

Conditional Forms and Meanings in Korean

Chang-Bong Lee

1. Introduction

The conditional constructions in Korean are formed by the change of verb forms in the protasis; that is, by attaching conditional markers (verbal suffixes) to the verb stem. Among these conditional markers *-myen* and *-tamyen* are the two most frequently used in forming the conditional constructions in Korean. This paper aims to study the forms and meanings of these two conditional markers and their functional division within the Korean grammar.

The study of Korean conditionals is almost a barren field except for a few buds planted by a couple of Korean linguists, Bak (1987) and Lee, (1991). Bak (1987) examined the semantic properties of these two conditional markers and discussed the difference in their pragmatic function. His main argument was that *-myen* is the unmarked ubiquitous conditional marker used in what he calls 'given' conditionals as well as in 'irrealis' and 'counterfactual' conditionals, whereas *-tamyen* is restricted to mark only 'irrealis' and 'counterfactual' conditionals. Along this line of argument, Bak also claimed that unlike English conditionals, a 'given' situation can also be a conditional target in Korean; that is, even the realis situation is subject to conditionality in Korean.

In the first half of the paper, I argue against Bak's above claim and advocate the following points. I claim that *-myen* is not a ubiquitous conditional marker in Korean. I bring the evidence to show that the presence of *-myen* does not necessarily constitute a conditional clause. It will be shown that *-myen* can be used to express both a temporal clause for future reference and a 'given that *P*' clause. Having proved that not every occurrence of *-myen* clause constitutes a conditional construction, I argue that the fact that *-myen* is compatible with the 'given' (realis) situation in some set of

examples should not lead to the conclusion that even the realis domain can be a conditional target in Korean. I argue that Korean has two kinds of *-myen* in its lexicon: that is, *-myen_c* (conditional) and *-myen_g* (given that *P*) and its temporal use is an instance of *-myen_c* which is interpreted as temporal only in future reference context.

In the second half of the paper, I discuss the functional division between *-myen* and *-tamyen*. I start the discussion by noting their difference in (morpho)syntactic form. I observe that *-tamyen* can be characterized as a Korean version of what Inoue (1983) called a 'cleft-conditional' which is often paraphrased as 'if it is the case that ...' or 'if it is true that...' in English. I note that the cleft-conditional feature of *-tamyen* clause gives rise to the following two semantic features which are utilized pragmatically in the appropriate contexts. First, it provides the *-tamyen* clause with a 'quotative' feature. This semantic feature is utilized to make a mere hypothesis by quoting what is believed by somebody other than the speaker. One of such usage is found in what Iatridou (1990) called 'Factual Conditional' type where the speaker quotes what the addressee has just said in the previous discourse. I observe that in this context *-tamyen* is favorably chosen over the plain *-myen* for rhetoric purpose. Second, the cleft-conditional feature is responsible for the (highly) hypothetical feature of *-tamyen* clause. We will observe that the choice between *-tamyen* and *-myen* is determined by the speaker's attitude toward the content of the protasis or of the whole conditional sentence; that is, *-tamyen* is favored over *-myen* when the content of the protasis is viewed as an unexpected and remote possibility (highly hypothetical), whereas *-myen* prevails over *-tamyen* to mark the expected or immediate possibility (less hypothetical). We will observe that this hypothetical feature of *-tamyen* clause explains why it prevails over *-myen* when the content of the protasis describes an unrealistic situation with a counterfactual flavor. I also note that this hypothetical feature of *-tamyen* explains the fact that it is not compatible with the so-called *Generic Conditionals or Restrictive IF-clause* context where the content described in the protasis or in the whole conditional sentence is not characterized by being (highly) hypothetical.

2. The Semantics of *-myen*

2.1. The Domain of Conditionality in Korean

The general consensus on the conceptual domain of conditionals in natural language is that only the irrealis domain is subject to conditionality and the speaker's positive conviction is excluded in its target since it belongs to the realis domain, as argued by Akatsuka (1985, 1986). Bak (1987) challenged this long-standing generalization by arguing that Korean is exceptional in this generalization in that even the realis situation can be a conditional target in Korean. His argument was based on the observation that the *myen* clause which used to be believed as a prototypical conditional clause in Korean due to its morphosyntactic property is used to represent the speaker's positive conviction in the realis domain in some examples.

The first set of data Bak (1987) discussed are the following types as in (1).¹

(1) a. pom-i o-myen, isa-lul ha-l yeyceng-i-ta
 spring-NOM come-if moving-ACC do-MOD plan-be-DEC
 “When spring comes, I am going to move”

b. yel si-ka toy-myen cong-i wullin-ta.
 10 o'clock-NOM become-if bell-NOM ring-DEC
 “If (when) it gets to be 10 o'clock, the bell rings.

Bak (1987: 167)

Bak argued that the antecedents in (1) above represent given events that must occur in the course of time due to the nature of things and the fact that *-myen* is appropriate in this context clearly shows that given situations can be a conditional target in Korean. I argue, however, that the above sentences do not constitute the examples of conditional data.² Notice that the most appropriate interpretation of each example in (1) above should be

¹ Throughout this paper the following abbreviation will be used in the gloss.

NOM-nominative	ACC-accusative	DEC-declarative
HON-honorific	PST-past	QM-question marker
NEG-negation	FUT-future	TOP-topic
IMP-imperative	PRS-present	PROP-propositive
MOD-modifying ending	SUPP-supposition	QUO-quotative

temporal, but not conditional. For instance, in (1a), the fact that the spring comes is so natural that nobody will assume it as a possibility; that is, this situation is not subject to conditionality. The speaker doesn't mean, by uttering this *-myen* clause, that under the condition (possibility) that spring comes he will move, but it is interpreted as meaning that when (after) spring arrives he will move.

The next set of data is the most interesting and puzzling kind. Bak (1987) observed that in some deitic contexts *-myen* can be used to describe the situation which the speaker knows already. Consider (2).

- (2) a. ney-ka enni-myen ceyil-iya?
 you-NOM elder sister-if best-be-QM
 'Given that you are my elder sister, can you do anything?'
 Bak (1987: 168)

- b. hyung-i-myen hyung-tapkey hayngtong-hay
 elder brother-be-if elder brother-like behave-IMP
 'Given that you are my elder brother, behave like my brother.'

The speakers uttering the above sentences patently knows the content of the antecedent clause. For instance, (2a) can be felicitously uttered by a younger sister to her older sister in the appropriate context: for instance, when she is upset about her sister's arrogant attitude. This seems to be a real example to show that even the positive conviction can be a conditional target in Korean.

² Lukoff (1982) also observed that those phrases consisting of a noun denoting a period of time or a point of time plus the verb like *toyta* (to become) or *ota* (to come) realized by *-myen* in the antecedent clause should be translated as temporal; that is, something like 'when it gets to be...'. Let us note a couple of his examples. It is worth noting that the temporal interpretation of those sentences which are syntactically of conditional form is most often found with reference to future events.

- (1) yoruymbanghak-i toy-myen san-ina pata-ro nolre kanta
 summer vacation-NOM become-if mountain-or sea-to to play go
 'When summer recess starts, they go on vacation to the mountains or sea-shore.'
- (2) pom-i o-myen nal-i kilece-yo
 spring-NOM come-if day-NOM become longer-DEC
 'When spring comes over, the days grow longer.'

However, again in this case, I argue that these examples do not constitute the conditional data despite the presence of *-myen*. Under the situation that the speaker obviously knows the content of the *-myen* clause in the realis domain, the use of *-myen* clause in this case does not evoke IF-conditional meaning but rather it creates the 'given that *P*' reading. For instance, in (2b), the younger brother who is talking with his real older brother won't suppose the possibility of the hearer being his brother as a condition unless he is insane or joking for sarcastic purpose, since the relationship of brotherhood is innately given. Under this situation the only available reading by the use of *-myen* clause is 'given that *P*' reading.

There is a plenty of examples to show this type of *-myen* clause in Korean. Consider the following set of example.

(3) a. (receiving \$10 from a friend)

\$10 *i-myen* chwwungpwunhay

\$10-*be-if* enough-DEC

'Given \$10, it is enough.'

b. (knowing that the wife just delivered a baby girl)

ttal-*i-myen* ettayyo? ttai-*i-myen* te coha-yo

daughter-*be-if* what's wrong? daughter-*be-if* more better-DEC

'Given that we got a baby girl, what's wrong with it? It's better to get a baby girl'.

Both of the examples in (3) above show that *-myen* clause is used to create a 'given that *P*' type of clause. For instance, the husband can felicitously utter (3b) to his wife to answer her question like "Honey, aren't you disappointed that we got a girl instead of a boy?" Since both the husband and the wife already know the sex of their child after delivery, the use of *-myen* clause in this case never evokes the conditional reading. What *-myen* clause does in this case is mark the given situation (we got a baby girl).³

However, it is important to notice that what decides a type of reading in the use of *-myen* clause is the speaker's subjective attitude toward the content of the *-myen* clause at the time of utterance. The same sentence with *-myen* clause can be read either as an ordinary conditional sentence or as a

³From a discourse point of view this *-myen* clause is used to mark the given knowledge (shared knowledge) between the speaker and the hearer as a topic.

'given that P' (A) type of composite sentence depending on the different attitude the speaker takes toward its content at the time of utterance. Consider the following example.

- (4) *nayngchangko-ey maykcwu-ka issuy-myen, hancan hayyaci*
 refrigerator-in beer-NOM exist-if, a cup have to drink
 'Given that we have beer in the refrigerator, we have to drink some.'
 'If there is some beer in the refrigerator, we will have to drink some.'

The speaker uttering (4) above can express two different attitudes depending on the context at the point of utterance.⁴ Suppose that the speaker is on his way back to his home with his friend in the evening. He is not sure whether he stored some beer in the refrigerator in the morning. In this situation, what he intends to say by uttering (4) is something like 'I am not sure whether there is some beer in the refrigerator. However, if there is some, surely we will drink some.' However, think of a different context. Suppose that the speaker and his friend arrive at his home. He has not stayed at home for some days, and thus he is not sure what will be inside the refrigerator. However, he just hopes that there is some beer so that he and his friend can enjoy drinking some. He opens the refrigerator door to check it out and notices that there is indeed some beer stored. In this situation, what the speaker intends to say by uttering *-myen* clause is something like 'I was not sure what will be inside the refrigerator. I am so happy to find some beer. Given that we have some beer in the refrigerator, we surely should enjoy drinking some.'

Reflecting upon the observation so far, we realize that the fact that in some examples *-myen* clauses can represent the realis situation should not lead to the conclusion that the realis domain can be a conditional target in Korean because it was verified that those examples do not constitute the conditional data. The discussion of *-myen* clause data so far then contra-

⁴ The fact that one morphosyntactically uniform sentence (*-myen* clause) can be read in two different ways convinces us that the conditional sentence in Korean is not definable morphosyntactically. This fact in Korean supports Akatsuka (1985: 628)'s claim that conditionals should be identified conceptually by considering the speaker's attitude toward the situation described in the antecedent clause or in the whole conditional construction, but not by its (morpho)syntactic form.

dicts Bak's claim but confirms Akatsuka (1985)'s position that the conceptual domain of conditionals is universally the irrealis world.

2.2. *-myen_c* and *-myen_r*

In the previous section we observed that *-myen*, what used to be believed as a prototypical conditional marker in Korean, can create such non-conditional readings like temporal clauses and 'given that *P*' clauses besides conditional clauses. Given this fact on *-myen* clause data, the question arises as to how *-myen* should be stored in the Korean lexicon. We might first think that there are three kinds of *-myen* clause such that *-myen_c* (conditional), *-myen_t* (temporal) and *-myen_r* (given) in the Korean lexicon. However, I vote for the position that there are two kinds of *-myen* clause; namely, *-myen_c* and *-myen_r*, and as for *-myen_t*, it is an instance of *-myen_c* which is interpreted as temporal in the appropriate context for the following reasons.

If we think of *-myen* clause as a separate temporal clause, we expect it to be interchangeable with a more prototypical temporal clause *-(ul)ttay* clause (roughly *when* clause in English). However, we find that *-myen* clause cannot always be used to create a temporal clause replacing *-ttay* clause as in (5).

- (5) *cip-ey tochakha-yess-ulttay (*umyen)*, *chenhwa-ka wass-eyo*
 home-at arrive-PAST-when(*if) telephone-NOM came-DEC
 'When (I) arrived at home, a telephone rang.'

In (5), the use of *-myen* can never be interpreted as temporal. With the past tense form of the verb in the antecedent clause, *-myen* clause is only interpreted as conditional. Consider (6) again.

- (6) a. *Chelswu-ka cip-ey tochakha-yess-umyen*, *chenhwahal-keya*
 Chelswu-NOM home-at arrive-PAST-if call-will-DEC
 'If Chelswu arrived at home, (he) will call.'
- b. *Chelswu-ka cip-ey tochakha-yess-ulttay (*-umyen)*,
cenhwaha-yess-ta
 Chelswu-NOM home-at arrive-PAST-when(*if),
 call-PAST-DEC
 'When Chelswu arrived at home, (he) called (me).'

Notice in (6) that *-myen* clause cannot replace the function of *-ttay* clause to describe the simultaneous temporal relation between two past events. The use of *-myen* clause with the past tense form of the verb creates only the conditional reading as in (6a). If we take the position that Korean has *-myen*, as a separate form in the lexicon, we have no answer to explain why (6b) with *-myen* should be bad.

At this point we should notice that all those examples where *-myen* clause is interpreted as temporal is when the tense of the verb in the protasis is in the future tense as we saw in the earlier examples as in (1). Strictly speaking the situation in the future is not in the realis domain no matter how obvious it is in terms of its possible realization since it is not realized yet. Actually, the possibility of a conditional clause being interpreted as a temporal clause when it predicts the future event that is obvious from the speaker's point of view is also found in English. Reilly (1986) points out that in English there are certain instances in which a *when* temporal and a conditional clause (*if* clause) are roughly synonymous. One of such cases is typically found when the content of the protasis refers to the predictive future event as in (7) below.

- (7) When/If the strawberries are in, we'll make fresh strawberry pie.
(Reilly 1986: 313)

The observation so far suggests that we view those *-myen* clauses in (1) as those which are interpreted as temporal clauses when things that are supposed in the protasis are too obvious in terms of their possible realization.

Considering these points, I conclude that there are two kinds of *-myen* clause; namely, *-myen_c* and *-myen_g*, in the lexicon and as for *-myen*, it is an instance of *-myen_c* which is interpreted as temporal in the appropriate context.

3. The Functional Division between *-myen* and *-tamyen* Clause

When we conceive an isolated example of *-myen* and *-tamyen* clause, they look interchangeable with no semantic difference as they are both equally translatable by IF-clause in English as in (8).

- (8) nayil Chelswu-ka Seoul-ey o-*myen*(n-*tamyen*), manna-kess-eyo
tomorrow Chelswu-NOM Seoul-to come-*if*, meet-will-DEC
'If Chelswu comes to Seoul, I will meet him.'

However, the closer look of the form of each clause and its associated semantic feature will reveal that these two clauses map two different semantic and/or pragmatic functions such that one is exclusively used in some contexts where the other cannot be used or one is chosen favorably over the other for rhetoric purpose.

3.1. The 'Cleft-conditional' Form of *-tamyen* Clause

The starting point to find a difference between *-myen* and *-tamyen* should be found in their morphosyntactic form. Unlike the plain *-myen*, *-tamyen* is a contracted form of *-tako hamyen* which consists of the complementizer *ko* followed by the conditional form of the verb *hata*(=say). Assuming that the contracted form preserves the underlying meaning associated with the full form, then we predict that *-tamyen* clause evokes such conditional meaning like 'if somebody says that...'

Inoue (1983) introduces the term *cleft* and *non-cleft* conditional clause to characterize the forms of conditional construction in Japanese. She notes that Japanese is equipped with both *cleft* and *non-cleft* conditionals exemplified in (9) below.

- (9) a. Tokyo-ni sum -e ba kuruma-ga ir-ana-i
Tokyo-in live -if car-NOM need-not-Nonpast
- b. -(no) nara (ba)
'If (one) lives in Tokyo, (one) does not/will not need a car.'
(Inoue 1983: 252)

According to Inoue, *-e ba* clause in (9a) is an example of *non-cleft* form consisting of the tenseless verbal ending *-e* followed by the conditional marker *-ba*, while (9b) is an example of *cleft* form consisting of the complementizer *no* followed by *nara*, the conditional form of the nonpast copula *-da*, followed by the optional *-ba*.

Comparing the structural feature of *-tamyen* clause in Korean with the Japanese data in (9) above, I observe that *-tamyen* clause parallels *(no) nara (ba)* clause having a cleft-conditional form.⁵ One of the important pie-

⁵ It is worth noting here that the cleft-conditional forms in two languages differ in two aspects. One is that in Japanese, as Inoue reported, the conditional marker *-ba* can be optional, but such possibility is never allowed in Korean as the following example demonstrates; e.g., **nayil Chelwu-ka Seoul-ey o-n-ta(ko) ha man-*

ces of evidence to show the cleft-conditional feature of *-tamyen* clause is the fact that *-tamyen* clause must contain a tense or mood marker inside the verbal conjugation unlike *-myen* clause. For instance, consider the data in (10).

- (10) a. Chelswu-ka Seoul-ey ka-myen, na-to kal-ke-ya
 Chelswu-NOM Seoul-to go-if, I-too go-will-DEC
 'If Chelswu goes to Seoul, I'll go, too.'
- b. Chelswu-ka Seoul-ey ka-n-tamyen, na-to kal-kess-ya
 -PRES
- c. *Chelswu-ka Seoul-ey ka-tamyen, na-to kal-kess-ya
- d. *Chelswu-ka Seoul-ey ka-ta.
- e. Chelswu-ka Seoul-ey ka-n-ta.

We observe that unlike *-myen* clause in (10a), *-tamyen* cannot be attached directly after the infinitival stem form *ka* (to go) as in (10c). There should be a tense morpheme like *n* between the stem and *-tamyen* as in (10b). This restriction is directly explained by the fact that we do not have such independent sentence like (10d) whereas (10e) is fine. What this fact shows is that *-tamyen* clause is attached only after the full and quotable form of independent sentence.

The following set of examples in (11) shows that *-tamyen* clause can be used to quote the independent clause with a full range of tense, aspect, and modal variation because it originally contained the complementizer *-ko* (roughly English *that*) attached after the declarative ending form *-ta*.

- (11) a. Chelswu-ka Seoul-ey ka-ss-tamyen, cikwum cip-ey
 -PAST now home-at
 i-ssuyl-keya
 stay-FUT-SUPP
 "If Chelswu went to Seoul, he may be at home."

na-kess-eyo. In this example, the conditional marker *-myen* must be present after the verb stem *ha*. The other difference is that the conditionalized verb is the copula verb *-da* in Japanese, while it is the verb *hata* (=say) in Korean. It might be worth researching on the semantic and/or pragmatic differences of the cleft conditionals associated with this formal difference between two languages, if such study turns out to be significant.

the IF-clause to be true. For instance, in (12b), the content of the IF-clause is believed by the speaker A. In other words, the FC IF-clause does not merely specify the circumstances in which the consequent is true, but assumes that the circumstances under which the consequent is true are the actual ones for some person. This some one is usually an addressee and it can be somebody else not participating in the discourse. For this reason, Iatridou calls this type 'Factual Conditional'.⁶

Let us consider one such context in Korean. Consider (13).

(13) A: Younghee-ka Hankuk-ey tolaol-kess-kass-a
 Younghee-NOM Korea-to return-FUT-seemto be-DEC
 "I think Younghee will return to Korea."

B: Younghee-ka Hankuk-ey tolao-(?myen)-n-*tamyen*
 Younghee-NOM Korea-to return-PRES-if
 way acikto cenwha-ka ep-ni?
 why still call-NOM not exist-Q
 "If Younghee is going to return to Korea, why there is still no call from her?"

In (13) the speaker B cites the speaker A's belief or opinion about Younghee in the form of *-tamyen* clause in his/her conditional statement. The use of *-myen* clause in this case is not impossible but rather infelicitous lacking the appropriate rhetoric effect to express the speaker's challenging attitude against the hearer's belief or opinion. Notice in (13) that the speaker B expresses his/her doubt by asking a question taking the hearer's belief as a mere hypothesis quoting it under *-tamyen* clause. The use of *-myen* clause in this context fails to provide this rhetoric effect.

This line of observation shows that *-tamyen* clause may be said to be a realized form of what Iatridou (1990) called 'Factual Conditionals' (FC). The

⁶ This name is not a good one to use because the adjective 'factual' may mislead some readers to think that the context where this type of conditional is used should describe a fact rather than an imaginable situation. However, as we will notice later, this type is mainly used to quote somebody else's subjective belief or opinion independent from its factuality. In fact, Iatridou acknowledges that this is a bad name (class lecture). I propose to use the name 'Quotative conditional' instead since the adjective 'quotative' can well express the typical nature of context where this type of conditional is used; that is, to quote somebody else's belief or opinion.

fact that Korean reserves a distinctive conditional marker for the FC type of conditional strongly supports Iatridou's original motivation to identify such type as one of the important types of conditionals in English. It is a very interesting observation that one type of conditional construction in one language is realized as a separate form in the grammar of the other language.

Based on this initial observation it is predicted that *-tamyen* is expected to occur when the presupposition requirement for the FC type is met; that is, in the context where the content of the antecedent clause is believed by somebody other than the speaker himself/herself.⁷ This prediction is borne out by the tendency that *-tamyen* clause in Korean is mostly used to represent the third party's feeling or opinion about which the speaker has no controlled judgment over its possible realization or the truth of the described situation and takes it as a mere hypothesis.

Consider the following example.

- (14) A: Chelswu-ka ttokttokhan-kess-kass-a
 Chelswu-NOM smart-seem to be-DEC

⁷ The felicitous use of *-tamyen* in this context is used to quote the belief or opinion by others who are not participating in the discourse. Consider (1).

- (1) A: (Upon hearing the news about Younghee from a friend)
 Younghee-ka Mikwuk-ey kongpwuha-re kan-tey
 Younghee-Nom U. S.-to study-to go-QUO
 "They say that Younghee is going to the U. S. to study."

- B: cengmal? Younghee-ka Mikwuk-ey kongpwuha-re kan-tamyen,
 really Younghee-Nom U. S.-to study-to go-if
 kaki-ceney songpyulhoy-rato hayyacci.
 going-before farewell party have to-SUGG
 "Really? If Younghee is going to the U. S. to study, why don't we have
 a farewell party before her departure?"

In the above example the content of *-tamyen* clause is not believed by the addressee. Notice that the addressee himself/herself initially quoted the content of *-tamyen* clause upon hearing the news about Younghee from other people. In this situation, then, it is somebody else not participating in the actual discourse who believes the content of *-tamyen* clause. We find that even in this situation the use of *-tamyen* clause is felicitous carrying the same rhetorical effect we observed in (13). The speaker B here accepts the content of the antecedent clause as a mere hypothesis since it just entered his/her knowledge as a newly learned information.

“I think Chelswu is smart.”

B: Chelswu-ka ttokttokha-*tamyen* (?*myen*),
 Chelswu-NOM be smart-*if*
 way tayhak-ey-nun mos ka-ss-ni?
 why college-to-TOP not not go-Past-QM
 “If Chelswu is smart, why he failed to get into college?”

In (14) the speaker A expresses his/her own subjective opinion about Chelswu's intelligence. The speaker B strongly challenges the addressee's view by providing the counter evidence in the question form, granting what the speaker A said to be true. In this context *-tamyen* is much more favorably used than *-myen* to quote what the addressee has just said as a mere hypothesis and argue from that point.

3. 2. 2. The Hypothetical Feature of *-tamyen*

In the previous section we observed that *-tamyen* clause is rhetorically used to quote the hearer's belief as a mere hypothesis in the middle of a discourse. In this section we will observe that *-tamyen* is not restricted to this kind of discourse bound context. We will observe that the speaker can felicitously use *-tamyen* conditional without necessarily repeating the belief or statement by others participating in the discourse as long as the speaker views the content of the antecedent clause as being more *hypothetical* from his/her own subjective point of view; that is, *-tamyen* is chosen over *-myen* by the speaker to mark the protasis or the whole conditional sentence as more hypothetical.

Comrie (1986) proposes 'hypotheticality' as one of the important parameters which can explain the crosslinguistic variation of conditionals. He defines the term 'hypotheticality' as the degree of probability of realization of the situations referred to in the conditional and more especially in the protasis.⁸ What decides the degree of hypotheticality in the conditional construc-

⁸ Comrie (1986: 88) adds that hypotheticality is a continuum with no clear-cut divisions and that different languages simply distinguish different degrees of hypotheticality along this continuum, the choice of form often being determined by subjective evaluation rather than by truth-conditional semantics. I argue, in this section, that Korean is one of such languages where the degree of hypotheticality is expressed by the different choice of two available conditional clauses; that is, *-tamyen* is chosen over *-myen* when the content described in the protasis or in the whole conditional sentence is considered more hypothetical.

tion is the speaker's subjective attitude toward the content described in the protasis or in the whole conditional construction.

I argue, in this section, that *-tamyen* is felicitously chosen over the plain *-myen* when the content described in the protasis or in the whole conditional sentence is viewed more hypothetical from the speaker's subjective point of view. Consider the following example.

- (15) A: ney pwukhan-i cengmal haykmwuki-lul kaciko-iss-tako
sayngkakha-ni?
you North Korea-NOM really nuclear weapon-ACC have-
COMP think-QM
'Do you think that North Korea really has a nuclear weapon?'
- B: kuylssey. pwukhan-i haykmwuki-ka iss-tamyen,
-(?umyen)
Well. North Korea-NOM nuclear weapon-NOM have-if,
kos namhan-ul chetuyleolcito molla.
soon South Korea-ACC invade may-DEC
'Well. I think that if North Korea has a nuclear weapon, they
may invade South Korea soon.'

Notice in (15) that the nature of the situation described in the protasis is something few speakers can regard as a highly probabilistic situation supported by his/her own belief. The possibility of North Korea having a nuclear weapon has been a current news focus in the international society and we the public have no other choice but to continue to resort to media coverage to find out the possible truth of such situation. In this situation, no speaker can view this situation as a highly probabilistic (less hypothetical) possibility within his/her own world of belief since no crucial evidence has been available. This situation then belongs to a more hypothetical realm of the speaker's world of probability and this leads him/her to choose *-tamyen* over the plain *-myen* to express the hypothetical nature of such situation.

This initial observation predicts then that the speaker will be led to choose *-tamyen* over *-myen* when the content of the protasis is viewed as the unexpected or remote possibility, whereas *-myen* is favored when it is considered as the expected or immediate possibility. In the following example we observe that the truth-conditionally same sentence is conditionalized by the different choice of two available markers, *-myen* and *-tamyen*, de-

pending on the speaker's subjective view of its hypotheticality reflected in the different kinds of discourse context. Consider the following example.

- (16) a. [A and B are both lecturers and they expect their workstudy student *Jin* to come soon to work according to his work schedule.]

A: i-il-un Jin-i-ka o-myen (#n-tamyen) shikhi-psita
 this work-TOP Jin-NOM come-if let him do-PROP
 'As for this work, if Jin comes, let's let him do it.'

B: kuyretkhye hap-sita. kuymbang ol-teynikka
 sc do-PROP soon come-SUPP
 'Let's do so, since he is going to come soon.'

- b. [A and B are both lecturers and they have a lot of work to do. They wish that their work study student comes to work for them. However, they are not sure since there is a heavy snow coming down.]

A: (Looking at the window and realizing there is a heavy snow coming down.)

iretkhye nwun-i o-nuntey Jin-i-ka ol-kkayo?
 sc snow-NOM come-while Jin-NOM come-will-QM
 'While it is snowing this much, will Jin come (do you think?)'

B: kuylsseyyo. Jin-i-ka o-n-tamyen ('myen), towum-i mhani
 toylthentay

Well. Jin-NOM come-if help-NOM much
 become-DEC

'Well. If Jin comes, it will be a lot of help.'

Notice in (16) that the truth conditionally same sentence is marked by two different conditional markers. In (16a) the speaker A views the content of the protasis as something expected as an immediate possibility and in this context *-myen* prevails over *-tamyen*. In fact the use of *-tamyen* is almost infelicitous in this context. On the contrary, in (16b), the possible realization of the same content in this context is not immediately expected and thus viewed as a less probabilistic (highly hypothetical) situation by the speaker. This hypothetical context leads the speaker B to choose *-tamyen* over *-myen* in (16b). This observation confirms that the choice between two conditional markers is governed by the speaker's subjective attitude toward the content

of the protasis in the individual discourse context such that *-tamyen* is chosen over *-myen* when the conditionalized context is more hypothetical.

This hypothetical nature of *-tamyen* conditional explains its incompatibility with the following types of conditionals. First, *-tamyen* clause is not appropriate to function as what Farkas & Sugioka (1983) identified as *restrictive IF-clauses*. This type of conditional clause is typically found with *generic NP* subjects and it is characterized by the interchangeability with *when*.⁹ The function of the *IF-clause* in this type is to restrict the domain of subject NP denotation and one of the important characteristics of this type of sentence is that it is paraphrasable by restrictive relatives as in (17).

- (17) a. Cats are intelligent when/if they have blue eyes.
 =Cats which have blue eyes are intelligent.
 b. Dogs are expensive when/if they are of a rare breed.
 =Dogs which are of a rare breed are expensive.
 (Carlson 1979)

When we think of the corresponding Korean examples of this type, we find that only *-myen* clause can be used for this type, whereas *-tamyen* is never compatible in this type.

- (18) a. koyangi-nun nwun-i pharah-myen(*tamyen), ttoktokha-ta
 cats-TOP eyes-NOM blue-if smart-DEC
 ‘Cats are intelligent when/if they have blue eyes.’
 b. kay-nun kwuihan phwumcong i-myen (*lamyen), pissa-ta
 dogs-TOP rare breed be-if expensive-DEC
 ‘Dogs are expensive when/if they are of a rare breed.’

The incompatibility of *-tamyen* clause in this type is predicted since the function of the conditional clause of this type is not to mark the (highly) hypothetical situation but rather restrict the denotation of the subject NP independent of the hypotheticality of the situation expressed in the protasis.

Second, *-tamyen* conditional is not compatible to mark what Reilly (1986) identified as *Generic Conditionals*. According to Reilly, this type de-

⁹ Actually the first linguist who identified this type of context is Carlson (1979). He called this sense of ‘when’ *atemporal when*.

scribes a regular co-occurrence relationship between two events as in (19).¹⁰

(19) If/when Jamie drinks cranberry juice, he gets a rash.

In this type *IF-clause* is just a part of stating such a regular co-occurrence relation and its content is not characterized by being (highly) hypothetical. Now let us consider one such example in Korean.

(20) i tanchwu-lul nwuluy-myen(*n-tamyen), cenki-ka tuyleomni-ta
 this button-ACC push-if, electricity-NOM get turned on-DEC
 'If you push this button, the electricity is turned on.'

(20) describes the co-occurrence relation between the pushing of a button and the resultant power-on of the electrical appliances. In this kind of context *-tamyen* is not compatible since the protasis is simply a part of stating a regular causal relation between two events in the whole conditional clause not being (highly) hypothetical in its content.

Now let us note one last context where *-tamyen* prevails over *-myen*. Bak (1987) noted that one of the important contexts where *-tamyen* is favorably used over *-myen* is where the content of the protasis expresses the unrealistic hypothesis with a counterfactual flavor. Consider the following example.

(21) nayil cikwu-ka mangha-(?myen)-n-tamyen, ne-nun
 tomorrow earth-NOM collapse-if, you-TOP
 mwuess-ul ceyil ha-ko sip-ni
 what-ACC most do want to-QM
 "If the earth collapses tomorrow, what do you what to do most?"

¹⁰ Because of this characteristic, this type of conditional is typically used to describe a rule or to predict a law-like consequence between two events as in the following examples.

- (1) a. If you get a touchdown, you get 6 points.
 b. If you are not over 21, you are not allowed to drink by the Pennsylvania law.

Generic Conditionals share the feature of being interchangeable with *when* with the *restrictive conditional* type. However, there are several kinds of syntactic and/or semantic differences. The discussion of such difference is worth noting but due to the reason of space readers are recommended to refer to Carlson (1979), Farkas & Sugioka (1983) and Reilly (1986).

The content described in the protasis in (21) is a very unrealistic hypothesis. In this context *-tamyeŋ* is favored over *-myeŋ* emphasizing the implication of unrealistic nature of the content of the protasis. Here it is not impossible to use *-myeŋ* instead of *-tamyeŋ*. However, it conveys the sense of immediate possibility of such a situation rather than expressing its unrealistic nature.

This tendency is much stronger in the preferential use of *-lamyeŋ* (the allomorphic variant of *tamyeŋ* after the copula verb 'ita' (=to be)) over the plain *-myeŋ*. *-lamyeŋ* is exclusively used to mark the unrealistic or even counterfactual antecedent clauses and in this context *-myeŋ* is not appropriate.

- (22) *nay-ka supemayn-i-lamyen* (?*myeŋ*) *Payktwusan-ey nalakal-thente*
 I-NOM superman-be-if Payktwu mountain-to fly-would be able to
 "If I were a superman, I would be able to fly to Mt. Payktwu."

The above two examples show that *-tamyeŋ* is strongly favored over the plain *-myeŋ* to hypothesize the unrealistic or even a counterfactual situation.

Such tendency of *-tamyeŋ* being favored to mark the unrealistic situation with a counterfactual flavor is easily explained by the (highly) hypothetical feature of *-tamyeŋ* conditional. The unrealistic situation with a counterfactual flavor is surely something any speaker puts in the (highly) hypothetical realm of his/her world of probability and this is surely compatible with the (highly) hypothetical feature of *-tamyeŋ* clause. For instance, in (21), the possibility of the earth being collapsed tomorrow is a kind of remote possibility just being an imaginable situation and in this context the speaker chooses *-tamyeŋ* over *-myeŋ* to express his/her (highly) hypothetical attitude toward the content described in the protasis.

We have observed so far that *-tamyeŋ* clause carries a (highly) hypothetical feature compared with the plain *-myeŋ* clause. Here the important question arises as to why *-tamyeŋ* carries such feature; that is, what explains such feature of *-tamyeŋ*. I argue in the following discussion that the structural feature of *-tamyeŋ* clause as being a cleft-conditional form is again responsible for such feature.

Recall from the previous discussion that we defined 'hypotheticality' as the degree of probability of realization of the situations referred to in the

conditional and more especially in the protasis, following Comrie (1986). We observed through several examples that what decides the degree of hypotheticality in the conditional construction is the speaker's subjective attitude toward the content described in the protasis or in the whole conditional construction. The degree of hypotheticality in each individual conditional context is then determined by the degree of the speaker's expression of probability in his/her own subjective world of belief. Here we need to recall that due to its cleft-conditional form *-tamyen* clause evokes such conditional reading paraphrasable in English by such expression like 'if it is the case that...' or 'if it is true that...'. This kind of conditional form is contrasted with the plain form of conditional sentence 'if *P*' in that the content of the protasis is quoted as if it is somebody else's belief. This gives the speaker a means of avoiding his/her own involvement in expressing any kind of belief as to the probability of the situation expressed in the conditional sentence. This means that the use of *-tamyen* clause carries a reduced degree of the speaker's expression of the probability of the conditional context and thereby increases the sense of hypotheticality.

4. Summary and Closing Remark

This paper studied the forms and meanings of two conditional markers *-myen* and *-tamyen*, presenting two main themes of argument. First, I argued that *-myen* is not a ubiquitous conditional marker in Korean and, contra Bak (1987)'s position, that Korean is not exceptional in its domain of conditionality; that is, the realis domain cannot be a conditional target in Korean. Second, I argued that *-tamyen* clause is characterized by its cleft-conditional form and this structural feature explains its felicitous use over *-myen* in the following contexts. One of such contexts was what Iatridou (1990) called 'Factual Conditional' type where the speaker quotes what the addressee just said in the previous discourse. The other context was where the speaker views the content of the protasis as (highly) hypothetical. We observed that the choice between *-tamyen* and *-myen* is determined by the speaker's attitude toward the content of the protasis or in the whole conditional sentence; that is, *-tamyen* is favored over *-myen* to mark the unexpected and remote possibility or the unrealistic situation with a counterfactual flavor (more hypothetical), whereas *-myen* prevails over *-tamyen*

when the content of the protasis is viewed as the expected or immediate possibility (less hypothetical) or when it is not characterized by being hypothetical as in *Restrictive If-clause* types or *Generic Conditionals*.

The observation made in the paper makes two contributions to the crosslinguistic study of conditionals. One is that Korean provides an example of languages where one morpheme which is morphologically uniform functions as a 'given that *P*' clause marker as well as a conditional marker. The other is that Korean is one of those languages that employs two different forms of conditional construction to express the different degree of hypotheticality. If it turns out that there are some other such languages that show the same pattern as in Korean conditionals, it will be a significant typological study to attempt to identify what aspect of grammar is shared in that group of languages to explain the sensitivity to such common property of grammar.

References

- Akatsuka, N (1985) 'Conditionals and the Epistemic Scale,' *Language* 61, 3.
- Akatsuka, N (1986) 'Conditionals are Discourse-bound' in Traugott, E. et al. (1986) *On Conditionals*, 333-351, Cambridge University Press.
- Bak, Sung-Yun (1987) 'Conditionals in Korean' in Kuno, S et al., ed., *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics II*, Hanshin Pub. Co., Seoul, Korea.
- Carlson, G. (1979) 'Generics and Atemporal 'When',' *Linguistics and Philosophy* 3, 49-98.
- Comrie, B. (1986) 'Conditionals: A Typology' in Traugott et al. (1986).
- Farkas, D. and Sugioka, Y. (1983) 'Restrictive If/When Clauses,' *Linguistics and Philosophy* 6, 225-258.
- Iatridou, S. (1990) 'Topics in Conditionals,' Ph. D. Dissertation, MIT.
- Inoue (1983) 'An Analysis of a Cleft Conditional in Japanese-Where Grammar meets Rhetoric,' *Journal of Pragmatics* 7, 251-62.
- Lee, Chungmin (1991) 'Conditional Constructions in Korean,' *Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress of Linguistics*, 451-54.
- Levinson (1983) *Pragmatics*, Cambridge University Press.
- Lukoff, Fred (1982) *An Introductory Course in Korean*, Yonsei University, Seoul.
- Traugott, E. et al. (1986) *On Conditionals*, Cambridge University Press.

ABSTRACT

Conditional Forms and Meanings in Korean

Chang-Bong Lee

The paper aims to study the forms and meanings of two conditional markers, *-myen* and *-tamyen*, and their functional division within the Korean grammar of conditionals. I claim the following two main points. First, I argue contra Bak (1987) that *-myen* is not a ubiquitous conditional marker in Korean and Korean is not exceptional in its domain of conditionality; that is, the realis domain cannot be a conditional target in Korean. Second, I argue that *-tamyen* clause is characterized by its cleft-conditional form and this structural feature explains its felicitous use over *-myen* in the following contexts. One of such contexts is what Iatridou (1990) called 'Factual Conditional' type where the speaker quotes what the addressee just said in the previous discourse. The other context is where the speaker views the content of the protasis as (highly) hypothetical. We observe that the choice between *-tamyen* and *-myen* is determined by the speaker's attitude toward the content of the protasis or in the whole conditional sentence such that *-tamyen* is favored over *-myen* to mark the unexpected or remote possibility or the unrealistic situation with a counterfactual flavor (more hypothetical), whereas *-myen* prevails over *-tamyen* when the content of the protasis is viewed as the expected or immediate possibility (less hypothetical) or when it is not characterized by being hypothetical as in *Restrictive If-clause* types or *Generic Conditionals*.

The observation made in the paper makes two pieces of contribution in the crosslinguistic study of conditionals. One is that Korean provides an example of languages where one morpheme which is morphologically uniform functions as a 'given that *P*' clause marker as well as a conditional marker. The other is that Korean is one of those languages that employs two different forms of conditional construction to express the different degree of hypotheticality.

Department of Linguistics
University of Pennsylvania
Williams 619
Philadelphia, PA 19104
U. S. A.