

## Categorization of Korean Double Accusative Constructions

Park, Wookyung\* and Lee, Kyoungmi\*\*

Kyungwoon University

Kyungpook National University

\*First Author / \*\*Corresponding Author

 OPEN ACCESS



<https://doi.org/10.18627/jslg.35.3.201911.389>

pISSN : 1225-4770

eISSN : 2671-6151

Received: October 01, 2019

Revised: October 25, 2019

Accepted: November 15, 2019

This is an Open-Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial License which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Copyright©2019 the Modern Linguistic Society of Korea

본인이 투고한 논문은 다른 학술지에 게재된 적이 없으며 타인의 논문을 표절하지 않았음을 서약합니다. 추후 중복게재 혹은 표절된 것으로 밝혀질 시에는 논문게재 취소와 일정 기간 논문 제출의 제한 조치를 받게 됨을 인지하고 있습니다.

### ABSTRACT

*The Journal of Studies in Language 35.3, 389-399.* The current study has reviewed Korean double accusative constructions (DACs), which refer to constructions where two NPs marked with -(으)어 appear at the same time in a sentence. It gives rise to questions about which one is a grammatical object and what the other NP is in a sentence. To solve these questions, we have classified DACs into four types according to syntactic and semantic/pragmatic perspectives. There are four types of DACs: NP2 as a grammatical object, NP1 as a focus or topic; NP2 as a grammatical object, NP1 as a topic; NP1 as a grammatical object, NP2 as a modifier; NP1 as a grammatical object, NP2 as a part of the predicate. That is, in the first two types, NP2 is a grammatical object, while in the other two types, NP1 is a grammatical object. Additionally, the NP, which is not a grammatical object in the first three types, can be left out from a sentence, whereas it is obligatory in the last type. (Kyungwoon University · Kyungpook National University)

**Keywords:** double accusative constructions, postpositional particles, -(으)어, focus, topic

### 1. Introduction

Double accusative constructions (hereafter, DACs) refer to constructions where two NPs with accusative case markers appear usually in a sequence. It raises a question which NP is the grammatical object between the two noun phrases and what is the role of the other noun phrase in a sentence (hereafter, we will refer to the first noun phrase as NP1 and the second noun phrase as NP2). There are some example sentences of DACs.

- (1) a. Minsu-ka Younghi-lul son-ul cap-ass-ta.  
     M.-NOM Y.-ACC hand-ACC hold-PST-Decl  
     ‘Minsu held Younghi’s hand.’
- b. Minsu-ka kwail-ul sakwa-lul coahan-ta.  
     M.-NOM fruit-ACC apple-ACC like-DECL  
     ‘As for the fruit, Minsu likes apples.’
- c. Minsu-ka kwutwu-lul kemunsayk-ul sa-ass-ta.  
     M.-NOM shoe-ACC black-ACC buy-PST-DECL  
     ‘Minsu bought black shoes.’
- d. Minsu-ka enehak-ul yonku-lul ha-ess-ta.  
     M.-NOM linguistics-ACC study-ACC do-PST-DECL  
     ‘Minsu studied linguistics.’

Four sentences above illustrate frequently used types of Korean DACs that we often face in our everyday life. We will investigate four types of constructions in terms of not only syntactic perspectives but also semantic/pragmatic perspectives. We also look into the relationship between the two NPs. The four types are divided into two categories regarding which NP is a grammatical object in a sentence. Then those two categories are divided again into two sub-categories according to the roles of the other NPs. In result, Korean DACs can be narrowed down into four types as follows: NP2 as a grammatical object, NP1 as focus or topic; NP2 as a grammatical object, NP1 as topic; NP1 as a grammatical object, NP2 as a modifier; NP1 as a grammatical object, NP2 as a part of predicate. The key sentences in (1) represents examples in each type and we will investigate them with those key sentences in order. We will look into previous literature in section 2 and discuss the roles of NPs in DACs in detail in section 3. The function of Korean postpositional particle -(l)ul will be discussed in terms of its pragmatic features along with syntactic analysis.

## 2. Literature Review

Yoon (2015) classifies DACs into two types: a topic type and a possession type, depending on the role of NP which is not a grammatical object. Yoon classifies the types with regard to the possibility whether or not the NP1 and NP2 can be separated. In the topic type, the ACC marker in NP1 can be replaced by a topic marker, whereas in the possession type, NP1 can not receive a topic marker because NP1 and NP2 are not able to be split. Yoon shows his perspective above with following examples in (2) and (3).

- (2) a. John-i Mary-lul tongsayng-ul ttayli-ess-ta  
     J.-NOM M.-ACC younger.sibling-ACC beat-PST-DECL  
     ‘John assaulted Mary’s younger sibling.’
- b. John-i Mary-nun tongsayng-ul ttayli-ess-ta  
     J.-NOM M.-TOP younger.sibling-ACC beat-PST-DECL  
     ‘Speaking of Mary, John assaulted her younger sibling (but he didn’t hit anyone else’s sibling).’

- (3) John-un Mary-lul elkwul-ul ttwulecikey chyeta.po-ass-ta  
 J.TOP M.-ACC face-Acc intently stare-PST-DECL  
 ‘John stared intently at Mary’s face.’

(Yoon, 2015: 90-93)

In (2) the first NP (i.e., NP1) can be topic marked because NP1, Mary and NP2, her younger sibling are alienable, whereas in (3) the first NP Mary cannot be a topic because they are inalienable. Yoon also suggests that NP1 in DACs does not receive a theta-role from a predicate. NP1 in both cases is dependent on the thematic role due to the fact that a predicate assigns theta-role to the whole noun phrase. In this respect, we agree with Yoon’s (2015) perspective that one NP marked with *-(l)ul* can receive a topic marker. However, Yoon’s two types have been classified as separable, but there is no further explanation for the non-separable noun phrases. In this study, we try to search for a way to describe a relationship between the two NPs from a different perspective.

Chung (2015) discusses Korean DACs with respect to the patterns of ditransitive constructions as illustrated by Goldberg’s construction grammar (1995). Chung shows thematic roles of the arguments involved in Korean double accusative constructions. The following sentence in (4) is an example showing how Chung applies her analysis to DACs.

- (4) John-i Mary-lul senmwul-ul cwu-ess-ta.  
 J.-NOM M.-ACC gift-ACC give-PAST-DECL  
 ‘John gave Mary a gift.’

(Chung, 2015: 58)

In the ditransitive construction in (4), NP1 receives RECIPIENT and NP2 receives PATIENT. However, not all DACs cannot be accounted for based on thematic roles of arguments, even though thematic roles can apply to a typical ditransitive construction. In this regard, it seems that thematic roles are not enough to explain various types of Korean DACs and we need to introduce another mechanism with which can explain them. The previous research has not delved into the function of *-(l)ul* in DACs in detail, which leads us to investigate the function of Korean particle *-(l)ul*.

According to Standard Korean Dictionary, *-(l)ul* is divided into two categories: a case postpositional particle and an auxiliary postpositional particle. The former category is classified into again ten sub-categories to explain the roles of a case particle; the latter category, an auxiliary particle plays a role to emphasize the meaning of the element which it attaches. Shin (2014) with many researchers also suggests that the function of *-(l)ul* is classified into two groups and tries to explain the difference between the roles of two NPs in terms of the transitivity.<sup>1)</sup>

Meanwhile, other researchers along with Lee and Lee (1998) divided the roles of *-(l)ul* into three categories: usage of a case particle, usage of other than a case particle, and usage of pragmatic perspectives. Yi (2004) also presents three categories of *-(l)ul*, which can be used as a case maker, as a meaning of patienthood in terms of thematic roles, and as a speaker-oriented category. In the last usage, *-(l)ul* shows completeness or patienthood which is assigned from the speaker’s point of view. In addition, Yi asserts that this last category has a distinctive property which performs the relationship between a speaker and the meaning of a whole sentence or a certain part of a sentence. That is, it presents

1) Hopper and Thompson (1980) suggest ten variables about transitivity. Transitivity is traditionally understood as a global property of an entire clause, such that an activity is ‘carried-over’ or ‘transferred’ from an agent to a patient.

the relationship between the speaker and the theme, which the speaker uses as the purpose of judgment or description. In this regard, *-(l)ul* is argued in a speaker-oriented category.

From these perspectives, in this paper, *-(l)ul* seems to have two functions in DACs: one as a case maker, and the other as an auxiliary particle which has a pragmatic function. We will investigate DACs based on both syntactic and semantic/pragmatic perspectives of *-(l)ul*. In the process, we can find out a grammatical object in DACs.

### 3. Four Types of DACs

Korean double accusative constructions are divided into two categories; either NP1 as a grammatical object or NP2 as a grammatical object. Each category can be divided again into two sub-categories according to the role of the other NP which is not a grammatical object in a sentence. First, let us consider the case that NP2 is used as a grammatical object.

#### 3.1 NP2 as Grammatical Object

In this section, the sentences in which NP2 is a grammatical object are investigated, and the roles of NP1 in those sentences will be accounted for regarding their functions in a sentence.

##### 3.1.1 NP1 as Focus or Topic

We will consider the first type with the sentence in (5) revisiting (1a).

(5) Minsu-ka	Younghi-lul	son-ul	cap-ass-ta.
M.-NOM	Y.-ACC	hand-ACC	hold-PST-DECL
'Minsu held Younghi's hand.'			

Given the theta role of the predicate in (5), NP2 is a grammatical object.<sup>2)</sup> This gives rise to a question on what the NP1 is. In order to reveal the role of NP1, we should look into the following example first. The sentence (6) shows contrastive condition between NP1s in each conjunct; two NP1s in each contrastive clause, Sujin and Younghi, are put into contrastive relations. As a result, the construal of the sentence is that what Minsu held is not Sujin's hand but Younghi's hand. In fact, the two NP1s are contrastively focused.

(6) Minsu-ka	Sujin-lul	son-ul	capun-ke	anira
M.-NOM	S.-ACC	hand-ACC	hold-COMP	not
Younghi-lul	son-ul	cap-ass-ta		
Y.-ACC	hand-ACC	hold-PST-DECL		
'Minsu didn't hold Sujin's hand, but Younghi's hand.'				

2) The predicate *hold* assigns theme role to NP2 not NP1 considering the construal of the sentence. The sentence could mean that what Minsu held is Younghi. Given the truth condition, however, the proposition of the latter (P: Minsu held Younghi) does not always qualify the proposition of the former (Q: Minsu held Younghi's hand). In other words if P is true Q is not always true.

Therefore, we can speculate that NP1 in DACs is either a focus or a topic. In (5), *-(l)ul* in NP1 can be a focus or topic marker and *-(l)ul* in NP2 is a accusative case marker specifying a grammatical object. In (7) we examine the relations between two accusative marked NPs. As mentioned above, the sentence in (7a) can be construed in two ways: one interprets NP1 either as a focus or as a topic. We can try to substitute *-(l)ul* in NP1 with another Korean particle as long as it delivers the same meaning. *-(l)ul* can be replaced with *-uy* as in (7b).

- (7) a. Minsu-ka Younghi-lul son-ul cap-ass-ta.  
M.-NOM Y.-ACC hand-ACC hold-pst-Decl  
‘It was Younghi’s hand that Minsu held, not others’.  
‘As for Younghi, Minsu held her hand.’
- b. Minsu-ka Younghi-uy son-ul cap-ass-ta.  
M.-NOM Y.-GEN hand-ACC hold-pst-Decl  
‘Minsu held Younghi’s hand.’

We assert that the structure (7a) can be derived from (7b), supporting possession ascension analysis. That is, the two NPs show possessive relation.

Among many Ura (1996) and Yang (1998) suggest that the possessor raises from inalienable possessive constructions. The current study follows this line of thought. When the possessor *Younghi* with a genitive marker separates from the head of NP *son* and raises to TopP or FocP, the genitive marker *-uy* is replaced by the topic or focus postpositional marker *-lul*.<sup>3)</sup>

- (8) a. [NP Younghi-uy son]-ul  
b. [[TopP/FocP Younghi-lul] ... [NP Younghi-uy son]-ul]



In the current study, the possession ascension can be applied as illustrated in (9). NP1 *Younghi-lul* should move to the focus or topic position because it cannot remain at the genitive position in NP2. NP1 *Younghi-lul* is overtly marked with *-(l)ul*, which is a focus/topic postpositional marker. That is, NP1 raises from VP to Spec-FocP or Spec-TopP to satisfy a pragmatic feature of focus in (9a) or topic in (9b), respectively.

- (9) a. [FocP [NP1 Younghi-lul] [VP [NP2 [NP1 Younghi-lul] son-ul] cap-ass-ta]]]  
b. [TopP [NP1 Younghi-lul] [VP [NP2 [NP1 Younghi-lul] son-ul] cap-ass-ta]]]

In possessive relations, NP1 as a genitive of NP2 is embedded in NP2 and NP1 moves from the projection of NP2. As NP1 originally plays a genitive role, it cannot be used with a accusative case postposition particle. In short, *-(l)ul* in NP1 is an auxiliary postpositional particle receiving focus or topic. *-(l)ul* in NP2 is an accusative case particle.

3) The same mechanism is applied in the double nominative constructions. See Lee and Park (2019).

### 3.1.2 NP1 as Topic

Let us move on to the second type of DACs as in (10) revisiting (1b).

- (10) Minsu-ka      kwail-ul      sakwa-lul      coahan-ta.  
           M.-NOM      fruit-ACC      apple-ACC      like-DECL  
           'As for the fruit, Minsu likes apples.'

We have observed in the previous sub-section that NP1 in a certain DAC undergoes possession ascension moving to FocP/TopP. The NP1 in (10) is also seen as a topic, but it does not seem to undergo possession ascension as in (8) because the relationship between two NPs is not a possessive relation.

When two NPs, *kwail* and *sakwa*, are considered in terms of their relationship, *kwail* seems to include *sakwa* as a kind and the two NPs present whole-part relation as shown in (11).

- (11) ... kwail-chungay sakwa  
             fruit-among    apple  
       '... among kinds of fruit, apple ...'

In that sense, it is obvious that NP1 does not undergo any derivation as the previous type. Instead, NP1 has been essentially placed at the surface position. Therefore, *kwail* in (10) seems to be a hanging topic. A hanging topic is not derived through movement, but it is base-generated in the surface position. Let us examine the difference between two kinds of topics in (12).

- (12) a. \*[<sub>ADJ</sub> With John<sub>i</sub>'s computer], he<sub>i</sub> began to write a book.  
     b. ✓ [<sub>ADJ</sub> In Ben<sub>i</sub>'s office], he<sub>i</sub> is an absolute director.

(Speas, 1991: 250)

Both prepositional phrases in (12) appear at the sentence initial position as a topic in each sentence, and both have co-indexed r-expression. Yet, the consequences of the two topicalizations differ concerning binding effects. (12a) is illegitimate because it violates binding principle C, whereas (12b) is grammatical. From this fact, we can assume that the topic phrase moves from the embedded VP adjunction position to the surface position in the former case. It means, for the interpretation, its base copy is counted at LF. On the other hand, in the latter case, the prepositional phrase should not undergo movement operations. If it were base-generated in VP and moved from there, it would reconstruct to its base position, causing binding principle C violation. However, this is not true. The fact that binding principle C is observed means that the topicalized phrase does not undergo movement; rather, it is base-generated in the surface position as a hanging topic.

Therefore, we propose that NP1 in (10) is a hanging topic; it merges directly to Spec-TopP as shown in (13). It provides ‘aboutness’ to a following proposition. Consequently, it is interpreted only as ‘As for the fruit, Minsu likes apples the best.’

- (13) [<sub>TopP</sub> NP1 ... [<sub>VP</sub> NP2 V] ]

If one of the two *-(l)ul* in NPs is a accusative case particle, the other is understandably an auxiliary postpositional particle. As NP1 is a hanging topic and the predicate specify only NP2, *-(l)ul* in NP2 is an accusative case particle and *-(l)ul* in NP1 is actually an auxiliary postpositional particle. That is, NP2 is the grammatical object in the sentence (10).

### 3.2 NP1 as Grammatical Object

In this section the sentences in which NP1 is a grammatical object are investigated, and the roles of NP2 in those sentences will be explained: one as a prenominal modifier and the other as a part of predicate.

#### 3.2.1 NP2 as Prenominal Modifier

We will recall (1c) to investigate the third type with the sentence in (14).

- (14) Minsu-ka    kwutwu-lul    Kemunsayk-ul    sa-ass-ta.  
M.-NOM    shoe-ACC    black-ACC    buy-Pst-Decl  
‘Minsu bought black shoes.’

- (15) Minsu-ka    kemunsayk(-uy)    kwutwu-lul    sa-ass-ta.  
M.-NOM    shoe-ACC    black-ACC    buy-Pst-Decl  
‘Minsu bought black shoes.’

The sentence above in (14) is derived from the canonical sentence in (15) through several steps. NP1 *Kemunsayk-uy* and NP2 *kwutwu-lul* are a prenominal modifier and a grammatical object, respectively. From the canonical order, NP2 moves to preceding position of NP1 by means of object shift (henceforth, OS). In result, NP1 with a particle *-uy* surfaces right before a predicate, verb. *-uy* needs to be changed to another particle which can be used before a verb, since an NP marked with Korean particle *-uy* should be placed in front of another noun. Therefore, by virtue of Last Resort, *-uy* changes into *-(l)ul* in NP1.

There are two types of Korean adnominal particle *-uy*: genitive *-uy* and modifical *-uy*. A genitive marker *-uy* realized as a grammatical case attaches to a noun phrase of referential semantic type. In contrast, a modifical marker *-uy* has a role of attributive modification, by being combined with a noun phrase of property semantic type. The example sentence in (15) above, falls onto the second category and the relationship between the two NPs can be construed as modifier and modifiee relation. *Kemunsayk* describes the property of the grammatical object NP; that is, they represent the attributions such as color, size, number and etc.

Let us consider OS in Korean. We accept Han et al.’s (2007) perspective that Korean requires OS, where object raises from its theta-position above VP. A brief examination on the following examples below will provide clear explanation of OS process.

- (16) a. \*Toli-ka      cal      maykcwu-lul      masi-n-ta.  
           Toli-Nom    well    beer-Acc        drink-Pres-Dec  
           ‘Toli drinks beer well.’
- b. Toli-ka      maykcwu-lul      cal      masi-n-ta.  
           Toli-Nom    beer-Acc        well    drink-Pres-Dec  
           ‘Toli drinks beer well.’

(Han et al., 2007: 16)

The sentence in (16a) illustrates that the object remains at VP, which results in non-sense. Meanwhile, the object in (16b) moves from its base position above the VP modifying adverb cal; this confirms OS is a real phenomenon in Korean. (17) simplifies OS.

- (17) [FP NP<sub>OBJ</sub>    [VP NP<sub>OBJ</sub> V]]



Applying OS to (14),

- (18) a. ... [FP kwutwu-lul [VP [NP Kemunsayk(-uy) [NP kwutwu]] sa-ass-ta]

It raises a question why only the modifiee undergoes OS stranding the modifier, or the whole noun phrase including both the modifiee and the modifier moves out VP. If the modifeer moves out of VP alone, it violates left branch condition (hereafter, LBC). In case of LBC, the left branch is banned to separate from the whole noun phrase.<sup>4)</sup> If the whole noun phrase moves out of VP, it is vacuous because it does not change the word order from the canonical order.

Modifiers marked with *-uy* cannot stand alone without overt host NP which they modify because *-uy* is an auxiliary postpositional particle. An NP marked with Korean particle *-uy* should be placed in front of another noun. Therefore, by virtue of Last Resort, *-uy* changes into *-(l)ul* in NP1. This conversion is plausible because *-(l)ul* does not play as a genuine accusative but as a focus or some pragmatic purposes. This phenomenon is in accordance with the perspectives that Son (2012), Kwon (2012), and Lee (2012) indicate pre-verbal position has essentially default focus.<sup>5)</sup>

4) a. Who<sub>i</sub> did you see [DP a picture of t<sub>i</sub>] yesterday?

b. \*Whose<sub>i</sub> did you see [DP t<sub>i</sub> picture] yesterday?

5) Consider the examples below. In (ia), sentential focus naturally falls on sakwa-lul ‘apples’, the element that is in the immediate left position of the verb. In (ib), the immediate preverbal word *ppalli* ‘quickly’ is given an accented focus, which is driven by P(rosodic)-Movement as pointed by Son (2012). The point here is that the immediate preverbal position receives a default focus.

(i) a. Mary-ka [VP ppalli    sakwa-lul    mek-ess-ta.]  
           M-NOM    quickly    apple-ACC eat-PAST-DEC  
           ‘Mary quickly ate apples’  
       b. Mary-ka sakwa-lul<sub>i</sub> [VP ppalli t<sub>i</sub> mek-ess-ta.]  
           M-NOM    apple-ACC    quickly    eat-PAST-DEC  
           ‘Quickly, Mary ate apples’  
           (excerpted from Kwon, 2012)

*Kemunsayk-ul* receives a focus.<sup>6)</sup>

### 3.2.2 NP2 as a Part of Predicate

Let us see the last type of DACs as in (19) revisiting (1d).

- (19) Minsu-ka    enehak-ul        yenkwu-lul    ha-ess-ta.  
           M.-NOM    linguistics-ACC   study-ACC   do-PST-Decl  
           ‘Minsu studied linguistics.’

According to Kim (2016), light verb construction (hereafter, LVC) consists of *-ha* and an activity-denoting noun (verbalized noun).<sup>7)</sup> *-ha* in LVC does not partake in the composition of sentential meaning, whereby it makes a sense to name it as a light verb. In LVC, the preceding verbalized noun plays a role of the main predicate of the sentence.

The complex predicate can be formed with or without ACC case on the verbalized noun in LVC as seen in (20).

- (20) a. Minsu-ka    enehak-ul        yenkwu-lul    ha-ess-ta.  
           M.-NOM    linguistics-ACC   study-ACC   do-PST-Decl  
           ‘Minsu studied linguistics.’  
     b. Minsu-ka    enehak-ul        yenkwu        ha-ess-ta.  
           M.-NOM    linguistics-ACC   study        do-PST-Decl

According to many, including Grimshaw and Mester (1988), Ahn (1990), Lee (2001), and Choi (2016), both complex predicate constructions above have the same structures, which can be demonstrated as in (21).

- (21) [<sub>vP</sub> NP1 [<sub>vP</sub> VN – ha]]

6) The following examples can be analyzed in the same manner as (14); the modifiee undergoes OS and the particle in the modifier changes.

- (i) a. Minsu-ka    chaek-ul        se-kwon-ul        sa-ass-ta.  
           M.-NOM    book-ACC        three-CL-ACC    buy-PST-Decl  
           ‘Minsu bought three books.’  
     b. Minsu-ka    se-kwon-uy    chaek-ul        sa-ass-ta.  
           M.-NOM    three-CL-GEN book-ACC    buy-PST-Decl  
           ‘Minsu bought three books.’

The sentence below seems to be a same structure as the ones we have discussed, but it has originally different structure. NP2 is not a prenominal modifier but an adverbial modifying the entire VP, even though it is surfaced at pre-verbal position along with object shift.

- (ii) Minsu-ka    chaek-ul        se-sikan-ul        ilk-ess-ta.  
           M.-NOM    book-ACC        three-hour-ACC    read-PST-DECL  
           ‘Minsu read books for three hours.’

7) There are two other types of *-ha*: auxiliary verb (a) and main verb (b), according to Kim (2016).

- (i) a. … chaek-ul    ilk-eya        han-ta / … ilk-kon        ha-ess-ta  
           book-ACC read-CONN do-DECL / read-used to do-PST-DECL  
           ‘… must read books.’ / ‘… used to read books.’  
     b. … saep-ul        ha-ta        / … kwikoli-lul    ha-ta  
           business-ACC do-DECL / earring-ACC do-DECL  
           ‘… run business.’ / ‘… wear earings.’

Then, how can we account for the presence/absence of ACC marker in the verbalized noun? Choi (2016) argues that the ACC marker on the verbal noun (here, NP2) is not a case marker but a focus marker. Choi asserts that the focus morpheme *-(l)ul* is isomorphic with the case morpheme *-(l)ul*. In the same line, *-(l)ul* can be used to emphasize an element in a sentence from the perspective of the speaker as mentioned in section 2.

This last type posits distinct patterns from the other three types above we have discussed previously. There are two NPs; one is a grammatical object and the other plays a different role as a genitive, a wholeness, or a modifier.

Here the NPs that are not grammatical objects of four types should be considered whether it is necessary or not in a sentence. The first three types are optional, but the last type is necessary in a sentence.

Adjuncts and complements are two main elements in a sentence. Complements are words or phrases that are used to complete the meaning of a given sentence. Adjuncts are parts of sentences that contain extra information; they are not necessary to complete the meaning of a sentence. The main difference between adjunct and complement is whether it is an essential element in a sentence: adjuncts are optional to a sentence whereas complements are a necessary part of a sentence. That is, relationship between the NPs in the last type can be considered as object-predicate, whereas the relationship of the other categories is object-adjunct. In the last type, the grammatical object is a complement of the following predicate. If any element is omitted in this category, the sentence will be grammatically incorrect because both NPs are inevitable elements, predicate and object. On the other hand, all of adjuncts in three categories can be omitted without leaving a grammatical error.

## 4. Conclusions

The current study has examined the properties of *-(l)ul* in Korean DACs. It is problematic when two NPs marked with *-(l)ul* appear at the same time in a sentence. At first glance, it is confusing to distinguish a grammatical object NP from the other NP. By exploring DACs according to syntactic and semantic/pragmatic perspectives, we have revealed the grammatical object and the role of the other NP. There are four types of DACs: NP2 as a grammatical object, NP1 as a focus or topic; NP2 as a grammatical object, NP1 as a topic; NP1 as a grammatical object, NP2 as a modifier; NP1 as a grammatical object, NP2 as a part of a predicate.

In the first type, two NPs are under the possessive relation where the preceding NP (NP1) raises to Spec-FocP or Spec-TopP, the process of which is called possession ascension. The genitive marker *-uy* is substituted with topic or focus postpositional marker *-(l)ul*. As for the second type, the whole-part relation is shown between two NPs, and NP1 as a hanging topic merges to Spec-TopP. The third type specifies the relation of modifiee-modifier, which seems to be an abnormal sequence. This sequence results from the canonical order, modifier-modifiee, by means of OS. An auxiliary postpositional particle *-uy* in the modifier changes into *-(l)ul* for the reason that the modifier naturally receives focus due to the pre-verbal focus position. The last type includes an LVC where NP2 plays a part of a predicate as a verbalized noun. *-(l)ul* in NP2 realizes the speaker's intension of emphasis.

In the first two types, NP2 is a grammatical object, while in the other two types, NP1 is a grammatical object. Additionally, the NP which is not a grammatical object in the first three types can be left out from a sentence, whereas it is obligatory in the last type.

## References

- 국립국어연구원. 2019. 표준국어대사전. <https://stdict.korean.go.kr>.
- 신서인. 2016. 대격 중출구문에서의 ‘을/를’의 기능 연구: 타동성을 중심으로. 『우리말글』 68, 1-35.
- 이희자·이종희. 1998. 『사전식 텍스트 분석적 국어 어미의 연구』. 서울: 한국문화사.
- Ahn, H.-D. 1990. On Light Verb Constructions in Korean and Japanese. *Japanese Korean Linguistics* 1, 221-237.
- Choi, Y. S. 2016. Verbal Noun in Korean Light Verb Construction Redux. *The Journal of Studies in Language* 32.1, 115-140.
- Chung, E. 2015. A Construction Grammar Approach to Korean Double Accusative Construction. *Language Information* 21, 41-66.
- Goldberg, A. E. 1995. *Constructions: A construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Grimshaw, J. and A. Mester. 1988. Light Verbs and e-marking. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 205-232.
- Han, C.-H., J. Lidz, and J. Musolino. 2007. Verb-raising and Grammar Competition in Korean: Evidence from Negation and Quantifier Scope. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38.1, 1-47.
- Hopper, P. J. and S. A. Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse. *Language* 56.2, 251-299.
- Kim, J.-B. 2016. *The Syntactic Structures of Korean*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kwon, J. 2012. Middle Field Scrambling as Topicalization. *The Association of Modern British and American Language and Literature* 30.3, 151-171.
- Lee, H. and J. Lee. 1998. *A Study of Korean Particle Based on the Analysis of Dictionary Text*. Han'guk Munhwasa.
- Lee, K. 2012. *Focus and Floating Numeral Quantifiers in Korean*. Master's Thesis, Kyungpook National University.
- Lee, K. and W. Park. 2019. Categorization of Double Nominative Constructions in Korean: Based on the Properties of – i/-ka. *English* 21 32.1, 249-266.
- Lee, M.-J. 2001. The Light Verb *hata* Construction and English Loans. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* 9, 552-562.
- Park, S.-Y. 2014. Two Types of Adnominal Particle ‘uy’ in Korean: Genitive and Modificational ‘uy’. *Studies on Modern Grammar* 81, 1-27.
- Son, G. 2012. *Overt Focus Movement to the Edge of vP*. Ms., Kyungpook National University.
- Yi, H.-S. 2004. On the Meaning of the Particle ‘eul’. *Korean Semantics* 15, 303-327.
- Yoon, James H. S. 2015. Double Nominative and Accusative Constructions. *The Handbook of Korean Linguistics* 79-97.

Park, Wookyung, Professor  
 730, Gangdong-ro, Sandong, Gumi, Gyeongbuk, 39160, Republic of Korea  
 School of Global Education, Kyungwoon University  
 E-mail: parkwoo@ikw.ac.kr

Lee, Kyungmi, Instructor  
 80 Daehak-ro, Buk-gu, Daegu, 41566, Republic of Korea  
 Department English and Literature, Kyungpook National University  
 E-mail: kmlee2007@gmail.com