**North and South Korean: A comparative development of the Korean plural-marker *-tul***

Danica MacDonald, *University of Calgary*

**Background**: Korean, like other Eastern Asian languages, is considered to be a classifier language. A predominant property of classifier languages is that they lack plural-marking (Allen 1980, Chierchia 1998); however, Korean poses an interesting problem for this claim since it appears to have an optional plural-marker: *-tul* (Kang 1994, Baek 2002, Kim 2005). Korean *-tul* has been studied extensively; however, there is little consensus as to its distribution or function. My research takes a unique approach to the analysis of *-tul* by examining its development in South Korean (SK) dialects, in frequent contact with languages such as English, a mass-count language, and North Korean (NK) dialects, where there is limited contact with outside languages.

**Goals & Research Question:** The goal of this paper is twofold. First, I hope to shed light on the modern-day uses of *-tul* through investigating its past. Second, I propose a comparative analysis of NK and SK dialects and I explore the hypothesis that changes in the SK dialect are primarily language-external. The specific questions that my paper addresses are the following: Do SK and NK dialects undergo the same development with respect to the morpheme *-tul*? Do differences in usage lend support for a language-internal change, a language-external change (through extensive contact with English, a mass-count language), or some combination of both types of changes in SK dialects? My presentation will focus on SK and NK data and will outline the use and distribution of *-tul* in both data sets. Then I will focus on the changing status of *-tul* from an internal/external change debate and from a historical linguistic perspective.

**Methodology:** The SK study is based on a corpus analysis which investigated the historical use and development of *-tul*. The study was based on 125 newspaper articles which covered a 100-year period. I analyzed the articles for data relevant to the distribution of *-tul*, the number of cases of *-tul*, the type of nouns which *-tul* attached to, as well as cases where a plural interpretation was clear, but *-tul* was not used (MacDonald, 2014). The NK study was also a corpus analysis which investigated the distribution and use of *-tul* in newspaper articles written by North Koreans journalists. This pilot study investigated 10 newspaper articles which were written in 2016. The same criteria which were applied to the SK data were also applied to the NK data.

**Analysis:** The SK research showed that in both the 1924 and 1946 data, there were very few cases of *-tul* found in the texts. The cases which I did find were limited to use with human nouns. In the early data, *-tul* did not seem to be functioning as a plural marker. Instead, *-tul* seemed to be functioning as a way to place emphasis or focus on the plural noun to which it attached. In the later data (from 1970, 1995, and 2011), *-tul* is used more frequently and its use is extended to include non-human nouns, and later concept-denoting abstract nouns. The distributional patterns that were found in the latest data from South Korea differed significantly from the NK data. There were far fewer instances of *-tul* being used and the use of *-tul* appeared to be limited to certain categories of nouns; namely human, animate, and a few inanimate nouns. This pattern matched most closely to what was observed in the SK data in the 1970s.

**Discussion:** Lee (1989) and Baik (1992) have claimed that modern *-tul* was borrowed from English. Baik (1992) points out that during the period 1965 – 1985, which mirrors the period where we see an increased use of *-tul*, there was a period of large contact between English and Korean. While a borrowing hypothesis is possible, it is important to remember that Korean *-tul* existed long before contact with and influence by the English language. It is also important to note that in the newspaper articles from 1970 and later we see a substantial increase in the use of *-tul*. While the SK dialects did undergo heavy influence from English, the same cannot be said for NK dialects. This is mirrored in the data as NK newspaper articles do not exhibit the extensive use of *-tul* seen in SK.

## References

Allan, K. (1980). Nouns and countability. *Language* 56: 541-67.

Baek, M.-H. (2002). Handkwuke pokswu uymi yenkwa. [A study on Korean plural senses.] *Discourse and Recognition*. 9(2): 59-78.

Baik, M. J. (1992). Language shift and identity in Korea. *Journal of Asian Communication* 3(1): 15-31.

Chierchia, G. (1998). Reference to kinds across languages. *Natural Language Semantics* 6:339-405.

Corbett, G. (2000). *Number*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kang, B.-M. (1994). Plurality and other semantic aspects of common nouns in Korean. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 3: 1-24.

Kim, C.-H. (2005). The Korean plural marker *tul* and its implications. PhD Dissertation (University of Delaware).

Lee, S. (1989). The subversion of Korean. *English Today* 20: 34-37.

MacDonald, D. (2014) The changing status of plural-marking in Korean. *Proceedings of the 30th Northwest Linguistics Conference.* Simon Fraser University. Vancouver, Canada.

Park, S. (2010). Grammaticalization of plurality marker *tul*. Seoul International Conference on Linguistics.

Park, S.-Y. (2008). Plural marking in classifier languages: a case study of the so-called plural marking –*tul* in Korean. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 28, 281-295.

Song, J.-J. (1997). The so-called plural copy in Korean as a marker of distribution and focus. *Journal of Pragmatics* 27, 203-224.