Topics in Subordinate Clauses in Korean

Hyeson Park

(Keimyung University)

Park, Hyeson. 2008. Topics in Subordinate Clauses in Korean. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal, 16*(2), 125-142. It has been observed that topic phrases in Korean are restricted in their distribution: They cannot occur in factive complements, the antecedent of conditionals, and relative clauses. Built upon Shin (1987), who noted the similarity of meaning among the topic, the antecedent of conditionals, and the relative clause, this paper develops an analysis of this restriction based on the semantic tripartite structure proposed by Diesing (1992), Partee (1995), and Hajičová et al. (1998). It is argued that the topic phrase and the three constructions all share a common semantic feature, that is, presupposition, one characteristic of which is to be raised and mapped to the restrictive clause at LF. Since each of the three constructions competes against the topic phrase for the same position, the co-occurrence restriction is derived.

Key Words: topic, presupposition, tripartite structure, restrictive clause, syntax-semantics interface

1. Introduction: The data

It has been observed in Korean that the distribution of topic phrases is restricted: first, a topic expression cannot occur in the complement clause of a factive verb (cf. Kiparsky & Kiparsky, 1971). As shown in (1) and (2), when the main verb is a non-factive verb (e.g. *mitta* (believe) or *chuwchanghata* (claim)), the pre-verbal NP in the embedded clause can be marked with either the nominative case particle *-ka* or the topic particle *-nun*.[1] However, in a sentence with a factive verb

---

such as *kiekhata* (remember) or *alachayta* (notice), the pre-verbal NP in the subordinate clause can have only the nominative case particle *-ka*. If a topic phrase occurs in the pre-verbal position, the sentence becomes ungrammatical or less acceptable (3-4)[2].

(1) Na-nu [Mary-ka/nun   ku il-ul   ha-lkes-ila-ko]
    I-TOP Mary-NOM./TOP the work-ACC do-FUT-DC-COMP
    mit-nun-ta[3].
    believe-PRS-DC
    'I believe that Mary will do the work.'

(2) John-un   [sin-i/un   chwuk-ess-ta-ko] chuwchanghay-ss-ta.
    John-TOP   god-NOM/TOP die-PST-DC-COMP   claim-PST-DC
    'John claimed that God was dead.'

(3) Na-nun [Mary-ka/*nun   ku il-ul   ha-n]   kess-ul
    I-TOP   Mary-NOM/TOP   the work-ACC do-ADN   fact-ACC
    kiekha-n-ta.
    remember-PRS-DC
    'I remember that Mary did the work.'

(4) Na-nun [Mary-ka/?*nun   imshinhay-ss-ta-nun] kes-ul
    I-TOP   Mary-NOM/TOP   pregnant-PST-DC-ADN] fact-ACC
    alachay-ss-ta.
    notice-PST-DC.
    'I noticed that Mary was pregnant.'

Secondly, a topic phase is not allowed in the antecedent clause of

---

2) Native speakers' intuition on the acceptability of sentences with factive and non-factive verbs varies, as was also pointed out by Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1971) in their study of English factive verbs. The judgment of the data, except those quoted from previous studies, is based on the author's intuition as a native speaker of Korean.

3) Abbreviations:

ACC: accusative case	ADN: adnominal marker	COMP: complementizer
DC: declarative marker	NOM: nominative case	REL: relativiser
PST: past tens	PL: plural	POSS: possessive
PRS: present		

conditionals or in relative clauses.

(5) Na-nun [Mary-ka/*nun hal-swu iss-nun] il-ul   chass-ass-ta.
    I-TOP   Mary-NOM/TOP do can   - REL work-ACC find-PST-DC
    'I have found a work that Mary can do.'

(6) Na-nun [pwule-ka/*nun nungtongha-n] saram-ul chass-ass-ta
    I-TOP French-NOM/TOP fluent-REL person-ACC find-PST-DC
    'I found a person who was fluent in French.'

(7) nay-ka/*nun say-ramyen, (na-nun) ku-eykey nala-ka-ltente.
    I-NOM/TOP   bird- if   (I-TOP)   he- to   fly-go-would
    'If I were a bird, I could fly to him'

(8) John-i/*nun ttokttokha-myen, (na-nun) ku-lul   koyongha-ltente.
    John-NOM/TOP smart-if   I-TOP he-ACC   hire-would
    'If John were smart, I would hire him.'

As shown in (5)-(8), a topic expression either in the relative clause or in the antecedent clause of the conditional renders the sentences unacceptable.

It might be argued that all subordinate clauses do not allow topic phrases. However, some subordinate clauses appear to be more compatible with topic phrases than others. For example, conjunctive suffixes such as −(e)se (because) and −chiman (though) can cooccur with a topic phrase (9-11), while time adverbial clauses with huuey (after) or −ttay (when) are less acceptable when a topic phrase occurs in them (12). (Kim, 1994; Shin, 1987).

(9) ku namcha-nun minam-i-ese,   manhun yecha-tul-i
    the man-TOP   handsome-be-because many   woman-PL-NOM
    ku-lul   choaha-n-ta.
    he-ACC   like-PRS-DC
    'Becuase he is handsome, many women like him.'

(10) nay atul-un smarthay-se,   na-nun kekcheng-i   ep-ta.
     my   son-TOP smart-because I-TOP   worry-NOM have.not-DC
     'Since my son is smart, I don't have any worries.'

(11) ku namcha-nun minam-i-chiman,   yecha-tul-i   ku-lul
     the man-TOP   handsome-be-though, woman-PL-NOM   he-ACC
     choaha-chi   ahn-nun-ta.
     like-COMP   not -PRS-DC
     'Though he is handsome, women do not like him.'
(12)?ku haksayng-un kuykaha-l-ttay,   ku-uy   emeni-ka
     the student-TOP   return.home-ADN-when he-POSS mother-NOM
     ku-lul   pick-up   han-ta.
     he- ACC   pick-up   do-DC
     'When the student returns home, his mother picks him up.'

2. Previous Research

Kim (1994) noted the restrictions on the distribution of topic phrases and proposed that only independent propositional sentences, which can be subjected to a truth value judgment, can have a topic phrase. Examples (13) and (14) are the test Kim used to determine whether a sentence has a truth value or not:

(13) Na-nun [Mary-ka/nun   ku il-ul   hal swu iss-ta-ko]
     I-TOP   Mary-NOM/TOP the work-ACC do can   -DC-COMP
     mit-ess-ta,   hachiman ku kes-un   sasil- i   ani-ess-ta.
     believe-PST-DC but   the fact-TOP truth-NOM not-PST-DC
     'I believed that Mary could do the work, but it was not true.'
(14) *Na-nun [Mary-ka/?*nun   imshinhay-ss-ta-nun]-kes-ul
     I-TOP   Mary-NOM/TOP   pregnant-PST-DC-ADN   fact-ACC
     alachay-ss-ta. hachiman ku kes-un   sasil- i   ani-ess-ta.
     notice-PST-DC. but   the thing-TOP   truth-NOM not-PST-DC
     'I noticed that Mary was pregnant, but it was not true.'

According to Kim, denying the truth of the complement of a non-factive verb does not render the sentence ungrammatical (13), while negating the truth of the complement of a factive verb results in ungrammaticality (14). Kim suggests that this contrast is due to the

fact that the complement of a factive verb is not an independent proposition, and thus can not be subjected to a truth judgement.   The antecedent of conditionals and relative clauses also do not allow a topic phrase due to the same reason; they are not independent propositions.

There are, however, cases which Kim's proposal cannot account for: Some independent propositions do not allow a topic phrase. For example, sentences in (15) do not allow a topic marked NP in the pre-verbal position even though they are independent propositions, which are supposed to be able to be subjected to a truth value judgment.

(15) a. phi-ka/*nun   o-n-ta.
　　　 rain-NOM/TOP   come-PRS-DC
　　　 'It is raining
　　 b. han saram-i/*un   owa-ss-ta.
　　　 One   person-NOM/TOP   come-PST-DC
　　　 'A person came.'

In order to deal with this problem, Kim hypothesized that all sentences have a topic, in either a covert or overt form; sentences without an overt topic have a covert one. Thus a covert topic is assumed to exist   in (15a) and (15b), which can be abstract entities such as 'time' or 'space'. Her proposal is based on the assumption that sentences with an overt topic are usually generic sentences, which are not constrained by 'time' and/or 'space', while covert topic sentences are constrained by these factors. However, there are counter-examples to this proposal; a sentence can have an overt topic phrase and still be restricted by 'time' and/or 'space'. For example in (16), the overt topic phrase does not make the sentence unacceptable even though the sentence is about a particular situation. This kind of example makes Kim's proposal difficult to hold.

(16) ku   chayk-un   nay-ka   eche   sa-ss-ta
　　 the book - TOP   I-NOM   yesterday buy-PST-DC
　　 'The book, I bought yesterday.'

Shin (1987) attempted to account for the restrictions on the distribution of topics from a functionalist perspective. According to Shin, the function of a topic phrase, the antecedent of conditionals and relative clauses is one and the same; that is, they express the notion of a speaker's contrastive choice, which is derived when an object or event is singled out from possible candidate sets which are presupposed to exist. Therefore, the co-occurrence of the topic phrase and the if-clause, or of the topic and the relative clause leads to conceptual confusion due to the dual focus.

Shin's observation is in the right direction in that he noted the similarity of meaning among the topic, the antecedent of the conditional, and the relative clause. My proposal, however, differs from Shin's in the following points: first, I argue that the factive complement is also similar to these constructions in its meaning. Secondly, I consider the similarity of meaning among these constructions from the perspective of the syntax-semantics interface, rather than from a purely functional perspective.

3. A New Analysis

My proposal is based on Diesing's (1992) Mapping Hypothesis. Specifically, I propose that the topic, which is presuppositional, is raised to the IP-adjoined position at LF, and consequently is mapped to the restrictive clause of the semantic tripartite structure at the syntax/semantics interface, as was also proposed by Partee (1995) and Hajičová et al. (1998). The factive complement, the antecedent of conditionals, and the relative head noun are also mapped to the restrictive clause at the syntax/semantics interface, competing with the topic phrase for this position, hence the observed co-occurrence restriction. The tripartite structure of these constructions, adapted from Partee (1995), is shown below.

(17) operator   restrictive clause   nuclear scope
                           topic   focus
                        antecedent   consequence
      genericity   relative head   relative clause
      specificity   factive complement   main clause

3.1. Factive Complement

Let us first consider some consequences of my proposal when applied to the factive complement. Berman (1991) proposed that a factive complement is raised at LF out of the VP and is mapped to the restrictive clause, a process commonly called 'presupposition accommodation'. Pinar (1996) adopts Berman's approach in explaining the negative concord phenomenon in Spanish. According to Pinar, the behavior of negative concord in Spanish varies depending on the mood of the embedded clause.

(18) No recuerdo   que conozcas-SUBJ a ningun artista
      not I remember   that you know   any   artist
      'I don't remember that you know any artists.'
(19)* No recuerdo   que conoces-IND a ningun artista
      not I remember   that you know   any   artist
      'I don't remember that you know any artists.'

As shown in (18), when the embedded clause is in the subjunctive mood, the N-word *ningun* is licensed by the negation in the main clause and the sentence is grammatical. On the other hand, when the embedded clause is in the indicative mood as in (19), the N-word in the embedded clause does not seem to be licensed by the negation in the main clause. Pinar explains the contrast in grammaticality between the two sentences in the following way: the indicative clause, which is presupposed, is raised out of VP and adjoins to IP at LF, moving the N-word out of the scope of the negation.

A similar explanation can be applied to the licensing of negative

polarity items (NPI) in Korean.

(20) Na-nun [ku-ka   amuwto   sarangha-n-ta-ko]
     I-TOP   he-NOM   anybody love-PRS-DC-COMP
     mit-chi   ahn-nun-ta.
     believe-COMP   not-PRS-DC
     'I don't believe that he loves anybody.
(21) Na-nun [ku-ka   amuwto   sarangha-chi ahn-nun-ta-ko]
     I-TOP   he-NOM anybody love -COMP   not-PRS-DC-COMP
     mit-nun-ta.
     believe-PRS-DC
     'I believe that he does not love anybody.'
(22) Na-nun [ku-ka   amuwto   sarangha-chi ahn-ass-ta-ko]
     I-TOP   he-NOM anybody   love-COMP   not-PST-DC- COMP
     kiekha-n-ta.
     remember-PRS-DC
     'I remember that he did not love anybody.'
(23) *Na-nun [ku-ka   amuwto   saranghay-ss-ta-ko]
     I-TOP   he-NOM   anybody   love-PST-DC-COMP
     kiekha-chi   ahn-nun- ta.
     remember-COMP   not-PRS-DC
     'I do not remember that he loved anybody.'

When the main verb is a non-factive verb (20 & 21), both local and
long distance licensing of the NPI are possible. On the contrary, as
shown in (22) and (23), factive verbs allow local licensing of NPI only.
These data can be explained if we assume, following Berman (1991)
and Pinar (1996), that the factive complement raises out of VP and
adjoins to IP at LF. The movement of the factive complement renders
the NPI out of the scope of the negation, making its licensing by the
negation in the main clause impossible. The unacceptability of the topic
phrase in the factive complement follows from the fact that the
restrictive clause is already occupied by the factive complement, and
hence the topic does not have a place to move into at LF.

The proposal that factive complement moves at LF can shed some light on the factive island sensitivity of adjuncts. In her discussion of the constraints on the extraction from 'picture' noun phrases, Diesing (1992) claims that an NP with a strong determiner is presupposed, and moves out of VP before LF; once the NP is moved out of VP, nothing can move out of the already moved NP. A similar analysis is applicable to the factive island sensitivity of adjuncts. The sentences in (24) and (25) present the contrast in grammaticality when a *wh-* argument or a *wh-*adjunct moves out of the factive complement.

(24) mwues$_1$-ul ne-nun [ku-ka t$_1$ sa-ss-ta-ko] kiekha-ni?
     what-ACC you-TOP he-NOM buy-PST-DC-COMP remember-Q?
     'What do you remember that he bought?'

(25) *way$_1$ ne-nun [ku-ka   ku chayk-ul t$_1$ sa-ss-ta-ko]
     Why you-TOP he-NOM the book-ACC   buy-PST-DC-COMP
     kiekha-ni?
     remember-Q?
     'Why do you remember that he bought the book?'

This contrast cannot be explained by subjacency or the shortest movement constraint since the distance of movement of the *wh-*phrases is the same in both cases. The LF raising approach can account for this contrast: after LF raising of the complement of the factive verb, the trace of the argument *wh-*phrase is still governed by the embedded verb and the sentence is grammatical. However, after LF raising of the embedded clause, the trace of the adjunct *wh-*phrase is not properly governed by its antecedent as shown in (26):

(26) LF: *[$_{IP}$ ku-ka   ku chayk-ul t$_1$ sa-ss- ta-ko]$_2$
             he-NOM   the book-ACC   t$_1$ buy-PST-DC-COMP
         way$_1$ ne-nun [t$_2$] kiekha-ni?
         why you-TOP   remember-Q?

The LF raising of factive complements may have some relevance in

accounting for the contrast shown in (27). Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1971) and Postal (1974) note that object raising in general operates only with non-factive verbs (27a), and thus factive verbs cannot have an infinitival complement even though they can select a finite complement with an equivalent meaning.

(27) a. I believe it to be possible for them to have visitors.
     b. He regrets that Bacon is the real author.
                                        (Kiparsky & Kiparsky, p. 161)
     c. * He regrets Bacon to be the real author.

The ungrammaticality of (27c) can be explained this way: since 'regret' has an accusative case to check, it should be possible for 'Bacon' to raise and get its case checked against 'regret' at LF[4]. However, if it is assumed that the infinitival complement raises at LF, then 'Bacon' is not in a position to check its case against 'regret', leading to the ungrammaticality observed. The general tendency of factive verbs' resistance to infinitival complements can be attributed to the raising of the presupposed complement at LF.

3,2. Relative Clauses

A functionalist analysis proposes that the relation between what is relativized and the proposition expressed by the relative clause is that of topic and comment (Kuno, 1973; Lambrecht, 1994). For example, in the phrase 'the man I saw this morning', 'the man' corresponds to the topic and 'I saw this morning' to the comment.

(29) The man [I saw this morning]
          topic   comment

In this construction, the entity 'the man' is singled out, and the

----

4) I assume that accusative case is weak in English and gets checked at LF. However, see Koizumi (1993) and Lasnik (2001) for analyses which propose overt object raising in English.

comment about that entity is added. My proposal adopts the functionalist perspective, but reinterprets it from a formalist perspective. I would argue that the relative head is mapped to the restrictive clause and the comment to the nuclear scope. The quantifier, the domain of which is restricted by the relative head, can be a definite determiner, which usually accompanies a relative head, or in some cases a specificity operator.

   That the relative clause forms the semantic tripartite structure, which consists of the quantifier, restrictive clause, and nuclear scope, was proposed by Basilico (1996) in his study of head internal relative clauses (IHRC) in some Amerindian languages. According to Basilico, in these languages, the internal head moves overtly out of the VP of the relative clause to escape existential closure, and is mapped to the restrictive clause. For example, in the following Diegueño relative clause, the demonstrative -*pu* functions as an iota operator which binds the variable within the relative clause. Thus, (30a) is interpreted as (30b):

   (30) .a. i:pac   'wu:w-pu-c
            man   I.saw-DEM-SUBJ
            'the man that I saw'
        b. (x) [man (x)] [I saw (x)]   (Basilico, p. 507)

Extending Basilico's theory, I propose that the same semantic structure is formed for externally headed relative clauses (EHRC) in Korean. In (31), the relative head is mapped into the restrictive clause, while the relative clause forms the nuclear scope. Since Korean does not have an overt definite determiner, I would assume that it has a covert determiner, which functions as an operator. Thus the sentence has roughly the LF form in (31b).

   (31) a. [nay-ka onul achim-ey   pho-n]   saram
            I-NOM this morning-in   see-REL   man
            'The man I saw this morning'

b. \<quantifier\> \< restrictive clause\> \<nuclear scope\>

ø	saram	nay-ka onul achim-ey bota
	man	I saw this morning
(x)	[man (x)]	[I saw (x) this morning]

The proposal that the relative head is mapped to the restrictive clause may provide some answer to a puzzle related to the behavior of a topic phrase. One restriction on the topic phrase in Korean is that it has to be definite. Thus, indefinite NPs including *wh*-pronouns cannot occur in the topic position, as shown in (32) and (33):

(32) *yecha hana-nun   kwisin-ul   cacwu po-n-ta.
     woman one-TOP   ghost-ACC   often   see-PRS-DC
     'A woman sees ghosts often.'   (Kim 1994: 223)

(33) nwu-*nun/ ka   tongsaron-lul   karuchi-ni?
     who- TOP/NOM   syntax-ACC   teach-Q
     'Who teaches syntax?'

However, as noted by Kim (1994), an indefinite NP is possible in the topic position when it is modified by a relative clause as in (34):

(34) Nay-ka a-nun   yech hana-nun kwishin-ul   cacwu   po-n- ta.
     I-NOM know-REL woman one-TOP ghost-ACC often   see-PRS-DC
     'A woman I know sees ghost often.'   (Kim 1994: 222)

Kim speculates that when an indefinite NP is modified by a relative clause, the definiteness restriction on the topic can be overridden. According to Diesing(1992), an indefinite NP is ambiguous between a cardinal reading and presuppositional reading. The presuppositional reading is obtained when the indefinite NP is raised and mapped to the restrictive clause. I would propose, based on Diesing, that the indefinite head of the relative clause in (34) raises and is mapped to the restrictive clause, resulting in the presuppositional interpretation, which helps overcome the definiteness restriction on the relative head.

3.3. Conditionals

Noting that conditional clauses and topics are marked with identical morphemes in a number of unrelated languages, Haiman (1978) proposed that conditionals be treated as topics. Shin (1987), based on Korean data, agrees with Haiman, and argues that in Korean, the topic marker *-nun,* the conditional marker *-myen*, and the relativizer *-un* are variable forms of the same morpheme, what is called an archimorpheme. He further argues that the semantic feature common to all these three constructions is 'presupposition'. With regard to the conditional construction, he states, "The antecedent of the conditional clause expresses a presupposition upon which the propositional content of the main clause is to be understood" (p.2).

A similar approach to Shin's with regard to the presuppositional nature of the antecedent of the conditional is found in Kratzer (1986), Partee (1995), and Hajičová et al. (1998). They consider that the main function of the if-clause is to restrict the domain of various operators. Sentence (35) may have the tripartite structure of (36), following Partee's scheme (1995). The function of the if‑clause in this sentence is to restrict the domain of the quantifier, *chomcherem* 'seldom'.

    (35) phi-ka   o-myen, wuri-nun chomcherem   chuwkku-lul
         rain-NOM come-if   we-TOP   seldom   soccer-ACC
         ha-chi   ahn-nun-ta.
         do-COMP   not-PRS-DC
         'If it rains, we seldom play soccor.'
    (36) Operator   restrictive clause nuclear scope
         chomcherem phi-ka o-myen   chwukku-lul ha-chi ahn-nun-ta.

I would suggest that the impossibility of a topic phrase in the if-clause is an indirect syntactic support for the mapping of the if-clause to the restrictive clause; once the restrictive clause is occupied by the raised if-clause, the topic phrase does not have a place to move into.

3.4. A Remaining Problem

I have proposed that topic phrases are not allowed in factive complements, relative clauses, and the antecedent of conditionals because these structures raise at LF and are mapped to the restrictive clause of the tripartite structure. In executing this proposal, a question remains to look into. Though a topic phrase is not allowed in the subordinate clause of the three constructions we have examined in this paper, a topic is possible in the main clause of these structures. In example (3), repeated here as (37), the pre-verbal NP in the main clause has the topic particle.

(37) Na-nun [Mary-ka/*nun ku il-ul   ha-n] kess-ul
     I-TOP   Mary-NOM/TOP the work-ACC do-ADN fact-acc
     kiekha-n-ta.
     remember-PRS-DC
     'I remember that Mary did the work.'

The word order of (37) at LF would be like (38) after LF raising of the factive complement.

(38) [Mary-ka/*nun ku   il-ul   ha-n] kess-ul   na-nun
     Mary-NOM/TOP the work-ACC do-ADN fact-ACC I-TOP
     kiekha-n-ta.
     remember-PRS-DC
     'I remember that Mary did the work.'

In this structure, if the topic of the main clause also has to be mapped to the restrictive clause, there does not seem to be an empty position for the topic to move into since the restrictive clause is already occupied by the factive complement.

One tack to try is to adopt the scope theory developed by Beghelli and Stowell (1995), a main point of which is that scope taking elements take different scope positions at LF. Pinar (1996) showed that Beghelli

and Stowell's proposal might be in the right direction through a comparison of the behavior of indicative and interrogative complements of factive verbs. In both cases, the complement raises at LF, the former as a presuppositional raising, and the latter as an interrogative raising. Pinar noted that even though both types of complements raise, they behave differently in their interaction with negative elements. In the case of the indicative complement in (39), the complement appears to be outside of the scope of the negative element in the main clause, while in the case of the interrogative complement in (40), it appears to be under the scope of the negative element.

(39) Rara vez ne acuerdo de que un estudiante hace-IND trampa
     Rarely I   remember   that a   student   cheats
     *For few x [student x∧cheat x][I remember student x∧cheat x]

(40) Rara   vez ne acuerdo de [que estudiantes hacen trampa]
     Rarely I remember   of   which students   cheat
     'I rarely remember which students cheat.'
     For few x [student x∧ cheat x][I remember student x∧ cheat x]

Pinar explains the difference in grammaticality between the two sentences by proposing that the indicative complement moves to a position above the negation or other negative elements, while the interrogative clause moves to a position under the scope of the negative element.

Adopting this line of analysis, I would speculate that in Korean the topic of the main clause with a factive verb is raised, but is not mapped to a position as high as the restrictive clause. A piece of data which might support this proposal is presented below.

(41) Panda-nun   daynamuw-lul   mek-nun-ta.
     Panda - TOP   bamboo -ACC   eat-PRS-DC.
     'Pandas eat bamboos'

(42) Daynamuw-nun   panda-ka   mek-nun-ta.
     Bamboo- TOP   panda-NOM   eat-PRS-DC
     'As for bamboos, pandas eat.'

Generic nouns in the pre-verbal position are marked with the topic particle and are possibly mapped to the restrictive clause (Kim, 1994). In (41), the generic noun 'panda' is marked by the topic marker -*nun*. However, in (42), it is the topicalized object which is marked by the topic marker, and the generic noun 'panda' is marked with the nominative case particle. If it is the case that generic NPs are to be mapped to a position outside the nuclear scope, in (42), 'panda' may be mapped to a position higher than the nuclear scope, but lower than the restrictive clause since the restrictive clause is already occupied by the topicalized object. One problem with this tack is, then, that it is not clear why the generic NP is marked by the nominative case particle while the main clause subject of a factive verb still gets the topic marker if both the generic NP and the factive main subject are mapped to a position lower than the restrictive clause and higher than the nuclear scope. Further research into this question is needed.

References

Beghelli, F. & Stowell, T. (1997). Distributivity and negation: The syntax of *each* and *every*. In A. Szabolcsi (Ed), *Ways of scope taking* (pp.71-108). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

Basilico, D. (1996). Head position and internally headed relative clauses. *Language*, 72(3), 498-532.

Berman, S. (1991). On the semantics and logical form of wh-clauses. Doctoral dissertation. University of Massachusetts. Amherst, MA.

Diesing, M. (1992). *Indefinites*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hajicová, E., Partee,B., & Sgall, P. (1998). *Topic-focus articulation, tripartite structures, and semantic content*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Haiman, J. (1978). Conditionals are topics. *Language,* 54(3), 564-589.

Kim, J-R (1994). *Korean topic constructions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Maryland. College Park, MD.

Kiparsky, C. & Kiparsky, P. (1971). Fact. In M. Bierwisch & K.

Heidolph (Eds.) *Progress in linguistics: A collection of papers.* (pp. 143 - 173). The Hague: Mouton.

Koizumi, M. (1993). Object agreement phrases and the split VP hypothesis. In *MIT working papers in linguistics 18* (pp. 99-148). Cambridge, MA: MITWPL.

Kratzer, A. (1986). Conditionals. In A. M. Farley, P. Farley, & K. E. McCullough (Eds.) *Papers from the parasession on pragmatics and grammatical theory* (pp.1-15). Chicago Linguistic Society.

Kuno, S. (1976). Subject, theme, and the speaker's empathy: A reexamination of relativization phenomenon. In C. Li & S. Thompson (Eds.) *Subject and topic* (pp. 417-444). New York: Academic Press.

Lambrecht, K. (1994). *Informational structure and sentence form: Topic, focus and the mental representations of discourse referents.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lasnik, H. (2001). Subjects, objects, and the EPP. in W. D. Davis & S. Dubinsky (Eds.) *Objects and other subjects: Grammatical functions, functional categories, and configurationality* (pp.103 - 122). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press.

Partee, B. (1995). Quantificational structures and compositionality. In E. Bach, E. Jelinek, A. Kratzer, & B. Partee (Eds.), *Quantification in natural languages* (pp.541-602). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

Pinar, L. P. (1996). *Negative polarity licensing and negative concord in the romance languages.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Arizona. Tucson, AZ.

Postal, P. (1974). *On raising: One rule of English grammar and its theoretical implications.* Boston, MA: MIT Press.

Shin, S-C (1987). *A unifying theory of topic, conditional and relative constructions in Korean: A case for archimorpheme across syntactic categories.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Michigan. Ann Arbor, MI

Hyeson Park
Department of English Language and Literature
Keimyung University
1000 Shindan-Dong, Dalseo-Gu, Daegu, 704-70, Korea
Phone: 053-580-5091
Email: parkhy@kmu.ac.kr