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1. Introduction

Two core syntactic phenomena, movement and ellipsis, have common features in both conceptual and empirical grounds. Conceptually, the two share an operation “delete” and contain copies lacking phonological elements under the standard minimalistic treatments. Empirically, some categories can undergo both movement and ellipsis. VPs, for example, can undergo ellipsis, as shown in (1) and movement, as shown in (2).

---
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(1) a. Mag Wildwood wants to read Fred’s story, and I also want
to [read Fred’s story].
   b. You shouldn’t play with rifles because it’s dangerous to [play
      with rifles].
(2) … read Fred’s story, I also want to ___. (Johnson 2001:446)

APs also can undergo ellipsis, as shown in (3a) and movement, as shown in (3b).

(3) a. John is proud of himself, and Bill is [proud of himself], too.
   b. [How proud of himself] does John think Bill will be______?

Despite the fact that VPs and APs can undergo movement and ellipsis, it is not the case that all the categories freely undergo ellipsis and movement. For instance, CPs don’t undergo ellipsis, as shown in (4a) although the same CPs can undergo movement as in (4b).

(4) a. “Myron believed that the senator was guilty, but I didn’t believe
     [that the senator was guilty].” (CP ellipsis)
   b. That the senator was guilty, Myron didn’t believe.
     (CP movement)

In the case of PPs and DPs, movement is possible but ellipsis isn’t.

(5) a. *Jim can talk to Mary and Kim can talk [to Mary] too.
     (PP ellipsis)
   b. It’s [to Mary] that Jim said Kim can talk. (PP movement)
(6) A: I saw John’s brother.
   B: *I also saw [DP John’s brother]. (DP ellipsis)
(7) a. [DP John’s boss] appeared to be arrested___.
   b. [DP Which car] can you buy__now? (DP movement)

In the case of TPs and NPs, by contrast, ellipsis is allowed but movement is not. (Johnson 2001:443)

(8) a. Jose asks that we go to the meeting, and Sally will tell us when
    [TP we go to the meeting]. (TP ellipsis)
b. *It's [TP we go to the meeting] that Sally will tell us when__.
   (TP movement)

(9) a. John's book was good, but [TP Mary [D's [NP book]]] was even better.
   (NP ellipsis)
   b. *It's [NP story ] that Joe Bell will read Holly's__.
   (NP movement)

This paper aims to show that conditions on movement and ellipsis are not reducible to a single principle, and are subject to independent licensing principles in UG. We propose two overarching licensing conditions on movement and ellipsis. Our proposed licensing conditions explain why certain categories cannot undergo ellipsis or movement.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses what licenses ellipsis. Section 3 discusses which element can undergo movement. Section 4 discusses further issues like unique properties of VPs, nonfinite TPs like control and raising, peculiar behaviors of CPs, and exceptional properties of right node raising constructions (RNR). Conclusion and summary are presented in Section 5.

2. Licensing the Ellipsis

Following Ahn & Cho (2009), we suggest that only functional heads such as C, T, and D can bear the [E] feature (cf. Merchant 2001) which enables to license the ellipsis of their complements (cf. Lobeck 1995, 1999).1

The licensing condition advanced here has several nontrivial predictions. First, DP, PP, TP, and CP which are directly selected by V cannot be elided since they are complements of the lexical category V which gives a theta role.2

---

1 We assume without further discussion that T is a functional category that inherits its uninterpretable features from C following Chomsky (2007, 2008).

2 The licensing condition advanced here is a necessary condition. In order to account for the following examples, further sufficient condition should be added. Lobeck (1991) and Saito & Murasugi (1998) argue that only agreeing functional categories permit ellipsis of their complements. Here, we simply assume without further discussion that only agreeing functional categories can have an [E] feature. Due to additional condition, we predict that TP ellipsis and NP ellipsis are restricted to certain syntactic environments.
Ellipsis is barred

\[ V \rightarrow XP = DP, PP, TP, \text{and CP} \]

As shown in (11), DP cannot undergo ellipsis since it is complement of a lexical category V.\(^3\)

(11) A: I saw John's brother.
    B: *I also saw \([DP \text{ John's brother}]\).

PP cannot undergo ellipsis, either, as shown in (12) for the same reason.

(12) *Joe can talk to Mag Wildwood and Holly can talk \([PP \text{ to Mag Wildwood}]\) too. (Johnson 2001:444)

TP ellipsis in (13) is not possible because nonfinite "raising" TP is a direct complement of V which does not have an [E] feature.

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

CP cannot undergo ellipsis, as shown in (14), since CP is a complement of V.

(14) A: I regret that we bought the charcoal grill.
    B: *I don't regret \([CP \text{ that we bought the charcoal grill}]\).
    (cf. Kennedy & Merchant 2000:1)

Second, the analysis advanced here predicts that VP, AP, TP, and NP can be elided since they are complements of functional categories T,

(i) a. Miffy bought something, but I don't know what \([TP \text{ Miffy bought-something}]\), actually. (Aelbrecht 2011:6)
    b. Miffy didn't like Aggie's shoes, but I liked she liked Melanie's \([NP \text{ shoes}]\), as well. (Aelbrecht 2011:6)
(ii) a. *Miffy said she had bought a present, but I don't know whether \([TP \text{ Miffy bought-a-present}]\), actually. (Aelbrecht 2011:6)
    b. *Miffy likes the shoes and I liked the \([NP \text{ shoes}]\), as well. (Aelbrecht 2011:6)

\(^3\) We assume that \(\text{pro}\) cannot appear in finite clause in English unlike Korean.
C, and D, respectively.

(15) \[ \text{CP/TP/DP} \quad \text{Ellipsis is possible} \]
\[ \text{C/T/D} \quad \text{XP} = \text{TP, VP, AP and NP} \]

Finite TP can undergo ellipsis (which is known as "sluicing"), as shown in (16), because it is a complement of C that can have an [E] feature.

(16) Jose asks that we go to the meeting, and Sally will tell us when [TP we go to the meeting].

VP can also undergo ellipsis, as shown in (17) because the elided part is a complement of T.\(^4\)

(17) a. John drank beer, and Mary did \([VP \text{ drink beer}]\) too.
   b. John drank beer, and Mary also wanted to \([VP \text{ drink beer}]\).
   c. Ybarre-Jägger ate rutabaga, and Holly has \([VP \text{ eat rutabaga}]\) too.

AP too can undergo ellipsis, as shown in (18) since the elided part is a complement of T.

(18) John is proud of himself, and Bill is \([AP \text{ proud of himself}]\), too.

---

\(^4\) One might raise a question of identity between antecedent \(vP\) and elided \(vP\) in (17). Suppose (17) has the structure like (i).

(i) John \(T [\alpha \text{ John drank beer}], and Mary did \([VP \text{ drink beer}]\) too.

We have to note that the traces of Spec of \(v\) are A-movement traces. According to Lebeaux (2009), DP's before Case assignment/checking are not identical with those after Case assignment/checking. According to him, the elements in both the antecedent and elided \(vP\)'s are \(pros\). Hence, identity holds between two \(vP\)'s, as shown in (ii).

(ii) John \(T [\alpha \text{ pro1 drank beer}], and Mary did \([VP \text{ pro2 drink beer}]\) too.

Here pro1 and pro2 do not share the identical referential index, hence, the requirements for deletion do not necessarily meet "strict" identity, as is usually assumed in the previous work (cf. Merchant 2001).
NP can undergo ellipsis because it is a complement of a functional category D which can have an [E] feature.

(19) Mag will read Fred's story, and Joe Bell will read Holly's [NP story]. (Johnson 2001:443)

The analysis advanced here can also account for the contrast in (20).

(20) a. Ken said he could have heard the news, but George said that he could not ___.
    b. *Ken said he could sing, and he could obviously ___. (Ernst 1990:7)

Elements after Neg can also undergo ellipsis, as shown in (20a), while those after adverbs cannot, as shown in (20b). At some point of derivation, the second conjunct in (20a) has the structure like (21).

(21)  

```
TP
  ^
 DP  T
   ^
 he  T  NegP Ellipsis
     ^
 could  Neg  VP
        ^
          not  have heard the news
            [E]
```

The functional category, Neg has the [E] feature which enables its complement VP to undergo ellipsis.

The second conjunct in (20b) has the structure like (22).

(22)  

```
TP
  ^
 DP  T
   ^
 he  T  VP
     ^
 could  obviously  VP Ellipsis is barred!
         ^
          sing
```

Again, there is no functional projection to have an [E] feature to license the lower segment of VP that undergoes ellipsis. Thus, such ellipsis is not possible.
3. Licensing the Movement

Regarding movement, we suggest that only "phasal" constituents can undergo movement. Our proposal, first, accounts for the grammatical contrast between DP movement in (23a-b) and NP movement in (23c) since unlike DP, NP is not a phase, and hence cannot undergo movement.\(^5\)

(23) a. [DP John's boss] appeared to be arrested__.
   b. [DP Which car] can you buy__now?
   c. *It's [NP story] that Joe Bdl will read Holly's__.
   (Johnson 2001:443)

Let us consider PP movement, as shown in (24).

(24) [PP Up a huge hill] John ran. (Radford 1988:106)

Given that PP is a phase, the PP in (24) can undergo movement.\(^6\) TP, which is not a phase, cannot undergo movement, as shown in (25).

(25) *It's [TP we go to the meeting] that Sally will tell us when__.

---

\(^5\) One might wonder whether NP can undergo movement, as shown in (i).

(i) [Genius], Mary is t.

We can analyze the moved constituent in (i) as Predicate Phrase (PrP), whose evidence is observed in (ii).

(ii) a. John is [a banker] and [extremely rich].
   b. John is [moody] and [under the weather].
   c. John is [a superb athlete] and [in a class of his own]. (Radford 1988: 155)

The conjoined constituents in (ii) can be PrPs. Citko (2014: 137) argues that PrP is a phase. A similar explanation can be possible for (iii).

(iii) It is Green that her eyes are.

The moved constituent in (iii) can be PrP.

\(^6\) Drummond, Hornstein, and Lasnik (2010) provides evidence that TP is a phase.
In sum, our proposal can explain the ellipsis and movement asymmetries under the premises: (i) only functional categories can license the ellipsis of their complements, (ii) movable categories should be phases.

4. Further Implications

4.1 VP

This section discusses VP movement and ellipsis. According to our licensing condition, only phases can undergo movement. Hence, the moved constituent in (26) is not VP but vP.

(26) [Fix the car], I believe John did.

Huang (1993) shows that VP movement must be analyzed as vP movement. According to him, (27) has the structure like (28).

(27) John, said that wash himself[i/j] Bill, certainly would.
(28) John said that [t v [wash himself]] Bill certainly would t v.

Due to subject trace in the specifier position of vP in (28), the anaphor himself refers to only Bill. Then, one might have a question about VP

---

7 We also assume that the fronted "unaccusative" verb in (i) is also an instance of vPs or projections bigger than vPs (see Ahn (1991: chapter 2) for a detailed discussion).

8 Likewise, the moved constituent in (i) seems to be bigger than AP.

(i) [vP Leave] he did.

(i) [How proud of himself[i/j] does John think Bill] will be_______?

Considering the binding fact, (i) should be analyzed as (ii).

(ii) [t How proud of himself[i/j] does John think Bill] will be_______?

Since subject trace of Bill is contained in the moved constituent, the anaphora refers to only Bill. Suppose the subject is base-generated in spec of a and ap is a phase. Then the moved category in (ii) is not AP but ap that undergoes movement parallel to ap.
ellipsis, as shown in (17), repeated here as (29).

   b. John drank beer, and Mary also wanted to [VP drink beer].
   c. Ybarre-Jaegger ate rutabagas, and Holly has [VP eaten rutabagas] too.

v assigns a theta role, so they can be regarded as semi-lexical categories, which cannot have an [E] feature that licenses ellipsis. As a result, their complements, VPs are not expected to undergo ellipsis, contrary to fact. Thus, we suggest that the elided categories in (29) are in fact vPs that are selected by the functional head T that has an [E] feature, as shown in (30).

(30) a. John drank beer, and Mary did [vP drink beer] too.
   b. John drank beer, and Mary also wanted to [vP drink beer].
   c. Ybarre-Jaegger ate rutabagas, and Holly has [vP eaten rutabagas] too.

Thus, unlike other categories vPs can both undergo movement and ellipsis under our analysis.

We further note Johnson’s (2001) proposal. He indicates that VP ellipsis is reducible to the syntax of VP movement. He notes that VP ellipsis is not possible in an adjunct or subject infinitival, as shown in (31).

(31) a. *Mag Wildwood came to read Fred’s story, and I also came to [read Fred's story].
   b. *You shouldn’t play with rifles because to [play with rifles] is dangerous. (Johnson 2001: 441)

According to Johnson (2001:446), for a VP to elide it must first topicalize

---

movement, as discussed in the text.

Similarly, we can explain movement in (iii).

(iii) [Fond of every boy] some girl is.

The moved category in (iii) is not AP but aP that undergoes movement parallel to VP movement.
prior to ellipsis. Under the account, the ill-formedness of (31b) results form impossibility of VP movement.

(32) *You shouldn’t play with rifles because play with rifles [to ___] is dangerous. (Johnson 2001: 447)

However, Aelbrecht & Hægeman (2012) shows that VP movement and VP ellipsis are not distributionally equivalent, as shown in (33-34).

(33) a. *I knew that one student presented this article in my class but I can’t recall now which of the students [present this article]. did t. (Aelbrecht & Hægeman 2012: 599)
   b. *John hoped that Max would find his hat, but I wonder how [find it], she ever could t. (Emonds 1976)

(34) a. I knew that one student presented this article in my class but I can’t recall now which of the students did_____. (Aelbrecht & Hægeman 2012: 599)
   b. John hoped that Max would find his hat, but I wonder how she ever could _____. (Aelbrecht & Hægeman 2012: 599)

As shown in (33), VP topicalization is illicit in the domain of whe-extraction, whereas as shown in (34), VP ellipsis is licit in the same domain. Hence, here too conditions on movement and ellipsis are not reducible to a single principle.

4.2 Non-finite TPs: Control vs. Raising

In the case of control infinitivals, both ellipsis and movement are possible (Kyle Johnson by personal communication).

(35) John tries to solve the problem, and Mary also tries.
   (36) It’s [to get a job in Europe] that she really wants.

Given that control infinitivals are CPs, the second conjunct in (35) has the structure like (37).
(37) Mary also \[[VP \text{ tries } [CP \text{ C } \text{TP to solve the problem}]]\]
(here C is a null morpheme)

In (37) C has an [E] feature, so TP can be the target of ellipsis. In (36), CP \([\text{to get a job in Europe}]\) is a phase, so it can undergo movement.

Raising infinitivals, by contrast, cannot undergo ellipsis and movement, as shown in (38) (Kyle Johnson by p. c.).

(38) a. *John seems to solve the problem, Mary also seems.
   b. *It's [to procrastinate] that people tend.

Raising infinitival is generally treated as TP, which is directly selected by V, as shown in (39).

(39) Mary also \[[VP \text{ seems } [TP \text{ to solve the problem}]]\]

Thus, TP cannot be elided. Further note that TP isn't a phase, either, so TP movement is impossible.

Under the analysis advanced here, we can explain the following grammatical contrast in English.9

(40) a. *John seems to solve the problem, and Mary also seems.
   b. John tries to solve the problem, and Mary also tries.

We assume that the second conjunct in (40a) and (40b) have structures like (41a) and (41b), respectively.10

(41) a. Mary also \[[VP \text{ seems } [TP \text{ to solve the problem}]]\]

---

9 See Ahn (1991, chapter 2) for an alternative account of these contrasts in terms of the conjunctive ECP.
10 Ha (2009) also assumes that CP occurs only in the complement of control predicates. He accounts for the following grammatical contrast.

(i) a. Jane was not sure he could leave, but he tries to____.
   b. *John believed Mary to know French, but Peter believed Jane to _____.

As shown in (i), the control construction allows VP-ellipsis, but the ECM construction doesn't. He suggests that an occurrence of ellipsis depends on the existence of a functional projection, Ellipsis Phrase (EP). Given that EP can only be projected within CP, the control construction including CP in \textit{to infinitive} allows VP ellipsis.
b. Mary also [VP tries [CP to solve the problem]]

The raising verb *seem* takes TP as its complement, whereas the control verb *try* takes CP as its complement. At some point of derivation (40a) has the structure like (42).

\[(42) \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{TP}
\end{array} \quad \text{Ellipsis is barred.}
\]
\[
\text{seem} \\
\text{[E]} \\
\text{to solve the problem}
\]

Because V doesn’t have the [E] feature, TP ellipsis isn’t possible in (40). Hence, (40a) is not well-formed. Note that (40b) has the structure like (43) at some point of derivation.

\[(43) \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{CP}
\end{array} \quad \text{Ellipsis occurs}
\]
\[
\text{try} \\
\text{[E]} \\
\text{to solve the problem}
\]

Control C has the [E] feature, so TP can be the target of ellipsis. Therefore, (40b) is well-formed.

### 4.3 CP

Another issue we consider here is movement of CP as shown in (44).

\[(44) \quad \text{That the senator was guilty, Myron didn’t believe.}
\]

Interestingly, although CP is a phase, it cannot move in some cases as shown in (45).\(^\text{11}\)

\[\text{i) \quad [CP To provide good evidence, the employees joined a rigorous program voluntarily.}\]

\[^{11}\text{We assume that the following CP does not involve movement.}\]

\[^{11}\text{We assume that the following CP does not involve movement.}\]
(45) "That the senator was guilty, Myron didn’t hear.

It is not obvious why certain CPs cannot undergo movement. Kim (2011) suggests that when CPs are inherently nominal or D-like, they can undergo movement to Spec of TopP. Under this analysis, movable CPs are regarded as DPs in disguise. It substitution presents indirect evidence that CP can be a DP in disguise (Postal 2004).

(46) a. Myron believed that the senator was guilty, but I didn’t believe it.
   b. *Myron heard that the senator was guilty, but I didn’t hear it.

The CP in (44) can be replaced by a weak pronoun *it* as shown in (46a) but the CP in (45) can’t, as shown in (46b). Thus, it is predicted that only the former which is nominal can undergo movement.

CP fragments also show interesting distributions. As pointed out by Morgan (1973), CP fragments occur, as shown in (47-48).

(47) A: What does no one believe?
   B: *(That) I am taller than I really am.

(48) A: What are you ashamed of?
   B: *(That) I ignored you.

CP fragments in (47-48) pattern with CP displacements in (49-50) (Morgan 1973, Stowell 1981) since CP fragments are derived via move-and-delete (Merchant 2004):

(49) *(That) I’m taller than I really am, no one believes.
(50) *(That) I ignored you, I’m ashamed of.

The CP fragments in (47-48) should be “nominal” that undergoes movement prior to ellipsis:

(51) a. That I’m taller than I really am, [no-one-believes__].

---

position without movement.
b. That I ignored you, [I'm ashamed of ____].

A potential problem arise: Unlike CP movements, the distribution of CP fragments is much less restricted. For example, CP movement is degraded as shown in (52) (cf. (45)), while the corresponding CP fragment answer is relatively ok as in (53). 12

(52) *That the senator was guilty, I heard.
(53) A: What did you hear?
    B: That the senator was guilty.

Regarding the CP fragment in (53B), we have to note that as argued by Ahn & Cho (2012), English has two types of fragments; case-marked fragments and caseless fragments. Ahn & Cho (2012) proposes that the two types of fragments in English have different structures and their interpretative mechanisms are systematically different. Case-marked fragments have full sentential structures prior to ellipsis and the interpretation follows from the sentential structures that are the sources of propositional interpretations. Caseless fragments, on the other hand, are non-sentential XPs whose interpretations come directly from pragmatics-discourse. Following this, we suggest that (53B) is not derived by move-and-delete operation and that it is base-generated in a similar way to caseless fragments. Thus, (Caseless) CP fragments may not pattern with CP movement.

12 Ginzberg & Sag (2000:300) shows that VP, TP and AP fragments in (i-iii) pattern with non-elliptical counterparts in (iv-vi).

(i) A: What did you make Bo do?
    B: *(To) leave the house.
(ii) A: What did you force Bo to do?
    B: *(To) leave the house.
(iii) A: How did Bo seem?
    B: *(To be) sick.
(iv) *(To) leave the house] I made Bo.
(v) *(To) leave the house] I forced Bo.
(vi) *(To be) sick] Bo seemed.

Merchant (2004:697) claims that the non-elliptical counterparts are distinctly odd in American English. He suggests that the constraints that give rise to their oddity are similar to a wide range of amelioration effects induced by ellipsis.
4.4 Right Node Raising

The analysis advanced here has a couple of implications on right node raising (RNR). According to Ross (1967), Maling (1972), Bresnan (1974), Postal (1974, 1993), and Hudson (1976), RNR involves movement. Note, however, that TP RNR and NP RNR occur as shown in (54) (Bošković 2004: fn. 4)

(54) a. John asked when___, but he didn’t why, Mary left.
   TP RNR
   b. I like expensive___, and you like cheap, dresses.
   NP RNR

Such analyses seem to be incompatible with our analysis since we suggest that TP and NP are immobile since they aren't phases.

Movement analyses of RNR encounter several crucial problems. The shared constituent in RNR can be buried within an island.

(55) a. John knows a man who likes ___ and Bill knows a man who dislikes, syntax.
   b. John wondered whether Mary bought ___ and Bill wondered whether Sue sold, the car.

Bošković (2004) shows that VP RNR in (56) differs from VP preposing in (57) and that VP RNR patterns with VP ellipsis in (58).

(56) a. Mary must have, and Bill could have, been being hassled by the police.
   b. Mary must have been, and Bill could have been, being hassled by the police.
(57) a. *Been being hassled by the police, Bill must have.
   b. *Being hassled by the police, Bill must have been.
(58) a. Mary must have been being hassled by the police, and Bill must have too.
   b. Mary must have been being hassled by the police, and Bill must have been too.
RNR of a certain DP (complement of P) is also observed, stranding prepositions.

(59) Mary talked to and Sally talked about, Marilyn Manson. RNR of DP (Johnson 2007:15)

However, as noted by Johnson (2007:16), rightward movement cannot strand prepositions.

(60) *Mary talked to __ yesterday Marilyn Manson.

Hence, impossibility of P-stranding in rightward movement shows that RNR in (60) does not involve movement.

Certain CPs undergo RNR, as shown in (61).

(61) Mary heard, and John said, that Tom was a secret agent.
    (An 2007:85)

In contrast to CP RNR in (61), the corresponding CP movements are not possible:

(62) a. *[CP that Tom was a secret agent], Mary heard.
    b.*[CP that Tom was a secret agent], John said.

Thus, RNR is unlikely to be a result of (rightward) movement.

Right node raising construction may receive an ellipsis analysis. Some previous literature suggests that RNR involves ellipsis (An 2007, Bošković 2004, Ha 2008, Hartmann 2000, Sag 1976, Wilder 1997). In an ellipsis account, the first copy of the target is deleted under identity with the second or third copy of the target, which remains in-situ in the second or third conjunct.

Such analyses seem to be incompatible with our analysis on ellipsis since we suggest that only complements of functional categories can undergo ellipsis. Several pieces of evidence are observed against ellipsis analysis of RNR. First, RNR shows collectivity effects whose triggers are distributed across conjuncts, which may run afoul of ellipsis account (cf. Grosz 2009, Barros & Vicente 2010).
(63) a. Alice is proud that Beatrix and Claire is glad that Diana (have/has) travelled to Cameroon.
   b. I saw the linguist yesterday and I'll meet the philosopher tomorrow who (were/was) singing at the ice-cream social.

Second, non-constituents can undergo RNR, which is problematic for some ellipsis approaches, and problematic for all movement analyses:

(64) a. [a positively___] and [a negatively charged electrode]
   (Wilder 1997:86)
   b. [the in___] and [the output] of this machine....
   (Hohle 1991)

Third, DP, PP, and CP undergo RNR, as shown in (65).

(65) a. John enjoyed, but Jane disliked, the TV show.  
   RNR of DP (Ha 2008:101)
   b. John can talk, and Mary must talk, about that old guy. 
   RNR of PP
   c. Mary suspected, and John believed, that Tom was a secret agent.  RNR of CP (An 2007:85)

Note, however, that DP, PP, and CP ellipsis aren’t allowed, as shown in (66).

(66) a. *John enjoyed [NP the TV show], but Jane disliked △.
   (Ha 2008:101)
   b. *John can talk [PP to that old guy], and Mary must talk △.
   c. *Mary suspected [CP that Tom was a secret agent], but John believed △.

Thus, ellipsis analysis of RNR in English is not tenable, either.

5. Conclusion
Although movement and ellipsis share an operation "delete" and contain copies lacking phonological elements, categories that undergo these two operations do not seem to be identical. Our proposal explains the ellipsis and movement asymmetries under the following premises: (i) only functional categories can license the ellipsis of their complements, (ii) movable categories should be phases.

Under the analysis advanced here, VP movement and ellipsis are analyzed as V movement and VP ellipsis. In the case of V, when it is a complement of a functional category T that has an [E] feature, it undergoes ellipsis. Further, since V is a phase, it is movable.

We have also discussed some peculiar properties of CPs. Although they are phases, there are restrictions on movement of CPs. In contrast to CP movements, however, CP fragments freely occur. We suggest that CP fragments are not always derived by move-and-delete operation and that they are in some cases base-generated in a similar way to caseless fragments.

RNRS seem to violate our licensing conditions on movement and ellipsis, which implies that RNR may neither involve ellipsis nor movement.
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