1-28-2013

Case Drop from Fragment Answers in Korean

Junghyoe Yoon
Indiana University, junyoon@indiana.edu

Yoshihisa Kitagawa
Indiana University, kitagawa@indiana.edu

Case Drop from Fragment Answers in Korean

Case Drop from Fragment Answers in Korean

Junghyoe Yoon and Yoshihisa Kitagawa*

1 Introduction

Korean exhibits case marking and case drop as exemplified in (1)-(3).

(1) Wh-questions:
    a. Nwukwu-{***ka*** / *$\varnothing$}   wuyu-lul   sass-ni?
        who-NOM   milk-ACC   bought-Q
        'Who bought milk?'
    b. YungHee-ka   mwues-{***ul*** / $\varnothing$}   sass-ni?
        YungHee-NOM   what-ACC   bought-Q
        'What did YungHee buy?'
(2) Case Drop in Clausal Answers:
    a. YungHee-{***ka*** / *$\varnothing$}   wuyu-lul   sass-e.
        YungHee-NOM   milk-ACC   bought-DCL
        'YungHee bought milk.'
    b. YungHee-ka   wuyu-{***ul*** / $\varnothing$}   sass-e.
        YungHee-NOM   milk-ACC   bought-DCL
(3) Case Drop in Fragment Answers:
    a. YungHee-{***ka*** / $\varnothing$}
        YungHee-NOM
        'YungHee (bought milk).'
    b. Wuyu-{$\varnothing$ / ***lul*** }
        milk-ACC
        '(YungHee bought) milk.'

As can be seen in (2) and (3), clausal and fragment answers exhibit puzzling asymmetry in both case marking and case drop. In this paper, we concentrate on the case drop involved in fragment answers as in (3) (henceforth **FAs**), and attempt to explicate why the overt case marker is sometimes realized, need not be realized, or cannot be realized in this construction. [1]

     One obvious question that needs to be answered in our analysis of (3) is why and how subject-object asymmetry arises in *case-marked FAs* (i.e., ^{ok}ka vs. $*lul$) while no such asymmetry is observed in *bare FAs* (indicated as *NP-$\varnothing$*). To provide an answer, we will argue for the following analyses. First, despite their appearance, FAs as in (3) are syntactically analyzable as sentences that involve ellipsis. Second, case-marked FAs and bare FAs involve distinct types of sentential construction. [2]

---

     [1]For the analysis of the case phenomena in a clausal construction as in (2), the readers are referred to Yoon (2011) and Kitagawa and Yoon (2011). The term 'case drop' in this paper is meant to refer to the absence of phonetic content of a case particle from a nominal argument, nothing more or less. Throughout, we will indicate case drop in linguistics examples with '$\varnothing$' as in (1)-(3) without any implication of the existence of a phonetically empty case particle intended. The term 'drop' does not imply the involvement of any operation of deleting phonetic contents, either.
     [2]This is not to claim that all instances of fragments in Korean (or any other language) are analyzable as sentential.

Editor's Note: This paper, presented at PLC 35, was accidentally omitted from PWPL volume 18.1

2 Case-marked Fragment Answers

We propose first that *case-marked FAs* in Korean as in (3) below are to be analyzed as sentences involving VP-ellipsis.

(4) a. YungHee-***ka***
         YungHee-NOM

         'YungHee (bought milk).'
     b. Wuyu-***lul***.
         milk-ACC
         '(YungHee bought) milk.'

A nominative-marked FA, for instance, is derived as illustrated in (5A).[3]

(5) Q: [$_{TP}$ **nwukwu-ka**$_1$ [$_{VP}$ t$_1$ wuyu-lul   sa-ss-ni]]
         Who-NOM   milk-ACC   buy-PST-Q
     A: [$_{TP}$ **YungHee-ka**$_1$ [$_{VP}$ ~~t$_1$ wuyu-lul   sa-ss-e~~]]
         YungHee-NOM   milk-ACC   buy-PST-DCL

For ease of description, we illustrate VP-ellipsis here in terms of the deletion of the element crossed out. Under the LF-copy approach, the deleted VP in (5A) would be base-generated as an empty VP whose content is copied from the antecedent VP in (5Q) at LF.

   The derivation of an accusative-marked FA, on the other hand, would not be fulfilled by ellipsis of any single constituent that is permitted in Korean:

(6) Q: [$_{TP}$ YungHee-ka$_1$ [$_{VP}$ t$_1$ **mwues-ul** sa-ss-ni]]]
          YungHee-NOM   what-ACC buy-PST-Q
     A1: *[$_{TP}$ ~~YungHee-ka~~$_1$ [$_{VP}$ t$_1$ **wuyu-lul** ~~sa-ss-e~~]]]
          YungHee-NOM   milk-ACC   buy-PST-DCL
     A2: *[$_{TP}$ ***pro***$_1$ [$_{VP}$ t$_1$ wuyu-lul   ~~sa-ss-e~~]]]
                                    milk-ACC   buy-PST-DCL

First, on the standard assumption that ellipsis targets a single constituent, the derivation of accusative-marked FAs in terms of discontinuous ellipsis as in (6A1) would be prohibited. Second, we cannot assume that the FA here is derived as in (6A2), either, in which a null subject appears and V-ellipsis applies in a way similar to that in a gapping construction. As can be seen in (7a-b) below, V-ellipsis in gapping always takes place regressively rather than progressively in Korean.

(7) a. YungHee-nun sakwa-lul [$_V$ ∅], (kuliko) YungHee-nun photo-lul **mek**-ess-e.
         YungHee-TOP apple-ACC   and   YungHee-TOP grapes-ACC eat-PST-DCL
         'YungHee (ate) apples and YungHee ate grapes.'
     b. *YungHee-nun sakwa-lul **mek**(-ess-e), (kuliko) YungHee-nun photo-lul   [$_V$ ∅].
          YungHee-TOP apple-ACC eat-PST-DCL   and   YungHee-TOP grapes-ACC
          'YungHee ate apples and YungHee grapes.'

We can also confirm that V-ellipsis is not a viable option in Korean when we try to answer (6Q) with the subject represented overtly as a topic phrase as in (8A4).

(8) A4: [$_{TP}$**YungHee-nun**$_1$ [$_{VP}$ t$_1$ wuyu-lul   {**sa-ss-e** / *[$_V$ ∅]}]]]
          YungHee-TOP   milk-ACC   buy-PST-DCL

It is difficult, therefore, to consider that V-ellipsis is involved in (6A2).

---

[3]We suppress the *v*P analysis here for simplicity.

These observations would lead us to conclude that the accusative-marked FAs are prohibited in Korean because there is no way to derive them in a legitimate way with ellipsis in this language. We believe that this is a quite desirable result since we can now capture the subject-object asymmetry observed in the case-marked FAs in (4) (i.e., ^{ok}ka vs. *lul) without postulating anything special. It simply follows from the asymmetry in the applicability of VP-ellipsis between the two answer clauses in (5) and (6).

3 Bare Fragment Answers

We now turn to the derivation of **bare FAs** indicated as *NP-∅* in (9).

(9) a. YungHee-{*ka* / ∅}
    YungHee-NOM
    'YungHee (bought milk).'
  b. Wuyu-{∅ / ***lul*** }
    milk-ACC
    '(YungHee bought) milk.'

We claim that bare FAs are also derived when ellipsis takes place in a full-fledged clause. Unlike in the case of case-marked FAs, however, bare FAs are realized not in a canonical sentential construction but in a pseudocleft construction.

Let us motivate this analysis step by step. First, when a *wh*-question is asked in Korean, it can be answered not only with a parallel 'canonical' sentence but also with a pseudocleft sentence, as in (10A2) (for a subject *wh*) and (11A2) (for an object *wh*).

(10)Q: **Nwu(kwu)-ka**   sicang-eyse   wuyu-lul   sa-ss-ni?
    who-NOM   market-at   milk-ACC   buy-PST-Q
    'Who bought the milk at the market?'
  A1: **YungHee-ka**   sicang-eyse   wuyu-lul   sa-ss-e.
    YungHee-NOM   market-at   milk-ACC   buy-PST-DCL
    'YungHee bought the milk at the market.'
  A2: [Sicang-eyse   wuyu-lul   sa-n   kes-un]   **YungHee**-{∅ / ***ka**}-ya.
     market-at   milk-ACC buy-ADN thing-TOP   YungHee-**NOM-COP.INFORMAL**
    'The person who brought milk at the market is YungHee.'
(11)Q: ChelSwu-ka   sicang-eyse   ***mwues-ul***   sa-ass-ni?
    ChelSwu-NOM   market-at   what-ACC   buy-PST-Q
    'What did ChelSwu buy at the market?'
  A1: ChelSwu-ka   sicang-eyse   ***wuyu-ul***   sa-ass-ni?
    ChelSwu-NOM   market-at   milk-ACC   buy-PST-Q
    'ChelSwu bought mile at the market'
  A2: [ChelSwu-ka   sicang-eyse   sa-n   kes-un]   **wuyu**-{∅ / ***lul**}-ya.
     ChelSwu-NOM   market-at   buy-ADN thing-TOP   milk-**ACC-COP.INFORMAL**
    'The thing which YungHee brought at the market is milk.'

A pseudocleft answer to a *wh*-question as in (10A2) and (11A2) are nothing special. They are used quite naturally and frequently in Korean.

Furthermore, such pseudocleft answers may appear in different sizes when different items involved there are expressed phonetically empty as in the examples below — as in (12) when the topic phrase is elided, and as in (13) when the informal copula *ya* in (12) is replaced by its phonetically empty version *[e]$_{ya}$*.

(12)a. ~~[Sicang-eyse   wuyu-lul   sa-n   kes-un]~~   YungHee-{∅ / *ka}-ya.
          market-at   milk-ACC   buy-ADN   thing-TOP   YungHee-NOM-COP.INFORMAL
        '(The person who brought milk at the market) is YungHee.'
     b. ~~[ChelSwu-ka   sicang-eyse   sa-n   kes-un]~~   wuyu-{∅ / *lul}-ya.
          ChelSwu-NOM   market-at   buy-ADN   thing-TOP   milk-ACC-COP.INFORMAL
        '(The thing which YungHee brought at the market) is milk.'

(13)a. YungHee-{∅ / *ka}-**[e]**$_{ya}$.
        YungHee-NOM-COP.INFORMAL
        '(The person who brought milk at the market) is YungHee.'

     b. wuyu-{∅ / *lul}-**[e]**$_{ya}$.
        milk-ACC-COP.INFORMAL
        '(The thing which YungHee brought at the market) is milk.'

Note now that the NPs appearing in the pre-copula position in (13a-b) are equivalent to what we have called bare FAs.

   Bare FAs in (13) in fact are nothing but the reflection of the phenomena commonly observed in a pseudocleft construction. First, copulas in general may often appear phonetically empty in Korean (henceforth '**copula drop**'), [4] not only in a simple copular sentence as in (14) below but also in a pseudocleft sentence as in (15).

(14) Ku   salam-i   kaswu-{ **i** / **[e]**$_i$ }-ta.
      the person-NOM   singer-COP-DCL
      'The person is a singer.'

(15)a. [Sicang-eyse   wuyu-lul   sa-n   kes-un]   YungHee-{ **ya** / **[e]**$_{ya}$ }.
          market-at   milk-ACC   buy-ADN   thing-TOP   YungHee-**COP.INFORMAL**
        'The person who brought milk is YungHee.'

     b. [YungHee-ka   sicang-eyse sa-n   kes-un]   wuyu-{ **ya** / **[e]**$_{ya}$ }.
          YungHee-NOM market-at   buy-ADN   thing-TOP   milk-**COP.INFORMAL**
        'The thing which YungHee brought is milk.'

(15a-b) indicate that the informal copula *ya* may often undergo copula drop even within the full form of the pseudocleft answers as in (10A2) and (11A2). This point can be confirmed by the fact that the informal status of these sentences is maintained even when the overt *ya* is missing.

   Second, as has been indicated in all sizes of the pseudocleft answers in (10) through (13) above, overt case markers are prohibited from appearing on the pre-copula NP in this construction. This will also be a natural consequence in the proposed analysis, since structural case particles are prohibited in all pre-copula positions in Korean. This restriction applies to all types of copular constructions (including pseudoclefts) and all structural case particles alike, as shown in (16)-(17) (Kang (2006: 254-279)). [5]

(16)a. Ku salam-i   kaswu-**(*i/*ul)-*i*-**ta.
        the person-NOM   singer-NOM/ACC-COP-DCL
        'The person is a singer.'
     b. Mary-ka   manna-n kes-un   John-**(*ul)-*i*-**ta.
        Mary-NOM   meet-ADN thing-TOP   John-ACC-**COP**-DCL
        'The person who Mary met was John.'
     c. John-ul   manna-n kes-un   Mary-**(*ka)-*i*-**ta.
        John-ACC   meet-ADN thing-TOP   Mary-NOM-COP-DCL
        'The person who met John was Mary.'

---

[4] Here again, the term 'drop' does not imply deletion but simply indicates the absence of phonetic content.
[5] The obligatory case drop from the pre-copula NPs in (16b-c) and (17) suggests that whether or not the pre-copula NP is predicative is irrelevant in this phenomenon.

(17)[Wuyu-lul   sa-n   kes]-un   YungHee-(*ka)-*ya*.
    milk-ACC buy-ADN thing-TOP   YungHee-NOM.COP.INFORMAL
    'The person who bought milk was YungHee.'

To sum up, we have proposed that a bare FA in Korean is to be analyzed as an 'elliptical' pseudocleft sentence as in (18).

(18)a. [~~$_{\text{NP}}$ Wuyu-lul   sa-n   kes-un~~]$_{\text{Topic}}$ [YungHee-$\varnothing_{\text{case}}$]$_{\text{Focus}}$-[$_\text{V}$ e]$_{ya}$
       milk-ACC   buy-ADN thing-TOP   YungHee-COP.INFORMAL
       'The person who bought milk was YungHee.'
   b. [~~$_{\text{NP}}$ ChelSwu-ka   sa-n   kes-un~~]$_{\text{Topic}}$ [wuyu-$\varnothing_{\text{case}}$]$_{\text{Focus}}$-[$_\text{V}$ e]$_{ya}$
       ChelSwu-NOM buy-ADN thing-TOP   milk-COP.INFORMAL
       'The thing which ChelSwu bought was milk.'

In this construction, the topic phrase is elided, the informal copula *ya* appears without its phonetic content, and the focused NP appears in the pre-copula position obligatorily as a bare FA.

The immediate advantage of this analysis is that we can now provide an answer for the question we raised on the paradigm in (3) at the beginning of this paper. We noted there that subject-object asymmetry arises in *case-marked* FAs (i.e., $^{\text{ok}}ka$ vs. **lul*) but no such asymmetry is observed in *bare* FAs. We already reduced the asymmetry in *case-marked* FAs to the asymmetrical applicability of VP-ellipsis. We now know why case drop applies symmetrically between subjects and objects when bare FAs are obtained. A bare FA is a focused NP appearing in the pre-copula position in a pseudocleft sentence, but case marking is prohibited across-the-board in Korean for pre-copula NPs. In the next section, we will provide further motivation for the proposed analysis of bare FAs as described in (18).

4 Further Motivation

First, the postulation of the phonetically empty informal declarative copula *ya* plays a key role in the proposed analysis of bare FAs, permitting us to capture their fragmentary appearance as well as bareness in case marking. We would like to argue now that the empty copula showing up in bare FAs indeed must be this particular informal and empty copula.

To begin with, Korean is known to have an elaborated system of clause-final particles. For instance, the outermost (= final) verbal suffix usually expresses modality like declarative or question, which may be preceded by a marker indicating the formality of the utterance, as illustrated in (19a-c).[6]

(19)a. cohahay-ss-**ta**
     like-PST-DCL
   b. kaswu-i-**ta**
     singer-COP-DCL
   c. sa-ss-**upni-kka**
     buy-PST-FORMAL-Q.FORMAL

To make the long story short, Korean verb stems (root + tense) in general must be accompanied by an overt modality marker, and hence cannot stand alone at surface, as shown in (20).

(20)a. YungHee-ka   sakwa-lul   cohahay-ss-{**ta** / **[**e**]$_{ta}$}.
     YungHee-NOM apple-ACC   like-PST-DCL
     'YungHee liked apples.'

---

[6] Sometimes, the modality marker itself indicates the formality as in (19c). Some modality markers may also indicate speakers' attitude toward what they are saying.

   b. YungHee-ka   nwukwu-lul manna-ss-{**ni** / *[**e**]$_{ni}$}?
      YungHee-NOM   who-ACC   meet-PST-Q
      'Whom did YungHee meet?'

The situation is the same with a clause-final copula. Although the copula itself can be phonetically empty as we saw above, the modality marker cannot be empty:

(21)a. Ku salam-i   kaswu-{[**e**]$_i$-**ta** / ***i**-[**e**]$_{ta}$}.
       the person-NOM   singer-COP-DCL
       'The person is a singer.'
    b. Wuyu-ul sa-n   kes-un   YungHee-{[**e**]$_i$-**ta** / ***i**-[**e**]$_{ta}$}.
       milk-ACC buy-ADN   thing-TOP   YungHee-COP-DCL
       'The person who bought milk was YungHee.'

The informal declarative copula *ya* is exceptional in this respect, as seen in (22).

(22)Ku salam-un   kaswu-**ya**.
    that person-TOP singer-COP.INFORMAL
    'That person is a singer.'

The absence of an overt modality marker is exceptionally tolerated with *ya*, presumably because this copula involves 'fusion' indicating the declarative and informal status of the utterance. We can also confirm that *ya* in (22) can undergo 'copula drop' when we observe that (23) below permits a copular interpretation even though it does not involve any overt copula.

(23)Ku salam-nun   kaswu.
    the person-TOP singer
    'The person is a singer.'

This sentence, in fact, must also be interpreted as an informal declarative utterance on a par with the *ya* construction in (22) above. We can capture these interpretive restrictions imposed on (23) when we hypothesize that *ya* can appear phonetically empty, as in (24).

(24)Ku salam-un   kaswu-[**e**]$_{ya}$.
    that person-TOP   singer**-COP.INFORMAL**

   With this much background, we now are ready to examine the crucial paradigm (25)-(26) below to support our postulation of the phonetic empty *ya* in bare FAs.

(25)Q: Nwu(kwu)-ka   wuyu-lul   sa-ss-**upni-kka**?
        who-NOM   milk-ACC   buy-PST-**FORMAL**-Q.**FORMAL**?
        'Who bought the milk?'
    A1: YungHee-{i-**pni**-ta / [e]$_i$-**pni**-ta}.
        YungHee-COP-**FORMAL**-DCL
    A2: *YungHee.
(26)Q: Nwu(kwu)-ka   wuyu-lul   sa-ss-**ni**?
        who-NOM   milk-ACC   buy-PST-Q.**INFORMAL**
        'Who bought the milk?'
    A1: YungHee-**ya**
        YungHee**-COP.INFORMAL**
    A2: **ok**YungHee.

When a *wh*-question is asked in the *formal* style as in (25Q), it can be legitimately answered with an "NP+copula" that is appropriately marked as formal as in (25A1) (with or without copula drop). The same is true with the *informal* question-answer pair (26Q) and (26A1). Quite interestingly, however, the formal question cannot be answered with a bare FA, while the informal question can,

as the contrast between (25A2) and (26A2) indicates. One may consider that (25A2) is unacceptable simply because case drop is incompatible with the formality of the involved conversation. Although it is true that case drop is generally attuned to and observed more often in informal utterances, it is not necessarily prohibited in the formal utterances. Case drop in fact is permitted even in the formal question in (25Q), as illustrated in (27).

(27) Q: Nwu(kwu)-ka   wuyu-{**lul** / ∅}   sa-ss-**upni-kka**?
     who-NOM   milk-ACC   buy-PST-**FORMAL**-Q.**FORMAL**?
     'Who bought the milk?'

The contrast between (25A2) and (26A2) follows straightforwardly if bare FAs are analyzed as involving the phonetically empty *ya* under the approach we proposed, as in (28).

(28) [$_{TP}$ [$_{NP}$ ~~Wuyu-lul~~ ~~sa-n~~   ~~kes-un~~]$_{Topic}$ YungHee-[**e**]$_{ya}$]
          milk-ACC   buy-ADN   thing-TOP   YungHee-**COP.INFORMAL**

Under this analysis, the formality of the question-answer pair is consistent in (26) but not in (25). One may consider that (25A2) is ungrammatical simply because a formality marker is missing in a formal conversation. If so, the FA in (25A2) may not necessarily involve ∅$_{ya}$. The paradigm in (29) below, however, suggests that this is not the case.

(29) Q: etten   *pwun*-i   wuyu-lul   sa-ss-**yo**?
         which   person(**HON**.)-NOM milk-ACC buy-PST-**Q.FORMAL**
     A1: YungHee-**pni**-ta.
          YungHee-**FORMAL**-DCL
     A2: YungHee-**ta**.
          YungHee-DCL
     A3: *YungHee-**ya**.
           YungHee-INFORMAL
     A4: *YungHee-∅$_{ya}$.
           YungHee-INFORMAL

The particle *yo* is a neutral formality marker, but the presence of the honorific expression *etten pwun* 'which person (HON)' forces it to function as a formal marker in (29Q). The appropriateness of the answer (29A1) with the formal marker *pni* shows that it indeed is a formal situation. Crucially, however, the same question may be answered legitimately even when a formal marker does not accompany the declarative marker, as shown in (29A2). Yet, not only the presence of the informal marker *ya* in (29A3) but also its absence in (29A4) is also rejected in FAs. This suggests that (29A4) should be analyzed as involving a null informal marker functioning on a par with *ya*, i.e., ∅$_{ya}$. In short, a bare FA is always interpreted as informal due to its involvement of the phonetically empty informal (and declarative) copula *ya*.

    A virtually identical contrast can also be observed in full-fledged pseudocleft sentences. Compare the contrast between (25A2) and (26A2) with that between (30c) and (31b).

(30) a.   [Wuyu-ul   sa-n   kes-un]   YungHee-i-**pni**-ta.
            milk-ACC   buy-ADN   thing-TOP   YungHee-COP-**FORMAL**-DCL
           'The person who bought milk is YungHee.'
     b. **ok**[Wuyu-ul   sa-n   kes-un]   YungHee-[e]$_i$-**pni**-ta.
            milk-ACC   buy-ADN   thing-TOP   YungHee-COP-**FORMAL**-DCL
     c. *[Wuyu-ul   sa-n   kes-un]   YungHee.
            milk-ACC   buy-ADN   thing-TOP   YungHee
(31) a.   [Wuyu-lul   sa-n   kes-un]   YungHee-**ya**.
            milk-ACC   buy-ADN   thing-TOP   YungHee-**COP.INFORMAL**
         'The person who brought milk is YungHee.'

    b. **ok**[Wuyu-lul   sa-n   kes-un]   YungHee.
           milk-ACC   buy-ADN   thing-TOP   YungHee

Once again, the contrast between (30c) and (31b) can be reduced to their asymmetry concerning the formality of the question-answer pair when they are analyzed as in (32).

(32)   [Wuyu-lul   sa-n   kes-un]   YungHee-[**e**]*ya*.   (cf. (15) above)
              milk-ACC   buy-ADN   thing-TOP   YungHee-**COP.INFORMAL**

This observation supports the following two major components of the proposed analysis: (i) that bare FAs are nothing but elliptical pseudocleft sentences, and (ii) they involve the phonetically empty *ya*.

     The pseudocleft analysis of bare FAs can be further motivated by the parallel 'connectivity' effects observed in bare FAs and pseudoclefts. The bare FAs in (33A1)-(33A3) below exhibit the same patterns as those which the simple paraphrasing sentences exhibit with respect to various binding behaviors, as in (34).

(33)Q: [John-kwa   Bill]$_X$-un   **nwukwu**-lul   conkyengha-ni?
              John-and   Bill-TOP   **who**-ACC   respect-Q
              'Whom do John and Bill respect?'
     A1: **ok**[*caki*$_X$-ui   komwun]-∅.
           self-GEN   advisor
         '**John** respects **John's** advisor and **Bill** respects **Bill's** advisor.'
     A2: *****ku-tul**$_X$-∅.
         he-PL
         '([John and Bill]$_X$ respect) them$_X$.'
     A3: **ok**[**ku-tul**$_X$-ui   komwun]-∅.
         he-PL-GEN   advisor
         '([John and Bill]$_X$ respect) [their$_X$ advisor(s)].'
(34)a. **ok**[John-kwa   Bill]$_X$-un   [*caki*$_X$-ui   komwun]-ul   conkyenghay.
          John-and   Bill-TOP   self-GEN   advisor-ACC   respect
         '**John** respects **John's** advisor and **Bill** respects **Bill's** advisor.'
     b. *[John-kwa   Bill]$_X$-un   **ku-tul**$_X$-ul   conkyenghay.
         John-and   Bill-TOP   he-PL-ACC   respect
         '[John and Bill]$_X$ respect them$_X$.'
     c. **ok**[John-kwa   Bill]$_X$-un   [**ku-tul**$_X$-ui   komwun]-ul   conkyenghay.
         John-and   Bill-TOP   he-PL-GEN   advisor-ACC   respect
         '[John and Bill]$_X$ respect [their$_X$ advisor].'

The single-denoting reflexive *caki* 'self' in (33A1) can take the plural antecedent *John-kwa Bill* 'John and Bill' in (33Q) and exhibits a distributive reading, as indicated by its translation. Such a bound variable interpretation is known to be possible only when the item to be interpreted as a variable is c-commanded by its operator as in (34a). *Ku-tul* 'they' appearing in (33A2), on the other hand, cannot take *John-kwa Bill* as its antecedent. The contrast between (33A2) and (33A3) in the availability of such an anaphoric interpretation suggests to us that what we are observing in bare FAs here is the same contrast as that induced by the Binding Condition (B) in full-fledged clauses as in (34b-c). Under the proposed analysis, this observation can be reduced to the well-known connectivity effect exhibited by pseudoclefts as in (35).

(35)a. **ok**[[John-kwaBill]$_X$-i   conkyengha-n kes-un]   [*caki*$_X$-ui   komwun]-ya.
          John-and Bill-NOM respect-ADN   thing-TOP   self-GEN advisor-COP.INFORMAL
         'The person who **John** respects is **John's** advisor and the person who **Bill** respects is **Bill's** advisor.'

   b. *[[John-kwa Bill]$_X$-i   conkyengha-n kes-un] [**ku-tul$_X$**]-ya.
      John-and Bill-NOM respect-ADN   thing-TOP he-PL-COP.INFORMAL
    'The people who [John and Bill]$_X$ respect are them$_X$.'

   c. **ok**[[John-kwaBill]$_X$-i   conkyengha-n kes-un] [**ku-tul$_X$**-ui komwun]-ya.
      John-and Bill-NOM respect-ADN   thing-TOP he-PL-GEN advisor-COP.INFORMAL
    'The person/people who [John and Bill]$_X$ respect is/are [their$_X$ advisor(s)].'

    The proposed pseudocleft analysis of bare FAs can be further motivated even when we observe the absence of expected connectivity effects. First, since Higgins (1973), it has been repeatedly pointed out that pseudoclefts in English show connectivity in the licensing of negative polarity items (NPIs), as illustrated in (36a) in comparison to (36b-c).

  (36)a. He bought lots of textbooks; [what he did**n't** buy] was **any** good novels.
      b. He did**n't** buy **any** good novels.
      c. *[What he did**n't** buy] shocked **anyone**.   (Heycock and Kroch 1999: p. 366)

Interestingly and quite mysteriously, pseudoclefts in Korean fail to show this connectivity effect on NPIs:

  (37)*[Sohee-ka   pwulci   **mosha**-n   kes-un]   **amwu**   mwuncey-**to**-ya.
        Sohee-NOM   solve   cannot-ADN   thing-TOP   any   question-also-COP
      'What Sohee couldn't solve was any question.'

Since Korean pseudocleft sentences do exhibit some connectivity effects similar to those observed in many other languages (e.g., on binding, as we just saw in (35)), this absence of connectivity (henceforth '**anti-connectivity**') is quite surprising. What is not surprising to us, however, is that this anti-connectivity effect on NPIs is also observed in bare FAs in Korean. When the question in (38) is asked in an appropriate context that makes its negativity natural, the NPI expression *amwu … -to* 'any' can appear in a simple sentential answer as in (38A1) while the corresponding fragment answer in (38A2) cannot.

  (38)[Context: Sohee failed to pass an examination, in which she had to answer
                 all 10 questions correctly to make the passing mark.]
    Q: Sohee-ka   mwues-ul   pwulci   moshay-ss-ni?
       Sohee-NOM   what-ACC   solve   cannot-PST-Q
       'What could Sohee not solve?'
    A1: Sohee-nun   **amwu** mwuncey-**to**   pwulci   **moshay**-ss-e.
       Sohee-TOP   any   question-also   solve   cannot-PST-DCL
       'Sohee could not solve any question.'
    A2: ***amwu**   mwuncey-**to**.
        any   question-also
       '(Sohee could not solve) any question.'

Once again, what we observe here is parallel behaviors between bare FAs and pseudoclefts but not in canonical sentence, this time with respect to the anti-connectivity effect on NPIs. It supports the proposed pseudocleft analysis of bare FAs in Korean, perhaps even more strongly. Similar anti-connectivity phenomena can be parallelly observed between bare FAs and pseudoclefts in regard to 'postposition drop' and case drop in 'pair-list' answers to multiple *wh*-questions, which we regrettably cannot present in this paper due to the space limitation. For those arguments, the readers are referred to Yoon (2011), which also attempts to capture how the elided topic phrase and the pre-copula focus come to be interpretively associated, and how the connectivity effects come to be achieved in bare FAs, adopting the 'LF-internal derivation' of pseudocleft sentences proposed by Heycock and Kroch (1999). Based upon the results of an experiment, Yoon (2011) also points out that contrastive focus makes an accusative-marked FA as in (3b) grammatical. She argues that covert movement applied to a contrastively focused item causes this unexpected phenomenon.

5 Summary

In this paper, we presented a portion of our analyses of both 'case-marked' and 'bare' fragment answers in Korean. It was proposed and argued, first, that a case-marked FA arises when a canonical sentence involves VP-ellipsis. This analysis allowed us to capture the fact that a nominative case particle can but an accusative case particle cannot be dropped from FAs. Second, it was argued that a bare FA arises when a pseudocleft sentence as an answer involves the ellipsis of a topic phrase and a phonetically empty version of the informal copula *ya*. The pre-copula NP in this construction necessarily appears without a case particle and comes to be interpreted as a focused bare FA.

References

Heycock, Caroline and Kroch, Anthony (1999). "Pseudocleft Connectedness," *Linguistic Inquiry, vol. 30.3*: pp. 365-397.

Higgins, R (1973). *The Pseudocleft Construction in English*. Ph. D. dissertation, MIT.

Kang, Bosook (2006). "Some Peculiarities of Korean *Kes* Cleft Constructions," *Studia Linguistica, vol. 60.3*: pp. 251-281.

Kitagawa, Yoshihisa and Jungyoe Yoon (2011) "Case Adjacency without Case," Poster presented at Japanese/Korean Linguistics Conference 21, Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea.

Yoon, Junghyoe (2011) *Case Drop in Korean - Its Empirical and Theoretical Investigation*, Ph. D. dissertation, Indiana University.

Department of Linguistics
Memorial Hall 322
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405-7005
U.S.A.
junyoon@indiana.edu
kitagawa@indiana.edu