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1. Introduction

In a discourse a linguistic utterance can be a fragmentary utterance that is smaller than a grammatically complete sentence. The following examples show that fragment utterances can be of a variety of categories, such as DPs, PPs, and VPs (Merchant 2006: 2):

(1) a. Who did she see?
   b. John.
(2) a. When did he leave?
   b. After the movie ended.
(3) a. What does Bush want to do to Iraq?
   b. Take it over.

Interestingly, the fragments that consist of non-sentential XP in (1b), (2b) and (3b) convey the same propositional content as fully sentential answers like (4a), (4b) and (4c), respectively, and they have assertoric force as their full sentential counterparts.

(4) a. She saw John.
   b. After the movie ended, he left.
   c. Bush wanted to take it over.

A non-trivial question that arises about the fact is how non-sentential XPs have the parallel propositional meaning that the full sentential counterparts have. Roughly speaking, two types of analyses have been made so far: direct interpretation analyses and ellipsis analyses. The direct interpretation analyses are proposed by van Riemsdijik (1978), Yanofsky (1978), Barton (1990), Stainton (1995, 1997, 1998), Ginzburg and Sag (2000), Jackendoff (2002), Jackendoff and Culicover (2005) and others. Minor differences aside, these analyses basically assume that a fragment phrase such as (1b) consists of a non-sentential XP, as shown in (5).

(5) [DP John]

In this case, we need to allow non-propositional semantic objects to be used to make assertions. The unexpressed parts of the fragment's interpretation are supplied not through syntactic structure but via direct correspondence with the meaning of the
antecedent sentence. Hence, the answer in (1b) is interpreted by relating it to the interpretation of \textit{Who did she see?} substituting the interpretation of \textit{John} for the interpretation of \textit{who} and changing the illocutionary force to declarative.

By contrast, the ellipsis analyses proposed by Hankamer (1979), Morgan (1973, 1989), Stanley (2000) and Merchant (2001, 2004, 2006) assume that a fragment has a full sentence structure. For example, Merchant (2004) claims that a fragmentary utterance such as (1b) is derived through movement of remnant fragments prior to ellipsis of the full-fledged sentential structures, as in (6).\(^1\)

\[(6) \quad [\text{DP John}] [\text{she saw ti}]\]

In (6), \textit{John} undergoes movement to a sentence-initial position prior to ellipsis of the full-fledged sentence structure. Hence, the ellipsis analyses account for the fact that fragments convey the same propositional content as fully sentential answers, preserving the usual mapping of syntax and semantics. The ellipsis analyses are based on the structural uniformity: uniform factors in interpretation must stem from uniform syntactic source.

In this paper, we aim to show that the Move + ellipsis analysis accounts for connectivity effects observed in many languages including Korean and English.\(^2\) This

\(^1\) Hankamer (1979) and Morgan (1973) make use of non-constituent deletion. Under the analyses, non-constituent \textit{she saw} undergoes ellipsis without movement as shown in (i).

\[(i) \quad [\text{She saw John}]\]

These analyses are problematic because most of recent analyses argue against non-constituent deletion.

\(^2\) An anonymous reviewer questions whether our ellipsis analysis can extend to the AP fragment indicating that AP resists movement to a sentence-initial position.

\[(i) \quad \text{a. How are you?} \quad \text{b. Fine.} \quad \text{c. Fine, I am ti.}\]

We doubt that (ic) actually underlies (ib), and is amenable to ellipsis: perhaps (ib) is a formulated or frozen expression the source of which is somewhat opaque. As pointed out by Elugardo and Stainton (2005), although there are many things to which 'ellipsis' can be readily applied to, it's quite unclear whether all of them can be analyzed in the same way. In this paper, we will show how well our ellipsis...
paper is organized as follows: Section 2 shows a wide range of data in favor of the ellipsis analysis assuming that fragments have full sentential structure. Section 3 discusses interesting puzzles that non-case-marked fragments in Korean show: postposition-stranding and case maker stranding.

2. Evidence for the Ellipsis Analyses

2.1 Case connectivity

Merchant (2004: 676) provides case connectivity to support an ellipsis analysis. More specifically, the morphological case form of fragment DP is exactly the same as the one we find in the corresponding DP in a fully sentential structure. Merchant (2004) shows that case connectivity holds for many languages such as English, Russian, German, Urdu, Hebrew, and Korean. The examples in (7) and (8) are illustrated for Greek.

(7) Q: Pjos idhe tin Maria?
       who nom saw the Maria
'Who saw Maria?'
       the Giannis nom
       the Giannis acc

       the Giannis nom saw the Maria acc
'Giannis saw Maria.'
   b. A: *Ton Gianni idhe tin Maria.
       the Giannis acc saw the Maria acc
'Giannis saw Maria.'

analysis captures connectivity observed in DP/PP fragments. We will leave AP and/or other formulated fragments for future research.
On the ellipsis analysis, no additional assumptions are necessary to license the cases on fragments. That is, the usual mechanisms that are responsible for shaping cases internal to clauses can be also relevant to cases on fragments.

The grammatical contrast in (9b) and (9c) illustrates that case connectivity is also observed in English (Merchant 2004: 678).³

(9) a. Q: Whose car did you take?
   b. A: John's.

This effect is correctly predicted under the ellipsis analysis because the nominal in the fragmentary utterance is subject to the usual case licensing mechanism that the one in its non-fragmentary counterpart is. By contrast, direct interpretation analysis cannot account for case connectivity discussed above since they assume that the syntactic structure of the antecedent is relevant only to the interpretation of the fragment.

However, a version of direct interpretation analysis proposed by Jackendoff & Culicover (2005) seems to account for the connectivity effects. They suggest that the syntactic structure of the antecedent is relevant not only to the interpretation of the fragment but also to its syntactic well-formedness. They call a fragment an orphan. The orphan can be matched with an existing constituent of clause, as shown in (10).

(10) Matching (Jackendoff & Culicover 2005: 264)

³ Likewise, case connectivity is observed in sluiceing (Merchant 2001: 127).

(i) a. The police said that someone's car took all morning, but I can't remember whose.
   b. *The police said that someone's car took all morning, but I can't remember who.
They superscript the fragment with *IL* ("indirectly licensed"), the antecedent with *ANT*, and the orphan with *ORPH*. When there is a match for the orphan within *ANT*, they superscript it with *TARGET*. This analysis accounts for case connectivity observed in (9).

Nonetheless, Jackendoff & Culicover (2005) encounter a problem because they assume that the fragment doesn't have its own syntactic structure and that the syntactic structure of the fragment depends on the one of its antecedent. Let us look at the following data (Merchant 2004: 703).

(11) a. Q: Who wanted the plants?
   b. A: Me.
   c. A: *I.
   d. A: I wanted the plants.

Given that the syntactic structure of fragment depends on the one of its antecedent, case morphology of the fragment should be nominative as in (11d), contrary to fact. By contrast, the ellipsis analysis correctly predicts accusative case marking on the fragment. Let us consider (12).

(12) \[ FP \ [ Me_i ] \ [ TP \ t \ _\text{wanted the plants}] \]

Although the details remain unclear, the focal stress property of the landing site in the left periphery may trigger strong form of the pronoun (See Merchant 2004: 704).\(^4\) The

\(^4\) Pronouns in many languages fall into the two distinct classes: strong and deficient (or lone) pronouns. Selkirk (1980) notes that lone pronouns in canonical argument positions tend to be unstressed and often surface without onsets and/or reduced vowels. By contrast, strong pronouns in non-canonical positions are unable to undergo phonological reduction: e.g. *moi* and *toi* in French. Some of morphological accusatives in English are used as strong pronouns: *me, him, her, and them*. In the case of [first person, plural] strong pronoun nominative *we* seems to be more widely used than accusative *us*: e.g. *Who met Eric? We/?Us*. We assume strong pronouns occur only in dislocated (focal) positions, and further note that the morphological shapes of them are uniform, hence do not reflect their (case) connectivity to underlying syntactic sources. Thus, case connectivity is expressed only by deficient/lone pronouns in English.
move+ellipsis analysis is supported by the fact that the case morphology on the fragment is similar to the one on the left-dislocated nominal, as shown in (13).

(13) a. Me, I wanted the plants.
    b. *I, I wanted the plants.

However, Merchant (2004: 703) claims that in spite of similarity observed with pronoun case forms, the two constructions aren't exactly parallel. The contrast between (14) and (15) shows that left-dislocation is island-insensitive while a fragment is island-sensitive.

(14) Me, the FBI interviewed everyone I went to school with.
(15) [Looking at a photo of a couple, both applicants for intelligence jobs]
    A: Did the FBI interview everyone she went to school with?
    B: *No, him.                              (Merchant 2004: 703-704)

The structure of (14) and (15B) is depicted in (16a) and (16b), respectively.

(16) a. Me, the FBI interviewed everyone I went to school with.
       [_________________________]
    b. *No, him, [the FBI interview everyone <he> went to school with]
       [_________________________]

As shown in (16a), the left-dislocated nominal me can have co-reference with I inside the complex noun phrase. By contrast, as shown in (16b), the fragment him cannot refer to its correlate <he> inside the complex noun phrase. The difference can be captured under the assumption that the left-dislocated nominal is base-generated in the left peripheral position, whereas the fragment is derived through movement to a clause-peripheral position.5

Now, let us look at fragments in Korean. Morgan (1989) presents the following sets of data in (17-18), which show case-matching connectivity.

5 It seems that neutralized-case-marked (i.e. strong pronoun) fragments in English pattern similarly with non-case-marked fragments in Korean. We will show that non-case-marked fragments in Korean are also distinct from left-dislocation in section 3.2.
This fact supports the premise that fragments are syntactically fully sentential. Moreover, case-marked fragments in Korean show case-alternation in favor of the claim that fragments have hidden sentential structures. Consider the following examples that involve case-alternation in emotional constructions.

Again, note that Jackendoff & Culicover (2005) (a version of direct interpretation analyses) assume that fragments which don't have their own syntactic structure depend on the one of its antecedent. In (19a), the correlate of the fragment nwukwu 'who' is

---

Kang (1986) claims that nominative case marking may occur through default case licensing. We simply note here that regarding fragments, the default case mechanism is not on the right track. If the default mechanism were possible, nominative case marking on Yengswu in (18) would be permitted.
marked with accusative case, but the fragment answers can be marked with either accusative (19b) or nominative case (19c). If syntactic well-formedness of fragments were to depend totally upon their correlates, (19c) would be ill-formed. Hence, the direct interpretation analyses don't predict that case alternation is possible in some contexts.

By contrast, the ellipsis analysis correctly predicts the case alternation shown in (19b-c) because we assume that fragmentary utterances are derived through movement of remnant fragments prior to ellipsis of the full-fledged sentential structures. Note that there are two possible full sentential answers to (19a): namely, (20a) and (20b), which underlie the fragment answers (19b) and (19c), respectively.

(20) a. Yenghi-nun Chelswu-lul manna-ko sip-ess-ta
   Yenghi-Top Chelswu-Acc meet-Comp want-Past-Dec
   'Yenghi wanted to meet Chelswu.'

   b. Yenghi-nun Chelswu-ka manna-ko sip-ess-ta
   Yenghi-Top Chelswu-Nom meet-Comp want-Past-Dec
   'Yenghi wanted to meet Chelswu.'

(19b) and (19c), then, have the following derivations. Before ellipsis, the fragments undergo movement to the sentence-initial position.

(21) a. [[DP Chelswu lul], [Yenghi-nun t manna-ko sip-ess-ta]]

   b. [[DP Chelswu ka], [Yenghi-nun t manna-ko sip-ess-ta]]

Thus, under our ellipsis analysis, case alternation in fragment answers is expected irrespective of case-forms on wh-phrases in antecedent clauses since fragments parallel their non-elliptical sentential counterparts, and (19) provides substantial evidence that the fragment has moved prior to the ellipsis.

2.2 Scope

An anonymous reviewer points out that (19c) is much worse than (19b) as an answer to (19a). Some of our informants also prefer (19b) to (19c), and judge (19c) rather "unnatural." We speculate that some sort of parallelism strategy on processing is at work here. However, we believe that the source of deviancy is not syntactic, hence beyond the grammatical analysis.
Scope freezing in Korean fragments, as observed in Ahn & Cho (2005), further supports the ellipsis analysis. Consider the following utterances for QP/Neg scoping interaction.8

(22) a. Mary-ka motwu ta an manna-ss-ni? (>neg, neg>∀)
    Mary-Nom all all neg meet-Past-Q
    'Didn't Mary meet all?'
b. Ung, motwu ta.
    Yes all all
    'Lit, Yes, (she didn't meet) all (=No, none of them)'

Unlike the antecedent clause, the fragment displays disambiguation. Although neg>∀ reading is available in its antecedent clause, as shown in (22a), it disappears in the fragment utterance, as shown in (22b). This is unexpressed under the direct interpretation analyses because they assume that the fragment's interpretation are supplied not through its own syntactic structure but via direct correspondence with the meaning of the antecedent sentence. By contrast, according to the ellipsis analysis advocated in Ahn & Cho (2005), the fragment undergoes movement to the left-peripheral position and is interpreted in the position.

(23) [motwu ta], [Mary-ka an t, manna ss ta]

Notice that the full sentential counterpart of (23) prior to ellipsis displays only wide scope reading of motwu ta 'all' over sentential negation an 'not'. Hence, the ellipsis

---

8 Conflicting judgments have been observed in previous literature, as discussed in Han (2005), namely, there are two groups of speakers particularly concerning wide scope possibility of (short-form) Neg over QP (here we basically follow scope judgments of Neg-Obj QP ambiguities reported in Kim 2003 and Choe 2000). Chungmin Lee and Changguk Yim independently pointed out (by p.c.) that the appearance of overt Case marker in QP forces wide scope reading of QP as in (i) (see Ahn (1991: ch. 3) for further discussion). Otherwise, as they observed, Neg can be interpreted as taking scope over bare QPs. Thanks also to Upyong Hong and Sook-Whan Cho for helpful discussion.

(i) Q: Mary-ka motwu-lul ta an mannass-ni? (> neg only)
    Mary-Nom all-Acc all not met-Q 'Didn't Mary meet all?'
analysis correctly predicts the widest scope interpretation of motwu ta 'all' in (22b), parallel to its non-elliptical sentential source given in (23).

3. Non-case-marked Fragments

3.1 Preposition/Postposition-stranding (P-stranding)

With respect to preposition-stranding, wh-questions and fragments show parallelism. Languages such as English and Scandinavian languages allow preposition-stranding wh-movement in questions. The bare DP answers to such questions are also allowed in such languages (Merchant 2004:685).

(24) English
   a. Who was Peter talking with?
   b. Mary.

(25) Swedish
   a. Vem har Peter talat med?
      Who has Pater talked with?
   b. Mary.

By contrast, in non-preposition stranding languages such as Greek and German, preposition-stranding wh-movement in questions and bare DP answers to the questions are impossible. The impossibility of bare DP answers is illustrated in (26-27) (Merchant 2004:686).

(26) Greek
   a. Me pjon milise i Anna?
      With whom spoke the Anna
   b. *(Me) ton Kosta.
      with the Kostas

(27) German
   a. Mit wem hat Anna gestochen?
      With whom has Anna spoken
   b. *(Mit) dem Hans.
      with the Hans
The parallelism illustrated above is expected on the ellipses analysis, which assumes both constructions involve movement of fragments out of elided clauses.

However, Korean doesn't confirm the parallelism between fragments and full sentential counterparts. A bare DP answer is possible, as seen in (28c).

(28) a. Yenghi-ka ecey ku sasil-ul nwukwu-hanthey malhay-ss-ni?
    Yenghi-Nom yesterday the fact-Acc who-to talk-Past-Q
    'Who did Yenghi talk to yesterday?'
b. Chelswu-hanthey.
   Chelswu-to
c. Chelswu.

Note that its putative full sentential counterpart needs presence of postposition hanthey 'to', as seen in (29).

(29) Chelswu-*hanthey, Yenghi-ka ecey ku sasil-ul malhay-ss-ta.
    Chelswu to Yenghi-Nom yesterday the fact-Acc talk-Past-Dec
    'Yenghi talked to Chelswu about the fact.'

This discrepancy is quite general in Korean. Bare DP fragments are well-formed without postpositions, as shown in (30c) and (31c).

(30) a. Yenghi-ka ecey ku sasil-ul eti-ese malhay-ss-ni?
    Yenghi-Nom yesterday the fact-Acc where-at talk-Past-Q
    'Where did Yenghi talk about the fact yesterday?'
b. Hakkyo-eythe.
   School-at
c. Hakkyo.
   School
(31) a. Yenghi-ka encey ku sasil-ul malhay-ss-ni?
    Yenghi-Nom when the fact-Acc talk-Past-Q
    'When did Yenghi talk about the fact?'
b. ilyoil-ey.
   Sunday-on
c. ilyoil.
   Sunday
In contrast, the putative full sentential counterparts require obligatory presence of postposition, as seen in (32) and (33).

(32) Hakkyo-*(eyse), Yenghi-ka ecey ku sasil-ul malhay-ss-ta  
    school-at Yenghi-Nom yesterday the fact-Acc talk-Past-Dec  
    'Yenghi talked to Chelswu about the fact at school.'

(33) ilyoil-*(ey), Yenghi-ka ku sasil-ul malhay-ss-ta  
    Sunday-on Yenghi-Nom the fact-Acc talk-Past-Dec  
    'Yenghi talked about the fact on Sunday.'

Hence, the question arises as to why P-stranding is allowed only in fragments if fragments parallel sentential structures; i.e., if fragments underlie hidden sentential sources, P-stranding in fragments is expected to be excluded on a par with that in their sentential counterparts. We propose that P-stranding in Korean is a PF (Phonetic Form) constraint. If the structure containing the violation is elided before the PF interface, the deviance is eliminated. For example, (31c) has the following structure.

(34) [ilyoil]i [Yenghi-ka ti ey ku sasil-ul malhay-ss-ta]

Moving ilyoil out of PP ilyoil-ey violates a PF constraint because postpositions in Korean are PF affixes. In fragments, such violations can be nullified as a result of the ellipsis at PF. This kind of salvation strategy at PF is reminiscent of repairing island violations by ellipsis as widely discussed in Merchant (2001), Fox & Lasnik (2003) and many others.

---

9 Chae (1996) and Chae & No (1998) show that postpositions in Korean differ from prepositions in English in that Korean postpositions cannot be stranded and conjoined. They treat postpositions as "clitics" which they distinguish from "affixes." Here we remain agnostic as to the distinction between the two. The term "affixes" in the text simply indicates that they are phonologically dependent elements; that is, they cannot stand alone.

10 A'-extraction out of a deleted TP in sluicing is generally insensitive to the left branching condition (Merchant 2001:167).

(i) a. *How detailed does he want [a ____ list]?
    b. He wants a detailed list, but I don't know how detailed.
Our ellipsis analysis may extend to account for a set of facts in Brazilian Portuguese. According to Almeida (2005), cited in Lansnik (2006), Brazilian Portuguese is a strongly non-stranding language, but a sluicing remnant can be the apparent bare object of a preposition. The examples in (36) illustrate that P-stranding is not allowed in question. The example in (37), however, illustrates that P-stranding is allowed in the sluicing construction.

(35) A Maria dançou com alguém.
    the Maria danced with someone
    'Maria danced with someone.'

(36) a. Com quem que a Maria dançou?
    With whom that the Maria danced
    'With whom did Maria dance?'

   b. *Quem que a Maria dançou com?
    Whom that the Maria danced with
    'Whom did Maria dance with?'

(37) A Maria dançou com alguém, mas eu não lembro (com) quem.
    the Maria danced with someone, but I neg remember with whom
    'Maria danced with someone, but I don't remember (with) whom.'

Given that sluicing is derived by movement + ellipsis, P-stranding in the Brazilian Portuguese sluicing construction seems to be parallel to P-stranding in Korean. We assume that P-stranding in Brazilian Portuguese is also a PF constraint. If the structure containing the violation is eliminated before the PF interface, the structure is saved from a PF-crash.

A natural question that comes up at this point is why P-stranding is not allowed in fragments in other non-P stranding languages such as Greek and German. We claim that in these languages, P-stranding constraint is not a PF constraint but a derivational

---

According to Merchant (2001:167), (ib) has the structure like (ii).

(ii) I don't know [DeqP how detailed], he wants [t[an list]]

He suggests that deletion at PF repairs the otherwise ungrammatical extraction of attributive adjectival phrases.
constraint in narrow syntax. Hence, PF deletion cannot repair the P-stranding violation in these languages.\textsuperscript{11}

3.2 Case marker stranding

Parallel to postpositions, case markers that attach to nominals in Korean can also be unpronounced freely in fragments, as shown in (38).\textsuperscript{12}

(38) a. Q: nwu-ka  ku chayk-ul sa-ss-ni?
   who-Nom the book-Acc buy-Past-Q
   'Who bought the book?'
      Yengswu-Nom
   c. A: Yengswu.

We propose that (38b) and (38c) have the structures (39a) and (39b), respectively.

(39) a. \[[DP[NP Yengswu]-ka], [t ku chayk-ul sa ss-ni]]
   b. \[[NP Yengswu] [for-t-ka ku chayk-ul sa ss-ni]]

\textsuperscript{11} Lasnik (2006: 4) also indicates that there seems to be more than one kind of P-stranding constraint. Note, in passing, that the deviant fragment in (ib), as discussed in (9), needs further consideration:

(i) a. Q: Whose car did you take?
   b. A: *John
   c. John\textsubscript{1} [I took [t's car]]

If the PF-deletion can repair the violation in (ic), (ib) should be incorrectly ruled in. We speculate that movement of John stranding genitive -'s in English is barred in narrow syntax since genitive case -'s is licensed in DP cycle, which somehow causes the John-'s complex as an unanalyzable unit that resists morpho-syntactic separation, hence, the violation cannot be salvaged in PF via ellipsis.

\textsuperscript{12} As an anonymous reviewer indicates, the politeness particle -yo can be freely added to the fragments: Yengswu-ka-yo, yengswu-yo. We are not in a position to discuss the exact nature of this particle here. However, we speculate that -yo can be attached to any XP except for vocatives (*Yengswu-ya-yo) and elements modifying smaller than XP (*cal-yo 'well', *an-yo 'not', tel-yo 'less'). Thus, this merely indicates that fragments are instances of XPs distinct from vocatives.
These structures are based on the assumptions that argument nominals are in fact "DPs" (Abney 1987) and that case markers belong to the category of D (Ahn 1988). In (39a), DP undergoes movement to the sentence initial position and the full clause except DP undergoes ellipsis. By contrast, in (39b), the NP buried inside the subject DP undergoes movement and the full clause except the NP is subject to ellipsis. Note that without ellipsis, this derivation is not permitted in a full sentential utterance because the NP movement makes the affix *ka* stranded. The whole case paradigm remains as a major puzzle for the direct interpretation analyses.

In contrast to the analysis advanced here, one might possibly assume that non-case-marked fragments are derived from left-dislocation (LD) structure, since left-dislocated (LDed) nominals in Korean arguably occur without case markers (see related discussions in Kim 1998, Ahn 1999, Hong 2004, among others). However, in what follows we show that non-case-marked (non-CM) fragments and LDed nominals pattern differently. Below we illustrate one important semantic contrast to show the difference.

Ahn & Cho (2006) observe that dislocated *wh*-phrases without overt cases in Korean exhibit only D(iscourse)-linked interpretation, as seen in (40).

(40) a. Nwukwu, Yenghi-ka ecey manna-ss-ni?
    Who, Yenghi-Nom yesterday meet-Past-Q
    'Who did Yenghi meet yesterday?'
    b. Nwukwu, kekise chayk-ul manhi saka-ss-ni?
    Who there book-Acc a lot buy-Past-Q
    'Who bought a lot of books there?'

(40) becomes more acceptable if the *wh*-phrase is modified by D-link-inducing elements, as in (41).

(41) a. I cwung-eyse nwukwu, Yenghi-ka ecey manna-ss-ni?
    this group-among who, Yenghi-Nom yesterday meet-Past-Q
    'Which person of this group did Yenghi meet yesterday?'
    b. I cwung-eyse nwukwu, kekise chayk-ul manhi saka-ss-ni?
    this group-among who, there book-Acc a lot buy-Past-Q

---

13 Boeckx (2003) calls this kind of movement SubMove (movement of a constituent from a larger functional shell), and analyzes *wh*-movements in *wh*-resumption structures this way.
'Which person of this group bought a lot of books there?'

As a result of domain specification like *i cwungeyse*, (41a-b) seem to be more natural than (40a-b). In both (40) and (41), *wh*-phrases always have D-linked interpretations.

The phenomenon found in (40) raises the question as to why dislocated bare *wh*-phrases (without overt case markers) have semantic restriction. According to Ahn & Cho (2006), nominals with unpronounced case markers in dislocated positions correlate with LD. Under this analysis, a LDed nominal occupies a sentence-initial position, binding a resumptive pronoun (unpronounced *pro*) located in an original argument position. Hence, only D-linked reading arises in constructions with LDed *wh*-phrases in Korean, which are parallel to *wh*-resumption or *wh*-clitic doubling constructions found in many other languages (see Boeckx 2003 for extensive discussion).

Note, however, that the interpretation of non-CM *wh*-fragments is crucially not parallel to that of LDed *wh*-phrase, as shown in (42-43).

(42) A: Yenghi-ka ecey (etten salam-ul) manna-ss-ta.
    Yenghi-Nom yesterday some one-Acc meet-Past-Dec
    'Yenghi met (someone).'
B: Nwukwu?
   'Who?'

(43) A: (Etten salam-i) kekise chayk-ul manhi saka-ss-ta.
    some one-Nom there book-Acc a lot buy-Past-Dec
    '(Someone) bought a lot of books there.'
B: Nwukwu?
   'Who?'

(42-43) show that unlike LDed *wh*-phrases, non-D-linked (as well as D-linked) reading is possible for non-CM *wh*-fragments.

Further note that in the case of non-*wh*-phrases, non-CM fragments can refer to non-specific entities, as shown in (44B).

    Yenghi-Nom yesterday home-at some one-Acc meet-Past-Dec
    'Yenghi met (someone) at home.'
B: Namca?
   'Man?'
The LDed nominals, by contrast, must be interpreted as specific, as in (45).

   Man, Yenghi-Nom yesterday home-at meet-Past-Dec.
   'A man, Yenghi met him at home yesterday.'

b. etten/ku namca, Yenghi-ka ecey cip-eyse manna-ss-ta.
   some/the man, Yenghi-Nom yesterday home-at meet-Past-Dec.
   'A certain man/The man, Yenghi met him at home yesterday.'

Due to the semantic difference mentioned above, the alternative LD analysis to non-CM fragments is not tenable, and we conclude that Move-and-Delete analysis is also plausible for non-CM fragments in Korean.

4. Concluding remarks

In this paper, we have explored the nature of form-function mismatch puzzles as observed in fragments in many languages including Korean and English. We have showed that the Move + Delete analysis is superior in explaining crucial properties of fragments such as case connectivity and scope. Our proposal also resolves interesting puzzles like P-stranding asymmetries and non-CM fragments. We have shown that the ellipsis analysis of case-marked fragments can be naturally extended to non-CM fragments in Korean. We have also indicated that parallel to fragments in English, non-CM fragments in Korean cannot be subsumed to hidden LD constructions.
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