

### Mismatches in Ellipsis and the Parallelism Domain

**PROPOSALS.** Recent studies have shown that ellipsis can tolerate mismatches in various features, although identity between the subpart of the elided constituent (EC) and that of its antecedent constituent (AC) remains required (Rudin 2019, Landau 2023, Anand et al. 2025). This paper supports this view by arguing that honorification and factivity mismatches are allowed in Korean ellipsis. I further propose that the parallelism domain is contextually determined, in line with Bošković's (2014) contextual phasehood.

**HONORIFICATION MISMATCHES.** Korean addressee honorification marker *-(su)pni* (henceforth, HONA) is used when the addressee is a person of higher status than the speaker, as illustrated in (1).

- (1) a. Sopho-ka tochakha-ess-ta. parcel-NOM arrive-PAST-D  
'A parcel arrived.' (Addressee is of non-high status.)  
b. Sopho-ka tochakha-ess-supni-ta. parcel-NOM arrive-PAST-HONA-D  
'A parcel arrived.' (Addressee is of high status.)

Inspired by Rizzi's (1997) articulated CP periphery system and Arregi and Hanink's (2021) bidirectional agreement model, allowing both downward and upward Agree, Jou (2024) proposes that *-(su)pni* is realized in the functional head  $\text{Agr}_{\text{Addr}}$ . The honorific feature of the head is unvalued (i.e.,  $[\text{HON}: \_ ]$ ) and enters into an Agree relation with a valued honorific feature on  $\text{Addr}$  located higher than  $\text{ForceP}$ , as illustrated in (2).

- (2) Step 1: Agree  $[\text{SpkP} [\text{AddrP} [\text{ForceP} [\text{Agr}_{\text{AddrP}} \dots \text{Agr}_{\text{Addr}}[\text{HON}: \_ ]] \text{Force}] \text{Addr}[\text{HON}: \alpha]] \text{Spk}]$

Step 2: Valuation  $[\text{SpkP} [\text{AddrP} [\text{ForceP} [\text{Agr}_{\text{AddrP}} \dots \text{Agr}_{\text{Addr}}[\text{HON}: \alpha]] \text{Force}] \text{Addr}[\text{HON}: \alpha]] \text{Spk}]$

Another type of honorification in Korean is subject honorification (henceforth, HONS), exemplified in (3).

- (3) A: Sensayngnim-kkeyse o-\*(si)-e/ass-ta. teacher-NOM come-HONS-PAST-D  
'Teacher Kim came.'  
B: Nay tongsang-to o-\*(si)-e/ass-ta. my younger.brother-also come-HONS-PAST-D  
'My younger brother came as well.'

In (3A), where the subject holds a higher social status than the speaker, the HONS marker *-si* must appear. Conversely, in (3B), where the subject is of lower status, the HONS marker must be absent. According to Jou (2024),  $[\text{HON}: \_ ]$  in  $\text{Agr}_{\text{Subj}}$  located between  $\text{AspP}$  and  $\text{TP}$  is valued either as  $[+]$  or  $[-]$  as a result of agreement with the subject, as illustrated in (4) (cf. Choi and Harley 2019, Lee 2024).

- (4)  $[\text{TP} [\text{Agr}_{\text{SubjP}} [\text{AspP} [\text{VoiceP} \text{Subj} \dots \text{Voice}] \text{Asp}] \text{Agr}_{\text{Subj}}[\text{HON}: \pm]]$  (downward Agree)

Now, let us consider the sentences in (5), which show honorification mismatch in clausal ellipsis. In (5),

- (5) A: Sensayngnim, swukoha-si-ess-supni-ta. Speaker A holds a lower social status than  
teacher hard.work-HON<sub>Subj</sub>-PAST-HON<sub>Addr</sub>-D Speaker B. Accordingly, in (5A), Speaker A  
Teacher, I appreciate for your hard work. uses both the HonA *-supni* and the HonS *-si*  
B: Kulay. Ne-to swukoha(\*-si)-ess(\*-supni)-ta. when he/she says the sentence to speaker B. In  
yes you-also hard.work-HON<sub>Subj</sub>-PAST-HON<sub>Addr</sub>-D contrast, in (5B), Speaker B's utterance is  
B': Kulay. Ne-to (swukoha-ess-ta). acceptable only if those two honorific  
yes you-also hard.work-PAST-D morphemes are absent. This implies that (5A)  
'I appreciated your hard work, as well.' contains  $\text{Agr}_{\text{Addr}}[\text{HON}: +]$  and  $\text{Agr}_{\text{Subj}}[\text{HON}: +]$ ,

while (5B) contains  $\text{Agr}_{\text{Addr}}[\text{HON}: -]$  and  $\text{Agr}_{\text{Subj}}[\text{HON}: -]$ . (5B') is derived from (5B) – clausal ellipsis preceded by movement of the fragment to a clause-peripheral position above the ellipsis site (i.e.,  $[\text{Spec}, \text{FP}]$ ) (Merchant 2004). Importantly, the AC in (5A) contains  $\text{Agr}_{\text{Addr}}[\text{HON}: +]$  and  $\text{Agr}_{\text{Subj}}[\text{HON}: +]$ , while the EC in (5B') contains  $\text{Agr}_{\text{Addr}}[\text{HON}: -]$  and  $\text{Agr}_{\text{Subj}}[\text{HON}: -]$ . The disparity between the AC and the EC with respect to the HON values of  $\text{Agr}_{\text{SubjP}}$  and  $\text{Agr}_{\text{AddrP}}$  indicates that honorification features in  $\text{Agr}_{\text{Addr}}$  and  $\text{Agr}_{\text{Subj}}$  are exempt from clausal ellipsis, despite being located inside the ellipsis site, as shown in (6).

- (6) a. (5A):  $\dots [\text{AddrP} [\text{ForceP} [\text{Agr}_{\text{AddrP}} [\text{TP} [\text{Agr}_{\text{SubjP}} \dots \text{Agr}_{\text{Subj}}[\text{HON}: +]] \text{T}] \text{Agr}_{\text{Addr}} [\text{HON}: +]] \text{Force}] \text{Addr}[\text{HON}: +]]$   
b. (5B'):  $[\text{FP} \text{Ne-to} ([\text{AddrP} [\text{ForceP} [\text{Agr}_{\text{AddrP}} [\text{TP} [\text{Agr}_{\text{SubjP}} \dots \text{Agr}_{\text{Subj}}[\text{HON}: -]] \text{T}] \text{Agr}_{\text{Addr}} [\text{HON}: -]] \text{Force}] \text{Addr}[\text{HON}: -]])]$

**FACTIVITY MISMATCH.** Lee (2019) argues that the Korean verb *al*, which corresponds to *know* in English, takes either a nominalized DP for factivity or a CP for a non-factivity, as shown in (7) (cf. Özyıldız 2017).

- (7) a. #Tom-un [DP Mina-ka ttena-n kes-ul] al-ko iss-ci man, sasil, Mina-nun ttena-ci anh-ass-ta.  
Tom-TOP Mina-NOM leave-ADN<sub>past</sub> N-ACC know-ASP-but in.fact Mina-TOP leave-NEG-PAST-D  
'I know the fact that Mina<sub>i</sub> left, but in fact, she<sub>i</sub> did not leave.'  
b. Tom-un [CP Mina-ka ttena-ess-ta-ko] al-ko iss-ci man, sasil, Mina-nun ttena-ci anh-ass-ta.  
Tom-TOP Mina-NOM leave-PAST-D-C know-ASP-but in fact Mina-TOP leave-NEG-PAST-D  
'Tom non-factively knows [i.e., believe] that Mina<sub>i</sub> left, but in fact, she<sub>i</sub> did not leave.'

In the first sentence in (7), the proposition that *Mina left* is factively presupposed, which leads to a

contradiction with the subsequent sentence. In contrast, no such contradiction arises in (7b), as the embedded CP complement of *al* is non-factive. This contrast in factivity stems from the disparity in morpheme sequences: *-n-kes-ul* encodes factitive meaning, whereas *-ta-ko* encodes non-factive meaning. Based on this, we can assume that the nominalized DP complement of *al* carries a [+factive]-feature, while the CP complement of *al* contains a [–factive]-feature, as illustrated in (8).

- (8) a. Tom-un [DP [+FACTIVE] [CP Mina-ka ttena-n kes-ul] al-ko iss-ci man, ...  
 b. Tom-un [CP [–FACTIVE] Mina-ka ttena-ess-ta-ko] al-ko iss-ci man, ...

Consider the sentence in (9), where the EC is selected by *hwuhoyha* ‘regret’, which only takes a factive complement (i.e., a complement containing a [+factive]-feature in the present terms), as in English.

- (9) Na-nun [CP [–FACTIVE] Tom<sub>i</sub>-i kecismalha-ess-ta-ko] al-ko iss-ess-nuntey, anina talulkka, ku-nun  
 I-TOP Tom-NOM lie-PAST-D-C know-ASP-PAST-and no difference he-TOP  
 na-eykey oase ([DP [+FACTIVE] ku<sub>i</sub>-ka kecismalha-n kes-ul]) hwuhoyha-n-ta-ko malha-ess-ta.  
 I-to come he-NOM lie-ADN<sub>past</sub> N-ACC regret-PRES-D-REP say-PAST-D

‘I non-factively knew [i.e., believed] that Tom<sub>i</sub> lied, and as expected, he came to me and said that he<sub>i</sub> regretted having lied.’

In (9), the AC bears a [–factive]-feature, whereas the EC bears a [+factive]-feature. Despite this disparity, ellipsis of the factive complement of *hwuhoyha* ‘regret’ is licensed. This suggests that although factivity features reside within the ellipsis site, they lie outside the parallelism domain, and therefore are exempt from identity. Note that what is elided in (9) is an argument, which indicates that null arguments can tolerate factivity mismatch. I do not claim here that (9) is compatible with only a particular approach to argument ellipsis. However, the elliptical sentence in (9) can be derived as follows: Assuming that null arguments involve PF-deletion (Takahashi 2020, Fujiwara 2022), the factive feature is located higher than the parallelism domain (tentatively, VoiceP inside the CP and the DP), and deletion then applies under identity.

**PARALLELISM DOMAIN.** The following examples show that Voice and Aspect must be included within the parallelism domain of ellipsis. That is, ellipsis does not tolerate Voice and Aspect mismatches.

- (10) A: Kyengchal-i nwukwu-lul cap-ass-ni? B: Salinbem-i \*(kyengchal-ey cap-hi-ess-e).  
 police-NOM who-ACC arrest-PAST-Q murderer-NOM police-by arrest-PASS-PAST-D  
 ‘Who did the police arrest?’ ‘A murderer (was arrested by the police).’  
 (11) A: Ku-nun mwuncey-lul phwul-ko iss-ni? B: Ani, cikum mak \*(ku-nun kukes-ul pwul-ess-e).  
 he-NOM problem-ACC solve-PRES.PROG-Q no just he-TOP it-ACC solve-PRES.PERF-D  
 ‘Is he solving the question?’ ‘No, he has just solved it.’

Given that AspP is present in the structure only when sentences contain aspect information, and that AspP–not VoiceP selected by Asp–serves as the parallelism domain when AspP is present, I propose that the parallelism domain is the highest projection of the argument/verbal domain. This means that when AspP is absent, VoiceP functions as the parallelism domain – the parallelism domain is determined contextually and aligns with the argument/verbal domain phase (Bošković 2014). This predicts that tense and modal mismatches are allowed, and this prediction is confirmed in Ahn (2012), Park (2013) and Takita (2024).

**EXTENSION.** The elliptical sentence in (12B) cannot mean *John did not meet Mina*. This shows that polarity mismatch is disallowed, which implies that negation in (12A) is in the verbal domain (cf. Han et al. 2007).

- (12) A: John-i<sub>i</sub> nwukwu-lul an manna-ess-ni? B: Mina-nun #(pro<sub>i</sub> manna-ess-ta).  
 John-NOM who-ACC NEG meet-PAST-D Mina-CONT meet-PAST-D  
 ‘Who did not John meet?’ ‘(Intended)John did not meet Mina.’

Meanwhile, (13) shows that a negative-sensitive item can serve as a fragment answer to a positive question. At first glance, this seems to suggest polarity mismatch–i.e., the EC bears the neg-feature, while the AC does not–contrary to what was discussed above. However, this is not the case, as several studies support polarity identity between the AC and the EC in this context (Kim 2013, Tieu and Kang 2014; cf. Kim 2024). One such study is Watanabe (2004), which argues that the neg-feature of negation in the EC in (13B) is deleted via Neg-Factorization. Thus, the AC and the EC become identical in polarity (cf. Chung 2012).

- (13) A: [CP [TP Nwu-ka [VoiceP [VP o]]-ass]-ni]? B: Amwuto<sub>1</sub> ([CP [TP t<sub>1</sub> [VoiceP [VP an[–neg] o]]-ass]-e).  
 who-NOM come-PAST-Q no one/anyone NEG come-PAST-D  
 ‘Who came?’ ‘No one.’

[SELECTED REFERENCES] Anand, P., Hardt, D. & McCloskey, J. 2025. The Domain of Formal Matching in Sluicing. *Linguistic Inquiry*. Bošković, Ž. 2014. Now I’m a Phase, Now, I’m Not a Phase: On the Variability of Phases with Extraction and Ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry*. Jou, E. 2024. Honorification as Agree in Korean and beyond. *Glossa*. Lee, C. 2019. Factivity Alternation of Attitude ‘know’ in Korean, Mongolian, Uyghur, Manchu, Azeri, etc., and Content Clausal Nominals. *Journal of Cognitive Science*. Watanabe, A. 2004. The genesis of negative concord: Syntax and morphology of negative doubling. *Linguistic Inquiry*.