

## Clefts in Japanese and Korean

Sungdai Cho, SUNY at Binghamton  
John Whitman, Cornell University  
Yuko Yanagida, University of Tsukuba

### 1 Introduction

Clefts in Korean and Japanese show a remarkable set of similarities. Both languages allow casemarked (CM, adopting the label of Hoji 1987) and non-casemarked (non-CM) clefts (1); both allow multiple clefts (2); many speakers disallow clefting of casemarked subjects and/or objects in single focus clefts (4); but both allow clefting of casemarked subjects and objects in multiple clefts (5). In (1-4) below, the (a) sentences are Korean, the (b) sentences Japanese.

#### (1) CM and non-CM clefts

- a. [Yumi ka san kes] un chayk (ul) sey-kwen i-ta.  
Yumi NOM bought COMP TOP book ACC 3-CL be-DEC  
'What Yumi bought is three books.'
- b. [Yumi ga katta no] wa hon (o) san-satu da.  
Yumi NOM bought COMP TOP book ACC 3-CL is  
'What Yumi bought is three books.'

#### (2) Multiple Clefts

- a. [Yumi ka ku chayk ul san kes] un caknyen LA eyse i-ta.  
Yumi NOM that book ACC bought COMP TOP last year LA in be-DEC  
'Where/when Yumi bought that book is last year in LA.'
- b. [Yumi ga sono hon o katta no] wakyonen LA de da.  
Yumi NOM that book ACC bought COMP TOP last year LA in is  
'Where/when Yumi bought that book is last year in LA.'

#### (3) Case marked subjects are out for many speakers in non-multiple clefts

- a. [Ttokttokhan kes] un kolay (\*ka) i-ta  
intelligent COMP TOP whale NOM be-DEC  
'What is intelligent is whales.'
- b. [Kasikoi no] wa kuzira (\*ga) da  
intelligent COMP TOP whale NOM is  
'What is intelligent is whales.'

#### (4) Case marked objects are out for some speakers in non-multiple clefts

- a. [Yumi ka san kes] un sey-kwen uy chayk- (\*ul) i-ta.  
Yumi NOM bought COMP TOP 3-CL GEN bookACC be-DEC  
'What Yumi bought is three books.'
- b. [Yumi ga katta no] wa san-satu no hon (\*/?o) da.  
Yumi NOM bought COMP TOP 3-CL GEN book ACC is  
'What Yumi bought is three books.'

#### (5) Case marked subjects and objects can be clefted in multiple clefts

- a. [San kes] un Yumi ka ku chayk ul LA eyse i-ta.

- bought COMP TOP Yumi NOM that book ACC LA in be-DEC  
 ‘What *pro* bought was Yumi that book in LA.’
- b. [Katta no] wa Yumi ga sono hon o LA de da.  
 bought COMP TOP Yumi NOM that book ACC LA in is  
 ‘What *pro* bought was Yumi that book in LA.’

These similarities are too striking to be accidental. The objective of this paper is to explain them. After reviewing the longstanding debate about whether some cleft structures in Korean and Japanese are derived by movement, and if so, by what kind of movement (Hoji 1987, Kuroda 1999, Koizumi 2000, Kim 2007), we conclude that the arguments are inconclusive. Although some type of movement is clearly involved in CM clefts, the facts do not show whether the movement is inside the presuppositional clause, or directly to focus position.

We then introduce a basic set of parallels between Korean and Japanese CM clefts and the pattern in (6), labeled **amalgam clefts** by Declerck (1988).

- (6) [What Yumi bought] is [she bought a Lexus at Royal Motors].

We argue that CM clefts in Korean and Japanese are covert amalgam clefts, generated by ellipsis of the verb in the second clause in precopular position:

- (7) a. [Yumi ka san kes] un [*pro* Lexus ul Royal Motors eyse ~~sassta~~] i-ta.  
 Yumi NOM bought COMP TOP Lexus ACC Royal Motors at bought be-DEC  
 ‘What Yumi bought is (she bought a Lexus at Royal Motors.)’
- b. [Yumi ga katta no] wa [*pro* Lexus o Royal Motors de ~~katta~~] da.  
 Yumi NOM bought COMP TOP Lexus ACC Royal Motors at bought be-DEC  
 ‘What Yumi bought is (she bought a Lexus at Royal Motors.)’

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces previous research and discusses the role of movement in CM and non-CM clefts. Section 3 examines multiple clefts and previous analyses of them. Section 4 proposes an amalgam cleft analysis for Korean and Japanese CM clefts. Section 5 looks briefly at a Japanese-Korean difference. Section 6 concludes the paper.

## 2 Case marked and Non-Case marked Clefts

Hoji (1987) argues that what he calls C(ase)M(arked) clefts in Japanese show subjacency effects. The contrast is shown in (8a-b). The Japanese examples in (8) are from Hoji and Ueyama (2003).

- (8) Japanese: Subjacency asymmetry with CM and non-CM clefts
- a. \*John ga [ano ban e<sub>i</sub> hookasita] otoko] o otteiru no wa [kono John NOM that night set.fire man ACC is chasing COMP TOP this gekizyoo ni]<sub>i</sub> da.  
 theater to is

‘Where John is chasing the person who set fire [e] that night is to that theater.’

- b. John ga [e<sub>i</sub> kaita] hito<sub>i</sub>] ni aitagatteiru no wa ano hon<sub>i</sub> da.  
John NOM wrote person DAT is wanting to see COMP TOP that book is  
‘What John wants to see the person who wrote is that book.’

The same facts hold for Korean (9):

(9) Korean: Subjacency asymmetry with CM and non-CM clefts

- a. \*John i [ku nal e<sub>j</sub> panghwahan] namca] lul ccocakan kes un i kukcang  
John NOM that night set.fire man ACC chases COMP TOP this theater  
eyse<sub>j</sub> i-ta.  
to be-DEC  
‘Where John is chasing the person who set fire [e] that day is to that theater.’
- b. ?John i [e<sub>i</sub> ssun] salam<sub>i</sub>] ul manako siphhanun kes un ku chayk  
John NOM wrote person ACC meet want COMP TOP this book  
i-ta.  
be-DEC  
‘What John wants to meet the person who wrote is this book.’

On the basis of the contrast in (8a-b), Hoji concludes that CM clefts must involve movement, while non-CM clefts need not. As Hoji implies, the contrast in (8) does not show that non-CM clefts **cannot** involve movement. Both CM and non-CM clefts show reconstruction effects for anaphor binding, as shown in (10).

(10) Korean: Condition A reconstruction effects

- [Kutul<sub>i</sub> i sensayng ul sokayhan kes] un selo<sub>i</sub> uy pumonim  
they nom teacher ACC introduced COMP TOP each.other GEN parent  
eyekey i-ta.  
to be-DEC  
‘Who they introduced the teacher was to each other’s parents.’

The same facts hold for Japanese (11).

(11) Japanese: Condition A reconstruction effects

- [Karera<sub>i</sub> ga sensei o syookaisita no] wa otagai<sub>i</sub> no ryoosin (ni) da.  
they NOM teacher ACC introduced COMP TOpeach.other GEN parent to is  
‘Who they introduced the teacher was to each other’s parents.’

These facts can be explained if CM clefts must be derived by movement, while non-CM may involve movement or not. The obligatory movement derivation explains why CM clefts cannot escape the effects of Subjacency in (8-9a). The availability of a non-movement derivation for non-CM clefts explains the

possibility of escaping Subjacency in (8-9b). The availability of a movement derivation explains the possibility of reconstruction for A-binding in clefts of both types in (10-11).

The particular movement analysis adopted by Hoji (1987) and Hoji & Ueyama (2003) is null operator movement within the presuppositional *no*-clause, as in (12):

- (12) [OP [... t ...] no] wa XP<sub>FOCUS</sub> da  
           COMP TOP                 is

Hoji and Hoji & Ueyama give as a reason for adopting null operator movement, rather than direct movement to focus position, the fact that negative polarity items are ruled out in the focus position of clefts in (13-14).

- (13) Korean: NPIs licensed in presupposition may not be clefted  
       \*[John i phaati eyse an-masin kes] un maykcwu han-peyng ul  
       John NOM party at not-drank COMP TOP beer one-CL ACC  
       cocha i-ta.  
       even be-DEC  
       ‘What John did not drink at the party is even one bottle of beer.’
- (14) Japanese: NPIs licensed in presupposition may not be clefted  
       \*[John ga paati de nom-anakatta no] wa biiru ip-pon o mo da.  
       John NOM party at drank-not COMP TOP beer one-CL ACC even is  
       ‘What John did not drink at the party. is even one bottle of beer.’  
       (Ueyama & Hoji 2003)

While there is a clausemate condition on NPI licensing in both languages, other types of direct movement, such as Scrambling, allow NPIs to be extracted from their source clauses (Nishiyama et al 1996). Therefore, the unacceptability of (13-14) suggests on first glance that CM clefts do not involve direct movement to the precopular focus position.

However on closer inspection the force of this argument is doubtful. NPIs are disallowed in the focus position of CM clefts in both languages even when the matrix copula is negated (15-16).

- (15) Korean: NPIs disallowed in focus of CM cleft even with matrix negation  
       \*[John i phaathi eyse masin kes] un maykcwu han-pyeng ul cocha an-i-ta.  
       John NOM party at drank COMP TOP beer one-CL ACC even not-be-DEC  
       ‘What John drank at the party is not even one bottle of beer.’
- (16) Japanese: NPIs disallowed in focus of CM cleft even with matrix negation  
       \*[John ga paati de nonda no] wa biiru ip-pon o mo zya nai.  
       John NOM party at drank COMP TOP beer one-CL ACC even is not

‘What John drank at the party is not even one bottle of beer.’

This is in spite of the fact that negation of the matrix copula is quite possible in clefts in both languages (17-18).

- (17) Korean: matrix (copular) negation possible  
[John i phaati eyse masin kes] un maykcwu ka an-i-ta.  
John NOM party at drank COMP TOP beer NOM not-be-dec  
‘What John drank at the party is not beer.’
- (18) Japanese: matrix (copular) negation possible  
[John ga paati de nonda no] wa biiru zya nai.  
John NOM party at drank COMP TOP beer is not  
‘What John drank at the party is not beer.’

Therefore we cannot rule out the possibility of direct movement in CM clefts.

In contrast to Hoji (1987) and Hoji and Ueyama (2003), Hiraiwa and Ishihara (2002) claim that CM clefts are derived by direct movement to the focus position, while non-CM clefts involve no movement. But at least the latter claim is too strong, as it fails to explain the existence of A-binding reconstruction effects in non-CM as we saw in (10-11). More generally, Hiraiwa and Ishihara’s arguments for direct movement run up against two kinds of problems (Cho 2007). First, the movement diagnostic they present, adjacency, fails to distinguish between direct movement to focus position and null operator movement within the presuppositional clause, as already pointed out in Hoji and Ueyama’s work. Second, Hiraiwa and Ishihara’s analysis of CM clefts is problematic. They posit direct movement to Spec, FocusP in the extended left projection framework of Rizzi (1997). After movement of the focused constituent (or in multiple clefts, constituents), the remnant presupposition is moved around the focused constituent to Spec, TopicP, as in (19).

- (19) Hiraiwa & Ishihara’s analysis of CM clefts
- a. [FOCP Chayk ul sey-kwen [TP Yumi ka t<sub>chayk ul sey-kwen</sub> san kes] i-ta.]  
book ACC 3-CL Yumi NOM bought COMP be-DEC
- b. [TOPP[TP Yumi ka t<sub>chayk ul sey-kwen</sub> san kes] un [FOCP chayk ul sey-kwen t<sub>CP</sub>  
Yumi NOM bought COMP TOP book ACC 3-CL  
i-ta]]]  
be-DEC  
‘What Yumi bought is three books.’
- (19) Hiraiwa & Ishihara’s analysis of CM clefts
- a. [FOCP Chayk ul sey-kwen; [TP Yumi ka t<sub>i</sub> san kes] i-ta.]  
book ACC 3-CL Yumi NOM bought COMP be-DEC
- b. [TOPP[TP Yumi ka t<sub>i</sub> san kes] un [FOCP chayk ul sey-kwen; t<sub>CP</sub> i-ta]]]

Yumi NOM bought COMP TOP book ACC 3-CL be-DEC  
 ‘What Yumi bought is three books.’

On this analysis, the presupposition is a TP, and the other components of the cleft structure (the copula, the focused constituent) reside in the same extended clausal projection. But it is easy to show that clefts in Korean and Japanese have a biclausal structure. For example, NPIs in the presupposition must be licensed by negation on the predicate in the presupposition, even though, as we saw in (17-18), the matrix copular predicate can be negated independently.

- (20) Korean: NPIs must be licensed by negation in the presupposition
  - a. [John i amukesto an-masin kes] un phaati eyse i-ta.  
 John NOM anything not-drank COMP TOP party at be-dec  
 ‘Where John didn’t drink anything is at the party.’
  - b. \*[John i amukesto masin kes] un phaati eyse ka an-i-ta.  
 John NOM anything drank COMP TOP party at NOM not-be-DEC
- (21) Japanese: NPIs must be licensed by negation in the presupposition
  - a. [John ga nanimo nom-anakatta no] wa paati de da.  
 John NOM anything drink-didn’t COMP TOP party at is  
 ‘Where John didn’t drink anything is at the party.’
  - b. \*[John ga nanimo nonda no] wa paati de zya nakatta.  
 John NOM anything drink COMP TOP party at is not

We conclude that clefts in Korean and Japanese have a biclausal structure, and that movement within the presupposition (the counterpart of Hoji and Hoji & Ueyama’s (12)) is available in at least some cleft patterns.<sup>1</sup> In the following section we present a simple explanation of the coincident properties of CM and multiple clefts: we suggest that CM clefts are in fact a subtype of multiple cleft.

### 3 Multiple Clefts and the Amalgam Cleft Analysis

Hiraiwa & Ishihara (2002) point out one property of CM clefts that clearly distinguishes them from non-CM clefts: only CM clefts can be multiple. The multiple cleft pattern in (5) is possible only if case markers and postpositions are retained:

- (22) Korean: Multiple clefts possible only with CM clefts  
 [Yumi ka san kes] un ku chayk \*(ul) LA \*(eyse) i-ta.  
 Yumi NOM bought COMP TOP that book ACC LA in be-DEC  
 ‘It was that book in LA that Yumi bought.’

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that movement within the presupposition need not be null operator movement: on a head extraction analysis of Japanese and Korean complex NPs, the functional elements *no Comp*, ‘the one’ and *kes Comp*, ‘the thing’, can be analyzed as being moved from the underlying position of the variable in the presupposition to the edge of the clause.

- (23) Japanese: Multiple clefts possible only with CM clefts  
 [Yumi ga katta no] wa sono hon \*(o) LA \*(de) da.  
 Yumi NOM bought COMP TOP that book ACC LA in is  
 'It was that book in LA that Yumi bought.'

Hiraiwa & Ishihara's analysis accounts straightforwardly for this fact: multiple clefts are derived by multiple movements to Spec, FocP in the CM cleft pattern, while non-CM clefts involve just a single base generated focus constituent. Unfortunately, as we have seen, Hiraiwa & Ishihara's extended CP analysis fails to account for the biclausal structure of Korean and Japanese clefts. There are two other proposals in the literature that are potentially compatible with a biclausal structure. Koizumi (2000) proposes that multiple CM clefts are in fact VP clefts. Under Koizumi's analysis, a sentence like (23) is derived by raising the verb in the presupposition out of VP (24a); the remnant VP is then clefted (24b):

- (24) Koizumi's (2000) analysis of multiple CM clefts as remnant VP clefting  
 a. [Yumi ka [VP ku chayk ul LA eyse t<sub>v</sub>] san kes] un i-ta.  
 Yumi NOM that book ACC LA in bought COMP TOP be-DEC  
 b. [Yumi ka t<sub>VP</sub> san kes] un [VP ku chayk ul LA eyse t<sub>v</sub>] i-ta.  
 Yumi NOM bought COMP TOP that book ACC LA in be-DEC

Takano (2002) points out a number of difficulties with Koizumi's remnant VP cleft proposal, and presents an alternative under which the focused items in a multiple CM cleft form not a VP but a derived constituent. This 'surprising constituent' approach utilizes a proposal of Saito (1994) under which arguments and adjuncts of the predicate may adjoin to one another (25a) and then move as a unit out of the clause (25b). Under the 'surprising constituent' approach, (22) has the structure in (25):

- (25) Takano's (2000) 'surprising constituent analysis of multiple CM clefts  
 a. [Yumi ka [PP ku chayk ul<sub>i</sub> [PP LA eyse]] t<sub>i</sub> san kes] un i-ta.  
 Yumi NOM that book ACC LA in bought COMP TOP be-DEC  
 b. [Yumi ka t<sub>PP</sub> san kes] un [PP ku chayk ul [PP LA eyse t]] i-ta.  
 Yumi NOM bought COMP TOP that book ACC LA in be-DEC

As Takano himself acknowledges, one of the biggest questions facing the 'surprising constituents' analysis is why this type of argument-to-argument adjunction is not available to feed clefting (or other kinds of A' movement) in, for example, English. We leave a fuller discussion of Takano's analysis to future work. For now, we would like to point out another difficulty with Koizumi's VP cleft analysis.

This difficulty is semantic. Koizumi's analysis claims that the variable in the presupposition, and the focused constituent, should be of semantic type <e,<e,

t>>, that is, a VP. Let us consider the properties of VP clefts as exemplified by the English pseudocleft in (26)

(26) a. VP cleft

What Yumi did was buy 3 books. She bought a magazine too.

b. Argument cleft

What Yumi bought was 3 books. (#)She bought a magazine too.

The exclusivity implication is weaker in pseudoclefts than in *it*-clefts, but the continuation in (26b) still has the flavor, if not of a contradiction, of a cancellation. In contrast, there is no such flavor with the continuation in (26a).

Compare multiple CM clefts in Korean (27a) and Japanese (27b):

(27) a. [Yumi ka san kes] un chayk ul LA eyse i-ta.

Yumi NOM bought COMP TOP book ACC LA in be-DEC

(#)Capci to sassta.

magazine too bought

‘What Yumi bought is three books in LA. She bought a magazine too.’

b. [Yumi ga katta no] wa hon o LA de da. (#)Zassi mo katta.

Yumi NOM bought COMP TOP book ACC LA in is magazine too bought

‘What Yumi bought is three books in LA. She bought a magazine too.’

The examples in (27) have the same flavor of cancellation as (26b), not the interpretation associated with the VP cleft in (26a).

The same point is made even more clearly by comparing the question-answer pairs in (28) with their Japanese and Korean counterparts.

(28) A: What did Yumi do?

B: a. What she did was buy three books in LA.

b. #What she bought was three books in LA.

(28Bb) is infelicitous because the argument cleft does not answer the question in (28A). (28Ba) is felicitous because the focus of the cleft (VP) corresponds to the focus of the question. Now let’s look at Korean (29) and Japanese (30):

(29) A: Yumi nun mwues hayss-ni?

Yumi TOP what did-Q

‘What did Yumi do?’

B: #Yumi ka/nun san kes un chayk ul LA eyse i-ta.

Yumi NOM/TOP bought COMP TOP book ACC LA in be-DEC

‘What Yumi bought is three books in LA.’

(30) A: Yumi wa nani sita?

Yumi TOP what did-Q

‘What did Yumi do?’

- B: #Yumi ga/wa katta no wa hon o LA de da.  
 Yumi NOM bought COMP TOP book ACC LA in is  
 ‘What Yumi bought is three books in LA.’

The CM cleft responses in (29-30B) are just as infelicitous as their English argument cleft counterpart in (28Bb). On this basis, we conclude that the clefted category in multiple CM clefts is not VP.

#### 4 The Amalgam Cleft Analysis

Let us pause and take stock of what we have determined so far. We know that the focused category in Japanese and Korean multiple CM clefts is not VP, and we know that a multiple movement analysis of such clefts is problematic, at least if it requires a monoclausal structure. Is there another cleft pattern that provides a better fit for the Korean and Japanese data?

We suggest that there is. Declerck (1988) labels the English pattern in (31) **amalgam clefts**:<sup>2</sup>

- (31) Amalgam clefts (Declerck 1988)  
 What Yumi bought is Yumi bought a LEXUS.

Amalgam clefts appear to predicate a full clause [*Yumi bought a LEXUS*] in (31) of the copula in a pseudocleft structure. The focalized constituents in the postcopular clause must include an item corresponding to the variable in the presupposition. In (31), this is *LEXUS*, where focal stress is indicated by capitals. The obligatoriness of this requirement is shown by the infelicity of (32).

- (32) \*What Yumi bought is YUMI bought a Lexus.

(32) is infelicitous because the focalized item in the precopular clause does not correspond to the variable in the presupposition. However the focalized material in an amalgam cleft need not be limited to the constituent corresponding to the variable in the presupposition. As long as this constituent is focalized, other material may be as well as in (33):

- (33) What she bought is YUMI bought a LEXUS.  
 (34) What Yumi bought is she bought a LEXUS in LA for HER  
 BROTHER.

---

<sup>2</sup> The label amalgam clefts refers to the phenomenon of **syntactic amalgams** studied by Lakoff (1974). Syntactic amalgams seem to involve a fusion of two independent clauses, as in *Daisuke threw I don't know how many sinkers*. See Tsubomoto and Whitman 2000 for an analysis of these structures.

(34) shows that the focalized material in an amalgam cleft may in fact include items not included in the presupposition. The ability of amalgam clefts to put multiple items in focus makes them felicitous answers to multiple wh questions:

- (35) A: What did Yumi buy where for whom?  
B: What Yumi bought was she bought a LEXUS in LA for MINA.

CM multiple clefts in Japanese and Korean have exactly the same information structural properties. (36) is the Korean and (37) the Japanese counterpart of (35).

(36) Korean amalgam cleft

- A: Yumi nun mwues ul eti eyes nwukwu hantey sa cwuess-ni?  
Yumi TOP what ACC where in who for buy gave-be-DEC  
'What did Yumi buy where for whom?'  
B: [Yumi ka sa cwun kes] un [Lexus ul LA eyse oppa hanthey]  
Yumi NOM bought gave COMP TOP Lexus ACC LA in elder brother for  
i-ta.  
be-DEC  
'What Yumi bought is she bought three books in LA for her  
elder.brother.'

(37) Japanese amalgam cleft

- A: Yumi wa nani o doko de dare ni katte ageta no?  
Yumi TOP what ACC where in who for buy gave-Q  
'What did Yumi buy where for whom?'  
B: [Yumi gakatta no] wa [Lexus o LA de oniisan ni] da.  
Yumi NOM bought COMP TOP Lexus ACC LA in elder.brother for is  
'What Yumi bought is a Lexus in LA for her elder brother.'

Note that there is missing material in the precopular clause in (36-7) that is overtly present in English amalgam clefts. We assume that the subjects in these clauses are realized as *pro*, as in Korean (38a) and Japanese (38b):

- (38) a. [Yumi ka sa cwun kes] un [*pro* Lexus ul LA eyse oppa hanthey]  
Yumi NOM bought gave COMP TOP Lexus ACC LA in elder brother for  
i-ta.  
be-DEC  
'What Yumi bought is she bought three books in LA for her  
elder.brother.'  
b. [Yumi ga kattano] wa [*pro* Lexus o LA de oniisan ni] da.  
Yumi NOM bought COMP TOP Lexus ACC LA in elder.brother for is  
'What Yumi bought is a Lexus in LA for her elder brother.'

As shown in (5), the subject can be realized overtly in the precopular clause if it is unpronounced in the presupposition:

- (39) a. [pro sa cwun kes] un [Yumi ka Lexus ul LA eyse  
          bought gave COMP TOP Yumi NOM Lexus ACC LA in  
          oppa hanthey] i-ta.  
          elder.brother for be-DEC  
‘What she bought is Yumi bought a Lexus in LA for her elder.brother.’
- b. [pro katta no] wa [Yumi ga Lexus o LA de oniisan ni] da.  
          bought COMP TOP Yumi NOM Lexus ACC LA in elder.brother for is  
‘What she bought is Yumi bought a Lexus in LA for her elder brother.’

The second item missing in the Japanese and Korean pattern is the verb in the precopular clause. Both languages, unlike English, are subject to a very general constraint that finite verbs may not appear before the copula. Both languages also have two patterns of ellipsis that delete the finite verb under identity with an discourse antecedent.

- (40) a. Yumi ka Lexus ul LA eyse sass-kwunyo.  
          Yumi NOM Lexus ACC LA in bought-APPRECEPTIVE  
‘Yumi bought the Lexus in LA, didn’t she?’  
Kuliko Mina ka Mercedes ul NY eyse i-nkayo?  
and.then Mina NOM Mercedes ACC NY in be-Q  
‘And it’s Mina the Mercedes in NY?’
- b. Yumi ga Lexus o LA de katta ne.  
          Yumi NOM Lexus ACC LA in bought right  
‘Yumi bought the Lexus in LA, right?’  
Sosite Mina ga Mercedes o NY de datta ka na ?  
and.then Mina NOM Mercedes ACC NY in was Q TAG  
‘And it was Mina the Mercedes in NY?’

Hoji (1990, cited in Fukaya & Hoji 1999) labels this ellipsis pattern Stripping, after Hankamer’s (1971) label for the English pattern in (41):

- (41) Yumi bought a Lexus, and Mina, too.

Superficially, Stripping looks like a good candidate for the process that derives the CM clefts, since the latter involve one or more case marked constituents and apparent replacement of the lexical verb by a form of the copula. In fact, however, this resemblance is only superficial. On the biclausal analysis of Korean and Japanese clefts that we motivated in section 2, the copula is the matrix predicate, not a pro-verb for the lexical verb. It is possible, of course, that CM clefts have a

syntactic representation like (42), where the copula *qua* pro-verb is deleted before the matrix copula by a haplology-like process:

- (42) a. [pro sa cwun kes] un [Yumi ka Lexus ul LA eyse oppa  
                                   bought gave COMP TOP Yumi NOM Lexus ACC LA in  
                                   hanthey i-] i-ta.  
                                   brother for be-DEC  
                                   ‘What she bought is Yumi bought a Lexus in LA for her elder brother.’  
  b. [pro katta no] wa [Yumi ga Lexus o LA de oniisan ni da] da.  
                                   bought COMP TOP Yumi NOM Lexus ACC LA in brother for is is  
                                   ‘What she bought is Yumi bought a Lexus in LA for her elder brother.’

However a stronger argument against a Stripping analysis of CM clefts comes from the fact that the conditions on case marking in Stripping and CM clefts are different. We observed in (3) that many speakers of Japanese and all, as far as we know, of Korean, reject CM clefts with nominative case retained in position directly before the copula. However those same speakers (in particular, the co-authors of this paper) accept nominative case directly before the copula in Stripping:

- (43) A: Yumi-ka ku sensayng-ul pipanhayssta.  
                                   Yumi-NOM that teacher-ACC criticized  
                                   ‘Yumi criticized that teacher.’  
  B: Ani. Mina-ka Ø-ta.  
                                   No. Mina- NOM COP-DEC.  
                                   ‘No, Mina.’  
(44) A: Yumi-ga sono sensei-o hihansita.  
                                   Yumi-NOM that teacher-ACC criticized  
                                   ‘Yumi criticized that teacher.’  
  B: Iie. Mina-ga da.  
                                   No. Toyota-NOM COP  
                                   ‘No, Mina.’

It is possible that this contrast between Stripping and CM clefts is due to a subtle information theoretic difference which is not obvious to us, but for now we take this as reason not to posit Stripping as the ellipsis process at work in CM Clefts.

Instead we propose that the ellipsis process responsible for deriving CM clefts is Gapping. Here we do not choose between the various analyses of Gapping in Korean and Japanese (see, among others, Saito 1987 and Abe & Hoshi 1993), but merely point out that Verb Gapping satisfies the requirement that a finite verb not precede the copula.

The amalgam cleft analysis explains why CM multiple clefts are not interpreted like VP clefts (section 3). It also explains why multiple clefts must retain case marking and postpositions (22-23), since case drop in Japanese and

Korean is generally restricted to immediate preverbal position. Subjacency and reconstruction effects in CM clefts can be explained by positing movement within the presupposition, as proposed by Hoji and Hoji & Ueyama. A further fact noted by Hiraiwa & Ishihara is also explained by the amalgam cleft analysis. Hiraiwa and Ishihara note that while non-CM clefts allow lexical head nouns in the presupposition, CM clefts do not:

- (45) a. [Yumi ka san kes] un sakwa ul sey-kay i-ta.  
Yumi NOM bought COMP TOP apple ACC 3-CL be-DEC  
'What Yumi bought is three apples.'
- b. [Yumi ka san kwail] un sakwa (\*ul) sey-kay i-ta.  
Yumi NOM bought fruit TOP apple ACC 3-CL be-DEC  
'The fruit that Yumi bought is three apples.'
- (46) a. [Yumi ga katta no] wa ringo o san-ko da.  
Yumi NOM bought COMP TOP apple ACC 3-CL is  
'What Yumi bought is three apples.'
- b. [Yumi ga katta kudamono] wa ringo (\*o) san-ko da.  
Yumi NOM bought fruit TOP apple ACC 3-CL is  
'The fruit that Yumi bought is three apples.'

This contrast is explained in a simple way under the amalgam cleft analysis. Under this analysis, the predicate is a clause; the constituent predicated of it must also be a clause. Thus amalgam clefts are ruled out in English as well when the presupposition is a complex NP:

- (47) a. What Yumi bought is that Yumi bought 3 apples.
- b.\*The fruit that Yumi bought is Yumi bought 3 apples.

Although we have proposed the amalgam cleft analysis to account for multiple CM clefts, the analysis extends naturally to CM clefts of all kinds. On this approach, the amalgam cleft analysis of, for example, Korean (1a) would be:

- (48) [Yumi ka san kes] un [pro chayk (ul) sey-kwen] i-ta.  
Yumi NOM bought COMP TOP book ACC 3-CL be-DEC  
'What Yumi bought is three books.'

## 5 A Korean-Japanese difference

In (3) and (4) we pointed out that for many speakers non-multiple subject and object clefts are severely or completely degraded. The degree of unacceptability seems to be more severe in Korean than in Japanese. Some previous accounts have attempted to derive the relative unacceptability of subject CM clefts from deep properties of the analysis; for example, in Koizumi's (2000) analysis, the unacceptability of (3) can be accounted for if subjects (or, in the case of (3), individual level subjects) are excluded from the verb phrase. Similarly, on

Takano's surprising constituents approach, (3) can be explained by a ban on movement of nominative-marked subjects.

The problem with this type of approach is that it is not difficult to find examples of non-multiple CM clefts with case-marked subjects or objects in Japanese, like the following.

- (49) Saisyo ni hyoosyoodai ni agatta no wa Kim Taisa ga  
first LOC award.platform LOC ascended COMP TOP Kim colonel NOM  
datta.  
was  
'Who first ascended the award platform was Colonel Kim.'  
([www.chosunonline.com/article/20050620000059](http://www.chosunonline.com/article/20050620000059))
- (50) Go hun de hyakuman en okaiage sita no wa ano Paris  
5 minute in million yen purchase made COMP TOP that Paris  
Hilton ga datta.  
Hilton NOM was  
'Who made a million yen in purchases in 5 minutes was that Paris  
Hilton.'
- ([abcdane.net/blog/archives/200608/paris\\_monaco.html](http://abcdane.net/blog/archives/200608/paris_monaco.html))

In contrast, Korean sentences corresponding to (49-50) are unacceptable, as shown in (51-52).

- (51) \*Cheum ey sang ul swuyepatun salam un Kim taylyeng i i-ta.  
first LOC award ACC ascended person TOP Kim colonel NOM was  
'Who first ascended the award platform was Colonel Kim.'
- (52) \*O pun man ey paykman woneci lul palun salam un Paris  
5 minute just in million won ACC purchase COMP TOP Paris  
Hilton i i-ta  
Hilton NOM is  
'Who made a million yen in purchases in 5 minutes was that Paris  
Hilton.'

This suggests that the relative unacceptability of nominative (and for some speakers, accusative) in non-multiple CM clefts is a surface phenomenon. The examples in (5) show that the ban applies only to immediate precopular position in both languages. (49-50) show that the ban is relatively weak (or subject to individual speaker differences) in Japanese, while (51-2) show that the ban is stronger in Korean.

## 6 Conclusion

We have argued in this paper that cleft sentences with multiple case marked constituents retained in the copular position are derived from a structure where a

full clause is generated in focus position, parallel to the amalgam cleft pattern identified by Declerck. The amalgam cleft analysis explains why multiple constituents appear in focus position, and why they bear case marking, and why the focused material is not interpreted like a VP. Truncation of the focused clause is explained by gapping. A more detailed analysis of the properties of amalgam clefts in Korean, Japanese, and English must await further research.

## References

- Abe, J. & H. Hoshi. 1993. Gapping and P-stranding. In M. Saito, ed. *Japanese Grammar (II): Second Annual Report for the Research Project, Development of a Formal Grammar of Japanese* 16-28. Storrs: University of Connecticut.
- Cho, S. 2007. Silent structure in *wh-in-situ* language: sluicing. *Harvard ISOKL* (International Studies on Korean Linguistics). Volume 12. Harvard University.
- Declerck, R. 1988. *Studies in copular sentences, clefts, and Pseudo-Clefts*. Leuven: Leuven University Press and Dordrecht: Foris.
- Fukaya, T. and H. Hoji. Stripping and sluicing in Japanese and some implications. WCCFL 18.
- Hankamer, J. 1971. *Constraints on deletion in syntax*. Yale University Ph.D. dissertation.
- Hiraiwa, K. and S. Ishihara. 2002. Missing links: cleft, sluicing, and “*No da*” construction in Japanese. MITWPL 43,35-54.
- Hoji, H. 1987. Japanese clefts and chain binding/reconstruction effects. Paper presented at WCCFL VI.
- Hoji, H. 1990. Theories of anaphora and aspects of Japanese Syntax. Ms., University of Southern California.
- Hoji, H. and A. Ueyama. 2003. Resumption in Japanese: A preliminary study. Handout from WECOL 2003, University of Arizona.
- Kim, J. 2007. What sluicing comes from in Korean is pseudocleft. MA thesis. UCLA.
- Kim, J. and C. Lee. 2007. Why multiple clefts are disallowed. Paper given at WCCFL 26, UC Berkeley.
- Koizumi, M. 2000. String vacuous overt verb raising. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 9, 227-285.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1999. Shubunaizai kankeisetsu. In S.-Y. Kuroda and M. Nakamura eds. *Kotoba no Kaku to Shūhen*. 27-104. Tokyo: Kuroshio.
- Lakoff, G. 1974. Syntactic amalgams. *CLS* 10, 321-44.
- Nishiyama, K., J. Whitman, and E. Yi. 1996. Syntactic movement of overt wh-phrases in Japanese and Korean. In N. Akatsuka, S. Iwasaki, and S. Strauss eds. *Japanese and Korean Linguistics V*. Stanford, CSLI, 337-352.
- Rizzi, L. 1997. The fine Structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman, ed. *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*. 281-337. Amsterdam: Kluwer.
- Saito, M. 1987. Three notes on syntactic movement in Japanese. In T. Imai & M. Saito, eds. *Issues in Japanese Linguistics*, Dordrecht: Foris.
- Saito, M. 1994. Additional-*wh* effects and the adjunction site theory. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 3, 195–240.
- Sohn, K. W. 2000. Operator movement and cleft conditions. Paper presented at the International Workshop on Generative Grammar. Seoul, Korea.
- Takano, Y. 2002. Surprising constituents. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 11, 243-301.
- Tsubomoto, A. and J. Whitman. 2000. A type of head-in-situ construction in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31.1, 176–183.