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1. EPP-only movement in English

XPs can undergo EPP-only movement, independent of Agree or uninterpretable feature valuation. According to Nevins & Anand (2003) and Nevins (2004), movement of \textit{on some stage} in (1a) is different from movement of \textit{some actress} in (1b).

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(1) a.] \textbf{On some stage} stood every actress. \hspace{1em} (\exists > \forall)
\item[(1) b.] \textbf{Some actress} stood on every stage. \hspace{1em} (\exists > \forall, \forall > \exists)
\end{enumerate}

In (1b) uninterpretable feature valuation such as phi-feature or Case occurs between \textit{some actress} and T. By contrast, no feature valuation occurs in the case of the locative PP movement in (1a). The PP undergoes movement in order to satisfy the EPP requirement on T.

Scope difference in (1) is due to EPP-only movement of \textit{on some stage} in (1a) vs. feature-checking movement of \textit{some actress} in (1b). Nevins & Anand (2003:102) suggest the following generalization (see also Lee (1994) and Sohn (1995) for related discussion):

(2) If the only feature-checking relation a probe and goal G stand in is EPP, then G cannot reconstruct.

For our purposes the following Scope Principle is assumed (cf. Aoun and Li 1989, Hoji 1985, Huang 1982):

(3) QP\textsubscript{1} may have scope over QP\textsubscript{2} if QP\textsubscript{1} c-commands QP\textsubscript{2} or a trace of QP\textsubscript{2}.

Combining (2) and (3), the trace in (1a) is inactive, hence, only \(\exists > \forall\) reading is obtained while the trace in (1b) is active for scope determination, hence, \(\forall > \exists\) reading is possible.\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{1} The present scheme is mostly excerpted from a collaborated work with Sungeun Cho. However, all novel errors and misinterpretations found here are solely mine.

\textsuperscript{2} Lasnik (2001) observes another case in which movement seems to occur without Agree. When the QP subject in embedded clause precedes the particle \textit{out}, it must scope over negation.
Regarding locative inversion as the movement solely driven by the EPP is independently supported by the following facts. First, although the PP moves to Spec of T, it is the post-verbal NP that has the Agree relation with T (Levine 1989).

(4) a. In the garden **stand**/*stands** two fountains.
    b. Down through the hills and into the forest **flows**/*flow** the little brook.

Second, when the post-verbal NP is a pronoun, it is marked with Nominative Case (Green 1992).

    b. In the garden is **HE**/*HIM**.

Cardinaletti (2004) further observes that there are two positions for subjects in the left periphery of IP. She claims that referential subjects can occupy the positions distinct from nonreferential subjects, as shown in (6).

(6) a. John, in my opinion, is a nice guy.
    b. *There, in my opinion, is hope.

Cardinaletti argues that a higher subject position expresses the substantive subject-predicate relation, hence requires a referential subject of which the predicate is predicated as in (6a), whereas a lower subject position is demanded by a purely structure need such as Case/Agree valuation, hence may be filled by an expletive as in (6b).

Chomsky (2005:23 n.67) also notes that locative inversion in (7a) may be to the same position as in (7b), possibly with null expletive.

(7) a. In the square **e*** stood a statue. **(e* = null expletive)**
    b. In the square, there stood a statue.

(i) a. I made out every Mersenne number not to be prime. **(\forall >\text{Neg}, \text{Neg} > \forall )**
    b. I made every Mersenne number out not to be prime. **(\forall >\text{Neg})**

In (ib), movement of every Mersenne number is not driven for Case or Phi-feature valuation. Hence, scope freezing effect of the QP in (ib) is predicted under the EPP-only movement analysis (see Fox & Nissenbaum (1999) for further evidence on (covert) EPP-only movement).
Chomsky points out the restrictions on V-C movement in (8) can be explained by the representation (7a).

(8)*Did in the square stand a statue?

Baker (2003) independently advances that inverted PP exhibits dual properties: like the subject, it undergoes subject-to-subject raising (9a), and its extraction gives rise to that-trace effects (9b); like a CP-adjunct it cannot appear in certain embedded clauses (9c) and it cannot crossed by subject-auxiliary inversion (8) above.

(9) a. On the desk seemed to stand a trophy.
   b. On which desk do you think (*that) _ stood a trophy?
   c.*Because on the desk stood a trophy, Chris put the package on the table.

Baker (2003:322) proposes “The apparent contradiction is resolved by saying that the PP is adjoined to CP but locally controls an NP (phonologically null—HDA) in subject position, which may itself have (for example) undergone subject raising.” Hazout (2004:414 n.19) further suggests that the empty NP e* in (7a) is lexically underspecified for the number feature. See Hazout (2004) for extensive discussion on correlations with expletives and underspecified empty NP. We note that the structures induced by Leftedge movements in Korean pattern exactly alike.

In sum, there exist EPP movements independent of Agree/Valuation. Remaining question: What if a language lacks an expletive (even null expletives) like Korean (Chomsky 2005:23, Jung 2005)? We claim that in contrast to English IP, IP plays a “weak” role in Korean; namely, no “pure” EPP requirement is forced on IP-Edge, hence Spec-I is filled only if there is an effect on the outcome (surface semantic effects). Put differently, EPP = discourse/scope in Korean, but not necessarily in English, in contrast. Thus EPP-only movements in Korean are expected to display heavy discourse-scope property (i.e., stronger surface semantic effects than English). Hence no reconstruction effects for EPP-movements in Korean.

We also would like to point out that EPP-movements in Korean are not PF-movement or feature-movement in conjunction with subsequent category-movement at PF in the sense of Sauerland & Elbourne (2002). Consider the following contrasts in Sauerland & Elbourne (2002:293)

(9) a. A northern team is likely to be in the final.  
   (∃>likely, likely>∃)
b. A northern team are likely to be in the final. \((\exists > \text{likely only})\)
c. There is likely to be a northern team in the final.
d.\* There are likely to be a northern team in the final.

Sauerland & Elbourne’s claim:
(i) Subject-verb agreement in (9a) takes place in two ways: If the subject takes wide scope, subject movement takes place in narrow syntax (category-movement). If the subject takes narrow scope, feature-movement occurs in narrow syntax or LF as in (9c), and category movement involves only phonological features in the PF, hence total reconstruction effects.
(ii) Subject-verb agreement in (9b), in contrast, takes place in a single fashion: namely, only via category movement in narrow syntax since [Mereology: plural] feature on T cannot be checked by feature movement by assumption. Thus anti-reconstruction effects result (also see Ahn 1997 for some discussion on two types of agreement in English).

We extend this idea to the property of EPP-movements in Korean: They pattern with unusual subject-verb agreement in English in that they are not involved in normal (agreement) feature-checking, and correlate more with semantic (agreement) relations.

2. EPP-only movement in Korean

We propose that EPP in Korean is not parasitic on some other features such as structural Case or phi-feature (cf. RKim 2003).\(^3\) This proposal is based on the fact that Korean lacks morphological agreement (cf. Miyagawa 2005). We also propose that similar to locative inversion in English, movement to a certain phase-edge in Korean is an instance of EPP-only movements and that a copy/trace made as a result of EPP-only movement is not active for scope determination.

First, consider the following utterance for Neg/QP scoping interaction.

(10) Q: Mary-ka motwu ta an mannass-ni? \((\forall > \text{neg}, \neg \neg > \forall )\)
   Mary-Nom all all not met-Q
   ‘Didn’t Mary meet all?’
A: Ung, motwu ta. \((\forall > \text{neg})\)
   Yes, all all
   ‘No, (she didn’t meet) all.’

---

\(^3\) We assume that the EPP is the requirement that the selecting feature \([P]\) on a head \(H\) must be satisfied in a local configuration with a phonologically visible element, “local” meaning a sister of a \([P]\)-bearing node: either \(H\) (resulting in head-adjunction) or \(H^\prime\) (resulting in specifier merge). cf. Chomsky (2001), Landau (2005).
Unlike the purported fully sentential source, its fragmental counterpart displays scope disambiguation. Although the neg > ∀ reading is available in a full sentence as in (10Q), it disappears in fragments as in (10A). We account for the scope discrepancy in (10) on a par with (1) under the assumption that the fragment motwu ta ‘all’ in (10A) undergoes EPP-only movement like locative inversion in English, which is independent of formal feature valuation, and the copy/trace made as a result of EPP-only movement to a phase-edge position doesn't involve scope determination (cf. Williams (2003)). Hence motwu ta ‘all’ as a fragment is predicted to take widest scope in (10A) but not in (10Q).  

Now let us look at (11).

(11) a. nwu-ka manhun haksayngtul-ul mannass-ni?
   Who-Nom many students-Acc met-Q ‘Who met many students?’
   b. myechmyech salamtul-i.
      several people-Nom ‘Several people.’
   c. myechmyech salamtul-i manhun haksayngtul-ul mannassta.
      several people-Nom many students-Acc met
      ‘Several people met many students.’

The QP fragment in (11b) has the following structure:

---

4 Conflict judgments have been observed in previous literature as discussed in Han (2005). Here too, there are two groups of speakers particularly concerning wide scope possibility of (short-form) Neg over QP (here we basically follow scope judgments of Neg-ObjQP ambiguities reported in KKim (2003) and Choe (2000)). Chungmin Lee and Changguk Yim independently pointed out (by p.c.) that the appearance of overt Case marker in QP forces wide scope reading of QP as in (i) (see Ahn (1991: ch. 3) for further discussion). Otherwise, as they observed, Neg can be interpreted as taking scope over bare QPs. Thanks also to Upyong Hong and Sook-Whan Cho for helpful discussion.

(i) Q: Mary-ka motwu-ka ta an mannass-ni? (∃>neg only)
   Mary-Nom all-Nom all not met-Q ‘Didn’t Mary meet all?’
In (12) *myechmyech salamtul-i* undergoes EPP-only movement and its trace is inactive for scope determination. Thus, *Myechmyech salamtul-i* invariably takes scope over *manhun haksayngtul-ul* (11b).

The structure of the full sentential counterpart (11c) is illustrated in (13).

In (13) $t_1$, the trace of *myechmyech salamtul-i* is inert for scope determination. Since *myechmyech salamtul-i* c-commands *manhun haksayngtul-ul*, the former takes scope over the latter.

Now, consider the example showing scope discrepancy, as shown in (14).

(14) a. *myechmyech salamtul-i* nwukwu-lul mannass-ni?

    several people-Nom who-Acc met-Q

    ‘Who did many people meet?’

b. manhun haksayngtul-ul.  

    (many>∃, ∃>many)
many students-Acc  
‘Many students.’

c. manhun haksayngtul-ul myechmyech salamul-i mannassta. (many>∃)  
many students-Acc several people-Nom meet  
‘Many students, several people met.’

The full sentence answer in (14c) has the structure like (15).

(15)                FP  (order irrelevant)  
                        manhun haksayngtul-ul₂ F’  
                        F F’  
                            [E][EPP]  
                            myechmyech salamul-i₁ I’  
                                I [EPP]  
                                    vP  
                                        t₁ t₂  

Since movement to F-Spec and to I-Spec is driven only for EPP satisfaction in Korean, the traces are not active for scope determination. Thus, Manhun haksayngtul-ul takes scope over myechmyech salamul-i because the former c-commands the latter.

By contrast, the fragment answer in (14b) has the following structure.
In (16), the initial trace $t_2$ left by vP-edge scrambling of manhun haksayngtul-ul may enter into scoping interactions. We may assume that vP is not a phase in Korean, hence $t_2$ is “active” for scope determination unlike the traces left behind phase-edge or EPP-only movements as in (15). Hence, ambiguity arises in (14b) contra (14c).

Note, however, that if (16) were a possible derivation for non-elliptical (14c), in other words, if vacuous vP-edge scrambling or tucking-in scrambling can take place in (14c), it should be ambiguous, too (contra Bak (1999)). To resolve the problem, we claim that manhun haksayngtul-ul cannot undergo “intermediate” movement to vP-edge since it will be counted as an unnecessary (move) step, and would violate some version of economy principles such as fewest steps or minimize chain links. In fragments context, however, we suggest that such violations can be nullified as a result of the ellipsis at PF. This kind of salvation strategy at PF is reminiscent of repairing island violations by ellipsis as widely discussed in Merchant (2001), Fox & Lasnik (2003) and many others. This might imply that like certain island conditions, minimize chain links is an instance

---

5 Alternatively, the fragment answer in (13b) may have the following structure.

(i) $\text{[FP manhun haksayngtul-ul}_2 \text{[IP myechmyech salamtul-i}_1 \text{[t}_2 \text{[I [t}_1 \text{t}_2]]]}$

Here, the initial trace $t_2$ left by Richards (1997)’s style “tucking-in” scrambling of manhun haksayngtul-ul may enter into scope interactions. We thus ought to assume that the trace left by EPP-only movement to inner Spec position is “active” for scope determination unlike the traces left by EPP-only movement to outer Spec position as in (i).

6 According to Chomsky (2001:34), optional operations can apply only if they have an output effect on outcome. However, no output effects are observed in the case of scrambling to vP-edge in (16).
of representational economy (i.e., interface conditions) that can be ameliorated by PF-deletion.

3. Edge-features in Korean

The two heads delimiting the C system have a clear interpretive import (Rizzi 1997, 2000): Force expresses the illocutionary force (at least in main clauses) or the clausal type (Ahn & Yoon 1989); Finiteness expresses a property related to Tense and Mood.

Both Topic and Focus are assumed to be derivative discourse-semantic features that are morphologically realized as –nun (Hong 2005) and Case markers (-kal/lul), respectively, in Korean. Confusion arises due to “Bare NP” Left Dislocation strategy for unmarked Topic and “default Nom” for Topical Focus (=disguised focus; henceforth TopFocus) elements. The –nun Topic, marked in nature (in contrast to the bare NP Topic in LD constructions), is interpreted as Contrastive Topic (Jung 2001); Structure-Case-marked Focus is interpreted as Contrastive Focus in contrast to Default-Case(Nom)-marked Focus that is unmarkedly interpreted as Presentational Focus.

Topic is licensed in Spec-Force, and Focus in Spec-I in Korean (cf. In English Nom is licensed in Spec-I, and Acc in Spec-V) via inheriting Edge-Feature of C and of v*, respectively. A question remains how Nom and Acc are licensed in Korean. We tentatively assume that Acc is an instance of inherent Case (cf. Jeong 2003, Lee 2004, Lee 2005) and structural Nom is licensed in Spec-I (default Nom is licensed elsewhere).

Put more specific, basically adopting Hong (2005)’s analysis, we suggest the following paradigm:

A new typology of Topic/Focus constructions in Korean:

(i) Topic: Derived by External Merge to Left-Edge of ForceP, and Pro in-situ (optionally) for correlated argument-structure interpretations. Bare NP for plain Topic and nun-NP for contrastive Topic (traditionally distinguished as LD vs. Topic; now unified as Topic construction). Evidence: D-linked wh-interpretation only (See (17a) below).

(ii) Topic-Focus (Pseudo-Focus): Derived by Internal Merge to Left-Edge of ForceP, and Copy in-situ for correlated argument-structure interpretations. Evidence: non-D-linked wh-interpretation possible (See (17b) below). More evidence: widest scope interpretation (anti-reconstruction) of moved NP (see (18a) below). Nom = default Case (must be pronounced), Acc = inherent Case (must be pronounced): Case pronouncing as PF-conditions on EPP (Landau 2005).
Focus: Derived by Internal Merge to Left-Edge of IP, or “tucking-in” to ForceP, and Copy in-situ for correlated argument-structure interpretations. Nom = structural Case (must be pronounced), Acc = inherent Case (can be unpronounced). Evidence: non-D-linked wh-interpretation possible (see (17b) below). More evidence: narrow scope interpretation (reconstruction) of moved NP (see (18b) below).

(17) a. (I cwung-eyse) nwukwu Yenghi-lul mannass-ni (D-linked reading only)
this group-among who Yenghi-Acc met-Q
‘(Among this group of people,) which person met Yenghi?’
b. Yenghi-ka nwukwu mannass-ni? (non D-linked reading possible)
Yenghi-Nom who met-Q
‘Who did Yenghi meet?’

(18) a. na-nun motwu-ka phathi-ey o-ci-anhass-ta-ko sayngkakhanta (∀>Neg only)
I-Top all-Nom party-to come-Neg-Del-Comp thinks
‘I think that all didn’t come to the party.’
b. na-nun motwu-ka phathi-ey o-ci-anhass-eto culkewessta (∀>Neg, Neg> ∀)
I-Top all-Nom party-to come-Neg-although enjoyed
‘I enjoyed although all didn’t come to the party.’

Implicates Tripartite realizations but two functions: Topic (-nun or LD), Focus (Case)
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