

# RAISING OF MAJOR ARGUMENTS IN KOREAN (AND JAPANESE)\*

## 1. INTRODUCTION – THE STATUS OF SUBJECT-TO-OBJECT RAISING IN JAPANESE AND KOREAN

Since Kuno (1976), the consensus in generative inquiries of Japanese (and Korean) syntax has been that the case alternation on the embedded subject shown in (1a) and (1b) is the counterpart in these languages of the English constructions in (2a) and (2b), respectively. That is, Japanese and Korean possess the Subject-to-Object raising construction (and/or the Exceptional Case-Marking/Long-Distance Agree construction). Some recent examples of the dominant view include Hiraiwa 2002 and Tanaka 2002 for Japanese and S.-M. Hong 2005 for Korean.

- |     |    |   |                    |                     |              |          |
|-----|----|---|--------------------|---------------------|--------------|----------|
| (1) | a. | Cheli-nun                                   | Yenghi- <b>ka</b>  | yenglihay-ss-ta-ko  | mitnun-ta    | (Korean) |
|     |    | C-TOP                                       | Y-NOM              | smart-PST-DECL-COMP | believe-DECL |          |
|     |    | 'Cheli believes that Yenghi was smart.'     |                    |                     |              |          |
|     | b. | Cheli-nun                                   | Yenghi- <b>lul</b> | yenglihay-ss-ta-ko  | mitnun-ta    |          |
|     |    | C-TOP                                       | Y-ACC              | smart-PST-DECL-COMP | believe-DECL |          |
|     |    | 'Cheli believes Yenghi to have been smart.' |                    |                     |              |          |
- 
- |     |    |  |
|-----|----|--|
| (2) | a. | John believes (that) <b>he</b> is innocent |
|     | b. | John believes <b>him</b> to be innocent    |

However, Hoji (1991, 2005) (see also Saito 1983; Oka 1988; Sells 1990; Takano 2003) for Japanese and K.-S. Hong (1990, 1997) (see also P.-Y. Lee 1992) for Korean have challenged the conventional wisdom. These researchers take the construction in (1b) in Japanese/Korean not to be an SOR/ECM construction, but one where the accusative NP is base-generated in the matrix VP. In this view, (1a) and (1b) are not related syntactically by movement and/or optional case-assignment. In their recent book on raising and control, Davies and Dubinsky (2004: Chap. 10) appear to side cautiously with the latter regarding Japanese. Independently of the fate of Japanese/Korean SOR, they show that a number of constructions in different languages previously analyzed as involving SOR do not seem to be raising/ECM constructions, but something else. Davies (2005) argues that the construction in Madurese previously taken to exemplify SOR involves a base-generated object in the upstairs clause, on a par with the similar English (Prolepsis) construction shown in (3) below.

- (3) I believe about/regarding Bill that he is responsible for the failure

In this paper, I show that while there is apparent, but often ignored, evidence indicating that (1b) may not be a typical raising construction, the evidence can be reinterpreted to support a raising analysis – if we posit that what undergoes raising is not the embedded subject, but the embedded Major Subject. A Major Subject is the traditional designation for the ‘extra’ subject-like nominal of Multiple Nominative Constructions (MNCs). However, as argued by Heycock and Doron (2003), Major Subjects can be equated with subjects of categorical judgment sentences, or Categorical Subjects. Such subjects are not restricted to sentences with two subject-like nominals, as is well known (Diesing 1992). The hypothesis that the construction in (1b) involves raising of the embedded Major and/or Categorical Subject accounts for many of the apparent problems for the raising analysis. In turn, it is supported by evidence showing that the accusative-marked nominal in (1b) displays properties that could only have been determined in the lower clause. The argument for this position is made on the basis of detailed investigation of Korean. It is applicable to Japanese as well, insofar as the properties of the two languages parallel each other.

The organization of this chapter is as follows. In section 2, we introduce a number of properties of SOR in Korean and Japanese that appear to be problematic for the assumption that the languages possess a genuine SOR construction. In section 3, we propose that SOR in Korean (and Japanese) involves the raising of the embedded Major Subject. We demonstrate first that there is a correlation between the possibility of an embedded nominal – subject or nonsubject – to undergo SOR and its ability to be expressed as a Major Subject. We then show how this analysis accounts for the apparent problems for the raising analysis of SOR. Section 4 compares the proposed analysis with an alternative, base-generation analysis. We show that while the two are largely equivalent in terms of descriptive coverage, the base-generation analysis suffers from a number of drawbacks which favor the raising analysis defended in the paper. Section 5 concludes the paper.

## 2. APPARENT PROBLEMS FOR THE RAISING ANALYSIS OF SOR

If we take the properties of the English construction in (2b) to be representative of SOR crosslinguistically, a number of properties of the Korean construction in (1b) appear to indicate that it may not be a canonical SOR construction.<sup>1</sup>

First, the complement clauses of SOR verbs are unreduced, finite clauses, unlike English. This is a possible problem for movement and/or case-marking, since it is commonly assumed that a finite clause boundary acts as a barrier to these dependencies. However, the problem is internal to some theoretical assumptions and may not be considered critical.

A second apparent problem stems from the fact that unlike the English construction in (2a) and (2b), accusative-marking alternates with Nominative-marking on the complement subject. In other words, SOR is optional. These properties do not bode well for some theoretical assumptions either. They seem to