



the syntactic context where the relevant elements are located. Chomsky proposes that in the case where a head and a phrase merge, the head provides the label for the resulting object. When two maximal projections merge, there are two ways of determining labeling: *i*: One of them moves away (LA *i*) or *ii*: The phrases in question undergo feature sharing, i.e. agreement (LA *ii*). Now, Hornstein and Nunes (2008), Hunter (2010) and Bošković (2018) among others, argue that the adjunct configuration does not need labeling for interpretation, as in (6). I make a somewhat similar but stronger proposal: For adjunct configuration, it is not possible for one element to project (see Yoo 2019 for the relevant discussion) (8). Given that Korean and Japanese do not have feature-sharing option between NP and TP (see Saito 2016), the optionally base-generated elements in (1)-(4) are in the adjunct configuration like (6), as shown in (8).

(6) {? XP, YP}      (7) For adjunct configuration, it is not possible for one element to project  
(8) {? Scrambled elements, TP}

The current approach slightly modifies the timing of labeling from Chomsky 2013. For Chomsky (2013) labeling applies at the point of spell-out. Since spell-out is determined by phases, labeling takes place at the phasal level. However, Bošković (2015) points out a serious chicken-or-the-egg style question for the timing of labeling in Chomsky (2013): Bošković argues that phasehood determination requires labeling, i.e., phases do not exist prior to labeling. Without any labeling, we cannot determine phasal levels which means that it is also impossible to determine points of spell-out, hence structures cannot be sent to spell-out. But spell-out is necessary for labeling. Bošković (2015) resolves this issue by arguing that the Labeling Algorithm can apply when it can.

(9) Label when you can

Now, (8) and (9) deduce the ban on adjunct scrambling in (2). When the adjunct in (2) lowers to the embedded clause, the movement labels the merger as TP, which violates (7) (i.e. TP projects). In the same manner with (10), the Caseless element in (4) cannot undergo scrambling:

(10) \*<sub>TP</sub> {*riyuumo naku* TP}      (11) \*<sub>TP</sub> {*Nani* TP}

What enables scrambling in Korean and Japanese is then the presence of particles with the scrambled elements. I argue that the particles functions as a place-holder for the adjunct configuration. In the spirit of Stepanov 2001, Hagstrom 1998 and Bošković 2018 where Q-morpheme merges with *wh*-elements first, such particles first merges with the scrambled elements. When the particle merges with NP/AdvP in question, forming {particle, NP/AdvP} particle immediately labels it as particleP given LA and (9). The head of particle then head-moves to NP/advP for cliticization. Here I adopt Chomsky (2013)'s system here in that once the projection is labeled the head movement does not de-label it. Thus the movement of NP/AdvP thus does not violate (7) since the ParticleP functions as a place-holder for (7).

(11) {? {<sub>ParticleP</sub> Particle NP/AdvP} TP}

(11) accounts for the possibility of scrambling in (1) and (3) as illustrated below.

(12) {? {<sub>ParticleP</sub> <sub>t<sub>Particle</sub></sub> NP/AdvP} TP}

The pattern in (4b) (i.e. ban on scrambling of Case-less elements) that is captured by (12) is recently discussed in Saito (2016) and Miyagawa, Wu and Koizumi (*to appear*). In their system, Case particles functions as an anti-labeling device, which makes a constituent invisible for LA.

(13) {<sub>TP</sub> ~~DP-Case~~ TP}

By assuming that all syntactic objects must be labeled for interpretation, Saito (2016) argues that Case-marking is required for scrambling in Japanese otherwise it will result to unlabeled projection. He correlates this with the lack of  $\phi$ -agreement between Subject and TP in Japanese, which accounts for Case-marking in subjects. However, when real adjunct configuration like (3) are taken into consideration, this faces problem. In (14), the adverb *ecey* is adjoined to TP, and it must be Case-marked in Saito (2016)'s system for interpretation. However, it is optional.

(14) *ecey(-nun)*      *ku-ka*      *ttwietta*.  
yesterday(-TOP) he-NOM ran.  
'Yesterday, he ran'