



- (4) Haksaeng-til-eykey ton-i philyoha-ta.  
 student-pl-DAT money-NOM need-ind  
 'The students need money.'
- (5) Sunae-eykey suhak-i swi-wet-ta.  
 S. -DAT math-NOM easy-pst-ind  
 'Math was easy for Soonea.'

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

- (6) coh- 'like, prefer' musep- 'be afraid'  
 tulyep- 'be fearful' kwiyeop- 'be lovable'  
 kayep- 'be pitiful' silh- 'dislike'  
 pulep- 'be envious' kwichanh- 'be annoying'  
 cungyoha- '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  $\theta$ -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(ique); the EXP advances to 2, placing the Theme en chomage, then advances to 1.[3,4]

- (7) 2 OBL  
 CHO 2  
 CHO 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 (Gerdt's (ms.)). Second, we give evidence for the chomage of the Theme, a fact consistent with the advancement analysis but not the retreat analysis. Finally, we show in passing that, according to Youn (in preparation), there exist non-psych constructions in Korean which must also be treated as cases of OBL-2-1

advancement; thus an advancement analysis of psych constructions is possible with no cost to the grammar.

## 2. Korean Dative Subjects: An Overview.

Korean Dative Subjects have been discussed in many frameworks (see Yang (1972), Chung (1980), Youn (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 experiencer in Korean shows a variety of subject properties--even when it is DAT marked. As discussed in Youn (1985), it determines Subject Honorification, antecedes the reflexive *casin*, and controls a PRO subject in a *myense* construction as seen in (8).[5]

- (8) Mikuksimin-i-myense(to), apeci-eykey thongyekkwan-i  
 U.S. citizen-be-although father-DAT interpreter-NOM  
 casin-iy saep-ttaemuney philyoha-si-ta.  
 self-GEN business-for need-SH-ind  
 'Although PRO(i,\*j) is an American citizen,  
 Father(i) needs an interpreter(j) for his(i,\*j) business.'

These properties are otherwise limited to subjects, or, in some cases, possessors within subjects, as Youn (in preparation) discusses.[6]

### 2.2 Non-subject properties.

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

- (9) Tu haksang-i ecey hakkyo-ey o-at-ta.  
 2 student-NOM yesterday school-to come-pst-ind  
 'Two students came to school yesterday.'
- (9') Haksang-i ecey hakkyo-ey tu(-i) o-at-ta.

In contrast, Dative Subjects cannot as \*(10') shows.

- (10) Se ai-eykey kitil-iy sensaengnim-i  
3 child-DAT their-GEN teacher.HON-NOM  
muse-wet-ta.  
afraid-pst-ind  
'The three children were afraid of their teacher.'
- (10') \*Ai-eykey kitil-iy sensaengnim-i seys-(eykey)  
muse-wet-ta.

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 monostratal 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 1s in Korean.

Under a Retreat analysis, as represented in (1), the Dative Subject is a final 3 and, like other final 3s 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 a working 1 of clause b if and only if:  
a. it heads a 1-arc with tail b, and  
b. it heads a final term arc with tail b.

Youn (1985) points out that conditions on Subject Honorification and control of PRO in myense constructions can be stated in terms of Working 1.

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

- (12) Ki ton-in Chelsu-eyiyhae casin-iy pang-ey  
the money-TOP C. -by self-GEN room-in  
kamchu-eci-et-ta.  
hide-pas-pst-ind  
'The money was hidden by Chulsoo(i) in self(i)'s room.'

This generalization correctly predicts that Dative Subjects, since they are initial 1s under a Retreat analysis, could also antecede casin.

In summary, the Retreat analysis, by reference to the notions Working 1, Metastratal 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 I-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 Honorification and control of PRO are stated in terms of final 1s, while antecedents of casin are metastratal 1s.

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.

(13)

	Retreat	Advancement
Subject Honorification/control in <u>myense</u>	working 1	final 1
antecedent of <u>casin</u>	metastratal 1	metastratal 1
DAT Case	final 3	initial OBL

### 3. Case in Psych Constructions and Elsewhere.

The above discussion has focussed on EXPs in Psych constructions which appear in DAT case as in (14a); however, these EXPs 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. Haksaeng-til-eykey ton-i philyoha-ta.  
 student-pl-DAT money-NOM need-ind  
 b. Haksaeng-til-i ton-i philyoha-ta.  
 student-pl-NOM money-NOM need-ind  
 c. Haksaeng-til-eykey-ka ton-i philyoha-ta.  
 student-pl-DAT-NOM money-NOM need-ind  
 'The students need money.'
- (15) Kì ai- { eykey kae-ka muse-wet-ta  
           ka  
           eykey-ka  
 the child- { DAT dog-NOM be.afraid.of-pst-ind  
               NOM  
               DAT-NOM  
 'The child was afraid of the dog.'

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

- (16) Kim sensaengnim- { eykey  
                           i casin-iy ai-til-i  
 Kim teacher.HON- { eykey-ka  
                           DAT self-GEN child-pl-NOM  
                           NOM  
                           DAT-NOM  
 kili-usi-et-ta.  
 miss-SH-pst-ind  
 'Prof. Kim missed self'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 Gerdts (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 (14c).

### 3.1 S-Case and I-Case.

The relevant part of the Case Rule posited by Gerdts (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.  
 COM is licensed by a Com(itative).

The forms for the cases are given in (18).[10]

- |      |       |                                       |
|------|-------|---------------------------------------|
| (18) | NOM   | -i/-ka                                |
|      | ACC   | -il/-lil                              |
|      | DAT   | -eykey (animates)<br>-ey (inanimates) |
|      | INSTR | -ilo/-lo                              |
|      | COM   | -kwa/-wa                              |

Each case in (19) is properly licensed since it appears with a nominal with the appropriate grammatical relation.

- (19) Yengsu-ka Suni-eykey sopho-lil  
 Y.-NOM S.-DAT parcel-ACC  
 hangkongphyen-ilo ponae-t-ta.  
 air.mail-INST send-pst-ind  
 'Youngsoo sent the parcel to Soonie by airmail.'

### 3.2 I-Case.

Returning now to case marking in Psych constructions, we see that NOM 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. Gerdts (ms.) motivates this feature of (17) by showing cases of Final 1s which are nevertheless marked by I-Case. Such nominals have the career OBL/3-2-1 in either Passives or initially unaccusative structures.

For example, Youn (in preparation) motivates OBL-2-1 advancement for initially unaccusative clauses of the sort found in (20) and (21); these clauses are represented in the stratal chart in (22).

- (20) I kongcang-ey/-i pul-i na-t-ta.  
this factory-DAT/-NOM fire-NOM break.out-pst-ind  
'Fire broke out in this factory.'
- (21) I theyleybi-ey/-ka menci-ka kki-et-ta.  
this T.V. -DAT/-NOM dust-NOM collect-pst-ind  
'Dust collected on this T.V.'
- (22) 2 OBL  
CHO 2  
CHO 1  
(Theme) (Loc)

Parallel to the EXP in Psych Constructions, the advancee licenses either I-CASE (i.e., DAT, INSTR, etc.) or S-CASE (i.e., NOM), thus motivating (14).

Several arguments for the final 1-hood of the advancee can be given; here we summarize two which are based on Subject Honorification and Plural Copy. First, in cases where a final 1 is inanimate, it is possible for an inalienable possessor to determine S(ubject) H(onorification), for example, the final 1 of the Passive in (23).

- (23) Emenim-iy elkul-i Yengsu-eyiyhae  
mother.HON-GEN face-NOM Y.-by  
kili-eci-si-et-ta.  
draw-pas-SH-pst-ind  
'Mother's face was drawn by Youngsoo.'

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

- (24) Sensaengnim-iy elkul-ey/-i sangche-ka  
teacher.HON-GEN face-DAT/-NOM mark-NOM  
saengki-si-et-ta.  
appear-SH-et-ta.  
'A mark appeared on the teacher's face.'
- (25) Sensaengnim-iy meli-eyse/-ka melikhalak-i  
teacher.HON-GEN head-from/-NOM hair-NOM  
ppaci-si-et-ta.  
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) Sensaengnim-iy elkul-ey phali-ka  
teacher.HON-GEN face-DAT fly-NOM  
anc-(\*si)-at-ta.  
sit-(\*SH)-pst-ind  
'A fly sat on the teacher's face.'
- (27) Halapeci-iy kwi-ey moki-ka  
grandfather-GEN ear-DAT mosquito-NOM  
tileka-(\*si)-t-ta.  
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-hood. For example, the plural marking of ai in (28) may be copied onto the abstract nominal mul; in (29) where plural marking does not appear on ai, it cannot appear on mul either.

- (28) Ai-til-i mul-til-il masi-et-ta.  
child-pl-NOM water-pl-ACC drink-pst-ind  
'The children drank water.'
- (29) Ai-ka mul-(\*til)-il masi-et-ta.  
child-NOM water-(\*pl)-ACC water-pst-ind  
'The children drank water.'

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

- (30) I usan-til-ey/-i mul-til-i manhi  
this umbrella-pl-DAT/-NOM water-pl-NOM much  
pae-n-ta.  
permeate-pr-ind  
'Water really permeates these umbrellas.'
- (31) I kongcang-til-ey/-i pul-til-i na-t-ta.  
this factory-pl-DAT/-NOM fire-NOM break.out-pst-ind  
'Fire broke out in these factories.'

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

- (32) Chelsu-ka ki pyengwen-til-ey manhin  
C.-NOM the hospital-pl-DAT much  
ton-(\*til)-il kicingha-yet-ta.  
money-(\*pl)-ACC donate-pst-ind  
'Chelsu donated much money to the hospitals.'

Thus, the evidence from Subject Honorification 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. Gerdts (ms.) 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) \*haksaeng -lil-i/ -i-lil  
student-ACC-NOM/ -NOM-ACC  
(35) Chelsu-(\*lil)-ka cha-ey chi-i-et-ta.  
C. -(ACC)-NOM car-DAT hit-ps-pst-ind  
'Chulsoo 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.

- (36) Chelsu-ka Yengsu-eykey-lo kong-il tenci-et-ta.  
C.-NOM Y.-DAT-INST ball-ACC throw-pst-ind  
'Chulsoo threw the ball to(ward) Youngsoo.'  
(37) Chelsu-ka Yengsu-eykey-lo-wa na-eykey-lo kong-il  
C.-NOM Y. DAT-INST-COM I-DAT-INST ball-ACC  
tenci-et-ta  
throw-pst-ind  
'Chulsoo threw the ball to(ward) Yengsu 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 OBL-2 advancement constructions, as in (38) and (39) respectively; DAT and NOM co-occur in passives with 3-2-1 as in (40), in OBL-2-1 advancements as in (41), and in Psych constructions like (42) above.

- (38) Chelsu-ka Suni-eykey-lil chaek-il cu-et-ta.  
C. NOM S. -DAT-ACC book-ACC give-pst-ind  
'Chulsoo gave Soonie the book.'  
(39) Kim-sensaengnim-i Seul-ey-lil ka-si-et-ta.  
K.-teacher.HON-NOM Seoul-DAT-ACC go-SH-pst-ind  
'Prof. Kim went to Seoul.'  
(40) Suni-eykey-ka Chelsu-eyiyhae chaek-i cu-eci-et-ta.  
S. -DAT-NOM C.-by book-NOM give-pas-pst-ind  
'Soonie was given the book by Chelsu.'

- (41) I kongcang-ey-ka pul-i na-t-ta.  
this factory-DAT-NOM fire-NOM break.out-pst-ind  
'Fire broke out in this factory.'  
(42) Haksaeng-til-eykey-ka ton-i philyoha-ta.  
student-pl-NOM-DAT money-NOM need-ind  
'Students need money.'

The Case Rule in (17) together with the restriction in (33) accounts for case in (38)-(42). The I-Case DAT is properly licensed since each of the nominals is an initial OBL with an appropriate semantic role. The S-Cases ACC or NOM are licensed since the nominal is a final 2 or 1. Since (38)-(42) have only one S-Case, they are allowed by (33).

Furthermore, a principle of linearization of grammatical elements, the Satellite Principle (Gerdts (1981)), given informally in (43), assures that the cases in (38)-(42) appear in that order. [13]

- (43) If an element A is licensed in an earlier stratum than element B, then A appears inside B.

Since I-Case is determined in the initial stratum while S-Case is determined in the final stratum, (43) requires I-Case to precede S-Case. This prediction is correct as seen by comparing (42) to \*(44).

- (44) \*Haksaeng-til-i-eykey ton-i philyoha-ta.  
student-pl-NOM-DAT money-NOM need-ind  
'Students need money.'

In summary, the analysis for Korean case in Gerdts (ms.) together with the Advancement 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): [14]

- (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, Ben, Temp, etc.  
INSTR is licensed by an Instr, Path, etc.  
COM is licensed by a Comitative

According to (45), an initial 1 which retreats to 3 will necessarily appear in DAT case; thus (14a) 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 (43). Therefore, the Retreat Analysis fails to account for Case Stacking in Psych constructions without some revisions to the case system. [15]

#### 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 Advancement Analysis which posits that the Theme is a 2-chomeur, having been placed en chomage by the advancement of the EXP from OBL-2-1 (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-chomeur, or final 2; thus we infer that it is a final 2-chomeur.

We surmise that the Theme is an initial 2 due to the constraint on Korean ascensions in (47) justified in Gerdts (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 Gerdts and Youn (to appear) is relevant here.

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

(48) Yengsu-ka/eykey [i chaek-ɪl ilk-ki-]ka  
Y.-NOM/DAT this book-ACC read-cmp-NOM  
swi-/suwelha-/tulye-/cincelmelina-/cikye-wet-ta.  
easy/simple/dreadful/disgusting/tedious/-pst-ind  
'Yongsu finds this book easy/simple/etc. to read.'

A non-subject in the clausal Theme, for example chaek in (49) and iyca in (50) may ascend to 2 in the upstairs clause, in which case, the ascende, like its Theme host, is marked NOM.

(49) Sensaengnim-i/eykey kɪ chaek-ɪl/-i  
teacher.HON-NOM/-DAT the book-ACC/NOM  
ilk-isi-ki-ka swi-usi-et-ta.  
read-SH-cmp-NOM easy-SH-pst-ind  
'It is easy for the teacher to read the book.'

(50) Chelsu-ka/-eykey ce iyca-ey/-ka  
C. -NOM/-DAT that chair-LOC/-NOM  
an-ki-ka elyep-ta.  
sit-cmp-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 Honorification (see (51)) nor can it control a myense construction (see (52)).

(51) Sunhi-eykey/-ka yengesensaengnim-i  
S. -DAT/-NOM English.teacher.HON-NOM  
philyoha-(\*si)-et-ta.  
need-\*SH-pst-ind  
'Soonhee needed an English teacher.'

(52) !!Sikkɪleu-myenseto, ai-tɪl-i emenim-eykey  
noisy-although child-pl-NOM mother.HON-DAT  
kɪli-usi-et-ta.  
miss-SH-pst-ind  
!!'Although PRO(i/\*j) noisy, mother(i) misses children(j).'

In fact, Youn shows that the Theme is not a 1 at any

level since it cannot antecede the reflexive casin, as (53) shows.

- (53) Chelsu-eykey/ka Yengsu-ka casin-iy calmos-  
 C.-DAT-NOM Y.-NOM self-GEN fault-  
 ttaemuney tulyep-wet-ta.  
 because afraid-pst-ind  
 'Chulsoo(i) was afraid of Yengsu(j) because of  
 his(i,\*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)). [16] Second, final 2s can appear as Plain Topics (see Gerdt's (to appear)), whereas chomeurs, at least in the judgment of some speakers, have only a contrastive meaning when they appear as topics.

- (54) Ki kae-nin emenim-i/eykey muse-usi-et-ta.  
 the dog-TOP mother.HON-NOM/DAT afraid.of-SH-pst-ind  
 'The dog, mother is afraid of.'  
 (contrastive not plain topic)

This follows from the claim that the Theme in (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 chomage of the Theme is a problem for the Retreat Analysis. Youn (1985) posits Impersonal 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 en chomage by a final-1 dummy.

- (55)
- |       |         |     |
|-------|---------|-----|
| 1     | 2       |     |
| 3     | 2       |     |
| 3     | CHO     | 2   |
| 3     | CHO     | 1   |
| (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 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, Gerdt's (ms.) gives such an explanation.

Gerdt's 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 arcs, 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 en chomage.

Gerdt's (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 en chomage. Thus, the 2-chomeur in a 3-2 advancement clause (e.g. ((57)a)) represented in ((57)b)) is marked ACC, since it has been placed en chomage by a nominal which is a final 2, a nominal which licenses ACC case.

- ((57)) a. Chelsu-ka Suni-lil chaek-il cu-et-ta.  
 C.-NOM S.-ACC book-ACC give-pst-ind  
 'Chulsoo gave Soonie a book.'

- b.
- |          |         |         |
|----------|---------|---------|
| 1        | 2       | 3       |
| 1        | CHO     | 2       |
| (Chelsu) | (chaek) | (Sunie) |

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 en chomage by the advancee which, since it is a final 1, licenses NOM case.



(58) a. I    sensaengnim-i   haksaeng-til-eyiyhae  
           this teacher.HON-NOM student-pl-by  
           chaek-i   cu-eci-si-et-ta.  
           book-NOM give-pas-SH-pst-ind  
           'This teacher was given a book by the students.'

b.       1           2           3  
           1           CHO       2  
           CHO        CHO       1  
           (haksaeng) (chaek) (sensaengnim)

The case of the Theme is also accounted for under this view of Case Spread. The Theme is placed en chomage 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 then that the Advancement Analysis of Korean Psych constructions can be posited at no cost 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-motivated cross-linguistically and Gerdts (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 posited). 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 chomage 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 chomeur, supports RG, since these concepts were originally proposed in that theory.

#### Notes.

[1]We would like to thank Mahamane Abdoulaye, Yiehyoung Chae, Martin Haspelmath, Won Ho Kim, Sungki Suh, Yongnam Um for grammaticality 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: cmp complementizer, HON honorific, ind indicative, pas passive, pl plural, pr present, ps lexical passive, pst past, SH subject honorification, TOP 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 kkey has determined that, for some speakers, kkey can be used with 3s but not EXPs (see also Chung (1980)), leading us to the assumption that EXPs are not 3s.

- (i) Chelsu-ka   sensaengnim-kkey   chaek-il  
       C.-NOM   teacher.HON-DAT.HON book-ACC  
       tili-et-ta.  
       give.HON-pst-ind  
       'Chelsu gave the book to the teacher.'
- (ii) %Sensaengnim-kkey   ton-i   philyoha-si-et-ta.  
       teacher-DAT.HON   money-NOM need-SH-pst-ind  
       'The teacher needed money.'

Given the Oblique Law (Perlmutter and Postal 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 Halkomelem (see Gerdts (1981)) where the EXP is assigned the initial 2 relation while the Stimulus is an OBL (Gerdts call it a 'Causal').

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

[6]The condition on these rules is really very complicated as Youn (in preparation) discusses. Subject Honorification, as exemplified, section 3.2 may also be determined by the inalienable Possessor with the 1.. The reflexive casin can be anteceded by a

Possessor within a 1 as long as the head is inanimate.

[7]See Gerdts (1987) for a discussion of and counter-proposal to Shibatani (1977).

[8]We were unable to find a meaning 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  $\emptyset$  as in (i) while I-Case cannot as (ii) shows:

- (i) Chelsu-ka Suni -lil/ $\emptyset$  po-at-ta.  
C. -NOM S. -ACC/ $\emptyset$  see-pst-ind  
'Chulsoo saw Sooni.'
- (ii) Ki sopho-ka hangkongphyen-ilo/\* $\emptyset$   
the parcel-NOM air.mail-INST/\* $\emptyset$   
ponae-ci-et-ta.  
send-pas-pst-ind  
'The parcel was sent by airmail.'

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

- (iii) a. Insu - {kkaci -ka      keki-ey      ka-t-ta.  
I.            {mace -NOM      there-DAT      go-pst-ind  
                  {cocha  
                  even
- b. \*Insu-ka- {kkaci      keki-ey      ka-t-ta.  
                  {mace  
                  {cocha  
'Even Insoo went there.'
- (iv) a. \*Chelsu-ka cenche- {kkaci-eykey senmul-il  
C.-NOM      ex-wife- {mace -DAT      present-ACC  
                                  {cocha  
                                  even  
cu-et-ta.  
give-pst-ind
- b. Chelsu-ka cenche- eykey- {kkaci senmul-il cu-et-ta.  
                                  {mace  
                                  {cocha  
'Chulsoo gave even his ex-wife a present.'

Gerdts (in preparation) also discusses two other types of flagging--complex postpositions (e.g., ey iyhaese 'by' and ey kwanhaese 'about') and Topic markers

(-nin, -i/-ka).

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

[11]This situation, where a final 1 advancee appears in a non-nominative case, is not unique to Korean. For example, Zaenen, et al. (1985) discuss 'Quirky Case' in Icelandic and German; when an initial 2 is assigned an idiosyncratic case like DAT in (39a), this case also appears on the advancee in a passive like (i).

- (i) a. Ég hjalpaði honum. (Icelandic)  
I helped him(D)  
b. þeim var hjalpað.  
them(D) was helped

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

Zaenen, 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 Gerdts (ms.) for discussion.

[12]There are two notable exceptions to this position. Lefebvre and Muysken (1982) claim on the basis of Quechua 'Raising' data that structural case must be assigned whenever its description is met. Belletti (1988) claims that there are case, 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, Belletti suggests that the inherently marked subject can pass its structural case to another nominal. This is the Government/Binding equivalent of the phenomena Gerdts (ms.) discusses as Case Spread under a relational treatment. (See section 4.3.)

[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 Gerdts (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 Retreat Analysis. The EXP could be marked with for its semantics or its final relation, or both, in that order. Although this view saves the Retreat analysis with respect to Case, it also makes the single piece of evidence for Retreat in Korean disappear.

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

- (i) \*Chelsu-eykey-ka Suni-ka chaek-il cu-et-ta.  
C. -DAT-NOM S.-NOM book-ACC give-pst-ind  
'To Chulsoo, Sooni gave the book.'

[16]In a simple clause, the Theme in Psych constructions like those discussed here cannot appear in the ACC, as (i) shows.

- (i) Haksaeng-til-eykey/-i ton-i/\*-il philyoha-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'.

#### References.

- Aissen, Judith L. (1987) Tzotzil Clause Structure. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Aissen, Judith L. (to appear) Toward a Theory of Agreement Controllers. in Postal and Joseph (eds.).
- Belleti, Adriana, (1988) The Case of Unaccusatives. Linguistic Inquiry 19:1, 1-34.
- Belleti, Adriana, and Luigi Rizzi (1986) Psych-Verbs and Th-Theory. Lexicon Project Working Papers 13. MIT. (to appear in NLLT).
- Chomsky, Noam. (1981) Lectures on Government and Binding. Foris: Dordrecht.
- Chung, In Sang. (1980). Hyentaekueiky cueey taehan yenku. (A study of Subject in Modern Korean.) Kukeyenku. (Studies in Korean). 44.
- Gerdts, Donna B. (1981). Object and Absolutive in Halkomelem Salish. UCSD Dissertation.
- Gerdts, Donna B. (1987). Surface Case and Grammatical Relations in Korean: The Evidence from Quantifier Float. Studies in Language 11.1, 181-197.
- Gerdts, Donna B. (to appear) Ravaluation and Inheritance in Korean Causative Union. in Postal and Joseph (eds.).
- Gerdts, Donna B. (ms.) A Relational Theory of Case. State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Gerdts, Donna B. (in preparation) Korean Morphosyntax: A Relational Analysis.
- Gerdts, Donna B. and Cheong Youn. (to appear) An Inversion Analysis of Korean Tough Constructions. in Papers from the 1987 Harvard Workshop in Korean Linguistics.
- Kim, Min-Soo. (1970). Kukeiy kyekey taehaye (On Case in Korean). Kukekumunhak (The Korean Language and Literature), 49/50, 337-57.
- Lefebvre, Claire, and Pieter Muysken. (1982) Raising as Move Case. Linguistic Review 2:161-210.
- Perlmutter, David M. (1984) Working 1s and Inversion in Italian, Japanese, and Quechua. in Perlmutter and Rosen (eds.) Studies in Relational Grammar 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 292-330.
- Perlmutter, David M., and Paul M. Postal. 1983. Some Proposed Laws of Basic Clause Structure. In David Perlmutter (ed). Studies in Relational Grammar 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 30-80.
- Postal, Paul M. and Brian D. Joseph, eds. (to appear) Studies in Relational Grammar 3.
- Shibatani, Maysayoshi. (1977). Grammatical Relations and Surface Cases. Language 53:4, 789-809.
- Sung, Kwang-soo. (1982). Kukecosaiy yenku (A Study on Particles in Korean). Seoul: Hyengsel Publishing Co.
- Yang, In-Seok. (1972). Korean Syntax: Case Markers, Delimiters, Complementation, and Relativization. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Hawaii.
- Youn, Cheong. (1985). Inversion in Korean. M.A. Project. State University of New York, Buffalo. (in Soon Ae Chun, ed., Relational Studies on Korean. Buffalo Working Papers in Linguistics, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1986.)
- Youn, Cheong. (in preparation.) A Relational Analysis of Korean Multiple Nominative Constructions. Dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Zaenen, A., J. Maling, and H. Thrainsson (1985) 'Case and Grammatical Functions: The Icelandic Passive.' Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 3:4, 441-484.

# CLS 24

Papers from the  
24th Annual Regional Meeting of the  
Chicago Linguistic Society

Part One: The General Session

Chicago Linguistic Society  
1988

*edited by*

Lynn MacLeod

Gary Larson

Diane Brentari

## Contents<sup>1</sup>

<b>Abeillé, Anne:</b> Light Verb Constructions and Extraction out of NP in Tree Adjoining Grammar	1
<b>Ahn, Hee-Don:</b> Multidominance Structure, Scrambling, and the Theory of Grammar in Korean	17
<b>Arimura, Kaneaki:</b> see Tajima and Arimura	
<b>Barnes, Betsy K.:</b> Pragmatic Exploitation of <u>NP c' est que S</u> in Conversational Discourse	32
<b>Bashir, Elena:</b> Inferentiality in Kalasha and Khowar	47
<b>Breen, Walter:</b> Grammatical Relations, Thematic Roles and Control in Inversion Predicates	60
<b>Carreira, Maria:</b> The Structure of Palatal Consonants in Spanish	73
<b>Darden, Bill:</b> Truncation and/or Transderivational Constraints in Russian Word-Formation	88
<b>Deane, Paul:</b> Which NPs are there unusual possibilities for extraction from?	100
<b>de Reuse, Willem:</b> The Morphology/Semantics Interface: An Autolexical Treatment of Eskimo Verbal Affix Order	112
<b>Fox, Robert Allen:</b> Identification and Discrimination of Silent-Center Vowels	126
<b>Geluykens, Ronald:</b> The Interactional Nature of Referent-Introduction	141
<b>Gerdts, Donna. B. and Cheong Youn:</b> Korean Psych Constructions: Advancement or Retreat	155
<b>Gorecka, Alicja:</b> Polish Word Order and Its Relevance	176
<b>Janda, Laura:</b> Pragmatic vs. Semantic Uses of Case	189
<b>Joseph, Brian:</b> Pronominal Affixes in Modern Greek: The Case Against Clisis	203
<b>Keenan, Edward L.:</b> Complex Anaphors and Bind Alpha	216

<b>Kuno, Susumu:</b> Crossover Phenomena and Raising in LF	233
<b>Legendre, Géraldine:</b> Two Classes of Unergatives in French	259
<b>Levin, Beth and Tova Rapoport:</b> Lexical Subordination	275
<b>Oh, Sunseek:</b> A Promising Control Theory	290
<b>Rapoport, Tova:</b> see Levin and Rapoport	
<b>Rice, Curtis:</b> Stress Assignment in the Chugach Dialect of Alutiq	304
<b>Selkirk, Elizabeth and Koichi Tateishi:</b> Constraints on Minor Phrase Formation in Japanese	316
<b>Sietsema, Brian:</b> Reduplication in Dakota	337
<b>Subramanian, Uma:</b> Subcategorization and Derivation: Evidence from Tamil	353
<b>Tajima, Kazuhiko and Kaneaki Arimura:</b> Two Types of Variables: A D-structure Adjunction Approach to Null Operator Constructions	362
<b>Tateishi, Koichi:</b> see Selkirk and Tateishi	
<b>Thomas, Margaret:</b> Submissive Passives in Vietnamese	377
<b>*Vallduví, Enric:</b> Functional Load, Prosody, and Syntax: Left-detachment in Catalan and Spanish	391
<b>Youn, Cheong:</b> see Gerdts and Youn	
<b>Language Index to CLS 24/1: General Session</b>	405

- 
- <sup>1</sup> The following papers were not submitted for publication:
- Marta Lujan: A Syntactic Parameter of the Lexicon
  - Rob Chametsky: The Category Mistake
  - Lukowa Kidima: The Origin of Tone Groups in Kiyaka
  - Christopher Pinon: Metrical Organization and the Jer-Shift in Czech
  - Nancy L. Dray and David McNeill: Contrast at the Moment of Speaking: Issues for Pragmatics, Evidence from Gesture

\* indicates that this paper was not presented at the 24th Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society