



The essence of the structure in (9) is that *so* is a replacement of VP/AP and that the light verb *do/be* occupies the little *v* that selects VP/AP. Given the structure for the V/AP anaphora in English, to account for an impossible extraction out of such a V/AP anaphora, we suggest that an EPP feature be lacking or inactive in the [Spec,*v*P] position. We attribute the lack or inactivity of an EPP feature in the [Spec,*v*P] position to the unusual overt realization of the light verb in the little *v* position. This suggestion is grounded on (the derivational manifestation of) Koopman's (1996) thesis that languages have either an overt head with a silent Spec or a silent Spec with an overt head. Koopman derives this new reformulation of generalized 'doubly-filled Comp filter' from Kayne's (1994) linear correspondence axiom. If Koopman is right, the unusual lexical realization of the little *v* in the V/AP anaphora in English disables its Spec from being available or active. This accounts for the general ban on the extraction out of the VP anaphora in this language.

Following the same line of analysis as for the VP anaphora in English, we propose the structure of the VP/AP anaphora in Korean as in (10) above. In this structure, extraction out of the V/AP anaphora in Korean is allowed by virtue of the well-known multiple Spec strategy available in this language (Kuroda (1988)). The overt presence of the light verb *ha-* in the *v* position is not pernicious at all to the availability of the [Spec,*v*P] position, as Korean does not obey the strict one-head or one-Spec restriction. The [Spec,*v*P] position is available as an exit for a VP-internal element before the V/AP anaphora substitution in (4B) applies to the VP.

We now move on to (6B), which involves either TP substitution by *kuleh-* 'so' or CP substitution by *kukes* 'it'. (6B) containing the Accusative embedded subject is acceptable with TP substitution, but the same sentence containing the Nominative one is not. We account for this contrast in the following way. We first assume that in Korean, exceptional Case-marking applies to the embedded subject in the [Spec,CP] position (cf. Lee (1992); Kim (1996)). Thus, in (6B) with the Accusative embedded subject, the TP substitution applies successfully after the embedded subject undergoes permissible A-movement to the [Spec,CP] position. In (6B) with the Nominative one, however, the TP substitution cannot be fulfilled because the embedded subject is Nominative Case-marked in the [Spec,TP] position, thus its movement to the [Spec,CP] position being forbidden. Likewise, the illegitimate movement of the embedded object cannot feed the substitution by *kuleh-* 'so' in the embedded clause, either, as in (11):

(11)A: *cheli-nun* [LGB-lul<sub>i</sub> [*yengi-ka* t<sub>i</sub> *ilknuntako*]] *sayngkakhay*.

*Cheli-Top* [LGB-Acc [*yengi-Nom* read think

'Cheli thinks Yengi to be reading LGB.'

B: \**toli-nun* [Barriers-lul *kuleh-key*] *sayngkakhay*

*Toli-Top* [Barriers-Acc *so-Comp*] think

'(Lit.) Toli thinks Yengi to be doing so with Barriers.'

This amounts to saying that the TP substitution by *kuleh-* 'so' can only apply when the extraction out of it is derivationally legal. One word is in order about the morpheme *-key* that is attached to the TP substitution by *kuleh-* 'so'. This morpheme is regarded as an adverbializer/complementizer by attaching to an adverb phrase or clause. In this regard, it is reasonable to say that the morpheme *-key* after the TP substitution is a complementizer.

**References:** Baltin (2012); Haddican (2007); Houser (2010); Kayne (1994); Kim (1996); Koopman (1996); Kuroda (1988); Lee (1992); Stroik (2001); Thompson (2012)