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1. Introduction

This paper is concerned with the two observations in (1):*¹

---

*¹ Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the 6th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics, Nagoya University, Japan, on September 5, 2009 and the 10th Korea-Japan Workshop on Linguistics and Language Processing, Kyung Hee University, on March 5, 2011. I would like to thank all the audience at the workshops, especially Hee-Don Ahn, Jae-Woong Choe, Jong-Bok Kim, Sun-Woong Kim, Seungho Nam, Myung-Kwan Park, and Yukinori Takubo for questions and comments, and I also thank two anonymous reviewers for *Linguistic Research* for constructive comments and suggestions. All remaining errors are solely my own. This work was supported by the Korea Research Foundation Grant funded by the Korean Government (KRF-2010-327-A00211).

By a 'predicate' I mean a verb stem augmented by prefinal and final endings: V-Aff prefinal-Aff final. See Yang (1972) and Sohn (1999, 354) among others for the list of prefinal affixes and final affixes.
(1) a. Embedded ‘predicates’ (or embedded predicates plus some proper subset of their dependents) in Korean are immobile. (Chung 2007, 2008a)

b. Embedded ‘predicates’ (or embedded predicates plus some proper subset of their dependents) in Korean are non-elidable. (Chung 2009)

(1a), which is observed in Chung (2007, 2008a), says that inflected predicates in Korean do not move, when other dependent elements stay in situ. The observation in (1b), which is made in Chung (2009), is that embedded ‘predicates’ in Korean do not get deleted either.2

There have been some explanations of the former observation proposed in the literature. Chung (2007, 2008a) proposes a constituency account under the assumption that a verb stem and its inflectional endings merge at PF (J. H.-S. Yoon 1993, 1994, 1997, Park 1994, J.-M. Yoon 1996). In contrast, Ahn and Cho (2008a, b) attribute the immobility of the embedded predicate to Fox and Pesetsky’s (2004) Cyclic Linearization (CL) and Principle of Order Preservation (POP). (See Chung 2009, for some other possible accounts that are ultimately discarded.)

---

2 Chung (2009, 2011) argues that all Korean ‘predicates’, whether embedded or matrix and whether in an elliptical or non-elliptical context, are not syntactic constituents and invisible to syntax (immobile, undeletable, and unduplicable), as in Table II, although they sometimes appear to behave as constituents at the surface, as in the shaded areas in Table I. These apparently exceptional behaviors are argued to follow independently.

(i) Table I: Mobility/Deletability/Duplicability of Predicates and Non-Predicates (to be modified)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matrix</th>
<th>Predicate</th>
<th>Embedded</th>
<th>Predicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletability</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicability</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Table II: Mobility/Deletability/Duplicability of Predicates and non-Predicates (final)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matrix</th>
<th>Predicate</th>
<th>Embedded</th>
<th>Predicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletability</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicability</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As for the non-elidability of the embedded predicate, Chung (2009) claims that the same constituency requirement is responsible. In contrast, Ahn and Cho (2009, 2010) provide a ‘no illicit CP ellipsis’ account based on Lobeck (1995) and Merchant (2004), according to whom only a functional category licenses ellipsis. Not being a complement of a functional category, CP cannot be deleted.³

This paper makes the following claims. First, Ahn and Cho’s (2008a, b) CL+POP account faces some problems with respect to the immobility of the embedded predicate. Second, regarding the non-elidability of the embedded predicate, Ahn and Cho’s (2009, 2010) ‘no illicit CP ellipsis’ claim and Chung’s (2009) constituency account may be compatible, though I do not fully commit myself to the former. The statement that syntax does not target the embedded predicate will be shown to be a valid generalization which calls for an explanation. Third, the invisibility of the predicate to syntax comes from the morpho-syntactic properties of the inflectional endings.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 takes some examples showing that embedded predicates are immobile and compares Chung’s (2007, 2008a) account and Ahn and Cho’s (2008a, 2008b). Section 3 concerns the non-elidability of the embedded predicate. Two competing accounts, Chung’s (2009) constituency-based account and Ahn and Cho’s (2009, 2010) ‘no illicit CP ellipsis’ account, are compared. Section 4 concludes the paper.

³ There have been some other interesting proposals made in the literature, though not extensively addressed in this work. Pointing out some problems with Ahn and Cho’s (2009) account, Park (2009) proposes an account based on the isomorphic condition on ellipsis. Ahn and Cho (2010) responded to Park (2010) with a solution introducing pro instead of CP ellipsis in the problematic cases. Lee (2010) claims that all three accounts contain crucial problems with respect to the right node raising construction (RNR) and proposes another constituency account based on Kayne’s (1994) universal SVO word order hypothesis. For his main argument to hold, however, he must stick to a deletion analysis of RNR constructions, despite various problems with the deletion analysis, and he has to assume some not fully motivated conditions on deletion.
2. Immobility of Embedded Predicates and Competing Accounts

2.1 Immobility of Embedded Predicates

Non-predicates, that is, elements like arguments and adjuncts in the embedded clause, are free to undergo a short or long scrambling, as schematically represented in (2) and exemplified in (3).\(^4\)

\[
(2) [\text{CP/TP} \text{ XP-Nom} [\text{CP/TP} \text{ YP-Nom} \quad \text{ZP-Acc} \quad \text{Pred}_{\text{embedded}}] \quad \text{Pred}_{\text{matrix}}]
\]

\[
(3) \quad \text{a. na-nun} \quad \text{John-i ecey} \quad \text{Mary-lul manna-ess-ta-ko} \quad \text{I-Top}
\]
\[
\text{J.-Nom} \quad \text{yesterday} \quad \text{M.-Dat} \quad \text{meet-Pst-DE-C}
\]
\[
\text{sayngkakha-n-ta.} \quad \text{think-Pres-DE}
\]
\[
\text{‘I think that John met Mary yesterday.’}
\]
\[
\text{b. na-nun} \quad \text{John-i Mary-lul ecey ei manna-ess-ta-ko} \quad \text{sangkakha-n-ta.}
\]
\[
\text{c. na-nun} \quad \text{Mary-lul John-i ecey ei manna-ess-ta-ko} \quad \text{sangkakha-n-ta.}
\]
\[
\text{d. Mary-lul na-nun} \quad \text{John-i ecey ei manna-ess-ta-ko} \quad \text{sangkakha-n-ta.}
\]

In contrast, inflected predicates cannot move at all, as schematically represented in (4) and exemplified in (5).

\[
(4) [\text{CP/TP} \text{ XP-Nom} [\text{CP/TP} \text{ YP-Nom} \quad \text{ZP-Acc} \quad \text{Pred}_{\text{embedded}}] \quad \text{Pred}_{\text{matrix}}]
\]

\[
(5) \quad \text{a. na-nun} \quad \text{John-i Mary-lul salangha-n-ta-ko} \quad \text{sayngkakha-n-ta.}
\]
\[
\text{I-Top} \quad \text{J.-Nom} \quad \text{M.-Acc} \quad \text{lovet-Pres-DE-C} \quad \text{think-Pres-DE}
\]
\[
\text{‘I think that John loves Mary.’}
\]
\[
\text{b. *na-nun} \quad \text{John-i salangha-n-ta-ko} \quad \text{Mary-lul ei} \quad \text{sayngkakha-n-ta.}
\]

\(^4\) We are indifferent to the precise landing site of scrambled elements since it does not crucially affect the discussion.
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A predicate and a part (proper subset) of its dependents cannot move either, as represented in (6) and exemplified in (7).

\begin{align*}
(6) & \quad \text{[CP/TP \ XP-Nom [CP/TP YP-Nom \ ZP-Acc Pred}^{\text{embedded}} \text{] Pred}_{\text{matrix}}]\nonumber \\
& \quad \begin{array}{c}
* \\
* \\
\uparrow \\
\uparrow
\end{array}
\end{align*}

(7) a. na-nun [ John-i \ Mary-lul \ salangha-n-ta-ko] sayngkakha-n-ta.
   I-Top   J.-Nom   M.-Acc   lovet-Pres-DE-C   think-Pres-DE
   ‘I think that John loves Mary.’

Of course, the whole embedded CP can move, as represented in (8) and exemplified in (9).

\begin{align*}
(8) & \quad \text{[CP/TP \ XP-Nom [CP/TP YP-Nom \ ZP-Acc Pred}^{\text{embedded}} \text{] Pred}_{\text{matrix}}]\nonumber \\
& \quad \begin{array}{c}
\uparrow
\end{array}
\end{align*}

(9) a. na-nun [ John-i \ Mary-lul \ salangha-n-ta-ko] sayngkakha-n-ta.
   I-Top   J.-Nom   M.-Acc   lovet-Pres-DE-C   think-Pres-DE
   ‘I think that John loves Mary.’
b. [John-i Mary-lul \ salangha-n-ta-ko]i na-nun ei sayngkakha-n-ta.

A natural question that arises is why a language like Korean displays such asymmetries. This question will be addressed in the remainder of this section. In the following subsections, I briefly summarize and evaluate Chung’s (2007, 2008a) constituency-based account (Section 2.2.) and Ahn and Cho’s (2008a, 2008b) CL+POP-based account (Section 2.3.), and then I point out some possible difficulties of the latter approach (Section 2.4.).
2.2 A Constituency Account (Chung 2007, 2008a)

Chung (2007, 2008a) ascribes the ungrammaticality of sentences like (5b-d) and (7b-c) to the non-constituency of the moved elements based on the hypothesis that a verb stem and its inflectional endings project independently in syntax and merge at the level of PF. According to this PF-merge hypothesis (See H.-S. J. Yoon 1993, 1994, 1997, Park 1994, J.-M. Yoon 1996 among others), verbal endings in a language like Korean are independent heads at syntax that have their own projections and get merged to the last element of the preceding phrase at PF, as shown in (10) below.\(^5\)

\[(10)\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{MP} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{M} \\
\text{T'} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{M-lul} \\
\text{salangha}
\end{array}
\]

The embedded clause of the sentence in (5a), for example, will have the syntactic structure of (11):\(^6\)

---

\(^5\) The PF-merge hypothesis has drawn its main argument from the scope interpretation of the verbal endings in the coordinate structure: Verbal endings that morphologically appear at the final conjunct are claimed to have scope over the entire coordinate structure. Chung (2005), however, shows that verbal endings, except for final endings, do not necessarily have scope over the non-final conjuncts. The syntactic behaviors of the predicate to be discussed in this work will compose a more substantive piece of evidence for the phrasal affix analysis of the verbal endings than the scope interpretation of the verbal endings in the coordinate structure.

\(^6\) Though ignored in this structure, the small v projection can be postulated. Also the subject can be placed under a predicate projection.
Given this syntactic structure, the so-called predicate in Korean is not a constituent. For example, in (11), the string salangha-n-ta-ko is not a constituent in syntax, though it may form a word at the morphological level. Not being a constituent, the string cannot undergo a syntactic operation including movement, accounting for the ungrammatical status of (5b-d). A similar comment can be made on the cases where the object + predicate string is fronted. The string Mary-lul salangha-n-ta-ko does not form a constituent, either, and it cannot move, accounting for the badness of (7b-c). In order for the so-called predicate, that is, the string salangha-n-ta-ko, to move at all, we have to pied-pipe all the dependents of the predicate, as in the example like (9b).

Some remarks are in order about the constituency-based account. First, not all constituents are able to move. For example, MP and TP in (11) are syntactic constituents, but they cannot move. I suspect that the unavailability of such movements is due to morphological restrictions that individual morphemes display. If, for example, MP moves, C -ko is stranded. However, it cannot stand alone as a bound morpheme. Similarly, if TP moves, then the string -ta-ko is stranded. However, the string morphologically requires a verbal host. Moreover, the string salangha-n is illegitimate as a morphological word. In other words, these illegitimate

---

7 I thank Jae-Woong Choe (p.c.) for raising this question. The same comment applies to the ellipsis data to be discussed in Section 3.

8 VP and TP (under the VP internal subject hypothesis) can in fact move, if Jo (2004) is right in claiming that the so-called V-ki-V/ha construction involves a clausal movement. Notice, however, that this construction satisfies all the morphological requirements. See Chung (2009, 2011).
strings are not listed in the 'vocabulary' in the sense of distributed morphology. A second remark to be made concerns the possibility that some element of the embedded CP has scrambled and subsequently the whole CP moves over the previously scrambled element, as illustrated in (12) below:

    I-Top J.-Nom M.-Acc lovet-Pres-DE-C think-Pres-DE
    ‘I think that John loves Mary.’
   b. na-nun [John-i] [CP ei Mary-lul salangha-n-ta-ko]
      sayngkakha-n-ta.
   c. *[CP ei Mary-lul salangha-n-ta-ko] j na-nun [John-i] ei
      sayngkakha-n-ta.

Since neither the first nor second operation involves any illegitimate movement, (12c) should be possible, contrary to fact. I would like to attribute the ungrammatical status of (12c) to an effect of a Proper Binding Condition (PBC, Fiengo 1977), whatever theory is responsible for PBC effects.9

2.3 A CL+POP Account (Ahn and Cho 2008a, b)

Ahn and Cho (2008a, b) provide an alternative solution to the immobility of a predicate. They crucially resort to Fox and Petsetsky’s (2004) CL and POP. The gist of the two principles is that linearization applies phase-by-phase and the linear order fixed at a phase cannot be altered at a later phase. With this in mind, let us consider the relevant examples in (5) and (7), repeated as (13) and (14) with phases indicated.

(13) a. [CP2 na-nun [CP1 John-i Mary-lul salangha-n-ta-ko] sayngkakha-n-ta]
    I-Top J.-Nom M.-Acc lovet-Pres-DE-C think-Pres-DE
    ‘I think that John loves Mary.’
   b. *[CP2 na-nun [CP1 salangha-n-ta-ko, Mary-lul e] sayngkakha-n-ta]
   c. *[CP2 na-nun [CP1 salangha-n-ta-ko, John-i Mary-lul e] sayngkakha-n-ta]
   d. *[CP2 salangha-n-ta-ko, na-nun [CP1 John-i Mary-lul e] sayngkakha-n-ta]

9 In the previous work (Chung 2007, 2009), I pointed out some weaknesses in the PBC account coupled with the VP internal subject hypothesis, but I did not deny the existence of PBC effects.
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(14) a. [CP₂ na-nun [CP₁ John-i Mary-lul salangha-n-ta-ko] sayngkakha-n-ta]
   I-Top J.-Nom M.-Acc lovet-Pres-DE-C think-Pres-DE
   ‘I think that John loves Mary.’


c. *[CP₂ [Mary-lul salangha-n-ta-ko], na-nun [CP₁ John-i] sayngkakha-n-ta]

According to the CL+POP account, sentences like (13d) are ungrammatical because the word order established in the embedded CP phase is not preserved in the matrix CP phase, as illustrated in (15) below. In the embedded CP phase, the CL fixes the linear order: John-i precedes Mary-lul, which precedes salangha-n-ta-ko. In the matrix CP phase, however, the linear order has been changed such that the embedded predicate salanghan-ta-ko precedes the embedded subject John-i and embedded object Mary-lul, violating the POP. The ungrammatical status of (14c) can be similarly explained, since the linear order established in the embedded CP phase is altered in the matrix CP phase, as shown in (16) below.

(15) e.g. (13d): *POP
   Linear Order in phase CP₁: John-Nom>>Mary-Acc>>Pred\text{\textsubscript{embedded}}
   Linear Order in phase CP₂: Pred\text{\textsubscript{embedded}}>>I-Topic>>John-Nom>>
                              Mary-Acc>>Pred\text{\textsubscript{matrix}}

(16) e.g. (14c): *POP
   Linear Order in phase CP₁: John-Nom>>Mary-Acc>>Pred\text{\textsubscript{embedded}}
   Linear Order in phase CP₂: Mary-Acc>>Pred\text{\textsubscript{embedded}}>>I-Topic>>
                              John-Nom>>Pred\text{\textsubscript{matrix}}

2.4 Problems with the CL+POP Account

Ahn and Cho’s (2008) system seems to work fine. However, a question that may arise is what prevents the linear order from being changed in the embedded CP phase. Notice that rearranging the word order within in a phase is allowed in other instances of cyclic movement, for example, wh-movement out of an embedded clause, as in (17).
(17) Who, do you think $e_i$ that John loves $e_i$?

Without the rearrangement of the linear order within the embedded CP phase, the linear order established in the embedded CP phase would be necessarily altered in the matrix CP phase, violating the POP. Thus cyclic movement is necessarily assumed for wh-movement. Now let us go back to the sentences like (13d). Just as in wh-movement in (17), what if we first rearrange the linear order within in the embedded CP phase, placing the embedded predicate before the embedded subject and object, as shown in (18)?

(18) e.g. (13d)
   a. Order in the Base Structure: $\text{John-Nom} \gg \text{Mary-Acc} \gg \text{Pred}_{\text{embedded}}$

   Predicate Raising within phase CP1

   b. Linear Order in phase CP1: $\text{Pred}_{\text{embedded}} \gg \text{John-Nom} \gg \text{Mary-Acc}$

   c. Linear Order in phase CP2: $\text{Pred}_{\text{embedded}} \gg \text{I-Topic} \gg \text{John-Nom} \gg \\
      \text{Mary-Acc} \gg \text{Pred}_{\text{matrix}}$

Given that an embedded predicate moves cyclically, as in (18a), the derivation for (13d) satisfies the POP. For the CL+POP account to work, therefore, it is necessary to provide a reason for the lack of the predicate raising from the beginning. Ahn and Cho (2008a, b) suspect that some sort of anti-locality is responsible. The predicate fronting is banned because the raising in (18a) is too local.\footnote{There seems to be some internal inconsistency in Ahn and Cho's (2008a,b) account as to the lack of predicate movement. On the one hand, Ahn and Cho (2008b, 66) assume that “a stem augmented with endings is a (complex) head directly drawn from the lexicon (cf. Chomsky 1995) and that the endings are to be licensed by Agree in syntax.” If I understand correctly, this means that an inflected verb can be inserted under V in syntax. On the other hand, Ahn and Cho (2008b, 66-67, fn 3) claim that the inflected predicate cannot be adjoined to the embedded small v or to the embedded CP since an adjunction of an element to its own projection is banned. It may be said such an adjunction operation is barred since heads in a head-final language cannot undergo a leftward movement, as they (2008b, 62, fn 1) note. Notice, however, if an inflected verb is lexically inserted under V, it should be able to move leftward when its complement moves along, which is not borne out, as in (14b, c).} Notice, however, that embedded arguments can undergo a short scrambling. Besides, the non-head movement, as in (14b-c), has to be explained somehow. If an
inflected verb is lexically inserted under V, there is no reason not to move it (along with some internal argument) to a higher projection (ν or C) and rearrange the word order in the embedded clause. Given the possibility of the word order rearrangement in the first phase, however, the embedded predicate should be able to precede other elements that depend on the predicate, contrary to fact.

A second problem with the CL+POP account is that it makes an incorrect prediction with respect to rightward movement. It should be possible for an embedded predicate to move rightward across a matrix element without violating the POP. This rightward movement is disallowed, however, as illustrated in (19) and (20) below. Notice that the rightward movement satisfies the POP since the word order in the embedded CP has not been altered in the matrix CP, as shown in (21).

\[
(19) \ \text{*Subj}_{\text{Matrix}} \cdots \left[ \text{CP} \ \text{Subj}_{\text{embedded}} \cdots \epsilon_i \right] \cdots \text{Pred}_{\text{Matrix}} \left[ \text{Pred}_{\text{embedded}} \right]_i
\]

\[
(20) \ *[\text{CP2 na-nun} \ [\text{CP1 John-i Mary-lul e_i}] \ \text{sayngkakha-n-ta}]
\]

\[
I-\text{Top} \ J.-\text{Nom} \ M.-\text{Acc} \ \text{think-Pres-DE}
\]

\[
\text{love-Pres-DE-C}
\]

\[
\text{‘I think that John loves Mary.’}
\]

\[
(21) \ \text{Linear Order in phase CP1: John-Nom} >> \text{Mary-Acc} >> \text{LOVE}_{\text{embedded}}
\]

\[
\text{Linear Order in phase CP2: I-Topic} >> \text{John-Nom} >> \text{Mary-Acc} >> \text{THINK}_{\text{matrix}} >> \text{LOVE}_{\text{embedded}}
\]

In sum, Ahn and Cho's (2008a, 2008b) CL+POP account explains the immobility of an embedded predicate under the POP coupled with the anti-locality condition. Under the assumption that an inflected verb is lexically inserted under V, however, the predicate movement (possibly along with some internal argument) does not violate the anti-locality condition. (See also footnote 10). Furthermore, the CL+POP account makes an incorrect predication with respect to rightward movement.
3. Non-elidability of Embedded Predicates and Competing Accounts

This section addresses the non-elidability of the embedded predicate with respect to two competing analyses. We will first see how the embedded predicate is restricted with respect to ellipsis (Section 3.1), and then discuss Chung's (2009) constituency-based account (Section 3.2.) and Ahn and Cho's (2009, 2010) account in terms of the licensing condition on ellipsis (Section 3.3.). Finally, we will argue that the non-elidability of inflected predicates calls for an explanation nevertheless (Section 3.4.).

3.1 Non-elidability of Embedded Predicates

Consider the discourse in (22), to see the non-elidability of inflected predicates:

   I-Top J.-Nom M.-Acc love-Pres-DE-C believe-Pres-DE
   'I believe John loves Mary.'

   but I-Top J.-Nom S.-Acc love-Pres-DE-C believe-Pres-DE
   (intended) ‘But I believe that John loves Sue.’

   but I-Top T.-Nom M.-Acc love-Pres-DE-C believe-Pres-DE
   (Intended) ‘But I believe that Tom loves Mary.’

   I-too J.-Nom M.-Acc love-Pres-DE-C believe-Pres-DE
   ‘I believe that John loves Mary, too.’

As shown in the example in (22B), an embedded predicate does not undergo ellipsis despite the presence of a potential antecedent in the discourse. Ellipsis cannot target the combination of an embedded predicate and its internal argument, excluding the embedded subject, either, as shown in (22B’). As shown in (22B’’), the embedded predicate can undergo ellipsis only when all the dependents also undergo ellipsis. (See below for some qualification.)
3.2 Chung’s (2007, 2009) Constituency Account

The constituency-based account can easily accommodate the deletion fact, provided that ellipsis (like other syntactic operations) only applies to constituents.\(^\text{11}\)

First, consider the structure for the embedded clause in (23), repeated from (11).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{MP} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{M} \\
\text{T'} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{DP} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
[\gamma, \text{J.-i [}\beta, \text{M.-lul [}\alpha, \text{salangha -n -ta -ko]]}]
\]

The strings \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\) in (23) do not form a constituent and therefore do not undergo any syntactic operation including ellipsis, explaining the ungrammatical status of (22B and B'). \(\gamma\) is a constituent in syntax and is deletable as in (22B').\(^\text{12}\)

\(^{11}\) Mukai (2003) and Ahn and Cho (2006) claim that ellipsis can target a non-constituent string. See Chung (2008b), however, for some potential problems with the string deletion approach.

\(^{12}\) One of the reviewers wonders whether the same constituency account can handle the fact that embedded predicates even in a language like English are severely constrained as to syntactic operations such as movement and deletion, as in (i) and (ii) below:

(i) a. *Loves I think John ___ Mary. cf. (5d)
   b. *[loves Mary] I think John _____. cf. (7c)

(ii) a. *But I believe Tom ___ Mary. cf. (22B')
   b. *John, I believe ___ loves Mary. cf. (25b)
   c. *I believe John gave a book to Sue. cf. (29B)

First of all, we need a theory on how inflected verbs (verbs augmented by inflection) are formed in English: lexically, syntactically, or morphologically. If they are formed morphologically, i.e., at a post-syntactic level, just as in Korean, (ia) will be accounted for. (In fact (ia) also violates the so-called head movement constraint, even when *loves is a lexically introduced or syntactically

Ahn and Cho (2009, 2010) claim, following Lobeck (1995) Merchant (2001, 2004), that only a functional category licenses ellipsis. Therefore, CP cannot be deleted because it is not a complement of a functional category. According to them, (22B, B’) are ungrammatical because their structures involve an illicit CP ellipsis preceded by a scrambling of the overt elements to the matrix clause, as illustrated in (22)’.

believe-Pres-DE
(intended) ‘But I believe that John loves Sue.’

\footnote{Ahn and Cho’s (2009b) claim (based on Merchant 2004) that ellipsis targets the complement of a functional category and that CP cannot be an ellipsis target as complement of a lexical category (matrix verb) leads to an interesting implication as to the decomposition of movement into a combination of multiple syntactic operations, i.e., Copy + Merge + Ellipsis (Chomsky 1993, Nunes 1995, 2004, Bošković 2001, Bošković and Nunes 2004, Hornstein 2009, among others). CP can be displaced in English and Korean. Thus, either the decomposition of movement into multiple operations including ellipsis or the ellipsis target story itself has to be modified. (Movement may be an instance of multi-dominance, as argued in Johnson 2010.) The non-ellidable property of CP also affects the theory of the RNR. CP can be RNRd, as exemplified below:

(i) The scientist claimed but did not prove that the earth is round.
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believe-Pres-DE
(Intended) ‘But I believe that Tom loves Mary.’

As for the grammatical status of (22B”), they argue that it does not involve an illicit CP ellipsis. Instead, verb mit ‘to believe’ takes a pro object, as in (22B”).

(22)’ B”: na-to pro mit-nun-ta.
I-too believe-Pres-DE ‘I believe (it), too.’

A piece of evidence they provide is the fact that mit in (22B”) cannot be replaced by sayngkakha ‘to think’, a verb that cannot take pro, as shown in (24).

I-Top J.-Nom M.-Acc love-Pres-DE-C think-Pres-DE
‘I think John loves Mary.’

I-too J.-Nom M.-Acc love-Pres-DE-C think-Pres-DE
‘I think John loves Mary.’

(24B”) necessarily involves an instance of illicit CP ellipsis, accounting for its ungrammatical status.14
Another piece of evidence they provide for the ‘no illicit CP ellipsis’ account is with examples such as (25).

I-Top J.-Nom M.-Acc love-Pres-DE-C believe-Pres-DE
‘I believe John loves Mary.’

J.-Nom I-Top M.-Acc love-Pres-DE-C believe-Pres-DE
‘I believe John loves Mary.’

---

14 See Park (2009, 900-901, fn2) for the claim that verbs like sayngkakha simply do not take a null anaphoric complement due to their idiosyncratic lexical properties.
   M.-Acc I-Top J.-Nom love-Pres-DE-C believe-Pres-DE
   'I believe John loves Mary.'

   J.-Nom M.-Acc I-Top love-Pres-DE-C believe-Pres-DE
   'I believe John loves Mary.'

In (25b-d), some of the embedded elements scrambled to the sentence initial position, while the embedded CP has been deleted. Although the verb mit, 'to believe', may take a pro object, pro cannot replace the elided CP in (25b-d) because of the full interpretation principle. The replacement will leave the bold-faced elements uninterpreted, as in (26).

   I-Top J.-Nom M.-Acc love-Pres-DE-C believe-Pres-DE
   'I believe John loves Mary.'

   J.-Nom I-Top believe-Pres-DE
   'I believe John loves Mary.'

   M.-Acc I-Top believe-Pres-DE
   'I believe John loves Mary.'

   J.-Nom M.-Acc I-Top believe-Pres-DE
   'I believe John loves Mary.'

Thus, examples like (25b-d) appear to favor Ahn and Cho's (2009, 2010) 'no illicit CP ellipsis' account, but disfavor Chung's (2009) constituency-based account.

3.4 Non-elidability of an Embedded Predicate Still Asks for an Account

In this section, it will be argued that, whether CP ellipsis is banned or not, grammar should address the non-elidability of the predicate. Ahn and Cho (2009, 2010) attribute the ungrammatical status of (22B) and (22B') to an illicit CP ellipsis,
but their argument holds only under the assumption that the surviving embedded elements have undergone scrambling out of the embedded clause prior to the CP ellipsis. (See (22B') and (22B)' in the previous section.) What if these elements remain within the embedded CP? If scrambling is optional, which does seem to be the case, and the surviving embedded elements remain within the embedded CP, they have to address the problem of non-elidability of the embedded predicate. Thus, it is likely that both the ban on CP ellipsis and the ban on predicate ellipsis are required: the former for cases where the surviving embedded elements undergo scrambling; the latter for cases where no scrambling takes place.

The ungrammatical status of (25b-d) is also equivocal as to the two theories. Although these examples appear to indicate that Chung’s (2007, 2009) constituency approach fails, the strings in these examples do not necessarily support Ahn and Cho’s (2009, 2010) account, either. Notice there is an alternative analysis, which involves neither a CP ellipsis nor a pro object. As illustrated in (26)', these examples can result from deleting the embedded predicate (possibly along with some dependents) and then moving the whole embedded clause.

   J.-Nom M.-Acc love-Pres-DE-C I-Top believe-Pres-DE
   ‘I believe John loves Mary.’

   M.-Acc J.-Nom love-Pres-DE-C I-Top believe-Pres-DE
   ‘I believe John loves Mary.’

   J.-Nom M.-Acc love-Pres-DE-C I-Top believe-Pres-DE

Since there is nothing wrong with the CP movement, the ungrammatical status of sentences such as (25b-d) should be attributed to the non-elidability of the embedded predicate (possibly along with a proper subset of its dependents). Therefore, grammar should somehow account for the non-elidability of an embedded predicate.

Ahn and Cho do seem to be aware of the non-elidability of an embedded predicate, but for a different reason. In a footnote, they state that non-predicate elements cannot remain within the embedded clause if a predicate is deleted, since gapping and stripping cannot be allowed in the embedded clause in general even in
a language like English, taking the examples in (27):

(27) (=Ahn and Cho 2009c: 269, footnote 2, their (i))
   a. *Alfonse stole the emeralds, and I think Mugasy the pearls.
      (Hankamer 1979: 19)
   b. *The critics praised your book, and someone told me that the poem too.

Some comments are in order as to their account. First, it has to be explained why gapping or stripping is disallowed in the embedded clause. Second, English does seem to allow gapping in the embedded context, as exemplified in (28).

(28) a. My son, do not despise the LORD's discipline and do not resent his rebuke, because the LORD disciplines those he loves, as a father [disciplines] the son he delights in. (Proverbs 3: 11-12, NIV)
   b. May I never boast except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world has been crucified to me, and I [have been crucified] to the world. (Galatians 6:14, NIV)
   c. But if I do it, even though you do not believe me, believe the miracles, that you may know and understand that the Father is in me, and I [am] in the Father." (John 10: 38, NIV)
   d. It is true that some preach Christ out of envy and rivalry, but others [preach] out of goodwill. (Philippians 1:15, NIV)
   e. For I know how many are your offenses and how great are your sins. (Amos 5:12, NIV)

Differences between sentences such as (27a) and (28) warrant further study,15 but it is clear that gapping in the embedded context is at least sometimes, allowed in English, while predicate ellipsis in the embedded context is plainly disallowed in Korean.

15 Sung-Ho Ahn (p.c.) and Myung-Kwan Park (p.c) point out to me that examples in (28) can be accounted for by Johnson's (1994) analysis of gapping: a predicate can move leftward out of a coordinate structure in an ATB fashion. This kind of movement is blocked in a structure like (27a) due to the presence of a complementizer.
A third remark I would like to make is that no embedded element can remain overt when the embedded predicate is missing, no matter how many elements remain undeleted:

    I-Top J.-Nom M.-Dat book-Acc give-Pst-DE-C 
    mit-nun-ta. 
    believe-Pres-DE 
    ‘I believe that John gave Mary a book.’ 
B: [#[ na-nun [ John-i Sue-eykey chayk-ul cwu-ess-ta-ko] 
    I-Top J.-Nom S.-Dat book-Acc give-Pst-DE-C 
    mit-nun-ta. 
    believe-Pres-DE 
    (Intended) ‘I believe that John gave Sue a book.’

Utterances like (29B) can be equated neither with gapping nor stripping: It is not a gapping construction since what is deleted is not a predicate alone; It is also not a stripping since what is left is more than one element in the embedded clause. Finally, it is yet to be confirmed whether the lack of predicate deletion in Korean can be equated with gapping or stripping in English. Notice that the verb in English does not necessarily appear at the right edge of a clause, while the predicate in Korean is fixed at the right edge at least in the embedded context (and, arguably, in the matrix context as well, if Chung 2009, 2011 is right).

4. Summary and Conclusion


Ahn and Cho's (2008a, 2008b) CL+POP account of the immobility of the embedded predicate crucially needs an anti-locality condition as an auxiliary requirement. We have seen, however, that, under their own assumption that an inflected verb is lexically inserted, there is no reason not to move the embedded verb (possibly along with internal arguments) within the embedded CP phase, without violating the anti-locality condition. (See also footnote 10). Given this possibility, their CL+POP account fails to capture the immobility of the embedded predicate. Furthermore, we have seen that the CL+POP account makes a wrong predication with respect to rightward movement.

Ahn and Cho (2009, 2010) account for the non-elidability of the embedded predicate in terms of a licensing condition on ellipsis. They reanalyze all the problematic cases with respect to the non-elidability of the embedded predicate as involving a derivational history in which surviving embedded elements have scrambled to the matrix clause and an illegitimate CP ellipsis takes place. Such a derivation is disallowed in their system since CP cannot be deleted as a complement of a lexical category (V). Notice, however, that, unless the scrambling in such a structure proves to be obligatory, the surviving embedded elements may remain in the imbedded clause; grammar should address the non-elidability of the embedded predicate.

In conclusion, the statement that inflected predicates in Korean are invisible to syntax is a correct generalization which has to be addressed by grammar. We have argued that Chung's (2007, 2008a, 2009) constituency account based on the PF merge of a verb stem and its inflectional endings deals well with the generalization. To block the illicit case of CP ellipsis, we may have to assume, with Lobeck (1995), Merchant (2001, 2004), and Ahn and Cho (2009, 2010), that only a functional category licenses ellipsis.
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