Grammatical Relation Sensitivity: Some Different Conceptions of Pre/Post-Predicative Structures*

KATSUNOBU IZUTSU
Hokkaido University of Education
MITSUKO NARITA IZUTSU
Fuji Women's University
YONG-TAEK KIM
Georgia Institute of Technology

1 Introduction

Korean and Japanese are both SOV languages with agglutination, a rich particle system, topic prominence, honorifics, etc. Of these similarities, the relative flexibility of word order, notably right dislocation or postposing, has attracted a lot of attention from both generative and functional linguists (e.g. Whitman 2000; Lee 2009; Kim 2011; Shimojo 2005). In the two languages, some sentential or clausal elements (either so-called arguments or non-arguments) can occur after predicates. In the typical word order of each language, for example, subject NPs (*na-do* and *watasi-mo*) are placed before the predicates (*molla* and *siranai*), as in (1). At the same time, these NPs can also occupy post-predicative position, as in (2).

(1) K: **_na-do_** *molla*.
      I-too   don't.know
      'I don't know, either.'
  J: **_atasi-mo_** *sira-nai*. (*Fuyu no Sonata*: 159)[1]

[1] Works cited: *Gyeoul Yeonga*. E. Kim & E. Yun. Seoul: KBS, 2002 (*Fuyu no Sonata*, trans. by N. Miyamoto. Tokyo: NHK Shuppan, 2003); *82 nyeonsaeng Gim Jiyeong*. N. Jo. Seoul: Mineumsa, 2016 (*82 nenumare Kimu Tiyon*, trans. by M. Saito. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 2018); *Saiko no Rikon 1*. Y. Sakamoto & S. Momose. Tokyo: Fusosha, 2013 (*Choego eui Ihon 1*, trans. by J. Chu. Seoul: Bagha, 2018); *Dakosuru Tsuki*, S. Sakuragi. Tokyo: Futabasha, 2013 (*Gubichi neun Dal*, trans. by Yang Yunog. Seoul: Hyeondae Munhag, 2015); *Tenki no Ko*. M. Shinkai. Tokyo: Kadokawa, 2019 (*Nalssi eui Ai*, trans. by G, Min. Seoul: Daeweonssiai, 2019).

      I-too   know-not

(2) K: *molla,   **na-do***. (*Gyeoul Yeonga*: 157)
      don't.know I-too
      'I don't know, me neither.'
  J: *sira-nai-wa-yo, **atasi-datte***.
      know-not-FP-FP I-too[2]

However, a comparison between some parallel Korean and Japanese texts (Japanese novels with their Korean translations and Korean novels with their Japanese translations) reveals that both languages similarly allow the dislocation of clause-external elements (adverbials, vocatives, discourse markers, etc.) but Korean is more restrictive than Japanese on clause-internal elements (subject, object, possessive NPs, etc.).

    Vocative NPs are commonly found to occupy post-predicative position in the texts of both languages. Such NPs in one language (Korean) are translated as post-predicative vocative NPs in the other (Japanese), as in (3).

(3) K: *Jiyeongi mal-i   maja, **obba***. (*82 nyeonsaeng Gim Jiyeong*: 19)
      Jiyoung word-NOM match big.brother
      'What Jiyoung says is right, brother.'
  J: *Ziyon-san-no   iu-toori-da-yo, **niisan***. (*82 nenumare Kimu Tiyon*: 17)
      Ziyon-Ms-GEN say-as-COP-FP big.brother:POL

In contrast, subject NPs exhibit different distributions in the two languages. One remarkable contrast can be found with the Japanese *nani sore* construction (cf. Ono and Suzuki 1992), in which a subject NP follows an interrogative predicate, as in (4J). Most post-predicative subject NPs in Japanese texts are not translated as such NPs in Korean, as seen in (4K).

(4) J: *nani   sore?* (*Saiko no Rikon 1*: 174)
      what   that
      'What's that?'
  K: ***geuge*** *mweo-nya?* (*Choego eui Ihon 1*: 171)
      that   what-Q

Even when translated as post-predicative NPs, the Korean counterparts are accompanied by some grammatical marker that does not occur in the origi-

---

[2] Our word glosses use the following abbreviations: ACC(usative), ADN(ominalizer), AUX(iliary), COP(ula), DAT(ive), DIM(inutive), ERG(ative), F(ormal)N(oun), F(inal)P(article), GEN(itive), IMP(er)F(ctive), NOM(inative), POL(ite), PROG(ressive), Q(uestion), and TOP(ic).

nal Japanese text, as illustrated in (5).

(5) J: *ukari-masu-ka, **watasi?** (Dakoosuru Tsuki: 33)
    pass-POL-FP   I
    'Can I pass the exam?'
  K: *habgyeogha-lgga-yo, **je-ga?** (Gubichineun Dal: 43)
     pass-will-POL   I-NOM

When it comes to genitive NPs, Korean almost never allows them to occur in post-predicative position, as seen in (6K').

(6) J: *tanzyoobi purezento-daro, **neetyan-no**. (Tenkino Ko: 147)
    birthday   present-will.be   big.sister:DIM-GEN
    'It's a birthday present for my big sister, right?'
  K: ***nuna**   saengil seonmul-i-ji?* (Nalssi eui ai: 171)
    big.sister birthday present-COP-FP
  K':[??]*saengil seonmul-i-ji   **nuna-eui?***
     birthday present-COP-FP big.sister-GEN

As seen so far, Korean is more restrictive than Japanese on the occurrence of elements like subject/object or possessive NPs in post-predicative structures. We argue that what conditions the occurrence of those NPs has something to do with grammatical relation marking. Korean is more sensitive than Japanese to grammatical relation marking such as pre-verbal contiguity and case/topic/focus suffixation in pre/post-predicative structures.

2 Grammatical relation marking

2.1 Ordered contiguity and morphological markers

Grammatical relations or functions can be marked by (i) some syntactic ordering of the elements and/or (ii) some morphological markers.[3] (i) is represented by contiguity or constituent orders like SVO, SOV, and VSO, while (ii) manifests itself as case markers, topic markers, connectives, adnominal or adverbial markers, etc. For example, English and Chinese usually indicate the grammatical relation of subject and object NPs by their pre- and post-verbal positions rather than with morphological markers. In contrast, Basque, Korean, and Japanese mark the relations using morphological markers on the NPs. Korean and Japanese differ from Basque in that such

---

[3] Generally, grammatical relations/functions refer to the roles of subject, object, adnominal, or adverbial constituents in a phrase[clause/sentence]. Our discussion adopts a broader perspective in which the relations/functions also include the topic- or focus-hood of such constituents.

markers are occasionally optional in speech, and topic or focus NPs can also be marked by comparable morphological markers, as will be discussed below.

In Korean, when not accompanied by case markers, object NPs need to be marked for grammatical relation by contiguity to the verb, as in (7K). Otherwise, they are judged to be inappropriate, as in (8K). If accompanied by case markers, however, the object NPs become more acceptable (though still somewhat unnatural), as in (9K).

(7) K. **neo mweo** *ha-neun geo-ya?*
     you what do-ADN FN-FP
     'What are you doing?'
  J. **omae nani** *yat-ten-no?*
     you   what do-PROG-FP

(8) K.??**mweo neo** *ha-neun geo-ya?*
     what   you do-ADN FN-FP
     'What are you doing?'
  J. **nani omae** *yat-ten-no?*
     what you   do-PROG-FP

(9) K.?**mweo-l   neo-n**   *ha-neun geo-ya?*
     what-ACC you-TOP do-ADN FN-FP
     'What are you doing?'
  J. **nani-o   omae-wa** *yat-ten-no?*
     what-ACC you-TOP   do-PROG-FP

Korean requires the object NP to be marked as such by means of either ordering (pre-verbal contiguity) or morphological marker (accusative case). Japanese does not force such conditions, as in (7J) and (8J).

A similar account applies to the contrast between (10K) and (11K). Uncased object NPs must be marked for grammatical relation by pre-verbal contiguity, as in (10K); if not, they are unacceptable, as in (11K). However, if the subject NPs are accompanied by nominative markers, the overall sentences become acceptable, as in (12K).

(10) K. **na igeo** *hae du-lge*.
      I   this do place-will
      'I will do this.'
   J. **ore kore** *yat-toku-yo*.
      I   this   do-place-FP

(11) K.??***igeo na*** *hae du-lge*.
          this I   do place-will
          'This, I will do it.'
     J. ***kore ore*** *yat-toku-yo*.
          I   this do-place-FP

(12) K. ***igeo nae-ga*** *hae du-lge*.
          this I-NOM do place-will
          'This, I will do it.'
     J. ***kore ore-ga*** *yat-toku-yo*.
          this I-NOM do-place-FP

Here we can see that Korean requires object NPs to be marked for objecthood by means of pre-verbal contiguity or subject NPs to be marked for subjecthood so that the object NPs can be recognized as such. Korean speakers are thus required to mark the grammatical relation of object NPs by means of ordering or morphological markers. Japanese speakers are not susceptible to such requirements, as seen in (10J), (11J), and (12J).

    Grammatical relation markings (ordering of elements or markers on them) are exploited for different purposes. In (12), the nominative markers do not only mark the subjecthood but can also indicate the focus status of the NP referents in both Korean and Japanese: 'It is ME that will do this.' The object NPs achieve a topic- or theme-like status by being located at the beginning. Likewise, the accusative marker can indicate the "unexpectedness" status (Izutsu and Kim 2020: 144) as well as the objecthood of 'this'; the addressee is unlikely to eat it, as in (13b).

(13) a. *igeo meogeo?*
         this eat
         'You're gonna eat this?'
     b. *igeo-(**reu**)l*   *meogeo?*
         this-ACC eat
         'You're gonna eat this, are you sure?'

2.2 Post-predicative structures and grammatical relation sensitivity

Speakers can only get across their intended event conception (or propositional content) by clarifying the information status as well as semantic role of each event participant encoded by the subject or object NPs. To this end, Korean speakers are required to mark the grammatical relation of object or subject NPs by means of either ordering (pre-verbal contiguity) or morphological marker (accusative or nominative cases). In contrast, Japanese

speakers are allowed to dispense with such grammatical relation markings of those NPs in utterance production and understanding. This can be seen as a difference in GRAMMATICAL RELATION SENSITIVITY. Korean speakers exhibit a higher degree of such sensitivity.

Section 1 shows that Korean constrains the occurrence of subject/object NPs and possessive NPs in post-predicative structures far more than Japanese does. That kind of constraint can also be accounted for with respect to grammatical relation sensitivity. A specific context and an appropriate grammatical relation marking (accusative marker) allow the object NP to occupy a post-predicative structure, as in (14a); otherwise, such a post-predicative use is avoided, as in (14b). Although the objecthood or designated patient role of the NP can be understood without the accusative marker, it is unclear why the NP is uttered in post-predicative position. As is the case of (13b), the accusative marker specifies the unexpectedness of 'this' in that the addressee is unlikely to eat it.

(14) a. *meogeo, igeo-(**reu**)l?*
      eat   this-ACC
      'You're gonna eat this, are you sure?'
   b.^{??} *meogeo, igeo?*
      eat   this

(15) a. *kore taben-no?*
      this eat-FP
      'You're gonna eat this?'
   b. *taben-no, kore(-**o**)?*
      eat-FP   this-ACC
      'You're gonna eat this(, are you sure)?'

In contrast, Japanese does not so strongly require its speakers to specify or differentiate such grammatical relation markings. Whether accompanied or not by case markers, post-predicative subject or object NPs can readily be interpreted in a looser relationship with their preceding elements, as in (15b). We see from this too that Korean speakers have a higher degree of grammatical relation sensitivity than Japanese speakers.

The same line of account can be made for comparable examples of post-predicative NPs given in Section 1. In (5), the subject NP is uttered in post-predicative position in both languages. However, it receives nominative case marking in Korean. This can be attributed to grammatical relation sensitivity that requires the speaker to satisfy the discourse-functional condition of encoding the NP in post-predicative rather than more common pre-predicative structures. In (5K), the case marker seems to serve to emphasize

'I' as someone who is a less likely person to pass the exam, which allows the NP to occur in post-predicative structures for some topic or focus meaning. Strictly speaking, in this interpretation, (5K) might have somewhat different meaning from (5J), in which case Japanese would adopt NPs like *watasi-de-mo* 'even I' or *watasi-nanka-ga* 'someone like me.' (5J) is not accompanied by such nuances; it makes little difference from *watasi ukari-masu-ka?* with the subject NP in a pre-predicative structure.

A comparable account applies to (4) seen in Section 1. The subject NP stands in post-predicative position in Japanese but in pre-predicative position in Korean. The closest Korean translation of (4J) would be *mweo geugeo?* but this sounds very awkward. This can be ascribed to grammatical relation sensitivity in that the relevant event conception (propositional content) is left unclear if the two NPs 'what' and 'that' are not case-marked. This is supported by the fact that *mweo-(n)ya geugeo(-n)* with a copula on the complement NP, and optionally with the topic marker on the subject NP, improves the acceptability.

As observed so far, Japanese speakers have a lower degree of grammatical relation sensitivity than Korean speakers, but there do exist a number of cases where Japanese is sensitive to grammatical relation marking in post-predicative structures, as shown in (16). If the post-predicative possessive NP does not carry the genitive case marker, the sensitivity disallows it, as in (16J'). The ordered contiguity of the NP and its modified NP does not suffice to improve it, as in (16J''). The sensitivity requires the genitive marker.

(16) J: *tanzyoobi purezento-daro,* **neetyan-no***.* (=(6J))
         birthday   present-will.be   big.sister:DIM-GEN
         'It's a birthday present for my big sister, right?'
     J':²²*tanzyoobi purezento-daro,* **neetyan***.*
         birthday   present-will.be   big.sister:DIM
     J'': **neetyan**²²**(-no)**   *tanzyoobi purezento-daro*.
         big.sister:DIM-GEN birthday   present-will.be
         'It's a birthday present for my big sister, right?'

In Japanese, the genitive case marker alone satisfies the sensitivity, but in Korean, it does not, as in (17K). On the contrary, it is often optional, as in (17K'). Essential to Korean possessive meanings is the ordered contiguity of the possessive NP and its modified NP.

(17) K: ²²*saengil seonmul-i-ji*   **nuna-eui**
           birthday present-COP-FP big.sister-GEN
     K':**nuna(-eui)**   *saengil seonmul-i-ji?*
        big.sister-GEN birthday present-COP-FP

As seen so far, Japanese speakers are not required to have as high a degree of grammatical relation sensitivity in utterance production and understanding of subject and object NPs as Korean speakers are. In Japanese, subject or object NPs in pre-predicative as well as post-predicative structures can readily be interpreted in a looser relationship with the ensuing or preceding elements along with vocative NPs or discourse markers. So can possessive NPs, if accompanied by the genitive case marker. In Korean, however, the corresponding NPs must be marked for grammatical relation by means of ordered contiguity or morphological markers. Pre-predicative NPs are used with appropriate markings of grammatical relation like ordering or markers, while post-predicative NPs can be employed only if such markers satisfy the grammatical relation sensitivity. The different degrees of grammatical relation sensitivity produce the observed contrasts between Korean and Japanese in pre- and post-predicative structures.

3   Diverse ways of topic/focus marking in SOV languages

3.1 Pre-verbal contiguity

We have outlined how Korean and Japanese differ in terms of grammatical relation markings of subject, object, and possessive NPs in pre- and post-predicative structures. It remains to clarify, however, what distinguishes between pre-verbal position (contiguity) and other pre-predicative structures, which in turn stand in contrast with post-predicative structures. A comparison with Basque can explicate the conceptions associated with pre-verbal contiguity as well as pre/post-predicative structures in Korean and Japanese.

Basque is another SOV language with the neutral constituent order of "subject-adjunct-indirect object-direct object-attribute-verb" (Hualde and Ortiz de Urbina 2003: 448).[4] However, the most robust ordering constraint is based on focalization: "foci (and wh-words) immediately precede the verbal element" (Hualde and Ortiz de Urbina 2003: 454). The focus+verb unit (wh/focus+verb group) occupies clause-initial position (Hualde and Ortiz de Urbina 2003: 466), but any number of constituents can precede or follow the unit in marked contexts (Hualde and Ortiz de Urbina 2003: 455), as illustrated in (18).

(18) a. *Jonek   Mikeli   liburua* [ATZO   eman zion].
　　　 Jon.ERG Mikel.DAT book   yesterday give AUX

---

[4] One remarkable difference from Korean and Japanese is its morphosyntax of ergative traits. However, Basque syntax is not so different from the two East Asian languages as it is from English or other European languages. The authors believe that comparisons of the three SOV languages can bring us a number of fruitful insights and results.

'Jon gave Mikel the book yesterday.'
  b. [ATZO eman zion] *Jonek Mikeli liburua*.

<div align="right">(Hualde and Ortiz de Urbina 2003: 455)</div>

Here the focus+verb unit, indicated by square brackets, consists of the focus (ATZO) and the verb group (*eman zion* 'had given'). Constituents to the left of the unit "behave like marked topics," as in (18a), while those to the right do not function as marked topics, although usually representing old information, as in (18b) (Hualde and Ortiz de Urbina 2003: 455).

In positive clauses, wh-words and focalized constituents (indicated with small capitals) occur immediately to the left of the verb (Hualde and Ortiz de Urbina 2003: 464), as in (19).

(19) a. *NOR-I   azaldu zion Jonek   atzo   bere erabakia?*
        who-DAT explain AUX Jon.ERG yesterday his   decision
        'Who did Jon explain his decision to yesterday?'
     b. *BERA-RI azaldu zion Jonek   atzo   bere erabakia*.
        him-DAT explain AUX Jon.ERG yesterday his   decision
        'Jon explained his decision *to him* yesterday?'

<div align="right">(Hualde and Ortiz de Urbina 2003: 459)</div>

When co-occurring with a wh-word, the focus constituent cannot occupy the pre-verbal focus position, as in (20b); the wh-word must occupy it, as in (20a) (Hualde and Ortiz de Urbina 2003: 495). This means that wh-words have priority over focus constituents in terms of pre-verbal occurrence.

(20) a. *Nork   erosi dio MIRENI   liburua/liburua MIRENI?*
        who.ERG buy   AUX Miren.DAT book/book   Miren.DAT
        'Who bought MARY the book?'
     b. **MIRENI   erosi dio nork   liburua?*
        Miren.DAT buy   AUX who.ERG book
        'Who bought MARY the book?'

<div align="right">(Hualde and Ortiz de Urbina 2003: 495)</div>

In such a combination with a wh-word, the focus constituent is not specified by any designated position but is distinguished with contrastive stress (indicated by small capitals), as in (20a) (Hualde and Ortiz de Urbina 2003: 495).

Korean and Japanese exhibit some similarities to Basque with respect to some of these characteristics. First, the focus constituent occupies the immediate pre-verbal position, as Takami and Kuno point out for Japanese:

Information Structure in Japanese: Since the verb is generally fixed in sentence-final position in Japanese, a constituent immediately to the left of

> the verb represents the focus of the sentence when the verb represents less important information. (Takami and Kuno 2017: 190)

In (21), largely corresponding to (18), *eoje* and *kinoo* ('yesterday') occupy pre-verbal position and thus are most likely to be interpreted as focus.

(21) a. *Jon-eun   Mikel-ege   chaeg-eul   eoje   jueosseo*.
      Jon-TOP   Mikel-DAT   book-ACC   yesterday   gave
      'Jon gave Mikel the book yesterday.'
   b. *Jon-wa   Mikeru-ni   hon-o   kinoo   ageta(-nda-yo)*.
      Jon-TOP   Mikel-DAT   book-ACC   yesterday   gave-AUX-FP

Secondly, as is the case of the Basque examples in (20), wh-words cannot be employed in post-predicative structures in either Korean or Japanese, as in (22b) and (23b). They must be in pre-predicative structures, as in (22a) and (23a), although they need not be in pre-verbal contiguity.

(22) a. *nu-ga   sajueosseo,* MARI-HANTE *chaeg-eul*/*chaeg-eul* MARI-HANTE?
      who-NOM buy:gave   Mary-DAT   book-ACC/book-ACC Mary-DAT
      'Who bought MARY the book?'
   b. * MARI-HANTE *sajueosseo, nu-ga   chaeg-eul?*
      Mary-DAT   buy:gave   who-NOM book-ACC
      'Who bought MARY the book?'
(23) a. *dare-ga   katta(-no),* MARII-NI   *hon-o*/*hon-o*   MARII-NI?
      who-NOM bought-FP Mary-DAT   book-ACC/book-ACC Mary-DAT
      'Who bought MARY the book?'
   b. * MARII-NI   *katta(-no), dare-ga   hon-o?*
      Mary-DAT bought-FP who-NOM book-ACC
      'Who bought MARY the book?'

3.2 Specific morphological markers

Korean and Japanese differ from Basque in some respects. For one thing, they have topic/focus markers (*-(n)eun* and *-wa*), as illustrated in (21), but Basque does not. For another, clausal constituents are more commonly uttered in pre-predicative than post-predicative structures, as in (24).

(24) K. *nu-ga   * MARI-HANTE *chaeg-eul*/*chaeg-eul* MARI-HANTE *sajueosseo?*
      who-NOM Mary-DAT   book-ACC/book-ACC Mary-DAT   bought
      'Who bought MARY the book?'
   J. *dare-ga * MARII-NI   *hon-o*/*hon-o*   MARII-NI   *katta(-no)?*
      who-NOM Mary-DAT   book-ACC/book-ACC Mary-DAT bought(-FP)

In Korean and Japanese, wh-words are not necessarily restricted to pre-verbal contiguity, as is also shown in (24). Only Korean object wh-words like *mweo* 'what' (and *nugu* 'who') need to be placed in immediately pre-verbal position if they are not case-marked, as in (7K) and (8K) above. In this connection, wh-words can be more emphatic if uttered in immediately pre-verbal position, as in (25).

(25) K. *MARI-HANTAE chaeg-eul/chaeg-eul MARI-HANTAE nu-ga sajueosseo?*
      Mary-DAT   book-ACC/book-ACC Mary-DAT   who-NOM bought
      'Who bought MARY the book?'
   J. *MARII-NI   hon-o/hon-o   MARII-NI   dare-ga   katta(-no)?*
      Mary-DAT book-ACC/book-ACC Mary-DAT who-NOM bought(-FP)

These observations seem to be in line with what Takami and Kuno state:

> **Flow of Information Principle**: Elements in a sentence that does not contain emphatic stress or morphologically marked focus elements are ordinarily arranged in the order 'less important information first and more important information last.' (Takami and Kuno 2017: 190)

However, the relevant emphasis is only effective when the wh-words are case-marked. Therefore, it is not attributable to the ordering alone. The case markers play a key role in the emphatic effect. Unlike Basque, Korean and Japanese can be seen as being more dependent on specific markers for focalization.

4   Discrepancy in pre/post-predicative conceptions

As seen in Section 3, the grammatical relation marking of topic/focus is made by means of ordering (pre-verbal contiguity) or contrastive stress in Basque but is generally made by specific morphological markers in Korean and Japanese. Conversely, the grammatical relation marking of subject and object NPs is done by specific markers in Basque but is not necessarily made by such markers in Korean and Japanese. In Korean, subjecthood and objecthood can be marked by some ordering, as in (7K) and (10K) above.

In Basque, case marking is indispensable for subject/object NPs (and other NPs if any) in both pre-predicative and post-predicative structures, as illustrated in (26). *Zer* 'what' and *zuk* 'you' are recognized as absolutive and ergative forms of each pronoun.

(26) *Zer egiten duzu zuk   hemen?*
     what do.IMPF AUX you.ERG here
     'What are you doing here?'
                                 (Hualde and Ortiz de Urbina 2003: 464)

In contrast, such case marking is often optional or even unnecessary in pre-predicative structures of Korean and Japanese speech, as in (7) and (10) seen above in 2.1. In this respect, Basque can be seen as manifesting a higher degree of grammatical relation sensitivity than Korean and Japanese. In some cases, however, case marking can often be necessitated in Korean too. If a subject NP follows an object NP, neither of those can be tolerated without appropriate markers on them, as in (27a); adding the accusative and the topic marker to each could somewhat improve those NPs, as in (27b).

(27) a.??***mweo neo* *ha-neun geo-ya?***
　　　　what   you do-ADN FN-FP
　　　'What are you doing?'
　　b.?***mweo-l   neo-n*   *ha-neun geo-ya?***
　　　　what-ACC you-TOP do-ADN FN-FP
　　　'What are you doing?'

Further, Korean requires its speakers to adopt appropriate markers on post-predicative subject and object NPs so that addressees can understand why those NPs are uttered in post-predicative structures, as seen from the contrast between (a) and (b) in (14) in 2.2 as well as (28).

(28) a　*habgyeogha-lgga-yo,* ***je-ga?*** (=(5K))
　　　　pass-will-POL　　　 I-NOM
　　　　'Can I pass the exam?'
　　b. ?*habgyeogha-lgga-yo,* ***jeo?***
　　　　pass-will-POL　　　 I

As previously noted, those observations show that Korean has a higher degree of grammatical relation sensitivity than Japanese, which hardly puts comparable requirements on subject and object NPs in either pre-predicative or post-predicative structures.

　　Grammatical relation sensitivity can have further implications. Structuralist traditions have often presumed that pre-verbal or post-verbal (subject or object) positions in SVO languages, pre-predicative subject and object positions in SOV languages, or clause-external (sentence-initial or -final) positions are somewhat constant and homogeneous across each language type or language types. However, such syntactic positions can naturally vary more or less from language to language. Here Table 1 summarizes our discussion on what elements can or must be marked for grammatical relation by means of ordering (pre-verbal contiguity, pre-predicative structure, or post-predicative structure) or specific morphological markers (case

markers or topic/focus markers). Bold face indicates the NPs restricted to the respective structures or position.

Syntactic structure	PRE-PREDICATIVE STRUCTURE	IMMEDIATELY PRE-VERBAL POSITION	VERB GROUP	POST-PREDICATIVE STRUCTURE
obligatory marking	MARKER-SUFFIXATION	VERB-CONTIGUITY		MARKER-SUFFIXATION
Basque	any NP	**wh/FOC-NP**		**non-TOP/non-FOC NP**
Korean	post-OBJ SBJ-NP	**non-cased OBJ wh-NP**		CONTR TOP/FOC-NP
Japanese	POSS-NP			POSS-NP

Table 1. Obligatory marking of grammatical relations of NPs

Among the elements that occur in pre-predicative structures, all Basque NPs, Korean subject NPs placed after object NPs, and Japanese possessive NPs must be suffixed with specific markers. Basque wh-words and focus NPs and Korean non-cased objective wh-words must be contiguous to the verb. Pre-verbal contiguity only accommodates wh-words and focus NPs in Basque but puts no such constraints in Korean and Japanese. Post-predicative structures only allow non-topic/non-focus NPs in Basque and NPs of contrastive topic/focus in Korean but can accommodate almost any element except wh-words and non-cased possessive NPs in Japanese.

Basque exhibits the highest degree of grammatical relation sensitivity with respect to both the obligatory case marking of all NPs and pre-verbal contiguity of wh/focus NPs. Korean has a lower degree than Basque but a higher degree of sensitivity than Japanese in terms of the case marking of subject NPs following object NPs in pre-predicative structures and the topic/focus marking of NPs in post-predicative structures. Japanese has the lowest degree of grammatical relation sensitivity.

Basque and Korean speakers associate pre-verbal contiguity more or less with wh-questions and/or focalization of a participant in the event conception, but Japanese speakers do not necessarily do so. Basque and Korean speakers rely far more on case/topic/focus markings for identifying grammatical relations of pre/post-predicative elements than Japanese speakers do. On the other hand, pre-predicative structures are left for marked topic elements and post-predicative structures are for non-topic/non-focus elements in Basque. Likewise, post-predicative structures are largely confined to elements of contrastive topic/focus in Korean. In Japanese, however, such functional division is not clearly observed for pre/post-predicative structures. Here we can see different conceptions of immediately pre-verbal position and pre/post-predicative structures across languages.

5   Conclusion

We demonstrated that Korean speakers have a higher degree of grammatical relation sensitivity than Japanese in production and understanding of subject/object NPs. As one manifestation of this, those NPs in post-predicative structures usually need to be marked as contrastive topics/foci by means of specific markers in Korean. Likewise, object NPs in pre-predicative structures must be marked for grammatical relation by pre-verbal contiguity or specific markers, and/or subject NPs following them require specific markers. In Japanese, however, subject/object NPs, along with genitive-marked possessive NPs, can be employed far more freely in both post- and pre-predicative structures. Post-predicative structures can be employed in Korean only if their elements are marked as some contrastive topics/foci. In contrast, such a constraint does not hold in Japanese. We also showed that Korean lies between Japanese and Basque in its degree of grammatical relation sensitivity. Basque is the strictest with respect to case marking, pre-verbal contiguity, and pre/post-predicative alignment of NPs, while Japanese is the loosest of the three SOV languages in those terms.

References

Hualde, J. I. and J. Ortiz de Urbina. 2003. *A Grammar of Basque*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Izutsu, K. and Y.-T. Kim. 2020. Linguistic manifestations of fictive change participants: Apparent alternations between the accusative and the dative/comitative cases in Korean and Japanese. *Asian Languages and Linguistics* 1: 107–146.

Kim, T. 2011. An empirical study of postposing constructions in Korean. *Linguistic Research* 28(1): 223–238.

Lee, J.-S. 2009. A verb-initial single clause analysis of right-dislocated constructions in Korean. *Studies in Modern Grammar* 57: 127–157.

Ono, T. and R. Suzuki. 1992. Word order variability in Japanese conversation: Motivations and grammaticization. *Text* 12(3): 429–445.

Shimojo, M. 2005. *Argument Encoding in Japanese Conversation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Takami, K. and S. Kuno. 2017. Functional syntax. *Handbook of Japanese Syntax*, ed. M. Shibatani, S. Miyagawa, and H. Noda, 187–234. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Whitman, J. 2000. Right dislocation in English and Japanese. *Syntactic and Functional Explorations in Honor of Susumu Kuno*, ed. K. Takami, A. Kamio and J. Whitman, 445–470. Tokyo: Kurosio.