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Abstract

This thesis is a descriptive study of topic NP in Korean. It addresses two questions: how topic NP is related to discourse and how it is at the same time related to the clause.

Topic is what is under consideration. As such, it is something that the speech participants have in their minds (Brown and Yule (1983)). The Korean speaker systematically does not mention a topic(s), when he assumes that the hearer understands the topic(s) at that particular point in time. When a topic is introduced discourse initially, when there is a change in the topic, or when there is a contrast with another potential topic, topic is overtly expressed. It is expressed in order to maintain discourse cohesion (Halliday and Hasan (1976)). In this respect, topic NP signals a switched topic, a topic that the speaker wants the hearer to consider which he thinks the hearer may not have in mind at that particular point in time.

At the sentence level, topic NP is something that is simply there in the sentence. We assume the Extended Coherence Condition that requires a floating NP to be linked to Predicate-Argument structure of the verb (Bresnan and Mchombo (1987)). Two modes of satisfying the condition are described within the framework of Lexical Functional Grammar: the binding mechanism and the [+local] restriction (Bresnan and Mchombo (1987)). Topic NP that is understood as a core argument of the verb binds a clause-internal zero anaphor, a missing instance of the controlled Grammatical Functions, Subject, Object, etc.. Employing this mechanism, a topic NP can float outside the clause structure. Other topic NPs, such as Oblique topic NPs and Adjunct topic NPs, cannot utilize the binding mechanism since an Oblique NP and Adjunct are not a controlled Grammatical Function of the verb. Instead, Oblique topic NPs and some Adjunct topic NPs are analysed as occurring in the same clause as the verb. Hence, they are clause-internal, obeying the [+ local] restriction.
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# Phonetic Symbols in Transcription

## Consonant Phonemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Alveo-palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>t&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>k&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaspirated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p*</td>
<td>t*</td>
<td></td>
<td>k*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affricate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ch&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaspirated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ch*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fricative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liquid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r/l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nasal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>η</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Vowel Phonemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Back</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rounded</td>
<td>Unrounded</td>
<td>Rounded</td>
<td>Unrounded</td>
<td>Rounded</td>
<td>Unrounded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid</strong></td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td>æ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phonological Rules, Partial

1. \[
\text{-continuant} \quad \{ \text{+lax} \} \quad \rightarrow \quad \{ \text{+voice} \} / \{ \text{+voice} \} / \{ \text{+voice} \}
\]

2. \[
\text{-voice} \quad \{ \text{+continuant} \} \quad \{ \text{+delayed release} \} \quad \rightarrow \quad \{ \text{-release} \} \quad \{ \text{+anterior} \} \quad \rightarrow \quad \{ \text{+sonorant} \}
\]

Non-Phonemic Consonants Appearing in Transcription

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Alveo-palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Voiced</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unreleased</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affricate</td>
<td>Voiced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Semi-Vowels: y w

Combinations of Simple Vowel and Semi-Vowel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ye</th>
<th>yæ</th>
<th>yu</th>
<th>yo</th>
<th>y Modal</th>
<th>ya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wi</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>wæ</td>
<td>w Modal</td>
<td>w Modal</td>
<td>wa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abbreviations

ACC  accusative case marker  
AUX(CAUSE)  causative auxiliary verb  
AUX(DAT)  dative auxiliary verb  
AUX(INCHO)  inchoative auxiliary verb  
AUX(NEG)  negative auxiliary verb  
AUX(PASS)  passive auxiliary verb  
AUX(PROG)  progressive auxiliary verb  
AUX(RESLT)  resultative auxiliary verb  
BNOML  bound nominal  
CAUSE  causative suffix  
CL  classifier  
COM  comitative case marker  
COMP  complementizer  
CONJ  conjunctive  
CONN  verbal connective  
DAT  dative case marker  
DECL  declarative sentence ending  
DEIC  deictics  
FUT  future tense marker  
GEN  genitive case marker  
HON1  subject honorific suffix  
HON2  addressee honorifics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative sentence ending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTR</td>
<td>instrumental case marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTER</td>
<td>interrogative sentence ending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>interjection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC1</td>
<td>inner locative case marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC2</td>
<td>outer locative case marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGV</td>
<td>negative verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative case marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMR</td>
<td>nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>past tense marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>present tense marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL(HABI)</td>
<td>habitual relative tense marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL(PRES)</td>
<td>imperfective relative tense marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL(FUT)</td>
<td>irrealis relative tense marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL(PAST)</td>
<td>perfective relative tense marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>(contrastive) topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>ungrammatical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?*</td>
<td>unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??</td>
<td>very strange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>strange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>semantically anomalous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1. Aim, Scope and Organization of Thesis

The nature of two NPs, ‘NP-ūn’ and ‘NP-ī’, in Korean has been a puzzle for the last two decades. Previous studies teach us that ‘NP-ūn’ can be either ‘topic’ or ‘contrastive’ NP and, ‘NP-ī’ either ‘subject’ or ‘exclusive focus’ NP. However, whereas the discourse-functional characterization of the NPs themselves is highly suggestive, it is still an open question how the notions involving the NPs are relevant to Korean syntax. In this thesis, we shall limit ourselves to ‘topic NP’ and attempt to describe how the discourse notion of ‘topic’ is integrated into syntax in Korean.

Our basic assumption is that in order to function as part of a coherent unit of discourse, a sentence must have some built-in mechanisms specifically for maintaining discourse cohesion (Halliday and Hasan (1976), Foley and Van Valin (1984)) and topic NP is one such mechanism in Korean. Topic NP is outside the clause structure (Andrews (1985b)), but is a sentence-internal grammatical unit that connects one or more clauses with discourse. Thus, our discussion includes 1) how topic NP is related to discourse and 2) how topic NP is integrated into one or more clauses.

In the literature, ‘NP-ūn’ is generally hypothesized as the unmarked realization of topic. Thus, a sentence without ‘NP-ūn’ is traditionally regarded as the result of ‘topic NP deletion’ (Yang (1975) and elsewhere), and ‘bare NP’ (NP-Ō henceforth), a topic NP without the particle ‘ūn’, as the consequence of ‘ūn deletion’ (Hinds (1977) and elsewhere). However, such a characterization seems not only inadequate but also misleading. Analyses along traditional lines do not provide a satisfactory explanation as to why ‘NP-ūn’ and ‘ūn’ are deleted. They fail to show how ‘NP-Ō’ semantically contrasts with NP-ūn, and most importantly, they miss the fact that in a discourse-medial sentence topic NP systematically does not appear, i.e., topic is usually unexpressed.

---

1How to characterize these NPs is really a time-honoured question. According to Ko (1983), studies of the NPs can be dated back as early as 1935. Ever since Kim (1967) employed modern linguistic thought and tools, there have been annual challenges; Park-Kim (1970), Soh (1971), Im (1972), Park (1973), Seng (1974), Yang (1975), Shibatani (1976), Bak (1977), Kim (1978), Chae (1979), Chong (1980), Sohn (1981), Park (1982), Kim (1983), Cheo (1984) and Seng (1985) are just some of the linguists who have tackled problems involving the two NPs.
Topic is ‘what is under discussion’. As such, it is something that the speech participants have in their minds, rather than something that is in a given text (Brown and Yule (1983)). The Korean speaker does not express topic when he thinks that the hearer already understands the topic at that particular point in time. Thus, the unmarked realization of topic in Korean is ‘Ø’. When a topic is introduced discourse-initially, when topics change, or when there is a contrast with another potential topic, then topic NP appears in the sentence. The first claim of this thesis is that topic NP in Korean is a marked realization of topic, signalling in fact a fairly specific type of topic, let us call it **switched topic**. The difference between ‘NP-UNIX’ and ‘NP-Ø’ lies in the existence (or non-existence) of the abstract semantic value of the particle ‘UNIX’, **contrastiveness** (Im (1972), Yang (1972), Chae (1976), Sohn (1981, 1982)). ‘NP-UNIX’ signals a switched topic with a contrastive force, whereas ‘NP-Ø’ does without a contrastive force. ‘NP-Ø’ typically signals ‘newly-introduced topic’.

Consider (1). The sentences come from Lee, who argues from a discourse perspective that ‘UNIX marking’ is the preferred device for signalling the ‘thematic shift’ (Lee (1987:22)).

(1) a. uchUNIXebu w-at-tUNIXa.  
   *postman come-PAST-DECL*  
   b. uchUNIXebu-nUNIXn w-at-tUNIXa.  
   *postman-TOP come-PAST-DECL*  
   c. Ø w-at-tUNIXa.  
   *Ø come-PAST-DECL*  

"The postman has come."

(1)a-b can be translated into English as "The postman has come", and (1)c as "He has come" where ‘he’ is assumed to be ‘the postman’. As Lee correctly observes, (1)a-c are uttered in different situations. He states,

[... ] Sentence [(1)a] is the normal way to report one occurrence of the daily visit of the postman to the house. ... Sentence [(1)b] would be uttered when there are several other people to come on a given day, say, the plumber, electrician, etc. In this particular case, sentence [(1)b] means that as far as the postman is concerned, he has come. Sentence [(1)c] would be used only when the speaker and the addressee are assumed to have been waiting for the postman. ...

Lee’s observation can neatly be captured in our characterization. NP-Ø in (1)a signals non-contrastive switched topic. The speaker introduces a topic (something to be considered), assuming that the hearer does not have the topic in mind. Had he thought that the topic was in the hearer’s mind, he would have uttered (1)c. The topic signalled by NP-UNIX in (1)b ‘carries’ a contrastive force, due to the semantics of the particle ‘UNIX’. It is something that is supposed to be contrasted with other possible topics, ‘the plumber, electrician, etc.’ in Lee’s interpretation.

---

2I am indebted to Dr. Timothy Shopen for clarifying this point.

3For an explanation of ‘contrastiveness’, See Chapter 2.
From a syntactic point of view, topic NP (if there is one in the sentence) is something that is simply there, being motivated by discourse. As such, the verb does not have control over topic NP. This can easily be attested by the existence of free topic NP, a topic NP that is not understood to bear any semantic role with respect to the verb and yet is a coherent sentence-internal unit. ‘Coherent’ here means ‘linked to Predicate-Argument structure of the verb’ (Zaenen (1980), Fassi-Fehri (1984), Bresnan and Mchombo (1987)). Consider well-known sentences like (2)a-b.

(2) a. k*ochʰ-ûn chaŋmi-ga yepʰ-û-da.
   flower-TOP rose-NOM be pretty-DECL
   (Lit.) "As far as ‘flowers’ are concerned, ‘roses’ are pretty."

b. sænsôn-ûn tomi-ga choi-tʰa.
   fish-TOP red snappar-NOM be good-DECL
   (Lit.) "As far as ‘fish’ are concerned, ‘red snappars’ are good."

The verbs in (2)a-b imply one semantic role each, the ‘one that is pretty’ and the ‘one that is good’. Let us call it ‘the Carrier’ (Halliday (1985)). However, the understood Carrier role bearers of the sentences are not ‘k*ot’ (flowers) nor ‘sænsôn’ (fish), but are ‘chaŋmi’ (roses) and ‘tomi’ (red snappars), respectively. Despite this, the sentences are not non-sensical, i.e. the floating topic NPs are coherent sentence-internal units.

Nonetheless, in an actual discourse free topic NP is limited in distribution. Topic NPs are understood predominantly to bear a specific semantic role with respect to the verb. For expository purposes, we will call this kind of topic NPs a bound topic NP. Consider (3).

(3) a. suni-nûn yôghi-rûl manna-i-tʰa.
   Name-TOP Name-ACC meet-PAST-DECL
   "As far as Suni(i) is concerned, she(i) met Yôghi."

b. yôghi-nûn suni-ga manna-i-tʰa.
   Name-TOP Name-NOM meet-PAST-DECL
   "As far as Yôghi(i) is concerned, Suni met her(i)."

It is important to note that (3)a-b are not ambiguous in terms of whether the topic NPs are bound or free. They are bound topic NPs, understood respectively as the ‘one that met Yôghi’ and the ‘one that Suni met’. Hence, a problem to be explained: how is the NP that the verb cannot control understood as an argument of the verb? Although it seems reasonable to assume that, as with spatio-temporal expressions, a free topic NP (in (2)a-b) occurs whenever the sentence makes sense, the mechanism whereby a bound topic NP (in (3)a-b) acquires a specific semantic role needs a rigorous syntactic description. This is because the mechanism constitutes an important part of the Korean grammar.

---

^See Chapter 4.
For this purpose, we recognize a ‘zero anaphor’ as a regular pronominal. As is apparent from (1)c above, a zero anaphor is in an anaphoric relation with a discourse topic. We make a distinction between controlled Grammatical Functions, Subject and Object (and possibly Second Object), and non-controlled Grammatical Functions, Oblique əs. Only controlled Grammatical Functions induce ‘pronominal interpretation’ when their surface realizations are phonetically null (Bresnan (1982c) and elsewhere). In other words, we postulate zero anaphor only when the surface realization of a controlled Grammatical Function is missing. On this basis, the second claim of this thesis is that a bound topic NP can bear a specific semantic role since it binds a zero anaphor, and the understood specific semantic role is that borne by the zero anaphor.

There are other bound topic NPs, NPs in various Oblique cases with the particle ‘ûn’, as illustrated in (4)a-b.

(4) a. obûn-e-nûn  tag-ûl  kuw-ôit-t* a.

oven-LOC1-TOP  chicken-ACC  roast-PAST-DECL

"In the oven, the ‘someone’ roasted a/the chicken."

b. mûnduñi-ro-nûn  kæ-rûl  t*ûri-ôit-t* a.

stick-INSTR-TOP  dog-ACC  beat-PAST-DECL

"With the stick, the ‘someone’ beat a/the dog."

The discourse characteristics of these ‘NP-OBL-ûn’ are unclear. However, presumably because of the particle ‘ûn’, they generally bear a strong contrastive force, and in this sense they are topical. We will call them ‘Oblique topic NPs’. Our third claim is about these Oblique topic NPs. The coherence mechanism involving an Oblique topic NP is [+local] restriction (Bresnan and Mchombo (1987)), which requires the Oblique topic NP to be analysed as occurring in the same clause as the verb, i.e., it is clause-internal. Since Oblique NPs are not controlled arguments of the verb, Oblique topic NPs cannot utilise the binding mechanism. An Oblique topic NP is understood to bear a specific semantic role by virtue of the case-marker it carries (Andrews (1985b)) in conjunction with the semantics of the verb.

This thesis is organized as follows. Chapter 2 considers discourse-semantic aspects of topic NP. However, we will ignore free topic NPs and Oblique topic NPs. We review, critically, the traditional belief that ‘NP-ûn’ can be either topic or contrastive depending on whether or not the NP is anaphoric. We argue that ‘NP-ûn’ is contrastive and topical, characterizing the abstract meaning of the particle ‘ûn’ as contrastiveness. Then, employing Wierzbicka’s discussion of illocutionary purpose of topic-comment articulation (Wierzbicka (1975, 1980)), we develop the argument that topic NP signals something that the speaker wants the hearer to consider which the speaker thinks that the hearer does not have in mind at that particular point in time.
Chapters 3 and 4 consider the syntactic aspects of topic NP. Discussing topic NP in action sentences, Chapter 3 outlines our second and third claims. The chapter begins with discussions of topic NP being clause-external and of zero-anaphora in terms of Grammatical Functions. Then, the binding mechanism and its consequences are presented. We will also consider Oblique topic NP, demonstrating that an Oblique topic NP is analysed as occurring in the same clause as the main verb. That is, an Oblique NP cannot be extracted outside the clause where it occurs. Chapter 4 considers topic NP in a stative sentence, discussing further consequences of the two mechanisms proposed in Chapter 3. The chapter claims that, focusing on ‘Perception’, ‘Possession’ and ‘Ascription’ sentences, the mechanism whereby topic NP is understood as the ‘Perceiver’, the ‘Possessor’ and the ‘Carrier’ is the binding between the topic NP and the clause-internal zero anaphor. We will justify this claim by showing that these sentences are intransitive, the Perceiver, the Possessor and the Carrier role bearer being the Subject of the respective sentences. We will further argue that a topic NP in a stative sentence that is not understood to bear either of the three semantic roles obeys the [+local] restriction. Chapter 4 also includes our own interpretation of so-called ‘double-subject construction’ together with a brief discussion of the coherence mechanism involving free topic NP.

Our discussion of sentence-internal coherence mechanisms assumes the Functional Structure (henceforth F-Structure) of the Lexical Functional Grammar (henceforth LFG) developed by Bresnan and Kaplan (1982). The reader is referred to Andrews (1982a:1-6) for a brief description of the basic machinery of this Grammar. There are two reasons for this choice. First, since grammatical relations in Korean are not expressed by word order but by case markers, LFG is attractive for its assumption of grammatical functions as its theoretical basis. Second, the means for expressing anaphoric relation in LFG are as straightforward as the native speaker’s intuition of the relation. However, it should be made clear at the outset that we are not attempting to make a theoretical claim about language universals. Rather, we will be more concerned with a discussion of language specific features, leaving the broader task with other grammarians. Before embarking on the discussion, we will sketch the basics of Korean grammar so as to provide necessary background for our main discussion.
1.2. A Sketch of Korean Grammar

Korean is a case-marking verb-final language. An NP in a sentence is generally accompanied by a particle\(^5\) which shows the case status of the NP. Consequently, varying the order among NPs does not lead to differences in propositional meaning. Although the verb always occurs sentence-finally, ordering among NPs is rather free. Thus, (5)a-c below provide the same information regarding ‘who does what to whom’.

(5) a. John-i Mary-ege Fred-rül
   \(<\text{Introducer}>\)-NOM \(<\text{Introducee}>\)-DAT \(<\text{Introduced}>\)-ACC
   sogæhanda.
   \emph{introduces}

b. Mary-ege John-i Fred-rül
   \(<\text{Introducee}>\)-DAT \(<\text{Introducer}>\)-NOM \(<\text{Introduced}>\)-ACC
   sogæhanda.
   \emph{introduces}

c. Fred-rül John-i Mary-ege
   \(<\text{Introduced}>\)-ACC \(<\text{Introducer}>\)-NOM \(<\text{Introducee}>\)-DAT
   sogæhanda.
   \emph{introduces}

"John introduces Fred to Mary."

We may schematize a simple sentence with one NP in Korean as in (6). Note that NOUN stands for the head noun and VERB, the verb stem.

(6) \([N_{\cdot} N_{\cdot} [A - \text{NOUN}]_{N_{\cdot}} - B]_{N_{\cdot}} \text{VERB} - \Gamma]_S\)

Noun modifiers, if there are any, precede the head noun. They occur in position A. In position B, one finds case-markers, quantifiers and delimiters (Yang (1972)). In position \(\Gamma\) occur various verbal affixes, such as passive/causative morpheme, honorific suffix, tense marker, speech function marker, etc. We will sketch below nominal and verbal morphology with reference to the three positions A, B and \(\Gamma\). Since the verb is the only obligatory category\(^6\) in a sentence, we begin with morphemes occurring in position \(\Gamma\).

---

\(^5\)As we are calling it a particle, we are regarding a case-marker as an independent morpheme from the noun it occurs with. However, in our transcription of the examples in this thesis, we will use ‘hyphen’ between the noun and the case-marker, reflecting the spelling system in Korean.

\(^6\)Korean is well known for its extensive usage of ellipsis. Broadly stated, argument NPs are ellipsed when their pragmatic status is \emph{predictable from the context} (Chang (1984, 1986)).
1.2.1. Verbal Morphology

The position \( \Gamma \) can further be specified as in (7).

\[
(7) \text{VERB } \alpha - \beta - \gamma - \delta \\
\quad \text{-CAUSE/PASS -HONI -TENSE -VERB ENDING}
\]

There is a strict ordering among these morphemes. The mutually exclusive passive or causative suffix occurs right next to the verb stem. Then follows the honorific suffix (when the Subject of the sentence is ‘honorable’). Next comes an obligatory tense marker and, finally, an obligatory verb-ending.

Let us begin with verb-endings. Three basic speech function markers are in this category. By ‘speech function marker’, we mean the verb-ending signalling whether a given sentence is a statement, a question or a command. Consider (8). Note that the sentences here are ‘complete’ by themselves, and the missing nouns are, in principle, predictable from the context. We use variables "x, y, z" in representing the understood nouns in the gloss.

\[
(8) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. masi-n-da.} \\
\quad &\text{drink-PRES-DECL} \\
\quad &"X \text{ drinks } y." \\
\text{b. masi-ni?} \\
\quad &\text{drink-PRES-INTER} \\
\quad &"\text{Does x drink } y?" \\
\text{c. masi-ôra.} \\
\quad &\text{drink-IMP} \\
\quad &"\text{Drink } x." \\
\end{align*}
\]

The inventory of verb-endings is considerable. In position \( \delta \), one can find the three speech function markers above or morphemes signalling various speech acts such as might be translated into English as "I promise that I will do ...", "I wonder if ...", "I notice that ...", etc. (Lyons (1977b)). These markers are in complementary distribution. Consider (9).

\[
(9) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. masi-ma.} \\
\quad &\text{drink-<I promise>} \\
\quad &"\text{I promise that I will drink } x." \\
\text{b. masi-lk*}a? \\
\quad &\text{drink-<I wonder>} \\
\quad &"\text{I wonder if } x \text{ drinks } y?" \\
\text{c. masi-núngun!} \\
\quad &\text{drink-<I notice>} \\
\quad &"\text{Ah, I notice that } x \text{ drinks } y!" \\
\end{align*}
\]
Although we will not go into verb-endings in more detail, we can see here that the mechanism for expressing various speech acts in Korean is different from that in English. Whereas English depends on the syntax of the Subject NP and the finite element of the verb (Halliday (1985)) and uses various speech act verbs, Korean employs a group of morphemes (suffixed to the verb) to signal various illocutionary acts.\(^7\)

There are three tense markers; \(/-n-/\), \(/-\delta t-/\) and \(/-\text{get}-/\), which represent present, past and future tense, respectively. Consider (10).

(10) a. masi-\(n\)-\(t\)-\(a\).

\[\text{drink-PRES-DECL} \]

"X drinks y."

b. masi-\(\delta t\)-\(t\)^\(\ast\)\(a\).

\[\text{drink-PAST-DECL} \]

"X drank y."

a. masi-\(\text{get}\)-\(t\)^\(\ast\)\(a\).

\[\text{drink-FUT-DECL} \]

"X will drink y."

The actual realization of these tense markers is fairly complex. This is because of the phonological rules involved. The detailed phonological information does not, however, concern us. The inventory of the present tense markers is \(\{-n, \text{n\(n\)}n, \text{\(\emptyset\)}\}\).\(^8\) \(\emptyset\) as a present tense marker appears with a stative verb, which is basically the Korean counterpart of a predicative adjective in English. In a non-declarative sentence, \(\emptyset\) present tense marker can appear with an action verb.\(^9\) Consider (11).

(11) a. ch\(^\ast\)a-\(t\)-\(a\).

\[\text{be salty-DECL} \]

"X is salty."

b. masi-ja

\[\text{drink-<let' s>} \]

"Let's drink x."

The past and the future tense markers are likewise realized as \(\{-\text{at}, \text{\(\delta t\)}, \text{i}, \text{as}\^\ast, \text{\(\delta s\)}^\ast, \text{s}\^\ast, \text{an}, \text{\(\text{\(\text{\(\emptyset\)}\)}\))\}\).  

---

\(^7\)For more information about these verb-endings, see Suk (1976).

\(^8\)Note that \(-\text{n\(n\)}\text{n}\)- occurs after a consonant, otherwise \(-n\).

\(^9\)Note, however, that one can find \(\emptyset\) present tense marker in a declarative sentence which is uttered to an honourable addressee. See below.
Unlike the present tense marker, no verb takes $\emptyset$ as the past or future tense marker. Consider (12) and (13).

(12) a. ch*a-n-ni?
   *be salty-PAST-INTER
   "Was x salty?"

b. masi-ôn-ni?
   *drink-PAST-INTER
   "Did x drink y?"

(13) a. ch*a-get-t*a.
   *be salty-FUT-DECL
   "X will be salty."

b. masi-gen-ni?
   *drink-FUT-INTER
   "Will x drink y?"

Korean is not a language with rigorous agreement mechanisms. However, as is widely known, it has two distinctive agreement systems, whereby the verb reflects a socio-cultural feature of the Subject and the addressee. When the Subject is one that is culturally defined as honourable, the morpheme -si-, i.e., honorific suffix, is suffixed to the verb, and when the addressee is [+ honourable], the verb-ending (briefly described above) varies further. Following the tradition, we will call the former mechanism ‘Subject honorification’, and the latter ‘addressee honorification’. The question of who is honourable requires extensive socio-linguistic research to answer, but it will suffice for our purpose to say that elderly people, one’s parents, superiors in the work place, teachers, etc., are typical examples of people defined as honorable.

Consider (14). Note that HON1 in the gloss stands for Subject honorification.

---

10 The realization of the past tense marker is controlled by both preceding and following phonological environments. Firstly, if /-t-/ follows a consonant, either ‘a’ or ‘o’ is needed, but no such vowel is needed if it follows a vowel. Whether ‘a’ or ‘o’ is needed as a phonetic filler depends on the vowel of the immediately preceding syllable. If the vowel of the preceding syllable is ‘a’ or ‘o’, then ‘a’ is needed, otherwise ‘o’. Hence, -(a, o, $\emptyset$)t-. Secondly, if the past tense marker is followed by a nasal, t in -(...)t- becomes ‘n’ (cf. [...] stands for [a, $\delta$, $\emptyset$]). If it is followed by a vowel, it becomes tense $s^*$. Hence, -(...)t-, -(...)s*, -(...)n-.

11 If the future tense marker is followed by a nasal consonant, it is realized as ‘gen’, and if followed by a non-nasal consonant, as ‘get’. Otherwise, ‘ges*’.

12 A fair amount of work has been done on honorifics in Korean. For a general explanation of its mechanism, see Martin(1964). Also, see Hwang (1975) and Cho (1982).
(14)  a. masi-si-n-da.
   drink-HON1-PRES-DECL
   "Honourable x drinks y."

b. masi-n-da.
   drink-PRES-DECL
   "Non-honourable x drinks y."

c. masi-si-ni?
   drink-HON1-INTER
   "Does honourable x drink y?"

d. masi-ni?
   drink-INTER
   "Does non-honourable x drink y?"

The verbs in (14)a and c are marked with -si-, as the Subjects of the respective sentences (which are not explicit in the sentences) are [+honourable]. When the Subject is [-honourable], the verb is not marked.

Compared with Subject honorification, addressee honorification is complex. Four different speech levels are generally recognized. Thus, for instance, the declarative verb-ending has four variations which are used towards four different levels of honourable addressees. In practice, however, the levels are not clear-cut, and indeed, how to characterize them is controversial. We will not consider them in this thesis, but consider (15) to see how the mechanism works. Note that HON2 in the gloss represents addressee honorification.

(15)  a. masi-si-n-da.
   drink-HON1-PRES-DECL
   (I say to you non-honourable person)
   "Honourable x drinks y."

b. masi-mnida.
   drink-DECL(HON2)
   (I say to you ‘highly’ honourable person)
   "Non-honourable x drinks y."
c. masi-ni? 
\textit{drink-INTER} 
(I ask you \textbf{non-honourable} person) 
"Does non-honourable x drink y?"

d. masi-si-\textit{mnik}^{*}a? 
\textit{drink-HON1-INTER(HON2)} 
(I ask you 'highly' \textbf{honourable} person) 
"Does honourable x drink y?"

(15)a-b and d might give the impression that verb-endings can further be analysed into two morphemes: an addressee-exalting morpheme and a speech function marker (with the former preceding the latter). However, it is difficult to draw a line between them, and in most cases they are simply fused. Thus, it seems more realistic to view that the addressee honorification is conflated with the speech function marker. The inventory of verb-endings is thus far greater than is sketched here.

In (7), the morpheme occurring directly after the verb stem is either a causative suffix or a passive suffix. Consider (16)a-b.

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. mõg-i-\textit{dt-t}^{*}a. 
\textit{eat-CAUSE-PAST-DECL} 
"X made y eat z."
\item b. mõk-hi-\textit{dt-t}^{*}a. 
\textit{eat-PASS-PAST-DECL} 
"X was eaten (by y)."
\end{enumerate}

1.2.2. Nominal Morphology

1.2.2.1. Case Markers, Quantifiers and Delimiters

Let us look at the position B in (6). There are three kinds of morphemes which occur in this position: case-marker, quantifier and delimiter. Altogether, approximately forty morphemes can occur in this position. Below, we will sketch them in order.

There are seven case markers, as illustrated in (17).
Note that after a vowel ‘i’ (NOM), ‘ül’ (ACC), ‘uro’ (INSTR) and ‘gwa’ (COM) become ‘ga’, ‘rul’, ‘ro’ and ‘wa’, respectively.

In addition to the seven case markers above, there are three adnominal case markers, ‘üi’ (Genitive), ‘gwa’ and ‘ina’. The latter two are comparable respectively to English and and or in adnominal usage. Also, there are some double-case-markers, particularly in combination with Dative, Inner-locative and Instrumental case markers: ‘e-ro’/‘ege-ro’ (toward), ‘e-da’ (into, onto), ‘ro-s6’ (as), ‘ro-da’ (with), etc. We will ignore, however, problems concerning these complex case markers, together with the adnominal ones, since they are not important to our discussion.

These case markers, in particular, ‘il/ga’ (NOM) and ‘ül/rül’ (ACC) are not devices marking a specific semantic role of an NP, but basically marking an abstract structural role (Kang (1986)). However, we do not wish to preclude the possibility that these case markers might have some semantic value. Consider (18).

(18) a. koyaji-ga ori-rül ch*on-nun-da.
    cat-NOM duck-ACC chase-PRES-DECL
    "A/The cat is chasing a/the duck."

b. ori-ga koyaji-ege ch*ot-k*i-n-da.
    duck-NOM cat-DAT chase-PASS-PRES-DECL
    "A/The duck is being chased by a/the cat."

In a Primary Transitive (Andrews (1985b)) sentence, the Agent is marked with NOM, and the Patient with ACC. However, in a passive sentence, the promoted Patient is marked with NOM, and the demoted Agent with ‘ege’ (DAT).

---

13 Consider i).

i) a. [i-gōt-k*wa chō-gōs]-ül chu-se-yo.
   [this-thing-and that-thing]-ACC give-HON1-IMP(HON2)
   "Give me this and that."

b. [i-gōs-ina chō-gōs]-ül sa-se-yo.
   [this-thing-or that-thing]-ACC buy-HON1-IMP(HON2)
   "Buy this or that."
Verbs like ‘tô-da’ (to become) and ‘ani-da’ (Negative verb),¹⁴ etc. take NP-NOM as a kind of ‘predicate’, which in English grammar would be called a Subject complement. Consider (19).

(19) a. chêlsu-ga pyônhosa-ga tô-ôt-t’a.

_Name-NOM lawyer-NOM become-PAST-DECL_

"Chêlsu has become a lawyer."

b. suni-ôi mar-i nojdam-i

_Name-GEN words-NOM joke-NOM ani-ôt-t’a.

_NegativeVerb-PAST-DECL_

"Suni’s words were not a joke."

Similarly, an Object complement can be expressed as NP-ACC. Consider (20).

(20) a. mabôps’a-ga suni-rûl tor-ûl mandûr-ôt-t’a.

_sorcerer-NOM Name-ACC rock-ACC make-PAST-DECL_

"The sorcerer made Suni (into) a rock."

b. wañ-i suni-rûl anë-rûl sam-ai-t’a.

_king-NOM Name-ACC wife-ACC choose(?)-PAST-DECL_

(Lit.) "The king chose Suni a wife."

"The king selected(?) Suni as his wife."

Incidentally, NP-ACC often expresses the ‘path’ of an action expressed by a verb of motion. Consider (21).

(21) a. chêlsu-ga kir-ûl kôn-nûn-da.

_Name-NOM road-ACC walk-PRES-DECL_

"Chêlsu is walking on the road."

b. pihêngi-ga hanûr-ûl na-n-da.

_airplane-NOM sky-ACC fly-PRES-DECL_

"An airplane is flying in the sky."

Also, ‘NP-ûl’ can express the ‘purpose’ of the action denoted by a verb of motion. Consider (22).

---

¹⁴Verbs exemplified in the text may be called ‘citation’ form (Lukoff (1986)). They are in the form of a dictionary entry. The hyphen represents the boundary between the stem and the declarative ending which is customarily used in Korean dictionaries.
Thus, although they are generally structural case markers, it seems that 'i/ga' (NOM) and 'ül/rül' (ACC) might be 'deep' case markers as well as (21)-(22) suggest.

The Dative case marker 'ege' contrasts with the Inner-locative case marker 'e' in an interesting way. Consider (23).

(23) a. ömma-ga suni-ege chʰæg-ül chu-n-da.
    \textit{mum-NOM Name-DAT book-ACC give-PRES-DECL}
    "Mum is giving a book to Suni."

a. ömma-ga k*ochʰ-e mur-ül chu-n-da.
    \textit{mum-NOM flower-LOC1 water-ACC give-PRES-DECL}
    "Mum is giving water to the flower(s)" or "Mum is watering the flower(s)."

As is shown, 'ege' occurs with an animate NP, and 'e' with an inanimate NP. Thus, it seems possible to regard 'ege' and 'e' respectively as animate Dative case marker and inanimate Dative case marker. However, since 'e' contrasts with 'esō' (Outer-Locative case marker), we shall retain the label 'Inner-locative' for 'e'.

Consider (24).

    \textit{Name-NOM oven-LOC1 chicken-ACC roast-PRES-DECL}
    "Suni is a chicken in the oven."

a'. * suni-ga obūn-esō tag-ül kum-nūn-da.
    \textit{Name-NOM oven-LOC2 chicken-ACC roast-PRES-DECL}
    (intended to mean) "Suni is roasting a chicken in the oven."

b. * suni-ga puōkʰ-e tag-ül
    \textit{Name-NOM kitchen-LOC1 chicken-ACC}
    kum-nūn-da.
    \textit{roast-PRES-DECL}
    (intended to mean) "Suni is roasting a chicken in the kitchen."

b'. suni-ga puōkʰ-esō tag-ül kum-nūn-da.
    \textit{Name-NOM kitchen-LOC2 chicken-ACC roast-PRES-DECL}
    "Suni is roasting a chicken in the kitchen."
NP-LOC1 often expresses the location of the Theme. In contrast, NP-LOC2 denotes the location wherein the whole action or happening comes about.

However, there are cases where the status of location is not clear, so that both NP-LOC1 and NP-LOC2 can be used. Consider (25).

(25) ője kænbôra-e/esô sanp*ur-i
    yesterday Canberra-LOC1/LOC2 mountain fire-NOM
    nai-t*a.

    happen-PAST-DECL

"A bush fire broke out in Canberra yesterday."

When the verb has a sense of directionality, NP-LOC1 bears the Goal role, and NP-LOC2 the Source role. Consider (26).

(26) a. ch^ðlsu-ga hakk*yo-e ka-n-da.
    Name-NOM school-LOC1 go-PRES-DECL
    "Ch^ðlsu is going to school."

a'. ch^ðlsu-ga hakk*yo-e o-n-da.
    Name-NOM school-LOC1 come-PRES-DECL
    "Ch^ðlsu is coming to school."

b. ch^ðlsu-ga hakk*yo-esô ka-n-da.
    Name-NOM school-LOC2 go-PRES-DECL
    "Ch^ðlsu is going from school."

b'. ch^ðlsu-ga hakk*yo-esô o-n-da.
    Name-NOM school-LOC2 come-PRES-DECL
    "Ch^ðlsu is coming from school."

Returning to predicative NPs above, ‘Subject or Object complements’ can also be expressed by ‘NP-uro’ (NP-INSTR). Consider (27).

(27) a. őrûm-i mul-lo tø-øt-t*a.
    ice-NOM water-INSTR become-PAST-DECL
    "The ice has become water."

b. suni-ga kû-koa-rul yanja-ro
    Name-NOM DEIC(the)-orphan-ACC adopted son-INSTR
    sam-at-t*a.

    choose(?) PAST-DECL

"(?) Suni chose the orphan as her adopted son."
"Suni adopted the orphan."
Indeed, NP-INSTR expresses a wide range of Semantic Roles. Consider (28).^^

(28) kim-\textsuperscript{s}i-ga \textit{\öje} hoju-\textit{ro}
\textit{Name-Mr.-NOM yesterday Australia-INSTR}
t\textit{æsa-\textit{ro} KAL-\textit{ro} t\textsuperscript{\öna\textit{t}a}.
\textit{ambassador-INSTR KAL-INSTR leave-PAST-DECL}
"Mr. Kim left for Australia as ambassador by KAL yesterday."

As can be seen, NP-INSTR can be Directional as well as predicative and Instrumental.

The difference between an NP-LOC1 bearing the Goal role and a Directional NP-INSTR seems to be subtle. The former tends to emphasize the ‘arrival point’, and the latter the sense of ‘direction’. Consider (29).

(29) a. suni-ga k\textsuperscript{\öch\textit{h}-e} son-\textit{ü} t\textit{æ}-n-da.
\textit{Name-NOM flower-LOC1 hand-ACC touch(\?)PRES-DECL}
"Suni puts her hand to (touches) the flower."

a'. * suni-ga k\textsuperscript{\öch\textit{h}-\textit{üro} son-\textit{ü} t\textit{æ}-n-da.
\textit{Name-NOM flower-INSTR hand-ACC}
touch(\?)PRES-DECL
(intended to mean) "Suni puts her hand to (touches) the flower."

b. pi\textsuperscript{hængi-ga} pukch\textsuperscript{\ög-\textit{üro} nar-a ka-n-da.
\textit{airplane-NOM north-INSTR fly-CONN go-PRES-DECL}
"The/An airplane is flying to the north."

b'. * pi\textsuperscript{hængi-ga} pukch\textsuperscript{\ög-e nar-a ka-n-da.
\textit{airplane-NOM north-LOC1 fly-CONN go-PRES-DECL}
(intended to mean) "The/An airplane is flying to the north."
(acceptable if NP-LOC1 is the location of the Theme)
"The/An airplane is flying in the northern part of the sky."

\textsuperscript{15}Examples come from Shin (1984) with some modification.
'NP-wa' as a NP-COM is often translated into English as 'with NP'. It contrasts, however, with an NP with adnominal 'wa'. Consider (30).

(30) a. suni-ga chʰɔl-su-wa iyagiha-n-da.
    Name-NOM Name-COM talk-PRES-DECL
    "Suni is talking with Chʰɔl-su."

b. [suni-wa chʰɔl-su]-ga iyagiha-n-da.
    [Name-and(?) Name]-NOM talk-PRES-DECL
    "Suni and Chʰɔl-su are talking."

In the situation described by (30)a it is very likely that ‘Suni’ and ‘Chʰɔl-su’ are ‘talking to each other’. In contrast, (30)b appears to refer to a situation where ‘Suni’ and ‘Chʰɔl-su’ are ‘talking, perhaps in turn, to other unexpressed people’. Let us now go onto other categories occurring in the position B in (6) above.

Quantifiers include particles like ‘sʰik’ (as a unit), ‘kʰiri’ (between two animate beings), ‘man’ (only), ‘chʰum’ (sort), ‘jochʰa’ (even), etc. These quantifiers are difficult to gloss in English in a sensible way, and they do not seem to have been widely studied in the literature. Consider some examples.

(31) a. nôhi-kʰiri nor-ara.
    you(pl)-(?) play-IMP
    "Play among yourselves!"

b. chʰɔl-su-jochʰa suni-rul miw-ð
    Name-even(?) Name-ACC hate-CONN
    ha-n-da.
    AUX(do)-PRES-DECL
    "Even Chʰɔl-su hates Suni."

The particle ‘mada’ (every/each) can be included in this category. It is used in some environments where an English speaker would use ‘every’. However, ‘mada’ and ‘every’ are not fully compatible. We are not at present prepared to sketch ‘mada’, but consider i).

i) a. haksʰe-dûr-ûn chô-mada chʰwimi-ga
    student-PL-TOP self-every(?) hobby-NOM
    tarû-da.
    be different-DECL
    (similar to) "The students, everybody is different in their hobbies."

b. saram-dul-mada suni-rul pius-t³-a.
    person-PL-every(?) Name-ACC despise-PAST-DECL
    (similar to) "Everybody despised Suni."

See, however, Lee (1979a, 1979b).
c. suni-man  haks*әŋ-i-da.

*Name-only student-PRED-DECL

"Only Suni is a student."

d. se-saram-s*ik  nao-se-yo.

*three-person-(?) come out-HON1-IMP(HON2)

"Please come out (here) three by three."

Particles like ‘үn’ (contrastive (known as topic marker)), ‘do’ (inclusive(?)), ‘ya’ (emphatic(?)), etc. bear presuppositional meaning, and for this reason Yang (1972) calls them delimiters. Note that ‘үn’ becomes ‘nүn’ after a vowel. Consider (32).

(32) a. chʰольsu-nүn  haks*әŋ-i-da.

*Name-TOP student-PRED-DECL

"As far as Chʰольsu is concerned, he is a student."

b. chʰольsu-do  haks*әŋ-i-da.

*Name-INCL student-PRED-DECL

"Chʰольsu, as well as the one we’ve talked about, is a student."

c. chʰольsu-ya  haks*әŋ-i-da.

*Name-EMPH student-PRED-DECL

"I am sure Chʰольsu is a student."

The particle ‘үn’ is the one generally known as topic marker, and is one of the main concerns of this thesis. The particle ‘do’ is often translated into English as ‘also’, ‘even’ and ‘too’. It appears that these two particles are closely related with discourse presupposition (Givón (1978, 1979, 1982), Lee (1987)). The speaker, wanting to make a comment, appears to use the former when he selects a particular topic among the established set of discourse topics, whereas the latter is used when the speaker wants to ‘add’ a particular topic (which is not necessarily a newly introduced one) to the established topics. Compared with ‘үn’ and ‘do’, the particle ‘ya’ could be characterized more properly as a modal particle (Jackendoff (1972)). It is the particle that the speaker uses when he wants to show his certainty about a particular NP. We are not, however, going into any more detail about ‘do’ and ‘ya’.

Overall, inventories of position B drawn above in (6), which we repeat here, are rather complex.

(33)  s\[ N*: [ A - NOUN ]_N* - B ]_N*,  VERB - Γ ]_s

We may detail the position B in (33) as (34).
Notice that case markers, except for ‘i/ga’ (NOM) and ‘ul/rul’ (ACC), precede a quantifier. This is illustrated in (35).

(35) a. k*och\(^h\)-e-man mur-ul chu-ôra.
   flower-DAT-only water-ACC give-IMP
   "(Lit.) Give water only to flowers."
   a’. * k*och\(^h\)-man-e mur-úl chu-ôra.

b. pur-ùn sôur-esô-man na-i-t*a.
   fire-TOP Seoul-LOC-only happen-PAST-DECL
   "Fire broke out only in Seoul."
   b’. * pur-ùn sôur-man-esô na-i-t*a.

c. ch\(^h\)olsu-nün suni-wa-man iyagiha-n-da.
   Name-TOP Name-COM-only talk-PRES-DECL
   "As for Ch\(^h\)olsu, he talks only with Suni."
   c’. * ch\(^h\)olsu-nün suni-man-wa iyagiha-n-da.

By contrast, ‘i/ga’ (NOM) and ‘ul/rul’ (ACC) follow a quantifier. Consider (36).

(36) a. ch\(^h\)olsu-man-i yöghi-rul cho-a
   Name-only-NOM Name-ACC like-CONN
   ha-n-da.
   AUX(do)-PRES-DECL
   "Only Ch\(^h\)olsu likes Yöghi."
   a’. *ch\(^h\)olsu-i-man yöghi-rul cho-a ha-n-da.

---

18In fact, ‘uro(instrumental)’ is interesting. It can either precede or follow a quantifier. Consider i).

i) a. kù-wiwinha-nün haksæg-u\(^h\)ro-man
   the-committee-TOP student-only-INSTR
   kusönj-da-ô it-t*a.
   structure-become-CONN AUX(STATE)-DECL

b. kù-wiwinha-nün haksæg-man-u\(^h\)ro kusönj-da-ô it-t*a.
   "The committee is composed of only students."

There may be a subtle semantic difference between the two variations, but it is difficult to identify. i)a is said to have a true instrumental reading, whereas i)b, a predicative reading (Shin (1984)).
b. chʰōlsu-nūn ཡོགསྟྒྱ མིན man-ūl cho-a  
Name-TOP Name-only-ACC like-CONN  
ha-n-da.  
AUX(do)-PRES-DECL  
"As for Chʰōlsu, he likes only Yོགསྟྒྱ."  
b'. *chʰōlsu-nūn ཡོགསྟྒྱ-rūl-man cho-a ha-n-da.  

Finally, as with NOM and ACC, the three delimiters ‘ǔn’ (contrastive), ‘do’ (inclusive) and ‘ya’ (emphatic) follow the quantifier. Consider (37). Because there is a semantic incompatibility between ‘man’ (only) and ‘do’ or ‘ya’, we will use instead two other quantifiers, ‘jochʰa’ (even) and ‘chʰūm’ (sort) in (37)b and (37)c.

(37)  
a. chʰōlsu-man-ǔn yum-gi-ul cho-a  
Name-TOP Name-only-ACC like-CONN  
ha-n-da.  
AUX(do)-PRES-DECL  
"(Lit.) As for only Chʰōlsu, he likes Yོགསྟྒྱ."  
a’. * chʰōlsu-nūn-man yum-gi-rūl cho-a ha-n-da.  

b. chʰōlsu-nūn suni-ege-jochʰa-do kū-iyagi-rūl  
Name-TOP Name-DAT-even-also DEIC(the)-story-ACC  
ha-e-i-ᵗᵃ.  
say-PAST-DECL  
"As far as Chʰōlsu is concerned, he told the story even to Suni."  

c. kū-göt-chʰūm-iya munje ḍp-tᵃ.  
that-thing-sort(?)-EMPH problem NEGV-DECL  
"That kind of thing is not a problem at all."  
c’. * kū-göt-iya-chʰūm munje ḍp-tᵃ.  

1.2.2.2. Noun Modifiers  

Let us go onto noun modifiers occurring in position A in (6). Three types of noun modifiers can be distinguished: deictics, adnominal NPs and relative clauses. Deictics can be one of the three optional demonstratives: ‘i(this<near me>)’, ‘kū(that<near you>/the)’ and ‘chʰð(that<far from us>)’. Consider (38)
Adnominal NPs can further be divided into two sub-types: an NP with the genitive case marker and an NP simply juxtaposed to the head noun to form a complex noun. Consider (39).

(39)  

a. hoju-ui kyŏngch'i

_Australia-GEN scenery_

"the scenery of Australia"

b. hoju kugnip tāhak

_Australia Nation establishment University_

"the Australian National University"

Relative clauses in Korean are head-final. There is no relative pronoun involved and there is no way of showing the case of the relativised NP with respect to the verb of the relativised clause, i.e., Korean relative clauses use gapping strategy. Interpreting the relativised NP’s case is virtually the same as identifying the missing NP in the relative clause.

The verb of a relativised clause is suffixed with either of the four morphemes: ‘-dŏn’, ‘-n’, ‘-nŭn’ and ‘-l’.19 These suffixes express relative tenses (Comrie (1976, 1985), Noonan (1985)) as well as mark a clause as a relative clause. The first three express, respectively, habitual tense, perfective tense and imperfective tense with respect to the tense of the main verb. If we characterize these three as ‘realis’, ‘-l’ can be regarded as ‘irrealis’, i.e., it shows that the process denoted by a relative clause hasn’t happened yet with respect to the tense of the main verb. We will gloss them relative habitual, relative past, relative present and relative future, respectively. Consider (40).

(40)  

a. [suni-ga ik-t*ŏn] chŏng-i yŏgi

_Name-NOM read-REL(HABI) book-NOM here_

it-t*a.

_is(exist)-DECL_

"Here is the book which Suni _used to read._"
b. [suni-ga  ilg-ùn]  chʰæg-i  yǒgi  
Name-NOM  read-REL(PAST)  book-NOM  here  
it-tʰa.  
is(exist)-DECL  
"Here is the book which Suni read."

c. [suni-ga  in-nùn]  chʰæg-i  yǒgi  
Name-NOM  read-REL(PRES)  book-NOM  here  
it-tʰa.  
is(exist)-DECL  
"Here is the book which Suni reads."

d. [suni-ga  ilg-ú]  chʰæg-i  yǒgi  
Name-NOM  read-REL(FUT)  book-NOM  here  
it-tʰa.  
is(exist)-DECL  
"Here is the book which Suni will read."

Korean lacks adjectives as a formal grammatical category. An English adjective in attributive usage\(^{20}\) will be realized as either an adnominal NP or as a relative clause. For instance, "a pretty woman" in Korean will be as follows.

(41) a. mimo-ūi  yǒja  
pretty looks(noun)-GEN  woman  
(Lit.) "woman of pretty looks"

b. yepʰú-n  yǒja  
be pretty-REL(PAST)  woman  
(Lit.) "woman who is pretty"

Noun modifiers inside an NP do not carry information about the case of their head noun. That is, a noun modifier is not case marked following its head noun as it is, for example, in German and Greek. It thus seems better to posit a layer, as indicated in (6) (and (33)) above, inside which are noun modifiers and the head noun, and outside which, a case marker. Consider (42).

(42) [[chʰolsu-rúl  *æri-n]  kú-ai]-rúl  suni-ga  
Name-ACC  hit-REL(PAST)  DEIC(the)-boy-ACC  Name-NOM  
kʰojib-ót-tʰa.  
pinch-PAST-DECL  
"Suni pinched the boy who hit Chʰolsu."

An NP often has more than one kind of noun modifier, and can in principle have all kinds

\(^{20}\) As already stated, an English adjective in predicative usage will appear as a stative verb in Korean.
simultaneously. Hence, a question of ordering arises. Perhaps, we can say the same thing here as we did about ordering among NPs. That is, as long as the head noun occurs in the final position, the ordering of noun modifiers, except for juxtaposed adnominal NPs, is relatively free. However, there does seem to be a preferred order among them; i.e., "heavy one first". A relative clause tends to precede an adnominal NP, and an adnominal NP, a deictic. Consider (43).

(43) John-i saraŋha-nun mimo-ŭi kū-yŏjaJ[N]
    John-NOM love-REL pretty looks-GEN DEIC(the)-woman
    ...
    ...
    "(Lit.)the woman of pretty looks whom John loves ..."

1.2.3. Verbal Connectives

The final point we wish to add to our sketch of Korean grammar is 'verbal connectives'. They are morphemes involved in verbal linkage, which may be divided into three sub-types: verb serialization (Foley and Van Valin(1984)), 'auxiliary and main verb linkage' and conjunction. We will gloss the morphemes involved in verb serialization and auxiliary and main verb linkage as CONN, and those involved in conjunction as CONJ.

As in many other V-final languages, verb serialization is a pervasive phenomenon in Korean. CONNs involved in the serialization occur right after the verb stem, in the position \( \alpha \) in (7) which we repeat here.

(44) \( \text{VERB} \ -\alpha \ -\beta \ -\gamma \ -\delta \)
    \( \text{-CAUSE/PASS} \ -\text{HON1} \ -\text{TENSE} \ -\text{VERB ENDING} \)

These CONNs typically occur between two or more verbs in coordinate relation to form a complex verb. Consider (45).

(45) a. horan-i-ga tʰok*urul [chab-a môg]-ôi-t'a.
    tiger-NOM rabbit-ACC [catch-CONN eat]-PAST-DECL
    "The tiger caught (the rabbit) and ate the rabbit."

b. tʰok*ur-ga horan-ege [chab-a
    rabbit-NOM tiger-DAT [catch-CONN
    môk]-hi-ôi-t'a.
    eat]-PASS-PAST-DECL
    "The rabbit was 'catch and eat'-en by the tiger."
b'. * tʰokʰ-i-ga horagi-ege [cháp-hi-ðo
rabbit-NOM tiger-DAT [catch-PASS-CONN
mōk-hi]-ōt-tʰa.
eat-PASS]-PAST-DECL
(intended to mean) "The rabbit was caught and eaten by the tiger."

Incidentally, (45) suggests these connectives appear to be a means of combining verbs in the lexicon.

In a similar manner to the above serialization, the main verb and the auxiliary verbs can be connected. The function of these auxiliary verbs is basically to add some additional aspectual meaning to the main verb. Consider (46).

(46) a. namu ipʰ-i tʰōrōji-go it-tʰa.
tree leaf-NOM fall down-CONN AUX(PROG)-DECL
"Tree leaves are falling down."
b. namu ipʰ-i tʰōrōji-ð it-tʰa.
tree leaf-NOM fall down-CONN AUX(RESLT)-DECL
"Tree leaves are fallen down."
c. namu ipʰ-i tʰōrōji-ji an-nun-da.
tree leaf-NOM fall down-CONN AUX(NEG)-PRES-DECL
"The tree leaves do not fall down."
d. suni-ga namu ipʰ-ul tʰōrōji-ge
Name-NOM tree leaf-ACC fall down-CONN
hæ-i-tʰa.
AUX(NEGATION)-CAUSE-PAST-DECL
"Suni made the tree leaves fall down."

Note that (46)d is a morphological causative as opposed to the lexical causative introduced at the beginning of this section.

However, the position of a CONN occurring with an auxiliary verb appears to be between -α and -β in (44). Consider (47).

(47) a. abōji-ga chʰæksʰ-an-ul [nop-hi-ji
father-NOM table-ACC [be high-CAUSE-CONN
an]-usi-ōt-tʰa.
AUX(NEGATION)]-HONI-PAST-DECL
"Father did not ‘heighten’ the table."
a'. aboji-ga chʰæksʰaŋ-ǔl [nop-chʰi

father-NOM table-ACC [be high-CONN

an]-hi-si-ôt-ʰa.

AUX(NEG)]-CAUSE-HONI-PAST-DECL

(intended to mean) "Father did not ‘heighten’ the table." (but impossible to process)

b. aboji-ga suni-ege chʰæksʰaŋ-ǔl

father-NOM Name-DAT table-ACC

[nop-hi-ô chu]-si-ôt-ʰa.

[be high-CAUSE-CONN AUX(DAT)]-HONI-PAST-DECL

"Father ‘heightened’ the table for Suni."

Finally, CONJ occurs after the slot γ in (44) without a speech function marker. Consider (48).

(48) a. suni-ga tochʰakʰa-sʰ-ũna,

Name-NOM arrive-PAST-CONJ(but) ...

"Suni arrived, but ..."

b. suni-ga tochʰakʰa-i-kʰo,

Name-NOM arrive-PAST-CONJ(and) ...

"Suni arrived, and ..."

So far we have sketched a small part of Korean grammar. With this sketch as background, we will begin our discussion of topic NP in the Korean sentence. In the next chapter, we will consider discourse-semantic aspects of topic NP in Korean.
Chapter 2
Switched Topic and Topic NP

2.1. Introduction

Having sketched the necessary basics of Korean grammar, we will discuss in the following chapters how the discourse notion of topic is integrated into syntax in Korean. This thesis claims that topic NP is a sentence-internal but clause-external grammatical unit which connects one or more clauses with discourse. Consequently, our discussion involves two distinct mechanisms, one of which relates topic NP to discourse and the other which relates topic NP to one or more clauses. In this chapter, we will consider the former mechanism.

We have two objectives in this chapter. Our main objective is to justify the claim that topic NP signals switched topic. Topic NP contrasts with ‘∅’, i.e., no overt topic NP. However, ∅ is not a deleted category but is simply zero. This follows from the nature of the discourse notion of topic and the relevant part of the Korean grammar. Topic is ‘what is under consideration’ and, as such, it is in the speech participants’ mind (Brown and Yule (1983)).\(^1\) Korean grammar, compared with English grammar (cf. Li and Thompson (1976)), systematically allows the speaker not to express a topic(s), when he thinks that the hearer has the topic(s) in mind at that particular point in time. The question is, then, when and why a topic appears in the sentence, rather than when and why it does not appear. The simple answer is that a topic is overtly expressed when the speaker thinks that the hearer may not have the topic in mind at that particular point in time, and the overt marking is needed in order to maintain discourse cohesion. In this sense, topic NP in Korean signals a switched topic.

\(^1\)Brown and Yule (1983:68) state, "[...] it is speakers and authors who have topics, not texts."
In developing our argument, we will also demonstrate that 'NP-ŭn' signals switched topic with a contrastive force and 'NP-Ø' without a contrastive force. We understand the difference between the two topic NPs, i.e., 'NP-ŭn' and 'NP-Ø', lies in the nature of the particle 'ŭn'. We will propose that the particle might be a deictic category, or a presupposition trigger (Levinson (1983)), with the semantic value contrastive. That is, it signals that the referent of the NP has been selected from among the group of referents in the speaker's mind which the speaker assumes the hearer is aware of. Due to the semantics of 'ŭn', 'NP-ŭn' represents a contrastive switched topic, and 'NP-Ø' a non-contrastive switched topic. 'NP-Ø' typically signals a discourse initial topic.

Two points should be made clear here. First, our discussion of the discourse-semantic aspects of topic NP may be partial. We do not consider in this chapter free topic NPs and Oblique topic NPs since the primary goal of this thesis is to describe how topic NP, an NP which the verb does not control, is understood as an argument of the verb. Second, the distinction between 'NP-Ø' and 'NP-ŭn' is valid only in spoken Korean (Lee (1987)). 'NP-Ø' as topic NP is not acceptable in written Korean (except where a given written discourse is meant to be a 'graphic' representation of spoken discourse, as in a novel). However, 'NP-Ø' should not be shunted aside as the informal/colloquial version of 'NP-ŭn', since in spoken discourse these two contrast semantically, as was claimed above and will be demonstrated below.

This chapter is organized as follows. Section 2.2 reviews, taking the notion of topic for granted, the common belief that 'NP-ŭn' has two variations: topic NP and contrastive NP, and argues that 'NP-ŭn' is topical and at the same time contrastive. Comparing 'NP-Ø' with 'NP-ŭn', we will argue that this contrastive meaning comes from the semantics of the particle 'ŭn'. As the term 'contrastive' can be misleading, we will devote some pages to clarifying it. Section 2.3 presents the argument that the label topic in the claim that 'NP-ŭn' and 'NP-Ø' are topic NPs means in fact switched topic. There, employing Wierzbicka's discussion of illocutionary purpose of topic-comment articulation (Wierzbicka (1975, 1980)), we argue that topic NP in Korean represents a topic that the speaker wants the hearer to consider which he assumes the hearer may not have in mind at the particular point in time.

---

2 That is, topic marked NPs that are not understood to bear a semantic role with respect to the verb. The NP of a free topic NP is predominantly a generic NP.

3 That is, Oblique case-marked NPs with the particle 'ŭn'. We will, however, briefly discuss their discourse-semantic aspects in the next chapter.
2.2. NP-ǔn and Contrastive Force

Problems arising from ‘NP-ũn’ begin with a pair of sentences like (49).

(49) a. suni-nũn hakk*yo-e ka-n-da.
    \[ \text{Name-TOP school-LOC1 go-PRES-DECL} \]
    "Suni goes to school."

b. suni-ga hakk*yo-e ka-n-da.
    \[ \text{Name-NOM school-LOC1 go-PRES-DECL} \]
    "Suni goes to school."

Here, (49)a-b are translated into English as the same sentence. In particular, ‘Suni’ appears as the subject regardless of whether she is marked with ‘nũn/ũn’ or ‘ga/i’.

Naturally, the question arises, "what are the differences between the two NPs, ‘Suni-nũn’ and ‘Suni-ga’?"

A well-known hypothesis is that ‘NP-ũn’ is *topic*, and ‘NP-i’ *subject* (Kim (1967), Song (1967), Soh (1971), Yang (1975), Bak (1981)). By topic here, one means presumably the ‘something that is spoken about in a sentence’. Consequently, (49)a will be a statement about ‘Suni’. Assuming this is valid for the moment, the term ‘subject’ above would have to be qualified somehow as the subject of an English sentence is generally topic exactly in the above sense (Givón (1976:154)). Thus, the term **neutral-subject** is introduced, which was originally proposed by Kuno (1972, 1973)\(^5\) for Japanese ‘NP ga’. By ‘neutral subject’, Kuno means ‘the subject of a sentence with which the speaker describes what is happening/happened’. Accordingly, (49)b is not a statement about ‘Suni’ but a description of the scene before the speaker wherein ‘Suni’ is physically going to school. We may gloss (49) more ‘vividly’ as follows.

(50) a. suni-nũn hakk*yo-e ka-n-da.
    \[ \text{Name-TOP school-LOC1 go-PRES-DECL} \]
    "Speaking of Suni, she goes to school."
    \[ \text{not} \] "Look! Suni is going to school."

b. suni-ga hakk*yo-e ka-n-da.
    \[ \text{Name-NOM school-LOC1 go-PRES-DECL} \]
    "Look! Suni is going to school."
    \[ \text{not} \] "Speaking of Suni, she goes to school."

In fact, both ‘ũn/nũn’ and ‘i/ga’ are each said to have a second usage (Kim (1967) and

---

\(^4\)As was stated in Chapter 1, ‘ũn’ and ‘i’ occur after a consonant, and ‘nũn’ and ‘ga’ after a vowel.

\(^5\)Although Kuno did not use Korean data, there are well-known parallels between Japanese ‘wa’ and Korean ‘ũn/nũn’ and between Japanese ‘ga’ and Korean ‘i/ga’. It is proper to acknowledge here Kuno’s earlier works, Kuno (1972, 1973), from which this study owes much in its basic conception. For similarities and subtle differences between, in particular, Korean ‘i/ga’ and Japanese ‘ga’, see Haig (1983).
elsewhere). ‘NP-ūn’ can also be **contrastive**, and ‘NP-i’ **exclusive-focus** (Bak (1981)). Thus, in (49)a the speaker could be contrasting ‘Suni’ with other (unexpressed but identifiable) people, so that the context becomes "the other people may go to other places, but Suni goes to school". In (49)b, the speaker could also mean that "(among the people under discussion) Suni and only Suni goes to school. It is Suni, not others, who goes to school" (cf. Kuno (1973), Chafe (1976:37-38)). The differences between ‘NP-ūn’ and ‘NP-i’ can then be summarized as (51).

(51) a. **suni-nûn** hakk* yo-e ka-n-da.
    Name-TOP school-LOC1 go-PRES-DECL
    "(topic) Speaking of Suni, she goes to school."
    "(contrastive) The other people may go to other places, but Suni goes to school."

b. **suni-ga** hakk* yo-e ka-n-da.
    Name-NOM school-LOC1 go-PRES-DECL
    "(neutral-subject) Look! Suni is going to school."
    "(exclusive-focus) It is Suni, nobody else, who goes to school."

Notice that the notion exclusive-focus above seems similar to what tends to be labelled as contrastive in general linguistics. Let us compare Chafe’s notion of contrastiveness with exclusive-focus ‘NP-i’ and contrastive ‘NP-ūn’. Consider (52). Note that "the highest pitch and stress are on the stressed syllable of ‘Mary’, the remainder of the sentence being low pitched" (Chafe (1976:33)).

(52) Mary cooked the chicken.

According to Chafe (1976:33-38), there are three factors involved in contrastiveness: **awareness**, **the set of possible candidates** and assertion of which candidate is the correct one. Thus, in (52), we may say that 1) the speaker assumes that the hearer is aware of the fact that someone cooked the chicken, 2) the speaker assumes that the hearer believes in, or was at least thinking about one or more other candidates for the someone, and 3) the speaker is asserting in the sentence that the someone is ‘Mary’ rather than somebody else.

Given his arguments, we find in (51) that it is exclusive-focus, rather than contrastive, that is equivalent to Chafe’s notion of contrastive.⁶ Consider the mini discourse below.

---

⁶Thus, our characterization below of the notion contrastive ‘tagged’ along with ‘NP-ūn’ will involve rejection of Chafe’s observation. Chafe (1976:38) states, "The sometimes confusing overlap between expression of given vs. new and the expression of contastiveness is evidently found in the use of the Japanese particle wa and ga ... wa [Korean ūn/nûn] evidently appears with a focus of contrastive meaning, ... On the other hand, according to Kuno [(1972: 271)], ga [Korean i/ga] may also express contrastiveness in those cases where the focus of contrast is an exhaustive listing ... This use of ga [Korean i/ga] for exhaustive focus of contrast may be a special resource of Japanese not available in English...".

The so-called exclusive-focus does not seem to be unavailable in English. However, what we call contrastive usage of ‘NP-ūn’ will not be immediately clear to the English speaker (just as the usage of ‘the/a’ in English is not immediately clear to the Korean speaker).
In (53), we may say that A’s statement assures B that, first, A is aware of the fact that "someone roasted chicken" (Chafe’s factor 1) and, second, A believes that ‘Ch^61su’ was the "someone" (Chafe’s factor 2). Now, B’s statement tells us that B is asserting that "the someone is ‘Suni’ not ‘Ch^61su’" (Chafe’s factor 3). As is shown in (53)B, B’s assertion involves ‘ga/i’, and this usage of ‘i/ga’ is precisely what has been identified in Korean linguistics as exclusive-focus.

Substituting ‘un/niin’, assuming its contrastive usage, for ‘ga’ in (53)B results in a nonsensical discourse. Consider (54).

What’s wrong with (54)C? We may roughly paraphrase what C says as follows.

The infelicity of C’s utterance may be said to follow from ‘mismatched’ discourse presuppositions (Givón (1978, 1979a, 1982)). That is, where A is informing C that ‘something happened’ (i.e., that someone roasted chicken), C is giving A information about ‘Suni’ (i.e., that Suni did something). As such, C’s assertion entails that "roasted a chicken is the correct action that Suni did". However, it does not entail that "Suni is the correct one that roasted a chicken". In other words, both uses of ‘un/nün’ provide “information about the NP”, which neither use of ‘i/ga’ does.

Indeed, Chafe (1976:38) is right in pointing out that there is a "confusing overlap between expression of given vs. new and the expression of contrastiveness". One point which deserves mention in this respect is the ‘possible set of candidates’ (Chafe’s factor 2). Consider (55).
In the second sentence, ‘Chôlsu’ and ‘Suni’ are so-called contrastive. However, ‘Chôlsu’ and ‘Suni’ are not members of a set that the speaker could have chosen to fill a gap created by the presupposition of an event that has taken place (Chafe’s factor 1). This is evident, as "x boiled the soup" and "x roasted chicken" are not presupposed information in a strict sense. (Notice that something that fills ‘x’ can be regarded as ‘new’.) Rather, ‘Chôlsu’ and ‘Suni’ are members of the set, e.g., { Chôlsu, Suni, yori, ... }, that the speaker could have chosen to make a ‘comment’ about them. This set of possible candidates is created by the context, including the first sentence. (We may regard the members of this set as ‘potential’ givens.) In short, despite the same functional label, the contrastive sense of ‘NP-un’ is different from Chafe’s sense of contrastive.

Therefore, in (51) above, we equate exclusive-focus with Chafe’s sense of contrastive-ness. The contrastive reading of (51)a, on the other hand, does not entail that the speaker assumes that the hearer is aware of the fact that "someone goes to school". Subsequently, it is not true that the speaker asserts that ‘Suni’ is the correct one that goes to school".

Before going into the discussion of ‘NP-un’ in terms of topic and contrastive, let us consider what makes ‘NP-i’ neutral-subject or exclusive-focus.

Bak (1981) claims that ‘NP-i’ is neutral-subject when it occurs in a sentence with which the speaker describes a scene before him without taking any of the elements as being somehow given. He observes that ‘NP-i’ is most often neutral-subject when it occurs with the verb of existence or with an action verb indicating coming into existence or into view. When ‘NP-i’ occurs with a stative verb, according to his observation, it is understood as neutral-subject if the speaker is presenting the information as a new observation (Haig (1983)). Consider (56)a-c below.
(56) a. chʰɛksʰ’aŋ-wi-e chʰæg-i isʰ-ɗyo.
    desk-top-LOC1 book NOM is(existential)-DECL
    "Look! There is a book on the table."

b. a! param-i pu-n-da.
    INTJ wind-NOM blow-PRES-DECL
    "Ah! breeze." (Lit. Wind blows.)

c. tar-i chʰam pal-kʰun!
    moon-NOM very be bright-<I notice>
    "(Ah, I notice that) The moon is very bright!"

Note that (56)a-c are descriptions of the scene before the speaker, and the tokens of ‘NP-i’ are all neutral-subjects. In (56)a ‘NP-i’ occurs with the verb of existence, and in (56)b with an action verb indicating coming into existence. In (56)c ‘NP-i’ occurs with a stative verb, but, as the speech function marker ‘kun’ (I notice) suggests, the proposition, ‘the moon is bright’, is presented as a new observation.

Regarding exclusive-focus, Bak (1981) first defines a ‘definitional’ sentence, of which the verb stands for a long-term, stable condition, etc.. He then observes that in a definitional sentence the sentence-initial NP is generally marked with ‘i/ni/ni’, and that if this NP is marked with ‘i/ga’ it bears an exclusive-focus reading. He calls such a ‘i/ga’ the ‘delimiter i/ga’. As illustrated in (57) below, typical examples of a definitional sentence are those with ‘i-da’ (to be <COPULA>) and so-called double-subject constructions where the verb is predominantly a stative verb representing a long-term, stable condition (cf. Yang (1971)).

(57) a. chʰolsu-nǔn haksʰ’aŋ-i-da.
    Name-TOP student-is-DECL
    "Chʰolsu is a student."

    a’. chʰolsu-ga haksʰ’aŋ-i-da.
    Name-‘delimiter’ student-is-DECL
    "It is Chʰolsu that is a student."

b. chʰolsu-nǔn kʰi-ga kʰǔ-da.
    Name-TOP height-NOM be big-DECL
    (Lit.) "Chʰolsu, height is big."

    b’. chʰolsu-ga kʰi-ga kʰǔ-da.
    Name-‘delimiter’ height-NOM be big-DECL
    (Lit.) "It is Chʰolsu that height is big."

Under Bak’s characterization (also Sohn (1981, 1982)), the basic sentence structure of Korean looks like (58).

(58) [ NP [ ₁ₛ ]ₛ ]
Bak (1981) argues that if the first NP, which he observes is normally marked with 'UNIX/nun', is marked with 'delimiter i/ka' then it is exclusive-focus, and apparently an 'NP-i' occurring inside the inner S is a neutral-subject. Hence, in (59)a-b below, the sentence-initial 'NP-i' is exclusive-focus since 1) the sentence is 'definitional', 2) the first NP occurs outside the inner S, and 3) it involves the 'delimiter i/ka'.

(59) a. \[ ch^61su-ga \ [ haks*æŋ-i]_S ]_S-da. 
   [ Name-'delimiter' [ student-is] ]-DECL
   "It is Ch^61su that is a student."

b. \[ ch^61su-ga \ [ k^3i-ga \ k^6u]_S ]_S-da. 
   [ Name-'delimiter' [ height-NOM be big] ]-DECL
   (Lit.) "It is Ch^61su that height is big."

By contrast, in (60)a-b below 'NP-i' is neutral subject as 1) the speaker is describing a scene before him without taking any of the elements as being given and 2) 'NP-i' occurs inside the inner S of (58).

(60) a. a! \[ param-i pu-n]_S-da. 
   INTJ [ wind-NOM blow-PRES]-DECL
   "Ah! breeze." (Lit. Wind blows.)

b. \[ tar-i ch^3am pal\]_S=k^*un! 
   [ moon-NOM very be bright]-<I notice> 
   "(Ah, I notice that) The moon is very bright!"

Bak's characterization of 'NP-i' is attractive in that it includes, although partially, semantic, syntactic and pragmatic considerations. However, it contains three major problems. First, the crucial factor in understanding 'NP-i' as neutral-subject or exclusive-focus seems **pragmatic**, rather than semantic or syntactic (or combination of both), and this is not shown in Bak's analysis. There are numerous examples supporting this, but (61) will suffice for our purpose.

(61) ch^61su-ga yõŋô-sônsæŋ-i-gun! 
   Name-NOM English-teacher-is(COPULA)-<I notice> 
   1. **context**: I was wondering why Ch^61su speaks English so well, 
      "(I now know that) Ch^61su is an English teacher."
   2. **context**: I thought Suni was the/an English teacher, but 
      "(I now know that) It is Ch^61su that is an English teacher."

Notice first that (61) is, according to Bak's characterization, a definitional sentence where the NP occurring outside the inner S is marked with the 'delimiter i/ga'. However, it is not necessarily exclusive-focus as is apparent from reading 1. Second, given the semantics of the verb ending 'kun' (I notice/see), the proposition is presented as a new observation. However, as can be seen in reading 2, an exclusive-focus reading of the 'NP-i' is not impossible. In order to understand
whether a given ‘NP-i’ is neutral-subject or exclusive-focus, we therefore have to know the context, in particular, the information status of ‘NP-i’ determined by the speaker (Brown and Yule (1983:189)).

Second, although Bak (1981) should be given credit for pointing out that case markers in Korean may have a discourse function, advancing the ‘delimiter i/ka’ as a separate device from the Nominative case marker seems ad-hoc. A relevant question here would be: “can non-Nominative NPs have an exclusive-focus reading, and if they can, will they be in the form of ‘NP-i’?”. It appears that virtually all case markers can have this reading without being in the form of ‘NP-i’. Consider (62). Note that exclusive-focus reading is obtained in general, though not necessarily, when the NP occurs sentence-initially and the case-marker is stressed (Choe (1984)).

(62) a. ch'ilsu-rul suni-ga manna-i-t*a.
   Name-ACC Name-NOM meet-PAST-DECL
   (with a heavy stress on ‘-rul (ACC)’)
   “It is Ch'ilsu that Suni met.”

a’. * ch'ilsu-ga suni-ga manna-i-t*a.
   Name-? Name-NOM meet-PAST-DECL
   (intended to mean) “It is Ch'ilsu that Suni met.”

b. hakk*yo-e suni-ga ka-i-t*a.
   school-LOC1 Name-NOM go-PAST-DECL
   (with a heavy stress on ‘-e (LOC1)’)
   “Suni went to school.”
   (with a stress on ‘school’)

b’. * hakk*yo-ga suni-ga ka-i-t*a.
   school-? Name-NOM go-PAST-DECL
   (intended to mean) “Suni went to school.”
   (with a stress on ‘school’)

This clearly shows that the particle ‘i/ga’ in an exclusive-focus ‘NP-i’ is not a separate morpho-syntactic device from the Nominative case-marker. Rather, it would appear that a case marker may have the discourse function ‘focus’ (or contrastive in Chafe’s sense).

Third, although strictly speaking this may not be Bak’s problem, the binary distinction neutral-subject vs. exclusive-focus is questionable. As we have learned, the neutral-subject is the subject of a sentence which is by itself a chunk of new information in which none of the parts is presupposed. Consider (63).
(63) A: musun ir-i-mnik*a?

what matter-is-INTER(HON2)

"What happened?"

B: yônṣu-ga suni-rul t*əri-ôs*-ûmnida.

Name-NOM Name-ACC hit-PAST-DECL(HON2)

"Yônṣu hit Suni."

Since no part of B’s utterance in (63)B is presupposed, we may say that in (63)B ‘Yônṣu’ is neutral-subject, and in fact ‘Suni’ can be called neutral-object. By contrast, consider (64). Note that here we have three speech participants.

(64) A: nu-ga suni-rul t*əri-ôs*-ûmnik*a?

who-NOM Name-ACC hit-PAST-INTER(HON2)

"Who hit Suni?"

B: chôlsu-ga suni-rul t*əri-ôs*-ûmnida.

Name-NOM Name-ACC hit-PAST-DECL(HON2)

"Chôlsu hit Suni."

C: ani-mnida. yônṣu-ga suni-rul

NegV-DECL(HON2) Name-NOM Name-ACC

t*əri-ôs*-ûmnida.

hit-PAST-DECL(HON2)

(with a heavy stress on ‘-ga (NOM)’)

"No. It is Yônṣu who hit Suni."

In B’s utterance, ‘chôlsu-ga’ is the only NP that is not presupposed. We cannot say then that the ‘NP-i’ is neutral, since, contrary to (63)B, the information distribution in (64)B is sharply divided into two. However, it is not exclusive-focus, either, as there is no explicit negation in B’s reply. On the other hand, ‘NP-i’ in C’s utterance is exclusive-focus. The obvious question here concerns the ‘NP-i’ in (64)B, which is neither neutral-subject nor exclusive-focus. Perhaps, we would have to call it ‘non-exclusive-focus’.

Notice that, although both ‘Yônṣu-ga’ in (63)B and ‘Chôlsu-ga’ in (64)C are NPs chosen to fill the gap created by the presupposition, the latter, unlike the former, contains an additional\(^7\) illocutionary act (Levinson (1983:236-237)) of the speaker, i.e., the speaker contradicts a part of another speech participant’s prior statement. In short, whether or not the grammatical category ‘NP-i’ is interpreted as neutral-subject, non-exclusive-focus or exclusive-focus is basically a

\(^7\)It is ‘additional’ in the sense that both B’s and C’s replies have in common an illocutionary act of the speaker, i.e., ‘the speaker informs the hearer’.
function of pragmatics, i.e., a context-bound problem.  

Bearing this in mind, let us now consider the two usages of ‘NP-ûn’: topic and contrastive. It is another well-known hypothesis that ‘NP-ûn’ understood as topic must be either anaphoric, generic, or of unique reference but this need not be so for the NP of contrastive ‘NP-ûn’ (Yang (1975), Bak (1981)). Thus, in (65) (which appeared earlier as (51)a), ignoring generic and ‘of unique reference’ which seem irrelevant here, ‘Suni’ would be topic if anaphoric, and contrastive if non-anaphoric.

(65) suni-nûn hakk*yo-e ka-n-da.

_Name-TOP school-LOC! go-PRES-DECL_

"(topic) Speaking of Suni, she goes to school."

"(contrastive) The other people may go other places, but Suni goes to school."

The distinction between topic and contrastive in terms of anaphoric-ness was originally proposed by Kuno (1972, 1973) for the two usages of ‘NP wa’ in Japanese. Note that our notion of topic is theme in Kuno’s terminology. Consider the following Japanese sentences, which come from Kuno (1973:46).

(66) a. * ame wa futte imasu.

rain falling is

"Speaking of rain, it’s falling."

b. ame wa futte imasu ga, taisita koto wa arimasen

rain falling is but serious matter not exist

"It’s raining, but it is not much."

According to Kuno, (66)a is not possible in topic reading because ‘ame’ (rain) is neither anaphoric,\(^9\) generic nor of unique reference, whereas (66)b is acceptable because ‘ame’ in this sentence is contrastive.

The Korean counterparts of (66)a-b will be as follows.

---

\(^8\)Thus, we have come back to the time-honoured question, "what is ‘NP-i’?". We will not pursue this question in this thesis, but will assume that ‘NP-i’ is the canonical surface realization of the Subject grammatical relation. See, however, Chapter 4.

\(^9\)Regarding the definition of ‘anaphoric’, Kuno (1973:39) states, "[the NP] has some specific referent in the universe of discourse, but it also has already been referred to, so that listeners know what the speaker is talking about. Such a noun phrase will henceforth be referred to as an anaphoric noun phrase".
(67) a. ? pi-nun o-go is*-o yo.
   rain-TOP come-CONN AUX(PROG)-DECL(HON2)
   "Speaking of rain, it's falling."

b. pi-nun o-go it-ch*man, k^un
   rain-TOP come-CONN AUX(PROG)-but serious
   ir-ũn õps*-ôyo.
   matter-TOP not exist-DECL(HON2)
   "It is raining, but it is not much."

Like 'ame' (rain) in (66), 'pi' (rain) in (67)a is not generic since it refers to specific rain falling in a specific situation. Nor can 'pi' (rain) be of a unique reference in the sense that the 'sun' and the 'moon' are so. However, it is not clear why 'pi' here is non-anaphoric and why subsequently (67)a, with 'NP-ũn' being topic, is unacceptable. If we compare (67)a with (65), we find an implication that 'pi' in the former can only be non-anaphoric but 'Suni' in the latter can be either anaphoric or non-anaphoric. However, we are not told why this is the case.

In claiming that 'ame' (rain) is contrastive only in (66)b, Kuno (1973:46) appears to assume that (66)a is a discourse-initial sentence. Given the definition of 'being anaphoric', most importantly, "having already been referred to" (Kuno (1973:39)), 'ame' in discourse-initial (66)a and 'pi' (rain) in discourse initial (67)a would not be anaphoric. Thus, as Kuno predicts, the second sentence of (68) below (which is identical with (67)a), 'pi' (rain) is perfect in its topic reading since it is mentioned in the first sentence. Example (68) comes from Kim (1986:85).

(68) pi-ga an w-asô hyuũnyôn-i-ra-go
   rain-NOM not come-because year of famine-is-DECL-COMP
   hae-i-ch*iyo? kûrônâ, pi-nun o-go
   say-PAST-<didn't you> but rain-TOP come-CONN
   is*-ôyo. w-ado nomu
   AUX(PROG)-DECL(HON2) come-even too much
   w-asô kôkch*ôj-i-mnida.

   "You said it's going to be a year of famine because it does not rain, didn't you? But,
   (Lit.) speaking of rain, it is falling. In fact, it rains too much, so that it is a big worry."

However, if 'being anaphoric' is basically 'being known to the hearer', then prior mentioning would not be a necessary condition for an NP to be anaphoric. To be sure, in many cases the discourse-initial sentence will be devoted to creating a situational context so that the reader/hearer may identify the referent of the subsequent 'NP-ũn'. Nonetheless, in spoken discourse, for instance, anything that is in the speech situation noticed by the speech participants can be anaphoric. In written discourse, by virtue of its nature, the author can present an NP as anaphoric in the very first
sentence. Thus, an ‘NP-ūn’ occurring discourse-initially does not indicate that the NP is non-anaphoric.

Notice that the judgement appears to be ad-hoc, regarding whether or not the given instance of ‘NP-ūn’ in (65) and (67)a is anaphoric. Being divorced from the context, whether or not the given ‘NP-ūn’ is anaphoric or non-anaphoric depends very much on whether or not the analyst/informant can construct a possible context. Indeed, the claim that ‘NP-ūn’ can be non-anaphoric is questionable. If ‘pi’ (rain) in (67)b was indeed non-anaphoric, i.e., the hearer does not know what ‘pi’ (rain) it is, the hearer would immediately ask about it instead of entertaining the speaker’s contrast. Consider (69).

(69) A:  pi-nūn  o-go  it-ch*man  kʰūn
    rain-TOP come-CONN AUX(PROG)-but serious
    ir-ūn  ēps*-ēyo.
    matter-TOP not exist-DECL(H0N2)

    "It is raining (Lit. rain is falling), but it is not much."

B:  ne?  musūn-pi-mals*ūm-i-mnik*a?
    INTERJ which-rain-words-is-INTER(HON2)

    "Sorry? What rain are you talking about?"

Clearly, in order for (69)a to be understood as a contextually well-formed sentence, ‘pi’ (rain) must be anaphoric, i.e., the hearer must know what ‘pi’ the speaker is talking about. Hence, it is topical.

Thus, Kuno is correct in pointing out that topic-marked NP must be anaphoric, but the claim that ‘NP-ūn’ can be non-anaphoric and accordingly contrastive is unconvincing. That is, the distinction between topic and contrastive based on the anaphoric-ness is unwarranted.

Nonetheless, that ‘NP-ūn’ in (65) can be either topic or contrastive whereas that in (67)a seems contrastive only does require an explanation. Given the apparent irrelevancy of anaphoric-ness, a possible interpretation of the difference would be that ‘NP-ūn’ is inherently contrastive and the contrastive force can be weakened in (65) but not in (67)a.

That the contrastive force can be varied can find a support from Bolinger’s characterization of contrastive (Bolinger (1961:87)), who states as follows.

"... In a broad sense every semantic peak is contrastive .... As the alternatives are narrowed down, we get closer to what we think of as contrastive ..." (emphasis mine)

Consider (70)a-b (which appeared above as (65) and (67)a, respectively).
(70) a. suni-nun hakk*yo-e ka-n-da.
   Name-TOP school-LOCI go-PRES-DECL
   1. Speaking of Suni: "Suni goes to school."
   2. The other people <that can be contrasted with Suni> may go other places but:
      "Suni goes to school."

b. pi-nun o-go is*-øyo.
   rain-TOP come-CONN AUX(PROG)-DECL(HO2)
   1. ? Speaking of the rain: The rain is coming.
   2. The other things <that can be contrasted with rain> may not be coming: "The rain is coming."

Recall the 'set of candidates that the speaker can choose to make a comment', i.e., potential givens, mentioned earlier in connection with Chafe’s notion of contrastive-ness. Now, would it be really the case that 'NP-un' in (70)b bears a strong contrastive force whereas that in (70)a does not necessarily do so? Wouldn't it be the case that we are in fact saying that when we analyse these sentences, divorced from context, we can re-construct less number of potential givens in (70)b than in (70)a, since the number of meteorological 'entities' that can be contrasted with 'pi' (rain) is smaller than the number of personal names? In saying that 'NP-un' in (70)a can also be contrastive, aren't we deliberately restricting the number of the potential givens because we think the speech participants in the real world are likely to have a relatively small number of people available as potential givens? It seems to us that, as with the context-bound interpretation of 'NP-i' as neutral-subject, focus, etc., the seemingly varying degrees of contrastive could again be a function of pragmatics.

Hence, in (67)b above, we might say that it is a co-ordinate sentence consisting of two separate sentences, each of which has its own topic NP which inherently carries a contrastive force, 'pi' (rain) and 'k^n il' (serious matter), and that the contrastive force is highlighted because the speaker is contrasting two topics, as the occurrence of the conjunctive particle '-jiman (but/and)' might suggest.

That 'NP-un' is inherently contrastive is supported by the existence of non-contrastive 'NP-Ø', which is yet to be introduced.¹⁰ In spoken discourse, particularly in everyday conversation, the particle un of 'NP-un' is generally 'not used' unless the speaker wants to contrast the particular topic with other topics. An interesting example in this regards is the speaker's initial utterence in a telephone discourse. Consider (71).

¹⁰We will discuss 'NP-Ø' more in the next section in terms of topic. For an argument of definiteness of the referent of 'NP-Ø', see Prost (1981).
(71) The Receiver

A: yŏboseyo.

Hello

"Hello."

The Phoner

B: yŏboseyo, chŏ-Ô chŏl̄su-mnida.

Hello, I-TOP Name-PRED-DECL(HON2) ...

"Hello, this is (Lit. I am) Chŏl̄su. ..."

B': # yŏboseyo, chŏ-nun chŏl̄su-mnida.

Hello, I-TOP Name-PRED-DECL(HON2)

"Hello, this is (Lit. I am) Chŏl̄su."

As can be seen, in identifying himself as so-and-so, the speaker, more precisely ‘the phoner’, begins his sentence with ‘NP-Ø’ rather than ‘NP-un’. The question is why. Note that if (71)B’ was felicitous, then it would have been the initial statement of this particular phoner in a group telephone discussion. However, since a telephone discourse in our age usually involves only two speech participants, the phoner cannot assume that, in initiating the discourse, he and the receiver have established any topics other than ‘I’, i.e., the phoner, and ‘you’, i.e., the receiver. This suggests that, unless the phoner wants to contrast himself with the receiver (which seems rather a bizarre situation), ‘chŏ’ cannot be contrastive. Seeing that (71)B’ causes semantic anomaly, we can infer that the particle ‘un’ is contrastive.

Notice that the crucial notion in the contrastive meaning is the existence of ‘a multiple number of candidates that could have chosen to make a comment’. We may paraphrase this as ‘the existence of the established set of potential topics’.11 We understand this contrastive force comes from the particle ‘un’. In a broader sense, the particle ‘un’ of ‘NP-un’ may be regarded as a deictic category, or perhaps presupposition trigger (Levinson (1983)), that packages (Chafe (1976), Foley and Van Valin (1985)) the speaker’s consideration of the hearer’s mind.12 In presenting as topic NP a particular NP of which the referent is definite, the speaker appears to use ‘un’ when he wants to signal that he has selected this particular referent from the group of definite referents in his mind. Hence, in presenting ‘NP-un’ the speaker says in effect ‘I have selected the referent of this NP to say something about from among a group of referents in my mind, each of which I assume you can identify’.

11 As I do not attempt to capture the exact nature of the set in this thesis, the reader is referred to Brown and Yule’s discussion of topic framework (Brown and Yule (1983:73-79)) and Venneman’s notion of presupposition pool (Venneman (1975:314)).

12 It is a deictic category for a similar reason that the definite article ‘the’ is so in English. According to Chafe (1976:39), ‘the’, which lacks a counterpart in Korean, appears when the speaker thinks the hearer can identify the referent, so that the speaker says virtually that “I assume you already know this referent and I assume you can pick out, from all the referents that might be categorized in this way, the one I have in mind”.
Consider (72). Here, a school teacher is assigning a task to each of the three pupils.

(72) nǒhi set iri w-a. nô-nûn üija-rûl
you(PL) three this way come-IMP you(i)-TOP chair-ACC
omgi-go, nô-nûn chʰakʰ anj-ûl omgi-go, nô-nûn
move-and you(j)-TOP desk-ACC move-and you(k)-TOP
chʰajmun-ûl takʰ-ara.
window-ACC clean-IMP
"You three, come here! You(i) move the chairs, You(j) move the desks, and You(k) clean the windows!"

As (73) below shows, it is inappropriate for the speaker not to use ‘NP-ûn’ in contrasting topics. This follows from our characterization of the semantics of ‘ûn’.

(73) # nôhi set iri w-a. nô-Ô üija-rûl
you(PL) three this way come-IMP you(i)-TOP chair-ACC
omgi-go, nô-Ô chʰakʰ anj-ûl omgi-go, nô-Ô
move-and you(j)-TOP desk-ACC move-and you(k)-TOP
chʰajmun-ûl takʰ-ara.
window-ACC clean-IMP
"You three, come here! You(i) move the chairs, You(j) move the desks, and You(k) clean the windows!"

Finally, consider (74)a-b. We invite the reader to work out the difference between them.

(74) a. nôhi sè-Ô iri w-a.
you(pl) three-TOP this way come-IMP
"You three come here."

b. nôhi sè-ûn iri w-a.
you(pl) three-TOP this way come-IMP
"... and You three come here."

(74)b entails that the speaker had given an instruction to several other people before he uttered the sentence. This in turn entails that the speech participants involved share the set of established topics. By contrast, (74)a does not presuppose this. Rather, the three people concerned are presumably the only members of the set.

In conclusion, we have argued so far that the referent of a naturally used ‘NP-ûn’ is anaphoric, hence, it is topical. The particle ûn of ‘NP-ûn’ has semantic value, i.e., it signals that the referent of the NP has been selected from among a group of referents in the speaker’s mind which the speaker assumes the hearer is aware of. This we labelled contrastive.13 Thus, what ‘NP-ûn’

13Note that Sohn (1981, 1982) calls ûn contrastive particle, and in particular, Yang (1972) stated that ûn has the semantic value “the only concerned”.

signals is 'contrastive-topic', contrary to the common belief that 'NP-űn' has two variations, topic NP and contrastive NP. A problem remains unsolved, "what do we mean by topic in saying that 'NP-űn' and 'NP-Ǒ' are topic NPs?". We will attempt to answer this question in the next section.

2.3. Non-switched Topic, Switched Topic and Topic NP

The notion of topic in linguistics, also called theme by Prague School linguists (also Halliday (1967, 1968, 1985), Kuno (1972, 1973, 1976)), seems by no means non-controversial. One cannot readily apply the notion to a description of a particular language without invoking a further confusion. Briefly, and imprecisely, there may be two differing views of topic, or theme: topic/theme as a 'scalar concept' and topic/theme as a 'structural category'. Prague School linguists see it as an abstract composite notion relating to the least amount of Communicative Dynamism, the Given state, Aboutness, etc. (Daneš (1987)), but most importantly, it is not a structural category. For them, theme is typically sentence-initial, but it does not have to be (Firbas (1974, 1987), Sgall (1987)).

The other view would be that there is a category in the sentence structure, which functions as topic, or theme. Transformational generative grammarians appear to have this view in postulating a rule to move a syntactic unit to the front, i.e., topicalisation (Dahl (1969), Kim (1967), Song (1967), Sgall, Hajičová and Benečová (1973), Kuroda (1979)). Halliday’s use of the Prague School notion theme in connection with sentence-initial position may be another example of this view. Li and Thompson (1976), who claim that the sentence structure of some languages can be better described in terms of topic rather than subject, may be yet another example. In general, holders of this latter view seem satisfied with the characterization that topic/theme is 'something that is spoken about in a sentence'.

However, while finding the structural notion of topic relevant to their studies, many linguists also claim that characterizing topic as ‘something that is spoken about in a sentence’ is vague. Dijk (1977:114-115), for instance, finds the validity of the characterization questionable, since the speaker of (75) below might be talking about ‘a man’, ‘his walk’ or ‘a beach’ (Seng (1985)).

(75) A man is walking slowly along a beach.

In other words, virtually all the NPs in this sentence seem to satisfy the above characterization. If this is the case, unless we wish to be antagonistic about the notion of topic/theme, we would have to re-consider the notion. On such grounds, a new functional characterization of topic, related to the Prague School view, emerged at the end of the 1970s. Challenging the assumption shared by both proponents and opponents of the characterization that ‘topic is something that is spoken about in the sentence’, Givón (1981:51) argues that "topic is not an atomic, discrete entity", but a scalar notion. He speaks of degree of topicality in terms of which subject can be more topic than object, object more topic than obliques, etc...
As made clear at the beginning of this thesis, it is not our intention to pursue the question of the notion of topic in the language universal context. We are attempting to explain what is topic in Korean which has an NP that has been traditionally labelled as topic NP. In this respect, topic as a scalar notion seems irrelevant (see however Hwang (1983) and Lee (1987)). However, this statement should not be interpreted as a ‘criticism’ of the Prague School notion of theme or of Givón’s notion of topicality. Rather, we are identifying the nature of our problem as the precise characterization of a surface syntactic unit called topic NP.

Consider (76), which may be the Korean counterpart of (75).

(76) han-saram-i chöngöhnhi hæbyônk*a-rul köi-k*o
    one-man-NOM slowly beach-ACC walk-CONN
    it-t*a.
    AUX(PROG)-DECL

"A man is walking slowly along a/the beach."

In (76), interestingly, it appears to us that ‘what the speaker is talking about’ is neither ‘han saram’ (a man), ‘his walk’ nor ‘hæbyônk*a’ (a beach), but, although subtle, ‘what is happening in front of the speaker’. The picture seems clearer when a sentence has an explicit ‘NP-un’ as in (77), where the ‘topic discussed in Korean linguistics’ (henceforth topic) is undoubtedly understood as what ‘NP-un’ expresses.

(77) kii-saram-un chöngöhnhi hæbyônk*a-rul kôr-ôt-t*a.
    DEIC-man-NOM slowly beach-ACC walk-PAST-DECL

"Speaking of the man, he walked slowly along the/a beach."

Since there is no question of an ‘NP-un’ being more or less topic than any other unit in the same sentence, it sounds no more right to say in (77) that ‘kii-saram’ (the man) is more topic than, e.g., ‘hæbyônk*a’ (beach) than to say in (75) that ‘a man’ is more subject than, e.g., ‘a beach’. 
Stating above that topic is something that is spoken about in the sentence, we implied that this is a valid definition of *topic*. However, there are cases where the definition is vague. Consider (78).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(78)} & \quad \text{ch}^h\text{olsu-nun k}^\text{-ai-wa} & \text{ch}^\text{-jib-uro} \\
& \quad \text{Name-TOP DEIC(the)-child-COMM DEIC(that)-house-DIR} \\
& \quad \text{tur-t^a.} \\
& \quad \text{in-CONN go-PAST-DECL}
\end{align*}
\]

"Speaking of Ch^holsu, he went into that house with the child."

In (78) it is not difficult to maintain that ‘Ch^holsu’ is *topic*, but it is rather difficult to argue that this sentence is only about ‘Ch^holsu’. As with the English counterpart, we may say that the sentence is also about ‘k^\text{-ai}’ (the child), or ‘ch^\text{-jip}’ (that house). Notice that NPs in (78) occur with a deictic, compared with those in (76) and (77) above. The first are forced to be understood as definite NPs, whereas this is not the case with the last two. It seems, then, that "being what the speaker is talking about" is closely related to definite-ness, and that talking about-ness is not the nature of *topic*.

It seems that what is missing in the previous characterization of *topic* in Korean linguistics is a consideration of the speaker’s *illocutionary purpose*, i.e., for what purpose the Korean speaker presents something as the thing which he is ‘talking about’.

In order to clarify what we mean by this, we cite below a part of Wierzbicka’s discussion of topic-comment articulation (Wierzbicka (1980:287-345)). Consider (79), which is traditionally characterized as a topic-less sentence.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(79)} & \quad \text{It is raining.}
\end{align*}
\]

According to Wierzbicka (1980:295), the semantics of (79) consists of two components: the dictum, i.e., what is said, and the illocutionary purpose, i.e., why it is said. In terms of Wierzbicka’s semantic formula (Wierzbicka (1972)), the dictum will be represented as *I say: it is raining*, and the illocutionary purpose *I want you to know it (that it is raining)*. In contrast, consider (80).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(80)} & \quad \text{My wife is a Gypsy.}
\end{align*}
\]

In contrast to (79), the semantics of (80) consists of three components (Wierzbicka (1980:309-310)): 1) the topic component, *I am thinking of someone*, 2) two dicta, *I say: this someone is my wife* and *I say: this someone is a Gypsy*, and 3) three illocutionary purposes,\(^{14}\) *I want you to think of this someone (my wife)*, *I want to cause you to be able to think of this someone (my wife)* and *I want you to know it (that she is a Gypsy)*. The first two illocutionary purposes are associated with the first dictum, and the other with the second dictum.

\[^{14}\text{In fact, she states "two (possibly three) illocutionary purposes", with the component 'I want you to think of this someone' being parenthesized. However, I will assume all of the three illocutionary purposes in our discussion as they are extremely helpful clarifying topic NPs in Korean in a typological context.}\]
Wieżbicka’s analysis provides us with a useful insight for clarifying the notion of *topic*. Following Wieżbicka, the semantics of *topic* may be said to consist of 1) topic component "I am thinking of someone/something", 2) the dictum "I say: this someone/something is so-and-so" and 3) the illocutionary purposes "I want you to think of someone/something", "I want to cause you to be able to think of this someone/something". From this, *topic* may be tentatively defined as "**what the speaker has in mind which he wants the hearer to consider**". Topic NP, i.e., the realization of *topic*, is then realised because the speaker wants the hearer to be able to think of *the topic*.

The advantage of this definition over the previous one is self-evident. Returning to (78) above, we see that the speaker may be talking about ‘Chʰolsu’, ‘kū-ai’ (the child) and ‘chʰ-jip’ (that house), but he does not require the hearer to consider them all. We would argue that ‘Chʰolsu’ is topic NP and the other NPs are part of the ‘comment’ (the definition of which also follows from Wieżbicka’s analysis), i.e., participants of some process that the speaker wants the hearer to be informed of.

Although topic NP as a formal category may not be a language-universal phenomenon, topic as "something that the speaker wants the hearer to think of" appears to be so. That is, human communication, at least some part of it, is such that when two people engage in it, the speaker guides the hearer’s attention (Zubin (1979)) in a certain direction in order to achieve whatever communicative goals he/she has, while the hearer co-operates (Grice (1975), Prideaux (1987)) with the speaker by modulating his/her attention in that direction. Thus, the speaker’s explicit "I want you to think of this someone/something" is clearly motivated and the hearer’s compliance with the speaker’s request is expected.

Consider the following hypothetical discourse, where B and C are contradicting some part of A’s statement.

(81) A : John always yawns.
B : # No, that is not John. It is Fred.
C : No, he doesn’t.

(82) A : Look! John is yawning.
B : No, that is not John. It is Fred.
C : No, he isn’t.

(81)B is a rather strange, non-sensical reply to A’s statement, whereas there is nothing unusual in (82)B. Ignoring C’s reply, we would suggest that the strangeness of (81)B comes from the fact that the subject here is the topic NP, that is to say, ‘John’ is the one that the speaker tells us to think of. The subject of (82), however, is not topic NP.
As the strangeness of (81)B suggests, it would be more natural in (81) if the co-operative hearer were to wait for some more important information rather than intervening, as it were, in the speaker's choice of topic. In contrast, what the speaker tells us to think of in (82), or the direction in which he hopes to push our attention in a broader sense, is not really 'John', but rather some part of the world before us (Bolinger (1977)). The occurrence of the discourse particle 'look' clearly suggests this. Thus, 'John' in (82)A is not topic, but a piece of information that "the speaker wants to cause us to know". We do not see, then, why we cannot challenge (Givón (1982)) the speaker in selecting 'John' in (82).

Consider (83)a-b, which are the Korean counterparts of (81)A and (82)A.

   Name-TOP always yawning-ACC do-PRES-DECL
   "Speaking of John, he always yawns."

b. John-i  hap^um-ül  ha-go  it-t*a.
   Name-NOM yawning-ACC do-CONN AUX(PROG)-DECL
   "(Look!) John is yawning."

It should be clear by now how 'John' in (83)a, which is explicitly topic marked, is different from 'John' in (83)b. In Korean 'something that the speaker wants the hearer to consider' is grammaticalized as a distinctive category from 'NP-i', which is traditionally called subject NP.

Consider another example.^^

(84) Talking about the seminar;
   A: What happens when Mary talks?
   B: John always yawns.

Notice that (84)B and (81)A are identical sentences, if we ignore their prosodic features. Here the question is, "is 'John' in (84)B topic NP?". Can we interpret (84)B along the lines "I am thinking of someone, I want you to think of this someone ...". Presumably not. We would interpret it in the same way as we do the "it's raining" type of sentence. That is, we interpret it as a topic-less sentence, more precisely, as a sentence which does not have topic NP. Thus, we would expect

---

15That is, it is not the way we act in communicating with others.

16See also (76) and (77). It should make sense by now why in (76) topic is understood as 'what is happening in front of the speaker' and in (77) as 'kô-saram' (the man).

17More precisely, we need to qualify this with a phrase 'in some circumstance'. See below.

18I am indebted for this example to Dr. Timothy Shopen.

19The term 'topic-less' might be a mis-nomer. The topic in B's mind may be 'identified' as "what happens when Mary talks". Since there is no topic NP in (84), i.e., the phonic/graphic counterpart of topic, I would suggest (84) be a 'topic NP-less' sentence.
that the Korean counterpart of 'John' in (84)B will not be marked as a topic, and this is indeed the case. Consider (85).

(85) Talking about the seminar,

A: Mary-ga iyagiha-myŏn musŭn ir-i
\[\text{Name-NOM speak-if which happening-NOM} \]
irŏna-ni?
\[\text{occur-INTER} \]
"(Lit.)If Mary talks, what happens?"

B: John-i ŏnjena hapʰum-ŭl ha-n-da.
\[\text{Name-NOM always yawning-ACC do-PRES-DECL} \]
"(Lit.)John always does yawning."

B‘: # John-un ŏnjena hapʰum-ŭl ha-n-da.
\[\text{Name-TOP always yawning-ACC do-PRES-DECL} \]
"# Speaking of John, he always does yawning."

That topic is "something that the speaker wants the hearer to think of" suggests that the number of topic NPs in a sentence would be limited. Indeed, it appears that a simple sentence cannot have more than two tokens of topic NP, and subordinate clauses do not in general contain topic NP (Chae (1976)). Consider (86) and (87).

---

\(^{20}\)Obviously, I am excluding cases like the below where the speaker corrects him/herself in choosing the topic.

i) chŏlsu-nun, ani suni-nu, ani chŏlsu-nun hakk^yo-e
\[\text{Name-TOP no Name-TOP no Name-TOP school-LOC1} \]
kat-′a.
\[\text{go-PAST-DECL} \]
"Chŏlsu, I mean, Suni, no I mean Chŏlsu has gone to school."
Although sentences like (86)a appear in the available literature as evidence showing the two usages of ‘NP-un’, they reveal a kind of embedding, which could be called ‘thematic embedding’. As (86)b might suggest, it seems difficult to process if the embedding extends more than two layers. For a better example of thematic embedding consider (88).

---

21That is, topic NP and contrastive NP, which we have argued against in the previous section. It is argued that the initial ‘NP-un’ is topic NP and the other contrastive NP, but, for us, it means that the second ‘NP-un’ is interpreted to have more contrastive force. Incidentally, despite the relative popularity in the literature, sentences like (86)a have a minor place in an actual discourse. A more natural version would have one ‘NP-un’, the other being zero.
We may say that at the higher layer, ‘Ch^olsu’ is presented as the topic NP and the rest as something that the speaker wants us to know, and at the lower layer, ‘yökg’ (English) and ‘purô’ (French) are presented as topic NPs and ‘kogbuha-jiman’ (study, but) and ‘kogbuha-ji an-nun-da’ (not study) as the respective comments. However, since I am not at present prepared to be more explicit about thematic embedding, I will not go into any more detail.

Realizations of topic must include ‘NP-Ø’, which we briefly introduced as non-contrastive topic NP in the previous section. Although ‘NP-Ø’ has been generally regarded as the colloquial/informal variation of ‘NP-ûn’, there are good reasons to believe it to be another type of topic NP. The referent of ‘NP-Ø’ appears to be always definite, as Prost (1981) argues, and the semantics of ‘NP-Ø’ are fully compatible with those of topic. As we characterized, ‘NP-Ø’ differs from ‘NP-ûn’ in that, lacking the particle ‘ûn’, it does not have a contrastive force.22

Consider the following mini discourse.23 The context is that A went into a fruit shop, looked around and asked the price of fruit.

22 Also, as was stated at the beginning of this chapter, ‘NP-Ø’ is not used in written Korean.

23 The data is the initial part of a spoken discourse, which comes from pl08 ‘hangugô 1’ (Korean 1) published by ‘sôuldzhakk* yo ôhak yônguso’ (Seoul National University, Language Research Centre).
As in (89), 'NP-Ø' typically occurs in a discourse-initial sentence. Ignoring missing NPs in (89)B1 and B2 for the moment, notice that 'NP-Ø' of (89)A1 is a definite NP as the 'bananas' are in the discourse situation. It is something that A, the shopper, tells B, the shop-keeper, to consider. 'NP-Ø' in (89)A2 is contrastive-topic NP. In presenting 'kyur-ün' (mandarin) as topic NP, the speaker signals that he has selected 'kyul' (mandarin) from the group of definite referents in his mind, e.g., { i-banana, i-kyul, ... }. In this particular context, we may interpret (89)A2 in such a way that A is implicitly contrasting 'i-gyur' (these mandarins) with 'i-banana' (these bananas) (which have just been mentioned). The text continues.

(90) A3: kyur-ün s*a-nde, banana-nün
mandarin-TOP be cheap-but banana-TOP
pis*a-gun-yo.
expensive-EXCL-DECL(HON2)
"(I see that) Mandarin are cheap, but bananas are expensive!"

Of importance here is that we cannot replace 'NP-Ø' in (89)A1 with 'NP-ün', nor can we substitute 'NP-Ø' in (90)A3 for the two tokens of 'NP-ün' if we assume this particular situation, as shown in (91).
This clearly suggests that ‘NP-Ø’ is not just an informal variation of ‘NP-ūn’, but is a different kind of topic NP from ‘NP-ūn’. In (89)A2, however, using ‘NP-Ø’ instead of ‘NP-ūn’ may be acceptable. But, then, the sentence will lose its contrastive force. A possible context for (89)A2 with ‘NP-Ø’ might be "after asking the price of ‘bananas’, A looks around for a while and re-initiates the discourse."

It could be the case that ‘NP-Ø’ signals a ‘newly-introduced’ topic, and ‘NP-ūn’, particularly that in (89)A2, signals a switched topic. However, carrying inherently contrastive force due to the particle ‘ūn’, ‘NP-ūn’ signals a ‘less switched’ topic than ‘NP-Ø’ does. This is because the referent of ‘NP-ūn’ is meant to be related to some other established topics in the discourse universe, whereas that of ‘NP-Ø’ is not. Thus, a suggestion presents itself that both ‘NP-Ø’ and ‘NP-ūn’ represent switched topic, we are now equating topic with switched topic.

To appreciate the suggestion, let us turn to the other illocutionary purpose, "I want to cause you to be able to think of this someone/something". Notice that this component subsumes the speaker’s consideration of the hearer, i.e., the speaker thinks that the hearer cannot identify the topic unless he says it. The question is, "are there occasions where the speaker thinks that to ‘speak up’ the topic he has in mind is unnecessary?". The answer seems to be "yes". Recent quantified studies of topic continuity (Givón (1983b), Hwang (1983)) reveal a language-universal trend, "the more continuous a topic is, the less overt expression it needs to receive" (Givón (1981:67)). This means that the speakers do not speak up the topic when they continue to talk about it.

---

24I am indebted for the idea that topic NP be related with switched topic to Dr. Avery Andrews.
Consider (92).^25

(92) ... ton-ŭn chib-e tu-myŏn s'ŭ-gi
money-TOP house-LOC place-if spend-NOMR
swip-s'ŭmnida. ŭnhae-ê maik*i-ô tu-myŏn
easy-DECL(HON2) bank-LOC deposit-CONN keep-if
il-chi-hi-do an-k'ho s'ŭ-go
lose-CONN-also NEGV-and spend-CONN
sipʰ-ŭl-t'ae ŏnjena s'ŭ-l-su
want-REL(FUT)-when always spend-REL(FUT)-way(can)
is*-ŭmnida. ...
is-DECL(HON2)
"... Speaking of money, to spend (it) is easy if (you) keep (it) at home. If (you) deposit (it) in a bank, (you) don't lose (it) and (you) can spend (it) whenever (you) want to spend (it). ..."

The two successive sentences of (92) presumably share the same topic ‘ton’ (money), but as we can see topic NP does not appear in the second sentence.

For the speaker not to repeat the continued topic is by no means an optional strategy in Korean. Repeating topic NP or employing an overt pronominal as topic NP is simply inappropriate in Korean, as shown in (93).

(93) # ton-ŭn chib-e tu-myŏn s'ŭ-gi
money-TOP house-LOC place-if spend-NOMR
swip-s'ŭmnida. ton-ŭn/ku-gos-ŭn ŭnhae-ê
easy-DECL(HON2) money-TOP/the-thing-TOP bank-LOC
maik*i-ô tu-myŏn il-chi-hi-do an-k'ho
deposit-CONN keep-if lose-CONN-also NEGV-and
s'ŭ-go sipʰ-ŭl-t'ae ŏnjena
spend-CONN want-REL(FUT)-when always
s'ŭ-l-su is*-ŭmnida.
spend-REL(FUT)-way(can) is-DECL(HON2)
"Speaking of money, to spend (it) is easy if (you) keep (it) at home. # Speaking of money, if (you) deposit (it) in a bank, (you) don't lose (it) and (you) can spend (it) whenever (you) want to spend (it)."

^The corpus comes from a written discourse, titled ‘konggo kigwan’ (public institutions), p147, ‘hangugô 1’ (Korean 1), published by ‘sŏuldæhk’yo ŏhak yŏnguso’ (Seoul National University, Language Research Centre).
That topic NP does not appear in the second sentence in (92) might lead one to suggest a ‘deleted’ category which can perhaps be called ‘zero topic NP’ which may be coreferential with the topic in the air, e.g., ‘ton’ (money) in (92). This leads to a view that 1) in a Korean sentence there is always a topic NP (or perhaps topic NPs) that can be deleted whenever it is a continued topic, and that 2) the existence of topic NP is a very important typological feature of Korean.

Zero-topic NP, as opposed to overt topic NP, is a tempting notion to advance, but it raises an intriguing problem. Notice that unlike English, the apparent clause-internal anaphoric/pronominal element in a Korean sentence is not an unstressed pronominal but simply a gap, i.e., zero anaphora (Givón (1981), Kameyama (1985), Chang (1984, 1986)). If we advocate a category like zero topic NP, then we have to provide a way in which we can ‘sensibly’ distinguish it from zero anaphora. For instance, (92) above appears to have two zero anaphors which are in an anaphoric relation (Huddleston (1978:338)) with ‘you/they’ and ‘money’. In (89)B1 and B2 above, there seem to be two null categories²⁶ for ‘bananas/mandarins’ and ‘per kilo’. Assuming the existence of zero topic NP, how can we distinguish the apparent zero-topic NPs; for ‘money’ in the second sentence of (92) and for ‘bananas/mandarins’ in (89)B1 and B2, from zero anaphors? The answer does not seem to be easy. Even if we find the answer, it would hardly be convincing that such a phonetically null category is the ‘something that the speaker wants to cause the hearer to be able to consider’. Thus, I will argue instead that there is no such thing as a zero-topic NP. That is, in sentences without a topic NP, there is nothing that stands for ‘what the speaker wants to cause the hearer to be able to think of’.

Two important points to be made here are 1) to the speech participants the topic of the sentence that does not have a topic NP is ‘more definite’ than that of the sentence with an overt topic NP, and 2) it seems very likely that a zero anaphor itself is the category that is in an anaphoric relation with a discourse topic, rather than there being a separate covert topic NP. That is, the topic in the air may not be the ‘something unique’ but may be the ‘topic that is more topical than other topics’. This means that we must distinguish in Korean topic as the something that the speaker has in mind which s/he wants the hearer to think of, which we have been calling topic, from topic as one of the ‘somethings’ that the speaker has in mind which s/he assumes the hearer does as well²⁷ which is more definite than topic.

²⁶Note that a limited range of null categories will be defined as ‘zero anaphor’ for a semantic-syntactic reason in the next chapter. In particular, we postulate a zero anaphor when a controlled argument is missing. Deferring the justification and discussions of zero anaphor until next chapter, we will assume zero anaphor as the counterpart of the English unstressed pronominal.

²⁷I am indebted for this point to Dr. Timothy Shopen.
Consider (94).  

(94)  

A1: manna-as*-6? 
meet-PAST-INTER 
"Did (you) meet (her)?" 

B: ūŋ, manna-as*-6. 
yes meet-PAST-DECL 
"Yes. (I) met (her)."

A2: kūro-m, iri chw-6. 
then(PROVerb-if) this way(?) give-IMP 
kūrigu, ton-ūn westpac-e 
and(PROVerb-and) money-TOP Name of a bank-LOC 
nō-i-ch*i? 
put in-PAST-<didn't you> 

"Then, give (them) (to me). And (you) deposited the money at Westpac, I believe."

As an analyst, can we tell what are the topics of A and B from looking at (94)A1 to the first sentence of (94)A2? Maybe not. Notice that this is not identical with the question, "what are the referents of the zero anaphors?". Given the translations, we would suspect that the topic(s) could be one of, or some combination of (or all of), 'you', 'him', 'I' and 'them'. In contrast, we may say more positively that the topic of the second sentence of (94)A2 is 'ton' (money) (which A and B share) rather than 'you'.

Now what actually happened was this. "That morning, A phoned her friend and asked to borrow a pair of knitting needles. An hour later, B left home with two assignments, one of which was to pick up the needles and the other to deposit some money in their bank". The conversation above occurred when B returned home that afternoon. Armed with the context, the reader will not, as the author who played B's role did not, find it too difficult to deduce that (94)A1-B are about 'her' (the friend), rather than 'you' or 'I', and the first sentence of (94)A2 is about 'them' (the needles), rather than 'you' or 'me'.

We may note here two problems. First, given the context, how can we explain our intuition that among all the definite null categories, 'her' rather than 'you/I' is understood as the topic in the air in (94)A1-B, 'them' rather than 'you/I' in the first sentence of (94)A2?. Second, is it valid to regard 'her' as the topic that A and B have in (94)A1-B, and likewise is 'them' the topic that A and B have in the first sentence of (94)A2? Presumably, it is this particular context that forces us to understand that 'her' and 'them', rather than 'I' and 'you', are topics. Presumably, 'her' and 'them' are not the topics in these sentences, but they are just more topical than 'I' and 'you'. In other

---

28The data comes from one of the recordings of the author's conversation with his wife.
words, all of them may be topics. If I understand it correctly, it is on this point that Givón’s notion of topicality and his measurement method may shed light on Korean.

We may address another question, "will it be predictable from a syntactic-semantic consideration of a single sentence that, for instance, in (94)A1-B-A2 ‘her’ and ‘them’ are more topical than ‘I’ and ‘you’?". In particular, can we predict that the referent of a particular zero anaphor will be more of a topic because it is in a particular grammatical relation, since the data above might suggest that ‘objects’ are more topical in Korean? These are all interesting questions, but they seem beyond the scope of the present study.

For us, the important point is that in Korean a topic NP does not appear when the topic concerned is available in the immediate context, e.g., what the speech participants have been talking about, what they can ‘see’ in the speech situation, etc.. This suggests in turn that what topic NP signals is the topic that the speaker thinks that the hearer may not have in mind at the particular point of time. Notice that this topic is still something that the hearer should be able to identify. This we characterize as switched topic, and it is precisely because the speaker thinks that the hearer may not have this topic in mind that the illocutionary purpose, "I want to cause you to be able to consider this", is there.

To conclude this section, let us consider (95) of which the second set of sentences appeared as (92) above. Here, the author is changing topics from ‘님행’ (bank) to ‘돈’ (money), and returning to ‘님행’ (bank).

(95) 1 님행-님  돈-달  매테크시-요  예금-달

bank-TOP money-ACC entrst-CONN deposit-ACC

ha-go  토 돈-달  틀에-요  측-님

do-CONJ(and) also money-ACC loan-CONN using

kos-i-mnida.

PRO(place)-is-DECL(HON2)

"A/The bank is a place where (we/you) deposit money and get a loan."

---

29The corpus comes from a written discourse, titled ‘공공 기관’ (public institutions), p147, ‘한국 1’ (Korean 1), published by ‘서울대학교’ (Seoul National University, Language Research Centre).
Money is easy to spend if (you) keep (it) at home. If (you) deposit (it) in a bank, (you) don't lose (it) and (you) can spend (it) whenever (you) want to spend (it)."

"Thus, a/the bank is a place where (they) do good thing for the finance of the entire nation and the individual."

### 2.4. Summary

In this chapter, we have considered some discourse-semantic aspects of topic NP. We began with an argument that ‘NP-ün’ signals contrastive-topic. Despite the same functional label, the sense of contrastiveness that ‘NP-ün’ bears is different from contrastive in a theory neutral sense, in that the former is related to the speaker’s selection of the particular topic among the established topics, whereas the latter, which is similar to exclusive-focus, is related to the speaker’s selection of the particular referent as comment whereby the speaker contradicts some part of another speech participant’s prior utterance. We attempted to spell out, very crudely, the meaning of the particle ‘ün’, arguing that the plurality of the established topics is the crucial component of its meaning. Lacking the particle ün, ‘NP-∅’ therefore signals non-contrastive topic.

We then argued that topic, in the sense that ‘NP-ün’ and ‘NP-∅’ are topic NPs in Korean, is a fairly specific type of topic, i.e., switched topic. Although it is something that the hearer can identify, a switched topic is something that the speaker thinks that the hearer may not have in his/her consciousness at a particular point in time. Thus, the overt marking of the topic is required to maintain discourse cohesion. In this sense, topic NP is one of the coherence mechanisms in the
system of the Korean language. By contrast, it has been demonstrated that non-switched topics do not appear in a Korean sentence. As they are what the speaker has been talking about or are obvious in the given situation, the speaker can safely assume that they are in the hearer's mind, so that s/he finds it unnecessary to express topics explicitly. Not being equipped with pronominals, more precisely, unstressed pronominals, a Korean speaker does not express non-switched topics in his/her sentence.

Integrating all these points, we conclude that ‘NP-ûn’ signals a contrastive switched topic and ‘NP-Ø’ a non-contrastive switched topic. In the following two chapters, we will discuss syntactic aspects of topic NP, focusing at how the topic NP is understood as a coherent sentence-internal NP.
Chapter 3
Two Coherence Mechanisms

3.1. Introduction

The previous chapter considered the most important discourse-semantic aspects of topic NP. There we saw that topic NP signals a switched topic and non-switched topics do not appear in the sentence. Let us now turn our attention to syntactic aspects of topic NP. At the outset of this thesis we made a distinction between bound topic NP and free topic NP. To repeat, the former is a topic NP that is interpreted as an argument of the verb, and the latter a topic NP that is not understood as such but as a scene-setter. We will further divide bound topic NP into two sub-types: topic NP and Oblique topic NP. Henceforth, topic NP only refers to ‘NP-ûn’ or ‘NP-Ø’ as a bound topic NP, and Oblique topic NP stands for ‘oblique case marked NP-ûn’. In this chapter, we will consider topic NPs and Oblique topic NPs in action sentences, explaining in detail and justifying the two sentence-internal coherence mechanisms claimed at the beginning of this thesis: the binding mechanism and [+local] restriction. Bound topic NPs in stative sentences and free topic NPs will be considered in the next chapter.

Topic NPs and Oblique topic NPs interplay with case markers in an interesting way. To begin with, topic NP understood as the Agent, the Patient, etc. (which would be marked respectively with ‘i/ga’ (NOM) or ‘ûl/rûl’ (ACC) in a neutral description sentence) cannot occur with a case-marker. Consider (96).
(96) a. suni-\text{n\text{"u}n} ch\text{\text{"o}lsu-}ege ch\text{\text{"a}eg-}\text{\text{"u}l} chu-\text{\text{"o}t-t}*a.

\textit{Name-TOP Name-DAT book-ACC give-PAST-DECL}

"Speaking of Suni, she gave a/the book to Ch\text{\text{"o}lsu.}"

a'. * suni-ga-\text{n\text{"u}n} ch\text{\text{"o}lsu-ege ch\text{\text{"a}eg-}\text{\text{"u}l} chu-\text{\text{"o}t-t}*a.}

\textit{Name-NOM-TOP Name-DAT book-ACC give-PAST-DECL}

b. ch\text{\text{"a}eg-\text{"u}n} suni-ga ch\text{\text{"o}lsu-ege chu-\text{\text{"o}t-t}*a.}

\textit{book-TOP Name-NOM Name-DAT give-PAST-DECL}

"Speaking of the book, Suni gave it to Ch\text{\text{"o}lsu.}"

b. * ch\text{\text{"a}eg-\text{"u}l-\text{"u}n} suni-ga ch\text{\text{"o}lsu-ege chu-\text{\text{"o}t-t}*a.}

\textit{book-ACC-TOP Name-NOM Name-DAT give-PAST-DECL}

However, Oblique topic NPs\textsuperscript{1} understood to bear various Oblique semantic roles such as the Location, the Instrument, etc. must occur with an appropriate case marker. This is illustrated in (97).

(97) a. chaq-\text{-\text{n\text{"u}n}} suni-ga os-\text{\text{"u}l}

\textit{wardrobe-LOC1-TOP Name-NOM cloth-ACC}

n\text{"o-\text{"o}t-t}*a.

\textit{put in-PAST-DECL}

"In the wardrobe Suni put (the) clothes, (and ...)"

a'. * chaq-\text{-\text{"u}n} suni-ga os-\text{\text{"u}l}

\textit{wardrobe-TOP Name-NOM cloth-ACC}

n\text{"o-\text{"o}t-t}*a.

\textit{put in-PAST-DECL}

b. mo\text{\text{"o}nduqi-ro-\text{n\text{"u}n}} suni-ga k\text{"a-r\text{"u}l} t*\text{\text{"e}ri-\text{"o}t-t}*a.

\textit{stick-INSTR-TOP Name-NOM dog-ACC beat-PAST-DECL}

"With a stick Suni beat a/the dog, (and ...)"

b'. * mo\text{\text{"o}nduqi-\text{\text{"u}n}} suni-ga k\text{"a-r\text{"u}l} t*\text{\text{"e}ri-\text{"o}t-t}*a.

\textit{stick-TOP Name-NOM dog-ACC beat-PAST-DECL}

c. \text{"o}mma-wa-\text{n\text{"u}n} suni-ga ka-n-da.

\textit{Name-COM-TOP Name-NOM go-PRES-DECL}

"With mum Suni is going, (and ...)"

c'. * \text{"o}mma-\text{n\text{"u}n} suni-ga ka-n-da.

\textit{Name-TOP Name-NOM go-PRES-DECL}

\textsuperscript{1}For the semantic aspects of these Oblique topic NPs, see below.
d. puŏkʰ-esŏ-nŭn suni-ga kogi-rŭl
   kitchen-LOC2-TOP Name-NOM meat-ACC
   kum-nŭn-da.
   roast-PRES-DECL

  "In the kitchen Suni is roasting (the) meat, (and ...)"

d'. * puŏkʰ-ŭn suni-ga kogi-rŭl kum-nŭn-da.
   kitchen-TOP Name-NOM meat-ACC roast-PRES-DECL

Most interesting is the Recipient (switched) topic, which can be expressed in two different ways: as topic NP or as Oblique topic NP. Consider (98).

   Name-TOP Name-NOM book-ACC give-PAST-DECL

   “Speaking of Chʰŏlsu, Suni gave him a/the book.”

   Name-DAT-TOP Name-NOM book-ACC give-PAST-DECL

   “To Chʰŏlsu Suni gave a/the book.”

The above observation is due to Kim (1967) and Song (1967), who invoked two transformations, ‘topicalisation’ and ‘case marker deletion’, in attempting to explain the given data. According to them, topicalisation is a grammatical process whereby a base-generated NP is moved to the front while being marked with ‘ŭn/nŭn’, the topic marker in their terminology. They assumed that sentences like (99) below precede sentences like (96)a-b and (98) in the ‘flow’ of derivations.

(99) suni-ga chʰŏlsu-ège chʰæg-ŭl chu-ŏt-tʰ’a.
   Name-NOM Name-DAT book-ACC give-PAST-DECL

   “Suni gave a/the book to Chʰŏlsu.”

Ignoring other derivational stages such as ‘topic marker attachment’, topicalisation may thus be schematized as in (100) below. Here, a syntactic unit generated under S is moved to the front to be an adjunct to S’. 
Given the data (96)-(98), the transformationalists found it mandatory that the topicalisation should be followed by another transformation, i.e., ‘case marker deletion’. They note this latter transformation must be accompanied by accidental constraints such as (101).

\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
\text{topicalization} & \quad \text{case-marker deletion} \\
\text{NOM/ACC} & \quad \text{yes (obligatory)} \\
\text{DAT} & \quad \text{yes (optional)} \\
\text{others} & \quad \text{no (obligatory)}
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}

Currently, topic NP is viewed in general as basic/base-generated (Bak (1981), Sohn (1980, 1981), Choe (1984), see also Li and Thompson (1976)) in Korean linguistics. We agree with this non-transformational view that topic NP is not a derived category but is something that is simply there in the sentence. As the previous chapter argues, its function is to maintain discourse cohesion. Taking a clause as a subpart of a simple sentence, we might thus draw a tree structure like (102)a when there is a topic NP, and (102)b when there is no topic NP.

\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
\text{a. with a topic NP} \\
\text{b. without a topic NP}
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}

Following this, the next question to raise is, "how is the clause-external NP in a sentence structure like (102)a understood as a coherent sentence-internal unit?". As stated earlier, coherent here means linked to the Predicate-Argument structure of the verb. Regarding this question, current non-transformational views in the available literature seem no better than the topicalisation hypothesis. Under the transformational approach, one might say (though incorrectly we believe) that the topically NP is coherent by virtue of its pre-topicalization syntactic status. By contrast, current approaches appear to argue that topic NP is coherent because it is base-generated under the node S' (cf. Liejiong and Langendoen (1985)). We find this unsatisfactory.
Given that topic NP is clause-external, we will argue below that 1) topic NP binds a clause-internal zero anaphor and 2) zero anaphor is in the sentence structure when a controlled Grammatical Function, i.e., Subject or Object or possibly Second Object, is missing in the sentence. It follows from this that, first, Oblique topic NPs cannot employ the binding mechanism. Since Obliques are not controlled Grammatical Functions, there is no zero anaphor for an Oblique topic NP to bind. Hence, it may not be accidental at all that an Oblique topic NP must carry the Oblique case marker. Otherwise, there will be a violation of the Extended Coherence Condition. This suggests that an Oblique topic NP may not be clause-external. Indeed, as we will demonstrate in 3.4, the real generalisation of Oblique topic NPs can be more easily seen in a complex sentence: an Oblique topic NP, which occurs in general sentence-initially, is understood as occurring in the same clause as the main verb. This is what we mean by [+local] restriction. Second, the two variations of Recipient topic do not seem to be an accident, either. We will argue that they reflect the existence of ‘Dative-Fronting’ in Korean. Although the motivation for the fronting per se is unclear (cf. Givón (1979b)), it is a grammatical process widely observed in a number of languages.

This chapter is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces our theoretical framework. Discussing word order and zero anaphora in Korean, we advocate F-Structure in LFG as the most suitable representation for the sentence structure. In section 3, we re-consider what is meant by topic NP being a clause-external NP, and discuss the binding mechanism and its consequences in Korean syntax. We define clause-external as ‘case-unspecified’, and demonstrate that when it binds a clause-internal zero anaphor, topic NP cannot be understood to bear any other than a core grammatical relation (Andrews (1985b)), i.e., Subject or Object (and possibly Second Object). On this basis, issues of demoted Agent in a passive sentence and Dative-Fronting in Korean will be discussed. Section 4 considers Oblique topic NPs and the [+local] restriction. We will demonstrate that Oblique topic NPs do not involve zero anaphor but obey this restriction.

\[\text{^2The issue of Second Object requires a further study. Having not found a sensible means to determine which of the two Objects of ditransitive verbs like ‘chu-da (to give)’ is the Object and which is the Second Object, we simply assume that the Theme is the Object and the Recipient the Second Object. However, the coherence mechanism involving the Recipient topic NP is unclear. Informants’ (including the author’s) judgements of data regarding this is contradictory. They sometimes suggest a binding mechanism, sometimes [+ local]. We leave this for future study.}\]
3.2. The Functional Structure

In this section, we will seek to employ F[unctional]-Structure in LFG for representing sentence structure in Korean. Two factors led us to make this choice over the familiar tree structure: namely, word order and zero anaphora. As we will claim below, problems of word order, which inevitably arise in tree structural representation, unnecessarily complicate Korean syntax. Secondly, zero anaphora is a relational-functional notion, rather than structural. While the tree structural representation may handle there the two factors in its own way, we find the F-Structure of LFG most suitable for the representation of the sentence structure in Korean since F-Structure prevents superficial ordering problems from distracting our discussion. Also, since LFG adopts functional notions as its theoretical primitives, it allow us to express the phonologically null but psychologically existent category in a systematic way.

Korean may be characterized as a free word-order language. However, it is free only in the sense that core grammatical relations are not expressed by word-order. Grammatical relations are expressed by means of case markers. Thus, as demonstrated in Chapter 1 (1.2), varying the ‘physical’ order among constituents does not lead to a propositional meaning difference. In this language, altering the case markers will have an effect similar to that of varying the word order in configurational languages like English.

Case markers, ‘i/ga’ (NOM) and ‘ül/rül’ (ACC) in particular, signal the same sort of structural relationship which in English grammar the two positions, preverbal and postverbal, express. The two superficially different coding strategies are functionally the same, being devices which package the same kind of structural relations between the NP and the verb. Consider (103) below.

(103) a. chósul-x-ga suni-rül t*æri-ðt-t*a.
   Name-NOM Name-ACC hit-PAST-DECL
   "Chósul hit Suni."

b. chósul-æge suni-ga maj-at-t*a.
   Name-DAT Name-NOM be hit-PAST-DECL
   "Suni was hit by Chósul."
In (103)a our knowledge of Korean grammar tells us that NP-NOM is the Agent (the 'hitter') and NP-ACC the Patient (the 'one to be hit'). This grammatical knowledge does not say, however, that NP-NOM will by itself be the Agent. The situation that (103)b refers to is similar to that described in (103)a, but the semantic role borne by NP-NOM in (103)b is very different. It is the same role as NP-ACC is understood to bear in (103)a. This means that the case marker 'i/ga' signals that 'Chǒlsu' in (103)a and 'Suni' in (103)b are in the same structural relation, i.e., the 'i/ga' relation (which we are calling the Nominative for expository purposes), with the respective verb. The interpretation of this structural relation as the Agent or the Patient depends on the verb. Notice that this description may hold with English data, if we change the 'i/ga' relation into the 'preverbal' relation. We cannot thus regard the two coding properties as being radically different, just because they look different.

Now if we use a descriptive tool which requires the mapping of NP-NOM and NP-ACC onto the prescribed positions in a tree structure, i.e., under the node S and under the node VP, respectively, unless we want to say that there are no grammatical relations in Korean (which is obviously wrong as is apparent in (103)a-b above), we would have to 'edit' a sentence in such a way that NP-NOM precedes NP-ACC. This is because the tree structure is two-dimensional in nature, and one NP must precede (or follow) the other. This re-ordering is necessarily followed by an additional rule, such as 'scrambling' (Choe (1985), Kang (1985), Saito (1985)), to accommodate the seemingly fluid word-order in Korean. It is debatable, however, whether scrambling as a putative grammatical rule is psychologically real, i.e., has a psychological counterpart in the native Korean speaker's intuition about his/her language, or is a problem generated by the particular theory itself. Clearly, a grammatical model that has word-order in its theoretical basis would have to be further abstracted, otherwise it will unnecessarily complicate the syntactic description of languages like Korean.

Incidentally, we cannot say that word-order in Korean is free in a strict sense. This is because it is a function of various pragmatic factors, though it is unclear what the parameters controlling the variations are. Nevertheless, two generalizations about word-order in Korean have been made in the literature, 1) topic NP, if there is one in a sentence, generally occurs in sentence-initial position,

---

3Note that the English gloss in (103)b may not be accurate. Even though we translate the verb 'mat-t*a' as 'to be hit', it is not a derived verb. It is one of the verbs in Korean which has the affected aspect 'built in', as it were, into their meaning components. Since it is impossible to passivize the verb 't*ari-da' (to hit), we may call 'mat-t*a' (to be hit) a suppletive passive form of the verb 't*ari-da'.

4Notice that the question of whether or not Korean has a VP node is irrelevant here. In fact, it seems to be a self-contradiction to say, assuming such a descriptive tool, that Korean has a flat constituent structure.

5However, newer versions of Transformational Grammar, e.g., Marantz (1984), appear to abstract the positions further in a three-dimensional space, e.g., representing S as [NP, VP] rather than [NP VP]. Thus, the NP under the node S does not necessarily precede (or follow) the NP under the VP. If this is the case, it will not be a valid statement to say that the descriptive tool necessarily bears the problem of linear ordering.
and 2) as with Turkish (Erguvanli (1979)) and Hungarian (Horvath (1981)), the immediate pre-verbal position seems to be the unmarked position for new information/focus (Kim (1985)). Although the position of topic NP has been well discussed in the literature, the position of the unmarked focal NP needs a demonstration. Consider (104). Note that bold-faced nouns in the free translations below stand for a stressed noun.

(104) a. chholsu-ga yǒngsu-ege suni-rul sogaeha-go
   Name-NOM Name-DAT Name-ACC introduce-CONN
   is*-ùmnida.
   AUX(PROG)-DECL(HON2)
   "Chholsu is introducing Suni to Yǒngsu."

b. chholsu-ga suni-rul yǒngsu-ege sogaeha-go
   Name-NOM Name-ACC Name-DAT introduce-CONN
   is*-ùmnida.
   AUX(PROG)-DECL(HON2)
   "Chholsu is introducing Suni to Yǒngsu."

c. suni-rul yǒngsu-ege chholsu-ga sogaeha-go
   Name-ACC Name-DAT Name-NOM introduce-CONN
   is*-ùmnida.
   AUX(PROG)-DECL(HON2)
   "Chholsu is introducing Suni to Yǒngsu."

Of the three sentences, (104)a is the neutral, i.e., 'thematicall unmarked' (Huddleston (1984)), sentence. By contrast, NPs in (104)b and those in (104)c are ordered as such in order to highlight the 'introducee' and 'introducer', respectively. They are very likely answers to the questions, "To whom is Chholsu introducing Yǒngsu?" and "Who is introducing Yǒngsu to Chholsu?", respectively. In other words, the preverbal position in Korean is meaningful, being reserved for the unmarked focal NP, however not in the grammatical sense.

How can we represent our grammatical knowledge that with the verb ‘t*æri-da’ (to hit) in (103) above NP-NOM and NP-ACC are the ‘hitter’ and the ‘one to be hit’ without invoking scrambling, while not precluding word order from pragmatic analyses? Using LFG, we can achieve this along the following line.

---

6A native speaker is able to pinpoint, even if not immediately, a neutral variant among a set of thematic variations. In general, the neutral sentence is the one of which he/she cannot spell out the possible context, when asked why he/she would say it rather than other variants.
LFG employs two levels: C[onstituent]-Structure and F-Structure. C-Structure represents the superficial arrangement of words and phrases in the sentence. This is the representation on which phonological interpretation operates, and accordingly, we do not have to edit a given sentence. Thus, given sentences like (105)a-b, there are two C-Structure representations as in (106)a-b.

(105) a. chʰaŋsugi-ga chʰolsu-rūl kʰojib-ö̂t-tʰa.
    Name-NOM Name-ACC pinch-PAST-DECL
    "Chʰaŋsuk pinched Chʰolsu."

     a. chʰolsu-rūl chʰaŋsugi-ga kʰojib-ö̂t-tʰa.
     Name-ACC Name-NOM pinch-PAST-DECL
     "Chʰaŋsuk pinched Chʰolsu."

(106) a. 

        S
       /   \
      NP    NP  V
   Chʰaŋsugi-ga  Chʰolsu-rūl  kʰojib-ö̂t-tʰa.

b. 

        S
       /   \
      NP    NP  V
   Chʰolsu-rūl  Chʰaŋsugi-ga  kʰojib-ö̂t-tʰa.

By contrast, F-Structure represents surface Grammatical Functions. This representation is the input to the semantic component. Thus, for (105)a-b there is only one F-Structure, since, despite the difference in superficial word order, they are identical sentences in terms of Grammatical Functions. The F-Structure for (105)a-b will look like (107).

(107) F-Structure of (103)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{SUBJ} & \quad \text{PRED} 'Chʰaŋsuk' \\
\text{CASE} & \quad \text{NOM} \\
\text{OBJ} & \quad \text{PRED} 'Chʰolsu' \\
\text{CASE} & \quad \text{ACC} \\
\text{TENSE} & \quad \text{PAST} \\
\text{PRED} & \quad 'kʰojib-ö̂t-tʰa (to pinch) <(\text{SUBJ}) (\text{OBJ})>'
\end{align*}
\]

(107) obtains through annotated Phrase Structure rules such as (108). Note that * stands for "any number (including zero) of". The brace notation says "either of the equations". These equations specify the assigned Grammatical Function to the NP. The two arrows in ((\text{SUBJ}))=↓, etc. stand for "my mother node’s" and "me", respectively.

\[\text{Our sketch of LFG formalism is highly simplified. For the full description, see Bresnan and Kaplan (1982).}\]
The rule states that "expand any number of NPs, with each being annotated with a equation". Thus, among the strings of NPs, for instance, an NP annotated with \( (\text{SUBJ}) = l \) shall be read "my mother node’s SUBJ is me", i.e., the NP is the Subject NP.

The Grammatical Function assignment to a C-Structure category is governed by Case Marking Principles such as (109).

\[
\begin{align*}
(109) & \quad \text{a. If SUBJ then } (\text{CASE} = \text{NOM}) \\
& \quad \text{b. If OBJ then } (\text{CASE} = \text{ACC})
\end{align*}
\]

Although we shall assume in this thesis some version of Mohanan (1982) for simplicity, see Neidle (1982) and Ishikawa (1985)) for more sophisticated ‘feature decomposition’ case marking principles, and see Andrews (1982b, 1985a) for treatments of structurally unpredictable case marking.

Notice the lexical form of the verb in F-Structure above, which looks like (110).

\[
(110) \quad \text{‘k*ojip-t*a (to pinch) } (\text{SUBJ}) (\text{OBJ})\text{’}
\]

Grammatical Functions appearing inside the angle brackets are those Subcategorized by the verb. Just as the Case Marking Principles assign a Grammatical Function to a phrase structural category, Lexical Mapping Principles such as developed by Bresnan and Kanerva (1988) (also Bresnan (1982b)) assign a Grammatical Function to a semantic role in the Predicate-Argument structure of the verb. Thus, given a verb like ‘k*ojip-t*a’ (to pinch) in (105) above, Lexical Mapping Principles assigns SUBJ to the Agent (the ‘pincher’) and OBJ to the Patient (the ‘pinched’).

Grammatical Functions, SUBJ, OBJ, etc. here function as an intermediary. In practice, we may say that, by being assigned an appropriate Grammatical Function, a given surface phrase structure category NP-NOM is understood as the ‘pincher’ and, likewise, an NP-ACC the ‘pinched’.

By separating the superficial constituent configurations from surface Grammatical Functions, we can avoid pseudo-problems like scrambling, while opening the possibility of ‘sincere’ studies of word order in Korean. Note that from the rule (108) above it is predicted that there need be no Subject NP, Object NP, etc. in a sentence. Before discussing whether or not this means that the Subject NP, the Object NP, etc. are really optional in Korean, let us consider the ‘inaudible/invisible’ pronominal unit in Korean, the zero anaphor.
In the previous chapter, we claimed that zero anaphor is a category in an anaphoric relation with a discourse topic, i.e., it is by definition the most definite category. Below, defining zero anaphora as an instance where a core argument (Foley and Van Valin (1984), Andrews (1985b)) of the verb is missing, we argue to the effect that a zero anaphor is comparable with an 'unstressed' personal pronoun in similar environments in English.

Consider (111).

(111) t*æri-ði-t*a.
    hit-PAST-DECL
    "(The understood one(i)) hit (a second understood one(j))."

(111) is not an ungrammatical sentence. Even without being given any further information, native speakers do interpret the sentence as translated. Thus, even though (111) contains no phonic/graphic entities for 'the understood one' and 'a second understood one', it does not seem incorrect to posit two 'invisible pronominal entities'. Otherwise, it would be very difficult to explain why (111) is interpreted as such. Such an invisible pronominal entity is what is meant by 'zero anaphor'. Broadly speaking, a zero anaphor is similar to an unstressed pronoun in English (Givon (1979a, 1983b), Kameyama (1985)). In order to understand the 'full' propositional meaning of (111) above, we have to know the antecedents/referents of the zero anaphors, and, in order to identify the antecedents/referents of the zero anaphors, we have to know the specific context.

Viewing the zero anaphor as a normal pronominal in Korean is consonant with Kuroda’s position (Kuroda (1979), see also (Li and Thompson (1979)) on zero anaphora in Japanese. A Korean speaker, like a Japanese speaker, will use a 'pronominal' which is never realized phonetically, where an English speaker might have to choose, and 'unstress', one among 'I/we', 'you', and 'he/she/it/they'. As a regular pronominal, zero anaphor also has deictic usage. The missing subject of a declarative sentence is often understood as 'the speaker (I)', and that of a interrogative sentence as 'the hearer (you)'. This has been claimed in various places by various people (Chang (1984, 1986)).

(112) a. a, pʰiɡonha-da.
    INTERJ be tired-DECL
    "Ah, (I’m) tired."

b. pʰiɡonha-ni?
    be tired-INTER
    "(Are you) tired?"
A: nugu-se-yo?

who-(is)-HON1-INTER(HON2)
(on hearing someone knocking at the door)
"Who are (you, invisible one)?"
"Who is it?"

B: na-mnida.

I-(is)-DECL(HON2)
"(I) am I."
"It’s me."

Not only the two immediate speech participants, but also the third person(s) in the speech situation and one or more entities in the immediate speech situation can be ‘expressed’ by zero anaphor. Consider (114) and (115).

(114) kyesi-8?

is<existential(HON1)>-INTER
(in front of the boss’s office, asking the secretary if the boss is in)
"Is (s/he) in?"

(115) a. nun-i-da!

snow-is-DECL
(Lit.) "(It, i.e., the thing coming into my view) is snow!"
"Snow!/It’s snowing!"

b. todug-i-ya!

burglar-is-EXCL
(Lit.) "(S/He, i.e., the one in front of me) is a burglar!"
"Burglar!/We have a burglar!"

However, zero anaphora should not be regarded as any missing category in any sense in the sentence. For instance, in (111) (and similarly in other sentences above), there is no clear reason why we should not believe that the speaker in fact means "the ‘understood person’ hit another ‘understood person’ with the ‘understood instrument’ for the ‘understood reason’ in the ‘understood place’ at the ‘understood point in time’”, and so on. Are these all ‘missing’ categories, and will all of these persons, instrument, reason, etc. be understood as the ‘understood categories’ by this means?

We will confine zero anaphora to an instance where a core argument is missing (Bresnan (1982c:384-385)). This is supported by the following arguments. First, adjuncts, e.g., the Time, the Place, etc., seem irrelevant to our intuition about whether or not the given sentence is complete (Matthews (1981), Bresnan and Kaplan (1982:215), Andrews (1985b)). ‘Nil occurrence of an Adjunct’ need not be regarded as ‘there being a missing grammatical category’. By contrast,
Obliques such as the Instrument above seem relevant to the judgement of completeness of a given sentence. However, Obliques seem different from core arguments in that, from a careful language-specific observation, deliberate removal of a core argument always induces a definite reading, whereas this is not always true with Obliques. ‘Definite’ here means ‘having a unique identity’ (Shopen (1973)). Hence, Oblique arguments are also excluded, since the motivation for our postulating a zero anaphor is to explain the definiteness of missing arguments. Therefore, in (111), acknowledging the possibility that there may be more than two occurrences of argument ellipsis, we will limit the number of zero anaphor to two, one for the ‘understood hitter’ and one for the ‘person understood to be hit’.

Incidentally, our characterization of a zero anaphor as a definite pronominal might appear to conflict with the well known indefinite argument ellipsis associated with verbs like ‘to eat’ and ‘to drink’ in English. Consider (116).

(116) a. suni-ga  pab-ûl  mõg-ô-t’a.
    Name-NOM boiled rice-ACC  eat-PAST-DECL
    "Suni ate (the) boiled rice."

a’. suni-ga  mõg-ô-t’a.
    Name-NOM  eat-PAST-DECL
    "Suni ate ‘the something’.”
    ?* "Suni ate."

b. suni-ga  sur-ûl  masi-n-da.
    Name-NOM  alcholic drinks-ACC  drink-PRES-DECL
    "Suni drinks (the) alcholic drinks."

b’. suni-ga  masi-n-da.
    Name-NOM  drink-PAST-DECL
    "Suni drinks ‘the something’.”
    ?* "Suni drinks."

As we claimed, the respective missing Objects in (116)a’-b’ are understood as the "something that is under consideration by the speech participants", not as something indefinite. A similar phenomenon to indefinite ellipsis in English does obtain in Korean, but it is done with a form of ‘noun incorporation’. Consider (117).
Some nouns in Korean can be used as a bare NP to constitute a unit with the verb. This bare NP is different from ‘NP-Ø’, in that nothing (including a pause) occurs between the incorporated noun and the verb. The noun incorporation appears to give a similar semantic effect as the intransitive ‘to eat/to drink’, etc. does in English. In (117), ‘pap’ (boiled rice) and ‘sul’ (alcoholic drinks) do not have a unique identity in the real world: they are simply indefinite ‘pap’ and ‘sul’.

However, it is not the case that any noun can be incorporated into the verb. Semantically, as Dixon (forthcoming) observes in Fijian, with the verbs ‘mōk-t’*a’ (to eat) and ‘masi-da’ (to drink) the incorporated noun in Korean appears to be a somehow ‘usual’, in a culture-specific sense, one to eat and drink. The following contrasts are highly suggestive.

(118) b. ?? suni-ga tomabam-mōg-ōi-t*a.
   Name-NOM lizard-eat-PAST-DECL
   (Lit.) "Suni lizard-ate."

b’. suni-ga tomabam-ūl mōg-ōi-t*a.
   Name-NOM lizard-ACC eat-PAST-DECL
   "Suni ate a/the lizard."

d. ?? suni-ga hwibalyu-masi-n-da.
   Name-NOM petrol-drink-PRES-DECL
   (Lit.) "Suni petrol-drinks."

d’. suni-ga hwibalyu-rūl masi-n-da.
   Name-NOM petrol-ACC drink-PRES-DECL
   "Suni drinks (the) petrol."

Compared with ‘boiled rice’ and ‘alcoholic drinks’, a ‘lizard’ and ‘petrol’ are unusual things to eat and to drink in Korean culture. As such, the incorporation of these nouns results in strangeness. In this regard, we may say that noun incorporation in Korean is similar to indefinite argument ellipsis in English.

It is important to note that zero anaphora is always a clause-internal phenomenon. Zero anaphor is an invisible/inaudible but assumed-to-be-there pronominal unit being present in a core argument slot of the verb. As we argued in the previous chapter, we do not postulate an additional
null category such as zero topic (cf. Huang (1984)), for a non-switched topic, in the sentence structure. Consider (119). The context would be; A told B to give some particular books to the children they both know. Later, A wants to find out whether his request was carried out.

(119) A: chʰæk ai-dül-ege chu-ôn-ni?

"The books, did (you) give (them) to the children?"

B: üŋ, chu-os*’-o.

"Yes give-PAST-DECL"

(Lit.) "Yes, (I) gave (them(the books)) (them(the children))."

‘Chæk’ (book) in (119)A is non-contrastive switched topic NP. Turning to (119)B, we see that there is no change of topic, hence, no topic NP, i.e., ‘the books’ assumed by the speaker is also assumed by the hearer. Notice that in (119)B we cannot identify the apparent immediate discourse topic ‘chʰæk’ (the books) without context, but we can interprete the ‘giver’ and the ‘given’ and possibly the ‘recipient’ respectively as the ‘understood person’, the ‘second understood person’ and the ‘understood thing’. Clearly, recognizing the existence of zero anaphor(s) (which appear to be in an anaphoric relation with their respective discourse topic(s)) is a different matter from identifying the non-switched topic (which appears to be the most topical among the discourse topics). We need, strictly speaking, a study of context, not a study of syntactic categories, in order to explain why ‘chʰæk’ (the books) is the immediate discourse topic, rather than ‘I’ and ‘ai-dül’ (the children) in (119)B. Thus, unlike zero anaphor, an additional clause-external null category in the sentence structure for the non-switched topic is not motivated.

That zero anaphor is present in the sentence structure when a core argument is missing means in LFG terms that the F-Structure of the covert Subject or Object is supplied by an anaphoric control (Bresnan (1982c:326-343)). Below, we will examplify this.

Consider (120).

(120) yǒŋhi-ga k*øjib-ǒt-t*a.

"Yǒŋhi pinched the someone."

Under the Phrase Structure rules (108) above, the C-Structure representation of (120) will be (121).
Given a C-Structure like (121), the resulting F-Structure would be incomplete, since the verb says that it requires OBJ but it is missing in its F-Structure. Note this follows from local coherence mechanisms, i.e., complete and coherence conditions which govern the well-formedness of the sentence.

(122)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{SUBJ} \\
\text{PRED} 'Y\ddot{\text{o}}\ddot{\text{g}}\ddot{\text{hi}}' \\
\text{CASE NOM} \\
\text{TENSE} \ PAST \\
\text{PRED} 'k'^{ojip-t'^a \ (to \ pinch)} <(\text{SUBJ}) \ (\text{OBJ})> \\
\end{array}
\]

Thus, anaphoric control is applied to supply the relevant information. The F-Structure of (120) will resemble (123). Note that the value ‘PRO’ stands for ‘definite\(^8\) pronominal’ and the feature ‘U’ and the value ‘+’ stand for ‘no phonetic content’ (Bresnan (1982c:330)).

(123)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{SUBJ} \\
\text{PRED} 'Y\ddot{\text{o}}\ddot{\text{g}}\ddot{\text{hi}}' \\
\text{CASE NOM} \\
\text{OBJ} \\
\text{PRED} 'PRO' \\
\text{U} \ + \\
\text{TENSE} \ PAST \\
\text{PRED} 'k'^{ojip-t'^a \ (to \ pinch)} <(\text{SUBJ}) \ (\text{OBJ})> \\
\end{array}
\]

3.3. The Binding Mechanism

We now discuss our binding mechanism. In Korean the normal way of interpreting the semantic role of an NP in a sentence is, as we discussed in the previous section, to make reference to the case-marker in conjunction with the semantics of the verb. Topic NP differs from case-marked NPs in that the identification of its semantic role depends primarily on the distribution of the cases of other NPs in the same sentence. Topic NP gives the impression that it is a generalised core Grammatical Function, understood either as the Subject, Object or the Second Object of the sentence. However, this does not mean that there is another grammatical relation (cf. Li and Thompson (1976)). Given our characterization of zero anaphora, this means that there is a binding between topic NP and a clause-internal zero anaphor. We assume that the binding is motivated by the Extended Coherence Condition (Zaenen (1980), Fassi-Fehri (1981, 1984), Bresnan and Mchombo (1987)) which requires a floating NP like topic NP to be bound to Predicate-Argument Structure of the verb (Bresnan and Mchombo (1987)) in order for the sentence to be a coherent linguistic unit.

\(^8\)We define ‘PRO’ as a ‘definite pronominal’, although this may not be standard practice in LFG (cf. Bresnan (1982c:340-341)).
Consider (124)a-b.

(124) a. suni-Ø w-i-t*ä.
   \textit{Name-TOP come-PAST-DECL}
   "Suni(i), she(i) has come (back)"

b. chʰöl-su-nūn ilchʰiik iɾōnɑ-s*-ōyo.
   \textit{Name-TOP early get up-PAST-DECL(HON2)}
   "Speaking of Chʰöl-su(i), he(i) got up early."

c. suni-nūn chʰöl-su-rūl manna-i-t*ä.
   \textit{Name-TOP Name-ACC meet-PAST-DECL}
   "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) met Chʰöl-su."

d. nō-Ø chʰæg-ūl nugu-ege chu-ōn-ni?
   \textit{you-TOP book-ACC who-DAT give-PAST-INTER}
   "You, whom did you give the/a book to?"

In (124)a-d, topic NPs are \textit{obligatorily} understood as the ‘one that has returned’, the ‘one that got up early’, the ‘one that met Chʰöl-su’, and the ‘one that gave the/a book to someone’, respectively. This interpretation is possible because the topic NPs bind the zero anaphor, the Grammatical Function of which is the Subject in each of the sentences above.

Likewise, in (125)a below, topic NPs bind the respective zero anaphor the Grammatical Function of which is the Object. Hence, they are \textit{obligatorily} understood as the ‘one that Suni ate’ and the ‘one that Suni gave to Yōnghi’, respectively.

(125) a. pap suni-ga mōg-ōs*-ōyo.
   \textit{boiled rice Name-NOM eat-PAST-DECL(HON2)}
   "The boiled rice(i), Suni ate it(i)."

b. chʰæg-ūn suni-ga yōnghi-ege chu-ōt*ä.
   \textit{book-TOP Name-NOM Name-DAT give-PAST-DECL}
   "Speaking of the book(i), Suni gave it to Yōnghi."

We state in (124) and (125) above that topic NP is \textit{obligatorily} understood as the Subject or the Object. It is ‘obligatory’ because in these sentences there is only one zero anaphor. We would predict then that an ambiguous reading will obtain if there is more than one zero anaphor. This prediction is borne out. Consider (126).
(126) a. suni-nún pw-at-t*a.

_Name-TOP see-PAST-DECL_

"Speaking of Suni(i), (the understood one (I)) saw her(i)."

? "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) saw (the understood one)."

b. suni-Ø manna-n-ni?

_Name-TOP meet-PAST-INTER_

"Suni(i), did (the understood person (you)) meet her(i)?"

? "Suni, did she(i) meet (the understood person)?"

The topic NPs in (126)a-b can be understood either as the Subject or as the Object. It is as if the topic NP is understood as the Object when the ellipsed NP is understood to be NP-NOM; when the ellipsed NP is understood to be NP-ACC, the topic NP is understood as the Subject. Although the interpretation of topic NPs as the Subject in these sentences is marginal on independent pragmatic grounds, this does not exclude the possibility that the ‘NP-Ø’ can be understood as the Subject.

Given the obligatory binding relationship between topic NP and a clause-internal pronominal unit, we would like to see whether the pronominal unit must be zero anaphor. Consider (127).

(127) a. suni-nún künyō-ga manna-t-t*a.

_Name-TOP PRO(she)-NOM meet-PAST-DECL_

* "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) met ‘the understood person’."  

"Speaking of Suni(i), she(j) met her(i)."

b. chölsu-nún kū-rūl manna-t-t*a.

_Name-TOP PRO(he)-ACC pinch-PAST-DECL_

* "Speaking of Chölsu(i), ‘the understood person’ met him(i)."  

"Speaking of Chölsu(i), he(i) met him(j)."

As can be seen, topic NP cannot bind overt pronominals. In fact, ‘Suni’ in (127)a is obligatorily understood as the one that the referent of ‘künyō’ (she, other than ‘Suni’ herself) met. In (127)b ‘Chölsu’ cannot be other than the one that met ‘kū’ (him, other than ‘Chölsu’ himself). Thus, topic NP binds a zero anaphor not an overt pronominal.10

---

9As we suggested in the previous section, the missing subject in an interrogative sentence is in general understood as the second person, ‘you’.

10More precisely, we would have to call this an ‘overt independent pronominal’. As we will see later, there are other ‘pronominals’ that can bound to topic NP. We might call these bound pronominals. See Section 4.3 in the next Chapter.
Predictably, then, (128)a-b are impossible sentences in Korean.

    Name-TOP  PRO(she)-NOM  Name-ACC  meet-PAST-DECL
    (intended to mean) "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) met Chîōlsu."

b.  * chîōlsu-nun  suni-ga  kū-rūl  manna-i-t*a.
    Name-TOP  Name-NOM  PRO(he)-ACC  pinch-PAST-DECL
    (intended to mean) "Speaking of Chîōlsu(i), Suni met him(i)."

In (128)a-b there is no zero anaphor in the clause structure. That is, all the core argument slots of the verb have been filled, as it were, by overt NPs in these examples. Since topic NP cannot bind overt pronominal, we have ungrammatical sentences.

Incidentally, compared with zero anaphor, overt pronouns in Korean function similarly to stressed pronouns in English (Givon (1979a, 1983b), Kameyama (1985)). They are used either as ‘switched topic NPs’ or as ‘some part of the comment’, e.g., as ‘a part of new information’, ‘focused NP’, or ‘exclusive-focus (or contrastive in Chafe’s sense) NP’. As such, overt pronouns in Korean seem to be in a different functional dimension to zero anaphor. Consider (129), where the overt pronoun ‘nô’ is used as switched topic NP.

(129)  a.  nôhi  se  iri  w-a.
    you(PL)  three  this  way  come-IMP
    "You three, come here!"

b.  nô-nun  muôs-ül  mōg-ûlæ?
    you-TOP  what-ACC  eat-do  you  intend  to
    "(How about you?), what would you like to have?"

By definition, a switched topic is something that the speaker thinks that the hearer may not have in mind at that particular point in time. Hence, employing zero category here is ‘pragmatically inconsistent’.12

Consider (130), where the overt pronoun ‘na’ (I)13 is used as focused NP (cf. (119) in the previous subsection).

---

11 By ‘comment’, we mean what the speaker wants the hearer to be informed of.

12 I borrowed this expression from Bresnan and Kanerva (1988).

13 Note that ‘na’ becomes ‘nâ’ before the Nominative case marker.
(130) A: ch\æk nu-ga ai-dül-ege chu-ôn-ni?
book(s) who-NOM child-PL-DAT give-PAST-INTER
"The books, who gave (them) to the children?"
B: næ-ga chu-os*-ô.
I-NOM give-PAST-DECL
"I gave (them(the books)) (them(the children))."
B’: # chu-os*-ô.
# "(I) gave (them(the books)) (them(the children))."

Use of zero anaphor as in (130)B’ instead of the overt pronoun as in (130)B will cause semantic anomaly. Also, consider (131), where the overt pronouns ‘nô’ (you) and ‘na’ (I) are used as exclusive-focus NPs. As in (130) above, using zero anaphor instead of the zero anaphor seen in (131)B will cause semantic anomaly. This is shown in (131)B’.

(131) A: ch\æk ne-ga ai-dül-ege chu-ôn-ni?
book(s) you-NOM child-PL-DAT give-PAST-INTER
"The books, did you give (them) to the children?"
(with a heavy stress on 'you')
B: üŋ, næ-ga chu-os*-ô. wæ?
yes I-NOM give-PAST-DECL why
(Lit.) "Yes, I gave (them) (to them). Why?"
(with a heavy stress on 'I')
B’: # üŋ, chu-os*-ô. wæ?
# "Yes, (I) gave (them) (to them). Why?"

A focal NP, whether exclusive or not, signals comment (or some part of it). As such, it is a piece of information that the speaker wants the hearer to know. In this respect, employing the null category is pragmatically inconsistent.

--

14Note that ‘nô’ becomes ‘ne’ before the Nominative case marker.
Earlier, we defined zero anaphor as an instance of a missing controlled Grammatical Function of the verb. Thus, the binding relationship between topic NP and a clause-internal zero anaphor will not be explained in terms of Semantic Roles like Agent and Patient. To demonstrate this, let us consider active sentences like (132) first.

(132) a. sungyŏŋ-i todug-ŭl chab-at-t*a.
   *policeman-NOM burglar-ACC catch-PAST-DECL
   "The/A policeman caught the/a burglar."

b. sungyŏŋ-ŭn todug-ŭl chab-at-t*a.
   *policeman-TOP burglar-ACC catch-PASS-PAST-DECL
   "Speaking of the policeman(i), he(i) caught a burglar."

c. todug-ŭn sungyŏŋ-i chap-at-t*a.
   *burglar-TOP policeman-NOM catch-PAST-DECL
   "Speaking of the burglar(i), a/the policeman caught him(i)."

Our claim is that in (132)b topic NP binds the zero anaphor whose Grammatical Function is Subject, and in (132)c topic NP binds the zero anaphor which bears the Object Grammatical Function. However, the examples suggest that we could also explain the binding relationship in terms of semantic roles, replacing Subject and Object with Agent and Patient, respectively.

However, (133) below, the passive counterpart of (132), shows that the second explanation is not right. Compared with (133)b, (133)c is not a possible sentence in Korean.

(133) a. todug-i sungyŏŋ-ege chap-hi-ŏt-t*a.
   *burglar-NOM policeman-DAT catch-PASS-PAST-DECL
   "The/A burglar was caught by a/the policeman."

b. todug-ŭn sungyŏŋ-ege chap-hi-ŏt-t*a.
   *burglar-TOP policeman-DAT catch-PASS-PAST-DECL
   "Speaking of the burglar, he(i) was caught by a/the policeman."

c. * sungyŏŋ-ŭn todug-i chap-hi-ŏt-t*a.
   policeman-TOP burglar-NOM catch-PASS-PAST-DECL
   (intended to mean) "Speaking of the policeman, a burglar was caught by him."
The ungrammaticality of (133)c tells us that there is no zero anaphor that the topic NP can bind in the clause structure. This means that the demoted Agent is not a core argument of the passivized verb. Clearly, in binding a clause-internal anaphoric element, topic NP makes reference to the Grammatical Function of the element, not its semantic role. This is obvious since, despite its case, ‘sungyŏn-ege’ (policeman-DAT) in (133)a-b remains semantically the Agent. To emphasize, zero anaphora is a syntactic notion, not a logico-semantic one.

Now, how can we represent topic NP and the binding relationship between topic NP and a clause-internal zero anaphor? Notice that the answer to this question follows from how we choose to characterize the manner of syntactic encoding of topic NP. Two proposals are available in the literature. First, as the transformationalists argued, topic NP is an NP that is marked with the topic marker un. This proposal includes the idea that ‘NP-∅’ is the result of topic marker deletion. We do not subscribe to this view.

The second proposal would be that topic NP is sentence-initial, more precisely, an NP that is adjunct to S’ (Bak (1981), Sohn (1980, 1981), Kang (1985)). This seems basically correct in that it recognizes topic NP as a clause-external entity. However, this is not an attractive proposal, unless it declares that the tree structure should not be seriously regarded as the representation of the surface sentence structure. Although topic NP generally occurs sentence-initially as in (134)a, sentences like (134)b-c are not ungrammatical in Korean.

(134) a. suni-nun chŏlsu-rul manna-i-t’a.
   "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) met Chŏlsu."  
b. chŏlsu-rul, suni-nun, manna-i-t’a.
   "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) met Chŏlsu."  
c. chŏlsu-rul manna-i-t’a, suni-nun
   "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) met Chŏlsu."  

To be sure, (134)b-c above differ from (134)a in terms of pragmatics, particularly, in terms of the psychological state of the speaker at the specific point in time. It may thus be unfair to bring these sentences into a discussion of ‘system’ sentences. However, the point here is that an NP’s being adjunct to S’ is not packaged in terms of superficial ordering of the NP in Korean.
Our proposal is that topic NP is a case-unspecified NP. As we witnessed above, an NP's being marked with a case marker signals that the NP is clause-internal. In such a grammatical system, if an NP occurs without a case marker, then there should be a reason for it. We interpret this as "the NP is clause-external". 

In terms of LFG, this means an inclusion of (135) into Case Marking Principles, without changing the PS rule (cf. Bresnan and Mchombo (1987)).

(135)  If TOP then \( (\text{CASE}=\emptyset) \)

Thus, the C-Structure of (134)b above will be represented as (136).

(136)  

The F-Structure of (134)b should resemble (137). Notice that the attribute 'TOP' stands for topic as a grammaticized discourse function (Bresnan and Mchombo (1987)). As such, TOP is not a subcategorizable function: the lexical form of the verb cannot specify it. Notice also that the attribute-value pair of 'CASE Ø' shows that the topic NP 'Suni' is a case-unspecified NP.

(137)  

The binding relationship between topic NP and zero anaphor will be expressed by a dotted line, as was suggested by Bresnan and Mchombo (1987).

---

15In fact, topic NP, if there is one, generally occurs sentence-initially, and there is a noticeable pause between topic NP and the rest of the sentence. However, these do not seem to be a grammatical cue.

16Note that we are following Andrews (1985a) here. A standard treatment in LFG would be to introduce a topic with annotation such as i) below.

i)  

17To be more precise, 'TOP' would have to be switched topic function. Non-switched discourse topic(s) will not be specified in either C-Structure or F-Structure. They are the antecedents/referents of zero anaphors, which are sentence-internal entities.
The next question is how to characterize the difference between ‘NP-Ø’ and ‘NP- ún’. In the previous chapter, we characterized the semantics of the particle ún as contrastive. Since the particle has a very abstract semantic value, a similar sort of value to that which the definite article ‘the’ in English might have, we will advance the feature ‘Contrastive’ (CONT henceforth) and place this feature where ‘Definite’ for a definite NP of a European language is located. This feature can have two values + and -. In this way, the difference between ‘NP- ún’ and ‘NP-Ø’ can further be represented in the F-Structure. We modify (137) above as (138) below.

(138)  
```
TOP  PRED 'Ch'ilsu'
    CASE Æ
    CONT +
SUBJ  PRED 'Suni'
    CASE NOM
OBJ  PRED 'PRO'
    U  +
TENSE PAST
PRED  'manna-da (to meet) <(SUBJ) (OBJ)>'
```  

Subsequently, the F-Structure of (139) (which appeared as (125)a) will look like (140).

(139)  
```
boiled rice Name-NOM eat-PAST-DECL(HON2)
"The boiled rice(i), Suni ate it(i)."
```

(140)  
```
TOP  PRED 'pap (boiled rice)'
    CASE Æ
    CONT -
SUBJ  PRED 'Suni'
    CASE NOM
OBJ  PRED 'PRO'
    U  +
TENSE PAST
PRED  'mok-t*a (to eat) <(SUBJ) (OBJ)>'
```  

---

18 We suggested that ‘ún’ signals that the referent of ‘NP-ún’ has been selected from among a group of referents in the speaker’s mind.
Now consider the following sentence\(^{19}\)

\[(141)\; \text{ch}^{b}\text{öl}_s\text{u-n}n\; \text{suni-n}n\; k^{*}\text{ojib-ö}t^{*}t^{*}a.\]

*Name-TOP Name-TOP pinch(?)-PAST-DECL*

either "Suni pinched(?) \text{ch}^{b}\text{öl}_s\text{u}." or "\text{ch}^{b}\text{öl}_s\text{u} pinched (?) Suni."

(141) may be an unusual sentence from a pragmatic point of view. Its preferred reading would be the first one, since the culture-specific knowledge says that the ‘one that does k\(^{*}\)ojib-öt\(^{*}\)a ((?)pinch)’ is in general a female.\(^{20}\) Nonetheless, (141) is basically an ambiguous sentence, as is correctly argued in the literature. Under our proposal, it is ambiguous simply because each of the two case-unspecified NPs can bind randomly (if we ignore the context of course) one of the two clause-internal zero anaphors. This intuition can be easily represented in the F-Structure in terms of which zero anaphor is bound to which topic NP. Consider the C-Structure (142), and the two F-Structures (143)a-b.

\[^{19}\text{Incidentally, (141) supports Bresnan and Mchombo’s claim (Bresnan and Mchombo (1987)) about multiple-valued non-argument Grammatical Functions.}\]

\[^{20}\text{Note that ‘Ch}^{b}\text{öl}_s\text{u’ is male, and ‘Suni’ female.}\]
We saw in the above that a passive sentence is grammatically intransitive. The relevant examples were (144)a-b (which appeared above as (133)).

(144) a. todug-ūn sungyŏng-ego chap-hi-ŏt-*a.

"Speaking of the burglar, he(i) was caught by a/the policeman."


(intended to mean) "Speaking of the policeman, a burglar was caught by him."

We have argued that the reason why (144)b is ungrammatical is because there is no zero anaphor that the topic NP can bind. That is, the demoted Agent, i.e., NP-DAT in (144)a, is not a controlled argument of the passivized verb. The same is true of the Oblique Agent of the verb ‘mat-ij’a (to be
hit), a verb we introduced as the suppletive passive form of ‘t'æri-da’ (to hit), which nonetheless is not a derived verb. Consider (145).

(145) a. sungyøŋ-un todug-ege maj-at-t*a.
    policeman-TOP burglar-DAT be hit-PAST-DECL
    "Speaking of the policeman(i), he(i) was hit by a/the burglar."

b. * todug-ùn sungyøŋ-i maj-at-t*a.
    burglar-TOP policeman-NOM be hit-PAST-DECL
    (intended to mean) "Speaking of the burglar(i), a/the policeman was hit by him(i)."

However, not all instances of NP-DAT behave as the demoted or Oblique Agent does. The Recipient, which usually appears as an NP-DAT, gives an impression that it may also be a controlled argument. Consider (146)a-c. Topic NP of (146)a is obligatorily understood as the Recipient, the ‘one to whom Suni gave money’.

(146) a. ch^61su-nun suni-ga ton-ùl chu-õi-t*a.
    Name-TOP Name-NOM money-ACC give-PAST-DECL
    "Speaking of Ch^61su(i), Suni gave him(i) money."

b. suni-nun ch^61su-ege ton-ùl chu-õi-t*a.
    Name-TOP Name-DAT money-ACC meet-PAST-DECL
    "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) gave money to Ch^61su."

c. ton-ùn suni-ga ch^61su-ege chu-õi-t*a.
    money-TOP Name-NOM Name-DAT give-PAST-DECL
    "Speaking of the money(i), Suni gave it(i) to Ch^61su."

Our proposal will say that ‘Ch^61su’ in (146)a is understood as a coherent sentence-internal NP because there is a clause-internal zero anaphor that the topic NP can bind. This, in conjunction with (146)b-c, then indicates that the verb ‘chu-da’ (to give) governs three Grammatical Functions.

One question here is whether the zero anaphor in (146)a is there in the sentence because the Recipient NP-DAT is, despite the case, simply a controlled argument of the verb or it is there because a morpho-lexical rule is applied, which ‘elevates’ the grammatical status of the Recipient from an Oblique to a core Grammatical Function. The answer to this question will have an implication for the Case Marking Principles. If we consider (146)b-c, it would appear that the Recipient role bearing NP-DAT per se is the surface realization of the controlled Grammatical Function. However, (147) below suggests that there is a grammatical process operating on the Recipient in Korean. Here, the Recipient NP occurs as NP-ACC (and there are two instances of NP-ACC), suggesting that it is an Object.
Thus, the Recipient topic NP which binds a zero anaphor in (146)a may constitute further evidence that the grammatical process, whereby the Recipient is promoted to a core Grammatical Function from an Oblique status, exists in Korean. This promotion called ‘Dativisation’ (Bresnan (1982a)) or ‘Dative-Shift’ (Givón (1982)) is widely observed in other languages. Under the theory we are assuming, this will be the operation of a morpho-lexical rule on the lexical form of the verb ‘chu-da’ (to give), resulting in another lexical form (cf. Bresnan (1982a)).

Following this, there is the question of the identification of the Grammatical Functions involved. Given the sentences (146)a-c and (147)a-b, we can either say that, for instance, in (146)a the overt NP-ACC is Object and the particular zero anaphor Second Object, or the other way around. Unfortunately, we do not have a sensible means to determine which is Object and which is Second Object. To passivize the verb ‘chu-da’ (to give) is impossible, and native speakers provided contradictory answers to the test of ‘extractability’ (see the next section). Nonetheless, in as far as we recognize two different Object Functions, it will be an empirical issue which is Object and which is Second Object. Thus, leaving the justification for future study, we will assume that the zero anaphor bound to the topic NP in (146)a is the Second Object, and the overt NP-ACC the Object. We may schematize Dative-Fronting in Korean as (148), the two lexical forms of the verb ‘chu-da’ (to give) as (149).

(147) a. suni-ga chʰolsu-rul ton-ůl chu-ǒt-t’a.

"Suni gave Chʰolsu some money."

b. ton-ůn suni-ga chʰolsu-rul chu-ǒt-t’a.

"(Lit.) Speaking of the money(i), Suni gave Chʰolsu it(i)."

(148) Dative-Fronting

ObliqueRecipient --> OBJ2

(149) a. chu-da <(SUBJ) (OBJ) (OBLq)>

Agent(giver) Theme(given) Recipient

b. chu-da <(SUBJ) (OBJ) (OBJ2)>

Agent(giver) Theme(given) Recipient

Then, a principle like (150) should be included in the Case Marking Principles.

(150) If OBJ2 then \(\delta\text{CASE=ACC}\)
We propose then (151)a-b as the respective F-Structures of (146)a and (146)c.

(151) a. F-Structure of (146)a

```
TOP [PRED 'Ch\text{"olsu}'
   CASE \empty
   CONT +
]

SUBJ [PRED 'Suni'
   CASE NOM
]

OBJ [PRED 'ton (money)'
   CASE ACC
]

OBJ2 [PRED 'PRO'
   \U +
]

TENSE PAST

PRED 'chu-da (to give) <(SUBJ) (OBJ) (OBJ2)>
```

b. F-Structure of (146)c

```
TOP [PRED 'ton'
   CASE \empty
   CONT +
]

SUBJ [PRED 'Suni'
   CASE NOM
]

OBL\text{-}\theta [PRED 'Ch\text{"olsu}'
   CASE DAT
]

OBJ [PRED 'PRO'
   \U +
]

TENSE PAST

PRED 'chu-da (to give) <(SUBJ) (OBJ) (OBL\text{-}\theta)>
```
Before closing this section, let us briefly consider passivization as a morpho-lexical rule that operates on the lexical form of a active verb to result in another lexical form (Bresnan (1982a), see also Bresnan and Kanerva (1988) for a different treatment of Passives). As we saw in (144)b above, the lexical rule demotes the Agent to an Oblique. We may represent the process as follows.

\[(152) \quad (\text{SUBJ}) \rightarrow OBL^\text{Agent}\]
\[\quad (\text{OBJ}) \rightarrow (\text{SUBJ})\]

The application of (152) to the lexical form of the verb, e.g., ‘chap-t*a’ (to catch), which is (153)a, will result in (153)b.21

\[(153) \quad \text{a.} \quad \text{‘chap-t*a (to catch) } \langle \text{SUBJ} \rangle \langle \text{OBJ} \rangle^*\]
\[\quad \text{Agent} \quad \text{Patient}\]
\[\text{b.} \quad \text{‘chap-hi-da (to catch) } \langle \text{SUBJ} \rangle \langle \text{OBL}_q \rangle^*\]
\[\quad \text{Patient} \quad \text{Oblique}^\text{Agent}\]

We propose (154) as the F-Structures of (144)a.

\[(154) \quad \text{F-Structure of (144)a}\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TOP} \\
\text{PRED ‘toduk (burglar)’} \\
\text{CASE Ø} \\
\text{CONT +} \\
\text{SUBJ} \\
\text{PRED ‘PRO’} \\
\text{U +} \\
\text{OBL}_q \\
\text{PRED ‘sungyŏng (policeman)’} \\
\text{CASE DAT} \\
\text{TENSE PAST} \\
\text{PRED ‘chap-hi-da (to be caught) } \langle \text{SUBJ} \rangle \langle \text{OBL}_q \rangle^*\]
\end{array}
\]

Nonetheless, this lexical rule in Korean can be applied only to a limited range of verbs. This is because passivization in Korean is limited in distribution. While verbs like ‘mul-da’ (to bite), ‘pap-t*a’ (to step on), ‘k*ojip-t*a’ (to pinch), ‘ch*hi-da’ (to run over), ‘pi*t*ul-da’ (to twist), ‘k*ok-t*a’ (to break something in two), ‘noi-t*a’ (to put something on something), ‘ch*i-t*a’ (to tear), ‘mil-da’ (to push), etc. can be passivised, verbs like ‘ha-da’ (to do), ‘chugi-da’ (to kill), ‘kaji-da’ (to take), ‘t*nji-da’ (to throw), ‘masi-da’ (to drink), ‘n*it-t*a’ (to put something in something), ‘ch*hi-da’ (to beat), ‘ponae-da’ (to send) and many more verbs, including the verb ‘chu-da’ (to give) and ‘t*ari-da’ (to hit), cannot be passivized. It seems that passivization in Korean is not motivated by discourse-pragmatics, e.g., pivot selection (Foley and Van Valin (1984, 1985)),

---

21 As is apparent in our discussion of zero anaphora, Obliques are optional arguments in Korean. They are optional in the sense that ‘nil occurrence of an Oblique’ does not induce a definite pronominal reading. Hence, the fact that (OBL_q) is present in the subcategorization frame does not necessarily mean that the Oblique argument must appear in the sentence structure. Thus, we are interpreting local coherence conditions regarding Obliques loosely.
backgrounding vs. foregrounding (Keenan (1985)), but by semantics, i.e., whether or not the given situation in the real world is such that one participant is ‘directly affected’ by the other. Otherwise, there is no clear reason why passivization has such a limited distribution. The exact nature of the semantic constraints requires a further study.

In this section, we demonstrated the binding mechanism whereby a topic NP is interpreted as an argument of the verb. We argued that topic NP binds a clause-internal zero anaphor. A zero anaphor is a relational-functional notion assumed to be there in the sentence when a controlled Grammatical Function bearer is missing. In the brief discussion of the two morpho-lexical processes, Passivization and Dative-Fronting, we showed that our proposal neatly demonstrates the existence of widely observed facts such as 1) that demoted Agent is not a controlled Grammatical Function and 2) the existence of a morpho-lexical rule which promotes a Recipient to a controlled argument.

3.4. [+ Local] Restriction and Obliques

Let us now discuss the [+ local] restriction, which we claimed an Oblique topic NP must obey. The crucial notion in the binding mechanism is the relational-functional definition of zero anaphor: covert realization of a controlled Grammatical Function. We would expect then that an intended reading for a given topic NP as an Oblique argument would be impossible, and this prediction is correct (also recall that the demoted Agent cannot appear as topic NP). Consider first (155)a-d, where ‘non-topicalised’ Oblique arguments are present.

(155) a. ōmma-ga sórab-e kwaja-rúl tu-ḏt-t*a.
   *mum-NOM drawer-LOC1 biscuit-ACC put in-PAST-DECL
   "Mum put some/the biscuits in the/a drawer."

b. ōmma-ga *kʰal-lo muu-rúl sʰ-o-n-da.
   *mum-NOM knife-INSTR radish-ACC cut-PRES-DECL
   "Mum is cutting some/the radishes with the/a knife."

c. ōmma-ga suni-wa noræ-rúl ha-n-da.
   *mum-NOM Name-COM singing-ACC do-PRES-DECL
   "Mum is singing with Suni."

d. ōmma-ga twinmadag-esō chʰæg-ǔl iŋ-nũn-da.
   *mum-NOM backyard-LOC2 book-ACC read-PRES-DECL
   "Mum is reading a/the book in the backyard."
Now, consider (156)a-d. As we predict, they are all ungrammatical.

(156) a. * s6rab-un  ômma-ga  kwaja-rël  tu-ôt-t*a.

drawer-TOP mum-NOM biscuit-ACC put in-PAST-DECL

(intended to mean) "Speaking of the drawer(i), mum put some/the biscuits in it(i)."

b. * kʰar-nûn  ômma-ga  muu-rël  sʰ-o-n-da.

knife-TOP mum-NOM radish-ACC cut-PRES-DECL

(intended to mean) "Speaking of the knife(i), mum is cutting some/the radishes with it(i)."

c. * suni-nûn  ômma-ga  noræ-rël  ha-n-da.

Name-TOP mum-NOM singing-ACC do-PRES-DECL

(intended to mean) "Speaking of Suni(i), mum is singing with her(i)."


backyard-TOP mum-NOM book-ACC read-PRES-DECL

(intended to mean) "Speaking of the backyard(i), mum is reading a/the book in it(i)."

If an omitted Oblique argument in the sentence induces the definite pronominal reading, and an Oblique topic NP employs the binding mechanism, there should be no reason for the ungrammaticality of (156)a-d. Notice that this is consonant with our earlier claim that zero anaphor as a definite pronominal in Korean is not there in the sentence when there is a ‘non-occurrence’ of an Oblique argument.
However, this does not mean that Obliques cannot be selected as topic in the sense of ‘what the speaker has in mind that he wants the hearer to consider’. They can be, but with the appropriate case marker being present. Consider (157).

(157) a. sōrāb-e-ūn  ǒmma-ga  kwaja-rūl
drawer-LOC1-TOP  mum-NOM  biscuit-ACC
   tu-ōi-k*o,  ...  
   put in-PAST-CONJ(and)
"In the drawer mum put some/the biscuits, and ..."
b. kʰal-lo-nūn  ǒmma-ga  muu-rūl
knife-INSTR-TOP  mum-NOM  radish-ACC
   s*ōl-ga,  ...  
   cut-(PRES)-CONJ(and)
"With the knife mum is cutting some/the radishes, and ..."
c. suni-wa-nūn  ǒmma-ga  nore-rūl
Name-COM-TOP  mum-NOM  singing-ACC
   ha-go,  ...  
   do-(PRES)-CONJ(and)
"With Suni mum is singing, and ..."
d. twin-maṅg-esō-ūn  ǒmma-ga  chʰæg-ūl
back-yard-LOC2-TOP  mum-NOM  book-ACC
   ik-k*o,  ...  
   read-(PRES)-CONJ(and)
"In the backyard mum is reading a/the book, and ..."

Consider more examples of Oblique topic NPs. Earlier, we saw that the demoted Agent cannot occur as topic NP ((158)a). Needless to say, it can appear as an Oblique topic NP. This is illustrated in (158)b and (159)b ((158)a appeared in (144) in the previous section).

policeman-TOP  burglar-NOM  catch-PASS-PAST-DECL
(intended to mean) "Speaking of the policeman, a burglar was caught by him."
b. sungyōŋ-ege-nūn  todug-i
policeman-DAT-TOP  burglar-NOM
   chap-hi-ōi-k*o,  ...  
   catch-PASS-PAST-CONJ(and)
(Lit.) "By the policeman a burglar was caught, and ..."

Likewise, the Oblique Recipient can occur as an Oblique topic NP, as shown in (159) below (cf. (146) in the previous section).
(159) a. chʰólсу-nǔn suni-ga chʰæg-ǔl chu-Ŏt-tʰa.  
_Name-TOP Name-NOM book-ACC give-PAST-DECL_
"Speaking of Chʰólсу(i), Suni gave him(i) a/the book."

b. chʰólсу-ege-nǔn suni-ga chʰæg-ǔl chu-Ŏt-kʰo, ...
_Name-DAT-TOP Name-NOM book-ACC give-PAST-CONJ ...
"To Chʰólсу Suni gave a/the book, and ..."

So can the Oblique Agent in what we called the suppletive passive sentence of ‘tʰəɾi-da’ (to hit) (cf. (103)b in the previous section).

_Name-TOP Name-NOM be hit-PAST-DECL_
"Speaking of Chʰólсу(i), Suni was hit by him(i)."

b. chʰólсу-ege-nǔn suni-ga maj-˚a.  
_Name-DAT-TOP Name-NOM be hit-PAST-DECL_
"By Chʰólсу Suni was hit."

Notice our translations of the Oblique topic NPs. Compared with topic NPs, Oblique topic NPs appear predominantly as a pair and in general they bear a considerable contrastive force. 22 While the canonical usage of ‘NP-un’ is such that the speaker leads the hearer’s attention back to something mentioned before, that of ‘Oblique NP-un’ appears to be such that the speaker asks the hearer to be alert as there will be an immediate contrast. 23 Given our earlier characterization of the particle ‘un’, 24 it would not be too difficult to see why these Oblique topic NPs are contrastive. In this sense, we may regard them as topical.

22 We may note in the above examples that there may also be an exclusive-focus sense, superposed on clause-internal NPs. For differences between contrastive and exclusive-focus, see Chapter 2.

23 A good example of an English conterpart of Korean Oblique topic NP is as follows. The underlined Adjuncts would be translated by Oblique topic NPs in Korean.

i)  A: What did you do this morning?
    B: Well, at 9 I had breakfast and at 10 I did ...

Notice that the Adjuncts below are different from the ones above. Because of this, the Adjunct in ii)B will not appear as an Oblique topic NP in Korean.

ii)  A: so, you had breakfast at 10.
    B: No, I said at 9 I had breakfast.

24 Recall that ‘NP-un’ signals that the NP has been chosen from among a group of referents in the speaker’s mind. Thus, we may deduce that, in saying Oblique NP-un, the speaker has another Oblique topic NP in his/her mind.
In terms of syntax: the fact that an Oblique topic NP does not involve zero anaphora, and that it must carry the appropriate case marker so as to be a coherent unit suggests that an Oblique topic NP is not a clause-external entity. If an Oblique topic NP is basically a clause-internal argument, we would expect it to behave differently from topic NP (which is a clause-external entity employing the binding mechanism) in a complex sentence. Indeed, the sentence-initial Oblique topic NP is analysed as occurring at the same level of clause with the main verb (which is sentence-final), whereas this is not necessarily true of topic NP. Consider the behaviour of an ‘Instrumental topic NP’ below.

(161) [ maikʰ-ro-nůn [ chʰōlsu-ga suni-růl
    [ microphone-INSTR-TOP [ Name-NOM Name-ACC
      tʰær-i̱-tʰ a]-go paŋson-tə-ó̱tʰ a.
      hit-PAST-DECL]-COMP broadcast-become]-PAST-DECL
    "... and with the microphone it was broadcast that Chʰōlsu hit Suni."
    not "It was broadcast that Chʰōlsu hit Suni with the microphone."

Notice that the ‘microphone’ can plausibly be an Instrumental oblique argument of the two predicates, ‘to hit’ and ‘to broadcast’. However, (161) reveals that this Oblique topic NP is an argument of the matrix verb. If we remove the particle ‘ůn’, we get a different picture. Consider (162).

(162) [ maikʰ-ro chʰōlsu-ga suni-růl
    [ microphone-INSTR Name-NOM Name-ACC
      tʰær-i̱-tʰ a]-go paŋson-tə-ó̱tʰ a.
      hit-PAST-DECL]-COMP broadcast-become]-PAST-DECL
    "It was broadcast that Chʰōlsu hit Suni with a/the microphone."
    or marginally (provided that there is a clear pause between ‘microphone-INSRT’ and ‘Chʰōlsu-NOM’ or some other contextual cue)
    "It was broadcast with a/the microphone that Chʰōlsu hit Suni."

In (162), the Instrumental is naturally understood as that which is used in the Agent’s hitting, rather than used in broadcasting the message.

---

I am indebted for this idea to Dr. Avery D. Andrews.
Observe the Outer-locative Oblique in (163)a-c.

(163) a. sōur-esō suni-ga yōghi-rūl manna-i-t'a.
   "Suni met Yōghi in Seoul."

b. [ Ø [ sōur-esō suni-ga yōghi-rūl
   [ Ø [ Seoul-LOC2 Name-NOM Name-ACC
   manna-i-t'a]-go hae]-ia.
   "The 'someone' said that Suni met Yōghi in Seoul."

c. [ Ø [ sōur-esō-nūn suni-ga yōghi-rūl
   [ Ø [ Seoul-LOC2-TOP Name-NOM Name-ACC
   manna-i-t'a]-go hae-i-t'a.
   ".. and in Seoul the 'someone' said that Suni met Yōghi."

Notice that the Outer-locative Oblique is 'adjunct' to the embedded verb, hence, it designates the 'place where the two people met'. By contrast, the Outer-locative topic NP is adjunct to the main verb, hence, it refers to the 'place where the 'someone' reported that the two people met'. In other words, in (163)b we are not told where it was reported, and in (163)c we are not told where the two people met. Clearly, Obliques are local, and by [+ local] restriction, we would like to capture the generalisation that an Oblique topic NP (which is in general sentence-initial) is analysed as occurring in the same clause as the main verb.

Our [+ local] restriction also has an explanatory power regarding non-sentence-initial Oblique topic NP. Let us consider (164).

(164) ?? [ suni-wa-nūn chōlsu-ga ḍōmma-ga norē-rūl
   [ Name-COM-TOP Name-NOM [ mum-NOM singing-ACC
   ha-n-da]-go marhē]-i-t'a.
   do-PRES-DECL]-COMP say-PAST-DECL
   "(similar to) "With Suni Chōlsu declared(?) mum sings."

(164) is very strange. As we predict, the Comitative Oblique topic is adjunct to the main verb. Now the semantics of the verb 'malha-da' (to say) is such that the 'reciprocal' sense does not seem to be compatible with it, hence, the strange-ness. What will happen if the Comitative Oblique topic occurs 'in place'. Consider (165).
As a grammatical unit obeying [+ local] restriction, nothing forces the sentence-medial Oblique topic NP to be ‘adjunct’ to the local predicate. Hence, it is perfect.

Incidentally, consider (166).

(166) chʰölsu-nun [Ø [Ø suni-wa-nun norae-rul
Name-TOP(i) [Ø(i) [Ø Name-COM-TOP singing-ACC
ha-n-da]-go marhæ]-i-t*a.
do-PRES-DECL]-COMP say-PAST-DECL

"Speaking of Chʰölsu(i), he(i) said that he(i) sings with Suni (although he(i) may not do so with others)."

Topic NP can be understood as the ‘one who sings’, the Subject of the clause embedded two layers below it. Needless to say, this is the difference between the binding mechanism and the [+ local] restriction.

There are some difficulties in drawing the F-Structure of a sentence with Oblique topic NP. To begin with, regarding an Oblique topic NP as ‘TOP’ is a self-contradiction, since ‘TOP’ is a function that a ‘case-unspecified’ NP bears. Thus, we would have to avoid this. Secondly, consider an F-Structure like (167).

(167) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TOP} \\
\text{OBL}_0 \\
\text{PRED} \text{ ‘noun’} \\
\text{CASE} \text{ ‘oblique’} \\
\text{CONT +}
\end{array}
\]

Since LFG requires the **Functional Uniqueness Principle** to be satisfied, whether (167) is acceptable or not depends on what the attributes ‘TOP’ and ‘OBL\(_0\)’ are. We reject (167), since the fact that ‘TOP’ and ‘OBL\(_0\)’ are non-governable and non-controlled Grammatical Functions does not seem to override the principle. Thus, we adopt a third option, "regard Oblique topic NP as ‘OBL\(_0\)’ and let the feature ‘CONT’ represent this Oblique topic NP as topical in the sense of contrastive”.

Such a solution seems desirable, since we note the usage of ‘ узн’ is considerable in Korean. Not only NPs, but also Adverbs and Verbs can be marked with the particle. We could regard them as ‘topic whatever’ if we regard the particle as a topic marker. However, this is not an insightful way of describing Korean. They seem different from switched topic, but they are **contrastive**\(^26\)

\(^{26}\)Note that some traditional grammarians called the usage of ‘ узн’ with non-nominals ‘emphatic’
(which follows from the semantics of the particle ‘ǎn’). We suggest then that the F-Structures of (158)b and (159)b might resemble (168)a-b, respectively. Unlike TOP, ‘OBL₀’ may be a subcategorizable function, hence, it may be subject to the conditions of ‘coherence’ and ‘completeness’.

(168) a. 
\[
\begin{array}{l}
OBL_0 \\
\text{PRED ‘sungyǒŋ (policeman)’} \\
\text{CASE DAT} \\
\text{CONT +} \\
\text{SUBJ} \\
\text{PRED ‘toduk (burglar)’} \\
\text{CASE NOM} \\
\text{TENSE PAST} \\
\text{PRED ‘chap-hi-da (to be caught) "<(SUBJ) (OBL₀)>’} \\
\end{array}
\]

b. 
\[
\begin{array}{l}
OBL_0 \\
\text{PRED ‘Chʰ子弟’} \\
\text{CASE DAT} \\
\text{CONT +} \\
\text{SUBJ} \\
\text{PRED ‘suni’} \\
\text{CASE NOM} \\
\text{OBJ} \\
\text{PRED ‘chʰæk (book)’} \\
\text{CASE ACC} \\
\text{TENSE PAST} \\
\text{PRED ‘chu-da (to give) "<(SUBJ) (OBJ) (OBL₀)>’} \\
\end{array}
\]

3.5. Summary

In this chapter, we have discussed two sentence-internal coherence mechanisms: the binding mechanism and the [+ local] restriction, which we claimed at the outset of the thesis. To summarize, a topic NP is understood as a coherent sentence-internal unit by binding a clause-internal zero anaphor. A zero anaphor is a phonetically/morphologically null pronominal unit that is present in the sentence structure. Discourse-semantically, it is in an anaphoric relation with a discourse topic, and, syntactically, it is either the Subject or the Object (or possibly Second Object). As the syntactic counterpart of a switched topic, topic NP naturally binds a zero anaphor. By contrast, an Oblique topic NP does not employ the binding mechanism. Instead, an Oblique topic NP is analysed as occurring in the same clause as the main verb when it appears sentence-initially. In other cases, it is understood as being in the same clause as the proximate verb. This is what we call the [+ local] restriction. We have left issues of Secondary Objects for future study.
The two coherence mechanisms involving topic NP and Oblique topic NP in Korean clearly demonstrate that core arguments and obliques have a fundamentally different status in clause structure, and this is an observable fact even in a so-called 'non-configurational' languages like Korean. This we may claim as the reason our theory is more adequate both descriptively and explanatorily than previous studies on Korean topic NPs. As we discussed, the traditional topicalisation hypothesis found it accidental, in their framework, that the Nominative/Accusative case markers are 'deleted', whereas other oblique case markers must not be. More recent studies on this topic did not raise the question of coherence. As is apparent, the crucial notions underlying our proposal are 1) the functional-relational notion of anaphoric control and 2) clause boundaries drawn not by the superficial word order but by functional-relational notions such as Subject, Object, etc., the nature of which is now beginning to be unveiled by recent studies such as Bresnan and Kanerva (1988). If our proposal is successful, it is successful because our theoretical notions and tools are closer to being correct than the currently available alternatives. Having equipped ourselves with the two mechanisms and having distinguished between core arguments and obliques, let us now go on to stative sentences in Korean, and see what our theory will say about these notorious sentences.
Chapter 4
Topic NP in a Stative Sentence

4.1. Introduction

In the previous chapter, we considered topic NP in action sentences. There we argued that topic NP is a coherent sentence-internal unit as it binds a clause-internal zero anaphor. Because of this binding relation, topic NP is understood to bear a specific semantic role, i.e., the semantic role borne by the zero anaphor that the topic NP binds. We also argued that Oblique topic NP is not clause-external, i.e., it is subject to [+local] restriction (cf. Bresnan and Mchombo (1987)). Instead of employing the binding mechanism, an Oblique topic NP is analysed as occurring in the same clause as the main verb, and is understood to bear a specific semantic role by virtue of the oblique case-marker it carries (in conjunction with the semantics of the verb).

We now turn our attention to topic NP in stative sentences, and discuss further consequences of the coherence mechanisms. We will focus in this chapter on ‘Perception’, ‘Possession’ sentences and ‘Ascription’ (Lyons (1977:469-473)). We will argue below that in a stative sentence where topic NP is understood as the ‘Perceiver’, the ‘Possessor’ or the ‘Carrier’ (Halliday (1985)), the mechanism whereby this topic NP is understood as a coherent sentence-internal unit is not different from that in other sentences we have discussed so far. That is, 1) there is a clause-internal zero anaphor in the sentence, 2) the zero anaphor is a core Grammatical Function of the verb, bearing the specific semantic role, and 3) by binding the zero anaphor, the topic NP is understood to bear the particular semantic role. We identify, the Perceiver, the Possessor or the Carrier role bearing zero anaphor as the Subject Grammatical Function of the respective sentence.

In fact, a stative sentence in Korean is better known as a ‘double or multiple-subject construction’ in the literature (Soh (1971), Yang (1971), Park (1973, 1981, 1982), Seng (1974), Li and Thompson (1977), Kim (1978), Choe (1984), Yim (1985), Kang (1986)). Apparently, this label has been used to show the point that a stative sentence allows multiple tokens of NP-NOM (and yet it is not a complex sentence in this language). Consider (169)a-c below.
(169) a. ? nae-ga suni-ga sŏk*yŏg-i
   I-NOM Name-NOM character-NOM
   sir-ŭn sasil-ŭl amudo
   be unhappy with-REL(PAST) fact-ACC nobody
   morū-n-da.
   not know-PRES-DECL
   "Nobody knows the fact that ‘I’ am not happy with ‘Suni’(i), with her(i) ‘character’." 

b. ? suni-ga pʰar-i ơnch*og-i wi-ga
   Name-NOM arm-NOM left side-NOM top part-NOM
   ki-n sasil-ŭl amudo
   be long-REL(PAST) fact-ACC nobody
   morū-n-da.
   not know-PRES-DECL
   "Nobody knows the fact that ‘Suni’ is long, the ‘upper part’ of her ‘left’ ‘arm’ is long (that the upper part of Suni’s left arm is long)."

c. ? yŏnghi-ga chadoqchʰa-ga poni-ga tu-dæ-ga
   Name-NOM car-NOM brand Name-NOM two-CL-NOM
   in-nŭn sasil-ŭl amudo
   is(exist)-REL(PRES) fact-ACC nobody
   morū-n-da.
   not know-PRES-DECL
   "Nobody knows the fact that ‘Yŏnghi’ has a ‘car(s)’ (which is) ‘Pony’ (which is) ‘two’ (in number) (that Yŏnghi has two ‘Pony’ cars)."

Clearly, the label, double/multiple-subject construction, is based on the assumption that NP-NOM is the subject NP. The subject here, however, cannot be the same concept as the Subject in the theory we are assuming in this thesis. Our notion of Subject is one of the syntactic primitives (being assumed to be simply there in Korean syntax), not a derived notion from the structural property such as being marked with ‘i’ (NOM). Subsequently, a given instance of NP-NOM could be the overt realization of the Subject, but a given NP’s being NP-NOM does not mean that the NP is the realization of the Subject. For such reasons, it is not necessarily the case for us that (169) is a multiple-subject construction (Shibatani (1976, 1977)). Nonetheless, it is still a problem to determine what the grammatical status of the NP-NOMs is, let alone explain why these multiple NP-NOMs are possible in this language (and in many of the so-called topic-prominent languages (Li and Thompson (1977)).
Under our analysis, the Subject of the embedded clause is ‘na’ (I) in (169)a, ‘Suni’ in (169)b and ‘Yōphi’ in (169)c. They are the Perceiver, the Carrier and the Possessor role bearers, respectively, and are the only NP-NOM in the corresponding clause that induces anaphoric control, i.e., a definite pronominal reading, when removed. The other NP-NOMs, which we will call a Second Nominatives\(^1\) (‘2nd NOM’ henceforth), may be regarded under our framework as a cluster of some kind(s) of Adjuncts\(^2\) each of which occurs in different layers. We say that they form a cluster, since, as we will demonstrate in Section 4.2.3, nothing can occur between ‘suni-ga’ (Name-NOM) and ‘sōŋk\(^*\)yōg-i’ (character-NOM) in (169)a, and nothing (apart from 2nd NOMs’) between ‘pʰar-i’ (arm-NOM) and ‘wi-ga’ (top part-NOM) in (169)b, and between ‘chadoŋchʰa-ga’ (car-NOM) and ‘tu-dae-ga’ (two-CL-NOM) in (169)c. We suspect that these 2nd NOMs occur in different layers, since the ordering among these 2nd NOMs cannot be re-shuffled.

On semantic grounds, we will say that 2nd NOM is the Range (Halliday (1967, 1968, 1985), Teng (1975)).\(^3\) The Range role bearers of the three types of stative sentences can be selected as topic, but their syntactic behaviour cannot be uniformly described. The Range topic in a Perception sentence obeys [+ local] restriction. By contrast, despite not being a controlled Grammatical Function, the Range seems extractable outside the clause boundary in a Possession sentence and in an Ascription sentence. However, this apparent Range topic NP resembles a free topic NP in that it functions as the scene-setter (not the Range any more) and in that it has a generic reading.

This chapter is organized as follows. Section 4.2 justifies the above claims which are: 1) that the mechanism whereby topic NP is understood as the Perceiver, the Possessor and the Carrier is the binding between the topic NP and a clause-internal zero anaphor, and 2) 2nd NOM is a kind of Adjunct. We will discuss in order Perception, Possession and Ascription sentences, demonstrating that the Perceiver, the Possessor and the Carrier role bearers are the respective Subject Grammatical Function, and that 2nd NOMs are not controlled Grammatical Functions. Section 4.2.3 includes a further discussion of the behaviour of 2nd NOMs as a cluster with a layered structure. Finally, Section 4.3 introduces briefly free topic NPs. We leave the coherence mechanism involving free topic NPs for future study.

---

\(^1\)The term ‘Second Nominative’ was suggested to me by Dr. Avery D. Andrews.

\(^2\)The question immediately arising would be, ‘“adjunct” to what?’. At present, we simply suspect that there may be two kinds of Adjuncts: one ‘adjunct’ to the entire clause, and one to the F-Structure of which the head is a noun. In a more familiar tree structural terms, we might say S Adjunct and NP Adjunct, respectively. The answer to the question raised here presupposes an analysis of the F-Structure of an argument, which seem far beyond our scope. Hence, we leave it vague.

\(^3\)These 2nd NOMs appear to be in the domain of discourse. Perhaps, we may regard them as a type of ‘focal NP’. That is, just like the discourse notion topic can be divided into topic in the air, switched topic, etc., there may be multiple sub-types of the discourse notion of ‘focus’ (cf. Bresnan and Mchombo (1987)), and these 2nd NOMs are grammaticized focal NPs (rather than something signalled by other means such as prosody or as word order) signalling one sub-type of focus. A further study is in order to find out what this sub-type of focus is, and why they are marked with the Nominative case.
4.2. Topic NP and Perception, Possession and Ascription

4.2.1. The Perceiver

We begin with a group of stative sentences where the sense of Perception is involved. Here are some examples of Perception verbs in Korean.4

(170)  
  a. ‘chot-tʰa’ "to be happy with"
  b. ‘sil-tʰa’ "to be not happy with"
  c. ‘mip-tʰa’ "feel (?) rejection toward"
  d. ‘kūrip-tʰa’ "to be nostalgic about"
  e. ‘kwiyǒp-tʰa’ "(? ) to be charmed by"
      (the Perceiver finds the Range to be cute)
  f. ‘purǒp-tʰa’ "feel envious toward"
  g. ‘kolanha-da’ "to be embarrassed with"

In this subsection, we will speak of two semantic roles in association with these Perception verbs: the Perceiver and the ‘Range’. The Perceiver is the obligatory role in Perception. It is conceptually necessary in the sense that without the Perceiver there is no Perception.5 We call the other role the Range in the light that it specifies the range/scope of the Perceiver’s Perception (Halliday (1985)). Compared with the Perceiver, the Range appears to be an optional semantic role in Perception.

Consider (171). Notice that the topic NP is understood as the Perceiver, and the overt NP-NOM as the Range.

(171)  
  a. na-nǔn suni-ga chot-tʰa.  
      I-TOP Name-NOM be happy with-DECL  
      "I am happy with Suni."
  b. na-nǔn yǒghi-ga sil-tʰa.  
      I-TOP Name-NOM be unhappy with-DECL  
      "I am not happy with Yǒghi."

On the basis of the fact that in a Korean sentence the Subject appears as NP-NOM unless it is ellipsed, we address two questions in this subsection. First, "in (171) above, which is the Subject, the zero anaphor bound to the topic NP or the overt NP-NOM understood as the Range?" The answer we will present is that the Subject is the zero anaphor understood as the Perceiver, not the

---

4Note these verbs are translated in Korean-English dictionaries as transitive verbs: ‘to like’, ‘to dislike’, etc. However, under our analysis, this seems inaccurate. They appear to be intransitive verbs, as will be apparent below.

5Likewise, the Possessor and the Carrier which we will discuss in the following two subsections are ‘obligatory’ roles in Possession and Ascription sentences, respectively, since without them there is no Possession nor Ascription. Note that Halliday (1985:144-157) identifies this kind of semantic roles as ‘the Medium’ function in his grammar.
overt NP-NOM. Following this, there is a second question, "what is the grammatical status of the overt NP-NOM?". We argue below that it is a kind of Adjunct. As we stated earlier, we will call the Range role bearing NP-NOM the 2nd NOM. Thus, we propose the F-Structure of (171)a, though partial, might basically look like as follows.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TENSE} \quad \text{PAST} \\
\text{PRED} \quad '\text{choi-t}^\text{h}a \text{ (to be happy)} <(\text{SUBJ}) (\text{?})> ' \\
\text{SUBJ} \quad \text{PRED} \quad '\text{PRO}' \\
\text{U} \quad - \\
\text{PERS} \quad I \\
\text{CASE} \quad \emptyset \\
\text{TOP} \quad [\text{PRED} \quad '\text{PRO'}] \\
\end{array}
\]

Before going further, some preliminary remarks on Perception sentences are in order. In Korean, as is widely known, describing non-first person’s feelings and asking of the third person’s feelings generally requires an ‘aspectual’ auxiliary verb ‘-\text{\textcircled{-} ha-da}’ (\text{?}to manifest a sign of). As the semantics of the auxiliary verb suggest, the intuition behind the usage of the auxiliary verb is that feelings are an internal matter for an individual. Not to use the auxiliary verb may give a strange impression that the speaker has a direct access to the particular individual’s mind. Consider (173).

\begin{itemize}
  \item (173) a. \text{ch}^\text{h}\text{o}lsu-nun \text{kohya}ŋ-\text{ul} \quad \text{kuriw}^\text{-}\text{o} \\
  \quad \text{Name-TOP hometown-ACC be nostalgic-CONN} \\
  \quad \text{ha-n-da.} \\
  \quad \text{AUX(manifest(?) }) \text{PRES-DECL} \\
  \quad "\text{Speaking of Ch}^\text{h}\text{o}lsu(i), he(i) (behaves as if he(i)) misses his hometown." \\
  \item b. na-nun \ [\text{ne-ga} \text{ suni-\text{r}ul} \text{ pur\text{\text{\text{-}\text{w}}}\text{o}} \\
  \quad \text{I-TOP [you-NOM Name-ACC feel envious toward-CONN} \\
  \quad \text{ha}]-\text{n-un-ji} \\
  \quad \text{AUX(manifest(?) }) \text{ REL(PRES)-fact(?)} \\
  \quad \text{mol-at-\text{-}o}. \\
  \quad \text{not know-PAST-DECL.} \\
  \quad "(As for) me, I didn’t know (notice) that you (behave as if you) envy Suni." \\
  \item c. \text{ch}^\text{h}\text{o}lsu-nun \text{ ai-dur-\text{ul} \quad sir-\text{o}} \\
  \quad \text{Name-TOP child-PL-ACC (?)be displeased with-CONN} \\
  \quad \text{ha-ni?} \\
  \quad \text{AUX(manifest(?) }) \text{INTER} \\
  \quad "\text{Speaking of Ch}^\text{h}\text{o}lsu(i), does he(i) (behave as if he(i)) dislikes children?" 
\end{itemize}
Nonetheless, we cannot regard it as a strict grammatical matter whether or not to use the auxiliary verb in the above mentioned environments. In novels, for instance, often the auxiliary verb is not used even though the Perceiver is the third person. Consider (174).

(174)  chʰɔlsu-nun  kohyaŋ-i  kурiープt*a.

"Speaking of Chʰolsu(i), he(i) is nostalgic about his hometown."

not "Speaking of Chʰolsu(i), he(i) behaves as if he misses his hometown."

Instead of being regarded as ungrammatical, it is understood that in sentences like (174), the author/speaker utters the sentence taking the third person Perceiver’s point of view rather than his/her own (cf. Kuroda (1973:377-379)). Thus, among the data presented below, ‘shifted points of view’ would have to be noted when the Perceiver is the third person. (See (177)a, (178), (181) and (184)a below.)

Notice that the aspectual auxiliary verb in (173)a-c above involves a valency change of the Perception verb. That is, the Range appears to be an Adjunct in a Perception sentence, but, when the auxiliary verb is used, it is promoted to the Object (which might then be the Perceived/Theme). Strictly speaking, however, (173)a-c may no longer be a statement about the Perceiver’s Perception but about the behaviour of the appears-to-be Perceiver. Indeed, as far as the binding mechanism is concerned, (173)a-c seem very much the same as transitive Action sentences. For this reason, we will not discuss sentences like (173)a-c.

Let us consider the first claim that the Perceiver is the Subject of a Perception sentence. What evidence do we have to show that it is the Subject?

In Korean there is an agreement, which has been traditionally called Subject-Honorification, whereby the verb is marked with the honorific suffix -si- if the Subject is one that is culturally defined as honourable (Shibatani (1976, 1977)). Consider (175)a-b below.

(175) a.  kim-sōnsæŋnim-i  suni-rul

"Mrs. Kim pinched Suni."

a’.  kim-sōnsæŋnim-i  suni-rul

"Mrs. Kim pinched Suni."
b. kim-sŏnsaegnim-i suni-ege

Mrs. Kim[+honorable]-NOM Name-DAT

k*ojip-hi-si-ŏt-t*a.

pinch-PASS-HON1-PAST-DECL

"Mrs. Kim was pinched by Suni."

b'. ?* kim-sŏnsaegnim-i suni-ege

Mrs. Kim[+honorable]-NOM Name-DAT

k*ojip-hi-ŏt-t*a.

pinch-PASS-PAST-DECL

"Mrs. Kim was pinched by Suni."

(175)a' and b' are unacceptable, because the verbs do not agree with the respective [+honourable] Subjects. Notice that (175)b is a passive sentence. The unacceptability of (175)b' in particular confirms that the agreement operates in terms of Grammatical Functions. Thus, we can employ Subject-Honorification as an objective tool in identifying the Subject Grammatical Function.

6The observation that the Subject-Honorification is a grammatical process in which the Subject Grammatical Relation plays the crucial role is originally made by Shibatani (1976, 1977). However, the interaction between the 'Subject-Honorification' and the 'Passive' reveals that Shibatani’s argument is stronger in Korean than it is in Japanese. This point was brought to my attention by Dr. Avery D. Andrews. Unlike Korean speakers encountering (175) above, Japanese speakers seem to be unsure about the acceptability of i)b below. I am indebted for this data to Ms Midori Oosumi (personal communication).

i) a. Yamada sensei ga Taroo o o-tataki-ni

Name[+HON] Mr. NOM Name ACC HON-hit-CONN

hant-ta.

HON-PAST

"Mr. Yamada hit Taroo."

b. ?? Yamada sensei ga Taroo ni

Name[+HON] Mr. NOM Name DAT

o-tataka-re-ni nat-ta.

HON-hit-PASS-CONN HON-PAST

"Mr. Yamada was hit by Taroo."
Consider (176).

(176) a. na-nūn kim-sōnsægnim-i
    I[-honorable]-TOP Mr. Kim[+honorable]-NOM
    mip-tʰa.
    feel hatred toward-DECL
    "I feel hatred toward Mr. Kim."

b. * na-nūn kim-sōnsægnim-i
    I[-honorable]-TOP Mr. Kim[+honorable]-NOM
    miu-si-da.
    feel hatred toward-HON1-DECL
    (intended to mean) "I feel hatred toward Mr. Kim."

Notice that, while the overt NP-NOM ‘Kim-sōnsægnim’ (Mr. Kim) in (176)a is clearly an [+honorable] NP, the verb cannot have the honorific suffix -si- as is shown in (176)b. Thus, despite its case, the overt NP-NOM is not the Subject. Hence, it is 2nd NOM. By contrast, when the topic NP in sentences like (176)a above is [+honorable], the verb must be marked with the suffix -si-.

This point is illustrated in (177)a below.

(177) a. kim-sōnsægnim-un suni-ga
    Mr. Kim[+honorable]-TOP Name[-honorable]-NOM
    cho-ŭsi-da.
    be happy with-HON1-DECL
    "Mr. Kim is happy with Suni."

b. * kim-sōnsægnim-un suni-ga
    Mr. Kim[+honorable]-TOP Name[-honorable]-NOM
    chot-tʰa.
    be happy with-DECL
    (intended to mean) "Mr. Kim is happy with Suni."

We can infer from the unacceptability of (177)b that the clause-internal zero anaphor that is bound to the topic NP is the Subject.

Although it is difficult to find a natural simple sentence where the Perceiver occurs as NP-NOM (and there are then two instances of Nominative NPs), it is relatively easy to find a subordinate clause where both the Perceiver and the Range occur as Nominative NPs. We will advance sentence (178) below as an example where the zero anaphor, which is the Subject, is overtly realized.

---

Footnote:

7Recall that a sentence lacking both topic NP and zero anaphor is what Kuno (1973) calls a ‘neutral description’ (of which the canonical type would be a description of what is actually happening in front of the speaker). The difficulty in finding a double-nominative Perception sentence may be interpreted as showing that Perception may not be neutrally described.
"It seems that Mr. Kim is pleased with Suni."

Having demonstrated that the Perceiver is the Subject, let us go onto the question of the 2nd NOM. Consider (179). Here, the topic NP, which has a strong contrastive force, is understood as the Range and the understood Perceiver is the speaker, i.e., ‘na’ (I).^8

(179) a. suni-nn̄n  chot-tʰa.

*Name-TOP  be happy with-PAST-DECL*

"With Suni (I) am happy (although I am not so with others)."

b. yǒng-hi-nn̄n  sîl-tʰa.

*Name-TOP be unhappy with-DECL*

"With Yǒghi (I) am not happy (although I am not so with others)."

If the topic NP in (179)a-b is bound by anaphoric control, then the Range would be another controlled Grammatical Function. There are then two zero anaphors in (179)a-b, one of which is in an anaphoric relation with the topic in the air, which is ‘na’ (I, i.e., the speaker), and the other with the topic NP. Subsequently, we might say that, having seen the Perceiver is the Subject, the Range is the Object.

However, the 2nd NOM, understood as the Range, is not an Object. There are three reasons for this claim. First, the case is wrong. The Range cannot be marked with the Accusative case marker, which is the usual device to mark the Object Grammatical Function (although NP-ACC is not necessarily the Object NP). A sentence like (180) is inconceivable (cf. (178)).

(180) *  [kim-sǒnsɛŋnim-i suni-rûl

* [Mr. Kim[+honourable]-NOM Name-ACC

cho-ûsî]-n

be likable-HON1]-REL(PAST)

moyan-î-da.

shape((?)PRO)-is(COP)-DECL

(intended to mean) "It seems that Mr. Kim is pleased with Suni."

---

^8Note that the verb ‘chot-tʰa’ is ambiguous between an Ascriptive verb, i.e., ‘to be good’, and a Perception verb, i.e., ‘to be happy (with)’. Hence, (179) can also mean, ‘Suni is good.’. Incidentally, ‘to be bad’ and ‘to be unhappy (with)’ are expressed by two different verbs, ‘nap’û-da’ (to be bad) and ‘sîl-tʰa’ (to be unhappy (with)).
Second, there appears to be an ordering constraint between the Perceiver and the Range, that is to say, the former must occur before the latter. Assuming that the Range is an Object, this would be rather an unusual phenomenon in the grammatical system of Korean. Consider (181).

(181) su-ni-ga chʰǒlsu-ga cho-ǔn
    Name-NOM Name-NOM be happy with-REL(PAST)
    moyaŋ-i-da.
    shape(?)-is(COP)-DECL
    "It seems that Suni is happy with Chʰǒlsu."
    not "It seems that Chʰǒlsu is happy with Suni."

The same ordering constraint obtains in sentences like (182), where both of the Perceiver and the Range co-occur as NP-TOP. The initial NP-TOP must be the Perceiver and the second the Range. Note that this is not the case with an Action sentence. When the Agent and the Patient co-occur as NP-TOP, as we witnessed in the previous chapter (e.g. (141)), the sentence is basically ambiguous (though there may be a preferred reading).

(182) a. na-nǔn su-ni-nǔn cho-tʰa
    I-TOP Name-TOP be happy with-PAST-DECL
    "Speaking of myself, I am happy with Suni (although I am not so with others)."

b. ?* su-ni-nǔn na-nǔn cho-tʰa-go
    Name-TOP I-TOP be happy with-PAST-DECL-COMP
    hae-t-tʰa.
    say-PAST-DECL
    (intended to mean) "Speaking of myself, I said that I am happy with Suni (although I am not so with others)."
    (acceptable if it means) "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) said she(i) is happy with me
    (although she is not so with others)."

Third, most importantly, the Range cannot be supplied by anaphoric control. Consider (183)a-b. The sentences are the results of the deliberate removal of 2nd NOMs from (171)a-b (which appeared at the beginning of this subsection).

---

9 Although the reason for the superficial ordering constraint between the two NP-TOPs will become clear at the end of this subsection, it is not entirely clear why the Perceiver and the Range must be ordered as in (181). At present, given that the preverbal position is reserved for an unmarked focal NP (as we demonstrated in the previous chapter), we can only provide the apparent generalisation that the Range is more focal than the Perceiver. Note that Jo (1985) made a similar observation about the ordering constraint.

10 Notice that in (182)b if there is a clear pause between the initial topic NP and the second topic NP or some other contextual cue, signalling that the second topic NP is an unusual topic NP to occur there, then (182)b may be acceptable.
(183) a. na-nun Choi-t'ha.
I-TOP be happy with-DECL
?* "I like the ‘one under consideration’.
"I am pleased(accepting(?)).", or marginally "The ‘someone’ is happy with me
(although he/she may not be so with others).

b. na-nun s'il-t'ha.
I-TOP be unhappy with-DECL
?* "I dislike the ‘one under consideration’.
"I am displeased(rejecting(?)).", or marginally "The ‘someone’ is unhappy with me
(although he/she may not be so with others).

As can be seen, topic NPs in (183)a-b can be either the Perceiver (where the Range is vaguely understood) or the Range (where the Perceiver is supplied by anaphoric control). That is, the invisible/inaudible pronominal cannot be understood to bear the Range semantic role.

Given this, we find that (179)a can also mean that ‘Suni is pleased/happy, etc.’, not merely ‘With Suni I am happy, although I am not so with others’ as we have translated. However, the sentence cannot mean that ‘Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) likes the ‘someone under discussion’. Likewise, (179)b cannot mean "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) dislikes the ‘someone under consideration.”.

The 2nd NOM in a Perception sentence must therefore be distinguished from an NP-NOM as the Subject NP in Korean syntax, since the former, unlike the latter, does not induce anaphoric control when omitted. In this sense, it may perhaps be seen as a kind of Adjunct whose semantic function is to limit the range/scope of the Perceiver’s Perception, i.e., being pleased/displeased, etc. (and whose pragmatic function seems to be a type of focus). A further study is in order, regarding how and why this ‘Adjunct’ is in the ‘Nominative’ case.

Since NP-TOPs of the marginal readings in (183)a-b, the second NP-TOP in (182)a and NP-TOPs in (179)a-b cannot be bound by anaphoric control, they must utilize the local topicalisation mechanism proposed for Obliques in the previous chapter. If this is correct, we would expect that the Range cannot occur as a topic NP outside the clause where the Perception verb occurs. This is indeed the case. Consider (184)a-b.
(184) a. suni-nun [Ø yǒghi-ege [Ø chʰólṣu-ga
Name(i)-TOP [ (i) Name-DAT [ (i) Name-NOM
sil-tʰa]-go hae-i-t'a.
be unhappy with-DECL]-COMP say-PAST-DECL]
"Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) told Yǒghi that she is unhappy with Chʰólṣu."

b. * chʰólṣu-nun [Ø yǒghi-ege [suni-ga (?)
Name(j)-TOP [ (j) Name-DAT [ Name-NOM (?)
sil-tʰa]-go hae-i-t'a.
be unhappy-DECL]-COMP say-PAST-DECL]
(intended to mean) "Speaking Chʰólṣu(j), he(j) told Yǒghi that Suni is not happy
(with him(j))."
(acceptable if it means) "Speaking of Chʰólṣu(j), he(j) told Yǒghi that he(j) is not
happy with Suni."

In (184)a, the topic NP, which is understood as the Perceiver, occurs two layers above the clause
where the Perception verb occurs. On the other hand, in (184)b the intended reading is impossible,
suggesting that there is no zero anaphor for the Range topic NP.

By contrast, consider (185)a-b.

(185) a. na-nun [Ø yǒghi-ege [Ø chʰólṣu-nun
I(i)-TOP [ (i) Name-DAT [ (i) Name-TOP
sil[tʰa]-go hae-i-t'a.
be unhappy with-DECL]-COMP say-PAST-DECL]
"(As for) me, I told Yǒghi that I am not happy with Chʰólṣu (although I am not so
with others)."

a. na-nun [Ø chʰólṣu-nun [Ø yǒghi-rul
I(i)-TOP [ (i) Name(j)-TOP [ (j) Name-ACC
tʰeri-ősò] sil-tʰa].
hit-because] be unhappy with-DECL]
"(As for) me, I am not happy with Chʰólṣu (although I am not so with others) because
he hit Yǒghi."

In (185), the Range occurs as a topic NP, but inside the same clause where the Perception verb
occurs. This clearly shows that the NP-TOP which is not understood as the Perceiver is an Adjunct
topic NP which must obey the [+local] restriction.
4.2.2. The Possessor

Let us go on to another group of stative sentences, where the sense of Possession is involved. Consider (186)a-d.

(186) a. suni-nun chadoŋchʰa-ga ii-tʰ a.
   Name-TOP car-NOM be 'a'-DECL
   (Lit.) "Speaking of Suni, a car is."
   "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) has 'unspecified number of' car."

b. suni-nun chadoŋchʰa-ga 6p-tʰ a.
   Name-TOP car-NOM be no-DECL
   (Lit.) "Speaking of Suni, no car is."
   "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) has no car."

c. suni-nun chadoŋchʰa-ga man-tʰ a.
   Name-TOP car-NOM be many-DECL
   (Lit.) "Speaking of Suni, car(s) are many."
   "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) has many cars."

d. suni-nun chadoŋchʰa-ga ch6k-tʰ a.
   Name-TOP car-NOM be few-DECL
   (Lit.) "Speaking of Suni, car(s) are few."
   "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) has few cars."

Note that Korean lacks the verb 'to have'. Despite the literal translations, (186)a-d are uttered when an English speaker would say as translated. Broadly stated, the semantics of the verbs in (186)a-d are a mixture of 1) some part of the semantics of the English verb 'to have' and 2) one of the following English quantifiers, 'a', more precisely, 'unspecified number of' 11 (cf. Wierzbicka (1980:60-66)), 'no', 'many' and 'few'.12

We will speak of two semantic roles in this subsection: the Possessor and the Range. The motivation for the label 'the Possessor' seems obvious, but that for 'the Range' needs an

11We will write 'a' in the gloss, meaning 'unspecified number of'.

12We may regard sentences like i) as Possession sentences.

i) suni-nun chadoŋchʰa-ga tas6t-tʰæ-i-da.
   Name-TOP car-NOM five-CL-COP-DECL
   (Lit.) "Speaking of Suni(i), car(s) are five."
   "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) has five cars."

One can use any numerals in front of the classifier 'tae', to show various numbers of 'chadoŋchʰa' (car), and various 'classifiers', depending on the 'type' of the Range (see below). However, in claiming that sentences like i) are Possession sentences, we have to assume that the construction 'Numeral-Classifier-Copula-(DECL)' is a verb, which seems to require a careful further study. We ignore the problems involving this construction. Note that the classifier 'tae' in i) is used when counting products of various 'modern' technology, e.g., TV, radio, airplane, robot, computer, etc.
explanation. In (186)a-d above, we note 1) that, unlike in English, the properties of ‘unspecified-ness’, ‘no-ness’, ‘many-ness’ and ‘few-ness’ are not ‘adjunct’ to a nominal category, but ‘melded’ into the verb, and 2) that, subsequently, unlike what the above English translations suggest, the properties of ‘unspecified-ness’, ‘no-ness’, etc., are understood as those of the respective topic NPs, rather than that of the respective overt NP-NOMs. Notice, however, that this does not mean that the number of the denotata of the topic NP is ‘unspecified’, ‘no’, etc.. Rather, it means that in (186)c, for instance, the property of ‘having many’ is associated with ‘Suni’ and the overt NP-NOM, ‘cha\d{o}q\d{h}^a’ (car), specifies the range/scope of this property. In this sense, we identify the semantic role of the overt NP-NOM the Range. Hence, the ‘car’ is understood as ‘car(s)’ owned by ‘Suni’. In other words, one would not utter (186)c to describe the situation where ‘Suni’ is standing next to many cars which are not owned by her.

We argue that 1) the Possessor role bearer is the Subject. Hence, topic NP is understood to bear the Possessor role in (186)a-d through our binding mechanism. Regarding the overt NP-NOM in (186)a-d, we argue that, just like a 2nd NOM in a Perception sentence discussed in the previous subsection, 2) it is a kind of ‘Adjunct’ (which might be a grammaticized focus). Thus, we might suggest the F-Structure of (186)a should resemble (187).

\[
\begin{align*}
(187) \quad & [\text{TOP}] \\
& [\text{PRED} \quad \text{‘Suni’}] \\
& [\text{CASE} \quad \emptyset] \\
& [\text{CONT} \quad +] \\
& [\text{SUBJ}] \\
& [\text{PRED} \quad \text{‘PRO’}] \\
& [\text{U} \quad +] \\
& [\text{(?!)ADJ}] \\
& [\text{PRED} \quad \text{‘cha\d{o}q\d{h}^a’ (car)}] \\
& [\text{CASE} \quad (?!)\text{NOM}] \\
& [\text{TENSE} \quad \text{PRES}] \\
& [\text{PRED} \quad \text{‘it-t^a (to be ‘a’) <(SUBJ) (?!)>’}] 
\end{align*}
\]

Let us begin with the claim that the Possessor is the Subject. Recall that Subject-Honorification functions as an objective tool in identifying the Subject, and consider (188)a-b below.

\[
(188) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a.} \quad & \text{kim-s\d{h}ens\d{q}nim-\d{u}n \ ad\d{u}-i \ \d{\d{h}p}^*\d{s}*-\d{\d{u}si}-\d{d}a.} \\
& \text{Name[+honorable]-TOP son-NOM be no-HON1-DECL} \\
& \text{"Speaking of Mr. Kim(i), he(i) has no sons."} \\
\text{a’.} \quad & \text{* kim-s\d{h}ens\d{q}nim-\d{u}n \ ad\d{u}-i \ \d{\d{h}p}-\d{t}^a.} \\
& \text{Name[+honorable]-TOP son-NOM be no-DECL} \\
& \text{"Speaking of Mr. Kim(i), he(i) has no sons."}
\end{align*}
\]
b. chʰolsu-nun adûr-i Ṝp-t’a.
Name[ honourable]-TOP son-NOM be no-DECL
"Speaking of Chʰolsu(i), he(i) has no sons."

b’. * chʰolsu-nun adûr-i .opend*-usi-da.
Name[ honourable]-TOP son-NOM be no-HON1-DECL
"Speaking of Chʰolsu(i), he(i) has no sons."

As can be seen, topic NP is responsible for the appearance of the honorific suffix -si-. Hence, we can say from this that the zero anaphor that is bound to the topic NP is the Subject.

As with the Perception sentences discussed in the previous subsection, it is difficult to find a natural simple declarative sentence where the Possessor occurs as NP-NOM, it is relatively easy to find the Possessor occurring as NP-NOM (hence, two tokens of NP-NOM) in sentences with various non-declarative speech function markers, as in (189). We would interpret (189)a-b as cases where the Subject is overtly realized.

(189) a. suni-ga adûr-i it-t’onga?
Name-NOM son-NOM be ‘a’-<I cannot recall>
"(I can’t recall whether) Suni has a son?"

b. suni-ga ton-i Ȝm-na?
Name-NOM money-NOM be no-<I wonder>
"(I wonder whether) Suni has no money?"

However, contrary to our claim, in (188)a-b above one could argue that it is the overt NP-NOM, ‘adûl’ (son), that is directly responsible for the appearance of the suffix -si-. As the literal translation of the verb ‘it-t’a’ (to exist) might suggest, what we call a Possession verb may in fact be an Existential verb, whereby the Possessor is an abstract ‘Location’ and the ‘Possessed’ an abstract ‘Located(Theme)’. One could claim that, while the Subject Grammatical Function is assigned to the Located(Theme) (with the Location being oblique), ‘adûl-i’ (son-NOM) acquires the feature [+ honorable] from topic NP (which would then be Location) by an independent mechanism. In other words, in (188)a-b above, the overt NP-NOM could be the trigger for the honorific suffix -si-, and ‘adûl’ (son) in (188)a acquires the feature [+honorable] from ‘Kim-sŏnsægnim’ (Mr. Kim) through an independent mechanism. If this turns out to be the case, our claim that the zero anaphor bound to ‘Kim-sŏnsægnim’ (Mr. Kim) in (188)a-b is the Subject will be invalidated.

Notice that the core issue here is whether the overt NP-NOM is an argument of the verb or not. We are arguing that it is not an argument of the verb, but the counter proposal in the previous paragraph suggests that it is. Compared with the Possessor, the Range NP-NOM has an interesting
distribution. First, it must be something that has a variable reading,\(^\text{13}\) that is to say, it is by itself an indefinite category but is referentially dependent on the Subject (which is the Possessor). For example, ‘aılı’ (son) in (188) is by itself vague in terms of whose ‘son’ it is, but because it is referentially dependent on the Subject (zero anaphor), it is understood as ‘Mr. Kim’s son’ and ‘Chʰölṣu’s son’, respectively. This kind of ‘referential dependency’ is a structural characteristics of Possession sentences. Thus, as (190)b below shows, the overt NP-NOM in a Possession sentence cannot be something that has an independent reference, e.g., the overt NP-NOM cannot occur with a deictic category such as ‘kŭ’ ((?the))\(^\text{14}\).

\[(190)\]  
    \textit{Name-TOP car-NOM be ‘a’-DECL}
    "John has unspecified number of car(s)."

b. ?* John-ṭun kŭ-chaɗŋa-ha-ga it-ṭa.
    \textit{Name-TOP \textit{DEIC(the)}-car-NOM be ‘a’-DECL}
    (intended to mean) "John has the car."

Secondly, what we call the Range cannot be relativised. Consider (191).

\[(191)\]  
a. * [ chaɗŋa-ga in]-nuŋ chaɗŋa ...
    \textit{[ Name-NOM is ‘a’]-REL(PRES) car ...}
    (impossible to process, but could be) "The car that has Chʰölṣu ..."

b. [ chaɗŋa-ha-ga in]-nuŋ chaɗŋa ...
    \textit{[ car-NOM is ‘a’]-REL(PRES) Name ...}
    "Chʰölṣu who has a car ..."

Assuming Bresnan and Mchombo (1987), who argue that 1) the relativised NP bears topic function (Kuno (1976)) and 2) a syntactic unit cannot be topic and focus at the same time, the fact that the Range cannot be relativised means that what we are calling the Range is, as we have been suspecting, basically a focus (more precisely a structural, as opposed to ‘prosodic’, etc., focus).

\(^\text{13}\)In this regard, the Range in a Possession sentence (and in an Ascription sentence which we will discuss) differs from that in a Perception sentence.

\(^\text{14}\)Incidentally, "John has the car.", as opposed to "John has a(unspecified) car.", will turn out in Korean as an ‘Existential’ sentence or as a transitive sentence, as illustrated in i) below.

\[(191)\]  
i. a. kŭ-chaɗŋa-ha-nuŋ John-ege it-ṭa.
    \textit{DEIC(the)-car-TOP Name-DAT be<existential>-DECL}
    "Speaking of the car(i), it(i) is (to)with John.”

b. John-ṭun kŭ-chaɗŋa-ha-rul kaji-go
    \textit{Name-TOP DEIC(the)-car-ACC hold-CONN}
    it-ṭa.
    \textit{AUX(PROG)-DECL}
    (Lit.) "John is holding the car.”
    "Speaking of John(i), he(i) has the car.”
Clearly, the notion ‘argument of the verb’ is not a concept for this kind of structural entity. In short, the overt NP-NOM is not an argument of the verb.

This bring us to another question about the verb ‘ii-t* a’ (to exist), "is it really one verb?". The answer is "no". It has two lexemes, that of Possession and that of Existence. Here is the evidence. Most Korean verbs derive their exalted form by attaching -si- to the stem. However, verbs such as ‘cha-da’ (to sleep), ‘mŏk-t*a’ (to eat), ‘chuk-t*a’ (to die), etc., do not follow the usual derivation scheme, but have a suppletive exalted form instead. When the subject is [+honourable], these verbs become correspondingly ‘chumusi-da’ (to sleep), ‘chapsusi-da’ (to eat), ‘toragasi-da’ (to die), etc.. The verb ‘ii-t* a’ has two exalted forms: ‘is*û-si-da’ and ‘kyesi-da’. The former is a Possession verb, and the latter that of Existence. Consider (192).

(192) a. chŏ-baŋ-e suni-ga
   that-room-LOC1 Name[-honorable]-NOM
   it-t*a.
   be<existential>-DECL
   "Suni is in that room."

b. chŏ-baŋ-e kim-sŏnsăeŭnim-i
   that-room-LOC1 Mr. Kim[+honorable]-NOM
   kyesi-da.
   be<existential(HON1)>-DECL
   "Mr. Kim is in that room."

b’. * chŏ-baŋ-e kim-sŏnsăeŭnim-i
   that-room-LOC1 Mr. Kim[+honorable]-NOM
   is*û-si-da.
   be ‘a’-HON1-DECL
   (intended to mean) "Mr. Kim is in the room."

Compared with the Subject of (192)a, that of (192)b is [+honourable]. Hence, the verb ‘kyesi-da’ (to be<existential> [Honorific]) is used. Notice that suffixing -si- to the verb ‘ii-t*a’ (to be<existential>) as in (192)b’ is not acceptable. By contrast, consider (193)a-b’ below. They clearly show that Koreans distinguish grammatically Possession from Existence.

^15 Notice that these honorific verbs contain the morpheme -si- inherently, as it were, so that if we delete the morpheme they will not make sense.
Here, as a Possession verb, the verb ‘it-t*a’ follows the usual derivation scheme, i.e., suffixing -si- to the verb.

Likewise, as is demonstrated in (194) below, the verb ‘dp-t*a’ (to not be <existential>/to be ‘no’) will be in the form of the conjunction of the negative particle ‘an’ and the honorific verb ‘kyesi-da’ (to be <existential Honorific>) when it is a verb of Existence and when the Subject is [+honorable]. When it is a verb of Possession and when the Subject is [-i-honorable], on the other hand, the verb is simply suffixed with -si-.
c. suní-nún  t*ar-i  ōp-t*a.
  Name-TOP daughter-NOM be no-DECL
  "Speaking of Suní(i), she(i) has no daughter."

d. kim-sŏnsaegnim-ŭn  t*ar-i  ōp*s*-ŭsi-da.
  Name[+honorable]-TOP daughter-NOM be not-HON1-DECL
  "Speaking of Mr. Kim(i), he(i) has no daughters."

d’. * kim-sŏnsaegnim-ŭn  t*ar-i
  Name[+honorable]-TOP daughter-NOM
  an-gyesi-da.
  be not-HON1-DECL
  (intended to mean) "Speaking of Mr. Kim(i), he(i) has no daughters."

Without distinguishing Possession from Existence, it will be difficult to explain this grammatical difference. There would be no reason for the ungrammaticality of (193)b’ and (194)d’, if we thought that the Subject of (193)b, and of (194)d, was the overt NP-NOM, which acquired in some way the feature [+honorable] since it ‘(?)refers’ to ‘Mr. Kim’s son/daughter’. Thus, the speculation that the overt NP-NOM (the Range 2nd NOM) might be directly responsible for the appearance of the honorific suffix -si- is rejected.

Incidentally, the following examples demonstrate that the Location in an Existence sentence, unlike the Possessor in a Possession sentence, is not a controlled Grammatical Function.

(195) a. kim-sŏnsaegnim-ŭn  chŏ-baŋ-e
  Mr. Kim[+honorable]-TOP that-room-LOC1
  kyesi-da.
  be(HON1)-DECL
  "Speaking of Mr. Kim(i), he(i) is in that room."

b. chŏ-baŋ-e-nŭn  kim-sŏnsaegnim-i
  that-room-LOC1-TOP Mr. Kim[+honorable]-NOM
  kyesi-da.
  be(HON1)-DECL
  "(?) In that room is Mr. Kim."

c. * chŏ-baŋ-ŭn  kim-sŏnsaegnim-i
  that-room-TOP Mr. Kim[+honorable]-NOM
  kyesi-da.
  be(HON1)-DECL
  (intended to mean) "Speaking of that room(i), Mr. Kim is in it(i)."

Needless to say, (195)c is ungrammatical since there is no zero anaphor that the topic NP can bind, that is, Location is not a controlled Grammatical Function of an Existential sentence.
Other Possession verbs, i.e., stative verbs with the sense of ‘quantity’, are also systematically ambiguous, if not vague, in Possession and Existence. Consider (196).

(196) a. kū-puok\textsuperscript{h}-\textsuperscript{ün} chwi-ga man-t\textsuperscript{h}a.

\textit{DEIC(the)-kitchen-TOP rat-NOM be many-DECL}

\textit{Possessor Range}

"Speaking of the kitchen(i), it(i) has many rats."

a’. kū-puok\textsuperscript{h}-e-nūn chwi-ga man-t\textsuperscript{h}a.

\textit{DEIC(the)-kitchen-LOC1-TOP rat-NOM be many-DECL}

\textit{Location Located}

"In the kitchen are many rats."

b. chō-umsikch\textsuperscript{*}om-\textsuperscript{ün} sonnim-i chōk-t\textsuperscript{*}a.

\textit{DEIC(that)-restaurant-TOP customers-NOM be few-DECL}

\textit{Possessor Range}

"Speaking of that restaurant(i), it has few customers."

b’. chō-umsikch\textsuperscript{*}om-e-nūn sonnim-i

\textit{DEIC(that)-restaurant-LOC1-TOP customers-NOM}

\textit{Location Located}

chōk-t\textsuperscript{*}a.

\textit{be few-DECL}

"In that restaurant are few people(who are customers)."

\textsuperscript{16} Note that a non-human Possessor seems to be ‘something’ that must be perceived as ‘having a space to accommodate things’.

i) a. ?* kū-jibuq-\textsuperscript{ün} chwi-ga man-t\textsuperscript{h}a.

\textit{DEIC(the)-roof-TOP rat-NOM be many-DECL}

"Speaking of the roof(i), it(i) has many rats."

b. kū-jibuq-e-\textsuperscript{ün} chwi-ga man-t\textsuperscript{h}a.

\textit{DEIC(the)-roof-LOC1-TOP rat-NOM be many-DECL}

"On(?) the roof are many rats."
Now consider (197).

(197) a. suni-nun [ Ø namja chʰingu-nun man-tʰa. ]
   Name-TOP(i) [ Ø(i) boy friend-TOP be many-DECL ]
   "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) has many boy friends (although she may not have many
   ‘X that can be contrasted with boy friends’)."

b. namja chʰingu-nun suni-ga man-tʰa.
   boy friend-TOP Name-NOM be many-DECL
   "(?) As far as boy friends are concerned, it is Suni that has many."  
   "(?) As far as boy friends are concerned, Suni has many."

   not * "Speaking of the boy friend(i), he(i) has many Suni’s."

Given our discussions of the [+ local] restriction, the Range topic NP ‘in place’ as in (197)a should not be controversial. Notice that sentences like (197)b, wherein the Range precedes the Possessor, are not possible in Perception sentences as we saw in the previous subsection (cf. (182)b). This seems in fact desirable, because we can advance (197)b as a piece of evidence of existing local topicalisation and then observe empirically its behaviour in a complex sentence, using the [+ local] restriction. Two points to be made here are, however, that unlike an Oblique topic NP, the apparent Range topic NP in (197)b does not have a strong contrastive force, and in (197)b the Possessor NP-NOM can bear a strong exclusive-focus (contrastive in Chafe’s sense) force.\(^\text{17}\)

Let us see now the Range topic’s syntactic behaviour in a complex sentence. Given our two coherence mechanisms, the binding and the [+ local] restriction, we would expect an ungrammatical sentence if we extract the Range outside the clause boundary, since the Range is not a controlled argument. However, consider (198)a-b.

(198) a. suni-nun [ chʰölsu-ga [ Ø namja chʰingu-ga
   Name(i)-TOP [ Name(j)-NOM [ (i) boy friend-NOM
   man-tʰa]-go hæ-i-tʰa. ]
   be many-DECL]-COMP say-PAST-DECL ]
   "Speaking of Suni(i), Chʰölsu said that she(i) has many boy friends."

b. ? namja chʰingu-nun [ chʰölsu-ga [ suni-ga (?)
   boy friend(i)-TOP [ Name-NOM [ Name-NOM (?)
   man-tʰa]-ga hæ-i-tʰa. ]
   be many-DECL]-COMP say-PAST-DECL ]
   "(?) As far as boy friends are concerned, Chʰölsu said Suni has many."

\(^{17}\)In Chapter 2, we stated that whether a given NP-NOM is understood as ‘neutral-subject’, ‘focus’ or ‘exclusive-focus’ is basically a function of pragmatics. That it has a strong exclusive-focus force by itself suggests (197)b above might be an example of structural ‘focus’.
In (198)a, as we expect, topic NP can bind the zero anaphor occurring in two layers below the clause boundary. Needless to say this is because the zero anaphor is the Subject. By contrast, (198)b seems disturbing. Although it sounds unnatural, (198)b seems considerably better than (184)b in the previous subsection. As it stands, the apparent Range topic is clause-external. This means that either the Range is a core argument, contrary to our claim that it is a kind of Adjunct, employing the binding mechanism, or that there may be another coherence mechanism yet to be detected. Below, we will claim that the second speculation is basically correct, although we will not consider the nature of the mechanism.

Given our earlier discussion about the argument status of the Range, it is unlikely that binding is involved here. A simple test would be to see whether or not the deliberate removal of the Range from the sentences like (186)a-d above induces a definite pronominal reading. Consider (199), in contrast with (186)a-b above.

(199) a. suni-nun it-t*a.  
   Name-TOP be<existential>-DECL 
   "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) is (here)."
   not "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) has the 'something under discussion'."

b. suni-nun òp-t*a.  
   Name-TOP be not<existential>-DECL 
   "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) is not (here)."
   not "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) does not have the 'something under discussion'."

Notice that, instead of resulting in a definite pronominal reading, the omission of the Range 2nd NOM forces a Possession sentence to be understood as an Existential sentence (or, one could claim that an indefinite ellipsis (Shopen 1973)) is involved). It thus seems unlikely that the mechanism involving the apparent Range topic is our binding mechanism.

Another piece of evidence showing that the Range topic does not involve zero anaphor is that the apparent Range topic NP cannot be replaced with NP-NOM (nor with NP-ACC). This is a crucial difference between the Possessor topic NP and the apparent Range topic NP. Consider the following sentences. Compared with (200)b, (200)a is incomprehensible.

(200) a. * namja chʰingu-ga/rúl suni-ga in-na?  
   boy friend-NOM/ACC Name-NOM be 'a'-<I wonder>  
   * "(I wonder whether) a/the boy friend has ‘a’ Suni?.

b. suni-ga namja chʰingu-ga in-na?  
   Name-NOM boy friend-NOM be 'a'-<I wonder>  
   "(I wonder whether) Suni has ‘a’ boy friend?"
That the apparent Range topic NP fails to occur as the Subject/Object NP clearly shows that there is no zero anaphor involved. This is because zero anaphor is not an ad hoc category, but should be able to be overtly realised as the Subject or the Object NP if it is ‘forced’ to.

Notice also that (200) manifests the hidden familiar ordering constraint: the Range follows the Subject. Again we can only provide at present an apparent generalisation, such as ‘the Range is more focal than the Possessor’.

Thus, it appears that we should recognize another coherence mechanism involving this apparent ‘unbound’ topic NP, which may be a sub-type of what we have been calling free topic NP. Indeed, there is a subtle difference in the semantics of the apparent Range topic NP and the Range topic NP in place (and the Range 2nd NOM). That is, the apparent Range topic NP is not the Range any more. In (197)a, for instance, ‘namja ch’ingu’ (boy friend) is understood in effect as ‘Suni’s boy friends’, but in (197)b it is understood as ‘generic boy friend’.

Although it would have been better to provide coherence mechanisms involving both bound and free topic NPs, for our purpose in this thesis, we will leave the problem as it is.

---

18 We defined a free topic NP as a topic NP that is not understood as an argument of the verb.

19 Notice that such a phenomenon does not obtain in a sentence with a non-controversially ‘transitive’ verb. Consider i) below.

i) chadŏngch’-a-nŭn suni-ga pusi-ŏi-t’a.

"Speaking of the car(s)(i), Suni smashed it(them)(i)."

* "Speaking of cars in general, Stini smashed one(some)."

In i) the topic NP and the clause-internal zero anaphor have, loosely stated, the same referent.

20 Consider (197)b again, which we repeat here.

i) namja ch’ingu-nŭn suni-ga man-t’a.

"(?) As far as boy friends are concerned, it is Suni that has many."

We may note two points here: that the ‘apparent’ Range topic is ‘generic’ and that the Possessor NP-NOM is exclusive-focus. Given this, consider ii), which is a slightly modified version of (182) in the previous subsection.

ii) ?* suni-nŭn na’e-ga chot-t’a

(intended to mean) "As far as Suni is concerned, I am happy."

The ungrammaticality of ii) might come from either 1) that the ‘apparent’ Range topic is something that cannot be ‘generic’, or 2) that, given the ‘person’ constraint imposed on the Perception sentence, it is pragmatically inconsistent to focus ‘I’ exclusively (that is, the Perceiver expressed through the syntactic structure is basically ‘I’).
4.2.3. The Carrier

The final type of stative sentences we are going to discuss is the Ascription sentence type. By Ascription sentence, we mean a sentence which says basically, "how a ‘something’ (concrete or abstract) is". As such, an Ascription verb implies the Carrier role, which carries the property denoted by the verb. The property ascribed to the Carrier can be expressed by NP-COPULA or by a stative verb denoting a ‘quality’. Consider (201).

(201) a. suni-nun haks*ae-i-da.
   Name-TOP student-is(COP)-DECL
   "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) is a student."

b. suni-nun yep*u-da.
   Name-TOP be pretty-DECL
   "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) is pretty."

As we will argue, in sentences like (201)a-b there is a clause-internal zero anaphor which is the Subject Grammatical Function which bears the Carrier role, and by binding the zero anaphor the topic NP is understood to be the Carrier.

An Ascription sentence allows more than one instance of NP-NOM. Here are some examples of double-nominative Ascription sentences. Examples with more than two NP-NOMs will be discussed later.

(202) a. ch^61su-nun tari-ga kil-da.
   Name-TOP leg-NOM be long-DECL
   "Speaking of Ch^61su(i), (his(i)) legs are long.
   "Speaking of Ch^61su(i), he(i) has long legs."

b. ch^61su-nun mog-i kuk-t*a.
   Name-TOP neck-NOM be thick-DECL
   "Speaking of Ch^61su(i), (his(i)) neck is thick.
   "Speaking of Ch^61su(i), he(i) has a thick neck."

21 By contrast, the verb in a Possession sentence which we discussed in the previous subsection can be generalised as a verb of ‘quantity’.

22 In contrast, an Ascription sentence with the nominal predicate seems to rarely allow an ‘additional’ NP-NOM. However, consider i).

i) suni-nun chigob-i haks*æŋ-i-da.
   Name-TOP occupation-NOM student-is(COP)-DECL
   "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) is a student in profession (i.e., being a student is her(i) occupation."

Since they can be explained in the same way as those with a quality-denoting verb, Ascription sentences with a nominal predicate will be ignored.
c. chiholsu-nun kôngaq-i nap*ũ-da.

_Name-TOP health-NOM be bad-DECL_

"Speaking of Chiholsu(i), (his(i)) health is bad.

"Speaking of Chiholsu(i), he(i) is unhealthy."

d. chiholsu-nun sŏng*yŏg-i chihakb-a-da.

_Name-TOP character-NOM be lovely(?)-DECL_

"Speaking of Chiholsu(i), (his(i)) character is lovely.

"Speaking of Chiholsu(i), he(i) is a lovely person."

Constructions like (202)a-d invite two forms of analysis. One form of analysis is that the overt NP-NOM is the subject of the verb and the NP-TOP (or another NP-NOM)\(^{23}\) is the subject of the ‘composite’ predicate formed from the verb and the overt NP-NOM. We may schematized this view as in (203) below.

\[(203) \text{NP-TOP/NOM [ NP-NOM \ VERB ]} \]

\[\text{Subject} \quad \text{Predicate1} \]
\[\text{Predicate2} \]

This view has a long tradition, which many linguists of Korean seem to ascribe to. The advantage of this analysis is that we can be faithful (to some extent) to the overt form of the NPs, but it turns out that it does not actually account for the significant properties of the construction. By treating the two instances of NP-NOM as being the same thing, this view masks differences (which we will demonstrate shortly) between the two ‘subjects’. Also, the notion of composite predicate seems obscure and difficult to elucidate.

The other form of analysis, which we will pursue here, is that one of the NPs is the Subject and the other is something else. The obvious disadvantage of this analysis is that it involves the clarification of the reasons for the formal identity of the NPs involved if they are different, which at present is unclear. However, we believe it is here that the challenge lies. We will focus on showing that the first NP is the Subject and the overt NP-NOM is a 2nd NOM. Just like those in Perception and Possession sentences, the 2nd NOMs in Ascription sentences seem semantically the Range, and pragmatically a type of focus.

\(^{23}\)Note that NP-TOP in (202)a-d can ‘freely’ be replaced with NP-NOM. Under our proposal, this instance of NP-NOM will be the overt realization of the Subject Grammatical Function.
Let us consider why the Carrier role bearer is the Subject Grammatical Function. It has been observed in the literature (Chun (1985), Kang (1985)) that a 2nd NOM in an Ascription sentence must be an inalienably Possessed body part (concrete or abstract) of the Carrier. Subsequently, our Subject-Honorification test will need to be elaborated a bit, to show whether the Carrier or the Range is responsible for the honorific suffix. Since the Range is something that is inalienably possessed by the Carrier, it may not be immediately clear whether it is the ‘honourable Carrier’ or the ‘Range obtained the feature [+honourable] from the Carrier in some way’ that is directly responsible for the honorific suffix -si-. Thus, before applying Subject Honorification test, we will consider the ‘optionality’ of the Range in an Ascription sentence.

Consider (204).

(204) a. tari-ga kil-da.
   leg-NOM be long-DECL
   1. ?* "Legs(unspecific) are long."
   2. "A/The leg(s)(specific) are long."
   3. "The ‘someone’ has long legs."

b. kôngan-i nap*ū-da.
   health-NOM be bad-DECL
   1. ?* "Health(unspecific) is bad."
   2. (impossible) "Health(specific) is bad."
   3. "The ‘someone’ is unhealthy."

Notice that one cannot have an ‘unspecific’ reading of the NP-NOM. Thus, when the traditional view above says that the NP-NOM here is the subject, we may correctly assume that either reading 2 or 3 is being considered. Ignoring (204)b, consider reading 2 of (204)a. Under our analysis, the ‘leg’ in this example is the Carrier, hence, it is the Subject. It is not impossible to ‘add’ the Range, as illustrated in (205).

(205) tari-ga kiri-ga kil-da.
   leg-NOM length-NOM be long
   "The leg(s) is(are) long in length."

Now consider reading 3 of (204)a-b. Are these NP-NOMs the Carrier or the Range? We believe they are the Range and the Carrier is the ‘someone’. Whether or not one agrees with us, we note one important fact: the Carrier is always there in an Ascription sentence.
By contrast, consider (206), where the overt NP-NOM is assumed to be removed.

(206)  
a. suni-nun kil-da.

_Name-TOP be long-DECL_

"Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) is long."

_not "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) has ‘the’ long ‘body part under consideration’."

b. suni-nun nap*ũ-da.

_Name-TOP be bad-DECL_

"Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) is bad."

_not "Suni has ‘the’ bad ‘inalienably Possessed under consideration’."

In (206), we cannot have a definite reading for the assumed ellipsed NP-NOM. That is, (206) never entails that the body part, concrete or abstract, of Suni’s under consideration is ‘long’ or ‘bad’. Being forced to identify the apparent missing part, one might say that it is perhaps ‘the whole body, including the face, the arms and the legs’ in (206)a, and as ‘the behaviour/character’ in (206). In other words, when omitted, the Range is vaguely understood, and cannot be provided by anaphoric control.

Although both of them can be expressed as NP-NOM, the Carrier and the Range must be distinguished in Korean grammar. The former is a controlled argument of the verb of ‘quality’, whereas the other is not. Notice, however, that we are not claiming that there is a ‘prescribed’ way of identifying the Carrier. Rather, we are claiming that in an Ascription sentence there is one and only one Carrier, and that the existence of an additional NP-NOM does not mean that the clause has multiple Carriers. Also, even though nouns which inherently imply the Possessor (Seiler (1983)), e.g., those referring to body parts, etc., are likely to be understood as the Range, we cannot say that the nouns are always the Range. In this regard, consider (207).

---

24Needless to say, ‘health’ in (204)b can be the Carrier, although it would have to be ‘generic health’. Consider i).

i) kôngaq-ũn chuŋyoha-da.

_health-TOP be important_

"Speaking of ‘health’(i), it(i) is important."
(207) a. \(kh^i\)-\(\mathbf{-O}\) ch\(^{h}\)am k\(^{h}\)ü-\(\mathbf{g\text{\-}un}\!
\)
\textit{height-TOP very be big-}(<\text{I find}>)

"(I find) The stature/height(i), it(i) is very big!"
(equivalent to) "What a tall person!"

b. iya! tari-\(\mathbf{O}\) ch\(^{h}\)am yep*\(\mathbf{u}\)-\(\mathbf{da}\).
\textit{wow leg-TOP very be pretty-DECL}

"The leg(s)(i), they(i) are pretty!"
(equivalent to) "Wow, what legs!"

Having seen that the Range is optional in an Ascription sentence, consider (208)a-b.

(208) a. suni-n\(\mathbf{n}\)n k\(^{h}\)i-ga k\(^{h}\)ü-da.
\textit{Name[-honourable]-TOP height(?)-NOM be big-DECL}

"Speaking of Suni(i), (her(i)) height is big."
"Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) is tall."

a'. *? suni-n\(\mathbf{n}\)n k\(^{h}\)i-ga

\textit{Name[-honourable]-TOP height(?)-NOM}

k\(^{h}\)ü-si-da.
\textit{be big-HON1-DECL}

b. kim-s\(\mathbf{\text{\-}o\text{\-}n}\)nim-\(\mathbf{\text{\-}u}\)n k\(^{h}\)i-ga
\textit{Mr. Kim[+honorable]-TOP height(?)-NOM}

k\(^{h}\)ü-si-da.
\textit{be big-HON1-DECL}

"Speaking of Mr. Kim(i), (his(i)) height is big."
"Speaking of Mr. Kim(i), he(i) is tall."

b'. *? kim-s\(\mathbf{\text{\-}o\text{\-}n}\)nim-\(\mathbf{\text{\-}u}\)n k\(^{h}\)i-ga k\(^{h}\)ü-da.
\textit{Name[+honourable]-TOP height(?)-NOM be big-DECL}

Here, the topic NPs are the Carriers, and must be there in the sentence (overtly or covertly), whereas ‘\(kh^i\)’ (height) is the Range, something optional that is vaguely understood if it does not appear in the sentence. It is unlikely that an optional category is responsible for the appearance of the suffix. Hence, it is the zero anaphor bound to topic NP that is the Subject.
Regarding extractability, the Range in an Ascription sentence follows the same kind of arguments as the Range in a Possession sentence (see 117-119). Consider (209).

(209) a. chʰŏlsu-nun [Ø tari-nun kil]-da.
   Name-TOP(i) [Ø(i) leg-TOP be long]-DECL
   "Speaking of Chʰŏlsu, he(i) is long with leg (but he may not be with other body parts)."

b. tari-nun chʰŏlsu-ga kil-da
   leg-TOP Name-NOM be long-DECL
   "As far as legs are concerned, it is Chʰŏlsu that is long."
   "As far as legs are concerned, Chʰŏlsu is long."

c. ? tari-nun [saram-dur-i [chʰŏlsu-ga (?)
   leg-TOP [person-PL-NOM [Name-NOM (?)
   kil-da]-go ha-n]-da.
   be long-DECL]-COMP say-PRES]-DECL
   "As far as legs are concerned, people say that Chʰŏlsu is long."

(209)a is an example of the Range topic NP 'in place'. (209)b is ambiguous: either the topic NP 'tari-nun' (leg-TOP) here is a free topic NP and 'Chʰŏlsu' is the Subject, or 'tari-nun' (leg-TOP) is 'clause-internal' and 'Chʰŏlsu' is a 'floating' focal NP. In (209)c, the 'leg-TOP' seems to be a free topic NP, which is not understood as 'Chʰŏlsu's leg' but is 'generic leg'.

Korean Ascription sentences with the Range do seem to have their counterparts in English. Although the standard translation of such sentences will be something like 'X has (an) Adjective Y', there are sentences like (210)a-f in English which seem closer to Ascription sentences in Korean.

(210) a. John is large in stature.
   b. Mary is round in shape.
   c. That guitar is harsh in sound.
   d. John is patient in temperament.
   e. Mary is elegant in speech.
   f. That train is short in length.

An interesting fact is that the PPs in English in the above examples can be removed to result in vague interpretation of the Range of the Carrier's property. Consider the following sentences.

Note that here we are simply assuming some mechanism whereby the floating focal NP is 'bound' to the Subject.

Although the Range PP in an English Ascription sentence seems predominantly in-PP, other prepositions do appear as illustrated in i) below. I am indebted for i)a-b to Dr. Avery D. Andrews.

i) a. Fred is flush with recent ill-gotten funds.
    b. Mary is well-endowed with charms.
    c. John is gloomy by nature.
(211) a. suni-nunn kʰi-ga kʰu-da.
   Name-TOP height-NOM be big-DECL
   "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) is big in (?)height."

b. suni-nunn chʰe hyoŋ-i tungurêt-tʰa.
   Name-TOP body shape(?)-NOM round-DECL
   "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) is round in (?)body shape."

c. chʰ-gi³-ha-nunn sori-ga sikʷʰop-tʰa.
   that-guitar-TOP sound-NOM be noisy(?)-DECL
   "Speaking of that guitar(i), it(i) is noisy in sound."

d. suni-nunn malsʰi-ga uaha-da.
   Name-TOP way of speaking(?)-NOM elegant-DECL
   "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) is elegant in (?)way of speech."

e. chʰ-gichʰa-nunn kiri-ga chʰap-tʰa.
   that-train-TOP length-NOM be short-DECL
   "Speaking of that train(i), it(i) is short in length."

Removing these 2nd NOMs has the same effect as omitting the PPs in (210)a-f. Consider (212).

(212) a. suni-nunn kʰu-da.
   Name-TOP be big-DECL
   "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) is big."

b. suni-nunn tungurêt-tʰa.
   Name-TOP round-DECL
   "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) is round."

c. chʰ-gi³-ha-nunn sikʷʰop-tʰa.
   that-guitar-TOP be noisy-DECL
   "Speaking of that guitar(i), it(i) is noisy."

d. suni-nunn uaha-da.
   Name-TOP elegant-DECL
   "Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) is elegant."

e. chʰ-gichʰa-nunn chʰap-tʰa.
   that-train-TOP be short-DECL
   "Speaking of that train(i), it(i) is short."

(212)a-e are all Ascription sentences where the Range is vaguely understood.
Before closing this section, let us briefly demonstrate our earlier claim that multiple 2nd NOMs are a cluster (with a layered structure) of some kind of Adjunct, by showing relevant data. Notice, however, that despite their relative popularity in discussions of Korean syntax, one is very unlikely to hear/see such sentences in actual discourse (Choe (1984)). Consider (213).

(213) suni-nun òlgur-i õnch*og-i wi-ga
    Name-TOP face-NOM left side-NOM top part-NOM
    yep*ù-da.
    be pretty-DECL

"'Suni'(i) is pretty, her(i) 'face'(j), its(j) 'left side'(k), its(k) 'upper part' is pretty."

We claimed earlier that they form a cluster, since nothing can occur between 'òlgur-i' (face-NOM) and 'wi-NOM' (top part-NOM). Consider (214). Note that _ below stands for a possible place for, e.g., an Adverb and * represents a place which rejects an Adverb.

(214) a. suni-nun _ òlgur-i * _ õnch*og-i _
    Name-TOP face-NOM left side-NOM top part-NOM
    wi-ga _ yep*ù-da.
    be pretty-DECL

b. suni-nun usùp*k*edo òlgur-i õnch*og-i
    Name-TOP funnily enough face-NOM left side-NOM
    wi-ga yep*ù-da.
    top part-NOM be pretty-DECL

"Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) is pretty, funnily enough, her(i) 'face'(j), its(j) 'left side'(k), its(k) 'upper part' is pretty."

c. suni-nun òlgur-i õnch*og-i wi-ga
    Name-TOP face-NOM left side-NOM top part-NOM
    aju yep*ù-da.
    very much be pretty-DECL

"Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) is pretty, her(i) 'face'(j), its(j) 'left side'(k), its(k) 'upper part' is very pretty."
We also said that we suspect that these 2nd NOMs occur in different layers, since the ordering among these 2nd NOMs cannot be re-shuffled. Consider (215).

(215) a. suni-nun ólgur-i ónch*og-i wi-ga

_Name-TOP face-NOM left side-NOM top part-NOM_

yep*ǔ-da.

_be pretty-DECL_

"Suni(i) is pretty, her(i) ‘face’(j), its(j) ‘left side’(k), its(k) ‘upper part’ is pretty."

b. ?* suni-nun ónch*og-i ólgur-i wi-ga

_Name-TOP left side-NOM face-NOM top part-NOM_

yep*ǔ-da.

_be pretty-DECL_

c. ?* suni-nun ólgur-i wi-ga ónch*og-i

_Name-TOP face-NOM top part-NOM left side-NOM_

yep*ǔ-da.

_be pretty-DECL_

In short, the double(multiple)-subject tradition in Korean linguistics must be re-considered, since there are no grounds for elevating the 2nd NOMs to the same grammatical status as the Carrier (and the Possessor) role bearer just because they are marked with the same case-marker.

Of interest is that among the 2nd NOM cluster, only the 2nd NOM occurring the left-most position, i.e., ‘ólgul’ (face) in (216)a below can float to be NP-TOP. This may be interpreted as "only the left-most 2nd NOM is in the same ‘level’ of clause structure as the verb and the zero anaphor". Consider (216), to see the impossibility of extracting 2nd NOM from inside the cluster.

(216) a. suni-nun ólgur-i ónch*og-i wi-ga

_Name-TOP face-NOM left side-NOM top part-NOM_

yep*ǔ-da.

_be pretty-DECL_

"Speaking of Suni(i), she(i) is pretty, her(i) face(j), its(j) left side(k), its(k) upper part is pretty."

b. ?? ólgur-un suni-ga ónch*og-i wi-ga

_face-TOP Name-NOM left side-NOM top part-NOM_

yep*ǔ-da.

_be pretty-DECL_

"As far as faces are concerned, Suni(i) is pretty, (her face’s) left side(j), its(j) upper part is pretty."
c. * öng¹g₂n suni-ga ölgur-i wi-ga
   left side-TOP Name-NOM face-NOM top part-NOM
   yep*ũ-da.
   be pretty-DECL
   (impossible to process) "As far as left sides are concerned, ..."

d. * wi-nun suni-ga ölgur-i öng¹g₂n
   top part-TOP Name-NOM face-NOM left side-NOM
   yep*ũ-da.
   be pretty-DECL
   (impossible to process) "As far as upper parts are concerned, ..."

This leads to an appealing suggestion that the cluster-like 2nd NOMs might have a structure (a structure similar to a clause structure with core arguments, obliques and adjuncts, etc.) of which the head is the argument of the verb, and wherein the head and the left-most 2nd NOM, ‘ölgul-NOM’ (face-NOM) are at the same level of structure (see 133). We would suggest that the ‘Noun Phrase’ should be studied further in terms of its functional structure to understand this cluster-like 2nd NOMs (including topic and focus). To close this section, we might suggest the F-Structure of (216)a could be similar to (217).

(217) TOP
    [ PRED ‘Suni’ ]
    CASE Ø
    CONT +

SUBJ
    [ PRED ‘PRO’ ]
    U +

(?)ADJ
    [ ? ]
    PRED ‘ölgul (face) <(?)> ’
    CASE 2nd NOM

(?)NADJ
    [ ? ]
    PRED ‘önch*ok (leftside) <(?)> ’
    CASE 2nd NOM

(?)NADJ
    [ ? ]
    PRED ‘wi (upperpart) <(?)> ’
    CASE 2nd NOM

TENSE PRES
    [ PRED ‘yep*ũ-da (be pretty) <(SUBJ)> ’ ]
4.3. Free Topic NP

As the final topic of this chapter, we briefly describe free topic NPs. We defined a free topic NP as a topic NP that is not understood as an argument of the verb. There appear to be three different kinds of free topic NPs: 1) various spatio-temporal expressions, 2) generic topic NPs and 3) topic NP that binds a ‘bound nominal’ in core argument position. It seems intuitively clear that the coherence mechanism involving spatio-temporal expressions is basically semantic. Also, on the basis of our study of the two coherence mechanisms, it may not be too difficult to understand what we mean by topic NP’s binding a bound nominal. However, the mechanism for generic free topic NP is puzzling, and seems to require further abstract analysis. Below, we will exemplify the three subtypes of free topic NPs in Korean.

Spatio-temporal expressions functioning as scene-setters include ‘temporal’ expressions like ‘오어’ (yesterday), ‘오늘’ (today), ‘내일’ (tomorrow), ‘아래’ (a while ago), ‘언달’ (a long time ago), etc., and ‘locational’ expressions like ‘요기’ (this place) ‘ chỗ’ (that place over there) ‘곳’ (the place where you are standing/the place we know where it is), etc.. Consider (218).27

(218) a. 요기-명 오름-이 오-오-은-нима-만 곡-용-만
  here-TOP ice-NOM ice-PAST-DECL(HON2)-but there-TOP
  옛-어요?
  how is-INTER(HON)
  (In a trunk call)
  "Here, it is iced all over. How is it there (where you are)?"

b. 내일-용 쪼리가 콩-구-울给孩子-ACC go-PRES-DECL
  tomorrow-TOP Name-NOM picnic-ACC go-PRES-DECL
  "Tomorrow, Suni goes (on a) picnic." 

With respect to (218)a-b, we can only repeat what Chafe (1976) stated. In (218)a, the two topic NPs, ‘here’ and ‘there’, limit the applicability of the respective main predications, ‘that it is iced’ and ‘(?)how it is’, and likewise in (218)b, the topic NP, ‘tomorrow’, sets the domain where the predication ‘that Suni goes to picnic’ can be applied.

27Note that these spatio-temporal expressions are nominals, rather than adverbials. Taking a case-marker, they behave more or less the same as other nouns. Consider i).

i) a. 퍼기-널 보라- commodo 우리-용 보-니?
  you-ACC look-IMP but why here-ACC look-INTER
  "(I said) look over there, but why are you looking at here (at me)?"

b. a, 온나-이 쪼리 삽르-이-일
  INTJ today-NOM Name birthday-is-<I recall>
  "Ah, (I recall) today is Suni’s birthday!"
The second type of free topic NP includes well-known examples such as (219).

(219)  a. sasse-n-ün tomi-ga chōi-tʰa.
      fish-TOP red snappar-NOM be good-DECL
      "As far as fish are concerned, red snappars are best."
b. kʰochʰ-ün chaŋmi-ga yepʰ-ǔ-da.
      flower-TOP rose-NOM be pretty-DECL
      "As far as flowers are concerned, roses are most pretty."

We may also include the apparent Range topic NP of a stative sentence. Consider (220)a-b.

(220)  a. nun-ǔn suni-ga kʰū-ða.
      eye-TOP Name-NOM be big-DECL
      "As far as eyes are concerned, Suni is big (Suni’s are big)."
b. chadroχh-a-nǔn suni-ga man-tʰa.
      car-TOP Name-NOM be many-DECL
      "As far as cars are concerned, Suni has many."

The semantics of this generic topic NP are not entirely clear. Perhaps, we may say that the generic topic NP is predicative (Burton-Roberts (1976)). It is ‘predicative’ in the sense that by presenting, for instance, ‘nun’ (eye) as topic NP in (220)a the speaker appears to be saying "if the thing under consideration is ‘nun’ (eyes)”, rather than "consider ‘nun’ (eyes)". Nonetheless, it does not seem incorrect to say that these generic topic NPs also set the scene. On the other hand, it seems somehow incorrect to say that these generic topic NPs are understood as a coherent sentence-internal unit in the same manner as a spatio-temporal free topic NPs are. It seems very much the case that there may be another binding mechanism involving ‘indefinite Pronominal’, just like the binding mechanism (involving zero anaphor as a definite pronominal) we have studied in this thesis.

The third type of free topic NP is that which binds a clause-internal indefinite nominal. Typically, in this case, the clause-internal indefinite nominal gives the impression that it is a core argument and is referentially dependent on the topic NP. That is to say, the NP seemingly in an argument role is by itself an indefinite NP, but is understood as a definite NP as it is bound to topic NP.\textsuperscript{28} Consider (221)a-b.

\textsuperscript{28}By ‘indefinite’ and ‘definite’, we mean ‘having no specific referent’ and ‘having a specific referent’, respectively (Shopen (1973))
(221) a. suni-nún abōji-ga toragasi-öt-t’a.

_Name-TOP father-NOM die(HONI)-PAST-DECL_

(Lit.) "Speaking of Suni(i), (her(i)) father has died."

b. ch’olsu-nún yŏdonṣæŋ-i ölgr-i yep’u-da.

_Name-TOP younger sister-NOM face-NOM be pretty-DECL_

"Speaking of Ch’olsu(i), (his(i)) younger sister has a pretty face."

c. i-hakk*yo-nún haks*æŋ-dûr-i temo-rûl

_this-school-TOP student-PL-NOM demonstration-ACC_

chaju ha-n-da.

_frequently do-PRES-DECL_

"Speaking of this university(i), (the(i)) students frequently demonstrate."

It is apparent that these topic NPs do not bear any semantic role with respect to the respective verbs. The Subject of (221)a appears to be ‘abōji’ (father),\(^{29}\) that of (221)b, ‘yŏdonṣæŋ’ (younger sister), and that of (221)c a common noun. These apparent Subject NPs may not have a unique referent by themselves, but because of the topic NPs we can safely locate the referents (or understand what they are).

Nonetheless, the syntactic distribution of the clause-internal indefinite nominal is unclear in terms of their Grammatical Function. Unlike those in the above, indefinite Object and Second Object do not seem to be bound easily to the topic NP.

(222) a. ? suni-nún ch’olsu-ga tŏngsæŋ-ûl

_Name-TOP Name-NOM younger brother-ACC_

t*æri-öt-t’a.

_hit-PAST-DECL_

(Lit.) "Speaking of Suni(i), Ch’olsu hit (her(i)) younger brother."

b. ? namu-nún suni-ga mur-ûl se-gùrû-rûl

_tree-TOP Name-NOM water-ACC three-CL-ACC_

chu-öt-t’a.

_give-PAST-DECL_

(Lit.) "Speaking of the trees(i), Suni gave water to (watered) three of them(i)."

Also, the semantic relationship between topic NP and the indefinite nominals seems to be that of ‘Possessor-Possessed(?)’, ‘Set-Subset(?)’, etc., the exact syntactic relationship between topic NP

\(^{29}\)Notice the honorific verb.
and the indefinite clause-internal NP requires a further study.\(^{30}\)

In this chapter, we have considered topic NP in three groups of stative sentences, Perception, Ascription and Possession, and discussed the consequences of our binding mechanism. Under our analysis, the three types of stative sentences are intransitive sentences. It is the Perceiver, the Carrier and the Possessor role bearer that bears the Subject Grammatical Function. As a governed Grammatical Function, the three role bearers induce anaphoric control when deleted. Hence, our binding mechanism works. We also argued (although we leave a rigorous proof for further study) that an additional NP-NOM in a stative sentence is semantically the Range, syntactically some kind of Adjunct, (and pragmatically a type of focus). Thus, the topic NP in the three types of stative sentences that is not understood as the Perceiver, the Carrier nor the Possessor is a kind of ‘Adjunct topic NP’, which is either subject to [+local] restriction or it could be a ‘scene-setting free topic NP’.

4.4. Conclusion

In this thesis, we studied a syntactic unit in Korean, traditionally called topic NP. To summarize the main points: topic is something that the speech participants have in their minds. The Korean speaker systematically does not mention a topic(s) when he thinks that the hearer knows what it is. Hence, topic NP in Korean is the syntactic counterpart of switched topic, a kind of topic that the speaker thinks that the hearer cannot identify if he does not explicitly state it. At the sentence level, topic seems to be predominantly realized as one of the core arguments of the verb. This is reflected in our binding mechanism, which we might repeat as "topic NP binds a clause-internal zero anaphor". Nonetheless, Olique argument can also be selected as topic, but its syntactic counterpart must carry the relevant clause-internal grammatical status. This means that it cannot occur outside the clause where it is supposed to occur. Hence, it is always clause-internal, i.e., "it is subject to [+local] restriction".

Our study leaves problems of a sentence-internal coherence mechanism involving indefinite categories. A Relation-Functional analysis of NP-internal structure might be needed to understand this. Nonetheless, we believe our study has made a contribution to general linguistics in

\(^{30}\)It may be the case that the NP-NOM is, syntactically, a kind of ‘predicative’ Adjunct that is ‘adjunct’ to the Subject, and is, in terms of discourse, a ‘focal NP’. This means that the Subject in those sentences is by no means explicit, but some ‘abstract’ psychological entity which the topic NP binds to which a ‘focal NP’, i.e., the NP-NOM, is bound(?). To be more precise: although we have described as ‘binding’ the relationship that obtains between ‘topic NP’ and ‘zero anaphor bound to the topic NP’, and have stated that topic NP ‘binds’ clause-internal zero anaphor (which is basically a missing instance of the ‘Subject’ NP, the ‘Object’ NP or the ‘Second Object’ NP). There may be another way of analysing the situation. Taking zero anaphor as central, we may describe the same relationship in such a way that ‘zero anaphor’ takes a kind of Adjunct, i.e., topic NP. Given this, we can see that zero anaphor takes another kind of Adjunct, which is ‘adjunct’ to the zero anaphor from perhaps the ‘opposite’ direction. In this regards, we could regard (221)a-c as cases of ‘split realization of Subject’. This seems plausible, but requires a thorough re-examination of NP-NOM and ‘NP-ACC’ from the point of view of ‘focus’ and Grammatical Functions.
demonstrating that core arguments of the verb must be clearly distinguished from Obliques, and in showing that Korean, a non-configurational language, does have a 'neat' clause-structure. What is required is an abstraction of so-called configuration as a putative language-universal coding device of core grammatical relations.

In this respect, credit should be given to the theory of LFG. The seemingly complex phenomenon of topic NP in Korean can be neatly analysed (the shortcomings of analysis and presentation are mine) on the basis of this theory. Despite the pervasive ellipsis, despite the puzzling case-marking strategy in stative sentences, and despite the fact that it does not have the same topic-like pragmatic role as the Subject in European languages, the notion Subject (and other grammatical relations) is viable in Korean syntax.
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Appendix

An Example of Written Discourse

chip (House)

(1) adükhan yennal saram-dur-ûn tarûn
far old days human-PL-TOP other

toŋmul-lo-butû-û pʰiha-rûl mak-*i wihayô
animal-INSTR-from-GEN damage-ACC block-NOMR for

i*atʰa-go sal-gi choûn sup sog-esô namu
warm-and live-NOMR good bush inside-LOC2 tree

wi-ûi sæŋhwar-ûl ha-yôt-i* a.
top-GEN living-ACC do-PAST-DECL

"In ancient times, human-beings lived on trees in the bush, which is a warm and good place to live, to avoid attacks from other animals."

\[\text{The text comes from ‘kugô (national language) 5-1’, textbook used by 5th grade elementary school students in Korea, published by the Ministry of Education, pp 63-69, 1983.}\]
(2) kü-hu  t’aŋ-e  næri-ö
DEIC(the)-after(BNOML) ground-LOC1 down-CONN
w-a sal-ge tǒ-myǒnsŏ-butʰŏ  tarŭn
come-CONN live-CONN AUX(INCHO)-while-from other
toŋmul-gwa sʰau-ge tǒ-ja
animal-COM fight-CONN AUX(INCHO)-CONN(as soon as)
pawi tʰŭm-ină kul sok kahŭn kos-e
rock aperture-or cave inside like place(BNOML)-LOC1
namutkʰaji-na pʰulipʰ-ŭl kʰal-go sal-ge
tree branch-or grass blade-ACC spread-CONN live-CONN
tǒ-ôi-kʰo  kŭrihanŭn
AUX(INCHO)-PAST-CONJ(and) doing so
toŋan-e chib-ŭl chit-kʰe
period(BNOML)-LOC1 house-ACC build-CONN
tǒ-ôt-tʰa.
AUX(INCHO)-PAST-DECL
"From the time they came down to the ground to live, they became (involved in) fighting
with other animals, and they started to live in between rocks or in holes, spreading
tree-branches or grass, and while doing so, they started to build houses."

(3) kü-dwi  pinja sidæ-ga w-asŏ
DEIC(the)-back(BNOML) glacier epoch-NOM come-CONN(as)
saram-dŭr-ŭn tongur-e pʰinahna-yǒt-tʰa.
human-PL-TOP cave-LOC1 escape-PAST-DECL
"After that, as the glacier epoch came, human-beings escaped to caves."
(4) **saram-dür-ûn** tongul sog-esö chimsûŋ-ûi
definite(PL-TOP) cave inside(BNOML)-LOC2 beast-GEN

human-PL-TOP cave inside(BNOML)-LOC2 beast-GEN

kajug-ûl turû-go pur-ûl pʰiws-ô tongul

skin-ACC wear-CONN fire-ACC kindle-CONN cave

sog-ûl tʰatʰa-ge ha-yêt-tʰa.

inside(BNOML)-ACC warm-CONN AUX(CAUSE)-PAST-DECL

"In the cave, they wore animal skins and warmed the inside of the cave by making fire."

(5) **piŋha** sidæ-ga chinaga-myônsö **saram-dür-ûn**
glacier epoch-NOM pass-while definite(PL-TOP)

glacier epoch-NOM pass-while definite(PL-TOP)

namuṭk'ai-na pʰul-gwa hûk tʰo-nûn namu-rûl
tree branch-or grass-and soil or-TOP wood-ACC

iyônha-yôsö tasi chib-ûl chit-k'o sal-ge

use-CONN again house-ACC build-CONN live-CONN

 tô-êt-tʰa.

AUX(INCHO)-PAST-DECL

"(After) the glacier epoch finished, human-beings started to build houses again, using tree-branches or grass and soil, or wood."

(6) **kûriha-yô** kû-dwi-e-nûn
do so-CONN DEIC(the)-back(BNOML)-LOC1-TOP

pʰyônph'yôñha-n kos-eda kiduñ-ûl

level place(BNOML)-onto pillar-ACC

pak-k'o pʰul-lo chibun-ûl i-ûn

establish-CONN grass-INSTR roof-ACC piecing together

chib-ûl chit-k'e tô-êt-tʰa.

house-ACC build-CONN AUX(INCHO)-PAST-DECL

"So that, thereafter, they came to build a house with a grass roof and pillars established on a level place."
"Such being the case, human houses have developed differently from region to region."

"In cold regions, they build houses which can prevent the cold, and in hot regions, they build houses which can block the heat."

"Building a house suitable to the local climate and natural features is still an important factor in modern architecture."
Eskimos who live in a cold region near the north pole, build a house which looks like an upside down calabash, by cutting snow rolls, when winter comes, into hexahedron. 

"The fact that they build a house by cutting snow rolls in the cold region sounds funny, but snow has an advantage in preventing the warmth inside the room from getting away."
"This is because snow transfers less heat than wood or stone."

"The fuel is scarce and even if they have some they can’t burn much because the house is built in snow, but the house is insulated because the snow prevents the warmth, though it’s little, from getting out of the house and blocks cold winds."
(14) hanpyŏn tŏu-n chibap-ŭi chip-t’ŭr-ŭn

meanwhile hot region-GEN house-PL-TOP

öts’ŏha-nga?

how is -<we wonder>

"As for the house in hot regions, how is it?"

(15) ap’ŭrikʰa nam-ch’og-e sal-go

Africa south-side-LOC1 live-CONN

in-nun han chŏnjog-ŭn chinhug-ŭl tungu-n

AUX(PROG)-REL(PRES) one tribe-TOP clay-ACC round

kidun moyan-ŭro kuchʰ-i-ŏsŏ pyŏg-ŭl

pillar shape-INST harden-CAUSE-CONN wall-ACC

chʰi-go kŭ wi-e pʰul-lo

put up-CONN(and) DEIC(the) top-LOC1 grass-INST

chibun-ŭl i-ŏsŏ chib-ŭl chin-nun-da.

roof-ACC piecing together house-ACC build-PRES-DECL

"A tribe in southern Africa builds houses in such a way of setting up walls with pillars made of hardened clay in a round shape and weaving the roof with grass."

(16) chinhug-ŭro mandu-n chib-ŭn t’ugŏu-n

clay-INST make-REL(PAST) house-TOP hot

tʰ’eyaŋ-yŏr-ŭl pʰiha-gi-e chŏkʰapʰa-gi

sun-heat-ACC avoid-NOMR-LOC1 suitable-NOMR

i*’eun-i-da.

reason-is-DECL

"This is because a house made of clay has an advantage in avoiding the sun."
In a rainy place like Southeast Asia, among hot regions, people build a house by weaving bamboo or other woods, instead of a clay house, to have a good ventilation.

Or, there are other places where they build houses on top of a tall tree, or even, by planting pillars, on water.

As for the houses in our country, they are divided into, roughly, northern type ones and southern type ones.
(20) i-nun kihu t*emun-i-da.

_this-TOP climate reason-is-DECL

"This is because of the climate."

(21) pukp*u-hyöŋ-ün han chʰæ-ui könmul an-e

northern part-type-TOP one CL-GEN building inside-LOC1

puõk an-p*aŋ ui-p*aŋ aræi-p*aŋ twit-p*aŋ

kitchen inner room upper room lower room back room

tæchʰðŋ hòük*an hyaŋk*an tüŋ-i

main floored hall store room stable etc.-NOM

pʰohamdʰ-n kuso-ro tʰ-ð

be included-REL(PAST) structure-INSTR become-CONN

it-t*ə.

AUX(RESULT)-DECL

"The northern type is constructed with the kitchen, all kinds of rooms, the floored main hall, the storeroom and the stable built inside a single building."

(22) kūrönde nambu-hyöŋ-ün an-p*aŋ

such being the case southern part-type-TOP main room

ui-p*aŋ könmôn-baŋ tæchʰðŋ puõk

upper room opposite room main floored hall kitchen

tüŋ-i pʰohamdʰ-ð in-nun

etc.-NOM be included-CONN AXU(RESULT)-REL(PRES)

an chʰæ-wa kógi-e yōni-un tar-ün chʰæ-ui

inside CL-and there-LOC1 connecting different CL-GEN

pusok könmul-dûl-lo iru-ð

attachment building-PL-INSTR compose-CONN

ji-ð it-t*ə.

AUX(PASS)-CONN AUX(RESULT)-DECL

"On the other hand, the southern type consists of a main building containing all kinds of rooms, the floored main hall and kitchen, and secondary building annexed to it."
"Our houses, regardless of the types, have a distinctive feature in that all of them are built to block the cold in winter."

"It is the only difference (between the two types) that they put all kinds of features like rooms, the kitchen, the stable, etc., inside the house by building a double-layered house in the northern type because it is colder in the northern part than in the southern part."

"Next, let's consider (houses) from the material's side."
(26) kônchʰuk chaeryo-nun  odense chibaq-i-dűnji kû
architecture material-TOP which region-is-ever DEIC
chibaq-eső  swipsʰari kuha-l  su
region-LOC2 easily obtain-REL(FUT) way(BNOML)
in-nûn  mulchʰa-rūl iyônha-n-da.
exist(can)-REL(PRES) goods-ACC use-PRES-DECL

"People use things as building materials, which they can easily obtain in the region, whichever region it is."

(27) esûkʰimo-uri nun toγnam asia-uri tænamu túŋ-ûn
Eskimo-GEN snow Southeast Asia-GEN bamboo etc.-TOP
kakkʰi  kû  chibaq-eső  kuha-gi  swiu-n
respectively DEIC region-LOC2 obtain-NOMR easy
kötʰúr-i-da.
things-PL-is-DECL

"Eskimo’s snow, Southeast Asian’s bamboo, etc. are those which can be easily obtained in each of the regions."

(28) uri nara-uri  chipʰi-ul-do  uri nara-esô
we country-GEN house-PL-also our country-LOC2
kuha-gi  swiu-n  chaeryo-rūl  iyônha-yô
obtain-NOMR easy material-ACC use-CONN
chi-ôtʰa.
build-PAST-DECL

"Our houses have also been built in those materials which can be easily obtained in our country."

(29) namu-wa hûk-kʰwa chipʰi  chip-chin-nûn
wood-and soil-and straw-NOM house-build-REL(PRES)
chaeryo-ro  man-i  sʰú-i-ô  w-àtʰa.
material-INSTR a lot use-PASS-CONN come-PAST-DECL

"It is wood, soil and straws that have been mainly used as the materials in building houses."
"It has been the practice to set up the main frame with woods and to make walls, weaving laths with hemp stalks or kaoliang stalks, by applying the soil on the laths."

"And roofs were tiled sometimes, but in many cases they have been made of straw."

"But, these days, our building materials are very different."

"We are using mineral materials, such as metal, bricks, cement, glass, slate and so on."
"This is because these materials have become easily obtainable since transportation has become more convenient and our country’s industry has become more developed."

"It is also because our living standard has improved to the extent (that we can afford to do so)."

"Our houses are not changing only their outer shape."
As our living condition is getting better, straw roofs are being changed into tiled roofs and heating equipment is being furnished.

Also, our traditional kitchen which is inconvenient to go in and out and to work in is being improved.
(39) kūrigo ūija-sik paŋ-gwa ondol paŋ-i hamk*e
and chair-way room-and ondol room-NOM together
kaichʰu-ő ji-n chip-tʰul-do
furnish-CONN AUX(PASS)-REL(PAST) house-PL-also
nūr-ő ga-go itʰ-a.
increase-CONN go-CONN AUX(PROG)-DECL
"And, houses having rooms with chairs^ as well as 'ondol'^ rooms are increasing in number."

(40) uri chosaŋ-dūr-ǔn chib-ǔi ¯p-hyǒŋ-pʰ un
we ancestor-PL-TOP house-GEN surface-shape-only
anir-a chuai hwangyǒŋ-gwa-ǔi
NEGV-CONN surroundings environment-GEN
chohwae-do nun-ǔl tol-li-go kaok
harmony-LOC1-also eye-ACC turn-CONN(and) house
næbu-ǔi kujo-e-do chuui-rŭl kiur-i-ðsŏ
inside-GEN structure-LOC1-also attention-ACC directing
sæŋhwar-ǔl pHyŏnha-ge ha-go
life-ACC be convenient-CONN AUX(CAUSE)-CONN(and)
Pʰuŋbuha-ge ha-m-e
ample-CONN AUX( CAUSE)-NOMR-LOC1
noryŏkʰa-yŏtʰ-a.
meme effort-PAST-DECL
"Our ancestors tried to make their life more convenient and to enrich the quality of their
life, by drawing their attention to not only the outer shape of their houses but also to
the harmony of the houses with the surroundings, and to the inner structure of the
house."

2Western style rooms, as opposed to traditional 'ondol' rooms where sitting-on-the-floor life is led.
3A traditional under-floor heating system.
Although the shape and structure of our houses are changing these days, we will have to improve our house, handed down to us from our ancestors, to be more suitable to natural features of Korea and to our life style.