

The Study of Subject Honorific Marker -(u)si- in RRG*

Byung-sun Yaang

(Univ. of Washington & Jeonju University)

Yaang, Byung-sun. 2006. The Study of Subject Honorific Marker -(u)si- in RRG. *The Linguistics Association of Korean Journal*, 14(3), 95-115. The framework in which this investigation is to be carried out is Role and Reference Grammar[RRG]. In this paper, I investigate Korean subject honorific marker -(u)si- and suggest that it is not the grammatical inflectional operator such as aspect, modality and tense, but the result of lexical phenomena like passive or causative suffixes -i-, -hi-, -li-, and -ki-. Also this paper shows how the subject honorification can be handled without mentioning grammatical relations in RRG. This analysis satisfies RRG's assumption that the ordering of the morphemes expressing operators with respect to the verb indicates their relative scope and that there is a relative order among the morphemes with reference to the nucleus.

Key Words: Role and Reference Grammar, subject honorific marker -(u)si-, subject honorification, grammatical inflectional operator

1. Introduction

The framework in which this investigation is to be carried out is Role and Reference Grammar[RRG]. In RRG, a structuralist-functional theory of grammar, developed and presented in Foley and Van Valin (1984), Van Valin(1993, 2004, 2005), and Van Valin and LaPolla(1997),

* This research was done while I stayed in the Dept. of Linguistics, Univ. of Washington in Seattle as a visiting scholar in 2002-2003 and earlier versions of this paper were presented at the 2005 Spring Conference of the Linguistic Association of Korea held at Chonnam National University on May 14th and at the Spring Conference of the Society of Modern Grammar held at Daegu University on May 28th. I am grateful to the audience and anonymous reviews of *The Linguistics Association of Korean Journal* for their valuable discussion and comments.

grammatical categories like aspect, tense, and modality are treated as operators modifying different layers of the clause. The operators consist of morphemes which are the realization of grammatical categories of aspect, tense, and modality, while the constituents of the layered structure consist of the predicate, its arguments, and periphery. One of the major claims regarding operators made in RRG is that the ordering of the morphemes expressing operators with respect to the verb indicates their relative scope and is that there is a relative order among the morphemes with reference to the nucleus.

The categories of tense, aspect, and modality are expressed with verbal inflections in Korean. The verbal suffixes (also negation prefixes) express various grammatical functions. Korean is a typical agglutinative language in the sense that verb affixes are attached to the verb stem and the ordering among the verb affixes is fixed as in (1).

- (1) *apechi-kkeyse kel-(usi)-lswuiss-ess-kess-upni-ta*
 father-NOM(HON) go-(SH)-ABLE-PST-PRESUM-POL-DEC
 '(I) guess(POL) that father(HON) might walk(HON).'

The only grammatical form (1) is with elements in the following arrangement: verb stem - subject honorific suffix - ability suffix - tense suffix - guess suffix - polite suffix - declarative suffix. The other orderings are impossible.

Korean is a well known language for its rich system of honorifics. In Korean, it is conventional to use an honorific expression when addressing a person to whom the speaker is expected to show deference such as old people and parents. The honorifics are expressed with inflectional suffixes: the subject honorific suffix *-(u)si-*, the object honorific suffix *-tuli-*, and the polite suffix *-(u)p-*. The subject honorific suffix *-(u)si-* indicates the speaker's deference to the subject of the clause. The object honorific suffix *-tuli-* indicates the speaker's deference to the object of a predication. The morphemes *-(u)si-* and *-tuli-* are also called 'the reference-honorific' markers and the polite suffix *-(u)p-* is also called 'addressee honorific' marker. As for the

position of the honorific suffixes, the honorific suffix *-(u)si-* can be attached to the verb stem. Nothing except a passive or causative suffix can intervene between a verb stem and honorific suffix as in (2).

- (2) a. emeni-kkeyse atul-eykey pap-lul mek-i-(si)-ess-ta
 mother-NOM(HON) son-DAT meal-ACC give-CAU-(SH)-PST-DEC
 'Mother(HON) fed(HON) (her) son'
 b. *emeni-kkeyse atul-eykey pap-lul mek-i-ess-(si)-ta
 mother-NOM(HON) son-DAT meal-ACC give-CAU-PST-(SH)-DEC
 c. *emeni-kkeyse atul-eykey pap-lul mek-i-ilswu-(si)-ess-ta
 mother-NOM(HON) son-DAT meal-ACC give-CAU-ABLE-SH-PST-DEC

This suffix would be used if the referent in question (especially subject) is senior to the speaker in terms of age and/or higher in social status. Thus, many studies (cf. Kuno and Y.J. Kim 1985; C. Youn 1989) treat this honorific suffix as a test for subjecthood and/or subject honorific marker. Thus, the honorific suffix is either a core or a clause operator in RRG's concept of operators in the layered structure of the clause, since core operators modify the relation between a core argument (i.e. subject) and the action, and clausal operators modify the clause as a whole.

A question will be raised if we suggest that the subject honorific marker *-(u)si-* is a grammatical inflectional operator, which is either a core or a clause operator, since it indicates the speaker's (i.e. core argument) deference to the subject of the clause. However, it can be attached to the verb stem and nothing except a passive or causative suffix can intervene between a verb stem and honorific suffix as in (2). It seems to go against Bybee's relevance principle¹⁾ and RRG's claim that there is a relative order among the morphemes with reference to the grammatical categories and assumes that the ordering indicates their

1) Bybee (1985) points out that the categories of tense, aspect, and modality tend to be expressed cross-linguistically with verbal inflections and proposes Relevance Principle, which dictates that a morpheme whose meaning is more relevant to the semantics of the verb is positioned closer to the verb stem.

relative scopes. Subject honorific suffix, which can be regarded as core or clause operator if it is considered as a grammatical operator, is closer to the nucleus than the morphemes realizing nuclear operators. According to RRG's assumption, it should be outside of those signalling nuclear and/or core operators.(Van Valin 2005:11).

In this paper, I will investigate the subject honorific marker *-(u)si-* and suggest that it is not a grammatical inflectional operator, but the result of lexical or semantic phenomena, as somewhere I(B.S. Yang 1994) suggested an alternative analysis in which the highest ranking argument with respect to the Actor-Undergoer Hierarchy controls subject honorification. This analysis satisfies RRG's assumption that the fixed linear ordering of verb suffixes shows that relative ordering reflects the scope of the operator. To do these, §2 will introduce the RRG theory of clause structure and notions of operators, §3 will argue that subject honorific suffix *-(u)si-* is a lexical morpheme not a grammatical inflectional operator, and §4 will show how the subject honorifics can be handled in RRG. §5 will be the conclusion of this study.

2. Theoretical Background of RRG²⁾

RRG takes language to be a system of communicative social action, in which grammatical structures are employed to express meaning in context(Van Valin 2005:1). From this viewpoint, RRG is concerned with the interplay of syntax, semantics and pragmatics in grammatical system and the representation of clauses must allow for the representation of all of these factors. Under the RRG notion of

2) This paper assumes familiarity with the fundamental principles and ideas of RRG. This section will mention the principles of RRG which is relevant to this paper. To see more through principles of RRG, refer to Van Valin(1993, 2004, 2005), Van Valin and LaPolla(1997) and B.S. Yang(1994, 1997). To see RRG's principles in short, refer to Van Valin(1998) and Butler(2003), among others. Butler(2003) is a critical introduction to RRG along with a comparison of it with Functional Grammar and Systemic Functional Grammar. To see some extensive studies of Korean in the RRG framework, refer to B.S. Yang(1994, 1996a, b, 1997, 1998, 1999), K.S. Park(1995), H. Lee(1998), J. Han(1999), among others.

(non-relational) clause (i. e. syntactic) structure, the layered structure of the clause [LSC] is represented in the Constituent Projection. Morphologically realized grammatical categories like aspect, tense, and modality are treated as operators modifying different layers of the clause, and are represented in the Operator Projection³⁾.

2.1. RRG Theory of Clause Structure: the Layered Structure of the Clause

RRG does not posit any abstract underlying syntactic representation; the syntactic representation of a sentence corresponds closely to its actually occurring form. Accordingly, it rejects the standard formats for representing clause structure, such as grammatical relations and x-bar syntax, because they do not have universal applicability. The RRG notion of (non-relational) clause structure is called 'layered structure of the clause'[LSC] and it is based on two fundamental contrasts: between the predicate and non-predicating elements, on the one hand, and, among the non-predicating elements, between arguments and non-arguments, on the other. On this view, there are three layers which constitute a clause, each enclosing the lower one: the innermost layer is the 'nucleus', which contains the predicate(usually a verb); the 'core', which contains the nucleus plus all arguments of its predicate; the outermost layer is the 'clause'. The 'periphery' consists of adjuncts, e.g. locative and temporal adverbials which modify the core within the clause⁴⁾. The representation of layered structure itself is referred to as

3) Two other projections are Linking from Semantics to Clause Structure and Focus Structure Projection. The pragmatically motivated focus structure of RRG is represented in the Focus Structure Projection.

4) These units(NUC, CORE, CLAUSE and PERIPHERY) are syntactic units, while the units predicate and argument are semantic. A major difference between RRG and some other theories is that the category of VP, which plays a central role in Chomskyan approaches, has no analogue in the layered structure of the clause. In RRG, the VP is treated not as the conception of clause structure, but as focus structure which is pragmatically motivated.(see Van Valin 2005: §3.5) There are two additional elements which may appear in a simple sentence, the 'precore slot'[PrCS]/ 'postcore slot'[PoCS] which is clause-internal

the Constituent Projection in RRG.

2.2. RRG Theory of Grammatical Categories: Operators

In RRG, grammatical categories such as aspect, tense, negation, and modality (determiners, negation, and quantifiers in NP) are treated as operators⁵⁾, which modify different layers of the clause (and NP). Each of the clause and NP levels, i. e. nucleus, core, and clause/NP, may be modified by one or more operators. The operators are further divided into categories according to their scope: Nuclear, Core, and Clausal operators. The nuclear operators scope over the nucleus; they modify the action, event, or state itself without reference to the participants. Core operators modify the relation between a core argument, normally the actor, and the action. Clausal operators, which fall into two groups, one containing tense and status, and the other evidentials and illocutionary force, modify the clause as a whole. Each of the clause levels is modified by one or more of the operators as in table 1.

but core-external, and the 'left detached position' [LDP]/ 'right detached position' [RDP] which is outside of the clause but within the sentence. (cf. Van Valin 2005: §1.1).

5) Both RRG and Functional Grammar [FG] employ layered conceptions of clause structure. Both theories posit operators modifying different clause layers. One of the differences between the two systems is that FG takes the operators to be part of the layers, while RRG does not (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997:46).

Table 1. Operators in the Layered Structure of the Clause in RRG
(cf. Van Valin 2005:9)

Nuclear operators:
Aspect
Negation
Directionals (only those modifying orientation of action or event without reference to participants)
Core operators:
Directionals (only those expressing the orientation or motion of one participant with reference to another participant or to the speaker)
Event Quantification
Modality (root modals, e. g. ability, permission, obligation)
Internal (narrow scope) negation
Clausal operators:
Status (epistemic modals)/ External (wide scope) negation
Tense
Evidentials
Illocutionary Force [IF]

One of the major claims regarding operators made in RRG is that the ordering of the morphemes expressing operators with respect to the verb indicates their relative scope. That is, taking the nucleus as the reference point, the morphemes realizing nuclear operators should be closer to the nucleus than those expressing core operators, and those manifesting clausal operators should be outside of those signalling nuclear and core operators. This claim assumes, crucially, that a relative order among morphemes with reference to the nucleus can be established. If, for example, tense is a prefix and aspect is a suffix on the verb, then no relative ordering can be determined and therefore this claim is not applicable; if, on the other hand, both are suffixes, then the claim is that the aspect suffix would be between the verb stem and the tense suffix⁶.(Van Valin 2005:11)

6) This claim can be validated from the large number of languages that are surveyed in Foley and Van Valin(1984) and Bybee(1985), and no exceptions to this general claim are found. According to this view, there are two possible linear orderings of operators depending on the position of verb stem, as in (i). Refer to B.S. Yang(1994, 1999) for the relative order among the morphemes of Korean.

Since operators are technically not part of the nucleus, core, or periphery, but are modifiers of these units, they are represented in a distinct projection of the clause from predicates and argument (i.e. Constituent Projection): Operator Projection. The two projections are joined through the nucleus, which is the central element in the clause both in terms of defining the range of possible arguments and being the primary entity to which the operator grammatical categories are oriented (cf. refer to Van Valin 2005: figure 1.4 for LSC with operator and constituent projections in RRG)

3. Subject Honorific Marker *-(u)si-* as a Lexical Morpheme not as a Grammatical Inflectional Operator.

As mentioned in §2.2, RRG follows the general assumption that there is a relative order among the morphemes with reference to the nucleus and assumes that the ordering indicates their relative scopes. When an ordering relationship can be established among operators, they are always ordered in the same way cross-linguistically, such that their linear order reflects their scope. Thus, the ordering restrictions on the morpheme expressing the operators are universal. That is, the morphemes realizing nuclear operators should be closer to the nucleus than those realizing core or clausal operators, and those expressing core operators should be between those realizing nuclear operators and clausal operators, and those manifesting clausal operators should be outside of those signaling nuclear and core operators⁷⁾.

As mentioned in §1, however, subject honorific suffix, which could be regarded as a core or a clause operator if it is considered as a

-
- (i) a. IF-EVID-TENSE-STATUS-MOD-DIR-ASPECT-Verb Stem
(cf. Tiwi of Australia, English)
b. Verb Stem-ASPECT-DIR-MOD-STATUS-TENSE-EVID-IF
(cf. Kewa, Lisu(Tibeto-Burman), Imbarura Quechua, Turkish, Japanese, Korean)

7) It should be noted that within a group of operators at the same level, there is some variation in ordering. Aspect is normally inside of nuclear directionals, but in a few languages it occurs outside of them. Tense and status vary in their position relative to each other across languages, but they are always inside of evidentials and illocutionary force.

grammatical inflectional operator, occurs inside of nuclear aspect and directionals. According to RRG's assumption, it should be outside of those signalling nuclear and/or core operators. It will lead to a serious problem of RRG's general assumption that the ordering of the morphemes expressing operators with respect to the verb indicates their relative scopes. If we consider the honorific suffixes are lexically-based suffixes like lexical passives/ causatives or are handled with pragmatic phenomena, not grammatical categories like aspect, tense, and modality, this analysis satisfies RRG's assumption. Also, it fully follows the RRG operator system.

The idea that the honorific suffixes are lexically-based suffixes like lexical passives/ causatives and can be handled with pragmatic phenomena is supported by several kinds of evidence. First, the occurrence of the subject honorific suffix is optional unlike other inflectional morphemes such as tense, aspect, and modality as in (3)⁸⁾.

- (3) a. emeni-ka atul-eykey pap-lul mek-i-(si)-*(ess)-ta
 mother-NOM son-DAT meal-ACC give-CAU-(SH)-PST-DEC
 'Mother fed(HON) (her) son'
 b. sensayngnim-i o-(si)-*(n)-ta
 teacher(HON)-NOM come-(SH)-PRES-DEC.
 '(A) teacher(HON) comes(HON).'

8) It should be noted that the optionality is not the characteristic of derivational or lexically-based suffixes as one of anonymous reviewers of *The Linguistics Association of Korean Journal* suggests, since the other lexical morphemes such passive or causative suffixes are not optional like inflectional suffixes as in (i).

- (i) Chulsoo-ka atul-eykey pap-lul mek-*(i)-*(ess)-ta
 -NOM son-DAT meal-ACC give-CAU-PST-DEC
 'Chulsoo fed (his) son'

In RRG, the grammatical operators are represented in operators, while lexical passives are formulated in terms of the hierarchy of PSA selection(cf. §4.1), and causatives are represented in clause linkage and interclausal relations hierarchy(cf. B.S. Yang1998). Refer to §4.2 for subject honorific marker *-(u)si-* as a lexically-based suffix in RRG.

- c. *apeci-ka* *piano-lul* *chi-(si)-*(ess)-*(sup)-nikka ?*
 father-NOM piano-ACC play-(SH)-PST-POL-Q
 'Did Father play(HON) the piano ?'

Second, let's examine the following sentences with the subject honorific suffix and non-human subject.

- (4) a. *sensaynim, ton-i* *iss-(usi)-sip-nikka ?*
 sir, money-NOM have-(SH)-POL-Q
 'Do (you) have(HON) money, sir ?'
- b. **apechi, chinchi-ka* *sik-usi-pni-ta.*
 father meal(HON)-NOM getting.cold-SH-POL-DEC
- b'. *apechi, chinchi-ka* *sik-supni-ta.*
 father meal(HON)-NOM getting.cold-POL-DEC
 'Father, the meal is getting cold.'

In (4a) the subject honorific suffix is possible with non-human subject while it is impossible in (4b). In (4a) the subject of the sentence, *ton* 'money', is not the entity of honorific, but the addressee, *sensaynim* 'sir'. In (4b), not only the subject *chinchi* 'meal(HON)' but also the addressee *apechi* 'father' cannot be the entity of subject honorifics while *apechi* 'father' is possible for addressee honorifics as it takes the deferential ending *-(su)pnita* as in (4b'). These show that the subject honorific should be handled with pragmatic phenomena, not grammatical phenomena.

Third, the honorific marker *-(u)si-* does not have any syntactic restriction for its use in complex sentences, unlike tense, aspect, and modality (J.I. Kwon 1985:12) as shown in (5).

- (5) a. *emeni-ka* *piano-lul* *chi-(si)-ko-iss-(usi)-ess-ta*
 mother-NOM piano-ACC play-(SH)-CONN-CONT-(SH)-PST-DEC
 'Mother was playing(HON) the piano.'
- b. *emeni-ka* *piano-lul* *chi-(si)-ko* *nolay-lul* *pwulu-(si)-ess-ta*
 mother-NOM piano-ACC play-SH-CONN song-ACC sing-SH-PST-DEC

'Mother sang a song while playing the piano.'

'Mother played the piano and then sang a song.'

c. emeni-ka piano-lul chi-(si)-ko
 mother-NOM piano-ACC play-(SH)-CONN
 apeci-ka nolay-lul pwulu-(si)-ess-ta
 father-NOM song-ACC sing-(SH)-PST-DEC

'Mother played the piano, while father sang a song.'

At each level of a complex sentence(i.e. a nuclear juncture (5a), a core juncture (5b), and a clausal juncture (5c))⁹⁾, the honorific suffix can occur in each constituent. That is, the suffix can occur at either the nuclear level, the core level, or the clause level, even though it is not obligatory.

Fourth, the existence of special honorific verbs in Korean is further evidence that the honorific morpheme is lexical rather than grammatical. In Korean, some verbs have their own lexicalized honorific form as well as a plain form. Examples of verbs with two forms are given in (6)¹⁰⁾.

9) The taxonomy of clause linkage in RRG is based on two concepts: juncture, the theory of units for complex sentence constructions, and nexus, the theory of relations for complex sentence constructions. RRG takes the units in complex constructions to be those of the layered structure of the clause: nucleus, core, and clause. Linkage in the complex constructions is possible at any layer of the clause. RRG also posits three nexus relations between clauses in complex sentences(coordiantion, subordinantion, and cosubordination). Refer to B.S. Yang(1994) for nine linkage categories and the juncture-nexus types and interclausal relations hierarchy in Korean and B.S. Yang(1998) for clause linkage of phrasal causative constructions and the IRH in Korean.

10) However, these two forms of verbs have its own specific usage. Plain verb+ subject honorific suffix *-(u)si-* can be detachable from the verb as in (ib), while the honorific verbs cannot be as in (iib).

- (i) a. apeci-ka hakkyo-ey iss-(usi)-ess-ta
 father-NOM school-LOC be-(SH)-PST-DEC
 'Father was(HON) in the school.'
 b. apeci-ka hakkyo-ey iss-e-po-(si)-ess-ta
 father-NOM school-LOC be-CONN-try-SH-PST-DEC
 'Father tried to be(HON) in the school.'
- (ii) a. apeci-ka hakkyo-ey keysi-ess-ta
 father-NOM school-LOC be(HON)-PST-DEC
 'Father was (HON) in the school.'

(6) Verb Forms

<u>Honorific Verbs</u>	<u>Plain Verbs</u>	<u>English glosses</u>
kyesi-ta	iss-ta	'be'
phyenchanusi-ta	apwu-ta	'sick'
capswus-ta/tusi-ta	mek-ta	'eat'
cwumwusi-ta	ca-ta	'sleep'
tolakasi-ta	cwuk-ta	'die'

Also, there are lexicalized honorific nouns as well as plain nouns as in (7)

<u>(7) Honorific Nouns</u>	<u>Plain Nouns</u>	<u>English glosses.</u>
chinch	pap	'meal'
chia	i	'teeth'
tayk	chip	'house'
conham	ilum	'name'
yakcwu	swul	'wine'
malsum	mal	'speaking'
pyengwhan	pyeng	'sick'
sayngsin	sayngil	'birthday'
yensey	nai	'age'

For plain nouns referring human beings can be used with honorific particle *-nim* to show honorific as in (8).

<u>(8) Honorific Nouns</u>	<u>Plain Nouns</u>	<u>English glosses.</u>
<i>apenim</i>	apecthi	'father'
<i>halapenim</i>	halapecthi	'grandfather'
<i>nuwnim</i>	nwuna	'elder sister'
<i>atunim</i>	atul	'son'
<i>ttanim</i>	ttal	'daughter'
Kim sensayng <i>nim</i>	Kim sensayng	'Mr/Mrs Kim'
Pak moksa <i>nim</i>	Pak moksa	'Minister Park'

Contrary to plain nouns, the honorific noun should be used with honorific subject marker *-kkeyse*¹¹⁾ instead of plain subject marker

b. *apeci-ka hakkyo-ey key-e-po-si-ess-ta
 father-NOM school-LOC be(HON)-try-SH-PRES-DEC
 'Father tried to be(HON) in the school.'

11) The honorific indirect object marker *-kkey* instead of plain indirect object marker *-eykey* is used for the honorific of indirect object in Korean.

-i/ka and should be matched with honorific verbs. That is, an honorific noun occurring as subject(or object) should be used with an honorific verb, not with an plain verb, as in (9) (cf. H.B. Lee 1989:58).

- (9) *emenim-kkeyse* *cwumwusi-n-ta*
 mother(HON)-NOM(HON) sleep(HON)-PRES-DEC
 'Mother(HON) sleeps(HON).'
- (cf. ??*emenim-kkeyse* *ca-n-ta*
 mother(HON)-NOM(HON) sleep-PRES-DEC)

If an honorific form of the verb does not exist, however, a plain verb is used with the honorific suffix *-(u)si-*.

- (10) *emenim-kkeyse* *hakkyo-ey ka-*(si)-n-ta*
 emenim(HON)-NOM(HON) school-to go-SH-PRES-DEC
 'Mother(HON) goes(HON) to school.'

In (10), the honorific marker *-(u)si-* is obligatory. These phenomena show that the honorific suffixes are used instead of honorific form of the verbs(i.e. lexical forms, not grammatical operators) and support the idea that the honorific suffixes are derivational or lexical like passive or causative suffixes *-i-*, *-hi-*, *-li-*, and *-ki-* rather than inflectional or grammatical like aspect, modality and tense.

4. How can the subject honorific *-(u)si* be handled in RRG ?

As shown in §3, the subject honorific *-(u)si-* is lexical or pragmatic rather than grammatical operator. How can the syntactic grammatical processes of subject honorification be handled in RRG ? In this section we will show how macroroles, non-macrorole core arguments and syntax-semantics interface handle it within in RRG. Other syntactic theories explain the syntactic grammatical processes of subject

honorification (as well as case-marking), directly (RelG, GB) or indirectly (CG) with grammatical relations. Since RRG has no place for grammatical relations such as subject and object, case marking and agreement must be accounted using other notions. RRG handles the case marking and agreement with macroroles and direct core argument status (refer to Van Valin 2005: chapter 5 for Russian, English, Icelandic, and German finite verb agreement). In B. S. Yang (1994: §2.3.2.2), I suggested an alternative analysis in which the highest ranking argument with respect to the Actor-Undergoer Hierarchy controls subject honorification within RRG's syntax-semantics interface framework without invoking any grammatical relations. This supports that subject honorific *-(u)si-* suffix is the result of lexical or semantic phenomena, too.

4.1. Syntax-semantics Interface in RRG

RRG's assumptions regarding grammatical relations are different from other theories on three points: i) RRG does not consider the grammatical relations to be basic, like RelG and LFG do, nor does it derive them from structural configurations, like GB does, ii) RRG recognizes only one syntactic function, not up to three like other theories; there is nothing in RRG corresponding to notions like direct object and indirect object, and iii) RRG does not assume that grammatical relations are universal, but assumes that semantic roles are universal (Van Valin 2005:89). The central concept in RRG for handling grammatical relations is the 'privileged syntactic argument of grammatical construction' [PSA]. The notion of PSAs¹²⁾ is different from

12) The privileged syntactic arguments, which are pivots and controllers, can be divided into two sub-types: syntactic and semantic pivots and controllers depending on whether the distinction between two or more semantic roles is neutralized for syntactic purposes (cf. Van Valin 2005: §4.1). In addition the syntactic pivots and controller can be divided into variable and invariable depending on whether the selection of the PSA is not fixed. RRG selection of the argument to function as PSA in a syntactic construction can vary depending upon whether discourse-pragmatic considerations influence this selection (Van

syntactic subject on two points: i) pivots are construction-specific, while grammatical relations like subject are not, ii) there are many languages like Jakalteq (Van Valin 1981) or Sama (Walton 1986) in which the PSA is not the same as subject¹³⁾ as defined by case-marking and verb agreement, even though the PSA is the same with syntactic subject in English. The choice of PSA for transitive verbs, which have both actor and undergoer, depends on whether the language is syntactically accusative (i.e. English, Korean) or ergative (i.e. Kalkatungu, Sama) as PSA selection hierarchy (11) and the accessibility to PSA principles (12):

- (11) Privileged syntactic argument selection hierarchy
 - arg. of DO > 1st arg. of **do'** > 1st arg. of **pred'**(x,y) > 2nd arg. of **pred'**(x,y) > arg. of **pred'**(x)
- (12) Accessibility to privileged syntactic argument principles
 - a. Accusative constructions: highest ranking direct core argument in terms of (11) (default) (i.e. English, Korean)
 - b. Ergative constructions: lowest ranking direct core argument in terms of (11) (default) (i.e. Dyirbal, Sama, Kalkatungu)

The principles in (11) and (12) may express the default selection in languages with voice oppositions. In RRG passive is formulated in terms of the hierarchy of PSA selection in (12a): passive always involves a marked PSA choice, with the undergoer appearing as PSA in the default situation. While there are languages such as German, Italian and Indonesian in which only macrorole arguments (i.e. undergoer) may appear as PSA in a passive construction, however, there are languages in which non-macrorole direct core arguments can be PSA as in Icelandic, Georgian, Kinyarwanda. For example, a dative NP in Icelandic sentences may function as a true PSA in a passive construction, in which

Valin 2005: §4.3).

13) In Jakalteq, for example, there are five different PSAs for seven major grammatical constructions surveyed in Van Valin (1981). For these languages the assumption that there is a single notion of subject operative in the grammatical system is extremely problematic. (Van Valin 2005:99)

Icelandic differs from German, in which dative subjects in passives do not take on the behavioral properties of nominative subjects and in permitting non-macrorole arguments to function as the PSA in certain constructions. This contrast is stated as the restrictions on PSA in terms of macrorole status in addition to the principles in (12) and (12)(cf. Van Valin 2005:§4.5 in details).

In RRG morphosyntactic functions and structures are based on the lexical-semantic properties of verbs. The lexical representation of a given predicate determines the morphosyntactic functions. This is why an uncommonly rich system for the lexical decomposition of verbs is used to define the thematic relations which are linked to syntactic positions via the semantic macroroles.¹⁴⁾

4.2. Subject Honorification in Korean

In Korean, subject honorification as well as reflexivization, and *-myense* constructions are regarded as tests of subjecthood in other theories (Shibatani 1976, 1977, 1990, Kuno and Y-J Kim 1985, C. Youn 1986, 1989) but will be handled using thematic roles and macroroles here. In Korean, like Icelandic, the NOM NP is the actor, and functions as syntactic subject. The ACC NP is the undergoer and works as syntactic object in most clauses. The NOM NP always controls subject honorification as well as reflexivization, and *-myense* constructions (cf. B.S. Yang 1994:§2.3). This is illustrated in (13).

- (13) *apeci-kkeyse Swunhi-lul ttayli-si-ess-ta*
 father-NOM(HON) -ACC hit-SH-PST-DEC
 'Father(HON) hit(HON) Soonhi.'

14) There are two discrete levels: Logical Structure and Syntactic Function. The levels are linked through a linking algorithm. Such an algorithm "is central to a theory like RRG that posits only one level of syntactic representation, for it must be able to deal not only with canonical clause patterns as well." (Van Valin 2005:128) Refer to Van Valin(2005:129, Figure 5.16) for a representation of linking syntactic and semantic representation in RRG.

In (13), the actor(i.e. *apeci* 'father') controls subject honorification. That is, the highest ranking macrorole(i.e. actor) is the controller in this syntactic construction. The finite verb agreement rule for Russian, English, Icelandic and German¹⁵⁾ can apply to the subject honorific syntactic construction as follows:

(14) Subject Honorific Agreement in Korean

The highest ranking macrorole is the controller of subject honorification.

However, this syntactic rule can not apply to Korean stative psych-verb constructions, in which there is only one macrorole(i.e. undergoer), since they are unaccusatives, even though there are two core arguments. In psych-verb constructions which are regarded as unaccusatives and M-intransitives, not only the NOM NP, but also the DAT NP, which is non-macrorole core argument¹⁶⁾, can act as controller of honorification as in (15).

- (15) a.*Swunhi-ka /-eykey apeci-kkese mwusewu-si-ta
 -NOM /-DAT father-HON-NOM fear-SH-DEC
 'Soonhi fears(HON) father(HON).'
- b. apeci-kkese /kkey swunhi-ka mwusewu-si-ta
 father-NOM/DAT(HON) -NOM fear-SH-DEC
 'Father(HON) fears(HON) Soonhi.'

In (15), the single macrorole is an undergoer, which receives nominative case(i.e. the second NOM NP), but the remaining argument is non-macrorole core argument, which receives dative case(i.e. the first

15) The finite verb agreement rule for Russian, English, Icelandic and German is given in (i).(Van Valin 2005:108)

(i) The finite verb agreement in Russian, English, Icelandic and German
 The controller of finite verb agreement is the highest ranking macrorole argument.

16) See B. S Yang(1994:§2.1.3) for detailed arguments in support of the conclusion that stative psych-verbs are intransitive states(i.e. **predicate'**(x,y)[+MR], unaccusatives, M-intransitives) and first NOM NP and DAT NP is non-macrorole core argument.

NOM NP). The DAT NP or the first NOM NP, not the second NOM NP, controls subject honorification. The ungrammaticality of (15a) shows that the second NOM *apeci* (i.e. theme, undergoer) cannot trigger subject honorification. The grammaticality of (15b) shows that either a NOM or a DAT experiencer (i.e. *apeci*) triggers honorification. An experiencer, which is non-macrorole, functions as a true PSA for honorification in stative psych verb constructions. Case-marking does not matter for honorific agreement. This points out that these syntactic phenomena are sensitive to either case-marking or word order.

These cases of stative psych verbs can not be explained with the general rule for determining controller for subject agreement (14) since the DAT nominal is not macrorole in DAT-NOM constructions. Instead of following the rule in (14), the controller of subject honorification is always the experiencer argument, not the undergoer (i.e. theme) as in (15). As mentioned in §4.1, in Icelandic, Georgian, Japanese, Korean, and Kinyarwanda, non-macrorole arguments can be PSA. A dative NP in Icelandic sentences may function as a true PSA in passive construction, as shown in Van Valin (2005:§4.5). These syntactic phenomena can be explained in terms of the same PSA selection proposed for Icelandic passive construction: "the highest ranking argument with respect to the Actor end of the Actor-Undergoer Hierarchy, regardless of whether it is a macrorole or not, is the PSA." (Van Valin 1991b:181) From these we can generalize the controller for Honorific Agreement (as well as Reflexivization, and *-myense* constructions) in Korean psych-verbs as follows:

(16) Subject Honorific Agreement in psych-verb constructions

The highest ranking argument with respect to the Actor end of the Actor-Undergoer Hierarchy, regardless of whether it is a macrorole or not, is the controller for honorification.

This supports RRG's assumption that semantic roles are universal in that the controller is determined on semantic ground without concern for grammatical relations or case-marking.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I investigate Korean subject honorific marker *-(u)si-* and suggest that it is not the grammatical inflectional operator such as aspect, modality and tense, but the result of lexical phenomena like passive or causative suffixes *-i-*, *-hi-*, *-li-*, and *-ki-*. Also this paper shows how the subject honorification can be handled without mentioning grammatical relations in RRG. That is, I suggest an alternative analysis in which the highest ranking argument with respect to the Actor-Undergoer Hierarchy controls subject honorification. This analysis satisfies RRG's assumption that the ordering of the morphemes expressing operators with respect to the verb indicates their relative scope and that there is a relative order among the morphemes with reference to the nucleus

References

- Butler, Christopher. (2003). *Structure and Function: a Guide to Three Major Structural-Functional Theories* (2vols.). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bybee, Joan. (1985). *Morphology*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Foley, William A. and Van Valin, Robert D., Jr. (1984). *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Han, Jeonghan. (1999). *Morphosyntactic Coding of Information Structure in Korea (Multiple Case Marking, Light Verb Construction, Quantifier Float): A Role and Reference Grammar Account*. Published Ph. D. dissertation, SUNY at Buffalo. Seoul: Hankuk Publisher.
- Kuno, Susumu and Young-Joo Kim. (1985). The Honorific Forms of Compound Verbals in Korean. In Susumu Kuno et. al.(eds), *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* (pp. 178-189). Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co.
- Kwon, Jae-il. (1985). *Kwuke-uy Pokhappmwun Kwuseng Yenkwu* [A

- Study on Complex Sentence Constructions in Korean*] (written in Korean). Seoul: Cipmwuntang.
- Lee, Hansol H.B. (1989). *Korean Grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, Heechul. (1998). *The Syntax and Semantics of the Korean Periphrastic Causative Construction*. Published Ph. D. dissertation, SUNY at Buffalo. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co.
- Park, Ki-Seong. (1995). *The Semantics and Pragmatics of Case Marking in Korean: A Role and Reference Grammar Account*. Published Ph. D. dissertation, SUNY at Buffalo.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. (1976). Relational Grammar and Korean Syntax. *Language Research*, 12(2), 241-251.
- (1977). Grammatical Relations and Surface Cases. *Language* 53, 789-809.
- (1990). *Language of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Valin, Robert D., Jr. (1981). Grammatical Relations in Ergative Languages. *Studies in Language* 5, 361-394.
- (1993). A Synopsis of Role and Reference Grammar. In Robert D. Van Valin(ed), *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar* (pp.1-164). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- (1998). A Brief Overview of Role and Reference Grammar. *Linguistics* 6(1), 235-272, published by the Linguistic Association of Korea.
- (2001). *An Introduction to Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2004). *The Syntax-Semantics-Pragmatics Interface: An Introduction to Role and Reference Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2005). *Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- and Randy J. LaPolla. (1997). *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walton, Charles. (1986). Sama Verbal Semantics: Classification, Derivation, and Inflection. (published version of Walton (1983), M.A. thesis, Temple University) Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Yang, Byong-seon. (1994). *Morpho-syntactic Phenomena of Korean in Role and Reference Grammar: Psych-verb Constructions, Inflectional*

Verb Morphemes, Complex Sentences, and Relative Clauses.
Published Ph. D. dissertation, SUNY at Buffalo. Seoul: Hankuk
Publishers.

- (1996a). A Role and Reference Grammar Account of
Unaccusativity: Split Intransitivity. *Linguistics*, 4, 77-94, published
by The Linguistics Association of Korea
- (1996b). An Overview of Unaccusativity and the Issues.
Humanities Research 2, 122-39, published by Jeonju University.
- (1997). *Role and Reference Grammar Kaylon* [Introduction to Role
and Reference Grammar] (written in Korean). Seoul: Hankuk
Publisher.
- (1998). Clause Linkage and Interclausal Relations Hierarchy in
Korean, *Korean Journal of Linguistics*, 23(2), 343-365.
- (1999). An RRG Account of Korean Verbal Inflection: Operator
Projection. *Linguistics*, 7, 275-96, published by The Linguistics
Association of Korea.
- Youn, Cheong. (1989). A Relational Analysis of Korean Multiple
Nominative Construction. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, SUNY
at Buffalo

Byung-sun Yaang
Dept. of English
Jeonju University
1200 1-ga Hyoja-dong, Wansan-gu
Jeonju, 560-759, Korea
Phone: 82-63-220-2213
Email: bsyang@jj.ac.kr

Received: 6 Jun, 2006
Revised: 6 Sep, 2006
Accepted: 15 Sep, 2006