

Gerds, Donna B. and Cheong Youn (1988) "Korean Psych Constructions: Advancement or Retreat?" in *CLS* 24, 155-175.

Kang, Myung-Yoon (1987) "Possessor Raising in Korean," in *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics II*, Hanshin, Seoul, 80-88.

Kang, Young-Se (1986) *Korean Syntax and Universal Grammar*, Ph.D. Diss. Harvard U.

Kim, Young-joo (1989) "Inalienable Possession as a Semantic Relationship Underlying Predication: The Case of Multiple Accusative Constructions," in *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics III*, Hanshin, Seoul, 445-468.

Kim, Young-joo (1990) *The Syntax and Semantics of Korean Case*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University.

Lee, Chungmin (1989) "(In)Definites, Case Markers, Classifiers and Quantifiers in Korean," *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics III*, Hanshin, Seoul, 469-487.

Mirto, Ignazio M. (1991) "A Non-Linear View of the Double Accusative Construction in Korean," Cornell University, ms.

Rosen, Carol (1987) "Possessors and the Internal Structure of Nominals." Paper presented at the Third Biennial Conference on Relational Grammar, University of Iowa, October 1987.

Yang, Byong-Seon (1991) *Unaccusativity and Related Phenomena in Korean*. M.A. Thesis, SUNY-Buffalo.

Yoon, James Hye-Suk (1989) "The Grammar of Inalienable Possession Constructions in Korean, Mandarin and French," in *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics III*, Hanshin, Seoul, 357-368.

Youn, Cheong (1989) *A Relational Analysis of Korean Multiple Nominative Constructions*. Ph.D. Dissertation, SUNY at Buffalo.

Stalking the Elusive Argument:
the Case of the Part-NP*

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-NP as verbal argument or (adverbial) adjunct. My goal here is a very limited one: (i) to show that the part-NP does NOT necessarily agree with the whole-NP, either in Korean or cross-linguistically, and (ii) to argue that the part-NP 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. Chelsoo-ka Suni-lul meli-ul piskiko-iss-ta.
Chelsoo-Nom Suni-Acc hair-Acc combing-be-Ind
'Chelsoo is combing Suni's hair.'
- b. Kangto-ka Yumi-lul phal-ul pulettuli-ess-ta.
burglar-Nom Yumi-Acc arm-Acc break-Pst-Ind
'The burglar broke Yumi's arm.'
- c. Nay-ka panana-lul kkepcil-ul kka-ass-ta.
I-Nom banana-Acc skin-Acc peel-Pst-Ind
'I peeled the banana.'
- (2) a. Suni-ka meli-ka/*lul piski-eci-ko-iss-ta.
Suni-Nom hair-Nom/*Acc comb-Pass-ing-be-Ind
'Suni's hair is being combed.'
- b. Yumi-ka phal-i/*ul pulettuli-eci-ess-ta.
Yumi-Nom arm-Nom/*Acc break-Pass-Pst-Ind
'Yumi's arm was broken.'
- c. Panana-ka kkepcil-i/*ul kka-ci-ess-ta.
banana-Nom skin-Nom/*Acc peel-Pass-Pst-Ind
'The banana was peeled.'

Moreover, there exist multiple dative examples,¹ as first noted by Young-joo Kim (1989:462):

- (3) Nay-ka Yumi-eykey ima-ey kissuha-yess-ta.
I-NOM Yumi-DAT forehead-DAT kiss-Pst-Ind
'I kissed Yumi 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 Inalienable Possession construction is usually characterized as a Multiple Identical Case construction, not just in Korean, but cross-linguistically. For example, Seiler (1983) cites examples of multiple datives as well as multiple accusatives in classical Greek, and suggests that this construction is marked by identical case on the whole and part NPs. I want to focus on the simple descriptive and theoretical question: is there a rule of case-agreement underlying the apparently shared case-marking in this construction? My answer to this deceptively simple question is NO: the apparent case-agreement in this construction is actually epiphenomenal, as argued by Maling & Kim (1992). They show that the case-marking on whole- and part-NPs actually DIFFERS in predictable contexts; hence when the case-marking IS shared, it cannot and should not be attributed to case-agreement.

Let's look more closely at the Inalienable Possession construction in order to determine what the principles for case-marking really are. There are three possible sources of case for the part-NP as outlined in (4):

- (4) a. case via agreement with the whole-NP
- b. semantically-assigned (e.g. locative) case
- c. case assigned by V, either "structural" case (NOM or ACC) or lexically governed "inherent" case (for Korean: DAT)

There are any number of analyses in the literature which assume the existence of a rule of Case-agreement, e.g. agreement under predication or apposition, or a small clause analysis with feature percolation of the case assigned to the N-bar or SC node dominating it. We might refer to any of these approaches as the CASE AGREEMENT HYPOTHESIS. I will discuss here only the most explicit of such analyses, that of Young-joo Kim (1989/1990:261), because it is precise enough to allow us to examine the underlying assumptions.

- (5) CASE AGREEMENT HYPOTHESIS (Young-joo Kim 1990:261)
 - (i) Possessor and IP NPs are base-generated as separate constituents
 - (ii) The IP NPs are adjuncts rather than subcategorized arguments of V
 - (iii) the IP NP is not assigned Case from the verb, but gets morphological case via Case-agreement with its possessor NP
 - (iv) Case agreement is based on the semantic relationship of inalienable possession which holds between the Possessor and the IP NP.
 - (v) the inalienable-possession relationship may constitute a form of minor/secondary predication, which is a cross-linguistically known licensing condition for Case agreement.

Young-joo Kim's approach can be seen as an attempt to make the syntax of multiple case constructions less "exotic" by reducing it to the familiar phenomenon of case agreement found in languages outside of East Asia. Like many other recent analyses, her analysis attempts to retain the notion that a predicate may assign only as many Cases as

the number of arguments it subcategorizes for (Biuniqueness). 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 cross-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 Kim cites. Note the following contrast:

- (6) a. Je lui croyais une maîtresse dans chaque port. (Kim 1989:450)
 I him-DAT thought a mistress in each port.
 'I thought he had a mistress in every port'
- b. On le considère le fils spirituel de Valéry.
 one him-ACC considers the son spiritual of Valéry.
 'he is considered the spiritual son 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 INFL depending on its surface position

Under our analysis, the case-agreement observed in the Inalienable Possession Construction must be considered epiphenomenal, due not to a rule 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 NOM not to case-agreement with the whole-NP but rather to the fact that passive verbs in Korean are non-Case-assigners,² as illustrated in (8). Here, too, the multiple accusatives in the active turn into multiple nominatives:

- (8) a. Cheli-ka Mary-lul panci-lul senmul-ul ha-yess-ta ACTIVE
 Cheli-Nom Mary-Acc ring-Acc gift-Acc do-Pst-Ind
 'Cheli presented Mary with a ring.'

- (14) a. Nay-ka Yumi-eykey phal-ey cwusa-lul noh-ass-ta. DAT DAT
 I-Nom Yumi-Dat arm-Dat shot-ACC give-Pst-Ind ACC DAT
 b. Nay-ka Yumi-lul phal-ey cwusa-lul noh-ass-ta. ACC ACC
 c. Nay-ka Yumi-lul phal-ul cwusa-lul noh-ass-ta. DAT ACC
 d.?Nay-ka Yumi-eykey phal-ul cwusa-lul noh-ass-ta.

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, fn.22; p. 272). This assumption simplifies the statement of lexical requirements, and allows us to consider *-ey* and *-eykey* instances of the same case marker. Nothing in our analysis hinges on whether this dative particle is actually a case-marker (like NOM/ACC) or a postposition.

For some speakers, all four case patterns in (14) are acceptable; for others, only the (a,b) patterns are acceptable. 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 in Korean (see Section 3 for discussion), then the dative on *phal* 'arm' in (14) must have some other source, related directly or indirectly to the case-assigning properties of the verb *noh* 'inject'. 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-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.⁵ 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.⁶ 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.

3. DATIVE AS LOCATIVE CASE ON PART-NPS?

If part-NPs do not get case via agreement, what is source of the dative marker *-ey* on the part-NP in the following examples?

- (15) a. Nay-ka Yumi-eykey ima-ey kissuha-yess-ta.
 I-NOM Yumi-DAT forehead-DAT kiss-Pst-Ind
 b. Nay-ka Yumi-eykey phal-ey cwusa-lul noh-ass-ta.
 I-NOM Yumi-DAT arm-DAT shot-ACC give-Pst-Ind

Young-Se Kang (1986) and O'Grady (1987) analyze the part-NP as an adverbial NP with locative meaning, following an observation originally due to Susumu Kuno. Under this analysis, one might hypothesize that the use of the dative *-ey* on the part-NP in (15a,b) is a semantically predictable use of locative case, parallel to the use of instrumental case in (16):

- (16) a. Inho-ka kay-lul kkoli-lo/lul cap-ass-ta.
 Inho-NOM dog-ACC tail-INST/ACC hold-Pst-Dec
 'Inho held the dog by the tail' (Y.-J.Kim 1990:275, 24b)
 b. Inho-ka kay-lul eti-lul cap-ass-ni?
 Inho-NOM dog-ACC where-ACC hold-Pst-Q
 'Where did Inho hold the dog?'

This suggestion seems initially plausible since the corresponding question word is *eti* 'where' rather than *mes* 'what', as shown in (b). But on closer inspection, this suggestion proves untenable, since the use of *-ey* turns out to be lexically governed. Observe that dative *-ey* is impossible with normal ACC-assigning verbs, e.g. *ccalu* 'cut', *cha* 'kick':

- (17) a. Nay-ka Yumi-lul/*eykey cha-ass-ta.
 I-NOM Yumi-ACC/*DAT kick-Pst-Dec
 'I kicked Yumi'
 b. Nay-ka Yumi-lul tali-lul/*ey cha-ass-ta.
 I-NOM Yumi-ACC leg-ACC/*LOC kick-Pst-Dec
 'I kicked Yumi in the leg'

For such verbs neither the whole-NP nor the part-NP can be dative. A locative marker on the part-NP in (17b) is ungrammatical even though the meaning of the sentence is clear; therefore, the ungrammaticality 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 *lexically-governed*. Adjuncts typically bear some semantically appropriate Case-marker/postposition which is constant across verbs types, voice, aspect, etc. This clearly contrasts with the dative that appears on part-NPs, which is licensed only for verbs that can assign DAT 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 V: the part-NP gets case-marked in the same manner as any verbal argument. DAT is possible on the part-NP if and only if the verb assigns DAT case to the relevant argument.⁷ 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 *by*-phrase in passives: is it an argument? an adjunct? or something in between (what Grimshaw (1990) calls an *a-adjunct*)? All logical possibilities have been taken in the literature:

- (18) a. the part-NP is an *adjunct*:
 1. part-NP is an adverbial NP with locative meaning
 (Young-Se Kang 1986; O'Grady 1987)
 2. part-NP is a secondary predicate (Young-joo Kim 1989/1990)

- b. the part-NP is a verbal argument (at least underlyingly):
1. all Possessor Ascension analyses (in RG terminology, the part-NP is an underlying 2)
 2. within GB, James Yoon 1990; Choe 1987: possessee is the 'logical subject or object' (p. 101)

In the Possessor Ascension analysis of Relational Grammar, the part-NP is considered a verbal argument: an "initial 2" which gets put en chômage. Young-Se Kang (1986) and O'Grady (1987) on the other hand analyze it as an adverbial NP with locative meaning, following an observation originally due to Kuno. Young-Joo Kim (1989; 1990, Ch. 6) argues that that the part-whole relation is an instance of "secondary" predication, and assumes that 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 Warlpiri counterpart, the part-NP is predicated of the whole-NP. In short, all logically 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 account 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/nonreferential, 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 some other source, namely, Case-agreement with the Possessor NP, which IS an argument of V

Following Kang (1986), Young-joo Kim (1990:269ff) takes optionality 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 pro-drop languages. Moreover, since there are no morphological markers for argumenthood, the data underdetermines the possible analyses. So, I'm going to take the opposite tack, taking advantage of the fact that there ARE overt morphological markers for case in Korean,⁸ 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: 108); a subcase is the standard assumption that lexical or inherent Case is theta-related (Zaenen et al.1985; Chomsky 1986:196).

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 adverbial adjuncts of various kinds (see e.g. Maling 1989), the argument that the part-NP is an argument is in fact a bit subtler 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 may 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) a. category: NP vs PP reach NP 'reach the station'
 arrive [at NP] 'arrive at/*to the station'
 come [to NP] 'come to/*at the station'
- b. case: DAT, GEN, INST

It is well-known that in many European languages (e.g. German, Icelandic, 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" (ECM): no ECM verb assigns oblique case to the embedded 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 dative 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.⁹

- (22) Dative as lexically-governed inherent case in Korean
- monotransitives: DAT on object is lexically governed
e.g. object of kissu-ha 'kiss'; malha 'talk to'; kamsa-ha 'thank'; takao 'approach'; wiphyep-ha 'threaten' either DAT or (preferably) ACC (cf. hyeppak-ha 'threaten')
 - ditransitives:
DAT ACC only: ponay 'send'; soksaki 'whisper'; pak 'stick'; tenci 'throw'; ssu 'write'; yaksokha 'promise', etc.
DAT ACC/ACC ACC: cwu 'give'; noh 'give'; kaluchi 'teach'; seltukha 'persuade'; sit 'load'; ppayat 'rob'; nakkachay 'snatch', etc.
 - complex verbs consisting of $V_{sem} + cwu-$
sa-cwu 'buy'; chaca-cwu 'find'; poye-cwu 'show'; kaceka-cwu 'take to'
kwuwe-cwu 'bake' cf. kwup DAT ACC only
pulle-cwu 'sing' cf. pulu DAT ACC only
sokayhay-cwu 'introduce' cf. sokay-ha 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 manha 'to meet' can take either accusative or comitative 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 option,¹⁰ (this alternation might better be interpreted as optional assignment of DAT to the goal/source). Complex verbs consisting of $V_{sem} + cwu-$ inherit the case-assigning properties of the head cwu- in allowing the case alternation.¹¹ Although there is certainly idiolectal variation in which ditransitive verbs allow the ACC ACC case frame, the point is that for all speakers there will be some ditransitive verbs which do not allow the alternation, and some which do, and the distinction is not predictable on the basis of thematic role. This means that for such verbs, the part-NP will be assigned inherent Case by V, and hence it must be theta-marked by V. Given the basic premise that inherent Case is assigned only under theta-assignment, it follows that the part-NP is a verbal argument, and not 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 two (or more) NPs together fill one argument

position in the verb's theta-grid. We assume following Yoon (1989) *inter alia* that the part-NP is an unsaturated 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 subcategorized 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. kuman hwaskim-ey ku ssangnyen-eykey ppaym-ul ttayli-ess-ta.
just anger-DAT the bitch-DAT cheek-ACC hit-Pst-Ind
'and then, out of anger, I hit the bitch on the cheek'
- b. *...ku ssangnyen-eykey cha-lul ttayli-ess-ta.
the bitch-DAT car-ACC hit-Pst-Ind
'and then, out of anger, I hit the bitch on the/her car'

The verbs which allow this include ttayli 'hit', cha 'kick' and chi 'slap'.¹² 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-joo Kim (1990:269ff) following Young-se Kang (1986) 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 ppop 'to pluck', cal(u) 'to cut', and kkakk 'to clip'. Unlike examples with verbs such as ttayli '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 (24) and (25):

- (24) a. *Chelsoo-ka talk-ul ppop-ass-ta.
Chelsoo-NOM hen -ACC pluck-Pst-Ind
'Chelsoo plucked the hen'
- b. *Chelsoo-ka (meli-ka kin) haksayng-tul-ul cal-lass-ta.
Chelsoo-NOM (hair-NOM long) student-pl-ACC cut-Pst-Ind
'Chelsoo cut the (long-haired) students'
- c. *Chelsoo-ka emeni-lul kkakka-tuli-ess-ta.
Chelsoo-NOM mother-ACC clip-HON-Pst-Ind
'Chelsoo clipped his mother'
- (25) a. Chelsoo-ka thel-ul ppop-ass-ta.
Chelsoo-NOM feather-ACC pluck-Pst-Ind
'Chelsoo plucked the feather(s)'
- b. Chelsoo-ka meli-lul cal-l-ass-ta.
Chelsoo-NOM hair-ACC cut-Pst-Ind
'Chelsoo cut the hair'
- c. Chelsoo-ka sonthop-ul kkakka-tuli-ess-ta.
Chelsoo-NOM nail-ACC clip-HON-Pst-Ind
'Chelsoo clipped the fingernail(s)'

These Korean verbs do not take animate objects except in the irrelevant (rather metaphorical) interpretation in which *ppop* and *cal(u)* 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:

- (26) a. %Chelsoo-ka talk-ul thel-ul ppop-ass-ta.
Chelsoo-NOM hen-ACC feather-ACC pluck-Pst-Ind
'Chelsoo plucked the hen.'
b. %Chelsoo-ka meli-ka ki-n haksayng-tul-ul meli-lul cal-lassta.
Chelsoo-NOM hair-NOM long-REL student-pl-ACC hair-ACC cut
'Chelsoo cut the hair of the long-haired students'
c. %Chelsoo-ka emeni-lul sonthop-ul kkakka-tuli-ess-ta.
Chelsoo-NOM mother-ACC nail-ACC clip-HON-Pst-Ind
'Chelsoo clipped his mother's nails.'

Young-se Kang (1986:95-96) reports that the whole-part construction is not possible with these verbs, and apparently considers these examples 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-joo Kim (1989:458ff/1990:269, 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 examples. It may be that some speakers impose a stricter "entailment" 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.63b) presents the following passive sentence as grammatical:

- (27) [meli-ka ki -n] ku haksayng-i sensayng-nim-eykey meli-ka
hair-NOM long-REL that student-NOM teacher-HON-by hair-NOM
cal-li-ess-ta.
cut-Pass-Pst
'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 prenominal (genitive) modifier inside the NP headed by the part NP).

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

the selectional restrictions)

- (28) a. *Congsoli-ka Yumi-lul kwy-lul ttayli-ess-ta.
bell.sound-NOM Yumi-ACC ear-ACC hit-Pst-Ind
b. *Congsoli-ka Yumi-lul ttayli-ess-ta.
c. Congsoli-ka [Yumi-uy kwy]-lul ttayli-ess-ta.
GEN ear

Note that even speakers who accept the examples in (26) reject (28a). The contrasts illustrated in these examples shows 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 Soowon 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-joo 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 Ascension is limited to hosts heading a 2-Arc (Youn 1989:68; Gerdts 1991b) cannot be maintained. They also argue against the suggestion that Q-float is a subcase of Ascension (Choi 1986), since for most speakers, Q-float from dative antecedents is prohibited.

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

syntactic passive and a Case-assigning "adversity" 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 *-uy* as *-ey*. However, phonetic confusion cannot be the correct account of the multiple datives, since sentential adverbs can be inserted between the two NPs:

- (i) Kongcang-ey kapcaksulepkey changko-ey pul-i na-(a)ss-ta.
factory-DAT all.of.a.sudden storeroom fire break.out-Pst-Ind

Such adverbs cannot be inserted between a prenominal GEN modifier and the head N (except of course in gerundial constructions).

4. This is independently noted by Choe (1987:106), who observed that all (ditransitive) verbs with the 'benefactive' marker (i.e. *cwu*) 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 *cwusa* is dropped: (i) Nay-ka Yumi-lul phal-ul cwusa noh-ass-ta. Unexplained is the marginal status of the fourth possible combination in (d).

6. Passivizing the examples in (14) produces the following patterns:
(i) a. Yumi-eykey phal-ey payksin-cwusa-ka noh-aci-ess-ta. DAT DAT
Yumi-Dat arm-Dat vaccine-shot-Nom give-Pass-Pst-Ind
b. Yumi-ka phal-ey payksin-cwusa-ka noh-aci-ess-ta. NOM DAT
c. *Yumi-eykey phal-i payksin-cwusa-ka noh-aci-ess-ta. *DAT NOM
d. *Yumi-ka phal-i payksin-cwusa-ka noh-aci-ess-ta. *NOM NOM
'Yumi was given a vaccine shot in the arm.'

Given the grammaticality of accusative on the part-NP in the active, it is unclear why nominative is not possible in the passive, that is, why there is no passive corresponding to (14c). Gerdts (1991b) accounts for this by hypothesizing that the part-NP is actually a locative, but this suggestion fails to account for the larger array of data discussed here and in Maling & Kim (in press), nor does it explain why dative on the part-NP is possible only for verbs which govern dative on the relevant argument.

Note that while the verb *noh* 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-NP reflects the case-assigning properties of the predicate rather than whatever governs the assignment of accusative to various adverbials in Korean, see Maling (1989:303).

8. The overtiness of NOM/ACC markers unfortunately does not eliminate debate as to what they mark: case (NOM/ACC); GFs (Subj vs OBJ); Focus markers (Jong-Yurl 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 Gerdts (1991a:8, fn.6) who claims that non-standard Case in Korean is "a regular and not idiosyncratic

feature in Korean" and never lexicalized.

10. See Ki-Sun Hong (1991) 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 Affectedness. If this suggestion proves tenable, then the evidence for lexically-governed case on the part-NP is reduced to the monotransitive verbs in (a).

11. Taegoo Chung (1991) 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 percolate to the compound V.

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

REFERENCES

- Choe, Hyon Sook (1987) "Syntactic Adjunction, A-chain and the ECP - Multiple Identical Case Construction in Korean," *NELS 17*, Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the Northeast Linguistic Society, MIT, 1987, pp. 100-120.
- Choi, Young-Seok (1986) "Quantifier Floating as an Instance of Ascension," *Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics 18*, 1-58.
- Chun, Soon Ae (1985) "Possessor Ascension for Multiple Case Sentences," *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics 1*, pp. 30-39.
- Chun, Soon Ae (1986) "Possessor Ascension in Korean," *Buffalo Working Papers in Linguistics 1*, 51-97.
- Chung, Taegoo (1991) "Argument Structure of Compound Verbs in Korean," paper read at the Workshop on Korean Syntax & Semantics, LSA Summer Institute, July 26, 1991.
- Gerdts, Donna (1991a) "Outline of a Relational Theory of Case," unpublished ms. dated July 7, 1991, Simon Fraser University.
- Gerdts, Donna (1991b) "The Syntax of Possession in Korean," paper read at the Workshop on Korean Syntax & Semantics, LSA Summer Institute, July 26, 1991.
- Gerdts, Donna and Cheong Youn (1989) "Non-nominative Subjects in Korean," *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics 3*, 235-247.
- Grimshaw, Jane (1990) *Argument Structure*, MIT Press.
- Hale, Kenneth (1981) "Preliminary Remarks on the Grammar of Part-Whole Relationship in Warlpiri," in J. Hollyman and A. Pawley (eds.), *Studies in Pacific Languages and Cultures*, Linguistic Society of New Zealand, Auckland, pp. 333-344.
- Hong, Ki-Sun (1991) "Alternations between Objects and Obliques in Korean," paper read at the Workshop on Korean Syntax & Semantics, LSA Summer Institute, July 27, 1991.
- Kang, Young-Se (1986) *Korean Syntax and Universal Grammar*, Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University; published by Hanshin, Seoul.
- Kim, Yang Soon (1988) *Licensing Principles and Phrase Structure*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison; published by Hanshin, Seoul.
- Kim, Young-joo (1989) "Inalienable Possession as a Semantic Relationship underlying Predication: the Case of Multiple Accusative Constructions," *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics 3*, 445-467.

- Kim, Young-Joo (1990) The Syntax and Semantics of Korean Case: the Interaction Between Lexical and Syntactic Levels of Representation, Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University; published by Tayhak Press, Seoul.
- Lee, Jeong-Shik (1991) "Case Minimality: Case Alternation in the Korean ECM Construction," to appear in Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics 4, 317-328.
- Maling, Joan (1989) "Adverbials and Structural Case in Korean," Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics 3, 297-308.
- Maling, Joan (1991) "Whether to Agree or Not: the Case of the Part-NP," Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics 4, 339-352.
- Maling, Joan and Soowon Kim (1990) "The Inalienable Possession Construction and Case in Korean," in Eung-Jin Baek (ed.) Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Korean Linguistics, University of Toronto Press, pp. 350-360.
- Maling, Joan and Soowon Kim (1992) "Case Assignment in the Inalienable Possession Construction in Korean," Journal of East Asian Linguistics 1, 37-68.
- Massam, Diane (1985) Case Theory and the Projection Principle, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- O'Grady, William (1987) "Against the Case Tier: Evidence from Korean," Language Research 23, 607-619.
- Seiler, Hansjakob (1983) Possession as an Operational Dimension of Language, Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen.
- Song, Seok Choong (1984) "Semantics of Korean Particles: *kwa*, *lul*, and *ey*," Papers in East Asian Languages 2, 88-100.
- Song, Seok Choong (1988) Explorations in Korean Syntax and Semantics, Korean Research Monograph No. 14, Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley.
- Yang, In-Seok (1972) Korean Syntax: case-markers, delimiters, complementation and relativization, PhD dissertation, University of Hawaii; published by Baekhapsa, Seoul.
- Yoon, James Hye-Suk (1989) "The Grammar of Inalienable Possession Constructions in Korean, Mandarin and French," Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics 3, 357-368.
- Yoon, James Hye-Suk (1990) "Theta Theory and the Grammar of Inalienable Possession Constructions," NELS 20, Proceedings of the 20th Conference of the Northeast Linguistic Society, Carnegie Mellon University, pp. 502-516.
- Yoon, Jong-Yurl (1990) Korean Syntax and Generalized X-bar Theory, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, published by Hanshin, Seoul.
- Youn, Cheong (1989) A Relational Analysis of Korean Multiple Nominative Constructions, Unpublished PhD dissertation, SUNY, Buffalo.
- Zaenen, Annie, Joan Maling, and Höskuldur Thráinsson (1985) "Case and Grammatical Functions: the Icelandic Passive," Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 3, 441-483.

Department of Psychology
Brandeis University
Waltham, MA 02254-9110
maling@brandeis.bitnet

Case Alternation and Word Order Variation in Nominal Clauses

Young-Suk Lee (ysl@linc.cis.upenn.edu)
University of Pennsylvania

1 Introduction

Recently, a number of interesting studies have been done on scrambling ([Webelhuth 1989], [Mahajan 1990], [Saito 1990], [Frey 1990], [Miyagawa 1990], etc.).¹ 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. [Saito 1985], [Webelhuth 1984]), 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. [Farmer 1980], [Hale 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 induced by the requirement of case 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 this unclear 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 discuss at length 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 order possibilities which are sensitive to the kind of case which the arguments bear (cf. [Iida 1987], [Shibatani and Kageyama 1988], [Sells 1990], [Miyagawa 1990] for Japanese, and [Cho and Sells 1991] for Korean). The intricacy of the data serves to constrain certain details in the theory of grammar which have, until now, been left undetermined.

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 revolving 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 this 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 1988], [Sells 1990], [Miyagawa 1990] for Japanese, and [Cho and Sells 1991] for Korean, a process/event noun (process noun hereafter), as opposed to

¹This research has been partially funded by DARPA N00014-90-J-1863. I have greatly benefited from presenting this work at the LSA Summer Institute Workshop on Korean Syntax/Semantics, Santa Cruz. It is a pleasure to thank Richard Campbell, Dong-In Cho, Stanley Dubinsky, Robert Frank, Jeong-Ryeol Kim, Michael Niv, Beatrice Santorini, James Yoon, Raffaella Zanuttini for helpful discussions on the issue, and Young-Mee Cho, Eunjo Han, Ki-Sun Hong, Sun-Hyun Hong, Chang-Bong Lee, Kenziro Matsuda, Hiroaki Tada, Saeko Urushibara for their native speaker's judgments. My special thanks go to my advisor Anthony Kroch for pointing out to me the importance of the data discussed here, Aravind Joshi for supporting this research financially, and Shigeru Miyagawa for encouraging me to pursue this issue by providing relevant material at various occasions. Without his help, this paper wouldn't have existed at all. All errors and shortcomings are, of course, my own.

²Some typical diagnostics used to resolve this issue are anaphor/pronoun binding, reconstruction effects, and parasitic gap licensing.

³As for a claim that scrambling is induced by the requirement of case realization, see [Miyagawa 1990] and [Mahajan 1990].