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Ahn & Cho (2005) proposes that some fragmentary utterances in Korean are derived from the full sentential structure via movement and deletion. Right dislocation (RD) in Korean can be analyzed in a similar way to fragments. D. Chung (2009), Kim & Hong (2013), and Ahn & Cho (2014) suggest that RD in Korean has bi-clausal structure (host clause plus appendix clause) and that an RDed phrase undergoes movement to a clause initial position in appendix clause and the rest of the clause undergoes deletion. This type of analysis accounts for the fact that RDed elements and fragments share core properties (cf. D. Chung 2009, 2012a, Kim & Hong 2013). Ko (2014), however, examines the question of whether the RDed elements can be treated in the same way as sentence fragments and argues that RDed elements significantly differ from fragments. This paper aims to defend the parallelism between RDed elements and fragments by reconsidering the data Ko (2014) discusses.
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1. Introduction

A fragment answer is a short answer to a question such as that in (1b). The fragment which consists of non-sentential NP in (1b) conveys the same propositional content as a fully sentential answer like (1c).

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

---
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Ahn & Cho (2005), following the idea of Merchant (2004), claims that a fragmentary utterance in Korean is derived through movement of remnant fragments followed by PF-deletion of the full-fledged sentential structures. Under the analysis, (1b) has the following derivational step.

(2) \[Yenghi-lul, Chelswu-ka \text{ manna-ss-e}] \\
In (2), the pronounced fragment *Yenghi-lul* ‘Y-Acc’ moves to the sentence-initial position and the rest of the sentence undergoes ellipsis.

D. Chung (2009, 2012a), Kim & Hong (2013), and Ahn & Cho (2014) suggest that right dislocation (RD) in Korean is analyzed as bi-clausal structure (host clause and appendix clause) and a right-dislocated (RDed) element undergoes movement to a clause-initial position in appendix. Thus, (3) has the structure like (4).

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

(4) \[\text{Host Chelswu-ka pro, manna-ss-e}] \\
\[\text{Appendix Yenghi-lul, Chelswu-ka t, manna-ss-e}] \\
This type of analysis is predicted to account for the fact that RDed elements and fragment answers share core properties (D. Chung 2009, 2012a, Kim & Hong 2013, Ko 2014 and others). For example, parallelism between two constructions is observed in scope facts involving negation and quantifier as shown in (5-6).
Although the question in (5A) shows scope ambiguity, the fragment answer allows only one interpretation; i.e., the quantifier must take scope over the negation (see Ahn & Cho 2005, 2010 for relevant details). Likewise, in the right dislocation construction (RDC), the RDed quantifier must take scope over the negation, as shown in (6). Thus, we can see a parallelism between RDCs and fragments.

However, Ko (2014) argues that despite some similarities the two constructions show different behavior in many respects: e.g., island sensitivity, NPI licensing, Case drop, and wh-fragment. In this paper, by exploring the data Ko (2014) discusses, we show that the differences Ko (2014) observes are not real and the parallelism between RDCs and fragments can be maintained.

2 Parallelism between RDCs and Fragments

2.1 Albert's Generalization

Ko (2014) shows that the distinct behavior with respect to certain types of island is observed in fragments and RDCs. Consider (7) for fragments in island contexts.

(7) Island Insensitivity of fragments (Ko 2014: 299)

\[1\] Ko (2014, 2015) argues for a hybrid analysis of the Korean RDC. She assimilates argument-type RDCs to a sort of specification construction, akin to a cleft construction. Adjunct-type appendices are base-generated at the end of the utterance and the head of the adjunct may undergo sideward movement onto the host clause. D. Chung (2015) points out conceptual and empirical needs of a unified analysis of the Korean RDCs.
A: Cheli-nun [nwu-ka sacwu-n] mokkeli-lul peli-ess-ni?
   C.-Top who-Nom bought-RC necklace-Acc throw.away-Pst-Q
   'Who is such that Cheli threw away the necklace that the person bought for him?'

B: Emma-(ka).
   Mom-Nom
   'Mommy'

A fragment answer in (7B) is acceptable although it induces island violation if it were derived via move-and-delete (we assume that island violation can be ameliorated for fragments in Korean following Park 2005). Ko notes that the RDC in Korean patterns differently concerning island sensitivity as shown in (8). I.e., unlike fragments in (7), the RDED phrase is not allowed if the correlate occurs in the island.

(8) Island sensitivity of RDCs (Ko 2014: 299)^2
   C.-Top bought-RC necklace-Acc throw.away-Pst-Dec mom(-Nom)
   'Cheli threw away the necklace that his mother bought for him'.

An anonymous reviewer points out that when the gap in the host clause in (8) is filled with an indefinite, the sentence sounds marginal, as shown in (i).

(i)??Cheli-nun nwukwunka-ka sacwu-n mokkeli-lul peli-ess-e emma-(ka).
   C.-Top somebody-Nom bought-RC necklace-Acc throw.away-Pst-Dec mom(-Nom)
   'Cheli threw away the necklace that (his) mother bought for him'.

As indicated by Ott & Vries (2013), in the afterthought variety of RD, the correlate is indefinite, as shown in (ii).

(ii) Jan heeft iets moois gebouwd: EEN GOUDEN ICKLO (Dutch)
   Jan has something beautiful built: a golden igloo
   'John has something beautiful built: a golden igloo.'

The dislocated nominal in (ii) expresses discourse-new information about the referent of its correlate and is consequently realized with focal stress. The ill-formedness of (i) and (iii) shows that this type of construction does not occur in Korean.

(iii) a. ??Na-nun nwukwunka-uy emma-uy cha-lul pilii-ess-e Yenghi-(uy)
   I-top someone-Gen mother-Gen car-Acc borrow-Pst-Dec Y.-Gen
   'I borrowed Yenghi’s mother’s car.'

b. ??Yenghi-ka nwukwunka-uy emma-uy manass-tay Cheli-(uy)
   Y.-nom someone-Gen mother-Acc met-Q{}hear Y.-Gen
   'Yenghi met Cheli’s mother.'
'Cheli threw away the necklace that (his) mother bought for him'.

If RDCs and fragments are treated as the same construction (for example, as in move-and-delete analysis), both constructions are expected to pattern together with respect to island violations, contrary to fact.

Note, however, that the constructions given by Ko (2014) for fragments and RDCs are lacking in genuine parallelism. In particular, the correlate of fragment, *nwo-ka* ‘who-Nom’ occurs in (7A), whereas the correlate of RD is not overtly realized in the host clause, as shown in (8).

This reminds us of two subtypes of sluicing in English. Sluicing is the ellipsis of all but the interrogative phrase of a constituent question. Chung et al. (1995) distinguishes two subtypes of sluicing: *Merger* and *Sprouting*. In Merger, the interrogative phrase that is the remnant of ellipsis has an overt correlate in the antecedent clause as shown in (9) (Chung et al. 2011: 1).

(9) a. They’ve made an offer to a phonologist, but I’m not sure which one.
   b. She insulted somebody but she won’t tell me who.

In (9a), the interrogative phrase, *which one* has an overt correlate, *a phonologist* and in (9b), the interrogative phrase, *who* has an overt correlate, *somebody*.

In Sprouting, the interrogative phrase that is the remnant of ellipsis has no overt correlate within the antecedent clause, as shown in (10) (Chung et al. 2011: 1):

(10) a. They were firing, but at what was unclear.
   b. She applied for the position but nobody could figure out why.

As noted by Chris Albert, reported by Chung et al. (1995), island violations are not repaired in Sprouting (hence, named Albert’s generalization). However, they are repaired in Merger (Ross 1969, Chung et al. 1995, and Merchant 2001).

(11) *Sandy was trying to work out which students would speak, but she refused to say who to.
(12) Sandy was trying to work out which students would be able to solve a certain problem, but she wouldn’t tell us which one.

Parallel to English sluicing, in Korean fragment constructions, absence of overt correlate may also result in ill-formedness as shown in (13).

---

3.4
(13) Absence of correlates & Island sensitivity of fragments
A: Cheli-nun [____ sacwu-n] mokkeli-lul peli-ess-ni?
   C-Top bought-RC necklace-Acc throw.away-Pst-Q
   'Did Cheli throw away the necklace that the person bought for him?'
B: *Ung. Emma-(ka)
    Yes Mommy-Nom
    'Yes, Mommy'

In stark contrast to (7) where the correlate of the fragment overtly occurs, when question does not have a correlate of its fragment answer, the fragment that moves across island, emma-ka ‘mommy-Nom’ is not possible as shown in (13B). Hence, exact parallelism holds between (8) and (13B), which supports the analysis that fragments and RDCs are derived in a similar way.

Ko (2014) further argues that fragments differ from RDCs in licensing extraction out of complex NP structures. Consider the contrast in (14) vs. (15).

(14) Fragment answer out of complex NPs (Ko 2014: 302)
   You-Top who-Gen mother-Gen car-Acc borrow-Pst-Q
   'Whose mother's car did you borrow?'
B: Yenghi-uy
   Y.-Gen
   'I borrowed Yenghi's mother car.'

(15) Adnominals in the appendix associated with complex NPs (Ko 2014: 302)
   I-top mother-Gen car-Acc borrow-Pst-Dec Y.-Gen
   'I borrowed Yenghi's mother's car.'

A fragment can be licensed when it moves out of complex NPs, as shown in (14). By contrast, as shown in (15), adnominal phrases cannot appear in the

3 Note that when the correlate is present in the host clause, the RDeD phrase can also be immune to island violations parallel to fragments in (7):

(i) Cheli-nun [emma-ka sacwu-n] mokkeli-lul peli-ess-e emma-ka
   C-Top mom-Nom bought-RC necklace-Acc throw.away-Pst-Dec mom-Nom
   'Cheli threw away the necklace that his mother bought for him.'

4 Regarding the nature of correlates, an anonymous reviewer points out the difference between implicit argument and pro. According to Romero (1998), a covert correlate is an indefinite implicit argument. Given that pro in (13) can be indefinite in Korean, a parallel analysis seems to be possible.
appendix when it is embedded under another NP which does not function as the head of the object. Again, we have to note that the overt correlate of fragment, *nwukwu-uy* ‘who-Gen’ occurs in (14A). By contrast, the overt correlate of RD is not present in the host clause, as shown in (15). Note that presence or absence of correlate may result in different behaviors with respect to extraction out of complex NPs, which can be evidenced by (16).

(16) Fragment answer out of complex NPs
   A: Ne-nun [_______ emma-uy cha-lul] pilli-ess-ni?
      You-Top mother-Gen car-Acc borrow-Pst-Q
      'Did you borrow mother’s car?'
   B: *Ung, *Yenghi-uy.
      Yes, Y.-Gen
      'Yes. I borrowed Yenghi’s mother car.’

As shown in (16), when question does not have an overt correlate of its fragment answer, the fragment *Yenghi-uy* ‘Y.-Gen’ that moves across complex NP islands is not possible. Hence, here too exact parallelism takes place between fragments and RDCs contra Ko (2014).

2.2 Chung’s Generalization

Ko (2014) further notes that RDCs and fragments show different behaviors with respect to case drop.6

---

5 Note in passing that when the correlate is present in the host clause, the RDed phrase can also be immune to complex NP island violations parallel to fragments in (14):

   I-top Y.-Gen mother-Gen car-Acc borrow-Pst-Dec Y.-Gen
   'I borrowed Yenghi’s mother’s car.’

6 Ko (2014:295-296) suggests that case connectivity effect between the host clause and appendix in RDCs is much stronger than that of fragments, as shown in (ii).

(ii) Rigid Case identity in RDCs without a gap (Ko 2014: 296)

---

(i) Case variability in fragments (Ahn 2012: 66)
   A: Ne-nun eti-ka ka-ko sip-ni?
      you-Top where-Nom go-and want-Q
      'Where do you want to go?'
   B: Hakkya-ka/Hakkya-lul/Hakkya-ey
      school-Nom/school-Acc/school-to
      'to school.’
(17) Optional Case drop in fragments -case of genitive (Ko 2014: 300)
A: Yenghi-ka nwukwu-uy emma-lul marnass-tay?
    Y.-nom who-Gen mother-Acc met-Q
    'Whose mother did Yenghi meet?'
B: Cheli uy Cheli
    C.-Gen/C
    'Cheli’s'

(18) Obligatory Case marking in RDCs -case of genitive (Ko 2014: 300)
Yenghi-ka emma-lul marnass-tay Cheli uy Cheli
    Y.-nom mother-Acc met-Q C.-Gen/C
    'Yenghi met Cheli’s mother.'

Ko (2014: 295) notes that even if wh-counterpart of a fragment answer is nominative-marked, as shown in (iA), the fragment NP may bear different Case morphology, as shown in (iB). By contrast, as shown in (ii), if the host clause contains a nominative-marked argument, the RDed NP must also bear nominative Case. Ko (2014) further notes that when the host clause contains a gap, the appendix may allow three types of Cases listed in (iii).

(iii) Case variability in RDCs with a gap (Ko 2014: fn. 10)
Na-nun hakkya-ka ka-ko sip-e hakkya-ka/hakkya-lul/hakkya-ey
I-top school-to go-and want-Dec school-Nom/school-Acc/school-to
'I want to go to school.'

A bi-clausal analysis of RDC, however, predicts that irrespective of a gap in the host clause, the appendix has the same structure, as shown in (iv).

(iv) a. hakkya-ka [na-nun t ka-ko sip-e]
    b. hakkya-lul [na-nun t ka-ko sip-e]
    c. hakkya-ey [na-nun t ka-ko sip-e]

Hence, it is predicted in the bi-clausal analysis of RDC that there is no difference in judgement. Actually, to our ears, three types of Cases, hakkya-ka/hakkya-lul/hakkya-ey in the appendix clause sound acceptable in gapless RDCs of (ii) contra Ko’s judgment.

An anonymous reviewer points out the following possibility in the appendix of (18) prior to ellipsis.

(i) Cheli Yenghi-ka [t emma-lul] marnass-tay

Ahn & Cho (2009:38) shows that sub-extraction out of the case-marked DP is barred. Likewise, (i) should be ruled out.
As shown in (17), genitive case marking can be freely dropped in fragments without affecting grammaticality. As shown in (18), case drop seems to be much more limited in RDCs; Genitive case drop makes (18) ungrammatical.

Impossibility of case drop in (18) reminds us of Chung's generalization. Chung (2005) has observed that even in preposition-stranding languages, prepositions cannot be stranded in the elided TP in sprouting cases—when the interrogative phrase that is the remnant of ellipsis has no overt correlate in the antecedent clause. Compare (19) with (20) (Chung et al. 2011: 9).

(19) a. They are jealous but it's unclear of who/who of.
   b. Last night he was very afraid, but he couldn't tell us of what/what of.
   c. Mary was flirting, but they couldn't say with who/who with.
(20) a. *They are jealous but it's unclear who.
   b. *Last night he was very afraid, but he couldn't tell us what.
   c. *Mary was flirting, but they couldn't say who.

Hence, comparison between (17) and (18) does not seem to be on the right track. Again, overt correlate of the fragment Cheli-uy/Cheli, mukuna-uy 'who-gen' occurs in (17A), but overt correlate of the right dislocated element Cheli-uy/Cheli does not occur in the host clause of (18). When an overt correlate of a fragment answer is not present in its question, genitive case marker drop makes the sentence ungrammatical, as shown in (21).8

(21) Obligatory Case marking in fragments -case of genitive
   A: Yenghi-ka emma-lul  mannass-tay?
      Y.-Nom mother-Acc met-Q
      'Whose mother did Yenghi meet?'
   B: Ung, Cheli-uy/Cheli.9
      Yes, C.Gen/C
      'Yes, Cheli's'

Hence, regarding case marker drop, fragment answers and RDCs also show parallel behaviors contra Ko (2014).10

---

8 An anonymous reviewer indicates that (21) shows that Left Branching Condition (LBC) can be violated in fragment answers in Korean. However, what is at issue in (21) is not LBC but Chung's generalization. When the case marker is stranded in sprouting, identity condition is violated.

9 You may wonder whether Cheli in (21) can be a Caseless fragment. Because of absence of appropriate context, the Caseless fragment Cheli cannot be interpreted (cf. Ahn 2012).
2.3 Two Types of Fragments

Ko (2014: 297) also points out that fragments and RDCs show radically distinct behavior with respect to NPI licensing. If the question contains a negation, NPI cannot be used as a fragment, as shown in (22B), whereas various types of NPIs such as \textit{amwukesto} ‘anything’, \textit{sayngsen-pakkey} ‘fish-only’ and \textit{enukesto} ‘anything’ can appear in RDCs, as shown in (23).

(22) NPI licensing and fragments (Ko 2014:297)
\begin{align*}
A: & \text{NWu-ka  o-ci-ahn-ass-ni?} \\
& \text{who-Nom come-CI-Neg-Pst-Q} \\
& \text{‘Who didn’t come?’} \\
B: & *\text{amwu/Chelippakey/nwukwu-to} \\
& \text{anyone/-C-only/anyone} \\
& \text{‘Nobody/only Cheli/nobody’}
\end{align*}

(23) NPI licensing and RDCs (Ko 2014:297)
\begin{align*}
\text{Chel-ka mek-ci-ahn-ass-ni?} & \text{amwukesto/sayngsen-pakkey/enukesto} \\
\text{C.-Nom eat-CI-Neg-Pst-Q} & \text{anything/fish-only/anything.}
\end{align*}

The difference between (22B) and (23), however, does not mean that NPI fragments and RDC NPIs are licensed by different mechanisms. Rather, the ill-formedness of (22B) seems to result from presupposition of the negative question (22A), \textit{NWu-ka o-ci-ahn-ass-ni?} ‘who didn’t come?’ (22A) seems to be uttered in a situation when many people already came. Hence, the answers in (22B) seems to come conflict with the presupposition of the question.\footnote{As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, when presupposition is cancelled, NPI fragment is possible, as shown in (i), which supports our analysis.}

11 On a par with fragments, when overt correlate of the right dislocated element \textit{Chel-i/y/Cheli} occurs in the host clause, genitive case drop is possible:

(i) Yenghi-ka \textit{Cheli-i/y emma-lul marrass-tay Cheli-i/y Cheli} \\
Y.-nom \textit{C.-Gen mother-Acc met-Qmerry C.-Gen/C} \\
‘Yenghi met Cheli’s mother.’

12 As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, when presupposition is cancelled, NPI fragment is possible, as shown in (i), which supports our analysis.

(i) A: \text{NWu-ka  o-ci-ahn-ass-ni?} \\
\text{who-Nom come-CI-Neg-Pst-Q} \\
‘Who didn’t come?’
B: \text{saisil-un amubu.} \\
\text{In fact-Top anyone} \\
‘In fact, nobody.’
With respect to the NPI, another difference is observed in (24-25). D. Chung (2009) notes that NPI fragments can be licensed without overt negation (an observation also due to Watanabe 2004), as shown in (24b). However, NPI RD is not licensed in affirmative sentence as shown in (25).

(24) A: Cheli-ka nwukwu-lul manna-ss-ni? (Ko 2014: 298)
    C.-Nom who-Acc meet-Pst-Q
    ‘Who did Cheli meet?’
B: Amwuto.
    anyone
(25) *Cheli-ka manna-ss-e amwuto.
    C. -Nom meet-Pst-Dec anyone
    ‘Cheli met anyone.’

In order to understand the contrast between (24b) and (25), we have to note that as argued by Ahn & Cho (2011), Korean has two types of fragments; namely, Case-marked fragments and Caseless fragments. Ahn & Cho (2011) proposes that the two types of fragments in Korean have different structures and their interpretative mechanisms are systematically different. Case-marked fragments have full sentential structures prior to ellipsis and the interpretation follows from the sentential structures that are the sources of propositional interpretations. Caseless fragments, on the other hand, are non-sentential XPs whose interpretations come directly from pragmatics-discourse.

Note that antecedent sentential source of the fragment amwuto ‘anyone’ in (24b) isn’t a clause specified as [NEG+]. Nonetheless, the negative polarity item amwuto is licensed as a fragment answer in (24b). We think it is the role of pragmatics that may adjust the positive environment to the negative one and licenses the NPI fragment amwuto. Thus, apparent polarity mismatching doesn’t

---

D. Chung (2012b:545) shows a similar example like (ii).

(ii) A: mwues-mwues-ul ani-kacieo-ess-ni?
    what-what-Acc Neg-Bring-Past-Q
    ‘What things didn’t you bring?’
B: ssul-manha-n kes-un amwukes-to-yo.
    useful-Rel thing-Top AMWUKES-TO-DE
    ‘Nothing useful’

12 Our analysis is different from Ko (2014). Ko (2014: 297) points out that fragments and RDCs show radically distinct behavior with respect to NPI licensing. We suggest that Case-marked fragments and RDCs show parallelism with respect to NPI licensing, while Caseless fragments show distinct behavior due to pragmatic licensing.
make the fragment deviant thanks to pragmatic strategies available for caseless (base-generated) fragments.\textsuperscript{13} However, the appendix in (25) has the structure like (26), prior to deletion. In this clause, \textit{amwuto} is not licensed. Hence, (25) is ill-formed.\textsuperscript{14} \textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{13} Patterns of fragments containing NPIs are interesting. Consider (i) and (iiA) (Ahn & Cho 2011: 28).

(i) *Kay ton-ul cenhye pel-ess-e.  
he money-Acc at all earn-Pst-Dec  
‘Lit. He earned money at all’

(ii) Q: Mary-ka ton-ul pel-ess-ri?  
Mary-Nom money-Acc earn-Past-Q  
Did Mary earn money?  
A: Cenhye.  
at all  
‘(She didn’t earn) at all.’

(i) is ill-formed because there is no [+Neg] that licenses the NPI cenhye ‘at all’. Nonetheless, (iiA) is well-formed in a similar situation. Here too the Caseless fragment cenhye ‘at all’ is pragmatically licensed, which results in well-formedness of (iiA).

\textsuperscript{14} D. Chung (2012b) further indicates the difference between Case-marked vs. Caseless fragments in negative polarity items (NPI).

(i) A: John-eykey mwuaun calmos-i iss-ri?  
J-Dat what fault-Nom exist-QE  
‘What fault does John have?’  
B: amwu calmos-to(-yo)  
any fault-TO(-DE)  
C: *amwu calmos-i(-yo)  
any fault-Nom(-DE)  
(Intended) ‘Not any fault.’

(ii) A: John-i mwuaun yakhal-ul ha-ko.iss-ri?  
J-Nom what role-Acc do-Prog-QE  
‘What role is John playing?’  
B: amwu yakhal-to(-yo)  
any role-TO(-DE)  
C: *amwu yakhal-ul(-yo)  
any role-Acc(-DE)  
(Intended) ‘Not any role.’

When the fragments occur with Case marker, the NPI fragments cannot be licensed without overt negation, as shown in (iB) and (iiB). When the fragments occur without Case marker, as shown in (iC) and (iiC), they can be licensed without overt negation.

D. Chung (2012:557) shows pragmatic accommodation like (iii) occurs in the case of caseless NPI fragments.
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(26) amwuto, Cheli-ka t, manna-ss-e

The contrast between (27B) and (28) also shows that parallelism between fragment and RDC is confined to only “Case-marked” fragment and RDC.

(27) Caseless fragments (Ahn 2012: 43)
A: Nayil mwe hay-yo?

(ii) A: John-eykey mwusun calmos-i iss-ri?
J-Dat what fault-Nom exist-QE

'B What fault does John have?
B: amw calmos-to △ (Syntax & LF)
any fault-TO ↓ (Pragmatic accommodation)

Any fault (JOHN DID NOT HAVE)

Ahn & Cho (2011, 2012b) suggest that Case-marked NPI fragments require syntactic licensing of negative concord. Case-marked NPI fragments in (i-ii) have full-fledged structure and do not have the privilege of being interpreted through pragmatic accommodation. Hence, they are expected to be ruled out.

15 An anonymous reviewer points out (i).

(i) A: Chelswu-ka nwukwu-eykey chayk-ul cwu-ess-ri?
C.Nom who-to bookAcc give-Pst-Q

'To whom did Chelswu give a book?
B: Nwukwu-eykey-to.

nobody-to-even

‘Chelswu gave nobody a book.’

(ii) A: Chelswu-ka nwukwu-eykey ku saa-ul mahluy-ss-ri?
C.Nom who-to the fact-Acc tell-Pst-Q

‘Whom did Chelswu tell the fact?
B: Nwukwu-eykey-to.

nobody-to-even

‘Chelswu told nobody the fact’

nwukwu-eykey ‘who-to’ doesn’t alternate with accusative marked nwukwu-lul ‘who-Acc’ in (iiA). In this respect, (iiB) seems to be able to be analyzed as a Caseless fragment. Note that nwukwu-eykey ‘who-to’ can alternate with accusative marked nwukwu-klul ‘who-Acc’ in (iiA), which may imply that eykey in (iB) can be a Case-marked fragment that doesn’t allow polarity mismatch. To our ears, perhaps for this reason (iiB) sounds better to our ears.

(iiB) does not sound good to our ears. However, speakers judging (iiB) acceptable seem to regard eykey in (iiB) as post-position. As a result, (iiB) is a Caseless fragment, where pragmatic adjustment occurs. Compare (i) with (ii). (iiB) sounds better to our ears.
tomorrow what do-Q
‘What are you going to do tomorrow?’

B: San.
‘Mountain.’

(28) Caseless RDC (Ko 2014: 301)16 17
*Na-nun nayil hay san.
I-top tomorrow do mountain
(intended) ‘I will go to the mountain tomorrow.’

The caseless fragment, san ‘mountain’ in (27B) is not derived from a sentential structure. The caseless fragment in (27B) has no internal structure at all and its interpretation comes directly from pragmatics and discourse. It is natural that Caseless fragment and RDCs, which are derived in different ways, show different properties.15

Note that the appendix clause in (28) has the sentential source like

16 An anonymous reviewer wonders why the main clause in (28) cannot be combined with san directly. Ahn & Cho (2011) shows that pragmatics cannot mix with syntax. Caseless fragments, which are pragmatically licensed, are not combined with sentence structure, which is supported in the grammatical contrast between (B) and (iC).

(i) A: Mary-ka ton-ul pel-ess-nil?
      Mary-Nom money-Acc earn-Pst-Q
      ‘Did Mary earn money?’
B: Cenhye.
      at all
      ‘(She didn’t earn money) at all.’
C: Cenhye ton-ul.
      at all money-Acc
      ‘(She didn’t earn) money at all.’

In (B), although there is no [+Neg], the caseless fragment enhye is pragmatically licensed. By contrast, the case-marked fragment ton-ul, which needs a sentential source, cannot co-occur with caseless fragment enhye, as in (C).

17 One reviewer indicates (28) is acceptable. In this case, san ‘mountain’ in (28) might involve a contracted form of tungan ‘climbing’, as shown in (i).

(i) Na-nun nayil hay tungsan.
      I-top tomorrow do climbing
      (intended) ‘I will go climbing tomorrow.’

18 Note that Case-marked fragments and RDCs, which are derived in similar ways, show parallel behaviors, as shown in (i-ii).

(i) Case-marked fragment
   A: Nayil mwe hay-yo?
(29), which is semantically ill-formed, which makes (28) ill-formed.

(29) *San na-nun nayil hay.
   mountain I-top tomorrow do
   (intended) 'I will go to the mountain tomorrow.'

Tense mismatching data also shows that parallelism between fragment and RDC is confined to Case-marked fragments only. A temporal adverb should be harmonized with tense in its clause. Nonetheless, tense mismatching is observed with a Caseless fragment.

(30) A: Cheli-ka ecey Yuni-lul manna-ss-ni? (Ko 2014: 301)
   C.-Nom yesterday Y.-Acc meet-Pst-Q
   'Did Cheli meet Yuni Yesterday?'

B: Ani, nayil.
   No tomorrow
   'No, tomorrow.'

Although the question clause has the past tense verb *manna-ss-ni*, 'meet-Pst-Q', the fragment answer can have a future time adverb *nayil* 'tomorrow', as shown in (30A). Again, notice that the fragment isn't case-marked. Thus, the fragment doesn't have to correlate with sentential source and can be interpreted directly. Owing to pragmatic adjustment from past tense to future tense, the fragment *nayil* 'tomorrow' can have the interpretation like 'He will meet Yumi.' By contrast, pragmatic adjustment with respect to tense is not possible in RDCs, as shown in (31), which have sentential structure like Case-marked fragments.

(31) *Cheli-ka Yuni-lul manna-ss-e nayil-(to) (Ko 2014: 301)
   C.-Nom Y.-Acc meet-Pst-Dec tomorrow too
   'Cheli met Yuni, and tomorrow too. (he will meet Yumi.)'

   tomorrow what do-Q
   'What are you going to do tomorrow?'

B: *San-ul.
   Mountain-Acc
   'Mountain.'

(ii) RDC
   *Na-nun nayil hay san-ul.
   I-top tomorrow do mountain-Acc
   (intended) 'I will go to the mountain tomorrow.'
2A Whfragments

Ko (2014) further notes that whfragments are quite freely licensed in Korean, in contrast to wh-phrases in RDCs. Consider the contrast between (32B) and (33).

(32) A: Yuni-ka ku salam-ul manna-ss-ni?
    Y.-Nom that person-Acc meet-Pst-Q
    'Did Yuni meet that person?'

    B: Nwukwu-lul?
    'Who-Acc?'

(33) *Yuni-ka manna-ss-ni nwukwu-lul?
    Y.-Nom meet-Pst-Q who-Acc
    'Intended: Who did Yuni meet?'

Whfragments are acceptable as shown in (32B) whereas whappendices are not, as shown in (33). This raises a question related to whlicensing and similarity of these two constructions.

First of all, consider the structure of (32B) prior to deletion, as shown in (34).

(34) [nwukwu-lul, Yuni-ka t manna-ss-ni C]
     [+wh]        [+wh]

(34) obeys whlicensing condition (35), proposed by Ahn & Cho (2014).


[+Wh] C has whphrase, nwukwu-lul in its probe domain. Hence, (32B) can be properly interpreted as whquestion.

Now, let us look at the structure of (33), as shown in (36).

(36) [host Yunika pro manna-ss-ni C]
     [+wh]

---

19 (33) is ill-formed when it involves one utterance meaning 'Who did Yuni meet?' If (33) is a sequence of two utterances like yes-no question and whquestion, (33) is well-formed. (i) is a sequence of two utterances, too.

(i) Yuni-ka nwukwunka-lul manna-ss-ni nwukwu-lul?
    Y.-Nom someone-Acc meet-Pst-Q who-Acc
    'Did Yuni meet some? Who?'
(36) violates \[wh\]-licensing condition (35). Here \textit{pro} in the host clause doesn't contain \[+wh\] feature (see Ahn & Cho 2012, Ahn 2012, Chung 2013 for discussion). Notice that there is no expression containing a \[+wh\] feature to be linked to the C in the host clause. Thus, (33) cannot be interpreted as \textit{wh}-question.

At this point, the following question arises: Why isn't the appendix clause independently interpreted as \textit{wh}-question, either? If the appendix clause has an independent projection responsible for marking force/clause type and the force clause type is \[+wh\] C, the appendix in (36) can be interpreted as \textit{wh}-question irrespective of the status of the host clause, contrary to fact.

Following D. Chung (2009), we assume that the host clause and the appendix clause should always share the same force. Witness, for example (D. Chung 2009: 15):

(37) a. Yuni-ka m\textit{wues-ul} ilk\textit{ess-ni} ecey.
Y.-Nom what-Acc read-Pst-Q yesterday
‘What did Yuni read yesterday?’
b. Nehitul ka-la ppalli.
youguys go-Imp hurriedly
‘You guys go.’

Both the force in the host clause and the appendix clause in (37a) conveys an interrogative reading. In (37b), both the host and the appendix have imperative reading. There seems to be a strict identity requirement between the host and appendix with respect to force/clause type.20

Unlike appendix clauses, however, fragments can have force/clause types different from their antecedents (cf. D. Chung 2009: 15, Ahn & An 2011).

(38) a. M\textit{wues-ul} sikhi\textit{l-kka}? Interrogative
what-Acc order-Q
‘What should I order?’
b. pap-ul. Imperative

20 At this stage we do not have a solid answer why this requirement holds in RD constructions (but see D. Chung 2009 for a proposal).
rice(-Acc)  
'(Order) rice.'

(39) a. Wuli mwe mek-ul-kka? Interrogative
   we what eat-fut-Q
   'What shall we eat?'

   b. pap(-ul). Propositional
      rice(-Acc)
      '(Let's have) rice.'

In sum, (33) cannot be interpreted as wh-questions both in the host clause and the appendix clause due to wh-licensing condition (35) in conjunction with strict identity requirements between the host and appendix with respect to force/clause type.

3. Concluding Remarks

We have examined the various phenomena related to similarities or differences between fragments and right dislocation constructions Ko (2014) points out. We have shown that parallelism between Case-marked fragments and RDCs still holds. Some of the data that seems to show apparent differences between the two constructions are related to Caseless fragments, which differ significantly from RDCs in derivation. The former has no internal structure and the latter has full sentential structure. The difference regarding island violation is concerned with presence or absence of correlate of fragments. In the absence of correlates in the antecedent/host clause, both the constructions, fragments and RDCs are sensitive to islands.
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