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1. Introduction
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In a discourse a linguistic utterance can be a fragmentary utterance that is smaller than a grammatically complete sentence, as shown in (1B).

(1) A: Chelswu-ka nwukwu-lul manna-ss-ni?
   C.-Nom who-Acc meet-Pst-Q
   ‘Who did Chelswu meet?’

   B. Yenghi-lul.
   Y.-Acc

Interestingly, the fragment that consists of nonsentential DP in (1B) conveys the same propositional content as a fully sentential answer like (2), and it has the same assertoric force as its full sentential counterpart.

(2) Chelswu-ka Yenghi-lul manna-ss-ta.
   C.-Nom Y-Acc meet-Pst-Dec
   ‘Chelswu met Yenghi.’

Ahn & Cho (2006a, 2011) suggest that Case-marked fragments such as (1B) is derived through movement of remnant fragments prior to ellipsis of the full-fledged sentential structures, as shown in (3).

Merchant (2004:675) suggests that the landing site of the moved element in the fragment construction in English is a clause-peripheral specifier position of a functional projection, agnostically called FP (though he suspects that FP is to be identified with Rizzi’s (1997) Focus Phrase). He also argues that the movement involved here has the properties independently identified for focus movements and similar left-peripheral movements like clitic-left dislocation. Following Merchant (2004), we might assume that in (3), Yenghi-lul undergoes uninterpretable feature checking movement parallel to English fragments.

Similarly, in wh-movement in English, the driving force of the movement is not focus feature but uninterpretable [wh] feature checking. In both the fragment and wh-movement construction, as a result of movement, focus effect occurs. However, unlike English, focus movement seems to occur overtly in Korean. The movement of the fragment Yenghi-lul can be analyzed as focus. Regarding the nature of this movement, see also section 3 of this paper on quantifier scope.
By contrast, Caseless fragments like (4B) are analyzed differently.

(4) A: Chelswu-ka nwukwu-lul manna-ss-ni?
   C.-Nom who-Acc meet-Pst-Q
   ‘Who did Chelswu meet?’

   B. Yenghi.
   Y.

According to Ahn & Cho (2011), Caseless fragments such as (4B) are just CPs dominating nonsentential NPs.2)

---

2) Ahn (2010) proposes that CP is always present in fragment answers in Korean and that C refers to the node responsible for marking force/clause-type.

(i) a. Mwues-ul sikhi-l-kka?
   what-acc order-fut-Q
   ‘What should I order?’
   b. pap(-ul).
   rice(-Acc)
   ‘(Order) rice.’
   Imperative

(ii) a. Wuli mwe mek-ul-kka?
    we what eat-fut-Q
    ‘What shall we eat?’
    b. pap(-ul).
    Rice(-Acc)
    ‘(Let’s have) rice.’
    Propositive

The following question arises why overt clause type marker such as ta, nya, ca, and la are never attested in fragments despite the fact that fragment utterances can in principle be interpreted in various clause types. Regarding this, Ahn & An (2011) assume that it is ruled out due to a morphological property of the clause
Caseless fragments like (5) are not derived by ellipsis; that is, they are base-generated without the derivation of a full sentential source. According to Ahn & Cho (2011) adjunct adverbial phrases and postpositional phrases in Korean are also analyzed as Caseless fragments that are not derived from ellipsis but are interpreted directly.3)

The analysis of Caseless fragments gives rise to further theoretical and empirical consequences. This paper aims to discuss some of its consequences and implications related to P-stranding, quantifiers, and anaphoric binding. Section 2 discusses P-stranding phenomena in the Korean fragment construction and show how well apparent P-stranding fragment is accounted for under the analysis of Caseless fragments. Section 3 deals with scope phenomenon of Caseless quantifier fragments and attempts to explain why it only takes widest scope. Section 4 discusses distribution of Caseless anaphoric fragments and describe how they differ from Case-marked anaphoric fragments. Concluding remarks are provided in Section 5.

2. P-stranding

type markers, which require a bound stem. In other words, although these suffixes have to attach to the stem of the predicate, the fragments don’t have it. See Ahn & An (2011) for technical details of this issue.

3 The analysis advanced here reminds us of Fukaya & Hoji’s (1999) analysis of Japanese sluicing. Fukaya & Hoji (1999) suggest that sluicing constructions in Japanese are analyzed differently depending on whether the remnants are Case-marked or not. More specifically, Case-marked remnants involve movement whereas Caseless remnants involve no movement in their derivation.
Merchant (2004) argues that fragments and their sentential correlates show parallelism with respect to (Preposition)-stranding, which supports Move-and-delete analysis of fragments. Languages such as English and Scandinavian languages allow P-stranding in *wh*-movement, and the bare DP answers to such questions are also allowed in such languages (Merchant 2004:685).

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

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

By contrast, languages such as Greek and German don’t allow P-stranding in *wh*-movement, and hence such phenomenon is observed with fragments, too: bare DP answer to the questions are impossible, as shown in (8-9) (Merchant 2004:686).

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

(9) German
   a. Mit wem hat Anna gestrochen?
      With whom has Anna spoken
   b.*(Mit) dem Hans.
      with the Hans
The parallelism illustrated above is expected in Merchant’s (2004) Move-and-Delete analysis. Given that fragments have full-fledged sentential structures prior to ellipsis, the parallel pattern between fragments and their sentential correlates are well accounted for.

Interestingly however, with respect to P-stranding, Korean doesn’t confirm the parallelism between fragments and full sentential counterparts. In Korean a bare DP fragment is possible without postposition as in (11b) in addition to a Case-marked fragment in (11a) as a reply to (10a), for example, although the postposition eykey ‘to’ cannot be stranded as shown in (10b), presumably due to the Stray Affix Filter (Lasnik 1981).

(10) a. Chelswu-ka nwukwu-eykey ku sasil-ul malhay-ss-ni?
   C.-Nom when who-to the fact-Acc talk-Pst-Q
   ‘To whom did Chelswu talk about the fact?’
   b. *Nwukwu, Chelswu-ka t-eykey ku sasil-ul malhay-ss-ni?
      who C-Nom to the fact-Acc talk-Pst-Q
      ‘Who did Chelswu talk about the fact to?’

(11) a. Yenghi-eykey.4)
    Y.-to
    ‘To Yenghi.’
    b. Yenghi.
    Y.
    c. *Yenghi, Chelswu-ka t-eykey ku sasil-ul malhay-ss-ta.
       Y. C-Nom to the fact-Acc talk-Pst-Dec

Under Merchant’s Move-and-Delete analysis, fragments underlie hidden sentential sources. Hence, it is expected that P-stranding in fragments like (11b) is not possible on a par with that in their sentential counterparts like (11c), contrary to fact. Thus, P-stranding connectivity

4 We assume that Yenghi-eykey ‘to Yenghi’ is not PP but an instance of Case-marked fragments which are derived through movement of the remnant fragment prior to ellipsis of the full-fledged sentential structure.

However, the well-formedness of (11b) is well-accounted for under the analysis advanced in Ahn & Cho (2011). Here we confirm the fact that (11b) should be analyzed as an instance of Caseless fragments that are argued to be directly generated as non-sentential X(Ps) that don’t undergo movement & ellipsis. Therefore, the fragment in (11b) involves neither movement nor P-stranding. Hence, the presence of fragments like (11b) cannot be considered as evidence against Merchant’s (2004) Move-and-Delete analysis of fragments in general. Their presence just shows that Korean has another kind of fragments different from ones Merchant (2004) put forward.

The apparent P-stranding fragment example reminds us of another difference in fragments between English and Korean. Merchant (2004) notes the grammatical contrast related to the morphological case marking of fragment DPs.

(12) Whose car did you take?
   a. John’s.
   b. *John.

The morphological case form of the fragment DP in (12) is exactly the same as the one we find in the corresponding DP in a fully sentential structure in (13).

(13) Whose car did you take?
   a. I took John’s.
   b. *I took John.

Merchant’s (2004) clausal ellipsis analysis can explain the ill-formedness of (12b) and (13b) in a parallel fashion. We also note Merchant’s (2001, 2004) claim that P-stranding cannot be repaired by ellipsis. A similar
claim can be made with respect to Case affix stranding. Hence, the following derivation isn’t possible.

(14) John, [TP I took John’s car]

Thus, like P-stranding violation, Case affix stranding cannot be ameliorated, either (perhaps derivation crashes immediately when movement takes place out of a morphological word unit violating the Stray Affix Filter). However, morphological Case marking of fragments in Korean isn’t parallel to the one in English. Compare (15b) with (12b).\(^5\)

(15) Nwukwu-uy cha-lul Chelswu-ka sa-ss-ni?
    Who-Gen car-Acc C.-Nom buy-Pst-Q
    *‘Whose car did Chelswu buy?’
    a. Yenghi-uy.
       Y.-Gen
    b. Yenghi.
       Y.

Although genitive marking on the fragment is absent, (15b) is still well-formed in Korean. Given that Case affix stranding isn’t possible

\(^5\) Genitive Case-marked nominals like (15a) can be stranded without their possessed only in fragments; that is, the so-called N’-ellipsis is allowed only in fragments in Korean. See the contrast between (i) and (ii) (Duk-Ho An by p.c.).

(i) Na-nun Yenghi-uy apeci-lul manna-ss-ko kyay-nun
   I.-Top Y.-gen father-Acc meet-Pst-C he-Top
   Chelswu-uy *(apeci-lul) manna-ss-ta.
   C.-Gen father-Acc meet-Pst-Dec
   ‘I met Yenghi’s father and he met Chelswu’s father.’
(ii) A: Ne-nun nwukwu-uy apeci-lul manna-ss-ni?
      You-Top who-Gen father-Acc meet-Pst-Q
      *‘Whose father did you meet?’
    B: Chelswu-uy (apeci-lul).
       C.-Gen father-Acc
       ‘Chelswu’s father.’
in Korean, the derivation like (16) isn’t possible, parallel to the English counterpart (14).

(16) Yenghi [Chelswu ka ______ buy cha-lul sa ss ta]
    Y.    C-Nom       Gen car-Acc buy-Pst-Dec

Instead, we suggest that unlike Case-marked fragments like (15a) whose Case feature has to be checked in syntax (thus they are derived via clausal ellipsis), Caseless fragments like (15b) are generated as a bare NP without Case feature to be checked (thus they do not require Case licensing structure). Therefore, Case-marking must be absent in (15b). Ahn & Cho (2011) further indicate that unlike Case-marked fragments, the relevant interpretations of Caseless fragments are from pragmatic inference. In other words, the reading ‘Chelswu bought Yenghi’s car’ is forced for (15a) due to its hidden sentential structure before ellipsis. In contrast, although this reading is pragmatically dominant, other readings can be pragmatically possible for (15b): e.g., ‘The car that Yenghi inherited from her father’, ‘The car that Yenghi drives now (but the owner is Tongswu)’, ‘The car that Yengi wants to buy’ ... etc. Thus, unlike the Case-marked fragment (15a), the Caseless fragment (15b) is not necessarily interpreted as Yenghi’s car, but it can be any car that has to do with Yenghi pragmatically.

At this point, the following question arises naturally: Isn’t t Caseless fragment an option available in English as in (12b) parallel to Korean Caseless fragments? It it were, the bare fragment in (12b) would be well-formed, contrary to fact. As noted in Ahn & Cho (2011), there are two ways of licensing fragmental utterances; namely, syntactic licensing and pragmatic licensing. Further, it is noted that Case-marked fragments are syntactically licensed while Caseless fragments are pragmatically licensed. These two options seem to be fully available in Korean (recall (15)), whereas it is not the case in English: Caseless
fragments seem to be suppressed if Case-marked fragments are available as shown in (12). In other words, Case-marked fragments seem to bleed Caseless ones in English (hence, English chooses only Case-marked fragment option when it is possible), while the two types of fragments are equally available in Korean (hence, both the Case-marked fragments and Caseless fragments are free variants in Korean).

It is not clear at this stage what underlies the parametric difference between the two languages concerning the availability of two types of fragments. One possibility is that syntactic licensing universally overrides pragmatic licensing when the two constructions compete with each other. Thus, English fragmental constructions are no exceptions. By contrast, we speculate that in discourse-prominent languages like Korean, the “syntax-over-pragmatics” principle is neutralized, and hence the competing fragmental constructions are equally available (see O’Grady (2012) for some related discussion on the differences between English and Korean binding conditions along similar lines).

The contrast between English and Korean further results in the contrast in interpretation, as shown in the following.

(17) A: Who did you meet yesterday?
   B: Mary.
(18) A: Ne ecey nwukwu manna-ss-ni?
      you yesterday who meet-Pst-Q
   *‘When did you meet yesterday?’*
   B: Yenghi.

Although (17B) is interpreted only as ‘I met Mary’, (18B) has other interpretative possibilities in addition to the preferred reading ‘I met Yenghi’. For example, in a situation that the speaker and listener know that there was a blind date yesterday, (18B) can mean that the speaker B met a person who Yenghi introduced to him. This reading, by contrast,
is not available in (17B). Thus, this interpretative contrast indicates that (18B) is an instance of Caseless fragments while (17B) should be an instance of unambiguously Case-marked fragments (despite the absence of morphological realization of Case in English).

3. Quantifier Scope

Caseless fragments like (19A) displays scope disambiguation unlike the purported fully sentential sources like (19A’) and (19A”). Although the neg\textgreater\textlt reading is available in a full sentence as in (19A’) and (19A”), it disappears in a fragment as shown in (19A).

(19) Q: Yenghi-ka ta an manna-ss-ni? (\textgreater\textlt neg, neg\textgreater\textlt)
    Y.-Nom all not meet-Pst-Q
    *Didn’t Mary meet all? *
A: Ung, ta. (\textgreater\textlt neg)
    Yes, all
    ‘No, (she didn’t meet) all.’
A’: Ung, Yenghi-ka ta an manna-ss-e. (\textgreater\textlt neg, neg\textgreater\textlt)
    Yes, Y.-Nom all neg meet-Pst-Dec
A”: Ung, ta Yenghi-ka an manna-ss-e. (\textgreater\textlt neg, neg\textgreater\textlt)
    Yes, all Y.-Nom neg meet-Pst-Dec
    ‘No, she didn’t meet all.’

According to Ahn & Cho’s (2011) analysis of fragments, the adverbial fragment should be analyzed as nonsentential X(P) fragment that doesn’t undergo movement and subsequent clausal ellipsis. At first glance, the scope interpretation asymmetry above seems to support non-elliptical analysis of Caseless fragments in Korean.

However, somewhat surprisingly, the property of Caseless quantifier fragments in Korean seems to pattern with Case-marked fragments in this respect. Note that Case-marked fragments also show scope
asymmetry against their sentential correlates, as first noted in Ahn & Cho (2005).

(20) Q: Yenghi-ka motwu-lul an manna-ss-ni?  \( (\forall \neg, \neg \forall) \)  
'Y.-Nom all-Acc not meet-Pst-Q' 

A: Ung, motwu-lul.  \( (\forall \neg) \)  
'Yes, all-Acc' 

A': Ung, Yenghi-ka motwu-lul an  \( (\forall \neg, \neg \forall) \)  
'Yes, Y.-Nom all-Acc neg manna-ss-e. meet-Pst-Dec' 

A'' : Ung, motwu-lul Yenghi-ka an  \( (\forall \neg, \neg \forall) \)  
'Yes, all-Acc Y.-Nom neg manna-ss-e. meet-Pst-Dec' 

Unlike the purported fully sentential source, its fragmental counterpart displays scope disambiguation. That is, although the \( \neg \forall \) reading is available in a full sentence as in (20Q), (20A'), and scrambling sentence (20A''), it disappears in Case-marked fragments as in (20A).

Following Ahn & Cho (2010), we assume that movement taking place purely for discourse purposes (i.e., presumably for surface semantics in general, including focus, topics, presupposition, frame) does not allow scope reconstruction. Ahn & Cho further suggest that fragments in Korean undergoes focus-movement prior to clausal ellipsis (here, TP-ellipsis). As a result, the universal quantifier has only wide scope interpretation in fragmental utterances (see Ahn & Cho 2010 for technical details of this argument).6)
Back to Caseless quantifier fragments in (19A), we need an additional assumption to account for the anti-reconstruction property of scope. According to Ahn & Cho (2012a,b), quantifiers in Korean are analyzed as a complex phrase [QP NP + Q] (here Q includes (general) quantifiers such as universals, existentials, numerals & quantifier-like modifiers including NPIs and WHs). The property of the preceding NP (which can be a null pronoun pro) is determined by an appropriate context that the modifying Q is employed. Given this assumption, Caseless quantifier fragment ta ‘all’ in (19) is now analyzed as a complex QP salamtul-ul ta ‘people-Acc all’ where the restriction part salamtul-ul ‘people-Acc’ is not pronounced:

(21) Q: Yenghi-ka (salamtul-ul) ta an (\(\forall\neg, \neg\forall\))
  Y.-Nom people-Acc all not
  manna-ss-ni?
  meet-Pst-Q
  ‘Didn’t Mary meet all?’
A: Ung, (salamtul-ul) ta. (\(\forall\neg\))
  Yes, people-Acc all
  ‘No, (she didn’t meet people) all.’

We further assume the null argument pro for unpronounced salamtul-ul.

Ahn & Cho (2010) suggest that (20A") is ambiguous because the fronted QP in (20A") undergoes either scrambling or focus movement. Movement taking place purely for discourse purposes such as focus movement doesn’t allow scope reconstruction. According to Ahn & Cho (2010), scrambled phrases adjoin to XP (here TP), and adjoined phrase must obligatorily undergo reconstruction at LF for independent reasons (Bošković & Takahashi 1998). Hence, scope ambiguity occurs in (20A"). However, the fragment QP in (20A) cannot be an instance of scrambled QPs, namely a QP adjoined to TP, because we cannot elide a “segment” TP which is not a proper target of deletion. Hence, fragment QP undergoes focus movement only, and wide scope reading of fragment is predicted just as it is with focus movements in other languages.
‘people-Acc’ in (21). Consequently, the adverbial quantifier is analyzed in a way parallel to Case-marked fragment. Then, (19A) now has the structure like (22) prior to ellipsis.

(22)

Here too, the adverbial quantifier complex in (22) undergoes focus-movement on a par with the Case-marked fragment motwul ‘all-Acc’ in (20A). Therefore, the Caseless quantifier fragment in (19A) is expected to take only wide scope like Case-marked quantifier fragment in (20A).7)

4. Binding

Merchant (2004:680) argues that reflexives in fragments show a distribution regulated by the Binding Theory parallel to their correlates in fragmentary sentential complement (see Ahn & Cho 2009 for detailed discussion of this issue):

(23) Who does John like?
   a. Himself.

7 An anonymous reviewer points out a possibility that pro in (22) can be Caseless NP salamul ‘people’. We suggest that regardless of appearance of Case-markers, salamul-ul ‘people-Acc’ all should be treated as an instance of arguments that must check syntactic features unlike adjuncts.
b. John likes himself.

(24) Who does John think Sue will invite?
   a. ??Himself.
   b. ??John thinks Sue will invite himself.

By contrast, in Korean, anaphors which cannot occur in subject positions in fully sentential answers can occur in the same position in their fragment answers, as first noted in Ahn & Cho (2006b:126).

(25) a. Nwu-ka Chelswu-lul piphanye-ss-ni?
   who-Nom C.-Acc criticize-Pst-Q
   ‘Who criticized Chelswu?’

b. Cakī-ka,
   himself-Nom
   ‘Himself.’

   himself-Nom C.-Acc criticize-Pst-Dec
   ‘Lit. Himself criticized Chelswu.’

(26) a. Nwu-ka [Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul] piphanye-ss-ni?
   who-Nom C.-and Y.-Acc criticize-Pst-Q
   ‘Who criticized Chelswu and Yenghi?’

b. Kakca-ka,
   each-Nom
   ‘Each (themselves).’

   each-Nom C.-and Y.-Acc criticize-Pst-Dec
   ‘Lit. Each themselves criticized Chelswu and Yenghi’

---

* An anonymous reviewer points out speakers’ variation of the grammatical judgement of (25b). These judgments in (25–27) are somewhat idealized and vary among some speakers. For example, the judgement reported in Park (2005) rules out similar examples like (27b): e.g., sēlō-uy emma-ka ‘each other’s mom’ as a fragment answer to (27a). However, most speakers that we have consulted so far share our judgments, and our analysis concerns only those speakers who accept (25–27)b.
(27) a. Nwu-ka [Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul], piphanhay-ss-ni?
   who-Nom C.-and Y.-Acc criticize-Pst-Q
   ‘Who criticized Chelswu and Yenghi?’

   b. Selo-ka.
   each other-Nom
   ‘Each other.’

   c. *Selo-ka [Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul],
   each other-Nom C.-and Y.-Acc
   piphanhay-ss-ta.
   criticize-Pst-Dec
   ‘Lit. Each other criticized Chelswu and Yenghi.’

Although the fully sentential answers including the subject anaphors in (25-27)c are all ruled out, the corresponding fragment answers are all fully acceptable in the similar environment as in (25-27)b.

The binding discrepancy seems to be problematic for the ellipsis analysis of fragments because DPs in fragments are predicted to pattern with their correlates in non-fragmentary sentential equivalents under the approach.

According to Ahn & Cho (2006b), the full sentence in (25c) has the structure like (28). In (28), Binding Principle A is not satisfied and Binding Principle C is violated since caki-ka 'self-Nom' and its trace bind the R-expression Chelswu-lul 'Chelswu-Acc'.

\[
\text{(28)}
\]

According to Ahn & Cho (2006b), the fragment answer (25b), on the other
hand, may have the structure like (29), which is derived by (PF-vacuous) object scrambling followed by subject movement. Here object scrambling alters Binding Principle A possibility.  

Since Chelswu-lul c-commands t₂, the copy of moved subject anaphor caki-ka, Binding Principle A is satisfied.

At this point, two problems can be resolved. First, if (29) were a possible derivation for non-elliptical (25c), in other words, if vacuous vP-edge scrambling or tucking-in scrambling can take place, (25c) should also satisfy Binding Principle A, contrary to fact.

To resolve the problem, Ahn & Cho (2006b) claim that Chelswu-lul cannot undergo “intermediate” movement to vP-edge in (25c) since it will be counted as an unnecessary (move) step, and would violate some version of economy principles such as fewest steps and the shortest derivation condition. In fragments context, however, Ahn & Cho (2006b) suggest that 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

Motivation of object scrambling is related to Fox’s (2000) so-called “output economy”, which basically states that optional operations can apply only if they have an effect on outcome. In (29), object scrambling alters Binding Principle A Possibility, which has an effect on outcome.
Lasnik (2003), and many others. This might imply that like certain island conditions, “fewest steps” is an instance of representational economy (i.e. interface conditions) that can be ameliorated by PF-deletion.

The second problem arises as to the consequence that \( t' \) seems to bind the R-expression \textit{Chelswu-lul}. In other words, our question is how (29) avoids violating Binding Principle C. The amelioration of Binding Principle C in fragments seems to be attributed to the so-called “Vehicle Change effects” in elliptical contexts. This analysis is based on the non-trivial assumptions on Binding Principles: (i) Binding Principle A can be satisfied at any point of derivation (Lebeaux 1994, Saito 2003), (ii) Binding Principle C is an LF condition.

In sum, the amelioration of putative violations in derivational and interpretive representations in terms of ellipsis can capture the binding condition asymmetries between fragments and their sentential correlates.

Now let us turn to the distribution of the following Caseless anaphoric fragments that have not been previously paid attention to.

(30) a. \textit{Nwu-ka Chelswu-lul, piphanhay-ss-ni?} \\
\hspace{1cm} who-Nom C.-Acc criticize-Pst-Q \\
\hspace{1cm} ‘Who criticized Chelswu?’

b. ?cakį,10

\hspace{1cm} himself

\hspace{1cm} ‘Himself.’

c. *Cakį Chelswu-lul, piphanhay-ss-ta.

\hspace{1cm} himself C.-Acc criticize-Pst-Dec

\hspace{1cm} ‘Lit. Himself criticized Chelswu.’

(31) a. \textit{Nwu-ka [Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul], piphanhayss-ni?} \\
\hspace{1cm} who-Nom C.-and Y.-Acc criticize-Pst-Q \\
\hspace{1cm} ‘Who criticized Chelswu and Yenghi?’

---

10 As an anonymous reviewer points out, speakers’ variation can be found for grammatical judgement of (30b). Again, our analysis is relevant for only those speakers who (marginally) accept it.
b. *Kakca.,
each (themselves)
‘Each’
c. *Kakca, [Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul], piphanhay-ss-ta.
each C.-and Y.-Acc criticize-Pst-Dec
‘Lit. Each themselves criticized Chelswu and Yenghi’

(32) a. Nwu-ka [Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul], piphanhay-ss-ni?
who-Nom C.-and Y.-Acc criticize-Pst-Q
‘Who criticized Chelswu and Yenghi?’
b. *Selo,
each other-Nom
‘Each other.’
c. *Selo, [Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul], piphanhay-ss-ta.
each other C.-and Y.-Acc criticize-Pst-Dec
‘Lit. Each other criticized Chelswu and Yenghi.’

With respect to binding, Caseless fragments show distribution similar to Case-marked fragments. Although the fully sentential answers including the subject anaphors in (30-32)c are all ruled out, the corresponding fragment answers are all fully acceptable in the similar environment as in (30-32)b. The ill-formedness of (30-32)c seems to result from Binding Principle A or C violation.

Note further that the grammatical contrast between (33-35)b and (33-35)a shows the different properties between Caseless anaphors and Case-marked anaphors.11)

(33) a. *Chelswu-lul, caki piphanhay-ss-ta.
C.-Acc himself criticize-Pst-Dec
C.-Acc himself-Nom criticize-Pst-Dec

11) Here too, judgment is very subtle, and hence is subject to the speaker’s variation.
'Lit. Himself criticized Chelswu.'

(34) a. *[Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul] kaka, piphanhay-ss-ta.
   C.-and Y.-Acc each criticize-Pst-Dec
b. [Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul] kaka-ka, piphanhay-ss-ta.
   C.-and Y.-Acc each-Nom criticize-Pst-Dec

'Lit. Each themselves criticized Chelswu and Yenghi'

   C.-and Y.-Acc each other criticize-Pst-Dec
b. [Chelswu-wa Yenghi-lul] selo-ka
   C.-and Y.-Acc each other-Nom piphanhay-ss-ta.
   criticize-Pst-Dec

'Lit. Each other criticized Chelswu and Yenghi.'

As shown in (33–35), scrambling makes environments where binding requirements of Case-marked anaphors can be satisfied, while the same operation doesn’t make environments where binding requirements of Caseless anaphors can be satisfied. If Caseless fragments in (30–32) were derived from full sentential sources, they would be ill-formed on a par with (33–35)a. The grammatical contrast, thus, supports that Caseless fragments are generated as nonsentential XPs and that they aren’t derived through ellipsis with movement.

Further evidence is found with Caseless anaphoric fragments in object positions.

(36) a. Chelswu-ka, nwukwu-lul piphanhay-ss-ni?
    C.-Nom who-Acc criticize-Pst-Q
    'Whom did Chelswu criticize?'

b. caki,
   himself
   'Himself.'

C.-Nom himself criticize-Pst-Dec  
‘Lit. Chelswu criticized himself.’

(37) a. Chelswu-kaₐ nwukwu-lul piphanhay-ss-ni?  
    C.-Nom who-Acc criticize-Pst-Q  
    ‘Whom did Chelswu criticize?’

b. casĩₐ  
    himself  
    ‘Himself.’

    Chelswu-Nom himself criticize-Pst-Dec  
    ‘Lit. Chelswu criticized himself.’

Again, unlike the full sentences that involve Caseless anaphors (see Ahn 1999 for an analysis of ill-formedness in (36–37)c), Caseless fragments of anaphors are well-formed, which lends a further support to the premise that Caseless fragments aren’t derived from full sentential structures.

On the other hand, unlike Caseless fragments of anaphors, Case-marked fragments of anaphors in object positions show distribution similar to their sentential correlates.

(38) a. Chelswu-kaₐ nwukwu-lul piphanhay-ss-ni?  
    C.-Nom who-Acc criticize-Pst-Q  
    ‘Whom did Chelswu criticize?’

b. caki-lulₐ  
    himself-Acc  
    ‘Himself.’

c. Chelswu-kaₐ caki-lulₐ piphanhay-ss-ta.  
    Chelswu-Nom himself criticize-Pst-Dec  
    ‘Lit. Chelswu criticized himself.’

(39) a. Chelswu-kaₐ nwukwu-lul piphanhay-ss-ni?  
    C.-Nom who-Acc criticize-Pst-Q  
    ‘Whom did Chelswu criticize?’
b. casin-ul,
   himself-Acc
   ‘Himself.’

C.-Nom himself-Acc criticize-Pst-Dec
   ‘Lit. Chelswu criticized himself.’

In sum, Caseless fragments of anaphors have unique distributional properties that are crucially distinct from Caseless anaphors employed in the complete sentence structure. In other words, if Caseless fragments of anaphors were derived from Move-and-Delete like Case-marked ones, it would be mysterious why they do not pattern with Caseless anaphors in sentential correlates. The unique syntactic and semantic behavior of Caseless anaphoric fragments may be subsumed to the nature of Caseless fragments in general; namely, they are directly generated as nonsentential XPs.\(^{12}\)

---

\(^{12}\) Chung (2012) further indicates the difference between Case-marked vs. Caseless fragments in negative polarity items (NPI). He points out that only Caseless NPIs are possible for fragments, as shown in (ii–iii)B.

   J.-Dat any fault–Nom/TO not;exist–DE
   ‘John has no fault.’

   J.-Nom any role–Acc/-TO Neg-do-Prog–DE
   ‘Chelswu is not playing any role.’

(ii) A: John–eykey mwusun calmos–i iss–ni?
    J.-Dat what fault–Nom exist–QE
    ‘What fault does John have?’

   B: {amwu calmos–to(-yo)/, *amwu calmos–i(-yo)}
      any fault–TOx–DE/ any fault–Nom(-DE)
      (Intended) ‘Not any fault.’

(iii) A: John–i mwusun yekhal–ul ha–ko, iss–ni?
    J.-Nom what role–Acc do-Prog–QE
    ‘What role is John playing?’

   B: {amwu yekhal–tof–yo/ *amwu yekhal–ulf–yo}
      any role–TOx–DE/ any role–Accf–DE)
      (Intended) ‘Not any role.’
5. Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we have shown that Ahn & Cho’s (2011) hybrid analysis of fragments in Korean has non-trivial consequences and implications in three seemingly independent phenomena: P-stranding, quantifier scope and anaphoric binding. Merchant (2004) argues that fragments and their sentential correlates show parallelism with respect to P-stranding, quantifier scope and anaphoric binding. We have indicated that Caseless fragments in Korean do not behave on a par with their sentential correlates. We suggest that Caseless fragments fundamentally differ from Case-marked ones: The latter are derived via Move-and-Delete operation, while the former is directly base-generated as nonsentential XPs. We have shown that this difference can explain the asymmetries between Caseless fragments and their sentential correlates with respect to P-stranding, quantifier scope and anaphoric binding. More extensive study of Caseless fragments should be conducted to other domains in the theory of grammar to confirm the hybrid analysis of fragments across languages.
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