

**SYNTACTIC AND INFORMATION STRUCTURE OF STATIVE VERB  
SENTENCES WITH EXPERIENCER NP-S IN KOREAN**

ELENA RUDNITSKAYA

*Institute of Oriental Studies, Language Division, Moscow*

This paper considers bivalent stative verbs with ‘EXP(erienter)’ and ‘TH(eme)’/ ‘Patient’ arguments in Korean, such as *mwusep-ta* ‘be afraid of’ or *coh-ta* ‘like’. Whereas the ‘TH’ argument of *mwusep-ta* ‘be afraid of’ is NOM(inative), the ‘EXP’ argument can, besides DAT(ive) (1a), be marked TOP(ic) or NOM (1b–c). Such verbs often have a non-stative counterpart (*mwusep-ha-ta* ‘be-afraid-of-do’) with an ACC(usative) ‘TH’ object (1d). The ‘TH’ NP in (1a–c) is not ACC because a stative verb in Korean cannot govern an ACC complement.

- (1) a. *Chelswu-eykey Mia-ka mwusep-ta*  
Chelswu-DAT Mia-NOM be-afraid-of-DECL  
b. *Chelswu-nun Mia-ka mwusep-ta*  
Chelswu-TOP Mia-NOM be-afraid-of-DECL  
‘Chelswu is afraid of Mia’  
c. *Chelswu-ka Mia-ka mwusep-ta*  
Chelswu-NOM Mia-NOM be-afraid-of-DECL  
‘It is Chelswu who is afraid of Mia’ [marginal]  
d. *Chelswu-nun/ka Mia-lul mwusep-ha-n-ta*  
Chelswu-TOP/NOM Mia-NOM be-afraid-of-do-ASP-DECL  
‘Chelswu is afraid of Mia’

It has been proposed (originally by Heycock and Lee 1989) that the pattern in (1b–c) includes two (syntactic) predications, similar to well-known “double predication” sentences with “two subjects” (2a–b). This proposal is mainly based on the NOM-NOM pattern in (1c) and the assumption that a NOM NP is a subject (that is, (1c) has two subjects: *Chelswu* and *Mia*). According to Teng 1974 and Heycock 1993, in a sample “double predication” sentence (2a–b), the first TOP/NOM NP (*Waikhikhi*) is not an argument, but the logical and at the same time the “major” subject of the sentence. The second NOM NP (*kyongchi*) is the grammatical subject included into the sentential predicate of *Waikhikhi*: [*kyongchi-ka coh-ta*] ([NP(NOM)-V]). *Waikhikhi* and *kyongchi-ka coh-ta* in (1b–c) form an additional verb-less “syntactic” (and semantic) predication.

Lee and Kim 1988, and Yoon 2003, on the contrary, claim that (1b–c) correspond to only one predication: the ‘EXP’ NP is the syntactic subject, whereas the ‘TH’ NP is the syntactic object.

TOP in Japanese/ Korean is a marker of a logical subject rather than of a discourse topic (Kuroda 1972), but NOM marks rheme or focus (cf. (2a–b)). In an embedded context, all subjects are NOM (2c).

- (2) a. *Waikhikhi-nun kyongchi-ka coh-ta*  
Waikiki-TOP landscape-NOM good-DECL  
‘Waikiki has good landscape’  
b. *Waikhikhi-ka kyongchi-ka coh-ta*  
Waikiki-NOM landscape-NOM good-DECL  
‘It is Waikiki that has good landscape’  
c. *Na-nun Waikhikhi-ka kyongchi-ka*  
I-TOP Waikiki-NOM landscape-NOM  
*coh-ta-ko sayngkakha-n-ta*  
good-DECL-QUOT think-ASP-DECL  
‘I think that Waikiki has good landscape’

Based on my data, TOP/NOM sentences (1b–c) have one predication based on the argument structure of bivalent stative verbs with an ‘EXP’ semantic role (*mwusep-ta* ‘be-afraid-of’). However, the TOP/NOM ‘EXP’ is grammaticalized as a logical subject of its [NP(NOM, ‘TH’) – V] sentential predicate. This results in the “frozen” information structure of (1b–c) and certain restrictions on the information status of the ‘EXP’ and the ‘TH’ NP-s.

In the (1b–c) pattern, the ‘EXP’ NP always controls honorific verb agreement (3a–b); only the ‘EXP’

NP – ‘TH- NP binding relation is possible (4a–b). Thus, agreement and reflexivization tests allow us to conclude that TOP/NOM-NOM sentences contain one predication, based on a bivalent predicate, with the ‘EXP’ NP as a grammatical subject.

- (3) a. Chelswu-nun halape-nim-kkeyse  
 Chelswu-TOP grandfather-HON-NOM.HON  
 mwusew-(\*usi)-ta  
 be-afraid-of-(\*HON)-DECL  
 ‘Chelswu is afraid of the grandfather’  
 b. Halape-nim-kkeyse Chelswu-ka  
 grandfather-HON-NOM.HON Chelswu-NOM  
 mwusew-usi-ta  
 be-afraid-of-HON-DECL  
 ‘The grandfather is afraid of Chelswu’  
 (4) a. Mia-nun caki-casin-i mwusep-ta  
 Mia-TOP self-self-NOM be-afraid-of-DECL  
 b. \*Caki-casin-nun Mia-ka mwusep-ta  
 self-self-TOP Mia-NOM be-afraid-of-DECL  
 ‘Mia is afraid of herself’

What are the grammatical features of the (1b–c) TOP/NOM-NOM pattern that distinguish it from (1d) with the regular TOP/NOM-ACC pattern?

Certain syntactic similarities between (1b–c) and (2a–b) can be regarded as evidence for a “double predication” analysis of (1b–c). First, the order of the ‘EXP’ and the ‘TH’ NP-s in (1b–c) (*Chelswu* and *Mia*) is fixed: (1b) cannot be translated as ‘Mia is afraid of Chelswu’. Similarly, *kyongchi* ‘landscape’ cannot be the “major” subject marked TOP in (2a) with the ‘As for landscapes, Waikiki’s one is good’ interpretation. (In general, word order in Korean is free, and a both subject and object can be marked as TOP.) Second, the ‘TH’ NP in (1b–c) cannot be relativized, as in (5a), similar to the “second subject” in a “double predication” sentence – cf. (5b). Lee and Kim 1988 and Mirto 1998 view this restriction as evidence for the “predicative NP” status of the “second subject” (similar to director in John is a director).

- (5) a. Namphyen-i mwusew-un pwuin un napp-un pwuin-i-ta  
 husband-NOM be-afraid-of-PART wife-TOP bad-PART wife-be-DECL  
 ‘A wife that is afraid of her husband is a bad wife’,  
 \*‘A wife that her husband is afraid of is a bad wife’  
 b. \*Mikwuk-i manh-un kes-un catongcha-0-ta  
 America-NOM a-lot-PART thing-TOP car-be-DECL  
 ‘Things that are numerous in America are cars.’

The information structure of (1b–c), however, is kind of “frozen”, unlike (2a–c), which allows all regular information structure options. First, the TOP-NOM pattern in (1b) is highly preferred to the NOM-NOM pattern in (1c). Second, (1b–c), unlike (2a–b), cannot be embedded with the ‘EXP’ NOM NP being non-focused (cf. (2c) and (6)). Third, neither the ‘EXP’ NP, nor the ‘TH’ NP can be a *wh*-question focus (7a–b), whereas both of the two “subject” NP-s in “double predication” sentences can (8a–b).

- (6) Na-nun Chelswu-ka Mia-ka mwusep-ta-kosayng kakha-n-ta  
 I-TOP Chelswu-NOM Mia-NOM be-afraid-of-DECL-QUOT think-ASP-DECL  
 ‘I think that it is Chelswu who is afraid of Mia’;  
 \*‘I think that Chelswu is afraid of Mia’

- (7) a. \*Nwu-ka Mia-ka mwusep-ni?  
 somebody-NOM Mia-NOM be-afraid-of-QUEST  
 ‘Who is afraid of Mia?’  
 b. \*Chelswu-nun nwu-ka mwusep-ni?  
 Chelswu-TOP somebody-NOM be-afraid-of-QUEST  
 ‘Who is Chelswu afraid of?’
- (8) a. Enu kos-i kyongchi-ka cohni?  
 some place-NOM landscape-NOM good-QUEST  
 ‘What place has a good landscape?’  
 b. ??Waikhikhi-nun mwues-i coh-ni?  
 Waikiki-TOP something-NOM good-QUEST  
 ‘What is good in Waikiki?’,  
 ‘What good things does Waikiki have?’

The information structure restrictions mentioned above suggest that the ‘EXP’ NP in (1b–c) is not only the grammatical subject but also a grammaticalized logical subject, whose sentential predicate is the [NP(NOM)-V] constituent. Unlike “double predication” sentences, the ‘EXP’ NP in (1b–c) is not a “major” subject (that is, not a subject of an additional semantic predication).

The logical subject status of the ‘EXP’ NP can account for the marginal status of (1c) and the “‘EXP’ as focus” interpretation of (6), as well as for (7). Since the ‘EXP’ NP is a grammaticalized logical subject, it cannot be a neutral embedded subject in (6) or be questioned in (7a). The ‘TH’ NP cannot form a separate information structure entity (e.g. question focus in (7b)) because it is part of the [NP(NOM)-V] constituent, which is a grammaticalized predicate for the ‘EXP’ NP logical subject.

The restriction on the ‘EXP’ NP – ‘TH’ NP order mentioned above and the ban on the ‘TH’ NP relativization in (5a) can also be explained by the “grammaticalized logical subject” hypothesis. ‘EXP’ must precede ‘TH’ because logical subject cross-linguistically precedes the sentential constituent predicated over it (Aissen 1999). The ‘TH’ NP cannot be relativized because a relativized NP must be able to form a separate information structure entity (for instance, because it is realized as a null NP in the relative clause).

To conclude, the ‘EXP’ and the ‘TH’ NP-s in TOP/NOM-NOM sentences are arguments of the stative verb, corresponding to grammatical subject and object. In the information structure, the ‘EXP’ NP is grammaticalized as logical subject, whereas the ‘TH’ NP is part of the sentential [NP(NOM)-V] constituent, predicated over the ‘EXP’ NP. Such “frozen” information structure results in restrictions on information status options available for both argument NP-s.

Another instance of a clause with two argument NOM NP-s (Agent and Patient), in which the Agent NP has the logical subject status, is the Caucasian “binominative construction” (Kazenin and Testelelets 1999, and Kibrik 2003: 353).

## REFERENCES

- AISSIN, J. 1999. External possessor and logical subject in Tz’utujil. In: D. L. Payne and I. Barshi (eds.), *External possession*, 167–193. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- HEYCOCK, C. 1993. Syntactic predication in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 2, 167–211.
- HEYCOCK, C. and Y.-S. LEE. 1989. Subjects and predication in Korean and Japanese. In H. Hoji (ed.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 1, 239–253. Stanford: SLA Publications.
- KAZENIN, K. I. and YA. G. TESTELETS. 1999. Porjadok slov i struktura sostavljajuschix [Word order and constituent structure]. In: A. E. Kibrik (ed.), *Elementy tsaxurskogo yazyka v tipologicheskom osveschenii* [Studies in Tsakhur: a typological perspective], 293–346. Moskva: Nasledie.
- KIBRIK, A. E. 2003. K probleme yadernyx aktantov i ix “nekanonicheskogo kodirovanija”: svidetel’stva archinskogo yazyka [On the problem of terms and their “non-canonical coding”: evidence from Archi]. In *Konstanty i peremennye yazyka* [Constants and variables of language], 332–368. S.-Petersburg: Aleteya.
- KURODA, S.-Y. 1972. The categorical and thethetic judgment. Evidence from Japanese syntax. *Foundations of Language* 9: 2, 153–185.
- LEE, H.-B. and M.-K. KIM. 1988. Double-Nominative constructions in Korean. In Linguistic Society of Korea (ed.), *Linguistics in the Morning Calm* 2, 489–505. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co.

- MIRTO, I. M. 1998. *The syntax of the meronymic constructions*. Pisa, ETS.
- TENG, S. 1974. Double Nominatives in Chinese. *Language* 50, 455–473.
- YOON, J.-H. 2003. Non-nominative (Major) Subjects and Case-stacking in Korean. To appear in: P. Bhaskararao, and K. V. Subbarao (eds.), *Non-nominative subjects*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.