Case Stacking and Focus in Korean

Donna B. Gerdts and Cheong Youn

Simon Fraser University and Kyungil University

1. Introduction*

As noted by Gerdts and Youn (1988, 1990) and Youn (1990, 1995), Korean exhibits an interesting pattern of case assignment in sentences like the following: the nominal with the thematic role of experience, location, or goal can appear in either the dative case (DAT), or in the nominative case (NOM) or accusative case (ACC), or in both cases stacked on top of each other.

(1) Chelswu-eykey/-ka/-eykey-ka ton-i philyoha-ta.
C.DAT/-NOM/-DAT-NOM money-NOM need-IN
'Chulsoo needs money.'

(2) Semyukongcang-ey/-i/-ey-ka pwul-i na-ss-ta.
textile factory-DAT/-NOM/-DAT-NOM fire-NOM break out- PST-IN
'Fire broke out in the textile factory.'

(3) Chelswu-ka Swuni-eykey/-lul/-eykey-lul chayk-ul cwu-ess-ta.
C.-NOM S.-DAT/-ACC/-DAT-ACC book-ACC give- PST-IN
'Chulsoo gave Sooni a book.'

(4) Kim-sensayngnim-i Sewul-ey/-ul/-ey-lul ka-si-ess-ta.
K.-teacher.HON-NOM Seoul-DAT/-ACC/-DAT-ACC go-HON- PST-IN
'Prof. Kim went to Seoul.'

Two alternative analyses have been proposed to treat the double marking examples. First, it has been claimed that they are instances of case stacking (Gerdts 1991, Gerdts and Youn 1988, 1990, Youn 1990, 1995). Under the case stacking analysis, henceforth CSA, the DAT case is an inherent case that is marking the thematic relation of the nominal while the NOM or the ACC is a structural case. The constructions in (1)-(4) involve the 'movement' of the nominal from an indirect object or locative position, which governs DAT case, to a subject or object position, where it can also be assigned NOM or ACC case. Second, Schütze (1996) has put forth an alternative analysis where DAT is regarded as case but NOM or ACC, at least in the double marked examples, are focus particles. Under the focus marking analysis, henceforth FMA, DAT is the only true case in these

to appear in S. Kuno et al. (eds), *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics VI: Proceedings of the 1999 Harvard International Symposium on Korean Linguistics,* Hanshin Publishing Company, Seoul.

examples, hence the title of his paper 'Case Stacking Isn't'.

This paper seeks to contrast these two alternatives. In section 2, we review the case for the CSA. In section 3, we examine two of the arguments against CSA put forward in Schütze. Then in section 3.3 we turn to an examination of Schütze's most interesting evidence for the FMA based on multiple focus constructions. Section 3.4 summarizes the systematic differences in Schütze's data and Youn's. We conclude with a proposal for reconciling the two disparate viewpoints and discuss the implications of our proposal for case theory.

It is not an easy task to contrast these analyses. It is a matter of common knowledge that NOM and ACC have a double life in Korean grammar—they are markers of structural case and they are markers of focus. Furthermore, the two analyses are, in fact, not mutually exclusive. Once it is recognized in the grammar that DAT and NOM and ACC can morphologically concatenate, then the situations under which this concatenation can appear could a priori involve NOM/ACC as straight case markers or as focus markers. So a grammar could conceivably have both the CSA and the FMA. The constructions that arise through each would be difficult to tease apart.

From a theoretical perspective, both analyses make good use of independently needed mechanisms in the grammar. Under the CSA, double marking results as the concatenation of the application of two indepentently attested case rules. Under the FMA, crucial use is made of the fact that NOM and ACC not only get used for case marking arguments but also get used to mark focused nominals occupying non-argument positions. So both analyses are able to accommodate double marking without additional mechanisms.

Finally, the task of comparing the two grammars is made difficult because of the sensitivity of the judgements concerning the data. Many Korean speakers dislike case stacking of the type in (1)-(4) altogether. The data sound sub-standard or childish to them. But other speakers, including Youn, who is a native of Taegu, find these data perfectly natural and they arise in Youn's every-day speech. There are profound and systematic differences in grammaticality judgements between Schütze's consultants and Youn, and these, in part, lead to diametrically opposed viewpoints.

2. The Case for Case Stacking

The data in (1)-(4) pose an interesting puzzle: do the different case markings correlate with different syntactic constructions, or is there a single syntactic analysis for all of the differently case-marked version of the clause? In previous work, we have found the second viewpoint to be correct. The sentences in (1)-(4) are syntactically identical at all levels of structure, regardless of case marking. They all have two levels of structure: an initial

level of structure where the nominal is an experiencer, goal, or locative and a surface level where the nominal occupies the subject or object position. Case marking proceeds as in (5).[1]

(5) Korean Case (partial):
  a. S-Case
   NOM (*-i/-ka*) is licensed by a "subject"
   ACC (*-ul/-lul*) is licensed by an "object"
  b. I-Case
   DAT (*-eykey* for animates, *-ey* for inanimates) is licensed by a
   Goal, Exp, Loc, Ben,Temp etc.

The relevant NP can either appear in DAT, by virtue of its semantic relation, or in NOM or ACC case, by virtue of its syntactic position. Although some languages, e.g. Icelandic, demand that an I-case such as DAT appear on a dative subject, Korean has no such requirement. Thus, either DAT or NOM case is possible on Korean dative subjects, as in (1) and (2). Also, either DAT or ACC is possible on Korean dative objects, as in (3) and (4). In sum, Korean lacks a case resolution rule that would give priority to either DAT case or NOM/ACC case, and the result is something of a case free-for-all.

2.1 Evidence for Subjecthood and Objecthood

Crucial to this viewpoint is the claim that the relevant nominal moves to the subject or object position. we will not repeat all of the argumentation here, referring you to Youn (1990) and Gerdts and Youn (1988, 1990) for a full discussion. Suffice it to say that the first NP in (1) and (2) passes several tests for subjecthood, regardless of its case marking. Its subject properties include determining subject honorification (6), plural copying (7), controlling *myense* clauses (8), and anteceding the reflexive *casin* in (9).

(6) Emenim-eykey/-i/-eykey-ka kohyang-i kuli-wusi-ess-ta.
mother-DAT/-NOM/-DAT-NOM hometown-NOM miss-SH-PST-IN
'Mother missed her hometown.'

(7) Ku ai-tul-eykey/-i/-eykey-ka kongpwu-(tul)-i silh-ess-ta.
the child-pl-DAT/-NOM/-DAT-NOM studying-(pl)-NOM dislike-PST-IN
'The children disliked studying.'

(8) Mikwuksimin-i-myenseto Chelswu-eykey/-ka/-eykey-ka
U.S. citizen-be-though C.-DAT/-NOM/-DAT-NOM
yengesensayngnim-i philyoha-ta.
English teacher-NOM need-IN
'Even though $he_{i/*j}$ is an American citizen, $Chulsoo_i$ needs an English $teacher_j$.'

(9) Chelswu-eykey/-ka/-eykey-ka Yengswu-ka casin-uy sengkong-ul wihay
C.-DAT/-NOM/-DAT-NOM Y.-NOM self-GEN success-for
philyoha-ta.
need-IN
'Chulsoo$_i$ needs Youngsoo$_j$ for self's$_{i/*j}$ success.'

Arguing for the status of the second nominal in (3) and (4) is more difficult due to a dirth of tests for objecthood in Korean. One argument is that the nominal in (3) can be passivized as in (10).

(10) Sensayngnim-eykey/-i/-eykey-ka chayk-i cwu-eci-si-ess-ta.
C.-DAT/-NOM/-DAT-NOM book-NOM give-PAS-HON-PST-IN
'The teacher was given the book.'

Passivization is not generally a property of indirect objects in Korean and nominals which do not exhibit DAT/ACC alternation (11) also do not appear as subjects in passives (12).

(11) Na-nun Swuni-eykey/-*lul/-*eykey-lul sopho-lul ponay-ss-ta.
I-TOP S.-DAT/-*ACC/-*DAT-ACC parcel-ACC send-PS-IN
'I sent a parcel to Sooni.'

(12) Swuni-*ka/-*eykey-ka sopho-ka ponay-eci-ess-ta.
S.-DAT/-*NOM/-*DAT-NOM parcel-NOM send-PAS-PS-IN
'Swuni was sent a parcel.'[2]

Unfortunately, passive does not give consistent results in the case of the locative advancement sentences like (4). Most speakers, including Youn, reject all passive versions of (4); a passive verb form simply does not exist for *ka* 'go'.

(13) *Sewul-ey/-i/-ey-ka ka-ci-ess-ta.
Seoul-DAT/-NOM/-DAT-NOM go-PAS-PST-IN
'Seoul was gone to.'

O'Grady (1991:231-2) notes that one speaker he consulted (Young-Seok Choi) allows (15), the passive of (14), though again Youn finds this ungrammatical.

(14) Manhun salam-tul-i san-ey/-ul ol-lass-ta.
many person-PL-NOM mountain-DAT/-ACC climb-PS-IN
'Many people climbed the mountain.'

(15) Ku san-i manhun salam-tul-eyuyhay olla-ci-ess-ta.
this mountain-NOM many person-PL-by climb-PAS-PS-IN
'This mountain was climbed by many people.'

So, clearly further tests need to be developed for objecthood in Korean. In the meantime, we are assuming an analysis involving advancement to object of the data in (4) as well as for the data in (3).

2.2 Limits on Case Stacking

Not all nominals that take I-case can stack S-case onto it. In this section we explore the limitations on case stacking. The generalization is very simple: only nominals that allow case alternation allow case stacking.[3]

First, we focus the discussion in this paper to case stacking examples with some variety of dative case as the first element. These include: *eykey/ey* 'experiencer, goal, location, benefactive' and *eyse* 'source, location'. Other postpositions do not seem to allow case alternation nor stacking. For example, *-ulo* 'instrumental, path' (16)-(18) or *-wa* 'comitative' (19)-(20).

(16) Phokwu-lo/*ka/*lo-ka ku tali-ka mwunec-ess-ta.
torrential rain-INS/*NOM/*INS-NOM the bridge-NOM collapse-PS-IN
'The bridge collapsed from a torrential rainfall.'

(17) Mokswu-ka namwu-lo/*-lul/*-lo-lul chaykcang-ul
carpenter-NOM wood-INS/*ACC/*INS-ACC bookcase-ACC
mantul-ess-ta.
make-PS-IN
'The carpenter made a bookcase out of wood.'

(18) Changmwun-ulo/*-ka/*-ulo-ka talpich-i pang-an-ey
window-INS/*-NOM/*-INS-NOM moonlight-NOM room-inside-DAT
hulle-tuleo-ass-ta.
flow-come into-PS-IN
'The moonlight flowed into the room through the window.'

(19) Swuni-wa/*ka/*wa-ka Chelswu-ka hakkyo-ey ka-n-ta
S.-COM/*NOM/*COM-DAT C.-NOM school-DAT go-PRES-IN
'Chelswu goes to school with Swuni.'

(20) Chelswu-ka Swuni-wa/*lul/*wa-lul hakkyo-ey ka-n-ta
C.-NOM S.-COM/*ACC/*COM-ACC school-DAT go-PRES-IN
'Chelswu goes to school with Swuni.'

Second, not all examples of DAT allow alternations nor case stacking. For example, DAT/ACC alternations are lexically governed. So we find case alternation and stacking with the verb *chu-ta* 'give' (3), but not with the

verb *poyn-ta* 'send' (11). And while case alternation and stacking is grammatical with the verb ka-ta 'go' (see (4)), it is ungrammatical with *o-ta* 'come':

(21) Kim-sensayngnim-i Sewul-ey/*-ul/*-ey-lul
K.-teacher.HON-NOM Seoul-DAT/*-ACC/*-DAT-ACC
o-si-ess-ta.
come-HON- PST-IN
'Prof. Kim came to Seoul.'

Third, Gerdts and Youn (1990) and Youn (1990, Chapter 3) claim that locative inversion constructions as in (2) are can occur also occur with temporals (22) and sources (23).

(22) Cinan kyeul-ey/-i/-ey-ka nwun-i manhi o-ass-ta.
last winter-DAT/-NOM/-DAT-NOM snow-NOM much come-PST-IN
'We had a lot of snow last winter.'

(23) Chenceng-eyse/-i/-eyse-ka mwul-i tteleci-n-ta.
ceiling-DAT/-NOM/-DAT-NOM water-NOM drip-PRST-IN
'Water drips from the ceiling.'

However, only unaccusative predicates show case alternation and stacking; unergative predicates do not as shown by the following:

(24) I uyca-ey/*-ka/*-ey-ka Chelswu-ka anc-ass-ta.
this chair-DAT/*-NOM/*-DAT-NOM C.-NOM sit-PST-IN
'Chulsoo sat on this chair.'

(25) Cinan ilyoil-ey/*-i/*-ey-ka Swuni-ka ttena-ss-ta.
last Sunday-DAT/*-NOM/*-DAT-NOM S.-NOM leave-PST-IN
'Sooni left last Sunday.'

(26) I pang-eyse/*-i/*-eyse-ka Yengswu-ka nao-ass-ta.
this room-DAT/*-NOM/*-DAT-NOM Y.-NOM come out-PST-IN
'Youngsoo came out of this room.'

Thus, we see that case stacking is not freely associated with any I-case nominal, or even with any DAT nominal. Rather, it is a highly constrained phenomena limited to constructions that also exhibit case alternations.

3. The Case against Case Stacking

Schütze (1996) gives five 'aspects' of the behaviour of stacked case that are unexpected if it merely involves the optional realization of structural case. In this section, we will review two of his arguments and

show how each one rests on grammaticality judgements that Youn does not share. We conclude that his case against case stacking does not hold for a speaker like Youn whose judgements do not match those of his consultant.

3.1 Special Prosodics

First, Schütze claims that case stacking sentences require special marked prosody to sound felicitous: typically, there should be a pause after DAT, and a pitch accent on NOM or ACC.
This prosodic effect is possible, as far as we know, for all speakers. It is not only possible on stacked NOM and ACC but also on simple NOM and ACC as well and it carries with it a special meaning of contrastive focus. So for example the following sentences can focus either the subject or the object or both with special intonation.

(27) Chelswu-KA kangto-lul cap-ass-ta.
C.-NOM robber-ACC catch-PST-IN
'**Chelsoo** caught a robber.'

(28) Chelswu-ka kangto-LUL cap-ass-ta.
C.-NOM robber-ACC catch-PST-IN
'Chelsoo caught a **robber**.'

(29) Chelswu-KA kangto-LUL cap-ass-ta.
C.-NOM robber-ACC catch-PST-IN
'**Chelsoo** caught a **robber**.'

Moreover, we see that the prosodic phenomenon of a pause and special pitch is not a property of the NOM or ACC case per se but can occur on any ending. So for example the DAT on the locative in (30) can also take this prosodic effect.

(30) Na-nun Sewul-EY sopho-lul ponay-ss-ta.
I-TOP Seoul-DAT parcel-ACC send-PS-IN
'I sent a parcel to **Seoul**.'

Recall that case alternation or stacked ACC is not possible on such examples (11). Therefore, this cannot be accounted for by an analysis that moves the prosodics onto the DAT and then deletes the ACC.

This prosody is especially useful in elicitations when working with speakers who are not really comfortable with case stacking data. Some people feel happier about stacked NOM or ACC if there is a reason for it to be there, for example, if it is indicating contrastive focus, as indicated by the special pitch. However, it is not really an argument against the CSA since in Youn's speech, case stacking is possible with the same sort of

neutral intonation that exists on simple NOM and ACC marked elements. With neutral intonation NOM carries the usual meaning of exhaustive listing.

Furthermore, we can see the lack of emphasis on the stacked ACC in examples like the following.

(31) Na-nun Sewul-ey-lul/-eyl ka-ess-ta.
I-TOP Seoul-DAT-ACC/DAT+ACC go-PST-IN
'I went to Seoul.'

It is quite normal in rapid speech to contract the combination of ey-lul to eyl with no special pitch.[5] If special prosody were required including a pause between the DAT and the NOM, then we would not expect contraction to be possible.[6]

In sum, the prosodic effects that are sometimes seen in case stacking examples do not argue for the FMA over the CSA since prosodic focus exists independently of case stacking and case stacking does not require special prosodics, at least for speakers like Youn.

3.2 Case Stacking and Non-Arguments

Another argument against the CSA given by Schütze is based on data that he claims show that case stacking is not limited to subject, but can also apply to by-phrases (32), locatives (see (23) above), and temporal adjuncts (see (22) above).

(32) %Holangi-eykey-ka koyangi-ka mek-hi-ess-ta. (Schütze ex. (5))
tiger-DAT-NOM cat-NOM eat-PASS-PS-IN
'The cat was eaten by the tiger.'

Schütze notes the tentativeness of the judgement on (32) by marking it as %. We have yet to find any speakers to verify this example. If it is possible, then it is not only a challenge to the CSA but also to the generalization that only nominals that show case alternation allow case stacking, since NOM case alone on (32) is presumably ungrammatical of all speakers.

As for the locative and temporal examples, although Schütze says they fail subjecthood tests (he gives no data), Gerdts and Youn (1990) and Youn (1990, Chapter 3) give many types of evidence that the case alternating/stacking nominal has subject properties. For example, plural copy, which is a phenomena limited to subjects, is possible with locatives (33), temporals (34), and sources (35).

(33) Ku kongcang-tul-ey/-i/-ey-ka pwul-tul-i na-ss-ta.
the factory-PL-DAT/-NOM/-DAT-NOM fire-ACC-NOM break out-PS-IN
'Fire broke out in the factories.'

(34) Ilen nal-tul-ey/-i/-ey-ka nwun-tul-i simhakey
such day-PL-DAT/-NOM/-DAT-NOM snow-PL-NOM heavily
nayli-n-ta.
fall-PR-IN
'Snow falls heavily on days like this.'

(35) I chenceng-tul-eyse/-i/-eyse-ka mwul-tul-i tteleci-n-ta.
this ceiling-PL-DAT/-NOM/-DAT-NOM water-(pl)-NOM drip-PR-IN
'Water drips from these ceilings.'

We conclude then that Schütze's claim that nominals that are not subjects or objects can exhibit case stacking is not supported by the evidence that he gives.

3.3 Multiple Focus

Now let us turn to the evidence that Schütze gives in favor of the FMA. Under this analysis, stacked NOM/ACC are indicators of focus, to be more precise, "information focus, that is, new information that is not necessarily contrastive or exhaustive." To substantiate this claim, Schütze gives four types of evidence. Due to length restrictions, we will only address one of his arguments.

Schütze claims that since Korean has been argued to have multiple focus, then examples with multiple case stacking should also be possible. He gives an example like (37) in which there are two cases of stacked DAT plus NOM in a row.

(37) Cip-an-eyse-ka kyewul-ey-ka Swunhi-eykey namphyen-i
house-in-DAT-NOM winter-in-NOM S.-DAT husband-NOM
mwusep-ta. (S: 18)
fear-IN
'In the house in winter Swunhi fears her husband.'

However, Youn finds this example totally ungrammatical. Similarly, the example in (38) is also ill-formed.

(38) *Cangmachel-ey-ka i kongcang-eyse-ka phyeyswu-ka
rainy season-DAT-NOM this factory-DAT-NOM waste water-NOM
hulte-nao-ass-ta.
flow-come-PS-IN
'During the raining season, waste water flowed out of this factory.'

Also, an example with three consecutive nominals with case stacking is also ungrammatical; this would be predicted to be grammatical under the FMA.

(39) *Cip-an-eyse-ka kyewul-ey-ka Swunhi-eykey-ka
house-in-DAT-NOM winter-in-NOM S.-DAT-NOM
namphyen-i mwusep-ta.
husband-NOM fear-IN
'In the house in winter Swunhi fears her husband.'

Note that it is impossible to appeal to a surface condition that blocks all consecutive occurrences of case stacking, since data like (37) above allow this, at least for some speakers. Also, the ungrammaticality of (38) and (39) cannot be explained by appealing to the unavailability of case stacking on any of the nominals, because, in Youn's judgement, they can each take case stacking, as long as there is only one case-stacked nominal per clause and none of the other relevant nominals are in NOM case:

(40) Cip-aneyse-ka Swunhi-eykey namphyen-i mwusep-ta.
house-in-NOM S.-DAT husband-NOM fear-IN
'In the house Swunhi fears her husband.'

(41) Cip-aneyse Swunhi-eykey-ka namphyen-i mwusep-ta.
house-in S.-DAT-NOM husband-NOM fear-IN
'In the house Swunhi fears her husband.'

(42) Kyewul-ey-ka Swunhi-eykey namphyen-i mwusep-ta.
winter-in-NOM S.-DAT husband-NOM fear-IN
'In winter Swunhi fears her husband.'

(43) Kyewul-ey Swunhi-eykey-ka namphyen-i mwusep-ta.
winter-DAT S.-DAT-NOM husband-NOM fear-IN
'In winter Swunhi fears her husband.'

(44) Cangmachel-ey-ka i kongcang-eyse phyeyswu-ka
rainy season-DAT-NOM this factory-DAT waste water-NOM
hulte-nao-ass-ta.
flow-come-PS-IN
'During the raining season, waste water flowed out of this factory.'

(45) Cangmachel-ey i kongcang-eyse-ka phyeyswu-ka
rainy season-DAT this factory-DAT-NOM waste water-NOM
hulte-nao-ass-ta.
flow-come-PS-IN
'During the raining season, waste water flowed out of this factory.'

Moreover, the locative and temporal adjuncts in these examples are different from other instances of case stacking discussed above because, as Schütze points out, they do not have plain NOM counterparts.

(46) *Cip-i Swunhi-eykey/-ka/-eykey-ka nampyen-i mwusep-ta.
house-NOM S.-DAT/-NOM/-DAT-NOM husband-NOM fear-IN
'In the house Swunhi fears her husband.'

(47) *Kyewul-i Swunhi-eykey/-ka/-eykey-ka nampyen-i mwusep-ta.
winter-NOM S.-DAT/-NOM/-DAT-NOM husband-NOM fear-IN
'In winter Swunhi fears her husband.'

(48) *Cangmachel-i i kongcang-eyse/-i/-eyse-ka
rainy season-NOM this factory-DAT/-NOM/-DAT-NOM
phyeyswu-ka hulte-nao-ass-ta.
waste water-NOM flow-come-PS-IN
'During the raining season, waste water flowed out of this factory.'

Also, the nominal subcategorized by the verb, not the non-adjunct nominal, shows subject properties, for example plural copying, regardless of the case marking on either:

(49) Cangmachel-ey i kongcang-tul-eyse/-i/-eyse-ka
rainy season-DAT-NOM this factory-PL-DAT/-NOM/-DAT-NOM
phyeyswu-ka hulte-tul-nao-ass-ta.
waste water-NOM flow-PL-come-PS-IN
'During the raining season, waste water flowed out of this factory.'

(50) Cangmachel-ey-ka i kongcang-tul-eyse phyeyswu-ka
rainy season-DAT-NOM this factory-PL-DAT waste water-NOM
hul-e-tul-nao-ass-ta.
flow-CON-PL-come-PS-IN
'During the raining season, waste water flowed out of this factory.'

(51) Hyuil-tul-ey(-ka) i kongcang-eyse kasu-ka
holiday-PL-DAT-NOM this factory-PL-DAT gas-NOM
say-e-(-*tul)-nao-ass-ta.
leak-CON-PL-come-PS-IN
'During holidays, waste water flowed out of this factory.'

Multiple focus is one area where the CSA and the FMA make opposite predictions. Under the CSA, if we claim that case stacking appears only in case alternation contexts, case stacking arises in examples involving A-movement—movement to either a subject or object position. These movements are mutually exclusive and non-reiterative within a clause, so multiple case stacking is not expected, and this is a correct prediction according to Youn's judgements. This is a problem for the FMA. However, under the A-movement analysis view of the CSA, case-stacking is not expected in data like (40), (42), and (44) because they do not have alternates with just NOM case as seen in (46), (47), and (48). Thus the CSA

makes the wrong prediction.

Clearly, if the CSA is to be maintained, the position that case stacking only arises through A-movement must be modified or dropped. One way to modify the rule is to limit case stacking to cases of A-movement, but to allow NOM to mark the adjunct instead of the subject. This can be formalized as in (52).

(52) Case extension rule:
If NOM case does not appear on the I-case marked subject, then NOM case may appear on a temporal or locative adjunct.

The difference in judgement between Schütze's consultant and Youn is that she apparently allows this rule to reiterate, yielding (37), while Youn limits the rule to a single application, thereby blocking multiple adjuncts with case stacking. Note that, even if the rule reiterates, (39) should be blocked: since the DAT subject takes NOM case, there is no NOM to extend to either the temporal or the locative. Thus, the CSA predicts that (39) should be ungrammatical for all speakers, while the FMA predicts that it should be grammatical. Unfortunately, Schütze does not supply his consultant's judgement on an example like this.

Notice that this case extension allows case stacking on adjuncts but only in a small class of examples, namely only in DAT subject constructions. It correctly predicts that adjuncts in general cannot take case stacking. Since case stacking is linked to A-Movement, which is limited to unaccusative or passive contexts (Gerdts and Youn 1990, and Youn 1990), we do not expect case stacking on adjuncts of unergative or transitive clauses, and this predication is correct.

(53) Hyusiksikan-ey-(*ka) wuntongcang-eyse(-*ka) ai-tul-i
recess-DAT(-*ka) playground-DAT(-*ka) child-PL-NOM
no-n-ta.
play-PR-IN
'During recess, children play on the playground.'

(54) Cangmachel-ey(*-ka) na-nun MANY chayk-lul ilk-nun-ta.
rainy season-DAT-NOM I-TOP many book-ACC read-PRST-IN.
'During the raining season, I read many books.'

We see then that the case extension rule in (52) allows case stacking on adjuncts, but only as an instantiation of a very limited rule of feature passing of a DAT-marked subject.

The CSA together with the Case Extension Rule makes correct preditions concerning the cases when case stacking can appear on adjuncts.

3.4 Summary

To summarize, we find that there are two major difficulties with the arguments that Schütze gives against the CSA. One is that he does not consider alternative accounts for the data he presents that are, in fact, compatible with the CSA.. In addition, he simply ignored our evidence for the subjecthood of locatives and temporals.

Second, Youn's judgements on the Korean data are diametrically opposed to the judgements Schütze reports on all the crucial examples.

(55) Case Stacking Properties:	Youn	Schütze
Does DAT + NOM/ACC require special prosodics?	no	yes
Can by-phrases have stacking?	no	yes
Can case stacking appear on more than one focussed oblique phrase?	no	yes

This poses an interesting problem: What does one do when there is no consensus opinion regarding the judgements? One viewpoint is that it may be possible for speakers of the same language to have slightly different grammars. In fact, we expect alternative analyses for data that are rare and/or marginal. For example, parasitic gap constructions in English are well-known for the disagreement in native speaker judgements. What we expect is that the grammars might overlap in the treatment of mutually agreed upon data but diverge in systematic ways from this core grammar. But to discover these parallel grammars, careful study must be made of a systematic set of facts taken from a group of homogenous speakers. It is counterproductive to select a hodgepodge of data from different sources since this will obscure the correlation between facts. Moreover, care should be taken not to dismiss another scholar's data just because it is not accommodated by one's own analysis.

So the challenge is how to accommodate both of the above set of judgements. Youn's set of judgements, are only compatible with the CSA and not the FMA. However, as we have pointed out in the above discussion, the second set of judgements are also compatible with the CSA with the following additions to the grammar. For Schütze's speaker case is worth stacking only if there is a reason for doing so, such as special emphasis or focus or the need to disambiguate the thematic relation of the nominal. Otherwise, only one case is used. For Youn's grammar the case extension rule (52) is limited to one application, while for Schütze's speaker it is not. The one piece of data that the CSA cannot account for is case stacking on by-phrases, as in example (32) above. Even Schütze admits the tenuousness of this datum.

4. CONCLUSION

We conclude that Schütze has not given a compelling case for the focus marking analysis over the case stacking analysis when a fuller range of data is taken into consideration. In fact, the case stacking analysis remains the more elegant approach, since the same mechanism that assigns NOM or ACC to nominals in case alternation constructions is also responsible for assigning NOM and ACC in case stacking examples. So in the case stacking examples, the nominal is assigned two "morphological" cases. Schütze claims that "well-known facts from Icelandic show...that this cannot be true. ...[U]niversally, lexical case features block the kind of feature-checking relationship required for morphological NOM case assignment and subject-verb agreement." Schütze p. 13-14.

However, Icelandic is crucially different from Korean. Namely it does not have case alternation. The subject of pysch constructions and passives of inherently marked goals and themes always appear in DAT, never in NOM, in Icelandic. So, in fact, the Icelandic data is totally irrelevant to our view of case licensing in Korean. Icelandic not only lacks case stacking, but it also lack the necessary precursor of it—case alternation.

The case stacking analysis can be instantiated in many different theoretical approaches to clause structure and to case. The key element of an adequate treatment of Korean case stacking, however, is to allow case to be assigned at two different levels of structures. DAT case in Korean, under our analysis, is not structural case, but rather a semantically determined case. NOM and ACC, on the other hand, are structural cases. In Korean, these two levels of case assignment are not mutually excluded, at least for some speakers, and hence case stacking arises. We see then that universally it is not the case that a single NP cannot bear two morphological cases. What does seem to be prohibited universally is the morphological stacking of two structural cases.

Notes

*We would like to thank Kyungil University and Simon Fraser University for funding that allowed us to work together on this project. Also Gerdts' research was supported by a grant from the Social Sciences Humanities Research Council of Canada. We thank Inque Lee and Kyungsook Chung for their comments and suggestions.

[1]This bears obvious similarities to the case in tiers model of Yip et al.

[2]Note it is possible to have a clause with *Sooni* in DAT, as follows, but in this case, *sopho* 'parcel' not *Swuni* is the subject :

(i)	Swuni-eykey	sopho-ka	ponay-eci-ess-ta.
	S.-DAT	parcel-NOM	send-PAS-PS-IN
	'A parcel was sent to Sooni.'		

[3]We are only discussing S-case stacking in this paper. For a discussion of the stacking of two I-cases see Gerdts (1991) or Youn (1990, 1995).

[4]The postposition eykey is used for animates and ey for inanimates. See Youn (1996) for a discussion of other varieties of DAT case marking.

[5]Contraction is impossible in stacked forms such as *ey-ka, eykey-ka, eyse-lul, ey-;ol, ey-wa,* etc. We have encountered several speakers who use the contracted form *eykeyl* (*eykey+lul*) in sentences like:

(i) Ne-nun ku shayk-ul nwukwu-eykeyl cwu-ess-ni?
you-top the book-ACC who-DAT+ACC give-PS-QS
'Who did you give the book?'

[6]In addition, this contracted form can be used with contrastive focus, in which case the whole form takes special pitch.

References

Gerdts, Donna B. 1991. "An Outline of a Relational Theory of Case." In *Working Papers in Linguistics*, Vol. 1, pp. 25–53, Simon Fraser University

Gerdts, Donna B., and Cheong Youn. 1988. "Korean Psych Constructions: Advancement or Retreat?" *CLS* 24, pp. 155–175.

Gerdts, Donna B., and Cheong Youn. 1990. "Non-Nominative Subjects in Korean." *HSKL* III pp. 235–248.

O'Grady, William. 1991. *Categories and Case: The Sentence Structure of Korean.* John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Schütze, Carson, T. 1996. "Korean "Case Stacking" Isn't: Unifying Noncase Uses of Case Particles," *NELS 26*, 351-365.

Yip, Moira, Joan Maling, and Ray Jackendoff. 1987. "Case in Tiers." *Language* 63:2, 217–250.

Youn, Cheong. 1990. A Relational Analysis of Korean Multiple Nominative Constructions. Hanshin Publishing Company. Seoul.

Youn, Cheong. 1995. "A Relational Analysis of Case Stacking." Hyentaymwunpepyenkwu (Studies in Modern Grammatical Theories) 6, 121-147.

Youn, Cheong. 1996. "The Double Dative Case Ban in Korean." Hyentay-mwunpepyenkwu (Studies in Modern Grammatical Theories) 9, 97-117.

Department of Linguistics
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, BC V5A 1S6
Canada
e-mail: gerdts@sfu.ca

Department of English
Language and Literature
Kyungil University
Kyungsan, Korea 712-201
cyoun@bear.kyungil.ac.k