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CASE ASSIGNMENT IN THE INALIENABLE POSSESSION CONSTRUCTION IN KOREAN

In the Inalienable Possession Construction in Korean, the whole (possessor) and part (possessed) NPs typically agree in case. In this article, we argue that the apparent case-agreement is epiphenomenal. Investigation of verbs of various types that exhibit alternative case patterns reveals that the part-NP bears all and only the cases assigned by V to the relevant argument, whereas the whole-NP may bear either the case(s) assigned by V or nominative assigned by Ind, depending on its surface position. Thus the observed case-marking cannot be a consequence of case-agreement per se, but rather reflects direct case assignment by V and Ind independently to both part- and whole NPs. We call this the Direct Case Hypothesis. We further show that predication in small clause constructions is not marked by case-agreement in Korean, and suggest that case-agreement in this language is in fact limited to so-called Quantifier-floating. Finally, the evidence from case-marking is shown to shed light on the distinction between lexical versus syntactic passives.

1. THE KOREAN MULTIPLE CASE CONSTRUCTION

This paper discusses the principles for assigning case to the NPs in the so-called Inalienable Possession or Possessor Ascension Construction in Korean, illustrated in (1) and (2).1 Note in particular that passive converts the multiple accusative sentences into multiple nominative sentences.

(1) a. Cheollo-ka Sunt-i-lul pekiko-iss-ta.
Cheollo-Nom Sunt-Acc hair-Acc combing-be-Ind
‘Cheollo is combing Sunt’s hair.’

burglar-Nom Yumi-Acc arm-Acc break-Pst-Ind
‘The burglar broke Yumi’s arm.’

l-Nom banana-Acc skin-Acc peel-Pst-Ind
‘I peeled the banana.’

(2) a. Sunt-ka muri-kati ul pekiki-ii-iss-ta.
Sunt-Nom hair-Nom/Acc comb-pass-Ing-be-Ind
‘Sunt’s hair is being combed.’

In this paper we will argue instead for the hypothesis that the case that each of the part-NP(s) and the whole-NP bears is in fact assigned independently by the verb. We will refer to this as the Direct Case Hypothesis:

(3) **Direct Case Hypothesis**

a. the part-NP is assigned case directly by V

b. the whole-NP is assigned case either by V or by Infl, depending on its surface position

Note that the whole-NP always precedes the part-NP(s). We assume that nominative is assigned to [Spec, IP], and that VP-internal complements which do not bear some inherent oblique case will get either nominative or accusative depending on the case-assigning properties of the predicate. Note, however, that since only one NP can move to [Spec, IP], it follows that the part-NP(s), which must follow the whole-NP, will always be VP-internal. Nothing in our analysis hinges on the precise mechanisms by which nominative case is assigned or what makes assignment of nominative to NPs within VP possible. What turns out to be crucial, however, is the assumption that inherent case is theta-related.

If part-NP(s) get assigned case directly by the verb, it remains to be explained why they typically agree in case with the whole-NP. When we look more closely at the data, however, we find that the case-assignment analysis cannot be correct for two reasons: firstly, there are instances where the case marking does not agree, and secondly, predication relations are not typically marked by case agreement in Korean.

In Section 2 of this paper, we provide evidence in favor of the Direct Case Hypothesis, which correctly allows for those instances where the case marking diverges. In Section 3 we discuss the implicatures of our hypothesis for the analysis of the lexical passive in Korean. Section 4 discusses how limited case agreement under ‘small clause’ predication actually is in Korean. In the final section, we will discuss the implications of the Direct Case Hypothesis for the argument/adjunct status of the whole- and part-NPs.

2. **Evidence for Direct Case Assignment**

The most striking evidence for how part-NP(s) get assigned case comes from verbs with arguments that may occur in the dative. As first noted by Kim (1989), combining these with the Part-Whole Construction gives rise to *multiple dative* constructions. In this section we will consider two
major classes of verbs: locative existential verbs whose subjects can be either dative or nominative, and ditransitive verbs whose goal arguments are typically dative.

2.1. Dative Subject Verbs

The first evidence in support of the Direct Case Hypothesis comes from locative existential (or ‘locative inversion’ if Relational Grammar terminology) verbs of the type illustrated in (4):

(4) a. Konggang-ey pul-i na-(a)ss-ta.
    factory-Dat fire-Nom break.out-Pst-Ind
    ‘A fire broke out in the factory.’

b. Mikwuk-ey cin-i
    America-Dat earthquake-Nom
    na-(a)ss-ta. (Kim 1990, 167, 40b)
    occur-Pst-Ind
    ‘An earthquake occurred in America.’

These verbs can be used in the Part-Whole Construction, giving rise to multiple dative constructions, as illustrated in (5):

(5) a. Konggang-ey changkoe-ey pul-i
    factory-Dat storeroom-Dat fire-Nom
    na-(a)-ss-ta. Dat Dat
    break.out-Pst-Ind
    ‘A fire broke out in the factory in the storeroom.’

b. Mikwuk-ey sepu-ey cici-i
    America-Dat west-Dat earthquake-Nom
    na-(a)ss-ta. Dat Dat
    occur-Pst-Ind
    ‘An earthquake occurred in the western part of America.’

Note that the Part-Whole Construction is recursive; there is no principle limit on the number of part-NPs (see footnote 4 for examples).

How can we account for the shared case marking on whole- and part-NPs? There are two possible explanations to consider: either the verb assigns dative to the whole-NP and the part-NPs get dative via agreement, or the verb assigns case independently to both whole- and part-

NP as under the Direct Case Hypothesis. Both hypotheses predict the existence of the multiple dative sentences illustrated above. However, the two hypotheses make different predictions with respect to a larger set of data, to which we now turn. Although the theme argument of a locative existential verb is always nominative, the locative argument can be either dative or nominative (Gerits and Yoon 1989). This case alternation is illustrated below:

(6) a. Konggang-ey-i pul-i
    factory-Dat/Nom fire-Nom
    na-(a)ss-ta. Dat Nom, Nom Nom
    break.out-Pst-Ind
    ‘A fire broke out in the factory.’

b. Mikwuk-ey-i cici-i
    America-Dat/Nom earthquake-Nom
    na-(a)ss-ta. Dat Nom, Nom Nom
    occur-Pst-Ind
    ‘An earthquake occurred in America.’

The case alternation on the locative subject 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 (as in (5) above) or both nominative. On the other hand, if these verbs can assign either dative or nominative to their locative 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 indeed, all four possible combinations of dative and nominative are acceptable. This surprising fact is illustrated in (7) and (8):

(7) a. Konggang-ey changkoe-ey pul-i na-(a)ss-ta.
    Dat Dat Nom

b. Konggang-i changkoe-ka pul-i na-(a)ss-ta.
    Nom Nom Nom

c. Konggang-i changkoe-ey pul-i na-(a)ss-ta.
    Nom Dat Nom

d. Konggang-ey changkoe-ka-pul-i na-(a)ss-ta.
    Nom Nom Nom

(8) a. Mikwuk-ey sepu-ey cici-i na-(a)ss-ta.
    Dat Dat Nom

b. Mikwuk-i sepu-ke cici-i na-(a)ss-ta.
    Nom Nom Nom
We observe that when such verbs are used in the Part-Whole Construction, the case marking on both whole- and part-NPs varies independently. The case patterns in examples (c, d) where the case marking differs are unexpected under the Case-agreement Hypothesis, but are consistent with the Direct Case Hypothesis, receiving case independently, either from V or from Indl, depending on surface position. We 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 (for these verbs, optionally) associated with dative (see Section 5 for further discussion).

The variety of case patterns illustrated above for locative existential verbs contrasts sharply with the very restricted pattern found on true locatives. Since these locatives are not subjects, dative does not alternate with nominative (see Gerde and Youn (1989) for further discussion):

(9) a. Kongang-eye/-ey Cheli-ka myech sikan-ul anca-iss-ta. factory-Dat/-Nom Cheli-Nom a few hours-Acc sitting-be-Ind
   ‘Cheli was sitting in the factory for a few hours.’

b. Mikwuk-eye/-ey Cheli-ka salko-iss-ta. America-Dat/-Nom Cheli-Nom living-be-Ind
   ‘Cheli is living in America.’

(10) a. Kongang-eye/-ey changko-eye/-ey Cheli-ka myech factory-Dat/-Nom storeroom-Dat/-Nom Cheli-Nom a few sikan-ul anca-iss-ta. hours-Acc sitting-Trans
   ‘Cheli was sitting in the factory storeroom for a few hours.’

b. Mikwuk-eye/-ey sepu-eye/-ey Cheli-ka salko-iss-ta. America-Dat/-Nom west-Dat/-Nom Cheli-Nom living-be-Ind
   ‘Cheli is living in the western part of America.’

For such locatives, dative is the only possible case on both whole- and part-NPs. While this apparent case agreement is consistent with the Case-agreement Hypothesis as well, only the Direct Case Hypothesis can account for the nonagreeing case patterns found wherever case alternations exist independently of the Part-Whole Construction.

2.2. Ditransitive Verbs

We 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 -cwa ‘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:

(11) a. Cheli-ka ku yeey-eykey chayul cwa-wwa-ta. Dat Acc Cheli-Nom the girl-Dat book-Acc give-Pst-Ind
   ‘Cheli gave the girl a book.’

b. Cheli-ka ku yeey-lul chayul cwa-wwa-ta. Acc Acc Cheli-Nom the girl-Dat book-Acc give-Pst-Ind
   ‘Cheli gave the girl a book.’

   ‘I gave Yumi a shot.’

   ‘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 (13):

give-Pst-Ind
   ‘Nay gave Yumi a shot.’

b. Nay-ka Yumi-lul phal-ey cwa-wwa-lul noh-asa-ta. Acc Acc I-Nom Yumi-Dat arm-Dat shot-Acc give-Pst-Ind
   ‘Nay gave Yumi a shot.’

c. Nay-ka Yumi-lul phal-lul cwa-wwa-lul noh-asa-ta. Acc Acc I-Nom Yumi-Dat arm-Dat shot-Acc give-Pst-Ind
   ‘Nay gave Yumi a shot.’

   ‘Nay gave Yumi a shot.’

The case marking -ey on the part-NP is often called locative. However, since -ey and -eykey 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, n. 1), Kim (1990, 167, tr. 22, p. 272)). This assumption simplifies the state-
ment of lexical requirements, and allows us to consider -ey and -eykey
instances of the same case.

What, then, is the source of the dative case on the part-NP in (13)? If
the part-NP does not get a semantically predictable locative case in
Korean, then the dative on phal 'arm' in (13) must have some other
source, related directly or indirectly to the case-assigning properties of
the verb mah 'injekt'. As before, there are two possibilities to consider:
either the verb assigns dative to the whole-NP and the part-NP gets
dative via agreement, or the verb assigns case to both whole- and part-
NPs, consistent with the Direct Case Hypothesis.

As with locative existential verbs, we find that the case on the whole-
and part-NPs can vary independently: it can be either dative or accu-
sative. This surprising fact is consistent with our claim that matrix verb
assigns case directly to both part- and whole-NPs. The Direct Case
Hypothesis predicts correctly that for ditransitive verbs such as these
which allow either dative or accusative on the goal argument, both part-
and whole-NP will exhibit case-alternations. These case alternations
are entirely unexpected under the Case-agreement Analysis, which
predicts the same cases to occur on the co-indexed NPs, either Dat Dat
or Acc.Acc, but neither Dat Acc nor Acc Dat are expected to occur.

By way of contrast, consider the verb pak 'to stick', which allows only
dative on the goal argument, as illustrated in (14).

(14) Roman-Pl-Nom Yeyoun-nim-kkey*ul mos-ul pak-ass-ta.
Roman-Nom Jesus-Hom-Dat/*Acc nail-Acc stick-Past-Ind
'The Romans stuck a nail in Jesus.'

As predicted under the Direct Case Hypothesis, only dative is possible
on the part-NP in the Part-Whole Construction in both active and
(lexical) passive versions. This is illustrated in (15).

(15) a. Roman-Pl-Nom Yeyoun-nim-kkey son-ey*ul mos-ul
Roman-Nom Jesus-Hom-Dat hand-Dat/*Acc nail-acc
pak-ass-ta.
stick-Past-Ind
'The Romans stuck a nail in Jesus' hand.'

b. Yeyoun-nim-i son-ey*ul mos-ul
Jesus-Hom-Nom hand-Dat/*Nom/Acc nail-Acc
pak-bi-si ess-ta.
stick-Pass-Hom-Past-Ind
'Jesus had a nail stuck in his hand.'

(Note the accusative case on mah 'nail' in (15b); unlike the periphrastic
-of-passive, a lexical passive verb is an accusative case assigner; See
Section 3 for further discussion.) The obligatoriness of dative in the
active is consistent with both the Case-agreement Hypothesis and the
Direct Case Hypothesis. The observed case pattern in the passive, how-
er, is expected only under the Direct Case Hypothesis. Since the goal
argument is obligatorily dative, the Direct Case Hypothesis predicts
correctly that in the active both part- and whole-NP must be dative,
while in the passive, only the part-NP is dative. This contrast is sharply
with ditransitive verbs, such as mah 'give' in example (13), which allow
either dative or accusative on the goal argument.

To conclude, we have shown that the part-NP does not get case under
agreement with the whole-NP. Rather it gets its case like any other
argument of the verb. As predicted by the Direct Case Hypothesis,
dative is possible on the part-NP if and only if the verb assigns dative
case to the relevant argument, and nonagreeing case patterns are found
wherever case alternations exist independently of the Part-Whole
Construction.

2.3. Other Multiple Dative Constructions

Further evidence bearing on how part-NPs get case comes from sen-
tences containing verbs which lexically assign dative to their objects.
Such verbs in Korean include kiusuha 'kiss', maulu 'talk to'), and takao
'approach'. As first observed by Kim (1969), such verbs can appear in
the multiple case construction, and when they do, both the whole-NP
and the part-NP must be dative. This is illustrated in (16):

1-Nom Yumi-Dat head-Dat/*Acc kiss-Past-Ind
'I kissed Yumi on the forehead.'

1-Nom Inho-Dat ear-Dat talk do-Past-Ind
'I whispered to Inho.'

c. Ai-ka emen-eykey plum-yu/ ul kiese
child-Nom mother-Dat breast-Dat/*Acc crawling
akaw-ass-ta.
approach-Past-Ind
'The child crawled to the mother's breast.'
As noted above, the Part-Whole Construction is recursive; there is in principle no limit on the number of dative part-NPs, as illustrated by the following example from Y.-J. Kim (1990, 271, ex (17)):

(17) Nay-ka Yumi-ekey ima-eey ohoncok-eey
    I-Nom Yumi-Dat forehead-Dat right-side-Dat
    kissuhayess-ta.
    kiss-Pst-Ind

    ‘I kissed Yumi on the right side of the forehead.’

2.3.1. Case Alternations under Passive: Dative Objects

These multiple dative examples are consistent with both the Case-agreement Hypothesis and the Direct Case Hypothesis. However, when we consider the (periphrastic) passives of these verbs which assign lexical (inherent) dative to an argument NP, we see that only the Direct Case Hypothesis remains viable. In languages like Icelandic, inherent case is preserved under NP-movement (Zaanen et al. (1985)); in Korean, however, this is not true.13 Unlike Icelandic, dative objects often resist passivization in Korean; for example, the verb takesi ‘to approach/contact’ which takes a dative object, has no passive. We leave for future research the problem of determining the conditions under which a cpassive or toypassive exists and whether dative can or cannot be preserved in such a passive. Relevant factors surely include whether dative is obligatory in the active (i.e., whether dative on the goal argument alternates with accusative) and the argument status of the theme. What is important here is that the assignment of dative is lexically governed.

Consider first a verb for which dative must be preserved in the cpassive. The dicative verb soksa ki- ‘whisper’ takes only Dat Ace (and not Ace Ace) in the active, and in the passive, Dat Nom is the only possible case pattern, as illustrated in (18):

    I-Nom Inho-Dat secret-Ind Dat Ace
    pimilul soksa-ki-ess-ta.
    whisper-Pst-Ind

    ‘I whispered a secret to Inho.’

b. Inho-ekey ‘ka pimilul soksa-ki-ess-ta.
    Dat Nom, *Nom Nom

    ‘The secret was whispered to Inho.’

When NP is the derived subject in (18b) is open to question, but since a -ci passive is not an accusative case assigner, pimil ‘secret’ can only be

nominative in the passive even if it is the retained object rather than derived subject.

With this in mind, consider what happens when this verb is used in the Part-Whole Construction:

    I-Nom Inho-Dat ear-Dat/Acc secret-Acc whisper-Pst-Ind

    ‘I whispered the secret into Inho’s ear.’

b. Inho-ekey kwatul pimilul
    Inho-Dat ear-Dat/Acc secret-Nom
    whisper-Pst-Ind

    ‘The secret was whispered into Inho’s ear.’

c. Inho-ka kwatul pimilul
    Inho-Nom ear-Dat/Acc secret-Nom
    whisper-Pst-Ind

The theme pimil ‘secret’ bears accusative case in the active, but nominative in the passive, as expected. The whole-NP can be either dative as in (19b) or (surprisingly) nominative as in (19c). What is significant is the fact that the part-NP must remain dative in both instances, even when the possessor NP is nominative. The Case-agreement Hypothesis predicts that in (19c) the part-NP should be nominative under coincidence with the possessor NP; but in fact, nominative is simply impossible. The observed case patterns follow immediately from the Direct Case Hypothesis, however, since this verb assigns only dative to the goal as an internal argument.

Now consider a verb for which there is no case preservation in the passive. Recall that the simple transitive verb kissu-ka takes a dative object.

    I-Nom Yumi-Dat hair-Acc
    kissu-ka
    howess-ta.
    how-Pst-Ind

    ‘I gave Yumi a kiss on the forehead.’

    Yumi-Nom hair-Acc
    kissu-ka
    get-(Pass)-Pst-Ind

    ‘Yumi got kissed on the forehead.’
(20) c."Yumi-eykey imu-e yisuk-ka toy-(eexi)-esst-ta.
Yumi-Dat forehead-Dat kiss-Nom get(Pass)-Pst-Ind

In the light verb construction, the theta-marking noun (cf. Grimshaw and Mester (1988)) yisu bears accusative in the active voice, but nominative in the passive voice. It is unclear to us why the possessor NP cannot be dative in the passive, but the fact that the part-NP must remain dative is exactly as expected under the Direct Case Hypothesis, since it is syntactically inert and remains in VP-internal position, where it receives the dative case obligatorily assigned to the goal argument.

2.3.2. Other Dat Acc Patterns

For some speakers, certain verbs like stayli ‘hit, beat’, cha ‘kick’ and chi ‘slap’, which never assign dative to their objects, nonetheless allow the whole-NP to be marked dative if there is a part-NP bearing accusative. This is illustrated in (21):

1-Nom Yumi-Acc*Dat hit-Pst-Ind
stayli: Acc, *Dat

b. Nay-ka Yumi-ilu ppaym-ul/ey
1-Nom Yumi-Acc cheek-Acc*Dat
hit-Ind
stayli-ess-ta.
Acc, *Acc Dat

‘hit Yumi on the cheek.’

(22) a. Nay-ka Yumi-eykey ppaym-ul/ey
stayli-ess-ta.
Dat, *Dat Dat

Whatever the source of the dative case on Yumi in (21c), such examples provide further support for the claim that it is the part-NP which is subcategorized for and case-marked by the verb (see Section 5 for further discussion). Since stayli ‘hit’ never assigns dative to its object, it follows from the Direct Case Hypothesis that the part-NP can never be dative. This is true even when there is more than one part-NP, as shown in example (22).

We leave for future research the problem of determining what licenses the dative case-marking on the possessor NP in such examples for some speakers.

3. Lexical vs. Syntactic Passive

Further evidence that the case on the part-NP is determined by the verb comes from the apparent alternation between nominative and accusative in the lexical passive, as illustrated below:

1-Nom child-Acc hand-Acc hold-Pass-Pst-Ind
‘I held the child by the hand.’

child-Nom hand-Nom/Acc hold-Pass-Pst-Ind
‘The child was held by the hand.’

Much of the literature gives the impression that nominative and accusative are in free variation. However, as noted independently by Maling (1989) and Kim (1990), the two case-marking patterns actually have different distributions. The part-NP bears accusative case only in the so-called lexical passive; in the periphrastic c-passive, the part-NP can only be nominative. This difference is illustrated by the contrast between (24a, b):

(24) a. Inho-ka son-i *ul mul-li
1-Nom hand-Nom/Acc bite-Pass
eat-Pst-Ind
‘Inho was bitten on the hand.’

lexical passive
1-Nom hand-Nom/Acc bite-Pass-Pst-Ind

Of course, if passive morphology always results in case absorption, then we would expect only nominative on the part-NP, and never accusative. What, then, is the source of the accusative in the lexical passive? We assume that the morphological lexical passive is syntactically ambiguous between a direct passive which absorbs accusative case and an indirect 'adversity' passive which adds a benefactive/malefactive subject argument and assigns accusative case to its complements (Maling...
In both types of passive, the whole-NP is the surface subject and gets nominative case, while the part-NP remains in V-head position where it can receive the case assigned by the V. In other words, nominative and accusative are not in free variation, but are determined by the different case-assigning properties of the lexical passive verb. This is exactly as required under the Direct Case Hypothesis.

Support for this suggestion comes from the observation that the Nom-Acc pattern is subject to an animacy constraint, in that the subject must be an “object of empathy, ... animate object or an anthropomorphized inanimate object” (Kim (1990, 287); see also Lee (1973, 150)).

book-Nom cover-Nom-Acc hold-Pass-Pst-Ind
‘The book was held by the cover.’

b. Mun-i kwonnye-ka *ful
door-Nom middle-Nom-Acc
punch-Pass-Pst-Ind
‘The door, (its) middle part got punched.’

The reason that the part-NPs in (25) cannot bear accusative is that the inanimate subjects cannot be interpreted as (adversely) affected arguments; for a given lexical passive verb, accusative case on the part-NP is usually determined by the animacy of the subject, as illustrated by the contrast in (26):

(26) a. Ai-ku pal-4i
child-Nom foot-Nom/Acc
palm-hi-ess-ta.
stomp-Pass-Pst-Ind
‘The child was stomped on the foot.’

b. Kooch-i cwolli-ka *ful
flower-Nom stalk-Nom-Acc
palm-hi-ess-ta.
stomp-Pass-Pst-Ind
‘The flower stalk was stomped on.’

Examples like the following, often cited in the literature, are in fact atypical, since inanimate subjects are usually incompatible with the adversity passive analysis. In fact, many speakers find them less than perfect with accusative on the part-NP:

(27) Ku nanu-ka kaci-ka/1ul
that tree-Nom branch-Nom/Acc
cal-li-ess-ta.
cut-Pass-Pst-Ind
‘That tree was trimmed.’

Kim’s (1990, 287) suggestion that some sort of anthropomorphization underlies the use of accusative case in such examples seems plausible, especially in light of the considerable idiosyncratic variation that exists, it may be worth noting that kaci ka/ul can be used as a compound verb meaning ‘to trim.’ There is a subtle difference in meaning correlated with the difference in case on the part-NP, which for some speakers becomes sharper with the addition of a floating quantifier:

(28) a. Ku namu-ka kaci-ka
that tree-Nom branch-Nom
hankay-ka cal-li-ess-ta.
cut-Pass-Pst-Ind
‘That tree was trimmed one branch.’

The nominative version is a straightforward passive, an objective description of the event. The accusative version in (28b), which should be odd as an adversity passive with an inanimate subject, resists modification. This is consistent with the suggestion that it is really a compound verb meaning ‘to trim,’ a process which does not normally entail the precise counting of branches cut. With a true adversity passive, there is no such restriction on the addition of quantifiers:

(29) Ai ku sonkadak al
child-Nom finger-Acc
hankay-ful
cut-Pass-Pst-Ind
‘The child had one finger cut.’

This supports our suggestion that the lexical passive is indeed ambiguous between a true syntactic passive and a syntactically active adversity construction.

Further support for the syntactic ambiguity of the (morphological) lexical passive comes from the observation that the Nom-Acc pattern can be used for both alienable and inalienable possession, whereas the Nom-Nom case pattern is “strictly limited to the inalienable possession relationship, and they have active counterparts of the Acc-Acc pattern” (Kim (1990, 287)). Thus, lexical passives of the Nom-Acc type do not always have active sources: where the relation is not one of inalienable possession, an active counterpart does not exist, and only Acc is possible on the part-NP. This is illustrated in (30) (taken from Maling (1989, 304, ex. 27a,b)) and (31):

(30) Ku namu-ka kaci-ka/1ul
that tree-Nom branch-Nom/Acc
hankay-ka cal-li-ess-ta.
cut-Pass-Pst-Ind
‘That tree was trimmed.’
(30) a. Mary-ka Cheli-ekey kwacal-ul *ka
    Mary-Nom Cheli-Dat cookies-Acc/*Nom
tamek-bi-ess-ta.
    Alienable Possession
cat-Pass-Pst-Ind
    'Mary had her cookies eaten by Cheli.'

    Cheli-Nom Mary-Acc cookies-Acc cat-Pst-Ind
    Cheli took and ate Mary's cookies.

(31) a. Yumi-ka kapang-ul *
    Yumi-Nom bag-Acc/*Nom
mul-li-ess-ta.
    Alienable Possession
bite-Pass-Pst-Ind
    'Yumi's bag was bitten.'

    dog-Nom Yumi-Acc bag-Acc bite-Pst-Ind
    'The dog bit Yumi's bag.'

Since being an accusative case assigner is a syntactic property of the lexical passive verb, part-NPs will necessarily share the same case when they are VP-internal, as illustrated in example (32), taken from Y.-J. Kim (1990, 289, ex. 42):

(32) Yumi-ka k'ay-ekey kapang-ul gyncook-ul *
    Yumi-Nom dog-Dat bag-Acc left-side-Acc/*Nom
kkuth-ul *
    mul-li-ess-ta.
    end-Acc/*Nom bite-Pass-Pst-Ind
    'Yumi had her bag bitten on the left side at the end by a dog.'

As noted by Y.-J. Kim (1990, 289–90), this is true even when the part-NP can be marked either nominative or accusative in the lexical passive, all the following part-NPs must get the same case marker, as illustrated in (33):

(33) a. Yumi-ka phlul gyncook-ul *ul k'kuthul
    Yumi-Nom arm-Nom left-side-Nom/*Acc end-Nom
cap-bi-ess-ta.
    catch-Pass-Pst-Ind

Thus absorption of accusative case cannot be simply optional for the VP-internal part-NPs; rather it is a case property of the verb. This is consistent with our hypothesis that the part-NP(s) get case directly from the matrix V.

Note that this is true not just for the Part-Whole Construction; all verbal arguments must be nominative in ci- and toy-passives.17 Hence multiple accusative constructions turn into multiple nominative constructions, as illustrated by the following examples adapted from Maling (1989, 298f.):

(34) a. Cheli-ka Mary-lul pancli-lul h'yesa-ta Active
    Cheli-Nom Mary-Acc ring-Acc gift-Acc do-Pst-Ind
    'Cheli presented Mary with a ring.'

b. Mary-ka punci-ka semmul-i toy-ess-ta Passive
    Mary-Nom gift-Nom become-Pst-Ind
    'Mary was presented with a ring.'

Kim (1990, 286) also assumes that accusative on part-NPs is the result of accusative case marking by lexical passive verbs; thus, in the 'adversity' passive, both part-NP and whole-NP must be licensed and case-marked independently, not via case agreement, even when the semantic relation of Inalienable Possession happens to be satisfied.

We have seen that even though in general, part-NPs "must all agree in Case with their highest inalienable possessor" (Kim 1990, 289)), this fact must have an explanation other than case agreement.18 Fortunately this apparent case agreement is also compatible with the Direct Case Hypothesis. Under the Case-agreement Analysis, we expect that whenever the whole-NP becomes the derived subject of a syntactic passive and receives nominative case, the coindexed part-NPs will also receive nominative case. This is not what we observe, however. Under the Direct Case Hypothesis, on the other hand, the part-NP will always be case-marked by the verb since it remains internal to VP. However, since ci- and toy-passives are not accusative-case assigners, the end result is usually the same: nominative case is assigned to both part-NP and the
(derived) surface subject. However, the two hypotheses make different predictions with respect to the larger set of data discussed above in Section 2.

4. **THE CASE OF PREDICATE COMPLEMENTS IN KOREAN**

In many languages, a predicative complement or secondary predicate must agree in case with the NP it is predicated of. This phenomenon is illustrated with the following examples of small clause complements from Icelandic. Note that the case marking on an objective complement switches from accusative to nominative when the subject of the small clause is passivized.

    'Icelanders chose her-Acc president-Acc
    'Icelanders elected her president in 1980.'

    b. hinn var kosin forsuti 1980.
    she-Nom was chosen president-Nom
    'She was elected president in 1980.'

(36) a. Eg taldi [Harald allaf stólan af sjálftum sér].
    I consider Harold-Acc all-Acc proud-Acc of himself
    'Harald is considered all-Acc proud-Nom of himself

In Korean, however, small clause constructions do not typically exhibit case agreement. As Kim herself notes, "the workings of Case-agreement here are not very productive" (p. 273), being limited to two verbs, mantul 'make' and sam 'make', 'which take only small clauses, and never take copular complements' (p. 274, fn. 10). Even for these two verbs, accusative alternates with instrumental.

(37) a. Nas-ka aialul uyya-koral
    I-Nom child-Acc doctor-Instr/Acc
    make-Pst-Ind
    'I made my child a doctor.'

    b. Inho-ka ku aialul chinkwa-lo/lul
    Inho-Nom that child-Acc friend-Instr/Acc
    sam-ass-ta.
    make-Pst-Ind
    'Inho made that child a friend.'

Kim (1990, 273–4) takes the possibility of accusative in (37a) as evidence for case agreement; the fact that only instrumental is possible in the passive version undermines this argument.

    child-Nom doctor-Instr/Nom make-Pass-Pst-Ind
    'My child was made a doctor.'

    that child-Nom friend-Instr/Nom make-Pass-Pst-Ind
    'That child was made a friend.'

In fact, for most verbs, instrumental is the only possible case on an objective complement, and for such verbs, objective complements never exhibit case agreement, as illustrated in the following examples:

    I-Nom child-Acc doctor-Instr/Acc make-Pst-Ind
    'I brought my child up to be a doctor.'

    child-Nom doctor-Instr/Acc Nom make-Pass-Pst-Ind
    'My child was brought up to be a doctor.'

    voter-Nom he-Acc president-Instr/Acc choose-Pst-Ind
    'The voters elected him president.'

    he-Nom president-Instr/Nom choose-Pass-Pst-Ind
    'He was elected president.'

    he-Nom Yumi-Acc genius-Instr/Acc consider-ing he-Nom
    'He considers Yumi a genius.'
(41) b. Yumi-ka cheney-byo!*ha yeki-ce-ko-iss-ta.  
Yumi-Nom genius-Inoc.*Nom consider-Pass-ing-be-Ind  
‘Yumi is considered a genius.’

Note that the objective complements stay instrumental in the passive, despite the case change in the underlying object NP from accusative to nominative. We conclude that predication does not entail case agreement in Korean. We speculate that in small clause and Exceptional Case Marking (ECM) constructions, only Spec position is transparent to case marking by the matrix verb, and that in Korean, unlike Icelandic, there is no mechanism for transmitting the case marking assigned to that position to complements of the embedded verb.13 This might be correlated with the general lack of subject-verb agreement (Spec-Head agreement) in Korean.

Secondly, consider Korean counterparts to ECM constructions. While the analysis of such constructions is controversial, it is clear that the nominative case marking on predicate NP complements to the verb be cannot be analyzed as case agreement with the subject, since the case remains nominative even when the embedded subject is marked accusative by the matrix ECM verb.

Yumi-Nom fool-Nom note-be-Past-Inf  
‘Yumi was not a fool.’

I-Nom [Yumi-Acc fool-Nom/*Acc note-be-Suspect-Comp]  
believe-Past-Ind  
‘I believed Yumi not to be a fool.’

Contrast the obligatory nominative on the embedded predicate nominal in (42b) with the obligatory accusative case marking on the Icelandic counterparts:

(43) a. Haraldur er vondur kokkur.  
Harold-Nom is bad cook-Nom  
‘Harold is a bad cook.’

b. Ragnhildur taldi [Harald vera vondur kokk]  
Ragnhildur believed Harold-Acc to-be bad cook-Acc  
‘Ragnhildur believed Harold to be a bad cook.’

Once again, we see that predication is not marked by case agreement in Korean. While this observation in no way undermines a predication analysis of the Part-Whole Construction, it does show that to the extent that there is case agreement, the agreement cannot be due to predication.

Kim’s suggestion is that part-NPs are “unselected minor predications of the semantic relation possession” which fits in the paradigm of predication relations. Her analysis is motivated by (i) cross-linguistic observations that minor predication licenses Case agreement; and (ii) the fact that some languages exhibit, to a limited extent, minor predication based on the possession relationship” (p. 301). Although copular relations are typically marked by case agreement cross-linguistically, the possession relation is not, even when a copula is used.

5. SELECTIONAL RESTRICTIONS ON PART-NPS

The Part-Whole Construction has other syntactic properties of note to which we now turn. Basically, two types of restrictions on part-NPs have been observed: selectional ones and syntactic ones. As observed by Kang (1986, 95–97), there are cases in which the part-NP must satisfy the lexical restrictions of the verb; treating the part-NP as an unselected adjunct does not account for this fact (Yoon 1990, 502–510). Since verbs can impose selectional restrictions on the NPs they subcategorize for, it is expected that part-NPs must be able to be a-selected. We conclude, therefore, that the part-NP is a subcategorized argument of the verb. Independent evidence for this conclusion comes from the case marking on part-NPs, which we have demonstrated is a function of the case-assigning properties of verbs. For discussions of the syntactic restrictions on part-NPs, see Kim (1990), Yoon (1989), and Maling and Kim (forthcoming); see also Cheng and Ritter (1988) for Mandarin Chinese and French. We assume that the syntactic inerrness of the part-NP is derivable from the fact that it is never referential.

Selectional restrictions have sometimes been used to argue for the adjunct status of part-NPs (Kang 1986, Kim 1990), a conclusion at odds with the case-marking data reported here. Kim (1990, 269ff) following Kang (1986) observes that part-NP are generally optional. Since “free deletability is the most prominent property of adjuncts as contrasted with arguments” (p. 270), the optionality of the part-NPs is provided as evidence in support for the claim that they are unselected adjuncts, whereas the whole-NPs are the subcategorized arguments of the verbs. But the validity of this generalization is open to doubt.
Consider verbs such as pprop ‘to pluck’, onul ‘to cut’, and kkak ‘to clip’ with respect to the Part-Whole Construction, as illustrated in (44): 10

\[
(44) \begin{align*}
\text{a. Chelsoo-ka talk-ul *(thel-ul) pprop-ass-ta.} \\
\text{Chelsoo-Nom hen-Acc feather-Acc pluck-Pst-Ind} \\
\text{‘Chelsoo plucked the hen.’} \\
\text{b. Chelsoo-ka meli-ka kin haixyang-tul-ul *(meli-lul) } \\
\text{Chelsoo-Nom hair-Nom long student-pl-Acc hair-Acc} \\
\text{cut-Pst-Ind} \\
\text{‘Chelsoo cut the hair of the long-haired students.’} \\
\text{c. Chelsoo-ka emeni-lul *(sonthop-ul) kkakka-tuli-es-ta.} \\
\text{Chelsoo-Nom mother-Acc nail-Acc clip-Hon-Pst-Ind} \\
\text{‘Chelsoo clipped his mother’s nails.’}
\end{align*}
\]

The part-NPs are not optional for these verbs, unlike for verbs such as tuyi ‘hit’ and chu ‘kick’. These verbs do not take an animacy object except in the irrelevant (rather metaphorical) interpretation in which pprop and onul mean ‘to choose’ and ‘to fire’, respectively. Hence, for these verbs, it is the part-NP which is obligatory, and the whole-NP can be optional (given that Korean is also a pro-drop language):

\[
(45) \begin{align*}
\text{a. Chelsoo-ka pro thel-ul pprop-ass-ta.} \\
\text{Chelsoo-Nom feather-Acc pluck-Pst-Ind} \\
\text{b. Chelsoo-ka pro meli-lul cal-las-ta.} \\
\text{Chelsoo-Nom hair-Acc cut-Pst-Ind} \\
\text{c. Chelsoo-ka pro sonthop-ul kkakka-tuli-es-ta.} \\
\text{Chelsoo-Nom nail-Acc clip-Hon-Pst-Ind}
\end{align*}
\]

(Of course, the whole-NP can also occur as a nominal modifier with genitive case inside the NP headed by the part-NP.) The contrasts illustrated in (44a–c) show that these verbs select for the semantic property of the part-NP (viz., –animate) but not that of the whole-NP. This fact is thus consistent with the Direct Case Hypothesis: the part-NPs are subcategorized for and hence must be able to be s-selected.

What then licenses the whole-NP? Various linguists have observed that certain nouns are ‘relational’ in the sense that they always have an (implicit) possessor (cf. Tellier (1989), Yoon (1989), Croft (1990) inter alia). Cross-linguistically, relational nouns include body parts and kinship terms. Nouns with relational interpretations may be thought of as having an open position for an implicit possessor, or an unarticulated argument structure (Yoon (1990)). Put differently, the distinction between ordinary nouns and relational nouns is that the former do not have any open position to be saturated, whereas the latter do.

Speas (1990, chapter 2) defines three different kinds of theta-relations: theta-marking, theta-identification, and theta-identification (see also Higginbotham (1985)). A verb theta-marks its argument, which is to turn theta-binds an open position in the argument structure of the verb II, on the other hand, the argument itself has an open position to be saturated, then the verb does not theta-mark but theta-identifies the argument (here, the part-NP), which in turn theta-binds another NP (here, the whole-NP) which is licensed by an unarticulated position in the part-NP, the whole-NP theta-binds the open position in the argument structure of the part-NP. Notice that under this view, the whole-NP is an argument of the part-NP and not of the verb; hence the verb does not theta-mark the whole-NP. This means that the verb still has a theta-role to be discharged in the mode of theta-marking, but it may not theta-mark the whole-NP, its true argument, for the reason just discussed. Therefore, the whole-NP and the part-NP together theta-bind the open position in the verb’s argument structure in a compositional manner in order to allow the verb to discharge its theta-role in the mode of theta-marking. From this, it then follows that the whole-NP and the part-NP appear to share the same theta-role, which explains the fundamental property of the Part-Whole Construction with respect to the Theta Criterion. Indepedent support for this claim comes from the fact that when a theta-related inherent case is optionally assigned to a particular thematic argument (e.g., goal), the inherent case varies independently on the whole- and part-NPs which share that theta-role. In other words, even though it is not an argument of V, the whole-NP can be assigned inherent case by V because it is associated with a particular theta-role (e.g., goal) which is in turn associated with a particular inherent case.

This analysis then predicts that the Part-Whole Construction is universally available, which is however not what we observe. Following the suggestion of Yoon (1990), we assume that the availability of the Part-Whole Construction correlates with the case properties of the languages in question, in that this construction is available only if such languages have the Case-theoretic resources to provide case to both whole- and part-NPs. An option used by many languages is to use some oblique case to mark the semantic relation of Possessor. In Korean, on the other hand, accusative case can be assigned to any NP within the
maximal projection of V, i.e., within VP can be considered the Case Domain (Lee (1991), and also Sigurðsson (1989) for Icelandic) within which accusative can be assigned. We assume that there is no principled limit on the number of NPs which can receive accusative case within this domain, thus making it possible to assign case to both whole- and part-NPs.

6. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have investigated the principles for assigning case to the NPs in the Part-Whole Construction in Korean. We have shown that 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. The part-NP exhibits all and only the cases assigned by the verb to the relevant argument, whereas the whole-NP may bear either the case assigned by V or nominative assigned by inf, depending on its surface position. These facts, which must be accounted for by any analysis of the Part-Whole Construction, follow naturally from the Direct Case Hypothesis.

NOTES

* We are grateful to Hee-Duk Ahn, Ki-Sun Hong, Young-oo Kim, Saumun Kono, Chunjung Lee, Myung Yip, James Hyan-Sti Yoon and three anonymous reviewers for helpful comments and discussion. None of them necessarily agrees with our conclusions and the usual disclaimers apply. An earlier version of this paper was read at the 7th International Conference on Korean Linguistics in Osaka, August 1999. The overall organization of the paper has benefited greatly from suggestions by one of the reviewers.

1 The Yale Romanization system has been used to transcribe Korean examples. The following abbreviations are used: Top: topic marker -na; Nom: nominative marker -ni; Acc: accusative marker -ni; Dat: dative marker -ni; Gen: genitive marker -geo; Loc: locative marker -geo; Instruments marker -i; Past: past tense marker -so; Pres: present tense marker -si; Pst passive voice marker; Nom: nominative marker. Korean is a typical head-final language. Nothing in our analysis hinges on whether -so/si/geo is categorially a postposition rather than a simple dative case marker. The allomorphy of the nominative, accusative, and topic markers is phonologically conditioned by whether the preceding segment is a vowel or non-vowel.

2 This can even be seen in the French examples Kim cites (1989, 450):

(i) Je lui envoie une maitresse dans chaque port.
   I him=Dat sends a mistress to each port.
The Stative is more duties when the relation is one of possession, as in (i), but accussative when the relation is the usual type of predication as in (6)

(iii) On le considère le fils spirituel de Valery.
    one him=Acc considers the son spiritual of Valery.
    'He is considered the spiritual son of Valery.'

3 Or vice versa, of course. We consider here only the most explicit formulation of the Case-Assignment Hypothesis in the literature, that of Y. J. Kim (1989, 1990).

4 For unknown reasons, the d-patterns in (7) and (8) is very slightly degraded, but still acceptable to most speakers we have consulted. An anonymous reviewer points out that the acceptability of the (d) examples hinges against a Relational Grammar account involving Inversion and Possessor Accession in either order. Such an approach would account for (b) and (c), but not (d). However, unordered rule application may be problematic for theory-internal reasons. Choi (1986, 53, fn. 23) observes that Inversion followed by Possessor Accession is ruled out by the Host Limitation Law of Pullum&t (1983).

Our account predicts that if there are three NPs in the part-whole relation, then there should be 2\(=8\) possible patterns, as illustrated below:

(i) Hanwook-si Seul-ey namsam-yang-si gyeo-pul na(a)yo-ja
   Korea-Dat Seoul-Dat marker-Dat fine-Nom break-out-Pat-Ind
(ii) Hanwook-si Seul-ey namsam-yang-si gyeo-pul nac-e-ja
(iii) Hanwook-si Seul-ey namsam-yang-si gyeo-pul na(e)-ja
(iv) Hanwook-si Seul-ey namsam-yang-si gyeo-pul na(e)-ja
(v) Hanwook-si Seul-ey namsam-yang-si gyeo-pul na(e)-ja
(vi) Hanwook-si Seul-ey namsam-yang-si gyeo-pul na(e)-ja
(vii) Hanwook-si Seul-ey namsam-yang-si gyeo-pul na(e)-ja
(viii) Hanwook-si Seul-ey namsam-yang-si gyeo-pul na(e)-ja

The generalization which emerges is that Noun preceding Dat leads to some degree of degradation, but it is not clear to us what to make of this. Putting the topic marker =nul on the lefmost NP makes these all perfect.

5 There is another class of Dat-Nom verbs in Korean, namely, the class of psych- predicates. Choi (1986, 32, ex. 86a) gives the following example to illustrate the impossibility of Combining Possessor Accessions with Inversion:

(i) *Youngsoo-e-yeyup hyeong-e-si gyeo chu-ko pihyoh-e-ja
   Youngsoh-Dat brother-Nom/Dat car-Nom need-I
   *Youngsoo’s brother needs a car.

Note, however, that this example uses the kinship adoree of inalienable possession, which often exhibits greater restrictions. Choi (1987, 115, fn. 4) notes that since both whole- and part-NPs must be afflicted, there is a difference between kinship and body-part relations. She cites the following examples to illustrate the contrast:

(ii) *Cheese-ko Youngul-thul abshul po-mtu-ja. Kinship Relation
     Cheese-Nom Youngul=Acc father=Acc see-Pat-Ind
     *Cheese saw Youngul by seeing her father.

(iii) Cheese-ko Youngul-thul owshul po-mtu-ja Body-Part Relation
     Cheese-Nom Youngul=Acc eyes see-Pat-Ind
     *Cheese saw Youngul by seeing her eyes.

While (ii) is not fully acceptable to all speakers, the contrast is clear. As can be seen from the English translations, there is an entailment requirement on the Part-Whole Construction. If Cheese sees Youngul’s eyes, then in some sense, he also sees Youngul; this does not follow, of course, if Cheese sees Youngul’s father.
CONCLUDING FOR THIS FACTOR, WE OBSERVE THAT IT IS POSSIBLE TO COMBINE THE WHOLE CONSTRUCTION WITH PSYCH PREDICATES, AS ILLUSTRATED BELOW:

(vi) Youngsoo was eating apples in the park.

Youngso-Dat eats Dat Nom-poss:to

"Youngso was eating apples in the park."

Of the four logically possible combinations of Dat and Nom on the Possessor NP, only two are actually acceptable.

(vii) Youngso wants to eat apples in the park.

Youngso Nom Dat

"Youngso wants to eat apples in the park."

The unacceptability of Nom on the part-NP is presumably related to the fact that these psych-verbs allow Nom case only on animate subjects.

Thus the observed case marking patterns are exactly as expected under the Direct Case Hypothesis.

1. This is independently noted by Choi (1987, 109) who observed that all (ditransitive) verbs with the 'benefactive' marker (i.e., case) assign the Acc case pattern.

2. These examples show that the claim that Possessor Ascension is limited to hosts heading a 2-Arc (Yoon (1989, 48)) cannot be maintained. They also argue against the suggestion that Q-flux is a subcase of Ascension (Choi (1985)), since for most speakers, Q-flux is prohibited from daivee antecedents.

Young-Se Kang (1946) and O'Grady (1987) analyze the part-NP as an adverbial NP with locative meaning, following an observation originally due to Sungmi Kwon. Under this analysis, one might hypothesize that the use of the daivee 'ey' on the part-NP in (13) is a semantically predictable use of locative case, parallel to the use of instrumental case in (1):

(i) Inho-Dog walk him in the park.

Inho-Dog walk Dat

3. This suggestion seems initially plausible since the corresponding question word is ei 'where rather than who/what'.

(ii) Inho-Dog where walk Dat ei

"Where did Inho walk the dog?"

But on closer inspection, this suggestion proves untenable, since the use of 'ey' turns out to be lexically governed. Daivee 'ey' is impossible with normal passive-assigning verbs, e.g., walk 'er', eat 'e', etc.

(iii) Yao-Daey eat apples.

Yao-Daey eat Dat

1. Nom: Yao Dat

4. Given the account for the fact that passive is not possible in the passive, it is clear why there is no passive corresponding to (13):

Yoo-Seong (1995, 1997, 2000) observes that Acc on Yoonsimm is possible if one adds //s/ to the cross.

(i) Roman-Nom-ee Yoonsim

Rom-Nom-ee Yoonsim

The Romans struck a nail in the wall on the cross.
[P] will escape the verb’s case domain in languages for which even inherent case is assigned at structure. This suggestion makes certain predictions and raises certain problems which we leave for further research.

The lack of case preservation is nonetheless somewhat surprising given that Korean does have native experiential subjects of certain nonpassive verbs; see Geddes and Youn (1989) and references cited there. We suggest that the lack of case preservation in Korean is related to the fact that nominative must be assigned, i.e., descriptively speaking, every clause contains a nominative NP. Fukui and Spes (1986) suggest that nominative is a case-feature which must be discharged. This is clearly not true of Icelandic, which contains nominal predicates, both super and passive, in which the sole NP bears the oblique case; see Zawistowski (1983), Yip (1987).

Kang (1986, 1988) attributes the case alternation to a difference in status, but as Malin (1989) notes, this suggestion is problematic and not independently motivated. Youn (1990, 273, fn. 10) notes that the occurrence of accusative on the host (the parti-

The lexical passive morpheme has various allomorphs: /i/ /i/ /i/; the same morpheme is used for the causative. But not all verbs have lexically passive forms; composite verbs formed with ha ‘do’ and ditransitive verbs systematically lack lexical passive/causatives.

However, verbs which ‘affect’ their (animate) objects tend to have lexical passives, a presupposition for occurring in the adversity passive construction. Affecting a particle of a non-dominant construction on the Part-Whole Construction in Korean. These verbs like je ‘see’ and konjung-je ‘admit’ do not occur in this construction because their objects are not ‘affected’ themes. Note that the verb mul ‘draw’ as in (i) (taken from Chen (1985, 35, ex. 15a)) is an exception to the adverseness constraint. Interestingly, this verb lacks a lexical passive form:

(i) Johri’s Mary-ta akk-sal alli-eex-eta.
John-Nom Mary-ta face-Acc draw-Past-Ind
‘John drew Mary’s face.’

The adverseness constraint may also account for the fact (noted by Choi (1986, 17)) that gerund nominals cannot host Possessor Acession:

(i) *Ku kay-da Yumi-ku iranu top-eex-eta.
that dog-Nom Yumi-Nom eyes-Nom become Past-Ind
‘The dog became Yumi’s eyes.’

See also footnote 5.

As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, Nom is marginally possible in the follow-

(i) Chinsan ka ton ekip-ul t?i?
pay-loc money-loc
Chinsan-Nom money-within-Acc?Nom sub-Past-Ind
‘Chinsan had his wallet stolen.’

The possibility of Nom may reflect the fact that Chinsan can be interpreted as source rather than possessor, since (as in English) the verb pay-loc ‘steal’ can be ditransitive:

(i) Kang-ku Chinsan-ekeye-te ton ekip-ul payjav-at-eta
borrow-Nom Chinsan-Dat-Acc money-within-Acc steal-Past-Ind
‘Kim (1990, 287, ex. 3.5a) judges this example as ungrammatical with accusative case, but some speakers do accept the Acc-Acc pattern.

As noted by Malin (1989) and Hong (1991), Chen (1985, 35) and Geddes (1986, 1987) noted the grammaticality of en-passives with accusative on the retained object, but to this fact that argument of a ditransitive verb could not passivize. However, this constraint on en-passives is invariant: since the same sentences are grammatical with nominative rather than accusative on the retained object. In more recent work within 100, the occurrence of nominative is attributed to Case Spread, which allows a non-nom to spread its Case to a nominal to which it has been attached (Geddes and Youn 1989, 244).

This is not to say that case agreement plays no role in non-Nom. Consider the case marking of so-called ‘floating quantifiers’. Note the obligatory case agreement between quantifier and subject, as illustrated by the following contrast from Choi (1986, 43, ex. 15.1b):

(iii) a. Hakang-ku kay-ekeye se-gi mul-e-lu-ea-
student-Nom dog-Dat three-Num bite-Pass-Past-Ind
‘Three students were bitten by a dog.’

b. *Hakang-ku kay-ekeye se-gi mul-e-ew-ea-
student-Nom dog-Dat three-Num bite-Pass-Past-Ind
The contrasts in (b) and (b) make it clear that the case marking on the post-NP(s) has a different source than the case marking on floating quantifiers.

(iii) a. Hakang-ku kay-ekeye son-i mul-e-lu-ea-
student-Nom dog-Dat hand-loc bite-Pass-Past-Ind
‘The student was bitten on the hand by a dog.’

b. Hakang-ku kay-ekeye son-i mul-e-lu-ea,
student-Nom dog-Dat three-Num bite-Pass-Past-Ind
‘Three students were bitten on the hand by a dog.’

Case restrictions on floating quantifiers provide independent evidence that case agree-

That a floating quantifier gets case via agreement with its antecedent is surely the stan-

That as pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, Nom is marginally possible in the follow-

The possibility of Nom may reflect the fact that Chinsan can be interpreted as source rather than possessor, since (as in English) the verb pay-loc ‘steal’ can be ditransitive:

(i) Kang-ku Chinsan-ekeye-te ton ekip-ul payjav-at-eta
borrow-Nom Chinsan-Dat-Acc money-within-Acc steal-Past-Ind
‘Kim (1990, 287, ex. 3.5a) judges this example as ungrammatical with accusative case, but some speakers do accept the Acc-Acc pattern.

As noted by Malin (1989) and Hong (1991), Chen (1985, 35) and Geddes (1986, 1987) noted the grammaticality of en-passives with accusative on the retained object, but to this fact that argument of a ditransitive verb could not passivize. However, this constraint on en-passives is invariant: since the same sentences are grammatical with nominative rather than accusative on the retained object. In more recent work within 100, the occurrence of nominative is attributed to Case Spread, which allows a non-nom to spread its Case to a nominal to which it has been attached (Geddes and Youn 1989, 244).

This is not to say that case agreement plays no role in non-Nom. Consider the case marking of so-called ‘floating quantifiers’. Note the obligatory case agreement between quantifier and subject, as illustrated by the following contrast from Choi (1986, 43, ex. 15.1b):

(iii) a. Hakang-ku kay-ekeye se-gi mul-e-lu-ea-
student-Nom dog-Dat three-Num bite-Pass-Past-Ind
‘Three students were bitten by a dog.’

b. *Hakang-ku kay-ekeye se-gi mul-e-ew-ea-
student-Nom dog-Dat three-Num bite-Pass-Past-Ind
The contrasts in (b) and (b) make it clear that the case marking on the post-NP(s) has a different source than the case marking on floating quantifiers.

(iii) a. Hakang-ku kay-ekeye son-i mul-e-lu-ea-
student-Nom dog-Dat hand-loc bite-Pass-Past-Ind
‘The student was bitten on the hand by a dog.’

b. Hakang-ku kay-ekeye son-i mul-e-lu-ea,
student-Nom dog-Dat three-Num bite-Pass-Past-Ind
‘Three students were bitten on the hand by a dog.’

Case restrictions on floating quantifiers provide independent evidence that case agree-

That a floating quantifier gets case via agreement with its antecedent is surely the stan-

That as pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, Nom is marginally possible in the follow-

The possibility of Nom may reflect the fact that Chinsan can be interpreted as source rather than possessor, since (as in English) the verb pay-loc ‘steal’ can be ditransitive:

(i) Kang-ku Chinsan-ekeye-te ton ekip-ul payjav-at-eta
borrow-Nom Chinsan-Dat-Acc money-within-Acc steal-Past-Ind
‘Kim (1990, 287, ex. 3.5a) judges this example as ungrammatical with accusative case, but some speakers do accept the Acc-Acc pattern.
idiolectal variation (but Kim 1989, 4588, 1990, 269, fn 6) independently noted that some speakers accept such sentences).

Interestingly, Kang (p. 109, ex. 8.89) presents the following passive sentence in grammatical

(ii) jun-ka kiri-ku ba-si ye-ri man-yong-im bie-key men-ka
hair-Nom long-Rec the student-Nom teacher-Hon-by hair-Nom
null
cut-Pass-Pt

'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 ungrammatical active counterpart in (406).
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LONG DISTANCE SCRAMBLING IN JAPANESE

This paper examines the nature of scrambling in Japanese in the light of Webelhuth (1989) and Mababa (1985). Webelhuth proposes that scrambling is uniformly movement to a third type of position, the non-operation/nom-A position, and that this position has the binding properties of both A and A’ (operator) positions. Mababa does not recognize the third type of position, and argues that clause-internal scrambling can be either A or A’ movement, while “long distance” scrambling is necessarily A’ movement. I argue in this paper that these two apparently inconsistent hypotheses are both necessary for the analysis of scrambling in Japanese.

As evidence for Webelhuth’s hypothesis, I show that unlike advancement, scrambling need not establish a semantically significant operator-variable relation. Then, I argue that Mababa’s hypothesis, based on the A/A’ dichotomy, is also needed to account for the distinction between clause-internal scrambling and “long distance” scrambling with respect to anaphor binding. Finally, adopting Tada’s (1998) proposal that non-operator/nom-A positions are licensed at S-structure but not at LF, I suggest that a modified version of Webelhuth’s hypothesis applies at S-structure, and Mababa’s hypothesis applies at LF.

1. INTRODUCTION

Since Ross (1967), there has been much discussion on the nature of scrambling. In Saito (1985), I discussed scrambling in Japanese and argued that it is an adjunction operation.1 The following is the precise formulation of scrambling proposed there:

(1) Adjoin-α, where α is Xαα.

According to this hypothesis, the examples in (2a–b) have the structures shown in (3a–b) respectively.2

(2) a. Sono hon -o Taroo-ga katta (koto) that book-Acc -Nom bought fact ‘Taro bought that book’
b. Sono hon -o Hanako-ga Taroo-ga katta to that book-Acc -Nom -Nom bought COMP omotezu (koto) think fact ‘Hanako thinks that Taro bought that book’