

Exclusiveness and Contrastiveness

Yong-Beom Kim

(Kwangwoon University)

ybkim@daisy.gwu.ac.kr

1. Introduction

In this paper it will be argued that two different focus-related notions can be established: exclusiveness and contrastiveness. For this purpose, Korean and English focus constructions are reviewed. It is claimed that exclusiveness applies to a limited number of evoked entities primarily due to the conversational implicature created in a certain context. On the other hand contrastiveness is a lack of exclusive implicature which results from blocking the implicature that are potential in the same context in which the exclusiveness can arise.

This paper will also touch on issues involving exhaustivity, as discussed by Szabolci (1980) and Kuno (1973). The dichotomy between informational vs identificational focus as proposed by Kiss (1988) will also be examined.

2. Contrastiveness vs Exclusiveness

In this section we begin by reviewing some of the previous studies on focus. The next few sections will reassess various authors' view on focus including Jackendoff (1972) and Gundel (1999).

2.1 Gundel's (1990) View

Gundel talks about *contrastive focus* in the examples like (1)¹.

- (1) A: What did Bill's sisters do at the party?
B: Bill's YOUNGEST sister kissed JOHN. (LH*)

A special kind of pitch pattern can be given to a constituent when the denotatum of the constituent is contrasted with something else. Thus, in (1) Bill's youngest sister is contrasted with the other sisters and it carries what Bolinger (1965) calls B accent, i.e., the LH* pitch pattern.

Fronted constituents usually have contrastive focus as shown in (2) and they usually show the same pitch pattern as (1B). Consider a situation where a married couple is planning to go on a trip and deciding what kind of clothing they should take. Suppose they laid out on their bed various kinds of clothes from which they are going to choose.

- (2) A: I can't really decide what to take on the trip.
B: This COAT I bought you, I think you should TAKE.

¹ In this paper, small capital letters were used to represent contrastive focus, and large capital letters indicates the H* pitch pattern

In this case *This COAT* is contrasted with other clothes on the bed. Consider (3).

- (3) a. Dogs must be CARRIED
b. DOGS must be CARRIED. (Halliday 1976)
c. THE DOG must be CARRIED.

(3a) could be a sign posted at the entrance of an escalator or an announcement, presumably with no special pitch pattern except for the final high pitch. (3b) could be uttered, we could imagine, while an usher gives an empty-handed customer a pet to carry on the escalator. (3c) can be uttered to a pet owner who is just about to put his/her dog on a leash in a situation where the pet owner who accompanies a cat is expected to pick up the dog.

What is common in (1), (2), and (3c) is that there are alternative items that can potentially satisfy the properties expressed by the predicate in question. For instance, in (1), some other sister of Bills could have kissed John; in (2) some other clothing item on the bed could have been mentioned to be considered; in (3c) a cat is an alternative item that could have been evoked

Secondly, those alternatives as well as the focused items are *given* in the sense that they can be seen as located in a kind of mental representation of the interlocutors. Prince (1981) termed it *situationally* or *textually evoked*. If Gundel, Jeanette K., N. Hedberger, and R. Zacharski's (1993) term is borrowed, the entities denoted by such nominal expressions will attain an *activated* status

Third, there is no implicature of an exclusive nature in the above examples like the one found in (4):

- (4) A: Who came to meet you, Sue or Mary?
B: Sue did

In uttering (4B), it is implicated that May did not show up, although B did not mention anything about Mary. This may be explained by invoking the Maxim of Quantity of Grice, which says that information as much as is needed should be provided. In other words, (4B) shows *exclusiveness* whereas the previous examples in (1), (2) and (3c) do not have such an exclusiveness implicature. Further consider (5) which does not implicate such kind of exclusiveness as can be seen in (4).

- (5) A: Who is teaching Ling 410 this term, Smith or Baker?
B: Professor Baker won't be able to teach it. He's gonna be on sabbatical leave.

Unlike the case in (4), the presupposition [someone is teaching Ling 410 this term] is not contained or inherited by (5). This lack of inheritance seems to be one of the causes that create the difference in implicature². In (3c), the semantic content of the sort like [dogs are to be tied on a leash] seems to be situationally shared by the interlocutors since the dog is being tied on the leash in the situation in question, but such shared information is not inherited by (3c), either.

2.2. Jackendoff (1972)

Jackendoff states that focus is assigned by two different pitch-accent patterns in English. Borrowing Bolinger's term, Jackendoff argues that (6a) has two different readings, (6b) and (6c),

2. See the next section for Jackendoff's (1972) view of B accent focus or contrastive focus

depending on the pitch-accent pattern assigned to focus.

- (6) a. [_F FRED] doesn't write poetry in the garden.
b. It is Fred who doesn't write poetry in the garden (A accent)
c. It isn't Fred who writes poetry in the garden (B accent)

Accordingly the presupposition of each reading is also different as shown below:

- (7) a. λx [x doesn't write poetry in the garden] (<-- 6b)
b. λx [x writes poetry in the garden] (<-- 6c)

In a discussion of multiple focus, Jackendoff further notes that A accent focus can be viewed as a dependent variable and B accent focus as independent variable. This means that A accent focus variable is not chosen freely but in such a way as to make the sentence true. This means that presupposition alone suffices to determine the correct value of the focus. On the other hand, B accent focus is viewed as an independent variable that can be chosen freely of presupposition. This requires that there be another variable to mediate the meaning between the presupposition and the focus. That is what Jackendoff calls an affirmation/negation variable and this is chosen as a depend variable. This point can indirectly be confirmed in (7) as well. As can be seen in (7b), negation elements are not included in the presupposition of the B accent construction. This also implies that pitch accent patterns are very important elements in focus in that they determine the semantic contents of presupposition.

So in many cases, as shown in (8), a B accent focus appears with affirmation/negation being the most important contribution of meaning in discourse.

- (8) A: Did John and Bill leave yet?
B: Well, JOHN has left, but BILL hasn't.

2.3. Contrastiveness vs Exclusiveness

Let us extend Gundel's and Jackendoff's ideas to Korean cases. In Korean, the expressions corresponding to (4) and (5) employ different particles, indirectly showing that there are differences in discourse functions between (4) and (5).

- (9) A: Sue-wa Mary-cwung nwuka macwung nawass-ci?
and among who seeing-off came-Qes.
'Who came to see you off, Sue or Mary?'
B: Sue-ka wass-e.
Nom. came-Pst
'Sue came'
- (10) A: ipen hakki-ey Smith-wa Baker-cwung nwuka enehak 410-ul kaluci-ci?
this term-in and among who linguistics Acc. teach-Qes.
'Who is teaching Ling 410 this term, Smith or Baker?'
B: Baker kyoswu-nun kaluchi-l swu epeyo. Yenkwunyen-iketunyo.
professor-cntr. teach-Ftr able is-not research-year-is
'Professor Baker wont be able to teach. He is on research leave'

(9B) has an exclusiveness implicature whereas (10B) does not

This paper argues that *-i/-ka* is an exclusive focus marker and *-un/-nun* a contrastive focus marker. Let us further examine whether the two types of focus can be distinguished in other respects. Consider (11).

- (11) A: ecey moim-ey Mary-wa Sumi-cwung nuka wass-ci?
yesterday gathering-at M.-and S.-among who came-Q
'Who came to yesterday's gathering, Mary or Sumi?'
- B: ?*Sumi-ka wass-e. Kulenty Mary-nun molla.
by-the-way don't-know
'Sumi came. But I don't know what happened to Mary'
- B' Sumi-nun wass-e. Kulenty Mary-nun molla
by-the-way don't-know
'Sumi came. But I don't know what happened to Mary'

The contrast between (11B) and (11B') is predictable and can be accounted for by the previous proposal: *-ka/-i* implicates that the unmentioned alternatives do not satisfy the presupposition whereas *-un/-nun* marker does not yield such implicatures, but only potentializes (or cancels) the conversational implicatures.

The same kind of presupposition inheritance failure can be observed in English, as in the examples in (5), as repeated in (12)

- (12) A: Who is teaching Ling 410 this term, John or Tom?
B: John won't be able to teach it He's gonna be on sabbatical leave
B': Tom is

This example shows that contrastive focus somehow disrupts the simple presupposition inheritance mechanism and adds another dimension of meaning elements to be considered, as hinted by Jackendoff. This may lead us to suggest that in the exclusive focus construction we only need to look at its presupposition to do its semantics while contrastive focus construction obligates us to consider affirmation/negation dimension as well.

Now, what is one of the discourse functions of exclusive focus and contrastive focus? In general, there are two opposing forces in conveying our thoughts to the addressee. One type of force tells us to make our utterance convey information as clearly as possible, and the other force leads us to make our statements less clear in other cases.

In the case of exclusive focus which seems to contribute to increasing the level of clarity of utterance, the focus satisfies the *presupposition* and we can further imply that the excluded entity does not satisfy the same function. This conforms to Rooth's observation that focus may communicate conversational implicatures on the part of the speaker (see Rooth 1996: 274). This type of focus can be used in a situation where corrections are made, or instructions are given about potentially confusing matters.

On the other hand, there are cases in which it may somehow be necessary to restrict the assertion force of an utterance or its implication, for instance, in order to save the face of the less favored individuals, to show indifference, or to restrain the assertion force of one's statement because of lack of knowledge. These kinds of socio-linguistic needs seem to call for a less

exclusive statement. In other words, we want to somehow *cancel* or *potentialize* the exclusive implicature. Suppose two teachers are talking about scholarship award candidates and are about to finalize on one out of Minhø and Sumi. Further suppose Minhø and Sumi belong to the two teachers' respective homeroom.

- (13) A' swuhak sengcek-ul mence pociyo.
 math records-Acc. first see
 'Let us look at the math records first'
 B' Mihno-**ka** cal haneyyo. *Sumi-nun molukesseyo
 M -foc well do S.-kntr dont know
 '(I can see that) Minhø is better' (*I don't know about Sumi)
 B'. Mihno-**nun** cal haneyyo. Sumi-nun molukesseyo
 M.-cntr. . well do S.-cntr dont know
 '(I can see) Minhø is good. I dont know about Sumi'

Korean optionally uses a comparative marker and therefore adjectives and adverbs can be used either comparatively or in a non-comparative sense. The preferred reading of (13B) is the comparative one and this precludes the other possibility of predication involving Sumi. The plain reading is also possible as shown in (13B), but in this case the particle should be changed from *-ka* to *nun* and the feasibility of the additional statement indicates that there is no exclusiveness implication in (13B). The speaker is reserving or withholding his opinions about the unmentioned entity. The contrastive statement thus can show indifference to the unmentioned entity.

Compare (14) and (15).

- (14) SOKUM-**UL** nehuseyyo.
 salt-foc. put
 'Please put salt (in it) (not sugar)'
 (15) SOKUM-**un** nehuseyyo.
 salt-kntr. put
 'Please put salt'

(14) can be used to make correction, for instance, when the woman in question is confused about what to put in the soup she is making and, is about to pick up sugar which is located near to salt So it implies [don't put sugar (in it)], for instance. On the other hand, (15) do not contain such an implicature and remain silent on the other ingredient.

In sum, contrastive focus does not implicate exclusiveness, but potentializes or cancels the exclusiveness implicature that usually holds in such cases. We will call this a *potentialized implicature* This notion is very similar to Buring's (1999: 150-151) notion *residual topic* in that there can exist an implicature that is not communicated positively on the part of the speaker. In this sense, the Korean contrastive focus marker has a kind of *defocusing* effect.

3. Informational Focus vs Exclusive focus

How does the exclusive focus compare with Kiss' (1998) *informational* focus or Gundel's (1999) *semantic* focus? Gundel, whose paper appeared later than Kiss, did not seem to pay much attention to Kiss definition of focus, so there is little common ground in their discussions. Except for the novelty criteria, there seems to be no common denominator on the basis of which their

analyses can be compared to each other. However, if we compare these two authors' approaches in order to unify the ideas contained in the both papers, we can imagine that Gundel's semantic focus and Kiss' informational focus are dealing with the same phenomenon since both carry new information and their truth conditions are affected (see Gundel 1999). Furthermore they both carry A accent, although Kiss doesn't mention this explicitly. The problem here is what difference there is between informational focus and exclusive focus. The two types of focus seems to share the same pitch accent patterns and novelty properties.

One of the key notions we employ in differentiating various types of focus is a *contrast set*, which parallels Rooth's (1985) *alternative set*, since the semantic interpretation of focus construction is dependent on the contrast set or the alternative set. This notion is so critical that we can say that the alternative set lays the basis on which any semantic interpretation of focus is built.

Furthermore, we can say that the contrast set³, as defined here, is determined in different ways depending on the kinds of focus. Consider (16).

- (16) A: Do you know who came to the party last night?
 B: John did.

In (16), the contrast set (C-set, hereafter) may be the set of all the mutual friends or acquaintances of the speakers. The upper limit of the set is largely determined by the *background knowledge* involving the two speakers. So the C-set may vary considerably depending on how A's and B's social lives intersect. So *John* could be referring to one that belongs to one of the various groups of people. However, in (16) the C-set is very large in principle, and (16B) can be very *informational* since [John] is one of many alternatives. Thus, the focus phrase *John* in (16B) will be called *informational* or *semantic* focus.

Furthermore, (16B) does not imply that John is the only person who was at the party. In other words (16B) does not exclude the possibility that unmentioned people were at the party. This is a difference very important in distinguishing discourse focus and semantic/information focus.

- (17) A: Who arrived first, John or Bill?
 B: Bill did.

As has already been proposed, *Bill* has exclusive focus and the contrast set in this case is not determined based on our knowledge, lexical or encyclopedic, but is in principle evoked or determined in a immediate discourse situation, like the immediately preceding text or discourse scene. In (17), the size of the C-set is very small and contains only two individuals. Thus, (17B') can be said to be less informational. These properties seems to distinguish informational focus from exclusive focus.

Many Korean linguists assume that examples like (17) express *exhaustivity*, following Kuno (1973) whose famous example can be translated almost word-to-word into Japanese from (18).

- (18) pwukpanku-ka mwumyen kukka-ka namca-ka pyengkyun swumyeng-i ccalpta.

3 A *contrast set* is defined as a set of entities that includes focus and its alternatives, and it limits the domain of contrast w. r. t. a given presupposition. A contrastive set is a set of entities whereas Rooth's alternative set is a set of propositions. Mine is exactly the same as ALT(F) in Krifka (1998)

northern hem.-nom civilized nation-nom. men-nom. average life-span-nom. is-short
 'It is in the northern hemisphere that in the civilized countries men have a shorter average
life span'

It is very difficult to describe the intuitively felt meaning of (17), but if the translation of (17) is read with a higher pitch on the underlined parts, it will describe the Korean speakers intuition more or less satisfactorily. Kuno used the term *exhaustivity* for the Japanese counterpart. So we will examine Korean data to see if exhaustivity can be applicable to Korean as well. Lets consider a situation where two teachers are talking about three students in order to pick out one or two students who will do volunteer activities. Consider (19) and (20)⁴.

(On the basis of other considerations, let us suppose that two students have been chosen and are being talked about as candidates for volunteer activities. The two students are Minhø and Sumi. The two teachers must finalize on one out of the two.)

- (19) A: MINHO-wa SUMI-ka cekkyek-ici
 M.-and S.-nom. suitable-is
 'MINHO and SUMI are suitable'
 B: ?*(Anya), MINHO-ka cekkyek-iya
 no M.-nom. suitable-is
 '(No), MINHO is suitable'
 B': Anya, MINHO-man-i cekkyek-iya
 no M.-only-nom. suitable-is
 '(No), only MINHO is suitable'

According to the test for exhaustivity⁵, if the Korean particle *ka* were an exhaustive focus marker, (19B) should be an acceptable response to (19A) However, (19B) seems to be an unacceptable response to (19A). This is because (19B) can be inferred from (19A). Compare this to (19B') which encodes exhaustivity lexically. The naturalness of (19B') seems to suggest that (19B') cannot be inferred from (19A). Thus, we can say, the Korean particle *-ka* may not express exhaustivity⁶ unlike some of the Hungarian or English focus constructions (see Kiss 1998). As defined above we claim that an utterance like (19A) involves *exclusive* focus as we have seen above

As in English, Korean has a focalizer *-man* 'only' which explicitly expresses exclusiveness⁷

4. When an earlier version of this paper was presented at the 1999 fall meeting of Korean Society for Language and Information, the feasibility of this sentence was checked with about 20 Korean linguists and none of them thought (19B) is an acceptable response to (19A).

5) I follow Szabolci (1980) in defining the notion exhaustivity.

6 There are ways in which exhaustivity is expressed in Korean As shown in (i), we can talk about exhaustivity in a kind of cleft construction or *man*-marked phrase'

- (i) A: Cekkyekun haksayng-un Minhø-wa Sumi-ci
 suitable student-top M.-and S -is
 'It is Minhø and Sumi who are suitable'
 B: Anya, Cekkekin haksayng-un Minhø-ci
 no suitable student-top. M.-is
 'No, it is Minhø who is suitable'
 B': Anya, Minhø-man cekkek-ici.
 no M -only suitable-is
 'No, only MINHO is suitable'

We will not deal with cleft structures in this paper and *man*-marked phrases will be discussed later

and a scope ambiguity, as argued by J.-W. Choe (1996), K.-S. Sung (1979), and J.-W. Youn (1988) among others. In this section we will argue that *-man* in fact expresses *exhaustivity* a notion which will be defined below.

Let us first consider what would result if the lexical focalizer *-man* combines with focus markers in Korean. What are the interactions between the lexical focalizer and the pragmatic focus markers? How does the focalizer fit into the system?

Let us hypothesize that *-man* expresses *exhaustivity* lexically so that it may impose on the relevant construction a stronger restriction than exclusiveness. Before going further, let us first examine its distributional properties. Consider (20):

- (20) A: Wuli hakkyo taypyo-lo nwuka cekkyek-ici?
 our school representative-as who suitable-is
 Who is suitable as our school representative?
 B: *Minho-man cekkyek-ici/ponayca
 Minho-only is-suitable/ send
 Only Minho is suitable/ Lets send Minho only
 B':*Minho-man-I cekkyek-ici.
 M.-only-nom. suitable-is
 Only Minho is suitable

Without prior discussion of the candidates, either (20B) or (20B') is unacceptable as a response to (20A). This example seems to indicate that *-man* is not compatible with informational/semantic focus since (20A) would create an informational/semantic focus context. So the presumed *exhaustivity* of *-man* may not be compatible with semantic focus.

However, if the domain of the discourse universe is more limited, the sentence sounds acceptable as shown below in (21).

- (21) A: Nehi-tul osip myen cwung nwuka kal swu issci?
 you-pl 50 class. among who go way is
 'Who can go among the 50 of you?'
 B: Minho-man kal swu isseyo.
 M.-only go way is
 'Only Minho can go'
- A: Nehi-tul pan-eyse nwuka kal swu issci?
 you-pl class-among who go way have
 'Who can go from your class?'
 B: Ce-man kal swu isseyo
 I-only go way have
 'Only I can go'

It is not clear how the domain should be restricted. However, the pattern shown in (20) through (21) seems to conform to our hypothesis that exclusiveness or exhaustivity can be defined over a limited set of entities. This paper is not much interested in the exact distribution of *man* other

7 Choe (1996) and Youn (1988) suggest 'exclusiveness' ('paythaseng' in Korean) while Sung (1979) propose 'uniqueness' ('ywuilseng'), but their notions are not rigorously defined

than the existence of a kind of restriction that can be roughly stated as follows: the more restricted⁸⁾ a discourse domain is, the more feasible the use of *man* is. In fact, Rooth (1992) concludes about its English counterpart *only* that it requires that the context in which it is interpreted provide a set of alternatives of a *narrowly specifiable* sort. However, note that there is a difference between what is explicitly mentioned and what can be uniquely inferable in determining the *definiteness* of a noun phrase (see the pebble examples in Kadmon 1987). In (29), the domain of the discourse of universe is not explicitly mentioned but can only be inferred, while in (31) the domain of the universe is explicitly introduced.

These considerations lead us to believe that the lexical focalizer will fit well into discourse focus, i.e., contrastive focus and exclusive focus, since these types of focus, unlike semantic focus have a smaller C-set, as we proposed. As predicted, *-man* can be added to contrastive focus marker *un/-nun* as well as to the exclusive focus marker *i/-ka* as shown in (22) and (23):

- (22) A: koyangi-lul kelye-to toynayo?
 cat-acc. walk-even-though acceptable
 'May I walk my cat?'
 B: koyangi-man-un anko kaseyyo (contrastive focus)
 cat-only-cntr. carry go
 'As for the cat only, carry it (in your arms)'

- (23) I salam-man-i kwukmin hwahap-ul ilul swu issta.
 this man-only-foc. people unity-acc. accomplish able
 'Only this man can accomplish national unity'

- (24) A: Ku ses cwung nwuku-lul ponayl-keyeyo?
 the three among who-acc. send-will
 'Who will you send among the three?'
 B: Minho-man(-ul) ponayl-keyeyo. (exclusive focus)
 M.-only(-foc.) send-will
 'We will send Minho only'

If we say that *-man* expresses exhaustivity which is applicable to a relatively well-defined small set of discourse entities, we not only account for (22) through (24) but the unacceptability of (20B) and (20B'). What, then, is exhaustivity in this context? *-Man* may not express the same dimension or scale of exclusiveness as the focus marker, since phrases marked with *-ka/-i* do not pass the exhaustivity test, as we have seen above. How should exhaustivity or any notion be defined for *-man*, without violating the compositionality of sentence semantics? Let us first consider the case where *-man* is used along with *i/-ka* as shown in (25) and (26):

- (25) A: MINHO-wa SUMI-ka cekkyek-ici
 M.-and S-nom. suitable-is
 MINHO and SUMI are suitable
 B: ?*(Any), MINHO-ka cekkyek-iya.
 no M.-nom. suitable-is

8) To be more specific, the restriction could be something like 'a set of individually evocable objects' this means that the interlocutors are assumed to be able to identify the individual members of the set

- (No), MINHO is suitable
 B': Anya, MINHO-**man**-i cekkyek-iya.
 no M.-only-nom. suitable-is
 (No), only MINHO is suitable
 (26) MINHO-wa SUMI-**man**-(i) cekkyek-ici
 M.-and S.-only-nom. suitable-is
 Only MINHO and SUMI are suitable

As we have hypothesized, (25B') seems to pass the exhaustivity test. That is, (25A) and (26) does not entail (25B') as the naturalness of the sequence suggests, and (25B') also contradicts (26). What can we say about this? Just as the contrastive focus marker has a pragmatic force that cancels pragmatic implicature, the exhaustivity marker *man* as a semantic focalizer has such a force that it cancels the semantic entailment among the relevant proposition. It also creates contradictions that ordinary sentences would not manifest, as we have seen above. Within this approach, then, there is no conflict between discourse focus markers (*-i/-ka*, *-nun/-un*) and the semantic focalizer since the former deals with pragmatic implicature whereas the latter involves a kind of semantic operation.

Next consider (27)

- (27) A: MINHO-wa SUMI-**man-un** cekkyek-ici
 M -and S.-nom. suitable-is
 'As for MINHO and SUMI only, they are suitable'
 B: (Kelssey,) MINHO-**nun** cekkyek-ici.
 well M.-nom. suitable-is
 '(Well), as for MINHO, he is suitable'
 B' (Kelssey), MINHO-**man-un** cekkyek-ici.
 well M.-only-nom suitable-is
 '(Well), as for MINHO only, he is suitable'

In (27) it is not very clear whether (27A) entails anything or not, but (27A) seems to entail what is expressed by (27B) or (27B'). Furthermore, (27B') does not contradict (27A). Unlike the case with exclusive focus, the contrastive focus marker *-nun/-un* seems to have a kind of defocalizing force because it cancels the implicature that builds up a backdrop of focus. In other words, the two morphemes *man* and *un/-nun* exert forces in opposite directions of each other. How can we explain this difference in entailment relations if *-man* is an entailment blocker? As mentioned before, the interpretation of its English counterpart *only* gives uniqueness effect among given alternatives. But such uniqueness cannot be maintained in the contrastive focus of Korean, as shown above.

It is very difficult to see what is operating here without broadening our scope of comparison. Let us compare what is implicated, what is *de*implicated, and what is blocked in (25) through (27). What complicates our judgment on (27) seems to be that there is a discrepancy between what is entailed by (27A) and what is *de*implicated or potentialized by (27B) or (27B'), as shown in (28) and (29):

(convention' [Minho] --> m, [Sumi] --> s, [Cekkyeki] --> C)

- (28) exclusive focus with *-man*
- a. entailment of (25A): {C(m), C(s)}
 - b. sentence meaning of (25B'): {C(m)}
 - c. implicatures of (25B)/(25B'): {~C(s)}
- (29) contrastive focus with *-man*
- a. entailment of (27A)' {C(m), C(s)}
 - b. sentence meaning of (27B)': {C(m)}
 - c. potentialized implicature of (27B)/(27B)': {~C(s)}

As shown in (28), in the case of exclusive focus, entailment between (28a) and (28b) is blocked by *-man*, so there need not be any inference between (25A) and (25B'). Furthermore, as can be seen, (28b) and (28c) do not conflict with each other, so there is nothing that stops the locution of (25A) and (25B'). On the other hand, in the case of contrastive focus, there is an entailment relation between (29a) and (29b) and there should be overall coherence among (29a), (29b) and (29c). As shown in (29), there seems to be no semantic conflict among the semantic relations, but some oddity can be found between what the speaker explicitly mentioned and what the speaker should not have implicated. As (29c) indicates, in uttering (27B') the speaker does not want to mention anything about Sumi for some reasons, but (27A) directly mentions Sumi. There seems to arise some conflict in what is communicated or insinuated if the interlocutors say (27A) and (27B)/(27B') at the same time. The locution in (27) is not meaningless because of the differences in the hidden intentions of the utterances. This seems to indicate that there arises some conflict within one's speech act if one ignores *potentialized* implicatures.

4. Conclusions

In this paper it has been argued that there are three distinct types of focus: *contrastive focus*, *exclusive focus*, and *semantic focus*. What motivated such categorization most strongly is the way the C-set is determined and how large the C-set is. Various other properties can be derived from the property of the C-set and other general semantic notions. Exclusiveness is a notion definable in terms of implicature, whereas contrastiveness involves cancelled or potentialized implicatures. Furthermore, the lexical focalizer *man* was analyzed as an entailment blocker in conjunctive operations, so it can be viewed as an exhaustivity marker. It has been shown that the lexical focalizer also needs a well-defined specific set of discourse entities.

REFERENCES

- Allwood, Jensen., L-G. Anderson and O. Dahl (1977) *Logic in Linguistics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Bollinger, Dwight (1965) *Forms of English: Accent, Morpheme, Order*. I. Abe and T. Kanekiyo (eds). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bosch, Peter and Rob van der Sandt (eds.) *Focus*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK
- Choe, Jae-Woong (1996) Scopal Ambiguity of man, *Ene (Language): Journal of the Linguistic Society of Korea* 21, 673-692.
- Gundel, Janet K. (1999) On Different Kinds of Focus, in Peter Bosch and Rob van der Sandt (eds.) *Focus*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 293-305

- Gundel, Jeanette K., N. Hedberger, and R. Zacharski (1993). Cognitive Status and the Form of Referring Expressions in Discourse, *Language* 69, 274-307
- Jackendoff, Ray (1972) *Semantic Interpretation is Generative Grammar*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Jacobs, Joachim (1991) Focus Ambiguities, *Journal of Semantics* 8, 1-36.
- Kadmon, Nirit (1990) Uniqueness, *Linguistics and Philosophy* 13, 273-324
- Kadmon Nirit (1987) *On Unique and Non-Unique Reference and Asymmetric Quantification*, PhD Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Kadmon, Nirit and Fred Landman (1993) Any, *Linguistics and Philosophy* 16, 353-422.
- Kenesei, Istvan (1986) On the Logic of Hungarian Word Order, in Abraham Warner and Sjaak de Meij (eds.) *Topic, Focus, and Configurationality*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam. pp. 143-159
- Kim, Yong-Beom (1999) *To-uy Uymi-Hwayonglon* [Semantics and Pragmatics of *To*] *Language and Information* (Journal of Korean Society for Language and Information) vol 3
- Kim, Yookung (1999) A Situation Semantic Account of Topic vs. Nominative Marking, in Kiyong Lee (ed.) *Korean Formal Semantics: Lecture Notes for 1999 Linguistic Institute of Linguistic Society of America*, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- Kuno, Susumo (1973) *The Structure of the Japanese Language*, MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Landman, Fred (1989) Groups I, *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12, 559-606.
- Lee, Chungmin (1999) Contrastive Event Topics and Inverse Scalar Implications. Paper present at Conference on Korean Linguistics, University of Illinois, Urbana.
- Lee, Kiyong (ed.) (1999) *Korean Formal Semantics: Lecture Notes for 1999 Linguistic Institute of Linguistic Society of America*, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- Kenesei, Istvan (1986) On the Logic of Hungarian Word Order, in Abraham Warner and Sjaak de Meij (eds.) *Topic, Focus and Configurationality*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp 143-159.
- Kiss, Katalin . (1998) Identificational Focus versus Information Focus, *Language* 74, 245-273.
- Krifka, Manfred (1993) Focus and Presupposition in Dynamic Interpretation, *Journal of Semantics* 10, 269-300.
- Krifka, Manfred (1998) For a Structured Account of Questions and Answers, Paper presented at Sinn and Bedeutung 98.
- Partee, Barbara. H (1999) Focus, Quantification, and Semantics-Pragmatics Issues, in Peter Bosch and Rob van der Sandt (eds.) *Focus*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K. pp-213-231
- Pierrehumbert, Janet B. (1980) *The Phonology and Phnetics of English Intonation*, PhD dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- Prince, Ellen F. (1981) Toward a Taxonomy of Given-New Information, in Peter Cole (ed.) *Radical Pragmatics*, Academic Press, New York, pp. 223-256.
- Rooth, Mats (1985). *Association with Focus*, PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Rooth, Mats (1996) Focus, in Salom Lappin (ed.) *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*, Blackwell, Cambridge, MA, pp 271-98.
- Searle, John (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Languages*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stalnaker, R. (1978) Assertion, *Syntax and Semantics 9: Pragmatics*, Academic Press, New York, pp. 315-322.
- Selkirk, Elizabeth (1984) *The Phonology and Syntax: The Relation between Sound and Structure*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

- von Stechow, Arnim (1991) Focusing and Background Operators, in Abraham Warner (ed.), *Discourse Particles*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Szabolci, Anna (1981) The Pragmatics of Topic-Focus Construction, in Jan Groenendijk, Theo Jansen, and Martin Stokhof (eds.) *Formal Methods in the Study of Language*, Matematish Centrum, Amsterdam, pp513-541.
- Sung, Kwnag-Soo (1979) *Kwukeyu cosa yenkwu (A Study on Case Particles of Korean)*, Hyungsul Publishing Company, Daegu.
- Warner, Abraham and Sjaak de Meij (eds.) *Topic , Focus, and Configurationality*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Wee, Hye-Kyung. S. (1999) *Definite Focus*, PhD dissertation, University of Groningen, Netherlands.
- Yang, In-Seok (1972) *Korean Syntax: Case Markers, Delimiters, Complementation and Relativization*, PhD Dissertation, University of Hawaii, Honolulu
- Youn, Jae-Won (1988) *Kwukewocosauy tamhwa puunsekcek yenkwu (A Discourse analysis of Korean postpositional particles)*, PhD Dissertation, Youngnam Univesity, Kumi, Korea