

## A Semantic typology of Psych Adjectives in Korean: Agentive vs. Patientive Experiencer

- There have been various proposals on the typology of psych verbs: e.g., Belletti & Rizzi (1988), Grimshaw (1990), Pesetsky (1995), Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1993, 2005) among others. Most of them classify transitive psych verbs like *frighten* and *amuse* in terms of the syntactic and semantic properties of Stimulus [STM] subject, particularly focusing on the agentivity of the Stimulus. Extending the previous studies and the event structure-based approaches of Jackendoff (1990), Pustejovsky (1995), Grimshaw (1990) and DiDesidero (1999), this paper proposes a semantic typology of psych adjectives in Korean. The typology to be proposed is crucially based on the “Agentivity of Experiencer [EXP] argument,” which has not been well-discussed in the literature.

- We identify two major semantic types of psych adjectives in Korean: They are defined in terms of their semantic structure – i.e., (i) Event structure: composition of a psychological state/process and its causing sub-event, and (ii) Argument structure: how Experiencer [EXP] and Stimulus [STM] participate in the causing sub-event. Thus we define them as follows:

I. “**Agentive**” psych adjectives [APA]: APAs take an EXP argument which plays a role of Agent in the causing event; and the causing event and the caused psychological event take place simultaneously.

II. “**Patientive**” psych adjectives [PPA]: PPAs take an EXP argument which cannot play a role of Agent but play a role of Patient or Theme in the causing event; and the causing event temporally precedes its caused event.

In (1) below, the APA *cilwuha*- ‘be bored/boring’ interprets its EXP ‘I’ as the Agent of ‘movie-watching’ event, and the causing event occurs concurrently with the caused event ‘my feeling bored.’ In (2), however, the EXP ‘Jini’ is interpreted as a Patient of the causing event ‘Koni ignoring her,’ and the causing event temporally precedes the caused event ‘Jini feeling disappointed.’

- (1) a. na-nun ku yenghwa-ka muchek cilwuha-ess-ta  
 I-Top that movie-Nom very.much bored-Past-Decl  
 ‘I was very much bored with that movie.’
- b. na-nun [ku yenghwa-lul po-ki]-ka muchek cilwuha-ess-ta  
 I-Top that movie-Acc watch-ing-Nom very.much bored-Past-Decl  
 ‘I was very much bored with watching that movie.’
- (2) a. cini-nun koni-ka sepsepha-ess-ta  
 Jini-Top Koni-Nom be.disappointed-Past-Decl  
 ‘Jini was disappointed with Koni.’
- b. cini-nun [koni-ka caki-lul musiha-nun.kes]-i sepsepha-ess-ta  
 Jini-Top Koni-Nom self-Acc ignore-ing-Nom be.disappointed-Past-Decl  
 ‘Jini<sub>i</sub> was disappointed that [Koni ignored her<sub>i</sub>].’

- The two classes of psych adjectives display different argument realization patterns: The APAs allow “**Experiencer alternation**” – Experiencer argument can be realized either as a subject or as a dative adjunct (compare (1a) and (3a)). In contrast, PPAs allow “**Stimulus alternation**” – Stimulus argument can take either nominative or dative/oblique case (compare (2a) and (4a)).

- (3) a. ku yenghwa-ka na-hanthey-(nun) muchek cilwuha-ess-ta  
 that movie-Nom I-Dat-(Top) very.much bored-Past-Decl  
 ‘I was very much bored with that movie.’
- (4) a. cini-nun koni-hanthey sepsepha-ess-ta  
 Jini-Top Koni-Dat be.disappointed-Past-Decl  
 ‘Jini was disappointed with Koni.’

- We account for the argument realization patterns in terms of “under-specification” of event structure (Pustejovsky 1995). A psych predicate involves two sub-events – the causing sub-event (Event1:e1) and the caused psychological state/process (Event2:e2) – and the argument realization is determined by the relative focus among the two sub-events. We claim that agentive PAs may focus either [e1] or [e1+e2], whereas patientive PAs may focus either [e2] or [e1+e2]. We adopt the account of argument realization in Generative Lexicon theory: Only the arguments of focused/headed sub-event can be realized syntactically. Then we have the following proposition:

(5) **Argument Realization of Psych Adjectives:** If the caused sub-event [e2] is more focused than the causing event [e1], the predicate takes an EXP subject. If the causing sub-event [e1] is more focused, then the STM argument surfaces as the subject.

- This paper illustrates various syntactic asymmetries illustrating the structural difference between the two types of psych adjectives: Asymmetry in (i) the form of clausal complement, (ii) honorifics-agreement, (iii) relativization, and (iv) scrambling.

- As for the form of clausal complement, PPAs take a full clausal complement with “V-nun.kes” denoting the causing event, but they do not take a VP complement with “V-ki-ka” form that requires a controlled PRO:

(6) \*Cini-nun [PRO Koni-lul manna-ki]-ka sepsep-ess-ta  
 Jini-Top Koni-Acc meet-ing-Nom be.disappointed-Past-Decl  
 ‘Jini<sub>i</sub> was disappointed that she<sub>i</sub> met Koni.’

- Honorifics Agreement of alternating adjectives: Nominative EXP has to agree with the predicate, but dative EXP never agrees with the predicate as shown in (7a, b). Further, we will show that in double nominative construction, i.e., both EXP and STM take nominative case, STM may not agree with the predicate. Without a nominative EXP, nominative STM agrees with the predicate.

(7) a. sensayngnim-kkeyse(-nun) ku yenghwa-ka muchek cilwuha-SI-ess-ta  
 teacher(Hon)-Nom(Hon)-Top that movie-Nom very.much bored-Hon-Past-Decl  
 ‘The teacher was very much bored with that movie.’  
 b. \*sensayngnim-kkey(-nun) ku yenghwa-ka muchek cilwuha-SI-ess-ta  
 teacher(Hon)-Dat(Hon)-Top that movie-Nom very.much bored-Hon-Past-Decl  
 ‘The movie was very boring to the teacher.’

- Asymmetry in Relativization: Nominative EXP but not STM can be relativized as shown in (8). Without a nominative EXP, however, nominative STM can be relativized. This asymmetry parallels with that in the honorifics-agreement.

(8) a. [e ku cangmyen-i musew-un] aitul-un kapcaki hunuki-ess-ta  
 that scene-Nom scared-Past-Rel children-Top suddenly sobbed  
 ‘The kids who were scared by the scene sobbed all of a sudden.’  
 b. \*[aitul-i e musew-un] cangmyen-un modwu sakceytoy-ess-ta  
 kids-Nom scared-Rel scene-Top all erased  
 ‘The scenes which were scary to the kids were all erased.’

- Scrambling: EXP subject must precede nominative STM, but dative EXP may follow nominative STM as shown in (9).

(9) a. \*holangi-ka ai-tul-i musew-ess-ta  
 tiger-Nom child-PI-Nom fear-Past-Decl ‘The Children feared the tiger.’  
 b. holangi-ka ai-tul-hanthey musew-ess-ta  
 tiger-Nom child-PI-Dat fear-Past-Decl ‘The tiger was scary to the children.’