

# Substitution Errors by English L1-KFL Learners: Nominative-by-Accusative

**Author/Contributor:**

Shin, Seong-Chul

**Publication details:**

International Review of Korean Studies (IROKS)

v. 3

Chapter No. 1

pp. 59-90

1449-7395 (ISSN)

**Publication Date:**

2006

**License:**

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/au/>

Link to license to see what you are allowed to do with this resource.

Downloaded from <http://hdl.handle.net/1959.4/39406> in <https://unsworks.unsw.edu.au> on 2023-09-27

# Substitution Errors by English L1-KFL Learners: Nominative-by-Accusative

Seong-Chul Shin

*Korean Studies Program, School of Languages and Linguistics,  
University of New South Wales, Sydney, 2052. [s.shin@unsw.edu.au](mailto:s.shin@unsw.edu.au)*

**Abstract:** This study aims to examine the grammatical constructions associated with the frequent substitution of the nominative particle (-i/-ka) by the accusative particle (-ul/-lul) made by English L1-KFL learners and provide a strategy for the facilitation of Korean language learning and pedagogical improvement. The study explores the sentential constructions that 'trigger' such substitutions and attempts to give linguistic and pedagogical explanations. As a pedagogical strategy, the study proposes to use Korean-oriented English sentence constructions such as 'As for X+Top/Nom, Y+Nom Z-Predicate'.

**Keywords:** Korean case particle errors, nominative particle errors, substitution errors, common errors, pedagogical strategy

## Introduction

It is often observed that English L1-KFL learners<sup>1</sup> generally have a poor grammatical knowledge of case and such basic concepts as subject, verb, object and complement. A number of studies (e.g. Kim Namkil 2002, Ross King 2005) point out this aspect and emphasise the need for more emphatic grammar instructions in Korean as a foreign language (KFL). Statistical analyses of Error Analysis (EA) studies in Korean (e.g. Sohn Ho-Min 1986; Shin Kyu-Suk 1995; Lee Jung-Hee 2003; Shin Seong-Chul 2006) have shown that English L1-KFL learners do have a great deal of difficulty with the use of Korean case particles.<sup>2</sup> One of the most frequent, if not the most frequent, case particle errors that are referred to in EA studies are substitutions of the nominative particle (-i/-ka)<sup>3</sup>, and they mainly occur in substitutions such as nominative by accusative, nominative by topic and nominative by locative-static. Among the nominative substitutions, I shall focus on the substitution of the nominative particle by the accusative particle in this study.

KFL instructors now have a better understanding of some causes of such substitutions, but there are sentential constructions and grammatical factors that still need to be examined and explained with regard to the nominative-by-accusative substitution. The conventional assumption that the nominative and topic particles may be the most difficult for learners to use distinctly is not often supported by the production and frequency of case particle errors, although it may be theoretically true. Studies (e.g. Lee Jung-Hee 2003, Shin Seong-Chul 2006) revealed that substitutions of the nominative particle by the accusative particle were more significant than those of the nominative particle by the topic particle. It is interesting and pedagogically useful to know what grammatical constituents assist such a high production of substitution errors, and in this regard this study explores the sentential constructions that 'trigger' such substitutions and attempt to provide some possible linguistic and pedagogical explanations for the cause. In addition, there is an issue of pedagogical strategies that deal with the nominative-by-accusative

---

<sup>1</sup> It refers to students whose 1<sup>st</sup> or main language is English and who learn Korean as a foreign language (KFL).

<sup>2</sup> Andy Kirkpatrick (1995) argues that given the degree of difficulty involved in learning, Korean should not be taught to non-Korean background speakers until the later years of secondary schooling. He claims that it takes many more years for English-speaking learners to learn the character-based languages (e.g. Chinese, Japanese and Korean) than roman letter-based languages such as Indonesian.

<sup>3</sup> In this paper the Yale romanisation system is used to transcribe Korean.

substitution. Some studies (e.g. Lee Jee-Young 1996; Kim Chung-Sook and Nam Ki-Chun 2002; Cho In-Jung 2006) have proposed pedagogical strategies through contrastive analyses, but their arguments were largely based on the equivalent English sentence structures of the Korean sentences in question. In these strategies students should depend on the equivalent English sentences or translation to work out the correct particles. Although it may be advantageous to make use of the learners' L1, an English-oriented presentation of Korean sentences produces further confusion for students and does not work with some other structural patterns. As a response to such a methodological problem, I propose to use an alternative construction type in the presentation of problematic Korean structures: Korean-oriented English sentence constructions, e.g. 'As for X+Top/Nom, Y+Nom Z-Predicate', where the nominative nominal is placed immediately before the predicate so that the necessity of having the nominative particle is enhanced. I shall demonstrate how the presentation of such a pattern works with most problematic structures that produce substitutions of nominative particles by accusative particles.

### Common Nominative-by-Accusative Substitutions

The substitution of the nominative particle by the accusative particle is closely related to the syntactic behaviour of certain verb types and sentence constructions. In the following I shall present examples<sup>4</sup> of some key grammatical elements that trigger the production of frequent errors with brief interpretations, before going into detailed discussions about the respective linguistic and pedagogical aspects.

Firstly, the cause of the nominative particle substitution is associated with existential verbs<sup>5</sup> e.g. *iss.ta* 'exist, stay, have', *eps.ta* 'do not exist, do not stay, do not have', *manh.ta* 'be much, many, have a lot' or *cek.ta* 'be little, few, do not have a lot' as shown in (1).

- (1) a. 4.si.ey.nun ta.lun *swu.ep.ul* (>*swu.ep.i*) *iss.e.yo*.  
'I have another class at 4.'
- b. Ho.cwu.ey.nun sa.hoy *mwun.cey.lul* (>*mwun.cey.ka*) *manh.i iss.e.yo*.  
'There are many social problems in Australia.'
- c. Kum.yo.il.ey.nun *swu.ep.ul* (>*swu.ep.i*) *eps.e.se nuc.key il.e.na.yo*.  
'I have no class on Fridays, so I get up late.'
- d. Ne.mwu.na cay.mi.eps.ko pay.wul *kes.ul* (>*kes.i*) *eps.ki ttay.mwun.ip.ni.ta*.  
'Because it is too boring and there is nothing (for me) to learn.'
- e. Hal *il.ul* (>*il.i*) *manh.a.yo*.  
'I have many things to do.'

Some learners are unaware that when existential verbs are used to express possession, the subject nominal (the noun preceding the adjectival verbs) functions as the object with its nominative particle remaining intact (Sohn Ho-Min 1999: 284). Existential sentences take the 'X + existential verbs' construction in which 'X' is the subject and thus needs nominative particles, i.e. X + *-i/-ka isssta, epsta, manhsta, ceksta*, etc. Also part of the confusion appears to be caused by the transfer of the English verb 'have' (or 'do not have'), which needs an object in English but is normally interpreted as one of the existential verbs in Korean that do not require an object and accusative particles unless it is interpreted as *ka.ci.ta* or *so.yu.ha.ta* 'own, possess'.

Secondly, the misinterpretation of the case of the noun referred to by descriptive adjectives causes the nominative particle substitutions, as in (2). Learners tend to mistakenly interpret a complement in the

<sup>4</sup> The examples of common nominative-by-accusative substitutions come from compositions of KFL learners.

<sup>5</sup> The term 'existential' referred to in this paper denotes existence, location and possession (e.g. 'have').

descriptive sentences as an object. This is also due to a lack of knowledge of the sentence construction of 'X + adjectival verbs' where 'X' is the subject and thus needs nominative particles.

- (2) a. *Kim.chi.lul (>kim.chi.ka) ne.mwu may.we.yo.*  
'Kimchi is too spicy.'
- b. *Tan.e.ha.ko mwun.pep.ul (>mwun.pep.i) a.cwu e.lye.we.yo.*  
'Vocabulary and grammar are very difficult.'
- c. *Han.kwuk mwun.hwa.lul (>mwun.hwa.ka) a.cwu cay.mi.iss.ki ttay.mwun.ey...*  
'Because the Korean culture is interesting...'

Thirdly, the substitution of the nominative particle by the accusative particle is caused by the misinterpretation of the noun preceding intransitive verbs as in (3). Some substitutions in this category are caused by the confusion of the similarity in form between the intransitive and its corresponding transitive verbs, e.g. N+-*i/-ka* *kkuth.na.ta* '(N) finish' vs N+-*lul/-ul* *kkuth.nay.ta* 'finish (N)' and N+-*i/-ka* *il.e.na.ta* '(N) rise' vs N+-*ul/-lul* *il.u.khi.ta* 'raise (N)'.

- (3) a. *Wu.li hak.kyo kun.che.ey tok.pang.ul (>tok.pang.i) na.wass.e.yo.*  
'(lit.) A single room came up (for lease) near my school.'
- b. *Ki.lum.ul (>ki.lum.i) manh.i say.nun.tey ko.chye.ya.ci.yo.*  
'The fuel is leaking a lot, so you should fix it.'
- c. *Ca.cwu yek.ey ki.cha.lul (>ki.cha.ka) nuc.key on.ta.*  
'Often the train arrives late at the station.'

Fourthly, transitive sensory (or psychoemotive) adjectival verbs such as *silh.ta* 'be disagreeable, dislike', *pwu.lep.ta* 'be envious, envy' and *mwu.sep.ta* 'be scary, fear' cause confusion in the choice of a particle for the object as in (4).

- (4) a. *Tay.hak sayng.hwal.ul (>sayng.hwal.i) silh.e.yo.*  
'I dislike university life.'
- b. *May.wun um.sik.ul (>um.sik.i) silh.ess.ci.man ci.kum (un) coh.a.yo.*  
'I disliked spicy food, but now I like it.'

There are two kinds of sensory adjectival verbs that need to be considered here. One is intransitive sensory adjectival verbs such as *kipputa*, 'be happy' and *sulphuta* 'be sad', and the other is transitive sensory adjectival verbs such as *cohta* 'be good, like' and *pwulepta* 'be envious, envy'. Each of these has a corresponding verb<sup>6</sup> such as *kippehata* 'feel happy' and *sulphehata* 'feel sad' and *cohahata* 'like' and *pwulewehata* 'envy'. The structure which causes greater confusion in relation to the use of a case particle is a transitive sensory adjective structure in which the object is in the nominative case, not the accusative case. Only when the transitive sensory sentence is constructed with sensory verbs is the object in the accusative case (Sohn Ho-Min 1999: 383).

Fifthly, sentences containing inchoative verbs such as *toy.ta* 'become', *ci.ta* 'get, become' affect the occurrence of the substitution errors in the nominative particle as in (5). This is the case where learners are unaware that in inchoative sentences a subject and a complement are both in the nominative case and thus they need to learn the concept of such an inchoative construction and the subject-complement relation.

<sup>6</sup> It becomes a transitive verb by attaching the infinite suffix *-e/-a* and the verb *hata* 'show signs of being'.

- (5) a. Sin.mwun ki.ca a.ni.myen *thuk.pha.wen.ul* (>*thuk.pha.wen.i*) *toy.ko* siph.sup.ni.ta.  
 'I would like to *become* a newspaper journalist or *foreign correspondent*.'  
 b. Ci.kum *swu.yeng.ul* (>*swu.yeng.i*) *coh.a.cyess.e.yo*.  
 'Now (my) *swimming* has got better.'

Sixthly, adjectival verbs that denote necessity are responsible for another type of substitution error in the nominative particle as in (6). The subject of the sentence is marked by dative *ey.key/han.they/kkey*, nominative or topic particles, and the nominal referred to by the necessity adjectival verbs functions as an object but is marked with a nominative particle, as for the existential verb *issta*. The confusion in this type also is related to negative transfer from English, which is often induced by giving the meaning of *philyohata* as 'to need' instead of 'X is necessary/needed'.

- (6) Hak.sayng pi.ca.wa *ye.kwen.ul* (>*ye.kwen.i*) *phil.yo.hay.yo*.  
 '(He/she) *needs* a student visa and a *passport*.'

Another type of substitution error in this category is the nominative case in the embedded clause of interrogative constructions such as 'Do you know where...?', as in (7). KFL learners often wrongly interpret the subject in the embedded clause as the object of 'do you know...' or the interrogative 'where'.

- (7) Cey.il coh.un han.kwuk sik.*tang.ul* (>*sik.tang.i*) *e.ti.in.ci a.sey.yo?*  
 'Do you know *where* the best Korean restaurant is?'

Thus far, we have observed that the erratic substitutions are triggered by existential verbs, necessity verbs, descriptive verbs, transitive sensory (or psychoemotive) verbs and copular verbs (particularly copular negative) in adjectival verb sentence constructions. These triggering constructions and verb types presented account for a large proportion of the nominative substitutions, among which the existential and intransitive constructions provide the major cause for such substitutions. But there are some other notable constructions, such as multiple-subject sentences, which similarly cause confusion to KFL learners resulting in the production of the same nominative by accusative substitution. Below I shall explore the linguistic and pedagogical factors of the nominative substitution in more detail.

### Exploration into Nominative-by-Accusative Substitutions

The cases in which the nominative particle *-i/-ka* is wrongly substituted by the accusative particle *-ul/-lul* are associated with the use of particular verb types, sentential constructions or grammatical items. I shall broadly categorize them into three types of sentential constructions, which are then subcategorized according to verb types and grammatical items. They are: 1) adjectival verb sentences (existential, descriptive, transitive sensory (or psychoemotive), necessity and copular negative verbs); 2) intransitive sentences (common, locomotive, inchoative, processive and passive verbs); 3) other constructions (relative clauses, multiple-subject sentences, quoted clauses, defective nouns and negative adjective *-ci anh* 'be not' constructions). Many of the substitutions are caused by distinctive grammatical features where a predicate functions like a transitive verb that takes an object, and it involves grammatical difference between the learner's L1 (i.e. English) and their target language (i.e. Korean). Other erratic substitutions are closely related to the characteristic usage of the Korean language, particularly in sentence constructions and the functions of its constituents. In the following I shall examine such constructions, along with detailed discussions explaining the respective linguistic and pedagogical aspects.

## Adjectival Verb Sentence Constructions

Erratic substitutions of the nominative particle by the accusative particle are triggered by existential verbs, necessity verbs, descriptive verbs, transitive sensory (or psychoemotive) verbs and copular verbs (particularly copular negative) in adjectival verb sentence constructions. Below I shall explain how and why these items and constructions play a triggering role, along with some pedagogical suggestions.

### Existential Verb Constructions

The most significant factor relevant to 'nominative-by-accusative' substitution errors is the use of existential verbs which denote not only existence and location but also possession. English L1-KFL learners tend to wrongly perceive these existential and possessive verbs as transitive verbs which take an object, thereby attaching the accusative particle to the subject in replacement of the nominative particle. This seems to be associated with at least two grammatical reasons, both of which are related to interference from English. Firstly, when English L1 speakers learn the usage of *iss.ta* 'exist, stay, have' and *eps.ta* 'do not exist, do not stay, do not have', they are often taught to or tend to interpret the existential verbs in conjunction with an English sentence structure such as 'There is/are N in/at/on ...'. At this time learners who have an insufficient knowledge of the so-called surrogate or 'dummy' subject (i.e. 'there' in this case) and the 'true' subject (i.e. nominal noun) tend to perceive the noun as the object of the adjectival verb 'to be' and accordingly misinterpret the structure in the target language, Korean. Secondly, and more commonly, when the learners perceive or interpret the usage of *iss.ta* or *eps.ta* as possession, they immediately equate it, as usually taught, with the English verbs 'to have' and 'do not have', which require an object. Then, the learners almost instinctively apply or extend their grammatical knowledge in English to Korean by wrongly placing the accusative particle in the nominative subject which is the subject of the existential verb '*iss.ta/eps.ta*'.

Existential verbs are used in two typical sentence patterns in Korean, and they are summarised as follows: 1a) Existence and location: Nominal (inanimate) + *-ey* + Subject nominal + *-i/-ka* + Existential verb (lit. 'There is/are SN at/in/to N. '); 1b) Existence and location: Nominal (animate) + *-ey.key/-han.they/-kkey* + Subject nominal + *-i/-ka* + Existential verb (lit. 'There is/are SN with N. ') and 2) Existence and possession: Subject nominal + *-i/-ka/-un/-nun* + Nominal + *-i/-ka* + Existential verb ('SN have/has N. ').

The first pattern is demonstrated in the examples in (8) below, where (8a) and (8b) show the existence and location of the subject in the particle place or person which is marked by locative case particles *ey/eykey/hanthey/kkey*, while (8c) denotes both existence and possession of the subject which belongs to a particular person or animate nominal, which is marked by the nominative or topic particles.

- (8) a. *Wu.li pan.ey mi.kwuk hak.sayng.i iss.ta.*  
'(lit.) There is an American student in my class.'
- b. *A.ppa.kkey pi.mil.i iss.ta.*  
'(lit.) There is a secret with my dad.'
- c. *Nam.tong.sayng.ey.key chin.kwu.ka manh.ta.*  
'(lit.) There are many friends with my younger brother.'

Learners need to be aware that *wu.li pan* 'our/my class', *a.ppa* 'dad' and *nam.tong.sayng* 'younger brother' in the examples are not the subject and that the subject of the sentence is *hak.sayng* 'student', *pi.mil* 'secret' and *chin.kwu* 'friend' respectively, so that none of them need the accusative case particle but rather the subject case particle (i.e. nominative particle).

The second pattern, which is used when possession is intended, is more complex in that it appears to take dual subjects, in which the locative nominal marked by *ey/eykey/hanthey/kkey* is shifted to the nominative case as the topic of the sentence, and the original subject nominal functions as the object not with the accusative particle, but still with the nominative particle. Consider the examples in (9).

- (9) a. *Wu.li pan.i/un mi.kwuk hak.sayng.i iss.ta.*  
 ‘Our class has an American student.’
- b. *A.ppa.ka/nun pi.mil.i iss.ta.*  
 ‘Dad has a secret.’
- c. *Nam.tong.sayng.i/un chin.kwu.ka manh.ta.*  
 ‘My younger brother has many friends.’

(9a) in the above examples sounds less frequent than (9b) and (9c) because it takes an inanimate subject, thus denoting more its existence and location rather than one’s possession, but all three sentences taking dual/multiple subject particles are perfectly grammatical and acceptable. As for the two sentence patterns, learners need to be aware of the necessity of having the topic particle, and the shift of the subject and its grammatical function. Pedagogically, it may be desirable to introduce the existential verbs not independently but with the topic particle in a nominal sentential form by stressing ‘N + *-i/-ka iss.ta*’. In fact, it is necessary to remind the learners that the accusative particle is never used with existential verbs. In addition to *iss.ta*, *ep.ta*, *manh.ta* and *cek.ta*, there are some more existential verbs such as *kyey.si.ta* ‘be/exist (honorific)’ and it is necessary to introduce those existential predicates for pedagogical purposes. It is also useful to compare the usage of existential verbs with that of transitive verbs denoting possession such as *kac.ta (ka.ci.ta)* ‘have, hold, own, possess’, *an kac.ta (ka.ci.ta)* ‘do not have, hold, own, possess’ and its progressive forms *kac.ko iss.ta (ka.ci.ko iss.ta)*, *an kac.ko iss.ta (ka.ci.ko iss.ta)*, as the latter requires an object and thus the accusative particle with it. By being aware of these rules, learners would have a clearer idea that the English notion of ‘have’ or ‘do not have’ is realised in two ways in Korean i.e. one by existential verbs *iss.ta*, *eps.ta*, in which case the nominative particle is required in the subject nominal functioning as the object, and two by transitive verbs *kac.ta (ka.ci.ta)* denoting possession only in which case the accusative particle is required for an object.

### ‘Necessity’ Verb Constructions

One of the most significant causes of the nominative substitution is related to the use of adjectives which refer to necessity such as *phil.yo.ha.ta* ‘need, be necessary / needed’. One cause is interference from English translation. A necessity is expressed often by the transitive verb ‘need’ in English, but in Korean it is expressed by its adjectival verb *phil.yo.ha.ta* ‘be necessary / needed’. Therefore, English-speaking learners erroneously think that the object of *phil.yo.ha.ta* requires the accusative particle in Korean. The second reason is attributable to the lack of understanding of the sentence pattern in which necessity adjectives are used. As for the existential verb (possession) *iss.ta* ‘have’ and *eps.ta* ‘do not have’, there are normally two ways to express sentences of necessity. One is done by having the nominal in the locative case marked by the particles *eykey*, *hanthey*, *kkey* ‘at, to (an inanimate)’ and *ey* ‘at, to (an inanimate)’ in addition to a subject, as in (10) below, and the other by shifting the locative nominal to the subject, as shown in (11).

- (10) a. *Cin.swu.han.they ye.ca.chin.kwu.ka phil.yo.hay.yo.*  
 ‘To Jinsu, a girl friend is needed.’
- b. *Ho.cwu.ey IT cen.mwun.ka.ka manh.i phil.yo.ha.ta.*  
 ‘For/in Australia, IT specialists are a lot needed.’

- (11) a. *Cin.ho.ka yong.ton.i com phil.yo.hay.yo.*  
 ‘For Cinho, some pocket money is needed.’
- b. *Ho.cwu.nun celm.un sa.ep.ka.ka phil.yo.hay.yo.*  
 ‘For Australia, young businessmen are needed.’

With these patterns, it is important to draw the attention of learners to the use of the nominative particle by stressing it and by introducing the necessity verb together with the nominative particle from the very beginning, e.g. *X+i/-ka phil.yo.ha.ta*. At the same time, it will be useful to provide learners with information about the equivalent usage of the English ‘need’ by presenting it along with *-ul/-lul phil.yo.lo.ha.ta*, i.e. by explaining the difference between *phil.yo.ha.ta* ‘be necessary’ and *phil.yo.lo.ha.ta* ‘need’.

### Descriptive Verb Constructions

Another significant trigger for the substitution is related to the use of descriptive adjectives. A descriptive sentence requires a pattern such as ‘S + *-i/-ka* Descriptive Verb’, but some learners interpret the subject nominal not as the subject of the descriptive verb but as the object, thus using the accusative particle instead of the nominative particle. This is primarily because of their lack of knowledge about the concept of case and the basic sentence structure not just in Korean but also in their own language, i.e. English, but it may also be due to a lack of input and training as well. It would be helpful to carry out intensive pattern practice in a meaningful way, for instance, through functional tasks (David Nunan 1996), by using typical patterns of adjective sentences with an ample list of descriptive verbs which are within the range of KFL learning.<sup>7</sup> (12) and (13) below illustrate a couple of typical patterns.

#### (12) X+*-i/-ka* Descriptive Verb

- a. *nal.ssi.ka may.wu chwu.we.yo.* (weather: ‘be cold’)  
 ‘(lit.) The weather is very cold.’
- b. *Hak.ki.mal si.hem.i a.cwu e.lye.wess.e.yo.* (examination: ‘be difficult’)  
 ‘The end-of-semester examination was very difficult.’

#### (13) X+*-i/-ka* Y+*-po.ta (te)* Descriptive Verb

- a. *Swu.ci.ka Mi.swu.po.ta te yey.ppe.yo.*  
 ‘Swuci is prettier than Miswu.’
- b. *Han.kwuk.i ho.cwu.po.ta hwel.ssin cak.ta.*  
 ‘Korea is much smaller than Australia.’

When descriptive verbs are presented to students, it is desirable that they are presented intact with the nominative particle as in *-i/-ka tep.ta*, *-i/-ka coh.ta* and *-i/-ka e.lyep.ta*, stressing that the subject, as the subject of the sentence and the descriptive verb, should be marked not by the accusative particle but by the nominative particle.

<sup>7</sup> For descriptive verbs, I have surveyed the Korean Learner’s Dictionary (Seo Sang-Kyu et al. 2004) and identified more than 170 “commonly important” descriptive verbs among the “Important Vocabulary List” which covers about 3000 entries selected as “commonly important vocabulary” out of 26 kinds of KFL textbooks and vocabulary lists.



## Sensory Verb Constructions

In Korean, there are a good number of sensory (or psychoemotive) adjectival verbs which denote the speaker's emotion or sensation in declaratives and the hearer's in interrogatives. What matters here in relation to the erroneous substitutions of the nominative particle by the accusative particle is that while some words are intransitive, e.g. *sim.sim.ha.ta* 'be bored', some other sensory adjectives are "always used as transitive" (Sohn Ho-Min 1999: 285), e.g. *mip.ta* 'be hateful, hate', *pwu.lep.ta* 'be envious, envy', *silh.ta* 'be disagreeable, dislike' and *coh.ta*, be good, like' or used as both intransitive and transitive, e.g. *sul.phu.ta* 'be sad, feel sad' and *mwu.sep.ta* 'be scary, fear'. As transitives, these sensory words appear to need the accusative particle for the object, but in transitive constructions the object is in the nominative case with those sensory adjectives (Sohn Ho-Min *ibid.*, p.383). This is where many English L1-KFL learners are confused and produce substitution errors. In a typical sentence pattern the subject (the speaker or the hearer) is marked by the topic particle and the object by the nominative particle instead of the accusative particle. Observe the following examples.

- (14) X+-*un/nun* Y+-*i/ka* Transitive Sensory Adj.
- Na.nun Min.swu.ka pwu.lep.ta.*  
'I envy Minswu.'
  - Na.nun ku swuk.cey.ka silh.e.yo.*  
'I dislike the homework.'
  - Ne.nun kay.ka mwu.sep.ni?*  
'Do you fear a dog?'
  - Ne.nun ku sa.lam.uy cwuk.um.i ku.leh.key sul.phu.ni?*  
'Do you feel sad about his death that much?'

Along with the emphasis on the use of the nominative particle in the accusative case with adjectival verbs, it is necessary to provide learners with grammatical explanations about how to express someone else's emotions as well by giving the auxiliary construction *-e/a ha.ta* 'show signs of ...', which makes a sensory adjectival verb from its corresponding transitive verb, e.g. *mi.we.ha.ta* 'hate', *pwu.le.we.ha.ta* 'envy', *silh.e.ha.ta* 'dislike' and *coh.a.ha.ta* 'like'. In these transitive verb constructions, the object is in the accusative particle, and it is important for learners to learn this comparative usage by using the typical construction patterns, as shown in (15).

- (15) a. X+-*un/nun* Y+-*i/-ka* Transitive Adjectival verb.
- mip.ta* 'be hateful, hate'  
*pwu.lep.ta* 'be envious, envy'  
*silh.ta* 'be disagreeable, dislike'  
*coh.ta* 'be good, like', etc.
- b. X+-*un/nun* Y+-*ul/-lul* Transitive Verb.
- mi.we.ha.ta* 'hate'  
*pwu.le.we.ha.ta* 'envy'  
*silh.e.ha.ta*, 'dislike'  
*coh.a.ha.ta* 'like', etc.

Along with these common sensory words, it is also necessary to provide learners with an explanation of the usage of a special transitive sensory adjectival verb, i.e. *siph.ta* 'be desirable, wish'. As a bound adjectival verb, this desiderative adjectival verb must be preceded by the nominaliser suffix *-ko* to form a verb clause, which is the object of the adjectival verb, e.g. *sa.ko siph.ta* 'wish to buy', *mek.ko siph.ta* 'wish to eat' and *ka.ko siph.ta* 'wish to go'. When transitive verbs such as *sa.ta* 'buy' and *mek.ta* 'eat' are used, the object of such a verb is marked by either the nominative particle or the accusative particle, with more fluency by the nominative particle probably due to the influence of the main predicate '*siph.ta*' being stronger than the local embedded transitive verb. When *sip.eo.ha.da*, the corresponding verb form of *siph.ta*, is used to express someone else's desire or wish, the object always takes the accusative particle as for the other sensory verbs mentioned above. Observe the following examples.

- (16) a. *Na.nun o.nul cem.sim.ey ppang.i/ul mek.ko siph.ta.*  
 'I would like to eat bread for lunch today.'
- b. *Nam.tong.sayng.i say.cha.lul (\*ka) sa.ko siph.e.hay.yo.*  
 'My younger brother wants to buy a new car.'

For reinforcement and remedial purposes, I have searched transitive sensory adjectival verbs in the *Korean Learner's Dictionary* (Seo Sang-Kyu et al. 2004) and have not found very many, but a sufficient number to utilize. The adjectival verbs listed in (17) are almost all the transitive sensory adjectives that are found in the dictionary.

- |      |                           |                          |                          |                            |
|------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| (17) | <i>kek.ceng.su.lep.ta</i> | 'feel uneasy, worry'     | <i>ko.map.ta</i>         | 'be thankful, thank'       |
|      | <i>ku.lip.ta</i>          | 'be missed, miss'        | <i>twu.lyep.ta</i>       | 'be afraid, fear'          |
|      | <i>pwul.ssang.ha.ta</i>   | 'be pitiful'             | <i>ma.um.ey iss.ta</i>   | 'be in one's mind'         |
|      | <i>ma.um.ey eps.ta</i>    | 'be not in one's mind'   | <i>mip.ta</i>            | 'be hateful, hate'         |
|      | <i>mwu.sep.ta</i>         | 'be scary, fear'         | <i>pwu.lep.ta</i>        | 'be envious, envy'         |
|      | <i>sa.lang.su.lep.ta</i>  | 'be lovable'             | <i>sep.sep.ha.ta</i>     | 'feel sorry, regret'       |
|      | <i>so.cwung.ha.ta</i>     | 'be valuable, value'     | <i>silh.ta</i>           | 'be disagreeable, dislike' |
|      | <i>a.kkap.ta</i>          | 'be regrettable, regret' | <i>ca.lang.su.lep.ta</i> | 'be proud', boast          |
|      | <i>co.sim.su.lep.ta</i>   | 'feel cautious'          | <i>coh.ta</i>            | 'be good, like'            |

### Copular Negative Verb

Copular sentences take a complement, and copulative complements are usually nominals, thus forming double nominative constructions such as 'Subject (nominal) + Complement (nominal) + Copular'. What is important here in relation to the use of the nominative particle is that in negative sentences the nominal complement takes the nominative case, thus forming the negative predicate *-i/-ka a.ni.ta* 'be not'. Unlike in positive sentences where the nominal complement is unmarked, this provides learners with a source for the erroneous substitution of the nominative particle. There are at least two reasons for this. One is that some KFL learners wrongly perceive the nominal complement as the object of *a.ni.ta* 'be not', and the other is that students mistakenly assume that the nominal which occurs after the subject nominal is the object of the sentence. It is necessary to explain to learners that the copula *i.ta* or its negative counterpart *a.ni.ta* (derived from *an* 'not' + *i.ta*), which inflects in the same way as adjectival verbs do, is supposed to take the nominative or topic particle with the complement nominal, although covert or unmarked in positive sentences. It is also important to remind them that the referent of *a.ni.ta* is not an object but a complement, thus unable to take the accusative particle or replace the nominative particle with the

accusative particle. Learners should be reinforced with typical sentence patterns such as the one shown in (18).

- (18) X +*-un/nun/i/ka* Complement +*-i/ka* + *a.ni.ta*.
- Ce.ki ce sa.lam.un han.kwuk sa.lam.i a.ni.ey.yo.*  
'That person over there is not a Korean.'
  - Ol.lim.phik.un tan.swun.hi su.pho.chu.ka.a.ni.ta.*  
'Olympic Games are not simply a sporting event.'

### Intransitive Sentence Constructions

Intransitive verbs provide another trigger for the erroneous nominative-by-accusative substitution. As for descriptive adjectives, some learners wrongly perceive the subject nominal to be the object of the intransitive verb. This is primarily due to a lack of understanding of the basic sentence structure, Subject + Intransitive Verb, as in *kkoch.i phin.ta* 'A flower is blooming' and *ca.tong.cha.ka tal.lin.ta* 'A car is running', but it also seems to involve some kind of psychological illusion that sees the subject as the object of an act of happening, for example, a flower as the object of an act of blooming and a car as the object of an act of running. This kind of confusion often occurs in sentence types such as 'Subject + Descriptive Verb' and 'Subject + Intransitive Verb' that do not need an object, unlike in a transitive sentence such as 'Subject + Object + Transitive Action Verb' sentence type. It is necessary to remind learners that a subject nominal requires the nominative particle and that it cannot be an object of a predicate, accordingly unable to give the accusative particle to the subject. At the same time, it is also necessary to provide learners with information about what kind of verbs make it possible to form an intransitive sentence and in what intransitive sentence patterns those verbs are used.

Intransitive sentences are formed with various types of intransitive verbs such as locomotive verbs (e.g. *ka.ta* 'go', *o.ta* 'come'); inchoative verbs (e.g. *toy.ta* 'become', *ci.ta* 'get, become'); processive verbs (e.g. *na.ta* 'happen, appear', *tul.ta* 'suffer from'); passive verbs (e.g. *mek.hi.ta* 'be eaten', *tul.li.ta* 'be heard'); reciprocal verbs (e.g. *kyel.hon.ha.ta* 'marry', *ssa.wu.ta* 'fight') and common verbs (e.g. *ca.ta* 'sleep', *nol.ta* 'play').<sup>8</sup> It may be necessary to carry out some structured input exercises before undertaking a class activity involving intransitive sentence patterns which consist of these intransitive verbs, emphasising the use of the nominative particle for the subject. In the following, I shall discuss some typical intransitive sentence patterns in particular in relation to the nominative-by-accusative substitution.

### Inchoative and Processive Verbs

One of the most significant grammatical items that trigger the erroneous substitutions of the nominative particle comes from inchoative verbs such as *toy.ta* 'become', *ci.ta* 'get, become' and processive verbs such as *na.ta* 'happen, occur' and *tul.ta* 'enter, suffer from'. The complement nouns of these verbs are in the nominative case and what is more important is that inchoative sentences consisting of the inchoative verb *toy.ta* and processive sentences occur with two nominative cases. In inchoative sentences both a subject noun and a complement noun are in the nominative case, and in processive sentences also, both a subject (an experiencer) and a complement (a theme) are in the nominative case, as in (19).

- (19) a. *Cey o.ppa.ka ku hak.kyo.uy sen.sayng.nim.i toy.ess.e.yo.*  
'My elder brother became a teacher of that school.'

---

<sup>8</sup> Such classification is used in Sohn Ho-Min (1999).

- b. *Wu.li em.ma.ka hwa.ka mah.i nass.e.*  
‘My mom has got angry a lot.’
- c. *E.cej hal.me.ni.ka kam.ki.ka tu.syess.e.yo.*  
‘Grandma caught flu yesterday.’

In (19a), (19b) and (19c) also, learners tend to treat the complement nouns, i.e. *sen.sayng.nim* ‘teacher’, *hwa* ‘anger’, and *kam.ki* ‘flu’ as the object of the sentence and the object of *toy.ta*, ‘become’, *na.ta*, ‘occur’ and *tul.ta* ‘suffer from’, thus using the accusative particle instead of the nominative particle. Moreover, learners are generally accustomed to there being one nominative case in a sentence and thus get confused with the requirement of two nominative cases, which seems to lead them to use the accusative particle in the second (i.e. complement) noun that is wrongly assumed as an object. It is important to provide the learners with typical sentence patterns of these inchoative and processive sentences, highlighting the nominative case particles and stressing the use of an accusative particle being ungrammatical.

- (20) a. Subject+*-i/-ka* DVS+*-e/-a+ci.ta*. (‘get, become’)
- b. Subject+*-i/-ka* Complement Noun+*-i/-ka toy.ta*. (‘become’)
- c. Subject+*-i/-ka* Theme Noun+*-i/-ka na.ta*. (‘happen, occur’)
- d. Subject+*-i/-ka* Theme Noun+*-i/-ka tul.ta*. (‘enter, suffer from’)

Usually *ci.ta* ‘get, become’ is used as an auxiliary verb and most productively with the infinitive suffix *-e/-a*, as in (20a) above, thus forming a complement construction *-e/-a ci.ta* e.g. *coh.a.ci.ta*, ‘get better’, *na.ppa.ci.ta*, ‘become worse’, etc. Typical matches of *ci.ta* can be categorised like this: 1) Combined with adjectival verbs, e.g. *ki.pwun.i – coh.a.ci.ta* ‘feelings – get better’, *pam.i – ccalp.a.ci.ta* ‘night – become shorter’, *nac.i – kil.e.ci.ta* ‘daytime – become longer’ and *na.ssi.ka – chwu.we.ci.ta* ‘weather – become colder’; 2) Combined with intransitive or passive verbs, e.g. *mwun.i – yel.lye.ci.ta* ‘door – be opened’, *sang.hwang.i – pa.kkwi.e.ci.ta* ‘situations – be/become changed’, *ka.pang.i – noh.ye.ci.ta* ‘bag – be placed’ and *sil.ma.li.ka – po.ye.ci.ta* ‘clue – be seen’, and 3) Combined with transitive verbs, e.g. *kwu.twu.ka – takk.a.ci.ta* ‘shoes – get cleaned’, *wu.san.i – phye.ci.ta* ‘umbrella – get open (unfolded)’ and *os.i – kay.e.ci.ta* ‘clothes – get folded’.

The primary meaning of *toy.ta* is similar to that of *ci.ta*, which is ‘become, get to be’, but it is used in a very wide range of contexts with specific meanings, as shown in (21). It is important for the learners to understand how its equivalent is expressed in English, and such knowledge will be helpful in consolidating the complement constructions in which the nominal is the complement of the inchoative verb, not only in Korean, but also in English in nearly all contexts. Students should be reminded often that the complement word should not be treated as an object by giving the accusative particle.

- (21) a. *In.swu.ka pwu.ca.ka toy.ess.ta*. ‘Inswu became a rich man.’
- b. *Nay.ka pel.sse swu.mwu.sal.i toyn.ta*. ‘I am turning 20 already.’
- c. *Mwul.i swu.cung.ki.ka toy.ess.ta*. ‘Water turned into vapour.’
- d. *Kil.i.ka 100 mi.the.ka toyn.ta*. ‘The length measures 10 meters.’
- e. *Ku.uy mal.i ke.cis.mal.i toy.ess.ta*. ‘His words turned out to be a lie.’
- f. *Um.sik.i ton.i toyn.ta*. ‘Food succeeds in getting money.’
- g. *Ywun.swu.ka haym.lis.i toyn.ta*. ‘Yunswu acts as Hamlet.’

h. *Ku.ka nay co.kha.ka.toyn.ta.* ‘He stands to me in the relation of nephew.’

In the meantime, *na.ta* ‘appear, happen, occur’ and *tul.ta* ‘enter, suffer from, appeal’ are also used in wide contexts with typical sentence constructions such as the one with nominative-nominative cases, as shown above, and the construction with dative/locative-nominative cases as shown in (22) or the construction with nominative-dative/locative cases as in (23).

- (22) a. *Nwun wi.ey pal.ca.kwuk.i nass.ta*  
‘There left footsteps on snow.’
- b. *Cha.ey.se i.sang.han so.li.ka nan.ta.*  
‘A strange sound came out of the car.’
- c. *Ku nam.ca han.they.se naym.sae.ka nan.ta.*  
‘It smells (lit. a smell comes) from the man.’
- (23) a. *Swu.ho.ka ca.cwu ci.kak.hay.se sen.sayng.nim nwun.ey nass.e.yo.*  
‘Swuho got out of the teacher’s favour because he was often late.’
- b. *I kkoch.i ma.um.ey tun.ta.*  
‘This flower appeals to me (lit. my mind).’

Some complement constructions require dative or locative cases in idiomatic expressions such as *nwun.ey nata* ‘get out of one’s favour’ and *ma.um.ey tul.ta* ‘appeal to one’s mind’ but *na.ta* and *tul.ta* are used most productively with the nominative case. For pedagogical utilisation, some typical matches of *na.ta* and *tul.ta* are listed in the following.<sup>9</sup>

- (24) a. N+-i/ka *na.ta* (‘appear, happen, occur’):

<i>phwul.i – na.ta</i>	‘grass – sprout’	<i>yen.ki.ka – na.ta</i>	‘smoke – break out’
<i>so.li.ka – na.ta</i>	‘sound – come out’	<i>ki.chim.i – na.ta</i>	‘cough – develop’
<i>so.mwun.i – na.ta</i>	‘rumour – spread’	<i>cay.mi.ka – na.ta</i>	‘interest – grow’
<i>hwa.ka – na.ta</i>	‘angry – get’	<i>nwun.mwul.i – na.ta</i>	‘tears – flow’
<i>thi.ka – na.ta</i>	‘look/style – have’	<i>ca.kwuk.i – na.ta</i>	‘trace – leave’
<i>kil.i – na.ta</i>	‘road – be opened’	<i>ca.li.ka – na.ta</i>	‘seat/job – open up’

- b. N+-i/ka *tul.ta* (‘enter, appeal, suffer from’):

<i>son.nim.i – tul.ta</i>	‘guest – have’	<i>ceng.sin.i – tul.ta</i>	‘one’s sense – come into’
<i>hays.pich.i – tul.ta</i>	‘sunshine – get’	<i>kam.ki.ka – tul.ta</i>	‘cold – catch’
<i>cam.i – tul.ta</i>	‘sleep – go to’	<i>mwul.i – tul.ta</i>	‘colour – take /dye’
<i>sel.thang.i – tul.ta</i>	‘sugar – contain’	<i>pi.yong.i – tul.ta</i>	‘expense – involve’

<sup>9</sup> The examples have been selected from Seo Sang-Kyu et al. (2004).

## Passive Verb Constructions

A passive verb in a passive sentence also plays a role as a triggering factor for the substitution of the nominative particle by the accusative particle. In passive sentences where a passive verb occurs with a 'patient'/goal subject in the nominative case and the 'patient'/goal subject is 'targeted' by the 'agent' nominal which is marked by *ey.key* or *han.they* meaning 'by' in English in this context, some learners tend to wrongly perceive the 'patient'/goal as the 'target' i.e. object of the 'agent' or the agent's action rather than as the subject of the sentence. This seems to be due to a certain psychological confusion but it has also something to do with the active (transitive) counterparts where the 'agent' nominal functions as the subject and the 'patient' or goal nominal as the object of the agent's action, thus giving the accusative particle, as illustrated in (25).

- (25) a. Agent Subject+*-i/ka* Patient/Goal Object+*-ul/lul* Active Verb (vt.)  
b. Patient/Goal Subject+*-i/ka* Agent Nominal+*-hanthey/eykey* Passive Verb (vi.)

(Patient/Goal Subject often perceived as the target or goal of the agent by learners)

- a1. *Kyeng.chal.i un.hayng kang.to.lul cap.ass.e.yo.*  
'The policeman caught the bank robber.'  
b1. *Un.hayng kang.to.ka (\*lul) kyeng.chal.han.they cap.hyess.e.yo.*  
'The bank robber was caught by the policeman.'

In (25b1), some learners substitute the nominative case for the accusative case by perceiving the 'patient' subject (robber) as the target or goal of the 'agent' (policeman) or its action, i.e. 'catch'. It seems that this confusion is affected by the active (transitive) constructions where the object (robber) is in the accusative case. It is important, therefore, to remind learners that in intransitive passive sentences in which the 'patient' and the 'agent' are involved, the 'patient' nominal is the subject of the sentence, although it may be the target of the 'agent' action, so that it should be in the nominative case, not the accusative case.

Intransitive passive verbs which can cause similar confusions are found in suffixal passive verbs (e.g. *-i/ka cap.hi.ta* 'be caught' < *-ul/lul cap.ta* 'catch' as shown above), lexical passive verbs (e.g. *-i/ka mac.ta* 'be hit' < *-ul/lul ttay.li.ta* 'hit' and *-i/ka chang.phi.tang.ha.ta* 'be insulted' < *-ul/lul chang.phi.cwu.ta* 'insult'), and phrasal passive verbs consisting of *-e/-a ci.ta* 'become, get to be, turn into' (e.g. *-i/ka math.kye.ci.ta* 'be entrusted' < *math.ki.ta* 'entrust').<sup>10</sup> In Korean, there are quite a large number of suffixal, lexical and phrasal passive verbs which have the 'patient/goal-agent' relation in meaning and syntactic behaviour, and students need to be aware of those verbs that are frequently used or within the range of KFL learning. Instructors need to stress that the subject nominals in such passive construction should not be seen as the target or object of the agent and its action but as the subject of the sentence, thus requiring the nominative particle instead of the accusative particle.

## Common Intransitive and Locomotive Verbs

The common intransitive verbs and locomotive verbs are most widely used in intransitive sentences, and its simplest type consists of a subject and an intransitive verb. There are a large number of common intransitive verbs such as *ku.chi.ta* 'stop, finish', *swi.ta* 'rest', *anc.ta* 'sit', *ca.ta* 'sleep', *ca.la.ta* 'grow' and *cwuk.ta* 'die' and many locomotive verbs such as *ka.ta* 'go', *nal.ta* 'fly', *tal.li.ta* 'run', *o.ta* 'come', and *ci.na.ka.ta* 'pass by', which are all widely used in KFL learning contexts. Learners need to be aware

<sup>10</sup> Passive verbs classified by Sohn Ho-Min (ibid.).

that the ‘experiencer’ who does or shows such actions should not be seen as an object involved in the state or action but as the subject of the sentence. Also, it is necessary to present these verbs to the learners with an appropriate sentence type by emphasising the use of the nominative particle with the subject nominal. Some examples are given in (26) under the simplest sentence type with common intransitive (CI) and locomotive verbs (LV), which can be accompanied by modifiers or adjuncts.

- (26) X+*-i/-ka* CI or LV (+ optional modifiers or adjuncts)
- a. *Ceng.wen.ey kkoch.i manh.i phi.ess.e.yo.* (flower: ‘bloom’)  
‘Flowers are in bloom a lot at the garden.’
  - b. *a.i.tul.i kong.wen.ey.se nol.ko iss.e.yo.* (children: ‘play’)  
‘Children are playing at the park.’
  - c. *E.ce pi.ka manh.i wass.e.yo.* (rain: ‘come’)  
‘(lit.) Rain came a lot yesterday.’
  - d. *a.ppa.ka ci.nan.cwu.ey il.pon.ul ke.chye han.kwuk.ey kass.e.yo.* (dad: ‘go’)  
‘Dad went to Korea by way of Japan last week.’

### Other Sentence Constructions

The nominative-by-accusative substitution also occurs in other sentence constructions such as relative clauses, multiple-subject sentences, quoted clauses, defective nouns and negative *-ci ahn* constructions. In the following, I shall present how these constructions relate to the nominative-by-accusative substitution, with some examples.

#### Relative Clauses

There are two types of relative clauses which are particularly relevant to the nominative-accusative substitutions: relative clauses with the defective noun *kes* ‘thing, fact’ as the head nominal and the fact-S type interrogative relative clause.<sup>11</sup> Relative clauses with the defective noun *kes* are often termed ‘headless relative clauses’ as they behave as if they do not have a head. The problem in such constructions is in the embedded subject that should be in a nominative case, and some learners often perceive the nominal as the direct object of the main verb, placing it in the accusative case, as shown in (27).

- (27) a. \**Na.nun Yong.swu.lul(>ka) hak.kyo.ey ka.nun kes.ul po.ass.ta.*  
‘I saw Yongswu going to school.’
- a’. *Na.nun hak.kyo.ey ka.nun Yong.swu.lul po.ass.ta.*  
‘I saw Yongswu who was going to school.’

<sup>11</sup> Sohn Ho-Min (1999: 310) categorises relative clauses into four subtypes: 1) relative clauses proper; 2) fact-S type clause; 3) headless relative clause; and 4) coreferent-opaque clause. The fact-S type clause is like the English construction, ‘the fact that ....’ as in ‘the fact that I like the woman’. Shin Kyu--Suk (2003) presents a detailed study of Korean relative clauses and claims that the head-final clause has ‘semantic constraints on the head noun’ and that there is a certain order of difficulty, accordingly an effective order of instruction, in the acquisition of relative clauses.

In (27a), *Yongswu.ka hak.kyo.ey ka.nun* ‘Yongswu going to school’ is the relative clause of the head nominal *kes* which is virtually empty of semantic content, and the whole relative clause, not the nominal *Yongswu* only, is the object of the main verb *poassta*. The relative clause is an embedded sentence in which *Yongswu* is the subject, thus requiring the nominative particle. Some learners, however, perceive the subject of the relative clause (*Yongswu*) as the object of the verb as in (27a’) while constructing a headless relative clause using *kes* or a nominal phrase using the nominaliser *-ki* (e.g. *hak.kyo.ey ka.ki* ‘going to school’), which produces further ungrammaticality. It is necessary for instructors to emphasise the necessity of the nominative particle in the subject of the relative clause, explaining and comparing the two types of relative clause.

Another type of relative clause that is concerned with the nominative substitution relates to the ‘fact-S type’, particularly those in the interrogative clause. Some learners perceive the subject in an embedded interrogative relative clause as the object of the main clause, as shown in (28).

- (28) a. \**Ku sa.lam.ul (>i) nwu.kwun.ci(.lul) mol.la.yo.*  
 ‘(Intended) I don’t know who that person is.’
- b. \**Swu.ho.lul (>ka) en.cey o.nun.ci(.lul) al.a.yo?*  
 ‘(Intended) Do you know when Swuho comes?’

As in (28a) and (28b), learners tend to perceive the embedded subjects ‘that person’ or ‘Swuho’ of the *wh*-clauses as the object of the verb ‘to know’ rather than identifying the whole *wh*-clauses as the object of the verb of the main clause. KFL learners need to distinguish the main clause from its embedded clause in the complex syntactic structure and need to be aware that the subject nominal in the embedded clause should be in the nominative case.

### Multiple-Subject Sentences

Multiple-subject sentences are another construction that provides the source for nominative-accusative substitution. In Korean, there are many types of simple sentences where more than one nominative case appears (Park Byung-Soo 1982; Sohn Ho-min 1999). They have the constituent structure where the NP plays a role, not as a subject of a predicate verb or adjective, but as a sentential subject taking the remaining whole sentence as its predicate, and the following nominative-marked nominal is again the sentential subject of the remaining sentence, as shown in (29).

- (29) a. *Cin.ho.ka hye.ka ccalp.a.yo.*  
 ‘Cinho has a short tongue.’
- b. *Cey nwu.na.ka khi.ka 190cm.ka toy.yo.*  
 ‘My elder sister is 190cm tall.’
- c. *Ku yang.mal.i han.ccak.i aph pwu.pwun.i kwu.meng.i nass.e.yo.*  
 ‘The front part of a pair of the socks has a hole.’

As observed in the above examples, the nominative-marked nominals cannot be in the accusative case. *Cinho* in (29a), *nwuna* ‘elder sister’ in (29b) and *yangmal* ‘socks’ in (29c) need the nominative particle since they are there as sentential subjects of the following sentences, and *hye* ‘tongue’, *khi* ‘one’s height’ and *hanccak* ‘a pair’, respectively, also need the nominative particle as the sentential topics or subjects of the remaining sentences. In this way the sentential topic or subject of the remaining sentence is stacked, so is the nominative particle. Due to the nature of such sentence constructions, these kinds of multiple



nominative constructions usually come with intransitive verbs which were discussed earlier. In KFL settings, learners should be given sufficient explanations about these multiple-subject constructions, the necessity of the nominative particle and the function, such as possession, location and stage-setting which is implied in the particle connecting a topic nominal and the following nominal.

### Defective Noun Constructions

Use of defective nouns also provides the source of nominative-accusative substitutions. There are a large number of defective nouns such as *ci* 'since', *ci* 'whether', *swu* 'possibility, ability', *li* 'good reason', *pep* 'good reason', *kes* 'fact, thing' and *tus* 'as if', and these defective nouns are used with the nominative particle, typically in such constructions as existential *iss.ta*, *eps.ta* 'exist, do not exist', inchoative *toy.ta* 'become', and negative adjectival VS + *-ci anh*. Observe the following examples.

- (30) a. *Ku sa.lam.ul man.nan ci.ka 5.nyen.i toy.ess.ta.*  
'It has been 5 years since (I) met him.'
- b. *Ku.uy kang.uy.lul i.hay.hal swu.ka eps.ta.*  
'I can't understand his lecture.' (lit. 'There is no possibility...')
- c. *Yong.swu.ka ke.ki.ey kal li.ka eps.ta.*  
[lit.] There is no good reason for Yongswu going there.'
- d. *Ce cang.mi.nun yey.ppu.ci.ka ahn.ta.*  
'That rose is not pretty.'

As noted in the above examples, the defective nouns *ci*, *swu*, *li* and the nominaliser suffix *-ci* must be in the nominative case and cannot be replaced with the accusative case, though in (30d) *-ci* can be acceptable with the accusative particle in a limited manner. These kinds of constructions are similar to the multiple nominative constructions that have been discussed earlier but particular attention needs to be given to the combinations of defective nouns and the nominative particle. As most of the constructions are used as set expressions, it would be more effective if introduced or presented as set phrases, e.g. *-n/un ci.ka ...toy.ta* 'it has been ... since ...', *-(u)l swu.ka eps.ta* 'There is no possibility of ...', *-(u)l li.ka eps.ta* 'There is no good reason for ...', AVS + *-ci.ka ahn.ta* 'be not Adj.'

### Quoted Sentences as a Subject

Nominative-accusative substitutions could also be made when a full sentence is quoted and used as the subject of the sentence. As for normal sentence types, the quotation as the subject should be in the nominative case but some learners tend to perceive it as the object of the complement nominal, partly because of confusions associated with psycholinguistic process, since it is not a single word but a full sentence consisting of usually three or more words, and partly because of insufficient knowledge about such sentence types as copular, adjective and intransitive sentences, as in the following examples.

- (31) a. *Cham.nun.ca.ka i.kin.ta.ka nay cwa.wu.myeng.i.ta.*  
'One who is patient wins' is my favourite motto.'
- b. *Ka.hwun.u.lo hwa.mok.ha.key sal.ca.ka cey.il coh.ta.*  
'Let's live in happiness' is the best as a family precept.'
- c. *Cwuk.nu.nya, sa.nu.nya.ka sayng.kak.nan.ta.*  
'Whether to live or die' occurs to me.'

Thus far, I have tried to show some major grammatical items and constructions that contribute to the substitution of the nominative-by-accusative cases. In the learners' compositions, many of such substitution errors have been found in adjectival verb constructions and some in intransitive constructions, but as their learning progresses further and becomes diverse there is a strong possibility that the substitution can also be caused by less used verbs such as passive and processive, and more complex sentence constructions such as relative clause, multiple-nominative sentences, quotative-subject sentences and defective nouns. In the following I will present some strategies and make some broad suggestions to deal with erroneous constructions.

### Pedagogical Strategies

I shall illustrate how to organise a remedial class and carry out remedial exercises/activities using the linguistic information, with a particular focus on nominative-accusative particles. The instructor may use erroneous constructions produced by a single student or a group of students in class or commonly produced by various groups at different levels. After marking the errors, the instructor notes the main areas of errors that should be dealt with in class, and in this demonstration the main area is the substitution of the nominative particle by the accusative particle in the adjective and descriptive constructions.

The first step for remedial teaching is to demonstrate the errors on a board or screen, with the selected key erroneous parts which show the particle substituted by the accusative particle in bold, as in (32) below.

- (32)
- |                                                                    |                                                                                              |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Kim.chi.lul may.we.yo</i><br>'Kimchi – is hot'                  | <i>Ey.e.khen.ul iss.e.yo.</i><br>'Air conditioner – exists'                                  |
| <i>Mwun.pep.ul e.lye.we.yo.</i><br>'Grammar – is difficult'        | <i>Chey.su.lul yu.sa.ha.ci.man...</i><br>'Chess – is similar, but...'                        |
| <i>Han.kwuk.e.lul e.lyep.ci.man</i><br>'Korean – is difficult but' | <i>Mwun.hwa.lul cay.mi.iss.ki ttay.mwun.ey,</i> etc.<br>'Because the culture is interesting' |

It is desirable or necessary to re-write both the erroneous noun phrase wrongly marked by the accusative particle and its predicate part since the accusative-marked phrase alone does not reveal the error but it becomes clear only when it is contextualised with the predicate. The same is applicable to other types of grammatical errors such as conjunctive errors.

The second step is to demonstrate the correct form and/or methods of construction along with some explanation. In the case of nominative-accusative substitution, it would be effective to demonstrate the correct form along with the accusative-marked phrase accompanying an appropriate dynamic (or action) verb for comparison, as shown in (33).

- (33)
- a. *Kim.chi.ka may.we.yo.* 'Kimchi is spicy'
  - a'. *Kim.chi.lul mek.e.yo.* '(I) eat Kimchi.'
  - b. *Ey.e.khen.i iss.e.yo.* 'There is an air-conditioner.'
  - b'. *Ey.e.khen.ul khye.yo!* 'Turn the air-conditioner on!'
  - c. *Mwun.pep.i e.lye.we.yo.* 'Grammar is difficult.'
  - c'. *Mwun.pep.ul pay.we.yo.* '(I) learn grammar.'

Along with the demonstration of correct forms as above, it is necessary to give explanations about how to construct the correct form and why it is needed in the particular construction.<sup>12</sup> In this exemplary case, it is necessary to explain why the nominative case, instead of the accusative case, is required in the adjective/descriptive constructions. The possible explanations might be that: 1) An adjective construction is different from a transitive construction in that the former does not normally require an object, thus the accusative particle, as its constituent, while the latter does; 2) if a nominal is used as the subject of the sentence, use the subject particle *-i/-ka* instead of the object particle *-ul/-lul*; 3) unless the intention is to contrast the subject with a seen or unseen counterpart or stress it, use the nominative particle *-i/-ka* instead of the topic particle *-un/-nun*; 4) if the predicate that refers to the nominal is an adjective/descriptive (or intransitive) verb, use the nominative particle for the nominal instead of the accusative particle; 5) the accusative particle is normally attached to the object nominal, which is the object of the dynamic or action verb, and thus it is not used in a normal adjective construction which does not require an object; 6) with the existential adjectival verb *iss.ta/eps.ta*, which is interpreted as not only 'there is' (existence/location) but also 'have' (possession) that requires an object in English, use the formula – 'As for X+TOP, Y+NOM exists (*issta*)' to indicate existence, location and possession, unless intended to contrast or stress, in which case the nominative particle is replaced by the topic particle; and 7) in transitive constructions that use transitive sensory adjectival verbs, e.g. *coh.ta* 'like', *pwu.lep.ta* 'envy', *silh.ta* 'dislike', *mip.ta* 'hate' and *mwu.sep.ta* 'fear', the object is not in the accusative case but in the nominative case. There may be more details explaining the necessity of the nominative particle in such constructions and the work could continue in this way with the use of other particles in questions.

At this point of discussion, I shall turn my point to a Korean-oriented English pattern – 'As for X+TOP, Y+NOM Predicate' and demonstrate how the presentation of such pattern would work for the nominative-accusative construction. The reason for this suggestion is to intentionally highlight the subject nominal being located immediately before the predicate so that it can assist English L1 learners in identifying what is normally required (i.e. subject) before the predicate just as in their own language, English. Although some constructions with such a pattern may not be readily used in English, it would be advantageous to maximise such a Korean-oriented English pattern if it is practically and/or grammatically complete. Some examples using the suggested pattern for presentation are listed below.

**Suggested Pattern:** As for X+TOP, Y+NOM Z-predicate

(34) Existential: As for X+TOP, Y+NOM Existential verbs

- a. As for Minswu, a girlfriend exists/does not exist. (Eng: Minswu has a girlfriend.)  
민수는 여자 친구가 있다/없다. Minswunun yeca chinkwuka issta/epsta.
- b. As for Seoul, the population is large. (Eng: There is a large population in Seoul.)  
서울은 인구가 많다. Seoulun inkwuka manhta.

(35) Adjectival: As for X+TOP, Y+NOM Adjectival verbs

- a. As for Swumi, her stature is short. (Eng: Swumi is short in stature.)  
수미는 키가 작다. Swuminun khika cakta.
- b. As for Yongswu, his brain is good. (Eng: Yongswu has a good brain > Yonswu is smart.)  
용수는 머리가 좋다. Yongswunun melika cohta.
- c. As for fruit, apples are tasty. (Eng: Among the fruit, apples are tastier.)  
과일은 사과가 맛있다. Kwailun sakwaka masissta.

- (36) Sensory (psychoemotive): As for X+TOP, Y+NOM Sensory Verbs
- a. As for me, cold weather is favourable. (Eng: I like a cold weather.)  
나는 추운 날씨**가** 좋다. Nanun chwuwun nalssika cohta.
  - b. As for me, summer is hateful/unpleasant. (Eng: I hate summer.)  
나는 여름**이** 싫다. Nanun yelumi silhta.
- (37) ‘Necessity’: As for X+TOP, Y+NOM Necessity verbs (be needed/necessary).
- a. As for Minci, a friend is needed. (Eng: Minci needs a friend.)  
민지는 친구**가** 필요하다. Mincinun chinkwuka philyohata.
  - b. In Campsie, English is not needed. (Eng: You don’t need (to speak) English in Campsie.)  
캠시에서는 영어**가** 필요없다. Campsie-eysenun yengeka philyoepsta.
- (38) Processive: As for X+TOP, Y+NOM Processive verbs
- a. As for my computer, a breakdown has occurred. (Eng: My computer is broken.)  
내 컴퓨터**가**(는) 고장**이** 났다. Nay kemphyuthe(computer)-ka kochangi nassta.
  - b. To Swumi, a problem has arisen. (Eng: Swumi has a problem.)  
(수미에게) 문제**가** 생겼다. (Swumieykey) mwunceyka sayngkyessta.

The suggested pattern, however, does not work with some problematic constructions such as copular negative sentences (e.g. \*As for John, an American is not.) and inchoative sentences (e.g. \*As for Susie, a teacher has become.), so some discretionary latitude should be exercised in utilising the pattern for presentation of the problematic constructions in English-speaking KFL settings.

### Conclusion

In conclusion, there seems to be three reasons for the frequent nominative-by-accusative substitutions: insufficient basic knowledge about sentence constructions (e.g. distinction between object and complement), interference from English (e.g. necessity construction - ‘need’), and insufficient or inappropriate instructional input (e.g. transitive sensory adjective constructions). While emphasizing the necessity of the nominative case, it is important and in some cases necessary: 1) to train learners by utilising types of sentence constructions, particularly adjectival verb and intransitive constructions, with linguistic comparison of their L1 (i.e. English) and their target language (i.e. Korean); 2) to give them explanations about the usage of some characteristic verbs (e.g. *iss.ta* ‘to exist’, *coh.ta* ‘be good’, *phil.yo.ha.ta* ‘be needed/necessary’) and grammatical features (e.g. multiple-subject constructions) in Korean; 3) to introduce the characteristic verbs as they are marked by the nominative case as if they are a set expression (e.g. X+*-i/ka phil.yo.ha.ta*) or by matching them with nominative-marked nominals (e.g. *ki.pwun.i – coh.ta* ‘feeling/mood – be good’); and 4) to train learners by using, where possible, a formal and complete sentence that requires the use of the nominative case, rather than a casual talk where the message (i.e. meaning) is important, thus overlooking the deletion or avoidance of the nominative and other case particles. KFL learners need to be given effective strategies to learn the function of the sentence constituents and their syntactic relation with co-occurring elements, thereby assisting them to apply the concepts and grammatical operations to the learning of Korean.

## References

- Bang, Seong-Won (2005). Mwunpep kyo haksupuy nayyongkwa pangpep (Teaching of grammar: content and methods). In IAKLE (ed.) *Hankwukekyoyuklon* (KFL teaching methodology) Vol. 2.
- Corder, S. Peter (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, Rod (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- James, Carl (1998). *Errors in language learning and use*. London: Longman.
- Kim, Chung-Sook & Ki-Chun Nam (2002). An analysis of error in using Korean particles by natives speakers of English. *Journal of Korean Language Education*, Vol. 13, No.1: 27-45.
- Kim, Namkil (2002). The importance of grammar in Korean language teaching. *Teaching Korean as a foreign language*, Vol 27: 119-139.
- King, Ross (2005). Korean grammar education for Anglophone learners: Missionary beginnings. In IAKLE (ed.) *Hankwukekyoyuklon* (KFL teaching methodology) Vol. 2.
- Kirkpatrick, Andy (1995). Learning Asian languages in Australia: which languages and when?. *Babel*, Vol. 30, No. 1: 4-29.
- Krashen, Stephen D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.
- Lee, Jung-Hee (2003). *Hankwuke haksupcauy olyu yenkwu* (A study on errors produced by KFL learners). Seoul: Pakiceng
- Lee, Jee-Young (1996). *Hankwuke cosaury kyoswu mohyeng* (A teaching model of Korean particles). Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Sangmyung University, Seoul.
- Long, Michael H. (1991). Focus on form: a design feature in language teaching methodology in de Bot et al. (eds.) (1991). *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- NAKL (The National Academy of the Korean Language 2005a). *Oykwukinul wihan hankwuke mwunpep* (Korean grammar for foreigners), Vol. 1. Seoul: Communication Books.
- Nunan, David (1991). *Language teaching methodology: a textbook for teachers*. Prentice Hall International.
- Nunan, David (1996). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Paik, Pong-Ja (2001). Oykwukeloseuy hankwuke kyoyukmwunpep (Instructional grammar in Korean as a foreign language). *Journal of Korean Language Education* 12-2. International Association for Korean Language Education.
- Park, Byung-Soo (1982). The double subject construction revisited. In The Linguistic Society of Korea (ed.) *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*, Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co.
- Pienemann, Manfred (1986). Is language teachable? Psychological experiments and hypotheses. *Australian working papers in language development*. Vol.1, No. 3.
- Richards, Jack C. (eds.). (1974). *Error analysis: Perspectives on second language acquisition*. London: Longman.
- Seo, Sang-Kyu et al. (2004). *Korean Learner's Dictionary*. Seoul: Ministry of Culture and Tourism.
- Shin, Kyu-Suk (1995). Problems in learning Korean by beginners: an error analysis. *Korea Observer*, Vol. 16, No. 4: 503-528.
- Shin, Kyu-Suk (2003). Characteristics of the relative clause in Korean and the problems second language learners experience in acquiring the relative clause. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Curtin University of Technology.
- Shin, Seong-Chul. (2006). High frequency errors in KFL and pedagogical strategies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of New South Wales.
- Sohn, Ho-Min. (1986). Patterns of American students' composition errors in Korean. *Linguistic expeditions*. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co. 487-528.
- Sohn, Ho-Min. (1999). *The Korean language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Stenson, Nancy (1974). Induced errors. In Robinett, B. and J. Schachter (eds.). (1983). *Second language learning: contrastive analysis, error analysis and related aspects*.