

A Bi-clausal Analysis of Multiple Fragments in Korean

BACKGROUND. There are two types of nominal fragments (as an answers to a question) in Korean: case-marked fragments in (a) and caseless fragments in (b) below.

- (1) Nwu-ka chayk-ul sa-ss-ni?
 Who-Nom book-Acc buy-Pst-Q ‘Who bought a book?’
 a. Yengswu-ka. b. Yengswu.
 Y.-Nom Y. ‘Yengswu bought a book.’

Interestingly, two options, case-marked fragment and caseless fragment, are not always available when they occur together, as shown in (2).

- (2) Nwu-ka nwukwu-lul ttayli-ess-ni?
 who-Nom who-Acc hit-Pst-Q ‘Who hit whom?’
 a. Chelswu-ka Yenghi-lul. b. Chelswu-ka Yenghi. c. Yenghi-lul Chelswu-ka.
 d. Yenghi-lul Chelswu. e.*Chelswu Yenghi-lul. f.*Chelswu Yenghi.
 g.*Yenghi Chelswu-ka. h.*Yenghi Chelswu. ‘Intended reading: Chelswu hit Yenghi.’

Park & Kim (2015) yields the generalization in (3) to capture the contrasts in (2).

- (3) Dependent Marker Drop Generalization in Multiple Fragment Answer (MFA)

In the MFA environment, only its right-most fragment can drop its dependent marker.

Then, why can only a string final fragment in the multiple fragments be caseless? Park & Kim (2015) attempts to derive the contrasts given in (2) via some sorts of “intervention” effects, which is thoroughly “syntactic” in nature. An (2016), on the other hand, tries to derive the contrasts in (2) in terms of PF-strategy, which is totally “phonological” in nature (since the deletion process An assumes essentially ignores syntactic constituents).

PROPOSALS. We advance a novel proposal that when the first fragments are caseless in multiple fragments, the constructions in question are always ruled out due to their infelicitous sentential counterparts (namely, semantically deviant host clauses). On this analysis, we are able to derive the Park’s (2013) generalization in (3). We suggest that case-marked and caseless fragments have different sentential connection., The case-marked fragment in (4b) is derived from full clausal ellipsis in (5a), whereas the caseless fragment in (4c) is derived from the reduced copula construction (the so-called “limited” ellipsis analysis inspired by Merchant 2004), as in (5b).

- (4) a. Max-ka nwukwu-lul manna-ss-ni?
 M.-Nom who-Acc meet-Pst-Q ‘Who did Max meet?’
 b. Yengswu-lul. c. Yengswu.
 Y.-Acc Y. ‘Max met Yengswu.’

- (5) a. [_{CP} Yengswu-lul_i [_{TP} ~~Max-ka t_i manna-ss-e~~]]
 b. [_{CP} Yengswu [_{TP} ~~ku-ken-t_i-a~~]]

We suggest that multiple fragments are repetitive gapless right dislocation plus subsequent ellipsis on the host clause. We claim that the distribution of caseless fragment in multiple fragments is closely related to the nature of right dislocation constructions (RDCs). Following Ahn and Cho (2016), we assume that Korean RDCs are composed of two juxtaposed clauses (the host clause and the clause stranding the appendix via ellipsis) and that the syntactic and semantic composition of the host clause is complete by itself, and the parenthesis (here the clause including appendix) is always a non-restrictive addition. We argue that the restriction on multiple fragments is explained as a result of syntactic and semantic completeness of the host clause. For example, we assume that (2e) has the structure like (6a) or (6b).

- (6) a. [Chelswu_i t_i-Yenghi-lul ttayli-ess-e] [Yenghi-lul_j-Chelswu-ka t_j-ttayli-ess-e]
 b. [Chelswu-ya] [Yenghi-lul_j Chelswu-ka t_j-ttayli-ess-e]

Neither of the derivations can be licit under our analysis since neither of the host clauses prior to ellipsis in (6) can be a felicitous answer to the question. Accordingly, (2e) is predicted to be ruled out under our proposal, and *mutatis mutandis* (2f-h).