

A base generation approach to *kulehkey* replacement leaving remnants

It is generally believed that an English pro-form like *so* (or *it*) cannot replace a target when some constituent inside the target moves out of it.

- (1) A: The professor believes [_{IP} a male student to be a genius].
 B: a. I believe so, too. (*so*=[_{IP} a male student to be a genius].)
 b. *I believe a female student so. (*so*=[_{IP} t to be a genius])
 c. *Which male student does the professor believe [_{IP} so]?

However, *kulehkey*, Korean counterpart of *so*, seems to behave differently. Consider the following Korean counterparts of (1) involving ECM. .

- (2) A: ku kuyoswu-nun han namhaksayng-ul chencay-la-ko mit-e
 the professor-Top a male student-Acc genius-be-Comp believe-EM
 B: a. Na-to kulehkey mit-e (*kulehkey*=[han namhaksayng-ul chencay-la-ko])
 I-also so believe-EM
 b. Na-nun han yehaksayng-ul kulehkey mit-e (*kulehkey*=[t chencay-la-ko])
 I-Top a female student-Acc so believe-EM
 c. etten namhaksayng-ul ku kyoswu-nun kulehkey mit-ni
 which male student-Acc the prof-Top so believe-Q

Unlike English *so*, which cannot replace the subjectless embedded clause (=to be a genius), *kulehkey* seems to be able to replace the same target (=chencay-la-ko). Seeing this, Park (2013) claims that *kulehkey* can replace the subjectless embedded clause (= IP under his framework) of the ECM verb *mit-* after the subject NP(=NP-Acc) moves out of the target.

- (3) na-nun han yehaksayng-luli [_{t_i} chencay-la-ko] mit-e
kule replacement + *key*

However this paper argues against such replacement-after-movement (RAM) analysis, instead rooting for the base-generation+replacement (BGR) analysis. First of all, it is not the case that any kind of element inside the embedded clause can be a remnant phrase. Although NP-Acc can be a remnant, other types of phrases, such as NP-Dat, cannot, as shown in (4). This is not expected if (4B) is derived through *kulehkey* replacement after the remnant phrase movement.

- (4) A: na-nun Mary-eykey_i [John-i e_i sakwahayssta-ko] mitnunta
 '(Lit) I believe, to Mary, John apologized.'
 B: *na-nun Tom-eykey *kulehkey* mitnunta
 '(Lit) I believe so, to Tom.'

Another evidence against the RAM analysis comes from the behavior of NPIs. Korean NPIs are locally licensed by negation like *ani* in overt syntax (Choe 1988, Sohn 1995). What is notable is that an NPI *amwuto* cannot be a remnant in (5B) below.

- (5) A: na-nun [namkaysayng cwung amwuto chencay-ka ani-la-ko] mit-e
 I-Top male student among anybody genius-Nom not-be-Comp believe-EM
 '(Lit) I believe any of the male students not to be a genius.'
 B: *na-nun yehaksayng cwung amwuto *kulehkey* mit-e
 I-Top female student among anybody so believe-EM
 '(Lit) I believe any of the female students so.'

If *kulehkey* can replace the embedded clause after the NPI *yehaksaung cwung amwuto* first checks off its Neg-feature with *ani* and then moves out of the embedded clause, (5B) should be grammatical. But the sentence is severely degraded. Thirdly, it is not clear under RAM why the same derivation is not available for English *so* construction in (1).

To account for these observations, I propose the following: (i) Hoji (2005) type major object analysis is at least possible for Korean ECM and hence the remnant phrase can be base generated in the surface position and is licensed via a kind of aboutness relation with the embedded clause. (ii) There is no internal structure in the pro-form *kulehkey*. (i) and (ii) explain why we can't have an NPI remnant: Simply there is no local licenser for it in overt syntax. Notice that the NPI in (5A) is within the embedded clause and hence can be licensed without any problem. Also, it explains why only NP-Acc is a possible remnant because that is the only kind of phrase allowed outside embedded clause in Korean ECM construction. Also the contrast between Korean and English noted above can be attributed to the structural difference in ECM while maintaining the important thesis that we cannot peep into the pro-forms. It will also be shown that the proposed analysis can explain other facts including the asymmetry between NP-Nom and NP-Acc as a remnant, and the impossibility of multiple remnants, etc.

Selected References

- Hoji, H. 2005. A Major object analysis of the so-called raising-to-object construction in Japanese (and Korean), a talk given at Korean Japanese syntax and semantics workshop at Kyoto Univ.
- Park, M. -K. 2013. The Syntax of clausal and verbal pro-form/ellipsis in Korean: Focusing on *mit-* 'believe' and *sayngkakha-* 'think' Verbs in *Studies in Generative Grammar* 23.2. pp.221-242.
- Sohn, K. -W. 1995. *Negative polarity items, scope, and economy*. PhD dissertation, University of Connecticut.