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Stalking the Elusive Argument: the Case of the Part-HP

Joan Maling, Brandeis University

The Inalienable Possession construction has received considerable attention in the literature on Korean syntax. This construction poses a number of well-known problems, especially for theta-theory and GB case-theory. I will discuss here only two of the many theoretical issues: the source of the Multiple Case marking and the status of the part-HP as a verbal argument or (adverbal) adjunct. My goal here is a very limited one: (1) to show that the part-HP does not necessarily agree with the whole-HP, either in Korean or cross-linguistically, and (11) to argue that the part-HP must be a verbal argument rather than an adjunct.

Consider first the Korean examples of the Inalienable Possession construction given in (1) and (2). Note in particular that passive converts the multiple accusative sentences in (1) into the multiple nominative sentences in (2).

(1) a. Chol-owa Sim-ri neul pikkol-i-ta. Chol-owa Sim-ri hair-Acc combing-he=Ind 'Cholso is combing Sim's hair.'
   c. Noy-ka banza-ri neul kdings-i=es-ta. Noy-ka banza-ri hair-Acc make=Pass-Pat=Ind 'I peeled the bananas.'

(2) a. Sim-ki neul-ri/ri pikkol-e-ci=es-ta. Sim-ki hair-Acc comb=Pass-Pat=Ind 'Sim's hair is being combed.'
   b. Kim-ri pikkol-i=es-ta. Kim-ri hair-Acc comb=Pass-Pat=Ind 'Kim's arm was broken.'
   c. Noy-ka pikkol-ri neul kding-e-ci=es-ta. Noy-ka hair-Acc make=Pass-Pat=Ind 'The bananas were peeled.'

Moreover, there exist multiple native examples, as first noted by Young-joon Kim (1989:662):

   'I-Ind pen-Adv head-to-Adv kiss=Pass-Pat=Ind 
   'I kissed Noy on the forehead.'
Based on such examples, it appears that the whole (possessor) and part (possessed) NPs must agree in case in Korean. Indeed, the
number of arguments it subcategorizes for (Blumgarten). Moreover, since case-agreement under predication and apposition is
independently motivated for many languages, the Case-agreement
analysis is at first glance an attractive account for the shared
case-marking in this construction. It is worth noting, however, that
when copular constructions are used to express the semantic
relationship of possession (e.g. in Arabic, Finnish, Russian), this
relationship is not marked by case-agreement. Rather, what we find
case-linguistically is that the whole-NP is marked with some oblique
case, typically dative, whereas the part-NP gets the appropriate
syntactic case, typically nominative. This can be seen even in the
French examples Kit cites. Note the following contrast:

(6) a. Je lui croyais une miettress dans chaque port. (Kim 1989:450)
   'I thought he had a mistress in each port.'
   b. On le considère le fils spirituel de Valéry.
   'One him-ACC considers the son spiritual of Valéry.'

The clitic is overtly dative when the semantic relation is one of
possession, as in (6a), but accusative when the relation is the more
usual type of copular predication as in (6b). The fact that
possession is not marked by agreement cross-linguistically suggests,
I think, that it would be surprising if the semantic relationship
expressed in the Part-Whole construction were marked by case-
agreement in Korean.

So if it's not Case-agreement, what is it? In a number of
recent papers on case-marking, Maling & Kim look at a wider range
of data than previously considered in the literature in an attempt to
answer the following questions: (i) what is the source of Case on the
part NP? (ii) what does that tell us about the argument status of
the part NP? Based on our observation that the part-NP bears ALL AND
only the cases assigned by V to the relevant argument, we were led to
what we called the DIRECT CASE HYPOTHESIS stated in (7):

(7) DIRECT CASE HYPOTHESIS (Maling & Kim 1990; 1992)
   a. the part NP is assigned case by V.
   b. the whole NP is assigned case either by V or by DNP
      depending on its surface position

Under our analysis, the case-agreement observed in the Inalienable
Possession construction must be considered epiphenomenal, due to not
be a role of Case-agreement between whole and part-NP but rather to
other independently motivated case assignment properties of the
language. In particular, we attribute the fact that the part-NPs in the
passive sentences in (2) is marked NOK not to case-agreement with
the whole-NP but rather to the fact that passive verbs in Korean are
non-case-assigned, as illustrated in (8). Here too, the multiple
accusatives in the active turn into multiple nominatives:

(8) a. Chel-ka Mary-lul 1cunul ha-yeus-1a
   Chel-ka Mary-Acc ring-acc gift-ACC do-pot-IND
   'Chel presented Mary with a ring.'
b. Mary-ka penci-ka nereal-i toy-ess-ta
Mary-Nom ring-Gen gift-Gen become-Pst-Ind
'Mary was presented with a ring.'

Note that this parallelism is entirely expected if part-NPs get case
directly from V as under the Direct Case Hypothesis, but goes
unexplained under the Case-Marking Hypothesis. The Direct Case
Hypothesis is consistent with the common observation that the
Inalienable Possession construction exists only in languages with
the case-theoretic resources to supply 3-case to both NPs (Newman 1985;
Yoon 1990), i.e. only in languages which have other multiple
accusative constructions such as ditransitive verbs. Furthermore,
we predict that in languages where passive verbs ARE accusative case-
assigners, there will be no case-agreement between whole and part-NPs
in the passive: as surface subject, the possessor NP will be
nominalized, but the body-part NP will be assigned accusative case
by the (passive) verb. The following data from classical Greek suggest
that this prediction is correct:

(9) a. hoënek' yrn amédhion class Hvi' adjectives
'since indeed the Muse has taught
'since indeed the Muse has taught them
Homer, Od. 8.480

b. dedákounai lexis Buridice, Andromache 739
'we shall be taught speeches'

(10) a. Ídomeneus i' yrn oikódómo biletis xwéraste
Ídomeneus-MOM put Petr Oikódómo-MOM struck stomach-ACC
'Ídomeneus struck Oikódómo in the middle of his stomach'
Homer, II. 12.506

b. bliëto gar ékton
double.
struck.3sg.pass for shoulder-ACC speak-GTT...
'for he was struck on the shoulder with a spear'
Homer, II. 11.7.598

We conclude that the part-NP does NOT necessarily agree with
the Possessor-NP. On the contrary, we predict nonagreing case patterns
to be found wherever case alternations exist independently of
the Part-Whole Construction.

2. CASE ALTERNATIONS IN KOREAN

To test this prediction, we need to look for case alternations.
Passive is a primary source of case alternations in many languages.
Korean happens to be unusually rich in other sources of case
alternations, which provide further evidence in support of the Direct
Case Hypothesis. Consider verbs which exhibit case alternations on
a particular thematic argument. There are two primary classes of such
verbs: locative existential verbs and certain ditransitive verbs.

2.1 Locative Existential Verbs:
The theme argument of a locative existential verb is always
nominalive, but the locative argument can be either dative or
nominalive (Gardts & Yoon 1989), as illustrated in (11):

(11) a. Kongpang-ey/l pul-i ra-(a)s-ta.
factory-DAT/NOM fire-burn break-out-Pst-Ind
'A fire broke out in the factory.'

The case alternation on the locutive allows us to test the source of
the case marking on the part NP. If case agreement is responsible
for the shared case marking, then when such verbs are used in the
Part-Whole Construction, we expect to find two possible case
patterns: the part- and whole-NPs should either be both dative or
both nominative. On the other hand, if these verbs can assign either
dative or nominative to their locutive subject argument, and case is
assigned independently to both whole and part-NPs, then there are in
principle four possible combinations of dative and nominative.
It turns out that for some speakers, all four possible
combinations of dative and nominative are acceptable. This surprising
fact is illustrated in (12):

(12) a. Kongpang-ey changko-ey pul-i ra-(a)s-ta.
factory-DAT/NOM fire-burn break-out-Pst-Ind

For such speakers, when such verbs are used in the Part-Whole
Construction, the case-marking on both whole and part-NPs varies
independently. For other speakers, only the (a,b) patterns are
acceptable. For ALL speakers, there is at least one case pattern,
namely the one in (12b) where the case marking on whole and part-NPs
differs. This is unexpected under the Case-agreement hypothesis, but
is consistent with the Direct Case Hypothesis, according to which
whole and part-NPs receive case independently, either from V or from
Inf, depending on surface position. I assume that dative is an
inherent, theta-related case, and that both whole- and part-NPs are
linked to a single argument position which is associated with dative.

2.2 Ditransitive Verbs

I have suggested that the Case on the part-NP is a function of
the Case-assigning properties of the matrix verb. Further support
for the Direct Case Hypothesis comes from another type of multiple
accusative construction in Korean, namely, ditransitive verbs. Many
ditransitive verbs (especially those formed with -gwa 'give') occur
with two case patterns on their complements (with no change in word
order): either DAT ACC or ACC ACC. These case alternations are
illustrated below:

I-Nom Yumi-DET shot-ACC give-Pst-Ind

I-Nom Yumi-ACC shot-ACC give-Pst-Ind
'I gave Yumi a shot.'

Suppose we combine the Part-Whole Construction with a ditransitive
verb whose goal argument can be either dative or accusative. This
combination is illustrated in (14):

(14) a. Kongpang-ey/l pul-i ra-(a)s-ta.
factory-DAT/NOM fire-burn break-out-Pst-Ind

b. Kongpang-ey changko-ey pul-i ra-(a)s-ta.
factory-DAT/NOM fire-burn break-out-Pst-Ind

Kongpang-ey/l pul-i ra-(a)s-ta.
The case-marking -gy on the part-NP is often called locative. However, since -gy and -gye are in complementary distribution, depending on the animacy of the NP, we assume they are allomorphs of a single morpheme which we gloss here as dative (Song 1984; 1988:65, 1988:66; 1994:167, fn. 231 p. 272). This assumption simplifies the n.1; Kim 1990:167, fn. 221). For some instances of the same case marker, nothing in our analysis depends on whether this dative particle is actually a case marker. For some speakers, all four case patterns in (14) are acceptable; for others, only the (a): (b) patterns are acceptable.  Therefore, in the case of the dative case on the part-NP in (14)? What, then, is the source of the dative case on the part-NP in (14)? If the part-NP does not get a semantically predictable locative case, then the dative on the part-NP in (14) must have some other source, related directly or indirectly to the case-assigning properties of the verb itself. As before, there are two possibilities to consider: either the verb assigns dative to the whole-NP and the part-NP gets dative via some other agreement, or the verb assigns dative to both whole- and part-NP, consistent with the Direct Case Hypothesis. As with locative existential verbs, we find that the case on the whole- and part-NPs can be either dative or accusative. The Direct Case Hypothesis predicts correctly that for ditransitive verbs such as which allow either dative or accusative on the goal argument, both dative and accusative will occur; the part-NP will exhibit case-alternations. These case alternations are entirely unexpected under the Agreement Hypothesis, which predicts the same case to occur on the co-indexed part of the whole-NP. If only one case occurs, either dative or accusative, then the whole- and part-NPs are expected to occur. For such verbs neither the whole-NP nor the part-NP can be dative. A locative marker on the part-NP in (17b) is grammatical even though the meaning of the sentence is clear; therefore, the grammaticality must be accounted for on syntactic rather than semantic grounds. We conclude that the dative in the examples in (15a,b) reflects the fact that the matrix verbs assign dative to their (goal objects); in other words, this use of dative is semantically-motivated. Adjectives typically bear some semantically appropriate case-markers/postpositions which is constant across verbs (type, voice, aspect, etc). This clearly contrasts with the dative that appears on part-NPs, which is licensed only for verbs that assign D to the relevant argument. We conclude that the part-NP does not get a semantically predictable locative case in Korean. Having excluded Case Agreement and locative case as possible sources, the only remaining source for case on the part-NP is the Vi; the part-NP gets case-marked in the same manner as any verbal argument. Dative case is possible on the part-NP if and only if the verb assigns dative case to the relevant argument. This is exactly as expected under the Direct Case Hypothesis.

4. THE ARGUMENT STATUS OF THE PART-NP

A basic distinction in the current literature is that of verbal argument vs. adjunct. What, if anything, does the case-marking tell us about the argument status of the part-NP? The criteria for determining whether something is an argument or an adjunct are notoriously fuzzy, see e.g. the controversy concerning the status of the II-phrase in passives: is it an argument? an adjunct? or stretching in between (Gristlov 1995) calls an N-adject? All locative possibilities have been excluded in the literature. We conclude that the part-NP is an adjectival NP with locative meaning (Young-Se Kwon 1986; O'Grady 1987)
b. the part-NP is a verbal argument (at least underlyingly):
   1. all Possessor Accusation analyses (in NG terminology, the part-NP is an underlying 2)
   2. within GB; James Yoon (1990); Choe (1987); possessor is the 'logical subject or object' (p. 101)

In the Possessor Accusation analysis of Relational Grammar, the part-
NP is considered a verbal argument: an 'initial' 2 which gets got an
adverb. Young-De Kang (1986) and O'Grady (1987) on the other hand
analyze it as an adversial NP with locative meaning, following an
observation originally due to Nino. Young-Joo Kim (1989; 1990, Ch.
6) argues that that the part-whole relation is an instance of
"secondary" predication, and assumes that the the whole-NP is the
subcategorized argument of the verb, whereas the part-NP is a
secondary predicate, i.e., a type of unselected adjunct. Ken Hale
(1981) also assumes that in the Kariipirz counterpart, the part-NP is
predicated of the whole-NP, with basically possible
positions on the argument status of the part-NP are represented in
the literature.

It is interesting, therefore, to compare and contrast the
arguments that have been used in support of these various hypotheses.
Once again, I will take the analysis of Young-Joo Kim (1990) as my
starting point, because it is by far the most precise acount in the
literature to date. The structure of her argument is as follows:

(19) Young-Joo Kim's (1990) argument
   1. the part NP is optional/inherent, hence it must be an
      adjunct
   2. if it is an adjunct, it cannot be theta-marked by V
   3. if it is not theta-marked by V, it cannot be Case-marked by
      V
   4. if it is not Case-marked by V, the overt case-marking must
      have other sources, namely, Case-agreement with the
      Possessor NP, which is an argument of V

Following Kang (1986), Young-Joo Kim (1990:206ff) takes optinility
as the primary diagnostic, based on the fact that adjuncts are always
optional; "free deletability is the most prominent property of
adjuncts as contrasted with arguments" (p.270). Absolutely true.
The problem, however, is that arguments can also be optional; pseudo-
transitives 'John ate'; even subjects are optional in some sense in
Korean and other radically prosodically languages. Moreover, since there
are no morphological markers for argumenthood, the data under-
determines the possible analyses. So, I'm going to take the opposite
track, taking advantage of the fact that there ARE overt morphological
markers for case in Korean, and let the data do the talking.

Recall the basic descriptive generalization: the part-NP bears
ALL AND ONLY the cases assigned by V to the relevant argument. In
Maling & Kim (1992), we used this generalization to argue that the
part-NP must be a subcategorized argument of V rather than an
unselected adjunct. The structure of our argument is outlined below:

(20) Maling & Kim (1990; 1992)
   a. the part-NP does NOT necessarily agree with its Possessor NP
   b. since it does not get case via agreement, it must be
      assigned Case from some other source
   c. since it does not get a semantically predictable (e.g.
      locative) case, it must get case from V
   d. since the part-NP may be assigned inherent Case by V,
      it must be theta-marked by V
   e. since the part-NP is theta-marked by V, it (and not the
      Possessor NP) is the subcategorized argument

The basic premise is that verbs can select for the form of their
arguments, but not for the form of adjuncts (see e.g. Grimshaw 1990: 105);
so a subcase is the standard assumption that lexical or inherent
Case is theta-related (Kuroyanagi et al. 1985; Chomsky 1980:196).
I have argued here that the part-NP gets its case directly from
V, like any verbal complement. Since in Korean, it appears that
structural case can be assigned to adversial adjuncts of various
kinds (see e.g. Maling 1989), the argument that the part-NP is an
argument is in fact a bit weaker than this. So let me take the time
now to emphasize the point about case-marking and argumenthood. Our
claim is that the case assigned to part-NPs be lexically
 governed, hence the part-NP must be an argument, not an adjunct. As
Grimshaw (1990:108) discusses, arguments can be selected and
subcategorized; arguments must be licensed, i.e. they must be theta-
 marked by a predicate as a function of the predicate's argument
structure. By way of contrast, adjuncts are not selected or
subcategorized, hence their form is free, and they are never required
by the argument structure of any predicate.

Consider some concrete examples. A Verb may impose requirements
on the form of its complements; more precisely, on the form of any
complement that it theta-marks. These requirements may be on either
the syntactic category of the complement or the lexical case-marking.

(21) category: NP vs PP reach NP 'reach the station'
      arrive [at NP] 'arrive at the station'
      come [to NP] 'come to the station'
      DAT, GEN, INJ

It is well-known that in many European languages (e.g. German, Is-
landic, Russian), certain verbs require their complements to bear a
certain lexical (or inherent) case. Such lexical case-marking is
associated with particular thematic arguments of a predicate; hence it
is possible only on arguments which are theta-marked. It follows
that only structural case can be assigned "exceptionally" (Em): no
them verb assigns oblique case to the extended subject even when it is
other wise an assigner of inherent case. The key property
is lexically-governed.

Thus, before we can conclude that the part-NP is actually a
verbal argument, it remains to show that the case it bears may be
lexically governed. I now summarize the evidence that the case-
marking on part-NP in Korean may be lexically governed. As far as I
am aware, the derivative that occurs with locative existential predicates
is fully productive, and thus does not bear on the issue at hand.
With ordinary transitive verbs, however, there are uses of dative that appear to be lexically-governed, in the sense that this information must be part of the lexical entry of particular predicates.\(^1\)

(22) dative as lexically-governed inherent case in Korean

a. nontransitives: DAT on object is lexically governed

\[\text{e.g., object of } \text{hjimasu 'kiss'; gahna 'talk to'; hajama-ha 'thank'; tagoo 'approach'; sinyimnak-ha 'threaten' either DAT or (preference) ACC (cf. hajama-ha 'threaten')}\]

b. ditransitives: DAT ACC only

\[\text{pooyu 'send'; sokseki 'whisper'; pgy 'stick'; pgy 'throw'; sinyimnak 'write'; sinyimnak 'promise', etc.}\]

\[\text{DAT ACC ACC ou 'give'; pbh 'give'; kalasik 'teach'; sinyimnak 'persuade'; ib 'load'; ppy 'rub', etc.}\]

c. complex verbs consisting of \(\text{V}_{\text{ACC}}\) only:

\[\text{sa-ou 'say'; chosu-ou 'find'; pooyu-ou 'shout'; kajaka-ou 'take to'}\]

\[\text{pa-ou 'sing'; cf. pulu DAT ACC only}\]

\[\text{sokseki-ou 'introduce'; cf. sokseki-ou DAT ACC only}\]

Although the verbal arguments which take dative are arguably all goals (or more rarely, sources or benefactives), this correlation is only one-way. Many goal arguments cannot bear dative. Note in particular that the Korean verb \text{neyap} 'to meet' can take either accusative or dative on its complement, but never dative (unlike Japanese). I assume therefore that this information must be included in the lexical entries of individual predicates. For ditransitives, ACC on the (animate) goal argument appears to be a lexically governed (nonanimate) case on the object argument (cf. \(\text{V}_{\text{ACC}}\) only). This alternation might better be interpreted as optional,\(^2\) with the assignment of DAT to the goal/source. Complex verbs consisting of \(\text{V}_{\text{ACC}}\) only inherit the case-assigning properties of the head \(\text{V}\) in allowing the case alternation.\(^3\) Although there is certainly morphological variation in which ditransitive verbs allow the ACC ACC idiomatic variation in which ditransitive verbs allow the ACC ACC the basic premise which inherent case is assigned only under theta-assignment, it follows that the part-NP is a verbal argument, and not on an unselected adjunct.

4. SELECTIONAL RESTRICTIONS

At this point the reader may well be wondering why the same arguments don't apply to the whole-NP, and if so, doesn't it also follow that the whole-NP is an argument? In a sense, the answer is yes, due to the well-known theta-theoretic problem posed by this construction that too (or more) \%E together fill one argument position in the verb's theta-grid. We assume following Yoon (1989) inter alia that the part-NP is an unstated nominal which licenses a possessor. Fortunately, there is additional evidence that points to the conclusion that it is the part-NP rather than the whole-NP which is subject-organized for.

First, there exist cases where the whole-NP gets some unexpected case. Some (but not all) speakers accept examples like (23a) below:

(23) a. kaen hagwa-mi-ku spegøy-ku eykoy sinyim-tul taguyi-eus-te-ya.

\[\text{just anger-DAT the hitch-DAT} \quad \text{choc-ACC hit-PST-IND} \quad \text{and then, out of anger, I hit the hitch on the cheek}\]

b. ....ku spegøy-ku eykoy dali taguyi-eus-te-ya.

\[\text{the hitch-DAT} \quad \text{acc-ACC hit-PST-IND} \quad \text{and then, out of anger, I hit the hitch on the/her car} \]

The verbs which allow this include \text{taguyi 'hit', cha 'kick' and chi 'slap.'} Whatever the source and meaning of the DAT on the whole-

NP, it is the part-NP which bears the case assigned by \(V\). The ungrammaticality of (23b) indicates that this is an instance of the Part-whole construction.

Secondly, and more importantly, there is clear evidence based on selectional restrictions that the part-NP is the subcategorized argument. Recall that Young-se Kang (1996:289ff) following Young-se Kang (1994) observes that part-NPs are optional, and uses this optionality as evidence in support for the claim that they are unselected adjuncts, whereas the (obligatory) possessor NP is the subcategorized argument of the verb. However, the validity of this generalization is open to doubt. Consider verbs such as \text{goop 'to pluck', nali 'to cut', and kkak 'to clip.'} Unlike examples with verbs such as \text{taguyi 'to hit' and cha 'to kick,'} the part-NP is not optional for these verbs. This is because these verbs impose selectional restrictions on their objects, as shown by the contrast between (24a) and (25):


\[\text{Chelosas-ka talk-ACC ppy-PST-IND} \quad \text{'Chelosas plucked the hen'}\]


\[\text{Chelosas-ka talk-ACC ppy-PST-IND} \quad \text{Chelosas cut the (long-haired) students} \]


\[\text{Chelosas-ka talk-ACC ppy-PST-IND} \quad \text{Chelosas plucked his mother} \]


\[\text{Chelosas-ka talk-ACC ppy-PST-IND} \quad \text{Chelosas cut the chickens} \]


\[\text{Chelosas-ka talk-ACC mawi-PST-IND} \quad \text{Chelosas cut the hair} \]


\[\text{Chelosas-ka talk-ACC ppy-PST-IND} \quad \text{Chelosas plucked the fingernail(s)} \]
These Korean verbs do not take animate objects except in the irrelevant (rather metaphorical) interpretation in which poop and call mean ‘to choose’ and ‘to fire’, respectively. When such verbs are used in the whole-part construction, we get idiolectal variation on the grammaticality judgments, as indicated by the percent sign:

   ‘Chelseko plucked the head.’
(b) Chelseko-xeul Ki-n habasyung-ul ulul cal-lam-ka. Chelseko-NOM hair-NOM long-BIL student-pl-acq hair-ACC cut
   ‘Chelseko cut the hair of the long-haired students’
   ‘Chelseko clipped his mother’s tail.’

Young-seo Kang (1986:95-96) reports that the whole-part construction is not possible with these verbs, and apparently considers these cases as ungrammatical himself. But we polled six native speaker linguists regarding the judgments of these examples, and all of them found these and similar examples either perfectly grammatical or “quite acceptable.” Young-joon Kim (1989:458ff/1990:1269, fn.6) independently noted that some speakers accept such sentences. It isn’t clear how best to account for the apparent idiolectal variation regarding these samples. It may be that some speakers accept a stricter “infillment” relation such that the whole NP must also satisfy the selectional restrictions imposed by the verb on its argument, the part NP.

Interestingly, Kang (1986:109, ex.6b) presents the following passive sentence as grammatical:

(27) [eul go-n ku habasyung-k sensanyng-ni=eyak] eul-go mull-xeul hair-NOM long-BIL that student-NOM teacher-NOM=by hair-NOM cal-lam-ses-te.
cut-PAT-PAT
   ‘That long-haired student got his hair cut by the teacher.’

But this implies that even according to his own judgments, there exists a grammatical passive which would have to be derived from the (for him) ungrammatical active counterpart in (26b). Because of the animacy restriction, for these verbs, it is the part-NP which is obligatory and the whole NP which appears to be optional. These verbs clearly select for the semantic properties (i.e., inanimacy) of the part-NP but not that of the whole-NP. This fact is consistent with the conclusion based on case-marking: the part-NPs are subcategorized for and hence must be s-selected. (Given that Korean is also a pro-drop language, the whole-NP can also, of course, occur as a pronoun’s (semantic) modifier inside the NP headed by the part NP).

Young-joon Kim (1990:270, ex. (16)) cites the following examples (which illustrate the same point: although she cites these as evidence in support of the opposite claim that the part NP is unsel ected adjunct rather than subcategorized argument). What such examples actually show is that for her BOTH whole and part NPs must satisfy the selectional restrictions:

   c. Compilki-van yu-nil yu-nil ttaoil-ees-ta. GNM ear

Note that even speakers who accept the examples in (28) reject (26b). The contrasts illustrated in these examples show that these verbs select for the semantic property of the part NPs (viz., ‘animate’) but not that of the whole NPs. This fact is thus consistent with the evidence from case-marking; the part-NPs are subcategorized for and therefore must be able to be s-selected.

Overall, we conclude that it is the part-NP which for all speakers must satisfy the lexical restrictions of the verb. As noted by James Yoon (1990), these selectional restrictions point to the conclusion that it is the part-NP rather than the possessor-NP which is the argument of the verb: treating the part-NP as an unselected adjunct does not capture this fact. Independent evidence for this conclusion comes from the case-marking patterns discussed in this paper. As we have shown here, the case marking on the Part-NP is a function of the case assigning properties of the matrix verb, even when this is lexically-governed. Since verbs can impose restrictions only on the form of their arguments, and not on the form of (unselected) adjuncts, we therefore conclude that part-NPs are arguments. It is expected, then, that part-NPs can also be s-selected since verbs can impose selectional restrictions only on the NPs they subcategorize.

**FOOTNOTES**

* I am indebted as always to Susan Kim for both native speaker judgments and fruitful discussion of the theoretical implications of the data. Much of this material is presented in our joint papers on Korean case-marking, in particular, Maling & Kim (1990); in press). I also benefitted from presenting this material to my graduate seminar in Korean syntax at Harvard University in the spring of 1991, and to the 4th Harvard Workshop on Korean Linguistics. Thanks to Mark Hale for providing the examples from Classical Greek. This research was inspired by the striking observation of Young-joon Kim (1989) that the possibility of multiple case constructions extends to verbs which assign dative case to their complements.

1. Such examples show that the claim that Possessor Accusation (i.e., a limited to hosts) heading a 2-Acc (Yoon 1989:168; Gerst 1991b) cannot be sustained. They also argue against the suggestion that Q-float as a subcase of Accusative (Bol 1986), since for next speakers, Q-float from dative argument is prohibited.

2. There are several different passives in Korean. The ci- and top-passives never assign ACC case to their complements. As discussed in Maling & Kim (1990; 1992), the lexical passive is ambiguous between a
syntaxic passive and a Case-assigning "adverbial" passive.

3. A number of speakers have suggested to me that the acceptability of the DAT DAT pattern in (a) is due to the tendency of younger speakers to pronounce -ny as -ny, however, phonetic confusion cannot be the correct account of the multiple datives, since semantical adverbs can be inserted between the two NPs:

(i) Koeuraey kapakalugdey changokyo-ny mil-1 na(-a)(ss)-ta.

factory-DAT all.of.a.mudden storeroom fire break.DAT-IND

Such adverbs cannot be inserted between a pronominal case modifier and the head N (except of course in genitival constructions).

4. This is independently noted by Cho (1987:100), who observed that all (ditransitive) verbs with the 'benefactive' marker (i.e., -mu) allow the ACC ACC case pattern, and by Hong (1991).

5. Example (c) is a little awkward, perhaps because of the three accusatives; it becomes perfect if the accusative on casu is dropped:

(i) New-ka 1uhl(1) plahui cu-naw-ss-ta. (transcribed)

The clausal is the marginal aspect of the fourth possible combination in (d).

6. Passivizing the examples in (14) produces the following patterns:

(a) Yuni-ey phai-ey paksuin-casu-nna noh-ac-ess-ss-ta. DAT DAT

Yuni-Gal arm-Dat vaccine-shot-nom give-pass-DAT-IND

b. Yuni-ka phai-ey paksuin-casu-nna noh-ac-ess-ss-ta. NOM DAT

Yuni-ka phai-ey paksuin-casu-nna noh-ac-ess-ss-ta. NOM NOM

Yuni was given a vaccine shot in the arm.

Given the passivizability of accusative on the part-HP in the active, it is unclear why nominative is not possible in the passive, that is, why there is no passive corresponding to (14c). Gerlach (1995b) accounts for this by hypothesizing that the part-HP is actually a locative, but this suggestion fails to account for the larger array of data discussed here and in Balling & Kim (in press), nor does it explain why dative on the part-HP is possible only for verbs which govern dative on the relevant argument.

Note that while the verb dat in the sense of 'give' allows either dative or accusative on the goal, in the sense of 'put', it allows only dative on the locative.

7. For arguments that accusative on the part-HP reflects the case-assigning properties of the predicate rather than whatever governs the assignment of accusative to various adverbials in Korean, see Naljig (1999:203).

8. The overtness of NOM/ACC markers unfortunately does not eliminate debate as to what they mark: case (NOM/ACC); GAs (acc) vs DAT; Focus markers (Jong-Purl Yoon 1990); or some combination of the above.

9. Thus we believe that some (but not all) uses of dative in Korean have been lexicalized, contra Gerlach (1991a:18, fn.6). We claim that non-standard Case in Korean is "a regular and not idiosyncratic feature in Korean" and never lexicalized.

10. See Ki-Sun Hong (1991a) for a list of other verbs which do or do not allow the alternation. Hong proposes to account for the case alternation in terms of Affectiveness. If this suggestion proves tenable, then the evidence for lexically-grounded case on the part-HP is reduced to the nontransitive verbs in (a).

11. Tengyo Byun (1951) discusses a type of compound verb which he argues is doubly-headed. If this suggestion is correct, the case-assigning properties of each head should pertain to the compound V.

12. As John Whitman (p.c.) notes, these are all verbs whose objects are thematically goals rather than themes.
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1 Introduction

Recently, a number of interesting studies have been done on scrambling ([Webelhuth 1989], [Ma- hajna 1990], [Saleh 1990], [Frey 1990], [Miyagawa 1990], etc.). Despite the difference in the kind of languages they deal with, all these studies take it for granted that scrambling is a movement phenomenon (cf. [Baltz 1981], [Webelhuth 1989]) and focus on the issue of its status as A or A-bar movement.2 Even though we know a lot about scrambling in terms of its A/A-bar properties by now, it is still not clear what the nature of scrambling is. In particular, the issue of whether scrambling is better analyzed as movement, as opposed to base-generation (cf. [Farnell 1980], [Rale 1982]), has not been completely resolved. Even if we accept the standard view that scrambling is movement, it doesn’t seem to fit any of the existing types of movement: it doesn’t seem to be indexed by the re- quirement of word order realization (A-movement), since not only an NP but also a PP can be scrambled,3 nor by the requirement of creating an operator-variable structure (A-bar movement), since in many scrambling languages such as Japanese and Korean, scrambling of wh-elements is not obligatory.

Given the similar situation concerning the nature of scrambling, event/process nominal clauses in Japanese and Korean constitute a useful testbed for these conflicting theories. As we will dis- cuss in section 2, an event nominal clause, where the head noun is followed by an aspect morpheme, exhibits different case arrays for the same argument structure, and different word or- der possibilities which are sensitive to the kind of clause which the arguments bear (cf. [Iida 1987], [Shibatani and Kageyama 1986], [Saleh 1990], [Miyagawa 1990], and [Cho and Saito 1991] for Japanese). The intricacy of the data serves to constrain certain details in the theory of grammar which have, until now, been left underdetermined.

In this paper, we focus on the data concerning case array and word order variation in event/process nominal clauses, propose an analysis of it, and discuss its consequences concerning case licensing and phrase structure, which are the main issues revolved around scrambling phenomena. I present the data in section 2. I review [Miyagawa 1990]’s analysis, and discuss its problems in section 3. I propose my own analysis in section 4, which maintains the main ideas in [Miyagawa 1990], but improves on his analysis. In section 5, I discuss some of the consequences of the analysis. Finally, I conclude the paper in section 6. Most of the examples are given in Korean, but the arguments hold for Japanese as well, unless otherwise specified.

2 Data Description

As discussed by [Iida 1987], [Shibatani and Kageyama 1986], [Saleh 1990], [Miyagawa 1990] for Japanese, and [Cho and Saito 1991] for Korean, a process/event noun (process-noun hereafter), as opposed to

2 This research has been partly funded by DARPA N00014-89-1-1843. I would greatly benefit from presenting this work at the LISA Summer Institute Workshop on Korean Syntax/Semantics Santa Cruz, 1988. It is a pleasure to thank Richard Campbell, Dong-Sha Chai, Stanislaw Dzikowski, Robert France, Joseph Hyman, Michael Neus, Beatrice Santorini, James Youn, Rebecca Zeevi for helpful discussions on the issues, and Young-Moo Cho, Bojanic Han, Kiyoshi Hori, Sun-Young Hong, Chang-Bong Lee, Namkoon Maksud, Hiroshi Tada, Tadeo Gruber, for their kind help.

3 Some typical diagnostics used to resolve this issue are anaphor pronoun binding, retraction effects, and case marking.

4 As for a claim that scrambling is induced by the requirements of case realization, see [Miyagawa 1990] and [Miyagawa 1990].