

Extended Focus: Korean Delimiter *man**

Jae-Woong Choe
(Korea University)

Choe, Jae-Woong. (2002). Extended focus: Korean delimiter *man*. *Language Research* 38(4), 1131-1149.

The issue we address in this paper is whether the Korean exclusive particle *man* is a focus marker or a scope marker. We start from the well-known assumption that it is a focus marker, but also note that there are some cases where *man* seems to function as a scope marker. An in-depth analysis of some key sentences is provided, with a particular attention to ways to sort out native speakers' intuition. It is concluded that the analysis of *man* as a focus marker can be extended to accommodate some cases of its apparent role as a scope marker, especially coupled with the idea of 'extended' focus. It is further argued that this conclusion is also confirmed by diverse cases of *man*-related ambiguity reported in Choe (1996).

Key words: Korean delimiter *man*, focus, extended focus, focus marker, scope marker, ambiguity

1. Introduction

Korean particle *man*, which roughly translates into English *only*, typically attaches to its associated focus.

- (1) John-i Mary-*man* ttara-tanin-ta.
 John-NOM Mary-*man* chase after-DCL
 'John chases after Mary only.'

In (1), the bound morpheme *man* attaches to *Mary*, thus making it the focal element of the sentence. It is also most natural for *Mary* to get some phonetic prominence in the sentence.

*A draft version of this paper was presented at the Conference on Korean Linguistics at University of Illinois, Urbana on July 23, 1999. I would like to thank the audience for their encouraging comments. I also thank three anonymous reviewers for *Language Research* for their helpful and critical comments. Needless to say all the remaining errors are my own. This work has been supported by the Brain Korea 21 project.

However, *man* sometimes appears next to an apparently larger constituent than the phonetically prominent element, as is illustrated in (2).

- (2) mikuk-un [irakhu-ka **misail**-ul paychiha]-nun kes-*man* pantayha-nta.
 USA-TOP Iraq-NOM missile-ACC deploy thing-*man* oppose
 'USA only opposes (the idea) that Iraq deploy missiles.'

Notice that in (2) *man* is attached to the so-called 'defective' noun or pronominal *kes*, which is hardly a likely place to be focussed. Thus in (2), unlike in (1), *man* no longer seems to function as the focus marker. It rather seems to function as the scope marker for the focus *misail* as *man* c-commands the whole embedded clause.¹⁾

Now an interesting question that can be raised with the Korean particle *man* is how the focus and scope are identified in a sentence with it. Is it the focus marker as is usually assumed to be, or something else as (2) indicates? In this paper, following the generally accepted view since Yang (1973), we will argue that *man* is indeed the focus marker but the term 'focus' needs more elaboration. It does not necessarily mean the constituent to which *man* is attached on the surface, as is usually assumed. We will propose that a more flexible notion is needed so that we can explain various cases of ambiguity that arise due to the presence of *man*. Following the idea in Choe (1996), we argue that apparent cases of *man* as a scope marker can and should be considered as cases of 'extended' focus. 'Extended' focus, it is claimed, will help us to a better understanding of the *man* related focus and scope phenomena. We also propose a focus marking mechanism by which the extension of focus is achieved.

In Section 2, we discuss *man* as the focus marker, and in the next section we discuss more complicated cases like (2) that seem to suggest that *man* is the scope marker. In Section 4, we consider cases where *man* attaches to a subpart of the focus, which require some kind of

1) To be exact, *man* is attached to the pronominal *kes*, and does not appear next to the embedded clause as a scope marker is expected to do. However, Sohn (1999, p. 313) remarks, "Relative clauses with the defective noun *kes* 'thing, fact, assumed fact' as the head often behave as if they do not have a head from a semantic point of view." Thus, given that *kes* is almost null in its semantic content, we will tentatively assume in this paper that the pronominal does not significantly affect the focus structure of the sentence. But obviously this assumption requires further investigation.

extension or projection of focus in any adequate explanation of them. We also discuss how the extension or projection has to be realized in the grammar. But first let us introduce some theoretical background that pertains to the structure of focus in general.

Following the standard analyses of *only* (Rooth, 1985, 1992, 1996; von Stechow, 1991), it is assumed in this paper that *man* as an ‘exclusive’ operator requires an associated focus and its scope for a proper semantic interpretation. von Stechow (1991), like many other previous works on focus, defines a focus as a constituent with the F-feature, which accompanies some phonetic prominence in the case of English. As a way to introduce some analytical tools, consider the following English sentence:

(3) John [_{VP} only [_{VP} invited **Sue**]].

The focused word *Sue* is in bold face in (3), reflecting its phonetic prominence. The focus is associated with the adverb *only*, in that the adverb contrasts ‘Sue’ with alternatives, say, ‘Tom’ or ‘Mary’.

In addition, *only* has a scope, which provides a frame or a template for the contrast with the alternatives, something like (4).

(4) [John invited *x*].

In this template, *x* stands for a variable, a slot where some alternatives can be tested or ‘filled in’ to get the right interpretation. More technically, we will assume that the scope of *only* is the whole clause that it is a member of.²⁾

Now, returning to *man* in Korean, our question is what the surface distribution of *man* reveals concerning its associated focus and scope.

2. *man* as a focus marker

Most typical distribution of *man* shows that it attaches to its associated focus. Since Yang (1972, 1973, 1993), it has been widely accepted that the

2) Or it can be assumed that the lower VP, the c-command domain of *only*, is the scope. For some related discussion or assumption, see Partee (1999) and Kadmon (2001), and references cited there.

concept of 'sister member' plays a key role in the semantics of some Korean particles including *man* (Sung, 1979; Yoon, 1988). For example, in Sentence (1), repeated here as (5),

- (5) John-i Mary-*man* ttara-tanin-ta.
 John-NOM Mary-*man* chase after-DCL

the attachment of *man* to *Mary* triggers a reading that there is a set of 'sister members' to *Mary* such that John does not chase after them. The importance or necessity of the concept 'sister members' for a proper interpretation of the whole sentence can be shown in the following (Yang 1973 : 243):

- A: Semantics of *man* (including its 'exclusive' or 'only' interpretation)
 Presupposition: Registered or expected sister members exist.
 Assertion: (1) The *man*-attached element is unique.
 (2) The *man*-attached element is the limitation.
 (3) The *man*-attached element is exactly defined.
 Implication: (1) Registered sister members have the opposite value.
 (2) Higher members have the same value as the *man*-
 attached element has.

Without the concepts like 'man-attached element' ('focus' in current terms) and 'sister members' ('alternatives' in current terms), none of the definitions in the above would hold.

As the expression 'man-attached element' indicates, *man* attaches to its focus. In other words, *man* is assumed to be a focus marker. This assumption in Yang's (1973) pioneering work on Korean delimiters has virtually gone unchallenged until recently,³⁾ and it no doubt confirms that the primary function of *man* is its role as the focus marker, as well as its 'exclusive' reading.

Then the question is how the scope of the focus structure is identified. If *man* plays any non-trivial role in determining the scope as well as the focus, there are two possibilities that come to mind in the framework of generative grammar. One is to assume that the *c-command* domain of *man* is the scope. But then the scope of the focus structure would be of

3) A different idea was proposed in choe(1996), which will be discussed in Section 4.

little theoretical significance since the focus and the scope are the same.

(6) [PP [NP **Mary**]-*man*]

The other possibility is to assume that *man* somehow moves to a higher position at LF, thus marking its *c*-command domain as the scope. In other words, one can hypothesize that while *man* is attached to the focus at surface structure, it covertly moves to the appropriate scope position. But notice that the idea of *man* movement at LF is just like the focus movement.

If we take the scope as something that provides a template for contrast, then the scope becomes VP or the smallest clause that contains the focus and the focus marker (Partee, 1999; Kadmon, 2001).

(7) [_S John-i x ttara-tanin-ta]

The problem we have is the apparent mismatch between the surface position of *man*, presumably as a sister to its focus, and the need to have a higher node (VP or S) for its proper interpretation, that is, as the template for contrast. One solution to this problem is to assume that the focus, along with its marker *man*, moves to the A-bar position at LF like other quantifiers (Jackendoff 1972, Chomsky 1976). Sentence (1), after focus movement, will look like (8).

(8) [PP Mary -*man*]_i [_S John-i t_i ttara-tanin-ta]

So the theory of focus movement seems to offer a nice solution to the mismatch. One can argue that *man* simply marks the focus at surface structure, and then the scope is determined by some covert movement of the focus at LF. But, as is the case with English *only* (Taglicht, 1984; von Stechow, 1991; Rooth, 1985; Drubig, 1994; Partee, 1999), things get complicated when we consider other cases of *man* distribution, as we do in the following.

3. *man* as a scope marker?

It is not the case that *man* always shows up next to its focus. Consider (2), repeated here as (9).

- (9) mikuk-un [irakhu-ka **misail**-ul paychiha]-nun kes-man pantayha-nta.
 USA-TOP Iraq-NOM missile-ACC deploy thing-man oppose

In one reading, (9) roughly means ‘The US opposes (the idea) that Iraq would deploy missiles, but not that Iraq would deploy other things.’ We can say that *misail* ‘missile’ is the focus of the embedded clause, and there seems to be a contrast between *misail* and its possible alternatives. The appropriate substitutive frame would be something like (10).

- (10) [Iraq would deploy ____]

If some other part of the embedded clause, for example, *paychiha* ‘deploy’, gets the focus, the frame for contrast also changes.

- (11) mikuk-un [irakhu-ka misail-ul **paychiha**]-nun kes-man pantayha-nta.

In (11), a contrast is now detected between the phonetically prominent *paychiha* ‘deploy’ and its alternatives, say, *yenkwuha* ‘do a research on’ or *kaypalha* ‘develop.’⁴ The substitutive frame is

- (12) [Iraq would _____ missiles.]

Thus depending on which constituent the phonetic prominence falls on inside the embedded clause, the focus structure seems to require different scopal frame. In other words, examples like (9) lead us to a tentative conclusion that *man* functions as a scope marker as it apparently marks the scope, that is, the frame for contrast in (9) and (11). But further consideration of related facts contradicts this conclusion.

Consider the following sentence.

- (13) mikuk-un [irakhu-ka **misail-man** paychiha]-nun kes-ul pantayha-nta.
 USA-TOP Iraq-NOM missile-man deploy thing-ACC oppose

4) An anonymous reviewer seems to suggest that (9) and (11) should be taken as cases of *man*-lowering. This possibility goes against the general assumption on movement that the moved element c-commands its original position. One issue that needs further research, though we do not attempt any in-depth discussion here, is the relationship between the phonetic prominence and *man*.

In (13), *man* marks the focus *misail* ‘missile’, as was discussed in Section 1. Supposing the embedded clause is the scope, we come to the conclusion that (9) and (13) can be of the same interpretation. Is this conclusion supported by native speakers’ intuition? The intuition seems quite elusive in this case, so let us try and sort out the fine shades of meaning in terms of scopal differences.

In the first place, (13) is ambiguous. In a way to elicit the speakers’ intuition, suppose we have the following hypothetical scenario.⁵⁾ Iraq and the US reach an agreement that complies with the stipulation (13). Later Iraq embarks on a couple of projects for building its military as listed in the following table, and the US brings the matter to the International Court of Justice, arguing that Iraq has breached the previous agreement between the two countries. How would the Court decide on this issue? We have provided five situations, including three different situations and two possible combinations of the three. The question is that given each situation, whether Iraq has breached the agreement in that situation.

In one reading of (13), let us call it R1, where *paychiha* ‘deploy’ is a kind of reference point for contrast, the speakers’ intuition is like the following. A slight pause before the main verb *pantayha* ‘oppose’ helps to get this reading (**misail-man-paychiha-nun-kes-ul # pantayha-nta**).

Table 1

Situations: What Iraq has done.		Has Iraq breached the agreement?		
		Yes	No	Irrelevant
S1	research on missiles			✓
S2	deployment of missiles	✓		
S3	deployment of submarines			✓
S4	S1+S2	✓		
S5	S2+S3		✓	

In the other reading, call it R2, where the verb in the main clause *pantayha* ‘oppose’ becomes a reference point for contrast, the intuition goes like the following. Putting in a little pause after the *man* phrase and phonetically concatenating the rest of the sentence as if it were a

5) Perhaps a brief note on the example sentences and the situations described is needed here. Needless to say, they are purely hypothetical, and they were chosen solely on the basis of their convenience in eliciting native speakers’ intuition.

single phonetic unit help to get this reading (*misail-man* # *paychiha-nun-kes-ul-pantayha-nta*).

Table 2

Situations: What Iraq has done.		Has Iraq breached the agreement?		
		Yes	No	Irrelevant
S1	research on missiles			✓
S2	deployment of missiles	✓		
S3	deployment of submarines		✓	
S4	S1+S2	✓		
S5	S2+S3	✓		

The distinction between 'No' and 'Irrelevant' seems rather subtle. In both cases, however, Iraq can argue that it has not breached the agreement. The crucial point of comparison between Table 1 and Table 2 is S5, because that is the situation where the two readings contrast sharply. In one case, the judgement is that Iraq complied with the agreement. According to this reading R1, Iraq can argue that it has not breached the agreement as long as it deploys other weapons as well as missiles.

In the other case, Iraq is considered to have violated the agreement. According to this reading the US can argue that Iraq has failed to keep the promise since Iraq has deployed missiles after, all, regardless of the deployment of other weapons.

Assuming that the speakers' intuition reflected in Tables 1 and 2 are more or less valid, the question we might raise is how the two readings, R1 and R2, can be captured in the grammar. The analysis tools we have at hand, such as focus and scope, and possibly focus movement, can be exploited to represent R1 and R2.

For R1, we limit the scope of the focus to the embedded clause as nothing in the main clause plays a role for the contrast with alternatives. On the other hand, for R2, we extend the scope of the focus to the main clause since the main verb *pantayha* 'oppose' is the reference point. So assuming that *misail* is the focus in both cases, we have the following table.

Table 3 (to be revised)

	focus	Scope
R1	(<i>misail</i> 'missiles')	embedded clause
R2	(<i>misail</i> 'missiles')	main clause

Let us now return to (9), which is repeated as (14).

- (14) mikuk-un [irakhu-ka **misail**-ul paychiha]-nun kes-*man* pantayha-nta.
 USA-TOP Iraq-NOM missile-ACC deploy thing-*man* oppose

Sentence (14) is like (13) except for the position of the delimiter *man*, which led us to hypothesize that *man* is the scope marker. We first need to sort out the speakers' intuition on the meaning of the sentence, and Table 2 given above reflects it most closely, which we called R2.

However, we have assumed in Table 3 that the scope for R2 should be the whole sentence. In other words, in R2 the focus *misail* 'missiles' is somehow related to the verb in the main clause. So we are now forced to retract our previous conclusion that *man* is the scope marker. Then a question still remains for (14): if *man* in (14) is neither a focus marker nor a scope marker, what is it doing in the sentence?

Limiting our analytical tools to the ones we already have, there is a way to accommodate the readings given in Tables 1 and 2 making use of the concepts focus and scope. We suggest revising Table 3 as follows:

Table 3'

	focus	Scope
R1	<i>misail</i> 'missiles'	embedded clause
R2	N with embedded clause	main clause

Table 3' essentially claims that *man* in (14)(=9)) is the focus marker. In other words, the *man* attached noun with the embedded clause IS the focus. The merit of this assumption is rather obvious. The rather mysterious status of *man* in (14) is now clarified, and we can say that *man* has a single unified function as a focus marker.⁶⁾

Let us summarize our discussion before we move on. We are suggesting two configurations as the focus structure associated with *man*. One is (15), where there seems to be a scope ambiguity with respect to *man*.

- (15) [so ... [NP_{SI} ... X-*man* ...] N] ...]

6) The contrast frame we provided in (10) and (12) will have to be extended accordingly. See further discussion in the following.

The other configuration is (16), where there is no ambiguity that is directly caused by *man* marking.

(16) [so ... [NP_{S1} ... X ...] N] -*man* ...]

(16) can be ambiguous, as (9) and (11) show, but the ambiguity is covariant with the placement of phonetic prominence rather than with the surface position of *man*. Let us call this ambiguity PP-induced ambiguity or meaning variation, which is reflected in the variation between S1 and S2 in Tables 1 and 2. PP-induced ambiguity contrasts with (15) where there is an ambiguity without any variation in phonetic prominence. Let us call this *man*-induced ambiguity, which is reflected in the variation between S2 and S3 in Tables 1 and 2.

We claim that in (15) there are two possible focus structures that are generated due to the properties of *man*. In one, the focus structure is represented on the surface: the *man* attached category is the focus. The other focus structure for (15) is just like (16), where the focus is extended to the embedded clause and the (semantically empty) head noun. Our claim is that these two possibilities match the *man*-induced meaning variation, which is summarized in Table 3'. In other words, while (15) allows both the focus-in-the-embedded-clause reading and the focus-in-the-main-clause reading, in (16) the former is blocked.

Postponing our discussion on how (15) can correspond to (16) and what further arguments there are for our claim (See Section 4), let us consider a more complicated case. We could push the speakers' intuition to its extreme, and check the grammaticality and readings of the following sentence.

(17) mikuk-un [irakhu-ka **misail-man** paychiha]-nun kes-*man* pantayha-nta.
USA-TOP Iraq-NOM missile-*man* deploy thing-*man* oppose

Notice that there are two *man*'s in (17), which is like a combination of (13) and (14). The significance of this sentence in light of our current discussion is that if the second *man* has no role at all, (17) should be identical to (13).

Native speakers' reaction and comments to (17) are various, ranging from the comment "It is OK, but sounds redundant" to the one like "It seems to constrain things more, compared to (13) and (14)." The following table seems to represent speakers' intuition on (17) rather closely, taking it

into consideration that the distinction between ‘No’ and ‘Irrelevant’ is not clear-cut.

Table 4

Situations: What Iraq has done.		Has Iraq breached the agreement?		
		Yes	No	Irrelevant
S1	research on missiles		✓	
S2	deployment of missiles	✓		
S3	deployment of submarines		✓	
S4	S1+S2		✓	
S5	S2+S3		✓	

In (17) the contrast now holds between ‘deployment of missiles’ and all the other situations, which are excluded because of the presence of double *man*. Iraq has now more options open to itself as long as it does not confine itself only to the deployment of missiles, that is, it is O.K. now even to deploy missiles if it simultaneously does something else as well. For example, if it deploys submarines as well as missiles, it can claim that it complies with the agreement. Or it is now allowed to deploy missiles if it conducts some research on missiles at the same time. The options for Iraq to choose from get wider as the content of the stipulation that is narrowed down by the use of the exclusive operator *man* becomes more specific.

(18) [_{so} ... [_{NP}[_{S1} ... NP-*man* ...] N]-*man* ...]

So the meaning of (17) is not identical to that of (13), and the second *man* seems to play a certain role in (18). We will take (18) as containing two *man*-induced focus structures, one being embedded in the other. Their semantic effect is as follows: The first *man* blocks PP-induced variation as it blocks other parts in the embedded clause to get phonetic prominence, while the second *man* blocks *man*-induced meaning variation which was allowed in the configuration (15).

Summarizing our discussion so far, we have proposed a more flexible notion of focus is needed to settle the issue whether *man* is the focus marker or a scope marker. While *man* in Korean typically marks the focus in the surface structure, the focus can be extended to a larger

constituent, which we call the ‘extended’ focus. In the case of (15), the category with *man* is the focus, but the focus can also be extended to include the embedded clause and the relative clause head, thus resulting in the ambiguity. In (16), there is no such ambiguity as *man* is already attached to the relative head on the surface. In the next section, we provide more arguments for the concept of extended focus, again based on the ambiguity that involves *man* but in different constructions.

4. Focus Extension

Consider the following sentence (Choe, 1996).

- (19) Mary-uy son-*man* cap-ass-e.
 Mary-GEN hand-*man* hold-PAST
 ‘I only held Mary by her hand.’

Sentence (19) is ambiguous in two ways: In one reading, which is called the ‘regular’ reading, the *man* attached noun *son* ‘hand’ may contrast with some other part of Mary’s body, say, her shoulder.⁷⁾ But a much more preferred interpretation is that hand-holding is the only thing he did, strongly implying that he didn’t do anything heavier than that, say, kissing (cf. Yang, 1993, p. 244), or hugging, or something more intimate. In this reading, the whole VP phrase, ‘holding hands’ may contrast with other intimate behaviors between Mary and the speaker. This is what we now call the ‘extended’ focus reading. Notice that the *man* attached noun *son* ‘hand’ constitutes only part of the extended focus.⁸⁾ On the basis of such ambiguity, I argued in Choe (1996) that the *man* attached element may constitute only part of the larger substitutive phrase. In our current terms, the larger substitutive phrase is the extended focus, and we will first recapitulate some of the major arguments in Choe (1996), and then will discuss how the extension can be achieved.

7) An anonymous reviewer raises the possibility that the ambiguity can better be explained in terms of Horn’s R-inference, an interesting point that needs further research.

8) Choe (1996) used the term ‘scope’ in different sense from the one used in this paper. There, the ‘scope’ of *man* meant the man-attached constituent, or the larger substitutive part. The ‘wide-scope’ reading of *man* in Choe (1996) now corresponds to ‘extended focus’ reading in this paper.

A piece of evidence that supports the focus ambiguity of *man* comes from the semantic ambiguity of the simple sentences that involve *man*. For example, in (5), repeated here as (20),

- (20) John-i Mary-*man* ttara-tanin-ta.
 John-NOM Mary-*man* chase after
 ‘John chases after Mary only.’

it is possible to interpret the sentence as meaning ‘John indulges in chasing after Mary (to the exclusion of other activities like studying).’ I argued in Choe (1996) that this reading becomes salient in the following where the underlined phrase is inserted.

- (21) John-i kongpu-nun anha-ko Mary-*manttaratani*-nta
 John-NOM study not (and) Mary-*man*chase after
 ‘John does not study but chases after Mary.’

Note that the alternative members in this reading should be something that corresponds to the content of the VP, rather than the object NP as was the case in the first reading.

Additional supporting evidence for the possibility of extended focus of *man* can be found in the idiomatic expressions like the following, as discussed in Choe (1996).

- (22) ay-*man* tha-nta.
 worry/anxiety-*man* burn
 ‘(I am) nervous/worried.’

ay-ka tha-ta ‘get anxious’ is an idiom, whose meaning does not observe the usual compositionality principle. But notice that in (22), *man* is attached like an infix to the idiom. It is again synonymous with (23).

- (23) ay-ka tha-ki-*man* ha-nta.
 worry/anxiety-NOM burn-NMNLZR-*man* do-DCL

Thus, *man* in (22) should be treated as taking the whole idiom as its focus, not its part as it does on the surface.

A third type of evidence that supports the possible extended focus

reading of *man*, also from Choe (1996), involves *man* attached expressions that apparently cause a paradoxical situation. Given the ‘sister member’ restriction on the use of *man*, there are certain words that *man* cannot attach to. For example, a universal expression *moduni* ‘everybody’ cannot properly combine with *man* because, given that it has a universal reading, there cannot exist a set of its alternatives; the universal quantification involves every expected member in the given domain. But consider the following that sounds quite ok.

- (24) *moduni-man* *tonguiha-myen*, *na-to* *ttaru-kess-so*.
 everybody-*man* agree-if, I-too follow-would
 ‘Only if everybody agrees, I would follow, too.’

The apparently paradoxical combination of *moduni* ‘everybody’ and *man* cannot be appropriately explained if only the ‘default’ reading is allowed for *man*. (24) is equivalent in meaning to the following sentence where *man* is attached to the clause, as can be expected now.

- (25) *moduni-ka* *tonguiha-ki-man-hamyen*, *na-to* *ttaru-kess-so*.
 everybody-NOM agree-NMNLZR-*man*-if, I-too follow-would

Chae (1977) found out certain question words, numeral expressions, and adverbs sound ungrammatical when *man* is attached to them.

- (26) **motwu-man* ‘everybody’, **amwu-man* ‘nobody’, **te-man* ‘more’,
 **ilccik-man* ‘early’

But I pointed in Choe (1996) that many of Chae’s examples, though not all, become quite acceptable when the context is appropriate. For example, (27a) and (28a) respectively have the ‘ungrammatical’ expressions *te-man* and *ilccik-man* that are listed in (26).

- (27) a. *te-man* *kakkai* *o-a* *b-oa*.
 more-*man* close come see
 ‘If you come closer, (I’ll beat you).’
 b. *te* *kakkai-man* *o-a* *b-oa*.
 more close- *man* come see
 ‘If you come closer, (I’ll beat you).’

- (28) a. *ilccik-man ttena- myen toi.*
 early-*man* leave if fine
 'We only have to leave early.'
- b. *ilccik ttena-ki-man ha-myen toi.*
 Early leave-NMNLZR-*man* do if fine
 'We only have to leave early.'

The (a)-sentences in the above, when interpreted as in (b) where the focus associated with *man* is an extended one, sound ok. This again confirms the hypothesis that *man* can be associated with a phrase that dominates it.

Let us now summarize our discussion so far concerning the constructions where the focus extension is allowed. (29) gives an overview of focus extension.

- (29) Cases of focus extension
- a. A focus consisting of XP+*man* can be extended to include its nearest dominating VP. ((20), (22))
- b. A focus consisting of XP+*man* can be extended to include its nearest dominating S. ((24), (27), (28))

A caveat is in order. The observation in (29) ignores some of the structural properties of *man* construction. For example, we suggest (29) covers cases like (30) and (31), but *man* in (31) is positioned between the nominalized main verb *thaki* 'burn' and the light verb *hanta* 'do.'⁹⁾

- (30) *ay-man tha-nta.*
 worry/anxiety-*man* burn
 '(I am) nervous/worried.'

9) In constructions like (31) it is possible for *man* to mark only the nominalized noun as focus. In the following sentence, for example,

ai-tul-i ssau-ki-man ha-e.
 kid-PL-NOM fight-NMNLZR-*man* do-DCL
 'Kids only do the fighting.'

it is possible to interpret only *ssau-ki* 'fighting' as the focus. However, in (31), where the subject and the verb forms an idiom, it seems not possible to get the reading where *tha-ki* by itself constitutes the focus. In (31), the phonetic prominence still falls on *ay-ka*.

- (31) ay-ka tha-ki-man ha-nta.
worry/anxiety-NOM burn-NMNLZR-man do-DCL

Presumably, the surface distribution of *man* is regulated primarily by its morphological constraints. As a bound morpheme, the range of categories it can attach to is limited to NPs and AdvP's, thus sometimes conflicting with its semantic and pragmatic function. Therefore the generalizations in (29) have to be understood as reflecting the propositional content than the surface structure per se. Cases that involved relative clause construction that were discussed in Section 3 do not exactly conform to the generalization (29b).

- (32) [so ... [NP_[SI] ... X-man ...] N] ...] (=15)

But again, provided that the relative head noun is semantically empty (See Footnote 1), we will assume that (29) also covers cases like (32).¹⁰⁾

As for the question of how the extension is achieved, we can adopt a version of Focus Projection like the one proposed by Selkirk (1984).

(33) Focus Projection

- a. An accented word is F-marked.
- b. F-marking of the head of a phrase licenses F-marking of the phrase.
- c. F-marking of an internal argument of a head licenses F-marking of the head.

In English, focus is marked by the phonetic prominence. Adopting (33) to our discussion of *man*, we can propose the following hypothesis.

10) When the head noun is not semantically empty, the extension of focus is not allowed.

- i) Na-man co-a-ha-nun saram-lul mana-ess-e
Me-man like person-ACC meet-PAST-DCL
'(I) met the person who likes me only.'
- ii) Na-lul co-a-ha-nun saram-man mana-ess-e
Me-ACC like person-man meet-PAST-DCL
'(I) met only the person that likes me.'

(34) Focus Marking by *man*¹¹⁾

- a. A *man*-attached phrase is the focus.
- b. The *man*-attached focus can be extended to its nearest dominating VP.
- c. The *man*-attached focus can be extended to its nearest dominating S when the S is part of the subordinate clause.

(34) covers cases of focus extension given in (29). There are two comments we would like to add to (34). One is that although (34) suits our purpose well now, ultimately we want the extension mechanism stated on the semantic representation as was pointed out earlier. The second comment is that focus extension is not done automatically: there have to be some triggering factors from the context. Either the context has to heavily favor the extension, or the context has to force the extension as in the case of idiomatic expressions.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have explored several possibilities concerning the proper role of the particle *man* in the Korean grammar. Starting from the widely held assumption that *man* is the focus marker, we have partly confirmed this assumption and yet there were some complicating cases for which we need to introduce a concept 'extended' focus to explain semantic ambiguity involving *man*. Several arguments for focus extension were presented based on various kinds of constructions. We have also proposed a focus marking mechanism for the focus extension. In this research, particular attention was paid to the question of how to elicit native speakers' intuition regarding some complicated data.

References

Chae, W. (1977). A study on particles in Modern Korean. [in Korean].

11) An anonymous reviewer suggests that 'projection' would be a more appropriate term than 'extension,' but we keep the latter in this paper since it sounds less associated with the syntactic structure and thus more neutral.

- Kwueyenkwu [Korean Studies]* 39, Seoul National University.
- Choe, J.-W. (1996). Scopal ambiguities of *man*. [in Korean]. *Ene [Language]* 21(1-2), 673-692.
- Chomsky, N. (1976). Conditions on rules of grammar. *Linguistic Analysis* 2, 303-51.
- Drubig, H. B. (1994). *Island Constraints and the Syntactic Nature of focus and Association with Focus*. University of Tübingen, Ms.
- Jackendoff, R. (1972). *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Kadmon, N. (2001). *Formal Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Partee, B. (1999). Focus, quantification, and semantics-pragmatics issues. In P. Bosch and van der Sandt, eds., *Focus: Linguistic, Cognitive, and Computational Perspectives* (pp. 213-231). London: Cambridge University Press.
- Rooth, M. (1985). *Association with Focus*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. UMass, Amherst.
- Rooth, M. (1992). A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1, 75-116.
- Rooth, M. (1996). Focus. In S. Lappin, ed., *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory* (pp. 271-298). Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Selkirk, E. O. (1984). *Phonology and Syntax: The Relation between Sound and Structure*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Sohn, H.-M. (1999). *The Korean Language*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Sung, K.-S. (1979). *A Study of Korean Particles*. [In Korean]. Taegu, Korea: Hyeongseol Publishing Co.
- Taglicht, J. (1984). *Message and Emphasis: On Focus and Scope in English*. London: Longman.
- von Stechow, A. (1991). Current issues in the theory of focus. In A. von Stechow and D. Wunderlich, eds., *Semantik/Semantics: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research* (pp. 804-825). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Yang, I.-S. (1972). *Korean Syntax*. Seoul: Paekhapsa.
- Yang, I.-S. (1973). Semantics of delimiters. *Language Research* 9(2), 84-121.
- Yang, I.-S. (1993). *Linguistic Explorations*. Seoul: Hanshin.
- Yoon, J.-W. (1988). *A Study of Koran Particles from a Discourse-analytic Perspective*. [in Korean]. unpublished doctoral dissertation. Yeungnam University, Korea.

Jae-Woong Choe
Department of Linguistics
Korea University
5-ga, 1 Anam-dong, Seongbuk-gu
Seoul 136-701, Korea
E-mail: jchoe@korea.ac.kr

Received: Sept. 1, 2002

Revised version received: Nov. 19, 2002

Accepted: Nov. 27, 2002