Linguistic Research 30(3), 453-472

Multiple fragment answers in Korean*

Bum-Sik Park
(Dongguk University)

Park, Bum-Sik. 2013. Multiple fragment answers in Korean. *Linguistic Research* 30(3), 453-472. There are two main approaches to fragments: the Ellipsis Approach (Morgan 1973, Merchant 2004, 2010) and the Direct Interpretation Approach (Yanofsky 1978, Stainton 1998, 2006, Barton and Progovac 2005). Examining fragment answers in Korean and proposing a generalization of them, this paper argues that the Direct Interpretation Approach fails to account for the wide range of data and suggests two possible directions toward an analysis. It is proposed that fragment answers involve both ellipsis and *pro*/cleft and that contrary to what the Direct Interpretation Approach assumes, fragment answers involve structure. The arguments come from various 'word order' effects of multiple fragments and island (in)sensitivity of fragment answers. **(Dongguk University)**

Keywords fragment answers, multiple fragments, ellipsis, Direct Interpretation Approach, *pro*, cleft, island sensitivity

1. Introduction

In the literature, there are two main opposing views on fragments (including fragment answers). One approach argues that fragments can be derived from their corresponding sentences via ellipsis (Morgan 1973, Hankamer 1979, Stanley 2000, Merchant 2004, 2010, among many others). Under this ellipsis approach, when a speaker utters a fragment, what she really produces is a complete sentence, and the fragment is derived from this sentence via ellipsis.

The other approach proposes that (certain) fragments do not involve ellipsis but are generated as they are and can be interpreted as propositions, assertions and

* A preliminary version of this paper was presented at the Workshop on Sluicing and Related Phenomena, organized by the Institute for the Study of Language and Information, Nov. 8, 2013, Kyung Hee University. I would like to thank the audience at the workshop for helpful comments and suggestions, and especially Jong-Bok Kim for giving me a chance to present my work. I would also like to thank anonymous reviewers of this journal for helpful comments and criticism. I am also very grateful to Sei-Rang Oh and the audience of my Syntax Seminar (Fall, 2013) for insightful discussion and judgements. All remaining errors are solely mine.

questions by themselves via pragmatic processes (Yanofsky 1978, Morgan 1989, Barton 1990, Stainton 1993, 1994, 1995, 1997, 1998, 2006; Barton and Progovac 2005). According to this approach, termed as the Direct Interpretation Approach (DIA, henceforth), no syntactic structures for the unpronounced part are involved in the first place.

Korean also allows fragments in various contexts. Depending on whether fragment bears a case marker or not, (nominal) fragments are divided into two types:

(1) A: nwu-ka Yenghuy-lul manass-ni?
who-Nom Y.-Acc met-Q
'Who met Yenghuy?'
B: Chelswu-ka **[Case-marked FA]**
Chelswu.-Nom
'Chelswu'

(2) A: nwu-ka Yenghuy-lul manass-ni?
who-Nom Y.-Acc met-Q
B: Chelswu **[Case-less FA]**
Chelswu

In this paper, I will focus on fragment answers as in (1)-(2) and discuss how they fair with the two approaches. Reviewing various analyses under these approaches in detail, I will argue that the DIA is not plausible in accounting for fragments answers (FAs, henceforth). However, it will also be shown that the ellipsis approach alone is not sufficient in accounting for FAs in Korean. Bringing up a novel set of data, I will suggest two possible directions toward an analysis.

2. Previous analysis

2.1 Ellipsis approach and direct interpretation approach

Arguments for the ellipsis approach come from various connectivity effects, such as case connectivity and binding connectivity (Morgan 1973, Merchant 2004, Park 2005a,b, Park 2008, Ahn and Cho 2011). As shown in (3), the FA in (3B) must bear

the morphologically same case marker that the corresponding sentence would bear as in (3B'). This case connectivity receives a natural account if we assume that the fragment moves to a left peripheral position, followed by ellipsis of XP/TP:

(3) A: nwu-ka Yenghuy-lul manass-ni?
who-Nom Y.-Acc met-Q
'Who met Yenghuy?'
B: Chelswu-ka/(*lul)
B': Chelswu-ka/(*lul) Yenghuy-lul manass-e
C.-Nom/(Acc) Y.-Acc met-Dec
'Chelswu met Yenghuy.'
(4) Chelswu-ka [$_{XP/TP}$ t_i Yenghuy-lul manass-e]

However, case-less FAs seem to constitute a problem for the ellipsis approach. As first pointed out by Morgan (1989), the problem here is that there is a contrast between the case-less FA and its potentially corresponding sentence, as shown in (5) and (6):

(5) A: nwu-ka Yenghuy-lul manass-ni?
who-Nom Y.-Acc met-Q
'Who met Yenghuy?'
B: Chelswu
B': *Chelswu Yenghuy-lul manass-e[1]
Chelswu Y.-Acc met-Dec
(6) A: Chelswu-nun nwukwu-ekey sathang-ul cwuess-ni?
C.-Top who-Dat candy-Acc gave-Q
'To whom did Cheoswu gave a candy?'
B: Yenghuy(-ekey)

---

[1] Taken alone, this full sentence sounds better as an answer to (i), which suggests that *Chelswu* can be interpreted as a topic. This topic-related interpretation of *Chelswu* in (5B'), however, seems not possible in the question-answer context of (5), which renders (5B') unacceptable.

(i) Chelswu(-nun), nwukwu-lul manass-ni?
C.-Top who-Acc met
'Speaking of Chelswu, who did he meet?'

Y.(-Dat)
'Yenghuy.'

B': Chelswu-nun Yenghuy*(-ekey) sathang-ul cwuess-e.
C.-Top Yenghuy(-Dat) candy-Acc gave-Dec
'Chelswu gave Yenghuy a candy.'

Given the contrast, Morgan proposes that case-less FAs in Korean, but not case-marked FAs, must be accounted for by the DIA.

The discussion so far suggests that the two types of FAs in Korean resist a unified analysis. This consideration has led some researchers to proposes that the two types of FAs should be analyzed differently. There are two lines of analyses that take this direction. I will discuss these in the next two sections.

2.2 Hybrid analysis

Given the contrast between case-marked and case-less FAs, some researchers propose that the former are derived by ellipsis while the latter can be explained by the DIA (Morgan 1989, Fortin 2007, Ahn and Cho 2011). However, as pointed out by Park 2005b, and Choi and Yoon 2009, putting case-less FAs under the roof of the DIA raises the question of why multiple case-less FAs are not allowed as in (7B') and (8B'):

(7) A: nwu-ka nwukwu-lul manass-ni?
who-Nom who-Acc met-Q
'Who met whom?'

B: Chelswu-ka Yenghuy-lul (C.-ka Y.-lul manass-e)
C.-Nom Y.-Acc (C-Nom Y-Acc met-Dec)
'Chelswu met Yenghuy.'

B': ?*Chelswu Yenghuy (?*Celswui. Yenghuy manass-e)

(8) A: Chelswu-nun nwukwu-ekey mwuess-ul cwuess-ni?
C.-Top who-Dat what-Acc gave-Q
'Who did Chelswu give what?'

B: Yenghuy-ekey sathang-ul (C.-nun Y.-ekey sathang-ul cwuess-e)
Y.-Dat candy-Acc (C.-Top Y.-Dat candy-Acc gave-Dec)

'Chelswu gave Yenghuy a candy.'
B': *Yenghuy sathang (*C.-nun Yenghuy sathang cwuess-e)
(C.-Top Y. candy gave-Dec)

The unacceptability of (7B') and (8B') constitutes a non-trivial problem for the DIA since there is *a priori* no reason to disallow it under this approach. On the other hand, the ellipsis approach naturally accounts for the parallel pattern between multiple FAs and their potentially corresponding sentences (indicated in parentheses).

To summarise, none of the analyses introduced so far provide an account for FAs in Korean. The ellipsis approach cannot account for the singleton case-less FAs, while the DIA cannot account for the unacceptability of multiple case-less FAs. The hybrid approach adopts both approaches and thus inherits their weakness.

2.3 Dependent marking parameter analysis: Choi and Yoon (2009)

Following Baker and Nicole (1986), Choi and Yoon (2009) propose Dependent Marking Parameter in (9):

(9) Dependent Marking Parameter
Languages like K/J, due to the presence of dependent-markers [such as case markers][2], arguments combine in a cluster first, looking for a compatible predicate.

According to (9), when FAs are case-marked, they can appear multiply because case-marked NPs combine first and anticipate a predicate. For instance, (10B) produces (11), and predicate resolution becomes successful by equating (11) with the source clause (10A), which has the form of (12).[3] [(10) is repeated from (7) for

---

[2] The expression in [ ] is mine.

[3] To my best knowledge, the same contrast between the forms, [NP-case NP-case] and *[NP-ø NP-ø], is first observed by Park (2005a) in matrix sluicing contexts, as shown in (i) [Park (2005a): p134]:

(i) A: enu-nam-haksayng-i enu-ye-haksayng-ul coahay
some male-student-Nom some-female-student-Acc like
'Some male-student likes some female-student.'
B: enu-nam-haksayng-i, enu-ye-haksayng-ul?

convenience]:

(10) A: nwu-ka nwukwu-lul manass-ni? [=(7)]
who-Nom who-Acc met-Q
'Who met whom?'
B: Chelswu-ka Yenghuy-lul
B': ?*Chelswu Yenghuy

(11) P(Chelswu, Yenghuy)

(12) λXλY. met(X, Y),
P(Chelswu, Yenghuy) = 'Chelswu met Yenghuy'

In contrast, case-less FAs do not restrict predicate since they do not select a predicate. When they have a salient linguistic antecedent, their meaning is resolved when they can be construed as serving as an argument of abstracted element of the source clause. Multiple case-less FAs are not allowed since they cannot combine with each other hence cannot look for a predicate.

Choi and Yoon's (2009) analysis, however, cannot account for the contrast in (12) and (13):

(13) A: nwu-ka nwukwu-lul manass-ni?
who-Nom who-Acc met-Q
'Who met whom?'
B: Chelswu-ka Yenghuy (C.-ka Y. manass-e)
C.-Nom Y. (C-Nom Y. met-Dec)
B': *Chelswu Yenghuy-lul (*C. Y.-lul manass-e)
C. Y.-Acc (C. Y-Acc met-Dec)

---

which-male-student-Nom which-female-student-Acc
'Which male-student likes which female-student?'
C: *enu-nam-haksayng, enu-ey-haksayng?
which-male-student which-female-student
'Which male-student likes which female-student?'

In Park (2005a), I argue that examples like (iC) are problematic for the DIA approach. As will be clear, the same argument also holds for FAs. (See the relevant discussion under the current context below.)

(14) A: Chelswu-nun nwukwu-ekey mwuess-ul cwuess-ni?
C.-Top who-Dat what-Acc gave-Q
'Who did Chelswu give what?'
B: Yenghuy-ekey sathang (C.-nun Y.-ekey sathang cuwess-e)
Y.-Dat candy (C-Top Y.-Dat candy gave-Dec)
B': *Yenghuy sathang-ul (*C.-nun Y. sathang-ul cuwess-e)
Y. candy-Acc (C-Top Y. candy-Acc gave-Dec)

(13) and (14) involve 'mixed' multiple FAs in that the case-marked and case-less fragment appear together. The contrast arises depending on the order of the fragments. No matter how Choi and Yoon's analysis could be modified, their system would not be able to account for this contrast since their analysis should be blind to the order of fragments. It is also important to note that this contrast clearly constitutes another problem for the DIA since pragmatic in nature, the DIA should not be sensitive to the order either.

However, just like the multiple case-less FAs in (7B') and (8B'), the parallel pattern with the potentially corresponding sentences (shown in parentheses) seems to support the ellipsis approach.

3. Interim summary

The discussion so far leads to the following two points.

(15): For the FAs where at least one fragment bears a case marker, ellipsis is needed.[4] This accounts for examples like (10B) and (13)-(14).
(16): For the other cases of FAs where none of fragments bears a case marker, the DIA is needed. This accounts for the singleton FA in (2), but not the multiple case-less FA in (10B'). Probably, then, one might need to stipulate that the DIA somehow disallows multiple case-less FAs.

The potential directions in (15) and (16) leave the multiple case-less FAs problematic unless a stipulation is made. I believe that the problem arises because we are missing a bigger generalization of FAs. In the next section, I argue against

[4] As is suggested by Ahn and Cho (2012).

the directions in (15) and (16) and propose a generalization of FAs, based on which I will suggest possible directions toward an analysis in the succeeding section (section 5).

4. Multiple fragment answers generalization

(15) predicts that whenever at least one of the fragments in FAs is case-marked, the FAs are derived by ellipsis. Unfortunately, however, this prediction is not borne out:

(17) A: nwukwu-lul nwu-ka manass-ni?[5]
who-Acc who-Nom met-Q
'Who met whom?'
B: (?)Yenghuy-lul Chelswu (*Y.-lul C. manass-e)
Y.-Acc C. (Y.-Acc C. met-Dec)
'lit. Yenghuy, Chelswu met'
B': ?*Yenghuy Chelswu-ka (?*Y. C.-ka manass-e)
Y. C.-Nom (Y. C.-Nom met-Dec)

(18) A: nwu-ka nwukwu-ekey sathang-ul cuwess-ni?
who-Nom who-Dat candy-Acc gave-Q
'Who gave whom a candy?'
B: (?)Chelswu-ka Yenghuy (*C.-ka Y. sathang-ul cuwess-e)
C.-Nom Y. (C-Nom Y. candy-Acc gave-Dec)
'Chelswu gave Yenghuy a candy'
B': *Chelswu Yenghuy-ekey (*C. Y.-ekey sathang-ul cuwess-e)
C. Y.-Dat (C. Y-Dat candy-Acc gave-Dec)

(19) A: nwukwu-ekey nwu-ka sathang-ul cuwess-ni?
who-Dat who-Nom candy-Acc gave-Q
'Who gave whom a candy?'
B: (?)Yenghuy-ekey Chelswu (*Y-ekey C. sathang-ul cuwess-e)
'Chelswu gave Yenghuy a candy'
B': *Yenghuy Chelswu-ka (*Y. C.-ka sathang-ul cuwess-e)

[5] The object *wh*-element is fronted so that the answers are ordered in a parallel fashion.

Unlike the (B') examples, the (B) examples all show a contrast with their potentially corresponding sentences, indicating that (15) is not correct. To my best knowledge, this kind of contrast has not been discussed in detail before. I believe that taking this contrast into consideration will lead us to a correct generalization.

The correct generalization we can make for all of the multiple FAs discussed so far (i.e., (7)-(8), (13)-(14) and (17)-(19)) is that when the first NP is case-marked, the FAs are all acceptable, and when the first NP is case-less, the FAs are not acceptable. The morphological form of the second NP does not affect the acceptability. This generalization also holds for other types of morphological marker such as postpositions as in (20) and (21):

(20) A: nwu-ka nwukwu-lul wuyhay noray pwuless-ni?
who-Nom who-Acc for song sang-Q
'Who sang a song for whom?'
B: (?)Chelswu-ka Yenghuy (*C.-ka Y. noray pwuless-e)
C.-Nom Y. (C-Nom Y. song sang-Dec)
'Chelswu sang a song for Yenghuy'
B': *Chelswu Yenghuy-lul wuyhay (*C. Y.-lul wuyhay noray pwuless-e)
C. Y.-Acc for (C. Y.-Acc for song sang-Dec)

(21) A: nwu-ka nwukwu-lopwute senmwul-ul patass-ni?
who-Nom who-from present-Acc got-Q
'Who got a present from whom?'
B: (?)Chelswu-ka Yenghuy (*C.-ka Y. senmwul-ul patass-e)
C.-Nom Y. (C.-Nom Y. present-Acc got-Dec)
'Chelswu got a present from Yenghuy'
B': *Chelswu Yenghuy-lopwute (*C. Y.-ropwute senmwul-ul patass-e)
C. Y.-from (C. Y-from present-Acc got-Dec)

Given the discussion so far, I propose the following generalization of FAs in Korean:

(22) **Multiple FA Generalization**

Multiple FAs that have the form of [NP-maker, NP-marker/-ø] are acceptable, but not [NP-ø, NP-marker/-ø][6,7]

If the generalization in (22) is correct, it suggests that (multiple) FAs in Korean cannot be accounted for by the DIA. The reasoning is simple: No matter how the DIA would be modified, being pragmatic in nature, it should be blind to the order of fragments and be silent about the contrast, indicated in the generalization (22). Thus it is important to bear in mind that a proper analysis should not be dependent upon the DIA.

In the following section, I suggest two possible directions toward an account of (22) which have no recourse to the DIA.

5. Deducing the multiple FA generalization

In this section, I propose two possible directions toward an account. Both of the directions employ the same 'hybrid' analysis in that FAs involve ellipsis or *pro*/cleft. But they differ from each other in its application. I would also like to note in advance that each of the directions is not without a potential problem. Still, I believe that the directions seem to be more promising than previous analyses, as discussed

---

6 Here the term 'marker' means to include both case markers and postpositions.

7 A reviewer notes an interesting possibility that the generalization might be reduced to Lasnik's (2013) analysis of multiple sluicing in English. Let us consider the relevant examples below, taken from Lasnik (2013):

(i) a. ?Someone talked about something, but I can't remember who about what.
b. ?*Someone saw something, but I can't remember who what.

However, as the same reviewer himself/herself notes, the pattern seems opposite in that while in general English only allows the second *wh*-phrase to be PP. as shown in the contrast between (ia) and (ib), Korean is not subject to this sort of restrictions. This suggests that different analyses are needed. Lasnik proposes that while the first wh-phrase moves to CP, the second *wh*-phrase undergoes PP-extraposition and thus the multiple sluicing exhibits the Right Roof Constraint (Ross 1969), as in (ii). However, Korean is not subject to such a constraint, as in (iii). This further confirms that Korean FAs need to be treated differently.

(ii) a. Fred denied that a certain boy talked to a certain girl.
b. ???I wish I could remember which boy to what girl.
(iii) A: Minswu-nun nwu-ka nwukwu-ekey yeki-hayssta-nun-ket-ul pwuin-hayss-ni?
M.-Top who-Nom who-to talk-did-Top-KET-Acc denial-did-Q
'lit. Fred denied (that) who talked to whom?'
B: Chelswu-ka Yenguy-ekey
C.-Nom Y.-to
'Minswu denied that Chelswu talked to Yenguy.'

below.

5.1 First attempt: *pro*/cleft + ellipsis analysis

As a first attempt to explain the Multiple FA Generalization in (22), I propose that FAs involve either ellipsis or *pro*. In line with Sohn (2000) and Park (2005b) (see also Fukaya and Hoji 1999), I assume that *pro* can refer to various entities in the antecedent (such as questions, proposition, predicates, and nominal elements), which can roughly be represented as *kuken* 'it' in the current context.[8] It seems that this *pro*/*kuken* also refers to the presuppositional part in a cleft.

Let us consider the relevant examples discussed above to see how the proposal works:

(23) A: nwu-ka Yenghuy-lul manass-ni?
who-Nom Y.-Acc met-Q
'Who met Yenghuy?'
B: kuken(/*pro*/Yenghuy-lul manan-ken) [Chelswu]
it Y.-Acc met-ken [Chelswu]
'It is Chelswu (that met Yenghuy)'
B': *kuken(/*pro*/Yenghuy-lul manan-ken) [Chelswu-ka]
it Y.-Acc met-ken [Chelswu-Nom]
⇦ derived by ellipsis from [Chelswu-ka Yenghuy-lul manass-e][9]
[C-Nom Y.-Acc met-Dec]
'Chelswu met Yenghuy'

The case-less fragment in (23B) is acceptable with *kuken/pro*, while the same fragment with nominative marker in (23B) is not, which is a well-known contrast for a cleft in Korean. But this fragment is 'rescued' by the other available option, i.e., ellipsis, as shown in (23B'). (Thus, without *kuken*, the fragment is perfect.)

The multiple FAs in (24) are also accounted for in the same way: since neither

---

[8] *kuken* is a contracted form of *kukes-un* 'it-Top'.

[9] I assume with Park (2005a,b) that ellipsis takes place following the remnant movement to a left peripheral position, as shown below:

(i) Chelswu-ka$_i$ [$_{TP}$ t$_i$ ~~Yenghuy-lul manass-e~~]

pro nor ellipsis derives (24B) or (24B"), these examples become unacceptable. Although *pro* does not derive (24B') or (24B'") either, these example can be derived by ellipsis and become acceptable.

(24) A: nwu-ka nwukwu-lul manass-ni?
who-Nom who-Acc met-Q
'Who met whom?'
B: *kuken [Chelswu Yenghuy]
it [C. Y.]
'lit. it is Chelswu Yenghuy'
B' ?/??kuken [Chelswu-ka Yenghuy] ⇦ derived by ellipsis from
it C.-Nom Y. [C.-ka Y. manass-e]
C.-Nom Y. met-Dec
'Chelswu met Yenghuy'
B": *kuken [Chelswu Yenghuy-lul]
B'": *kuken [Chelswu-ka Yenghuy-lul] ⇦ derived by ellipsis

As mentioned above, crucially, these examples cannot be straightforwardly accounted for by the DIA.

The same analysis seems to apply to (25) and (26):

(25) A: nwukwu-ekey nwu-ka sathang-ul cuwess-ni?
who-Dat who-Nom candy-Acc gave-Q
'Who gave whom a candy?'
B: ??kuken [Yenghuy-ekey Chelswu] (vs. ?[Y.-ekey C.])
B': *kuken [Yenghuy Chelswu-ka]
B" *kuken [Yenghuy Chelswu]
B'": ??/?*kuken [Yenghuy-ekey Chelswu-ka] ⇦ derived by ellipsis

(26) A: nwu-ka nwukwu-lul wuyhay noray pwuless-ni?
who-Nom who-Acc for song sang-Q
'Who sang a song for whom?'
B: ??/?*kuken [Chelswu-ka Yenghuy] (vs. (?)[C.-ka Y.])
it C.-Nom Y.

B': *kuken [Chelswu Yenghuy-lul wuyhay]
it C. Y.-Acc for
B'': *kuken [Chelswu Yenghuy]
it C. Y.
B''': ??/?*kuken [Chelswu-ka Yenghuy-lul wuyhay] ⇦derived by ellipsis
it C.-Nom Y.-Acc for

Note, however, that there seems to be some discrepancy in judgements. For example, as an answer to (26A), putting *kuken* before *[Chelswu-ka Yenghuy]* seems to lead to a more degraded status for many speakers, which is indicated as ??/?* in (26B). (Without *kuken*, the FA is almost acceptable, marked with ?). I acknowledge that there is speaker variation for multiple FAs in general, but if this sort of discrepancy turns out to be systematic and real, this could be a potential problem for the proposed analysis.[10]

5.2 Second attempt: Deterministic *pro*/cleft + ellipsis analysis

As an alternative to the first analysis, I propose another analysis. This analysis is the same as the first one in that both *pro*/cleft and ellipsis are available for FAs. But it differs from the first one in one crucial respect: ellipsis deterministically applies only if the first NP bears a marker, in accordance with the Multiple FA Generalization in (24). The proposed analysis is shown in (27):

(27) Deterministic *pro*/cleft + ellipsis analysis

NP_{first}-marker	⇦	ellipsis only
NP_{first}-ø	⇦	*pro*/cleft only

This analysis applies to (24)-(26) in the same way as the first one does. However, it opens up the possibility that the potentially problematic case in (26B) are derived without a problem. To see this more clearly, let us consider (28) again, which is repeated here as (27), for convenience:

---

[10] Collecting wide range of data judgments and more detailed analysis of them are beyond the scope of this paper, I leave this issue for another occasion.

(28) A: nwu-ka nwukwu-lul wuyhay noray pwuless-ni?
who-Nom who-Acc for song sang-Q
'Who sang a song for whom?'
B: Chelswu-ka Yenghuy-lul wuyhay ⇦ ellipsis
B': (?)Chelswu-ka Yenghuy ⇦ ellipsis
B": *Chelswu Yenghuy-lul wuyhay ⇦ *pro*/cleft
(*kuken [Chelswu Yenghuy-lul wuyhay])
it C. Y.-Acc for
B'": *Chelswu Yenghuy ⇦ *pro*/cleft
(*kuken [Chelswu Yenghuy])
it C. Y.

According to the proposed analysis in (27), only (28B) and (28B') are derived by ellipsis. It is straightforward how (28B) is derived by ellipsis. For (28B'), for instance, I propose the following derivation:

(29) Chelswu-ka$_i$ Yenghuy$_i$ [~~t_i t_j-lul wuyhay noray pwuless-e~~][11]
C.-Nom Y. Acc for song sang
'Chelswu sang a song for Younghuy' [Derivation of (28B')]

In (29), movement of *Younghuy* strands the complex postposition maker *-lul wuyhay* in its base position. Following Kim (2010), I assume that the stranded marker can be repaired by ellipsis (cf. Merchant 2001), This will lead to the acceptability of (28B'), as desired.[12] For (28") and (28'") is only *pro*/cleft option available and as discussed above, this option does not derive them properly.

An obvious prediction is that when the first and second NP in (28B') and (28B") are switched as in (30B') and (30B"), respectively, the acceptability is also reversed. This prediction is borne out:

(30) A: nwukwu-lul wuyhay nwu-ka noray pwuless-ni?

---

[11] For some speakers *[Chelswu-ka Yenghuy-lul]* is acceptable. For them, it would involve the following derivation: Chelswu-ka$_i$ *Yenghuy-lul$_j$* [~~*t_i t_j*-wuyhay noray pwuless-e~~].

[12] It might be the case that this repair strategy leads to a slightly marginal status, marked with (?), for some speakers. Similar degradedness has often been reported for the island violation repair cases in sluicing environments in English.

who-Acc for who-Nom song sang-Q
'Who sang a song for whom?'
B: Yenghuy-lul wuyhay Chelswu-ka ⇦ ellipsis
B': *Yenghuy Chelswu-ka ⇦ *pro*/cleft
(*kuken [Yenghuy Chelswu-ka])
B'': (?)Yenghuy-lul wuyhay Chelswu ⇦ ellipsis
B''': *Yenghuy Chelswu ⇦ *pro*/cleft
(*kuken [Yenghuy Chelswu])

(30B') can only involve *pro*/cleft, which lead to the unacceptability. On the other hand, (30B'') can only involve ellipsis, which is represented as (31). (31) involves repair of the stranded the nominative case marker and becomes acceptable:

(31) Yenghuy-lul wuyhay$_i$ Chelswu$_j$ [~~-ka$_j$ t$_i$ noray pwuless-e~~]
Y-Acc for C. Nom song sang-Dec
'Chelswu sang a song for Yenghuy'

Note also that the proposed analysis correctly predicts that multiple case-less FAs in (30B''') are not allowed since it can only be derived from *pro*/cleft.

Under the proposed analysis, the singleton FA in (32B) and (32B') are derived differently, as well. Given that being the sole fragment, the singleton FA can count as the first NP in (27), if it bears a case-marker it is derived by ellipsis. If it is case-less it is derived from *pro*/cleft.

(32) A: nwu-ka Yenghuy-lul manass-ni? [from (1) and (2)]
who-Nom Y.-Acc met-Q
'Who met Yenghuy?'
B: Chelswu-ka ⇦ ellipsis only
B': Chelswu ⇦ *pro*/cleft only (kuken Chelswu)

With this in mind, let us consider (33). (33) shows that FAs, case-marked or not, are not island sensitive (Park 2005a, Choi and Yoon 2009):

(33) A: Chelswu-nun Swunhuy-ekey [$_{island}$ etten yori-lul calhanun

C.-Tom S.-Dat which food-Acc do-well
saram-ul] sokaysikie cwuess-ni?
person-Acc introduce give-Q
'lit. *What kind of food did Chelswu introduce Swunhuy a person who cooks well?'

B: cwungkuk yori (kuken cwungkuk yori)
China food it China food
'It's Chinese food'

B': (?)cwungkuk yori-lul
China food-Acc

Supporting their Dependent Marking Parameter Analysis (section 2.3), Choi and Yoon take this fact to indicate that FAs are not derived by ellipsis. Likewise, the DIA would take the same stance. However, these analyses face a serious problem when multiple FAs are involved in an island context as in (34). (34) involves two fragments: one from the matrix clause and the other from inside the island. Given that without an island these fragments are acceptable as in (35), the unacceptability of (34B) and (34B') must be due to an island effect. Under the standard assumption that island effects result from a movement operation, this island sensitivity of (34) cannot easily be accounted by the DIA or Dependent Marking Parameter Analysis since these analyses do not assume movement.

(34) A: Chelswu-nun nwukwu-ekey [$_{island}$ etten yori-lul calhanun
C.-Tom who.-Dat which food do-well
saram-ul] sokaysikie cwuess-ni?
person-Acc introduce give-Q

B: *Yenghuy-ekey cwungkuk yori
Y.-Dat China food
[intended meaning] 'Chelswu introduced Yenghuy a person who cooks Chinese food well'

B': *Yenghuy-ekey cwungkuk yori-lul
Y.-Dat China food-Acc

(35) A: Swunhuy-nun nwukwu-ekey [nwu-ka olkela-ko]
S.-Top who-Dat who-Nom will.come-Comp

malhass-ni?
said-Q
B: Yenghuy-ekey Chelswu
B': Yenghuy-ekey Chelswu-ka
Y.-Dat C.-Nom

Under the proposed analysis, (33B) is derived from *pro*/cleft while (33B') is derived by ellipsis. As shown above, the *pro*/cleft option renders the former acceptable. For the latter, I assume with Park (2005a,b) that the island violation, induced by movement of *cwungkuk yori-lul*, can be repaired by ellipsis (Merchant 2001). Unlike (33B) and (33B'), the FAs in (34B) and (34B') are derived in the same way via ellipsis. Then, whatever accounts for (34B') also accounts for (34B), exhibiting the same pattern in acceptability. (See Park (2005a) for an analysis of (34B') under the assumption that these fragments undergo movement to a left peripheral position, followed by ellipsis.[13]) To sum up, the island sensitivity in (34) constitutes a convincing argument for the proposed analysis and against the DIA or the Dependent Marking Parameter Analysis

Although the proposed analysis may have a better explanatory power (than the first attempt, and cleary than the DIA or the Dependent Marking Parameter Analysis), it raises the important question of why it is the case the first NP determines/signals which option must be taken. Under the standard assumption that movement feeds ellipsis (at PF), not vice versa (Merchant 2001), this is not a trivial question. I hope that further investigation of the interactions of movement and ellipsis will lead to a better understanding the generalization in (27).

6. Conclusion

In this paper, I have argued that FAs in Korean cannot be accommodated by the DIA or the Dependent Marking Parameter Analysis. This in turn constitutes a strong argument against the claim that fragments are generated as such without further structure and can be interpreted properly via pragmatic processes (see Barton and

[13] In Park (2005a), I argue that the multiple fragments in an island environment in (33) necessarily induce a Parallelism violation (Fox and Lasnik 2003), resulting in the ungrammaticality.

Progovac 2005 for more recent discussion in favor of this claim.)

In attempting to deducing the multiple FA generalization, I suggest two potential directions that allow both ellipsis and *pro*/cleft option for fragments. Although the proposed analyses are not without potential problems, I hold that these analyses have more explanatory power and thus they are on the right track. If the proposed analyses are on the right track, FAs in Korean can be taken as evidence in favor of the claim that fragments involves structure.

Then, a more important question arises: How far can we go with ellipsis? Put differently: Can we generalize this claim to other types of fragments? I leave this important issue for future research.

References

Ahn, Hee-Don and Sungen Cho. 2011. Notes on two types of fragments. *Linguistic Research* 28: 9-35.

Ahn, Hee-Don and Sungen Cho. 2012. On caseless fragments n Korean. *Studies in Modern Grammar* 70: 25-47.

Barton, Ellen. 1990. *Nonsentential constituents*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam.

Barton, Ellen and Ljljana Progovac. 2005. Nonsententials in Minimalism. In Elugardo, R. and R. J. Stainton (eds.), *Ellipsis and Nonsentential Speech,* 71-93.

Choi, Youngju and James Yoon. 2009. Fragments with and without Articulated Constituents at LF. In Anisa Schardi, Martin Walkow and Muhammad Abdurrahman (eds.), *NELS* 38: 177-188.

Fortin, Catheine. 2007. Some (not) all nonsententials are only a phase. *Lingua* 117: 67-94.

Fox, Danny and Howard Lasnik. 2003. Successive cyclic movement and island repair: The difference between sluicing and VP-ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34: 143-154.

Fukaya, Teruhiko and Hajime Hoji. 1999. Stripping and sluicing in Japanese and some implications. *WCCFL* 18: 145-158.

Hankamer, Jorge. 1979. *Deletion coordinate structures.* Garland: New York. [Ph.D. thesis, Yale University 1971].

Kim, Sun-Woong. 2010. On the Reparability of Preposition Stranding. *Language Research* 27(1): 137-164.

Lasnik, Howard. 2013. Multiple Sluicing in English? *Syntax* [Online version: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/synt.12009/abstract].

Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and identity in ellipsis.* Oxford University Press.

Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistic and Philosophy* 27(6): 661-738.

Merchant, Jason. 2010. Three kinds of ellipsis. 2010. In Francois Recanati, Isidora Stojanovic, and Neftali Villanueva (eds.), *Context-Dependence, Perspective, and Relativity,* 141-192. Walter de Gruyter: Berlin.

Morgan, Jerry. 1973. Sentence fragments and the notion 'sentence.' In Braj Jashru, Robert Lees, Yakov Malkiel, Angelian Pietrangeli, and Sol Saporta (eds.), *Issues in Linguistics*, 719-751. University of Illinois Press: Urbana.

Morgan, Jerry. 1989. Sentence fragments revisited. In Bradley Music, Randolph Graczyk, and Caroline Wiltshire (eds.), *CLS* 25. Parasession on language in context, 228-241. Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago, Ill.

Park, Bum-Sik. 2005a. *Locality and Identity in Ellipsis*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Connecticut.

Park, Bum-Sik. 2005b. Island-insensitive Fragment Answers in Korean. In *Proceedings of the 24th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics 24 (WCCFL 24)*, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, Canada.

Park, Bum-Sik. 2008. Fragments and ellipsis in Korean. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 18: 13-28.

Ross, John Robert. 1969. Guess who? In *Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society,* ed. Robert I. Binnick, Alice Davison, Georgia M. Green and Jerry L. Morgan.

Sohn, Keun-Won. 2000. A non-sluicing, non-clefting approach to copula construction. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 10: 267-295.

Stainton, Robert. 1993. *Non-Sentential Assertions*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Stainton, Robert. 1994. Using Non-Sentences: An Application of Relevance Theory. *Pragmatics and Cognition* 2: 269-284.

Stainton, Robert. 1995. Non-Sentential Assertions and Semantic Ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 18: 281-296.

Stainton, Robert. 1997. Utterance meaning and syntactic ellipsis. *Pragmatics and Cognition* 5: 51-78.

Stainton, Robert. 2006. *Words and thoughts: Subsentences, ellipsis and the philosophy of language.* Oxford University Press.

Stanley, Jason. 2000. Context and Logical Form. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 23: 391-434.

Yanofsky, Nancy. 1978. NP utterances. In Donka Farkas, Wesley Jacobson, and Karol Todrys (eds.), *CLS* 14: 491-502. Chicago Linguistic Society: Chicago, Ill.

Bum-Sik Park
Department of English
Dongguk University-Seoul
3-26 Pildong, Chung-ku,
Seoul 100-715, Korea
E-mail: bumsikpark@dongguk.edu

Received: 2013. 11. 12
Revised: 2013. 12. 09
Accepted: 2013. 12. 09