

# Revisiting Cleft(-like) Constructions in Korean\*

Jung-Min Jo

(Suncheon National University)

**Jo, Jung-Min. (2021). Revisiting cleft(-like) constructions in Korean.** *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, 29(4), 45-64. This paper examines two putative cleft constructions in Korean: Kes-construction and Ki-construction. Since both constructions denote the same truth-conditional meaning along with the similar information structure of topic and focus, it could be conjectured that similar morphosyntactic processes are responsible for deriving the two constructions. Park and Kim (2019) pursued this possibility and claimed that the two constructions are derived from distinct movement processes: Kes-construction from movement to clause-external topic and focus projections, and Ki-construction from movement to clause-internal topic and focus projections. In doing so, they claimed the existence of clause-internal topic and focus projections in Korean, independently of the clause-external topic and focus projections often posited in the analysis of Kes-construction in the literature. This paper closely examines the morphosyntactic and semantic properties of the two constructions and critically reviews Park and Kim's claim. Providing a variety of empirical evidence, this paper refutes Park and Kim's claim and shows that Ki-construction is not involved with any movement regarding topic and focus information structure and the topic information in Ki-construction is simply base-generated.

**Key Words:** Kes-construction, Ki-construction, cleft, topic, focus, information structure, base-generation

---

\* I am grateful to three anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions. Any remaining errors are mine.

## 1. Introduction

Sentences in natural languages convey propositional meaning, a state of affairs in the world, but also have information structure such as topic (given) and focus (new) information. Depending on the status of information in the proposition delivered in the utterance context, speakers utilize phonological or morphosyntactic strategy or both for packaging the corresponding information (Lambrecht, 1994). For instance, sentences in (1) have the same propositional meaning accompanied with a similar state of affairs. In contrast to a simple declarative sentence (1a), pseudo-cleft and cleft sentences (1b-c) have distinct information structure where the nominal expression following the copular verb is construed as focus while the rest as topic/given information. This is an instance of syntactic realization of information packaging. Speakers may choose a phonological strategy for conveying a similar kind of information, employing an appropriate pitch accent in (1a) (Pierrehumbert & Hirschberg, 1990; Steedman, 1991; Lee, 2000, 2001 *inter alia*).

- (1) a. John ate a sandwich.  
 b. What John ate is a sandwich.  
 c. It is a sandwich that John ate.

Interestingly Korean seems to have cleft-like constructions. Given a simple sentence in (2a), apparently we have two versions of topic and focus constructions (Kes-construction and Ki-construction hereafter).

- (2) a. Yenghi-ka sakwa-lul mek-ess-e  
 Y-Nom apple-Acc eat-Past-Decl  
 ‘Yenghi ate an apple.’  
 b. Yenghi-ka mek-un kes-un sakwa-i-ess-e  
 Y-Nom eat-Adn KES-Top apple-Cop-Past-Decl  
 c. Yenghi-ka mek-ki-nun sakwa-lul mek-ess-e  
 Y-Nom eat-KI-Top apple-Acc eat-Past-Decl

Kes-construction is widely discussed in the literature and many researchers converge on the movement analysis to capture morphosyntactic and semantic properties of the construction (Jo, 2005; Kim & Lee, 2008; Park, 2014, *inter alia*). Park and Kim (2019)

further claims that Ki-construction is derived from the focus and topic movement similarly to Kes-construction while the difference between the two constructions arises due to the difference in the landing sites of the movement for each construction. This paper shows that the observation and analysis of the two constructions claimed in Park and Kim (2019) is empirically and theoretically flawed and claims that while the movement analysis for Kes-construction can be upheld, Ki-construction is not involved with movement at all, supporting the base-generation approach. Section 2.1 presents morphosyntactic and semantic properties of the two constructions, section 2.2 briefly presents the previous analyses of Kes-construction in the literature and provides a critical review on the analysis of Kes- and Ki-constructions claimed in Park and Kim (2019), and section 3 provides a variety of empirical evidence against movement but for base-generation approach to the analysis of Ki-construction. Section 4 concludes the paper.

## 2. Morphosyntactic and Semantic Properties of Kes-construction and Ki-construction

### 2.1. Constructions at Issue

We first take a close examination of two constructions in their morphosyntax and semantics. Given a simple sentence in (3a), we have corresponding Kes-construction and Ki-construction in (3b-c), respectively. In both constructions, constituents realized after the topic-marked element are construed as focus information and the preceding constituents marked with the particle *-nun* are construed as topic information. With regard to the focus information realized in Kes-construction (Jo, 2005), it is taken as identification (or contrastive) focus in the sense of Kiss (1998). Noting further distinction in the kinds of topic and focus in the two constructions, Park and Kim (2019) claims that Kes-construction is involved with noncontrastive or unmarked topic and identification focus while Ki-construction with contrastive topic and information focus (Kiss, 1998, 1999).<sup>1)</sup>

- (3) a. Yenghi-ka sakwa-lul mek-ess-e  
       Y-Nom apple-Acc eat-Past-Decl  
       ‘Yenghi ate an apple.’

---

1) This point will be critically reviewed in section 2.2.

- b. Yenghi-ka mek-un kes-un sakwa-i-ess-e  
 Y-Nom eat-Adn KES-Top apple-Cop-Past-Decl
- c. Yenghi-ka mek-ki-nun sakwa-lul mek-ess-e  
 Y-Nom eat-KI-Top apple-Acc eat-Past-Decl

Morphosyntactically, two constructions are similar in that both seem to have a missing argument in the topic-marked expressions while they are different in that Kes-construction is accompanied with the copular verb and KES, which has often been analyzed as complementizer or bound noun in the literature (Jo, 2005 among others), and Ki-construction with the repetition of the main predicate and KI, which has been glossed as a nominalizer (bound affix) in the literature. As illustrated in (4), speakers have different ways of encoding information structure: simple declarative sentence with pitch accent on the object or Kes-construction and Ki-construction as morpho-syntactic mechanism.

- (4) A: Yenghi-ka mwues-ul mek-ess-ni?  
 Y-Nom what-Acc eat-Past-Q  
 ‘What did Yenghi eat?’
- B: a. Yenghi-ka sakwa-lul mek-ess-e  
 Y-Nom apple-Acc eat-Past-Decl
- b. Yenghi-ka mek-un kes-un sakwa-i-ess-e  
 Y-Nom eat-Adn KES-Top apple-Decl-Past-Decl
- c. Yenghi-ka mek-ki-nun sakwa-lul mek-ess-e  
 Y-Nom eat-KI-Top apple-Acc eat-Past-Decl

Distinct from Ki-construction at issue here, which clearly has topic and focus information structure as in (4c), there are constructions that are only involved with contrastive topic information as illustrated in (5). Sentence (5a) is accompanied with the repetition of the main predicate, similarly to the Ki-construction (4c), while sentence (5b) with the dummy verb *ha-*. Despite the difference in their morphosyntactic behavior, both sentences (5a-b) have the same meaning intended to convey the concessive admission of the given proposition but crucially induce conventional scalar implicature, which is deduced from the context and is often in contrast to the admitted proposition (Lee, 1999, 2000, 2003, 2006, 2007).

- (5) A: Chelswu-ka Yenghi-lul manna-ss-ni?  
 C-Nom Y-Acc meet-Past-Q  
 'Did Chelswu meet Yenghi?'
- B: a. Chelswu-ka Yenghi-lul manna-ki-nun manna-ss-e  
 C-Nom Y-Acc meet-KI-Top meet-Past-Decl  
 b. Chelswu-ka Yenghi-lul manna-ki-nun hay-ss-e  
 C-Nom Y-Acc meet-KI-Top do-Past-Decl  
 'Chelswu met Yenghi (but ...)'

Predicate repetition construction (5a) which has contrastive topic interpretation only allows a word order similar to the Ki-construction with focus information as shown in (6), where topic-marked predicate has strong pitch accent with following elements deaccentuated.

- (6) A: Chelswu-ka Yenghi-lul manna-ss-ni?  
 C-Nom Y-Acc meet-Past-Q  
 'Did Chelswu meet Yenghi?'
- B: Chelswu-ka manna-ki-nun Yenghi-lul manna-ss-ci  
 C-Nom meet-KI-CT Y-Acc meet-Past-Decl  
 'Chelswu met Yenghi (but...)'

Noting the existence of constructions of predicate repetition or dummy verb *ha-* which are associated with contrastive topic information only, remaining sections are confined to the Ki-construction with topic and focus information.<sup>2)</sup>

## 2.2. Critical Review of Park and Kim (2019)

With regard to Kes-construction, many researchers have proposed movement analysis due to the morpho-syntactic connectivity between the missing argument in the topic-marked Kes-clause and focus constituent as exemplified in (7) (Jo, 2005; Kim & Lee,

---

2) For readers interested in the predicate contrastive topic constructions, see Choi (2000, 2001) for head movement approach, Cho & Kim (2002) for a construction-based HPSG approach, Jo (2013) for phrasal movement approach. Jo, in particular, provides a uniform analysis of two types of predicate contrastive topic constructions with variations resulting from selective PF-deletion process in the lower copy of the moved constituent.

2008; Park, 2014) though they are different in the details of the analysis.<sup>3)</sup> Dative case-marked focus nominal in (7b) is directly related to the missing argument position in the Kes-clause by (focus) movement along with the topicalization of the remnant Kes-clause, roughly represented in (7c).

- (7) a. Chelswu-ka Yenghi-eykey senmwul-ul cwu-ess-e  
 C-Nom Y-Dat gift-Acc give-Past-Decl  
 ‘Chelswu gave a gift to Yenghi.’  
 b. Chelswu-ka senmwul-ul cwu-n kes-un Yenghi-eykey-i-ess-e  
 C-Nom gift-Acc give-Adn KES-top Y-Dat-Cop-Past-Decl  
 c. [[Chelswu-ka  $t_i$  senmwul-ul cwu-n] kes-un  
 [Yenghi-eykey<sub>i</sub> [ $t_j$ -i-ess-e]]]

Interestingly, Park and Kim (2019) claims that not just Kes-construction but also Ki-construction is derived from similar movement processes while the two constructions differ in the sites the moved constituents are landed in. Given a simple sentence (8a), the object nominal is fronted to the Spec of FocP projected outside FinP and the remnant FinP to the Spec of TopP projected over FocP, so-called CP-periphery in the sense of Rizzi (1997), resulting in Kes-construction, schematically represented in (8b). On the other hand, Ki-construction is claimed to be derived from the movement to the TP-internal and vP-external topic and focus position, as represented in (8c), claiming the existence of clause-internal syntactic projections for topic and focus information, so-called vP-periphery, in Korean.<sup>4)</sup>

- (8) a. Yenghi-ka sakwa-lul mek-ess-e  
 Y-Nom apple-Acc eat-Past-Decl  
 b. [<sub>TopP</sub> [Yenghi-ka mek-un kes-un]<sub>j</sub> [<sub>FocP</sub> sakwa<sub>i</sub> [<sub>FinP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub>  $t_i$   $t_j$  -i-ess-e]]]]  
 Y-Nom eat-Adn KES-Top apple Cop-Past-Decl  
 c. [<sub>TP</sub> Yenghi-ka [<sub>TopP</sub> mek-ki-nun]<sub>j</sub> [<sub>FocP</sub> sakwa-lul<sub>i</sub> [<sub>vP</sub>  $t_i$   $t_j$  mek-ess-e]]]]  
 T-Nom eat-KI-Top apple-Acc eat-Past-Decl

3) For base-generation approaches to Kes-construction, see Yoon (2001, 2005), Kang (2006), Choi (2011), Kim & Sells (2013), and Hong (2015).

4) This is based on Belletti (2001, 2004), who argued for the existence of vP periphery parallel to CP periphery of Rizzi (1997) by examining Romance languages like French and Italian.

The analysis of Kes-construction is similar to the movement analyses mentioned above. What is peculiar about Park and Kim's is the postulation of the clause-internal topic and focus-related syntactic projections for deriving the Ki-construction, independently of clause-external topic and focus projections. In so doing, additional stipulations are in order with regard to the status of *kes* and *-ki* and the appearance of the copular verb and the repetition of the main predicate in the process of deriving (8b-c) from (8a), respectively. They treated both *kes* and *-ki* as last resort affixes for the topic marker *-un* to be attached, assuming late lexical insertion in Distributed Morphology (Halle & Marantz 1993). Similarly, the copular verb in the Kes-construction is treated as a rescue affix for verbal affixes to be attached. In a similar vein, the repetition of the predicate in the Ki-construction should be treated as a rescue affix for stranded verbal affixes. However, this stipulative nature of analyzing morphosyntactic formatives raises more questions rather than revealing the morphosyntactic properties of the two constructions. As pointed out in Jo (2005), the morpheme *kes* carries grammatical functions of the noun or the complementizer, heading the relative clause in (9a), the object complement clause in (9b), even occurring at the precopular position as in (9c). Hence the treatment of *kes* in the Kes-construction as a rescue strategy for the topic marker *-nun* to be attached does not seem to be on the right track since it clearly performs grammatical functions required by some other syntactic formatives.

- (9) a. Yenghi-nun [Chelswu-ka phathi-ey t<sub>i</sub> kacyeo-n] kes<sub>i</sub>-ul  
 Y-Top C-Nom party-Loc bring-Adn KES-Acc  
 Tongswu-eykey cwu-ess-ta  
 T-Dat give-Past-Decl  
 'Yenghi gave to Tongswu what Chelswu brought to the party.'
- b. Yenghi-nun [Chelswu-ka phathi-ey photocwu-lul kacyeo-n  
 Y-Top C-Nom party-Loc wine-Acc bring-Adn  
 kes]-ul molla-ss-ta  
 KES-Acc not.know-Past-Decl  
 'Yenghi didn't know that Chelswu brought wine to the party.'
- c. [Yengi-ka Tongswu-eykey senmwul-ul cwu-n kes]-i-ta  
 Y-Nom T-Dat gift-Acc give-Adn KES-Cop-Decl  
 'It is that Yenghi gave a gift to Tongswu.'

In addition, the treatment of both *kes* and *-ki* as a last resort rescue strategy for the topic marker *-nun* to be attached makes the selection of one form over the other totally arbitrary, deriving sentences like (10). In the putative Kes-construction in (10a), *-ki* instead of *kes* is inserted, resulting in the ungrammaticality, while in the putative Ki-construction in (10b), *kes* instead of *-ki* is inserted with the resulting sentence sounding better in contrast to (10a). This contrast is totally mysterious in Park and Kim's analysis.

- (10) a. \*Yenghi-ka mek-ki-nun sakwa-i-ess-e  
           Y-Nom  eat-KI-Top  apple-Cop-Past-Decl  
       b. (??)Yenghi-ka mek-un kes-un  sakwa-lul  mek-ess-e  
           Y-Nom  eat-Adn  KES-Top  apple-Acc  eat-Past-Decl

They also claim there is a distinction in the kinds of topic and focus information manifested in each construction: noncontrastive or unmarked topic and identification focus with exhaustive interpretation in Kes-construction, and contrastive topic and information focus with non-exhaustive interpretation in Ki-construction (*a la* Kiss, 1998, 1999), providing the following contrast.

- (11) a. Chelswu-ka manna-n kes-un Yenghi-i-ta #Swunhi-to yeksi manna-ss-ciman  
           C-Nom  meet-Adn  KES-Top  Y-Cop-Decl  S-also  too  meet-Past-though  
       b. Chelswu-ka manna-ki-nun Yenghi-lul manna-ss-ta  Swunhi-to yeksi  
           C-Nom  meet-KI-Top  Y-Acc  meet-Past-Decl  S-aslo  too  
           mann-ss-ciman  
           meet-Decl-though

Very subtle, and even if there is such a distinction, it does not validate the argument for separate syntactic projections for topic and focus information. Furthermore, as shown in the interaction (12) where identification (contrastive) focus information is manifested in the answer, Ki-construction as well as Kes-construction seems fine.

- (12) A: Yengh-ka sakwa-lul cohahay-ss-ni?  
           Y-Nom  apple-Acc  like-Past-Q  
           'Did Yenghi like an apple?'  
       B: a. ani, Yenghi-ka cohaha-n kes-un  ttalki-i-ess-e



- no Y-Nom like-Adn KES-Top strawberry-Cop-Past-Decl  
 b. ani, Yenghi-ka cohaha-ki-nun ttalki-lul cohahay-ss-e  
 no Y-Nom like-KI-Top strawberry-Acc like-Past-Decl  
 'No, it was strawberry that Yenghi liked.'

Even the Kes-construction, claimed to have noncontrastive topic interpretation, can be involved with contrastive topic information as shown in (13), where two Kes-clauses are in contrast and should be interpreted as contrastive topic.

- (13) A: Yenghi, Swunhi-ka nwukwu-lul manna-ss-ni?  
 Y S-Nom who-Acc meet-Past-Q  
 'Who did Yenghi and Swunhi meet?'  
 B: Yenghi-ka manna-n kes-un Tongswu-i-ko  
 Y-Nom meet-Adn KES-Top T-Cop-Conj  
 Swunhi-ka manna-n kes-un Chelswu-i-ss-e  
 S-Nom meet-Adn KES-Top C-Cop-Past-Decl  
 'It was Tongswu that Yenghi met and it was Chelswu that Swunhi met.'

This seems to suggest that the distinction in the kinds of topic and focus information cannot be attributed to each construction but rather to the utterance context. Even if there is difference in the types of topic and focus information between the two constructions, it does not justify the separate clause-internal topic and focus projections, independently of clause-external topic and focus projections often postulated for the analysis of the Kes-construction in the literature.

Park and Kim claim that the focus information in the two constructions has specificity effect. Hence an indefinite nominal expression in a simple declarative sentence (14a) may have nonspecific or specific interpretation. In contrast, the one in the corresponding Kes- and Ki-constructions in (14b-c) is claimed to have specific interpretation only so that speakers uttering the given sentences have a specific individual in mind.

- (14) a. Chelswu-ka etten yeca-lul manna-ss-ta <specific, nonspecific>  
 C-Nom some woman-Acc meet-Past  
 'Chelswu met some woman.'

- b. Chelswu-ka manna-n kes-un etten yeca-i-ta <specific>  
 C-Nom meet-Adn KES-Top some woman-Cop-Decl
- c. Chelswu-ka manna-ki-nun etten yeca-lul manna-ss-ta <specific>  
 C-Nom meet-KI-Top some woman-Acc meet-Past-Decl

However, as shown in the following examples, nonspecific interpretation seems to be available, suggesting that the matter of specificity cannot be attributed to the given constructions but rather to the utterance context.

- (15) a. Chelswu-ka manna-n ke-n etten yeca-la-nuntey  
 C-Nom meet-Adn KES-Top some woman-Cop-hearsay  
 hwaksilhi nwukwunci-nun molla  
 surely who-Cop-Comp-Top not.know  
 ‘Chelswu met some woman but I don’t know for sure who.’
- b. Chelswu-ka manna-ki-nun etten yeca-lul manna-ss-ta-nuntey  
 C-Nom meet-KI-Top some woman-Acc meet-Past-hearsay  
 nwukwunci-nun molla  
 who-Cop-Comp-Top not.know

The evidence that they claim strongly supports clause-internal and external separate topic and focus projections comes from the contrast shown in (16) with regard to the availability of tense inflections which are indicators of TP projections. That is, past tense inflection can be included as part of topic information in the Kes-construction while it cannot in the Ki-construction as shown in (16d).

- (16) a. Chelswu-ka manna-n kes-un Yenghi-i-ta  
 C-Nom meet-Adn KES-Top Y-Cop-Decl
- b. Chelswu-ka manna-ss-ten kes-un Yenghi-i-ta  
 C-Nom meet-Past-Adn KES-Top Y-Cop-Decl
- c. Chelswu-ka manna-ki-nun Yenghi-lul manna-ss-ta  
 C-Nom meet-KI-Top Y-Acc meet-Past-Decl
- d. \*Chelswu-ka manna-ss-ki-nun Yenghi-lul manna-ss-ta  
 C-Nom meet-Past-KI-Top Y-Acc meet-Past-Decl

However, it is not clear how strong their judgement is concerning (16d) since it is not bad enough to be judged ungrammatical and it is totally acceptable as a scrambled version of predicate contrastive topic constructions which have contrastive topic interpretation only with the sequences after the topic-marked constituent deaccentuated. Not just tense but also mood affixes may be included as part of Ki-clause in predicate contrastive topic constructions as shown below.<sup>5)</sup>

- (17) a. Yenghi-ka swul-ul masi-ess-ki-nun masi-ess-e  
 Y-Nom liquor-Acc drink-Past-KI-Top drink-Past-Decl  
 b. Yenghi-ka swul-ul masi-ess-ki-nun hay  
 Y-Nom liquor-Acc drink-Past do-Decl  
 ‘Yenghi drank liquor (but...)’  
 c. Yenghi-ka swul-ul masi-ess-ta-ki-nun masi-ess-ta-tela  
 Y-No liquor-Acc drink-Past-Decl-KI-Top drink-Past-Decl-hearsay  
 d. Yenghi-ka swul-lul masi-ess-ta-ki-nun ha-tela  
 Y-Nom liquor-Acc drink-Past-Decl-KI-Top do-hearsay  
 ‘(I heard) Yenghi drank liquor (but...)’

Hence the claim cannot be substantiated or is very weak at best for the existence of clause-internal separate topic and focus projections on the basis of the availability of tense inflections in the Kes- and Ki-constructions.

According to Park and Kim, Kes-construction is derived from the application of movement to focus and topic projections above FinP while Ki-construction from the application of movement to TP-internal focus and topic projections, which gives rise to the syntactic structure as represented in (18). Postulation of dual syntactic projections for topic and focus information predicts that focus information can be followed by contrastive topic information which is supposed to occupy TP-internal TopP, as marked in boldface in (18). However, this prediction is not borne out. Irrespective of grammatical functions of focus and (contrastive) topic information, topic-marked expressions should precede focus information and otherwise sentences are severely degraded as shown in (19) and (20), confirming the unmarked order of topic and focus information observed cross-linguistically.

---

5) See Jo (2013) for the account of systematic distribution of verbal affixes in predicate contrastive topic constructions.

(18) [TopP [**FocP** [FinP [TP [**TopP** [FocP [vP .....]]]]]]]]

(19) A: *nwuka sakwa-lul mek-ess-ni?*

who apple-Acc eat-Past-Q

‘Who ate an apple?’

B: a. ?\**Yenghi-ka sakwa-nun mek-ess-e*

Y-Nom apple-Top eat-Past-Decl

b. *Yenghi-ka sakwa-lul mek-ess-e*

Y-Nom apple-Acc eat-Past-Decl

c. *sakwa-nun Yenghi-ka mek-ess-e*

apple-Top Y-Nom eat-Past-Decl

(20) A: *Yengi-ka mwues-ul mek-ess-ni?*

Y-Nom what-Acc eat-Past-Q

‘What did Yenghi eat?’

B: a. *Yenghi-nun sakwa-lul mek-ess-e*

Y-Top apple-Acc eat-Past-Decl

b. \**sakwa-lul Yenghi-nun mek-ess-e*

apple-Acc Y-Top eat-Past-Decl

It can be concluded that Park and Kim’s claim for the clause-internal topic and focus projections has little empirical basis and the movement approach to the Ki-construction itself is in serious doubt, which is addressed in the next section.

### 3. Base-generated Topic in the Ki-construction

Independently of topic and focus projections for the movement analysis of Kes-construction, clause-internal syntactic projections for topic and focus cannot be supported. Instead, apparent cleft-like Ki-construction is none other than a simple base-generated topic and focus construction with no movement involved whatsoever.

Without the well-known pause effect which improves otherwise awkward sentences in Korean, subtle difference in the intervention of sentence adverbials in (21) implies that *-ki-nun* constituent occupies high in the clause level along with sentence adverbials.

- (21) a. Solcikhi Cheswu-ka masi-ki-nun soju-lul masi-ess-e  
 frankly C-Nom drink-KI-Top soju-Acc drink-Past-Decl  
 ‘Frankly, what Chelswu drank was soju.’  
 b. ??Chelswu-ka solcikhi masi-ki-nun soju-lul masi-ess-e  
 C-Nom frankly drink-KI-Top soju-Acc drink-Past-Decl  
 c. Chelswu-ka masi-ki-nun solcikhi soju-lul masi-ess-e  
 C-Nom drink-KI-Top frankly soju-Acc drink-Past-Decl

Another piece of evidence for the separate clausal boundary between the topic-marked expression and the following sequences comes from availability of resumptive pronouns. As shown in (22), subject resumptive pronouns make sentences degraded.<sup>6)</sup> In contrast, resumptive pronouns may occur after the topic-marked expression in the Ki-construction, suggesting the separate clausal boundary between the topic-marked expression and the following sequences.<sup>7)</sup>

- (22) a. Yenghi-nun sakwa-lul cohahay-ss-e  
 Y-Top apple-Acc like-Past-Decl  
 b. ?\*Yenghi-nun key-ka/key-nun/kunye-ka sakwa-lul cohahay-ss-e  
 Y-Top pro-Nom/pro-Top/she-Nom apple-Acc like-Past-Decl  
 c. Yenghi-ka cohaha-ki-nun  
 Y-Nom like-KI-Top  
 key-ka/key-nun/kunye-ka sakwa-lul cohahay-ss-e  
 pro-Nom/pro-Top/she-Nom apple-Acc like-Past-Decl

---

6) Sentences should be uttered with no pause. Pause after the topic-marked expression make sentences better (i.e., pause effect) and the initial element can function as a base-generated ‘scene-setting’ topic, independent of the following main clause.

7) In contrast to the Ki-construction here, involved with topic and focus information structure, predicate contrastive topic constructions do not allow resumptive pronouns, suggesting that the former construction is fundamentally different from the latter:

- (i) Yenghi-ka sakwa-lul mek-ki-nun (\*key-ka) mek-ess-e  
 Y-Nom apple-Acc eat-KI-Top pro-Nom eat-Past-Decl  
 (ii) Yenghi-ka sakwa-lul mek-ki-nun (key-ka) kacang cal mek-ess-e  
 Y-Nom apple-Acc eat-KI-Top pro-Nom most well eat-Past-Decl

Constructions involved with contrastive topic interpretation only, which are involved with phrasal movement to the functional projection above TP in Jo (2013), have two variations, repetition of main predicate or dummy verb *ha-*, both of which are the last resort operation to rescue stranded verbal affixes as shown in (23a-b). Since the Ki-construction is analyzed as remnant VP movement preceded by focus movement in Park and Kim (2019), repetition of verbal predicate is similarly claimed to be the operation to rescue stranded verbal affixes, which predicts another pattern of sentence accompanied with the dummy verb *ha-*. This prediction is not borne out, as the ungrammaticality in (23d) suggests.

- (23) a. Yengi-ka sakwa-lul mek-ki-nun mek-ess-e  
 Y-Nom apple-Acc eat-KI-Top eat-Past-Decl  
 b. Yenghi-ka sakwa-lul mek-ki-nun hay-ss-e  
 Y-Nom apple-Acc eat-KI-Top do-Past-Decl  
 c. Yenghi-ka mek-ki-nun sakwa-lul mek-ess-e  
 Y-Nom eat-KI-Top apple-Acc eat-Past-Decl  
 d. \*Yenghi-ka mek-ki-nun sakwa-lul hay-ss-e  
 Y-Nom eat-KI-Top apple-Acc do-Past-Decl

Jo (2013) provides a few pieces of evidence for base-generation of the topic-marked expression in the Ki-construction involved with focus information, which in turn should be fundamentally different from the predicate contrastive topic constructions exemplified in (23a-b), which have contrastive topic interpretation only and are claimed to be involved with phrasal movement in Jo (2013). First, the movement analysis of the Ki-construction cannot account for why the Ki-construction behaves differently from the predicate contrastive topic construction with regard to long distance scrambling as shown in (24). The predicate contrastive topic construction with contrastive topic interpretation and the Ki-construction accompanied with focus information are realized as embedded clauses in (24a) and (24c), respectively. Long distance scrambling of the topic-marked expression in the former construction renders the sentence degraded as shown in (24b). In contrast, long distance scrambling of the topic-marked expression in the latter construction makes no difference in the grammatical status as shown in (24d). This contrast suggests that the Ki-construction with topic and focus information is syntactically different from the predicate contrastive topic construction which is involved with strictly local movement process in Jo (2013).

- (24) a. Yenghi-nun [Swunhi-ka maykcwu-lul masi-ki-nun]  
 Y-Top S-Nom beer-Acc drink-KI-Top  
 ha/masi-ess-ta-ko sayngkakha-n-ta  
 do/drink-Past-Decl-Comp think-Pres-Decl  
 ‘Yenghi thinks that Swunhi DID drink beer (but..)’
- b. \*[Swunhi-ka maykcwu-lul masi-ki-nun]<sub>i</sub> Yenghi-nun  
 S-Nom beer-Acc drink-KI-Top Y-Top  
 t<sub>i</sub> ha/masi-ess-ta-ko sayngkakha-n-ta  
 do/drink-Past-Decl-Comp think-Pres-Decl
- c. Yenghi-nun [Swunhi-ka masi-ki-nun] maykcwu-lul  
 Y-Top S-Nom drink-KI-Top beer-Acc  
 masi-ess-ta-ko sayngkakha-n-ta  
 drink-Past-Decl-Comp think-Pres-Decl  
 ‘Yenghi thinks that as for Swunhi’s drinking, she drank beer.’
- d. [Swunhi-ka masi-ki-nun]<sub>i</sub> Yenghi-ka t<sub>i</sub> maykcwu-lul  
 S-Nom drink-KI-Top Y-Nom beer-Acc  
 masi-ess-ta-ko sayngkakha-n-ta  
 drink-Past-Decl-Comp think-Pres-Decl

Second, final predicates in the Ki-construction do not have to be the same as the initial topic-marked predicate as shown in (25). Obviously, topic-marked expressions in (25) are not associated with the following sequences in any form of movement process and must be base-generated as independent initial clauses.

- (25) a. [maum-i coh-ki-nun] Yenghi-ka choyko-ya  
 heart-Nom good-KI-Top Y-Nom best-Cop-Decl  
 ‘As for a person with a good heart, Yenghi is the best.’
- b. [hongswu-ka na-ki-nun] chilwel-i kacang simha-ta  
 flood-Nom happen-KI-Top July-Nom most heavy-Decl  
 ‘As for the flood happening, it most heavily occurs in July.’
- c. [maykcwu-lul masi-ki-nun] wuntong cikhwu-ka kacang coh-ta  
 beer-Acc drink-KI-Top workout right.after-Nom most good-Decl  
 ‘As for drinking beer, it is the best right after working out.’

These sentences look just like ordinary simple declarative sentences of topic-comment information structure as shown in (26). Given initial topic information, the rest of the sentence (comment) is about the topic, which encodes focus information, simply reflecting the unmarked order of information packaging.

- (26) a. maum-nun Yenghi-ka choyko-ya  
 heart-Top Y-Nom best-Cop-Decl  
 ‘As for heart, Yenghi is the best.’  
 b. hongswu-nun chilwel-i kacang simha-ta  
 flood-Top July-Nom most heavy-Decl  
 ‘As for the flood, it is most heavy in July.’  
 c. maykcwu-nun wuntong cikhwu-ka kacang coh-ta  
 beer-Top workout right.after-Nom most good-Decl  
 ‘As for beer, it is the best right after working out.’

Lastly, since topic-marked expressions in the Ki-construction are taken as base-generated clauses independent of expressions encoding focus information, they are expected to behave more like adjuncts as base-generated ‘scene-setting’ topics, which is precisely the case as shown in (27a-a’). The topic marker *-nun* in the Ki-construction in (27a) can be replaced by a typical adjunct-introducing marker *-lon-nun* as shown in (27a’). In contrast to the Ki-construction with focus information, the topic marker in predicate contrastive topic constructions cannot be replaced by the adjunct marker as shown in (27b-c’), again confirming that the initial topic-marked expression in the Ki-construction is base-generated.

- (27) a. nolay-lul cal pwulu-ki-nun Swunhi-ka cal pwulu-n-ta  
 song-Acc well sing-KI-Top S-Nom well sing-Pres-Decl  
 a’. nolay-lul cal pwulu-ki-lo-nun Swunhi-ka cal pwulu-n-ta  
 song-Acc well sing-KI-Inst-Top S-Nom well sing-Pres-Decl  
 ‘Speaking of singing well, Swunhi sings well.’  
 b. Swunhi-ka nolay-lul cal pwulu-ki-nun cal pwulu-n-ta  
 S-Nom song-Acc well sing-KI-Top well sing-Pres-Decl  
 b’. \*Swunhi-ka nolay-lul cal pwulu-ki-lo-nun cal pwulu-n-ta  
 S-Nom song-Acc well sing-KI-Inst-Top well sing-Pres-Decl



- c. Swunhi-ka nolay-lul cal pwulu-ki-nun hay  
 S-Nom song-Acc well sing-KI-Top do-Decl
- c'. \*Swunhi-ka nolay-lul cal pwulu-ki-lo-nun hay  
 S-Nom song-Acc well sing-KI-Inst-Top do-Decl

As pointed out in Jo (2013), the predicate phrase may undergo phrasal nominalization (cf. Yoon 1996) and this independently generated nominalized phrase may function as the topic of the sentence with the topic marker attached. If this nominalized phrase is uttered as a 'scene-setting' topic of the sentence, the remaining material is construed as comment/focus information about the given topic which is in turn realized by pitch accent. Hence there is no syntactic movement involved to generate the Ki-construction with topic and focus information. Given this base-generated topic in the Ki-construction, syntactic properties discussed in this section are all as expected: intervention of sentential adverbials, permission of resumptive pronouns, long-distance scrambling expected to occur as base-generated clausal topics, and adjunct-like patterns. To the extent that the meaning denoted by the topic-marked expression is compatible with the meaning denoted by the comment/focus expression, the predicates in the Ki-construction may be permitted to differ.

## 4. Conclusion

Due to the apparent similarity of Ki-construction to the topic and focus information structure of Kes-construction, it would be ideal for both constructions to be derived by morphosyntactically similar processes and indeed, Park and Kim (2019) came up with this idea. They claimed that the two constructions are derived by similar syntactic movement processes while the difference between the two arises from the difference in the landing sites corresponding topic and focus constituents move to, claiming the existence of clause-internal topic and focus projections, independently of clause external topic and focus projections often postulated in the movement analysis of Kes-construction. However, the critical review of their analysis has shown their claim cannot be empirically substantiated with little or no morphosyntactic or semantic evidence for the existence of clause-internal topic and focus projections. Instead, a series of morphosyntactic evidence presented here concerning Ki-construction point to the base-generation of Ki-clause, which

is independently generated as a separate clause and functions as topic information with the topic marker attached, and resulting topic and focus information structure turns out to be just an unmarked order of topic and focus information observed cross-linguistically.

## References

- Belletti, A. (2001). Inversion as focalization. In A. Hulk & J.-Y. Pollock (Eds.), *Subject inversion in Romance and the theory of universal grammar* (pp. 60-90). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Belletti, A. (2004). Aspects of the low IP area. In L. Rizzi (Ed.), *The structure of CP and IP: The cartography of syntactic structures 2*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cho, S.-Y., & Kim, J.-B. (2002). Echoed verb construction in Korean: A construction-based HPSG analysis. *Korean Journal of Linguistics*, 27, 661-682.
- Choi, K.-Y. (2000). Korean VP-focus constructions: Another case of base adjunction of X0 to Y0. *Studies in Generative Grammar*, 10, 329-356.
- Choi, K.-Y. (2001). The echoed verb construction in Korean: Evidence for V-raising. In P. Clancy (Ed.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics, vol. 11*. Stanford: CSLI Publication.
- Choi, K.-Y. (2011) Hankwuke kyunyelkwumwunuy kes (Kes in Korean clefts). *Studies in Generative Grammar*, 21, 21-47.
- Halle, M., & Marantz, A. (1993). Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection. In S. Keyser & K. Hale (Eds.), *The view from building 20*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hong, Y.-C. (2015). Kes punyel kwumwunuy chocem yosoey tayhan kice sayngseng pwunsek (A base-generation analysis of the focused phrase in the kes cleft construction). *Studies in Generative Grammar*, 25, 159-180.
- Jo, J.-M. (2005). Suicing? It's just one of copular constructions. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, 13, 143-167.
- Jo, J.-M. (2013). Predicate contrastive topic constructions: Implications for morpho-syntax in Korean and copy theory of movement. *Lingua*, 131, 80-111.
- Kang, B. (2006). Some peculiarities of Korean kes cleft constructions. *Studia Linguistica*, 60, 251-281.

- Kim, J., & Lee, C. (2008). Why multiple clefts are disallowed? In *Proceedings of WCCFL 26*, 332-339.
- Kim, J.-B., & Sells, P. (2013). Interactions between (pseudo-)clefts and copular constructions in Korean. *Linguistic Research*, 30, 93-139.
- Kiss, K. (1998). Identification focus versus information focus. *Language*, 74, 245-273.
- Kiss, K. (1999). The English cleft construction as a focus phrase. In L. Mereu (Ed.), *Boundaries of morphology and syntax* (pp. 217-229). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Lambrecht, K. (1994). *Information and sentence form: topic, focus and the mental representations of discourse referents*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, C. (1999). Contrastive topic: A locus of the interface. In K. Turner, et al. (Eds.), *The semantics/pragmatics interface from different points of view*, CRISPI, vol. 1 (pp. 317-341). London: Elsevier.
- Lee, C. (2000). Contrastive predicates and conventional scales. In A. Okrent & J. Boyle (Eds.), *CLS 36-1* (pp. 243-257).
- Lee, C. (2001). *Contrastive topic and proposition structure*. Paper presented at the Asymmetry Conference, University of Quebec, Montreal.
- Lee, C. (2003). Contrastive topic and/or contrastive focus. In B. McClure (Ed.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, vol. 12. Stanford: CSLI Publication.
- Lee, C. (2006). Contrastive topic/focus and polarity in discourse. In K. Von Stechow & K. Turner (Eds.), *Where semantics meets pragmatics*, CRISPI, vol. 16 (pp. 381-420). London: Elsevier.
- Lee, C. (2007). Contrastive (predicate) topic, intonation, and scalar meanings. In C. Lee, M. Gordon, & M. Buring (Eds.), *Topic and focus: cross-linguistic perspectives on meaning and intonation* (pp. 151-175). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Park, M.-K. (2014). Copular and sluicing constructions in Korean, Chinese, and Japanese. *Korean Journal of Linguistics*, 39, 427-452.
- Park, S.-Y., & Kim, S.-J. (2019). *-kinun* versus *-kesun*-clefts and the Korean left periphery. *Studies in Generative Grammar*, 29(2), 235-258.
- Pierrehumbert, J., & Hirschberg, J. (1990). The meaning of intonational contours in the interpretation of discourse. In P. Cohen, J. Morgan, & M. Pollack (Eds.), *Intentions in communication* (pp. 271-311). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rizzi, L. (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (Ed.), *Elements of grammar* (pp. 281-337). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Steedman, M. (1991). Structure and intonation. *Language*, 67-2, 260-296.
- Yoon, J. H.-S. (1996). Nominal gerund phrases in English as phrasal zero derivations. *Linguistics*, 34, 329-356.
- Yoon, J. H.-S. (2001). What the Japanese/Korean copula reveals about the interaction of morphology and syntax. In P. Clancy (Ed.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, vol. 11. Stanford: CSLI Publication.
- Yoon, J. H.-S. (2005). Non-morphological determination of nominal particle ordering in Korean. In L. Heggie & F. Ordonez (Eds.), *Clitic and affix combinations: Theoretical perspectives* (pp. 239-283). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

**Jung-Min Jo**

Professor

Department of English Education

Sunchon National University

255, Jungangno, Suncheon

Jeonnam 57922, Korea

Phone: +82-61-750-3322

Email: jmjo@scnu.ac.kr

Received on October 31, 2021

Revised version received on December 17, 2021

Accepted on December 31, 2021