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1. Facts to be Accounted for
   In a well-formed multiple Case construction in Korean and Japanese, any of the newly-created multiple Case phrases has properties (1a, b, c):
   (1) a. It induces intervention effects.
   b. It induces focus effects.
   c. It undergoes obligatory movement.
   Consider the Korean Possessor-Raising as shown in (2):
   (2) a. $\text{[TP[DP John-uy, (*kapcaki) tongsayng-i] caki-uy, j cip-eyse cwuk-ess-ta].}$
      J.-GEN suddenly brother-NOM self-GEN house-at die-PAST-DEC
      'John's (*suddenly) brother died at self's house.'
   b. $\text{[CP John-i] [TP t (kapcaki) [DP t, tongsayng-i] caki-uy, j cip-eyse cwuk-ess-ta]].}$
      J.-NOM suddenly brother-NOM self-GEN house-at die-PAST-DEC
      'John, his brother suddenly died at self's house.'
      (Boldfaced letters indicate being focused.)
   c. $\text{[CP Op, [TP John-uy tongsayng-i] t, cwuk]-un] cip.}$
      J.-GEN brother-NOM die-REL house
      'the house where John's brother died.'
   d. $\text{[CP Op, John-i] [TP t, [TP[DP t, tongsayng-i] t, cwuk]-un] cip.}$
      J.-NOM brother-NOM die-REL house
      'the house where John, his brother died.'
   e. $\text{[CP John-i] [TP t, [TP[DP t, tongsayng-i] khun cip-ul sa-ess-ta]].}$
      J.-NOM brother-NOM big house-ACC buy-PAST-DEC
      'John, his brother bought a big house.'
   f. $\text{[CP khun cip-ul, John-i] [TP t, [TP[DP t, tongsayng-i] t, sa-ess-ta]].}$
      J.-NOM brother-NOM buy-PAST-DEC
      'A big house, John, his brother bought.'
   Note that the possessor phrase cannot bind the subject-oriented anaphor caki nor allow an adverb like kapcaki between it and the possessee phrase before Possessor-Raising applies as we see in (2a), whereas it can after Possessor-Raising applies as we see in (2b). These phenomena are best accounted for under the assumption that Possessor-Raising moves the possessor phrase overtly from the position within the subject DP to the outer Spec of TP, since (2b) would have the same property as (2a) with respect to the anaphor-binding and the adverb-insertion if Possessor-Raising can be an optional or covert movement.
   On the other hand, the Possessor-Raised phrase shows focus effects as indicated by boldfaced letters in (2b, d, e, f) as well as the intervention effects as shown in (2c, d, e, f). Specifically, in (2d, f) the newly-created multiple Case phrases, being focused, may be assumed to have undergone Focus Movement to the edge of the CP phase; indeed the relativization of cip 'house' in (2d) and the preposing of the object khun cip-ul 'big house-ACC' in (2f) are blocked due to the PIC.

2. Intervention Effects
   The intervention effects of the newly-created multiple Case phrase are induced by the PIC, since Focus Movement has to apply to the newly-created multiple Case phrase due to the Distinctness Condition (3), moving to the edge of the phase:
   (3) Distinctness Condition (Richards 2001)
      Linearization of structurally adjacent syntactic objects with the same label is blocked.
      $\alpha, \beta$ are structurally adjacent if (i) $\alpha$ c-commands $\beta$ and (ii) there is no $\gamma$ such that $\alpha$ asymmetrically c-commands $\gamma$ and $\gamma$ fully dominates $\beta$.
   Note that in (2b) the newly-created multiple Case phrase John-i in the outer Spec-T has to undergo Focus Movement to the edge of the CP phase in order to avoid the violation of (3).

3. Focus Effects
   The focus effects of the newly-created multiple Case phrase are induced by the Interface Effect
Condition (4) and the [+INT] Valuation Condition (5):

(4) Interface Effect Condition (Chomsky 2001)
Optional operations can apply only if they have an effect on the outcome [by assigning [+INT] feature to be valued at the interface].

(5) [+INT] Valuation Condition
At the interface, [+INT] feature is valued as strong INT effects (focus, topic, specialized semantic effects, etc.) at the edge of a phase, whereas it is valued as weak INT effects (specificity, definiteness, D-linking, etc.) at the edge of a non-phase.

The reason why the newly-created multiple Case phrase is susceptible to (4) is because it undergoes (6) optionally:

(6) Default Case/φ-Feature Assignment
A default Case/φ-feature may be assigned to a phrase so that the phrase may undergo ‘defective’ Agree.

In the derivation of (2b) from (2a), for example, (6) applies to the possessor phrase John-uy in (2a), imposing on it a default Case/φ-feature, which makes it undergo ‘defective’ Agree with T and be valued as nominative, leading to a multiple nominative Case structure in (2b). Note that the application of (6) here is optional since (2a) is also grammatical.

The optional application of (6) accounts for INT effects in all the INT(focus)-creating A-movements as in multiple Case constructions, alternative Case constructions, major subject constructions, Case-marked adverbials, Case-stacking, etc., in Korean/Japanese, and inverted locative constructions in English like (8) below. (6) applies obligatorily in the derivation of quirky subject constructions in Icelandic and expletive there constructions in English; in other words, if (6) does not apply for the derivation of these sentences, they will crash. Indeed, these sentences do not induce INT effects.

The notion of multiple Agree consisting of ‘full’ Agree and ‘defective’ Agree(s), which is adopted in this study, is better motivated than Ura’s (2000) notion of multiple checking as follows. First, multiple checking posits the feature [+multiple] on the checker head or probe but multiple Agree does not. Second, multiple Agree consisting of ‘full’ Agree and ‘defective’ Agree(s) automatically captures significant distinctions between the ‘full’ Agree phenomena and the ‘defective’ Agree phenomena, such as distinctions between derived multiple Case phrases and the original Case multiple phrases, whereas multiple checking does not. Third, through (6) for ‘defective’ Agree, the optionality factor for (4) is uniquely located in the derived multiple Case phrase; in other words, (6) explicitly identifies the element to be assigned [+INT] or focused by (5).

4. Obligatory Movement
The obligatory movement of a newly-created multiple Case phrase is induced by the INT Effect Realization Condition (7):

(7) INT Effect Realization Condition
INT effects due to optionality or the Interface Effect Condition (4) are realized only through overt movement.

Thus, for multiple Case constructions, the newly-created multiple Case phrase first undergoes A-movement through defective Agree to the Spec-T/v due to (6)-(4)-(7) and then undergoes Focus Movement to the edge of the CP/vP phase due to (3); hence, the [+INT] feature assigned to the newly-created multiple Case phrase by (4) will be valued as a strong INT effect like focus by (5). On the other hand, for inverted locative constructions like (8) in English, the inverted locative phrase undergoes only A-movement through defective Agree with T to the Spec-T due to (6)-(4)-(7), unless deliberately focused and forced to move to the edge of the CP phase by Focus Movement:

(8) In the swamp was found a child, wasn’t there?

Hence, the [+INT] feature assigned to the inverted locative phrase in the swamp in (8) will be valued only as a weak INT effect by (5).
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