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1. The unity of Subject in Korean: Topic as a quasi-subject.

Nominative (NOM) -i/-ka vs. Topic (TOP) -(n)un.
- The subject cannot be fully identified with NOM because some of standard criteria of a subject, e.g. [Keenan 1976], can be applied to both NOM and TOP NP-s.
- [Li & Thompson's 1876] hypothesis that Japanese and Korean are both subject prominent and topic prominent languages.
- Are TOP and NOM NP-s quasi-subjects? Another candidate for quasi-subject is a Dative (DAT) NP (2c).

(1) a. Swuni₁-eykey-nun Mia-ka Ø₁ ku chayk-ul
    Suni₁-DAT-TOP Mia-NOM Ø₁ this book-ACC
cwu-ess-ta give-PAST-DECL
"To Suni, Mia did give the book" (whereas Chelsu had to borrow it in the library)

b. Mia-nun Swuni-eykey ku chayk-ul
    Mia-TOP Suni-DAT this book-ACC
cwu-ess-ta give-PAST-DECL
"Mia gave this book to Suni" (as an answer to the question "What did Mia do?"

c. Mia-ka Swuni-eykey ku chayk-ul
    Mia-NOM Suni-DAT this book-ACC
cwu-ess-ta give-PAST-DECL
    (A) "Mia gave this book to Suni" (as an answer to the question "What happened?") or
    (B) "MIA gave this book to Suni (as an answer to the question "Who gave this book
to Suni?"

(1a) - Fronted constituent, which is a sentence topic (TOP), cf. (2a);
(1b) - Base-generated topic (Major Subject position according to [Yoon 2004]);
(1c) – NOM subject, which is included into the sentence focus (that is all the sentence in (A)), or is a contrastive focus (in (B)).

Definitions of TOP:
- "Absolute" case (traditional Korean grammars; L.R. Koncevič, p.c.);
- Topicality/ thematicity marker [Chang 1996; Sohn 1999];
- Contrastiveness/ focusing marker [Nikol'skij 1962]

-Wa 'TOP' in Japanese - [Vardul' 1964; Kuroda 1972]

(2a) - the issue of topic in Russian.
(2b-c) - a DAT NP in Russian as a quasi-subject: no alternation with genitive (GEN) under negation [Testlec 2002: 441-442].
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2. Morphosyntactic properties of TOP, NOM (and ACC, GEN) markers.

Frequent ellipsis of nominal affixes/ particles:

(3)a. Con-Ø   pap-Ø   mek-ess-ni?
John-NOM/ TOP    rice/food-ACC    eat-PAST-DECL
"Did John eat?" [Yoon 1995: 333]

b. *Con-i Mali-Ø   nol-ass-ey  yo
John-NOM Mary-COMM play-PAST-DECL POLITE
"John played with Mary" [Yoon 1995: 333]

(4)a. A: Con-i nwukwu-hako nol-ass-ni?
John-NOM somebody-COMM play-PAST-DECL
"Who did John play with?"
B: Mali-hako/ Mali-Ø
Mary-COMM
"With Mary" [Yoon 1995: 336]

b. A: Cen-i mwues-ul hay-ss-ni?
John-NOM something-ACC do-PAST-DECL
"What did John do?"
B: Pap-Ø   mek-ess-ey  yo /*mek*/mek-ess
Rice/food-ACC    eat-PAST-DECL.IMP / eat/ eat-PAST
"(He) had dinner" [Yoon 1995: 337]

Order of the nominal affixes
TOP, NOM, -man- 'only', and "indirect"/Lexical case particles:

(5)a. pap-man-i/ /pap-i-man
food-only-NOM/ food-NOM-only
b. pap-man-un/ /pap-un-man
food-only-TOP/ food-TOP-only
"Only food"
c. Hankwuk-ey-man/ Hankwuk-man-ey
Korea-LOC-only/ Korea-only-LOC
"Only in Korea"
d. coh-key-man/ coh-[h]-man-ey
good-ADV-only/ good-only-ADV
"Only good [adverb]"
TOP, NOM, ACC(usative), GEN in one structural position (ban on co-occurrence):

(6)a.  "Hankwuk-i-nun/ Hankwuk-un-i
"Korea-NOM-TOP/ Korea-TOP-NOM  "Korea" [NOM]

b.  "Hankwuk-ul-un/ Hankwuk-un-ul
"Korea-ACC-TOP/ Корея-ТОП-ВИН  "Korea" [ACC]

c.  "Hankwuk-uy-nun/ Hankwuk-un-uy
"Korea-GEN-TOP/ Korea-TOP-GEN  "Korea" [GEN]

[Cho, Sells 1995]: NOM, ACC, GEN, TOP are in the last "Delim-2" position in the
nominal affix string. -Man- ‘only’ is in the preceding "Delim-1" position. "Indirect"/
Lexical cases (LOC, INSTR, etc.) are in the "Post" position:

(7)a.  [Base]-[Post]-[Delim-1]-[Delim-2]  [Cho, Sells 1995; shortened]

b.  nal-lo-ka ani-la sikan-mata
year-INSTR-NOM be.NEG-DECL hour-every
"not with every year, but with every hour"  [Nikolskij 1962: 128]

Conclusions:

1. Nominal affixes have strong particle properties [Sohn 1999; Yoon 1995].

2. The claim in Traditional Korean grammars that TOP is (an "Absolute")
Case marker is based, in addition to its use in (1b), on morphological data in (5)-(6).

2a. The claim that NOM and ACC in Korean are not opposed with regards to
the Agent/ Patient semantic roles (because both of them alternate with TOP (exx.
(8a), (8c) below) is not well-based. NOM, ACC, GEN (if we do not consider TOP a
Case) are "direct"/ Structural cases occupying the same position "Delim-2".

3. "Delim-1" and "Delim-2" are associated not only with a grammatical, but also
with a certain Information Structure function (e.g. topicalizing, focusing, cf. (7b)).

3. The nine Subject criteria in Korean

Based on [Keenan 1976; Y. Cho, Han, C. Sohn 1990; Yoon 2004; Testelec 2002]:
1. Nominative marking; 2. Control of verb agreement; 3. Obligatory verb agreement
(with an NP Subject having a "honorative nominative" ending –kkeyse). 4. Control of
coordinate deletion (i.e. deletion of the subject/ object of one of two sentential
conjuncts). 5. Subject raising. 6. Sentence-initial position. 7. Control of reflexives and
text anaphora. 8. Syntactic copying of the plural marker -tul-. 9. Transformation into a
null subject of a converb/ participle/ complement clause.

1. Nominative. See exx. (1a-c).
2. Control of verb agreement.
- Generally optional (cf. (10a)). A TOP or NOM Subject NP in (8a).
- A DAT Experiencer NP (8b) can control verb agreement.
- An ACC/TOP Object NP cannot in (8c).
- A GEN/ TOP possessor can in inalienable possession cases (9a-b).

(8) a. Halape-nim-i/-un o-si-n-ta
grandfather-HON-NOM/-TOP come-HON-ASP-DECL
"The grandfather has come" ['NOM/ TOP Agent Subject] (cf. (10c))
b. ??Halape-nim-kkey
grandfather-HON-DAT.HON
ku khun kay-ka mwusewu-si-ta
this big dog-NOM fearful-HON-DECL
"The Granny is afraid of this big dog" [lit. 'To Granny, this big dog is fearful']
?? DAT Exp NP]
c. Halape-nim-ul/-un sonca-ka
grandfather-HON-ACC/-TOP grandson-NOM
cohaha(*-si)-n-ta
love-(-HON)-ASP-DECL
"The grandsons do love the Granny" (more than the Grandma) [* NOM Exp NP] [* ACC/ TOP Goal NP]

(9)a. Sensayng-nim (?)-uy/-un son-i khu-si-ta
teacher-HON-GEN/-TOP hand-NOM big-HON-DECL
"The teacher has big hands" [Y. Cho, Han, C. Sohn 1990][Possessor, Inal.poss.]
b. Sensayng-nim-uy/-un sonca-ka
teacher-HON-GEN/-TOP grandson-NOM
cak(-usi)-ta
small(-HON)-DECL
"The Teacher has a small grandson" [* Possessor, Al.poss]

Conclusions: Verb agreement is strongly determined by:
- Honorific markers (-nim-, -kkey, for -kkeyse see below) on the controller;
- the semantic role of the Controller (8a-c);
- the controller - controllee relation (9a-b). Cf. (27b).

3. Obligatory verb agreement (with an NP Subject having a "honorative nominative" ending –kkeyse).
- -Kkeyse ([Post] position, cf. halape-kkeyse-man-i 'only the grandfather') requires obligatory agreement (10b); the "honorific" base does not (10a).,
- -Nim- if tied to a prominent semantic role requires agreement (10c), (11).
- -Kkeyse, unlike -nim, is tied to a prominent semantic role (11).

(10)a. Halapeci-ka/-nun chayk-ul sa(-si)-ess-ta
grandfather-NOM/ TOP book-ACC buy(-HON)-PAST-DECL
b. *Halapeci-kkeyse chayk-ul sa-ss-ta
grandfather-NOM.HON book-ACC buy-PAST-DECL
c. *Halape-nim-i chayk-ul sa-ss-ta
grandfather-HON-NOM book-ACC buy-PAST-DECL
"The grandfather bought a book"
d. Sonca-'ka/ 'kkeyse
   'grandson-NOM/ 'NOM.HON'   "Grandson"

(11) Mia-nun ape-'kkeyse/ 'nim-i mwusep(-si)-ta
    Mia-TOP father-'NOM.HON/ 'HON-NOM fearful(-HON)-DECL
   "Mia is afraid of (her) father"   [lit. 'To Mia, (her) father is fearful']

Conclusions: NOM/ TOP marker or a "honorific" base cannot induce obligatory agreement; markers -nim-, -kkeyse-, -kkey with honorific meaning are needed.

4. Control of coordinate deletion (i.e. deletion of the subject/ object of one of two sentential conjuncts)
   - A NOM subject cannot corefer a deleted ACC object (12a), or a NOM object (12b-c) - deletion obeys both semantic role identity and case identity.
   - A TOP NP can corefer a deleted ACC or GEN/ possessor NP (12d-e).

(12) a.  (Na-nun)
      (I-TOP)
   [[Mia-ka yeppu-ta-ko]
    [[Mia-NOM pretty-DECL-CONV.COORD]
     (Ø)
    (ACC) love-ASP-DECL]]
   (-ko sayngkakha-n-ta)
   (-QUOT think-ASP-DECL)
   "(I think that) Mia is pretty and (that she) loves her husband";
   "(I think that) Mia is pretty and (that) her husband loves (her)"

b.  (Na₁-nun)
     (I₁-TOP)
   [[Mia-ka₁ elisek-ko]
    [[Mia-NOM₂ silly-CONV.COORD]
     [Ø₁ Sensayng-nim-i]
     [Ø₂ teacher-HON-NOM/GOAL]
    mwusep-ta]]
   (-ko sayngkakha-n-ta)
   (-QUOT think-ASP-DECL)
   "(I think that) Mia is silly and (that I am) afraid of the Teacher"
   [lit. (I think that) Mia is silly and (that) the Teacher is fearful (to me)]
   "(I think that) Mia is silly and (that she is) afraid of the Teacher"
   [lit. (I think that) Mia is silly and (that) the Teacher is fearful (to her)]"
   "(I think that) Mia is silly and (that the Teacher) is afraid (of her)"
   [lit. (I think that) Mia is silly and (that she) is fearful to the Teacher]"

c.  (Na₁-nun)
     (I₁-TOP)
   [[Mia-ka₂ elisek-ese]
    [[Mia-NOM₂ silly-CONV.COSEQ]
     [Ø₂ Sensayng-nim-i]
     [Ø₂ teacher-HON-NOM/GOAL]
    mwusep-ta]]
   (-QUOT think-ASP-DECL)
[(I think that) Mia is silly and so (that she is) afraid of the Teacher"
[lit. (I think that) Mia is silly and so (that the Teacher is fearful (to her)]]
"(I think that) Mia is silly and (that the Teacher) is afraid (of her)"
[lit. (I think that) Mia is silly and (that she is) fearful to the Teacher]"

d. Mia-nun [SUBJ] yeppu-ko
Mia-TOP [SUBJ] pretty-CONV.COORD
namphyen-i Ø cohaha-n-ta
husband-NOM ØACC love-ASP-DECL
"Mia is pretty, and (her) husband loves her"

e. Mia-nun [SUBJ] yeppu-ko
Mia-TOP [SUBJ] pretty-CONV.COORD
Ø sengkkyek-i coh-ta
ØGEN personality-NOM good-DECL
"Mia is pretty and has good personality" [lit. "... and (her) personality is good"

Conclusions: NOM controls coordinate deletion, apart from special "psych stative predicate" cases (10b).

5. Subject raising.


Japanese/ Korean - the "Raising" analysis is problematic, e.g. [Takano 2003, Davies 2005]. For instance:
- the base position for raising cannot be SpecIP EMB (because movement would cross the A' position SpecCP/ a barrier for A-movement), (14b);
- raising is optional (14a);
- cases of "indirect object raising" are possible;
- idiomatic meanings in which the raised subject is involved are not retained after raising; ...

-- [Yoon 2007] proposes that raising proceeds from the SpecCP position (the position for Major Subject, see [Yoon 2004]: that would allow to cancel some of the problems listed above and "save" the raising analysis.

--- Another of Yoon's arguments is the 'property' / 'individual stage predicate' restriction, cf. (14a-b) and (15a-b).
--- In the TOP raised possessor construction [(9a-b), (16)] (or "Double-nominative"/ "TOP-NOM" construction), only the possessor raises; cf. (17) vs. (18).

(13) a. I believe he is smart  b. I believe him to be smart

(14) a. Cheli-nun [Yenghi1-ka
Cheli-TOP [Yonghi1-NOM
kengangha-ta-ko] sayngkakha-n-ta
healthy-DECL-QUOT] think-ASP-DECL
"Cheli thinks that Yonghi is healthy"
b. Cheli-nun Yenghi1-lul
Cheli-TOP Yonghi1-ACC
"Cheli thinks of Yonghi that (she) is healthy"/ "Cheli believes Yonghi to be healthy"

(15)a. Cheli-nun [Yenghi-ka cikum chayk-ul
Cheli-TOP [Yonghi-NOM now book-ACC
po-nun-ta-ko] sayngkakha-n-ta
read-ASP-DECL-QUOT] think-ASP-DECL
"Cheli thinks that Yonghi is now reading"

b. "Celi-nun Yenghi1-lul [Ø1 cikum chayk-ul
Cheli-TOP Yonghi1-ACC [Ø1/NOM now book-ACC
po-nun-ta-ko] sayngkakha-n-ta
read-ASP-DECL-QUOT] think-ASP-DECL
Intended: "Cheli believes Yonghi to be now reading"

(16) Na-nun [Waikhikhi1-ka/-nun kyengchi-ka
I-TOP [Waikhikhi1-NOM/TOP landscape-NOM
coh-ta-ko] sayngkakha-n-ta
good-DECL-QUOT] think-ASP-DECL
"I think that Waikiki has good landscape"

(17) Na-nun Waikhikhi1-lul [Ø1 kyengchi-ka
I-TOP Waikhikhi1-ACC [Ø1 landscape-NOM
good-DECL-QUOT] think-ASP-DECL
"I believe Waikiki to have good landscape"/
"I think of Waikiki that it has good landscape"

(18) "Na-nun catongcha2-lul [Mikwuk1-man-i Ø2
I-TOP car2-ACC [America-only-NOM Ø2/NOM
man-tha-ko] sayngkakha-n-ta
many-DECL-QUOT] think-ASP-DECL
Intended: "I believe cars to be numerous only in America"

Conclusions:
- In a standard case (14a-b), argument-and-subject raises (cf. criteria 4, 6-7).
- In the TOP raised possessor/ Double-nominative construction [(9a-b), (16)], the TOP NP has a priority over the NOM NP for raising: the subject loses some of its distinctive features transferring them to the TOP possessor, see [Payne, Barshi 1999].

6. Sentence-initial position.
- Both TOP and NOM NP-s prefer initial position.
  TOP because it marks topic (1b);
  NOM marks focus (1c) but it is an SOV language grammatical subject. ((19a-c) are from [Sohn 1999: 293]).
- Both can occur in non-initial position in a special [my] context, cf. (19b-c).
- In case of a TOP raised possessor/ TOP-NOM construction, such as (16), the TOP NP/ "Major subject" normally has to be initial [Tateishi 1989], [Yoon 2004]. A reverse order is possible if both the possessor and possessee are contrastive; e.g. (20).
(19)a. Na-nun/nay-ka ecey  san-eyse  kkweng-ul  
I-TOP/I-NOM yesterday  mountain-LOC pheasant-BIH  
cap-ass-e  yo  
catch-PAST-DECL.IMP POL  
"I caught a pheasant on a mountain yesterday"

b. ecey na-nun/nay-ka san-eyse  kkweng-ul  cap-ass-e-yo  
"Yesterday, I caught a pheasant on a mountain" [as an answer to "What did you do on the mountain?"; "What did you catch on the mountain?""]

c. san-eyse ecey kkweng-ul na-nun/nay-ka cap-ass-e-yo  
"On a mountain, yesterday, I caught a pheasant" [as an answer to "What did you do to the pheasant on the mountain?"; "Who caught the pheasant?"]

(20) Kyengchi-nun  Waikhikhi-ka  coh-ta  
landscape-TOP Waikiki-NOM good-DECL  
"It is the landscape [but not the climate or accommodation] that is good just in Waikiki [but not in Santa-Barbara or San-Francisco]"

Conclusions: NOM is sentence-initial for grammatical (subjecthood) reason; TOP for topic-marking reason (cf. criteria 4, 5, 7). TOP raised possessor cases are special.

7. Control of reflexives and text anaphora. (NB: Is it traditionally considered a universal feature of a topic and/or subject?)

- Preference of TOP over NOM ONLY in special contexts: a TOP raised possessor (21a-b); a TOP subject of a belief and a NOM goal (22).

(21)a. ʻMia1-nun nwuna2-ka caki1/2 hakkyo-eyse  
Mia1-TOP sister2-NOM self1/2 school-LOC  
ceyil yeppu-ta  
most pretty-DECL  
"Mia1's sister2 is the prettiest in her1 (Mia's) school / "in her2 (Mia's sister's) school"

b. Mia1-nun atul-i  khu-ss-nunteyto  
Mia1-TOP son2-NOM big-PERF-CONV.not_only_but_also  
Ø1/2 hakkyo-ey an  tani-ta  
Ø1/2 school-LOC he  go.ITER-DECL  
"Even though Mia1's son2 is big, she1/he2 does not go to school"

(22) Ō1/2 Celme-(i)ss-ul  ttay  
Young-be-PART.FUT time  
Cholswu1-nun Mia2-ka  yeppu-ess-ta  
Cholsu1-TOP Mia2-NOM pretty-PAST-DECL  
(A) "When Chelsu1 was young, Mia2 was/ seemed pretty to him1"  
(B) ""When Mia2 was young, she2 was/ seemed pretty to Chelsu1"

Conclusions:  
- A morphologically marked topic (TOP NP) is highly context-salient/prominent; this is why TOP NP has European subject features both in syntax (anaphora, word order, criteria 5-6) and in morphology (agreement, criterion 2).
8. Syntactic copying of the plural marker -tul-.
- Subject ‡ non-finite verb form (23a); NOM/TOP ‡ adverb (23b);
- Vocative ‡ location NP (24a); Object ‡ destination NP (24b);

(23) a. neyhuy-tul-Ø si-tul
    you-PL-Ø poem-PL
    ilk-e-tul po-ass-ni?
    read-INF-PL try-PAST-DECL
    "Did you (PL) try to read the poems?" [Y. Cho, Han, C. Sohn 1990: 21]

b. Haksayng-tul-i/-nun hakkyo-lo
    student-PL-NOM/-TOP school-INSTR
    kuphi-tul ka-n-ta
    hurridly-PL go-ASP-DECL
    "Schoolchildren hurry to school" [Y. Cho, Han, C. Sohn 1990: 21]

(24) a. Ay-tul-a, hakkyo-eyse-tul
    child-PL-VOC school-LOC-PL
    nola-la!
    play-IMP
    "Children, play at school!" [at the playground] [Y. Cho, Han, C. Sohn 1990: 21]

b. Swuni-ka ai-tul-ul
    Suni-NOM child-PL-ACC
    ku pang-u-tul ponay-ess-ta
    this room-INSTR-PL send-PAST-DECL
    "Suni sent the children to this room"

Conclusions: Vocative and ACC induce –tul- copying - this criterion is not a strictly subject criterion.

9. Transformation into a null subject of a converb/participle/complement clause.
- Infinitive-like purpose clauses - coreference with matrix subject (25a-b).
- TOP NP-s - no preference for subjects, cf. (26-27); (26b-c) is 'same-subject'.
- A TOP NP IS possible in an embedded clause (28), usually contrastive; so it is not for sure that the null “ØNOM-s” in (25-27) and above are really NOM but not TOP.

    Chelsu-NOM [Ø NOM / Suni-NOM escape-CONV.GOAL]
    sitohay-ss-ta attempt-PAST-DECL
    "Chelsu attempted to escape" [Y. Cho, Han and C. Sohn 1990: 20]

b. 'Chelswu-ka [Ø cak-ulyeko] nolyekay-ss-ta
    Chelsu-NOM [Ø NOM short-CONV.GOAL] endeavor-PAST-DECL

1 Cf. in Russian: the "core-argument-oriented" criterion 'selection of a plural actant with verbs of plural action' [Testelec 2002: 439].

(i) on pere-bole-l vse-mi boleznj-ami
    he MULT-be_sick-PAST all-INSTR.PL illness-INSTR.PL
    'He got multiply sick having experienced all the illnesses'.
"Chelsu tried to be short" [Y. Cho, Han and C. Sohn 1990: 20]

(26)a. \textit{\text{""Ku si$_1$-nun [nay-ka $\emptyset_1$}}
\begin{itemize}
  \item this \textit{poem$_1$-TOP [I-NOM $\emptyset_{1/ACC}$}
  \item ci-ess-umyense(to)}] Swuni-ka
  \item make-PAST-CONV.OPPOS] Suni-NOM
  \item $\emptyset_1$ nangsonghay-ss-ss-ta
  \item $\emptyset_{1/ACC}$ recite-PAST-DECL
\end{itemize}

"Although I wrote the poem, Suni recited it" [Y. Cho, Han and C. Sohn 1990: 23]

b. Chelswu$_1$-ka theylleypicen-ul po-myense
   Chelsu$_1$-NOM television-ACC see-CONV.SIM
   $\emptyset_1$ kongpwu-lul ha-n-ta
   $\emptyset_{1/ACC}$ study-ACC do-ASP-DECL
   "Chelsu does the homework and [at the same time] watches TV"

c. Chelswu$_1$-ka theylllypicen-ul po-myense
   Chelsu$_1$-NOM television-ACC see-CONV.SIM
   Swuni$_2$-nun kongpwu-lul ha-nun-ta
   Suni$_2$-TOP study-ACC do-ASP-DECL
Int.: "At the time when Chelsu watches TV, Suni does her homework"

(27)a. \textit{\text{[Namphyen-i $\emptyset_1$ mwusewe-ha-n] pwuin$_1$-un}}
\begin{itemize}
  \item [husband-NOM $\emptyset_{1/ACC}$ fearful-do-PART] wife$_1$-TOP
  \item napp-un pwuin-i-ta
  \item bad-PART wife-be-DECL
\end{itemize}
"A wife that her husband is afraid of is a bad wife"

b. \textit{[\emptyset$_{1/GEN/NOM}$ nwun-i khu-n]}
\begin{itemize}
  \item [eye-NOM big-PART]
  \item ai$_1$-nun yeppy-ta
  \item child$_1$-TOP pretty-DECL
\end{itemize}
"Children that have big eyes are pretty"

(28) \textit{\text{Na-nun[Mia$_1$-nun sengkek-i}}
\begin{itemize}
  \item I-TOP [Mia$_1$-TOP personality-NOM
  \item coh-ci anh-ciman namphyen-i $\emptyset_1$
  \item good-CONV NEG-CONV.OPPOS husband-NOM $\emptyset_{1/ACC}$
  \item cohaha-l] kes-ul a-n-ta
  \item love-PART] thing-ACC know-ASP-DECL
\end{itemize}
"I know that although Mia does not have a good personality, her husband loves her"

Conclusions:
- Korean is an object-drop language; a null NP can be identified only by semantic role and syntactic position.
- No general preference for NOM NP-s transformation into a null subject can be observed. Like criterion 8, this is not a subject criterion.
4. The resulting table and conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>TOP NP</th>
<th>NOM NP</th>
<th>Other case marked NP-s</th>
<th>Only for arguments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nominative marking</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Control of verb agreement</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Obligatory verb agreement with –kkeye ‘NOM.HON’/-kkey ‘DAT.HON’</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO (*)</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Control of coordinate deletion (i.e. deletion of the subject/object of one of two sentential conjuncts)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>STAND</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Subject raising</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>STAND</td>
<td>YES/NO*</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sentence-initial position</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>STAND</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Control of reflexives and text anaphora</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>STAND</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Syntactic copying of the plural marker -tul-</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Transformation into a null subject of a converb/participle/complement clause</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>YES [ACC]</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCLUSIONS:

1. Criterion 1 (NOM marking) does not entirely correlate with other important criteria, such as Control of verb agreement, criterion 2 [Yoon 2004].

2. Distinctive criteria 3 and 4 (agreement with -kkeye 'NOM.HON', control of coordinate deletion) and criteria 5-7 show that NOM NP-s have most grammatical subject features.

4. A TOP NP-s has subject features based on criteria 5-7 because of TOP's high discourse prominence and topicalizing function; a TOP NP can be considered as quasi-subject with a lot of subject features.

5. Our conclusions are consistent with [Yoon's 2004] "Two subject positions" sentence structure (based on Heycock's 1993) "syntactic predication" concept:

[[Major Subject] [Grammatical Subject] [(Sentential/Syntactic) Predicate]]

6. GEN NP-possessor and DAT NP-experiencer have fewer than TOP NP subject features (e.g. criteria 2 and 7: (marginal) control of verb agreement, control of text anaphora). They can probably be called "quasi-subjects" ranked lower than TOP-s.

---

In Yoon's framework, we have NO instead of YES/NO* for criterion 5, column 3 (because all raised non-NOM NP-s are argued by Yoon to first move to the Major Subject position, cf. [Yoon 2007]).
References:


