

Semantic Alternation of Korean Case Markers '에|e' and '에게|ege', and '에서|eseo' and '에게서 egeseo'

Jungnam Kim · Yanghee Shim
(Kyung Hee Univ. · Portland State Univ.)

■ ABSTRACT ■

In this paper, we maintain that case makers '에|e' and '에게|ege', and '에서|eseo' and '에게서|egeseo' are not two separate morphemes but are simply allomorphs of the same morphemes respectively. When '에|e' and '에게|ege' are used as a dative marker, they show exactly the same semantic function and are in complementary distribution in relation to the semantic features of their preceding noun; that is, if the preceding noun is an animate noun, '에게|ege' is used and '에|e' is used if not. Also, '에게서|egeseo' and '에서|eseo' as ablative and locative case makers show exactly the same semantic function and show complementary distribution depending on whether the preceding noun is animate or non-animate. Therefore, we assume that these markers are semantically conditioned allomorphs.

Key Words

Korean case markers, allomorph, complementary distribution, semantic sameness, semantic alternation

한국어 격표지, 이형태, 상보적 분포, 의미적 동질성, 의미론적 교체

1. Introduction

There has been the tendency of considering morphology and semantics as two distinct fields in the sense that one should be considered without referring to the other. It is because morphological analyses are believed to be processed without referring to the semantic environment of a morpheme for the majority of linguists. However, given the fact that the definition of morpheme is a minimal meaningful unit, there should be no morpheme that is a meaningless constituent, and thus, it is natural to provide a meaning to each morpheme and regard morphological processes in relation to the semantic interpretation of a morpheme.

In analyzing morphological processes, the paradigmatic relation of morphemes and their syntactic environments have been mostly considered while their semantic environments have been excluded. It was because the semantic interpretation was believed not to provide objective validity compared to its structural or distributional explanation due to the subjective view in semantic interpretations and the ambiguity of meaning boundary. However, the notions of subjectivity and ambiguity should not be the reason to absolutely exclude semantic environments in analyzing morphemes. Rather, we may subject to subjective interpretation if we consider grammatical factors only because grammatical items are more opaque than lexical items in the determination of morphemes. Therefore, we should not completely exclude semantic environment when we determine allomorphic relations.

There are two essential conditions determining whether two different morphemes are distinctive morphemes or allomorphs of the same morphemes: semantic sameness and complementary distribution. Both of these conditions must be satisfied in order for two morphemes to be considered as allomorphs of the same morphemes, and they should not be considered as two distinctive morphemes if they satisfy all of these two conditions.

There have been traditionally two types of morphemic alternations: phonologically conditioned ones and morphologically conditioned ones. Most of morphemic alternations in Korean are phonologically conditioned because phonological restrictions are mostly automatic and rule-governed. Thus, it is natural that phonologically conditioned alternations are the most popular examples of allomorphs although their semantic sameness is less emphasized.

However, even in such phonologically conditioned alternations, semantic sameness must be fulfilled in order for those pairs to be regarded as allomorphs. The units of such alternations in the analyses are not phones but morphemes, and those morphemes are not meaningless units. Thus, semantic sameness among the units must be established even though those units have abstract meanings.

In this study, we examine semantically conditioned allomorphs in Korean aside from well-known phonologically or morphologically conditioned allomorphs¹⁾, and by doing this, we emphasize the importance of semantic sameness in determining whether two morphemes are allomorphs of the same morpheme or two distinctive morphemes. It is never enough to emphasize that semantic sameness is the most important factor to determine allomorphic relations especially when the alternations are not phonologically restricted.²⁾ Grammatical items are different from lexical items whose meanings are fixed in the sense that the meaning of grammatical items is determined depending on the context and thus flexible.

1) 고영근Ko, Young-Kun(2005:25) did not accept grammatically conditioned allomorphs in Korean by arguing following Mugdan(1986, 1993) that there are only three types of morphemic alternations that can be considered as allomorphs: allomorphic alternations based on phonemic, morphophonemic, and lexical conditions. The alternation of ‘e/ege’ in this study can be classified as lexically conditioned allomorphs since this alternation is based on the semantic features of the preceding nouns.

2) Although we emphasize the semantic sameness, we do not overlook the condition on complementary distribution of allomorphs, which will be further discussed in details in chapter 2.

With this much of a background, this study examines the relation of locality or dative case markers ‘에/에게e/ege’ and of source or origination markers ‘에서/에게서eseo/egeseo.’ These markers may not seem to be qualified as consideration of allomorphs at first because ‘에게e/ege’ includes ‘에e’ and ‘에게서egeseo’ includes ‘에e’ hence ‘에게e/ege’ or ‘에게서egeseo’ is hard to be seen as a single morpheme(에+게e+ge and 에+게+서e+ge+seo).

However, this study reveals that these markers need to be considered as a single morpheme by examining their historical origin and by approaching with a diachronic analysis. Furthermore, this paper shows that there are semantic sameness among these markers and are in complementary distribution and thus argues that they are allomorphs.

The advantage of taking this view is that we can establish a more systematic and rule-governed behavior among Korean case markers and thus reduce many grammatical errors that have been frequently observed from L2 learners of Korean as well as native speakers of Korean. Such grammatical errors frequently occurred because speakers often did not realize ‘에/에게 e/ege’ and ‘에서/에게서eseo/egeseo’ alternations as allomorphs of the same morpheme.

Therefore, this study will contribute to enhance a more sophisticated theory of Korean morphology and will bring a practical advantage in language performance at the same time. We will also consider if these allomorphic relations can be a part of language universal characteristics.

2. Complementary Distribution of ‘에/에게e/ege’ and ‘에서eseo’ and ‘에게서egeseo’

The observation that ‘에e’ and ‘에게e/ege’ are in complementary distribution is traced back to 박양규Pak, Yang-Gyu(1975:99). Since then, similar observations have also been found in 이익섭 & 임홍빈Lee, Ik-Seop & Im, Hong-Bin(1983:151~156), 김원경Kim, Won-Gyeong(1997), 최호철

Choi Ho-Cheol et al.(1998), 이남순Lee Nam-Sun(1998), 이익섭 & 채완Lee, Ik-Seop & Chae, Wan(1999:54), and 성광수Sung, Gwang-Su(1999), etc. They all argue that ‘에’ and ‘에게ege’ are in complementary distribution.

- (1) 영희는 여동생{에게/*에} 물을 주었다.
Younghee-neun yeodongsaeng-{ege/*e} mul-eul jueussa.
(Younghee gave water to her sister.)
- (2) 영희는 꽃{에/*에게} 물을 주었다.
Younghee-neun kkoch-{e/*ege} mul-eul jueussa.
(Younghee gave water to flowers.)

As we see in (1) & (2) above, ‘에’ and ‘에게ege’ are in complementary distribution. Dative ‘에’ is not compatible with animate nouns and should be with non-animate nouns; on the other hand, ‘에게ege’ comes with animate nouns only and is not compatible with non-animate nouns. This restriction is not limited to dative verbs like ‘주다give,’ but is also applied to verbs such as ‘다가가다approach,’ which is not a dative verb, as we see in (3) & (4) below.

- (3) 영희는 여동생에게/*에 다가갔다.
Younghee-neun yeodongsang-ege/*e dagagassda.
(Younghee approached her sister.)
- (4) 영희는 벤치에/*에게 다가갔다.
Younghee-neun bench-e/*ege dagagassda.
(Younghee approached a bench.)

Further, such relation of ‘에/에게e/ege’ holds not only with those indirect objects but also with agents in passive sentences.

- (5) 도둑이 경찰관에게/*에 잡혔다.
Dodug-i gyeongchalguan-{ege/*e} japhyessda.
(A burglar is caught by a policeman.)

- (6) 도둑이 경찰 당국에/*에게 잡혔다.
 Dodug-i gyeongchaldangguk-*{e/*ege}* japhyessda.
 (A burglar is caught by the department of police.)
- (7) a. 도둑이 경찰에게 잡혔다.
 Dodug-i gyeongchal-ege japhyessda.
 (A burglar is caught by the police.)
- b. 도둑이 경찰에 잡혔다.
 Dodug-i gyeongchal-e japhyessda.
 (A burglar is caught by the police.)

In (5) & (6), when the agent is a person (animate noun) ‘에게ege’ is used while ‘에e’ is used when the agent is ‘경찰 당국a department of police’(non-animate-noun), but in (7), both ‘에e’ and ‘에게ege’ can be used because ‘경찰police’ can mean either ‘경찰관a policeman’ (animate noun) or ‘경찰 당국a department of policeman’ (non-animate noun). ‘에게ege’ is used in (7a) when the agent is interpreted as a person while ‘에e’ is used in (7b) since the agent is interpreted as the department.

We also see the same complementary distribution of ‘에/에게e/ege’ in expressions including personification.

- (8) a. 꽃들에게/*에 희망을!
 Kkotdeul-*{ege/*e}* huimang-eul!
 (Hope to flowers!)
- b. 시(詩)에게/*에 전화 걸기
 Si-*{ege/*e}* jeonwha geolgi
 (Make a call to poem.)

In (8) ‘꽃들flowers’ and ‘시poem’ are non-animate nouns; nonetheless the use ‘에e’ to these nouns is awkward, and the use of ‘에게ege’ is more natural since these nouns are personified.

On the other hand, an animate noun ‘총리prime minister’ has a marker ‘에e’ in (9) below because ‘총리prime minister’ is objectified in the

interpretation of (9).

(9) 대학생 부모들 모두 총리에 사죄해야.

Daehaksaeng bumodeul modu chongri-e sajoihaeya.

(The parents of college students should apologize to the prime minister.)

(9) is an excerpt from a newspaper, where ‘총리prime minister’ is interpreted as a public administration rather than an individual; hence ‘에e’ is used. We can also see a similar distribution with ‘에서eseo’ and ‘에게서egeseo’ that are assumed as source or origination in (10) & (11). They show parallel complementary distribution relations with animate and non-animate nouns.

(10) 그는 문화부 장관에게서/*에서 상을 받았다.

Geu-neun munwhabu janggwan-{egeseo/*eseo} sang-eul badassda.

(He received a prize from the Minister of Culture.)

(11) 그는 문화부에서/*에게서 상을 받았다.

Geu-neun munwhabu-{eseo/*egeseo} sang-eul badassda.

(He received a prize from the Ministry of Culture.)

In (11), ‘문화부the Ministry of Culture’ is not simply a place but the main body which offers the prize. Similar distributions with ‘에서/에게서eseo/egeseo’ can be easily found in many other sentences. See (12) & (13) below for more examples:

(12) 그는 훌륭한 부모에게서/*에서 태어났다.

Geu-neun hullyunghan bumo-{egeseo/*eseo}taeonassda.

(He was born from great parents.)

(13) 그는 훌륭한 가문에서/*에게서 태어났다.

Geu-neun hullyunghan gamun-{eseo/*egeseo}taeonassda.

(He was born from a great stock.)

(12) shows that animate nouns are combined with ‘에게서egeseo’ but not with ‘에서eseo’ while (13) shows that non-animate nouns are combined only with ‘에서eseo.’ We see similar observations in (14) & (15).

(14) 그는 그녀에게서/*에서 옛 사랑의 그림자를 발견했다.

Geu-neun geunyeo- {egeseo/*eseo} yes sarang-ui geurimja-reul
balgyeonhaessda.

(He found a shadow of the old love from her.)

(15) 그는 바닷가에서/*에게서 옛 사랑의 그림자를 발견했다.

Geu-neun badasga- {eseo/*egeseo} yes sarang-ui geurimja-reul
balgyeonhaessda.

(He found a shadow of the old love from the beach.)

All of the above examples provide us a piece of argument that ‘에/에게 e/ege’ and ‘에서/에게서eseo/egeseo’ can be analyzed as allomorphs respectively.

김유범Kim Yu-Beom(2001:88) tried to extend such complementary relations to even particles and suffixes in general: Kim(2001:89) argued following 안병희Ahn Byeong-Hui(1968) that alternations of possessive markers ‘ㅅs’ and ‘의/aui/ui’ are due to the fact that they are allomorphs showing that they are in complementary distribution. Up to this point, we are in line with Kim’s view. However, we are not with Kim(2001)’s extended assumption that interrogative suffixes and vocative case markers ‘하ha’ are also explained under the same token. Vocative markers ‘하ha’ and ‘아/a/a/a/ya’ as well as interrogative makers ‘-가-ga’ / ‘-고-go,’ and interrogative suffixes ‘-ㄴ가-nga’ / ‘-ㄴ고-ngo’ are not in complementary distributions respectively, thus, they should not be analyzed as allomorphs of the same morpheme.

(16) a. 大龍王아 <월석10:68a>, 大王아 <능엄2:4b>

Daeryongwang-a, Daewang-a

(Great dragon king!, Great king!)

- b. 大王하 <월석21:192a>
 Daewang-ha
 (Great king!)

Unlike Kim(2001)’s analysis, the fact that ‘아’ and ‘하’ can be combined with the same noun ‘왕(wang(king))’ clearly tells us that they are not in complementary distribution, and thus these markers are not allomorphs of the same morpheme.

The same is true with (17) below. Kim(2001:98) states that particle {-고/-가-go/-ga} and ending suffix {-잇고/-잇가-isgo/-isga} are allomorphs and that their distributions depend on the type of interrogatives: that is, ‘-고/-잇고-go/-isgo’ is used when interrogatives are wh-questions, and ‘-가/-잇가-ga/-isga’ is used when they are yes-no questions. However, Kim’s assumption is not correct because in fact, they are not in complementary distribution.

In (17) ‘-고-go’ and ‘-가-ga’ tend to be combined with the same noun ‘일il(affair).’

- (17) a. 부모 동생 니벼른 므스 일고? <순천3:5>
 Bumo dongsang nibyeoraun meusau il-go?
 (What made the parents be separated from their sons?)
 b. 찰방이 그더도록 귀코 빈슨 일가? <순천4:7>
 Chalbangi geudeodorog guiko bidsan il-ga?
 (Is a station officer such a noble and valuable job?)

The suffixes of ‘-고-go/-가-ga’ in (17a) & (17b) are not in complementary distribution but vary depending on the element preceding ‘일il(affair)’: if a wh-word proceeds ‘일il(affair),’ ‘-고-go’ is attached ; otherwise, the other suffix ‘-가-ga’ is used. Therefore, there seems to have a kind of agreement between a wh-word and its suffix. ‘-나가-nga’ and ‘-나고-ngo’ in (18a)-(18c) show the same alternation patterns.

- (18) a. 널문인가? 무슨 문이고? <飜朴58a>
Neolmuninga? Meuseum mun-ingo?
(Is it a wooden board door? What kind of door is it?)
- b. 므스 일이고 흐여 <小學5:112a>
Meuseu il-ingo hauyeo
(I) wonder what is happening)
- c. 잇기 어려운 일인가 너기건마는 <捷解初6:2a>
Isgi eoryeoon il-inga neogigeonmanaun
(Although it was considered to be a difficult affair...)

(18a) is another example in which either ‘-인가-inga’ or ‘-이고-ingo’ can be combined with the same noun ‘문mun(door).’ (18b) & (18c) also show that either marker can be attached to the same noun ‘일il(affair)’ showing that the alternation of ‘-이고-ingo’ and ‘-인가-inga’ is not restricted by a phonological condition. Thus, these suffixes are not in complementary distribution. We maintain that the alternation of ‘-인가-inga’ and ‘-이고-ingo’ should be explained by a kind of agreement or co-occurrence.: i.e. a wh-word like ‘무슴museum(what) or 무스museum(what)’ is responsible for this alternation.

3. Semantic sameness of ‘에/에게e/ege’ and ‘에서eseo’ and ‘에게서egeseo’

In chapter 2, we have seen that ‘에/에게e/ege’ and ‘에서/에게서eseo/egeseo’ show complementary distribution, and further, we have distinguished allomorphic relations from other alternations by establishing the precise concept of complementary distribution. Now let us consider the semantic relationships between these morphemes since they are not regarded as allomorphs of the same morpheme if they do not share semantic sameness.

유현경Yu, Hyeon-Gyeong(2003) argued that there is a semantic difference

between ‘에’ and ‘에게e.’ As we see in (19a)-(19c) that Yu(2003:165) provided, lexical aspects of ‘주다juda(give)’ are different in each sentence, and such difference comes from meaning difference of articles attached to a noun phrase. Yu(2003) argued that semantic features of dative objects determines the lexical aspect of a dative verb, ‘주다juda(give),’ and this difference in the lexical aspect is attributed to the semantic difference between ‘에’ and ‘에게e.’ Therefore, Yu(2003) argued that ‘에/에게e/e’ lacks semantic sameness.

(19) a. 철수가 꽃에 물을 주는 중이다.

(Chulsoo is giving water to flowers.)

철수가 천천히 꽃에 물을 주었다.

(Chulsoo gave water to flowers slowly.)

철수가 한 시간 동안 꽃에 물을 주었다.

(Chulsoo has been giving water to flowers for an hour.)

철수가 한 시간 만에 꽃에 물을 주었다.

(Chulsoo gave water to flowers during an hour.)

b. 철수가 밭에 비료를 주는 중이다.

(Chulsoo is giving a fertilizer to fields.)

철수가 천천히 밭에 비료를 주었다.

(Chulsoo gave a fertilizer to fields slowly.)

철수가 한 시간 동안 밭에 비료를 주었다.

(Chulsoo has been giving a fertilizer to fields for an hour.)

철수가 한 시간 만에 밭에 비료를 주었다.

(Chulsoo gave a fertilizer to fields during an hour.)

c. ??철수가 영희에게 책을 주는 중이다.

(??Chulsoo is giving a book to Younghee.)

??철수가 천천히 영희에게 책을 주었다.

(??Chulsoo gave a book to Younghee slowly.)

??철수가 한 시간 동안 영희에게 책을 주었다.

(??Chulsoo has been giving a book to Younghee for an hour.)

??철수가 한 시간 만에 영희에게 책을 주었다.³⁾

(??Chulsoo gave a book to Younghee during an hour.)

The lexical aspect of dative verb ‘주다give’ in (19a) & (19b) is ‘completion,’ and (19a) & (19b) are acceptable while (19c) is not acceptable because the lexical aspect of ‘주다give’ is ‘achievement.’ However, such interpretation seems to be problematic because it is hard to accept the view that the same verb can have different lexical aspects depending on the preceding noun phrase. Rather, it is natural to assume that the same noun phrase can have different interpretations depending on the verb in a sentence, and even in Universal Grammar, it is generally believed that a verb governs argument but not vice versa.

(20) a. 철수가 영희에게 꽃을 주었다.

(Chulsoo gave flowers to Younghee.)

b. 철수가 영희에게 꽃을 받았다.

(Chulsoo received flowers from Younghee.)

In (20a) ‘영희에게to Younghee’ receives a dative case from the verb ‘주다give,’ but the same noun ‘영희에게from Younghee’ gets ‘source’ or ‘origination’ case from the verb ‘받다receive’.⁴⁾ Like this, verbs are generally assumed to assign a case to their arguments.

Further, it is still debatable if the verb ‘주다give’ has only ‘achievement’ aspect in (19c) because the lexical aspect of ‘주다give’ can also be interpreted as having ‘completion.’ The act of giving to someone does not usually require a lot of time; however, if we set up a situation in which books are being given to many people in an awarding ceremony, (19c) can be equally acceptable as much as (19a) & (19b). We can see this in (19d)

3) This is a quotation from examples (16’) in Yu(2003).

4) Korean case marker ‘에게ege’ is interpreted as ‘to’ or ‘from’ according to the thematic role that its governor, verb has.

below that was a modification of (19c). (19d) is the same as (19c) except that ‘book’ is replaced by ‘baby formula,’ and yet (19d) gets exactly the same interpretation as (19a).

- (19) d. 철수가 아기에게 분유를 주는 중이다.
 (Chulsoo is giving baby formula to a baby.)
 철수가 천천히 아기에게 분유를 주었다.
 (Chulsoo gave baby formula to a baby slowly.)
 철수가 한 시간 동안 아기에게 분유를 주었다.
 (Chulsoo has been giving baby formula to a baby for an hour.)
 철수가 한 시간 만에 아기에게 분유를 주었다.
 (Chulsoo gave baby formula to a baby during an hour.)

(19d) shows that the lexical aspect of ‘주다give’ can be ‘completion,’ and this fact tells us that the semantic features of a noun such as ‘animate/non-animate’ cannot determine the lexical aspect of a verb. Let us reconsider examples of Yu(2003:166).

- (21)⁵⁾ a. 철수가 꽃에 물을 주다가 말았다.
 (Chulsoo was giving water to flowers and stopped.)
 ⇒ b. 철수가 꽃에 물을 주었다.
 (Chulsoo gave water to flowers.)
- (22) a. 철수가 밭에 비료를 주다가 말았다.
 (Chulsoo was giving a fertilizer to fields and stopped.)
 ⇒ b. 철수가 밭에 비료를 주었다.
 (Chulsoo gave a fertilizer to fields.)
- (23) a. 철수가 영희에게 책을 주다가 말았다.
 (Chulsoo was giving a book to Younghee and stopped.)
 ⇒ b. 철수가 영희에게 책을 주었다.
 (Chulsoo gave a book to Younghee.)

5) These examples are (17), (18), and (19) of Yu(2003) respectively.

(21a) and (22a) implies (21b) and (22b) respectively while (23a) does not imply (23b). In other words, we find inclusive meaning relations in (21) & (22) but not in (23). This contrast between (23) and (21)-(22) should be due to the difference between ‘give a book/fertilizer’ and ‘give water’ and should not be attributed to the difference between ‘에e’ and ‘에게ege’ as in Yu(2003:166). The act of ‘giving’ is not generally occurred in an instant without continuation of action, and thus this difference is not due to the verb ‘주다give’ but due to an aspectual difference of the verb phrase containing its object. Yu(2003) also mentioned this point a bit. Yu(2003:167) stated that a predicative action for ‘books’ represents a single action because objects like ‘books’ are concrete and quantitative nouns; on the other hand, a predicative action for ‘water’ has both starting and ending points representing a sense of ‘completion of a process’ because ‘water’ is a non-countable, qualitative noun. And yet, Yu(2003) attributed this difference to the semantic difference of the markers attached to nouns, not to the semantic difference of nouns themselves. She should have verified this distinction not with material nouns like ‘물water’ but concrete nouns like ‘책book’. Yu(2003:169) also pointed out that ‘에e’-NP has a case role of ‘destination’ while ‘에게ege’-NP has a case role of a ‘beneficiary’, which has the features of having animate nouns and a voluntary action. However, if we consider (19d), it is hard to understand that a baby receiving formula has voluntary action of receiving, and we cannot come to the conclusion that ‘에게ege’ and ‘beneficiary’ are correlated concepts. As for expressions like ‘give water’ when we pour water into a cup or a glass and give it instantly to someone, we do not find an intrusion of a long process of giving but only a momentary action. In that situation, the act of ‘stop giving water’ implies ‘not giving water,’ and this difference cannot be traced back to the difference of ‘에e’ and ‘에게ege.’ If we replace the object of (23) with ‘분유baby formula’ as in (24) below, it becomes acceptable.

- (24) a. 철수가 아기에게 분유를 주다가 말았다.
 (Chulsoo was giving baby formula to a baby and stopped.)
 b. 철수가 아기에게 분유를 주었다.
 ⇒ (Chulsoo gave baby formula to a baby.)

When we replace the object of ‘주다give’ as in (24), we clearly see a semantic inclusive relation between (24a) & (24b). (24a) implies (24b) as in (21-22). This proves that the aspectual meanings of ‘주다give’ are not differentiated depending on the semantic difference of ‘에/에게e/ege.’

The following examples also support evidence that a noun phrase does not determine the aspectual meaning of a verb, and rather, a verb determines the semantic case of a noun phrase and also a grammatical function of a case marker attached to a noun phrase. Consider following examples.

- (25) a. 영화는 가수가 좋다.
 (For Younghee, a singer is her favorite.)
 b. 영화는 가수가 장래 희망이다.
 (For Younghee, a singer is her future dream.)
 c. 영화는 가수가 되었다.
 (Younghee became a singer.)

In (25) noun phrase ‘가수가singer-ga’ does not have a pre-determined case, and predicates like ‘좋다is favorite,’ ‘장래 희망이다is her future dream,’ or ‘되었다became’ are not interpreted depending on ‘가수가singer-ga.’ On the contrary, noun phrase ‘가수가singer-ga’ is interpreted as object case, subject case, or complement depending on the following predicate. (26) also gives additional support to our view.

- (26) a. 책이 책상 위에 있다.
 (There is a book on the desk.)
 b. 오늘 그 문제에 대해 말씀드리겠습니다.
 (I will talk about the problem today.)
 c. 밥에 떡에 케이크에 과자에 얼마나 많이 먹었는지 모르겠다.

(I don't know how much I ate including rice, rice cake, cake, and cookies, etc.)

d. 술에 술 탄 듯, 물에 물 탄 듯.

(As if we add liquor to liquor, and water to water.)

e. 또 다시 그 팀에 패할 수는 없다.

(We cannot lose again against that team.)

The same marker '에e' in each of (26a)-(26e) has a different interpretation on its semantic role, and this difference is traced back to a different predicate which gives a different semantic role to 'NP-e' in each of (26a)-(26e). Accordingly, '에e' marker is interpreted as having different grammatical role. Therefore, we should ban the false assumption that predicates are interpreted differently because maker '에e' inherently has distinctive meanings.

So far, we have argued against previous assumption that '에/에게e/ege' are basically different in meaning. However, our counter argument does not serve as a sufficient condition on the evidence that '에e' and '에게ege' are semantically same. Also, the external form of '에게ege' seems to be a combined form of '에e' and '게ge,' and this external form may lead us to a doubt that '에게ege' may have an additional meaning that is not included in '에e.' However, synchronically, '에게ege' is regarded as one morpheme that cannot be divided into '에e' and '게ge,' and thus '에게ege' should not be interpreted as a combined form of '에e' and '게ge.'

If we analyze '에게ege' with a diachronic approach, it is analyzed as '익/의+귀gui/ui+gui,' in which '귀gui' is originated from '그에geunge', and thus it is more reasonable to assume dative marker '에게ege' as a combined form of '에e' and '게ge,' but not as a form of '에e' and '게ge.' In this analysis, dative marker '에e' attached to non-animate noun is interpreted as the same element of the last syllable of '에게ege,' '에e.' Then, how do we explain '익/의 귀gui/ui geung' which is considered as a historical precedence of '에게ege'? If this much of a difference is due to the difference of '에e' and '에게ege,' such a difference certainly

contributes the semantic difference between these two elements.

The existence of ‘의/의 궤au/ui geung’ can be problematic in concluding ‘에/에게e/ege’ as allomorphs of the same morpheme in two aspects. First, the existence of this element may force us to view ‘에게e’ not to be a single morpheme. If ‘에게e’ is not a single morpheme, we cannot move up any further step toward morphemic distinctiveness because allomorphic relations need to be considered among elements with semantic sameness. Second, when there is an additional element added to an existing morpheme, that additional element is believed to have its semantic content, and then, there should be no semantic sameness between the morpheme with additional element and the morpheme without such element.

The first problem can be solved by considering ‘에게e’ as a single morpheme which cannot be further analyzed synchronically. For example, no linguist argues against that particle ‘서seo’ is a single morpheme although ‘서seo’ is historically descended from ‘이서iseyo’ because ‘이서iseyo’ is not analyzed as a combined form of stem ‘이시-isi-’ and ending ‘-어-eo.’ Other examples can be found in postposition ‘를leul’ and ‘는neun.’ Historically, ‘를leul’ is formed by ‘르l’ added to ‘을eul,’ and ‘는neun’ is formed by ‘ㄴn’ added to ‘은eun,’ nonetheless, both are not regarded as combined forms. In the same vein, ‘에게e’ should be considered to become an inseparable single morpheme.

Dative and locative cases were originally the same things, and yet it was hard to say animate nouns as the object of a dative case, and “무엇(궁 something(geung) of that animate noun” is named to be the object. A similar observation can be found in dative form ‘이손디uisondai’ in Middle Korean.

(27) a. 須達이손디 보내야닐 <釋詳6:15b>

(Because (he) sends (something) to Sudatta, ...)

b. 王이 導師이손디 가샤 니르샤디 <月釋22:35b>

(The king went to a spiritual guide and said to him...)

In (27a) ‘須達sudal(Sudatta)’ or ‘導師dosa(spiritual guide)’ does not have a meaning of location where to or from where, but that ‘손son’ represents a direct location. We can provide a parallel interpretation to ‘의/의 궤aui/ui geung’ in the interpretation of ‘에게ege,’ and this element is assumed to be developed into a case marker as one grammatical morpheme.

The second problem of the added semantic element no longer works because there does not exist independent meaning for the added element since the meaning of ‘의/의 궤aui/ui geung’ becomes obsolete. Hence, there exist no semantic difference between ‘에게ege’ and ‘에e’ as a dative case marker. A similar explanation holds for ‘에서/에게서eseo/egeseo’ alternations. Therefore, we argue that ‘에e’ and ‘에게ege’ which cannot be further analyzed synchronically should not be officially regarded as two distinct morphemes ; thus, they should be interpreted as allomorphs of the same morpheme that are in complementary distribution.

4. Conclusion

So far, case makers ‘에e’ and ‘에게ege’, and ‘에서eseo’ and ‘에게서egeseo’ are not two separate morphemes but are simply allomorphs of the same morphemes respectively. When ‘에e’ and ‘에게ege’ are used as a dative marker, they show exactly the same semantic function and are in complementary distribution in relation to the semantic features of their preceding noun ; that is, if the preceding noun is an animate noun, ‘에게ege’ is used and ‘에e’ is used if not. Also, ‘에게서egeseo’ and ‘에서eseo’ as ablative and locative case makers show exactly the same semantic function and show complementary distribution depending on whether the preceding noun is animate or non-animate. Therefore, we assume that these markers are semantically conditioned allomorphs.

These allomorphic relations are different from free variations which neither show complementary distribution nor semantic sameness, and also

different from alternations of interrogative marker ‘-가-ga/-고-go’ and of interrogative suffix ‘-ㄴ가-nga/-ㄴ고-ngo’ which show semantic sameness but not in complementary distribution. These markers should be analyzed as two distinctive markers or suffixes rather than allomorphs since they did not satisfy two essential conditions that allomorphs should fulfill.

In general, we can find the semantically conditioned allomorphs like ‘에|에게|e/ege’ and ‘에서|eseo/에게서|egeseo,’ it is that, animate nouns are distinguished from non-animate nouns in relation to their grammatical function in Burushaski, Russian, etc. In Korean, animate nouns are treated differently from non-animate nouns in a sense that they are evaluated as a special or more important lexical category compared to non-animate nouns. For example, English verb ‘take’ is translated into two different lexical words ‘데려가다’ for animate objects and ‘가져가다’ for non-animate objects. The word for ‘bring’ shows similar behaviors, too. It is translated into ‘데려오다’ or ‘가져오다’ depending on whether the object is an animate noun or not. ‘Load’ is also expressed into two distinct lexical words in Korean depending on whether the object is a thing or a person, e.g. ‘(차에) 태우다’ for animate objects and ‘(차에) 싣다’ for un-animate objects.

However, we do not view this alternation as a unique phenomenon when we consider universal properties of world languages because each language has its own device in classifying groups of words either lexically or grammatically. English shows some important grammatical distinctions on qualitative vs. quantitative nouns and also countable vs. non-countable nouns. This is because in English, types of nouns are differentiated in a way they have an article or not, or plural makers or not. In European languages too, the gender of nouns shows an important categorical distinction since nominal suffixes vary depending on the gender. Now we just saw that each language has its own important factor in classifying lexical expressions, and this property seems to be language universal. This contrastive study on the behavior of Korean markers thus gives an important contribution on language typology and universality.

❖ References

- 고영근(1999), 국어형태론연구, 서울대학교출판부.(Ko, Young-Keun, *A study on Korean Morphology*, Seoul National University Press.)
- 고영근(2005), 형태소의 교체와 형태론의 범위 -형태음운론적 교체를 중심으로-, 국어학 46.(Ko, Young-Keun, A Study on Alternation of Morphemes and Domain of Morphology, *Journal of Korea Linguistics*, 46.)
- 김원경(1997), ‘에게’와 격, 한국어학의 이해와 전망, 박이정.(Kim Won-Gyeong, ‘*ege*’ and case, *Understanding and a prospect of Korean Linguistics*, Pagijong Press.)
- 김유범(2001), 15세기 국어 문법형태소의 형태론과 음운론, 고려대학교 박사학위논문.(Kim, Yu-Beom, *Morphology and Phonology of the Grammatical Morphemes in the 15th Century Korean*, Korea University doctoral thesis.)
- 김정남(2005), ‘-답다, -롭다, -스럽다’의 분포와 의미, 한국어의미학 18.(Kim, Jung-Nam, The Distribution and Meaning of ‘-dabda’, ‘-lobda’, ‘-seureobda’. *Korean Semantics*, 18.)
- 박양규(1975), 소유와 소재, 국어학 3.(Pak, Yang-Gyu, Possession and position, *Journal of Korea Linguistics*, 3.)
- 성광수(1999), 격 표현과 조사의 의미, 월인.(Seong, Gwang-Su, *Case expression and the meaning of case markers*, Worin Press.)
- 안명철(1982), 처격 ‘에’의 의미, 관악어문연구 7.(Ahn, Myeong-Cheol, The meaning of locative ‘e’, *Journal of Language & Literature in Gwanak*, 7.)
- 안병희(1968), 중세국어의 속격어미 ‘-스’에 대하여, 이승녕박사송수기념논총, 을유문화사.(Ahn, Byeong-Hui, About genitive ending ‘-s’ in middle Korean, *Journal for commemorating Longevity of Doctor Lee Sung-Nyeong*, eulyumunwha co.)
- 유현경(2003), ‘주다’ 구문에 나타나는 조사 ‘에게’와 ‘에’, 국어학 20.(Yu, Hyeon-Gyeong, Case marker ‘ege’ and ‘e’ in construction of ‘juda(give)’, *Journal of Korean Linguistics*, 20.)
- 이남순(1998), 격과 격표지, 월인.(Lee, Nam-Sun, *Case and case markers*, Worin Press.)
- 이익섭 · 임홍빈(1983), 국어문법론, 학연사.(Lee, Ik-Seop/Im, Hong-Bin, *Korean Grammar*, Hakyoonsa.)
- 이익섭 · 채완(1999), 국어문법론 강의, 학연사.(Lee, Ik-Seop/Chae, Wan, *Lecture of Korean Grammar*, Hakyoonsa.)
- 최호철 외(1998), 기계 번역을 위한 한국어 논항 체계 연구, 한국어의미학 3.(Choi, Ho-Cheol et al., A study on Korean argument system for mechanical translation, *Korean Semantics*, 3)
- Aronoff, M.(1976), *Word Formation in Generative Grammar*, Massachusetts: MIT

Press.

Bloomfield, L.(1933), *Language*, Allen and Unwin.

Crystal, D.(1980), *A First Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, Andre Deutsch.

Harris, Z.(1942), "Morpheme Alternants in Linguistic Analysis," *Language* 18.

Haspelmath(2002), M., *Understanding Morphology*, Oxford University Press.

Hockett, C.(1947), "Problem of Morphemic Analysis," *Language* 23.

Mugdan(1986), "Was ist eigentlich ein Morpheme?," *Zweischrift fuer Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 39.

Mugdan(1993), Morphological units, Kasher(ed), *The encyclopedia of language and linguistics* 5, Pergamon Press.

Nida, E.(1949), *Morphology : the Descriptive Analysis of Word*, Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press.