Subject Raising in Korean Redux:
Base-generated Left Dislocation*

YoungSik Choi

(Soonchunhyang University)

Choi, YoungSik. 2011. Subject Raising in Korean Redux: Base-generated Left Dislocation. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal. 19*(3). 1-23. I will deal with subject raising of a finite complement clause in Korean. I critically review two proposals which have thus far attracted the most attention: raising for case approach and prolepsis approach. I will show that neither approach provides a satisfactory account for the relevant data. I suggest that the putative accusative case of the subject of the finite complement clause is in fact an instantiation of a topic morpheme, subject to topicalization comparable to left dislocation in English. I hence diverge from the standard assumption in the literature since Choi (1961) that *lul* is invariably accusative case morpheme. The present proposal has a nontrivial crosslinguistic implication, shedding new light on our understanding of the true nature of so called exceptional case marking constructions in languages typologically akin to Korean.

Key words: object, raising, prolepsis, case, topic

1. Introduction

Korean is wellknown to show a very interesting phenomenon of case alternation of the embedded subject of a finite complement clause as shown below in (1). The case of the embedded subject can be realized either as nominative or accusative.

(1) a. John-un   Mary-**lul** ttokttokhata-ko sayngkakhanta.
         J-TOP   M-ACC   smart-COMP   think
         'John thinks that Mary is smart.'
    b. John-un Mary-ka   ttokttokhata-ko sayngkakhanta.
         J-TOP   M-NOM   smart-COMP   think
         'John thinks that Mary is smart.'

At various stages of the generative grammar, there have been many proposals to deal with the so called case alternation as in (1) in Korean type languages with a finite complement clause (see Massam 1985, Yoon 1991, and Hoji 1991, O'Grady 1991, Yang 1999, Schütze 2001, Hoji 2005, Takano 2003, among many others). Among these, two proposals figure prominently. One is raising for case approach as advocated by Yoon (1991), and Yang (1999) among others, and the other prolepsis as suggested by Hoji (1991, 2005) and Takano (2003) (cf. Saito 1985). The two approaches converge in that *lul*-marking on the embedded subject is the case morpheme. They crucially diverge, however, in that for the former, the embedded subject in (1a) is raised to the matrix clause for case whereas for the latter it is base generated in the matrix clause.

Below in sections 2 and 3, I will critically review these two approaches and make an alternative proposal in section 4. I suggest *lul* above in (1a) is a topic morpheme following Schütze (2001) and Choi (2008) among others, and that the relevant phenomenon is topicalization as comparable to left dislocation in English. Section 5 is the conclusion and theoretical implications of the present proposal. Throughout, I will gloss *lul* and its allomorph *ul* as the accusative case, only as a descriptive cover term.

2. Raising for Case

Beginning with Rosenbaum (1967), Postal (1974), and Postal and Pullum (1988), it has been argued by many researchers that the example below in (2a) in English involves raising of the embedded subject into the matrix object position as schematically represented in (3) (see Rouveret and Vergnaud 1980, Chomsky 1973, 1981, 1986b, 1995, Lasnik 1999 for the related discussion).[1]

(2) a. John believes him to be intelligent.
    b. John believes that he is intelligent.

(3) NP-NOM [$_{VP}$ V NP$_i$-ACC [$_{CP}$[$_{IP}$ t$_i$ to [$_{VP}$ V]]]]

It has been claimed by Yoon (1991) and Yang (1999) among others that the example above in (1a) also involves raising of the *lul* marked embedded subject directly from the embedded subject position in a way analogous to English ECM construction above in (2a), following the proposal by Kuno (1976), along with the assumption that *lul* is invariably an accusative case morpheme as suggested by Choi (1961). According to Kuno (1976), the accusative marked embedded subject in Japanese similar to the Korean one above in (1a) is raised out of the finite complement clause into the matrix clause for case at the surface, His analysis is based on several phenomena including the relative position of an adverbial with respect to the embedded subject of the finite complement clause in Japanese.

This view, however, is difficult to maintain. The strongest argument against raising for case approach to associate (1a) with ECM construction above in (2a) in English has to do with the fact that elements other than the embedded subject can also have accusative case marked as illustrated below in (4-5).

(4) a. John-un   Mary-**lul**   atul-i   ttokttokhata-ko
       J-TOP   M-ACC   son-NOM   smart-COMP
       sayngkakahanta.
       think
       'John thinks that Mary's son is smart.'
    b. John-un   Mary-uy   atul-i   ttokttokhata-ko
       J-TOP   M-POSS   son-NOM   smart-COMP
       sayngkakahanta.
       think
       'John thinks that Mary's son is smart.'

---

1) Within the theory of minimalism, the object is claimed to be raised into the specifier of a functional projection in the matrix clause, that is, AgroP (see Lasnik 1999 among others).

(5) a. John-un Tom-**ul** Mary-ka   meli-lul   ttaylyessta-ko
     J-TOP   T-ACC   M-NOM   head-ACC hit-COMP
     sayngkakhanta.
     think
    'John thinks that Mary hit Tom's head.'
  b. John-un Mary-ka   Tom-uy meli-lul   ttaylyessta-ko
     J-TOP   M-NOM   T-POSS head-ACC hit-COMP
     sayngkakhanta.
     think
    'John thinks that Mary hit Tom's head.'

From a theoretical point of view, raising for case approach also has nontrivial problems regarding case theory. As shown above in (1b), the embedded subject position of a finite complement clause is a nominative case assigned position and therefore the movement of the embedded subject in (1a) for the accusative case is not warranted from the very beginning, a point as discussed elsewhere (see Choi 2008 among others). In a similar way, movement of the NPs in (4a) and (5a) for the accusative case is not warranted, either, since they are already possessive case marked in their base position as shown in (4b) and (5b), respectively (Chomsky 1995, also see Chomsky 1981, 1986b). The following example with the *lul* marked NP within the syntactic island of a sentential subject poses an additional problem to raising for case approach.

(6) John-un   Mary-**lul** cinachikey   ikicekin kes-i
   J-TOP   M-ACC   too   selfish   KES-NOM
   mwuncey-lako   sayngkakhanta.
   problem-COMP   think
  'John thinks that Mary is too selfish is a problem.'

According to raising to case approach, it follows that *lul*-marked Mary in (6) should be raised out of the syntactic island to the matrix clause, which, however, is impossible given subjacency as a standard test for movement (Chomsky 1977, 1986a). Throughout, this paper will mostly discuss data from Korean with the understanding that the present proposal extends to Japanese as well.

3. Prolepsis

Hoji (1991, 2005) and Takano (2003) among others recently suggest that the embedded subject with *o*-marking below in (7) is base-generated in the matrix predicate and the morpheme so attached to the embedded subject is the accusative case morpheme (cf. Saito 1985).

(7) Yamada-wa   Tanaka-o   baka dato   omotte ita.
     Y-TOP   T-ACC   fool-COMP   think
    'Yamada thinks that Tanaka is a fool.'
     (Kuno 1976:29)

According to their proposal, the Japanese example above in (7) thus shares more of its syntactic properties with the so called prolepsis construction from English below in (8) rather than ECM construction as above in (2a).

(8) I believe of John that he is smart.

To be specific, the embedded subject in (7) is base-generated in A-position in the matrix clause and binds an empty pronominal subject in the embedded clause, while at the same time the embedded subject receives the accusative case from the matrix predicate, along with the assumption that their proposal can extend to Korean as well. Thus, when applied to Korean in (1), repeated below as (9), the structure for (9a) will roughly be as below in (10).

(9) a. John-un   Mary-**lul**   ttokttokhata-ko   sayngkakhanta.
        J-TOP   M-ACC   smart-COMP   think
        'John thinks that Mary is smart.'
     b. John-un   Mary-ka   ttokttokhata-ko   sayngkakhanta.
         J-TOP   M-NOM   smart-COMP   think
        'John thinks that Mary is smart.'

(10) NP-NOM [$_{VP}$ NP$_i$-ACC [$_{CP}$[$_{IP}$ pro$_i$ to [$_{VP}$ V]]] V]

With no movement involved unlike English ECM construction, the prolepsis approach thus seems to be free from the aforementioned problems inherent in raising for case approach when it comes to the examples above in (1), and (4-6).

Prolepsis approach, however, has nontrivial problems when it comes to examples involving the accusative case marking of adverbial expression as below in (11) and case stacking in (12) (see Gerdts and Yoon 1988, Yoon 1990, Schütze 2001, Choi 2008, and others).

(11) a. John-un yeolsimhi-**lul**   Mary-ka   kongpwuhanta-ko
        J-TOP   hard-ACC   M-NOM   study-COMP
        sayngkakhanta.
        think
       'John thinks Mary is studying hard.'
    b. John-un   Mary-ka   yeolsimhi   kongpwuhanta-ko
        J-TOP   M-NOM   hard   study-COMP
        sayngkakhanta.
        think
       'John thinks Mary is studying hard.'

(12) a. ?John-un   Mary-eykey-**lul**   Tom-i   chayk-ul
        J-TOP   M-DAT-ACC   T-NOM   book-ACC
        cwuessta-ko   sayngkakhanta.
        gave-COMP   think
       'John thinks that Tom gave Mary a book.'
    b. John-un   Tom-i   Mary-eykey   chayk-ul
        J-TOP   T-NOM   M-DAT   book-ACC
        cwuessta-ko   sayngkakhanta.
        gave-COMP   think
       'John thinks that Tom gave Mary a book.'

The accusative case morpheme *lul* is assigned to the adverb in (11a), although case is typically a property of nominals crosslinguistically (see Blake 2001). As a result, the adverb should be treated as an argument as base generated in A-position. Then, what grammatical relation or semantic role does it have

whatsoever, given the close connection between case and semantic roles (Chomsky 1986b)? Also, when it comes to the example above in (12a), where case is doubly marked on the dative NP, the prolepsis approach has to say that case stacking in Korean is allowed. This is not a solution, however, since it poses a serious problem to theta theory, with one NP having more than one case, thus ending up with more than one semantic role, given the close connection between case and semantic roles.

All this having been said, prolepsis approach argues that the scope fact as below in (13) lenders a strong argument to their proposal. [2]

> (13) a. ?John-un   sey myeng-uy haksayng-**ul**   motun
>   J-TOP   three-POSS   student-ACC   every
>   kyoswu-eykey sokaytoyessta-ko   sayngkakhanta.
>   professor-DAT was introduced-COMP   think
>   'John thinks that three students were introduced to every professor.'
>   (*every > three, three > every)
>   b. John-un sey myeng-uy   haksayng-i   motun
>   J-TOP   three-POSS   student-NOM   every
>   kyoswu-eykey   sokaytoyessta-ko   sayngkakhanta.
>   professor-DAT   was introduced-COMP   think
>   'John thinks that three students were introduced to every professor.'
>   (every > three, three > every)

Unlike(13b), (13a) does not have narrow scope of the numeral QP *sey myeng-uy haksayng* 'three students' with respect to the universal QP *motun kyoswu* 'every professor.' The scope fact in (13a), according to the prolepsis approach, is attributed to its claim that the numeral QP is base-generated outside the embedded clause, hence no possibility of scope interaction with the universal QP in the embedded clause that is known to be clause bound (see Abusch 1994,

---

2) The *lul*-marking of the subject of the passive finite complement clause is deviant especially when the predicate is a ditransitive. Also, as an anonymous reviewer notes, there have been several observations regarding the common property of the *lul*-marked subject of the finite complement clause from various aspects including semantics, pragmatics and syntax (see Hong 1990, Dik 1978, Choi and Lee 2008, among others).

Reinhart 1997, Farkas 1997, among others). However, a careful examination of the scope fact in (13a), as will be discussed later in section 4, reveals that it does not argue for the prolepsis approach.

4. Topicalization as Left Dislocation

It has been a standard assumption in Korean literature since Choi (1961) that *lul* is invariably the accusative case morpheme. This has been the predominant view embraced without criticism in the literature until recently (see Yoon 1991, Lee 1992, and Yang 1999, among many others). Yet, given the long standing standard assumption (Jesperson 1924, Chomsky 1981, 1986b, 1995) that case is a system of marking nominal expressions for the relationship they have with their heads, namely, grammatical relations, *lul*-marking on the adverbial expression and case stacking above in (11) and (12), repeated below as (14) and (15) is quite puzzling if it is indeed an instance of case morpheme.

(14) a. John-un   yeolsimhi-**lul**   Mary-ka   kongpwuhanta-ko
         J-TOP   hard-ACC   M-NOM   study-COMP
          sayngkakhanta.
          think
         'John thinks Mary is studying hard.'
     b. John-un   Mary-ka   yeolsimhi   kongpwuhanta-ko
         J-TOP   M-NOM   hard   study-COMP
         sayngkakhanta.
         think
        'John thinks Mary is studying hard.'

(15) a. ?John-un   Mary-eykey-**lul**   Tom-i   chayk-ul
          J-TOP   M-DAT-ACC   T-NOM   book-ACC
          cwuessta-ko   sayngkakhanta.
          gave-COMP   think
         'John thinks that Tom gave Mary a book.'

b. John-un   Tom-i   Mary-eykey   chayk-ul
   J-TOP   T-NOM   M-DAT   book-ACC
   cwuessta-ko   sayngkakhanta.
   gave-COMP   think
   'John thinks that Tom gave Mary a book.'

As pointed out above in section 3, one may naturally wonder what grammatical relation the adverbial expression above in (14) has if *lul* is indeed the accusative case morpheme. Still, furthermore, if *lul* on the dative case marked NP in (15) is the accusative case morpheme, it means that the same NP enters simultaneously into more than one grammatical relation, which is highly implausible especially given the long standing observation for the close connection between case and grammatical relations in grammar.

4.1. Isomorphicity of *lul*

One is thus led to believe that *lul* on the adverb and dative NP above in (14-15) is not a case morpheme but something else, diverging from the fundamental assumption shared between raising for case and prolepsis approaches. For this, I suggest it is a topic morpheme isomorphic with the accusative case morpheme *lul*, a proposal essentially in tandem with the independent observation in Hong (1990), Schütze (2001) and Choi (2008).

With this revisionist view, the conceptual problems of *lul* as a case morpheme simply disappear in (14-15). It is not a surprise that *lul* as a topic morpheme can attach not only to the adverbial expression, but to the already case marked NP. Note that adverbial expressions can be topicalized as shown below in (16) with nun attached to them, which is a bona fide topic marker.

(16) a. John-i   ecey-nun   hakkyo-ey   kassta.
        J-NOM   yesterday-TOP   school-to   went
       'John went to school yesterday.'
     b. John-i   ppalli-nun   ttwuynta.
        J-NOM   fast-TOP   run
       'John runs fast.'

The observation that *lul* is isomorphic between case and topic is not something of a surprise, especially given the fact that case inflections are commonly derived from other categories crosslinguistically as observed in Heine (2009: 468). They themselves may thus be deployed for further functions such as topicality, which is the case in Korean. Korean is a topic prominent language where topicality is typically marked with morphology not prosody quite unlike subject prominent language such as English.

Along with our discussion of *lul* in (14-15) as a topic morpheme isomorphic with the accusative case morpheme, now let us turn to (9), repeated below as (17). I argue, following Schütze (2001) and Choi (2008), that the embedded subject in (17a) is, as the reader will well expect by now, is in fact an instance of topicalization. [3]

(17) a. John-un Mary-**lul** ttokttokhata-ko   sayngkakhanta.
        J-TOP   M-ACC   smart-COMP   think
        'John thinks that Mary is smart.'
     b. John-un Mary-ka   ttokttokhata-ko   sayngkakhanta.
         J-TOP   M-NOM   smart-COMP   think
        'John thinks that Mary is smart.'

The marking of *lul* above in (17a) as topicalization is further supported by the fact more than one element can be topicalized as shown below in (18).

(18) a. John-i   Mary-nun   kki-nun   khuta-ko
        J-NOM   M-TOP   height-TOP   tall-COMP
         sayngkakhanta.
         think
        'John thinks Mary is tall.'
     b. John-un   Mary-**lul** kki-**lul**   khuta-ko

---

3) Here by topic I mean noncontrastive topic. The sentence in (17a) is thus interpreted as (ia) but not (ib).
   (i) a. John thinks that as for Mary, she is smart.
      b. John thinks that Mary, as opposed to others, is smart.

J-TOP   M-ACC   height-ACC   tall-COMP
sayngkakhanta.
think
'John thinks that Mary is tall.'

As one can see, more than one element in the embedded clause can be topicalized as indicated with the topic morpheme *nun* in (18a). The same is true for *lul* in (18b), which shows exactly the same distribution with *nun* in (18a), thus strongly suggesting its function as a topic morpheme. The present view can find further support in the fact that the *lul*-marked embedded subject NP below in (19a), in contrast to *ka*-marked one in (19b), has a specific construal only, hence expressing old information, which is a typical characteristic of topicalization.[4)]

    (19) a. John-un   nwukunka-**lul**   ttokttokhata-ko   mitnunta.
             J-TOP   someone-ACC   smart-COMP   believe
             'John believes that someone is smart.'
       b. John-un   nwukunka-ka   ttokttokhata-ko   mitnunta.
             J-TOP   someone-NOM   smart-COMP   believe
           'John believes that someone is smart.'
           (adapted from Yoon 1989: 372)

    Now, assuming that the *lul*-marking of the embedded subject is a topic morpheme, the important question to ask is whether it is base generation or movement phenomenon. For this, I suggest it is base generation, which is comparable to left dislocation in English, the difference being that in Korean the topicalized element binds an empty pronominal, whereas in English it binds a pronounced pronominal element as schematically represented below in (20-21), respectively.[5)6)]

---

4) Note the observation as made by Rizzi (2000: 243), which runs:
   The topic is a preposed element characteristically set off from the rest of the clause by comma intonation and normally expressing old information, somehow available and salient in previous discourse; the comment is a kind of complex predicate, an open sentence predicated of the topic and introducing new information.[sic]

(20) NP-NOM   NP$_i$-TOP ... [$_{IP}$ pro$_i$ [$_{VP}$ V]]

(21) John$_i$, I do not like him$_i$.

Note that it is a well known fact that left dislocation in English typically expresses topicality. In fact, the example below in (22) with the overtly realized pronominal subject in the embedded clause is, as I suggest, the overt counterpart of the left dislocation construction as schematically represented above in (20).

(22) John-un Tom$_i$-**ul** ku$_i$-ka   ttokttokhata-ko sayngkakhanta.
     J-TOP   T-ACC   he-NOM smart-COMP   think
     'John thinks that Tom is smart.'

The present proposal for topicalization as base generated left dislocation is based on the example below in (23) where the topicalized expression *ku chayk* 'that book,' which is the thematic object of the predicate of the relative clause, *cohta* 'be fond of' can appear outside of the relative clause.

(23) a. Na-nun [$_{NP}$[$_{CP}$ ku   chayk-**ul**   cohta-nun] salam-ul]
        I-TOP   that book-ACC   like   man-ACC
        acik poci   mos   hayssta.
        yet   see   NOT   did
        'I have not seen a man who likes that book.'

---

5) I diverge from Schütze (2001) and Choi (2008), according to which the *lul*-marked embedded subject as in (17) undergoes movement from the embedded clause to the matrix clause or embedded Spec of CP.

6) Note that crosslinguistically the resumptive pronoun in the left dislocation construction has a strong tendency to have the same case with the antecedent as exemplified below in (i) (see Aoun and Li 1990, Ouhalla 2001:153, Montalbetti 1984, among others).
   (i) John$_i$, Mary likes *he$_i$/him$_i$
   Thus the nominative case carried by *ku* 'he'above in (22) may provide anecdotal evidence against the view that *lul* is invariably the accusative case morpheme.

b. Ku   chayk-**ul**   na-nun [$_{NP}$[$_{CP}$ cohta-nun   salam-ul]]
   that book-ACC   I-TOP   like   man-ACC
   acik   poci   mos   hayssta.
   yet   see   NOT   did
  'I have not seen a man who likes that book.'

Given the nature of the embedded predicate, *cohta* 'be fond of' as shown below in the so called nominative accusative construction in (24), the source of the *lul*-marking on the fronted NP out of the relative clause is topicalization.

(24) a. John-i   Mary-ka   cohta.
    J-NOM   M-NOM   like
  'John likes Mary.'
  b. *John-i   Mary-lul   cohta.
    J-NOM   M-ACC   like
  'John likes Mary.'

This state of affairs strongly suggests that topicalization does not involve movement, but base generation under the standard assumption that subjacency is a test for movement (Chomsky 1977, 1986a among others). [7]

    Then, another important question to ask is: where is the precise locus of the topicalized subject in (17a)? For this, one may   suggest Spec of CP in the

---

7) Raising for case approach may take the following in (ia), which involves a proper binding condition violation under its system, as a genuine argument against base generation of the embedded *lul*-marked subject (Fiengo 1974, 1977, Chomsky 1976, Lasnik and Saito 1992).
  (i) a. ??[t_i ttokttokhata-ko]$_j$ John-un t_j Mary$_i$-**lul**   mitnunta.
       smart-COMP   J-TOP   M-ACC   believe
     'John believes that Mary is smart.'
    b. ?John-i   Mary$_i$-**lul**   mitnunta,   [t_i ttokttokhata-ko]
     J-NOM   M-ACC   believe   smart-COMP
    'John believes that Mary is smart.'
  The problem for the approach is that it cannot explain why the grammaticality of (ib) considerably improves, although it also involves proper binding condition violation under the approach. This state of affairs rather suggests that what is going on in (i) is not the proper binding condition but something else such as language processing (see related discussion in Hoji 2005).

embedded clause, following Chomsky (1977) (see Baltin 1982, Johnson 1988, Rochemont 1989, Lasnik and Saito 1992, Maki etal. 1999, for related discussions). However, if so, the scope fact of the temporal adverbial *ecey* 'yesterday' below in (25) will remain unaccounted for, since (25b), although subtle, admits the matrix construal of the temporal adverbial only, in contrast to (25a), which is ambiguous between the matrix and embedded readings of the adverb.

(25) a. John-un   ecey   Mary-ka   hakkyo-ey   kassta-ko
        J-TOP   yesterday   M-NOM   school-to   went-COMP
        malhayssta.
        said
        'John said yesterday Mary went to school.'
     b. John-un   ecey   Mary-**lul**   hakkyo-ey   kassta-ko
        J-TOP   yesterday   M-NOM   school-to   went-COMP
        malhayssta.
        said
        'John said yesterday that Mary went to school.'

Also the relative acceptability of the example below in (26a), as compared with (26b) that is ungrammatical, suggests that the locus for the *lul*-marked embedded subject is not in the embedded Spec of CP. Given that nominative case marked NP is sitting in the embedded subject position, the surface word order in (26b) will be simply impossible, unlike (26a) where the *lul*-marked embedded subject is base-generated in the matrix VP-adjoined position with *pro* in the embedded subject position.

(26) a. ?John-un   Mary$_i$-**lul**   mitnunta, [$_{CP}$ pro$_i$ ttokttokhata-ko]
         J-TOP   M-ACC   believe   smart-COMP
         'John believes that Mary is smart.'
     b. *John-un   Mary-ka   mitnunta, [$_{CP}$ ttokttokhata-ko]
         J-TOP   M-NOM   believe   smart-COMP
         'John believes that Mary is smart.'

Now based on the paradigm above in (25-26) I suggest the locus for

topicalization above in (17a) is the matrix VP-adjoined position, as schematically represented below in (27). [8)]

(27) NP-NOM $[_{VP}$ NP$_i$-TOP $[_{VP}[_{CP}[_{IP}$ pro$_i$ to $[_{VP}$ V]]] V]]

Incidentally, this is in agreement with the observation in the literature as made by Horvath (1981, 1986, 1995), according to which the VP-adjoined position is not for case but for topic or focus, whereas case involves spec head agreement mechanism.[9) 10)]

---

8) One may suggest the example below in (i) as an argument for base generation of the *lul*-marked embedded subject in the embedded Spec of CP but not matrix VP-adjoined position.

    (i) Mary-**lul**   ttokttokhata-ko John-un mitnunta.
        M-ACC   smart-COMP   J-TOP   believe
        'John believes Mary is smart.'

This does not necessarily pose a problem to the present analysis, especially given the possibility of overt raising of the embedded CP to matrix IP-adjoined position followed by the overt raising of *Mary* from matrix VP-adjoined position to the matrix IP-adjoined position as shown in (ii).

    (ii) $[_{IP}$Mary$_k$-**lul** $[_{IP}[$pro$_k$ ttokttokhata-ko]$_j$ $[_{IP}$John-un $[_{VP}$ t$_k$ $[_{VP}$ t$_j$ mitnunta]]]]]
        M-ACC   smart-COMP   J-TOP   believe
        'John believes that Mary is smart.'

9) The present proposal has a nontrivial theoretical implication for the following   example:

    (i) John-i   Mary-lul   son-ul   capassta.
        J-NOM   M-ACC   hand-ACC   caught
        'John caught Mary's hand.'

According to the present proposal, the first *lul*-marked NP in multiple object construction should serve as a topic morpheme.

10) The examples below apparently show the *lul*-marked embedded subject varies   in position with respect to the matrix adverb.

    (i) a. John-un paposulepkeyto Mary$_i$-**lul** [pro$_i$ ttokttokhata-ko] sayngkakhanta.
        J-TOP   stupidly   M-ACC   smart-COMP   think
        'Stupidly, John thinks that Mary is smart.'
      b. John-un Mary$_i$-**lul**   paposulepkeyto [pro$_i$ tokttokhata-ko] sayngkakhanta.
        J-TOP M-ACC   stupidly   smart-COMP   think
        Stupidly, John thinks that Mary is smart.'

The position of the embedded subject with respect to the matrix VP adverbial above simply follows since the target of topicalization is matrix VP-adjoined A'-position under the present system, hence freely alternating in position with the matrix adverbial. Note that the adverb

4.2. Prolepsis vs. Topicalization as Left Dislocation

At this point, one may wonder what difference is there between the prolepsis approach and the present proposal, when it comes to the structure for (17a) repeated below as (28) since both approaches assume base generation along with the postulation of the empty pronominal *pro* in the embedded subject position.

> (28) John-un   Mary-**lul**   ttokttokhata-ko   sayngkakhanta.
>   J-TOP   M-ACC   smart-COMP   think
>   'John thinks that Mary is smart.'

However, there are nontrivial differences between the two approaches. The most salient difference is regarding the status of the morpheme *lul* of the embedded subject above in (28). Note that prolepsis approach crucially assumes that the *lul*-marking is a case morpheme and that the *lul*-marked embedded subject is base generated in A-position. Thus, according to the prolepsis approach, (28) is treated in a way as an exceptional case marking construction in that the case of the embedded subject is given from the matrix predicate. As argued in section 4.1, however, (28) is not exceptional case marking but the morpheme *lul* of the embedded subject is a topic morpheme, hence topicalization as base generated left dislocation.

   Also note that prolepsis approach has a nontrivial problem of violating theta theory. Since according to prolepsis approach the matrix predicate assigns case to the *lul* marked embedded subject, the question is where the theta role of this NP is from. Matrix predicate is not a candidate since it has only two theta roles to assign, given its argument structure. Then is it from *pro* in the embedded subject position via the process of theta role transmission? It cannot be, because they are not local, being separated from CP boundary, hence no theta role transmission. Under the present system, this problem of theta theory does not arise, since *lul* above in (28) is analyzed as a topic morpheme isomorphic with case morpheme, hence the *lul*-marked NP is an instance of topicalization as base generated in A'-position, that is, VP-adjoined position in the matrix clause.

---

   paposulepkeyto 'stupidly' is licensed by its semantically compatible head of matrix VP (see Marantz 1984, Travis 1988, Johnson 1991, Alexiadou 1997 among many others).

Moreover, our approach makes a better empirical prediction than the prolepsis approach when it comes to scope interaction of QPs involving *lul*-marked embedded subject constructions. For this, consider (13) first, repeated below in (29).

(29) a. ?John-un   sey myeng-uy   haksayng-**ul**   motun
         J-TOP   three-POSS   student-ACC   every
         kyoswu-eykey   sokaytoyessta-ko   sayngkakhanta.
         professor-DAT   was introduced-COMP think
         'John thinks that three students were introduced to every professor.'
         (*every > three, three > every)
     b. John-un   sey myeng-uy   haksayng-i   motun
         J-TOP   three-POSS   student-NOM   every
         kyoswu-eykey   sokaytoyessta-ko   sayngkakhanta.
         professor-DAT   was introduced-COMP   think
         'John thinks that three students were introduced to every professor.'
         (every > three, three > every)

Recall that in prolepsis approach the lack of narrow scope of the numeral QP with respect to the universal QP in (29a) is ascribed to its claim that the QP is base-generated in the matrix predicate. Thus prolepsis and the present approach converge when it comes to the scope fact in (29a) since the *lul*-marked numeral QP is base-generated in the matrix clause in both approaches.

The present proposal, however, crucially diverges from the prolepsis approach, making different predictions, when we consider additional data involving scope interaction between matrix QP and *lul*-marked embedded QP as below in (30).

(30) Motun   kyoswu-ka   nwukwunka-**lul**   ttokttokhata-ko
      every   professor-NOM   someone-ACC   smart-COMP
      sayngkakhanta.
      think
      (*∀ > ∃,   ∃ > ∀)

The above sentence in (30) means that 'there is a particular individual such that every professor thinks that he is smart.' It does not admit the reading, which is 'there is someone or other such that every professor thinks he is smart.' In other words, the narrow scope reading of *nwukwunka* 'someone' is missing, quite unlike the following in (31) with the same word order between the two QPs as above in (30):

(31)   Motun kyoswu-ka   nwukwunka-lul   chotayhayssta.
         every professor-NOM   someone-ACC   invited
         (∀ > ∃,   ∃ > ∀)

According to the prolepsis approach, it is thus quite a mystery why (30) does not admit narrow scope of the existential quantifier. Under the present system, the lack of narrow scope of the *lul*-marked QP in (30) has to do with the specific construal of it.

Based on our discussion of the scope fact in (30-31), I therefore conclude that specific construal of the topicalized QP is indeed behind the lack of scope ambiguity in (29a) as well. The present view regarding the scope fact in (29a) is further supported by the scope fact in English topicalization construction. It is a wellknown fact in English that when a QP undergoes topicalization, it loses its quantificational force, having only a specific interpretation (see Postal 1993, Lasnik and Stowell 1991, among others).[11]

(32) a. Many people, someone saw.
       b. A few people, someone saw.
          (Sohn 1995: 189)

The only reading for (32a) is the one where *many people* is interpreted as specific, thus meaning 'there is a specific group of many people such that someone saw them.' We thus far saw that the present proposal can give a more satisfactory

---

11) Postal (1993: 542) also observes that topicalized QPs have a specific construal only (also see
     Choe 1995: 322, fn.10 for the same observation).
   (i) a. Anyone less popular, they would have fired.
       b. Anyone who was sick, they would have fired.

account for the data for which raising for case and prolepsis approaches fail to do so.

5. Conclusion and Theoretical Implications

I dealt with the so called case alternation on the subject of a finite complement clause in Korean, which has played a central role in the theory of grammar and has been a topic of much controversy in the literature. I reviewed two proposals in the literature that have thus far attracted the most attention, namely, raising for case approach (Kuno 1976, Yoon 1991, among others) and the prolepsis approach (Hoji 1991, 2005, Takano 2003, among others). I showed both approaches are fraught with various problems.

Departing from the standard assumption in Korean literature, I argued that *lul* is an isomorphic morpheme between topic and case and the *lul*-marked subject of a finite complement clause is base generated in a VP-adjoined position of the matrix clause. The present proposal has a nontrivial crosslinguistic implication in that it may shed new light on our understanding of the true nature of so called exceptional case marking constructions with a finite complement clause in languages typologically akin to Korean. The result of the present research also confirms the crosslinguistic observation in the literature (Horvath 1981, 1985, 1995) that the topic or focus is somehow closely related with the syntactic category of V and its projection. Hence, it is not a surprise that the embedded subject with the topic marker *lul* should end up with matrix VP- adjoined position in Korean.

References

Alexiadou, A. (1997). *Adverb placement: A case study in antisymmetric syntax.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
Abusch, D. (1993). The scope of indefinites. *Natural Language Semantics 2*(2),

83-135.

Aoun, J. & Li, Y. A. (1990). Minimal disjointness. *Linguistics 28*(2), 189-203.

Baltin, M. (1982). A landing site theory of movement rules. *Linguistic Inquiry 13*(1), 1-38.

Blake, B. (2001). *Case*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Choe. H. S. (1995). Focus and topic movement in Korean and licensing. In K. E. Kiss (Ed.). *Discourse configurational languages*(pp.269-334), New York, Oxford University Press.

Choi, H. P. (1961). *Our grammar*. Seoul: Yeonsei University Press.

Choi, I. & Lee, E. (2008). The partial parallelism between double nominative construction and ECM construction in Korean. *Studies in Modern Grammar 53*, 75-101.

Choi, Y. S. (2008). Case alternation in Korean: Case and beyond. *Studies in Modern Grammar 54*, 105-122.

Chomsky, N. (1973). Conditions on transformations. In S. Anderson, & P. Kiparsky (Eds.). *A festschrift for Morris Halle* (pp.232-286), New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Chomsky, N. (1976). Conditions on rules of grammar. *Linguistic Analysis 2*, 303-351.

Chomsky, N. (1977). On wh-movement. In P. Culicover, T. Wasow, & A. Akmajian (Eds.). *Formal syntax* (pp.71-132), New York: Academic Press.

Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, N. (1986a). *Barriers*. Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1986b). *Knowledge of language*. New York: Praeger.

Chomsky, N. (1995). *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.

Dik, S. (1978). *Functional grammar*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.

Farkas, D. (1997). Evaluation indices and scope. In A. Szabolcsi (Ed.). *Ways of Scope Taking*(pp.183-215), Dorerecht: Kluwer Academic publishers.

Fiengo, R. (1974). *Semantic conditions on surface structure*. Doctoral dissertation, Cambridge, MA., MIT.

Fiengo, R. (1977). On trace theory. *Linguistic Inquiry 8*(1), 35-61.

Gerdts, D. & Youn, C. (1988). Korean psych constructions: Advancement or retreat? In L. MacLeod, G. Larson, & D. Brentari (Eds.). *Papers from the 24th*

Annual Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, Part One: The General Session, 155-175.

Heine, B. (2009). Grammaticalization of cases. In A. Malchukov, & A. Spencer (Eds.). *The oxford handbook of case*(pp. 458-478), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hoji, H. (1991). Raising to object, ECM, and the major object in Japanese. Paper presented at Japanese Syntax Workshop, University of Rochester.

Hoji, H. (2005). Major object analysis of the so called raising to object construction in Japanese(and Korean). Paper presented at Korean and Japanese Syntax and Semantics Workshop, Kyoto University.

Hong, K. S. (1990). Subject to object raising in Korean. In K. Dziwirek, P. Farrell, & E. Mejias-Bikandi (Eds.). *Grammatical relations: A cross-theoretical perspective* (pp. 215-225), Stanford University: CSLI.

Horvath, J. (1981). *Aspects of Hungarian syntax and the theory of grammar.* Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Horvath, J. (1986). *FOCUS in the theory of grammar and the syntax of Hungarian,* Dordrecht: Foris.

Horvath, J. (1995). Structural focus, structural case, and the notion of feature-assignment. In K. E. Kiss (Ed.). *Discourse configurational languages*(pp.1-64), New York: Oxford University Press.

Jesperson, O. (1924). *The philosophy of grammar.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, K. (1988). Clausal gerunds, the ECP, and government. *Linguistic Inquiry 19*(4), 583-609.

Johnson, K. (1991). Object positions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 9*(4), 577-636.

Kuno, S. (1976). Subject raising. In M. Shibatani (Ed.). *Syntax and semantics 5*(pp.17-49), New York: Academic Press.

Lasnik, H. (1999). Chains of Arguments. In S. Epstein, & N. Hornstein (Eds.). *Working minimalism*(pp.189-215), Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.

Lasnik, H. & M. Saito. (1992). *Move-α: conditions on its applications and output.* Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.

Lasnik, H. & T. Stowell. (1991). Weakest crossover. *Linguistic Inquiry 22*(4), 687-720.

Lee, J. S. (1992). *Case alternation in Korean: Case minimality.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Maki, H., Kaiser, L. & Ochi, M. (1999). Embedded topicalization in English and Japanese. *Lingua 107*, 1-14.

Marantz, A. (1984). *On the nature of grammatical relations,* Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.

Massam, D. (1985). *Case theory and the projection principle.* Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Montalbetti, M. (1984). *After binding: On the interpretation of pronouns.* Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

O'Grady, W. (1991). *Categories and case: The sentence structure of Korean.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Ouhalla, J. (2001). Parasitic gaps and resumptive pronouns. In P. Culicover, & P. Postal (Eds.). *Parasitic gaps* (pp.147-179), Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.

Postal, P. (1974). *On raising: One rule of English grammar and its theoretical implications.* Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.

Postal, P. & Pullum, G. (1988). Expletive noun phrases in subcategorized positions. *Linguistic Inquiry 19*(4), 635-670.

Postal, P. (1993). Remarks on weak crossover effects. *Linguistic Inquiry 24*(3), 539-556.

Reinhart, T. (1997). Quantifier scope: how labor is divided between QR and choice functions. *Linguistics and Philosophy 20*(4), 335-397.

Rizzi, L. (2000). The fine structure of the left periphery. In C. Otero (Ed.). *Comparative syntax and language acquisition* (pp.241-295), London and New York: Routledge.

Rochemont, M. (1989). Topic islands and the subjacency parameter. *Canadian journal of linguistics 34*, 145-170.

Rosenbaum, P. (1967). *The grammar of English predicate complement constructions.* Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.

Rouveret, A. & Vergnaud, J.-R. (1980). Specifying reference to the subject: French causatives and conditions on representations. *Linguistic Inquiry 11*(1), 97-202.

Saito, M. (1985). *Some asymmetries in Japanese and their theoretical implications.* Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Schütze, C. (2001). On Korean case stacking: The varied functions of the particles

ka and *lul. Linguistic Review 18*(3), 193-232.

Sohn, K. W. (1995). *Negative polarity items, scope and economy.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Takano, Y. (2003). Nominative objects in Japanese complex predicate constructions: a prolepsis analysis. *Natural Language* and *Linguistic Theory 21*(4), 779-834.

Travis, L. (1988). The syntax of adverbs. *McGill Working Papers in Linguistics: Special Issue on Comparative Germanic Syntax,* 280-310.

Yang, D. W. (1999). Case features and case particles. In S. Bird, A. Carnie, J. Haugen, & P. Norquest (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 18th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics,* 626-639.

Yoon, J. M. (1989). ECM and multiple subject constructions in Korean. In S. Kuno etal. (Eds.). *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics 3,* 369-381.

Yoon, J. M. (1991). *The syntax of A-Chains: A typological study of ECM and scrambling.* Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University.

Yoon, J. Y. (1990). *Korean syntax and generalized X-bar theory.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.

YoungSik Choi

Department of English Language and Literature

Soonchunhyang University

Asan, Chungnam 336-745, Korea

Phone: 82-41-530-1124

Email: youngsic@sch.ac.kr