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in LD. The grammaticality of (10a) is predicted under the assumption that there is no movement involved.

(10) a. John, I believe this mother loves him.
    b. John, I believe this mother loves him.

Crossover (WCC) effects (cf. Showell & Lasnik (1987)).

Another property of localization and LD in English is that neither of them induce Week.

(9) a. John, I believe this book, John put it on the table, it's S's. (G&F: Chap. 3)

However, multiple localization seems to be non-naturally acceptable as in the following example.

(8) a. John, Mary, he saw her. (G&F: Chap. 3)


This correctly predicts the ungrammaticality of multiple LD, as seen in (8) (cf. Postal)

This suggests, as L is S more, that the base generated node LD is not licensed in embedded contexts. Then, embedded localization must be derived in some other fashion.

L may not, as in (7b), (cf. Postal, 1971: 136), Baldwin (1982).

However, localization may occur in embedded clauses, as in (7a), but

In Chomsky's (1977) system we would expect LD to be able to occur in every context in which some instances of localization must involve R-function. I.e., point out that under L is S, however, give convincing arguments that at least

Lasnik & Saito (1989; Heim & Lasnik (1989).) However, give convincing arguments which captures

the fact that only localization gives rise to island effects.

In Chomsky (1977), the sentences in (1) and (2) are given the following structures, which captures
instances of topcategorization in K-f phrases with TD in English. This section, we will show a number of constructions where scrambling in K-f behaves as phonomInternally, termed "scrambling", is derived by a process that adopts XP to S (IP) in syntax. In $K$-f are typical of the so-called free order languages. tial is Ho! (1983) affirms that this

3. Scrambling and topcategorization in Korean and Japanese

undergoes reconstruction.

Thus, it seems that topcategorization in English does not exhibit SCO effects, but rather, obligatory

C. Himself!, John likes 1.

b. * Him, he thinks Mary loves 1 with all her heart.

(14) a. * Him, he respects 1.

Topcategorization since the contrasts in (14) cannot be due to SCO effects. [7]

Examples from Bass (1987: 22) provide further evidence for the existence of reconstruction in

however, does not show reconstruction effects at all, as illustrated in (13). The following

(12) can be explained if bringing Principle A and C are satisfied after reconstruction. [6] TD,

b. John's mother's? He loves her? (c). He! loves John's mother.

(13) a. [Pieces of himself,] John likes him.

b. John's mother, he loves 1.

(12) a. Pieces of himself, John likes.

Topcategorization further contrasts with TD in that only topcategorization exhibits reconstruction effects.

b. John, he claimed that Mary disliked him.

(11) a. John's, he claimed that Mary disliked 1.

invoke Principle C violation at TF.

below, the ill-formedness of (11a) may not be due purely to SCO effect since reconstruction will

Crossover (SCO). However, if topcategorization obligatorily undergoes reconstruction, as we suggested

Interestingly, there seems to be a contrast in grammaticalty with regard to strong

Topcategorization seems observable with SCO effects. [5]

When appears to be a typical WCO configuration. Here, we will simply note the generalization that
Scrambling phrases in K-J, however, can override WCC effects.

(20) a. *cašin-ey Mary-ka k battalion-ju! ı̄n-kahayn Mary, I_{(20)}
   b. *cašin-ey Mary-ka k battalion-ju! ı̄n-kahayn Mary, I

In general, K-J displays the same type of standard WCC effects as in English.

(69) a. John-ey-key John-ka c union-ju! Mary-give the money to John
   b. *Mary-ey-key John-ka c union-ju! John-give the money to John

Also, unlike topic constructions, deviations with multiple scrambling are freely generated in K-J.

(70) a. *Bill-ı̄! John-ka r safulness Mary-ka c union-ju! I-said John, Mary loved
   b. Bill-ı̄! John-ka r safulness Mary-ka c union-ju! I-said John, Mary loved

Inscrambling of embedded (non-contained) topicalization in K-J, however, are ill-formed.

(71) a. *Bill-ı̄! John-ka r safulness Mary-ka c union-ju! I-said John, Mary loved
   b. Bill-ı̄! John-ka r safulness Mary-ka c union-ju! I-said John, Mary loved

Parallel to English topicalization, scrambling is allowed in embedded contexts, as in (17).

(17) a. *John-ka r safulness Mary-ka c union-ju! I-said John, Mary loved
   b. John-ka r safulness Mary-ka c union-ju! I-said John, Mary loved

Dependent pronouns.

"topic" (Kuno (1973) and Saïdo (1983)). Scrambling on the other hand, does not license such.

Like L2 in English topic constructions in K-J can occur with overt pronouns correlated with the

(18) a. John and the woman who loves him.
   b. John and the woman who loves him.

The examples in (15)

(15) a. John and the woman who loves him.
   b. John and the woman who loves him.

However, does not always exhibit violations of Island effects (cf. Kuno (1973)), as witnessed by.

First of all, scrambling obeys Subjacency (cf. Saïdo (1983)). Topicalization in K-J.
IOPI is expected to exhibit SCo effects. A 

SOCI is correctly ruled in. However, it is unsuitable in K-1, is unsuitable in SCo effects we 

After reconstruction (26) will no longer be in violation of Principle A of the Binding Theory. 

(John's mother) 

Table 6 (casin-nl John-I-1) phambanayissa. 

(26) principle related to SCo (see also (14a-c)). 

Supposing that scrambling exhibits SCo effects as seen in (25).

If scrambling, like IOPI in English, obligatorily undergoes reconstruction, then it is not 

(John, his mother) 

Table 7 (casin-nl John-I-1) phambanayissa. 


(John, his mother) 

Table 8 (casin-nl John-I-1) phambanayissa. 

Reconstruction, (11) 

Scrambling further contrasts with K-1 IOPI in that only scrambling undergoes 

(John, his mother) 

Table 9 (casin-nl John-I-1) phambanayissa. 

(22) a. John-nti (casin-nl-1 John-I-1) phambanayissa. 

Topicalization in K-1, as will, exhibit neither WCO nor SCo effects. 

(John, his mother) 

Table 10 (casin-nl John-I-1) phambanayissa. 

(21) a. nukawen-nti (casin-nl-1 John-I-1) phambanayissa. 

(who acc sel-gen Joun-I) phambanayissa. 

(John's mother) 

Table 11 (casin-nl John-I-1) phambanayissa. 

(20) a. See-gen Joun-I (casin-nl-1 John-I-1) phambanayissa. 

(John's mother) 

Table 12 (casin-nl John-I-1) phambanayissa. 

(19) a. See-gen Joun-I (casin-nl-1 John-I-1) phambanayissa. 

(John, his mother) 

Table 13 (casin-nl John-I-1) phambanayissa. 

(18) a. See-gen Joun-I (casin-nl-1 John-I-1) phambanayissa.
parallel with WH-Ø binding but not WH-Rel binding, as illustrated in (30).

However, the possibility of reconstruction in English replication and scrambling in K-1 seems to
in this respect, WH-Rel binding resembles English replication and scrambling in K-1.

John Lennon, who his fans adored, was killed by a crazy man.

(29) a. Who does his wife have? b. Where does his wife have it?

WCO effects (cf. Slowew & Lasnik 1987)

scrambling in K-1. WH-Ø binding contrasts with WH-Rel binding in that only the former exhibits
have also shown that the WCO effects don't show up with English replication and

b. We drink with a woman, whom she helps it.

(30) a. Who does her husband it?

seen, they are cancelled with English replication and scrambling in K-1.

Second, SCQ effects obtain with WH-Ø binding and WH-Rel binding, but, as we have

b. The man walked up to the woman, who didn't know whom.


WH-interruption and WH-relevance formations as illustrated in (27).

WQ-irrelevance and WH-relevance formations, as illustrated in (30).

application in English and scrambling in K-1 appears to be possible, while it is not allowed in

either WH-Ø binding or WH-Rel binding, a fact derived from the standard properties of Move-WH.

The result, that we obtain from the preceding discussion is somewhat surprising in that both

4. Conclusion

[13]

Similar specacs which should be cumially distinct from adunction V-bar movement [12], [13]
Hence, it is meaningful to some speakers. However, Hochemond and Culicover (in press) note that 3.

According to Lautsch & Sales (1992: 18, Chap. 3), (10) may mildly violate Subjacency and refer to grammaticality. However, that the Japanese counterparts of the Korean examples cited bear the same stains with no.

Due to lack of space, we give only Korean examples throughout. It is our judgment, however, that some recent analyses of such asymmetries, see Conners (1989) and Tulima (1992).

To be added.

Acknowledgements

Rule Move-WH

Dependences beyond the WH-O binding/WH-Rel binding distinction specifically associated with the differences, but they at least emphasize the need for a further-grained hypothesis of a-bar Necessity to say, the paradigms that we have seen do not exhaust all the similarities and the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>WH-O</th>
<th>WH-Rel</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Top</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>K-1</th>
<th>Scrambling</th>
<th>K-1</th>
<th>Top</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(31)

Summarized in the following chart.

The class with WH-interrogative and WH-relative formations. In sum, what we have discussed can be

We have so far seen that English topication and scrambling in K-1 do not form a natural

d. The picture of his mother, which everyone adopted, is on the wall.

c. The books by himself, which John wrote, were on sale.

b. Which picture of his mother does everybody adopt?

(30) a. Which books by himself does John like?
Similar examples are discussed in Leeches (1988: 146). We will put off discussion of these exceptions. In this case, the effects are not expected because the reconstruction of these comparable examples. In the reconstruction described as such, does not give rise to further effects. It is difficult to determine what role these effects play in this case. However, they also occur in the case of intellectual entities and processes, and as such, they do not give rise to further effects.

For the lack of WCO effects in these constructions, one might assume that they involve a different type of non-additive interaction. In other words, a different type of non-additive interaction which binds a null name. Hence, a null name is involved in the interaction. The question then is raised whether these effects can be predicted or impossible if it is unambiguously derived.

Following Pescek (1989), can be ruled out if embedded WO-movement lands in Spec of CP. I wonder whether on the table, while John put it.

Following sentence:

The table in (i) can freely be derived by IP-application. Further, the constraints with the table in (i) are not derived by IP-application. In English, on his account, the phrase in (i) is moved to Spec of IP. If he is correct, the topic in (i) is moved to Spec of IP. If he is correct, the topic in (i) is moved to Spec of IP. Further, Pescek (1969) continues to argue that there is no projection of Comp in root clauses could be problematic for a unified IP-application approach. (c. Rochermon 1961)

---

Subjectivity should not be interpreted as excluding configurations of multiple application. See also...
Thus, if we assume that only argument NPs (not N or No) can undergo such in-1-possessive modification, such as John’s-won, we must be NP arguments localized outside of NP. This, if we assume that in-1-possessive modification, such as John’s-won, must be NP arguments localized outside of NP, we assume that the difference in NPs’ sentences: Finally, we invoke a Principle C Violation at Liz. We assume that the difference in grammaticality between scrambling undercrosses recognition, as does English objectification, we would expect (24a) to be grammatical, whereas (24b) is not. Therefore, according to Hoijtink (1988), (24a) is a violation of WCO, and hence, can be derived from a V-movement and hence, can license pronominal gaps.

10. Hoijtink (1988): Chp. 2 notes the following paradigm as evidence that scrambling is a subcase of V-movement and hence, can license pronominal gaps.

Examples are from Hoijtink (1988:153).

That (b) is not perfect may be due to the fact that WH/0-NPs generally resist objectification.

In the following examples:

9. The same effect can be detected in English. A objectified WH can violate WCO effect as seen multiple times in English, which we, however, believe to be incorrect.

8. (19) is grammatical; if the second NP is interpreted as contrastive, Kuroda (1988) allows for generally not allowed.

7. The marginal status of (14b) may be due to the fact that objectified pronouns in English are
and recognition. (1879) for some contrasts between restrictions and apophoria and discussion with respect to WCO
we illustrate the relevant examples from apophoric relative clauses only. See also Wren's Last
all instances of head constituent phrases are derived by IP-adjunction.

I.4. We assume that relative clause formations in English involve null operator movement. Here

although (a) and (b) are identical as IP's, in Spanish the former is a copulaization formation and

(a) a. John-\(\text{\`u}\) Mary-\(\text{\`u}\)

(b) John-\(\text{\`u}\) Mary-\(\text{\`u}\)

(c) John-\(\text{\`u}\) Mary-\(\text{\`u}\)

(d) John-\(\text{\`u}\)


Although (a) and (b) are identical as IP's, in Spanish the former is a copulaization formation and

ambiguously identified as either IP or null pronoun or IP-adjunction with null

If this type of reasoning is correct, then some instances of copulaization in K-7 are in fact

From-School, there are many people who came to America

from America-to come-comp people-time are many

Seoul-Gye-\(\text{\`o}\)-\(\text{\`u}\) (\(\text{\`u}\)-\(\text{\`u}\)-\(\text{\`u}\)-\(\text{\`u}\)-\(\text{\`u}\)

in the following example:

copulaization of PS in Japanese obeys Subjacency. This is borne out in Korean as well, as seen

yields the standard island effect, parallel to scrambling in K-7. As noted in Saito (1983),

I.3. Some instances of copulaization in K-7 may involve IP-adjunction. This type of copulaization

scrambling in German is clear.

Mahajan (1989), see also Wepelman (1989) for


Mahajan (1989), see also Wepelman (1989). See also Wepelman (1989) for

Mahajan (1989) for additional arguments that subjects of NP in Japanese appear as

al. L.F. See Hořký (1897) for additional arguments that subjects of NP in Japanese appear as

Spears (1986), Frankl (1986) (the whole NP will be recognized: yielding a plausible C realization

L.1. In English, however, these modifiers must be in Spec of NP or of DP (see Frankl &

behind and before adverbs or prepositions at LF (cf. Lopeaux (1983) and Chomsky (1986)),

recognition, only the argument emana nominal will be recognized standing the adjacent
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