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Keywords: small clauses, complement, adjunct, null subject, -lo resultatives, -jay resultatives.

* This work has been developed from a graduate seminar on small clauses at SNU in 2014 Spring. I thank the participants of the seminar for helpful discussion. An earlier version of this work was presented at 38th Seoul International Conference on Generative Grammar (SICOOG 18). Special thanks go to the audiences at SICOOG 16: especially to Daebo Chung, Hyeran Lee, Myung Kwan Park, Jong Un Park, Sehyoul Seo, Gayoung Cha, and Hang Jin Youn for helpful feedback. I am also grateful to three anonymous reviewers of Studies in Generative Grammar for very helpful comments. Any remaining errors are my sole responsibility.

1. Outlook

A small clause (SC) is a cover term to express a thematic core which denotes a subject-predicate relationship in language. Small clauses are 'clausal' in the sense that they contain a subject and predicate phrase but generally believed to be 'small' in that they do not contain a complementizer or inflectional node as we observe in other clausal structures such as TP and CP. The impoverished yet propositional structure of small clauses has led to a number of interesting questions. This paper addresses issues regarding the movement and linearization of small clauses, with reference to resultative constructions in Korean. In particular, I argue for the following three claims:

First, I argue that small clauses in Korean contain an asymmetric structure mediated by a functional head, which takes an unsaturated monadic XP as its complement. The claim that a function head mediates the relationship between the subject and the predicate in SCs has been proposed by many researchers (see Bowers's 1998 Pr; Adger and Ranchard's 2003 Pr; Den Dikken's 2006 RELATOR, Ciklo's 2008 i, among others). This paper adopts the theory of predication proposed by Den Dikken (2006) for small clauses in Korean. In this paper, I focus on resultative small clauses in which -lo is attached to the nominal predicate as a RELATOR, and compare them with resultative clauses with the -jay suffix. For convenience, the subject of an SC will hereafter be referred to as SC-subject, and the predicate of the SC, SC-predicate.

Secondly, following Ko (2011, 2014a, to appear), I argue that the small clause domain RP, as a whole, undergoes cyclic Spell-out and linearization (cf. Den Dikken 2006, 2007 who argues that the complement of SC is spelled-out separately from the SC-subject). In particular, this paper considers the consequences of this claim for predicate fronting in and out of resultative SCs - which include different types of complement and adjunct resultatives in Korean. I show that Spell-out of an SC yields order freezing of the elements merged within the SC. Coupled with the theory of anti-locality, this proposal explains why predicate fronting out of an SC is severely limited even in scrambling languages like Korean.

Thirdly and most importantly for the typology of small clauses, I propose that resultative constructions in Korean are categorized into four types, with two major factors intertwined: (i) whether the SC is combined via complementation or adjunction and (ii) whether the SC-subject can be null or not. The table in (1) and examples in (2)-(5) illustrate the typology of resultative small clauses proposed in this paper. I show that the presence or absence of a null subject in
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SC plays a crucial role in understanding the different types of resultative constructions in Korean. This paper also provides a semantic diagnostic to distinguish between null subject-type vs. overt subject type SCs, based on the theory of Aarts (1992).

(1) Typology of Resultative Small Clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement</th>
<th>Null SC-subject</th>
<th>Overt SC Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type I (e.g. (2))</td>
<td>Type II (e.g. (3))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Type III (e.g. (4))</td>
<td>Type IV (e.g. (5))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Type I: Complement SC with null SC-subject

Apeci-nun **khongul sasopho** ppahassta
father-Top bean-Acc powder-Res pounded
‘The father pounded beans into powder.’

(3) Type II: Complement SC with overt SC-subject

Mapepsa-nun **mwalul phacwandho** mantulessta
magician-Top water-Acc wine-Res made
‘A magician turned water into wine.’

(4) Type III: Adjunct SC with null SC-subject

John-un **petulul angayley** chihayessta
J-Top floor-Acc white-Res painted
‘John painted the floor white.’

(5) Type IV: Adjunct SC with overt SC-subject

John-un **petulul angayley** chihayessta
J-Top floor-Nom white-Res painted
‘John painted the floor white.’

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, I present some interesting asymmetries between resultative small clauses with the -jo suffix - the complement type SCs (Type I and II). In particular, I discuss divergent behavior of the two types of complement SCs in predicate fronting, predicate right-dislocation, and predicate omission. In section 3, I explain the set of asymmetries, adopting the theory of small clauses by Aarts (1992) and the theory of predicate fronting proposed by Ko (2014). In sections 4 and 5, I turn to the adjunct type SCs (Type III and IV), which is marked by -jay. I argue that the proposal made for complement SCs extends to adjunct SCs, with an interesting twist due to their adjunct status. Section 5 concludes the paper.

2. Two Types of Complement Small Clauses in Korean

The nominal predicate of resultative small clauses is marked by -jo 'as' in Korean, and two representative examples are given in (6) and (7). In both (6) and (7), the SC represents a propositional meaning such that the -jo marked predicate comes to denote a property of the accusative-marked argument as a result of the main event. As will be shown shortly, however, the two constructions show different syntactic and semantic characteristics. The two types of SCs are distinguished by the semantics of the main verb (see section 3 for discussion). One type is typically embedded under a "change of state" verb such as *pyabita 'pour', cabita 'cut', and mwalulita 'dyer', as exemplified in (6). The other type is selected by a so-called 'inherently denature verb' (adopting a term *pyaeng tongga* coined in Nam 2001). It is represented by *mwalita 'made' in (7). According to my survey, speech act verbs like *apeciwa 'proclaim' and senpohata 'declare' also behave in the same way as denature verbs. For ease of presentation, I call the former *pour-type* SC and the latter *make-type* SC.

(6) Apeci-nun **khongul sasopho** ppahassta **pour-type**

father-Top bean-Acc powder-Res pounded
‘The father poured beans into powder.’

(7) Mapepsa-nun **mwalul phacwandho** mantulessta **make-type**

magician-Top water-Acc wine-Res made
‘A magician turned water into wine.’

The SCs in (6) and (7) share the same canonical ordering; namely, *main subject < SC-subject < SC-predicate < main verb*. Crucially, however, the two constructions in (6) and (7) exhibit different characteristics with respect to the distribution of SC-predicates. Consider first predicate fronting. As described in (8),

1 Though I borrow the term 'denature verbs' from Nam (2001), I do not agree with Nam's semantic criteria to classify verbs in Korean. As will be discussed in section 3, I adopt Aarts' (1992) criteria to distinguish *pour-type* from *make-type* verbs. This paper focuses on resultative phrases embedded under a transitive verb. The resultative phrase under an intransitive verb such as *calita 'grow up' * and *topita 'become' * are not discussed here. See Han (1998) for discussion of this type of data.

(8) Ku *calita* gawuup

that child-Nom doctor-Res grewup

Water became ice.

(9) Mwal-i *dunmu* buyesta

water-Res become

‘That child grew up as a doctor.’

(10) Mwal-i *dunmu* buyesta

water-Res become

‘Water became ice.’
**pound-type** SCs allow predicate fronting (with some judgment variations; cf. (9)). In (8), *kalwu-lo* 'powder-Res' can be fronted to the left of the SC-subject *khong-ul* without affecting the resultative meaning of the sentence in (6).²

(8) ? kalwu-lo apeci-nun khangul (kopkey) ppahassta powder-Res father-Top bean-Acc fine-grained pounded 'The father pounded beans into (fine-grained) powder.' (cf. (6))

In contrast to (8), predicate fronting out of the *male-type* SC results in a totally different meaning from the original sentence. For instance, the sentence in (7) with canonical ordering means 'a magician made wine out of water' (more precisely, 'a magician turned water into wine'). By contrast, (9) with predicate fronting means 'a magician made water out of wine'. In other words, *photocwu* 'wine' in (9) is interpreted as a source, instead of a result predicate, which is the exact opposite of what (7) means. The -*lo* suffix in Korean may in principle be ambiguous between a resultative marker and a postposition 'with' to indicate a source or an instrument. In (9), the -*lo* phrase cannot be interpreted as a resultative marker and must be interpreted as a postposition 'with' (with no judgment variations, 10/10).

(9) photocwu mapepsa-nun mantulessta wine-Res magician-Top water-Acc made √'A magician made water out of wine.' (= A magician made water) *A magician made wine out of water.' (= A magician made wine)

The contrast between (10) and (11) shows a similar type of asymmetry between *pound-type* vs *male-type* SCs in right-dislocation. When *kalwu-lo* is right-dislocated over the verb *ppahassta* 'pounded' in (13), it may preserve the resultative meaning seen in (6) (with some variations). In contrast, when *photocwu* is right-dislocated over *mantulessta* 'made' as in (11), it cannot maintain its resultative meaning, and is interpreted as a source of the event.³

(10) Apeci-nun khangul (kopkey) ppahassta kalwu-lo father-Top bean-Acc fine-grained pounded powder-Res 'The father pounded beans into (fine-grained) powder.' (cf. (6))

(11) Mapepsa-nun mantulessta photocwu water-Res magician-Top water-Acc made √'A magician made water out of wine.' (= A magician made water) *A magician made wine out of water.' (= A magician made wine; cf. (7))

In contrast to predicate fronting, the asymmetries between *pound-type* vs *male-type* SCs disappear when the SC-subject and its predicate are fronted or right-dislocated together. This is illustrated with (12) and (13). In both (12) and (13), the -*lo* marked predicate is interpreted as the result of the main event. The puzzling change in the meaning that we observed in (9) and (11) does not occur when the SC-subject and SC-predicate move together - whether they move to the right or to the left. In (12) and (13), the resultative meaning remains intact regardless of verb types.

(12) a. khangul photocwu apeci-nun (kopkey) ppahassta bean-Acc powder-Res father-Top fine-grained pounded 'The Father pounded beans into (fine-grained) powder.'
b. Apeci-nun (kopkey) ppahassta khangul kalwu-lo

(13) a. mantulessta photocwu mapepsa-nun mantulessta water-Res magician-Top water-Acc made √'A magician made water out of wine.' (= A magician made water) *A magician made wine out of water.' (= A magician turned water into wine)
b. Mapepsa-nun mantulessta photocwu

The data in (14) and (15) illustrate a further contrast between *pound-type* SCs and *male-type* SCs in predicate omission (see Han 1998, Cho 1998, Nam 2003, Ko 2011, 2014a, and Lee 2014 for omission of -*lo* predicates). As in (14), the SC-predicate *khangul*-lo of the *pound-type* SC can optionally be omitted. By contrast, the SC-predicate *photocwu*-lo 'wind-Res' of the *male-type* SC cannot be omitted. If omitted, the sentence loses its resultative meaning altogether, and the verb 'make' is read as a simple transitive verb, roughly meaning 'produce', and cannot be interpreted as a denature verb.

(14) Apeci-nun khangul photocwu ppahassta father-Top bean-Acc powder-Res pounded 'The father pounded beans into powder.'

---

² Lee (2004) reports that predicate fronting like (8) is unacceptable, but according to my own survey, there are speakers (8/10) who clearly accepted (9), though some (4/10) find it marginal. See note 3 for further comments.

³ Most speakers (8/10) accepted (12), but some (2/10) rejected it. Most speakers (7/10) rejected (13) with a resultative reading, but there were some speakers (3/10) who marginally accepted it. In section 3, I provide an analysis based on the data from the speakers who accept (9) and (13), and speculate on judgment variations in section 4 (see note 9).
The data shown above lead us to ask some interesting questions concerning the sub-types of resultatives. One is why (sole) predicate fronting or right-dislocation of make-type SCs (e.g. (9), (11)) is not compatible with a resultative meaning, in contrast to render-type SCs (e.g. (8), (10)). The other is why displacement of a small clause does not affect the resultative meaning (e.g. (13a), (13b)), in contrast to predicate movement in (9) and (11). It is also puzzling why predicate omission is allowed in render-type SCs, whereas it is impossible in make-type resultative SCs. Moreover, one would reasonably wonder whether there is any logical connection among the puzzles addressed here, which can be derived from a deeper principle in the grammar (cf. Park and Shin 2014 for a unified account for leftward movement, right dislocation and anaphora of embedded predicates in Korean with different types of data).

Given that the -jo predicate denotes the result status of the accusative-marked argument in both types of SCs, it is mysterious why the asymmetries shown above exist. Some previous studies on -jo predicates in Korean postulate a constraint that a property-denoting predicate cannot precede its own subject (e.g. Cho 1998). This constraint may accommodate the predicate fronting data in (9). It is not clear, however, why such a constraint should exist. This approach also has little to say about the asymmetries between render-type vs. make-type SCs discussed here. Other studies assume that a certain variety of -jo predicates functions as an adjunct, so that they can be freely omitted and moved (e.g. Cho 1998, Nam 2001). One may argue that this claim applies to the SC-predicate embedded under render-type verbs. Crucially, however, previous studies do not present an independent reasoning on which type of -jo predicate must be considered as an adjunct and why it should be so. In this paper, I will in fact argue against the claim that -jo predicates in render-type SCs are adjuncts.

In the next section, I provide an analysis for the set of asymmetries between the two types of SCs, based on the theory of Aarts (1992) and predicate fronting by Ko (2014a). In the following sections, we will see that the argument-adjunct distinction indeed matters, but it is only indirectly related to the puzzles addressed above. Rather, the presence or absence of a null subject is the key factor in determining the distribution of SC-predicates.

5. Proposal

5.1. Theoretical background

I argue that the set of asymmetries seen in section 2 can be explained by interactions among independently motivated factors in the grammar: (i) syntax-phonology interface (i.e. cyclic linearization of small clauses), (ii) syntax-semantics interface (i.e. argument structure of main verbs), and (iii) the syntax proper (e.g. anti-locality and probe-goal Agree).

Let us first consider the syntactic structure and linearization of small clauses. Building on the research program advanced by Ko (2011, 2014a), I propose that a predicational structure in general undergoes cyclic Spell-out and linearization regardless of its transitivity (cf. Matushansky 2000, Legate 2003, Den Dikken 2006, Bošković 2014 for similar proposals based on Chomsky’s (2000) phase system). In particular, I argue that small clauses must undergo cyclic Spell-out as a predicational unit in syntax. As for the structure of SCs, I adopt Den Dikken’s (2006) claim that small clauses are headed by a RELATOR head and extend it to resultative constructions. I assume that -jo in Korean is a lexicalized RELATOR head. The structure of SCs is depicted in (16). The semantics of the resultative RELATOR is given in (17), modified from the semantics of a copular verb proposed by Adger and Ramchand (2003).

(16) The structure of small clauses (adopted from Den Dikken 2006: 3)

(17) [RELATOR] = λx.λy.[INTO (x, y)]

On this proposal, it is assumed that the entire small clause, RP undergoes cyclic Spell-out and linearization (see Fox and Pesetsky 2005 and Ko 2014a for overall discussion on cyclic linearization). Thus, the ordering between the SC-subject and the SC-predicate is fixed as soon as the RP undergoes Spell-out. This proposal inherits the insight of Den Dikken (2006) in assuming that small clauses function...
as a cyclic unit, but crucially departs from the original proposal by Den Dikken (2006) in that the entire small clause (not just the complement of RP) undergoes cyclic Spell-out and linearization.

Secondly, I argue that there exist two different types of SCs in Korean, adopting the extensive work on English SCs by Aarts (1992). The two types of SCs can be diagnosed by the semantics of the main verb. To illustrate this, consider the contrast between (18) and (19) in English. In (18), the epistemic verb consider is employed and notably, (18)a does not entail (18)b. By contrast, epistemic verbs like appoint in (19) show the opposite characteristic in that (19)a does entail (19)b. As Aarts (1992) argues, the semantic contrast between (18) and (19) in English can be explained by assuming that the two verbs take different types of argument structures. The epistemic verb consider takes a propositional SC as its complement. Thus, (18)a does not entail (18)b. In contrast, epistemic verbs like appoint may take a direct object as their complement (e.g. theme of the event), and the SC contains a null subject, PRO controlled by the object. Under this proposal, it is expected that (19)a entails (19)b because that minister in (19)a is in fact merged as the object of the main verb, not as the subject of the SC, just as in (19)b. In the next subsection, I show that the same argument holds in Korean, and this plays a key role in explaining the syntax of the two types of SCs seen in section 2.4

(18) a. Prof. Kim considered that minister as his student.
   b. Prof. Kim considered that minister.

(19) a. SNU appointed that minister as a professor.
   b. SNU appointed that minister.

Lastly, I assume that scrambling in Korean is regulated by the general computational properties of the syntax proper. Specifically, I argue that scrambling in Korean is triggered by probe-goal Agree (20) (Chomsky 2000) and regulated by anti-locality (21) (Abels 2003; Bolković 2005; Deggott 2004; Grafman 2003; Saito and Murasugi 1999 inter alia). In the following, I show that these computational constraints result in extremely rigid ordering in and out of small clause domains even in scrambling languages like Korean.

4 Following Aarts (1992), I argue that SCs can be divided into two types, depending on whether a null subject is merged as the SC subject. Originally, Aarts (1992) argued that a null subject can be found in adjunct SCs (e.g. as its professor in (19) is treated as an adjunct). In this paper, however, I extend this claim to complement SCs, and propose that a null subject can be merged in complement SCs as well as adjunct SCs. See section 4 for further discussion.

(20) Probe-goal Agree

A probe may Search and Agree with a goal under the closest c-command.

(21) Anti-locality

Complement cannot merge into the specifier of its own head.

3.2. The syntax and semantics of subject resultative small clauses

Following the lead of Aarts (1992), let us first consider the semantic relationship between the main verb and the following object in the two types of SCs seen in section 2. As illustrated in (22), when a pound-type verb is employed, the sentence with a resultative SC entails the one without a resultative predicate. For instance, (22)a entails (22)b. In contrast, when the main verb is of the make-type the entailment relationship we observe in (22) does not hold. For instance, (23)a with the resultative SC does not entail (23)b. This is similar to what we observed in the contrast between (18) and (19) in English.

(22) a. Apeci-nun khong-ul saheseo ppahasasta pound-type
   father-Top bean-Acc powder-Res pounded
   ‘The father pounded beans into powder.’
   ≈ b. Apeci-nun khong-ul ppahasasta

(23) a. Mapepa-nun mwul-ul photocwu-lo mantulessta make-type
   magidan-Top water-Acc wine-Res made
   ‘A magician turned water into wine’
   ≈ b. Mapepa-nun mwul-ul mantulessta

Adopting Aarts (1992), I propose that the contrast between (22) and (23) can be derived from different argument structures of the main verb. In particular, I argue that pound-type verbs take an accusative-marked object as their direct object, and the resultative SC contains a null subject which is controlled by the object. Since khong-ul in (22)a is merged as the direct object of the main verb, it follows that (22)a entails (22)b. The make-type verbs, on the other hand, take a propositional SC as their sole complement. Put differently, the make-type verb in (23) takes a proposition ‘water becomes wine’ as its complement. The main verb in (23) does not take mwul-ul as its object. Thus, it follows that (23)a does not entail (23)b.

Taken together, the syntax of pound-type and make-type SCs can be represented as follows. As described in (21), a pound-type verb takes a direct object as its complement and the resultative clause contains a null subject.
associated with the object (cf. Bowers 1993 for the position of clausal complement). make-type verbs, by contrast, take a propositional SC as their sole complement, as in (25). In (25), the SC-subject (e.g. *na-

nal-ul ‘water-Acc’ in (25a)) is externally merged as the subject of the resultative predicate.5

(24) Structure of pound-type (e.g. (6))

 VP

   Objects

   V

   RP

   PRO

   RELATOR

   SC-predicate

(25) Structure of make-type (e.g. (7))

 VP

   SC-subject

   R'

   SC-predicate

   RELATOR

Under the proposal that SCs undergo cyclic Spell-out, the entire RP is assumed to undergo cyclic linearization both in (24) and (25). Crucially, however, Spell-out results in different ordering restrictions for (24) and (25). In (24), the object is not linearized at the same domain as the SC-predicate. Thus, no ordering relationship is established between the object and SC-predicate when the RP is spelled out. By contrast, in (25), the SC-subject is linearized together with the SC-predicate within RP. Thus, the ordering between the SC-subject and the SC-predicate is fixed in (25) once RP is spelled-out.

5 In my (2011, 2014a, to appear) previous work, I argued that non-resultative AS small clauses can be sub-divided into two types: geutae ‘point-type’ take a Control-SC and yakhna ‘concord-type’ take an ECM-SC. The analyses in (24-25) are an extension of this proposal to resultatives. Adopting the logic developed in my work on small clauses, Lee (2014) argues for a dichotomy of *-resultatives similar to (24-25). Lee (2014), however, takes a movement analysis of Control unlike (24) and leaves the internal syntax and position of SCs vague. As will be discussed in section 4.2, I assume that *-resultative predicates are combined into VP via complementation. Bowers (1993) argues that a thematic object is merged in Spec,VP and that a small-clause complement is merged below the thematic object (but above a goal) within VP. I adopt Bowers’ (1993) theory in (26). Besides small clauses, an oblique argument (a, a certain type of nominal object (g)–(h), and a non-finite phrase (iv) belong to this type of complement. As shown below, this type of complement cannot be passivized even though the main verb is transitive. It can also be optionally omitted in some cases as in (i) and (ii).

(i) John went there. ‘Home was gone by John.

(ii) Mary left the room angry. The room was left angry by Mary.

(iii) John received Bill. ‘Bill was received by John.

(iv) The package weighed 10 lbs. ‘The package was weighed by the package.

3.2 Analysis

With the proposals presented above, let us revisit the puzzles concerning the distribution of SC-predicates shown in section 2. For ease of understanding, I examine predicate omission data first, which straightforwardly follow from the argument structure of the main verb. I then turn to the puzzles concerning predicate fronting and omission.

Recall that predicate omission in pound-type SCs is possible, whereas predicate omission is impossible in make-type SCs. This asymmetry naturally follows from the current proposal. Consider first predicate omission in pound-type SCs, the data in (14). Under the structure in (24), the apparent SC-subject khong-ul ‘bean-Acc’ in (14) is in fact a direct object of the verb pphasasta ‘pounded’, merged independently of the SC-predicate. This is illustrated in (26).

In (26), the object is selected by the main verb, and its theta role is also given by the verb. The syntax and semantics of the object khong-ul is independent of the SC-predicate. Thus, even if the SC-predicate is omitted, as in (14), it does not affect the grammaticality of the sentence as a transitive clause, which means ‘the father pounded beans’. On this view, ‘predicate omission’, if possible, is analyzed as omission of an entire small clause, which contains PRO and an SC-predicate. Crucially, however, such RP-omission does not affect the core meaning of the verb ‘pound’ in (14), which takes a nominal object in VP.


The make-type denature verb, on the other hand, is incompatible with predicate omission. Under the proposal in (25), make-type verbs take a proposition as their sole complement, and the SC-subject is base-generated within the RP. The SC-subject is not an object of the main verb, and thus its presence is dependent on the support of the SC-predicate. In other words, the SC-predicate photocvulo in (15) must be semantically present to assign a theta-role to its subject, nual-ul ‘water-Acc’. Thus, a possible way to license predicate omission in (15) would be to ‘phonologically’ elide the SC-predicate, standing the SC-subject. As shown in (27), however, such ellipsis (i.e. predicate ellipsis) is independently banned in Korean. Under the proposals in (24) and (25), we can explain why predicate omission is impossible in (15) and (27), but is grammatical in (14) - the former involves a genuine case of predicate ellipsis which is independently banned, whereas the latter involves RP-ellipsis (or lack of RP-selection).8
(27) a. Mapesu-naun [be wargul kalwu-lo | manultlessta]  
    magician-Top prince-Acc frog-Res made-and  
    ‘A magician turned a prince into a frog, and’  

b. Manye-naun [be longu-ndal manultlessta]  
    witch-Top princess-Acc frog-Res made  
    ‘A witch turned a princess into a frog.’

Next, let us turn to predicate fronting asymmetries illustrated in (8) and (9). We have seen that predicate fronting of *pred-type* SCs is possible, whereas predicate fronting of *make-type* SCs is impossible. I argue that this asymmetry can also be derived from the different internal structures of SCs. In the case of *pred-type* SCs, predicate fronting of *make-type* SCs is impossible because this is in fact an instance of RP-fronting, containing a PRO subject. Recall the internal structure of (8), depicted in (28). Under this structure, we obtain the linear ordering $\text{PRO} < \text{kalwu-lo}$ when RP is spelled-out. Note, crucially, that the object $\text{khong-ul}$ is merged in a separate domain from the RP. Since the matrix object is externally merged in a separate domain from RP, the RP may be fronted over the object when an RP-external element (say, $i$) triggers such scrambling. Movement of RP adds a new ordering in the matrix domain (RP<0), and it does not contradict any ordering established within the RP domain. Specifically, as illustrated in (28), no ordering contradiction arises even after RP-fronting, and thus the grammaticality of (8) follows.

(28) Ordering statements for the derivation in (8):  
    $[\text{[be PRO kalwu-lo]; [spec-rd-naun [be khongul t1 ppahassta]]}]$  

4 A question remains why predicate ellipses is impossible in (27) (Chung 2007, 2011), one might argue that predicates in Korean cannot be ommated because they are not constituents in syntax. Alternatively, bare predicate ellipses may be banned because a predicate by itself does not form a proper cyclic unit as an $<i,j>$ type (in contrast to RP, which forms a closed predication $<p>$). Refer also to Park and Shin (2014) for an approach to the uniformity of ellipsis/argument and movement, based on a MaxMove constraint (in a different context). I leave this issue open for now. A reviewer notes that (9) involves lack of RP-selection instead of RP-ellipsis. If RP-ellipsis were available in *pred-type* verbs, the second clause in (9) may mean ‘the mother pounded red beans into powder’. But the reviewer does not get the resultative reading in (9). I leave it for future research whether RP-ellipsis is generally banned or unavailable in (9) for other reasons.

5 Apec-Russian *khong kalwu* ppahassta, emeren-naun *phathul* ppahassta, father-Top bean-ACC powder-res panned-and and-mother-Top red-bean-ACC panned. ‘The father pounded beans into powder, and the mother pounded red beans (*into powder’.

b. ordering at matrix vP: *kalwu-lo < aprin-naun < nangul < ppahassta*

In the case of *make-type* SCs, neither the SC-subject nor SC-predicate can move within RP. Specifically, since the SC-subject is merged at the edge of RP, there is no probe that can search and agree with the SC-subject within the RP (see Ko 2014a for further evidence). Therefore, the SC-subject cannot undergo movement within RP. The SC-predicate cannot move within RP under anti-locality, either. The SC-predicate *photocwu-lo* in (7) is merged as the complement of the R head. Under anti-locality, the SC-predicate cannot move into its own specifier - this type of movement is considered too local and there is no morphological reason to merge a complement to its own specifier (see Pesetsky and Torrego 2001). Therefore, if RP undergoes cyclic linearization, the ordering that the SC-subject precedes the SC-predicate must be fixed and preserved in the higher domains. If predicate fronting occurs in a later stage of derivation, as in (9), it would necessarily yield an ordering contradiction between the RP domain and the higher domain. See (29) for a concrete illustration. In the RP domain, the SC-subject *nangul* precedes *photocwu-lo* as in (29a), but in the higher domain, the ordering is reversed due to predicate fronting, as in (29b). Consequently, PF cannot decide a proper ordering and the derivation is ruled out as being unpronounceable at PF (see Ahn and Cho 2008 and Ko 2011, 2014a for precursors of this line of analysis based on *jeolda* ‘consider’ constructions in Korean).

(29) Ordering statements for the derivation in (9):  
    $[\text{[be photocwu-lo; mapesu-naun [be nangul t1 mantulessta]]}]$  

a. ordering at RP: *nangul < photocwu-lo*  

b. ordering at matrix vP: *photocwu-lo < mapesu-naun < nangul < mantulessta*

Note that my analysis for (8) and (9) can be straightforwardly extended to RP-fronting in (12a) and (13)a. As seen in (12a) and (13)a, fronting of a small clause is possible whether the RP is embedded under a *pred-type* verb or *make-type* verb. This is because the entire RP, not parts of the RP, is fronted over the matrix subject. Such movement may add a new ordering (RP<matrix subject), but it does not contradict any ordering established within the RP domain. More precisely, (13)a is grammatical as an instance of RP-fronting *nangul* *photocwu-in* and (12a) involves multiple scrambling of *khong-ul* and [PRO *kalwu-lo*] to the left of *aprin-naun* at SpecvP (before Spell-out of vP). By contrast, (9) (=29) is ungrammatical as an instance of bare predicate fronting over its own SC-subject.
RP-fronting in (12)a and (13)a just adds new ordering statements at RF while predicate fronting in (9) necessarily causes an ordering contradiction between the RF domain and a higher domain.

More broadly construed, my arguments imply that there is no genuine case of 'predicate fronting' which crosses over its own subject in an SC. Such fronting would be ruled out by the interaction of anti-locality and cyclic linearization.

Apparent predicate fronting (e.g. (8)) is in fact an instance of clausal fronting: the fronted predicate contains a null subject which is co-indexed with a predicate-external noun (e.g. a matrix object). In this vein, my approach provides a viable explanation for the so-called Proper Binding Condition (PBC; Fiengo 1977) effects without resorting to the notion of 'trace'. Chung (2011), for instance, suggests that predicate fronting may be impossible due to the PBC by assuming that a predicate must be fronted together with an unbound trace of its subject (cf. Chung 2007 for a different approach based on constituency of SCs). The proposal advanced here explains the ungrammaticality of (9) without resorting to the PBC. This theoretical move is desirable in that 'traces' or an explanation based on the distribution of traces has little, if any, grammatical status in the current syntactic theory (see Takita 2010 for further evidence that the current line of analyses is on the right track).7

Now consider the right-dislocation data in (10) and (11). Similar to the predicate fronting asymmetry, *predicate*-type SCs allow predicate right-dislocation, but *make*-type SCs do not. In right-dislocation constructions, however, the SC-subject precedes the SC-predicate, just as in the base structures, (6) and (7). Thus, there is no issue of ordering contradiction here. Rather, the issue is which type of syntactic category can be right-dislocated. Under my proposal, the apparent 'predicate' right-dislocation in (10) may in fact correspond to right-dislocation of an entire RP. By contrast, (11) involves a genuine case of predicate right-dislocation to the exclusion of the SC-subject.

On my proposal, the derivation of (10) is possible to the extent that right-dislocation of a small clause is possible. Though details may differ from theory to theory, it is factually true that small clauses can be right-dislocated in Korean, and so can the RP in (10). A proposal of any sort that can explain the grammaticality of (12)b and (13)b may also extend to (10). Right-dislocation by itself is a widely debated topic, which has received much attention in the recent literature, and a number of interesting proposals have been presented. For the lack of space, however, I cannot review all the extant theories here (see Park and Kim 2009, Yim 2013, Ko 2014b for reviews and references therein). In this paper, I follow one specific claim on right-dislocation in Korean, leaving further evaluation of the claim for a future study.

Specifically, I follow the proposal that an argument of a closed type (e.g. <x>, <y>) can be right-dislocated in a mono-clausal structure via movement, whereas a predicate of an open type (e.g. <ep>) can be right-dislocated in a bi-clausal structure via sideward movement. On this proposal, the derivation of (10) proceeds as follows. Since the small clause is a closed domain, the RP may undergo movement to the right of the verb within RP, and later land at the right periphery of CP. Successive cyclic movement of an RP may occur as long as it is triggered in a proper *preter-gad* configuration and does not contradict orderings established in the previous domains. A sample derivation for (10) at the RP level is given in (30).

(30) [ə-speči-nun [or kʰuŋ-gul, ɨppahassta [[ko] PRO šadvedel]]]

The derivation of (11), however, cannot proceed in the same way as (10). Under the proposal in (23), a predicate is right-dislocated in (11), stranding its SC-subject. Acknowledging that other possibilities may exist, I provide a solution to the puzzle based on the discussion in Ko (2015). Ko (2015) argues that a part of predication can be right-dislocated via sideward movement in syntax. Crucially, however, this type of movement is restricted by the general condition on sideward movement. Specifically, the element that undergoes sideward movement must be a thematic object of the verb, just like parasitic gap constructions (see Ko 2015 for independent evidence for this). On this proposal, (11) is not grammatical under the resumptive meaning because the SC-subject cannot be a thematic object of the main verb (recall (23)). Since *-do in Korean is ambiguous between a resumptive marker and a postposition 'with', the only way to make sense of (11) is to interpret -do as a postposition, indicating a source. When the -do phrase is interpreted as a source, *mutul’su makes a theta role from the main verb ‘make’, which in turn loses the resumptive meaning.
In this section, I have argued that resultative small clauses marked by the
-jo suffix can be divided into two types, based on the semantic entailment test
by Aarts (1992). In the case of pound-type SCs, the main verb takes a nominal
object as its complement and the SC may contain a null subject. By contrast, in
make-type SCs, the main verb takes a resultative small clause as its sole
complement. I have explained a set of asymmetries between the two types of SCs
by interactions among independently motivated factors in the grammar. In the
next section, I show that this proposal extends to adjunct resultative clauses
marked by the -key suffix, with an interesting twist due to their adjunct status.

4. Two Types of Adjunct Small Clauses in Korean

In this section, I provide further support for my proposal by examining -key
resultative constructions in Korean. In section 4.1, I discuss some interesting
similarities between -key resultative and -jo resultative phrases, due to the presence
or absence of a null subject. In section 4.2, I turn to some surprising differences
between -key resultative vs. -jo resultative phrases, due to the mode of merge:
adjunction vs. complementation. I propose an analysis that captures the similarities
and differences between -jo resultative and -key resultatives. By doing so, I argue
for a typology of resultative constructions in Korean introduced in (1).

4.1. Null subject matters again!

The syntax and semantics of the -key resultative construction have been widely
discussed in the literature (see section 4.2 for references). Two representative
examples embedded under a transitive verb are given in (32) and (33). The two
equivalent examples in (32) and (33) "roughly" mean the same in that:  hayah-key 'white-Res'
denotes a property of the preceding noun patak 'floor', which is a result of the
main event. Crucially, the two differ from each other in the morphological
marking on the resultative subject. In (32), the resultative subject is marked by
accusative Case, but it is marked by nominative Case in (33). For convenience, I
call the former an ACC-key resultative, and the latter a NOM-key resultative.

(32) John-un patak-ul (hayah-key) chilhayessta ACC-key
     J-Top floor-Acc white-Res painted
     'John painted the floor white.'

(33) John-un patak-ul hayah-key chilhayessta NOM-key
     J-Top floor-Nom white-Res painted
     'John painted the floor white.'

Interestingly, the two constructions in (32) and (33) exhibit a set of
asymmetries that we have seen with -jo predicates in pound-type vs. make-type
SCs. As in (34), predicate fronting is possible with the ACC-key resultative, but it
is impossible with the NOM-key resultative, as in (35). As illustrated in (36) and
(37), predicate right-dislocation is possible with the ACC-key resultative, but it
is impossible with the NOM-key resultative. The data in (38) and (39) show that
predicate omission is possible in the ACC-key resultative, but it is impossible in
the NOM-key resultative. This is exactly what we have observed with the contrast
between -jo predicates in pound-type vs. make-type SCs. Specifically, as far as the
distribution of the SC-predicate is concerned, the ACC-key resultative behaves in
the same way as the pound-type SC, whereas the NOM-key resultative behaves in
the same way as the make-type SC.

(34) Hayah-key John-un patak-ul white-Res J-Top floor-Acc painted
     'Hayah-key John-un patak-ul white-Res J-Top floor-Acc painted
     'John painted the floor white.'

(35) *Hayah-key John-un patak-ul chilhayessta
     chilhayessta
     *Hayah-key John-un patak-ul chilhayessta
     'John painted the floor white.'

(36) John-un patak-ul chilhayessta hayah-key right-dislocation
     J-Top floor-Acc painted white-Res
     'John painted the floor white.'

(37) *John-un patak-ul chilhayessta hayah-key
     chilhayessta
     *John-un patak-ul chilhayessta hayah-key
     'John painted the floor white.'

Moreover, the two constructions in (32) and (33) carry different semantic
entailments, replicating the contrast between pound-type and make-type SCs.
Specifically, (32) entails (40), whereas (33) does not entail (40). When the
resultative subject is marked by accusative Case, as in (32), it entails that the resultative subject is interpreted as the affected theme of the main event. In (32), the painting event must be performed directly on *patak-ul_floor-Acc*, just as in (40). By contrast, when the resultative subject is nominative Case-marked, as in (33), the resultative subject is not necessarily interpreted as an affected theme. Rather, it may express a reading such that the affected theme of the event differs from the SC-subject. For instance, in (33), *patak_floor-Nom* does not have to be interpreted as the affected theme of the verb. It may convey a reading in (41) such that the floor accidentally got covered with white paint as a result of John’s clumsily painting something else, say, the wall (see Kim & Maling 1997, Wechsler & Noh 2001, Shim & den Dikken 2009, Ko 2011 for this generalization). This indicates that *patak* in (41) is not the object of the main verb, but is merged as a subject of the resultative clause (see Shim & den Dikken 2009, Ko 2011).

(40) John-un *patak-ul* chihayessta  
     J-Top floor-Acc painted  
    ‘John painted the floor.

(41) John-un */patak-ul* *patak-* *kuyab-key* chihayessta  
     J-Top wall-Acc floor-Nom white-Res painted  
    ‘John painted the (wall) so that the floor became white.’

Given the semantic entailment test, I argue that the ACC-key resultatives and the NOM-key resultatives are embedded under a different argument structure. In particular, in the ACC-key type, the main verb takes a noun as its complement and the small clause contains a null subject that is (potentially) associated with the object. This is illustrated in (42). In the NOM-key type, on the other hand, the nominative SC-subject is directly merged within the small clause, as in (43). On this view, the argument structure of (42) can be assimilated to the one of pound-type SCs, and the structure of (43) can be assimilated to the one of make-type SCs (see Shim & den Dikken 2009 and Ko 2011 for further evidence for this line of analysis).

(42) John-un *patak-ul* [ex pro *kuyab-key*] chihayessta  
     J-Top floor-Acc white-Res painted  
    ‘John painted the floor white.’ [a null subject in SC = *pound-type SC*]

(43) John-un [ex *pro patak-* *kuyab-key*] chihayessta  
     J-Top floor-Nom white-Res painted  
    ‘John painted the floor white.’ [a lexical subject in SC = *make-type SC*]

Under (42) and (43), my proposal for the contrasts between *pound-type SCs* vs. *make-type SCs* naturally extends to the contrasts between ACC-key and NOM-key resultatives. Specifically, due to the presence or absence of a null subject, the two constructions show different behavior in predicate fronting, predicate right dislocation, and predicate omission. When a null subject can be licensed within the SC, as in (42), the SC-predicate (in fact, the entire RP with a null subject) can be fronted, right-dislocated or omitted. When a null subject cannot be licensed, as in (43), the distribution of SC-predicates is severely constrained by grammatical factors such as anti-locality, linearization, and side movement as argued in section 3. Crucially, this argument holds whether it is a -to predicate or -key predicate.

So far, we have seen some interesting similarities between -to predicates and -key predicates in the distribution of SC-predicates. In the next sub-section, however, I discuss some surprising differences between -to resultatives vs. -key resultatives. Further elaborating on the analyses presented in (42) and (43), I argue that the differences do not affect the main thrust of the proposal, but can be independently derived from a different mode of merge in syntax: complementation for -to resultatives vs. adjunction for -key resultatives.

### 4.2. On the typology of resultative small clauses

Though the details may vary, studies on -key resultatives can be divided into three groups. One group argues that the -key resultative phrases in (32) and (33) are all complements of the main verb (e.g. Kim 1993, 1999, Kim and Maling 1997, Jang and Kim 2001, Wechsler and Noh 2001, Lee and Lee 2008). Another group argues that the ACC-key phrase in (32) is a complement, whereas the NOM-key phrase in (33) is an adjunct (e.g. Yeo 2006; Son 2008; cf. M-K Park 2010 for ECM-resultatives). Yet another group argues that -key phrases in (32) and (33) are all adjuncts (e.g. S-M Hong 2005, Shim and den Dikken 2009, D-W Park 2010, Ko 2011, K-S Hong 2011). In this paper, I argue for the universal adjunct approach. In particular, I argue that -key resultative phrases are adjuncts regardless of Case marking on the resultative subject. In this paper, in particular, I capitalize on the following factors that separate -to resultatives from -key resultatives.

First, -to resultatives differ from -key resultatives in which elements can be interpreted as the resultative subject. As extensively argued in Levin and Rappaport (1995), the resultative phrase of a complement type obeys the DOR (direct object restriction), so that only the object of the main verb is interpreted
as the subject of the resultative predicate. By contrast, the resultative phrase of an adjunct type does not obey the DOR (see Simpson 1983). In Korean, -lo resultative phrases obey the DOR, whereas -key resultative phrases do not (Kim and Maling 1997, Kim 1999, Shim and Den Dikken 2009, Wechsler and Noh 2011, Ko 2011, Hong 2011, Lee 2014, among others). In the case of -key resultatives, not only the object of the main verb but also the subject of the main verb (e.g. (44)), or even an element that can be inferred from the discourse can be interpreted as the subject of a -key predicate (e.g. (45)). By contrast, the subject of -lo resultative predicate must be the object of the verb (e.g. (46)). For instance, as observed in Lee (2014), ‘excellent person’ in (46) must be a predicate of John and not of apoe ‘father’.

    Susana-NOM Jim-ACC in.pain-RIS hit
    ‘Susana hit Jim so that she/he was in pain.’ (Ko 2011)

    Susana-NOM Jim-ACC hand-Nom in.pain-RIS hit
    ‘Susana hit Jim so that her/his hand was in pain.’

(45) A-ka changdekey₁ sikang-eye khun aoli-lo wulessta
    child-Nom embarrassed-Res restaurant-at loud voice-with cried
    ‘A child cried loudly in a restaurant so that someone got embarrassed.’
    (Hong 2011)

(46) Apeci-nun John-1ul, isangwukho yanguwukhayasta
    father-TOP John-ACC excellent person-Res nurtured
    ‘The father nurtured John into an excellent person.’ (Lee 2014)

Second, -key resultative phrases can be iterated as long as the pragmatics allows it. For instance, a series of -key resultatives may appear in the same clause, as in (47). As seen in (8), a -key predicate (e.g. -key ‘fine-grained-Res’) may also co-occur with a -lo predicate (e.g. lo ‘powder-Res’) in the same clause. As argued in previous studies, the semantic interpretation of -key resultatives are also rather free so that they can be interpreted not only as a result, but also as a degree, purpose, and hyperbole (see Yeo 2006, Son 2008, Hong 2011, among others). As in (48) and (49), however, the semantic content and the iteration of the -lo resultative are severely restricted by the main verb, in contrast to -key resultative phrases (see Lee 2014; cf. note 8).

(47) Cheli-ka pyek-ul  nong-ulo  dawkey₁ mantelessta pyetuvkey₁ dchilhayasta
    C-Nom wall-Res eye-Res well be.seen-Res stylish-Res red-Res painted
    ‘Cheli painted the wall so that it stands out, looks stylish and is red.’
    (Hong 2011)

(48) Cheli-ka tothori-1ul  nolansayk-ulo  mantulessta
    C-Nom acom-Acc jello-Res black-Res make
    ‘Cheli made acorns into jello (and black-color).’ (make-type)

(49) Cheli-ka miangwun-eye  medil-ulo 肮gedul (肮gedul) calasta
    C-Nom hairhop-at hair-Acc short-cut-Res yellow-Res cut
    ‘Cheli cut his hair short (and yellow).’ (round-type)

Third, as in (32) and (33), the resultative subject of the -key predicate can be marked by nominative or accusative Case when the main verb is transitive. By contrast, the subject of -lo predicate must be marked by accusative Case when the main verb is transitive. For instance, sentences like (50) and (51) are simply ungrammatical. It is also notable that the predicate of -lo resultatives is nominal, whereas the predicate of -key resultatives is adjectival.

(50) *Apeci-nun khong-i loppahasta  round-type
    father-Top bean-Nom powder-Res pounded
    ‘The father pounded beans into powder.’

(51) *Mapepsa-nun  mantulessta  make-type
    magician-TOP water-Nom wine-Res made
    ‘A magician turned water into wine.’

I argue that the contrast between -lo resultatives and -key resultatives can be explained by assuming that -lo predicates are merged as a complement (recall (2) and (25)), whereas -key predicates are merged as an adjunct, as depicted in (52) and (53). I also argue that the null subject has different properties in the two types of resultatives. In -lo resultatives, it is an object-oriented PRO, whereas it is a discourse-bound PRO in -key resultatives. This proposal reflects the fact (e.g. (44-46)) that the null subject in -lo resultatives must be anaphoric to the object. By contrast, the null subject of the -key resultative may refer to a salient element in the discourse, like regular pronouns. The overall typology of resultative constructions in Korean is given in (54).
Case marking also works in the expected way under this proposal. In -lo resultatives, the resultative SC is selected by the main verb and thus the most natural source of Case is the main verb, which may assign accusative Case to the SC-subject (e.g. mantultsota ‘made’ assigns accusative Case to mantul in (5); see Ko 2011 for ACC-assignment onto different types of complement SCs). Under my proposal, the -key resultative phrases are all adjuncts. Since a main verb cannot assign Case to the subject of an adjunct clause, Case of the SC-subject must be assigned independently of the main verb. The SC-subject in -key resultatives is either pro or nominative-marked, which is independent of the main verb. Though I do not argue for a particular type of Case theory here, my proposal is in line with the previous claim that -key resultative phrases are independent Case domains. For instance, Jang and Kim (2011) argue that it is a default Case strategy in Korean. Shim and den Dikken (2009) argue that Korean -key resultatives contain a Tense node that licenses nominative Case (see also MK Park 2010). Hong (2011) argues that -key phrases are in general adverbial clauses, which can be paraphrased in various ways such as result (e.g. so that), purpose (e.g. in order to until), degree (e.g. to the extent that), etc. (see also Yeo 2006 and Son 2008 for “quasi” resultative meanings of -key phrases).

This proposal captures not only the differences between -lo and -key resultatives, but also the similarities between the two examined in the preceding sections. Note that the distribution of the SC-predicate is not affected by the adjunct status of the SC (contra Cho 1998). Rather, it is affected by the presence or absence of a null subject within SC in both complement and adjunct SCs. If the main verb can take a nominal object, the SC-predicate can be fronted, right-dislocated, or omitted, both in -lo and -key resultatives (e.g. pound-type SC in (2), ACC-key SC in (4)). In these constructions, the resultative SC contains a null subject (e.g. PRO or pro) that may be associated with the main object. The syntax of the main object and that of the SC-predicate are largely independent from each other. By contrast, if the main verb does not take a nominal object in base structure, the SC-predicate cannot be fronted, right-dislocated, or omitted.

---

8 I am indebted to Lee (2014) for this point. Though the details differ from this paper, Lee (2014) argues for a complementation analysis of -lo resultatives, based on DOR and selection tests. Lee (2014) further claims that -lo resultatives can be categorized as a weak resultative proposed by Washio (1997). It is not clear, however, whether all -lo resultatives in Korean are weak resultatives. Some -lo resultatives behave like Washio’s strong resultative structures (e.g. (3)), and unlike pound-type verbs, verbs like mantultsala ‘make’ do not impose a particular semantic disposition on the SC-predicate that can be predicted from the lexical property of the main verb.

9 A reviewer notes a potential problem with the proposal, however. If make-type verbs assign accusative Case to their SC-subject as in (25), we would expect that PRO may also receive Case from the pound-type verb in (24), which goes against the traditional claim that PRO lacks lexical Case. At this moment, it is not clear to me how to solve this puzzle and I leave it for future research. It is also noteworthy that a range of judgment variation on predicate movement is observed exactly when speakers are forced to take a null subject analysis for complement small clauses (e.g. (8), (10)). It suggests that the null-subject strategy is most felicitous with small clauses of an adjunct type (e.g. -key phrases), and is adopted for complement SCs with some variation and degradation. A large-scale experimental study is needed to understand the nature of speaker variation, however.
regardless of the type of resumptive phrase (e.g. make-type SC in (3), NOM-key SC in (5)). In these constructions, the SC-subject and the SC-predicate must be merged together within the same proposition RP; and thus their relationship is close enough to be constrained by the grammatical factors that range over the propositional domain.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I have proposed a typology of resumptive constructions in Korean, capitalizing on the presence of a null subject and the mode of merge. I have shown that the presence or absence of a null subject plays a key role in explaining the distribution of SC-predicates. When the SC-subject must be merged within SC, the SC-predicate cannot be fronted, right-dislocated, or omitted. When a null subject can be posited, however, the distribution of SC-predicates is much freer. Crucially, this holds whether the SC is a complement or an adjunct. I have also shown that -lo resumptives and -key resumptives behave differently despite their striking similarities, and their differences can be explained by assuming that the -lo suffix is attached to complement resumptives, and the -key suffix, to adjunct resumptives. In explaining the four different types of resumptive constructions, I have argued for the research program that small clauses undergo cyclic Spell-out and linearization, and that movement within SC is restricted by general computational properties such as anti-locality and probe-goal Agree. This paper also provides a viable explanation for the so-called ‘BC effects’ in predicate fronting, based on the interaction of anti-locality and cyclic linearization.
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