

Quantifier Float in Korean

Author(s): Ki-Sun Hong

*Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (1990), pp. 175-186

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

---

*The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

## Quantifier Float in Korean\*

Ki-Sun Hong  
Stanford University

### 0. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the so-called quantifier float construction in Korean (Shibatani 1977, Gerdts 1985, Lee 1989, among others). I will first examine previous analyses, concentrating on Gerdts' analysis in terms of constituent structure. Second, I will present two kinds of problems in her proposal: one conceptual and the other empirical. Third, I will propose an alternative view. I will show that this construction is subject to a more general condition on the redundancy of semantic information, which is independently required in Korean grammar.

### 1. Previous Analyses

Quantifier phrases in Korean can appear outside of the noun phrases which they modify, as in (1-2).<sup>1</sup>

- (1) a. *sey haksayng-i o-ass-ta.*  
three student-nom come-past-indicative  
'Three students came.'  
b. *haksayng-i seys-i o-ass-ta.*  
students-nom three-nom come-past-indicative
- (2) a. *nay-ka sey haksayng-ul manna-ass-ta.*  
I-nom three student-acc meet-past-indicative  
'I met three students.'  
b. *nay-ka haksayng-ul seys-ul manna-ass-ta.*  
I-nom student-acc three-acc meet-past-indicative

They form a separate constituent from those NPs, as evidenced by adverb insertion as in (3).

- (3) a. *haksayng-i ecey seys-i o-ass-ta.*  
student-nom yesterday three-nom come-past-indicative  
'Three students came yesterday.'  
b. *nay-ka haksayng-ul wuyenhi seys-ul manna-ass-ta.*  
I-nom student-acc by chance three-acc meet-past-indicative  
'I happened to meet three students.'

Following some studies on quantifier float (O'Grady 1982, Belletti 1982, Gerdts 1985), I consider these quantifiers as base-generated anaphors, although it is not the main concern of this paper.

This construction is not always possible: when the relevant NP is marked with a case neither nominative nor accusative (e.g., *eykey* 'to', *eykeyse* 'from', *eyse* 'at', etc.),<sup>2</sup> it cannot antecede a quantifier phrase.

- (4) a. *nay-ka sey haksayng-eykey kong-ul tenci-ess-ta.*  
I-nom three student-to ball-acc throw-past-indicative  
'I threw a ball to three students.'  
b. \**nay-ka haksayng-eykey seys-eykey kong-ul tenci-ess-ta.*  
I-nom student-to three-to ball-acc throw-past-indicative

- (5) a. *nay-ka sey hakkyo-lopthe phyenci-lul pat-ass-ta.*  
 I-nom three school-from letter-acc receive-past-indicative  
 'I received letters from three schools.'
- b. \**nay-ka hakkyo-lopthe seys-ulopthe phyenci-lul pat-ass-ta.*  
 I-nom school-from three-from letter-acc receive-past-indicative

This contrast between (1-2) and (4-5) leads Shibatani (1977) to claim that quantifier float is sensitive to surface case: quantifiers can be anteceded only by NPs marked nominative or accusative.

This analysis implies that the case of the antecedent NP and that of the quantifier should agree. Gerdts (1985) argues against this proposal, mostly based on complex sentences where this agreement view fails to provide a correct prediction. First, in a subject-to-object raising construction, the raised object can antecede the quantifier phrase. Either nominative or accusative case can appear on the quantifier, as in (6).

- (6) a. *John-i sey haksayng-ul [chencay-la-ko] mit-nunta.*  
 nom three student-acc genius-be-comp believe-indicative  
 'John believes three students to be geniuses.'
- b. *John-i haksayng-ul seys-i/ul chencay-la-ko mit-nunta.*  
 nom student-acc three-nom/acc genius-be-comp believe-indicative  
 (Gerdts (17-18))

Under the surface case analysis, it is predicted that the quantifier phrase is marked only in accusative case: it cannot be marked in nominative since there is no antecedent with this surface case. Second, the same kind of problem is observed in a causative sentence, as in (7). The surface case analysis cannot account for the nominative case marking on the quantifier phrase, since there is no possible antecedent with that case.

- (7) a. *nay-ka sey haksayng-eykey [ttena-key] ha-yess-ta.*  
 I-nom three student-to leave-comp make-past-indicative  
 'I made three students leave.'
- b. *nay-ka haksayng-eykey seys-i ttena-key ha-yess-ta.*  
 I-nom student-to three-nom leave-comp make-past-indicative (Gerdts (19))

Third, a topic sentence provides us with further counterevidence. Here again, there is no antecedent sanctioning the quantifier phrase in accusative case.

- (8) *Chayk-un nay-ka seys-ul sa-ass-ta.*  
 book-topic I-nom three-acc buy-past-indicative  
 'As for books, I bought three.' (Gerdts (20))

On the basis of these arguments, Gerdts claims that the account in terms of surface case cannot be maintained. She notes that these data are not tenable with the grammatical relations account either, which dictates that only subjects and objects can antecede quantifier phrases.

- (9) a. *haksayng-i sonyen-tul-ul chayk-ul seys-ul cwu-ess-ta.*  
 student-nom boy-plural-acc book-acc three-acc give-past-indicative  
 'The student gave the boys three books.'
- b. *ku cikhong-i sonkalak-i kikyey seys-i calli-ess-ta.*  
 the worker-nom finger-nom machine-loc three-nom cut-past-indicative  
 'Three fingers of the worker were cut in the machine.' (Gerdts (21-22))

*Chayk* 'book' in (9a) and *sonkalak* 'finger' in (9b) sanction quantifier phrases, although they are chomeurs within her theory.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, the grammatical relations account fails to provide an adequate explanation.

Instead of these two accounts, which have turned out to be inadequate, Gerdts proposes an approach based upon constituent structure, as in (10).

- (10) Only nominals which are not contained within a Postpositional Phrase can antecede Quantifiers. (Gerdts (27))

This statement is based on two assumptions. First, in Korean, only nominative and accusative case are inflectional suffixes attached to a nominal in the lexicon, while other cases are postpositions which form a PP with the preceding NP in the syntax.<sup>4</sup> This explains why only NPs in nominative or in accusative case can antecede a quantifier phrase in (1-5) and (9). Second, an empty NP is required to explain (6-8). In those constructions, there should be an empty NP which bears some function in the embedded clause, and this NP antecedes a quantifier phrase according to (10).

## 2. Problems in Gerdts

In spite of a consistent account of given data, Gerdts' analysis leaves two problems. First, contrary to her claim, NPs marked in non-nominative/accusative case markers as in (4-5) may sanction quantifier float, even in simple sentences. Second, lexical phonology (Kiparsky 1982, 1985, Mohanan 1982) provides us with evidence that all the case markers should be inflectional suffixes attached to a noun in the lexicon (Y.Cho 1988).<sup>5</sup> Accordingly, we cannot rely on differences in morphological status of the two classes of case markers. Let us consider each problem in detail.

First, NPs marked with non-nominative/accusative case markers can antecede quantifier phrases in two cases: (i) when a delimiting particle (*man* 'only', *to* 'also', *cocha* 'even', etc.; for discussion of so-called delimiters, see Yang 1972)<sup>6</sup> is attached to either the noun phrase or the quantifier phrase, as in (11), and (ii) when either the noun phrase or the quantifier phrase gets stress for contrastive reading, as in (12). As far as case marking is concerned, all of the sentences include NPs in dative case. However, delimiters or stress make them perfectly grammatical.

- (11) a. *nay-ka chinkwu-tul-hanthey-nun* seys-hanthey X-mas card-lul  
 I-nom friend-plural-to-contrast three-to acc  
*ponay-ess-ta.*  
 send-past-indicative  
 'I sent Christmas cards to three friends (contrastive to other groups of people, e.g., teachers).'
- b. *nay-ka chinkwu-tul-hanthey-man* seys-hanthey X-mas card-lul  
 only  
*ponay-ess-ta.*  
 send-past-indicative  
 'I sent Christmas cards only to three friends (not to any other groups of people).'
- c. *nay-ka chinkwu-tul-hanthey* seys-hanthey-*na* X-mas card-lul  
 as many as  
*ponay-ess-ta.*  
 send-past-indicative  
 'I sent Christmas cards to as many as three friends.'



- |      |   |   |
|------|---|---|
| (16) | <b>Structural Case</b><br>a. structural information<br>b. no case preservation<br>c. deletable<br>d. appears last on the NP | <b>Semantic Case</b><br>only semantic information<br>case preservation<br>no deletion possible<br>attached at the noun stem |
|------|---|---|

First, nominative and accusative belong to the group of structural case.<sup>7</sup> Both of them (i) carry structural information, as (17) illustrates (nominative: [NP,S], accusative: [NP, VP] in most cases); (ii) are not preserved when they compete with some delimiters, as in (18); (iii) are deletable when the grammatical relations are clear from the context (e.g., in the unmarked word order), as in (19); and (iv) appear as the last suffix in the NP form, as (20) demonstrates.

- (17) a. John-i o-ass-ta.  
           nom come-past-indicative  
       'John came.'  
       b. nay-ka John-ul manna-ass-ta.  
           I-nom acc meet-past-indicative  
           'I met John.'
- (18) a. John-to (\*John-ka-to / \*John-to-ka) o-ass-ta.  
           also nom-also also-nom come-past-indicative  
           'John also came.'  
       b. nay-ka John-to (\*John-lul-to / \*John-to-lul) manna-ass-ta.  
           also acc-also also-acc meet-past-indicative  
           'I met John, too.'
- (19) a. John o-ass-ni?  
           come-past-interrogative  
           'Did John come?'  
       b. na John manna-ass-e.  
           I meet-past-indicative  
           'I met John.'
- (20) ai-tul-hanthey-man-i/lul  
       child-plural-to-only-nom/acc  
       'only to children'

In contrast, all the other case markers are semantic in the sense that they (i) carry semantic information, as in (21); (ii) are preserved when they compete with delimiters, as in (22); (iii) are not deletable (example (23)); (iv) are attached to the noun stem as (24) demonstrates.

- (21) a. hanthey, eykey : to (goal, experiencer, possessor)  
       b. hantheyse : from (source)  
       c. ey : to (goal), at (location)  
       d. ulo: by (instrumental)
- (22) a. John-hanthey-to  
           to-also  
           'to John too'  
       b. John-hantheyse-cocha  
           from-even  
           'even from John'
- (23) a. na-nun ku hakkyo-eyse John-ul manna-ass-e.  
           I-topic the school-at acc meet-past-indicative  
           'I met John at the school.'  
       b. \*na ku hakkyo John manna-ass-e.

- (24) ai-tul-hanthey(-man-i)  
child-plural-to(-only-nom)

The second and the third characteristics of the semantic case markers seem to be a natural result of the first one: they should be preserved in any case in order to avoid loss of semantic information.

Then, on the basis of this dichotomy, how can we account for the quantifier float construction?

### 3.2. Alternative Analysis of Quantifier Float

We may rephrase Gerdts' condition given in (10) in terms of a distinction between structural case and semantic case. However, we still cannot explain how non-nominative/accusative case markers can antecede quantifier phrases when a delimiter is attached to either the noun phrase or the quantifier phrase or when either the noun phrase or the quantifier phrase gets stress as we have observed in (11-12), repeated here as (25-26).

- (25) a. nay-ka chinkwu-tul-hanthey-*nun* seys-hanthey X-mas card-lul  
I-nom friend-plural-to-contrast three-to acc  
ponay-ess-ta.  
send-past-indicative  
'I sent Christmas cards to three friends (contrastive to other groups of people, e.g., teachers).'
- b. nay-ka chinkwu-tul-hanthey-*man* seys-hanthey X-mas card-lul  
only  
ponay-ess-ta.  
send-past-indicative  
'I sent Christmas cards only to three friends (not to any other groups of people).'
- c. nay-ka chinkwu-tul-hanthey seys-hanthey-*na* X-mas card-lul  
as many as  
ponay-ess-ta.  
send-past-indicative  
'I sent Christmas cards to as many as three friends.'
- (26) a. nay-ka CHINKWU-TUL-HANTHEY seys-hanthey X-mas card-lul  
ponay-ess-ta.  
'I sent Christmas cards to three friends (contrastive to other groups of people).'
- b. nay-ka chinkwu-tul-hanthey SEYS-HANTHEY X-mas card-lul  
ponay-ess-ta.  
'I sent Christmas cards to three friends (contrastive to four of them).'

On the basis of these data, I propose an alternative view of this construction. All the previous studies concern only the antecedent of the quantifier phrase: its grammatical function, case marking, or syntactic category. In contrast, I argue that the relationship between the NP and the quantifier phrase provides us with a simpler and correct generalization. First, I will consider the structure of an NP in Korean and propose two types of semantic information carried by an NP. Second, I will show that a quantifier phrase is an NP. Third, I will propose a condition on the cooccurrence of NPs to the effect of avoiding the redundancy of semantic information. Last, I will show that this rule is independently required in Korean grammar by showing that this quantifier float construction is one instance of so-called multiple case marking constructions in Korean, and that our condition equally applies to all the cases belonging to the construction.

First, let us consider the structure of an NP in Korean. The classification of case markers provides us with a simple account of the structure of an NP (for the use of the term *root*, see Cho and Sells 1990).

(27) Root - Semantic Case - Delimiters - Structural Case

In general, an NP in Korean consists of a root and inflectional suffixes of three classes as illustrated in (27). A root can have only one semantic case (example (28a)) or one structural case (example (28b)). Or a semantic case can be followed by a structural case in some instances as in (28c). Delimiters are particles carrying various kinds of semantic information, for example, contrast (e.g., *nun* 'as for') or scope (e.g., *man* 'only', *to* 'also'). They generally come between a semantic case and a structural case, although some of them (e.g., *nun* 'as for', *to* 'also', *cocha* 'even') override a structural case as in (28d-e).

- (28) a. John-hanthey  
to  
b. John-i  
nom  
c. John-hanthey-ka  
to-nom  
d. John-hanthey-man-i  
to-only-nom  
'only to John'  
e. John-hanthey-to(-\*ka)  
to-also(\*-nom)  
'to John too'

Given these considerations, we can say that inflectional suffixes of an NP carry two types of semantic information: one is thematic roles expressed by means of semantic case markers, and the other is expressed by delimiters. Let me call the former Type 1 information, and the latter Type 2 information. Structural case markers do not carry any semantic information. We should note that stress also carries Type 2 information, that is, a contrastive meaning.

Second, let us consider the syntactic category of the quantifier phrase.

- (29) a. seys-hanthey  
three-to  
b. seys-kwa neys  
three-and four  
c. ku seys  
the three

The quantifier phrase is clearly an NP: (i) semantic case is attached to it (example (29a)); (ii) it can be coordinated with another noun by means of *kwa* (example (29b)); (iii) it can be modified by a demonstrative adjective (example (29c)). Then, we can say that a typical quantifier float construction as in (1b) is the case where two NPs with the same case occur in a clause.

On the basis of these considerations, I propose a condition on the cooccurrence of NPs (for a similar proposal in Hindi, see T. Mohanan 1990).

- (30) NPs carrying exactly and only the same type of semantic information are disallowed in a clause, where type of information = Type 1 and Type 2.

The intuition behind this condition is to avoid redundancy of semantic information. This condition guarantees that two NPs in a clause be distinguishable in at least one of the two types of semantic information, that is, Type 1 information carried by semantic case markers and Type 2 carried by delimiters and stress. This condition accounts for (31).

- (31) a. haksayng-i seys-i  
 student-nom three-nom  
 b.\*haksayng-hanthey seys-hanthey  
 to to  
 c.\*haksayng-hanthey-man seys-hanthey-man  
 to-only to-only  
 d. haksayng-hanthey-man seys-hanthey  
 to-only only  
 e. haksayng-hanthey seys-hanthey-man  
 to to-only

(31a) is grammatical, since no semantic information is involved. (31b) is ungrammatical, since the two NPs carry exactly and only the same kind of semantic information, that is, Type 1. (31c) is explained in the same way. In (31d), the first NP carries Type 1 and Type 2 information, while the second one carries only Type 1 information. Accordingly, (31d) does not violate (30). (31e) is accounted for in the same way.

Some clarification of this condition is in order. First, this condition cannot be purely phonological, since a series of two NPs with different phonological realizations of one semantic case (example (32a)) or of one delimiter (example (32b)) is also ruled out.

- (32) a.\*haksayng-eykey seys-hanthey  
 student-to three-to  
 'to three students'  
 b.\*haksayng-eykey-kkaci seys-eykey-cocha  
 student-to-even three-to-even  
 'even to three students'

Second, this condition does not apply to NPs belonging to different clauses. In (33), *Mary-eykey* and *ai-tul-eykey* can cooccur since the former belongs to a higher clause.

- (33) nay-ka Mary-eykey [John-i ai-tul-eykey sathang-ul  
 I-nom to nom child-plural-to candy-acc  
 cwu-ess-ta]-ko malha-yess-ta.  
 give-past-indicative-comp tell-past-indicative  
 'I told Mary that John gave candies to children.'

Given these considerations, (30) accounts for all the quantifier float data presented so far: (1-3) are grammatical, since NPs in structural case cooccur; (4-5) are ungrammatical due to a repetition of Type 1 information; (6-8) are explained in any theory assuming empty NPs in the embedded clause, as Gerdts notes;<sup>8</sup> (9) involves only NPs with structural case; and last, (11-12) involve NPs carrying Type 1 information, but they are distinguished in terms of Type 2 information.

Lastly, we observe that this general condition on a series of NPs is equally applicable to all the cases of so-called multiple case marking constructions.<sup>9</sup> (34) demonstrates that multiple nominative/accusative marked NPs can occur in a clause.

- (34) a. ku cip-i           cengwon-i nelp-ta.  
           the house-nom garden-nom be big-indicative  
           'The garden of the house is big.'  
       b. na-nun ku cip-ul   cengwon-ul po-ass-ta.  
           I-topic the house-acc garden-acc see-past-indicative  
           'I saw the garden of the house.'

However, this multiple case marking is not always possible, as in (35).

- (35) a. \*ku cip-ulo   cengwon-ulo ka-ca.  
           the house-to garden-to go-let's  
           'Let's go to the garden of the house.'  
       b. \*ku cip-uloputhe cengwon-uloputhe naymsay-ka na-nta.  
           the house-from garden-from smell-nom come-indicative  
           'A smell is coming from the garden of the house.'  
       c. \*ku cip-eyse cengwon-eyse party-ka yelli-nta.  
           the house-at garden-at nom be held-indicative  
           'A party is going to be held in the garden of the house.'

If the NPs are marked in the same semantic case, they cannot cooccur in a clause. However, if a delimiter is attached to either of them or if one of the NPs receives contrastive stress, the sentences become grammatical.

- (36) a. ku cip-ulo-nun   cengwon-ulo ka-ca.  
                           contrast  
       b. ku cip-uloputhe-nun   cengwon-uloputhe naymsay-ka na-nta.  
                           contrast  
       c. ku cip-eyse cengwon-eyse-man party-ka yelli-nta.  
                                   only  
 (37) a. KU CIP-ULO cengwon-ulo ka-ca.  
       b. ku cip-uloputhe CENGWON-ULOPUTHE naymsay-ka na-nta.  
       c. ku cip-eyse CENGWON-EYSE party-ka yelli-nta.

This contrast between (35) and (36-37) is exactly the same as in the quantifier float construction. Accordingly, the condition in (30) is equally applicable to this case. This is why we have multiple nominative/accusative constructions, rather than multiple dative/ablative constructions.

A closer look reveals that the quantifier float construction is an instance of this multiple case marking construction. First, the two constructions are the same as far as the structure in terms of discourse functions is concerned.

- (38) a. ku cip-i           cengwon-i nelp-ta.  
           the house-nom garden-nom be big-indicative  
           'Speaking of the house, (its) garden is big.'  
       b. haksaying-i seys-i o-ass-ta.  
           student-nom three-nom come-past-indicative  
           'Speaking of students, three (of them) came.'

The closest translations of the sentences are as given in (38). The first NP is interpreted as a theme, in the sense that it specifies the domain or the universe of discourse with respect to which the predication following it is going to present some relevant information (Dik 1978:132).<sup>10</sup> However, the two constructions differ in the semantic relationship between the two NPs: (i) (38a) shows a whole-part relationship, while (38b) an appositive one (Lee 1989); (ii) the second phrase is an anaphor only in (38b).

These differences result in some differences in word order, as in (39-42). First, within an NP, an NP denoting a part cannot precede one denoting a whole, as in (39b). In contrast, either of them can precede the other one if they are in an appositive relation as in (40).<sup>11</sup> Second, as the quantifier phrase is an anaphor, it should be bound by some NP. Accordingly, (42b) is ruled out. This condition does not hold in non-anaphoric cases such as (41).

- (39) a. ku cip      cengwon  
       the house garden  
       b. \*cengwon ku cip  
           garden the house
- (40) a. chinkwu    seys (or sey myeng)  
       friend      three    three classifier  
       b. sey myeng chinkwu  
           three classifier friend
- (41) a. ku cip-i      cengwon-i nelp-ta.  
       the house-nom garden-nom be big-indicative  
       'Speaking of the house, (its) garden is big.'  
       b. cengwon-i ku cip-i nelp-ta.  
       garden-nom the house-nom be big-indicative  
       'Speaking of gardens, (the one of) the house is big.'
- (42) a. haksayng-i sey-i o-ass-ta.  
       student-nom three-nom come-past-indicative  
       'Speaking of students, three (of them) came.'  
       b. \*seys-i haksayng-i o-ass-ta.  
       three-nom student-nom come-past-indicative

On the basis of these discussions, we can safely claim that the condition in (30) is required in Korean grammar for all the cases where multiple NPs occur in a clause. In other words, we do not need a specific condition only for the quantifier float construction, contrary to the claims of previous studies.

#### 4. Conclusion

In this paper, I have proposed an alternative analysis for the quantifier float construction in Korean. In contrast with other works which concentrate on the antecedent NP, a general condition on the redundancy of semantic information provides us with a correct generalization.

#### Notes

\*I am grateful to Joan Bresnan, K.P. Mohanan, and Peter Sells for their valuable discussions and comments.

1. Gerdts (1985:59) notes that Korean is distinguished from Japanese in the respect that the floated quantifier can be case marked. As in Gerdts, this paper is concerned only with the cases where the quantifier is case marked.

2. Such forms as *lul uihaye* 'for' or *ey uihay* 'by' should be analyzed as a form consisting of a case marker and adverbial form of a verb, although their meanings are pretty similar to prepositions in English. They change their forms by means of inflection, which is impossible for the other case markers (e.g., *lul uiha-n*, *ey uiha-n*).

3. For various discussions on grammatical relations in the multiple nominative/accusative constructions, see Park 1981, Chun 1985, Kang 1985, Yoon 1987, among others. As my own data provides a case where the relevant element is clearly neither a subject nor an object, I will not go into details here to figure out which NP is the real subject/object in this construction.

4. Gerdts recently seems to adopt a different view on Korean case marking (Gerdts and Youn 1988:160): she distinguishes between S-case and I-case, which is almost the same as my distinction between structural case and semantic case.

5. There are three views on case markers: (i) to deal with every case marker as an inflectional suffix (J.Cho 1988, Park 1988); (ii) to analyze nominative/accusative as suffixes and others as postpositions (Yoo 1989); (iii) to deal with every case marker as a postposition.

6. The so-called topic marker may be analyzed as a delimiter, in the sense that it adds to a contrastive meaning (Yang 1972). As is predicted, all the topics sanction quantifier float, as in (1).

- (1) a. haksayng-hanthey-nun nay-ka seys-hanthey cenhwa-ul ha-yess-ta.  
 student-to-topic I-nom three-to call-acc make-past-indicative  
 'To students, I made phone calls to three of them.'  
 b. chinkwu-hantheyse-nun nay-ka seys-hantheyse cenhwa-ul  
 friend-from-topic I-nom three-from call-acc  
 pat-ass-ta.  
 receive-past-indicative  
 'From friends, I received phone calls from three of them.'

7. Here, I omit *ui* (genitive), since we are mainly concerned with sentential arguments/adjuncts. It belongs to the structural case: it carries structural information [NP, NP]; is deletable; appears as the last suffix. However, it should be preserved when competing with delimiters.

8. Peter Sells has pointed out to me that we need a more careful characterization of the empty noun. For example, in the framework of Lexical Functional Grammar, this empty noun cannot be accounted for in terms of Functional control due to a case conflict.

9. There are other kinds of multiple nominative constructions, for example, where the first nominative marked NP is interpreted as an experiencer (Gerdts and Youn 1988). They should be distinguished from (31), where a possessor relationship holds between two NPs. However, the condition in (30) is equally applicable to this case.

10. Several studies (Yoon 1987, Heycock and Lee 1989, among others) propose a different pair of terminologies, for example, predication subject and predication, focus and subject. However, I believe that the intuition they attempt to express is the same as mine. I do not think that such terms as topic or focus give the correct generalization, since the first nominative marked NP can be interpreted as a topic or a focus depending on the discourse context. I propose the notion of theme to cover both.

11. Two points are in order: (i) in (39-42), I deliberately select examples where the genitive marker *ui* is deleted to simplify my argument. The examples where *ui* is involved need more explanation; (ii) in (40b), I substitute *seys* 'three' by *sey myeng* 'three person (classifier)'. There is no meaning difference between the two expressions. But for some mysterious reason, *seys chinkwu* 'three friends' is not grammatical.

## References

- Belletti, Adriana. 1982. On the anaphoric status of the reciprocal construction in Italian. *Linguistic Review*. 2.2. 101-38.  
 Cho, Jae Ohk. 1988. Case and coordination in Korean. *Korean Linguistics*. 5.  
 Cho, Young-mee Yu. 1988. Phonological evidence for the lexical treatment of Korean suffixes. Paper presented at the LSA annual meeting. New Orleans.  
 Cho, Young-mee Yu and Peter Sells. 1990. A lexical account of phrasal suffixes in Korean. Ms., Stanford.

- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Chun, Soon Ae. 1985. Possessor ascension for multiple case sentences. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics*. 1. 30-9.
- Dik, Simon. 1978. *Functional Grammar*. (North-Holland Linguistic Series). Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.
- Gerds, Donna. 1985. Surface case and grammatical relations in Korean: The evidence from quantifier float. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics*. 1. 48-61.
- Gerds, Donna and Cheong Youn. 1988. Korean psych constructions: Advancement or retreat. *CLS*. 24. 155-75.
- Heycock, Caroline and Young-Suk Lee. 1989. Subjects and predication in Japanese and Korean. To appear in the *Proceedings of the First Southern California Conference on Japanese and Korean Linguistics*.
- Kang, Young-Se. 1985. Case marking in Korean. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics*. 1.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1982. Lexical morphology and phonology. *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*. ed. by I. Yang. Seoul: Hanshin.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1985. Some consequences of Lexical Phonology. *Phonology Yearbook*. 2.
- Lee, Chungmin. 1989. (In)definites, case markers, classifiers, and quantifiers in Korean. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics*. 3.
- Mohanan, K.P. 1982. *Lexical Phonology*. MIT Diss.
- Mohanan, Tara. 1990. *Arguments in Hindi*. Stanford Diss.
- O'Grady, William. 1982. The syntax and semantics of quantifier placement. *Linguistics*. 20. 519-39.
- Park, Byung-Soo. 1981. Double subject revisited. *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*. ed. by I. Yang. Seoul: Hanshin.
- Park, Byung-Soo. 1988. How to handle Korean verbal suffixes in GPSG. *Proceedings of the International Circle of Korean Linguistics*. 6.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1977. Grammatical relations and surface cases. *Language*. 53.4. 789-809.
- Yang, In-Seok. 1972. *Korean syntax: Case marking, delimiters, complementation and reflexivization*. Seoul: Baikhap Publishing.
- Yoo, Beom. 1989. The morphological status of Korean case markers. *Working Papers in Linguistics*. 37. 28-38. Columbus: Ohio State University.
- Yoon, James Hye-Suk. 1987. Some queries concerning the syntax of multiple subject constructions in Korean. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics*. 2. 138-62.