

The PA/SN Distinction in Korean*

Hye-Kyung Lee
(Ajou University)

Lee, Hye-Kyung, (2005). The PA/SN distinction in Korean. *Language Research* 41(4), 807-827.

This paper explores the so-called PA/SN distinction in Korean and proves that there IS that distinction in Korean. This claim is supported by the fact that the two types of contrastive connection are realized by different kinds of connectives. It is also proved that the relevant connection and connectives are sensitive to different types of implicatures, which is observed in several other languages such as German, Spanish, Japanese and so on. At the same time, this paper demonstrates the versatile nature of the discourse marker *kuntey*, especially in spoken discourse. In doing so, I support that the discourse marker *kuntey* has expanded its functions and that it shows differences from similar connectives in other languages.

Key words: PA/SN distinction, contrast, implicatures, connectives, discourse markers

1. Introduction

The clashes between ideas or opinions can be presented in various ways. One of the most common ways is to use the so-called adversative connectives. The English word *but* would be a typical example of adversative connectives. First of all, it has to be acknowledged that the clash between ideas or adversativity can be of quite different kinds or natures.¹⁾ Among them, the following two have been paid a lot of attention in the literature.

*This work was supported by the new faculty research fund of Ajou University. An earlier version of this paper was presented in a monthly meeting of the Korean Society of Language and Information (October, 2004). I would like to thank the audience for their comments and corrections. I also thank three anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments on this paper. All errors are mine, of course.

1) In this paper, the terms 'adversativity' and 'contrast' will be used without any theoretical distinctions.

(In the context: A and B are discussing the economic situation and reach the conclusion that they should hear the opinion of a specialist in economic affairs.)

(1) A: John is an economist.

B: He is not an economist, *but* he is a businessman.

(2) A: John is an economist

B: He is not an economist *but* a businessman.

(Dascal and Katriel 1977:143-144)

In the given context, the two responses by B in (1) and (2) lead to quite different interpretations. In (1), B implies that John's opinion is worth seeking though he is not an economist. In contrast, B's response in (2) implies that John's opinion should be disregarded because he is a businessman, not an economist. That is, the two responses give rise to opposing conclusions. The contrasts or adversative connections shown in (1) and (2) are called PA and SN respectively (Anscombe and Ducrot 1977). The term PA is derived from the Spanish word *pero* and the German word *aber*, whereas SN is from the Spanish word *sino* and the German word *sondern*. At least in these two languages, the two adversative conjunction types in (1) and (2) are represented by two different connectives, while the two can be expressed by the same connective *but* in English. It was also demonstrated that the PA and SN connections are sensitive to different kinds of implicatures. That is, while the PA connection is sensitive to R-implicatures in Horn's (1984) term, the SN connection is compatible with Q-implicatures (c.f Lee (2004, to appear). The interaction between these two kinds of implicatures and the PA/SN distinction will be discussed in detail in Sections 2 and 3.

In this paper, I look at how the types of adversativity illustrated in (1) and (2) are realized in Korean. Specifically, I demonstrate that the PA contrast shown in (1) is expressed by the connective *-ciman* or *-nuntey*²⁾, while the SN contrast is carried by *-la* or *-ko*. This amounts to the claim that there is the PA/SN distinction in Korean. I will also demonstrate that the connectives *-ciman* and *-la* interact with implicatures differently.

2) '*nuntey*' has various morphological variants, the commonest of which is '*-ntey*'.

It has been noted that a connective in a language is not exactly equivalent to a corresponding connective in a different language even if they both carry the PA or SN adversativity (Park 1997; Schwenter 2002). I will show that the versatile Korean discourse marker *kuntey* has extended its function or usage to the SN adversativity. At the same time, I prove that the discourse connective *kuntey* has wider functions than its corresponding verbal suffix *-nuntey*. In that respect, *kuntey* is slightly different from its counterparts in other languages.

2. Adversativity and Implicatures

2.1. Types of Adversativity

In the literature, it has generally been believed that there are at least two types of contrast. The following illustrates the two types.

(3) Tom is tall, *but* John is short.

(4) Tom is short *but* he is good at basketball.

There is an explicit contrast between the two lexical items in (3): *tall* and *short*, where there is not an overt lexical contrast in (2). The first type is called the semantic opposition (Lakoff 1971), the contrast use (Blakemore 1987, 1989, 2002), or the external *but* (Halliday and Hasan 1976). Meanwhile, in (4) there is not an explicit contrast, but it is felt that there is a contrast. This contrast comes from our world knowledge that short people are normally not good at basketball. However, this assumption is denied in the second conjunct of (4) which says that the short person at issue is good at basketball. This type of contrast is called the denial of expectation (Lakoff 1971; Blakemore 1987, 1989, 2002) or the internal *but* (Halliday and Hasan 1976). Despite vigorous debates as to whether the two usages in (3) and (4) should be treated as the same or not, not much has been discussed about the adversativity shown in (1) and (2) in English.³⁾ This may be due to the fact that in English the

3) Horn (1985) discusses certain syntactic and phonological characteristics which distinguish the PA connection from the SN connection in English.

same connective *but* can cover all the usages. In this paper, I will not distinguish the two kinds of contrast shown in (3) and (4) and focus on the PA/SN distinction.

As mentioned in the previous section, in several languages such as German, Spanish and Hebrew, different connectives are used for the PA and SN connections as opposed to English. It is also noted that the PA/SN distinction is sensitive to the types of implicatures. Let me briefly examine the types of implicatures which pertain to the PA/SN distinction.

2.2. Implicatures

Implicatures are inferences that the hearer believes the speaker to intend by an utterance (Jaszczolt 2002). The following example illustrates an implicature.

- (5) (In the context: the milkman usually delivers milk about 6 o'clock in the morning)
 A: Can you tell me the time?
 B: Well, the milkman has come. (Levinson 1983:97)

Instead of answering the question directly, B in (5) says that the milkman has come. From B's response, A can infer that it is about 6 o'clock in the morning. Here, this inferred information is called an implicature. Surely, much of information in our everyday conversation is communicated this way. Grice (1975:26) proposes that when recovering implicated information, the hearer is guided by certain principles of conversation, which is dubbed the Cooperative Principle:

Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the state at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of talk exchange in which you are engaged.

The principle is further broken down into four sets of maxims which summarize the assumptions about conversation. They are maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner. In later studies, Grice's maxims are either reduced into two or three maxims (Horn 1984, 1988, 1989; Levinson 1987, 2000), or replaced by one general cognitive principle

relevance (Sperber and Wilson 1986). Among these several proposals, Horn's approach is mainly employed to prove the sensitivity of the PA/SN distinction to implicatures (Koenig and Benndorf 1998; Schwenter 1999, 2002). I will briefly discuss Horn's two implicatures.

Horn proposes to reduce Grice's maxims to two principles, which are the Q(uality) Principle and the R(elational) Principle.

The Q Principle: Make your contribution sufficient: Say as much as you can (given R)

The R Principle: Make your contribution necessary: Say no more than you must (given Q)

The Q principle is responsible for the inference shown in the following example.

(6) He has six pets.

When we hear this utterance, we usually infer that he has exactly six pets and no more. The speaker needs not to say explicitly that he has *only six* pets because hearers are believed to be able to derive this piece of information. The inference derived via the Q principle is called a Q implicature. Here are some of the typical examples of Q implicatures. The expressions that are responsible for Q implicatures are italicized.

(7) a. *Some* of the students were absent → Not all of the students were absent.⁴⁾

b. *If* Bill saw my manuscript, he is a plagiarist. → Bill may or may not have seen my manuscript and he may or may not be a plagiarist.

(Modified from Levinson (1995))

As the above examples illustrate, in most of the cases, Q implicatures rely on contrast sets of expressions or Hornian (1984) scales. For example, the number 6 in (6) gives rise to a contrast set or a scale which may look like < . . . 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1> and makes us infer that something higher than the expression at issue in the scale does not

4) The symbol "→" means 'implicates'.

apply. That is, we infer that it is not the case he has 7 or more pets. Similarly, the presence of the expression *some* in (7a) evokes a scale, <all, some> and implicates that the higher expression *all* does not hold. In short, the Q principle summarizes our commonsensical intuition that the expression the speaker uses is all that the speaker can say. Otherwise, the speaker should have used a higher expression in the scale.

In contrast, the R principle is at play in the example shown in (8).

(8) I lost a book.

Upon hearing (8), we usually infer that the speaker lost his/her book, not somebody else's. Again, the implicature that the lost book belongs to the speaker needs not to be spelled out because hearers are credited to deriving this piece of information. The R principle is an economy principle. That is, the speaker does not spell out the information that the hearer is believed to be able to infer. The inference derived via the R principle is called an R implicature. The following examples normally make us derive R implicatures. The relevant expressions are italicized.

- (9) a. Ann pushed the button *and* the engine started. → Ann pushed the button *and then* (or *therefore*) the engine started.
 b. *If* you mow the lawn, there will be no trouble. → *If and only if* you mow the lawn, will there be no trouble.

It was proved, at least in German and Spanish, that PA and SN connections are sensitive to R and Q implicatures respectively. That is, when a Q implicature of the first conjunct is contrasted with the content in the second conjunct, an SN connection is used. In contrast, for an R implicature, the PA connection is used. I will illustrate this phenomena with two German connectives, *aber* and *sondern*. As demonstrated by Koenig and Benndorf (1998), the connective *aber* is compatible with the negation of an R implicature but not with that of a Q implicature.

(10) Gestern habe ich ein Buch verloren, *aber* nicht meins.

I lost a book yesterday, but not mine.'

(The R implicature derivable from the first conjunct 'the book is

mine' is *p*, *not p* is 'the book is not mine.')

- (11) *Sie mochte ihn, *aber* liebete ihn.

'She liked him, but loved him.'

(The Q inference derivable from the first conjunct 'she didn't love him' is *p*, *not p* is 'she loved him.')

(Koenig and Benndorf 1998:374)

The second German adversative connective is *sondern*. One point worth mentioning here is that the SN connection always involves a negation in the first conjunct as shown in (2) above. As opposed to the PA connection, the SN connection is compatible with the negation of a Q implicature, but not with that of an R implicature as in the following examples.⁵⁾

- (12) Jana mochte ihn nicht, *sondern* liebte ihn.

'Jana didn't like him, but loved him.'

- (13) *Gestern habe ich ein Buch verloren, *sondern* nicht meins.

'I lost a book yesterday, but not mine.'

(Koenig and Benndorf 1998:377)

However, the interaction between the PA and SN conjunctions and the kinds of implicatures is viewed rather differently in C. Lee's work (2004, to appear), which seems to work better for several languages like Korean, English and Japanese. This will be addressed in Sub-section 3.2.

Schwenter (2002:67) asks if the extension of the PA/SN distinction can be made in other languages because it has to do with 'the issue of functional equivalence (and equivalents) both within and across languages.' This paper is an attempt to pursue the issue suggested by Schwenter (2002). As far as I am aware, there have not been any attempts to draw the PA/SN distinction in Korean except for quite a few discussions such as C. Lee (2004, to appear) and Choi (2004). This topic will be taken up in the following section.

5) It has been pointed out by Koenig and Benndorf (1998) and Schwenter (2002) that it is not the lexical item *sondern* (or *sino* in Spanish) alone that is sensitive to Q implicatures, but the whole *nicht . . . sondern* (or *no . . . sino* in Spanish) construction.

3. The PA/SN Distinction in Korean

3.1. Connectives and Adversative Connectives in Korean

There are at least two ways of connecting two sentences in Korean, i.e. by conjunctive adverbials or by conjunctive verbal suffixes. The conjunctive adverbials are placed at the initial position of a sentence. That is, when it connects two propositions, the full stop is placed before the adverbial. I will call these adverbials *discourse markers* (a la Schiffrin 1987; Fraser 1999; c.f. Blakemore 1987, 2002). On the other hand, the verbal suffixes can also connect two clauses. In most of the cases, conjunctive adverbials have corresponding conjunctive verbal suffixes. For instance, the adverbial *'kulehciman'* and *'kuluntey'* have suffixal counterparts *'-ciman'* and *'-nuntey'* respectively. I will refer to both types as connectives because their primary function is to connect sentences or propositions.

Let me first focus on the second type of connectives with reference to adversativity. There are various adversative connectives in Korean: *-nuntey*, *-ciman*, *-(i)na* (mainly used in written discourse), *-(a/e)to* and so on. As in German, Hebrew, or Spanish, the two kinds of adversativity illustrated in (1) and (2) are expressed by different connectives in Korean. I consulted a dozen of Korean native speakers and most of them agreed that the PA connection is represented by *-ciman* or *-nuntey*,⁶⁾ whereas the SN connection is by *-la* or *-ko*. In most of the researches on

6) It has to be acknowledged that the connectives *-ciman* and *-nuntey* have various functions apart from the adversative function as discussed by K. Lee (1988) or Kim (1994). For example, K. Lee (1998) calls *-nuntey* a background establishing marker when it is used in examples like (i) and (ii).

(i) ku sasalam-i ecey kyothong sako-lul tangha-ess-nuntey cikum pyengwen-ey ipwenha-ess-eyo.
that person-NM yesterday traffic accident-AC have-PST-nuntey now hospital-at hospitalized-be-DC
'Yesterday that person had a traffic accident, and now he is in a hospital.'

(ii) na-uy cimcak-i-ntey, ku salam-un mopsi aph-a
my guess-be-ntey that person-NM very sick-DC
'This is my guess: That man is very sick.' (Kim 1994:512)

In (i) the *-nuntey* clause provides background information regarding the man's hospitalization. However, this explanation doesn't hold in the case of (ii). To accommodate the use of *-nuntey* as in (ii) Kim (1994) claims that *-nuntey* clauses function as speech act adverbial clauses because they are employed to modify the speech act performed by asserting the main clause. While acknowledging the various functions of *-nuntey*, I will focus on the adversative function of *-nuntey* in this paper.

Korean grammar, the last two connectives *-la* and *-ko* are not discussed under adversativity. However, if the SN connection is included as a kind of adversativity, I believe that *-la* and *-ko*, which are employed for the SN connection in Korean, should be regarded as adversative connectives.

As in other languages, the SN connection always involves a negation in the first conjunction. Let me discuss the issue of selecting adequate equivalents in different languages. In a contrastive study, it is pretty essential to choose right counterparts in contrasted languages. According to Krzeszowsky (1990), in determining the equivalents in different languages, it is necessary to rely on the informants' bilingual competence. The informants I consulted chose *-ciman* and *-nuntey* for the PA connection, whereas choosing *-la* and *-ko* for the SN connection. Also in research on adversativity in Korean such as Choi (2004) and C. Lee (2004, to appear), *-ciman* and *-la* are mainly discussed with reference to the two types. So I choose *-ciman* and *-la* for the two types of contrastive connection.⁷⁾ When it is necessary to compare the use of *-ciman* and that of *-nuntey* I will use both of them. The two particles, *-la* and *-ko* have similar functions as far as the adversativity is concerned. Nevertheless, the two show certain differences in terms of their morphological or syntactic behaviors.⁸⁾ I am not going to discuss the differences in detail since that issue does not pertain to the discussion of this paper. In this paper, I will use the connective *-la* following other researchers.

3.2. The Interaction of the PA/SN Distinction and Implicatures Revisited

At the end of Sub-section 2.2, I mentioned that the interaction

7) In a conversation analytic research by Park (1997:55), *-nuntey* is used overwhelmingly frequently than *-ciman* in real conversations. For example, in turn initial positions, there are 145 tokens of *-nuntey*, whereas there are only 2 tokens of *-ciman* in her data. However as one referee rightly points out, the high frequency of *-nuntey* is might be due to the fact that *-nuntey* has a wider variety of functions than other adversative connectives.

8) As one referee rightly points out, the connective *-ko* can occur when the first conjunct does not contain a negation as in the following while *-la* cannot.

(i) ku salam-un haksayng i-ko/*-la sensayng-i an-i-ta.
 that man-NM student be-and teacher-NM not-be-DC
 'He is a student, not a teacher.'

Conceptually (i) is similar to the SN connection. It also appears that the use of *-ko* in (i) has to do with the coordinating conjunction. I will leave this issue for future studies.

between the PA/SN connection and implicatures are explained differently in C. Lee's work. Let me expound on that issue. It seems to be the case that the two connections are sensitive to the two different kinds of implicatures discussed in Section 2 above. That is, while the *-ciman* connection is compatible with the negation of an R implicature, the *-la* connection is compatible with that of a Q implicature. The following examples illustrate that.

(14) chayk-ul han kwen sa-ss-*ciman*/*-*la* nay chayk-un an-i-ta
 book-AC a volume buy-PST-but my book-CT not-be-DC
 'I bought a book, but it is not mine.'

(15) chayk-ul sey kwen san key ani-*la*/*-*ciman* ney kwen sa-ss-ta
 book-AC three volume buy NOM not-but four volume buy-PST-
 DC
 'I didn't buy three books but four.'

(14) involves a typical example of R implicatures. From the first conjunct, we normally infer that the speaker bought his/her own book. This is an R implicature derivable from the first conjunct because we infer more specific information from the articulated utterance. This R implicature is negated in the second conjunct of (14). For this use, only *-ciman* is permissible, while *-la* is not.⁹⁾ In contrast, the first conjunct of (15) evokes a Q implicature which says that the speaker bought exactly three books. This evoked Q implicature is negated in the second conjunct. As (15) demonstrates, *-la* is acceptable for this connection, while *-ciman* is not.

C. Lee (2004, to appear) puts forward a different explanation for this phenomenon. He notices that when a numeral smaller than *three* appears on the second conjunct of (15), *-ciman* can be used alongside with *-la* as demonstrated in the following examples.

(16) a. chayk-ul sey kwen san key ani-*la* twu kwen sa-ss-ta.
 book-AC three volume buy NOM not-*la* two volumes buy-

9) The reason *-la* is not acceptable in this sentence can be explained in the same way as the unacceptability of connectives *sondern* and *sino* is explained. That is, the *sondern*-kind of connectives can be employed only when the first conjunct has a negative particle. Nevertheless, it is the case that *-ko* can be used in (14).

PST-DC

- b. chayk-ul sey kwen-un an sa-ss-*ciman* twu kwen-un sa-ss-ta.
 CT not -*ciman* CT

When *-ciman* is used in this kind of context, *-nun* should be suffixed to the contrasted elements in both conjuncts as we can observe in (16b). Based on the examples in (16), C. Lee claims that while it is true that *-ciman* and *-la* are employed for the PA and SN connections respectively, Koenig and Benndorf's (1998) explanation on the interaction between the PA/SN connections and implicatures is wrong. According to C. Lee, the PA connection, instead of the SN connection, evokes a Q implicature. For example, the first conjunct of (16b) on its own can trigger an implicature that somebody bought one or two books. As the implicature in this case is based on a scale < . . . -three, -two, -one>, it is argued to be a Q implicature. He also claims that the main function of the PA conjunction is to express concessivity. He adds that the SN connection, on the other hand, is related to the so-called metalinguistic negation but can be denotational by suggesting the following example (personal communication).

- (17) hayngpokha-n key ani-*la* hwanghol/picham-hay.
 happy not-la ecstatic/terrible-be
 'I'm not happy; I'm ecstatic/terrible'.

I agree with C. Lee to the point that the PA connection has to do with Q implicatures since we have examples like (16b). However, as we examined in Section 2, the PA connection is sensitive to R implicatures. As for the relation with the SN connection and implicatures, it appears that the SN connection can occur with the negation of a Q implicature of the first conjunct as we can observe in previous examples like (12) and (15). At the same time, it is the case that the SN connection can be used to suggest an alternative to a negated element, which has nothing to do with implicatures.

So I conclude that the PA connection can be employed either for negating an R implicature of the first conjunct or for expressing a Q implicature., its main function being expressing concessivity. However, the SN connection lacks this concessivity, while allowing for the co-occurrence either with the assertion of a Q implicature of the first

conjunct or with an alternative to the negated element as shown in (17).

Based on the examples and the discussion in this section, I claim that there is the PA/SN distinction in Korean as in German, Spanish, Hebrew or Japanese. More specifically, the PA and SN connections are expressed by different lexical items. If this claim is going to be tenable, it has to be the case that *-la* and *-ko* are included in the adversative connectives.

Most discussions on the PA/SN distinction are focused on monological situations. That is, they look at the connectives when they are employed by the same speakers. Schwenter (2002) is one of the researchers who examine the adversative connectives in dialogical situations. In the following section, I will discuss how adversative connectives function in dialogical situations and what kinds of differences adversative connectives show between monological discourses and in dialogical discourses.

4. PA/SN in Dialogical Situation

4.1. *Pero* and *Sino* in Spanish

Schwenter (2002) discusses two Spanish adversative connectives, *pero* and *si*,¹⁰⁾ specifically as discourse markers. Although there are still disagreements on the category of discourse markers, Schourup (1999) suggests three essential characteristics of discourse markers: i) they express connectivity, ii) they are optional syntactically, and iii) they do make no contributions to the truth-conditions of an utterance. Schwenter (2002) also focuses on discourse markers in dialogical situations. The following examples illustrate the different kinds of adversativity in dialogues.

(In the context: A is trying to convince B to hire Juan for a linguistics position.)

(18) A: Juan es inteligente.

‘Juan is intelligent.’

B: *Pero* no sabe nada de ligüística.

but no know nothing of linguistics

‘But he doesn’t know anything about linguistics.’

10) As discussed in Section 2, *pero* is contrasted with *sino* in Spanish. However, in dialogical discourses, the connective *si* is employed instead of *sino* for the SN function.

- (19) A: Juan es inteligente.
 ‘Juan is intelligent.’
 B: *Si* no sabe nada de linguística.
 ‘*Si* he doesn’t know anything about linguistics.’

B’s utterances in (18) and (19) have the same propositional content except the discourse marker used. According to Schwenter, the two connectives *pero* and *sino* in these examples have different functions. The existence of *pero* in (18) makes the hearer interpret the utterance that follows it to be stronger than the one put forward by A. That is, B argues that though ‘it is true that Juan is intelligent, it is also true that he doesn’t know anything about linguistics and this is a stronger argument for NOT hiring him’ (Schwenter 2002:51). That explains why *pero* can occur in the following example.

- (20) (In the context: A and B are talking about Maria’s chances of passing an exam.)
 A: Maria es inteligente.
 ‘Maria is intelligent.’
 B: *Si, pero* no sabe estudiar.
 yes, but no knows study-INF
 ‘Yes, but she doesn’t know how to study.’

Si employed by B in (20) is an affirmative particle corresponding to *yes* in English. So *si* in (20) is a different lexical item from *si* in (19). (20) shows that *pero* can combine with the affirmative particle. The speaker who employs *pero* can hold two contrasting ideas and at the same time indicates that the proposition which follows *pero* is a stronger one than the preceding one.

In contrast, in (19), B’s use of *si* has the function of denying the relevance of A’s utterance. In other words, ‘it doesn’t matter to B whether Juan is intelligent or not- this piece of information is immaterial to the issue at hand’ (Schwenter 2002:51). So (19B) can be paraphrased as ‘irrespective of what you say/think, he doesn’t know anything about linguistics and THIS is what’s relevant to the issue at hand’ (ibid).

In summary, in the case of *pero*, the same form is used in both monological and dialogical discourses. In dialogical discourse, it has the role of providing a stronger argument than prior ones. On the other

hand, *si*, which is a rough counterpart of *sino* in monologues, corrects some part of a prior view point by denying its relevance to the situation under consideration.

4.2. Adversative Discourse Markers in Korean

I am going to begin with the definition of Korean discourse markers. In languages such as English, the same form can be used as a sentential connective (21) and as a discourse marker (22).

(21) Mary was singing *and* John was playing the piano.

(22) Zelda: . . . And Samuel was s-seven. So that . . .

Irene: *And* being a change of sex makes a difference too.

(Schiffrin 1987:152)

In the Korean language, verbal suffixes are employed for sentential conjunction as in (21), whereas conjunctive connectives are used for the function of discourse markers. Korean linguists such as Kim and Suh (1996) discuss several discourse markers including *kuntey* and confirm that there are discourse markers in Korean. It seems that it is generally agreed upon that conjunctive connectives can function as discourse markers in Korean.

There are several adversative discourse markers in Korean. They all have corresponding verbal suffixes mentioned at the onset of Section 3. They consist of the predicate *kuleha* 'be so'+ an adversative suffix as in the following.

kulena ← *kulehata* + *-na*

kulehciman ← *kulehata* + *-ciman*

kulayto ← *lukehata* + *-a/eto*

kulentey ← *kulehata* + *-ntey*

According to a conversation analytic research by Park (1997), *kulentey* or its contracted form *kuntey* occurs much more frequently than the other three forms. For example, in one of Park's pilot studies, the frequency of *kulentey* is 64 out of the total 73 occurrences of the four above connectives. The rare occurrence of *kulena* might be attributable

to the fact that it is normally employed in written discourse. I do not have any clear explanation for the lower frequencies of *kulehciman* and *kulayto*. It appears that as *kulentey* or *kuntay* gains great popularity among Korean native speakers, the other forms become less favoured, especially in conversations.¹¹⁾

In Korean, the two discourse markers, *kulentey* and *kulehciman* seem to function similarly to *pero* in Spanish. I will focus on *kulehciman* (*haciman*) for the reasons expounded on in Section 3. Like *pero* in Spanish, *kulehciman* signals that the proposition it introduces is a stronger argument than the previous one. Also *kulehciman*(*haciman*) can occur with an affirmative particle corresponding to *yes* in English.

(23) A: ku salam ttokttokhay-yo.

he man smart-DC

'He is smart.'

B: Yey, *haciman* kongpwuha-nun pep-ul cal molla-yo.

yes, but study-MD way-AC well not-know-DC

'Yes, but he doesn't know how to study.'

This example also confirms C. Lee's (2004, to appear) argument concerning the concessivity of the PA connection since (23B) is accepting his/her interlocutor's point concessively.

I will move on to the function displayed by *si* in Spanish. Most of the Korean native speakers I have consulted answered that there are at least two expressions in Korean for the function played by *si* in Spanish: *kukeyanila* and *kukeyaniko*. However, they commented that it is hard to tell whether the two discourse markers have the function of denying the relevance of the prior utterance. Arguably, the Spanish marker *si* and the Korean marker *kukeyanila* share only parts of their meanings or functions.

In all the literature on Korean linguistics that I am aware of, the two above expressions have never been discussed in terms of discourse markers. Still it is true that the two serve the similar functions of

11) Park (1997:20) points out that not all occurrences of *kulentey* express a contrastive meaning. Instead, the connective can convey a meaning equivalent to *and then*, *so*, or *by the way*. Other functions of *-kuntay* are discussed in previous works such as K. Lee (1988) or Kim (1994).

corresponding discourse markers in other languages. So I will tentatively consider them to be discourse markers, leaving the issue as to whether the expressions under consideration are entitled to be discourse markers for future studies. These two expressions consist of the combination of several words and morphemes as shown in the following.

- kukeyanila ← *kukes* ‘that’ + *i* ‘nominative particle’ + *an* ‘negative particle’ + *i* ‘be’ + *la* ‘conjunctive suffix’
kukeyaniko ← *kukes* ‘that’ + *i* ‘nominative particle’ + *an* ‘negative particle’ + *i* ‘be’ + *ko* ‘conjunctive suffix’

The two markers include a negative particle *an* in themselves. This is what makes these two different from their corresponding particle *si* in Spanish. So their corrective function is explicit and prominent. I will focus on *kukeyanila*. Here is an example involving this expression.

- (24) A: kusalam ttokttokhay-yo.
he smart-DC
‘He is smart.’
B: *kukeyanila* kusalam chenjay-ya.
kukeyanila he genius-DC
‘*kukeyanila* he is a genius.’

Contrary to (23B) in which the speaker more or less accepts the prior view point, speaker B in (24) corrects the prior viewpoint. For this reason, it is hard to use an affirmative particle like *yes* before *kukeyanila*. From the discussion in this section, I can conclude that there is also the PA/SN distinction in dialogues in Korean, which is similar to the *pero/si* distinction in Spanish.

4.3. The Ubiquity of the Connective *Kulentey*

As pointed out by Park (1997), *kulentey* or *kuntey* has gained great popularity among Korean native speakers, while the other adversative connectives are less favoured especially in spoken discourse. Let us examine the following.

- (25) A: *ilum-i calmos tuleka iss-eyo. Lee-ka first neyim-ulo tuleka iss-eyo.*
 name-NM wrong register be-DC Lee-NM first name register be-DC
 ‘You are registered with a wrong name Lee (which is the last name) as the first name.’
- B: *kuntey last neyim-i-yo Yi-lo ssuketun-yo?*
 but last name-NM Yi-as spell-DC?
 ‘But my last name spells Yi (not Lee).’ (Park 1997:69)

In (25B), the contrast speaker B intends to express is an SN contrast because B corrects A’s misuse of the spelling of his/her last name which has been mistaken for the first name. For this function, the discourse marker *kukeyanila* or *kukeyaniko* is expected to be employed. However, as in (25), *kuntey* can be used for this function. If this is the case, we can conclude that the marker *kuluntey* or *kuntey* has expanded its function as to cover the SN connection and that the functions of *kuluntey* do not correspond to its counterparts in other languages.

Let me examine several more examples which support the expanding function of the marker *kuluntey*.

- (26) A: *meli yemsayk-i cal mos toy-ss-ney.*
 hair dye-NM well not become-PST-DC
 ‘Your hair was dyed poorly.’
- B: *kukeyanila/?kuntey/*haciman wancen mangchi-ess-e.*
 totally become horrible.
 ‘*kukeyanila/?kuntey/*haciman* it was dyed horribly.’
- (27) A: *kay-ka sey mali-ya.*
 dog-NM three CL-DC
 ‘There are three dogs.’
- B: *kekeyanila/?kuntey/*haciman ney mali-ya.*
 four CL-DC
 ‘*kekeyanila/?kuntey/*haciman* there are four dogs.’

In examples (26) and (27), an alternative to an element in A’s utterance is provided by B. For this function, we normally employ the marker *kukeyanila*. However, as we can see from (26) and (27), the use of

kuntey is more acceptable than that of *haciman*, which is the typical connective for the PA connection. From these examples, we can again observe that the marker *kuntey* has much wider functions than the marker *haciman*, or its corresponding markers in other languages such as Spanish or German.

In that respect, the discourse marker *kuntey* is more freely employed than its corresponding suffix *-n(un)tey* as demonstrated in (28) and (29).

(Context: B asks A whether a person looks like a woman or a man.)

- (28) A: ce salam yeca-ya.
 that person woman-DC
 ‘That is a woman.’
 B: ?*kuntey* namca-ya.
 kuntey man-DC
 ‘*kuntey* that is a man.’

- (29) ce salam yeca-ka ani-*la*/*-*ntey* namca-ya.
 that person woman-NM not-*la*/*-*ntey* man-DC
 ‘That is not a woman but a man.’

While the discourse marker *kuntey* can be used for an SN connection as in (28), its corresponding suffix *-ntey* is not that acceptable as we can observe in (29).¹²⁾ Again it is proved that the discourse marker *kuntey* has extended its functions to the SN connection in Korean.

5. Conclusion

This paper has aimed to achieve two goals. First, it has intended to demonstrate that there are explicit linguistic devices for the so-called PA and SN connections in Korean. It has been proved that the PA connection is realized by the suffix *-ciman*, while the SN connection is by *-la* or *-ko*. The relevant connectives have also been shown to be sensitive to different kinds of implicatures. That is, while the PA connection allows for the negation of an R of the first conjunct or for

12) It is still the case that the use of *kuntey* is less natural than that of the typical SN marker *kukeyanila*.

expressing its Q implicature, the SN connection is compatible with an assertion of Q implicature or a metalinguistic alternative.

This paper has also aimed to show that the discourse marker *kuntey* is employed ubiquitously at least in contemporary Korean spoken discourse. To support the second claim, I have demonstrated that the PA connection are compatible with the marker *kuntey* unlike *haciman*. The use of *kuntey* has also shown that the functions or usages of connectives which look equivalent in several languages are different to a certain degree.

References

- Anscombe, J.-C and O. Ducrot. (1977) Deux *mais* en français? *Lingua* 43, 23-40.
- Blakemore, D. (1987) *Semantic constraint on relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Blakemore, D. (1989) Denial and contrast: A relevance theoretic analysis of *but*. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12, 15-38.
- Blakemore, D. (2002) *Relevance and linguistic meaning: the semantics and pragmatics of discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Choi, S. (2004, July) Concessives and negation: Korean *-nun* and Japanese *-wa* in scalar predicates. Paper presented at the 2004 Linguistic Society of Korea International Conference.
- Dascal, M. and T. Katriel. (1977) Between semantics and pragmatics: the two types of 'but'-Hebrew 'aval' and 'ela.' *Theoretical Linguistics* 4, 143-172.
- Fraser, B. (1999) What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics* 14, 383-395.
- Grice, P. (1975) Logic and conversation. In P. Cole and J. L. Morgan, eds., *Syntax and semantics 3: speech acts* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press. Reprinted in *Studies in the way of words*, by P. Grice, (pp. 22-40). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. and R. Hasan. (1976) *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Horn, L. (1984) Toward a new taxonomy for pragmatic inference: Q- and R- based implicature. In D. Schiffrin, ed., *Meaning, form and use in context: linguistic application* (pp. 11-42). Washington DC: Georgetown

University Press.

- Horn, L. (1988) Pragmatic theory in Linguistics. In F. J. Mewmeyer, ed., *The Cambridge survey*, vol. 1 (pp. 121-174). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horn, L. (1989) *A natural history of negation*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Jaszczolt, K. M. (2002) *Semantics and pragmatics: meaning in language and discourse*. London: Longman.
- Kim, H. (1994) 'Speech act' adverbial clauses in Korean. In Y.-K. Kim-Renaud, ed., *Theoretical issues in Korean linguistics* (pp. 403-415). Stanford: CSLI.
- Kim, K. and K. Suh. (1996) Dealing with prior talk: discourse connectives in Korean conversation. In N. Akatsuka, S. Iwasaki and S. Strauss, eds., *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, vol. 5 (pp. 83-99). Stanford: CSLI.
- Koenig, J.-P. and B. Benndorf. (1998) Meaning and context: German *aber* and *sondern*. In J.-P. Koenig, ed., *Discourse and cognition: bridging the gap* (pp. 365-386). Stanford: CSLI.
- Krzyszowski, T. P. (1990) *Contrasting languages: the scope contrastive linguistics*. Berlin: Gruyter.
- Lakoff, R. T. (1971) *Its, and's and but's* about conjunction. In C. Fillmore and D. Langendoen, eds., *Studies in linguistic semantics* (pp. 114-149). New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston.
- Lee, C. (2004, July) Implicature and presupposition: from polarity and contrastive topic. Paper presented at the 2004 Linguistic Society of Korea International Conference.
- Lee, C. (to appear) Contrastive topic/focus and polarity in discourse. In K. Turner and K. von Heusinger, eds., *Where semantics meet pragmatics*. London: Elsevier.
- Lee, H.-K. (2005) Presupposition and implicature under negation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31, 191-218.
- Lee, K. (1988) Verbal connectives of contrast. In E. Baek, ed., *Papers from the 6th International Conference on Korean Linguistics* (pp. 403-415). Seoul: Hanshin.
- Levinson, S. (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, S. (1987) Minimization and conversational inference. In J. Verschueren and M. Bertucelli-Papi, eds., *The pragmatic perspective: Selected Papers from the 1985 International Pragmatics Conference* (pp. 61-129). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Levinson, S. (1995) Three levels of meaning. In F. Palmer, ed., *Grammar and meaning: essays in honour of Sir John Lyons* (pp. 91-115). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Levinson, S. (2000) *Presumptive meanings*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Park, Y. (1997) *A Cross-linguistic study of contrastive connectives in English, Korean, and Japanese conversation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, UCLA.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987) *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schourup, L. (1999) Discourse markers. *Lingua* 107, 27-65.
- Schwenter, S. (1999) *Pragmatics of conditional marking: implicature, scalarity, and exclusivity*. New York: Garland.
- Schwenter, S. (2002) Discourse markers and the PA/SN distinction. *Journal of Linguistics* 38, 43-69.
- Sperber, D. and D. Wilson. (1986) *Relevance: communication and cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hye-Kyung Lee
Department of English
Ajou University
Wonchon-dong, Youngtong-gu
Suwon, Kyungki-do
Korea 443-749
e-mail: hklee@ajou.ac.kr

Received: Oct. 10, 2005

Revised version received: Dec. 10, 2005

Accepted: Dec. 13, 2005