한국언어정보학회
Korean Society for Language and Information

소식지 제 104 호 (2011년 9월)

발행인: 남승호
편집인: 이해윤
발행처: 한국언어정보학회
발행일: 2011년 9월 19일
URL: http://society.kisti.re.kr/~ksli/

449-791
경기도 용인시 처인구 모현면
한국외국어대학교 인문대학 언어인지과학과 이해윤 교수 연구실내
전화: (031) 330-4284
e-mail: haeyun@hufs.ac.kr

1. 월례 논문발표회

이번 2학기에는 월례 발표회 3회 (9월 24일, 10월 15일, 12월 10일)와 학술대회 (공동: 현대언어학회, 11월 5일)가 계획되어 있습니다.

이번 9월 월례 발표회 (9월 24일)에서는 박종언 선생님 (동국대)과 조윤경 선생님 (한국외대)의 기회논문, 그리고 남승호 선생님 (서울대), 최인철 선생님 (경북대)의 일반논문 발표가 계획되어 있습니다. 월례회에 대한 문의사항이 있으시면 송민영 연구이사(songmy@dongguk.ac.kr)나 이해윤 총무이사(haeyun@snu.ac.kr)에게 연락 주시기 바랍니다.

2. 가을 학술대회 논문 모집

저희 언어정보학회와 현대언어학회가 공동으로 주최하는 가을학술대회가 아래와 같이 열립니다. 여러분의 소중한 연구결과를 이번 학술대회에 발표하시어 현대언어학회의 여러분들과도 함께 교류하시는 기회가 되시길 바랍니다.

► 일시: 2011년 11월 5일(토) 오전 10시-오후 6시
장소: 공주사범대학교
주최: 언어정보학회, 현대언어학회
논문발표신청: 2011년 10월 5일까지 초록(A4 1쪽 분량)을
연구이사 송민영 교수 (songmy@dongguk.ac.kr) 께 보내 주십시오.

3. [언어와 정보] 논문 모집

► [언어와 정보]에 실을 원고를 수시로 모집하고 있습니다. 심사용 논문은 자유로운 스타일로 아래아 한글이나 MS Word로 작성하셔도 됩니다. 어느 경우이든 꼭 논문 요약을 포함시켜 주시기 바라고, 그 외 논문의 스타일은 학회 홈페이지(http://society.kisti.re.kr/~ksli/)에 자세히 소개되어 있으니 참조하시기 바랍니다.

► [언어와 정보]는 일반 논문(general paper) 외에도 소고(squib), 서평 또는 논평(review), 또 이에 대한 답론(reply) 등 여러 형태의 투고를 받습니다. 논문 투고 시 투고 형태를 알려 주시기 바랍니다.

► 논문 심사료와 게재료는 다음과 같습니다. 논문 출판 시 라텍 편집비는 따로 받지 않습니다.

심사료: 30,000원

논문 게재료:

1) 연구비 수혜 논문: 270,000원 (심사료 포함 총 300,000원)
2) 연구비 수혜를 받지 않은 일반논문:
   (i) 저자 중 한 사람 이상이 전임인 경우 170,000원 (심사료 포함 총 200,000원)
   (ii) 모든 저자가 전임이 아닌 경우 20,000원 (심사료 포함 총 50,000원)

► 논문 게재에 관하여 기타 문의사항이 있으시거나, 원고 제출에 관해 의논하시려면 편집위원장인 위혜경 교수님(hkwee@dankook.ac.kr)께 연락하시면 됩니다.

4. 회원 가입 및 회비 납부 안내

► 우리 학회는 회원 여러분들께서 납부하신 회비로 운영됩니다. 원활한 학회 운영을 위해 가급적 빠른 시일 내에 2011년도 연회비를 납부해 주시기 바랍니다. (계좌번호: 우리은행 1002-839-410880 예금주: 이영주)

연회비: 정회원 40,000원, 준회원 20,000원, 기관회원 100,000원
평생회비: 400,000원

► 회원주소록은 연중 관리하고 있습니다. 주소 및 이메일, 전화번호가 바뀌신 분은 변경된 내용을 총무이사 (haeyun@hufs.ac.kr)에게 알려주시면 많은 도움이 되겠습니다. 아울러 주변의 교수님들과 대학원생들이 신입회원으로 많이 가입할 수 있도록 적극적으로 홍보해 주시기를 부탁 드립니다.

5. 학술대회 (논문/초록 모집) 안내

► 제 23회 한글 및 한국어 정보처리 학술대회
- 일시: 2011-10-06 ~ 07
- 장소: KT연구개발센터, 서울교육문화회관 별관

► The 21st Japanese/Korean Linguistics Conference
- 일시: 2011-10-20 ~ 22
- 장소: Seoul National University

► The 25th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation (PACLIC 25)
- 일시: 2011-12-16 ~ 18
- 장소: Nanyang Technological University (Singapore)
- 사이트: http://portal.cohass.ntu.edu.sg/PACLIC25/

한국언어정보학회 2011학년도 2학기 월례회 일정표

장소: 대우재단 7층 1 실　시간: 9:30 – 13:00

날짜	시간	구분	발표자	논문제목	사회
9/24 (토)	09:30 10:30	기획1	박종언 (동국대)	Jussive Clauses and Obligatory Control Effects in Korean	송민영 (동국대)
	Coffee Break (15분)				
	10:45 11:45	기획2	조윤경 (한국외대)	Heavy Complements in English	
	Coffee Break (15분)				
	12:00 12:30	일반	남승호 (서울대)	Symmetric Paths: their structures and relations	
	12:00 13:00	일반	최인철 (경북대)	Feature Conflict and Reconciliation in HPSG	
10/15 (토)	09:30 10:30	기획	최운호 (서울대)	TBA	조세연 (강원대)
	Coffee Break (15분)				
	10:45 11:45	특강	임희석 (고려대)	뇌정보처리 기술과 언어정보처리	
	Coffee Break (15분)				
	12:00 12:30	일반	이혜경 (아주대)	TBA	
	12:30 13:00	일반	윤신원 (경희대)	TBA	
12/10 (토)	09:30 10:30	기획	유현조 (서울대)	TBA	양정석 (연세대)
	Coffee Break (15분)				
	10:45 11:45	특강	채희락 (한국외대)	TBA	
	Coffee Break (15분)				
	12:00 12:30	일반	홍민표 (명지대)	On Free Choice and Subtrigging	
	12:30 13:00	일반	김윤신 (신라대)	TBA	

한국언어정보학회 2011년 9월 월례회 발표논문 초록

<기획 논문>

Jussive Clauses and Obligatory Control Effects in Korean

박 종 언 (동국대)

It has recently been observed in the literature that obligatory control (OC) dependencies arise in Korean when a promissive, imperative or exhortative clause is embedded as in (1a), (1b) and (1c), respectively (cf. Gamerschlag (2007), Madigan (2008a,b), J. Park (2009, 2010)).

(1) a. Subject Control

John$_i$-un Mary$_j$-eykey [e$_{i/*j}$ hakkyo-ey ka-**ma**-ko] yaksokhay-ss-ta.
John-top Mary-dat school-to go-prm-comp promise-past-decl
'John promised Mary to go to school.'

b. Object Control

John$_i$-un Mary$_j$-eykey [e$_{*i/j}$ hakkyo-ey ka-**la**-ko] myenglyenghay-ss-ta
John-top Mary-dat school-to go-imp-comp order-past-decl
'John ordered Mary to go to school.'

c. Split (Antecedent) Control

John$_i$-un Mary$_j$-eykey [e$_{i+j}$ hakkyo-ey hamkkey ka-**ca**-ko]
John-top Mary-dat school-to together go-exh-comp
ceyanhay-ss-ta.
propose-past-decl
'John proposed to Mary to go to school together.'

The point of interest lies in the fact that the type of control in these data varies depending on the type of complement clauses which a few recent studies (Pak (2006) and Pak et al. (2007)) label 'jussive clauses': the subject control is possible if the embedded clause is a promissive marked by *–ma*, as in (1a); the object control arises if the complement clause is an imperative marked by *–la*, as in (1b); and the split control is possible if an exhortative clause marked by *–ca* is embedded.

More crucially, the control type of each sentence is correlated with the person restriction imposed on the subject of the embedded clause. In root contexts, the subject of a promissive clause is necessarily first person, the speaker, that of an imperative clause is second person, the addressee, and that of an exhortative is first person plural inclusive, both the speaker and addressee. On the other hand, in embedded contexts like (1a-c), the null subject of the promissive complement is construed as the matrix subject, the speaker of the reported speech act; that of the imperative clause as the matrix object, the addressee of the reported speech act, and that of the exhortative as the matrix subject and object, the

speaker and addressee of the reported speech act.

Against this backdrop, the primary goal of this paper is to offer a syntactic analysis of the control dependencies in (1a-c) and capture the correlation between the clause type of jussive complement and the control type. More specifically, the analysis suggested in this paper aims to answer the questions in (2a) through (2c).

(2) a. What licenses controlled subjects? (Syntactic environments (or Licensing condition))
b. What are controlled subjects? (Categorial status of controlled elements)
c. How are controllers determined? (Controller choice)

As for the question in (2a), I suggest that the head of TP in a jussive complement has [futurate] feature, which explains why the tense of the jussive complement is invariably unrealized with respect to the matrix clause, as illustrated in (3).

(3) a. ecey John$_i$-un Mary$_j$-eykey [**pro**$_j$ ttena-**la**-ko] seltukhayssta.
yesterday John-top Mary-dat leave-imp-comp persuaded
'Yesterday, John persuaded Mary to leave.'
≠ 'There is a time *t* yesterday such that John persuaded Mary at *t* that she left at *t*.'

b. *onul John$_i$-un Mary$_j$-eykey [**pro**$_j$ ecey ttena-**la**-ko]
today John-top Mary-dat yesterday leave-imp-comp
seltukhayssta
persuaded
Intended: 'Today, John persuaded Mary to leave yesterday.'

c. ecey John$_i$-un Mary$_j$-eykey [**pro**$_j$ nayil ttena-**la**-ko]
yesterday John-top Mary-dat tomorrow leave-imp-comp
seltukhayssta
persuaded
'Yesterday, John persuaded Mary to leave tomorrow.'

Secondly, regarding the question in (2b), I argue that the null subject in a jussive complement is neither PRO nor an A-trace but **pro**. The immediate advantage of this claim is to capture the fact that the null subject in (1a-c) can be replaced with an overt subject. Third, as for the way the controller of a null subject is chosen in (1a-c), I suggest that the control dependencies of the kind found in each sentence is an instance of shift in indexicality (cf. Schlenker (2003), Anand and Nevins (2004)), and that it can be decomposed into syntactic agreement in person, which is followed by syntactic binding. To begin with, I assume with Pak et al. (2007) and Zanuttini et al. (2011) that the null subject, **pro**, in each type of jussive complement undergoes Agree in person with Jussive^0, a functional head where the person feature of the jussive complement is encoded. This assumption is motivated by the fact that even when a third person overt subject appears in place of **pro**, the person feature of the subject manifested in terms of pronominal

binding remains unchanged: that is, it is first person in the promissive, second person in the imperative and first person plural inclusive in the exhortative clause, as shown in (4a-c).

(4) Overt Subjects and Binding Facts in Jussive Clauses

a. emma-ka$_i$ nay$_i$/*kunye-uy$_i$ chinkwu-lul teliko.o-**ma**.
mother-nom my/her friend-acc bring.come-prm
'Mother will bring my friend' (*mother* = speaker)

b. Inho-ka$_i$ ney$_i$/*ku-uy$_i$ chinkwu-lul teliko.o-a**la**.
Inho-nom your/his.male friend-acc bring.come-imp
'Inho bring your friend!' (*Inho* = addressee)

c. emma-wa Inho-ka$_i$ wuli$_i$/*ku-uy$_i$ chinkwu-lul teliko.o-**ca**.
mother-and Inho-nom our/his friend-acc bring.come-exh
'Mother and Inho will bring our friend' (*mother* = speaker; *Inho* = addressee)

Zanuttini et al. (2011: 11)

However, given that each type of jussive clause is not a root clause but an embedded one in (1a-c), we need to explain how the person feature of the jussive subject can be referentially connected to the subject, object or both. For this reason, capitalizing on Baker's (2008) analysis of shifting indexicality, I propose that the controlled subject in (1a-c) can be licensed only if it is bound by the relevant discourse participant operator, which is assumed to appear in Speaker/Addressee Phrase on top of Jussive Phrase: in particular, the null subject of the embedded promissive clause in (1a) needs to be bound by the speaker operator, that of the embedded imperative clause in (1b) by the addressee operator, and that of the embedded exhortative clause by the speaker-addressee operator. Notice, furthermore, that these operators should in turn be bound by the relevant matrix argument due to their nature—that is, what they denote is not the speaker or addressee of the actual speech act but of the reported speech act.

References

Anand, Pranav and Andrew Nevins. 2004. Shifty operators in changing contexts. In *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) XIV*, ed. by Robert B. Young, 20–37. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, CLC Publications.

Baker, Mark C. 2008. *The Syntax of Agreement and Concord*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gamerschlag, Thomas. 2007. Semantic and Structural Aspects of Complement Control in Korean. In Barbara Stiebels (ed.), *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 47, 61-123.

Madigan, Sean. 2008a. Split control is obligatory control: evidence from Korean. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39.3, 493–502.

Madigan. Sean. 2008b. *Control Constructions in Korean*. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Delaware.

Pak, Miok. 2006. Jussive Clauses and Agreement of Sentence Final Particles in Korean. In T. Vance and K. Jones, eds., *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 14, 295-306. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Pak, Miok, Paul Portner, and Raffaella Zanuttini. 2007. Agreement and the Subjects of Jussive Clauses in

Korean. In E. Elfner and M. Walkow, eds., *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society* 37. Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Park, Jong Un. 2009. *Jussive Particles and Obligatory Control in Korean*. Studies in Generative Grammar 19.3, 399-421.

Park, Jong Un. 2010. On Null Subjects in Embedded Jussive Clauses in Korean. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 19*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Schlenker, Philippe. 2003. A Plea for Monsters. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26, 29-120.

Zanuttini, Raffaella, Miok Pak and Paul Portner. 2011. A Syntactic Analysis of Interpretive Restrictions on Imperative, Promissive, and Exhortative Subjects. To appear in *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.

<기획 논문>

Heavy Complements in English

조 윤 경 (한국외대)

This study mainly concerns English data where an overt element apparently intervenes between the head and the complement, which posits an interesting question under the X-bar schema. For the data, three possible movement-based accounts (the incorporation, the rightward movement, the verb movement approaches) will be discussed but it will be pointed out that those transformational approaches encounter critical problems. Thus, it will be concluded that the complement that comes after a modifier is base-generated and is placed in a special complement position that is preserved at the right periphery, being mediated by the light verb phrase which connects the theme structure to the rheme structure. This proposal has an advantage of making a generalization that heavy elements occur at the right periphery. This study further accounts for distributional and grammatical contrasts between non-nominal complements and nominal complements that appear after a modifier. Also, this current account can structurally distinguish subject inversion and the construction of the heavy complement which have previously been viewed as a heavy NP shift identically, explaining their different distributional fact.

<일반논문 1>

Symmetric Paths: their structures and relations

남 승 호 (서울대)

The goal of this paper is two-fold: (i) the paper aims to characterize unique semantics of so called “symmetric” locatives like *across the street* – this will provide a guiding semantics for annotating a variety of paths; and (ii) the paper claims that we need “symmetric” paths to give a unified account of the various

semantic effects of symmetric locatives. The paper illustrates several semantic effects induced by symmetric locatives: (i) symmetric underspecification, (ii) path-/event-quantification, (iii) static symmetric relations, and (iv) the symmetric inference by the adverb back. The paper defines the semantic class of symmetric locatives, and accounts for the symmetry effects in terms of properties and relations of *Path Structure* proposed by Nam (1995).

<일반논문 2>

Feature Conflict And Resolution in HPSG

최 인 철 (경북대)

Pollard and Sag (1994) declares that a linguistic theory should be rendered in a formal logic as long as its content can be made clear and unambiguous in natural language. This line of doctrine can actually be driven from the one advocated by Chomsky (1957), in which it is said that only the formalized theory can provide solutions for many linguistic problems and recognize the productive potential. For the precise description of linguistic entities and eventual modeling of the natural language, the HPSG framework employs a system of typed feature structures.

A feature structure is a way of representing linguistic information of a linguistic entity and consists of features and their values. In HPSG framework, a linguistic entity is of a certain type. It means that the entity allows only a certain feature structure that is appropriate for it. For example, only the feature structure in (1a) between those in (1) is well-typed.

(1) a. $\begin{bmatrix} noun \\ \text{CASE } case \end{bmatrix}$ b. $\begin{bmatrix} noun \\ \text{AUX } boolean \end{bmatrix}$

The feature structure in (1a) is equipped with the information that a nouns requires, for example, the case specification such as nom or acc. On the other hand, that in (1b) has a feature description that is not appropriate to a noun but a verb.

The HPSG framework authorized by Pollard and Sag (1994) adopted further criteria of completeness. That is, they suggest that a feature structure be totally well-typed and type-resolved (Carpenter 1992). In a totally well-typed feature structures, every feature that is appropriate for the type should be present.

(2) a. *synsem*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{CATEGORY } category \\ \text{CONTENT } content \\ \text{CONTEXT } context \end{bmatrix}$$

b. *case*

$$[\text{CASE } nom]$$

For example, the linguistic entity synsem, should specify category, content and context information to be

well-typed. If it neglects any of these features, it will not be a well-typed feature structure. In addition, the value of a terminal feature should be maximally specified. A feature may require a value that is further specified by another feature structure or that is an atomic type. For example, the feature CASE requires the value case, as an atomic value without any further feature structure specification. In this case, the value should be a maximal type such as nom or acc but not the supper type case. This is because a feature structure should be type-resolved, following the tenet of Pollard and Sag (1994).

The aim of this paper is to examine whether this type of strong version of feature logic can survive intact when it deals with natural language. Recent developments in HPSG framework, particularly Sag (2003), tend to admit that a structural description may not be in one-to-one relation with the feature structure. Building on Sag's retreat from the type resolution of the feature structure, I will show that such relief is inevitable to deal with various phenomena particularly regarding coordination, case mismatch and mixed category phenomena in English and Korean. In addition, I will provide a demonstration of the solution for the phenomena while adopting the Sag's underspecification analysis.