

## **Inalienable possession construction and passive markers inducing an idiomatic interpretation\***

**Soo-Hwan Lee\*\*<sup>a</sup> · Doo-Won Lee\*\*\*<sup>b</sup>**  
(Sogang University<sup>a</sup> · Korea National University of Transportation<sup>b</sup>)

**Lee, Soo-Hwan and Doo-Won Lee. 2017. Inalienable possession construction and passive markers inducing an idiomatic interpretation.** *Linguistic Research* 34(3), 239-272. When a genitive marker, instead of an accusative or a nominative marker, is realized with the first nominal in a multiple case marking (MCM) construction that is relevant to the inalienable possessive structures in Korean, the given sentence may receive an idiomatic interpretation. The nominative possessum within MCM constructions may participate in either preserving or triggering idiomatic interpretations, whereas the accusative possessum may only participate in preserving idiomatic meanings and not in triggering them. With consideration to MCM constructions and passivization which enable idiomatic interpretations to be preserved or triggered compositionally in syntax, we argue that the passive verbal ending *(a/e) ci* qualifies as the strongest passive marker whereas the overt passive morpheme *i/hi/li/ki* is the next strongest, and the null passive morpheme  $\emptyset_{\text{PASS}}$  the weakest. Hence, we propose that at least within idiomatic domains the null passive morpheme should be regarded as a quasi-passive morpheme which is remarkably different from the overt passive morpheme *i/hi/li/ki* or the passive verbal ending *(a/e) ci*. (Sogang University · Korea National University of Transportation)

**Keywords** *(a/e) ci*, idiomatic preserving/triggering, inalienable possession construction, multiple case marking, (null) passive morpheme, verbal passive

### **1. Introduction**

It has been well known in literature (J. H. Yoon 1989; Ura 1996; Cho 2000; and Ahn

---

\* An earlier version of this paper was presented at The 2017 Fall Conference of The Linguistic Society of Korea held at Seoul National University. We would like to thank the anonymous reviewers of this journal for their helpful comments. We would also like to thank Myung-Kwan Park for introducing us to a previous research analyzing verbal passives from a cross-linguistic viewpoint. Any remaining errors are entirely ours. The first author was supported by CORE and funded by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and the National Research Foundation of Korea in 2017. The corresponding author was supported by Korea National University of Transportation in 2017.

\*\* First author

\*\*\* Corresponding author

& Cho 2013; Lee 2017a, among others) that inalienable possession-type (i.e., body-part type) constructions permit multiple case marking (MCM) constructions in Korean. With consideration to this vital notion, this paper mainly focuses on the inalienable possession-type MCM constructions conveying idiomatic interpretations in both active and passive diatheses in Korean. Similar to the term *sinsang* ‘personal matters or details’, which is considered to be an inalienable object of a person such as the body parts *son* ‘hand’ and *pal* ‘foot’, *papcwul* ‘gullet’ in (1a) is regarded as an inalienable object of a human being.<sup>1</sup> At this point, it is vital to realize that the possessor *Chelswu* may undergo multiple accusative or multiple nominative case marking process as in (1a, b). What is at stake here is that when the inalienable possession construction in (1a) is passivized to (1b) or (1c), the sentence holds onto its idiomatic interpretation.<sup>2</sup> To illustrate, the example in (1c) shows that the accusative possessor *Chelswu-lul* ‘Chelswu-ACC’ in (1a) may be realized as a nominative subject leaving the accusative-marked possessum *papcwul* ‘gullet’ in-situ while preserving its idiomatic meaning.

- (1) a. *sacang-i Chelswu-uy/-lul papcwul-ul kkunh-ess-ta.*<sup>3</sup> (idiomatic)  
 boss-NOM C-GEN/-ACC gullet-ACC cut-PST-DC  
 Idiomatic meaning: ‘The boss fired Chelswu.’
- b. *Chelswu-uy/-ka papcwul-i sacang-ey uyhay*  
 C-GEN/-NOM gullet-NOM boss-by  
*kkunh-**ki(-e ci)**-ess-ta.* (idiomatic)  
 cut-PASS-PST-DC  
 Idiomatic meaning: ‘Chelswu got fired by the boss.’
- c. *Chelswu-ka sacang-ey uyhay papcwul-ul*  
 C-NOM boss-by gullet-ACC  
*kkunh-**ki(\*-e ci)**-ess-ta.*<sup>4</sup> (idiomatic)  
 cut-PASS-PST-DC  
 Idiomatic meaning: ‘Chelswu got fired by the boss.’

1 For further detail on this issue, refer to section 4.

2 In both English and Hebrew, phrasal idioms can be shared between root-alternants in the active and passive forms (Horvath and Siloni 2017; Siloni et al. 2017). For example, the English verbal passives such as *the beans were spilled* share their idiomatic meanings with their corresponding transitives such as *spill the beans* which show cross-linguistic similarities with the Korean examples in (1).

3 The term *papcwul* whose literal meaning is ‘line of steamed rice’ does not exist in actuality.

4 The passive verbal ending (*a/e ci*) cannot appear in (1c), as will be discussed in section 4.

Additionally, the idiomatic interpretation in (2a), which is in its active voice, is left unharmed when the sentence is put into its inherent passive verb construction producing a null passive morpheme, as shown in (2c).<sup>5</sup> Here, we additionally refer to such construction as the suppletive passive construction.

- (2) a. halmeni-kkeyse      halapeci-uy/-lul      twythongswu-lul  
 grandmother-HON grandfather-GEN/-ACC back of the head-ACC  
 ttayli-si-ess-ta. (idiomatic)  
 hit-HON-PST-DC  
 Literal meaning: ‘Grandmother hit the back of Grandfather’s head.’  
 Idiomatic meaning: ‘Grandmother betrayed Grandfather.’
- b. \*halapeci-uy/-kkeyse      twythongswu-ka      halmeni-ey uyhay  
 grandfather-GEN/-HON back of the head-NOM grandmother-by  
 mac- $\emptyset$ <sub>PASS</sub>-usi-ess-ta.<sup>6</sup> (idiomatic)  
 be.hit- $\emptyset$ -HON-PST-DC  
 Idiomatic meaning: ‘Grandfather was betrayed by Grandmother.’
- c. halapeci-kkeyse      halmeni-ey uyhay twythongswu-lul  
 grandfather-HON grandmother-by      back of the head-ACC  
 mac- $\emptyset$ <sub>PASS</sub>(/\*-ki/\*-e ci)-usi-ess-ta. (idiomatic)  
 be.hit-PASS-HON-PST-DC  
 Literal meaning: ‘The back of Grandfather’s head was hit by Grandmother.’  
 Idiomatic meaning: ‘Grandfather was betrayed by Grandmother.’  
 ( $\emptyset$ <sub>PASS</sub> = null passive morpheme)

Meanwhile, the idiomatic meaning in (3b) is not preserved but rather triggered by the passive markers such as *i/hi/li/ki* or *(a/e) ci*, which draws a dissimilar pattern from (1c) and (2c).<sup>7</sup> What is crucial here is that idiomatic interpretations can be

5 There exist some verbs with inherent passive meanings such as *mac* ‘get struck’, *ip* ‘suffer, undergo’, *tangha* ‘suffer, be afflicted with’, and *pat* ‘receive’ whose subject has the semantic role of a patient, not that of an agent (Chang 1996). Refer to Lee and Lee (2017c) for the suppletive verb *mac* ‘get struck’. These inherent passive verbs may be referred to as lexical passive verbs (Kim 2016). In this view, an inherent passive verb has a null passive morpheme (i.e.,  $\emptyset$ <sub>PASS</sub>) and *mek* ‘eat’ may also appear as an inherent passive verb (Lee and Lee 2017b).

6 The literal meaning of (2b) is marginal at best.

preserved or triggered by the passive markers such as  $\emptyset_{\text{PASS}}$ , *i/hi/li/ki*, or *(a/e) ci* on Chomsky's (2001) phase head *v*, which creates an idiomatic domain, as shown in the idioms of the verbal passives in (1b, c), (2c), and (3b).<sup>8</sup>

- (3) a. halmeni-kkeyse      halapeci-uy/\*-lul      philim-ul  
 grandmother-HON grandfather-GEN/\*-ACC film-ACC  
 kkunh-usi-ess-ta. (literal)  
 cut-HON-PST-DC  
 Literal meaning: 'Grandmother cut grandfather's (camera) film.'
- b. kwaum-ulo halapeci-uy/-kkeyse      philim-i  
 excessive drinking-with grandfather-GEN/-HON film-NOM  
 kkunh-ki/-e ci-si-ess-ta. (idiomatic)  
 cut-PASS-HON-PST-DC  
 Idiomatic meaning: 'Grandfather did not remember what happened to him due to his excessive drinking.'

The passive counterpart of (3a) permits the multiple nominative construction (MNC), triggering an idiomatic interpretation with the presence of a passive marker

7 In regards to endowing a conceptual term, the null passive morpheme  $\emptyset_{\text{PASS}}$ , the overt passive morpheme *i/hi/li/ki*, and the passive verbal ending *(a/e) ci* are referred to as passive markers here.

8 It has also been well known in literature (Marantz 2008, Park 2012, Stone 2008, 2013; K. Kim 2015; Lee and Lee 2017a, among others) that the phase head *v* forming an idiom creates an idiomatic domain. Unlike in English and Hebrew where a verbal passive phrasal idiom necessarily shares an idiomatic meaning with its corresponding transitive (Horvath and Siloni 2009, 2017), there are some verbal passive phrasal idioms in Korean which cannot hold onto their active idiomatic counterparts, as shown in (3). This shows more clearly that the verbal passive is a post-lexical output (i.e., derived in syntax). This is also what the example in (ia) shows. Similar to the morpheme *ki/e ci* in (3b), *hi* in (ia) is the passive marker triggering an idiomatic interpretation.

- (i) a. ki-ka      mak-hi-ta (idiomatic)  
 energy-NOM stop-PASS-DC  
 'to be much stifled.'
- b. ki-lul mak-ta (\*idiomatic)  
 energy stop-DC  
 'to stop energy.' (H. Kim 2005:14)

To be more concrete, if the passive marker in (3b) and (ia) is missing, the idiomatic interpretation fails to be conveyed.

such as *ki* or *(a/e) ci*, as shown in (3b).<sup>9</sup> Here, the component *philim* ‘film’ giving rise to an idiomatic interpretation refers to the meaning ‘remembrance’, which is considered to be inalienable, as will be discussed with greater detail in section 4. Unlike Hovarth and Siloni’s (2009) argument that the idioms in the verbal passive always share idiomatic meanings with their transitive counterparts, we will suggest that the idiomatic availability of passivization for the non-idiomatic transitive in Korean may rely on whether the passive marker belongs to the idiomatic interpretation or not. In (3b), the possessor raising process of *halapeci-kkeyse* ‘grandfather-HON’ involves adjoining the raised nominative possessor to a higher spec-TP position while the lower spec-TP position is occupied by the possessum *philim-i* ‘film-NOM’. Furthermore, the higher copy of the honorific genitive possessor is present but unpronounced while the chain is realized by the lower copy within the possessum phrase (cf. Han and Kim 2004; Choi and Harley 2016). In this regard, the higher copy is licensed by the honorific feature [+hon] on T through the spec-head agreement à la Chomsky’s (1993) approach.

To summarize, the objectives of this paper are six-fold. First, it will be shown that when the first nominal of a DP receives a genitive case marker instead of an accusative or a nominative case marker in an inalienable possessive structure, the given sentence may preserve its idiomatic interpretation (cf. Choi and Harley 2016). Second, we will show that the multiple nominative marking process which involves adjoining the raised nominative possessor to TP where the possessum is situated in the subject position may arise at LF (cf. Choi and Harley 2016). This, in turn, will essentially indicate that an inalienable possessive structure can preserve its idiomatic interpretation even after MNC passivization (i.e., MNC verbal passives such as (1b)) takes place and can license the subject-honorific marker *si* through the spec-head agreement in Korean honorification. Third, we will demonstrate that when passivization takes place, the genuine inalienable possession-type constructions allow their possessor to be realized as the nominative subject on its own, leaving the accusative-marked possessum in-situ, which clearly depicts a different pattern from the kinship-type constructions. Fourth, it will be shown that such a construction is not compatible with *(a/e) ci* passivization, but with (null) morphological passivization, as the distinction can be made through agentivity. Fifth, as far as the

---

9 Note that *kkeyse* is an honorific nominative marker.

passivization of the inalienable possessor-possessum structure is concerned, we will argue that the degree of passivity varies among passive morphemes, since *(a/e) ci* displays the strongest type of passivity while *i/hi/li/ki* and  $\emptyset_{\text{PASS}}$  respectively come next in line of order. Finally, we will argue that the null passive morpheme  $\emptyset_{\text{PASS}}$  should be considered as a quasi-passive morpheme since it cannot be compatible with the nominative possessum when passivization occurs.

## 2. Previous Researches of Idioms in the Verbal Passives

Nunberg et al. (1994) argue that not all verbal idioms are alike and that they can essentially be classified into two distinct types: Idiomatically Combining Expressions (ICEs) and Idiomatic Phrases (IdPs) (see also Nunberg 1978; Wasow et al. 1984; Gazdar et al. 1985; Fillmore et al. 1988; Ruwet 1991). These two sub-classes of idioms are distinguished along three lines: conventionality, opacity, and compositionality. Conventionality refers to the discrepancy between the figurative reading and the predicted literal meaning of the expression. Opacity (vs. transparency) refers to the ease with which the motivation for the use of a particular idiomatic interpretation can be recovered. IdPs are typically highly conventionalized and opaque, whereas ICEs are less conventionalized and more transparent. The most important distinction between IdPs and ICEs, however, is compositionality, which refers to the degree to which the phrasal meaning can be analyzed in terms of the contributions of the sub-parts of the expression. ICEs are more compositional than IdPs. To give a concrete example, compare the ICE *spill the beans*, which means ‘divulge a secret’, with the IdP *kick the bucket*, which means ‘to die’. The ICE *spill the beans* is more compositional than the IdP *kick the bucket* in that the individual components of the literal expression can be directly mapped onto individual elements of the figurative reading. That is, the lexical verb *spill* in the idiomatic interpretation directly corresponds to the lexical verb *divulge* in the figurative interpretation, and the direct object *the beans* is straightforwardly mapped onto the direct object ‘the secret’. In regards to IdPs, however, the expression as a whole is mapped onto the figurative reading. In the case of *kick the bucket*, for instance, neither *kick* nor *the bucket* can be uniquely mapped onto the idiomatic reading. Instead, the entire phrase must be mapped onto the lexical verb *die*.<sup>10</sup>

Wasow et al. (1984), Fillmore et al. (1988) and Nunberg et al. (1994) note that

the distinction between IdPs and ICEs correlates with certain syntactic properties which these idioms exhibit, namely the extent to which they can be syntactically manipulated. In other words, if an ICE is syntactically transformed through operations such as passivization, the idiomatic interpretation remains intact, as shown in (4a). If an IdP, on the other hand, undergoes passivization, the idiomatic reading is lost altogether and only the literal interpretation remains, as shown in (4b).<sup>11</sup> This is what the contrast between (5b) and (6b) also shows.

- (4) a. The beans were spilled (by Bob). (ICE: Passivisation)  
b. #The bucket was kicked (by Bob). (IdP: No passivisation)
- (5) a. Yenghi-ka Chelswu-uy/lul palmok-ul cap-ass-ta. (ambiguous)  
Y-NOM C-GEN/ACC ankle-ACC catch-PST-DC  
Literal meaning: 'Yenghi caught Chelswu's ankle.'  
Idiomatic meaning: 'Yenghi put a strain on Chelswu's ambition.'

10 Whether the individual components of a literal expression in Korean is directly mapped onto the individual elements of a figurative reading is not a major concern here. Instead, the main focus of this work is figuring out whether the verbal idioms in Korean can undergo verbal passivization or not. This will be shown through the contrast between English verbal passives such as (4).

11 # indicates the loss of an idiomatic interpretation. In English, ICEs can undergo topicalization and adjectival modification as in (i), whereas IdPs cannot as in (ii).

- (i) a. The beans, Bob has most certainly spilled. (ICE: Topicalisation)  
b. Bob spilled the juicy beans. (ICE: Modification)
- (ii) a. #The bucket, Bob has gone and kicked. (IdP: No topicalisation)  
b. #Bob kicked the rusty bucket. (IdP: No modification)

However, idioms in Korean cannot be compatible with adjectival modification, regardless of whether they are an IdP or ICE. We further need to note that in Korean, unlike IdPs, ICEs may undergo movement (or topicalization).

- (iii) a. Chelswu-uy palmok-ul Yenghi-ka cap-ass-ta.  
C-GEN ankle-ACC Y-NOM catch-PST-DC  
Literal meaning: 'Yenghi caught Chelswu's ankle.'  
Idiomatic meaning: 'Yenghi put a strain on Chelswu's ambition.'
- b. son-ul Chelswu-ka ssiss-ess-ta.  
hand-ACC C-NOM wash-PST-DC  
Literal meaning: 'Chelswu washed his hands.'  
?\*Idiomatic meaning: 'Chelswu quit something bad.'

For expository purposes, we only focus on ICEs in their verbal passives such as the one shown in (5b).

- b. Chelswu-ka palmok-i Yenghi-ey uyhay cap-hi-ess-ta. (ambiguous)

C-NOM ankle-N Y-by catch-PASS-PST-DC

Literal meaning: 'Chelswu's ankle was caught by Yenghi.

Idiomatic meaning: 'Chelswu's ambition was put on a strain by Yenghi.

- (6) a. Chelswu-ka son-ul ssiss-ess-ta.<sup>12</sup> (ambiguous)

C-NOM hand-ACC wash-PST-DC

Literal meaning: 'Chelswu washed his hands.

Idiomatic meaning: 'Chelswu quit something bad.'

- b. Chelswu-ka son-i ssiss-ki-ess-ta. (literal)

C-NOM hand-NOM wash-PASS-PST-DC

Literal meaning: 'Chelswu's hands were washed.

\*Idiomatic meaning: 'Chelswu was forced to quit something bad.'

An idiom in the verbal passive derived from its transitive verbal idiom as in (4a) is formed after and beyond the lexicon (Baker et al. 1989; Collins 2005; Horvath and Siloni 2008; Meltzer-Asscher 2012, among others). That is, the so-called verbal passives are derived within syntax instead of the lexicon.

In fact, the idioms in the English verbal passive which are shown in (4a) can only be generated via passivization. In this sense, they always share idiomatic interpretations with their corresponding transitives. The first quantitative examination of these observations is reported by Hovarth and Siloni (2009), who present a survey of Hebrew idioms designated to examine their distribution across diatheses. Hovarth and Siloni (2009) surveyed Hebrew verbal idioms inspired by those existing in French, which is revived in Horvath and Siloni (2017) and Siloni et al. (2017). By means of further facilitating the understanding of such cases, English idioms are exemplified for verification as well.

In terms of additional cross-linguistic analysis, however, we take the example in (5b) to be the idiom of a verbal passive in Korean and show that unlike Hovarth and Siloni's (2009) argument, the triggering of idiomatic interpretations through the passivization of non-idiomatic transitives in Korean may depend on whether their passive markers belong

12 Idioms such as *os-ul pes* 'clothes-ACC take off' meaning 'retire from the (government) post', *son-ul kkunh* 'hands-ACC cut' meaning 'quit something bad', *kwuy-lul mak* 'ear-ACC close' meaning 'ignore' or *mwun-ul kam* 'eye-ACC close' meaning 'overlook one's mistake' cannot be syntactically transformed into passives while holding onto their idiomatic interpretations at the same time. Therefore, we can say that, similar to (6a), they are not ICEs.

to the idiomatic domain or not.<sup>13</sup> In other words, the idioms in Korean verbal passives do not necessarily share their idiomatic meanings with their corresponding transitives, which clearly demonstrates that such idiomatic verbal passives are derived compositionally within syntax.

### 3. Inalienable Possessive Constructions and Idiomatic Interpretations

It is well known in literature (Kang 1987; J.-Y. Yoon 1989; Ura 1996; Yun 2004; Choi and Harley 2016, among many others) that Korean undergoes the process of possessor raising, which may give rise to multiple nominative constructions (MNCs). Kim, Sells, and Yang (2007) observe that in examples such as (7a), the two consecutive nominative nominals in an MNC possessive construction may convey an idiomatic reading, which is attested by the alternation of the genitive marker on the first nominative nominal. Additionally, Choi and Harley (2016) point out that when the first nominal receives a genitive marker instead of a nominative marker within a given context, it can also receive an idiomatic interpretation as in (7b).<sup>14</sup>

- (7) a. John-uy/-i            pal-i            nelp-ta. (ambiguous)  
       John-GEN/-NOM feet-NOM wide-DC  
       Literal meaning: ‘John’s foot is wide.’  
       Idiomatic meaning: ‘John has a lot of connections with other people.’
- b. John-uy    pal-i(-un)            epkye-eyse            cengmal  
       John-GEN feet-NOM(-TOP) business.world-in really  
       nelp-ta. (idiomatic)  
       wide-DC  
       Idiomatic meaning: ‘John really has a lot of connections with other people in the business world.’

13 This is not in line with Kim’s (2015) argument in the sense that the idioms of verbal passives in Korean may be triggered by the passive marker from the non-idiomatic transitives. Kim (2015) argues that the variable behavior availability of passivization for idioms may depend on whether the phase Voice head can belong to the idiomatic interpretation or not.

14 In a possessive relation, *-uy* may simply be dealt with a morphological marker of nominal modification, which indicates possessive relations (cf. An 2015; Choi and Harley 2016). However, whether it is categorized as a case marker is not a major concern to be dealt here.

We further observe that the genitive marker in Korean may undergo case alternation with the accusative marker of the first nominal, which is the possessor of the second nominal when it comes to the possessor-possessum relation.<sup>15</sup> Interestingly, even after case alternation, the preservation of the idiomatic interpretation is possible. Consider the contrast between the following data provided below:

- (8) a. Yenghi-ka Chelswu-uy/lul palmok-ul cap-ass-ta. (5a) (ambiguous)  
 Y-NOM C-GEN/ACC ankle-ACC catch-PST-DC  
 Literal meaning: ‘Yenghi caught Chelswu’s ankle.’  
 Idiomatic meaning: ‘Yenghi put a strain on Chelswu’s ambition.’  
 b. halmeni-kkeyse halapeci-uy/\*-lul philim-ul  
 grandmother-HON grandfather-GEN/\*-ACC film-ACC  
 kkunh-usi-ess-ta. (3a) (literal)  
 cut-HON-PST-DC  
 Literal meaning: ‘Grandmother cut grandfather’s film.’

It has been well known in literature (Ura 1996; Cho 2000; and Ahn & Cho 2013; Lee 2017a, among others) that there are two types of MCM constructions in Korean. One is the multiple accusative construction (MAC) and the other is the MNC.<sup>16</sup> Generally, MCMs are classified into inalienable possession-type (i.e., body part-type) constructions, kinship-type constructions, macro-micro-type constructions, and floating quantifier-type constructions. For the sake of convenience, the four types of constructions mentioned above are shown in the order of (8a) and (9a, b, c).<sup>17</sup> The kinship-type MACs may be

15 Note that idiomatic interpretations seem to be available only when the possessor is a human being and when the possessum is an inalienable object as it is shown in (i).

(i) halmeni-kkeyse (a)thokki/(b)halapeci-uy(/-lul) kkoli-lul cap-usi-ess-ta.  
 grandmother-HON (a)rabbit/(b)grandfather-GEN(/-ACC) tail-ACC catch-HON-PST-DC  
 a. Literal meaning: ‘Grandmother caught a rabbit’s tail.’  
 b. Idiomatic meaning: ‘Grandmother found out grandfather’s secret.’

The example in (ib) can be passivized, preserving an idiomatic interpretation, as will be shown in (26b).

16 The accusative possessor is situated in the specifier position of D whose maximal projection occupies the verbal complement position. The accusative possessor showing discourse effects undergoes movement to the specifier position of *v* (cf. Ura 1996; Cho 2000; Lee 2015), which is not a main concern here.

17 The causative construction or the so-called benefactive suffix (*a/e*) *cwu* construction also allow

categorized as a subtype of inalienable possession-type MACs. However, the kinship-type MACs cannot leave its accusative possessum in-situ when passivization is required. This will be shown in (13b). Unlike the possessors of alienable possessums, the possessors of inalienable possessums can be extracted out of their original domain (i.e., Possessor Raising) (cf. Alexiadou 2003; Lin 2007).<sup>18</sup> As for now, we consider the idiomatic example in (10) as the inalienable possession-type MAC where the genitive case-marker of a nominal may undergo case alternation with the accusative. That is, the idiomatic component *cwumeni* ‘money (only in an idiomatic sense)’ can be realized as an inalienable possessum similar to how *sinsang* ‘personal matters or details’ is realized as an inalienable part of a human being, which will be shown in section 4. As for now, we focus on the inalienable possessive examples such as (8a) and the idiomatic example in (10).

- (9) a. Chelswu-ka Yenghi-uy/-lul ye-tongsayng-ul  
         C-NOM   Y-GEN/-ACC   female-younger sister-ACC  
         cha-ss-ta.<sup>19</sup>  
         kick-PST-DC  
         Literal meaning: ‘Chelswu kicked Yenghi’s younger sister.’  
         Idiomatic meaning: ‘Chelswu dumped Yenghi’s younger sister.’  
     b. Chelswu-ka paci-lul phalan sayk-ul phal-ass-ta.  
         C-NOM   pants-ACC blue   color-ACC sell-PST-DC  
         ‘Chelswu sold blue pants.’

---

ACC-ACC sequences. That is, these constructions allow the accusative causee or indirect object to appear, which is quite dissimilar from the inalienable possessive constructions. Other types of MAC are as follows.

- (i) a. Object and Accusative Marked Adverb  
         Chelswu-ka chayk-lul sey sikan/pen-ul ilk-ess-ta.  
         C-NOM   book-ACC three hour/time-ACC read-PST-DECL  
         ‘Chelswu read a book for three hours/three times.’  
     b. Topic-Comment  
         Chelswu-ka kwail-ul sakwa-lul cohaha-n-ta.  
         C-NOM   fruit-ACC apple-ACC like-PRES-DC  
         ‘As for fruit, Chelswu likes an apple.’

18 Alexiadou (2003) and Lin (2007) argue that inalienable possessums subcategorize for a possessor argument. Extending on their argument, Harwood et al. (2016) further suggest that the NP of an inalienably possessed noun (forming an idiom here) does not constitute a DP-phase (Chomsky 2007) which is not referential in the discourse,

19 The kinship-type MACs such as (9a) are not as grammatical or acceptable as the body type MACs (Lee 2014).

- c. *sensayngnim-kkeyse haksayng-tul-ul sey-myeng-ul*  
 teacher-HON student-PL-ACC three-CL-ACC  
*pinanha-si-ess-ta.*  
 criticize-HON-PST.  
 ‘A teacher criticized three students.’

- (10) *somaychiki-ka Chelswu-uy/-lul cwumeni-lul thel-ess-ta.*  
 pickpocket-NOM C-GEN/-ACC pocket-ACC dust-PST-DC  
 Literal meaning: ‘A pickpocket dusted Chelswu’s pocket.’ (?\*MAC)  
 Idiomatic meaning: ‘A pickpocket stole Chelswu’s money.’

At this point, it is interesting to note that the inalienable possession constructions such as (8a), (10), and (9a) may undergo passivization leaving their idiomatic interpretations unharmed. The morphological passivizations of the examples in (7a), (10), and (9a) are as follows:<sup>20</sup>

- (11) a. *Chelswu-ka palmok-i Yenghi-ey uyhay cap-hi-ess-ta.* (5b)  
 C-NOM ankle-NOM Y-by catch-PASS-PST-DC  
 Literal meaning: ‘Chelswu’s ankle was caught by Yenghi.’  
 Idiomatic meaning: ‘Chelswu was stuck with Yenghi.’  
 b. *Chelswu-ka Yenghi-ey uyhay palmok-ul cap-hi-ess-ta.*  
 C-NOM Y-by ankle-ACC catch-PASS-PST-DC  
 Literal meaning: ‘Chelswu’s ankle was caught by Yenghi.’  
 Idiomatic meaning: ‘Chelswu was stuck with Yenghi.’
- (12) a. *Chelswu-uy cwumeni-ka emma/somaychiki-ey uyhay*  
 C-GEN pocket-NOM mother/pickpocket-by  
*thel-i-ess-ta.*  
 dust-PASS-PST-DC  
 Literal meaning: ‘Chelswu’s pocket was dusted by Mother.’  
 Idiomatic meaning: ‘Chelswu was robbed by a pickpocket.’

<sup>20</sup> To present a quantitative analysis of the instances retrieved as idiomatic verbal passives such as the ones shown in (12a, b) is a matter of our further research (cf. Song 2015).

- b. Chelswu-ka cwumeni-ka somaychiki-ey uyhay thel-i-ess-ta.  
 C-NOM pocket-NOM pickpocket-by dust-PASS-PST-DC  
 (?)/?Literal meaning: 'Chelswu's pocket was dusted by a pickpocket.'  
 Idiomatic meaning: 'Chelswu was robbed by a pickpocket.'
- c. Chelswu-ka somaychiki-ey uyhay cwumeni-lul thel-i-ess-ta.  
 C-NOM pickpocket-by pocket-ACC dust-PASS-PST-DC  
 ?Literal meaning: 'Chelswu's pocket was dusted by a pickpocket.'  
 Idiomatic meaning: 'Chelswu was robbed by a pickpocket.'
- (13) a. Yenghi-uy/(?)-ka ye-tongsayng-i Chelswu-ey uyhay cha-i-ess-ta.<sup>21</sup>  
 Y-GEN/(?)-NOM female-younger sister-NOM C-by kick-PASS-PST-DC  
 Literal meaning: 'Yenghi's younger sister was kicked by Chelswu.'  
 Idiomatic meaning: 'Yenghi's younger sister got dumped by Chelswu.'
- b. \*Yenghi-ka Chelswu-ey uyhay ye-tongsayng-ul  
 Y-NOM C-by female-younger sister-ACC  
 cha-i-ess-ta.  
 kick-PASS-PST-DC  
 Literal meaning: 'Yenghi's younger sister was kicked by Chelswu.'  
 Idiomatic meaning: 'Yenghi's younger sister got dumped by Chelswu.'

21 Unlike the stative verb constructions (i.e., individual-level predicate) in (ia), the kinship-type MNC in its morphological passive voice holding onto an active verb (i.e., stage-level predicate) may be somewhat awkward as in (13a). Refer to Diesing (1992) for the individual/stage-level predicate distinction.

- (i) a. Yenghi-uy/-ka ye-tongsayng-i yeppu-ta.  
 Y-GEN/-NOM female-younger sister-NOM pretty-DC  
 'Yenghi's younger sister is pretty.'
- b. Yenghi-uy/?\*-ka ye-tongsayng-i Chelswu-ey uyhay mac- $\emptyset$  PASS-ass-ta.  
 Y-GEN/?\*-NOM female-younger sister-NOM C-by be.hit- $\emptyset$ -PST-DC  
 'Yenghi's younger sister was hit by Chelswu.'
- c. Yenghi-uy/-ka palmok-i Chelswu-ey uyhay cha-i/\*mac- $\emptyset$  PASS-ess-ta.  
 Y-GEN/-NOM ankle-NOM C-by kick-PASS/be.hit- $\emptyset$ -PST-DC  
 'Yenghi's ankle was kicked by Chelswu.'

The kinship-type MNC in the inherent passive construction like (ib) is more marginal than that in the overt morphological passive construction like (13a). The distinction seems to arise from the phenomenon that null passive morphemes are more agentivity-oriented than overt passive morphemes, as will be shown in this section. Note that while the morphological passive verb may or may not take an agentive subject, the inherent passive verb may only take an agentive subject, as the contrast between (ib) and (ic) shows.

Here, it is crucial to understand that idiomatic meanings may be preserved or triggered by morphological passivization, as shown in (11), (12) and (3b). Additionally, the genuine inalienable possession-type constructions such as the one shown in (8a) and the idiomatic expression conveyed in (10) illustrate that a possessor can independently be realized as the nominative subject, leaving the accusative-marked possessum in-situ as in (11b) and (12c). Meanwhile, the kinship-type constructions do not allow such type of passivization to take place. This is shown in (13b). Hence, the kinship-type constructions show a different pattern from the genuine inalienable possession-type constructions which will be verified once again in (16).

Furthermore, the nominal bearing a genitive case (i.e., *Chelswu-uy* 'C-GEN') in (14a) does not undergo case alternation with the accusative case. In fact, this is why the possessor cannot be passivized into (14d). Interestingly, however, when *cwumeni* 'pocket' and *papcwul* 'gullet' appear as a part of an idiom within the phrases *cwumeni(-lul) thel* 'pocket(-ACC) dust' and *papcwul(-ul) kkunh* 'gullet(-ACC) cut', which respectively mean 'to steal one's money' and 'to take the bread out of one's mouth', they are regarded as an inalienable possessum which is considered as a part of a human, mainly because they are recognized as concepts that are directly related to personal matters such as personal belongings and means of living. To add further clarification to the issue at hand, note that *kwunpok/cwumeni* 'military uniform'/'pocket' is an alienable possessum which cannot induce its possessor to undergo the process of nominative possessor-raising from (14b) to (14c).<sup>22</sup>

- (14) a. somaychiki-ka    Chelswu-uy/?\*-lul    kwunpok/cwumeni-lul  
          pickpocket-NOM   C-GEN/-?\*ACC    military uniform/pocket-ACC  
          ccic-ess-ta.  
          tear-PST-DC  
          'A pickpocket tore Chelswu's military uniform/pocket.'
- b. Chelswu-uy kwunpok/cwumeni-ka                    somaychiki-ey uyhay  
          C-GEN        military uniform/pocket-NOM pickpocket-by  
          ccic-ki-ess-ta.  
          tear-PASS-PST-DC  
          'Chelswu's military uniform/pocket was torn by a pickpocket.'

<sup>22</sup> Case alternation to MACs seems to be more restrictive than case alternation to MNCs, which is not a major concern of this study.

- c. (?)Chelswu-ka kwunpok/cwumeni-ka somaychiki-ey uyhay  
 C-NOM military uniform/pocket-NOM pickpocket-by  
 ccic-ki-ess-ta.  
 tear-PASS-PST-DC  
 ‘Chelswu’s military uniform/pocket was torn by a pickpocket.’
- d. ?\*Chelswu-ka somaychiki-ey uyhay kwunpok/cwumeni-lul  
 C-NOM pickpocket-by military uniform/pocket-ACC  
 ccic-ki-ess-ta.  
 tear-PASS-PST-DC  
 ‘Chelswu’s military uniform/pocket was torn by a pickpocket.’

The observation above provides a reasonable explanation on why the examples in (12b, c) can only be interpreted idiomatically. For further clarification, let’s look anew at the MAC of (10), repeated in (15).

- (15) somaychiki-ka Chelswu-lul cwumeni-lul thel-ess-ta. (idiomatic)  
 pickpocket-NOM C-ACC/GEN pocket-ACC dust-PST-DC  
 ?\*Literal meaning: ‘A pickpocket dusted Chelswu’s pocket.’  
 Idiomatic meaning: ‘A pickpocket stole Chelswu’s money.’

The genitive marker on the possessor *Chelswu* in (10) cannot undergo case alternation with the accusative marker since the possessum is not an inalienable matter within its literal context. Thus, the possessor cannot undergo movement to the subject position when passivization is required. In fact, this provides the reason why the literal meaning of (12c) may be awkward. Note that when the possessum is alienable, the possessor’s alternation with the accusative marker is not available.

At this point, we may wonder why the passivized example in (13b) is not grammatical even though its active counterpart in (9a) seems to accept MAC. As aforementioned, it is because the accusative nominal *ye-tongsayng-ul* ‘female-younger sister-ACC’ is not a genuine inalienable possessum. The contrast between (13b) and (16) provides verification to the issue at hand.

- (16) Yenghi-ka Chelswu-ey uyhay palmok-ul cha-i-ess-ta.  
 Y-NOM C-by ankle-ACC kick-PASS-PST-DC  
 ‘Yenghi’s ankle was kicked by Chelswu.’

In this section, we suggested that the possessor in the genuine inalienable possession-type MAC construction is realized as the nominative subject. In doing so, we argue that the nominative subject leaves its accusative-marked possessum behind when passivization demanding the presence of a (null) passive morpheme takes place. In the following section, it will also be demonstrated that *(a/e) ci* passivization does not allow the accusative possessum to move out of its position due to its absence of agentivity.

#### 4. Idiomatic (Null) Passive Morphemes

It has been well known in literature (H. Kim 2005; Park 2012; Lee and Lee 2017a, among others) that a passive morpheme may be part of an idiom as in (17b). As previously mentioned, if the passive morpheme is dropped, the idiomatic interpretation disappears, as shown in (17a).

- (17) a. ki-lul            mak-ta. (literal)  
           energy-ACC stop-DC  
           ‘to stop energy.’
- b. sako        hyencang-eyse    Chelswu-nun nemwu ki-ka  
           accident scene-in            C-TOP        too        energy-NOM  
           mak-hi-ese            mal-i  
           stop-PASS-because word-NOM  
           an    nawa-ss-ta. (idiomatic) (hi = idiomatic passive morpheme)  
           not come out-PST-DC  
           ‘Chelswu was at a loss for words because he was much too stifled  
           at the scene of the accident.’ (cf. H. Kim 2005:14)

Having this in mind, let’s consider the so-called inalienable possessive structure where the possessor-possessum relation emerges. The inalienable possessive structures in (18a) and (19a) may generate MCM constructions as in (18b) and (19b). The idiomatic meaning may be triggered by the passive morpheme when the inalienable possessor-possessum structure undergoes morphological passivization as in (19a, b).<sup>23</sup>

- (18) a. halmeni-kkeyse    halapeci-uy    kwuy-lul ttwulh-usi-ess-ta. (literal)  
 grandmother-HON grandfather-GEN ear-ACC pierce-HON-PST-DC  
 Literal meaning: 'Grandmother pierced grandfather's ear.'
- b. halmeni-kkeyse    halapeci-lul    kwuy-lul ttwulh-usi-ess-ta. (literal)  
 grandmother-HON grandfather-GEN ear-ACC pierce-HON-PST-DC  
 Literal meaning: 'Grandmother pierced grandfather's ear.'
- (19) a. halapeci-uy    kwuy-ka    halmeni-ey uyhay  
 grandfather-GEN ear-NOM grandmother-by  
 ttwulh-li(/\*-e ci) - si-ess-ta. (literal/idiomatic)  
 pierce-PASS-HON-PST-DC  
 Literal meaning: 'Grandfather's ear was pierced by Grandmother.'  
 Idiomatic meaning: 'Grandfather made a tremendous progress in learning a language by Grandmother's teaching.'
- b. halapeci-kkeyse    kwuy-ka    halmeni-ey uyhay ttwulh-li(/\*-e ci) -  
 grandfather-HON ear-NOM grandmother-by  
 si-ess-ta. (literal/idiomatic)  
 pierce-PASS-HON-PST-DC  
 Literal meaning: 'Grandfather's ear was pierced by Grandmother.'  
 Idiomatic meaning: 'Grandfather made a tremendous progress in learning a language by Grandmother's teaching.'
- c. halapeci-kkeyse    halmeni-ey uyhay kwuy-lul  
 grandfather-HON grandmother-by ear-ACC  
 ttwulh-li(/\*-e ci)-si-ess-ta. (literal)  
 pierce-PASS-HON-PST-DC  
 Literal meaning: 'Grandfather's ear was pierced by Grandmother.'

---

23 The noun+verb form *kwuy-lul ttwulh* 'ear-ACC pierce' meaning 'make someone understand something' may be idiomatic in the context of (i).

- (i) i    yenge tutki    kyocay-ka na-uy kwuy-lul ttwulh-ess-ta. (idiomatic)  
 this English listening text-NOM I-GEN ear-ACC pierce-PST-DC  
 Idiomatic meaning: 'This English listening text made me understand English colloquial speech.'

However, the transitive counterpart of the idiom in the verbal passive in (19b) has only the literal meaning, as shown in (18a). This, in turn, demonstrates that the idiomatic meaning of the verbal passive in (19b) is triggered by the passive marker.

As it is illustrated above, the passive markers may not allow accusative possessums but nominative possessums to be a part of a given idiomatic interpretation, which is what the contrast between (19a, b) and (19c) shows. Crucially, note that *triggering* is different from *preserving* of idiomatic interpretations here. In order to comprehend such concepts in further detail, we need to note that the examples in (21a, b) can only convey idiomatic meanings, while the example in (20a) may only convey a literal interpretation.

- (20) a. halmeni-kkeyse      halapeci-uy      philim-ul  
 grandmother-HON    grandfather-GEN    film-ACC  
 kkunh-usi-ess-ta. (3a) (literal)  
 cut-HON-PST-DC  
 Literal meaning: 'Grandmother cut grandfather's (camera) film.'
- b. \*halmeni-kkeyse      halapeci-lul      philim-ul  
 grandmother-HON    grandfather-ACC    film-ACC  
 kkunh-usi-ess-ta. (3a)  
 cut-HON-PST-DC  
 'Grandmother cut grandfather's (camera) film.'
- (21) a. kwaum-ulo                      halapeci-uy      philim-i  
 excessive    drinking-with grandfather-GEN    film-NOM  
 kkunh-ki/-e **ci** - si-ess-ta. (cf. 3b) (idiomatic)  
 cut-PASS-HON-PST-DC  
 \*Literal meaning: 'Grandfather's (camera) film was cut due to his excessive drinking.'  
 Idiomatic meaning: 'Grandfather did not remember what happened to him due to his excessive drinking.'
- b. kwaum-ulo                      halapeci-kkeyse      philim-i  
 excessive    drinking-with grandfather-HON    film-NOM  
 kkunh-**ki/-e ci** - si-ess-ta. (idiomatic)  
 cut-PASS-HON-PST-DC (cf. 3b)  
 \*Literal meaning: 'Grandfather's (camera) film was cut due to his excessive drinking.'  
 Idiomatic meaning: 'Grandfather did not remember what happened to him due to his excessive drinking.'

- c. *halapeci-kkeyse philim-lul*  
 grandfather-HON film-ACC  
*kkunh(?)?-ki/\*-e ci-si-ess-ta. ((?)?literal/\*idiomatic)*  
 cut-PASS-HON-PST-DC  
 (??)Literal meaning: ‘Grandfather’s film was cut by Grandmother.’  
 \*Idiomatic meaning: ‘Grandfather did not remember what happened to him’

Unlike (22a), (20a) displays the nominal with the genitive case (i.e., *halapeci-uy* ‘grandfather-GEN’) which cannot undergo case alternation with the accusative as in (20b) since *philim* ‘film’ is not an inalienable possessum. This, in turn, obscures the grammaticality of the literal meaning for the morphological passive in (21c). Going a step further, we realize that (*a/e*) *ci* passivization does not allow the accusative possessum to be in-situ, as shown in (21c) and (22c). Meanwhile, the nominal *papcwul* ‘gullet’ which participates in making up the idiomatic interpretation shown in (22) is regarded as an inalienable possessum. Thus, the possessor may undergo possessor raising or movement to the subject position when passivization occurs. Additionally, the preservation of the idiomatic meaning is made possible. For clarification, the example of this is shown in (22b, c).

- (22) a. *sacang-i Chelswu-uy/-lul papcwul-ul kkunh-ess-ta. (idiomatic)*  
 boss-NOM C-GEN/-ACC gullet-ACC cut-PST-DC  
 Idiomatic meaning: ‘The boss fired Chelswu.’  
 b. *Chelswu-uy/-ka papcwul-i sacang-ey uyhay*  
 C-GEN/-NOM gullet-NOM boss-by  
*kkunh-**ki(-e ci)**-ess-ta. (idiomatic)*  
 cut-PASS-PST-DC  
 Idiomatic meaning: ‘Chelswu was fired by the boss.’  
 c. *Chelswu-ka sacang-ey uyhay papcwul-ul*  
 C-NOM boss-by gullet-ACC  
*kkunh-**ki(\*-e ci)**-ess-ta. (idiomatic)*  
 cut-PASS-PST-DC  
 Idiomatic meaning: ‘Chelswu was fired by his boss.’

Moreover, the genitive nominal (i.e., *halapeci-uy* ‘grandfather-GEN’) in (20a) cannot undergo case alternation in order to construct a MAC since its possessum (i.e., *philim-i* film-NOM’) is an alienable object within the literal context. This, in turn, does not allow the honorific marker *si* to be realized which eventually prevents the spec-head agreement of honorification (see Choi and Harley 2016 for further discussion on this issue). On the other hand, note that the idiomatic component *philim* ‘remembrance’ in (21a, b), which is remarkably different from the literal sense of a film strip, is realized as an inalienable possessum within its idiomatic context. Here, it is crucial to realize that while the idiomatic meaning in (22b) is preserved by the passive markers such as *i/hi/li/ki* or *(a/e) ci*, the idiomatic meanings in (21a, b) are triggered by the passive markers when the inalienable possessor-possessum structure undergoes passivization. Note that the accusative possessum cannot participate in idiomatic triggering but only in idiomatic preserving, as the contrast between (21c) and (22c) shows.

Now, it is interesting to pay closer attention to *(a/e)-ci* passivization which triggers the interpretation of idioms as in (21a, b) and (23b). While some object-verb idioms may undergo morphological passivization, they may not undergo *(-a/e) ci*-passivization.<sup>24</sup> Although *(a/e) ci* may be a part of an idiom, *(a/e)-ci* passivization cannot be compatible with accusative nominals due to its absence of agentivity.

- (23) a. phalan/ppalkan pwul-ul khye-ta. (literal)  
           blue/red light-ACC turn on-DC  
           ‘to turn on the blue/red light.’  
       b. phalan/ppalkan pwul-i/\*-ul khi-e ci-ta. (idiomatic)  
           blue/red light-NOM/\*-ACC turn on-CI-DC  
           ‘for the things to work well.’/‘for a sign of danger to appear.’

Similar to morphological passivization, *(a/e) ci* passivization may preserve idiomatic meanings as in (22b), (24b), and (25b), as far as the nominative nominals are concerned.

24 The object-verb idioms may not undergo *(-a/e) ci*-passivization without their having the head  $v_{CAUS}$  or  $v_{PASS}$  which belongs to the idiomatic domain (Marantz 2008). See Lee and Lee (2017a) for more detail on this notion related to Korean.

- (24) a. Chelswu-ka santhong-ul kkay-ss-ta. (idiomatic)  
           C-NOM counting stick box-ACC break-PST-DC  
           ‘Chelswu brought failure.’  
       b. santhong-i Chelswu-ey-uyhay  
           counting stick box-NOM C-by  
           kkay-ci-ess-ta. (idiomatic)  
           break-CI-PST-DC  
           ‘Chelswu ended in failure’
- (25) a. Chelswu-ka cwuuy-lul kiwuli-yess-ta. (idiomatic)  
           C-NOM attention-ACC devote-PST-DC  
           ‘Chelswu paid attention.’  
       b. cwuuy-ka Chelswu-ey uyhay kiwuli-e ci-ess-ta. (idiomatic)  
           attention-NOM C-by tilt-CI-PST-DC  
           ‘Attention was devoted by Chelswu.’ (cf. Park and Whitman, 2003)

Considering what has been mentioned thus far, we realize that the passive markers may trigger or preserve idiomatic interpretations.

Now, let us return to the *si*-honorification in (19a). Following Han and Kim (2004), Choi and Harley (2016) suggest that a higher copy of the honorific possessor is present but unpronounced as the chain is realized by the lower copy. The higher copy is licensed by the honorific feature [+hon] on T through the spec-head agreement. At LF, this is identical to the *kkeyse*-marked subject, which mandatorily triggers honorification (cf. Choi and Harley 2016). Note that the possessor raising process involves adjoining the raised nominative possessor to TP whose subject position is occupied by the possessum, as mentioned above. This is what the idiomatic examples in (19a, b) and (21a, b) show. At this point, notice that the [+hon] feature of the *kkeyse*-marked subject induces agreement on the verb via the spec-head relationship between an honorific subject in spec-T and the verbal suffix *si* on T according to Chomsky’s (1993) approach. This is what the examples in (26a, b) also illustrate. Furthermore, only an idiomatic interpretation is available for the example in (26b).

- (26) a. halapeci-uy/-kkeyse kkostay-ka (halmeni-ey uyhay)  
           grandmother-G/-H bridge of the nose-N (G-by)

kkekk-i-si-ess-ta.

break-PASS-HON-PST-DC

Literal meaning: 'The bridge of Grandfather's nose was broken (by Grandmother).'

Idiomatic meaning: 'Grandfather came down a peg (by Grandmother).'

- b. halapeci-uy/-kkeyse kkoli-ka (halmeni-ey uyhay)

grandfather-G/-H tail-NOM (grandmother-by)

cap-hi-si-ess-ta.

catch-PASS-HON-PST-DC

Idiomatic meaning: 'Grandfather got busted by Grandmother.'

Additionally, let us consider the passive suppletive construction in (28c). The idiomatic interpretation of the example in (27) sustains its meaning even when its inherent passive verb construction appears. Since there exists no overt passive marker for such case, a null passive morpheme appears. This is shown in (28c).

- (27) a. halmeni-kkeyse halapeci-uy twythongswu-lul

grandmother-HON grandfather-GEN back of the head-ACC

chi/ttayli-si-ess-ta.

hit-HON-PST-DC

Literal meaning: 'Grandmother hit the back of Grandfather's head.'

Idiomatic meaning: 'Grandmother betrayed Grandfather.'

- b. halmeni-kkeyse halapeci-lul twythongswu-lul

grandmother-HON grandfather-ACC back of the head-ACC

chi/ttayli-si-ess-ta.

hit-HON-PST-DC

Literal meaning: 'Grandmother hit back of Grandfather's head.'

Idiomatic meaning: 'Grandmother betrayed Grandfather.'

- (28) a. \*halapeci-uy twythongswu-ka halmeni-ey uyhay

grandfather-GEN back of the head-NOM grandmother-by

mac- $\emptyset$ <sub>PASS</sub>-usi-ess-ta.

be.hit- $\emptyset$ -HON-PST-DC

\*Literal meaning: 'The back of Grandfather's head was hit by

Grandmother.’

\*Idiomatic meaning: ‘Grandfather was betrayed by Grandmother.’

- b. \*halapeci-kkeyse twythongswu-ka halmeni-ey uyhay  
 grandfather-HON back of the head-NOM grandmother-by  
 mac- $\emptyset$ <sub>PASS</sub>-usi-ess-ta.

be.hit- $\emptyset$ -HON-PST-DC

\*Literal meaning: ‘The back of Grandfather’s head was hit by Grandmother.’

\*Idiomatic meaning: ‘Grandfather was betrayed by Grandmother.’

- c. halapeci-kkeyse halmeni-ey uyhay twythongswu-lul  
 grandfather-HON grandmother-by back of the head-ACC  
 mac- $\emptyset$ <sub>PASS</sub>-usi-ess-ta. (idiomatic)

be.hit- $\emptyset$ -HON-PST-DC

Literal meaning: ‘The back of Grandfather’s head was hit by Grandmother.’

Idiomatic meaning: ‘Grandfather was betrayed by Grandmother.’

( $\emptyset$ <sub>PASS</sub> = null passive morpheme)

The example in (28c) shows that the possessor *halapeci* ‘grandfather’ in (27b) can be realized as the nominative subject, leaving the accusative-marked possessum in-situ. Needless to mention, the idiomatic interpretation in (28c) is preserved, which is what the typical overt morphological passives such as (11b) show as well. In fact, it is quite prevalent that the so-called inherent passive verb constructions which make use of null passive morphemes accept (accusative) object-verb sequences when passivization takes place. This is shown in the null morphological passive in (29) which conveys an idiomatic interpretation.<sup>25</sup>

- (29) Chelswu-ka Yenghi-ey uyhay yes/mwul(-ul)  
 C-NOM Y-by taffy/water(-ACC)  
 mek- $\emptyset$ <sub>PASS</sub> (/\*-i/\*-e-ci/\*-i-e-ci)-ess-ta.  
 eat- $\emptyset$  (/\*-PASS/\*-CI/\*-PASS-CI)-PST-DC

25 Note that the example in (29) is not related to the MCM construction. Additionally, *mek* ‘to eat’ may also be realized as an inherent passive verb, as shown in (29). See Lee and Lee (2017a) for more information.

Idiomatic meaning: ‘Chelswu was deceived by Yenghi.’

( $\emptyset_{\text{PASS}}$  = null passive morpheme) (Lee and Lee 2017a:249-50, (26b))

Interestingly, between the two types of passives mentioned above, only the overt morphological passives allow possessive phrases (i.e., *Chelswu-uy palmok* ‘Chelswu-GEN ankle’ in (5a)) to move up to the subject position when passivization occurs, which enables the original idiomatic interpretation to be preserved. Such case is shown in (5b).

In brief, after the (non)-idiomatic object-verb sequence undergoes passivization, it is able to carry an idiomatic interpretation due to either the triggering or preserving effect, which is motivated by the passive markers such as  $\emptyset_{\text{PASS}}$ , *i/hi/li/ki*, or *(a/e) ci* with the passive feature [+PASS] on the phase head *v* forming an idiomatic domain (cf. H. Kim 2005; Marantz 2008; Park 2012; K. Kim 2015; Lee and Lee 2017a).

Before moving on to the next stage, let us review Lee’s (2017a) observation on MCM constructions and the case-drop of genuine objects and subjects. Consider the following data shown in (30)

- (30) a. Mary-ka John-ul tali<sup>??</sup>(-lul) cha-ss-ta.  
           M-NOM J-ACC leg(-ACC) kick-PST-DC  
           ‘Mary kicked John’s leg.’  
       b. Mary-ka John-ul ye-tongsayng<sup>??</sup>(-ul) ttayli-ess-ta.  
           M-NOM J-ACC female-younger sister(-ACC) hit-PST-DC  
           ‘Mary hit John’s younger sister.’  
       c. John-i apeci<sup>??</sup>(-ka) hoysa sacang-i-si-ta.  
           J-NOM father(-NOM) company president-be-HON-DC  
           ‘John’s father is the president of the company.’ (cf. Lee 2017a:  
           262, (1)~(3))

According to Lee (2017a), a genuine object or subject cannot undergo case-drop within MCM constructions. Nonetheless, he argues that when the verbal accusative or nominative theme forms an idiom with a verb within MCM constructions, the case marker may or may not be overtly realized on the theme, while the preservation of the idiomatic interpretation is possible in either way. This critical finding relevant to the morphosyntactic idiosyncrasy of idioms is shown in (31).<sup>26</sup>

- (31) a. Yenghi-ka Cheslwu-lul palmok-ul cap-a peli-ess-ta. (ambiguous)  
 Y-NOM C-ACC ankle-ACC catch-throw away-PST-DC  
 Literal meaning: ‘Yenghi have caught Chelswu’s ankle.’  
 Idiomatic meaning: ‘Yenghi caught up with Chelswu. (cf. Lee 2017a:263, (4a))
- b. Yenghi-ka Cheslwu-lul palmok cap-a  
 Y-NOM C-ACC ankle catch-throw  
 peli-ess-ta. (ambiguous/??literal)  
 away-PST-DC  
 ??Literal meaning: ‘Yenghi have caught Chelswu’s ankle.’  
 Idiomatic meaning: ‘Yenghi caught up with Chelswu. (cf. Lee 2017a:263, (4b, c))
- c. halapeci-kkeyse palam(-i) na-si-ess-ta.<sup>27</sup> (idiomatic)  
 grandfather-HON having an affair(-N) happen-HON-PST-DC  
 Idiomatic meaning: ‘Grandfather is in an secret affair. (cf. Lee 2017a:263, (5))

Having realized the given notions mentioned above, let’s return to the example in (27b). The case marker of the genuine object in (27b) may not be realized in (32), which can only convey an idiomatic interpretation.

- (32) sakikkwun-i Kim sacang-ul twythongswu(-lul)  
 swindler-NOM Kim boss-ACC back of the head-ACC  
 chi/ttayli-ko mal-ass-ta.  
 hit-KO stop-PST-DC  
 (Literal meaning: ‘A swindler ended up hitting back of CEO Kim.’)  
 Idiomatic meaning: ‘A swindler ended up betraying CEO Kim.’

If the accusative case-marker of the inalienable possessum is not realized when passivized, the sentence may only hold onto its idiomatic interpretation while its literal interpretation is gone. This is shown in (33a, b).

26 *Peli* in (31a, b) and (33a) and *mal* in (32) and (33b) are auxiliary verbs.

27 The example in (31c) only has an idiomatic reading.

- (33) a. Chelswu-ka Yenghi-ey uyhay palmok(-ul)  
           C-NOM       Y-by                   ankle(-ACC)  
           cap-**hi** - e peli-ess-ta.  
           catch-PASS-throw away-PST-DC  
           (Literal meaning: ‘Cheslwu’s ankle has been caught by Yenghi.’)  
           Idiomatic meaning: ‘Cheslwu got caught up with by Yenghi.’
- b. Kim sacang-i sakikkwun-ey uyhay twythongswu(-lul)  
           Kim CEO-NOM swindler-by               back of the head  
           mac- $\emptyset$ <sub>PASS</sub>-ko mal-ass-ta.  
           be.hit- $\emptyset$ -stop-PST-DC  
           (Literal meaning: ‘The back of CEO Kim’s head ended up being  
           hit by a swindler.’)  
           Idiomatic meaning: ‘CEO Kim ended up being betrayed by a  
           swindler.’  
           ( $\emptyset$ <sub>PASS</sub> = null passive morpheme)

Further, unlike *(a/e) ci*, the overt passive morpheme *i/hi/li/ki* compatible with the accusative possessum may take an agentive subject (cf. Kim and Lee 2017). Similar to the overt passive morpheme *i/hi/li/ki*, the null passive morpheme  $\emptyset$ <sub>PASS</sub> must take an agentive subject. This agentivity is attested by the contrast between (34) and (35) in the literal context. In detail, the contrast is observed when the expressions in question are modified by an agentive adverbial such as *ilpwule* ‘on purpose/intentionally.’ Note that the adverb is only compatible with the accusative possessum (i.e., accusative genuine object, here), which means that the sentential subject is the agentive subject. Here, the contrast between the examples in (34a, b) and (35a, b) verifies that the accusative possessum is only available to the agentive subject in the passive constructions. This observation is in accordance with the fact that *(a/e) ci* is restrictive in usage. Following this analysis, it is only natural to categorize *(a/e) ci* as a strong type of passive marker which prohibits the realization of an accusative possessum as shown in (34c).

- (34) a. Cheslwu-ka ilpwule (ppyam-i ani-la) congali-lul  
           C-NOM   intentionally (face-N   not-LA) calves-ACC  
           mac- $\emptyset$ <sub>PASS</sub>-ass-ta.  
           be.hit- $\emptyset$ <sub>PASS</sub>-PST-DC  
           ‘Cheslwu was hit (not his face but) on his calves intentionally.’

- b. Chelswu-ka ilpwule (phal-i ani-la) tali-lul  
 C-NOM intentionally (arm-NOM not-LA) leg-ACC  
 cap-hi-ess-ta.  
 catch-PASS-PST-DC  
 ‘(Not Chelswu’s arm but) his leg was caught intentionally.’
- c. halapeci-kkeyse (phal-i ani-la) tali-ka/\*lul (\*ilpwule)  
 grandfather-HON (arm-NOM not-LA) leg-NOM/\*ACC (\*intentionally)  
 pwule-ci-si-ess-ta.  
 break-PASS-HON-PST-DC  
 ‘(Not Grandfather’s arm but) Grandfather’s leg was broken  
 (\*intentionally).’
- (35) a. \*Cheslwu-ka (ppyam-i ani-la) congali-ka (ilpwule)  
 C-NOM (face-NOM not-LA) calves-NOM (intentionally)  
 mac- $\emptyset$ <sub>PASS</sub>-ass-ta.  
 be.hit- $\emptyset$ <sub>PASS</sub>-PST-DC  
 ‘Chelswu was hit (not his face but) on his calves (\*intentionally).’
- b. Chelswu-ka (phal-i ani-la) tali-ka (\*ilpwule)  
 C-NOM (arm-NOM not-LA) leg-NOM (\*intentionally)  
 cap-hi-ess-ta.  
 catch-PASS-PST-DC  
 ‘(Not Chelswu’s arm but) his leg was caught (\*intentionally).’

In interim conclusion, the null passive morpheme  $\emptyset$ <sub>PASS</sub> and (a/e) *ci* show complementary distribution while the overt passive morpheme *i/hi/li/ki* shares common grounds inbetween the two. This critical notion is further elaborated below in <Table 1>.

〈Table 1〉 Traits of Passive Markers in Inalienable Possessive Structures

voice	criteria for voice judgment	∅ <sub>PASS</sub>	<i>i/hi/li/ki</i>	<i>(a/e) ci</i>
passivity	<i>by-agent phrase</i>	+	+	+
		( <i>halmeni-ey uyhay</i> in (28c))	( <i>sacang-ey uyhay</i> in (22b))	( <i>sacang-ey uyhay</i> in (22b))
passivity	MNC	-	+	+
		( <i>halapeci-uy/-kkeyse</i> & <i>twythongswu-ka</i> in (28a, b))	( <i>Chelswu-uy/-ka</i> & <i>papcwul-i</i> in (22b))	( <i>Chelswu-uy/-ka</i> & <i>papcwul-i</i> in (22b))
agentivity	nominative possessor & accusative possessum	+	+	-
		( <i>halapeci-kkeyse</i> & <i>twythongswu-lul</i> in (28c))	( <i>Chelswu-ka</i> & <i>papcwul-ul</i> in (22c))	( <i>Chelswu-ka</i> & <i>papcwul-ul</i> in (22c))

In <Table 1>, the (+/-) features represent the compatibility/incompatibility of syntactic structures. Namely, these structures are *by-agent phrase* structures, MNC structures, and nominative possessor-accusative possessum structures. MNC stands for the genitive possessor-nominative possessum sequence or the nominative possessor-nominative possessum sequence. Also, agentivity is one of the characteristics for active voice constructions.

On top of what has been mentioned, the null passive morpheme is compatible with the nominative possessor which carries agentivity, whereas it is not compatible with the nominative possessum which does not carry agentivity. This is in accordance with the observation that the inherent passive verb realized with a null passive morpheme may only be compatible with its genuine agentive subject, as the contrast in (28) shows. To sum up the analysis presented in <Table 1>, we would like to propose that the three passive markers mentioned above are all considered to be passive markers varying in terms of the *degree* of passivity. Here, we argue that *(a/e) ci* is the strongest type of passive marker whereas *i/hi/li/ki* is the next strongest, and ∅<sub>PASS</sub> the weakest.<sup>28</sup> Hence, there exist evidence on why the null passive morpheme ∅<sub>PASS</sub> in particular should be taken as a *quasi*-passive morpheme. This is will be further investigated in the next section.

28 The test making use of imperatives which are only compatible with an agentive subject also demonstrates the classification of *degree* for passivity since it can be used with the (null) passive morpheme, not with the passive verbal ending. Refer to Kim and Lee (2017) for more detail.

## 5. Further Discussions on Quasi-passive Morpheme

When the null passive morpheme appears due to passivization, the accusative possessor in the genuine possessor-possessum structure may be realized as a nominative subject, leaving the accusative-marked possessum in-situ. This is verified in (28c). At this point, it is crucial to understand that the accusative possessor (i.e., *halapeci-lul* in (27b)) may undergo movement to the passive subject position instead of the accusative possessum (i.e., direct object *twythongswu-lul* in (27b)). This is illustrated in (28c). Now, let's consider the null morphological passivization of the causative construction in (36b). The morphological causative construction allows the multiple accusative marking process to take place, which induces the dative case of the causee to undergo case alternation with the accusative case as in (36a) (Song 2005).<sup>29</sup>

- (36) a. Yenghi-ka Chelswu-eykey/-lul sangche-lul  
           Y-NOM    C-DAT/-ACC           sratch-ACC  
           ip-hi-ess-ta.  
           wear-CAUS-PST-DC  
           ‘Yenghi had Chelswu’s feelings hurt.’ (idiomatic morphological  
           causative)
- b. Chelswu-ka Yenghi-ey uyhay sangche-lul  
           C-NOM    Y-by               scratch-ACC  
           ip- $\emptyset$  (/ \*-i/\* -e-ci/\* -hi-e-ci)-ess-ta.  
           wear- $\emptyset$  (/ \*-PASS/\* -CI/\* -PASS-CI)-PST-DC  
           ‘Chelswu was hurt by Yenghi.’ ( $\emptyset$  = null passive morpheme)  
           (cf. Lee and Lee 2017a: 253, (34))

It is here that we suggest that the accusative causee or possessor may be “strongly

<sup>29</sup> The so-called benefactive suffix (*a/e*) *cwu* construction also accepts the ACC-ACC sequence, as mentioned above.

(i) Mary-ka haksayngtul-eykey/-ul yenge-lul kaluchi??(-e cwu)-ess-ta.  
     Mary-NOM students-DAT/-ACC English-ACC teach-E-give-ess-ta  
     ‘Mary taught English to the students. (Lee 2015: 235, (13b))

The dative case of the goal in (i) may undergo case alternation with the accusative case. However, the MAC in (i) is not a main concern here. See Lee (2015) for more information.

affected” by the action of the agentive subject (cf. Jelinek and Carnie 2003; Jung and Miyagawa 2004; Lee 2015). In fact, this factor seems to induce only the accusative possessor or causee to move up to the subject position while the accusative possessum remains in-situ within a passive construction. Such analysis is verified through (28c) and (36b). This, in turn, indicates that the accusative direct object (i.e., *twythongswu-lul* in (27a) or *sangche-lul* in (36a)) cannot move up to the subject position due to the presence of a null passive morpheme. Here, we need to note that while the direct object may be passivized within the structures holding onto *i/hi/li/ki* or *(a/e) ci*, only the accusative possessor or causee may be passivized within the structures holding onto the null passive morpheme. Having in mind that the former satisfies vital traits of the passive voice as illustrated in <Table 1>, we argue that the null passive morpheme should be considered as a quasi-passive morpheme, which is remarkably *weak* when compared to the overt passive morpheme *i/hi/li/ki* or the passive verbal ending *(a/e) ci*.

## 6. Conclusion

All in all, we have observed that the genitive case marker of the first nominative nominal may undergo case alternation with the accusative case marker while the preservation of an idiomatic interpretation is possible when consideration to inalienable possessor-possessum relation is given. Furthermore, it has been observed that the possessor alone may be realized as the nominative subject which leaves the accusative-marked possessum in-situ within a genuine inalienable possession-type construction. This is valid in (null) morphological passivization while it is not in *(a/e) ci* passivization. In this respect, a (null) passive morpheme is compatible with the accusative possessum, which holds onto agentivity as shown in <Table 1>. Additionally, we have shown that the multiple nominative marking construction that involves adjoining the raised nominative possessor to the spec of TP may arise at LF. In such case, the spec of TP in the subject position can be occupied by the possessum. Thus, a given sentence structure may receive an idiomatic interpretation or enable the licensing of the subject-honorific marker *si* via spec-head agreement, even if the genitive marker instead of the nominative marker is assigned to the first nominal. Further, we have pointed out that while direct objects can be passivized when the overt passive morpheme structure or the *(a/e) ci* structure appears, only the accusative possessor or causee may be passivized

in the null passive morpheme structure. Considering that the former type of passivization carries genuine traits of passive voice, we have argued that the null passive morpheme should be considered as a quasi-passive morpheme, which is remarkably dissimilar from the overt passive morpheme *i/hi/li/ki* or the passive marker *(a/e) ci*. Last but not least, unlike Hovarth and Siloni's (2009) argument that the idioms in the verbal passive always share idiomatic meanings with their transitive counterparts, we have shown that the idiomatic availability of passivization of non-idiomatic transitives in Korean may depend on whether the passive marker belongs or does not belong to an idiomatic interpretation.

## References

- Ahn, Hee-Don and Sungeun Cho. 2013. Notes on apparent  $X^0$  replacement of Pro. *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 38(2): 397-412.
- Alexiadou, Artemis. 2003. Some notes on the structure of alienable and inalienable possessors. In Martine Coene and Yves D'hulst (eds.), *In From NP to DP. Volume 2: The expression of possession in noun phrases*, 167-188. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- An, Duk-Ho. 2015. Genitive case in Korean and its implications for noun phrase structure. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 23: 361-392.
- Baker, Mark, Kyle Johnson, and Ian Roberts. 1989. Passive arguments raised. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 219-251.
- Chang, Suk-Jin. 1996. *London Oriental and African Language Library 4: Korean*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cho, Sungeun. 2000. Three forms of case agreement in Korean. Ph.D. Dissertation, State University of New York at Stony Brook.
- Choi, Jaehoon and Heidi Harley. 2016. Locality domains and morphological rules: Phases, heads, node-sprouting and suppletion in Korean honorification. Ms., University of Arizona.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In Kenneth Hale and Samuel Keyser (eds.), *The view from building 20*, 1-52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, 1-52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2007. Approaching UG from below. In Hans-Martin Gartner and Uli Sauerland (eds.), *Interfaces+Recursion = Language? Chomsky's Minimalism and the view from syntax-semantics*, SGG 89, 1-29. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Collins, Chris. 2005. A smuggling approach to the passive in English. *Syntax* 8(2): 81-120.
- Diesing, Molly. 1992. *Indefinite*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Fillmore, Charles J., Paul Kay, and Mary C. O'Connor. 1988. Regularity and idiomaticity

- in grammatical constructions: the case of Let Alone. *Language* 64: 501-538.
- Gazdar, Gerald, Ewan Klein, Geoffrey K. Pullum, and Ivan A. Sag. 1985. *Generalized phrase structure grammar*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Han, Chunghye and Jong-Bok Kim. 2004. Are there “double relative clauses” in Korean?, *Linguistic Inquiry* 35: 315-337.
- Harwood, Will, Marko Hladnik, Sterre Leufkens, Tanja Temmerman, Norbert Corver, and Jeroen van Craenenbroeck. 2016. Idioms, phasehood and projection. Ms., Utrecht University, Netherlands.
- Horvath, Julia and Tal Siloni. 2008. Active lexicon: Adjectival and verbal passives. In Sharon Armon-Lotem, Gabi Danon, and Susan Rothstein (eds.), *Current issues in generative Hebrew linguistics*, 105-134. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Horvath, Julia and Tal Siloni. 2009. Hebrew idioms: The organization of the lexical component. *Brill's Annual of Afroasiatic Languages and Linguistics* (BAAL) 1: 283-310.
- Horvath, Julia and Tal Siloni. 2017. “Contractions” and grammar: Evidence from idioms. In Claire Bowern, Laurence Horn, and Raffaella Zanuttini (eds.), *On looking into words (and beyond)*, 471-489. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Jelinek Eloise. and Andrew Carnie. 2003. Arguments hierarchies and the mapping principle. In Andrew Carnie (ed.), *Formal approaches to function in grammar in honor of Eloise Jelinek*, 265-296. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Jung, Yeun-Jin and Shigeru Miyagawa. 2004. Decomposing ditransitive verbs. In *Proceedings of SICGG*, Summer 2004, 101-120.
- Kim, Hyeong-Bae. 2005. Study on fixity of idioms with causative and passive expressions (in Korean). *Korean Culture Studies* 16: 1-28.
- Kim, Jong-Bok. 2016. *The syntactic structures of Korean: A construction grammar perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, Jong-Bok, Peter Sells, and Jaehyung Yang. 2007. Parsing two types of multiple nominative constructions: A constructional approach. *Language and Information* 11(1): 25-37.
- Kim, Kyumin. 2015. Phase-based account of idioms and its consequences. *Linguistic Research* 32(3): 631-670.
- Kim, Min-Jung and Soo-Hwan Lee. 2017. Passive suppletion of *mac-* ‘to be hit’ in Korean. In *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Meeting of Berkeley Linguistics Society* 43: 23.
- Lee, Doo-Won. 2014. Major subject honorification in inalienable possession constructions. *Studies in Linguistics* 33: 271-293.
- Lee, Doo-Won. 2015. Causative *cwu*-constructions revisited. *Studies in Linguistics* 35: 227-46.
- Lee, Doo-Won. 2017a. Idiomatic complement and null pro subject. *Journal of Language Sciences* 24(1): 261-76.
- Lee, Doo-Won. 2017b. Morphological passivization of object-verb idioms. *The Mirae Journal of English Language and Literature* 22(2): 273-94.
- Lee, Soo-Hwan and Doo-Won Lee. 2017a. Passivization of accusative object-verb idioms

- and null passive morphemes. *The Journal of Linguistic Science* 81: 235-56.
- Lee, Soo-Hwan and Doo-Won Lee. 2017b. Inherent passive verb *mek* 'to eat' incompatible with suppletion in the *kkeyse*-marked subject context. *The Journal of Linguistic Science* 83: 275-301.
- Lee, Soo-Hwan and Doo-Won Lee. 2017c. Analyzing Korean suppletion *molu* and *mac*: With reference to zero exponent approach of distributed morphology. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Summer Conference of The Linguistic Science Society*, 36-49.
- Lin, Chien-Jer Charles. 2007. Processing (in)alienable possessions at the syntax-semantics interface. Paper presented at the conference on linguistic interfaces, University of Ulster, Northern Ireland, June 1-3, 2007.
- Marantz, Alec. 2008. Phases and sords. Ms., New York University.
- Meltzer-Asscher, Aya. 2012. Verbal passives in Hebrew and English: A comparative study. In Martin Everaert, Marijana Marelj, and Tal Siloni (eds.), *The theta system: Argument structure at the interface*, 279-307. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nunberg, Geoffrey D. 1978. The pragmatics of reference. Ph.D. Dissertation, City University of New York.
- Nunberg, Geoffrey, Ivan Sag, and Thomas Wasow. 1994. Idioms. *Language* 70: 491-538.
- Park, Sang-Doh, and John Whitman. 2003. Direct movement passives in Korean and Japanese. *Japanese and Korean Linguistics* 13: 307-21.
- Park, So-Young. 2012. Voice Alternations and the principle of idiomatic interpretations (in Korean). *Studies in Modern Grammar* 69: 1-20.
- Ruwet, Nicolas. 1991. *Syntax and human experience*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Siloni, Tal, Julia Horvath, Hadar Klunover, and Ken Wexler. To appear. Idiom storage and the lexicon. *Journal of Linguistics*.
- Song, Hong-Ki. 2005. *Causatives and resultatives in Korean*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Song, Sanghoun. 2015. Automatic acquisition of "noun+verb" idiomatic compounds in Korean. *Linguistic Research* 32(1): 253-280.
- Stone, Meagan. 2008. Passivizable and nonpassivizable idioms: A minimalist approach. Ms., University of Arizona.
- Stone, Meagan. 2013. Can idioms be passivized?: Evidence from online processing? In *Coyote Papers: Proceedings of the Arizona Linguistics Circle* 6: 1-22. Arizona: University of Arizona Linguistics Circle.
- Ura, Hiroyuki. 1996. Multiple theory of checking: A theory of grammatical function Splitting. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.
- Wasow, Thomas, Geoffrey Nunberg, and Ivan Sag. 1984. Idioms: an interim report. In Shiro Hattori and Kazuko Inoue (eds.), *Proceedings of the 13th International Congress of Linguists*, 102-115. The Hague: CIPL.

- Yoon, James Hye-Suk. 1989. The grammar of inalienable possession construction in Korean, Madarin and French. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* 3: 357-368.
- Yun, Gwanhi. 2004. Constraints on possessor raising and its structure in Korean. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 46: 406-421. Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

**Soo-Hwan Lee**

Department of English Language and Literature  
Sogang University  
35 Baekbeom-ro, Mapo-gu, Seoul, 04107, Republic of Korea  
soohwanlee@sogang.ac.kr

**Doo-Won Lee**

Department of English Language and Literature  
Korea National University of Transportation  
50 Daehak-ro, Daesowon-myeon, Chungju-si, Chungbuk, 27469, Republic of Korea  
dwlee@ut.ac.kr

Received: 2017. 10. 08.

Revised: 2017. 11. 20.

Accepted: 2017. 11. 28.