

Subject-less Clefts in Korean: Towards a Deletion Analysis*

Park, Myung-Kwan

This paper explores the syntactic category of a phonologically suppressed subject in the so-called subject-less cleft construction in Korean, and investigates into its derivation. In the previous analyses, Takahashi (1994) and J.-S. Kim (1997) argue against the cleft analysis of the construction at issue, proposing that the construction involves deletion of IP or a smaller category than IP. On the other hand, Nishiyama et al. (1996) and K.-W. Sohn (1998/2000) argue for the cleft analysis of the construction at issue, maintaining that the subject of the construction can be an overt or empty pronominal. In this paper, keeping in line with the latter analysis, I argue that the construction at issue is analyzed as a cleft construction. Departing from it, however, I also argue that the empty subject of the construction must be regarded as a clefted clause rather than as a pronominal subject, and results from deletion of the clefted clause.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to identify the nature of the following type of construction as in (1). More specifically, I will investigate into the syntactic derivation of the empty subject of this construction, which is indicated by [_{ec} e] in (1):

*Portions of this paper have been presented in the Winter Research Colloquium of the Linguistic Society of Korea in February, 1998 and in the Winter Presentation Session of the Linguistic Society of Korea in February, 2000, as they have been developed along the way. I am grateful to Professor Sun-Woong Kim and two anonymous reviewers of this journal for comments and suggestions. I also would like to acknowledge the financial support of Dongguk University Research Grant in the program year of 2001.

- (1) (na-nun) con-i ecey mwuenka-lul saass-tako tul-ess-nuntey,
 I -Top John-Nom yesterday what bought-Comp heard-Circum¹
 na-nun [_{ec} e] mwues-inci molu-kess-ta
 I -Top what-Inter don't know
 'I heard that John bought something yesterday, but I don't know
 what.'

Note that the empty subject of the sentence in (1) can be substituted for by the overt counterpart constituents such as the clefted clause headed by the semantically incomplete nominal *key/kes* in (2a), the clefted clause headed by a lexical NP in (2b) and the pronoun *kukey/kukes* in (2c):

- (2) The candidate for the empty subject position [_{ec} e] in (1):
- a. (con-i ecey san key/kes-i)
 John-i yesterday bought that-Nom 'what John bought yesterday'
- b. (con-i ecey san mwulken-i)
 John-Nom yesterday bought thing-Nom 'the thing John bought
 yesterday'
- c. (kukes/kukey-i)
 it -Nom
 'it'

Based on the distribution and referential property of these constituents in (2a-c) within the context of the empty subject position of (1), I will argue that the empty subject of (1) is derived by deleting a clefted clause headed by the semantically incomplete nominal as in (2a). In this sense, I will suggest that the embedded clause of the second conjunct in (1) is identified with the subject-less cleft construction.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, the previous approaches to sentences like (1) will be presented and evaluated. In the previous approaches there have been two types of analysis. One is the deletion-based analysis, which argues for deletion of IP or a smaller category than IP in the construction at issue. The other is the analysis of

1. Circum = Circumstantial. This ending indicates a background circumstance.

the construction at issue as a cleft construction which has an empty pronominal subject. These two types of analysis will be compared, and empirical problems with them will be pointed out. In section 3, it will be argued that the overt and the empty pronominal subject of the construction at issue must be regarded as a clefted clause, but not as any other elements. In section 3, I will explore the possibility that the empty subject of the construction at issue results from deletion of a clefted clause, rather than being base-generated as an empty pronominal *pro*.

2. Previous Analyses

2.1. Takahashi (1994)

In the previous approach to the sentences like (1), Takahashi (1994) notes that the operation equivalent to sluicing (IP ellipsis) in English exists in Japanese. The example (3) makes a case for the sluicing-like operation:

- (3) Taroo-ga **nanika-o** katta sooda ga,
 -Nom something-Acc bought heard but
 boku-wa **nani-o ka** wakaranai
 I -Top what-Acc Q know-not
 'I heard Taroo bought something, but I don't know what.'

Takahashi argues that the embedded clause of the second conjunct involves IP ellipsis, as represented in (4):

- (4) boku-wa [_{CP} **nani-o** [_{IP} e] [_C **ka**]] wakaranai

Note that the derivation of the embedded clause in (4) is crucially based on the hypothesis that there is overt wh-movement in Japanese.

2.2. Nishiyama, Whitman and Yi (1996)

In contrast to Takahashi, Nishiyama et al. (1996) argue that there is no

sluicing in Japanese and Korean. Instead, they claim that sentences like (1) are derived from the cleft construction, as represented in (5):

- (5) Minna-wa [John-ga dareka -o aisiteiru to] otta ga,
 everyone-Top -Nom someone-Acc love Comp said but
 boku-wa (sore-ga) dare-o (da) ka wakaranai
 I -Top -Nom who-Acc be Q know-not
 'Everyone said that John loves someone, but I don't know who (it is).'

They particularly note that the overt pronominal subject *sore-ga* 'it-Nom' and the copula *da* 'be' can occur in this construction. These type of elements are characteristic of the canonical cleft construction in the two languages. They argue that the distribution of these elements renders clear evidence for the assimilation of sentences like (1) to the cleft construction.

2.3. J.-S. Kim (1997)

Turning to J.-S. Kim (1997), he resurrects Takahashi's deletion-based analysis of this construction. However, departing from Takahashi's overt wh-movement hypothesis, he argues that overt focus movement instead of wh-movement is followed by the deletion of XP, which is a projection just below FocusP.

Kim supports his focus movement-cum-deletion analysis by providing a negative argument against the cleft analysis of sentences like (1). He claims that multiple remnants are possible in what he calls the Korean sluicing-like construction, as in (6):

- (6) con-i ecey mwuenka-lul nwukwunka-eykey cwuesstako
 John-Nom yesterday something-Acc someone-Dative gave
 tuless-nuntey, na-nun mwues-ul nwukwu-eykey-inci alko sipta
 heard-Circum I-Top what-Acc who-Dative-Interr know want
 'I heard that John gave something to someone yesterday. I want to know what to whom.'

Unlike in (6), however, Kim claims that multiple foci are not allowed in the clefted constituent position of the cleft construction, as the

ungrammaticality of (7c) indicates:

- (7) a. con -i ecey meyri-eykey chayk-ul cwu-ess-ta
 John-Nom yesterday Mary-Dat book-Acc gave
 'John gave a book to Mary yesterday.'
- b. con -i ecey meyri-eykey cwu-n kes -un **chayk-i-ta**
 John-Nom yesterday Mary-Dat gave that-Top book-copula-Decl
 'It is a book that John gave to Mary yesterday.'
- c. con-i ecey cwu-n-kes-un **meyri-eykey chayk-i-ta**
 Mary-Dat book-copula-Decl
 '*It is to Mary, a book that John gave yesterday.'

The impossibility of multiple foci as clefted constituents in the canonical cleft construction as in (7c) may apparently weaken the view of sentences like (1) as a cleft construction.

2.4. K.-W. Sohn (1998/2000)

In contrast to J.-S. Kim, K.-W. Sohn (1998/2000) reinstates Nishiyama et al.'s cleft analysis. More specifically, he argues that sentences like (1) are a copula construction with the pronominal subject *kukey/kukes-i* 'it-Nom' or its empty counterpart *pro*. In Sohn's analysis, the example in (1) is represented as (8), where the embedded clause of the second conjunct can have *kukey/kukes-i* as a subject:

- (8) con-i ecey **mwuenka-lul** sasstako tules-nuntey,
 John-Nom yesterday what bought-Comp heard-Circum
 na-nun (**kukey/kukes-i**) mwues-inci molukessta
 I -Top it -Nom what-Interr don't know
 'I heard that John bought something yesterday, but I don't know what it is.'

Sohn notes that the copula construction with the subject *kukey* can host multiple foci in the complement of the copula, as in (9):

- (9) con-i ecey **mwuenka-lul** **nwukwunka-eykey** cwuesstako
 John-Nom yesterday something-Acc someone -Dative gave
 tules-nuntey, na-nun **kukey/kukes-i** **mwues-ul** **nwukwu-eykey**-inci
 heard-Circum I-Top it-Nom what-Acc who-Dative-Interr
 alko sipta.
 know want
 'I heard that John gave something to someone yesterday. I want to
 know what to whom it is.'

The grammaticality of (9) undermines J-S. Kim's argument against the analysis of sentences like (1) as a cleft construction in Korean.

2.5. Evaluation of the previous analyses

2.5.1 The 'wh/focus-movement followed by deletion' analysis

Now let us evaluate the previous analyses of the construction at issue.

The first problem with Takahashi's and J-S. Kim's movement-cum-deletion approach to the construction comes from the obligatory presence of the copula and the occasional presence of the tense marker within a presumably IP-deleted clause, as in (10):

- (10) con-i **mwuenka-lul** sass-tako tules-nuntey,
 John-Nom what bought-Comp heard-Circum
 na-nun [_{CP} **mwues**-[_{IP} e]-i-(**ess**)-**nci**] molukessta
 I -Top what-Inter don't know
 'I heard that John bought something yesterday, but I don't know
 what.'

Takahashi's analysis leaves open the syntactic status of the copula. The more problematic case that refutes his analysis is the presence of the tense marker. If the copula and the tense marker are projected within IP, his IP deletion analysis cannot be maintained.

The second problem with the movement-cum-deletion analysis is that, despite the absence of Spec-head agreement through the [+ Wh] Comp, a fragmentary remnant can appear as in (11)-(12):

- (11) con-un [caki-ka meyri-eykey **mwuenka-lul** cwuesstako] malhayss-ciman,
 John-Top self-Nom Mary-Dat what gave-Comp said -but
 na-nun [con-i [**mwues-i** -lako] malhayss-**nunci**] kieknaci anh-nunta
 -Top John-Nom what -Cop-Comp said -Interr remember don't
 'John said that he gave Mary something, but I can't remember
 what John said that it was.'
- (12) con-un [meyri-ka cihachel-eyse kapang-ul ilhepeliess-tako] malha-ciman,
 John-Top Mary-Nom subway-in bag -Acc lost -Comp say-but
 na-nun [**cihachel-eyse**-lako] sayngkahaci anhunta
 I -Top subway-in-Comp think don't
 'John says that Mary lost a bag in the subway, but I don't think
 that it is in the subway.'

Obviously, the fragmentary remnant in (11) and (12) does not enter into Spec-head agreement with a [+Wh] Comp, though in Takahashi's analysis this agreement is required to trigger IP deletion. Note, however, that these examples are judged grammatical.

2.5.2. The cleft and copula analysis

Turning to the cleft or copula approach to the construction at issue, Nishiyama et al. and K-W. Sohn each assumes that the construction is a copula clause with the overt pronominal *kukey/kukes-i* or its empty counterpart *pro* in the subject position.

The problem with this assumption is that the overt pronominal *kukey/kukes-i* cannot occur in the so-called antecedent-less, Case-particle-deleted construction. Let us first look at the examples in (13):

- (13) a. con -i **nwukwunka-lul wuyhayse** kkoch-ul sassta-ko tules-nuntey
 John-Nom someone -for flowers-Acc buy-Comp heard-Circum
 na-nun (kukey) **nwukwu-lul wuyhayse-inci** molu-kess-ta
 I-Top it-Nom whom- for -Interr don't know
 'I heard that John bought flowers for someone, I don't know for whom.'
- b. con -i **nwukwunka-lul wuyhayse** kkoch-ul sassta-ko tules-nuntey,
 na-nun (kukey) **nwukwu-inci** molu-kess-ta

In (13a-b), the *wh*-phrase in the embedded clause of the second conjunct, which is highlighted, is referentially associated with the indefinite antecedent in the first conjunct. Note that (13a) and (13b) are both grammatical, regardless of whether the *wh*-phrase retains the Case particle that is attached to the indefinite antecedent.

However, when a *wh*-phrase in the embedded clause of the second conjunct does not have its corresponding indefinite antecedent in the first conjunct, it must have a Case particle retained, as the contrast between (14a) and (14b) indicates:

- (14) a. con -i kkoch-ul sassta-ko tulesse-nuntey,
 John-Nom flowers-Acc buy-Comp heard-Circum
 na-nun (**kukey**) **nwukwu-lul wuyhayse-inci** molu-kess-ta
 I-Top it-Nom whom- for -Interr don't know
 'I heard that John bought flowers, but I don't know for whom.'
- b. *con -i kkoch-ul sassta-ko tulesse-nuntey,
 na-nun (**kukey**) **nwukwu-inci** molu-kess-ta

The contrast between (15b) and (16b) also shows that in the antecedent-less construction, a *wh*-phrase must have a Case particle preserved. Otherwise, the sentence turns out to be ungrammatical:

- (15) a. con-i **mwuenka-lo** changmwun-ul pwuswuesstako hate-ntey,
 John-Nom something-with window-Acc broke-Comp said-Circum
 ne-nu (**kukey**) **mwues-ulo-inci** al-ni?
 you-Top it what-with-Interr know-Interr
 'People said that John broke the window with something, but do you know with what it is?'
- b. con-i **mwuenka-lo** changmwun-ul pwuswuesstako hatentey, ne-nu
 (**kukey**) **mwues-inci** al-ni?

- (16) a. con-i changmwun-ul pwuswuesstako hate-ntey,
 John-Nom window-Acc broke-Comp said-Circum
 nen-nu (**kukey**) **mwues-ulo-inci** al-ni?
 you-Top it-Nom what-with-Interr know-Interr
 'People said that John broke the window, but do you know with what it is?'

- b. *con-i changmwun-ul pwuswuesstako hatentey, ne-nun (**kukey**)
mwues-inci al-ni?

Recall that in the cleft or copula approach, Nishiyama et al. and K-W. Sohn each assumes that the construction at issue is a copula clause with the overt pronominal *kukey/kukes-i* or its empty counterpart *pro* in the subject position. Furthermore, they argues explicitly (for Sohn) or tacitly (for Nishiyama et al.) that the overt or empty pronominal in this construction is base-generated as such. Since its distribution is subject to such known conditions as Binding Condition (B) and the syntactic licensing condition on *pro*, the overt or empty pronominal is predicted to occur freely in this construction if it does not violate these conditions. However, as shown by the contrast in Case particle retainability between the antecedented and the antecedent-less constructions, the prediction is not achieved. This means that the distribution of the pronominal subject should be constrained in some way to account for the contrast. Rather pursuing this line of analysis, in the next section I will turn to motivate an alternative analysis for the construction at issue.

3. Towards an Analysis

3.1. The clefted clause hypothesis for the *kukey/kukes-i* 'it(-Nom)' subject

In this section, I will demonstrate that the subject of the subject-less cleft construction at issue is a clefted clause. Before proceeding, let me briefly examine the canonical cleft construction in Korean.

Let me begin by introducing a piece of descriptive terminology which will be useful in discussing clefts, given in (17):

- (17) [clefted clause] [clefted constituent]
con-i ecey ilk-un kes-un haymlit-i-ta
 John-Nom yesterday read that-Top Hamlet-copula-Comp
 'It is Hamlet that John read yesterday.'

I will refer to the pre-copula constituent, *haymlit* in (17) as a clefted constituent, and the subject-like constituent, *con-i ecey ilk-un kes-un* in (17) as a clefted clause.

I suggest that the cleft construction in Korean is analyzed on a par with the cleft construction in English. First, the clefted constituent in (18) of Korean can be a wh-phrase like that in the cleft construction (19) of English. However, the clefted constituent of the pseudo-cleft construction in English cannot be a wh-phrase as in (20-21):

(18) ku chayk-ul ilk-un kes-un **nwukwu-i-nya?**
 that book-Acc read-Past that-Top who-copula-Interr
 'Who is it that read the book?'

(19) a. What is it that Ben is?
 b. I wonder what it was that those brats did.

(20) a. What Ben is is proud of himself.
 b. *What is what Ben is?

(21) a. What those brats did was all get in the tub at once.
 b. *I wonder what those brats did was.

Second, note that the clefted constituent in (22) of Korean cannot be a negative polarity item (NPI), just like that of the cleft construction (23) in English. However, the clefted constituent of the pseudocleft construction (24) in English can be an NPI:

(22) *ku-ka ilk-ci anh-un kes-un **amwu chayk-to-i-ta**
 he-Nom read not what-Top any book-Add-Cop-Decl
 '*It is any books that he didn't read.'

(23) *It was any good novels that he didn't buy.

(24) What he didn't buy was any good novels.

Let me now turn to the Case-particle retainability of the clefted

constituent of the cleft construction. The following paradigm of examples in (25) and (26), which are noted by S-E. Jhang (1994), makes this point:

- (25) a. con -i i pangmang-**ilo** changmwun-ul pwuswu-ess-ta
 John-Nom this club-with window-Acc break -Past -Decl
 'John broke the window with this club.'
- b. con -i changmwun-ul pwuswu-n ken I pangmangi-*(**ilo**)-ta
 John-Nom window-Acc break-Past what this club-with-Decl
 'It is with this club that John broke the window.'
- c. con -i changmwun-ul pwuswu-n tokwu-nun i pangmangi-*(**ilo**)-ta
 John-Nom window-Acc break-Past instrument-Top this club-with-Decl
 'The instrument with which John broke the window is this club.'
- (26) a. con -i meyri-**lul wuyhayse** kkoch-ul sa-ass-ta
 John-Nom Mary-for flower-Acc bought
 'John bought flowers for Mary.'
- b. con -i kkoch-ul sa-n ken meyri-*(**lul wuyhayse**)-i-ta
 John-Nom flower-Acc bought what Mary-for-Cop-Decl
 'It is for Mary that John bought flowers.'
- c. *con -i kkoch-ul sa-n salam-un meyri-i-ta
 John-Nom flower-Acc bought person-Top Mary-Cop-Decl
 'The person for whom John bought flowers is Mary.'

The examples in (25) and (26) show that, on the one hand, the cleft construction with the clefted clause headed by the semantically incomplete nominal *kes* must have a Case particle retained by a clefted constituent. On the other hand, the cleft construction with the clefted clause headed by a lexical head NP must have a Case particle removed from a clefted constituent. However, the latter construction is not always judged grammatical, as the grammatical contrast between (25c) and (26c) indicates.

Given the background information on Case particle retainability in the cleft construction, let me go back to the examples in (13)-(16). Examining how the overt pronominal subject *kukey* of the cleft construction in these examples can be interpreted or reconstructed, I will conclude that the pronominal subject must be identified with the clefted clause headed

by a semantically incomplete nominal.

First, as the grammatical contrast between (14a) and (14b) indicates, it must be the case that in the antecedent-less cleft construction a clefted constituent has a Case particle retained when the subject is *kukey*. (16a) and (16b) are repeated below as (27a) and (27b), respectively:

- (27) a. *con-i changmwun-ul pwuswuesstako hate-ntey ne-nu (kukey)*
mwues-ulo-inci al-ni?
 'People say that John broke the window, but do you know with what it is?'
 b. **con-i changmwun-ul pwuswuesstako hatentey, ne-nun (kukey)*
mwues-inci al-ni?

This implies that *kukey* is identified with the clefted clause headed by the semantically incomplete nominal, that is, *con-i changmwun-ul pwuswu-n ken* 'that John broke the window.' Recall that when a clefted constituent has a Case particle attached as in (27a), the subject of the cleft construction cannot be the clefted clause headed by a lexical NP. When a clefted constituent has a Case particle missing as in (27b), the pronominal subject cannot be allowed, whether it is overtly or covertly realized. Note that if the pronominal subject were identified with the clefted clause headed by a lexical NP, that is, *con-i changmwun-ul pwuswu-n tokwu* 'the instrument with which John broke the window,' (27b) would be grammatical. However, this is not the case. The remaining possibility that the pronominal subject of (27b) is identified with the clefted clause headed by the semantically incomplete nominal is ruled out, because the Case-particle-removed clefted constituent prevents this possibility. The thing to be noted again is that the ungrammaticality of (27b) can be accounted for by regarding the overt pronominal or the empty subject of the example as a clefted clause headed by the semantically incomplete nominal.

In contrast to the antecedent-less construction, the clefted constituent may have a Case particle retained or removed in the antecedented cleft construction of (13a-b), which are repeated below as (28a-b):

- (28) a. con -i **nwukwunka-lul wuyhayse** kkoch-ul sassta-ko tules-nuntey
 na-nun (**kukey**) **nwukwu-lul wuyhayse-inci** molu-kess-ta
 'I heard that John bought flowers for someone, I don't know for whom.'
- b. con -i **nwukwunka-lul wuyhayse** kkoch-ul sassta-ko tules-nuntey,
 na-nun (**kukey**) **nwukwu-inci** molu-kess-ta

What is the overt subject *kukey* identified with in this construction? It must be that *kukey* is not identified with the indefinite antecedent NP, that is, *nwukwunka* in (28a). If that were the case, the embedded clause in the second conjunct of (28a) after replacing *kukey* with the indefinite NP would be: *nwukwunka-ka nwukwu-lul wuyhayse-inci*, which is ungrammatical. Note that the clefted clause with a lexical NP, that is, *con-i kkoch-ul sa-n salam* is also ungrammatical. Then the only possibility remaining is that *kukey* is identified with the clefted clause, *con-i kkoch-ul sa-n ken/key*.

How about the example (28b)? As we have seen in (25b), when the clefted constituent has a Case particle deleted, the clefted clause headed by a lexical NP must occur in the subject position. However, the clefted clause headed by a lexical NP which is reconstructed in the embedded clause of the second conjunct of (28b) will be (29).

- (29) *con -i kkoch-ul sa-n salam-i **nwukwu-i-inci**
 John-Nom flower-Acc bought person-Nom who-copula-Interr
 'Who the person for whom John bought flowers is.'

However, the cleft construction postulated in (29) is ill-formed.

I suggest that an alternative form which is reconstructed for the pronominal subject of the embedded clause in the second conjunct of (28b) is (30).

- (30) (con -i kkoch-ul **nwukwunka-lul wuyhayse** sa-n (palo ku) key/kes-i)
nwukwu-inci

In (28), the clefted constituent in the second conjunct has the indefinite antecedent phrase in the first conjunct. The clefted clause reconstructed

in (30) reflects on the existence of this antecedent phrase. That is, in (30) the beneficiary phrase *nwukwunka-lul wuyhayse* ‘for someone’ does not appear as a gap, but the phrase appears in its entirety and the indefinite within the phrase functions as a sort of resumptive pronoun linked to the clefted constituent.² Note, incidentally, that the clefted clause in (30) is headed by the semantically incomplete nominal *key/kes*. Since the Case particle of the antecedent indefinite phrase which is reconstructed within the clefted clause identifies the syntactic and semantic role of the Case-particle-deleted clefted constituent, the pronominal subject *kukey* does not need to be reconstructed as a clefted clause headed by a lexical NP.

It seems that Case particle retainability of a clefted constituent depending on the presence or absence of its corresponding element in the antecedent clause is analyzed on a par with extraction out of PP in English. As the examples (31) and (32) show, the whole adjunct PP can be extracted, but extraction out of within adjunct PP is not possible:

- (31) a. Under what circumstances will use force?
 b. *What circumstances will we use force under?

- (32) a. In what sense is this theory right?
 b. *What sense is this theory right in?

However, as Chung et al. (1995) argue, in the sluicing or IP Ellipsis construction the remnant wh-phrase in the [Spec,CP] position can be linked to an indefinite antecedent within adjunct PP that occurs within the reconstructed structure for the sluiced or IP-elided site. The grammaticality of (33) and (34) illustrates this point:³

- (33) We are willing to use force under *certain circumstances*, but we will not say in advance **which ones**_i [we are willing to use force under certain circumstances]_i.

2. It seems that when the emphatic element *palo ku* ‘the very’ is inserted before the semantically incomplete head nominal as in (30), the indefinite NP within the clefted clause can be more easily identified as a resumptive pronoun.

3. The underlined constituent in (33) and (34) indicates the elided one.

- (34) This theory is surely right in *some sense*; it's just not clear **which/what**_i exactly [this theory is surely right in some sense]

In brief, the *kukey* subject of the cleft construction refers to none other than a clefted clause. I have also shown that a clefted clause is reconstructed differently depending on the presence or absence of an indefinite antecedent that is linked referentially to a clefted constituent.

Let me assume that the properties related to the overt pronominal subject of the cleft construction carry over to the empty counterpart. This assumption seems to be empirically supported by island effects of the construction at issue, which I will turn to momentarily in the next subsection.

3.2. Island sensitivity of the subject-less cleft construction

In section 3.2, I will now show that the presence or absence of an antecedent constituent corresponding to a clefted constituent affects the distribution of the subject-less cleft construction in terms of island sensitivity.

In the antecedent-less type of construction, a clefted constituent is always sensitive to the position of its gap within the phonologically suppressed clefted clause in the subject position. Thus, as the contrast between the (a)-examples and the (b)-examples in (35) and (36) shows, the clefted constituent is interpreted within the clefted clause reconstructed:

- (35) a. con -i swuep cwung-ey pyenci-lul ssu-ess-tako ha-tentey,
 John-Nom class during letter -Acc wrote -Comp said-Circum
 ne-nun **nwukwu-eykey**-inci alko iss-ni
 you-Top who-Dat-Interr know -Interr
 'People said that John wrote a letter, but do you know to whom it is.'
- b. *sensayngnim -i [swuep cwung-ey pyenci-lul ssu-ko isste-n
 teacher-Nom class during letter -Acc was writing-Comp
 haksaying-ul kkwuciess-tako ha-tentey, ne-nun
 student -Acc scolded -Comp said-Circum you-Top
nwukwu-eykey-inci alko iss-ni
 who-Dat-Interr know -Interr
 '*People said that the teacher scolded the student who was writing a letter, but do you know to whom it is.'

- (36) a. con-i cemsim-ul mekesstako hate-ntey,
 -Nom lunch-Acc ate-Comp said-Circum
 ne-nun **nwukwu-wa**-inci al-ni
 you-Top who-with-Comp know-Interr
 ‘People said that John ate lunch, but do you know with whom.’
- b. *con-i cemsim-ul mek-un taumey ttesstako hate-ntey,
 -Nom lunch-Acc ate-after left-Comp said-Circum
 ne-nun **nwukwu-wa**-inci al-ni
 you-Top who-with-Comp know-Interr
 *‘People said that John left after he ate lunch, but do you know
 with whom.’

That is, since the clefted constituent in (35a) and (36a) is interpreted within the reconstructed, clefted clause that does not form an island, the sentences turn out to be grammatical. On the other hand, since the clefted constituent in (35b) and (36b) is interpreted within the island-forming clefted clause reconstructed, the sentences show island effects. This clearly shows that the subject of the subject-less cleft construction is identified with a clefted clause.

In contrast to the antecedent-less cleft construction, the antecedented cleft construction does not show island effects. The examples (37) and (38) make this point.

- (37) sensayngnim-i [**etten mwunceyinka-lul** cal phwun
 teacher -Nom some problem-Acc correctly solved
 haksaying-ul] chingchanhaysstako hate-ntay, **etten mwuncey**-inci
 student-Acc praised-Comp said-Circum which problem-Interr
 ne-nun al-ni
 you-Top know-Interr
 ‘People said that the teacher praised the student who solved a
 certain problem correctly, but do you know which problem.’

- (38) [con-i **etten haksayng-ul** taylyesski ttamwuney] sensayngnim-i
 John-Nom some student-Acc beat-because teacher-Nom
 hwa-ka naysiesstako hate-ntey, ne-nun **etten haksayng-inci**
 anger-Nom expressed-Comp said-Circum you-Top which student-Interr
 al-ni
 know-Interr
 'People said that the teacher got angry because John beat some
 student, but do you know who(m)?'

The contrast in island sensitivity between the antecedented and the antecedent-less cleft constructions in Korean can be compared with the similar contrast in the sluicing construction of English (see also the discussion of (33) and (34) above, which belong to the type of antecedented sluicing construction), as noted by Ross (1969) and Chung et al. (1996):

- (39) a. *Tony sent Mo a picture that he painted, but it is not clear
with what_i [_{IP} Tony sent Mo a picture that he painted *t*_i].
 b. *That Tom will win is likely, but it's not clear **which race**_i [_{IP}
 that Tom will win *t*_i is likely].
- (40) a. The administration has issued a statement that it is willing to
 meet with ***one of the student groups***, but I'm not sure **which
 one**_i [_{IP} the administration has issued a statement that it is
 willing to meet with ***one of the student groups***_i/**t*_i].
 b. That ***certain countries*** would vote against the resolution ha
 been widely reported, but I'm not sure **which ones**_i [_{IP} th
certain countries/**t*_i would vote against the resolution has bee
 widely reported].

Sentences like (39a-b), which do not contain any antecedent phrase in the first conjunct that corresponds to a (highlighted) remnant wh-phrase outside the sluiced/elided IP of the second conjunct, display island effects. That is, (39a) is ruled out by the Complex NP constraint, and (39b) by the Subject condition. However, sentences like (40a-b), which contain an (italicized and highlighted) antecedent phrase in the first

conjunct that corresponds to a (highlighted) remnant *wh*-phrase in the second conjunct, do not show island effects.

Chung et al. account for this contrast in island sensitivity between (39a-b) and (40a-b) by arguing that the former involve the usual operation of Form Chain, whereas the latter involve the binding-like operation of Merge. Note that Form Chain must meet crucial locality requirements in each of its links (Chomsky (1995)). Since the elided IP in the second conjunct contains an island context, movement of the remnant *wh*-phrase out of it cannot meet the locality requirements. On the other hand, the relation between the remnant *wh*-phrase and its antecedent phrase in the antecedented sluicing construction does not involve movement. Rather, it is licensed by the binding-like operation of Merge, which does not satisfy any locality requirement.⁴

In the similar line of analysis with Chung et al., I argue that the antecedent-less and the antecedented cleft constructions are subject to different derivations: the former involves movement, and the latter involves binding. In the former construction, when the phonologically suppressed clefted clause contains an island environment, the resulting structure will invite a violation of the locality requirements for Form Chain. This is responsible for the ungrammaticality of (35b) and (36b).

In the latter antecedented cleft construction, on the other hand, the clefted remnant is linked via binding to the antecedent constituent within the phonologically suppressed clefted clause. In this sense, the phonologically suppressed subject of the embedded clause in the second conjunct of (37) and (38) are not (41), but (42):

- (41) a. *sensayngnim-i [t_i cal phwun haksayng-ul] chingchanhaysstako
 haten **kes_i-i**
 b. *[con-i t_i taylyesski ttamwuney] sensayngnim-i hwa-ka naysiesstako
 haten **kes_i-i**

4. See Fox and Lasnik (2001) for a recent analysis of the contrast, which departs from that of Chung et al.

- (42) a. *sensayngnim-i* [*etten mwunceyinka-lul*; *cal phwun haksayng-ul*]
chingchanhaysstako haten (palo ku) key_i/kes_i-i
- b. [con-i *etten haksayng-ul*; *taylyesski ttamwuney*] *sensayngnim-i*
hwa-ka naysiesstako haten (palo ku) key_i/kes_i-i

In an analogy to the cleft construction with the overt pronominal subject *kukey* as discussed in section 3.1, it can be said that when the clefted remnant has its antecedent constituent in the first conjunct, the phonologically suppressed clefted clause is reconstructed by the resumptive strategy rather than by the creation of a gap corresponding to the clefted remnant. Since the clefted remnant can bind the resumptive antecedent phrase within the reconstructed clefted clause without being sensitive to island constraints, the antecedented, subject-less cleft construction does not show island effects.

4. The Derivation of the Empty Subject in the Subject-less Cleft Construction

Until now, I have argued that the overt or the empty pronominal subject of the cleft construction is identified with a clefted clause. I have also argued that the formation of a clefted clause is affected by whether in the previous discourse there is an antecedent constituent which corresponds to a clefted constituent. In the antecedented subject-less cleft construction, the pronominal subject *kukey/kekes-i* 'it-Nom' is freely distributed, and no island effects are observed. On the other hand, in the antecedent-less, subject-less cleft construction, the pronominal subject is not freely distributed, and the island effects are observed in the case of island-forming clefted clauses.

Now, let us investigate into the empty subject of the subject-less cleft construction. The question to be posed on this matter is whether its empty subject is just a small *pro* that corresponds either to the pronominal *kukey/kukes-i* or to the clefted clause, or the empty subject results from deletion of the clefted clause.

It seems tricky to decide on one of the alternatives on the status of the empty subject of the subject-less cleft construction. As is well known,

in the previous literature there have been two competing views of an ellipsis site. On the one hand, Lobeck (1995) and others maintain that it is *pro*. On the other hand, Chomsky and Lasnik (1993) and others advance the view that it is derived by deletion of an overt constituent at PF. It seems that a variety of evidence advanced by one camp of analysis for its sake can be given an alternative analysis by the other camp of analysis.

Returning to the construction at issue in this paper, I will now argue that the empty subject of the construction should be given a deletion-based analysis. Since the empty subject is identified as a clefted clause, as demonstrated in the previous section, I will now focus on the operation that is applied in deriving the empty subject from a clefted clause postulated.

First, let us look at the multiple *wh*-in-situ construction in (43):

- (43) con -i **nwukwu-eykeyse etten senmwul-ul** patassni
 John-Nom who-from which present-Acc receive-Interr
 'From whom did John receive which present?'

(43) is given a pair-list interpretation. That is, in this interpretation the response to the question (43) can be 'John received a book from Mary, he received a CD from Susan, and so on.'

As Takahashi (1994) notes, this is also the case with the subject-less cleft construction when clefted remnants are multiple⁵:

- (44) con -i ecey **etten chinkwuinka-eykeyse etten senmwulinka-ul**
 John-Nom yesterday some friend-from some present-Acc
 patasstako hatentey, na-nun **nwukwu-eykeyse etten**
 receive said-Circum I-Top who-from
senmwul-(ul)-inci kwungkumhata
 which present-Acc-Interr wonder
 'People said that John received some present from some friend,
 but I wonder from whom which present.'

5. One of the anonymous reviewers does not accept the judgment reported regarding the cleft construction with multiple clefted remnants in such examples as (43) and (44) in the text. Though I do not have anything to add on the reviewer's differing judgement, I would like to point out that the acceptability of such examples as (43) and (44) was already reported by J-S. Kim (1997) and K-W. Sohn (1998/2000), as noted in section 2.

However, when the pronominal *kukey/kukes-i* occupies the subject of the cleft construction, most people find it very hard to get the expected pair-list interpretation.

- (45) con -i ecey etten chinkwuinka-eykeyse etten senmwulinka-ul
 John-Nom yesterday some friend-from some present -Acc
 patasstako hatentey, na-nun kukey nwukwu-eykeyse etten
 receive said-Circum I-Top it-Nom who-from
senmwul-(ul)-inci kwungkumhata
 which present-Acc-Interr wonder
 'People said that John received some present from some friend,
 but I wonder from whom which present.'

Noting the interpretational contrast between (44) and (45), Takahashi concludes that the two sentences cannot be given the same analysis. He argues that (44) is a sluicing construction that results from IP deletion, and (45) is a cleft construction proper that has a pronominal subject.

As argued above in section 2.5.1, (44) cannot be analyzed as undergoing IP ellipsis. Then, the interpretational contrast between (44) and (45) should receive an alternative analysis.

What I would like to suggest on this matter is that the empty subject of the embedded clause in the second conjunct of (44) is derived by deleting the clefted clause, whereas the pronominal subject of the embedded clause in the second conjunct of (45) is base-generated as such.⁶

6. As a response to my claim that the overt pronominal subject *kukey/kukes-i* is base-generated as such in the cleft construction in Korean, one of the anonymous reviewers raises a question as to how to account for the Case retainability of clefted constituents discussed in section 3.1. To be more concrete, let me consider the following example (i), which is repeated from the example (14a) in the text:

- (i) a. con-i changmwun-ul pwuswuesstako hate-ntey ne-nu (**kukey**) **mwues-ulo-inci** al-ni?
 'People say that John broke the window, but do you know with what it is?'

The problem here is that the clefted remnant **mwues** 'what' comes with the particular Case particle **-ulo** 'with.' One way of accounting for the occurrence of this Case particle is to assume that it is licensed within the reconstructed clefted clause. In my analysis, then, I have to say that the overt pronominal subject **kukey** 'it' is replaced with the reconstructed clefted clause at LF since it is base-generated as such. The reviewer, however, points out that the LF replacement cannot make a right prediction for the surface realization of the Case particle at PF. As far as I can see, he assumes the so-called T model of grammar. Since PF and LF are

Under the deletion approach to ellipsis, an ellipsis site undergoes phonological suppression at PF. This means that at all syntactic levels, the elided string of words is identical in structural and interpretational roles to the phonologically realized string of words. Then, a prediction is that when a clefted clause is overtly realized in the subject position of the embedded clause in the second conjunct of (44), the sentence gets the expected pair-list interpretation. The prediction seems to be borne out, as in (46), which gets a pair-list interpretation:

- (46) con-i senmwul-lo patun key **nwukwu-eykeyse**
 John-Nom present -as receive that who -from
mwues-inci ne-nun al-ko iss-ni
 what -Interr you-Top know-Interr
 'From whom, what is it that John received as a present?'

The contrast between (44) and (46), on the one hand, and (45), on the other, provides conclusive evidence that the empty subject of the embedded clause in the second conjunct of (44) is not the empty counterpart of the pronominal, but the elided counterpart of the clefted clause.

Leaving the discussion, I would like to point out that the pronominal substitution of the clause where a pair-list interpretation is possible suppresses the interpretation. That is, it seems to me that when a pronoun occurs in the second conjunct, the example (47) does not have the pair-list interpretation that is available when the pronoun is not overt:

- (47) [con-i **nwukwu-eykeyse etten** **senmwul-ul** patassnunci]
 John-Nom who-from which present-Acc received-Interr
 meyri-ka alko isttako hatentey, ne-to (**kukes-ul**) al-ko issni
 Mary-Nom know-Comp said-Circum you-Add it -Acc know-Interr
 'People said that Mary knew [from whom, which present John received], but do you know it?'

not directly related, apparently an LF side licensing cannot exert its effect on the PF side realization. If, however, I accept the covert checking instead of the overt one (Chomsky (1995)), LF licensing of the Case particle in (i) does not raise a problem any longer.

This points to, at least, one thing. That is, the traditional assumption that the empty argument position is occupied by the small *pro* cannot be maintained, because, under that assumption, the overt pronoun and the empty *pro* are expected to behave in an identical way; however, they do not behave in the same way.

It has been demonstrated in this section that the phonologically null subject of the cleft construction is derived from deletion of a clefted clause rather than being base-generated as an empty pronominal as argued by Nishiyama et al. (1996) and K-W. Sohn (1998/2000). It has also been shown that the deletion approach to the empty subject of the construction is supported by the contrast in pair-list interpretation between the overt pronominal and the empty category in the subject position of the construction.

5. Summary and Conclusion

To summarize, in this paper I have explored the syntactic nature of the empty subject of the cleft construction in Korean. I have argued against Takahashi's and J-S. Kim's previous analysis of the construction at issue on a par with the sluicing construction in English. I have also examined the validity of Nishiyama et al.'s and K-W. Sohn's analysis, which each regards the construction at issue as a cleft construction with an empty pronominal subject. The analysis presented in this paper is in keeping with the latter analysis. However, crucially departing from it, I have argued that the empty subject of the construction is identified with a clefted clause rather than with an empty pronominal as argued by Nishiyama et al. and K-W. Sohn. Furthermore, I have also argued that the empty subject of the construction results from deletion of a clefted clause, which is evidenced by the interpretational contrast between the empty subject and the overt pronominal subject of the construction.

Though the analysis presented here seems to be successful, what has not been explored to a full length is whether the deletion approach to the empty subject of the cleft construction can be extended to all the empty categories in the argument position in Korean (and in Japanese). In the previous analyses, Huang (1988), Otani and Whitman (1991), and

E-J. Lee (1999) argue that empty objects in these languages result from the similar operation to VP deletion in English. But the pending issue is whether the same analysis can be applied to empty subjects. Even though the analysis advanced here paves a way for the deletion approach to empty subjects, I will leave open for a future research further work on this issue.

References

- Chomsky, Noam and Howard Lasnik (1993) *The theory of principles and parameters*. In *Syntax: An international handbook of contemporary research*, eds., J. Jobs et al. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter.
- Chomsky, Noam. (1995) *The Minimalist Program*, MIT Press., Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.
- Chung, Sandra, William Ladusaw and James McClosky. (1996) 'Sluicing and logical form,' *Natural Language Semantics* 3, 239-282.
- Fox, Danny and Howard Lasnik. (2001) Successive cyclic movement and island repair: The difference between sluicing and VP ellipsis, Ms., MIT and University of Connecticut.
- Huang, C.-T. James. (1988) 'Commenting on Hasegawa's paper,' in *Proceedings of Japanese syntax workshop. Issues in empty categories*, ed. Tawa Wako and Mineharu Nakayama, 77-93, Connecticut College, New London.
- Jhang, Sea-Eun. (1994) *Headed nominalization in Korean: Relative clauses, clefts, and comparatives*, Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Kim, Jeong-Seok. (1997) *Syntactic focus movement and ellipsis: A Minimalist perspective*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Lee, Eun-Ji. (1999) 'Identity of the null object and VP ellipsis,' *The Korean Journal of Linguistics* 24, 597-618.
- Lobeck, Anne. (1995) *Ellipsis. Functional heads, licensing and identification*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Nishiyama, Kunio, John Whitman and Eun-Young Yi. (1996) 'Syntactic movement of overt Wh-phrases in Japanese and Korean,' *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 5, 337-351.

- Otani, Kazuyo and John Whitman. (1991) 'V-raising and VP-ellipsis,' *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 345-358.
- Ross, John Roberts. (1969) 'Guess who?' Proceedings of *CLS* 5, 252-286.
- Sohn, Keun-Won. (1998) 'Clefting and sluicing,' an handout delivered at the Research Colloquia of Generative Studies.
- _____ (2000) 'A non-sluicing, non-clefting approach to copula construction,' *Studies in Generative Grammar* 10, 267-295.
- Takahashi, Daiko. (1994) 'Sluicing in Japanese,' *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 3, 241-265.

Department of English
Dongguk University
3-ga 26, Pil-dong, Chung-gu, Seoul, Korea
E-mail : parkmk@dgu.edu