

On the ordering of *un/nun*-marked topics and *man*-marked foci in Korean

Sue Y. Yoon

University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa

1. Introduction

Korean has a wide range of nominal particles that specify the grammatical function of the host noun phrase (NP) or add extra meaning to the host NP (Yeon & Brown, 2013). Nominal particles in Korean are generally classified into two categories: case particles (*kyekcosa*) and semantic particles (*pocosa*). Case particles follow an NP and morphologically mark its grammatical function (e.g., *i/ka* marking subject and *ul/lul* marking object). For example, in (1), (2), and (3), the particle *ka* marks the subject (i.e., *chelswu*) of the predicate *kaluchita* ‘to teach’. When an NP is marked by a case particle, the grammatical function of the NP remains the same regardless of its position in the sentence, as exemplified in (1), (2), and (3). Moreover, case particles typically do not affect the meaning of the host NP, therefore no extra meaning is added to the *ka*-marked NP *chelswu* in (1), (2), and (3).

- (1) a. *chelswu-ka swuci-∅ kaluch-ye*¹.
Cheolsoo-NOM² Suji teach-IE
b. *swuci-∅ chelswu-ka kaluch-ye*.
Suji Cheolsoo-NOM teach-IE
‘Cheolsoo(SUBJ³) teaches Suji(OBJ²).’
- (2) a. *chelswu-ka swuci-lul kaluch-ye*.
Cheolsoo-NOM Suji-ACC teach-IE
b. *swuci-lul chelswu-ka kaluch-ye*.
Suji-ACC Cheolsoo-NOM teach-IE
‘Cheolsoo(SUBJ) teaches Suji(OBJ).’
- (3) a. *chelswu-ka swuci-to kaluch-ye*.
Cheolsoo-NOM Suji-ALSO teach-IE
b. *swuci-to chelswu-ka kaluch-ye*.
Suji-ALSO Cheolsoo-NOM teach-IE
‘Cheolsoo(SUBJ) teaches Suji(OBJ) also.’

¹ The Yale romanization system is adopted for the romanization of Korean sentences in this paper.

² Following the general conventions in Korean linguistics, *i/ka* is glossed as NOM (nominative) and *ul/lul* is glossed as ACC (accusative) in this paper.

³ Subject and object are glossed as SUBJ and OBJ, respectively.

Unlike the case particle *ka* in (1), (2), and (3), semantic particles do not mark the grammatical function of their host NP, but add extra meaning to it. For instance, the particle *to* in (4) and (5), translated as ‘also’ in English, is a semantic particle which indicates that the content of the predicate applies not only to its host NP (i.e., *chelswu*), but also other members of the presupposed set (i.e., other teachers). What distinguishes semantic particles from case particles is that they can appear in both the subject and object positions, without affecting the grammatical function of their host NP. For example, the semantic particle *to* occurs with the subject NP *chelswu* in (4) and the object NP *swuci* in (5) and adds the meaning of ‘also’ to them (i.e., ‘Cheolsoo also’ in (4) and ‘Suji also’ in (5)). Another characteristic of semantic particles is that they can generally occur after an NP on their own without a case particle, as shown in (4) and (5).

- (4) *to* in subject position
- a. *chelswu-to swuci-lul kaluch-ye.*
 Cheolsoo-ALSO Suji-ACC teach-IE
- b. *swuci-lul chelswu-to kaluch-ye.*
 Suji-ACC Cheolsoo-ALSO teach-IE
 ‘(Not only other teachers but) Cheolsoo(SUBJ) also teaches Suji(OBJ).’
- (5) *to* in object position
- a. *chelswu-ka swuci-to kaluch-ye.*
 Cheolsoo-NOM Suji-ACC teach-IE
- b. *swuci-to chelswu-ka kaluch-ye.*
 Suji-ALSO Cheolsoo-NOM teach-IE
 ‘Cheolsoo(SUBJ) teaches (not only other students but) Suji(OBJ) also.’

The present paper focuses on *un/nun* and *man*, which are also categorized as semantic particles. Similar to *to*, *un/nun* and *man* can appear in both the subject and object positions and occur after an NP on their own without accompanying a case particle⁴, as depicted in (6) and (7). The semantic particles *un/nun* and *man* serve to add extra meaning to their host NP. The particle *un/nun* is roughly translated as ‘as for, concerning’ and attached to an NP to mark it as a sentence topic, as in (6a). As in (6b), *un/nun* can also be attached to an NP to evoke a contrastive interpretation. The particle *man* carries the exhaustive and contrastive meaning of ‘only’ and adds the meaning to its host NP, as in (7a) and (7b).

- (6) *un/nun*
- a. *chelswu-nun swuci-lul kaluch-ye.*
 Cheolsoo-TOP⁵ Suji-ACC teach-IE
 ‘As for Cheolsoo(SUBJ), he teaches Suji(OBJ).’
- b. *chelswu-ka swuci-nun kaluch-ye.*

⁴ Although morpheme-level features of *un/un* and *man* will not be discussed in this paper, it is noteworthy to mention that *man* is different from *un/nun* and *to* in how it interacts with a case particle after an NP. That is, after an NP, *man* can appear with a case particle (e.g., *chelswu-man-i* ‘only Cheolsoo-NOM’). However, due to a morphological restriction, *man* always precedes a case particle when they co-occur. Some other semantic particles that share the same characteristic include *pwuthe* ‘from’ (e.g., *pwuthe-ka*, **ka-pwuthe*), *kkaci* ‘until’ (e.g., *kkaci-ka*, **ka-kkaci*), and *eyse* ‘from’ (e.g., *eyse-ka*, **ka-eyse*). On the other hand, *un/nun* and *to* are not allowed to occur with a case particle regardless of order (e.g., **chelswu-nun-i*, **chelswu-ka-nun*, **chelswu-to-i*, **chelswu-ka-to*).

⁵ In this paper, noncontrastive topic is glossed as TOP, while contrastive topic is glossed as CONT.

Cheolsoo-NOM Suji-CONT teach-IE
 ‘Cheolsoo(SUBJ) teaches Suji(OBJ) (but not other students).’

- (7) *man*
 a. *chelswu-man swuci-lul kaluch-ye.*
 Cheolsoo-ONLY Suji-ACC teach-IE
 ‘Only Cheolsoo(SUBJ) teaches Suji(OBJ).’
 b. *chelswu-ka swuci-man kaluch-ye.*
 Cheolsoo-NOM Suji-ONLY teach-IE
 ‘Cheolsoo(SUBJ) teaches Suji(OBJ) only.’

Several studies of Korean nominal particles have analyzed the semantic and syntactic properties of *un/nun* and *man*⁶ (e.g., Yang, 1972, 1973; Lee, Y., 2004, 2005; Lim, 2005; Park, 2015). The particle *un/nun* has been described as associated with two main functions: marking (noncontrastive) topic and contrast (e.g., Choi, 1996; Han, 1998; Lee, C., 2006; Kim, 2015). As for *man*, it has been described as a marker of contrastive focus (Hwang et al., 2010), which typically denotes exhaustive interpretation (Lee, C., 2004). Although the characteristics of *un/nun* and *man* as semantic particles have previously been examined in isolation in the Korean linguistics literature, to the best of my knowledge, the ordering relation between an *un/nun*-marked NP and a *man*-marked NP has not yet been fully investigated. To fill the research gap, this paper seeks to explore how an *un/nun*-marked NP and a *man*-marked NP interact in a particular way when they are co-present in a sentence, focusing on their ordering relations.

When an *un/nun*-marked NP and a *man*-marked NP occur within the same sentence, certain constraints are imposed on the order of the NPs. That is, an *un/nun*-marked NP can precede a *man*-marked NP, as in (8), whereas an interpretation problem occurs when a *man*-marked NP precedes an *un/nun*-marked NP, as in (9). I argue that the constraints are caused by ordering restrictions among contrastive foci, contrastive topics, and noncontrastive topics.

- (8) *chelswu-nun swuci-man kaluch-ye.*
 Cheolsoo-TOP/CONT Suji-ONLY teach-IE
 a. ‘As for Cheolsoo(SUBJ), he teaches Suji(OBJ) only.’
 b. ‘As for Cheolsoo(OBJ), only Suji(SUBJ) teaches him.’
- (9) *swuci-man chelswu-nun kaluch-ye.*⁷
 Suji-ONLY Cheolsoo-TOP/CONT teach-IE
 a. *‘As for Cheolsoo(OBJ), only Suji(SUBJ) teaches him.’
 b. ‘As for Cheolsoo(SUBJ), he teaches Suji(OBJ) only.’

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents the theoretical assumptions on the functions of the semantic particles *un/nun* and *man*. Section 3 demonstrates ordering restrictions observed in the sentences involving both an *un/nun*-marked NP and a *man*-

⁶ In Sohn (1999), both *un/nun* and *man* have been categorized as delimiters that delimit the semantic scope of the attached words and phrases. In the current paper, I will focus on the functions of *un/nun* as a marker of topic/contrast and *man* as a marker of focus.

⁷ My five native Korean-speaking consultants all agreed that (9) may sound unnatural, but is acceptable if it has the interpretation in (9b). See Sections 3 and 4 for a more detailed analysis of (9).

marked NP. In section 4, I identify and examine in detail three properties of an *un/nun*-marked NP and a *man*-marked NP, which may affect the ordering restrictions presented in Section 3. Section 5 then concludes the paper.

2. Theoretical assumptions on functions of *un/nun* and *man*

2.1. *un/nun*

The particle *un/nun* has been referred to as ‘topic marker’ previously in the literature (e.g., Choi, 1996; Han, 1998; Lee, C., 2006; Kim, 2013; 2015). It has been widely accepted that the topic marker *un/nun* has two main functions. First, *un/nun* marks the noncontrastive aboutness topic of a sentence. The ‘aboutness’ concept of topics in Reinhart (1981) views a topic as an expression whose referent is what the sentence is about (p. 57).

Several linguistic tests have been proposed as tools to identify the aboutness topic of a sentence. Of the tests, in the *what about X?* diagnostics devised by Gundel (Gundel, 1974; Gundel & Fretheim, 2004), an element is considered a topic if the sentence can answer the question *what about X?*, where *X* is the topic. Both (10b) and (10c) are felicitous responses to (10a), and *Jane* is understood as the topic of either (10b) or (10c).

- (10) a. What about Jane? What’s Jane doing?
 b. Jane’s walking her dog.
 c. As for Jane, she’s walking her dog. (Gundel & Fretheim 2004: 16)

Consider the Korean example in (11). In response to (11a), (11b) is interpreted as a sentence uttered about *chelswu*, and the particle *nun* functions to mark *chelswu* as a noncontrastive (aboutness) topic. (11b), on the other hand, is an infelicitous answer to (11a), as the subject marking particle *ka* cannot evoke the interpretation of *chelswu* being a noncontrastive topic.

- (11) a. *chelswu-nun?* *chelswu-nun* *nwukwu kaluch-ye?*
 Cheolsoo-TOP Cheolsoo-TOP whom teach-IE
 ‘What about Cheolsoo? Who does Cheolsoo teach?’
 b. *chelswu-nun swuci-man kaluch-ye.*
 Cheolsoo-TOP Suji-ONLY teach-IE
 ‘As for Cheolsoo, he teaches Suji only.’
 c. #*chelswu-ka swuci-man kaluch-ye.*
 Cheolsoo-NOM Suji-ONLY teach-IE
 #‘Cheolsoo teaches Suji only.’

Second, as has been previously reported, *un/nun* serves as a marker of contrast. Some researchers have used the term ‘contrastive topic’ (e.g., Lee, C., 2006; Rangelov, 2012; Kim, 2013) to describe the contrastive use of *un/nun*. The notion of ‘contrastive(ness)’ I adopt in this paper is understood as presupposing a contextually closed set of alternatives to contrast with (Lee, C., 2003). In Lee, C. (2006), it is pointed out that contrastive topics are typically produced with a high tone or a contrastive contour, whereas noncontrastive topics are low in pitch in Korean.

For example, (12a) provides a set of alternatives (i.e., *chelswu*, *swuci*, and *minci*). The *nun*-marked NP *chelswu* produced with a high tone in (12b) would be interpreted as contrastive topic, as *chelswu* is being contrasted with other members of the set (i.e., *swuci* and *minci*). (13a), on the other hand, does not contain a set of alternatives and is uttered only about Cheolsoo. Therefore, producing *chelswu-nun* in a high tone in (13b) would be awkward, as *chelswu* here could only be interpreted as a noncontrastive topic, which lacks a set of alternatives to contrast with.

- (12) a. *chelswu, swuci, minci-ka hakkyo-ey w-ass-ta.*
 Cheolsoo Suji Minji-NOM school-LOC come-PST-DC
 ‘Cheolsoo, Suji, and Minji came to school.’
 b. *chelswu-nun^{HIGH} swuhak kongpwu-lul h-ass-ta.*
 Cheolsoo-TOP math study-ACC do-PST-DC
 ‘Cheolsoo studied math.’
- (13) a. *chelswu-ka hakkyo-ey w-ass-ta.*
 Cheolsoo-NOM school-LOC come-PST-DC
 ‘Cheolsoo came to school.’
 b. #*chelswu-nun^{HIGH} swuhak kongpwu-lul h-ass-ta.*
 Cheolsoo-TOP math study-ACC do-PST-DC
 #‘Cheolsoo studied math.’

In his paper, Lee, C. also claims that contrastive topic functions to serve as a sentence topic (in the aboutness sense) and yield a contrastive interpretation at the same time. Further, Chung (2016) demonstrates that an *un/nun*-marked contrastive topic is interpreted as topical and that its topicality is supported by the *what about X?* diagnostics, as in (14). In (14a), the *nun*-marked NP *sakwa* becomes a selected member of the pre-established set *apples*, *oranges*, and *bananas*, leaving *oranges* and *bananas* as unselected members. Therefore, (14a) can trigger follow-up questions as to who has eaten the oranges and/or bananas. The *nun*-marked NP *oleyn-ci* is given a contrastive reading in (14c) and understood as an answer to the question *what about oranges?* in (14b). Thus, (14c) is interpreted as a sentence uttered about oranges, but not apples or bananas.

- (14)⁸ Context: John brought some apples, some oranges, and some bananas last night, but there aren’t any left this morning.
- a. *sakwa-nun john-i mek-ess-e.*
 apple-CONT John-NOM eat-PST-DC
 ‘As for apples, it is John who ate them.’
- b. *oleyn-ci-nun? oleynci-nun nwuka mek-ess-ni?*
 orange-CONT/TOP orange-CONT/TOP who eat-PST-Q
 ‘What about oranges? Who ate them?’
- c. *oleyn-ci-nun swuci-ka mek-ess-e.*
 orange-CONT/TOP Suji-NOM eat-PST-DC
 ‘As for oranges, it is Suji who ate them.’

⁸ (14) is adapted from Chung (2016), example (202) on pp. 163-164.

In sum, the particle *un/nun* marks its host NP as a contrastive topic or a noncontrastive topic in the sentence. The above discussion has shown that contrastive topics and noncontrastive topics are both topical in the sense that they indicate what the sentence is about, as confirmed by the *what about X?* diagnostics. What distinguishes contrastive topics from noncontrastive topics is that contrastive topics evoke a set of contrasting alternatives, while noncontrastive topics do not presuppose a set of alternatives to contrast with.

2.2. *man*

In the Korean linguistics literature, *man* has been generally referred to as a marker of focus (e.g., Yang, 1972, 1973; Lee, Y., 2004, 2005; Lim, 2005; Hwang et al., 2010; Park, 2015). This paper will regard the particle *man* as a marker of contrastive focus⁹, which is aligned with what Kiss (1998) refers to as identificational focus. Kiss (1998) claims that identificational focus can carry the feature [+ contrastive] combined with the feature [+ exhaustive]. Adopting this notion of identificational focus, the *man*-marked NP *swu* in (15) is interpreted as being both exhaustive and contrastive.

- (15) *swu-man ku seymina swuep-ey tuleka-ss-e.*
 Swu-ONLY that seminar class-LOC enter-PST-DC
 ‘Only Swu entered that seminar class (among, e.g., the students who are registered for the class).’ (Hwang et al, 2010: 2)

The test proposed by Donka Farkas (cited in Kiss 1998) can be used to identify the function of the Korean particle *man* in expressing exhaustive-contrastive identification of an NP. The negative response in (16b) is a logical consequence of (16a), showing that the particle *man* is not compatible with the additive particle *to* meaning ‘also’. As depicted in (16a), the *man*-marked NP *khothu* is interpreted exhaustively (i.e., a coat only) and contrastively (i.e., not a hat). The positive response in (16c), thus, is not a logical consequence of (16a). If *khothu* is marked by the object marking particle *lul*, as in (17), it does not express exhaustive or contrastive identification. Therefore, the negative response in (17b) and the positive response in (17c) would both be regarded as logical consequences of (17a).

- (16) a. *chelswu-ka khothu-man sa-ss-e.*
 Cheolsoo-NOM coat-ONLY buy-PST-DC
 ‘Cheolsoo bought a coat only.’
 b. *ani. moca-to sa-ss-e.*
 no hat-ALSO buy-PST-DC
 ‘No. (Cheolsoo) also bought a hat.’
 c. **ung. moca-to sa-ss-e.*
 yes hat-ALSO buy-PST-DC
 *‘Yes. (Cheolsoo) also bought a hat.’

⁹ Hwang et al. (2010) has previously described *man* as a marker of contrastive focus.

- (17) a. *chelswu-ka kothu-lul¹⁰ sa-ss-e.*
 Cheolsoo-NOM coat-ACC buy-PST-DC
 ‘Cheolsoo bought a coat.’
 b. *ani. moca-to sa-ss-e.*
 no hat-ALSO buy-PST-DC
 ‘No. (Cheolsoo) also bought a hat.’
 c. *ung. moca-to sa-ss-e.*
 yes hat-ALSO buy-PST-DC
 ‘Yes. (Cheolsoo) also bought a hat.’

As discussed above, *un/nun* and *man*, both being semantic particles, carry important semantic functions and reflect the information structural properties of their host NP in relation to the rest of the sentence. *Un/nun* marks its host NP as a contrastive topic or a noncontrastive topic, whereas *man* marks its host NP as a contrastive focus. The following sections will show how the interplay of the information structural properties of each particle results in certain ordering restrictions when they are co-present within the same sentence.

3. Ordering constraints on *un/nun*-marked NP and *man*-marked NP

When an *un/nun*-marked NP and a *man*-marked NP co-occur within the same sentence, they can appear in two ways, as in (18) and (19). In (18), the *nun*-marked NP *chelswu* precedes the *man*-marked NP *swuci*. As shown in (18a) and (18b), (18) as a stand-alone sentence can be interpreted in two different ways.

- (18) *chelswu-nun swuci-man kaluch-ye.*
 Cheolsoo-TOP/CONT Suji-ONLY teach-IE
 a. ‘As for Cheolsoo(SUBJ), he teaches Suji(OBJ) only.’
 b. ‘As for Cheolsoo(OBJ), only Suji(SUBJ) teaches him.’
- (19) *swuci-man chelswu-nun kaluch-ye.*
 Suji-ONLY Cheolsoo-TOP/CONT teach-IE
 a. *‘As for Cheolsoo(OBJ), only Suji(SUBJ) teaches him.’
 b. ‘As for Cheolsoo(SUBJ), he teaches Suji(OBJ) only.’

In (18a), *chelswu-nun* is identified as the grammatical subject, and *swuci-man* is identified as the object. On the other hand, in (18b), *chelswu-nun* is identified as the grammatical object, and *swuci-man* is identified as the subject. Although the grammatical functions of *chelswu-nun* and *swuci-man* are reversed, their information-structural roles remain the same in (18a) and (18b). In both interpretations, *chelswu-nun* is interpreted as a topic, and *swuci-man* is interpreted as a focus.

The *what about x* diagnostics confirms that *chelswu-nun* indicates what the sentence is about, as (18) serves as a response to both the questions in (20a) and (21a). If (18) is uttered as a response

¹⁰ (17a) can be responded with either a positive response or negative response only when *kothu-lul* is produced with neutral prosody. Some researchers (e.g., Chung, 2016) have claimed that a *lul*-marked NP could be read exhaustively if it is given prosodic prominence.

to (20a), it would be interpreted as (20b). On the other hand, if (18) is uttered in response to (21a), it would be interpreted as (21b).

(20) a. *chelswu-nun?* *chelswu-nun* *nwukwu kaluch-ye?*

Cheolsoo-TOP Cheolsoo-TOP whom teach-IE

‘What about Cheolsoo? Who does he teach?’

b. *chelswu-nun* *swuci-man* *kaluch-ye.*

Cheolsoo-TOP Suji-ONLY teach-IE

‘As for Cheolsoo(SUBJ), he teaches Suji(OBJ) only.’

(21) a. *chelswu-nun?* *chelswu-nun* *nwuka kaluch-ye?*

Cheolsoo-TOP Cheolsoo-TOP who teach-IE

‘What about Cheolsoo? Who teaches him?’

b. *chelswu-nun* *swuci-man* *kaluch-ye.*

Cheolsoo-TOP Suji-ONLY teach-IE

‘As for Cheolsoo(OBJ), only Suji(SUBJ) teaches him.’

Further, (22) and (23) show that *chelswu-nun* in (18) can also carry a contrastive meaning, implying that there is a set of contrasting alternatives (e.g., ‘other teachers or other students’). If (18) is uttered after (21a), *chelswu* becomes the selected member of the pre-established set *teachers*, as interpreted in (22b). If (18) is uttered after (23a), *chelswu* becomes the selected member of the pre-established set *students*, as interpreted in (23b). In sum, sentences such as (18), where an *un/nun*-marked NP appears before a *man*-marked NP, are always understood as grammatically well-formed sentences, regardless of how they are interpreted.

(22) a. *chelswu, minswu, minci-nun sensayngnim-i-ya.*

Cheolsoo Minsoo Minji-TOP teacher-COP-IE

‘Cheolsoo, Minsoo, and Minji are teachers.’

b. *chelswu-nun* *swuci-man* *kaluch-ye.*

Cheolsoo-CONT Suji-ONLY teach-IE

‘Cheolsoo(SUBJ) (not other teachers) teaches Suji(OBJ) only.’

(23) a. *chelswu, minswu, minci-nun haksayng-i-ya.*

Cheolsoo Minsoo Minji-TOP student-COP-IE

‘Cheolsoo, Minsoo, and Minji are students.’

b. *chelswu-nun* *swuci-man* *kaluch-ye.*

Cheolsoo-CONT Suji-ONLY teach-IE

‘Only Suji(SUBJ) teaches Cheolsoo(OBJ) (not other students).’

(19) differs from (18) in that a *man*-marked NP precedes an *un/nun*-marked NP. Although the *man*-marked NP and the *un/nun*-marked NP are ordered reversely, it is still expected that the sentence would yield two possible interpretations. However, unlike (18), a problem emerges with respect to the interpretation of (19); it allows one interpretation only.

If *chelswu-nun* is interpreted as the grammatical object of the sentence, as in (19a), a problem occurs in its information structural interpretation. That is, *chelswu-nun* can be interpreted neither as a contrastive topic nor a noncontrastive topic. (19) is regarded as an infelicitous response to the

question in (24a), showing that a noncontrastive aboutness reading of *chelswu-nun* is blocked, as in (24b). (19) as a sentence subsequently linked to (25a) is also infelicitous, as in (25b), showing that a contrastive reading of *chelswu-nun* is also blocked.

- (24) a. *chelswu-nun?* *chelswu-nun* *nwuka kaluch-ye?*
 Cheolsoo-TOP Cheolsoo-TOP who teach-IE
 ‘What about Cheolsoo? Who teaches him?’
 b. **swuci-man chelswu-nun kaluch-ye.*
 Suji-ONLY Cheolsoo-TOP teach-IE
 *‘As for Cheolsoo(OBJ), only Suji(SUBJ) teaches him.’
- (25) a. *swuci, minswu, minci-nun sensayngnim-i-ya.*
 Suji Minsoo Minji-TOP teacher-COP-IE
 ‘Suji, Minsoo, and Minji are teachers.’
 b. **swuci-man chelswu-nun kaluch-ye.*
 Suji-ONLY Cheolsoo-CONT teach-IE
 *‘Only Suji(SUBJ) teaches Cheolsoo(OBJ) (not other students).’

However, as indicated in (19b), (19) is acceptable (although generally not preferred), only if *chelswu-nun* is interpreted as the grammatical subject of the sentence. (19) is interpreted as (26b) as a felicitous response to (26a), in which *chelswu-nun* is interpreted as a noncontrastive topic (i.e., ‘as for Cheolsoo’). On the other hand, it would be very unnatural to utter (19) after (27a), and a contrastive reading of *chelswu-nun* (i.e., ‘Cheolsoo, not other teachers’) is blocked. In other words, (19) is considered acceptable only if the sentence-medial *swuci-nun* is interpreted as a noncontrastive topic in the subject position.

- (26) a. *chelswu-nun?* *chelswu-nun* *nwukwu kaluch-ye?*
 Cheolsoo-TOP Cheolsoo-TOP whom teach-IE
 ‘What about Cheolsoo? Who does Cheolsoo teach?’
 b. *swuci-man chelswu-nun kaluch-ye.*
 Suji-ONLY Cheolsoo-TOP teach-IE
 ‘As for Cheolsoo(SUBJ), he teaches Suji(OBJ) only.’
- (27) a. *chelswu, minswu, minci-nun sensayngnim-i-ya.*
 Cheolsoo Minsoo Minji-TOP teacher-COP-IE
 ‘Cheolsoo, Minsoo, and Minji are teachers.’
 b. **swuci-man chelswu-nun kaluch-ye.*
 Suji-ONLY Cheolsoo-CONT teach-IE
 *‘Only Suji(OBJ), Cheolsoo(SUBJ) (not other teachers) teaches her.’

The above discussion has demonstrated how the positions of an *un/nun*-marked NP and a *man*-marked NP become restricted when they are co-present within the same sentence. To summarize, two main observations have been noted in this section. First, when an *un/nun*-marked NP precedes a *man*-marked NP, as in (18), the sentence is perceived as a completely well-formed sentence and yields two possible interpretations. Second, when a *man*-marked NP precedes an

un/nun-marked NP, as in (19), the only possible way to interpret the sentence is to understand the sentence-medial *un/nun*-marked NP as a noncontrastive topic in the subject position.

4. Analysis

In this section, I will identify and examine three properties of an *un/nun*-marked NP and a *man*-marked NP, which may affect the ordering restrictions presented in Section 3.

4.1. Restriction on the distribution of *un/nun*-marked NP and *man*-marked NP

An assumption can be made that the ordering restrictions result from the constraints pertaining to the semantic particles *un/nun* and/or *man*. However, an *un/nun*-marked NP or a *man*-marked NP is typically not constrained in its distribution in a sentence. NPs marked by *un/nun* can appear anywhere within a sentence as the subject or object of the sentence, as shown in (28) and (29)¹¹, respectively.

- (28) a. *chelswu-nun swuci-lul kaluch-ye.*
 Cheolsoo-TOP/CONT Suji-ACC teach-IE
 b. *swuci-lul chelswu-nun kaluch-ye.*
 Suji-ACC Cheolsoo-TOP/CONT teach-IE
 ‘As for Cheolsoo(SUBJ), he teaches Suji(OBJ).’

- (29) a. *chelswu-ka swuci-nun kaluch-ye.*
 Cheolsoo-NOM Suji-CONT teach-IE
 ‘Cheolsoo(SUBJ) teaches Suji(OBJ) (not others).’
 b. *swuci-nun chelswu-ka kaluch-ye.*
 Suji-TOP/CONT Cheolsoo-NOM teach-IE
 ‘As for Suji(OBJ), Cheolsoo(SUBJ) teaches her.’

Similarly, NPs marked by *man* can appear anywhere within a sentence. A *man*-marked NP can occupy the subject position, as in (30), or the object position, as in (31).

- (30) a. *chelswu-man swuci-lul kaluch-ye.*
 Cheolsoo-ONLY Suji-ACC teach-IE
 b. *swuci-lul chelswu-man kaluch-ye.*
 Suji-ACC Cheolsoo-ONLY teach-IE
 ‘Only Cheolsoo(SUBJ) teaches Suji(OBJ).’

- (31) a. *chelswu-ka swuci-man kaluch-ye.*
 Cheolsoo-NOM Suji-ONLY teach-IE

¹¹ The sentence-medial *swuci-nun* in (29a) as a stand-alone sentence is only read contrastively, functioning as a contrastive topic (e.g., being contrasted to other students). On the other hand, *swuci-nun* in (29b) as a stand-alone sentence can be interpreted as both a noncontrastive topic (i.e., the sentence is about *swuci*) and contrastive topic (i.e., *swuci* is being contrasted with other students). Although it is a noteworthy difference, what causes such a restriction will not be specified within the scope of this paper.

- b. *swuci-man chelswu-ka kaluch-ye.*
 Suji-ONLY Cheolsoo-NOM teach-IE
 ‘Cheolsoo(SUBJ) (is the one who) teaches Suji(OBJ) only.’

As demonstrated in the above observations, both an *un/nun*-marked NP and a *man*-marked NP are flexible as to where they can appear within a sentence when they do not co-occur. Thus, the ordering restrictions between an *un/nun*-marked NP and a *man*-marked NP do not result from the particles’ distributional constraints.

4.2. Absence of case-marking

As pointed out earlier, the Korean language makes use of case particles to identify the grammatical functions (i.e., subject or object) of argument NPs. In sentences such as (18) and (19), where argument NPs are only marked by semantic particles without accompanying case particles, it can be expected that identifying the grammatical functions of the argument NPs is difficult and that interpretational problems will arise.

If neither the subject argument NP nor the object argument NP is marked by any case particle, the sentence is typically interpreted in the order of subject-object-verb (SOV). As exemplified in (32a), the first argument NP (i.e., *chelswu-∅*) is interpreted as the subject, while the second argument NP (i.e., *swuci-∅*) is interpreted as the object.

- (32) *chelswu-∅ swuci-∅ kaluch-ye.*
 Cheolsoo Suji teach-IE
 a. ‘Cheolsoo(SUBJ) teaches Suji(OBJ).’
 b. *‘Suji(SUBJ) teaches Cheolsoo(OBJ).’

The above observation has indicated that sentences with NPs unmarked by any case particle(s) allow one interpretation only. This, however, is not the case when each of the two NPs accompanies the semantic particle *un/nun* or *man*. As discussed in Section 3, (18) is interpreted in two different ways; both an *un/nun*-marked NP and a *man*-marked NP can be interpreted either as the subject or the object of the sentence, as long as the *un/nun*-marked NP precedes the *man*-marked NP. On the other hand, (19) can be interpreted in one way only, in which the sentence-initial *man*-marked NP and the sentence-medial *un/nun*-marked NP are interpreted in the order of object-subject. This, in turn, indicates that the absence of case-marking cannot be the cause of the restrictions observed in Section 3.

4.3. Ordering constraints relating to topic and focus in Korean

4.3.1. Contrastive focus and contrastive topic

As described in Sections 2 and 3, the particles *un/nun* and *man* indicate the information structural properties of their host NP in relation to the rest of the sentence. The particle *un/nun* marks an NP as a contrastive topic or a noncontrastive topic. The particle *man*, on the other hand, marks an NP as a contrastive focus.

This section will examine in depth how the ordering restrictions between an *un/nun*-marked NP and a *man*-marked NP are associated with the relative order of topics and foci. Cross-

linguistically, it has been observed that the syntactic distribution of topic and focus is restricted when they occur together in the same sentence. That is to say, it is possible for a topic to precede a focus, as in (33a), whereas it is impossible for a topic to follow a focus, as in (33b).

- (33) a. topic [COMMENT FOCUS [BACKGROUND ...]]
 b. *FOCUS [BACKGROUND topic [COMMENT ...]]

Neeleman et al. (2009) further examined the placement of topic and focus, adopting the view that regards topic, focus, and contrast as independent syntactic features. In Dutch, topics and foci that are interpreted contrastively undergo A'-scrambling. When these movements take place, there are no designated landing sites for a moved topic and focus, however, a rigid ordering restriction is observed; a moved topic can precede a moved focus, but a moved focus cannot precede a moved topic.

Vermeulen, R. (2011) demonstrated that the feature [+contrast] also licenses A'-scrambling in Korean and Japanese and that a contrastive topic or focus can optionally undergo A'-scrambling in both languages. (34) presents the four predictions regarding the relative order between contrastive topics and foci from Vermeulen, R. (2011). The Korean examples (35), (36), (37), and (38) from the paper bore out all four predictions. (36a) and (38a) show that a contrastive topic and a contrastive focus that remains *in situ* can be ordered freely, bearing out the predictions in (34a) and (34b). (36b) shows that a moved contrastive focus cannot precede a contrastive topic that remains *in situ*, whereas (38b) shows that a moved contrastive topic can precede a contrastive focus that remains *in situ*, and in turn the predictions in (34c) and (34d) are borne out.

- (34) a. [... CT ... CF ...] (CF = Contrastive Focus; CT = Contrastive Topic)
 b. [... CF ... CT ...]
 c. #_{[YP CF [YP=DoC for CF ... CT ... t_{CF} ...]]} (DoC = Domain of Contrast)
 d. [_{YP CT [YP=DoC for CT ... CF ... t_{CT} ...]]}

- (35) *John-un/i ecey pathi-eyse mwuess-lul mekesse?*
 'What did John eat at the party yesterday?'

- (36) *Hmm, John-un molu-keyss-ko*
 'Well, I don't know about John, but...'
 a. *Bill-un*_[CONT TOP] *8-si-ey* *khong-man*_[CONT FOC] *mekesse.*
 Bill-TOP 8 o'clock-at beans-ONLY ate
 b. #*khong-man*_{[CONT FOC]_i} *Bill-un*_[CONT TOP] *8-si-ey* *t_i* *mekesse.*
 beans-ONLY Bill-TOP 8 o'clock-at ate
 'As for Bill, he was eating only beans around 8 o'clock.'

- (37) *ecey party-eyse nwuka pasta-lul mekesse?*
 'Who ate the pasta at the party yesterday?'

- (38) *Hmm, pasta-nun molu-keyss-ko*
 'Well, I don't know about the pasta, but...'
 a. *Bill-man*_[CONT FOC] *khong-un*_[CONT TOP] *8-si-ey* *mekesse.*
 Bill-ONLY beans- TOP 8 o'clock-at ate

- b. *khong-un*_{[CONT TOP]i} *Bill-man*_[CONT FOC] *8-si-ey* *t_i mekesse.*
 beans-TOP Bill-ONLY 8 o'clock-at ate
 'As for the beans, only Bill ate them at 8 o'clock.'

I will now return to (18) and (19) and examine whether Vermeulen's observations on the ordering relations between contrastive topics and contrastive foci can account for the differences between (18) and (19). When a contrastive topic and a contrastive focus appear in the order of subject-object, respectively, they can stay *in situ*. In (40a), *chelswu-nun* in the subject position is a contrastive topic, and *swuci-man* in the object position is a contrastive focus. (40a) is a felicitous response to (39), as it has the structure in (34a). (40b), on the other hand, is an infelicitous answer to (39), as it has the ill-formed structure in (34c). In the order of object-subject, a contrastive topic and a contrastive focus cannot stay *in situ*, so (40b) cannot have the structure in (34b) as well.

- (39) *minswu-nun nwukwu-lul kaluch-ye?*
 Minsoo-TOP who-ACC teach-IE?
 'Who does Minsoo teach?'

- (40) *kulssey minswu-nun cal molukeyss-ko*
 well Minsoo-TOP/CONT well not.know-and
 'Well, I don't know about Minsoo, but'

- a. *chelswu-nun*_[CONT TOP] *swuci-man*_[CONT FOC] *kaluch-ye.*
 Cheolsoo-TOP/CONT Suji-ONLY teach-IE
 b. **swuci-man*_{[CONT FOC]i} *chelswu-nun*_[CONT TOP] *t_i kaluch-ye.*
 Suji-ONLY Cheolsoo-TOP/CONT teach-IE
 'As for Cheolsoo(SUBJ), he teaches Suji(OBJ) only.'

In (42), as a response to (41), *swuci-man* in the subject position is a contrastive focus, and *chelswu-nun* in the object position is a contrastive topic. (42a) is an infelicitous answer to (41), although it has the well-formed structure in (34b), in which a contrastive focus and a contrastive topic stay *in situ* in the order of subject-object. However, the infelicitousness of (42a) can be explained if we assume a vacuous movement. If the contrastive focus *swuci-man* has moved out of a constituent containing the contrastive topic, the sentence is expected to be infelicitous. Finally, (42b) is felicitous as it has the structure in (34d), in which a moved contrastive topic precedes a contrastive focus that remains *in situ*.

- (41) *nwu-ka hyenci-lul kaluch-ye?*
 who-NOM Hyunji-ACC teach-IE?
 'Who teaches Hyunji?'

- (42) *kulssey hyenci-nun cal molukeyss-ko*
 well Hyunji-TOP/CONT well not.know-and
 'Well, I don't know about Hyunji, but'

- a. **swuci-man*_[CONT FOC] *chelswu-nun*_[CONT TOP] *kaluch-ye.*
 Suji-ONLY Cheolsoo-TOP/CONT teach-IE
 b. *chelswu-nun*_{[CONT TOP]i} *swuci-man*_[CONT FOC] *t_i kaluch-ye.*
 Cheolsoo-TOP/CONT Suji-ONLY teach-IE

‘As for Cheolsoo(OBJ), only Suji(SUBJ) teaches him.’

As we have seen in (40) and (42), the ordering relations between the contrastive topics and contrastive foci in (18) and (19) can be explained by Vermeulen’s observations in (36) and (38). However, the question still remains unanswered as to whether the same will be observed for the ordering relations between a contrastive focus and a noncontrastive topic.

Consider the question-answer pair in (43) and (44) for examples containing a contrastive focus and a noncontrastive topic. (44a) and (44b) are both felicitous responses to (43). (44a) shows that a noncontrastive topic in the subject position can precede a contrastive focus in the object position. (44b), contrary to expectations, shows that a contrastive focus in the object position can precede a noncontrastive topic in the subject position. (34) cannot account for why (44b) is felicitous, and it is thus necessary to examine how a noncontrastive topic differs from a contrastive topic in its distribution.

(43) *chelswu-ka nwukwu-lul kaluch-ye?*
 Cheolsoo-NOM who-ACC teach-IE?
 ‘Who does Cheolsoo teach?’

(44) a. *chelswu-nun*_[NON-CONT TOP] *swuci-man*_[CONT FOC] *kaluch-ye.*
 Cheolsoo-TOP Suji-ONLY teach-IE
 b. *swuci-man*_[CONT FOC] *chelswu-nun*_[NON-CONT TOP] *ti kaluch-ye.*
 Suji-ONLY Cheolsoo-TOP teach-IE
 ‘As for Cheolsoo(SUBJ), he teaches Suji(OBJ) only.’

4.3.2. Contrastive focus and noncontrastive topic

According to Vermeulen, R. (2011), a noncontrastive topic in Korean either has moved to the initial position of the clause or is base-generated there. On the other hand, a contrastive topic can remain *in situ* or undergo scrambling to the medial or initial position of the clause. However, inconsistent with what Vermeulen suggests about the distribution of Korean noncontrastive topics, they can appear in the medial position of the clause, as is evident from (44b).

(45) *nwu-ka swuci-lul kaluch-ye?*
 who-NOM who-ACC teach-IE?
 ‘Who teaches Suji?’

(46) a. #*chelswu-man*_[CONT FOC] *swuci-nun*_[NON-CONT TOP] *ti kaluch-ye.*
 Cheolsoo-ONLY Suji-TOP teach-IE
 b. #*swuci-nun*_[NON-CONT TOP] *chelswu-man*_[CONT FOC] *kaluch-ye.*
 Suji-TOP Cheolsoo-ONLY teach-IE
 ‘Only Cheolsoo(SUBJ) teaches Suji(OBJ).’

Further, noncontrastive topics, unlike contrastive topics, can occupy the subject position of the sentence only, but not the object position, as shown in (45) and (46). The above points

altogether indicate that noncontrastive topics and contrastive topics are distinct from each other and that they would differ in their distribution when occurring with a contrastive focus¹².

Given that contrastive topics and noncontrastive topics are two distinct types of topics, the question arises as to what the ordering relation is among a contrastive topic, a contrastive focus, and a noncontrastive topic when they all occur within a ditransitive sentence. (48a)-(48f), in response to (47), contain the three argument NPs: *na-nun* (subject) as a noncontrastive topic, *swuci-hantey-nun* (indirect object) as a contrastive topic, and *kkoth-man* (direct object) as a contrastive focus. As shown in (48a)-(48f), two restrictions are imposed on the ordering of an *un/nun*-marked contrastive topic, a *man*-marked contrastive focus, and an *un/nun*-marked noncontrastive topic. First, a *man*-marked contrastive focus cannot precede an *un/nun*-marked contrastive topic, as in (48b), (48e), and (48f). Second, an *un/nun*-marked noncontrastive topic cannot appear after an *un/nun*-marked contrastive topic and a *man*-marked contrastive focus, as in (48d) and (48f). In (48d), even if an *un/nun*-marked contrastive topic precedes a *man*-marked contrastive focus, it results in an ungrammatical state due to the *un/nun*-marked noncontrastive topic being preceded by both the *un/nun*-marked contrastive topic and *man*-marked contrastive focus.

- (47) *ne-nun chinkwu-tul-hantey mwusun senmwul-ul cwe-ss-e?*
 2SG-TOP friend-PL-TO what gift-ACC give-PST-IE
 ‘What (kind of) gifts did you give to your friends?’

(NCT = Noncontrastive topic)

- (48) a. *na-nun swuci-hantey-nun kkoth-man cwe-ss-e.* (NCT CT CF)
 1SG-TOP Suji-to-TOP/CONT flower-ONLY give-PST-IE
 b. **na-nun kkoth-man swuci-hantey-nun cwe-ss-e.* (*NCT CF CT)
 1SG-TOP flower-ONLY Suji-to-TOP/CONT give-PST-IE
 c. *swuci-hantey-nun na-nun kkoth-man cwe-ss-e.* (CT NCT CF)
 Suji-to-TOP/CONT 1SG-TOP flower-ONLY give-PST-IE
 d. **swuci-hantey-nun kkoth-man na-nun cwe-ss-e.* (*CT CF NCT)
 Suji-to-TOP/CONT flower-ONLY 1SG-TOP give-PST-IE
 e. **kkoth-man na-nun swuci-hantey-nun cwe-ss-e.* (*CF NCT CT)
 flower-ONLY 1SG-TOP Suji-to-TOP/CONT give-PST-IE
 f. **kkoth-man swuci-hantey-nun na-nun cwe-ss-e.* (*CF CT NCT)
 flower-ONLY Suji-to-TOP/CONT 1SG-TOP give-PST-IE
 ‘(As for me), I gave Suji (not other friends) flowers only.’

(50a)-(50f), in response to (49), are also ditransitive sentences and contain the three argument NPs, *swuci-hantey-nun* (indirect object) as a noncontrastive topic, *na-nun* (subject) as a contrastive topic, and *kkoth-man* (direct object) as a contrastive focus. (50a)-(50f) show the same restrictions as in (48a)-(48f).

- (49) *salam-tul-i swuci-hantey mwusun senmwul-ul cwe-ss-e?*
 people-PL-NOM Suji-to what gift-ACC give-PST-IE
 ‘What (kind of) gifts did people give to Suji?’

¹² I will further discuss what leads to the differences between the distribution of noncontrastive topics and that of contrastive topics in the presentation.

- (50) *kulssey salam-tul-un cal molukeyss-ko*
 well people-PL-TOP/CONT well not.know-and
 ‘Well, I don’t know about other people, but’
- a. *swuci-hantey-nun na-nun kkoth-man cwe-ss-e.* (NCT CT CF)
 Suji-to-TOP 1SG-TOP/CONT flower-ONLY give-PST-IE
- b. **swuci-hantey-nun kkoth-man na-nun cwe-ss-e.* (*NCT CF CT)
 Suji-to-TOP flower-ONLY 1SG-TOP/CONT give-PST-IE
- c. *na-nun swuci-hantey-nun kkoth-man cwe-ss-e.* (CT NCT CF)
 1SG-TOP/CONT Suji-to-TOP flower-ONLY give-PST-IE
- d. **na-nun kkoth-man swuci-hantey-nun cwe-ss-e.* (*CT CF NCT)
 1SG-TOP/CONT flower-ONLY Suji-to-TOP give-PST-IE
- e. **kkoth-man swuci-hantey-nun na-nun cwe-ss-e.* (*CF NCT CT)
 flower-ONLY Suji-to-TOP 1SG-TOP/CONT give-PST-IE
- f. **kkoth-man na-nun swuci-hantey-nun cwe-ss-e.* (*CF CT NCT)
 flower-ONLY 1SG-TOP/CONT Suji-to-TOP give-PST-IE
 ‘(As for Suji), I (but not other people) gave her flowers only.’

In short, four main observations are noted in this section. First, an *un/nun*-marked contrastive topic (whether it moves or remains *in situ*) can precede a *man*-marked contrastive focus, whereas a *man*-marked contrastive focus (whether it moves or remains *in situ*) cannot precede an *un/nun*-marked contrastive topic. Second, a moved *man*-marked contrastive focus can only precede an *un/nun*-marked noncontrastive topic in the subject position. Third, a *man*-marked contrastive focus cannot precede an *un/nun*-marked contrastive topic in ditransitive sentences, where an *un/nun*-marked contrastive topic, a *man*-marked contrastive focus, and an *un/nun*-marked noncontrastive topic occur together. Fourth, in ditransitive sentences, an *un/nun*-marked noncontrastive topic cannot appear after an *un/nun*-marked contrastive topic and a *man*-marked contrastive focus.

5. Conclusion

This paper has explored the ordering relations between an *un/nun*-marked NP and a *man*-marked NP in Korean. When an *un/nun*-marked NP precedes a *man*-marked NP, the sentence is perceived as a well-formed utterance and can be interpreted in two different ways. On the other hand, when a *man*-marked NP precedes an *un/nun*-marked NP, the sentence is perceived as a somewhat unnatural utterance and can be interpreted in one way only within a limited context. In order to account for the ordering restriction, three properties of an *un/nun*-marked NP and a *man*-marked NP were examined. First, the ordering restriction does not result from the distributional constraints pertaining to the semantic particles *un/nun* or *man*. Both an *un/nun*-marked NP and a *man*-marked NP are flexible as to where they can appear within a sentence when they do not co-occur. Second, the restriction is not caused by the absence of case-marking. Sentences with two NPs accompanying a semantic particle are grammatical and interpretable, as long as an *un/nun*-marked NP precedes a *man*-marked NP. Finally, the information structural properties of an *un/nun*-marked NP and a *man*-marked NP restrict them to appear in a certain order. The particle *un/nun* marks an NP as a contrastive topic or a noncontrastive topic, while the particle *man* marks an NP as a contrastive focus. In Korean, a contrastive topic (whether it moves or remains *in situ*) can precede

a contrastive focus, whereas a contrastive focus (whether it moves or remains *in situ*) cannot precede a contrastive topic. Due to this restriction, an *un/nun*-marked contrastive topic can precede a *man*-marked contrastive focus, whereas a *man*-marked contrastive focus cannot precede an *un/nun*-marked contrastive topic. However, a *man*-marked contrastive focus can precede an *un/nun*-marked topic if interpreted noncontrastively in the subject position. Further, two restrictions were observed in ditransitive sentences, in which a *man*-marked contrastive focus, an *un/nun*-marked contrastive topic, and an *un/nun*-marked noncontrastive topic occur together. First, a *man*-marked contrastive focus cannot precede an *un/nun*-marked contrastive topic. Second, an *un/nun*-marked noncontrastive topic cannot appear after an *un/nun*-marked contrastive topic and a *man*-marked contrastive focus, regardless of how the contrastive topic and contrastive focus are ordered (i.e., *CT CF NCT, *CF CT NCT).

References

- Choi, H-W. (1996). Optimizing structure in context: Scrambling and information structure (Doctoral dissertation).
- Chung, H. B. (2016). On the syntax/semantics of Korean nominal particles. (Doctoral dissertation, City University of New York).
- Gundel, J. K. (1974). The role of Topic and Comment in linguistic theory. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.
- Gundel, J. K., & Fretheim, T. (2004). 8 Topic and Focus. *The handbook of pragmatics*, 175.
- Han, C-H. (1998). Asymmetry in the interpretation of-(n) un in Korean. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, 7, 1-15.
- Hwang, K., Schafer, A. J., & O'Grady, W. (2010). Contrastive focus facilitates scrambling in Korean sentence processing. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, 17.
- Kim, I. (2013). *Korean-(n) un, salience, and information structure*. (Doctoral dissertation, Yale University).
- Kim, I. (2015). Is Korean -(n)un a topic marker? On the nature of -(n)un and its relation to information structure. *Lingua*, 154, 87-109.
- Kiss, K. (1998). Identificational focus versus informational focus. *Language* 74 (2), 245-273.
- Lee, C. (2003). Contrastive topic and/or contrastive focus. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, 12, 352-364.
- Lee, C. (2004). Scalar meanings of the concessive (-to), the contrastive topic marker (-nun) and-man 'only' in Korean (and Japanese). In *Proceedings of the 18th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*, 217-226.
- Lee, C. (2006). Contrastive (predicate) topic, intonation, and scalar meanings. In *Topic and focus*, 151-175. Springer, Dordrecht.
- Lee, Y. (2004). *The syntax and semantics of focus particles* (Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology).
- Lee, Y. (2005). Exhaustivity as agreement: The case of Korean man 'only'. *Natural Language Semantics*, 13(2), 169-200.
- Lim, D-H. (2015). Semantics of focus particles in Korean. *Journal of Korean Linguistics*, 73, 335-373.
- Neeleman et al. (2009). A syntactic typology of topic, focus and contrast. *Alternatives to cartography*, 1551.
- Park, C-W. (2015). On the interrelation between the functions of auxiliary noun endings and the information structure in Korean. *Journal of Korean Linguistics*, 73, 269-307.
- Rangelov, S. A. (2012). *The grammar and usage of Korean phrase-final particles* (Doctoral dissertation, SOAS, University of London).
- Reinhart, T. (1981). Pragmatics and linguistics: An analysis of sentence topics in pragmatics and philosophy I. *Philosophica anc Studia Philosophica Gandensia Gent*, 27(1), 53-94.
- Sohn, H-M. (1999). *The Korean language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Vermeulen, R. (2011). The syntax of topic, contrast and contrastive topic. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*, 58.
- Yang, I-S. (1972). *Korean syntax: Case marking, delimiters, complementation and relativization*. Seoul: Paek Hap Sa.
- Yang, I-S. (1973). Semantics of delimiters.
- Yeon, J., & Brown, L. (2013). *Korean: A Comprehensive Grammar*. Routledge.