Fragments vs. Null Arguments in Korean[*]

Hee-Don Ahn[a], and Sungeun Cho[b]

[a]Department of English, Konkuk University,
Seoul 143-701, Korea
hdahn@konkuk.ac.kr
[b]Department of English Education, Yeungnam University,
Gyeongsangbukdo 712-749, Korea
scho1007@ynu.ac.kr

Summary. This paper aims to show that two types of answers shorter than full sentential answers involve two different anaphora and that the sources of interpretation are fundamentally distinct. Fragments pattern differently with null arguments in that only the former may display genuine sloppy readings. The latter may yield sloppy-like readings which are pragmatically induced by the explicature that can be cancelled unlike genuine sloppy readings in fragments. Evidence (wh-ellipsis, weak quantifier ellipsis, strong quantifier ellipsis) all lends substantial support to our claim that fragments are analyzed as an instance of clausal ellipsis while null arguments are analyzed as an instance of null pronoun *pro*; hence, the former is surface anaphora whereas the latter is deep anaphora in the sense of Hankamer & Sag (1976).

Keywords: fragments, null objects, surface anaphora, deep anaphora, pro

1 Introduction

Korean has two types of answers shorter than a full sentential answer, as shown in (1B-B').

(1) A: na-nun John-uy hyeng-ul   manna-ss-ta.
       I-Nom J.-Gen brother-Acc meet-Pst-Dec
       'I saw/met John's brother.'
   B: na-to.   (Fragment)
      'I also (met John's brother).'
   B': na-to __ manna-ss-ta.   (Null Argument)
       I-too   meet-Pst-Dec
       'I also met (John's brother).'

(1B), the fragment construction and (1B'), the null argument construction, seem to have the same interpretation. However, we argue that they involve two different types of anaphora, and the sources of interpretation given in (1B-B') are fundamentally distinct. More specifically, we propose that fragments are analyzed as an instance of clausal ellipsis while null arguments are analyzed as an instance of null pronoun *pro*; hence, the former is surface anaphora whereas the latter is deep anaphora in the sense of Hankamer & Sag (1976).

2 Clausal Ellipsis and *Pro*

We note that although the fragment surfaces as a DP, it conveys the same propositional content as its fully sentential counterpart. As shown in (2B-B'), in the case of a fragment which functions as subject, only nominative case-marked fragment is grammatical. The case connectivity noted by Morgan (1989) supports that the fragment has the source of full sentential structure.

(2) A: Nwu-ka   ku chayk-ul sa-ss-ni?
       Who-Nom the book-Acc buy-Pst-Q
       'Who bought the book?'
   B: Yenghi-ka.
       Y.-Nom
   B':*Yengh-lul.
       Y-Acc

We further assume that fragments such as (1B) are derived from movement of remnants followed by PF-deletion on a par with fragments in English put forward in Merchant (2004) (see Ahn & Cho 2006, 2009, 2010 for discussion).

(3) [$_{CP}$ Na-to$_i$ [$_{TP}$ t$_i$ John-uy hyeng-ul mannas-ta]]

In (3), the fragment *na-to* 'I, too' undergoes movement to Spec of C and TP undergoes ellipsis. Although the object and verb aren't pronounced in (3), they remain at LF for clausal interpretation. Consequently, (1B) has the same interpretation as its full sentential counterpart, *Na-to John-uy hyeng-ul manna-ss-ta* 'I also met John's brother'.

By contrast, we suggest that the null argument exemplified in (1B') involves *pro* (see also Park 1994, Hoji 1998, Moon 2010).

(4) [$_{TP}$ Na-to *pro* manna-ss-e]

In (4), *pro* may be understood as *John-uy hyeng-ul* 'John's brother'. As a result, (1B') has the interpretation 'I also met John's brother' (NB: the precise analysis of this construction will be somewhat different in the presentation).

We further claim that the interpretive processes are different in these two types of short answers. Some pieces of evidence are given in the following:

First, interpretation of indefinite or *wh*-pronouns lends support to our analysis.

(5) A: Chelswu-ka nwukwu-lul manna-ss-ni?
       C.-Nom   who-Acc   meet-Pst-Q
       'Who did Chelswu meet?' or 'Did Chelswu meet anyone?'
   B: Kulssey, kulem Yenghi-nun?
       Well,   then   Y.-Top?
       'Well, then, who did Yenghi meet?' or 'Well, then, did Yenghi meet anyone?'
   B': Kulssey, kulem Yenghi-nun manna-ss-ni?
       Well,   then   Y.Top   meet-Pst-Q
       'Well, then, did Yenghi meet anyone?' *'Well, then, who did Yenghi meet?'

In Korean, the pronoun *nwukwu* is ambiguous between indefinite interpretation 'someone' and *wh*-interpretation 'who'. Hence, (5A) is interpreted as either yes-no interrogative or *wh*-interrogative. The fragment (5B) has the structure similar to (5A), as shown in (6).

(6) Yenghi-nun [nwukwu-lul manna-ss-ni]?

        Y.-Top   who-Acc   meet-Pst-Q

Then, (6) can be interpreted as either yes-no question or *wh*-question on a par with (5A). (5B'), by contrast, is not ambiguous since it has the structure like (7).

    (7) Yenghi-nun *pro* manna-ss-ni?
       Y.-Top   meet-Pst-Q

Note that *pro* in (7) cannot be interpreted as *wh*-pronoun, but it can only be interpreted as indefinite nominal (NB: the precise analysis of this construction will be articulated in the presentation). Hence, (5B') is interpreted only as yes-no question, which cannot be captured under ellipsis analyses of null arguments such as Kim (1999), Oku (1998), Saito (2004, 2007), Takahashi (2008), Lee & Kim (2010), and Lee (2011) inter alia.

    Second, our analysis is supported by a series of contrasts in sloppy interpretation and sloppy-like interpretation in the following.

    (8) A: Chelswu-ka sey   pwun-uy sensayngnim-ul manna-ss-ta.
         C.-Nom   three Cl-Gen teacher-Acc meet-Pst-Dec
         'Chelswu met three teachers.'
      B: Yenghi-to.
        'Lit. Yenghi-also.'
      B': Yenghi-to _____ manna-ss-ta .
        Y.-also   meet-Pst-Dec
        'Lit. Yenghi met (three teachers), too.'

(8B) and (8B') can be interpreted as either 'Yenghi also met the same teachers Chelswu met.' (strict identity reading) or 'Yenghi also met three teachers different from the ones Chelswu met.' (sloppy identity reading). Following Hoji (1998) and Ahn & Cho (2011, a,b,c), we argue that the interpretations considered to be sloppy identity readings in the null argument construction in Korean are not in fact genuine sloppy interpretations but more or less similar to "sloppy-like" readings. We suggest that the missing object in (8B') is *pro* which is equivalent to a bare nominal *sensayngnim-ul* 'teacher-Acc' in (9). The reading 'Yenghi met three teachers' in (8B') is equivalent to the "explicature" of (9) in the context of (8A).

    (9) Yenghi-to sensayngnim-ul manna-ss-ta.
      Y.-also   teacher-Acc   meet-Pst-Dec
    'Yenghi also met teachers, too.'

According to the relevance theory (Sperber & Wilson 1986), the explicature is recovered from three pragmatic processes: disambiguation, reference assignment and enrichment. With these pragmatic adjustments, (8B') can yield the interpretation like 'Yenghi also met three teachers'. Given that the explicature reading is pragmatically determined (like implicatures), it is cancellable unlike semantic entailments.

    (10) Yenghi-to manna-ss-ta kulentey Yenghi-nun twu pwun-uy sensayngnim-ul manna-ss-ta.
      Y.also   meet-Pst-Dec but   Y.-Top   two Cl-Gen teacher-Acc   meet-Pst-Dec
      'Yenghi met (teachers), too.' But Yenghi met two teachers.'

As shown in (10), the sloppy-like reading, pragmatically induced as an explicature, is cancellable.

However, the genuine sloppy reading of the surface anaphora that occurs in (8B) is not cancellable, as shown in (11).

    (11) #Yenghi-to. kulentey Yenghi-nun twu pwun-uy sensayngnim-ul manna-ss-ta.
           Y.also   but   Y.-Top   two-Gen   teacher-Acc   meet-Pst-Dec
          'Yenghi, too. But Yenghi met two teachers.'

As shown in (11), the interpretation 'Yenghi met three teachers.' is not cancellable, which indicates that sloppy reading in (8B) is semantically induced unlike one in (8B').
    A similar contrast is observed with examples containing universal quantifiers *motwu* 'all'.

    (12) A: motwu Cheli-lul   cohaha-y.
           all   Cheli-Acc like-Dec
            'Everyone likes Cheli.'
        B: Tongswu-to.
          Tongswu-also
          'Lit. Tongswu, too.'
        B': Tongswu-to cohaha-y.
           T.-also   like-Dec
          'Lit. (Everyone) likes Tongswu, too.'

We note the possibility that the *motwu* in (12A) can be paraphrased as *salam-tul-ul motwu* 'people-Pl-Acc all' in Korean, as shown in (13).

    (13) A: (salamtul-i)   motwu Cheli-lul cohaha-y.
          (People-Nom) all   Cheli-Acc like-Dec
          'Everyone likes Cheli.'
        B: pro(=salamtul-i) Tongswu-to cohaha-y.
                     T.-also   like-Dec
        'People like Tongswu, too.'

Then, the null argument in (12B') refers to *salamtul-i* 'people-Nom'. Thus, (12B') in fact conveys the reading like the following (14a), which under this particular context through pragmatic explicature, can be further understood as (14b).

    (14) a. People like Tongswu, too.
         b. Everyone likes Tongswu, too.

Then, this is indeed another instance of sloppy-like readings in Hoji's (1998) sense. The sloppy-like reading is pragmatically induced, and hence is cancellable, as shown in (15).

    (15) Tongswu-to cohaha-y. kulentey motwu-ka ta Tongswu-lul cohahanunkesun ani-ya.
        T.-also   like-Dec   but   all-Nom all T.-Acc   like   not-Dec
        'People like Tongswu, but all the people don't like Tongswu.'

Unlike the reading in the null argument construction such as (12B'), the sloppy reading observed with the fragment as in (12B) is genuine sloppy reading. As a result, the reading isn't cancellable as shown in (16).

    (16) #Tongswu-to. Kulentey motwu-ka ta Tongswu-lul cohahanunkesun ani-ya
         T.-also   but   all-Nom all T.-Acc   like   not-Dec

'Tongswu, too. But all the people doesn't like Tongswu.'

3   Concluding Remarks

In sum, fragments pattern differently with null arguments in that only the former may display genuine sloppy readings. The latter may yield sloppy-like readings which are pragmatically induced by the explicature that can be cancelled unlike genuine sloppy readings in fragments. Thus, the above evidence (wh-ellipsis, weak quantifier ellipsis, strong quantifier ellipsis) all lends substantial support to our claim that fragments and null arguments are fundamentally different: fragments are instances of ellipsis (surface anaphora), while null arguments are instances of *pro* (deep anaphora).

In the presentation, we will further discuss apparent argument ellipsis of NPI, reflexives, and weak/strong quantifiers, and suggest that they indeed all involve *pro*. We will indicate that they all involve peculiar double object constructions [NP + QP], and suggest that the apparent argument ellipses of QPs are all instances of *pro* replacement of the NP parts of this structure.

(Selected) References

Ahn, H.-D. & S. Cho. 2006. On form-function mismatch puzzles in fragments: an ellipsis analysis. *Discourse and Cognition* 13: 91-110.

Ahn, H.-D. & S. Cho. 2009. Notes on fragments in English & Korean. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 9:327-349.

Ahn, H.-D. and S. Cho. 2010. Reconstruction asymmetries in ellipsis: Implication for scrambling. *Linguistic Analysis*: 34, 3-4 (Special Issue on *Phase Edge Investigations*. guest-edited by K. Grohmann and P. Panagiotidis).

Ahn, H.-D. and S. Cho. 2011a. Notes on apparent DP ellipsis: A reply to Lee & Kim (2010). *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 36: 457-471.

Ahn, H.-D. and S. Cho. 2011b. Notes on the absence of CP ellipsis in Japanese and Korean: A reply to Saito (2007). *Studies in Modern Grammar* 65: 145-170.

Ahn, H.-D. and S. Cho. 2011c. On sloppy-like interpretation of null arguments. *Linguistic Research* 28(3):471-492.

Hankamer, J. and I. Sag. 1976. Deep and surface Anaphora. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7 :391-428.

Hoji, H. 1998. Null object and sloppy identity in Japanese. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29: 127-152.

Kim, S. 1999. Sloppy/strict identity, empty objects, and NP ellipsis. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 8: 255-284.

Lee, W. and J. Kim. 2010. DP ellipsis as independent phenomena from pro in pro-drop languages. *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 35: 1009-1029.

Lee, W. 2011. Zero realization of arguments revisited. *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 36:1031-1052.

Merchant, J. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27: 661–38.

Morgan, J. 1989. Sentence fragments revisited. *CLS* 25:228-241.

Moon, G-S. 2010. Null arguments redux. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal* 18: 67-92.

Oku, S. 1998. LF copy analysis of Japanese null arguments. In Proceedings of *CLS* 34, 299-314.

Park. M. 1994. *A morpho-syntactic study of Korean verbal Inflection.* Doctoral Dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Saito, M. 2004. Ellipsis and pronominal reference in Japanese clefts. *Studies in Modern Grammar* 36: 1-44.

Saito, M. 2007. Notes on East Asian argument ellipsis. *Language Research* 43: 203-227.

Sperber, D. and D. Wilson. 1986. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Takahashi, D. 2008. Noun phrase ellipsis. In S. Miyagawa and M. Saito, (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, 394-422. New York: Oxford University Press.