

Variations of double nominative in Korean and Japanese

Dieter Wunderlich

Preface:

- A personal note. Once I tried to climb, together with Sebastian Löbner, mount Fushi, the king of mountains. Because of ongoing rainfall we could do nothing but turning back, and ended in a sauna with a saki-bar: the double ascent became a double passiveness; both of us suffered from this failure. The king of cases is the nominative; a double nominative has two kings of the same rank, and a double nominative passive is a double nominative ending in a passive. The doubling experience made me ultimately decide on writing 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 many fields of Japanese and Korean syntax, mostly parallel in these languages. Not wrongly – Japanese and Korean linguists hold the double nominative with such a figuration for a unique feature of their languages.
- A prejudice. A double nominative is not spectacular by 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 previously was believed. In many languages, if (for some reason) accusative is blocked for an object, nominative becomes the automatic case instead.
- 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 into major fields of Korean and Japanese grammar as well as into the historical, often parallel, development of these languages. At least some alternations are lexically triggered; it also plays a role that accusatives are sometimes forbidden in a stative context. Thus, a lexical framework might be fruitful to account for the interaction between vocabulary classes, information and phrasal structures.

1. Introduction: Possessor-raising as a source of 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: $\lambda x V(x) \Rightarrow \lambda x \lambda y [\text{POSS}(y,x) \ \& \ V(x)]$. 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 bodypart, 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) **J** a. Syusyoo-no byooki-ga saikin omo-i.
 [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) **K** a. Swungsang-uy pyeng-i choykun simha-ta.
 [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) **J** a. Hanako-ni(wa) kono hon-no naiyoo-ga yoku waka-ru.
 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) **K** a. Mary-ka John-uy/-ul tali-lul cha-ess-ta. *inalienable*
 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*
 Mary-NOM John-GEN/*ACC car-ACC kick-PAST-DECL
 ‘Mary kicked John’s car.’

Concerning the constructions (3) and (4), the respective counterparts in the other language are somewhat odd. In Korean, something like *content(book)* isn’t inalienable enough (or, not affected enough) to enter the ACC-construction; and the Japanese ACC-ACC construction is only accepted if the two ACCs are separated by adverbs (Kim 1989), see (6).

- (5) **K** a. Hanna-eykey(-nun) i chayk(-uy) nayyong-i cal ihaytoy-n-ta.
 Hana-DAT(-TOP) this book(-GEN) content-NOM well understandable-PRS-DECL
 ‘Hana understands the content of this book well.’
- (6) **J** a. Mary-ga John- no/?-o asi- o ketta.
 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.’

A first question: Why appears the case pattern NOM-NOM 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 it 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 non-stative verb, allows ACC. Finally, Korean allows ACC-ACC-objects, but Japanese does not; this is because of the Japanese-specific high-ranking of UNIQUENESS(ACC).

- (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.)

In the literature, it has extensively been discussed whether constructions such as those in (1, 2) have two subjects (as suggested by the term ‘double subject’, which mostly is used for the NOM-NOM construction), or, if there is only one subject, which NP is it. Kuroda (1978) proposed the structure [N1 [N2 PRED]_{S1}]_{S2} for the double-subject. Regretfully, the most common subject tests (such as binding of jap. *zhigun*, resp. of kor. *caki* ‘self’, honorific agreement with the verb, or plural agreement with adverb or verb in Kor.) yield unclear results.

Another question is why the Korean object-possessor construction shows ACC-ACC rather than DAT-ACC. Some authors assume a requirement of case-concordance (*case-sharing*, *case-agreement*), similar to what might happen between nominal argument and nominal predicate (Consider NOM-NOM in German copula clauses: *er wurde als ihr Vorgesetzter eingeführt* ‘he was introduced as her boss’; ACC-ACC: *man führte ihn als ihren Vorgesetzten ein*, ‘one introduced him as her boss’.)

The Korean passive (Yang 2000) speaks against *case-sharing*, see the NOM-ACC version of (8a). Indeed, DEFAULT only requires *one* NOM, not *two*. However, since NOM-NOM-passive is possible, too, case-sharing (in the presence of an inalienable relation) is a possible option.

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

Note that ‘possessor raising’ (either lexically or syntactically) is an iterative operation.

- (9) K a. Mary-ka John-ul tali-lul oluncok-ul cha-ss-ta
 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)

A more specific question is, what relations allow ‘possessor-raising’. According to Bak (2004), there is a split low in the hierarchy *body parts* > *family member* > *clothing* > **equipment*. Compare (10a,b):

- (10) K a. Youngsu-ka Chelsu-uy/lul phal-ul ttayli-ess-ta.
 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.’

According to Cho (2003), an *entailment* of the following sort should be possible (which clearly is too a narrow restriction because it excludes family members) :

John’s leg was kicked \Rightarrow John was kicked. (NOM-NOM is possible.)

John’s friend was kicked $\neg \Rightarrow$ John was kicked. (*NOM-NOM)

(Considering N1 to be a second subject seems somewhat to be based on such an entailment.)

There exists a semantic restriction (effective in Japanese and Korean as well as in English): relative clauses can only be built with the non-relational possessor as the head – the relative clause then has an argument gap. If the relational possessee were the head, the relative clause would not have any gap and therefore could not be formed (Nakamura 2002)

- (11) J a. Hanako-ni naiyoo-ga waka-ru hon
 H.-DAT content-NOM understand-PRES book
 ‘the book the content of which Hanako understands’
 b. * Hanako-ni(wa) kono hon-ga waka-ru naiyoo-ga
 H.-DAT(TOP) this book-NOM understand-PRES content-NOM

There is still a somewhat mysterious interaction: possessor-raising is possible just in case it leads, under normal circumstances, to NOM-NOM or ACC-ACC. In other words, possessor-raising is excluded with non-stative predicates and (usually) with Japanese objects. These

seem to be cumulative factors, which do not follow from a simple assumption. There might be some historical contingencies. The constraints mentioned above, *ACC/+stat und UNIQUE-NESS(ACC), could be the product of a development conditioned by accidental variation in the domain of possessor-raising.

Independent of all this, 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 results (2005) clearly contradict such an assumption: this author showed in *self-paced* reading experiments that NOM-NOM causes significant delays. It is perhaps spoken language in which an advantage is present, or because the sum of expressive means is enhanced.

Let us consider the following 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, either (i) information-structurally or (ii) in the formation of even more complex sentences.

In the following, I will offer a suite with 12 dances of different length. My polonaise 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, followed by 4 in which nominatives enable topic or focus interpretations. The Korean topic clauses in 5 are followed by Japanese scope variations in 6. Then we have two Japanese dances: 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 the sadness of a double-nom passive in 11. Korean is coming a little more strong than Japanese in 12, and we end up 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 alternations. 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) K a. Part-whole relationship (or inalienable possession)

John-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.’

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

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

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

this mountain-LOC/NOM trees-NOM abundant

‘There are many trees at 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) K a. John-i Mary-ka cohta.
 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) K a. John-i kasu-ka anita.
 John-NOM singer-NOM be-not
 ‘John is not a singer.’

- b. Mary-ka uysa-ka toyesta
 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) K a. Nay-ka sakwa-lul/*ka mekkessta.
 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) J a. John-ga huransugo-ga/*o deki-ru.
 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.

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

- (18) K a. *Specification*. If N2 is more specific than N1 ($|N1| \supset |N2|$), NOM-NOM is obligatory:

kwait-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 sseskessta.
 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 bodypart-construction under passive (Sim 2006):

- (19) K a. Chelswu-ka koki-lul phiraymi-lul cap-ass-ta.
 C.-NOM fish-ACC smallfish-ACC catch-PAST-DECL
 ‘As for fish, Chelswu caught small ones.’
 b. koki-ka phiraymi-i/*-ul cap-hi-ass-ta.
 fish-NOM smallfish-NOM/*ACC grab-PASS-PAST-DECL
 ‘As for fish, small ones were caught.’
- (20) K a. Leia-ka Yoda-lul son-ul cap-ass-ta.
 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) K a. John-un haksayng-ul sey-myeng-ul/*-i pwuca-lako mitnunta.
 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-i/²-ul twukkepta-ko mitnunta.
 Mary-TOP banana-ACC skin-NOM/²-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, where it is doubtful whether they are really *distinct* arguments, while type IIb predicates are stative and clearly have two distinct arguments with NOM case. Type IIa and IIc predicates have one argument that can alternate to NOM under specific conditions. Type I predicates have a relational argument which in turn have an argument by itself that can alternate to 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 structure. Note that both Japanese (see *-ni-wa* ‘DAT-TOP’) and Korean (see (22)) show a sequence of case marker and topic marker.

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

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

Type1: DAT+NOM, LOC+NOM, INSTR+NOM

Case-stacking is an additional alternative to case-alternation. As we have seen, DAT and LOC often alternate with NOM; in the case-stacking case they are realized together. The instrumental mostly 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) K a. Cheli-eykey/ka/eykey-ka ton-i philyoha-ta.
 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 *elyepta*.
 that tool-INST/*NOM/INST-NOM I-DAT-TOP car-ACC fix-NML-NOM difficult
 ‘It is that tool with which I find it difficult to fix the car.’

Type2: DAT+ACC. (24b) is an instance of *raising-to-object*. One easily can see that the object (with a facultative focus particle) is augmented with a focus interpretation.

- (24) K a. John-i Mary-eykey-(man)-ul chayk-ul cwu-ess-ta.
 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 sayngkakhhan-ta.
 I-TOP C.-DAT-(only)-ACC that.kind problem-NOM exist-DECL-COMP think-DECL
 ‘I think that only Cheli has that kind of problem.’

Type3: DAT+GEN: (DAT kodiert die *goal*-Interpretation, GEN ist allg. vom Nomen lizensiert)

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

Type1 und type2 case-stacking give rise to focus interpretation:

[_]_{N-CASE/CASE} ⇒ [_]_{N: Fokus}

Schütze (2001) assumes that the Korean suffixes /ka/ and /lul/ are ambiguous between case (NOM resp. ACC) and FOC marking. Yoon (2004) argues against that by assuming that focus interpretation is contextually rather than lexically triggered. Note that, in principle, focus as well as topic interpretation are possible on the basis of simple NOM or ACC marking.

DDDDD Typ 3 scheint keine so eindeutige Interpretation zu bewirken (??). Warum ist case stacking *GEN-NOM: [[]_N]_v ausgeschlossen?

It is often assumed that double-case is based on two different syntactic domains (biclausal analysis). According to Yoon (2004), a *stacked* NOM is base-generated in SpecTP 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 signalling 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 it 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 focus-reading regardless of whether it is stressed (27c).

- (27) K a. khokkiri-nun kho-ka kil-ta. TOP - NOM
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 ---.’
- c. khokkiri-ka kho-ka kil-ta. NOM (=FOC) - NOM
elephant-NOM nose-NOM long-DECL
‘It is elephants whose noses are long.’

Kim (2000) states that only the initial NOM of a sentence expressing a *kinship*-relation can get focus-reading, while the initial NOM of a sentence expressing a *bodypart*-relation gets 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 *bodypart* were more than gradually different.

- (28) K a. Mary-ka son-i yepputa. *topic*
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 are surprisingly many 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 focus reading regardless of whether the noun is stressed (29c).

- (29) J a. Neutral or stress on the predicate
 Zoo-no hana-ga **nagai.** GEN - NOM
 Elephant-GEN nose-NOM long
 ‘An elephant’s nose is long.’
- b. Possessor-topic
Zoo-wa hana-ga nagai. TOP - NOM
 Elephant-TOP nose-NOM long
 ‘As for an elephant, it has a long nose.’
- c. Possessor with contrastive focus
Zoo-ga hana-ga nagai. NOM (=FOC) - NOM
 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) J a. Neutral or predicate stress
 Ken-ni butsuri-ga wakaru. DAT - NOM
 Ken-DAT physics-NOM understand
 ‘Ken understands physics.’
- b. Subject-topic
 Ken-wa butsuri-ga wakaru. TOP - NOM
 Ken-TOP physics-NOM understand
 ‘As for Ken, he understands physics.’
- c. Subject with contrastive focus
Ken-ga butsuri-ga wakaru. NOM (=FOC) - NOM
 Ken-NOM physics-NOM understand
 ‘It is Ken who understands physics.’

Thus, not only the case systems but also the topic-focus systems of Korean and Japanese are very similar.

The order of the constituents of a NOM-ACC or a DAT-NOM pattern can be reversed without changing the meaning. This is not possible for a TOP-NOM or a NOM-NOM pattern, where argument structure is overridden by information structure. The order of a GEN-NOM pattern, which is part of a nominal phrase, is also fixed.

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 topicalised N1 binds a gap in the relative clause headed by N2 : N1_i [[e_i REL] N2].

- (33) K Ku yeca-ka ecey salangha-nun naca-ka cwuessta.
 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) K a. chinkwu-ka salko iss-nun aphatu-ka acwu khuta.
 [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’

6. Scope variation (in Japanese)

Differences in information structure are connected with scopal differences. The elder literature on Japanese sometimes mentions this fact but not very systematic. – 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) J a. Object in focus
 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 im Fokus
 Ken-ga/wa mizu-o **nomi-tai.** NOM/TOP - ACC
 Ken-NOM/TOP water-ACC drink-want
 ‘Ken wants to *drink* water.’

If the object is in focus, the scopal conditions shift: the NOM-object has 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.

- (36) J a. John-ga migime-dake-o tumur-e-ru.
 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 in general show the alternation ACC/NOM on the object, see (36b).

- (37) J a. Yamada-ga miruku-o/*ga nom-u. NOM - ACC
 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), while with a potential verb the object can be ACC, NOM or GEN (38b), see Nakamura & Fujita (1998).

- (38) J a. Yamada-no miruku-o/*ga/*no nom-u-koto GEN - ACC
 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’

It is reasonable to assume that NOM is excluded in a nominal domain (*NOM/+N), like ACC. The alternation ACC/NOM on the object then relates to conditions within the verbal domain (as mentioned in the paragraph following (17) in section 2 above: either CAN takes the VP with ACC-object, or CAN takes only V and subsequently a NOM-object because of *ACC/+stative). It seems that if the object is realized as ACC or NOM and the subject as GEN, a VP is embedded under *-koto* ‘fact’ rather than simply the verb or a full clause. However, with a GEN-GEN pattern the construction must be viewed as V-embedding. In that case the GEN-object has wide scope over *can*. Consider the five possible structures shown in (39).

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

Only if the object is realized as GEN, it must belong to the N-domain. Interestingly, GEN at the object is only possible, if the alternation with NOM is possible. In other words, double-NOM in (36b, 38b) enables double-GEN. Thus, the [+stative] variant of [VERB]-CAN seems to be a transitional state between VP- and V-embedding under *-koto*; note that nominals are automatically stative. – This could reflect the historical fact that *ga* (=NOM) was a GEN-particle in the

13th century, which later was recategorized. In those contexts in which 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 S- and VP-embedding. A GEN-subject can have scope over the head-noun, while a NOM-subject cannot (Hiraiwa 2001, Ahn 2006):

- (40) J a. Gakusee-tachi ga/no yon-da yon-satsu no hon wa tsumarana-i.
 [student-PL NOM/GEN read-PAST] 4-CLASSIF GEN book TOP 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 50% ijou da.
 [ruby or pearl] NOM/GEN cheap-CONT become-PRES probability NOM 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 by partial reduction (*are* < *e* in the potential) they became different.

- (41) J a. Kono syatu-ga sensei-ni araw-are-ru. *passive*
 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 neither can be antecedens 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) J a. * Kono syatu-ga sensei-ni go-jibun-de o-araw-are-ninar-u. *passive*
 this shirt-NOM teacher-BY HON-self-BY HON-wash-PASS-HON-PRES
 ‘This shirt is washed by the teacher (HON).’
- b. Kono syatu-ga sensei-ni go-jibun-de o-arai-ninar-e-ru. *potential*
 this shirt-NOM teacher-DAT HON-self-BY HON-wash-HON-CAN-PRES
 ‘As to 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 (similar to experiencer constructions), which is optional. This gives place for a possible historical explanation: when *are* was split into passive on the one hand and potential on the other, two different interpretation possibilities arised for an optional subject-*ni*-phrase. If the subject is marked, the object could

occupy the nominative. Thus, ultimately, the potential construction became a generator for NOM-NOM geworden (which alternates with GEN-GEN).

Modern Japanese shows the tendency of giving up GEN-subjects in favor of NOM. Harada (1971) already pointed out that elder persons (above forty) preferably accept GEN-ACC in the nominal construction (39b), while younger persons (below forty) refute GEN-ACC in favor of either GEN-NOM or NOM-NOM – a process that seems to continue (Ahn 2006). Thus, the differences between the five constructions shown in (39) are increasingly flattened.

In Korean, all GEN-subjects are lost since middle Korean.

8. More examples for 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) J Complement clause of a noun

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 who the cake was eaten by.’

c. Object extracted in the causative

Ichiro ga/no musuko ni s-ase-ta shukudai wa yasashi-katta.
 [I. NOM/GEN son DAT do-CAUS-PAST] homework TOP easy-PAST
 ‘The homework that Ichiro made his son do was easy.’

d. Causee extracted in the causative + passive construction

Shinbun ga/no yom-ase-rare-ta kodoma wa joozuni yom-ana-i.
 [newspaper NOM/GEN read-CAUS-PASS-PAST] child TOP skilled 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):

[_N [_V _{X_{NOM}} WRITE(x,y)] BOOK(y)]

[_N _{X_{GEN}} [_V WRITE(x,y)] BOOK(y)]

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) K a. [[i sacen-ul sayongha]-ki] -ka swipta. ACC-NOM
 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) K a. [i sacen-uy sayongpep] -i swipta. GEN-NOM
 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.’

10. Cadencia or a first summary

There is the tradition, especially in Korean linguistics, to consider NOM-NOM as ‘double-*subject*’, with N1 = *major* (or *extra*) *subject*, and N2 = *minor* (or *real*) *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 exists 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? The dominant conviction is that the NOM-NOM construction, at least the type 1 (see section 2), has two subjects (related to each other) and is therefore biclausal. In particular, investigations in the framework of minimalist syntax assume biclausality because in this framework each NOM-constituent needs its own syntactic NOM-assigner. But if one considers NOM as the default case, there is no need for a particular constellation of NOM-assignment.

Possessor-raising means that N1 does not belong to the domain defined by N2 (which is smaller than a clause) but rather to the domain of the predicate; with other words, N1 becomes co-argument of N2. In a biclausal analysis, N1 would have to move even one predicate-domain higher. That two arguments of a predicate may remain as unmarked (nominative) results from the fact that ACC is blocked in a [+stative] context, and that the appearance of DAT either requires three arguments or a lexical feature. Similarly, the DAT/NOM- and LOC/NOM alternations should be regarded as clause-internal.

All these alternations yielding nominative make the NP accessible to one of the following operations: (i) the NP can be marked in situ for topic (by jap. *wa*, kor. *nun*); (ii) the NP can serve in situ for ‘explicite’ focus (just by NOM-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 case of the 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 case of the 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.

N1 in the NOM-NOM construction is a good candidate for topic-extraction as an additional operation. Two further remarks are in place: (i) The focus-interpretation of N1 (especially in case of *case-stacking*) is not particularly based on extraction – because focus is always possible in situ, both in Korean and Japanese. (ii) Likewise, the existence of ACC-ACC in Korean could not be explained if extraction is assumed from the start – because the formation of ACC-ACC does not build up additional phrasal structure.

11. The double-NOM passive is especially sad

Now, after we failed to climb the Fushiyama, I come to the announced common *Leideform* ('suffering form', the term by which 'passive' is translated into German). The following sentence (slightly changed from Washio 1995) contains an instance of the double-NOM passive, where N1 is to be read as the possessor of N2.

- (47) *watashi-tachi-ga/wa* *gakusei-tati-ni* *tyosyo-ga* *waruku* *yom-are-te* *i-ru.*
 me-company-NOM/TOP student-PL-BY book-NOM badly read-PASS-CONT be-PRES
 'As for us, our books have been read badly by the students.'

Wunderlich (2001) proposed to capture this construction by means of the *topmost possessor*, similar to some instances of German. (48a) can only get the reading that 'he' is the possessor of the foot, (48b) establishes that the order of indefinite pronouns, showing the actual argument hierarchy, is DAT-NOM, and (48c) shows the lexical representation of the dative-subject variant of *schmerzen* 'to hurt'. The lexically assigned feature [+hr] ensures that the subject indeed is realized as dative. Since the Japanese topmost possessor is realized as NOM, no such a feature is needed there.

- (48) Topmost possessor in German
 a. *Ihm* *schmerzt* *der Fuß.*
 he.DAT hurts the foot
 'His foot hurts.'
 b. *weil* *wem* *was* *schmerzte*
 because somebody.DAT something.NOM hurt.PAST
 **weil* *was* *wem* *schmerzte*
 c. $\lambda x \lambda u \lambda s$ [POSS(u,z) & HURT(x)](s) with z=x
 +hr
- (49) Topmost possessor in Japanese (Wunderlich 2001)
 a. Topmost possessor: $\lambda V \lambda u \lambda s$ [POSS(u,z) & V](s)
 where z must be identified with an argument of V
 b. Double-NOM passive:
 $\lambda y \lambda u \lambda s$ [POSS(u,z) & $\exists x$ READ(x,y)](s) with z=y

(49a) describes the rule of 'Possessor Raising', where the possessor is introduced as a higher argument, and the possessee is identified with one of the former arguments of the verb. In the double-NOM passive, this rule is applied to the simple passive form *yom-are* 'to be read'.

There are two problems to be solved:

- (i) (a more technical one:) To capture the Korean ACC-ACC construction, one has to apply the topmost possessor rule at the VP shell, so that a highest object is introduced, leaving the subject as the overall-highest argument. Such a rule is known as applicative. That is, in the case of double-ACC the topmost possessor rule reduces to the more simple applicative possessor rule $\lambda V \lambda u \lambda z \lambda s$ [V(z) & POSS(u,z)](s), see Wunderlich (2012).
 (ii) (an empirical one:) According to what we know already about NOM-NOM constructions, they are restricted to stative predicates. It is not so evident that passive itself is stative, although it very often invites for a stative version (the stative passive).

12. Korean is coming a little more strong 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 *bodypart* noun in

the progressive provided that the state goes on. The progressive contains a stative component. (50b) is problematic because stomping on someone's foot usually is not seen as a continuing activity.

- (50) J a. Takashi ga asi-ga koteis-are-te i-ta.
 T. NOM foot-NOM fix-PASS-CONT 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-CONT be_on-PAST
 'Takashi had his foot stomped.'

Korean is not sensitive to those niceties; double-NOM passive is possible with all bodyparts independent of verbform and result state. Jang-Ho's suffering can be expressed as brutally as it is.

- (51) K a. Jang-Ho-ka pal-i palp-i-ess-ta.
 J.-NOM foot-NOM stomp-PASS-PAST-DECL
 '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) K John-i/nun Mary-eykey meli-ul kkakk-i-ess-ta.
 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 was cut his hair by Mary.' *passive*

Does this observation help us any further? In a way, yes. A causative never can be stative, while a passive can. The particular contrast between causative and passive readings may establish a stative interpretation of passives as the most natural one. We may conclude that passives are about states that result from an event, while causatives are about the dynamics of events.

13. The great Korean-Japanese harmony

Because of lack of informants, I was not able to consider Japanese and Korean always contrastively. However, it seems that most of the structural properties discussed here are shared. If one looks at examples such as (1) and (2) in the very beginning, one realizes: yes, these sentences are identical, but have different vocabularies. It has often been discussed in what extent Korean and Japanese are genealogically related. For me, it is pretty clear that, in some way or the other, the predecessors of Japanese and Korean shared fundamental parts of their grammar. As we saw, certain interactions between case system, informational structure, extraction and complex verb formation historically took place in a similar way. It would be interesting to know whether there was a common initiation or beginning of these developments before the people becoming later Japanese left the Asian continent, or whether these developments took place in later times in so remarkable parallels, and – if the latter is the case – by what kind of mechanism the similarity of developments was enabled. After the Japanese people left the Asian continent, borrowing was certainly not a major source of their linguistic harmony with the Koreans (as we know, their political harmony was always rather small).

Literature:

- Ahn, Byron (2006) Nominative-genitive conversion in Japanese. A consequence of the syntax. Ms., Cornell Univ.
- Bak, Jaehee (2004) *Optional case marking of the possessor in Korean*. M.A. thesis, Univ. of Manitoba.
- Cho, S. E. (2003) A conditioning factor in possessor agreement constructions. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 11: 343-351.
- Chung, Chan (1998) Argument composition and long-distance scrambling in Korean. An extension of the complex predicate analysis. In E. Hinrichs, A. Kathol & T. Nakazawa (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics 30: Complex predicates in nonderivational syntax*, 159-218.
- Harada, S. I. (1971) *Ga-no* conversion and idiolectal variation in Japanese. *Gengo Kenkyu* 60: 25-38.
- Hoye, Masako Oku (2003) *Why Japanese double-ga construction cannot be scrambled*. M.A. thesis, Univ. of North Texas.
- Imai, Shingo (1998) *Logical structure and case marking in Japanese*. M.A. thesis, Univ. of New York at Buffalo.
- Kim, Hee-Soo & Acrisio Pires (2003) Ambiguity in the Korean morphological causative/passive. In W. McClure (ed.) *Japanese/ Korean Linguistics 12*, 255-266. Stanford: CSLI.
- Kim, Jong-Bok (2000) A constraint-based approach to some multiple nominative constructions in Korean. *Language, Information and Computation (PACLIC 14)*, 2000, 165-176.
- Kim, Young-Joo (1989) Inalienable possession as a semantic relationship underlying predication: the case of multiple-acc constructions. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* 3: 445-467.
- Koizumi, Masatoshi (1994) Nominative objects: the role of TP in Japanese. In H. Ura & M. Koizumi (eds.) *MITWPL 24: Formal Approaches to Japanese Linguistics* 1, 211-230.
- Kuno, Susumu (1973) *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT.
- Kuno, Susumu & Yuki Johnson (2005) On the non-canonical double nominative construction in Japanese: the particle *ga* as an object marker. *Studies in Language* 29: 285-328.
- 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. 37th Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS 37), University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, IL.
- Lee, Chungmin (2006) Contrastive (predicate) topic, intonation, and scalar meanings. In Chungmin Lee, Matt Gordon and 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 select unbounded dependency constructions in Korean*. Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State Univ.
- Nakamura, Hiroaki & Takeshi Fujita (1998) Case alternations in potential constructions in Japanese and their semantic implications. *Language, Information and Computation (PACLIC 12)*, 18-20 Feb. 1998, 172-183.
- Nakamura, Hiroaki (2002) Double subject, double nominative object and double accusative object constructions in Japanese and Korean. *Language, Information and Computation (PACLIC 16)*, 31Jan-2 Feb. 2002, 358-369.
- Schütze, Carson T. (2001) On Korean 'case stacking': the varied functions of the particles *ka* and *lul*. *The Linguistic Review* 18: 193-232.
- Shekar, Chandra & Brian Agbayani (2003) Accusative-nominative case conversion and complex predicates in Kannada and Japanese/Korean. SALA 23, UT Austin, Oct 10-12, 2003.
- Sim, Chang-Yong (2006) Accusative case in passives. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 16: 515-533.
- Tada, H. (1992) Nominative objects in Japanese. *Journal of Japanese Linguistics* 14: 91-108.
- Venditti, Jennifer J., Kikuo Maekawa, and Mary E. Beckman (2007) Verb Prominence marking in the Japanese intonation system. To appear in Shigeru Miyagawa and Mamoru Saito (eds.) *Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Washio, Ryuchi (1995) *Interpreting voice. A case study in lexical semantics*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Wunderlich, Dieter (2001) Argument linking in Japanese – some facts and suggestions. Ms., Univ.

Düsseldorf.

Wunderlich, Dieter (2012) Operations on argument structure. In Claudia Maienborn, Klaus von Heusinger and Paul Portner (eds.) *HSK: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning*, vol.3, 2224-2259. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Yang, Dong-Whee (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, James H. (2004) Non-nominative (major) subjects and case stacking in Korean. Ms., Department of Linguistics, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL, U.S.A.