2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. ABOUT LINGUISTIC THEORIZING

It is an old observation that verbs are the elements that play the major role in clause structure. They constrain what kind of other elements we can expect in the clause. Also, there are grammatical constructions that can be used only with certain types of verbs. Consequently, a general starting point for linguistic analysis is to define the basic clause types according to the type of verbs that function as the predicate in them. For example, below is a sample of clause types commonly attested in languages (adapted from Bendor-Samuel and Thomas 1982: 47):

(1)	**ditransitive**	John gave Mary a present.	NP + V + NP + NP
	transitive	She kissed him.	NP + V + NP
	semi-transitive	He went home.	NP + V + NP
	intransitive	He slept peacefully.	NP + V
	stative	John was happy.	NP + V(cop) + Adj
	equative	John was Mary's sweetheart.	NP + V(cop) + NP

However, despite the general observation that certain types of verbs tend to be associated with certain types of clauses, it has proved to be a difficult task to produce coherent classifications. Languages present fluidity that clear-cut divisions cannot capture. There is, for example, frequently some overlap between verb types and corresponding clause types. By definition, intransitive verbs are not supposed to take direct objects. A common phenomenon, however, is that intransitive verbs appear with object-like NPs and the resulting structure is similar to a transitive clause: *He ran / He ran the whole way.*

In such cases syntactic tests often are employed to distinguish between intransitive and transitive verbs. In English, intransitive verbs cannot usually be passivized. One would not say **The whole way was run by him.* Nevertheless, in certain special contexts a verb that usually does not accept a passive construction might do so, perhaps after the addition of other elements that make the subject appear somehow affected by the event. Rice (1987: 257-258) gives the following example:

(2) a. *?The auditorium was left by John.
b. The auditorium was left unattended by John.

In neutral interpretation, the clause in (2a) is ungrammatical or at least awkward. The addition of the word *unattended* in (2b), however, makes it more acceptable; now the auditorium can be construed as somehow affected by John leaving it. One could, for example, imagine that there was an overhanging risk of vandalism due to John's negligence.

To account for fuzzy boundaries in categorization, attempts have been made to employ scales and continua instead. A criterion for verb classification could be the degree to which the verbs describe static or dynamic situations. The least dynamic verbs refer to various kinds of states, such as *be* or *sit*. Somewhat more dynamic are processes like *sleep* and *grow*. The most dynamic situations express actions or action-processes: e.g. *kick, build, feed*. In general, the least dynamic verbs are typically intransitive, while the more dynamic verbs are found in transitive constructions. But these features by no means coincide. The clause *He likes me* is semantically static, but grammatically it is transitive. *He stumbled* depicts a dynamic scene but the verb is intransitive.

Another problem is that words, and especially verbs, are often ambiguous, acquiring their exact meaning only in context. Many languages contain verbs that behave both intransitively and transitively: *The rock moved* vs. *I moved the rock.* Or, there may be variation between a stative, an inchoative, or a causative reading. The English verb *open*, for example, lends itself to all three possibilities:

(3) a. He opens the door. **causative**
b. The door opens. **inchoative**
c. The door is open. **stative**

Typically a situation like this is handled by syntactic rules or by separating independent lexical entries: *open* (tr.), *open* (intr.), and *open* (adj.). Apart from this, verb ambiguity does not usually receive much attention in linguistic theories (Croft 1990; Pajunen 1988).

A complex issue is also the question dealing with grammatical relations and semantic roles. There is no one-to-one correspondence between an underlying semantic structure and its linguistic representation. Subject position is not reserved for agents only, nor is object position restricted to patients exclusively. We interpret the roles differently depending on the type of predicate:

		NP-1	NP-2
(4)	a. John hit Mary.	*John*: **agent**	*Mary*: **patient**
	b. John hated Mary.	*John*: **experiencer**	*Mary*: **phenomenon**

In (4a) where the verb is *hit*, we conclude that *John* does something to *Mary* who is a mere receiver of the action. But in (4b) where the verb is *hate*, *John* becomes the experiencing entity and *Mary* the one prompting his unpleasant feelings. However, the interpretation is not attributable to the predicate verb alone. What also needs to be taken into account is the inherent meaning of the nominal arguments:

		NP-1	NP-2
(5)	a. John hit Mary.	*John*: **agent**	*Mary*: **patient**
	b. The arrow hit John.	*arrow*: **instrument**	*John*: **patient**
	c. The arrow hit the target.	*arrow*: **instrument**	*target*: **location**

With the same verb *hit*, an animate subject is interpreted as the doer of the action (5a), while an inanimate NP is understood to be an instrument (5b). Similarly an NP in the object position receives different readings according to its animacy: *Mary* and *John* in (6a, b) are taken to be patients, but the inanimate target in (6c) is a location.

We can thus observe that one form can express several meanings. Problems concerning the relationship between form and meaning are not restricted to sentence level only. Equally important is the fact that certain structures are typically used to convey certain discourse situations. The marking of subjects in Korean is an example of this:

(6) a. Sonnim-**i** o-ass-eyo.
guest-NOM come-PAST-POL
'A guest came.'

b. Sonnim-**un** o-ass-eyo.
guest-TOP come-PAST-POL
'The guest came.'

In isolation both of the above sentences are correct; a subject NP can be marked either with a nominative or with a topic particle. In actual language use, the two marking patterns are not interchangeable, but they are appropriate in different contexts. Clause (6a) could be uttered in a situation where the speaker does not expect the hearer to know whom he is referring to, for example, when there is suddenly a

guest standing at the door. Clause (6b), on the other hand, assumes that the hearer knows whom the speaker is talking about. Now the speaker just wants to make the point that the guest has arrived. Hence, the nominative and the topic marking of the subject direct the hearer to pay attention to different parts of the message. The nominative particle marks the subject as "the news", or the focused part of the sentence, whereas the topic particle lets the focus fall on the predicate.

These are just a few examples illustrating that languages are systems made up of parts that work together to meet the communicative needs of their speakers. There are devices that let the hearer know which of the potential themes are developed and which are dropped. Other signals indicate when a new participant is introduced or when the theme changes. This enables the hearer to understand how the situations and participants are related to each other. Only then can he or she comprehend the main thought running through the message and avoid being diverted by what is just complementary information. This kind of coding of participants and situations, although manifested on sentence level, cannot be adequately explained unless we go beyond the sentence boundaries to observe the whole, which the sentences serve to create.

2.2. ABOUT KOREAN AND CHINESE LINGUISTICS

The tradition of syntactic studies in Korea is not long. Until the sixties, the focus was on phonology and historical linguistics. The interest in modern syntactic theories came through Korean students trained in the USA, a number of whom wrote their dissertations applying transformational generative grammar to Korean. The first decades following the introduction of Western theories in South Korea can be summarized as mainly traditional or generative in approach. (Lee Ki-moon 1983: 139).

Recently other modern theories have gained increasing importance as analytical tools. Articles published in journals like *Kwukehak yenkwu*, *Hangul*, or such international publications as *Language* or *Studies in Language*, have probed Korean language from new perspectives. However, the general tendency among Korean scholars, at least until recently, has been to concentrate on the same topics that in English have aroused wide discussion (Lee Ki-moon 1983: 144). Nam (1983: 151) states that none of the imported theories has been "confirmed as having meaningfully sufficient relevance to Korean grammatical phenomena". Most studies have paid little attention to discourse, and functional analysis of Korean has hardly begun. A pioneer in this area is Hwang (1987) with her research on Korean narrative discourse.

In China, too, the history of syntactic studies is rather short; the main attention has been devoted to phonology, historical linguistics, and to the study of Chinese dialects. In mainland China the approach to grammar is still mainly structuralist. Due to the Cultural Revolution, which occurred from 1966 to 1976, the influence of transformational grammar came late and has played only a minor role in the linguistics of the PRC. (Norman 1993: 153.) Outside of mainland China, however, work has been done from the perspective of generative transformational grammar as well as from that of other modern theories. Some of the research clearly emphasizes function and discourse. An example of this is the Mandarin Chinese reference grammar by Li and Thompson (1989 [1981]), which is the first presentation of Chinese grammar in functional terms.

The research done on Korean and Chinese by native and non-native speakers has had reciprocal influence. Western linguists have not only contributed new perspectives, but also have encountered phenomena that have necessitated further development of their frameworks. Mother-tongue speakers of these languages have, on the other hand, provided both evidence for and challenges to theory building in the West.

2.3. A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF KOREAN

There are several theories about the origins of the Korean language. According to the so-called Altaic theory, Korean would belong to the same family as Mongolic, Turkic, and Tungusic languages (Ramstedt 1952; Poppe 1965). Structurally Korean is rather similar to Japanese, but whether these two share a common protolanguage has not been verified. Clear, however, is that Korean is not genetically related to Chinese, from which it has borrowed about half of its vocabulary.

Unlike Chinese, Korean is an agglutinative language. It possesses a rich inventory of suffixes that can be attached to predicates. Both of the example clauses below consist of a single predicate. These predicates can be analyzed as being formed by several different morphemes.

(7) a. Coha-ci-ess-ci-yo?
good-become-PAST-isn't.it-POL
'It has become good, hasn't it?'

b. Ka-ya-keyss-kwuna!
go-must-VOLIT-EXCL
'Oh, I must go!'

The affixes in Korean frequently have two allomorphs: one for nouns or verb roots ending in a consonant, and another for those ending in a vowel. Compare the topic markers and the declarative endings of the predicates in the following clauses:

(8) a. Meyli-**nun** chayk-ul ilk-**nunta.**
Mary-TOP book-ACC read-DEC
'Mary reads a book/books.'

b. Cyon-**un** chayk-ul sa-**nta.**
John-TOP book-ACC buy-DEC
'John buys a book/books.'

Grammatical relations are expressed with case particles. These frequently have more than one function (see Sohn 1994: 85-86, 225-227):

(9)

-i/ka	**nominative**
-ul/lul	**accusative**
-eykey	**dative**
-ey	**static locative, goal, temporal**
-eyse	**dynamic locative, ablative**
-kwa/wa, -hako	**comitative**
-ulo/lo	**instrument, direction**

The basic unmarked word order in Korean is SOV, i.e. subject - object - predicate:

(10) Cyon-un swukcey-lul ha-nta.
John-TOP homework-ACC do-DEC
'John is doing homework.'

Except for the predicate, which has to come last, the order of elements is relatively free. Postpositional particles serve to clarify the grammatical relations. For example, the clause below can be arranged in six different ways (adapted from Yi Chong-no 1983: 266). The first rendering is the most neutral:

(11) a. Cyon-un tosekwan-eyse swukcey-lul ha-nta.
John-TOP library-in homework-ACC do-DEC
'John is in the library doing homework.'

b. John-TOP homework-ACC library-in do-DEC
c. Library-in John-TOP homework-ACC do-DEC

d. Homework-ACC John-TOP library-in do-DEC
e. Homework-ACC library-in John-TOP do-DEC
f. Library-in homework-ACC John-TOP do-DEC
g. *John-TOP library-in do-DEC homework-ACC
h. *Do-DEC John-TOP homework-ACC library-in

As can be expected from an SOV language, modifying elements precede the modified ones. In example (12a) below, the modifier is a single word functioning as an attribute. In (12b) a clause has been relativized with a prenominal suffix and appears embedded before its head noun:

(12) a. Na-nun **say** os-ul sa-ss-ta.
I-TOP new clothes-ACC buy-PAST-DEC
'I bought new clothes.'

b. **Wuli-ka** **kongpwuha-nun** chayk-i elyep-ta.
we-NOM study-MD book-NOM difficult-DEC
'The book that we are studying is difficult.'

Verbs do not agree in number, person or gender. Instead, there is a system of agreement based on honorifics and politeness. Kim (1990) distinguishes three basic levels of speech reflecting the relationship between the speaker and the hearer: plain, polite, and deferential. (For a more detailed classification of speech levels, see Sohn 1994: 8-10).[2] Compare the verb endings attached to the stem *ka-* 'go':

(13) a. *ka-**nta*** 'he is going.' **plain**
b. *ka-**yo*** 'he is going.' **polite**
c. *ka-**pnita*** 'he is going.' **deferential**

The verbs in (13a-c) reflect an increasingly respectful attitude toward the hearer. The plain style can be found, for example, in newspaper and other neutral contexts where no individual reader is addressed. A sentence containing a deferential ending would be appropriate in a polite conversation with a person one is not familiar with. The polite ending is less formal and is common between adults who know each other. The following examples illustrate clauses, which are correct in isolation, but which would turn inappropriate if used in wrong situations:

(14) a. Na-nun sicang-ey ka-pnita **to an adult:** acceptable
I-TOP market-to go-DEF **to a child:** not used
'I am going to the market.'

b. Cyon-un Hankwuk-ey ka-nta. **to readers in general:** acceptable
John-TOP Korea-to go-DEC **in a personal letter:** not used
'John will go to Korea.'

Simultaneously, the speaker can also express respect toward the referent of the sentence. Special honorific markers, such as the verb suffix *-si-* are employed for this purpose. One could, for example, refer to a teacher by using one of the following renderings:

(15)

*ka-**si**-nta*	go-HON-DEC	'he is going.'	**plain**
*ka-**si**-eyo*	go-HON-POL	'he is going.'	**polite**
*ka-**si**-pnita*	go-HON-DEF	'he is going.'	**deferential**

These verb forms could not be used if the subject of the sentence were, say, 'child' or 'student', or a pronoun denoting first person, because the subject and the predicate have to agree with each other with respect to degree of honorificity. Of the following pair of examples, the first one would thus be unacceptable:

(16) a. *Ku ai-nun cip-ey **ka-si-nta.**
That child-TOP home-to go-HON-DEC
'That child is going home.'

b. Ku ai-nun cip-ey **ka-nta.**
that child-TOP home-to go-DEC
'That child is going home.'

From a syntactic point of view, the only obligatory element in Korean is the predicate. A clause does not become ungrammatical even if all the complements, including the subject NP, are dropped. Usually the missing argument is deducible from the deictic situation or from the discourse context. A question like 'Did you buy that dictionary?' would typically elicit an answer where both the subject and the object are ellipted:

(17) Ney, sa-ss-eyo.
yes. buy-PAST-POL
'Yes, (I) bought (it).'

In summary, Korean is an agglutinative, polysyllabic language with a basic SOV word order. The language is characterized by a complex system of honorifics and levels of politeness. Genetically unrelated to Chinese, Korean however contains a high percentage of words of Chinese origin.

2.4. A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF CHINESE

Mandarin Chinese is the official common language of the People's Republic of China. This common language, or *Pǔtōnghuà*, is based on the northern form of speech as spoken in Beijing. Mandarin Chinese belongs to the Sinitic main branch of the vast Sino-Tibetan language family.

Typologically, Chinese is an isolating language. It does not inflect words or build up complex word forms by adding prefixes or suffixes to a root. A substantial part of the vocabulary consists of words with one syllable only. On the whole, however, modern Mandarin is not a monosyllabic language. Compounding is a prevalent phenomenon, which results in combinations of varying degrees of separability. Often, a morpheme may occur both independently and in various kinds of combinations: e.g. *xiǎo* 'small' and *xīn* 'heart' can be combined to form *xiǎoxīn* 'be careful'.

The question of basic word order is not a straigthforward one. Mandarin Chinese exhibits SVO as well as SOV language features (Li and Thompson 1989: 19-26). In simple transitive sentences the ordering is subject - verb - object.

(18) a. Wǒ dǎ nǐ.
I hit you
'I hit you.'

b. Nǐ dǎ wǒ.
you hit I
'You hit me.'

Complex sentences also typically follow this pattern. Other SVO language features are the existence of prepositions and the fact that auxiliaries precede the main verb:

(19) a. Tā **gěi** wǒ xiě xìn. **preposition + head**
3sg[3] to I write letter
'He writes a letter to me.'

b. Tā **huì** xiě Hànzì. **auxiliary + main verb**
3sg can write Chinese character
'He can write Chinese characters.'

The SOV features, however, are not few. Li and Thompson (1989: 24) list the following: i) SOV sentences occur; ii) prepositional phrases precede the verb; iii) postpositions exist; iv) relative clauses and genitive phrases precede the head noun; v) aspect markers follow the verb, and vi) certain adverbials precede the verb.

(20) a. Wǒ bǎ **huā-píng** nòng pò le. **object + verb**
I BA flower-vase make break PFV/CRS[4]
'I broke the vase.'

b. Tā **zài** wūzi-**li** zuò zuòyè. **preposition + head + postposition**
3sg at room-in do homework
'He is doing his homework in his room.'

c. Kàn shū de nà ge xuésheng. **relative clause + head**
read book NML that CL student
'That student who is reading a book'

d. Wǒ de péngyou **genitive phrase + head**
I GEN friend
'my friend'

e. Tā qù **guo** Běijīng. **verb + aspect marker**
3sg go EXP Beijing
'He has been to Beijing.'

f. Kuài lái! **adverb + verb**
quick come
'Come quickly.'

The examples above come from standard *Pǔtōnghuà*. Further transitions towards an SOV type of word order can be found in the northernmost and northwestern variants of Mandarin. This adoption of foreign word order has been called 'altaicization' by Hashimoto. Hashimoto (1986: 91-95) suspects that the "genuine Pekinese" was created as a kind of creole. According to him, the Mongolians and Manchus, who dominated the Chinese administration and politics during the past centuries, spoke a "pidgin Chinese" with Chinese words but an Altaic syntax.

Verbs in Chinese do not agree in number, gender, or person; neither is there any system of agreement based on honorifics or polite forms.

In expressing basic grammatical relations, Chinese relies on various means. One of them is the word order, as illustrated in (18). Another clue to correct interpretation is the inherent meaning of the NPs. In the example (21a), the animate subject in clause-initial position is understood to be agent, while the inanimate NP 'room' in the same position in (21b), is interpreted as the entity that receives the action:

(21) a. Wǒmen yǐjīng shōushi hǎo wūzi le.
we already tidy good room CRS
'We have tidied up the rooms already.'[4]

b. Wūzi yǐjīng shōushi hǎo le.
room already tidy good CRS
'The rooms have been tidied up already.'

While subject and object are unmarked, more peripheral constituents often take prepositions:

(22) Wǒ **cóng** bā diǎn **dào** shí-èr diǎn gōngzuò.
I from eight o'clock until twelve o'clock work
'I work from eight until twelve o'clock.'

Syntactically, only the predicate is obligatory in Chinese sentences. In a manner similar to Korean, constituents that are understood from the context may be dropped:

(23) A: Nǐ kàn jiàn tā le ma?
you look see 3sg CRS Q
'Did you see him?'

B: Kàn jiàn le.
watch see CRS
B: 'Yes, (I) saw (him).'

In summary, modern Mandarin Chinese is an isolating, but not a monosyllabic, language that exhibits characteristics of both SVO and SOV word order types.