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1. Dative Subjects: Two Views[1].

Dative Subjects, that is, Dative marked nominals which exhibit properties otherwise limited to subjects, have been recognized in several languages and discussed in many frameworks. Among the syntactic proposals for Dative Subjects, two recent ones take directly opposite approaches. In Relational Grammar (e.g., Perlmutter 1984) the dative marked EXP(eriencer)s in psych constructions are treated as initial 1s which *retreat* to 3 as represented in (1); the subject properties of the EXP are captured by reference to notions of subject other than final 1 (e.g. Working 1 or Metastral 1).

(1)

In Government/Binding Theory (e.g., Belletti and Rizzi (1986)) EXPs are internal arguments of the verb at D-structure accounting for their DAT case, etc.; in some instances the EXP moves to subject position (see (2)), thus acquiring other subject properties such as preverbal word order.

(2)

Recent discussions of Dative Subjects usually take either (1) or (2) as a point of departure, depending on the framework adopted by the researcher. What we do here is contrast the two proposals with respect to Korean Psych constructions like those in (3)-(5):[2]

(3) Chelsu-eykey Suni-ka mopssi kili-wet-ta.
C.-DAT S. -NOM badly miss-pst-ind
'Chulsoo missed Sooni badly.'
Haksaeng-nil-sykey ton-i philyha-ta.
student-pl-DAT money-NOM need-ind
'The students need money.'

(5) Non-sykey mubak-l svi-wet-ta.
- -DAT math-NOM easy-PAT-ind
'Math was easy for Soomae.'

Some examples of the many predicates which appear with
DAT EXPs in Korean are listed in (6).

(6) Coh-
- 'like, prefer'
muep-'be afraid'
kayep-'be fearful'
keiyep-'be lovable'
ekil-'be pitiful'
pulap-'be anxious'
kwichanh- 'be annoying'
cumyoha- 'be important'
mip- 'hate'

These constructions are widely discussed in the
literature on Korean; nevertheless, the previously
attested properties of Korean Dative Subjects are
compatible with either the Retreat or Advancement
analyses, as section 2 demonstrates. Therefore, we
bring new evidence to bear on this problem in sections
3 and 4. This new evidence leads us to support the
Advancement analysis over the Retreat analysis for
Korean Dative Subjects.

We cast this discussion in RG since this framework
can allow either analyses, unlike GB where devices in
the grammar, including the 6-criterion, would prohibit
an analysis equivalent to (1).

The specific Advancement analysis we propose is
represented in stratal chart in (7); the initial
structure is unaccusative—the Theme is an initial 2
and the EXP is an initial OBL(lique); the EXP advances
to 3, placing the Theme en chomege, then advances to
1,(3,4)

(7) 2 OBL
CHI 2
CHI 1
(Theme) (EXP)

We justify this analysis in three ways. First, we
claim that case assignment under an advancement
analysis but not under a retreat analysis follows from
a previously proposed account of Korean case (Gerdes
(86)). Second, we give evidence for the chomege of
the Theme, a fact consistent with the advancement
analysis but not the retreat analysis. Finally, we
show in passing that, according to Yoon (in
preparation), there exist non-psycho constructions in
Korean which must also be treated as cases of OBL-2-1
and advancement; thus an advancement analysis of psycho
constructions is possible with no cost to the grammar.

Korean Dative Subjects have been discussed in many
frameworks (see Yang (1972), Chung (1980), Yoon (1985)
among others), the consensus being that there is much
evidence, as section 2.1 shows, that the EXP is a 1 at
some level and no evidence other than case, for its
final 3-hood, as section 2.2 discusses. However, as
section 2.3 shows, these results are compatible with
either a Retreat or an Advancement analysis; the
previously discussed properties of Korean Dative
Subjects are insufficient to decide between these
analyses.

2.1 Subject properties.
As typical in the cross-linguistic literature on
Dative Subjects, the experimenter in Korean shows a
variety of subject properties—even when it is DAT
marked. As discussed in Yoon (1985), it determines
subject Nominalization, antedates the reflexive casii,
and controls a PRO subject in a myneo construction as
seen in (8),(9)

(8) Mikukscin-i-myussec(to), apeci-sykey thongyakkwian-i
U.S. citizen be-although father-DAT interpreter-NOM
casii-ky seep-ttaksukey philyha-si-al-ta.
casii-father business for need-SH-ind
'Although PBD(1,3) is an American citizen,
father(1) needs an interpreter(3) for his(1,3) business.'

These properties are otherwise limited to subjects, or,
in some cases, possessors within subjects, as Yoon (in
preparation) discusses.(8)

2.2 Non-subject properties.
Other than Case marking, the only non-subject
property attributed to Dative Subjects by Yoon (1985)
is their inability to float quantifiers. Final 1 can
float quantifiers as seen in (9,10)

(9) Tu haksaeng-i ecore hakkyo-ey o-at-ta.
Two students case school-to come-PAT-ind
'Two students came to school yesterday.'

(10) Haksaeng-i ecore hakko-o ey dal-i o-at-ta.

In contrast, Dative Subjects cannot as *(10)' shows.
(10) Say aley-eykìt-iy seneoongmii-i
   child-DAT their-GEN teacher.NOM-NOM
   mae-veet-ta.
   afraid-pst-ind

(10') *Aley-eykìt-iy seneoongmii-i eeykìt-(eykìt)
   mae-veet-ta.

The three children were afraid of their teacher.'

However, if the nominals which float quantifiers
are delimited—not in terms of grammatical
relations—but in terms of surface case, as suggested
by Shibatani (1977), then the grammatical relation of
the Dative subject in *10' is irrelevant. (7)

2.3 Two analyses: Retreat vs. Advancement.

In sum, Korean Dative Subjects have properties
usually ascribed to monestral subjects in Korean
except for Dative case. This distribution of
properties is compatible with either a Retreat or an
Advancement analysis of Psych constructions.

2.3.1 Inversion and Working 1 in Korean.

Under a Retreat analysis, as represented in (11),
the Dative Subject is a final 1 and, like other final
3a in Korean, appears in the DAT(ive) case. The
subject properties of the nominal must be accounted for
by reference to notions of subject other than final 1,
since under this analysis the Dative Subject is a final
3—not a final 1.

One relevant notion is Working 1, as proposed by
Perlmutter (1984):

(11) A nominal is working 1 of clause b if and only if:
a. it heads a 1-arc with tail b, and
b. it heads a final 1-arc with tail b.

Youn (1985) points out that conditions on Subject
Nomorification and control of ERG in Dative
constructions can be stated in terms of Working 1.

A second notion—metastral 1—that is a nominal
which heads a 1-arc in any stratum could capture a
condition on the Reflexive Case. Youn (1985) shows
that case may be antecedent not only by a final 1 but,
in some cases, by the initial 1/final chooser in a
Passive, e.g. in (12).

(12) Kì ton-in Chelu-eyyphas cases-iy hang-ey
   'the money-top c. by self-GEN room-in
   kaechu-act-act-ta.
   hide-pas-pst-ind

The money was hidden by Chulsoo(1) in self(1)'s room.'

this generalization correctly predicts that Dative
subjects, since they are initial is under a Retreat
analysis, could also antecede again.

In summary, the Retreat analysis, by reference to
the notions Working 1, Metastral 1, and final 1 can
account for both the subject and non-subject properties
of the Dative Subject in Korean.

2.3.2 Advancements and 1-Case.

However, an Advancement analysis can also account
for these properties. Under this analysis, the Dative
Subject is an initial OBL which advances to 1, as
represented in (3). The subject properties of the
Dative Subject are straightforwardly accounted for
since this nominal is a final 1. Under this analysis
the conditions on Subject Nomorification and control of
pro are stated in terms of final 1, while antecedents
of case are metastral 1.

In contrast, that the Dative Subject is in the DAT
Case would be taken to be a property of its initial OBL
relation. The necessary case rule is discussed in
section 3.

2.3.3 Summary.

Thus, either the Retreat or Advancement analyses
can account for the split in properties of the Dative
Subject nominal, though both analyses require reference
to a non-final level of structure to do so. The table
in (13) summarizes the requirements of each analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Retreat</th>
<th>Advancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Nomorification/</td>
<td>working 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>control in</td>
<td>final 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chelu</td>
<td>metastral 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hang-ey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kaechu-act-act-ta.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hide-pas-pst-ind.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Case in Psych Constructions and Elsewhere.

The above discussion has focused on ERGs in Psych
constructions which appear in DAT case as in (14a)
however, these ERGs may be marked two other ways—NOM as
in (14b) and both DAT and NOM as in (14c); (15) gives a
further example of these three types of marking.[8]

(14) a. Haksaaeng-t'il-eykey ton-i philyoha-ta.
    student-pl-DAT money-NOM need-ind
b. Haksaaeng-t'il-i ton-i philyoha-ta.
    student-pl-NOM money-NOM need-ind
c. Haksaaeng-t'il-eykey-ka ton-i philyoha-ta.
    student-pl-DAT-NOM money-NOM need-ind
'The students need money.'

(15) Ki ai- eykey kae-ka muse-vet-ka
    the child-DAT dog-NOM be.afraid-of-pat-ind
    DAT-NOM
'The child was afraid of the dog.'

Whatever its case, the EXP is demonstrably a final 1.
For example, it determines Subject Honorific and
antecedes main in (16).

(16) Kim sanaengnig-i
    Kim teacher-NOM
    eykey-ka
    self-GEN child-pl-NOM
 'Prof. Kim's children.'

The challenge for each analysis is to account for
this array of case marking. We claim here that the
case rules already proposed for Korean in Gerds (ms.)
accommodate the various cases of the EXP, but only
under the Advancement Analysis. The Retreat Analysis,
as section 3.4 discusses, fails to account for the case
pattern in (14b).

3.1 s-case and I-case:
The relevant part of the Case Rule posited by
Gerds (ms.) is given in (17); two types of case are
distinguished—s-case and I-case; s-case is grammatical
case licensed in terms of final structure while I-case
is selected on the basis of the semantic role of the
nominal and licensed in initial structure.[9]

(17) Korean Case (partial):
a. S-case
   NOM is licensed by a final 1.
   ACC is licensed by a final 2.
b. I-case
   DAT is licensed by a goal, Exp, Loc, Ben, Temp, etc.
   INSTR is licensed by an Instr, Path, etc.
   CON is licensed by a Comitative).
The forms for the cases are given in (18).[10]

(18) s-case
   -i/-ka
   -i/-l'i
   -e
   -i
   -hwa/-wa
Each case in (19) is properly licensed since it
appears with a nominal with the appropriate grammatical
relation.

(19) Yengnu-ka
    Sanaeng-eykey sopo-11
    Y- NOM
    -DAT parcel-ACC
    hungkongphyen-410 ponae-ta.
    air.mail-INSTR send-pat-ind
    'Youngso sent the parcel to Soonil by airmail.'

3.2 i-case:
Returning now to case marking in Psych
constructions we see that N0M case is properly
licensed in (14b) since it appears with a nominal
which, under the Advancement analysis, is a final 1.
Furthermore, (14a) is also accounted for; since DAT
is properly licensed by the EXP, which is claimed to be an
initial OBL under the Advancement Analysis. We see
then that the Advancement Analysis together with (17)
makes the correct prediction that the EXP can be either
NOM or DAT.

DAT-marked EXPs follow under (17) since I-case
rules reference initial level. Gerds (ms.) motivates
this feature of (17) by showing cases of final is which
are nevertheless marked by I-case. Such nominals have
the career OBL-3/-2-1 in either Passives or initially
un accusative structures.

For example, Youn (in preparation) motivates
OBL-2-1 advancement for initially un accusative clauses
of the sort found in (20) and (21); these clauses are
represented in the stratal chart in (22).
Parallel to the EXP in Psych Constructions, the advance issues either I-CASE (i.e., DAT, INSTR, etc.) or F-CASE (i.e., NOM), thus motivating (24). Several arguments for the final 1-hood of the advances can be given; here we summarize two which are based on Subject Nomoration and Plural Copy. First, in cases where a final 1 is inanimate, it is possible for an inanimate possessor to determine $\text{subject}$ (Nomoration), for example, the final 1 of the Passeive in (23).

(23) Ezenin-iy elkul-e Yengasu-siyihs mother:"NOM-GEN face:"NOM 1-ey x4li-o'ul-si-et-ts. draw-pae-SH-pst-ind. 'Mother's face was drawn by Youngsoo.'

The possessor of the advances in (24) and (25) can also determine SH, regardless of the case of the advances, giving evidence for its final 1-hood.


(25) Senasangnim-iy meli-siye-ka melikhalak-1 teacher:"NOM-GEN head-from:"NOM hair-NOM ppoel-si-et-ts. fall-down-SH-pst-ind. 'Hair fell out of the teacher's head.'

Advancements of this sort are allowed in initially unaccusative clauses, but not in initially unergative clauses. Since there is no advancement in (26) and (27), the OBL is not a final 1 and so its possessor cannot determine SH.

(26) Senasangnim-iy elkul-e phali-ka teacher:"NOM-GEN face-DAT fly-NOM and=(+1l)-et-ts. sit=(SH)-pst-ind. 'A fly set on the teacher's face.'

(27) Halpect-ty Kwi-ey nok-ka grandfather:"NOM ear-DAT mosquito:"NOM tilek=(+1l)-et-ts. enter=(SH)-pst-ind. 'A mosquito entered grandfather's ear.'

Plural Copy (see Youn (in preparation)), where the plural marking of a subject is copied onto various non-subject elements, provides a second test for final 1-ood. For example, the plural marking of 1l in (28) may be copied onto the abstract nominal mul; in (29) where plural marking does not appear on 1l, it cannot appear on mul either.


The advances in OBL-2-1 constructions also allows Plural Copy, as seen in (30) and (31).

(30) I usan-t'ul-e-y/-i mul-t'ul-i manhi this umbrella-pl-DAT:"NOM water-pl-NOM much pae-pet-ts. permeate-pst-ind. 'Water really permeates these umbrellas.'

(31) I kongang-ty-si-ey/-i pul-t'ul-i na-t-ts. this factory-pl-DAT:"NOM fire-DAT break.pst-out ind. 'Fire broke out in these factories.'

In contrast, a DAT nominal which is not an advancee to 1l does not allow Plural Copy, as (32) shows.

(32) Chelsu-ka k4 pyenqen-t'ul-e manban c."NOM the hospital-pl-DAT much tom=(+1l)-e1 kicinahi-pet-ts. money=(PL)-ACC donate-pst-ind. 'Chelsu donated much money to the hospital.'

Thus, the evidence from Subject Nomoration and Plural Copy shows that an OBL can be a final 1 even when it appears in the DAT case. We see then that ExpS are not the only advancees which appear with I-Case. [11]
3.3 Case Stacking.

Under most views of Case (see for example, Chomsky (1981)), only one Case can be assigned to a nominal. (12) The Korean data, however, show that such a restriction is too strong. Gerstöf (ns.) shows that Korean needs the restriction in (33):

(33) A nominal can have at most one S-Case.

The restriction in (33) prohibits the co-occurrence of the S-cases NOM and ACC, hence the impossibility of the combination of cases in (34) and (35).

(34) haksunge -illi-1 -illi学生-ACC-NOM -NOM-ACC
(35) Chelso-ke(illi)-ka ocha-ey chi-4-et-ta.
C. -illi-NOM car-DAT hit-pst-pst-ind

'Chelsoo was hit by a car.'

However, (34) allows two types of co-occurrence of cases—referred to here as Case Stacking. First, more than one I-Case may appear on a nominal, as (36) and (37) show.


'Chelsoo threw the ball to(ward) Youngsoo.'

tanci-et-ta

throw-pst-ind

'Chelsoo threw the ball to(ward) Youngsoo and me.'

Second, both I-Case and S-Case can appear on a nominal. For example, DAT co-occurs with ACC in 3-2 and OBI-2 advancement constructions, as in (38) and (39) respectively: DAT and NOM co-occur in passives with 3-2-1 as in (40), in OBI-2-1 advancements as in (41), and in Psych constructions like (42) above.

(38) Chelso-ka Suni-eykey-lil cheak-il cu-et-ta.
C. NOM S. -DAT-ACC book-ACC give-pst-ind

'Chelso gave Youngil the book.'

K. teacher-NOM NOM 1-DAT-ACC go-3H-pst-ind

'Prof. Kim went to Seoul.'

(40) Suni-eykey-ka Chelso-eybyhse cheak-il cu-ecl-et-ta.
S. -DAT-NOM C.-by book-NOM give-pas-pst-ind

'Soonil was given the book by Chelsoo.'

In summary, the analysis for Korean case in Gerstöf (ns.) together with the Advance ment Analysis handles the three types of case marking of the EXP in (14a-c).

3.4 Case under the Retreat Analysis.

In contrast, case marking is problematic under the Retreat Analysis, since only two of the patterns are accommodated.

First, in order for DAT case to be taken as evidence for the final 3-hood of the EXP, the rule in (17) needs to be revised as in (45):

(45) S-case (final level)

NOM is licensed by a 1
ACC is licensed by a 2
DAT is licensed by a 3

I-Case (initial level)

DAT is licensed by a Loc, Den, Temp, etc.
INST is licensed by an Instr, Path, etc.
COD is licensed by a Comitative
According to (45), an initial 1 which retreats to 3 will necessarily appear in DAT case; thus (14b) is accounted for. Sentence (14b) where the EXP is NOM can be accounted for by positing a structure in which the EXP is the final 1, in other words, there is no retreat in (14b) as represented in (46), then the EXP is the initial/final 1 and hence NOM.

(46) 1 2 (EXP) (Theme)

Section 4 discusses this proposal further. However, data with Case Stacking as in (14c) are a dilemma. The Inversion Analysis would posit retreat, since the EXP is DAT, but then the EXP is not a final 1 and thus cannot license NOM case. Furthermore, the 1 is in an earlier stratum than the 3 yet the element (NOM case) apparently licensed by the 1 is outside the element (DAT case) licensed by the 3 contradicting the Satellite Principle (45). Therefore, the Retreat Analysis fails to account for Case Stacking in Psych constructions without some revisions to the case system.

4. The Theme.

So far we have focussed on the EXP in Psych constructions but an analysis of these constructions is not complete without some discussion of the other nominal: this nominal referred to as the Theme plays the semantic role of Stimulus of the psychological event. This section discusses the Theme, showing that its properties are more consistently treated under the Advance Analysis which posits that the Theme is a 2-choineur, having been placed en chonce by the advancement of the EXP from O(N) to 1 (cf. 7). Section 4.1 gives evidence for the grammatical relations of the Theme, section 4.2 discusses it with respect to the Inversion Analysis, and section 4.3 provides an explanation for its NOM case.

4.1 Relational Properties of the Theme.

The properties of the Theme lead us to conclude that it is an initial 2 but it is not a final 1, 1-choineur, or final 2; thus we infer that it is a final 2-choineur. We surmise that the Theme is an initial 2 due to the constraint on Korean ascensions in (47) justified in Gerunds (in preparation).

(47) An ascension host must head an initial 2 arc.

constraint (47) limits the hosts of Possessor ascension, Subject Raising, and Non-Subject Raising; the latter, argued for in Gerunds and Youn (to appear) is relevant here.

Many psychological predicates can take a clause Theme which has a PRO subject controlled by the EXP, as exemplified in (48).

(48) Yengeu-kwa/eoykey [i. chaeek-li ilk-ki-]/ka Y.-NOM/DAT this book-ACC read-3SG-NOM
swi-/mvwe/-ha/-tyuye/-cilcini/-cil-ye-wet-ta.

easy/simple/dreadful/disgusting/teelious/pst-ind.

'Youngso finds this book easy/simple/etc. to read.'

A non-subject in the clause Theme, for example chak in (49) and NAER in (50) may ascend to 2 in the upbeat clause, in which case, the ascended, like its Theme host, is marked NOM.

(49) Sansaengin-i/eoykey ki chaeek-ki/-1 teacher.NOM/NOM/-DAT the book-ACC/NOM
ilk-kei-ki-ka swi-usi-et-ta.
read-SHR-REP-NOM easy-MSC-pst-ind

'It is easy for the teacher to read the book.'

(50) Chulso-ka/-eoykey ce tyae-ey/-ka C. -NOM/-DAT that chair-LOC/-NOM
an-ki-ka euyep-ta.
sit-omp-NOM hard-ind

'It is hard for Chulsoo to sit in that chair.'

That the Theme can be the host of non-subject raising would follow from the assumption that it is an initial 2, given the condition on ascension hosts in (47).

Furthermore, Youn (1985) argues that the Theme is not a final 1; so, for example, it cannot determine Subject Honorificiation (see (51)) nor can it control a WhNOM construction (see (52)).

(51) Sunhi-eoykey/-ka yengeeonsaengin-i S. -DAT/-NOM English.teacher.NOM/NOM
phliyohä-(-eul-)/et-ta.
nead-MSC-pst-ind

'Soonhee needed an English teacher.'

(52) 1si1kxiion-mynasoo, zi-ti-i eoykey noisy-although child-pl-NOM mother.NOM/DAT
kii-usi-et-ta.
miss-MSC-pst-ind

'll! Although PRO(I/4) noisy, mother(I) misses children(J).'
level since it cannot anteced the reflexive *casin*, as (53) shows.

(53) Chelsu-aykey/ka Yensu-ka *casin-*ay calcev-
C.-DAT-ROM Y.-NOM self-GEN fault-
tasumay tuley-wet-ka.

'Chuleso(j) was afraid of Yensu(j) because of his(4,*j) fault.'

Finally, the Theme lacks two properties of final 2s. First, ACC not NOM is the case which appears on final 2s (cf. (17)). Second, final 2s can appear as Plain Topics (see Gerdes (to appear)), whereas chomeurs, at least in the judgment of some speakers, have only a constrative meaning when they appear as topics.

(54) Kae-nin emenin-i/eykey musu-uni-et-ka.

the dog-TOP mother.NOM-NOM/DAT afraid.of-BH-pst-ind

'The dog, mother is afraid of.'

(contrastive not plain topic)

This follows from the claim that the Theme is (54) is a
2-chomeur.

Since the Theme appears to have the properties of an initial 2, but not a final 1, 1-chomeur, or final 2, we can infer that its final relation is 2-chomeur, as posited under the Advancement Analysis (see (7)).

4.2 Inversion and the Theme.

In contrast, the chomeur of the Theme is a problem for the Retreat Analysis. Foon (1989) posits Inversion (where a Dummy enters as a 2 then advances to 1), as represented in (55), to account for the non-1-hood of the Theme; furthermore, the NOM case of the Theme could arise from brother-in-law case under (55) since the Theme is placed on chomeur by a final-1 dummy.

(55) 1 2
     3 2
     3 CHO 2
     3 CHO
     (EXP) (Theme) (D)

However, no retreat is posited when the EXP is marked NOM rather than DAT, thus it is predicted that the Theme is not in the final 2, as represented in (46), contradicting the data in (54), which show that the Theme is not a final 2 whether or not the EXP is in NOM or DAT case. Such data thus present a problem to the Inversion Analysis.

4.3 The Case of the Theme.

If the Theme is a final 2-chomeur, as claimed above, an explanation for its NOM case is necessary, since neither 2-chomeurs nor non-final 2s are potential licensors according to the Korean Case rule in (17). Again, Gerdes (ns.) gives such an explanation. Gerdes proposes that many instances of Case spread, where an S-Case appears on a nominal which does not license it, are best analyzed as examples of Lateral Feature Passing (LFP). Aissen (1987, to appear) develops this concept to accommodate cases of surrogate Agreement, where agreement is controlled by a nominal which is not a regular agreement controller in a language, and proposes the following limitation on LFP(17):

(56) Lateral Feature Passing Law: (Aissen 1987, p. 205)

If a passes its features to b, where a and b head nominal areas, then there are arcs A and B where a heads A and b heads B, and b overruns A.

Among other things, (56) allows a nominal to pass features to a nominal which it has placed on chomeur.

Gerdes (following a suggestion from Albert Bickford (personal communication)) makes use of LFP to account for the fact that 2-chomeurs in Korean may be marked ACC or NOM depending on the final relation of the nominal which has placed it on chomeur. Thus, the 2-chomeur in a 3-2 advancement clause (e.g. ((57a)) represented in ((57b)) is marked ACC, since it has been placed on chomeur by a nominal which is final 2, a nominal which licenses ACC case.

C.-NOM S.-ACC book-ACC give-pst-ind

'Chulsu gave Sooni a book.'

b. 1 2 3
   1 CHO 2
   3 (Chelsu) (chaeek) (Suni)

In contrast, the 2-chomeur in a 3-2-1 advancement construction (e.g. (58a) represented in (58b)) is marked NOM: it has been placed on chomeur by the advances which, since it is a final 1, licenses NOM case.
The case of the Theme is also accounted for under this view of Case Spread. The Theme is placed en chonmage by the EXP which, under the Advancement Analysis, is the final 1 (see (7)). The final 1 nominal passes its ability to license NOM Case to the Theme in accordance with the Feature Passing Law.

5. Conclusion.

To conclude, we see that the Advancement Analysis of Korean Psych constructions can be positioned as no tax to the grammar. All aspects of this analysis are needed elsewhere in the analysis of Korean: Unaccusatives, OBL advancements, I-Case/S-Case alternations, I-Case and S-Case stacking, and Case Spread. Furthermore, Unaccusatives and OBL advancements are well-activated cross-linguistically and Gerds (ms.) gives a cross-linguistic justification for I-Case, Case Stacking, and Case Spread.

In contrast, the Retreat Analysis requires several additional concepts not otherwise needed in the grammar of Korean: Inversion, Working 1, and Dummies (since Impersonal Inversion is possible). However, even with these additional concepts the Retreat Analysis still has difficulty accounting for the case marking of the EXP and the Theme and the apparent chonmage of the Theme in double NOM Psych constructions.

We conclude that Advancement—not Retreat—is the preferred analysis of Korean Psych constructions. We suggest that the cross-linguistic evidence for Inversion (and perhaps Retreats in general) should be re-evaluated in light of our conclusion here. This result does not distinguish between theories, since both Relational Grammar and Government Binding allow some version of Advancement. However, our analysis, which makes crucial use of the concepts Unaccusative and Chomsky’s Supports HO, since these concepts were originally proposed in that theory.

Notes:
[1] We would like to thank Mahasane Abdoulaye, Yiehyowing-Chae, Martin Happehietz, Non Ho Kie, Sungki Park, Yongsma Lee for grammatical judgments, questions, and comments on an earlier version of this paper though we are responsible, of course, for any errors or shortcomings in this paper.
[2] The following abbreviations are used in the glosses of the Korean data: ADD complementizer, NOM nominal, INH indicative, PAS passive, PL plural, DX present, DS lexical passive, SAS past, SH subject honorific, DNS topic.
[3] Although we have posited here that the EXP is an initial OBL, an analysis positing initial 3-hood is also possible; the discussion is unaffected by this choice.

Some preliminary research on the honorific form of the DAT key has determined that, for some speakers, keye can be used with 3s but not EXPs (see also Chung (1980)), leading us to the assumption that EXPs are not 3S.


Chelsu gave the book to the teacher.


The teacher needed money.

Given the Obligee Law (Perlisheet and Pastel 1983), which stipulates that, if a nominal heads an OBL arc it does so at the initial level, an analysis which involves retreat to OBL is impossible.

[4] Assignment of initial relations in psych constructions seems to be subject to cross-linguistic variation. Under this proposal, the EXP is an initial OBL while the Theme, semantically the Stimulus, is an initial 2. Thus, the initial relations in Korean differ from Balkemeem (see Gerds (1981)) where the EXP is assigned the initial 2 relation while the Stimulus is an OBL (Gerds call it a ‘Causal’).

[5] We do not use data with the more commonly and naturally occurring reflexive CAU, since this form may have a non-subject antecedent.

[6] This condition on these rules is really very complicated as Youm (in preparation) discusses. Subject Honorific, as exemplified, section 3.1 may also be determined by the inalienable Possessor with the 1. The reflexive CASI can be antecedent by a
Possessor within a 1 as long as the head is inanimate.


[8] We were unable to find a meaningful difference between these sentences, other than the fact that a NOM marked nominal can have an exhaustive listing reading. While we have found no speakers that do not accept examples like (14b), we have encountered a few speakers who dislike ones like (14a), though examples of this sort are quite common in the literature. Case Stacking as in (14c), which is in general a more marginal phenomenon, is described in Kim (1970).

[9] The division of case into these two types is an approach taken in many theories. It is well motivated in Korean (as many scholars note) since S-Case and I-Case differ in many respects. For example, S-Case can be # as in (i) while I-Case cannot as (ii) shows:

(i) Chelsu-ka Suni -sil/ pe-ot-ta.
    C. -NOM S. -ACC/# see-pst-ind
    'Chulsoo saw Sooni.'

(ii) Ki sopho-ka hangkonghyen-i/ro/9
    the-NOM see-mail-DAT/#
    pone-ni-ct-ta.
    send-pas-pst-ind
    'The parcel was sent by airmail.'

Also, delimiters such as kkaci, pace, and cocha, appear before S-Case but appear after I-Case, as (iii) and (iv) show.

(iii) a. Insu - (kkaci -ka) kaki-eye ka-t-ta.
    pace -NOM there-DAT go-pst-ind
    cocha
even

b. *Insu-ka - (kkaci eye) kaki-eye ka-t-ta.
    pace
even

'Even Insoo went there.'

(iv) a. Chelsu-ka /kkaci-ekey semmul-i/1
    C. -NOM ex-wife pace -DAT present-ACC
    cocha
    cu-ct-ta.
    give-pst-ind

    pace
    'Chulsoo gave even his ex-wife a present.'

Gerdt (in preparation) also discusses two other types of flagging-complex postposition (e.g., SV byhasse 'by' and my kvanhasse 'about') and Topic markers

(1) a. Sgi hjalsp/1 honum. (Icelandic)
    I helped him(D)

b. Vel var hjalsp/9.
    then(D) was helped

Thaely resembles (14a). However, as Gerdt (ms.) discusses, Icelandic differs in a crucial respect: NOM is not possible in (39b) thus there is no Icelandic parallel to (14b).

[10] Where there are pairs of forms, the first appears following consonants and the second following vowels.

[11] This situation, where a final 1 advances appears in a non-nominative case, is not unique to Korean. For example, Zaanen, et al. (1985) discuss 'Quirky Case' in Icelandic and German: when an initial 1 is assigned an idiosyncratic case like DAT in (39a), this case also appears on the advances in a passive like (1).

(1) a. Sgi hjalsp/1 honum. (Icelandic)
    I helped him(D)

b. Vel var hjalsp/9.
    then(D) was helped

Thus, (39b) resembles (14a). However, as Gerdt (ms.) discusses, Icelandic differs in a crucial respect: NOM is not possible in (39b) thus there is no Icelandic parallel to (14b).

Zaanen, et al. offer the following explanation: DAT case on a final 1 is assigned by a language specific rule, but while NOM on a final 1 is assigned by a universal rule, and language specific rules take priority over universal rules. This solution will not carry over to Korean, since (14b) is possible. See Gerdt (ms.) for discussion.

[12] There are two notable exceptions to this position. Lefebvre and Muytken (1982) claim on the basis of Quechua 'raising' data that structural case must be assigned whenever its description is met. Balletti (1988) claims that there are cases, e.g. quirky case in Icelandic (see footnote 11) which can be taken as instances of inherent case combining with structural case, though this is not morphologically realized on a single nominal. Korean Case Stacking, since both I-Case and S-Case can be morphologically manifested, is more interesting in this regard.

Furthermore, Balletti suggests that the inherently marked subject can pass its structural case to another

[13] This is a revised formulation. The principle is intended to constrain grammatical elements, of all types, nominal as well as verbal morphology, affixes as well as freer forms (clitics, particles). Although the Satellite Principle may be systematically violated in some languages, this principle is necessary in Korean.
as evidenced by other aspects of the morphosyntax. See Gerdtz (in preparation) for support of this claim.

Formal definitions of the terms 'grammatical element', 'earlier' and 'inside', of course, are necessary to make this principle precise.

(14) Of course, a case rule like (17) could be posited under the Retrace Analysis. The XP may be marked with its semantic or its final relation, or both. In that order. Although this view saves the Retrace analysis with respect to Case, it also makes the simple piece of evidence for Retrace in Korean disappear.

(15) An alternative which proposes that the NOM case in (14) is a topic marker rather than a 0-Case marker would fail to explain the fact that DAT-marked final 3s do not allow Case Stacking, as (1) shows:

(1) **Chalsu-euky-e-k-ka Suni-k-chaek-1l cu-at-ta.
C.-DAT-NOM 3-NOM book-ACC give-pas-t-ind
'To Chulseo, Sooni gave the book.'**

(16) In a simple clause, the theme in Psych constructions like those discussed here cannot appear in the ACC, as (1) shows:

(1) ***Haksaeng-tt-eyeky-e-l ton-i/*-41 phiulyoa-ta.
student-pl-DAT/*-NOM money-NOM/*-ACC need-ind
'The students need money.'**

(17) See Aissen (1987) and references therein for a definition of 'overrun'.
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