

# 5 Double Nominative and Double Accusative Constructions

---

JAMES HYE SUK YOON

## 1 Introduction

The constructions that constitute the focus of this chapter—Double Nominative and Double Accusative Constructions (DNC and DAC)—have been the subject of extensive investigation in both traditional and contemporary investigations of Korean. The study of these constructions touches on a number of interrelated topics that are of interest to linguistic theory and typology as well, such as the mechanisms of case-marking, the relationship between case and grammatical relations, as well as the typology of case-marking. An in-depth discussion of any one of these issues is impossible in a chapter of this length and scope. However, in as much as the understanding of DNCs and DACs informs linguistic theory and typology in general, questions of larger significance will be addressed as appropriate.

## 2 Double Nominative Constructions

The term DNC could be applied to different constructions where the particle taken to express nominative case *i/ka* (*ka* herein) is realized on more than one nominal in a single clause. Possible examples of DNCs are given below.<sup>1</sup>

- (1) a. Cheli-**ka** meli-**ka** kalksayk-i-ta  
C-NOM hair-NOM brown-COP-DECL  
'Cheli has brown-colored hair.'
- b. Enehak-**i** chwicik-**i** elyep-ta  
Linguistics-NOM employment-NOM difficult-DECL  
'(It is) in linguistics (that) getting employed is difficult.'
- c. Cheli-**ka** ton-**i** philyoha-ni?  
C-NOM money-NOM need-INTER  
'Does Cheli need money?'

In the literature, the sentences in (1a–c) have been viewed as different sub-types of DNCs, based on non-DNC paraphrases. That is, (2a) is a close paraphrase of (1a), while (2b) and (2c) paraphrase (1b) and (1c), respectively.

- (2) a. Cheli-**uy** meli-ka kalksayk-i-ta  
 C-GEN hair-NOM brown-COP-DECL  
 ‘Cheli’s hair is brown.’
- b. Enehak-**eyse-(nun)** chwicik-i elyep-ta  
 Linguistics-LOC-(TOP) employment-NOM difficult-DECL  
 ‘In linguistics, getting employed is difficult.’
- c. Cheli-**eykey** ton-i philyoha-ni?  
 C-DAT money-NOM need-INTER  
 ‘Does Cheli need money?’
- d. Nampankwu-**ka** munmyeng-kwuk.ka-**ka** namca-**ka**  
 south.hemisphere-NOM civilized-country-NOM men-NOM  
 phyengkywun-swumyeng-**i** ccalp-ta  
 average-lifespan-NOM short-DECL  
 ‘It is the southern hemisphere where it is in the civilized countries where it is the men whose average lifespan is short.’

Based on these correspondences, (1a) is called the **Possessor type** DNC, while the DNC in (1b) is called the **Adjunct type** DNC. In the first two types of DNCs, only one of the nominative-marked NPs (the second of the two) is a selected argument of the predicate. In the DNC in (1c), by contrast, both of the nominative NPs are arguments of a dyadic non-agentive predicate. Thus, the second of the nom-marked NPs is viewed as an Object, and (1c) is called the **Nominative Object type** DNC. Thus, (1c) only displays multiple assignment of nominative case, whereas in the first two types, there is a problem over and above multiple occurrences of nominative case, as only one of the two nom-marked NPs is an argument of the predicate. We must therefore address the question of the thematic licensing of the initial NP in addition to its case-marking. Our focus will be on the first two types of DNCs in this chapter.

Finally, we should note that the term DNC is a misnomer, since the number of nominative-marked NPs in DNCs is not limited to two, as exemplified by (2d), based on Kuno (1973), which has a mix of Adjunct and Possessor type relations among nom-marked NPs. While we should bear in mind that DNCs are multiple nominative constructions (MNCs), for expository purposes, we will frame our discussion in terms of DNCs. In order to distinguish the two nom-marked NPs in a DNC in a perspicuous manner, we will employ the terms **outer nominative** and **inner nominative** to refer to the first and second nom-marked NPs respectively.

## 2.1 *Issues and approaches*

According to Yoon (2009), the following issues frame the debate on the proper analysis of DNCs.

- (3) a. What mechanisms license the outer nominative in DNCs?  
 b. Are all *ka*-marked NPs Subjects? In other words, is there more than one Subject in DNCs?

- c. If both nominatives in DNCs are Subjects, how are Subject properties distributed between the outer and inner nominative and why?

While these do not exhaust the questions we can ask about DNCs, they provide a good starting point. In the literature on DNCs, we can discern the following constellations of answers to these questions.

In one line of thinking, it is maintained that there is only one Subject in DNCs. The outer nominatives are not Subjects, but topics and/or foci. Consequently, the particle that looks like nominative case on the outer nominative does not mark case (James Yoon 1986; Jong Yurl Yoon 1989; Schütze 2001; Yeon 2003).

A second line of thinking posits that the outer nominative is a derived Subject, in at least some types of DNCs. This line of thinking is developed in Possessor Raising analyses (Chun 1985; Youn 1990; Choe 1986; Cho 2003).

A third approach posits that both nominatives are Subjects. The outer nominative functions as a Major Subject, while the inner nominative functions as the Minor (or Grammatical) Subject. In this approach, the reason nominative case is realized on both inner and outer nominatives is because there is more than one Subject in DNCs. This line of thinking is endorsed in traditional accounts of DNCs and defended in B. Park (1973), I. Lee (1987), Heycock (1993), James Yoon (2004, 2009), and C. Park (2010).

And though not much work has been done on the third issue, answers to it are intertwined with that to the question of whether DNCs have more than one Subject, and if so, at what level(s) of representation.

*2.1.1 Outer nominatives are not topic or foci* Prima facie, there are good reasons for the first approach. Under this approach, DNCs have a unique Subject, the inner nominative. What gives rise to the appearance that the outer nominative is a Subject is the particle *ka*. But if *ka* also functions as a marker of discourse roles such as focus, it is not necessary to assume that nominative case is assigned more than once in a clause, or that DNCs are special in having more than one Subject (Jong Yurl Yoon 1989; Schütze 2001).

The argument for this approach is based on observations like the following. The DNC in (4) cannot answer a question like ‘Tell me something about Cheli,’ which expects an answer shown in the second interpretation (‘As for Cheli, his father came to school today’). Instead, (4) has the interpretation ‘It is Cheli whose father came to school today,’ which is felicitous as an answer to the question ‘Whose father came to school today?’ Answers to Wh-questions are in focus and this seems to support the focus analysis of the outer nominative in (4).

- (4) Cheli-ka apeci-ka hakkyo-ey onul o-si-ess-ta  
 C-NOM father-NOM school-LOC today come-HON-PST-DECL  
 ‘It is Cheli whose father came to school today.’  
 =/= ‘As for Cheli, his father came to school today.’

However, if outer nominatives in DNCs are viewed as focus, (5) becomes a problem.

- (5) Pihayngki-ka 747-i ceyil khu-ta  
 Airplane-NOM 747-NOM most big-DECL  
 ‘As for airplanes, the 747 is the biggest.’  
 =/= ‘It is airplanes that the 747 is the biggest.’

Given what we know about airplanes (the 747 is a type of airplane), the focus reading of the outer nominative ('It is airplanes ...') is infelicitous, and yet the DNC is acceptable.

Similarly, when the inner nominative is a Wh-phrase, the outer nominative can retain its *ka*-marking but is not interpreted as focus. This is confirmed by the fact that *ka* can alternate with the topic-marker *nun* without a change in meaning.

- (6) pihayngki-ka/nun etten kicong-i ceyil khu-ni?  
 airplane-NOM/TOP which model-NOM most big-INTER  
 'Which model of airplane is the biggest?'

Responding to observations like this, Schütze (2001) proposes that in addition to focus, the non-case-marking function of *ka* extends to topic-marking, so that in (5) and (6), the outer nominative carries the topic-marker *ka*. The proposal thus makes *ka* three-ways ambiguous (nominative, focus, and topic).

The proposal that the outer nominatives in (5) and (6) are topics cannot be sustained, however. Topics that carry the topic-marker *nun* cannot be embedded in certain structures (cf. 7a). If the outer nominatives in (5,6) are topics, these DNCs should not be embeddable. However, they can, as shown in (7b).

- (7) a. pihayngki-ka/\*?nun wiyhemhata-nun sasil-ul na-nun  
 airplane-NOM/TOP dangerous-REL fact-ACC I-TOP  
 moll-ass-ta  
 not.know-PST-DECL  
 'I didn't know about the fact that airplanes are dangerous.'  
 b. pihayngki-ka/\*?nun 747-i khuta-nun sasil-ul na-nun  
 airplane-NOM/TOP 747-NOM big-REL fact-ACC I-TOP  
 moll-ass-ta  
 not.know-PST-DECL  
 'I didn't know about the fact that the 747 is big.'

Additional arguments against this approach come from Subject properties. As we shall see, the outer nominative functions as a Subject in certain respects. This is not expected under an approach where the outer nominative is not a Subject. See also Chapter 10 Topic and Focus for arguments against analyzing *ka* as a topic marker.

2.1.2 *Outer nominatives are not derived Subjects* A second approach to DNCs posits that the outer nominative in at least some types of DNCs is derived by a Subject-creating process from a structure where it is licensed as a Possessor. An illustration of the Possessor Raising (PR) analysis couched in Relational Grammar terms (Chun 1985) is given below (1 = Subject, 1-cho = Subject *chômeur*, P = predicate).<sup>2</sup>

- (8) [Cheli-uy khi]-ka khu-ta  
 C-GEN height-NOM big-DECL  
 1 P  
 →**Possessor Raising**  
 Cheli-ka khi-ka khu-ta  
 1 1-cho P



- (12) a. Cheli-ka apeci-ka tolaka-si-ess-ta  
 C-NOM father-NOM pass.away-HON-PST-DECL  
 'Cheli's father passed away.' (Kang 2001)
- a'. Cheli-uy apeci-ka tolaka-si-ess-ta  
 C-GEN father-NOM pass.away-HON-PST-DECL  
 'Cheli's father passed away.'
- b. \*?Cheli-ka apeci-ka nemeci-si-ess-ta  
 C-NOM father-NOM fall-HON-PST-DECL  
 'Cheli's father (tripped and) fell.'
- b'. Cheli-uy apeci-ka nemeci-si-ess-ta  
 C-GEN father-NOM fall-HON-PST-DECL  
 'Cheli's father (tripped and) fell.'

Finally, it should be obvious that this approach inherits all the problems associated with taking the outer nominative in Adjunct-type DNCs to be focus/topic.

2.1.3 *Major Subjects and Sentential Predicates* A third approach takes both the outer and inner nominatives to be Subjects and DNCs to contain multiple layers of predication (Heycock 1993). The predicate and the inner nominative enter into a Subject-Predicate relationship, forming a sentence. What is special in DNCs is that the sentence composed of a Subject and Predicate is re-interpreted as a predicate, a **Sentential Predicate**, which is predicated of another Subject, the **Major Subject**. This pattern can iterate, yielding sentences with multiple Major Subjects and nested Sentential Predicates.

The reason both outer and inner nominatives are marked with *ka* is because they are Subjects, and because nominative can be assigned to more than one NP in Korean. Since *ka* on outer nominatives instantiates case in all types of DNCs, the analysis avoids difficulties that stem from the assumption that *ka* is not a case-marker in some DNCs. And while it shares with the second approach the supposition that the outer nominative is a Subject, it maintains that DNCs are uniform in this regard. Finally, since DNCs are not derived from other structures, problems stemming from violations of constraints on movement and/or the possibility of resumption (cf. 10), the lack of synonymy of Possessive and DNC structures (cf. 11), do not plague this approach.

For the idea of Sentential Predication to hold water, we need to know the conditions under which a sentence can be reinterpreted as a predicate. Imagine now that Yenghi is Cheli's child and she has a habit of bullying her classmates. The proposition expressed by the sentence 'Yenghi hit her class-mates again' would be relevant to Cheli in a real world sense. For example from it we may infer that Cheli needs to discipline Yenghi. However, the following shows that a felicitous DNC cannot be constructed with this sentence reinterpreted as a Sentential Predicate of the Major Subject 'Cheli.' The question is why.

- (13) \*Cheli-ka [Yenghi-ka pan-chinkwutul-ul tto ttayli-ess-ta]  
 C-NOM Y-NOM classmates-ACC again hit-PST-DECL  
 'As for Cheli, Yenghi (=his daughter) hit her classmates again.'

The answer comes from the specific semantic mechanisms of Sentential Predicate formation. A sentence denoting a proposition is converted to a predicate through Predicate Abstraction. Predicate Abstraction in turn requires a variable (Heim and Kratzer 1998).<sup>3</sup> What goes wrong in (13) is that there is no variable within the

would-be Sentential Predicate.<sup>4</sup> Hence, the Major Subject ('Cheli') cannot be licensed semantically as it fails to receive a theta role.

By contrast, in (12a, b), the (null) Possessor of the noun *apeci* ('father') constitutes the variable.<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, the two DNCs differ in acceptability. James Yoon (2009), following B. Kang (2001), proposes that felicitous Sentential Predicates should denote **Characteristic Properties**. Someone's father having died can characterize an individual, given the significance of the event and because the state of having lost one's parents continues after the event. By contrast, someone's father having fallen is not significant enough to characterize an individual. People fall and almost always get up afterwards.

However, unlike the semantic requirement of a variable, or the syntactic requirement that both outer and inner nominatives be case-marked, what counts as a Characteristic Property is context-dependent. The pragmatic nature of this condition provides the key to understanding why certain Major Subjects are optimal if they are focused (as in 4). James Yoon (2009) argues that when the property that a Sentential Predicate denotes is not characteristic in the strict sense, the focus interpretation of Major Subjects helps to foreground the property, allowing it to count as characteristic in that context. By contrast, a Major Subject in construction with a Sentential Predicate denoting a properly characteristic property need not be interpreted as focused (as in 5).<sup>6</sup>

It is not just Sentential Predicates that are restricted interpretively. Major Subjects must satisfy certain interpretive conditions as well, since they must denote entities on which Characteristic Properties can be felicitously predicated. James Yoon (2004) dubs this the **News-worthiness Condition**. This condition can be recruited to explain the following contrast.

In the literature it is claimed that body-part denoting relational nouns can occur as inner nominatives (Grammatical Subjects), but not as outer nominatives (Major Subjects). If movement is employed to model PR (Choe 1986), this can be blamed on the Improper Movement Condition, which bans unbound traces (cf. 14b).<sup>7</sup>

- (14) a. Cheli<sub>i</sub>-ka [t<sub>i</sub> khi]-ka khu-ta  
 C-NOM height-NOM tall-DECL  
 'Cheli is tall.'  
 b. \*[t<sub>i</sub> khi]-ka Cheli<sub>i</sub>-ka khu-ta  
 height-NOM C-NOM tall-DECL  
 =\*?'Speaking of height, Cheli is tall.'

However, NPs headed by relational nouns do occur as Major Subjects in certain DNCs (cf. 15a). In fact, even (14b), which is odd out of context, is acceptable if it answers (15b).

- (15) a. (Ku thim-eyse-nun) khi-ka Shaquille O'Neal-i ceyil khu-ta  
 That team-among-TOP height-NOM S.O.-NOM most tall-DECL  
 '(In that team), speaking of height, Shaquille O'Neal's is the greatest.'  
 b. Khi-ka nwu-ka ceyil khu-ni?  
 Height-NOM who-NOM most tall-INTER  
 'Speaking of height, who is the tallest?'

The contrast shown above is attributable to the News-worthiness Condition. People are more news-worthy than their height normally, and so people constitute the ‘reference points’ (see Kumashiro and Langacker 2003 and C. Park 2010 on the Major Subject as a ‘reference point’ Subject) for their height. However, there are situations where height becomes more news-worthy than people so that it becomes the ‘reference point’ by which people are categorized. This can be in the context of a basketball team (in 15a) or an explicit question about height (in 15b).

In sum, the third approach to DNCs overcomes technical and conceptual problems with previous approaches. It takes the traditional idea that DNCs are multiple Subject constructions and fleshes out the syntactic (multiple case-marking), semantic (Sentential Predicate formation through Predicate Abstraction), and pragmatic (Characteristic Property and News-Worthiness Conditions) factors that are needed to obtain a well-formed DNC. Importantly, it does not distinguish subtypes of DNCs in terms of how the outer nominative is licensed.

*2.1.4 Subject properties in DNCs* Recall that in the second approach, DNCs are divided into two types. It is only in the Possessor type DNC that the outer nominative is a Subject; in the Adjunct-type it is not. The bifurcation is challenged by the uniform *ka*-marking on the outer nominative in all DNCs. However, proponents of this approach attribute this to the accidental homophony of focus/topic and case-marking. The argument leaks, as we have seen, but there may be other Subject properties besides *ka*-marking that systematically differentiate the two types of DNCs, supporting the non-uniform analysis of DNCs. Subject Honorification might be such a property, since it seems to be controlled by the outer nominative in (16a) but by the inner nominative in (16b), suggesting that the Subjects in the two DNCs may be different.

- (16) a. Kim-sensayngnim-i cip-i puca-i-si-ta (Possessor type DNC)  
 K-teacher-NOM household-NOM rich-COP-HON-DECL  
 ‘Professor Kim is from a rich family.’  
 b. Naynyen-i Kim-kyoswunim-i unthoyha-si-n-ta (Adjunct type DNC)  
 Next.year-NOM K-professor-NOM retire-HON-PRS-DECL  
 ‘Professor Kim is retiring next year (not this year).’

The problem with concluding that the outer nominative is not a Subject in (16b) on the basis of Subject Honorification is that it displays other properties attributable to Subjecthood, such as the ability to undergo Subject-to-Object Raising (James Yoon 2007).<sup>8</sup>

- (17) Na-nun naynyen-ul Kim-kyoswunim-i unthoyha-si-nta-ko  
 I-TOP next.year-ACC K-prof-NOM retire-HON-DECL-COMP  
 sayngkakhay-ss-ess-ta  
 think-PERF-PST-DECL  
 ‘I thought that Professor Kim is retiring next year (not this year).’

This apparent paradox can be resolved as follows. A positional deconstruction of Subject properties (McCloskey 1997) or something similar (Falk’s 2006 dichotomy of Subject properties based on Pivot vs. Prominent Argument) is widely adopted in the literature nowadays. Building on these proposals, James Yoon (2009) argues

that while both outer and inner nominatives are Subjects, they control different sub-sets of Subject properties. Concretely, Subject Honorification is controlled by the inner nominative (Subject *qua* Prominent Argument), while SOR is the privilege of the outer nominative (Subject *qua* Pivot). Thus, it is not paradoxical that different nominals control different Subject properties in (17).

A problem for this view is that Subject Honorification seems to be controlled by the outer nominative in (16a). To explain this, James Yoon (2009) adopts the insight of Hong (1991), who proposed that the inner nominative is the actual controller but that through metonymy, Honorification is construed with the outer nominative. Specifically, when people are chosen as reference points (C. Park 2010), the associated conceptual domain will include families. Entities within the conceptual domain can be metonymic targets through which we access the reference point. Evidence that the metonymic approach is on the right track comes from the contrast between (16) and (18) below.

- (18) \*?Kim-kyoswunim-i cha-ka oyceycha-i-si-ta  
 K-professor-NOM car-NOM import.car-COP-HON-DECL  
 'Professor Kim drives an import.'

If the outer nominative is the controller of Subject Honorification when the inner nominative is non-human-denoting, it should make no difference whether the inner nominative refers to automobiles (cf. 18) or households (cf. 16a), but it does. However, the contrast makes sense under the metonymy approach, since cars are not likely to be a part of the conceptual domain associated with individuals (not everybody has a car) and cannot serve as a successful metonym for people.<sup>9</sup>

In sum, there are good reasons to think that DNCs instantiate a structure with multiple Subjects and (nested) Predicates, where the Subjects are uniformly marked with nominative case. This is essentially the traditional take on DNCs. The promise of contemporary alternatives was to ground the analysis of DNCs on properties that are found in other languages, thus minimizing what is language-particular about DNCs. However, the endorsement of a traditional view of DNCs does not mean that the analysis rests on irreducibly language-particular properties. The decomposition of Subject properties is something established on independent grounds. Multiple case-marking is attested cross-linguistically (Bejar and Massam 1999). Predicate Abstraction is a mechanism deployed widely (Heim and Kratzer 1998). It is only the pragmatic licensing conditions on Major Subjects and Sentential Predicates that look language-particular. Even these, one can argue (C. Park 2010), are rooted in recurring cross-linguistic properties like reference point and metonymy. Thus, contemporary understandings of linguistics offer no challenge to the traditional insight that DNCs are indeed structures with multiple Subjects, namely, that DNCs are Multiple Subject Constructions.

### 3 Double Accusative Constructions

As with DNCs, we should delimit the range of Double Accusative Constructions (DACs), since there are a number of structures where the accusative case-marker *ul/lul* (*lul* herein) occurs on more than one nominal within a single clause/VP. Even excluding cases where it marks non-arguments

(Floated Quantifiers, Predicates, or Adverbials), we find the following candidate DACs.

- (19) a. John-un Yenghi-lul/-uy phal-ul pwuthcap-ass-ta  
 J-TOP Y-ACC/-GEN arm-ACC grab-PST-DECL  
 'John grabbed Yenghi by the arm.'
- b. John-un Yenghi-lul/-eykey senmul-ul ponay-ss-ta  
 J-TOP Y-ACC/-DAT present-ACC send-PST-DECL  
 'John sent Yenghi presents.'
- c. John-un cemsim-ul/-un cacangmyen-ul mek-ess-ta  
 J-TOP lunch-ACC/-TOP noodle.name-ACC eat-PST-DECL  
 'John had cacangmyen noodles for lunch.'

Among these, (19b) is usually not considered to be a DAC, because both acc-marked nominals are arguments of a ditransitive verb. The remaining sentences display acc-marking on two nominals of which only one seems to be a direct argument of the verb. We restrict the term DAC to sentences of this type.

The DAC in (19a) has been the subject of intensive research. Because of the interpretive relation between the **outer accusative** and the **inner accusative**, (19a) is called the **Inalienable Possession-type DAC**, or **External Possession-type DAC** (Payne and Barshi 1999). While there is no established term for the type of DAC in (19c), we shall designate (19c) as **Topic-type DAC**. An interesting question is whether there is anything substantive behind this surface typology. C. Park (2013) does not think so and proposes a unified account of the two types of DACs. However, there are in fact significant differences between the two types of DACs, as we shall see.

### 3.1 *Issues and approaches*

James Yoon (2001) identifies the following issues in the analysis of DACs.

- (20) a. How can a strictly transitive verb license more than one Object-like NP?  
 b. How do multiple NPs end up with accusative case?

In addition, there is the question of whether DACs are genuine multiple Object constructions or structures with a unique Object but with multiple acc-marking. An adequate answer must be grounded on Object diagnostics, as we shall see.

Regarding the first issue, an influential line of thinking (for Possessor type DACs) holds that the outer accusative is licensed (initially) as the Possessor of the inner accusative nominal, which is selected as an internal argument of the verb. PR analyses (Chun 1985; Cho 2003) adopt this position. This view is also adopted by analyses that posit non-movement mechanisms by which the Possessor role is inherited by the constituent made up of the verb and the inner accusative and assigned to the outer accusative (James Yoon 1990; Jeong-Me Yoon 1997; O'Grady 1998; Shin 2005; Vermeulen 2009). In either approach, the licensing of outer and inner accusatives is connected. Thus, these analyses espouse **Dependent Licensing**.

Another line of thinking holds that the outer and inner accusatives are licensed independently (**Independent Licensing**). Specific proposals include those that take the outer accusative to be a verb-selected argument and the inner accusative to be a locative adjunct (Kang 1985); those that take both the outer and inner accusatives to

be arguments of the verb (J. Lee 1992); and analyses that assume that the outer accusative is a verbal argument while taking the inner accusative to be a secondary predicate (Kim 1989). Tomioka and Sim's (2007) proposal that takes the outer accusative to be an argument of a silent applicative verb and the inner accusative to be an argument of the base verb also endorses this perspective.

As for the second issue, a group of researchers takes all *lul*-marked NPs in DACs to be assigned case by the verb in one-to-many fashion (Kang 1985; James Yoon 1990; Maling and Kim 1992; O'Grady 1991, 1998; Cho 2003; C. Park 2013). While still taking *lul* to realize case, others (Tomioka and Sim 2007) posit that accusative case is assigned in a one-to-one fashion, because there are multiple verbs assigning case in DACs. As these researchers view *lul* as assigned directly by the verb(s), they endorse **Direct Case Marking**.

Others posit that only one NP receives case directly from the verb. *lul*-marking on the other NPs arises indirectly (through concord or agreement) (Kim 1989). A variant of such **Indirect Case Marking** view holds that while *lul* on the Direct Object (outer or inner accusative, depending on the type of DAC) realizes case, *lul*-marking on the non-DO NP is a realization of focus/topic-marking (Jong Yurl Yoon 1989).

3.1.1 *The licensing of the outer accusative in Possessor-type DACs* Possessor-type DACs can be paraphrased by adnominal possessive structures (cf. 19). This fact undergirds analyses that derive DACs from Possessive structures via PR. In this analysis, the outer accusative is licensed thematically as a Possessor, thus explaining the most salient fact about Possessor type DACs, that the inner accusative must be a relational noun (Barker 1991). This explains why, even if Yenghi is Tongswu's wife, we cannot have DACs like (21).

- (21) \*John-un Tongswu-lul Yenghi-lul ttayli-ess-ta  
 J-TOP T-ACC Y-ACC hit-PST-DECL  
 Intended: 'John affected Tongswu by hitting his wife, Yenghi.'

However, the PR analysis is not without problems. If PR derives DACs from possessive structures, we do not expect the two to differ in their properties, but they do. For one, a possessive relation between outer and inner accusatives is not sufficient to license a DAC.

- (22) ??John-un Mary-lul namca-chinkwu-lul ttayli-ess-ta  
 J-TOP M-ACC male-friend-ACC hit-PST-DECL  
 'John hit Mary's boyfriend.'

Proponents of PR respond by claiming that the outer accusatives must stand in a relation of **inalienable possession** to the inner accusative (Chun 1985). However, this cannot be correct, as we see below.

- (23) a. John-un Mary-lul kapang-ul nakkachay-ss-ta  
 J-TOP M-ACC purse-ACC snatch-PST-DECL  
 'John snatched Mary's purse.'  
 b. John-un Mary-lul sinpal-ul palp-ass-ta  
 J-TOP M-ACC shoes-ACC step.on-PST-DECL  
 'John stepped on Mary's shoes.'

Furthermore, not all DACs with inalienable possessors are acceptable.

- (24) ??John-un Mary-lul yeph.mosup-ul molly cik-ess-ta  
 J-TOP M-ACC side.view-ACC discreetly photograph-PST-DECL  
 'John snapped a picture of Mary's profile without her knowledge.'

The **Affectedness Condition** (AC, Yoon 1990, 2001; Yoon 1997; Tomioka and Sim 2007, Deal ) has been proposed as an account of these facts. The AC requires that the referent of the outer accusative be understood as being 'affected' by the action denoted by the inner accusative plus the verb. Since the most direct way to affect a possessor is via physical contact with an inalienably possessed body part, the AC explains why inalienable possession is the norm in DACs. It also explains why inalienable possession alone may be insufficient to license certain DACs (cf. 24). Stealing a glimpse of someone's (inalienably possessed) profile does not physically affect that person. The AC also helps us to understand how alienable possessors are acceptable in some DACs. Snatching someone's purse physically affects the person (cf. 23a), as does stepping on someone's shoes (cf. 23b), as long as the possessor and possessee are **contiguous** (Yeon 2003, 2010)—that is, if Mary was carrying the purse or wearing the shoes at the time of the event. The marginality of (22) can be blamed on the fact that the boyfriend relation is alienable and not contiguous.

While the AC sheds light on the interpretive conditions that hold in felicitous DACs, pinning down the exact nature of the AC is tricky. For example, verbs that do not denote physical contact are possible with some inalienables (Jeong-Me Yoon 1997). Example (25) is acceptable if we understand the action to impact Mary.

- (25) John-un Mary-lul elkwul-ul ttwulecikey chyeta.po-ass-ta  
 J-TOP M-ACC face-ACC intently stare-PST-DECL  
 'John stared intently at Mary's face.'

And while DACs in other languages that display sensitivity to AC do not allow non-sentient, non-human-denoting NPs as external possessors (Deal, to appear), such DACs are possible in Korean. For example, (26), about a deceased president, is fine, as is (26b) with an inanimate outer accusative.

- (26) a. John-un Rho.moohyun-taythonglyeng-ul kamun-ul motokha-yss-ta  
 J-TOP R-president-ACC family-ACC defame-PST-DECL  
 'John('s actions) defamed President Rho's family.'  
 b. John-un hyenkwanmun-ul soncapi-lul kal-ass-ta  
 J-TOP entry.door-ACC handle-ACC replace-PST-DECL  
 'John replaced the handle of the entry door.'

In addition, there are speakers who accept kinship terms in DACs, though kinship is not inalienable and assaulting someone's brother does not physically impact that person.

- (27) John-i Mary-lul tongsayng-ul ttayli-ess-ta  
 J-NOM M-ACC younger.sibling-ACC beat-PST-DECL  
 'John assaulted Mary's younger sibling.'

While a comprehensive account of all the factors that go into Affectedness remains elusive, some conclusions can be drawn on the basis of what we have seen so far.

First, the AC rules out a classical PR analysis, especially one that models PR by movement, as movement cannot add interpretive properties.

Second, it rules out a Control analysis of DAC as well. To the best of my knowledge, nobody has championed a Control analysis. However, it is possible to take the AC effects to imply that the outer accusative and the (null) Possessor of the inner accusative enter into a Control relation, with the former licensed as an argument of a higher (null) predicate, and the latter as an argument of the base verb.<sup>10</sup> In this analysis, AC effects are due to the thematic role ('Affectee' role, as suggested by Tomioka and Sim 2007) assigned to the outer accusative which controls the Possessor of the inner accusative.

However, the AC cannot be thematic, as what counts as 'affected' is context-dependent. Suppose the outer accusative in DACs is assigned an 'Affectee' role. Example (23b) would then mean something like 'John affected Mary (in an adverse manner) by stepping on her shoes.' Surely Mary is affected if she's wearing the shoes, but stepping on shoes that she's not wearing at the moment can also affect her, especially since, as (25) and (27) show, no physical contact is necessary in DACs. Theta-roles do not vary by context, and so are not good tools to model the context-dependent nature of Affectedness.

This conclusion is reinforced by comparing DACs with the Benefactive construction where the benefactive morpheme (*cwu-*) assigns a thematic role to the outer accusative.

- (28) John-un Mary-lul namca.chinkwu-lul ttaylie-**cwu**-ess-ta  
 J-TOP M-ACC boyfriend-ACC beat-BEN-PST-DECL  
 'John beat up Mary's boyfriend (on her behalf).'

The outer accusative is understood as receiving the Benefactive role regardless of the type of possessive relation between it and the inner accusative, unlike in DACs where only certain types of possession relations are permitted (cf. 28).

A related difference is that while inanimate outer accusatives can be "affected" in DACs (cf. 26b), only an animate NP can receive the Benefactive role in the Benefactive construction.

- (29) John-un hyenkwanmun-ul soncapi-lul kala-**cwu**-ess-ta  
 J-TOP entry.door-ACC handle-ACC replace-BEN-PST-DECL  
 =/'John replaced the handle for the benefit of the entry door'  
 = 'John replaced the door handle for X.'

In fact, the Benefactive construction behaves similarly to DACs in other languages showing AC effects, for which Control type analyses have been proposed (Lee-Schoenfeld 2006). In these languages Affectness displays thematic properties, but not in Korean DACs, indicating that Control is not the right path to pursue.<sup>11</sup>

Additional difficulties for Control (or Control-as-movement) analyses come from the following, which shows that the relation between the outer and inner accusatives does not show the locality typical of Control/A-movement. The possibility of resumption similarly argues against a Control analysis.<sup>12</sup>

- (30) a. John-un Tom-ul [(ku-ka) meyko iss]-nun kapang]-ul  
 J-TOP T-ACC (he-NOM) carry PROG-REL bag-ACC  
 nakhacha-yss-ta  
 snatch-PST-DECL  
 'John snatched the bag that Tom was carrying.'
- b. John-un Tom-ul [(ku-uy) phal]-uy wis-pupun]-ul seykey ttayli-ess-ta  
 J-TOP T-ACC (he-GEN) arm-GEN top-part-ACC hard hit-PST-DECL  
 'John hit the top part of Tom's arm hard.'

Finally, the fact that there can be multiple Possessor-Possessee relations in DACs militates against viewing the Possessor to be licensed as an argument of a (null) higher predicate, as the number of such null predicates would have to be multiplied.

In sum, the previous discussion leads us to conclude the following.

- (31) a. In DACs, the outer accusative enters a dependency with the Possessor of the inner accusative.  
 b. The dependency should not be modeled by Movement or Control.  
 c. The outer accusative is not an argument of an invisible predicate.  
 d. Affectedness cannot be reduced to thematic properties.

A number of existing analyses are consistent with these conclusions. Non-movement/non-Control mechanisms of delayed assignment of the Possessor role to the outer accusative have already been proposed (James Yoon 1990; Jeong-Me Yoon 1997; Shin 2005; Vermeulen 2009). And Affectedness is not taken to reflect a thematic property except in Tomioka and Sim (2007). Neither is the outer accusative taken to be an argument of a higher (null) predicate in most approaches to DACs.

3.1.2 *Unified account of DACs?* Recall that at the outset of our discussion of DACs, we distinguished Possessor-type and Topic-type DACs. However, C. Park (2013) claims that the two should be analyzed in the same way. Specifically, C. Park (2013) views both types of DACs as Reference Point (RP) Object constructions. For Possessor-type DACs, the possession relation is responsible for licensing the outer accusative as a RP Object, while for Topic-type DACs, the requisite relation is grounded on a taxonomic hierarchy or profile-base relationship. For example, the Topic-type DAC in (32) below has an RP Object *kwail* ('fruit'), designating a general category, and the inner Object *sakwa* ('apples'), which designates a specific kind of fruit.

- (32) John-un kwail-ul sakwa-lul coahan-ta  
 J-TOP fruit-ACC apple-ACC likes-DECL  
 'As for fruit, John likes apples.'

While unified accounts should be sought where possible, there are differences between Possessor and Topic-type DACs that militate against seeing the two types of DACs as the same construction. For one, only the Possessor-type DAC is subject to the AC, while the Topic-type is not (cf. 32). In Park's account, the differences must

stem from the different types of relationships between the RP Object and the inner Object in the two types of DACs—say, possession vs. taxonomic hierarchy. However, we have seen that the possession relation does not suffice as an account of the AC. In fact, C. Park (2013) does not address the interpretive differences between the two types of DACs, though he claims they are the same construction. Without a comprehensive account of the differences, his unified account remains at best incomplete.

Another difference between the two types of DACs is that while the outer accusative in Possessor-type DACs can undergo processes affecting Objects while leaving the inner accusative intact, this is not the case with Topic-type DACs. For example, the outer accusative in the Possessor-type DAC can become a Subject under Passive, leaving the inner accusative intact, but this is not possible with Topic-type DACs. This suggests that while the outer accusative in Possessor-type DACs is Object-like, that in Topic-type DACs is not.

- (33) a. John-i (Mary-eykey) phal-ul pithul-li-ess-ta  
 J-NOM (M-BY) arm-ACC twist-PASS-PST-DECL  
 ‘John had his arm twisted (by Mary).’  
 b. Kwait-i yocum sakwa-\*lul/ka (manhi) mek-hi-n-ta  
 Fruit-NOM these.days apple-\*ACC/NOM (a.lot) eat-PASS-PRS-DECL  
 ‘Speaking of fruit, apples are eaten a lot these days.’

We therefore take the two types of DACs to be licensed differently. However, since both yield structures with multiply acc-marked Object-like NPs, a DAC that cannot be licensed properly as a Possessor-type DAC might be reconstrued as a Topic-type DAC. This may explain in part the shifting judgments that speakers have about Possessor-type DACs with kinship terms, such as (27) we saw earlier. Example (27) does not satisfy the AC since the possession relation is non-contiguous and alienable. Nevertheless, there are speakers who accept such sentences. We submit that their acceptance is based on analyzing (27) as a Topic-type DAC. Two pieces of evidence suggest that this conjecture may be on the right track.

First, acceptability of such DACs improves if the outer NP is topic-marked. And the change in marking induces a Topic-type interpretation of the DAC.

- (34) John-i Mary-nun tongsayng-ul ttayli-ess-ta  
 J-NOM M-TOP younger.sibling-ACC beat-PST-DECL  
 ‘Speaking of Mary, John assaulted her younger sibling (but he didn’t hit anyone else’s sibling).’

A second indication that the structure may be a Topic-type DAC is that passivization of the outer accusative while retaining acc-marking on the inner accusative is not possible in such DACs.

- (35) Mary-ka (John-eykey) tongsayng-\*ul/-i putcap-hi-ess-ta  
 M-NOM (J-BY) younger.sibling-\*ACC/-NOM grab-PASS-PST-DECL  
 ‘Mary had her brother caught/arrested by John.’

3.1.3 *Licensing of case* We do not have much room to discuss the issues surrounding the mechanisms of acc-case licensing in DACs. The positions advanced regarding the provenance of *lul* in DACs parallel those proposed regarding *ka* in DNCs. The case for taking *lul* in DACs to be something other than case is even weaker than the parallel argument for *ka*. The remaining issue is the source of multiple acc-marking. Proposals that posit that accusative is assigned in a one-to-one manner (Tomioka and Sim 2007) must posit a plethora of unmotivated null predicates. The remaining options are either direct, multiple assignment of accusative from the verb, or a singly assigned accusative spreading to other nominals via case agreement. Maling and Kim (1992) provided the conclusive demonstration that case agreement fails. Thus, what we are left with is direct, multiple, case-marking by the verb.

## 4 Conclusion

In this chapter, we surveyed some key properties of DNCs and DACs in Korean, and reached the conclusion that both are “base-generated.” We identified certain properties of these constructions that any adequate analysis must provide an account of. At the heart of both constructions lie universal semantic mechanisms that allow a delayed assignment of semantic roles that are normally assigned in a local manner. Coupled with the property of multiple case-assignment, and certain pragmatic properties (Characteristic Property Condition and the Affectedness Condition) that ultimately may be cashed out in terms of more basic, recurring, pragmatic properties (like metonymy and reference point), we have shown that while the constructions may look exotic and language-particular at first sight, a careful investigation reveals that much of what appears special reflects cross-linguistic properties. It is only the particular way in which these properties are packaged in Korean that gives rise to the initial appearance of language particularity of these constructions.

## NOTES

---

- 1 The following list of abbreviations is used in this chapter: NOM ‘nominative,’ ACC ‘accusative,’ GEN ‘genitive,’ LOC ‘locative,’ DAT ‘dative,’ TOP ‘topic,’ DECL ‘declarative mood,’ INTER ‘interrogative mood,’ BEN ‘benefactive suffix,’ HON ‘subject honorific suffix,’ PST ‘past tense suffix,’ PRS ‘present tense suffix,’ PASS ‘passive suffix,’ PERF ‘perfective suffix,’ REL ‘relative/adnominal ending,’ CONJ ‘conjunction,’ COP ‘copula.’
- 2 In Relational Grammar, a Subject (notated as 1) becomes a Subject *chômeur* (1-cho) when another nominal becomes the Subject through Possessor Raising.
- 3 In a nutshell, Predicate Abstraction is a way of turning a sentence (which is of type *t*) that contains a pronominal element (such as pronouns and traces of movement) into a predicate (of type  $\langle e, t \rangle$ ) that can combine with another nominal (type *e*) and is the mechanism employed to analyze structures like Topicalization, Relative Clauses, and so on. The pronominal element is the variable on which Predicate Abstraction works.

- 4 If Sentential Predicates need a variable, we must be able to identify such a variable even in DNCs like (9a), where we claimed that the outer nominative is not related to the Possessor of the inner nominative.

Given that the outer nominative can be expressed as a domain-setting adjunct (as seen below), we posit that a (covert) adjunct position is abstracted over in (9a) to yield the Sentential Predicate (see Kuroda 1986).

- (i) Enehak-eyse-(nun)            chwicik-i                    elyep-ta  
Linguistics-LOC-(TOP)    employment-NOM        difficult-DECL  
'In (the field of) linguistics, getting employed is tough.'

The fact that Adjunct-type DNCs can be coordinated with Possessor type DNCs (contra the claim by Vermeulen 2005) indicates that the predicates are the same type, lending support to the supposition that Sentential Predicates are present in both types of DNCs.

- (ii) Boston-i    [[kwankwangkyak-i    nul        pumpi-ko]        [acwu alumtap-ta]]  
B-NOM    tourists-NOM                    always    bustle-CONJ    very    beautiful-DECL  
'Boston always bustles with tourists and is also very beautiful.'

- 5 That is, the Sentential Predicate in (12) is [ $\lambda x$ : x's father died/fell].  
6 This predicts (12b) should improve if it is uttered as an answer to the question 'whose father fell?' It does, indeed.  
7 Improper Movement Condition is violated in (14b) since the trace of the moved phrase *Cheli-ka* is not c-commanded by it. In order for a trace to be bound, it has to be c-commanded by its antecedent.  
8 James Yoon (2007) argues that only (certain kinds of) Subjects undergo SOR, despite claims to the contrary (Hong 1991).  
9 As a DNC, (18) is odd even without honorification, perhaps because the Sentential Predicate does not express a characteristic property. However, adding honorification seems to make it worse, so that we can still salvage the argument that failed metonymy is a factor in the overall judgment.  
10 Tomioka and Sim (2007) take the outer accusative to be an argument of a null predicate ('Aff'), and the inner accusative to be licensed by the base verb. However, they do not posit a Control relation between the outer accusative and the Possessor argument of the inner accusative, but instead employ Event Composition to get the effect of PR, espousing what we have called Indirect Licensing. Vermeulen (2009) argues that the Possessor of the inner accusative must be implicated in order to avoid over-generation.  
11 Vermeulen (2009) also views the AC as pragmatic. She says AC effects arise because the outer accusative is not a thematic argument of the verb, but must nevertheless be construed as a participant in the eventuality named by it. Affectedness is a means to signal this integration, in her view.

Her idea seems to be on the right track. The reason that the outer nominative (in DNCs) and the outer accusative (in DACs) show more stringent, or prototypical, Subject/Object properties may be because they do not receive theta-roles from the predicate. It follows that the additional interpretive properties imposed on them cannot be thematic.

- 12 The relation between a Controller and Controllee in Obligatory Control is local, as is well-known, but in (30), the relation between the outer accusative (presumed Controller) and the Controllee (*ku-uy/ku-ka*) is non-local. In addition, Controllees in Obligatory Control are typically null, but this not the case here as the Controllee can be spelt out as a pronoun.

## REFERENCES

- Barker, Chris. 1991. *Possessive Descriptions*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Bejar, Susana and Diane Massam. 1999. "Multiple case checking." *Syntax*, 2: 65–79.
- Cho, Sungeun. 2003. "A conditioning factor in possessor agreement constructions." In *Japanese/Korean Linguistics, Vol. 11*, edited by Pat Clancy, 343–351. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Choe, Hyon Sook. 1986. "Syntactic adjunction, a-chains, and the ECP." In *Proceedings of the 17<sup>th</sup> Northeast Linguistic Society*, edited by Joyce McDonough and Bernadette Plunkett, 100–121. Amherst, MA: GLSA Publications.
- Chun, Sun-Ae. 1985. "Possessor ascension for multiple case sentences." In *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics Vol. 1*, edited by Susumu Kuno et al., 30–39. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing.
- Deal, Amy. To appear. "External possession and possessor raising." In *The Companion to Syntax*, 2nd ed., edited by Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Falk, Yehuda. 2006. *Subjects and Universal Grammar: An Explanatory Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heycock, Caroline. 1993. "Syntactic predication in Japanese." *Journal of East Asian Linguistics*, 2: 167–211.
- Heim, Irene and Angelika Kratzer. 1998. *Semantics in Generative Grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Hong, Kisun. 1991. "Argument Selection and Case-Marking in Korean." PhD diss., Stanford University.
- Kang, Beommo. 2002. *Pemcwu Munpep: Hankwuke-uy Hyengthaylon, Thongsalon, Thaip-nonliceK Uymilon* (Categorial Grammar: The Morphology, Syntax, and Type-Logical Semantics of Korean). Seoul: Korea University Press.
- Kang, Young-Se. 1985. "Korean Syntax and Universal Grammar." PhD diss., Harvard University.
- Kim, Young-Joo. 1989. "Inalienable possession as a semantic relationship underlying predication: the case of multiple-accusative constructions." In *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics, Vol. 3*, edited by Susumu Kuno et al., 445–468. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing.
- Kumashiro, Toshiyuki and Ronald W. Langacker. 2003. "Double-subject and complex-predicate constructions." *Cognitive Linguistics*, 14: 1–45.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kuroda, Sige-Yuki. 1986. "Movement of noun phrases in Japanese." In *Issues in Japanese Linguistics*, edited by Takashi Imai and Mamoru Saito, 229–271. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Lee, Ik-Hwan. 1987. "Double subject constructions in GPSG." In *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics, Vol. 2*, edited by Susumu Kuno et al., 287–296. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing.
- Lee, Jeong-Shik. 1992. "Case Alternation in Korean: Case Minimality." PhD diss., University of Connecticut.
- Lee-Schoenfeld, Vera. 2006. "German possessor datives: raised and affected." *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*, 9: 101–142.
- Maling, Joan and Soowon Kim. 1992. "Case assignment in the inalienable possession construction in Korean." *Journal of East Asian Linguistics*, 1: 37–68.
- McCloskey, James. 1997. "Subjecthood and subject positions." In *Elements of Grammar: Handbook of Generative Syntax*, edited by Liliane Haegeman, 197–235. Dordrecht: Springer.
- O'Grady, William. 1991. *Categories and Case: The Sentence Structure of Korean*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- O'Grady, William. 1998. "Korean case: a computational approach." In *Papers from the 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the International Circle of Korean Linguists*, edited by Byung-Soo Park and James Yoon, 1–19. Seoul: Hankwukmunhwasa.

- Park, Chongwon. 2010. "The role of metonymy in the interpretation of Korean multiple subject constructions." *Language Sciences*, 33: 206–228.
- Park, Chongwon. 2013. "Metonymy in grammar: Korean multiple object constructions." *Functions of Language*, 20: 31–63.
- Park, Byung Soo. 1973. "On the multiple subject constructions in Korean." *Linguistics*, 100:63–76.
- Payne, Doris, and Immanuel Barshi. 1999. *External Possession*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schütze, Carson. 2001. "On Korean 'case stacking': the varied functions of the particles *ka* and *lul*." *The Linguistic Review*, 18: 193–232.
- Shin, Keun Young. 2005. "External possession constructions," In *Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, edited by Nikki Adams et al., 445–455. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Tomioka, Satoshi, and Chang-Yong Sim. 2007. "The Event Semantic Root of Inalienable Possession." Unpublished Ms, University of Delaware.
- Vermeulen, Reiko. 2005. "Possessive and adjunct multiple nominative constructions in Japanese." *Lingua*, 115: 1329–1363.
- Vermeulen, Reiko. 2009. "On the syntax of external possession in Korean." In *Japanese/Korean Linguistics, Vol. 16*, edited by Yukinori Takubo et al., 422–436. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Yeon, Jaehoon. 2003. *Korean Grammatical Constructions: Their Form and Meaning*. London: Saffron Books.
- Yeon, Jaehoon. 2010. "Constraints on double-accusative external possession constructions in Korean: A cognitive approach" In *Selected Papers from the 2<sup>nd</sup> European Conference on Korean Linguistics*, edited by Jaehoon Yeon and Jieun Kiaer, 188–201. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Yoon, Jeong-Me. 1997. "The argument structure of relational nouns and inalienable possessor constructions in Korean." *Language Research*, 33: 231–264.
- Yoon, James. 1986. "Some queries concerning the syntax of multiple subject constructions in Korean." *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*, 16: 215–236.
- Yoon, James. 1990. "Theta theory and the grammar of inalienable possession constructions." In *Proceedings of the 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Northeast Linguistic Society*, edited by Juli Carter et al., 502–516. Amherst, MA: GLSA Publications.
- Yoon, James. 2001. "Multiple (Identical) Case Constructions." Lecture Notes, LSA Summer Institute, University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Yoon, James. 2004. "Non-nominative (major) subjects and case-stacking in Korean." In *Non-nominative Subjects, Vol. 2*, edited by Peri Bhaskararao and K. V. Subbarao, 265–314. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yoon, James. 2007. "Raising of major arguments in Korean and Japanese." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 25: 615–653.
- Yoon, James. 2009. "The distribution of subject properties in multiple subject constructions." In *Japanese/Korean Linguistics, Vol. 16*, edited by Yukinori Takubo et al., 64–83. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Yoon, Jong Yurl. 1989. "On the multiple *ka* and *lul* constructions in Korean." In *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics, Vol 3*, edited by Susum Kuno et al., 383–394. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing.
- Youn, Cheong. 1990. "A Relational Analysis of Korean Multiple Nominative Constructions." PhD diss., State University of New York at Buffalo.