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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.

* This paper was supported by 2012 Hannam Research Fund. I thank two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions. The remaining errors are my own.
(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. 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.’
But I-Top Nom Acc love-Dec-C believe
ani han-ta
not do-Dec
‘But I don’t believe that Yenghi loves Toli.’

---

2 Lee & Kim (2010) discusses the possibility of DP deletion in Korean but I will not get into the discussion of DP deletion in this paper, referring readers to Ahn & Cho’s (2010) counterarguments to Lee & Kim’s arguments.
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; Toli-lul [CP t_i t_j saranghantako]
   mitci ani hanta
B2’. Haciman, na-nun Yenghi-ka; [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. 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.

   I-Top Nom Acc love-Dec-C think-Dec
   ‘I think that 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

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.

    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 *-kes* 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 tolaao-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. As evidence for this, we can see that a Case marker can be attached to this ending, which is not possible after the complementer \(-ko\).

(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 tochakhayssun-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 behavior 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
   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
          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.

   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).

    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], 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 [NegP amwu chayk-toi [CP t_i t_i 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 *kus 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

---

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.
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