<Grammaticalization in Progress: Differing Patterns of Korean and Japanese Plurality> It is well-known that countable nouns in Korean and Japanese do not have to be obligatorily marked for plurality despite the existence of the plural suffix, -tul/-tachi. However, research in the past two decades has revealed that plural marked nouns in the two languages not only mark plurality but also denote discourse-related meanings of definiteness and specificity (Kang 2007, No 2008, Kim 2011, Kurafuji 2004, Nakanishi & Tomioka 2004, Lee, Cho & Park 2018).

Regarding the debate as to whether the marked reading of these suffixes denotes the feature of "definite" or "specific", we maintain our claim that both Korean and Japanese plural marking involves [+specific] (Lee, Cho & Park 2018), rather than [+definite], based on the following definitions (Ioni, Ko & Wexler 2004:5).

- (1) If a Determiner Phrase (DP) of the form [D NP] is...
  - a. [+definite], then the speaker and hearer presuppose the existence of a unique individual in the set denoted by NP.
  - b. [+specific], then the speaker intends to refer to a unique individual in the set denoted by the NP and considers this individual to possess some *noteworthy* property.

In particular, when [+specific] is involved (as evidenced in the clear distinction of singular and plural forms in personal and demonstrative pronouns such as *na/uli & watashi/watashi-tachi*), marking plurality/non-plurality is obligatory, contrary to the commonly held view about the optionality of plural marking. There are two interpretations available of plurality: (1) unmarked plurality (much like English plurals) and (2) marked-reading with the feature [+specific].

In this paper, we argue that there is a strong correlation between grammaticalization of plurality and the universal Animacy Hierarchy (AH) (human> animal>other animate nouns>inanimate countable nouns > abstract nouns) (e.g., Comrie 1989, Croft 2003, Corbett 2000). In other words, the plural marker can be attached as a neutral grammatical marker without the added meaning of [+specific] if the noun is higher in AH. The unmarked plural reading has arisen due to a century-long process of grammaticalization that has been more active in Korean than in Japanese. The Korean plural marking, compared to the Japanese counterpart, has undergone rapid change, further from the Late-Middle Korean "quasi-plural suffixes" that did not mark plural number per se but a group membership (Lee & Ramsey 2011). A careful examination of the contemporary data, drawn from Korean and Japanese media show that Japanese prefers the singular form for the corresponding Korean plural noun (e.g. 'people/politicians/students/reporters/collaborators' [data from Korean-Japanese bilingual articles in *Choongang Ilbo* Newspaper]).

One crucial diagnostic test for determining the extent of plural grammaticalization is to embed the noun in question in environments redundantly marked in plurality, as exemplified in (2). When the predicate already encodes the plurality of the subject noun, it is extremely awkward to mark plurality in the noun as well unless the reading of unmarked plurality is allowed ('students' and 'cats'). The second case is the classifier context where a plural number is explicitly used with the classifier, exhibiting an even clearer pattern of grammaticalization. Unmarked plural nouns higher in AH can co-occur with a plural classifier phrase while the nouns lower in the hierarchy tend to resist overt plural marking.

(2) Redundant Plural Marking & The Animacy Hierarchy

a. Occurring with a predicate such as manh-ta/takusan 'to be many' haksaeng-tul-i manh-ayo.

"There are many students."

koyangi-tul-i manh-ayo.

"There are many cats."

?saengseon-tul-i manh-ayo. "There are many fish."

?chaek-tul-i manh-ayo.

"There are many books." ?soli-tul-i yelekaci-ta.

"There are various sounds."

b. Occurring with a classifier

tases-myeng-uy haksaeng-tul

"five students"

?tases-mali-uv so-tul "five cows"

?\*tases-kae-uy hwapun-tul

"five flower pots"

?\* tases-kaci-uy kamkak-tul "five kinds of senses"

gakusei-tachi-ga takusan-iru

neko-tachi-ga takusan-iru

?/\*sakana-tachi-ga takusan-iru

\*hon-tachi-ga takusan-aru

\*oto-tachi-ga takusan-aru

go-nin-no gakusei-tachi

?/\*go-tou-no uchi-tachi

\*go-ko-no uekibachi-tachi

\*go-shurui-no kankaku-tachi

However, as an active process of language change, the grammaticalization exhibits wide variability in the plural marking of inanimate nouns on the basis of the speaker's age, gender, and education as well as situation, register, genre, and the perceived degree of specificity. As the unmarked use spreads along AH in Korean, we find increasingly more cases of certain abstract nouns denoting parts of the whole with -tul (e.g. pupun 'part', cokak 'fragment', cem 'point/aspect,' *uikyen* 'opinion', *saengkak* 'thought') in the nonspecific unmarked context.

In contrast, in Japanese, while the unmarked usage of *-tachi* for nouns and mass nouns of nonhuman animate is more often seen (e.g., tori-tachi 'birds' and ikimono-tachi 'creatures'), the unmarked use of tachi for inanimate nouns is very restricted. Speakers use tachi for inanimate nouns when they consider them "noteworthy", i.e., [+specific]. For instance, in the phrase, Ranju Tomu-san-no-guzzu-tachi "merchandise for the top star Ranju Tom," the speaker refers to this star's collection of many types of merchandise (guzzu) and feels strongly connected to them, hence "noteworthy." We consider "Personification" to be one aspect of "Noteworthiness." Therefore, the occurrences of tachi with inanimate nouns in Japanese often encode both "Specificity" and "Noteworthiness" on the speaker's part.

In addition, we propose that the "event-plural" reading only available in Korean (achimpap-tul ppalli-tul mek-ko-tul hakkyo-tul kala-tul 'You (pl.) eat breakfast and go to school quickly') and the Japanese "associative-plural" (hanako-tachi 'Hanako and her associates') contribute to the diverging patterns of plural grammaticalization in the two languages. Korean "event-plural" marking, a relatively modern innovation (Ko 1991), allows -tul marking to all types of nouns and all parts of speech, hence facilitating an increase of unmarked plurality while the Japanese "associative-plural" is restricted to human nouns, thus putting a break on the spread of unmarked plurality.