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1. Goals of the study:
  - To provide an analysis of Korean pseudoclefts with ‘-kes’
  - To account for a peculiar reconstruction puzzle, Highest Subject effect, by arguing that some instance of C, ‘-kes’ is a defective category (Gallego 2007)

2. Basic Properties of ‘-kes’
   (1) ‘-kes’ as a bound morpheme whose literal meaning is ‘thing’ ‘fact’
      a. ‘ku-kes’ (the thing, thing)
      b. mek-ul-kes (eat-Asp-thing)= ‘(a) thing to eat’
      c. eten-kes (which-thing)= ‘which’
     - Characteristics of clefts/pseudoclefts:
       Presuppositionality, Exhaustivity, Given-Focus information structure with the appearance of Copula verb, Reconstruction (Condition A, in particular) effect, etc.
   (3) Diverse occurrences of ‘-kes’ in Korean syntax

3. Signature properties of Pseudoclefts
   (4) Def.&Types. Pseudoclefts are defined as having a free relative in subject position (Higgins 1979). Paul (2000) defines that pseudoclefts are constructions either with headless relative or free relative in subject position. Different types of Focus constructions, including b-clefts, wh-clefts (Hankamer, 1974); clefts vs. pseudoclefts vs. inverse pseudoclefts.
      a. It is this book, the John bought (Cleft)
      b. What John, is important to himself, (Specificational Pseudocleft)
      c. Important to himself, is what John, is (Inverse Specificational Pseudocleft)
      d. What John, is important to him, (Predicational clefts)
      e. *Important to him, is what John, is
   (5) Connectivity effects: Condition A, bound variable reading, NPI connectivity
      a. What John, bought was a picture of himself, (Condition A reconstruction)
        a’ John, bought a picture of himself,
      b. What every professor bought was his own book (bound variable reading)
      b’. Every professor bought his own book
      c. (?) What John didn’t buy was any books (NPI) (cf. *It was any books that John didn’t buy)
      c’. John didn’t buy any books
   (6) Anti-Connectivity effects (Sharvit 1999, Cecchetto 2000) or Connectivity breakdown (Boskovic, 1997)
      a. The man who every professor, thinks should get a raise is himself
      b. *Every professor, thinks himself, should get a raise.
      b. What John, thinks that Bill, likes is a picture of himself
      b’. John, thinks Bill, likes himself
      c. John, doesn’t believe that Mary will graduate (ambiguous, high Neg reading, low Neg reading)
      c’. What John doesn’t believe is that Mary will graduate (under the low Neg reading)
   (7) Boskovic’s analysis includes the following:
      a. In SPC, Wh-clause is base-generated in [Spec, VP], the counterweight is base-generated in post-copula position
      b. Wh-Op in English SPC is replaced by the counterweight in LF (i.e. ‘What’ in SPC is not present in LF)
      c. Differentiating antecedent-trace relation created in overt syntax and in LF
         - Counterweight created in overt syntax cannot LF-move to Wh-clause (anti-connectivity cases)
      - English ‘not’ overtly raises to the matrix clause in SPC; so connectivity relation cannot be licensed (or checked) in LF
      d. the anaphor undergoes head movement to INFL (Chomsky 1986) so the anaphor in the counterweight can and must LF-moves to Wh-clause
      Overt syntax: VP [VP What, John likes t1[v’ is] ] this car
      LF: [VP [VP What, John likes t1[v’ is] ] this car ] => [VP [VP this car, John likes [this car, v’ is] ▲ ]] 

4. Syntactic Properties of Korean ‘-kes’ constructions: null cleft operator
   (8) Examples (from Jhang 1994) and abstract representations
      a. Mary-ga i caeyk-ul sa-ess-ta (non-cleft)
         Mary-Nom this book-Buy-Pst-Decl
         Mary bought this book
      b. Mary-ka sa-n KES-un i caeyk i-ta (Pseudocleft)
         Mary-Nom buy-Prs C-Top this book be-Decl
         What Mary bought is this book
      c. i caeyk-i-ta [i [Mary-ka sa-n]-KES i-ta (Inverse Pseudocleft)
         this book-N/Top Mary-Nom bought-Asp]-C be-Prs-Decl
         This book is what Mary bought
Diverse Information structures in English (Dikken 2000)

a. Mary bought this book. (canonical sentence, neutral)

b. What Mary bought is this book. (pseudocleft, Old/ Given/ Presupposed - New/ Focus)

c. It is this book that Mary bought (cleft, New/ Focus - Old/ Given/ Presupposed)

d. This book is what Mary bought (inverse PC, New/ Focus - Old/ Given/ Presupposed)

e. [Taro-ga tabeta]-no wa kono ringo-o da (Japanese cleft)

f. [Taro-ga tabeta]-wa kono ringo-ø da (Japanese pseudocleft)


Case markers/postpositions: NOT allowed in argument clefting, optionally allowed in adjunct clefting.

a. [Mary-ka sa-n]- kes]-un i caeyk- ul/ø i-ta (pseudocleft S)

Mary-N. buy-Prs]-KES-Top this book-Acc/ø be-Decl

b. [Taro-ga tabeta]-no wa kono ringo-o da (Japanese cleft)

c. [Taro-ga tabeta]-wa kono ringo-ø da (Japanese pseudocleft)


Case markers/postpositions: NOT allowed in argument clefting, optionally allowed in adjunct clefting.

a. [Mary-ka sa-n]- kes]-un i caeyk- ul/ø i-ta (pseudocleft S)

Mary-N. buy-Prs]-KES-Top this book-Acc/ø be-Decl

b. [Taro-ga tabeta]-no wa kono ringo-o da (Japanese cleft)

c. [Taro-ga tabeta]-wa kono ringo-ø da (Japanese pseudocleft)
5. Highest Subject effect in Korean Pseudoclefts

(11) Korean/Japanese Binding condition (A) requires c-commanding subjects(s)

a. Chomsky kyousu-nun-ka cais-in-uy nonmun-ul il-ess-ta
   Chomskyy prof. Top/N. self-Gen article-Acc read-Pst-Decl
   Prof. Chomsky, read his, (literally, self’s) own article
b. John-nun Mary-ka caisin-uy imo-lul koilophi-n-ka-ko malhha-ess-ta
   John-Top/N. Mary-Nom self’s aunt-Acc torture-Prs-Decl-C say-Pst-Decl
   John, said that Mary tortures self’s aunt
c. Taroo-ga [Hanako-ga [Masa-o-ga zibun-no hahayao-ni atta to] itta to] omoteiru
   Tar-o-Nom Hanako-Nom Masa-0-Nom self-Gen mother-Dat met C said C think
   Tar-o, thinks that Hanako said that Masa-0 met self’s/aunt’s mother

(12) Korean anaphors’ caisin’ (=Selff) bound by an Operator/Quantifier (Hong 1985)

a. nuk(wu)-ka caisin-uy anay-lul ttaeri-ess-ci?
   Who(-Nom) self-Gen wife-Acc hit-Pst-C
   Who hit self’s wife?
   John, wondered who hit self’s wife
c. nukwuna-ka kakekeum caisin-uy anay-lul ttaeri-n-ta
   Everyone-(Nom) sometimes self-Gen wife-Acc hit-Prs-Decl
   Everyone hits self’s own wife once in a while

(13) Highest Subject effect in (Pseudo-)Clefted constructions

   John-N. [Chomsky prof. -N. read-Past-Decl] C think-Asp]-C-Top
   cas-in-uy nonmun i-ess-ta
   Self-Gen article be-Pst-Decl
   [What John thinks that Prof. Chomsky, read ] was his, (literally, self’s) own article
   John-N. Mary-N. torture-Prs-C said-Past-Asp]-C-Top self’s aunt be-Pst-Decl
   [What John, said that Mary tortures ] was self’s/aunt’s

   John-N. Mary-N. be generous-Prs-Decl-C say-Asp]-C-Top self-to be-Pst-Decl
   [What John, said that Mary is generous (to t ) ] was self’s/aunt’s

d. [ casin-uy anay-lul ttaeri-n]-KES-uns nukwu-(i)-ci?
   [ Self’s/ wife-Acc hit-Asp] C Top who-(be)-CQuestion
   [ e hit his own wife] was who?
   =Who is it that hit his, own wife?

e. John-i [e casin-uy anay-lul ttaeri-ess-ta-ko] malhha-n]-KES-uns nukwu-(i)-ci?
   John-N. [e Self’s/ wife-Acc hit-Pst-Decl]-C Top said-C] kes-Top who-(be)-CQuestion
   John-i said] [e hit his 1/2 own wife] was who?
   =Who is it that John, said that t hit his 1/2 own wife?

f. (Clausal scrambled version of e)
   John said] e hit his own wife was who?
   =Who is it that John, said that t hit his own wife?

g. John-i [nu(kwu)-ka ttaeri-ess-nun-ci] kungkumhaya-n]-KES-uns casin-uy
   John-N. [Who-N. e hit-Pst-Asp]-CQ wonder-Prs]-C-Top self’s
   anay-i-ess-ta
   wife-be-Pst-Decl

Lit [What John, wondered [who, [t hit ] was his own wife]

(14) High Subject effects in Japanese clefts (Kizu 2005)

found even in SBJ oriented local anaphor (zibun-zisin) and local anaphor w/o orientation(kare-zisin)

a. Taroo-ga [Hanako-ga [Masa-o-ga zibun-no hahayao-ni atta to] itta to] omoteiru
   Tar-o-Nom Hanako-Nom Masa-0-Nom self-Gen mother-Dat met C said C think
   Tar-o, thinks that Hanako said that Masa-0 met self’s/aunt’s mother

b. [Hanako-ga [Masa-o-ka e atta to] itta to] omoteiru no wa zibun-no hahayao-ni
   Tar-o-Nom Hanako-0-Nom Masa-0-Nom e met C said C think-NM]-TOP self’s mother-Dat
   datta
   Cop-Pst
   It was self’s/aunt’s mother that Tar-o, thinks that Hanako said that Masa-0 met e

c. Taroo-ga [Hanako-ga [Masa-o-ga zibun-zisin-ni yasasi-sugiru to] omoteiru
   Tar-o-Nom Hanako-Nom Masa-0-Nom self-Gen self-Dat be too kind
   Comp think
   Tar-o, thinks that Hanako was too kind to her/hisself

d. Taroo-ga [Masa-o-ka yasasi-sugiru to] omoteiru no]-wa zibun-zisin-ni datta
   Tar-o-Nom [Masa-0-Nom be too kind C] think-NM]-TOP self-self-Dat Cop-Pst
   It was himself/sSelf] that Tar-o thought that Masa-0 was too kind to

6. Proposing an explanation/analysis for Highest Subject effects

(15) ‘-kes’ C is a defective functional category; C demands the relaxation of C
   subcommand into Subcommand; Subcommand is available not only through DP
   but through CP as well.

   a.[Cak-i ka i seysang-e se ceil yeppuke toy-nun-KES]-i
   Self-N, this world-in most pretty become-Asp-C-N. Mary-Gen. dream-be-Decl
   It is Mary’s dream that Self becomes the prettiest in the world
   b. Xiaoming de taidu shi zijai jue bu ren cuo
   Xiaoming Poss attitude be self EMPH not admit mistake
   Xiaoming’s attitude is that self will never admit any mistake
7. Further empirical supports

(17) Korean Externally Headed Relative Clause (EHRC)

a. John-i [Mary-ka t sa-ess-ta]-ko malha-n casin-uy caeyk
b. John-i [Mary-ka t tari-ess-ta]-ko malha-n casin-uy imo

(18) Raising constructions with ‘-kes’ (Hong 2007, 2009)

- Clausemate condition for Korean NPI licensing is violated => ‘-kes’ is defective
  a. *John-i amwuteto ka-un-KES kath-ta
     John-Nom anywhere go-Prs-C seem-Decl
     *It seems that John has gone anywhere
  b. John-i amwuteto ka-ci ahn-un-KES kat-ta
     John-Nom anywhere go-Neg-Prs-C seem-Decl
     It seems that John has not gone anywhere
  c. John-i amwuteto ka-n-KES kat-ci ahn-ta
     John-Nom anywhere go-Prs-C seem-Neg-Decl
     It does not seem that John has gone anywhere

-NPI object
  a. *John-i amwuto manna-n-KES kath-ta
     John-Nom anyone meet-Prs-C seem-Decl
     *It seems that anyone meets John
  b. John-i amwuto manna-ci ahn-un-KES kath-ta
     John-Nom anyone meet-Neg-Prs-C seem-Decl
     It seems that John does not meet anyone
  c. John-i amwuto manna-n-KES kath-ciahn-ta
     John-Nom anyone meet-Prs-C seem-Neg-Decl
     It does not seem that John meets anyone

-NPI subject
  a. *amwuto John- ul manna-n-KES kath-ta
     anyone John-Nom meet-Prs-C seem-Decl
     *It seems that anyone meets John
  b. amwuto John- ul manna-ciahn-un-KES kath-ta
     anyone John-Nom meet-Neg-Prs-C seem-Decl
     *It seems that anyone does not meet John
  c. amwuto John- ul manna-n-KES kath-ciahn-ta
     anyone John-Nom meet-Prs-C seem-Neg-Decl
     It does not seem that anyone meets John

(19) Wh-questions

John-N. Mary-N. self-Gen which picture-Acc see-Pst-Asp-C_Q ask-Pst-Decl
John asked which picture of self
Mary-N. Mary-N. see-Pst-Asp-C_Q ask-Asp]-C Top self-Gen which pict.-be-C_Q

[What] John, said that Mary’s tortures ]] was self’s aunt

John-N. Mary-N. torture-Prs-C say-Past-Asp-C Top Self’s aunt be-Pst-Decl
[What] John, said that Mary’s tortures ]] was self’s aunt

[John, thought that Chomsky’s read was self’s article]
8. Theoretical consequences

Phase Sliding/Extension via Head movement may be evitable in pro-drop languages (Gallego, Dikken 2007, 2008, Hong 2009)

More defective categories? \( T_{\text{def}} \) (Chomsky 2000), \( C_{\text{def}} \) (Gallego 2007)
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