

Variations of double nominative in Korean and Japanese

Dieter Wunderlich

Preface

A personal note. Once Sebastian Löbner and I tried to climb Mount Fuji, the king of mountains. Because of heavy rainfall, we were forced to turn back, and ended in a sauna with a sake bar. The double ascent had become a kind of double passivity; and both of us were disappointed by this failure. The king of cases is the nominative; a double nominative has two kings of different descent, sometimes emerging in the passive voice (*Leideform* in German). This doubling experience made me ultimately decide to write this article.

An observation. The double nominative is a very popular subject for Japanese and Korean linguists. There are, presumably, hundreds of papers discussing how it interacts with various fields of Japanese and Korean syntax, mostly parallel in these languages. Not wrongly, Japanese and Korean linguists consider the double nominative to be a unique feature of their languages.

A prejudice. A double nominative is not spectacular in itself. Some linguists believe that nominative is assigned in a specific context, say SpecT. In that case, one has to ask: and what assigns the second nominative? Alternatively one might believe that nominative is the default case (often unmarked), and so a double nominative may be more frequent than was previously believed. In many languages, if (for some reason) accusative is blocked for an object, nominative becomes the automatic case instead by default.

A brief abstract. In this paper, various types of alternations bringing about double nominatives are discussed. Nominatives in particular invite focus or topic interpretations, dependent on further circumstances. They also result when more complex structures are formed by extraction. Sometimes, double accusatives and double genitives with similar functions are found. These case-doubling

and case-stacking alternations appear as a key to major areas of Korean and Japanese grammar as well as to the historical, often parallel, development of these languages. Many alternations are lexically triggered. Sometimes the double-nominative emerges because the accusative is forbidden in a stative context. A lexical constraint-based framework might be fruitful to account for the interaction between vocabulary classes, information structure and constructional properties.

1 Introduction: Possessor-raising as a source for double-nominative

Japanese and Korean exhibit the same type of double-nominative (NOM-NOM) construction, which relates to a more ‘basic’ GEN-NOM construction by ‘possessor raising’: the possessor ‘moves’ out of a nominal domain into a higher verbal domain – such a variation might be described as syntactic movement or by a lexical rule adding a possessor argument to the verb: $\lambda xV(x) \Rightarrow \lambda x\lambda y[\text{POSS}(y, x) \ \& \ V(x)]$. In a sentence such as (1b) or (2b), the first NOM-NP (=N1) stands in a relational or functional ‘inalienable’ relationship with the second NOM-NP (=N2) – as the ‘possessor’ of a body part, an illness, a relative, a piece of clothing, etc. While the combination GEN-NOM forms a single syntactic constituent, NOM-NOM does not, as shown by the fact that N1 and N2 can be separated by a sentence adverb (Nakamura 2002). However, the order of the two NOM arguments cannot be changed, similarly to the fixed order in the GEN-NOM constituent. In the following, J=Japanese, K=Korean. Note that Korean NOM is either realized by /-ka/ (after vowel) or by /-i/ (after consonant).

- (1) a. *Syusyoo-no byooki-ga saikin omo-i.* J
 [Prime Minister-GEN illness-NOM] recently serious-PRES
 b. *Syusyoo-ga saikin byooki-ga omo-i.*
 Prime Minister-NOM recently illness-NOM serious-PRES
 ‘The Prime Minister is seriously ill.’
- (2) a. *Swungsang-uy pyeng-i choykun simha-ta.* K
 [Prime Minister-GEN illness-NOM] recently serious-DECL
 b. *Swungsang-i choykun pyeng-i simha-ta.*
 Prime Minister-NOM recently illness-NOM serious-DECL
 ‘The Prime Minister is seriously ill.’

In addition, both Japanese and Korean have a number of related structures which also exhibit some sort of ‘possessor raising’: among them are NOM-NOM objects in Japanese dative-subject verbs (3), and ACC-ACC objects in Korean (4), see Nakamura (2002) and Kim (1989). Similar to NOM-NOM, the ACC-ACC construction is not possible with an alienable possessor, see (4b).

- (3) a. *Hanako-ni(wa) kono hon-no naiyoo-ga yoku waka-ru.* J
 H.-DAT(TOP) [this book-GEN content-NOM] well understand-PRES
 b. *Hanako-ni(wa) kono hon-ga yoku naiyoo-ga waka-ru.*
 H.-DAT(TOP) this book-NOM well content-NOM understand-PRES
 ‘Hanako understands the content of this book well.’
- (4) a. *Mary-ka John-uy/-ul tali-lul cha-ess-ta.* inalienable, K
 Mary-NOM John-GEN/ACC leg-ACC kick-PAST-DECL
 ‘Mary kicked John’s leg.’
 b. *Mary-ka John-uy/*-ul cha-lul cha-ess-ta.* alienable, K
 Mary-NOM John-GEN/*ACC car-ACC kick-PAST-DECL
 ‘Mary kicked John’s car.’

Concerning the constructions (3) and (4), the counterpart in the respective other language is odd. In Korean, something like *content (book)* doesn’t seem inalienable enough (or, affected enough) to enter the ACC construction, see (5). In Japanese, the ACC-ACC construction is only accepted if the two ACCs are separated by adverbs (Kim 1989), see (6b), or if the possessor is scrambled (6c), clefted (6d), or associated with a focus-inducing element (6e) (examples from Hiraiwa 2010).

- (5) *Hanna-eykey(-nun) i chayk(-uy) nayyong-i cal ihaytoy-n-ta.* K
 Hana-DAT(-TOP) this book(-GEN) content-NOM well intelligible-PRS-DECL
 ‘Hana understands the content of this book well.’
- (6) a. *Mary-ga John-no/*-o asi-o ketta.* J
 M.-NOM J.-GEN/*-ACC leg-ACC kicked
 ‘Mary kicked John’s leg.’
 b. *Mary-ga John-o kinoo undoozyo-de asi-o ketta.*
 M.-NOM J.-ACC yesterday playground-LOC leg-ACC kicked
 ‘Yesterday, Mary kicked John’s leg at the playground.’
 c. *John-o Mary-ga asi-o ketta.*
 J.-ACC M.-NOM leg-ACC kicked
 ‘John, Mary kicked (his) leg.’

- d. [*Mary-ga asi-o ketta-no*]-*wa John-o da.*
 M.-NOM leg-ACC kicked-C-TOP J.-ACC COP
 ‘It was John that Mary kicked the leg of.’
- e. *Mary-ga John-mo/dake/sae/wa asi-o ketta.*
 M.-NOM J.-also/only/even/TOP leg-ACC kicked
 ‘Mary also/only/even kicked John’s leg.’

The first question is: Why does the case pattern NOM-NOM appear, rather than NOM-ACC or DAT-NOM? Answer: All predicates that allow NOM-NOM as an alternation are static, and static predicates are excluded from having ACC arguments in both Japanese and Korean. (Note, by the way, that German adjectives, which form a class of stative predicates, also exclude ACC arguments.) A binary verb construction with dative would have to be lexically marked, as is the case with *wakaru* ‘understand’ in (3). That dative-subject verbs have a NOM object is conditioned by the universal constraint (7a). Since ‘understand’ is stative, ACC is excluded, while ‘kick,’ a nonstative verb, allows ACC. Finally, Korean allows ACC-ACC objects, but Japanese does not; this is because UNIQUENESS(ACC) is specifically highly ranked in Japanese.

- (7) a. DEFAULT. Each case domain contains the default case NOM. (universal)
 b. *ACC/+stative. Accusative is not possible with stative verbs. (Jap./Kor.)
 c. UNIQUENESS(ACC). ACC occurs only once in a case domain. (Jap.)

These constraints are part of the package proposed in Wunderlich (2001), a first attempt to extend the analysis of optimal case patterns in German and Icelandic (Wunderlich 2003) to a typologically different language such as Japanese. None of the individual constraints given in (7) is new, but what may be new is that each of these constraints can be violated when they are part of a ranked system of constraints. A case domain is governed by a lexical head (such as a verb, or a noun, or some other argument-taking entity), it is thus more specific than Chomsky’s concept of *phase*. Both (7b) and (7c) are well-known in Japanese linguistics: (7b) was observed by Kuno (1973), and (7c) has been called *double-o constraint*, first described by Harada (1973).

Poser (2002) distinguishes between underlying and surface double-o constraint; it is the latter that is captured by (7c). The underlying double-o constraint forbids ACC on the causee of a causativized transitive verb; such a constraint is unnecessary under the assumption that the medial argument of a 3-place predicate is underlyingly dative. In fact, many of Poser’s observations are predicted by Lexi-

cal Decomposition Grammar (Wunderlich 1997), for example, that “the verbs that take dative objects permit accusative causees, while those that take accusative objects do not” (1997: 12) (they instead require dative causees) – note that in both instances an optimal NOM-ACC-DAT pattern results, although in different distributions. According to Poser, path-adverbials, which are realized by accusative, can co-occur with an ACC object. Thus, there exist exceptions to the double-o-constraint; in other words, this constraint might be dominated by an even more specific one.

Hiraiwa (2010) explicitly restricts the domain of the double-o constraint to a phase, and also discusses the possibilities for escaping this constraint, as shown in (6c) - (6e) above. Hiraiwa does not discuss what seems to be important, namely that the escape structures have their own functions. A scrambled object possessor like in (6c) could be a topic, while a clefted possessor as in (6d) is in focus. Moreover, the particles added to *John* in (6e) are focus-inducing. The cleft construction (6d) is certainly biclausal, but whether the scrambled version (6c) as well as the focus-particle version (6e) constitute an extra phase (an extra case domain) might be questionable. It could well be the case that these constructions count as exceptions to the double-o-constraint for other than structural reasons.

Another question is: Why does the Korean object-possessor construction show ACC-ACC rather than DAT-ACC? Some authors assume a requirement of case sharing (*case concordance, case-agreement*). The Korean passive, however, speaks against *case sharing* as a rule, because NOM-ACC is possible alongside NOM-NOM (8a,b, Yang 2000). (Note that DEFAULT (7a) does not require more than one NOM.) Similarly, the raised possessor of a dative-marked object can be DAT or NOM (8c, Maling & Kim 1992), thus, case sharing can, but doesn't have to apply. Inversely, in the nominal predicate construction, where German shows case sharing (NOM-NOM: *er_{NOM} wurde nicht als Idiot_{NOM} angesehen* ‘he wasn't considered a fool,’ ACC-ACC: *man sah ihn_{ACC} nicht als Idioten_{ACC} an* ‘one didn't consider him a fool’), Korean does not, as shown in (8c).

- (8) a. *John-i/*-ul tali-ka/-lul cha-i-ess-ta.* K
 John-NOM/*ACC leg-NOM/ACC kick-PASS-PAST-DECL
 ‘John’s leg was kicked.’
- b. *John-i tali-lul kkuth-ul cha-i-ess-ta.*
 John-NOM leg-ACC end-ACC kick-PASS-PAST-DECL
 ‘The end of John’s leg was kicked.’

- c. *John-i Yumi-lul papo-ka/*lul an-i-la-ko mit-ess-ta.*
 J.-NOM Y.-ACC fool-NOM/*ACC not-be-SUSP-COMP believe-PAST-DECL
 ‘John believed Yumi not to be a fool.’

Note that ‘possessor raising’ is recursive (regardless of whether it is considered a lexical or a syntactical operation).

- (9) a. *Mary-ka John-ul tali-lul oluncok-ul cha-ss-ta.* K
 Mary-NOM John-ACC leg-ACC right.side-ACC kick-PAST-DECL
 ‘Mary kicked the right side of John’s leg.’
 b. *Mary-ka John-uy/ul elkwul-ul sacin(-ul) ccik-ess-ta.*
 M.-NOM J.-GEN/ACC face-ACC picture(-ACC) take-PAST-DECL
 ‘Mary took a picture of John’s face.’ (Cho 2003: 346)

It has been extensively discussed in the literature whether NOM-NOM constructions have two subjects (as suggested by the usually used notion of ‘double subject’), or, if they have only one subject, which NP it is. Kuroda (1978) proposed the structure [N1 [N2 PRED]_{S1}]_{S2} for the double-subject. Regretfully, the most common subject tests (such as binding of Japanese *zibun*, resp. of Korean *caki* ‘self’, honorific agreement with the verb, or plural agreement with an adverb or verb in Korean) yield unclear results. Yet if one uses [N1.NOM [N2.NOM PRED]] in a raising-to-object construction, one would expect N1 to be raised.

Yoon (2009) states that in the multiple subject construction (with iterative NOM doubling), only the final NOM-NP is the grammatical subject (which is predicated of), while all the preceding NOM-NPs are major subjects related to the grammatical subject. More precisely, in my words: each of these NPs fills a gap in the respective subsequent NP, which expresses a relational (or even functional concept). But why something which, for example, gives a value for a body part function such as *someone’s leg* should have the same grammatical function as the body part itself, remains a mystery.

What is interesting here is the fact that something which in English is processed from an innermost body part up to a large area (‘the [leg of the [president of the [parliament of the [European Union]]]] is broken’), becomes a reversed chain ‘[European Union [parliament [president [leg is broken]]]]’ in Japanese and Korean. In English, an expectation about a property and the possessor of some leg is built up, while in Japanese a piecemeal zooming-in takes place.

A more specific question is: Which relations allow ‘possessor raising’? According to Bak (2004), there is a split low in the inalienable hierarchy *body parts* >

family member > *clothing* > **equipment*, compare (10a,b). The restriction is the same with intransitive predicates, see (10c,d), friendship is alienable in the same way that shoes are (10e) (Sun 2013).

- (10) a. *Youngsu-ka Chelsu-uy/lul phal-ul ttayli-ess-ta.* K
 Y.-NOM C.-GEN/ACC arm-ACC hit-PAST-DECL
 ‘Youngsu hit Chelsu’s arm.’
- b. *Youngsu-ka Chelsu-uy/*lul cup-ul ttayli-ess-ta.*
 Y.-NOM C.-GEN/*ACC cup-ACC hit-PAST-DECL
 ‘Youngsu hit Chelsu’s cup.’
- c. *Mary-uy/ka nwun-i yeypu-ta.*
 M.-GEN/NOM eye-NOM pretty-DECL
 ‘Mary’s eyes are pretty.’
- d. *Mary-uy/*ka sinpali-i yeypu-ta.*
 M.-GEN/*NOM shoe-NOM pretty-DECL
 ‘Mary’s shoes are pretty.’
- e. *Mary-uy/*ka shinkwu-ka yeypu-ta.*
 M.-GEN/*NOM friend-NOM pretty-DECL
 ‘Mary’s friend is pretty.’

Cho (2003) claims that possessor raising is only possible when an *entailment* of the following sort holds (which clearly is too a narrow restriction because it wrongly excludes family members):

- John’s leg was kicked ⇒ John was kicked. (NOM-NOM is possible)
 John’s friend was kicked ⇒ John was kicked. (*NOM-NOM)
 John’s father was kicked ⇒ John was kicked. (but NOM-NOM is possible!)

(Those who consider the raised possessor as a second subject sometimes seem to have such an entailment in mind.) A further question is: Which predicates allow the possessor of their subject to be raised? Above, it has been suggested that the predicates must be stative. Evidence is given by (11): the genitive possessor allows two interpretations, while the raised possessor is restricted to the stative interpretation (Sun 2013). An interpretational asymmetry like that in (11) tends to trigger bifurcation: NOM-NOM ↔ generic, GEN-NOM ↔ episodic interpretation.

- (11) *Mary-uy/ka atul-i chwukku-lul ha-n-ta.* K
 M.-GEN/NOM son-NOM soccer-ACC do-PRES-DECL
 (i) ‘Mary’s son is playing soccer (now).’ GEN *NOM
 (ii) ‘Mary’s son is a (professional) soccer player.’ GEN NOM

Note, however, that the possessor of an *object* of a dynamic verb like ‘kick’ or ‘hit’ can be raised (see the examples above). There is obviously a complex (and somewhat mysterious) interaction between the kind of predicate, the sort of noun, the relationship between noun and possessor, the fixed word order between possessor and noun, the role of the noun (whether it is subject or object), the domain of the possessor (whether it belongs to the nominal or the verbal domain), the case marking of the noun and possessor, and the three constraints given in (7) (and possibly more). The raised possessor of an object is a further object (and thus marked accusative by default), while the raised possessor of a subject is not an object (and thus marked nominative by default) – this seems simple, yet I think the rigid case-marking of the raised possessor is the most embarrassing problem. All these factors (at least the ways they interact) could vary due to historical contingencies. The constraints mentioned above, *ACC/+stat (7b) and UNIQUENESS(ACC) (7c), could be the product of some development conditioned by accidental variation in the domain of possessor raising.

It is extremely surprising that Japanese and Korean, considered to be genealogically unrelated by most linguists, ended up with nearly the same system (except for UNIQUENESS(ACC)). Many linguists are tempted to seek the common properties within Universal Grammar, identified by (some sort of) syntax. Therefore, they have a syntactic account in mind, and in the process of elaboration they tend to narrow down the empirical domain. I am skeptical about achieving any progress along these lines, and so I would like to propose another treatment: (i) identify all the connections within the possessor-raising net, (ii) determine lexical contributions and compositional semantic interpretations, (iii) study (perhaps via simulation) how the various factors in this net react to some disturbances, (iv) estimate a reasonable value for the relatedness of Japanese and Korean. Languages that share most of their basic vocabularies (like Indo-Aryan, Quechuan or Alor-Pantar languages) are often quite distinct in parts of their grammars, like those concerned with argument structure and case. Why are Japanese and Korean so different – distinct in their vocabularies but very similar in their grammars?

Independently, one can ask for the functional potential of double-NOM. Does the pattern NOM-NOM (or ACC-ACC) constitute any processing advantage (for instance in the sense that every NOM occurrence triggers a new syntactic borderline)? Kwon’s (2006) results clearly contradict such an assumption: this author showed in *self-paced* reading experiments that NOM-NOM causes significant delays. Is it perhaps spoken language in which an advantage is present, or because the expressive power is enhanced?

Let us consider a hypothesis: The advantage of shifting the possessor from an argument of the noun to an argument of the governing verb is to make a better use of it: (i) in creating information structure, or (ii) in forming more complex sentences.

In the following, I will discuss a number of constructions and interpretations connected with the double nominative. I do not have an integrating theory in mind from which all of this could follow, but along my way I will stress a number of points having to do with lexical contribution and semantic representation, sometimes neglected but worth taking note of. In the process, I have chosen a suite with 12 dances of different length. My polonaise in 2 is a numeration of the NOM-NOM types found in Korean. In 3, case stacking in Korean is introduced as a means of inducing focus, while in 4, nominatives are studied as enabling topic or focus interpretations. The Korean topic clauses in 5 are followed by Japanese scope variations in 6. Then two Japanese dances follow: potential and passives in 7, and genitive subjects in 8, followed by a very short Korean *tough*-constructional melody in 9. A first summarizing cadence is given in 10, which is then followed by a saxophone's double-NOM passive in 11. That Korean is a little less sensitive than Japanese comes out in 12, and finally we end with the great Korean-Japanese harmony in 13.

2 Types of NOM-NOM constructions

For Korean, I have found the following list of NOM-NOM predicates (Lee 2003). Probably, one might come up with a similar list for Japanese. Let us introduce these types step by step.

Type I comprises predicates with GEN/NOM alternation. N2 (which is predicated of) is a relational noun whose open argument is filled by N1 – which is either the usual GEN possessor or its possessor-raised NOM-variant.

- (12) a. Part-whole relationship (or inalienable possession) K
ohn-uy/-i son-i cakta.
John-GEN/NOM hands-NOM small
'John's hands are small/John has small hands.'
- b. Relational concepts (e. g. *kinship*)
John-uy/-i atul-i cakta.
John-GEN/NOM son-NOM short
'John's son is short/John has a short son.'

- c. Alienable possession (it is unclear how far the alternation is possible)

John-uy/-i cip-i cakta.

John-GEN/NOM house-NOM small

‘John’s house is small/John has a small house.’

- d. Argument of a verbal noun

i mwunce-uy/-ka haykeyl-i swipta.

this problem-GEN/NOM solution-NOM easy

‘The solution of this problem is easy/This problem has an easy solution.’

Type II includes predicates with two separately required arguments. There are three subtypes.

IIa. A LOC or DAT argument can get a NOM-alternative:

- (13) a. *i san-ey/-i namwu-ka manhta.* K

this mountain-LOC/NOM trees-NOM abundant

‘There are many trees on this mountain/This mountain has many trees.’

- b. *John-eykey/-i komin-i saynggi-ess-ta.*

John-DAT/NOM worry-NOM become-to-exist

(lit.) ‘To John, there happen to be some worries/John has gotten some worries.’

IIb. *Simple* [+stative] predicates (such as psych adjectives or copula verbs) have a NOM-object, and therefore show the NOM-NOM pattern just from the start.

- (14) a. *John-i Mary-ka cohta.* K

John-NOM Mary-NOM be fond of

‘John is fond of Mary.’

- b. *nay-ka tongsaying-i mipta*

I-NOM brother-NOM hate

‘I hate my brother.’

- (15) a. *John-i kasu-ka anita.* K

John-NOM singer-NOM be-not

‘John is not a singer.’

- b. *Mary-ka uysa-ka toyessta.*

Mary-NOM doctor-NOM became

‘Mary became a doctor.’

Iic. A *complex stative predicate* formed with the verb ‘want’ (or, with the potentialis suffix ‘can’ in Japanese) again shows ACC/NOM alternation (Shekar & Agbayani 2003).

- (16) a. *Nay-ka sakwa-lul/*ka mekkessta.* K
 I-NOM apple-ACC/*NOM ate
 ‘I ate an apple.’
 b. *Nay-ka sakwa-lul/ka mekko sephta.*
 I-NOM apple-ACC/NOM eat want
 ‘I **want** to eat an apple.’
- (17) a. *John-ga huransugo-ga/*o deki-ru.* J
 John-NOM French-NOM/*ACC capable-PRES
 ‘John is capable of French.’ (‘John speaks French.’)
 b. *John-ga huransugo-ga/-o hana-se-ru.*
 J.-NOM French-NOM/ACC speak-POT-PRES
 ‘John **can** speak French.’

This alternation can be captured by the assumption of optional verb complex formation:

- ACC is licensed by the embedded verb in the structure [[ACC eat] want], while
- NOM is accepted by the stative verb complex [NOM [eat want]].

A similar result might be achieved by assuming that the feature [+stative] is optional.

Type III includes two special cases, namely specifications and numerals with classifiers.

- (18) a. *Specification.* If N2 is more specific than N1 ($|N1| \supset |N2|$), NOM-NOM is obligatory: K
*kwail-i/*uy sakwa-ka masissta.*
 fruit-NOM/*GEN apples-NOM tasty
 ‘As for fruit, apples are tasty.’
- b. *Numerals with classifiers.* If the quantifier is floating, i. e. shifts into a postnominal position to the noun, NOM-NOM is obligatory:
- i. *twu-kay-uy sakwa-ka ssekessta.*
 two-CLF-GEN apples-NOM rotten
 ‘Two apples are rotten.’

- ii. *sakwa-ka twu-kay-ka ssekessta.*
 apples-NOM two-CLF-NOM rotten
 ‘Two of the apples are rotten.’ (floating quantifier)

Obviously, ‘tasty’ in (18a) and ‘rotten’ in (18b) remain intransitive (even if they combine with a NOM-NOM pattern), which may explain why these two special cases show strict *case-sharing* – in contrast to the alternation cases found before. Further tests are the application of passive in the ACC-ACC construction, or *raising-to-object* in the NOM-NOM construction: do both nominals shift their case, or not? In the two special cases, both nouns shift their case – see (19) and (21a). Otherwise, *case-sharing* is optional – see (20) and (21b).

Specification under passive compared with a body part construction under passive (Sim 2006).

- (19) a. *Chelswu-ka koki-lul phiraymi-lul cap-ass-ta.* K
 C.-NOM fish-ACC small.fish-ACC catch-PAST-DECL
 ‘As for fish, Chelswu caught small ones.’
 b. *koki-ka phiraymi-i/*-ul cap-hi-ass-ta.*
 fish-NOM small.fish-NOM/*ACC grab-PASS-PAST-DECL
 ‘As for fish, small ones were caught.’
- (20) a. *Leia-ka Yoda-lul son-ul cap-ass-ta.* K
 L.-NOM Y.-ACC hand-ACC grab-PAST-DECL
 ‘Leia grabbed Yoda’s hand.’
 b. *Yoda-ka son-i/-ul cap-hi-ass-ta.*
 Y.-NOM hand-NOM/ACC grab-PASS-PAST-DECL
 ‘Yoda’s hand was grabbed.’

Floating quantifiers under *raising-to-object* compared with a part-whole-relation under *raising-to-object*:

- (21) a. *John-un haksayng-ul sey-myeng-ul/*-i pwuca-lako mitnunta.* K
 John-TOP student-ACC 3-CL-ACC/*NOM rich.be-COMP believe
 ‘John believes three students to be rich.’
 b. *Mary-nun panana-lul kkepcil-i²-ul twukkepta-ko mitnunta.*
 Mary-TOP banana-ACC skin-NOM/?-ACC thick.be-COMP believe
 ‘Mary believes a banana’s skin to be thick.’

Summing up, type III predicates are characterized by two case-identical constituents, which encode one and the same argument under different perspectives,

while type IIb predicates are stative and clearly have two distinct NOM arguments. Type IIa and IIc predicates have one argument that can alternate with NOM under specific conditions. Type I predicates have a relational argument, which in turn has an argument by itself alternating with NOM by possessor-raising. The question is, what factors usually trigger the NOM-alternatives?

3 Case-stacking in Korean as a means of inducing focus-interpretation

Korean differs from Japanese in that it allows *case stacking*, where a noun bears two different case suffixes in sequence. The first case encodes argument structure under normal circumstances (including appropriate semantic conditions), while the second case encodes an additional structure, which often has to do with information status. Both Japanese (*-ni-wa* ‘DAT-TOP’) and Korean (22) show a sequence of case marker and topic marker.

- (22) *Ce haksayngtul-eykey-nun mwuncey-ka taytanhi-tul manh-ta.* K
Those students-DAT-TOP problem-NOM extremely-PL much-DECL
‘Those students have a lot of problems.’

There is no focus marker in these languages, but a stacked NOM or ACC invites a focus *interpretation*. Yoon (2004) discusses three types of case-stacking in Korean.

Type 1: DAT+NOM, LOC+NOM, INSTR+NOM. Here, case-stacking is an alternative to case-alternation. As we have seen, DAT and LOC often alternate with NOM; in the case-stacking case they are realized together (23a,b). The instrumental generally does not alternate with NOM, but interestingly, case-stacking is possible, see (23c). This is an obvious innovation in which two different functions are separated: semantic encoding + structural encoding in favor of a discourse-interpretation.

- (23) a. *Cheli-eykey/ka/eykey-ka ton-i philyoha-ta.* K
C.-DAT/NOM/DAT-NOM money-NOM necessary-DECL
‘It is Cheli who needs money.’
b. *Semyukongcang-eyse/i/eyse-ka pwul-i na-ss-ta.*
textile.factory-LOC/NOM/LOC-NOM fire-NOM break.out-DECL
‘It was in the textile factory that a fire broke out.’

- c. *Ku kongkwu-lo/*ka/lo-ka na-eykey-n cha-lul kochi-ki-ka*
 that tool-INST/*NOM/INST-NOM I-DAT-TOP car-ACC fix-NML-NOM
elyepta.
 difficult
 ‘It is that tool with which I find it difficult to fix the car.’

Type 2: DAT+ACC. (24a) contains a ditransitive verb with a dative recipient, while (24b) is an instance of *raising-to-object*. One can see that the object (with a facultative focus particle) is augmented with a focus interpretation.

- (24) a. *John-i Mary-eykey-(man)-ul chayk-ul cwu-ess-ta.* K
 J.-NOM M.-DAT-(only)-ACC book-ACC give-PAST-DECL
 ‘It was only to Mary that John gave the book.’
- b. *Na-nun Cheli-eykey-(man)-ul kulen mwuncey-ka iss-ta-ko*
 I-TOP C.-DAT-(only)-ACC that.kind problem-NOM exist-DECL-COMP
sayngkakhana-ta.
 think-DECL
 ‘I think that only Cheli has that kind of problem.’

Type 3: DAT+GEN. Here, DAT encodes *goal* interpretation, and GEN is the case licensed by the noun.

- (25) *Mary-uy John-eykey-uy phyenci* K
 M.-GEN J.-DAT-GEN letter
 ‘Mary’s letter to John’

It is unclear whether (25) has focus interpretation, but the case-stacking types 1 and 2 certainly have.

$$[_]_{N-CASE-/CASE} \Rightarrow [_]_{N: Focus}$$

Schütze (2001) assumes that the Korean suffixes *ka* and *lul* are ambiguous between case (NOM or ACC) and focus marking. Yoon (2004), however, argues that focus interpretation is contextually determined rather than lexically encoded. In general, focus as well as topic interpretation are available on the basis of a simple NOM or ACC marking. According to Yoon, a *stacked* NOM is base-generated in SpecT and characterizes the presence of a *major subject*.

4 NOM-NPs are accessible to topic and focus interpretation

Both Korean and Japanese show intonational peaks signaling contrastive topic (CT) or focus; the phonetic details can be found in Lee (2006) for Korean, and Venditti et al. (2007) for Japanese. Within the N-domain only intonational focus is possible, while outside of it the NOM-NOM construction enables additional marking for topic and focus.

The topic-marker (Kor. *nun*/ Jap. *wa*) marks *about*-topic or contrastive topic (CT). The *about*-topic is an element in the beginning of a sentence; both arguments and adverbials can be moved into that position. All non-initially topic-marked elements function as CT: they are contrastively selected from the set of elements denoted by a preceding topic, which itself, however, does not need to be introduced explicitly as a topic.

The following dialogue nicely shows how CT functions. The CT on *Sue* in line d was prepared by *nwukwu-lul* ‘someone-ACC’ in line b: somebody (out of the set of kids including Sue) seems to have been hit. CT is a focus within a given topic. Thus, the answer to a question does not need to be a pure focus; it can also be a CT.

(26) <conversation> (Bak 2004: (3.8))

- a. A1: *Jina-ka way honna-ko issni?*
 J.-NOM why be_scold-COMP be
 ‘Why is Jina scolded?’
- b. B1: *ung, nwukwu-lul ttayli-ess-na boa.*
 Um, someone-ACC hit-PAST-COMP seem
 ‘(Jina) seems to have hit somebody.’
- c. A2: *Jina-ka nwukwu-lul ttayli-ess-ni?*
 J.-NOM whom-ACC hit-PAST-Q
 ‘Whom did Jina hit?’
- d. B2: *ung, Jina-ka Sue-nun ttayli-ess-na boa.*
 um, J.-NOM S.-TOP(CT) hit-PAST-COMP seem
 ‘Jina seems to have hit **Sue**.’

The *about*-topic, the first element of a series of topics, has the most comprising denotation (‘from the whole to the parts’). When the elephant becomes an *about*-topic in (27a,b), the parts of the animal can advance to CTs. Intonationally, the initial *about*-topic in (27a,b) remains flat, while the following CT-marker *nun* (27b) is strongly stressed (by pitch and duration) – interestingly, it is not the topicalized

element but the topic marker itself that is stressed (Lee 2006). By contrast, the first nominal (N1) of a NOM-NOM construction (27c) gets a focus reading regardless of whether it is stressed.

- (27) a. *khokkiri-nun kho-ka kil-ta.* TOP - NOM K
 elephant-TOP nose-NOM long-DECL
 ‘(As for) elephants, their noses are long.’
- b. *khokkiri-nun kho-nun kil-ta.* TOP - CT
 elephant-TOP nose-TOP(CT) long-DECL
 ‘(As for) elephants, their noses are long, but ...’

Kim (2000) states that only the initial NOM of a sentence expressing a *kinship*-relation can get a focus reading, while the initial NOM of a sentence expressing a *body part* relation does not, see (28a,b). These are at best preferred readings. My tests showed that, in principle, both types of relations enabled a focus or a non-focus reading. In fact, it would be surprising if *kinship* and *body part* were more than gradually different.

- (28) a. *Mary-ka son-i yepputa.* topic K
 Mary-NOM hands-NOM pretty
 ‘Mary’s hands are pretty.’
- b. *Mary-ka emeni-ka yepputa.* focus
 Mary-NOM mother-NOM pretty
 ‘It is Mary whose mother is pretty.’

There is a surprising amount of realizational and interpretational alternatives. Even in a topic- or a focus-preferring context a GEN-NP can be found.

Hoye (2003) says about Japanese that, in the GEN-NOM construction, the predicate can be stressed (29a). If N1 is topic-marked, either an *about*-topic reading or a CT reading results, dependent on whether the topic-phrase is stressed (29b). Similarly, N1 in the NOM-NOM construction gets a focus reading regardless of whether the noun is stressed (29c).

- (29) a. Neutral or stress on the predicate GEN - NOM J
Zoo-no hana-ga nagai.
 Elephant-GEN nose-NOM long
 ‘An elephant’s nose is long.’

- b. Possessor-topic TOP - NOM
Zoo-wa hana-ga nagai.
 Elephant-TOP nose-NOM long
 ‘As for an elephant, it has a long nose.’
- c. Possessor with contrastive focus NOM (=FOC) - NOM
Zoo-ga hana-ga nagai.
 Elephant-NOM nose-NOM long
 ‘It is an elephant that has a long nose.’

The same distribution is found in type II NOM-NOM constructions resulting from DAT/NOM or LOC/NOM alternations.

- (30) a. Neutral or predicate stress DAT - NOM J
Ken-ni butsuri-ga wakaru.
 Ken-DAT physics-NOM understand
 ‘Ken understands physics.’
- b. Subject-topic TOP - NOM
Ken-wa butsuri-ga wakaru.
 Ken-TOP physics-NOM understand
 ‘As for Ken, he understands physics.’
- c. Subject with contrastive focus NOM (=FOC) - NOM
Ken-ga butsuri-ga wakaru.
 Ken-NOM physics-NOM understand
 ‘It is Ken who understands physics.’

Obviously, not only the case systems but also the topic-focus systems of Korean and Japanese are very similar. Although many more details have to be studied, one can see how double-NOM and the topic-focus system closely interact in producing the zooming effect, which is characteristic for processing in these languages.

In contrast to the fixed ordering of a GEN-NOM pattern, the order of the constituents of a NOM-ACC or a DAT-NOM pattern can be reversed without any change of meaning. This is not possible for a TOP-NOM or a NOM-NOM pattern, where argument structure is overridden by information structure. In other words, the zooming effect is possible only with a fixed word order.

5 Topic clauses (in Korean)

Topic clauses are similar to relative clauses. In a topic clause, an item is extracted from a clause and put into the beginning, while in a relative clause an item is extracted and put into the end. This can lead to *long-distance* or *unbounded dependencies*, where the item is extracted from a farther embedded clause.

- (31) a. topic_i [[e_i]]
 b. [[e_i]] rel-head_i

The symmetry is complete: if an element can be extracted to the right, it can also be extracted to the left, and vice versa (Lee 2004: 177, 179).

- (32) *I fell asleep while reading* K
 a. [*nay-ka* [*ilk-taka*] *camtu-n* **chayk** relative clause
 [_{I_i}-NOM [_{e_i} e_k read-while] fall_asleep-REL] book_k
 ‘The book that I fell asleep while reading (it)’
 b. *ku chayk-un* [*nay-ka* [*ilk-taka*] *camtul-ess-ta*]. topic clause
 that book_k-TOP [_{I_i}-NOM [_{e_i} e_k read-while] fall_asleep-PRES-DECL]
 ‘As for the book, I fell asleep while reading (it).’

Relative clause formation and topicalization can also be combined (Lee 2004: 144). In the following example, the position of the adverb ‘yesterday’ indicates that ‘that woman’ is extracted. Moreover, this example shows that also an *about*-topic can be realized by NOM. More precisely, in (33) the topicalized N1 binds a gap in the relative clause headed by N2 : N1_i [[e_i REL] N2].

- (33) *Ku yeca-ka ecey salangha-nun naca-ka cwuessta.* K
 that woman_i-NOM [yesterday [_{e_i} e_k love-REL] man_k-NOM died]
 (lit) ‘That woman, yesterday the man who (she) loved died.’
 [In German, ‘Gestern starb der Frau ihr geliebter Mann.’]

The topic can simply be marked by NOM rather than by the topic marker (so that double NOM can result). Actually, sentences like these are sometimes ambiguous in whether an initial NOM-phrase has to be viewed as extracted or not; note that (34a) and (34b) are surface-identical but differently structured, and so get different interpretations. (34c) again shows that the extracted topicalized item of (34b) can instead also serve as extracted head of a relative clause.

- (34) a. *chinkwu-ka salko iss-nun aphatu-ka acwu khuta.* K
 [friend-NOM e_k live is-REL] apartment_k-NOM very big
 ‘The apartment where the friend lives is very big.’

- b. *chinkwu-ka salko iss-nun aphatu-ka acwu khuta.*
 friend_i-NOM [[e_i e_k live is-REL] apartment_k-NOM very big]
 (lit.) ‘As for the friend, the apartment where (he) lives is very big.’
- c. *salko iss-nun aphatu-ka acwu khu-un chinkwu*
 [[e_i e_k live is-REL] apartment_k-NOM very big-REL] friend_i
 (lit.) ‘The friend whose apartment where (he) lives is very big’

Similar effects are found with raised possessors. By extraction, they either precede or follow the clause in which the possessed NP occurs, as shown by the examples in (34d,e) (Nakamura 2002). The double-NOM construction just fits nicely into the constructional toolkit of these languages.

- (34) d. *hon-ga Hanako-ni naiyoo-ga waka-ru* J
 book_i-NOM [H.-DAT [e_i content-NOM] understand-PRES]
 ‘As for the book, Hanako understands (it’s) content.’
- e. *Hanako-ni naiyoo-ga waka-ru hon*
 [H.-DAT [e_i content-NOM] understand-PRES] book_i
 ‘The book the content of which Hanako understands’

Note that, for general semantic reasons only, the non-relational possessor can be extracted in this way, but not the relational possessee. The latter would be impossible also in English (**As for the content, Hanako understands the book, *the content which Hanako understands the book*).

6 Scope variation (in Japanese)

Differences in information structure are connected with scopal differences. The elder literature on Japanese sometimes mentions this fact, but it is not dealt with very systematically. In some verbs (such as Jap. *suki* ‘like,’ *kirai* ‘dislike’) as well as verb complexes (formed with *-tai* ‘want’ or *-(ar)e* ‘can’ = potential) the object can alternate between ACC and NOM. An object realized as NOM triggers focus interpretation on the object. Compare (35a) with NOM-object and (35b) with ACC-object.

- (35) a. Object in focus J
 Ken-ga/wa *mizu-ga nomi-tai.* NOM/TOP – NOM (=FOC)
 Ken-NOM/TOP water-NOM drink-want
 ‘It is water that Ken wants to drink.’

b. Predicate in focus

Ken-ga/wa mizu-o nomi-tai. NOM/TOP – ACC
 Ken-NOM/TOP water-ACC drink-want
 ‘Ken wants to *drink* water.’

When the object is in focus, the scopal conditions shift: the NOM-object becomes wide scope (Tada 1992, Koizumi 1994). That is compatible with the assumption that the entity in focus is semantically highest; consider the paraphrase ‘it is only his right eye that John can close’ for ONLY > CAN. Since ONLY > CAN is the only interpretation of (36b) with a NOM-object, CAN > ONLY remains the more interesting interpretation of (36a) with an ACC-object – such an entailment could be grammaticalized by bidirectional optimization.

- (36) a. *John-ga migime-dake-o tumur-e-ru.* J
 J.-NOM right_eye-only-ACC close-CAN-PRES
 ‘John can close only his right eye.’ CAN > ONLY, ONLY > CAN
- b. *John-ga migime-dake-ga tumur-e-ru.*
 J.-NOM right_eye-only-NOM close-CAN-PRES
 ‘John can close only his right eye.’ *CAN > ONLY, ONLY > CAN

Potential constructions generally show the alternation ACC/NOM on the object, see (37b).

- (37) a. *Yamada-ga miruku-o/*ga nom-u.* NOM – ACC J
 Y.-NOM milk-ACC/*NOM drink-PRES
 ‘Yamada drinks milk.’
- b. *Yamada-ga miruku-o/ga nom-(ar)e-ru.* NOM – ACC/NOM
 Y.-NOM milk-ACC/NOM drink-CAN-PRES
 ‘Yamada can drink milk.’

If the verbal meaning is embedded under a nominal like the suffix *-koto* ‘fact’ in (38), the subject can also be realized as genitive (GEN), besides being realized as NOM. With the simple verb, the object remains ACC (38a), whereas with a potential verb the object can be ACC, NOM or GEN (38b), see Nakamura & Fujita (1998).

- (38) a. *Yamada-no miruku-o/*ga/*no nom-u-koto* GEN – ACC J
 Y.-GEN milk-ACC/*NOM/*GEN drink-PRES-fact
 ‘The fact that Yamada drinks milk’
- b. *Yamada-no miruku-o/ga/no nom-(ar)e-ru-koto* GEN – ACC/NOM/GEN
 Y.-GEN milk-ACC/NOM/GEN drink-CAN-PRES-fact
 ‘The fact that Yamada can drink milk’

The combination ‘drink-CAN’ opens 2 alternatives for the object, while the combination ‘drink-CAN-fact’ opens 3 alternatives. It is reasonable to assume that ACC-objects are in the V-domain (VP), NOM-objects in the tensed CAN-domain (IP), and GEN-objects in the N-domain (NP). Consequently, the nominal suffix directly takes a (saturated) IP, or a VP plus one argument, or the verb plus two arguments; CAN in turn takes a (saturated) VP plus one argument, or a verb plus two arguments (recall the remark below (17) in section 2). This yields the five possible structures shown in (39). (Miyagawa 1993 argues that structures of this kind belong to LF, the logical form on which case features are checked. This is exactly what a lexicon- or semantics-based account predicts.)

- (39) a. [NP [IP X_{NOM} [VP Y_{ACC} VERB] CAN-PRES] NOUN] IP-embedding
 [NP [IP X_{NOM} Y_{NOM} [VERB] CAN-PRES] NOUN]
 b. [NP X_{GEN} [IP [VP Y_{ACC} VERB] CAN-PRES] NOUN] VP-embedding
 [NP X_{GEN} [IP Y_{NOM} [VERB] CAN-PRES] NOUN]
 c. [NP X_{GEN} Y_{GEN} [IP [VERB] CAN-PRES] NOUN] V-embedding

Interestingly, GEN on the object is only possible if the alternation with NOM is possible, i. e., double-NOM enables double-GEN. In other words, argument extraction (if one considers it syntactically) is a local operation: the object moves first to the CAN-domain, and then to the N-domain. The GEN-NOM alternation played an important role in the history of Japanese. Notice that Jap. *ga* (=NOM) was a GEN-particle in the 13th century, that later was recategorized. Only in contexts where such a recategorization did not take place, an explicit GEN remained in the form *no*.

Scopal differences between NOM- and GEN-*subjects* give evidence for the distinction between IP- and VP-embedding. A GEN-subject can have scope over the head noun, while a NOM-subject cannot (Ahn 2006, Hiraiwa 2010, see also Miyagawa 1993):

- (40) a. *Gakusee-tachi ga/no yon-da yon-satsu no hon wa*
 [student-PL NOM/GEN read-PAST] 4-CLASSIF GEN book TOP
 tsumarana-i. J
 boring-PRES
 ‘The four books that the students read were boring.’
 NOM: books > students, *students > books
 GEN: books > students, students > books (=each of the students read 4 books)

- b. [Rubii ka shinju] ga/no yasu-ku na-ru kanousei ga
 [ruby or pearl] NOM/GEN cheap-CONT become-PRES probability NOM
 50% ijou da.
 50% more COP
 NOM: PROB > OR, *OR > PROB
 GEN: PROB > OR, OR > PROB
 PROB > OR: ‘The probability that rubies or pearls become cheap is over 50%.’
 OR > PROB: ‘The probability that rubies become cheap or the probability that pearls become cheap is over 50%.’

The assumption that a NOM-subject remains in the V-domain implies that it cannot have scope over the nominal head, while a GEN-subject within the N-domain may or may not have scope over the nominal head.

7 Potential and passive in Japanese

The two sentences given in (41a,b) are very similar, in particular, the common suffix *-ni* suggests that the Japanese potential construction involves a passive effect. Historically, the potential and the passive morphemes were identical, and only became different by partial reduction (*are < e* in the potential).

- (41) a. *Kono syatu-ga sensei-ni araw-are-ru.* passive J
 this shirt-NOM teacher-BY wash-PASS-PRES
 ‘This shirt is washed by the teacher.’
 b. *Kono syatu-ga sensei-ni araw-(ar)e-ru.* potential
 this shirt-NOM teacher-DAT wash-CAN-PRES
 ‘This shirt can be washed by the teacher.’

However, in fact the two constructions are very different. In the passive, the subject is existentially bound: it can neither be an antecedent for *zibun* ‘self’, nor can it undergo honorific agreement with the verb (42a). By contrast, in the potential the subject is still present: it can control *zibun*, and it can agree with the verb (42b), see Nakamura & Fujita (1998).

- (42) a. **Kono syatu-ga sensei-ni go-jibun-de*
 this shirt-NOM teacher-BY HON-self-BY
o-araw-are-ninar-u.
 HON-wash-PASS-HON-PRES passive J
 ‘This shirt is washed by the teacher (HON).’

- b. *Kono syatu-ga sensei-ni go-jibun-de*
 this shirt-NOM teacher-DAT HON-self-BY
o-arai-ninar-e-ru.
 HON-wash-HON-CAN-PRES potential
 ‘As for the shirt, the teacher (HON) can wash it.’

The two *ni*'s have different function. In the passive (42a), *ni* marks an oblique adverbial, whereas in the potential (42b), *ni* marks a dative subject (similarly to experiencer constructions) – therefore the object can occupy the nominative. The dative itself is optional: if the subject precedes the object, a NOM-NOM construction is possible, too (similarly to what has been shown for Korean in (13b) above). Double-NOM in turn makes double-GEN possible, as we have seen in the preceding section. This scenario suggests a possible historical path: when *are* was split into the passive on the one hand and the potential on the other, two different interpretation possibilities arose for a subject-*ni*-phrase along the ways just sketched. In the end, the potential construction was able to become a generator for NOM-NOM (alternating with GEN-GEN).

The actual process by which double-NOM was generated might have been more complex. Modern Japanese shows the tendency of giving up GEN-subjects in favor of NOM. Harada (1971) already pointed out that older people (above forty) were more likely to accept GEN-ACC in the nominal construction (38b), while younger people (below forty) refuted GEN-ACC in favor of either GEN-NOM or NOM-NOM – a process that seems to be continuing (Ahn 2006). Thus, the differences between the five constructions shown in (39) are increasingly flattened. In Korean, all GEN-subjects have been lost since middle Korean.

8 More genitive subjects in Japanese

As already argued above in section 6 for the bound suffix *-koto* ‘fact,’ the subject of a clause embedded under a noun (a complement or an object-relative clause) can alternate between NOM and GEN (Ahn 2006). (43) shows a complement clause of the noun ‘fact,’ while (44) shows relative clauses with several kinds of extraction.

- (43) Complement clause of a noun J
John ga/no ki-ta koto wa sira-na-katta.
 J. NOM/GEN come-PAST fact TOP know-not-PAST
 ‘(I) didn’t know (the fact) that John came.’

- (44) a. Object extracted
John ga/no kai-ta hon wa omosiro-i.
 [J. NOM/GEN write-PAST] book TOP interesting-PRES
 ‘The book that John wrote is interesting.’
- b. BY-subject extracted in the passive
Boku wa keeki ga/no tabe-rare-ta inu o mi-ta.
 I TOP [cake NOM/GEN eat-PASS.PAST] dog ACC see-PAST
 ‘I saw the dog by whom the cake was eaten.’
- c. Object extracted in the causative
Ichiro ga/no musuko ni s-ase-ta shukudai wa
 [I. NOM/GEN SON DAT do-CAUS-PAST] homework TOP
yasashi-katta.
 easy-PAST
 ‘The homework that Ichiro made his son to do was easy.’
- d. Causee extracted in the causative + passive construction
Shinbun ga/no yom-ase-rare-ta kodoma wa joozuni
 [newspaper NOM/GEN read-CAUS-PASS-PAST] child TOP skilled
yom-ana-i.
 read-NEG-PRES
 ‘The child who was made to read the newspaper does not read well.’

If we follow the spirit of section 6, we can describe the NOM/GEN alternation as induced by different structurings. For instance, the subject of (44a) can be integrated within the domain of ‘write’ (yielding NOM) or within the domain of ‘book’ (yielding GEN):

$$\begin{array}{l} [\text{NP } [\text{IP } x_{\text{NOM}} \text{ WRITE}(x,y)] \text{ BOOK}(y)] \\ [\text{NP } x_{\text{GEN}} [\text{IP } \text{ WRITE}(x,y)] \text{ BOOK}(y)] \end{array}$$

9 Once again, argument gaps in Korean

Lee (2003) considers Kor. *tough*-constructions such as (45b) as a subspecies of NOM-NOM constructions of type 1 (46b): N2 has an argument gap, which is filled by N1.

- (45) a. *[[i sacen-ul sayongha]-ki]-ka swipta.* ACC-NOM K
 this dictionary-ACC use-NML -NOM easy
 ‘It is easy to use this dictionary.’

- b. *i sacen_k-i* [_{-k} *sayongha-ki*]-*ka swipta.* NOM-NOM
 this dictionary-NOM use-NML -NOM easy
 ‘This dictionary is easy to use.’
- (46) a. [*i sacen-uy sayongpep*]-*i swipta.* GEN-NOM K
 this dictionary-GEN usage -NOM easy
 ‘The usage of this dictionary is easy.’
- b. *i sacen_k -i* [_{-k} *sayongpep*]-*i swipta.* NOM-NOM
 this dictionary -NOM usage -NOM easy
 (lit.) ‘The usage of this dictionary is easy.’

(45) and (46) only differ in the way the verb ‘use’ is used: in (45) it is combined with the nominalizer *ki* (translated as ‘to use’), while in (46) a lexical noun derived from ‘use’ is taken.

10 Cadenza or a first summary

There is a tradition, especially in Korean linguistics, to consider NOM-NOM as ‘double-subject,’ with N1 = *major* (or *extra*) *subject*, and N2 = *minor* (*real* or *grammatical*) *subject*. In principle, both N1 and N2 can show honorific agreement with the verb, and (in Korean) both can agree with the verb (or adverb) in number. There are a number of contradicting opinions concerning these issues, and possibly there are also dialectal differences. Other subject tests concern the control of *zibun/caki* ‘self’ and the control of a dependent subject in connection with control verbs, and finally the option of *raising-to-object*.

How can one integrate these ‘double subjects’ within syntactic theory? One possibility is to assume that these subjects (related to each other) belong to different domains or phases, and that they are assigned nominative in their respective domains. The other possibility is to assume that they belong to the same domain, which has the property to assign (or to license) nominative more than once. Both have been proposed. Ura (1996) assumes a parameter to the effect that PROCRASTINATE might be violated, and therefore more than one NOM can be checked by the same finite T. Sun (2013) assumes that NOM of the grammatical subject is licensed by the finite T, while NOM of the raised possessor is licensed by the gnomic (generic) aspect, considered as an extra structure (recall (11) in section 1: the raised possessor only admits the generic interpretation, while it excludes the episodic one). Similarly, topic and focus nominatives might be licensed by an additional, again different structure. I think that all these proposals

are construction-specific: each construction in which double-NOM appears has its own licensing condition.

A more general solution is to distinguish between case domains like those proposed in (39). These domains have a lexical head which determines how many arguments have to be realized and how they are ordered, and sometimes also specifically assigns lexical case. Everything else is determined by argument hierarchy features and additional constraints, according to the program of *Lexical Decomposition Grammar* (LDG, Wunderlich 1997). In this account, NOM is considered to be the default case, and there is no need for a particular constellation of NOM-assignment. (Another question is why the nominative in languages like Japanese and Korean is marked rather than unmarked phonologically.)

Possessor-raising means that N1 does not belong to the domain defined by N2 but rather to the domain of the predicate; in other words, N1 becomes co-argument of N2. Whenever there is a double-NOM, or a double-ACC, or a double-GEN construction, the two entities involved either are co-arguments, or are explicitly distributed into two different domains. Thus, it depends on the respective head and further general constraints whether such a combination of two identical cases is licensed. One important factor is that the two entities that make up a double-case construction mostly respect a strict linear ordering, by which they are distinguished.

All the alternations yielding NOM make the respective NP accessible to one of the following operations: (i) the NP can be marked in situ for topic (by Jap. *wa*, Kor. *nun*), but doesn't have to be in order to get interpreted as topic; (ii) the NP can serve in situ for 'explicit' focus (just by the NOM-suffix, which in Korean might be stacked upon another case-suffix); (iii) the NP can undergo *raising-to-object* as well as *unbounded extraction* (relative clause or topic clause formation). As we have seen, a topic-marked constituent isn't necessarily the highest topic, and topic-interpretation might be possible even on the basis of simple NOM-marking.

There seem to be lexical triggers for all these alternations: in the case of GEN/NOM alternation it is the inherent relational (or functional) character of N2 together with the higher predicate that integrates the further NOM argument; in the case of DAT/NOM alternation it is the predicate that predicates on that argument from the start (which, however, might be less clear with local adverbials). Therefore, a lexical analysis (such as the HPSG analysis of Lee 2004) seems to be on the right track.

11 The double-NOM passive is somewhat special

Having failed to climb Mount Fuji, we experienced with the common *Leideform*. (47a) is an example of the double-NOM passive (slightly changed from Washio 1995: 224), which goes back to the structure shown in (47b).

- (47) a. *watashi-tachi-ga/wa (gakusei-tati-ni) tyosyo-ga waruku*
 me-company-NOM/TOP (student-PL-BY) book-NOM badly
yom-are-te i-ru. J
 read-PASS-PROG be-PRES
 ‘As for us, our books have been read badly by the students.’
- b. *gakusei-tati-ga watashi-tachi-no tyosyo-o waruku yom-de*
 student-PL-NOM me-company-GEN book-ACC badly read-PROG
i-ru.
 be-PRES
 ‘The students have been reading our books badly.’

Two derivations are conceivable: (i) possessor-raising followed by passive, or (ii) passive followed by possessor-raising. The former would lead to the virtual intermediate stage of double-accusative, which as such cannot surface in Japanese, yet, a derivation doesn’t have to be blocked by virtual stages. I assume that passive binds the highest argument existentially (so that it can only be referred to indirectly, e. g., by means of an optional *by*-phrase) (Wunderlich 2012). Furthermore, possessor-raising regarding the subject yields the possessor as the highest argument, while possessor-raising regarding the object yields the possessor as a medial argument. PR(S) is realized by the topmost possessor (Wunderlich 2001), while PR(O) is realized by a specific kind of applicative (Wunderlich 2012). In route (i) from above we have to start with the applicative, while in route (ii) the topmost possessor must apply with respect to the highest unbound argument (which is the object); thus we get similar results. (Although ‘&’ is asymmetric, namely internally structured as ‘(A (& B))’, in the results yielded in (48d,e) no difference appears in the relative ordering of $u > y$.)

- (48) Operations for deriving the double-NOM passive
- a. $\text{passive}(V): \lambda V[\exists x V(x)]$
 All lower arguments of V are inherited to the result by functional composition
- b. $\text{topmost possessor}(V): \lambda V \lambda x \lambda u[\text{POSS}(u, x) \& V(x)]$

- c. possessor-applicative(V): $\lambda V \lambda y \lambda u \lambda x [V(x, y) \ \& \ \text{POSS}(u, y)]$
 d. route (i): $\lambda y \lambda u \exists x [\text{READ}(x, y) \ \& \ \text{POSS}(u, y)]$ with $u > y$
 e. route (ii): $\lambda y \lambda u [\text{POSS}(u, y) \ \& \ \exists x \text{READ}(x, y)]$ with $u > y$

Both the topmost and the medial possessors are also found in German. In (49a), the possessor is medial and regularly takes the dative, while in (49b), the possessor is highest (according to the ordering of indefinite pronouns shown in (49c)) and is lexically marked for a dative.

(49) Possessors in German

- a. *Sie verband ihm den Fuß.*
 she bandaged he.DAT the.ACC foot
 ‘She bandaged his foot.’
- b. *Ihm schmerzte der Fuß.*
 he.DAT hurt.PAST the.NOM foot
 ‘His foot hurts.’
- c. *weil wem was schmerzte*
 because somebody.DAT something.NOM hurt.PAST
 **weil was wem schmerzte*

There remains an empirical problem. Double-NOM constructions are restricted to stative predicates. However, it is not so evident that passive is stative, even if it often elicits a stative version (the stative passive).

12 Korean is a little less sensitive than Japanese

Washio (1995, appendix) shows that the Japanese double-NOM passive is possible under two conditions: (i) with a relational noun (such as *osiego* ‘student of’, *imooto* ‘sister of’, *syuto* ‘capital of’) in the progressive (*-te iru*) or with simple tense, (ii) or with a body part noun in the progressive provided that the resulting state continues. The progressive contains a stative component. Tying someone’s foot results in a state that can continue (50a), while stomping on someone’s foot usually is not seen as a continuing action, hence, (50b) is problematic. In other words, the double-passive only arises in a stative scenario.

- (50) a. *Takashi ga asi-ga koteis-are-te i-ta.* J
 T. NOM foot-NOM fix-PASS-PROG be-PAST
 ‘Takashi had his foot tied (to something).’

- b. ?? *Takashi ga asi-ga hum-are-te i-ta.*
 T. NOM foot-NOM stomp-PASS-PROG be_on-PAST
 ‘Takashi had his foot stomped.’

Korean is not sensitive to those niceties; double-NOM passive is possible with all body parts independent of verb form and resulting state.

- (51) *Jang-Ho-ka pal-i palp-i-ess-ta.* K
 J.-NOM foot-NOM stomp-PASS-PAST-DECL
 (lit.) ‘Jang-Ho was stomped on his foot.’

Since Kor. /i/ is ambiguous between causative and passive (where the latter is possible only with inalienables, Kim & Pires 2003), a sentence such as (52) has both a causative and a passive reading.

- (52) *John-i/nun Mary-eykey meli-ul kkakk-i-ess-ta.* K
 J.-NOM/TOP M.-DAT hair-ACC cut-CAUS/PASS-PAST-DECL
 (i) ‘John had Mary cut the hair.’ (John’s or someone else’s hair) causative
 (ii) ‘John had his hair cut by Mary.’ passive

The causative cannot be stative, but a passive can. The particular contrast between causative and passive readings may establish a stative interpretation of passives as the most natural one. Passives can refer to states that result from certain events, while causatives refer to the dynamics of events.

13 The great Korean-Japanese harmony

Interestingly, the causative-passive suffix *i* in (52) is one of the verbal markers whose etymologies were investigated by Robbeets (2007, 2008). Comparing Japanese, Koreanic, Tungusic, Mongolic and Turkic, she reconstructs the morpheme **ki* as an element of the common proto-Transeurasian (another name for ‘greater’ Altaic), the ancestor of the individual branches: in Mongolic and Turkic it was the independent verb ‘do, make,’ in Tungusic it switched to a causative-passive auxiliary or a suffix *ki*. Korean has the suffix variants *ki*, *hi*, and *i*, Old Japanese has (C)*i*, which induces vowel change (e. g., *aga*-(C)*i* → *age* ‘rise→raise’). It seems that the periphrastic **ki* substituted for an elder **ti* (Old Japanese *t*, Korean *t*, *chi*), which also expresses causative-passive and can be found in a number of lexicalized verbs.

Summarizing the constructional data discussed in this paper, one has to conclude that most of the structural properties are shared by Japanese and Korean. If

one looks at examples such as (1) and (2) at the very beginning, one realizes: yes, these sentences are identical, but have different vocabularies. (Although there are some obvious lexical similarities: Kor. *-ka*, Jap. *-ga* NOM; Kor. *choykun*, Jap. *saikin* ‘recently’; Kor. *pyeng*, Jap. *byooki* ‘illness’; Kor. *swungsang*, Jap. *syusyoo* ‘Prime Minister.’) Both Korean and Japanese are agglutinative; nearly every morpheme of one language finds its counterpart in the other, in the same ordering, with similar restrictions and similar polysemies. The differences are extremely marginal.

It has always been debated whether Korean and Japanese are genealogically related, and what their relationship is to the Altaic languages (Tungusic, Mongolic and Turkic). The ancestor of Korean was originally spoken in the southeastern part of the Korean peninsula (Silla kingdom), the ancestor of Japanese (the language of the Yayoi who spread between 4th century BC and 7th century AD to the Japanese islands) was spoken in the southwestern parts of the Korean peninsula. There must have been intensive contact (during the time of the three kingdoms, during the Yayoi immigration and during the Silla extension, which Koreanized the whole peninsula), hence, in principle it is possible that pre-proto-Japanese and proto-Korean formed a sprachbund. Janhunen (1999), propagating this scenario, confesses that people who share morphosyntactic structures are expected to share phonological structures, too, which Japanese and Korean obviously do not. In particular, Korean roots are typically CVC-syllables (producing medial consonant clusters when they are combined), while Japanese roots are mostly CV or CVCV. Janhunen assumes Altaic origin for Korean, but Sinitic origin for Japanese.

Both Samuel Elmo Martin (1924-2009) and Roy Andrew Miller (born 1924) from Yale, excellent researchers of Korean and Japanese, published various papers to show the lexical and morphosyntactic relatedness of these languages. Miller also advocated the Altaic hypothesis, according to which Korean and Japanese belong to the Altaic family. It is assumed that the branches of this family separated 6000 years ago, earlier than Indo-European and Uralic. Over such a long time, many traces of a common origin are erased. All the more surprising that a number of verbal roots and morphemes, such as diathesis operators, nominalizers, and participle-forming suffixes (Robbeets 2009), can still be reconstructed as having the same origin.

Japan colonized Korea for 35 years (1910-1945), thereby propagating a common identity. It may have something to do with this fact (which has largely been

ignored at a political level) that Korean and Japanese scholars who study the parallelisms of the two languages mostly remain silent about the origin of the similarities – a reservation that occurs to me as a sort of political correctness. It is mostly researchers from America, Russia, Germany, Scandinavia or the Netherlands who have cultivated the hot debate. ‘Cognates or Copies?’ is the content of the controversy (see Johanson & Robbeets 2012). In any case, the double-nominative network, a complex system of interactions between case marking, information structure, extraction and verb complex formation, cannot have emerged independently in the two languages, all the more because they have influenced each other in the last 1400 years only marginally.

Bibliography

- Ahn, B. 2006. Nominative-genitive conversion in Japanese. A consequence of the syntax. Ms., Cornell Univ.
- Bak, J. 2004. *Optional case marking of the possessor in Korean*. University of Manitoba MA thesis.
- Cho, Sungeun. 2003. A conditioning factor in possessor agreement constructions. In Patricia M. Clancy (ed.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics*, vol. 11, 343–351. CSLI Publications.
- Harada, S. I. 1971. *Ga-no* conversion and idiolectal variation in Japanese. *Gengo Kenkyu* 60. 25–38.
- Harada, S. I. 1973. Counter Equi NP deletion. *Annual Bulletin, Research Institute of Logopedics and Phoniatrics* 7. 113–147. University of Tokyo.
- Hiraiwa, K. 2010. Spelling out the double-o constraint. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 28. 723–770.
- Hoye, Masako Oku. 2003. *Why Japanese double-ga construction cannot be scrambled*. University of North Texas MA thesis.
- Janhunen, J. 1999. A contextual approach to the convergence and divergence of Korean and Japanese. *International Journal of Central Asian Studies* 4. 1–23.
- Johanson, L. & M. Robbeets (eds.). 2012. *Copies versus cognates in bound morphology*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kim, Hee-Soo & A. Pires. 2003. Ambiguity in the Korean morphological causative/passive. In W. McClure (ed.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics*, vol. 12, 255–266. Stanford: CSLI.
- Kim, Jong-Bok. 2000. A constraint-based approach to some multiple nominative constructions in Korean. In Akira Ikeya & Masahito Kawamori (eds.), *Proceed-*

- ings of the 14th Pacific Asia conference on language, information, and computation, 165–176. Tokyo: Logico-Linguistic Society of Japan.
- Kim, Young-joo. 1989. Inalienable possession as a semantic relationship underlying predication: The case of multiple-accusative constructions. In Susumu Kuno et al. (ed.), *Harvard studies in Korean linguistics*, vol. III, 445–467. Harvard University Press.
- Koizumi, M. 1994. Nominative objects: the role of TP in Japanese. In H. Ura & M. Koizumi (eds.), *MITWPL 24: Formal approaches to Japanese linguistics. Proceedings of FAJL 1*, 211–230.
- Kuno, S. 1973. *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kuroda, Shige-Yuki. 1978. Case marking, canonical sentence patterns and counter-Equi in Japanese. In J. Hinds & I. Howards (eds.), *Problems in Japanese syntax and semantics*, Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Kwon, Nayoung. 2006. Case marking signals more than structure building: processing evidence from Korean double nominative constructions. Paper presented at the 37th Annual meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS 37), NELS 37, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, IL.
- Lee, Chungmin. 2006. Contrastive (predicate) topic, intonation, and scalar meanings. In Chungmin Lee, Matt Gordon & Daniel Buring (eds.), *Topic and focus: Crosslinguistic perspectives on meaning and intonation*, 151–175. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Lee, Sun-Hee. 2003. Korean *tough* constructions and double nominative constructions. In Jong-Bok Kim & Stephen Wechsler (eds.), *Proceedings of the 9th international conference on HPSG*, 187–208. Stanford University.
- Lee, Sun-Hee. 2004. *A lexical analysis of selected unbounded dependency constructions in Korean*: Ohio State University dissertation.
- Maling, J. & Soowon Kim. 1992. Case assignment in the inalienable possession construction in Korean. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 1. 37–68.
- Miyagawa, S. 1993. LF case-checking and minimal link condition. In *Case and agreement II, MIT working papers in linguistics* 19, 213–254. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT.
- Nakamura, H. 2002. Double subject, double nominative object and double accusative object constructions in Japanese and Korean. In *Language, information and computation (PACLIC 16)*, 358–369.

- Nakamura, H. & T. Fujita. 1998. Case alternations in potential constructions in Japanese and their semantic implications. In *Language, information and computation (PACLIC 12)*, 172–183.
- Poser, W. J. 2002. The double-o constraints in Japanese. Ms. <http://www.billpouser.org/papers.html>.
- Robbeets, M. 2007. The causative-passive in the Trans-Eurasian languages. *Turkic Languages* 11. 235–278.
- Robbeets, M. 2008. The development of passive morphology in Korean. In *Current issues in unity and diversity of languages*, Seoul: LSK. Collection of the papers selected from the CIL 18, Korea University.
- Robbeets, M. 2009. Insubordination in Altaic. *Voprosy filologii uralo-altajskije isledovanija* 1. 61–79.
- Schütze, C. T. 2001. On Korean ‘case stacking’: the varied functions of the particles *ka* and *lul*. *The Linguistic Review* 18. 193–232.
- Shekar, C. & B. Agbayani. 2003. Accusative-nominative case conversion and complex predicates in Kannada and Japanese/Korean. SALA 23, UT Austin.
- Sim, Chang-Yong. 2006. Accusative case in passives. In *Studies in generative grammar*, vol. 16, 515–533. Walter de Gruyter.
- Sun, Jisung. 2013. The derivational nature of external possession. In *University of Pennsylvania working papers in linguistics*, vol. 19, 217–226.
- Tada, H. 1992. Nominative objects in Japanese. *Journal of Japanese Linguistics* 14. 91–108.
- Ura, Hiroyuki. 1996. *Multiple feature checking: A theory of grammatical function splitting*: MIT dissertation.
- Venditti, J. J., K. Maekawa & M. E. Beckman. 2007. Verb prominence marking in the Japanese intonation system. To appear in S. Miyagawa & M. Saito (eds.), *Handbook of Japanese linguistics*, Oxford University Press.
- Washio, R. 1995. *Interpreting voice. A case study in lexical semantics*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Wunderlich, D. 1997. Cause and the structure of verbs. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28. 27–68.
- Wunderlich, D. 2001. Argument linking in Japanese – some facts and suggestions. Ms., University Düsseldorf.
- Wunderlich, D. 2003. Optimal case patterns: German and Icelandic compared. In E. Brandner & H. Zinsmeister (eds.), *New perspectives on case theory*, 331–367. Stanford: CSLI.

- Wunderlich, D. 2012. Operations on argument structure. In C. Maienborn, K. von Stechow & P. Portner (eds.), *HSK: An international handbook of natural language meaning*, vol. 3, 2224–2259. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yang, Dong-Whe. 2000. Review article: Three forms of case agreement in Korean. By Sungeon Cho, Ph.D. dissertation, State Univ. of New York at Stony Brook.
- Yoon, J. H. 2004. Non-nominative (major) subjects and case stacking in Korean. In P. Bhaskararao & K. V. Subbarao (eds.), *Non-nominative subjects*, vol. 2, 265–314. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Yoon, J. H. 2009. The distribution of subject properties in multiple subject constructions. In Y. Takubo, T. Kinuhata, S. Grzelak & K. Nagai (eds.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics*, vol. 16, 64–83. Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Author

Dieter Wunderlich
Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft Berlin
dieterwdl@t-online.de