

A NOTE ON GENITIVE DROP IN KOREAN

Duk-Ho An
Nanzan University

1. Introduction

In languages like Korean, Case is overtly marked on noun phrases by so-called Case markers. It has also been observed that Case interacts with a variety of linguistic phenomena in the language. Thus, the many aspects of Case in Korean have been subjected to extensive investigation in the generative literature (see Saito 1982, 1985, Hoshi 1993, Ahn 1996, 1999, Kim 1990, Kim 1998, Hong 1994, 2004, Aoyagi 2004, Kwon and Zribi-Hertz 2006, Harada 2007, among others, for relevant discussion). In this paper, we will be concerned with the genitive Case marker *uy* in Korean, which has received relatively little attention compared to the more familiar structural Cases such as nominative and accusative. More specifically, we examine the pattern of omission of *uy*.¹ (Henceforth, we refer to this phenomenon as *genitive drop*.) We argue that theta role assignment plays a central role in determining the possibility of genitive drop. In the course of the exposition, data from Japanese will also play an important role.²

2. The Distribution of *Uy*

As mentioned above, elements in the clause may be overtly marked with a Case marker in Korean. Thus, in (1), the subject is marked with a nominative Case marker *i* and the object

* This paper was written while I was visiting Nanzan University in January 2009 as a post-doc researcher. I would like to thank all the members of the Center for Linguistics at Nanzan University for the help, support, and friendship. Especially, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Mamoru Saito and Keiko Murasugi who spent many hours with me to discuss linguistics and various other things. I would also like to thank Yasuaki Abe, Hiroshi Aoyagi, Jonathan Bobaljik, Chisato Fuji, Tomoko Haraguchi, Masatake Arimoto, Shigeru Miyagawa, Toshiko Oda, Tatsuya Suzuki and Yasuki Ueda for the various help I received from them. Part of the content of this paper was also presented at the 2nd Workshop of the Nanzan International Research Project on Comparative Syntax and Language Acquisition on January 15, 2009. I thank the audience of the workshop for their helpful comments.

¹ Nominative and accusative Case markers can also be omitted in certain environments (see the references cited in the text). As shown below, however, there is evidence that Case marker drop in clauses and that in noun phrases are different. In this paper, we are only concerned with Case marker drop in noun phrases.

² As noted by An (2009), noun phrases in Japanese and Korean bear quite much similarity, which merits further investigation from a comparative perspective. However, we will be primarily concerned with Korean data in this paper.

an accusative Case marker *lul*.

- (1) John-**i** Mary-**lul** coahanta.
 J-nom M-acc likes
 ‘John likes Mary.’

Similarly, elements that appear within the noun phrase may also be marked with a Case marker. But, in the nominal domain, the usual nominative and accusative Case markers, e.g., *ka/i* and *ul/lul*, respectively, do not show up regardless of the grammatical function of their host.³ Rather, the only Case form allowed for elements within the noun phrase is *genitive*.⁴

- (2) a. roma-**uy** phagoy (object)
 Rome-gen destruction
 ‘the destruction of Rome’
 b. *roma-**lul** phagoy
 Rome-acc destruction
- (3) a. oykyein-**uy** chimlyak (subject)
 alien-gen invasion
 ‘the invasion of Aliens’
 b. *oykyein-**i** chimlyak
 alien-nom invasion

I list below further contexts where *uy* can appear. (The list here is not meant to be exhaustive.) It should be noted that *uy* can attach to a variety of elements within the noun phrase.

- (4) a. Chelsu-**uy** cha
 C-gen car
 ‘Chelsu’s car’

³ Traditionally, it is assumed that the noun head does not have the ability to assign structural Case such as nominative and accusative. Therefore, (ia) is ruled out by a violation of the Case Filter.

(i) a. *the destruction Rome
 b. the destruction of Rome

⁴ Note that Korean is a head-final language. Therefore, all the elements within the noun phrase precede the head noun, i.e., the head noun occupies the last position within the noun phrase. (There are some exceptions to this remark. But these cases do not matter for our discussion.)

- b. dol-lo-**uy** kongkyek
stone-with-gen attack
'an attack with stones'
- c. sey-kwen-**uy** chayk
three-CL-gen book
'three books'
- d. Roma-**uy** phagoy
Rome-gen destruction
'Rome's destruction'
- e. ecey-**uy** nalssi
yesterday-gen weather
'yesterday's weather'
- f. Taipei-**uy** nalssi
Taipei-gen weather
'Taipei's weather'
- g. Haruki-wa-**uy** intebyu
H-with-gen interview
'an interview with Haruki'
- h. oykyein-**uy** chimlyak
alien-gen invasion
'Alien's invasion'
- i. kongpo-**uy** sunkan
terror-gen moment
'a moment of terror'
- j. yulep-ulo-**uy** yehayng
Europe-to-gen trip
'a trip to Europe'

3. Genitive Drop

In the previous section, we saw that *uy* can appear quite pervasively within the noun phrase. Interestingly, *uy* can also be omitted in certain contexts. Crucially, not all of the

contexts in (4) allow genitive drop.⁵ I regroup below the data in (4) based on the pattern of genitive drop they manifest.

- (5) a. Chelsu-(**uy**) cha
 C-gen car
 ‘Chelsu’s car’
- b. Roma-(**uy**) phagoy
 Rome-gen destruction
 ‘Rome’s destruction’
- c. ecey-(**uy**) nalssi
 yesterday-gen weather
 ‘yesterday’s weather’
- d. Taipei-(**uy**) nalssi
 Taipei-gen weather
 ‘Taipei’s weather’
- e. oykyein-(**uy**) chimlyak
 alien-gen invasion
 ‘Alien’s invasion’
- (6) a. dol-lo-*(**uy**) kongkyek
 stone-with-gen attack
 ‘an attack with stones’
- b. sey-kwen-*(**uy**) chayk
 three-CL-gen book
 ‘three books’
- c. Haruki-wa-*(**uy**) intebyu
 H-with-gen interview
 ‘an interview with Haruki’

⁵ The Korean data given in (4) are actually based on the Japanese data examined by Saito, Lin, and Murasugi (2008). It is interesting to note that Japanese, whose noun phrases behave exactly the same as those in Korean in the basic cases, do not allow genitive drop at all. However we will not be concerned with this difference in this paper. See Saito and An 2009 for relevant discussion.

- d. kongpo-*(**uy**) sunkan
terror-gen moment
'a moment of terror'
- e. yulep-ulo-*(**uy**) yehayng
Europe-to-gen trip
'a trip to Europe'

Let me summarize the pattern we are looking at here. First, as mentioned above, it is clear that not all contexts in (4) allow genitive drop. The data in (5) illustrate that possessives, arguments (subject and object), temporal and locative phrases allow genitive drop. However, there are also a variety of contexts that disallow genitive drop, as shown in (6).⁶ Given this observation, the next step toward an analysis of genitive drop would be to see what the contexts in (5) and (6) have in common, to which we turn immediately.

4. Analysis: Genitive Drop and Argumenthood

In the previous section, we examined the contexts that allow genitive drop as well as those contexts that disallow it. At first glance, these contexts appear to be quite heterogeneous. But, if we can identify a property that is shared by each group of genitive (non-)drop contexts, it would also help us identify the factor that is involved in determining the possibility of genitive drop. Thus, in this section, we will look more closely at the genitive (non-)drop contexts and argue that there is actually a way to draw a line between the contexts that allow genitive drop and those that do not. In so doing, a comparison with N'-ellipsis in Japanese will play a crucial role. More specifically, we will argue that what determines whether an element can drop its genitive Case marker is its argumenthood. That is, genitive drop is contingent on theta role assignment to the host of the genitive Case marker. Thus, only when the host is assigned a theta role, it may drop its genitive Case marker.

Before we go on to discuss genitive drop, let us digress temporarily to discuss Saito, Lin, and Murasugi's (2008) analysis of N'-ellipsis in Japanese, which will provide us with a useful background for the discussion to follow.

4.1. N'-Ellipsis: Saito, Lin, and Murasugi 2008

The sentence in (7) is derived by N'-ellipsis, whereby the NP complement of DP is

⁶ We provide evidence below that adjuncts and the PPs in (6) pattern in the same way. Given this, we may assume that the PPs in (5) are actually adjuncts. (It should be noted that it is not always entirely clear whether a given PP is an argument or an adjunct, when it comes to nominal domains, where so many things appear only optionally.)

elided.⁷

(7) I have read Bill's book, but I haven't read [_{DP} John's [_{NP} ~~book~~]]

According to the standard analysis of N'-ellipsis, the NP complement of DP is elided when the D head undergoes Spec-Head agreement (or, simply, feature checking) with its Spec (see Saito and Murasugi 1990, Lobeck 1990, Saito, Lin, and Murasugi 2008, among others). For instance, in (7), the possessor phrase *John's* occupies DP Spec and undergoes feature checking with the D head. Therefore, the NP complement *book* can be elided. On the other hand, the D head *a* in (8) does not have anything in its Spec. Given that there is no feature checking in DP, the fact that N'-ellipsis is not allowed in (8) is correctly captured.

(8) *I have edited a book, but I haven't written [_{DP} a [_{NP} book]]

It has also been argued that N'-ellipsis is available in Japanese (Saito and Murasugi 1990, Saito, Lin, and Murasugi 2008, among others).⁸ For instance, in (9), the possessor phrase *Hanako-no* 'Hanako's' and the object of the head noun *Kyoto-no* 'Kyoto's' are assumed to be in DP Spec and undergo feature checking with the D head, correctly licensing N'-ellipsis.⁹

(9) a. Taroo-no taido-wa yoi ga, [Hanako-no ~~taido~~]-wa yokunai. (J)
 T-gen attitude-top good though H-gen attitude-top good.not
 'Though Taro's attitude is good, Hanako's isn't.'

⁷ Given this analysis, the phenomenon in question does not really involve "N-bar" ellipsis. However, I will continue to use the traditional term.

⁸ Interestingly, noun phrases in Korean do not allow N'-ellipsis despite the similar behavior they manifest with respect to noun phrases in Japanese. See Saito and An 2009 for relevant discussion.

⁹ As shown in (4), the genitive Case marker *uy* in Korean can appear quite pervasively on various elements within the noun phrase. The same is true of the genitive Case marker *no* in Japanese. Saito, Lin, and Murasugi (2008) argue that *no* is a contextual Case marker that is attached to any prenominal constituent that is sister to a projection of N/D. More specifically, they adopt a version of Kitagawa and Ross's (1982) Mod Insertion rule.

(i) Mod Insertion

[_{DP} ... XP N/D^α] → [_{DP} ... XP Mod N/D^α], where Mod = *no*.

Assuming that (i) applies to the distribution of the genitive Case marker *uy* as well, Saito and An (2009) suggest further that the Mod Insertion rules in Japanese and Korean are subject to a micro-parametric variation, which they argue is responsible for the lack of N'-ellipsis in Korean, noted in footnote 8.

- b. Rooma-no hakai-wa [Kyooto-no ~~hakai~~]-yorimo hisan datta.
 R-gen destruction-top K-gen destruction-than miserable was
 ‘Rome’s destruction was more miserable than Kyoto’s.’

Crucially, it is assumed that DP Spec is an argument position, in which adjuncts may not occur. It is then predicted that adjuncts will not license N’-ellipsis, which is indeed the case, as shown in (10).¹⁰

- (10) a. *Hare-no hi-wa yoi ga, [ame-no ~~hi~~]-wa otikomu. (J)
 clear-gen day-top good though rain-gen day-top feel.depressed
 ‘Clear days are OK, but I feel depressed on rainy days.’
- b. *Taroo-wa iti-niti-ni san-satu-no hon-o yomu ga,
 T-top one-day-in three-CL-gen book-acc read though
 Hanako-wa [go-satu-no ~~hon~~]-o yomu.
 H-top five-CL-gen book-acc read
 ‘Taroo reads three books in a day, but Hanako reads five.’
- c. *Hutakire-no hamu-wa yuusyoku-ni naru ga,
 two slices-gen ham-top supper-to make though
 [hitokire-no ~~hamu~~]-wa nara-nai.
 one slice-gen ham-top make-not
 ‘Two slices of ham make up a supper, but one slice does not.’

We have examined in this section the patterns on N’-ellipsis in Japanese. The crucial point to keep in mind is that arguments allow N’-ellipsis and adjuncts don’t.

¹⁰ The genitive Case marker *no* is in principle allowed on adjuncts, as illustrated in (i). Therefore, the source of the ungrammaticality of (10) has nothing to do with Case-marking the adjuncts.

- (i) a. ame-no hi
 rain-gen day
 ‘rainy day’
- b. san-satu-no hon
 three-CL-gen book
 ‘three books’
- c. hutakire-no hamu
 two slice-gen ham
 ‘two slices of ham’ (Saito and Murasugi 1999)

As discussed below, adjuncts can also be marked with *uy* in Korean.

4.2. Genitive Drop and Argumenthood

In this section, we propose an analysis of genitive drop in Korean. Let us consider first the contexts that allow genitive drop. The relevant examples are repeated below.

- (11) a. Chelsu-(**uy**) cha
 C-gen car
 ‘Chelsu’s car’
- b. Roma-(**uy**) phagoy
 Rome-gen destruction
 ‘Rome’s destruction’
- c. ecey-(**uy**) nalssi
 yesterday-gen weather
 ‘yesterday’s weather’
- d. Taipei-(**uy**) nalssi
 Taipei-gen weather
 ‘Taipei’s weather’
- e. oykyein-(**uy**) chimlyak
 alien-gen invasion
 ‘Alien’s invasion’

In (11a) through (11e), the types of the grammatical function of the host of *uy* are quite diverse: they include possessor, object, temporal phrase, locative phrase, and subject, respectively. Though it might not be obvious at first glance what they have in common, we believe that there is a way to group them together based on a property that they share. The evidence comes from N’-ellipsis in Japanese. Interestingly, the direct counterparts to the noun phrases in (11) in Japanese all allow N’-ellipsis, as illustrated in (12).

- (12) a. Taroo-no kuruma-wa yoi ga, [Hanako-no ~~kuruma~~]-wa yokunai.
 T-gen car-top good though H-gen car-top good.not
 ‘Though Taroo’s car is good, Hanako’s isn’t.’
- b. Rooma-no hakai-wa [Kyooto-no ~~hakai~~]-yorimo hisan datta.
 R-gen destruction-top K-gen destruction-than miserable was
 ‘Rome’s destruction was more miserable than Kyoto’s.’

- c. Kyoo-no ondo-wa [kinoo-no ~~ondo~~]-yorimo takai.
 today-gen temperature-top yesterday-gen temperature-than high
 ‘Today’s temperature is higher than yesterday’s.’
- d. Taipei-no tenki-wa [Kyooto-no ~~tenki~~]-yorimo ii.
 T-gen weather-top K-gen weather-than good
 ‘Taipei’s weather is better than Kyoto’s.’
- e. Teki-no sinryaku-wa huseg-eru ga,
 enemy-gen invasion-top prevent-can though
 [utyuuzin-no ~~sinryaku~~]-wa huseg-e-nai.
 alien-gen invasion-top prevent-can-neg
 ‘Though enemy’s invasion can be prevented, aliens’ invasion cannot be prevented.’

(12a) shows that possessors can license N'-ellipsis. (12b) is repeated from (9b), where the object of the head noun licenses N'-ellipsis. (12c) and (12d) show that temporal and locative phrases allow N'-ellipsis.¹¹ (12e) illustrates that the subject of the head noun can license N'-ellipsis.

It is important to remember that according to Saito, Lin, and Murasugi (2008), only those elements that can appear in DP Spec, an argument position, allow N'-ellipsis. Given this, we suggest that the property relevant for determining the possibility of genitive drop is the notion of argumenthood. Thus, only arguments may allow genitive drop, just like the fact that only arguments allow N'-ellipsis.

Note again that the types of the grammatical function of the host of *uy* that disallow genitive drop, repeated in (13), appear to be quite diverse. They even differ with respect to their categorial status. If the current hypothesis (13) to behave like adjuncts. Thus, it is predicted that the direct counterparts to (13) in Japanese do not allow N'-ellipsis. This prediction is borne out, except for (13), as illustrated in (14).¹²

¹¹ Anderson (1983) argues based on examples like (i) that temporal and locative phrases can occupy DP Spec, an argument position, and function as “extended possessors”.

- (i) a. yesterday’s temperature
 b. last year’s protest against war
 c. Taipei’s weather

It is also noteworthy that Larson (1985) argues that temporal and locative phrases are inherently theta-marked.

¹² (14a) and (14c) are from Tomoko Haraguchi (p.c., January 2009). (14b) and (14d) are from Saito, Lin, and Murasugi 2008, p.253. (14e) is from Toshiko Oda and Mamoru Saito (p.c., January 2009).

- (13) a. dol-lo-*(**uy**) kongkyek
stone-with-gen attack
‘an attack with stones’
- b. sey-kwen-*(**uy**) chayk
three-CL-gen book
‘three books’
- c. Haruki-wa-*(**uy**) intebyu
H-with-gen interview
‘an interview with Haruki’
- d. kongpo-*(**uy**) sunkan
terror-gen moment
‘a moment of terror’
- e. yulep-ulo-*(**uy**) yehayng
Europe-to-gen trip
‘a trip to Europe’
- (14) a. *ya-de-no koogeki-wa kantan-da ga, (J)
arrow-with-gen attack-top easy-dec though
[isi-de-no ~~koogeki~~]-wa muzukashii.
stone-with-gen attack-top difficult
‘Although the attack with arrows was easy, the attack with stones was difficult.’
- b. *Taroo-wa iti-niti-ni san-satu-no hon-o yomu ga,
T-top one-day-in three-CL-gen book-acc read though
Hanako-wa [go-satu-no ~~hon~~]-o yomu.
H-top five-CL-gen book-acc read
‘Taroo reads three books in a day, but Hanako reads five.’
- c. *Chomsky-to-no intabyuu-wa muzukasii ga,
C-with-gen interview-top difficult though
[Abe sensei-to-no ~~intabyuu~~]-wa kantan-da.
Prof. Abe-with-gen interview-top easy-dec
‘Though the interview with Chomsky was difficult, the interview with Prof. Abe was easy.’

- d. *Hare-no hi-wa yoi ga, [ame-no ㄱㄹ]-wa otikomu.
 clear-gen day-top good though rain-gen day-top feel.depressed
 ‘Clear days are OK, but I feel depressed on rainy days.’
- e. ?Yooroppa-e-no ryokoo-wa mizika katta ga,
 Europe-to-gen travel-top short was but
 [amerika-e-no ~~ryokoo~~]-wa naga katta.
 America-to-gen (travel)-to long was
 ‘The travel to Europe was short, but the one to America was long.’

Given Saito, Lin, and Murasugi’s (2008) account of N’-ellipsis, the ungrammaticality of the examples in (14a) through (14e) illustrate that the relevant prenominal elements function as adjuncts. The fact that the corresponding elements in (13a) through (13e) also fail to license genitive drop is significant and provides support for our hypothesis that the argumenthood of the host of *uy* is the key factor in determining the possibility of genitive drop.

Regarding the mismatch between (13) and (14), we suspect that the categorial status of the relevant prenominal elements matters. That is, in the good cases of genitive drop, illustrated in (11), none of the prenominal elements is a PP, while some of the bad cases in (13) do involve PPs (e.g., (13a), (13c), and (13e)). Given this, we assume that in the noun phrases in Korean, PPs function as adjuncts, while they may function as arguments in cases like (14) in Japanese. However, precisely how (14e) is different from the rest of the examples in (14) is not clear to us at the moment. We hope that future research will shed more light on this contrast.

To summarize, we have seen in this section that there is a parallelism between genitive drop and N’-ellipsis. Under Saito, Lin, and Murasugi’s (2008) analysis of N’-ellipsis, we proposed based on this observation that the relevant factor involved in licensing genitive drop is the argumenthood of the host of *uy*. That is, if the host of *uy* bears a theta role, it may optionally drop *uy*. In the following section, we will discuss some complex cases of genitive drop, which necessitates introduction of an additional constraint on genitive drop.

5. Some Complex Cases

In the previous section, we proposed that genitive drop is allowed only if the host of *uy* receives a theta role, i.e., only if it is an argument in an extended sense, seeing that temporal and locative phrases also allow genitive drop (see footnote 11). Here, it is noteworthy that in all the examples we have examined so far, the relevant prenominal element is the only prenominal element within the noun phrase. Interestingly, if more than one element appears prenominally, a new pattern emerges with respect to genitive drop. More specifically, there seems to exist a complex pattern of adjacency requirements on genitive drop. Consider the data in (15).

- (15) *oykyein*-(uy) *ciku*-(uy) *chimlyak*
 alien-gen earth-gen invasion
 ‘Alien’s invasion of the earth’

Here, the subject *oykyein* ‘alien’ may not drop its genitive Case marker, while genitive drop is allowed for the object *ciku* ‘earth’.¹³ Therefore, it seems that the intervening object somehow blocks genitive drop from the subject. Furthermore, it is not only an intervening genitive-marked object that blocks genitive drop from the initial constituent. Other categories such as relative clauses can also block genitive drop from the initial constituent.

- (16) *oykyein*-(uy) [amuto yeysang mothan] *chimlyak*
 alien-gen anyone predict could.not invasion
 ‘the invasion of Aliens that nobody could predict’

Given this, it seems that in addition to being a theta role holder, as argued in the previous section, the host of *uy* must also be adjacent to the head noun. However, the picture gets more complicated given the availability of genitive drop for the temporal phrase *ecey* ‘yesterday’ in (17), which is not adjacent to the head noun.

- (17) *ecey*-(uy) Kim *kyosu*-(uy) *kanguy*
 yesterday-gen Prof. Kim-gen lecture
 ‘Prof. Kim’s yesterday’s lecture’

We suspect that the relevant difference between (15) and (17) has to do with the way the relevant initial constituent is theta-marked. That is, the initial constituent in (15) is assigned a theta role from the head noun, while that in (17) is inherently theta-marked (see footnote 11).¹⁴

Given this, the adjacency requirement on genitive drop can be summarized as follows:

¹³ Recall that subjects can in principle drop *uy*, as repeated below.

- (i) *oykyein*-(uy) *chimlyak*
 alien-gen invasion
 ‘Alien’s invasion’

¹⁴ In fact, temporal and locative phrases enjoy quite much freedom with respect to genitive drop, regardless of their position with respect to the head noun.

- (i) *ecey*-(uy) Taipei-(uy) *nalssi*
 yesterday-gen Taipei-gen weather
 ‘Yesterday’s Taipei’s weather’
 (ii) Taipei-(uy) *ecey*-(uy) *nalssi*

- (18) a. If the host receives a theta role from the head noun, it must also be adjacent to the head noun.
- b. If the host is inherently theta-marked, it does not have to be adjacent to the head noun.

At the moment, it is not entirely clear to us why this restriction holds. But, we suspect that it derives at least in part from the independently motivated locality restriction on theta role assignment.

6. Further Issues

Before we conclude, let us briefly consider a few remaining issues. First, one might suspect that genitive drop involves some kind of incorporation process¹⁵, given that adjacency is required, which is typical of incorporation, and also that when the genitive Case marker is dropped, the resulting structure looks like a compound (see, e.g., (11)). However, there is reason to believe that genitive drop does not involve an $[X^0 N^0]$ configuration, which would arise if genitive drop involved incorporation of the prenominal element into the head noun. The evidence comes from the fact that prenominal elements that allow genitive drop can be syntactically complex, i.e., they are phrasal, as illustrated by (19).

- (19) a. Chelsu-lang Yenghi-(uy) chinku
 C-and Y-gen friend
 ‘Chelsu and Yenghi’s friend’
- b. [[mikuk-eyse on] haksayng]-(uy) pumo
 America-from came student-gen parents
 ‘the parents of a student who came from America’

Given this, we conclude that the incorporation analysis of genitive drop is hard to maintain.¹⁶

¹⁵ See, for instance, Hong 1994, 2004 for an incorporation analysis of Case marker drop in clauses. However, regardless of whether Case marker drop in clauses can be analyzed in terms of incorporation or not, there is no a priori reason to expect the same analysis to carry over to genitive drop. We show below that genitive drop in fact behaves differently from Case marker drop in clauses.

¹⁶ The argument here is inspired by Massam’s (2001) discussion on noun incorporation in Niuean, where she argues that the phenomenon in question is phrasal and does not involve word-level processes at all. (Hence, Massam actually refers to the phenomenon in question as “pseudo noun incorporation (PNI)”.)

It is also interesting to note that PNI is similar to genitive drop in that it requires adjacency. The gist of her analysis of the adjacency requirement on PNI is that the adjacency effect is only apparent and that it involves phrasal movement. Given that we have left open the question about the precise nature of the adjacency requirement on genitive drop, it is tempting to try to extend Massam’s analysis to

In An 2009, an alternative formulation of the incorporation analysis is considered, where it is suggested that what is incorporated is not the prenominal constituent, but the genitive Case marker itself. If this is the case, the problem posed by the phrase status of the host of *uy* would not matter. It would also easily capture the adjacency requirement. One aspect that remains mysterious is why the genitive Case marker never surfaces anywhere after the putative incorporation.

Finally, it is well-known that Case marker drop is also possible in clauses. There have also been various approaches to this phenomenon. For instance, Ahn (1996) argues that Case marker drop in clauses involves some kind of left dislocation. On the other hand, Hong (1994, 2004) argues for an incorporation analysis of Case marker drop in clauses (see Saito 1982, 1985, Hoshi 1993, Ahn 1996, 1999, Kim 1998, Hong 1994, 2004, Kwon and Zribi-Hertz 2006, Harada 2007, among others, for further discussion). Here, the question is whether Case marker drop in clauses and genitive drop can receive a uniform analysis. Regarding this, we would like to point out that genitive drop crucially differs from Case marker drop in clauses, which suggests that a unified analysis of these phenomena may be hard to achieve.

First, note that certain adjuncts may be Case-marked in Korean, as illustrated in (20).

- (20) Chelsu-ka mikuk-lul tu pen-**ul** yehaynghayssta.
 C-nom America-acc two time-acc traveled
 ‘Chelsu traveled America twice.’

Here, the Case marker on the adjunct *tu pen* ‘twice (or two times)’ is optional.

- (21) Chelsu-ka mikuk-lul tu pen yehaynghayssta.
 C-nom America-acc two time traveled

Recall however that in the noun phrase, adjuncts may not drop their genitive Case marker, as shown in (22).

- (22) a. Chelsu-uy tu pen-**uy** yehayng
 C-gen two time-gen travel
 ‘*lit.* Chelsu’s two times’ travel’
 b. *Chelsu-uy tu pen yehayng
 C-gen two time travel

Second, as discussed above, genitive drop places a strict adjacency requirement on the host of *uy*. However, in the case of Case drop in clauses, there does not seem to be such

account for the adjacency effect in genitive drop. But, there seems to be no obvious way to do so at the moment.

requirement.¹⁷

- (23) a. ku chayk-(**ul**) way sass-ni?
the book-acc why bought-Q
‘Why did you buy the book?’
- b. way ku chayk-(**ul**) sass-ni?

We believe that these differences demonstrate clearly that the two phenomena should be subjected to different analyses.

7. Conclusion

We have examined in this paper the phenomenon of genitive Case marker drop in Korean. In the course of the exposition, we have identified a number of significant properties of genitive drop: first, there is a certain parallelism between N'-ellipsis in Japanese and genitive drop in Korean; second, only those elements that bear a theta role may drop the genitive Case marker; third, if the host of the genitive Case marker is an argument of the head noun, it must also be adjacent to the head noun to be able to drop the genitive Case marker.

However, we have also left a number of important questions. For instance, we are not sure whether the parallelism between N'-ellipsis and genitive drop stems from a deeper property of the grammar of Japanese and Korean. Moreover, the nature of the adjacency requirement seems to require further exploration. We hope that future research will allow us to explain these questions in a better way.

References

- Ahn, H. (1988) “Preliminary Remarks on Korean NP,” in E.-J. Baek, M. Kang, Y. Kim, and S. Lee, eds., papers from the 6th International Conference on Korean Linguistics, Hanshin Publishing, Seoul, 1-15.
- Ahn, H. (1996) “A Study of Syntactic Word Formation,” in H. Ahn, ed., *Proceedings of 1996 Seoul International Conference on Generative Grammar*, Hankuk Publishing, Seoul, 1-21.
- Ahn, H. (1999) “Notes on Case Deletion,” in Y.-W. Kim, I.-K. Kim, and J.-W. Park, eds., *Linguistic Investigations: In honor of In-Seok Yang*, Hankuk Publishing, Seoul, 1-16.
- An, D. (2009) “On the Nature of Genitive Case in Korean: with Reference to Japanese,” paper presented at the 2nd workshop of the Nanzan International Research Project on Comparative Syntax and Language Acquisition, Nanzan University, January 15.
- Anderson, M. (1983) “Prenominal Genitive NPs,” *The Linguistic Review* 3, 1-25.

¹⁷ In fact, in the case of Case marker drop in clauses, it is not even clear which element the host of the Case marker should be adjacent to. A potential candidate might be the verb. But, (23) shows clearly that this may not be correct.

- Aoyagi, H. (2004) "Morphological Case as Phoneticization," paper presented at the 2004 LSK International Conference, Yonsei University, Seoul, July 28th.
- Harada, N. (2007) "Case Drop beyond Structure," *Snippets* 14, 4-5.
- Hong, Y. (1994) "Yunghap Ilonkwa Kyekcosa Punpo," *Studies in Generative Grammar* 4, 1-43.
- Hong, Y. (2004) "Hankukeuy Kyekcosa Tallakkwa Kyekcosa Pucay," *Phurangsu Emun Kyoyuk* 18, 295-314. [written in Korean]
- Hoshi, H. (1993) "Case Marker Drop and Wh-movement in Japanese," *Tsukuba English Studies* 12, 191-246.
- Kim, Y. (1998) "Overt Case and Covert Case in Korean," *Studies in Generative Grammar* 8, 177-237.
- Kim, Y. (1990) *The Syntax and Semantics of Korean Case: The Interaction between Lexical and Syntactic Levels of Representation*, Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.
- Kitagawa, C. and C. Ross (1982) "Prenominal Modification in Chinese and Japanese," *Linguistic Analysis* 9, 19-53.
- Kwon, S. and A. Zribi-Hertz (2006) "Bare Objects in Korean: (Pseudo) Incorporation and (In)definites," in S. Voegeleer and L. Tasmowski, eds., *Non-definites and Plurality*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 107-132.
- Larson, R. (1985) "Bare-NP Adverbs," *Linguistic Inquiry* 16, 595-621.
- Lobeck, A. (1990) "Functional Heads as Proper Governors," *NELS* 20, 348-362.
- Massam, D. (2001) "Pseudo Noun Incorporation in Niuean," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19, 153-197.
- Saito, M. (1982) "Case Marking in Japanese," ms., MIT.
- Saito, M. (1985) *Some Asymmetries in Japanese and their Theoretical Implications*, Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Saito, M. and D. An (2009) "A Comparative Syntax of Ellipsis in Japanese and Korean," ms. Nanzan University, Nagoya, Japan.
- Saito, M. and K. Murasugi (1990) "N'-deletion in Japanese," in J. Ormazabal and C. Tenny, eds., *UConn Working Papers in Linguistics* 3, Department of Linguistics, University of Connecticut, Storrs, 87-107.
- Saito, M. and K. Murasugi (1999) "Subject Predication within IP and DP," in K. Johnson and I. Roberts, eds., *Beyond Principles and Parameters*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 167-188.
- Saito, M., J. Lin, and K. Murasugi (2008) "N'-ellipsis and the Structure of Noun Phrases in Chinese and Japanese," *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 17, 247-271.