

In this work, we examine the asymmetry in the distribution of nominative-accusative particles as well as their disappearance in fragment answers to *Wh*-questions in Korean. We will propose a "no movement" analysis of non-contrastive fragment answers.

[1] **Puzzles:** When a Korean sentence involves the unmarked word order as in (1a-b), the so-called 'case drop' is permitted from the object NP but *not from the subject NP*. When the *Wh*-questions in (1a-b) are replied with 'Fragment Answers (henceforth FA)' as in (2a-b), on the other hand, we observe a quite distinct range of case marking properties. (We examine only the case drop from *Wh-foci* or *their answers* to avoid inadvertently mixing elided topic marker *-nun* into our data, although the proposed analyses can be applied to FAs in other contexts as well (cf. Kuno (1973: MIT Press)). First, the subject-object asymmetry arises when an overt case particle appears on the fragment answers — the nominative case particle *-ka* is permitted as in (2a) but the accusative *-lul* is *prohibited* as in (2b) unless it is contrastive (cf. Lee (2006: *Discourse/Cognition Linguistics Conference Papers*). Second, a distinct type of asymmetry arises, this time, between overt case particles and their elision — the 'null (or deleted)' case particles are permitted *both in the subject and object positions* unlike their overt counterparts. Fukaya and Hoji (1999: *WCCFL 18*) propose that when the pre-copula NP is case-marked in the stripping construction of Japanese as in (3B), it involves: (i) movement of the corresponding case-marked NP out of the antecedent IP as in (3A), and (ii) LF-copying of the remnant IP onto the ellipsis site. Crucially, however, if we adopt a similar approach to the analysis of fragment answers in Korean, we fail to capture the nominative-accusative asymmetry as reported in (2). Note that the movement proposed for (3) should be applicable to both nominative-NP in (2a) and accusative NP in (2b).

[2] **Proposals & Motivations:** We adopt a "no movement" (or more precisely "in-situ") analysis for non-contrastive fragment answers and propose *two distinct syntactic sources* for them. First, we identify an FA accompanied by an overt case particle simply as a case-marked argument in a 'regular' declarative sentence which involves 'constituent ellipsis' as in (4a-b). The immediate advantage of this analysis is that it allows us to capture the "*ka* vs. *lul*" asymmetry in (2) without having to appeal to any special mechanism or assumption. The accusative-marked FA in (2b) is prohibited simply because ellipsis cannot target any single constituent in (4b) excluding this FA. Second, an FA with null case is identified as an NP appearing in the focused position of an *elided pseudo-cleft construction* as in (5B) and (6B). Generally, a *copula* can be phonologically null in Korean, including the copula in a pseudo-cleft construction, as illustrated in (7). It is also well-known that *pre-copula nominals* in Korean, including those in a pseudocleft construction, generally do not permit *any* case particle, as illustrated in (8a-c) (Kang 2006: *Studia Linguistica* 60.3: 279). When the topic NP as the background of focus is elided in a pseudo-cleft construction, both these properties are reflected and we obtain FAs as in (5B) and (6B) above. The asymmetry between overt and null case marking in FAs in (2) also follows when we combine the analyses in (4)-(6) — overt case marking is prohibited only with accusative in the elided 'regular' declarative sentence as in (4b). Case particles are never permitted, on the other hand, in the pre-copula positions in the elided pseudo-cleft sentences as in (5B) and (6B).

[3] **Further Motivations:** The proposed derivation of 'null case' FAs from a pseudocleft construction can be further motivated when we examine (i) FAs to multiple-*Wh*-questions, (ii) NPIs as FAs, and (iii) the contrast between formal and informal copulative constructions. For instance, suppose that a multiple-*Wh*-question like (9) is answered with an FA consisting of a pair of a nominative subject and an accusative object as in (10). The only pattern that is permitted in its answer is A4, in which the nominative particle is retained but the accusative particle is elided. We can observe a completely parallel paradigm in (11), when the same question is answered with a fully-expressed pseudo-cleft construction. If 'null-case' FAs are nothing but the focused NPs in an elided pseudo-cleft construction as we claimed, the observed parallelism naturally follows, which otherwise would remain quite mysterious. This work further argues for the following analyses. (i) *Non-contrastive Wh-foci* don't trigger any overt movement whereas *contrastive foci* trigger it, making acceptable the otherwise illegitimate accusative-marked FAs as in (2b) (cf. Gengel 2006: *LingO*). (ii) The subject-object asymmetry of null case marking in (1) arises from the distinct methods of NP-licensing involving nominative and accusative case.

- (1) a. *Nwukwu*-{*ka* / * \emptyset } wuyu-lul sass-ni? 'Who bought milk?'
 who-NOM milk-ACC bought-Q
 b. YungHee-ka *mues*-{*ul* / \emptyset } sass-ni? 'What did YungHee buy?'
 YungHee-NOM *what*-ACC bought-Q

- (2) a. YungHee- $\{ka / \emptyset\}$ b. Wuyu- $\{^*lul / \emptyset\}$
YungHee-NOM milk-ACC
'YungHee (bought milk).' '(YungHee bought) *Milk*.'
- (3) A: Toyota₁-ga [_{IP} t₁ soko-no roodoo-kumiai-o hihansita]. 'Toyota criticized its labor union.'
Toyota-NOM | it-GEN labor-union-ACC criticized
↑
B: Iya. Nissan-ga [_{IP} e]-da. 'No. It is Nissan (that criticized its labor union).'
No Nissan-NOM -COP
- (4) a. [_{TP} YungHee-ka₁ [_{IP} t₁ [_{VP} ~~wuyu-lul sass-e~~]]] ⇒ Case-marked FA: ^{ok}YungHee-ka
YungHee-NOM milk-ACC bought-DCL YungHee-NOM
b. * [_{TP} ~~YungHee-ka~~₂ [_{IP} t₁ [_{VP} wuyu-lul ~~sass-e~~]]] ⇒ Case-marked FA: *Wuyu-lul
YungHee-NOM milk-ACC bought-DCL milk-ACC
- (5) A: [wuyu-lul sa-n salam-un] nwukwu-~~Ø~~_{ka}-~~Ø~~_{ya}-ni? 'He who bought milk is *Who*?'
milk-ACC buy-ADN person-TOP who-NOM-COP-Q (ADN = Adnominal)
B: [~~wuyu-lul sa-n salam-un~~] YungHee-~~Ø~~_{ka}-~~Ø~~_{ya}. '(He who bought milk is) *YungHee*.'
milk-ACC buy-ADN person-TOP YungHee-NOM-COP.INF(OR)M(A)L
- (6) A: [YungHee-ka sa-n kes-un] mues-~~Ø~~_{lul}-~~Ø~~_{ni}? 'That which YungHee bought is *what*?'
YungHee-NOM buy-ADN thing-TOP what-ACC-COP-INFML-Q
B: [~~YungHee-ka sa-n kes-un~~] wuyu-~~Ø~~_{lul}-~~Ø~~_{ya}. '(That which YungHee bought is) *milk*'
YungHee-NOM buy-ADN thing-TOP milk-ACC-COP-INFML
- (7) [_{TP} [sicang-eso wuyu-lul sa-n salam]-un YungHee-~~Ø~~_{ka}{-ya / -~~Ø~~_{ya}}]
market-at milk-ACC buy-ADN person-TOP YungHee-NOM-COP-INFML
- (8) a. Ku salam-i kaswu-(^{*}i/^{*}u)-i-ta. 'The person is a singer.'
The person-NOM singer-NOM/ACC-COP-DCL
b. [wuyu-ul sass-n salam-un] Mary-(^{*}ka)-i-ta. 'He who bought milk is Mary.'
milk-ACC bought-ADN person-TOP Mary-NOM-COP-D(E)CL(ARATIVE)
c. [Mary-ga sass-n kes-un] wuyu-(^{*}u)-i-ta. 'That which Mary bought is milk.'
Mary-NOM bought-ADN thing-TOP milk-ACC-COP-DCL
- (9) Q: ChelSwu-ekey nwu-ka mwue-ul cwu-ess-ni?
ChelSwu-DAT who-NOM what-ACC give-PAST-Q 'Lit. Who gave what to ChelSwu?'
- (10) A1: *YungHee-ka chayk-ul, kuriko YungSwu-ka yenpil-ul.
YungHee-NOM book-ACC and YungSwu-NOM pencil-ACC
A2: *YungHee-~~Ø~~ chayk-~~Ø~~, kuriko YungSwu-~~Ø~~ yenpil-~~Ø~~.
A3: *YungHee-~~Ø~~ chayk-ul, kuriko YungSwu-~~Ø~~ yenpil-ul.
A4: YungHee-ka chayk-~~Ø~~, kuriko YungSwu-ka yenpil-~~Ø~~.
- (11) [ChelSwu-ekey cwu-n kes]-un:
ChelSwu-to give-ADN thing-TOP
A1: * [YungHee-ka chayk-ul kuriko YungSwu-ka yenpil-ul]-iya.
YungHee-NOM book-ACC and YungSwu-NOM pencil-ACC-COP-INFML
'Lit. YUNGHEE gave A BOOK to ChelSwu and YUNGSWU gave A PENCIL to ChelSwu.'
A2: * [YungHee-~~Ø~~ chayk-~~Ø~~ kuriko YungSwu-~~Ø~~ yenpil-~~Ø~~]-iya.
YungHee-NOM book-ACC and YungSwu-NOM pencil-ACC-COP-INFML
A3: * [YungHee-~~Ø~~ chayk-ul kuriko YungSwu-~~Ø~~ yenpil-ul]-iya.
YungHee-NOM book-ACC and YungSwu-NOM pencil-ACC-COP-INFML
A4: [YungHee-ka chayk-~~Ø~~ kuriko YungSwu-ka yenpil-~~Ø~~]-iya.
YungHee-NOM book-ACC and YungSwu-NOM pencil-ACC-COP-INFML