1. Introduction

In Korean, canonical subjects are nominative-marked, as exemplified in (1), where the subject ‘Suni’ is marked with the nominative case marker -ka.

(1) Swuni-ka cemsim-lul mek-ess-ta
    Suni-NOM lunch-ACC eat-PAST-DEC
    ‘Suni ate lunch.’

However, subjects in Non-Canonical Subject (NCS) constructions are not marked with nominative case, as illustrated in (2).

(2) a. (locative) existential
    i maul-ey kang-i iss-ess-ta
    this town-DAT river-NOM exist-PAST-DEC
    Lit. ‘In this town, there is river’ / ‘There is river in this town.’

b. (possession) existential
    Swuni-eykey kum-i iss-ess-ta
    Suni-DAT gold-NOM exist-PAST-DEC
    Lit. ‘To Suni, there is gold.’ / ‘Suni has gold.’

c. Clauses involving verbs like sayngki- ‘come.to.exist’ or na- ‘happen’
    i sem-ey cicin-i nas-ess-ta
    this island-DAT earthquake-NOM happen-PAST-DEC
    ‘On this island, an earthquake happened.’
    ‘There was an earthquake on this island.’

In these constructions, the alleged subjects appear in sentence-initial position and are marked with dative case. Although these look like adjuncts, they have been known to behave like subjects.¹
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Interestingly, psych-constructions (3) have been observed to have properties similar to those of the NCS constructions in (2) (Gerdts and Youn 1988, 1989; Kim Y.J. 1990). The predicates in (3) belong to class III according to Belletti and Rizzi’s (1988) classification.

(3) a. Swuni-eykey Inho-ka miw-ess-ta
    Suni-DAT Inho-NOM hate-PAST-DEC
    ‘Suni hated Inho.’

b. Swuni-eykey holangi-ka musew-ess-ta
    Suni-DAT tiger-NOM be.afraid.of-PAST-DEC
    ‘Suni was afraid of a tiger.’

Recently, it has been proposed that experiencers are oblique and thus syntactically they are PPs (Landau 2010). Importantly, however, experiencers, like non-canonical subjects, do not seem to pattern with PPs (see section 3).³ This paper addresses the following question: how does the argument structure of psych-constructions in Korean reflect the similarities that these constructions share with the NCS constructions in (2)?³ Contrary to Landau, I argue that, although they have locative semantics, experiencers in Korean are not locative syntactically; namely, they appear in applicative structures (4). Experiencers are introduced by a non-agentive head, Appl, which merges external to vP.

(4)     ApplP
        Swuni-eykey
         ‘Suni’
                Appl’
                [dat] Inho
                miw- ‘hate Inho’

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 shows that experiencers in Korean are semantically locative. However, as will be shown in section 3, their locative semantics does not necessarily mean that syntactically they are PPs. In section 4, I propose that Appl, rather than P, must be the head that introduces dative experiencers. Section 5 concludes the paper.

² It seems to be rare across languages for psych-constructions to pattern with existential clauses, although it is common for psych-constructions to pattern with locatives.

³ For reasons of space, the full range of data relevant to NCS (2) are not provided here.
2. The locative semantics of experiencers

The proposal that dative experiencers in Korean (5a) have locative semantics is not new. Kim, Y.J. (1990) argues that dative experiencers have the Lexical Conceptual Structure (LCS) in (5b). The motivation behind (5b) is that psych-constructions have properties similar to locative existential clauses (2a), repeated below as (6)) and the dative marker in Korean is homophonous with the locative marker in the language (see also (8) below). The marker -ey is used for inanimate entities, while the marker -eykey is used for animate entities.

(5) a. Swuni-eykey Inho-ka miw-ess-ta
    Suni-DAT Inho-NOM hate-PAST-DEC
    ‘Suni hated Inho.’

    b. LCS [BE (x [being hated] [AT y])]
       STATE PLACE
       ‘At y, x is in the state of being hated.’

(6)  i maul-ey kang-i iss-ess-ta
     This town-DAT river-NOM be-PAST-DEC
     ‘In this town, there is river.’

In terms of the LCS (5b), the experiencer is the “place” where the state described by the verb phrase is located. Thus, in (5a) the dative experiencer ‘Suni’ is the place where ‘Inho’ is in the state of being hated.

A similar view has been suggested in other literature. For example, Arad (1998) treats experiencers as mental locations (or containers) of mental states.

Morphological facts also suggest that experiencers are semantically locative. Landau (2010), for instance, shows that many languages express experiencers as locative adpositions. For instance, in Irish the experiencer ‘X’ is marked with the locative prepositions ag ‘on’ (7a) or ar ‘at’ (7b).

(7) a. tááa fuath do Y ag X
     is hatred to Y at X
     ‘X hates Y.’

    b. Tá eagla roimh Y ar X
       is fear before Y on X
       ‘X is afraid of Y.’  (McCloskey and Sells 1988)

A similar pattern is found in Korean. As mentioned above, the dative marker that marks experiencers in Korean is morphologically similar to the locative marker in the language, as illustrated in (8):
‘A butterfly sat on teacher’s head.’

The location ‘teacher’s head’ is marked with the dative marker -ey that is used with inanimate entities.

Both conceptual and morphological evidence indicate that dative experiencers in Korean are semantically locative, as argued by Landau (2010).

3. **Locative experiencers are not PPs**

An experiencer can be semantically locative, as discussed in the previous section, and this is what is claimed by Landau. As a consequence of this claim, Landau argues that all (object and quirky) experiencers are oblique and thus they are syntactically PPs, as illustrated in (9).  

(9)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{Exp} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{DP}
\end{array}
\]

In (9), the experiencer is the complement of P and the PP is an internal argument of the VP. Dative case on the experiencer is assigned by P. The PP structure in (9) predicts that PP experiencers will pattern with other types of PPs. In some languages, this is the case. In Irish, for instance, experiencers are argued to be locative PPs (Adger and Ramchand 2006), and they can undergo causativization just like any other locative PP. However, in Korean, experiencers do not seem to be PPs.

In the sections to follow, I discuss those properties of a dative experiencer which suggests that the dative experiencer may not be a PP.

3.1 **Case stacking and alternation**

In the Korean literature, it is well known that nominative case can be stacked on a dative experiencer, and it can also alternate with dative case on the experiencer.

---

4 Another consequence argued for by Landau is that PP experiencers undergo locative inversion (see section 4.3 for a short discussion of this issue).

5 Adger and Ramchand (2006) also argued that another set of experiencers in the language are introduced by Appl, and not by P. This Appl head is syntactically similar to the Appl proposed in this paper in that it merges external to the predicate, but it is different in that its semantics is possessive. It remains to be seen how possessive Appl is different from, or similar to, the (locative) Appl argued for in this paper.

6 Unlike Ps in Japanese (e.g., Sadakane and Koizumi 1995), Ps and case markers in Korean including the dative case marker do not behave any differently with respect to quantifier float. Both allow quantifier float (Y.H. Kim 1984).
(Gerdts and Youn 1988, 1989). This is exemplified in (10a) and (10b) respectively.

(10) a. Swuni-eykey-ka Inho-ka miw-ess-ta
    Suni-DAT-NOM Inho-NOM hate-PAST-DEC
    ‘Suni hated Inho.’

    b. Swuni-ka Inho-ka miw-ess-ta
    Suni-NOM Inho-NOM hate-PAST-DEC
    ‘Suni hated Inho.

In contrast, canonical PPs cannot undergo case stacking or case alternation. As in (11), nominative and accusative case cannot be stacked on the PP. The examples in (12) show that the PPs do not allow case alternation either.

(11) a. sensayngnim-uy meli-ey-ka/-*lul napi-ka
    teacher-GEN head-LOC-*NOM/-*ACC butterfly-NOM
    anc-ass-ta
sit-PAST-DEC
    ‘A butterfly sat on teacher’s head.’

    b. i san-alay-*ka/-*lul Swuni-ka oa-ss-ta
    this mountain-under-*NOM/-*ACC Suni-NOM come-PAST-DEC
    ‘Suni came to the bottom of the mountain.’

(12) a. sensayngnim-uy meli-ka/-*lul napi-ka anc-ass-ta
    teacher-GEN head-*NOM/-*ACC butterfly-NOM sit-PAST-DEC
    ‘A butterfly sat on teacher’s head.’

    b. i san-*i/-*lul Swuni-ka oa-ss-ta
    this mountain-*NOM/-*ACC Suni-NOM come-PAST-DEC
    ‘Suni came to the bottom of the mountain.’

3.2 Agreement and plural copying

It has been shown that PP experiencers do not agree with T (Baker 2012). For example, in Amharic, experiencers do not trigger subject agreement (13).

(13) a. Aster ʧənnak’-∅-at
    Aster.F worry-3MS-3FO
    ‘Aster is worried.’

    b. Almaz amma-∅-at
    Almaz.F hurt-3MS-3FO
    ‘Almaz is sick.’ /‘Almaz hurts.’ (Baker 2012)
The experiencers ‘Aster’ (13a) and ‘Almaz’ (13b), which are argued to be null PPs, do not trigger subject agreement.\(^7\) In (13a), for example, the verb shows a default third person masculine agreement.\(^8\) Baker argues that the PP experiencers cannot satisfy the EPP feature of T.

If dative experiencers in Korean are PPs, the prediction is that they will not show any form of agreement with T. This prediction turns out to not be true. In Korean, honorific agreement is analyzed as agreement with T (Ura 1999), and as illustrated in (14a), the dative experiencer ‘the teacher’ shows honorific agreement with the verb. In contrast, as shown in (14b), the nominative theme cannot trigger honorific agreement with the verb. When nominative case is stacked on the dative experiencer, or if it alternates with dative case on the experiencer, the experiencer can still show honorific agreement, as in (15).

(14) a.  
\[
\text{teacher-DAT} \quad \text{Inho-NOM} \quad \text{hate-HON-PAST-DEC}
\]

‘The teacher hated Inho.’

b.  
\[
\text{Suni-DAT} \quad \text{teacher-NOM} \quad \text{hate-HON-PAST-DEC}
\]

‘Suni hated the teacher.’

(15)  
\[
\text{teacher-DAT-NOM/teacher-NOM} \quad \text{Inho-NOM} \quad \text{hate-HON-PAST-DEC}
\]

‘The teacher hated Inho.’

Importantly, in contrast to the dative experiencer in (14a), PPs do not trigger honorific agreement. In (16), the PP ‘the teacher’s head’ cannot license the honorific morpheme on the verb.

(16)  
\[
[\text{teacher-GEN} \quad \text{head-DAT}] \quad \text{butterfly-NOM} \quad \text{sit-HON-PAST-DEC}
\]

‘A butterfly sat on the teacher’s head.’

The phenomenon of plural copying in Korean provides a similar conclusion. Plural copying is when the plural marker on a subject is copied onto other constituents (e.g., an object, adverb, or preposition, etc.), but not vice versa (Kuh 1987). The presence of copied plural markers on non-subject constituents indicates the plurality of the subject, not the plurality of the non-subject constituents. If a non-subject constituent is a count noun and it has a plural marker, the plural marker only can indicate the plurality of the count noun. Thus, I will present examples with ‘water’, a non-subject constituent which is a mass noun. Consider the examples in (17).

---

\(^7\) They show object agreement, as the 3rd person feminine object suffix (i.e., -at) on the verb indicates.

\(^8\) A subject agreement marker in (13) is /a/, but it is deleted before a vowel initial suffix (Baker 2012). I present it as [∅ in (13).
In (17a), the plural marker on the subject ‘children’ is copied onto the object ‘water’. However, the plural marker cannot be copied onto the object when the subject is singular (17b). The same pattern is observed with psych-constructions, as shown in (18).

(18) a. ku ai-tul-eykey mul-tul-i silh-ess-ta
    DEM child-PL-DAT water-PL-NOM hate-PAST-DEC
    ‘The children hated water.’

b. *ku ai-eykey mul-tul-i silh-ess-ta
    DEM child-DAT water-PL-NOM hate-PAST-DEC
    ‘The child hated water.’

In (18a), the experiencer is plural, as the plural marker -tul indicates, thus the plural marker can be copied onto the theme ‘water’. However, as with canonical transitive clauses (17b), the plural marker cannot be copied onto the theme if the experiencer is singular, as in (18b). When nominative case is stacked on a dative experiencer (19), or it alternates with dative case on the experiencer (20), the experiencer behaves in the same way.

(19) a. ku ai-tul-eykey-ka mul-tul-i silh-ess-ta
    DEM child-PL-DAT-NOM water-PL-NOM hate-PAST-DEC
    ‘The children hated water.’

b. *ku ai-eykey-ka mul-tul-i silh-ess-ta
    DEM child-DAT-NOM water-PL-NOM hate-PAST-DEC
    ‘The child hated water.’

(20) a. ku ai-tul-i mul-tul-i silh-ess-ta
    DEM child-PL-NOM water-PL-NOM hate-PAST-DEC
    ‘The children hated water.’

b. *ku ai-ka mul-tul-i silh-ess-ta
    DEM child-NOM water-PL-NOM hate-PAST-DEC
    ‘The child hated water.’

In contrast, PPs cannot trigger plural copying. In (21), the PP is plural, as the plural marker -tul on the DP ‘chair’ suggests. However, the plural marker on
the PP cannot license the plural morpheme on the DP ‘water’ in the same clause: (21) is ungrammatical.

(21) *i uyca-tul-ey mul-tul-i teleci-ess-ta
    this chair-PL-DAT water-PL-NOM drop-PAST-DEC
    Lit. ‘Water dropped on these chairs.’

The difference between the experiencer and the PP with respect to plural copying can be accounted for in terms of their agreement with T. The morphological realization of -tul on non-subject constituents has been argued to be the result of agreement with T (Choe 1988). Abstracting away from the technical details of agreement, an important point with respect to the current discussion is that the copied -tul on non-subject constituents is the realization of subject agreement. Unlike regular agreement with T, which is usually realized on the verb (e.g., honorification agreement), with the plural copying in (19)-(20), agreement morphology occurs on the theme objects, not on the verb. Thus, dative experiencers can agree with T, but PPs cannot, as the contrast with plural copying shows. This further corroborates the argument that dative experiencers are not PPs.

3.3 Binding

There is another difference between arguments of P and experiencers. The former cannot be a binder (22), but the latter can (23).

(22) *Swuni1-yephulo caki1-uy moca-ka nalao-ass-ta
    Suni-next to self1-GEN hat-NOM fly.come-PAST-DEC
    Lit: ‘Beside Suni, her hat flew.’ (‘Suni’s hat flew over to her side.’)

As exemplified in (22), the complement of P, ‘Suni’, cannot bind the reflexive pronoun caki. However, in (23), the experiencer ‘Suni’ can bind caki.

(23) Swuni1-eykey [caki1-uy tongsayng-i] miw-ess-ta
    Suni-DAT self-GEN sister-NOM hate-PAST-DEC
    ‘Suni hated her sister.’

4. Appl introduces dative experiencers

The discussion in sections 2 and 3 suggests that dative experiencers may be semantically locative, but this does not necessarily entail that they are syntactically locative PPs. I propose that experiencers are applicative, rather than adpositional, as illustrated in (24).

(24) a. Swuni-eykey Inho-ka miw-ess-ta
    Suni-DAT Inho-NOM hate-PAST-DEC
    ‘Suni hated Inho.’
Like Voice heads, Appl in (24b) merges external to vP and introduces an argument in its specifier (Pylkkänen 2008). That is, the complement of Appl is an event. However, unlike Voice which introduces an agent, the semantics of Appl is non-agentive (Kim, K. 2011, 2012).

I argue that experiencers in Korean are introduced by Appl and merges as the specifier of Appl, as in (24b). The dative case on the experiencer is assigned by Appl (see (25i) below) (Cuervo 2003).

I assume experiencers move to the specifier of TP to satisfy an EPP feature on T (Ura 1999), as illustrated in (25). The experiencer agrees with T in terms of its relevant phi-features, which can result in honorific agreement and plural copying. The proposal in (24b) can account for case stacking as well as the case alternation between dative and nominative case discussed in section 3.1. For case stacking, dative DPs raise to the specifier of TP to check an EPP feature on T; from there they can be stacked with nominative case, as in (25i). The nominative theme also gets its case from T, since multiple case checking is possible in Korean (Ura 1996). For case alternation, when Appl does not assign inherent case, the DPs raise to the specifier of TP, receiving nominative case and checking EPP on T (25iii).

(iii) no inherent dative case; nominative case from T

     (i) inherent dative case from Appl
     (ii) nominative case can be stacked

4.1 Hierarchical relationships

It is well-known in the literature that applied arguments asymmetrically c-command complement theme objects (Barss and Lasnik 1986, Marantz 1993). Evidence from Exceptional Case Marking (ECM), raising, binding, and scope ambiguity suggests that applied arguments (i.e., dative experiencers) in (24a) asymmetrically c-command the theme object. First, in ECM clauses, dative experiencers are ECMed (26a), rather than the theme (26b). The contrast in (26) indicates that dative experiencers merge higher than the theme, as proposed in (24b).
(26) a. ku namca-ka kunye-eykey Inho-ka mip-ta-ko
   That man-NOM she-DAT Inho-NOM hate-DEC-COMP
   mit-ess-ta
   believe-PAST-DEC
   ‘That man believed her to hate Inho.’

b. #ku namca-ka Inho-lul kunye-eykey mip-ta-ko
   That man-NOM Inho-ACC she-DAT hate-DEC-COMP
   mit-ess-ta
   believe-PAST-DEC
   ‘That man believed Inho to be hated by her.’

Raising clauses suggest the same conclusion. The dative experiencer is
the one which raises in raising constructions (27a); the theme cannot raise (27b).

(27) a. Swuni-eykey Inho-ka miw-unkes kath-ass-ta
   Suni-DAT Inho-NOM hate-COMP seem-PAST-DEC
   ‘Suni seemed to hate Inho.’

b. #Inho-ka Swuni-eykey miw-unkes kath-ass-ta
   Inho-NOM Suni-DAT hate-COMP seem-PAST-DEC
   ‘Inho seemed to be hated by Suni.’

Another indication of an asymmetric hierarchical relationship between
dative experiencers and themes is found in binding examples. As in (23),
repeated here as (28a), the experiencer ‘Suni’ can bind the reflexive pronoun
caki ‘self’, the possessor of the theme, while in (28b), the theme ‘Inho’ cannot
bind the reflexive pronoun caki, which is the possessor of the experiencer.

(28) a. Swuni1-eykey [caki1-uy tongsayng-i] miw-ess-ta
   Suni-DAT self-GEN sister-NOM hate-PAST-DEC
   ‘Suni1 hated her1 sister.’

b. *[caki1-uy tongsayng-eykey] Inho1-ka miw-ess-ta
   self-GEN brother-DAT Inho-NOM hate-PAST-DEC
   ‘His1 brother hated Inho1.’

The Appl proposal can also account for the ambiguity in psych-
constructions. Kuno (1971) noted that in Japanese existential clauses ambiguity
arises when a quantified theme moves in front of a quantified dative DP; thus he
argued that the dative DP linearly precedes the theme. Linear precedence
suggests an asymmetric relationship between the two arguments. This ambiguity
is also attested in psych (29) constructions.
The ambiguity can be accounted for by the current proposal (24b). When the theme moves across the experiencer to sentence-initial position, it c-commands the quantified dative argument, resulting in reading (i) in (29). The dative experiencer c-commands the trace of the theme even after this movement has occurred. This is possible as the dative experiencer merges asymmetrically higher than the theme, as the structure proposed in (24b) suggests, permitting the reading in (29ii).

4.2 Locative inversion and psych-constructions

As discussed in section 3, Landau (2010) argues that experiencers are semantically locative. One of the consequences of this is that the experiencer is oblique, and thus it is syntactically a PP. Another consequence argued for by Landau is that experiencer PPs undergo locative inversion (either at LF or PF). In this section, I show that Korean psych-constructions with dative experiencers cannot be analyzed as locative PPs in inversion constructions.

Consider sentences (30a) and its counterpart (30b), where the PP and the subject appear to switch positions. Albeit disputable, some studies suggest that locative inversion as in (30b) is the result of movement of the PP to subject position (e.g., Collins 1997), which is assumed by Landau.

(30) a. My friend Rose was sitting among the guests.
   b. Among the guests was sitting my friend Rose. (Bresnan 1994)

This movement of the PP in inversion is what Landau argues to be similar to PP experiencers: PP experiencers move to the specifier of TP. In particular, in both inversion and constructions with PP experiencers, the PP moves from an internal verbal position to the subject position.

With Korean experiencers, movement seems to be to the specifier of TP, as honorification (14) and plural copying (18) suggest. With psych-clauses in Korean, there is no corresponding non-inversion clause (see (32a)). Let’s first consider what PP inversion is like in Korean. The example (31a) is a clause with a PP, and (31b) shows inversion of (31a).

(31) a. macnun panghyang-i [vP [pp ku pang-ulo]-i]-ta
    right direction-NOM that room-P-BE-DEC
    ‘The right direction is to that room.’

   b. [pp ku pang-ulo-*k(ka)]1 [vP t1 macnun panghyang-i]-ta
    that room-P-NOM right direction-BE-DEC
    ‘To that room is the right direction.’
Similar to its English counterpart in (30b), the locative PP in (31a) moves to sentence-initial position in the inversion construction (31b). When it moves, nominative case is obligatory, which may suggest that the PP in (31b) is in the specifier of TP. Although nominative case is also available on dative experiencers, nominative case is only optional and not obligatory. Furthermore, unlike the PP inversion clause (31a), dative experiencer constructions do not have a non-inverted counterpart, as shown in (32a).  

(32) a. # Inho-ka [vP [Swuni-eykey] miw]-ess-ta
Inho-NOM Suni-DAT hate-PAST-DEC
‘Suni hated Inho.’

b. [Swuni-eykey]2 [AppP t2 [vP Inho-ka miw]-ess-ta
Suni-DAT Inho-NOM hate-PAST-DEC
‘Suni hated Inho.’

Another important difference between PP inversion and constructions with dative experiencers is that with experiencers, movement of the argument is from a VP-external position to the specifier of TP. Unlike PPs (30b/31b) and PP experiencers (9), movement is not from a VP-internal position.

The discussion leads to the conclusion that an experiencer raising to the specifier of TP is not necessarily locative inversion. The experiencer in Korean moves to the specifier of TP as it is a subject, not because it is a PP. Thus, PP inversion does not necessarily provide evidence for an analysis of dative experiencers as PPs.

5. Conclusion

This paper shows that locative experiencers like those in Korean can occur in a non-locative syntactic structure, namely AppIP. An applicative approach can capture these experiencers’ non-PP-like properties, their VP-external status, the inherent case they receive, and their non-agentive semantics. Moreover, this paper suggests that not all locative experiencers occur in PPs; App is also an available head. Another consequence is that an applicative approach seems to have advantages over the well-known v approach (e.g., Arad 1998, Ura 1999), where the v head is stipulated to introduce an experiencer and assign case to the experiencer. Under the App proposal, there is no need for such a stipulation. App can capture the inherent case and semantics of experiencers, as inherent case and non-agentive semantics are the properties of App. The current analysis leaves at least one important question unanswered: how should App be distinguished from P syntactically and semantically? Although the current analysis provides some basic ways of distinguishing between the two heads,

---

9 The interpretation of (32a) may require previous discourse in order to be interpreted correctly.

10 A similar conclusion is drawn for Spanish impersonal constructions with respect to locative inversion (see Fernández-Soriano1999).
given the similarities between Appl and P (e.g., Baker 1988), it remains to be seen how these two heads can be differentiated in more principled ways.

References


