

Korean ECM construction and Cyclic Linearization

PROPOSALS: This paper proposes that in Korean a Functional Phrase (FP) should exist between vP and VP from the perspective of Cyclic Linearization (CL), and direct objects and ECM subjects move to Spec, FP to satisfy the EPP on F. In addition, I will suggest that ECM subjects in Korean and Japanese that cross the CP boundary should move to the higher clause without landing in the embedded Spec, CP under the assumptions of CL.

1. Based on the assumption that ‘cal (well)’ is left-adjoined to VP (Hagstrom 2002), the fact that the object cannot follow ‘cal’ as in (1a) implies that Korean has Object Shift (OS).

- (1) a. *Tom-i cal si-lul ssu-ess-ta.
 Tom-NOM well poem-ACC write-PAST-D
 ‘Tom wrote poems well.’
- b. Si-lul Tom-i sey-kay cal ssu-ess-ta.
 poem-ACC Tom-NOM three-CL well write-PAST-D
 ‘Tom wrote three poems well.’

(1b) shows that the accusative DP and NQ_{obj} were once located higher than VP edge adverb ‘cal’ together after the OS, and the accusative DP undergoes movement. Under the system where v subcategorizes VP, there could be two positions above the VP edge adverb. One potential position would be Spec, VP. However, this results in some problems. When it is assumed that the long form negation ‘-ani’ is a head of NegP and subcategorizes VP, following Han et al. (2007), the movement of the object with the focus marker ‘-man (only)’ to Spec, VP cannot explain how the focus marker ‘-man (only)’ can take scope over matrix negation element as in (2).

- (2) Na-nun Tom-man-ul manna-ci ani-ha-ess-ta.
 I-TOP Tom-only-ACC meet-ci NEG-do-PAST-D
 ‘It is only Tom that I did not meet.’ (only>not)/‘It is not the case that I met only Tom.’ (not>only)

In addition, this movement violates Constraints on Chain Link (Bošković 2005). The other potential landing site of the shifted object would be Spec, vP. However, this causes some objection under CL. If the object lands in Spec, vP, the representation can be described as in (3).

- (3) [_{VP} [_{DP} Obj NQ_{obj}] [_{VP} Subj [_{VP} t V] v]]

In order for (1b) to be generated from (3) under CL, Subj has to move across the DP and the accusative Obj moves across the displaced Subj again within vP. However, the movement of the subject is prevented, because it violates the Search Domain Condition by Ko (2005b).

I propose that FP exist below vP and above VP as in (4) and that the object moves to Spec, FP to satisfy the EPP (If Neg is introduced in the derivation, FP should be in between vP and NegP). This can capture not only the word order of (1b) as in (5) but also that of (6) where the nominative object and its NQ can be split by the dative subject in Dative Subject Construction.

- (4) [_{VP} Subj [_{FP} [_{DP} Obj NQ_{obj}]_i [_{VP} t_i V] F] v]
 (5) [_{VP} Obj_k [_{VP} Subj [_{FP} [_{DP} t_k NQ_{obj}]_i [_{VP} t_i V] F] v]] (=1b)
 (6) [_{VP} Yenpil-ik [_{VP} Tom-eykey [_{FP} [_{DP} t_k twu-kay]_i [_{VP} t_i pilyo]] F] ha]]-ess-ta.
 pencil-NOM Tom-DAT two-CL need-PAST-DECL
 ‘Tom needed two pencils.’

In Korean ECM constructions, when matrix clause has long form negation, the EMC subject with the focus marker ‘-man’ shows the same scope interpretation as the object with ‘-man’ in (2) as in (7).

- (7) Tom-i Mary-man-ul ttokttokha-ta-ko sayngkakha-ci ani-ha-ess-ta.
 Tom-NOM Mary-only-ACC smart-DECL-C think-ci NEG-do-PAST-DECL
 ‘Tom thought that it is not the case that only Mary was smart.’ (not > only)
 ‘It is only Mary that Tom thought was smart.’ (only > not)

I believe this is because the EPP on F makes both the ECM subject and the object move to Spec, FP over NegP (while they are assigned accusative Case in Spec, FP by v).

2. Given that the ECM subject can be located at the sentence initial position through A-movement (Bruening 1991, Tanaka 2002), it can be assumed that Spec, FP is an A-position, in order to avoid improper movement. Korean ECM verbs can subcategorize CP. If ECM subjects in the embedded CP move out of CP via the Spec, CP, this is an improper movement. I propose that we can be void of this problem if the ECM subjects do not move via Spec, CP. This is possible with CL, since this does not change the word order that is fixed in the Spell-Out domain CP, under the assumption that embedded C does not have a proper motivation to cause the Caseless ECM subjects to move to its specifier position. If this is on the right track, it can be predicted that the ECM sentence is ill-formed when some element is located in embedded Spec, CP, since the word order fixed in embedded CP is not preserved in higher phase. The prediction is borne out in (8).

(8) ??*Tom-i John-lul_i [CP way [TP t_i [vP cwuk]-ess]-ta-ko] sayngkakha-ni?
 Tom-NOM John-ACC why die-PAST-DECL-C think-Q
 (Lit.) ‘Why_j does Tom think [that John was dead t_j]?’

According to Ko (2005a), Korean ‘way (why)’ in Korean and ‘naze (why)’ in Japanese are adverbs base-generated in Spec, CP. The sentence (8) is ungrammatical since the word order ‘why < Mary’ which is fixed in embedded CP is not preserved in the next higher Spell-Out domain. A sentence with the same word order as (8) can ask the reason of Tom’s thinking. In this case, however, ‘why’ is base-generated in the matrix Spec, CP as in (9).

(9) [CP Tom-i_j John-lul_i [CP way [TP t_j [vP t’_i [CP [TP t_i [vP cwuk]-ess]-ta-ko] sayngkakha-ni?
 Tom-NOM John-ACC why die-PAST-DECL-C think-Q
 ‘Why_j does Tom think [that John was dead] t_j?’

(10) also shows that the prediction is borne out. I assume that topic phrase is in the Spec, CP for the simplicity. (10) is ill-formed because the word order between the ECM subject with neutral meaning which cannot move to Spec, CP and the topic phrase, fixed within CP is not preserved.

(10) *Tom-i modun canyetul_i-ul [CP i cip-eyse-nun t_i hayngbokha-ta-ko] sayngkakhan-ta.
 Tom-NOM all children-ACC this family-LOC-TOP happy-DECL-C think-DECL
 ‘Tom thinks that all children in this family are happy.’

Another prediction comes from Japanese. Hiraiwa (2001a) claims that ECM subjects optionally cross the CP boundary in Japanese. If ECM subjects do not move via embedded Spec, CP just like Korean when they move out of CP, it can be predicted that the ECM sentence where ‘naze’ generated in the embedded Spec, CP is followed by the accusative ECM subject can have an interpretation asking the reason of event or state the embedded clause denotes, and the movement of ECM subject is prevented, since the word order between ‘why’ and ECM subject is not preserved. This prediction is borne out as in (11).

(11) a. Tom-wa [CP naze John-o sinda-to] omotteiru-no?
 Tom-TOP why John-ACC died-C think-Q
 b. *Tom-wa John-o_i [CP naze t_i sinda-to] omotteiru-no?
 ‘Why_j does Tom think [that John was dead t_j]?’

However, a sentence with the same word order as (11b) is grammatical only when it has an interpretation asking the reason of Tom’s thinking, since it has the structure identical to (9).

Selected References [1] Bošković, Željko. 2005. On the locality of left branch extraction and the structure of NP. *Studia Linguistica* 59. [2] Bruening, Benjamin. 2001. Raising to Object and proper movement. Ms., University of Delaware. [3] Hagstrom, Paul. 2002. Implications of child error for the syntax of negation in Korean. *JEAL* 11. [4] Han et al.. 2007. V-Raising and Grammar Competition in Korean. *LI* 38. [5] Hiraiwa, Ken. 2001a. Multiple agree and the defect intervention constraint. In *The proceedings of the HUMIT 2000*. MIT Working Papers in linguistics 40. [6] Ko, Heejeong. 2005a. Syntax of why-in-situ, *NLLT* 23 [7] Ko, Heejeong. 2005b. *Syntactic edges and linearization*. PhD dissertation. MIT. [8] Tanaka, Hidekazu. 2002. Raising to Object out of CP. *LI* 33.