

## Licensing of Non-theta-marked (Major) Arguments in Dependent-Marking Languages

1. Most formal theories of syntax take argument licensing in syntax to be based on lexical projection (Theta Criterion in GB; Completeness/Coherence in LFG; Valence Principle in HPSG, etc.). However, constructions exist which feature an argument that is not theta-marked by a head. Subjects of Copy Raising Constructions (1a) and Tough Constructions (1b) are base-generated but do not receive a theta-role from a head (Heycock 1993, Runner and Potsdam 2001).

Nonetheless, these constructions do not entail wholesale abandonment of lexical projection (as in constructionist approaches), since there are tight constraints on the licensing of non-thematic arguments (**major arguments**, MA). The mechanisms involved in licensing major arguments are tied indirectly to lexical projection. For example, phrasal predication by open CPs depends on the delayed assignment of a theta-role assigned by a lexical predicate. However, major arguments (as in the Major Subject Construction in (2)) are pervasive in languages like Japanese and Korean and have been argued to be implicated in processes such as raising (Yoon 2004b).

Existing accounts do not address the differences among languages adequately. For example, Rezac (2004) proposes that whether or not the null OP creating the phrasal predicate must match the features of the major argument underlies the difference between English and Japanese/Korean. This simply begs the question of why match is not required in the latter.

2. My claim is that the pervasiveness of MA in J/K is due to the fact that in these languages arguments select their predicates (rather than vice versa), based on the properties of dependent markers (i.e., case markers) they combine with (Choi 2008, 2007a,b, 2006, Choi and Yoon 2007, 2006). I take this to be a fundamental macroparameter (Dependent Marking Parameter: Choi 2008, 2007) that sets apart the languages in question. Since dependent markers provide arguments with the information of grammatical functions and what type of predicate the arguments are compatible with, arguments are able to combine first and look for an appropriate predicate. Case marked arguments all have the same category, V/V, which means that whenever they have a verb, they become a verb. A nominative NP is compatible with all kinds of predicates ((3a)). When it combines with an accusative NP, intransitive predicates are excluded ((3b)). When a dative NP joins, transitive as well as intransitive predicates are excluded ((3c)). As long as an argument or an argument chunk has an appropriate predicate, its predicate requirement is satisfied and a unit for argument-predicate relation, which is normally a clause, is closed ((4c)).

How do MAs arise in this system? Since predicates do not restrict the arguments, arguments which are not related to lexical predicates can stack very freely. However, their occurrences are not totally free. They always arise in multiple identical case constructions ((5)). It is due to the constraint which prohibits arguments with the same case marker from combining with each other. When the two nominative NPs are combined, two different semantic values competes for the single 'subject' slot, resulting in unification failure ((6b)). In order to save the derivation, the second nominative NP opens a new argument-predicate unit ((6c)). As a result, each nominative NP requires its own predicate ((6d)). When the lexical predicate *pwucata* comes, the second one, which is active, satisfies its predicate requirement, closing its unit and becoming a V ((6e)). The first argument still requires its predicate and its requirement is satisfied by the newly formed phrasal verb *apeci-ka pwucata* ((6f)). The same thing happens in Major object construction (multiple accusative construction) ((7)). When more than one MA occurs, the same procedure applies. The last argument fulfills its predicate requirement first with a lexical predicate. All the other arguments (MAs) fulfill the requirement with phrasal predicates in turn.

3. The macro-parametric view better explains the MAs because previous analyses have to assume different mechanisms for MAs in multiple nominative and multiple accusative constructions and for the single MAs and multiple MAs. Moreover, accounting for MA's in Major Subject/Object Constructions is another supportive evidence for the dependent marking parameter, as well as argument chunk coordination (Choi and Yoon 2006), multiple fragments (Choi and Yoon 2007), light verb constructions (Choi 2008), scrambling (Choi 2006), and multiple clefting (Choi 2007b).

## Licensing of Non-theta-marked (Major) Arguments in Dependent-Marking Languages

- (1) a. **The book<sub>i</sub>** sounds like it<sub>i</sub> will sell well. b. **The book<sub>i</sub>** is easy OP<sub>i</sub> to read e<sub>i</sub>
- (2) **bunmeikoku-ga dansei-ga heikin-zyumyoo-ga mizikai**  
civilized.country Nom male-Nom average-lifespan-Nom short  
'It is civilized countries that men's average lifespan is short in.' (Japanese)
- (3) a. Cheli-ka ca-ss-ta / manna-ss-ta / sokayhay-ess-ta  
C-Nom sleep-Pst-Dcl meet-Pst-Dcl introduce-Pst-Dcl  
'Cheli slept/met (him)/introduced (him to him)'  
b. Cheli-ka Yenghi-lul \*ca-ss-ta / manna-ss-ta / sokayhay-ess-ta  
C-Nom Y-Acc sleep-Pst-Dcl meet-Pst-Dcl introduce-Pst-Dcl  
'Cheli \*slept/met Yenghi/introduced Yenghi (to him)'  
c. Cheli-ka Yenghi-lul Tongi-eykey \*ca-ss-ta / \*manna-ss-ta / sokayhay-ess-ta  
C-Nom Y-Acc T-Dat sleep-Pst-Dcl meet-Pst-Dcl introduce-Pst-Dcl  
'Cheli \*slept/\*met /introduced Yenghi to Tongi'
- (4) a. [Cheli-ka<sub>v/v</sub> Predicate requirement  
b. [[Cheli-ka Yenghi-lul]<sub>v/v</sub> Argument chunk Predicate requirement  
c. [[Cheli-ka Yenghi-lul]<sub>Argument chunk</sub> mannassta]<sub>v</sub> Unit Closure
- (5) a. Cheli-ka (Major subject: MA) apeci-ka pwuca-ta  
C-Nom father-Nom the.rich-Dcl  
'Cheli's father is rich' Multiple Nominative Construction  
b. Cheli-ka Yengi-lul (Major object: MA) phal-ul cap-ss-ta  
C-Nom Y-Acc arm-Acc catch-Pst-Dcl  
'Cheli caught Yengi's arm' Multiple Accusative Construction
- (6) a. [Cheli-ka<sub>v/v</sub>  
b. [Cheli-ka<sub>v/v</sub> apeci-ka<sub>v/v</sub> Unification Failure  
c. [Cheli-ka<sub>v/v</sub> **Predicate Requirement** [apeci-ka<sub>v/v</sub> **Pred. Req.** Opening a new unit  
d. [Cheli-ka<sub>v/v</sub> **Predicate Requirement** [apeci-ka<sub>v/v</sub> pwucata<sub>v</sub>] Unit Closure  
e. [Cheli-ka<sub>v/v</sub> **Predicate Requirement** [apeci-ka pwucata]<sub>v</sub>  
f. [Cheli-ka [apeci-ka pwucata]<sub>v</sub>] Unit Closure
- (7) a. [[Cheli-ka Yenghi-lul]<sub>v/v</sub> **Predicate Requirement** [phal-ul<sub>v/v</sub> **Predicate Requirement**  
b. [[Cheli-ka Yenghi-lul]<sub>v/v</sub> **Predicate Requirement** [phal-ul capassta]<sub>v</sub>  
c. [[Cheli-ka Yenghi-lul] [phal-ul capassta]]<sub>v</sub>

### Selected References

- Choi, Y. 2008. Korean and Japanese light verb construction and its implication on typological variation. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal* 16.2: 143-164.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007a. *Dependent Marking Parameter: Coordination, Clefting, Fragments, and Scrambling in Korean and Japanese*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007b. Cleft constructions and focus interpretation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of Western Conference on Linguistics (WECOL 2007). University of California, San Diego (Nov. 30-Dec. 2, 2007)
- Choi, Y. and J. Yoon. 2007. Fragments with and without articulated constituents. Paper presented at the 38<sup>th</sup> meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS 38). University of Ottawa. (Oct. 26-28, 2007)
- Doron, E. and C. Heycock. 1999. Categorical Subjects. Gengo Kenkyuu.
- Heycock, C. 1993. Syntactic Predication in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 2: 167-211.
- Rezac, M. 2004. *Elements of Cyclic Syntax: Agree and Merge*. Univ. of Toronto. PhD dissertation.
- Yoon, J. 2004a. The independence of grammatical case from interpretive factors In I-H Lee et. al. eds., *Proceedings of the LSK 2004 International Conference*, Linguistic Society of Korea
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004b. Raising specifiers: a macroparametric account of subject-to-object raising in some Altaic languages. In *MITWPL 46: Proceedings of the Workshop on Altaic in Formal Linguistics*. MIT.