

Subjecthood Tests in Korean¹

Ki-Sun Hong

0. Introduction

This paper attempts to find some “behavioral properties” (Keenan 1975, T. Mohanan 1990: 158) of unequivocal instances of grammatical subjects in Korean. This inquiry is intended to provide some reliable tests for controversial cases like “non-nominative subjects” (Gerds and Youn 1988) and “multiple nominative construction” (Yoon 1987, among others). It will ultimately give substance for the theoretical definition of subjecthood.

The following constructions have been claimed as relevant diagnostics in various works: honorification, equi control, *caki* binding, plural marker copying, coordination, control in *-myense* ‘although’ adverbial clauses, subject-to-object raising, plain (non-contrastive) topicalization, and quantifier float. I will review each test to locate five different groupings: first, Grammatical Subjecthood for honorification and the equi control construction; second, Consciousness and Predication Subjecthood for *caki* binding and plural marker copying; third, Discourse Topichood for coordination, control in *-myense* clauses, and subject-to-object raising; fourth, word order for plain topicalization; and last, anti-redundancy for quantifier float. These groups are related to the notion of grammatical subject in various ways: first, grammatical subject takes first priority to be interpreted as a discourse topic (Kuno 1976); second, grammatical subject is placed sentence-initially in unmarked word order; third, grammatical subject takes nominative case in many instances. Based on these results, I will claim that honorification and the equi control construction are what we can rely on as necessary and sufficient subjecthood tests: they pick out *all and only* gram-

¹This is an abridged version of Ch. 2 of Hong (1991). I would like to thank Joan Bresnan, Donna Gerds, Paul Kiparsky, Young-Suk Lee, Joan Maling, K. P. Mohanan, William O’Grady, Peter Sells and Steve Wechsler for valuable comments on shorter papers which have developed into this.

grammatical subjects. *Caki* binding and plural marker copying pick out all the grammatical subjects *and something else*. Accordingly, if something is a grammatical subject, it should be picked out by these tests; but not vice versa. Coordination, control in *-myense* clauses, subject-to-object raising, plain topicalization, and quantifier float do not bear any direct relationship to subjecthood, although they tend to pick up subjects in many cases, for different reasons as mentioned above.

1. Grammatical Subject

1.1. Honorification

In Korean, the expression of respect is grammaticized in three different ways, depending on who is paid respect. One of these ways is to attach a verbal suffix *si* onto a verb stem as in (1).

- (1) a. halapeci-ka o-si-nta.
 grandfather-nom come-hon-ind
 ‘Grandfather comes.’
- b. sensayngnim-i swuhak-ul kaluchi-si-nta.
 teacher-nom mathematics-acc teach-hon-ind
 ‘The teacher teaches mathematics.’

Some studies (Suh 1977, Yoon 1987) claim that *si* marking is pragmatically oriented rather than a kind of grammatical agreement², mainly based on *si* marking triggered by a genitive NP, and on facts in the multiple nominative construction. Contrary to this claim, I will argue that the grammatical subject is responsible for *si* marking (Youn 1990, C. Lee 1990 and E. Han

² As for its orientation, *si* marking is indeed pragmatic, in that it crucially depends on how the speaker views the referent of the subject. Thus, (i) is perfect, if students do not pay respect to the teacher.

- (i) coyongha-yela. sensayng o-nta.
 be quite-imp teacher come-ind
 ‘Be quiet! The teacher is coming.’

However, what is important is that the marking displays a grammatical regularity involving the notion of grammatical subjecthood, *once* the speaker decides to pay respect to its referent (C. Lee, personal communication).

1990, among others), although semantic and pragmatic factors play a significant role.³

In simple sentences, the grammatical subject uncontroversially determines *si* marking. In (2a) where the subject denotes a person who is honorified, a verbal suffix *si* is obligatory. The object does not trigger *si* marking as in (2b). (2c) and (2d) show that the head noun (e.g., *sonca* 'grandson' and *sensayngnim* 'teacher' respectively), rather than a genitive noun within the subject NP (e.g., *sensayngnim* 'teacher' and Minswu, respectively), determines *si* marking.

- (2) a. *sensayngnim-i o-si-nta.*
 teacher-nom come-hon-ind
 'The teacher comes.'

³ Like other discourse oriented phenomena in Korean, *si* marking is not restricted to a sentence level.

- (i) a. (*halapeci-ka o-si-ess-ta.*) *son-i*
 grandfather-nom come-hon-past-ind hand-nom
tachi-si-ess-te-la.
 be injured-hon-past-retrospective-ind
 '(Grandfather came.) (his) Hands were injured.'
- b. *halapeci-nun, onul-to 12-si-i-si-ilkka?*
 grandfather-top today-again 12-o'clock-be-hon-int
 'Tonight, will grandfather come back home midnight again?'

In (ia), the NP denoting the person who is honorified occurs in the previous discourse, rather than within the same sentence as *si*. We may account for this, assuming a zero pronoun which is bound to a discourse topic. Example (ib) raises a real problem, as the first NP is not even subcategorized by the predicate. It may be claimed that either a subject or a topic determines *si* marking (Y. Kim 1990: 194). However, (ii) demonstrates that not every topic is eligible (example due to J. Bresnan).

- (ii) (Give medicine to every patient.)
 **halapeci-nun 12-si-i-si-ta.*
 grandfather-topic 12-o'clock-be-hon-ind
 'Give medicine to grandfather at 12 o'clock.'

In comparison with (ib) where the grandfather is interpreted as a subject of an implicit predication (i.e., Grandfather will be back home)' *si* marking is not possible when the grandfather is interpreted as a goal argument as in (ii). This seems to suggest that we need a notion of subject at a more abstract level including grammatical subject, for an optimal account of honorification in Korean.

- b. *Minswu-ka sensayngnim-ul manna-si-ess-ta.
 nom teacher-acc meet-hon-past-ind
 'Minswu met the teacher.'
- c. *sensayngnim-ui sonca-ka crib-ey nwue
 teacher-gen grandson-nom crib-in lie
 iss-usi-ta.⁴
 be-hon-ind
 'The teacher's grandson is lying in the crib.'
- d. Minswu-ui sensayngnim-i o-si-nta.
 gen teacher-nom come-hon-ind
 'Minswu's teacher comes.'

(3) demonstrates that the object cannot trigger *si* marking, even if it is topicalized. In (4), we observe that a grammatical subject, rather than a logical subject (i.e., a passive agent), is responsible for *si* marking in the passive construction.

- (3) *sensayngnim-un Minswu-ka manna-si-ess-ta.
 teacher-top nom meet-hon-past-ind
 'As for the teacher, Minswu met him.'
- (4) a. *Minswu-ka sensayngnim-kkey cap-hi-si-ess-ta.
 nom teacher-by catch-pass-hon-past-ind
 'Minswu was caught by the teacher.'
- b. sensayngnim-i Minswu-eyuihaye ai-tul-eykey
 teacher-nom by child-pl-to
 sokay-toy-si-ess-ta.
 introduce-pass-hon-past-ind
 'The teacher was introduced to the children by Minswu.'

Lexical and phrasal causative constructions confirm this hypothesis. In the lexical causative construction formed by *-i/hi/li/ki* affixation, the causer (which is mapped onto the grammatical subject), rather than the causee (which is realized as the grammatical object), is responsible for *si* marking,

⁴The word *nwue* should be further analyzed as *nwu-e*, the second morpheme of which is required when a predicate comes before an auxiliary. I leave this kind of word unanalyzed throughout this paper, only because the grammatical status of the second morpheme is not clear.

as in (5). Phrasal causatives by the verb *ha-* 'make', which retain a biclausal structure, lend themselves to the same account. If the subject of the matrix clause denotes a person who is honorified, it triggers *si* marking only on the main verb (ex. (6a)). In contrast, the subject of the embedded clause sanctions *si* marking onto the verb of the same clause, not on the matrix verb (ex. (6b)).

- (5) a. *sensayngnim-i Minswu-lul wul-li-si-ess-ta.*
 teacher-nom acc cry-caus-hon-past-ind
 'The teacher made Minswu cry.'
- b. **Minswu-ka sensayngnim-ul wul-i-si-ess-ta.*
 nom teacher-acc cry-caus-hon-past-ind
 'Minswu made the teacher cry.'
- (6) a. *sensayngnim-i [Minswu-ka ttena-key] ha-si-ess-ta.*
 teacher-nom nom leave-comp make-hon-past-ind
 'The teacher made Minswu leave.'
- b. *Minswu-ka [sensayngnim-i ttena-si-key] ha-yess-ta.*
 nom teacher-nom leave-hon-comp make-past-ind
 'Minswu made the teacher leave.'

Unlike these uncontroversial cases, all of which involve a subject denoting an animate being, we need a more sophisticated solution to the cases where the subject denotes an inanimate thing. We have observed in (2c-d) that *si* is determined by the head noun, rather than the genitive NP, when the head noun denotes an animate being. Nevertheless, in some cases where the head noun denotes an inanimate thing, a genitive noun within the subject NP can trigger *si* marking, as noted by most works on Korean honorification.

- (7) a. *sensayngnim-ui son-i khu-si-ta.*
 teacher-gen hands-nom be big-hon-ind
 'The teacher's hands are big.'
- b. *sensayngnim-ui caysan-i manh-usi-ta.*
 teacher-gen possessions-nom be many-hon-ind
 'The teacher is rich.'

I propose to account for this in terms of a *metonymic* usage of language: something related to a person, e.g., body parts, can represent the person.⁵

By assuming that an NP denoting an animate being and its metonyms bear the same honorific feature,⁶ we can explain why a subject NP denoting an inanimate thing sanctions *si* marking when used as a metonym of an animate being. In (7a), the subject (*son* 'hands') can trigger *si* marking, since it shares the honorific feature with the NP (*sensayngnim* 'the teacher') of which it is a metonym. (7b) is explained in the same way.

This metonymy interpretation totally depends on various semantic or pragmatic factors.⁷ Let us first consider the semantics of the head noun. The metonymic interpretation is restricted to some semantic classes of nouns as (8) illustrates: (i) body parts (e.g., hands, feet, eyes), (ii) logophoric nouns (e.g., speech, mind, thought), (iii) significant properties (e.g., home, hometown, inheritance). All of them are attributes salient enough to characterize the person to whom they belong. The term *inalienable possession* fails to cover the three classes, since the third group is clearly alienable. As for now, we have to be content with a coarse term, *significant attributes*: when something is regarded as a significant attribute of a person, it can be metonymically used.⁸ This is in direct contrast to other insignificant belongings or things loosely related to a person which are not regarded as representing the person. For example, a pair of glasses or a doghouse as in (9) is not usually considered a significant attribute of somebody.⁹

⁵ I am indebted to K. P. Mohanan for this notion.

⁶ The honorific feature sharing cannot be accounted for in terms of a syntactic feature percolation (Williams 1981), as the feature originates from a non-head.

⁷ There is one syntactic condition dictating that the trigger be overtly expressed. In other words, *si* marking is not determined by the denotation. This explains why a pronoun cannot trigger *si* marking.

(i) *[nay-ka sensayngnim-ui nwun-ul cohaha-nun kes-un
 I-nom teacher-gen eyes-acc like-adj reason-top
 kukes-i khu-si-ki ttaymun-i-ta
 they-nom be big-hon-nominal why-be-ind
 'The reason why I like the teacher's eyes is that they are big.'

⁸ This seems to be a reason for idiolectal differences in judgment of honorification: it varies according to participants of specific discourse situations whether to regard something as a significant attribute of somebody or not.

⁹ Suh (1988) claims that the account in terms of subjecthood is not tenable based on lexical passive constructions as in (i)-(ii), in which uncontroversial metonyms fail to trigger *si* marking.

- (8) a. *sensayngnim-ui* *nwun-i* *yeppu-si-ta.*
 teacher-gen eyes-nom be pretty-hon-ind
 ‘The teacher’s eyes are pretty.’
- b. *sensayngnim-ui* *malssum-i* *olh-usi-ta.*
 teacher-gen speech-nom be correct-hon-ind
 ‘The teacher’s speech is correct.’
- c. *sensayngnim-ui* *tayk-i* *nelp-usi-ta.*
 teacher-gen house-nom be big-hon-ind
 ‘The teacher’s house is big.’
- (9) a. **sensayngnim-ui* *ankyeng-i* *kum-i-si-ta.*
 teacher-gen glasses-nom gold-be-hon-ind
 ‘The teacher’s glasses are made of gold.’
- b. **sensayngnim-ui* *kaycip-i* *khu-si-ta.*
 teacher-gen doghouse-nom be big-hon-ind
 ‘The teacher’s doghouse is big.’

Second, pragmatic information is also relevant to a metonymy interpretation. The lump may represent the teacher when it is a part of him as in (10a). Once separated from the teacher, it does not represent him any more: it is simply an object which happened to belong to him. (11) is ac-

- (i) **sensayngnim-ui* *malssum-i* *tul-li-si-nta.*
 teacher-gen speech-nom hear-pass-hon-ind
 ‘The teacher’s speech is heard.’
 (Suh 1977, ex. (12a))
- (ii) **sensayngnim-ui* *mosup-i* *po-i-si-nta*
 teacher-gen appearance-nom see-pass-hon-ind
 ‘The teacher is visible.’

I contend that these predicates are reanalyzed as dyadic ones taking an experiencer and a theme argument, based on the fact that the sentences can have a subject in dative or nominative as in (iii)–(iv), which is not possible in the lexical passive construction. Since the theme arguments (*malssum* ‘speech’, *mosup* ‘appearance’) are mapped onto non-subjects, they naturally cannot trigger *si* marking.

- (iii) *nay-key/ka* *sensayngnim-ui* *malssum-i* *tulli-nta*
 I-dat/nom teacher-gen speech-nom hear-ind
 ‘I can hear the teacher’s speech.’
- (iv) *nay-key/ka* *senhsayngnim-ui* *mosup-i* *poi-nta.*
 I-dat/nom teacher-gen appearance-nom see-ind
 ‘I can see the teacher.’

counted for in a similar way. The teacher himself is directly affected when his hands are cured in (11a). In contrast, the hands drawn on the blackboard have nothing to do with the teacher in (11b).

- (10) a. *sensayngnim-ui meli-ui hok-i maywu*
 teacher-gen head-gen lump-nom very
khu-si-ta.
 be big-hon-ind
 ‘The lump on the teacher’s head is very big.’
- b. **sensayngnim-ui hok-i pyeng-ey tule iss-usi-ta.*
 teacher-gen lump-nom jar-in inside be-hon-ind
 ‘The teacher’s lump (removed by surgery) is in the jar.’
- (11) a. *sensayngnim-ui son-i kochie ci-si-ess-ta.*
 teacher-gen hands-nom cure pass-hon-past-ind
 ‘The teacher’s hands were cured.’
- b. **sensayngnim-ui son-i chilphan-ey kulie*
 teacher-gen hands-nom blackboard-on draw
ci-si-ess-ta.
 pass-hon-past-ind
 ‘The teacher’s hands were drawn on the blackboard.’

The discussion so far leads us to a generalization that (i) if the subject denotes an animate being, it determines *si* marking, and (ii) if the subject denotes an inanimate thing, it determines *si* marking only when it is interpreted as a metonym of an animate being. This amounts to saying that every subject, and nothing else, is responsible for *si* marking, either directly or metonymically. We can rephrase this generalization as in (12), which expresses that *si* marking picks out *all and only* subjects. This test may be used as follows: (i) if a sentence has an NP denoting an animate being, see whether this NP is responsible for *si* marking, and (ii) if not, substitute an NP denoting an animate being for every instance of NPs in the sentence and see in which position it triggers *si* marking.

(12) Honorification Test

- a. If an NP denoting an animate being which determines *si* marking is a verbal argument, then it is the subject.
- b. If it is not a verbal argument, its most specific metonym¹⁰ is the subject.

1. 2. Equi Control

Our second test, that is, the equi control construction, does not need much discussion, as it is relatively straightforward and universally attested to (K. P. Mohanan 1983, Yoon 1987). First, some predicates require that both a “missing” element in a complement clause (i.e., a controllee) and its antecedent in a matrix clause (i.e., a controller) be the subject. (13a) is grammatical as the controllee (i.e., who hits Minswu) is interpreted as the subject, whereas (13b) is not possible since the controllee (i.e., who is hit) is interpreted as the object. The predicates in (14) bear the same characteristic.

- (13) a. Swuni-ka [Minswu-lul ttayli-lyeko] *sitoha-yess-ta.*
 nom acc hit-to attempt-past-ind
 ‘Swuni attempted to hit Minswu.’
 b. *Swuni-ka [Minswu-ka ttayli-lyeko] *sitoha-yess-ta.*
 nom nom hit-to attempt-past-ind
- (14) *kitoha-* ‘attempt’, *nolyekha-* ‘endeavor’, *ha-* ‘try’, *ayssu-* ‘endeavor’, etc.

On the other hand, the other class of predicates require that the grammatical object or the goal argument be the controller. As (15) demonstrates, the controllee should again be the subject. (16) lists more examples.

- (15) a. nay-ka Minswu-lul [Swuni-lul manna-key]
 I-nom acc acc meet-to
 seltukha-yess-ta.
 persuade-past-ind
 ‘I persuaded Minswu to meet Swuni.’
 b. *nay-ka Minswu-lul [Swuni-ka manna-key]
 I-nom acc nom meet-to
 seltukha-yess-ta.
 persuade-past-ind

¹⁰ I am grateful to Peter Sells for pointing out that we need restrict the subject only to the *most specific* metonym, to rule out intermediate metonyms (e.g., *elkwul* ‘face’) to be the subject in (i).

- (i) sensayngnim-ui elkwul-ui sangche-ka khu-si-ta.
 teacher-gen face-gen mark-nom be big-hon-ind
 ‘A mark on the face of the teacher is big.’

- (16) kangyoha- 'force', sikhi- 'force', chwungkoha- 'advise', ceyanha- 'suggest', etc.

Both classes of predicates share the characteristic that the controllee should be the subject: hence another subjecthood test as formulated in (17). We can see which NP of a given sentence is interpreted as a controllee, when embedded under a matrix predicate which belongs to either (14) or (16).

(17) Equi Control Test

The controllee of equi control predicates should be the subject.

Note that this test is restricted in two respects. First, this behavior is due to a lexical specification of some special predicates. Second, only a specific class of predicates can occur in a complement clause (Y. Kim 1990). Descriptively speaking, only those denoting a "controllable" event, for example, acting as if honest or walking as in (18a, b), are allowed.¹¹ In comparison, being short or being seated by others as in (18c, d) is not a controllable event.

- (18) a. *nay-ka* [solcikha-lyeko] *nolyekha-yess-ta.*
 I-nom be honest-to try-past-ind
 'I tried to be honest.'
- b. *nay-ka* [kel-ulyeko] *nolyekha-yess-ta.*
 I-nom walk-to try-past-ind
 'I tried to walk.'
- c. **nay-ka* [cak-ulyeko] *nolyekha-yess-ta.*
 I-nom be short-to try-past-ind
 'I tried to be short.' (Y. Kim 1990: 71)
- d. **nay-ka* [anc-hie ci-lyeko] *nolyekha-yess-ta.*
 I-nom sit-caus pass-to try-past-ind
 'I tried to be seated.'

In this section, we have established two subjecthood tests, i.e., *si* marking and equi control. Both of them are necessary and sufficient, in picking out *all and only* subjects, with some restrictions on the second one. From now

¹¹ The distinction in terms of "stativity" does not work: *solckih*- 'be honest' in (18a) and *cak*- 'be short' in (18c) are stative, whereas the other two are active.

is equally considered (ex. (23b)) or a causative action (ex. (23c)), the object is interpreted as playing a more agentive role. That is why *Swuni* can be an antecedent in both sentences. We can find several pairs that exhibit the same effect in this respect. In (24), all the second cases share the characteristic that *Minswu* may be conscious of the specific situation depicted in the sentence, and is therefore more likely to be the antecedent of *caki*.

- (24) a. Minswu-eykwanhay malhacamyen: Minswu-ui kwancemeyse
 about speaking gen point of view
 pomyen
 seeing
 'talking about Minswu': 'from Minswu's point of view'
- b. Minswu-eykey malhata: Minswu-eykey malhay
 to say for say
 cwuta
 give the favor of
 'to tell Minswu': 'to give Minswu the favor of telling'
- c. Minswu-eykey malhata: Minswu-eykey allita/kaluchita
 to say to inform/teach
 'to tell Minswu': 'to inform/teach Minswu'
- d. Minswu-eykwanhay uinonhata: Minswu-wa uinonhata
 about discuss with discuss
 'to discuss about Minswu': 'to discuss with Minswu'

Several generalizations about the antecedents of *caki* directly follow from this proposal. First, *caki* is preferably bound to an NP taking an experiencer thematic role, since one cannot think or feel if one is not conscious. Second, among the NPs taking a goal or a patient role, the object of a lexical causative is most salient. In predicates such as *meki*- 'feed', *anchi*- 'seat', the object plays a more agentive role. Third, in general, the first/second person cannot antecede *caki*, as the first and the second person pronouns are already available to refer to the speaker and the hearer respectively, who are always expected to be conscious of the discourse situation. So *caki* can refer to the first/second person only when s/he is objectified. Finally, this analysis obviates the issue of the binding domain of *caki*, since semantically appropriate controllers may appear in any syntactic domain including discourse.

2.2. Plural Marker Copying

Contrary to previous studies (Song 1975, Kuh 1987), I contend that Plural Marker Copying (PMC) presents another phenomenon which requires semantic information. In Korean, plurality of a noun is expressed by optionally attaching a derivational suffix *tul* onto a noun stem.

- (25) a. *haksayng-tul-eykey* b. *ai-tul-hantheyse-man*
 student-pl-to child-pl-from-only
 'to students' 'from children only'

In addition to this plural marking on countable nouns, we find cases where the plural marker is marked on uncountable/singular nouns or on other constituents.¹⁴

- (26) a. *nehi-tul* *ku chayk-tul* *ilke-tul* *po-ass-ni?*
 you(pl) the book-pl read-pl try-past-int
 'Have you(pl) tried to read the book?'
 b. *haksayng-tul-i* *hakkyo-lo-tul* *kuphi-tul* *ka-nta.*
 student-pl-nom school-to-pl hurriedly-pl go-ind
 'The students go to school hurriedly.'

Song and Kuh generalize to the claim that when the subject denotes a plural entity, the suffix, *tul*, may be attached to the other elements within a clause, including an object, the infinitival form of a verb, an oblique argument or even adverbials (ex. (26)). Intuitively, PMC indicates the plurality of events denoted by the predicate. For instance, in (26b), *A* hurriedly goes to school, *B* hurriedly goes to school, and *C* does too, and so forth.¹⁵ PMC is clearly distinguished from the ordinary plural marking in the ordering

¹⁴ Eunjo Han (personal communication) points out that uncountable nouns may be marked in plural in some contexts.

(i) (There are three bowls of steamed rice on the table.)
 ne ce pap-tul ta mek-e.
 you that rice-pl all eat-imperative
 '(you, sg.) Eat (all the bowls of) steamed rice.'

¹⁵ Y. Kim (1991) argues that PMC in (26) is grammatical only in the distributive reading. Thus, (i), where the adverbial phrase *him-ul moa* 'together' enforces the collective reading, is ungrammatical. This sentence, in fact, may constitute a strong argument against the proposal in terms of subjecthood.

among suffixes. When the noun itself is plural, the derivational suffix comes before all the other suffixes including such a semantic case marker as *ey* 'to' as in (27a). In contrast, when the noun itself is singular and the plural marker is copied onto it, the plural suffix comes after semantic case markers as (27b) shows.

- | | |
|--|--|
| (27) a. <i>hakkyo-tul-ey</i>
school-pl-to
'to the schools' | b. <i>hakkyo-ey-tul</i>
school-to-PL
'to the school' |
|--|--|

Contrary to their prediction, a direct object and a dative argument can also trigger PMC, especially when the predicate is (i) a lexical causative (e.g., *iphi-* 'dress', *meki-* 'feed') or (ii) a three place predicate (e.g., *cwu-* 'give', *ponay-* 'send', *kaluchi-* 'teach') as in (28-29).

- | |
|---|
| (28) a. <i>Swuni-ka ai-tul-ul ku pang-ulo-tul ponay-ess-ta.</i>
nom child-pl-acc the room-to-pl send-past-ind
'Swuni sent the children to the room.' |
| b. <i>ai-tul-ul kenkanghakey-tul khiwu-si-ess-kwunyo.</i>
child-pl-acc healthy-pl raise-hon-past-ind
'(You (sg)) have raised the children to be healthy.' |
| c. <i>ai-tul-ul coyonghi-tul sikhi-ela.</i>
child-pl-acc quietly-pl make-imp
'(You (sg)) Let the children keep quiet.' |
| (29) a. <i>Swuni-nun enceyna ai-tul-eykey ku si-tul-ul</i>
top always child-pl-to the poem-pl-acc
<i>khukey-tul ilk-hi-nta.</i>
loudly-pl read-caus-ind
'Swuni always makes the children read the poem loudly.' |
| b. <i>ai-tul-hanthey pap-tul-ul manhi-tul mek-i-ela.</i>
child-pl-to steamed rice-pl-acc much-pl eat-caus-imp
'(You (sg)) Make the children eat much steamed rice.' |

- (i) *manhun salam-tul-i him-ul moa pawuy-*tul-ul*
many people-pl-nom power-acc gather rock-*pl-acc
olmki-ko iss-ta.
move be-ind
'Many people are moving a rock together.'

- c. Swuni-ka ai-tul-eykey ton-tul-ul ilpwul-ssik-tul
 nom child-pl-to money-pl-acc one dollar-each-pl
 cwu-ess-ta.
 give-past-ind
 'Swuni gave the children money, 1 dollar each.'

In (28–29), PMC occurs when a direct object or a dative argument, rather than a subject, is plural. These non-subject arguments are interpreted as the subject of the PREDICATION (Williams 1980). For instance, in (28a), *the children* is the subject of the implied predicate *going to the room*. Also *the children* is the subject of the implied predicate *being healthy*. Based on this, I propose that PMC should be used as a test for the predication subject. This naturally explains why the grammatical subject can generally trigger PMC.

Note that the plural marker of the semantic subject is copied only onto elements within the domain of semantic predication. In (30), *the children* is interpreted as the subject predicated by *going to the room*, ensuring that its plural marker may be copied onto the locative argument, *ku pang-ulo* 'to the room'. However, it may not be copied onto the sentential adverb, *oy* 'why', or the infinitival form of the main verb, *ponay* 'send', as they are not within the semantic predication.

- (30) Swuni-ka oy-*tul ai-tul-ul ku pang-ulo-tul
 nom why-pl child-pl-acc the room-to-pl
 ponay-*tul peli-ess-ni?
 send-*pl per-past-int
 'Why has Swuni sent the children to the room?'

In sum, the *caki* binding test and the PMC test pick out every subject, but something else. Thus they only provide necessary tests for subjecthood.

3. Discourse Topichood

In this section, I will argue that three control constructions (coordination, control in *-myense* clauses, and subject-to-object raising) are subject to a condition in terms of a discourse topic, which does not bear a direct relationship to subjecthood. Before examining each phenomenon, it is useful to clarify the terminology, "discourse topic". A discourse topic refers to the

entity which the sentence is about. It may carry old information or new information, depending on the context.¹⁶ Among multiple potential topics within a sentence, the first one is called a “primary topic” (Givon 1983: 6). The topic does not have to be linked to an argument in the predication proper;¹⁷ it is interpreted as a possessor in (31a),¹⁸ and presents a set of which the following entity is a member in (31b).

- (31) a. ku cip-i pang-i nemu cak-ta.
 the house-nom room-nom too be small-ind
 ‘As for the house, (its) rooms are too small.’
- b. kang-un Pwukhankang-i alumtap-ta.
 river-top nom be beautiful-ind
 ‘As for the river, Pwukhankang is beautiful.’

3. 1. Coordination

Yoon (1987) claims that coordination may be used as a subjecthood test, since it has been universally attested that both a null grammatical function (controllee) and its antecedent (controller) in a coordination structure should take the same grammatical function, as in (32): both of them take the subject function in (32a), and the object function in (32b) (cf. T. Mohanan 1990 on Hindi). Based on this observation, it has been claimed that the controller is a subject if the controllee is one.

- (32) a. Swuni-nun yeppu-ko kenkangha-ta.
 top be pretty-and be healthy-ind
 ‘Swuni is pretty and is healthy.’

¹⁶ In this respect, my notion is closer to a *discourse theme* (Dik 1978), which comprehends both a topic (which is generally restricted to old information) and a focus (which carries new information or the exhaustive reading).

¹⁷ Dik (1978: 142) distinguishes between a topic and a theme: the former refers to the case where the relevant element is linked to the predication proper, while the latter is in principle presented as independent of the predication. This distinction does not play any role for the sake of our discussion.

¹⁸ (31a) presents the so-called multiple nominative construction in Korean (Park 1981, among others). I include the first nominative NP in the set of discourse topics, since it also presents an entity which the following predication bears upon. It may be sub-classified as a focus (Saito 1985 in Japanese, Yoon 1987, Y. Kim 1990), as nominative case brings in the exhaustive reading.

- b. *nay-ka ku si-lul ssu-ko Swuni-ka*
 I-nom the poem-acc write-and nom
ilk-ess-ta.
 read-past-ind
 'I wrote the poem and Swuni read it.'

Contrary to Yoon's prediction, the controller and the controllee may take distinct grammatical functions. In (33a), the controller is a subject, and the controllee an object. An oblique goal may be controlled by a subject (ex. 33b), or by an object (ex. 33c).

- (33) a. *Swuni-nun chakha-ko chinkwu-tul-i manhi chacao-nta.*
 top be kind-and friend-pl-nom many visit-ind
 'Swuni is kind and many friends come to see her.'
- b. *Swuni-nun Minswu-eykey chayk-ul cwu-ko*
 top to book-acc give-and
 (ku taplyey-lo) *Minswu-nun kkoc-ul cwu-ess-ta.*
 the return-in top flower-acc give-past-ind
 'Swuni gave a book to Minswu and (in return) Minswu gave flowers to her.'
- c. *Minswu-nun Swuni-lul manna-ko phyenci-to ponay-ess-ta.*
 top acc meet-and letter-also send-past-ind
 'Minswu met Swuni and sent a letter to her too.'

An account in terms of thematic roles is not viable either: the controller bears the agent role, while the controllee bears the goal role in (33b). I contend that the controller is interpreted as a discourse topic, and that the controllee indicates that the same topic continues in the second conjunct (i.e., "topic continuity", proposed by Givon 1983: 7). This explains an ambiguity revealed in (34), in terms of a topic/focus.

- (34) *na-nun Minswu-lul cohaha-ko Swuni-nun silheha-nta.*
 I-top acc like-and top dislike-ind
 a. 'As for me, I like Minswu and dislike Swuni.'
 b. 'As for Minswu, I like him and Swuni dislikes him.'

First, when *I* is the controller, it is interpreted as a continuous topic for both conjuncts. The sentence has the reading of (34a), in which *Minswu* and *Swuni* are contrastive foci. Second, when *Minswu* is the controller

which is interpreted as the topic of the sentence, *I* and *Swuni* get a contrastive focus reading, as in (34b).

Two generalizations follow from this proposal. First, this control relationship is subject to a topic interpretation availability hierarchy (Kuno 1976a, Kameyama 1985), as in (35), whereby the left-most element is most commonly interpreted as a topic in the unmarked case, while the right-most element is hardly ever interpreted as one.

- (35) subject < object < indirect object < object of pre (post)positions < genitive < a conjunct

Accordingly, it is most common for the controllee to be understood as the subject, while it is difficult to interpret as a genitive or as a conjunct. Second, it is preferred that the controller and the controllee bear the same grammatical function (cf. Kameyama 1985 on Japanese), which enables us to interpret a sentence with multiple controllees. Unlike Yoon's generalization, it is a preferential tendency rather than an obligatory condition.¹⁹

3.2. Control in *-myense(to)* 'Although' Adverbial Clauses

Control of the unrealized element in the *-myense(to)* 'although' adverbial clause presents another topic-oriented phenomenon. Youn (1989) claims that the lexically unrealized subject of the *-myense(to)* construction is always controlled by the subject of the matrix clause as in (36).

- (36) a. [pappu-*myense(to)*] Minswu-nun Swuni-lul kaluchi-nta.
 be busy-although top acc teach-ind
 'Although he is busy, Minswu teaches Swuni.'
 b. [kenkangha-*myense(to)*] Minswu-nun cacwu kamki-ey
 be healthy-although top frequently cold-by
 kelli-nta.
 catch-ind
 'Although he is healthy, Minswu frequently catches a cold.'

However, this claim is incorrect in two respects. First, *-myense* clauses do

¹⁹ See No (1988) for grammatical sentences characterized by different functions of the controller and the controllee.

not have to be infinitival: tense or modality can be marked. Second, neither the controller nor the controllee is restricted to grammatical subject as (37–38) show.²⁰ Both the controller and the controllee are objects in (37a), and obliques in (37b). (38) illustrates the multiple nominative construction in Korean. The first NP, *Minswu*, can be the controller, although most studies agree that the second NP, *mother*, is the subject of the sentence.

- (37) a. ku si-nun [nay-ka ci-ess-*myense(to)*]
 the poem-to I-nom write-past-although
 Swuni-ka nangsongha-yess-ta.
 nom read-past-ind
 ‘Although I wrote the poem, Swuni read it.’
- b. Kim sunsayngnim-eyuihay [hoyui-ka cinhayng-toy
 teacher-by meeting-nom preside-pass
 -*myense(to)*] siniphoywon-tul-un sokay-toici anh-ass-ta.
 -although new member-pl-top introduce-pass neg-past-ind
 ‘Although the meeting was presided over by prof. Kim, new
 members were not introduced (by him).’
- (38) Minswu-ka [puca-i-*myense(to)*] emeni-ka il-ul
 nom rich-be-although mother-nom work-acc
 ha-si-nta.
 do-hon-ind
 ‘As for Minswu, (his) mother works although he is rich.’

(37–38) indicate that this control phenomenon is not related to subjecthood. Instead, I argue that they involve a discourse topic: the controller is a topic in all the sentences above. Accordingly, like the coordination construction, we can make two predictions. First, the control is subject to a topic interpretation availability hierarchy: the controllee is most commonly interpreted as a subject in an unmarked case, while it is hardly ever interpreted as a

²⁰ In many cases, the sentence sounds more natural, if the *-myense* clause is placed after the controller, rather than sentence-initially. My speculation is that it is due to a discourse factor: as topics precede non-topic in the unmarked word order in Korean, the controller should generally be placed before other elements, if it is a topic, as I argue to be the case. In our sentences, the adverbial clause is placed in various places for the most natural reading, insofar as it does not make any difference in the control relationships.

er', *mit*- 'believe', *kiekha*- 'remember', *kitayha*- 'expect' belong to this class. Unlike raising verbs in English, which take only infinitive clauses, *ko* complements are finite in Korean: tense or modality can be expressed. Second, the controllee in the lower clause is not restricted to the subject (J. Yoon 1987, J. M. Yoon 1989). In (41), the controllee is the locative phrase selected for the predicate of the lower clause. (42) demonstrates that the controllee does not have to be an argument: a time adverbial phrase is related to the clause semantically, but it does not bear any direct syntactic relationship (e.g., argumenthood). (43) shows that the control relationship can be long-distant.

- (41) Minswu-ka L.A.-lul [hankwuksalam-i ceyil manhi
 nom acc Korean-nom most
 sa-nta]-ko sayngkakha-nta.
 live-ind-comp think-ind

'Minswu thinks that L.A. has the largest Korean population.'

- (42) a. Minswu-ka ecey-lul [nalssi-ka chwu-ess-ta]-ko
 nom yesterday-acc weather-nom be cold-past-ind-comp
 sayngkakha-yess-ta.
 think-past-ind

'Minswu thought yesterday was cold.' (J. Yoon 1987, ex. (27))

- b. Minswu-ka ku samnyen tongan-ul [cencayng-i
 nom the three years during-acc war-nom
 kacang simha-yess-ta]-ko kiekha-nta.
 most be severe-past-ind-comp remember-ind

'Minswu remembers that the war was most severe during the three years.'

- (43) na-nun ku cel-ul [motun haksayng-tul-i
 I-top the temple-acc every student-pl-nom
 [Sinla sitay-ey cie-ci-ess-ta]-ko malha-lila]-ko
 dynasty-in build-pass-past-ind-comp answer-ind-comp
 sayngkakha-nta.
 think-ind

'I think that every student will answer that the temple was built in Shilla dynasty.'

What is crucial in (41-43) is that the controller (i.e., the matrix object)

presents a discourse topic that the lower clause bears upon. For instance, in (41), the relevant NP, *L.A.*, acts as the object of the higher clause and the topic of the lower clause at the same time (i.e., *As for L.A., it has the largest Korean population*).

However, this construction departs from the other two constructions analyzed above. First, the controller is always restricted to the object, while the other constructions allow a free choice. Second, this construction is subject to an independent semantic condition,²¹ dictating that the lower clause should provide significant information to characterize the controller.²² As a result, only a subset of the discourse topics constitute eligible controllers. An account for several minimal pairs, which have been postulated unrelated, follows from this proposal. In both sentences of (44) where the controller is a topic, only (44a) is grammatical since the description that it has the largest Korean population is considered to provide information enough to characterize the topic, *L.A.*, while the event of my brother's living there is not usually considered an important characteristic of the city. (45) has been analyzed in terms of a surface word order constraint. However, a deeper reason lies in the kind of description. Having big hands is an important property of *Minswu's*, whereas one instance of *Minswu's* having big hands cannot provide us with a general idea of what a hand is. As in (46), an NP bearing the agent thematic role cannot be the controller: the house's being built does not characterize *Minswu*. (57) demonstrates that individual level predicates (e.g., *be a teacher, be pretty, be a genius*) (Carlson 1977) are preferred to stage level ones (e.g., *be surprised, be tired, be open*) as the predicate of the lower clause. This is because the former group of predicates referring to a permanent feature of something is considered to provide a solid characterization of it, compared to the latter group referring to a temporarily acquired feature.

²¹ In fact, there is one more semantic condition on this construction, due to objecthood of the controller. It requires that the object of these raising type predicates should denote a *specific thing*, in the sense that its reference is registered in the speaker's mind so that it can be identified by the speaker (C. Lee 1989: 12).

²² We should note one thing. This semantic condition is not specific for the SOR construction, but generally applies to the multiple nominative construction (see also S. J. Park 1985, B. M. Kang 1988, O'Grady 1991). This is because both constructions share the characteristic that the preceding NP presents the discourse topic for the lower clause.

- (44) a. *na-nun L.A.-lul* [hankwuksalam-i ceyil manhi
 I-top acc Koreans-nom most
 sa-nta]-ko sayngkakha-nta.
 live-ind-comp think-ind
 'I think that L.A. has the largest Korean population.'
- b. **na-nun L.A.-lul* [nay tongsayng-i sa-nta]-ko
 I-top acc my brother-nom live-ind-comp
 sayngkakha-nta.
 think-ind
 'I think that my brother lives in L. A.'
- (45) a. *na-nun Minswu-lul* [son-i khu-ta]-ko
 I-top acc hands-nom be big-ind-comp
 sayngkakha-nta.
 think-ind
 'I think that Minswu has big hands.'
- b. **na-nun son-ul* [Minswu-ka khu-ta]-ko
 I-top hands-acc nom be big-ind-comp
 sayngkakha-nta.
 think-ind
 'I think that Minswu has big hands.'
- (46) a. *na-nun ku cip-ul* [Minswu-eyuihaye cie
 I-top the house-acc by build
 ci-ess-ta]-ko mit-nunta.
 pass-past-ind-comp believe-ind
 'I believe that Minswu built the house.'
- b. **na-nun Minswu-lul* [ku cip-i cie
 I-top acc the house-nom build
 ci-ess-ta]-ko mit-nunta.
 pass-past-ind-comp believe-ind
 'I believe that Minswu built the house.'
- (47) a. *na-nun Minswu-lul* [apeci-ka sensayngnim-i-si-ess-ta]
 I-top acc father-nom teacher-be-hon-past-ind
 -ko sayngkakha-nta.
 -comp think-ind
 'I think that Minswu's father was a teacher.'

- b. **na-nun Minswu-lul* [apeci-ka nolla-si-ess-ta]
 I-top acc father-nom be surprised-hon-past-ind
 -ko sayngkakha-nta.
 -comp think-indicative
 'I think that Minswu's father was surprised.'

In this section, we have examined three phenomena relevant to topichood. In spite of some preferences, they do not bear any direct relationship to subjecthood.

4. Word Order: Plain Topicalization

Chun (1985: 36) proposes that topicalization can be used as a test for termhood (i.e., SUBJ, OBJ, OBJ2) in the framework of Relational Grammar (Perlmutter 1983). She uses the term topicalization to describe the process of placing some element sentence-initially and marking it with *nun*. Chun claims that topicalized terms have both plain (non-contrastive) and contrastive meaning, while non-terms tend to have only a strong contrastive meaning when topicalized. In (48a), the subject does not need to contrast with something else, when it is topicalized. But when an oblique argument is topicalized, it requires a contrastive clause as in (48c).

- (48) a. *i chayk-un aitul-eyuihayse manhi ilk-hi-ess-ta.*
 this book-top children-by much read-pass-past-ind
 'This book was read much by the children.'
- b. *'ai-tul-eyuihayse-nun i chayk-i manhi*
 child-pl-by-top this book-nom much
ilk-hi-ess-ta.
 read-pass-past-ind
 'By the children, this book was read much.'
- c. *ai-tul-eyuihayse-nun i chayk-i manhi*
 child-pl-by-top this book-nom much
ilk-hi-ess-una elun-tul-eyuihayse-nun cenhye
 read-pass-past-although adult-pl-by-top at all
ilk-hi-ci anh-ass-ta.
 read-pass-comp neg-past-ind
 'By the children, this book was read much, but by the adults, it was not read at all.' (Chun 1985, ex. (16))

Example (49) poses a problem to her proposal. The contrastive reading is stronger in (49a) where a topic is linked to a subject, rather than in (49b) where it is linked to an adjunct phrase.

- (49) a. *pi-nun* ecey o-ass-ta.
 rain-top yesterday come-past-ind
 'Yesterday it rained (but it did not snow).'
- b. *ecey-nun* pi-ka o-ass-ta.
 yesterday-top rain-nom come-past-ind

Then, what brings in this contrastive reading? I argue that two things are involved: (i) *nun* marking always involves some degree of contrastive meaning (Lee and Im 1983: 65–68); (ii) the contrastive meaning becomes stronger if *nun* is attached to any non-initial element in the unmarked word order. The contrastive reading is thus a result of both *nun* marking and word order. First, let us consider a distinction between *ka* and *nun*. Unlike Japanese where nominative is never used for old information (Kuno 1973), it may carry old information in Korean (No 1989).

- (50) han ai-ka wuli cip-ey o-ass-ta. ku ai-ka/*nun*
 one child-nom our house-to come-past-ind the child-nom/top
 senmul-ul kaciko o-ass-ta.
 present-acc bring come-past-ind
 'One child came to my house. The child brought a present.'

In the second sentence, the topic linked to the subject can be marked either nominative or *nun*. Though subtle and vague, the difference between the two markers lies in the implication. The nominative marker implies nothing about the existence of other individuals: the child may be the only individual in our discourse setting. In comparison, *nun* marking implies that the speaker will talk only about the child which has been already introduced, although there may be other individuals in our discourse situation. In other words, *nun* marking contrasts this child with all the other individuals possibly present in the setting.

Second, this contrastive meaning becomes stronger when *nun* is attached to any non-initial elements in the unmarked word order. This is based on the intuition that a marked word order will bring in some kind of markedness in meaning, e.g., contrastive reading (Uzskoreit 1986). Despite the

fact that Korean is a relatively free word order language, we can observe some unmarked order, in which no element in a sentence is given a special contrast.²³

- (51) a. subject–time adverbial–place adverbial–oblique–object–verbal
adverb–verb–auxiliary
- b. nay-ka ecey hakkyo-eyse Minswu-hanthey
I-nom yesterday school-at to
chayk-ul mollay cenhaye cwu-ess-ta.
book-acc secretly hand in give the favor of–past–ind
'Yesterday, I secretly gave a book to Minswu at school.'

Assuming this observation to be correct, although incomplete, let us consider the relationship between word order and a contrastive reading. (52) is a sentence in the unmarked order based on (51a), and (53) enumerates various cases of *nun* marking. In (53a) where the first element, a subject, is marked *nun*, we get only a weak contrastive implication such that the speaker will talk only about *I*, though there *may* be others in our discourse (e.g., *Swuni*). In all the other sentences where *nun* is attached onto non-initial elements, the contrastive meaning becomes stronger.

- (52) nay-ka ecey Minswu-eykey phyenci-lul yenphil-lo
I-nom yesterday to letter-acc pencil-with
ssu-ess-ta.
write-past-ind
'I wrote a letter to Minswu with a pencil.'
- (53) a. *na-nun* ecey Minswu-eykey phyenci-lul
yenphil-lo ssu-ess-ta.
b. nay-ka *ecey-nun* Minswu-eykey phyenci-lul
yenphil-lo ssu-ess-ta.
c. nay-ka ecey *Minswu-eykey-nun* phyenci-lul
yenphil-lo ssu-ess-ta.
d. nay-ka ecey Minswu-eykey *phyenci-nun*
yenphil-lo ssu-ess-ta.
e. nay-ka ecey Minswu-eykey phyenci-lul
yenphil-lo-nun ssu-ess-ta.

²³ This order may be changed by such factors as specificity and definiteness.

(54) presents versions of (53), but the *nun* marked element is placed sentence-initially this time (topicalized in Chun's sense). But reversing the word order does not change a contrastive reading: (54a) gets only a weak contrastive reading, whereas others are subject to a strong contrastive interpretation. Chun incorrectly predicts that (54c) and (54d), where an indirect object and an object are topicalized respectively, will get a plain (or weak contrastive in our sense) reading.

- (54) a. *na-nun* ecey Minswu-eykey phyenci-lul
 yenphil-lo ssu-ess-ta.
- b. *ecey-nun* nay-ka Minswu-eykey phyenci-lul
 yenphil-lo ssu-ess-ta.
- c. *Minswu-eykey-nun* nay-ka ecey phyenci-lul
 yenphil-lo ssu-ess-ta.
- d. *phyenci-nun* nay-ka ecey Minswu-eykey
 yenphil-lo ssu-ess-ta.
- e. *yenphil-lo-nun* nay-ka ecey Minswu-eykey
 phyenci-lul ssu-ess-ta.

In sum, we may get only a weak contrastive reading when *nun* is attached to an initial element in the unmarked word order, while *nun* attached to a non-initial element always brings in a strong contrastive reading. Even though the subject is generally the initial element, and therefore not strongly contrastive, such is not always the case. This test thus fails to be a diagnostic for subjecthood.

5. Anti-Redundancy of Semantic Information: Quantifier Float

Perlmutter and Postal (1974) propose that quantifier float is universally accounted for in terms of grammatical functions. They argue that only subjects and direct objects can antecede the quantifiers in Japanese, a language which is very similar to Korean in many respects.²⁴ This analysis accounts for a distinction between (55) and (56).

²⁴ Gerdtz (1985: 59) notes that Korean is distinguished from Japanese, in that the floated quantifier can be case marked. Like her, I will deal only with the cases where the quantifier phrase is case marked. I basically believe that the quantifier phrase without case should be explained in terms of case deletion in general.

- (55) a. *haksayng-i seys-i o-ass-ta.*
 student-nom three-nom come-past-ind
 'Three students came.'
- b. *nay-ka ai-tul-ul seys-ul manna-ass-ta.*
 I-nom child-pl-acc three-acc meet-past-ind
 'I met three children.'
- (56) a. **nay-ka haksayng-eykey seys-eykey kong-ul*
 I-nom student-to three-to ball-acc
tenci-ess-ta.
 throw-past-ind
 'I threw a ball to three students.'
- b. **nay-ka ai-tul-lopithe seys-ulopithe phyenci-lul*
 I-nom child-pl-from three-from letter-acc
pat-ass-ta.
 receive-past-ind
 'I received letters from three students.'

The subject and the object antecede the quantifier phrases as in (55), whereas obliques cannot, as (56) shows. However, multiple nominative constructions evade this generalization.

- (57) *haksayng-i sonkalak-i seys-i tachi-ess-ta.*
 student-nom finger-nom three-nom be injured-past-ind
- a. 'As for three students, their fingers are injured.'
- b. 'As for the student, his three fingers are injured.'

If we assume that a sentence has only one subject in accordance with Universal Grammar, only one of the two nominative marked NPs should be a possible antecedent. However, either of them can antecede the quantifier phrase. This indicates that the quantifier float construction cannot be used as a subject/object test.

Based on such data as in (55-57),²⁵ Gerdts (1985) proposes an account in terms of constituent structure of an antecedent: only nominals which

²⁵ For the detailed argument against a potential account in terms of "acting 1s", see Gerdts (1985: 55-56). She also provides arguments against Shibatani's (1977) proposal in terms of surface case, mostly based on complex sentences involving an empty NP (raising sentences, syntactic causatives, and topic sentences).

are not contained within a postpositional phrase can antecede quantifiers, under the assumption that nominative and accusative case are true inflectional suffixes, whereas others are postpositions. Though this solution provides a principled account for given data, a new set of data raises a problem. NPs marked neither nominative nor accusative case can antecede quantifier phrases within a clause, when a delimiting particle (*man* 'only', *to* 'also', *cocha* 'even', etc.) is attached to either the noun phrase or the quantifier phrase, or to both, as in (58). Gerdt's proposal incorrectly predicts that the sentences in (58) should be ungrammatical, since "nominals which are contained within a postpositional phrase" antecede quantifiers.²⁶

- (58) a. *nay-ka chinkwu-tul-hanthey-nun seys-hanthey*
 I-nom friends-to-contrast three-to
card-lul ponay-ess-ta.
 acc send-past-ind
 'I sent greeting cards to three friends (contrastive to teachers).'
- b. *nay-ka chinkwu-tul-hanthey seys-hanthey-na*
 I-nom friends-to three-to-as many as
card-lul ponay-ess-ta.
 acc send-past-ind
 'I sent greeting cards to as many as three friends.'
- c. *nay-ka chinkwutul-hanthey-nun seys-hanthey-na*
 I-nom friends-to-contrast three-to-as many as
card-lul ponay-ess-ta.
 acc send-past-indicative
 'I sent greeting cards to as many as three friends (contrastive to teachers).'

In contrast with previous studies which concern only the status of the antecedent, I propose an alternative view of this construction: the relationship between the antecedent NP and the quantifier phrase matters. First, I will

²⁶ In fact, sentences like (56) are fine in my idiolect: they sound redundant, but are not ungrammatical. I find the same thing in multiple case sentences: not only nom/acc but also other cases can repeat (for some examples, see Yang 1975; Yoon (as cited in Maling 1989) also seems to agree.) Various factors (e.g., adding delimiters as in (58), putting a stress on either element, putting a pause between two elements) make sentences more generally acceptable.

consider a distinction of case markers, and the internal structure of NP. Second, based on the argument that a quantifier phrase is also an NP, I will propose a condition on the series of NPs to the effect of avoiding redundancy of semantic information. Last, we will see that this condition is independently required in Korean grammar to account for multiple nominative/accusative constructions.

First, based on the morphological facts that non-nominative/accusative markers are also inflectional suffixes (Y. S. Kim 1985, Cho and Sells 1991), I propose a distinction in terms of NON-SEMANTIC CASE and SEMANTIC CASE (Chomsky 1981, Gerdts and Youn 1988). The former, which includes nominative and accusative, does not carry any information on thematic roles and appears as the last suffix in the NP form. In contrast, all the other case markers, which are attached to the noun stem, are **semantic in the sense** that they are associated with a specific thematic role. The internal structure of NP in Korean may be analyzed as follows:

(59) [~~Stem-Semantic Case-Delimiters-Non-Semantic Case~~]_{NP}

Generally, a stem is followed either by a semantic case or by a non-semantic one. A non-semantic case can follow a semantic one in some instances (e.g. "Case Stacking" proposed by Gerdts). Semantic information other than on thematic roles is carried by delimiters, for example, contrast (e.g., *nun* 'as for') or scope (e.g., *man* 'only', *to* 'also', *na* 'as many as'). They generally come between a semantic case and a non-semantic one, although some of them (e.g., *nun* 'as for', *to* 'also', *cocha* 'even') override the latter.

Next, what is the syntactic category of the quantifier phrase? It is clearly an NP: (i) a semantic case is attached to it (ex. 60a); (ii) it is coordinated with another NP by means of *kwa* (ex. 60b); it is modified by a demonstrative adjective (ex. 60c).

- (60) a. *seys-hanthey*
 three-to
 b. *seys-kwa* *emeni*
 three-and mother
 c. *ku* *seys*
 the three

If all these assumptions are correct, a typical quantifier float construction is

a case where two NPs with the same non-semantic case occur in a clause. On the basis of these considerations, I propose a condition on the cooccurrence of NPs as in (61), to ensure that NPs whose inflectional suffixes carry the same semantic information cannot cooccur (for a similar proposal in Hindi in terms of the OCP effect, see T. Mohanan 1990).

- (61) NPs carrying *exactly and only* the same semantic information expressed by inflectional suffixes are disallowed in a clause.

The intuition behind this condition is to avoid redundancy of semantic information.²⁷ This condition accounts for all the quantifier float data presented so far. (55) and (57) are possible, since no semantic information is involved. (56) is impossible, since the two NPs carry exactly and only the same semantic information. In (58), the two NPs do not carry the same semantic information: in (58a, b), one of them has more information than the other; they carry different information (*contrast* vs. *as many as*) in (58c).

In sum, the quantifier float construction is subject to a more general condition based on the redundancy of semantic information. This condition is based on a distinction between nominative/accusative and other case markers. As subject and object frequently take nominative and accusative respectively, this construction apparently seems to be sensitive to grammatical functions. However, as this is not always the case, we cannot rely on this construction to find out what the subject is.

7. Summary

In this paper, I have examined nine tests which have been claimed as diagnostics for subjecthood in Korean. I have attempted to show that only

²⁷ This condition is independently required in Korean grammar for all the cases where a series of NPs occur in a clause, i. e., multiple case constructions. In fact, I think that the quantifier float is one instance of the multiple case construction, in that they share the discourse function structure characterized by binary branching of topic (theme)-comment (rheme). Their difference lies in the semantic relationship between two NPs: (i) two NPs in the former construction are in the appositive relation (C. Lee 1989), while those in the later, in the whole-part relationship; (ii) only in the former construction, the second NP is the anaphor. These semantic differences also result in some distinctions in word order.

some of them are reliable. Honorification and equi control pick out all and only subjects: so they may be used as necessary and sufficient subjecthood tests. *Caki* binding and plural marker copying pick out not only the subjects but also other elements of the sentence which are semantically constrained: they are eligible to be a necessary condition on subjecthood. Other phenomena, including coordination, control, raising, topicalization, and quantifier float, tend to pick up subjects in many cases for various reasons, but do not bear any direct relationship to subjecthood. It has been argued that the notion of discourse topic provides an adequate and simpler account for coordination, control, and raising. The result of this investigation may be employed to figure out the subjects of controversial cases such as "dative subjects", "locative subjects", "the multiple nominative construction".

References

- Carlson, G. N. (1977) 'Reference to Kinds in English,' *Doctoral Dissertation*, University of Massachusetts.
- Chang, S. J. (1986) 'The Reflexive *Caki* Reconsidered: A (Micro to) Macro View,' in *Proceedings of SICOL-86*.
- Cho, Y. (1985) 'An LFG Analysis of the Korean Reflexive *Caki*,' in S. Kuno et al. eds., *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics*, Hanshin, Seoul.
- Cho, Y. and P. Sells (1991) 'A Lexical Account of Phrasal Suffixes in Korean,' ms., Stanford.
- Chomsky, N. (1981) *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Foris, Dordrecht.
- Chun, S.A. (1985) 'Possessor Ascension for Multiple Case Sentences,' in S. Kuno et al. eds., *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics*, Hanshin, Seoul.
- Clements, G. (1975) 'The Logophoric Pronoun in Ewe: Its Role in Discourse,' in *Journal of West African Languages*, Vol. 2, 141-177.
- Dik, S. (1981) *Functional Grammar*, Foris, Dordrecht.
- Gerdts, D. (1987) 'Surface Case and Grammatical Relations in Korean: the Evidence from Quantifier Float,' in *Studies in Language*, Vol. 11. 1, 181-197.
- Gerdts, D. and C. Youn (1988) 'Korean Psych Constructions: Advancement or Retreat?' in *CLS*, 155-175.

- Givon, T. (1983) *Topic Continuity in Discourse: A Quantitative Cross-Linguistic Study*, John Benjamins, Philadelphia.
- Han, E. (1991) 'Honorification in Korean,' ms., Stanford University.
- Hong, K. S. (1989) 'Consciousness Condition on the Korean Reflexive *Caki*,' in *BLS*, 161-169.
- Hong, K. S. (1991) 'Argument Selection and Case Marking in Korean,' Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University.
- Im, H. (1987) *Kwuke-ui Caykwuysa Yenkwu (A Study of the Korean Reflexives)*, Shinkwu Munhwasa, Seoul.
- Kameyama, M. (1985) 'Zero-Anaphora: the Case of Japanese,' Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University.
- Kang, B. M. (1988) 'Functional Inheritance, Anaphora, and Semantic Interpretation in a Generalized Categorical Grammar,' Doctoral dissertation, Brown University.
- Keenan, E. (1975) 'Towards a Universal Definition of Subject,' in C. Li ed. *Subject and Topic*, Academic Press, New York.
- Kim, Y. J. (1990) 'The Syntax and Semantics of Korean Case: the Interaction between Lexical and Syntactic Levels of Representation,' Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University.
- Kim, Y. K. (1992) 'The Syntax and Semantics of Korean Spurious Plurals,' in *Proceedings of the Eighth ICKL*.
- Kim, Y. S. (1985) 'Aspects of Korean Morphology,' Doctoral Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.
- Kim, Y. S. (1988) 'Licensing Principles and Phrase Structure,' Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Kuh, H. (1987) 'Plural Copying in Korean,' in S. Kuno et al. eds., *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* Vol. 2, 239-250.
- Kuno, S. (1973) *The Structure of the Japanese Language*, The MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Kuno, S. (1976a) 'Subject, Theme and the Speaker's Empathy,' in C. Li ed., *Subject and Topic*, Academic Press, New York.
- Kuno, S. (1976b) 'Subject Raising,' in M. Shibatani ed., *Syntax and Semantics* 5, Academic Press, New York.
- Kuno, S. (1987) *Functional Syntax*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Lee, C. (1988) 'Issues in Korean Anaphora,' in *Proceedings of the Sixth*

ICKL.

- Lee, C. (1989) '(In)Definites, Case Markers, Classifiers, and Quantifiers in Korean,' in S. Kuno et al. eds. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* Vol. 3, 469-488, Hanshin, Seoul.
- Lee, C. (1990) 'Grammatical Constraints on Honorific Expressions in Korean,' ms., Seoul National University.
- Lee, I. S. and H. B. Im (1983) *Kwuke Munpeplon (Korean Grammar)*, Hakyensa, Seoul.
- Maling, J. (1984) 'Non-Clause Bounded Reflexives in Modern Icelandic,' in *Linguistics and Philosophy* 7, 211-241.
- Maling, J. (1989) 'Adverbials and Structural Case in Korean,' in S. Kuno et al. eds., *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* Vol. 3, 469-488, Hanshin, Seoul.
- Mohanan, K. P. (1988) 'Functional and Anaphoric Control,' in *Linguistic Inquiry* 14, 641-674.
- Mohanan, T. (1990) 'Arguments in Hindi,' Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University.
- No, Y. (1990) 'Case Alternation on Verb-Phrase Internal Arguments,' ms., Ohio State University.
- O'Grady, W. (1982) 'The Syntax and Semantics of Quantifier Placement,' in *Linguistics* 2, 519-539.
- O'Grady, W. (1991) *Categories and Case: the Sentence Structure of Korean (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 71)*, John Benjamins, Philadelphia.
- Park, B. S. (1981) 'The Double Subject Constructions Revisited,' in I. S. Yang ed., *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*, Hanshin, Seoul.
- Perlmutter, D. (1983) *Studies in Relational Grammar*, Vol. 1, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Perlmutter, D. and P. Postal (1974) Lectures on Relational Grammar, lecture given at the Summer Linguistic Institute of the LSA at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Saito, M. (1982) 'Case Marking in Japanese: a Preliminary Study,' ms., MIT.
- Sells, P. (1987) 'Aspects of Logophoricity,' in *Linguistic Inquiry* 18, 445-479.
- Shibatani, M. (1977) 'Grammatical Relations and Surface Cases,' in *Lan-*

- guage* 53.4, 789–809.
- Song, S. C. (1975) 'Rare Plural Marking and Ubiquitous Plural Marker in Korean,' in *CLS* 11.
- Suh, C. S. (1977) 'Remarks on Subject Honorification,' in C.W. Kim ed., *Papers in Korean Linguistics* 297–304.
- Uzskoreit, H. (1986) 'Constraints on Order,' in *CSLI Report* No. 86-46, CSLI, Stanford.
- Williams, E. (1981) 'On the Notions 'Lexically Related' and Head of Word,' in *Linguistic Inquiry* 12, 245–274.
- Yang, I. S. (1972) *Korean Syntax: Case Markers, Delimiters, Complementa-tion, and Relativization*, Paykhap, Seoul.
- Yoon, J. (1987) 'Some Queries Concerning the Syntax of Multiple Subject Constructions in Korean,' in S. Kuno et al. eds., *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* Vol. 2, Hanshin, Seoul.
- Yoon, J. M. (1989) 'ECM and Multiple Subject Constructions in Korean,' in S. Kuno et al. eds., *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* Vol. 3, 369–381, Hanshin, Seoul.
- Youn, C. (1989) 'A Relational Analysis of Korean Multiple Nominative Constructions,' Doctoral Dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.

ABSTRACT

Subjecthood Tests in Korean

Ki-Sun Hong

This paper attempts to find some behavioral properties of unequivocal instances of grammatical subjects in Korean in order to provide some reliable subjecthood tests. I will examine nine tests which have been claimed as diagnostics for subjecthood in Korean. I will review each test and show that only some of them are reliable. Others will be shown not to bear any direct relationship to subjecthood, although they tend to pick up subjects in many cases for various reasons.

Department of English language and literature
College of Humanities
Seoul National University
Shillim-dong, Kwanak-ku
Seoul, 151-742
Korea