

Case and Postposition Stranding in Multiple Fragments: Why is the Final Fragment (not) Special?*

Bum-Sik Park
Hyosik Kim
(Dongguk University)

Park, Bum-Sik and Kim, hyosik. (2015). Case and Postposition Stranding in Multiple Fragments: Why is the Final Fragment (not) Special?. *Language Research*, 51.3, 569-596.

This paper examines the variability of Dependent Marker (DM) drop in multiple fragments. Building on Park (2013), we first observe that only the right-most fragment can optionally drop in multiple fragment answers, which is hard to be captured by the main approaches to fragments. Assuming that multiple fragments are derived by ellipsis we argue that stranding DM (i.e., case-marker and postposition) is possible under ellipsis, but that DM-stranding movement across an intervener outside of ellipsis site leads to a PF-crash, therefore capturing the fact that only the right-most fragment can strand its DM. The analysis can also capture a puzzling fact that Korean allows postposition stranding although it is not a P-stranding language under regular movement (Merchant 2001). Finally, it is shown that the analysis can be extended to a different type of fragments, dubbed as focus doubling construction.

Keywords: multiple fragments, case stranding, postposition stranding, P-stranding, ellipsis, repair by ellipsis

1. Introduction

Fragments in Korean exhibit an interesting property regarding the possi-

* An earlier version of this work was presented at the 9th International Workshop on Theoretical East Asian Linguistics (2014, the University of Nantes) and the 89th Annual Meeting of the LSA (2015, Portland). We are very grateful to the audience, and especially to Sei-Rang Oh and Suyoung Bae for insightful discussion and judgments. We also thank three anonymous reviewers of *Language Research* for helpful comments and criticism. All remaining errors are solely ours. This work was supported, in part, by the National Research Foundation Grant funded by the Korean Government (NRF-2013S1A5A2A03044783), given to the first author.

bility of omitting dependent markers (DM, henceforth) such as case-markers and postpositions. As shown in (B)-examples in (1)-(3) below, these markers can optionally be omitted/dropped in fragments. In contrast, in non-fragment, full-sentential environments these markers must be retained as shown in (C)-examples:¹⁾

- (1) A: **nwu-ka** Yenghi-lul manness-ni?
 who-Nom Y.-Acc met-Q
 B: Chelswu(-ka)
 C.-Nom
 ‘Chelswu’
 C: Chelswu*(-ka) Yenghi-lul manness-e
 C.-Nom Y.-Acc met-Dec
 ‘Chelswu met Yenghi.’
- (2) A: Chelswu-ka **nwukwu-ekey** nonmun-ul ponass-ni?
 C.-Nom who-Dat paper-Acc sent-Q
 ‘Who did Chelswu send a paper?’
 B: Minswu(-ekey)
 M.-Dat
 ‘Minswu’
 C: Chelswu-ka Minswu*(-ekey) nonmun-ul ponass-e
 C.-Nom M.-Dat paper-Acc sent-Dec
 ‘Chelswu sent Minswu a paper.’

1) The accusative marker of an object is an exception when the object appears adjacent to the predicate as shown in (i) (Kuno 1972; Saito 1985). To avoid potential complications, in what follows we will not discuss omission of accusative marker in this context (see Park 2013 for related discussion).

- (i) a. Chelswu-ka nonmwun(-lul) ilkess-e
 C.-Nom paper-Acc read-Dec
 ‘Chelswu read a paper.’
 b. Chelswu-ka nonmwun*(-lul) Yenghi-ekey ponass-e
 C.-Nom paper-Acc Y.-DAT sent-Dec
 ‘Chelswu sent a paper to Yenghi.’

- (3) A: Chelswu-ka **nwukwu-lo pwuthe** ton-ul patass-ni?
 C.-Nom who-from money received-Q
 ‘Who did Chelswu received money from?’
 B: Yenghi(-lo pwuthe)
 Y.-from
 ‘From Yenghi’
 C: Chelswu-ka Yenghi*(-lo pwuthe) ton-ul patass-e
 C.-Nom Y.-from money-Acc received-Dec

At first glance, omission of dependent markers in fragments seems to occur freely. However, as is observed by Park (2013), it becomes pretty restricted in multiple fragment answer (MFA) environments. As shown in the following examples, when two NPs appear as fragments, only the second fragment can drop its dependent marker (DM) (cf. Choi and Yoon 2009; Ahn 2012):²⁾

- (4) A: **nwu-ka nwukwu-ekey** nonmun-ul ponass-ni?
 who-Nom who-Dat paper-Acc sent-Q
 ‘Who sent whom a paper?’
 B: Chelswu-ka Minswu-ekey C.-Nom M.-Dat
 C: *Chelswu-Ø Minswu-ekey
 D: (?)Chelswu-ka Minswu-Ø
 E: *Chelswu-Ø Minswu-Ø
- (5) A: **nwu-ka nwukwu-lo pwuthe** ton-ul patass-ni?
 who-Nom who-from money-Acc received-Q
 ‘Who received money from whom?’
 B: Chelswu-ka Yenghi-lo pwuthe
 C.-Nom Y-from
 C: Chelswu-ka Yenghi-Ø
 D: *Chelswu-Ø Yenghi-lo pwuthe
 E: *Chelswu-Ø Yenghi-Ø

2) Ø indicates omission/dropping of DM.

- (6) A: [nwukwu-lo pwuthe]i nwu-ka t_i ton-ul patass-ni?
 who-from who-Nom money-Acc received-Q
 ‘Who received money from whom?’
 B: Yenghi-lo pwuthe Chelswu-ka
 Y.-from C.-Nom
 C: ?Yenghi-lo pwuthe Chelswu-Ø
 D: *Yenghi-Ø Chelswu-ka
 E: *Yenghi-Ø Chelswu-Ø

Based on the restricted pattern, Park (2013) proposes the Multiple FA Generalization in (7) and provides two potential ways of deducing it:³⁾

- (7) Multiple FA Generalization (Park 2013: (22))
 Multiple FAs that have the form of [NP-maker, NP-marker/-Ø]
 are acceptable, but not [NP-Ø, NP-marker/-Ø]

In this paper, we will show that the generalization is merely part of a bigger generalization and thus needs to be modified accordingly. We will also show that Park’s analysis falls short of dealing with the modified generalization and suggest that the generalization can be deduced from interactions of DM-stranding and ellipsis at PF.

3) Note that the same pattern is observed when the subject and the object fragment are involved as shown in (iB). For some speakers, when these fragments all lack their case-marker, the status gets slightly improved. We conjecture that for these speakers the subject fragment is understood as a left-dislocated element in the sense of Ahn and Cho (2007). This might account for the fact that when an adjunct fragment precedes as in (ii) the fragments become severely degraded even for those speakers:

- (i) A: nwu-ka mwues-ul mekess-ni?
 who-Nom what-Acc ate-Q
 ‘Who ate what?’
 B: Chelswu*(-ka) ppang(-ul)
 C.-Nom bread-Acc
 ‘Chelswu ate bread.’
- (ii) A: encey nwu-ka mwues-ul mekess-ni?
 when who-Nom what-Acc ate-Q
 ‘Who ate what and when?’
 B: *ecey Chelswu ppang
 yesterday C. bread
 ‘Chelswu ate bread yesterday.’

2. Dependent Marker Drop Generalization in MFA

The Multiple FA Generalization (7) is to capture the possibility of dependent marker drop in the environment where the number of fragments is two. However, the generalization is merely part of a bigger one. As shown in (8)-(9), when more than two fragments are involved it turns out that only the right-most fragment can drop its DM, about which the generalization in (7) is silent (see also Park and Kim 2014, 2015; An 2015; Ku and Cho 2014):

- (8) A: **nwu-ka mwues-ul nwukwu-ekey** ponayss-ni?
 who-Nom what-Acc who-Dat sent-Q
 ‘Who gave what to whom?’
 B: Chelswu*(-ka) ton?*(-lul) Yenghi(-ekey)
 C.-Nom money-Acc Y.-Dat
 ‘Chelswu sent money to Yenghi.’
- (9) A: **nwu-ka mwues-ul nwukwu-lo pwuthe** patass-ni?
 who-Nom what-Acc who-from received-Q
 ‘Who received what from whom?’
 B: Chelswu*(-ka) ton*(-ul) Yenghi²(-lo pwuthe)
 C.-Nom money-Acc Y.-from
 ‘Chelswu received money from Yenghi.’

Furthermore, a caseless argument can appear with an adjunct fragment, but again in a restricted way. As shown in (10B) and (10C), an adjunct fragment can precede a caseless argument fragment but when they appear in the opposite order the fragments are not acceptable:

- (10) A: Chelswu-ka (**encey**) **nwukwu-lo pwuthe** (**encey**) ton-ul patass-ni?
 C.-Nom when who-from when money-Acc received-Q
 ‘When did John borrow money from whom?’
 B: ecey Yenghi(-lo pwuthe)
 yesterday Y. -from
 ‘Yesterday, from Yenghi, Chelswu borrowed money.’
 C: *Yenghi ecey
 Y. yesterday

Given that in non-fragment environments DM cannot be dropped, the right-most fragment is very special in that only it can drop its DM. Thus we propose that the generalization (7) needs to be revised as (11):

(11) Dependent Marker Drop Generalization in MFA

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

Note here that (11) is also intended to capture cases like (10) where both an argument fragment and an adjunct fragment are involved. Being a non-right-most-fragment, the argument fragment in (10C) cannot drop its case-marker, given the generalization in (11). For adjuncts, being inherently non-DMed, it is trivially true that they can appear in a ‘bear’ form in any position.⁴⁾

Park (2013) points out that the Multiple FA generalization (7), if true, presents non-trivial problems for major approaches to fragments. Given that the Dependent Marker Drop Generalization in MFA (11) is just a revised version of (7), the same problems still carry over to these approaches. For example, under the Direct Interpretation Approach, the fragments are derived via some pragmatic process, not involving any hidden syntactic structures (cf. Yanofsky 1978; Morgan 1989; Barton 1990; Stainton 1993, 1994, 2006; Barton and Progovac 2005; Kim 2015). However, the word order effect that only the right-most fragment can be in a bare form seems very hard to be explained under this approach. The same problem arises for the Dependent Marking Parameter analysis proposed by Choi and Yoon (2009) and Choi (2007). According to the

4) In other words, the statement (11) mutually entails the following one: In MFA environments, the non-right-most fragments cannot drop their DMs. Anticipating what we propose later (Sect. 4), this statement may well be more appropriate one.

A reviewer suggests a way of deducing the generalization: the right most fragment seems to bear the most prominent focus and thus drop its DM. Although it seems to be an interesting possibility, it is not clear to us whether the right-most fragment is indeed special in this way. Even if it is so, the question that arises is why prominent focus would allow DM-drop. Note also that in line with Lasnik (2013), Ahn (2012) suggests that MFA involves movement of the second fragment to a post-verbal position. But Park and Oh (2014) convincingly argues that MFA is derived from a mono-clause, which we adopt in this paper.

analysis, presence of DM plays a crucial role in allowing MFA. This entails that when the fragments in MFA all lack their DMs, this leads to the acceptability. This would successfully account for why fragments in (8) and (9) become unacceptable when they all lack dependent markers. But it fails to account for why only the right-most fragment, but not the other fragments, can optionally drop its DM.

Park (2013) offers two potential directions to deduce the generalization (7). In the next section, we introduce his analysis and discuss whether it can be extended to capture the Dependent Marker Drop Generalization (11).

3. *Pro*/(Pseudo-)cleft and Ellipsis

As a first attempt to deduce the generalization (7), Park (2013) pursues *pro*/(pseudo-)cleft approach. According to this approach, the singleton bare fragment answer in (1), repeated as (12), involves the underlying source in (13), where *pro* is represented as the overt pronominal element *kuken* ‘it’ that seems to refer to various entities in the antecedent including the presupposition part in a (pseudo-)cleft.

- (12) A: **nwu-ka** Yenghi-lul mannass-ni?
 who-Nom Y.-Acc met-Q
 ‘Who met Yenghi?’

B: Chelswu

- (13) B: *kuken*(/Yenghi-lul mannan-ken/) Chelswu
 it Y.-Acc met-KEN C.
 ‘It (/The person who met Yenghi/) was Chelswu.’

As Park himself points out, however, this analysis faces a potential problem for MFA. For instance, the contrast between the acceptable MFA in (5C), repeated as (14C), and the degraded status of its potential *pro*/(pseudo-)cleft source in (15) remains unaccounted for under this analysis.⁵⁾

5) When all the relevant DMs are retained in MFA as in (14B), Park assumes that they

- (14) A: **nwu-ka** **nwukwu-lo pwuthe** ton-ul patass-ni?
 who-Nom who-from money-Acc received-Q
 ‘Who received money from whom?’
 B: Chelswu-ka Yenghi-lo pwuthe
 C: Chelswu-ka Yenghi-Ø
- (15) C ??/?*kuken(/ton-ul patun-ken/) Chelswu-ka Yenghi(-ya)
 it money-Acc received-KEN C.-Nom Y.(-YA)
 ‘*It (/The persons who received money/) was Chelswu, Yenghi.’

The contrast becomes more conspicuous when we consider cases where more than two fragments are involved. Let us take (9) as an example. Given the Dependent Marker Drop Generalization (11), only the right-most element can be dropped as shown in (16B). But the potential *pro*/(pseudo)-cleft source in (17) is severely degraded:

- (16) A: **nwu-ka** **mwues-ul** **nwukwu-lo pwuthe** patass-ni? (=9A)
 who-Nom what-Acc who-from received
 ‘Who received what from whom?’
 B: ?Chelswu-ka ton-ul Yenghi-Ø
- (17) *kuken (/patun-ken/) Chelswu-ka ton-ul Yenghi(-ya)
 it received C.-Nom money-Acc Y.(-YA)
 ‘*It (/The person who received something from someone/) was C.,
 money, Y.’

Given the problem pointed out for examples like (14)-(15), Park pursues another approach, what he calls Deterministic *pro*/cleft + ellipsis analysis.⁶⁾ Considering cases where only two fragments are involved, he suggests that when the first fragment is bare, the fragments must be derived from the *pro*/(pseudo)-cleft source. On the other hand, when the first fragment bears a DM, the fragments must be derived via ellipsis. This is exemplified in (18):

are derived via TP-ellipsis, preceded by multiple fronting of the focused elements (Park 2015a,b; Merchant 2004).

6) The term *pro*/cleft is equivalent to the term *pro*/(pseudo)-cleft used in this paper. For simplicity, we use the latter term throughout the paper.

- (18) A: **nwu-ka nwukwu-lul wuyhay** noray pwules-ni? (Park 2013: (28))
 who-Nom who-Acc for song sang-Q
 ‘Who sang a song for whom?’
- B: Chelswu-ka Yenghi-lul wuyhay ⇐ ellipsis
 B’: (?)Chelswu-ka Yenghi-Ø ⇐ ellipsis
 B’’: *Chelswu-Ø Yenghi-lul wuyhay ⇐ *pro*/(pseudo)-cleft
 (*kuken [Chelswu Yenghi-lul wuyhay])
 it C. Y.-Acc for
 B’’’: *Chelswu-Ø Yenghi-Ø ⇐ *pro*/(pseudo)-cleft
 (*kuken [Chelswu Yenghi])
 it C. Y.

As shown above, when the first fragment of the two is bare as shown in (18B’’) and (18B’’’), the fragments is determined to be derived from only the *pro*/(pseudo)-cleft source. This is supported by the fact that the unacceptability of (18B’’) and (18B’’’) tracks the unacceptability of the corresponding *pro*/(pseudo)-cleft sources (as shown with the expressions in the parentheses in (18B’’) and (18B’’’’)).

In contrast, when the first fragment bears a case-marker as in (18B) and (18B’), the fragments must be derived by ellipsis of TP. What is interesting here is that the second fragment in (18B’) lacks its postposition and the fragments are fairly acceptable. In line with Ahn and Cho (2006) and Kim (2010), Park suggests that the DM of the second fragment can be stranded within the elliptical site, as shown in (19).

- (19) Chelswu-ka_i Yenghi_i [_i t_i t_i-lul wuyhay noray pwules-e] [Derivation of (18B’)]
 C.-Nom Y. Acc for song sang
 ‘Chelswu sang a song for Yenghi.’

Note here that in non-elliptical environments, stranding DM is prohibited as in (20) for morphological reasons. However, he assumes with Ahn and Cho (2006) that stranding DM within the elliptical site is allowed since ellipsis can rescue the structure by virtue of eliminating the stranded DM (cf. Chomsky 1972; Merchant 2001; Fox and Lasnik 2003).

- (20) *Yenghi_i [Chelswu-ka_i t_j-lul wuyhay noray pwulesse-e]
 Y. C.-Nom -Acc for song sang-Dec
 ‘Chelswu sang a song for Yenghi.’

This analysis, however, is also silent about cases where more than two fragments are involved. Let us consider (8) again, repeated as (21) below:

- (21) A: **nwu-ka mwues-ul nwukwu-ekey** ponayss-ni?
 who-Nom what-Acc whom-Dat sent-Q
 ‘Who gave what to whom?’
 B: Chelswu*(-ka) ton[?]*(-lul) Yenghi(-ekey)
 C.-Nom money-Acc Y.-Dat
 ‘Chelswu sent money to Yenghi.’

Recall that given the Dependent Marker Drop Generalization (11), only the right-most element can be bare, as shown (21B). Of the various unacceptable fragment answer combinations arising from (21B), what is relevant to our discussion is the one in (22). (22) is pretty degraded but the degradedness doesn’t seem to be captured by the Deterministic *pro*/cleft + ellipsis analysis. If we assume that bearing its case-marker, the first fragment requires the application of ellipsis deterministically, (22) should be acceptable, contrary to fact. The case markers of the second and third fragment would be stranded within the ellipsis site, and thus nothing would correctly rule out (22):

- (22) *Chelswu-ka ton-Ø Yenghi-Ø

In the next section we offer an account to deduce the Dependent Marker Drop Generalization (11). Specifically, we assume in line with Park (2013) that *a priori* DMs can be stranded within the elliptical site, but argue that in MFA only the right-most element is allowed to strand its DM. We will argue that this restriction naturally comes about since DM-stranding movement has an effect outside the ellipsis site.

4. Stranding Case-markers and Postpositions in Ellipsis Site

In this section, we attempt to deduce the Dependent Marker Drop Generalization based on the ellipsis approach to fragments. Specifically, we propose to modify Park's (2013) analysis of fragments. Recall that in his second attempt, Park suggests that Dependent Markers (DM) can be stranded, and subsequent ellipsis of a constituent containing the stranded DM repairs the structure at PF. The ellipsis process repairs the structure since the stranded DM induces a PF-crash. To capture the generalization, however, we propose that not only the stranded DM leads to a PF-crash, but the intervening element located between the moved NP and its stranded DM leads to a PF-crash since it breaks the dependency between them at PF. This suggests that to rescue the structure, the intervener must also be deleted. Our proposal is stated in detail below:

(23) PROPOSAL

I. We propose that DM-stranding movement has an effect on the intervening element (as well as on the stranded DM) in PF. That is, the intervening element (YP), as well as the stranded DM leads to a PF-crash.

⇒ * $[XP_i \ [_{TP} \ ..YP.. \ [t_i-DM]..]]$

II. When the subsequent TP-ellipsis eliminates YP, the structure is repaired (since both YP and the stranded DM are eliminated)

⇒ $[XP_i \ [_{TP} \ ..\cancel{YP}.. \ [t_i-\cancel{DM}]..]]$

III. However, when an intervening element (ZP), survives TP-ellipsis, no repair effect is detected.

⇒ * $[XP_i \ ZP \ [_{TP} \ ..\cancel{YP}.. \ [t_i-DM]..]]$

(23I) and (23II) are supposed to explain how bare singleton fragment such as (24B) is derived. The derivational steps of (24B) are shown in (25) (See also Park 2015 for arguments that bare singleton fragment can be derived in the same way).

- (24) A: Chelswu-ka **nwukwu-ekey** Mary-lul sokayhass-ni?
 C.-Nom who-Dat Mary-Acc introduced-Q
 Who did Chelswu introduce Mary to?

B: Minswu

- (25) a. Minswu_i [_{TP} ~~Chelswu-ka~~ t_i-ekey Mary-lul sokayhass-e] ⇒
 b. Minswu_i [_{TP} ~~Chelswu-ka~~ t_i-ekey ~~Mary-lul sokayhass-e~~]

The movement of *Minswu* strands its dative case-maker within the TP in (25a). Without TP-ellipsis it will lead to a PF-crash. We suggest that (25a) is unacceptable without ellipsis since there exist two (closely-related) trouble makers at PF. The first trouble maker is the stranded DM, since as the term ‘dependent’ already implies, the dependent marker *-ekey* cannot be stranded from its host NP. We propose that any intervening element between the moved NP and its dependent marker also counts as a trouble maker at PF, since it separates the moved NP and its stranded DM and thus breaks the dependency between them. This makes the subject *Chelswu-ka* in (25a) an intervener and has an effect in PF. When TP-ellipsis takes place, however, these trouble makers are all eliminated as shown in (25b), giving rise to a repair effect.

(23III) is supposed to directly deduce the Dependent Marker Drop Generalization in MFA (11). Here XP and ZP are multiple fragments that are extracted inside from TP, and the former has moved across both ZP and YP, stranding its DM behind within TP. Without ellipsis, there are three trouble makers at PF: ZP, YP and the stranded DM. What happens when TP-ellipsis takes place? It only eliminates the latter two. The remaining intervener ZP survives TP-ellipsis and thus leads to a PF-crash. This entails that only the right-most element can strand its dependent markers and thus deduce the generalization.⁷⁾

7) We assume that both XP and ZP undergoes to focus movement to FP. The timing of movement and where ZP is originated in TP are immaterial since being located between XP and its stranded DM after movement takes place, ZP will always count as an intervener. (Thus we do not indicate where ZP is originated from in TP in (23III)). Note also that as a reviewer points out, it is plausible to assume that the case-maker is a head projecting to KP. Then the DM-stranding is understood as K-stranding here.

To see this more clearly, let us consider (5), repeated as (26):

- (26) A: **nwu-ka nwukwu-lo pwuthe** ton-ul patass-ni?
 who-Nom who-from money-Acc received-Q
 ‘Who received money from whom?’
 B: Chelswu-ka Yenghi-lo pwuthe
 C: Chelswu-ka Yenghi-Ø
 D: *Chelswu-Ø Yenghi-lo pwuthe
 E: *Chelswu-Ø Yenghi-Ø

(26D) and (26E) are unacceptable since the final fragment is the intervener located between the first fragment and its stranded DM. In contrast, there is no intervener that survives TP-ellipsis in (26C). ((26B) does not involve any trouble makers to begin with.) The same account applies to cases where more than two fragments are involved.

Under the proposed analysis, the Dependent Marker Drop Generalization (11) can be restated as the following (cf. fn. 4): In MFA, the non-final fragments are not allowed to strand their DMs. (In other words, non-final fragments, not the final fragment, are special in that they cannot drop their DMs.) The reason is obvious. They cannot strand their DMs since there will always be at least one intervener to their right.⁸⁾

Note that the gist of this analysis is that ‘illegitimate’ movement (i.e., movement that strands DM and crosses the intervener) has an effect on the intervener outside the ellipsis domain at PF. A similar effect also

8) Two reviewers wonder whether the proposed analysis can extend to MFA that involves LBE of modifiers. As shown in (i), the LBEed AP cannot precede another fragment:

- (i) A: **nwukwu-uy tongsayng-i mwues-ul sass-ni?**
 Who-Gen brother-Nom what-Acc bought-Q
 ‘Whose brother bought what?’
 B: *Chelswu-uy chayk-ul
 C.-Gen book-Acc
 Intended: ‘Chelswu’s brother bought a book.’

It seems that the unacceptability of (ib) can be captured under the proposed analysis with the assumption that LBE of the possessor in (iB) renders the second fragment the surviving intervener (Park and Oh 2015). Although the analysis would straightforwardly capture (i), there are some compounding issues. See fn. 15 for discussion.

has been observed for English. Since Ross (1969), it has become a standard assumption that sluicing repairs island violations, as shown in (27).

(27) a. I believe the claim that he bit someone, but they don't know who I ~~believe the claim that he~~ bit.

(Complex NP Constraint, noun complement)

b. They want to hire someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which (Balkan language) they ~~want to hire someone who speaks~~ t.

(Complex NP Constraint, relative clause)

Chomsky (1972) proposes that the island-crossing movement of the *wh*-phrase a *-feature on the island itself and that subsequent (TP-)ellipsis get rid of this *-feature, yielding the amelioration effect. This, however, cannot be the whole story since VP-ellipsis in the same environment fails to repair the structure (Chung, Ladusaw, and McClosky 1995; Lasnik 2001, Merchant 2001):

(28) a. *I believe the claim that he bit someone, but they don't know who I do [_{VP} ~~believe he claim that he~~ bit].

b. *They want to hire someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which (Balkan language) they do [_{VP} ~~want to hire someone who speaks~~ t].

Two main analyses have been proposed. Fox and Lasnik (2003) suggests that the ungrammaticality arises due to interactions of a Parallelism constraint on ellipsis (Fiengo and May 1994) and locality of movement. Assuming that the indefinite correlate does not move but is bound by a choice function operator (Reinhart 1997), they claim that Parallelism ensures one-fell-swoop movement of the *wh*-phrase in the elliptical clause. This will violate locality of movement on the every crossed maximal projection, encoded with a * on it. TP-ellipsis gets rid of all the *'s whereas VP-ellipsis doesn't. In (28), for instance, the * on TP and AspP still survives VP-ellipsis.

Merchant (2008) also takes advantage of *-marking but without assuming Parallelism. Assuming, with Chomsky (1986), Fox (2000), and López and Winkler (2003), that *wh*-movement proceeds by adjunction to intervening maximal projections, he suggests that island-escaping XPs are marked with the *-feature, due to a violation of locality. All subsequent copies/traces of this *XP will themselves also be *-marked. Finally, he assumes that the *-feature can be erased (checked) in the final spec-head relation that a +*wh* XP comes to be in with a +*wh* C. Under this analysis, the contrast between TP-ellipsis and VP-ellipsis regarding island repair possibility comes about naturally. Only in the VP-ellipsis environment in (28) there remain copies of *wh*-phrase that bear *-feature at PF.

An interesting consequence of these two analyses is that the island-violating extraction has the effect outside the island itself (contra Chomsky 1972), thereby resulting in the contrast between VP-ellipsis and TP-ellipsis. Our analysis of multiple fragments has the same consequence. The DM-stranding movement has an effect on the element (i.e., intervener) outside the elliptical site (=TP). Since it is located outside of TP, ellipsis of TP does not repair the structure (entirely).⁹⁾

5. Postposition Stranding from a Typological Perspective

In the previous section, we have argued that being a type of DM, postpositions *a priori* can be stranded under ellipsis. If true, this has some interesting typological consequence. Merchant (2001) observes that there is a striking correlation between the behavior of *wh*-movement under sluicing and that of regular *wh*-phrase movement regarding the (im)possibility of preposition stranding across languages. What he calls P-stranding Generalization is given in (29):

9) Given the similarity, it seems possible to recast the proposed analysis in terms of *-marking with certain assumptions on the timing of multiple focus movement (see Park and Kim 2014, 2015 for this line of approach). In this paper, however, we do not adopt a version of the *-marking approach since it would require complicated assumptions, e.g., regarding the timing of multiple focus movement.

(29) P-stranding Generalization (Merchant, 2001:92)

A language L will allow preposition stranding under sluicing iff
L allows prepositionstranding under regular *wh*-movement.

The English data in (30)-(31) and the Greek data in (32)-(33) below are some of the representative examples:

(30) Who was Peter talking with?

(31) Peter was talking with someone, but I don't know (with) who.

(32) *Pjon milise me?

who she.spoke with

Intended: 'Who did she speak with?'

(33) I Anna milise me kapjon, alla dhe ksero *(me) pjon.

the Anna spoke with someone but not I.know with who

'Anna spoke with someone, but I don't know with who.'

(Greek, Merchant, 2001:94)

Recall that Korean does not permit postposition stranding under any non-elliptical environments (as shown in (20)). Thus if we naturally extend Merchant's P-stranding Generalization to fragments, we would predict that postposition stranding must be disallowed, contrary to fact. This suggests that Korean does not belong to the reported typology.

The conclusion might be too hasty since it is often reported that there are some languages that do not permit P-stranding under regular *wh*-movement but still allows it under sluicing. For instance, as noted by Vicente (2008), Spanish is one of the languages. However, Vicente argues that these examples do not constitute a real problem for the P-stranding Generalization since it is derived from a cleft source (see also Rodrigues et al., 2009). The cleft analysis of sluicing has also been proposed for other languages, including French, Italian (Vicente 2008) and Polish (Szczeplniak 2005, 2008). Crucially, however, Korean does not take

advantage of this kind of strategy (see dissuasion in Section 3). The relevant examples (16)-(17) are reproduced below as (34)-(35), respectively, for convenience.

- (34) A: **nwu-ka** **mwues-ul** **nwukwu-lo** **pwuthe** patass-ni?
 who-Nom what-Acc who-from received
 ‘Who received what from whom?’
 B: ?Chwlswu-ka ton-ul Yenghi-Ø

- (35) *kuken (/patun-ken/) Chelswu-ka ton-ul Yenghi(-ya)
 it received C.-Nom money-Acc Y.(-YA)
 ‘*It (/The person who received something from someone/) was
 C., money, Y.’

In (34B), the right-most fragment strands its postposition. Importantly, as shown in (35) the (pseudo-)cleft or *pro* source cannot underlie the fragments in (34B), which differentiates Korean from the Spanish type languages (see also Sato 2011 and Park 2015 for relevant discussion).

It is unclear to us that what underlying properties make Korean different from other types of language with respect to postposition-stranding under ellipsis. Although further research is required, it seems fruitful to take into consideration the case-marker stranding as well, as it exhibits the same pattern as the postposition-stranding in MFA.¹⁰⁾

In the next section, we will extend our analysis to a different type of fragment construction, called Focus Doubling Construction. If successful, this shows that the proposed analysis can be applicable to fragments in general. Furthermore the construction also presents non-trivial issues for some alternative approaches to fragments.

10) Two reviewers wonder if we assume that case-markers and postpositions are of the same category. We don't: we simply argue that they are dependent markers (cf. Choi 2007) and thus exhibit the same pattern in the relevant respects as discussed above.

6. Focus Doubling

Korean allows a construction where an NP is duplicated in the sentence initial position as shown in (36). What is interesting for the discussion to follow is that the duplicated NP can optionally drop its case-marker or postposition.

- (36) a. nonmwun(-ul), Chelswu-nun nonmwun-ul ilkess-e
 paper-Acc C.-Top paper-Acc read-Dec
 'John read a PAPER.'
- b. Chelswu(-ka), (onul) Chelswu-ka nonmun-ul ilkess-e
 C-Nom today C.-Nom paper-Acc read-Dec
 'CHELSWU read a paper.'
- c. Yenghi(-ekey), (onul) Chelswu-ka Yenghi-ekey nonmun-ul ponass-e
 Y.-Dat today C.-Nom Y.-Dat paper-Acc sent-Dec
 'Today Chelswu sent YENGHI a paper.'

To our best knowledge, Akiyama (2014) is the first one who observes and provides an analysis of this kind of construction for the corresponding Japanese construction. He observes that the duplicated NP in the sentence initial position and the original NP in the subsequent clause bear a certain amount of focus. Thus he calls the construction Focus Doubling Construction (FDC). He argues that FDC consists of two separate clauses conjoined with a null conjunction (which is marked by a pause), and that the sentence-initial focused NP is derived from the first clause via ellipsis.¹¹⁾ Crucially, he argues that the focused NP in the first clause in (36) need not be extracted out of it, but can remain in situ, followed by application of non-constituent ellipsis within the first clause. The derivation of (36a) is schematically represented in (37). One of the advantages of assuming the non-constituent ellipsis is that the case-marker can optionally be included in the domain of ellipsis as shown (37), therefore yielding the caseless NP.¹²⁾

11) One of the arguments for the claim that two separate sentences are involved has to do with licensing of the negative polarity items like *-sika* 'only'. Later in this section, we will provide an additional argument that has to do with binding and scope interactions.

12) It is not entirely clear to us whether the singleton case-marked NP can or must be

(37) [_{TP1} ..X.. nonmwun-lul ..Y:] (Conj) [_{TP2} ..X.. nonmwun-lul ..Y..]

Interestingly, FDC allows multiple NPs sentence-initially and they must observe the same restriction observed for MFAs discussed above: FDC is also subject to the Dependent Marker Generalization (11). As shown in (38), only the right-most NP can drop its case-marker. Given the correlation between FDC and MFA, it is now obvious that the same analysis proposed for Multiple Fragment Answers also straightforwardly accounts for these facts:¹³

- (38) a. Chelswu*(-ka) nonmwun(-ul), onul Chelswu-ka nonmwun-ul ilkess-e
 C.-Nom paper-Acc today C.-Nom paper read-Dec
 'Today, CHELSWU read a PAPER.'
- b. Chelswu*(-ka) nonmwun*(-ul) Yenghi[?](-lo pwuthe), onul Chelswu-ka
 C.-Nom paper-Acc Y.-from today C.-Nom
 nonmwun-ul Yenghi-lo pwuthe patass-e
 paper-Acc Y.-from received-Dec
 'Today, CHELSWU received a PAPER from YENGHI.'

Akiyama (2014), however, offers a different account. To account for the fact that only the final fragment can optionally drop its DM, he makes several assumptions in such a way to force all the NPs except the final

derived in situ under Akiyama's analysis. If it must be, one should assume that ellipsis can optionally exclude the case marker as in (i). This uncertainty however will not affect the discussion in this section. What is crucial for our purposes is that under Akiyama's analysis the caseless NP must be derived in situ. (See discussion below.)

(i) [_{TP1} ..X.. nonmwun-lul ..Y:] (Conj) [_{TP2} ..X.. nonmwun-lul ..Y..]

- 13) Akiyama provides one argument for his in-situ analysis. As shown in (ia), the case-marker of the fronted *wh*-object is not allowed to drop (we are providing corresponding Korean examples). However, the same *wh*-object can drop its case-marker in FDC as in (ib). Thus, he concludes that as a sole NP remnant in (ib), the *wh*-object must not be fronted but be in situ. Note that this contrast can also be captured by our analysis, since it allows case-stranding only within the elliptical site.

- (i) a. *mwe, John-i nwukwu-ekey cwuess-ni?
 what J.-Nom who-Dat gave-Q
 'What did John give to whom?'
 b. mwe?(-lul), John-i Bill-ekey mwe(-lul) cwuess-ni?
 what-Acc J.-Nom Bill-Dat what-Acc gave-Q
 'What did John give to Bill?'

one to undergo movement to FocP. Given that Akiyama assumes that NP-movement does not strand its DM, the moved NPs must bear their case-makers. In contrast, the case-marker of the final NP that remains in situ does not need to bear its case marker since the non-constituent ellipsis can (optionally) target its case marker. The derivation of (38a) is schematically shown in (39):

- (39) [_{FocP} Chelswu-ka_i [_{TP1} ..t_i.. nonmwun-lul ..Y..]] (Conj) [_{TP2}]

This analysis however faces both theoretical and empirical problems. Recall that the crucial aspect of his analysis is the assumption that non-constituent ellipsis is allowed. However, the standard assumption is that as a grammatical operation, ellipsis can only target constituents. As an illustration, let us consider Pseudogapping as in (40a):

- (40) a. John considered Mary smart and Bill did Sue
 b. John considered Mary smart and Bill did Sue consider-t_i-smart.
 c. John considered Mary smart and Bill did consider Sue smart.

The standard take on Pseudogapping is to assume the derivation in (40b), where the focused object undergoes an object ‘shift’ out of VP, followed by VP-ellipsis (see Lasnik 1999, Johnson 2001 for arguments). An approach that assumes derivations like (40b) has not seriously been put forward because it would employ non-constituent ellipsis.

Being theoretical, the objection might turn out not to be strong. Still, the analysis faces some empirical problems as well. The first has to do with binding. Let us consider (41). As is well known that scrambled/fronted NP can bind into the anaphoric subject as shown in (41b):

- (41) a. ?*selo_i-uy pwumo-ka [John kwa Mary]_i-lul pinanhass-e
 each other-Gen parents-Nom J. and M.-Acc blamed
 ‘*Each other’s parents blamed John and Mary.’
 b. [[John kwa Mary]_i-lul [selo_i-uy pwumo-ka t_i pinanhass-e]
 J. and M.-Acc each other-Gen parents-Nom blamed
 With this in mind, let us consider (42):

- (42) John kwa Mary-(lul), onul [John kwa Mary]_i-lul [selo_i-uy pwumo-ka t_i pinanhass-e]
 J. and M.-Acc today J. and M.-Acc each other-Gen parents-Nom blamed
 ‘*Today each other’s parents blamed JOHN and MARY.’

The second clause in (42) is identical with (41b) and thus Principle A is satisfied. Recall that under Akiyama’s analysis, the caseless NP in (42) indicates that it must remain in situ in the first clause as shown in (43), where ellipsis has not taken place. The configuration in (43) is identical with the one in (41a) and thus (43) violates Principle A. The conclusion is that (43) cannot be the underlying source of (42):

- (43) ?*[_{TP1} [selo_i-uy pwumo-ka] [John kwa Mary]_i-lul pinanhass-e] (Conj) [_{TP2} ...]

Note that vehicle-changing the subject *selo-uy pwumo-ka* ‘each other’s parents’ into the pronoun *kutul-i* ‘they-Nom’ would not improve the status, as shown in (44). Here the coreference between the pronoun in the first clause and the anaphor in the second is strongly disfavored and thus induces a semantic incongruity under the intended interpretation:

- (44) #[*kutul-i*]_j John kwa Mary-lul pinanhass-e, (Conj) onul [John kwa Mary]_i-lul
 they-Nom J. and M.-Acc blamed today J. and M.-Acc
 [[selo_i-uy pwumo]_j-ka t_i pinanhass-e]
 each other-Gen parents-Nom blamed-Dec
 ‘*They_j blamed John and Mary, Today each other_i’s parents_j blamed [John and Mary]_i.’

Another problem concerns scope interactions. As shown in (45a), when the indefinite subject c-commands the universal QP, only the indefinite wide scope is available. On the other hand, the universal QP is fronted over the indefinite subject the sentence becomes ambiguous (Hoji 1985; Ahn 1990; Sohn 1995). With this as a background, let us consider the FDC in (46).

- (45) a. *nwukwunka-ka motun chayk-ul ilkess-e* (∃ > ∀) *(∃ < ∀)
 someone-Nom all book-Acc read-Dec
 ‘Someone read every book.’
 b. [*motun chayk-ul*]_i *nwukwun-ka t_i ilkess-e* (∃ > ∀) (∃ < ∀)
 ‘Every book, someone read.’

- (46) motun chayk-(ul), (onul) motun chayk-ul nwukwun-ka ilkess-e ($\exists > \forall$) ($\exists < \forall$)
 all book-Acc today all book-Acc someone-Nom read-Dec
 'Today EVERY BOOK someone read.'

(46) allows ambiguous interpretations. If the caseless object QP in the first clause remained in situ, this ambiguity would not be captured since the first clause will only allow the indefinite subject wide scope. This is shown with the representation in (47):

- (47) [_{TP1} nwukwun-ka motun chayk-ul ilkess-e] (Conj) [_{TP2} motun chayk-ul
 someone-Nom all book-Acc read-Dec all book-Acc
 nwukwun-ka ilkess-e] ($\exists > \forall$) *($\exists < \forall$)
 someone-Nom read-Q
 'Someone read every book. Every book, someone read.'

(47) represents the structure before ellipsis takes place and the entire construction only allows the indefinite subject wide scope. Given that the indefinite subject c-commands the universal QP in the first clause, only the indefinite subject wide scope is permitted. In contrast the second clause taken alone allows ambiguous interpretations due to the fact that the universal QP has moved over the indefinite subject. However, when these two are combined the first clause disambiguates the second clause. The disambiguation effect naturally comes about due to the Parallelism constraint on Ellipsis (Fox 2000). Given the discussion so far, we can draw the conclusion that (47) is not the source of (46), contra what Akiyama (2014) predicts. Note here that the disambiguation fact strongly suggests that the fragment in FDC involves its own sentential structure. This fact would be very difficult to be captured under other approaches to fragment that do not assume structure like the Direct Interpretation Approach or the Dependent Marking Parameter analysis (Section 2).

Under our analysis, these problems do not arise since the fragment always undergoes movement (optionally stranding its DM). This also leads to a desirable consequence that ellipsis targets the TP-constituent.¹⁴⁾

14) An (2015) proposes an interesting alternative. He attempts to capture the (Dependent Marker Drop) generalization that only the right-most element can drop its dependent marker in MFA by assuming a notion of string ellipsis in PF, which is shown in (i). In (iB) the ellipsis process includes *eky* 'Dat' while in (iB') it does not. The ellip-

7. Conclusion

In this paper, we have argued that the Dependent Marker Drop Generalization (11) is deduced from the possibility of stranding DM under ellipsis. We have suggested that DM-stranding movement is not allowed when there is an intervener outside the ellipsis site, and thus it follows that the non-final fragments cannot strand their DMs in multiple fragments. We have also shown that the analysis provides a straightforward account for the Focus Doubling Construction, which is also subject to the same generalization.

tical process in (iB) would involve a case of non-constituent ellipsis contra the standard assumption:

- (i) A: *nwu-ka nwukwu-ekey nonmun-ul ponass-ni?*
 who-Nom who-Dat paper-Acc sent-Q
 ‘Who sent whom a paper?’
 B: *Chelswu*(-ka) Minswu-ekey [nonmwun-ul ponass-e]*
 B’: *Chelswu*(-ka) Minswu-ekey [nonmwun-ul ponass-e]*
 B’’: **Chelswu-ka Minswu-ekey [nonmwun-ul ponass-e]*
 B’’’: *?*Chelswu-ka Minswu-ekey [nonmwun-ul ponass-e]*

Another potential problem has to do with the fact that ellipsis cannot target *ekey* alone, as shown in (iB’). To block this, An assumes that ellipsis of *ekey* is possible only if the ‘TP’ part is elided (a case of Extra Deletion in his term). Although it might have interesting consequences, the assumption as it is would need to rely on the notion of syntactic categories like TP. As an alternative, one might assume that ellipsis takes place from the bottom, which would correctly block (iB’). But this would allow the ellipsis process to stop anywhere in the middle, yielding undesired result as in (iB’’). Note that this problem does not arise under our analysis if we assume that not being focused, the direct object does not undergo focus movement to begin with. As expected, even with Acc retained, the construction is still degraded. (We are grateful to a reviewer for directing our attention to the question of how our analysis would deal with (iB’’)).

FDC presents another problem for An’s analysis. As discussed above, FDC involves ellipsis in the first clause. Under An’s analysis the FDC in (36c), repeated as (iia), would be derived as (iib):

- (ii) a. *Yenghi(-ekey), (onul) Chelswu-ka Yenghi-ekey nonmun-ul ponass-e*
 Y.-Dat today C.-Nom Y.-Dat paper-Acc sent-Dec
 ‘Today Chelswu sent YENGHI a paper.’
 b. *Yenghi-ekey Chelswu-ka nonmun-ul ponass-e (onul) Chelswu-ka...*

The ellipsis process in (iib) indicates that ellipsis could freely target some intermediate string of words (under identity) at PF. (Recall that An’s analysis does not assume the notion of constituency for the purpose of ellipsis). Then, it is predicted that ellipsis should be able to target Nom of the first fragment in (iB) and (iB’) and Dat of the second fragment in (iB’), contrary to fact.

One of the interesting implications of the analysis is that Korean is a language that allows DM-stranding. As discussed in Section 5 this opens up a new possibility to address the issue of how and why Korean allows postposition-stranding despite the fact that it is not a P-stranding language under regular movement or does not permit an alternative sources like (pseudo-)cleft. The prediction is that if a language allows DM-stranding under ellipsis, we expect to find the similar pattern in this language as well. We leave further investigation of the cross-linguistic implications for another occasion.¹⁵⁾

References

- An, Duk-Ho. (2015). Extra Deletion. Paper read at Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics 11. University of York.
- Ahn, Hee-Don. (2012). Fragments in English and Korean. [Written in Korean]. Seoul: Hankwuk Publishing.
- Ahn, Hee-Don and Sungeun Cho. (2006). On Form-Function Mismatch Puzzles in Fragments: an Ellipsis Approach. *Discourse and Cognition* 13.1.
- Ahn, Hee-Don and Sungeun Cho. (2007). Non-Case-Marked Wh-phrases and Left-Dislocation. *University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics* 16, ed. A. Omaki, I. Ortega-Santos, J. Sprouse and M. Wagers, pp. 111-141. College

15) It seems promising to extend the proposed analysis to LBE of modifiers. As shown in the contrast between (iA) and (iB), it seems that the same generalization holds for the phenomena:

- (i) A: nwu-ka etten chayk-ul ilkess-ni?
 who-Nom what book-Acc read-Q
 'Who read what book?'
 B: Chelswu-ka maywu caymissnun (chayk-ul)
 C.-Nom very interesting book-Acc
 'Chelswu read a very interesting book.'
 C: maywu caymissnun *(chayk-ul) Chelswu-ka

However, there are some compounding issues. For instance, it must be clarified whether the host NP is indeed 'stranded' by the left-branch extraction under ellipsis, which otherwise is not allowed. This issue becomes more compounded with the fact that Korean is a *pro*-drop language. Another issue has to do with the possibility of allowing an alternative source in the sense of Barros et. al. (2014) (cf. Park and Oh (2015) for related discussion). Due to space limitation, we leave investigating data like (i) for another occasion.

- Park, MD.
- Ahn, Sung-Ho. (1990). *Korean Quantification and Universal Grammar*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Akiyama, Masahiro. (2014). Focus-Doubling, Left-Branch Modifiers and Ellipsis is focus Constructions. In *Proceedings of Seoul International Conference on Generative Grammar (SICOGG)* 16, 47-66.
- Barros, Matt, Patrick Elliott and Gary Thoms. (2014). There is no island repair. Ms. Rutgers/UCL/University of Edinburgh.
- Barton, Ellen. (1990). *Nonsentential constituents*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam.
- Barton, Ellen and Ljiljana Progovac. (2005). Nonsententials in Minimalism. In Elugardo, R. and R. J. Stainton (eds.), *Ellipsis and Nonsentential Speech*, 71-93.
- Chomsky, Noam. (1972). Some empirical issues in the theory of transformational grammar. In *Goals of linguistic theory*, ed. by Paul Stanley Peters, 62-130, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Choi, Youngju. (2007). Dependent Marking Parameter: Coordination, Clefting, Fragments and Scrambling in Korean and Japanese. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- Choi, Youngju and James Yoon. (2009). Fragments with and without Articulated Constituents at LF. Anisa Schardi, Martin Walkow and Muhammad Abdurrahman (eds.), *NELS* 38, 177-188.
- Chomsky, Noam. (1986). *Barriers*. MIT Press: Cambridge, MA.
- Chung, Sandra, William Ladusaw, and James McClosky. (1995). Sluicing and Logical Form. *Natural Language Semantics* 3, 239-282.
- Fiengo, Robert and Robert May. (1994). *Indices and Identity*. MIT Press and MITWPL: Cambridge, Mass.
- Fox, Danny. (2000). *Economy and Semantic Interpretation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Fox, Danny and Howard Lasnik. (2003). Successive cyclic movement and island repair: The difference between sluicing and VP-ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34, 143-154.
- Hoji, Hajime. (1985). *Logical Form Constraints and Configurational Structures in Japanese*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington, WA.
- Johnson, Kyle. (2001). What VP Ellipsis Can Do, and What It Can't, but Not Why, in M. Baltin and C. Collins (eds.) *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*, 439-479. Blackwell Publishers.
- Kim, Sun-Woong. (2010). On the Reparability of Preposition Stranding. *Language Research* 27.1, 137-164.
- Kim, Jong-Bok. (2015). Fragments in Korean: A Direct Interpretation Approach. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 25.3, 703-733.

- Ku, Nahyun and Sae-Youn Cho. (2014). Markers, Index, and Multiple Fragment Answers in Korean. *Studies on Generative Grammar* 24.3, 591-612.
- Kuno, Susumu. (1972). Functional sentence perspective: A case study from Japanese and English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3, 269-320.
- Lasnik, Howard. (1999). Pseudogapping Puzzles. In *Fragments: Studies in Ellipsis and Gapping*, ed. by S. Lappin and E. Benmamoun, 141-174. Oxford University Press.
- Lasnik, Howard. (2001). When can you save a structure by destroying it? In Minjoo Kim and Uri Stuss (eds.), *NELS* 31, University of Massachusetts.
- López, Luis and Susanne Winkler. (2003). Variation at the syntax-semantics interface: evidence from gapping. In *The interfaces: Deriving and interpreting omitted structures*, eds. Kerstin Schwabe and Susanne Winkler, 227-248. John Benjamins.
- Lasnik, Howard. (2013). Multiple Sluicing in English? *Syntax* [Online version: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/synt.12009/abstract>].
- Merchant, Jason. (2001). *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and identity in ellipsis*. Oxford University Press.
- Merchant, Jason. (2004). Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27, 661-738.
- Merchant, Jason. (2008). Variable island repair under ellipsis. 2008. In Kyle Johnson (ed.), *Topics in ellipsis*, 132-153. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Morgan, Jerry. (1989). Sentence fragments revisited. In Bradley Music, Randolph Graczyk, and Caroline Wiltshire (eds.), *CLS* 25. Parasession on language in context, 228-241. Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago, Ill.
- Park, Bum-Sik. (2005a). Locality and Identity in Ellipsis. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Connecticut.
- Park, Bum-Sik. (2005b). Island-insensitive Fragment Answers in Korean. In *Proceedings of the 24th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics 24 (WCCFL 24)*, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, Canada.
- Park, Bum-Sik. (2013). Multiple Fragment Answers in Korean. *Linguistic Research* 30.3, 453-472.
- Park, Bum-Sik and Hyosik Kim (2014). The Variability of Case-Marking in Fragment Answers and PF-Rescue. Paper read at the Theoretical East Asian Linguistics 9, the University of Nantes.
- Park, Bum-Sik and Sei-Rang Oh (2014). Multiple Fragments Do Not Mean Multiple clauses. *Studies in Generative Grammar*, 24.1, 307-323.
- Park, Bum-Sik and Hyosik Kim (2015). Rescuing Broken Dependency in Korean Fragments. Paper read at The 89th Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Portland.

- Park, Bum-Sik and Sei-Rang Oh (2015). What can multiple fragments tell us about Left Branch Extraction? Paper read at Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics 11, University of York.
- Park, Bum-Sik (2015). Ways of Deriving Bare Fragments: Case-stranding and Postposition-stranding under Ellipsis. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 25.4, 825-849.
- Reinhart, Tanya. (1997). Quantification Scope: how labor is divided between QR and choice functions. *Linguistic and Philosophy* 20, 335-397.
- Rodrigues, Cilene, Andrew Nevins, and Luis Vincent. (2009). Cleaving the interactions between Sluicing and Preposition Stranding. In Leo Wetzels and Jeroen van der Weijer (eds). *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory* 2006, 175-198. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ross, John Robert. (1969). Guess who? In *Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. Robert I. Binnick, Alice Davison, Georgia M. Green and Jerry L. Morgan.
- Sato, Yosuke. (2011). P-Stranding under sluicing and repair by ellipsis: Why is Indonesian (not) special? *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 20, 339-382.
- Saito, Mamoru. (1985). *Some asymmetries in Japanese and their theoretical implications*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- Sohn, Keun-Won. (1995). *Negative Polarity Items, Scope, and Economy*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Stainton, Robert. (1993). *Non-Sentential Assertions*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- Stainton, Robert. (1994) Using Non-Sentences: An Application of Relevance Theory. *Pragmatics and Cognition* 2, 269-284.
- Stainton, Robert. (2006). *Words and thoughts: Subsentences, ellipsis and the philosophy of language*. Oxford University Press.
- Szczegielniak, Adam. (2005). All sluiced up, but no alleviation in sight. ms. Boston College.
- Szczegielniak, Adam. (2008). Islands in sluicing in Polish. In Natasha Abner and Jane Bishop (eds). *Proceedings from the 27th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 404-412. Somerville, Calif.: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Vicente, Luis. (2008). Syntactic isomorphism and non-isomorphism under ellipsis. ms. UCSC.
- Yanofsky, Nancy (1978). NP utterances. In Donka Farkas, Wesley Jacobson, and Karol Todrys (eds.). *CLS* 14, 491-502. Chicago Linguistic Society: Chicago, Ill.

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

Hyosik Kim
Department of English
Dongguk University-Seoul
3-26 Pildong, Chung-ku, Seoul 100-715, Korea
Email: hyosik87@gmail.com

Received: November 2, 2015
Revised version received: December 14, 2015
Accepted: December 18, 2015