

On the Evasion Approach to Island Repair in Sluicing in English and Korean*

Jong Un Park**

|| Contents ||

1. Introduction
2. The Evasion Approach to Island Repair by Ellipsis
3. Some Problems for the Evasion Approach
4. Clefts as the Only Source for LBC Violation Repair in Korean
5. Conclusion

[Abstract]

The major goal of this paper is to examine whether Barros et al.'s (2013a,b, 2014) evasion approach to island repair in English sluicing is tenable. Major syntactic research (e.g., Ross, 1969; Chomsky, 1972; Lasnik, 2001; Merchant, 2008) has argued that violations of island constraints in sluicing, such as Complex Noun Phrase Constraint (CNPC) and Left Branch Condition (LBC), can be ameliorated by deleting illegitimate traces. Crucially, such an approach hinges on a licensing condition for ellipsis, mandating that the ellipsis site should

* An earlier version of this work was presented at the 2015 KGGC-ELSOK-PMCK Joint Conference held at HUFS. I'd wish to extend my gratitude to the audience and the three anonymous reviewers for this journal for their helpful comments on the submitted version. All remaining errors are of of course mine. This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean Government(NRF-2014 S1A5A2A03064842).

** Department of English, Dongguk University-Gyeongju (Assistant Professor), jupark@dongguk.ac.kr

contain an isomorphic structure to the antecedent. Recently, it is argued (Fukaya, 2007; Abels, 2011) that island repair is not due to deletion of the illegitimate representation but to the absence of an island itself. In particular, Barros et al. (2013a,b, 2014) claim that there are three types of alternative sources available for amelioration of syntactic island violations, which include ‘short,’ ‘predicational’ and ‘cleft’ sources. Their approach, dubbed the evasion approach, however, remains unclear about when clefts are available as an alternative source for island repair. This paper demonstrates that unlike what the evasion approach argues, the clefts may not be an appropriate source for amelioration of LBC effects in English. After that, clefts are shown to be only alternative source for sluicing in Korean, and furthermore, two competing cleft-based analyses of Korean sluicing are evaluated to figure out which works better.

Key words : Island repair, evasion approach, isomorphism, Complex Noun Phrase Constraint, Left Branching Condition, clefts

1. Introduction

Ross (1969) makes a well-known observation that violations of island constraints, such as the Complex Noun Phrase Constraint (CNPC), can be ameliorated by sluicing (i.e., deletion of TP in modern terms), as in (1).

(1) They want to hire someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which one.

a. They want to hire someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which one_i [TP they want to hire someone who speaks *t_i*]

- b. *Which language_i do they want to hire someone who speaks _{ti}?

Ross (1969)

Many subsequent studies in the generative literature (e.g., Chomsky, 1972; Lasnik, 2001; Merchant, 2001, 2008) share the idea with Ross, claiming that this so-called ‘island repair’ in (1) is made possible by deleting illegitimate traces, which would otherwise cause a problem at PF. In particular, Merchant (2001) argues that not only CNPC violations but Left Branch Condition (LBC) violations can also be remedied by sluicing as in (2).

- (2) Mary married a tall man, but I’m not sure how tall.
a. Mary married a tall man, but I’m not sure how tall_i
[TP she married a _{ti} man].
b. *How tall_i does she marry a _{ti} man?

Merchant (2001)

Importantly, this line of analysis hinges on a licensing condition for ellipsis, namely the isomorphism constraint: that is, the ellipsis site contains an isomorphic structure to the antecedent.

Recently, however, it has been argued (Fukaya, 2007; Abels, 2011; Barros et al., 2013a,b, 2014) that the grammaticality of (1) and (2) is not due to deletion of the illegitimate representation but to the absence of an island itself. To put it differently, (1) and (2) can be derived from (3) and (4), respectively.

- (3) They want to hire someone who speaks a Balkan

language, but I don't know which onei [TP he speaks ti].

(Short source)

(4) Mary married a tall man, but I'm not sure how talli [TP
he is ti]. (Predicational source)

In particular, Barros et al. (2013a,b, 2014) argue that there are three types of alternative sources available for amelioration effects of syntactic island violations, and they include not only 'short' and 'predicational' sources but also 'cleft' sources. Their approach, named the evasion approach (to island repair), however, remains unclear about when clefts are available as an alternative source for island repair.¹⁾

Given this background, the major goal of this paper is to show that Barros et al.'s (2013a,b, 2014) evasion approach, which claims that the so-called 'island repair' does not actually involve an island but is rather attributed to alternative sources (e.g., predicational, short and cleft sources), have some empirical problems. In addition, it is argued that languages may be different in the range of alternative sources available for ellipsis—that is, a cleft source does not fit into English while it works well for some East Asian languages, especially, Korean. Finally, this paper demonstrates that of two competing analyses of

1) As informed by one of the anonymous reviewers, there is in fact an additional line of approach to the same phenomena. Specifically, researchers like Wang (2007) and Beockx (2008) advocate what is called the resumption strategy, arguing that there is no actual movement chain across an island boundary in examples like (1b). However, in order to avoid digression, this paper will not attempt to evaluate the validity of the resumption strategy, instead focusing on the comparison of the repair-by-ellipsis approach with the evasion approach. Thanks to the reviewer for informing me of another possible alternative view.

Korean sluicing in terms of clefts, the reduced cleft approach (Mikkelsen, 2005; Kizu, 1997) is preferred over the bi-clausal approach (M-K Park, 2014). As for the organization of this paper, section 2 reviews the evasion approach to repair by ellipsis. Section 3 shows that there are some problems for the evasion approach in explaining sluicing in English. In section 4, cleft sources are argued to fit better for Korean than English, and evidence is presented as a support for the view that the reduced cleft structure is superior to the bi-clausal structure for Korean sluicing. Section 5 provides a conclusion.

2. The Evasion Approach to Island Repair by Ellipsis

As sketched in section 1, the previous major syntactic approaches, which adopt the isomorphism as a licensing condition for sluicing, argue that (1) and (2), repeated below, are grammatical because of the so-called 'repair by ellipsis': that is, illegitimate PF features yielded due to island-escaping movement are deleted when TP is elided for sluicing (e.g., Chomsky, 1972; Lasnik, 2001; Merchant, 2001, 2008).

- (1) They want to hire someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which one.
- (2) Mary married a tall man, but I'm not sure how tall.

By refuting the isomorphism constraint, however, a group of other researchers have maintained that the structure in the ellipsis site is non-isomorphic to the antecedent in (1) and (2). In particular, Barros

et al. (2013a,b, 2014), who pursue the evasion approach, argue that island repair is illusory in (1) and (2) since their underlying structures do not actually involve any syntactic islands.

2.1 Evidence against Island Repair by Ellipsis

Barros et al. (2013a,b, 2014) present two arguments in favor of the evasion approach but against the isomorphism approach. The first argument comes from Case mismatch found in apparent left branch (LB) extraction contexts in German.

More specifically, in German, a remnant AP in examples like (7) does not pattern in Case with the AP modifier in (6) but with the AP predicate in (5) (from Barros et al. (2013a,b)).

- (5) Der Mann ist groß. (Predicative groß)
 The man is tall
 'The man is tall.'
- (6) Lena hat einen groß*(en) Mann geheiratet.
 L. has a tall(.ACC) man married
 'Lena has married a tall man.' (Attributive groß)
- (7) Lena hat einen großen Mann geheiratet,
 L. has a tall.ACC man married,
 aber ich weiß nicht wie groß*(en).
 but I know not how tall(.ACC)
 (Closer to predicative groß)
 'Lena married a tall man, but I don't know how tall.'

As illustrated in (7), the adjective groß 'tall' as a remnant is not identical with its antecedent in the form of Case. This data seems to

strongly suggest that the remnant AP in (7) is not merged as a modifier but as something else in the elliptical clause. If this claim is true, (7) should be ruled out by the isomorphism constraint, contrary to fact.

The second argument against the isomorphism, but in favor of the evasion approach, has to do with ban on non-predicative adjectives in left-branching contexts in English. Although both predicative adjectives, such as *diligent* and *ugly*, and non-predicative adjectives, such as *hard* (as in *hard-working*) and *heavy* (as in *drink heavily*), can play a role as a modifier, as in (8), only the former can function as a predicate, as in (9).

- (8) a. Billy hired a diligent/hard worker. (Attributive usage)
 b. Mary ignored a(n) ugly/heavy drinker.
- (9) a. This worker is diligent/*hard. (Predicative usage)
 b. The drinker was ugly/*heavy.

Barros et al. (2013a,b)

More importantly, both predicative and non-predicative adjectives can be fronted if they are gradable, as in (10), but only the predicative adjectives can be stranded as a remnant in LB extraction contexts, as in (11b) and (12b).

- (10) a. [[How diligent/hard]_i a _{ti} worker]_j did Billy hire _{tj}?
 b. [[How ugly/heavy]_i a _{ti} drinker]_j did Mary ignore _{tj}?
- (11) a. ?*Billy hired a hard worker, but I don't know how hard.
 (Non-predicative AP)
 b. Billy hired a diligent worker, but I don't know how diligent.
 (Predicative AP)

- (12) a. ?*Mary ignored a heavy drinker, but I don't know how heavy. (Non-predicative AP)
b. Mary ignored an ugly drinker, but I don't know how ugly. (Predicative AP)
Barros et al. (2013a,b)

Based on the contrast between (a) and (b) in (11)-(12), Barros et al. claim (i) that there is no such thing as 'repair by ellipsis' in LB extraction contexts; and (ii) that repair-by-ellipsis cases like (11b) and (12b) are just apparent, and they in fact involve 'predicational' sources, as in (13).

- (13) Mary married a tall man, but I'm not sure how talli [he is ti]. (Predicational)

Likewise, even amelioration effects in Complex Noun Phrase Constraint (CNPC) contexts like (1) are argued to involve a different kind of alternative source, namely a 'short' source, as in (14).

- (14) They want to hire someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which onei [he speaks ti]. (Short source)

2.2 Clefts as Another Alternative Source

Barros et al. (2014: p.5) also argue that sentences that apparently involve 'island repair' can be derived not only from predicational or short sources, as discussed in 2.1, but also from cleft sources—especially, truncated clefts without relative clauses in

Mikkelsen's (2005) sense, as in (15).

- (15) a. They hired someone who speaks a Balkan language –
guess which!
b. They hired someone who speaks a Balkan language –
guess which it was! (Cleft source)

In order to support their claim about the availability of clefts as another alternative source, Barros et al. (2014) first argue that p-or-q sluices are those that resist isomorphism as a licensing condition. That is, they show that in sluicing cases like (16) where a disjunction of propositions in the form of p-or-q is an antecedent, it is difficult for the remnant sluice to be isomorphic to the antecedent (originally noted in AnderBois (2011)). Barros et al. rather argue that the sentence has a cleft as its source, as shown in (17)

(16) Either something's on fire, or Sally's baking a cake, but I don't know which.

(17) Either something's on fire, or Sally's baking a cake, but I don't know which [it is].

Barros et al. (2014: p.6)

Secondly, Barros et al. (2014: p.6) point out that disjunction sluices are available in languages, such as English, Spanish and Portuguese, where cleft continuations like (17) are allowed; by contrast, in languages like Russian and Polish, where the cleft continuation is disallowed, the disjunction sluices is not permitted, either.

Furthermore, in German, the sluicing remnant is marked with NOMINATIVE case, which is the same type of case as pivots in clefts,

as in (18).

(18) Entweder es brennt wo oder die
 Either it burns where or the
 Susi backt wieder Kuchen, aber ich weiß
 Susi bakes again cake, but I know
 nicht, welches von beiden (es ist).
 not, which.NOM of.the two it is
 ‘Either something is on fire or Susi is baking a cake
 again, but I don’t know which.’

Barros et al. (2014: (20))

3. Some Problems for the Evasion Approach

Although the data Barros et al. (2013a,b, 2014) present contradict the predictions made by the previous approaches to island repair assuming the isomorphism constraint, there appear to be different properties between *wh*-sluices and *wh*-pivots in English. It has already been demonstrated in the literature that *wh*-sluices behave differently from *wh*-pivots in clefts in English (e.g., Merchant, 1998, 2001).

First of all, implicit arguments or adjuncts are possible in sluicing while they are not in the pivot of a cleft, as in (19).

- (19)a. He’s hidden the jewels, but I don’t know where (*it is).
 b. He fixed the car, but I don’t know where (*it was).

Secondly, assuming that a fragment answer (FA) is an instance of

sluicing, Merchant shows with (20) that the fragment does not exhibit the same exhaustive or presuppositional property as the cleft pivot.

(20)a. Q: What did the burglar take? (FA)

A: Nothing.

b. #It was nothing that the burglar took.

Third, the wh-pivot cannot be assigned stress, as in (21d), which is possible for the wh-slucose, as in (21b).

(21)a. Someone gave me a valentine, but

b. I don't know WHO.

c. I don't know who it WAS.

d. *I don't know WHO it was.

Fourth, the parenthetical expression, for example, can co-occur with a wh-slucose, but not with a wh-pivot, as in (22).

(22)A: You should talk to somebody in the legal department for help with that.

B: Could you tell me who (*it is), for example?

Finally, Barros et al.'s (2013a,b, 2014) evasion approach to sluicing appears to make incorrect predictions. As discussed in S-W Kim (2011), Grevenyova (2005) observes that LB extraction out of a(n) (adjunct) island cannot be ameliorated, as in (23).

(23) *Mary will be angry if John buys an expensive car, but I don't know how expensive_i [Mary will be angry if John

buys an ti car].

According to Barros et al. that view apparent LBC violations as employing predicational sources, sentence (23) is predicted to be grammatical, contrary to fact.

In section 3, we have seen that Barros et al.'s (2013a,b, 2014) evasion approach seems right in arguing that island repair may be illusory, and most of amelioration effects can in fact be attributed to 'alternative' sources, such as predicational, short and cleft sources, all of which do not actually involve islands.

Nonetheless, there are some problems for their approach, in that (i) wh-slucices do not behave similarly with wh-pivots in clefts in English in several aspects, and (ii) an incorrect prediction is made for the case where LBC violation cannot be remedied.

4. Clefts as the Only Source for LBC Violation Repair in Korean²⁾

4.1 Sluicing in Korean is an Instance of (Pseudo-)Cleft

It turned out that clefts may not be a right kind of alternative source for island repair in English. However, it will be shown that the same type of alternative source cannot be simply an appropriate alternative source, but the only option available in other languages, in particular, Korean.

2) One reviewer comments that more Korean data need to be added and discussed in this section. Notice, however, that this section can be meaningful in that it provides a venue to think about a crosslinguistic consequence of the evasion approach, in particular, on Korean which has been often argued to be a language that does not involve genuine sluicing in the literature (e.g., K-W Sohn (2000)). Instead, further discussion about more Korean data will be reserved for future research.

It has been demonstrated by many researchers (J. Kim, 2012; M-K Park 2012, 2014) that just as in (pseudo-)cleft constructions in Korean, the copula is obligatory when the wh-slucice is nominal, as in (24a), but prohibited when it is adjectival, as in (24b).

- (24)a. Chelswu-ka nwukwunka-lulcohaha-ciman,
 Chelswu-NOM someone-ACC like-but,
 nwukwu-*(i)-nci molukeyssta.
 who-be-Q don't.know
 'Chelswu likes someone, but I don't know who.'
- b. Yenghuy-ka cha-lul sassta-tentey,
 Yenghuy-NOM car-ACC bought-I.heard
 elmana pissa-*(i)-nci molukeyssta.
 how expensive-be-Q don't.know
 'I heard that Yenghuy bought a car, but I don't know how expensive.'

M-K Park (2014: (1))

Similarly, if there is a genuine type (i.e., English type) of sluicing in Korean, the case patterns of the wh-slucices in (25) are not predictable.

- (25) a. John-i nwukwunka-uy chaky-ul
 John-NOM someone-GEN book-ACC

 piliess-ciman, na-nun nwukwu(-*uy)-i-nci
 borrowed-but, I-TOP who-GEN-be-Q
 molunta.
 don't.know
 'John borrowed someone's book, but I don't know

whose.'

- b. John-iettienka-lo ttenass-nuntey,
 John-NOM somewhere-to left-but,
 na-nun eti(-*lo)-i-nci molunta.
 I-TOP where-to-be-Q don't.know
 'John left for somewhere, but I don't know where.'

4.2 On the Structure of Sluicing in Korean

Then, the next question we need to address is what the structure of sluicing in Korean looks like. There are two major (cleft-based) approaches to the syntactic structure of Korean sluicing: that is, the bi-clausal approach and reduced cleft analysis.³⁾

Beginning with the bi-clausal analysis, M-K Park (2014) suggests that the structure of sluicing in Korean looks like the following:

(26)but ... [SMALL CLAUSE [CP1 Opi [TP ... ti ...]] [CP2 pivoti
 [CP3 ti]] Relator] + i + ta.

He makes a couple of assumptions about the structure in (26) above.

3) In fact, a couple of more approaches are also suggested in the literature, but they differ depending on whether deletion is assumed or not in deriving sluicing from the (pseudo-)cleft construction (e.g., J. Kim (2012) in favor of deletion; M-K Park (1998), K-W Sohn (2000) against it). Notice, however, that we will not be able to do justice to the existing approaches to sluicing in Korean, and that since this paper focuses more on the contrast between the mono-clausal vs. bi-clausal approach to cases of Korean sluicing involving island violations, our current discussion is limited to M-K Park's (2014) bi-clausal approach and Mikkelsen (2015) style mono-clausal reduced cleft approach.

First, the (pseudo-)cleft construction is a small clause selected by the copula, which consists of two clauses. Second, CP1 is a cleft clause with the null operator extracted out of it, but it appears as a null form in most cases. Third, CP2 is an inferential cleft clause from which a focal pivot is extracted and renders CP3 deleted.

Alternatively, it is not unreasonable to assume that sluicing in Korean is a reduced cleft in the sense of Mikkelsen (2005), which can be roughly represented as in (27) (cf. Kizu's (1997) analysis of Japanese sluicing).

(27) John met someone, but I don't know [who [it is]].

It seems that there are a couple of pieces of evidence in favor of the reduced cleft approach over the bi-clausal analysis. The first evidence for the former approach has to do with sluicing with the p-or-q antecedent. As seen in section 3, in German, the disjunction wh-slucose is identical in case with the wh-pivot in the cleft (e.g., (18)), leading Barros et al. (2014) to suggest that sluicing cases in German where isomorphism fails to be met are derived from a cleft source.

Given the current view that sluicing in Korean is derived from a cleft, sluicing with the p-or-q antecedent is predicted to be possible in Korean, and this prediction is borne out, as in (28). If the bi-clausal analysis were adopted, it would seem difficult to account for this fact.

(28)	mwuenka-ka	pwulipwutess-kena	Susi-ka
	something-NOM	on.fire-or	Susi-NOM
	kheyik-ul	mantulkoiss-nuntey,	na-nun
	cake-ACC	is.baking-but,	I-TOP
	ettenkes-i-nci	molukeyssta.	

which-be-Q don't.know

'Either something is on fire or Susi is baking a cake, but I don't know which.'

The second evidence that favors the reduced cleft approach over the bi-clausal approach comes from the availability of amelioration effects in LB extraction contexts. That is, since the clefts are only sources of sluicing in Korean, another prediction can be made that amelioration of LBC violations should be possible in Korean as well, which is borne out by (29a) and (29b) (repeated from (24b) and (25a), respectively).

(29)a. Yenghuy-ka cha-lul sassta-tentey,
 Yenghuy-NOM car-ACC bought-I.heard
 elmana pissa-(*)-nci molukeyssta.
 how expensive-be-Q don't.know
 'I heard that Yenghuy bought a car, but I don't know how expensive.'

b. John-i nwukwunka-uy chayk-ul
 John-NOM someone-GEN book-ACC
 piliess-ciman, na-nun nwukwu(-*uy)-i-nci
 borrowed-but, I-TOP who-GEN-be-Q
 molunta.
 don't.know

'John borrowed someone's book, but I don't know whose.'

Under the bi-clausal analysis, however, it seems unclear how to get this kind of amelioration effects. This is because, under the bi-clausal analysis where a remnant (called a 'pivot') is assumed to be displaced

to the edge position by leftward movement in CP2 in (26), the remnant extracted out of a left-branch position in examples like (29a,b) should exhibit LBC effects even after deletion in Korean. As such, those sentences are predicted to be ungrammatical, contrary to fact.⁴⁾

5. Conclusion

It has been demonstrated that Barros et al.'s (2013a,b, 2014) view that 'repair by ellipsis' is illusory in that alternative sources are employed in English is on the right track, but the range of alternative sources is not wider than they claim. In particular, clefts may not be an appropriate source in English; and their analysis of LB extraction cases appears to overgenerate.

By contrast, languages like Korean are doomed to rely on the clefts as they are only sources of sluicing in those languages. However, of the two competing approaches to (pseudo-)clefts for sluicing in Korean, the reduced cleft analysis has been shown to be superior to the bi-clausal analysis.

Despite some empirical problems, however, Barros et al.'s (2013a,b, 2014) evasive approach seems to deserve attention as it provides compelling evidence for the claim that island repair may involve alternative sources like short and predicative ones in English. In the similar vein, it would be worth considering whether and when other alternative sources than clefts can be used as an underlying structure for Korean sluicing. This issue, however, will be left open for future

4) Thanks to a reviewer for asking me to clarify why the bi-clausal analysis fails to explain the grammaticality of the LBC amelioration cases.

research.

[국문초록]

영어와 한국어 섬 제약 위반 보수 회피접근법에 관하여

박종언

본고는 영어의 문장생략에서 관찰되는 섬 제약위반 보수에 대한 Barros et al.(2013a,b, 2014)의 회피접근법이 타당성이 있는가를 검토하는데 목적이 있다. 주요 통사연구에서는 오랫동안 복합명사구제약이나 좌분지제약 등의 섬 제약 위반이 부적격한 흔적을 삭제하기만 하면 그 위반 효과가 사라질 수 있다고 주장해왔다(Ross, 1969; Chomsky, 1972; Lasnik, 2001; Merchant, 2008). 특히, 이러한 접근법은 생략에 의해 삭제된 구조는 선행절의 구조와 동일해야 하는 ‘동형성조건’에 기반을 두고 있다. 그러나 최근 들어 몇몇 학자들(Fukaya, 2007; Abels, 2011)이 소위 섬 제약 위반의 보수는 부적격 표상의 삭제가 아니라 아예 통사적 섬 자체가 존재하지 않기 때문이라고 주장을 제기했다. 특히, Barros et al.(2013a,b, 2014)는 통사적 섬 제약 위반 개선효과는 섬 절점이 결여된 단문, 서술절, 분열구문 등에서 적출이 적용되었기 때문이라고 주장했다. 하지만 Barros et al.의 회피접근법은 분열문이 섬 제약 위반 보수효과의 기저구조로 언제 사용 가능한지에 대해 명쾌한 설명을 제시하고 있지 않은데, 본고에서는 회피접근법의 주장과 달리 적어도 영어에서 좌분지제약위배 보수효과의 기저구조로 분열구문이 사용되기 어려움을 입증할 예정이다. 나아가 문장생략이 섬 절점의 여부와 상관없이 분열구문만을 기저구조로 허용하는 언어가 있으며, 한국어가 그 대표적인 사례임을 보인 후 한국어의 문장생략이 분열구문을 기저구조로 가정하고 있는 두 가지 접근법을 비교하여 어떤 분석이 타당성이 있는지 논의한다.

주제어: 섬 제약 위반 보수, 회피접근법, 동형성조건, 복합명사구제약, 좌분지제약, 분열구문

References

- AnderBois, S. 2011. Issues and Alternatives. Ph.D. Dissertation, UC Santa Cruz.
- Barros, M., P. Elliott and G. Thoms. 2013a. More variation in island repair: the clausal/non-clausal island distinction. Paper presented at Chicago Linguistic Society 49.
- Barros, M., P. Elliott and G. Thoms. 2013b. Island evasion explains variability in island repair. Paper presented at Manchester Forum in Linguistics.
- Barros, M., P. Elliott and G. Thoms. 2014. There is no island repair. MS., Edinburgh/UCL/Rutgers.
- Boeckx, C. 2008. Bare Syntax. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chomsky, N. 1972. Spheres of influence in the age of imperialism: papers submitted to the Bertrand Russell Contemporary Symposium, Linz, Austria.
- Grebenyova, L. 2004. Sluicing and left-branch extraction out of islands. Proceedings of WCCFL 24, 164-172.
- Kim, J. 2012. What sluicing comes from in Korean is pseudo-cleft. Korean Journal of Linguistics 37.1, 69-106.
- Kim, S.-W. 2011. A note on NP/DP parameter: Left branch extraction in Korean. Linguistic Research 28.2, 257-269.
- Kizu, M. 1997. Sluicing in wh-in-situ languages. Proceedings of the Thirty-third Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, 231-244.
- Lasnik, H. 2001. When can you save a structure by destroying it? In M. Kim and U. Strauss (eds.), Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society 31, 301-320.
- Merchant, J. 1998. Pseudogapping elliptical clefts in Japanese and English. In A. Alexiadou, N. Fuhrhop, P. Law, and U. Kleinhenz (eds.), ZAS Working Papers in Linguistics, 88-112.
- Merchant, J. 2001. The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands and Identity in Ellipsis. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Merchant, J. 2008. Variable island repair under ellipsis. In K. Johnson (ed.), Topics in Ellipsis, 132-153. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mikkelsen, L. 2005. Copular Clauses: Specification, Predication and Equation. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Park, M.-K. 1998. Sluicing in English and Korean. Handout presented at the

Linguistic Society of Korea Winter Meeting.

Park, M.-K. 2012. Left branch extraction in fragment and truncated cleft constructions of Korean. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 22.1, 219-233.

Park, M.-K. 2014. Some implications of the distribution of the copula on the analysis of sluicing constructions in Korean, Chinese and Japanese. *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 39.3.

Ross, J. R. 1969. Guess who? In R. I. Binnick, A. Davison, G. M. Green, and J. L. Morgan (eds.), *Proceedings of Chicago Linguistic Society*, 252-286.

Sohn, K.-W. 2000. A non-sluicing, non-clefting approach to copular constructions. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 10.2, 267-294.

Wang, C. A. 2007. Sluicing and resumption. In *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society* 37, 239-252. Amherst: GLSA Publications.

이 논문은 2016년 11월 4일 접수되어 12월 6일까지 심사받아 12월 19일 게재 확정됨.

