Case Variations in Korean
Periphrastic Causative Constructions

Sung, Tae-Soo
(Namseoul University)

Sung, Tae-Soo. 1999 **Case Variations in Korean Periphrastic Causative Constructions.** *Linguistics,* 7-1, 1-31. The case variation of the causee in Korean is argued to be examined under the assumptions of the pragmatic correlations between causer and causee. In some causative situations, the causer affects its causee very strongly: in others, the influence of the causer over its causee is weak, relatively. However, despite this kind of difference, we argue that 1) causative sentences share the same underlying structure whether they involve a NOM causee, a DAT causee, or an ACC causee (case-marked as '-ka', '-eke', or '-lul', respectively); 2) why the causee of Korean periphrastic causative constructions alternates with '-ka', '-eke', and '-lul' is that the seemingly structural cases play a role of delimiters. Among '-ka', '-eke', and '-lul', the latter two are regarded as delimiters. In this article, it is argued that the case-doubling in Korean periphrastic causative construction appears only as a side-effect in uttering a causative construction under a specific situation. (**Namseoul University**)

1. Introduction

A variety of discussions on causative constructions have been made more broadly than any other kind of constructions in most theoretical frameworks.[1] Among others, Korean causative constructions deserve considering on a morphological, syntactic, semantic, or pragmatic basis. In this article, we assume that lexical causative constructions

---

1) Cho, Eui-Yon (1986); Kang, Young-Se (1984); Lee, Hyo-Sang (1985); Lee, In (1994); Lee, Kee-Dong (1975); Lee, Seung-Jae (1998); Park, Kab-Yong (1986); Shibatani (1973a, 1973b); Song, Jae-Jung (1988); Song, Seok-Choong (1978); Yang, In-Seok (1976), etc.

(hereinafter referred to 'LCC') and periphrastic causative constructions (hereinafter referred to 'PCC') share the same underlying structure, of which the former are derived by means of some transformations and that syntactic and semantic differences between both constructions be attributed to the style or the usage.

I will endeavor to clarify the semantic and pragmatic circumstances under which causative constructions occur, suggesting some semantic and pragmatic constraints with respect to Korean PCC. In section 2, I will first consider the case-markers (e. g., '-ka' (NOM), '-ul' (ACC), '-eke' (DAT)) which are attached to the causees of the Korean PCC, and then try to show that the three kinds of Korean PCC share the analogous properties in the syntax. In section 3.1, it will be claimed that the case hierarchy presented in Comrie (1976) does nothing but indicate an appropriate situation in which several cases might alternate under the assumptions of some pragmatic and semantic conditions. Section 3.2 shows that the case-doubling is a side-effect in uttering a causative construction under a specific situation. Firstly, we will try to account for the differences between non-causative constructions and causative constructions in terms of doubling and consider the reason why the case variations in the position of the causee in Korean PCC take place. And then I will suggest that there should be two kinds of cases in Korean: structural cases and delimiters. On these grounds, such case markers as '-eke', and 'lul' will be claimed to be used as delimiters in order to manifest an appropriate pragmatic situation, when a causative construction is uttered. The case variation appears scalar according to the extent to which a causer affects a causee coercively. Lastly, the conclusions will be followed.

2. Syntactic Considerations on Causative Constructions

Case-marking to the causees in Korean causative constructions takes

place as shown in (1) below. Example (1a) is an LCC and (1b-d) are PCCs, all of which include an intransitive verb:

(1) a. Younghi-ka   Chulsu-lul/*-ka/*-eke   ttuy-ki-ess-ta.
            nom   acc/nom/dat   run-cause-past-dec
       'Younghi made Chulsu run.'
    b. Younghi-ka   Chulsu-lul   ttuy-ke   ha-ess-ta.
            nom   acc   run-comp do-past-dec
       'Younghi made Chulsu run.'
    c. Younghi-ka   Chulsu-eke   ttuy-ke   ha-ess-ta.
            nom   dat   run-comp do-ess-dec
    d. Younghi-ka   Chulsu-ka   ttuy-ke   ha-ess-ta.
            nom   nom   run-comp do-past-dec

Case-marker '-ka' stands for NOM case; '-lul'[2], ACC case; '-eke', DAT case. The sentences in (1) are equal in the sense that they all are causative constructions, but the causers in LCCs such as example (1a) possess very strong intention of their own and the causees in the same construction have little volitionality. Whereas the causees in PCCs such as (1b), (1c) and (1d) can take all of three case-makers ('-ka', '-eke' and '-lul'), of which the causer of (1b) is the strongest and that of (d) is the weakest. At this point, (1d) has been claimed to possess a permissive meaning rather than a causative meaning. The fact that the causee is marked as ACC when the causer is the most coercive in PCCs is in agreement with the fact that the causees of lexical causative constructions must always take ACC case. At any rate, the three kinds of the case variations are available for the causee.

Let us next examine the cases in which the lower predicates are a transitive verb as in (2) below:

---

2) There are two accustive case-markers in Korean: '-lul' is suffixed to the word ending with a vowel and '-ul' is suffixed to the word ending with a consonant. We will henceforth use '-lul' as a cover term.

(2) a. Younghi-ka Chulsu-eke/-lul[3]/*-ka chayk-ul ilk-hi-ess-ta.
         nom   dat/acc/nom book-acc read-cause-past-dec
     'Younghi made Chulsu read a book.'

  b. Younghi-ka Chulsu-ka   chayk-lul ilk-ke   ha-ess-ta.
         nom   nom   book-acc read-comp do-past-dec
     'Younghi made Chulsu read a book.'

  c. Younghi-ka Chulsu-eke chayk-lul ilk-ke   ha-ess-ta.
         nom   dat   book-acc   read-comp do-past-dec

  d. Younghi-ka Chulsu-lul   chayk-lul ilk-ke   ha-ess-ta.
         nom   acc book- acc   read-comp do-past-dec

In (2), likewise, the LCCs such as (2a) possess a causee taking '-eke' or '-lul'; the PCCs such as (2b), (2c) and (2d) possess a causee taking three kinds of case ('-ka', '-eke' and '-lul'). Let's consider the grammatical difference between the four sentences exemplified in (2) above when an NP-preposing rule (scrambling) is applied to the causees, as shown in (3):

(3) a. Chulsu-eke/-lul   Younghi-ka chaek-ul ilk-ki-ess-ta.
         dat/acc   nom book-acc read-cause-past-dec
     'Younghi made Chulsu read a book.'

  b. Chulsu-eke Younghi-ka   chaek-ul ilk-ke   ha-ess-ta.
         dat   nom   book-acc read-comp do-past-dec
     'Younghi made Chulsu read a book.'

  c. Chulsu-ul Younghi-ka   chaek-ul ilk-ke   ha-ess-ta.
         acc   nom book-acc read-comp do-past-dec

---

3) Like the '-eke' DAT in double object constructions, this '-eke' causee in the lexical causative constructions can alternate with '-lul' ACC, as in the following:

(i) a. Chulsu-ka Younghi-eke chayk-lul cu-ess-ta.
         nom   dat book-acc give-past-dec
     'Chulsu gave Younghi a book.'

  b. Chulsu-ka Younghi-lul chayk-lul cu-ess-ta.
         nom   ac book-acc give-past-dec

I

d.*Chulsu-ka Younghi-ka chaek-ul ilk-ke ha-ess-ta.
      nom   nom   acc read-comp do-past-dec

Examples (3a-c) are grammatical but example (3d) is ungrammatical. The ungrammaticality of (3d) seems to stem from the failure in having the expected interpretation of (2d). As Lee (1998) points out, the impossibility of reading (2d) is due to the NOM case duplication, of which the two subjects should be strictly ordered to avoid the misinterpretation possible.

I will next consider the grammaticality of the Korean causative sentences with a reflexive pronoun 'caki' in the following. This analysis is usually used to validate the difference between LCCs and PCCs: that is, the former is mono-clausal and the latter is bi-clausal. Notice that the difference whether a causative construction is mono-clausal or bi-clausal is crucial to the case variation which will be discussed in section 3:

(4) a. Younghi-ka Chulsu-lul caki-ui pang-eso ttuy-ki-ess-ta.
           nom   acc self-gen room-in run-cause-past-dec
      'Younghi made Chulsu run in her/his room.'
   b. Younghi-ka Chulsu-lul caki-ui pang-eso ttuy-ke ha-ess-ta.
           nom   acc self-gen room-in run-comp do-past-dec
      'Younghi made Chulsu run in her/his room.'
   c. Younghi-ka Chulsu-eke caki-ui pang-eso ttuy-ke ha-ess-ta.
           nom   dat self-gen room-in run-comp do-past-dec
      'Younghi made Chulsu run in her/his room.'
   d. Younghi-ka Chulsu-ka caki-ui pang-eso ttuy-ke ha-ess-ta.
           nom   nom self-gen room-in run-comp do-past-dec
      'Younghi made Chulsu run in her/his room'

The antecedent of 'caki' in the LCC like (4a) is just 'Younghi' but not 'Chulsu'.[4] The antecedents of 'caki' in (4b), (4c) and (4d) can be not only 'Younghi' but also 'Chulsu'. But as for (4d), I admit that the

interpretation that 'caki' refers to 'Chulsu' sounds more natural. This kind of judgment on (4d) is also shown in Kang (1984). I suppose that by this semantic difference between (4b-c) and (4d), the underlying structures of their own should not be assumed distinctively. I will therefore go on with the assumption that (4b-d) are bi-clausal and the causees alternate with '-ka' NOM, '-eke' DAT, '-lul' ACC' or even '-hante' OBL, hinging on each specific pragmatic situation.

As Shibatani (1976) points out, if there are more than double subjects in complex structures, Korean reflexive pronoun 'caki' is interpreted as ambiguous. I assume that LCCs are mono-clausal and PCCs are bi-clausal. In fact, examples (4b-d) have syntactic and semantic similarity to one another except for the degree to which causer affects causee.

Let us next take into consideration about how adverbs can be interpreted with regard to the scope of modification. I will confine my observation to place adverbs rather than other kinds of adverbs. Now consider the following (5):

(5) a. Chulsu-ka   Younghi-ka   pang-ese   ul-ke   ha-ess-ta.
            nom   nom room-in   cry-comp do-past-dec
        'Chulsu made Younghi cry in the room.'
    b. Chulsu-ka   Younghi-eke   pang-ese   ul-ke   ha-ess-ta.
            nom   dat   room-in   cry-comp do-past-dec
        'Chulsu made Younghi cry in the room.'
    c. Chulsu-ka   Younghi-lul   pang-ese   ul-ke   ha-ess-ta.
            nom   acc   room-in   cry-comp do-past-dec

---

4) Park (1986) suggests that morphological merger--the correspondence of two lexical items in one syntactic representation with a single constituent in another representation--takes place at a syntactic level rather than in the mapping between levels in the language. He claims that morphological merger be applied in the deep structure of Korean causative constructions; therefore, there happens a difference on binding effects between lexical causative constructions and periphrastic causative constructions.

'Chulsu made Younghi cry in the room.'

Though Yang (1976) doesn't refer to whether there is a difference between PCCs with '-ka' causee, '-eke' causee or '-lul' causee, he seems to assume that two interpretations be predictable commonly from (5a), (5b) and (5c): the place adverb 'in the room' may modify either the causer's activity (e.g., In the room, Chulsu-ka made Younghi cry.) or the causee's activity (e.g., Chulsu made Younghi cry in the room.). At this point, we assume that the three sentences in (5) above have the same underlying structure and work similarly on all syntactic derivations. Likewise, for the sake of some further evidence to the similarities among the three kinds of causative constructions in (5), decided by which case marker the causee in each construction selects, refer to the discussions on Delimiters, honorifications, negation, etc. that Yang (1976) has made.

　　The different case markers which are manifested onto the causee (-ka, -eke, and -lul) are not likely to change the syntax of a causative construction. In the next section, let us take account into the reason why the case alternation happens except that it affects the syntactical points. In section 3, we will first examine Comrie(1976)'s Case Hierarchy which shows the most appropriate situation which conveys a causative meaning. Secondly, it will be discussed that 'doublings' appear in causative constructions and take place as a side-effect in applying the scalarity axiom to the relation between causer and causee.

3. Semantic or Pragmatic Approaches

3.1 Comrie's Case Hierarchy

Comrie (1976) contends that LCCs are bi-clausal in the underlying structure, and the higher predicate and the lower predicate are merged into one predicate through fusion. As a result of this operation, the

subject of the lower predicate--thus, causee--takes ACC if the lower predicate is intransitive, DAT if the lower predicate is transitive, and OBL if it is a 3-place predicate. The subject of the lower predicate is moved rightward along with the following hierarchy:

(6) NOM > ACC > DAT > OBL

The subject of the lower predicate is demoted to the following order without Case being filled in the course of deriving the causative constructions. Comrie's claim above can be applied to Korean LCCs in an appropriate fashion, as are seen in (7) below:

(7) a. Younghi-ka   Chulsu*-ka/*-eke/-lul   ul-i-ess-ta.
              nom   nom/dat/acc   cry-cause-past-dec
        'Younghi made Chulsu cry.'
    b. Younghi-ka Chulsu*-ka/-eke/-lul chayk-ul ilk-hi-   ess-ta.
              nom   nom/dat/acc   book-acc read-cause-past-dec
        'Younghi made Chulsu read a book.'
    c. *Younghi-ka Chulsu-eke   chaek-ul na-eke cu-i-   ess-ta.
              nom   dat   book-acc I-dat give-cause-past-dec
        'Young made Chulsu give me a book.'

Since the lower predicate 'ul-ta' taking the subject 'Chulsu' in (7a) does not take its direct object, the subject becomes a direct object of the higher predicate in terms of (6), and since in (7b), the lower predicate 'ilk-ta' takes its direct object, the subject becomes an indirect object of the higher predicate. (7c) as an unacceptable sentence includes the lower 3-place predicate which takes both direct object and indirect object, and the subject of the lower predicate should become a DAT NP. In relation to the ungrammaticality of (7c), in Korean, make sure that the number of arguments a predicate takes does not exceed three including its subject. But notice that its periphrastic counterpart in (8c) is accepted as grammatical.

As to the case-system of Korean, there are NOM, ACC and DAT, (depending on the valency of a verb) and other OBLs. In PCCs like (8), however, the case-marking appears complicated, including the case marking based on (6):

(8) a. Younghi-ka Chulsu-ka/-eke/-lul   nol-ke   ha-ess-ta.
             nom   nom/dat/acc   play-comp do-past-dec
        'Younghi made Chulsu play.'
    b. Younghi-ka Chulsu-ka/-eke/-lul yak-ul   muk-ke   ha-ess-ta.
             nom   nom/dat/acc medicine-acc eat-comp do-past-dec
        'Younghi made Chulsu take the medicine.'

    c. Younghi-ka Chulsu-ka/-eke/-lul na-eke   chayk-ul cu-ke
             nom   nom/dat/acc I-dat   book-acc give-comp
        ha-ess-ta
        do-past-dec
        'Younghi made Chulsu give me a book.'

According to the case hierarchy (6), 'Chulsu-lul' sounds the most natural among the three kinds of case in (8a), 'Chulsu-eke' in (8b), and 'Chulsu-hante' in (8c).

    Let me next examine the reason why the case variation takes place in the course of case-marking. We know that even the simplest forms of linguistic expressions in virtual contain complicated affairs. As it were, a linguistic expression might be variously recognized according to the types of 'act' performed by a speaker in uttering a sentence, including 'actions' such as 'requesting', 'commanding', or 'stating'.[5]

---

5) There are four important categories of speech acts: utterance acts; illocutionary acts; perlocutionary acts; and propositional acts. (see Austin (1962) and Searle (1969)) Yet, here will be focused on illocutionary acts in that they are central to linguistic communication. That is why our normal conversations are composed in large part of statements, suggestions, requests, proposals, greetings, and the like.

Taking an example of (8a), its speech act can be represented like the following (9), in saying that 'Younghi-ka Chulsu-ka/-eke/-lul nol-ke-ha-ess-ta.':

(9) a. Na-nun 'Younghi-ka Chulsu-ka nol-ke ha-ess-ta'ko
      I-topic '   -nom   nom play-comp do-past-dec'comp
      cucangha-n-ta.
      claim-present-dec
     'I claim that Younghi made Chulsu play.'
  b. Na-nun 'Younghi-ka Chulsu-eke nol-ke ha-ess-ta'ko
      I-topic '   nom   dat play-comp do-past-dec'comp
      cucangha-n-ta.
      claim-present-dec
     'I claim that Younghi made Chulsu play.'
  c. Na-nun 'Younghi-ka Chulsu-lul nol-ke   ha-ess-ta'ko
      I-topic '   nom   acc play-comp do-past-dec'comp
      cucangha-n-ta.
      claim-present-dec
     'I claim that Younghi made Chulsu play.'

The case variation in Korean PCCs should be understood distinctively under various communicative situations. It depends on the speaker's speech acts in the first person singular present indicative active sentence. In performing an utterance act, the speaker will endow some coerciveness to the causer or some volitionality to the causee, when he utters a causative construction. However, to our regret, the explanation of the case variation which takes place in the position of the causee, is not at work in syntax. To make matters worse, Kang (1984) claims that under the assumptions of Austin's framework, the difference between '-lul' causative and '-eke' causative should be attributed to the perlocutionary difference, for 'eke' causative doesn't exhibit successive effects.[6] I don't think, however, that his judgement on his data is convincing. Let's consider the following examples:

(10) a. Younghi-ka   Chulsu-ka nol-ke   ha-ass-ciman,
             nom   nom play-comp cause-past-dec
        Chulsu-ka   nol-ci   anh-ass-ta.
             nom   play-comp not-past-dec
        'Younghi caused Chulsu to play, but Chulsu didn't play.'
    b. Younghi-ka   Chulsu-eke nol-ke   ha-ass-ciman,
             nom   nom play-comp cause-past-dec
        Chulsu-ka   nol-ci   anh-ass-ta.
             nom   play-comp not-past-dec
        'Younghi caused Chulsu to play, but Chulsu didn't play.
    c. Younghi-ka   Chulsu-lul nol-ke   ha-ass-ciman,
             nom   nom play-comp cause-past-dec
        Chulsu-ka   nol-ci   anh-ass-ta.
             nom   play-comp not-past-dec
        'Younghi caused Chulsu to play, but Chulsu didn't play.'

As Sung (1998) claims, English LCCs always convey direct causative
meaning, and English PCCs convey both direct and indirect causative
meaning. Whereas Korean causative constructions, whether they include
lexical or periphrastic causative verbs, can all convey both direct and

---

6) Let's consider the following examples suggested by Kang (1984):
(i) a. *John-un   Bill-ul   ka- ke- ha- ess-ciman,
           top   acc   go-comp-cause-past-dec
       Bill-un kkutnay ka-ci   anh-ass-ta.
       top ultimately   go-comp not-past-dec
     '*John forced Bill to go, but Bill did not go after all.'
    b. John-un   Bill-eke ka- ke- ha- ess-ciman,
           top   acc   go-comp-cause-past-dec
       Bill-un kkutnay ka-ci   anh-ass-ta.
       top ultimately go-comp not-past-dec
     'John caused Bill to go, but Bill did not go after all.'
Kang judges that (ia) produces a contradictions and is ungrammatical; in
contrast, (ib) hasno contradiction and is grammatical. But his judgment is not
correct. Many Korean native speakers, including me, can easily recognize that
both are interpretable and grammatical.

indirect causative meaning. Which indicates that a way of expressing causative meaning appears parametric in the world languages.

As is shown in (10), however, the case variation in the position of the causee never plays any role in distinguishing between direct causation and indirect causation. The case variation appears to take place only on the basis of a given pragmatic context: NOM might be changed into DAT, and then ACC. While this case variation is in progress, a pragmatic condition should be satisfied, which would be described as in (11):

(11) Appropriateness Condition
     The hearer recognizes what the speaker is intending to
     communicate literally (and directly)

The similar phenomenon is found in the constructions in which honorification emerges. This kind of affixation seems to be decided by condition (11): the speaker's speech acts in the first person singular present indicative active sentence should be understood distinctively under various communicative situations. On uttering, the speaker will endow some deference toward the very person referred to. Let's see the following examples:.

(12) a. Aboci-kkeso   halaboci-kke   sinmun-lul   ilk-si-ke
       father-nom(hon) grandpa-eke(hon) newpaper-acc read-hon-comp
       ha-si-ess-ta.
       do-hon-past-dec
       'Father made Grandfather read a newspaper.'
    b. Aboci-ka halaboci-kke sinmun-lul ilk-si-ke ha-ess-ta.
            nom   eke(hon)   acc
    c. *Aboci-kkeso halaboci-ka sinmun-lul ilk-ke ha-si-ess-ta.
        nom(hon)   nom   acc

In (12), the speaker is supposed to be younger than 'aboci' (father) and

'halaboci' (grandfather). If the speaker utters (12a) to his own grandfather, it might sound impolite and awkward. That is why the speaker had better speak (12b), for 'halaboci' is senior to 'aboci'. (12c) sounds unnatural and impolite, for 'aboci' is junior to 'halaboci', yet more deference is paid to the former than to the latter.

Moreover, each sentence in (10) conveys both direct causation and indirect causation. The former can be paraphrased as 'Younghi forced Chulsu to play.'; the latter can be paraphrased as 'one property that Younghi has or one event that Younghi did before forced Chulsu to play.' Even in a specific case in which Younghi doesn't tell Chulsu to play, Younghi's kindness can make Chulsu feel free to play.

Although the case variation cannot predict the difference between direct causation and indirect causation, it works under the assumption of the semantic property in the following (13):

(13) Scalarity Axiom
   The more coercively the causer affects its causee, the less the
   causee's volitionality becomes.

Condition (13) implies that NOM causees have the most volitionality and ACC causees have the least. Notice that indirect causation is excluded from the scalarity condition, for in the indirect causative constructions, the causing event and the caused event are not directly (i.e., physically or directively) connected each other, and almost the occurrences of the caused event are accidental or indirect.[7]

In this next section, we will examine how Axiom (13) of a semantic criterion affects case-marking. Among others, the constructions with case-doubling will be treated: double NOM constructions and double ACC constructions.

3.2 Considerations of Case-Doubling

---

7) See Sung (1998b) for the details.

In this section, we will consider double-subject constructions and double-object constructions in Korean. we assume that the PCCs are bi-clausal, involve two subjects in the syntax and experience a pragmatic change after syntax. The causee alternates its case among ACC, DAT, and NOM on the basis of some conditions such as (11) and (13).

Comrie (1976) claims that the examples of double NOM constructions are hard to find among the world languages except for Korean and Japanese. Korean causative constructions are distinct from those in other languages, in that the causee of the Korean causatives are realized as either ACC, DAT, or NOM. In Korean, consequently, there are likely to exist not only the examples of double NOM construction, double ACC constructions but also double indirect object constructions.

In 3.2, we will first discuss some kinds of double NOMs and double ACCs in Korean language. Secondly, the fact will be clarified that only the causee in causative constructions goes through the case variation for the pragmatic reasons after syntax. .

3.2.1 Double NOM Constructions

On the semantic basis, there are three kinds of double NOM constructions in Korean. Thus, the two subjects of double NOM constructions either may or may not be in close connection with each other, as exemplified in (14) below. Unlike the previous two, the other appears in such PCC as (18):

(14) a. Chulsu-ka   pal-i   ku-ta
            nom foot-nom big-dec
        'Chulsu's feet are big.'
    b. Chulsu-ka   ton-i   manh-ta.
            nom   money-nom much-dec
        'Chulsu has much money.'

As is seen in (14), '-ka' and '-i' are both NOM markers in Korean. The outer subject 'chulsu-ka' must be subsidiary and can be deleted without change of meaning, but the inner subjects of 'pal-i' and 'ton-i' cannot be deleted and the meaning of the whole sentence, if deleted, has been changed. These kinds of double NOM constructions are characterized as including an adjective predicate with the copulas (i.e., i-ta, toe-ta, or iss-ta).

(15) a. ku-ka   manhun jaysan-i   iss-ul-kka?
        he-nom much fortune-nom be-may-dec
        'Does he have much fortune?'
     b. ku-ka   umak-i   chuimi-ta.
        he-nom   music-nom hobby-dec
        'His hobby is playing or listening to the music.'

Given the examples presented above, the close semantic relation between the outer subject and the inner subject seems to make it possible to bring about the composition of double NOM constructions. This semantic relation is exhibited by changing the outer NOM into genitive. In (14), 'Chulsu-ka' can be changed into 'Chulsu-ui'.

   Unlike this, there is another case, in which an outer subject and an inner subject in double NOM constructions seldom have a semantic relation to each other. Consider the following examples in (16):

(16) Olchayngi-ka   kaekuri-ka   toe-ess-ta.
       'polliwog-nom frog-nom   become-past-dec
       A polliwog became a frog.'

In (16), it is impossible to change 'olchaengi-ka' into 'olchaengi-ui'.
   let us next concentrate on a third type of double NOM causative constructions, as exemplified in (17) below. we will suggest four differences between double NOM non-causative constructions and double

NOM causative constructions in Korean.

First, in (17a,b), their outer subjects don't take the genitive case, and can be deleted. Also, between the causer 'Chulsu' and the causee 'Younghi' lies a semantic relation--a causal relation. This means that (17a,b) are distinct from either (14) or (16):

(17) a. Chulsu-ka Younghi-ka   ul-ke   ha-ess-ta.
              nom   nom cry-comp cause-past-dec
       'Chulsu caused Younghi to cry.'
     b. Chulsu-ka Younghi-ka chayk-ul ilk-ke   ha-ess-ta.
              nom   nom book-acc read-comp cause-past-past
       'Chulsu caused Younghi to read a book.'

(17a,b) are all grammatical. Further, in (17a,b), the deletion of 'Younghi-ka' sounds a little more natural than that of 'Chulsu-ka'. LCCs, however, are different from PCCs in connection with the case variation, as exemplified in (18) below:

(18) a. Chulsu-ka Younghi-lul ul-i-ess-ta.
              nom   acc cry-cause-past-dec
       'Chulsu made Younghi cry.'
     b. Chulsu-ka Younghi-eke chaek-ul ilk-hi-ess-ta.
              nom   dat   book-acc read-cause-past-dec
       'Chulsu made Younghi read a book.'

The case-marking in (18) is convincingly explained under the case hierarchy (6). As is assumed in section 2, LCCs are mono-clausal and PCCs are bi-clausal. Under this assumption, (18a) and (18b) are derived from (19a) and (19b), respectively:

(19) a. Chulsu-ka Younghi-lul ul-ke   ha-ess-ta.
              nom   acc cry-comp do-past-dec
     b. Chulsu-ka Younghi-eke chaek-ul ilk-ke   ha-ess-ta.

nom   dat   book-acc read-comp do-past-dec

A second difference is that the NOM case-marker 'ka' of the inner subjects in (17) can alternate with '-eke' and '-lul'. Like (20) and (21), however, those in (14) and (16) cannot alternate with '-lul' or '-eke', as shown in the following:

(20) a. *Chulsu-**ka**   bal-**lul**   ku-ta.
            nom   feet-acc   big-dec
    b. *Chulsu-**ka** bal-**eke** ku-ta.
            nom   dat
(21) a. *Olchaengi-**ka** kaekuri-**lul** toi-ess-ta.
         polliwog-nom frog-acc   become-past-dec
    b. *Olchaengi-**ka** kaekuri-**eke** toi-ess-ta.
            nom   dat

Thirdly, the difference between (14)/(16) and (17) is in accordance with the fact that (14)-(16) are mono-clausal and (17) is bi-clausal in the surface structure.[8] It is natural that two clauses include double NOMs and the double NOMs in (17) surely have their own predicates unlike the subjects in (14) and (16), of which both are predicated of one predicate. Recall that some evidence to the claim that PCCs are bi-clausal was suggested in section 2.. Further, in Korean, the embedded clauses of complex sentences should always take the so-called complementizers such as '-ke', '-tolok', '-ko', '-ki', '-nun', etc. at the back of themselves, as shown in the following (22); yet, the double NOM non-causative constructions of (14) and (15) don't involve any complementizer:

(22) a. Chulsu-ka Younghi-ka **ul-ke**   ha-ess-ta.

---

8) Some linguists such Kim (1986ab) and Sung (1981) claim that parts of the double NOM constructions and double ACC constructions should be categorized as a complex sentence.

               nom   nom cry-comp do-past-dec

       'Chulsu made Younghi cry.'

   b. Chulsu-ka Younghi-ka   ul-**tolok** ha-ess-ta.

               nom   nom cry-comp do-past-dec

       'Chulsu caused Younghi to cry.'

   c. Chulsu-ka Younghi-ka un-ta-**ko**   sayngha-n-ta.

               nom   nom cry-dec-comp think-present-dec

       'Chulsu thought that Younghi cried.

   d. Chulsu-ka noraypuru-**ki**-ka oryop-ta.

               nom sing-comp-nom difficult-dec

       'It is difficult for Chulsu to sing.'

   e. Pap-ul mok-**nun** saram-i   Chulsu-i-ta.

       rice-acc eat-comp man-nom   cop-dec

       'The man who is eating rice is Chulsu.'

Finally, a great number of subjects appear together at the same clause in the double NOM non-causative constructions like (23), but not in the double NOM causative constructions:

(23) a. Chulsu-ka   bal-i   tongjung-i   simha-ta.

               nom feet-nom sickness-nom serious-dec

      'Chulsu's feet have a serious ache.'

   b. Chulsu-ka   ton-i   cipye-ka manh-ta.

               nom money-nom bill-nom many-dec

      'Chulsu have many bills.'

In summary, first, the second NOM in the double NOM non-causative constructions doesn't alternate with ACC or DAT, while the second NOM (causee) shows a variety of case variations, including ACC causee, and DAT causee, in terms of the Scalarity Axiom suggested in 3.1. More attention should now be paid to the fact that it is totally impossible for a structural case to alternate with another structural case in other constructions except the PCCs.

Secondly, we probed into Korean double NOM constructions: double NOM non-causative constructions and double NOM causative constructions. To argue that double NOM causative constructions should be differentiated from double NOM non-causative constructions, we suggested four kinds of evidence. In 3.2.2, we will consider 'case-doubling', in comparing both double ACC non-causative constructions and double ACC causative constructions.

3.2.2 Double ACC Constructions

Like double NOM constructions, examined in 3.2.1, double ACC constructions can be grouped into double ACC non-causative constructions and double ACC causative constructions. Also, the former can be divided into two kinds, according to a possibility of assigning genitive case to the outer object as well as a semantic relation between the first object and the second object.

Let us first consider two types of a double ACC non-causative constructions, as shown in (24) below:

(24) a. Chulsu-ka   Younghi-lul   son-ul   cab-ess-ta.
              nom   acc hand-acc catch-past-dec
        'Chulsu caught Younghi's hand.'
      b. Chulsu-ka   songaji-lul   ongdongi-lul   ttari-ess-ta.
              nom   calf-acc   buttocks-acc hit-past-dec
        'Chulsu hit a calf's buttocks.'

In (24a,b), the first object 'Younghi-lul' can be changed into the genitive 'Younghi-ui', and 'songaji-lul' into 'songaji-ui'. The second objects in (24) are part of the first objects. Whereas the first object of the two ACCs in (25) cannot be changed into genitive:

(25) a. Chulsu-ka Younghi-lul   anay-lul sam-ess-ta.
              nom   acc wife-acc made-past-dec

'Chulsu got married to Yonughi.'
b. Chulsu-ka podo-lul   sul-ul   mandul-ess-ta.
        nom grape-acc alcohol-acc make-past-dec
'Chulsu brewed wine with grapes.'

Let us next consider the double ACC examples which are found in PCCs. The double ACC causative constructions ought to take transitive verbs as their lower predicates, like the following example (26):

(26) Chulsu-ka Younghi-lul chayk-ul   ilk-ke   ha-ess-ta.
        nom   acc book-acc   read-comp do-past-dec

Of the two objects in (26), the second is not part of the first, then cannot be changed into genitive. But the double ACC causative construction of (26) are not identified with the double ACC non-causative construction of (23). That is why 'Younghi-lul' in (25) cannot be alternated with 'Younghi-ka' or 'Younghi-eke' unlike 'Younghi-lul' in (26). Moreover, the inversion between the double ACCs is impossible in (25), but possible in (26), as shown in (27) below. A difference of inversion also happens in the process of examining double ACC constructions. (27a) is a non-causative construction; (27b) is a causative construction:

(27) a. *Chulsu-ka anay-lul Younghi-lul sam-ess-ta. (from (25a))
            nom wife-acc   acc make-past-dec
     b. Chulsu-ka chayk-ul Younghi-lul ilk-ke   ha-ess-ta. (from (26))
            nom book-acc   acc read-comp do-past-dec

Example (27) shows that the relation between the two objects in causative constructions is different from that of non-causative constructions.[9]

---

9) But Yoon (1989) points out that the first of the double NOMs or the double

So far we have investigated 'case-doubling' with respect to double NOM constructions and double ACC constructions. It appears that the criteria and consequences of distribution are the same in analyzing the two kinds of constructions: double NOM construction and double ACC constructions.

We are now compelled to question what the difference between double NOM causative constructions and double ACC causative constructions is. We suggest that the relation between the outer subject and the inner subject in double NOM causative constructions is causal, for the outer subject refers to causer and the inner refers to causee. But the relation between the outer object and the inner object in double ACC causative constructions is not causal and the outer object is not an agent to the inner object--its patient.

Among world languages, double ACC causative constructions are more common double NOM causative constructions. As pointed out ahead, virtually, Korean is the only language with double NOM causative constructions. At this point, our assumption becomes persuasive that the '-ka' case-marked causee is an underlying form and is replaced by '-eke' case-marked causee or '-lul' case-marked causee, in conformity with Condition (11) and Axiom (13). It seems that double NOM causative constructions are more strongly constrained than double ACC causative constructions by Condition (11) and Axiom (13). In consequence, '-ka' case-marker, used usually to stand for agent should be replaced by other particles, as causee loses its agenthood more and more.

In 3.2.3, we will claim that '-ka' causative, '-eke' causative, '-lul' causative have the same syntactic structure irrespective of the case variation. In other words, all PCCs have the same syntactic structure in common whether they have a NOM, ACC, DAT or OBL causee under

---

ACCs should be distinguished from the second in the sense that the first conveys a focus/contrast meaning. Whether a causative construction and a non-causative construction, there should be a pause between the double subjects or the double objects.

some semantic and pragmatic assumptions.

3.2.3 '-eke' and '-lul' as delimiters

The two types of double NOM non-causative constructions were taken account in 3.2.1. One is (28b) in which the first NOM subject of both can be changed into '-ui' genitive; the other is (29b) in which the second NOM subject of both can be changed into '-ro' OBL which means a directional:

(28) a. Chulsu-**ka**   pal-i   ku-ta
              nom   foot-nom   big-dec
        'Chulsu's feet are big.'
     b. Chulsu-**ui**   pal-i   ku-ta.
              gen   foot-nom   big-dec
        'Chulsu's feet are big.'
(29) a. Olchayngi-**ka**   kaykuri-**ka**   toe-ess-ta.
              polliwog-nom frog-nom   become-past-dec
        'A polliwog became a frog.'
     b. Olchayngi-**ka**   kaykuri-**ro**   toe-ess-ta.   ·
              polliwog-ka   frog-obl   become-past-dec.

In (28) and (29), the structural case '-ka' alternates with other OBL cases or delimiters, but not with other structural cases '-lul' or '-eke'. For the next time, the examples of causative constructions in (8) are repeated like (30):

(30) a. Younghi-ka Chulsu-ka/-eke/-lul/-hante nol-ke ha-ess-ta.
     b. Younghi-ka Chulsu-ka/-eke/-lul/-hante chayk-lul ilk-ke
        ha-ess-taa.
     c. Younghi-ka Culsu-ka/-eke/-lul/-hante na-eke chayk-ul cul-ke
        ha-ess-ta.

Differently from the non-causative constructions of (28) and (29), the causative constructions in (30) go through the case variation with seemingly structural cases ('-lul' and '-eke') as well as OBL case 'hante'. How could it be justified that several structural cases alternate in the same causee position? Though we have so far been observing various double NOM constructions whether they are either causative or non-causative, we have not yet discovered a concrete criterion which can extract a distinctiveness from the two types of constructions.

Let us next turn to Hong (1983)'s discussion. He examines the difference between the usages of structural cases (like NOM and ACC) and those of delimiters. Consider the following examples:

(31) Chulsu-**ka**   kongpuha-n-ta.
　　　　　 nom study-present-dec
(32) a. Chulsu-**to**   kongpuha-n-ta.
　　　　　　 too   study-present-dec
　　 b. Chulsu-**man**   kongpuha-n-ta.
　　　　　　 only   study-present-dec
　　 c. Chulsu-**kkaci**   kongpuha-n-ta.
　　　　　　 even   study-present-dec

'Chulsu-ka' in (31) functions as a subject and is predicated of 'kongpuhanta' (study). On the other hand, 'Chulsu-to' in (32a), 'Chulsu-man' in (32b), and 'Chulsu-kkaci' in (32c) involve a delimiter and the hearer's subjective judgment, estimation, or expectation is connoted in (32). (32a) implies a situation in which other students than Chulsu is studying. (32b) implies a situation in which only Chulsu is studying. (32c) implies a situation in which all students are studying and Chulsu dislikes studying but now he is studying. Yang (1972) claims that delimiters add some semantic functions such as presupposition, assertion, implication, etc. to an element to which they attached.[10] These kinds of delimiters can supercede all structural cases, simultaneously adding some kinds of semantic aspects. We can also see

the substitution of the ACC case-maker '-lul' in (33) by delimiters in
the following examples:

(33) Chulsu-**ka** chayk-**lul** cohaha-n-ta.
　　　　　 nom 　book-acc 　like-present-dec
　　'Chulsu likes a book.'
(34) a. Chulsu-**ka** chayk-**to** cohaha-n-ta.
　　　　　　　 nom　　　　 also
　　b. Chulsu-**ka** chayk-**man** cohaha-n-ta.
　　　　　　　 nom　　　　 only
　　c. Chulus-**ka** chayk-**kkaci** cohaha-n-ta.
　　　　　　　 nom　　　　　 even

(34a) implies a situation in which Chulsu likes other things than books.
(34b) implies a situation in which Chulsu likes only books. (34c) implies
a situation in which there are many things that Chulsu likes except for
books.
　　Here let's return to the discussion of (30). I assume that '-eke', and
'-lul' in a causee are not structural case markers, but nothing more
than delimiters which express a semantic relation between causer and
causee. Axiom (13) is crucial in this process. We can discover some
other examples in which the structural cases ('-eke' and '-lul') in
(35b) and (35c) alternate with each other. Let's see the following
examples in (35):

(35) a.*Chulsu-**ka** Younghi-**ka** chayk-lul cu-ess-ta.
　　　　　　　 nom　　　　 nom book-acc give-past-dec
　　　'Chulsu gave Younghi a book.'
　　b. Chulsu-**ka** Younghi-**eke** chayk-lul cu-ess-ta.
　　　　　　　 nom　　　　 dat book-acc give-past-dec
　　c. Chulsu-**ka** Younghi-**lul** chayk-lul cu-ess-ta.

---

10) Refer to Yang (1973) for more details.

        nom   acc book-acc give-past-dec

The examples in (35) includes a non-causative verb of a 3-place predicate, 'give' and are different from those in (30b), for the double NOM construction like (35a) appears ungrammatical. Notice that 'eke' in (35b) alternates with '-lul' in (35c), but not with '-ka' in (35a).

     Let us consider the usages of '-eke' and '-lul' in some more details. Generally, '-eke' and '-lul' are structural cases, whose location is determined by the lexical information of each verb. The former represents indirect object and the latter represents direct object.

     In contexts, however, their usages vary. First, 'ku-eke' in (36a) is an indirect object, representing an OBL case--a kind of structural case, which is assigned by the verb 'give'. Unlike (36a), (36b,c,d,e) don't have a structural case-marked argument of an indirect object, where '-eke' is regarded as a particle, having a variety of meanings. (36b,c,d,e) have an '-eke' case-marked argument in common. In (36b), 'haksayng-eke' is not an indirect object, rather just an object of 'his understanding'. (36c) includes 'ku-eke' not as an indirect object, but as an object to compare with 'she'. 'nuku-eke' in (36d) is only an object of having a book. '-eke' in (36e) is a directional particle:

(36) a. uri-nun ku-**eke** kyungui-**lul** pyohan-ta.
        we-nom he-dat respect-acc show-pres-dec
        'We pays respect to him.'
    b. koysa-nun haksayng-**eke** chungyoha-ta.
        teacher-top students-for important-dec
        'Teachers are important to students.'
    c. him-i seki-nun   kunyo-ka ku-**eke** moschi-anh-ta.
        strength-nom degree-top she-nom he-with incomparable-not-dec
        'Her strength is comparable to his.
    d. nuku-**eke**   kuron chayk-i issul-kka?
        who-to(or on)   such   book-nom be-pres-ques
        'Who has such a book?'

e. ikos-i   nuku-**eke**   onun   pyunchi-i-ni?
  this-nom   who-directional   coming letter-be-pres-ques
  'Whose letter is this?'

We have still another kind of '-eke' case-marked argument. Let's see the example of (38);

(37) Chulsu-ka Younghi-**eke** chayk-ul ilk-ke ha-ess-ta.

If (37) is assumed to be a Korean PCC and bi-clausal, 'Younghi' seems to be assigned '-ka' NOM case, as the embedded subjects in other bi-clausal constructions are. But in (37), 'Younghi-eke' is case-marked as OBL, further may be substituted for ACC '-lul'. At this point, whether '-eke' case-marked arguemts in (36) are a structural case-marker or a particle, it differs from '-eke' in (37). Accordingly, we claim that '-eke' in (37) is not not only a structural case-marker but also a particle.

Let us try to discuss the usages of '-lul'. In fact, the functions of '-lul' are very various, as well. The '-lul' case-marked NP's in (38a,b) are not objects of the intransitive verbs such as 'nal-ta' (fly) and 'ttuy-ta' (run), and those in (39a,b) are not suffixed to an NP, but to adverbials such as 'cip-e' (to the house) and 'kakkai' (near):

(38) a. Say-ka   hanul-**lul** nal-n-ta
        bird-nom   sky-acc   fly-present-dec
        'A bird flies in the sky.'
     b. Chulsu-ka   undoncang-lul   ttuy-ess-ta.
             nom ground-acc   run-past-dec
        'Chulsu ran in the ground.'
(39) a. Chulsu-ka   cip-e-**lul**   ka-ess-ta.
             nom house-directional-acc   go-past-dec
        'Chulsu went to the house.'
     b, Chulsu-ka kakkai-**lul**   o-ci   anh-ass-ta.

nom near-acc come-comp not-past-dec
'Chulsu didn't come close (to me).'

Moreover, Yang (1973) observes that a delimiter can modify or specify the preceeding elements such as sentential complements in addition to nouns, adverbs, and conjunctors, as shown in (40a):

(40) a. Chulsu-ka Younghi-lul   ul-ke-lul   ha-ess-ta.
              nom   acc cry-comp-acc do-past-dec
     b. Chulsu-ka Younghi-lul ul-ke-to   ha-ess-ta.
              nom   acc cry-comp-also do-past-dec

Our point is that '-lul' in (40a) can be substituted for the delimiter of '-to' (also) in (40b). This is the same as those in (38) and (39). All the '-lul's' in (38) and (39) can be replaced by other delimiters (-man, -to, -kkachi, etc.). As is examined above, '-lul' has many other characteristics than structural case-markers.

     Let us compare (38)-(40) with (41), as to '-lul'. (41) is so-called a double ACC causative construction. Among them remains a similarity: all of them do not include an ACC case-marked argument. According to our assumptions, the causee (Younghi-lul) is a variation of its underlying form 'Younghi-ka', for causee is assigned NOM case in syntax and then shifted into another kind of case in some levels of pragmatics or semantics:

(41) Chulsu-ka Younghi-lul chayk-ul ilk-ke ha-ess-ta.

Judging from (37) and (41), '-eke' and '-lul' may be assumed to be a delimiter. Specifically, '-eke' and '-lul' can be acknowledged as a delimiter in PCCs,[11] for either is selected for a causal relation between

---

11) In this article, we will not discuss whether '-lul' and '-eke' can be used in other constructions than periphrastic causative constructions. Indeed, '-lul'

causer and causee. In case the effect of causer toward causee is relatively strong, '-lul' case-marked causee would be selected; otherwise, '-eke' case-marked causee would be selected.

To assume that '-lul' and '-eke' are a delimiter, we have to specify what meaning they imply. '-lul' and '-eke' in (37) and (41) might be the focusing delimiters which denote 'this in particular'.[12] Under (11) and (13), a speaker would select the more appropriate of '-lul' and '-eke', when he uttered a PCC.

Turning to our discussion in section 2, we suggested that all the causees in (8a,b,c) alternate with '-ka', '-eke', and '-lul'. But of which, '-ka' case-marked causee seems to sound more awkward than the two others. Song (1988) also considers that '-ka' case-marked argument is

---

and '-eke' don't alternate with each other except in periphrastic causative constructions.

12) Usually, more than delimiters can be suffixed to an NP. But when we assume that '-lul' and '-eke' may be used as a delimiter, we have to indicate the difference between them. '-eke' is followed by another delimiter, but '-lul' is not, as shown. in (i) below:

(i) (36) a. Chulsu-ka Younghi-eke-to/man/kkaci chayk-ul   ilk-ke
              nom   dat-also/only/even book-acc   read-comp
         ha-ess-ta.
         cause-past-dec
      b. *Chulsu-ka Younghi-lul-to/man/kkaci   chayk-ul ilk-ke
              nom   acc-also/only/even book-acc read-comp
         ha-ess-ta.
         cause-past-dec

Of course, although the presence of '-eke' in the indirect object is not obligatory, the '-eke' DAT case marker had better be overtly represented when the subject and the object in a sentence are equally specified by delimiters. It is because two interpretations occur ambiguously from the following example (ii) whose subject and object are both followed by delimiters:

(ii) Chulsu-man Younghi-to chayk-lul ilk-ke   ha-ess-ta
         only   also book-acc read-comp do-past-dec
    a. Chulsu-ka Younghi-eke-to chayk-lul ilk-ke ha-ess-ta.
       'Chulsu made others read a book, and he also made Younghi read a book.'
    b. Younghi-to Chulsu-eke-man chayk-lul ilk-ke ha-ess-ta.
       'Others made only Chulsu read a book, but Younghi, too, made only Chulsu read a book.'

much likely to appear in the purposive constructions like (42):

(42) na-nun ku-ka   chayk-ul ilk-ke   tosokwan-eso manhun
     I-top   he-nom book-acc read-comp library-from   many
     chayk-ul piri-ess-ta.
     book-acc borrow-past-dec
     'I borrowed many books from the library in order for him to read.'

'ku-ka' can be shifted into neither 'ku-lul' nor 'ku-eke'. Anyway, Korean language seems to be tolerant of the usage of '-ka' causee in periphrastic causative constructions. Even in Japanese, which accepts double NOM non-causative constructions, NOM causees cannot exist in any case. Whereas, double ACC causative constructions are frequently found among world languages. Concludingly, we argue that condition (11) constrains very strongly a causal relation between causer and causee in all PCCs. (11) prohibits both causer and causee in a sentence from sharing the same case on pragmatic basis.

4. Conclusions

The case variation of the causee in Korean was examined in this article. The primary reason of the variation was attributed to the pragmatic correlations between causer and causee. In some causative situations, the causer affects its causee very strongly: in others, the influence of the causer over its causee is weak, relatively.

The argument that causative sentences have the same underlying structure whether they involve a NOM causee, a DAT causee, or an ACC causee (case-marked as '-ka', '-eke', and 'lul', respectively) was supported by the fact that the application of some kinds of syntactic derivations to the three kinds of sentences arises in the same result. The causee which is case-marked as NOM 'ka' is an underlying form and the rest two are derived ones. And we argued that in DAT causee and ACC causee, both of 'eke' and 'lul' are not structural cases, rather

delimiters.

References

서정수. 1991. 현대한국어 문법연구의 개관, 개정판, 한국문화사

성광수. 1979. 국어조사의 연구, 형설출판사.

이익섭.이홍빈. 1983. 국어문법론, 학연사.

홍사만. 1983. 국어특수조사론, 학문사.

Akmajian, A., R. Demers, A. Farmer and R. Harnish. 1993. *Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication*, the 3rd edition, the MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Cormrie, B. 1976. "The Syntax of Causative Constructions: Cross-Language Similarities and Divergences," *Syntax and Semantics* 6.

Ek, Jan A. and Nicol J. Robat. 1984. *The Student's Grammar of English*, Basil Blackwell. Goldberg, A. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*, The University of Chicago Press.

Guasti, M. 1994. "Argument Structure: An Introduction Analysis of Causative," ms. Kang, Young-Se. 1984. "Two Types of Periphrastic Causative Constructions in Korean," *Language* 9-1.

Lee, In. 1994. *Analysis of Korean Complex Predicates: an Argument Structure account*, Ph.D dissertation, the University of Kansas.

Lee, Seung-Jae. 1998. "Four-way Alternations on the Causee in the Korean Causative Constructions," *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 23-2.

Shibatani, M. 1976. "The Grammar of Causative Constructions: Aconspectus. Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 6.

Song, Jae-Jung. 1988. "Clause Linkage in Korean Periphrastic Causative and Purposive Constructions," *Language Research*, Vol. 24-4.

Wierzbicka, A. 1988. *The Semantics of Grammar*, SLCS 18, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Yang, In-Seok. 1973. "The Semantics of Delimiters in Korean," *Language Research* 9-2.

Dept. of English

Namseoul University

21 Maeju-ri, Seonghwan-eup, Cheonahn-si
Choongnam, Korea, 330-800
E-mail: taesung@nsu.ac.kr
Fax: +82-417-582-2117