

A Study on *Kke*

Sae-Youn Cho (Kangwon National University)

sycho@kangwon.ac.kr

1. Issues

It is well known that natural languages vary with respect to how to map the concepts of possession into linguistic constructions. Among the concepts, the alienability between Possessor and Possessed would be a key factor to construct legal possessive expressions in some languages such as French and Korean. Similar to French, the Possessor and the Possessed in Korean Double Accusative Constructions (DAC) should have an inalienable relation to be acceptable as shown in (1).

- (1) Johnny-ka Marcia-lul meri-lul ttaylyessta
Johnny-Nom Marcia-Acc head-Acc hit
'Johnny hit Marcia's head.'

Otherwise, it has been believed that Korean possessive relation is generally mapped into NP possessive constructions containing the possessive morpheme *-uy* regardless of alienability, as in (2).

- (2) a. Marcia-uy meri
Marcia-Poss head
'Marcia's head'
b. Marcia-uy hayntuphon
Marcia-Poss cellular phone
'Marcia's cellular phone'

If so, then a question of why there are no constructions only for alienable relations follows. For this, I claim here that the Korean Possessive construction involving *kke* in (3) can deliver only the alienable relation between Possessor and Possessed.

- (3) Ne nay kke hayntuphon poass-ni?
You my thing (Poss) cellular phone saw-Q
'Did you see my cellular phone?'

2. Some Properties of ‘Kke’

To support my claim, I provide some linguistic properties of *kke* with various empirical data. The word *kke* is frequently found either in conversations among young people or written expressions in computer chatting. In Korean dictionaries including Shim *et al* (1999), *kke* is not listed as a lexical item, and instead is believed to be a variant form of the word ‘*kes*’ whose function is Possessive as in (4-C).

(4) *kes* **Dependent Noun**

A) a noun referring things

(ex) mek-ul kes/kke
eat-MOD thing
‘something to eat’

B) a bad word to refer people

(ex) saypalan kes/*kke
blue thing
‘young man’
ku kes/*kke
the thing
‘the man’

C) a possessive meaning

(ex) Marcia kes / kke
‘Marcia’s.’

Furthermore, the possessive structures with *kke* like (5a-b), i.e. *NP[Poss]+kke+NP* or *NP+NP[Poss]+kke*, have not been listed or exhibited so far, and hence remain untouched.

(5)a. [nay kke hayntuphon]
 [NP[Poss] + kke + NP]

b. [hayntuphon nay kke]
 [NP + NP[Poss] + kke]
 ‘my cellular phone’

Syntactically, the dependent noun *kke* in the structures requires two NPs: NP[+Poss] realized as either contracted possessive pronouns such as *nay* ‘I+uy’ or *ney* ‘you+uy’ or Proper

noun with implicit *-uy* as in (6a-b) and NP[-Specific] as in (7a-b).

- (6) a. *nay* = *na* + *uy*,
 ney = *ne* + *uy*, etc.
 b. Johnny (*?uy) *kke* hayntuphon,
 Marcia (*?uy) *kke* hayntuphon, etc.
- (7) a. *nay kke *(i/ke)* hayntuphon
 this/the
 b. **(i/ke)* hayntuphon *nay kke*

Semantically and Pragmatically, NP[+Poss] and NP[-Specific] subcategorized by *kke* only have an alienable relationship as shown in the contrast between (8a) and (8b).

- (8a) *nay kke* hayntuphon
 (8b) *nay kke *son/ *meri/?merikhalak*
 hand/head/a hair

In addition, though the NP[+Poss] need not be animate, the NP [-Specific] would be personal properties as in (9).

- (9a) *onul kke sinmwun* vs. *sinmwu onul kke*
 Today's newspaper
 'Today's newspaper'
- (9b) *nay kke yenphil / os / chayksang / ?*cip*
 pencil / cloth / desk / house

Though the word *kke* above plays an important role in syntactically mapping alienable possessive relations, there are at least two questions unanswered: one is whether it is the same *kke* as a variant of (4-A) or not and the other is whether it is the same *kke* appearing in the appositive expression with *kke* in (10) or not.

- (10) **i hayntuphon, nay kke ni-ka pwusyessni?**
 the cellular phone my Poss you broke-Q
 Literal meaning: 'Did you break the cellular phone, mine?'

The word *kke* in (4-A) cannot be the same one as the *kke* at issue because the first does not

subcategorize for NP[+Poss]. Moreover, the *kke* in the appositive as in (10) has NP[+Specific] and hence the possessive *kke* is different. If it is so, the lexical information of the *kke* at issue can be summarized as in (11).

(11) <i>kke</i> :	CATEGORY Noun SUBCAT <NP _i [Poss], NP _j [-Specific]> OR <NP _j [-Specific], NP _i [Poss]> SEMANTICS RELATION [<i>alienable-possession</i> <POSS-OR i, POSS-ED j>] PRAGMATICS [j = <i>personal properties</i>]
-------------------	--

Cf. (P & S (1994))

3. Conclusion

In conclusion, we claim that the concept ‘possession’ can be mapped into either inalienable possession constructions, i.e. DAC, or alienable ones, i.e. *kke* Possessive Constructions, with respect to alienability. Otherwise, we use *uy* possessive constructions in general without differentiating alienability.

Selected References

- Pollard, C. and I. Sag. 1994. *Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Shim et al. 1999. *Kwulipkwukeyenkwiwen Phyocwunkwuetaysacen*. Doosan Dong-A Publishing Co..