

Overt subject NPs as a contrast marker in Korean discourse*

Narah Lee

(The University of Queensland)

Lee, Narah. 2021. Overt subject NPs as a contrast marker in Korean discourse. *Linguistic Research* 38(2): 365-393. Contrast has been regarded as one of the major functions for the understanding of the overt subject in pro-drop languages like Japanese, Korean, Portuguese, and Spanish, in which null subject is more frequent than overt subject in discourse. The literature in Korean linguistics commonly addresses contrast as a significant aspect of an expressed subject, but the research can be further developed with empirical data analysis and re-definition of the notion of contrast. The present study, analysing TV drama scripts, claims how contrast may be differently identified in relation to the recognition of contrastive candidates in discourse. I find that contrast in the data is in various types and that overt subject NPs are used in marking contrast either in a single utterance or over several utterances as the discourse develops. By providing an extended analysis of overt subject NPs as a contrast marker, this study seeks to broaden the understanding of subject expression in Korean discourse. (The University of Queensland)

Keywords: overt subject, contrastive candidate, explicit contrast, implicit contrast, Korean discourse

1. Introduction

Korean is known as a ‘pro-drop’ or ‘null-subject’ language, and the syntactic mechanism of a null subject in a sentence has been examined in numerous studies (e.g. Ahn and Kwon 2012; Im 1985; H. B. Lee 1987, 1993; Yang 1979, 1986). What is relatively less explored is the subject remaining overt in the null-subject language where utterances with no overt subject occur more commonly than ones with overt subject. In the studies explaining pragmatic reasons or motivations of overt subject, contrast has been identified as one of the principal factors not only in Korean (e.g. H. Kim 1999; W. Kim 1996; Jung 2007; N. Lee 2014; Oh 2007) but also in other pro-drop languages like Japanese (Clancy and Downing 1987; Lee and Yonezawa 2008), Spanish (Myhill and Xing 1996; Mayol 2010; Posio 2011), Portuguese (Silva 1993) and Javanese (Ewing

* This paper is supported by the 2021 ECR Research Support Scheme from the University of Queensland. I thank two anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback.

2014).

As shown in (1), an overt subject is often found in Korean discourse where the speaker tries to express an opposing idea to what was formerly said.¹

- (1) 1 S: pap mekesse?
 meal ate
 ‘Have (you) eaten?’
 2 J: ani, an-mekesse-yo.
 no NEG-ate-HON
 ‘No, (I) haven’t eaten.’
 3 S: **na-n** pap mek-ko
 1sg-TOP meal ate-CON
 4 wassnunte.
 came
 ‘I ate and came.’

(N. Lee 2014: 146)

While the application of contrast among overt subjects in Korean appears to be significant in the literature, the descriptions of contrast and the scope of the analyses are limited. In the meantime, it has been substantially studied how the case maker *-(n)un* creates contrast in Korean discourse (e.g. Jun 2005, 2019; I. Kim 2015, 2016; K. Kim 2017; T. Kim 2008; H. Lee 2010, 2015; Oh 2007). In particular, T. Kim (2008:154) clarifies how case markers play a significant role in contrast revealing that “an overt marking rather than a zero-marking is preferred for encoding subjects that are contrastive”.² Adapting and expanding the research of case markers in contrast, the current study is to discover the contrastiveness of overt subject as opposed to null subject; we want to include cases of an overt subject NP affixed with other particles than *-(n)un* or no particle that may be in a contrastive relation. Additionally, the alternation between

1 The following abbreviations are in glosses: ACC = accusative; CAUS = causative; CNN = connective; COND = conditional; COP = copula; DAT = dative; DEC = declarative; EXCL = exclamative; HON = honorific; IMP = imperative; INS = instrumental; LOC = locative; NEG = negative; NOM = nominative; POS = possessive; Q = interrogative; QT = quotative; REL = relative; TOP = topic marker; SUG = suggestive; VOC = vocative

2 T. Kim (2008) not only analyses contrastiveness of case markers but discusses their overall discourse-pragmatic functions that are missing in the absence of the case markers.

a subject-marking particle and a zero particle would give us different implications from the alternation between overt subject and null subject.

The present study aims to examine contrast as a primary reason for a subject to be expressed overtly instead of omitted while suggesting more specific definition and types of contrast and analysing the contrastive nature that overt subjects display at different levels in discourse rather than only in a sentence. Regarding the difference between contrast, focus and topic, as noted by many researchers, it is not that they are always in a clear distinction, but in the current analysis, contrast is defined as having a concrete contrastive counterpart in the discourse (Chafe 1976; Lambrecht 1994; Repp 2010; Umbach 2004). Then it will divide contrast into explicit and implicit by the possibility of clear identification of contrastive candidates either in the same utterance or in the discourse as it develops. While we observe overt subjects appearing in contrastive alternatives in discourse, the focus of analysis will be on first- and second-person subjects excluding third-person. It is because first- and second-persons can show dynamic aspects of overt subjects in conversational discourse, not only as the subject in a sentence but also as the discourse participant, whereas the third-person is only addressed by the first- and second-persons.

The present paper is organised as follows. Section 2 reviews definitions of contrast and their utilisation in the literature of case markers and overt subject. The data set used in the present research is introduced in Section 3, and the overall distribution of overt subjects in contrast is also analysed. Sections 4 and 5 discuss the overt subjects in the data appearing in explicit contrast and implicit contrast, respectively. The findings are summarised in Section 6 with concluding remarks.

2. Overt subject and contrast

Only a few researchers (e.g. W. Lee 1989; W. Kim 1996; H. Kim 1999; Jung 2007; Oh 2007) have addressed the pragmatic meaning of overt subjects, and 'contrast' has been commonly maintained in the studies as one of the crucial factors of a subject overtly expressed instead of unexpressed. For example, Jung (2007: 110) claims that subjects are not omitted when speakers want to explicitly show that they are 'engaged' with other speakers in the discourse. More concreteness is found in W. Lee (1989) and W. Kim (1999) where it is noted that speakers tend to use an overt subject when it is in contrast,

focus, or emphasis in Korean discourse. W. Kim (1996: 282) specifically states that the use of an overt subject is mandatory when a speaker intends to emphasise the contrastive meaning of the subject (i.e. the very referent, not someone else) to other participants in the discourse. Similarly, Oh (2007) suggests that overt first-person subject is used to indicate the speaker's contrastive opinion to the preceding utterances and overt subject is used to show the difference between the addressee and the speaker herself or between another referent in the context and the speaker herself.

While a general meaning of contrast may be easily captured in our mind, a clear and unified definition of contrast is yet to be reached in the literature. It is because contrast takes a relative status in information structure, and as Lambrecht (1994) notes, contrast is a gradient, and not on one level. The identification of contrast has been correspondingly varied, such as contrast, contrastive focus or contrastive topic, because focus, topic and contrast are alike in nature. Chafe (1976) clarifies that the distinction between them is made by the specificity of contrastive candidates. For instance, when a speaker says a contrastive sentence, such as, 'Ronald made the hamburgers', with the subject stressed and high-pitched, she expresses her knowledge that Ronald, not other candidates that might be in the addressee's mind, is the right choice for the subject role. The speaker presumes that the addressee is aware of the fact that someone made the hamburgers, which Chafe (1976) names background knowledge, and that the addressee has a set of possible candidates in her mind. The set of candidates—persons who might have made the hamburgers—normally has a limited range rather than an unlimited set of possibilities. Namely, contrast of a sentence is achieved by "the assertion of which candidate is the correct one" (Chafe 1976: 34).

Umbach (2004) confirms that the limited number of candidates distinguishes contrast from focus. For instance, when the addressee of the sentence 'Ronald made the hamburgers' has no specific candidate in her mind or an endless list of them, we can say that Ronald is in focus. Conversely, if the addressee has a particular person who could have made the hamburgers, as well as Ronald, in her mind and it is confirmed by the speaker's utterance that Ronald is the one, we can say that Ronald is in contrast. Repp (2010) also notes that a contrasting item has alternatives in a limited range and an explicit relationship with the alternatives, whereas a focused item has an unlimited range of alternatives and they can be implicitly related. It is lucidly stated, "We have focus on an item but contrast between items" (Repp 2010: 1335).

In the current research of overt subject, I focus on the cases of overt subject in

contrast according to the definition clarified above. That is, overt subjects of ‘implicitness (i.e. topical relations)’ are not included in the analysis, and only overt subjects of ‘explicitness (i.e. contrastive relations)’ is considered contrastive. Chafe (1976) suggests the notion of ‘double contrast’ that refers to a pair of contrastive items, is adopted in many empirical studies that test subjects in contrast in other pro-drop languages (e.g. Myhill and Xing 1996; Mayol 2010; Travis and Cacoullos 2012). Travis and Cacoullos (2012) specifically redefine it as having two differences: “one difference must be in the subjects, and the second in the predicates, which must be related, but in some sense converse”. Although this characteristic of double contrast gives a clear recognition of subjects in contrast, it actually limits the observation of contrastive subjects and misses some instances of contrastive candidates that do not meet the strict criteria of having different subjects and different predicates. For instance, a contrastive pair can have the same subject with different predicates or different subjects with the same predicates. The present study defines contrast to be in contrastive relations but does not limit it to have contrastive subjects in contrary predicates.

I further divide the contrastive relation into explicit and implicit, depending on the realisation of contrastive candidates in discourse. Overt subject in implicit contrast is counted as contrast, not a topic or focus, because the contrastive counterpart is definite and obvious in the discourse although it is not expressed.³ One of the examples that are on the boundary between focus and contrast is as in (2).

- (2) 1 B: pannyen kongpwuha-myen sapepkosi pwuth-nuntako
 half.year study-COND bar.exam pass-QT
 2 nwu-ka kulay?
 who-NOM so
 ‘Who says that (one) passes the bar exam after studying for a half
 year?’
 3 S: **na-nun** pwuthe. kulikwu ne colepha-myen
 1sg-TOP pass and 2sg graduate-COND
 4 inthen welkup pan, na cwun-tamye.
 intern salary half 1sg give-QT

3 In the current analysis, ‘implicit’ contrast indicates not topical but contrastive relations that have definite contrastive candidates with one candidate unrealised in the discourse. The concept of ‘implicit contrast’ is also used in the literature of contrast (e.g. Mayol 2010) for the same definition as in this study.

'I pass. And, (you) said you are going to give me a half of the intern salary when graduated.'

[S1: between a younger brother and an older sister]

An older sister (S) says that she will pass the bar exam after studying for a half year even if it seems impossible, while her younger brother (B) doubts it. In the previous part of the dialogue, S says that she will study for the bar exam in the next semester, and B teases her that a semester is not enough for passing the exam by asking who says that one passes the bar exam after studying for a half year (lines 1 and 2). S affirms that she does, using the plain 1sg pronoun *na* as the first-person subject affixed with the marker *-nun* (line 3). The rhetorical utterance of B means that no one can pass the bar exam with such a short period of preparation, and S makes an exception of herself from 'no one', which consequently brings a focus on *na-nun*. According to the characteristics of contrast described above, *na* by S has no contrastive candidates, either specified or enumerated in the context. *Na* in (2) is contrastive to indefinite candidates, so it is focused, and a focused subject with indefinite candidates is excluded from the current analysis of the overt subject in contrast.

While there has been no comprehensive discussion of contrast in the research of subject expression or omission, it is well established in the study of particles in Korean (e.g. Jun 2005, 2019; I. Kim 2015, 2016; K. Kim 2017; T. Kim 2008; H. Lee 2010, 2015). As Oh (2007) points out, there are certain patterns found in the use of particles attached to overt subjects, such as *-(n)un* in contrast, *-i/ka* for attributing responsibility, and zero particles to note the speaker's existence or select next speaker. The contrast of *-(n)un* correlates with the contrast of the subject to which *-(n)un* is affixed, and many examples of overt subject in contrast are affixed with the particle *-(n)un* in our data.

However, as shown in Table 1, not all subjects in the contrastive relationship are marked by *-(n)un*,⁴ and there are contrastive subjects affixed with other particles in our data as we will see in the following sections.

4 T. Kim (2008) also notes that *-i/ka* can be used to mark contrast as well as *-(n)un*.

Table 1. Distribution of particles used with overt subject (first and second person) in contrast

Particles	Contrast	No contrast	Total
zero	27	307	334
<i>i/ka</i>	63	339	402
<i>(n)un</i>	114	131	245
<i>to</i>	0	88	88
others	11	16	27

Therefore, by surveying all overt subjects affixed with any particles, the present study seeks to find a more general answer to the question of what an overt subject does in discourse. While the discussion of contrastive subject has some overlap with the discussion of contrastive particles, there is a new contribution to be made by analysing overt subjects in contrast, whether or not they are affixed with a ‘contrastive’ particle.

3. Data

I use ten episodes of five Korean TV drama scripts as data in the current research. Some may have concerns with using TV drama scripts in a discourse-analytic study. Although the scripts are written by certain authors and are not naturally occurring conversations, discourses in TV dramas are strictly based on the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic rules of a language and reflect the use of the language in everyday conversations legitimately and plausibly. It is also found in other studies that the grammatical or stylistic appearances of utterances from TV drama scripts are similar to those that naturally occur in conversation (Hong 2014; Nariyama 2004). Moreover, the diversity in settings and dynamics of interactions are not practically captured in recorded mundane dialogue. Thus, I find that TV drama scripts are a valuable means of discourse analysis data where we want to review the use of a grammatical item like a subject at the discourse level.

Two episodes are taken from five separate TV dramas that were broadcast in Korea since 2010. The titles of the dramas and the year they were broadcast are as follows: *Ocakkyo hyengceytul* (‘The Brothers of Ocakkyo’, 2011–2012, KBS), *Chengtamtong Ayllisu* (‘Alice in Chengtamtong’, 2012–2013, SBS), *Neuy moksolika tullye* (‘I hear your voice’, 2013, SBS), *Nay ttal Seyeng-i* (‘My daughter, Seyeng’, 2012–2013, KBS) and *Ceyppangwang Kimthakkwu* (‘Baking King, Thakkwu Kim’, 2010, KBS).⁵ Excerpts taken

from the episodes are presented with the information about the drama title and speakers, such as [O1: between classmates at university] to indicate that it is the first episode of *Ocakkyo hyengceyttul* (O1) and dialogue between classmates at university. Overt subjects in the transcribed excerpts are marked in bold, and the English translations are underlined and in bold, as in *na* ‘I’ in the Korean transcription and **I** in the English translation.

As noted in the introduction, we only look at the first- and second-persons in the analysis of overt subject.

Table 2. Ratios of overt subject for first, second, and third person

Subject	Null	Overt	Total
First-person	1,202 (68%)	578 (32%)	1,780
Second-person	1,840 (78%)	518 (22%)	2,358
Third-person	737 (38%)	1,209 (62%)	1,946

While the discursive dynamic that third-person has is to be different from those of first- and second-persons, the ratio of overt subject in third-person is notably distinctive from first- and second-persons, as shown in Table 2 above.

4. Overt subject in explicit contrast

Firstly, we examine overt subject in explicit contrast where two or more referents are in contrast. For the sake of our analysis of a first- or second-person subject, at least one of the referents is overt subject in the discourse. I count them as explicit contrast, by extending the interpretation of contrast to pragmatic meanings from sentence structure or semantic meanings. Explicit contrast is then divided into two in the analysis: one that has both contrastive candidates in the utterance by one speaker (analysed in 4.1) and the other that has contrastive candidates not in one utterance but in different utterances in the discourse, whether spoken by one speaker or spoken by different speakers (analysed in 4.2). The division is based on the different degrees of contrast that the two types of explicit contrast have. The first type of explicit contrast is simple and obvious to notice because the contrast between contrastive candidates occurs in a single utterance. The second type of explicit contrast is, in general, less noticeable and tends to be found in

5 The underlined initial alphabets in the Korean titles are used for tagging the data source in the information of each excerpt as in ‘O1’ or ‘A2’.

- (5) 1 K: mwulcekulo sonhay-lul kkichyess-umyen
 physically damage-ACC make-COND
- 2 kyengceycek posang-ul
 financial compensation-ACC
- 3 ha-nun key tangyenha-yyo.
 do-REL thing-NOM natural-HON
 ‘If (one) made physical damage, it is natural to give financial compensation.’
- 4 P: mwulcek sonhay-lul
 physical damage-ACC
- 5 mwulcek posang-ulo pat-ko siphunci,
 physical compensation-INS receive-CNN wish.whether
- 6 kyengceycek posang-ulo patko siphunci-nun
 financial compensation-INS receive-CNN wish.whether-TOP
- 7 **phihayca-ka** kyelcengha-nun ke-cyo.
 victim-NOM decide-REL thing-DEC
- 8 **kahayca-ka** ha-nun key ani-la.
 assailant-NOM do-REL thing NEG-but
 ‘As for receiving either physical compensation or financial compensation for physical damage, **a victim** decides. Not **an assailant** does.’

[N2: between two speakers unknown each other]

The subjects in this utterance are required to maintain the meaning of the sentence. The contrast between the two subjects is also lost if they are unexpressed. Specifically, P could have said, ‘I decide on the kind of compensation. You do not’, where the pronouns for first- and second-person subjects simply indicate the speakers are of two different statuses: one making the decision and the other not making the decision. However, she chooses general nouns that specify the speakers’ different statuses in the situation, which they are currently facing as ‘an attacker’ and ‘a victim’. By using the general nouns for subject instead of employing pronouns, sharper contrast is realised between the speakers, highlighting the specific meanings that general nouns convey.

Both subjects are required to be overt to keep the semantic meaning of the utterances as well as the contrastive nature between the subjects in the contrastive utterances in (4)

third-person. The sentence needs clarification of the subject, namely, who is willing to do or who is assumed to do, and S uses the plain form of 1sg pronoun *na* for the first-person subject.⁷ By contrast, the second-person subject *ne* can be unexpressed without changing the meaning of the utterance. It is because the second sentence is imperative; in imperative sentences, the second-person subject is generally unexpressed in Korean like in English. In other words, contrast does not always guarantee a subject to be overtly expressed, contrary to the claim that a contrastive subject needs to be overt (e.g. W. Kim 1996; H. Kim 1999).

Despite its redundancy in expression, the overt subject *nen* in (6) adds the meaning of 'as for you', which explicitly strengthens the differences to the preceding first-person subject in the utterance where the speaker divides his labour and that of the interlocutor. If *ne* was unexpressed in (6), *na* in the utterance would be categorised as an implicit contrast, not as a topic, since the contrast between the first- and second-persons in the utterance remains and the contrastive candidate of the overt first-person subject, namely, the second-person subject, is definite although it is not phonetically realised.

4.2 Contrastive candidates in different utterances in the discourse

We have seen the candidates of explicit contrast appear in the same utterance while the speaker contrasts two referents in opposite or different situations. They are easier to recognise as contrastive owing to the symmetrical sentence forms as well as the short distance between candidates. The following examples also show contrast between two or more candidates, but they are not in contrast at first as only one candidate is introduced earlier in the discourse. These become contrastive later as the other candidate(s) is/are introduced in subsequent utterances in the discourse. Also, the sentence forms vary, or the predicates are the same in some cases, but the overt subjects are still in contrast.

Let us consider an example in which speakers use overt first-person subject contrastively to show their different opinions. A son (S) and his father (F) talk about Korean pop singers in (7) and they use overt first-person subject contrasting whom they like.

7 Some relationship between modality verbs and overt subject is recognised in the current research. It is not definite, i.e. willingness modality always makes the subject overt, but is likely that overt subject appears more often with some modality verbs.

- (7) 1 S: appa, **na-n** hyoli-ka
 dad 1sg-TOP hyoli-NOM
 2 nay suthailinkapwa. wus-ul ttay cincca ippe.
 my style-COP-seem smile-REL time really pretty
 ‘Dad, I guess Hyoli is my type. (She) is so pretty when smiling.’
 3 F: wus-ul ttayman ippuci.
 smile-REL time.only pretty
 4 cengsaykha-lttay sengkkalisse poituntay.
 serious-RELtime testy look.but
 ‘Pretty only when smiling. (She) looks testy in a serious face.’
 5 **na-n** yuli-ka te cohtula.
 1sg-TOP yuli-NOM more like
 6 moksoli-ka ttak ni emma-ya.
 voice-NOM exactly 2sg mum-COP
 ‘I like Yuli more. The voice is just like your mum.’
 [N1: between a son and a father]

S says that he likes a member of a Korean pop girl group, using *na* as a first-person subject, and F says that he likes another member of the group, using *na* as well. *Na* affixed with the topic marker *-n* is used in S’s utterance while stating his preference, and the utterance has no contrast in itself. In the following utterance, F also says *nan* while expressing his own preference with disagreement to A’s utterance (‘Pretty only when smiling. (She) looks testy in a serious face’). The use of *nan* by F evokes contrast between the preferences of S and F, and it cannot be unexpressed in the utterance.

While speakers in (7) use an overt subject to express that they have different opinions, speakers in the following examples in (8) and (9) use overt subjects to appoint counterparts in an argument. In (8) and (9), a senior journalist (S) argues with her junior journalist (J) on their problems. In (8), S first criticises that J has an issue (line 1) and describes the issue that he only pursues exclusive news disregarding principles.

- (8) 1 S: **ne-n** kuke-y mwuncey-ya.
 2sg-TOP that-TOP problem-COP
 ‘You have that problem.’
 2 kunom-uy thukcong thukcong.

- that-POS exclusive exclusive
 ‘That exclusive, exclusive.’
- 3 amwuli thukcongpyengey kellye
 no.matter exclusive.obsession.with have
- 4 phokcwu-lul hayto choysohan-uy
 drive-ACC although minimum-POS
- 5 wenchik-un cikhyesseyaci!
 principle-NOM follow.should
 ‘Even though (you) are so much obsessed with that exclusive and
 overreacting, (you) should have followed the least principles!’
 [O2: a senior journalist to her junior at work]

S uses the plain 2sg pronoun *ne* as the second-person subject of the first sentence with the topic marker *-n* affixed to *ne*. While she claims that J has a problem of being obsessed with exclusive news and of disregarding principles, the overt subject *ne* does not have a contrastive candidate mentioned in the utterance. There is no contrastive candidate to be assumed in the context yet, so it cannot be implicit contrast either. The overt subject *ne* is topical, not contrasted, with which S particularly appoints J to criticise him.

In his response in (8), J criticises S in return, saying that she has an issue (line 1), and he describes the issue that she only considers principles (line 3) and has poor achievement in the viewing rating (lines 4 and 5). J begins his utterance with *thimcangnim* as overt subject NP along with the same topic marker *-un* that S used for overt subject in her sentence. By doing so, explicit contrast between *ne* and *thimcangnim* is created.⁸ That is, the focused *ne* spoken by S in (8) lacks the definiteness and certainty of its contrastive candidate(s), whereas the *thimcangnim* spoken by J in (9) confidently has a contrastive candidate, which is the preceding overt subject *ne* by S. It is an interesting fact of discourse analysis that an utterance with no contrast in itself can be contrastive in relation with other utterances. Moreover, the same predicate can be

8 The contrast could have been even more discernible if the utterances are in English, of which the subjects would be both the second-person pronoun ‘you’, and if we have phonetic information, such as a high-pitch or stress on the second-person subjects. In spite of the absence of morphological similarity or phonetical marks, we can still perceive the contrastive meaning between the two overt subjects since the utterances are part of discourse and have context.

interpreted contrastively because the subjects are different, and the connotations of the predicate are different. To maintain the contrast that both the speakers have problems, and the problems are different from each other, it is essential that the subjects in (8) and (9) are expressed overtly.

- (9) 1 J: **thimcangnim-un** kuke-y mwuncey-pnita.
 team.head-TOP that-NOM problem-DEC-HON
 ‘**You** have that problem.’
- 2 kunom-uy wenchik, wenchik.
 that-POS principle principle
- 3 kulayse wuliphulo-ka cencem
 thus1pl program-NOM gradually
- 4 sichenglyul-i tteleci-nun-ke-lakwu-yo!
 viewing.rating-NOM drop-REL-thing-QT-HON
- 5 ilen sikulo ci-nun-ke pwunha-ko ccokphallicito anh-usi-pnikka?
 this way lose-REL-thing furious-CNN embarrassing NEG-HON-Q
 ‘That principle, principle. That is why the viewing ratings of our
 programme continue dropping. Are (you) not furious and embarrassed
 with losing like this?’
- [O2: a junior journalist to his senior at work]

Similarly, the overt subject in A’s utterance in (10) is not contrastive on its own, but it becomes contrastive with the overt subject in the following utterance by B, which completes a contrastive pair.

- (10) 1 A: wayan-tuleka **ne**?
 why NEG-go.in 2sg
 ‘Why aren’t **you** going in?’
- 2 B: kule-nun **ne-nun**, way an-tulekanuntey?
 so-REL 2sg-TOP why NEG-go.in.but
 ‘Why aren’t **you** going in while saying so?’
- [N1: between two high school students]

Two classmates, A and B, are standing outside the door to the teacher’s office and

hesitating to go in after being summoned. A finds B in front of the door and asks why she is not going in, using *ne*. In this utterance, the overt subject is not in contrast and is unexpressed in the utterance. That is, the interrogative utterance *way antuleka?* ‘Why aren’t (you) going in?’ without the overt subject can still convey the same meaning as in the original utterance with *ne*. By using the overt subject, A adds pragmatic meanings like distancing or pestering. B also uses *ne* with the topic marker *-nun* affixed and asks why A does not go inside herself, asking the same question.

With the repeated question in line 2, B reminds A that she is not going in while she is supposed to, and the reminding question with *ne* makes explicit contrast to the first question by A. The overt subject *ne* by B may be unexpressed together with the modifying phrase *kulenun* ‘while saying so.’ If the entire phrase including *nenun* is unexpressed, that is, *way antulekanuntey?* ‘Why aren’t (you) going in?’ the utterance would sound odd in this context because the contrastive nuance B tries to emphasise, namely, ‘Why are YOU not going in?’ or ‘How about YOU?’ is lost. Thus, the overt subject is necessary in B’s utterance for highlighting the contrast between the speakers. As pointed out in the case of (7), it is also noteworthy that contrast can be defined even if the predicates of contrastive candidates are the same. The contrast in (10) stems from the difference in the agents of the predicates, not from the difference in the predicates themselves, while predicates for the contrastive overt subjects are the same.

The explicit contrast in (7), (8), (9) and (10) occurs on the subjects, however, what the subjects do is the same for the contrastive utterances. For example, first-person liking a singer in (7), second-person having problems in (8) and (9), and second-person not going into the teacher’s office in (10). That is, the sentences with the contrastive subjects are symmetrical in respect to the syntax and the semantic meaning of predicates and information structure. This symmetric feature of overt subject in contrast is also the same in the case where contrastive candidates appear in a single utterance as shown in (3) through (6). Interestingly, it is also possible that contrastive candidates are in asymmetrical situations. For example, the first-person subject in (11) seems unrelated to each other because they have dissimilar information structure if seen separately. One is in ‘I will be finished with classes at four’, and the other is in ‘I have an appointment in the evening, so (I) cannot’. Nevertheless, the two first-person subjects make an explicit contrastive pair in the context:

- (11)1 D: itta konghang-ey kathi ka-si-l-kkecyo?
 later airport-LOC together go-HON-FUT-Q
 ‘Would (you) go to the airport together later?’
- 2 **ce-nun** swuep neysi-myen kkuthna-yo.
 1sg-TOP class four-COND end-HON
 ‘**I** will be finished with classes at four.’
- 3 M: ilnyeney sumwupento nemkey ka-nun chwulcangiya.
 one.year twenty.times.even over go-REL business.trip
- 4 ka-lttaymata kulehkey yunan-ul tteleyakeysse?
 go-REL every.time so fuss-ACC make.should
 ‘(He) goes on a business trip more than twenty times a year. Every time should (you) make a fuss?’
- 5 **na-nun** cenekey yaksok-i iss-ese antway.
 1sg-TOP evening appointment-NOM have-CAUS cannot
 ‘**I** have an appointment in the evening, so (I) cannot.’
- 6 D: kule-m, senmwul cwunpihaynonke iss-usi-myen
 so-COND gift prepare.thing have-HON-COND
- 7 ceyka taysin cenhay-tulil-kkayo?
 1sg-NOM behalf give-HON-Q
 ‘Then, if (you) have prepared a gift, shall I give it (to him)?’
- 8 M: nena alase hay. na-nun **nay-ka** alase ha-lthey-nikka.
 you.just know do 1sg-TOP 1sg-NOM know do-FUT-CAUS
 ‘(You) mind your own business. **I** will take care of mine.’
- [O2: between a daughter and her stepmother]

The daughter (D) in (9) above asks her stepmother (M) whether she wants to go to the airport to see off her father later (line 1). She adds that she finishes her class at four (line 2), using the deferential 1sg pronoun *ce* as the overt subject with the topic marker *-nun* affixed and expects that M would respond with her own availability. However, M says that she has an appointment in the evening (line 5) using *na* as the overt subject with the topic marker *-nun* affixed in her utterance, which becomes the reason that she is not available for the send-off.

While the contrastive sentences in (7) to (10) are in symmetry, for example, *nen kukey mwunceyya* ‘You-pronoun have that problem’ in (8) and *thimcangnimun kukey*

mwunceypnita ‘You-title have that problem’ in (9), those in (11) are not similar at the sentence level. The contrast in (11) is more indirect than in the previous examples and the pragmatic interpretation of ‘I have an appointment in the evening’, namely, ‘I am not available’, becomes contrastive to the pragmatic meaning of the first contrastive utterance ‘I will be finished with classes at four’, namely, ‘I am available’.

What is noteworthy here is that the overt subject *na* in M’s utterance in line 5 underlines the contrast between herself being unavailable for D’s suggestion and D being available. The utterance with the subject unexpressed, that is, *cenyekey yaksoki issese antway* ‘(I) have an appointment in the evening, so (I) cannot’ would make sense on its own. However, considering that she criticised D for making a fuss previously in the utterance and gives an answer that she is unable to go to the airport with D, the use of overt subject makes a critical difference. If *na* was not said in this particular context, the degree of contrast would have been much lower as well as the signalling impact of returning to the original question, which is availability to go to the airport, after adding comments on D’s suggestion to go to the airport. Further, M confirms the contrast between the availabilities of herself and D more clearly in her last utterance by having another *na* and its implicit contrastive candidate in the imperative: ‘(You) mind your own business, I will take care of mine’.

As noted earlier, explicit contrast in the discourse is created as the discourse proceeds, and there can be more than a pair of contrastive candidates. In the following dialogue in (12), children talk about their preferences for bread and make a series of contrastive utterances in turns.

- (12)1 A: a, pwusileyki-nun komppang
 EXCL crumble-TOP kompo.bread
 2 pwusileyki-ka wangcwungwang-i-ntey.
 crumble-NOM king.of.king-COP-but
 ‘Ah, as for crumbles, kompo bread crumbles are the best.’
 3 B: **na-nun** tanphathppang-i mek-ko siph-untey.
 1sg-TOP tanphath.bread-NOM eat-CNN wish.but
 ‘**I** want to eat tanphath bread.’
 4 C: **na-nun** komppangitun tanphathppangitun
 1sg-TOP kompo.bread.whether tanphath.bread.whether
 5 paypwulthecilttaykkaci mekepokina hayss-um cohkeyssta.

- full.explode.until eat.just do-COND wish
 ‘Whether kompo or tanphath, I wish (I) could eat until extremely full.’
- 6 A: (overlap) na-twu!
 1sg.also
 ‘Me too!’
- 7 B: (overlap) na-twu!
 1sg.also
 ‘Me too!’
- 8 D: **na-n** kulehkey mek-ul-swu issnuntey.
 1sg-TOP so eat-REL-ability have.but
 ‘I can eat like that.’

[K1: among four children]

Speaker A begins the conversation by describing a specific kind of bread he likes (lines 1 and 2). B then says that he wants to eat another kind of bread (line 3), using *na* as overt subject with *-nun* affixed. This raises the first contrast between different preferences for bread of A and B, which is implicit as the first candidate subject is unexpressed in A’s utterance. After the contrast between two different kinds of bread liked by A and B is formed, C says that he wants to eat either kind until he feels full (lines 4 and 5), using *na* as overt subject again with *-nun* affixed. The use of *nanun* by C creates the second contrast between the wish for a specific taste and the wish for eating an enormous amount of bread regardless of the kind. A and B agree with C, stating that they also want to have as much bread as possible (lines 6 and 7, respectively). Finally, D makes another contrast to the previous utterances, by saying that he can eat like that, specifically, as much as he wants (line 8), using *na* as an overt subject affixed with *-n*. The third contrast occurs between being unable to eat bread and being able to eat as much bread as he wanted.

As seen in the example of (12), contrastive can develop and extend as discourse carries on because of the characteristic that it requires a candidate. While the forms of contrastive candidates in (12) are identical, that is, *na*, the contrast of each contrastive pair are in different forms. The first contrast is between the unexpressed subject in favour of a kind of bread and *na* in favour of another kind of bread (A versus B). The second contrast is between *na* preferring specific kinds of bread and *na* wishing to eat any kind of bread until full (A and B versus C). The third contrast appears between *na* unable

to eat bread and *na* able to eat bread (A, B and C versus D). Each contrast is created when the second candidate in the pair is uttered. The contrast is strengthened by the use of overt subjects that indicate the speakers' different statuses or opinions. The utterances without an overt subject would not only be unnatural themselves but also less interactive as a result of losing contrast. That is, the overt subject in this example function as a powerful indicator of contrast, which is one of the ways to connect utterances in discourse and to display interaction, while multiple speakers express different opinions, preferences, or abilities.

To summarise, what I want to highlight from the examples in this section is that contrast can be created through the discourse and that explicit contrast is not always captured in one utterance. The first candidate of explicit contrast is not contrastive itself, but it becomes contrastive when the second candidate is uttered. What is contrasted depends on what the speaker of the second candidate sees as contrastive from the two candidates. In many cases, the contrasted predicates are in the same forms as in 'You-pronoun have the problem' in (8) and 'You-title have the problem' in (9). In other cases, pragmatic meanings of utterances with overt subject contribute to the contrast as in 'I will be finished with classes at four' and 'I have an appointment in the evening' in (11). While the utterances may look completely irrelevant to each other, the use of overt subject in the second utterance is required to create contrast in addition to establishing relevance to the preceding utterance. Namely, overt subject explicitly and tightly connects contrastive utterances that are apart in the discourse regardless of the forms of sentences.

5. Overt subject in implicit contrast

In this section, I discuss another type of overt subject in contrast, i.e. in implicit contrast that has definite candidates with one of the candidates unrealised. To be specific, there is an overt subject as a contrastive candidate, and we can enunciate another contrastive candidate in the discourse even though it is not uttered. For example, in (13), speaker B makes a contrast between herself and her friend, A, with only the second-person subject overtly expressed.

- (13)1 A: akka nolla-se ceytaylo insato mos-hayssney.
 earlier surprised-CAUS properly greeting.even NEG-did
 ‘(I) was surprised earlier and couldn’t say hello properly.’
- 2 elmaman-ici wuli?
 how.long-COP 1pl
 ‘How long have we been (not seeing)?’
- 3 B: sipnyenman-in-ka? pepceng-eyse po-n-ke-y
 ten.years-COP-Q court-LOC see-REL-thing-NOM
- 4 macimak-i-n-ke kathuntay. kiekna?
 last-COP-REL-thing seem.but remember
 ‘Been 10 years? Seeing at the court was probably the last.’
- 5 kuttay **ne-n** pepcengmwun aph-eyse tomangchyess-canha.
 then 2sg-TOP court.gate front-LOC escaped-DEC
 ‘Do (you) remember? **You** ran away in front of the gate to the court.’
- 6 A: kulayss-na?
 so-Q
 ‘Did (I)?’

[N2: between two female friends]

The two speakers were friends at high school, and both were summoned as witnesses for a crime scene. Since speaker A ran away because she was scared, B attended the court by herself. They now encounter again at the court after 10 years passed, as this excerpt shows. B recalls that A ran away from the court in the past (line 5), using *ne* as the overt subject with the topic marker *-n* affixed. It would become ambiguous who ran away from the court if the subject is unexpressed, that is, *kuttay pepcengmwun apheyse tomangchyesscanha*, so B specifies the subject of running away with the overt subject. In addition, the topic marker *-n* affixed to *ne* clearly conveys the contrast that the interlocutor ran away while someone else did not. The context shows that the contrastive candidate of *ne* by B (line 5) is apparently B herself. B pinpoints the fact that A escaped as opposed to herself who did not run away and attended the court with the utterance with *ne*. Although the contrastive candidate of the overt subject *ne* is not realised in (13), it is unambiguously the speaker herself from the shared context. Thus, this can be an example of contrast, and as one of the contrastive candidates is not realised, it is implicit contrast.

Similarly, the overt subject *na* in (14) is in implicit contrast, but in this case, there are two contrastive candidates unrealised. Speaker H talks about herself being inexperienced in relationships, whereas her friends, M and Y, are experienced (lines 12 and 13).

- (14)1 M: pyengho-ka na-hanthey ilelswu-n eps-nun ke-ya,
 pyengho-NOM 1sg-DAT do.this way-TOP no-REL thing-COP
 2 ilel swu-n eps-nun ke-ya.
 do.this way-TOP no-REL thing-COP
 ‘Pyengho can’t do this to me, can’t do this.’
- 3 H: ku-nikka, ni-ka elmana pyengho-lul salanghayss-nuntey.
 so-CAUS 2sg-NOM how.much pyengho-ACC loved-but
 ‘That is so. After you loved Pyengho so much.’
 (pouring alcohol to M)
- 4 Y: kuman cwe, nitul nemwu masyesse.
 stop give 2pl too drank
 ‘Stop giving (alcohol). You guys have been drinking too much.’
- 5 H: way? ilekheyhimtulehanuntey masikey nayptwe.
 why this suffer.but drink let
- 6 masye, miyen-a, masye.
 drink miyen-VOC drink
 ‘Why? (She) is suffering this hard. Let (her) drink. Drink, Miyen, drink.’
- 7 M: (cry)
- 8 H: (cry) miyen-a.
 miyeon-VOC
 ‘Miyen.’
- 9 Y: salang-i mwencito molu-nun ke-y
 love-NOM what.even not.know-REL thing-NOM
- 10 a-nun chek haki-nun.
 know-REL pretend do-TOP
 ‘(You) pretend to know while not knowing what love is.’
- 11 H: maca, **na-n** salangmas molununke kathay.
 correct 1sg-TOP love.taste not.know.thing seem

- ‘Right, **I** probably don’t know the taste of love.’
- 12 **na-nun** yengun-a, namca ttaymwuney wunceck-i eps-ta.
 1sg-TOP yengun-VOC man because cry.time-NOM no-DEC
 ‘Yengun, **I** have never cried because of a man.’
- 13 elmana coh-umyen ilel swu iss-nun ke-ni? pwulepta.
 how.much like-COND this way be-REL thing-COP-Q envy
 ‘How much does (she) love (him) and be like this? (I) envy (her).’
 [S2: between three female friends]

Speakers in (14) are drinking alcohol after Miyen (M) has broken up with her boyfriend, Pyengho. Hoceng (H) tries to console M, but Yengun (Y) says that H does not know what love is but pretends to know (lines 9 to 10). H then admits that she does not know what love is (line 11) and has no experience of crying over a man herself (line 12).

The last utterance by H may seem that it merely describes the subject of not knowing love. However, considering the previous utterance by Y, that is, criticising that H does not know love, and the context that M is crying because her relationship with Pyengho has ended, we can discover that the overt subject *na* in H’s last utterance highlights the contrast between herself and the other two interlocutors. H makes contrast between herself being ignorant of love and her friends being experienced and knowledgeable about love, by using overt first-person subject. As the contrastive candidates are not overtly said, for example, *nehuy* ‘you (pl.)’, we categorise this case as implicit contrast. The use of *na* as overt subject in H’s utterance makes it clear that there is contrast between herself and the other interlocutors as well as that the subject is first-person. If *na* was unexpressed in the utterance, namely, *yenguna, namca ttaymwuney wunceki epsta* ‘Yengun, (I) have never cried because of a man’, the meaning would become incomplete because of the absence of the subject of ‘being inexperienced’. Moreover, the speaker’s pragmatic intention to emphasise the contrast between herself and the interlocutors is lost if the overt subject is unexpressed.

Let us consider another example of implicit contrast in (15). While the overt subject NP in (14) is used to contrast the speaker’s ignorance and inexperience to the interlocutors’ knowledge and experience, the overt subject NP in (15) is used to confirm the speaker’s contrastive stance to the interlocutor’s in regard with the situation that they are dealing with together.

- (15)1 B: na wass-ta!
 1sg came-DEC
 'I am home.'
- 2 S: ppalli wass-ney.
 quickly came-DEC
 '(You) are early.'
- 3 B: mianhay, nwuna. komap-ko.
 sorry sister thank-CNN
 'Sorry, Seoyoung. And thank you.'
- 4 S: kukello an-twayss-ul theyntey, eccekilo haysse?
 that.with NEG-do-FUT possibility.but how.plan did
 'It would not have been enough, how did (you) sort it out?'
- 5 B: nameci-n **nay-ka** colepha-ko kaph-nuntako kakse ssuko wasse.
 rest-TOP 1sg-NOM graduate.and repay-QT letter write came
 '(I) wrote an agreement that I will repay when graduating.'
- 6 S: kakse-lul way **ni-ka** sse? apeci issnuntey.
 letter-ACC why 2sg-NOM write father be.but
 'Why did you write it? Father should.'
- 7 B: apeci hako kathi wasse. apeci kyeys-il tey-ka eps-ese.
 father.with together came father be-HON-FUT place-NOM no-CAUS
 '(I) came with Father. He has no place to be.'
- 8 S: mwe?
 what
 'What?'
- 9 B: eccel swueps-canha.
 how wayno-DEC
 'There is no other way.'
- 10S: **na-n** apecilang mos sala! yekise ettehkey apecilang isse?
 1sg-TOP father.with cannot live here how father.with be
 'I can't live with Father. How would (I) be with him here?'
- 11B: nalang kathi. colep ttaykkaciman kathi kosayngha-ca.
 1sg.withtogether graduate time.until.only together suffer-IMP
 'With me. Let's go through this together only until (I) graduate.'
- [S1: between brother and sister]

Speakers in (15) are a brother (B) and a sister (S), dealing with their problematic father and his debt. While B shows his willingness to repay the father's debt by writing a letter to the lenders (line 5), S says that it should be the father himself who writes a letter, not her brother B (line 6). B also suggests having their father stay with them (line 7), but S declines by saying that she cannot live with him (line 10). In her utterance, S uses *na* as an overt subject with *-n* affixed, and the use of *na* indicates that the speaker has a contrastive opinion about living with their father. The implicit contrastive candidate of *na* in S's utterance is obviously B who just suggested living with the father.

The overt subjects in (13), (14) and (15) contribute to the contrast with other referents in the context, and the contrastive candidates are implicit in their realisation. What is contrasted in each case varies, but speakers commonly use overt subject NPs to emphasise their contrastive status to other referents. Although the contrastive candidates are not explicitly said, they can be definitely nominated. From the examples in this section, we find that overt subject plays a significant role in creating contrast even though their contrastive candidates are not explicitly shown in the discourse. By including implicit contrast in our analysis, which was overlooked in the literature, we could expand the scope of contrast and observe multiple degrees of contrast. It enables us to witness more examples of overt subject NPs that solidify the function of overt subjects as contrast markers in discourse.

6. Conclusion

The present study has examined the aspect of overt subject NPs as an indicator of contrast by analysing discourse data from TV drama scripts. Contrast premises a set of candidates that is limited and tangible, as described in the literature (Chafe 1976; Lambrecht 1994; Umbach 2004; Repp 2010). For our analysis, we only included overt subject that has definite and concrete contrastive candidates to be nominated in the context, whether explicit or implicit. Contrastive candidates of overt subject are not only found in the same utterance. Contrast can often be completed as the discourse proceeds while the contrastive counterparts are uttered in the following turn.

As long as contrastive candidates are explicitly uttered in the discourse, I categorised the overt subject as in explicit contrast. While double contrast is defined to have different predicates as well as different subjects, it is possible that two syntactically and/or

semantically identical sentences are in explicit contrast as long as the speakers are different. The overt subject in the utterance refers to different referents and the contrast is given to the speakers, so what the utterances mean finally become contrastive. I argue that the definition of explicit contrast in the current research enables us to look at the use of overt subject as contrastive indicators multilaterally, whereas double contrast is relatively flat and misses the characteristics of overt subject as a reference of active participants in spoken discourse.

When an overt subject is contrastive, that is, has a set of candidates that can be specifically and limitedly listed, but the candidate is not explicitly uttered, I categorised the subject as in implicit contrast. The commonality of overt subject in explicit and implicit contrast is found where the use of overt subject is critical in the utterance to maintain the contrast. Some of the overt subject NPs may be replaced with null subject with the sentence meaning retained, but the contrast that the overt subject accents is lost. The results of the present study support that overt subject in Korean discourse enhances contrast, whereas previous understanding of overt subject remained that ‘it is not omitted when in contrast’ or where it is solely attributed to the contrastive particle. Meanwhile, it was confirmed that contrast in Korean discourse is closely related to the particles affixed with overt subject NPs as noted in many studies. Future research focusing on different particles marking contrastiveness of overt subject NPs will further develop the findings of the current analysis. The present study may also lack diversity in the type of discourse data by only analysing some TV drama scripts, but by carefully redefining and clarifying contrast at the discourse level, we were able to identify different types of contrast, i.e. explicit and implicit. Also, by recognising contrast in varied forms, I believe it contributes to further understanding of overt subject as a contrast marker.

References

- Ahn, Hyun-Jung and Yeon-Jin Kwon. 2012. A study of topic prominence in Korean. *Journal of Humanities Therapy* 33: 81-101.
- Chafe, Wallace. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic Press.
- Clancy, Patricia M. and Pamela A. Downing. 1987. The use of wa as a cohesion marker in Japanese oral narratives. In John Hinds, Shoichi Iwasaki, and Senko Maynard (eds.), *Perspectives on top-*

- icalization: The case of Japanese wa*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Benjamins.
- Ewing, Michael C. 2014. Motivations for first and second person subject expression and ellipsis in Javanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 63: 48–62.
- Hong, Jong-seon. 2014. User-centered Korean grammar encompassing the spoken and written language (written in Korean). *Emwunyenkwu* 42(1): 7–35.
- Im, Hong-pin. 1985. On ‘syntactic’ empty categories in Korean (written in Korean). *Language Research* 21(3): 331–384.
- Jun, Youngchul. 2005. Contrastive focus in Korean (written in Korean). *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal* 43: 215–237.
- Jun, Youngchul. 2019. A semantics for (n)un as an information structure marker: With a focus on the meaning of contrast (written in Korean). *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal* 85: 99–137.
- Jung, Yeonchang. 2007. A note on subject ellipsis (written in Korean). *Journal of Language Sciences* 14(2): 101–120.
- Kim, Haeyeon. 1999. Referring expressions for speaker and hearer in Korean conversation (written in Korean). *Discourse and Cognition* 6(1): 73–100.
- Kim, Ilkyu. 2015. Is Korean -(n)un a topic marker? On the nature of -(n)un and its relation to information structure. *Lingua* 154: 87–109.
- Kim, Ilkyu. 2016. Can Korean -(n)un mark (contrastive) focus? *Language Sciences* 56: 105–117.
- Kim, Kyu-hyun. 2017. Topic marker -nun as an exploratory device: Shifting domains for stance management in pursuit of intersubjectivity. *The Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea* 25(2): 29–72.
- Kim, Taeho. 2008. *Subject and object markings in conversational Korean*. PhD Dissertation. State University of New York at Buffalo, Ann Arbor.
- Kim, Woo-Sung. 1996. Subject ellipsis in Spanish: Comparative study with Korean (written in Korean). *Bilingual Research* 13: 267–287.
- Lambrech, Knud. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, Duck-Young and Yoko Yonezawa. 2008. The role of the overt expression of first- and second-person subject in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40(4): 733–767.
- Lee, Hanjung. 2010. Explaining variation in Korean case ellipsis: Economy versus iconicity. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 19(4): 291–318.
- Lee, Hanjung. 2015. Information structure, topic predictability and gradients in Korean case ellipsis: A probabilistic account. *Linguistic Research* 32(3): 749–771.
- Lee, Hong Bae. 1987. On empty categories in Korean. *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 12(2): 261–294.
- Lee, Hong Bae. 1993. Theories of the null subject parameter and Korean. *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 18(2): 331–361.
- Lee, Narah. 2014. A reconsideration of the omission of first and second person subjects in modern spoken Korean: Focusing on the pragmatic meanings of the overt subject expressions (written in Korean). *Discourse and Cognition* 21 (3): 145–164.

- Lee, Narah. 2019. *A pragmatic and sociocultural perspective to subject expression in spoken Korean: With focus on first- and second-person*. PhD Dissertation. The Australian National University.
- Lee, Won-Pyo. 1989. *Referential choice in Korean discourse: cognitive and social perspective*. PhD Dissertation. University of Southern California.
- Mayol, Laia. 2010. Contrastive pronouns in null-subject Romance languages. *Lingua* 120(10): 2497–2514.
- Myhill, John and Zhiqun Xing. 1996. Towards an operational definition of discourse contrast + word-order in Biblical Hebrew and Chinese. *Studies in Language* 20(2): 303–360.
- Nariyama, Shigeiko. 2004. Subject ellipsis in English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36(2), 237–264.
- Oh, Sun-Young. 2007. Overt reference to speaker and recipient in Korean. *Discourse Studies* 9(4): 462–492.
- Posio, Pekka. 2011. Spanish subject pronoun usage and verb semantics revisited: First- and second-person singular subject pronouns and focusing of attention in spoken Peninsular Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(3): 777–798.
- Repp, Sophie. 2010. Defining ‘contrast’ as an information-structural notion in grammar. *Lingua* 120(6): 1333–1345.
- Silva, Vera Paredes Lucia. 1993. Subject omission and functional compensation: evidence from written Brazilian Portuguese. *Language Variation and Change* 5: 35–49.
- Travis, Catherine E. and Rena Torres Cacoullous. 2012. What do subject pronouns do in discourse? Cognitive, mechanical and constructional factors in variation. *Cognitive Linguistics* 23(4): 711–748.
- Umbach, Carla. 2004. On the notion of contrast in information structure and discourse structure. *Journal of Semantics* 21: 155–175.
- Yang, Dong-Whee. 1979. Zero anaphora in Korean. *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 4(2): 19–53.
- Yang, Dong-Whee. 1986. A theory of anaphora in Korean (written in Korean). *The Journal of Korean Linguistics* 15: 41–162.

Narah Lee

Associate Lecturer
 School of Languages and Cultures
 Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
 The University of Queensland
 St Lucia, QLD 4072 Australia
 E-mail: narah.lee@uq.edu.au

Received: 2021. 01. 29.

Revised: 2021. 04. 22.

Accepted: 2021. 05. 18.