Apparent CP Deletion and DP Relatedness*

Keun-Won Sohn

(Hannam University)

Sohn, Keun-Won. 2012. Apparent CP Deletion and DP Relatedness. *Linguistic Research* 29(1), 107-126. This paper deals with the apparent CP deletion phenomena in Korean discussed in Ahn & Cho (2009) first. Ahn & Cho claim that CP deletion is not allowed in Korean and the cases which seem to involve CP deletion are not really CP deletion constructions, but involve invisible pronoun *pro*. Although sharing the same view regarding the non-existence of real CP deletion, this paper deduces a different generalization from Ahn & Cho. According to Ahn & Cho, *pro* is allowed only when overt pronoun *ku kes* is allowed, regardless of whether there is a clausal DP counterpart of the apparently deleted CP or not. But this paper claims that there is a perfect parallelism between the occurrence of *pro* and the comparable clausal DP counterpart of the CP complement. This paper also provides an alternative analysis for the NPI containing CP deletion cases, showing that deletion is possible in these cases only when the NPI and its licenser are both included in the deletion (or replacement) site. **(Hannam University)**

Keywords   apparent CP deletion, *pro*, overt pronoun, DP relatedness, NPIs, constituent, substitution

1. Introduction

Recently, there have been two different types of analyses proposed for the possibility of CP/DP deletion in Korean. Ahn & Cho (2009, 2010, 2011), in a series of papers, claim that there is no CP nor DP deletion in Korean just as in English. It has been claimed in English that only functional categories can license deletion of their complements and hence, CP appearing as a complement of the lexical category V cannot be a target of deletion (Lobeck 1995, Merchant 2001). The following examples from Lobeck (1995:125) show that functional categories C, T, and D can license TP, VP, and NP deletion, respectively.

---

(1) A: John caught a big fish.

    B: a. Yes, but we don't know how [$_{TP}$ e].

       b. Yes, but Mary didn't [$_{VP}$ e].

       c. Yes, but Mary's [$_{NP}$ e] was bigger.

The examples in (2) (and (3) from Merchant (2001:119), in turn, show that CP deletion is not possible. (I have slightly modified the examples).[1]

(2) A: I regret/asserted that we bought the charcoal grill.

    B: *I regret/asserted [$_{CP}$ e], too.

(3) A: I proposed/demanded that we buy the charcoal grill.

    B: *I proposed/demanded [$_{CP}$ e], too.

Following this guiding idea, Ahn & Cho claim that only functional categories can license deletion in Korean and hence there is no CP/DP deletion in Korean as well. There are some apparent counterexamples to their claim because we can find some constructions in which CP seems to be able to be deleted, as shown below.

(4) A: Na-nun [Yenghi-ka Toli-lul   saranghan-ta-ko] mitnunta

      I-Top   Nom   Acc love-Dec-C   believe

      'I believe that Yenghi loves Mary.'

    B: Na-nun _____ mitci   ani hanta

      I-Top   believe not do

      '(Lit) I don't believe.'

But Ahn & Cho propose that this seeming CP or DP deletion is not really a deletion but a construction containing an invisible pronoun *pro*. On the other hand, Park (2009) and Lee & Kim (2010) claim that this kind of construction can involve the deletion of either CP or DP and hence CP or DP deletion is actually possible in Korean.

---

[1] Surely, DP deletion is not allowed in English either as shown below. As an anonymous reviewer points out, the comprehensive discussion of deletion in Korean must include DP deletion, but I will not get into the discussion of DP deletion in this paper as it is independent of the focus of this paper.

This paper delves into this issue of the (non)existence of CP deletion in Korean and shows that Ahn & Cho's view is on the right track.[2] But at the same time, it is proposed that a new generalization is needed to capture the genuine states of facts regarding this issue. More specifically it will be proposed that apparent CP complement deletion is possible only when the relevant construction has a DP complement analogue. It will also be shown that the NPI containing CP complements can be replaced by *pro* only when they contain both the NPI and the licenser within the replacement site, departing from Park (2009) and Ahn & Cho (2009).

2. Previous Analysis

2.1 Apparent CP Deletion as *pro* Substitution − Ahn & Cho (2009)

Chung (2008, 2009) notes that predicate deletion is not allowed in Korean and attributes the unacceptability of this predicate deletion to the impossibility of non-constituent deletion. Consider the following examples (I use the modified version of Chung's original examples used in Ahn & Cho (2009) for the clarification of presentation).

(5) A.   Na-nun [Yenghi-ka Toli-lul   saranghan-ta-ko]   mitnun-ta
        I-Top   Nom   Acc love-Dec-C   believe-Dec
        'I believe that Yenghi loves Toli.'

   B1. Haciman, na-nun [Yenghi-ka Toli-lul   ~~saranghan-ta=ko~~]   mitci
        But   I-Top   Nom   Acc love-Dec-C   believe
        ani   han-ta
        not   do-Dec
        'But I don't believe that Yenghi loves Toli.'

B2. Haciman, na-nun [Yenghi-ka ~~Toli-lul saranghantako~~] mitci ani hanta

B3. Haciman, na-nun ~~[Yenghi-ka Toli-lul saranghantako]~~ mitci ani hanta

Chung claims that (5B1) and (5B2) are degraded because the deleted sequence has the following structure, respectively.

(6) a. [$_{CP}$ [$_{MP}$ [$_{TP}$ Yenghi-ka Toli-lul *sarangha-n*] *ta*] *ko*] (for 5B1)

　　b. [$_{CP}$ [$_{MP}$ [$_{TP}$ Yenghi-ka *Toli-lul sarangha-n*] *ta*] *ko*] (for 5B2)

Regardless of whether *Toli-lul* is included in the ellipsis site or not, *saranghantako* is too dispersed over several categories to be a constituent and Chung claims that this is why neither *saranghantako* nor *Toli-lul saranghantako* can be deleted. Naturally, the reason (5B3) is acceptable is that the deleted sequence can form a constituent, under Chung's analysis.

However, Ahn & Cho (2009) provide a different account for the predicate non-deletion contexts. They raise a question of why the following structures are not allowed for the given examples.

(7) B1'. Haciman, na-nun   Yenghi-ka$_i$ Toli-lul$_j$ [$_{CP}$ t$_i$ t$_j$ ~~saranghantako~~]
　　　　 mitci ani hanta

　 B2'. Haciman, na-nun   Yenghi-ka$_i$ [$_{CP}$ t$_i$ ~~Toli-lul   saranghantako~~]
　　　　 mitci ani hanta

This kind of structure should be available as long as moving *Yenghi-ka* and *Toli-lul* out of the embedded clause through scrambling is possible. Notice that there is no theoretical reason for us not to allow such movement.[3] In these structures, there is a plausible target for deletion, the complement CP *[$_{CP}$ t$_i$ t$_j$ saranghantako]* or *[$_{CP}$ t$_i$ Toli-lul saranghantako]* and hence the account based on non-constituent deletion can no longer work for these examples. After pointing out this possibility of having a constituent deletion context, Ahn & Cho go on to claim that the unacceptability of (5B1/5B2) is not due to the non-constituent deletion but to the impossibility of CP deletion in general in Korean.

---

[3] For the given structure to be possible, the scrambling of the embedded subject should be allowed. For the relevant discussion, see Lee (1993), Sohn (1995), Ko (2007) and many others.

More specifically, Ahn & Cho (2009) propose that only functional heads such as C, T, and D can bear the [E] feature (*a la* Lobeck (1990, 1995) and Merchant (2001)) and this [E] feature licenses the ellipsis of their complements. But as V is not a functional head and hence doesn't bear the [E] feature, complement CP deletion is not allowed. They bring the following set of examples to attention to support their claim.

(8) A: Na-nun [Yenghi-ka Toli-lul   salanghan-ta-ko] sayngkakhan-ta
       I-Top   Nom   Acc love-Dec-C   think-Dec
       'I thinkl thhat Yenghi loves Toli.'
    B: *Na-to _____ sayngkakhan-ta
       I-also   think-Dec
       '(Lit) I think, too.'

If CP deletion is allowed, the status of (8B) is left unexplained as there seems to be no reason for (8B) not to be allowed.

Then how can we explain the examples which seem to involve CP ellipsis? The relevant examples are introduced below.

(9) A: Na-nun [Yenghi-ka Toli-lul   sarangha-n-ta-ko] mitnun-ta
       I-Top   Nom   Acc love-Dec-C   believe-Dec
       'I believe that Yenghi loves Toli.'
    B: Na-nun _____ mitci   ani han-ta
       I-Top   believe not do-Dec
       '(Lit) I don't believe.'

For the grammaticality of (9B), Ahn & Cho claim that the categorial status of the unrepresented complement position in (9B) is not CP, but DP. They attribute the wellformedness of (9B) to the existence of the DP complement counterpart as shown below.

(10)   A: Na-nun [Yenghi-ka Toli-lul   saranghan-ta-nun kes]-ul
          I-Top   Nom   Acc love-Dec-Adn   fact-Acc
          mitnun-ta

believe-Dec

'I believe the fact that Yenghi loves Toli.'

B: Na-nun _____ mitci ani han-ta

There is also an overt counterpart of this missing DP construction as correctly pointed out by Ahn & Cho.

(11)   Na-to ku   kes/sasil-ul   mitnun-ta
       I-also that thing/fact-Acc believe-Dec
       'I believe that, too.'

But what they propose is not a DP-ellipsis analysis, but a *pro* analysis such that the missing NP/DP position is occupied by the null pronoun *pro,* which is allowed in Korean and Japanese, but not in English.[4] According to this proposal, (10B) has the structure given below and there is no such operation as CP or DP ellipsis in Korean, just as in English.

(12)   Na-to   pro   mitnunta
       I-also   believe
       '(Lit) I believe, too.'

Ahn & Cho's observation is significant as it provides a crosslinguistic support for Lobeck's (1995) and Merchant's (2001) proposal that only functional categories can license deletion. But Park (2009) raises several interesting questions about this analysis, which will be discussed in the next section.

2.2 Park (2009) — Raising Questions for the Apparent CP Deletion

Park (2009) first notes that there is a question of how the relevant deletion phenomenon meets the identity condition on ellipsis, which requires that deletion applies in identity with its antecedent. The antecedent is a non-nominal verbal clause in (9A) while the elided element in (9B), for example, is claimed to be a nominal

---

4 Ahn & Cho refer readers to Huang (1984, 1989, 1991) for the nature of *pro*.

clause. This, Ahn & Cho claim, is not really a problem because we are not dealing with deletion, but replacement phenomena.

Secondly, Park points out that the wellformedness of (13B) below can be problematic for Ahn & Cho's analysis.

(13) A: ?Na-nun [Yenghi-ka   amwu chayk-to   ilkess-ta-ko] mitci
          I-Top   Nom any   book-also read-Dec-C believe
          ani han-ta
          not do-Dec
          'I don't believe that Yenghi read any book.'
      B: Na-to _____ mitci   ani han-ta
         I-Top   believe not do-Dec
         '(Lit) I don't believe, either.'

If Ahn & Cho are correct, (13B) is allowed because there is a nominal counterpart that can be the antecedent of *pro* in the complement position of *mit-*. But (14), the DP counterpart of (13A), is not quite acceptable, and hence it doesn't seem to be clear why (13B) is allowed.

(14) ?*Na-nun [Yenghi-ka   amwu chayk-to   ilkess-ta-nun kes]-ul
          I-Top   Nom any   book-also read-Dec-Adn fact-Acc
      mitci   ani han-ta
      believe not do-Dec
      '(Lit) I don't believe the fact that Yenghi read no book.'

Ahn & Cho reply to Park's second question by saying that it doesn't matter whether the DP counterpart of the CP is allowed or not, as long as the overt pronominal counterpart is allowed. To prove their point, they give (15), judging it to be grammatical.[5]

(15) Na-to ku kes-ul   mitci   ani han-ta
      I-also the thing-Acc believe not do-Dec

---

[5] I will revisit this example in a later section as there is a different judgment on it, which leads to a significantly different conclusion from Ahn & Cho.

'(Lit) I don't believe that, either.'

To make a long story short, the generalization eventually Ahn & Cho's analysis arrives at is that *pro* is allowed when the overt pronoun is allowed in the CP complement position regardless of whether there is a clausal DP counterpart or not. But it will be shown in the sections to follow that the generalization should also consider the (non-)existence of clausal DP counterpart as a crucial factor. Either the seeming CP complement itself has the property of DP or it at least has to have the clausal DP counterpart, to allow the overt pronoun or *pro* replacement. It is also shown that Ahn & Cho's analysis of NPI constructions (=(13-15)) piggybags an unwanted assumption about the nature of *pro* substitution such that *pro* replaces a non-constituent and hence a new analysis will be proposed to remedy this potential problem.

3. CP Deletion across Constructions

To confirm this idea of DP relatedness with more comprehensive set of data, I will examine various different types of CP complement constructions in this section and show that DP relatedness is the crucial pre-condition for apparent CP deletion contexts.

3.1 Factive Verbs

Factive verbs like *hwuhoyha-(regret)* take a *-ke*s complement, which is nominal by nature (Yang 1990, etc.) and hence allow their complement to be replaced by overt/covert pronouns. The parallelism between the DP status of the complement and the pronoun replacibility obtains in the clearest way.

(16)   a. Mary-nun [swukcey-lul   an han kes]-ul
              Top homework-Acc not do   Nom-Acc
         hwuhoyhanta/kiekhanta
         regret   memorize
         'Mary regrets/remembers that she didn't do her homework.'

b. Na-to (ku kes-ul)   hwuhoyhanta/kiekhanta
I-also   the thing-Acc regret   remember
'(Lit) I regret/remember (that), too.'

3.2 Future Oriented Verbs Taking −*ki* Complements

The future oriented verbs such as *wenha-(want), para-(hope)* take −*ki* complements and they behave just like the factive verbs.

(17) a. John-un   [kunye-ka tolao-ki]-lul   paranta/wenhanta
          Top she-Nom return-C-Acc hope/want
      'John hopes that she comes back. John wants her to come back.'
      b. Na-to (ku kes-ul) paranta/wenhanta
      '(Lit) I hope/want (that), too.'

These verbs don't just allow the overt pronoun *kukes* or *pro* as in (19b), but the original CP complement itself appears attached with the Case marker −*lul*. Although it is possible for the complement clause to appear without this Case marker -*lul*, the sentence is more natural with the Case marker unelided. This is well in accord with the long standing observation that -*ki* in Korean is a nominalizer (see Rhee 2012, for example) and the parallelism between the DP status of CP and the replacibility by overt/covert pronoun is fulfilled.

3.3 Question Verbs Taking Interrogative Clauses as Complements

Interrogative clause complements appear attached with the complementizer −*ci* as is well known and this −*ci* marker seems to assign a sort of nominal power to the complement clause.[6] As evidence for this, we can see that a Case marker can be attached to this ending, which is not possible after the complementizer −*ko*.

(18)   a. Yenghi-nun [nwu-ka   Toli-lul   cohahanun-ci](-lul)   anta/mulessta
             Top who-Nom   Acc like-C(-Acc)   know/asked

---

6 Yang (1990) also classifies −*ci* as a [+nominal] head, based on the Case marker attachment facts and others.

'Yenghi knows/asked who likes Toli.'

    b. Minseo-to   (ku kes-ul)   anta/mwulessta

                also the thing-Acc know/asked

    '(Lit.) Minseo knows/asked (that), too.'

(19) a. Sinwoo-nun [nwu-ka   tochakhayssnun-ci](-ka)

             Top who-Nom arrived-C   Nom

    kwungkumhata/alko sipta

    wonder/want to know

    'Sinwoo wonders/want to know who arrived.'

    b. Hyunsoo-to   (ku kes-i)   kwungkumhata/alko sipta

             also the thing-Nom wonder/want to know

Furthermore, this *-ci* clause can also serve as the subject of a sentence.

(20) a. A: [Ney-ka   nwukwu-lul mannanun-ci]-ka cwungyohata

         you-Nom who-Acc   meet-C-Nom   important

        'Who you meet is important.'

    B: Ung, (ku kes-i)   cwungyohay

      yes   the thing-Nom important

      'Yes, (that is) important.'

    b. A: [ku yonguyca-ka encey tolawassnun-ci]-ka pwunmyenghaci

         the suspect-Nom when returned-C-Nom   clear

         ani hata

         not do

        'When the suspect has returned is not clear.'

    B: Ung, (ku kes-i)   pwunmyenghaci ani hay

      Yes   the thing-Nom clear   not do

      'Yes, (that is) not clear.'

All of these *−ci* clauses can be replaced by *ku kes* or *pro* as shown above. Hence it seems reasonable to conclude that replacibility by overt/covert pronoun parallels the DP status of the seeming CP complement.

3.4 *seltukha-* (persuade) Type Verbs Taking NP CP Complements

The next group of verbs to be examined is the *seltukha-(persuade)* type verbs. This also patterns with the previous two types of verbs as we can see from the following examples.

(21) a. Ku kyengchal-i   nay-key maul-ul   ttenara-ko
          the policeman-Nom I-Dat   town-Acc leave-C
          seoltukhayssta/kangyohayssta
          persuaded/forced
          'The policeman persuaded/forced me to leave the town.'
       b. Ku kwunin-to nay-key (ku   kes-ul)
          the soldier-Dat I-Dat   the   thing-Acc
          seoltukhayssta/kangyohayssta
          persuaded/forced
          '(Lit) The soldier also persuaded/forced me that.'
       c. Ku kyengchal-i   nay-key [maul-ul   ttenal **kes**]-ul
          the policeman-Nom I-Dat   town-Acc leave **thing**-Acc
          seoltukhayss-ta/kangyohayssta
          persuaded/forced
          '(Lit) the policeman persuaded/forced me the thing that I should leave the town.'

3.5 Causatives

Causatives in Korean have the ‑*key* marker attached at the end of its complement and this ‑*key* is not quite compatible with the Case marker and there is no DP counterpart available. The impossibility of overt/covert pronoun hence is well in accord with these properties of causatives.

(22) a. John-un   tongsaying-i/eykey ku chayk-ul   sa-key(*-lul)
              Top brother-Nom/Dat   the book-Acc buy-KEY-Acc
          hayssta/mantulessta
          had/made

'John had/made his brother buy the book.'

b. Mary-to kulehkey/*kukes-ul/*pro hayssta/mantulessta

4. *pro* and DP Relatedness

4.1 A Closer Look at the Verb *mit- (believe)*

So far, we saw that in all the constructions we have examined, CP deletion is allowed only when the CP in concern actually have a DP status, or has at least a clausal DP counterpart. This leaves the *mit-* construction as the only exception for the generalization. In this section, I will show that this *mit-* construction is not an exception but perfectly conforms to the generalization. To show this point, we need to observe the beahvior of the verb *'mit-'* more closely. Consider the following examples.

(23) (In the context that I am not the advisor of the two students in concern)

a. I   haksayng-un   nay-ka caki citokyoswu-la-ko mitnunta
   this student-Top   I-Nom self advisor-be-C   believe
   'This student believes that I am his advisor (although I am not).'

b. *Ce haksayng-to _____ mitnunta

c. Ce haksayng-to kulehkey/*ku kes-ul mitnunta

(24) a. I   haksayng-un Brazil-i   Eurep-ey iss-ta-ko   mitnunta
      this student-Top   Brazil-Nom Europe-at be-Dec-C believe
      'This student believes that Brazil is in Europe.'

b. *Ce haksayng-to _____ mitnunta
    that student-also   believe
   '(Lit) That student believe, too.'

c. Ce haksayng-to kulehkey/*kukes-ul mitnunta
   that student-also so   it   believe
   'That student believes so/*it, too.'

Unlike the examples in (9) discussed previously to show that apparent CP

deletion is possible with the complement of the verb *mit-*, apparent CP deletion is not allowed in the above examples.

What is significant is that the overt pronoun counterparts of (23b) and (24b) are not allowed either. Hence, Ahn & Cho's original generalization for the relatedness between the apparent CP deletion and overt pronoun counterpart still seems to hold. Recall that their *pro* replacement is allowed only when its overt counterpart *ku kes* is allowed in the deleted CP position. But the important question is still not answered − the question of why it is possible to have the overt/covert pronoun substitution in the examples in (9), but not in the above examples.

What captures our attention is again the generalization we arrived at in examining various different type of CP complement constructions: Only when there is a clausal DP counterpart of the complement CP (or when the complement CP has actually the DP status) *pro* can replace the complement CP. Notice that the clausal DP counterparts of (23a) and (24a) are not acceptable in the given contexts.

(25) a. *I   haksayng-un [nay-ka   caki citokyoswu-la-nun kes]-ul
            this student-Top   I-Nom   self advisor-be-Adn   thing-Acc
         mitnunta
         believe
         '(Lit) This student believes the fact that I am his advisor (although
         I am not).'
     b. *I   haksayng-un [Brazil-i   Eurep-ey iss-ta-nun   kes]-ul
            this student-Top   Nom Europe-in be-Dec-Adn thing-Acc
         mitnunta
         believe
         '(Lit) This student believes the fact that Brazil is in Europe.'

Hence, the discussion so far clearly shows that the DP relatedness of the CP complement is crucial in the seeming CP deletion cases. The apparent CP ellipsis is allowed only when the seeming CP is actually a DP or when the seeming CP has a clausal DP counterpart. This generalization is represented in (26):

(26) Generalization on CP replacing *pro*
      pro can replace the CP complement only when

(i) the CP itself has a DP status or

(ii) there is a clausal DP counterpart.

4.2 NPI Containing CP Deletion

Given (26), we have to naturally ask why there is still one exception to this generalization. We saw in section 2 that there is a dissociation between the existence of the clausal DP counterpart and the acceptability of the overt/covert pronoun replacement is the NPI case. The relevant examples are reintroduced below.

(13) A: ?Na-nun [Yenghi-ka   amwu chayk-to   ilkess-ta-ko] mitci
            I-Top   Nom any   book-also read-Dec-C believe
          ani han-ta
          not do-Dec
          'I don't believe that Yenghi read any book.'
      B: Na-to _____ mitci   ani han-ta
          I-Top   believe not do-Dec
          '(Lit) I don't believe, either.'

(14) ?*Na-nun [Yenghi-ka   amwu chayk-to   ilkess-ta-nun   kes]-ul
          I-Top   Nom any   book-also read-Dec-Adn fact-Acc
       mitci   ani han-ta
       believe not do-Dec
       '(Lit) I don't believe the fact that Yenghi read no book.'

What I would like to point out is that there is a different type of judgment for (13B). I share the same judgment with Park (2009), regarding (13A) and (14), but (13B) seems quite degraded. The same type of judgment is reported from the native speakers I have consulted, as well.

In close inspection, this alternative judgment for (13B) can lead to an explanation of otherwise unexplicable facts in a very natural way. Ahn & Cho, in answering Park's question regarding the NPI containing CP deletion cases, take up an assumption that doesn't seem to be quite motivated. It is widely accepted now that NPIs in Korean and Japanese are licensed in overt syntax (S-structure government account by Takahashi (1990) and Suh (1990), and overt checking

account by Sohn (1995), for example).

    (27) a. Na-nun [John-i   amwuto saranghaci ani han-ta-ko]   mitnunta
             I-Top   Nom anyone love   not do-Dec-C   believe
             'I believe that John doesn't love anyone.'
        b. ?*Na-nun [John-i   amwuto saranghanta-ko] mitci   ani hanta
             I-Top   Nom anyone love-C   believe not do
             'I don't believe that John loves anyone.'
        c. amwuto$_i$ na-nun [John-i   t$_i$ saranghanta-ko] mitci ani hanta

    The sentence is grammatical when the NPI *amwuto* occurs as a clausemate of the negation as shown in (27a). The reason (27b) is degraded is that the NPI *amwuto* is located in the embedded clause while the licenser *ani* is in the matrix clause. The sentence becomes grammatical as soon as the NPI is moved to the matrix clause, as in (27c). Seeing this, Sohn (1995) proposes that NPIs in Korean are licensed through checking in overt syntax. To satisfy this requirement, the NPI has to move to spec of NegP in overt syntax and if this doesn't happen, the sentence becomes ungrammatical. One potential problem for this analysis is that there are people who accept (27b), judging this example to be marginal. In fact, the acceptability of this example seems to change for everyone depending on how they read it. When this sentence is read without any pause, the sentence is felt to be clearly unacceptable. But when it is read with a pause just after the NPI *amwuto,* its acceptability improves quite radically. The question is why do we have this contrast, as shown in (28a,b)?

    (28)   a. ?Na-nun John-i amwuto # saranghanta-ko mitci ani hanta
          b.?*Na-nun [John-i amwuto saranghanta-ko] mitci ani hanta
          c. *[John-i amwuto saranghanta-ko]$_i$ na-nun t$_i$ mitci ani hanta

    According to Sohn, this is attributed to the dislocation possibility entertained by the given sequence. That is, the embedded subject and the NPI, can independently move to the matrix clause, and as a result the NPI can be located in the NegP spec in overt syntax. The pause after the NPI is an indicator that such movement has occurred. Without the pause, the sentence is ungrammatical as there is no movement

involved, and hence the NPI is left unlicensed in overt syntax. This explanation receives a direct support from the fact that when the embedded clause is preposed as in (28c), the sentence is totally unacceptable, This is because there is no way for the NPI *amwuto* to be licensed in the given sequence.

With this much background on the nature of Korean NPIs, let us go back to the NPI examples (13) and (15).

(13) A: ?Na-nun Yenghi-ka amwu chayk-to ilkessta-ko mitci ani hanta
       B: Na-to _____ mitci ani hanta
(15) Na-to kukes-ul mitci ani hanta

That the native speakers find (13B) degraded, I claim, is natural. (13A) is marginally acceptable because there is a derivation in which the embedded subject is moved to the matrix clause above NegP and the NPI to the NegP Spec. But this very fact makes the account given by Ahn & Cho incoherent.

It is well known that substitution by a pronoun is strictly dependent on the constituency relation. More specifically, only a constituent can be a target of substitution. Assuming that this is true, Ahn & Cho's account for the given set of examples faces a serious problem. The following is the structure after *Yeonghi-ka* and *amwu chayk-to* have moved out of the embedded clause.

(29) [$_{TP}$ Na-nun Yeonghi-ka$_i$ [$_{NegP}$ amwu chayk-to$_j$ [$_{CP}$ t$_i$ t$_j$ ilkessta-ko] mitci ani] hanta]

We can easily see that although the NPI is properly licensed in this structure, the sequence *[Yeonghi-ka amwu chayk-to ilkessta-ko]* is no longer a constituent. This being so, it is not clear how the overt pronoun *ku kes-lul* or the covert pronoun *pro* can replace this sequence unless we assume that *kukes* and *pro* can replace even non-constituents.

Also unexplained is why only in this case, the nicely working DP relatedness hypothesis for CP deletion contexts breaks down. In all other cases where the seeming CP deletion is allowed, the CP in concern either has a DP or nominal property or has a clausal DP counterpart of the CP. This generalization doesn't hold only in this NPI containing CP deletion context.

Both of these problems can be remedied as soon as we turn our attention to the alternative judgment pattern. As reported above, native speakers I have consulted (including me) find (13B) unacceptable in the given context. Under this type of judgment, everything falls out naturally. First, the illformedness of (13B) is accounted for because the invisible pronoun *pro* cannot replace the non-constituent, with the embedded subject and NPI moved out of the embedded clause. Secondly, we can keep the generalization (26) intact. *Pro* is employed only when there is a DP relatedness and the NPI construction is not an exception any more. It is not possible to have the seeming CP deletion in the NPI construction in concern because there is a conflict between the NPI licensing requirement and the constituency requirement for *pro* replacement. If there is no such conflict, the sentence becomes perfect as shown below.

(30) A: Na-nun Yenghi-ka   amwu chayk-to ilkci ani hayssta-ko
         I-Top   Nom any   book-also read not did-C
         mitnunta
         believe
         'I believe that Yenghi didn't read any book.'
     B: Na-to (ku kes-ul)   mitnunta
         I-also   the thing-Acc believe
         '(Lit) I believe (that), too.'

Hence, it is concluded that there is a deeper relation to be captured in the apparent CP deletion context, not just restricted to the *pro* - overt pronoun relation. Admittedly, *pro* is allowed only when the overt pronoun *ku kes* is allowed. But there is a deeper level of generalization that *pro* (and the overt pronoun, for that matter) is allowed only when the substituted CP either has a DP status or has a clausal DP counterpart. The next stage of the research would be to find out why such parallelism obtains at all. How to accommodate this parallelism under the current theoretical framework will be left as an open question for now.[7] [8]

---

[7] One point to be reported is that there are some speakers who are very strict about *pro*/overt pronoun replacement and thus are resistant to using *pro* in the given context. Instead, they need to have *kulehkey* (*so* or *that way*) in the CP complement position. In fact, this specific example(=iB) doesn't seem look too good to me either. The implication of the existence of this type of judgment and example calls for further research.

5. Conclusion

This paper tried to show the DP relatedness of the CP complement to be replaced by the overt/covert pronoun. It has been claimed that for apparent CP deletion to be allowed, the complement CP either has to have the DP property or has the clausal DP counterpart. Also this paper provided a different type of account for the NPI involving CP deletion cases, based on the idea that pronoun replacement, covert or overt, is possible only with a constituent.

References

Ahn, Hee-Don and Sungeun Cho. 2009. On the absence of CP ellipsis in English and Korean. *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 34(2): 267-281.

Ahn, Hee-Don and Sungeun Cho. 2010. More on the absence of CP ellipsis: A Reply to Park (2009). *Studies in Generative Grammar* 20(1): 137-148.

Ahn, Hee-Don and Sungeun Cho. 2011. Notes on apparent DP ellipsis: A Reply to Lee & Kim (2010). *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 36(2): 457-472.

Chung, Daeho. 2008. On (im)mobility of predicates in Korean: some discrepancies between non-elliptical vs. embedded contexts. Paper presented at 2008 Fall Joint Conference of KSLI and MGC.

Chung, Daeho. 2009. Do not target a predicate: it is not a constituent. Paper presented at 6th Altaic Formal Linguistics.

Huang, C-T. James. 1984. On the distribution and reference of empty pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15: 531-574.

(i) A: Na-nun [Yenghi-ka   maul-ul   imi   ttenassta-ko] mitnunta
     I-Top   Nom town-Acc already left-C   believe
     'I believe that Yenghi already left town.'
  B: ??Na-to _____   mitnunta
     I-also   believe
     '(Lit) I believe, too.'
   B': Na-to **kulehkey**   mitnunta
     I-also so/that way   believe
     'I believe so, too.'

[8] As a reviewer points out, this generalization that only DP related CP complements can be replaced by *pro* or an overt pronoun definitely requires further explanation. It is because the mechanism that allows this is not clear at all at this point. The question is where the syntactic replacement peeps into, to allow the substitution in concern?

Huang, C-T. James. 1989. Pro drop in Chinese: A generalized control theory. In Osvaldo Jaeggli and Ken Safir, eds., *The Null Subject Parameter.* Kluwer. Dordrecht.

Huang, C-T. James. 1991. Remarks on the status of the null object. In Robert Freidin, ed., *Principle and Parameters in Comparative Grammar*. MIT Press. Cambridge, MA.

Ko, Heejung. 2007. Asymmetries in scrambling and cyclic linearization. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38: 49-83.

Lee, Wooseung & Kim Jihyun. 2010. DP ellipsis as independent phenomena from *pro* in *pro*-drop languages. *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 35(4): 1009-1030.

Lee, Young-Sook 1993. *Scrambling as Case-driven obligatory movement*. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Lobeck, Anne. 1990. Functional heads as proper governors. *NELS* 20: 348-362.

Lobeck, Anne. 1995. *Ellipsis: Functional Heads, Licensing, and Identification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands, and the Theory of Ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Park, Myung-Kwan. 2009. An (Impossible) excursion into matrix [Spec,vP] out of an elided complement clause in Korean. *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 34: 895-917.

Rhee, Seongha. 2012. On the rise of fall of Korean nominalizers, In Maria Jose Lopez-Couso and Elena Seoane (eds.), in collaboration with Teresa Fanego. *Rethinking Grammaticalization: New Perspectives for the Twenty-first Century.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Sohn, Keun-Won. 1994. Doctoral dissertation. University of Connecticut, Storrs. *Negative polarity items, scope, and economy.*

Suh, Jin-Hee. 1990. *Scope phenomena and aspects of Korean syntax*. PhD dissertation, University of Southern California.

Takahashi, Daiko. 1990 Negative polarity, phrase structure, and the ECP. *English Linguistics* 7: 129-146.

Yang, Hyun-Kwon. 1990. *Categories and barriers*. PhD dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.

Keun-Won Sohn
Department of English Education
Hannam University
Daejeon, Korea 306-791
E-mail: kwsohn@hnu.kr