Two Types of NP Conjunctions:
A Lexical Approach*

Sae-Youn Cho

(Kangwon National University)

Cho, Sae-Youn. 2008. Two Types of NP Conjunctions: A Lexical Approach. *Linguistic Research* 25(3), 133-148. Though it is widely believed that not every conjunction can be derived from S coordination by Ellipsis, Yoon & Lee (2005) recently claims that some type of NP coordination is derived from S coordination in Korean. To support their claim, they provide interpretive and/or syntactic evidence. Against the Ellipsis analysis, we propose a Lexical analysis for the constructions. To show that the lexical analysis is more preferable than the Ellipsis analysis, we critically review their supporting evidence and then point out that the Ellipsis analysis seems to be empirically and theoretically problematic. Rather, it is shown that the Lexical approach gives a simpler explanation for their supporting data. **(Kangwon National University)**

1. Introduction

It is widely believed that not every conjunction can be derived from S-coordination in English either by Conjunction Reduction or by Ellipsis on the basis of examples such as (1) and (2). (Cf. Gleitman (1965), Ross (1967), Yoon & Lee (2005))

(1) a. The king and queen are an amiable couple
  b. *The king is an amiable couple and the queen is an amiable couple
(2) a. Tom, Dick, and Harry are similar
  b. *Tom is similar, Dick is similar and Harry is similar.

Unlike English Conjunctions, Korean NP conjunctions can be classified into various types. Among them, Yoon and Lee (2005) recently has investigated the properties of two types of surface NP coordination in Korean and claimed that one type is constituent coordination of NPs whereas the other is derived by Ellipsis from a larger, clausal, coordination. According to them, the two types are distinguished as follows:

Type A: Case is marked only on the final conjunct and non-final conjuncts carry the nominal conjunctive suffix−(*k*)*wa* (or other conjunctive suffixes such as−*hako*).

  Pattern A: **[NP-(k)wa   NP-ka/i]**

 (3) a. Tom-kwa   Marcia-ka hakkyo-ey   ka-ss-ta (**Type A**)
     T-conj   M-nom school-loc   go-past-decl
    'Tom and Marcia went to school.'

Type B: Case-markers occur on all conjuncts and *kuliko* occurs between the conjuncts.

  Pattern B: **[NP-ka/i   kuliko   NP-ka/i]**

 (3) b. Tom-i kuliko Marcia-ka hakkyo-ey   ka-ss-ta   (**Type B**)
     T-nom and   M-nom   school-loc go-past-decl
    'Tom and Marcia went to school.'

Based on the two types classified by Yoon & Lee (2005), they argue that Type A coordination like (3a) is interpreted in the collective or distributive sense while Type B like (3b) is interpreted primarily in the collective sense. Admitting that (3b) can be ambiguous between collective and distributive readings, they claim that on the basis of the initial preference for a collective interpretation of (3b), Type A is the normal constituent NP coordination whereas Type B is not a constituent NP coordination but a surface NP coordination by Ellipsis. To support their claims, they provide interpretive and/or syntactic arguments for so-called Ellipsis approach. However, there seem to be lots of empirical and theoretical problems they face.

To avoid such difficulties, we claim here that though the two types of NP coordination mentioned above are all ambiguous, they can be uniformly analyzed as NP coordination. To clarify this claim, we suggest a lexical approach to give a simpler explanation for the properties of the two types of NP coordination in Korean.

The organization of this paper is as follows: Section 2 introduces the Ellipsis

analysis by Yoon & Lee (2005) and checks whether or not their interpretive and/or syntactic arguments for their analysis are tenable empirically and theoretically. In section 3, we propose a lexical approach to the two types of NP coordination in Korean, which enables us to avoid the empirical and theoretical difficulties they face. In concluding remarks, it is pointed out that not all Type B coordination is derived from S coordination in terms of the Ellipsis. Further, the failure of such claims as Yoon & Lee (2005) seems to be due to the idea that the preferable interpretation of a given sentence is heavily dependent upon syntactic structures. Rather, we try suggesting that the meaning of a given structure should be more closely related to that of each word in that structure.

2. The Ellipsis Approach by Yoon & Lee (2005)

Yoon & Lee's (2005) claim is that Type B coordination is not constituent coordination of NPs but coordination derived by Ellipsis from coordination of Ss. To support their claim, they provide interpretive and/or syntactic evidence for the Ellipsis analysis. Throughout investigating the data related to Type A & Type B coordination, they suggest the following generalizations:

(4) The Generalizations on Korean NP Coordination by Yoon & Lee (2005)
    a. Type B coordination does not form constituents.
    b. Type B coordination differs interpretively from Type A coordination.
    c. Certain Number Sensitive Items (NSIs) cannot occur in the predicate of Type B coordination. (Note: NSIs are Collective Predicates and Modifiers)
    d. NSIs that can occur in the shared predicate in Type B coordination are modifiers of plural events, rather than modifiers that depend on the plurality of the subject NP.

To check whether their generalizations on Type B coordination are empirically and theoretically problematic or not, we are going to go through the data they are based on. Their generalizations above can be simplified as follows:

(5) Observations on Type B coordination by Yoon & Lee (2005)
                        (Simplified Version)
    (a) Interpretively, Type B coordination is different from Type A coordination.

(b) Syntactically, Type B coordination is not constituents and as a result certain NSIs cannot occur in the predicate of Type B coordination.

On the basis of the simplified version of their generalizations, we introduce their idea and the relevant data, and then determine the validity of their claims in each section.

2.1 Interpretive Differences between the Two Types

According to Yoon & Lee (2005), there is a difference in meaning between (6a) and (6b): Though both sentences below are ambiguous between collective and distributive reading, (6a) is interpreted primarily in the collective sense while (6b) is interpreted mainly in the distributive sense.

(6) a. Tom-kwa   Marcia-ka   ochen-pwul-ul   pelessta
        T-con   M-nom   5000-dollars-acc made (Collective> Distributive)
    b. Tom-i   kuliko Marcia-ka ochen-pwul-ul   pelessta
        T-nom conj   M-nom   5000-dollars-acc made (Collective<Distributive)
     #1: Tom and Marcia each made $5000
     #2: Tom and Marcia together made $5000
    (6a): 2 > 1   vs. (6b): 1 > 2

Though the question of which reading is more preferable in the examples above can be interesting, it does not mean that the interpretive difference or preference points to the fact that the two conjunction types should differ in structure. In fact, the preferable reading of a given sentence among various readings can be varied with respect to the contexts, where the sentence is uttered. For example, if someone wants to know who made $5000 last year in a group whose members are 10, he or she may ask a question to a listener who is believed to know the answer as in (7).

(7) Nwu-ka   nehuytul-cwung-eyse ochen-pwul-ul   pelessni?
    Who-nom   you-among   5000-dollars-acc made
    'Who made $5000 among you?'

    As an answer for the question (7), the sentences (6a-b) are all construed primarily in the distributive sense. Hence, the initial preferable interpretation of a sentence is not that meaningful if the contexts where the sentence is uttered are not deliberately considered.

    Similarly, sentences (3a-b) are ambiguous between distributive and collective reading. In addition, they may differ in the preferable interpretation, as Yoon & Lee (2005) pointed out. Such preferences in reading are changed depending on the contexts. For instance, when a husband wants to know who went to school together among his sons and daughters including *Tom* and *Marcia*, he may ask a question to his wife as in (8). In this context, the relevant answer can be (3a) or (3b), which is collectively interpreted, regardless of the initial interpretive preference for the sentences.

(8) Wuliaitul-cwung-e   Nwu-ka   hakkyo-ey hamkkey ka-ss-e?
    Our children-among   who-nom school-loc together   went-que
    'Who went to school together among our children?'

    Moreover, (9) can be an answer for the question (8). If Type B coordination like (9) draws an almost unambiguous response as a distributive reading, the two questions immediately follow: how come (3b) is naturally interpreted as a collective reading and why (9) can occur with collective adverbs such as *hamkkey* ('together').

(9) Tom-i kuliko Marcia-ka hakkyo-ey **hamkkey** ka-ss-e   (=(3b))
    T-nom   and   M-nom   chool-loc together go-past-decl
    'Tom and Marcia went to school together.'

    It appears to be not easy to answer the questions under the Ellipsis analysis.
    So far, it has been shown that the preferable interpretation of the given sentences heavily depends on the contexts in which the sentences are uttered. Hence, the existence of interpretive differences on which reading is preferable for given sentences does not mean the fact that they have a structural difference. Rather, it seems that the

interpretive differences at stake must be closely related to the properties of each conjunction word involved in the coordination data mentioned above.

2.2 Differences in Constituency between the Two Types

According to the second item of the simplified version of Yoon & Lee (2005)'s generalizations, Type B coordination does not form constituents and as a result, certain NSIs cannot occur in the predicate of Type B coordination. To support their claim, they provide 3 different set of coordination data involving NSIs such as predicates or modifiers that require plural NPs. In addition, the supporting data showing that Type B coordination does not form constituents are provided. In the following, the supporting data for the Ellipsis analysis are introduced and reviewed critically.

2.2.1 NSI and Type B Coordination

Their purpose of showing the impossibility of the co-occurrence with NSIs and Type B coordination is to demonstrate that NSIs requiring plural NPs are not compatible with Type B coordination which does not form a constituent NP.

The first evidence for the Ellipsis analysis by Yoon & Lee (2005) is the examples with Collective Modifiers as an NSI as illustrated in (10). Assuming that there is a difference in grammaticality between (10a) and (10b), they suggest that Type A coordination like (10a) which is construed as plural NP can occur with the NSI *hamkkey* ('together') whereas Type B coordination like (10b) which is not understood as NP coordination cannot.[1]

(10) a. Tom-kwa Marcia-ka   chayksang-ul **hamkkey**   mantul-ess-eyo
           T-conj   M-nom   desk-acc   together   make-past-decl

      b. (*?)Tom-i kuliko Marcia-ka   chayksang-ul **hamkkey**   mantul-ess-eyo
            T-nom conj M-nom   desk-acc   together   make-past-decl
           'Tom and Marcia made a desk together.'

Unlike their grammatical judgment, sentence (10b) sounds not that bad, though there seems to be a subtle meaning difference between the two. Specifically, (10a) involving

---

1) Following Lasersohn (1995), Yoon &Lee (2005) argues that the NSIs such as *hamkkey* may refer to plural events. This semantic issue is beyond the scope of this paper.

Type A coordination is commonly used when the speaker knew the fixed members of the actors' set of making a desk together. On the other hand, (10b) involving Type B coordination can be used only when the speaker tries to pick out and pronounce the members from the actor's set of making a desk together one by one. So (10b) sounds not that good, since such contexts are rare. But it does not mean that (10b) is ungrammatical as Yoon & Lee (2005) assumed.

As for more evidence, they provide the data with collective and symmetric predicates such as *pwupwu-ya* ('be a couple') to support their claim as shown in (11). Assuming that (11a) is grammatical whereas (11b) is not, they argue that (11b) is ungrammatical because Type B coordination cannot occur with the NSI predicate.

(11) a. Tom-kwa   Marcia-ka   pwupwu-ya
        T-conj   M-nom   couple-cop.decl
    b. (*)Tom-i   kuliko   Marcia-ka   pwupwu-ya
            T-nom   conj   M-nom   couple-cop.del
        'Tom and Marcia are a couple.'

Again, though (11b) sounds a little bit odd, it can be understood by the same fashion of how sentences with Type B coordination are interpreted as mentioned above. Most native speakers could find that sentence (12), which contains non-proper nouns as conjuncts and NSI predicates with modifiers, sounds better.[2]

(12) i   namca-ka   kuliko ece   wuli-ka mannan yeca-ka
     this man-N   conj   yesterday we-N   met-Rel woman-N
     selo   pwupwu-ya
     each other couple-cop.D
     'This man and that woman who we met yesterday are a couple.'

If so, their claim that the co-occurrence of Type B coordination and NSI predicates is impossible is untenable. Furthermore, The NSI predicates such as *pisushata* ('be similar') and *talmta* ('resemble') seem to occur with Type B coordination as illustrated in (13).

---

2) As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, an important question is whether (12) is grammatical or not. We believe (12) to be grammatical in this paper.

(13) i   yeca-ka   kuliko ce yeca-ka   (selo)   pisushata
      this woman-nom conj   that woman-nom   each other   similar
      'This woman and that woman are similar.'

Though Type B coordination occurs with the NSI *pisushata* in (13), this sentence sounds great regardless of the existence of the word *selo* ('each other'). If it is correct, Type B coordination can be regarded as a constituent conjunct, unlike the generalizations by Yoon & Lee (2005). In addition to that, the fact that the reciprocal *selo* can appear in sentences with Type B coordination and NSIs shows us that Type B coordination is a plural NP constituent because the reciprocal requires a plural subject.

Similar evidence provided by Yoon & Lee (2005) comes from the NP conjunction with collective pronominal modifiers as NSIs as in (14).

(14) a. cal   ewulli-nun   namca-wa   yeca-ka   pang-ulo tuleoassta
        well matched-rel man-conj   woman-nom room-into enter-pst-decl
    b. (*)cal ewulli-nun # namca-ka kuliko yeca-ka   pang-ulo tuleoassta
        well matched-rel man-nom conj   woman-nom room-into enter-pst-decl
        'A well-matched man and woman entered the room.'

They argue that on the basis of the fact that the collective pronominal modifier *cal ewulli-nun* ('well matched') requires plural nominal(s) as its head, the Type B coordination in (14b) does not constitute a plural NP and thus it is ungrammatical. Unlike Yoon & Lee (2005), the oddness of (14b), in fact, can be accounted for in a different way. First, if there is a pause between the collective pronominal modifier and the Type B coordination, (14b) seems to be a little bit better. Put aside the phonological factor, it is natural that Type B coordination is not easy to be used in the situation where the speaker already saw the well-matched actors of entering the room and then pick out them from the set one by one. Hence, (14b) sounds a little bit odd. But it is unclear that the oddness of (14b) is due to either syntactic or semantic problems. In other words, this issue is neutral.

2.2.2 Type B Coordination & Constituency

Yoon & Lee (2005) argues that Type B conjunction allows adverbs to intervene between the conjuncts while Type A conjunction does not, as in (15).[3]

(15) a. *Tom-kwa   himtulkey   Marcia-ka   swukce-ul   hass-ta
         T-conj   with.difficulty M-nom   homework   did
         'Tom and Marcia did the homework with a lot of effort.'
     b. Tom-i himtulkey   kuliko Marcia-ka swipkey   swukce-ul hass-ta
        T-nom with.difficulty conj   M-nom   easily   homework   did
        'Tom did homework with difficulty and Marcia did homework with ease.'

According to their explanation, (15a) is ungrammatical since Type A pattern is a case of real NP coordination whereas (15b) is grammatical because Type B pattern is surface NP coordination derived from S coordination by Ellipsis. In fact, the suffix ‐kwa in Korean is ambiguous between a conjunction and a comitative postposition. If the suffix ‐kwa in (15a) is a conjunction, it is ungrammatical because it violates the Coordinate Structure Constraint (CSC) by Ross (1967). As for (15b), they use this example to show that Type B coordination is not an NP constituent but S coordination. This sentence, however, is a typical Non-Constituent Coordination (NCC) in natural languages whose pattern is [**Subject Adverbial Phrase VP & Subject Adverbial Phrase**]. The English NCC examples such as Mary talked about Mark on Wednesday and Johnny on Thursday can be easily found in English. (Cf. Cho (1996)) Hence, (15b) with Type B coordination should be differently dealt with under the rubric of the NCC.

---

3) Yoon &Lee (2005) provides more supporting data for the claim that type B coordination does not form a constituent. The additional supporting data are as follows: The impossibility of Type B modified by Relatives, that of Type B in the focal position of Pseudo-cleft sentences, and that of the last part of Type B containing the suffix ‐ *man*. It seems that such impossibilities are not due to the fact that Type B does not constitute a constituent. Rather, they are due to a constraint to each construction. More specifically, the impossibility of Type B in Psuedo-cleft sentence is obviously due to the co-occurrence restrictions between the nominative marker and a copular verb. The other arguments are unreliable because the data they provided are acceptable in an appropriate context, which we are not going to go through all of them here. (Cf. Yoon & Lee (2005))

2.3 The Ellipsis Analysis by Yoon & Lee (2005)

The essence of Yoon & Lee's (2005) mechanisms is that a case-marked NP without
a following predicate is an elliptical structure. This idea enables them to regard Type
B coordination as coordination of Ss under the Ellipsis analysis, since the first part of
Type B pattern, i.e. [**NP-Case** kuliko NP-Case], without a following predicate means an
elliptical structure. On the other hand, Type A coordination, i.e. [NP-wa **NP-Case**], is
predicted to be NP coordination because only the last conjunct has a case marker. So
the Ellipsis analysis can represent the structures of Type A and B coordination as in
(16a) and (16b), respectively.

(16) a. [NomP [NP [NP Tom]-kwa   [NP   Marcia]] [Nom −ka VP]]
       b. [NomP [NP Tom] [Nom −i VP]] kuliko [NomP [NP Marcia] [Nom −i VP]]

After emphasizing that they can account for the data mainly related to NSIs above,
they turn to other NSIs such as distributive modifiers as in (17).

(17) a. Tom-kwa Marcia-ka   kakkak   cip-ulo   kass-ta
          T-conj   M-nom   each   home-loc went-decl
       b. Tom-i kuliko Marcia-ka kakkak cip-ulo   kass-ta
          T-nom conj   M-nom   each   home-loc went-decl
          'Tom and Marcia each went home.'

The fact that Type A coordination and the distributive NSI *kakkak* like (17a)
co-occur within a sentence invites no problem to the Ellipsis analysis, if they just
assume that the conjunction −*kwa* may deliver either collective or distributive readings.
But sentence (17b), which involves Type B coordination and the NSI, should have
been ungrammatical under the Ellipsis analysis since the putative pre-Ellipsis structure
is ungrammatical as shown in (18).

(18) *Tom-i kakkak cip-ulo   kass-ta   kuliko Marcia-ka kakkak
        T-nom each   home-loc went-decl conj   M-nom   each
        cip-ulo   kass-ta
        home-loc went-decl

To avoid such difficulties, Yoon & Lee (2005) employs so-called Displacement operation under the Ellipsis approach. Instead of positing the putative pre-Ellipsis structure like (18), they postulate a quite abstract sentence as a pre-Ellipsis structure for (17b) as shown in (19).

(19) Tom-i cip-ulo   kassta kuliko Marcia-ka cip-ulo   kassta, kakkak
     T-nom home-loc went conj   M-nom   home-loc went   each

Assuming that the newly posited pre-Ellipsis structure like (19) is accepted as a legal one, they propose that the Ellipsis mechanism operates firstly on (19), resulting in (20a). In turn, the Displacement mechanism optionally operates on (20a) and so (20b) can be obtained if the Displacement works. If not, the result should be (20c).

(20) **a. When the Ellipsis is applied**
     Tom-i kuliko Marcia-ka cip-ulo   kassta, kakkak
     T-nom conj M-nom   home-loc went   each
   b. When the Displacement is applied
     Tom-i kuliko Marcia-ka *kakkak* cip-ulo   kassta,
     T-nom conj M-nom   *each*   home-loc went
   c. When the Displacement is not applied
     Tom-i kuliko Marcia-ka cip-ulo   kassta, *kakkak*
     T-nom conj M-nom   home-loc went   *each*

Given the Ellipsis and the Displacement mechanisms, the Ellipsis analysis by Yoon & Lee (2005) seemingly works in order to generate the data involving Type B coordination and the distributive NSI. However, there appears to be at least two problems: one is the question of how we can prove that the abstract pre-Ellipsis structure like (19) is the right one for (20b) or (20c) and the other is the question on whether we need such Rule orderings as in (21).

(21) **Rule Orderings (PF deletion)**
     The Ellipsis operation must precede the optional Displacement operation.

So far, we have critically reviewed the supporting data for the Ellipsis analysis by Yoon & Lee (2005). Through reviewing the data, we could observe that the data they

provided do not seem to support the first part of their simplified generalizations in (5), which said that Type B coordination is interpretively different from Type A coordination. Rather, the interpretive differences among the relevant data cited above point to the fact that the contexts and the properties of each conjunction appear to play important roles on determining sentential meanings. As for the second part of the simplified generalizations, the data cited above do not support their claim that Type B coordination is not constituents and as a result, certain NSIs cannot occur in the predicate of Type B coordination. Unexpectedly, they appear to point out that Type B coordination forms an NP constituent. We believe that the failure of such claims in Yoon & Lee (2005) stems from the wrong idea that syntactic structures are directly related to semantics.

3. A Lexical Approach

Assuming that syntactic structures and their semantics are independent, we claim that the interpretive and/or syntactic differences between the two types can be accounted for under a lexical approach.[4]

To show that it is so, we propose that the conjunction -*kwa* is ambiguous between Comitative -*lang* ('with') and the NP Conjunction 'and', while the conjunction *kuliko* is ambiguous between the subordination 'kuliko+se' ('and then') and XP conjunction 'and'. This can be summarized as follows:

(22) Grammatical Information for the two Conjunctions
  a. Morpheme '-(k)wa'
   Function   1) Comitative particle ('with')
             2) NP conjunction (This particle cannot occur with Case.)
                      (Cf. Cho & Sells (1995))

---

4) By 'a lexical approach', we mean that all explanations are based on the lexical information of the two conjunctions, i.e. - *wa* and *kuliko*. Though the syntactic and semantic lexical information of the conjunctions are specified as in (22)-(23), we are not going to provide any syntactic structure for the data mentioned in this paper just because they all can be NP coordination under our analysis of the two conjunctions, i.e. -*wa* and -*kuliko*. Though the syntactic and semantic lexical information of the conjunctions are specified as in (22)-(23), we are not going to provide any syntactic structure for the data mentioned in this paper just because they all can be NP coordination under our analysis.

　　b. Word　　'kuliko'
　　Function　　1) Reduction form of 'kuliko+se' ('and-then')
　　　　　　　　2) XP conjunction

<p align="center">(Cf. Cho (2004))</p>

As for the semantic information of each conjunction, we can provide the following description in plain English:

(23) Meaning Difference between the two Conjunctions, i.e.'-(k)wa' and 'kuliko'
　　a. The conjunction '-(k)wa' in Type A pattern can deliver collective or distributive interpretations.
　　b. The conjunction 'kuliko' in Type B pattern, in principle, can deliver both readings. But it could be used only when the speaker tries to pick out and pronounce the members from the actor's set of a given event one by one.

Given the lexical information in (22) and (23), we can give a simpler explanation for the data that Yoon & Lee (2005) provided for Ellipsis approach. For your readability, we reintroduce the two representative data as follows:[5]

　　　　Pattern A:　**[NP-(k)wa　NP-ka/i]**
　(3) a. Tom-kwa　　Marcia-ka hakkyo-ey　ka-ss-ta (**Type A**)
　　　　T-conj　　　M-nom　school-loc　go-past-decl
　　　　'Tom and Marcia went to school.'
　　　　Pattern B:　**[NP-ka/i　kuliko　NP-ka/i]**
　(3) b. Tom-i kuliko Marcia-ka　hakkyo-ey　ka-ss-ta (**Type B**)
　　　　T-nom and　M-nom　　school-loc　go-past-decl
　　　　'Tom and Marcia went to school.'

As mentioned above, the two sentences with Type A or B can obtain either collective or distributive readings depending on the contexts. This is correctly predicted under the lexical analysis because of the semantic constraint (23). In addition, the lexical information in (22) enables us to predict that (3a) and (3b) are well-formed. More specifically, (3a) and (3b) are grammatical in terms of the second article of the

---

5) We are not going to discuss how (22) & (23) are formalized under the HPSG framework. The relevant issues are discussed in Cho (2004) and SW & B (2003).

constraint (22a) and that of (22b), respectively.

Furthermore, it can be predicted that the data with Type B coordination and the NSI *talmta* ('resemble') are acceptable as in (24), which cannot be accounted for under the Ellipsis analysis.

(24) i   yeca-ka   kuliko ce yeca-ka   (selo)   talmassta
    this woman-nom conj   that woman-nom each other   resemble
    'This woman resembles that woman.'

The fact that the Type B coordination in (24) can occur with the NSI requiring a plural subject just follows from the lexical constraint in (22b) and the semantic constraint (23b). But this fact would be another puzzle to the Ellipsis analysis in the sense that Type B coordination cannot be NP coordination under the Ellipsis approach. To avoid this difficulty, they need to postulate another abstract pre-Ellipsis structure only for the predicate on a needed-basis. Of course, it is not desirable.

Lastly, this lexical analysis gives a simpler explanation for sentence (20b), which involves Type B coordination and the distributive NSI *kakkak* ('each').

(20b) Tom-i kuliko Marcia-ka *kakkak* cip-ulo   kassta,
     T-nom conj   M-nom   *each*   home-loc went
     'Tom and Marcia each went home.'

By the definition of (22b) and (23b), sentence (20b) can be predicted to be grammatical because Type B coordination can have a distributive reading and hence
the distributive NSI *kakkak* can freely occur in the sentence, if the contexts are appropriate. In accounting for this construction, the lexical analysis proposed here does not need any additional rule or statement. But as mentioned above, the Ellipsis analysis definitely needs an abstract pre-Ellipsis structure for the sentence and an optional Displacement mechanism, in addition to the Ellipsis mechanism. Again, this is undesirable.

4. Conclusion

The Ellipsis analysis by Yoon & Lee (2005) looks quite attractive in the sense that

on the basis of the two conjunction types in Korean, Type A coordination can be analyzed as real NP coordination whereas Type B coordination can be analyzed as a surface NP coordination derived from S coordination in terms of Ellipsis. The claim that unlike English, Korean conjunctions can be classified into two types seems to be a great achievement, only if it is fully supported and attested by empirical data. But it is not the case. Throughout the review of the supporting data they provided, we have observed that the data cited above seem to be problematic empirically and theoretically. We believe that the failure of the Ellipsis analysis directly stems from the idea that syntactic structures and semantics are heavily dependent. Hence, the Ellipsis analysis invites too many problems they cannot avoid. Furthermore, if patterns such as **[NP-null kuliko NP-case]** and **[NP-acc/dat kuliko NP-acc/dat]** are included in the Type B coordination, it is questionable whether or not those patterns should be interpreted only in a distributive sense. If so, we need to check further data which they did not deal with. If not, they have to redefine the Type B coordination.

On the other hand, the lexical approach proposed here has given us a simpler explanation for the evidence for the Ellipsis analysis that Yoon & Lee (2005) provided. Moreover, even the data such as (20b), which requires an additional rule under the Ellipsis analysis, can be accounted for without any ad hoc rule. Assuming the idea that syntactic structures and semantics are independent, we propose a lexical approach toward Korean conjunctions on the basis of the lexical properties of each conjunction at issue. This enables us to predict the grammaticality and the meanings of the coordinate structures.

In conclusion, though we still have to work for some residuals such as the formalization of the lexical information in (22) and (23), we believe that the lexical analysis of coordination constructions is on the right track.

References

Cho, Sae-Youn. 1996. *Non-Constituent Coordination As a Subtype of Constituent Coordination*. Doctoral Thesis. University of Illinois. Urbana-Champaigne.

Cho, Sae-Youn. 2004. Sequentiality and Non-Tensed Verbal Coordination in Korean. *BLS* 30. Berkeley. CA. USA.

Chomsky, Noam. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.

Gleitman, Lila. 1965. Coordinating Conjunctions in English. *Language* 41, pp.260-293.

Lasersohn, Peter. 1995. *Plurality. conjunction and events*. Volume 55 of studies in linguistics and philosophy. Dordrecht London: Kluwer.

Ross, John. 1967. *Infinite Syntax,* pp.97-120. Ablex Publishing Corporation. Norwood. New Jersey.

Sag, Ivan A., T, Wasow. and Emily M, Bender. 2003. *Syntactic Theory: A Formal Introduction*. the 2nd edition. CSLI Publications.

Yoon, James H.-S. and Woo-Seung Lee. 2005. Conjunction Reduction and Its Consequences for Noun Phrase Morphosyntax in Korean. *Proceedings of WCCFL* 24, pp.379-387. John Alderete et. al. eds.. Somerville. MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Yu-Cho, Young-Mee and Peter Sells. 1995. A Lexical Account of Inflectional Suffixes in Korean. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 4, pp.119-174.

Cho, Sae-Youn

Department of English Language and Literature

Kangwon National University

192-1 Hyoca 2-dong

Chuncheon City, Kangwon-do, 200-701

Republic of Korea

E-mail: sycho@kangwon.ac.kr