

# The Syntax of VP Ellipsis in Korean\*

Myung-Kwan Park

This paper argues against the existence of VP ellipsis in Korean. The constructions examined below are the Main Verb Only construction, the auxiliary verb construction and the stripping construction. The first construction, which Otani and Whitman (1991) argue as involving VP ellipsis, is better analyzed as containing null pronominal *pro* rather than null VP. The second construction, which can be considered as a counterpart of the VP ellipsis construction in English, does not allow VP ellipsis at all. The last, third construction, which Kim (1996) argues as resulting from VP ellipsis, should be treated on a par with the pseudoleft construction independent of VP ellipsis. It is suggested below that absence of VP ellipsis in these constructions is attributed to lack of tense which undergoes overt Spec-head Case checking relation, and of a head-governing free-morphemic positive or negative marker in Korean.

## 1. Introduction

One of the controversial issues surrounding Korean syntax is whether the VP ellipsis construction which corresponds to its counterpart in English exists in Korean. Based on the Main Verb Only (or MVO) construction, Otani and Whitman (O & W) (*ibid.*) and Takahashi (1993) present some positive arguments on the question. Hoji (1994), however, advances some negative arguments on the issue. This paper further supports Hoji's view of the MVO construction as not involving VP ellipsis. I then examine other related constructions than the MVO construction, and explore what implications these constructions suggest for the study of Korean syntax.

---

\*The earlier version of the paper was presented at the 7th Harvard International Symposium on Korean Linguistics in July 1997. I would like to thank the audience there, and two anonymous reviewers of this journal for their questions and comments. This research is supported, in part, by the 1997 Dongguk University Research Grant.

## 2.1. MVO as Involving VP Ellipsis?

The construction that O & W present as the counterpart of the VP ellipsis construction in English is in (1a) of Korean, whose surface form is just like (1b) of Irish:

- (1) a. Mary-ka Bill-ul manna-ass -ta kuliko  
       -Nom -Acc meet -Past-Decl and  
       Sue-to manna-ass -ta  
       -ALSO meet -Past-Decl  
       'Mary met Bill and Sue met (Bill).'

- b. Q: Ar chuir tu inteach air  
       INTERR COMP you in on it  
       'Did you apply for it?'

- A: Chuir  
       put [PAST]  
       'Yes.'

Irish : (McClosky (1990))

The main verb of the second conjunct in (1a) appears on the surface, but its object does not.<sup>1</sup> O & W argues, on a par with (1b), that sentences like (1a) are produced when the main verb raises out of the VP, which in turn undergoes ellipsis.<sup>2</sup> O & W's empirical motivations for assimilating the construction like (1) to the canonical VP ellipsis construction of English are: (i) the construction yields a sloppy identity reading just like the English VP ellipsis construction; (ii) and the MVO construction exhibits locality effects on a sloppy reading just like the English VP ellipsis construction. However, Hoji (ibid.) maintains that what is considered as a sloppy reading in the MVO construction of Japanese (and Korean) is not a genuine sloppy reading. The crucial evidence Hoji presents to disprove O & W's claim is in the following:

- (2) a. [ceney John-ul<sub>1</sub> kaluchi-ess -te -n] sensayng-i  
       before -Acc teach -Past-Retro-ME teacher -Nom

<sup>1</sup> The second conjunct of (1a) can, of course, be construed ambiguously, depending on whether the NP *Sue-to* is interpreted as a subject or an object. As we examine whether a null VP is possible in Korean, we are only concerned with cases where an object NP within VP is presumably elided.

<sup>2</sup> Throughout the paper I use *ellipsis* as a neutral term between *deletion* and *copying*.

ku ai -lul<sub>1</sub> chingchanha-yess-ta.

that guy-Acc praise -Past-Decl

'The teacher who had taught John before praised the guy.'

b. [Bill-ul kaluchi-ess -te -n] sensayng-to

-Acc teach -Past-Retro-ME teacher -ALSO

chingchanha-yess-ta.

praise -Past-Decl

'The teacher who had taught Bill did (praise Bill).'

(3) a. The teacher who had taught John<sub>1</sub> before praised the guy<sub>1</sub>.

b. The teacher who had taught Bill did \*(praise Bill).

As is well known, the sloppy or bound variable reading requires a c-command relation between a (LF reconstructed) bound variable and its antecedent. The c-command requirement accounts for the lack of the bound variable reading in (3b). In the MVO construction (2b) of Korean, however, c-command relation does not obtain between the relative clause object NP and the unrealized matrix object NP, but coreference between them holds. The comparative consideration of the two languages casts doubt upon the existence of a genuine sloppy reading in the MVO construction of Korean. This, in turn, refutes O & W's analysis of the MVO construction on a par with the VP ellipsis construction in English.

## 2.2. MVO as Involving Empty Pronominal *pro*

In this section I present three more arguments against O & W's view of the MVO construction in Korean as involving VP ellipsis. First, the Korean MVO construction is different from the English VP ellipsis construction in the possibility of phonetically unrealized adverbials:

(4) a. John-i ppali tali-ko Mary-to \*(ppalli) tali -nta<sup>3</sup>

-Nom fast run-Conj -also leave-Decl

---

<sup>3</sup> As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, it is possible to have the intended meaning of (4a) when the verb phrase of the second conjunct is replaced with *kule+ha* 'do so' as in (i):

(i) John-i ppali tali-ko Mary-to kule+h -nta

-Nom fast run-Conj -also so+do-Decl

Since *kule+ha* is a pronominal verb phrase that does not result from verb phrase ellipsis, it is outside my investigation in the text.

(intended meaning: 'John runs fast and Mary runs fast too.')

- b. John-i      kulen iwu   -lo ttena-ass -ko  
               -Nom that reason-for leave-Past-Conj  
 Mary-to      \*(kulen iwu-lo) ttena-ass -ta  
               -also                                   leave-Past-Decl

(intended meaning: 'John left for such a reason and Mary left for such a reason too.')

- (5) a. John runs fast and Mary does [<sub>VP to be elided</sub> run fast] too  
 b. John leaves for such as reason and  
     Mary does [<sub>VP to be elided</sub> leave for such a reason] too.

In (5a-b) of English, the VP which contains manner or reason adverbials can be elided, whereby the adverbials can be recovered across a discourse boundary when they are phonetically unrealized. In the MVO construction (4a-b) of Korean, however, phonetically null manner or reason adverbials cannot be recovered from a previous discourse.

Note that unlike manner adverbials, however, temporal and locative adverbials in addition to argument NPs can be recovered across a discourse boundary in the MVO construction when they are not phonetically realized, as in (6) and (7):

- (6) a. John-i      kongwen-eyse nol-ko iss -e  
               -Nom park    -in    play-be ing-Informal  
               'John is playing in the park.'  
 b. Mary-to      (kongwen-eyse) nol -ko iss-e  
               -ALSO park    -in    play-be ing-Informal  
               'Mary is playing in the park.'

- (7) a. John-i      ecey      swukcey -lul    ceychwulha-yess-e  
               -Nom yesterday homework-Acc submit    -Past-Informal  
               'John submitted his homework yesterday.'  
 b. Mary-to      (ecey) (swukcey -lul) ceychwulha-yess-e  
               -ALSO yesterday homework-Acc submit    -Past-Informal  
               'Mary submitted her homework yesterday.'

This sort of asymmetry between argument NPs and temporal or locative adverbials, on one hand, and manner and reason adverbials, on the other hand, mirrors whether these categories can be realized as an empty

pronominal (*pro*) or not. As shown convincingly by Saito (1985) and Murasugi (1991), only the former group of categories, but not the latter group of ones can be generated as such an empty category. This means that the distribution of null elements in the MVO construction exactly corresponds to the distribution of *pro*. This renders compelling evidence that the unrealized element in sentences like (1a) does not result from VP ellipsis, but is an empty pronominal.

Second, as Hankamer and Sag (1976) note, null VPs in English cannot appear without their linguistic antecedents as in (8). The MVO construction in Korean, however, does not require linguistic antecedents for null categories as in (9), where the parenthesized elements describe a non-linguistic situation:

- (8) (John was writing a letter to his teacher.)  
 \*I will [<sub>VP to be elided</sub> write a letter to my teacher] too.

- (9) (John was writing a letter to his teacher.)  
 na-to ssu-kess-e  
 I -also write-shall-Informal  
 'I will write a letter to my teacher too.'

The grammatical contrast between (8) and (9) implies that the Korean MVO construction is different in surface form generation from the English VP ellipsis construction. That is, the former capitalizes upon the *pro* strategy of substituting the empty pronominals for presupposed NPs, whereas the latter results from VP ellipsis. As generally acknowledged, *pro*'s as in the two object positions of (9) do not require their linguistic antecedent to be present, whereas elided VPs as in (8) do.

Third, O & W's assumption that in Korean (and Japanese), a verb raises out of VP at overt syntax cannot be maintained when we carefully examine the interaction of a quantified phrase with negation in the negative construction of Korean as in (10):

- (10) John-i motun chayk-ul an(i)-ilk -ess-ta  
 -Nom all book -Acc not-read-Past-Decl  
 'John didn't read, all the books.'  
 (c-command relation in Korean: object > negation)

If we put aside focus effects to be involved, the natural/neutral inter-

pretation of (10) is that the object QP takes wide scope over the negation. If the verb and negation combination raised to the higher Infl position at overt syntax,<sup>4</sup> it would wrongly predict that the negation takes wide scope over the object QP. The scope fact provides convincing evidence that, contrary to O&W's assumption, the verb stays in situ in Korean.

### 3.1. VP Ellipsis Disallowed in the Auxiliary Verb Construction

Arguing against the view of the MVO construction as involving VP ellipsis, let us now examine other constructions which can be considered to correspond to the VP ellipsis construction of English, especially, those in which auxiliary verbs appear. As argued by Han (1987) and Kang (1988), in Korean *ha*-support takes place as an English counterpart operation of *do*-support as in (11) and (12):

- (11) John-i    Mary-lul    manna-ci    ani-ha-yess-ta  
       -Nom        -Acc meet -VE not-do-Past-Decl  
       'John didn't meet Mary.'

- (12) John-i    Mary-lul    manna-ki-nun/-to ...    ha-yess-ta  
       -Nom        -Acc meet -VE-Focus ...    do-Past-Decl  
       'John did (too) meet Mary.'

With this operation of *ha*-support in mind, the conceivable construction that corresponds to the English VP ellipsis construction as in (15) and (16) is in (13B) and (14B):

- (13) A: John-i    Mary-lul    manna-ass -e  
       -Nom        -Acc meet -Past-Informal  
       'John met Mary.'  
       B: Bill-to \*<sub>(VP to be deleted)</sub> manna-ki-nun/to/... ha-yess-e  
       -ALSO                    meet -VE-Focus ...    do-Past-Informal  
       B': √Bill-to    (Mary-lul) manna-ass -e<sup>5</sup>  
       -ALSO                    -Acc meet -Past-Informal  
       'Bill did too.'

<sup>4</sup>If the verb raised to the Infl position, the bound morphemic negation marker *an(i)* would raise there along with it, just like the English counterpart *n't* as follows:

(i) Doesn't every student leave yesterday?

- (14) A: John-i      Mary-lul    man-na-ass -ni  
                   -Nom            -Acc meet -Past-Interrogative  
                   'Did John meet Mary?'  
 B: ani, \*(<sub>VP to be deleted</sub> man-na-ci) an-h -ass -e  
                   no,                            meet -VE not-do-Past-Informal  
 B': √an -man-na-ass -e  
                   not-meet -Past-Informal  
                   'No, John didn't.'

- (15) He said he would change his socks, but  
                   he didn't (<sub>VP to be deleted</sub> change his socks).

- (16) He said he would change his socks, and  
                   he did so/too (<sub>VP to be deleted</sub> change his socks).

(13B) and (14B) of Korean are totally ungrammatical, whereas the MVO construction (13B') and (14B') are grammatical. The ungrammatical VP-ellipsis auxiliary verb construction of Korean is in contrast to the grammatical counterpart construction in (15) and (16) of English. One may contend that the contrast between English and Korean stems from the morphological selectional requirement of the supported expletive verb. In English, the expletive verb *do* does not select the morphological form of its complement verb; that is, the form of its complement verb is bare, i.e. not inflected (cf. Lasnik (1994)). In Korean, on the other hand, the expletive verb *ha* requires its complement verb to be inflected with the verbal ending *-ci* or *-ki* plus a focus marker. Therefore, when VP deletion takes place, the principle of deletion under identity is obeyed in English, but it is always violated in Korean.

This impromptu consideration, however, can not be justified when we take into account more cases, where the principle of deletion under identity is obeyed apparently, but ungrammaticality results, as in (17B) through (20B).

- (17) A: John-i      Mary-lul    man-na-ki -nun      ha-yess-e  
                   -Nom            -Acc meet -VE-Cont Top do-Past-Informal  
                   'John did meet Mary.'

---

<sup>5</sup> The notation, √ indicates the grammaticality of a so marked sentence.

- B: Bill-to ?\*(man-na-ki-nun) ha-yess-e  
 -ALSO meet -VE-Cont Top do-Past-Informal  
 'Bill did too.'
- (18) A: John-i Mary-lul man-na-ci anh -ass-e  
 -Nom -Acc meet -VE not · do-Past-Informal  
 'John didn't meet Mary.'
- B: Bill-to ?\*(man-na-ci) anh -ass -e  
 -ALSO meet -VE not · do-Past-Informal  
 'Bill didn't either.'
- (19) A: Mary-ka yeppu-ki-nun ha-yess-e  
 -Nom pretty-VE-Cont Top do-Past-Informal  
 'Mary was pretty.'
- B: Eli-to ?\*(yeppu-ki-nun) ha-yess-e  
 -ALSO pretty -VE-Cont Top do-Past-Informal  
 'Eli was too.'
- (20) A: Mary-ka yeppu-ci anh -ass-e  
 -Nom pretty-VE not · do-Past-Informal  
 'Mary wasn't pretty.'
- B: Eli-to ?\*(yeppu-ci) anh -ass-e  
 -ALSO pretty-VE not · do-Past-Informal  
 'Eli wasn't either.'

In these sentences, deleted null VPs are not allowed though the principle of deletion under identity can be satisfied.

### 3.2. Lack of Spec-head Case-checking Tense and VP Ellipsis

Comparing Korean to English, a legitimate question that arises at this point is why Korean does not allow VP ellipsis, unlike English? To explore this question, we follow the lead of Lobeck's (1990) approach to VP ellipsis. Lobeck argues that VP ellipsis is licensed by Tense (i.e. a functional category) that participates in overt Spec-head Case checking relation, drawing on the following examples:

- (21) a. Mary met Bill at UCONN, and Sue did [e] too.  
 b. Mary met Bill at UCONN, and Sue didn't [e].

- (22) a. John tried to be courageous, and Mary tried to [e], also.  
 b. Bill convinced Sarah to go to the party, and Jill convinced Betsy to [e].  
 c. ?\* I believed John to be courageous, and I believed Mary to [e], also.  
 d. ?\* John is believed to be courageous, and Mary is believed to [e], also.

(23) \* John acts crazy, and sometimes Mary seems \*(AP crazy) too.

(24) \* Ralph is believed to have committed suicide (last summer), and Jane is believed to have [e] (last fall), also.

(21a-b) show that the finite Tense licenses the following null VP. The contrast between (22a-b) and (22c-d) reveals that the control Tense differs from the raising Tense in that only the former allows VP ellipsis. Following Chomsky and Lasnik (1994), it is assumed that only the control Tense checks null Case for PRO in a Spec-head relation, but not the raising Tense. (23) witnesses that a nonfunctional, lexical category cannot permit an elided V/AP. (24) evidences that null VPs cannot be licensed by a higher clause Tense element. A set of the data above evince that VP ellipsis sites are allowed by a clausemate Tense element that undergoes overt Spec-head Case checking relation.<sup>6</sup>

Extending Lobeck's hypothesis to Korean, I argue that the impossibility of VP ellipsis in Korean is attributed to lack of Tense in this language that experiences overt Spec-head Case checking relation. The contrast in Case checking relation between English and Korean (plus Japanese) was argued for in length by Kuroda (1988), Lee (1992) and Park (1994). The strong piece of evidence that Infl, in particular Tense, in Korean does not undergo obligatory overt Spec-head Case-checking with a subject NP comes from the interaction between the negation and a quantifier in

---

<sup>6</sup> As noted by Lobeck (*ibid.*), there is a complement vs. noncomplement asymmetry in allowing VP ellipsis in control structure as follows.

- (i) a. \* You shouldn't play with rifles because to [ ] is dangerous.  
 b. \* John selected Bill to talk to the reporters yesterday, but today he chose Ralph to [ ].

Lobeck proposes that the infinitive marker stranded after VP ellipsis must be head-governed by the higher head.

subject position.

- (25) manhun haksayng-tul-i ku chayk-ul ilk -ci  
 many student -PL-Nom that book-Acc read-VE  
 anh -ass -ta  
 not · do-Past-Decl

'It is not case that many students read the book.'

(c-command relation in Korean : Tense > Negation > Subject)

- (26) Many students didn't read the book.

(c-command relation in English : Subject > Tense > Negation)

The natural interpretation of (26) in English, putting aside focus effects, is that the subject QP takes wide scope over the negation. This scope fact mirrors the surface c-command relation between them: the subject c-commands the negation. In contrast, the focus-free, natural interpretation of (25) in Korean is that the subject QP takes narrow scope below the negation. The scopal fact then is taken as manifesting that the subject NP in Korean appears at overt syntax in the position c-commanded by the negation, that is, in its base-generated VP-internal subject position.<sup>7, 8</sup> This implies that the Tense element in Korean does not participate in obligatory overt Spec-head Case checking relation with the subject NP. Lack of an overtly Spec-head Case checking Tense element prevents proper VP ellipsis in this language, in contrast to English.

---

<sup>7</sup> In a fast speech context without pause after the subject phrase, the sentence (25) is interpreted as the negation taking wide scope over the subject QP. (An anonymous reviewer, however, reports that its natural interpretation is the other way around, which I obviously do not agree on.) I do not deny that (25) can be interpreted as the subject QP taking wide scope over the negation, which is facilitated by pause after the subject phrase. It is assumed that the latter interpretation of the subject QP over the negation holds when the former has scrambled over the latter to adjoin to TP, not to move into Spec of TP. Scrambling is assumed to be a movement where Spec-head feature checking does not arise in a target position.

<sup>8</sup> The hypothesis that unlike in English, a subject NP does not raise to Spec of TP, but stays in its base-generated VP-internal position has far reaching consequences for the study of Korean syntax. I will not go into this issue here, but see Lee (1992) and Park (1994) for discussions bearing on it.

## 4. The Stripping Construction: VP Ellipsis?

If ellipsis is licensed by a Spec-head agreeing functional category, another question to be addressed is: is there any construction in Korean in which Spec-head agreement exists and thereby ellipsis within IP or CP is allowed? Kim (1996) presents a positive answer to this question. Let me rehearse his argument for a while. Kim claims that, corresponding to the ungrammatical sentences (13B) and (17B) through (20B) above, there are grammatical sentences (27B) through (34B)<sup>9</sup>:

- (27) A: John-i     Mary-lul   manna-ass -e  
               -Nom        -Acc meet -Past-Informal  
               'John met Mary.'  
 B: Bill-to    -ya  
               -ALSO-Coplua+Informal  
               'Bill did too.' or 'John met Bill too.'
- (28) A: John-i     Mary-lul   manna-ki -nun        ha-yess-e  
               -Nom        -Acc meet -VE-Cont Top do-Past-Informal  
               'John did meet Mary.'  
 B: Bill-to    -ya  
               -ALSO-Coplua+Informal  
               'Bill did too.' or 'John did meet Bill too.'
- (29) A: John-i     Mary-lul   manna-ci anh        -ass -e  
               -Nom        -Acc meet -VE not · do-Past-Decl  
               'John didn't meet Mary.'  
 B: Bill-to    -ya  
               -ALSO-Coplua+Informal  
               'Bill didn't, either.' or 'John didn't meet Bill, either.'
- (30) A: Mary-ka    yeppu-ki-nun        ha-yess-e  
               -Nom pretty-VE-Cont Top do-Past-Informal  
               'Mary was pretty.'  
 B: Eli-to      -ya  
               -ALSO-Coplua+Informal

---

<sup>9</sup> Note that the ungrammatical example (14B) does not produce any counterpart sentence that has similar structure to (27B)-(34B).

'Eli was too.'

- (31) A: Mary-ka yeppu-ci anh -ass -e  
 -Nom pretty-VE not · do-Past-Decl

'Mary wasn't pretty.'

- B: Eli-to -ya  
 -ALSO-Coplua+Informal  
 'Eli wasn't either.'

- (32) A: John-i ppali tali-nta.  
 -Nom fast run-Decl

'John runs fast.'

- B: Bill-to -ya  
 -ALSO-Coplua+Informal  
 'Bill does too.'

- (33) A: John-i ppang-to mek-ess -ni  
 -Nom bread -ALSO eat-Past-Interrogative

'Did John eat bread also?'

- B: ppang-un ani- i -ess -e  
 bread-Top not-Copula-Past-Informal  
 'John didn't eat bread.'

- (34) A: John-i pap -ul mek-ess -e  
 -Nom steamed rice-Acc eat-Past-Informal

'John ate steamed rice.'

- B: ?ppang-to - i -yess-e  
 -ALSO-Coplua-Past-Informal  
 'John ate bread also.'

One characteristic of this construction is that the second sentence contains one focus-particle marked element (sometimes along with the negative or tense marker as in (33B) and (34B)), which is followed by the copula *-i-* and the informal ending *-a/-e*. The other elements identical to those in the first sentence do not appear in the surface. The construction at issue is much like the following stripping construction of English, the second conjunct of which also has all the recoverable elements except for one constituent stripped:



B': (John-i manna-n salam-un)/pro Bill-to -ya  
 -Nom meet -ME person-Top -ALSO-Coplua+Informal  
 'The person who John met is Bill too.'

(34) A: John-i pap-ul mek-ess-e  
 'John ate food.'

B: ?(John-i mek-un-kes -un)/pro ppang-to - i -yess-e  
 -Nom eat-ME-what-Top bread-ALSO-Coplua-Past-Informal  
 'What John ate was bread too.'

The underlined subject of the (B)-sentences above bears information shared by both the speaker and the hearer since the information has been mentioned in the previous discourse. A sort of the economy principle therefore allows the subject to be realized as a null pronominal *pro* instead of the verbally repeated expression. Note that the pseudocleft analysis of the sentences (27B)-(34B) attributes the existence of the copula to the nature of the copula marked constituent being a predicate NP.

In fact, Kim considers a pseudocleft analysis of the stripping construction, but refutes it, drawing on multiple occurrences of undeleted, remnant constituents within the second sentence of the stripping construction as follows:

- (36) A: John-i Mary-eykey chayk-ul cwu-ess -e  
 -Nom -to book -Acc give-Past-Informal  
 'John gave a book to Mary.'
- B (i): Bill-to -ya 'And Bill did also.'  
 -ALSO-Coplua+Informal
- B (ii): noth -to -ya 'And notebook also.'  
 notebook-ALSO-Coplua+Informal
- B (iii): Susan-eykey-to -ya 'And to Susan also.'  
 -to -ALSO-Coplua+Informal
- B (iv): ① ?Susan-eykey noth -to -ya  
 -to notebook-ALSO-Coplua+Informal  
 'John gave SUSAN a NOTEBOOK also.'
- ② ?noth-ul Susan-eykey-to -ya  
 -Acc -to -ALSO-Coplua+Informal  
 'John gave a NOTEBOOK to SUSAN also.'
- ③ ?Susan-eykey Bill-to-ya  
 -to -ALSO-Coplua+Informal  
 'BILL also gave a book to SUSAN.'

- ④ ?noth -ul Bill-to -ya  
 notebook-Acc -ALSO-Coplua+Informal  
 'BILL also gave Mary a NOTEBOOK.'

In B(i-iii) of (36) one argument NP appears, but in (Biv) double remnant NPs appear. Kim maintains that, unlike the stripping construction (Biv), the pseudocleft construction cannot contain two constituents preceded by the copula as in (37):

- (37) a. \*John-i senmwulha-n kes -un Susan-eykey chayk- i -ess -ta  
 -Nom present -ME thing-Top -to book-Copula-Past-Decl  
 'What John presented is a book to Susan.'  
 b. \*John-eykey senmwulha-n salam -un chayk-ul Susan- i -ess -ta  
 -to present -ME man-Top book-Acc -Copula-Past-Decl  
 'The person who presented to John is Susan, a book.'

The grammatical contrast between the stripping construction like (36Biv) and the pseudocleft construction like (37a-b) in the possibility of double constituents before the copula, Kim argues, provide decisive evidence that they originate from different sources.

I agree with Kim in judgment of the marginality of the sentences (37a-b).<sup>10</sup> If, however, we adjust the sentences by adding a focus marker to one of the constituents, the sentences improve substantially as in (38).

- (38) a. (?) John-i senmwulha-n kes -un Susan-eykey-nun  
 -Nom present -ME what-Top -to -Cont Top  
 chayk- i -ess -ko Bill-eykey-nun noth - i -ess -ta  
 book -Copula-Past-Conj -to -Cont Top notebook-Copula-Past-Decl  
 'What John presented was a book, to Susan, and a notebook, to Bill.'  
 b. ? John-eykey senmwulha-n salam-un chayk-un  
 -to present -ME person-Top book -Cont Top  
 Susan- i -ess -ko noth-un Bill- i -ess -ta  
 -Copula-Past-Conj notebook-Cont Top -Copula-Past-Decl  
 'The person who presented was Susan, a book and Bill, a notebook.'

The grammaticality of examples (38a-b) implies that, contrary to Kim's claim, double constituents can appear preceded by the copula in the

<sup>10</sup> To my ear, however, (37a) is much better in grammaticality than (37b).



element for null categories such as TP or VP in Korean cannot be maintained fully. This renders further support to Lobeck's hypothesis that VP ellipsis is only licensed by the overtly Case checking Tense element.

## 5. Negative or Positive Marker and VP Ellipsis

I now will examine the final issue on licensing VP ellipsis by the positive or negative element. Recently, departing from Lobeck (*ibid.*), Lopez (1994) argues that in English and Spanish, the positive or negative element is a licensing element for VP ellipsis. In (40) through (42), the negative marker not in English provides a saving effect for ungrammatical (a)-sentences.<sup>11</sup>

- (40) a. \*I consider Bill intelligent and I consider Sally.  
 b. I consider Bill intelligent and I consider Sally not.  
 (Williams 1994: 196)

- (41) a. \*You shouldn't play with rifles because to [e] is dangerous.  
 b. You shouldn't play with rifles because not to [e] is dangerous.  
 (Lobeck 1987)

- (42) a. \*John is leaving and Mary's [e] too.  
 b. John is leaving but Mary's not [e].

In Spanish also, the positive marker *si* or the negative marker *no* functions as a licensing element for the null VP as in (43), in contrast to the ungrammatical sentences (44):

- (43) a. Juan ha comido pero Susana no [e].  
 'Juan has eaten but Susana not.'  
 b. Juan no ha comido pero Susana si [e].  
 'Juan not has eaten but Susana yes.'
- (44) a. \*Juan no ha comido pero Susana ha [e].  
 'Juan not has eaten but Susana has.'  
 b. \*Juan ha comido pero Susana no ha [e].  
 'Juan has eaten but Susana not has.'

---

<sup>11</sup> In English the positive marker, which is phonetically null, does not appear in the nonfinite clause.

It is to be noted that the positive or negative element in these grammatical examples is a free morpheme. This reminds us of Lobeck's claim that head government in addition to Spec-head relation plays a crucial role in permitting null VPs. When head government does not obtain because of lack of an auxiliary verb or auxiliary verb reduction, the positive or negative head has the ability to function as a head governor and licensing element for the null VP despite the absence of the Spec-head Case checking Tense marker. In Korean, however, the negative marker cannot appear on its own, that is, it is a bound morpheme. Its inability to function as a head governor prevents the negative marker in Korean from allowing VP ellipsis.

## 6. Summary

To summarize, null VPs in Korean are not allowed either in the MVO construction nor in the auxiliary verb construction. I argued that the absence of VP ellipsis in Korean is attributed to lack of Tense that experiences forced overt Case checking relation, and to lack of a head-governing free-morphemic positive or negative marker in this language. Furthermore, the stripping construction in Korean, which Kim argues allows VP or TP deletion since Focus movement activates the Spec-head agreeing functional head, are better analyzed as involving pseudoclefting. That is, as in the MVO construction, the stripping construction involves null pronominals instead of the presupposed subjects.

## References

- Chomsky, Noam and Howard Lasnik (1994) 'Principle and Parameter Theory,'  
*In Syntax: an International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, ed.  
 J. Jacobs et al.. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Han, Hak-Sung (1987) *The Configurational Structure of the Korean Language*,  
 Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.
- Hankamer, Jorge and Ivan Sag (1976) 'Deep and Surface Anaphora', *Linguistic Inquiry* 7: 391-426.
- Hoji, Hajime (1994) 'The Null Object Construction and the Sloppy Identity in Japanese,' A handout read at the Formal Approaches to Japanese Linguistics at MIT.

- Kang, Myung-Yoon (1988) *Topics in Korean Syntax*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Kim, Jeong-Seok (1996) 'On Ellipsis and Focus Movement in Korean and Japanese,' Ms., University of Connecticut at Storrs.
- Kuroda, Yuki (1988) 'Whether We Agree or Not: a Comparative Syntax of English and Japanese,' In *Papers from the Second International Workshop on Japanese Syntax*, ed. William Poser, 103-143. CSLI.
- Lasnik, Howard (1994) 'Verb Morphology: Syntactic Structures Meets the Minimalist Program,' In *Evolution and Revolution in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Carlos Otero*, ed. Paula Kemchinsky et al., 251-275. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Lee, Eun Ji (1992) 'On the Extended Projection Principle,' Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut at Storrs.
- Lobeck, Anne (1990) 'Functional Heads as Proper Governors,' *Proceedings of NELS 20*, Volume 2, 425-435.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1987) *Syntactic Constraints on VP Ellipsis*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington at Seattle.
- Lopez, Luis (1994) 'The Syntactic Licensing of VP-Ellipsis: a Comparative Study of Spanish and English,' In *Issue and Theory in Romance Linguistics: Selected Papers from the Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages XXIII*, ed. Michael L. Mazzola, 333-354, Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- McClosky, James (1990) 'Clause Structure, Ellipsis and Proper Government in Irish,' Syntax Research Center, Cowell College, University of California at Santa Cruz.
- Murasugi, Keiko (1991) *Noun Phrase in Japanese and English: A Study in Syntax, Learnability and Acquisition*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut at Storrs.
- Otani, Kazuyo and John Whitman (1991) 'V-Raising and VP-Ellipsis,' *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 345-358.
- Park, Myung-Kwan (1994) *A Morpho-Syntactic Study of Korean Verbal Inflection*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut at Storrs.
- Saito, Mamoru (1985) *Some Asymmetries in Japanese and Their Theoretical Implications*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Takahashi, Daiko (1993) 'On Antecedent-Contained Deletion,' Ms., University of Connecticut at Storrs.
- Williams, Edwin (1994) 'A Reinterpretation of Evidence for Verb Movement

in French,' In *Verb Movement*, ed. David Lightfoot and Norbert Hornstein, 189-206, Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Department of English  
Dongguk University  
Pil-dong, Chung-gu, Seoul, Korea  
e-mail: myungk@chollian.dacom.co.kr