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This paper aims to resolve apparent problems of pro analysis of null arguments. Ahn & Cho (2011a,b,c, 2012a,b) suggest that sloppy-like interpretation of null arguments arises when the missing argument, i.e. pro is roughly equivalent to a bare nominal and that the interpretation is derived by pragmatic explicature that can be cancelled, unlike genuine sloppy interpretation. Park & Bae (2012) and Park & Oh (2013) argue that the so-called identity reading of null argument constructions can be best accounted for by the ellipsis analysis. A clear understanding of the cases demonstrated for the identity reading can provide a basis for claiming that they are not regarded as counter-examples for pro analysis. The interpretational discrepancy between bare nominals and null arguments arises because some contexts force generic interpretations of bare nominals. Hence, presence of identity readings is not arguments against the pro analysis.
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1. Introduction


* We would like to thank Myung-Kwan Park for his helpful inputs and suggestions on earlier ideas. Portions of this paper were presented at the Summer Conference of the Society of Modern Grammar at Yeungnam University (August 2013). We thank anonymous reviewers of this journal for useful comments.
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(1) A: Swunhi-ka sensayngnim-ul sey pwun-ul manna-ss-e.
   S.-Nom teacher-Acc three Cl-Acc meet-Pst-Dec
   ‘Swunhi met three teachers.’
B: Yenghi-to _ sensayngnim-ul manna-ss-e.
   Y.-also teacher-Acc meet-Pst-Dec
   ‘Lit. Yenghi met, too.’

Many people indicate that (1A) can be interpreted as either ‘Yenghi also met the same three teachers Swunhi met.’ (strict reading) or ‘Yenghi also met three teachers different from the ones Swunhi met’ (sloppy reading).

Ahn & Cho (2012b), however, suggest that the second reading is not genuine sloppy interpretation but sloppy-like interpretation and that its source hinges on the possibility that the null argument pro refers to the NP part of QP structure, as shown in (2).

(2) QP
   Pro → NP
   sensayngnim-ul sey pwun-ul (ul)

Ahn & Cho further claim that when pro refers to the NP sensayngnim-ul ‘teacher-Acc’, a sloppy-like reading arises like the following sentence (1'B):

(1') A: Swunhi-ka sensayngnim-ul sey pwun-ul manna-ss-e.
   S.-Nom teacher-Acc three Cl-Acc meet-Pst-Dec
   ‘Swunhi met three teachers.’
B: Yenghi-to sensayngnim-ul manna-ss-e.
   Y.-also teacher-Acc meet-Pst-Dec
   ‘Yenghi met teachers, too.’

Note that (1'B) can be easily interpreted as ‘Yenghi also met three teachers different from the ones Swunhi met’ in this particular context. Ahn & Cho propose that the seemingly sloppy reading ‘three teachers’ in (1B) patterns with (1'B) in that they both are instances of “sloppy-like” readings that result from pragmatic explicatures.¹

¹ Pragmatic intrusion into Grice's notion of what is said was analyzed as explicature in relevance theory (Sperber & Wilson 1986). Recanati (2004) postulated pragmatic enrichment process called "saturation" whereby a given slot, position, or variable in the linguistically decoded logical form
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The sloppy-like reading induced by explicatures is cancellable (similar to implicatures; hence, they are pragmatically induced), as shown in (3), which essentially supports the pro analysis of (1B) parallel to (1'B).

(3) A: Swunhi-ka sensayngnim-ul sey pwun-ul manna-ss-e.
   S.-Nom teacher-Acc three Cl-Acc meet-Pst-Dec
   ‘Swunhi met three teachers.’
B: Yenghi-to (sensayngnim-ul) manna-ss-e. kulentey Yenghi-nun
   Y.-also teacher-Acc meet-Pst-Dec but Y.-Top
   (sensayngnim-ul) twu pwun-(ul) manna-ss-e.
   teacher-Acc two Cl-(Acc) meet-Pst-Dec
   ‘Lit. Yenghi met (teachers), too. But Yenghi met two teachers.’

Park & Bae (2012) and Park & Oh (2013) claim that some constructions induce the so-called identity readings, which are captured only by ellipsis. For example, Park & Oh (2013) argue that interpretation of null argument in modifier + noun constructions below can be best accounted for by the ellipsis analysis.

(4) A: John-un khi khun yeca-lul coahay.
   J.-Top height tall woman-Acc like
   ‘John likes tall women.’
B: Bill-to _ coahay.
   B.-also like
   ‘Bill also likes tall women.’
C: Bill-to yeca-lul coahay.
   B.-also women-Acc like
   ‘Bill also likes women.’

(4B) means that Bill also likes tall women. Park & Oh (2013) suggest that this reading is straightforwardly captured when we assume that the null argument is derived by eliding khi khun yeca-lul ‘tall woman-Acc’. If pro could indeed yield

is contextually filled, as shown in the square brackets in the following examples:

(i) a. Elizabeth is cleverer [than Naomi].
   b. I enjoyed reading the book [written by John].
   c. John was late [for the seminar].

Possessive expressions like (ib) seem to be similar to the constructions discussed in this paper which give rise to saturation via explicature.
the identity reading and be construed as a bare nominal, we expect that (4C) should also yield the identity reading (i.e. 'the tall women' reading) via explication, contrary to fact.

Park & Bae (2012) also argue that interpretations related to certain quantifiers can only be obtained by ellipsis.

   J.-Top some food-Acc eat-not-Dec (that fish-Dec)
   'John does not eat a (certain kind of) food. It's fish.'

   B: Bill-to mekci-anh-a. (kuken twaycikoki-ya.)
   'Bill does not eat, either. It's pork.'

   B': Bill-to umsik-ul mekci-anh-a. (#kuken twaycikoki-ya.)
   'Bill does not eat food, either. It's pork.'

One interpretation in (5A) we have to note is that the food that John does not eat is different from the one that Bill does not eat. Park & Bae (2012) indicate that with an overt bare nominal in place of the null argument as in (5B'), this interpretation is not available. They suggest that under the assumption that (5B) is derived by ellipsis of *etten umsik-ul* 'a certain kind of food-Acc', the reading is easily captured, in contrast to (5B') which involves no ellipsis.

A couple of questions arise at this point: Why are the identity readings forced in some contexts? Are they regarded as genuine problems of *pro* analysis? We attempt to answer these questions in this paper. The following section explores four instances of apparent problems of *pro* analysis and shows why a specific interpretation occurs in these four contexts.

2. Four Instances of Apparent Problems of *Pro* Analysis

2.1 Modifier N

Park & Bae (2012) and Park & Oh (2013) argue that in modifier-noun contexts, identity reading of null argument is captured only by the ellipsis analysis. Consider (4), repeated here as (6).

   J.-Top height tall woman-Acc like
'John likes tall women.'
B: Bill-to ______ cohahay.
B.-also like
'Bill also likes tall women.'
C: Bill-to yeca-lul cohahay.
B.-also women-Acc like
'Bill also likes women.'

The discrepancy in interpretation between (6B) and (6C) seems to support the ellipsis analysis. In addition, the continuation test as shown below seems to further support the ellipsis analysis.

(7) A: John-un khi khun yeca-lul cohahay.
   J.-Nom height tall woman-Acc like
   'John likes tall women.'
B: Bill-to ___ cohahay. #kulentey khi cakun yeca-lul cohahay.
   B.-also like but height short woman-Acc like
   'Lit. Bill also likes, but he likes short women.'
B': Bill-to khi-khun yeca-lul cohahay. #kulentey khi cakun
   B.-also height tall woman-Acc like but height short
   yeca-lul cohahay.
   woman-Acc like
   'Lit. Bill also likes, but he likes short women.'

Park & Oh (2013) indicate that the identity reading in (7B) is not cancellable, hence they claim that it is an instance of genuine sloppy readings.

Note, however, that the so-called identity reading is not forced in other modifier-noun contexts as shown in (8-9) if we employ different verb classes. The continuation test in (8-9) shows that null argument and bare nominal have parallel interpretation.

(8) A: John-i khi khun yeca-lul chilyoha-yss-e.
   J.-Nom height tall woman-Acc treat-Pst-Dec
   'John treated a tall woman.'
B: Bill-to ___ chilyoha-yss-e. kulentey (Bill-un) khi cakun yeca-lul
   B.-also treat-Pst-Dec. But B.-Top height little woman-Acc
   chilyoha-yss-e.
   treat-Pst-Dec
'Lit. Bill also treated, but he treated a short woman.'
C: Bill-to yeca-lul chilyoha-yss-e. kulenty (Bill-un) khi cakun
B.-also woman-Acc treat-Pst-Dec. But B.-Top height little
yeca-lul chilyoha-yss-e.
woman-Acc treat-Pst-Dec
'Lit. Bill also treated a woman, but he treated a short woman.'

(9) A: John-i khi khun yeca-eykey cha-y-ess-e.
J.-Nom height tall woman-by dump-Pass-Pst-Dec
'John was dumped by a tall woman.'
B: Bill-to _ cha-y-ess-e. kulenty khi cakun yeca-eykey
B.-also dump-Pass-Pst-Dec. but height short woman-by
cha-y-ess-e.
dump-Pass-Pst-Dec
'Lit. Bill was dumped, too, but he was dumped by a short woman.'
C: Bill-to yeca-eykey cha-y-ess-e. kulenty khi cakun yeca-eykey
B.-also woman-by dump-Pass-Pst-Dec. but height short woman-by
cha-y-ess-e.
dump-Pass-Pst-Dec
'Lit. Bill was dumped by a woman, too, but he was dumped by a short woman.'

It seems that the generic property of the bare argument + predicate combination
yeca-lul chilyohayss makes the interpretation difference between (6B) and (6C). By
contrast, as seen in (8-9), the bare argument + predicate combinations such as
yeca-lul chilyohayss-e 'treated a woman' or yeca-eykey cha-y-ess-e 'dumped by a
woman' do not force generic interpretation. Hence (8B) and (9B) are interpreted
in the same way as (8C) and (9C), respectively.

The examples (8-9) show that the interpretation discrepancy between bare
nominals and *pro* is illusory. Thus, a generalization based on an exceptional
example like (6) does not seem to be conclusive. We could not say that the
identity readings are forced in all the modifier-noun contexts. Accordingly, (6)
seems not to be a solid counterexample to Ahn & Cho's (2011, 2012a,b) *pro*
analysis of null arguments.

### 2.2 Quantified Arguments

Park & Bae (2012), and Park & Oh (2013) argue that the identity reading in the
following quantifier context is difficult to explain under the *pro* analysis. Consider
(5), repeated here as (10).\(^2\)

(10) A: John-un etten umsik-ul mekci-anh-a. (kuken sayngsen-iya.)
  J.-Top some food-Acc eat-not-Dec (that fish-Dec)
  'John does not eat a (certain kind of) food. It’s fish.'
B: Bill-to mekci-anha. (kuken twaycikoki-ya.)
  B.-also eat-not-Dec (that pork-Dec)
  'Bill does not eat, either. It’s pork.'
B': Bill-to umsik-ul mekci-anh-a. (#kuken twaycikoki-ya.)
  B.-also food-Acc eat-not-Dec (that pork-Dec)
  'Bill does not eat food, either. It’s pork.'

(10B) may yield sloppy identity reading while (10B') does not. As discussed in section 2.1, a generic interpretation is forced in a certain context. Here, negation seems to play such a role in (10B'). In other words, the combination of ‘the bare nominal + negation’ (and presumably with some other factors such as present tense) in (10B') seems to yield only generic interpretation, so the interpretational difference occurs between (10B) and (10B'). Compare now (10) with (11) which minimally differs in tense and polarity.

(11) A: John-un etten umsik-ul mek-ess-e. (kuken sayngsen-iya.)
  J.-Top some food-Acc eat-Pst-Dec (that fish-Dec)
  'John ate a (certain kind of) food. It’s fish.'
B: Bill-to mek-ess-e. (kuken twaycikoki-ya.)
  B.-also eat-Pst-Dec (that pork-Dec)
  'Bill ate, too. It’s pork.'
B': Bill-to umsik-ul mek-ess-e. (kuken twaycikoki-ya.)

---

\(^2\) A reviewer points out to us that the examples in (5), repeated here as (10), sound weird and that when *umsik* ‘food’ is replaced by *kwail* ‘fruit’ and the follow-up sentences are changed, the examples sound more natural.

(i) A: John-un etten kwail-ul mekci-anh-a. (kuken sakwa-ya.)
  J.-Top some fruit-Acc eat-not-Dec (that apple-Dec)
  'John does not eat a (certain kind of) fruit. It’s an apple.'
B: Bill-to mekci-anh-a. (kuken pokswunga-ya.)
  B.-also eat-not-Dec (that peach-Dec)
  'Bill does not eat, either. It’s a peach.'
B': Bill-to kwail-ul mekci-anh-a. (#kuken pokswunga-ya.)
  B.-also fruit-Acc eat-not-Dec (that peach-Dec)
  'Bill does not fruit, either. It’s a peach.'
B.-also food-Acc eat-Pst-Dec (that pork-Dec)
‘Bill ate, too. It’s pork.’

(11B) and (11B’) are interpreted in the same way. Note in particular that (11B’) does not force generic reading in contrast to (10B’) where the bare nominal complement occurs with present tense negation. Thus, (10) may not be conclusive evidence for ellipsis analysis of null arguments, and problems for Ahn & Cho’s (2011a,b,c, 2012a,b) pro analysis of null arguments.

Park & Oh (2013) also indicate that a null argument example like Bill-un phalci mos-han-ta ‘Bill cannot sell’ in (12a) has different interpretation from an example with bare nominal, Bill-un cha-lul phalci mos-han-ta ‘Bill cannot sell a car.’ in (12b).

    J. -Top one month-for ten-Cl more-Gen car-Acc sell-but
    Bill-un phalci-mos-han-ta.
    B.-Top see-cannot-do-Dec
    ‘John sells more than 10 cars per month, but Bill cannot sell more than 10.’

b. John-un han tal-ey yel-tay isang-uy cha-lul phalci-man
    J. -Top one month-for ten-Cl more-Gen car-Acc sell-but
    Bill-un cha-lul phalci-mos-han-ta.
    B.-Top car-Acc see-cannot-do-Dec
    ‘John sells more than 10 cars per month, but Bill cannot sell a car.’

According to Park & Oh (2013), (12a) yields identity reading while (12b) does not, as indicated in the English translation. Parallel to (10), however, we claim that the complex cha-lul phalci-mos-han-ta ‘car-Acc sell-cannot-do-Dec’ in (12b) induces generic interpretation, which results in the interpretational difference in question. Otherwise, bare nominal and null argument have the parallel interpretation, as shown in (13B) and (13C), which lends crucial support to Ahn & Cho’s (2011a,b,c, 2012a,b) pro analysis of null arguments.3

3 Park & Oh (2013) also indicate that in (i), the indefinite paywu-lul ‘actor-Acc’ does not have wide scope reading unlike (iB).

(i) A: Motun ramhaksayng-i enu paywu-lul cohahay. (ALL>SOME, SOME>ALL)
    ‘Every male student likes an actor.’
B: Motun yehaksayng-to cohahay. (ALL>SOME, SOME>ALL)
    J.-Nom last month-in 10-Cl more-Gen car-Acc sell-Pst-Dec
    'John sold more 10 cars last month.'
    B.-also sell-Pst-Dec. but five-Cl-only neg-sell-Pst-Dec
    'Bill sold, too, but he sold only 5 cars.'
    B.-also car-Acc sell-Past-Dec. but five-Cl-only neg-sell-Pst-Dec
    'Bill sold cars, either, but he sold only 5 cars.'

2.3 Missing Antecedents

Saito (2007) also provides an example that might be best captured by the ellipsis analysis. The corresponding Korean example like (14) is given by Park & Bae (2012).

Absence of wide scope reading of the bare nominal seems to be also related to the generic property of the argument + predicate combination paywu-lul cohahay 'like an actor' in (iiC), which makes the interpretational difference between (iiB) and (iiC). To our ears, (iiC) usually yields only generic reading like 'Every female student also likes actors' where the scope issue in question does not seem to arise unlike Park & Oh (2013). Compare now (i) with (ii) where generic reading is not forced as shown in (iiC).

    All male.student-Nom some actor-Acc hit-Pst-Dec
    'Every male student hit an actor.'
B: Motun yehaksayng-to _ tta-yi-ess-e.
    All female.student-also hit-Pst-Dec
    'Lit. Every female student also hit.'
C: Motun yehaksayng-to paywu-lul tta-yi-ess-e.
    All female.student-also actor-Acc like-Pst-Dec
    'Lit. Every female student also hit an actor.'

Here, although the scope judgement is less clear, we may get scope ambiguity in (iiC) parallel to (iiB). Thus, here too Ahn & Cho's (2011a,b,c, 2012a,b) argument for the necessity of pro analysis of null arguments is well supported.
(14) Ku pension-un halu-ey sey-thim isang-ul patulswuissci-man
   the pension-Top one day-in three-group more than-Acc can accreditation-but
i pension-un _ patulswueps-e.
this pension-Top cannot accreditation-Dec
'That pension/inn can accommodate more than three teams per day but
this pension cannot.'

Park & Bae (2012:855) argue that under Ahn & Cho's *pro* analysis, *pro* can be
construed as a bare nominal but in (14) nothing seems to be a candidate. Unlike
Park & Bae's (2012) claim, however, there can be a (hidden or implicit) bare
nominal that *pro* refers to in (14), as shown in (15).

(15) Ku pension-un (swukpakkayk-ul) halu-ey sey-thim isang-ul
   the pension-Top (guest-Acc) one day-in three-group more than-Acc
patulswuissci-man i pension-un _ patulswueps-e.
   can accreditation-but this pension-Top cannot accreditation-Dec
'That pension/inn can accommodate more than three teams per day but
this pension cannot.'

When we replace the null argument by the bare nominal *swukpakkayk-ul*
'guest-Acc', however, the interpretation is not the same with (16).

(16) Ku pension-un (swukpakkayk-ul) halu-ey sey-thim isang-ul
   the pension-Top (guest-Acc) one day-in three-group more than-Acc
patulswuissci-man i pension-un swukpakkayk-ul patulswueps-e.
   can accreditation-but this pension-Top guest-Acc cannot accreditation-Dec
'That pension/inn can accommodate more than three teams per day but
this pension cannot.'

In (14), negation (with present tense) seems to force the generic interpretation,
which renders (15) and (16) have different interpretation. If we alter the polarity
from negative to positive, the similar interpretation occurs, as shown in (17B-B').

(17) A: Ku pension-un halu-ey sey-thim isang-ul
   the pension-Top one day-in three-group more than-Acc
patulswuiss-e.
can accreditation-Dec
'That pension can accommodate more than three teams.'
B: i pension-to patulswuiss-e. twu thim isang-man. 
this pension-also can.accomodate-Dec two team more-than-only
`Lit. This pension can accommodate, but it can accommodate only
more than two teams.'

B': i pension-to swukpakkayk-ul patulswuiss-e. twu thim 
this pension-also guest-Acc can.accomodate-Dec two team isang-man.
more than-only
`Lit. This pension can accommodate quests, but it can accommodate
only more than two teams.'

Thus, (14) (and (16)) may not support their ellipsis analysis of null arguments, either.

Park & Bae (2012: 855) further argue that examples like (18) seem problematic for the pro analysis.

(18) [Speaker A and B are classmates and took an exam. They together 
checked their own scores on the exam (so they know the other person 
also checked his/her own score) and say.]
A: Na-nun payk-cem-ul pat-ass-e. 
I-Top 100-Cl-Acc get-Pst-Dec
'I got 100 (perfect score).'

B: Na-to __ pat-ass-e. (#kulentey phalsip-cem-ul pat-ass-e.) 
I-also get-Pst-Dec (but 80-Cl-Acc get-Pst-Dec)
`Lit. I also got. (But I got 80.)'

B': #Na-to (sihem) cemswu-lul pat-ass-e. (kulentey phalsip-cem-ul 
I-also (test) score-Acc get-Pst-Dec (but 80-Cl-Acc 
pat-ass-e.) 
get-Pst-Dec)
'I also got a (test) score. (But I got 80.)'

Park & Bae (2012) argue that it is difficult to identify a bare nominal that the potential pro refers to in the antecedent in (18B). The candidate could be (sihem) cemswu ‘test score’. However, with or without the continuation, (18B) seems to sound weird.

We assume that the null argument in (18B) is similar to ku kes-ul ‘it’. In this case, the continuation is expected to be semantically ill-formed, as shown in (19).

I-Top 100-Cl-Acc get-Pst-Dec
'I got 100 (perfect score).'

B: Na-to ku kes-ul pat-ass-e. (#kulentey phalsip-cem-ul pat-ass-e.)
I-also the thing-Acc get-Pst-Dec (but 80-Cl-Acc get-Pst-Dec)
'Lit. I also got it, (but I got 80.)'

It seems that *ku kes-ul ‘it’ in Korean can not only denote references but also properties or kinds. The following example can be accounted for in the same way.

(20) A: Na-nun cacangmyen-ul cohahay.
I-Top black.bean.sauce.noodle-Acc like.
'I like black-bean-sauce noodle.'

B: Na-to cohahay.
I-also like
'I like, too.'

B': Na-to ku kes-ul cohahay.
I-also the thing-Acc like
'I also like it.'

The null argument in (20B) is similar to *ku kes-ul ‘it’ in (20B’). (20B) and (20B’) may have the same (identity) interpretation; namely, ‘I also like black-bean-sauce noodle’. Thus, the obligatory identity reading in (18B) can also be captured under the pro analysis.

2.4 Null Arguments in Wh-Question-Answer Pair

Park & Oh (2013) suggest that the interpretation difference between null arguments and bare nominals are also observed in wh-question-answer pair.

(21) A: Nwu-ka twu-kwen-uy chayk-ul ilk-ess-ni?

Park & Oh (2013:160-161) argue that the question-answer pair in (21) seems to require the identity reading, presumably through presupposition or Givenness: in (21A), ‘x read two books’ is presupposed/given. Answering (21A) indicates that this presupposition carries over to Speaker B’s utterance in (21B), which in turn means that the null argument should be understood as the identical two books. Contrary to their claim, such presupposition might not be carried. Consider (i).

(i) a. A: Nwu-ka twu-kwen-uy chayk-ul ilk-ess-ni?
Who-Nom two-Cl-Gen book-Acc read-Pst-Q
Who-Nom two-Cl-Gen book-Acc read-Pst-Q
‘Who read two books?’
B: Bill-i ___ ilk-ess-e.
B.-Nom read-Pst-Dec
‘Lit. Bill read.’
B’: Bill-i chayk-ul ilk-ess-e.
‘Bill read a book/books.’

The interpretation in (21B) is different from the one in (21B’). The generic property of the argument + predicate combination chayk-ul ilk-ess-e ‘read a book’ seems to render the interpretation difference between (21B) and (21C). Observe (22)5:

‘Who read two books?’
B: Bill-i ___ ilk-ess-e. kulentey han kwen-man ilk-ess-e.
B.-Nom read-Pst-Dec but one Cl-only read-Pst-Dec
‘Lit. Bill read, but he read only one book.’

To us (and Myung-Kwan Park by personal communication), (i) sounds well-formed. 5

As pointed out by a reviewer, there seems to be speakers’ variations with respect to the availability of the examples (21B-B’) and (22B-B’). Instead of them, (iB) and (iiB) sound natural to our ears.

(i) A: Nwu-ka twu-kwen-uy chayk-ul ilk-ess-ni?
   Who-Nom two-Cl-Gen book-Acc read-Pst-Q
   ‘Who read two books?’
   B: Bill-i.
   Bill-Nom
   ‘Bill.’

(ii) A: Nwu-ka twu-kwen-uy chayk-ul ccic-ess-ni?
   Who-Nom two-Cl-Gen book-Acc tear-Pst-Q
   ‘Who tore two books?’
   B: Bill-i.
   Bill-Nom
   ‘Bill.’

With respect to the availability of reading we discuss in (21B) and (22B), speakers’ variation may be related to the potential violations of the Gricean Maxims.

(iii) A: Nwu-ka twu-kwen-uy chayk-ul ccic-ess-ni?
   Who-Nom two-Cl-Gen book-Acc tear-Pst-Q
   ‘Who tore two books?’
   B: Bill-i ccic-ess-e. kulentey sey kwen-ul ccic-ess-e.
   Bill-Nom tear-Pst-Dec but three Cl-Acc tear-Pst-Dec
   ‘Bill tore, but he tore three books.’
   B’: Bill-i ccic-ess-e. kulentey han kwen-ul ccic-ess-e.
(22) A: Nwu-ka twu-kwen-uy chayk-ul cci-ess-ni?
   Who-Nom two-Cl-Gen book-Acc tear-Pst-Q
   'Who tore two books?'
B: Bill-i ___ cci-ess-e.
   Lit. Bill tore.
B': Bill-i chayk-ul cci-ess-e.
   'Bill tore a book/books.'

In contrast to (21), the argument + predicate combination such as chayk-ul cci-ess-e 'tore a book/books' doesn't force generic interpretation. Hence (22B) and (22C) are interpreted in the same way. Accordingly, (21) may not support ellipsis analysis of null arguments, and Ahn & Cho's (2011a,b,c, 2012a,b) pro analysis of null arguments may still hold.

3. Concluding Remarks

A clear understanding of the cases demonstrated for the identity reading discussed in Park & Bae (2012) and Park & Oh (2013) can provide a basis for claiming that they are not regarded as genuine counter-examples for pro analysis of null arguments. The interpretational discrepancy between bare nominals and null arguments arises because some contexts force generic interpretations of bare nominals, which are not genuine arguments against the pro analysis.6

6 A reviewer indicates that the "counter-examples we discuss are not small enough to be brushed under the rug and that they appear very real, though small in number; there are whole classes of regular syntactic processes affecting the data and hence they deserve due attention."

We have to note that what matters here is whether they are really counter-examples of pro analysis of null arguments. Almost all of them are related to the presence of generic interpretation which is tied to negation, present tense, class of predicates and so on. As indicated by the reviewer, an elaborate analysis of generic contexts seems to be worthwhile. We leave this issue for future research.
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