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The aim of this squib is to resolve problems pointed out by Hong & Park (2005) and Park (2008). Following Ahn & Cho (2006), we argue that the binding facts peculiar to fragments in Korean result from (PF-vacuous) scrambling that is allowed in elliptical environments and vehicle change effects that are observed in elliptical contexts.
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1. Introduction

Fragmentary utterances are short utterances smaller than full sentences. The interesting fact is that these fragmentary utterances convey the same propositional content that full sentences do. To capture such form-function mismatch, ellipsis analyses of fragments such as Merchant (2004) argue that fragments have full-fledged sentential structures before ellipsis. Under the analyses, DP fragments are predicted to pattern with their correlates in non-fragmentary sentential equivalents. In Korean, however, anaphors which cannot occur in subject positions in full sentential answers can take place in the same position in their fragment answers.

Ahn & Cho (2006) suggest that scrambling operation prior to ellipsis may alternate Binding Principle A possibility, and vehicle change effects (or something equivalents as in Merchant 2001) in ellipsis contexts may invalidate Principle C violation in Korean (anaphoric) fragments. Hong & Park (2005) and Park (2008) point out several problems that arise under the analysis advanced by Ahn & Cho.
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The aim of this paper is to resolve the problems pointed out by Hong & Park (2005) and Park (2008). This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 briefly introduces Ahn & Cho (2006) and resolves problems noted by Hong & Park (2005) and Park (2008). Concluding remarks are provided in Section 3.


Ahn & Cho (2006) note a binding phenomenon peculiar to fragments in Korean. A fully sentential answer including anaphors in subject position is ruled out, as shown in (1b, 2b, and 3b), while its fragment counterpart is fully acceptable, as shown in (1c, 2c, and 3c).

(1) a. Nwu-ka Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul, piphanhay-ss-ni?
   Who-Nom Chelswu-and Yenghi-Acc criticize-Past-Q
   Who criticized Chelswu and Yenghi?

   each other-Nom Chelswu-and Yenghi-Acc criticize-Past-Dec
   Lit. Each other criticized Chelswu and Yenghi.

c. Selo-ka.
   each other-Nom
   'Each other.'

(2) a. Nwu-ka Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul, piphanhay-ss-ni?
   Who-Nom Chelswu-and Yenghi-Acc criticize-Past-Q
   'Who criticized Chelswu and Yenghi?'

An anonymous reviewer points out the possibility that the following sentences may be fully sentential counterparts of fragments in (1-3):

   each other-Nom each other-Acc criticize-Past-Dec
   'Lit. Each other criticized each other.'

   each-Nom each-Acc criticize-Past-Dec
   'Lit. Each criticized each.'

   self-Nom self-Acc criticize-Past-Dec
   'Self. Himsell criticized himself.'

The well-formedness of (i) raises a question: What binds the anaphors in the subject positions? A phonologically null topic or emphatic pronoun can be a binder of anaphors in the subject position in (i). Ahn & Cho (2006) show that neither null topic analysis nor emphatic anaphor analysis is tenable as an alternative for anaphoric fragments in Korean. See Ahn & Cho (2006) for full details.
b. *Kakca-ka; Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul, piphanhay-ss-ta.
   each-Nom Chelswu-and Yenghi-Acc criticize-Past-Dec
   ‘Lit. Each criticized Chelswu and Yenghi.’

c. Kakca-ka;
   each-Nom
   ‘Each.’

(3) a. Nwu-ka Chelswu-lul, piphanhay-ss-ni?
   Who-Nom Chelswu-Acc criticize-Past-Q
   ‘Who criticized Chelswu and Yenghi?’

      self-Nom Chelswu-Acc criticize-Past-Dec
      ‘Lit. Himself criticized Chelswu.’

   c. Caki-ka.
      Self-Nom
      ‘Himself.’

At first blush, the representational derivation for (1c) seems to be the following under the spirit of Merchant’s (2004) analysis of fragment utterances:

(4) Selo-ka [Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul, piphanhay-ss-ta]

(1c), then, is expected to be ruled out parallel to (1b), contrary to fact. The binding discrepancy seems to be problematic for ellipsis analyses of fragments because DPs in fragments are predicted to pattern with their correlates in non-fragmentary sentential equivalents under this approach.

Ahn & Cho (2006) suggest that (4) cannot be a representation for (1c) and that (1c) is derived by the following derivational representation.

(5)
(5) is derived in the following three steps: step one is scrambling of *Chelswu*-wa *Yenghi-lul* 'Chelswu and Yenghi' to edge-κ; step two is movement of *selo-ka* 'each other' to edge-C and finally step three is ellipsis of the TP. The first step in this derivation, namely, "κ-internal scrambling" of the object *Chelswu*-wa *Yenghi-lul*, results in Principle A satisfaction because the object *Chelswu*-wa *Yenghi-lul* binds the anaphor *selo-ka* at the point of the derivation. In (5), the copy 1₂ left by *selo-ka* seems to bind the R-expression *Chelswu*-wa *Yenghi-lul* prior to ellipsis. Then, a crucial question arises as to how (5) avoids violating Principle C. The amelioration of Principle C in fragments seems to be attributed to the so-called "vehicle change" effects in elliptical contexts (Fienko and May 1994, Merchant 2001, 2004, and others). Merchant (2004: 682) advances the analysis of vehicle change effects in ellipsis to fragment answers in English as follows.

(6) a. Who did you tell *t* about Bill₁’s raise?
   b. Him₁.
   c. I told him₂ about Bill₁’s raise.

The semantic structure of elided TP in (6b) is like (7) where the correlate possessive ‘name’ is interpreted as a ‘pronoun.’ Hence, no Condition C violation occurs.

(7) I told him₁ about his₂ raise.

Similarly, Ahn & Cho (2006) claim that the elided clause contains a [+pronominal] empty category, Pro that corresponds to the R-expression *Chelswu*-wa *Yenghi-lul* in the antecedent clause, as shown in (8).

---

2 We assume Binding Principle A can be satisfied at any point of derivation (Lebeaux 1994, Saito 2003).

3 We assume that Binding Principle C is an IF condition. Fox (2000: 8-10), however, notes that Principle C may apply at the interface with the semantic component (and perhaps beyond) based on the correlation between Binding Principle C and scope reconstruction.

4 Ahn (1985) and Huang (1989, 1991) independently put forward that the PRO/pro distinction is unnecessary, and they postulate only one pure pronoun empty category Pro, the notion of which we employ in the text. Ahn & Cho (2006) speculate that Pro may be neutral for [anaphoric] value; namely, Pro is represented as [Ua, .tp] (U = unspecified value). One piece of evidence comes from the fact that unpronounced null object, arguably Pro, can induce a sloppy reading (cf. Lee 2003).

   Chelswu-Top self-Acc *deceive-Past-Dec* ‘Chelswu deceived himself.’

   *Yenghi*-to self-Acc *deceive-Past-Dec* ‘Yenghi did, too (=Yenghi deceived herself).’
We suggest that vP-internal scrambling of Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul may be barred in non-elliptical sentences like (1b) since vehicle change effects are possible only for elliptical contexts. Hence, (1b) is ill-formed because of Binding principle C violation.

To sum up, vP-internal scrambling operation prior to ellipsis may alternate binding possibility for Principle A, and further vehicle change effects (or something equivalents as in Merchant 2001) in ellipsis contexts may invalidate Principle C violation in Korean (anaphoric) fragments.

Hong & Park (2005) and Park (2008) argue that Ahn & Cho’s (2006) analysis of the binding phenomenon in a fragment utterance ascribed to A-scrambling encounters the following problem: (9a-c), which arguably involve A-scrambling of the object antecedent, are not acceptable.5

(9) a. ??Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul selo-ka piphanhay-ss-ta.
Chelswu-and Yenghi-Acc each other-Nom criticize-Past-Dec
‘Lit, Chelswu and Yenghi, each other criticized.’
b. ?? Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul kakca-ka piphanhay-ss-ta.
Chelswu-and Yenghi-Acc each-Nom criticize-Past-Dec
‘Lit, Chelswu and Yenghi, each criticized.’
c. ?? Chelswu-lul caki-ka piphanhay-ss-ta.
Chelswu-Acc self-Nom criticize-Past-Dec
‘Lit, Chelswu, himself criticized.’

In (ib), a sloppy reading is possible, which indirectly supports that the empty category is at least not specified for [-anaphoric] value which normally is not compatible with sloppy reading.

5 Ahn & Cho (2006: fn. 6) note that (9a) is at best marginal since Binding Principle may be violated. Ahn & Cho (2006) assume that (9) has the structure like (i).

(i) [CP Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul, [v selo-ka [v [v t3 [v t2]]]]]
Under the analysis, the reciprocal sero is not bound by an appropriate antecedent in A-position and the trace of R-expression t3 is bound by sero which may violate Binding Principle C. However, this approach doesn’t seem to be on the right track. Note, first of all, that (9a-c) are not totally ruled out (to our ears, at least). If (9a-c) are all instances of Principle C violation, they should be completely ill-formed. Thus, Ahn & Cho’s (2006) analysis doesn’t seem to be tenable for (9a).
We suggest that the objects in (9) may scramble to Spec-T (for EPP or case reasons following Miyagawa 2001), which renders Binding Principle A satisfaction. Further note that since Spec-T movement, namely A-movement, may not leave a trace following Lasnik (1998), (9) may obviate Binding Principle C violation. Thus, (9) are predicted to be ruled in. However, they are still marginal. The reason seems to be related to Rizzi’s (1986) chain condition, as illustrated in (10).

(10) Chains: C = (X₁, X₂, ..., Xₙ) is a chain iff, for 1<i<n, Xᵢ locally binds Xᵢ+1:

[Chain Diagram]

For example, in (9a), Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul, its trace, and selo-ka ‘each other’ form a chain, which violates the chain condition. This appears to be responsible for the marginality of (9). At this point, a non-trivial question arises: How does (1c) obviate Rizzi’s chain condition violation? For example, the configuration in (8) seems to violate the chain condition on a par with (9). Our answer to this question may rely on PF repair of representational conditions put forward by Boeckx & Lasnik (2006). We suggest that violation of the chain condition, one of representational conditions is ameliorated at PF, as a result of ellipsis.

Park (2008) further indicates that the following b-examples are problematic under Ahn & Cho’s (2006) analysis.

(11) a. Nwu-ka Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul piphanhay-ss-ni?
Who-Nom Chelswu-and Yenghi-Acc criticize-Past-Q
‘Who criticized Chelswu and Yenghi?’
b. Selo-ka piphanhay-ss-ta.
each-Nom criticize-Past-Dec
‘Lit, Each other criticized Chelswu and Yenghi.’
(12) a. Nwu-ka Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul piphanhay-ss-ni?
Who-Nom Chelswu-and Yenghi-Acc criticize-Past-Q
‘Who criticized Chelswu and Yenghi?’
each-Nom criticize-Past-Dec
‘Lit, Each criticized Chelswu and Yenghi.’
(13) a. Nwu-ka Chelswu-lul piphanhay-ss-ni?
Who-Nom Chelswu-Acc criticize-Past-Q
‘Who criticized Chelswu?’
b. Caki-ka piphanhay-ss-ta.
   Himself-Nom criticize-Past-Dec
   ‘Lit, Himself criticized Chelswu.’

These b-examples, however, can all be instances of tP deletion. Suppose (11b), for example, involves object scrambling to Spec-v altering Binding Principle A possibility prior to subject movement to Spec-T and subsequent deletion of tP, as shown in (14).蒿

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{TP} & \text{selo-ka} & T \\
\text{Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul} & \text{piphanhay-ss-e} & \text{ellipsis}
\end{array}
\]

Then, (11)-(13) should pattern essentially with fragments in (1)-(3), respectively, as predicted under our analysis utilizing vacuous object scrambling inside the elliptical site.7

蒿 It seems that we have to assume V-raising to T, C or at least higher projection than v: Note also that Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul in the elliptic site should be reanalyzed as Pro to be immune from Binding Principle C, the so-called vehicle change effects.

7 Hong & Park (2005) and Park (2008) also point out the ill-formedness of (iB) is problematic for Ahn & Cho (2006).

(i) A: Nwu-ka Chelswu-lul piphanhay-ss-ni?
   Who-Nom Chelswu-Acc criticize-Past-Q
   ‘Who criticized Chelswu?’

B: Ku-ka.
   He-Nom ‘He.’

Ahn & Cho (2006: fn.15), however, accounts for the ill-formedness of (iB). In B, the elided clause contains a [+pronominal] empty category, and the coreference between Pro and ku violates neither Binding Principle B nor C. Hence, (iB) is expected to be well-formed, contrary to fact. Extending Chomsky’s (1981) Avoid Pronoun Principle somewhat, Ahn & Cho (2006) suggest that in Korean there exists a preference against the use of a pronoun if a reflexive is available in the same environment, as similarly shown in (ii).

   John-Top Mary-Nom self/He-Acc saw-Comp think-Past-Dec
   John thought that Mary saw him.’

In line with this reasoning, a reflexive fragment (iii) below has a preference over a pronoun fragment (iB) as an answer to a question (iA).

(iii) Caki-ka.
   Self-Nom ‘Himself.’
3. Concluding Remarks

In this squib, we have shown that the binding phenomena observed in fragments are well accounted for under the analysis Ahn & Cho (2006). We have also shown that the binding facts peculiar to fragments in Korean result from (PF-vacuous) scrambling that is allowed in elliptical environments and vehicle change effects that are observed in elliptical contexts. We have further considered two significant counterexamples to our analysis, which were raised by Hong & Park (2005) and Park (2008). We suggest that their apparent counter-examples can be well explained under the extension of Ahn & Cho (2006) with some additional theoretical assumptions. We thus conclude that their arguments against our proposal are far from decisive.
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