

A Reexamination of "Double-Subject" in Korean

Chang, Kyung Ki. Kang, Sun Young

Dept. of English Language and Literature

(Received December 30, 1981)

〈Abstract〉

This paper aims to analyze the so-called Korean double-subject constructions according to Dik's (1978) framework and to show the adequacy of our analysis.

The so-called Korean double-subject construction has been the object of persisting interest and argumentation in the literature. Roughly speaking, before the appearance of transformational grammar, the argument that Korean has double subjects had prevailed and after that, the argument that double-subject construction in the surface structure is the transformation of single-subject construction in the deep structure is prevailing.

This paper differs from the previous treatments as follows:

- (1) Korean has a single subject as many natural languages do.
- (2) Transformational analysis not only fails to capture the subtle meaning differences in the surface structure, but is not helpful in solving the problem of double-subject constructions.
- (3) We hypothesize that subject is a multi-factor concept.

Dik's (1978) framework will be partially used to support our arguments and other evidence to support them will be presented.

국어의 이중주어 再論

장 경 기 · 강 선 영

英語 英文學科

(1981.12.30 접수)

〈요 약〉

본 논문은 국어의 이중주어 문제를 Dik(1978)의 틀(framework)에 의하여 분석, 설명할 수 있음을 보이고 그 타당성을 제시하는데 목적이 있다.

국어의 이중주어 현상에 대한 문제는 그동안 학계의 꾸준한 관심과 논란의 대상이 되어 왔다. 대체로 말해서 빈익문법의 출현 이전에는 국어는 표면 구조에 나타난대로 이중주어를 가진 언어라는 주장이 지배적이었고, 빈익문법의 출현 이후에는 표면구조의 이중주어 현상은 심층구조의 단일 주어의 변형일 뿐이라고 주장되어 왔다.

본 논문은 우리의 주장과 다음과 같이 입장을 달리하고 있다.

1. 국어의 주어는 많은 자인언어와 마찬가지로 하나라고 가정한다.
2. 빈익에 의한 분석방법은 표면구조에 나타나는 미묘한 의미의 차이를 포착하지 못할 뿐만 아니라 본질적 문제의 해결에 도움을 주지 못한다.
3. 주어의 복합 요인 개념(multi-factor concept)이라고 가정한다.

Dik(1978)의 틀(framework)이 위의 주장에 대한 지지의 증거로 사용되고 다른 증거들도 제시될 것이다.

I. Introduction

Double-subject constructions in Korean are, doubtless, one of the areas which have been investigated in depth from a variety of different theoretical points of views; traditional (Y.K. Kim, 1957), transformational (C.S. Suh, 1971), relational (M. Shibatani, 1977), and functional (K.H. Kim, 1981), etc. Though a number of insightful treatments of this subject have appeared, it has become apparent that the double-subject phenomenon still defies easy generalizations and explanations. There are many problems and issues to be settled yet.

Our aim in this paper is to show that (a) S.C. Dik's functional grammar along with E. Keenan's conception of 'subject' as a multi-factor entity provides an adequate theoretical framework for the description of Korean double-subject constructions and (b) some thorny problems, which will be pointed out later in this paper, can be explained rather adequately in this framework.

This paper is organized as follows:

1. A brief survey of earlier analyses of double-subject constructions.
2. An outline of Dik's functional grammar.
3. Definition of subject.
4. Our analysis of double-subject sentences in this framework.
5. Conclusion.

II. A brief survey

This section briefly sketches a few notable theoretical approaches to the problem of identifying 'subject' in the Korean language. Traditionally, grammatical relations such as subject of', 'object of' etc. were identified by

the nominative and accusative case markers respectively: i.e., NPs with particles (n)in and i/ka were regarded as the subject NPs and NPs with particles (l)il as the object NPs. Look at the following example:

- 2.0. Ki ai-ka nun-i yeppi-ta. ⁽¹⁾
 The child eyes pretty
 (The child's eyes are pretty.)

Sentence (2.0) has two NPs in the nominative case, i.e., ki-ai and nun. Such sentences with two nominative NPs were termed "double-subject sentences" by many traditional grammarians (Y. K. Kim, 1957, M. S. Kim, 1960). The first NP 'ki ai' was called major subject and the second NP 'nun' minor subject. This distinction was based upon the semantic parameter whole/part: that is, the first NP denotes the whole of an entity while the second NP denotes a part of the whole entity.

Such an analysis is obviously counterintuitive in that a predicate has two subjects in a simple sentence. Furthermore, the claim that a sentence has two subjects derives from the confusion of two distinct notions of grammatical relations and case marking. An NP in the nominative case is not necessarily the subject NP of a sentence:

- 2.1. Sakwa-nin Chanho-ka choa-han-ta.
 Apples Chanho likes.
 (Chanho likes apples.)

In (2.1) the NP with nominative case marker nin, that is, Sakwanin, is not the subject but the object of the sentence.

The late sixties and early seventies saw a number of papers dealing with the double-subject constructions within the transformational generative framework. TG grammarians (C.S. Suh, 1971, etc) made an attempt to derive double-subject constructions from the

(1) The cognitive meanings of our Korean examples are identical to those of the given English translations. However, no attempts were made to express the pragmatic aspects of meaning such as the topicality or thematicity in the English translations.

deep structure in which there exists only one subject NP. Their main point is that double-subject construction is a surface phenomenon and that there is only one subject for each sentence. Their idea of 'one subject per one sentence' seems to be quite insightful.

Transformational generative approach was, however, faced with some serious difficulties. To cite a few examples, TG grammarians derived (2.2) from (2.3) via the application of Nominativization:

2.2. Nae-ka mæri-ka aph-ta.
I head hurt.
(I have a headache.)

2.3. Na-iy mæri-ka aph-ta.
My head hurts.
(My head hurts.)

Nominativization, however, changes the meaning of a sentence subtly. That is, the derived NP, i.e., nae-ka, has Kuno's "exhaustive listing" reading (S.Kuno, 1973). Namely, (2.2) roughly translates into English as follows: "It is I and only I whose head hurts."

Grammatical relations such as subject and object are given derivative definitions in transformational grammar. Within the theory, subject is defined as a purely syntactic concept. The inadequacy of Chomskyan definition of 'subject of' has been convincingly demonstrated by relational grammarians (P. Postal, 1977, D. Johnson, 1974). Instead, E. Keenan's notion of subject as a 'multi-factor' concept will be discussed in section IV.

The most serious problem with transformationally deriving double-subject construction from an underlying structure is that there are many double-subject sentences which can never be explained in terms of transformations. (2.4) is such an example:

2.4. TV-nin Zenith-ka coh-ta.
TV Zenith good.

(Zenith is a good TV.)

A number of such sentences show that transformational analysis of double-subject sentences is only partially revealing.

A further problem with the transformational approach is that a class of double-subject sentences can be derived from two different underlying structures without producing any sort of ambiguity. Look at the following examples (C.S. Suh, 1971):

2.5 Kiiy-ka caecu-ka mocaran-ta.
He talent poor.
(He has a poor talent.)

2.5a Kiiy-u caecu-ka mocaran-ta.
His talent poor.
(His talent is poor.)

2.5b Kiiy-eke caecu-ka mocaran-ta.
To him talent poor.
(To him talent is poor.)

Two underlying structures (2.5a) and (2.5b) end up as the identical surface structure (2.5) without producing any sort of ambiguities. TG grammarians then should either abandon their analysis or posit a deeper structure.

In sum, the earlier approaches to the double-subject in Korean are faced with at least three problems:

1. The definition of subject is not consistent. This is really crucial in analysing the double-subject in Korean.
2. The analysis by TG grammarians did not capture the subtle differences of meaning which have communicative importance.
3. There are many cases in Korean which could not be explained in terms of transformations.

These problems compel us to reanalyse Korean double-subject constructions from a radically different theoretical point of view. We think Dik's functional grammar can adequately deal with the double-subject constructions in Korean without causing any problem as tradi-

tional or transformational grammars did.

III. Dik's Functional Grammar

Double-subject constructions in Korean were mainly analysed in terms of formal mechanisms such as case marking system and transformations. Such a purely formal treatment of double-subject sentences did not take into consideration the fact that a language should be conceived of as an instrument of social communication used with the specific purpose of establishing communications between speakers and addressees. Dik's functional grammar includes not only formal syntactic, semantic systems but also pragmatic mechanisms dealing with the functional notions of speaker/addressee, Theme and Topic, etc.

In this regard, Dik's functional grammar can serve as a fully adequate theoretical framework within which Korean double-subject sentences are described in terms of their formal properties as well as their pragmatic characteristics. At this point, it may be appropriate to present an outline of S.C. Dik's functional grammar.

Dik's functional grammar, which has neither transformation, nor any filtering devices, specifies functional relations at three different levels:

(1) semantic functions: agent, goal, recipient, etc.

(2) syntactic functions: subject and object.

(3) pragmatic functions: theme and tail, topic and focus.

Roughly, he defines the difference between the three levels of functions as follows:

"Semantic functions specify the roles which the referents of the terms involved play within the 'state of affairs' designated by the predication in which they occur. Syntactic functions specify the informational status of the constituents within the wider communicative setting in which they occur..."

Pragmatic functions, being of crucial impor-

tance in our discussion of Korean double-subject constructions, will be discussed in detail. According to Dik, after the assignments of semantic and syntactic functions have taken place, pragmatic functions are assigned. Four pragmatic functions are distinguished, two external and two internal to the predication proper. The external functions are:

Theme: The theme specifies the universe of discourse with respect to which the subsequent predication is presented as relevant.

Tail: The tail presents, as an 'afterthought' to the predication, information meant to clarify or modify it.

And the internal ones given by Dik are:

Topic: The topic presents the entity 'about' which the predication predicates something in the given setting.

Focus: The focus presents what is relatively the most important or salient information in the given setting.

For the adequate assignments of pragmatic functions, Dik proposed a general functional schema of the following form:

(x_i) Theme, Predication, (x_j) Tail.

As is clear from the discussion of pragmatic functions and the functional schema from above, one thing that characterizes Dik's framework is his differentiation of Theme and Topic: that is, Theme is outside the scope of predication, while Topic is inside the predication proper. He gives several arguments for this position.

In the first place, the Theme constituent is outside the performative modality of the subsequent predication. That is, the predication following the Theme can have the full range of performative modalities such as declarative, imperative, and interrogative, as can be seen in examples (3.0)–(3.2):

3.0 That guy, is he a friend of yours?

3.1 That trunk, put it in the car.

3.2 As for the students, they won't be

invited.

A second fact pointing to the independence of the Theme is that it can itself have interrogative modality, etc. as in (3.3):

- 3.3 My brother? I haven't seen him for years.

A third argument is based on the following observation that Theme constituent usually has a sort of "absolute form" characterized by the most unmarked case (typically, the nominative). Look at the following examples:

- 3.4 a. That man, we gave the book to him yesterday.
 b. To that man, we gave the book to him yesterday.
- 3.5 a. Cet homme, nous lui avons donne le livre hier.
 b. *A cet homme, nous lui avons donne le livre hier.

In both (3.4) and (3.5) Theme constituents have the semantic and syntactic function markings one would expect them to have if they were extracted from the predications. Both examples, however, turn out to be ungrammatical. Such facts support the hypothesis that Theme may be independent of predication.

7. Definition of "Subject"

In traditional grammar à la Jespersen, grammatical relations such as subject, object, etc. were not given a precise and formal definition. To remedy such a defect in linguistic theory, Chomsky (1965) set out to give a purely formalistic definition to the notions of grammatical relations in terms of the phrase structure configurations. For instance, 'subject' is defined as the NP immediately dominated by the root S. Other grammatical relations were treated in a similar fashion. It was noticed, however, that such a derivative definition

could not be universally applicable to natural languages. In some Malayo-Polynesian languages the basic word order is VSO. These languages do not have a VP node directly dominating V and O. It is, therefore, quite obvious that Chomsky's definitions are not universally valid. Walbiri and Tagalog also pose a serious problem to Chomsky's definitions, for in these languages the relative positions of subject and object is completely free (E. Keenan, 1976). Furthermore, in many SOV languages such as Turkish, Hindi, etc. there is little or no crucial evidence for the existence of the VP node.

In the early 1970s, syntacticians began to develop an increased interest in "grammatical relations" such as subject, direct object, and indirect object in order to capture the universality of syntactic rules of natural languages. To take one example, Passive construction exists in many natural languages. The structural descriptions of this rule are rather varied, if viewed from transformational standpoint. But they have one characteristic in common: that is, object in active construction becomes subject in passive construction. This universal aspect cannot be captured by Chomskyan structural description of passive construction.

In this respect, Relational Grammar claims that grammatical relations are needed to capture the universality of natural languages and that these grammatical relations should be posited as the theoretical primitives (P. Postal, 1977). Relational Grammarians, however, did not give any definitions of the notion of grammatical relations.

In other words, if we cannot identify the grammatical relations such as subject and object in any natural languages, their claims are seriously weakened. For example, if native speakers of Korean cannot identify the subject of the double-subject constructions in their

language, a number of generalizations involving grammatical relations lose their validity.

"Subject" has long been considered as a fundamental concept in analyzing the grammatical relations in sentence. According to Li and Thompson (1976), however, there are some languages that can be better analyzed in terms of topic-comment relation than subject-predicate relation.

Their argument is that (i) the notion of topic may be as basic as that of subject and (ii) languages may differ in their strategies in constructing sentences according to the prominence of the notions of topic and/or subject.

Using these two seemingly different but not unrelated notions, they proposed the following four basic types of languages:

<u>Subject-Prominent Languages</u>	<u>Topic-Prominent Languages</u>
Indo-European Niger-Congo :	Chinese Lahu (Lolo-Burmese) Lisu (" ")
<u>Subject-Prominent and Topic-Prominent Languages</u>	<u>Neither Subject- Prominent nor Topic-Prominent Languages</u>
Japanese Korean	Tagalog Ilocano

For example, in Lisu, a Topic-Prominent language, topic is explicitly marked, but the subject of a sentence is not codified in any way:

4.0 lathyu nya ana khu-a.
 people topic dog bite-declarative
 marker marker
 "People (topic) they bite dogs,"
 dogs bite them."

4.1 ana nya lathyu khu-a.
 dog topic people bite-declarative
 marker marker
 "Dogs(topic) they bite people."
 people bite dogs."

As the two sentences (4.0) and (4.1) show,

topics in Lisu are explicitly marked. Lisu, however, is ambiguous as far as subjecthood or agency is concerned. In this language semantic and/or pragmatic properties play decisive roles in disambiguating the sentences.

Li and Thompson (1976) classified Korean as a subject and topic prominent language. Their crucial point is that semantic and pragmatic factors as well as syntactic ones have to be taken into consideration in identifying the subject of a sentence in Korean. In fact, traditional grammarians identified subject only in terms of the case marking an NP carries. Consequently, their treatment of Korean subjecthood was greatly handicapped by not considering semantic and pragmatic factors. Such an argument is further bolstered by E. Keenan's proposal that subject should be regarded as a multi-factor concept with syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic properties (E. Keenan, 1976).

Syntactic properties include coding properties such as case marking, verb agreement and also behavior and control properties, e.g. deletion, movement, case changing properties, control of cross-reference, etc. Semantic properties designate agency, autonomous existence, selection restrictions, etc. His major claim is that the more such properties an NP has, the more it is subjectlike. Keenan's approach, as Dik himself admits, is not incompatible with Dik's framework, within which semantic factors determine the assignment of subject function.

V. Double-subject constructions in Korean

Look at the following often-cited example of double-subject sentence in Korean:

5.0 Khokkiri-nin kho-ka kil-ta.
 Elephant nose long.

(The elephant has a long nose.)

A number of generative grammarians (P.S. Park, 1981, C.S. Suh, 1971, Shibatani, 1977) derived the sentence (5.0) from the possessive construction in which the first nominative NP functions as the possessor and the second the possessed. That is, (5.0) derives from the structure underlying (5.1);

- 5.1 Khokkiri-iy kho-ka kil-ta.
Elephant's nose long.
(The elephant's nose is long.)

Sentence (5.0) derives from the structure underlying (5.1) via the application of the rule Nominativization. This rule removes the possessor NP "khokkiri" from the original possessive construction which is in the nominative and then marks it with the nominative, because that is the case the original possessive construction is in. As noted earlier, however, transformational approach has some problems: (1) meaning change and (2) there is a subset of double-subject sentences that cannot be derived from possessive construction. Sentence (5.3) is a clear case that cannot be handled by the rule Nominativization:

- 5.3 TV-nin Zenith-Ka cho-ta.
TV Zenith good
(Zenith is a good TV.)

Existence of such a set of examples clearly demonstrates the inadequacy of transformational solution.

Instead, if Dik's functional schema can deal with Korean double-subject phenomenon in a uniform way, then it is theoretically more adequate and satisfying in that it captures the generality of the phenomenon. Let's see how Dik's functional schema accommodates Korean double-subject constructions:

- | | | | |
|-----|--------------|--------------|---------|
| | (Theme), | Predication, | (Tail) |
| 5.4 | Khokkiri-nin | kho-ka | kil-ta. |
| 5.5 | TV-nin | Zenith-ka | cho-ta. |

The following examples can also be analyzed

by the same schema:

- | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|--------------|-----------|
| | (Theme), | Predication, | (Tail) |
| 5.6 | Ki cha-nin | sokto-ta | ppari-ta. |
| | The car | speed | fast |
| | (The car runs fast.) | | |
| 5.7 | John-n | mari-ka | aphi-ta. |
| | John | head | hurt |
| | (John has a headache.) | | |

Now compare the following sentence (5.8) with (5.0):

- 5.8 Kho-nin khokkiri-ka kil-ta.

Even though the two sentences are the same in the cognitive meaning, their usage in the real communicative situations is rather different. In other words, in (5.0) the speaker talks about elephant (khokkiri) and in (5.8) the speaker talks about nose (kho), that is, the theme of (5.0) is elephant and the theme of (5.8) is nose. Transformational grammar is not much of help in dealing with the sentence (5.8), because it cannot be derived from the following sentence (5.9):

- 5.9 *Kho-iy khokkiri-ka kil-ta.
Nose elephant long.

Furthermore, the NP 'kho' in (5.8) is a generic noun, that is, it does not designate the nose of the elephant, but the whole class of nose. This fact presents an additional problem to the transformational solution of double-subject sentence. Such observations justify our schema:

- | | | | |
|--|----------|-------------|---------|
| | (Theme), | Predication | (Tail) |
| | Kho-nin | khokkiri-ka | kil-ta. |

Up to now, it has been demonstrated that Dik's functional grammar which separates theme from predication proper can give a uniform treatment to a variety of double-subject constructions. Such a uniform treatment is a sign that Dik's functional grammar has a far greater explanatory and descriptive adequacy than transformational generative approach.

In support of this paper's aim to provide ways and means of identifying the subject of a Korean double-subject sentence, now it will be argued that Dik's schema assigns subject function to a term within the domain of predication proper. Following examples (5.0), (5.3), and (5.4) show how it is done:

	(Theme),	Predication	
		Subject	Predicate
5.0	Khokkiri-nin	kho-ka	kil-ta.
5.3	TV-nin	Zenith-ka	co-ta.
5.4	Kho-nin	khokkiri-ka	kil-ta.

The following data can be explained in the same way:

	(Theme),	Predication	(Tail)
		Subject	predicate
Kunkang-in	tingsan-i	climbing	coh-ta.
Health		climbing	good
(Climbing is good for health.)			
Silang-in	hakkiyo-ka	schools	man-ta
Now		schools	many
(Now there are many schools.)			
Sunsangnin-in	kae-ka	dog	musup-ta
Teacher		dog	afraid
(The teacher is afraid of dogs.)			
Na-nin	kkot-i	flower	coh-ta
I		flower	good
(I like flowers.)			
Na-nin	paekuntae-ka	hill	nop-ta
I		paekuntae hill	high
(Paekuntae hill is high for me.)			

Furthermore, according to Dik's framework, we must assign topic function to the NP in the predication, which is a pragmatic function. Dik's definition of topic shows that the subject in the predication can serve as the topic. Therefore, it should be noted that subject and topic are not independent notions but they are closely interrelated. This observation justifies

multi-factor concept of subject in Korean. Now we can assign topic function to the given data:

	(Theme),	Predication
5.0	Khokkiri-oin	kho-ka kil-ta
		subject
		topic
5.3	TV-nin	Zenith-ka coh-ta
		subject
		topic
5.4	Kho-nin	khokkiri-ka kil-ta
		subject
		topic

What follows are the above three sentences (5.0), (5.3), and (5.4) with all three semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic assignments (We assume that semantic function has already been assigned):

Khokkiri-nin kho-ka kil-ta.
 (Khokkiri), Kil-ta (kho)
 (x1) Theme, (xj) ϕ .Sub.Top. ⁽²⁾
 TV-nin Zenith-ka coh-ta.
 (TV) coh-ta (Zenith)
 (x1) Theme (xj) ϕ .Sub.Top.
 Kho-nin khokkiri-ka kil-ta.
 (Kho) kil-ta (khokkiri)
 (x1)Theme (xj) ϕ .Sub.Top.

As was mentioned earlier, since our basic position is that subject had best be considered as a multi-factor concept, we will now put forward some evidence supporting our argument in terms of a semantic aspect of subject in double-subject sentences: that is, selection restrictions. McCawley (1968) says that selection restrictions are given within the dictionary entries of verbs in a semantic theory and operate between the verb and the semantic properties of an entire subject noun phrase. To put it another way, selection restrictions

(2) Dik says: "If a State predication has only one argument, I shall say that that argument has zero semantic function ϕ . I see no good reason to assign any particular semantic function to such arguments..."

hold between a predicate and a term within predication proper. The corollary of this argument is that selectional restrictions need not hold between theme and a predicate, since theme is outside the scope of Predication. Following examples from Sohn (1980) will show our point:

- 5.10 Cha-nin cak-in kəs-i coh-ta.
Cars small ones good.
(Small cars are better.)
- 5.11 I chaek-in caem-ka iss-ta.
This book interest is
(This book is interesting.)

Though causative constructions are a controversial topic among linguists, they provide a sure test for deciding which NP of a sentence is the subject NP. B. Comrie (1976) set up the "paradigm case" of causative constructions on the basis of a number of languages like French and Turkish, etc. He argued that this provides a framework with *n* which it is possible to give a systematic discussion of causative constructions in a wide range (genetically, typologically and geographically) of languages. While discussing causatives of intransitives, he said that in the paradigm case, causatives of intransitives should have the embedded subject as direct object. He gave the following examples from various languages:

- 5.15 Rāmo madhulīham pātayati. (Sanskrit)
Ramo boo(DO) fly-Caus
(Subj)
(Rama makes the bee fly.)
- 5.16 Gianni fa venire Paolo. (Italian)
(Gianni makes Paolo come.)
- 5.17 A tanulók vár-at -ják a tanár -t.
(Hungarian)
the pupils wait Caus the teacher DO
(The pupils make the teacher wait.)

Comrie's observation helps us to pinpoint the subject NP in the double-subject constructions. Look at the following data:

- 5.18a Kinyə-nin kho-ka nop-ta.

she(Theme) nose(Subj) high

- 5.18b Kinyə-nin kho-lil nop-hi əss-ta.

She(Theme) nose(DO) high-Caus

- 5.19a Kī-nin kiyunmun-i nul-ta

He(Themē) knowledge(S) wide

- 5.19b Kī-nin kiyunmun-ıl nul-hi-əss-ta.

(Theme) (DO) wide-Caus.

Sentences (5.18b) and (5.19b) are the causatives of (5.18a) and (5.19a), respectively. Kho(nose) and kiyunmun(knowledge) are the direct objects in the causatives. Then, as Comrie argued, they are the subject NPs in the intransitives. The above data conform to not only Comrie's paradigm case but also Dik's functional schema. Therefore, it can be said that our hypothesis that subject function should be given to the first term within Predication proper and subject should be treated as a multi-factor concept is a valid one in its treatment of the knotty problems involved with the Korean double-subject constructions in general.

There remains, however, one major issue yet to be resolved: how much 'subjectlike' are NPs of a particular language? According to Li and Thompson, since Subject-Prominent languages and Topic-Prominent languages of the world are located at different points along the continuum, the subject NP of one language may differ in the degree of subjecthood from the subject NP of another language. One problem here is to determine the degree of subjecthood in the Korean language. It will be quite a while before we can have the answer to this question.

Last but not least, closely related with the double subject construction is the still unresolved problem of particles (n)in and (i)ka. Specifically, we want to address the following question: Is only theme and no other allowed to have particle (n)in? Although these particles still await definitive analysis, in this paper we propose a pragmatically-based view of them.

Concerning particles (n)in and i/ka, Shibat-

ani said in the footnote of his 1977 paper as follows:

"Since there has been general agreement, at least among the transformational grammarians, as to the status of the topic marked by (n)in as opposed to an NP marked by ka or i, not many people now perhaps consider a sentence like na nin mə li ka aph ta as a double-subject construction"

Above quotation clearly shows that TG grammarians regard only (n)in as the topic (our theme) marker, and i/ka as subject markers. Such a classification of particles (n)in and i/ka, though not completely wrong, does not capture the pragmatic complexity and subtlety of these particles in sentence. The theoretical fallacy committed by TG grammarians is no other than their misguided conception of subject and topic. In their view, the notions of subject and topic are in complementary distribution. As mentioned earlier, subject and topic are not independent. They are closely interrelated. Look at the following example:

5.20 Khokkiri-ka kho-ka kil-ta.

In sentence (5.20) "khokkiri" is obviously the theme of the sentence, but is marked by ka. This sentence demonstrates the fundamental inadequacy of TG grammarians' classification of (n)in as the topic (our theme) marker. Contrast (5.20) with (5.21) below:

5.21 Khokkiri-nin khh-ka kil-ta.

How are we to account for the difference between the two sentences? Themes marked by (n)in are the natural themes. Furthermore, what the TG grammarians have missed in their treatment of particles is that particles (n)in and i/ka have different semantic contents. For example, particle (n)in has its own lexical meaning of Contrastiveness (H.M. Sohn, 1981), though the contrastive meaning sometimes disappears completely. Theme "Khokkiri-nin" in

(5.21) denotes contrast as the following example shows:

5.22 Khokkiri-nin kho-ka kil-ci-man, won-sungi-nin kho-ka kil-ci-an-ta.

On the other hand, particle i/ka functions as the focused theme as in (5.20) and the following dialogue:

5.23 Q: Muə-ka kho-ka kil-ci?

(What has a long nose?)

5.24a Ans: Khokkiri-ka kho-ka kil-ta.

(The elephant has a long nose.)

5.24b Ans: *Khokkiri-nin kho-ka kil-ta.

In (5.24a) Khokkiri-ka is not only the Theme, but also the focused NP in the sentence, since it provides new information to the question (5.23). In contrast to this, (5.24b) with khokkiri-nin is inappropriate to question (5.23) in that particle (n)in implicates that the questioner already knows that it is Khokkiri that has a long nose. If the questioner knew the answer to his own question, then he violated one of the preparatory conditions for the successful performance of the illocutionary act of question: i.e., questioner does not know 'the answer' (J. Searle, 1969). The following sentence (5.25) also supports our argument.

5.25 Na-nin hakkıyo-e kan-ta.

I school to go

(I go to school.)

It is quite obvious that in (5.25) NP na marked by nin syntactically functions as the subject contrary to the arguments of some TG grammarians.

As noted above, theme and subject in Korean cannot be complementarily marked by certain case markers only. (n)in and i/ka all can be used respectively as theme, topic, and subject markers in the particular context or situation. Further will be discussed in our forthcoming paper.⁽³⁾

(3) Kuno (1972) presented the analysis of Japanese particles 'wa' and 'ga' that can be summarized as follows:
A. 'Wa' marks either the theme or the contrasted element of the sentence. The theme must be either

VII. Conclusion

A brief summary of the major points of our research efforts will be given below:

1. The so-called double-subject sentences have only one subject.
2. Transformational derivations of double-subject sentences from possessive constructions or what not cannot adequately deal with the subtle and complex pragmatic meaning differences among the sentences.
3. Transformational approach cannot adequately deal with the phenomenon of meaning

changes in double-subject constructions.

4. The theoretical framework adopted here has not only consistency but also descriptive and explanatory adequacy in that it can cover the double-subject phenomenon in a uniform way.

5. Surface cases and grammatical relations are two different things, in spite of the good correspondence between them. That is, not all the NPs marked by *1/ka* are subject.

6. Dik's definition of subject in semantic terms is not incompatible with E. Keenan's definition of subject as a multi-factor concept.

7. Subject function is assigned to a term within the Predication proper.

anaphoric (i.e., previously mentioned) or generic, while there is no such constraint for the contrasted element.

- B. 'Ga' as subject case marker is either for neutral description or for exhaustive listing. When the predicate represents a state (but not existence) or a habitual generic action, only the exhaustive listing interpretation is obtained.

Kuno's such analysis of Japanese particles 'wa' and 'ga' seems to have been too readily applied to analyze double-subject constructions in Korean, especially Korean particles (n)+n and *1/ka* by almost all Korean grammarians. They thought that Korean (n)+n corresponds to Japanese 'wa' and Korean *1/ka* does to Japanese 'ga'. According to their inference, Korean (n)+n marks theme and contrast and *1/ka* as subject case marker marks exhaustive listing and neutral description.

Nevertheless, counterexamples can be easily found in the Korean language. Look at the following examples:

- (1) Na-n+n maeil hakkyo-e kan-ta. (Theme and Subj)
I everyday to school go
(I go to school everyday.)
- (2) Na-n+n sakwa-n+n coha-han-ta. (Contrasted element and Object)
I apples like
(I like apples only.)
- (3) K+n+n kunin-i t'p--ass-ta. (Complement)
He soldier become
(He became a soldier.)
- (4) Seoul-e-n+n cha-ka man-ta. (Adverb)
In Seoul cars many.
(There were many cars in Seoul.)

The above examples show that Korean particles (n)+n and *1/ka* are used in a wider scope than Japanese particles 'wa' and 'ga', only if Kuno's analysis is valid. Lastly, this point of our paper is one of the significant differences from Kim (1981), which deals with double-subject constructions from the point of view of functional approach.

Reference

- Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Comrie, B. 1976. "The Syntax of Causative Constructions: Cross-Language Similarities and Divergences." In *Syntax and Semantics*, vol.3, edited by M. Shibatani (1976). New York: Academic Press.
- Dik, S.C. 1978. *Functional Grammar*. North-Holland Linguistic Series 37. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Johnson, D. E. 1977. "On Relational Constraints on Grammars." In *Syntax and Semantics*, vol.8, edited by P. Cole and J. Sadock (1977). New York: Academic Press.
- Keenan, E. L. 1976. "Towards a Universal Definition of Subject." In *Subject and Topic*, edited by C. N. Li. New York: Academic Press.
- Kim, K. H. 1981. "Functional Approach to the Nature of so-called Korean Double-Subject Constructions." In *UIT Report*, vol.13, no.2. Ulsan: Korea.
- Kim, M. S. 1960. *Kukəmunpəpyunku*. Seoul: Thongmunkwan.
- Kim, Y. K. 1957. *Kotəng Naramalpon*. Seoul: Tonga Press.
- Kuno, S. 1972. "Functional Sentence Perspective: A Case Study from Japanese and English." *Linguistic Inquiry*, vol.3: 269–320.
- Li, C. N. and Thompson, S. A. 1976. "Subject and Topic: A New Typology of Language." *Subject and Topic*, edited by C. N. Li (1976). New York: Academic Press.
- Perlmutter, D. and Postal, P. 1977. "Toward a Universal Characterization of Passive." *Papers from the Third Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, pp.394–417.
- Scarle, J. 1969. *Speech Acts*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Shibatani, M. 1977. "Relational Grammar and Korean Syntax." *Language Research*, vol. 12–2: 241–251.
- Sohn, H. M. 1980. "Theme-Prominence in Korean." *Korean Linguistics*, vol.2. 1–19.
- Suh, C. S. 1978. *Kukə Kumunlon Yunku*. Seoul: Tower Press. pp.239–266.
- Yim, H. P. 1974. "Cuə Cungchullonil Chacasə." *Munpəp Yunku*, vol.1.