Why No Part-whole Reading?

Mina Lee
(University of Southern California)

Lee, Mina. 2001. Why No Part-whole Reading? *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal 9*(2), 65-84. It is observed that there are two existential readings possible when *NP-Loc* precedes *NP-Nom* in Japanese. However, the sentence is not ambiguous if *NP-Nom* is preposed to the sentence initial position, resulting in an order of NP-Nom^NP-Loc. This generalization also holds in Korean. In this paper, we will see how this generalization can be captured by the analysis of overt Focus movement and Specificity, which has been proposed for analyzing so-called Intervention Effects in Korean in M. Lee (2001a, b). **(University of Southern California)**

1. Introduction

Muromatsu (1998) (cited in Tomioka 2001) observes that there are two existential readings possible when *NP-Loc* precedes *NP-Nom* in Japanese; i.e. locative reading and part-whole reading. Even though people say that scrambling does not affect the meaning of a sentence in Japanese and Korean, part-whole reading is sensitive to the word order of sentences. In this paper, I am going to provide an observation that Tomioka (2001) makes in Japanese and the same observation in Korean and, then, discuss how this observation can be accounted for under the independently motivated analysis.

First, I will give a generalization on absence or presence of a part-whole reading in Japanese and Korean in section 1. Then, in section 2, we will discuss previous analyses that have been proposed to account for the generalization and also raise some problems on the analyses. Following M. Lee (2001a, b), I propose a Condition on Focus Movement in section 3. Finally, in section 4, we will see how the

Condition on Overt Focus Movement, interacting with Specificity, can capture the generalization on absence or presence of a part-whole reading.

2. Absence/presence of part-whole readings in Japanese and Korean

Tomioka (2001) discusses the observation made by Muromatsu (1998) that sentences are ambiguous between locative reading and part-whole reading when an *NP-Loc* precedes an *NP-Nom* in Japanese, as illustrated in (1):

(1) Torakku-ni enzin-ga aru.
    Truck-Loc engine-Nom exist
    a. Locative: There is an engine in the/a truck (placed on its bed, for instance).
    b. Part-whole: The/a truck has an engine (as one of its essential parts).

If the *NP-Nom* precedes the *NP-Loc*, however, the sentence is no more ambiguous and the part-whole reading is not available.

(2) Enzin-ga torakku-ni aru.
    engine-Nom truck-Loc exist
    a. Locative: There is an engine in the/a truck (placed on its bed, for instance).
    b. *Part-whole: The/a truck has an engine (as one of its essential parts).

This generalization also holds in Korean; in other words, a sentence is ambiguous in the order of a locative NP preceding a nominative NP whereas switching of the two NPs disambiguates the sentence. The

following Korean sentence has both a locative reading and a part-whole reading.

(3) thulek-ey eyncin-i iss-ta.
   Truck-Loc engine-Nom exist-Dec
   a. Locative: There is an engine in the/a truck (placed on its bed, for instance).
   b. Part-whole: The/a truck has an engine (as one of its essential parts).

Just as in the Japanese counterpart, preposing of the nominative NP makes the sentence unambiguous as shown in (4): i.e., only locative reading is available.

(4) eyncin-i thulek-ey iss-ta.
    engine-Nom truck-Loc exist-Dec
   a. Locative: There is an engine in the/a truck (placed on its bed, for instance).
   b.*Part-whole: The/a truck has an engine (as one of its essential parts).

It seems that, in both Japanese and Korean, it is natural to mention a whole NP first and then a part of it when we intend to deliver part-whole readings.

Tomioka (2001) notes that in Japanese, there are several cases where the part-whole reading survives even in the order of a part-NP preceding a whole-NP. First, if the part *sonna enzin* 'that type of engine' is Topicalized by an overt marking of *-wa*, the part-whole interpretation is obtained:

(5) Sonna enzin-**wa** torakku-ni aru
   That type engine-Top truck-Loc exist
   a. Locative: As for that type of engine, there is one in the truck.

b. Part-whole: That type of engine is a thing that a truck has.

Secondly, if the *NP-Nom* is focused, we can get the part-whole reading as well as the locative interpretation as in the cases where a locative NP precedes a nominative NP:

(6) [ROOTARII-ENZIN-ga]F matsuda-no kuruma-ni aru
   Rotary-engine-Nom   Mazada-Gen car-Loc exist
   'It is a Rotary engine that a Mazada car has.'

The same elaboration on the part NP saves the part-whole reading in Korean. First, the Topicalized part NP *ku congbyu-uy eyncin* 'that type of engine' marked by *-(n)un* can precede the locative NP, *truck-ey* 'truck-Loc', still keeping its part-whole interpretation:

(7) ku conglyu-uy eyncin-**un** thulek-ey iss-ta.
   That type-Gen engine-Top truck-Loc exist-Dec
   a. Locative: As for that type of engine, there is one in the truck.
   b. Part-whole: That type of engine is a thing that a truck has.

If the *NP-Nom* is interpreted as Focus, secondly, the part-whole reading survives.

(8) [ROTARI-EYNCIN-i]F matsuta cha-ey iss-ta.
   Rotary-engine-Nom   Mazada car-Loc exist-Dec
   'It is a Rotary engine that a Mazada car has.'

Tomioka (2001) points out that different from the matrix clause, the disambiguation effect of the NP-Nom^NP-Loc word order is not attested in embedded contexts. Both locative and part-whole readings are allowed in an embedded clause even when a nominative NP precedes a locative NP:

(9) Siito-beruto-ga kuruma-ni aru-koto-**wa** kodomo-demo siiteiru.
   Seabelt-Nom car-Dat extst-fact-top kid-even know

'Even a kid knows that a car has seatbelts.'

The following Korean sentence shows the same phenomenon:

(10) coasekpeltu-ka cha-ey iss-nun kes-**un** ai-to a(l)-n-ta.
    Seabelt-Nom car-Loc extst- PNE thing-Top kid-even know
    'Even a kid knows that a car has seatbelts.'

In short, a NP-Loc^NP-Nom word order yields two existential readings; i.e., a locative reading and a part-whole reading in Japanese and Korean. However, switching of the two NPs makes a sentence unambiguous and only locative reading is attested. Different from matrix clauses, a sentence in an embedded clause does not show the effect.

3. Previous Analyses

3.1. Tomioka (2001)

Tomioka (2001) claims that a movement approach (Tsujioka 2000) cannot explain the presence of part-whole reading in embedded contexts.[1] Since both readings are derived via movement of the arguments, we do not expect any contrast between the matrix and the embedded clauses. Assuming a Topic and Focus structure in Japanese, therefore, Tomioka (2001) argues that the absence of a part-whole reading is followed by non-availability of an *NP-Nom* being a Topic under the proposed information structure in Japanese. Following Vallduvi's (1992) information packing, he proposes that a sentence

---

1) Tsujioka (2000) assumes that the thematic structure of the part-whole reading is different from that of the locative reading and proposes that the part-NP select the whole-NP as its internal argument, assigning a possessor theta-role. The word order of an NP-Loc preceding an NP-Nom is derived via an A-movement of the whole NP to [Spec, IP] and the opposite order is derived via remnant movement of the part NP to the second Spec of IP, under the multiple Specifier system.

consists of Focus and Ground and Ground is composed by Link and Tail:

(11) Sentence: FOCUS: New Information
GROUND: Old Information
LINK: Thematically connects the sentence to the previous discourse. Topic-marked phrases are Link.
TAIL: Non-Link of old information

Based on the information structure, Tomioka (2001) provides three possible ways of interpreting the NP-Loc^NP-Nom word order sentence which is shown in (12) again.

(12) Torakku-ni enzin-ga aru
Truck-Loc engine-Nom exist

First, he assumes that the Topic maker -wa is dropped after the locative marker in the sentence. Under this assumption, an *NP-Loc* can be a Link and the rest of the sentence is a Focus. He argues that this information structure is compatible with both locative and part-whole readings.

(13) [Truck-Loc-(wa)]$_{Link}$ [engine-Nom exist]$_{Focus}$
a. Speaking of trucks, they are the things that have engines.
b. Speaking of the trucks, there is an engine located on it.

Second possibility is that *NP-Loc* is Focus and the rest of the sentence is a Link, as illustrated in (14) below:[2]

---

2) In Tomioka (2001), it seems that orders of a Link and a Focus are not relevant; in other words, a Focus may precede or follow a Link.

(14) [Truck-Loc]$_{Focus}$ [engine-Nom exist]$_{Link}$

When *truck-Loc* is Focus, both readings are possible.

As a third possibility, Tomioka (2001) argues that the Davidsonian eventuality argument can function as an implicit Link (cf. Gundel 1999, and Matsuda 1997). Therefore, the whole sentence is a Focus and the implicit eventuality argument is a Link.

(15) [e$_{eventuality}$]$_{Link}$ [truck-Loc engine-Nom exist]$_{Focus}$

He argues that the information structure in (15) induces only a locative reading since the eventuality argument is present only with stage-level predicates (Krazter 1995) which denote some changes over time; part-whole readings do not involve in stage level predicates whereas locative readings do.

Now, let us consider the opposite word order, i.e., 'NP-Nom^NP-Loc'. The first option to interpret this sentence is to understand the NP-Nom as a Link. However, it is not compatible with this word order since the presence of a nominative marker implies no Topic-marker. As illustrated in (16), a nominative or an accusative particle cannot co-occur with the Topic marker on the same NP whereas the other particles can:

(16)	Korean	Japanese (Tomioka 2001)
a. *NP-Nom-Top	*Mira-ka-nun	*Mira-ga-wa
b. *NP-Acc-Top	*Mira-lul-nun	*Mira-o-wa
c. NP-Dat-Top	Mira-eykey-nun	Mira-ni-wa
d. NP-Loc-Top	truck-ey-nun	truck-ni-wa

Therefore, only two possibilities are left. First, there may be an implicit eventuality argument as in (17). In this case, only locative reading is available under the same logic as in (15).

(17) [e$_{eventuality}$]$_{Link}$ [engine-Nom truck-Loc exist]$_{Focus}$

The last possibility for part-whole reading in this word order is that the nominative NP is a Focus and the rest of the sentence is a Link. For the NP-Nom^NP-Loc word order sentence to get a part-whole reading, therefore, an NP-*Nom* must be focused:

(18) [engine-Nom]$_{Focus}$ [truck-Loc exist]$_{Link}$

In sum, Tomioka (2001) claims that the absence of a part-whole reading is due to the eventuality argument which is an implicit Link that does not allow the part-whole reading.

As for the embedded clause, he argues that the whole clause can be served as a Link since it is *wa*-marked and thus the implicit eventuality argument is not required. Therefore, the information structure as follows is compatible with both locative and part-whole readings:

(19) [seatbelt-Nom car-Loc exist-fact-**wa**]$_{Link}$ [kid-even know]$_{Focus}$

3.2. Problems

Tomioka (2001) explains well how the readings are present or absent in the alternate orders of a nominative NP and a locative NP both in a matrix and an embedded clause without assuming a different internal structure for a part-whole reading as Tsujioka (2000) does. However, it would be nicer if we can explain absence or presence of a locative reading under the proposed information structure without assuming the implicit eventuality argument in a sentence.

Moreover, there are some problems to be solved in this analysis. First, different from what Tomioka (2001) claims, topic-marker alone does not save the part-whole reading. As shown in (20), even though the marker -*(n)un* makes *engine* easily understood as Topic, it is not sufficient for the sentence to have part-whole reading: *engin-(n)un* is interpreted as only specific in the locative reading.

(20) eyncin-**un** thulek-ey iss-ta.
　　 engine-Top truck-Loc exist-Dec
　　 (i) Locative: The engine is in the truck./*There is an engine in
　　　　 the truck.
　　 (ii) *Part-whole: The/a truck has an engine (as one of its
　　　　 essential parts).

As Tomioka (2001) points out, secondly, he does not have a clear answer to the questions raised from the constructions below in (21) where *wa* marking in a Locative NP saves the part-whole reading keeping the NP-Nom^NP-Loc word order.

(21) a. Enzin-ga torakku-ni aru　 (Locative reading only)
　　　　 engine-Nom truck-Loc exist
　　 b. Enzin-ga torakku-ni-**wa** aru(Locative and part-whole reading)
　　　　 Engine-Nom truck-Loc-Top exist

The presence of the Part-whole reading is predicted if the topic-marked DP-Loc is Link since the implicit eventuality argument is not required in that case. As Tomioka (2001) points out, however, there are two questions arising. We will come back to this issue in section 4.

(22) a. If the topic-marked locative is a Link, what is a Focus in
　　　　 (21b)? In general, a contrastive topic can be the only
　　　　 constituent that bears prosodic prominence in a sentence. In
　　　　 such as case, what is a Focus?
　　 b. Contrastive topics can co-occur with the usual topic (thematic
　　　　 topic). In such a case, do we have two Links?

4. Proposal: Focus Movement and Specificity

In M. Lee (2001a, b), I argue that so-called Intervention Effects

(mainly discussed in Beck 1996 and Beck and Kim 1997) are reanalyzed as "Specificity Effects". Following Gundel (1999) and Vergnaud and Zubizarreta (2000), I propose that every sentence has at least one Focus. Proposing an Information structure as in (23), M. Lee (2001a, b) claims that Focus must be checked in Syntax via overt movement of focus element to the Focus Projection.

(23) [CP [TopP [IP [FocP [+Focus] [VP V]]]]]

Underlying assumption of this proposal is that nonspecific NP cannot move out of the nuclear scope of a sentence (i.e., VP or FocP), following Diesing (1992). This explains why an NPI cannot precede a wh-phrase in Korean, as follows:

(24) *Amwu-to   mwues-ul ilk-ci anh-ass-ni?
      someone-even what-Acc read-CI not do-Past-Q
      'What did no one read?'
(25) Mwues-ul; amwu-to   t; ilkci-anh-ass-ni?
      what-Acc   someone-even read-neg-past-Q
      'What did no one read?'

A wh-phrase is always a Focus in wh-questions, so it must overtly be in [Spec, FocP]. On the other hand, an NPI is nonspecific and thus cannot move higher than FocP, which is illustrated in (26b):[3]

(26) a. *Amwu-to   mwues-ul ilk-ci   anh-ass-ni?
        someone-even what-Acc read-CI not do-Past-Q
        'What did no one read?'
     b. [IP [FocP [+Focus] [VP anyone what-Acc read-not]]]

We can easily predict why the scrambling of wh-phrase over NPI can

---

3) For discussion on Specificity and specific NPI, see M. Lee (2001a, b).

make the sentence well-formed; movement of wh-phrase satisfies the requirement of focus feature checking and the overt structure shows that NPI stays in the nuclear scope.

(27) a. Mwues-uli *amwu-to*　t; ilkci-anh-ass-ni?
　　　what-Acc　someone-even read-neg-past-Q
　　　'What did no one read?'
　　b. [$_{IP}$ [$_{FocP}$ what-Acc; [$_{VP}$ someone-even t; read-not]]]

In sum, I propose that an overt Focus movement is obligatory in Korean since [+Focus] must be checked overtly in [Spec, FocP].

(28) Conditions on Focus Movement (M. Lee 2001a, b) (to be revised)
　　a. Every sentence contains one Information Focus position and the focus feature must be checked via overt movement to the Focus Projection.
　　b. [$_{CP}$ [$_{TopP}$ [$_{IP}$ [$_{FocP}$ [+Focus] [$_{VP}$ V]]]]]

This overt movement interacting with the unavailability of nonspecific element moving out of a VP readily accounts for the so-called Intervention Effects. Then, let us see how this analysis can be extended to the case of absence or presence of part-whole readings in Japanese and Korean in the following section.

5. Absence/Presence of part-whole reading as Specificity effects

5.1. Analysis

In this section, I will show that absence or presence of part-whole reading is nicely accounted for under our proposal. First, let us consider the information structure of the sentence that has both locative and a

part-whole readings. Either *truck-Loc* or *engine-Nom* can be an Information Focus; if *truck-Loc* is a Focus, the rest of the sentence stays in a VP, as in (29a); and when *engine-Nom* is a Focus, *truck-Loc* may be understood as a Topic, as in (29b):

(29) (=3) thulek-ey eyncin-i iss-ta.
　　　Truck-Loc engine-Nom exist-Dec
　　　a. [IP [FocP truck-Loci [VP engine-Nom ti exist-Dec]]]]]
　　　b. [TopP/IP truck-Loci [FocP engine-Nomj [VP tj ti exist-Dec]]]]]

If the *engine-Nom* precedes *truck-Loc*, two ways of information structure are possible, as illustrated in (30a, b). As noted in section 2, a part-whole reading is absent in this configuration unless *engine-Nom* is a Focus; i.e., (30a) is not a good structure when an *NP-Nom* is a part of a whole *NP-Loc*, whereas (30b) is fine for either reading. In other words, *engine-Nom* cannot move higher than a FocP if it is interpreted as a part NP:4)

(30) (=4) eyncin-i thulek-ey iss-ta.
　　　engine-Nom truck-Loc exist-Dec
　　　a. [IP engine-Nomj [FocP truck-Loci [VP tj ti exist-Dec]]]]] (* when
　　　　NP-Nom is a part)
　　　b. [IP [FocP engine-Nomj [VP tj truck-Loc　exist-Dec]]]]]

I claim that an *NP-Nom* is nonspecific when it is ˝part˝ which cannot be interpreted independently without a ˝whole˝-NP. If an NP is nonspecific, it cannot move out of a VP to a position higher than a FocP. Therefore, a sentence with a *part NP* cannot be interpreted properly unless the *part NP* is a Focus. Then, we can see why (30a) is

---

4) Different from English, I assume that cases are assigned within nuclear scope, i.e. VP in Korean and Japanese. Therefore, if NP-nom may stay inside VP unless movement is derived by some kind of feature checking, such as Topic or Focus.

not an appropriate structure for a part-whole reading.

Then, how is the locative reading obtained when *engine-Nom* is focused?[5] As shown in the sentence in (30a), *truck* is a Focus and *engine-Nom* is a Topic. When the sentence gets a locative reading and *engine-Nom* is not a Focus, it is indefinite and specific.

(30a) [IP engine-Nom$_j$ [FocP truck-Loc$_i$ [VP t$_j$ t$_i$ exist-Dec]]]]] (* when NP-Nom is a part)

In short, we can conclude that the reason of the absence of a part-whole reading when *part-NP* precedes *whole-NP* is that *part-NP* cannot move out of a VP unless it is interpreted as a Focus.

If our analysis is correct, we do not have to assume implicit eventuality argument as a Topic as Tomioka (2001) proposes. In the following subsection, let us discuss how this analysis can explain the rest of the problems raised in section 2.

5.2. Answer to the problems

Tomioka (2001) points out that the Topic marker -*wa* makes it possible for the sentence as in (31) to have a part-whole reading in Japanese.

(31) *Sonna* enzin-**wa** torakku-ni aru

---

5) As a reviewer pointed out, Tomioka (2001) proposes locative reading as in (17) above (also shown below again).

(17) [eventuality]$_{top}$ [engine-Nom truck-Loc exist]$_{foc}$

In this analysis, *engine-Nom* cannot be a Topic in Japanese whereas in Korean, *engine-Nom* is actually a Topic in the case (30a). It is attested that an NP-Nom cannot precede a wh-phrase in Japanese while it is common in Korean (cf. Matsuda 1997, Tomioka 2001). This might be one very important difference between Japanese and Korean and it seems to be worthy of further study.

That type engine-Top truck-Loc exist
(i) Locative: As for that type of engine, there is one in the truck.
(ii) Part-whole: That type of engine is a thing that a truck has.

However, it seems that it is not quite true to say that Topicalization itself can save the part-whole reading as shown in Korean example in (32). A part-whole reading is hardly obtained when there is no modification on the part NP. Moreover, it should be the specific engine which is supposedly to be known to the people in the conversation.

(32) eyncin-**un** thulek-ey iss-ta.
   engine-Top truck-Loc exist-Dec
   (i) Locative: The engine is in the truck./*There is an engine in
                   the truck.
   (ii) *Part-whole: The/a truck has an engine (as one of its
                   essential parts).

If the NP is preceded by a modifier such as *kulen conlyu-uy* 'that type of' in Korean, the NP-nun is easily interpreted as a generic NP and thus as a Topic.6)

---

6) A reviewer points out whether the distinction between generic and nonspecific is clear in the case of NP-nom as in the following sentence (=4):
   (i) eyncin-i thulek-ey iss-ta.
       engine-Nom truck-Loc exist-Dec
engine-i in this example is indefinite and (non)specific but not generic. In Korean, when generic properties are discussed -*nun* marker is used rather than a nominative marker. For instance, we use -*nun* when we talk about generic property of water, as illustrated in the following sentence:
   (ii) mwul-un twumyengha-ta.
       water-nun transparent-Dec
       'Water is transparent.'
If the nominative case -*i/ka* marks *water*, the sentence does not discuss the general property of water but a liquid which is transparent among others.
   (iii) mwul-i twumyengha-ta.
       water-Nom transparent-Dec
       'It is water that is transparent.'

(33) *kulen conlya-uy* eyncin-un tulek-ey iss-ta.

That type-Gen engine-Top truck-Loc exist

  (i) Locative: Speaking of that type of engine, there is one in the
truck.

  (ii) Part-whole: That type of engine is a thing that a truck has.

Moreover, a part-whole reading is readily obtained if we use generic
adverbs, such as *ilpancekulo* 'generally':

(34) *ilpancekulo*, eyncin-**un** thulek-ey iss-ta.

Generally engine-Top truck-Loc exist-Dec

'Generally, the/a truck has an engine (as one of its essential
parts).'

The "part"-NP can be a Topic only when it is interpreted as generic
(cf. Diesing 1992). So, we can conclude that a part-NP cannot move out
of a VP unless it is interpreted as a Focus or a generic Part (Topic).7)

There is also a structural distinction between a generic NP and a nonspecific
NP (Diesing 1992).

  7) According to a reviewer, the following sentences seem to have both
readings, different from the sentence discussed in this paper:
  (i) a. kyenpocangchi-ka say cip-tul-ey iss-ta.
       security-alarm-Nom new house-Pl-Loc exist-Dec
    b. sinhyeng eyncin-i Daewoo-ey iss-ta.
       brand-new engine-Nom Daewoo-Loc exist-Dec
If the nominative NPs are not Focus, it is still hard to be interpreted as
part-whole. However, it seems that there is some contrast between the simple
verbs in (i) and the complex predicates in (ii) which are provided by the
reviewer.
  (ii) a. kyenpocangchi-ka say cip-tul-ey selchi-toye-iss-ta.
       security-alarm-Nom new house-Pl-Loc be-installed-Dec
    b. sinhyeng eyncin-i Daewoo-ey pwucak-toye-iss-ta.
       brand-new engine-Nom Daewoo-Loc be-installed-Dec
One reason might be that the complex predicates 'be-installed' overtly denote
"part-whole" relation. In this case, it is not clear whether the structure is same
as the existential sentences in (i). However, it is an interesting contrast we need
to consider in a future work.

Our analysis can also predict the presence of part-whole reading when whole-NP is marked by *-nun*. We saw part-whole reading is not available unless the nominative NP is interpreted as Focus when the whole NP is marked by the locative particle. Different from the case, the following Korean sentence, where *-nun* marks the whole NP, induces both locative and part-whole readings.

(35) eyncin-i thulek-ey-**nun** iss-ta.
     engine-Nom truck-Loc-nun exist-Dec
     (i) Locative: There is an engine in the/a truck.
     (ii) Part-whole: The/a truck has an engine (as one of its
                     essential parts).

The same phenomena is attested in Japanese (Tomioka 2001):

(36) a. Enzin-ga torakku-ni aru   (Locative reading only)
        engine-Nom truck-Loc exist
     b. Enzin-ga torakku-ni-**wa** aru(Locative and part-whole reading)
        Engine-Nom truck-Loc-Top exist

As shortly mentioned in section 3, Tomioka (2001) raises two questions regarding the possible part-whole reading in (36b), which is quoted again in (37) below:

(37) a. If the topic-marked locative is Link, what is Focus in (36b)?
        In general, a contrastive topic can be the only constituent that
        bears prosodic prominence in a sentence. In such as case,
        what is Focus?
     b. Contrastive topics can co-occur with the usual topic (thematic
        topic). In such a case, do we have two Links?

The main concern that Tomioka (2001) has in his analysis arises from the misunderstanding of Contrastive Topic and Contrastive Focus.

As discussed in M. Lee (2001c), a Contrastive Topic must be distinguished from a Contrastive Focus.[8] Following M. Lee (2001c), I argue that the *truck-(n)un/-wa* is actually a Contrastive Focus and the reason that a part-whole reading is possible even without a nominative NP being focused is that the option of a covert focus movement of *NP-(n)un* is possible since the NP is marked morphologically by *-(n)un*. However, a covert movement is justified only when there is overt marking (phonological/morphological).

(38) Conditions on Focus Movement (final)
  a. Every sentence contains one Information Focus position and the focus feature must be checked overtly; via an overt movement to the Focus Projection or an overt phonological/morphological marking.
  b. When there is an overt marking, a covert focus movement is allowed for proper interpretation.
  c. [$_{CP}$ [$_{TopP}$ [$_{IP}$ [$_{FocP}$ [+Focus] [$_{VP}$ V]]]]]

Nonspecific part-NP stays inside VP through the whole derivation and the in-situ locative-NP moves to [Spec, FocP] for focus feature to be checked for proper interpretation at LF.

(39) a. S-structure:
  [$_{IP}$ [$_{FocP}$ [+Focus] [$_{VP}$ engine-Nom truck-Loc-**nun** exist-Dec]]]
  b. LF:
  [$_{IP}$ [$_{FocP}$ truck-Loc-**nun**$_i$ [$_{VP}$ engine-Nom t$_i$ exist-Dec]]]

6. Concluding Remarks

---

8) M. Lee (2001c) claims that *-nun* is Contrastive marker in Korean and Contrastive Topic is generated outside nuclear scope (VP/FocP) whereas *XP-nun* inside the nuclear scope is Contrastive Focus (cf. C. Lee 2000, Choe 1995).

In this paper, we have shown why part-whole reading is not available when a nominative NP precedes a locative NP in Japanese and Korean. I argued that a part-NP is nonspecific unless it is interpreted as generic indefinites. The absence and the presence of a part-whole reading in the whole paradigm in Japanese and Korean were accounted for under our analysis of an overt Focus movement interacting with Specificity.

References

Aoun, J. & Li, Y.-H. A. (1993). *Syntax of Scope.* Boston: MIT Press.

Aoun, J. & Li, Y.-H. A. (2000). Resuming the Quest: Superiority and Interpretation. ms. University of Southern California.

Beck, S. (1996). Quantified Structures as Barriers for LF Movement. *Natural Language Semantics 4*, 1-56.

Beck, S. & Kim, S-S. (1997). On wh- and operator scope in Korean. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics 6*, 339-384.

Büring, D. (1999). Topic, in Focus. In P. Bosch & R. van der Sandt (Eds). *Focus: Cognitive, and Computational Perspectives.*

Choi, H.-W. (1997). Topic and Focus in Korean: The Information Partition by Phrase Structure and Morphology. In H.-M. Sohn & J. Haig (Eds.). *Japanese and Korean Linguistics 6*, 545-561.

Choe, H. S. (1995). Focus and Topic Movement in Korean and Licensing. In Kiss (Ed.). *Discourse Configurational Languages.*

Chung, D. (1996). *On the Representation and Licensing of Q and Q-Dependencies.* Doctoral dissertation, USC.

Diesing, M. (1992). *Indefinites.* Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

Drubig, B. (1994). Island constraints and the syntactic nature if focus and association with focus, ms. University if Tubingen.

Fauconnier, G. (1975). Polarity and the scale principle. In *Papers from the eleventh meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 188-199.

Gill, K.-H. (1999). Rethinking Topicalization and Caki-Binding. In Susumo Kuno et al. (Eds.), *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics VIII*, 340-353.

Gundel, J. K. (1999). On different kinds of Focus. In P. Bosch & R. van der Sandt (Eds.), *Focus: Cognitive, and Computational Prospectives*.

Hagstrom, P. A. (1998). *Decomposing Questions*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Hoji, H. (1985). *Logical form constraints and configurational structures in Japanese*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington.

Hoji, H. (1986). Scope interpretation in Japanese and its theoretical implications. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 5*, 87-101.

Kim, S.-S. (2000). Intervention effects are focus effects, presented at The 10th Japanese/Korean Linguistics Conference.

Kim, S.-W. (1989). The QP status of wh-phrases in Korean and Japanese. In *Proceedings of WCCFL VIII*. 358-372.

Kim, S.-W. (1991). *Chain Scope and Quantification Structure*. Doctoral dissertation, Brandeis University.

Kishimoto, H. (1992). LF pied-piping: Evidence from Sinhala. *Gengo Kenkyu 102*, 46-87.

Kiss, K. É. (1995). NP movement, operator movement and scrambling. In K. É. Kiss (Ed.), *Discourse Configurational Languages*.

Lee, C. (1999). Contrastive topic: A locus of the interface evidence from Korean and English. In Ken Turner (Ed.), *The Semantics/ Pragmatics interface from Different Points of View*. University of Brighton, UK: Elsevier.

Lee, K. & Satoshi T. (2000). LF intervention effects are topic effects: Wh questions in Japanese and Korean, presented at The 10th J/K Linguistics Conference.

Lee, M. (2001a). Focus and Topic Movements in Korean, presented at The Graduate Student Workshop, University of Southern California, CA.

Lee, M. (2001b). Intervention Effects Revisited, presented at The Ninth

Harvard International Symposium on Korean Linguistics, Harvard University, MA. (to appear in *Harvard ISOKL IX*)

Lee, M. (2001c). Contrastive Topic vs. Contrastive Focus, presented at Topic and Focus: A Workshop on Intonation and Meaning, The 2001 LSA Institute, UC Santa Barbara, CA.

Lee, R. K. (1995). Deriving A-movement properties of scrambling a non-morphologically driven operation. *Edinburgh Occasional Papers in Linguistics*, University of Edinburgh, Scotland.

Lee, Y.-S. (1993). Licensing and semantics of any revisited. In Susumo Kuno et al. (Eds.), *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics V*, 577-592. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Company.

Matsuda, Y. (1997). *Representation of Focus and Presupposition in Japanese*. Doctoral Dissertation, USC.

Muromatsu, K. (1998). Two types of existentials: Evidence from Japanese. *Lingua 101*, 245-269.

Suh, C.-S. (1996). *Korean Grammar*. Seoul: Hanyang University Press.

Tomioka, S. (2001). Topic/Focus structure and two existential readings in Japanese, presented at WCCFL XX, USC.

Tsujioka, T. (2000). Improper remnant movement, presented at NELS 31, Georgetown University.

Vallduví, E. (1992). *The Information Component*, Garland, NY.

Vergnaud, J.-R. & Zubizarreta, M. L. (2000). Intervention effects in French wh-in-situ Construction: Syntax or interpretation?, class handout, USC.

Zubizarreta, M. L. (1998). *Prosody, Focus, and Word Order*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

Mina Lee
GFS 301, Department of Linguistics
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA 90089, USA
E-mail: minal@usc.edu