The Grammar and Usage

of Korean Phrase-Final Particles

Spas Angelov Rangelov

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

in Japan and Korea Language Research

2012

Department of the Languages and Cultures of Japan and Korea

School of Oriental and African Studies

University of London

Declaration for PhD thesis

I have read and understood regulation 17.9 of the Regulations for students of the School of Oriental and African Studies concerning plagiarism. I undertake that all the material presented for examination is my own work and has not been written for me, in whole or in part, by any other person. I also undertake that any quotation or paraphrase from the published or unpublished work of another person has been duly acknowledged in the work which I present for examination.

Signed: _____   Date: 7th December 2012

      Spas A. Rangelov

Abstract

This thesis is a study of the grammar and usage of a small group of Korean grammatical particles, four phrase-final *cosa*, **i/ka**, **ul/lul**, **un/nun** and **to**. I find that their structural similarity reflects their specific properties that set them apart from other *cosa*. They are grammatical formatives whose form and meaning reflect a complicated interaction of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic factors.

In Chapter 1 set my goals and formulate the research questions that will guide me in my work on the four chosen particles. In Chapter 2 I review the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic categories that are relevant for the discussion of the phrase-final *cosa*. The relevant **syntactic** categories for the discussion of Korean *cosa* are the **Grammatical Relations** (GR): Subject, (Direct) Object, Indirect Object, etc. They have been determined by syntactic criteria. The **semantic** categories relevant for the discussion are the **semantic participant roles** characterizing the referring expressions, i.e. the nominal phrases. They depend on the logical structure of the predicate. The **pragmatic** implications are concerned mainly with the **information structure** of the sentence. That is why the main categories relevant for the discussion of *cosa* usage are Topic, Focus (narrow focus and sentence focus), Contrastive Topic, Contrastive Focus, etc.

In the next four chapters the grammar and usage of each *cosa* is explored in the range of constructions in which they occur. Each of them has its own peculiar properties and characteristics but they also tend to share some features in pairs. The usage of the first pair, **i/ka** and **ul/lul**, reflects a complex interaction of pragmatic functions like Focus, semantic and cognitive factors like concrete semantic roles and

notions of affectedness and control over the event, as well as syntactic factors like grammatical relations. The usage of the second pair, **un/nun** and **to**, reflects mainly pragmatic functions, as well as pragmatic-cognitive distinctions related to Topic and Focus like the notions of contrast, concertiveness, concession, etc.

In Chapter 7 I summarize the findings of the previous chapters of the dissertation and discuss the implications for the theoretical treatment of the *cosa* in the morphology of the phrases and in the structure of the clause at the sentence-level analysis of Korean. I also point to the relevance of the present research for applied linguistics, mainly for the field of teaching and learning Korean as a non-native language.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my gratitude to all those who gave their time and help in assisting me with the undertaking of this project.

First of all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Jaehoon Yeon, for his constant assistance, patience and generosity. I am also very grateful to the two other members of my supervising committee: Grace Koh and Anders Karlsson.

I would like to thank the Korea Foundation for consistently supporting me in my efforts in the field of Korean studies.

I owe special gratitude to the people who have helped me and supported me during the years of research and writing in London and Sofia, as well as to the teachers and students I met during my specializations in Korea and Japan who have stimulated my interest in the Korean language and in general linguistics and have encouraged me to take up postgraduate studies in this field.

Finally, I also wish to thank my family and friends for standing by me during the whole time while I was working on this project.

ABBREVIATIONS AND CONVENIONS

Abbreviations

ACC, Acc	Accusative (marker)
ADV	adverbializing suffix
ATTR	attributive (adnominalizing) suffix
Aux	auxiliary
COMPL	complement marker
CONJ	conjunctive marker
CONN	connective verb suffix
CONTR	contrastive
d	declension
DAT, Dat	Dative (marker)
DECL	declarative suffix
Dem	demonstrative
DeV	descriptive verb
DISJ	disjunctive marker
EVID	evidentiality marker
Fem	feminine gender
FOC	Focus marker
G, GEN	Genitive (marker)
HORT	hortative suffix

INF	infinitive suffix (-**e(se)**/-**a(se)**)
LOC	Locative marker
Masc	masculine gender
N	noun
NMZ	nominalizing suffix
NOM, Nom	Nominative (marker)
NP	noun phrase
Num	numeral
OBJ	Object
OBL	Oblique marker
PAST	past tense (suffix)
PLU, Pl	plural (marker)
Po	postposition
POL	polite-style suffix
PRED	Predicate (marker)
PROC	processive suffix
PrV	processive verb
PP	postposition phrase/preposition phrase
Rel	relative clause
SUBJ	Subject
SUSP	suspective suffix
TOP	Topic marker
V	verb
VSUFF	verb suffix (unspecified)

Some ad hoc abbreviations have been explained accordingly in the text.

Notes on Glossing and Citation

I gloss the particles under discussion in accordance to the conventions in the literature, i.e. **i/ka** as NOM, **ul/lul** as ACC, **un/nun** as TOP and **to** as 'also'. Other *cosa* and verb suffixes are not glossed so specifically, hence both **ey** and **eyse** are glossed LOC and different connective suffixes of verbs get glossed with the same CONN. I also use INF for glossing the **–e/-a** and **–ese/-ase** forms of verbs. The processive suffix **-(nu)n-** (in declarative forms) and **–nu-** (in attributive forms) is marked as PROC. The suffix **–ci** that is used to form the suspective form of the verbs is marked as SUSP. These terms are borrowed from the literature (e.g. Martin (1992)) and we do not discuss them here since verb forms are out of the scope of the present thesis.

The *cosa* that are mentioned in the text appear with a bracketed element if this element is a prosthetic after bases ending in consonants, e.g. **(u)lo**. When a cosa or other functional morpheme is quoted as two forms, as **i/ka**, **kwa/wa**, **un/nun**, the first form is the one used after a consonant, the second – after a vowel.

I also honour the linguistic tradition to write *cosa* (particles) in Romanization separately from the phrase they are attached to regardless of Korean spelling conventions or different analyses.

Notes on Romanization

The Romanization of the Korean language follows the Yale system. The same system is used in the glosses and in the bibliography. A slight modification of this

system that I use is that the vowel **wu** is Romanized as **wu** after labial consonants in order to conform with current Hankul spelling. Therefore, 물 'water' is Romanized as **mwul**, while the verbal suffix -므로 as –**mulo**.

Korean personal names when quoted from English sources appear as they appear in the sources. Korean place names in the translations of some sentences appear in the Korean government system (1999), e.g. **Kyengcwu** in the gloss but **Gyeongju** in the translation. The Romanization of other languages follows the source or the standard system used in the linguistic literature.

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Korean *Cosa*

When students of Korean as a foreign language learn simple sentences, they are often confronted with pairs of sentences (and sometimes even a group of three or more sentences) that seem to "mean" the same thing but that is not exactly so. Let us start by looking at two such pairs:

(1.1) 철수는 학교에 갔다.

    Chelswu nun hak.kyo ey kassta.

    Chelswu TOP school LOC go.PAST.DECL

    Chelswu went to school./ (Speaking of) Chelswu, he went to school.

(1.2) 철수가 학교에 갔다.

    Chelswu ka hak.kyo ey kassta.

    Chelswu NOM school LOC go.PAST.DECL

    Chelswu went to school./It is Chelswu who went to school.

(1.3) 나는 김치를 좋아한다.

    na nun kimchi lul cohahanta

I TOP kimchi ACC like.PROC.DECL

I like kimchi.

(1.4) 나는 김치가 좋다.

na nun kimchi ka cohta

I TOP kimchi NOM is.good.DECL

I like kimchi.

Usually, students are told that both (1.1) and (1.2) "mean" 'Chelswu is a student' but they cannot be used interchangeably. On the other hand, (1.3) and (1.4) are said to "mean" the same thing (which is reflected in the English translations), and, in fact, could be used interchangeably, but the two sentences clearly have different morphosyntactic structures, which is somewhat confusing.

The formal difference between the first two sentences is the small morpheme that is attached to the first noun (after it) and is pronounced as one phonetic word with the noun. In fact in standard Korean orthography these short morphemes are never written as separate words. In (1.1) the morpheme is **nun** and in (1.2) the morpheme is **ka**. They seem to make all the difference in the case of these two sentences. The difference between (1.3) and (1.4) is a slight change in the verb (although both verbs have the same root morpheme, the one in (1.3) seems to have more suffixes attached) and again different morphemes attached to the second noun in the sentence: **lul** in (1.3) and **ka** in (1.4).

In Korean literature on grammar these morphemes, like **ka**, **nun**, **lul**, are called *cosa*. In English-language literature on Korean grammar they are usually called 'particles'.

As it becomes clear from the examples above, the usage of different *cosa* brings about change in the "meaning" of the sentences. In order to appreciate the differences, an analysis of the sentences' morphology, syntax and information structure is necessary.

Most generally speaking, (1.1) is used when 'Chelswu' is an established topic in the discourse or in the conversation, while (1.2) can be used to answer a question like "Who went to school?", i.e. when the focus is on 'Chelswu', or to answer a question like "What happened?", i.e. when the sentence is used to present – or explain – a (new) situation. The morpheme **nun** is called Topic marker (hence the gloss TOP), while the morpheme **ka** is called Nominative (case) marker (hence the gloss NOM). In fact, the two interpretations of (1.2), despite having the same morphosyntactic structure will have different prosodic characteristics (contours). In order to reflect the difference, we can present them with the prominent words in small capitals:

(1.2') 철수가 학교에 갔다.

    CHELSWU ka hak.kyo ey kassta.

    Chelswu NOM school LOC go.PAST.DECL

    CHELSWU went to school./It is CHELSWU who went to school.

(1.2") 철수가 학교에 갔다.

    CHELSWU ka HAK.KYO ey kassta.

    Chelswu NOM school LOC go.PAST.DECL

    CHELSWU went to school [, I realize/believe.]

However, (1.1) is different from the two "readings" of (1.2) in that it has a different morpheme, **nun**, in the place where (1.2) has **ka**. It can also have two different prosodic contours:

(1.1') 철수는 학교에 갔다.

    Chelswu nun HAK.KYO ey kassta.

    Chelswu TOP school LOC go.PAST.DECL

    Chelswu went to SCHOOL./ (Speaking of) Chelswu, he went to SCHOOL.

(1.1") 철수는 학교에 갔다.

    CHELSWU NUN hak.kyo ey kassta.

    Chelswu TOP school LOC go.PAST.DECL

    CHELSWU went to school./ (As for) Chelswu, he went to school. [I do not know about Inswu.]

Apparently, these two morphemes – **nun** and **ka** – are attached to the noun phrase which is assumed to be the subject in each of the sentences marking the constituent's specific status from a pragmatic point of view: in the case of (1.1') the morpheme **nun** seems to mark it as the topic constituent, while in (1.2') the morpheme **ka** seems to mark it as the Focus constituent. In (1.2") the morpheme **ka** marks the same constituent as in (1.2') but this time it is not a focalized subject but the subject of a sentence that presents new information. In (1.1') the first noun phrase is an established topic and the sentence provides some new information about it. In (1.1") the first noun phrase is a topical element that is contrasted with another topical element. (1.1') is an example of Aboutness Topic, while the topic in (1.1") is Contrasted Topic (these will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5).

Although the four sentences – (1.1'), (1.1"), (1.2') and (1.2") – could be said to describe the same state of affairs in real life, they have different structures from both pragmatic and morphosyntactic point of view. Apart from the prosodic means, normally not expressed in written texts, the usage of the morphemes **nun** and **ka** plays a key role in distinguishing the intended meaning of the concrete sentence.

Let us know look closely at (1.3) and (1.4). In (1.3) the object is marked with the Accusative case marker **lul**, while in (1.4) the same constituent, which could be regarded as the object in a construction with a two-place predicate, is marked with the Nominative case marker **ka**. The predicates in the two sentences are different. In Korean they belong to different morphological and semantic groups. The predicate in (1.3) is a processive verb (also called action verb), while the predicate in (1.4) is a descriptive verb. Descriptive verbs are stative according to the semantic classification of predicates and their objects are marked with the Nominative case marker, while their subjects could also be marked with it, i.e. (1.5) is also possible (**nay** is the idiosyncratic form of **na** always used in front of **ka**).

(1.5) 내가 김치가 좋다.

   Nay ka kimchi ka cohta

   I NOM kimchi NOM is.good.DECL

   I like kimchi.

Simple sentences, i.e. sentences with one predicate, in which two ore more constituents are marked with the Nominative case marker are not uncommon in Korean. There are sentences in which two or more constituents are marked with Accusative case marker or with the Topic marker as well. Morphemes like **nun**, **ka** and **lul** always appear at the very end of the noun phrase and cannot be used

simultaneously. The Topic marker **nun** can mark not only topicalized subjects but topicalized objects as well. The phrase **Celswu nun**, which instantiates a topicalized subject in (1.1), can also instantiate a topicalized direct object, as in (1.6):

(1.6) 철수는 어제 봤다.

    Chelswu nun ecey pwassta

    Chelswu TOP yesterday see.PAST.DECL

    As for Chelswu, [I] saw [him] yesterday.

       The morphemes that fill the very last slot in the noun phrase structure tend to mark grammatical meanings from different levels and categories, e.g. syntactic relations (Subject, Direct Object), pragmatic relations (Topic, Focus). These meanings are not logically incompatible (e.g. the Topic of a sentence could be its Subject or its Direct Object). However, it seems that when a noun phrase is marked with the Topic marker, the expression of the syntactic relation is suppressed. On the other hand, the choice of the case marker depends on semantic factors as well, e.g. the semantic classification of the predicate (as in (1.4)).

       From these preliminary observations it becomes clear that the appearance of a certain morpheme (*cosa*) in the very last position in the linear structure of Korean nominal phrases depends on a complex interaction of semantic, syntactic and pragmatic factors. The existence of this limited set of functional morphemes that are always phrase-final and cannot appear together is one of the morphological idiosyncrasies of the Korean language. The complex way in which these morphemes are used in order to express grammatical meanings and, apparently, a combination of grammatical meanings (e.g. the **ka** in (1.2') could be construed as expressing Focus and Subject) is fascinating. The clarification of their usage and functioning is

important for the better understanding of how Korean grammar works and will help us achieve a better description of the intricacies of Korean grammar. That will facilitate the processes of teaching and learning Korean as a foreign language as well. That is why we set to explore the complex grammar and usage of these phrase-final morphemes from a theoretical point of view, keeping in mind the needs of learners of Korean.

1.2 Objectives

This work explores the grammar and usage of several bound functional morphemes (also called *cosa* or particles) that are typically associated with nouns and nominal phrases in the Korean language. They are very common morphemes and are widely used across constructions. Their role is undeniably of crucial importance for the grammatical structure of the Korean language; yet some of them (the ones that will be the focus of this work) have been somewhat elusive to simple and straight-forward theoretical explanation. Their meaning and usage have also been admittedly difficult for students of Korean as a foreign language to learn. I aim to analyze the occurrence of four of them**, i/ka**, **ul/lul**, **un/nun** and **to**, across grammatical constructions. These four share the structural similarity of always appearing finally in nominal phrases (as well as in adpositional phrases and some verb forms) and cannot be followed by other elements, i.e. they are phrase-final. I will investigate the connections of the structural similarity to their meaning, i.e. what syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features they mark or code.

This work tackles the problem of providing a more integrated linguistic description and explanation of certain *cosa* that share a structural feature across

Korean grammatical constructions, so that a more comprehensive and useful account is achieved for each individual *cosa*. The understanding of the grammar and usage of each phrase-final *cosa* will be useful in achieving a broader understanding of their structural similarity. The goals and research questions for this work could be summarized as:

1. Describe and analyze the meaning and usage of individual phrase-final *cosa* in different grammatical constructions

What do *cosa* signify in concrete constructions? Do they tend to signify syntactic or semantic or pragmatic categories?

2. Explain the occurrence of the same *cosa* in different grammatical constructions

Why is the same *cosa* used for different syntactic or semantic or pragmatic categories? Why are different *cosa* used for the same syntactic or semantic or pragmatic category?

3. Assess the effects of the interaction of syntax, semantics and pragmatics on the functional morphology, i.e. *cosa*, in Korean

How and to what extent can the occurrence of a certain *cosa* reflect the interaction of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic categories?

The structure of the dissertation can be summarized as follows. In the introductory chapter I outline the research object, the phrase-final particles or *cosa*, and their similarities and differences from the other particles vis-à-vis the typological characteristics of the Korean language. I discuss the morphological status of *cosa* and the place of phrase-final *cosa* among other *cosa*. Then, in the second chapter, I outline the theoretical preliminaries from the theories of syntax, semantics and pragmatics, respectively, that I perceive as relevant for the study of the phrase-final

particles that are chosen for closer inspection and that I am going to use for the analyses in the following chapters. In this way I set up the contextual and methodological background to the study. Chapters 3 to 6 constitute the analysis and discussion of different constructions with each of the four *cosa* within the outlined framework. Each chapter is dedicated to an individual *cosa*. Finally, in Chapter 7 I draw together the highlights emerging from the analyses in the previous chapters, summarize the findings and discuss the implications for the theoretical linguistic treatment of the specific *cosa* as well as their treatment in applied linguistics and more specifically in the context of teaching and learning Korean as a foreign language.

1.3 Terminology

1.3.1 Particles/Cosa

In this section I address the issue of terminology associated with the morphemes under scrutiny in this work. The terminology associated with the morphosyntactic, semantic and pragmatic analyses used throughout the work is clarified in detail in the next chapter.

The traditional name for all bound functional morphemes associated with nouns and noun phrases in Korean linguistics is *cosa* ("auxiliary words"). They are one of the major features of Korean grammar and although they could be compared to certain functional morphemes in other languages, especially case markers and postpositions in other agglutinative and/or SOV languages (i.e. languages that share typological characteristics with Korean), it could still be claimed that they have

specifics in function and usage that set them quite apart from any potential candidates for direct counterparts from other languages. The only exception is their Japanese counterpart, *joshi*. The idiosyncrasy of Korean *cosa* deserves special attention. That is why a separate term has been needed to clearly indicate their specificity and differences from "traditional" terms like case suffixes/endings and postpositions. One such word that has become extremely popular especially in FLT (foreign-language teaching) textbooks of Korean (and Japanese) is "particles". It has been successful in setting them apart from case suffixes and postpositions but is still not satisfactory enough because of the ambiguity of the term "particle" itself, which is used to refer to quite different things in different languages. Although the term "particle" has now come to be widely associated with Korean and Japanese even in the literature in general linguistics and typology, I use the term *cosa* as a satisfactory provisional appellation throughout this work. I also find it somewhat less ambiguous when it comes to Korean phenomena. The term is also useful to distinguish between *cosa* and *joshi*.[1]

Some *cosa* could be described as "less functional" than others because they have more "specific" or "lexical" meaning and are sometimes described as postpositions, i.e. adpositions similar in syntactic function to prepositions in languages like English, French, or Arabic. Such *cosa*, e.g. 부터 **pwuthe** 'from', 까지 **kkaci** 'up to, till' could be described as heads of adpositional phrases, typically serving as adjuncts in the clause structure. In this paper we will concentrate on those *cosa* that tend to have less or no "lexical" content and are merely functional morphemes that are attached to nouns that are heads of nominal phrases, to other *cosa* with less functional content that are heads of adpositional phrases, and to

---

[1] Japanese is the only language that could be said to be really close typologically to Korean; still, Korean *cosa*, just like Korean verbal suffixes, have peculiarities that differentiate them from their Japanese counterparts on many levels, including morphological, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic.

certain adverbs and verb forms, and mainly serve to indicate syntactic and/or pragmatic roles and functions of the respective clauses. Typical examples of such *cosa* are 이/가 **i/ka,** 을/를 **ul/lul,** 은/는 **un/nun**, 도 **to**. They do not change the syntactic status of the phrase, be it an argument or an adjunct but they are used in a complex way to refer to the characteristics of the respective nominal and adpositional phrases in both the syntactic and information structure of the sentence. They are not tightly fused endings like case markers are in many languages: they can be omitted in certain registers, e.g. colloquial speech. They cannot be followed by other morphemes or formatives. There are two other *cosa* that are also associated with the last slot of the *cosa* template, i.e. they are phrase-final, 의 **uy** and 이다 **i-ta** (the latter one not considered a *cosa* in many accounts by non-Korean researchers). These two *cosa* share a lot of properties with other last-slot *cosa*. They are different from the others in that they are used to convert syntactically nominal and adpositional phrases to attributives and predicatives respectively, so that the phrases could be attributives in complex nominal clauses or express predication in clauses. These two remain outside the scope of the present work. I will concentrate on the four *cosa* **i/ka**, **ul/lul**, **un/nun** and **to**.

Calling these last-slot[2] *cosa* 'case markers' in order to distinguish them from the 'adposition' *cosa* is tempting but there is much more to them than merely marking 'subject', 'direct object', etc. For example **i/ka** is often termed the Nominative which may be useful and helpful in certain contexts but it could be misleading because it does not mark the Subject consistently: it could be omitted and missing entirely (e.g. in colloquial speech); it will not mark the subject if the Subject is the Topic in the sentence's information structure (and quite often the subject is the Topic); it could also mark other constituents of the clause, like objects of certain state

---

[2] The properties of last-slot *cosa* will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 2.

predicates, that are not subjects. For example, **i/ka** can mark a noun or a noun phrase that is a Subject in the syntactic structure and Focus in the information structure of a sentence but it cannot mark the syntactic Subject if it is the Topic in the information structure. On the other hand, **i/ka** could be used to mark phrases that are not Subjects in the syntactic structure, e.g. indirect objects and adjuncts, when they are focalized in the information structure. If a direct object is the Focus in the information structure, however, **i/ka** is not used to mark it.

There is also a consideration, coming from cross-linguistic typological research, that it is unusual for an adposition to be closer to the noun than a case marker.[3] Another interesting feature of the last-slot *cosa* is that they cannot be used together. On the other hand their usage is not compulsory in many instances, which means that what they mark, in many cases, could be compensated with non-morphological devices, e.g. prosody. That depends on stylistic considerations and is normal in certain speech registers. While the grammar and usage of *cosa* that are adpositions is described and explained in the literature (both theoretical and applied linguistics) in relatively simple and straight-forward terms, which is undoubtedly helped by their having easier-to-identify typological correspondences in numerous other languages, the treatment of the "more functional" or "more grammatical" *cosa* remains a bit controversial or one-sided, in the sense that often it is heavily based on their occurrence in certain constructions while their occurrence in other constructions is ignored or underestimated.

---

[3] Comrie (1989), Anderson (1992), Haspelmath (2002), Croft (2003).

1.3.2 Typology of Korean

Since the approach in this work is typological-functional, some terminology from linguistic typology is used. In this section I review how Korean is described in typological surveys and classified according to different typologies. Since the typological classification of Korean is out of the scope of the present work, the sketch here is just a summary of the ways Korean has been described vis-à-vis typological classifications, especially ones that are relevant for arguments and adjuncts rather than predicates. I draw mainly from Song (2001), Song (2005), Comrie (1989), Shopen (2007a), Shopen (2007b), Shopen (2007c), Kholodovich (1954), Martin (1992), Li and Thompson (1976), and Lee (1989).

Traditionally, Korean is classified as an agglutinative language. In a typical agglutinative language the boundaries between morphemes are clear-cut and one functional morpheme, e.g. an affix, normally corresponds to a single "meaning" or category. That is in contrast to the situation in inflectional languages. As we shall see the "meaning" of Korean phrase-final *cosa* is somewhat more complicated.

As for affixing, suffixing is exclusively preferred to prefixing when it comes to marking pure grammatical elements, including syntactical and information-structure relations. The few morphemes that could be construed as prefixes in Korean are associated with lexical content and negation. Apart from them, all possible candidates for affixes, clitics, adpositions, etc are post-positioned, not pre-positioned. All these phenomena are typical of SOV languages across the world (e.g. Song 2001). When it comes to the term 'prefix', we should clarify that we do not consider the small word class of adnominals, e.g. 옛 **yeys** 'old', 새 **say** 'new', 헛 **hes** 'empty; useless' 군 **kwun** 'extra', to be functional morphemes. They are content words, identified as the class of "Adjectives" by H. Lee (1989), which have specific syntax

26

and semantics. There are a number of verb prefixes in Korean but they are all derivational and not inflectional.

It has been widely accepted that the Korean language is predominantly dependent-marking rather than head-marking. This feature is quite relevant for research on *cosa*.

When it comes to word order, the basic word order of the Korean clause, in typological terms, is SOV. Although there may be some variations within the clause, the word order of the nominal phrase seems to be quite strict with the modifier always preceding the modified. In this vein, we could also note that relative clauses in Korean, as a rule, are prenominal and externally-headed. The implication of the SOV word order is that it is subject-initial, which is relevant for the "topic-prominent" feature, and it is OV which leads to correct predictions about the constituent order of phrases.

Korean tends to be typologically "consistent", i.e. it demonstrates all the typical dependent-head features of its type at the phrasal and the clausal level. Apart from OV, it has all types of modifiers (e.g. relative clauses, genitives, demonstratives, numerals, ets) preceding nominal heads (RelN, GN, DemN, NumN, etc), while adpositions (in this case, postpositions) follow the nominal heads (NPo), and auxiliaries follow the main verb (Vaux) (Song 2001). This means that the dependent consistently precedes the head of the phrase. As for verbs, we do not deal with verb structure in this work, so we are not going into any details here. The relative clause precedes the noun (phrase) it modifies and the marking is realized through an attributive ending/suffix on the verb of the relative clause. This observation is valid for complementation as well: complementizers are often, but not necessarily, 'dependent nouns', also called bound nouns (cf 形式名詞 *keishiki meishi* "formal nouns" in Japanese), which have a similar behaviour to the head nouns in "proper"

noun phrases. The attributive forms of descriptive verbs precede the nouns they modify. This is also valid for the small word class of adnominals or adnouns, as they are styled in the recent literature (like 새 **say** 'new', i.e. Lee 1989's "adjectives"), which only appear attributively preceding nouns and do not change form. Demonstratives (like 이 **i** 'this'), which morphologically belong to the same class of adnominals, also precede the nouns they modify. As for Numerals, the attributive forms of the Numerals, which morphologically are adnominals (cf 한 'one (attributively)' vs 하나 'one (nominally)', 두 'two (attributively)' vs 둘 'two (nominally)', 세 'three (attributively) vs 셋 'three (nominally)'), always precede Classifiers, which are often bound nouns according to their morphology and syntactic behaviour, while the Numeral-Classifier complex, formally a noun phrase, may precede the noun phrase expressing the entity being counted/quantified (in this case acting as a modifier of a noun head) or may have a different place, closer to the verb and following the noun phrase expressing the entity being counted/quantified.

As for adpositions, Korean certainly has postpositions and no prepositions. If we assume postpositions are the heads of the postposition phrases (PPs), then again we have the dependent-head order in place. The issue of postpositions and postposition phrases in Korean is closely related to the morphosyntactic status of *cosa* and is discussed in detail in the next chapter. The constituent order within noun phrases and within postposition phrases is very rigid: inversions, such as an attribute noun with the genitive marker or an attributive form of a verb following, rather than preceding the modified noun, are virtually non-existent. As for constituent order at the clausal level, it can show certain flexibility, based on semantic and pragmatic considerations. The verb-final position is pretty strict: it is still quite unusual to have a subject noun phrase or an object noun phrase following the main verb in "careful"

speech or in written Korean. Comrie (1989: 214) points out that even the most rigidly verb-final languages in the world "in fact allow some leakage of noun phrases to the right of the verb". Overall, however, the word order of the Korean language can be said to be relatively "settled", strict and consistent typologically, especially in comparison with many other languages.

The review of the literature on Korean syntax shows us that as far as alignment is concerned, Korean is typologically a nominative-accusative language, just like English and many other well-studied European languages. The category of Subject comprises the argument of single-argument verbs and the A argument of two-argument verbs. However, it is quite different from English and other European nominative-accusative languages in marking subjects and objects. European languages with developed case morphology of nouns (e.g. Latin, Russian, German) have been shown to mark subjects and objects in a more uniform and "consistent" manner, namely, marking all subjects in the same way (nominative), not marking objects or other arguments in the way subjects are marked, having a single subject phrase per clause, i.e. not having two or more "nominative" arguments for the same predicate, cross-referencing subject (agreement) on the verb, etc. Korean has been shown to mark topicalized subjects and focalized subjects differently, to mark the Subject as well as another constituent with the same nominative marker in one clause (double nominative), etc. Similar idiosyncratic phenomena have been observed with direct-object marking, dative marking, and so on.

When it comes to the typology of prominence of subject and topic (Li and Thompson 1976), Korean and English are at the opposite ends of the continuum, with English being subject-prominent and Korean being topic-prominent. Also, as we shall see in later chapters, in some grammatical constructions Korean tends to have a more direct reflection of semantic roles in the functional morphology. In fact,

it is exactly in our object of interest, Korean functional morphemes attached to noun phrases and to postpositional elements following nouns, that we can expect the semantic roles of arguments to be reflected in morphology to a significant extent. Consequently, we could expect that approaches which separate the syntactic level from semantic representations, i.e. syntactocentric or formalist approaches like generative grammar, will not be very productive in explaining the usage, the meaning and the function of such morphemes, especially in a language like Korean where semantic roles and pragmatic functions are reflected in morphology, as suggested by typological studies. In fact, in a "topic-prominent" language like Korean, we can expect a complex interaction of syntax, semantic and pragmatics to be expressed in the functional morphemes.

Because of that I think that it would be better and more productive to approach Korean *cosa* from a theoretical perspective that takes into account the interaction of semantics and pragmatics with syntax and morphology. The functional-typological perspective definitely seems more appropriate for such a research than formalist networks. We pay attention to the constructions as units of a grammatical system that best reveal the interaction of syntax, semantics and pragmatics. We work with real utterances and analyze the syntax and the semantics of the constructions which they exemplify. Since our focus is on specific functional morphemes, we start from the manifestations of those morphemes in concrete constructions and will review them cross-constructionally. We can also contrast the constructions cross-linguistically in a typological perspective. Thus, through analysis and generalizations we achieve an insight into the complex interaction of syntax, semantics and pragmatics that is relevant for more adequate descriptions and explanations of the functions of the individual *cosa*.

Chapter 2

Theoretical Preliminaries

2.1 Morphological Status of *Cosa*

In this section I address a more ontological issue: I try to understand what *cosa* are, especially in comparison with other morphemes in the language in the general picture of the morphological inventory of Korean.

Cosa are typically monomorphemic units that are dependent phonologically on the noun base to which they are attached, sometimes in clusters, postpositionally. Although they are normally attached to nouns, some of them appear attached to other lexical categories as well. When they are discussed in the literature in English, especially in connection with Korean language learning, they are called "particles" without further elaboration although, obviously, they are different in both form and function from what is traditionally called "particles" in the grammatical descriptions of Latin and other European languages from where the usage of the term "particle" originates. Furthermore, some general linguists have expressed dissatisfaction with the term as a whole and its relevance in the common terminology for describing languages has been questioned. I will start looking into this matter by exploring the classification of words and morphemes and the attempts to differentiate between them. The terms used are "(independent) words", "clitics" and "affixes". The questions that could be asked are: If they are words, what part-of-speech category do they belong to? If they are affixes, what is their place on the derivation/inflection continuum? Are they a homogenous class or are they different morphosyntactic

categories that just share a common structural property, namely appearing attached to the heads of noun phrases?

From a theoretical point of view contemporary linguistics does not provide clear boundaries between words, clitics, and affixes (Anderson 1992, Bickel and Nichols 2007, Dixon 2010). Rather, it arranges them on a cline with "free forms" at one end and "bound forms" on the other. On this cline words are put at the "free" end and affixes at the "bound" end. Clitics are between words and affixes. From this arrangement it emerges that the boundary between words and clitics, as well as the boundary between clitics and affixes will depend on the criteria that are chosen to distinguish them. We can expect that for some languages it will be more complicated than for other languages to formulate clear criteria. And it will be even harder to come up with universal criteria valid for all languages. We can also expect that, realising the diversity of human languages and depending on the criteria which will be more or less arbitrary, the divisions along this cline may be more than two, implying that resulting categories (e.g. words, clitics, affixes) could be more than three (or, at least, that for the morphological description of certain languages such divisions could be more useful). One problem with a tripartite division is that affixes and presumably clitics too are monomorphemic while words could be polymorphemic often including affixes (and phonological words including clitics too). This means that the units that we compare and arrange on the cline are not homogeneous and if we do not have clear definitions from the start some decisions about the status of a certain unit will be more or less arbitrary. The understanding is, though, that in most cases it will be agreed what the status of a certain form is and these cases will serve as orientation in determining the status of the more controversial items that inevitably exist in every language. One potential problem with the word-affix cline is that it crosscuts syntactic and phonological distinctions.

The terms "free" and "bound" are used widely to describe morphological units but they are primarily based on phonological distinction, not on morphology and syntax.

A further complication arises from the fact that morphemes are not always clear-cut linear units. For some languages (e.g. Arabic, Hebrew) it is not normal to have words consisting of roots only, while in other languages (many inflectional Indo-European languages) the boundaries between morphemes could be not very clear. Agglutinative languages, like Korean, have, as a rule, clear morphemic boundaries and for them it is presumably easy to determine whether a form is "free" or "bound" phonologically. As a rule, all *cosa* are bound. That is obviously behind the spelling convention of always writing them "together as one word" with the noun they form a phonological word with.[4] But what if we take into consideration syntactic distinctions?

While it is true that inflectional morphemes, e.g. case affixes, tend to be phonologically dependent and often are tightly fused endings, while adpositions, which head postpositional phrases and in many languages govern case, tend to be phonologically free-standing units, this need not be the case. For example, case markers in Lai Chin, a Tibeto-Burman language, are phonologically free units (also called "particles"), while Russian prepositions are phonologically dependent on their objects (Bickel and Nichols 2007: 173, 174). For the morphosyntactic distinction Bickel and Nichols propose a binary opposition between *word* and *formative*. *Formatives* are defined as markers of inflectional information that are "different from *words* in that they cannot govern or be governed by other words, cannot require or undergo agreement, and cannot head phrases: formatives are morphological entities, words syntactic" (ibid).

---

[4] Korean spacing in writing, especially earlier versions of the conventions, tends to be based on phonological-word considerations rather than others. It can be compared with the *bunsetsu* spacing in Japanese writing in children's books or in Japanese textbooks for foreigners.

If we use the *word - formative* opposition for the morphosyntactic distinction and the *free - bound* opposition for the phonological distinction, we can say that, in principle, words can be free or bound, although they tend to be free, and formatives can be bound or free, although they tend to be bound. Korean *cosa* are bound forms but some of them can be regarded as words (postpositions which head postpositional phrases) and some of them as formatives.

The definitions and the criteria for clitics vary significantly in the literature (Zwicky 1977, 1985, 1993, Zwicky and Pullum 1983, Klavans 1979, Anderson 1992, Haspelmath 2002, Bickel and Nichols 2007). They are always bound forms but from a syntactic point of view they can be words (like adpositions) or formatives. In one of its usages the term *clitic* is used for bound formatives that are unrestricted as to the syntactic category of the word they can attach to and in this sense clitics contrast with affixes which are more selective. Depending on the definition, all *cosa* can be described as clitics (postpositions like **ey**, **eyse**, **pwuthe** as phonologically bound words, while cosa like **i/ka**, **un/nun** as unrestricted bound formatives). However, according to the criteria developed in Haspelmath (2002), Korean *cosa* tend to be more like suffixes than like clitics.

Cho and Sells (1995) argue that Korean *cosa* are not clitics. They review the literature on both nominal and verbal functional morphemes and summarize that "there are three broad analyses of these morphemes (or words): as inflectional affixes (Kang (1985), Cho and Morgan (1988), Park (1988)); as clitics (Kuh (1988)); and as phrasal affixes (Kim (1986), Kendall and Yoon (1986), Lapointe (1990, 1991), Yoon (1987))" (ibid: 120). They also analyze the phonological and morphological evidence and conclude that "close investigation of the interaction between morphology and phonology reveals that the relevant morphemes are attached lexically: i.e. these

suffixes belong not only to a phonological word (as in the case of clitics) but also to a lexical word in the sense of Lexical Phonology (Kiparsky (1982, 1985), Inkelas (1989))" (ibid). In fact, determining the morphological status of *cosa* depends on the theoretical framework applied in the analyses. It is clear, however, that phonological and morphological evidence suggests that the phenomena at the morpheme boundary between *cosa* and nominals are analogous to the phenomena at the morpheme boundary between verb bases and suffixes (verb suffixes are more accepted as affixes since verb bases, unlike nouns, cannot function as independent words in utterances by themselves) and are clearly different from the phenomena at the morpheme boundary between two nouns, or noun stems, in compounds and between two words, e.g. a noun and a verb, in a phrase.

It has been observed that *cosa*, when they appear in clusters, tend to be in a certain order. It is true that Martin (1992) lists numerous attested sequences that seem to show *cosa* in almost any imaginable order. But in contemporary standard Korean the order in which *cosa* are used is more strict. Cho and Sells (1995: 137) identify four different slots for the most common *cosa* starting from the one closest to the base. The following table is adapted from their table (ibid).

First Slot	Second Slot	Third Slot	Last Slot
eykey to (DAT)	**kwa/wa** and	**man** only	**i/ka** SUBJ
kkey HON DAT	**(i)na** or	**cocha** even	**ul/lul** OBJ
kkeyse HON SUBJ	**pota** than	**mace** even	**un/nun** TOP
ey in; to (LOC)	**chelem** like	**kkaci** even	**to** also
eyse in, at (LOC)	**pwuthe** from	**pakkey** only	**uy** GEN
(u)lo INSTR			

kwa/wa COM **kkaci** up to, till			

Only one item from each column can be selected although elements from the second slot are known to allow multiple instances. Cho and Sells give the slots labels: Postpositions to the first slot, Conjunctives to the second lot, the third and the fourth slot are Delimiters, called X-lim and Z-lim respectively. They emphasise that these label are "only suggestive and have no theoretical status" and X-lim and Z-lim specifically come from an analysis in Yang (1972). Since Cho and Sells regard all *cosa* as suffixes the terms that they use as labels are just expedient means. There seem to exist exceptions to this ordering, but they could be accounted for. For example, the form **manulo** could be explained as a lexicalized *cosa* itself.[5] It is possible to add the copula **ita** to the *cosa* in the last slot column because of its structural similarities with the other members of this subgroup. This treatment of **ita** as a predicative *cosa* is common in the Korean-language literature but that treatment is regarded as misleading theoretically and is not common in the English-language literature on Korean grammar. We will not discuss it here because **ita** remains outside the scope of the present work. The table does not include all linguistic units that are marked as *cosa* in Korean dictionaries, but only the most frequent and typical ones.[6]

---

[5] They also list **(i)lato** in the last slot column. I treat **(i)lato** as a lexicalized *cosa* from a form of **ita** and **to**, which has the structural properties of **to**.

[6] Since this discussion is for the purpose of determining the status of the four *cosa* that interest us, we do not account for all *cosa*.

The *cosa* from the first two slots attach to nouns; more specifically to the heads of noun phrases. All of them are used as clause constituents to mark arguments or adjuncts in the predicate. Although grouped with "Conjunctives" for structural reasons, **pota** 'than', **chelem** 'like' and **pwuthe** 'from' are not used in coordination constructions as typical coordinators but in many cases behave more like the *cosa* from the first slot. The *cosa* **pota** is used as a marker of comparison. It is attached to the standard of comparison in constructions expressing the difference between compared entities. The *cosa* **chelem** is used in constructions expressing similarity between two entities and is normally attached to the phrase denoting the standard while the other one is deemed similar to it. The *cosa* **kwa/wa**, as its listing shows, can be used as a conjunctor between two or more noun phrases in a coordinated nominal phrase but is also used as a comitative marker with semantically appropriate verbs.[7] This feature is shared by other languages, including Japanese and Hausa (Schachter and Shopen (2007: 47)). The semantic connection between the comitative and the conjunctor is obvious. The *cosa* **(i)na** can be used as a disjunctor in coordination constructions but it can also be used on an argument of the verb, as in (2.1). In this case the meaning of the *cosa* is "something like", "or something similar". Again, the semantic closeness of the two usages is apparent.

(2.1) 차나 마시자.

  cha na masica

---

[7] This situation is not unique. One of the typological classifications of languages is based on whether languages have one or two words for "and" and "with". That feature of **kwa/wa** is shared by its synonym **hako**. On the other hand, Korean uses different *cosa* for the instrumental "with" (**(u)lo**)and the comitative "with" (**kwa/wa** or **hako** or **(i)lang**).

tea DISJ drink.HORT

Let's have something like tea./Let's drink tea or something similar.

A lot of the first-slot *cosa* mark circumstantial adjuncts, including locative, spatial, temporal. They have a number of properties that sets them apart from the last-slot *cosa*:

1. They tend to be disyllabic rather than monosyllabic.

2. They tend to have a single morphological form that is independent from the noun, i.e. they do not have allomorphs like **i/ka**, **un/nun**, etc.

3. They tend to have a lexical meaning rather than just a grammatical meaning.

4. They tend to be somewhat less dependent phonologically on the noun: they can be phonologically prominent by themselves, despite forming one phonological word with the noun, as in (2.2).

(2.2) 음악회는 9 시**부터** 아니고 9 시**까지** 예요.

Um.ak.hoy nun ahop si PWUTHE aniko ahop si KKACI yeyyo.

concert TOP nine o'clock from be.not.CONN nine o'clock till PRED.POL

The concert is not *from* nine o'clock but *till* nine o'clock.

All these features allow us to regard them as postpositions heading postpositional phrases. The postpositional phrase in this framework will correspond roughly to Chang's (1996: 66) "particle phrase" and to Lee's (1989: 145) "adverbial relational phrase". The postpositional phrases in Korean can be used adverbially. They cannot be used adnominally like preposition phrases in English. They can only

be used adnominally when the *cosa* **uy** is attached to them forming an adnominal (or attributive) phrase.

It has to be admitted that there are convincing arguments against postulating the existence of both nominal phrases (NPs) and postpositional phrases (PPs), e.g. in Cho and Sells (1995), Bratt (1996). In their treatment all these phrases should be considered NPs headed by nouns having modifiers to the left and lexical morphology (*cosa*) to the right. That description has its merits and I am not going to argue against it since the theoretical treatment of these facts does not influence directly the analysis of the four last-slot *cosa* this work focuses on.

The *cosa* from the first slot include mainly *cosa* that are attached to nominal phrases that express circumstantial information (chiefly locative, temporal, or describing manner, reason, etc) and are adjuncts in the structure of the clause. However, we find the Dative and the Instrumental here as well. The grouping of the Dative and the Instrumental markers with locative and temporal functional morphemes in a common category (e.g. prepositions in many European languages) is not rare cross-linguistically. The Instrumental as well as the Dative (not as often as the Instrumental, though) tend to mark non-core constituents of the clause and can be regarded as circumstantial parts of the clause structure, similar to locative and temporal expressions.

In Korean this group of *cosa* also includes **kkeyse** and **eyse** (when it marks Subjects)[8]. Both **kkeyse** and **eyse** are apparently grammaticalized fusions of the Dative with the element **se**. That explains the structural similarities with **kkey** and **ey**, respectively[9]. However, from a synchronic point of view they have peculiar features

---

[8] The *cosa* **eyse** is commonly used as a locative marker for the place of the action (venue) and that usage is not unusual when regarded in this group. However, **eyse** is also used to mark grammatical subjects in certain constructions and this usage is discussed here.
[9] Sohn (1999) points out that **kkeyse** can have a meaning of source ('from') symmetrically to **eykeyse** and **hantheyse**, but such usage is extremely rare.

that set them apart. Although commonly described and taught as some variants of **i/ka**, they are quite different from **i/ka** structurally and distributionally. The *cosa* **kkeyse** marks honorific Subjects, normally persons, including gods (i.e. its usage is restricted pragmatically and semantically)[10], while **eyse** marks Subjects that are perceived as an institution or a group but not a person (i.e. its usage is restricted semantically). Unlike **i/ka**, they mark only one syntactic category: the grammatical relation of Subjects; they do not mark Objects that **i/ka** can mark. They are not used to mark information-structure categories like Focus. They are not dropped when Topic or Focus markers are added to them, i.e. they allow Subjects to be topicalized or focalized morphologically while still being explicitly marked as Subjects by them. They stay closer to the noun when scope or information-structure markers are added. In fact, their properties characterize them as typical case markers. Because of the semantic and pragmatic restrictions, however, their usage is somewhat marginal. The *cosa* **kkeyse** has "absolutely no syntactic or semantic postpositional properties" (Cho and Sells (1995: 168)). The same argument can be made about the Subject **eyse**, the Dative Subject **eykey** and its variants and possibly about the Dative **eykey** and its variants (**kkey** and **hanthey**) when they mark the Indirect Object. What they share with postpositions is the appearance in a particular morphological slot.

It seems that in the first two slots we have *cosa* that are typical postpositions which can head a postpositional phrase and a few *cosa* that are typical case markers which are attached to noun phrases and have structural properties similar to the more typical postpositions. Again, that is not uncommon cross-linguistically. Croft (2002: 263) has stated that adpositions "represent problematic cases for syntactic definitions

---

[10] Kim and Sells (2007b) offer an analysis of the grammar of **kkeyse** in the context of Korean honorification and expressive meaning.

of headhood." And it has been pointed out by Haspelmath (2002) and others that adpositions "straddle the line" between functional and lexical categories.

There is one classification of adpositions – and adpositional elements – that might be useful in the present discussion. It divides them into two basic varieties, predicative and non-predicative (introduced in Bresnan (1982)). According to this classification, "[p]redicative adpositions function like predicates in that they contribute substantive semantic information to the clause in which they occur, both in terms of their own meaning and the meaning of the argument that they license… Non-predicative adpositions do not add any substantive semantic information to the clause and do not license the argument they mark. Rather, their argument is licensed by the predicate, i.e., it is a core argument; these prepositions are a function of the semantics of the predicate and are in effect free-morphemic case markers assigned by it." (Van Valin, Jr (2005:21)). An example of a predicative preposition is the English **to** in **John went to the city**; an example of a non-predicative preposition is the English **to** in **Mary gave the book to the child**.

In the context of Korean postpositions we can argue that the *cosa* like **kkaci** and the locative **ey** and **eyse** are predicative postpositions which head their postposition phrases, while the Subject **kkeyse** and **eyse** are non-predicative postpositions which are markers in the structure of the noun phrase. The status of the Dative and the Instrumental postpositions in this classification will depend on the syntactic analyses, i.e. if they are considered core arguments, they will be non-predicative postpositions; if they are considered obliques (see the discussion in Andrews (2007: 152)), they can be viewed as predicative postpositions. Since my focus is not on these *cosa*, I am not going to make premature conclusions if all of them could belong to the same morphosyntactic category. However, it could be said that a common feature of *cosa* from the first two slots is that they attach strictly to

nominal phrases only and seem to mark exclusively categories from the syntactic analysis of the clause (core cases, adjuncts) and no pragmatic categories. This is different from the *cosa* in the last two slots which attach not only to nominal phrases and (with the exception of the Genitive) seem to mark categories relevant for the information structure (focus structure) of sentences or even, in the case of the four *cosa* we focus on in this work, an intricate interaction of syntactic and pragmatic factors.

2.1.2 The Cosa *from the Last Two Slots*

Now I look at the *cosa* from the last two slots. In this section I will pay more attentions to the *cosa* from the third slot, while analysis and discussion of the cosa from the last slot will be presented in the next chapters.

As for the *cosa* from the third and the fourth slot (the so-called delimiters), it has been observed that they may attach not only to nominal and prepositional phrases but also to adverbs and verb forms, while *cosa* from the first two slots may not.

When it comes to the third slot, the *cosa* that seem to be more frequent than the others and introduced earlier in KFL (Korean as a foreign language) textbooks and manuals, and hence considered "more representative", are **man** 'only' and **cocha** "even". The *cosa* **pakkey** 'only' is similar to **man** but is used only with negative predicates. The *cosa* **mace** 'even' and **kkaci** 'even' are synonymous with **cocha** 'even' and their usage is similar to the usage of **cocha**. Both of them are engaged in marking categories of the information structure and quite often simply replace markers for syntactic categories. Thus, nominal phrases marked with them often do not have any explicit markers for their argument status in clause structure. However,

they are not mutually exclusive with *cosa* from the last slot and strings of a third-slot *cosa* and a last-slot *cosa* are not uncommon.

The *cosa* **man** 'only' and the *cosa* **cocha** 'even' are used to mark nominal as well as postpositional phrases. They mark subjects, direct objects, etc in the same way as last-slot *cosa* – directly attaching to them so that the phrases are not marked with anything explicit for their syntactic role (of course, excluding the cases of **eykey**, **kkeyse** and **eyse**). Both **man** and **cocha** can be followed by a *cosa* from the final slot. The *cosa* **man** is most frequently followed by **i/ka** and **ul/lul**, while **cocha** can be followed by **to**. The final-slot *cosa* mark the phrases for categories related to the information structure of the sentence ("pragmatic functions" in Lambrecht's (1994) terms). Both **man** and **cocha** are associated semantically with focus, just like their English counterparts **only** and **even**. But their meaning is more "contextual-pragmatic" (Erteschik-Shir (1997: 111)) rather than directly involved in the information structure of the concrete sentence. Very often the broad context, i.e the contextual-pragmatic topic, of **man** and **cocha** is outside the sentence and may not be explicitly present in the text. That is why it is possible for **man** and **cocha** phrases to be focalized with the *cosa* that "conventionally" mark narrow focus, thus creating *cosa* sequences with members of the penultimate and the final slot, e.g. **man.i**, **man.ul** (discussed in the following chapters).

The scope of **man** and **cocha** are the phrases they are attached to, but that can be ambiguous, especially with negative and modality sentences. The semantics of **man** is identifying a single member (or a subgroup in some cases) of a set (that is the contextual-pragmatic topic) as relevant and eliminating the other members. It can similarly operate on quantities. The semantics of **cocha** is identifying a single member (or a subgroup) of a set (that is the contextual-pragmatic topic) and not eliminating the other members. It operates on the set by interpreting the selected

member as least likely among the members of the set.[11] In the case of **man** the elimination of the other members of the set creates a relation of contrast or restrictiveness between the selected member and the rest of the set (depending on how the set is defined in the discourse), while in the case of **cocha** there is no contrast and restrictiveness between the selected member and the other members of the set.

As was already mentioned, the *cosa* from the last two slots can be attached to verb form while the postpositions and the conjunctives cannot. While a lot of conjunctive (or connective) verb endings used to mark subordinate or non-final clauses in complex sentences have grammaticalized elements that can be traced to specific *cosa* from the last two slots, from a synchronic perspective the verb forms that these *cosa* attach to in contemporary Korean tend to be parts of a complex predicate and normally are verb forms of the main verb that appear before an auxiliary verb. Structurally the *cosa* are attached to the verb form and are in front of the auxiliary verb that is in final form, i.e. they are between two verb forms, as in these phrases:[12]

(2.3) 적지만은 않았다

    cekci man un anh.assta

    write.SUSP only TOP do.not.PAST.DECL

    did not write

(2.4) 적어도 보았다

    ceke to po-ass-ta

---

[11] This analysis follows the analysis of the English **only** and **even** in Erteschik-Shir (1997: 110-119).
[12] The following five examples are taken and adapted from Cho and Sells (1995: 148).

write.INF also try.PAST.DECL

tried also writing

(2.5) 적어야만 한다

cekeya man hanta

write.must only do.PROC.DECL

must only write

(2.6) 가고들은 싶겠다

kako tul un siph.keyss.ta

go.CONN PLU TOP want.FUT.DECL

will want to go (pl.)

(2.7) 가게라도 했다

kakey lato hayssta

go.ADV even do.PAST.DECL

made (someone) even go

In (2.3) the **–ci** form of the verb has two *cosa* attached to it – **man** 'only' and **un** (one of the variants of the *cosa* **un/nun**, usually called a Topic marker), which in this case marks negation contrast. In (2.4) the *cosa* **to** 'also' is attached to a verb form called infinitive in a complex predicate construction involving an auxiliary verb. In (2.5) **man** is attached to the **–eya** form of the verb (expressing necessity) in a complex predicate, while in (2.6) a conjunctive form of the verb has two *cosa* attached to it – **tul** which denotes associative plurality and **un**, which here again

marks contrast. In (2.7) a variant of the *cosa* **(i)lato** 'even' is attached to an adverbial form of the verb in a syntactic causative construction to mark a specific kind of focus.

Since the *cosa* are in the predicate internal structure, they normally do not mark arguments, i.e. they cannot mark syntactic categories like grammatical relations. Instead, the complex structure of these particular predicates allows them to mark the predicate part of the sentence (by attaching directly to a form of the main verb) with additional semantic and pragmatic features. Due to structural constraints the final-slot *cosa* **uy** and the forms of **ita** cannot appear in front of auxiliary verbs.

We see that the *cosa* from the last two slots tend to express pragmatic categories associated with information structure. Even those that are associated with marking syntactic roles of nominal phrases are used in structural positions where they cannot be construed to be associated with grammatical relations, e.g. with (non-nominal) verb forms.

All four *cosa* under scrutiny in this work – **i/ka, ul/lul, un/nun** and **to** – can occur attached to verb forms and adverbials where they mark different categories of the information structure of sentences.

2.2 Syntactic Analyses and Grammatical Relations

In this section I try to clarify the theoretical implications associated with the syntactic analysis of the clause. In the first subsection I explore the notion of **case** in its theoretical multi-facetedness and cross-linguistic diversity. The incarnations of the notion across theoretical frames and across languages help shed light on its relevance for the grammatical description of Korean. In the second subsection, I

explore the notion of grammatical relations which is central in the analyses of grammatical constructions.

2.2.1 Case and Cosa

In order to describe the idiosyncratic usage of Korean *cosa*, the researchers have made use repeatedly of the term case. In order to assess the relevance of the category of case vis-à-vis the morphosyntax of Korean *cosa*, we will try do outline what understanding of the term case could be useful for this study.

The question of what constitutes a case marker should be closely related to the question what a case is. And here we are dealing with "a notoriously ambiguous notion" (Kiefer (1992: 217)). Case is defined in many ways and the technical term 'case' can have different meanings depending on the theoretical framework. One problem is that approaches and frameworks are often mixed and it is not always clear what type of case is meant by case in some situations. The traditional notion of morphological case refers to an inflectional category. The definition given by Blake (2001) mentions the tradition of the usage of this very old term:

> Case is a system of marking dependent nouns for the type of relationship they bear to their heads. Traditionally the term refers to inflectional marking, and, typically, case marks the relationship of a noun to a verb at the clause level or of a noun to a preposition, postposition or another noun at the phrase level.

Kiefer (1992: 217) states that morphological cases can be classified in various ways. Often the meaning of a nominal case is confined to a syntactic role and this is

a typical grammatical case. Typical grammatical cases in languages of the nominative-accusative type (as opposed to the ergative type) are the Nominative (signifying the grammatical subject) and the Accusative (signifying the direct object). Other common cases shared by many languages are the Dative (signifying the indirect object), the Instrumental (signifying the instrument or means) and the Genitive (signifying the adnominal attribute). Different functions can be expressed by the same case form; this phenomenon is widely spread and is called case syncretism. Most Korean *cosa* are intuitively perceived as having more than one distinct meaning (as one can see in their dictionary entries). Sometimes the different usages could be in different linguistic realms, e.g. the so-called Nominative form in Russian can be used not only to mark the grammatical subject but also in the vocative function. Interestingly, in order to express the vocative function most other Slavic languages have a separate noun form, distinct from the Subject form, and consequently a separate "case" in the traditional descriptions of their grammars, the Vocative. The Vocative, however, is used to mark constituents that normally are not part of the clause structure, i.e. clause-external elements of the sentence. So, the Vocative is not a grammatical/syntactic case because it does not mark dependents and stands outside the construction or could be inserted parenthetically. For example, modern Bulgarian has no declension of nouns, i.e. no grammatical case forms, but has preserved some Vocative forms that could be used alternatively to "unmarked" forms of address. In Yapese (an Austronesian language) too "there is no morphological case of nouns, but personal names have special forms used for address" (Blake (2001: 8)). Similarly, Korean Vocative *cosa* 아/야 **a/ya** and (이)여 **(i)yo** are hardly grammatical case if we follow the strict definitions, even if the referents they mark could be construed as arguments of the clause predicate. They can be regarded, however, as some sort of pragmatic markers (used for drawing the

attention of the hearer to what the speaker is saying or for signifying the level of respect towards the addressee).

In some languages, like Latin, German or Russian, the noun always appears in a form that is marked for case, i.e. the free word always contains case morphemes (although in inflectional languages the same morpheme usually has more meaning than just case, e.g. in Russian its meaning includes at least two other categories: number and declension type which is related to gender). In its every occurrence the noun is "in" a certain case and the case marker is compulsory, not optional; it cannot be dropped. In such languages the noun base cannot function as a free form (sometimes the base can coincide with a free form if the case morpheme is zero but it is still marked for case in the context of the whole language system) and the noun is perceived as a changeable word. Case in such languages is defined by the syntactic role of the noun in the clause but often particular adpositions (usually prepositions as in Latin, German, Russian or Classical Arabic, but postpositions too as in Hindi) can assign a specific morphological case within the postpositional phrase in a clause. Case is usually a category that is overtly expressed not only in the head of the noun phrase but in other words, e.g. the adjectives that modify the noun, i.e. there is agreement by case (usually together with agreement by other categories). I am illustrating these characteristics of case here with examples from Russian because I want to emphasise the notions of case as a category that is visible (perceivable) throughout the whole phrase and of case as a category that is rather idiosyncratic not only in its meanings but also in its manifestations (i.e. suffixes, lack of suffixes, etc). Another characteristic that becomes quite apparent is that the suffixes are intimately associated with the concrete nominal (or adjectival) form and cannot be separated from it or omitted. All these formal characteristics of case are rather different from the situation in Korean and it is important to realise these differences both for

typical and contrastive reasons. Let us consider (2.8), where some of the declension forms of two Russian nominal phrases are given:

(2.8)

xorosh-ij   **dom-**

nice-MascSgNom   house-1d(Masc)SgNom

nice house (Nominative)

xorosh-aja   **knig-a**

nice-FemSgNom   book-2d(Fem)SgNom

good book (Nominative)

xorosh-ego   **dom-a**

nice-MascSgGen   house-1d(Masc)SgGen

nice house (Genitive)

xorosh-ej   **knig-i**

nice-FemSgNom   book-2d(Fem)SgGen

good book (Genitive)

xorosh-im   **dom-om**

nice-MascSgIns   house-1d(Masc)SgIns

nice house (Instrumental)

xorosh-ej   **knig-oj**

nice-FemSgIns   book-2d(Fem)SgIns

good book (Instrumental)

xorosh-ije   **dom-a**

nice-MascPlNom house-1d(Masc)PlNom

nice houses (Nominative)

xorosh-ije   **knig-i**

nice-FemPlNom   book-2d(Fem)PlNom

good books (Nominative)

xorosh-ix   **dom-ov**

nice-MascPlGen   house-1d(Masc)PlGen

nice houses (Genitive)

xorosh-ix   **knig-**

nice-FemPlGen   book-2d(Fem)PlGen

good books (Genitive)

xorosh-imi   **dom-ami**

nice-MascPlIns   house-1d(Masc)PlIns

nice houses (Instrumental)

xorosh-imi   **knig-ami**

nice-FemPlIns   book-2d(Fem)PlIns

good books (Instrumental)

It is obvious that there is not a single morpheme or an isolatable material sequence that corresponds directly and only to a certain case. We cannot say what exactly is the Genitive marker or the Instrumental marker in Russian. And even for the same combination of case, number and declension type/gender there are variations. For example the marker for 1d(Masc)PlNom (the ending marking the Nominative Plural form of first declension nouns) is **–a** for **dom-** 'house' (i.e. **doma** 'houses'), but it is **–y** for **divan-** 'sofa; divan' (i.e. **divany** 'sofas'). Sometimes, the same marker stands for different combinations of categories. For example the **–i** in **knig-i** can signify 2d(Fem)SgGen as well as 2d(Fem)PlNom (i.e. the forms for the Singular Genitive and the Plural Nominative of second-declension nouns coincide). The zero morpheme with the noun base can signify either 1d(Masc)SgNom or 2d(Fem)PlGen. The adjective form **xorosh-im** signifies MascSgIns and NeutSgIns but signifies also MascPlDat, FemPlDat and NeutPlDat. Some forms have the same suffix but the distinction is realised with other means (e.g. prosodic): the form **dom-a** with the stress on the first syllable signifies 'house-1d(Masc)SgGen' (i.e. the Genitive Singular, putative translation "of a/the house"), while **dom-a** with the stress on the second syllable signifies 'house-1d(Masc)PlNom' (i.e. the Nominative Plural, "(the) houses"). Sometimes forms for different combinations of categories coincide. For example, the forms for the adjectives for the same case in the plural have the same forms for all genders. But we still have to admit that in every concrete occurrence in a phrase they are marked distinctly, overtly and unambiguously for all mentioned categories. The category of case emerges then as a category that is always overtly expressed although it is not easy to say which material section corresponds directly and uniquely to it. That leads some to conclude that the case morpheme is abstract which is also problematic since the material morphemes are real. It is only their segmentation that is not apparent. Another interesting feature of case is its

idiosyncrasy in usage as well. While it is true that certain verbs and prepositions require (or assign) a specific case, it is also true that different case-forms are used with the same verbs and prepositions with the result of difference in the meaning (or the nuance of the meaning),as the pairs in (2.9) and (2.10) show.

(2.9)

vypit'	**vod-y**		**vypit'**	**vod-u**
to drink (up)	water-2d(Fem)SgGen		to drink (up)	water-2d(Fem)SgAcc
to drink (some) water			to drink (the) water (up)	

(2.10)

v dom-		**v dom-e**
in house-1d(Masc)SgAcc		in house-1d(Masc)SgPrep
(in)to the/a house		in the/a house

The former phrase from the above example is used with verbs of movement and second phrase is used with verbs signifying the place where the action takes place. If we are to gloss them in Korean, they will be **cip-ey** and **cip-eyse** respectively.[13]

In this case we could presuppose that **v** from **v dom** and the **v** from **v dome** are just two different homonymous prepositions (especially if we consult the English and the Korean translations), one expressing direction and used with movement verbs, the other one expressing location or place of activity and used with stative and activity verbs. But that will be counterintuitive to the "in" semantics of the preposition. In another example, (2.11), two synonymous prepositions always assign the same case to nouns but the case is different with the different preposition, i.e. the semantics cannot account for the different cases:

---

[13] The situation is more complex, in fact. The second Russian phrase, **v dome**, can be used in constructions for location corresponding to the constructions with **issta** in Korean. In these cases the appropriate Korean translation will be **cip (an) ey** rather than **cip (an) eyse**.

(2.11)

o knig-e   **pro knig-u**

about book-2d(Fem)SgPrep   about book-2d(Fem)SgAcc

about the/a book   about the/a book

As we can see from these examples the semantics of what is usually expected to be expressed by "case" (as from the broad definition in Bright (1992)) is actually expressed by a combination of case suffix and preposition. That is why it is important to keep an open mind and study the situation in each particular language examining its own forms and ways of expression. The overall situation in Russian is similar to the situation in Latin, German, Polish and many other inflectional languages. In agglutinating languages the situation is a bit different.

In Turkish, for example, there is a certain number of endings that are seen as case endings, the noun has a declension paradigm and then certain postpositional function words combine with particular cased forms. The case suffixes are attached to the head of the noun phrase and are not overtly expressed in the other members of the phrase, like in Russian. In that, the morphology is more similar to Korean postpositional units. But it seems that the usage is not as flexible as in Korean, e.g. their occurrence is not exactly optional: they do not depend on style, speech level or the social status of the hearer. Much like the idiosyncrasies mentioned about the Russian usages of cased forms, the occurrence of a particular form is semantically motivated. For example the direct object in a sentence can appear with or without the Accusative suffix **–(y)I**, but the occurrence is not optional: it actually contributes to different meanings (the suffix is used with specific direct objects only, Blake (2001: 1)), much like the usage of either the Accusative or the Genitive for the direct object

in the cited Russian phrases. The following examples, (2.12), (2.13) and (2.14), are adapted from Comrie (1989: 132):

(2.12)

Hasan öküz-ü aldı

Hasan ox-Acc bought

Hasan bought the ox.

(2.13)

Hasan bir öküz aldı

Hasan a   ox   bought

Hasan bought an ox.

(2.14)

Hasan öküz aldı

Hasan ox   bought

Hasan bought an ox or oxen.

Most researchers agree that case suffixes in Turkish number six: Nominative/Absolute, Accusative, Dative, Locative, Ablative and Genitive (Kornfilt (1997: 212)). But it seems that the situation is not that clear-cut and there are other suffixes that can be viewed as having a "case-like function" (Kornfilt (1997: 214)). For example **–(y)lA** expresses instrumental or comitative functions. But it seems that it is not completely grammaticalized yet: it "behaves like a genuine suffix in becoming part of the phonological word with respect to Vowel Harmony, but it remains outside the domain of the word with respect to assignment of word accent" (ibid). It also has a free counterpart, **ile**, which leads some to call it a "clitic particle." There are also words dubbed postpositions in Turkish and they seem to be

independent from the noun head and can co-occur with case suffixes, like **için** 'for'
in (2.15) (from Kornfilt (1997: 215, 226)).

(2.15)

Bu kitab-ı   sen-in   için al-dı-m
this book-Acc you-Gen for   buy-Past-1Sg
I bought this book for you.

It seems that in Turkish, like in the inflectional languages mentioned so far
the case signifier is an inflectional affix and is much closer associated with the noun
base than the adpositions (prepositions or postpositions) which are regarded as
separate words and are not included in the structure of the noun or the noun template
broadly speaking. Phonetically too, the case signifiers are included in the phonetic
word of the noun while the adpositions are not necessarily part of the same phonetic
word. The proposed criteria for Korean are usually the exact opposite in this respect:
the postposition is closer to the noun than the case marker and it can be inside the
phonetic word between the noun base and the case marker, as it is apparent from the
constructions with "*cosa* stacking", sometimes also called "case stacking."

In the analyses of Korean it is often assumed that "case markers" signify very
basic grammatical functions, like subject or direct object, while "postpositions" have
"more" meaning, e.g. location, direction, etc. The following example from Hindi,
(2.16), shows that even such basic grammatical functions like Accusative can be
expressed with a postposition that is used with an already cased form. In Hindi nouns
have two case forms, Direct and Oblique, that are expressed with what is clearly
suffixes, while other postpositional elements can be added after the cased forms. For
example **bacc-ā** is the Direct form and **bacc-e** is the Oblique form of a noun meaning

'child.' (Both **ā** and **e** are clearly suffixes because they are added to a noun base that cannot be used as a separate word on its own.) The postposition **ko** (called postposition because it is added to words) marks the direct object (Accusative) and is used with the noun in the Oblique case.

(2.16)

Aurat bacce   ko   bulā   rahī hai
woman child.OBL ACC calling PROG is
The woman is calling the/a child.

In the above sentence (from Comrie (1989: 133)) it is clear that the noun is morphologically in the Oblique case while the direct object (Accusative) is marked by an additional postpositional element (traditionally called postposition in this context). This is important for understanding the morphological category of case as opposed to certain syntactic or other meanings that are assumed to be "cases". In the context of these facts it becomes clear that while "postposition" is clearly a kind of word, "case marker" is a very abstract notion that can refer to suffixes or functional words, and sometimes even to prosodic features or distinctive phonetic features (Haspelmath (2002)). From this point of view, the question whether a certain morpheme or some linguistic unit is a case marker or postposition seems not particularly relevant, especially in the context of languages like Korean.

The situation in Korean is obviously different from both inflectional languages like Latin and Russian and from agglutinative languages like Turkish. The markers for grammatical cases are not so intimately connected with the noun and they are not necessarily immediately attached to the noun base, nor necessarily present. Nouns can be viewed as non-changeable words and none of the *cosa* can be

seen as fusing with the base to form cased forms. While this statement is generally true it should be acknowledged that there are certain cases when some idiosyncratic changes can be observed at the contact point of nominals and *cosa*, as in (2.17), (2.18), (2.19) and (2.20):

(2.17)

나+가>내가; 너+가>네가; 저+가>제가; 누구+가>누가

na+**ka**>**nayka**; **ne**+**ka**>**neyka**; **ce**+**ka**>**ceyka**; **nwukwu**+**ka**>**nwuka**

I+NOM>I NOM; you+NOM>you NOM; I+NOM>I NOM; who+NOM>who NOM

(2.18)

나+의>내; 너+의>네; 저+의>제

na+**uy**>**nay**; **ne**+**uy**>**ney**; **ce**+**uy**>**cey**

I+GEN>my; you+GEN>your; I+GEN>my

(2.19)

나+에게>내게; 너+에게>네게; 저+에게>제게

na+**eykey**>**naykey**; **ne**+**eykey**>**neykey**; **ce**+**eykey**>**ceykey**

I+DAT>to me; you+DAT>to you; I+DAT>to me

(2.20)

거+이>게

ke(s)+**i**>**key**

thing+NOM>thing.NOM

The translation and glossing of these combinations depends on the context and the interpretation of the "meaning" of the *cosa* in each concrete occurrence. The glosses above reflect only some of the possible interpretations. The nominals **na** ('I'), **ne** ('you') and **ce** ('I (more formal and polite)') are used fairly frequently in colloquial speech and as a rule refer to participants in the speech act (sometimes they are called personal pronouns since functionally they correspond to personal pronouns in English and other languages). In fact they are typical deictic nouns. The nominal **ke(s)** 'thing; fact' has the syntactic properties of a noun but has a restricted distribution (for example it does not occur without an attributive modifier). In some uses it is called a complementizer. All these nominals have grammatical functions and their fusion with the *cosa* could be viewed as the initial stage of a kind of grammaticalization process. Such phenomena, though, are marginal in the system of nominals and *cosa* and their interaction in Korean.

Some Russian scholars in the 20th century (Kholodovich (1954), Mazur (1960, 1962), etc) talk about declension of the Korean noun and even provide a list with a limited number of cases and their respective forms, i.e. the forms with **i/ka** as Nominative**,** with **uy** as Genitive**,** with **ul/lul** as Accusative, with **(u)lo** as Instrumental, and so on. But then they have to introduce a lot of other categories and rules to account for different phenomena like ellipsis or combinations of *cosa* that can occur after a noun or a noun phrase or even after some word that is not a noun. This method of description is obviously too complicated and not economical.

Another solution that uses the term 'case' but in a more cautious way is the division of all *cosa*, traditionally called particles in English, into case particles and other, non-case, particles. Sometimes they are divided into two groups, sometimes into three groups (e.g. Chang (1996); Chang sets apart the *cosa* **tul** which has a different distribution from the other *cosa* and deserves special attention). Yeon

(2003: 21-22) divides the particles into two classes: case markers (**i/ka**, **ul/lul** and **uy**) and postpositions (the particles from the first slot).

There are also other divisions of particles. For example Sohn (1999: 212) divides all particles into "case particles" and "delimiters", identifying 17 cases with a different number of particles assigned to them and 19 different functions for the delimiters. While **i/ka**, **ul/lul**, and **uy** are classified as case particles along with the first-slot particles, **un/nun** and **to** are classified as delimiters marking Topic-contrast and Inclusion, respectively. Sohn (1999: 345) summarizes the difference between them in the following way: "While case particles mark syntactic relations among major constituents, delimiter particles delimit the meaning of the cooccurring element with little syntactic functions." Lee and Ramsey (2000: 139) divide all particles into "case particles" and "special particles", identifying seven cases with different numbers of particles assigned to each and also list ten special particles with different meaning. Although particles *(cosa)* in Korean belong to a small closed class, the usage of some words makes their classification ambiguous, hence the number of particles varies from description to description and from list to list. For example, Kim-Renaud (2009) lists **tongan** 'period of time' as a particle, while it is rarely listed as such in other accounts of Korean *cosa*. As in any language, the grammaticalization processes in Korean sometimes make the inclusion even in small closed classes debatable. However, it is clear that a lot of *cosa* cannot be associated with the category of case. Also, it is obvious that, unlike languages in which case is strongly associated with morphology, in Korean the inclusion of certain *cosa* into the subclass of "case particles" is problematic, as well as the number of cases that get grammatical marking by particles. Another complication comes from the fact that cases can be linked to grammatical relations like Subject, which has complex relationships with semantic roles, and to notions like Instrument, which is a syntactic

constituent related to a small and limited number of semantic roles. That is why in some classifications distinction is made between semantic and structural case. For example, Ko and Kwu (2008: 165) divide all *cosa* into *kyekcosa* 'case particles', *cepsokcosa* 'conjunctive particles' and *pocosa* 'auxiliary particles' and the *kyekcosa* are further divided into *kwucokyekcosa* 'structural case particles' and *uymikyekcosa* 'semantic case particles', the structural case particles being those case particles that are phrase-final.

2.2.2 Grammatical Relations

In this subsection I explore the key notion of grammatical relations and its relevance for the adequate description of the grammar and usage of Korean *cosa*.

In many linguistic works in the functional-typological vein grammatical relations (GR) have a central place in the descriptions, generalizations and explanations of phenomena in specific languages as well as across languages (e.g. Givon (1995, 1997); Croft (1990, 2003)). Noun declension and "nominal case morphology" have a prominent role in the approaches to GR; morphemes like Korean *cosa* are viewed as key elements of the coding of grammatical relations. For now, we can assume that we can divide *cosa* into different types based on different usage. Whether or not a certain role they mark is syntactic or not, depends on the definition and scope of syntax. For example, the *cosa* **i/ka** could mark the Subject argument of the predicate in certain constructions, which is perceived as a purely syntactic role in a more narrow interpretation of syntax, as well as Focus in other constructions, which is perceived as a discourse role, or a pragmatic role, and could be outside syntax or inside syntax depending on the definition or the understanding

of the scope of syntactic relations. Similarly, the prototypical role of the Topic marker **un/nun** can be viewed as related or not to syntax depending on whether information packaging is treated as part of the syntax of a language.

Despite the importance of semantic roles, and semantic and pragmatic factors in general, for Korean grammar, grammatical relations exist in Korean and are relatively easily identifiable in many constructions. Although there is correspondence between grammatical relations and morphological marking both cross-linguistically and in Korean to some extent, we subscribe to the view that grammatical relations are determined not so much by morphological marking but by sound syntactic criteria. The properties of the grammatical relation Subject are divided into coding properties (which can be morphological, like verb agreement and case marking, or syntactic, like rigid constituent order) and behavioral properties (which are syntactic and are based on different grammatical constructions in a concrete language). Such properties are not universal and although there are some strong tendencies cross-linguistically, "in individual languages each grammatical relation often has quite distinctive properties" (Van Valin, Jr. (2001: 41)).

Different tests and diagnostics for subjecthood have been proposed for Korean. Yoon (2009) summarizes them (referring to Yoon (1986), Hong (1991), Youn (1991), etc) as follows:

Proposed subject diagnostics for Korean:

a. Nominative case-marking

b. Controller of optional plural-marking

c. Controller of subject honorification

d. Target of Subject-to-Object raising

e. Target of Control

f. Controller of PRO in complement (obligatory) control

g. Controller of PRO in adjunct control

h. Controller of coordinate deletion

i. Antecedent of (subject-oriented) anaphors

j. Exhaustive-listing interpretation of *–ka/-i*.

However, according to Yoon (1986) (quoted in Yoon (2009)) only the following are reliable:

<u>Subject diagnostics</u>:

a. Subject honorification

b. Equi controller in Obligatory Control

c. Controller of coordinate deletion

Yoon (2009) claims that there is more than one subject in the Multiple Subject Constructions, also known as Multiple Nominative Constructions, and the properties of subject are split among them. Besides the grammatical subject, these constructions have "Major Subjects" (this notion will be discussed in the chapter on **i/ka**). According to Yoon (2009) the diagnostics for Major Subject and Grammatical Subject are:

Diagnostic for Major Subjects:

a. Subject-to-Object Raising

b. Nominative case-marking

Diagnostic for Grammatical Subjects:

a. Subject honorification

b. Equi controller in obligatory control

Kim and Sells (2010: 606) "primarily use two tests for subjecthood. The first is the possibility for an NP to host the honorific marker *kkeyse*. This is a strong test, as *kkeyse* can only mark subjects (Sells (1995), Yoon (2005)). The second test is honorific agreement between a predicate and its subject, which again is only possible with subjects. This is a highly robust and salient phenomenon of Korean grammar. Another grammatical diagnostic that we use involves "floated quantifiers", which […] distinguish the direct grammatical functions of subject and object from oblique grammatical functions".

Typically, researchers of Korean syntax identify grammatical relations using syntactic criteria across different grammatical constructions. For example, in order to identify Subject in Korean, Yeon (2003) uses syntactic rules such as reflexivisation, conjunction reduction and honorification. He distinguishes two types of double-nominative constructions. Type 1 is exemplified by (2.21) and (2.22) (adapted from (ibid: 49-50)).

(2.21) 순이가 어머니가 예쁘다.

Sun.i ka emeni ka yeypputa.

Suni NOM mother NOM is.beautiful.DECL

It is Suni (and only she) whose mother is beautiful.

(2.22) 선생님이 어린 손자가 똑똑하다.

Sensayngnim i elin sonca ka ttokttokhata.

teacher NOM little grandchild NOM is.bright.DECL

It is the teacher (and only he) whose little grandchild is intelligent.

These constructions are typically interpreted as providing new information in the first NP (focus) and can be used as answers to wh-questions[14], e.g. (2.21') in the case of (2.21).

(2.21') 누가 어머니가 예쁘니?

Nwu ka emeni ka yeyppuni?

who NOM mother NOM is.beautiful.Q

Who is it whose mother is beautiful?

In both (2.21) and (2.22) the first nominal phrase marked with **i/ka** is not part of the logical structure of the descriptive verb (i.e. is not selected by the predicate). These descriptive verbs are single-argument state predicates and their argument is denoted by the second nominal phrase, which is also marked with **i/ka**. The relevant tests show that the second nominal phrases are the subjects of the predicates.

The application of the **honorification** test in (2.23) and (2.24) shows that the predicate can take the honorific suffix **(u)si** only if the second NP can trigger it. As (2.24) clearly shows the first NP cannot trigger honorification in the verb.

(2.23) 순이가 어머니가 예쁘시다.

Sun.i ka emeni ka yeyppu-si-ta.

Suni NOM mother NOM is.beautiful.HON.DECL

It is Suni (and only she) whose mother [honorific] is beautiful.

---

[14] Other possible interpretations of the sentences exemplifying this type of double-nominative construction will be discussed in the chapter on **i/ka**.

(2.24) *선생님이 어린 손자가 똑똑하시다

Sensayngnim i elin sonca ka ttokttokha-*si-ta.

teacher NOM little grandchild NOM is.bright-HON-DECL

It is the teacher (and only he) whose little grandchild is intelligent.

The reflexive binding test shows that the reflexive word **caki** can only be co-referent with the second NP and not the first NP, as in (2.25):

(2.25) 순이가 어머니가 자기 나이보다 젊으시다.

Sun.i$_i$ ka emeni$_j$ ka caki$_{*i/j}$ nai pota celm-usi-ta.

Suni NOM mother NOM self age than is.young.HON.DECL

It is Suni$_i$ (and only she) whose mother$_j$ looks younger than her$_{*i/j}$ age.

As (2.26) shows, the **coordinate subject deletion** test also demonstrates that the second NP, not the first one, behaves like a syntactic subject.

(2.26) 순이가 어머니가 예쁘시고 부지런하시다.

Sun.i$_i$ ka emeni$_j$ ka yeyppu-si-ko [$\varnothing_{*i/j}$] pucilenha-si-ta.

Suni NOM mother NOM is.beautiful.HON.CONN is.diligent.HON.DECL

It is Suni (and only she) whose mother is beautiful and diligent.

Yeon (2003: 50) concludes that in Type 1 Multiple Nominative Constructions the subject is the second NP, the one which is the argument of the single-argument verb. The second NP and the predicate, without the first NP, are a well-formed

sentence. As for the status of the first NP, Yeon (ibid.) assumes that it is the 'focus nominal'.

There is a certain symmetry between sentences (2.21) and (2.27) below.

(2.27) 순이는 어머니가 예쁘다.

Sun.i nun emeni ka yeypputa.

Suni TOP mother NOM is.beautiful.DECL

As for Suni, her mother is beautiful.

Sentence (2.27) is usually regarded as a topic-comment sentence, and the topical element '**Sun.i nun**' is regarded as External Topic since it is not part of the logical structure of the predicate. However the comment part is clearly connected to the topic part. Similarly, we can regard the focal element '**Sun.i ka'** in (2.21) an example of External Focus since its referent is not an argument in the logical structure of the predicate but, similarly to the topic-comment construction, here the presupposition part is also clearly connected to the focal element. If this element, which is external in relation to the predicate structure, could be interpreted neither as Focus, nor as Topic (but as an NP within a sentence-focus construction, for example, as in (2.21") below[15]) (and this has been shown often, e.g. Yoon (2004a, 2004b, 2009) among others), then the question arises what its status is from a syntactic point of view.

(2.21") 순이가 어머니가 예쁘다.

Sun.i ka emeni ka yeypputa.

---

[15] Despite having the same linear structure, (1.21) and (1.21") will normally have different prosodic characteristics. We will return to these constructions in the chapter on **i/ka**.

Suni NOM mother NOM is.beautiful.DECL

(I see/realize that) Suni's mother is beautiful.

Actually, if we accept that it is Major Subject (as in Yoon's treatment), then (as a logical extension of this theoretical stance) we could regard the respective topic element (as in (2.27)) and the respective focal element (as in (2.21)) are instances of Topicalized Major Subject and Focalized Major Subject, respectively. Then, these three sentences ((2.21), (2.21") and (2.27)) will be regarded as allosentences[16] with basically the same syntactic structure but different information structures. We will discuss this in more detail in the chapter on **i/ka**.

Type 2 Multiple Nominative Constructions are exemplified by sentences (2.28) – (2.31).

(2.28) 선생이 학생이 필요하다.

Sensayng i haksayng i phil.yohata.

teacher NOM student NOM need.DECL

Teachers need students.

(2.29) 할아버지가 아들이 있다.

Hal.apeci ka atul i issta.

grandfather NOM son NOM have.DECL

Grandfather has a son.

(2.30) 할아버지가 돈이 많다.

---

[16] Here I use the term allosentence as defined by Lambrecht (1994) (see the section on information structure).

Hal.apeci ka ton i manhta.

grandfather NOM money NOM is.much.DECL

Grandfather has a lot of money.

(2.31) 내가 민호가 좋다.

Nay ka Minho ka cohta.

I NOM Minho NOM like.DECL

I like Minho.

The predicates of the sentences from Type 2 Multiple Nominative Constructions are also descriptive verbs, like in Type 1. However, they are typically two-argument state predicates. Here is how Yeon (ibid.: 54) characterizes them in contrast to Type 1:

These double-nominative constructions again typically answer WH-questions such as 'Who is it that needs students?', 'Who is it that has a son?', 'Who is it that has a lot of money?', 'Who is it that likes Minho?', and thus the first NP is a focus of new information. However, structurally this 'type 2' differs significantly from 'type 1'.

The first difference is that, whereas in type 1 the sentential predicate is a complete sentence by itself and the focus NP is not selected by the predicate, type 2 requires two NPs to satisfy the valency requirement of the predicate. In other words, the predicates in type 2 are two-place predicates.

A second difference is that there is no relatedness restriction or possessive relationship between the first NP and the second NP.

A third difference is that there are alternative constructions for type 2, the first NP being marked with the dative.

Sentences (2.28') – (2.31') are alternative versions of (2.28) – (2.31) respectively.

(2.28') 선생에게 학생이 필요하다

Sensayng eykey haksayng i phil.yohata.

teacher DAT student NOM need.DECL

Teachers need students.

(2.29') 할아버지에게 아들이 있다

Hal.apeci eykey atul i issta.

grandfather DAT son NOM have.DECL

Grandfather has a son.

(2.30') 할아버지에게 돈이 많다

Hal.apeci eykey ton i manhta.

grandfather DAT money NOM is.much.DECL

Grandfather has a lot of money.

(2.31') 나에게 민호가 좋다.

Na eykey Minho ka cohta.

I DAT Minho NOM like.DECL

I like Minho.

Sentences (2.28') – (2.31') are examples of the dative-subject constructions. In both sets of sentences ((2.28) – (2.31) and (2.28') – (2.31')) the first nominal, marked

either with **i/ka** or with **eykey**, is the Subject. Yeon (ibid.: 55) demonstrates this for the double nominative constructions, where the first nominal phrase controls **subject honorification**, as in (2.32) (in (2.33) the second nominal fails to trigger honorification in the predicate), **reflexive binding**, as in (2.34) and (2.35), and **coordinate subject deletion**, as in (2.36).

(2.32) 선생이 학생이 필요하시다.

Sensayng i haksayng i phil.yoha-si-ta.

teacher NOM student NOM need.HON.DECL

Teachers need students.

(2.33) *학생이 선생이 필요하시다.

Haksayng i sensayng i phil.yoha-*si-ta.

student NOM teacher NOM need.HON.DECL

Students need teachers.

(2.34) 선생이 학생이 자기 수입을 위해 필요하시다.

Sensayng$_i$ i haksayng$_j$ i caki$_{i/*j}$ swuip ul.wihay phil.yoha-si-ta.

teacher NOM student NOM self income for need-HON-DECL

Teachers$_i$ need students$_j$ for their$_{i/*j}$ income.

(2.35) 순이가 민호가 자기 동생보다 더 좋다.

Sun.i$_i$ ka Minho$_j$ ka caki tongsayng pota te cohta.

Suni NOM Minho NOM self younger.brother than more like.DECL

Suni$_i$ likes Minho$_j$ more than her$_{i/*j}$ brother.

(2.36) 내가 민호가 좋고 용이가 싫다.

Nay ka Minho ka cohko [∅] Yongi ka silhta.

I NOM Minho NOM like.CONN Yongi NOM dislike.DECL

I like Minho and dislike Yongi. (*I like Minho and Yongi dislikes Minho.)

With similar tests Yeon (ibid.: 60) shows that the first nominal in the dative-subject constructions is also the subject (hence the name of the construction). As for the status of the second nominal in the Type 2 Double Nominative Constructions and the Dative-Subject Constructions, Yeon (ibid.: 57) states that it is a non-subject and assumes that it is an object. As Van Valin, Jr. (2001: 59) writes, "[d]irect objects are difficult to characterize universally, because they have few unique or exclusive attributes". One common property of (direct) objects cross-linguistically is passivization, but it is not applicable in this case: Korean descriptive verbs do not have passivize.

In fact, many of the descriptive verbs used in these constructions can occur in constructions where they are single-argument state predicates. Hence **coh-**, for example, could be glossed as both 'is.good' and 'like'. The semantic of the lexical item seems to be important when it comes to Korean descriptive verbs. Obviously, *This book is green* is more objective than *This book is scary* and *John is good* is more subjective than *John is tall*. The predicates that are more "subjective" in meaning would call to a greater extent for a potential second argument, the "subject" of the subjective feeling.

Regarding the constructions under discussion Yeon (2003: 63) remarks:

At the moment, the positive evidence to clarify the grammatical relation of the second nominative NP is not very convincing. We assume that the case-marking of the object is also related to the degree of transitivity. The potential P is marked with the accusative and the non-prototypical P can be marked with the non-accusative or the nominative. The marking of P with the nominative in accusative languages was interpreted as an expression of ergativity by Moravcsik (1978b), in the sense that P and S are encoded identically with the nominative marker. We tentatively assume that in Korean objects very low in transitivity are marked as nominative instead of accusative.

We acknowledge that subjects in these constructions share properties with Subjects in other constructions (e.g. two-argument activity predicate constructions) to a greater degree than objects. That is why we can treat the objects in these constructions as construction-specific low-transitivity objects (LT Objects) that do not necessary share all the properties that prototypical Direct Objects in two-argument activity predicate constructions have. We can note that the LT Objects have semantic roles like stimulus, sensation, target (of emotion), possessed, i.e. the second argument of state predicates expressed by descriptive verbs in Korean. It is interesting that stimuli of seeing and hearing (normally expressed by processive verbs in Korean, e.g. **po-** 'see', **tut-** 'hear', etc, which have morphologically derivative passive and causative forms) are coded accusatively just like prototypical Direct Objects. Second arguments of processive verbs derived from descriptive verbs for emotion and need (like **coh.aha-** 'like' from **coh-** 'is.good'/'like') are also coded accusatively like prototypical Direct Objects[17]. That option is not available to descriptive verbs denoting possession, but possession can still be expressed with constructions using **ul/lul**-marked direct objects in constructions with processive

---

[17] Yoon (2004b: 265) states that for "psychological and necessity predicates participating in NNSCs [Non-nominative Subject Constructions], an event or state described with a NNSC can be alternately expressed using a transitive predicate."

verbs like **kac-** or **kaci-** 'hold'/'possess', Sino-Korean verbs like **soyuha-** 'own', etc. That means that morphosyntactic coding of arguments depends on semantic, as well as on lexicomorphological factors.

Another set of constructions that are usually associated with (sometimes) alternating **i/ka-** and **ul/lul-**marking are the constructions the so-called Adverbial Case constructions, involving *cosa*-attaching to adjunct nominal phrases for time (duration), frequency, and other quantification expressions. They have been analyzed extensively (e.g. Maling (1989), Hong (1991), Lee and Wechsler (1993), Wechsler and Lee (1996), Kim and Maling (1993), Bratt (1996), etc). I will not discuss them in detail because that will increase the volume of this study immensely and also because it seems that there is some disaagreement even among native speakers about the grammaticality/ungrammaticality of some of the examples discussed in the literature. However, I have to point to the fact that **ul/lul-** and **i/ka-**marking in these constructions seem to conform to the basic conclusions coming out of this study, namely that usage of the two *cosa* and the concrete choice which one of the two is used is based to a large extent on semantic, as well as pragmatic considerations, similar to the ones described in later chapters here (e.g. Hong (1991: 265), Wechsler and Lee (1996: 635-637), Kim (1990: 293), Bratt (1996: 90)). A key semantic feature identified by Hong (ibid) is agentivity. B. Kim (2008) links *cosa*-marking of these adverbials to "Identification Focus" (Contrastive Focus). The easiness with which the *cosa* in question can be omitted also points to semantics and pragmatic rather than to syntactic roles.

In the next section I will explore the theoretical implications of linguistic semantics for the grammar of Korean nominal phrases and *cosa*.

2.3 Semantic Roles and Categories

I turn now to elements of semantic theory that are relevant for my analyses and discussions of the *cosa* constructions in the next chapters.

It has been noted that the occurrence of Korean *cosa* depends on semantic factors, e.g. the semantic roles of the constituents they are attached to. That is why the semantic representation of sentences is relevant for a better understanding of the grammar and usage of *cosa*, especially the ones that are formatives rather than postpositions. The semantic representation of a sentence is based on the lexical representation of the verb or predicating element and the relations between the predicate and its arguments.

There are several classification of verbs, or more precisely – of predicates, based on their semantics in the literature (e.g. Vendler 1967, Dowty 1979, Jackendoff 1976, Andrews 2007). The logical structure of a concrete predicate expression assigns a certain number of argument positions. The number of arguments assigned by a predicate depends on the meaning and the usage of the predicate, i.e. the same verb can assign a different number of arguments in different constructions. Also, verbs in different languages, even if they "mean" the same thing, could assign different numbers of arguments, hence different numbers of semantic roles. There is not a full list or a "correct" set of semantic roles (Palmer (1994: 5-6), Van Valin, Jr. (2001: 23)). However, there are a number of semantic roles that are widely acknowledged and used in the semantic and syntactic analyses of languages. Their significance and relevance for the morphosyntax of sentences cannot be ignored. The importance of the logical structure of predicates and semantic roles they assign for the adequate description of Korean sentence grammar has been long recognized. Since the number of semantic roles is potentially quite large, generalizations that are

possible at several levels have been used. Thus, a set of more or less generalized semantic roles is used in the grammatical descriptions of languages. "It would seem that agent, patient, experiencer, recipient, instrumental and locative are the six roles which play a crucial role in the […] analysis of Korean and at the same time are relevant to cross-linguistic comparison" (Yeon (2003: 43)).

We will use the system developed in Van Valin, Jr. and LaPolla (1997) and Van Valin, Jr. (2005). They make a distinction between **participant roles** in states of affairs and **thematic relations** (Van Valin, Jr. and LaPolla (1997: 113)):

> The semantic relations between a predicate and its arguments which express the participant roles in the state of affairs denoted by the verb are called **thematic relations**. The labels usually used for thematic relations are basically the same as those used for participant roles […]. Thematic relations are linguistic entities, i.e. they are part of natural-language semantics, while participant roles are not; they are properties of states of affairs in the world. […] It is not legitimate to argue that a verb needs to have a participant kind of argument solely because of the state of affairs it denotes may have a specific kind of participant; […] verbs in different languages which may be used to refer to the same state of affairs may have quite different properties.

Even in the same language different verbs (i.e. different lexical items) that could be used to denote the same state of affairs can have different logical structures (i.e. different lexical representations), different numbers of arguments and different thematic relations, i.e. different "semantic interpretation[s] of an argument in a logical structure and in a sentence" (ibid.).

Some commonly used participant roles (that will be relevant for our analyses of *cosa* usage) and their definitions are given below (ibid.: 85-86):

agent: a willful, purposeful instigator of an action or event , such as in *Leslie* breaking the glass on purpose.

effector: the doer of an action, which may or may not be willful or purposeful, as in *Max* breaking the clock accidentally, *a puppy* chewing up Maria's new shoes.

experiencer: sentient beings that experience internal states, such as perceivers, cognizers and emoters as in *Felipe* thinking about/remembering/disliking the question.

instrument: normally inanimate entities manipulated by an agent in the carrying out of an action, as in Juan breaking a window with *a rock*.

force: somewhat like instruments, but they cannot be manipulated. They can include things like tornados, storms and acts of God, as in *a flood* washing away a village.

patient: things that are in a state or condition, or undergo a change of state or condition, e.g. *Sue* being tall, sick or dying, or *a window* breaking.

theme: things which are located or are undergoing a change of location (motion), as in *a book* being on the table or Carl putting *a book* on the table.

benefactive: the participant for whose benefit some action is performed, e.g. Ned baking a cake for *Yvonne*, or picking up some dry cleaning for *Tanisha*.

recipient: someone who gets something (recipients are always animate or some kind of quasi-animate entity, e.g. an organization), as in Vidhu sending a card to *Hari*.

goal: destination which is similar to recipient, except that it is often inanimate, as in Larry sending a package to *Baltimore*.

source: the point of origin of the state of affairs. It is used in a variety of cases, which can conflate the ambiguity between recipient and goal […]. In the case of David giving a book to Kristen, *David* is both an agent and a source. Agent and recipient can also be the same participant, as in *Yolanda* buying the dog from Bill.

location: a place or a spatial locus of a state of affairs, as in the book being on *the table* or Bob eating a sandwich in *the kitchen*.

path: a route, as in Quentin jogging along *the creek* to the park.

The states of affairs in the world can be different types, e.g. situations, events, processes and actions (according to one classification (ibid.: 83)). Lexical items, e.g.

verbs and other predicating elements expressing the type of the state of affairs and referring expressions (noun phrases) denoting the participants, are linguistic means used to code an event, a situation, etc into a concrete language expression. The same state of affairs can be expressed differently in the same language. Also, there are significant differences across languages what aspects of the state of affairs they lexicalize and what they require to be coded. The states of affairs are basic and the participant roles are derived. Verbs and other predicating elements have specific lexical representations depending on their type. These representations are called **logical structures** and they include sets of arguments denoting participants. In a clause the arguments are normally expressed by referring expressions (ibid.: 102). Arguments denoting certain types of generalized semantic roles tend to be morphologically and syntactically marked in a similar way.

According to the classification of verbs and predicates used in Van Valin, Jr. and LaPolla (1997: 115) and Van Valin, Jr. (2005: 55) (based on Vendler (1967)) two classes assign argument positions: state predicates (corresponding to situations in the classification of states of affairs) and activity predicates (corresponding to actions). The other classes have structures based on the structures of state and activity predicates.. State verbs can be single-argument verbs or two-argument verbs. Activity verbs can be single-argument verbs and one-or-two-arguments verbs. We are not going into the specifics of the representations of the logical structures of verbs. We will return to the semantic roles of arguments when we discuss the usage of specific *cosa* in the next chapters.

2.4 Information Structure and Pragmatic Functions

2.4.1 Information Structure of Sentences in Linguistic Theory

Now I outline the theoretical postulates and research findings in the field of information structure that I have found adequate, useful and applicable in the analysis of *cosa* usage in different constructions and types of sentences. In later chapters I use these in my analysis and discussion of the four *cosa* that I focus on in this work.

The pragmatic factors that are relevant for this research have to do with the pragmatics of sentences, and more specifically with their **information structure**. The study of information structure of sentences (sometimes called differently) has a long tradition in the linguistics of the twentieth century. It was studied by scholars of the Prague School of linguistics (e.g. Mathesius (1928, 1929), Daneš (1966)); they usually used the label "functional sentence perspective". More recent works in both formalist and functionalist traditions have highlighted the importance of this aspect of linguistic pragmatics (Halliday (1967), Kuno (1972), Chafe (1976), Vallduví (1990), Lambrecht (1994), Erteschik-Shir (1997, 2007), Van Valin, Jr. (1993, 2005)). In nearly all of them information structure is viewed as a level of grammatical analysis parallel to syntax and semantics. Following more closely Lambrecht (1994), Van Valin, Jr. and LaPolla (1997) and Van Valin, Jr. (2005), I will use their analyses and theoretical treatment of information structure as a component of sentence grammar when I analyze the relevant Korean sentences and constructions in order to explore the meaning and usage of phrase-final *cosa*. According to them, the structure of a sentence reflects a speaker's assumption about the hearer's state of knowledge and consciousness at the time of the utterance and the relationship between speaker

assumptions and formal sentence structure is governed by rules and conventions of grammar. According to Lambrecht's (1994: 5) definition, information structure is "that component of sentence grammar in which propositions as conceptual representations of the state of affairs are paired with lexicogrammatical structures in accordance with the mental states of interlocutors who use and interpret these structures as units of information in given discourse context".

The first two of the several key concepts used in the analysis of information structure are **presupposition** and **assertion**. Pragmatic presupposition (or simply presupposition) refers to the "old information" in the sentence, while pragmatic assertion (or simply assertion) refers to the "new information". Lambrecht's (ibid: 52) definitions are:

Pragmatic presupposition: The set of propositions lexicogrammatically evoked in a sentence which the speaker assumes the hearer already knows or is ready to take for granted at the time the sentence is uttered.

Pragmatic assertion: The proposition expressed by a sentence which the hearer is expected to know or take for granted as a result of hearing the sentence uttered.

These two concepts are linked to the two other key concepts in the analysis of the information structure of sentences, namely the pragmatic relations **topic** and **focus**. The topic is what the proposition is about. "The topic relation is the relation of aboutness between a proposition and a discourse entity… Fully active referents are the cognitively preferred topics" (ibid: 334). Distinction is made between "topic" as the entity or referent which stands in a topic relation with a proposition and "topic" as its linguistic expression in a sentence (ibid: 131):

I propose the following definitions of the pragmatic category "topic" and the grammatical category "topic expression":

Topic: A referent is interpreted as the topic of a proposition if in a given situation the proposition is construed as being about this referent, i.e. as expressing information which is relevant to and which increases the addressee's knowledge of this referent.

Topic expression: A constituent is a topic expression if the proposition expressed by the clause with which it is associated is pragmatically construed as being about the referent of this constituent.

It is noted that topics are often codes pronominally or inflectionally (e.g. bound pronouns) across languages. Another morphological feature is that they tend to be coded with definite NPs rather than indefinite NPs. Korean does not make use of such morphological means. However, as we have already demonstrated, the usage of the phrase-final particles with NPs is related to these pragmatic relations.

The focus is the "complement of the topic", "that semantic element whose presence makes the proposition into an assertion, i.e. into a potential piece of information" (ibid: 334). The definition of focus (also called "focus of the assertion") is (ibid: 213):

Focus: The semantic component of a pragmatically structured proposition whereby the assertion differs from the presupposition.

Focus is not a formal category and it can be marked by different prosodic and morphosyntactic means in a sentence. There is a distinction between the focus of the assertion and the syntactic constituent in which it appears in the sentence (e.g. NP, clause). The syntactic constituent in which focus occurs is the **focus domain**. Focus domains must be phrasal rather than lexical categories. Further distinction is made

between potential focus domain and actual focus domain. **Potential focus domain** is "the syntactic domain in which the focus element(s) may occur", while **actual focus domain** is "the actual part of the sentence in focus in the construction" (Van Valin, Jr. and LaPolla (1997)).

The **focus structure** of a sentence is "the conventional association of a focus meaning with a sentence form" (ibid: 222). There are different types of focus. There is narrow focus (called argument focus in Lambrecht (1994) and broad focus; and there are two types of broad focus:

> **Narrow focus** is when a single constituent, such as an NP, is focused. **Broad focus** is when the focus includes more than one constituent. It may include all but the topic, as in the so-called "topic-comment" construction, which Lambrecht calls **predicate focus**, or it may include the entire sentence, which Lambrecht calls **sentence focus**. These focus types correlate with three different communicative functions, i.e. identifying a referent, commenting on a topic and reporting an event or presenting a new discourse referent, respectively. (Van Valin, Jr. and LaPolla (1997: 206)).

Sentences with **narrow-focus** structure are also called **identificational sentences** ("since they serve to identify a referent as the missing argument in an open proposition" Lambrecht (1994: 122)) or focus-presupposition sentences (Andrews (2007)). Sentences with **sentence-focus** structure are also called **thetic sentences** (in Lambrecht (1994: 138) among others) but they – or subcategories of them – have also been called presentational (Bolinger (1954) and others), existential, event-reporting (Lambrecht (1987)), as well as neutral descriptions (Kuno (1972)) and

news sentences (Schmerling (1976)). Sentences with **predicate-focus** structure are also called **categorical** or **topic-comment** sentences[18].

Below I reproduce three example sentences ((2.37), (2.38) and (2.39)) for the three types of focus structure together with the analytical presentations of their information structure ((2.37'), (2.38') and (2.39')) are from Van Valin Jr. and LaPolla (1997: 206-207), which are slightly changed versions of Lambrecht's (1994: 223-233)). The analyzed sentences are the answers in the mini-dialogues (the prosodically prominent words are in small capitals). The question sentences point to the possible context in which the answer sentences could be uttered. I also provide representations of the focus structure with brackets and subscripts ((2.37"), (2.38") and (2.39")), following the representations used in Lambrecht's book.

(2.37) **Predicate focus**

Q: What happened to your car?

A: My car broke DOWN. (*or* It broke DOWN.)

(2.37')

Sentence: My car broke DOWN.

Presupposition: 'speaker's car is available as a topic for comment x'

Assertion: 'x = broke down'

Focus: 'broke down'

Focus domain: verb plus remaining postverbal core constituents

(2.37") TOP[My car] FOC[broke DOWN]

(2.38) **Sentence focus**

    Q: What happened?

    A: My CAR broke down.

(2.38')

Sentence: My CAR broke down.

Presupposition: none

Assertion: 'speaker's car broke down'

Focus: 'speaker's car broke down'

Focus domain: clause

(2.38") $_{FOC}$[My car broke DOWN]

(2.39) **Narrow focus**

    Q: I heard your motorcycle broke down

    A: My CAR broke down.

(2.39')

Sentence: My CAR broke down.

Presupposition: 'speaker's x broke down'

Assertion: x = car

Focus: 'car'

Focus domain: NP

(2.39") FOC[My CAR] broke down.

As it becomes clear from their different information structures the three sentences (2.37), (2.38) and (2.39) express different "meanings" from a certain point of view, despite being semantically equivalent, i.e. they relate the same proposition (that the car of the speaker has broken down). Lambrecht calls sentence pairs like (2.37) and (2.38), or (2.38) and (2.39), pairs of **allosentences**. Here is how he defines it (ibid: 6):

> Information-structure analysis is centered on the comparison of semantically equivalent but formally and pragmatically divergent sentence pairs, such as active vs. passive, canonical vs. topicalized, canonical vs. clefted or dislocated, subject accented vs. predicate accented sentences, etc. Using a term introduced by Daneš (1966), I will refer to such sentences as pair of ALLOSENTENCES. Differences in the information structure of sentences are always understood in terms of contrasts between allosentences, i.e. against a background of available but unused grammatical alternatives for expressing a given proposition.

In this case, (2.37), (2.38) and (2.39) all have the same linear syntactic structure. (2.37) is different prosodically from the other two. (2.38) and (2.39) have the same prosodies but they are used in different context. For example (2.39) can be replaced by (2.40) in the same context, while (2.38) cannot.

(2.40) It was my CAR that broke down.

According to Lambrecht (1994:17), sentences like (2.38) are unmarked for the feature "narrow focus", while sentences like (2.40) (using a cleft construction)

are marked. In English sentences with sentence-focus structure usually have the same prosodic contours as sentences with narrow-focus structure. It also becomes clear from these examples that the main focus-marking mechanisms in English are prosodic (ibid: 224). These facts highlight a linguistic phenomenon that seems to be universal, namely the functional underspecification of syntactic structures (ibid: 29). In Korean the main focus-marking mechanisms are prosodic and morphological (different phrase-final particles). However, constructional (e.g. cleft construction) and syntactic (e.g. constituent order) mechanisms could also be used.

There is a useful contrast between **marked** and **unmarked** narrow focus (Lambrecht (1994: 296), Van Valin, Jr. and LaPolla (1997: 209)). Korean has an unmarked focus position in the clause (Kim (1988), Yang (1994)), which is the immediately preverbal position. This is a typological feature normal for verb-final languages. If the focus element is in a different position, then the focus will be marked.

For the discussion of *cosa*, contrastive topics and contrastive foci are also relevant. When two or more topicalized constituents are contrasted, then there are **contrastive topics**. Sometimes, it is possible to have a single contrastive topic in a sentence. It is contrasted with presumably active entities from the world of the discourse that have been mentioned in previous sentences or are otherwise deemed accessible to the hearer. When two or more focalized constituents are contrasted, then there are **contrastive foci** (Lambrecht (1994), Heycock (2008)). Focus structure is also important for the interpretation of negation (polarity) and quantification. It is also related with other notions, like "only" and "even". Topics and Foci are discussed in the following chapters in connection with concrete interpretations.

Another element of the information-structure theory that is relevant for the discussion of *cosa* usage (including the lack of *cosa* and usage of bare nouns or

nominal phrases, as it becomes clear from Kwon and Zribi-Hertz (2008)) is the mental representations of discourse referents. Not all nominal phrases are referring expressions (e.g. the predicate nominal *an architect* in *John is an architect* is not a referring expression and does not have a referent). All referents of individual sentence constituents have mental representations (cognitive states) in the minds of speech participants (Prince (1981), Chafe (1987), Lambrecht (1994), LaPolla (1995)). Using the categories of **identifiability** and **activation**, Lambrecht summarizes the activation states (some of them with alternative appellations) in (1.11) (Lambrecht (1994: 109)).

(2.41) (1) unidentifiable/brand-new

(2) unidentifiable anchored/brand-new anchored

(3) inactive/unused

(4) textually accessible

(5) situationally accessible

(6) inferentially accessible

(7) active/given

The first two categories in (2.41) are unidentifiable, while (3) – (7) are identifiable. The identifiable categories are further divided into three subcategories (inactive, accessible and active) in accordance with the degree of activation. The accessible subcategories are further divided into three subcategories (textually accessible, situationally accessible and inferentially accessible). Lambrecht (1994: 108) also notes that "the tendency is strong for unidentifiable referents to be coded as indefinite noun phrases." Also, "pronominal coding and absence of pitch prominence are sufficient, but not necessary, conditions for activeness of a referent". Apart from

the pitch prominence, the other coding strategies are lexical and morphological. Korean does not make use of the formal category of definiteness and of pronominal co-referencing on verbs. Pronominal coding (apart from the deictic nominals **na** and **ne**, referring to the speaker and the addressee) is also really used. However, there are strong tendencies for phrase-final *cosa* of nominal phrases to be indicative of the cognitive states of referents in discourse.

2.4.2 Information Structure of Korean Sentences

The analysis of information structure is crucial for a more detailed and precise rendition of the structure and meaning of Korean constructions. Very often a certain utterance or a sentence has been examined in only one of its possible meanings, thus failing to fully acknowledge its polysemanticity when reviewed in isolation, outside the pragmatic context in which it may occur. But it has been widely acknowledged that the same sequence of words and morphemes, e.g. a sentence, can be analysed differently depending on its context and pragmatics; i.e. different grammatical constructions can have the same linear presentations. This structural ambiguity called "constructional homonymity" is somewhat neglected when sentences are quoted in isolation and are viewed only in one of their possible meanings. Often they are stuck with glosses and translations that obscure the other potential interpretations.

Consider the following two sentences:

(2.42) 새가 울고 있다.

    SAY ka WULKO issta.

bird NOM cry.CONN exist.DECL

A BIRD is crying./BIRDS are crying.

(2.43) 새가 울고 있다.

SAY ka wulko issta.

bird NOM cry.CONN exist.DECL

It is A/THE BIRD that is crying./It is (THE) BIRDS that are crying.

The linear structure of sentences (2.42) and (2.43) could be represented in the same way:

NP *i/ka* PrV-*ko issta*;

or even more specifically, with syntactic roles made clear:

SUBJ NP *i/ka* PRED PrV-*ko issta*.

These notations do not capture the difference between the two sentences. The contexts in which they are realized are different. Sentence (2.42) could be just a description of a situation new to the discourse, or a remark on the background of the speech act; for example the speaker hears birds crying when he or she does not expect it and verbalizes it, or remarks on the fact that birds are crying in a speech context to which this fact is new, e.g. in a conversation that is not about the situation that birds are crying. It could also be an answer to the questions like "What is happening?" or "What is this noise?". On the other hand, sentence (2.43) could be uttered in a response to a question on the identity of the emitter of a sound

perceivable by the participants in the speech act, or a remark countering an utterance which asserts that the sound is being emitted by something different from birds; for example the speaker is asked "What (or who) is crying?" and responds to it; or the speaker's conversation partner remarks "Insects are crying" and the speaker asserts that it is not insects but birds that emit the noise they can hear. Both sentences can occur in a number of different contexts. In the spoken language the noun phrase **say ka** is normally pronounced with prominence (high pitch that emphasizes the focus status of the phrase. However, only when the information structure is reflected in the notation, the difference between the two sentences becomes visible in the written language as well. This is an example of constructional homonymity. These two sentences highlight the functional underspecification of syntactic structures (Lambercht (1994: 29)).

The information structure for sentence (2.42) can be represented as (2.42'):

(2.42')

Sentence: Say ka wulko issta

Presupposition: none

Assertion: 'Say ka wulko issta'

Focus: 'Say ka wulko issta'

Focus domain: clause

and the representation of the focus structure will be

$_{FOC}$[SAY ka WULKO issta]

Now, this focus structure could be "generalized" to represent the construction of all sentences with the same linear structure and the same information structure (sentence focus):

$_{FOC}$[SUBJ NP *i/ka* PRED PrV-*ko issta*].

The information structure for sentence (2.43) can be represented as (2.43'):

(2.43')

Sentence: Say ka wulko issta

Presupposition: 'x ka wulko issta'

Assertion: x = 'say'

Focus: 'say'

Focus domain: NP

and the representation of the focus structure will be

$_{FOC}$[S$_{AY}$ ka] wulko issta

and the representation of the respective construction will be

$_{FOC}$[SUBJ NP *i/ka*] PRED PrV-*ko issta*

Constructions similar to sentence (2.42) have been referred to by different terms, including "neutral description". As for constructions similar to sentence (2.43), they have been sometimes called "exhaustive listing". We will use different terms

here. We will regard sentence (2.42) as an example of sentence-focus structure (the whole sentence is in the actual focus domain); and sentence (2.43) as an example of narrow-focus structure, also called argument focus (only the subject NP is in the actual focus domain). These terms are taken and adapted from the analyses of information structure in simple sentences in Lambrecht 1994, Erteschik-Shir 1997, Van Valin Jr. and LaPolla 1997, Van Valin Jr. 2005. They are useful for the discussion of *cosa* as markers of elements of the information structure. In my notation $_{FOC}$[] marks the actual focus domain and $_{TOP}$[] marks the topic part of a sentence (if there is one)[19].

It is possible for the Subject to be topicalized, as in (2.44):

(2.44) 새는 울고 있다.

Say nun WULKO issta.

bird TOP cry.CONN exist.DECL

The birds [*established Topic*] are CRYING./Speaking of the bird, it is CRYING.

For comparison with the representations of sentences (2.42) and (2,43), (2.42') and (2.43') respectively, the information-structure representation of sentence (2.44) will be (2.44').

(2.44')

Sentence: Say nun wulko issta

Presupposition: 'the *say* 'bird(s)' is available as a topic for comment x'

Assertion: x = wulko issta

Focus: 'wulko issta'

Focus domain: verb plus postverbal auxiliaries

and the respective representations will be

TOP[Say nun] FOC[WULKO issta]

and, for the construction,

TOP[SUBJ NP *un/nun*] FOC[PRED PrV-*ko issta*].

It becomes clear that the subject NP in sentence (2.44) is topicalized and the predicate is in the actual focus domain. This sentence is a typical topic-comment sentence. It could be uttered when the birds are already an established topic in the discourse, i.e. when all participants in the speech act are aware of the bird(s) that the utterance is about. For example the speaker could be answering a question like "What are the birds doing (now)?". Sentence (2.44) is an example of a predicate-focus structure. The contexts in which sentence (2.44) could occur are different from the contexts in which sentence (2.42) or sentence (2.43) would be acceptable. We can say that the sentences (2.42), (2.43) and (2.44) are examples of the *SF (sentence focus) Construction*, the *FOC SUBJ PRED (focalized subject and predicate) Construction* and the *TOP SUBJ PRED (topicalized subject and predicate) Construction*. If we want to specify how the predicate is expressed, we could be more specific in the naming of the constructions. If we write "intransitive processive (action) verb" as INTR PrV, then the names of the constructions will be the *SF INTR PrV-ko issta Construction*, the *FOC SUBJ INTR PrV-ko issta Construction* and the

TOP SUBJ INTR PrV-ko issta Construction respectively. Thus, we take into consideration as many aspects of the construction as possible.

In order to keep the names of the constructions and the notation in reasonable limits, we will have to consider only the factors that are relevant for this research. For example, when discussing grammatical marking of subjects in Korean (a nominative-accusative language), the type of the predicate – a processive verb, a descriptive verb, or a noun phrase plus **ita** – is not of particular relevance. On the other hand, the information structure, as already demonstrated, is quite relevant. That is why in the analysis we will try to put the emphasis on the relevant factors and avoid discussing redundant circumstances.

There is a sentence that could be regarded as a variant of (2.44) or the realization of a different construction altogether. Let us consider (2.45).

(2.45) 새는 울고 있다.

SAY nun WULKO issta.

bird TOP cry.CONJ exist.DECL

i. The BIRDS [*Contrastive Topic*] are CRYING./The BIRD is CRYING (; I do not know about the CAT(S)).

ii. (The) BIRDS are crying… (Maybe some other creatures are crying as well, I am not sure.)

The first interpretation of this sentence (i) could be uttered when the participants in the speech act are talking about birds in contrast to some other creatures, or when the speaker is answering a question like "What are the bird(s) and the cat(s) doing?" and they want to contrast what the bird is doing to what the cat is

doing, or to contrast their knowledge of what the bird is doing to their not knowing what the cat is doing, etc.

The respective representations will be:

CONTR TOP[SAY nun] FOC[WULKO issta]

and, for the construction,

CONTR TOP[SUBJ NP *un/nun*] FOC[PRED PrV-*ko issta*].

Here, we see that the *cosa* **un/nun** is used to mark a contrast in topic.

The second interpretation of this sentence (ii) could be uttered when the presupposition exists that some creatures are crying and the speaker is giving new information about what produces the noise. However the focalized constituent is contrasted with other discourse-inactive or brand new possible members of the potential set of crying creatures.

The difference between the two interpretations (i) and (ii) is subtle but important for the correct analysis of information structure.

For the discussion of *cosa*, contrastive topics and contrastive foci are also relevant. When two or more topicalized constituents are contrasted, then there are **contrastive topics**. Sometimes, it is possible to have a single contrastive topic in a sentence. It is contrasted with presumably active entities from the world of the discourse that have been mentioned in previous sentences or are otherwise deemed accessible to the hearer. When two or more focalized constituents are contrasted, then there are **contrastive foci** (Lambrecht (1994), Heycock (2008)). Focus structure is also important for the interpretation of negation and quantification. It is also

related with other notions, like "only" and "even". Such topics and foci are discussed in the following chapters in connection with concrete interpretations. In Chapter 5 I will also discuss different theoretical takes on contrastive topics and foci in connection with Korean.

Information structure considerations seem to be important not only for the choice of a certain *cosa* over another, but also for the choice not to use a *cosa* at all (i.e. just use a "bare noun"). A recent study (Kwon and Zbiri Hertz (2008)) has suggested that information structure is relevant for the usage of bare nouns as subjects and objects in Korean. In this work I use 'bare noun (phrase)' to mean just a noun (phrase) without any functional particles attached to it (as in ibid) and not a phrase formed of a lexical noun and a functional particle (as in Kuroda (2004), B. Kim (2008)). We will address the issue of bare nouns and bare noun phrases in the next chapters as well.

2.5 Set-up

Having established the morphological characteristics of the four phrase-final *cosa* that interest me and having clarified their structural properties, I look at the adequate tools for syntactic, semantic and pragmatic analyses of sentences in which the *cosa* occur. The aim is to come to understand their meaning and function across constructions, make generalizations and draw conclusions that can help satisfactorily explain the intricacies and the idiosyncrasies of their grammar and usage.

Chapter 3

Analysis and Discussion: The Grammar and Usage of I/KA

Now I proceed to analyze and discuss in detail a variety of constructions in which the *cosa* **i/ka** occurs. It is most often regarded as the Nominative case marker in Korean. This is due to the frequent occurrence of **i/ka** as marking Subjects in Sentence-Focus Constructions as well as the Focalized Subjects in Narrow-Focus Constructions. However, when the Subject is the Topic, which is typical cross-linguistically (Lee and Thompson (1976)), it is not marked with **i/ka** but with the Topic marker **un/nun**, or is not manifested at all. In colloquial speech Subjects are sometimes expressed by bare nouns, i.e. nouns that do not have any functional morphemes attached to the stem. Actually, unlike Korean verbs, Korean nouns can appear without any functional morphemes when they are in different grammatical relations and also asyntactically (Kwon and Zribi-Hertz (2008)). The Nominative marker under discussion here, which has two suppletive forms, **i** after consonants and **ka** after vowels, can also appear on nominal phrases that are not analyzed as subjects. It can also be on two or more constituents in a clause, which brings about challenges for its analysis. We start with constructions in which it is used to mark just one constituent.

3.1 Marking Narrow-Focus and Sentence-Focus Subjects

3.1.1 Focalized-Subject Constructions

Although sometimes lumped together as representatives of the "simple sentence" in Korean, the three sentences below instantiate three different constructions: the Topicalized-Subject Construction, the Focalized-Subject Construction and the Sentence-Focus Construction[20]:

(3.1) 철수는 학생이다.

Chelswu nun HAKSAYNG ita.

Chelswu TOP student PRED.DECL

Chelswu is A STUDENT.

(3.2) 철수가 학생이다.

CHELSWU ka haksayng ita.

Chelswu NOM student PRED

(It is) CHELSWU (who) is a student.

(3.3) 철수가 학생이다.

CHELSWU ka HAKSAYNG ita.

Chelswu NOM student PRED

CHELSWU is a student [, I realize].

---

[20] In these three examples the predicate is nominal; so they are examples of varieties of the respective constructions that include nominal predicate. Since the kind of the predicate (nominal, descriptive verb, or processive verb) is more or less irrelevant for this particular part of the discussion and we are more interested in the expression of the subjects, I do not go into too much detail in the labelling of the constructions. This discussion should be valid at least for all one-place predicates.

Their schematic representations will be (3.1'), (3.2') and (3.3') for sentence (3.1), sentence (3.2) and sentence (3.3), respectively.

(3.1') TOP[SUBJ NP *nun/un*] FOC[PRED NP *ita*]

(3.2') FOC[SUBJ NP *i/ka*] PRED NP *ita*

(3.3') FOC[SUBJ NP *i/ka* PRED NP *ita*]

In all three cases '**Chelswu**' is traditionally identified as the subject but in none of them is the particle present there encoding the constituent as the subject in the sense that it marks it with a unified subject marker. The particle **nun** is marking the Topic (in this case the Topicalized Subject), while the particle **ka** could be construed as marking the Focus, i.e. the Focalized Subject, in the second construction and the (neutral) Subject in the third construction, which is a sentence-focus construction (following Schütze (2001), Kuroda (1972), Lambrecht (1994)). The constituents are explicitly marked by the *cosa* from the viewpoint of information structure but the *cosa* **i/ka** also marks elements of the syntactic structure. It seems that unlike **un/nun,** which seems to be used to only mark elements of the information structure, **i/ka** is used in a more complicated way: in this case, for example, it marks Subjects but it does not mark Subjects consistently in Korean sentences (i.e. not like a "traditional" Nominative marker in many European language would do: the subject will be always marked as Nominative, regardless of the information structure). The Subject in the first sentence is not marked with **i/ka**, despite being in a typical pragmatic relation (topic) as a subject. It appears that **i/ka** only marks Subjects that

are not Topicalized, i.e. Subjects belonging to the Focus domain, typically Focalized Subjects (narrow focus) or Subjects in the Sentence-Focus constructions (broad focus).

We can say that in the (3.2') Construction the *cosa* **i/ka** marks the constituent that is in the role of the Focalized Subject. Similarly, we can claim that the *cosa* **un/nun** marks the constituent that is in the role of the Topicalized Subject in the construction represented in (3.1')

The sentences that were discussed here have a nominal predicate. But in Korean the *cosa* **i/ka** marks the Focalized Subject or the Sentence-Focus Subject in constructions with verbal predicates, intransitive and transitive processive verbs, as well as descriptive verbs. For example, the three sentences below (3.4), (3.5) and (3.6) have a descriptive verb as predicate and the three sentences (1.14), (1,13) and (1.12) have a processive verb as predicate. The observations about (3.1), (3.2) and (3.3) are valid for them as well[21]. That is why it is irrelevant for subject marking if the predicate is verbal or not. However, the semantics of the predicate and the whole clause is important for the choice of the *cosa*, as will be revealed.

(3.4). 마당의 꽃은 아름답다.

   Matang uy kkoch un ALUMTAPTA.

   yard GEN flower TOP is.beautiful.DECL

   It is the flowers in the yard that are BEAUTIFUL.

(3.5). 마당의 꽃이 아름답다.

   MATANG UY KKOCH i alumtapta.

---

[21] Sentences (3.4), (3.5) and (3.6) could have a different contour inside the subject NP if the locus of contrast is just the genitive NP but in this case the usage of clause-level *cosa*, which we are exploring, will not be affected.

yard GEN flower NOM is.beautiful.DECL

It is THE FLOWERS IN THE YARD that are beautiful.

(3.6). 마당의 꽃이 아름답다.

MATANG UY KKOCH i ALUMTAPTA.

yard GEN flower NOM is.beautiful.DECL

THE FLOWERS IN THE YARD are BEAUTIFUL.

The schematic representations will be (3.4'), (3.5') and (3.6') for sentence (3.4), sentence (3.5) and sentence (3.6), respectively.

(3.4') TOP[SUBJ NP *nun/un*] FOC[PRED DeV]

(3.5') FOC[SUBJ NP *i/ka*] PRED DeV

(3.6') FOC[SUBJ NP *i/ka* PRED DeV]

The generalized representations for the three constructions (the Topicalized Subject Construction, the Focalized-Subject Construction and the Sentence-Focus Construction will be (3.1"), (3.2") and (3.3"), respectively.

(3.1") TOP[SUBJ NP *nun/un*] FOC[PRED]

(3.2") FOC[SUBJ NP *i/ka*] PRED

(3.3") FOC[SUBJ NP *i/ka* PRED]

One interesting point to be made is that the (3.2) and (3.3) ((3.5) and (3.6), respectively) are examples of different constructions but have the same linear expression when written down conventionally, i.e. without taking into consideration that in (3.2) only the phrase **Chelswi ka**, the narrow focus, will be marked prosodically as prominent (high pitch). The rest of the sentence is the presupposition. In (3.3) both the subject and the predicate will be prominent. This is an example of constructional homonymity, at least in the written language. It could be argued that in the spoken language they are not homonymous since they will have different pitch contours. In any case, they are evidence for the functional underspecification of syntactic structures (Lambrecht (1994: 29)). This issue is especially poignant in the context of teaching Korean as a foreign language where sometimes, in the name of simplification, the difference between the two constructions is not very clearly drawn, resulting in confusion and misconceptions.

Sentences (3.2) and (3.5) are representatives of a narrow-focus construction, namely a focalized-subject construction: they are intended to specify what is doing something or possesses a certain property, or when answering a subject information question. They are characterized by prosodic prominence of the subject NP only. The subject NP is also marked by the *cosa* **i/ka**. Subjects in this construction cannot be omitted, i.e. they cannot be coded as zero. For example, (3.2) is felicitous as an answer to a question like *Who is a student?* (or *Who is the student?*) while (3.2"') is not.

(3.2"') 학생이다.

    HAKSAYNG ita.

    student PRED

[He] is A STUDENT.

This is in sharp contrast to the topic-comment construction. Both (3.1) and (3.2'') are felicitous answers to a question like *What does Chelswu do?* (or *What about Chelswu?*, *Tell me something about Chelswu*, etc).

It has also become clear from the findings of Kwon and Zribi-Hertz (2008) that the *cosa* **i/ka** in this construction cannot be omitted either. This is will be discussed later in this chapter.

We can summarize for now that the usage of **i/ka** to mark narrow focus on a Focalized Subject (at least with single-argument predicates) is compulsory (for all levels of speech). This finding is also important for applied linguistics and particularly for the field of Korean as a foreign language.

3.1.2 Subjects in Sentence-Focus Constructions

As it became clear from the previous section, the two sequences of words in sentences (1.12) and (3.6) (repeated below), depending on the intonation, the pauses and other prosodic elements, as well as context, could be interpreted not as examples of narrow-focus constructions but as sentence-focus constructions, conveying some sort of new information or "neutral description" (Yang (1972), Kuroda (1965, 1972), Kuno (1972, 1973, 1978)), without an explicit topic present in the sentence, or registering a new or an unexpected event, or a new impression, etc.

Sentences (2.42) (repeated below) and (3.6) describe a perception of a situation or an event. They are like comments to a non-explicit topic (that might be the context as a whole), i.e. conveying some new information or a new impression in

a given context. They describe a perceived situation or a state of affairs as a whole. They refer to the same proposition as the corresponding Topic or Narrow-Focus constructions but they refer to it holistically, without topicalizing or focalizing a component. They instantiate a construction that could be called (and has been called) a "topic-less comment construction", or a "neutral description" Construction. Again, the names of the constructions are just convenient labels and mnemonic devices rather than precise technical terms. They are thetic sentences in the terminology outlined in Chapter 1. For the focus structure we use Lambrecht's (1994) term "sentence focus".

(2.42) 새가 울고 있다.

    SAY ka WULKO issta.

    bird NOM cry.CONN exist.DECL

    A BIRD is crying./BIRDS are crying.

(3.6). 마당의 꽃이 아름답다.

    MADANG UY KKOCH i ALUMTAPTA.

    yard GEN flower NOM is.beautiful.DECL

    THE FLOWERS IN THE YARD are BEAUTIFUL.

    The representations of these two sentences are (3.7) and (3.8), respectively.

(3.7) FOC[SAY ka WULKO issta]

(3.8) FOC[MADANG UY KKOCH i ALUMTAPTA]

From the English translation it becomes clear that subjects in this construction can be indefinite or definite (in a language that has such a morphological category). In Korean the activation status of their referents is not relevant for their morphology: they can be unidentifiable or accessible. If an accessible-referent subject is activated (re-cast as active) and explicitly topicalized with the particle **nun/un**, then the sentence will become an instance of the Topicalized Subject Construction, like sentence (3.1).

This analysis is valid not only for declarative sentences but for sentences with illocutionary force, e.g. exclamative. Sentence (3.9) below, which represents an Exclamation Construction, can be uttered in a situation and context similar to the ones in which the discussed sentence (3.6) is uttered.

(3.9) 마당의 꽃이 아름답군요.

MADANG KKOCH i ALUMTAPKWUNYO.

yard flower SUBJ is.beautiful.EXCL

Oh, how beautiful are the flowers in the yard!/The flowers in the yard are (so) beautiful!

The only difference between (3.9) and (3.6) is that the declarative suffixes/endings of the predicate are replaced with exclamative suffixes/endings. The difference is irrelevant for the marking of the arguments of the predicate and for the properties of the *cosa* under discussion. In fact, for most constructions discussed here we have used declarative verbal suffixes/endings by default. Since the emphasis in this study is on the functional morphemes in the nominal phrases and not on verbal suffixes or the speech acts, we will not concentrate on verbal morphology unless it has some relevance for the *cosa*-marking on NPs.

We have observed that Thetic Subjects, i.e. Subjects in Sentence-Focus Constructions, in sentences with single-argument predicates are consistently marked with **i/ka**.

The constructions that we have examined up to now all involve intransitive predicates. If we examine sentences with typical two-argument activity predicates, we will find that situation is quite similar to the situation with single-argument predicates. Sentences (3.10), (3.11), and (3.12) consistently parallel (3.1), (3.2) and (3.3).

(3.10) 철수는 책을 읽었다.

    Chelswu nun CHAYK ul ilk.essta.

    Chelswu TOP book ACC read.PAST.DECL

     Chelswu read THE/A BOOK.

(3.11) 철수가 책을 읽었다.

    CHELSWU ka chayk ul ilk.essta.

    Chelswu FOC book ACC read.PAST.DECL

    (It is) CHELSWU (who) read the/a book.

(3.12) 철수가 책을 읽었다.

    CHELSWU ka CHAYK ul ilk.essta.

    Chelswu SUBJ student PRED

    CHELSWU read THE/A BOOK [, I realize].

The information structures and the focus-structure representations of (3.10), (3.11) and (3.12) will parallel the ones of (3.1), (3.2) and (3.3), respectively. The discussion of Focalized Subjects is valid for the focalized subject in (3.11) and the discussion of Thetic Subjects (the Subjects in Sentence-Focus Constructions) is valid for the subject in (3.12).

We can summarize that the *cosa* **i/ka** is used to mark the Subjects in Focalized-Subject Narrow-Focus (i.e. Identificational) Constructions and in Sentence-Focus Constructions with intransitive predicates and two-argument activity predicates. **i/ka** marking is compulsory for Focalized Subjects. According to Kwon and Zribi-Hertz (2008), however, thetic subjects can be expressed as bare nouns, i.e. nouns with no functional morphemes attached to them. The matter is discussed below.

3.1.3 *i/ka-marked Subjects vs Bare-Noun Subjects in Thetic Constructions*

According to Kwon and Zribi-Hertz (2008: 258), "[b]are subjects, unlike NEUN-marked topical subjects and GA-marked subjects, can be construed neither as active topics nor as foci, and always occur in tense-deficient clauses construed as thetic and anchored to speech time"[22]. The issue with bare subjects seems to be somewhat more complicated than the issue with bare objects (discussed in the chapter on **ul/lul**). Kwon and Zribi-Hertz (ibid: 285) first draw a distinction "between bare subjects and caseless nominals that may appear sentence-initially and that may be analyzed as asyntactic".

---

[22] Kwon and Zribi-Hertz (2008) use a Romanization system different from the Yale Romanization system used in this work. Their **neun** and **ga** correspond to our **nun** and **ka**. The example sentences from their work that are repeated here have been adapted to the Yale Romanization system.

The first kind of such asyntactic bare nouns is what looks like a vocative phrase. "Clause initial bare NPs in Korean are not necessarily subjects, or objects preceded by a null subject. They may in particular be left-adjoined to second person topics", as in (3.14), contrasting with (3.13)[23].

(3.13) 너는 뭐 먹었니?

    Ne nun mwe mek.essni?   [mwe ↑]

    2sg TOP what eat.PAST.Q

    And you, what did you eat?

(3.14) 민나 너는 뭐 먹었니?

    Minna ne nun mwe mek.essni?   [mwe ↑]

    Minna 2sg TOP what eat.PAST.Q

    And you Minna, what did you eat?

Kwon and Zribi-Hertz point out that in (3.14) "the addressee's name *Minna* is adjoined to the topic-marked 2SG pronoun *neo-neun* [*ne nun*] and triggers the interpretive effect conveyed by the English translation. In Korean, however, the adjoined name is linearly positioned on the left of the pronoun, while in English it occurs on its right". Such left-adjoined nouns can be used with bare subjects as well, as in (3.16), contrasting with (3.15).

(3.15) 너 카레라이스를 먹었니?

---

[23] I keep Kwon and Zribi-Hertz's translations and glosses (adapted to Yale Romanization), including glossing **i/ka** as KA and **ul/lul** as LUL. They also provide additional information on the word mwe ([mwe ↑]), showing its rising intonation consistent with the wh-interpretation of the questions, as opposed to yes/no-interpretation.

Ne khaleylaisu lul mek.essni?

2sg curry.rice LUL eat.PAST.Q

Have you eaten CURRY RICE?

(3.16) 민나 너 카레라이스를 먹었니?

Minna ne khaleylaisu lul mek.essni?

Minna 2sg curry.rice LUL eat.PAST.Q

Have you, Minna, eaten CURRY RICE?

According to Kwon and Zribi-Hertz, "[i]n these examples, the adjoined bare name does not have any effect on f-structure: the strings *neo(-neun)* [*ne (nun)*] and *Minna neo(-nun)* [*Minna ne (nun)*] are equally topical in [(3.13)] and [(3.14)], and equally nontopical in [(3.15)] and [(3.16)], which are construed as thetic clauses".

The second kind of asyntactic bare nominals are the ones occurring in isolation, as in (3.17 B2).

(3.17) A: 너 누구 만났니?

A: Ne nwukwu mannassni?   [nwukwu ↓]

2sg someone meet.PAST.Q

Did you meet anyone?

B1: 네, 민나를 만났어요.

B1: Ney: ∅ Minna lul mannass.eyo.

yes 1sg Minna LUL meet.PAST.DECL.POL

Yes: I met Minna.

B2: 응, 민나.

B2: Ung: Minna.

   yes.INFORMAL Minna

   Yes: Minna.

    Kwon and Zribi-Hertz that "[t]he response in [(3.17 B2)] pertains to informal style and contains a bare nominal that may be described as asyntactic – it only names a discourse-accessible referent, but fails to exhibit any syntactic structure".

    The third kind of asyntactic bare nominals are what Kwon and Zribi-Hertz call renamers. These "isolated bare nominal may […] occur clause-initially to rename a discourse referent and signal its activation as a sentence topic", as in (3.18).

(3.18) A: 민수는 뭐 하고 있니?

   A: Minswu$_z$ nun mwe hakoissni?   [mwe ↑]

    Minswu TOP what do.PROG.Q

    And Minswu, what's he doing?

   B: 민수? 테레비 보고 있어.

   B: Minswu? $\varnothing_z$ theyleypi pokoiss.e.

    Minswu 3 TV watch.PROG.DECL.INFORMAL

    Minswu? He's watching TV.

    According to Kwon and Zribi-Hertz's (ibid: 286) analysis, "[i]n this case, the null pronoun in the response is a sentence topic activated by the NEUN-marked topic

in the preceding question. The clause-initial bare name *Minsu* [*Minswu*] stands as an optional renamer that, although it contributes to activate the *Minsu*-topic in the following clause, does not itself instantiate a syntactic constituent, as hinted by its nonintegrated prosodic contour. For Korean as well as for English, we propose to keep clause-initial renamers outside of f-structure and to analyze them as asyntactic, on a par with isolated nominals as in [(3.17 B2)]". Asyntactic clause-initial bare renamers are followed by a prosodic break and are clearly separated from the sentence.

There are however prosodically integrated bare subjects. Kwon and Zribi-Hertz (ibid: 287) claim that they "do NOT stand as active sentence topics. Evidence showing this is provided by [(3.19)]".

(3.19) A: 민나는 좀 어떠해?

   A: Minna nun com ettehay?

      Minna TOP a.little how.do.DECL.INFORMAL

      And Minna, how is she (doing)?

   B1: 민나는 진짜 민수 싫어한대.

   B1: Minna nun cincca Minswu silh.ehanday.

      Minna TOP really Minswu dislike.PRS.EVID

      (I gather that) Minna, she really dislikes Minswu.

   B2: #[24] 민나 진짜 민수 싫어한대.

   B2: #Minna cincca Minswu silh.ehanday.

---

[24] In Kwon and Zribi-Hertz's notation the "symbol # indicates syntactically well-formed but infelicitous in its discourse context".

Minna really Minswu dislike.PRS.EVID

#I gather Minna really dislikes Minswu.

The bare subject option (3.19 B2) is infelicitous as an answer to (3.19 A) because it can only be interpreted as a thetic sentence.

In order to characterize bare-subject clauses, Kwon and Zribi-Hertz (ibid: 287) compare (3.20) and (3.21).

(3.20) 버스가 오고 있다.

Pesu ka o-koiss-ta.

bus KA come-PROG-DECL

(i) There's {a/the} bus coming.

(ii) It is {a/the} bus that is coming.

(3.21) 버스 온다.

Pesu o-n-ta.

bus come-PRS-DECL

(i) Here comes the bus.

(ii) *It is {the/a} bus that comes.

Sentence (3.20), similarly to pairs we have already discussed in previous sections, can have a Focalized-Subject reading (3.20 ii) and a Sentence-Focus, or thetic, reading. Sentence (3.21), on the other hand, cannot have a Focalized-Subject reading (hence, "bare subject cannot be focused" (ibid: 291)). The only possible reading for the bare-subject clause is thetic. Kwon and Zribi-Hertz go on to compare

the two thetic readings (3.20 i) and (3.21 i), and find that "the two types of thetic clauses differ with respect to the following four properties" (ibid: 288):

Property 1. In the GA thetic clause, the bus referent may or may not be discourse-accessible. […] With the bare subject in [(3.21)], by contrast, only the definite/accessible reading may be construed.

Property 3. In the GA thetic clause in [(3.21 i)], tense is free, whereas with the bare subject in [(3.21)], tense is restricted, with the event necessary anchored in speech time. […]

Property 3. GA-subjects may easily be modified, for example by descriptive adjectives, whereas bare subjects are more restricted in this respect. […]

Property 4. GA-subject thetic clauses may host any type of stage-level predicates[25], while bare-subject clauses are more restricted.

Regarding Property 2, Kwon and Zribi-Hertz specify that bare subjects cannot occur with the double past-tense marker. "[T]he affix *(a)ss/(eo)ss* [*(a)ss/(e)ss*], commonly glossed as *past* (PST), may actually occur twice within the same sentence. When it does, […] one occurrence is construed as an accomplished-aspect marker (glossed PST2), and the other as a past-tense marker (PST1). […] Only the marker that we gloss as pst1 may be properly identified as a PAST-TENSE marker. Now returning to bare-subject clauses, we note that they may host PAST2, but not PST1, as witnessed by [(3.22")]".

(3.22) 민수는 갔(었)니?

---

[25] Kwon and Zribi-Hertz, following Diesing (1989, 1992), Heim (1982), Kratzer (1989) and Erteschik-Shir (1997, 2007), distinguish stage-level predicates and individual-level predicates. According to Erteschik-Shir (1997: 35), who uses generative theory-specific terminology, "stage-level predicates do not differ from individual-level predicates in argument structure". However, "stage-level predicates differ from individual-level predicates structurally in two ways: (a) stage-level predicates have an extra argument position for spatio-temporal location. (b) the subjects of stage-level predicates are generated in spec, VP and are raised to spec, IP. Subjects of of individual-level predicates are generated in the latter position with PRO filling spec, VP." Therefore, stage-level predicates receive both an existential reading and a property reading, while individual-level predicates only get a property reading.

Minswu nun ka-ss(-ess)-ni?

Minwu TOP leave-PST2(-PST1)-Q

And Minswu, has he left (did he go)?

(3.22') 민수가 갔(었)니?

Minswu ka ka-ss(-ess)-ni?

Minwu KA leave-PST2(-PST1)-Q

Is it Minswu who has left (who went)?

(3.22") 민수 갔(*었)니?

Minswu ka-ss(*-ess)-ni?

Minwu leave-PST2(PST1)-Q

Has Minswu left (*did Minswu go)?

Kwon and Zribi-Hertz also note that bare subjects can co-occur with the processive suffix -**(nu)n**[26] They use generative theory-specific terminology to account for it (ibid: 289):

Bare-subject clauses may though be specified for what we, following common conventions (Go & Nam 2003), gloss as present tense (PRS), as in [(3.21)] above. The Korean 'present' marker, (neu)n [(nu)n], crucially does not signal temporal anchoring to speech time: like the English simple present, it occurs in generic and habitual clauses, for instance. We therefore conclude that it does not fill the Tense head in syntactic structures, but some other functional head, maybe the same one as the PST2 marker – with which it does not combine. Under the above descriptive assumptions, the fact that bare-subject clauses may host the markers glossed

---

[26] In this quote they use generativist theory-specific terminology, as well as standard semantics terms, from Reichenbach, to account for the observed phenomena.

as 'present' and 'past2' is consistent with the idea that such clauses are syntactically unspecified for tense: in bare-subject clauses, neither of these markers may signal REFERENCE TIME (Reichenbach 1947/1966). Their tense deficiency accounts for the fact that bare-subject clauses are pragmatically anchored to speech time, standing as a default options. In [(3.21)], our proposed English translation 'Here comes the bus' accurately captures the tense deficiency observed in Korean.

Kwon and Zribi-Hertz also address the fact, revealed by corpus studies (e.g. Lee (2006)) that "first- and second-person subject pronouns frequently occur as bare, an expected fact if bare-subject clauses are typically anchored to speech time." They examine two sets of sentences, where bare subjects are contrasted with their **un/nun** and **i/ka**-marked counterparts:

(3.23) 나는 배 고파.

Na nun pay kopha.

1sg TOP stomach hungry.DECL.INFORMAL

As for me, I'm hungry.

(3.23') 내가 배 고파.

Nay ka pay kopha.

1sg KA stomach hungry.DECL.INFORMAL

(i) *Lit. There's me being hungry.

(ii) It is ME who is hungry.

(3.23") 나 배 고파.

Na pay kopha.

1sg stomach hungry.DECL.INFORMAL

I'm hungry.

(3.24) 나는 (그 때) 배*(가) 고팠다.

Na nun (ku ttay) pay *(ka) kophassta.

1sg TOP that time stomach KA hungry.PAST.DECL.INFORMAL

As for me, I was (then) hungry.

(3.24') 내가 (그 때) 배*(가) 고팠다.

Nay ka (ku ttay) pay *(ka) kophassta.

1sg KA that time stomach KA hungry.PAST.DECL.INFORMAL

(i) I was hungry.

(ii) It was ME who was hungry.

(3.24") *나 (그 때) 배(가) 고팠다.

Na (ku ttay) pay (ka) kophassta.

1sg that time stomach KA hungry.PAST.DECL.INFORMAL

Kwon and Zribi-Hertz note that "[i]n contradistinction with the other examples in [the two sets of sentences], [(3.23")] suggests that in so-called multiple-subject constructions, both subjects may be morphologically bare and undergo incorporation. Under our proposed description, this means that in examples like [(3.23")] the predication relation fails to be visible in f-structure both upstairs and downstairs. This raises an interesting problem about the relation between syntax and

information structure, which we leave unsettled here. The above examples show that in some utterances anchored to speech time, the bare-subject pattern is the only available option to trigger a certain type of thetic interpretation crucially involving the invisibility of the syntactic subject in f-structure: [(3.23")] is what you say upon entering your home's kitchen. Due to its visibility in f-structure, the first-person GA-subject read as thetic triggers, if anchored to speech time – as in [(3.23')] – an infelicitous 'objectivization' effect, which disappears if the subject is third person (as in [(3.20)]), or if tense is anchored in the past".

I find this insight really important for the usage of the *cosa* **i/ka** with thetic subjects. The fact that the sentence **Nay ka pay kopha** (i.e. (3.23')) cannot be interpreted as a thetic sentence and the only acceptable interpretation is as a narrow-focus sentence, while the sentence **Nay ka (ku ttay) pay ka kophassta** (i.e. (3.23')) can be interpreted as both a thetic sentence and a narrow-focus sentence (not simultaneously, of course), shows that Thetic Subject (from Sentence-Focus Constructions) could be used either with or without **i/ka** (unlike Focalized Subjects (from Narrow-Focus Constructions), which are always marked with **i/ka**). At that, the two sentences are not equivalent: in the bare-subject clause the interpretation of the subject is restricted to situationally or otherwise accessible referents only, while the **i/ka**-marked subject is not. What is even more striking is that in some cases, namely when the subject is highly topical/accessible (e.g. the referent is one of interlocutors), without being the Topic expression in a categorical (aboutness) sentence, and the whole proposition is deixis-oriented ("anchored to speech time"), only the bare-subject option has a thetic reading (and that is the only reading it has (sentence (2.23")), while the clause with the **i/ka**-marked subject (sentence (2.23')) can only have an identificational (i.e. focus-presupposition) reading. As Kwon and

Zribi-Hertz point out, more detailed research is needed for clarification of this issue, but it seems that statistical results confirm their findings (ibid: 293).

I also find their distinction between asyntactic bare nominals and bare subjects (or objects) really important for the understanding of Korean clause structure and the grammar of phrase-final particles. Kwon and Zbiri-Hertz admit that "[t]he availability of clause-initial adjoined and asyntactic bare nominals in Korean is a potential source of disagreement among linguists for the description of bare subjects". However, it transpires from the analysis above that the left-adjoined vocative elements (albeit without the vocative *cosa* **a/ya**), as in (3.14) and (3.16), are not part of the clause structure even if their referents could be construed as arguments of the predicate. The same goes about the renamers, as in (3.18). Unlike the **un/nun**-marked Topic expressions, they do not belong to the prosodic unity of the clause. They could either be construed as parts of the sentence in a left-detached position, which is outside the clause but inside the sentence (LDP, as in Van Valin, Jr. and LaPolla's (1997) layered structure), or not part of the sentence at all. In Kwon and Zribi-Hertz's punctuation (3.18 B) they are just isolated nominals in interrogative utterances, quite similar to the isolated nominals in short answers, as in (3.17 B2).

For now, I can summarize that Topicalized Subjects (in Predicate-Focus Constructions) are always marked with **un/nun** and Focalized Subjects (in Narrow-Focus Constructions) are always marked with **i/ka**. When it comes to Thetic Subjects (in Sentence-Focus Constructions), they are sometimes marked with **i/ka** and sometimes they are unmarked bare nominals. Kwon and Zribi-Hertz (2008: 267) account for this by postulating an embedded focus structure in the actual focus domain, i.e. the sentence, "correlating with the predication relation between the subject and predicate. The complex f-structure representation […] is consistent with

Kaneko's syntactic and semantic analysis of thetic clauses in French (Kaneko 2002) and GA-thetic clauses in Japanese." Thus, they constitute the Thetic Subject marked with **i/ka** as a topic in the embedded structure (embedded topic) and the thetic predicate as a focus in the embedded structure, thus obtaining a new level of focus structure. Thus, the subject is identified as a focus-structure constituent and is considered focus-structure visible. Bare nominals as subjects cannot be constituted as focus-structure constituents, neither as topics nor as foci; "they fail to be visible in f-structure and consequently undergo f-structure incorporation." (Kwon and Zribi-Hertz (2008: 287)). The notion of focus-structure visibility "might ultimately stand as the crucial interpretive correlate of FUNCTIONAL position in syntax." (ibid: 258).

It seems that these conclusions need more elaboration, especially when it comes to finer definition of terms, but it is clear from their findings that a category closely related to information structure (which they call focus-structure (FS) visibility) is the crucial factor for the choice whether to use certain functional particles on a subject NP or not. It is also useful for the description of the grammar and usage of phrase-final particles.

Regarding the particle **i/ka**, it could be concluded that it is always used with Focalized Subjects as well as with FS-visible Thetic Subjects.

The discussion in this section was about constructions where **i/ka** marks one noun phrase. Sentences where non-nominals are marked with **i/ka** will be discussed in this chapter later.

3.2 Marking Two Phrases: Double Nominative Constructions

Now we look at constructions with predicates that have two arguments that are marked with **i/ka**. Following Yeon (2003), we distinguish at least two different types of such constructions.

3.2.1 Two-Argument State-Predicate Constructions

We will first examine the usage of the particle **i/ka** in Yeon's Type 2 Double-Nominative Construction, involving a subset of stative predicates. Sentences (3.25) and (3.27) below exemplify that construction. There are two nominal phrases marked with **i/ka**. In this case, it is the first nominal phrase that is the syntactic Subject. The second nominal phrase in this construction is also encoded by **i/ka**. Stative verbs are a subset of descriptive verbs that are semantically specific. The stative verbs in this construction are two-place predicates. We will refer to this construction as the Two-Argument Stative-Predicate Construction. Sentences (3.26) and (3.28) are the Subject Honorification versions of (3.25) and (3.27) respectively.

(3.25) 할아버지가 돈이 많다.

HALAPECI ka ton i MANHTA.

grandfather NOM money ACC is.much.DECL

GRANDFATHER has a lot of MONEY.

(3.26) 할아버지가 돈이 많으시다.

HALAPECI ka ton i MANH.USITA.

119

grandfather NOM money ACC is.much.HON.DECL

GRANDFATHER has a lot of MONEY.

(3.27) 선생이 학생이 필요하다.

SENSAYNG i haksayng i PHIL.YOhata.

teacher NOM student ACC is.needed.DECL

TEACHERS need STUDENTS.

(3.28) 선생이 학생이 필요하시다.

SENSAYNG i haksayng i PHIL.YOhasita.

teacher NOM student ACC is.needed.HON.DECL

TEACHERS need STUDENTS.

All four sentences can be interpreted as thetic sentences. Their schematic representation – of the Sentence-Focus Two-Argument Stative-Predicate construction – is

FOC[SUBJ NP1 *i/ka* OBJ NP2 *i/ka* StativeVerb]

The semantic roles of the two arguments in these constructions are typically EXPERIENCER/SENSAION, EMOTER/TARGET, POSSESSOR/POSSESSED, PERCEIVER/STIMULUS, WANTER/DESIRE, etc. The Subjects tend to be non-volitional subjects.

In this construction type the particle **i/ka** encodes the Subject, although it can be also interpreted that it encodes the Focus (not at the same time but under certain conditions) as it does elsewhere; but it also encodes the Object of a stative predicate

expressed by a descriptive verb, e.g. **phil.yohata** 'is needed; needs', **manhta** 'is numerous; has many', **cohta** 'is good; like', **silhta** 'is unpleasant; does not like', **issta** 'exist; has'.

When the interpretation of the first nominal phrase is unambiguously focus, as in sentences (3.29) – (3.32) that are constructional homonyms of (3.25) – (3.28), the sentences have the characteristic contour of Focalized-Subject Constructions.

(3.29) 할아버지가 돈이 많다.

HALAPECI ka ton i manhta.

grandfather NOM money NOM is.much.DECL

It is GRANDFATHER who has a lot of money.

(3.30) 할아버지가 돈이 많으시다.

HALAPECI ka ton i manhusita.

grandfather NOM money NOM is.much.HON.DECL

It is GRANDFATHER who has a lot of money.

(3.31) 선생이 학생이 필요하다.

SENSAYNG i haksayng i phil.yohata.

teacher NOM student NOM is.needed.DECL

It is TEACHERS that need students.

(3.32) 선생이 학생이 필요하시다.

SENSAYNG i haksayng i phil.yohasita.

teacher NOM student NOM is.needed.HON.DECL

It is TEACHERS that need students.

The schematic representation of the Focalized-Sibject Two-Argument Stative-Predicate Construction is

FOC[SUBJ NP1 *i/ka*] OBJ NP2 *i/ka* StativeVerb

The analysis of this construction type shows that the *cosa* **i/ka** is used to mark not only Subjects but also Objects in Korean. Although **i/ka** can be used to mark the first nominal phrase as a Subject (syntactically, as in the thetic sentences) or as a Focalized Subject (both syntactically and pragmatically, as in the narrow-focus sentences), it is still used with the second nominal phrase to mark it as on Object in this particular construction type. However, having two nominal phrases marked with the same functional particle poses some restrictions. The first nominal is always interpreted as the Subject and the second as the Object. This seems to explain why the constituent order in this construction type, especially of the two nominal phrases, is very rigorous and, unlike other constructions, inversions tend to be unacceptable.

The constructions of this type, where the Subject and the Object are both marked with **i/ka** (i.e. Nom-Nom), have counterparts where the Subject is marked with **eykey** (or **hanthey**) and the Object is marked with **i/ka** (i.e. Dat-Nom). They have more flexibility with constituent order which backs the explanation above. They are discussed below in the section on Dative-Subject Constructions.

3.2.2 Double-Nominative and Multiple-Nominative Constructions

Now I will discuss the usage of the particle **i/ka** in Yeon's Type 1 Double-Nominative Construction. In it there are two nominal phrases marked with **i/ka**, the second one being the Subject argument of the intransitive predicate. The first nominal phrase cannot be construed as an argument of the predicate. We will start by looking at sentences in which this first nominal phrase can be identified as Focus.

In the Topic Construction and the Double-Nominative Construction below the *cosa* accompanying the first nominal phrases are again marking categories of the information structure rather than syntactic relations in the sentences. In sentence (3.33) the *cosa* **nun** marks the Topic while the *cosa* **ka** marks the Subject of the descriptive verb in the Comment Clause, which is an instance of the Intransitive Neutral Description Construction embedded in the Topic Construction. In sentence (3.34) the *cosa* **ka** occurs twice: first marking the Focus and then marking the Descriptive Subject, i.e. the Subject of the descriptive verb (encoding an argument in the syntactic structure) (Yeon (2003: 53), Yeon and Brown (2011: 150)).

(3.33) 수미는 어머니가 예쁘다.

    Swumi nun emeni ka YEYPPUTA.

    Swumi TOP mother NOM is.beautiful.DECL

    As for Swumi, her mother is BEAUTIFUL.

(3.34) 수미가 어머니가 예쁘다.

    SWUMI ka emeni ka yeypputa.

    Swumi NOM mother NOM is.beautiful.DECL

    It is SWUMI whose mother is beautiful.

Sentence (3.34) is an instance of Yeon's Type 1 Double-Nominative Construction (Yeon (2003: 54)). We will call it here the Two-Argument Descriptive-Verb Focus Construction. Here is another pair of sentences, the second one being an example of this construction:

(3.35) 수미는 눈이 크다.

    Swumi nun nwun i KHUTA.

    Swumi TOP eye NOM is.big.DECL

    As for Swumi, her eyes are BIG.

(3.36) 수미가 눈이 크다.

    SWUMI ka nwun i khuta.

    Swumi NOM eye NOM is.big.DECL

    It is SWUMI whose eys are big.

In both of them the first nominal phrase cannot be construed as an argument of the predicate. In (3.35) the first nominal is Topic, called External Topic because it is not an argument in the clause structure (this issue will be discussed in Chapter 5). In (3.36) the first nominal phrase is Focus – definitely a narrow focus because the actual focus domain is one constituent but not really an argument focus since it is not an argument in the clause structure – and it is symmetrical to the Topic of (3.35). That is why I call it External Focus.

The schematic representation for (3.33) and (3.35) – External Topic – will be

TOP[NP1 *un/nun*] FOC[SUBJ NP2 *i/ka* PRED DeV],

and for (3.34) and (3.36) – External Focus – it will be

$_{FOC}$[NP2 *i/ka*] SUBJ NP2 *i/ka* PRED DeV.

The difference in focus between the two schematic representations above is that the focus in the first one is **broad focus** of the **predicate-focus** type, while the focus in the second one is **narrow focus** (in Lambrecht's terms). We can also note about this narrow focus that it is **marked**, since it is not in the **unmarked** focus position in the clause, which for Korean and other verb-final languages is the immediately preverbal position (Kim (1988), Yang (1994)). The broad focus in the first representation above includes all but the topic, as in typical topic-comment constructions. The narrow focus in the second representation includes just one constituent.[27] In fact, the sentence without the focus part expresses a presupposition and could be a complete sentence whose subject is marked with **i/ka**. Since NP1 is neither an argument of the verb nor an oblique, we could consider it an external part that is focalized (External Focus), similarly to the English cleft construction used to translate it.

The information structure of (3.36) (as per Lambrecht 1994, Van Valin, Jr. and LaPolla 1997) of this sentence can be represented as follows:

(3.36′)

Sentence: Swumi **ka** nwun **i** khuta

Presupposition: 'it is about x that we can say "nwun **i** khuta"("eyes are big")'

---

[27] Yeon 2003: 50 demonstrates that it cannot be described as Subject and assumes it is a 'focal nominal'.

Assertion: x = 'Swumi'

Focus: 'Swumi'

Focus domain: NP

In this Korean construction the focalized NP is closely related to the Subject NP semantically. In the Two-Argument Descriptive-Verb Focus Construction there is a semantic "relatedness restriction" on the relationship between NP1 and NP2: they have to be in a whole-part, inclusion, kinship or possessor-possessed relation, hence the interpretation that it marks Focalization of Possessor or Genitive. The focalized NP is not an argument of the verb itself; it is Focus in the information structure of the sentence and the rest of the sentence is presupposition. However, it has been noted hat the Focus element can be interpreted as a kind of subject, namely Major Subject (discussed below), with the rest of the sentence as Sentence predicate and the grammatical Subject of the predicate regarded as Minor Subject. Such treatment will be able to account for the cases when such Double-Nominative Construction are interpreted as thetic (or even as categorical), rather than as identificational sentences, as some of the examples in Yoon (2004b, 2009) (discussed below) are analyzed and translated.

There are analyses that claim that the focalized part could be construed as a focalized nominal modifier of NP2, namely a Possessor. Such an analysis could be valid for some sentences but not for others, since external parts, both focuses and topics, could be a very wide range of nominal phrases. Kim and Sells (2007a) recognize (at least) two subtypes of this construction: the Possessive Nominative Construction (PNC), in which the two nominal phrases are in a possessive relation, and the Adjunct Nominative Construction, in which there is no such relation. Their examples are:

126

(3.37) 존이/의 손이 크다.

Con i/uy son i khuta.

John NOM/GEN hand NOM is.big.DECL

John's hand is big.

(3.38) 여름이/에/*의 맥주가 최고이다.

Yelem i/uy/*ey maykcwu ka choyko ita.

summer NOM/GEN/LOC beer NOM best COP.DECL

Summer is the best time to have beer.

(3.37) represents PNC and (3.38) represents ANC. In (3.37) **i/ka** can be replaced by Genitive **uy** and the reset sentence will still be grammatical (although not expressing the same thing from information-structure point of view), while in (3.38) **i/ka** can be replaced by Locative **ey** but not by **uy**. Kim and Sells (ibid) note that these two subtypes share some properties. In both of them the first **i/ka** nominal phrase marks focus. The evidence is that it received exhaustive listing reading and the sentences cannot be used with the exclamatory expression **ceki** 'here', which is associated with neutral description.[28]

It is true that if the **i/ka**-marked nominal phrases in this construction type are just two, usually the first one is Focus. However, there are many examples discussed in the literature where the **i/ka**-marked nominal phrases are more than two,

---

[28] Yoon (2009) shows that the combination of these two constructions in the same sentence is also possible in Korean, as in the following sentence:

교보문고가 여러 종류의 책이 팔리고 위치도 아주 좋다.

Kyopo mwunko ka yele conglyu uy chayk i phalliko wichi to acwu cohta.

Kyopo bookstore NOM diverse type GEN book NOM sell.PASS.CONN location also very is.good.DECL

As for the Kyopo bookstore, many different types of books are sold and its location is also ideal.

sometimes even four (or potentially more). It is difficult to imagine that such sentences can be normally processed by addressees if they have so many foci. And indeed, in such cases, usually only the first nominal phrase is interpreted as Focus. Sometimes, even the whole sentence is interpreted as thetic.

In the theoretical treatment of such sentences the notion of Major Subject has been used (e.g. Kuroda (1986), Tateishi (1994), Yoon (2004b)). In such analyses the clause **nwun i khuta** (from (3.36)), for example, would be called a sentential predicate, i.e. a predicate, expressed by a complete sentence. The subject of this sentential predicate is presumably NP1. Such analyses render the whole construction as a complex combination of two sentence-level or clause-level constructions. I will discuss that interpretation below.

As Yoon (2004b) writes, "[t]raditional grammars of Korean (as well as those of Chinese and Japanese) often describe the first and second Nom-marked NPs in the following Multiple Nominative/Subject Constructions (MNC/MSC) as *Major Subjects* and *Minor Subjects*. The idea behind this description is that both of the Nom-marked NPs are Subject-like in some sense, in particular, in being marked with Nominative case." As we presented in Chapter 2, Major Subjects have other properties typical of subjects as well.

I accept the notion of Major Subject as convenient and useful for the treatment of the first nominal phrase in Type 1 Double-Nominative Constructions, but not the first nominal phrase in Type 2 Double-Nominative Constructions. However, in Multiple-Nominative Constructions (MNC), where the **i/ka**-marked nominal phrases are three or more, the first nominal phrase(s) (i.e. the third nominal phrase and all to the left of it, if there are any, counting from the back end) will always be Major Subjects because, even if the predicate is a two-place descriptive verb (Type 2), there cannot be more than two arguments of the predicate in the core.

(3.39) below is an example of a Type 2 Double-Nominative Construction "extended" into a Major Subject Construction by adding a nominative-marked nominal phrase to the left side, while (3.40) (taken from Yoon (2009), with my translation) is an example of Type 1 Double-Nominative Construction extended into a Multiple-Nominative Construction (a Multiple Subject Construction, according to Yoon's treatment) by adding a string of **i/ka**-marked nominal phrases to its left.

(3.39) 철수가 할아버지가 돈이 많다.

Chelswu ka hal.apeci ka ton i manhta.

Chelswu NOM grandfather NOM money NOM is.much.DECL

Chelswu's grandfather has a lot of money./It is Chelswu whose grandfather has a lot of money.

(3.40) 남반구가 문명국가가 남자가 평균수명이 짧다.

Nampankwu ka mwunmyengkwuk.ka ka namca ka phyengkyunswumyeng i ccalpta.

southern.hemisphere NOM civilized.country NOM male NOM average.lifespam NOM is.short.DECL

In the civilized countries of the southern hemisphere men's average lifespan is short.

Both sentences can be sentence-focus sentences and then the initial **i/ka**-marked NP(s) will not be Topics or Foci as in Yoon's (ibid.) analysis. However, the first NP could be construed as a Narrow Focus (Contrastive or Non-contrastive) and each of the next **i/ka**-NPs could be construed as a Contrastive Focus under certain circumstances (with the relevant prosodic features, etc). Such sentences will be

examples of constructions with a Focalized Major Subject. In an alternative analysis (where we do not treat the NPs as subjects of any sort) they could be just External Foci, parallel to the notion of External Topic (cf Foley (2007)), because their referents are not arguments of the predicate. In fact, if we are to logically extend the notion of Major Subject to the syntax of Korean sentences, we will have to treat the topic element in some External-Topic Constructions as a Topicalized Major Subject. In fact we can draw a parallel between the three sentences (1.21), (1.21") and (1.27) (repeated below) and the following three sentences (3.41), (3.42) and (3.43) (adapted from Yoon (ibid.)):

(1.21) 순이가 어머니가 예쁘다.

    Sun.i ka emeni ka yeypputa.

    Suni NOM mother NOM is.beautiful.DECL

    It is Suni (and only she) whose mother is beautiful.

(1.21") 순이가 어머니가 예쁘다.

    Sun.i ka emeni ka yeypputa.

    Suni NOM mother NOM is.beautiful.DECL

    (I see/realize that) Suni's mother is beautiful.

(1.27) 순이는 어머니가 예쁘다.

    Sun.i nun emeni ka yeypputa.

    Suni TOP mother NOM is.beautiful.DECL

    As for Suni, her mother is beautiful.

(3.41) 철이가 아버지가 학교에 오늘 오셨다.

CHEL.I ka apeci ka hak.kyo ey onul osyessta.

Cheli NOM father NOM school NOM today come.HON.PAST.DECL

It is CHELI whose father came to school today. (*narrow-focus reading*)

(3.42) 철이가 아버지가 학교에 오늘 오셨다

CHEL.I ka apeci ka hak.kyo ey ONUL osyessta.

Cheli NOM father NOM school NOM today come.HON.PAST.DECL

Chel.i's FATHER came to school TODAY. (*sentence-focus reading*)

(3.43) 철이는 아버지가 학교에 오늘 오셨다

Chel.i nun APECI ka hak.kyo ey ONUL osyessta.[29]

Cheli TOP father NOM school NOM today come.HON.PAST.DECL

Speaking of Cheli, his FATHER came to school TODAY. (*topic-comment reading*)

Such a treatment will make the relative independence of syntactic structures (template inventory) and information structure clearer. We regard Major Subject a syntactic feature of the language. That is why it does not have to be marked with **i/ka** in all its instances. It can be marked with **un/nun** when it is topicalized, just like grammatical subjects and objects are.

In my analysis, the first NP in all these sentences is Major Subject in the syntactic analysis of the sentence, i.e. I assume that Major Subject is a phenomenon of Korean (and Japanese) syntax. From the viewpoint of the information structure the

---

[29] In the sentence-focus and topic-comment readings the prosodic contour of the focus part could be different if there are contrastive foci.

same NP will be treated differently. It is a Major Subject in a thetic sentence (or a thetic Major Subject) in (1.21") and (3.42), a focalized Major Subject (or an External Focus NP) in (1.21) and (3.41), and a topicalized Major Subject (or an External Topic phrase) in (1.27) and (3.43). Thus, introducing Major Subject as a synactic feature, rather than a topic/focus feature, I account for its occurrence in sentences with different information structure.

At this point we could bring into discussion observations made about parallel Japanese constructions using the notion of Major Subject. Kuroda (1986) has introduced the term 'Major Subject' for elements in different grammatical constructions. Since then, a lot of elaborations have been made. For example, Tateishi (1994: 28, 105) insists that Major Subject should be distinguished from Pure Topic (which roughly corresponds to the notion of External Topic as used here) and uses different tests to show their differences. However, in my analysis the differences are resolved in an easier way. Since Major Subject is an element in the syntactic analysis and Topic is from the information-structure analysis, there is no controversy in a phrase being analyzed as both a Major Subject and a Topic (or an External Topic) in some cases and as a Major Subject but not a Topic, or an External Topic but not a Major Subject in other cases.

Regarding the test which shows that the External Topic, in a reset sentence, cannot be marked with the (Japanese) nominative marker **ga**, even when embedded (ibid), we can attribute that to the fact that not all External Topics are Major Subjects.[30] We should note, however, that when the topicalized element is a Major Subject, then the reset sentence could be marked with **ga**.

---

[30] The examples in Tateishi (1994: 107) of embedded Pure Topic sentences are all quotation sentences with the verb **iu** 'say' and more research is needed to clarify that issue. It is not clear if the same claims will be valid for Korean at all.

Regarding the scrambling test, we can claim that since the default position of the Topic is the beginning of the sentence, a phrase marked with a topic marker (**wa** in Japanese) can properly be interpreted as a Topic only in this position. That is why, a "scrambled" sentence in which a phrase marked with a topic marker appears in a non-initial position between other constituents and does not denote an argument of the predicate will be judged ungrammatical: the phrase marked with a topic marker cannot be interpreted as a Topic because it is not in the beginning of the sentence and it would be practically impossible for it to be interpreted as a Contrastive Focus since Contrastive Foci also have restrictions in their position: they are either in the unmarked focus position just before the predicate or prosodically marked in the default place of the respective argument in the constituent order (but a non-argument will not have a default place).

From the analysis of the Type 1 Double-Nominative Construction, and the closely related Multiple-Nominative Construction, both characterized by stative predicates, it emerges that the *cosa* **i/ka** is used to mark grammatical Subjects, i.e. the single argument of the predicate, as well as a specific category called Major Subject which characterizes the syntactic structure of these Korean constructions. As Kim and Sells (2007a) point out (in their terms), "'Multiple nominative' constructions present challenges to theoretical as well as computational linguists. In particular, the functions of the first nominal phrase in MNCs are not straightforward. The first NOM can be either a specifier or an adjunct, and it has a specific semantic relation with regard to the remaining sentence – it is "characterized" by the rest of the sentence."

Admittedly, the issue of the occurrence of **i/ka** in these constructions is complex and challenging. However, we can draw some conclusion from the discussion. In my analysis, Major Subject, albeit not an argument of the predicate, is

construed as a syntactic feature of the sentence, some sort of "subject" to the rest of the sentence, which is construed as a "sentential predicate". This "sentential predicate" does not have a logical structure like lexical predicates but there are some restrictions as to what it can consist of. Typically it is a stative predicate with its only argument, or – in Multiple-Nominative Constructions – an already constructed combination of a Major Subject and a sentential predicate. The Major Subject is typically marked with **i/ka**. It is true that quite often it is Focus, and in such cases we can argue that **i/ka** marks Focus, just like it marks Focalized Subjects in other narrow-focus constructions. (Similarly, it could be topicalized, marked with **un/nun**, and described as External Topic.) It was shown that in some cases **i/ka** just marks thetic Major Subjects. We can explain the usage of the marker **i/ka** in these cases – parallel to marking Subjects in other narrow-focus and sentence-focus constructions – with the noted semantic and pragmatic analogies between grammatical Subject and Major Subject.

3.2.3 Marking the Complement in toyta and anita Constructions

Now I turn my attention to other constructions where i/ka marks two constituents: the **toyta** construction and the **anita** construction. They both share more similarities with Type 2 Double-Nominative Constructions (discussed in 3.2.1) rather than with the Type 1 Double-Nominative (and Multiple-Nominative) Constructions (discussed in 3.2.2). They are two-argument constructions involving linking verbs. In contemporary Korean these are the constructions with the processive verb **toyta** 'becomes' and the descriptive verb **anita** 'is not'. First, let us have a look at some **toyta** sentences.

(3.44) 얼음이 물이 되었다.

El.um i mwul i toy.essta.

ice NOM water NOM become.PAST.DECL

The ice became water.

(3.45) 얼음이 물이 되었다.

EL.UM i mwul i toy.essta.

ice NOM water NOM become.PAST.DECL

It is the ICE that became water.

(3.46) 얼음은 물이 되었다.

El.um un mwul i toy.essta.

ice TOP water NOM become.PAST.DECL

Speaking of the ice, it became water.

Sentence (3.44) is an instance of the Two-Argument Sentence-Focus (Neutral-Description) **toyta** Construction. Here the subject has been neither topicalized nor focalized explicitly. The difference between (3.44) and (3.45) will be that in (3.44) there will be no prosodic marking and the sentence will be interpreted as a sentence-focus. In it the cosa **i/ka** marks the Subject in the focus domain. In (3.45) the subject is the focus which can be expressed with a specific intonation and prosodic means (higher pitch, pause) and with the *cosa* **i/ka** marking it as a focalized subject. In (3.46) the subject has been topicalized with the *cosa* **un/nun**. These three sentences are all examples of different constructions: the Two-Argument Sentence-

Focus **toyta** Construction ((3.44)), the Two-Argument Focalized-Subject **toyta** Construction ((3.45)) and the Two-Argument Topicalized-Subject **toyta** Construction ((3.46)).

The schematic representation of the Two-Argument Sentence-Focus (Neutral-Description) **toyta** Construction is

FOC[SUBJ NP1 *i/ka* COMPL NP2 *i/ka toyta*].

The schematic representation of the Two-Argument Focalized-Subject **toyta** Construction is

FOC[SUBJ NP1 *i/ka*] COMPL NP2 *i/ka toyta*.

In these constructions the *cosa* **i/ka** marks the thetic Subject and the focalized Subject, just like across other constructions I have already discussed. Predictably, when the Subject is topicalized (in topic-comment sentences), it marked not with i/ka but with **un/nun**. The interesting thing here is that **i/ka** is used to mark the predicate complement in all three types of sentences above. This is a typical Korean usage. In the corresponding Japanese constructions with the verb **naru** 'becomes' the complement is not marked with Nominative **ga** but with Dative **ni**. In this usage **i/ka** also has all the structural properties that characterize it when it marks nominal phrases across constructions: for example, if the complement nominal phrase is contrasted (Contrastive Focus) and marked with **un/nun**, **i/ka** will be dropped, as in (3.47).

(3.47) 그 사람은 군인은 되었다.

Ku salam un KWUN.IN un toy.essta

that person TOP soldier TOP become.PAST.DECL

Speaking of him, he did become a SOLDIER [but maybe not a general].

Now let us discuss some **anita** sentences. Similarly to its use in the **toyta** constructions, the *cosa* **i/ka** is used to mark the Complement in the **anita** constructions:

(3.48) 그것이 사과가 아니다.

Ku kes i sakwa ka anita.

that thing NOM apple NOM not.be

That is not an apple.

(3.49) 그것이 사과가 아니다.

KU KES i sakwa ka anita.

that thing NOM apple NOM not.be

It is THAT THING that is not an apple.

(3.50) 그것은 사과가 아니다.

Ku kes un sakwa ka anita.

that thing TOP apple NOM not.be

As for that thing, it is not an apple.

Again, as with the **toyta** examples above, these three sentences are examples of the Sentence-Focus **anita** Construction ((3.48)), the Focalized-Subject **anita** Construction ((3.49)) and the Topicalized-Sibject **anita** Construction ((3.50)), respectively. The interpretation of these negative constructions is relevant for the discussion of the **-ci ka** constructions below.

The possible explanation of the usage of **i/ka** in front of **anita** is that it is simply an expression – justified semantically by the negation – of the unmarked focus that is in the pre-verbal position, i.e. negation focus. This unmarked negation focus ("it is apple that that is not") could be considered as a default focus that goes with the negation to somehow "soften" it and make the sentence sound less categorical. (Later in this chapter we examine the use of **i/ka** with the **–ci** form of verbs in front of **anhta** 'not do' in negative sentences, which parallels the use of **i/ka** in front of **anita**.) The usage of this focus-marking **i/ka** is grammaticalized as a marker of the predicate complement in front of **anita**. Unlike **ita**, which is a bound formative and is suffixed to the head of the nominal phrase (or the head of the adpositional phrase), its negative counterpart **anita** is a free word (traditionally regarded as a descriptive verb) and allows structurally the complement NP to be marked with a *cosa*. Other analyses are also possible, especially considering the issue diachronically (Martin (1992)), but from a synchronic point of view, the take on **i/ka** as a focus marker being grammaticalized as a complement marker in negation constructions seems to hold. If it is Contrastive Focus, then the complement NP will be marked with the *cosa* **un/nun** (as in (3.51)). In this pre-verbal predicate-internal position it could only be interpreted as **marked** usage, i.e. contrastive focus. That will be further discussed in the chapter on **un/nun**.

(3.51) 이 책은 교과서는 아니다.

I chayk un KYOQKWASE nun anita.

this book TOP textbook TOP not.be

This book is not a TEXTBOOK.

The schematic representation of the Sentence-Focus **anita** Construction is

$_{FOC}$[SUBJ NP1 *i/ka* COMPL NP2 *i/ka anita*].

The schematic representation of the Focalized-Subject **anita** Construction is

$_{FOC}$[SUBJ NP1 *i/ka*] COMPL NP2 *i/ka anita*.

As can be seen, the usage of **i/ka** with predicate complement nominal phrases is symmetrical to the **toyta** constructions. They are two-place linking verbs that are semantically associated with the copula **ita** but are different from it structurally.

In contemporary Korean the copula **ita** is used only in affirmative sentences. Structurally, it is not a free word: it has to be attached to nouns or particles and it always has verbal suffixes, in most cases identical to those of the descriptive verbs. Its stem **–i-** can be omitted (or reduced to **–y-**) in some environments. The NP-**ita** complex is one phonological word and serves as a predicate which has one argument, its subject (as in sentences (3.1), (3.2) and (3.3)). Constructions with **anita**, which is treated as the negative of **ita** in theoretical literature and in KFL textbooks and manuals, have different structure. Sentences with **ita** and **anita** are not symmetrical and that is often a source of confusion for learners of Korean. Constructions with **toyta** are often used in contexts similar to contexts of **ita** constructions. However, they are structurally more similar to **anita** constructions.

The usage of **i/ka** to mark predicate complement as a specific constituent of these constructions is interesting from a theoretical point of view. Its peculiarity makes it a challenge for KFL learners at initial stages.

3.3. Dative-Subject Constructions

In this section I will analyze the occurrences of the *cosa* **i/ka** in Dative-Subject Constructions. In them the verbs are typically verbs of sensation, experience, emotion, involuntary action, necessity, existence, i.e. they are a semantically restricted subset. They normally belong to the class of descriptive verbs in Korean. As we shall see, they require two arguments, expressed with nominal phrases. They take an argument marked with the same particle as what is considered the Dative in the prototypical Dative construction. This construction expresses non-volitional and/or natural processes, which has been used as an explanation for the appearance of the Dative; it has also been stated that this construction shows "low transitivity" in comparison with other "high transitivity" constructions that involve processive verbs (also called action verbs) and the usage of the particle **ul/lul**, which is typically the Accusative particle in Korean. Here, we are just interested in the usage and functions of the particle **i/ka** and will not elaborate on this issue but we note the semantic content of the construction. It has been repeatedly pointed out in the literature that this pattern is quite common cross-linguistically. It is attested in languages like Japanese, German, Turkish, Bengali, Kannada, Malayalam, many Romance and Slavic languages, including Spanish, Russian, Bulgarian, and many more (e.g. Yeon (2003)). The grammatical constructions in these languages have their peculiarities. For example the Dative-marked constituents in some of these languages cannot be

identified as Subjects; in others it is possible. An often cited example is the difference between Dative constructions in German and Icelandic. In both languages the Experiencer is marked with Dative morphology but while in Icelandic it is also a Subject, in German it cannot be construed as a grammatical Subject (Van Valin, Jr and LaPolla (1997: 361, 400)). In Russian, like in German, the Dative-marked argument in many EXPERIENCE/SENSATION, WANTER/DESIRE, etc constructions cannot be identified as the grammatical Subject (Wade (2000)), while the Nominative-marked argument can.

So, on one hand we have a cross-linguistic tendency for Dative-marking (morphologically) of certain semantic roles but we see that from a syntactic (GR) point of view they are treated differently cross-linguistically.

In Korean, the EXPERIENCER is encoded as Subject with the prototypical Dative particle **eykey**, while the second nominal phrase, the SENSATION, is encoded as Object with the particle **i/ka**. The following sentences are examples of this construction.

(3.52) 나에게 뱀이 무섭다.

Na eykey paym i mwusepta.

I DAT snake NOM be.scary

I am afraid of snakes.

(3.53) 나에게 고향이 그립다.

Na eykey kohyang i kulipta.

I DAT hometown NOM be.missed

I miss my hometown.

The schematic representation of the Dative-Subject Sentence-Focus Construction is

FOC[SUBJ NP1 *eykey* OBJ NP2 *i/ka* DeV].

The Dative-Subject Construction follows a pattern that is not uncommon in accusative languages, namely a pattern of marking the Subject with what is traditionally regarded a prototypical Dative marker in a certain language and marking the Object with what traditionally is regarded as a prototypical Nominative marker. This pattern usually occurs in what is regarded as semantically "low transitivity" constructions. Of course, calling this element (the nominal phrase with the prototypical Dative marker) a Subject depends on the definition of Subject, but Yeon (2003) has shown that it is more appropriate to consider it a Subject rather than anything else. It shows all the features of the syntactic behaviour and the coding of a Subject except for the case marking, which is the rightmost element in the Subject Construction Hierarchy (Croft (2002: 155)). In fact, it shows a typical pattern that has been described in the literature: diachronically – and that is cross-linguistically – there is a stage in which, in mental verb constructions, "experiencers are coded as obliques, but have subject behavioural properties." (ibid: 157). In fact, in this construction even coding properties, like Subject Honorification are defining that element as a Subject. So, it will be only reasonable, rather than opportunistic, to say that in this particular construction the syntactic role of this particular element is Subject in the construction. There is also supporting evidence that the construction with the Dative marking precedes historically the corresponding construction where both arguments are marked with **i/ka**. Furthermore, as Yeon (2003) has shown, there is even more evidence that the second nominal phrase, the stimulus (semantically)

that is marked with the *cosa* **i/ka** cannot be considered a subject and the best-fitting label for it in this particular construction would be Object. Thus, we have the particle **i/ka** marking the syntactic role of Object corresponding semantically to the stimulus in the Dative-Subject Construction. The parallels to the Double-Nominative Constructions constructions are obvious.

It is worth mentioning that the particle **i/ka** could be used in a variety of this Korean construction for focalization of the Dative Subject (sentence (3.55) below). Similarly, the particle **un/nun** could be used for topicalization of the Dative Subject (sentence (3.54)). (3.54) is an instance of the Topicalized-Dative-Subject Construction, while (3.55) is an instance of the Focalized-Dative-Subject Construction.

(3.54) 나에게는 뱀이 무섭다.

　Na eykey nun paym i mwusepta.

　I DAT TOP snake NOM is.scary

　As for me, I am afraid of snakes.

(3.55) 나에게가 고향이 그립다.

　Na eykey ka kohyang i kulipta.

　I DAT NOM hometown NOM is.missed

　It is me who misses one's hometown.

The schematic representation is the Topicalized-Dative-Subject Construction is

TOP[SUBJ NP1 *eykey nun*] FOC[OBJ NP2 *i/ka* DeV].

The schematic representation is the Focalized-Dative-Subject Construction is

FOC[SUBJ NP1 *eykey ka*] OBJ NP2 *i/ka* DeV.

In these sentences the subject can be marked as subject with one *cosa* (the Dative-Subject **eykey**) and additionally as Topic or Focus with a different *cosa* (**un/nun** and **i/ka** respectively) that is attached to the Dative **eykey**. This is possible because of the structural properties of the Dative *cosa* **eykey**, which is a *cosa* from the first slot (as discussed in Chapter 2).

As for (3.55), it has been reported to me by native speakers that such sentences are not necessarily focus constructions, especially in colloquial Korean. It seems that in some contexts they are synonymous with the respective constructions with just the Dative particle **eykey**; in the case of (3.55) that is (3.53). In these cases it seems that we can accept the claims (often given in KFL settings) that the usage of **i/ka** just serves to "emphasize" that the nominal phrase is the subject, i.e. its "subjectivity" is reinforced. There are other constructions involving the *cosa* **i/ka**, where it is used solely for emphasis and reinforcement according to almost all accounts. We are going to examine them in the next section.

We can summarize that in Dative-Subject Constructions **i/ka** is used to mark the Object. It could be used with the Subject nominal phrase but that usage is to mark Focus. Still, as in other constructions, **i/ka** marks Focus when it is associated with the Subject. In such cases the *cosa* **i/ka** can occur twice even in Dative-Subject constructions: marking the Object and marking the Subject as Focus.

3.4 Usage in *man i* Constructions

Now I am going to discuss the usage of **i/ka** when it is attached to the *cosa* **man** that is already attached to a nominal or a different *cosa*.

With **man** the *cosa* **i/ka** is used – in the **man i** sequence – to focalize the phrase marked by **man**. The usage of **i** in these constructions could be interpreted as marking Focus rather than Subject, but at the same time it marks Focalized Subjects, i.e. **i** is used after **man** to mark focalized phrases that in "neutral" context (e.g. in sentence-focus constructions without **man**) will be marked with **i/ka** (i.e. Subjects, Objects of certain state predicates), or Subjects that are already marked with another *cosa* for their Subjecthood (e.g. Dative Subjects marked with **eykey**, honorific Subjects marked with **kkeyse**). In the latter cases we will have sequences like **eykey man i**. Let us consider the following two pairs of sentences:

(3.56) 진호만 왔다.

    Cinho man wassta.

    Cinho only come.PAST.DECL

    Only Cinho came.

(3.57) 진호만이 왔다.

    Cinho man i wassta.

    Cinho only NOM come.PAST.DECL

    It is only Cinho who came.

(3.58) 인수만 옷을 샀다.

Inswu man os ul sassta.

Inswu only clothes ACC buy.PAST.DECL

Only Inswu bought clothes.

(3.59) 인수만이 옷을 샀다.

Inswu man i os ul sassta.

Inswu only NOM clothes ACC buy.PAST.DECL

It is only Inswu who bought clothes.

Sentences (3.57) and (3.59) have a focalized Subject that is already marked with **man** 'only'. They could be uttered in specific contexts. For example, (3.57) could be uttered in response to something like "I heard a lot of your Korean friends came", while (3.59) could be uttered in response to "It seems your group went to the market and bought clothes". Sentences (3.56) and (3.58) can have slightly different interpretations depending on the context. For example sentence (3.56) can mean "Only Cinho came. [Nobody else came]" or it can mean something like "Only Cinho came [while the people who were expected to come with him, e.g. friends, family, etc, did not]". In both cases though it is clear that Cinho has come. However, with negative sentences we get a much higher level of ambiguity. In the negative sentences it is clear that **i/ka** marks Focus in the **man i** constructions and that is why the **man i** sentences, unlike their **man**-only counterparts, are unambiguous. The following two pairs of sentences have been discussed by Kuno and Kim-Renaud (2004: 31-33).

(3.60) 기호만 안 왔다.

Kiho man an wassta

Kiho only not come.PAST.DECL

i. Only Kiho didn't come. [Everybody else came.]

ii. Kiho didn't come alone. [Yumi came, too.]

(3.61) 기호만이 안 왔다.

Kiho man i an wassta

Kiho only NOM not come.PAST.DECL

It is only Kiho who didn't come.

(3.62) 기호만 올 수 없다.

Kiho man olq swu epsta

Kiho only come.ATTR possibility not.exist.DECL

i. Only Kiho cannot come. [Everybody else can come.]

ii. Kiho cannot come alone./It is not possible for Kiho to come alone.

(3.63) 기호만이 올 수 없다.

Kiho man i olq swu epsta

Kiho only NOM come.ATTR possibility not.exist.DECL

It is only Kiho that cannot come.

The sentences without **i**, (3.60) and (3.62), are ambiguous because of the possible different interpretations of the scope of **man** 'only'. Kuno and Kim-Renaud (ibid) call the first interpretation "higher-scope" and the second interpretation "lower-scope". They also note that the "lower-scope" usage is normally distinguished by "stress", i.e. high prominence on **man**. However, the sentences with

i, (3.61) and (3.63), are unambiguous. This is obviously due to the explicit focalization of the phrase marked with **i/ka**.

Again, we observe the tendency of **i/ka** to be attached to Subjects even when it is not marking them exclusively for Subjecthood. At the same time it is used to reinforce another category it is associated with – Focus.

3.5 Usage in *siphta* Constructions

The *cosa* **i/ka** has an interesting usage in **siphta** constructions. It can mark the object of the main processive verb in the construction that expresses "want to do something". Let us examine the following two sentences:

(3.64) 갑자기 음악을 듣고 싶다.

    Kapcaki um.ak ul tutko shiphta

    suddenly music ACC listen.CONN want.DECL

    Suddenly I want to listen to music.

(3.65) 갑자기 음악이 듣고 싶다.

    Kapcaki um.ak i tutko shiphta

    suddenly music NOM listen.CONN want.DECL

    Suddenly I want to listen to music.

The predicates in these constructions are complex – they consist of a processive verb with a connective suffix and a form of the descriptive verb **siphta** 'want' that could be sentence-final or not. In the cases when the processive verb is

148

transitive, its Object could be marked with Accusative **ul/lul**, as in constructions with simple predicate (sentences (3.64)). However, in the **siphta** constructions the Object could be marked with Nominative **i/ka** as well (sentences (3.65)). It seems that the two sentences have the same meaning, although for some native speakers, reportedly, there might be a slight difference in nuances.

It seems that the **siphta** constructions have a lot of parallels with the both the Double-Nominative Constructions and the Dative-Subject Constructions. The descriptive verb can be seen as similar to the stative predicates in those constructions. It is also semantically close to a subgroup of them, namely the ones that express sensation, experience, emotion, involuntary action, necessity, etc, i.e. of the "low transitivity" kind, since **siphta** expresses longing and desire. With transitive processive verbs marking the Object with **ul/lul** can be seen as something inherited from the transitive construction and characterizing the embedded clause. However, the stative predicate **siphta** calls for **i/ka** marking of the Object. One way to reconcile these differences is to allow both **i/ka** and **ul/lul** to be possible in this construction.

3.6 Marking Verb Forms

Now I review constructions where the *cosa* **i/ka** is attached to verb forms. Like the other *cosa* from the last two slots **i/ka** is attached to verb forms that are main verbs in complex verb predicates. Only some verb forms have the structural property of allowing *cosa* to be attached to them. Attaching *cosa* like **i/ka** and **ul/lul** to the -**ci** form of the verbs is a particularly frequent occurrence in contemporary colloquial Korean.

The usage of the *cosa* **i/ka** with the **–ci** form of verbs, both descriptive and processive, sometimes is left out of the discussion of its functions, especially in KFL literature, since the emphasis falls on the usage of the *cosa* with nouns and nominal phrases while the **–ci** form of verbs is normally regarded as a verb form, not a nominal form. Here we will not go into discussion about the ontology of the –**ci** form itself but we can note that it possesses some structural characteristics that are associated with nouns and nominal phrases, including the possibility of *cosa* like **i/ka** (in this case the form **ka**) to be attached to it. The **–ci** form of the verbs has been called the suspective by Martin (1992), Lee (1993). It has been noted the constraints on the usage of **–ci ka** are entirely semantic. According to Martin (1992: 289), "[i]f we set up a class of **ka**-preemphasizables, we will want to include in it:

(1) all adjectives [i.e. descriptive verbs];

(2) virtually all passives (with occasional problems of awkwardness);

(3) the intransitive verb **toy-** 'become' in all its uses;

(4) virtually all intransitive processive verbs pronounced **ci-**, including the auxiliary in **–e ci-** 'get to be, become';

(5) a few miscellaneous intransitive verbs, including **cwuk-** 'die', **phi-** 'bloom', and **kamki tulli-** 'catches a cold'."

Martin (1992: 316) stresses that "[f]or processive verbs the particle is normally **ul/lul**:

anc.ci anh.nunta 'does not sit' -> **anc.ci lul anh.nunta** 'does not SIT'

ku kes ul poci anh.nunta 'does not look at that' -> **ku kes ul poci lul anh.nunta** 'does not LOOK at that' (smoother with **ku kes ul** -> **ku kes un**)."

This restriction for **i/ka** with most processive verbs points to a semantic that is associated not only with emphasis or focus but also with more "stativeness" (as

opposed to "activeness") and intransitivity or low transitivity which we already came to associate with the *cosa* **i/ka**.

The **–ci** form is used in a host of constructions. It is widely used as a sentence-final suffix in declarative, interrogative, imperative, hortative constructions in colloquial and informal speech, where it is not normally followed by **i/ka** or **ul/lul**. It can also be used with practically all descriptive and processive verbs in the Post-Verbal Negation constructions (also called "long negatives"). It could be said that in these constructions **i/ka** and **ul/lul** mark a specific negation focus and that usage parallels their focus-marking in the other constructions we have discussed. In comparison with the usage of **i/ka** in front of **anita** 'not be' (discussed above) this usage is perceived as more marked and is less neutral for the negation. Choo and Kwak (2008: 242) describe it as "emphatic negation". The focus **i/ka** and **ul/lul** mark in these constructions is not contrastive. In fact, contrastive focus here would be marked with **–ci nun**. Let us discuss the difference between (3.66) and (3.67).

(3.66) 먹지를 않았다.

Mekci lul anh.assta.

eat.SUSP ACC not.do.PAST.DECL

It is eating that (she) did not do. She didn't EAT.

(3.67) 먹지는 않았다.

Mekci nun anh.assta.

eat.SUSP ACC not.do.PAST.DECL

She did NOT EAT. [I do not know if she drank or did other things.]/Eat, she didn't.

(3.66) could be a response to an information question or a question asking for clarification like "She didn't do what?". (3.67) is an example of Contrastive Focus where eating is singled out from a set of activities that may or may not be explicitly present in the discourse. Contrastive Focus is marked with **un/nun**, while non-contrastive Focus is marked with **i/ka** or **ul/lul**. The choice of **i/ka** or **ul/lul** for marking this focus depends largely on the semantics of the verb or the construction in terms of intransitivity/transitivity, "low transitivity"/"high transitivity", etc. The *cosa* **i/ka** tends to mark **–ci** forms of state predicates, while **ul/lul** tends to mark **–ci** forms of activity predicates, i.e. the choice is based not on syntactic but on semantic considerations.

It should be noted that for some native speakers **i/ka** and **ul/lul** can be used interchangeably. For example, Yi and Yi (2001: 30) accept both (3.68) and (3.69) as grammatical.

(3.68) 기분이 좋지가 않아.

  Kipwun i cohci ka anh.a.

  mood NOM is.good.SUSP NOM not.do

  I do not feel well.

(3.69) 기분이 좋지를 않아.

  Kipwun i cohci lul anh.a.

  mood NOM is.good.SUSP ACC not.do

  I do not feel well.

Further research is needed to establish what, if any, nuances of difference there will be between the two sentences for the native speakers who distinguish between usages of **–ci ka** and **–ci lul**.

3.7 Conclusions

In this chapter I addressed the research questions of this work regarding the *cosa* **i/ka**. I have described and analyzed the meaning and usage of the *cosa* across grammatical constructions. I have shown that the usage of the *cosa* is influenced by the interactions of syntactic, semantic, cognitive/pragmatic and stylistic factors.

What does the *cosa* **i/ka** signify in concrete constructions? The prototypical usage of **i/ka** is to mark the agent, i.e. the subject in active sentences, of both transitive and intransitive verbs. However, it does not mark Subject whenever it occurs. It cannot mark topicalized or contrasted subjects, which are normally marked with **un/nun**; it marks focalized subjects as well as subjects in sentence-focus constructions. It could mark subjects in subordinated clauses that could be topicalized or contrasted. It cannot mark subjects when they are marked pragmatically for non-uniqueness and other semantic and information-structure categories expressed by the *cosa* **to**. It does not mark subjects that are marked with the *cosa* **eykey** for subjecthood (Dative Subjects in Dative-Subject constructions), but can be used after the *cosa* **eykey** to convey the focalization of subjects, albeit that usage is marginal. The *cosa* **i/ka** is notably used to mark Objects in certain constructions with two-place stative predicates, while still marking the Subjects in them. This leads to double-nominative constructions. There are restrictions on the semantic roles of the Objects marked by **i/ka**. The usage of **i/ka** to mark phrases that

are not subjects is connected to its added semantics of high intransitivity, high control over the event, tendency to animacy, etc. If the stative predicate is expressed with the corresponding processive verb (higher transitivity), then **i/ka** marks the Subject, while the Object is marked with **ul/lul**. In this case the Subject tends to be more in control of the event and is perceived as volitional (in these constructions adverbs expressing the volition of the subject are possible, unlike in the **i/ka**-Object ones[31]). It is also possible for both arguments to be marked with **i/ka** which expresses the general tendency of **i/ka** to mark Subjects, when they are not topicalized, and the general tendency of **i/ka** to mark entities that are in control and more volitional. Also, **i/ka** is the syntactic default marker of the single arguments of one-argument predicates when they are not explicitly marked for pragmatic functions.

On the other hand, **i/ka** is used to mark the information-structure category of Focus, not per se, but to focalize mainly Subjects when they are narrow focus, as well as thetic Subjects. It does not mark topicalized or contrasted subjects. It does not mark specific kinds of Focus, like Contrastive Focus, Emphatic Focus. It also marks Subjects and some other categories that could be construed as arguments or adjuncts of an intransitive predicate. In colloquial speech it could be used to focalize a string of constituents in a clause. The *cosa* **i/ka** is also used with certain verb forms to mark predicates similarly to the way it marks nominal phrases, postpositional phrases and adverbials for focus.

In constructions with verbs of causative semantics it can mark the causee if the respective referent is perceived as performing the action volitionally and is in control of its execution.

Does the *cosa* **i/ka** tend to signify syntactic or semantic or pragmatic categories? It tends to signify both syntactic and pragmatic categories. At the same

---

[31] There are examples for this in Yeon (2003: 64).

time it is associated with a certain set of semantic roles that characterizes the usage of the **cosa.**

Why is the *cosa* **i/ka** used for different syntactic or semantic or pragmatic categories? The *cosa* **i/ka** marks different semantic participant roles that are generalized in different ways. It marks as Subjects the single arguments of both state and activity predicates (EFFECTOR, MOVER, PATIENT, ENTITY, etc). When it comes to predicates with two arguments, **i/ka** consistently marks as Subject the first argument of activity predicates (USER, OBSERVER, CREATOR, CONSUMER, PERFORMER, etc), i.e. the volitional Subject whose referent has control of the event and tends to be the active participant in the state of affairs. With two-argument state predicates **i/ka** tends to mark the second argument (THEME, POSSESSED, SENSATION, STIMULUS, TARGET, etc), i.e. the Object in constructions with a stative verb (usually a descriptive verb). In these cases the Object is interpreted as initiating or being more responsible for the event because the Subject is non-volitional and cannot control the event. In such cases the Subject could be marked as Dative Subject with a Dative *cosa*. However, **i/ka**-marked alternatives are possible for all Dative-Subject constructions, suggesting that **i/ka** can potentially claim to mark Subjecthood practically universally when it comes to narrow-focus Subejcts and thetic Subjects.

The *cosa* **i/ka** can can mark Subject and a stative-predicate Object even in the same sentence. It can also mark Predicate Complement in **toyta** and **anita** constructions. The reason it marks both Subjects and LT Objects, as well as the Predicate Complement of **toyta**, is that it has a tendency to mark participants that are semantically active, animate and more in control. It also tends to mark arguments of one-place predicates and stative predicates. Its usage in **anita** constructions are associated with its Focus-marking role.

155

How and to what extent can the occurrence of the *cosa* **i/ka** reflect the interaction of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic categories? Every occurrence of the *cosa* **i/ka** reflects the interaction of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic categories. For example, the occurrence of **i/ka** in sentence (1.2) (repeated below), with which we started, reflects the interaction of syntactic and pragmatic factors.

(1.2) 철수가 학교에 갔다.

Chelswu ka hak.kyo ey kassta.

Chelswu NOM school LOC go.PAST.DECL

Chelswu went to school./It is Chelswu who went to school.

When the sentence is uttered in reply to a question like "Who went to school?" or when correcting an assertion like "Inswu went to school", it is a narrow-focus sentence. In this sentence **i/ka** marks the first phrase as a Subject and Focus. If it was not Focus but Topic, even if it was Subject, the phrase would have been marked with a different *cosa*, **un/nun** (as in sentence (1.1). If the same noun phrase is not a Subject in a sentence but Direct Object, even if it was Focus, it would have been marked with a different *cosa*, **ul/lul**. Thus, we can say that it is exactly the interaction, or co-occurrence of the syntactic category Subject and the pragmatic category Focus that **i/ka** marks in sentence (1.2).

In sentence (1.4), reproduces below, **i/ka** marks the interaction of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic factors. It marks the phrase as a low-transitivity object because of the semantic classification of the stative verb (with a processive verb **ul/lul** would have been used, as in (1.3)). It is also there because the respective constituent is not topicalized or contrasted (in these cases **un/nun** would have been

used) or, for example, not marked as an Emphatic Focus (where **to** would have been used).

(1.4) 나는 김치가 좋다.

   na nun kimchi ka cohta

   I TOP kimchi NOM is.good.DECL

   I like kimchi.

     We have seen that the *cosa* **i/ka** has a specific usage in each construction it is used. Its occurrence is motivated by a combination of different consideration having to do with different levels of analysis.

Chapter 4

Analysis and Discussion: The Grammar and Usage of

UL/LUL

In this chapter I will analyze and discuss constructions in which the *cosa* **ul/lul** occurs. The *cosa* **ul/lul** is generally regarded as an Accusative or Direct-Object *cosa*. This treatment derives from its occurrence to mark Direct Objects in numerous transitive verb constructions, including sentence-focus constructions, narrow-focus constructions where the Object is focalized, as well as topic-comment constructions where the Subject is the Topic. In these cases the predicate is expressed with a transitive verb, as in (4.1) and (4.2):

(4.1) 책을 읽는다.

    chayk ul ilknunta

    book ACC read.PROC.DECL

    [I] read books./[I] am reading a book.

(4.2) 학생이 불고기를 먹는다.

    haksayng i pwulkoki lul meknunta

    student NOM pwulkoki ACC eat.PROC.DECL

    The students are eating pwulkoki.

Like any Korean last-slot *cosa*, however, its usage – and meaning – depend on a complex interaction between syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and stylistic factors.

The *cosa* **ul/lul** cannot be used to mark all nouns or noun phrases that are direct objects according to the relevant syntactic criteria for the grammatical relation, as is normally the case with Accusative case markers across numerous nominative-accusative languages (including inflectional languages like Latin or Russian, or agglutinative languages like Turkish).[32] For example, all direct objects in non-negative constructions in Russian and all definite direct objects in Turkish are in the Accusative case, irrespectively of whether they are topicalized or contrasted, and regardless of the style, register, speech level, or any other pragmatic considerations, i.e. marking their syntactic roles in the clause is not negotiable with non-syntactic factors. In Korean **ul/lul** must not be used when the direct object of a transitive verb is topicalized. Neither can it mark Objects of some state predicates, as discussed in the chapter on **i/ka**.

Let us consider the differences between the two sentences in the following pair:

(4.3) 이 케익을 직접 만들었어요.

   i kheyik ul cikcep mantuless.eyo

   this cake ACC directly make.PAST.POL

   I made this cake from scratch.

(4.4) 이 케익을 직접 만들었어요.

   I KHEYIK ul cikcep mantuless.eyo

   this cake ACC directly make.PAST.POL

   It is THIS CAKE that I made from scratch.

---

[32] In Turkish all definite direct objects are marked with the Accusative marker, a feature that is present in other languages as well (Comrie 1989).

Sentences (4.3) and (4.4) have the same syntactic structure but not the same information structure. We can distinguish them from the context they appear, but normally they are distinguished by prosodic features: the **ul**-marked phrase, in (4.4) will be pronounced with a prominence (higher pitch). In this way it is marked as a focalized Object and the rest of the sentence is Topic. Sentence (4.3) is an example of a sentence-focus construction and its schematic presentation will be

$_{FOC}$[OBJ NP *ul/lul* ADV PRED],

while (4) is an example of a narrow focus (argument focus) and its schematic presentation will be

$_{FOC}$[OBJ ul] ADV PRED.

Sentence (4.3) describes a new situation neutrally. There is a slight emphasis on the verb and on the constituent immediately in front of the verb (in this case the adverb), which is the unmarked Focus place for languages like Korean. The whole sentence is in the focus domain and all the information presented is presumed to be new to the hearer. In sentence (4.4), there is a focalized part, the direct object[33]. The rest of the sentence is old information: the hearer is supposed to know that the speaker has made a cake or something from scratch already. Similarly to the usage of **i/ka**, which marks both the focalized subject and the subject in the sentence-focus sentences,

---

[33] Actually the situation is a bit more complicated. If the presupposition is that the speaker has made something on its own, then the whole phrase **i kheik ul** will be prominent because it identifies the object that has been made. If the presupposition is that the speaker has made a cake and it has to be identified which one it is, then the prominence will be on the demonstrative **i**. However, these distinctions are not that important for the discussion of the usage of **ul/lul** in these constructions.

ul/lul is used to mark both the focalized direct object and the direct object in the sentence-focus sentences.

Now let us consider another pair of sentences:

(4.5) 이 케익은 직접 만들었어요.

　 i kheyik un cikcep mantuless.eyo

　 this cake TOP directly make.PAST.POL

　 (Speaking of) this cake, I made it from scratch.

(4.6) 이 케익은 직접 만들었어요. (그렇지만 저 케익은 가게에서 샀어요.)

　 I KHEYIK UN cikcep mantulesseyo (kulehciman ce kheyik un kakey eyse sass.eyo)

　 this cake TOP directly make.PAST.POL (but that cake TOP shop LOC buy.PAST.POL)

　 THIS CAKE I made from scratch. (But that one I bought at the shop.)

Sentence (4.5) has the following information structure

TOP[DOBJ NP *un/nun*] FOC[ADV PRED].

It has a topicalized direct object marked only with the topical particle **un/nun** and the rest of the sentence is new information (comment) about that topic. The hearer is supposed to be familiar with the referent of the topic phrase, i.e. the cake, but not with the information that follows. If the adverb **cikcep** in the focus was prosodically marked with high pitch, then the empahsis would be on the fact that the speaker not just made the cake but actually made it themselves from scratch, with no help from other people whatsoever. Sentence (4.6), on the other hand, is an example of a

contrasted direct object. With Topicalized and Contrasted Direct Objects **ul/lul** is not used.

Following Lambrecht's (1994: 286-296) concepts about contrastive topics and contrastive foci, I posit that the contrasted constituent in sentence (4.6) could be construed as both Contrastive Topic and Contrastive Focus, depending on the context. If it is a response to a question like "What about this cake and that cake?", it will be analyzed as Contrastive Topic since both discourse referents are active. If it is a response to a remark like "I heard you made that cake over there from scratch!", it will be analyzed as Contrastive Focus since the discourse referent of "this cake" is new: the utterer of the remark might not be aware that "this cake" exists at all, or that it was something made by the hearer.

In the case of Contrastive Topic analysis, the Topic NP is prosodically prominent because it is a marked Topic. Since the beginning of the clause is the unmarked position for Topic, the Contrastive Topic (a marked Topic) has to be prosodically prominent in order to be distinguished from an unmarked Topic construction (as exemplified by sentence (4.5)).

In the case of Contrastive Focus analysis, the Focus NP is also prosodically prominent because it is a marked Focus. It is in a marked position for a Focus (not immediately in front of the predicate but in the beginning of the clause) and, in the case of sentence (4.6) specifically, the Focalized Direct Objects is not accompanied by **ul/lul** but by **un/nun**. Just like the Contrasted Topic construction, it is distinguished from the unmarked Topic construction prosodically: it is prominent and followed by a pause. Of course, a Contrastive Focus NP can be in the unmarked syntactic position for Focus but it will still be marked prosodically (prominence) and morphologically (**un/nun**).

Both the Contrastive Topic NP and the Contrastive Focus NP are prosodically prominent and accompanied by the *cosa* **un/nun**. We can conclude that Contrastiveness leads to neutralization of the prosodic and morphological marking of the pragmatic functions topic and focus. That phenomenon parallels the neutralization of the morphological marking of grammatical relations in Topicalization.

We can conclude from these analyses that the distinction between Contrastive Topic and Contrastive Focus is not grammatical but depends on the activation states of the discourse referents and the conversational contexts. Here I subscribe to Lambrecht's conclusion that "contrastiveness, unlike focus, is not a category of grammar but the result of the general cognitive processes referred to as "conversational implicatures"." (ibid: 291)

My usage of the term Contrastive Focus is somewhat different from Choi (1999). Following Herring (1990: 164), who distinguishes "presentational focus" and "contrastive focus", and Dik et al (1981: 42), who differentiate "completive focus" and "contrastive focus", as well as Rochemont (1986) and Rochemont and Culicover (1990), Choi (1999: 80) distinguishes Completive Focus and Contrastive Focus. Completive Focus is "a regular new-information focus, i.e., a presentational or completive focus whose major function is to complete or fill in the information gap between the speaker and the hearer" (ibid: 82). Contrastive Focus "can be more explicitly expressed by an accompanying alternative phrase" (ibid: 82). In Contrastive Focus constructions "the existence of (potential) alternatives makes the […] focused item 'prominent' so that the focus (i.e., contrastive focus) gets 'emphasis', 'extra attention', or a 'contraexpectation' effect. […] In other words, there are two types of "prominence" or salience involved here. One is the kind that distinguishes 'focus' from 'non-focus' and the other is the one which tells

'contrastive' focus apart from 'regular' focus" (ibid: 82). It should be carified that in Choi's account prominence is an information feature in her feature-based information structure, the other feature being newness. Several types of Contrastive Focus are proposed following Dik et al (1981): selecting, restricting, expanding, replacing and parallel.

Choi's Completive Focus corresponds more or less to unmarked focus in my analysis, while her Contrastive Focus corresponds to my marked focus. Some of the kinds of Contrastive Focus will also be Contrastive Focus in my analysis but others will be considered as other types of marked focus

Choi does not distinguish Contrastive Topic as a kind of marked Topic: she considers Topic to be always contrastive "in the sense that it stands among other potentially "topical" elements in the discourse." (Choi (1990: 86)). However, I do not accept Aboutness Topic in topic-comment sentences to be contrastive. Once established, the Topic is not compared or contrasted, explicitly or implicitly, with other elements. Only the things about the Topic, i.e. the Comment, remain in focus. In fact, the Topic phrase can be easily dropped. Choi (1990) distinguishes Topic and Tail, Tail being "the given or old information to which no particular attention is paid" (ibid: 77). Tail, as it is used throughout Choi (1999), most often corresponds to phrases denoting active discourse referents in the comment part of topic-comment constructions or in the presupposition part of focus-presupposition constructions. And Choi's (ibid) Topic tends to be the Topic in the Topic-Comment construction, including Aboutness Topic and Contrastive Topic.

Choi analyzes the following two sentences (adapted from Choi (1999: 168)) as "neutral" (sentence (4.7)) and "contrastive focus" (sentence (4.8)):

(4.7) 순이가 인호를 만났어.

164

Swuni ka Inho lul mannass.e

Swuni NOM Inho ACC meet.PAST.DECL

Swuni met Inho.

(4.8) 순이가 인호는 만났어.

Swuni ka Inho nun mannass.e

Swuni NOM Inho TOP meet.PAST.DECL

Swuni met Inho [but maybe not others].

My interpretation of sentence (4.8) will also be as a construction with a direct object as contrastive focus: it is marked with **un/nun** and is in the unmarked position for focus and not in the canonical topic position. My interpretation of sentence (4.7) will also be as a neutral description, i.e. a sentence-focus construction. However, if the Direct Object phrase **Inho-lul** is prosodically prominent and the pragmatic context allows it (e.g. in response to an information question), an interpretation as a narrow-focus construction would also be valid. I will address the theoretical treatment of **un/nun** by Choi in the next chapter.

Sometimes using **ul/lul** to mark an Object depends on semantic factors. For example, in (4.9) **ul/lul** is used because of the animacy of the Subject and the animacy of the Object, as well as the specific semantics of the verb.

(4.9) 많은 시민들이 시장을 반대했다.

manh.un simin tul i sicang ul pantayhayssta

many citizen PLU NOM mayor OBJ oppose.PAST.DECL

Many citizens opposed the mayor.

In such constructions, with verbs like **pantayhata** 'oppose', **ttaluta** 'follow', etc, **ul/lul** is used to mark the Object only if the Subject is animate. Also, the Object could be marked with **ul/lul** or **ey** ("Dative inanimate") if it is inanimate but only with **ul/lul** if it is animate.[34] The semantic interpretations invoke the notion of "affectedness." Animate Subject referents are seen as more capable of affecting the Object entity. Also, Animate Objects are seen as more capable of being affected of the actions expressed by such verbs.

The interpretation of constructions where **ul/lul** can alternate with **kwa/wa** (as a comitative postposition) will be similar.[35] Let us compare the following two pairs of sentences:

(4.10) 철수가 미자와 사랑했다.

    Chelswu ka Mica wa saranghayssta.

    Chelswu SUBJ Mica COM love.PAST.DECL

    Chelsweu has been in love with Mica.

(4.11) 철수가 미자를 사랑했다.

    Chelswu ka Mica lul saranghayssta.

    Chelswu SUBJ Mica OBJ love.PAST.DECL

    Chelsweu has loved Mica.

(4.12) 그 친구와 작별한 지 십 년이 된다.

    ku chinkwu wa cakpyelhan ci sip nyen i toynta.

---

[34] These constructions are discussed in detail in Song (1988: 33).

[35] The following four sentences are adapted from Song (1988: 40). They are also discussed in Song (1993: 65).

that friend COM part.ATTR since ten year COMPL become.PROC.DECL

It has been ten years since I bid farewell to that friend.

(4.13) 그 친구를 작별한 지 십 년이 된다.

ku chinkwu lul cakpyelhan ci sip nyen i toynta.

that friend OBJ part.ATTR since ten year COMPL become.PROC.DECL

It has been ten years since I exchanged farewells with that friend.

The Objects in (4.11) and (4.13) are seen as more affected by – and the Subjects more in control of – the action expressed by the predicate verb of the clause than their counterparts in (4.10) and (4.12), respectively. The examples are relevant for my analysis because they show the strong connection of the *cosa* **ul/lul** with the notions of affectedness and control which allows it to be used in constructions with intransitive verbs marking an argument that, semantically, could be construed to be as affected by the action as a typical Direct Object would be, or somehow its affectedness and lack of control are comparable to that of a canonical Direct Object, even though the verb does not require a Direct Object. This supports my claim that semantic factors, sometimes not entirely in agreement with syntactic factors, are also at play when the choice of last-slot *cosa* is made. This phenomenon is typically Korean and is foreign to many languages that have morphological accusative marking on the Direct Objects. Other examples of **ul/lul** usage in constructions with intransitive verbs will be discussed later in this chapter.

However, in the beginning we will look at some typical and quite common occurrences of the *cosa*.

4.1 In Topic-Comment Constructions

One of the most common occurrences of the *cosa* **ul/lul** is to mark Direct Objects in the comment part of topic-comment constructions. Sentence (4.14) is a typical topic comment sentence where the Subject is the Topic and the rest of the sentence is the comment part (or predicate focus): it gives some new information about an established topic. This particular sentence could be used when people are introduced to each other.

(4.14) 나는 독서를 좋아해요.

Na nun tokse lul coh.ahayyo

I TOP reading.books ACC like.POL

(Speaking of me) I enjoy reading books.

The Direct Object is normally marked with the *cosa* **ul/lul** which in this case marks the grammatical relation. The topicalized phrase is the Subject NP – it is marked explicitly for its pragmatic function (Topic) and its syntactic role is not shown morphologically at all. Since the Direct Object is part of the new information, normally its referent is new in the discourse. If the Direct Object is topicalized, as in (4.15), then the *cosa* **ul/lul** will not be used and the Topic will be marked explicitly for its pragmatic function but the expression of the syntactic role will be suppressed.

(4.15) 독서는 좋아해요.

Tokse nun coh.ahayyo

reading.books TOP like.POL

Speaking of reading books, I enjoy it.

This usage of **ul/lul** in sentences like (4.14) is among the first usages of the *cosa* that learners of Korean as a foreign language. They learn that it typically marks Direct Objects. However, they should also learn that Direct Objects are not necessarily marked with this *cosa*. Depending on different factors, Direct Objects could be marked with other *cosa* or with no *cosa* at all. At the same time, **ul/lul** can occur with constituents that cannot be construed as Direct Objects.

4.2 In Sentence-Focus Constructions

The *cosa* **ul/lul** also marks Direct Object NPs in sentence-focus constructions. Such constructions introduce new entities and normally the discourse referents denoted by the phrases in them are new, as in (4.16), when uttered in response to a question like "What happened there?":

(4.16) 인수가 사과를 먹었다.

   Inswu ka sakwa lul mek.essta

   Inswu NOM apple ACC eat.PAST.DECL

   Inswu ate the/an apple.

In such constructions arguments are marked for their syntactic roles; **ul/lul** marks Direct Objects.

This usage is also relatively common in conversational Korean. Again, learners of Korean should be aware that in sentence-focus constructions, as well as in topic-comment constructions, the *cosa* **ul/lul** could mark not only Direct Objects

(which is assumed to be its default function) but also constituents that are analyzed not as Direct Objects but are also typically marked with **ul/lul** for different semantic and syntactic reasons (such case are discussed later in this chapter).

4.3 In Narrow-Focus Constructions

In this section I will review how Direct Objects are marked in different narrow-focus constructions, including when the Direct Object itself is focalized, and will discuss the occurrences of the *cosa* **ul/lul** in these constructions.

4.3.1 Marking Direct Objects in Focalized-DO Narrow-Focus Constructions

One of the typical unmarked focus constructions with focalized Direct Object is the information question (wh-question) like sentence (4.17). In such questions the Subject might not be present at all in the sentence or could be marked with **i/ka** as well. That depends in the activation state of the discourse referent of the Subject (its topicality) but does not change the focality of the Direct Object. In Choi's (1999: 77, 167) analysis topical elements that are not prominent (i.e. are not Topics in topic-comment constructions) are called Tail. In sentence (4.17) the **un/nun**-marked constituent is not Topic but part of the presupposition in a focus-presupposition construction; it would be a tail element in Choi's terms.

In the canonical answer to the question in sentence (4.17), the Direct Object is also Focus, as in sentence (4.18). In it the Subject is topical enough already and most often is omitted.

(4.17) 철수는 무엇을 잘 하니?

Chelswu nun mwues ul cal hani

Chelswu TOP what ACC well do.PROC.DECL

What is Chelswu good at?

(4.18) (철수는) 테니스를 잘 한다.

(Chelswu nun) theynisu lul cal hanta

(Chelswu TOP) tennis ACC well do.PROC.DECL

He/Chelswu is good at tennis.

Focalized Direct Objects in sentences like (4.17) and (4.18), i.e. unmarked focus constructions, are marked with **ul/lul**. We see that unlike Topic, there is no neutralization in the marking as Focus of constituents with different syntactic roles. On the contrary, unlike when Topicalized, when Focalized their grammatical relations are explicitly mark morphologically. That is not the case with some types of marked Focus, e.g. Contrastive Focus.

One type of marked focus which is normally marked with **ul/lul** is exemplified in sentence (4.19). In it the Focalized Direct Object is prosodically prominent, i.e. it is marked, but it is different semantically from Contrastive Focus because no contrast is implied. It could be uttered in response to a question like "What did you say Chelswu was good at?" or a remark like "I just heard that Chelswu was good at something." It is used in clarification or verification, so we could call it Clarification or Verification Focus.

(4.19) 철수가 테니스를 잘 한다(고 했다).

Chelswu ka THEYNISU lul cal hanta (ko hayssta)

Chelswu NOM tennis ACC well do.PROC.DECL (QUOT do.PAST.DECL)

(I said) Chelswu is good at TENNIS./It is TENNIS that Chelswu is good at.

Similarly to sentence (4.19), sentence (4.20) is also an example of marked Focus of the same type, Clarification or Verification Focus. Its markedness is enforced not only with prosodic prominence but also with the constituent appearing in the beginning of the sentence, not the canonical focus position. However, its position could be interpreted as somewhat consistent with its cognitive specifics: clarification, verification.

(4.20) 테니스를 철수가 잘 한다.

THEYNISU lul Chelswu ka cal hanta

Chelswu NOM tennis ACC well do.PROC.DECL

It is TENNIS that Chelswu is good at.

Unlike sentences (4.19) and (4.20), sentence (4.21) is an example of Contrastive Focus. It could be uttered in different contexts, for example in response to a remark like "I hear Chelswu is good at football".

(4.21) 철수가 테니스는 잘 한다.

Chelswu ka THEYNISU nun cal hanta

Chelswu NOM tennis TOP well do.PROC.DECL

Chelswu is good at TENNIS [not football]./It is TENNIS [not football] that Chelswu is good at.

This is a typical Focalized-Direct Object Contrastive Focus construction with the focalized constituent in the canonical direct-object position and the canonical focus position and explicitly marked morphologically with the *cosa* **un/nun**. At the same time its syntactic role is not marked morphologically.

This is also the case with other types of marked Focus, as in sentence (4.22):

(4.22) 철수가 테니스도 잘 한다.

Chelswu ka THEYNISU to cal hanta

Chelswu NOM tennis also well do.PROC.DECL

Chelswu is good at TENNIS too.

In sentence (4.22) the Focalized Direct Object is marked with the *cosa* **to**, which denotes a kind of marked focus (that will be discussed in detail in the chapter on the *cosa* **to**) and also, like **un/nun**, neutralizes the expression of the syntactic function of the respective constituent.

4.3.2 Marking Direct Objects in Other Narrow-Focus Constructions

In Narrow-Focus constructions where the focalized argument is not the Direct Object (or other "normally" **ul/lul**-marked constituents), as in sentence (4.23) where the Subject is focalized, **ul/lul**-marked constituents could be part of the presupposition. They usually retain their default marking with the *cosa* **ul/lul**, which

morphologically marks their syntactic functions (or, in some cases, more complex semantic-syntactic interactions). They can be treated as tail elements, in Choi's (1999: 77, 167) terms.

(4.23) 철수가 테니스를 잘 한다.

CHELSWU ka theynisu lul cal hanta

Chelswu NOM tennis ACC well do.PROC.DECL

It is CHELSWU who is good at tennis.

Constituents that are ul/lul-marked in sentences like (4.23) potentially could be marked with the *cosa* **un/nun** instead of **ul/lul**. That depends on their relative topicality, i.e. on the activation state. In sentence (4.24) the Direct Object is a topical element in the presupposition part and the Subject is Focus. This sentence could be uttered in response to a question like "Speaking of tennis, who is good at it?"

(4.24) 테니스는 철수가 잘 한다.

Theynisu nun CHELSWU ka cal hanta

tennis TOP Chelswu NOM well do.PROC.DECL

Speaking of tennis, CHELSWU is good at it.

It can be seen that in Narrow-Focus constructions where the focalized argument is not the Direct Object (or any other **ul/lul**-marked constituent), **ul/lul**-marking is retained in the presupposition part, as long as the activation state of the respective discourse referent is not extremely topical (active/given; Lambrecht (1994: 109)). Occurrences of such topical elements are found in information

questions and answers to information questions, where a phenomenon is observed that I could call retained topichood.

4.4 ul/lul-marked Objects vs Bare-Noun Objects

In this section I discuss sentences where the *cosa* **ul/lul** seems to have been dropped and the nominal phrases which under certain conditions could have been marked with it are used without any functional morpheme attached to them, i.e. they are bare (as defined in Chapter 2).

According to Kwon and Zribi-Hertz (2008: 258), "bare objects are never construed as topics or foci and always exhibit a form of semantic incorporation, while LEUL-marked objects always stand as f-structure constituents construed as focused at some level". They distinguish between **internally restricted bare objects** and **internally unrestricted bare objects**. The constituents that are in the first group "cannot include modifiers and are thus restricted as to their internal makeup". The constituents in the second group "seem unrestricted in their internal syntactic structure" (ibid: 273).

Commonly encountered **internally restricted bare objects** are nominals "from OV strings intuitively construed as activity-denoting" and the "OV combination variably [is] read as compositional or metaphorical, and perceived as idiomatic to some degree" (ibid). Their examples include combinations with the verb **hata** 'do; make', as well as with other verbs:

밥 하다

pap hata

cooked.rice make

cook; prepare food

여행 하다

yehayng hata

travel do

travel

밥상 차리다

papsang chalita

cooked.rice.table set

lay the table

노래 부르다

nolay pwuluda

song call

sing

텔레비전 보다

theylleypicen pota

television look.at

watch TV

In all these cases the objects cannot have any modifier. However, the *cosa* **ul/lul** could be used in all of them. Let us compare (4.25) and (4.25'), adapted from Kwon and Zribi-Hertz (2008: 274), and see what difference the usage of **ul/lul** makes.

(4.25) 민수는 텔레비전 보고 있어.

    Minswu nun theylleypicen pokoiss.e

    Minswu TOP television look.at.PROG.DECL

    Minswu is watching TV.

(4.25') 민수는 텔레비전을 보고 있어.

    Minswu nun theylleypicen ul pokoiss.e

    Minswu TOP television ACC look.at.PROG.DECL

    Minswu is watching (the) TV. / Minswu is looking at the TV.

As Kwon and Zribi-Hertz (2008: 274) point out, the "crucial semantic contrast between [the two sentences] is that in the first case the OV string may only be construed as activity-denoting, and thus provides a felicitous response to a WH-question bearing on the predicate, as in [(4.26)], but not to a WH-question bearing on the object, as in [(4.26')]".

(4.26) A: 민수는 뭐 하고 있니?

      Minswu nun mwe hakoissni?

      Minswu TOP what do.PROG.Q

      And Minswu, what is he doing?

   B: (4.25)/(4.25')

(4.26') A: 민수는 뭘 보고 있니?

      Minswu nun mwe l pokoissni?

      Minswu TOP what ACC look.at.PROG.Q

      And Minswu, what is he looking at?

    B: #(4.25)/(4.25')

According to Kwon and Zribi-Hertz, the focus structures of (4.25) and (4.25') are:

TOP[Minswu nun] FOC[theylleypicen pokoiss.e]

Minswu nun FOC[theyllepicen ul] pokoiss.e

respectively.[36] (4.25) is a predicate-focus construction, while (4.25') is a narrow-focus construction. Further, they "assume that in response to a wh-question bearing on the object, the object must be under narrow focus, but that in response to a wh-question bearing on the predicate, the object may be under narrow focus. This double option is illustrated in English by [(4.27)]."

(4.27) A: What did John do?

    B1: TOP[He] FOC[bought apples].

    B2: He bought FOC[apples].

---

[36] I use my notation for focus structure here in order to avoid confusion.

While that is true in the Korean case as well, I think that (4.25') can have a different focus structure: not a narrow-focus one but a predicate-focus one:

TOP[Minswu nun] FOC[theylleypicen ul pokoiss.e]

In this focus structure the **ul/lul**-marked direct object is simply interpreted as referential (identifiable or unidentifiable). Since all these OV combinations denote activities, we can assume, following Van Valin, Jr. and LaPolla (1997: 149), that the object in each of them is "non-referential and therefore functions as an inherent argument". In these cases the object is semantically incorporated into the verb (see also Lambrecht (1994: 85)) and the bare object is used. However, in some cases the direct object is referential and can be in narrow focus (as in Kwon and Zribi-Hertz's interpretation). In other cases it can be referential and used in the comment part of the topic-comment construction. In such constructions with activity verbs **ul/lul** marks a referential direct object. I agree with Kwon and Zribi-Hertz that the absence of **ul/lul** in these cases signals a degree of semantic incorporation with the verb constituent and that "the Korean bare objects under discussion are morphosyntactically deficient nominals construed as property-denoting predicate modifiers, whose combination with the verb triggers an activity-denoting effect and shows varying degrees of idiomaticity".

In fact, as Kwon and Zribi-Hertz observe, "[a]ny OV string may actually be realized with a bare object and activity-denoting reading in appropriate context. Thus, the adverbial *tto* 'again', which introduces a presupposition on the event, improves the acceptability of the bare object in [(4.28')]", compared to (4.28):

(4.28) 민수가 문(을) 부수고 있다.

Minswu ka mwun ??(ul) pwuswukoissta

Minswu NOM door ACC break.PROG.DECL

Minswu is breaking (the) door(s). / ??Minswu is engaged in door-breaking.

(4.28') 민수가 또 문(을) 부수고 있다.

Minswu ka tto mwun (ul) pwuswukoissta

Minswu NOM again door ACC break.PROG.DECL

Minswu is once again breaking (the) door(s). / Minswu is once again engaged in door-breaking.

We can conclude that **ul/lul**-marking depends on the referentiality of the object: referential objects are marked with **ul/lul** when they are in the actual focus domain. i.e. in sentence-focus (thetic) constructions; in the comment part of predicate-focus constructions; in the focus part of narrow-focus constructions. However, they might appear without **ul/lul** in the presupposition part of narrow-focus constructions which feature focalized subjects, as we shall see below.

Now I turn to examples of **internally unrestricted bare objects**. Internally unrestricted objects are typically referential. There are examples where internally unrestricted bare objects are acceptable even when they have genitive modifiers. Let us consider the following two pairs of sentences (adapted from Kwon and Zribi-Hertz (2008: 280)):

(4.29) 민수는 민나의 텔레비전을 보고 있어.

Minswu nun Minna uy theylleypicen ul pokoiss.e

Minswu TOP Minna GEN television ACC watch.PROG.DECL

(i) (How about Minswu?) Minswu is watching Minna's TV.

(ii) (What TV is Minswu watching?) Minswu is watching Minna's TV.

(4.29') *민수는 민나의 텔레비전 보고 있어.

Minswu nun Minna uy theylleypicen pokoiss.e

Minswu TOP Minna GEN television watch.PROG.DECL

(How about Minswu?) Minswu is engaged in Minna's-TV-watching.

(4.30) 민수가 민나의 텔레비전을 보고 있어.

Minswu ka Minna uy theylleypicen ul pokoiss.e

Minswu NOM Minna GEN television ACC watch.PROG.DECL

(Hey look!) Minswu is watching Minna's TV.

(4.30') 민수가 민나의 텔레비전 보고 있어.

Minswu ka Minna uy theylleypicen pokoiss.e

Minswu NOM Minna GEN television watch.PROG.DECL

(Who is watching Minna's TV?) Minswu is watching Minna's TV. / (It is) Minsu (who) is watching Minna's TV.

(4.29) can be construed both as a predicate-focus construction (the translation in (i)) and as a narrow-focus construction (the translation in (ii)). In both cases the focus is unmarked and the **ul/lul**-marked direct object is in the actual focus domain.

(4.29') is ungrammatical. It has an **un/nun**-marked subject, presumed to be Topic, and a bare direct object in the comment part, which is not acceptable.

(4.30) is an example of sentence-focus construction. It has an **i/ka**-marked subject and an **ul/lul**-marked direct object, both of them in the actual focus domain. This sentence, with the same linear structure but with different prosodic contours, could also be construed as an example of narrow-focus construction – both with focalized subject and focalized direct object.

The most interesting of the four sentences is (4.30'). In it the subject is **i/ka**-marked, as in (4.30), but the direct object is bare. It is acceptable only as an example of narrow-focus construction with a focalized **i/ka**-marked subject. The direct object in it is referential and is an active discourse referent, presumably just mentioned in the question. It is part of the presupposition (and could be interpreted as Tail in Choi's (1999) terms). Apparently such internally unrestricted bare objects which are part of the presupposition in narrow-focus constructions are acceptable in colloquial Korean. Kwon and Zribi-Hertz's (2008: 280) explanation is that "the entire predicate, including the object, is treated as presupposed information that fails to be encoded in f-structure, so that the bare object is optimal even though it contains a genitive modifier and is construed as discourse-accessible ('definite'). […] The 'incorporation' effect in this case derives from the fact that the entire predicate is actually left out of f-structure".

Indeed, this is a peculiarity of narrow-focus constructions with Subject in focus when no element from the presupposition has been explicitly topicalized. (4.30') is not a felicitous answer to a question like (4.31) where the direct object is explicitly topicalized with **un/nun**, while (4.32), where the topicalized constituent is repeated in the unmarked topic position (in the beginning of the sentence) or omitted altogether and the Subject is in the unmarked focus position (immediately in from of the predicate).

(4.31) 민나의 텔레비전은 누가 보고 있어?

Minna uy theylleypicen un nwu ka pokoiss.e?

Minna GEN television TOP who NOM watch.PROG.DECL

Speaking of Minna's TV, who is watching it?

(4.32) (민나의 텔레비전은) 민수가 보고 있어.

(Minna uy theylleypicen un) Minswu ka pokoiss.e

(Minna GEN television TOP) Minswu NOM watch.PROG.DECL

(Minna's TV,) Minswu is watching it.

(4.30') is felicitous when no element from the presupposition has been explicitly topicalized. Hence, no element of the presupposition part is realized in front of the Subject: the focus is in an atypical position. Since Subject correlates with Topic and Object with Focus (Lambrecht (1994: 131, 262)), having Subject as Focus in more marked than having Object as Focus. Since the unmarked focus position is the immediately preverbal position (Kim (1998), Yang (1994)), which is also the position of the direct object in the unmarked constituent order, a possible way to accommodate a narrow-focus Subject is to "integrate" the whole OV complex so that it can be construed as one predicate. It happens by using a bare object that is prosodically united with the verb (which realizes a semantic incorporation according to Kwon and Zribi-Hertz (2008)). That also distinguishes sentence (4.30') from its thetic allosentence (4.30).

The direct object that appears without **ul/lul** in (4.30') is an active discourse referent that is in the presupposition part of a narrow-focus construction. That is also in harmony with the tendency of the *cosa* **ul/lul** to mark new rather than active discourse referents and to mark Focus rather than non-focal elements.

4.5 Marking Two Phrases: Double-Accusative Constructions

In this chapter I review sentences that exemplify Double Accusative Constructions. Korean has an interesting feature: it can have two constituents marked with the Accusative **ul/lul** in the same clause. This feature sets it apart from Japanese, which does not allow two constituents in a clause to be marked with the Accusative marker **wo** (Shibatani (1973)).

4.5.1 Double-Accusative Possessor-Ascension Constructions

One type of these double-accusative constructions is the Possessor-Ascension construction (Palmer (1994), Hyman (1977), Fox (1981), Haiman (1985), Nichols (1988), Park (1985), Chun (1986), Kim (1990), O'Grady (1991), Shibatani (1994), Chappell and McGregor (1996), Katamba (1993), Yeon (2003)). Let us consider the following two pairs of sentences:

(4.33) 인수가 미라를 등을 밀었다.

    Inswu ka Mila lul tung ul mil.essta

    Inswu NOM Mila ACC back ACC push.PAST.DECL

    Inswu pushed Mila on the back.

(4.34) 인수가 미라의 등을 밀었다.

    Inswu ka Mila uy tung ul mil.essta

Inswu NOM Mila GEN back ACC push.PAST.DECL

Inswu pushed Mila's back.

(4.35) 개가 토끼를 다리를 물었다.

kay ka thokki lul tali lul mwul.essta

dog NOM rabbit ACC leg ACC bite.PAST.DECL

The dog bit the rabbit in the leg.

(4.36) 개가 토끼의 다리를 물었다.

kay ka thokki uy tali lul mwul.essta

dog NOM rabbit GEN leg ACC bite.PAST.DECL

The dog bit the rabbit's leg.

In sentences (4.33) and (4.35) there are two constituents marked with **ul/lul**. They both look like direct objects and both are perceived as dependents of the verb. In sentences (4.34) and (4.36) there is only one constituent marked with **ul/lul**, i.e. as a direct object, while the other noun is marked with the Genitive *cosa* **uy** and is a dependent in the direct-object nominal phrase whose head is the second noun. Semantically, the nominal phrase in this particular case expresses possession and the possessor is marked with **uy**. That is why the constructions exemplified by (4.33) and (4.35) are called Possessor-Ascension (or PA) constructions. In them, however, the possessor noun is the Primary Object and has the syntactic properties of a Direct Object, while the possessed noun is the Secondary Object and loses its status of a direct object. Following O'Grady (1991), Yeon (2003: 180) writes that one assumption about secondary objects could be that they have "adverb-type locative

interpretations". So, we can note now that in the Double-Accusative constructions the *cosa* **ul/lul** marks not only the syntactic direct object (Primary Object in this construction), required by the logical structure of the verb, but also the Secondary Object which is semantically connected to the Primary Object.

There are semantic restrictions on **ul/lul**-marking of the possessor in such constructions in Korean. The *cosa* is used only if the possessor is affected (or at least deemed affected to a large extent) by the action expressed with the verb. That is why the possessor (Swumi) in the sentence (4.37) cannot be marked with **ul/lul**:

(4.37) 인수가 수미의 목소리를 들었다.

Inswu ka Swumi uy moksoli lul tul.essta.

Inswu NOM Swumi GEN voice ACC hear.PAST.DECL

Inswu heard Swumi's voice.

We see again that not only the syntactic roles, but also the concrete meanings of the words, both verbs and nouns, and their semantic classifications are of crucial importance for the usage of specific *cosa*. In fact, the usage of the *cosa* **ul/lul** in these constructions, i.e. the possessor ascension phenomenon, is regulated by a complex of semantic and pragmatic factors. Yeon's (2003: 190) research has shown that factors like affectedness and contiguity are decisive for the choice of **ul/lul** in such constructions: "The crucial factor in Possessor Ascension is not really the absolute (or semantic) inalienable relation between the possessor and the possessed as is often assumed, but is rather whether or not the possessor is cognitively contiguous with the possessed object in an event, and the possessor is thought to be affected by the event as a consequence. The constraints of affectedness and contiguity, contrasting with inalienable possession, explain the possessor ascension more accurately. Furthermore,

it was noted that the concept of contiguity should be understood as a cognitive/psychological one, not as a physical contact or distance". Consequently, the usage of the *cosa* for the two constituents in these constructions reflects a complicated interaction of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic factors.

4.5.2 Double-Accusative Causative Constructions

The **morphologically causative** verbs in Korean are all transitive verbs by definition and their direct objects are marked just like the direct objects of lexically transitive verbs, especially if the causative verb derives from an intransitive verb, as in (4.38):

(4.38) 수미가 아이를 울리었다.

   Swumi ka ai lul wulliessta

   Swumi NOM child ACC cry.CAUS.PAST.DECL

   Swumi made the child cry.

When the morphologically causative verbs derive from an intransitive verb, the causee is the direct object in the causative construction. These constructions are comparable to the constructions with "ordinary" transitive verbs.

The situation with the morphologically causative verbs deriving from transitive verbs is more complicated. The direct object of the original transitive verb appears in the causative construction with the same morphological marking as in the

non-causative transitive construction, i.e. marked with **ul/lul**. [37] The situation becomes even more complicated because the causee in these Korean causative constructions appears marked with **ul/lul** but also with the Dative postposition **eykey**. In analytic causative constructions with auxiliary verbs the causee can be marked not only with **ul/lul** or **eykey** but also with **i/ka**. The marking of the direct object of the original transitive verb (which may be viewed in some ways similar to the "Retained Object" in passive constructions) with **ul/lul** is obviously related to the notion of affectedness and its semantic (and syntactic) status vis-à-vis the original transitive verb, while the choice of the *cosa f*or the marking of the cause depends entirely on semantic and cognitive consideration, like to what extent the cause is viewed as having control over the performed action, being affected by it, or even benefiting from it. Whatever the grammatical relations of the causee and the direct object of the original transitive verb according to syntactic criteria, the usage of the *cosa* in these constructions is obviously more connected with semantics than with syntax.

When the causee is marked with **ul/lul**, while the direct object of the original transitive verb is also present and marked with **ul/lul**, we have two constituents marked with the *cosa* **ul/lul**, another case of the so-called "double Accusative" or "double object" constructions. Let us consider (4.39) and (4.40):

(4.39) 엄마가 아이를 약을 먹이었다.

emma ka ai lul yak ul mek.iessta.

mum NOM child ACC medicine ACC eat.CAUS.PAST.DECL

Mum made/forced the child take the medicine.

---

[37] That feature of Korean contrasts with the situation in many languages described in the literature, in which monoclausal causative constructions usually have one direct object – the causee – and the direct object of the corresponding transitive verb appear, if at all, with different morphological marking. Such languages normally have restrictions: only one constituent can be the direct object and have accusative morphology in a single clause (cf Van Valin, Jr. and LaPolla (1994: 353))

(4.40) 엄마가 아이에게 약을 먹이었다.

emma ka ai eykey yak ul mek.iessta.

mum NOM child DAT medicine ACC eat.CAUS.PAST.DECL

Mum let/had the child take the medicine.

The causee is marked with **ul/lul** in (4.39) and with the Dative *cosa* **eykey** in (4.40). There is a semantic difference between the two constructions, as the translations also show. The one with the causee marked with **ul/lul** implies more direct "agency" on behalf of the causer and less control of the causee (including enforcement and coercion), while the one with causee marked with **eykey** implies more control of the causee on the situation and covers situation like permission, persuasion, etc (Yeon (2003: 96)). In terms of affectedness, the **ul/lul** constructions imply that the level of affectedness of the causee is higher (Comrie (1981), Song (2001)). In these constructions the occurrence of the *cosa* **ul/lul** has clear semantic references rather than syntactic ones.

At the same time, we note that in these Korean causative constructions, while the causee could be marked with either **ul/lul** or **eyekey**, it is normal for the direct object of the original construction to appear in the same clause, consistently marked with its original Accusative marker **ul/lul**. This phenomenon is somewhat parallel to the Retained Object constructions rather than to the Secondary Object constructions. For our analysis, it is important that the high-transitivity low-control original direct object, which semantically tends to be inanimate or non-human, is consistently marked with the *cosa* **ul/lul**.

With Korean **analytic causatives** the situation is even more complex. The following three sentences are examples of analytic causatives of an intransitive verb.

(4.41) 수미가 아이를 가게 했다.

Swumi ka ai lul kakey hayssta.

Swumi NOM child ACC go.ADV do.PAST.DECL

Swumi made the child go.

(4.42) 수미가 아이에게 가게 했다.

Swumi ka ai eykey kakey hayssta.

Swumi NOM child DAT go.ADV do.PAST.DECL

Swumi let the child go.

(4.43) 수미가 아이가 가게 했다.

Swumi ka ai ka kakey hayssta.

Swumi NOM child NOM go.ADV do.PAST.DECL

Swumi had the child go./Swumi did so that the child go.

As we can see the causee could be marked not only with the Object **ul/lul** or the Dative **eykey** (or its stylistic variant **hanthey**) but also with the Subject marker **i/ka** (thus producing a "double Nominative" construction). The variety of *cosa* that could be used here is allowed by the syntactic biclausality of the Korean analytic causative (Song (1988), O'Grady (1991), Yeon (2003)). The choice of the concrete *cosa*, however, depends on semantic factors. As with the morphological causatives of transitive verbs, the choice of *cosa* shows the degree of control of the causee on the event and the level of affectedness. In this case, the usage of **ul/lul** indicates the lowest degree of control and highest level of affectedness of the causee, while **i/ka**

indicates the highest level of control and the lowest level of affectedness (Comrie (1981), Yeon (2003)).

The situation with the causativization of constructions with stative predicates that have nominative-marked objects is somewhat parallel to the situation with the analytic causatives of intransitive verbs when it comes to marking the causee, i.e. it can be marked with **ul/lul** or with **i/ka**. However, it seems that the objects of the stative verb cannot be marked with **ul/lul**. Bratt (1996: 334) finds out that causative sentences with two **ul/lul**-marked constituents, like (4.45) and (4.47), are not very acceptable for native speakers. In fact, they are less acceptable than sentences where the causee is marked with **ul/lul** and the object of the stative verb is marked with **i/ka**, like (4.44) and (4.46). She reports that "speakers find the accusative marking somewhat worse than the nominative marking".

(4.44) ?마술사가 나를 순이가 좋게 했다.

?Maswulsa ka na lul Swun.i ka cohkey hayssta.

sorcerer NOM I ACC Swun.i NOM is.good.ADV do.PAST.DECL

The sorcerer made me like Swuni.

(4.45) ??마술사가 나를 순이를 좋게 했다.

??Maswulsa ka na lul Swun.i lul cohkey hayssta.

sorcerer NOM I ACC Swun.i ACC is.good.ADV do.PAST.DECL

The sorcerer made me like Swuni.

(4.46) ?마술사가 나를 책이 많게 했다.

?Maswulsa ka na lul chayk i manhkey hayssta.

sorcerer NOM I ACC book NOM is.many.ADV do.PAST.DECL

The sorcerer made me have a lot of books.

(4.47) ??마술사가 나를 책을 많게 했다.

??Maswulsa ka na lul chayk ul manhkey hayssta.

sorcerer-NOM I-ACC Swun.i NOM is.good.ADV do.PAST.DECL

The sorcerer made me have a lot of books.

Bratt (ibid) points out that "the problem with the causatives with nominative objects in [(4.44)] and [(4.46)] is not due to their content being unacceptable, because a parallel biclausal causative sentence, as in [(4.48)], where the causee is marked nominative, allows a nominative object."

(4.48) 마술사가 내가 순이가 좋게 했다.

Maswulsa ka nay ka Swun.i ka cohkey hayssta.

sorcerer NOM I NOM Swun.i NOM is.good.ADV do.PAST.DECL

The sorcerer made me like Swuni.

Bratt (ibid: 335) acknowledges that "accusative-marked objects will be ungrammatical in causatives of statives" but does not provide an explanation. In my view, the objects of stative verbs in causative constructions where stative verb have been causativized parallel Retained Objects in passive constructions (discussed in the next section) and similarly can be regarded as Retained Objects themselves. Retained Objects are retained together with their *cosa* marking: in the case of the passive constructions, the direct objects of the transitive activity verbs retain their Accusative **ul/lul**-marking, and in the case of the causative constructions, the objects of the

stative verbs retain their Nominative **i/ka**-marking. That explains why (4.45) and (4.47) are deemed highly unacceptable or downright ungrammatical by most speakers.

Similarly to the analytic causatives of intransitive verbs, the analytic causatives of transitive verbs are used in constructions where the causee could be marked with **ul/lul**, **eyeky** (**hanthey**), or **i/ka**. Since the original direct object of the transitive verbs is retained in the causative constructions with its Object marker **ul/lul** (and the transitive verb itself is there in its adverbial form ending with the adverbializing suffix -**key**), in the case where the causee is marked with **ul/lul**, we have a double-accusative construction again, just like in the constructions with morphological causatives of transitive verbs:

(4.49) 수미가 아이를 옷을 입게 했다.

Swumi ka ai lul os ul ipkey hayssta.

Swumi NOM child ACC clothes ACC dress.ADV do.PAST.DECL

Swumi made the child put on clothes.

(4.50) 수미가 아이에게 옷을 입게 했다.

Swumi ka ai eykey ipkey hayssta.

Swumi NOM child DAT clothes ACC dress.ADV do.PAST.DECL

Swumi let the child put on clothes.

(4.51) 수미가 아이가 옷을 입게 했다.

Swumi ka ai ka ipkey hayssta.

Swumi NOM child NOM clothes ACC dress.ADV do.PAST.DECL

Sumi had the child dress./Sumi did so that the child put(s) on some clothes.

The choice of the *cosa* for the causee in these three sentences depends on semantic considerations, namely the degree of control of the causee over the event and the level of affectedness. The semantic considerations for (4.49), (4.50) and (4.51) correspond to the semantic considerations for (4.41), (4.42) and (4.43), respectively. We note that with analytic causativization of transitive verbs, much like in morphological causatives of transitive verbs discussed above, **ul/lul** continues to mark consistently the direct object of the verb in the original construction. In fact, this time it looks less like a retained objects since it is an argument of the verb (in adverbial form). As for the causee marking, **ul/lul**-marking implies least control and **i/ka**-marking implies more control and less coercion.

These constructions could become even more complex if some of their constituents, e.g. the noun phrases expressing the causer and the causee or the adverbial form of the notional verb, get focalized, contrasted, etc, expressing subtle nuances of meaning and information packaging. In colloquial speech the Dative **eykey**-marked causee, as well as the adverbial form of the verb, could be often focalized or contrasted. This is normally marked with a last-slot *cosa*, in the case of the Dative-marked causee leading to "*cosa* stacking" (that phenomenon is thoroughly discusses by Schütze (2001).

4.5.3 Ditransitive Constructions

Korean constructions with ditransitive verbs normally have the theme marked as a direct object with **ul/lul** and the beneficiary marked as an indirect object with

eykey. However, in many instance, the indirect object could be marked with the *cosa* **ul/lul**, producing a Double-Accusative construction. However, we can view ditransitive constructions with verbs for giving as semantically causative, in the sense that giving is making or letting or having somebody have or receive or possess something.[38] If we view such constructions as **lexical causatives**, then we can regard the occurrence of "double Accusatives" in them as paralleling the morphological and the analytic causatives in some way. Let us consider the following two pairs of sentences:

(4.52) 수미는 친구에게 연필을 준다.

    Swumi nun chinkwu eykey yenphil ul cwunta.

    Swumi TOP friend DAT pencil OBJ give.PROC.DECL

    Swumi gives pencils to her friends.

(4.53) 수미는 친구를 연필을 준다.

    Swumi nun chinkwu lul yenphil ul cwunta.

    Swumi TOP friend OBJ pencil OBJ give.PROC.DECL

    Swumi gives her friend(s) pencils.

(4.54) 인수가 개한테 밥을 준다.

    Inswu ka kay hanthey pap ul cwunta.

    Inswu SUBJ dog DAT meal OBJ give.PROC.DECL

    Inswu gives food to the dog.

---

[38] This treatment is common in the literature (cf Van Valin, Jr. (2005), Harley (1997, 2002)).

(4.55) 인수가 개를 밥을 준다.

Inswu ka kay lul pap ul cwunta.

Inswu SUBJ dog OBJ meal OBJ give.PROC.DECL

Inswu feeds the dog./Inswu gives the dog food.

In sentences (4.52) and (4.54) the indirect object (or the causee of the lexical causative) is marked with the Dative **eykey** or **hanthey** and the direct object is marked with the Direct-Object marker **ul/lul**, while in (4.53) and (4.55) both objects, direct and indirect, are marked with **ul/lul**. Superficially these constructions seem somehow similar to the English constructions in which the indirect object could be with or without the preposition **to**: **Sally gave the ball to him./Sally gave him the ball.**[39] They also parallel the causative constructions with double-accusative marking. It seems that **ul/lul** has a tendency to be attached to indirect objects.

Jung and Miyagawa (2004) find that whether or not a ditransitive construction can have the dative marking on the argument denoting the participant roles of recipient or goal alternate with accusative ul/lul-marking depends on the semantic of the verb and the semantic of the nominal phrase as well. Only a subset of give-type verbs allow double-accusative marking, while send-type and other dative verbs do not. There is also an animacy constraint on the double-accusative marking: only animate recipients can be marked with ul/lul. Kim (2012: 132) notes that "there is a different semantic entailment between the [Dat-Acc] and the [Acc-Acc] orders, similar to the case in English (Oehrle (1976), Larson (1988)). […] In [(4.57)], the [Acc-Acc] order carries the implication that the students indeed acquired some

---

[39] This is the "traditional" treatment of these English constructions. However, the view that the beneficiary is the direct object and the theme is a secondary object in the second construction seems to be more justified (Andrews 2007).

knowledge of the Korean language, while this implication is relatively weaker in the [Dat-Acc] order in [(4.56)]."

(4.56) 수가 학생들에게 한국어를 가르치었다.

Swu ka haksayng tul eykey hankwuke lul kaluchiessta.

Sue NOM student PLU DAT Korean.language ACC teach.PAST.DECL

Sue taught Korean to the students.

(4.57) 수가 학생들을 한국어를 가르치었다.

Swu ka haksayng tul ul hankwuke lul kaluchiessta.

Sue NOM student PLU ACC Korean.language ACC teach.PAST.DECL

Sue taught the students Korean.

This observation is consistent with the tendency that **ul/lul**-marked constituents will tend to be influenced to a higher degree by the action, in this case the teaching, and their state is more likely to change, in this case they become Korean speakers.

Apart from the semantic and pragmatic differences, the two constructions, Dative-Accusative and Double-Accusative, have a lot of syntactic asymmetries (including nominalization and idioms) that have been discussed in different theoretical frameworks, e.g. L. Kim (2008, 2012), Levin (2008, 2010) among others. For example, there are no idioms in Korean in which the recipient is marked with **ul/lul** (L. Kim (2012)). That also shows that the usage of **ul/lul** in these constructions is a tool that is used in the interface of syntax and pragmatics rather than just a grammatical case marker.

We saw that the usage of **ul/lul** for the marking of indirect objects in the constructions with verbs of giving could be based on semantic considerations. But it could also be based on pragmatic (information packaging) structure. Choo and Kwak (2008: 247) note that in these cases **ul/lul** marks the "added exclusiveness" of the indirect object, i.e. the focalization of the nominal phrase denoting the indirect object. This notion seems to be corroborated by occurrences of the **ul/lul-**marked indirect object immediately in front of the predicate (where the unmarked focus position is) and closer to the verb than the direct object (whereas the direct object is closer to the verb in the unmarked constituent order), as in (4.58) and (4.59):

(4.58) 잡지를 그 친구를 주었다.

capci lul ku chinkwu lul cwuessta.

magazine ACC that friend ACC give.PAST.DECL

[She] showed that friend the magazine.

(4.59) 돈을 할아버지를 드렸다.

ton ul hal.apeci lul tulyessta.

money ACC grandfather ACC give.PAST.DECL

[I] gave Grandfather the money.

In such constructions **ul/lul** could be used after the cosa **eykey** (in "*case stacking*", cf Schütze (2001))[40] to mark the focalization of the indirect object, as in (4.60):

---

[40] It should be admitted that there is a lot of discussion in different theoretical frameworks about the information-structure implications of case stacking, including Youn (1998), Gerdts and Youn (1999). Yoon (2004b) argues against the focus analysis of case stacking but concedes that "the assessment of the debate is made difficult by the fact that Case Stacking is somewhat marginal to begin with.

(4.60) ?수미는 미라에게를 잡지를 주었다.[41]

Swumi nun Mila eykey lul capci lul cwuessta.

Swumi TOP Mila DAT ACC magazine ACC give.PAST.DECL

It is to Mila that Sumi gave the magazine./It is Mila that Sumi gave the magazine
to.

Here again, the predisposition of **ul/lul** to mark focalization of both direct and
indirect objects is observed. **ul/lul** marks focus on indirect objects even if they are
otherwise marked syntactically with **eykey** or other Dative *cosa*. That observation
confirms our thesis that **ul/lul** has a tendency to be associated with objecthood and
certain semantic categories that characterize it, like affectedness and low level of
control. It should be admitted, though, that **ul/lul** does not appear to mark
focalization on **i/ka**-marked object of stative verbs. This could be explained with the
structural differences of the Dative *cosa* and the Nominative *cosa*, the Dative
allowing other *cosa* to be attached to it. At the same time **i/ka**, parallel to **ul/lul**,
marks for Focus in narrow-focus constructions the constituents it marks syntactically
in sentence-focus constructions. That means that **i/ka** marks Subjects, but Objects of
stative predicates as well, in both thetic and identificational sentences. On the other
hand, **ul/lul** marks Direct Objects, as well as Indirect Objects, Primary Objects,
Secondary Objects, Retained Objects of passivized transitive activity verbs, and

---

Additional difficulty stems from the fact that speakers appear to have genuine differences in their
idiolects/dialects concerning the acceptability of crucial sentences. It is unfortunate that many of the
crucial arguments against the Focus analysis are based on disagreements regarding data".
[41] This sentence is found "strange" or not quite acceptable by many Korean native speakers. This
again confirms the marginality and the idiolect/dialect-dependency of the phenomenon, as mentioned
in the previous footnote. Thus, the analysis is valid for the variety of Korean that permits such
"stacking".

other objectoid constituents (discussed later in this chapter), in both identification and thetic sentences.

4.6 Marking Retained Object in Passive Constructions

The semantic-driven morphological marking which we have observed so far in Korean is also present in passive constructions. When the Direct or Primary Object of the Possessor-Ascension constructions (discussed in 4.5.1.) becomes the Subject in the respective passivization constructions, then we could expect the Secondary Object to retain its **ul/lul**-marking. In the passive sentences the Primary Object becomes Subject while the Secondary object retains its **ul/lul**-marking and is called Retained Object (Yeon (2003: 133)). The passive counterparts of the Possessor-Ascension (PA) sentences above, (4.33) and (4.35), will be (4.61) and (4.62), respectively:

(4.61) 미라가 인수에게 등을 밀리었다.

 Mila ka Inswu eykey tung ul milliessta.

 Mila NOM Inswu DAT back ACC push.PASS.PAST.DECL

 Mila was pushed on the back by Inswu.

(4.62) 토끼가 개에게 다리를 물리었다.

 thokki ka kay eykey tali lul mwulliessta.

 Rabbit NOM dog DAT leg ACC bite.PASS.PAST.DECL

 The rabbit was bitten in the leg by the dog.

The usage of such Retained-Object Passive constructions depends on semantic and pragmatic factors just like the usage of the double-accusative constructions.

We note here that the passivization of certain double-accusative constructions leads to sentences where we have a passive verb that has a single argument, the subject, and a constituent marked with the Accusative marker **ul/lul**. This can be explained with the specifics of Korean syntax and case marking. The passive sentence has the Direct Object from the active construction, which is an argument of the active predicate and called Primary Object in this particular construction, as Subject. At the same time, the Secondary Object is carried over (retained) to the passive sentence with its **ul/lul**-marking that it has in the active construction. As shown in 4.5.1, the Secondary Object is not only closely connected semantically to the Primary Object but also, both the Secondary and the Primary Object are affected by the action expressed by the predicate. In fact, this construction has a parallel construction with only one **ul/lul**-marked constituent (Direct Object), and that is the Secondary Object, while the Primary Object is marked with the Genitive *cosa* **uy** as a Possessor and a modifier of the Direct Object. (That is why this construction is called Possessor Ascension). Crucially, the parallel construction involves the same predicate. That means that the Secondary Object too could be an argument of the same verb semantically. Passives put affected entities –coded as direct objects in active sentences – in the spotlight by making them subjects (cf Foley (2007)). In Korean, subjects tend to be animate and agentive (cf Yeon (2003) among others). Possessors have the same tendency for semantic reasons. It is only natural that Korean passives will tend to have affected possessors as subjects rather that affected possessed entities that normally will tend to be inanimate and lacking volition. In the case of Possessor-Ascension constructions that will be also justified by the syntactic

analysis confirming that the Primary Subject is the "true" Direct Object that is an argument of the verb (cf 4.4.1.). The possessed entities (Secondary Objects in PA constructions) retained in the passive sentences are marked with **ul/lul** which they "inherit" but their presence in the passive sentences is also possible because they could be construed – and understood – as arguments of the active counterpart of the passive predicate. This situation is somewhat similar to the situation with the second nominal phrase in English sentences like **John was given a book**, where the semantic connection between the active counterpart of the predicate and the second nominal (**a book** can be an argument of **give**) is clear and allows correct pragmatic interpretation of the sentence.

4.7 Usage in Complementation Constructions

In complementation constructions in Korean the subordinate clause usually preserves the original marking of its constituents, as in (4.63). However, sentence (4.64) is also possible.

(4.63) 철수가 미라가 예쁘다고 생각한다.

Chelswu ka Mila ka yeypputako sayngkakhanta

Chelswu NOM Mila NOM be.pretty.COMPL think.PROC.DECL

Chelsu thinks that Mila is pretty

(4.64) 철수가 미라를 예쁘다고 생각한다.

Chelswu ka Mila lul yeypputako sayngkakhanta

Chelswu NOM Mila ACC be.pretty.COMPL think.PROC.DECL

Chelsu thinks of Mila that she is pretty

This marking of the subject of the descriptive verb in the subordinate sentence with **ul/lul**, i.e. raising it to direct object, could be explained in semantic terms. Major Subjects can be raised too (cf Yoon (2004b)). Korean allows constituents designating entities perceived cognitively as affected by the predicate, even if they are not in the syntactic role of Direct Object, to be marked with **ul/lul**, which is associated with the notions of high transitivity, affectedness, etc. This is a very specific feature of the grammaticalization of the Korean *cosa* **ul/lul**.

I will not go into further discussion of the theoretical implications for the different frameworks of this phenomenon. Accusative marking of these raised subjects is well attested and is widely acceptable by native speakers as well. It is a phenomenon that exists across languages, including English. In the case of Korean Accusative **ul/lul**-marking of the raised subject, we can comment that in the **ul/lul**-marked version, the referent of the constituent is perceived as somewhat more objectified and with low level of control in comparison with the referent of the subject. Since this construction occurs with a semantically very limited set of predicates and Korean subjects tend to be animate and volitional, the parallel existence of the two versions shows that different construals are possible of the same proposition. The version with **ul/lul**, by objectifying the respective constituent, affirms the subjecthood of the subject with the notions associated with it: animacy, agency, high level in control, and, with the predicates of this construction, human attributes like thinking, believing, talking, etc. That is in harmony with the tendencies we observe across Korean constructions.

4.8 Usage in Constructions with Intransitive Verbs

Now I proceed to analyze and discuss a specific usage of the *cosa* **ul/lul** in constructions involving intransitive activity verbs. It is used to mark nouns or nominal phrases referring to places in constructions with **intransitive verbs of movement**. It seems, again, that the choice of the *cosa* is based on semantic considerations. First, let us consider sentence (4.65).

(4.65) 칠수가 공원을 뛰었다.

    Chilswu ka kongwen ul ttwiessta.

    Chilswu NOM park ACC run.PAST.DECL

    Chilswu ran throughout the park./Chilswu ran the length of the park.

In (4.65) the usage of **ul/lul** indicates that the interaction between the space expressed by the place noun and the action expressed by the verb is total and not partial. The locative postpositional *cosa*, like **eyse** 'in' and **(u)lo** 'to; towards', which could be used instead of **ul/lul** in the sentence, fail to express the same "total affectedness". As Yeon (2003) points out there is "a correlation between the accusative NP and its affectedness which is one of the typical characteristics of high transitivity". That is why with verbs of movement (intransitive as well as transitive) which lexically (intrinsically) have the semantics of completeness or thoroughness of the action, the required *cosa* for the place noun is **ul/lul**, as in (4.66) and (4.67):

(4.66) 길을 건넜다

    kil ul kennessta

    road ACC cross.PAST.DECL

[He] crossed the street

(4.67) 도시를 지났다

tosi lul cinassta

city ACC pass.PAST.DECL

[They] passed the city/[They] went through the city

The *cosa* **ul/lul** is used with intransitive verbs of movement when the semantics of "reaching the destination", expressed with a place noun (as in (4.68) and (4.69)), or "achievement of the purpose", expressed with an activity noun (as in (4.70) and (4.71)), is implied.

(4.68) 작은집을 갔다.

cak.uncip ul kassta

uncle's.house ACC go.PAST.DECL

[He] went to uncle's place.

(4.69) 외국을 자주 나간다.

oykwuk ul cacwu nakanta

foreign.country ACC often go.out.PROC.DECL

 [She] often goes abroad.

(4.70) 남해안으로 여행을 떠났다.

namhay.an ulo yehayng ul ttenassta

south.see.coast DIR trip ACC leave.PAST.DECL

[She] left for a trip to the south coast

(4.71) 영화구경을 갈까?

yenghwakwukyeng ul kalkka?

film.seeing ACC go.PROP

Shall we go see a movie?

Although, in Korean, phrases marked with **ul/lul** in constructions with intransitive verbs cannot be considered Objects (considering the typical usage of **ul/lul** to mark Objects of transitive verbs), we can say that this feature is in concordance with a cross-linguistic tendency that has been revealed by typologists. It has been pointed out by Blake (2001: 66) that "the effect of advancing a locative to direct object is to add a sense of affecting an entity."

4.9 Usage in "Space-Object" Constructions

In this section I review briefly the usage of **ul/lul** in constructions that are similar to the **spray/load** alternation in English. Since they are as controversially treated theoretically as other constructions, I will only outline the usage of the Accusative *cosa* in them. It is used to mark the direct object in sentences like (4.72):

(4.72) 존이 정원에 소나무를 가꾸었다.

Con i cengwen ey sonamwu lul kakkwuessta

John NOM garden LOC pine.tree ACC plant.PAST.DECL

John planted pine trees in the garden.

In such sentences the place/space noun is marked with the locative marker **ey**. There are sentences similar to these in which the space noun is marked with the marker **ul/lul**, for example (4.73):

(4.73) 존이 정원을 소나무로 가꾸었다.

    Con i cengwen ul sonamwu lo kakkwuessta

    John NOM garden ACC pine.tree INSTR plant.PAST.DECL

    John planted the garden with pine trees.

The implication of **ul/lul** in (4.73) is semantic. The sentence implies that the whole garden has been affected. Again, the semantics of "total affectedness" as opposed to "partial affectedness" calls for the usage of the particle **ul/lul**. In this case the direct object from the first sentence is marked with the Instrumental *cosa* **(u)lo** which corresponds to similar constructions in other languages.

4.10 Usage in the *man ul* Constructions

Somewhat symmetrically with the usage of **i/ka** with **man**, **ul/lul** can be used with **man** (always in the **man ul** sequence) to focalize the phrase marked by **man**. The usage of **ul** in these constructions could be interpreted as marking Focus rather than Object, but at the same time it marks Focalized Objects and not Focalized Subjects, i.e. **ul** is used after **man** to mark focalized phrases that in "neutral" context (e.g. in sentence-focus constructions without **man**) will be marked with **ul/lul** (i.e. (Primary) Ojects of transitive verbs), or Objects that are already marked with another

cosa (e.g. the Dative **eykey**). In the latter cases we will have sequences like **eykey man ul**, a typical *cosa* stacking example. Let us consider the following two sentences:

(4.74) 기호만 만났다.

    Kiho man mannassta

    Kiho only meet.PAST.DECL

    I met only Kiho.

(4.75) 기호만을 만났다.

    Kiho man ul mannassta

    Kiho only ACC meet.PAST.DECL

    It is only Kiho that I met.

Sentence (4.75) has a focalized Object that is already marked with **man** 'only'. Sentence (4.74) can have slightly different interpretations depending on the context. For example it can mean "I met only Kiho [and no one else]" or it can mean something like "I met only Kiho [without the people whom I expected to meet together with him]". In both cases, though, it is clear that the speaker has met Kiho. However, with negative sentences we get a much higher level of ambiguity. In the negative sentences it is clear that **ul/lul** marks Focus in the **man ul** constructions and that is why the **man ul** sentences, unlike their **man**-only counterparts, are unambiguous. The following two sentences are from Kuno and Kim-Renaud (2004: 35):

(4.76) 기호만 안 만나겠어요.

Kiho man an mannakeyss.eyo

Kiho only not meet.FUT.POL

i. Kiho is the only one I will not see. [I will see anyone else]

ii. I will not see Kiho alone. [I want to see Yumi together with him]

(4.77) 기호만을 안 만나겠어요

Kiho man ul an mannakeyss.eyo

Kiho only ACC not meet.FUT.POL

It is only Kiho that I will not see. [I will see anyone/everyone else]

The sentence without **ul**, (4.76), is ambiguous because of the possible different interpretations of the scope of **man** 'only'[42]. However, the sentence with **ul**, (4.77), is unambiguous. This is obviously due to the explicit focalization of the phrase marked with **ul/lul**.

In these sentences **ul/lul** marks for Focus syntactic categories that are associated with **ul/lul**-marking in thetic sentences. Due to the structural properties of different *cosa*, the phrase-final **ul/lul** attaches to **man** 'only', which is between the nominal and the last-slot *cosa*.

---

[42] Kuno and Kim-Renaud (ibid) call the first interpretation "higher-scope" and the second interpretation "lower-scope".

4.11 Marking Verb Forms and Adverbs

Just like the other last-slot *cosa*, **ul/lul** is attached to certain verb forms. Most often this is the **–ci** form of the verbs. (This usage was discussed in more detail in Section 3.6. above.) This happens in negation constructions. The usage after **–ci** is mainly with processive verbs and in negation constructions where it marks the typical focus of negation (Martin (1992: 289)), as in (4.76) and (4.77).

(4.78) 앉지를 않는다

   anc.ci lul anh.nunta

   sit.SUSP ACC not.do.PROC.DECL

   [He] does not SIT.

(4.79) 그것을 보지를 않는다

   ku kes ul poci lul anh.nunta

   that thing ACC look.SUSP ACC not.do.PROC.DECL

   [She] does not LOOK at that.

The negation is highlighted by the usage of **ul/lul** as a negation focus marker and the accompanying phonological prominence which defines the scope of the negation.

As was already noted in the introductory chapter, this usage of **ul/lul** in contemporary Korean is with the main verb forms and in front of auxiliary verbs in complex verb predicates. Apart from negation constructions, it is also commonly used in modality constructions. It could also be used after the adverbial form in **–key**

and more rarely after the connective form in **–e(se)**, as well as after the interrogative forms in **–na** and **–nka**.

In (4.80) **ul/lul** is marking the focus in an imperative sentence.

(4.80) 우선 먹어를 보아라.

wusen mek.e lul poala

first eat.INF ACC see.IMP

Try EATING [something] first.

The **ul/lul** marking on the main verb adds a focalization effect on the importance of the action for the speaker. From syntactic point of view we can see that the form of the main verb is in an object-like position vis-à-vis the auxiliary verb **pota** 'see'. That again is in harmony with the morphological means (namely the *cosa* **ul/lul**) commonly used to focalize not only objects but also other object-like (non-subject) NP constituents, as we have seen in this chapter.

We mentioned that **ul/lul** could be used with **–key** adverbial forms of verbs. It can be used with adverbs as well, as in (4.81) and (4.82).

(4.81) 빨리를 가거라.

ppalli lul kakela

fast ACC go.IMP

Go QUICKLY!

(4.82) 목이 아파서 많이를 못 먹어요.

mok i aphase manh.i lul mos mek.eyo

throat NOM be.sore.INF much ACC not eat.POL

I have a sore throat and I cannot eat MUCH.

In (4.81) **ul/lul** marks a focalized adverb in an imperative sentence: the focus is on the manner of the action, while in (4.82) it marks the negation focus: it is not that the speaker cannot eat at all but that they cannot eat much. The usage of **ul/lul** in these constructions is similar to the usage with verb forms.

4.12 Conclusions

In this chapter I addressed the research questions of this work regarding the *cosa* **ul/lul**. I have described and analyzed the meaning and usage of the *cosa* across grammatical constructions. I have shown that the usage of the *cosa* is influenced by the interactions of different factors.

What does the *cosa* **ul/lul** signify in concrete constructions? The prototypical usage of **ul/lul** is to mark the Direct Object of transitive verbs, both lexically transitive and morphologically transitivized (including causative) verbs. However, it cannot mark Objects that are marked with the *cosa* **i/ka**, like the low-transitivity objects of stative two-place predicates. **ul/lul** could be used on more than one constituent of the clause for different reasons, for example with nominal phrase used in apposition with the direct object, or marking a Primary and Secondary object in specific constructions, or marking a Retained Object in passive constructions, etc. **ul/lul** cannot mark Direct Objects that are topics or contrasted or under Emphatic Focus. Other particles are used in these cases in order to mark the constituents for their pragmatic functions and these particles cannot co-exist structurally with **i/ka**.

The *cosa* **ul/lul** cannot mark Subjects or Predicate Complements. It cannot mark arguments of one-argument predicates. These are syntactic restrictions. On the other hand, it has semantic restrictions on what Objects it can mark. As we already discussed, it cannot mark Objects of non-volitional Subjects; it always marks phrases whose referents are perceived as "affected" and "not in control". It is the default marker of Oblique Objects, including Retained Objects. This allows for clauses where two phrases are marked with **ul/lul**. In constructions with verbs that have causative semantics it could mark the causee of the respective referent is perceived as not in control and the action is performed on them by somebody else.

The *cosa* **ul/lul** is used to mark phrases that are not direct objects in intransitive constructions with verbs of movement, passive verbs, etc. In them it bears a specific semantic that is contributed to the meaning of the constructions. This added semantics is affectedness, completeness (of the affectedness), low control over the event, tendency to inanimacy, etc. All of these semantic features are typically associated with high transitivity cross-linguistically from a typological-functional perspective.

The *cosa* **ul/lul** could be used on more than one constituent of the clause for different reasons, for example with nominal phrase used in apposition with the direct object, or marking a Primary and Secondary object in specific constructions, or marking a Retained Object in passive constructions, etc.

The *cosa* **ul/lul** marks the pragmatic function of Focus with Direct Objects when they are in narrow focus or in thetic sentences. It does not mark specific kinds of Focus, like Contrastive Focus, Emphatic Focus. On the other hand, **ul/lul** is used to focalize not only direct objects but also indirect objects. In colloquial speech it could be used to focalize any argument of a processive verb except for the subject, as long as it semantics can be interpreted as "affected" and "not in control". The *cosa*

ul/lul could be used to focalize causees if they are marked with the "Dative" **eyekey** as a causee marker. In this case the sequence **eyekey lul** is structurally possible. It is used with processive verb forms ending in **-ci** in negation constructions to emphasize the scope of negation.

There are restrictions on the semantic roles of the grammatical Objects it can mark. It marks the second semantic argument of activity predicates, but when it comes to state predicates, it can only mark their second argument when the lexical semantics of the verb itself allows for volitional Subjects and Objects whose referents are perceived as "affected" and "not in control" or "less in control".

Thus, the *cosa* **ul/lul** can be viewed to tend to mark both syntactic and pragmatic categories. At the same time, its usage is restricted by semantic considerations.

How and to what extent can the occurrence of the *cosa* **ul/lul** reflect the interaction of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic categories? Every occurrence of the *cosa* **ul/lul** reflects the interaction of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic categories. For example, the occurrence of **ul/lul** in sentence (4.4) (repeated below), reflects the interaction of syntactic and pragmatic factors.

(4.4) 이 케익을 직접 만들었어요.

   I KHEYIK ul cikcep mantuless.eyo

   this cake ACC directly make.PAST.POL

   It is THIS CAKE that I made from scratch.

(4.4) is a narrow-focus sentence. In it **ul/lul** marks the first phrase as a Direct Object and Focus. If it was not Focus but Topic, even if it was Direct Object, the phrase would have been marked with a different *cosa*, **un/nun** (as in sentence (4.5).

If the same noun phrase is not a Direct Object in a sentence but a Subject, even if it was Focus, it would have been marked with a different *cosa*, **i/ka**. Thus, we can say that it is exactly the interaction, or co-occurrence of the syntactic category Direct Object and the pragmatic category Focus that **ul/lul** marks in sentence (4.4).

In sentence (1.3), reproduces below, **ul/lul** marks the interaction of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic factors. It marks the phrase as a Direct object because of the semantic classification of the transitive processive verb (if the respective descriptive verb **cohta** had been used, a different *cosa*, **i/ka**, would have marked the nominal phrase, as in (1.4)). It is also there because the respective constituent is not topicalized or contrasted (in these cases **un/nun** would have been used) or, for example, not marked as an Emphatic Focus (where **to** would have been used).

(1.3) 나는 김치를 좋아한다.

    na nun kimchi lul cohahanta

    I TOP kimchi ACC like.PROC.DECL

    I like kimchi.

We have seen that the *cosa* **i/ka** has a specific usage in each construction it is used. Its occurrence is motivated by a combination of different consideration having to do with different levels of analysis.

Chapter 5

Analysis and Discussion: The Grammar and Usage of

UN/NUN

Now I proceed to analyze and discuss the grammar and usage of the *cosa* **un/nun** across constructions. The Korean *cosa* **un/nun** is a functional morpheme which prototypically seems to mark the Topic in the information structure of the sentence, hence the gloss TOP. It also marks Contrast between two or more entities but also potential or implied Contrast with only one entity stated and marked. Since such explicit morphological device is not common in many languages (e.g. European languages) where Topic and Contrast are marked with other means, including syntactic (word order) and prosodic (prominence), it attracts the attention and curiosity of the student of Korean. It has no counterpart in a typical agglutinative language like Turkish either. The only functional morpheme cross-linguistically that closely resembles **un/nun** in its properties and usage is the Japanese Topic marker **wa**. In this chapter we will examine what **un/nun** signifies in concrete uses in different constructions.

5.1 Marking Aboutness Topics

A typical usage of **un/nun** is when it marks the Topic in a Topic-Comment construction. Topics are in the beginning of a sentence and they set apart a phrase

referring to an entity which the rest of the sentence will be about. This is true cross-linguistically and has its cognitive and communicational explanations. Topics often express old information, i.e. information that is known by both the speaker and the listener, or at least the speaker construes it as such, and makes it immediately accessible and active in the information flow. That could be something that has been mentioned, or is part of their shared background, or something that is assumed to be widely known and expected to be known by the listener as a matter of course. Topicalized nominal phrases could be also used to change the topic of the conversation. The rest of the sentence is construed as Comment on the Topic, i.e. a statement about it, some new information, observation, definition, etc. It might be intended to inform the hearer about something that they (presumably) do not know, or to invite the hearer to agree or disagree, or to ask them about things connected to the topic, etc. The Topic in the Topic-Comment constructions is called Aboutness Topic and the Comment is called Predicate Focus in Lambrecht's (1994) terms.[43] I use the term Aboutness Topic only for topic-comment sentences where there the topic is not contrasted, i.e. does not have additional implications. Thus, I distinguish between Aboutness Topic and Constrastive Topic. Some authors use the term Non-Contrastive Topic for such topics (e.g. Lee (2002), Vermeulen (2011)).

Let us consider the following two sentences.

(5.1) 저는 중국에서 왔어요.

ce nun Cwungkwuk eyse wass.eyo

I TOP China LOC come.PAST.POL

I come from China.

---

[43] There are sentences where the Subject is Focus and the rest of the sentence is presupposition that is normally topical. They were discussed in the chapter on **i/ka**.

(5.2) 런던은 큰 도시이다.

Lenten un khun tosi ita

London TOP be.big.ATTR city PRED.DECL

London is a big city.

In sentences (5.1) and (5.2) the **un/nun**-marked (Topic-marked) nominal is an argument of the predicate. Very often the Topic is the subject of the clause. That is normal in a language like Korean that has an SOV word order, since Topics are normally stated in the beginning of an utterance to establish a common ground with the hearer. But the Topic can be an element that is not from the logical structure of the predicate and has no syntactic role in the sentence, as in (5.3) and (5.4). These Topics are Aboutness Topics too but they are External Topics because they are not part of the predicate structure.[44]

(5.3) 런던 시내는 건물이 예쁘다.

Lenten sinay nun kenmwul i yeypputa.

London centre TOP building NOM be.beautiful.DECL

In central London the buildings are beautiful.

(5.4) 오늘은 친구가 온다.

onul un chinkwu ka onta.

today TOP friend NOM come.PROC.DECL

Today a/my friend is coming.

---

[44] In the chapter on **i/ka** we discussed External Focus constructions that can be compared to External Topic constructions.

The Topic-marked nominals are established as Topics in the sentence and are followed by Comments about them that could be complete clauses by themselves. The Topicalized part is normally expressed by nominal phrases, including arguments with relative clauses (as in (5.5)) or nominalized clauses with bound nouns as heads (as in (5.6)):

(5.5) 저기에서 기다리는 남자는 어제 한국에서 온 학생이다.

ceki eyse kitalinun namca nun ecey hankwuk eyse on haksayng ita.

there LOC wait.PROC.ATTR man TOP yesterday Korea LOC come.ATTR student PRED.DECL

The man waiting over there is the student who came from Korea yesterday.

(5.6) 네가 매일 늦게 오는 것은 싫다.

ney ka mayil nuckey onun kes un silhta.

you NOM every.day be.late.ADV come.PROC.ATTR thing TOP dislike.DECL

(The fact) that you are late every day is unpleasant./[I] do not like (the fact) that you are late every day.

Aboutness Topics are typically nouns and nominal phrases but it is possible for them to be postpositional phrases as well as clauses ending in verb forms. In these cases **un/nun** is attached to a postposition ("*cosa* stacking") or to a verb form. In (5.7) **un/nun** is attached to the Locative postposition **(u)lopwuthe** 'from' in order to topicalize a postpositional phrase referring to a complex notion expressed by the postposition and its dependent nominal phrase, while in (5.8) it is attached to a verb form with the ending **–ese** in order to topicalize a situation expressed by the clause.

In fact, if we follow the thesis that what is regarded as postpositional phrase in Korean is indeed a nominal phrase (Cho and Sells (1995)) and consider that the **–ese** verb form has some nominal characteristics (Martin (1992)), we can conclude that un/nun tends to be attached to referential expressions, which is in agreement with the observation about Topics in Lambrecht (1994).

(5.7) 여기로부터는 서울이다.

yeki lopwuthe nun Sewul ita

this.place LOC TOP Seoul PRED.DECL

From here it is Seoul.

(5.8) 돈이 없어서는 아무것도 못 한다.

ton i eps.ese nun amwukes to mos hanta.

money NOM not.exist.INF TOP anything also NEG do.PROC.DECL

[When/If one] has no money, [they] cannot do anything.

The *cosa* **un/nun** marks Aboutness Topic that can be not only Subjects but any other constituent from the structure of the clause, as in the following sentences:

(5.9) 연필은 자주 쓴다.

yenphil un cacwu ssunta

pencil TOP often use.PROC.DECL

[Speaking of pencils,] I use pencils often.

(5.10) 미아에게는 전수가 선물을 많이 주었다.

Mia eykey nun Censwu ka senmwul ul manh.i cwuessta.

Mia DAT TOP Censwu NOM present ACC many give.PAST.DECL

[When it comes to Mia,] Censwu gave a lot of presents to Mia/her.

(5.11) 이 교실에서는 생물학을 공부한다.

i kyosil eyse nun sayngmwulhak ul kongpwuhanta.

this classroom LOC TOP biology ACC study.PROC.DECL

In this classroom we study biology.

In (5.9) the topicalized phrase is the Direct Object, in (5.10) – the Indirect Object, and in (5.11) – the adjunct expressing the venue of the activity. In (5.9) **un/nun** is attached directly to the noun that is the head of the noun phrase, which is normal for a Topicalized Direct Object. In (5.10) and (5.11) **un/nun** is attached to other (postpositional) *cosa*.

5.2 Marking Contrastive Topics

The *cosa* **un/nun** can be used to mark Contrasted phrases. When the contrasted entities are all referred to in the same sentence, then the interpretation of **un/nun** as marking contrast is obvious, as in (5.12).

(5.12) 수미는 서울에 갔지만 미라는 안 갔다.

Swumi nun Sewul ey kassciman Mila nun an kassta.

Swumi TOP Seoul LOC go.PAST.but Mila TOP NEG go.PAST.DECL

Swumi went to Seoul but Mila didn't.

221

However, the contrasted phrase often is only one and the things it is contrasted to are not mentioned explicitly in the same sentence. They could be mentioned in a previous sentence or could be expected to be clear from the context, including non-linguistic environment. Normally, the speaker assumes that the referents of the "missing phrases" are accessible to the hearer. That makes such utterances very context-dependent and difficult for analysis in isolation. Like many elements of the information structure their level is the text, not the sentence.

The following two sentences show how **un/nun** can express different pragmatic meanings.

(5.13) 인수는 선수이다.

Inswu nun senswu ita

Inswu TOP athlete PRED.DECL

Insu is an athlete. (That is what I know about Inswu.) (*Aboutness Topic*)

(5.14) 인수는 선수이다.

INSWU NUN senswu ita

Inswu TOP athlete PRED

INSWU is an athlete./As far is INSWU is concerned, he is an athlete. (But I am not sure about the other people there.) (*Contrastive Topic*)

In (5.13) **un/nun** marks the Aboutness Topic of the sentence. The schematic representation will be

TOP[SUBJ NP nun] FOC[SUBJ NP ita].

In (5.14) **un/nun** marks a Topic that is contrasted. The schematic representation will be similar:

CONTR TOP[SUBJ NP nun] FOC[PRED NP ita].

The NP marked with **un/nun** in (5.14) is contrasted with other entities that should be accessible to the hearer from the context. In fact the focus structure of Contrast constructions depends on context. For example, the sentence above could be an answer to a question about the professions of a group of certain people and the part **senswu ita** is new information, while Inswu is familiar to the hearer. Often Contrastive Topic constructions like the one in (5.14) are used in answering questions containing conjunctions, like "Speaking of Inswu and Inho, what are their professions?", to which (5.14) is a felicitous answer. In the spoken language the difference between (5.13) and (5.14) is that in (5.14) the Topic phrase will be prominent, i.e. marked. The Topic in (5.13) is unmarked non-contrastive **Aboutness Topic**. (5.14) also reveals information about Inswu but it reveals something more: that the speaker contrasts the information with something else depending on the context, e.g. his or her not knowing Inho's profession, etc. It is **Contrastive Topic**.

In (5.14) the **un/nun**-marked phrase has a typical Contrastive-Topic (CT) contour: there is a noticeable raising of the pitch followed by a low tone and a pause. Lee (2002) characterizes it in the following way: "CT is marked by something like B accent (Bolinger (1965), Jackendoff (1972)) or roughly L+H*LH% in English (Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg (1990))" and Lee (2003) confirms that it has the same contour in Korean, noting that it "starts L on the noun stem and rises directly to an H

tone on the CT marker –*nun*"; Vermeulen (2011) describes it as "maximally realized as L+H*, followed by a default low tone and a high boundary tone (L H%)".

A Contrasted phrase, unlike the Aboutness Topic which is normally at the beginning of a sentence, can be in other positions in the clause. If a **un/nun**-marked Contrasted phrase is not in the beginning of the sentence, then the *cosa* **un/nun** is unambiguously interpreted as a contrast marker and not as a topic marker and the prominence does not have to be that strong, as in (5.15).

(5.15) 인수는 피자는 먹었다.

    Inswu nun PHICA nun mek.essta

    Inswu TOP pizza TOP eat.PAST.DECL

    Inswu ate the PIZZA. [I do not know about the other food.]

This is also visible in the case of contrastive foci, as in the specific negation contrastive focus in (5.16).

(5.16) 인수는 피자는 안 먹었다.

    Inswu nun phica nun an mek.essta

    Inswu TOP pizza TOP not eat.PAST.DECL

    Inswu did not eat the PIZZA. [I do not know if he ate something else.]

Having established that **un/nun** marks both Aboutness and Contrastive Topics, we now turn to another contrastive usage of **un/nun**.[45]

---

[45] I am aware of the claims, made in Vermeulen (2010), that the Japanese *joshi* **wa** "should not be considered a topic marker. It marks topics, but it can also mark discourse anaphoric items." For now, I have not seen evidence that the same claims could be made about the Korean *cosa* **un/nun**. However, my conclusions in this section will still be valid within the topic-marking activity of the *cosa*.

5.3 Marking Contrastive Foci

The *cosa* **un/nun** is used to mark contrast not only when a Topic is contrasted but also when a Focus is contrasted (Contrastive Focus). Let us consider the following two sentences.

(5.17) 미아는 피자는 좋아하지만 스파게티는 싫어한다.

    Mia nun phica nun coh.ahaciman suphakeythi nun silh.ehanta.

    Mia TOP pizza TOP like.but spaghetti TOP dislike.PROC.DECL

    Mia likes pizza but hates spaghetti.

(5.18) 영어는 남동생은 잘 하지만 여동생은 잘 못 한다.

    yenge nun namtongsayng un cal haciman yetongsayng un cal mos hanta

    English TOP younger.brother TOP well do.but younger.sister TOP well not do.PROC.DECL

    Speaking of English, my younger brother can speak it well but my younger sister cannot.

In (5.17) the first **nun** marks the Topic of the sentence, while the second and the third **nun** mark Contrastive Foci. Neither **phica** 'pizza', nor **suphakeythi** 'spaghetti' are Topics; both of them are part of the Comment part. They are contrasted with each other as Contrastive Foci. In (5.18) the Topic is Direct Object while the Contrasted Foci are Subjects. These are examples of **un/nun** marking not Topic but Contrastive Focus. Like Contrastive Topic, sometimes there is only one phrase marked as

Contrastive Focus in the sentence. The thing or things with which its referent is contrasted might be expected to be retrieved by the hearer from the context, including general knowledge about something.

The next two sentences contain only one contrasted phrase each.

(5.19) 그 친구는 거짓말은 하지만…

ku chinkwu nun kecismal un haciman…

that friend TOP lie TOP do.but

That friend tells lies but [has no other bad habits]

(5.20) 요리는 어머니는 잘 하지만…

yoli nun EMENI nun cal haciman…

cooking TOP mother TOP well do.but

Speaking of cooking, MY MOTHER cooks well [but I do not]

In (5.19) **un** (the second occurrence of **un/nun** in the sentence) is an example if a Contrastive Focus. The things it is contrasted with are not mentioned explicitly in the same sentence. In (5.20) the first **nun** marks an Aboutness Topic which is Direct Object, while the second **nun** marks a Contrasted Focus which is Subject.

The prosodic prominence of contrastive-focus phrases has a typical Contrastive-Focus (CF) contour: a high tone, or quick rising to high tone, in the very beginning of the phrase. Lee (2003) notes that "[t]his rising or high tone (L+)H* both in Korean and English signals that something unresolved (i.e., a contrastively negated proposition) is to follow. In this sense, intonation is compositional and correlated with information structure (Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg (1990))". Non-contrastive narrow-focus phrases can also have a similar contour and that marks

them as different from the respective phrases in thetic sentences, but they tend to be less prominent than the contrastive-focus ones. With Contrastive Focus the specific contour is compulsory and significantly more prominent.

Following Lambrecht (1994) I consider Contrastive Foci to be contrasted focalized constituents. Contrastive Focus is contrasted with other Contrastive Foci or with other potential foci, i.e. new, inactive, unidentifiable referents. They cannot be mentioned in the discourse because that would make them active and topical. They could be retrievable from the context after the uttering of the contrastive-focus sentence. In this connection I do not treat as Contrastive Focus the Focus in answers to questions containing disjunctions (alternative disjunctive question in Lee (2003)), e.g. "Who is an athlete, Inswu or Inho?". The mentioning of the referents makes them both topical. If only one of them is an athlete, the answer will contain his name, but that will not be a Contrastive Focus. It will be just an unmarked narrow focus identifying the athlete. In this case, the new information will be not the referent but the information which one of the two. Still, it will be just a specific "disjunction" Focus but not Contrastive. This treatment differs from Lee's (2003), where such foci are considered Contrastive.

Also, I do not consider Contrastive the Focus used when contradicting a previous assertion, e.g. "(No,) Inswu ate the pizza." in response to the assertion "John ate the pizza." In this case 'Inswu' may be a new and inactive referent. Still, the new information is that he and not 'John' has eaten the pizza. In fact, 'John' is topical and cannot be considered new or inactive, since he has just been mentioned. This is one of the prototypical usages of "ordinary" non-contrastive Focus. Some authors (e.g. Kim (2008)) consider this type of Focus to be Contrastive; I do not.

My understanding of Contrastive Focus is closer (but not the same) to Choi (1990) (I already discussed it in the previous chapter). It seems that Contrastive Foci are marked consistently with **un/nun** in Korean.

Choi (ibid: 91, 170) has postulated an interesting theory about what **un/nun** marks. She has introduced two "cross-classifying information features": newness [New] and prominence [Prom]. Newness refers to the activation state of discourse referents, while prominence is salience in discourse, e.g. when one value is made to stand out among other alternatives. Using these two features she has classified the categories that she uses – Topic, Tail, Contrastive Focus and Completive Focus (which I discussed in the previous chapter) – in the following way:

	+Prom	**–Prom**
–New	Topic	Tail
+New	Contrastive Focus	Completive Focus

This classification accounts neatly for a lot of occurrences of the *cosa* **un/nun**. However, it becomes problematic in some cases. For example, often topical elements in the presupposition part of focus-presupposition sentences (they will be considered Tail in these terms) retain **un/un** without being prominent, as in (5.22) below. Such occurrences are also common in exchanges like an information question and its answer. In some sentences with multiple usage of **un/nun** the interpretation of prominence and newness depends on the context and non-prominent but topical elements can be marked with **un/nun**. In my view un/nun marks contrast consistently (both Contrastive Topic and Contrastive Focus), while with Topic, it marks Aboutness Topic in topic-comment constructions and can also mark highly topical elements in the presupposition part of narrow-focus constructions when they happen

to be in the initial position (as in (5.22)). (5.22) can be uttered in response to a question like "What sport is Chelswu good at?". In the answer the active referent can be dropped or repeated with a retained **un/nun**. We could call this occurrence a Retained Topic but that will complicate the analysis. We could just say that presupposition parts in narrow-focus sentences can contain topical elements that could be marked with **un/nun**. Further research will be needed in order to clarify these occurrences. They seem to be limited to matrix clauses and not common in relative and other subordinate clauses.

Since the unmarked Focus position for a constituent in Korean is the pre-verbal slot, the Direct Object, whose unmarked word-order positions is the pre-verbal one, is normally interpreted as part of the sentence focus, if unstressed, or as argument focus if prominent and marked with **ul/lul**. It will be interpreted as contrasted if it is in its unmarked pre-verbal slot and is marked with **un/nun**. If it is in the front of the sentence, i.e. in a marked word-order position, it will be interpreted as Focus if it is marked with **ul/lul** and prominent (prominence will be redundant in that case). But if it is fronted (marked position for a Direct Object) and marked with **un/nun**, it could be interpreted as Topic, if not prominent, and as Contrast, if prominent. Compare the differences between the following sentences (prominent parts in bold; information structure presentations included):

(5.21) 철수는 테니스를 잘 한다.

Chelswu nun theynisu lul cal hanta

Chelswu TOP tennis OBJ well do.PROC.DECL

$_{TOP}$[SUBJ NP *un/nun*] $_{FOC}$[DOBJ NP *ul/lul* PRED] ***Subject Topic-Comment***

Chelswu is good at tennis.

(5.22) 철수는 테니스를 잘 한다.

Chelswu nun THEYNISU LUL cal hanta

Chelswu TOP tennis FOC well do.PROC.DECL

SUBJ NP *un/nun* _{FOC}[DOBJ NP *ul/lul*] PRED ***Object Argument Focus***

It is TENNIS that Chelswu is good at.

The difference between (5.21) and (5.22) is that in (5.21) the **ul/lul**-marked Direct Object is part of the sentence focus, while in (5.22) it is the narrow-focus. The **un/nun**-marked phrase is Aboutness Topic in (5.21) and a topical element in the presupposition in (5.22). In Choi's (1999) terms the **un/nun**-marked phrase in (5.22) would be considered Tail.

The difference between (5.21) and (5.23) is that in (5.23) the topicalized subject is marked prosodically. It is a marked – Contrastive – Topic, while the Topic in (5.21) is unmarked (Aboutness).

(5.23) 철수는 테니스를 잘 한다.

CHELSWU NUN theynisu lul cal hanta

Chelswu TOP tennis ACC well do.PROC.DECL

_{CONTR TOP}[SUBJ NP *un/nun*] _{FOC}[DOBJ NP *ul/lul* PRED] ***Subject Contrastive Topic***

CHELSWU is good at tennis [but I do not want to comment on the other children].

Both (5.24) and (5.25) do not have **un/nun**-marked constituents. The difference between (5.24) and (5.25) is that (5.24) is a thetic sentence and (5.25) is a narrow-focus sentence. (5.25) contains topical elements. The topical phrase **theynisu lul** 'tennis ACC' cannot be marked with **un/nun** because in this non-initial position

of the sentence such usage will be interpreted as contrast. In fact, the phrase can be even dropped, e.g. in response to a question like "Who is good at tennis?"

(5.24) 철수가 테니스를 잘 한다.

    Chelswu ka theynisu lul cal hanta

    Chelswu NOM tennis ACC well do.PROC.DECL

    _{FOC}[SUBJ NP *i/ka* DOBJ NP *ul/lul* PRED] ***Sentence Focus***

    Chelswu is good at tennis[, I see].

(5.25) 철수가 테니스를 잘 한다.

    CHELSWU ka theynisu lul cal hanta

    Chelswu NOM tennis ACC well do.PROC.DECL

    _{FOC}[SUBJ NP *i/ka*] DOBJ NP *ul/lul* PRED ***Subject Argument Focus***

    It is CHELSWU who is good at tennis.

Both (5.26) and (5.27) have a direct object that is fronted and marked with **un/nun**. In (5.26) it is Aboutness Topic and the rest of the sentence is Predicate Focus that contains the subject and the predicate. In (5.27) the subject is prosodically prominent and is Narrow Focus, while the rest of the sentence is presupposition. The direct object is a topical element in the initial position and is marked by **un/nun** (see the discussion above). The situation in (5.27) is similar to that in (5.22) in that the fronted constituent that is part of the presupposition, in this case the Direct Object, is also marked "by default" with **un/nun**. In (5.27) the Subject is Narrow Focus and is in the position nearer the verb, which is the unmarked position for Focus. It is also prominent. i.e. several devices from different domains are used to facilitate the realization of the information structure of this sentence. That can be attributed to its

non-canonical constituent order which is OSV. The main difference between (5.27) and (5.25) is the constituent order. The other differences can be explained in the light of changes in constituent order. The unmarked constituent order in Korean is SOV for the grammatical relations and Topic-Focus for the pragmatic functions in the information structure of the sentence.

(5.26) 테니스는 철수가 잘 한다.

Theynisu nun chelswu ka cal hanta

tennis TOP Chelswu SUBJ well do.PROC.DECL

TOP[DOBJ NP *un/nun*] FOC[SUBJ NP *i/ka* PRED] ***Object Topic-Comment***

Speaking of tennis, Chelswu is good at it.

(5.27) 테니스는 철수가 잘 한다.

Theynisu nun CHELSWU ka cal hanta

tennis TOP Chelswu NOM well do.PROC.DECL

DOBJ NP *un/nun* FOC[SUBJ NP *i/ka*] PRED ***Subject Argument Focus***

(Speaking of) tennis, it is CHELSWU who is good at it.

In (5.28) the direct object is in the initial position and is marked with **un/nun** and the specific prosodic contour of Contrastive Topics with a high pitch on the *cosa*. Here, the phrase **theynisu nun** 'tennis TOP' is Contrastive Topic. It could have been contrasted to other sports that have been mentioned explicitly or not, or to other activities.

(5.28) 테니스는 철수가 잘 한다.

THEYNISU NUN chelswu ka cal hanta

tennis CONTR Chelswu NOM well do.PROC.DECL

CONTR TOP[DOBJ NP *un/nun*] FOC[SUBJ NP *i/ka* PRED] ***Object Contrastive Topic***

TENNIS, Chelswu is good at it [in contrast to (the) other sports].

Sentences (5.29) and (5.30) have the direct object in its default position (in situ), which is also the unmarked focus position. However, it is marked by **un/nun** and a high-pitch contour. That makes it a marked – Contrastive – Focus. In both sentences the direct object is in narrow focus. In (5.29) the subject is marked with **un/nun** as a topical element from the presupposition that is in initial position. In (5.30) the subject is marked with **i/ka** as part of the presupposition.

(5.29) 철수는 테니스는 잘 한다.

    Chelswu nun THEYNISU nun cal hanta

    Chelswu TOP tennis TOP well do.PROC.DECL

    SUBJ NP *un/nun* CONTR FOC[DOBJ NP *un/nun*] PRED ***Object Contrastive Focus***

    Chelswu, he is good at TENNIS. [but not at other sports.]

(5.30) 철수가 테니스는 잘 한다.

    Chelwu ka THEYNISU nun cal hanta

    Chelswu TOP tennis TOP well do.PROC.DECL

    SUBJ NP *i/ka* CONTR FOC[DOBJ NP *un/nun*] PRED ***Object Contrastive Focus***

    Chelswu is good at TENNIS [but what about other sports(, I wonder)?].

The nuance in the difference of meaning of these two sentences leads me to suggest alternative information-structure representations, i.e. to view Contrastive

Focus as contrasted focal elements from the actual domain of broad focus: predicate focus in (5.29) and sentence focus in (5.30). Thus, the Contrastive-Focus phrase is like embedded in broad focus constructions. Thus, in (5.29) the Subject can be interpreted as topicalized, while the whole sentence (5.30) can be considered in the actual focus domain. The alternative information-structure representations are given in (5.29') and (5.30') together with more explicit translations. This interpretation can explain why certain elements outside the Contrastive-Focus phrase can be marked with either **un/nun**, as topical, or **i/ka** (in the case of Subjects), as thetic.

(5.29')

TOP[SUBJ NP *un/nun*] FOC[CONTR FOC[DOBJ NP *un/nun*] PRED] *Predicate Focus with Object Contrastive Focus*

Speaking of Chelswu, he is good at TENNIS. [but not at other sports, or at other activities.]

(5.30')

FOC[SUBJ NP *i/ka* CONTR FOC[DOBJ NP *un/nun*] PRED] *Sentence Focus with Object Contrastive Focus*

Chelswu is good at **tennis** [as I can see. But I do not know about other sports].

We can make a few more observations when we compare across the sentences above. Sentence (5.21) is an example of the typical Topic-Comment constructions with the Subject as Topic, while (5.26) is also an example of the Topic-Comment construction but in it the Direct Object is the Topic. Both Topics are Aboutness Topics and are marked with **un/nun**. However, in (5.23) the Subject is a Contrastive Topic. If we compare (5.23) and (5.28), we will see that both feature

Contrastive Topics but in (5.28) the Contrastive Topic is Direct Object. Both Contrastive Topics are marked with **un/nun** irrespective of the grammatical relations. Sentence (5.24) is an example of Sentence Focus and it has no **un/nun-**marked phrases. Sentence (5.25), where the Subject is Narrow Focus (Argument Focus), does not have **un/nun**-marked phrases. In it the Direct Object is part of the presupposition but is not foregrounded in any way and is "neutrally" marked as Direct Object with **ul/lul**. However, in (5.22) where the Direct Object is in Narrow Focus (Argument Focus), the Subject which is part of the presupposition and is in the beginning of the sentence, i.e. the unmarked Topic position, is marked with **un/nun**. As we have already mentioned, it seems to be more natural to mark as Topic a fronted constituent which is part of the presupposition.

We can summarize that the variations of *cosa* usage are numerous and the functions and meanings of the *cosa* are dependent on syntactic and pragmatic factors but also on semantic factors since they are employed to convey nuances of the meaning of the sentences. The effect is achieved with an intricate combination of morphological (*cosa*), syntactic (constituent order) and phonological/prosodic (prominence) means. No doubt, the functional morphemes contribute immensely to the richness of expression tools in the Korean language.

5.4 Usage in Other Contrast Constructions

Now I review the usage of **un/nun** with to mark Contrast with postpositional phrases, as well as with verb forms of main verbs in complex predicates or with nominalized verb forms in certain expressions. Let us look at the following four

sentences. In the first sentences **un/nun** follows a locative particle and in the next three it is attached to verb forms.

(5.31) 극장에는 가지 않지만 음악회에는 간다.

    kukcang ey nun kaci anhciman um.ak.hoy ey nun kanta

    theatre LOC TOP go.SUSP not.do.but music.concert LOC TOP go.PROC.DECL

    I do not go to the theatre but I do go to music concerts.

(5.32) 극장에 가지는 않는다.

    kukcang ey kaci nun anhnunta

    theatre LOC go.SUSP TOP not.do.PROC.DECL

    I am not going to the theatre. (But I might be doing something else.)

(5.33) 도와는 줄게.

    towa nun cwulqkey

    help.INF TOP give.VSUFF

    I will help you [but…].

(5.34) 있기는 있다.

    isski nun issta

    exist.NMZ TOP exist.DECL

    I do have [some, if it is about having]. [As for attendance,] there are [several students].

In (5.31) **un/nun** marks two contrasted Locative adjuncts expressed by postpositional phrases. In (5.32) **un/nun** marks the specific contrastive focus of negation characteristic of the suspective form of the main verb in front of the auxiliary verb **anhta** 'not do'. In (5.33) and (5.34) the interpretation between Contrastive Focus and Contrastive Topic depends on the context (although in most occurrences it would be interpreted as Contrastive Focus, which is also helped by its preverbal position) but **un/nun** is undoubtedly being used to mark contrast (contrastiveness) in some way.

The *cosa* **un/nun** can be added to some clausal conjunctive forms of verbs in order to add emphasis to a certain part of the sentence, as in (5.35) and (5.36) (Yeon and Brown 2011: 196):

(5.35) 비가 오니까는 우산을 가지고 가야지.

    pi ka onikka nun wusan ul kaciko kayaci

    rain NOM come.because TOP umbrella ACC hold.CONN go.must.SUSP

    You have to take an umbrella because it's raining.

(5.36) 유미가 코트를 입다가는 벗었어요.

    Yumi ka khothu lul iptaka nun pes.ess.eyo

    Yumi NOM coat ACC put.on.then TOP take.off.PAST.DECL

    Yumi put on her coat and then took it off again.

This usage of **un/nun** in these two sentences is more similar to the Topic-marking in (5.7) and (5.8) than to contrast-marking. The placement of the subordinate clauses before the main clauses in Korean also facilitates such a perception.

The usage of **un/nun** attached to postposition *cosa* and verb forms is usually linked to the effect of contrastiveness, including the specific negation contrast. In certain cases, the use of **un/nun** could be interpreted as Contrastive Topic as well. The use in negation constructions is examined in more detail in the next section.

5.5 Usage in Negation Constructions

The *cosa* **un/nun** is often used in negation constructions. It can mark any constituent in a negation construction, including the form of the main verb in order to express the specific negation focus, which is a kind of Contrastive Focus. It defines the scope of the concrete negation contrasting it with other potential scopes of negation. Its usage with verbs is demonstrated in (5.37) and (5.38). The negation contrast marks its scope, thus contrasting it with other possible implications.

(5.37) 어렵지는 않다.

    elyepci nun anhta

    be.difficult.SUSP TOP not.do.DECL

    It's not DIFFICULT. [But it has some other drawbacks.]

(5.38) 먹어선 안 된다.

    mek.ese n an toynta

    eat.INF TOP not become.PROC.DECL

    You must not EAT this. [It is not for eating but for some other purpose]

The following two sentences feature **un/nun** marking a noun phrase that is a predicate complement. Representations of the information structure are also provided.

(5.39) 그 여자는 가수는 아니다.

ku yeca nun kaswu nun anita

that woman TOP singer CONTR be.not.DEC

TOP[SUBJ NP *un/nun*] FOC[CONTR FOC[PRED NP *un/nun*] *anita*]

Speaking of that woman, she is not a SINGER. (She may be a dancer but SINGER she isn't.)

(5.40) 그 여자가 가수는 아니다.

ku yeca ka kaswu nun anita

That woman NOM singer CONTR be.not.DECL

FOC[SUBJ NP **i/ka** CONTR FOC[PRED NP *un/nun*] anita]

That woman is NOT a singer(, I realize now.)

The difference between (5.39) and (5.40) is that the Subject in (5.39) is Topicalized, while the Subject in (5.40) is in the Sentence Focus domain. The complement noun in both is negatively contrasted adding additional highlighting in the focus domain. In fact, depending on context, other interpretations are possible as well. (5.39) and (5.40) parallel (5.29) and (5.30) in their information-structure implications.

Sometimes the *cosa* **un/nun** can be used multiply in a sentence for a stylistic effect, e.g. to "soften" a statement or to avoid sounding very categorical or judgmental. This is particularly used in negation sentences, as in (5.41). Here, the

meanings of Contrastive Topic and Contrastive Foci are retained but for a stylistic effect.

(5.41) 인수는 불어는 별로 공부는 하지는 않았다.

Inswu nun pwul.e nun pyello kongpwu nun haci nun anhass.ta

Inswu TOP French TOP especially study TOP do.SUSP TOP not.do.PAST.DECL

As for Insu, he did not study French that much. [But he may have studied other languages or other subjects, or done other things...]

In negation constructions the *cosa* **un/nun** marks negation Contrastive Focus that highlights the scope of negation and could be used for stylistic effect as well. This negation focus outlines the scope of negation somewhat neutrally, unmarkedly, when compared to the Emphatic Focus (discussed in Chapter 6) that is used in negation sentences, discussed in the next chapter, which is a marked Focus. It is associated not with **un/nun** but with another last-slot *cosa*, **to**.

5.6 Conclusions

The *cosa* **un/nun** is used to mark the constituents of the clause, arguments and adjuncts, according to their organization in the information structure. In a Topic-prominent language, like Korean, it often marks the Subject as Topic since the Subject tends to be the Topic in sentences. This has led some researchers to associate **un/nun** with the Nominative notion (especially in Kholodovich (1954), Mazur (1960, 1962) and the Russian tradition of KFL books), or at least with the notion of

syntactic roles[46]. However, **un/nun** clearly is a *cosa* that marks phrases according to pragmatic rather than syntactic factors. As a last-slot *cosa* it marks nominal phrases, postpositional phrases, adverbials and some verb forms without co-occurring with **i/ka, ul/lul, to,** which also mark the same categories pragmatically. It marks the Topic in the information structure. It can mark different grammatical relations as Topics. The unmarked Topic position is in the beginning of the sentence. The *cosa* **un/nun** also marks Contrasted phrases consistently. It marks both Contrastive Topics and Contrastive Foci. That is why it can occur in the actual focus domain of the sentence. Because of the interaction of the SOV unmarked word order and the Topic-Focus unmarked order, as well as possible inversions, the pragmatic meaning is sometimes realized or emphasized with the combination of morphological, syntactic and prosodic devices.

If we summarize the usage of **un/nun** vis-à-vis the grammatical relations, semantic roles and pragmatic functions, we note that un/nun can mark any syntactic role, including **Subject, LT Object, Direct Object, Indirect Object, Secondary Object, Retained Object, Oblique (Object), Predicate Complement**, as well as Major Subject, as discussed in Chapters 2 and 3**.** Any reference phrase can be marked as Topic, including nominalized verb forms and clauses. As Contrast it can mark even verb forms of main verbs in complex predicate constructions.

There are no restrictions on the semantic participant roles that can be marked with **un/nun** for topicalization or contrastivization.

Although the usage of **un/nun** is not restricted when it comes to grammatical relations and semantic roles, its usage in the marking of information-structure relations is restricted. It can mark all sorts of **Topic**, including **Aboutness (non-**

---

[46] The practice of grouping the Topic particle with the Nominative and Accusative particles has been extended to the treatment of Japanese Topic *joshi* **wa** as well, e.g. Tsujioka () groups it with the Japanese Nominative *joshi* **ga** and Accusative *joshi* **wo** in "case particles".

contrastive) and **Contrastive**, including negation contrast. It does not mark Concertive Topic, which is marked with the same-slot *cosa* **to**.

The *cosa* **un/nun** also marks Contrast consistently, which is cognitively related to Topic. That could be the explanation why it seems to mark all contrastive pragmatic relations, including **Contrastive Topics** and **Contrastive Foci**.

Although **un/nun** can mark Contrastive Focus (a marked focus), it cannot mark Narrow Focus or External Focus. They are exclusively marked by other *cosa*, **i/ka** and **ul/lul**, whose usage is heavily determined by syntactic and semantic factors as well.

The grammar and usage of the *cosa* **un/nun** is complicated and tricky because of its complex interrelations with information structure of sentences. Although it seems fairly unrestricted to what grammatical relation or semantic role it can attach, it usage is very complicated to describe and theoretically explain. Presumably, it is not so easy to learn and teach in the field of Korean as a foreign language. Awareness of the three types of constructions where it marks **Topic** – **Aboutness, Contrastive** and **External** – as well as the type of Topic where it is not used (Concertive), can help understand its usage better.

Chapter 6

Analysis and Discussion: The Grammar and Usage of TO

Now I proceed to analyze and discuss the constructions where the *cosa* **to** occurs. It is the last of the four last-slot cosa that are the focus of this work. It is most often glossed 'also' but its meaning and usage seems to be more complicated that the simple gloss suggests.

The last-slot *cosa* **to** seems to have a more clear semantics than the other last-slot *cosa*. Its typical usage is to mark equivalence, sameness or similarity to something that is already active in the discourse. It is often grouped with **un/nun** under the label of "discourse particles", "scope (or range) particles", "special particles", "non-case particles", etc. It has also been called the "emphatic particle" (Kim-Renaud (2009)). According to Lee (1993: 83), **to** "denotes increment either in the positive or in the negative direction, and the speaker uses it to show that something is an increment (to another)". It is often used with a single constituent in a sentence with the implication that its referent is similar or equivalent with other entities that are discernable from the context (e.g. they have just been mentioned in a previous sentence) or the shared background of the speaker and the hearer. In many case its usage seems to be the opposite of Contrast, i.e. it tends to indicate some sort of commonality like resemblance, likeness, analogy, unison, harmony, sameness between things. It can also have association with Focus (similarly to the particles **cocha** 'even', **mace** 'even' and the others from the penultimate slot).

The *cosa* **to**, like **un/nun**, can be used with nominal and postpositional phrases, as well as with adverbial phrases and verb forms.

6.1 Marking Concertive Topics

Just like **un/nun**, to seems to have no restrictions to being attached to any kind of grammatical relation or semantic participant role. Since it is in the same slot with **i/ka** and **ul/lul**, it cannot co-occur with them. Thus, when marked with **to**, similarly to the usage of **un/nun**, constituents are not marked explicitly for the syntactic relations of the core arguments of the predicate, like Subject and Direct Object. In fact, they remain unmarked for all sorts of syntactic relations that are marked by **i/ka** and **ul/lul**.

When it comes to information-structure categories, like Topic and Focus, it also seems that it does not mark uniquely a single category. It can mark both Topics and Foci but when they are specific marked varieties of Topic and Focus.

In the following two examples **to** marks a topic:

(6.1) 인수는 학교에 간다. 미라도 학교에 간다.

Inswu nun hak.kyo ey kanta. Mila to hak.kyo ey kanta.

Inswu TOP school LOC go.PROC.DECL Mila also school LOC go.PROC.DECL

Inswu is going to school. Mila, too, is going to school.

(6.2) 이것은 소설책이다. 그것도 책이다.

ikes un soselchayk ita. kukes to chayk ita.

this.thing TOP fiction.book PRED.DECL that.thing also book PRED.DECL

This is a fiction book. That is also a book.

In (6.1) and (6.2) **to** marks the Topic in the second sentence. Both sentences in (6.1) and (6.2) are of the topic-comment type. In the first one the Topic is marked expectedly with **un/nun**. It is an unmarked (non-contrastive) Aboutness Topic. In the second sentence the same comment, in the case of (6.1), or a very similar comment, in the case of (6.2), is made about a different but also active (in the discourse) entity. The two entities are not contrasted but rather the second one is likened to the already mentioned one by providing it with the same or comparable comment. Both phrases (the one marked with **un/nun** and the one marked with **to**) are Subjects and in the beginning of the sentence, i.e. they are in the unmarked Topic position and are interpreted as Topics. The second Topic, however, is marked with **to**, not with the default Topic marker **un/nun**. Even if the second Topic is introduced as a new Topic, it will still be marked with **to** because of the sameness of the comment. The new Topic is introduced in some logical connection, not completely without justification. This is a possible explanation why **un/nun** is not used even though a new Topic is introduced.

In the following example, (6.3), the Topics are Objects, not Subjects, but since the first Topic is marked as Topic with **un/nun** and the second Topic is in the unmarked Topic position (the beginning of the sentence), that facilitates the interpretation of the **to**-marked phrase as a Topic too.

(6.3) 여름은 내가 좋아한다. 가을도 좋아한다.

    yelum un nay ka coh.ahanta. kaul to coh.ahanta.

    summer TOP I NOM like.PROC.DECL autumn also like.PROC.DECL

    Speaking of summer, I like it. I also like autumn.

The *cosa* **to** marks Topics that are cognitively perceived as having something in common with other Topics that are already established and normally marked with **un/nun**. The semantic implication of **to** is that of commonality, "as-well-ness", or sameness with the other Topic(s). It shows that the Topic it marks is "in concert" of some kind with an already established or easily retrievable Topic. That is why I will call it **Concertive Topic**. Marking such Topics with **to** seems to be compulsory.

6.2 Marking Concertive Foci

The Topic status of the **to**-marked phrase in the second sentence in (6.3) may be disputed since the second sentence could have other interpretations. It could be interpreted as a sentence-focus construction whose background topic is the first sentence. It could also be interpreted as a focus-presupposition construction where the presupposition part is **coh.ahanta** 'like' (construed as established by the **coh.ahanta** in the first sentence, in the sense "speaking of things/seasons that I like") and the Focus is **kaul to** 'autumn too' which is marked with **to** because of the context created by the first sentence. In such interpretation **to** will be considered to mark a focalized Object. In both interpretations, topic-comment (as discussed in the previous section) and focus-presupposition, the Object in the second sentence is marked with **to** because of the symmetry of the two sentences and because of the discourse considerations of marking sameness are apparently more important in order to avoid a contrast interpretation. Just like when marking Contrastive Foci with the "typically" Topic marker **un/nun**, here too the "sameness" marker **to** is used regardless of whether the phrase is Topic or Focus. The *cosa* **to** marks commonality

or concert consistently. That is why it marks not only **Concertive Topics** but also **Concertive Foci**. The following three sentences demonstrate this:

(6.4) 오늘도 비 온다.

onul to pi onta

today also rain come.PROC.DECL

It is raining today as well.

(6.5) 승호가 간다면 나도 가고 싶다.

Sungho ka kantamyen na to kako siphta

Sungho NOM go.PROC.DECL.if I also go.CONJ want.DECL

If Sungho is going, I want to go too.

(6.6) 가는 말이 고와야 오는 말도 곱다.

kanun mal i kowaya onun mal to kopta.

go.ATTR word NOM be.fine.only.if come.ATTR word also be.fine.DECL

You have to be nice to people in order for people to be nice to you, too.

lit. Going words must be fine, so that coming words be fine too.

In sentence (6.4) **to** marks the adjunct **onul** 'today' and the likeness is assumed to be known by the hearer on the basis of shared knowledge (that could be context or speech act background), e.g. it has rained the previous day. In sentence (6.5) the usage of **to** is based on the fact that the Subject of the main clause is "harmonized" with the Subject of the subordinate clause in that their referents will both potentially do the same thing according to the proposition. In sentence (6.6) the

Subject in the main clause and the Subject in the subordinate clause, which is mentioned first, are associated by the commonality of their referents (**mal** 'words' in both cases) and the reciprocity that is implied.

In the sentences in this section and the previous one the *cosa* **to** is used once and it indicates the sameness or similarity of the referent of the constituent it marks with another entity that is explicitly expressed or is discourse-retrievable. The *cosa* **to**, however, quite often is used more than once in a sentence. Such constructions will be reviewed in the next section.

6.3 Multiple Usage in a Sentence

The *cosa* **to** is often used multiply in a sentence. Let us consider the following two sentences:

(6.7) 승호도 철수도 혜숙도 모두 같은 학교에 다닌다.

Sungho to Chelswu to Hyeyswuk to motwu kath.un hak.kyo ey taninta

Sungho also Chelswu also Hyeyswuk also all be.same.ATTR school LOC commute.PROC.DECL

Sungho, Chelswu, Hyeyswuk, all go to the same school.

(6.8) 그 아이는 피아노도 기타도 잘 한다.

ku ai nun phiano to kitha to cal hanta.

That child TOP piano also guitar also well do.PROC.DECL

That child is good at piano as well as guitar./That child plays both the piano and the guitar well.

In sentence (6.7) the three noun phrases marked with **to** are Subjects as well as Topics in the sentence's syntactic and information structure. They are Concertive Topics. In sentence (6.8) the two noun phrases marked with **to** are Objects. They are in the Focus part of the sentence while the Topic is the phrase **ku ai nun** 'that child TOP'. They are Concertive Foci. We can see that the *cosa* **to** can be used to mark two or more homogenous parts of the sentence, e.g. Subjects, Objects, Topics. The difference from the coordination constructions is that each phrase remains related to the predicate. The **to**-marked noun phrases in a clause do not constitute one complex noun phrase. Sentence (6.7) is different from sentence (6.7') because in (6.7') the phrase **Sungho wa Chelswu wa Hyeyswuk** is a single nominal phrase that consists of three noun phrases in coordination (with the use of the conjunctive **kwa/wa**). Consequently, there is a single Subject (although somewhat complex) phrase that is also topicalized.

(6.7') 승호와 철수와 혜숙은 모두 같은 학교에 다닌다.

Sungho wa Chelswu wa Hyeyswuk un motwu kath.un hak.kyo ey taninta

Sungho and Chelswu and Hyeyswuk TOP all be.same.ATTR school LOC commute.PROC.DECL

Sungho, Chelswu and Hyeyswuk all go to the same school.

The presence or absence of quantifying words (**motwu** 'all', **kathta** 'be same') is irrelevant for this analysis, as sentences (6.9) and (6.9') show. The difference between them is the same as the difference between (6.7) and (6.7') that was already discussed.

(6.9) 승호도 철수도 혜숙도 한국 사람이다.

Sungho to Chelswu to Hyeyswuk to Hankwuk salam ita

Sungho also Chelswu also Hyeyswuk also Korea person PRED.DECL

Sungho, Chelswu, Hyeyswuk are Koreans.

(6.9') 승호와 철수와 혜숙은 한국 사람이다.

Sungho wa Chelswu wa Hyeyswuk un Hankwuk salam ita

Sungho and Chelswu and Hyeyswuk TOP Korea person PRED.DECL

Sungho, Chelswu and Hyeyswuk are Koreans.

The multiple usage of **to** in a sentence can be with nominal phrases as well as with postposition phrases, marking arguments and adjuncts. Sentence (6.10) is an example of the usage of **to** with postposition phrases.

(6.10) 올 여름에는 유럽에도 아프리카에도 여행했다.

ol yelum ey nun Yulep ey to Aphulikha ey to yehaynghayssta

this summer LOC TOP Europe LOC also Africa LOC also travel.PAST.DECL

This summer [I] traveled to both Europe and Africa.

The multiple usage of **to** is also common in sentences where **to** marks arguments (or adjuncts) of different predicates. In these cases the propositions of the clauses are viewed as similar, or complementary, or equally important, or are evaluated in the same way, as in (6.11).

(6.11) 이 집은 술 값도 싸고, 분위기도 좋다.

i cip un swul kaps to ssako, pwun.wiki to cohta

this house TOP alcohol price also be.cheap.CONN atmosphere also be.good.DECL

[In] this place the alcohol is cheap and the atmosphere is good as well.

In (6.11) **to** marks phrases that are likened in some way, i.e. they are the opposite of contrastive; they are in concert. If they are focalized, then we can say that **to**, by analogy with the way **un/nun** marks Contrastive Foci, marks concerted or Concertive Foci. Similarly to contrast constructions in which there is only one phrase marked as Contrast while what it is contrasted to has to be retrieved from the background information, there are concert constructions with a single **to**-marked phrase. In them what the **to**-marked phrase is in concert with is judged to be retrievable by the hearer from the background information. In this connection, let us consider the following three sentences:

(6.12) 그 여자는 얼굴이 예쁘다.

ku yeca nun elkwul i yeypputa.

that woman TOP face NOM be.beautiful.DEC

She is pretty./She has a pretty face.

lit. [Speaking of] that woman, [her] face is beautiful.

(6.13) 그 여자는 얼굴은 예쁘다.

ku yeca nun ELKWUL un yeypputa.

that woman TOP face TOP be.beautiful.DEC

She is PRETTY [but I am not sure about her personality or her wit].

lit. [Speaking of] that woman, as for [her] face, it is beautiful.

251

(6.14) 그 여자는 얼굴도 예쁘다.

ku yeca nun ELKWUL to yeypputa.

that woman TOP face also be.beautiful.DEC

She is PRETTY too [in addition to having a pleasant personality or being very clever].

lit. [Speaking of] that woman, [her] face too is beautiful.

Sentence (6.12) has a topic-comment structure. Sentence (6.13) has a topic and a single Contrastive-Focus phrase. The implication for the real-life situation is that although the face is beautiful, other features (associated with the same participant) might actually contrast, or are known to contrast, with this "positive" feature, i.e. they might be, or are known to be, "negative". Sentence (6.14) is in a way the opposite of Sentence (6.13). In it **to** marks a Cencertive Focus whose implication is that the face is beautiful, a "positive" feature, which is in concert with other "positive" features that are known or expected.

This triad of allosentences purporting to refer to the same proposition shows how important the last-slot *cosa* are for the correct interpretation of the subtleties of the information structure of Korean sentences and the rich milieu of pragmatic and semantic implications that their usage generates.

6.4 Marking Emphatic Foci

Often, especially when used in constructions with predicates expressing modality, the interpretation of **to** could be a bit ambiguous.

(6.15) 그 아이는 신문도 읽을 수 있다.

ku ai nun sinmwun to ilk.ulq swu issta

that child TOP newspaper also read.ATTR possibility exist.DECL

i. That child can read newspapers too.

ii. That child can even read newspapers.

The first interpretation of (6.15) is as if the **to**-marked phrase is a Concertive Focus with the other entities that the referent of the phrase is "in concert" with being easily accessible from the context or shared knowledge, e.g. children's books, magazines, etc. The second interpretation construes the **to**-marked phrase as a Focus related to the meaning of 'even'. In order to avoid the ambiguous term "even-ness", I will call this type of Focus Emphatic Focus, alluding to the term emphatic particle cited above, even though this usage expresses not only emphasis but also the notions of 'even', surprise at the realization of unlikely, or even least likely, situations, actions, etc.

The usage of **to** these constructions is synonymous with the usage of some *cosa* from the third slot. The structural properties of **to** allow it to be attached to them. The usage of **to** with the *cosa* **cocha** 'even', **mace** 'even', **kkaci** 'even' is comparable to the usage of **i/ka** and **ul/lul** with **man** 'only' to focalize the phrase already marked with **man**. The *cosa* **cocha** and its synonyms highlight the phrase they attach to and add the meaning of 'even', i.e. identifying it as the least likely from a set without excluding the other members.[47] The *cosa* **to** can mark such

---

[47] This point was discussed in the introductory chapter when the *cosa* form the third slot were reviewed.

phrases as Emphatic Foci and thus can emphasize their semantic and establish them as Foci in the information structure, as in the following two sentences.

(6.16) 저 학생은 불어조차도 잘 한다.

ce haksayng un pwul.e cocha to cal hanta

that student TOP French even also well do.PROC.DECL

That student speaks well even French.

(6.17) 히말라야는 여름에조차도 눈이 있다.

Himallaya nun yelum ey cocha to nwun i issta

Himalayas TOP summer LOC even also snow NOM exist.DECL

In the Himalayas there is snow even in summer.

In (6.16) and (6.17) **to** is attached to a nominal and a postpositional phrase, respectively, both if them already marked by **cocha**. In (6.16) the constituent marked for Emphatic Focus with the *cosa* sequence **cocha to** is Direct Object. The *cosa* **ul/lul** that marks thetic Direct Objects and unmarked narrow-focus Direct Objects cannot be used together with **to** because of its structural properties. The situation is similar with Contrastive Focus, where **un/nun** is used. In (6.17) the adjunct-marking locative *cosa* **ey** can be used together with **cocha** and **to**, producing a string of three *cosa* from different slots. Thus, adjunct constituents remain marked explicitly for their syntactic role as well as for their information-structure status.

This Emphatic-Focus usage of the *cosa* **to** can be extended to exclamation sentences for stylistic effect, as in (6.18) and (6.19). This usage does not necessarily means that the speaker is surprised by the realization of the least probable option.

Rather, it is used to strengthen the effect of the exclamation. That is why in (6.19) it is repeated.

(6.18) 달도 참 밝구나!

Tal to cham palk.kwuna!

moon also really is.bright.EXCL

The moon is so bright!

(6.19) 고생도 고생도 지지리도 많이 했구나!

Kosayng to kosayng to cicili to manh.i haysskwuna!

suffering also suffering also horribly also much do.PAST.EXCL

Oh, (he/she/I) suffered so horribly!

Apart from marking Emphatic Focus, the *cosa* **to** can be used to mark another type of Focus as well, Concessive Focus, as discussed in the next section.

6.5 Marking Concessive Foci

Now I am going to analyze the usage of the *cosa* **to** in constructions where it expresses concession. As was mentioned, the *cosa* **to** can be attached to different verb forms. One such usage is found in (6.20).

(6.20) 조금쯤 날씨가 나빠도 가기로 하자.

cokum ccum nalssi ka nappa to kaki lo haca

little approximately weather NOM be.bad.INF also go.NMZ INSTR do.HORT

Let's go even if/though the weather is a little bad.

In (6.20) **to** is attached to a verb form usually called the infinitive. The resulting –**eto/-ato** verb form is grammaticalized and is used as a concessive form in different constructions expressing asking for permission, giving permission, etc. This usage is also common with nominal phrases, as in (6.21).

(6.21) 베개가 없으면 방석도 괜찮아요.

Peykay ka eps.umyen pangsek to kwaynchanh.ayo.

pillow NOM not.exist.if cushion also is.fine.POL

If there is no pillow, even a cushion will do.

This usage of **to** is paralleled by the *cosa* **(i)lato**, which is a grammaticalized form of the copula with **to**, similar to the –**eto/-ato** verb form. Sentence (6.22) has a constituent marked as Concessive Focus with **(i)lato**.

(6.22) 어느 쪽이라도 좋다.

Enu ccok ilato cohta.

which side even is.good.DECL

Either of them will do.

We can summarize that the *cosa* **to** is used to mark Concessive Focus in a way that is structurally similar to its marking Emphatic Focus. The difference between the two Foci is semantic.

6.6 Usage in Negation Constructions

Now I will consider the usage of **to** in negation constructions. One of the constructions is similar to the usage of the three *cosa* discussed previously with the –**ci** verb form in negation constructions, as in (6.23).

(6.23) 아이를 보지도 않았다.

    Ai lul POCI to anh.assta.

    child ACC look.SUSP also not.do.PAST.DECL

    (He) did not even LOOK at the child.

In (6.23) the *cosa* **to** marks Emphatic Focus in negation. Similarly to the usage of **i/ka**, **ul/lul** and **un/nun** in this environment, **to** marks a variety of negation focus. In the case of **i/ka** and **ul/lul** it is a sort of a narrow focus on the scope of the negation. In the case of **un/nun** it is contrastive, while here it is an emphatic negation focus.

The usage of **to** with numeral expressions in negation sentences is similar to its usage with the –**ci** verb form. It is usually attached to quantity expressions (as in (6.25) or often with the numeral for 'one', as in (6.24)) and question words or words expressing unspecified entities (as in (6.26) and (6.27), respectively) in order to make them negative expressions. The negation focus of **to** in the following examples is again a kind of Emphatic Focus.

(6.24) 한번도 안 했다.

han pen to an hayssta

one time also not do.PAST.DECL

[I] have not done it even once.

(6.25) 하나에 백원도 되지 않아요.

hana ey payk wen to toyci anh.ayo

one LOC hundred won also become.SUSP not.do.POL

It is not even 100 won per one.

(6.26) 그 사람은 어디에도 없었다.

ku salam un ete ey to eps.essta

that person TOP where LOC also not.exist.PAST.DECL

That person wasn't anywhere.

(6.27) 책상 위에는 아무것도 없었다.

chayksang wi ey nun amwukes to eps.essta

desk top LOC TOP anything also not.exist.PAST.DECL

There was nothing on the table.

This usage of the *cosa* **to** is specific to its functioning in negation sentences. There are no parallels with similar constructions with the other three last-slot *cosa*, unlike the **–ci** verb form negation sentences. This usage can be explained with the specific semantic of the Emphatic Focus in negation.

6.7 Conclusions

The *cosa* **to** is used to mark phrases according to their pragmatic functions in the information structure of the sentence. It is consistently used to mark the notion of concert or commonality: it marks **Concertive Foci** as well as **Consertive Topics**. It also tends to mark Focus, especially **Emphatic Focus** and **Concessive Focus**. The realization of the pragmatic meaning is often realized with a combination of morphological, syntactic and prosodic devices.

When it comes to grammatical relations and semantic roles, the usage of **to** is unrestricted. It can mark **Subjects, Direct Objects, Indirect Objects, etc**. It can also be used to mark phrases whose semantic roles can be quite different. However, its usage in the marking of information-structure relations is restricted. If we compare it to other last-slot *cosa*, we can say that its usage is the most heavily dependent on meaning and not on syntactic factors. It formalizes the meanings of "even-ness" (both in the emphatic and the concessive versions) and "also-ness" in the information structure of the sentence by marking the respective phrases morphologically as pragmatic functions (Topics, Foci).

Chapter 7

Conclusions and Implications

7.1 Summary of Findings

My first research goal was to describe and analyze the meaning and usage of four individual phrase-final *cosa* in different grammatical constructions. I wanted to find out what they signify in concrete constructions and what kind of categories – syntactic, semantic, pragmatic – each one of them tends to signify.

The analysis and discussion in the previous chapters has led me to conclude that the four phrase-final particles that I examined can be divided into two subgroups:

1. a subgroup whose usage reflects a complex interaction of pragmatic functions like Focus (mainly unmarked Narrow Focus or Sentence Focus), semantic and cognitive factors like concrete semantic roles and notions of affectedness and control over the event, as well as syntactic factors like grammatical relations, including Subject, Direct Object, Indirect Object, Oblique (Object). In this subgroup we include **i/ka** and **ul/lul**.

2. a subgroup whose usage reflects mainly pragmatic functions like Topic and Focus, as well as pragmatic-cognitive distinctions related to Topic and Focus like the notion of contrast between two or more entities (called Contrastiveness here), the notion of "also" and "as well" (called Concertiveness here), the notion of "even", or

identifying the least likely member of a set (called Emphatic here), the notion of concession (Concessive). The *cosa* **un/nun** and **to** belong to this group.

The *cosa* **i/ka** and **ul/lul** are similar in marking Focus in Narrow Focus constructions (typically focalized Subject and focalized Direct Object, respectively) and in Sentence Focus constructions (again Subject and Direct Object, respectively).[48] While Topic tends to be marked with the same *cosa*, **un/nun**, regardless of syntactic or semantic roles of the topicalized constituent, Focus is marked according to syntactic properties. But marking is not entirely dependent on grammatical relations. Often, as we have seen in Chapters 3 and 4, marking with **i/ka** or **ul/lul** is determined by semantic roles and other notions.

The *cosa* **i/ka** marks single arguments of predicates, first arguments of activity predicates, and also second and first arguments of state predicates. It also is preferred to other *cosa* (in certain constructions where the occurrence of other *cosa* is also possible, e.g. when marking the causee in Causative constructions) when the implications is that the referent is perceived as volitional, more in control of the activity and not (or less) affected by it. It can also mark the Object of non-volitional Subjects of certain state predicates. That is why **i/ka** is associated with intransitivity and low transitivity.

Almost symmetrically to **i/ka**, **ul/lul** marks second arguments of activity predicates. It also marks second arguments of certain state predicates but only when the predicate is expressed by a processive transitive verb and the Subject is volitional. It also marks Secondary Objects, Oblique/Retained Objects in certain constructions that have them (Passive, Causative). It also marks adjuncts of intransitive verbs

---

[48] Lambrecht (1994) points out that often marking is the same in Narrow Focus and Sentence Focus constructions across languages, which makes it difficult to distinguish them sometimes.

expressing places and spatial objects, periods of time, etc. The implication is that the referents are "totally and completely affected" by the activity or the state expressed by the predicate. It is used to mark the causee in Causative constructions when the causee is perceived as more affected and less in control of the event, usually when something is performed on them or when they are adversely affected by it. The *cosa* **ul/lul** is associated with high transitivity and affectedness.

The *cosa* **un/nun** marks Topic, typically the Aboutness Topic and External Topic but its association with the notion of Contrastiveness leads to its marking Contrastive Topics as well as Contrastive Foci. At the same time it is not restricted when it comes to grammatical relations and semantic roles.

The usage of the *cosa* **to** is also related mainly to information structure. Like **un/nun**, it can mark the pragmatic functions Topic and Focus but with an added semantic restriction: **to** marks Concertive Topics, Concertive Foci, Emphatic Foci and Concessive Foci.

My second research goal was to explain the occurrence of the same *cosa* in different grammatical constructions. I aimed to find out why the same *cosa* can be used for different syntactic or pragmatic categories and different *cosa* can be used for the same syntactic or pragmatic category.

The reasons why certain *cosa* can mark different categories are complex. With *cosa* like **i/ka** and **ul/lul** one of the reasons is that they tend to mark at least one syntactic category and one pragmatic category prototypically: Subject and Focus in the case of **i/ka**, and Direct Object and Focus in the case of **ul/lul**. In Korean, Focus, unlike Topic, does not have a single *cosa* that marks it prototypically. It has two and they are the ones that mark core arguments of the predicate syntactically. Their polysemy is carried over to Focus-marking and affects marking of other syntactic

categories like verb forms and adverbials. However, External Focus is marked with **i/ka** but not with **ul/lul**. It seems that the association with prototypical categories that *cosa* mark associates them with semantic categories that tend to correspond to those categories, e.g. Subject with agency, animacy, high level of control; Direct Object with inanimacy, low level of control, affectedness, etc. That leads to semantic-influenced choice of *cosa* and specific nuance in meaning in constituent-marking in complex sentences, e.g. causative constructions, etc.

The *cosa* from the second subgroup mark only pragmatic functions but they also alternate with *cosa* from the first subgroup because, crucially, there is not Focus marker per se. Although **un/nun** seems to mark Contrast consistently and **to** seems to mark Concertiveness consistently, they are used to mark both Topics and Foci, and are also associated with specific marked Foci.

All four *cosa* can be used in types of negation foci, contributing semantically to the scope and focus of the negation.

The usage of different *cosa* for the same syntactic category can be explained with the structural properties of the *cosa* and the distribution of their duties to mark pragmatic categories. That is why a Subject can be marked with **i/ka**, **un/nun** and **to** in different construction (as in (7.1) – (7.6) below) or left as a bare noun. The same is valid for Direct Objects as well.

We saw that in sentence focus and predicate focus (whose domain is normally a clause or a predicate phrase) marking of grammatical relations is prototypical, aside form some semantic-influences marking, like LT Objects. At the same time, in unmarked and marked narrow focus, and in topic phrases – which are referring expressions – marking of grammatical relations interacts with marking of pragmatic functions in specific ways. If we are to summarize the finding from the previous chapters about this, we can have something like the following table.

	TOPIC	FOCUS	NEGATION FOCUS
Aboutness	**UN/NUN**	-	-
Contrastive	**UN/NUN**	**UN/NUN**	**UN/NUN**
Concertive	**TO**	**TO**	**TO**
Emphatic	-	**TO**	**TO**
Concessive	-	**TO**	**TO**
External	**UN/NUN**	**I/KA**	
Narrow Focus	-	**I/KA, UL/LUL**	**I/KA, UL/LUL**

We see the tendency for **un/nun** and **to** to mark contrastiveness and concertiveness, respectively, universally, while apart from these features, **un/nun** marks (unmarked) Topics, and **to** marks specific marked Foci. At the same time, we see the tendency for **i/ka** and **ul/lul** to mark Foci, while the choice between **i/ka** and **ul/lul** depends not on the type of Focus, but on syntactic, and sometimes, semantic factors.

My third research goal was to assess the effects of the interaction of syntax, semantics and pragmatics on the functional morphology of Korean and mainly the four last-slot *cosa* under scrutiny. I aimed to find out how and to what extent the occurrence of a certain *cosa* reflects the interaction of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic categories.

My findings regarding the *cosa* **i/ka** and **ul/lul** show that their every occurrence is motivated by a combination of syntactic and pragmatic factors, while the choice between the two *cosa* for marking a syntactic or a pragmatic category can be motivated by semantic considerations.

The *cosa* **i/ka** marks Subjects for their syntactic role in a sentence but that usage is conditioned by pragmatic factors associated with the information structure of the sentence. **i/ka** marks Subjects in thetic sentences (although bare nouns are also possible under certain conditions, see Chapter 3) and unmarked narrow-focus Subjects. If the focus on Subjects is marked, e.g. Contrastive Focus, Concertive Focus, Emphatic Focus, Concessive Focus, etc, the *cosa* **i/ka** will not be used. A *cosa* from the second subgroup will be used with the Subject phrase for the marked types of Focus. Also, if the Subject is the Topic in a topic-comment sentence, then it is not marked by **i/ka** but by the particle **un/nun** from the second subgroup. This is exemplified by the following sentences. They do not exhaust all possible varieties of Topic and Focus.

(7.1) 인수가 책을 읽었다.

    Inswu ka chayk ul ilk.essta.

    Inswu NOM book ACC read.PAST.DECL

    Inswu read a/the book. *Thetic (Sentence Focus)*

(7.2) 인수가 책을 읽었다.

    INSWU ka chayk ul ilk.essta.

    Inswu NOM book ACC read.PAST.DECL

    It is INSWU who read the book. *Narrow Focus*

(7.3) 인수는 책을 읽었다.

    Inswu nun chayk ul ilk.essta.

    Inswu TOP book ACC read.PAST.DECL

Inswu read books. *Aboutness Topic*

(7.4) 인수는 책을 읽었다.

INSWU NUN chayk ul ilk.essta.

Inswu TOP book ACC read.PAST.DECL

INSWU read the book. [I do not know about Chelswu.] *Contrastive Topic*

(7.5) 인수도 책을 읽었다.

Inswu to chayk ul ilk.essta.

Inswu also book ACC read.PAST.DECL

Inswu too read the book. *Concertive Topic*

(7.6) 인수도 책을 읽었다.

INSWU to chayk ul ilk.essta.

Inswu also book ACC read.PAST.DECL

Even INSWU read the book. *Emphatic Focus*

(7.1) and (7.2) have the same linear morphological structure but have different prosodic contour and signify different information structure. The same can be said about the other two pairs, (7.3) and (7.4), and (7.5) and (7.6).

The *cosa* **i/ka** marks not only Subjects but also Objects of stative verbs. That usage is motivated by semantic considerations. The marking of these Objects cannot alternate with the Direct-Object marker **ul/lul** for syntactic marking, although it can alternate with cosa from the second subgroup in order to mark information structure.

Some Subjects can be marked with Dative *cosa* instead of **i/ka**, but that marking can alternate with **i/ka**.

Similarly to **i/ka**, every occurrence of **ul/lul** marks a combination of syntactic and pragmatic factors, and as shown in Chapter 4, there are occasions, e.g. marking the causee in causative constructions, where alternation is possible between **ul/lul** and **i/ka** and the choice seems to depend on semantic considerations, rather than on syntactic or pragmatic ones.

The usage of **i/ka** to mark the Predicate Complement in **anita** constructions is related more to pragmatic (Focus) than to syntactic considerations and has to do with the specifics of the different types of negation focus. **i/ka** also marks External Focus. That could be explained with the connection between External Focus and Major Subject and the fact that **i/ka** is the only candidate for a default marker for both Focus and Subject.

The usage of **un/nun** and **to** is related with pragmatic categories but since they are not the only ones that mark pragmatic categories, there is a complex alternation between them and the *cosa* from the fist subgroup. **un/nun** marks unmarked Topic as well as Topic and Focus marked for contrast. As the default Topic marker, it also marks External Topic. **to** marks Topics and Foci marked for concertiveness, and also marks some specific marked Foci. All four *cosa* appear in varieties of negation foci.

The present study contributes to the understanding of structural and pragmatic features of Korean related to the grammar and usage of a small group of *cosa* (particles) that can only appear phrase-finally. The phrase-final *cosa* directly mark pragmatic functions on phrases. Neither of these functions can be associated with *cosa* from the other slots. The *cosa* from the third slot have specific meanings that are related to information structure but do not mark pragmatic functions directly.

The postpositions and the conjunctives from the first two slots have roles in the clause structure but are not directly related to information structure.

Because of the idiosyncratic way of marking Focus in Korean, the *cosa* that are used to mark it are differentiated on grounds of grammatical relations and semantic roles which makes the grammar and usage of *cosa* quite intriguing.

7.2 Implications for Language Pedagogy

Apart from the theoretical implications the current study can potentially have implications for the growing field of Teaching Korean as a Foreign or Second Language (TKFL). The findings of the study emphasize the importance of the understanding of the grammar and usage of phrase-final *cosa* in relation to a variety of factors coming from different levels of analysis.

I realize that it is not possible to teach theoretical linguistics or grammar descriptions in particular theoretical frameworks to KFL learners. However, most of the findings about the grammar and usage of Korean last-slot *cosa* have to do with pragmatics and semantic considerations. It has been noted regarding pragmatics instruction that "explicit instruction combined with ample practice opportunities results in the greatest gains" (Kasper and Rose (2002: 273), quoted from Brown (2011: 266)). Students always welcome practical advice.

For example, awareness of the information structure of sentences could easily mend a frequently occurring issue with beginners. When beginning learners learn new sentence patterns (grammatical constructions), they tend to keep all elements of the pattern in the sentences in the discourse, thus over-repeating topicalized phrases unnecessarily. This is especially evident in self-introductions and when they present

other people. Once they are aware which of the three basic types of sentences they are using, they will be able to drop unnecessary topic phrases and producing more naturally sounding sequences of sentences.

The full understanding and mastery of the usage of phrase-final *cosa* should not be primarily concerned with syntactic features like *case*, but should take into account the information structure of the Korean sentence with the pragmatic functions stemming from it, as well as their different kinds. Encouraging the learners to analyze the information structure of sentences will eliminate the confusion that stems from brief explanations like "The particle **i/ka** marks the Subject" or "**ul/lul** is an Accusative particle" or "**un/nun** is a/the Topic particle in Korean" that conceal as much as they reveal about the grammar and usage of the concrete *cosa*.[49] Even from the first lessons in a textbook it becomes clear that very often Subjects are marked with **un/nun** or **to** (e.g. when students introduce themselves) with no **i/ka** present, while some sentences have **i/ka** marking an Object rather than Subject (e.g. when students talk about what they like or dislike). The association with **i/ka** and **ul/lul** exclusively with grammatical relations without emphasizing the semantic roles and the information-structure implications leads to confusion and misunderstanding. At the same time it might be even easier for students to analyze the information structure of simple sentences in context than their syntactic structure. The understanding of the different types of Topics and Foci (like Aboutness Topic, Contrastive Topic, Contrastive Focus, Concertive Topic, "Even-ness" Focus, etc) will also enhance performance by facilitating learner use of *cosa* like **un/nun** and **to**.

The explanation of the *cosa* usage should also include a thorough consideration of the semantic roles determined by the logical structure of the

---

[49] In fact, a good knowledge of grammatical relations or case in a learner's native language might lead to even more confusion and misunderstanding of Korean grammar if the "explanations" are kept brief and one-sided and the native language of the learner is very different in syntactic structure from Korean, which is very often the case.

predicates, as well as the notions that are important for the usage and choice of certain *cosa* or the preference of a certain choice over another when more than one *cosa* is possible but the nuance will depend on the concrete *cosa*. A good explanation of the relevant notions that underline a particular usage will help realize why the choice may seem random sometimes. The understanding of the notions of affectedness, control over the event, volitionality, etc helps learners to better use *cosa* like **i/ka** and **ul/lul**.

The syntactic analysis of sentences including identifying grammatical relations will help not only understand the peculiarities of Korean syntax but also contribute immensely to the proficient usage of all phrase-final *cosa*. Of course, application of syntactic analysis can be effective only with certain types of learners, e.g. university or high-school students who are already aware with syntactic analyses of their own or another foreign language. A comprehensive knowledge of the types of constructions and the grammatical relations combined with the pragmatic-semantic knowledge will help learners grasp phenomena like "*cosa* stacking", "dative subjects", etc. It will also provide them with understanding why some phrases tend to be focalized with **i/ka** and others with **ul/lul**. The association of both **i/ka** and **ul/lul** on the one hand and **un/nun** and **to** on the other with information structure and pragmatic functions helps realize their structural homogeneity and restriction of cooccurence.

Another example concerns the narrow-focus constructions, which are easily identifiable in discourse. In Chapter 3 we found that the usage of the *cosa* **i/ka** to mark a Focalized Subject in narrow-focus constructions is compulsory, i.e. it cannot be omitted (and a bare noun phrase used) and it cannot be replaced by the topic marker **un/nun**. For KFL learners that would be useful because they have a way to check if the phrase is a Focalized Subject (if it is an answer to an information

question about the subject, it should be). That will mean that the usage of **i/ka** is compulsory. Similarly, learners can check of the phrase is Topic (if it could be omitted, then it is topical enough). That will mean that the usage of **un/nun** is appropriate.

Knowledge of the phrase types in Korean and their properties helps understand what the roles and functions of the *cosa* **uy** and **ita** are and why they share the structural property of being phrase-final with the other *cosa* from the last slot.

7.3 Conclusion and Future Directions

The present study acknowledges the idiosyncrasy of Korean *cosa* and shows the peculiarities of the phrase-final *cosa* that set them apart from the others. Their characteristics also help explain why their position is further away from the noun than "classical" case markers and postpositions and why they have to be phrase-final in the context of Korean constituent order and syntax.

The findings in this work also point at the complex and unique features of Korean that set it apart from other languages in terms of language typology, including from the typologically similar Japanese. Although Korean is unarguably an accusative-nominative language, it has some interesting features that allow some of its constructions to show an alignment associated with other types, in which there is a closer connection between semantic and syntactic features. On the other hand, another salient feature is the wide use of morphology marking explicitly information-structure categories (pragmatic functions). At that, the morphological markers on the nominal phrase that are responsible for this marking – the last-slot *cosa* that are

under scrutiny here – mark the combination of categories in a fascinating way that is sometimes difficult to capture. The alternations of certain *cosa* in certain complex constructions, the marginality of some of the related phenomena in the standard language, as well as the disagreement of native speakers on what some utterances actually expresse, all point at the dynamic state of the language today that is important to understand in order to provide the most adequate theoretical description.

The usage of *cosa* from the penultimate slot and thei combination with last-slot *cosa* has the potential of further clarifying the specificity and idiosyncrasy of pragmatic and syntactic marking in Korean. I recognize that further research into the grammar and usage of Korean functional morphemes from the last two slots, perhaps in different theoretical frameworks, may throw up new perspectives that will enrich our understanding of the interface between syntax, semantics and pragmatics in Korean. Future studies will need to look more directly into the complex interaction of different levels of analysis.

The awareness and the understanding of the salient characteristics of contemporary Korean are also important for applied linguistics, including the rapidly growing fields of teaching and learning Korean as a foreign language and translation and interpretations from and into Korean. Although, admittedly, quite a challenge, a well thought-over incorporation of the theoretical findings about the Korean language into the process of teaching and learning Korean as a foreign language, under a suitable form and customized for different groups of learners, can potentially bring about useful improvements in accuracy and fluency.

Bibliography

Akatsuka, Noriko M. and Susan Strauss, eds. 2002. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 10.* Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Anderson, Stephen R. 1992. *A-morphous morphology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Andrews, Avery D. 2007. The major functions of the noun phrase. In Shopen, Timothy ed. 2007a. 132-223

Baek, Eung-Jin, ed. 1988. *Papers from the Sixth International Conference on Korean Linguistics*. Seoul: International Circle of Korean Linguistics.

Bhaskararao, Peri and Karumuri Venkata Subbarao, eds. 2004. *Non-nominative subjects, Volume 2*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins

Bauer, Laurie. 1988. *Introducing linguistic morphology.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Beukema, Frits and Marcel den Dikken, eds. 2000. *Clitic phenomena in European languages.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bickel, Balthasar and Johanna Nichols. 2007. Inflectional morphology. In Shopen 2007c.

Blake, Barry J. 2001. *Case (Second edition).* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bratt, Elizabeth Owen. 1996. *Argument composition and the lexicon: lexical and periphrastic causatives in Korean.* PhD dissertation. Stanford University.

Bright, William, ed. 1993. *International encyclopedia of linguistics.* New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bresnan, Joan, ed. 1982a. *The mental representation of grammatical relations*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bresnan, Joan. 1982b. Control and complementation. In Bresnan, Joan, ed. 1982a.

Bybee, Joan. 1985. *Morphology: A Study of the Relation between Meaning and Form*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Chae Hee-Rahk. *Clitic analyses of Korean "little words"* (Internet).

Chafe, Wallace.L. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In Li, Charles N. ed. 1976.

Chang, Suk-Jin. 1996. *Korean*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Cho, Jae Ohk and Jerry Morgan. 1988. Case and coordination in Korean. In *Korean Linguistics 5*.

Cho, Young-mee. 1991. A phonological constraint on the attachment of particles. In Korea in Kuno, Susumu et al, eds.

Cho, Young-mee Yu and Peter Sells. 1995. A lexical account of inflectional suffixes in Korean. In *Journal of East Asian Linguistics 4,2*. 119-174.

Choi, Hye-Won. 1999. *Optimizing structure in context: Scrambling and information structure*. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.

Choo, Miho and Hye-Young Kwak. 2008. *Using Korean: A guide to contemporary usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Choy Hyenpay. 1972. *Wuli mal pon [The grammar of our language]*. Seoul: Cengum mwunhwa sa.

Choy Tongcwu. 1999. 'i' kyey thukswu cosa uy mwunqpephwa [Grammaticalization of i-type special particles]. In *Hyengthaylon [Morphology] 1-1*. Seoul: Pagijong Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1989 (1981). *Language universals and linguistic typology: syntax and morphology. Second edition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Croft, William. 2003 (1990). *Typology and universals. Second edition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Croft, William. 2001, 2002 reprinted with corrections. *Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic theory in typological perspective.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Daneš, Frantisek. 1966. A three-level approach to syntax. In Daneš et al, eds.

Daneš, Frantisek et al. (eds.) 1966. *Traveaux linguistique de Prague vol. I.* University of Alabama Press.

DeClerck, R. 1988. *Studies on copular sentences, clefts and pseudoclefts.* Holland: Foris.

Di Sciullo, Anne-Marie. ed. 2001. *Asymmetry in grammar.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Dixon, R.M.W. 2010a. *Basic linguistic theory Volume 1 Methodology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dixon, R.M.W. 2010b. *Basic linguistic theory Volume 2.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dowty, David. 1979. *Word meaning and Montague Grammar.* Dordrecht: Reidel.

Dryer, Matthew S. 2007. Clause types. In Shopen, Timothy, ed. 2007a.

Eckardt, Andre. 1962. *Grammatik der Koreanischen Sprache.* Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag.

Em Cengho 2000. '-ita' uy 'i' nun cosa inka? [Is the 'i' of 'ita' a particle?]. In *Hyengthaylon [Morphology] 2-2.* Seoul: Pagijong Press.

Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 1997. *The dynamics of focus structure.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 2007. *Information Structure: The Syntax-Discourse Interface.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ewen, C. and J. Anderson, eds. 1985. *Phonology Yearbook 2.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Feldman, N. I. 1960. *Iaponskii iazyk.* Moscow: Nauka.

Farley, A. et al, eds. 1986. *Papers from the parasession on pragmatics and grammatical theory.* Chicago Linguistic Society.

Foley, William A. 2007. A typology of information packaging in the clause. In Shopen, Timothy, ed. 2007a.

Folli, Rafaella, and Christiane Ulbrich, eds. 2010. *Interfaces in linguistics: New research perspectives.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gerlach, Birgit and Janet Grijzenhout, eds. 2000. *Clitics in phonology, morphology and syntax.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Gundel, Jeanette K. Universals of topic-comment structure. In Hammond et al, eds. 1988

Halliday, Michael A. K. 1967. Notes on transitivity and theme in English part II. In *Journal of Linguistics 3.* 199-244.

Halpern, Aaron. 1995. *On the placement and morphology of clitics.* Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Halpern, Aaron L. and Arnold M. Zwicky, eds. 1996. *Approaching second: Second position clitics and related phenomena.* Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Hammond, Michael, Edith Moravcsik and Jessica Wirth, eds. 1988. *Studies in syntactic typology.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Han, Jeonghan. 1999. *Grammatical coding of information structure in Korean: a Role & Reference Grammar (RRG) account.* PhD dissertation. State University of New York at Buffalo.

Harley, Heidi. 1997. If you have, you can give. In *Proceedings of the 15th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 193–208. Stanford: CSLI Publications. [Distributed by Cambridge University Press.]

Harley, Heidi. 2002. Possession and the double object construction. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook 2*: 29–68.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2002. *Understanding morphology.* London: Arnold.

He Wung. 1995. *20 seyki wuli mal uy hyengthaylon [Morphology of our language in the 20th century].* Seoul: Saym mwunhwa sa.

Heycock, Caroline. 1993. Syntactic predication in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics 2:* 167-211

Heycock, Caroline. 2008. Japanese *–wa*, *-ga*, and information structure. In Miyagawa, Shigeru and Mamoru Saito, ed. 2008. 54-83

Hiraiwa Ken. 2002. Nominative-Genitive conversion revisited. In Akatsuka and Strauss 2002.

Hong Congsen, ed. 1998. *Kuntay kwuk.e mwunqpep uy ihay [Understanding the grammar of the early modern national language].* Seoul: Pagijong Press.

Hong Congsen et al. 2000. *Hyentay kwuk.e uy hyengseng kwa pyenchen 1: um.wun, hyengthay [Formation and change of the contemporary national language 1:* phonetics and morphology]. Seoul: Pagijong Press.

Hong, Ki-Sun. 1991. *Argument selection and case marking in Korean*. Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University.

Hopper, Paul J. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Imai, T. and M. Saito, eds. 1986. *Issues in Japanese linguistics.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Inkelas, Sharon. 1989. *Prosodic constituency in the lexicon.* PhD dissertation. Stanford University.

Jackendoff, Ray S. 1976. Toward an explanatory semantic representation. In *Linguistic Inquiry 7.1:* 89-150.

Jung, Y.-J. and S. Miyagawa (2004) Decomposing Ditransitive Verbs. In *Proceedings of SICG.* 101-120.

Kaisse, Ellen M. 1985. *Connected speech: The interaction of syntax and phonology.* Orlando: Academic Press.

Kang, Young-Se. 1985. Case-marking in Korean. In Kuno, Susumu et al, eds.

Katsuki-Pestemer, Noriko. 2003. *Japanese postpositions: theory and practice.* Munich: LINCOM Europa.

Keenan, Edward L. 1976. Towards a universal definition of "subject". In Li, Charles N., ed.

Kendall, S. A. and James Hye Suk Yoon. 1986. Morphosyntactic interaction with pragmatics and sentence particles. In Farley, A. et al, eds.

Kholodovich, A. A. 1954. *Ocherk grammatiki korejskogo jazyka [An outline of the grammar of the Korean language].* Moscow: Nauka.

Kiefer, Ferenc. 1992. Case, In Bright, William ed. *International encyclopedia of linguistics.* New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kim, Bo Kyung. 2008. Identificational focus of adverbial case in Korean. In Whitman, John et al. eds.

Kim Cinhyeng. 2000. Cosa yensok kwuseng kwa hapseng cosa ey tay haye [About the composition of cosa sequences and compound cosa]. In *Hyengthaylon [Morphology] 2-1.* Seoul: Pagijong Press.

Kim, Jong-Bok and Peter Sells. 2007a. Two types of Multiple Nominative Constuction: a constructional approach. In Müller, Stefan, ed.

Kim, Jong-Bok and Peter Sells. 2007b. Korean honorification: a kind of expressive meaning. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics 16, No. 4.* 303-336.

Kim, Jong-Mi. 1986. *Phonology and syntax of Korean morphology.* PhD dissertation. University of Southern California.

Kim Kihyek. 1995. *Kwuk.e mwunqpep yenkwu: hyengtay, thongelon [Research in the grammar of the national language: morphology, syntax].* Seoul: Pagijong Press.

Kim Kihyek. 2001. *Kwuk.ehak [National language studies].* Seoul: Pagijong Press.

Kim, Kyungan. 1995. *Causativity in Korean: syntactic causative, control, and purpose.* Ann Arbor: UMI Dissertation Services.

Kim, Lan. 2008. On the ditransitive construction in Korean. In *Proceedings of the Conference of the Student Organization of Linguistics in Europe XV*, 111–133.

Kim, Lan. 2012. An Asymmetric Theory of Korean Ditransitives: Evidence from Idioms. In *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium 18-1.* University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics.

Kim, Soowon and Joan Maling. 1993. Syntactic case and frequency adverbials in Korean. In Kuno, Susumu et al, eds. 368-378.

Kim, Young-joo. 1990. *The syntax and semantics of Korean case: the interaction between lexical and syntactic levels of representation.* Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.

Kim-Renaud, Young-Key. 2009. *Korean: an essential grammar.* Routledge. London.

Kim-Renaud, Young-Key and John B. Whitman ed. 2004. *Studies in Korean syntax and semantics by Susumu Kuno with Young-Joo Kim, Soo-Yeon Kim, Young-Key Kim-Renaud, Ik-Hwan Lee, Ken-Ichi Takami, and John B. Whitman.* Seoul: Pagijong Press

Kiparsky, Paul. 1982. Lexical morphology and phonology. In Linguistic Society of Korea, eds. 3-91.

Kiparsky, Paul. 1985. Some consequences of lexical phonology. In Ewen, C. and J. Anderson, eds. 85-138.

Klavans, Judith L. 1985. The independence of syntax and phonology in cliticization. In *Language 6.* 95-120.

Ko Yengkun. 1997. *Phyocwun cwungsey kwuk.e mwunqpeplon (kaycengphan) [A grammar of standard Middle Korean].* Seoul: Thap Chwulphansa.

Ko Yengkun, Kwu Ponkwan. 2008. *Wuli mal mwunqpeplon [The grammar of our language].* Seoul: Cipmwuntang.

Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1997. *Turkish.* London and New York: Routledge.

Kuh, Hakan. 1988. The morphological status of Korean case markers. In Baek, Eung-Jin, ed. 324-338.

Kuno, Susumu. 1972. Functional Sentence Perspective: a case study from Japanese and English. In *Linguistic Inquiry 3*. 269-320.

Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Kuno, Susumu. 1978. Japanese: a characteristic OV language. In Lehmann, Winfred P., ed.

Kuno, Susumu and Young-Joo Kim. 2004. The Syntax and Semantics of *Man* and *Pakkey* Constructions. In Kim-Renaud, Young-Key and John B. Whitman, ed. 179-206.

Kuno, Susumu and Young-Key Kim-Renaud. 2004. The Position of Quantifier-like Particles in Korean. In Kim-Renaud, Young-Key and John B. Whitman, ed. 17-44.

Kuno, Susumu et al, eds. 1985. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics I.* Dept of Linguistics, Harvard University. Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Kuno, Susumu et al, eds. 1991. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics IV*. Dept of Linguistics, Harvard University. Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Kuno, Susumu et al, eds. 1993. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics V*. Dept of Linguistics, Harvard University. Cambridge, Massachusetts. Seoul: Hanshin.

Kuno, Susumu et al, eds. 1997. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics VII*. Dept of Linguistics, Harvard University. Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Kuroda, Shige-Yuki. 1972. The categorical and the thetic judgments: Evidence from Japanese syntax. In *Foundations of Language 9*. 153-85.

Kuroda, Shige-Yuki. 1986. Movement of noun phrases in Japanese. In Imai, T. and M. Saito, eds.

Kuroda, Shige-Yuki. 2004. Milsark's generalization and caregorical judgments. In *Journal of Cognitive Science 4.2*. 121-147.

Kwen Cayil. 1998. *Hankwuk.e mwunqpepsa [A history of Korean grammar]*. Seoul: Pagijong Press.

Kwon, Song-Nim and Anne Zribi-Hertz. 2008. Differential function marking, case, and information structure: evidence from Korean. In *Language 84, 2*. 258-299.

Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form: topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lapointe, Steven. 1990. Two analyses of Korean verb inflections. In No, Y. and M. Libucha, eds.

Lapointe, Steven. 1991. Korean verb markers and Autolexical Theory. In *Proceedings of FLSM 2*. University of Michigan Working Papers in Linguistics.

Larson, Richard. 1988. On the double object construction. In *Linguistic Inquiry 19*. 335–391.

Lee, Chang Hei. 1955. *Practical Korean grammar.* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Lee, Chungmin. 2002. Contrastive Topic and proposition structure. In Di Sciullo, Anne-Marie. ed.

Lee, Chungmin. 2003. Contrastive Topic and/or Contrastive Focus. In McClure, Bill, ed.

Lee, Hanjung. 2006. Parallel optimization in case systems: Evidence from case ellipsis in Korean. In *Journal of East Asian Linguistics 15*. 69-96.

Lee, Hansol H. B. 1989. *Korean grammar.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lee, I-H et al, eds. 2004. *Proceedings of the LSK 2004 International Conference.* Linguistic Society of Korea.

Lee, Iksop and S. Robert Ramsey. 2000. *The Korean language.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Lee, Keedong. 1993. *A Korean grammar on semantic-pragmatic principles*. Seoul: Hankwukmwunhwasa.

Lee, Yae-Sheik and Stephen Wechsler. 1993. *Accusative adverbials in Korean*. University of Texas at Austin, ms.

Lehmann, Winfred P. ed. 1978. *Syntactic typology: studies in the phenomenology of language.* Hassocks, Sussex:The Harvester Press.

Levin, Beth. 2008. Dative verbs: a crosslinguistic perspective. In *LingvisticæInvestigationes* 31. 285- 312.

Levin, Beth. 2010. The semantic bases of Japanese and Korean ditransitives. In *Proceedings of the 20th JK Conference*.

Lewis, Geoffrey. 2000. *Turkish grammar. Second edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Li, Charles N., ed. 1976. *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic Press.

Li, Charles N. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1976. Subject and topic: a new typology of language. In Li, Charles N., ed. 1976.

Lim Jeeya. 1997. Case alternations on the object in Korean. In Kuno et al, eds.

Lin, Yi-An. 2008. The encoding of definiteness, specificity and referentiality in Korean nominals: a Probe-Goal approach. In Whitman, John, ed.

Linguistic Society of Korea, ed. 1982. *Linguistics in the Morning Calm.* Seoul: Hanshin.

Maling, Joan. 1989. Adverbials and structural case in Korean. In *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics III.* 197-308.

Maki, Hideki and Asako Uchibori. 2008. *Ga/No* Conversion. In Miyagawa, Shigeru and Mamoru Saito, eds.

Martin, Samuel Elmo. 1954. *Korean Morphophonemics*. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America.

Martin, Samuel Elmo. 1992. *A reference grammar of Korean.* Rutland and Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle.

Mathesius, Vilém. 1928 (1964). On linguistic characterology with illustrations from Modern English. In *Actes du Premier Congrès internationale de linguists à la Haye*. 56-63. Reprinted in Vachek, J., ed. 1964. 59-67.

Mathesius, Vilém. 1929 (1983). Functional Linguistics. In Vachek, J. ed. 1983.

Mathesius, Vilém. 1947. O tak zvanem aktualnim cleneni vetnem. [On the so-called actual articulation]. In *Cestina a obecny jazykozpyt.* Praha.

Mazur, Yury N. 1960. *Koreiskij iazyk [The Korean language].* Moscow: Izdatel'stvo vostochnoi literatury.

Mazur, Yury N. 1962. *Sklonenie v koreiskom iazyke [Declension in the Korean language].* Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta.

McClure, Bill, ed. 2003. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 12.* Stanford: CSLI Publications.

McDonough, J. and B. Plunkett, eds. 1987. *Proceedings of NELS 17.* Amherst: GLSA.

Miyagawa, Shigeru and Mamoru Saito, ed. 2008. *The Oxford handbook of Japanese linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Müller, Stefan, ed. 2007. *Proceedings of the HPSG07 conference.* Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Nam Kisim. 1993. *Kwuk.e cosa uy yongpep [Usage of the cosa of the national language].* Seoul: Pagijong Press.

Nam Kisim. 2001. *Hyentae kwuk.e thongsalon [A syntax of the contemporary national language].* Seoul: Thayhaksa.

Nam Kisim and Ko Yengkun. 1985. *Phyocwun kwuk.e mwunqpeplon [A grammar of the standard national language].* Seoul: Thap chwulphansa.

Napoli, Donna Jo. 1996. *Linguistics.* New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nikol'skij, Leonid. 1962. *Sluzhebnye slova v korejskom yazyke [Functional words in the Korean language].* Moscow: Izdatel'stvo vostochnoi literatury.

No, Y. and M. Libucha, eds. 1990. *Proceedings of ESCOL 7.* Dept. of Linguistics. Ohio State University.

Oehrle, Richard T. 1976. *The grammar of the English dative alternation.* PhD dissertation. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

O'Grady, William. 1991. *Categories and Case: The Sentence Structure of Korean.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Oh Mira. 1991. The Korean copula and palatalization. In *Language Research 27, 4*. 701-724.

Palmer, F. R. 1994. *Grammatical roles and relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Park, Byung-Soo. 1988. How to handle Korean verbal suffixes; a Unification Grammar approach. In Baek, Eung-Jin, ed.

Pashkovskii, A. A. 1967. Chlenenie iaponskogo predlozheniia [The articulation of the Japanese sentence]. In Vardul', I. F., ed. 1967b.

Pavey, Emma L. 2004. *The English it-cleft construction: a Role and Reference Grammar analysis*. PhD dissertation. University of Sussex.

Payk Pongca. 1999. *Oykwuk.e loseuy Hankwuk.e mwunqpep sacen [A dictionary of Korean grammar for foreigners]*. Seoul: Yensey tayhakkyo chwulphansa.

Ramstedt, G. J. 1939. *A Korean grammar*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Reichenbach, Hans. 1947/1966. *Elements of symbolic logic.* New York: The Free Press/London: Collier-McMillan.

Schachter, Paul and Timothy Shopen 2007. Parts-of-speech systems. In Shopen 2007a. 1-60.

Schütze, Carson T. 2001. On Korean "case stacking": the varied functions of the particles *ka* and *lul*. In *The Linguistic Review 18.* Berlin and New York.

Schwartz, Linda. 1993. On the syntactic and semantic alignment of attributive and identificational constructions. In Van Valin, Jr., Robert D. ed.

Se Cengswu. 1996. *Kwuk.e mwunqpep [A grammar of the national language]*. Seoul: Han.yang tayhak.kyo chwulphan.wen (Hanyang University Press).

Sells, Peter. 1995. Korean and Japanese morphology from a lexical perspective. In *Linguistic Inquiry 26.2.* 277-325

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1973. Semantics of Japanese causativization. In *Foundations of Language 9.* 327-373.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1990. *The languages of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shin, Soo-Song. 1991. Multiple Subject Constructions in Korean reconsidered. In *Language Research 27, 4.* 725-760.

Shopen, Timothy, ed. 2007a. *Language typology and syntactic description. Volume I: Clause structure. Second edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shopen, Timothy, ed. 2007b. *Language typology and syntactic description. Volume II: Complex constructions. Second edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shopen, Timothy, ed. 2007c. *Language typology and syntactic description. Volume III: Grammatical categories and the lexicon. Second edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sohn, Ho-min. 1994. *Korean*. London: Routledge.

Sohn, Ho-min. 1999. *The Korean language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Song, Jae Jung. 2001. *Linguistic typology: morphology and syntax*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Song, Jae Jung. 2005. *The Korean language: structure, use and context*. London: Routledge.

Song, Mean-Young. 1997. Semantic interpretation of focus in Korean. In Kuno et al, eds.

Song, Seok Choong. 1988. *Explorations in Korean syntax and semantics.* Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley.

Song Sekcung [Song, Seok Choong]. 1993. *Hankwuk.e mwunqpep uy say comyeng: thongsa kwoco wa uymi haysek [New insights into Korean grammar: syntactic structures and semantic analyses].* Seoul: Cisiksan.epsa.

Sugioka, Y. 1984. *Interaction of derivational morphology and syntax in Japanese and English.* PhD dissertation. University of Chicago.

Takubo, Y., T. Kinuhata, S. Grzelak, and K. Nagai, eds. 2009. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 16.* Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Tateishi, Koichi. 1994. *The syntax of subjects.* Stanford: CSLI Publications/Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.

Urushibara, Saeko. 1991. *Ey/Eykey*: a postposition or a case marker? In Kuno et al, eds.

Urushibara, Saeko. 1997. Korean accusative case and the morphological structure. In Kuno et al, eds.

Vachek, J. ed. 1964. *A Prague School reader in linguistics*. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press.

Vachek, J., ed. 1983. *Praguiana*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins

Vallduví, Enric. 1990. *The informational component*. PhD dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.

Van Valin, Jr., Robert D. 1993. A synopsis of Role and Reference Grammar. In Van Valin, Jr., Robert D., ed.

Van Valin, Jr., Robert D., ed. 1993. Advances in Role and Reference Grammar. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins

Van Valin, Jr., Robert D. 2001. *An introduction to syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Valin, Jr., Robert D. 2005. *Exploring the syntax-semantics interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Valin, Jr., Robert D. and Randy J. LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax: structure, meaning, and function.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vardul', I. F. 1964. *Ocherki potencial'nogo sintaksisa iaponskogo iazyka [Outlines of the potential syntax of the Japanese language].* Moscow: Nauka.

Vardul', I. F. 1967a. O dvux sintaksicheskix urovniax iazyka. [On the two syntactic levels of language]. In Vardul', I. F., ed. 1967b.

Vardul', I. F., ed. 1967b. *Issledovaniia po iaponskomu iazyku [Explorations in the Japanese language].* Moscow: Nauka.

Vendler, Zeno. 1967. *Linguistics in philosophy.* Ithaca: Corenll University Press.

Vermeulen, Reiko. 2010. Non-topical wa-phrases in Japanese. In Folli, Rafaella, and Christiane Ulbrich, eds. 135-148.

Vermeulen, Reiko. 2011. On the position of topics in Japanese. In *The Linguistic Review* (to appear). Retrieved from http://www.gist.ugent.be/members/reikovermeulen (15.09.2012).

Wade, Terence. 2000 (1992). *A comprehensive Russian grammar. Second edition.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Wechsler, Stephen and Yae-Sheik Lee. 1996. The domain of direct case assignment. In *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 14.* 629-664.

Whaley, Lindsay J. 1997. *Introduction to typology: the unity and diversity of language.* London and New Delhi: SAGE Publications. Thousand Oaks.

Whitman, John et al. eds. 2008. *Inquiries into Korean linguistics III.* Seoul: Hankwuk munhwasa.

Wu Swunco. 2000. 'ita' wa 'anita' uy sangkwanseng [The relation of 'ita' and 'anita']. In *Hyengthaylon [Morphology] 2-1.* Seoul: Pagijong Press.

Yang, In-seok. 1972. *Korean syntax: case marking, delimiters, complementation and relativization.* Seoul: Paek.hapsa.

Yeon, Jaehoon. 1999. On Korean Dative-Subject Constructions. In *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics 9.* London.

Yeon, Jaehoon. 2003. *Korean grammatical constructions: their form and meaning.* London: Saffron Books.

Yeon, Jaehoon and Lucien Brown. 2011. *Korean: A comprehensive grammar.* London: Routledge

Yi Huyca and Yi Conghuy. 2001. *Hankwuk.e haksup yong emi·cosa sacen [A dictionary of endings and particles for studying Korean].* Seoul: Hankwuk mwunhwasa.

Yi Iksep. 2005. *Hankwuk.e mwunqpep [Korean grammar].* Seoul: Sewul tayhakkyo chwulphanpwu

Yi Iksep, Yi Sangek, Chay Wan. 1997. *Hankwuk uy en.e [The language of Korea].* Seoul: Sinkwu munhwasa. Seoul.

Yi Sangwuk. 2006. Cwuecek sokkyek ey tayhan caylon [Discussion of the subject genitive]. In *Hyengthaylon [Morphology] 8-1*. Seoul: Pagijong Press.

Yoon, James H. 1987. Reconciling lexical integrity with affixation in syntax. In McDonough, J. and B. Plunkett, eds.

Yoon, James H. 2004a. The independence of grammatical case from interpretive factors. In Lee, I-H et al, eds.

Yoon, James H. 2004b. Non-nominative (Major) Subjects and case stacking in Korean. In Bhaskararao and Subbarao, eds. 265-314.

Yoon, James H. 2009. The distribution of subject properties in multiple subject constructions. In Takubo et al, eds. 64-83.

Zwicky, Arnold. 1977. *On Clitics.* Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Zwicky, Arnold and Geoffrey Pullum. 1983. Cliticization vs. inflection: English *n't.* In *Language 59.* 502-13.

Zwicky, Arnold. 1985. Clitics and particles. In *Language 61*. 283-305.

Zwicky, Arnold. 1993. Clitics: an overview. In Bright, William, ed.