

The Distribution of Subject Properties in Multiple Subject Constructions*

JAMES H. YOON

Department of Linguistics, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

1. Introduction

Grammatical relations (GR) such as subject and object have long been recognized to be indispensable in understanding how grammars of natural languages work, though there seems to be no logical necessity for arguments to be filtered through a layer of grammatical relations (GRs) as they receive morphosyntactic expression. Despite the pervasiveness of GRs, pinning down the properties of GRs has met with repeated challenges.

* The ideas in this paper were presented at the 2006 Linguistic Society of Korea International Conference (Seoul) and the 16th Japanese/Korean Linguistics Conference (Kyoto, October, 2006). I would like to thank the LSK and Yukinori Takubo, organizer of J/K 16, for their invitation and generosity. The paper has benefited from comments and feedback from the following individuals: Karlos Arregi, Hongbin Im, Ruth Kempson, Ji-Hye Kim, Soowon Kim, Chungmin Lee, Joan Maling, Chongwon Park, Byungsoo Park, Reiko Vermeulen, John Whitman, as well as members of the Korean syntax-semantics group at the University of Illinois—Daeho Chung, Youngju Choi, Juhyeon Hwang, Keunyoung Shin, and Yunchul Yoo.

The goal of this paper is to investigate questions of subjecthood in a well-known construction in the grammar of Japanese and Korean--the **Multiple Subject Construction** (MSC, also called the **Double Subject Construction** or the **Multiple Nominative Construction**). Here are some well-worn examples of MSCs often encountered in the literature:

- (1) a. Cheli-ka meli-ka pisangha-ta
 C-nom head-nom exceptional-decl
 'Cheli is exceptionally smart.'
- b. Nampankwu-ka mwunmyengkwwukka-ka namca-ka
 southern.hemisphere-nom civilized.country-nom men-nom
 phyengkyun-swumyeng-i ccalp-ta
 average-lifespan-nom short-decl
 'It is the southern hemisphere that it is the civilized countries where
 it is the men whose lifespan is short.'

The first problem concerning MSCs that this paper addresses is the following: only one of the nom-marked nominals in MSCs seems to be an argument of the predicate. For example, in (1b), the predicate *ccalp-ta* 'be short' is a one-place predicate, but there are four subject-like, nominative-marked, nominals in the sentence. Given the common assumption that subjects are arguments (i.e., the most prominent argument), the appearance of more than one subject-like nominal in MSC is puzzling.

The second problem concerns nominative case-marking. The supposition we made that there may be more than one subject in MSCs was based on nominative case-marking. Since we know that nominative case is neither sufficient nor necessary as a defining property of subjects crosslinguistically, the question arises whether all nominative-marked nominals in MSCs are indeed subjects, and if not, how nominative ends up being expressed on more than one nominal. A related question is whether the function of the particle taken to be a nominative case-marker (*-ka/-i* in Korean) is restricted solely to the case-marking function.

The problem with nominative case-marking is part of a larger problem concerning the distribution of subject properties in MSCs. How are subject properties besides nominative case-marking distributed among the subject-like nominals in MSCs? And why are they distributed the way they are? This constitutes the third problem addressed in this paper. To summarize, the following questions concerning subjecthood arise in the study of MSCs:

- (2) Subjecthood in MSCs:
- a. What semantic-thematic mechanisms license the nom-marked NPs that do not appear to be selected by the predicate?

- b. Is nominative a property diagnosing subjects? If so, how can an apparent subject coding property be distributed among several nominals in a sentence?
- c. How are the other subject properties distributed (if they are at all) among nominals that share nominative case?

In the vast literature on MSCs, we can discern the following lines of thinking regarding the first two issues identified above. In one line of thinking, it is maintained that there is only one subject in an MSC and that the additional nominative-marked nominals are not subjects, but topics and/or foci. Those who adhere to this position write off what looks like nominative case on the non-subject nominals as something other than case (Yoon 1986, J-Y Yoon 1989, Schütze 2001).

A second line of thinking posits that there is more than one subject in MSCs. In this approach, the reason nominative case, a typical subject coding property, is realized more than once is because there is more than one subject in an MSC. This is the line of thinking in traditional accounts of MSCs in East Asian languages and the position taken in Teng (1974), B-S Park (1973), I-H Lee (1987), Heycock (1993), and one that I have defended recently (Yoon 2003, 2004a,b, 2006/to appear).

A third approach posits that there is more than one subject in an MSC, but not at the same level of representation. Treatments of MSCs in the Relational Grammar (RG) framework (C. Yoon 1990) are framed in terms of this position. Under this approach, as in the second, nominative is case.

And though not much work has been done on the third issue (2c above) compared to the first two, answers to it depend on whether MSCs are deemed to have more than one subject, and if so, at what level(s) of representation.

My goal in this paper is two-fold. In the first part of the paper, I will present arguments in favor of the second type of approach to MSCs. In the second part, I will turn to an examination of the distribution of subject properties in MSCs. I shall demonstrate that the traditionally identified subject properties in Korean are distributed between the higher, or Major, subject and a lower, or Grammatical, subject. The distribution of subject properties in MSCs shows that both are subject-like in important ways, thus supporting the results of the first section. Discussion of the implications of the findings closes the paper.

2. Multiple Subject Construction; not Multiple Nominative Construction

2.1. Initial Nom-marked NPs are not Topics or Foci

Different authors have analyzed all but one nominative-marked NP in MSCs as something other than a subject (Li and Thompson 1976, Yoon 1986, J-Y Yoon 1989, Schütze 2001, C. Youn 1990, Vermeulen 2005). If they are not subjects, what could they be? The most common answer to this question is that the non-subject NPs in MSCs bear the discourse function of focus, but not the grammatical relation of subject. It follows in this approach that the particle *-ka* does not always realize case. However, there are some fundamental difficulties with this type of approach.

The focus analysis is based on the observation that in many contexts, the initial NP in an MSC is interpreted as (exhaustive listing) focus (Kuno 1973). For example, the MSC in (3a) is felicitous only if the initial *ka*-marked NP in (3a) is interpreted as focused, as indicated in the translation. To obtain a non-focused interpretation, the topic-marker (*-nun*) must be used, as we see in (3b). The focus analysis predicts this contrast.

- (3) a. Cheli-**ka** apeci-ka hakkyo-ey onul o-si-ess-ta
 C-nom father-nom school-loc today come-hon-pst-decl
 ‘It is Cheli whose father came to school today.’
 ≠ ‘Speaking of Cheli, his father came to school today.’
- b. Cheli-**nun** apeci-ka hakkyo-ey onul o-si-ess-ta
 C-top father-nom school-loc today come-hon-pst-decl
 ‘Speaking of Cheli, his father came to school today.’

However, this analysis begins to unravel when we examine additional data. As noted in Yoon (2004b), among others, there are MSCs where the initial NPs either are not or cannot be interpreted as focus. Consider (4a,b) below.

- (4) a. pihayngki-**ka** 747-i ceyil khu-ta
 Airplane-nom 747-nom most big-decl
 ‘As for airplanes, the 747 is biggest.’
 ‘It is airplanes that the 747 is big.’ (pragmatically odd)
- b. pihayngki-**nun** 747-i ceyil khu-ta
 Airplane-top 747-nom most big-decl
 ‘As for airplanes, the 747 is the biggest.’

Given that the 747 is a type of airplane, the focus interpretation of the initial NP in (4a) is pragmatically odd, since it implies that there are other entities besides airplanes that have the 747 designation. Therefore, the focus analysis predicts this sentence to be rejected by speakers. While a minority of speakers find the sentence odd, choosing (4b) instead (Y-S Kang 1985), most speakers find the sentence acceptable. And speakers who accept it interpret the initial NP as something other than focus.

Another context where the initial NP in an MSC is not (cannot) be interpreted as focus is shown in (5a) below. When the second nominative NP in an MSC is a Wh-phrase, the initial NP can be *ka*-marked.¹ Since the Wh-phrase is in focus, the initial NP cannot be focus. Nonetheless, (5a) is accepted by speakers, including those who find (4a) odd. This is not expected under the focus analysis.

- (5) a. pihayngki-**ka** etten kicong-i ceyil khu-ni?
 airplane-nom which model-nom most big-inter
 ‘Which model of airplane is the biggest?’
 b. pihayngki-**nun** etten kicong-i ceyil khu-ni?
 airplane-top which model-nom most big-inter
 ‘Among airplanes, which model is the biggest?’

Similarly, the initial NP in the following MSC need not be interpreted as focus, even though the second NP is not a Wh-phrase.

- (6) a. Cheli-**ka** khi-ka khu-ta
 C-nom height-nom big-decl
 ‘Cheli is tall.’
 b. Cheli-**nun** khi-ka khu-ta
 C-top height-nom big-decl
 ‘As for Cheli, he is tall.’

In order to deal with problems such as this, Schütze (2001) claimed that the function of initial NPs in MSCs encompasses both focus and topic. Accordingly, the initial NP in (4-6a) is a topic, while that in (3a) is focus.

Unfortunately, this alternative will not suffice. For example, since there is an undisputed topic-marker *-nun* in (4-6b), just what sort of topic is marked by *-ka* rather than *-nun* in (4-6a)? And why isn’t the ‘topic’ *-ka* available in (3a)? If it were, the NP should admit an interpretation as topic, in addition to focus, though we have seen that it does not.

A further argument against the focus analysis of initial NPs comes from the fact that when MSCs like (3a) occur in embedded or non-asserted contexts, no special discourse interpretation is required for the initial NP (Heycock 1994):

- (6) a. pihayngki-ka 747-i khu-ta-nun sasil-ul na-nun mallassta
 airplane-nom 747-nom big-decl-and fact-acc I-top not.know
 ‘I didn’t know about the fact that the 747 is big.’

¹ As far I as I am aware, this is not possible in Japanese.

- b. Cheli-ka apeci-ka hakkyo-ey encey o-si-ess-ni?
 C-nom father-nom school-loc when come-hon-pst-Q
 ‘When did Cheli’s father come to school?’

What these facts indicate is that the initial NPs MSCs cannot be licensed solely by an information-structural role such as topic or focus, but by something else. Once licensed, they may be interpreted in appropriate contexts as topic or focus.

What could the licensing mechanism in question be? In approaches to MSCs that treat the initial NP as focus/topic, this issue is not addressed systematically. The usual answers that proponents of the topic/focus analysis offer are that the initial nominals are either adjuncts (that have been moved to topic/focus position) or the possessor argument of the subject (that has moved to the initial position). These answers do not suffice, as we shall see. I will argue that they are licensed as subjects.

2.2. Major Subjects and Sentential Predicates

We just saw that the initial NP in MSCs does not have a consistent discourse function, such as topic or focus. We also noted that over and above any discourse function that they may have, we need an account of how they are licensed in the first place. I will argue, following earlier work (Yoon 2003, 2004a,b, 2006/to appear), that the initial NP is licensed as a subject, specifically, a Major Subject. Thus, MSCs have more than one subject—a unique **Grammatical Subject** that is selected by the predicate, which is its most prominent argument, and multiple **Major Subjects** that are in construction with (nested) **Sentential Predicates** (Teng 1974, B-S Park 1973, 1982, I-H Lee 1987, Heycock 1993).

A Major Subject differs from a Grammatical Subject in a number of respects. The obvious difference is that unlike a Grammatical Subject, a Major Subject is not an argument of the predicate. This is because while the predicate in construction with a Grammatical Subject is a thematically unsaturated VP, the predicate of a Major Subject is a thematically saturated sentence that is turned into a predicate, hence, a Sentential Predicate (B-S Park 1982; I-H Lee 1987). A corollary of this fact is that Major Subjects must denote entities on which such predication can be felicitously stated. This rules out expletives or idiom chunks as Major Subjects (Yoon 2003, 2006/to appear). A further property, which Yoon (2004a) calls the ‘news-worthiness’ condition, is imposed. Namely, the entity chosen as Major Subject must be important enough to predicate something about.

The Sentential Predicate is also restricted, when compared to VP. For a saturated sentence to function felicitously as Sentential Predicate, the sen-

tence must be construable as denoting a characteristic (or characterizing) property of the referent of the Major Subject (Kuno 1973, Y-J Jang 1998). By contrast, predicates in construction with Grammatical Subjects need not denote characteristic properties. Yoon (2003, 2006/to appear) notes that there are additional properties of Major Subjects that can be attributed to the property predication condition. The properties of the Major Subject and Sentential Predicate outlined above are exemplified below.

As noted, not all (referential) Major Subjects are felicitous in MSCs. Consider (7a-c). While (7a, c) are acceptable, (7b) is not. Many account for the contrast between (7a) and (7b) by assuming that the Major Subject in the former is derived by movement from the possessor of the Grammatical Subject. Under this account, (7b) is ruled out since the Major Subject *khi-ka* ‘height-nom’ has an unbound trace (Akiyama 2004). However, as shown by (7c), this cannot be correct (where MS=Major Subject, GS=Grammatical Subject, SP=Sentential Predicate):

- (7) a. Cheli-ka(MS) [SP khi-ka(GS) ceyil khu-ta]
 C-nom height-nom most tall-decl
 ‘Cheli is tall.’
- b. *?khi-ka(MS) [SP Cheli-ka(GS) ceyil khu-ta]
 height-nom C-nom most tall-decl
 ‘As for height, Cheli is tall.’
- c. Ku thim-eyse-nun khi-ka(MS) [SP O’Neal-i ceyil khu-ta]
 That team-loc-top height-nom O-nom most tall-decl
 ‘(In that team), Shaquille O’Neal is the tallest.’

What differentiates (7b) and (7c) is this: while normally people are characterized in terms of height and not vice versa (7a) vs. *(7b), given the right context (a basketball team), height can become ‘newsworthy’ enough, and when it is, it is felicitous as the Major Subject.

The contrast shown below indicates that not all Sentential Predicates are acceptable in MSCs: universities may be characterized by how many faculty members live close by, but not by whether an average Joe (=Cheli) lives close by. Thus, (8a) is felicitous as an MSC while (8b) is not.

- (8) a. Seoul-tayhakkyo-ka(MS) [SP kyoswutul-i kunche-ey santa]
 S-university-nom faculty-nom nearby-loc live
 ‘As for/it is SNU (that) faculty members live close by.’
- b. *?Seoul-tayhakkyo-ka(MS) [SP Cheli-ka kunche-ey santa]
 S-university-nom C-nom nearby-loc lives
 ‘As for/it is SNU (that) Cheli lives close by.’

The contrast between (9a,b) and (10a,b) below is amenable to a similar explanation. *Yelum* ‘summer’ can be expressed either as a (topicalized) temporal adjunct (9a,b) or as the Major Subject (10a,b). However, as (10) shows, not all adjuncts can be turned into Major Subjects (K-S Hong 1997).

- (9) a. Yelum-ey-(nun) maykcwu-ka(GS) choyko-i-ta
 summer-loc-(top) beer-nom best-cop-decl
 ‘It is during the summer that beer is best.’
 b. Yelum-ey-(nun) Cheli-ka(GS) cip-ey onta
 summer-loc-(top) C-nom home-loc comes
 ‘Cheli is coming home this summer.’
- (10)a. Yelum-i(MS) [_{SP} maykcwu-ka(GS) choyko-i-ta]
 summer-nom beer-nom best-cop-decl
 ‘Summer is the best time to have (a cold) beer.’
 b. *?Yelum-i(MS) [_{SP} Cheli-ka(GS) cip-ey onta]
 summer-nom C-nom home-loc comes
 ‘As for/it is during the summer (that) Cheli is coming home.’

Why is this so? The reason is that the Sentential Predicate ‘Cheli comes home’ is not construable easily as expressing a characteristic property of the Major Subject ‘summer’, while ‘beer is good’ can. Thus, the Major Subject-Sentential Predicate partition of a sentence cannot be equated with the Modifier-Modifiee partition.

Recall that we have argued in Section 2.1 against taking the Major Subject to be topic or focus. The argument for this conclusion can be strengthened by showing that while the Major Subject-Sentential Predicate articulation of a clause is subject to the interpretive conditions pointed out above, neither the Topic-Comment or Focus-Ground articulations are.² For example, the following are felicitous, compared to (10b):

- (11)a. Eney Cheli-ka cip-ey o-ni?
 When C-nom home-loc come-inter
 ‘When is Cheli coming home?’
 b. Yelum-ey(**Focus**) [_{Ground} Cheli-ka cip-ey o-a]
 Summer-loc C-nom home-loc come-decl
 ‘(Cheli’s coming home) during the summer.’

² Topics are licensed by an **Aboutness** relation. The Aboutness Condition is looser than the Characteristic/Characterizing Property Condition that Major Subjects are subject to. See Kuroda (1986) for important discussion of this point.

- (12) Yelum-(ey)-n(**Topic**) [Comment Cheli-ka cip-ey o-ko]
 Y-(loc)-top C-nom home-loc come-conj
 kyewul-(ey)-n(**Topic**) [Comment Yenghi-ka o-n-ta]
 winter-(loc)-top Y-nom come-prs-decl
 ‘Cheli is coming home during the summer and Yenghi’s coming in the winter.’

2.3. Derivationally Multiple but Stratally Unique Subjects

The position defended in the previous section is not the only one that posits more than one subject in MSCs. In RG, the Stratal Uniqueness Law (SUL) codifies the traditional assumption that a bearer of a given GR is unique, but relativizes uniqueness to a given strata. C. Youn (1990) offers a comprehensive analysis of MSCs that is consistent with SUL.

The basic idea in this approach is that MSCs are derived from structures where there is a unique subject (what we are calling GS) through a subject-creating process (Possessor Ascension) which creates a new subject (our MS) and places the erstwhile subject out of commission (*en chômage*, or unemployed). An illustration follows (1=subject, 1-cho=subject *chômeur*, P=predicate):

- (11) Cheli-ka khi-ka khu-ta ‘Cheli-nom height-nom tall-decl’:
 [Cheli-uy khi]-ka khu-ta *Stratum n*
 1 P
 → **Possessor Ascension**
 Cheli-ka khi-ka khu-ta *Stratum n+1*
 1 1-cho P

This type of analysis appears to kill two birds with one stone. Not only does it leave the stratal uniqueness of subjects (GRs, more generally) unscathed in the face of an apparent counterexample coming from MSCs, it also solves the problem of the semantic-thematic licensing of nominative-marked NPs in MSCs that do not have a direct argument relation to the predicate, without having to resort to the exotic notions of Major Subject and Sentential Predicate. It is no wonder that many researchers are drawn to this class of analysis. H-S Choe (1986) is an early example of this line of thinking for Korean, with Akiyama (2005) being a recent one for Japanese. As attractive as it is, this type of analysis cannot work. Yoon (1986) provided a number of arguments against the derivational analysis of MSCs. I will rehearse them here and add a few more.

The simple reason why MSCs cannot be derived from more basic structures through Possessor Ascension is that there are MSCs where the initial

NPs cannot be expressed as a Possessor of a subject. As widely acknowledged in the relevant literature, in addition to the ‘Possessor-type’ MSCs, there are the so-called ‘Adjunct-type’ (*aka* ‘Focus-type’) MSCs where the initial NP cannot be paraphrased as a possessor of the subject. (12b) below, the putative ‘source’ of (12a), is not equivalent to (12a).

- (12)a. Yelum-i(MS) maykcwu-ka choyko-i-ta
 Summer-nom beer-nom best-cop-decl
 ‘Summer is the best time for (a cold) beer.’
 b. *?Yelum-uy maykcwu-ka choyko-i-ta
 summer-gen beer-nom best-cop-decl
 ‘Summer’s beer (beer produced during the summer) is the best.’

However, the existence of a second type of MSCs has not resulted in Possessor Ascension analyses being discarded. Instead, it has invited what has become a familiar response: the derivational analysis works only for the Possessor-type MSCs, but not others. This is the path C. Yoon (1990) follows (also Akiyama 2004 for Japanese MSCs). However, this path leads to a dead-end. Even for Possessor-type MSCs, the analysis fails, since constraints on processes that promote a nominal to subject are violated.

Yoon (1986) noted that the derivational analysis of MSCs must severely violate Subjacency given that MSCs such as (13a) are possible. A related problem comes from (13b,c) where we see that the Major Subject can be related to a resumptive pronoun, even within an island, which is something unexpected on a movement analysis.³

- (13)a. Cheli-ka ekkay-uy olunccok-uy wis-pwupwun-i aphuta-tela
 C-nom shoulder-gen rightside-gen top-portion-nom hurts-I.hear
 ‘I heard that the top part of Cheli’s right shoulder hurts.’
 b. ?Yengswu-ka (ku-uy) hoysa-ka mangha-lkes kathta
 Y-nom (he-gen) company-nom go.bankrupt-comp seems
 ‘It seems that Yengswu’s company will soon go bankrupt.’
 c. ?Cheli-ka melcianha [(ku-lul) koyongha-n] hoysa]-ka
 C-nom soon he-acc hire-rel company-nom
 mangha-lkes kathta
 go.bankrupt-comp seems

³ Vermeulen (2005) notes a similar problem for movement analyses of MSCs.

The problem Yoon (1986) noted is for movement accounts of Possessor Ascension. For RG, the problems are different. Advancement to subject is constrained by the Relational Succession Law, by which a constituent that ascends can only take on the GR of the containing constituent. This is violated in (13a). The status of subjacency-like constraints on GR-changing processes is not dealt with in RG.

‘As for Cheli, it seems that the company that hired him will soon go bankrupt.’

Even in MSCs where Possessor Ascension does not incur any violation of known constraints, the movement/ascension analysis falters. This is because the putative input and output structures differ interpretively. We already encountered such data in (12). There are additional examples showing the discrepancy. Yoon (1986) noted that idiomatic interpretations may hold only in MSC but not in the presumed ‘source’ structure, making the derivational analysis unworkable. This is shown below.

- (14)a. Cheli-ka kapangkkun-i chinkwutul-cwungey kacang kil-ta
 C-nom bag.strap-nom friends-among most long-decl
 → ?Among friends, Cheli’s shoulder straps are the longest (literal)
 → Cheli is the most highly educated among friends (idiomatic)
- b. Cheli-uy kapangkkun-i chinkwutul-cwungey kacang kil-ta
 C-gen bag.strap-nom friends-among most long-decl
 → literal, *?idiomatic

And even when idiomatic readings are not at stake, a Possessor of a subject cannot always be expressed as the Major Subject, casting doubt on the viability of deriving Major Subjects from Possessors. The following contrasts are illustrative.

- (15)a. Cheli-uy phal-i sulmyesi Yenghi-uy heli-lul kamassta
 C-gen arm-nom surreptitiously Y-gen waist-acc wrapped
 ‘Cheli’s arms surreptitiously wrapped around Yenghi’s waist.’
- b. *?Cheli-ka(MS) phal-i sulmyesi Yenghi-uy heli-lul
 C-nom arm-nom surreptitiously Y-gen waist-acc
 kamassta
 wrapped
 ‘As for/it is Cheli his (whose) arms surreptitiously wrapped around Yenghi’s waist.’
- (16)a. Yengswu-uy etten chinkwu-ka cwuk-ess-ta (Y-J Jang 1998)
 Y-gen a.certain friend-nom die-pst-decl
 ‘A certain friend of Yengswu died.’
- b. *?Yengswu-ka(MS) etten chinkwu-ka cwuk-ess-ta
 Yengswu-ka a.certain friend-nom die-pst-decl
 ‘As for/it is Yengswu (that) a certain friend of his died.’

What lies behind the above contrasts are the conditions on Major Subject-Sentential Predicate articulation we noted earlier. Specifically, when Cheli is expressed as the Major Subject, the Sentential Predicate must state a characteristic property of Cheli. However, ‘his arm surreptitiously wrapping around Yenghi’s waist’ is not a plausible characteristic property of Cheli, and that is why (15b) is not felicitous. A similar explanation extends to the contrast between (16a) and (16b). Having an unknown friend die is not sufficient to characterize someone.

We thus claim that there is no difference between the so-called Possessor-type and Adjunct-type MSCs. Both are base-generated, have the same structure, and contain multiple subjects. However, this claim has been contested. C. Youn (1990) took the two types to be generated differently. Vermeulen (2005) also argues that they have different structures and derivations. I argue below that her arguments do not hold up to scrutiny.

Vermeulen’s (2005) argument that the types of MSCs are different is based on the claim that the predicates of Possessor-type MSCs and Adjunct-type MSCs cannot be coordinated, because one is a predicate(=VP) while the other is a sentence (Sentential Predicate). However, contrary to her judgment, coordinations of two types of MSCs are acceptable, at least in Korean. The MSCs coordinated in (17) are an Adjunct-type and Possessor-type respectively, as we can see in (18).

(17) Kyopo-mwunko-ka [[yele conglyu-uy chayk-i phalli-ko]
 K-bookstore-nom diverse type-gen book-nom sold-conj
 [wichi-to acwu coh-ta]]
 location-also very good-decl
 ‘As for the Kyopo bookstore, many different types of books are sold
 there and its location is also ideal.’

(18)a. Kyopo-mwunko-ka yele conglyu-uy chayk-i phallin-ta
 K-bookstore diverse types-gen book-nom sold
 a’. *Kyopo-mwunko-uy yele conglyu-uy chayk-i phallinta
 K-bookstore-gen diverse type-gen book-nom sold
 → **Adjunct-type MSC**
 b. Kyopo-mwunko-ka wichi-ka acwu coh-ta
 K-bookstore-nom location-nom very good-decl
 b’. Kyopo-mwunko-uy wichi-ka acwu coh-ta
 K-bookstore-gen location-nom very good-decl
 → **Possessor-type MSC**

In fact, the Sentential Predicates of both types of MSCs can be coordinated with VPs as well (cf. Heycock and Doron 2003):

- (19)a. Cheli-ka [[meli-ka coh-ko] [acwu sengsilha-ta]]
 C-nom head-nom good-conj very sincere-decl
 ‘Cheli is smart and sincere.’
- b. Boston-i [[kwankwangkyak-i manhi chac-ko] [acwu alumtapta]]
 B-nom tourists-nom a.lot visit-conj very beautiful
 ‘Boston is city that tourists often visit and is very beautiful.’

In (19a), the first conjunct is the Sentential Predicate of a Possessor-type MSC, while the second conjunct is a VP. In (19b), the predicate of the first conjunct is the Sentential Predicate of an Adjunct-type MSC, while the second conjunct is a VP. According to Vermeulen’s analysis, these structures should be out, though they seem to be fine.

Another claimed difference between Possessor and Adjunct-type MSCs is that while there may be multiple nom-marked NPs in the former, there are at most two such NPs in the latter (Tateishi 1991, Vermeulen 2005). However, the facts are different in Korean, as we see below:⁴

- (20)a. Yelum-i LA-ka pwulpep-imincatul-i il-ul manhi
 summer-nom LA-nom illegal-immigrants work-acc a.lot
 chac-nun-ta
 seek-prs-decl
 ‘It is during the summer that it is in LA that illegal immigrants look for work a lot.’
- b. Boston-i yelum-i kwankwangkyaktul-i manhi pwumpinta
 B-nom summer-nom tourists-nom a.lot bustles
 ‘Boston during the summer bustles with many tourists.’

Granted, run-of-the-mill MSCs have Major Subjects coindexed with a gap or pronoun within the Sentential Predicate and very often the gap/pronoun is a Possessor within the subject constituent. However, this is neither necessary nor sufficient, as we have seen. MSCs that fail to bind gaps within Sentential Predicates abound, and the existence of a possessor is no guarantee that a felicitous MSC can be constructed.

In the next section, I turn to the issue of subject diagnostics in Korean. We will see that in MSCs, subject diagnostics are distributed between the Grammatical Subject and the Major Subject. We will see, however, that the distribution of subject properties is not random.

⁴ Vermeulen (2005) gives two other arguments intended to show that the two types of MSCs are different. For reasons of space, we will not address them here.

3. The Distribution of Subject Properties in Multiple Subject Constructions

3.1. Subjecthood Diagnostics in Korean

The following is a representative list of properties proposed at one time or another as diagnosing subjecthood in Korean.

- (21) Proposed subject diagnostics for Korean: (Yoon 1986, K-S Hong 1991, C. Youn 1990, etc.)
- a. Nominative case-marking
 - b. Controller of optional plural-marking
 - c. Controller of subject honorification
 - d. Target of Subject-to-Object raising
 - e. Target of Control
 - f. Controller of PRO in complement (obligatory) control
 - g. Controller of PRO in adjunct control
 - h. Controller of coordinate deletion
 - i. Antecedent of (subject-oriented) anaphors
 - j. Exhaustive-listing interpretation of *-ka/-i*.

It should be obvious that MSCs constitute a testing ground for the adequacy of these diagnostics. However, it should also be clear that with MSCs, the answer as to whether something is a genuine subject property depends on one's theory of MSC. If MSCs have a unique subject, the set of subject properties will be quite small. If they have derivationally multiple subjects, subject properties will be larger, and distributed across derivationally distinct subjects. If they have multiple subjects at a single level of representation, subject properties will be distributed across different subjects, but not on a derivational basis.

With the purpose of showing that there is a unique subject in MSCs, Yoon (1986) evaluated some of the diagnostics offered as identifying subjects in Korean and came to the conclusion that of the many properties suggested as diagnosing subjects, only the following are reliable.

- (21) Subject diagnostics (Yoon 1986):
- a. Subject honorification
 - b. Equi controller in Obligatory Control
 - c. Controller of coordinate deletion

Reflexive binding, Subject-to-Object raising (SOR), and exhaustive listing interpretation--which are available to (what we are now calling) Major Sub-

jects and Grammatical Subjects alike--were claimed not to pick out subjects. What about the most obvious subject property, nominative case? Yoon (1986) claimed that it was not a marker of case, but focus, a position articulated further by other researchers, most notably Schütze (2001).

K-S Hong (1991) reduced the list to the first two, claiming that clear non-subjects can control coordinate deletion. She proposed that there are distinct subject-like notions which are responsible for some of the other claimed subject diagnostics. By contrast, researchers in the RG tradition (C.Youn 1990) embraced a larger set of subject properties by relying on the notion of derivational subjecthood. Some of the subject properties rejected by Yoon (1986) and Hong (1991) remain as subject properties in this approach.

Since I am now claiming that there is more than one subject in MSCs and since there are no longer any grounds for thinking of nominative as a marker of focus/topic, the issue of subjecthood in MSCs needs to be revisited. Perhaps the properties written off by Yoon and Hong as not picking out subjects may turn out to be subject properties after all, albeit of Major Subjects. I will argue that this is the case for some of the discarded subject properties. Specifically, following earlier work (Yoon 2003, 2004a,b, 2006/to appear), I will argue for the following:

(22) Diagnostics for Major Subjects:⁵

- a. Subject-to-Object Raising
- b. Nominative case-marking

(23) Diagnostics for Grammatical Subjects:

- a. Subject honorification
- b. Equi controller in obligatory control

Yoon (2003, 2006/to appear) argues that while SOR can seemingly target non-subjects, non-subject raising is quite restricted. He interprets this restriction to mean that only those non-subjects that can be expressed as Major Subjects can undergo SOR. If this line of analysis is correct, SOR is in fact a subject diagnostic, contrary to what Yoon (1986) and K-S Hong (1991) surmised. But there is now an interesting twist. Rather than being a diagnostic of Grammatical Subjects, SOR diagnoses Major Subjects. The sentences showing that raised non-subjects are always paraphrasable as Major Subjects are shown below:

⁵ The statement is to be understood as a conditional. That is, we are claiming that if something is a Major Subject, then it can undergo SOR, not that something undergoes SOR iff it is a Major Subject.

- (24)a. na-nun **Yenghi-lul**_i [ilen os-i e_i cal ewullinta-ko]
 I-top Y-acc this clothes-nom well match-comp
 sayngkakhanta
 think
 ‘I think that Yenghi looks good in this kind of clothing’
- b. Ilen os-i Yenghi-eykey/*lul cal ewullinta
 this clothes-nom Y-dat/*acc well match
- c. **Yenghi-ka**_i(MS) [ilen os-i e_i cal ewullinta]
 Y-nom this clothes-nom well match
 ‘It is Yenghi/as for Yenghi (that) this kind of clothing fits well.’

I propose that a second diagnostic of Major Subjects is nominative case. That is, all Major Subjects are nominative-marked. This may seem far-fetched in view of the fact that nominative case-marking is neither necessary nor sufficient for Grammatical Subjects. So how could nominative-marking be a necessary property of Major Subjects?

The argument that nom-marking is necessary on Major Subjects comes from the analysis of nom-stacked nominals as Major Subjects. Yoon (2004a,b) argues that nom-stacked nominals differ from unstacked nominals in requiring that the constituent they are in construction with be interpretable as a Sentential Predicate. Yoon also argues that the positions of nom-stacked and unstacked nominals are different, with the former higher than the latter (Schütze 2001, Yoon 2004a,b). Without stacking, we simply have a Modifier-Modifiee partitioning of the clause (or a subject-predicate partition with the inherently case-marked subject in a low subject position). Therefore, in nominative-stacked structures, the only indication that a Major Subject-Sentential Predicate partition exists is nominative-marking. This is what led Yoon to posit nominative as a necessary property of Major Subjects.

As for diagnostics of Grammatical Subjects, I follow K-S Hong (1991) in assuming that subject honorification (extended by metonymic interpretation) is a valid diagnostic. Being the controller in obligatory (subject) control is another valid diagnostic of Grammatical Subjects. Major Subjects cannot figure as the controller in these processes, as we see below.

- (25)a. *?Kim-sacangnim-i(MS) ankyeng-i kum-i-si-ta
 K-boss-nom glasses-nom gold-cop-hon-decl
 ‘Boss Kim’s glasses have rims made of gold.’
- b. Cheli-ka(MS) tongsayng-i_i [e_i yuhak-ul ka-ko] siphehanta
 C-nom brother-nom study.abroad-acc go-compwants
 ‘Cheli’s brother wants to study abroad.’

This naturally leads to the question of why the subject properties are distributed the way they are in MSCs. Many approaches to split subject diagnostics account for the distribution of subject properties by decomposing subjecthood into more elementary notions—typically, the **pivot** and the **most prominent (core) argument** (Dixon 1994, Falk 2006).⁶ This is a distinction that can be drawn upon to explain the split subject properties.

In a sentence with a single subject in Korean, the subject nominal is both pivot and the most prominent argument.⁷ However, in an MSC, the two are split—the subject-as-pivot is the (highest) Major Subject, while subject-as-prominent-argument is the Grammatical Subject. The Major Subject in an MSC can only be a pivot since it is never selected as a direct argument of predicates. We expect properties controlled by the Major Subject to be those of the pivot, while those controlled by the Grammatical Subject to be those of subject-as-prominent-argument.

As Falk (2006) points out, Raising is a property of subject-as-pivot cross-linguistically. Since the Major Subject is a pivot, it is understandable why SOR in Korean targets the Major Subject.

We argued that all Major Subjects are nominative-marked. Nominative is not a reliable property of either type of subject cross-linguistically (Falk 2006). Nonetheless, we can hypothesize that the obligatoriness of nominative on Major Subjects is due to its pivot status. Subjects that are prominent arguments (whether or not they are also pivots) do not need recourse to nominative-marking to indicate their subject status (for example, dative subjects), but a pivot subject that is not a prominent argument (that is, the Major Subject) seems to need nominative case-marking.

In addition to these two, there is at least one other respect in which the Major Subject acts as a pivot. Recall that one of the arguments against Vermeulen’s (2005) analysis given earlier was based on the fact that the Sentential Predicate of MSCs can be coordinated with VPs. The relevant example is repeated below:

- (26)a. Cheli-ka [[meli-ka coh-ko] [acwu sengsilha-ta]] (=19)
 C-nom head-nom good-conj very sincere-decl
 ‘Cheli is smart and sincere.’
- b. Boston-i [[kwankwangkyak-i manhi chac-ko] [acwu alumtapta]]
 B-nom tourists-nom a.lot visit-conj very beautiful
 ‘Boston is city that tourists often visit and is very beautiful.’

⁶ The decomposition of subject positions into SpIP and SpvP is one execution of this idea.

⁷ For Korean, this is true even for Dative Subject Constructions, since the Dative (prominent argument) also controls pivot properties such as honorification (cf. Yoon 2004b).

Falk (2006:16) cites ‘shared argument in coordinate clauses’ as another cross-linguistic diagnostic that is sensitive to subject-as-pivot status. Given this, we can view (26a,b) not as the constituent coordination of VP and SP under a shared subject, but as the coordination of clauses where the null subject pivot of the second clause is controlled by that the Major Subject pivot of the first clause. This is why such coordinations are possible.

As for the Grammatical Subject, it is the subject-as-prominent-argument and hence is expected to control properties sensitive to prominent argument status. Complement subject control in many approaches is based on argument structure (Pollard and Sag 1994). If this type of account is on the right track, we can see why only the Grammatical Subject figures as a controller in obligatory control in MSCs.

This type of explanation can be extended to subject honorification. That is, the controller of subject honorification may be the most prominent argument selected by the predicate. This claim can be tested with derived subjects that are not arguments of the predicates they are in construction with. In the Tough Construction, the raised nominal cannot trigger honorific agreement on the upstairs predicate, confirming this prediction:

- (27) *Kim-sensayngnim-i[1] haksayngtul-eykey-n[2] [PRO[2]
 K-teacher.hon-nom students-dat-top
 e[1] manna-ki]-ka acwu himtu-si-ta
 meet-nml-nom very difficult-hon-decl
 ‘Professor Kim is difficult for the students to meet.’

Neither are passivized raised (SOR) subjects felicitous as controllers of subject honorification, as we see below:

- (28) *Kim-sensayngnim-i[1] ku hakkyo-eyse-nun [e[1] chencayla-ko]
 K-teacher.hon-nom that school-loc-top genius-comp
 sayngkak-toy-si-nun kes kaththa
 think-pass-hon-rel thing seems
 ‘It seems that Professor Kim is considered a genius (by people) in that school.’

In sum, while a more detailed investigation of these conjectures is necessary and a re-examination of other subject diagnostics is needed, we now have an interesting, if tentative, picture of how subject properties are split between the Major and Grammatical Subject and, more importantly, why they are split the way they are. Importantly, the properties controlled by both subjects are subject properties cross-linguistically, and as such, lends

support to the hypothesis that MSCs are characterized by the presence of multiple subjects.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, I have revisited the question of the structure and licensing of MSCs. I have argued that MSCs have more than one subject and more than one predicate. I have also examined the distribution of subject properties in Korean. The distribution of subject properties is attributable to the fact that a Major Subject in an MSC is subject-as-pivot, while the Grammatical Subject is subject-as-prominent-argument.

References

- Akiyama, M. 2004. Multiple Nominative Constructions in Japanese and Economy. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35: 671-683.
- _____. 2005. On the General Tendency to Minimize Moved Elements: Multiple Nominative Construction in Japanese and Its Theoretical Implications. *The Linguistic Review* 22: 1-68.
- Choe, H-S 1986. Syntactic adjunction, A-Chains, and the ECP, *Proceedings of the 17th Northeast Linguistic Society*, 100-121.
- Diesing, M. 1992. *Indefinites*, Cambridge: MIT Press
- Dixon, R.M.W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Falk, Y. 2006. *Subjects and Universal Grammar*, Cambridge University Press.
- Heycock, C. 1993. Syntactic Predication in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 2:167-211.
- _____. 1994. Focus Projection in Japanese. *Proceedings of the 24th Northeast Linguistic Society*, 157-172.
- _____. and E. Doron 2003. Categorical Subjects. *Gengo Kenkyuu* 123: 95-135
- Hong, K-S 1991. Argument Selection and Case-Marking in Korean. Ph.D dissertation, Stanford University.
- Jang, Y-J. 1998. Multiple Subjects and Characterization. *Discourse and Cognition* 5: 99-116.
- Kang, M-Y. 1987. Possessor Raising in Korean. In *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics-II*, 80-88.
- Kang, Y-S. 1985. Korean Syntax and Universal Grammar. Ph.D Dissertation, Harvard University.
- Kuno, S. 1973. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Kuroda, S-Y. 1972. The Categorical and the Thetic Judgment. *Foundations of Language* 9: 153-185.
- _____. 1986. Movement of Noun Phrases in Japanese. *Issues in Japanese Linguistics*, eds. T. Imai and M. Saito, 229-271, Dordrecht: Foris.
- Lee, I-H. 1997. Double Subject Constructions in GPSG. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics II*, 287-296.

- Li, C., and S. Thompson 1976. Subject and Topic: A New Typology of Language. *Subject and Topic*, eds., C. Li and S. Thompson, 457-490, New York: Academic Press.
- McCloskey, J. 1997. Subjecthood and Subject Positions. *Elements of Syntax*, ed. L. Haegeman, 197-236, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Park, B-S. 1973. On the Multiple Subject Constructions in Korean. *Linguistics* 100: 63-76.
- _____ 1982. The Double Subject Constructions Revisited. *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*, ed. The Linguistic Society of Korea, 645-658. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Company.
- Pollard, C., and I. Sag 1994. *Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schütze, C. 2001. On Korean 'Case Stacking': The Varied Functions of the Particles *ka* and *lul*. *The Linguistic Review* 18, 193-232.
- Tateishi, K. 1991. The Syntax of 'Subjects'. Ph.D dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Teng, S-H. 1974. Double Nominatives in Chinese. *Language* 50: 455-473.
- Vermeulen, R. 2005. Possessive and Adjunct Multiple Nominative Constructions in Japanese. *Lingua* 115:1329-1363.
- Yoon, J. 1986. Some Queries Concerning the Syntax of Multiple Subject Constructions in Korean. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 16: 215-236, Department of Linguistics, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- _____ 2003. Raising Specifiers: A Macroparametric Account of SOR in Some Altaic Languages. Paper presented at the *Workshop on Formal Approaches to Altaic Languages*, MIT, Cambridge: MA.
- _____ 2004a. The Independence of Grammatical Case from Interpretive Factors. Paper presented at the *2004 Linguistic Society of Korean International Conference*, Seoul, Korea.
- _____ 2004b. Non-nominative (Major) Subjects and Case-stacking in Korean. *Non-nominative Subjects, Volume 2*. eds., P. Bhaskararao and K. V. Subbarao, 265-314, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- _____ 2006/to appear. Raising of Major Arguments in Korean (and Japanese). *New Horizons in the Grammar of Raising and Control*. eds., W. D. Davies and S. Dubinsky, Dordrecht: Springer.
- Yoon, J-Y. 1989. On the Multiple *ka* and *lul* Constructions in Korean. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics-III*, 383-394. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Company.
- Youn, C. 1990. A Relational Analysis of Korean Multiple Nominative Constructions. Ph.D dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.