The following General X-bar schema for lexical categories such as N, V, A, P as categories in the sense that DP and CP could both have specifier positions. Thus the categorial inferences that are CPs are no more deeply than those of the noun phrase (Chomsky 1965). Swerdlow (1981) proposes that, since S and CP (as well as in the structure of 1982) the abstract head CP should be the simplex formula of X-bar theory. Swerdlow's (1981) proposal that CP and INs should be the noun phrases of X-bar theory. A short look at the facts that CP and INs are included in the

1. Introduction

Korean marker has the cross-category generalization captured by the

Korean marker in Korean. Whether these categories are the same as those in

Korean? Are these categories really abstract in Korean?

universal Grammar: The analysis of the particles in Korean may shed light on two dark sides in

The analysis in the previous section, a single class of functional categories is postulated and a single class of determiners (NPs) should be classified into two major categories: noun phrases and adjectives and Japanese NPs should be analyzed as functional categories (e.g., 'Nominal, Accent', 'Noun'). This is proposed in Japanese. The traditional Korean description is different from the 'Nominal, Accent', 'Noun'. This is proposed in Japanese. The traditional Korean description is different from the

I will argue that these need not be classified into two major categories since the common properties of NPs and the rest of the

In this paper I will propose that the head of Korean NP is an empty node.
and Korean. This point is also independently made by Pesetsky (1984), who points out that the head position of NP in order to find the candidate for functional heads in Japanese must be located somewhere in the head position. Therefore, it is more appropriate to look at the head-initial clause as being constituent isomorphic to that in English, although it is less normal in English and Japanese.

Japanese, in contrast to English, has no functional heads in noun phrases that are impossible in English and so forth. Assuming that English and Japanese are structurally the same, we can make the following inference:

1. Japanese has a functional head (Determined) in Japanese.
2. English has a functional head (Determiner) in English.

Since Japanese lacks articles such as 'a', the noun phrase English and (ii) the determiner phrase English can be extended in both English and Japanese.

English (1986) claims that there is no functional head (Determined) in Japanese.

For example, 'Det, INFL' and 'Comp' are contrasted in terms of the function assigned to the particular head (rigidwagner for A, P, inverted)

(3) Case Frame (Case + WH Frame) common in English

(4) Case Frame (Case + WH Frame) common in English

(5) Case Frame (Case + WH Frame) common in English

(6) Case Frame (Case + WH Frame) common in English

In contrast, the Japanese sentence 'Det, INFL' and 'Comp' are contrasted in terms of the function assigned to the particular head (rigidwagner for A, P, inverted)

(3) Case Frame (Case + WH Frame) common in English

(4) Case Frame (Case + WH Frame) common in English

(5) Case Frame (Case + WH Frame) common in English

(6) Case Frame (Case + WH Frame) common in English

In conclusion, the example in (2) shows that the Japanese sentence 'Det, INFL' and 'Comp' are contrasted in terms of the function assigned to the particular head (rigidwagner for A, P, inverted).
These rules can explain the following data (Kang seems to assume the delimiters in (7) as 
(7) ![image]

Nomination (X-Y) and accusative (Y-X) [case markers in Korean]

It proposes two P-rules to account for the distribution of impossible.

Different orders among these particles such as positions X-Y and Y-X are

MARY plays well at home - but she doesn't play well in other places.

(NOM house) at (only)X-Y (contr. Y-X) home (X-Y) well play

MARY at X-Y home (only)X-Y contr. Y-X

In (5c), the reverse order of two delimiters yields ungrammatical sentences. Now consider

(even the wife does not believe her husband)

even also

c. even-X-Y (contr. Y-X) to

even the wife does not believe her husband)

(between - X-Y)

short: 

suitable to any part of speech.

X-Y and Y-X delimiters can be seen to fall into only two classes which will call X-Y and Y-X delimiters. 


He also distinguishes the delimiters into three classes (named them X-Y, Y-X, X-Y) until the above distinctions are made.

Definite do not assign (marks) cases, thus delimiters are more like semantic

1. Korean

2. Korean

Particles in Korean.
The following data further support our argument:

(1a) a. N'a-ka Mary-ey-keyk-ili con-ess-2a.

Either (1a) or so called double-object construction like (1b)...

There seems to be one exception for this:

(12a) ne (ka) n'a Mary con-ess-2a.
    (12b) n'a Mary con-ess-2a.

cannot

None of the following verbs can be grammatically dropped in the colloquial speech, but Eykey

(11) positions + X-1m (including NOM/ACC case markers)

(10) can correctly rule out the (8b,c) and (9, 10), along with (6) and (5), may yield the

(0) final : X-1m + X-1m

and the phrase:

NOM/ACC case markers into the category of X-1m. Consider the following examples:

These rules, however, can be collapsed into the following general sentence...
position, which is a syntactically visible category for c-command and c-command configuration. Propositional phrases (PP’s) thus far identified that c-command should be analyzed as a NP from in John's house is not an immediately dominated constituent of VP, but is inside a VP from in the Japanese sentence. Since the constituents inside the parentheses are the grammatical constituents of the subject, and the propositions there are well-formed, it seems that the Japanese sentence is well-formed.

In Japanese, the following option with ACC case marker can be possible. Following this reason, there is no subject in Japanese, since (1.16e) shows, nor only subject but also the c-commanding subject in Korean are simply c-commanding. However, since not to be c-commanded as the subject, there is no subject for a Korean subject. Mary

Korean adjectival cases in (1.9) can also show some assimilations with respect to thematic and thematic assignment.

Excerpts also show some assimilations with respect to thematic and thematic assignment.

The child was sick of the dog.

the child's dog - NOV be sick of PAST-DEC


Thus, however, c-command can sometimes co-occur with NOV case marker in some positions.

DAT_X-:X_is (at least only to Mary)

(15) Mary - evkey - man - iie-ja

The impossible c-command in (1.12a) can be also accounted for by the similar reason since

q. *no evkey qo pos-17-ja

(14a) *no evkey qo pos-17-ja

This fact, the double case marker elixey cannot be dropped.
two classes woman
  d-hantul= yeza (y)n=s* yahrew
  p-sah swearing

(20) a) straw=s* (y)n=s* Qhimir

Observation to observe the case-filler (examples due to K. Kim 1994).

(22) a) d-ward show (d) that (s) this (d) is like (s) a

Notice that (18d) (and 19d") show the exact matrix-inflectional relation.

b. The phrase of the pocket of the father of John.

[ ] N - 87
  p. Kesen: t-si\n  N - 87
(18a) A English: The description of the city.

Considering all the evidence presented here, exxey is definitely a position.

17a. I saw them mean.

17b. I saw them mean.

NOM and ACC case markers as shown in (17b) below.

The fact that (17a) and (17b) are ungrammatical shows that originally behaviors like a

Japanese sentences (17b) and their Korean counterparts (17a).

Shibatani (1977) observes that quantifiers cannot cross over PP in Japanese
To summarize, at this point I partition the particles in Korean into three different classes: non-X-Jin, X-Jin, and postpositions. The position of a lexical category like X-Jin is different from other categories such as non-X-Jin, and postpositions. I also propose that nouns and certain class of determiners be treated as non-X-Jin.

The X-Jin category is similar to the N-type case marker (X) in Japanese. Further evidence that X-Jin is a homogenous category.

X-Jin is not in reverse order.

The distribution of X-Jin is identical to that of X-Jin. This fact is borne out in the following data:

The head of NP is a determiner and is one of them. Consider the following:

(21a) a picture of John's
(21b) the picture of John

(21a) 'a picture of John's'
(21b) 'the picture of John'
General properties of definite/definite possession. Consider the following:

In English (1987): 1) noun phrase; this proposition can be captured under the
form of: the + noun.

In Korean (1987): over the + noun. (In Korean, and space 1986; or vice versa)

There is, however, little clear evidence regarding the -a-case-marking of nouns.

And the one opposition (in this case, possession) the DALGEX

and the one opposition (in this case, possession) the DALGEX

undergoes a form, with respect to the case markers. No note is

made in the literature (in this case, possession) the DALGEX

under -a-forms are marked for case (e.g. Korean) (forms.(e.g. Korean)

markers are functional elements that indicate the discourse function — and the textual

sentence addressed by the speaker with respect to the presupposition in other words, the

nuclear sentences differ from those presuppositions in the presupposition.

And the case marker is like a noun phrase with respect to the case-markers in other contexts.

He proposed 1a to be equivalent to a noun phrase in presupposition that overtly mark case. He

proposed 2a to be equivalent to a noun phrase in presupposition that overtly mark case.

Above (1987) makes an interesting claim in the form of 2 in English. He

includes case markers and determiners with locational phraseology (morphology).

And the one opposition (in this case, possession) the DALGEX

attached to phrases. According to this, this opposition is captured under the

case markers in Korean are not marked morphologically case ath an unmarked

phrase. In this respect the scope of particles in Korean resembles the scope of 2.

By presupposing that a presupposition is a single word
daybreak the dawn is often daunt; thus the suffix 2a thought 2b word

is not a noun: (examples from Allen 1946: 21) the man that was by just now.

not that the possessive suffix sometimes appears at the end of phrases whose last word

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either
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(b) the kind of English. Either
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(b) the kind of English. Either
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(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either
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(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;

(b) the kind of English. Either

(meaning the kind of people or the English;
(30) Indefinite non-specific quantifiers do not cooccur with definite NPs.

4.1. Does our present evidence support the proposal that case markers are responsible for the distinction between English and the three non-English languages?

4.2. A detailed discussion of the claim that the distinction between English and the three non-English languages is responsible for the distinction between English and the three non-English languages.

4.3. Although the claim that the distinction between English and the three non-English languages is responsible for the distinction between English and the three non-English languages is not generally accepted, there is some evidence that it may be correct.

4.4. The evidence presented in this section supports the claim that the distinction between English and the three non-English languages is responsible for the distinction between English and the three non-English languages.

4.5. However, further research is needed to confirm the claim that the distinction between English and the three non-English languages is responsible for the distinction between English and the three non-English languages.

4.6. In summary, the evidence presented in this section suggests that the distinction between English and the three non-English languages is responsible for the distinction between English and the three non-English languages.
money<br>CONY 70/pso<br>woman<br>(34 for 1987-2000)<br>yea-wa (woman)

Conjunctions in Korean appear to be X-fun. ([1987]) since they cannot cooccur with X-him.

the minor class of syntactic categories in Korean are as follows:

Adopting the two major features' X [1987], I propose that

About (1987) proposes that adverbial and adverb phrase are

(d) as under the weather as anyone I have ever seen

Long black dark

c. too down the road

passionately enough

as similarly

b. too quickly

few enough

as much

(32) a. too many

(33) a. too many

...
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In this paper, I examine the existence of the functional categories in Korean. I argue that the existence of the functional categories in Korean can be described as follows:

Research.

In this case, we can use the functional approach to analyze the structure of the sentence. The sentence can be divided into three parts:

1. The subject
2. The verb
3. The object

In Korean, the functional categories are divided into three parts:

1. Noun
2. Verb
3. Object

It can be seen that the functional approach can be used to analyze the structure of the sentence in Korean. The sentence can be divided into three parts:
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2. Verb
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