An experimental investigation of why-stripping in Korean*

Jeong-Seok Kim*** · Hye Jin Leea · Su-Hyuk Yoona · Jin Hyung Lee****
· Jee Young Leea · Soohyun Kwonb
(Korea Universitya · Seoul National Universityb)

Kim, Jeong-Seok, Hye Jin Lee, Su-Hyuk Yoon, Jin Hyung Lee, Jee Young Lee, and Soohyun Kwon. 2021. An experimental investigation of why-stripping in Korean. Linguistic Research 38(2): 271-299. The present study uses an acceptability judgment experiment designed to investigate whether the acceptability of Korean why-stripping is affected by (i) the polarity difference of the antecedent clause, (ii) the marker ami ‘not’ immediately preceding why, or (iii) the type (i.e., short-form or long-form) of negation in the antecedent clause. We propose that way ‘why’ in Korean why-stripping originates in CP and the non-wh remnant is a focus phrase associated with way ‘why’, following Yoshida et al.’s (2015) clausal ellipsis analysis of English why-stripping. Based on the experimental findings, we show that Korean why-stripping favors affirmative antecedent contexts over negative antecedent contexts, as expected from the processing perspective (Fischler et al. 1983; Herbert and Kübler 2011). We also show that the pre-why (i.e., clause-initial) ami ‘not’ in Korean why-stripping is not a negative marker but a discourse marker of conveying elements of surprise or disbelief (cf. Koo 2008). We further show that the type (i.e., short-form or long-form) of negation in the antecedent clause does not matter in why-stripping. In sum, we defend a grammar-plus-processing analysis of Korean why-stripping. (Korea University · Seoul National University)

Keywords acceptability judgment, discourse marker, extra deletion, focus, processing, why-stripping

1. Introduction

English has why-stripping (Weir 2014; Yoshida et al. 2015), which is a clausal ellipsis with a wh-phrase why followed by a non-wh remnant, as shown below:

(1) (I heard) Mary bought apples, but why apples?
    (= but why did she buy apples?)

* We would like to thank two anonymous reviewers whose valuable comments and suggestions have helped us to improve the paper. The usual disclaimer applies.
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Following the ellipsis tradition (Merchant 2001, among others), the overt non-wh phrase in the elided clause is called the “remnant”. In clausal ellipsis, the remnant typically corresponds to a particular phrase in the antecedent, called the “correlate”. We will refer to the clause containing the correlate as the “antecedent clause” and the clause undergoing ellipsis as the “ellipsis clause”.

Korean also has a similar construction, as illustrated in (2):

(2) Mary-ka sakwa-lul sassta-nuntey, way sakwa-lul?
Mary-Nom apple-Acc bought-but why apple-Acc
‘(I heard) Mary bought apples, but why apples?’

In Korean why-stripping, a wh-phrase way ‘why’ is followed by a non-wh remnant. The remnant in why-stripping such as apples in (1) or sakwa-lul in (2) corresponds to its correlate in the antecedent clause such as apples or sakwa-lul, respectively. Note that in why-stripping, the non-wh remnant is typically identical to its correlate in the preceding clause.

Why-stripping has not been sufficiently studied in Korean linguistics (Cho and Lee 2017; J.-B. Kim 2017; J.-S. Kim 2019; Bae and Park 2021). In this experimental study, we are interested in a certain aspect of Korean why-stripping, as illustrated below:

(3) a. Mary-ka sakwa-lul sassta-nuntey, ani way sakwa-lul?
Mary-Nom apple-Acc bought-but ANI why apple-Acc
‘(I heard) Mary bought apples, but why apples (she bought)?’

b. Mary-ka sakwa-lul an sassta-nuntey, (ani) way sakwa-lul?
Mary-Nom apple-Acc not bought-but (ANI) why apple-Acc

---

1 The following is the list of abbreviations used in morpheme glosses throughout the paper: Acc = accusative, Conn = connective, Cop = copula, Dat = dative, Dec = declarative, Dsr = discourse, Gen = genitive, Hon = honorific, Imp = imperative, Neg = negation, Nom = nominative, NS = nominalizer suffix, Q = question, Top = topic, and Voc = vocative.

2 Compare (3b) with the following:

(i) Mary-ka sakwa-lul an sassta-nuntey, (*ani) way sakwa-lul?
Mary-Nom apple-Acc not bought-but (*ANI) why apple-Acc
‘(I heard) Mary didn’t buy apples, but why apples (she didn’t buy)?’

The marker an, which is the contracted form of ani, is not tolerated in why-stripping in Korean. This is probably because the X0-clitic an cannot be adjoined to the XP adverb way ‘why’ (cf. Merchant 2006).
‘(I heard) Mary didn’t buy apples, but why apples (she didn’t buy)?’

The ellipsis site in (3a) has only a positive meaning, and does not have a negative meaning such as ‘... why didn’t she buy apples?’ in spite of the marker ani. Of interest to us is that the ellipsis site in (3b) has the negative meaning of the antecedent clause, irrespective of the marker ani ‘not’. Notice that in why-stripping like (3), the non-wh remnant is identical to its correlate. If the two examples in (3) are instances of why-stripping, this is puzzling because the marker ani functions as a typical negative marker in Korean (Sohn 1999), as in (4).

(4) Mary-ka sakwa-ul {an/ani sa-assta, sa-ci anh-assta}.
     Mary-Nom apple-Acc not    buy-Past buy-NS not-Past
     ‘Mary didn’t/did not buy apples.’

This fact raises a question about the status of ani ‘not’ as a negative marker in Korean, which boils down to the identity of ani way-stripping ‘not why-stripping’ in Korean.

To our knowledge, the validity of the judgments about “Korean why-stripping involving the clause-initial marker ani”, as sampled in (3), has not been seriously noted so far. In this light, we investigate whether (i) the polarity difference of an antecedent clause affects acceptability and (ii) the presence of the clause-initial marker ani affects acceptability in Korean why-stripping. We will argue that Korean why-stripping is explained by the analysis where way ‘why’ is base-generated in the left periphery (Ko 2005) and clausal ellipsis is operated after a non-wh remnant movement, along with extra deletion (An 2016).

The rest of this paper proceeds as follows. In section 2, we review Yoshida et al.’s (2015) work of English why-stripping as a theoretical background, and then briefly discuss certain theoretical issues of Korean why-stripping. In section 3, we report a formal experiment of Korean why-stripping and discuss the experimental results. In section 4, we propose a syntactic analysis of Korean why-stripping. Section 5 concludes.

2. Theoretical background

2.1 English why-stripping
The observation that *why* is somewhat different from other wh-phrases is not uncommon. Among others, Bromberger (1992) observes that only *why* as a question operator can trigger the “association with focus” effect. For instance, the answer to a *why*-question relies on focus, as illustrated in (5).

(5) a. A: Why did MARY buy Galaxy Tab S7?
   B: Because she was the only one who could afford it.
   b. A: Why did Mary buy GALAXY TAB S7?
   B: Because it was with all the power and good looks.

When the subject *Mary* is focused and thus is associated with *why*, the question is asking why Mary but not somebody else bought Galaxy Tab S7, while when the object *Galaxy Tab S7* is focused, the sentence is asking for the reason why Mary bought Galaxy Tab S7 instead of, for example, iPad air. Regarding this, it has been proposed that *why* is base-generated into Spec of CP without overt wh-movement (Rizzi 2001; Ko 2005). Therefore, the prejacent (i.e., TP) of *why* can generate focus exhaustivity. No such effect is observed with other wh-phrases such as *where*:

(6) a. A: Where did MARY buy Galaxy Tab S7?
   B: At Best Buy.
   b. A: Where did Mary buy GALAXY TAB S7?
   B: At Best Buy.

Yoshida et al. (2015) regard this as a piece of evidence that the focus-sensitive *why* in *why*-stripping is base-generated in CP. They propose that the *why*-stripping sentence in (7a) is derived as in (7b).

(7) a. John ate natto, but why natto?
   b. \([\text{CP why}\ [\text{FOC natto}_1\ \text{FOC (lt;John\ ate\ t)]}]\)

In (7b) *why* in *why*-stripping originates in Spec of CP, and the non-wh remnant *natto* moves to Spec of Foc(us)P, which is placed between CP and TP. If the rest of the clause (i.e., TP) is deleted, the *why*-stripping example is derived. Under this proposal, one problem to be solved is why the non-elided sentence is ungrammatical, as shown below:
(8) *Why NATTO did John eat?

To settle this conflict, Yoshida et al. (2015) argue that focused materials always move, leaving behind their copies under the copy theory of movement (Chomsky 1995). Focus movement in English is usually covert so that the lower copy is pronounced, but if the TP containing the lower copy is deleted as in (7b), then the higher copy should be pronounced due to a principle of recoverability (Pesetsky 1997). It amounts to saying that the higher copy of the focused material is to be pronounced when followed by ellipsis such as why-stripping.

Moving onto why not-stripping, let us consider Weir’s (2014) observation on why-stripping preceded by a negative antecedent clause as follows:

(9) A: Mary didn’t fix her printer. She didn’t fix her computer either.
    B1: Why not her computer? (= Why didn’t she fix her computer?)
    B2: ?*Why her computer? (= Why didn’t she fix her computer?)
    (Weir 2014: (13))

As shown by the contrast of (9B1) and (9B2), the negation in the antecedent in (9) seems to resist being construed within the why-stripped site. This contrasts with sluicing (Merchant 2001):

(10) Mary didn’t fix her printer because she didn’t have the parts. She didn’t fix her computer, either, but I don’t know why.
    (= I don’t know why Mary didn’t fix her computer.)
    cf. ..., but I don’t know why not.3
    (= I don’t know why Mary didn’t fix her computer.)

With respect to this peculiarity, Weir (2014) agrees with Yoshida et al.’s (2015) analysis of why-stripping as focus movement-plus-ellipsis, but argues that the focus head directly selects VoiceP (Collins 2005) instead of TP as follows:

3 Pollack (1976) observes that when the antecedent clause in sluicing contains a negative marker, the corresponding negative marker in the sluiced clause may be overtly realized. We thank an anonymous reviewer for bringing this point to our attention.
Weir argues that the difference between (9B1) and (9B2) can be explained if why-stripping targets VoiceP. If (non-constituent) sentential negation originates in a position higher than VoiceP (Zanuttini 1996), then it cannot be included within the why-stripping site. The why-stripped residue in (9B2) thus cannot be interpreted as ‘why didn’t she fix her computer?’ Weir assumes that the negation in (9B1) is not sentential negation but constituent negation. This is an unavoidable assumption under his VoiceP deletion analysis because sentential negation is usually conditioned by Tense (Zanuttini 1996).

On the other hand, Merchant (2006) presents a different analysis of why not-stripping. He points out that in English, adverbial or phrasal negation markers may be used in negative why-questions:

(12) A: Anna is not leaving.
B: Why not? (= Why isn’t Anna leaving?) (Merchant 2006: fn. 1, (ii))
   cf. Why? (= Why isn’t Anna leaving?)

Even if English has head negation like no, that head cannot be used in negative why-questions. On the other hand, a language like Greek uses the word no instead of not in negative why-questions:

(13) a. Why not? *Why no? (English)
    b. *Giati dhen? Giati oxi? (Greek)

Merchant argues that this follows if we assume that why not is formed with the adjunction of the negative marker to why. Since a head could not adjoin to a phrasal adverb such as why, English negation heads cannot be used in negative why-questions. Merchant’s insight could be applied to negative why-stripping as in (14).

(14) {CP [XP why][YP not] [FocP her computer][...-t-...]}
2.2 Korean why-stripping

English allows why-stripping in embedded clauses, as shown below:

(15) Mary bought apples, but I don’t know why apples. 
(= I don’t know why she bought apples.)

The following illustrates Japanese embedded why-stripping (Nakao et al. 2013) with a wh-phrase naze ‘why’ followed by a non-wh remnant ringo-o ‘apple-Acc’:

(16) Mary-ga ringo-o katta ga, 
     Mary-Nom apple-Acc bought but 
     boku-wa naze ringo-o ka wakara-nai. 
     I-Top why apple-Acc Q know-not 
     ‘Mary bought apples, but I don’t know why apples.’

On the other hand, the Korean counterpart of (16) is ungrammatical presumably due to the accusative marker immediately before the embedded question morpheme ci as follows:4

An anonymous reviewer points out that since the grammatical marker of a single remnant has a tendency to decrease the acceptability of embedded sluicing and stripping, the status of the accusative marker of the remnant sakwa may not be crucial for the acceptability of (i).

The reviewer further points out that unlike embedded why-stripping, matrix why-stripping (or fragments) cannot be uttered to a socially superior person in general (cf. Ahn and An 2011). See J. Kim (2017) for other limitations of (why-)stripping in matrix contexts. In addition, we acknowledge that the example in (18) sounds more natural in dialogue contexts as follows:

(ii) A: Mary-ka sakwa-lul sasse. B: Way sakwa-lul? 
    Mary-Nom apple-Acc bought why apple-Acc 
    ‘Mary bought apples.’ ‘Why apples?’

Further, in addition to our baseline as in (18), the following seems to be acceptable, as well:

---

4 However, the following example with the copula i ‘be’ prior to the Q-morpheme ci seems to be acceptable, although it is slightly degraded:

(i) ?Mary-ka sakwa-lul sass-nuntey, na-nun way sakwa-lul i-nci molunta. 
    Mary-Nom apple-Acc bought-but I-Top why apple-Acc be-Q know-not 
    ‘Mary bought apples, but I don’t know why apples (is).’
In this light, we will shift our interest from Korean embedded why-stripping to Korean matrix why-stripping, which permits the overt Case-marker of a why-stripped remnant, as in (2), repeated below as (18).5

(18) (iii) Mary-ka sakwa-lul sassta-nuntey, sakwa-lul way?
    Mary-Nom apple-Acc bought-but apple-Acc why
    a. ‘(I heard) Mary bought apples, but (when it comes to) apples, why (did she buy)?’
    b. ‘(I heard) Mary bought apples, but why (did she buy) apples (instead of, e.g., oranges)?’

It seems that the example in (iii) is ambiguous in that the non-wh remnant sakwa-lul may be interpreted as topic (as in (iiia)) as well as focus (as in (iiib)). We thank the anonymous reviewer for bringing these cases to our attention. In this study, however, we will focus on the derivation of (18).

Ross (1969) was the first to note that in clausal ellipsis, specifically sluicing, a remnant and its correlate must match in Case. This is known as the Case-matching generalization, which is detectible in languages like German that overtly Case-mark nominals. We observe that Korean why-stripping usually disallows Case mismatches as follows:

(i) John-i samchon-eykey hyepecohayssta-nuntey,
    John-Nom uncle-Dat assistedbut
    way samchon-eykey/*samchon-ul?
    why uncle-Dat/*uncle-Acc
    ‘(I heard) John assisted his uncle, but why his uncle?’

(ii) John-i samchon-ul towassta-nuntey,
    John-Nom uncle-Acc helpedbut
    way samchon-ul/*samchon-eykey?
    why uncle-Acc/*uncle-Dat
    ‘(I heard) John helped his uncle, but why his uncle?’

Case-matching effects are widely attested across languages with overt Case-marking. In Korean, some verbs like ucihata ‘to rely on’ are compatible with dual Case forms, in which instance the Case of the remnant and that of its correlate may differ in why-stripping, as shown below:

(iii) John-i samchon-eykey uychihayssta-nuntey,
    John-Nom uncle-Dat relied.onbut
    way samchon-eykey/samchon-ul?
    why uncle-Dat/uncle-Acc
    ‘(I heard) John relied (his) uncle, but why (his) uncle?’
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(18) Mary-ka sakwa-lul sassta-nuntey, way sakwa-lul?
   Mary-Nom apple-Acc bought-but why apple-Acc
   ‘(I heard) Mary bought apples, but why apples?’

In addition, English has why not-stripping (Weir 2014; Yoshida et al. 2015) as follows:

(19) (I heard) Mary bought apples, but why not oranges?
   (= but why didn’t she buy oranges?)
   cf. * (I heard) Mary bought apples, but why not apples?
   (= but why didn’t she buy apples?)

Notice that in why not-stripping, the stripped non-wh remnant must be different from the correlate in the antecedent clause. Meanwhile, the Korean counterpart of English why not-stripping in (19) is not grammatical:

(20) *Mary-ka sakwa-lul sassta-nuntey, way orange-lul ani-ci?
    Mary-Nom apple-Acc bought-but why orange-Acc not-Q
    ‘(I heard) Mary bought apples, but why not oranges?’

What is interesting is that if the accusative marker of the non-wh remnant orange-lul is replaced with the topic marker (n)un, why not-stripping seems to be tolerated in Korean, too, as in (21).

(21) Mary-ka sakwa-lul sassta-nuntey, way orange-nun ani-ci?
    Mary-Nom apple-Acc bought-but why orange-Top not-Q
    ‘(I heard) Mary bought apples, but why not oranges?’

This fact undermines the spirit of the non-structuralist approach according to which Case matching is directly encoded (Sag and Nykiel 2011; Jacobson 2016). Notice that under the non-structuralist approach, the identity condition for the syntax is on the overt material (i.e., a remnant and its correlate). In contrast, under the structuralist approach, the identity condition holds between what is missing and its antecedent—not on what is overt (Ross 1969; Merchant 2001). We thus may argue that the nature of when Case mismatches are allowed and when they are not allowed endorses the structuralist approach to ellipsis. See Wood et al. (2020) and J.-S. Kim (2021) for details.
Although J.-B. Kim (2017) does not explore the consequence of the Case-mismatch effect between a non-wh remnant and its correlate in Korean why not-stripping, he offers the following example:

(22) Mimi-ka kimchi-lul mek-ko iss-nuntey, way phica-ka ani-nci
Mimi-Nom kimchi-Acc eat-Conn exist-but why pizza-Nom not-Q
molu-keysse.
not-know
‘Mimi is eating kimchi, but I wonder why not pizza.’

(J.-B. Kim 2017: (13))

In (22) the correlate *kimchi-lul* and the remnant *phica-ka* have different Case, being in a contrastive relation. We further observe that if the nominative marker of the remnant in (22) is replaced with the accusative marker, the why-stripped sentence is ungrammatical, as demonstrated in (23).

(23) *Mimi-ka kimchi-lul mek-ko iss-nuntey, way phica-lul ani-nci
Mimi-Nom kimchi-Acc eat-and exist-but why pizza-Acc not-Q
molu-keysse.
not-know
‘Mimi is eating kimchi, but I wonder why not pizza.’

Given that Yoshida et al.’s (2015) movement-plus-ellipsis account is mainly motivated by connectivity effects, the Case (in a broad context, postnominal) mismatch requirement between remnants and correlates in Korean why not-stripping is very intriguing.  

---

6 An anonymous reviewer has suggested that the missing Case connectivity effect in Korean why not-stripping is due to the special property of *ani*, which may function as a negative copula, as illustrated below:

(i) John-i haksayng-i/un/*ul ani-ta.
John-Nom student-Nom/Top/*Acc Neg.Cop-Dec
‘John is not a student.’

As correctly pointed out by the reviewer, the nominal preceding *ani* may have either *i*/*ka* (as a focus marker) or *(n)un* (as a topic marker). If so, (22) could be derived from (ii).

(ii) … way ku kes-i phica-ka ani-nci molu-keysse.
why it-Nom pizza-Nom not-Q not-know
In addition to the Case connectivity mentioned in footnote 5, Korean why-stripping also exhibits binding connectivity and voice connectivity, as illustrated below:

Mimi-Gen brother-Nom self pictures-Acc sell-Past-Dec
‘Mimi’s brother sold pictures of himself.’
B: Way caki₂,ₙ₁ kulim-ul?
why self pictures-Acc?
‘Why pictures of himself?’ (J.-B. Kim 2017: (32))

(25) a. John-i sinmwun-ul paytalhaysssta-nuntey,
John-Nom newspaper-Acc delivered-but
way John-i/*John-eyuyhayse?
why John-Nom/*John-by
‘(I heard) John delivered the newspaper, but why John?’

b. Sangphwum-i Mary-eyuyhayse wunpantoyewassta-nuntey,
goods-Nom Mary-by be.delivered-but
way Mary-eyuyhayse/*Mary-ka?
why Mary-by/*Mary-Nom?
‘(I heard) the goods were delivered by Mary, but why by Mary?’
(based on J.-S. Kim 2019: 190, (98)-(100))

As in (24), the subject-oriented anaphor caki refers only to the subject referent oppa but not to the specifier Mimi of the subject in the antecedent clause. Also, Korean why-stripping does not tolerate active-passive mismatches: an active correlate cannot antecede a passive remnant, as in (25a), and vice versa, as in (25b). These binding and voice connectivity effects are easily subsumed under a movement-plus-ellipsis approach.

With this brief history of why-stripping in mind, we will embark on an experimental and theoretical investigation of Korean why-stripping from now on.

‘...I wonder why it was not a pizza.’

This seems like a highly promising approach to handle the broken Case connectivity in Korean why not-stripping. However, it is beyond the scope of this experimental study to explore the postnominal mismatch effect of Korean why not-stripping in detail. We leave an investigation of this issue to future work.
3. Experiment

We hypothesize that (i) the polarity difference of an antecedent clause affects acceptability of Korean why-stripping and (ii) the marker ani ‘not’ prior to why in why-stripping is a discourse marker of expressing emotion rather than a negative marker. Based on this hypothesis, we predict that negative antecedents decrease acceptability ratings of why-stripping since processing negation necessitates more computation, regardless of ellipsis types. We also predict that there will be no acceptability difference between way-stripping ‘why-stripping’ and ani way-stripping ‘not why-stripping’ in Korean, regardless of the polarity of antecedent clauses. In this light, we conducted an acceptability judgment experiment which explored the acceptability difference between why-stripping and apparent not why-stripping, preceded by either affirmative or negative antecedents.

Participants, materials, and design: Fifty-one self-reported native Korean speakers (age mean (SD): 21.38 (1.36)) were recruited. All were undergraduate students at a university in South Korea. They participated in this experiment in exchange for course credit. In general, participants completed the online experiment within 15 minutes. Three participants were excluded because they did not pay attention during the task (by the procedure described below). Accordingly, only the responses from 48 participants (eight participants for each of the six lists) were included in the analysis.

The experiment employed a $2 \times 3$ design, crossing ANTECEDENT (Affirmative (antecedent) vs. S-Neg (antecedent with short-form negation) vs. L-Neg (antecedent with long-form negation)) and ELLIPSIS (Why (stripping) vs. NotWhy (stripping)). Eighteen lexically matched sets of the six conditions were constructed, as sampled below:

(26) a. [Affirmative | Why]

John-i achim-ulo sakwa-lul mekessta-nuntey, way sakwa-lul?
John-Nom breakfast-for apple-Acc ate-but why apple-Acc
(way sakwa-lul John-i mekess-ni?)
why apple-Acc John-Nom ate-Q

‘(I heard) John ate apples for breakfast, but why did he eat apples?’

b. [S-Neg | Why]

John-i achim-ulo sakwa-lul an mekessta-nuntey, way sakwa-lul?
John-Nom breakfast-for apple-Acc not ate-but why apple-Acc
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(way sakwa-lul John-i an-mekess-ni?)
why apple-Acc John-Nom not-ate-Q

‘(I heard) John didn’t eat apples for breakfast, but why didn’t he eat apples?’

c. [L-Neg | Why]
John-i achim-ulo sakwa-lul mek-ci anh-assta-nuntey,
John-Nom breakfast-for apple-Acc eat-NS not-Past-but
way sakwa-lul?
why apple-Acc
(way sakwa-lul John-i mek-ci anh-ass-ni?)
why apple-Acc John-Nom eat-NS not-Past-Q

‘(I heard) John did not eat apples for breakfast, but why didn’t he eat apples?’

d. [Affirmative | NotWhy]
John-i achim-ulo sakwa-lul mekessta-nuntey,
John-Nom breakfast-for apple-Acc ate-but
ani way sakwa-lul?
ANI why apple-Acc
(way sakwa-lul John-i mekess-ni?)
why apple-Acc John-Nom ate-Q

‘(I heard) John ate apples for breakfast, but why did he eat apples?’

e. [S-Neg | NotWhy]
John-i achim-ulo sakwa-lul an mekessta-nuntey,
John-Nom breakfast-for apple-Acc not ate-but
ani way sakwa-lul?
ANI why apple-Acc
(way sakwa-lul John-i an-mekess-ni?)
why apple-Acc John-Nom not-ate-Q

‘(I heard) John didn’t eat apples for breakfast, but why didn’t he eat apples?’

f. [L-Neg | NotWhy]
John-i achim-ulo sakwa-lul mek-ci anh-assta-nuntey,
John-Nom breakfast-for apple-Acc eat-NS not-Past-but
ani way sakwa-lul?
Why-stripping was preceded by an affirmative antecedent clause in the [Affirmative | Why] condition, while it was preceded by a negative antecedent clause with short-form negation in the [S-Neg | Why] condition and by a negative antecedent clause with long-form negation in the [L-Neg | Why] condition. More precisely, the ANTECEDENT factor was implemented as a three-level factor in order to verify whether two types of negation in Korean influence acceptability ratings of why-stripping. On the other hand, the [Affirmative | NotWhy] condition contained ani way-stripping ‘not why-stripping’ preceded by an affirmative clause, while the [S-Neg | NotWhy] and [L-Neg | NotWhy] conditions contained ani way-stripping ‘not why-stripping’ preceded by a negative clause with either short-form or long-form negation, respectively. Each set contained why-stripping or not why-stripping with linguistic contexts (parenthesized interpretations added here for clarity). The full list of test items is available online.7

The experimental items were counterbalanced across six lists using a Latin square design so that the items were equally distributed into each list. The items appeared in one of six pseudorandomized orders such that no consecutive items were of the same type or condition. Accordingly, each participant was provided with three tokens from six conditions (i.e., 18 experimental items). The 72 filler items were of comparable length but with varying acceptability—24 good fillers, 18 mid fillers, and 30 bad fillers—based on the results from our previous tests. We controlled the number of good, mid, and bad fillers in order to help create a list of stimuli that are roughly balanced in terms of acceptability, so that participants will use the full range of the response scale provided.

Procedure: We programmed the experiment with a web-based experiment platform Ibex (Drummond 2016). Sentences were presented one at a time on a computer screen and participants were asked to make acceptability judgments on the basis of a 1-7 Likert scale (1 corresponding to a completely unacceptable sentence and 7 to a fully acceptable one). In addition to test items, there were 16 “gold standard” filler items. These filler

7 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348977235_Appendix_why-stripping
items included eight good and eight bad filler items, which showed either the highest or the lowest acceptability most clearly in the previous tests conducted on about 200 participants prior to the experiment. We obtained the expected value of these fillers (i.e., 1 for the bad ones and 7 for the good ones) from the results of these previous tests. For each gold standard item, we calculated the difference between each participant’s response and its expected value (i.e., 1 or 7). In order to compare the size of the differences that were either positive or negative numbers, we squared each of the differences and summed the squared differences for each participant. This gave us the sum-of-the-squared-differences value of each participant. We excluded any participants whose sum-of-the-squared-differences value was greater than two standard deviations away from the mean, suggesting that they were not paying attention during the task.

Data analysis: First, the raw judgment ratings, including both experimental and filler items, were converted to z-scores in order to eliminate certain kinds of scale biases between participants (Schütze and Sprouse 2013). This procedure corrects the potential that individual participants treat the scale differently (e.g., using only a subset of the available ratings), because it standardizes all participants’ ratings to the same scale. We analyzed the data with linear mixed effects (regression) models estimated with the lme4 package (Bates et al. 2015) in the R software environment (R Core Team 2020). Linear mixed effects models allow the simultaneous inclusion of random participant and random item variables (Baayen et al. 2008). We always used the maximal random effect structure by participant and item (Barr et al. 2013). P-value estimates for the fixed and random effects were calculated by the Satterthwaite’s approximation (Kuznetsova et al. 2017). A likelihood ratio test (using the anova( ) function in R) was used to compare multiple models and determine the final model that provided the best fit to the data.

Results and discussion: Figure 1 presents the mean of the z-scored ratings for the six experimental conditions. The zero represents the mean, so that a positive z-score means that the structure is rated above the mean, while a negative z-score means that the structure is rated below the mean. The ANTECEDENT effect is represented by the downward slope of the lines, and the ELLIPSIS effect is represented by a vertical separation between the lines. For the analysis, a $2 \times 3$ linear mixed effects model was run with ANTECEDENT and ELLIPSIS as fixed factors, participant and item as random intercepts, and the maximum number of random slopes, given that the data were justified (Barr et al. 2013). This revealed a significant main effect for ANTECEDENT ($\chi^2(2) = 44.575, p < .001$; Affirmative (mean: 0.531) vs. S-Neg (mean: 0.012); $\beta = −0.519$, $SE$
= 0.066, \( t = -7.839, p < .001; \) Affirmative (mean: 0.531) vs. L-Neg (mean: 0.063); \( \beta = -0.468, SE = 0.067, t = -6.934, p < .001). \) No significant main effect of ELLIPSIS was found (Why (mean: 0.190) vs. NotWhy (mean: 0.213); \( \chi^2(1) = 0.307, p = .580). \) The interaction between ANTECEDENT and ELLIPSIS was not significant (\( \chi^2(2) = 0.471, p = .79). \)

To obtain pairwise comparisons, a post-hoc test with Bonferroni correction was performed using the `emmeans` function (Lenth et al. 2018). First, consider the following table, which demonstrates the results of the post-hoc pairwise comparisons showing the effect of ANTECEDENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrast</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Affirmative</td>
<td>Why] - [S-Neg</td>
<td>Why]</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Affirmative</td>
<td>Why] - [L-Neg</td>
<td>Why]</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[S-Neg</td>
<td>Why] - [L-Neg</td>
<td>Why]</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Affirmative</td>
<td>NotWhy] - [S-Neg</td>
<td>NotWhy]</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Affirmative</td>
<td>NotWhy] - [L-Neg</td>
<td>NotWhy]</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[S-Neg</td>
<td>NotWhy] - [L-Neg</td>
<td>NotWhy]</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis confirmed that the [Affirmative] condition was more acceptable than either the [S-Neg] or [L-Neg] conditions, without being affected by the [Why] and [NotWhy] conditions.
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conditions. It also confirmed that the [S-Neg] conditions and the [L-Neg] conditions were judged statistically non-distinct, regardless of ELLIPSIS types.8

Table 2 provides the results of the post-hoc pairwise comparisons showing the effect of ELLIPSIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrast</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Affirmative</td>
<td>Why] - [Affirmative</td>
<td>NotWhy]</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[S-Neg</td>
<td>Why] - [S-Neg</td>
<td>NotWhy]</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[L-Neg</td>
<td>Why] - [L-Neg</td>
<td>NotWhy]</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis confirmed that there was no significant difference of the acceptability ratings between [Why] and [NotWhy] conditions, irrespective of whether the antecedent clause was affirmative or negative.

The results of the experiment suggest that processing negation costs more because, cross-linguistically, negation contains a syntactic or pragmatic content (e.g., *no*, *not*, or *never* in English and *안(이)모* ‘no/not’ or *네이* ‘never’ in Korean), which is found to impede processing in general (Fischler et al. 1983; Carpenter et al. 1999; Kaup et al. 2006; T. Kim 2008; Herbert and Kübler 2011). The results also point to no acceptability difference between *why*-stripping and *not why*-stripping when the polarity of the antecedent context was controlled. This suggests that the role of *an이* ‘not’ in both *why*-stripping and *not why*-stripping is insignificant.

4. General discussion and analysis of Korean *why*-stripping

Results from the experiment revealed three findings. First, the acceptability was higher when the antecedent clause was affirmative than when it was negative. It suggests that processing negative contexts is harder than processing affirmative contexts (Fischler et al. 1983; Carpenter et al. 1999; Kaup et al. 2006; T. Kim 2008; Herbert and Kübler 2011). That is, our experimental results bear out the claim that the polarity difference

---

8 We also ran a 2 × 2 linear mixed effects model excluding the [Affirmative] conditions—ANTECEDENT (S-Neg vs. L-Neg) × ELLIPSIS (Why vs. NotWhy). The linear mixed effects model revealed that there was no main effect (ANTECEDENT ($p = .331$) and ELLIPSIS ($p = .734$)) nor interaction ($p = .711$), meaning that there was no statistic difference between [S-Neg] and [L-Neg] conditions.
of the antecedent context is responsible for the acceptability difference in ellipsis. Second, there was no acceptability difference between ellipsis conditions. It suggests that the marker *not* did not play a significant role in both *why*-stripping and *not why*-stripping in Korean. Third, the type of negation of the antecedent clause, whether it is short-form or long-form, is insignificant in both *why*-stripping and *not why*-stripping.

In what follows, we will launch an analysis into the experimental findings. Along the line of Bromberger (1992), Ko (2005) argues that Korean *why* is base-generated in Spec of CP, while other Korean wh-phrases undergo covert wh-movement to Spec of CP at LF. Her argument is based on the intervention effect between wh-phrases and some non-polarity quantifiers (NPQs) like *man ‘only*. As shown in (27a), there is an intervention effect when a wh-phrase is lower than *man ‘only*. On the other hand, there is no intervention effect when *why* is lower than *man ‘only* as in (27b).

(27) a. *John-man mwues-ul ilk-ess-ni?
   John-only what-Acc read-Past-Q
   ‘What did only John read?’

   b. John-man way Boston-ul ttena-ss-ni?
   John-only why Boston-Acc leave-Past-Q
   ‘Why did only John leave Boston?’

She reasons that the lack of the intervention effect between *why* and the NPQ *man ‘only* is due to the origin of *why*, as shown below:

(28) a. *[CP [IP John-only what-Acc read-Past] Q]

   b. John1-only [CP [IP t1 Boston-Acc leave-Past] Q]

In (28a) the object wh-phrase *mwues-ul ‘what-Acc’ undergoes LF wh-movement beyond the NPQ subject *John-man ‘John-only’, which induces an intervention effect. The adjunct-wh *why* ‘why’ in (28b), on the other hand, is base-generated in Spec of CP and thus does not need to undergo LF wh-movement. The NPQ subject *John-man ‘John-only’ has undergone scrambling across *why* ‘why’, but this overt movement does not induce the intervention effect unlike LF wh-movement. This is why other wh-phrases except *why* ‘why’ exhibit the intervention effect. Based on her argument, we now assume that *why*
‘why’ in Korean why-stripping is base-generated in Spec of CP. We further assume that the non-wh remnant is a focus phrase that is associated with way ‘why’.

Following Yoshida et al.’s (2015) analysis of English why-stripping, we propose that Korean why-stripping is derived as follows:

(29) a. Korean why-stripping has the silent structure of a why-question.
   b. Way ‘why’ in Korean why-stripping originates in Spec of CP.
   c. The non-wh phrase in Korean why-stripping is a focus phrase associated with why.

In order to put the discussion of Korean why-stripping into perspective, we now need to address the sentential negation in Korean. Placing negative adverbs immediately before predicates is the most common way of negating sentences in Korean. The simple negation or negative intent is usually expressed by an/ani ‘not’. The contracted form an is usually used in speech, while an and ani are both used in writing. As mentioned above, Korean negation is expressed in two different ways: a short form and a long form, repeated below as in (30).

(30) a. Mary-ka sakwa-ul an/ani sa-assta. (short-form negation)
    Mary-Nom apple-Acc not buy-Past
    ‘Mary didn’t buy apples.’
   b. Mary-ka sakwa-ul sa-ci anh-assta. (long-form negation)
    Mary-Nom apple-Acc buy-NS not-Past
    ‘Mary didn’t buy apples.’

In general, the two types of negation are semantically non-distinct only with slight stylistic difference; short-form negation is less formal than long-form negation.9

Up to the early 20th century, the marker ani and its contracted form an both were used as negative markers prior to verbal forms in Korean. Koo (2008) observes, however, that since 1960s, there has been no token of ani as a negative marker based on the

---

9 Note, however, that short-form negation is generally restricted to taking narrow scope, while long-form negation is able to take wider scope, suggesting that they occupy different hierarchical positions. There has been a lot of discussion in the Korean literature regarding the scope differences between short-form negation and long-form negation (cf. Sohn 1995; Hagstrom 2000; Sells 2001; T.-S. Kim 2002; Han et al. 2007, etc.)
It seems that the contracted marker _an_ has (almost completely) replaced _ani_ as a negative marker in Modern Korean.

On the other hand, it seems that the marker _ani_ has taken a different path as a discourse marker, as observed by M.-S. Kim (1997). First, the adverb _ani_ functions as an exclamatory in the sense of ‘dear me’ or ‘good heavens’ showing surprise when something occurs unexpectedly:

(31) A: Kwacang-nim, ikes com, pwa cwu-sipsio.
    boss-Hon this a.bit review give-Hon.Imp
    ‘Boss, please review this.’
B: Ani, caney-nun ike-l il-ilako hayss-na?
    Dsr you-Top this-Acc job-even did-Q
    ‘ANI (= good heavens!), did you do this awful job?’
    (M.-S. Kim 1997: (12))

Second, the adverb _ani_ can be used to change conversation topics:

(32) [complaining about something]
    A: Ne cikum mwelakwu hayss-ni?
        you now what.the.hell talked-Q
        ‘What the hell did you say?’
    B: Ani, nalssi cohtakwu.
        Dsr weather is.nice
        ‘ANI (= well), the weather is nice.’
        (M.-S. Kim 1997: (20))

Third, the adverb _ani_ can be meant to correct the mistake to be made in the previous utterance:

(33) Chelswu-ya, Yenghuy, ani, Swunhuy olako hay-la.
    Chelswu-Voc Yenghuy Dsr Swunhuy to.come tell-Imp
    ‘Chelswu, tell Yenghuy, ANI (= no), Swunhuy to come.’
    (M.-S. Kim 1997: (28))

Now that we have all the ingredients for the analysis of Korean _why_-stripping
constructions, we return to the basic data as follows:

(34) *John-i sakwa-lul sassta-nuntey,  
\hspace{1em} \text{John-Nom apple-Acc bought-but}  
\hspace{1em} [CP way [\text{FocP sakwa-lul [\text{\textit{\textsc{cp}} \text{-\textsc{nom}} \text{-\textsc{acc}} \text{\textsc{sasst\text{-\textsc{nunt}}}]} ci]?}  
\hspace{1em} \text{why apple-Acc John-Nom bought Q}  
\hspace{1em} ‘(I heard) John bought apples, but why apples?’

Assimilating Yoshida et al.’s (2015) analysis of English why-stripping, let us suppose that Korean way ‘why’ is base-generated in Spec of CP and the non-wh remnant moves to Spec of FocP. An immediate question is then why (34) with the overt Q-morpheme \textit{ci} is unacceptable. We suggest that the affixal property of Q requests an adjacent verbal host, but the absence of the latter triggers the deletion (or drop) of the former as long as recoverability is maintained:\textsuperscript{10}

(35) [CP why [\text{FocP apple-\text{\textsc{acc}}} [\text{\textit{\textsc{cp}} \text{-\textsc{nom} t, bought]} Q]

The next ensuing question is then how a deletion operation can target a non-constituent (cf. Mukai 2003; An 2007, 2016).

Regarding this non-constituent ellipsis issue, we adopt An’s (2016) extra deletion approach. Observing that P/Case markers on ellipsis remnants can be missing only in string-final position, An argues that PF deletion extends into the part of ellipsis remnant—such as a P/Case marker or a head noun—insofar as recoverability and adjacency are satisfied.\textsuperscript{11} This extra deletion process is totally dependent upon the PF deletion operation. Although syntax decides what to be deleted, PF deletion also has its own

\textsuperscript{10} As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, the ungrammatical why-stripped output in (34) is remedied by the insertion of the copula \textit{i ‘be’} as follows:

(i) ?John-i sakwa-lul sassta-nuntey, way sakwa-lul i-ci?  
\hspace{1em} \text{John-Nom apple-Acc bought-but why apple-Acc be-Q}  
\hspace{1em} ‘(I heard) John bought apples, but why apples (be)?’

At the moment, we speculate under an ellipsis approach that the stranded Q due to the deletion of the verbal host is rescued by the copula insertion.

\textsuperscript{11} For reference, the essence of An’s (2016) extra deletion proposal was preceded by J.-S. Kim’s (1997) suggestion of P/Case-drop in Korean RNR (aka gapping): The P/Case-marker in Korean RNR may drop only if the remnant is immediately adjacent to the ellipsis site.
tenacity; i.e., to be elided is to be continuous. Under An’s proposal, PF deletion can thus ignore syntactic constituency (cf. Mukai 2003). Given this extra deletion proposal, we can derive any of the following from (34):

(36) a. *\( \text{[CP} \text{why [FocP apple}-1\text{-Acc [TP John-Nom i, bought]] Q]} \)
   b. \( \text{[CP why [FocP apple}-1\text{-Acc [TP John-Nom i, bought]] Q]} \)
   c. \( \text{[CP why [FocP apple}-1\text{-Acc [TP John-Nom i, bought]] Q]} \)
   d. \( \text{[CP why [FocP apple}-1\text{-Acc [TP John-Nom i, bought]] Q]} \)

Since the Q-morpheme \( ci \) should be affixal to a verbal host, (36a) is unacceptable after TP deletion. If \( ci \) is deleted via extra deletion for convergence, the why-stripped output in (36b) is then acceptable.\(^{12}\) Note that the Q-morpheme \( ci \) is recoverable from the wh-element why in the operator position. If the accusative marker of the non-wh remnant is further deleted by extra deletion, (36c) is derived. Since extra deletion can repeatedly apply up to recoverability and convergence, it can delete the non-wh remnant itself, deriving (36d).\(^{13}\)

Given the above theoretical devices, we propose that the experimental stimuli in (26) are derived in the following way:

\(^{12}\) As an alternative, Bae and Park (2021: fn. 6) simply assume, following Ahn and An (2011), that the why-stripping output like way sakwa-lul ‘why apples’ is derived from the why question in (i), but not from (34).

(i) \( \text{John-i for [sakwa-lul [\text{John-i bought-Dec Q]}] as [\text{John-Nom bought-Dec Q]]? } \)

They assume that Korean why-stripping targets TP, which contains the declarative marker \( e\); \( e \) functions as a question operator with a rising intonation and may appear with a null Q in C. We suspect, however, that this is not a genuine solution, merely going back to square one. A question remains why the full why question source of why-stripping in (i) must have the declarative \( e \) marker and a null Q instead of a normal question morpheme like \( ci \) or \( ni \).

\(^{13}\) Ackema and Szendroi (2002), extending Williams’s (1997) theory of dependent ellipsis, analyze determiner sharing:

(i) \( \text{Few girls will drink whiskey and few boys will drink wine.} \)

They treat determiner sharing as a type of dependent ellipsis because the null head in coordinate ellipsis permits the heads of its dependents to be null; i.e., in (i) deletion of the determiner relies on the deletion of the T head. As an alternative to An’s (2016) extra deletion analysis, we might resort to a dependent ellipsis formulation of the current concern.
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(37) a. [Affirmative | Why]
   \[CP \text{ why } [\text{FocP apple}_{1}\text{-Acc } [\text{John-Nom t} \text{-eat-Past}]] \text{-Q} \]
b. [S-Neg | Why]
   \[CP \text{ why } [\text{FocP apple}_{1}\text{-Acc } [\text{John-Nom t} \text{-not-eat-Past}]] \text{-Q} \]
c. [L-Neg | Why]
   \[CP \text{ why } [\text{FocP apple}_{1}\text{-Acc } [\text{John-Nom t} \text{-eat-Cl not-Past}]] \text{-Q} \]
d. [Affirmative | NotWhy]
   \[CP [\text{YP ANI}-[\text{XP why}]] [\text{FocP apple}_{1}\text{-Acc } [\text{John-Nom t} \text{-eat-Past}]] \text{-Q} \]
e. [S-Neg | NotWhy]
   \[CP [\text{YP ANI}-[\text{XP why}]] [\text{FocP apple}_{1}\text{-Acc } [\text{John-Nom t} \text{-not-eat-Past}]] \text{-Q} \]
f. [L-Neg | NotWhy]
   \[CP [\text{YP ANI}-[\text{XP why}]] [\text{FocP apple}_{1}\text{-Acc } [\text{John-Nom t} \text{-eat-Cl not-Past}]] \text{-Q} \]

As for the acceptability of [Affirmative | Why] in (37a), we propose that way ‘why’ is base-generated in Spec of CP and the non-wh remnant sakwa-lul ‘apple-Acc’ moves to Spec of FocP. Although the Q-morpheme is stranded after PF deletion of TP, it can be deleted via extra deletion, which is contingent on the deletion operation in PF. As for the acceptability of [Affirmative | NotWhy] in (37d), we propose that the phrasal-level discourse marker ani is adjoined to the XP wh-adjunct way ‘why’, which is base-generated in Spec of CP. After PF deletion of TP and extra deletion of the Q-morpheme ci, (37d) is derived.

Much the same point could be made for (37b/c) and (37e/f), both of which are relatively less acceptable than (37a) and (37d), respectively. All natural languages express negation (Horn 2001). Although negative expressions appear frequently in natural languages, they increase processing effort in comparison with equivalent affirmative expressions (Fischler et al. 1983; Carpenter et al. 1999; Kaup et al. 2006; T. Kim 2008; Herbert and Kübler 2011). For the decreased acceptability of (37b/c) and (37e/f), we propose that processing negative clauses is costlier than processing affirmative clauses. More precisely, we suggest that a processing result and a syntactic analysis can conspire to advance our understanding of complex syntactic phenomena such as ellipsis. Note that the negative meaning of [Neg] conditions such as (37b/c) and (37e/f) can be construed in the ellipsis site, which is recoverable from the antecedent clauses.

Concluding this section, it should be noted that certain questions may be raised
regarding the current ellipsis analysis of Korean why-stripping. In particular, an anonymous reviewer was skeptical of how the current analysis may handle the Case-drop effect in Korean why-stripping. Consider the following examples provided by the reviewer:

(38) a. John-i sakwa-lul sassta-nuntey, way sakwa(-lul)?
   John-Nom apple-Acc bought-but why apple(-Acc)
   ‘(I heard) John bought apples, but why apples?’

b. John-i sakwa-lul sassta-nuntey, way John(-i)?
   John-Nom apple-Acc bought-but why John(-Nom)
   ‘(I heard) John bought apples, but why John?’

The reviewer asked us (i) how the current analysis may explain the reversed word order in the ellipsis clause (e.g., sakwa-lul way and John-i way) if this pattern is not much different from the baseline data in (38), (ii) how it may explain the Case-drop possibility of why-stripped remnants in (38) if Case-drop affects acceptability, and (iii) how it may explain the potential difference between nominative Case-drop and accusative Case-drop if any exists. While these issues are beyond the scope of this experimental study, it should be examined via theoretical debates in future research.

---

14 Regarding the reviewer’s first question, we speculate that scrambling may be involved in “reversed” why-stripping. Refer back to footnote 4. Regarding the second and third questions, we would like to mention our work in progress (an experiment with 2 × 3 design) on “Accusative vs. dative Case-drop in Korean why-stripping”. The results of the experiment suggest that there is a difference between accusative Case-drop and dative Case-drop in Korean why-stripping. For accusative Case-drop, the difference of acceptability ratings between full why-questions and their why-stripping counterparts with an accusative-marked remnant was not significant (p = 1.0000), but it was significant between why-stripping with an accusative-marked remnant and that with an accusative-less remnant (p = .0001). For dative Case-drop, the difference of acceptability ratings between full why-questions and their why-stripping counterparts with a dative-marked remnant was not significant (p = .1346), but it was significant between why-stripping with a dative-marked remnant and that with a dative-less remnant (p < .0001). Of particular interest was that dative-less why-stripping was less acceptable than accusative-less why-stripping (p = .0380), although there was no statistic difference of acceptability ratings between dative-marked why-stripping and accusative-marked why-stripping (p = 1.0000) and between the full why-questions with a dative nominal and those with an accusative nominal (p = 1.0000). As pointed out by the reviewer, if any difference exists regarding the Case type (e.g., nominative, accusative, and dative) of the non-wh why-stripped remnant, An’s (2016) extra deletion account should be further articulated.
5. Conclusion

In this study, we have argued that the apparent negative marker ani ‘not’ prior to why is not a negative marker but a discourse marker in Korean why-stripping (cf. Koo 2008). Korean why-stripping appeared to favor affirmative antecedents over negative antecedents, which is expected from the processing perspective (Fischler et al. 1983; Carpenter et al. 1999; Kaup et al. 2006; Herbert and Kübler 2011). The negation would generally increase processing load due to the conceptual complexity as well as its marked status (T. Kim 2008). We showed that the XP adverbial ani ‘not’ as a discourse marker adjoins to the base-generated way ‘why’ in Spec of CP and that it does not play a significant role in the acceptability of Korean why-stripping. In addition, we demonstrated that the two types of negation in Korean—short-form negation vs. long-form negation—are not crucial for the acceptability of way-stripping ‘why-stripping’ and ani way-stripping ‘not why-stripping’. In short, this study presented how processing results and syntactic analyses can be used to inform each other and facilitate the understanding of ellipsis such as why-stripping. Overall, the findings of the present experiments would contribute to articulating and developing further studies in why-stripping in Korean and other languages including Japanese (Nakao et al. 2013) and Spanish (Ortega-Santos et al. 2014).

References


An experimental investigation of why-stripping in Korean


An experimental investigation of *why*-stripping in Korean

Department of English Language and Literature  
College of Liberal Arts  
Korea University  
145 Anam-Ro, Seongbuk-Gu,  
Seoul, 02841 Korea  
E-mail: ceo8048@korea.ac.kr

**Jin Hyung Lee**  
Lecturer  
Department of English Language and Literature  
College of Liberal Arts  
Korea University  
145 Anam-Ro, Seongbuk-Gu,  
Seoul, 02841 Korea  
E-mail: jinhlee@korea.ac.kr

**Jee Young Lee**  
Lecturer  
Department of English Language and Literature  
College of Liberal Arts  
Korea University  
145 Anam-Ro, Seongbuk-Gu,  
Seoul, 02841 Korea  
E-mail: jeeyoung@korea.ac.kr

**Soo hyun Kwon**  
Lecturer  
Department of English Language and Literature  
College of Humanities  
Seoul National University  
599 Gwanak-Ro, Gwanak-Gu,  
Seoul 08826 Korea  
E-mail: soohyunkwon@snu.ac.kr

Received: 2021. 03. 18.  
Revised: 2021. 06. 07.  
Accepted: 2021. 06. 10.