Particles and postpositions in Korea

Injoo Choi-Jonin

Article published in:
Adpositions: Pragmatic, semantic and syntactic perspectives
Edited by Dennis Kurzon and Silvia Adler
Amsterdam : John Benjamins [Typological Studies in Language 74], 2008
pp. 133–170

Particles and postpositions in Korean

Injoo Choi-Jonin
University of Toulouse-Le Mirail & UMR 5263, CLLE-ERSS

Abstract
In Korean, certain postpositions which may be used on their own may be also combined with another postposition, while others are necessarily complex. This latter case is considered by some scholars as peripheral or secondary postpositions and weakly grammaticalized. I propose, then, to examine the hypothesis of the degree of grammaticalization based on particle-omissibility of complex postpositions, on the one hand, and the categorial status of particles, on the other.

1. Introduction

As in many other languages, a large number of Korean grammatical words have developed from lexical words or from free phrases by the process of grammaticalization, i.e. semantic bleaching, decategorization, reanalysis and morphological / phonological fusion (*cf.* Heiner & Traugott 1991; Hopper & Traugott 1993). In line with grammaticalization theory, Rhee (2002) has investigated postpositional functions of six Korean verbs of motion, and assumed that they are not grammaticalized to the same degree. He establishes the varying degrees of grammaticalization on the basis of the omissibility of the so-called *particle*, among other criteria: if a complex postposition, formed with a grammaticalized verb and a particle, can be used without a particle, it is considered more grammaticalized than one which cannot. In other words, if a postposition requires a particle, it is due, according to the author, to its verbal status, which is not completely lost. In his work concerning the grammaticalization of spatio-temporal postpositions in Korean, Rhee (2004) has examined "postpositional constructions" containing six relational nouns and has argued again for their lesser degree of grammaticalization on the basis of the omissibility of genitive or locative particles.

However, this hypothesis of degrees of grammaticalization based on particle-omissibility of complex postpositions should be questioned. First of all, the Korean language exhibits a phenomenon called multiple case marking (cf. Schweiger 2000, for Australian languages). It is indeed possible in Korean for nominal constituents to have a choice of more than one particle attached to them, for example a genitive marker may be preceded by a dative marker or by a comitative marker. Moreover, some completely fossilized compound particles are formed by a particle and an archaic nominal or verbal form. A particle can then be preserved at the highest degree of grammaticalization.

On the other hand, the author does not make clear the category status of what he calls *postposition, particle* or *postpositional particle.* In fact, the term *particle* is commonly used, in the literature on Korean linguistics written in European languages, for designating various bound morphemes. It generally corresponds to Korean traditional *cosa* ("auxiliary word") which "attaches to a nominal to indicate the preceding noun's relation with other words in the sentence or to limit its meaning" (Lee 1992: 147). Even though in many Korean grammars *cosa* is considered a particular word category, the question whether all bound morphemes grouped in this category are independent words or not is rather controversial. As for the term *particle,* it is of no help in language descriptions, as already pointed out by Zwicky (1985: 284): "'particle', in its customary broad usage, is a pretheoretical notion that has no translation into a theoretical construct of linguistics, and must be eliminated in favour of such constructs". As shown by Zwicky for other languages, the controversial question about various Korean *particles* concerns whether they are to be classified as independent words, as clitics or as inflectional or derivational suffixes.

The term *postposition* seems to have been introduced into Korean grammar by way of comparison with European prepositions. Indeed, Ramstedt (1939: 283) uses it in this way: "The words which are here called postpositions correspond to the prepositions in English or other European languages". Apart from this kind of lexical correspondence, he doesn't give any theoretical criteria on which to base a Korean postpositional category. In the 1950s, Lee S.-N (1956) and Lee S.-W.(1957) included under postpositions certain particles such as *pwuthe* ("from"), *cocha* ("even") which they do not consider flexional suffixes or derivational suffixes. Later, in the 1980s, certain particles (i.e. so-called *adverbial particles,* cf. §2.1) were analyzed as postpositions*,* within the framework of generative grammar.[1] In this approach, postpositions, just as prepositions, function as syntactic heads governing their complement. However, the question which particles are analyzed as heads is not yet at all obvious.[2]

The aim of this chapter is, then, (i) to define precisely the categorial status of particles in order to identify postposition-like particles, (ii) to revalue Rhee's assumption concerning the correlation between particle omissibility and the degree of grammaticalization of so-called complex postpositions, and (iii) to propose an alternative hypothesis concerning the grammaticalization of (complex) postpositions. In section 2, after a brief account of Korean particles (2.1.), we will examine the categorial status of Korean particles from morpho-phonological accounts (2.2.) and from (semantico-syntactico-pragmatic) functional accounts (2.3.), concluding they are clitics which possess properties both of suffixes and of independent words (2.4.). In section 3, we will revaluate the criteria used by Rhee for

determining the degrees of grammaticalization, and propose other criteria which should be taken into account when discussing the grammaticalization of postpositions, especially the grammaticalization of postpositions from verbs (3.1.) and from nouns (3.2.). It will be shown that the omissibility of the particle in the structure of complex postpositions relies on its morphosyntactic status (suffix-like or postposition-like) rather than on the degree of grammaticalization of complex postposition. On the other hand, verbs or nouns grammaticalized to a lesser degree or not at all manifest other morphosyntactic behaviours, i.e. a morphological variability, typical of verbs, or a syntactic functional variability, typical of nouns.

2. Categorial status of Korean particles

Particles correspond in general, as we noted above, to the traditional Korean word category *cosa* ("auxiliary word"). They are, according to Sohn (1999: 213), *postpositional function words* because they "follow a nominal (noun, pronoun, or numeral), a nominal phrase or nominalized clause, an adverb or adverbialized clause, or a sentence". Particles are not syntactically autonomous and function as bound grammatical morphemes without lexical meaning. However, Sohn's definition of *postpositional function word* appears to be too broad. Indeed, if some particles can attach to any categorial phrase, others can follow only a nominal phrase. On the other hand, Sohn (1999: 213) recognizes himself that "there are some phonological grounds for particles to be equated with suffixes". Once more, this remark is relevant for certain particles but not for all particles. We propose then to examine morphophonological and semantico-syntactico-pragmatic properties of Korean particles. Before getting to the heart of the matter, a brief account on particles will come in useful.

2.1. A brief account of Korean particles

The particle word category traditionally comprises two sub-types, namely *kyek cosa* ("case auxiliary word") and *thuksu cosa* ("special auxiliary word"). The former, generally attached to a nominal phrase, indicates the syntactic, semantic or pragmatic function of their host constituent, and the latter, attached to a nominal or other phrase, delimits the meanings of the constituent to which it attaches (cf. Lee 1992: 148, 154). They are called by Sohn (1999) *case particles* and *delimiters*, respectively. Table 1 summarizes various kinds of particles mentioned by Lee (1992: 147-159) and by Sohn (1999: 213-215).

Table 1. Korean Particles (*cf.* Lee 1992; Sohn 1999)[3]

Case particles			**Special particles (or Delimiters)**	
Nominative		*ka / i,* *kkeyse* (AN, Hon.)	Theme	*nun / un* "as for"
Accusative		*lul / ul*	Inclusion	*to* "also, too, indeed"
Genitive		*uy*	Limitation	*man* "only, solely"
Adverbial cases	Dative	*eykey* (AN) *hanthey* (AN) *kkey* (AN, Hon.) *tele* (AN), *poko* (AN)	Toleration	*ya / iya (malo)* "only if it be, as only for, finally"
			Concession	*lato / ilato* "even, for lack of anything better"
	Locative / Goal	*ey* (IN)	Inception	*pwuthe* "starting from, beginning with"
	Ablative / Inessive	*eyse* (IN)	Boundary	*kkaci* "as far as, even, up to"
	Source	*eykeyse* (AN) *hantheyse* (AN) *kkeyse* (AN, Hon.)	Comprehensiveness	*mata* "each, every"
			Addition	*cocha* "even, as well"
	Directional / Instrument / Essive-Modal	*lo / ulo* "towards" *lo / ulo(-sse)* "with" *lo / ulo(-se)* "as"	Exhaustion	*mace* "so far as, even"
			Dissatisfaction	*nama / inama* "in spite of"
	Comitative	*wa / kwa,* *hako,* *lang / ilang* "with"	Alternative	*na / ina* "rather, or something" *tunci…tunci*
			Contrariness	*khenyeng* "far from, on the contrary"
	Comparative	*pota* "then"	Exclusiveness	*pakkey* "(not) except for, other than"
	Equative	*chelem* "as, like" *kathi* "like" *mankhum* "as much as"	***etc.***	
	etc.			
Connective		*ey(ta(ka))* "in addition to" *mye / imye,* *hamye, hako,* *lang / ilang,* *wa / kwa* "and" *na / ina* "or"		

It should be noted that Sohn classifies *pwuthe "*starting from" as a case particle (*ablative case*) and *pwuthe* "beginning with", as a delimiter (Inception), while Lee considers it, regardless of its meaning, as a special particle. Sohn mentions *tul* (plural marker) among delimiters, while for Lee, it is a nominal inflectional suffix. *Pakkey* (exclusiveness) appears, in Sohn's classification, among delimiters, while Lee analyzes *pakk* as a "dependent noun" followed by locative case particle *ey*. However, neither of them put forward any argument for their classification. Si (1997) distinguishes two types of *pakke* from the morpho-syntactic point of view: *pakk* (dependent noun) + *ey* (locative case particle); *pakkey* (suffix). The suffix *pakkey* seems to correspond to Sohn's delimiter *pakkey.* We will return to this point later, but what we may already say at this point is that the boundary between adverbial cases, inflectional suffixes, dependent nouns and delimiters appears problematic. It is also

interesting that in most Korean grammars, the list of adverbial cases and the list of delimiters are not presented exhaustively, as shown by the presence of "*etc.*" at the end of the list of adverbial cases as well as at the end of the list of delimiters in Table 1.[4] This seems to be due to the ongoing grammaticalization of certain lexical terms, which will be discussed in 3.

2.2. Morphophonological accounts

Certain particles manifest phonological properties proper to suffixes. Indeed, as noted by Sohn (1999: 213), an affixal boundary is found preceding a nominative case particle and not a word boundary. For example, before a word boundary, the consonant *s* changes to *t* if it is followed by a vowel (1a). This sound change does not occur before an affixal boundary (1b), nor before a nominative case particle (1c):

(1a) *os.an*[5] (clothes + inside 'inside of the clothes'): /ot/[6] + /an/ →[o.dan]
(1b) *wus.um* (laugh-$_{VR}$ + nominalizer suffix 'laugh$_{N}$'): /ut/ + /um/ → [u.sum]
(1c) *os.i* (clothes + Nom): /ot/ + /i/→ [o.si].

The same phonological evidence occurs with other particles realized by a vowel or beginning with a vowel:

(2a) *os.ul* (clothes + Acc): /ot/ + /ɨl/ → [o.sɨl]
(2b) *os.uy* (clothes + Gen): /ot/ + /ɨ(i)/ → [o.sɨ(i)]
(2c) *os.ey* (clothes + Loc): /ot/ + /e/ → [o.se]
(2d) *os.eyse* (clothes + Abl): /ot/ + /e.sə / → [o.se.sə]
(2e) *os.ulo* (clothes + Inst): /ot/ + /ɨ.lo/ → [o.sɨ.lo]

Another piece of evidence for suffixes is based on morphophonological fusion. According to Zwicky and Pullum (1983: 505), morphophonological idiosyncrasies are very common in inflectional formations, and some of the Korean particles may indeed be phonologically fused with their host, especially when the latter is realized by a personal pronoun or by an interrogative. Cho and Sells (1995) regard this phenomenon as an argument for their analysis of nominative and accusative particles as inflectional suffixes. However, the same phenomenon is observable also for genitive, locative, ablative, instrumental and thematic markers:

(3a) *ku-kes-i* (demonstrative-thing-Nom) [kɨ.gə.si] → *ku-key* [kɨ.ge]
**nwukwu-ka* (who-Nom) [nu.gu.ga] → *nwuka* [nu.ga][7]
(3b) *ku-kes-ul* (demonstrative-thing-Acc) [kɨ.gə.sɨl] → *ku-kel* [kɨ.gəl]

nwukwu-rul (who-Acc) [nu.gu.ɾɬl] → *nwu-kwul* [nu.gul]

na-rul (I-Acc) [na.ɾɬl] → *nal* [nal]

ne-rul (You-Acc) [nə.ɾɬl] → *nel* [nəl]

(3c) *na-uy* (I-Gen) [na. ɬi] → *nay* [nɛ]

ne-uy (You-Gen) [nə.ɬi] → *ney* [ne]

(3d) *eti-ey* (where-Loc) [ə.di.e] → *etey* [ə.de]

(3e) *eti-eyse* (where-Abl) [ə.di.e.sə] → *eteyse* [ə.de.sə] → *ese* [ə.sə][8]

(3f) *mwues-ulo* (what-Inst) [mwə.sɬ.ro] → *mwelo* [mwə.ro]

(3g) *nwukwu-nun* (who-Top) [nu.gu.nɬn] → *nwukwun* [nu.gun]

As for the honorific dative case particle *kkey,* it etymologically derives from the phonological fusion of the archaic genitive *s* and of the archaic noun *kuy* ('place') (cf. Sohn 1999: 262). The contracted dative non-honorific form for personal pronouns can thus be analyzed as the historical trace of the dative formed by the genitive and the archaic noun *kuy* (cf. Kim 1995: 196). Indeed, it is the contracted genitive forms *nay* and *ney* (3c) which appear in the following contracted dative forms:

(3h) *na-eykey* (I-Dat) [na.e.ge] → *naykey* [nɛ.ge]
ne-eykey (You-Dat) [nə.e.ge] → *neykey* [ne.ge]

Furthermore, some particles have two allomorphic forms depending on the phonological context. This is the case not only for nominative, accusative and thematic markers, as pointed out by Cho and Sells (1995), but also for instrumental and comitative markers:

(4a) Nominative: *i* (after consonant) / *ka* (after vowel)
(4b) Accusative: *ul* (after consonant) / *rul* (after vowel)
(4c) Thematic: *un* (after consonant) / *nun* (after vowel)
(4d) Instrumental: *ulo* (after consonant) / *lo* (after vowel)
(4e) Comitative: *kwa* (after consonant) / *wa* (after vowel)

The selection of one of these allomorphs according to the nature of the preceding sound is obligatory, while the short ablative form *se*, which can appear after a vowel, is a free variation of the long form *eyse*, because the latter can also occur in the same context:

(5a) *sangca-se / sangca-eyse*: box-Abl
(5b) **pang-se / pang-eyse*: room-Abl

Moreover, the two forms can equally accompany an interrogative form or a proper noun of location without taking phonological contexts into account:

(5c) *eti-se / eti-eyse*: where-Abl
(5d) *khanata-se / khanate-eyse*: Canada-Abl
(5e) *ilpon-se / ilpon-eyse*: Japan-Abl
(5f) *uiseng-se / uiseng-eyse:* Uiseng-Abl

It is worth noting that the Korean particles which manifest these phonological properties are mostly monosyllabic (the short form for the case of two allomorphs). According to Kabak (2006: 28) and Creissels (2006: 262), Turkish and Hungarian case affixes are predominantly monosyllabic, while most postpositions are at least bisyllabic in these languages. From the phonological accounts reviewed above, most Korean case particles presented in Table 1 are suffix-like ones. However, some case particles do not exhibit the phonological properties for a suffix. Indeed, the dative form *eykey* has some phonological behaviour as a suffix, being able to be contracted with personal pronoun (cf. ex. 3h), while the other dative forms *hanthey, tele* and *poko* do not behave phonologically as a suffix: (/na/ ("I") + /hanthe/, /tələ/, /pogo/ → [na.han.the], [na.də.rə], [na.bo.go]. Similarly, the source marker *eykeyse* can be contracted with the personal pronoun (/na/ ("I") + /egesə/ → [nɛ.ge.sə]), while the other source marker *hantheyse* cannot (/na/ ("I") + /hanthesə/ → [na.han.the.sə]; the comitatives *wa / kwa* are two allomorphic forms, while the other comitative form *hako* is not allomorphic. As for the comparative marker *pota* and the equative marker *chelem, kathi, mankhum,* they do not exhibit any phonological properties for suffixes. These particles are all bi- or trisyllabic.

In order to complete the morphophonological analysis, we will now explore the functional properties of particles, i.e. their semantic, syntactic and pragmatic functions.

2.3. Functional accounts

The case particles grouped into *Adverbial cases* receive a special treatment especially in research on generative grammar and, as mentioned above (cf. footnote 1), they are termed *postpositions.* This is also the case in Seo's classification (2006: 865-931). He claims that case particles have to be subdivided into five types, based on the syntactic function of the constituents to which they are attached, i.e. (i) function markers, (ii) postpositions, (iii) determinative, (iv) vocative, (v) connective. Function markers group the traditional nominative and accusative markers as postpositions corresponding to the adverbial case particles mentioned in Table 1 (dative, locative/goal, ablative/inessive, source, directional/instrument/essive-modal, comitative, comparative, equative) and the determinative function (nominal modifier), to the genitive (cf. Table 2).

Table 2. Subcategorization of case particles (following Seo 2006: 867-878)

	Case particles
Function markers	nominative, accusative
Postpositions	dative, locative / goal, ablative / inessive, source, directional / instrument / essive-modal, comitative, comparative, equative
Determinative	genitive
Vocative	vocative
Connective	connective

According to Seo (2006), postpositions cause a noun phrase to function as an adverbial constituent describing or modifying a verb or verbal phrase, a proposition or a sentence. On this view, they behave as *translatives* in the sense of Tesnière (1959).[9] The genitive marker may also be considered translative, but in contrast to postpositions, it causes a noun phrase to function as a nominal modifier and not as a verbal or propositional modifier. Other types of case particles such as nominative, accusative, vocative, connective don't change the grammatical function of the constituent to which they are attached.

Indeed, subject and object functions that can be explicitly indicated by nominative and accusative markers can also be stated without these function markers:

(6a) *Inswu-ka wa-yo*
Insoo-Nom com-TS
'Insoo is coming'
(6b) *Inswu wa-yo*
Insoo com-TS
'Insoo is coming'
(7) *na-ttaymune yak mek-ess-eyo*
I-because of poison eat-Pft-TS
'(He) took poison because of me'
yak-ul mek-ess-taku-yo
poison-Acc eat-Pft-QuotS-TS
'I told you that he took poison'

The issue, then, regarding these markers when they appear, is whether they just confirm the case already assigned by a predicator, or whether they accomplish a function other than case marking. For Seo (2006: 867), the two case markers are only formal *etiquettes* which attach to the subject and object constituents. However, Park (1995) and Han (1999) defend the approach that Korean nominative and accusative markers express not only a syntactic function but also a pragmatic function, namely focalization. It is also the assumption of Lee and Thompson (1989), who, in their study of the Korean accusative marker, notice that "the greater the amount of "sharedness", i.e. shared experience, shared context, and shared cultural background, the less necessary it is to specify grammatical relations" (121).[10] Choi-Jonin (2001) agrees with this analysis, and confirms, through a corpus-based study, that their

presence is not neutral in a pragmatic account, presenting the constituent to which they attach as unexpected information or surprise. Indeed, in the cases where the subject or the object constituent is focalized, the absence of a nominative or accusative marker is not possible:

(8a) *ku il-un nay-ka ha-keyss-ta*
that work-Th I-Nom do-Fut-TS
'*I* will do that work'
(8b) **ku il-un na ha-keyss-ta*
that work-Th I do-Fut-TS
(9a) *wuli-nun Inswu-rul hoycang-ulo ppob-ass-ta*
we-Th Insoo-Acc chairman-Ess elect-Pft-TS
'We elected *Insoo* chairman'
(9b) **wuli-nun Inswu hoycang-ulo ppob-ass-ta*
we-Th Insoo chairman-Ess elect-Pft-TS

Furthermore, the accusative marker can be attached to an adverbial constituent as shown in the following example:

(10) *tan cektanghi-rul ppwuli-myen cengmal kwaynchanh-ul-tus*
only moderately-Acc put on (perfume)-CS really be nice-AdnS-DN
'Only if applied moderately, (this perfume) may be really nice' (www.cherrya.com)

In this example, the adverb *cektanghi* ("moderately") combined with the accusative marker *rul* denotes a contrastive effect ("moderately but not too much"), and thus is focalized. In this case, only a pragmatic function is at work with the accusative marker, and not a syntactic function.[11] In sum, the nominative and accusative markers function not only as syntactic function markers (subject and object) but also as pragmatic function markers (focalizer). In both cases, as argued by Han (2003), they don't constitute a syntactic head, because in the former case, the semantic and syntactic functions are assigned by verbal predicate and not by the nominative and the accusative markers, and in the latter case, their role is to modify or limit the informational domain of the constituent to which they attach.

The genitive marker can be analyzed in a similar way. Its presence for a nominal complement is sometimes obligatory and sometimes not:

(11a)	*Inswu-ui cha*	*Inswu-ui hoyngpho*	*Inswu-ui kippwum*
	Insoo-G car	Insoo-G violence	Insoo-G joy
	'Insoo's car'	'Insoo's violence'	'Insoo's joy'
(11b)	*Inswu cha*	?? *Inswu hoyngpho*	**Inswu kippwum*
	Insoo car	Insoo violence	Insoo joy

The conditions for the absence of the genitive marker are not yet clearly drawn, but these are beyond the scope of this paper.[12] Nevertheless, what is important to note is that the role of the

genitive is limited to complement function. It thus needs a nominal head in order to function as a propositional or sentential constituent.

With regard to Seo's postpositions, defined as words that function as adverbials, they can function as arguments as well as adjuncts. Indeed, verbs like *cwu-ta* ("give") require a dative argument, and the latter can be realized by a bare nominal constituent or by a dative marker. Similarly, verbs like *ka-ta* ("go") and *naka-ta* ("go out") require respectively a goal argument and an ablative argument, which can be expressed by a bare nominal constituent, or by an adverbial case marker:

(12a) *ku panic swunhi-eykey cwu-ess-e*
that ring Sunhi-Dat give-Pft-TS
(12b) *ku panci swunhi cwu-ess-e*
that ring Sunhi give-Pft-TS
'I gave the ring to Sunhi'
(13a) *emeni sicang-ey ka-si-ess-e*
mother market-Loc go-Hon-Pft-TS
(13b) *emeni sicang ka-si-ess-e*
mother market go-Hon-Pft-TS
'Mother has gone to the market'
(14a) *makney-ka cip-eyse naka-ss-ta*
youngest brother-Nom home-Abl go out-Pft-TS
(14b) *makney-ka cip naka-ss-ta*[13]
youngest brother-Nom home go out-Pft-TS
'My youngest brother ran away from home'

However, an adverbial function constituent corresponding to a verbal argument cannot always be presented by a bare nominal constituent. Indeed, the dative argument of the verb *mwut-ta* ("ask"), the goal argument of the verb *tuleka-ta* ("go in") and the ablative argument of the verb *o-ta* ("come") should be accompanied by an adverbial case marker:

(12c) *Swunhi-eykey mwule-poa*
Sunhi-Dat ask-Aux-TS
'Ask Sunhi' (dative argument)
(12d) **Swunhi mwule-poa*

(13c) *Swunhi-ka pang-ey tuleka-n-ta*
Sunhi-Nom room-Goal go in-Pst-TS
'Sunhi goes into the room' (goal argument)
(13d) **Swunhi-ka pang tuleka-n-ta*
Sunhi-Nom room go in-Pst-TS

(14c) *eti-eyse o-si-ess-eyo?*
where-Abl come-Hon-Pft-TS(Hon)
'Where do you come from?' (ablative argument)

(14d) **eti o-si-ess-eyo?*[14]

On the other hand, the dative maker, the locative / goal marker and the ablative / inessive marker are necessary for adjunct marking:

(12e) *totwuk-i kyengchal-eykey cap-hi-ess-ta*
robber-N police-Dat capture-Pas-Pft-TS
'The robber is captured by the police' (dative adjunct)
(12f) **totwuk-i kyengchal cap-hi-ess-ta*
robber-N police capture-Pas-Pft-TS

(13e) *seklywunamwu-ey kkachi-ka anc-a iss-ta*
pomegranate tree-Loc magpie-Nom sit-Pst-TS
'A magpie is sitting on the pomegranate tree' (locative adjunct)
(13f) **seklywunamwu kkachi-ka anc-a iss-ta*
pomegranate tree magpie-Nom sit-Pst-TS

(14e) *Swunhi-nun phali-eyse kongpwu-ha-n-ta*
Sunhi-Th Paris-LocIness study-do-Pst-TS
'Sunhi studies in Paris' (locative-inessive adjunct)
(14f) **Swunhi-nun phali kongpwu-ha-n-ta*
Sunhi-Th Paris study-do-Pst-TS

As for the directional / instrumental / essive-modal marker as well as the comitative, equative and comparative markers, they are required to be attached to an argument as well as to an adjunct:

(15a) *wuli-nun Inswu-rul hoycang-ulo ppop-ass-ta*
we-Th Insoo-Acc chairman-Ess elect-Pft-TS
'We elected Insoo chairman' (essive-modal argument)
(15b) **wuli-nun Inswu-rul hoycang ppop-ass-ta*
we-Th Insoo chairman elect-Pft-TS
(15c) *Inswu-ka yenphil-lo pay-lul kuli-ess-ta*
Insoo-Nom pencil-Inst boat-Acc draw-Pft-TS
'Insoo drew a boat with a pencil' (instrument adjunct)
(15d) **Inswu-ka yenphil pay-lul kuli-ess-ta*
Insoo-Nom pencil boat-Acc make-Pft-TS

(16a) *Inswu-ka Mina-wa ssawu-n-ta*
Insoo-Nom Mina-Com quarrel-Pst-TS
'Insoo quarrels with Mina' (comitative argument)
(16b) **Inswu-ka Mina ssawu-n-ta*
Insoo-Nom Mina quarrel-Pst-TS
(16c) *Inswu-ka Mina-wa no-n-ta*
Insoo-Nom Mina-Com play-Pst-TS
'Insoo plays with Mina' (comitative adjunct)
(16d) **Inswu-ka Mina no-n-ta*
Insoo-Nom Mina play-Pst-TS

(17a) *ce salam-un ligen-chelem sayngki-ess-ta*
that person-Th Reagan-Eq (like) be formed-Pft-TS
'He looks like Reagan' (equative argument)
(17b) **ce salam-un ligen sayngki-ess-ta*
that person-Th Reagan be formed-Pft-TS
(17c) *na-chelem us-e po-a*
I-Eq (like) smile-CS Aux-TS
'Smile like me' (equative adjunct)
(17d) **na us-e po-a*
I smile-CS Aux-TS

(18a) *ne-ka na-pota nas-ta*
You-Nom I-Comp is better-TS
'You are better than me' (comparative argument)
(18b) **ne-ka na nas-ta*
You-Nom I is better-TS
(18c) *ne-ka na-pota ttokttokha-ta*
You-Nom I-Comp be intelligent-TS
'You are more intelligent than me' (comparative adjunct)
(18d) **ne-ka na ttokttokha-ta*
You-Nom I be intelligent-TS

From Seo's point of view, *adverbial case particles* are postpositions, regardless of argument or adjunct status of the constituent to which they attach.

Han's analysis (2003) is different. For him, *adverbial case particles* can constitute syntactic heads only when the constituents they co-occur with are not verbal arguments. Only in this case are they able to case-govern their preceding constituents, and thus can be considered postpositions. When they follow verbal arguments, which are case-governed by verbal predicates, they cannot be syntactic heads, and thus cannot be considered postpositions but "additional case markers", like the nominative, accusative and genitive case markers. It should be noted that the author works in the framework of Role and Reference Grammar. Therefore, the arguments of verbal predicates are dealt with in lexical conceptual structures (LCS). For him, the adverbial case particles which can be argument-marking as well as adjunct-marking are semantically predicates which include their argument, but they can constitute syntactic heads if only their argument is not selected as verbal argument in LCS. Even though we globally agree with his analysis, the disadvantage of this approach is that the same morpheme must be classified sometimes as a case marker, and sometimes as a postposition, according to the verbal predicate with which it co-occurs.[15]

Choi (1997), exploring the syntactic status of *special particles*, seems to be positioned between the analysis of the two preceding types. Like Seo, he considers adverbial case particles, regardless of their syntactic status (argument- or adjunct-marking), as postpositions.

However, dealing with special particles, he proceeds like Han, taking account of their syntactic status. For example, *pwuthe* ("from") is analysed as a special particle when the preceding constituents function, without it, as subject (19a), object (19b) or ablative constituent (19c), while it is analysed as a postposition when the ablative function of the preceding constituent cannot be stated without it (19d-e):

(19a) *ne(-pwuthe) mence hay-poa-la*
You(-from) first do-try-TS
'You try to do (it) first'

(19b) *i mwuncey(-pwuthe) mence haykyelha-ca*
this problem(-from) first resolve-TS
'Let's resolve this problem first'

(19c) *pwusan-eyse(-pwuthe) cwulkot twi-rul ccocha-wa-ss-ta*
Pusan-Abl(-from) continually behind-Acc chase-come-Pft-TS
'(I) chased (him) from Pusan'

(19d) *achim-pwuthe kitali-koiss-ess-ta*
morning-from wait-Prog-Pft-TS
'(I) was waiting from morning'

(19e) **achim kitali-koiss-ess-ta*[16]
morning wait-Prog-Pft-TS

In conclusion, nominative and accusative, when they mark arguments only, can be absent. In addition to argument-marking, they also mark pragmatic focal function. The genitive marker does not always occur for a nominal complement either. These particles, which only serve to indicate the syntactic or pragmatic function of their preceding constituent, do not themselves select a particular type of noun, such as animate, inanimate, place, time etc., unlike *adverbial case particles.*

Indeed, the locative / goal and the ablative / inessive markers combine only with inanimate nouns, and dative and source markers only with animate nouns. The two former case markers can attribute to their preceding noun a dynamic locative meaning (goal and ablative, cf. ex. 13c, 14c) or a static locative meaning (locative and inessive, cf. ex. 13e, 14e), but this difference of meaning depends on the preceding noun's semantic nature as well as the verb with which they occur[17]: accompanying a locational noun, if they occur with a verb of motion, they express a dynamic local case, and if they occur with a static verb, they express a static local case. When the locative marker follows a temporal noun, it triggers a static meaning whatever the nature of verb with which it occurs:

(20a) *Swunhi-nun saypyek-ey ttena-ss-ta*
Sunhi-Th dawn-Loc leave-Pft-TS
'Sunhi left at dawn'

(20b) *kwail-un* *yelum-ey* *manh-ta*
fruit-Th summer-Loc be abundant-TS
'Fruits are abundant in summer'

When it follows a noun expressing a "force" such as *palam* ("wind"), *cencayng* ("war"), *kamwum* ("dryness"), it is interpreted as a cause:

(21) *kamwum-ey namwu-tul-i manhi* *cwuk-ess-ta*
dryness-Loc tree-Pl-Nom many die-Pft-TS
'Many trees died of dryness'

As for the ablative marker, it can follow a temporal noun only accompanied by the particle *kkaci* ("until"), listed in Table 1 among special particles:

(22a) *10si-eyse* *12si-kkaci* *kongpwu-ha-ca*
10 o'clock-Abl 12 o'clock-until study-do-TS
'Let's study from 10 o'clock to 12 o'clock'

In this case, the ablative marker *eyse* can be combined with *pwuthe* ("from"), classified also, in Table 1, as special particles. Besides, this latter can denote, without the ablative marker, the starting point:

(22b) *10si-eyse-pwuthe* *12si-kkaci* *kongpwu-ha-ca*
10 o'clock-Abl-from 12 o'clock-until study-do-TS
'Let's study from 10 o'clock to 12 o'clock'
(22c) *10si-pwuthe* *12si-kkaci* *kongpwu-ha-ca*
10 o'clock-from 12 o'clock-until study-do-TS

This possibility of marking the starting point by the ablative, by *pwuthe* or by the combination of the two particles is observed also with a locational noun. In the example (19c), cited by Choi (1997), the ablative marker following a locational noun *Pusan* can combine with *pwuthe,* and the latter can have the same function without the ablative marker:

(19f) *pwusan-pwuthe* *cwulkot* *twi-lul* *ccocha-wa-ss-ta*
Pusan-from continually behind-Acc chase-come-Pst-TS
'(I) chased (him) from Pusan'

However, in (19d) where *pwuthe* follows a temporal noun and it is not accompanied by the particle *kkaci* ("until"), the ablative *eyse* can not combine with *pwuthe* (19g), nor can it have an ablative function in place of *pwuthe* (19h):

(19g) **achim-eyse-pwuthe* *kitali-koiss-ess-ta*
morning-Abl-from wait-Prog-Pft-TS

(19h) **achim-eyse* *kitali-koiss-ess-ta*
morning-Abl wait-Prog-Pft-TS

For the case particle *(u)lo,* when it is combined with a locational noun, it is considered a directional marker; when it is combined with a noun denoting an object entity, it is considered an instrumental marker; and when it is combined with a noun referring to a social status, it is considered an essive-modal marker:

(23a) *Inswu-nun sewul-lo ttena-ss-ta*
Insoo-Th Seoul-Dir leave-Pft-TS
'Insoo left for Seoul'
(23b) *ssal-lo mantu-n kwaca*
rice-Inst make-AdnS cake
'cake made of rice'
(23c) *wuli-nun Inswu-lul hoycang-ulo ppop-ass-ta*
we-Th Insoo-Acc chairman-Ess elect-Pst-TS
'We elected Insoo chairman'

As for the comitative,[18] it has to share the same semantic feature with the constituent with which it collocates. For instance, the comitative constituent, occurring with the verb *sanchaykhata* ("go for a walk") which requires a human entity as argument-subject, has to refer to a human entity, too. An entity referring to an animal is not accepted in this case in Korean, because it cannot stand for an argument-subject of the verb in question:

(24a) *Swunhi-ka Inswu-wa sanchaykha-n-ta*
Sunhi-Nom Insoo-Com go for a walk-Pst-TS
'Sunhi goes for a walk with Insoo'
(24b) ?? *Swunhi-ka kay-wa sanchaykha-n-ta*
Sunhi-Nom dog-Com go for a walk-Pst-TS
'Sunhi goes for a walk with a dog'
(24c) ?? *kay-ka Swunhi-wa sanchaykha-n-ta*
dog-Nom Sunhi-Com go for a walk-Pst-TS
'A dog goes for a walk with Sunhi'

The comparative and the equative markers function just like the comitative marker: the type of noun to which they attach has to be able to function as the argument of the verb with which it is compared:

(25a) *Inswu-nun Swunhi-chelem us-nun-ta*
Insoo-Th Sunhi-Eq (like) smile-Pst-TS
'Insoo smiles like Sunhi'
(25b) *Swunhi-nun Inswu-chelem us-nun-ta*
Sunhi-Th Insoo-Eq (like) smile-Pst-TS
'Sunhi smiles like Insoo'

(26a) *Inswu-ka* *na-pota* *khu-ta*
Insoo-Nom I-Comp be tall-TS
'You are taller than me'
(26b) *nay-ka* *Inswu-pota* *khu-ta*
I-Nom Insoo-Comp be tall-TS
'I am taller than Insoo'

Following Leeman (1998), French prepositions are linguistic operators specifying the semantic properties of their argument. In a similar vein, Lemaréchal (1998: 202-203) assumes that a preposition is not only "a relational element" but also "a classifier element"; the French preposition *dans,* for instance, classifies its complement approximately as "place", and then sub-classifies as "inside". In line with this semantic definition of prepositions, we assume that Korean adverbial case particles function as postpositions, because they determine the semantic feature of their arguments. The result of this analysis is the same as Seo's, even though the criteria used are different. In comparison to Han's analysis, we agree that Korean adverbial case particles are predicates that include their proper arguments. The difference comes, however, from the definition of postpositions: for Han, postpositions are syntactically defined, because they have to function as syntactic heads, while for us, they are semantically defined, because their function is to control the semantic feature of their arguments. Conceived as semantic predicates, they can thus be described from morpho-lexical accounts, as well as from syntactic accounts. Indeed, the question of whether they can or cannot constitute syntactic heads could be treated by taking account of their syntactic distribution: if they appear in syntactic positions governed by another predicate, they do not function as syntactic heads, and if they do not so appear, they function as syntactic heads.

2.4. Clitics and particles

Chae (1995, 1996) and Chae and No (1998) analyse Korean particles as clitics or *phrasal affixes*. According to Zwicky (1994: xii), clitics are words which act like independent words as well as like inflectional affixes: "[they] act like single-word syntactic constituents in that they function as heads, arguments, or modifiers within phrases, but like affixes in that they are "dependent", in some way or another, on adjacent words". Zwicky (1985: 287-288) notices, furthermore, that clitics resemble inflectional affixes both having the following characteristics:

(i) they cannot occur in complete isolation;

(ii) like inflectional affixes which "close off" words to further affixation, they close off combination to cliticization;

(iii) they are strictly ordered with respect to adjacent morphemes;

(iv) they have distributions describable by single principles like "combines with the head verb of a clause", "combines with the first constituent of a clause", "combines with the first word of a clause", or "combines with a NP";

(v) they rarely are morphologically complex.

Korean particles are bound morphemes, so they cannot occur in complete isolation. Their distribution is limited, but their combinatorial principles are not the same for all particles. Indeed, the *adverbial case particles* attach mostly to a noun. They can thus be analyzed, as assumed by Chae, as postposition clitics, because, unlike inflectional suffixes, they assign semantic features to their preceding noun, functioning as semantic predicates (cf. 2.3.). With regard to the so-called *special particles* (or *delimiters*) such as *man* ("only"), *mace, cocha* ("even") and *mata* ("each"), Chae analyses this type of particle as modifier clitics. Indeed, without modifying the grammatical status of their preceding constituent, they can attach to an adverb (27a), to a head noun (which might be followed by inflectional plural suffix *tul*) (27b), to an inflected verb (27c) and to a postposition clitic (27d):

(27a) *cal-man* *ha-myen*
well-only do$_{VR}$-CS,
'if (you) really do well'

(27b) *honin-ha-n* *anakney-tul-mace*
marriage-do$_{VR}$-AdnS woman-Pl-even
'even married women'

(27c) *ca-myense-cocha*
sleep$_{VR}$-CS-even
'even sleeping'

(27d) *po-nun* *salam-eykey-mata*
see$_{VR}$-AdnS person-Dat-each
'to every person (you) see'

As for the nominative and the accusative, as noticed above, they can indicate, in addition to the syntactic function of verbal arguments, the pragmatic focal function of their host constituents. In the first case, their presence is optional, but in the latter case, the focal function cannot be activated without them. They can attach not only to a noun but also to other kinds of words, i.e. adverb (cf. ex. 10), inflected verb (28a, 28b), postposition clitic (28c,

28d), and modifier clitic (28e, 28f). In the latter case, the focal function is at work rather than the syntactic subject or object function:

(28a) *wun-i* *coha-se-ka* *ani-la* *yelsimhi* *hay-se* *hapkyek-hay-ss-ta*
luck-Nom be good-CS-Nom be not-CS hard do-CS admission-do-Pft-TS
'(He) is admitted, not because he had good luck but because he worked hard'

(28b) *keki* *ka-se-rul* *po-nikka* *cengmal* *coh-te-la*
there go-CS-Acc see-CS really good-MS-TS
'I can say that that place is really nice, because I went and saw it'

(28c) *tonglyo-lo(se)-ka* *ani-la* *chinkwu-lo(se)*
colleague-Ess-Nom be not-CS friend-Ess
'As for a friend not as for a colleague'

(28d) *cip-ey-lul* *tuleoa-yaci*
home-Loc-Acc come in-TS
'You have to come back home'

(28e) *toksinca-man-i* *sal-swu* *iss-nun* *aphathu*
bachelor-only-Nom live-DN be-AdnS apartment
'apartment for bachelors only'

(28f) *toksinca-man-ul* *wiha-n* *kkaphey*
bachelor-only-Acc do for-AdnS coffee shop
'coffee shop for bachelors only'

The genitive marker can also be preceded by a postposition clitic or by a modifier clitic as well as by a noun:

(29) *[Inswu-hako(-man)-uy]* *mannam*
Insoo-Com-(only)-G meeting
'The meeting with Insoo only'

Moreover, the nominative, accusative and genitive close off the preceding constituent to further cliticisation, similar to the thematic marker and the special particles *to* ('also') and *(i)ya* ('as only for').

Chae and No (1998) call these particles *phrasal affixes*,[19] arguing that "even though all the nominal elements have some syntactic properties (such as phrasal scope and distribution), the Nom/Acc case markers and the topic marker have more lexical properties than postpositions (and delimiters)". They thus postulate that the feature of phrasal affixes as Nom(inative) propagates to the last syntactic formative of the phrase they close off. This would allow, according to the authors, the analysis of the honorific subject marker *kkeyse* as a postposition which nevertheless functions as subject in the following example:

(30) *sensayng-nim-tul-kkeyse-man-i* *o-si-ess-ta*
teacher-Hon-Pl-HonNom-only-Nom come-Hon-Pft-TS
'Only the teachers came'

Indeed, this honorific subject marker is a derivational use of the source marker *eykeyse* formed by the combination of the dative *eykey* and the archaic noun *se* ("exist"). The dative marker *eykey* has an honorific variation *kkey.* The combination of this honorific dative *kkey* with the archaic noun *se* yields the honorific subject marker *kkeyse.* The problem in (30) is that the nominative case seems to be marked twice, by the honorific form *kkeyse* and by the non-honorific form *i*.[20] Chae and No (1998) resolve this problem by analyzing *kkeyse* as a postposition. In this way, the nominative case is marked only by *i,* occurring at the end of the subject constituent. This is also Yoon (2005)'s analysis. We do not contest the analysis of *kkeyse* as a postposition, given that in Korean a postpositional phrase can function as subject (cf. Yoon 2004, 2005). However, in (30), the nominative *i* functions as focal marker rather than as subject marker. Likewise, in the main clause of the following example (in square brackets) in which occur two accusative markers, the one following the verbal form *wa-se* ("come-CS") marks the focal function, while the another one following *coen* ("advice") marks the object function:

(31) *mwusun* *chayk-ul* *poa-ya* *ha-l* *ci* *molu-l* *ttay-n*
which book-Acc read-SC do-AdnS DN ignore-AdnS moment-Th
[*kakkum* *i kos-ey* *wa-se-lul* *coen-ul* *et-ko-n* *ha-pnita*]
sometimes here-Loc come-CS-Acc advice-Acc receive-CS-Th do-TS
(http://badagirin.net)
'When I don't know which book I could read, I sometimes come here to ask for advice.'

Therefore, we distinguish between the nominative and the accusative as syntactic function marking and the same cases as pragmatic function marking. Even though the morphemes used are the same for the function markings of these two types, their distribution is different. As syntactic function marking, they attach to a noun as inflectional suffixes, and in this case, their presence is optional. As focal function marking, they attach to the end of the host-constituent, and their absence cancels this pragmatic function. In this paradigm may be listed the thematic marker *(n)un,* another focal marker *to* ("also") and the "tolerative" *(i)ya* ("only if it be") which also functions as thematic marker. These pragmatic function markers can be considered phrasal affixes.

The order in which various particles appear is fairly strict.[21] The inflectional suffixes attach to a noun, or to the plural suffix, if the host-noun is followed by it. The postposition clitics are followed by modifier clitics, which can be followed by phrasal affixes. The

following scheme shows the order of particles as well as the elements belonging to each paradigm:

Table 3. Pattern of the order of particles

[N–Infl] –	Postp Cl.				Modfier Cl.	Phrasal affixes
	P1[22]	P2	P3	P4		
N-Pl-Nom	Loc / Goal	*pwuthe* ('from')	Eq	Comp	*man* ('only')	Nom
Acc	Dat	*kkaci* ('until')			*mace* ('even')	Acc
G	Abl / Iness				*cocha* ('even')	#G
	Source				*nama* ('in spite of')	Th
	Dir / Inst / Ess				*mata* ('each')	*to* ('also')
	Com					*ya* ('as only for')

We put the genitive in the paradigm of inflectional suffixes as well as in that of phrasal affixes, just as the nominative and the accusative, even though we are not yet sure of its pragmatic function when it appears at the boundary of its host-constituent, preceded by other clitics. On the other hand, in this clitic-phrasal affix ordering scheme, we distinguish four types of postposition clitics because of their combinatory possibilities. Indeed, the postposition clitics classified in P1 cannot occur together, while the equative and the comparative markers can be preceded by another postposition clitic and followed by a modifier clitic:

(32a) *Swunhi-eykey-chelem Inswu-eykey-to cal hay-cwu-ela*
Sunhi-Dat-Eq Insoo-Dat-also well do-Aux-TS
'Be kind with Insoo as well as with Sunhi'
(32b) *Swunhi-chelem-man chakhay-la*
Sunhi-Eq-only be kind-TS
'Be only kind like Sunhi'
(33a) *Swunhi-eykey-pota Inswu-eykey te cal hay-cwu-ela*
Sunhi-Dat-Comp Insoo-Dat more well do-Aux-TS
'Be kind with Insoo more than with Sunhi'
(33b) *Swunhi-pota-man cal hay-la*
Sunhi-Comp-only well do-TS
'Do only better than Sunhi'

The equative marker can be followed by the comparative:

(33c) *Swunhi-chelem-pota Inswu-chelem sal-ko sip-ta*
Sunhi-Eq-Comp Insoo-Eq live-CS Aux-TS
'I would like to live like Insoo rather than like Sunhi'

The morphemes *pwuthe* ("from") and *kkaci* ("until") may also be preceded by a postposition clitic and followed by a modifier clitic:

(34) *keki-eyse-pwuthe-man-un coyonghi hay-la*
there-Abl-from-only-Th quiet do-TS
'Be quiet at least from there'
(35) *ne-eykey-kkaci-man-un pwuthakha-ci anh-keyss-ta*

You-Dat-until-only-Th ask-CS do not-Fut-TS
'At least I will not ask you'

Besides, they can be followed by the equative or by the comparative marker:

(36a) *cheum-pwuthe-chelem* *ssepisu-ka* *coh-ta*
beginning-from-Eq service-Nom be good-TS
'Services are good like at the beginning'
(36b) *10si-pwuthe-pota* *11si-pwuthe-ka* *nas-keyss-ta*
10 o'clock-from-comp 11o'colock-from-Nom be better-Fut-TS
'It will be better from 10 o'clock than from 11 o'clock'
(37a) *cikum-kkaci-chelem* *yelsimhi* *hay-la*
now-until-Eq hard do-TS
'Work hard as you did until now'
(37b) *10si-kkaci-pota* *11si-kkaci-ka* *nas-keyss-ta*
10 o'clock-until-comp 11o'colock-until-Nom be better-Fut-TS
'It will be better until 10 o'clock than until 11 o'clock'

As clitics can attach to material already containing clitics (cf. Zwicky & Pullum 1983: 504), it is possible to have a sequence formed by several types of clitics. On the other hand, with the definition of the postposition we adopted, the co-occurrence of postposition clitics would not be problematic. Indeed, we defined postpositions as semantic predicates which can function as syntactic heads if they are not governed by another predicate. We assume that in the case of a cluster of postposition clitics, it is the first one which functions as syntactic head, governing the others, if it is not governed itself by a verbal predicate. It is interesting to notice that the postposition clitics occurring in P1 which attach to a noun and not to another clitic are phonological suffix-like ones, just like the phrasal affixes which close off the clitic cluster.

3. Grammaticalization of postpositions

We will now discuss Rhee's hypothesis concerning the grammaticalization of Korean postpositions from lexical words, especially from verbs of motion on the one hand, and from relational nouns on the other.

3.1. From verb to postposition

Rhee (2002), investigating the grammaticalization of postpositions from six verbs of motion, assumes that morphosyntactic changes from verb to postposition would lead to the omission of particles required for verbs. The six verbs investigated in his work are *nemta* ("go over"), *cochta* ("chase") requiring an accusative object, *tayta* ("touch"), *pwuthta* ("adhere"), *takuta*

(“draw near”) requiring a locative object, and *ttalu-ta* (“follow”) requiring an accusative or a locative object:

(38) *san-ul* *nem-ta*
mountain-Acc go over-TS
‘go over the mountain’

(39) *totwuk-ul* *coch-ta*
thief-Acc chase-TS
‘chase a thief”

(40) *meli-lul* *nay* *ekkey-ey* *tay-ta*
head-Acc my shoulder-Loc touch-TS
‘(she) put her head on my shoulder’

(41) *sacin-i* *pyek-e* *pwuth-e iss-ta*
photo-Nom wall-Loc adhere-Pst-TS
‘There are photos on the wall’

(42) *pay-ka* *pwutwu-ey* *taka-o-n-ta*
boat-Nom port-Loc approach-come-Pst-TS
‘A/The boat is approaching the port’

(43a) *na-rul/*ey* *ttala-la*
I-Acc/*Loc follow-TS
‘Follow me’

(43b) *kang-ul/*ey* *ttala-ka-la*
river-Acc/*Loc follow-go-TS
‘Follow the river’

(43c) *nay* *myenglyeng-ul/ey* *ttala-la*
my order-Acc/Loc follow-TS
‘Follow my order’

For Rhee, when these verbs are used as postpositions, and must co-occur with the accusative or the locative markers, they do not completely lose their verbal properties, hence are not completely grammaticalized. His analysis is however problematic for several reasons. First of all, he does not define a postposition and seems to consider any Korean particle to be a postposition. Indeed, the grammaticalized form *cocha* (“even”) which is classified as a modifier clitic in this paper (cf. §2.4) is treated, in his work, as a postposition. However, unlike postpositions, it does not classify the semantic feature of the preceding noun. The grammaticalization from a verb would not lead only to a postposition but also to other grammatical elements.

The analysis of the bound form *neme* derived from the verb *nemta* (“go over”) as a postposition is also problematic. This form must be preceded by a noun that it classifies approximately as an entity to go (or step) over, and thus, it seems to function at first glance as a postposition. Nevertheless, it can be followed by variable clitics, including the locative:

(44a) *san-neme* *maul*

mountain-over village
'The village over the mountain'

(44b) *ce kang-neme-ka pwukhan-i-ya*
that river-over-Nom North Korea-be-TS
'Over that river is North Korea'

(44c) *cipyengsen-neme-rul po-ko iss-nun saram-tul*
horizon-over-Acc see-Prog-AdnS people-Pl
'People who are looking over the horizon'

(44d) *cwukum-neme-uy seykey*
death-over-G world
'World beyond death'

(44e) *san-neme-ey maul-i iss-ess-ta*
mountain-over-Loc village-Nom be-Pft-TS
'There was a village over the mountain'

In our clitic ordering scheme in Table 3, the nominative, accusative and genitive cases are phrasal affixes which can attach to a postposition clitic, while the locative *ey* is one of the postposition clitics which attach directly to a noun. If the bound form *neme* followed by the locative as in (44e) is analysed as a postposition clitic, our clitic order scheme must be modified. However, in our scheme, the postposition clitics occurring in P1 are those which classify their argument, roughly speaking, as animate, inanimate, place, time, co-agent, and more specified semantic features such as starting point, end point, are expressed by those occurring in P2. Actually, the postposition clitic *pwuthe* ("from") derived from the verb *pwuthta* ("adhere") occurs in this position. The bound form *neme,* if it functions as a postposition clitic, should logically occur after the locative but not before. On the other hand, its distribution is similar to relational nouns such as *wi* ("top"), *mith* ("bottom"), *aph* ("front"), *twi* ("behind"). Indeed, these relational nouns can be followed by any kind of clitic, including the locative as shown in the following examples:

(45a) *san-wi-ey tal-i tte-ss-ta*
mountain-upper-Loc moon-Nom rise-Pft-TS
'The moon rose above the mountain'

(45b) *san-mith-ey maul-i iss-ta*
mountain-under-Loc village-Nom be-TS
'There is a village under the mountain'

(45c) *cip-aph-ey cengwen-i iss-ta*
house-front-Loc garden-Nom be-TS
'There is a garden in front of the house'

(45d) *cip-twi-ey cengwen-i iss-ta*
house-behind-Loc garden-Nom be-TS
'There is a garden behind the house'

Moreover, they can be used without a preceding noun in a deictic or anaphoric use. The bound form *neme* ("over"), even though it does not have this deictic or anaphoric use, should be analyzed as a noun rather than as a postposition, because of its syntactic distribution. Korean dictionaries classify the bound form *neme* as a dependent noun which has to be determined or modified in order to function as a syntactic constituent; we agree with this classification. Another piece of evidence for analyzing it as a noun is that epenthetic *s* may be attached to the noun preceding *neme*:

(46) *kokay-s-neme* *mengtol* *path*
pass-s-over Mengtol field (http://life.ohmynews.com)
'Mengtol field over the mountain pass'

The epenthetic *s* is an archaic genitive and marks word boundary. It appears frequently in compound nouns formed by two independent nouns (cf. Labrune 1999).

Now, with regard to the degree of grammaticalization based on particle omissibility, it appears untenable if we consider the ablative *eyse,* formed by the locative *ey* and the archaic verb *se* ("exist"). This postposition clitic, completely grammaticalized from a verb, nevertheless, keeps the locative marker. As for the bound form *pwuthe* ("from"), it can combine with an ablative marker or with a directional marker, but while the former can be deleted (cf. ex. 22b-c, 19c, f), the latter cannot:

(47a) *Inswu-lo-pwuthe* *o-n* *pyenci*
Insoo-Dir-from come-AdnS letter
'letter from Insoo'
(47b) **Inswu-pwuthe* *o-n* *pyenci*
Insoo-from come-AdnS letter

Let us remember that the postposition clitic *pwuthe* can combine with the ablative marker if it is preceded by a locational noun, but if it is preceded by a temporal noun, it cannot combine with this marker, unless it is accompanied by *kkaci* ("until") (cf. 2.3.). When it follows a noun referring to a person as in (47), it must combine with the directional marker. Is the latter case less grammaticalized than other cases? Besides, the postposition clitic with which the bound form *pwuthe* combines is not the one required by the verb *pwuthta* ("adhere"). This verb needs a locative, while its bound form can combine with ablative, directional or source. The postposition clitic *pwuthe* can be viewed rather as a grammaticalized form derived from a verb for the following reasons. Firstly, it completely loses verbal inflection. Secondly, it takes as its argument not only a locational noun, but also other noun types such as a temporal noun

or a noun referring to a person. Its semantic change from “adhere” to “from” can, of course, also be taken into account.

We may now examine the remaining three cases. As we can see in (43a) - (43c), the verb *ttaluta* (“follow”) allows a locative object as well as an accusative object if the preceding noun denotes an instruction, but with a noun referring to a mobile entity or a long shaped entity, it allows an accusative object only, and not a locative object. The accusative marker, as discussed above, can be absent when it marks a verbal argument. As for the locative marker, it can also be absent, especially when the combination of the verb with its object expresses an event rather than a movement (cf. footnote 13). The accusative object of the verb *ttaluta* (“follow”) can thus be represented by a bare noun. Consequently, in the possible grammaticalization of this verb to a postposition, if the accusative or the locative is absent, it should be due to general principles of the omissibility of their particles and not to the loss of the verbal properties.

Let us consider the following examples where *ttala* seems to function as a postposition:

(48a) *pep-(ey)/(ul)-ttala* *cheliha-psita*
law-(Loc)/(Acc)-following settle-TS
‘Let’s settle (it) following the law’

(48b) *kyeykok-(ul)-ttala* *na-n* *suph-kil*
valley-(Acc)-following be out-AdnS woods-path
‘path along the valley’

(48c) *chel-ttala* *itongha-nun* *kileki*
season-following move-AdnS wild goose
‘wild geese migrating seasonally’

(48d) *onul-ttala* *pi-ka* *o-n-ta*
today-following rain-Nom come-Pst-TS
‘It’s raining a day like today / today of all days!’

In (48a), *ttala* can be morphologically variable according to the function of its host-constituent. Indeed, in (48e), it has an adnominalizer form for modifying the following noun, and in (48f), it has a hypothetical conjunctive form so that it forms a subordinate proposition:

(48e) *pep-ey-ttalu-n* *cheli*
law-Loc-follow-AdnS settlement
‘the settlement following the law’

(48f) *pep-ey-ttalu-myen*
law-Loc-follow-CS
‘if (we) follow the law’

In this case, the verb *ttalu-ta* (“follow”) does not lose its inflectional properties. It thus should not be considered grammaticalized to a postposition.

In (48b), we have a serial verbal construction, formed by two verbs *ttala* (“follow”) and *na* (“(be) out”). The verb *ttala* (“follow”) may be used as a verb of motion in combination with a deictic verb of motion: *ttala-kata* (follow-go, “follow”), *ttala-ota* (follow-come, “follow”), and expresses the semantic component “manner” in these compound verbs of motion.[23] When it is followed by *na* (“be out”) as in (48b), it is used as a static verb, and also expresses a manner in which the subject constituent appears. On the other hand, used in a serial verbal construction, it has a non-finite form suffixed by *a(se)* and cannot be suffixed by other inflectional elements. Nevertheless, it can be modified by an adverb (*cwuk* in the following example), which can occur between it and its complement constituent:

(48g) *illyel-lo* *changmwun-ul* *cwuk* *ttala* *na iss-nun* *uyca*
row-Inst window-Acc one after another follow be out-AdnS chair
‘chairs which are in a row one after another along the window’
(http://life.ohmynews.com)

Hence, the non-finite verbal form *ttala* (“follow”) does not lose its verbal properties when it is preceded by a noun referring to a long shaped entity or to an instruction.[24]

In (48c) and (48d), the same form follows a temporal noun, which cannot occur as a complement in its verbal use. In this case, it cannot be suffixed by another inflectional element and cannot be separated from its complement by an adverb, either. It thus seems to function as a postposition, but temporal nouns which can combine with it are, to my knowledge, very rare. It would thus be more economic to treat these nouns combined with *ttala* as lexical units, and Korean dictionaries actually relate to them as adverbs.

As for the verb *taku-ta* (“approach”), as exemplified in (42), when it is used as a dynamic verb, it needs a locative complement. Combined with the locative postposition clitic *ey*, its non-finite form *taka* can be used as reinforced locative postposition[25]:

(49a) *eti-ey-taka* *twu-ess-ci?*
where-Loc-“approach” put-Pft-TS
‘Where did I put it, then?’

In this postpositional use, *taka* is not morphologically variable and does not allow an adverb between it and its host-constituent. Moreover, it can be used without the locative postposition clitic, but in this case, the interrogative form *eti* (“where”) can phonologically be fused with the postpositional use *taka*:

(49b) *eti-taka* *twu-ess-ci?*
where-“ approach” put-Pft-TS
‘Where did I put it, then?’
(49c) *ettaka* *twu-ess-ci?*
where + “approach” put-Pft-TS
‘Where did I put it, then?’
(49d) *etta* *twu-ess-ci?*
where + “approach” put-Pft-TS
‘Where did I put it, then?’

This phonological fusion of *taka* with its host-constituent proves its high degree of grammaticalization.

The verb *tayta* (“touch”) requires a locative complement, as shown in (40). However, in the following examples cited by Rhee (2002), its non-finite form can be preceded not only by the locative but also by the dative:

(50a) *sensayngnim-i* *pakk-ey* *tayko* *khun* *soli-lo* *malssumha-si-ess-ta*
teacher-Nom outside-Loc “touch” big sound-Inst speak-Hon-Pft-TS
‘The teacher shouted in an outside direction’
(50b) *John-i* *nay* *hyeng-hanthey* *tayko* *yok-ul* *hay-ss-ta*
John-Nom my brother-Dat “touch” insult-Acc do-Pft-TS
‘John insulted my brother’

In its verbal use, *tayta* (“touch”) selects, as its locative complement, concrete entities one can touch, but in (50a), *pakk* (“outside”) is not of this type. The non-finite form *tayko* combined with this type of locational noun suffixed by the locative is not morphologically variable and does not allow an adverb between it and its locative complement. Combined with the locative clitic *ey,* it functions as a directional postposition, and its lexical meaning “touch” is completely lost. Therefore, it can be considered a grammaticalized postposition. The same phenomena are observed when the non-finite form *tayko* is preceded, as in (50b), by the dative *hanthey/eykey,* which follows an animate noun. In this case, it functions as a reinforced dative postposition. It should be noted that in two cases, the main verb is one of the *say*-verbs, and when *tayko* functions as a reinforced dative postposition, it has a derogatory meaning. Moreover, *tayko,* in its postpositional use (50d, e) as well as in its verbal use (50c), can be preceded by *taka* (“approach”) used as a reinforced locative postposition we analyzed above:

(50c) *ima-lul* *patak-ey-taka* *tay-ko* *wumciki-ci ma-la*
forehead-Acc ground-Loc-“approach” touch-SC move-DN do not-TS
‘Touch the ground with your forehead and don’t move’
(50d) *Inswu-ka* *pakk-ey-taka* *tayko* *solichi-n-ta*
Insoo-Nom outside-Loc-“approach” “touch” shout-Pst-TS

'Insoo shouts towards/in the direction of the outside'

(50e) *John-i Inswu-hanthey-taka tayko yok-ul hay-ss-ta*
John-Nom Insoo-Dat-"approach" "touch" insult-Acc do-Pft-TS
'John insulted Insoo'

In this case too, combined with the interrogative *eti* ("where"), *taka* can be fused with the latter, while *tay-ko* does not manifest any suffixe-like properties:

(50c') *eti-e-taka* *tay-ko? > eti-taka tay-ko > ettaka tay-ko > etta tay-ko*
where-Loc-"approach" touch-CS
'Touch where?'

(50d') *eti-e-taka* *tayko? > eti-taka tay-ko > ettaka tay-ko > etta tay-ko*
where-Loc-"approach" "touch"
'Towards where?'

The interrogative form *eti-(ey)-taka* (where-(Loc)-"approach") as well as its contracted form *etta(ka)* can be used also for an animate dative complement, which occurs in (50e) as a rhetoric question:

(50e') *etta(ka)* *tayko* *yok-ul* *hae?*
where+Loc+"approach" touch insult-Acc do
'Who are you insulting? (How dare you?)'

We can thus assume that *taka* ("approach") is more grammaticalized than *tayko* ("touch"), because of the possibility of its phonological fusion with its host-constituent and because of its lesser degree of selection of verb types with which it occurs (assuming that *tayko,* in its postpositional use, occurs mostly with *say*-verbs).

If we now summarize our analysis of the six verbs of motion investigated by Rhee,

- *cochta* ("chase") is not grammaticalized to a postposition but to a modifier clitic;
- *nemta* ("go over") is not grammaticalized to a postposition but to a dependent noun;
- *ttaluta* ("follow") keeps its verbal status;
- *pwuthta* ("adhere") and *tayta* ("touch") are grammaticalized to postposition clitics, in P2;
- *takuta* ("approach") is maximally grammaticalized to a postposition clitic, in P1.

The results of our analysis are quite different from Rhee's, which is based on particle omissibility for determining the degree of grammaticalization from verb to postposition.

3.2. From noun to postposition

Let us examine now the grammaticalization of postpositions from nouns. The postposition clitic *kkaci* ("until") illustrates this case, insofar as it comes from the archaic noun meaning "edge". Another example is *pakkey,* used in association with a negative verb; formed by the noun *pakk* ("outside") followed by the locative postposition *ey,* it means "apart from", but used with a negative verb, it triggers the meaning of exclusivity:

(51a) *ne-pakkey* *eps-ta*
you-apart from not be-TS
'I have only you'

In this meaning of exclusive, *pakkey* functions as modifier clitic, and can be preceded by a postpositional clitic:

(51b) *yeki-kkaci-pakkey* *mos* *ilk-ess-ta*
here-until-apart from Neg read-Pft-TS
'I read only until here'

Dealing with the grammaticalization of Korean spatio-temporal postpositions from nouns, Rhee (2004) considers that relational nouns such as *aph* ("front"), *twi* ("back"), *wi* ("top"), *alay* ("lower region"), *mith* ("bottom") exhibit ongoing grammaticalization, because they can be used without the locative postposition *ey,* and without the genitive *uy.* Once more, his analysis is based on the omissibility of particles, and we will show that this criterion is not reliable.

First of all, as we can see in the completely grammaticalized elements from nouns *kkaci* ("until") and *pakkey* ("apart from"), the locative postposition *ey* is absent in the former while present in the latter. Secondly, the honorific dative postposition clitic *kkey,* which is constituted by the archaic noun *kuy* ("place") preceded by the epenthetic *s,* corresponding to the archaic genitive, shows that the genitive is not always omitted in the process of grammaticalization. Thirdly, as shown above (2.3.), the genitive is not always present for marking the relation between two nominal constituents.

As for the relational nouns investigated by Rhee, they can be used without a preceding noun in their deictic or anaphoric uses:

(52a) *wi-lul* *poa-la*
top-Acc look-TS
'Look in an upside direction'

(52b) *alay-ui* *kul*
lower region-G writing
'the writing below'
(52b) *aph-i* *khamkhamha-ta*
front-Nom be obscure-TS
'It is obscure in front'
or 'The front is obscure'
(52c) *twi-eyse* *nwuka* *pwulu-n-ta*
back-Abl somebody call-Pst-TS
'Somebody calls (me) behind'
(53) *mith-ey* *salam-tul-i* *moye-iss-ta*
bottom-Loc people-Pl-Nom gather-be-TS
'People are gathered below'

As we can see in these examples, the relational nouns in question can be followed by any clitic, not only by the locative. The fact that they can be used without a preceding noun, and can be followed by any type of clitic shows clearly their nominal nature. Indeed, in the case of *ppakey* ("apart from"), grammaticalized to a modifier clitic, *pakk* ("outside") can be followed only by the locative *ey*, and not by other clitics. Moreover, the relational nouns examined here exhibit a preceding phonological word boundary. Indeed, as in 2.2, before a word boundary, the consonant *s,* for instance, changes to *t* if it is followed by a vowel, and this is what we observe before our relational nouns:

(54a) *os.wi* (clothes + top): /ot/ + / ɥi/ → [o.dɥi]
(54b) *peses.alay* (mushroom + lower region): /pəsət/ + /arɛ/ → [pə.sə.da.rɛ]
(54c) *sos.aph* (cooking pot + front): /sot/ + /ap/ → [so.da p□]

In addition, they can be followed by the epenthetic *s,* corresponding to the archaic genitive, when they function as nominal complement:

(55a) *wi-s cip* (top-*s* house) 'the house above'
(55b) *alay-s maul* (lower region-*s* village) 'the village below (ours)'
(55c) *twi-s kil* (back-*s* road) 'road behind (the house or the village)'

These arguments would be sufficient for considering Korean relational nouns as nouns, not as postpositions.

4. Conclusion

In the description of grammaticalization of Korean postpositions from verbs or from nouns, Rhee defends the hypothesis that particles mark verbal or nominal complements, and thus are omissible in the decategorization of verbs or nouns as postpositions. To revalue this

hypothesis, we at first have to clarify the categorial status of particles and conclude, for morphophonological and for functional reasons, that they are clitics, manifesting properties both of suffixes and of independent words capable of functioning as syntactic heads or as modifiers. We then distinguish postposition clitics, defining them as semantic predicates which control the semantic features of their arguments, from modifier clitics and phrasal affixes. As for the grammaticalization from verbs or from nouns, it can yield not only postpositions but also other bound morphemes, such as modifier clitics or dependent nouns. The grammaticalization of postpositions from verbs operates, not by eliminating particles, but by the lost of inflectional possibilities, by the cohesion between the fixed non-finite verbal form and its complement (disallowing the insertion of an adverb between them) and by the more extensive lexical selection of complement for postpositional uses than for verbal uses. The possibility of the phonological fusion of postpositions with their host-constituent may be considered a factor leading to a high degree of grammaticalization. As for the grammaticalization of postpositions from nouns, it operates by the restriction of postposition clitics which can follow them, rather than by their omission.

Abbreviations

Abl: Ablative	Acc: Accusative	AdnS: Adnominal Suffix	Adv: Adverb
AN: Animate	Aux: Auxiliary	Cl: Clitic	Com: Comitative
Comp: Comparative	Conn: Connective	CS: Conjunctive Suffix	Dat: Dative
Dir: Directional	DN: Dependent Noun	Eq: Equative	Ess: Essive-modal
Fut: Future	Hon.: Honorific	IN: Inanimate	Iness: Inessive
Inst: Instrumental	Loc: Locative	Mod.: Modifier	MS: Modal Suffix
Neg: Negation	Nom: Nominative	NP: Noun Phrase	Pas: Passive Suffix
Pft: Perfect Suffix	Ph Affix: Phrasal Affix	Pl: Plural	Postp: Postposition
PP: Postpositional Phrase	Prog: Progressive	QuotS: Quotative Suffix	Subj: Subject
Th: Thematic	TS: Terminal Suffix	Pst: Present Suffix	VP: Verbal Phrase
VR: Verbal Root			

References

Chae, H.-R. 1995. Clitic Analyses of Korean "Little Words". *Language, Information and Computation* 10, 97-101. City University of Hong-Kong.

Chae, H.-R. 1996. Hankwukeuy myengsalywuwa pempemcu "sotanwietul" ("Nominal and Cross-categorial 'Particles' in Korean"). *Enewa enehak* ("Language and Linguistics") 22, 297-315.

Chae, H.-R. 1999. Adverbial Nominal and the *–ul/lul* Marker. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* 7, 223-244.

Chae, H.-R. & No Y. 1998. A Survey of Morphological Issues in Korean: Focusing on Syntactically Relevant Phenomena. *Korean Linguistics* 9, 65-109.

Cho, Y.-M. & Sells P. 1995. A Lexical Account of Inflectional Suffixes in Korean. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 4, 119-174.

Choi, D.-J. 1997. Hyentaykwukewi thuswucosaey teyhan thongsacek kochal ("Syntactic consideration of Modern Korean particular particles"). *Kwukehak* ("Korean Linguistics") 30, 201-224.
Choi, K.-S. 1994. Thossikwuuy selcengey tayhaye ("On the formation of the Particle Phrase"). *Wulimal yenku* ("Research into our Language") 4, 91-107.
Choi, S. & Bowerman M. 1991. Learning to express motion events in English and Korean: the influence of language-specific lexicalization patterns. *Cognition* 41, 83-121.
Choi-Jonin, I. 2001. Thèmes en coréen. *Cahiers de Grammaire* 26, 75-99.
Choi-Jonin, I. 2002. Comitatif et jonctif en français et en coréen. *Cahiers de grammaire* 27*,* 11-28.
Choi-Jonin, I. & Sarda L. 2007. The expression of semantic components and the nature of ground entity in orientation motion verbs: a cross-linguistic account based on French and Korean, In M. Aurnague, M. Hickmann and L. Vieu (eds.), *The Categorization of Spatial Entities in Language and Cognition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 123-149.
Creissels, D. 2006. Suffixes casuels et postpositions en hongrois. *Bulletin de la société de linguistique de Paris* 101, 225-272.
Han, J.-H. 1999. *Grammatical Coding of Information Structure in Korean: a Role and Reference Grammar Account.* Ph.D dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.
Han, J.-H. 2003. Kyekcosanun hayki anita ("Case markers are not syntactic heads"). *Hankul* ("Korean Language") 260, 149-182.
Heine, B. & Traugott E. C. (eds.). 1991. *Approaches to Grammaticalization.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Hong, S.-S. 1985. *A and A' Binding in Korean and English: Government-Binding Parameters.* Ph.D Dissertation, University of Connecticut.
Hong, Y-P. 1984. Hyentaykwukeuy hwuchisa "kaciko" ("Postposition *kaciko* in Modern Korean"). *Tongyanghak* ("Oriental Researches") 14. 25-40.
Hopper P. J. & Traugott E. C. 1993. *Grammaticalization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hopper, P.J. 1991. On some principles of grammaticization. In E. C. Traugott & B. Heine (eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization,* vol.1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 17-35.
Kabak, B. 2006. An obstacle to the morphologization of postpositions. *Studies in Language*, 30/1, 33-68.
Kim, Y.-U. 1995. *Mwunpephyengthayuy yeksacek yenkwu – pyenhwauy ilonkwa silcey* ("Historical accounts of grammatical forms – theory and practice about change"). Seoul: Pakiceng.
Labrune, L. 1999. Variation intra et inter-langue. Morphophonologie du *rendaku* en japonais et du *sai-sios* en coréen. *Cahiers de Grammaire* 24, 117-152.
Lapointe, S. 1996. Comments on Cho and Sells: A lexical account of inflectional suffixes in Korean. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 5/1, 73-100.
Lee, J.-H. 1992. *Hyentay kwukemwunpep* ("Modern Korean Grammar"). Seoul: Tayhan Kyokwase Cusikhoysa.
Lee, H.-S. & Thompson, S. A. 1989. A discourse account of the Korean accusative marker. *Studies in Language* 13/1, 105-128.
Lee, H.-S. 1998. *La structure des compléments du groupe nominal en français et en coréen modernes: étude de linguistique comparative.* Ph.D dissertation, University of Paris 7.
Lee, S.-N. 1956. Cepmisa *-k(g)-, - ŋ -* ey tayhaye ("On the suffixes *-k(g)-, - ŋ -*"). Nonmwuncip (Seoul University) 4.
Lee, S.-W. 1957. Kwukeuy postpositioney tayhaye ("On Korean postpositions"). Ilsek Lee Huy-Sung sensayng songsukinyemnonchong ("In Honour of Professeur Lee Huy Sung").

Leeman, D. 1998. La préposition comme catégorie prédicative. In M. Forsgren, K. Jonasson, H. Kronning (eds.) *, Prédication, assertion, information, Actes du colloque d'Uppsala en linguistique française, 6-9 juin 1996*, *Studia Romanica Upsaliensia 56,* Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Uppsala, 327-334.
Park, J.-H. 1994. Thongsacek kyelhapkwankyeywa nonhangkwuco ("Syntactic relation and Head Structure"). *Kwuke yenku* ("Korean Research") 123.
Park, K.-S. 1995. *The Semantics and Pragmatics of Case Marking in Korean : A RRG Account*, Ph.D dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.
Prost, M. 1981. Cosa saynglyak mwuncayey kwanhaye ("On the omission of the particles"). *Hankul* 171, 153-180.
Ramstedt. G. J. 1939. *A Korean Grammar.* Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
Rhee, S. 1996. *Semantics of Verbs and Grammaticalization. The development in Korean from a Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, Seoul, Hankwuk Publisher.
Rhee, S. 2002. Grammaticalization of Postpositions from Movement Verbs in Korean. Paper presented at International Conference on Adpositions of Movement, January 14-16 2002, Katholieke Universititeit Leuven.
Rhee, S. 2004. Grammaticalization of Spatio-Temporal Postpositions in Korean. *enekwahak yenkwu* ("The Journal of Linguistic Science") 31, 169-188.
Schweiger, F. 2000. Compound Case Markers in Australian Languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 39/2, 256-284.
Sells, P. 1995. Korean and Japanese morphology from a lexical perspective. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26/2, 277-325.
Seo, C.-S. 1994/2006. *Kwuke mwunpep* ("Korean Grammar"). Seoul: Hansepon.
Si, J.-K. 1997. Pakke'uy hyengthay-thongsalon ("Morphosyntactic study of 'pakke'"). *Kwukehak* 30 ("Korean Linguistics"), 171-200.
Sohn, H.-M. 1999. *The Korean Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Tesnière, L. 1959. *Eléments de syntaxe structurale.* Paris: Klincksieck.
Yang, J.-S. 2004. Kyohosengkwa '-wa' ("reciprocity and '-wa'"). *Paytalmal* 35 ("Korean Word"), 369-408.
Yim D.-H. 1991. Kyekcosanun haykinka ("Are case markers heads?"). *Cusikyeng hakpo* ("Journal of Cu Si-Kyeng") 8, 119-130.
Yim, H.-P. 1987. *Kwukeuy caykwisa yenku* ("Research on Korean reflexive words"). Seoul: Sinkwu Mwunhwasa.
Yoon, J. H.-S. 2004. Non-nominative (major) subjects and case stacking in Korean. In P. Bhaskararao & K. V. Subbarao (eds.), *Non-nominative Subjects*, Vol. 2, Amsterdam/Philadephia: John Benjamins, 265-314.
Yoon, J. H.-S. 2005. Non-morphological Determination of Nominal Particle Ordering in Korean. In L. Heggie & F. Ordóñes (eds.), *Clitic and Affix Combinations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 239-282.
Traugott, E. C. 1993, Subjectification in grammaticalization. In D. Stein & S. Wright (eds.), *Subjectivity and subjectivisation. Linguistic perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 31-54.
Zwicky, A. M. 1985. Clitics and Particles. *Language* 61/2, 283-305.
Zwicky, A. M. 1994. What is a clitic? In J.A. Nevis, B. Joseph, D. Wanner and A. M. Zwicky, *Clitics – A comprehensive bibliography 1892-1991*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins*,* xii-xx.
Zwicky, A. M. & Pullum G. K. 1983. Cliticization vs. inflection: English *n't*. *Language* 59/3, 502-513.

[1] According to Yang J-S (2004: 380, footnote 14), Hong S-S (1985) is probably the first to propose this type of analysis in generative research.

[2] Choi D-J (1997), surveying the so-called *special particles,* analyzes some of them as postpositions. He also mentions that Yim D-H (1991), Park J-H (1994) and Choi K-S (1994) assume that the nominative and the accusative case markers function as heads, while Yim H-B (1987) and Choi D-J himself don't consider them as such (204, footnote 5).

[3] We consider here neither the predicative particle (*ita*), which follows a nominal predicate, nor the vocative particle, even though they appear in the list of case particles provided by Lee. The sentence final particles such as *yo* (politeness), *kulye* (confirmation) mentioned by Sohn and the quotative particles *(la)ko* mentioned by Lee are not considered either.

[4] For example, *twu-ko* (put_{VR} + CS), is mentioned as dative case particle in Kim (1995: 191-192), and Hong Y.-P. (1984) analyzes *kaci-ko* ($possess_{VR}$ + CS) as postposition in certain contexts.

[5] We use the Yale romanization system for the transcription of Korean (written in italics). The phonemic and phonetic transcriptions are given, only if necessary, in slashes and in square brackets. The syllabification (marked by a period) may differ between phonemic and phonetic transcriptions, due to the Korean phonological rule of "resyllabification": "When a syllable-final (coda) consonant is followed, without pause, by a vowel, a glide + a vowel, or h + a vowel in the following syllable, that consonant is carried over to the following syllable as its onset" (Sohn 1999: 164).

[6] The Korean implosive consonants are affected, before a consonant or a word boundary, by the phonological rule of "coda neutralization": "the bilabial stops *p* and *ph* are neutralized to [p]"; "alveo-dental and palatal stops and fricatives, *t, th, s, s', c, ch* and *h* are all neutralized to [t]"; "velar stops *k, kh,* and *k'* are neutralized to [k]" (Sohn 1999: 165).

[7] The phonological reduction is obligatory for the interrogative pronoun *nwukwu* ('who') co-occurring with the nominative marker *ka.*

[8] In the contracted ablative form *ese* of *etieyse,* the phonological contraction affects only the interrogative form *eti* and the first syllable of the ablative form *eyse.* As we will see below, the ablative form results from the combination of the locative *ey* and the archaic verb *se* ('exist').

[9] Tesnière (1959: 82) defines *translatives* as semantically "empty words" which change the category of "full words" (substantives, verbs, adjectives or adverbs) to another; for example, in *le livre de Pierre* ('the book of Pierre'), the role of the preposition *de* is to change the substantival category of *Pierre* to the adjectival category.

[10] Prost (1981) proposes a similar analysis for the Japanese accusative marker: if the object represents predictable information for the addressee, the accusative marker may be deleted.

[11] Chae (1999) analyses the accusative marker in this use as delimiter and not as case marker.

[12] We refer to Lee (1998), who provides an interesting analysis especially of the genitival structures of psychological nouns.

[13] This example is from Han (2003: 155), who considers that the ablative argument of the verb *naka-ta* ("go out') can be represented by the bare noun *cip* ("home") because this constituent is case-governed by the verb. When it is followed by the ablative marker *eyse,* the latter is, according to him, an additional case marker. However, it should be noted that the verb *naka-ta* ("go out"), when it co-occurs with the bare noun *cip* ("home"), does not denote a movement but an event. Similarly, in the example (13b), the verb *ka-ta* ("go") accompanied by the bare noun *sicang* ("market") denotes an activity rather than a movement; indeed, when people go to the market, it is normally for buying or for selling something. When verbs requiring a goal or an ablative argument denote a movement, the presence of the goal or the ablative maker is obligatory (cf. ex. 13c, 14c).

[14] The bare constituent *eti* ("where") in this example is interpreted obligatorily as goal argument and not as ablative argument

[15] Besides, Han (2003: 151) seems to consider postpositions to have word status, contrary to case markers which do have not, when he writes: "Do particles have a syntactic node? This question is directly connected to the question of whether particles are words."

[16] In this example, *achim* ('morning') is interpretable as object of the verb *kitarita* ('wait') ('I was waiting for breakfast') but not as ablative constituent.

[17] See Choi-Jonin & Sarda (2007) for the lexical selection of the case markers occurring with orientation motion verbs.

[18] We don't agree with the analysis of the comitative construction as syntactically derived from the coordinator, even though they are homonymous. See for this subject, Choi-Jonin (2002) and Yang (2004). For the semantic condition of the comitative constituent, see Choi-Jonin (2002).

[19] Yoon (2005), following Lapointe (1996), also points out that phrasal affixes (also called edge affixes or lexical clitics) possess properties of both lexical affixes and simple clitics, but for him, all nominal particles in Korean behave as phrasal affixes.

[20] This case supports Sells (1995) and Cho & Sells (1995) in their defence of their lexical approach of Korean particles. For a further discussion, see Yoon (2005).
[21] As noted by Chae & No (1998: 9, note 12), the modifier clitic *man* can precede the postposition clitics *ulo* or *ey*: *ton-man-ulo* (money-only-Inst, "with money only") vs *ton-ulo-man*; *sam-nyen-man-ey* (three-year-only-Loc, "in three years") vs **san-nyen-ey-man.* However, theses cases seem to be quite rare.
[22] By P1, P2, etc., we mean position 1, position 2, etc.
[23] In Korean verbs of motion, the semantic component "manner" is followed by *path,* which is followed by *deictic motion*: *ttala-tule-ota* (follow-enter-come, "come in following (someone)"). See on this subject Choi & Bowerman 1991, Rhee 1996, Choi-Jonin & Sarda 2007.
[24] It should be noted that *ttalase* (*ttala*$_{VR}$ + *se,* "follow" + SC)*,* without a preceding noun, is grammaticalized to a discourse connective, meaning "therefore".
[25] The contracted form *keytaka* [*keki* ("there") + *ey-taka* (Loc-"draw near")] is used as a discourse connective, meaning "besides".