

Soowon Kim & Joan Maling

SUNY at Albany & Brandeis University

This paper is part of our on-going work on case marking of adverbial NPs in Korean; we will focus here mainly on the case marking of frequency adverbial NPs and some of the implications for the analysis of lexical passives in Korean. As noted by Maling (1989, in press), the case marking of certain adverbial NPs denoting duration, frequency, and location in Korean and Finnish exhibits an interesting alternation between nominative (NOM) and accusative (ACC). This suggests the morphological case-marking on adverbial NPs in both Korean and Finnish might best be viewed as syntactic case rather than semantic or lexical case of the sort that adverbial NPs in other better-studied languages are known to bear.

The standard view in current Case theory is that argument NPs fall under the domain of syntactic case, but adjuncts, including adverbial NPs, do not. This stems from the view that case licensing correlates with thematic structure (or argument structure) in a one-to-one fashion. Hence adjunct NPs do not bear abstract Case, although they may bear lexical or semantic case in a language with a rich system of morphological case-marking. However, once case spreading is taken to be a parameter, as argued by Yip, Maling & Jackendoff (1987), there is no reason to believe that adverbial NPs necessarily lie outside the domain of structural case. This is because case spreading can serve as a source for structural case assignment and hence, the biuniqueness condition for case licensing may be overridden. With its multiple case constructions, Korean provides compelling evidence that case spreading within VP can bring arguments and adjuncts together under the domain of structural case, yielding multiple accusative case constructions.¹ If adverbial NPs receive structural case, it is then expected that they will exhibit case alternation in the same environments where argument NPs do. This expectation appears to be borne out. Of particular relevance here are the case patterns that frequency adverbials in Korean exhibit, to which we now turn.²

1. Frequency Adverbials and Syntactic Case

Adverbial NPs expressing frequency or duration are typical instances of adjuncts, and as such, they are always an optional element of a sentence. In Korean, such adverbials occur most naturally without any case markers, as illustrated in (1).

- (1) a. Chelsoo-ka sacangnim-eykey senmul-ul sey pen tuli-ess-ta.
Chelsoo-NOM boss-DAT gift-ACC 3 times give-Pst-Ind
'Chelsoo gave the boss a present three times.'
- b. Chelsoo-ka sacangnim-ul cip-ey sey pen chotayha-yess-ta.
Chelsoo-NOM boss-ACC house-DAT 3 times invite-Pst-Ind
'Chelsoo invited the boss to his house three times.'

However, when adverbials are forced to take case markers, the case they bear is either ACC or NOM rather than an oblique or lexical case. Of strong interest is the fact that frequency adverbials

take ACC in active sentences but take NOM in passive sentences; that is, the case marker that frequency adverbials can bear appears to alternate depending on voice. Some representative examples that illustrate this point are given in (2) and (3):

- (2) a. Chelsoo-ka i chayk-ul sey pen-ul/*i ilk-ess-ta. ACTIVE
Chelsoo-NOM this book-ACC 3 times-ACC/*NOM read-Pst-Ind
'Chelsoo read this book three times.'
- b. Chelsoo-ka ku pokose-lul twu pen-ul/*i kemthoha-yess-ta.
Chelsoo-NOM the report-ACC 2 times-ACC/*NOM review-Pst-Ind
'Chelsoo reviewed the report two times.'
- (3) a. I chayk-i sey pen-i/*ul ilk-hi-eci-ess-ta. ci-PASSIVE
this book-NOM 3 times-NOM/*ACC read-Pass-Pst-Ind
'This book was read three times.'
- b. Ku pokose-ka twu pen-i/*ul kemthotoy-ess-ta. toy-PASSIVE
the report-NOM 2 times-NOM/*ACC be-reviewed-Pst-Ind
'The report was reviewed two times.'

(2a,b) show that in active sentences, frequency adverbials may not take NOM. In the corresponding passive sentences in (3), however, the frequency adverbials may not occur in the accusative, and NOM is the only possible case for them. Notice that in passive examples of the sort illustrated in (3), ACC is not available for argument NPs either, as can be seen from ditransitives and part NPs illustrated in (4):

- (4) a. Chelsoo-ka/eykey chayk-i/*ul cwu-eci-ess-ta. DITRANSITIVE
Chelsoo-NOM/DAT book-NOM/*ACC give-Pass-Pst-Ind
'Chelsoo was given a book.'
- b. Chelsoo-ka paci-ka/*lul ccic-eci-ess-ta. PART-WHOLE
Chelsoo-NOM pants-NOM/*ACC tear-Pass-Pst-Ind
'Chelsoo's pants were torn off.'

This NOM-ACC case alternation indicates that frequency adverbials indeed bear structural case just like argument NPs.

In lexical passives, unlike ci-passives and toy-passives, frequency adverbials show an interesting range of case alternations, and in certain cases, they must bear ACC rather than NOM. The following generalization seems to emerge: when the subject is an inanimate NP, frequency adverbials may not bear ACC; but when the subject is an animate NP, especially human, frequency adverbials must occur in the accusative. Relevant contrasts are provided in (5) and (6):

- (5) a. Mun-i cecello twu pen-i/*ul yel-li-ess-ta.
door-NOM alone 2 times-NOM/*ACC open-Pass-Pst-Ind
'The door opened two times by itself.'
- b. Tolo-ka pelisse sey pen-i/*ul mak-hi-ess-ta.
road-NOM already 3 times-NOM/*ACC block-Pass-Pst-Ind
'The road was blocked three times already.'
- (6) a. Suni-ka sacang-eykey twu pen-ul/*i cha-i-ess-ta.
Suni-NOM boss-DAT 2 times-ACC/*NOM kick-Pass-Pst-Ind
'Suni was kicked by the boss two times.'

- b. Suni-ka kay-eykey sey pen-ul/??i mul-li-ess-ta.
Sunl-NOM dog-DAT 3 times-ACC/??NOM bite-Pass-Pst-Ind
'Sunl was bitten by a dog three times.'

The examples in (5) and (6) suggest that an animacy constraint of the sort discussed in Young-joo Kim (1990) and Maling & Kim (1992) is relevant to the case marking of frequency adverbials in lexical passives.³ As we will show in what follows, however, the case patterns shown above reveal more significant properties of lexical passives in Korean.

Our account for the contrasts is compatible with the suggestion made by Maling (1989) and Young-joo Kim (1990), namely, that lexical passives do not optionally absorb structural case, but rather the lexical passive morphology is best viewed as marking two different but homophonous syntactic constructions. We argue that examples like (5a,b) with NOM adverbials are ordinary passive sentences, whereas those like (6a,b) with ACC adverbials are syntactically active sentences with passive meaning. The case patterns reflect this difference.⁴ It has already been observed (e.g., Young-joo Kim 1990, Maling & Kim 1992) that the availability of ACC in lexical passives correlates with animacy of the subject NP: if the subject is inanimate, the part-NP in the part-whole constructions (or inalienable possession constructions) cannot be marked ACC, except under personification, as shown by the contrasts in (7).

- (7) a. Chayk-i phyoci-ka/*lul ccic-ki-ess-ta.
book-NOM cover-NOM/*ACC tear-Pass-Pst-Ind
'The cover of the book was torn off.'
- b. Chelsoo-ka paci-ka/lul ccic-ki-ess-ta.
Chelsoo-NOM pants-NOM/ACC tear-Pass-Pst-Ind
'Chelsoo got his pants torn off.'

The ungrammaticality of ACC on the part-NP in (7a) indicates that what is referred to in the literature as the adversity passive requires that the subject NP be animate, preferably [+human]. We assume that the adversity passive construction has an external argument, as sketched in (8a). The lexical passive morpheme licenses an added experiencer or affected patient argument which is the surface subject; the construction is syntactically active, and the verb assigns accusative case to its complement(s). The true syntactic passive, on the other hand, has a nonthematic subject position at D-structure, and is not an accusative case-assigner. Thus, the case alternation on the part-NPs illustrated in (7b) reflects the structural ambiguity of the construction at hand. The case in which part-NPs bear NOM, as seen in (7a,b), is depicted in (8b) (where the asterisk indicates recursion):

- (8) a. adversity pass: [NP EXP] [vp (NP-eykey) NP-ACC^{*} V-lex.pass]
b. syntactic pass: [NP e] [vp (NP-eykey) NP-NOM^{*} V-lex.pass]

Further support for this view comes from details of case marking of frequency adverbials in the part-whole construction. Consider the case patterns illustrated in (9):

- (9) a. Suni-ka kay-eykey pal-ul sey pen-ul mul-li-ess-ta.
Sunl-NOM dog-DAT foot-ACC 3 times-ACC bite-Pass-Pst-Ind
'Sunl got her foot bitten by a dog three times.'

- b. *Sunl-ka kay-eykey pal-ul sey pen-i mul-li-ess-ta.
Sunl-NOM dog-DAT foot-ACC 3 times-NOM bite-Pass-Pst-Ind
'Sunl got her foot bitten by a dog three times.'
- c. Sunl-ka kay-eykey pal-i sey pen-i mul-li-ess-ta.
Sunl-NOM dog-DAT foot-NOM 3 times-NOM bite-Pass-Pst-Ind
'Sunl's foot was bitten by a dog three times.'
- d.7*Sunl-ka kay-eykey pal-i sey pen-ul mul-li-ess-ta.
Sunl-NOM dog-DAT foot-NOM 3 times-ACC bite-Pass-Pst-Ind
'Sunl's foot was bitten by a dog three times.'

The case marking on the part-NP can be either ACC or NOM, hence the sentences become grammatical when the frequency adverbial is removed. Crucially, however, the case marking on the frequency adverbial must correlate with the case marking on the part-NP. When the part-NP occurs in the accusative, the frequency adverbial must also be accusative, as illustrated in (9a,b); when the part-NP occurs in the nominative, the frequency adverbial must also be nominative, as illustrated in (9c,d). Further examples are provided in (10):

- (10) a. Nay-ka koyangi-eykey elkwul-ul twu pen-ul/*i halki-wu-ess-ta.
I-NOM cat-DAT face-ACC 2 times-ACC/*NOM scratch-Pass.
'I was scratched on the face by a cat two times.'
- b. Nay-ka koyangi-eykey elkwul-i twu pen-i/??ul halki-wu-ess-ta.
I-NOM cat-DAT face-NOM 2 times-NOM/??ACC scratch-Pass.
'My face was scratched by a cat two times.'
- c. Chelsoo-ka son-lul twu pen-ul/*i pey-i-ess-ta.
Chelsoo-NOM hand-ACC 2 times-ACC/*NOM cut-Pass-Pst-Ind
'Chelsoo got his hand cut two times.'
- d. Chelsoo-ka son-i twu pen-i/?*ul pey-i-ess-ta.
Chelsoo-NOM hand-NOM 2 times-NOM/?*ACC cut-Pass-Pst-Ind
'Chelsoo's hand was cut two times.'

Once the structural ambiguity of lexical passives as sketched in (8) above is recognized, the solution to the observed case alternations presents itself. Adversity passive sentences are syntactically active, hence ACC is the only possible structural case for frequency adverbials. However, as can be seen in (9c,d) and (10b,d), in syntactic passives the part-NP must bear NOM, and so must the frequency adverbial. This is simply because accusative case is not available in syntactic passives in Korean. Note in passing that the observed case patterns cannot be accounted for by case agreement of the sort that may be licensed under predication relationships.

2. Frequency Adverbials and Case Alternations

There are however sentences in which frequency adverbials can be marked either NOM or ACC, resulting in case alternations. Consider the examples illustrated in (11) and (12):

- (11) Tol-i entek alay-lo twu pen-i/ul kwul-less-ta.
stone-NOM hill bottom-LOC 2 times-NOM/ACC roll-Pst-Ind
a. ACC adverbial: the (same) stone rolled down the hill twice.
b. NOM adverbial: it happened twice that a stone rolled down the hill.

- (12) Totwuk-i twu pen-i/ul cap-hi-ess-ta.
 thief-NOM 2 times-NOM/ACC arrest-Pass-Pst-Ind
 a. ACC adverbial: the (same) thief was arrested twice.
 b. NOM adverbial: two (different) thieves were arrested.

The sentences (11) (adapted from Young-joo Kim 1990:295) and (12) have two different interpretations. When the frequency adverbial is marked ACC, it is quantified over the predicate. So (11a) can mean that the same stone rolled down the hill twice, and (12a) can mean that the same thief was arrested twice. On the other hand, when the frequency adverbial is NOM, it is quantified over the entire event. This yields an interpretation similar to a floating quantifier one in which the frequency adverbial is associated with the subject NP, since it is highly likely that different events may involve different objects. On this interpretation, (11b) can mean two different stones rolled down the hill (perhaps each at a different time), and (12b) can mean that two (different) thieves were arrested.

This property of quantification may find a natural explanation if the sentences at hand are structurally ambiguous, as we argue here. A frequency adverbial NP actually quantifies over VP since it occurs within VP. However, when there is no external argument at D-structure, VP quantification yields the effect of event quantification (i.e., quantification over the entire sentence), since in that case, the VP can be construed as the sentence.

Given that intransitives or even unaccusatives are also accusative assigners in Korean, as recently argued by Hak-Sung Han (1991) and Ki-Sun Hong (1991), it is not surprising to see that the frequency adverbial in (11) bears accusative, when it quantifies over the predicate. This is so because in that case, the frequency adverbial acts as a VP modifier, and occurs within VP, which is the case domain of the verb. On the other hand, when the frequency adverbial quantifies over the event and is subsequently associated with the NP, a Q-float interpretation is obtained since it would act as an NP modifier. In many languages, including Korean, floated quantifiers are only case-marked via case agreement. From this, it then follows that the frequency adverbials in (11) and (12) can also bear nominative. Hence the observed case alternation.

Further evidence can be provided in support of this analysis. First, the ambiguity of quantification can be removed by replacing the subject NP in (11) and (12) with a proper name or a definite singular NP, as illustrated in (13):

- (13) a. Chelsoo-ka wuli cip-ey twu pen-ul/*i o-ass-ta.
 Chelsoo-NOM my house-DAT 2 times-ACC/*NOM come-Pst-Ind
 'Chelsoo came to my house two times.'
 b. I tol-i entek alay-lo twu pen-ul/*i kwul-ess-ta.
 this stone-NOM hill bottom-LOC 2 times-ACC/*NOM roll-Pst-Ind
 'This stone rolled down the hill two times.'

As expected, NOM is not possible for the frequency adverbial.⁵ In (13a,b), the frequency adverbial cannot be associated with the definite NP for an obvious semantic reason, hence a Q-float interpretation is inherently blocked. As a result, the frequency adverbial must bear ACC, as it only quantifies over the predicate.

Secondly, when the frequency adverbial undergoes movement (or scrambling) to sentence-initial position preceding the subject

NP, then the frequency adverbial must be ACC, and NOM turns out to be impossible. This is illustrated in (14) and (15):

- (14) Twu pen-ul/*i tol-i entek alay-lo kwul-ess-ta.
 2 times-ACC/*NOM stone-NOM hill bottom-LOC roll-Pst-Ind
 a. ACC adverbial: the (same) stone rolled down the hill twice
 b. *NOM adverbial: it happened twice that a stone rolled down
 (15) Twu pen-ul/*i totwuk-i cap-hi-ess-ta.
 2 times-ACC/*NOM thief-NOM arrest-Pass-Pst-Ind
 a. ACC adverbial: the (same) thief was arrested twice.
 b. *NOM adverbial: two different thieves were arrested.

The Q-float interpretation is blocked when the frequency adverbial is moved to sentence-initial position over the subject NP. The reason may be that a structural condition is imposed on quantifier floating such that the floated quantifier must be c-commanded by the NP with which it is associate. This condition is violated in (14) and (15) when the adverbial gets moved to a position that is not c-commanded by the subject NP.⁶ This means that the source for the nominative case is now removed, and ACC is the only possible case for the frequency adverbial in (14) and (15), as expected. Examples such as (13a) can be further contrasted with those like (16), in which ACC becomes unavailable.

- (16) Phyenci-ka cip-ey twu pen-i/*7ul o-ass-ta.
 letter-NOM house-DAT 2 times-NOM/*ACC come-Pst-Ind
 'Letters arrived at my house two times.'

(16) is odd with ACC on the adverbial for pragmatic reasons: the same letter cannot arrive more than once. Hence, the reading in which the predicate is quantified is naturally out, and this is why ACC is not possible in (16).

Similar facts also obtain in English, as illustrated below:

- (17) a. I saw a movie twice last month. (ambiguous)
 b. I called a student twice. (preferred: the same student)
 c. I bought a book twice. (preferred: not the same book)

(17a) is ambiguous as the frequency adverbial quantifies over either the event or the object NP. (17b,c) are however not ambiguous in the same way as (17a), and each has a (different) preferred reading as indicated above. This state of affairs surely requires a more sophisticated semantic analysis, but the intuitions seem clear enough.

Regarding the overtiness of case-markers mentioned in fn 6, it is worth noting a recent proposal made by Maling (1992). In an attempt to explain some important typological differences in case-marking between Icelandic and Korean, Maling suggests that all kinds of case assignment take place at S-structure in Korean, including the assignment of lexically-governed dative case. This proposal has several interesting consequences and will explain, among other things, the following facts. First, it explains why dative case is not preserved under NP-Movement in Korean, unlike Icelandic. It will also explain certain word order restrictions in the constructions with no external argument, as sketched in (18):

- (18) a. [IP e [VP NP₁-DAT NP₂-NOM V]]
 b. [IP NP₁-NOM [VP t₁ NP₂-NOM V]]
 c. [IP NP₂-NOM [VP NP₁-DAT t₂ V]]
 d. *[IP NP₂-NOM [IP NP₁-NOM [VP t₁ t₂ V]]]

Dative is assigned to a goal or experiencer argument (NP₁) that stays in VP (see (18a and c)). When it moves to Spec/IP, it receives nominative from Infl there (see (18b)). The other VP-internal argument (NP₂) can receive nominative from Infl in two different ways. When it stays in VP (see (18a and b)), Infl assigns nominative directly to it, given that the VP in this configuration is not a barrier to assignment of nominative case by Infl (see Sigurðsson 1989 for Icelandic; Hak-Sung Han 1991, Whitman 1991, Jeong-Shik Lee 1992 for Korean); when this NP moves to Spec/IP, it receives nominative from Infl there (see (18c)). When the NP₂ moves either to an IP-adjoined position or to a topic position, as in (18d), it fails to receive nominative, and an ungrammatical sentence therefore results. The following paradigm illustrates the empirical facts:

- (19) a. *Chelsoo-eykey chayk-i cwu-eci-ess-ta.* (=18a)
 Chelsoo-DAT book-NOM give-Pass-Pst-Ind
 'Chelsoo was given a book.'
 b. *Chelsoo-ka chayk-i cwu-eci-ess-ta.* (=18b)
 Chelsoo-NOM book-NOM give-Pass-Pst-Ind
 c. *Chayk-i Chelsoo-eykey cwu-eci-ess-ta.* (=18c)
 book-NOM Chelsoo-DAT give-Pass-Pst-Ind
 d. **Chayk-i Chelsoo-ka cwu-eci-ess-ta.* (=18d)
 book-NOM Chelsoo-NOM give-Pass-Pst-Ind

This proposal has two kinds of theoretical implications. First, nominative case in Korean is structural Case and is not a default case of the sort often proposed in the literature. This is a welcome result, being consistent with the conclusion reached by Whitman (1991, 1993). Secondly, it suggests that the trace of a VP-internal argument may not transmit Case to its antecedent. Turning back to case-marking of frequency adverbials, we see that this proposal can offer an interesting solution to the problem raised. Consider the following configurations:

- (20) a. [IP NP_{arg}-NOM [VP t NP_{adv}-NOM V]]
 b. *[IP NP_{adv}-NOM [VP NP_{arg}-NOM t V]]
 c. *[IP NP_{adv}-NOM [IP NP_{arg}-NOM [VP t t V]]]

In configuration (20a), the VP-internal frequency adverbial NP can receive nominative Case directly from Infl in the same way as an argument NP does (see (18b) above). But in configurations (20b and c), the adverbial NP fails to receive nominative Case, and this will explain why the nominative-marked frequency adverbial NP may not be moved over the subject NP in the examples provided in the text. Given that nonargument NPs like frequency adverbials occur in A'-positions, and if the Spec position of IP is (exclusively) an A-position, no adjunct NP can move into Spec/IP. Movement from A'-position to A-position (i.e., improper movement) is prohibited cross-linguistically, which can be subsumed under Principle C of Binding Theory (see Rizzi 1992 for recent discussion). (20c) is the same configuration as (18d) above, and is ruled out due to failure of case transmission, as empirically attested by sentence (14) in the text. Note further that there is still a distinction between arguments and adjuncts if case

transmission fails, as can be shown by the ungrammaticality of (21a) (cf. (19d) above) and the grammaticality of (21b) (=vii) in fn 6).

- (21) a. **Chayk-Ø Chelsoo-ka cwu-eci-ess-ta.*
 book-Ø Chelsoo-NOM give-Pass-Pst-Ind
 'Chelsoo was given a book.'
 b. *Twu pen-Ø tol-i untek alay-lo kwul-less-ta.*
 2 times-Ø stone-NOM hill bottom-LOC roll-Pst-Ind
 'A stone rolled down the hill twice.'

This distinction seems to indicate that the Case Filter (Chomsky 1981:175) applies only to argument NPs, an important implication that merits further investigation.

3. Further evidence for the ambiguity of lexical passives

We have argued that the lexical passive morpheme is structurally ambiguous between a true passive and a syntactically active construction, as sketched in (8a,b). It is worth noting in this regard that actives and passives show a crucial difference in terms of control properties. In active voice sentences, the agent can control participial adjuncts, but in the passive voice, the (understood) agent cannot. This contrast is illustrated in (22).

- (22) a. *Umak-ul tulu-mye chayk-ul ilk-ess-ta.* ACTIVE
 music-ACC listen-ASP book-ACC read-Pst-Ind
 'They read books listening to the music.'
 b. **Umak-ul tulu-mye chayk-i ilk-eci-ess-ta.* ci-PASSIVE
 music-ACC listen-ASP book-NOM read-Pass-Pst-Ind
 '*Books were read listening to the music.'

Of particular interest here is the fact that a similar contrast also shows up in lexical passives. An adversity passive exhibits the same sort of control property as an active sentence, when the part-NP occurs in the accusative. This is illustrated in (23a). But when the part-NP occurs in the nominative, as in (23b), an agent may not control participial adjuncts.

- (23) a. *Myentoha-ta kho-lul pey-i-ess-ta.* ADVERSITY PASSIVE
 shave-ASP nose-ACC cut-Pass-Pst-Ind
 'He got his nose cut shaving himself.'
 b. *?*Myentoha-ta kho-ka pey-i-ess-ta.* SYNTACTIC PASSIVE
 shave-ASP nose-NOM cut-Pass-Pst-Ind
 '*His nose was cut shaving himself.'

The contrast between (23a and b) is precisely what is expected if the adversity passive has an external argument. If correct, then the control property appears to lend further support to the present analysis that lexical passives are indeed structurally ambiguous, as sketched in (8a,b) above.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, we have shown that the case marker that frequency adverbial NPs in Korean bear is syntactic case, and as expected under this analysis, they show case alternations depending on voice. We have further shown that case alternations in lexical passives result from a structural ambiguity of lexical passives either as active sentences with an adversity passive reading, or as ordinary syntactic passives.

Notes

1. It is interesting to note that case-spreading extends to an even larger class of NPs in child language. Gyeonghee Chung (p.c.) reports a stage at which Korean children mark instrumental NPs with accusative case:

- (i) Wonswungi-ka mangchi-lo uyca-lul mantul-ess-e-yo. (Adult)
 monkey-Nom hammer-INST chair-ACC make-Pst-SE-Hon
 (ii) Wonswungi-ka mangchi-lul uyca-lul mantul-ess-e-yo. (Child)

2. We leave the case-marking on durational adverbs for further research. Kang (1993) claims that "[+ACC] is licensed for duration adverbial nominals in VP," i.e. accusative is the unmarked case for duration adverbial nominals. While this generalization is largely true (at least statistically), the full picture is certainly more complicated. Although judgments may vary from speaker to speaker, there are sentences where the case marking on durational adverbials alternates between NOM and ACC (Hong 1991), and even examples where accusative is simply impossible (Maling 1989:301, ex.(14); Bratt 1993, ex. (18)). See Kim 1990, Ch. 5.4; Hong 1991, Ch. 6.5; and Bratt 1993 for relevant discussion.

3. Some speakers allow ACC on frequency adverbials in certain lexical passive sentences even when the subject NP is inanimate:

- (i) AChayk-i sey pen-ul ilk-hi-ess-ta.
 book-NOM 3 times-ACC read-Pass-Pst-Ind
 'The book was read three times.'

It appears that such speakers also allow ACC on part-NPs in part-whole sentences of the sort illustrated in (ii):

- (ii) ANamu-ka kaci-lul cal-li-ess-ta.
 tree-NOM branch-ACC cut-Pass-Pst-Ind
 'Branches of the tree were cut.'

We put aside such (individual) variations here, noting that the breaking of the correlation between animacy of the subject NP and case marking on part-NPs or frequency adverbials is certainly limited to some individual sentences.

4. In (6a,b) above, the frequency adverbial seems to resist NOM, despite the expectation that when the subject is an animate NP, both NOM and ACC should be possible for frequency adverbials in lexical passives. As a relevant factor for this, we suggest that speakers tend to construe lexical passives as adversity passives (i.e., active sentences with a passive reading under our analysis) rather than true syntactic passives, especially when the subject NP is human. But when the context is appropriately controlled, as in the sentences in (9) and (10), the expectation is borne out.

5. This fact is also observed by Young-joo Kim (1990:293-295).

6. Susumu Kuno (p.c.) points out that when a numeral quantifier receives a focus (by taking a delimiter such as *man* 'only'), it can be moved to a position that is not c-commanded by the NP with which it is associated, and provides the following contrast as evidence:

- (i) Han pyeng-man na-nun photocwu-lul masi-ess-ta.
 1 bottle-only I-TOP wine-ACC drink-Pst-Ind
 'I drank only one bottle of wine.'

- (ii) *Han pyeng-ul na-nun photocwu-lul masi-ess-ta.
 1 bottle-ACC I-TOP wine-ACC drink-Pst-Ind
 'I drank one bottle of wine.'

While this observation is correct and it considerably weakens the widely-held view that *c-command* is a relevant syntactic condition on quantifier floating (both in Japanese and Korean), the whole picture is certainly more complicated than this. We find that overt morphological case-marking plays a more important role in licensing quantifier floating. Consider (iii) and (iv):

- (iii) Twue myeng-ø na-nun chinkwu-lul chotayha-yess-ta.
 a few CL-ø I-TOP friends-ACC invite-Pst-Ind
 'I invited a few friends of mine.'
 (iv) *Twue myeng-ul na-nun chinkwu-lul chotayha-yess-ta.
 a few CL-ACC I-TOP friends-ACC invite-Pst-Ind
 'I invited a few friends of mine.'

Notice that the (numeral) quantifier *twue myeng* 'a few' in (iii) and (iv) occurs outside of the NP headed by *chinkwu* 'friends', as can be seen from the fact that the subject NP intervenes the two. Hence, (iii) cannot be an instance of genitive case-marker drop (in which the genitive case-marker *uy* may drop inside NP). It is the overtness of the accusative case-marker on the preposed numeral quantifier that makes the difference in acceptability between (iii) and (iv). Why should overt case-marking play such a crucial role here? Note also that when the *c-command* condition on quantifier floating is satisfied, overtness of case-marking has no effect, as can be seen from the grammaticality of (v):

- (v) Na-nun chinkwu-lul twue myeng-ul/ø chotayha-yess-ta.
 I-TOP friends-ACC a few CL-ACC/ø invite-Pst-Ind
 'I invited a few friends of mine.'

It seems that the contrast between (i) and (ii) provided by Kuno can be reduced essentially to the possibility of case-marker drop. This can be shown by the unacceptability of (vi) in which the preposed numeral quantifier bears the accusative case-marker in addition to the delimiter *man*. Compare (i) and (vi):

- (vi) ?*Han pyeng-man-ul na-nun photocwu-lul masi-ess-ta.
 1 bottle-only-ACC I-TOP wine-ACC drink-Pst-Ind
 'I drank only one bottle of wine.'

We leave this matter for future research.

Related to this is the fact (pointed out to us by Young-Suk Lee (p.c.)) that when the nominative case-marker on the frequency adverbial NP in (14) drops, the sentence becomes grammatical, as illustrated in (vii), and furthermore, (vii) allows the same sort of ambiguity as sentence (11) above. The same is true for (15).

- (vii) Twu pen-ø tol-i untek alay-lo kwul-less-ta.
 2 times-ø stone-NOM hill bottom-LOC roll-Pst-Ind
 'A stone rolled down the hill twice.'

The ambiguity of (vii) follows directly from the ambiguity of sentence (11). Here, too, morphological case-marking turns out to play an important role.

References

- Bratt, Elizabeth Owen. 1993. Case Marking and Constituent Structure: Evidence from Korean. Paper read at the Winter meeting of the LSA, January 9, 1993.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Foris, Dordrecht.
- Chung, Gyeonghee N. 1993. Acquisition of Case Marking in Korean: a case study. *Proceedings of the Harvard International Symposium on Korean Linguistics*.
- Han, Hak-Sung. 1991. The Case of Korean Adjectives and Passive Verbs. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 2.1:219-249.
- Hong, Ki-Sun. 1991. *Argument Selection and Case Marking in Korean*. Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.
- Kang, Young-Se. 1993. Case Licensing. Presented at Harvard International Symposium on Korean Linguistics.
- Kim, Young-joo. 1990. *The Syntax and Semantics of Korean Case: The Interaction Between Lexical and Syntactic Levels of Representation*, Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.
- Lee, Jeong-Shik. 1992. *Case Alternation in Korean: Case Minimality*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Maling, Joan. 1989. Adverbials and Structural Case in Korean. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* 3, 297-308.
- Maling, Joan. 1992. Whether to Agree or Not: The Syntax of Inalienable Possession. Manuscript, Brandeis University.
- Maling, Joan. In press. Of Nominative and Accusative: The Hierarchical Assignment of Grammatical Case in Finnish. In A. Holmberg and U. Nikanne (eds.) *Case and other functional Categories in Finnish Syntax*, Mouton de Gruyter, Dordrecht.
- Maling, Joan and Soowon Kim. 1992. Case Assignment in the Inalienable Possession Construction in Korean. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 1, 37-68.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1992. The Definition of A Positions and Improper Movement. Colloquia talk given at MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts, February 1992.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1989. *Verbal Syntax and Case in Icelandic*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Lund. Reprinted by the Institute of Linguistics, University of Iceland, Reykjavik.
- Yip, Moira, Joan Maling, and Ray Jackendoff. 1987. Case in Tiers. *Language* 63, 217-250.
- Whitman, John. 1991. Locative Nominatives in Korean. *Harvard Workshop in Korean Linguistics IV*, 407-419.
- Whitman, John. 1993. Adjunct Major Subjects in Korean. Manuscript, Cornell University.

Soowon Kim
 Department of Linguistics & Cognitive Science
 State University of New York at Albany U Washington
 Albany, NY 12222
 soowon@albnyvmc.bitnet u.washington.edu
 Seattle, WA 98195-4340

Joan Maling
 Program in Linguistics & Cognitive Science
 Center for Complex Systems, MS-013
 Brandeis University
 Waltham, MA 02254-9110
 maling@brandeis.bitnet

Volen.brandeis.edu

HARVARD STUDIES IN KOREAN LINGUISTICS V

— Proceedings of the 1993 Harvard International Symposium on
 Korean Linguistics (HARVARD ISOKL-1993), January 15-17, 1993 —

Edited by

Susumu Kuno	Ik-Hwan Lee
John Whitman	Joan Maling
Young-Se Kang	Young-joo Kim

Department of Linguistics
 Harvard University
 Cambridge, Massachusetts
 U.S.A.

1993