

발행인: 남승호
편집인: 이해운
발행처: 한국언어정보학회
발행일: 2012년 9월 17일
URL: <http://society.kisti.re.kr/~ksli/>

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

1. 월례 논문 발표회

이번 학기에도 예전과 마찬가지로 네 차례의 월례발표회가 예정되어 있습니다. 오는 토요일(9월 22일)에 있을 첫 번째 월례 발표회에서는 임동식 (CCHS-CSIC), 윤애선 (부산대), 김지혜 (숭실대) 선생님의 발표가 계획되어 있습니다. 이번 학기의 발표 일정 및 발표요지는 아래를 참고하시고, 많은 참석과 관심을 바랍니다.

2. [언어와 정보] 논문 모집

- ▶ [언어와 정보]에 실을 원고를 수시로 모집하고 있습니다. 심사용 논문은 자유로운 스타일로 아래아 한글이나 MS Word로 작성하셔도 됩니다. 논문의 스타일은 학회 홈페이지 (<http://society.kisti.re.kr/~ksli/>)에 자세히 소개되어 있으니 참조하시기 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 편집위원장이신 류병래 교수(ryu@cnu.ac.kr)께 연락하시면 됩니다.

3. 회원 가입 및 회비 납부 안내

- ▶ 우리 학회는 회원 여러분들께서 납부하신 회비로 운영됩니다. 원활한 학회 운영을 위해 연회비를 납부해 주시기 바랍니다. 회비는 월례 발표회장에서 또는 아래의 학회계좌로 납부하실 수 있습니다. (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 부탁드립니다.

4. 학술대회 안내

- ▶ [CFP] 2012 International Conference for the Korean Association for Corpus Linguistics (KACL 2012)
 - 일시: 2012년 12월 10~11일
 - 장소: 부산
 - 사이트: <http://kacl.pusan.ac.kr>
 - 초록마감: 2012년 10월 15일
- ▶ The 26th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information, and Computation (PACLIC 26)
 - 일시: 2012년 11월 08~10일
 - 장소: Bali
 - 사이트: <http://pacific26.cs.ui.ac.id>

한국언어정보학회 2012학년도 2학기 월례회 일정표

장소: 대우재단 7층 실 시간: 9:30 - 13:00

날짜	시간	구분	발표자	논문제목	사회	
9/22 (토)	09:30 10:30	기획1	임동식 (CCHS- CSIC)	Evidentials at semantics-pragmatics interface: Perspective shifts and context-overwriting effects of Korean	류병래 (충남대)	
	Coffee Break (15분)					
	10:45 11:45	특강	윤애선 (부산대)	어의 중의성 해소(Word Sense Disambiguation): 한국어 WSD를 중심으로		
	Coffee Break (15분)					
	12:00 12:45	일반	김지혜 (송실대)	Tensed-S Condition (TSC) and the Determination of Binding Domain of Anaphors in Korean		
10/20 (토)	09:30 10:30	기획1	손익수 (경북대)	TBA	양정석 (연세대)	
	Coffee Break (15분)					
	10:45 11:45	특강	신호필 (서울대)	TBA		
	Coffee Break (15분)					
	12:00 12:30	일반	정대호 (한양대)	TBA		
	12:00 13:00	기획2	이한정, 김나연 (성균관대)	Usage Probability, Non-Canonical Word Order and Subject-Object Asymmetry in Korean Case Ellipsis		
11/17 (토)	09:30 10:30	기획1	임현서 (서울대)	TBA	미정	
	Coffee Break (15분)					
	10:45 11:45	특강	이용훈 (충남대)	TBA		
	Coffee Break (15분)					
	12:00 12:30	일반	김지은 (울산대)	TBA		
	12:30 13:00	일반	김동성 (고려대)	TBA		
12/15 (토)	09:30 10:30	특강1	최승권 (ETRI)	대화시스템을 위한 사용자 의도 태깅 코퍼스 구축	김윤신 (신라대)	
	Coffee Break (15분)					
	10:45 11:45	특강2	이기용 (고려대)	TBA		
	Coffee Break (15분)					
	12:00 12:30	일반	김지은 (한국외대)	TBA		
	12:30 13:00	일반	이우승 (협성대)	TBA		

<기획 논문 1>

**Evidentials at semantics-pragmatics interface:
Perspective shifts and context-overwriting effects of Korean
evidentials**

임 동 식 (CCHS-CSIC, Madrid, Spain)

Korean evidentials are known to exhibit so-called perspective shifts, which we define as (1).

- (1) Evidential perspective shift: the evidence holder indicated by an evidential marker is different from the utterer of the sentence.

In this study we identify two types of evidential perspective shifts in Korean (Lim & Lee C. 2012): shifts in interrogatives (Lim 2010, Lim in preparation) and shifts in declaratives (Lee C. forthcoming), exemplified as (2) and (3), respectively:

- (2) John-i Mary-lul chac-te-nya?
John-Nom Mary-Acc look.for-Dir.evi-Q
'Did John look for Mary?'

Implication: the addressee is expected to answer whether John looked for Mary based on her direct perceptual evidence.

- (3) John-i Mary-lul chac-te-lay?
John-Nom Mary-Acc look.for-Dir.evi-Rep.evi
'John looked for Mary.'

Implication: the source of the utterer's reportative evidence has direct perceptual evidence regarding the fact that John looked for Mary.

The goal of this study is to give a unified analysis of these two types of perspective shifts. Based on Lim's (2010, in preparation) proposal, according to which Korean evidentials are functions from propositions to characters (Kaplan 1989), we further argue that Korean evidentials overwrite the context parameter of the prejacent with the variable bound by the evidential, as schematized in (4):

- (4) For any evidential EVI , any prejacent ϕ of type $\langle s, t \rangle$, any utterance context c^* and any world of evaluation w^* ,
- $$\Downarrow EVI \diamond^{C^*, w^*} (\Downarrow \phi \diamond^{C^*, w^*}) = \lambda c. \Downarrow \phi \diamond^{C, w^*}$$

In this study we will illustrate how the lexical entry based on (4) explains both types of perspective shifts. In addition to this, we will discuss a puzzle regarding the exceptional licensing of the long-distance anaphor *caki* under *-te-*, which is first noticed by Lim (to appear) and exemplified in (5):

(5) (Scenario: Bill and John are close friends. Their children are also close friends, and go to the same school. Once Bill and John were invited to the school. In the school, when both Bill and John were observing a class from a distance, they saw a child causing trouble during class. After class, Bill asks Tom, the teacher, to scold that child, not knowing that he was his own son. John, however, noticed this. He says later...)

a. #Bill_i-i Tom-eykey cak_i atul-ul honnay-la-ko malha-ess-ta.

Bill-Nom Tom-Dat self son-Acc scold-Imp-Comp say-Past-Decl

b. #Bill_i-i Tom-eykey cak_i atul-ul honnay-la-ko malha-te-ta.

Bill-Nom Tom-Dat self son-Acc scold-Imp-Comp say-Dir.evi-Decl

'Billi told Tom to scold selfi's son.'

Implication: the utterer (John) saw Bill told Tom to scold his own son.

(5) shows that the long-distance anaphor *caki* can refer to the attitude holder *-te-*, even though the attitude holder does not have the relevant *de se* knowledge. In this presentation, we will also show how our proposal based on the context-overwriting effect of *-te-* in (4) can account for this puzzle.

References

- Kaplan, David. 1989. Demonstratives. In Joseph Almog, John Perry & Howard Wettstein (eds.), *Themes from Kaplan*, 481{563. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, Chungmin. forthcoming. Evidentials and modals: What makes them unique. To appear in *International Journal of Language Data Processing*.
- Lim, Dongsik. 2010. *Evidentials and Interrogatives: A case study from Korean*: University of Southern California dissertation.
- Lim, Dongsik. in preparation. Questions, characters, and evidentiality: a case study from Korean. Manuscript, USC & CCHS-CSIC.
- Lim, Dongsik. to appear. Temporal and inferential interpretation of Korean direct evidential *-te-*. In *Proceedings of the 47th Chicago Linguistics Society*, Chicago: Department of Linguistics, University of Chicago.
- Lim, Dongsik & Chungmin Lee. 2012. Perspective shifts of Korean evidentials and the effect of contexts. In Anca Chereches (ed.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory 22*, 26{42. Ithaca: CLC Publications.

<특강>

어의 중의성 해소(Word Sense Disambiguation) -한국어 WSD를 중심으로

윤 애 선 (부산대)

본 발표에서는 기존의 다양한 어의 중의성 해소(이하, WSD) 방법을 살펴보고, 한국어를 대상으로 부산대학교 한국어정보처리 연구실(KLPL)이 연구 중인 WSD 방법을 소개한다.

WSD는 여러 개의 의미로 사용될 수 있는 중의성 어휘가 특정 문맥에서 어떤 의미로 사용되었는지를 결정하는 것이다. WSD는 기계번역이나 정보검색과 같은 핵심적인 자연언어처리 응용 분야에서 매우 중요한 역할을 한다. 자연언어처리 분야에서 수행하는 WSD 방법으로는 (1) 지식(knowledge) 기반 방식과 (2) 말뭉치(corpus)를 이용한 방식이 있다. (1)에 사용되는 지식으로는 (a) 기계 가독형 사전의 풀이말, (b) 시소러스의 의미 범주, (c) 이중어 사전의 대응 어휘 쌍 등을 들 수 있다. 하지만 구축된 지식의 크기가 제한적이므로 언제나 자료 부족 문제(data sparseness problem)에 부딪히게 된다. (2)는 사용되는 말뭉치의 특성에 따라, (d) 의미 분석 말뭉치의 정보를 이용하는 감독(supervised) 방식, (e) 형태/원시 말뭉치를 이용하는 비감독(unsupervised) 방식으로 구분한다. (d)는 높은 정확도를 보이거나 신뢰성 있고 충분히 큰 의미 분석 말뭉치를 구하는 것이 관건이다. 특히, 한국어의 경우 사용할 수 있는 의미 분석 말뭉치는 아주 제한적이다. (e)는 다양한 분야의 큰 말뭉치를 쉽게 구할 수 있어 응용 범위가 아주 넓지만, 아직 실용 시스템에 사용할만한 정확도에 도달하지 못했다.

이에, KLPL에서는 한국어를 대상으로 감독 WSD 방식의 정확도를 증가하는 비감독 WSD 방식을 연구하고 있다. 구체적으로 비감독 WSD 방식에 지식을 추가한 통합 방식이며, 지식으로는 한국어 워드넷 KorLex의 의미관계를 사용한다. Senseval-2한국어 평가 데이터를 대상으로 KLPL에서 제안한 방식은 83.3-89.3% 정확도를 보여주며, 기존의 WSD 시스템에 비해 약 13-20%의 향상된 결과이다. 이 방식은 영어와 중국어를 대상으로도 정확도 향상을 얻을 수 있었다.

<일반논문>

Tensed-S Condition (TSC) and the Determination of Binding Domain of Anaphors in Korean

김 지 혜 (숭실대)

While there is consensus that Specified Subject Condition (SSC) characterizes the local domain where anaphors are bound (Binding Domain, BD), the status of TSC has been controversial. Though the assumption that SSC and TSC jointly define the BD can rule out (1a), the well-formedness of (1b), where *himself* violates TSC, is a problem.

- (1) a. *John thinks that himself is to blame

- b. John said that [pictures of himself] are on display

One response to this impasse is found in Chomsky (1981), where the definition of BD is modified (by appeal to an auxiliary definition of ‘Accessibility’) to allow (1b) as an exception to TSC. Another response (Pollard and Sag1992) holds that the BD is defined by the presence of a superior co-argument, which is another way of saying that only SSC is relevant in defining the BD. Under this view, TSC-violating anaphors don’t have a BD because there is no structurally prominent potential antecedent. However, this does not lead to ungrammaticality, and these anaphors become acceptable if there is a way to license them extra-grammatically, as exempt anaphors. In this view, as in similar views like Reuland (2011), syntax is not solely responsible for binding. What goes wrong in (1a) under this account is that the anaphor has the wrong case (= accusative). Evidence that (1b) involves an exempt anaphor comes from the fact that TSC-violating anaphors allow both strict and sloppy readings under VP-ellipsis, unlike locally bound anaphors.

- (2) a. John is proud of himself. So is Bill (=is proud of Bill(**sloppy**)/*?John(**strict**))
- b. John said that pictures of himself are on display. So did Bill (=said that pictures of Bill/John are on display)

Now, the equivalent of (1a) is well-formed in Korean. This is so not only for long-distance anaphors (LDA’s) like *caki* and *casin*, which are expected to be able to violate TSC, but even for local anaphors like *caki-casin* and *pronoun-casin*.

- (3) John-un [caki-casin-i/ku-casin-i chencayla-ko] mitnun-ta
- J-top self-nom genius-comp believes
- ‘John believes himself to be a genius.’

(3) favors Pollard and Sag’s account that locates the ill-formedness of (1a) on case-marking. However, the well-formedness of (3) by itself does not count as conclusive evidence for Pollard and Sag, since we haven’t established that the anaphor in (3) is an exempt anaphor. Indeed, the consensus in the literature on Korean (as well as Japanese, and Chinese, which are similar to Korean) thus far is that TSC-violations arise due to the parameterization of BD in these languages. Only SSC defines the BD (for local anaphors) in languages like Korean.

The question of whether TSC-violations in Korean are due to a parameterized BD or the possibility of exempt binding has never been addressed to the best of our knowledge. We therefore investigated this question using an experimental design, where we asked 40 Korean native speakers to judge the acceptability of sentences containing different types of binding (local, TSC-violating, SSC-violating) with both long-distance and local anaphors. We then asked them to rate the likelihood of strict/sloppy readings in a subsequent sentence containing VP-ellipsis.

The acceptability rating of locally (clause-mate) bound *caki-casin* and *pronoun-casin* did not differ

significantly from TSC-violations (Acceptability scores: *caki-casin*: local – mean = 3.85, TSC – mean = 3.85; *pronoun-casin*: local – mean = 3.77, TSC – mean = 3.83). However, the rate of sloppy readings for TSC violations differed significantly from that for local binding (sloppy reading possibilities: *caki-casin*: local – rate = 96.5%, TSC – rate = 73%; *pronoun-casin*: local – rate = 95.3%, TSC – rate = 70%), and strict readings increased considerably compared to local binding (strict reading possibilities: *caki-casin*: local – rate = 27%, TSC – rate = 74%; *pronoun-casin*: local – rate = 28%, TSC – rate = 75%). We take this result to indicate that TSC-violating local anaphors in Korean are licensed as exempt anaphors, and not as core anaphors bound in a larger BD. Comparison with genuine long-distance anaphors bolsters this interpretation. For the LDA *caki*, the acceptability of local binding did not differ from that for LD-binding (TSC violations, as well as TSC/SSC violations). On the other hand, *caki* did not differ from the complex anaphors and showed significant increase of strict reading in TSC conditions.

There is a clear lesson we can draw from these results. If the results of our study are representative, there is no parameterization of the BD for local anaphors (cf. Huang and Liu 2001 for a similar claim). Of course, the distinction between LDA's and local anaphors is real and must be accounted for somehow (Cole, Hermon, Sung 1990 and Reuland 2011 are representatives of early and recent attempts to account for the distinction between local and LDA's), but for local anaphors, languages are not divided in terms of those that choose SSC and TSC to define the BD versus those that only choose SSC to define the BD. The question is why. Under a theory where BD's can be parameterized (Yang 1983; Manzini and Wexler 1987; Progovac 1992), there is no ready answer. However, if the BD is rooted in something more fundamental like argument structure (as in Pollard and Sag 1992, and similar approaches like Reinhart and Reuland 1993), we can see why languages that have local anaphors (reflexivizers, in the theory of Reinhart and Reuland) will behave uniformly with respect to the determination of the BD.

References:

- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Foris, Dordrecht
- Cole, P, G. Hermon, and L.-M. Sung (1990). Principles and parameters of long-distance reflexives. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 21 (1), 1-22.
- Huang, C.-T. J., and C.-S. L. Liu (2001). Logophoricity, attitude, and *ziji* at the interface. *Syntax and Semantics*, 33, 141-195.
- Manzini, R. and K. Wexler (1987). Parameters, binding theory, and learnability, *Linguistic Inquiry*, 18, 413-444.
- Pollard, C. J., and I. A. Sag. (1992). Anaphors in English and the scope of Binding Theory. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 23, 261-303.
- Progovac, L. (1992). Relativized SUBJECT: Long Distance Reflexives Without Movement. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 23, 671-680.
- Reuland, Eric. (2011). *Anaphora and language design*, Cambridge: MIT Press
- Reinhart, T, and E. Reuland (1993). Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 24(4), 657-720.
- Yang, D.-W. (1983). The Extended Binding Theory of Anaphors. *Language Research*, 19(2), 169-192.