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1. Introduction

Ahn & Cho (2009, 2010) suggest that as a necessary condition, ellipsis occurs when functional heads such as C, T, and D can bear an [E] feature (cf. Merchant 2001) which enables to license the ellipsis of their complements. Along the same vein, they suggest that a lexical category like V or semi-lexical category v which gives a theta role cannot have an [E] feature. According to Ahn & Cho (2009, 2010), the missing element in (1) is not an instance of DP ellipsis but a pro.

*An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 2011 spring conference of the Korean Generative Grammar Circle held at the global campus of Kyung Hee University. We thank the participants of the conference and anonymous reviewers of this journal for useful comments. This paper was supported by Konkuk University in 2010 (first author).
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  I-Top John-Gen brother-Acc see/meet-Past-Dec
  'I saw/met John’s brother.'
B: na-to ___ poa/manna-ss-ta.
  I-Too see/meet-Past-Dec
  'Lit. I also saw/met (him).'

Recently, Lee & Kim (2010) claim that Korean has both pro and DP ellipsis. This paper aims to explore the examples that seem to be DP ellipsis and argue that it indeed involves pro.

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 briefly summarizes main points in Ahn & Cho (2009, 2010). Section 3 shows how well the problematic examples Lee & Kim (2010) point out can be explained under pro analysis advanced here. Section 3 further discusses other issues pro analyses might encounter. Concluding remarks are provided in Section 4.


Ahn & Cho (2009, 2010) explore the following examples showing absence of CP ellipsis.

(2) A: Na-nun [Yenghi-ka Toli-lul salangha-n-ta-ko]
  I-Top Y.-Nom T.-Acc love-Pres-Dec-C
  sayngkakha-n-ta.
  think-Pres-Dec
  'I think Yenghi loves Toli.'
B: *Na-to ___ sayngkakha-n-ta.
  I-also think-Pres-Dec
  'Lit. I think too.'

Ahn & Cho (2009, 2010) 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).\(^2\)

---

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

2 As pointed out by Ahn & Cho (2010), this is a necessary condition for ellipsis. Some functional categories cannot license ellipsis of their complement as shown in (i).
Thus, DP and CP which are directly 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.

\[
\text{(3)} \quad \text{\*VP/\(v\)P - Ellipsis is barred.} \\
\text{V/\(v\)XP = DP, CP and so on.}^{3,4}
\]

However, there is an example which apparently shows that CP ellipsis seems to be allowed.

\[
\text{(4) A: na-nun [Yenghi-ka Toli-lul salangha-n-ta-ko]} \\
\text{I-Top Y.-Nom T.-Acc love-Pres-Dec-C} \\
\text{mit-nun-ta.} \\
\text{believe-Pres-Dec} \\
\text{‘I believe Yenghi loves Toli.’} \\
\text{B: na-to ___ mit-nun-ta.} \\
\text{I-too believe-Pres-Dec} \\
\text{‘Lit. I believe too.’}
\]

(i) *I think [\(CP (\text{that}) [\text{TP John loves Mary}]\)].

In (i), the functional category C, whether it is overt or not, doesn’t license ellipsis of its complement, TP. Lebeck (1990) 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 sufficient conditions for licensing ellipsis require deeper considerations that we will put aside in this paper.

3 CP and DP cannot undergo ellipsis, as shown in (i-ii).

(ii) A: I saw John’s brother.

B: *I also saw [\(\text{John’s brother}\)].

PP and IP/TP, for example, cannot undergo ellipsis when they are complements of lexical categories, as shown in (iii). (Johnson 2001: 441-444)

(i) a. *Joe can talk to Mag Wildwood and Holly can talk [\(\text{to Mag Wildwood}\)] too.

b. *Jim started running down the street, but only after Jose started [\(\text{running down the street}\)].

c. *John seems to solve the problem, and Mary also seems [\(\text{to solve the problem}\)].

4 This licensing condition can naturally predict and explain absence of CP and DP ellipsis both in Korean and English. Unless there is any compelling evidence against this, we regard this licensing condition as a null hypothesis.
Ahn & Cho (2009, 2010) argue that the missing constituent is in fact a \textit{pro}, but not a result of CP complement ellipsis (see Park 2009 for an alternative analysis, and a reply from Ahn & Cho 2010). Note that the perceived interpretation of (4B) is the same as the ones in (5a). Thus, the missing constituent in (4B) can be \textit{pro} as in (5b).

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(5)] a. na-to ku kes/sasil-ul mit-nun-ta.
   I-too that thing/fact-Acc believe-Pres-Dec
   \textquoteleft I believe that fact.\textquoteright
b. na-to \textit{pro} mit-nun-ta.
\end{enumerate}

In contrast, where \textit{pro} is not allowed, the embedded constituent cannot be missing, as shown in (6), which indicates that CP ellipsis is barred.\footnote{An anonymous reviewer points out that the omission possibilities of CP in Korean might be related to lexical idiosyncracy of matrix verbs. The reviewer further notes the fact that among English matrix verbs which take \textit{so} as their complements, only a limited set of them allows phonological suppression of \textit{so}, as shown in (i): (i) a. I guess/expect/suppose (\textit{so}). b. I think/believe *\textit{(so)}. We believe that selection of \textit{so} is a matter of \textit{s}-selection, while selection of DP discussed in the text is an instance of \textit{c}-selection. However, the issue cannot be settled down here, which is beyond the scope of this paper.}

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(6)] a. Na-to [Yenghi-ka Soli-lul salangha-n-ta-ko]
   I-too Y.-Nom S.-Acc love-Pres-Dec-C
   sayngkakha-n-ta.
   think-Pres-Dec
   \textquoteleft I think that Yenghi loves Soli.\textquoteright
b. *Na-to ku kes-ul sayngkakha-n-ta.
   I-too the fact-Acc think-Pres-Dec
   \textquoteleft I think the fact.\textquoteright
\end{enumerate}

Ahn & Cho (2009, 2010) further claim that apparent missing CP in (4B) cannot be directly derived from DP ellipsis of \textit{ku kes/sasil-ul} \textquoteleft that thing/fact-Acc\textquoteright{} in (5a) since on a par with CP ellipsis, DP ellipsis cannot be properly licensed by functional heads, either.
3. The Interpretation of Pro: A Reply to Lee & Kim (2010)

Lee & Kim (2010) argue that the example in (7) can be problematic under the pro analysis advanced by Ahn & Cho (2009, 2010). They claim that the sloppy interpretation of (7B) may not be explained under the analysis assuming the pro with no internal structure.7

(7) A: Yenghi-nun [caki-uy nonmwun-i hwullyungha-ta-ko]
   Y.-Top self-Gen paper-Nom great-Dec-C
   mit-nun-ta.
   believe-Pres-Dec
   ‘Yenghi believes that her paper is great.’
B: Ha-ci-man, Toli-nun ___ mîtci anh-nun-ta.
   But, T.-Top believe not-Pres-Dec
   ‘Lit. But, Toli doesn’t believe.’

First of all, it is not clear whether (7B) also yields sloppy interpretation. To our ears, sloppy reading is less prominent than strict reading.8 For

---

6 As an anonymous reviewer points out, the examples in (4-6) may be equally accounted for under DP ellipsis analyses. However, conceptually our analysis can provide a uniform analysis for the absence of CP and DP ellipsis in English and Korean (see Ahn & Cho 2009 and fn. 4). Empirically our analysis can explain the absence of sloppy readings in null object constructions as we will see in section 3 contra Lee & Kim (2010).

7 An anonymous reviewer points out the possibility that even the pro analysis itself can account for sloppy identity interpretation if we adopt the analysis put forward in Fiengo & May (1994). Our analysis, however, departs from them since we are not assuming LF-copying analysis of ellipsis phenomena here.

8 Note that unlike (7B), sloppy reading is more easily obtained in the following example:
      Yenghi-Top self-Gen mom-Acc criticize-Pst-Dec
      ‘Yenghi criticized her mom.’
   B: Toli- to ___ piphanhay-ss-ta.
      Toli-Too criticize-Pst-Dec
      ‘Lit. Toli did, too.’ (= Toli criticized his own mom/Yenghi’s mom)

   We suggest that the missing object in (iB) is pro which is equivalent to emma-lul ‘mom-Acc’ in the following:
   (ii) Toli- to emma-lul piphanhay-ss-ta.
      Toli-Too criticize-Pst-Dec
      ‘Lit. Toli criticized mom.’

   Following Hoji (1998), we assume that a nominal projection whose sole content is its head N can be interpreted in various ways as the bare nominal in Korean. Then, the
those who can get sloppy(-like) reading in (7B), the following sentence may also yield sloppy(-like) reading.9

(7') Haci-man, Toli-nun kulen kes/sasil-ul mitci anh-nun-ta.

But, T.-Top that thing/fact-Acc believe not-Pres-Dec
‘But, Toli doesn’t believe that (fact).’

Then, the sloppy(-like) reading in (7B) can be derived from the pro interpretation of (7B) that is equivalent to kulen kes/sasil-ul ‘that thing/fact’ in (7’).10

Lee & Kim (2010:1022) argue that examples in (8) confirm that not content of the null argument is supplied by the context (henceforth the supplied N head). The supplied N head can be emma ‘mom’ in (8B)/(ii), and can function on a par with an indefinite in English. Hence, the “sloppy-like” reading can be obtained in (8B). This line of explanation, however, cannot be extended to (7B), and hence sloppy-like or sloppy reading is not expected in (7B) unlike (8B).

9 Ahn & Cho (2010) have indicated this possibility with similar examples in the text about which Lee & Kim (2010) report different judgments from ours.

10 Oku (1998) and Saito (2007) pointed out that sloppy reading is not possible in (8B) where the missing subject is replaced by a pronoun (example taken from Saito 2007:203):

(i) A: Hanako-wa [zibun-no teian-ga saiyoosaru to] omotte iru
H-Top self-Gen proposal-Nom accepted-be that think
‘Hanako thinks that her proposal will be accepted.’ (sloppy reading ok)
B: Taroo-mo [sore-ga saiyoosaru to] omotte iru
T-also it-NOM accepted-be that think
‘Taroo also thinks that her proposal will be accepted.’ (sloppy reading ok)

Similar contrast may be found in Korean:

J-Top self-Gen proposal-Nom be chosen-that think
‘John thinks that his proposal will be chosen.’ (sloppy reading ok)
B: Mary-to [ku kes-i chaytaktoylkela-ko] sayngkakhanta.
M-Top that-nom be chosen-that think
‘Mary also thinks that his proposal will be chosen.’ (sloppy reading *)

Note, however, that when the subject is unpronounced, sloppy reading seems to be available.

(iii) Mary-to [___ chaytaktoylkela-ko] sayngkakhanta.
M-Top be chosen-that think
‘Mary also thinks that her proposal will be chosen.’ (sloppy reading ok)

The seemingly sloppy reading in (iii) appears to be related to the following sentence:

(iv) Mary-to [ceyan-i chaytaktoylkela-ko] sayngkakhanta.
M-Top proposal-Nom be chosen-that think
‘Lit. Mary also thinks that the proposal will be chosen.’ (sloppy reading ok)

In other words, the source of sloppy reading in (iii) seems to be equivalent to sloppy-like reading in (iv) as discussed in Hoji (1998) and fn. 8.
all null arguments are explained as *pro*-drop. They claim that if Ahn & Cho (2010) are right, *pro* could be replaced by an overt pronominal *ku-ka* ‘he’ as in (8B’), which is not a correct interpretation of (8B).

(8) A: Nwukwuna Cheli-lul cohaa-y.
    whoever   C-Acc  like-Dec
    ‘Everyone likes Cheli.’
B: ___ Tongswu-to cohaa-y
    T-also  like-Dec
    ‘(Lit) Everyone likes Tongswu, too.’
B’: Ku-ka Tongswu-to cohaa-y.
    he-Nom  T-also  like-Dec
    ‘He likes Tongswu, too.’

We are sympathetic with their judgment concerning (8B’) which cannot yield the reading that (8B) does, namely, ‘whoever’ or ‘everyone’-like reading.

Recall that Ahn & Cho (2010) show the distribution of *pro* is parallel to the distribution of *ku kes* as shown in (5), repeated here as (9).

(9) a. na-to ku kes/sasil-ul mit-nun-ta.
    I-too that thing/fact-Acc believe-Pres-Dec
    ‘I believe that fact.’
b. na-to *pro* mit-nun-ta.

Note, however, that the claim that *pro* is allowed only when nominal is allowed does not imply that the interpretation of *pro* and overt pronoun is identical in all respects. The parallel distribution between (9a) and (9b) just shows that missing element is not a CP but a nominal. However, it is not at all clear if the semantic content of the *pro* in (9b) exactly parallels that of *ku kes/sasil-ul* ‘that thing/fact-Acc’ in (9a).

With this problem in mind, let us reconsider the possible overt (semantic) counterpart of the *pro* in (8B). We suggest that the singular pronoun *ku-ka* ‘he-Nom’ as in (8B’) is not a proper semantic counterpart of it since the *pro* in (8B) is interpreted as a definite plural nominal, one of the interpretations a bare nominal in Korean can have since Korean is an article-less language. Thus, we would like to suggest that the interpretation of (8B) is rather similar to (10).
Then, we can still maintain the pro analysis of missing subject in (8B) where the pro is semantically equivalent not to singular pronouns but to plural pronouns like ku-tul-i ‘he-Pl-Nom’.

A similar phenomenon is observed in object position, as shown in (11).

(11) A: Cheli-ka nwukwuna cohaha-y.
    Cheli-Nom whoever like-Dec
    ‘Cheli likes everyone.’
B. Tongswu-to ___ cohaha-y
    T.-also like-Dec
    ‘(Lit) Tongwu likes Everyone, too.’

Here, too, the pro in (11B) is interpreted as a definite plural nominal ku-tul-ul ‘he-Pl-Acc’.

Scope facts in the following examples further support our claim that the pro can be interpreted as a definite plural nominal.\(^{11}\) \(^{12}\)

---

\(^{11}\) Suh (1989), Baek (1998), and Kim (2000) report that sentences like (12A) allow both the ‘all > neg’ and ‘neg > all’ readings. Regarding the scope interpretation of (12B), there is no previous research in Korean as far as we know. One might doubt how the sentence like (12B) has the scope reading different from its antecedent clause like (12A). However, consider the contrast between (iA) and (iB).

(i) A: Na-nun motun chamkaca-lul mannci mos ha-ko ilpwu-man manna-ss-ta.
    I-Nom all participant-Acc meet neg do-C some-only meet-Past-Dec
    ‘I didn’t meet all the participants and met only some participants.’
B: ??Na-to mannci mos ha-ko ilpwu-man manna-ss-ta.
    I-also meet neg do-C some-only meet-Past-Dec
    ‘I didn’t meet either and met only some participants.’

The slight grammatical contrast in (iA) and (iB) is related to the fact that ‘neg > all’ reading is unavailable in (iB) and the second clause isn’t well-suited. Hence, the contrast supports that (12B) has only ‘all > neg’ reading.

\(^{12}\) An anonymous reviewer points out the following example.

(j) A. Chelswu-nun Swunhi-ka motun yenghwa-lul cohaha-n-ta-ko mit-ci anh-nun-ta.
    C-Top S-Nom all movie-Acc like-Pres-Dec-C believe not-Pres-Dec
    ‘Chelswu doesn’t believe Swunhi likes all the movie.’
B. Yenghi-to mitci anh-nun-ta.
    Yenghi-alo believe not-Pres-Dec
   I-Nom all participant-Acc meet neg do-Past-Dec
   'I didn’t meet all the participants.' (all > neg, neg > all)

   B: Na-to mannaci mos hay-ss-ta.
   I-also meet neg do-Past-Dec
   '(Lit.) I didn’t meet, either.' (all > neg reading only)

The scope fact in (12B) is similar to the one observed in overt pronoun, as shown in (13) where the object pronoun must take widest scope.13

(13) Na-to ku-tul-ul mannaci mos hay-ss-ta.
   I-also he-Pl-Acc meet neg do-Past-Dec
   '(Lit.) I didn’t meet them, either.'

A similar scope fact is observed in the case of missing subject, as shown in (14).

(14) A: Na-nun motun chamkaca-ka Yenghi-lul mannaci
   I-Nom all participant-Nom Y.-Acc meet
   mos hay-ss-ta-ko sayngkakha-n-ta.
   neg do-Past-Dec-C think-Pres-Dec
   'I think that all the participants didn’t meet Yenghi.'
   (all > neg, neg > all)

   Yenghi doesn’t believe, either.'

In (iB), the negation is in the matrix clause, and only 'neg > all' reading seems to be possible parallel to (iA). This scope parallelism, however, can be explained without assuming DP ellipsis analysis since the similar scope phenomenon occurs in (i) where DP ellipsis is not involved.

(ii) Yenghi-to ku kes-ul mitci anh-nun-ta.
   Yenghi-alo the thing-Acc believe not-Pres-Dec
   'Yenghi doesn’t believe the fact, either.'

13 It is not obvious whether pronouns are scope-bearing elements or not. Perhaps they simply do not take any scope like ‘pseudo-specific’ nominals in the sense of Enç (1991) (see also Fodor & Sag 1982 for relevant discussion of widest scope for the so-called referential indefinites). Generics as in (i) also seem to pattern with (null) pronouns with respect to scope-taking: i.e., they always take widest scope (see Rizzi (1986: 515-516) for related discussion on scope of generics and Italian object *pro*).
B: Na-to Yenghi-lul mannaci mos hay-ss-ta-ko sayngkakha-y.
I-also Y.-Acc meet neg do-Past-Dec-C think-Dec
'(Lit) I think that (they) didn’t meet Y, either.’
(all > neg reading only)

The scope disambiguity in (14B) is similar to the one observed in (15)

(15) Na-to ku-tul-i Yenghi-lul mannaci mos hay-ss-ta-ko
I-also they-Pl-Nom Y.-Acc meet neg do-Past-Dec-C sayngkakha-y.
think-Dec
'(Lit) I think that (they) didn’t meet Y, either.’ (all > neg only)

If Lee & Kim (2010) is right in that the missing elements are all
derived from DP ellipsis, it is not clear how the above scope asymmetries can be accommodated.

Lee & Kim (2010) further note that (16B) is problematic under the
pro analysis of null object since (16B’), an expected paraphrase under
pro analysis according to them, cannot be semantically equivalent to
(16A).

(16) A: na-nun amwuto an manna-ss-e.
   I-Top anyone neg meet-Past-Dec
   ‘I did not meet anyone.’
B: na-to ___ an manna-ss-e.
   I-too neg meet-Past-Dec
   ‘I did not meet anyone, either.’
B’: na-to ku-lul an manna-ss-e.
   I-too he-Acc neg meet-Past-Dec
   ‘I did not meet him, either.’

We argue that missing object in (16B), however, can be construed as
proarb (arbitrary pro) which is roughly equivalent to salam-tul-ul
‘people-Pl-Acc’ in Korean. Then, the interpretation of (16B) can be
semantically similar to ‘I didn’t meet anyone’.14 Thus, it is not necessary

14 Note that the proarb interpretation of (16B) is semantically "similar" but not "identical"
to the NPI interpretation of (16A). Regarding arbitrary pro, see Jaeggli (1986) and Rizzi
(1986). We will not explore the precise semantic distinction of the two readings in this
to assume the NPI *amwuto* deletion in (16B) contra Lee & Kim (2010).

According to Takahashi (2008), (17B) has either strict or sloppy interpretation.

(17) A: Taroo-wa sanin-no sensei-o sonkeisiteiru.
   T.-Top three-Gen teacher-Acc respects
   ‘Taroo respects three teacher.’
   B: Hanako-mo __ sonkeisiteiru.
   Hanako also respects
   ‘(Lit.) Hanako respects, too.’

Three teachers Hanako respects can be the same individuals Taroo respects or they can be different from individuals Taroo respects. Um (2011: 85) claims that a similar phenomenon is observed in Korean, which is problematic under *pro* analyses such as Moon (2010).

(18) A: Chelswu-nun sey myeng-uy sensayngnim-ul
   C.-Top three Cl-Gen teacher-Acc
   conkyengha-n-ta.
   respect-Pres-Dec
   ‘Chelswu respects three teachers.’
   B: Yenghi-to ttohan conkyengha-n-ta.
   Y.-also also respect-Pres-Dec
   ‘Yenghi respects, too.’

(18B) can have the interpretation that Yenghi respects three teachers who are different from the ones that Chelswu respects. The sloppy interpretation of (18B) can also be problematic under the *pro* analysis advanced here. However, regarding availability of sloppy reading of (18B), there seems to be speakers’ variation. Some speakers including us cannot get the exact sloppy interpretation. We rather get the interpretation like the following which is coined as sloppy-like reading à la Hoji (1998).

(19) Yenghi-to ttohan sensayngnim-ul conkyengha-n-ta.
    Y.-also also teacher-Acc respect-Pres-Dec
    ‘Yenghi respects teachers, too.’
Note that (19) is not exactly semantically identical to (18A). However, under this particular context, (18A) can be a subset reading of (19), and with relevant pragmatic adjustments such as implicature strategy (19) can yield pragmatic interpretation like (18A). As a result, (18B) can yield sloppy-like reading like (18A) since (18A) involves the pro that is equivalent to sensayngnim-ul 'teacher-Acc' in (19).15 Thus, here too, it is not necessary to postulate DP ellipsis for sloppy reading contra Takahashi (2008) and Um (2011).

Regarding sloppy interpretation of missing nominal, another interesting example is observed with a reflexive, as shown in (20). As pointed out by Um (2011), the sloppy interpretation in (20B) can be problematic under the pro analysis advanced here and Moon (2010).

(20) A: Chelswu-ka casin-ul pinanhay-ss-ta.
    Chelswu-Nom self-Acc criticize-Past-Dec
    'Chelswu criticized himself.'
B: Yenghi-to ec pinanhay-ss-ta.
    Y.-also criticize-Past-Dec
    'Yenghi criticized, too.'

Note that Hoji (1998) explores a similar phenomenon in Japanese.

(21) A: John-ga zibunzisin-o suisensita.
    John-Tom self-Acc recommended
    'John recommended himself.'
B: Bill-mo ec suisensita.
    Bill-also recommended
    'Bill recommended too.'

Hoji claims that the sloppy interpretation in (21B) can be of the same nature as the coreferential interpretation in (22B).

15 An anonymous reviewer asks a question on availability of sloppy-like reading in English indefinites. As shown in (iiB-iiB), parallel to bare nominals in Korean, indefinite nominals in English may have sloppy-like readings, too.

(i) A: I met three students.
    B: I met students, too.
(ii) A: Mary criticized her students.
    B: Bill criticized students, too.
(22) A: John-ga zibunzisin-o suisensita.
    John-Tom self-Acc recommended
    ‘John recommended himself.’
B: Bill,mo Bill,o suisensita.
    Bill-also Bill-Acc recommended
    ‘Bill, recommended Bill, too.’

Hoji (1995: 138) further argues that Principle B of the Binding theory is not violated in (21B) since bound variable anaphora is involved here, following the spirit of Reinhart (1983), according to which the (syntactic) binding theory, namely, the Principle B, concerns only the distribution of bound variable anaphora, and not the possibilities of coreference.

Likewise, the sloppy interpretation of (20B) can be of the same nature of the coreferential interpretation in (23B).

(23) A: Chelswu-ka casin-ul pinanhay-ss-ta.
    Chelswu-Nom self-Acc criticize-Past-Dec
    ‘Chelswu criticized himself.’
B: Yenghi,to Yenghi-lul pinanhay-ss-ta.
    Y.-also Y.-Acc criticize-Past-Dec
    ‘Yenghi, criticized Yenghi, too.’

Therefore, this data set can also be covered by the pro analysis, and hence DP ellipsis analysis is not required.

4. Concluding Remarks

We have shown that Lee & Kim’s (2010) arguments against the pro analysis advanced by Ahn & Cho (2009, 2010) are not convincing. More specifically we have shown that the apparent counter-examples raised by Lee & Kim’s (2010) can be explained under our pro analysis. We claim that pro can be interpreted as either referentially or arbitrarily. When it is interpreted arbitrarily, it is equivalent to bare plural nominals.
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