

Nominative-Genitive Conversion in Late Middle Korean

Synopsis: While genitive subjects are the norm in nominalized clauses in Altaic languages, Nominative-Genitive Conversion (NGC) is best known from Modern Japanese. This paper deals with two issues concerning NGC in Late Middle Korean (LMK; 15th century): (i) whether NGC occurs in this stage of the language; and (ii) how LMK NGC differs from both the modern Japanese and Modern Korean cases. Based on an extensive examination of LMK electronic corpora, I show that LMK, like Japanese but unlike Modern Korean (Sohn 2004), allows NGC, and that LMK differs from that in Japanese in that it does not obey Transitivity Restriction (Harada 1971).

Background: Pseudo-NGC in Modern Korean: Sohn (2004) argues that Modern Korean does not allow NGC. Apparent genitive subjects are in fact in Spec, DP in adnominal clause, and function as possessors, not subject of the adnominal clause predicate, as in (1a). IP-level adverb may not appear to the left of the apparent genitive subject (1b), in contrast to Japanese (See Miyagawa 1993).

- (1) a. [DP John_i-uy [IP pro_i ka-n] iyu] b. [DP [IP **Adverb** NP-GEN Predicate] N]
- John-GEN buy-Adnm.Pst reason
- ‘the reason why John went’

Contrasting with the Modern Korean case, Jang (1995) assumed there is a NGC in adnominal clauses and *-m* clauses in LMK (see also Suh 1971). However, Jang did not find the crucial data involving an adverb preceding Gen-NP in LMK. I use data **from** bound noun modifying clauses to confirm that NGC occurs in LMK. (2) shows a genitive subject in adnominal clause with a lexical head noun. (3, 4a-b) show the alternation between genitive and nominative in an adnominal clauses, while (5) shows the alteration in an *-m* nominalized clause. While the genitive subject might be analyzed as a possessor in (2) and (3a) with the lexical noun heads *ca* ‘seat’ and *sicel* ‘time’, the Gen-NP cannot function as a possessor of the bound noun *-Kes* in (4a) (Ko 2002: 69); needless to say, the Gen-NP cannot function as a possessor of the nominalized suffix *-m* in (5) either.

- (2) [SWUTAL-oy mongkoro-n CWA]
- Swutal-GEN make-Adnm.Pst position
- ‘the position Swutal made’ (*Sŏk sang* 6:30a)
- (3) a. [i CWUNGSAYNG-oy na-l sicel]
- this people-GEN born-Adnm.Fut time
- ‘the time when people will born’ (*Sŏk sang* 19:22)
- b. [i PIKWU-i cwuk-ulh SICEL]-ey
- this Pikwu-NOM die-Adn.Fut time-at
- ‘At the time while this Bigwu will die’ (*Sŏk sang* 19:31b) (Suh 1977, (126))
- (4) a. [CHWUKSAYNG-uy naho-n kesi]-l-ssol...
- animals-GEN give birth to-Adn.Pst thing-And if...
- ‘If something to whom animals gave birth...’ (*Sŏk sang* 11:31a)
- b. [PWUMO-Ø naho-n kes]-wun...
- parents-NOM give birth to-Adn.Pst thing-Top
- ‘someone to whom parents gave birth...’ (*Wer Sŏk* 17:58a)
- (5) a. ...WI SINLYEK-oy WOYWOY ho-m-i i re ho-nira.
- ...Buddha’s powers-GEN higt do-Nml-Nom like this do-End
- ‘...Buddha’s powers being higt is like this’ (*Sŏk Sang* 21:6b)
- b. ...WI SINLYEK-i WOYWOY ho-m-i i kot ho-nira.
- ...Buddha’s powers -NOM higt do-Nml-Nom like this do-End
- ‘...Buddha’s powers being higt is like this’ (*Beb Hua* 7:59b)

An account of LMK genitive subject case licensing: It is well known that the adnominal form is distinct from the conclusive form in Korean; this is the case in LMK as in ModK. I propose that genitive subjects in both adnominal (2-4) and nominalized clauses (5) is licensed by a [nominal] feature in C, as proposed by Hiraiwa (2001) for ModJ. Evidence for this proposal comes from the non-existence of a transitivity condition in LMK adnominal clauses.

Non-existence of Transitivity Restriction: Sugai (2004) gives a detailed study of object marking in two representative LMK texts, the *Sŏkpo sangjŏl* (1447) and the *Samgang haengsil to* (1481). Sugai finds a low proportion of bare objects (11.6% of 276 tokens) in main clauses, but a high proportion in

relative and nominalized clauses (82.5% of 160 and 62.6% of 123 tokens respectively). In fact, both nominalized clauses and relative clause show large numbers of bare objects in transitive clauses with genitive subjects (6-7) is a nominative clause contain bare object, And data of (7) is a nominal clause containe the element of PP.

- (6) [Ahoy-tolh-oy CAHYWOhonon kamagoy-Ø thywu-m]-ul tut-ti ani ho-nwora.
 Child-PI-GEN tender crow bit-Nml-Acc believe-Susp not do-End
 ‘(He) does not believe that children bit tendresse Crow’ (Tusi 15:22) (Suh 1977 (159))
- (7) [WANG-oy mwolay-lwo PWUSA ho-sya-m]-i koti anihwoita.
 [King-GEN sand-with offering do-Hon-Nml]-Nom same-Neg-be-End
 ‘The King making a (religious) offering with sand is not the same as (my making an offering with money).’ (Sök sang 24:35a)

These examples show that, in contrast to ModJ, objects may co-occur with genitive marked subjects in LMK adnominal clauses. However such apparent violations of the Transitivity Restriction seem to be limited to cases where morphological accusative is not spelled out. This restriction does not hold in *-m* nominalizations, as shown by (8), which contains a morphological accusative object.

- (8) [CENGHAKWONG-oy culumskilh-ulwo WOKCHAYK-ol CEN hwo-m-ol] mastola.
 Cenghakwong GEN shortcut-with Wochayk-ACC give-do-NML-Acc encounter.Past
 ‘(Someone) saw [Cenghakong give (someone) Okchayk by taking a shortcut].’ (Tusi 24:13b)

Comparative issues: It is well known that Japanese allowed NGC in adnominal clauses (9a), and *no* complement clauses (9b). As shown in (10), Japanese has the Transitivity Restriction: if there is a morphological accusative object in subordinate clause NGC is disallowed (10a), but NGC is possible when the subordinate clause contains another element like a PP, (10b). (See, Harada 1971, Watanabe 1996 a, b)

- (9) Modern Japanese
 a. [[kinoo John-ga/no katta] hon]
 yesterday John-NOM/GEN buy-Pst book
 ‘the book John bought yesterday’
 b. John-wa [kinoo Mary-ga/no kita no]-wo sira-nak-atta.
 John-Top yesterday Mary-NOM/GEN come-Pst NML-Acc know-Neg-Pst
 ‘John didn’t know that Mary caome yesterday.’ (Hiraiwa 2001, (86))
- (10) Modern Japanese
 a. [[John-ga/*no hon-wo kasita] hito] b. [[John-ga/no nihon-ni itta] hi]
 John-NOM/GEN book-Acc lent-Pst person John-NOM/GEN Japan-to go-Pst day
 ‘the person John lent a book’ ‘the day John go to Japan’

We observed above that bare objects are allowed in LMK adnominal clauses. We also find examples of bare nominative objects, as in (11) in LMK. This phonemenon does not contrast with Japanese phenomena that there is no Transitivity Restriction when clause contain morphorocal nominave object in adnominal clauses (See Hiraiwa 2011, (119)).

- (11) [SWUTL-oy pelwus-Ø epsu-n] cwul-ul pwoko...
 Sudal-GEN manner-nominative object did not have.Adnm.Pat fact (Light N)-Acc see.Pst
 ‘He saw the fact taht Swudal did not have manner...’ (Sök Sang 6:21)

Analysis: The data involving *-m* nominalizations in (8) is parallels with languages like Turkish, which have no Transitivity Restriction in clauses with genitive subjects. Miyagawa (2011) suggests that the difference between Turkish and Japanese is dues to the existence of [nominal] C in Turkish adnominal (and more generally, nominalized) clauses. If so, LMK *-m* nominalizations may be analyzed in the same way as Turkish. LMK adnominal clauses represent a situation intermediate between Turkish and Modern Japanese: they allow overt direct objects, but do not allow them to be marked with overt accusative case. I suggest that this is because LMK adnominal clauses no longer license genitive subjects with [nominal] C (like Modern Japanese), but have strategy for licensing bare objects distinct from Modern Japanese accusative case licensing.

Selected References: Hiraiwa, K. 2001. On nominative-genitive conversion. MITWPL 39, 66-125. Sohn 2004. Nom-Gen Conversion as a Spurious Phenomenon. Yengemunhak yenku (The English Linguistics) 2004, 183-202. Sugai, Yoshinori. 2004. Taykyek cosa uy yumu wa muncang uy kyeychung kwuco – *Sekpo Sangcel, Samgang hayngsilto* lul cwungsim ulo. *Kwukehak*43.