

# Contrastive Focus and Variable Case Marking: A Comparison between Subjects and Objects

Hanjung Lee\*

Sungkyunkwan University

**Hanjung Lee. 2009. Contrastive Focus and Variable Case Marking: A Comparison between Subjects and Objects.** *Language and Information* 13.2, 1–27. This paper examines the (a)symmetries in the realization of focused subjects and objects in Korean. Through rating experiments, we demonstrate that native speakers' judgments of acceptability of sentences containing case-marked or case-ellipsed subjects and objects are sensitive to the contrastiveness strength and the discourse accessibility of focused arguments. However, our experiments also show that focused subjects exhibit stronger preference for explicit case marking over case ellipsis and that contrastiveness strength and discourse accessibility have weaker influence on the case marking and ellipsis of focused subjects compared to focused objects. We propose an account of variable case marking that is capable of subsuming both the similarities and differences between focused subjects and objects under the universal theory of markedness. In particular, it is shown that the similarities between focused subjects and objects are predicted by the proposed account based on the contrastiveness strength and the discourse accessibility of focused arguments and that the differences between focused subjects and objects follow naturally from the relative markedness of focus as subjects. (Sungkyunkwan University)

**Key words:** case marking, case ellipsis, focus types, contrastive focus, accessibility contrastiveness strength, markedness

## 1. Introduction

Ellipsis is the phenomenon whereby speakers omit from an utterance normally obligatory elements of syntactic structure. One common type of ellipsis in Korean is case ellipsis, whereby case markers like *-i/-ka* and *-(l)ul* are omitted. An example of ellipsis of case markers is given in (1).

---

\* Department of English, Sungkyunkwan University, 53 Myoungryun-dong, 3 ga, Jongro-ku, Seoul 110-745, Korea. E-mail: hanjung@skku.edu

- (1) a. Ecey Minswu-ka chinkwu-lul manna-ss-ta.  
 yesterday Minsoo-Nom friend-Acc meet-Pst-Indic  
 'Minsoo met his friend yesterday.'
- b. Ecey Minswu-ka chinkwu- $\emptyset$  manna-ss-ta.  
 yesterday Minsoo-Nom friend(-Acc) meet-Pst-Indic  
 'Minsoo met his friend yesterday.'

In (1b), the object *chinkwu* 'friend' appears without the following accusative case marker *-(l)ul*, which would normally indicate the object of the verb. While (1a) and (1b) are semantically equivalent, i.e., in both cases the actor is *Minswu* and the theme is *chinkwu* 'friend', they may differ in contextually determined meanings, pragmatic functions, attitudes of interlocuters.

It is often claimed that case ellipsis in Japanese and Korean is constrained by discourse and semantic factors such as focus and exclusive/exhaustive interpretations. The notion of contrastive focus, although not always very well defined, has been claimed to be an important factor affecting case ellipsis in Japanese and Korean (Tsutsui, 1984; Masunaga, 1988; Ko, 2000; D. Lee, 2002, among others). For instance, Ko (2000) has suggested that the accusative case marker *-(l)ul* in Korean cannot be dropped when the object it marks is contrastively focused, i.e., when it is interpreted as contrasting with some other object(s) of the same type. More recently, D. Lee (2002) has analyzed the function of particle ellipsis in Japanese as 'absolute specification', i.e., referring to an entity without implying the existence of some alternative.

The present study examines the effect of contrastiveness on the realization of focused subjects and objects in colloquial Korean. Although few studies have compared the effect of contrastiveness on subjects and objects explicitly, the ellipsis of nominative case markers on contrastively focused subjects is much less natural compared to the ellipsis of accusative case markers on contrastively focused objects. Consider the following example in (2), which illustrates case ellipsis on the contrastively focused transitive subject.

- (2) A: I computer cikum-un toy. Ney-ka kochi-ess-e?  
 this computer now-Top work you-Nom fixed  
 'This computer is working now. Did you fix (it)?'
- B: Ani, i chinkwu-ka/???i chinkwu- $\emptyset$  kochi-ess-e.  
 No, this friend-Nom/this friend(-Nom) fixed  
 'No, this guy fixed (it).'

In this context, the version of (2B) with a case-ellipsed subject is much less natural than that with the case-marked counterpart and judged to be nearly unacceptable by native speakers. By contrast, case ellipsis on contrastively focused objects generally does not result in unacceptability. (3B) below is an example that contains a contrastively focused object. All native speakers we have consulted agree that both versions of (3B) are acceptable.

(3) A: Jinmi-ka computer(-lul) sa-ss-e.  
 Jinmi-Nom computer(-Acc) bought  
 ‘Jinmi bought a computer.’

B: Aniya, hywutaephon(-ul) sa-ss-e.  
 No, cell phone(-Acc) bought  
 ‘No, (she) bought a cell phone.’

In this paper we will report the results of two rating experiments that investigated the influence of focus types on the explicit realization and ellipsis of case markers on transitive subjects and objects. We will first demonstrate that patterns of native speakers’ judgments of acceptability of sentences containing case-marked or case-ellipsed subjects and objects cannot be accounted for in terms of the dichotomous distinction between contrastive and non-contrastive focus. Instead, native speakers’ judgments are sensitive to the contrastiveness strength and the discourse accessibility of focused subjects and objects. Our experiments will also show interesting differences between focused subjects and objects. Compared to focused objects, focused subjects exhibit stronger preference for explicit case marking over case ellipsis. Furthermore, contrastiveness strength and discourse accessibility have weaker influence on the case marking and ellipsis of focused subjects. We propose an account of variable case marking that is capable of subsuming both the similarities and differences between focused subjects and objects under the universal theory of markedness. In particular, it is shown that the similarities between focused subjects and objects are predicted by the proposed account of variable case marking based on the contrastiveness strength and the discourse accessibility of arguments and that the differences between focused subjects and objects follow naturally from the relative markedness of focus as subjects.

## 2. Focus Types and Case Ellipsis

In a number of previous studies, the notion of contrastive focus has been claimed to be one of the strongest factors affecting case ellipsis in Japanese and Korean (Tsutsui, 1984; Masunaga, 1988; Ko, 2000; D. Lee, 2002, among others).<sup>1</sup> For instance, Ko (2000) has suggested that the accusative case marker *-(l)ul* in Korean cannot be dropped when the object it marks is contrastively focused, i.e., when it is interpreted as contrasting with some other object(s) of the same type. She further contends that *-(l)ul* functions as an operator just like other delimiters such as *-man* ‘only’ and *-to* ‘also’. Adopting the theory of focus developed in Rooth (1985), which is elaborated in Vallduví and Vilksuna (1998), she treats *-(l)ul* as

<sup>1</sup> Additional factors affecting the naturalness of case ellipsis in Japanese and Korean which will not be discussed here include the following: the formality of the extralinguistic context, familiarity among interlocutors (H. Lee and Thompson, 1985; Ko, 2000), the kind of semantic role that a nominal argument bears (D. Lee, 2002), specificity of the object (Kim, 1993), syntactic position of the argument (Ahn and Cho, 2006; Ahn and Cho, 2007), length of the argument NP, utterance length, proximity of the NP to the predicate (Fry, 2001) and the animacy, definiteness and person of argument NPs (Lee, 2005; Lee, 2006b). For extensive reviews of previous studies, see Fry (2001), Lee (2005; 2006a; 2006b) and S. Lee (2006).

a ‘kontrastive’ focus marker which generates a set of alternatives comparable in semantic type.

This treatment of accusative case markers, however, is not supported empirically by the experimental data. Table 1 shows the rates of case-marked and case-ellipsed objects based on focus type in our experimental data (Lee, 2006a).

(4) Table 1. Interaction of focus type and object form

Focus type	Object-Acc	Object- $\emptyset$
Contrastive	3109 (59%)	1531 (29%)
Non-contrastive	2161 (41%)	3749 (71%)

The majority of the case-marked objects in our data are contrastively focused (3109/5270 = 59%), whereas a minority of the case-ellipsed objects are so (1531/5280 = 29%). Nevertheless, the correlation between overt case marking and contrastive focus is not absolute, as Ko claims, but a matter of degree. Even though overtly case-marked NPs are often contrastive, they do not have to be. Note that more than 40% of overtly case-marked objects are non-contrastive focus and that nearly 30% of case-ellipsed objects are contrastive focus. This pattern of results suggests that it would be premature to offer any categorical generalization about the correlation between contrastiveness and overt case marking and between lack of contrastiveness and case ellipsis.

Furthermore, Ko’s treatment of the accusative case marker as a ‘kontrastive’ focus marker suffers from the difficulty most other analyses which looked at focus effects in case ellipsis have in explaining why different focus types exert distinct influences on case ellipsis. Ko (2000) contends that the realization of argument NP forms in Korean is determined by kontrastiveness rather than informational rhematicity (the newness of a referent in discourse) (Ko, 2000, 203). It is not clear, however, why this should be so.

More recently, D. Lee (2002) has analyzed the function of particle ellipsis in Japanese as ‘absolute specification’, i.e., referring to an entity without implying the existence of some alternative. This analysis, however, is difficult to extend to Korean given the results of our earlier experiment (see Table 1 above) and the convincing counterexample offered by S. Lee (2006). He notes that in certain cases, ellipsis of the accusative case marker is favored even though the object it marks is contrastively focused. Consider the following example in (5):<sup>2</sup>

- (5) A: Jinmi-ka computer(-lul) sa-ss-e, hywutaephon(-ul) sa-ss-e?  
 Jinmi-Nom computer(-Acc) bought, cell phone(-Acc) bought  
 ‘Did Jinmi buy a computer or a cell phone?’

B: computer(-lul) sa-ss-e. ‘(She) bought a computer.’

In B’s reply, ‘computer’ is an example of what Dik and others (1981) refers to as ‘selecting contrastive focus’. This type of contrastive focus does not involve any explicit contradiction of some other previously stated alternative. As in B’s reply in (5), the speaker simply picks out one of the two candidates presented in a

<sup>2</sup> Exposition in this and the following sections closely follows Lee (2008).

disjunctive question uttered by A. What’s interesting about the formal expression of selecting focus objects is that as S. Lee (2006) notes, they seem to favor case ellipsis over explicit accusative marking. All Korean speakers we have consulted agree that the version with case-ellipsed selecting focus is more natural than that with the case-marked counterpart, while both versions are grammatically well-formed.

Selecting focus is in sharp contrast to ‘replacing focus’, which does not show strong preference for case ellipsis:

(6) A: Jinmi-ka computer(-lul) sa-ss-e.  
 Jinmi-Nom computer(-Acc) bought  
 ‘Jinmi bought a computer.’

B: Aniya, hywutaephon(-ul) sa-ss-e.  
 No, cell phone(-Acc) bought.  
 ‘No, (she) bought a cell phone.’

Unlike selecting focus, replacing focus explicitly contradicts a stated alternative and is considered the clearest instance of contrastiveness in some pragmatic approaches to contrastiveness (Lambrecht, 1994; C. Lee, 2007). The contrast between the two subtypes of contrastive focus illustrated above suggests that not all kinds of contrastive focus may behave in the same way with respect to their formal realization. This led us to ask whether and how the two subtypes of contrastive focus (replacing vs. selecting focus) exert distinct influences on variable case marking in Korean.

In previous work (Lee, 2008) we investigated this question through an elicitation experiment. Here we present a brief summary of the methods used in that study and its main findings. We asked participants to fill in a questionnaire, which contained short conversations between two speakers, providing contexts for the choice of case-marked and case-ellipsed forms of an object. The participants had to choose between the two object forms in the given contexts (A full list of experimental items is given in Lee (2008)). An example of the stimuli used in the experiment is given below.

(7) Table 2. Example stimuli

Condition	Stimuli
Contrastive- Replacing focus	A: Jinmi-ka computer-lul sa-ss-e. Jinmi-Nom computer-Acc bought ‘Jinmi bought a computer.’ B: Aniya, <u>hywutaephon-ul/hywutaephon-∅</u> sa-ss-e. No, cell phone-Acc/cell phone(-Acc) bought. ‘No, (she) bought a cell phone.’

Condition	Stimuli
Contrastive- Selecting focus	A: Jinmi-ka computer-lul sa-ss-e, TV-lul Jinmi-Nom computer-Acc bought, TV-Acc sa-ss-e? bought 'Did Jinmi buy a computer or a TV?' B: computer-lul/computer-∅ sa-ss-e. '(She) bought a computer.'
Non- contrastive- Informational focus	A: Ecey mwuel sa-ss-e? yesterday what.Acc bought 'What did you buy yesterday?' B: hwuka cwung ilk-u-lyeko chayk-ul/ break during read-to book-Acc/ chayk-∅ sa-ss-e. book(-Acc) bought '(I) bought books to read over the break.'

There were 20 items per condition, 60 items altogether. The items used in the questionnaire were further controlled for other factors in the following way:

- (8) a. Only the nominal objects of transitive verbs were included in the questionnaire.
- b. The type of the head of object NPs has been limited to a countable common noun.
- c. The factors of animacy and definiteness have been controlled by keeping them constant throughout the questionnaire. The object is always inanimate and indefinite.
- d. The form of the object NPs in the context sentences (questions uttered by A) has been controlled by keeping them consistently marked with the accusative case markers.

We found that case-ellipsed forms are most frequent in the selecting focus condition (65%) and least frequent in the replacing focus condition (35%). By contrast, accusative-marked forms are most frequent in the replacing focus condition (65%) and least frequent in the selecting focus condition (35%). These results are significant at the 0.05 level ( $\chi^2=9.66$ ,  $df=2$ )

When collapsing replacing focus and selecting focus into a single category of contrastive focus, the following picture emerges. Non-contrastive, informational focus objects show higher rate of overt case marking (55%) than contrastively focused objects (50%). Furthermore, the rate of case ellipsis for contrastively focused objects (50%) is higher than the rate for informational focus objects (45%), but the difference is not significant ( $\chi^2=0.5$ ,  $df=2$ ).

These results show that the dichotomous distinction between contrastive vs. non-contrastive focus is insufficient to account for the gradient pattern of case

marking and ellipsis for focused objects. Moreover, the results are not consistent with prior claims regarding the influence of contrastiveness on case ellipsis in Korean, calling into question the categorical generalization offered in previous studies that accusative case markers cannot be dropped when the object they mark is contrastively focused.

Why is it that the three subtypes of focus should affect the choice of object forms in the way they do? In the following section we will first discuss the function of case marking and then address the question why the three subtypes of focus exert distinct influences on case ellipsis.

### 3. Contrastiveness Strength, Accessibility and Case Ellipsis

One important motivation for case marking across languages is to encode semantic or pragmatic properties of arguments. This function of case marking is called ‘identifying function’. De Hoop and Narasimhan (2008) argue that in its identifying function case-marking identifies arguments that are strong or prominent subjects or objects in order to distinguish between more prominent or stronger subjects and objects and less prominent or weaker ones. Thus an account of case marking based on argument strength would predict more prominent or stronger focus type to be more frequently case-marked than weaker focus type. Of the two subtypes of contrastive focus tested in our earlier experiment, which one is stronger than the other in terms of contrastiveness? Let us consider main sources of contrastiveness to clarify this question. The most important criteria that have been discussed in the literature in connection with the definition of contrastiveness are listed below:

- (9) a. Membership in a set
- b. Limited set of alternatives
- c. Exhaustiveness
- d. Explicit contradiction of alternatives

The basic requirement for contrastiveness is membership in a set, namely that we can generate a set of alternatives for the focused constituent (Jackendoff, 1972; Rooth, 1985; Krifka, 1993; Vallduví and Vilkuna, 1998). Rooth (1985) and Krifka (1993) claim that a focus always evokes a set of alternatives. In many approaches to focus, however, membership in a set is narrowed down to the requirement of a *closed* set. The decisive criterion for contrastiveness is thus, according to Halliday (1967), Chafe (1976) and Rooth (1992), the availability of a limited number of candidates. When the set of possibilities is unlimited (or not contextually restricted), the sentence supplies only new information and fails to be contrastive.

Further criteria of contrastiveness are exhaustiveness (Chafe, 1976; Kiss, 1998) and explicit contradiction of some previously stated alternative(s). Halliday (1967) defined contrast to mean something that is contrary to a previously stated or predicted alternative. However, while it is the case that contrastiveness often has this corrective reading as in the case of replacing focus (example (6)), it does not require it, as shown in (5) above.







strength of the contrastiveness strength and discourse accessibility of focused argument NPs. If accessibility exerts a stronger influence on the choice of object forms than contrastiveness strength, then selecting focus arguments are expected to show highest rate of case ellipsis than arguments that represent focus types less accessible than selecting focus. On this account, the rate of case ellipsis for informational focus and replacing focus is not determined by their relative accessibility but by their difference in contrastiveness strength, which exerts a weaker influence than accessibility but nevertheless influences argument forms when the stronger factor does not clearly distinguish between the subtypes of focus, i.e., replacing focus and informational focus. Since replacing focus is more strongly contrastive than informational focus, it is predicted to show higher rate of case marking than informational focus:

- (14) Prediction of an interactive account  
 (accessibility effect > contrastiveness effect)  
 Case ellipsis  $\leftarrow \leftarrow \leftarrow \leftarrow \leftarrow \leftarrow \leftarrow \leftarrow \leftarrow \leftarrow \leftarrow \leftarrow \leftarrow \leftarrow$   
 Selecting focus > Informational focus > Replacing focus  
 $\Rightarrow \Rightarrow \Rightarrow \Rightarrow \Rightarrow \Rightarrow \Rightarrow \Rightarrow \Rightarrow \Rightarrow \Rightarrow \Rightarrow \Rightarrow$  Overt case-marking

If, on the other hand, the effect of contrastiveness strength is stronger than that of accessibility, the ordering of the three subtypes of focus in terms of the relative frequency of case marking predicted by this account would not differ from that predicted by the account of case variation solely based on contrastiveness strength (see (12)), though the exact frequency of argument forms might differ on the two accounts. The experiment to be reported in sections 4 and 5 will compare these predictions by examining speakers' judgments of acceptability of sentences containing the two forms of focused objects (Experiment 1) or subjects (Experiment 2).

#### 4. Focus Types and Object Case Ellipsis: Experiment 1

##### 4.1 Methods

The method for this experiment was a rating questionnaire that elicited off-line judgments about acceptability. In this experiment participants were asked to indicate relative goodness of sentences on a 5-point scale. Although acceptability judgments would probably not reflect actual performance in the same way as naturally occurring data would, the acceptability judgment task was chosen for the following reasons. First, given that the three types of focused arguments that we are of interest in this study are not highly frequent in either written or spoken Korean, it was considered necessary to use elicitation tasks, for it was unpredictable to what extent data collection methods which use naturally occurring data such as authentic spontaneous discourse would provide data rich enough for the present purposes.

Second, the acceptability judgment task was believed to be better-suited than the forced-choice method we used in Lee (2008) to examine the relative goodness of sentences. As discussed in section 1, sentences containing case-marked and case-ellipsed subjects that are contrastively focused show a considerable degree of difference in acceptability (see example (2)), whereas sentences containing case-marked

and case-ellipsed objects that are contrastively focused are generally both acceptable (see example (3)). The major advantage that the rating task has over the forced-choice method where participants are asked to make a dichotomous choice is that it provides more sensitive and precise information about the relative goodness of sentences. The forced-choice method is more likely to exaggerate or distort possible differences in relative goodness of sentences.

56 students from Sungkyunkwan University, ages 20-25, participated in this experiment. Each participant was asked to read short conversations between speakers and indicate to what degree the two object forms were suitable in the given context. To do this, their task was to rate the acceptability of sentences containing case-marked or case-ellipsed objects by assigning them grades from 1-5 on a five-point rating scale with 1 indicating completely unacceptable and 5 perfectly acceptable. We used the same experimental items as those in our earlier experiment (A full list of experimental items is given in Lee (2008)). A sample questionnaire including the instruction to the participant is given below (The actual questionnaire given to participants was written in Korean).

(15) Figure 1. Example of judgment task in questionnaire

Instruction: Please read through the following conversations, then make a judgment on underlined sentences in each conversation by assigning them grades from 1-5. Use the following scale to make your judgments:	
	1 = Completely Unacceptable 2 = Unacceptable 3 = Just Barely Acceptable 4 = Acceptable 5 = Completely Acceptable
1)	A: Jinmi-ka computer-lul sa-ss-e. Jinmi-Nom computer-Acc bought ‘Jinmi bought a computer.’ B-1: <u>Aniya, hywutaephon-ul sa-ss-e.</u> 1 2 3 4 5 No, cell phone-Acc bought. ‘No, (she) bought a cell phone.’ B-2: <u>Aniya, hywutaephon-∅ sa-ss-e.</u> 1 2 3 4 5 No, cell phone(-Acc) bought. ‘No, (she) bought a cell phone.’

The experiment has 2 independent variables in a within-subjects design:<sup>3</sup> 3 (focus type: replacing, selecting, informational) × 2 (object form: case marking vs. case ellipsis), creating 6 conditions (20 items per condition = 120 total items). Each participant rated all 120 items. Time of participation was approximately 30-35 minutes.

<sup>3</sup> The advantage of such a design is that participants can be treated as another independent variable in the statistical analysis, thus removing from the data variability due to differences among participants (Myers, Well, and Lorch, 2002).

## 4.2 Results and Discussion

The ratings for each participant were submitted repeated measures analyses of variance (ANOVA) with participants (F1) and experimental items (F2) as random factors and with focus type and object form as factors. The goal of this test was to control for individual speaker effects and to test the influence of focus type and object form, as well as the interaction of these two factors, on the acceptability of sentences with a case-marked or a case-ellipsed focused object. The results of the ANOVA, listed in Table 4, showed that both focus type and object form were significant predictors of the acceptability of sentences with a case-marked or a case-ellipsed focused object (focus type:  $F1(2, 165) = 7.52, p = .001$ ;  $F2(2, 57) = 3.45, p = .038$ ; object form:  $F1(1, 165) = 18.11, p = .000$ ;  $F2(1, 57) = 11.86, p = .001$ ): when the sentence contained an accusative-marked object, the stimuli with a replacing focus object were rated highest, and the stimuli with a selecting focus object were rated lowest. In contrast, when the sentence contained a case-ellipsed or zero-marked object, the stimuli with a selecting focus object were rated highest, and the stimuli with a replacing focus object were rated lowest.

The ANOVA also indicated significant interaction between focus type and object form ( $F1(2, 165) = 272.80, p = .000$ ;  $F2(2, 57) = 113.02, p = .000$ ). In other words, the acceptability of sentences with a case-marked or a case-ellipsed object depended on the focus type of the object: the stimuli with an accusative-marked object were rated higher in the replacing focus condition than in the other conditions. In contrast, the stimuli with a zero-marked object were rated higher in the selecting focus condition than in the other conditions.

(16) Table 4. ANOVA results (Experiment 1)

Effect	DF	<i>F1</i>	<i>p</i>	
Focus type	2	7.52	.001	
Object form	1	18.11	.000	
Focus*Form	2	272.80	.000	
Effect	DF	<i>F2</i>	<i>p</i>	
Focus type	2	3.45	.038	
Object form	1	11.86	.001	
Focus*Form	2	113.02	.000	
Average ratings				
	Replacing	Selecting	Informational	Means
Acc	4.10	2.18	3.10	3.13
Zero	2.80	4.11	3.20	3.37

These results corroborated the findings of Lee (2008), who found that the pattern of object case ellipsis is sensitive to subtypes of focus. In Lee (2008), we proposed that the gradient pattern of object case ellipsis and case marking shown by the three types of focused objects can be accounted for in terms of the interaction between the contrastiveness strength and the discourse accessibility of focused object NPs. The results for the current experiment are consistent with the prediction of this interactive account (see (14) above).

At the same time, the results of this experiment raise the question of whether

or not subtypes of focus influence subject case ellipsis and case marking in the same way they influence objects. The following experiment aims to answer this question.

## 5. Focus Types and Subject Case Ellipsis: Experiment 2

### 5.1 Methods

To this end we elicited judgments for sentences which contain a case-marked or case-ellipsed form of a subject of a transitive clause. An example of the stimuli used in the current experiment is given in Table 3. As in the first experiment, we contrasted three subtypes of focus (A full list of experimental items is given in Appendix). In each of these three conditions we varied whether the subject was nominative-marked or case-ellipsed.

(17) Table 5. Example stimuli (Experiment 2)

Condition	Stimuli
Contrastive- Replacing focus	A: I computer-lul ney-ka kochi-ss-e? this computer-Acc you-Nom fixed 'Did you fixed this computer?' B: Ani, i <u>chinkwu-ka/chinkwu-∅</u> kochi-ss-e. No, this guy-Nom/guy(-Nom) fixed. 'No, this guy fixed (it).'
Contrastive- Selecting focus	A: I necktie nuka sa cwu-ss-e? emma? this necktie(-Acc) who.Nom bought mom animyen yeca chinkwu? or girl friend 'Who bought this tie for you? Your mom or your girlfriend?' B: <u>Yeca chinkwu-ka/yeca chinkwu-∅</u> <u>senmwul-lo</u> girl friend-Nom/girl friend(-Nom) gift-as sa cwu-ss-e. bought 'My girlfriend bought (it for me) as a gift.'
Non- contrastive- Informational focus	A: Wuri eps-nun-dongan kangaci-nun nuka tolpo-ci? we be.absent-while dog-Top who.Nom take care of 'Who takes care of our dog while we are away?' B: kekceng ma. <u>cokha-ka/cokha-∅</u> tolpol ke-ya. don't worry. nephew-Nom/nephew(-Nom) take care of-will 'Don't worry. My nephew will take care of (the dog).'

There were 20 items per condition, 120 items altogether. 54 native speakers of Korean from the same population as in Experiment 1 participated in the study. The procedure was the same as in the previous experiment.

To keep the influence of factors other than focus type to a minimum, we have further controlled the items used in the questionnaire in the following way:

- (18) a. Only the nominal subjects of transitive verbs were included in the questionnaire.
- b. The type of the head of subject NPs has been limited to a countable common noun.
- c. Only human and definite subjects were included since they represent the most prototypical types of transitive subjects in terms of animacy and definiteness. Three kinds of definite subject NPs were involved in our stimuli: definite descriptions, names and kinship terms.

**5.2 Results and Discussion**

The ratings for each participant were submitted repeated measures analyses of variance(ANOVA) with participants (F1) and experimental items (F2) as random factors and with focus type and subject form as factors. The results of the ANOVA, listed in Table 6, revealed that both focus type and subject form were significant predictors of the acceptability of sentences with a case-marked or a case-ellipsed focused subject (focus type:  $F1(2, 159) = 62.46, p = .000$ ;  $F2(2, 57) = 85.96, p = .000$ ; subject form:  $F1(1, 159) = 3471.60, p = .000$ ;  $F2(1, 57) = 1596.22, p = .000$ ): as in Experiment 1, when the sentence contained an case-marked subject, the stimuli with a replacing focus subject were rated highest. However, unlike in Experiment 1. the stimuli with an informational focus subject were rated lowest. In contrast, when the sentence contained a case-ellipsed or zero-marked subject, the stimuli with a selecting focus subject were rated highest, and the stimuli with a replacing focus subject were rated lowest.

(19) Table 6. ANOVA results (Experiment 2)

Effect	DF	F1	p	
Focus type	2	62.46	.000	
Subject form	1	3471.60	.000	
Focus*Form	2	306.09	.000	
Effect	DF	F2	.p	
Focus type	2	85.96	.000	
Subject form	1	1596.22	.000	
Focus*Form	2	56.06	.000	
Average ratings				
	Replacing	Selecting	Informational	Means
Nom	4.79	4.70	3.90	4.46
Zero	1.10	2.80	1.20	1.70

The ANOVA also indicated significant interaction between focus type and subject form ( $F1(2, 159) = 306.09, p = .000$ ;  $F2(2, 57) = 56.06, p = .000$ ). In other words, the acceptability of sentences with a case-marked or a case-ellipsed subject depended on the focus type of the subject: the stimuli with a nominative-marked subject were rated higher in the contrastive focus conditions (replacing and selecting) than in the non-contrastive condition (informational). This result is consistent with the prediction of the account based on contrastiveness strength

(see (12)) In contrast, the stimuli with a zero-marked subject were rated higher in the selecting focus condition than in the other conditions. This is in line with the prediction of the accessibility-based account (see (13)).

In summary, the results of the current experiment were consistent with our hypothesis that native speakers' judgments of acceptability of sentences containing case-marked focus argument NPs are sensitive to their contrastiveness strength and that native speakers' judgments of acceptability of sentences containing case-ellipsed argument NPs are sensitive to their discourse accessibility.

However, our second experiment also showed some differences between focused subjects and objects. While there was no significant difference in average ratings between sentences with a case-marked focus object versus sentences with a case-ellipsed focus object (3.13 vs. 3.37), sentences with a case-ellipsed focus subject were judged as significantly less acceptable than sentences with a case-marked focus subject (1.70 vs. 4.46). Furthermore, while there was a considerable difference in average ratings between sentences with a case-marked replacing focus object versus sentences with a case-marked selecting focus object (4.10 vs. 2.18), sentences with the two types contrastive focus subjects were judged to be equally acceptable (4.79 vs. 4.70). In other words, the pattern of case-marking of focused subjects is in line with the simplified form of the scale of contrastiveness strength (contrastive focus > non-contrastive focus), hence exhibiting no sensitivity to the distinction between the two subtypes of contrastive focus.

The third difference between subjects and objects concerns the extent to which case ellipsis of focused arguments are sensitive to their accessibility status. While in both experiments sentences with case-ellipsed selecting focus were rated highest among the three zero-marked conditions, sentences with case-ellipsed replacing focus and sentences with case-ellipsed informational focus were judged to be different in the first experiment (2.80 vs. 3.10), but judged to be equally less acceptable in the second experiment (1.10 vs. 1.20). The last two differences between focused subjects and objects indicate that the effect of contrastiveness strength and discourse accessibility is weaker for focused subjects than for focused objects. Overall, the pattern of variable case marking for focused objects seems more elaborated than that of variable case marking for focused subjects in that both case-marking and case ellipsis of focused objects are influenced by the interaction between contrastiveness and accessibility. On the other hand, case-marking of focused subjects seems sensitive only to their contrastiveness strength, whereas case ellipsis of focused subjects is influenced by their degree of discourse accessibility but not by their contrastiveness strength.

## 6. General Discussion: Differences between Subjects and Objects

The data from the experiments reported in sections 4 and 5 showed two major differences between subjects and objects. First, focused (transitive) subjects showed strong preference for explicit case marking over case ellipsis, whereas focused objects showed preference for case ellipsis over explicit case marking. Second, the results showed that the effect of contrastiveness strength and discourse accessibility is weaker for focused subjects than for focused objects.

There are two possible explanations for the first difference. One possible source of the strong preference for explicit case marking of focused (transitive) subjects over case ellipsis lies in different bonding and adjacency between transitive subjects and the verb and between direct objects and the verb: there are more combinatorial or dependency relations that link direct objects to their head (verb) than link subjects to the verb. For example, a direct object NP may depend on its verb for its case and theta-role assignment. Moreover, it is c-commanded by the verb on which it is dependent for case assignment. The verb, in turn, is c-commanded by the direct object NP on which it depends for the construction of VP. A subject NP and the verb, by contrast, are not in a mutual c-command relation, and the case for the subject NP is not directly assigned by the verb, though the subject may depend on the verb for its theta-role assignment. Hawkins (2004) suggests that phrases are close to the element on which they are dependent for property assignment in proportion to the number of combinatorial or dependency relations. According to his theory, “the more syntactic and semantic relations of any type that link A and B, the tighter should be their adjacency (Hawkins, 2004, 136).” As predicted by this theory, direct object NPs prefer verb adjacency over subject NPs in many languages.

Tight adjacency between the object and its verb means that the grammatical function of the object is already indicated by its proximity to the verb. This makes use of explicit case marking for identification of objecthood less necessary, thereby increasing the overall preference for zero marking, i.e., case ellipsis. But since subjects are more frequently placed under non-adjacency to their verb because of weaker dependencies between them, it is expected that subject case is more frequently explicitly marked than object case.

This line of explanation offers an insightful account of the higher rate of case ellipsis for objects in comparison with subjects and the strong preference for explicit case marking of focused (transitive) subjects over case ellipsis. However, it offers no account of why compared to *focused* objects, *focused* subjects exhibit weaker sensitivity to contrastive strength and discourse accessibility. We therefore do not pursue the account in terms of different bonding and adjacency between argument NPs and their verb as a general explanation for the differences between focused subjects and objects.

If different bonding and adjacency between argument NPs and their verb are not the source of the patterns we observe, then what is it? We suggest that a consideration of the markedness of focused subjects offers a promising account. In the following, we will first discuss what notions of markedness prevail in the linguistic literature and under which premises the term markedness will be used in the present study. We will then present a unifying explanation for the patterns observed in our experiments on the basis of the notion of markedness.

In typological approaches to markedness (Greenberg, 1966; Croft, 1990), the term markedness is often used to refer to an asymmetrical relation between elements on prominence scales or hierarchies. Two examples of hierarchies that play a central role in the domain of morphosyntax are given in (20):



- (20)  $\Leftarrow \Leftarrow \Leftarrow \Leftarrow \Leftarrow \Leftarrow \Leftarrow \Leftarrow \Leftarrow \Leftarrow \Leftarrow \Leftarrow \Leftarrow$  Less marked as a topic  
 Definiteness hierarchy: Pronoun > Name > Definite > Indefinite  
 Grammatical function (GF) hierarchy: Subject > Non-subject  
 Less marked as a focus  $\Rightarrow \Rightarrow \Rightarrow \Rightarrow \Rightarrow \Rightarrow \Rightarrow \Rightarrow \Rightarrow \Rightarrow \Rightarrow \Rightarrow$

A substantial literature indicates that there is a correlation among the scale of topicality, types of an NP and the grammatical function of the NP. Both pronouns and other definite NPs tend to refer to elements that are assumed to be known to the reader/listener. Pronouns, however, are generally used to refer to discourse-salient entities or discourse topics (Ariel, 1990; Prince, 1981). Such salient entities tend to be encoded in subject position (Prince, 1992). Hence, pronouns occur in subject position more often than other definite NPs. Unlike definites, indefinites do not carry presuppositions of uniqueness and familiarity. Instead, they typically introduce referents. Such entities that are new to the discourse are generally introduced in non-subject positions.

The association of elements higher on the definiteness/topicality hierarchy with subjects is supported by Keenan (1976), who states that “highly referential” NPs such as pronouns and proper nouns can always be subjects, by Givón (1979), who shows that subjects are usually definite, and by the fact that in a number of languages subjects cannot be indefinites (Aissen, 2003). The association of elements lower on the hierarchy with objects is supported by Keenan (1976), who cites Philippine languages in which objects cannot be definites (at least with non-relativized verbs). There are also languages like Chamorro (Chung, 1998), Mam (England, 1983) and Halkomelem (Gerds, 1988), which exclude personal pronoun objects.

The tendency for high-prominence elements (e.g., pronouns and topic) to be associated with subject function and for low-prominence elements to be associated with object function is expressed in several types of syntactic systems. In languages like Chamorro, Mam and Halkomelem, marked associations of grammatical function with definiteness simply cannot surface through syntactically unmarked structures (e.g., active voice), but require more marked structures (e.g., passive voice or impersonal structures). In other languages, marked associations are expressed in syntactically unmarked structures, but require extra morphological marking in the form of case. In Hebrew, for example, only objects high in prominence on the definiteness hierarchy are case-marked (Aissen, 2003); and in Fore personal pronouns and names cannot be marked in subject function (Scott, 1978).

Although marked argument types that must be case-marked in languages like Hebrew and Fore are not obligatorily case-marked in Korean, it has been shown that markedness has fairly robust frequency effects on the choice between case-marked and case-ellipsed forms of subjects and objects in Korean. In a series of recent studies which examined variable case marking patterns of Korean as found in the CallFriend Korean corpus, Lee (2005; 2006b) has shown that animacy and definiteness interact with the choice between case-marked and case-ellipsed forms of subjects and objects in the corpus: the relative frequency of case-ellipsed forms over case-marked forms was found to increase with less marked argument types, i.e., subjects high in animacy and definiteness and objects low in those dimensions, and to decrease with more marked argument types, i.e., low-prominence subjects

and high-prominence objects. These results are consistent with the findings of Fry's (2001) study of particle ellipsis in Japanese and T. Kim's (2008) study of the same phenomenon in Korean.

Let us now turn to the problem of differences between focused subjects and objects. We will first show that strong preference for explicit case marking of focused subjects over case ellipsis follows naturally from the markedness-based account proposed here. Focus is a marked property for subjects (see (20)). Thus focused subjects are predicted to receive more complex formal marking than less marked subject types (topical subjects or subjects that are not in focus) as an indication of their semantic markedness.

The markedness-based account further predicts the higher rate of case marking of focused subjects compared to focused objects. Focus is more marked as subjects but less marked as objects. In other words, focused subjects are more marked than focused objects and should thus be more likely to receive an overt morphological marker as an indication of their semantic markedness. These predictions are consistent with the results of our experiments and have also been confirmed by S. Lee's (2009) corpus study which compares distributional differences between case-marked focused subjects and objects and between case-ellipsed focused subjects and objects.

Let us now turn to the question how the markedness of focus as subjects accounts for why the realization of focused subjects exhibits weaker sensitivity to contrastive strength and discourse accessibility. In the marked-based analysis proposed here, this difference between focused subjects and objects can be viewed as an instance of a more general markedness pattern referred to as 'positional neutralization': in general, more marked categories show less contrast or differentiation than less marked ones in both phonology and morphosyntax.

One of the classic cases in phonology showing this typological tendency to maximize feature values of segments in less marked positions is final devoicing in German and Dutch. In these languages, the contrast of voiced and voiceless obstruents is positionally neutralized in the specific context of a syllable coda. Elsewhere, a contrast is possible. In other words, the voicing contrast is suppressed in the syllable coda, a perceptually less salient position that is not best equipped to realize featural distinction (Kager, 1999, 408).

In morphosyntax, positional neutralization has been mainly documented in the domain of inflectional paradigms. One example that Greenberg (1966) gives is gender distinctions in the third-person pronouns in English. Typological evidence indicates that in a language with a singular-plural distinction, the plural is more marked than the singular (Greenberg, 1966; Croft, 1990). In English, the relative markedness of the plural is manifested in the following way:

(21)		Singular	Plural
	Masculine	he	they
	Feminine	she	they
	Neuter	it	they

As can be seen, the singular manifests a three-way morphological distinction of gender but the plural does not: the singular has a greater number of distinctions

than the plural, and hence is unmarked; conversely, the plural has fewer distinctions and is therefore marked. Similarly, the plural paradigms of verbs generally express less information about the person feature of the subject than their corresponding singular paradigms, as illustrated in (22):

(22)	Singular	Plural
	1 (I) am	(we) are
	2 (you) are	(you) are
	3 (he/she) is	(they) are

We find a similar situation in the case marking of focused subjects and objects. Focus is more marked as subjects but less marked as objects. Focused subjects, by their semantic markedness or disharmony, are not naturally equipped to distinguish between subtypes of focus. As the results of our experiment show, a fine-grained distinction among elements on the hierarchy of contrastiveness strength is suppressed in the position of focused transitive subjects. Thus variable case marking of focused subjects is less elaborated than that of focused objects. This may account for (i) why case marking of focused subjects is influenced by their status on the simplified form of the scale of contrastiveness strength (contrastive focus > non-contrastive focus), exhibiting no sensitivity to the distinction between replacing focus and selecting focus and (ii) why case ellipsis of focused subjects is sensitive to their degree of discourse accessibility but not to their relative strength in contrastiveness, showing no sensitivity to the distinction between replacing focus and informational focus.

In summary, we have shown that the current markedness-based account of variable case marking provides a unified explanation of the two major differences between focused subjects and objects observed in the experiments: (i) the strong preference for explicit case marking of focused subjects over case ellipsis and the higher rate of case ellipsis for focused objects, and (ii) the weaker influence of contrastiveness strength and discourse accessibility on the realization of focused subjects and the less elaborated nature of case marking of focused subjects. In this analysis, both patterns follow naturally from the relative markedness of focus as subjects and can be analyzed in a way analogous to an account of cross-linguistically widespread markedness phenomena: differential case marking of disharmonic argument types and positional neutralization in grammar. Aissen (2003) and Woolford (2001) note that the preference for unmarked subjects (with respect to features such as animacy, definiteness and topicality) appears to be more rigidly enforced than the preference for unmarked objects. The less elaborated nature of case marking of focused subjects can be understood as part of the cross-linguistically widespread tendency to suppress featural distinctions in more marked positions.

## 7. Conclusion

This paper has examined the (a)symmetries of the realization of focused subjects and objects. Through rating experiments, we have demonstrated that native speakers' judgments of acceptability of sentences containing case-marked or case-ellipsed

subjects and objects are sensitive to the contrastiveness strength and the discourse accessibility of focused arguments. Our experiments also have shown that focused subjects exhibit stronger preference for explicit case marking over case ellipsis and that contrastiveness strength and discourse accessibility have weaker influence on the case marking and ellipsis of focused subjects compared to focused object. We have proposed an account of variable case marking that is capable of subsuming both the similarities and differences between focused subjects and objects under the universal theory of markedness. In particular, it has been shown that the similarities between focused subjects and objects are predicted by the proposed account of variable case marking based on the contrastiveness strength and the discourse accessibility of focused arguments and that the differences between focused subjects and objects follow naturally from the relative markedness of focus as subjects.

### <References>

- Ahn, Hee-Don and Sungeun Cho. 2006. Layered Nominal Structures: Implications for Caseless Nominals. *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 31, 165–185.
- Ahn, Hee-Don and Sungeun Cho. 2007. Subject-Object Asymmetries of Morphological Case Realization. *Language and Information* 11, 53–76.
- Aissen, Judith. 2003. Differential Object Marking: Iconicity vs. Economy. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21, 435–483.
- Almor, Amit. 1999. Noun-phrase Anaphora and Focus: The Informational Load Hypothesis. *Psychological Review* 106, 748–765.
- Ariel, Mira. 1990. *Accessing Noun-Phrase Antecedent*. Routledge, London.
- Arnold, Jennifer. 1998. *Reference Form and Discourse Patterns*. Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University.
- Chafe, Wallace. 1976. Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics and Point of View. In Charles Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 25–56.
- Chung, Sandra. 1998. *The Design of Agreement: Evidence from Chamorro*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Clark, Herbert and Susan Haviland. 1977. Comprehension and the Given-New Contract. In R. Freedle (ed.), *Discourse Production and Comprehension*. Ablex, New Jersey, pp. 1–40.
- Croft, William. 1990. *Typology and Universals*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- de Hoop, Helen and Bhuvana Narasimhan. 2008. Differential Case Marking in Hindi. In Helen de Hoop and Peter de Swart (eds.), *Differential Subject Marking (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory)*. Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 63–78.
- Dik, Simon C. et al. 1981. On the Typology of Focus Phenomena. In Teun Hoekstra, Harry van der Hulst, and Michael Moortgat (eds.), *Perspectives on Functional Grammar*. Foris, Dordrecht, pp. 41–74.
- England, Nora. 1983. Ergativity in Mamean (Mayan) Languages. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 49, 1–19.

- Fry, John. 2001. *Ellipsis and 'wa'-Marking in Japanese Conversation*. Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University.
- Gerdts, Donna. 1988. *Object and Absolutive in Halkomelem Salish*. Garland, New York.
- Givón, Talmy. 1979. *On Understanding Grammar*. Academic Press, New York.
- Greenberg, Joseph. 1966. *Language Universals. With Special Reference to Feature Hierarchies*. Mouton, The Hague.
- Halliday, Michael A. K. 1967. Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English, Part II. *Journal of Linguistics* 3, 199–244.
- Hawkins, John. 1978. *Definiteness and Indefiniteness*. Humanities Press, Atlantic Highlands.
- Hawkins, John. 2004. *Efficiency and Complexity in Grammar*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1972. *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Kager, René. 1999. *Optimality Theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Keenan, Edward. 1976. Remarkable Subjects in Malagasy. In Charles Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 247–301.
- Kim, Dae-Bin. 1993. *The Specificity/Non-specificity Distinction and Scrambling Theory*. Thaeaksa, Seoul.
- Kim, Taeho. 2008. *Subject and Object Markings in Conversational Korean*. Ph.D. thesis, State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Kiss, Katalin. 1998. Identificational Focus versus Informational Focus. *Language* 74, 245–273.
- Ko, Eon-Suk. 2000. A Discourse Analysis of the Realization of Objects in Korean. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 9, 195–208. CSLI Publications, Stanford.
- Krifka, Manfred. 1993. Focus and Presupposition in Dynamic Interpretation. *Journal of Semantics* 10, 269–300.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Lee, Chungmin. 2007. Contrastive (Predicate) Topic, Intonation and Scaler Meanings. In Chungmin Lee, Matthew Gordon, and Daniel Buring (eds.), *Topic and Focus: Crosslinguistic Perspectives on Meaning and Intonation*. Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 151–175.
- Lee, Duck-Young. 2002. The Function of the Zero Particle with Special Reference to Spoken Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34, 645–682.
- Lee, Hanjung. 2005. Hierarchies and Case Ellipsis in Korean. *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 30, 295–322.
- Lee, Hanjung. 2006a. Iconicity and Variation in the Choice of Object Forms in Korean. *Language Research* 42, 323–355.
- Lee, Hanjung. 2006b. Parallel Optimization in Case Systems: Evidence from Case Ellipsis in Korean. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 15, 69–96.

- Lee, Hanjung. 2008. Focus Types and Gradients in Korean Case Ellipsis. *Language and Information* 12.2, 1–20.
- Lee, Hyo-Sang and Sandra A. Thompson. 1985. A Discourse Account of the Korean Accusative Marker. *Studies in Language* 13, 105–128.
- Lee, Sook. 2009. The Characteristics of Case Omission in Spoken Korean. *Journal of the Humanities* 43, 29–59.
- Lee, Sungbom. 2006. A Pragmatic Analysis of Accusative Case-marker Deletion. *Discourse and Cognition* 13, 69–89.
- Masunaga, Kiyoko. 1988. Case Deletion and Discourse Context. In William Poser (ed.), *Papers from International Workshop on Japanese Syntax*. CSLI Publications, Stanford, pp. 145–156.
- Matsui, Tomoko. 2000. *Bridging and Relevance*. Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Myers, Jerome, Arnold Well, and Robert Lorch. 2002. *Research Design and Statistical Analysis*. Routledge, London.
- Prince, Ellen. 1981. Toward a Taxonomy of Given-New Information. In Peter Cole (ed.), *Radical Pragmatics*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 223–255.
- Prince, Ellen. 1992. The ZPG Letter: Subjects, Definiteness and Information Status. In S. Thompson and W. Mann (eds.), *Discourse Description: Diverse Analyses of a Fundraising Text*. Benjamins, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, pp. 295–325.
- Rooth, Mats. 1985. *Association With Focus*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Rooth, Mats. 1992. A Theory of Focus Interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1, 75–116.
- Scott, Graham. 1978. *The Fore Language of Papua New Guinea*. School of Pacific Studies, Canberra.
- Tsutsui, Michio. 1984. *Particle Ellipsis in Japanese*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Vallduví, Enric and Maria Vilkuña. 1998. On Rheme and Kontrast. In Peter Culicover and Louise McNally (eds.), *The Limits of Syntax (Syntax and Semantics 29)*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 79–108.
- Woolford, Ellen. 2001. Case Patterns. In Géraldine Legendre, Jane Grimshaw, and Sten Vikner (eds.), *Optimality-Theoretic Syntax*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, pp. 509–543.

#### <Appendix: Materials for Experiment 2>

##### [Contrastive—Replacing focus]

1. A: 자네 부서 말이야. 부장이 회사 돈 빼돌리고 도망 갔다면서? 요즘 난리겠네.  
B: 아니, 과장이/과장 다 들고 잠적했다니까. 세상 무서워. 평가가 좋은 사람이었거든.
2. A: 형님도 참 너무 하시네. 어떻게 같이 사업한다는 사람이 널 속여 먹을 수가 있냐?  
B: 아니야, 사장이/사장 속인 거라니깐. 그 사람도 나랑 똑같이 속았어.

3. A: 작년도 그렇고 올해도 그렇고 동창회에 통 사람이 없어. 회장이 연락을 잘 안 하나?  
B: 총무가/총무 연락을 대충 돌리는 것 같더라고. 나만 해도 전화 받고 나온 거 아니야. 다른 사람 통해서 듣고 나왔지.
4. A: 3번 방 음식 잘 못 나왔대요. 주방장님이 다른 거 해서 내보냈나 봐요.  
B: 아니야, 지배인이/지배인 주문 잘 못 받아왔어. 이거 보면 알잖아.
5. A: 이번 재판 관련해서 소포가 하나 왔네요. 김 변호사님이 자료 좀 보낸 거 같은데요.  
B: 어디 보자. 이거 지난 주말에 의뢰인이/의뢰인 부친 거 같은데.
6. A: 너 내일 토익 시험이라고 못 온다더니 술 마신다니까 결국 나왔네.  
B: 내가 아니라 여자 친구가/여자 친구 시험 본다고. 다음 번엔 꼭 나온다고 너희들한테 안부 전해 주라더라.
7. A: 형규 선배 이제 과외 그만 둔다며? 선배가 공부하느라 힘들어서 그러자 했나 보네.  
B: 아니, 학생이/학생 그만 배우겠다고 하더라. 그래서 형규도 다른 데 알아보고 있어.
8. A: 오늘 공연, 노래는 진짜 좋았는데 선곡이 좀 단조롭더라. 기획자가 별로인가 봐.  
B: 그게 아니고, 가수가/가수 직접 다 자기 취향으로 고른 거래. 아까 중간에 무대에서 얘기 했잖아.
9. A: 현정이가 어제 저녁 다 봤다며? 아깝다. 난 왜 꼭 그런 날만 학교 안 오냐?  
B: 야, 그 짠순이가 무슨 밥을 사겠냐? 그때 그 선배가/그 선배 밥 한 그릇씩 산 거야.
10. A: 김 사장, 그 친구. 자기가 아무리 잘 나간대도 사람들 불러놓고 그렇게 막말 해도 돼?  
B: 그게 아니고요, 그 사모님이/그 사모님 말실수를 많이 하시더라고요. 그 정도면 경우 다 차릴 연세신데.
11. A: 이번 주 방송, 대본 좋던데? 여기 작가가 날이 갈수록 실력이 익는 것 같아.  
B: 그래요? 지난 주부터 제 후배가/제 후배 쓰고 있는데. 실력 하난 자신 있다더니 맞네.
12. A: (경찰서에서) 제 지갑 찾아준 친구가 이 친구 맞죠? 아이고, 이거 고마워서 어쩐나.  
B: 아니요, 저 학생이/저 학생 앞 골목에서 주웠대요. 참 착하죠?
13. A: 이 집 커피 정말 맛있네요. 사장님이 직접 만드시는 거예요?  
B: 아니요. 여기 이 형이/이 형 맛있게 잘 내려요. 자주 오세요.
14. A: 어? 이 음악, 작가님이 제일 좋아하는 노래 맞죠?  
B: 아니, 너네 감독이/너네 감독 엄청 좋아하지. 작품 안 될 때면 맨날 듣잖아.
15. A: 아까 낮에 상무님이 찾던 것 같던데. 만나 뵈고 오는 길이야?  
B: 아니, 너네 부장이/너네 부장 부르더라고. 이번 부서 통합 건 때문에 얘기 좀 하자고.
16. A: 어? 이제 모니터가 되네. 결국 김 기사가 와서 손 본 거야?  
B: 아니, 이 친구가/이 친구 고쳐줬어. 보기엔 이래도 컴퓨터 좀 만질 줄 알거든.

17. A: 언니가 내 운동복 또 입고 갔어? 그렇게 말도 없이 입고 가면 어떡해?  
B: 왜 나한테 그래? 오늘 빨래가 덜 말라서 엄마가/엄마 잠깐 입고 나간거야.
18. A: 이거 치마, 색깔이 너무 마음에 들어. 역시 우리 삼촌이 보는 눈도 최고야.  
B: 삼촌이 아니라 외숙모가/외숙모 사주셨다니까. 내일 감사하다고 전화나 한번 드려.
19. A: 오늘 수아가 또 쓰레기 버렸네. 엄마 힘든 것도 알고 우리 딸 이제 다 컸네.  
B: 음, 아닌데. 사실은 아까 오빠가/오빠 방 청소하는 김에 다 치웠어요. 내일은 제가 할게요.
20. A: 이 밤에 무슨 통화를 그렇게 길게 해? 또 남자 친구가 전화 한 거야?  
B: 아니, 요즘 밤마다 동생이/동생 전화를 자주 하네. 4학년이라 많이 힘든가 봐.

## [Contrastive—Selecting focus]

1. A: 이번 주 학급회의는 누가 의장이지? 반장? 부 반장?  
B: 셋 째 주니까 오늘 회의는 부 반장이/부 반장 진행할 차례예요.
2. A: 그 목도리 참 따뜻해 보인다. 직접 뜬 거 같은데? 누나가 떠웠어? 아님 애인?  
B: 나 이번에 취업했잖아. 회사 다닐 때 하라고 애인이/애인 떠서 주더라. 진짜 감동받았어.
3. A: 이번 주부터 청년 부 후보 누가 만든다고 했지요? 집사님? 아니면 간사님인가요?  
B: 간사님이/간사님 제작하겠다고 했어요. 집사님은 요즘 너무 바쁘신 것 같더라고요.
4. A: 나 심리학 중간과제 안 냈다고 문자 왔는데 이거 조교가 보낸 거야? 교수님인가?  
B: 어제 밤에 조교가/조교 보낸 거야. 화요일에 강의실 들어와서 물어봤었잖아.
5. A: 이번 특집기사 누가 기획한 거예요? 편집장님이요? 아님 국장님이 직접 생각 하셨어요?  
B: 편집장님이/편집장님 내보자고 했는데 시기가 좋아서 이번에 제대로 한번 터져준 거지.
6. A: 어제 그 프로 방송 사고 났다며? 누구야? 사회자야? 아니면 출연자 쪽 실수야?  
B: 사회자가/사회자 중간에 흐름을 완전히 놓쳤어. 시청자 게시판 가보면 장난 아니야.
7. A: 어? 자기 머리 잘랐구나. 세련되게 잘 했다. 그 때 그 언니가 해줬어? 아니면 원장님?  
B: 이번엔 원장님이/원장님 직접 만져주셨어. 확실히 가위질부터가 다르긴 하더라.
8. A: 자네 병원 사람 바꾼다면서? 왜? 간호사가 될 잘 못해? 아니면 위생사가 그래?  
B: 아무리 조만한 동네 치과라지만 간호사가/간호사 환자를 그렇게 불친절하게 대하니 원.
9. A: 언니, 어제 누가 집까지 데려다 주던데? 너 그 선배 아직도 만나? 아님 그 이웃집 오빠?  
B: 응. 그 오빠가/그 오빠 데려다 줬어. 침엔 별로였는데 자꾸 보니까 괜찮은 것 같기도 해.



10. A: 우리 딸 장학금 받은 거 축하해. 아까 어깨 두드려주신 분이 학장님이야, 총장님이야?  
B: 장학증서 나눠주고 저 학장님이/저 학장님 돌아가면서 다들 격려해주신 거예요.
11. A: 이 팀이 우리 의대 연구 성과 1등이야. 팀장님 덕분이야, 신입 연구원이 잘 해서 그래?  
B: 다들 고생했지만, 그 신입이/그 신입 이런 저런 연구를 많이 하더라고.
12. A: 여기 아파트 재개발, 그거 아니래. 관리소장인가 중개업잔가가 퍼뜨린 거래.  
B: 그 업자가/그 업자 지어낸 거 맞대. 부동산에 아무리 손님이 없다고 해도, 원.
13. A: 이번에 이민형씨 잘렸대. 대표님이 해고한 거야? 아니면 허 상무님이 그런 거야?  
B: 우리 대표가/우리 대표 나가라고 했대. 원래 자기 맘에 안 들면 늘 그런 식이잖아.
14. A: 너희 가게 이번에 페인트 칠 다시 한다며? 그 때 그 아저씨한테 해? 아님 저형님?  
B: 저 형님이/저 형님 싸게 해주시겠대서 이번에 같이 한 번 해보려고.
15. A: 여기까지 오시기 힘들셨을 텐데. 아드님 차 타고 오셨어요? 아니면 이 청년이?  
B: 요 청년이/요 청년 방향이 같다면 태워주더라고. 고마운 친구야.
16. A: 여기 대문 앞에 내 놓은 탁자 누가 훔쳐갔나 봐. 또 그 아줌마야? 아님 그 학생인가?  
B: 그 학생이/그 학생 들고 간 거 맞아. 자기도 내버린 건 줄 알고 가져갔겠지.
17. A: 야, 자네 요즘 처가 덕 톡톡히 보네. 장인어른 덕에 이런 차도 타고. 장모님 덕인가?  
B: 장모님이/장모님 넘기신 거예요. 이번에 차 바꾸신다고. 타던 건데요, 뭐.
18. A: 이 많은 음식을 누가 다 한 거야? 고모 솜씨예요? 아님 이 집 며느리?  
B: 고모님이/고모님 어제 일찍 오셔서 준비하신 거예요. 얼른 오셔서 맛들 좀 보세요.
19. A: 영민이네, 냉장고 바꿨네. 영민 아빠가 해준 거야? 아님 친정 엄마가?  
B: 친정 엄마가/친정 엄마 이번에 새로 하나 해주셨어요.
20. A: 우리 효정이, 오늘 머리 아주 예쁘게 하고 왔네. 누가 땡아 준 거야? 엄마? 할머니?  
B: 할머니가/할머니 아침에 땡아줬어요. 엄마는 회사 가야 해서.

[Non-Contrastive—Informational focus]

1. A: 올 가을 단합대회는 여기 사람들 아무도 빠지기 없기다! 근데 숙소 예약은 누가 할래?  
B: 이런 건 당연히 신입이/신입 처리해야지요. 제가 있다 오면 자세히 얘기해 놓을게요.
2. A: 내일 우리 둘 다 구청 가면 아침에 가게 문은 누가 열어? 갔다 와서 열면 너무 늦는데.  
B: 당신은 신경 안 써도 돼. 아줌마가/아줌마 일찍 와서 열거야.

3. A: 우리 이번 세미나는 신입생도 있고 하니 쉬운 주제로 가죠. 누가 주제 좀 정해와봐.  
B: 안 그래도 선생님이/선생님 가벼운 걸로 정해서 수요일까지 보내주시기로 했어요.
4. A: 너희 08 학번들끼리 어제 미팅했다며? 그래 전화번호는 누가 제일 많이 받았어?  
B: 이번 미팅은 어떻게 된 게 주선자가/주선자 제일 많이 챙겨 오는 것 같더라고요.
5. A: 우리 공연 홍보문구 만들어왔다. 이대로 인터넷에 죽 올리기만 하면 되는데, 누가 할래?  
B: 막내가/막내 모레까지 한 번 올려본대요. 전에 있던 데서 이런 거 많이 했대요.
6. A: 이 집 참 맛있네. 누가 소개해준 거야? 자네 원래 이 동네 잘 모르잖아.  
B: 전무님이/전무님 맛있다고 소개해주시더라고. 서울 맛 집은 다 꿰뚫고 계신 분이잖아.
7. A: 김 비서, 오늘 인터뷰 일정 그대로 진행하는 거지? 방송국에서 누구 온 사람 있어?  
B: 네, 회장님. 기자님이/기자님 안에서 기다리고 있습니다. 카메라 팀도 곧 도착한답니다.
8. A: 야, 출출하다. 누가 가서 컵라면이나 하나씩 사와라. 좀 쉬었다 하고.  
B: 안 그래도 지금 아저씨가/아저씨 사온대요. 잠깐 작업들 놓고 다들 이리 오세요.
9. A: 집 앞에 누가 또 가구 내버렸던데. 스티커도 안 붙이고 누가 막 갖다 버리는 거야?  
B: 아이고, 201호 그 총각이/그 총각 또 내놨네. 지난 번에도 그러지 말라고 했는데.
10. A: 너도 드디어 가는구나. 결혼 진짜 축하해. 아 참, 부케는 누가 받기로 했어?  
B: 이 언니가/이 언니 받기로 했어. 회사 언니들 중에서는 제일 급한 사람이거든.
11. A: 도서관에 책 반납했네? 학교 갈 시간 없다더니 누가 대신 갖다 준 거야?  
B: 어제 내 친구가/내 친구 반납했어. 주말에 집 근처에서 잠깐 만난 김에 부탁 좀 했어.
12. A: 김 씨, 다음 주에 아래 골목으로 이사한다며? 누가 와서 좀 도와줘야 하지 않아?  
B: 응. 고맙게도 이 양반이/이 양반 하루 거들어준대. 안 그러면 나도 엄두도 못 내지.
13. A: 국물 거의 다 끓었는데 콩나물 아직도 안 뻗어? 아까 누가 다듬고 있었잖아?  
B: 저 이가/저 이 금방 다듬겠다더니 몇 개 따다가 말았나 봐요. 제가 얼른 해결게요.
14. A: 이번 화보집 말이야. 편집 도와줄 사람이 좀 필요한데. 외부인으로 누구 좀 추천해 봐.  
B: 옛날 회사에서 제 동료가/제 동료 사진 편집을 좀 했다고 했었죠? 연락 한번 해볼게요.
15. A: 아까 식당 앞에서 보니까 누가 자네 차 열쇠 받아 가던데?  
B: 애 기사가/애 기사 내 차도 같이 넣어 준대서 넘기고 그냥 바로 들어왔어.

16. A: 민재 개 이번에 또 회사 때려치웠다면? 이번엔 또 누가 못 살게 했대?  
 B: 개네 상사가/개네 상사 민재를 그렇게 괴롭히더라. 사무실에서 아주 대놓고 그러더라.
17. A: 야, 너 이거 스키복 멋있는데. 집에서 또 사줬을 리는 없고. 누가 빌려줬어?  
 B: 사촌 형이/사촌 형 새 거라면서 엄청 생색 내며 빌려주더라. 그래도 색깔은 죽이지?
18. A: 생각해보니 너도 결혼 이제 얼마 안 남았다. 아 참, 예단은 누가 따로 해주신대?  
 B: 응. 숙부님이/숙부님 맡아 해주시겠다. 애기 때부터 딸처럼 예뻐해 주셨거든.
19. A: 엄마, 우리 여행가면 열흘 동안 멍멍이(강아지)는 누가 챙겨줘?  
 B: 이모가/이모 잘 돌봐준다고 했으니까 걱정 안 해도 돼. 얼른 짐이나 마저 싸자.
20. A: 밖에 비 오네. 우산 안 갖고 왔지? 수업 끝나고 누가 우산 갖고 온대?  
 B: 우리 누나가/우리 누나 갖고 온대. 아까 전화 왔어.

Submitted on: August 25, 2009

Accepted on: November 13, 2009