

Where Do We Find Clausal Adjuncts? *

Gwangrak Son
(Kyungnam University)

Son, Gwangrak. 2003. Where Do We Find Clausal Adjuncts? *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, 11(2), 185-205. Sentential PPs occurring in sentence-initial position have been widely assumed to be attached to S, S, or S (Williams (1975), Reinhart (1981), Huang (1989)). This assumption was largely motivated to capture the relative position of PPs with respect to matrix subject NPs that occupy the IP SPEC. Korean and Japanese, however, create complexity to this pre-IP adjunction analysis of clausal adjuncts, since in these languages a subject NP may not rise to the IP SPEC, but instead may stay in the VP SPEC throughout derivation (Fukui (1986), Kuroda (1988), Saito (1992)). Given the availability of the VP SPEC for the surface position of a matrix subject NP, the pre-IP adjunction analysis seems too strong in these languages, since, to deduce a sentence-initial appearance of adjuncts, it suffices for the adjuncts to stay above the VP SPEC. This paper is an attempt to find precise structural positions of clausal adjuncts in Korean. I claim that clausal adjuncts in Korean are in a position higher than NegP. This view is supported by two major pieces of evidence. First, clausal adjuncts in Korean linearly precede Negative Polarity Items (NPIs), which, according to Sohn (1995), must be in the [Spec, NegP] in overt syntax. Section 1 and section 2 deal with this issue. Second, the contrast in NPI-extraction out of complement versus adjunct clauses can be best accounted for assuming that adjunct clauses are in a higher position than NegP. Section 3 discusses this matter.

Key words: clausal adjuncts, focus, negative focus, NPI-licensing, VP-manner adverbials, NPI-extraction

* This paper is evolved from Son 1997. I am very grateful to Yafei Li and Mürvet Enc, with whom I have discussed the ideas presented in this paper at various stages of formulation. Thanks also go to two anonymous reviewers of the *Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, whose comments and suggestions greatly helped me to improve this paper. This work was supported by the Kyungnam University Research Fund (2003).

1. Overt NPI-Movement to the [Spec, Neg P]

Korean has what is called the VP-focus construction (Kang (1988), Ahn (1991), and Sohn (1995)). One of these is exemplified in the following:

- (1) John-i ku chaek-ul sa-ci-nun anh-ass-ta
 John-Nom the book-Acc buy-CI-Foc not-Past-Dec

In (1), the verb *sa* 'buy' is followed by *-ci*, which may be viewed as a nominalizer (see Kang (1988) for a detailed analysis), and a focus marker *-nun*. This sentence is ambiguous in that every lexical element preceding *-nun* can be independently negated with a special focus. The element that receives this negative focus interpretation is cued by carrying some special degree of stress on it. If the verb *sa* 'buy', for instance, is stressed, the sentence will be interpreted as 'John did something with the book, but what he did NOT do was an ACT OF BUYING.' If the object *ku chaek* 'the book', instead, receives some degree of stress and is consequently negated, the sentence conveys a meaning like 'John bought something (probably a book) but it was NOT THAT SPECIFIC BOOK that he bought.' The subject in (1), *John*, is also available for this sort of negative focus reading. In that case, the sentence will be understood as the one such as 'someone bought the book, but it was NOT JOHN who bought it.'

The 'localized' scope with respect to the negative focus interpretation in (1) can be explained if anything preceding the focus marker *-nun* is positioned under Focus Phrase (FocP), which in turn is under Negative Phrase (NegP), and an item receiving some special degree of stress rises to the Spec of FocP at LF to become a target of the focus marker. The existence of FocP and NegP has been largely assumed in languages like Korean and Japanese.¹⁾ Along this line of

1) See Kang (1988), Ahn (1991), R. Lee (1992), and Aoyagi (1994) for evidence.

reasoning, the structure of (1) roughly will be (I omit the structure beyond NegP, which is irrelevant for our discussion here):

- (2) [_{NegP} [_{FocP} [_{VP} John-i ku chaek-ul sa-ci] -nun] anh]

Importantly to our discussion, Sohn (1995), observed that an NPI in Korean serves as a blocker for the focus marker, so any element preceding an NPI cannot be focused, which I find to be correct. That is, in the following example in (3), only the verb *sa* 'buy' between the NPI '*amwukeosto*' and the focus marker *-nun* can be a target of negative focus, while the others such as *John* and *ecey* 'yesterday' cannot. Thus, the only possible reading of (3) is 'John did something yesterday, but what he didn't do was an activity of buying.'²⁾ The sentence does

2) An anonymous reviewer observes the utterance (3), which I adapted from Sohn 1995:23, to be awkward in the first place. The reviewer claims that if (3) presupposes 'John's doing of something yesterday,' as I implicitly assume in the paper, then the utterance could be given as an appropriate answer to the following question, which the reviewer considers shares the same presupposition with (3).

- (i) John-i ecey mwues-ul hayss-ni
 John-Nom yesterday what-Acc did-Q
 'What did John do yesterday?'

I agree with the reviewer in that (3) cannot make an appropriate answer to the question of (i). However, it is argued in the literature that scrambling correlates with (contrastive) focus (Yoon 1997, Choi 1999, Dayal, to appear, and Son 2002), and the following (ii) has a slightly different interpretation than (i).

- (ii) mwues-ul John-i ecey hayss-ni
 what-Acc John-Nom yesterday did-Q

That is, (ii) asks about the identity that John actually did under the presupposition that there is a set of things John might have done yesterday. The sentence (i), by contrast, relatively loses such a reading. The following (iii) also exhibits a presuppositional reading of the sort found in (ii).

- (iii) mwues-ul John-i ecey ha-ci anh-ass-ni
 what-Acc John-Nom yesterday did-CI not-Past-Q

The utterance (iii) involves a *wh*-word in scrambling position, and an answer to this question must pick out a thing from the set of activities that John didn't perform yesterday. (The presuppositional reading would become clearer by replacing *ha* 'do' with *sa* 'buy,' in which case the *wh*-referent must be familiar to a speaker and a hearer and the question solicits information about the identity

not carry such a meaning that 'John bought something, but it was NOT YESTERDAY.' or 'someone bought something yesterday, but it was NOT JOHN who bought it.'

- (3) John-i ecey amwukeosto sa-ci-nun anh-ass-ta
 John-Nom yesterday anything buy-CI-Foc not-Past-Dec

Sohn (1995) has convincingly argued that this blocking effect displayed by the NPI can be explained if the NPI rises to the Spec of NegP in overt syntax.³⁾ Specifically, he suggests the following derivation (4) as an S-structure representation of (3).

- (4) John-i ecey [_{NegP} amwaukeosto_i [_{FocP} [_{VP} t_i sa-ci]-nun] anh]...

According to Sohn, a strong [Neg]-feature of NPIs in Korean must be checked off before a derivation reaches LF for it to converge, and for this reason, in (4), *amwukeosto* has been raised to the Spec of NegP. This overt NPI-movement entails that *John'* and *ecey* occupy surface positions higher than NegP, which in turn is higher than FocP. By assuming so, the unavailability of '*John'*' and *ecey* as a target of negative focus is now simply obtained from the configuration itself, since they are outside the c-commanding domain of the focus marker in overt syntax.

This feature checking account for the blocking effect of an NPI crucially requires that an NPI must be in the NegP SPEC in overt

of the stuff from the familiar set.) Now, note that although (3), the utterance at issue, cannot make an appropriate answer to (i), it fairly does in response to such questions as (ii) and (iii). I owe to the reviewer for elaborating this interesting issue.

3) As an anonymous reviewer points out correctly, no NPIs are allowed to be focused. That is, such sentence as (i) cannot mean that what John did was not the activity of buying, while presupposing John's activity of purchasing something ((i) taken from the reviewer's comment).

(i) John didn't buy ANYTHING

This intuition is indeed reflected on the representation (4), where the NPI sits in the position outside FocP, thereby having no way to induce a focused reading.

syntax for both empirical and theoretical reasons: the overt NPI movement to the NegP SPEC not only checks off the strong [Neg]-feature of an NPI lest it should be an illegitimate LF object, but the movement also ensures that elements preceding an NPI cannot be targets of negative focus by forcing them to sit outside the scopal domain of the focus marker.

There is indeed another piece of empirical evidence supporting that the NPI-movement hypothesis is on the right track. Consider (5) and (6) below, giving attention to how variant positions of NPIs, in relation to those of VP-manner adverbials, bring about the contrast in acceptability.

- (5) a. John-un amwukeossto wanypyokhake ha-ci-mot-ha-n-ta
 John-Nom anything thoroughly do-CI not-do-Pres-Dec
 'John is not able to do anything thoroughly.'
- b. ??John-un wanpyokhake amwukeossto ha-ci mot-ha-n-ta
 John-Nom thoroughly anything do-CI not-do-Pres-Dec
- (6) a. John-un amwuto yolyolhiy/cinsimuro sarang-ha-ci
 John-Nom anybody passionately/heartily love-do-CI
 anh-ass-ta
 not-Past-Dec
 'John did not love anybody passionately/heartily.'
- b. ??John-un yolyolhiy/cinsimuro amwuto sarang-ha-ci
 John-Nom passionately/heartily anybody love-do-CI
 anh-ass-ta
 not-Past-Dec.

In the (a) sentences of (5-6), NPIs precede VP-manner adverbials and the sentences sound perfect. However, when NPIs follow VP-adverbials as in the (b) sentences, the grammaticality becomes severely degraded. This word order fact minimally suggests that NPIs should be best positioned higher than VP, to which VP-manner adverbials are attached, supporting the NPI-movement hypothesis; i.e., an NPI must move from its base-generated position to the Spec of NegP across VP in overt

syntax.

A question, however, does arise at this stage regarding the marginal status of the (b) sentences in (5–6).⁴ Suppose those NPIs in the (b) sentences stay in situ inside VP. Then, these (b) sentences should be ruled out with no hope, since, the NPI *amwukeossto* or *amwuto* cannot get its [Neg]-feature checked off in the position it occupies, which is a VP-internal position. The question then is: why aren't these (b) sentences completely ungrammatical? What follows is a possible answer I conjecture.

Let us suppose that the NPIs in this case are, in effect, already in the Spec of NegP and their strong [Neg]-feature is accordingly checked off by the Neg⁰ *anh* or *mot*, not'. If this is so, the marginality of the (b) sentences has nothing to do with the NPI-Licensing. Then, what will be the source of this marginality? I suggest that it may be due to scrambling, more precisely, scrambling of VP-manner adverbials. As the well-formedness of (7a) below shows, in Korean, scrambling of arguments is entirely welcomed regardless of how many Ss are crossed, whereas that of VP-manner adverbials, as in (7b), always creates some degree of marginality.

- (7) a. *ku il-ul_i* [John-un [Mary-ka wanypokhake *t_i* ha-ci
 the work-Acc John-Nom Mary-Nom thoroughly do-CI
mot-ha-n-ta-ko
 not-do-Pres-Dec-Comp
saengkak-ha-n-ta
 think-do-Pres-Dec
 (Lit.) 'The work_i, John thinks that Mary does not do *t_i*
 thoroughly.'
- b. ??wanypokhake_i [John-un [Mary-ka *t_i* ku il-ul ha-ci
 thoroughly John-Nom Mary-Nom the work-Acc do-CI
mot-ha-n-ta-ko saengkak-ha-n-ta
 not-do-Pres-Dec-Comp think-do-Pres-Dec

4) Thanks to Yafei Li for bringing out this point.

(Lit.) 'Thoroughly_i, John thinks that Mary does not do the work t_i.'

With this fact in mind, let us return to the (b) sentences of (5-6). I already suggested that in these examples the NPI-Licensing is satisfied through the movement of an NPI to the Spec of NegP. Taking this to be correct, the VP-adverbial would also have to move prior to the NegP to arrive at its surface position, as depicted in (8).

(8) ...adverbial_i [_{NegP} amwuto_j [_{FocP} [_{VP} t_i t_j ...]]].

In (8), scrambling of VP-manner adverbials is necessitated; as a result of this unwelcomed movement, the sentences become degraded.

So far, we have seen that an NPI in Korean must be in the NegP SPEC in overt syntax. The claim has been supported by two empirical facts: i) blocking effects of NPIs for the focus marker, and ii) the relative surface order of NPIs to VP-manner adverbials.

2. Linear Precedence of Clausal Adjuncts to NPIs

If it is true that an NPI in Korean overtly moves to the [Spec, NegP], as claimed above, we get such prediction that anything preceding NPIs must be in a higher position than NegP, while anything following NPIs must be in a lower position than NegP. This means that clausal adjuncts such as ones in (9) below are placed structurally higher than NegP.

- (9) a. [pi-ka wa-seo], amwuto pakke naka-ci
 rain-Nom fall-because anybody outside go out-CI
 anh-ass-ta
 not-Past-Dec
 'Because of rain, nobody went outside.'
- b. [hori-ka aph-a-seo], Mary-ka amwukeossto
 backbone-Nom painful-Lnkr-because Mary-Nom anything

tul-su op-ess-ta
 lift-Can not-Past-Dec.
 'Because of the pain in the backbone, Mary couldn't lift
 anything.'

In Korean, clausal adjuncts occur most naturally in sentence-initial position as they do in (9). Being in this position, clausal adjuncts linearly precede NPIs which have been supposed to be in the [Spec, NegP], and are straightforwardly predicted to be in a higher position than NegP, given the reasoning put forward above. There is, however, something we need to think about before we conclusively fix the surface position of clausal adjuncts to be above NegP. Consider such sentences as in (10), in which clausal adjuncts may still appear following NPIs, at least marginally.

- (10) a'. ?amwuto [pi-ka wa-so], pakke naka-ci
 anybody rain-Nom fall-because outside go out-CI
 anh-ass-ta
 not-Past-Dec.
- b'. ?amwukeossto [hori-ka aph-a-so],
 anything backbone-Nom painful-Lnkr-because
 Mary-ka tul-su ops-ess-ta
 Mary-Nom lift-can not-Past-Dec

Given the fact that these sentences are acceptable anyway, nothing seems to prevent such a hypothesis that those clausal adjuncts in (10) might be base-adjoined to somewhere below NegP, conflicting with the result we have established based on the data in (9). Can we take the observations made in (9-10) as indicating that a clausal adjunct may be placed either above or below NegP? The answer seems no, as being hinted by the less acceptable status of those sentences in (11), compared to their counterparts in (10), which are perfect. Then, why are those sentences in (10) marginal? Prior to dealing with this matter, let us think about what will happen if those clausal adjuncts in (10)

were indeed below NegP, as one might be tempted to suggest based on the data in (10). To facilitate this hypothesis, suppose the adverbial clauses in (10) were base-adjoined to VP, for instance, and the NPIs have moved to the Spec of NegP to have their strong [Neg]-features checked off:

- (11) ...[NegP NPI_i [VP [Adjunct...] [VP t_i ...]]...

Given (11) for the relevant S-structure representation of the sentences in (10), we would face an insuperable problem: why should this configuration of (11) be marked as marginal, with the existence of the perfectly grammatical sentences in (5a) and (6a), which are structurally identical with (11)? The following repeats one of them, (5a), with its S-structure representation:

- (12) John-un amwukeossto wanpyokhake ha-ci mot-ha-n-ta
 John-Nom anything thoroughly do-CI not-do-Pres-Dec
 'John is not able to do anything thoroughly.'
 (13) ...[NegP amwukeossto_i [VP [Adjunct wanpyokhake] [VP t_i...]]...

The sole difference in derivation between (11) and (13) lies in that in the former, it is a clausal which adjoins to VP and hence intervenes the chain of the NPI-movement, while in the latter, it is a lexical. Both of them, nonetheless, are adjuncts. Adopting a widely held view that a lexical or clausal status of a certain category has nothing to do with its role as a blocker to a movement, it is hard to answer the question of why (11) alone should be marginal, leaving (13) to be fully grammatical.

In contrast, take an alternative view that the clausal adjuncts in (10) are indeed above NegP. Then, those sentences in (10) will have the following structure, not that of (11):

- (14) ...[NPI_i] [Adjunct...] [NegP t_i' [VP ... t_i ...] not]...
 |_____ II _____| |____ I ____|

In (14), the NPI moves first to the Spec of NegP to check off its strong [Neg]-feature, and makes a further movement to the sentence-initial position over the adverbial clause. The first step of these does not involve any intervening object. Besides it is a morphologically required movement, driven by feature checking. Thus, the movement must be permissible under any version of syntactic constraints concerning move- α . Given this situation, we may suspect the second step, scrambling of an NPI, as a cause of clumsiness, which indeed turns out to be the case. (15-16) below illustrates some examples of such a case: the (a) sentences do not involve movement at all and contrast in acceptability with the (b) sentences which involve scrambling of NPIs to the sentence-initial position, and are consequently marginal.

- (15) a. John-i [amwuto caki-rul coahha-ci anh-nun-ta-ko]
 John-Nom anybody caki-Acc like-CI not-Pres-Dec-Comp
 saengkak-ha-n-ta
 think-do-Pres-Dec
 (Lit.) 'John thinks that anybody does not like himself.'
- b. ?*amwuto*_i [John-i [*t*_i caki-rul coahha-ci anh-nun-ta-ko]
 anybody John-Nom caki-Acc like-CI not-Pres-Dec-Comp
 saengkak-ha-n-ta
 think-do-Pres.-Dec.
 (Lit.) 'anybody_i, John thinks that *t*_i does not like himself.'
- (16) a. Mary-ekey-nun [amwuto ku munce-ekwanhay komin
 Mary-Dat-Contra anybody the problem-about worry
 ha-ci anh-nun-kes] katha
 do-CI not-Pres-thing seem
 (Lit.) 'It seems to Mary that anybody does not worry about
 the problem.'
- b. ?amwuto_i [Mary-eykey-nun [*t*_i ku munce-ekwanhay
 anybody Mary-Dat-contra the problem-about
 komin-ha-ci anh-nun-kes] katha
 worry-do-CI not-Pres.-thing seem

(Lit.) 'anybody_i, it seems to Mary that t_i does not worry about the problem.'

(17) below has a partial structure of the (b) sentences of (15–16).

(17) amwuto_i [_{IP}..[_{NegP} t_i' [_{VP} ... t_i ...] not]...
 |_____ II _____| |_____ I _____|

Why the second step of movement, NPI-scrambling, invariably creates a certain degree of marginality to an otherwise perfect sentence is still unclear. The only thing I can see at this stage of development is a descriptive fact, which indicates that this movement should be differentiated in one way or another from a morphologically driven movement such as a movement for [Neg]-feature checking, which we have seen as perfectly admissible. Based on this observational fact, I would attribute the less acceptable status of those sentences in (10) (with their structure in (14)) to this effect of unwelcomed NPI-scrambling.

Thus far discussions lead us to the conclusion that clausal adjuncts are placed in a higher position than NegP, as (18) below schematically represents:

(18) [_{Adjunct}...]...[_{NegP} [_{VP}...t_{NPI}...]]...

By positing (18), we could explain why those sentences of (10) are marginal, in contrast with the well-formed sentences of (9); (10) involves unwanted NPI-scrambling in addition to legitimate feature driven movement (see (14) above), while (9) involves only one single operation, which is feature driven, and hence legitimate. On the other hand, if clausal adjuncts were lower than NegP, as in (19) below, the perfect grammaticality of those sentences in (9) would never be accounted for, since in (19) 'amwuto', which occurs following adjunct, would have no way to get its morphological feature checked off in overt syntax, a wrong prediction. If (19) were taken for the relevant

structure containing clausal adjuncts, the marginality of those sentences in (10) would also remain unexplained, for the NPI-movement to the [Spec, NegP] across adverbials has been observed not to create marginality.

- (19) ...[_{NegP} [_{VP} [_{Adjunct...}] [_{VP...*amwuto...*]]]...}

In this section, I have argued, building on the work of Sohn (1995), that clausal adjuncts are base-adjoined to a position higher than NegP, since they, in general, occur sentence-initially, therefore occurring prior to NPIs in a sentence. Some cases where clausal adjuncts may appear following NPIs have been claimed not to run counter to my generalization. The marginal status of such cases was certainly well-captured given the analysis addressed in this section; that is, those sentences involving scrambling of NPIs are not completely bad because the [Neg]-feature checking requirement is satisfied; on the other hand, they are not perfectly good, because they involve morphologically non-driven movement.

3. NPI Extraction out of Adjunct Clauses

As is well-known, NPIs in Korean, unlikely those in English, must be within a minimal clause containing an appropriate licenser (normally a negator *ahn* or *mot*, 'not'), as illustrated in the following minimal pair:

- (20) a. John-un [Mary-ka amwuto sarangha-ci anh-nun-ta-ko]
 John-Nom Mary-Nom anybody love-CI not-Pres-Dec-Comp
 mit-nun-ta
 believe-Pres.-Dec.
 'John believes that Mary does not love anybody.'
- b. *John-un [Mary-ka amwuto sarangha-n-ta-ko]
 John-Nom Mary-Nom anybody love-Pres-Dec-Comp
 mit-ci anh-nun-ta
 believe-CI not-Pres-Dec

(intended meaning) 'John does not believe that Mary loves anybody.'

In the well-formed (20a), the NPI *amwuto* and the negator *anh* 'not' are clause-mates, whereas in the ill-formed (20b) this locality requirement is violated by a clausal boundary, resulting in ungrammaticality. Relevant to our discussion, (20b) is improved significantly, almost to the perfect degree, when the NPI is moved into the matrix clause, as can be seen in (21):⁵⁾

- (21) John-un *amwuto*_i [Mary-ka *t*_i sarangha-n-ta-ko]
 John-Nom anybody M.-Nom love-Pres-Dec-Comp
 mit-ci *anh*-nun-ta
 believe-CI not-Pres-Dec
 'John does not believe that Mary loves anybody.'

How does this NPI-movement rescue the sentence? The answer directly follows once we adopt a feature checking account pursued by R. Lee (1994) and Sohn (1995). That is, in (21) the NPI is already in the matrix NegP Spec, having been raised from the base-generated embedded object position, thereby having its [Neg]-feature checked off by the matrix negator *anh*.⁶⁾ In contrast, *amwuto* of (20b) has no way

5) This point has been referred to in Y.S. Lee (1993), R. Lee (1994), and Sohn (1995). The NPI-movement in (21) differs from a normal type of scrambling in that it is a forced one for the derivation to converge.

6) An anonymous reviewer raises an intriguing question with regard to the present claim that an NPI occupies the SPEC of the matrix NegP in such sentences as (20). He/she contends that being that the case, the following (i) should incorrectly be judged as grammatical since *amwuto* checks off its [Neg]-feature in the matrix NegP.

- (i) *Chulsoo-ka *amwuto*_i Youngsoo-eykey [_{IP} Younghee-ka *t*_i
 Chulsoo-Nom anybody Youngsoo-Dat Younghee0Nom
 saranghantako] malha-ci *anh*-ass-ta
 love tell-CI not-Past-Dec
 (Intended reading) 'Chulsoo didn't tell Youngsoo that Younghee
 loves anybody.'

to get its feature cancelled off since it is in place inside the embedded clause. Being inside the embedded clause, it is separated from the matrix negation, resulting in ungrammaticality. Taking this to be correct, the well-formed (21) has the following derivation:

(22) SS: ..._[NegP] *amwuto*_i [_{VP} [_{CP}... *t*_i ...] *mitci*] *anh*...

Keeping this salvaging schema at hand, let us turn to the clausal adjuncts to see if this movement strategy can be extended to the NPIs contained in the clausal adjuncts. Consider (23).

(23) a. **na-nun* [*Mary-ka amwukeossto cwu-n-ta haeto*],
I-Nom Mary-Nom anything give-Pres-Dec even though

As far as the [Neg]-feature is concerned, the reviewer's point is correct. However, note that (i) cannot be improved by replacing the NPI with a name that has nothing to do with the NPI-licensing. See (ii).

(ii) *(?) *Chulsoo-ka Minsoo-rul_i Youngsoo-eykey* [_{IP} *Younghee-ka t_i*
Chulsoo-Nom Minsoo-Acc Youngsoo-Dat Younghee-Nom
saranghantako] *malha-ci anh-ass-ta*
love tell-CI not-Past-Dec
(Intended reading) 'Chulsoo didn't tell Youngsoo that Younghee loves Minsoo.'

The unacceptability of (ii) indicates that (i) is bad not simply because of the NPI; it involves something else that leads to the derivation to crash. Note further that the fairly acceptable sentence in (20) becomes severely degraded with *malha-* 'say' or 'tell' in place of the matrix verb *mit-* 'believe.' See (iii).

(iii) *(?) *John-un amwuto_i [Mary-ka t_i sarangha-n-ta-ko]*
John-Nom anybody Mary-Nom love-Pres-Dec-Comp
malha-ci anh-nun-ta
say-CI not-Pres-Dec
(Intended reading) 'John didn't say that Mary loves anybody.'

Consideration of these data seems to suggest that extraction of an NP, especially out of Negation, has to do with the nature of a matrix verb, perception verb versus factive verb in the present case. More data are needed to confirm if this is so, however. Thanks go to an anonymous reviewer who inspired me to look at this interesting issue.

pat-ci anh-khet-ta
 receive-CI not-will-Dec
 (Lit.) 'I will not receive (it) even though Mary gives me
 anything.'

- b. *na-nun *amwukeossto*_i [Mary-ka *t_i* cuw-n-ta haeto]
 I-Nom anything Mary-Nom give-Pres-Dec even though
 pat-ci anh-khet-ta
 receive-CI not-will-Dec

The NPI *amwukeossto* in (23a) stays in situ inside the adverbial clause in which it fails to meet its licenser. In terms of the feature checking account, (23a) crashes due to the existence of the unchecked strong [Neg]-feature of the NPI *amwukeossto*. Now, let us transpose the NPI under examination to the NegP Spec in the matrix clause, as seen in (23b), exactly in the same way as was done in (21-22) above. What is of interest here is that the sentence does not improve at all despite the fact that the unwanted LF object is eliminated through the NPI-movement to the [Spec, NegP]. If the adverbial clause in (23) adjoined to somewhere below NegP, say, VP, as in (24) below, the ill-formedness of (23b) would remain hardly accounted for, since the NPI-movement performed in (24) is formally parallel to that of (22), which is well-formed, in that it is a necessary feature checking operation and an extraction out of an embedded clause.

(24) SS: ...[_{NegP} amwukesto_i [_{VP} [_{Adjunct}... *t_i* ...] [_{VP} pat-ci] anh]...

At this point, one might suggest that the ungrammaticality of (23b) (=derivation in (24)) may be due to the intervening adjunct island which breaks the chain of the NPI-movement. However, since Kuno (1973), it has been generally held that island constraint alone does not induce so severe degradation of a sentence in Korean and Japanese. Relativization, in particular, does not obey the adjunct constraint at all. (25a) is an example from Kuno (1973) showing this fact, and (25b) illustrates the same effect in Korean.

- (25) a. [NP [IP [Adjunct t_i sinda noni] *daremo kanasimanakatta*] hito_i]
 died although anyone saddened-not was person;
 (Lit.) 'the person_i who, although (he) died, no one was
 saddened'
 b. [NP [IP [Adjunct t_i cwuk-e-to] amwuto sulpho-ha-ci anh-nun]
 ie-Lnkr-although anybody sad-do-CI not-Pres
 saram_i]
 person

Scrambling out of adjunct clause has also been pointed out in literature (Kuno (1978b), Saito (1985), Y. Kim (1990)) that the constraint is not enough to make a sentence completely out. (26) shows some cases of this:

- (26) a. ?[youngheerul_i [IP John-i [Adjunct Mary-ka t_i manan hwuey]
 Younghee_i-Acc John-Nom M.-Nom. meet after
 ttona-ss-ta]
 leave-Past-Dec
 'John left after Mary met Yonghee.'
 b. ?[Seoul-ey_i [IP John-un [Adjunct Mary-ka t_i kako-siph-o
 Seoul-to John-Nom Mary-Nom go-want-Lnkr
 ha-ci-man], mwusi-ha-ess-ta
 do-CI-although ignore-do-Past-Dec.
 'Although Mary wanted to go to Seoul, John ignored
 that.'

Examples such as those in (26) involve chains of scrambled elements which break the adjunct islands; nevertheless, these examples are fairly acceptable. They are well accepted even in the written language of Korean, completely eliminating some possible salvaging effects of pragmatics in the spoken language.

Given this fact, the total unacceptability of the examples such as (23b) cannot simply be attributed to the adjunct constraint. It is then reasonable to ask why the examples such as (23b) are so bad (note

that (23b) is hopeless; it is far worse than those sentences in (25–26) involving a mere weak subjacency violation.)

A similar varying contrast in acceptability with respect to the NPI-extraction out of complement clause versus out of adjunct clause is also observed in the following pairs of (27) and (28):⁷

- (27) a. John-un amwuto towuryo-ko ha-ci anh-ass-ta
 John-Nom anybody help-Comp try-CI not-Past-Dec
 'John did not try to help anybody.'
- b. John-un amwuto choncae-ra-ko mit-ci
 John-Nom anybody genius-Dec-Comp believe-CI
 anh-nun-ta
 not-Pres-Dec
 'John does not believe anybody to be a genius.'
- (28) a. *John-un, [_{Adjunct} amwuto mannan hwuey], ttona-ci
 John-Nom anybody meet after leave-CI
 anh-ass-ta
 not-Past-Dec
 (Lit.) *'John did not leave after meeting anybody.'
- b. * [_{Adjunct} amwuto ka-n-ta-haeto], na-nun ka-ci
 anyone go-Pres-Dec-even if I-Nom go-CI
 anh-khess-ta
 not-will-Dec
 (Lit.) 'Even if anyone goes, I will not go.'

Grammaticality of such examples as in (27) is straightforwardly accounted for assuming that the NPIs in these cases are already in the [Spec, NegP] of the matrix clauses in overt syntax, as shown in (29):

- (29) SS: ... [_{NegP} amwuto_i [_{VP} [_{CP/IP} t_i...] V] anh]...

7) Examples listed in (27) are variants of Sohn's (1995:38–50). Discussions around (27) through (29) were made possible due to his analysis of the NPI-Licensing.

What is of interest for matters under discussion here is that this sort of assumption does not hold for the sentences of (28). Again, recall that in Korean, the adjunct constraint alone is not sufficient to rule these sentences out completely.⁸⁾ The ill-formedness, however, is an expected one, given the hypothesis that clausal adjuncts are in a higher position than NegP, as in (30):

(30) ..._[Adjunct amwuto]..._{[NegP [VP...]} anh]...

8) By observing unacceptability of such sentences as (i), an anonymous reviewer contends that the adjunct condition should hold in Korean.

(i) *John-un [_{IP} [_{Adjunct} amwuto mannan hwuey] Mary-ka
 John-Nom anybody meet after Mary-Nom
 tto'nasstako]] sayngkakha-ci anhnunta
 left think-CI not

His/her point is this: if the NPI *amwuto* in (i) overtly sits in the NegP SPEC of the matrix clause, as contended in this paper, and if the adjunct island is not responsible for the ungrammaticality of (i), then the sentence should turn out to be grammatical, which it is not. I agree with the reviewer's observation that the adjunct island holds in Korean. However, note in (ii) that almost the same degree of unacceptability is found with the NPI-extraction out of complement clause.

(ii) *(??)John-un amwuto_i [_{IP} Mary-ka [_{IP} *t_i* coahhantako]
 John-Nom. anybody Mary-Nom like
 malhaysstako]] sayngkakha-ci anhnunta
 said think-CI not

Now compare (ii) with the following (iii), which involves *amwuto* crossing over only one clause boundary and is almost grammatical.

(iii) (?)John-un amwuto_i [_{IP} Mary-ka *t_i* mannasstako]
 John-Nom anybody Mary-Nom met
 sayngkakha-ci anhnunta
 think-CI not

The descriptive generalization on the basis of data above is this: the more clause boundary is crossed, the worse the sentence becomes. That is, the total ungrammaticality of (i) is not simply due to the adjunct island, but to the combined effect of the adjunct constraint plus too many intervening clause on the way of NPI-extraction. I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer for making this point clear.

Being located in this higher position than NegP, the NPIs internal to the clausal adjuncts in (28) have no way to have their [Neg]-feature checked off in overt syntax, leading a derivation to crash.⁹⁾

In this section, we have seen that the NPI-movement out of the clausal adjunct in Korean is barred not because of the adjunct island but because of the structural position they occupy, that is, a position higher than NegP. By analyzing this way, we could correctly predict why the NPI-extraction is far worse than a mere subjacency violation. If we, on the other hand, treat clausal adjuncts to be lower than NegP, such prediction we obtained would remain mysterious.

4. Closing Remarks

In this paper I have claimed that clausal adjuncts in Korean are attached to a position higher than NegP. The view has received support from the two facts, the unavailability of clausal adjuncts for the negative focus reading and the impermissible licensing for the NPIs embedded in clausal adjuncts.¹⁰⁾

9) I assume with Sohn (1995) that in Korean the [Neg]-feature checking requirement holds in overt syntax (see Sohn (1995) for detailed argument for this claim). Even if assuming to the contrary such that it should hold at LF, the [Neg]-feature requirement would not be satisfied in the configuration of (30), due to the Fiengos (1974) Proper Binding Condition.

10) Pause affects structural position of clausal adjuncts, however. In Korean, clausal adjuncts are most naturally followed by a pause, and in this natural context, clausal adjuncts such as the one in (i) cannot be recipients of the negative focus. That is, the sentence (i) can be interpreted either in (i a) or in (i b), but not in (i c):

- (i) [pyonci-rul il-ko], John-i thongkok-ha-ci-nun anh-ass-ta
 letter-Acc read-after John-Nom wail-do-CI-Foc not-Past-Dec
 a. 'It was someone other than John who wailed after reading the letter.' (Negative focus on subject)
 b. 'John read the letter, but he did not wail.' (Negative focus on verb)
 c. *'John wailed, but it was not because of the letter.' or 'John wailed, but it was not before (not after) his reading the letter.'

Interestingly, when a pause is taken away, the clausal adjunct, which was previously unable to be a target of negative focus, becomes, all of sudden,

- Kuno, S. (1973). *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. (1988). Whether we Agree or Not: A comparative Syntax of English and Japanese. Papers from *the Second International Workshop on Japanese Syntax*. CSLI. Stanford. 103-143.
- Lee, R. K. (1994). *Economy of Representation*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Connecticut.
- Lee, Y.-S. (1993). *Scrambling as Case-Driven Obligatory Movement*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.
- Reinhart, T. (1981). Definite NP Anaphora and C-Command Domains. *LI*. 12. 605-636.
- Saito, M. (1992). Long Distance Scrambling in Japanese. *Journal of Japanese Linguistics*. 1. 69-118.
- Sohn, K.-W. (1995). *Negative Polarity Items, Scope, and Economy*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Connecticut.
- Son, G.-R. (1997). Structural Positions of Some Categories in Korean. Unpublished manuscript. University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Son, G.-R. (2001). *Scrambling, Reconstruction, and the Checking Principle*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Son, G.-R. (2002). On *Wh*-Scrambling. *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 27 (2). 293-314
- Son, G.-R. In preparation. Pragmatics of Pause.
- Williams, E. (1975). Small Clauses in English. In J.P. Kimball, (Ed.), *Syntax and Semantics* 4. New York: Academic Press.

Son, Gwangrak
Division of English Language and Literature
Kyungnam University
449 wolyoung, Masan, Kyungnam, South Korea 631-701
Phone: (055) 249-2121
E-mail: gson0@kyungnam.ac.kr

Received: 3 April 2003

Accepted: 2 Jun 2003

Revised: 8 Jun 2003