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ABSTRACT

This dissertation aims to determine the evolutionary pathways and contemporary functions of the following group of Korean pragmatic markers (PM) through an examination of historical and contemporary usage: ceki ‘excuse me’ vis-à-vis the attention-getter ipwa ‘hey/look’ and the address form yepo ‘honey’; (ke)pwa ‘you see’; and issci/isscanha ‘you know.’ The application of grammaticalization principles and mechanisms to these markers focuses on the area of semantic and pragmatic change.

In examining the evolutionary pathways of these markers, emphasis is laid on the following aspects: determining the source and its characteristics; ascertaining the semantic transparency between source and target concepts; establishing grammaticalization mechanisms and principles and the motivation that impelled the grammaticalization process; sketching the developmental clines for the PMs.

On the interactional domain the pragmatic markers ceki, (ke)pwa, ipwa, yepo, and issci/isscanha index the speaker’s epistemic and affective/interpersonal stances regarding upcoming discourse in relation to interlocutors. On the textual domain these markers function for intra-textual coherence and sequential coordination. Such multifunctionalities are the result of null referential meaning through the grammaticalization process. It is this null referential status that allows pragmatic markers to so effectively mark diverse functions dependent on local speech context at the interactional level.

The diachronic development of this group of markers adheres to a key principle of grammaticalization—unidirectionality and regularity in semantic change. Semantic
extension of lexical items occurs in the initial stage of the diachronic development of
these markers through the intervention of conceptual metaphoric and metonymic
processes. Subsequent to semantic generalization and extension, the group of pragmatic
markers underwent morpho-phonemic changes as well as change in syntactic distribution
and scope. The developmental paths of the pragmatic markers (ke)pwa and issci/isscanha,
the attention-getter ipwa, and the address form yepo suggest a new cline of
grammaticalization: from a matrix clause to a pragmatic marker through the process of
internal coalescence.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>ungrammatical (when placed before a phrase or a sentence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>morpheme boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>derived diachronically from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>derived diachronically to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca.</td>
<td>approximately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>causative particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>Cwungkan Nokeltay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>complementizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cond</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emph</td>
<td>emphasizing particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END</td>
<td>sentence/clause ending suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eval</td>
<td>evaluative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HON</td>
<td>honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPE</td>
<td>imperative ending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOC  locative
N    noun
NEG  negative
NO   Nokeltay Enhay
NP   noun phrase
NOM  nominative
Nomz nominalizer
Pass  passive
Perf  perfect
PM   pragmatic marker
PN   Penyek Nokeltay
Poss  possessive
PST  past tense
Prog  progressive
Q    interrogative
SS   Sekpo Sangcel
TAM  tense-aspect-modality
TOP  topic
V    verb
VLF  verbal filler/interjection
Vocat vocative
VP   verb phrase
Throughout this dissertation, the Yale romanization system is employed. The following table shows correspondences among the Hankul letters, the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA), and the Yale romanization system.

**Consonants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hankul letters</th>
<th>Phonetic value in IPA</th>
<th>Yale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ㄱ</td>
<td>[k, g]</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄲ</td>
<td>[kʰ]</td>
<td>kh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅋ</td>
<td>[k']</td>
<td>kk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅌ</td>
<td>[t, d]</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄸ</td>
<td>[tʰ]</td>
<td>th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅌ</td>
<td>[t']</td>
<td>tt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅍ</td>
<td>[p]</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅃ</td>
<td>[pʰ]</td>
<td>ph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅍ</td>
<td>[p']</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅃ</td>
<td>[c, j]</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅉ</td>
<td>[cʰ]</td>
<td>ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅉ</td>
<td>[c']</td>
<td>cc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅅ</td>
<td>[s]</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅆ</td>
<td>[sʰ]</td>
<td>ss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅎ</td>
<td>[h]</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅗ</td>
<td>[o]</td>
<td>ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅏ</td>
<td>[n]</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅓ</td>
<td>[l]</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅣ</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vowels and Diphthongs**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ㅏ</td>
<td>[a]</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅓ</td>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅗ</td>
<td>[o]</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅜ</td>
<td>[u]</td>
<td>wu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅣ</td>
<td>[i]</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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( ) researcher's comment on the speech participants' body language, voice quality, etc.

CAPS emphatic stress

= overlapping
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objectives

The aim of this dissertation is to determine the functions of the following selected group of Korean pragmatic markers (PM) through examining the usage of these markers in contemporary Korean: ce/ceki 'excuse me' in comparison with the attention-getter ipwa 'hey/look' and the address form yepo 'honey'; (ke)pwa 'you see'; and issci/isscanha 'you know.' As well, this dissertation aims at examining the evolutionary pathways of these pragmatic markers through an examination of Middle and Modern Korean texts.

Pragmatic markers are the major grammatical categories that serve to index the speaker's subjective thoughts and attitudes. The study of this category within grammaticalization is in a nascent stage: However, for the past twenty years this area has drawn significant attention from linguists (Brinton 1996, Traugott 2002). As will be presented, there are a substantial number of grammaticalization studies dealing with Korean grammatical markers. However, there are few extant studies examining grammaticalization processes in the area of pragmatic markers, especially from a diachronic perspective. The synchronic functions and diachronic development of the group of selected pragmatic markers introduced above have not been studied at all, to the best of my knowledge.

I selected these markers based on the common elements of their semantic attributes in relation to their applicability in the performance of synchronic functions: In other words, the principal function of these grammaticalized pragmatic markers in
contemporary Korean is to signal social distance; i.e., proximity and solidarity, and to express the speaker's interpersonal and affective perspectives in informal social contexts. In addition, this group of pragmatic markers shares the characteristic of polygrammaticalizational (Craig 1991); that is, the development of multiple grammatical markers from a single source item.

For instance, the pragmatic marker *issei* is derived from the locational existential verb *issta* 'to be (at a place)'; this verb has developed into multiple grammatical elements such as case marker, tense/aspect marker, connective, as well as pragmatic marker. The grammatical marker *i-pwa* is composed of the proximal deictic form *i* 'this,' the perception verb *pota* 'see,' and the plain/half-talk speech level marker *-a*. The perception verb *pota* 'see' also serves various grammatical functions through its diachronic processes such as dative marker, comparative marker, pragmatic marker (e.g., *ke-pwa* 'you see'), as well as the attention-getter *ipwa* 'hey/look.' As will be discussed, deictics (e.g., *ipwa*: proximal, *ceki*: distal), perception verbs (e.g., *pota* 'see'), as well as the existence verb (e.g., *issta* 'to be at a place') are the most common elements prone to undergo grammaticalization across languages.

To posit the functions of these markers, I will employ the diachronic pragmatic perspective (Traugott 1982, 1988, 1989, 1995, 2002; Brinton 1996) to determine the process of their functional change from concrete propositions to pragmatically-strengthened pragmatic markers utilized to express the speaker's interpersonal attitudes, beliefs, and perspectives. In the application of grammaticalization principles and mechanisms to these markers, I will focus on the area of semantic and pragmatic changes that are based on the general sense of unidirectionality and subjectivity as put forth by
Traugott (1988, 1989, 1995): Propositional material evolves in discourse situations to meet the purposes of creating text and indicating the speaker’s interpersonal stances and attitudes. In other words, the concrete and lexical form having propositional meaning evolves to serve in the creation of text (written text as well as oral discourse) and in “expressing self and representing the speaker’s subjective belief state/attitude toward the proposition.” (Traugott 1995:31; Finegan 1995) I will also look at the characteristics of the original sources of these markers (ce [distal deictic element], i [proximal deictic element], pota [perceptual verb], issta [existential verb], and ci [defective suffix]) for support of the argument that the principal function of the PM is to express the speaker’s social desire (Finell 1989, Finegan 1995, Brinton 1996, Diessel 1999, Fillmore 1997).

The pragmatic markers that I will undertake to examine for this dissertation are enumerated below:

- **ce/ceki(yo)** [ce-‘that’: distal deictic element, -eki: spatial defective noun, -yo: polite speech level marker/ polite interactional particle]

- **(ke)pwa(yo)** [ke ‘that’: distal deictic element, reduced form of kukes ‘that thing,’ -po ‘see’: perceptual visual verb stem, -a half-talk imperative ending, -yo: polite speech level marker/ polite interactional particle]

- **ipwa(yo)** ‘hey/look’ [i ‘this’: proximal deictic element, po-: perceptual visual verb stem ‘look at,’ -a: half-talk imperative ending, -yo: polite speech level marker/ polite interactional particle]

- **yepo** ‘honey’ [yeki ‘here’= (i ‘this’: proximal deictic element, -eki: spatial defective noun), po-: perceptual visual verb stem ‘look at’ -o: blunt imperative ending]
• *issci(yo)* [iss-‘to be (at a place)’: locational existence verb, -ci: half-talk speech level marker/utterance-final interactional particle, -yo: polite speech level marker/polite interactional particle]

The overarching goal of this study is to uncover the contemporary functions and semantic shifts of a selected group of Korean pragmatic markers that have undergone various diachronic processes. As mentioned, these issues have not been studied; in this sense, it is my hope that this dissertation will serve to contribute original research and open further avenues of research.

1.2 Research Questions

Contemporary Korean evinces a trend toward simplification of its elaborate honorific/deference system, both in lexicon and morpho-syntactic structures (Sohn 1986, Yi [Ik-sep] 1994). On the other hand, solidarity-oriented pragmatic markers, including particles that serve to soften and mitigate illocutionary force (e.g., –ci and –yo) are frequently employed in informal social interactions. Usage of interactional particles and speech level markers such as –yo and –ci was first attested in the early 20th century (Han 1991). This usage was in established use by the middle of the century (Se 1984). In contemporary Korean, usage of these particles and markers is dominant in informal speech contexts, paralleling the increased usage of pragmatic markers in contemporary Korean.

Thus, a primary question concerns the contemporary functions of the pragmatic markers selected for this study (*ceki(yo)* ‘excuse me’; *ipwa(yo)* ‘hey/look’; *yepo* ‘honey’; *(ke)pwa(yo)* ‘you see’; *issci(yo)* ‘you know’) in relation to combinational uses with the
interactional particles –yo and –ci. The other primary research questions concern the
diachronic development of these selected pragmatic markers. Among the lines of inquiry:
What are the mechanisms and motivations that underlie the processes of diachronic
development of this selected group of pragmatic markers? What are the sources of the
pragmatic markers cited above? What are the commonalities among the sources of the
pragmatic markers? What does the nature of these sources imply regarding the functions
of pragmatic markers? Is the semantic relationship between source and target (pragmatic
markers) transparent?

Let me illuminate the foregoing research questions by looking at the usage and
grammaticalization of the PM ceki(yo). From contemporary language uses, the pragmatic
marker ceki(yo) evinces multifunctional aspects (J. Park 2001). One function is getting
attention from the unknown individual whose relationship is based on a certain degree of
social distance from the interlocutor. This function of ceki(yo) is complementary to the
function of ipwa(yo) ‘hey/look,’ derived from the proximal deictic element i (this) and
the verb pota ‘see’ through the grammaticalization process (J. Park 2002b). The marker
ipwa is used in getting attention from close friends, family members, etc., whose
relationships are based on solidarity. The form ipwa(yo) is also employed as an attention­
getter, especially in unpleasant, impolite, annoying, and rude contexts during interactions
with strangers.

It can be seen from the above illustration that these two attention-getters function
in complementary opposition to each other. This functional difference can be fully
explained on the basis of deictic ground: The attention getters ceki(yo) and ipwa(yo)
evolved from distal and proximal deictic elements, respectively. Their complementary functions, then, are reflective of the characteristics of their source meanings.

Specifically, the proximal deictic element *i* ‘this,’ a component of the form *i-pwa* ‘this-look at,’ occupies speaker-oriented ground in that it is employed to refer to a point close to the speaker and distant from the addressee. Thus, attention-getters signifying solidarity between intimates and impoliteness between unknowns are all derived from the source meaning of the proximal deictic element *i*-‘this.’ On the other hand, the distal deictic element *ce*, the source for *ceki*, provides for common deictic ground for interlocutors in that it is employed to refer to a point distant from both the speaker and the addressee.

The commonality of the two attention-getters lies in the fact that they have both undergone semantic and pragmatic change through the grammaticalization process (J. Park 2002). Physical distance, the original determinant of proximal and distal deictics, has been pragmatically transformed into psychological distance for social interactions through metaphorical extension of the original meaning. Specifically, *ipwayo* is derived from the proximal deictic element marking solidarity and directness, whereas *cekiyo* is derived from the distal deictic marking distance and indirectness.

The distal deictic *ce* is unmarked; that is, it is employed when referring to a referent that is distant from both the speaker and hearer. Unlike the proximal deictic *i*, which is speaker-perspective oriented, *ce* provides a basis for expressing the speaker’s indirect interpersonal stance owing to its neutral and vague characteristics. This furthers the function of *ceki(yo)* as an attention-getter for unfamiliar interlocutors.
The contemporary functions and grammaticalization processes of the pragmatic markers (ke)pwa(yo) 'you see' and issei(yo) 'you know' also show similar aspects to ceki(yo) and ipwa(yo) concerning their interpersonal aspects.

1.3 Data/Primary Sources and Data Analysis

1.3.1 Historical Data

In dealing with historical data regarding the uses of pragmatic markers, there are inevitable hindrances owing to the fact that pragmatic markers operate primarily in the realm of spoken language. In addition, before the creation of the Korean alphabet, or Hankul, in 1446 (15c.), Chinese characters were employed in writing Korean, leading to a scarcity of authentic literature of the Middle Korean period (10c.-16c.). Thus, for this study I have selected texts that were written after the creation of Hankul.

Sekposangcel (SS), a volume written in 1447 concerning the life of Buddha, is the first work of literature written in the Korean alphabet. Besides this inherent value, Sekposangcel provides substantial Middle Korean data and thus has attracted the considerable interest of Korean linguists owing to its provision of an extensive amount of lexical items not listed in extant Middle Korean dictionaries (T.S. Kim 2000). Because it is written in narrative form, SS does not provide conversational data; however, it does provide invaluable, even unique, data and information on the sources from which the contemporary forms of pragmatic markers are derived. For instance, it provides information on the original demonstrative pronouns tyeki and the existential verb ista/isita from which pragmatic markers such as ceki 'excuse me' and issei 'you know' are respectively derived.
The principal genre of Korean texts after the creation of Hankul continued to be the narrative. For this reason, utilization of the translated text of the Chinese Nokeltay is of prime import for this study in that it consists primarily of conversations. This volume concerns the salesman’s daily trade life, such as the buying and selling of goods, cooking, small talk, asking directions, etc. In this sense, this text provides the broadest possible gamut of discourse features: request, apology, argument, explanation, excuse, topic change, etc.

Deborah Tannen (1990: 261), incorporating R. Lakoff’s quotation, notes the value of literary dialogue in the following way:

Robin Lakoff (Lakoff and Tannen, 1984) suggests that literary dialogue--the dialogue in fiction and drama--constitutes a competence model for interaction. It is not equivalent to the dialogue spontaneously produced in interaction. Paradoxically, however, the dialogue in drama or fiction often strikes audiences as extremely realistic. For example, a reviewer (Kendrick, 1983) observes that in Judith Rossner’s novel August, ‘The give-and-take of real conversation, its hesitation, repetition, and Freudian slips - all are reproduced with exact fidelity ...’ Lakoff suggests that, like the human ear and human memory, literary dialogue distills the wheat of conversation from the chaff of hesitations, fillers, hedges, and repetitions.

Nokeltay has been translated and revised in roughly 100-year-intervals since its creation. There are six versions in existence. Among these, I have chosen to examine Penyek Nokeltay (1517), henceforth PN, Nokeltay Enhay (1670), henceforth NO (1670), and Cwungkan Nokeltay (1795), henceforth CN, since these versions are translated from the same original Chinese text ‘Nokeltay.’

Since PN, NO, and CN were translated in different centuries, they are invaluable in studying historical aspects of the Korean language: lexicon, phonology, morphology, and syntax. The comparison of texts reveals change and loss of phonemes, morphemes,
and lexical items (e.g., hataka>manil ‘if’, i>kes ‘thing’). In addition, social structural changes are reflected in the usage of honorifics, which are in turn mirrored in the lexicon, case markers, and syntactic structures including speech levels/interactional markers. Among these features, I will look at the diachronic development of the contemporary Korean pragmatic markers ceki(yo), ipwa(yo), and issci(yo), yeo, and (ke)pwa(yo).

For 19th and early 20th century data, I employed novels and short stories. The salient characteristic of data from novels from these time periods is that owing to the introduction of Western culture and social values during this time period, hierarchical structures underwent dramatic change. This change is reflected in language use, especially in the lexicon and, pertinent to this study, interactional markers such as half-talk speech level markers and the polite form yo, along with pragmatic markers.

1.3.2 Contemporary Data

For contemporary data, natural conversations have been audio-recorded. I recorded telephone conversations with my family in Korea and with friends and teachers in the U.S. and Korea. As well, I employed three contemporary television dramas (soap operas) to capture current usage patterns of pragmatic markers. Two of them are urban-based dramas entitled Wulika eti naminkayo ‘Are we strangers?’ (http://www.kbs.co.kr/drama/nam/vod.htm) and Ikey salangiya ‘This is love’ (http://www.kbs.co.kr/drama/love_is/love); the other television program utilized is the rural-based drama entitled Taychwu namwu salang kellyessney ‘Love has been hanging on the jujube tree’ (http://www.kbs.co.kr/drama/daechu/).
I accessed these through an Internet browser that supports Korean characters through the multilingual program Microsoft Global IME™, also utilizing the Microsoft Media Player™ for viewing and listening to the Korean broadcast. The Internet allowed me to efficiently select data without being confined to recording a program at a certain time.

Let me now turn to a general synopsis of the three dramas. The urban-based dramas *Wulika eti naminkayo* ‘Are we strangers?’ and *Ikey salangiy* ‘This is love’ were being broadcast on the KBS network every weekday in 2001 and 2002; they are ongoing stories involving the same participants and topics. Both dramas are family oriented. The drama *Wulika eti naminkayo* ‘Are we strangers?’ is composed of 187 (of which I examined 144) episodes; each episode lasts 35 minutes without commercial break. The drama *Ikey salangiy* ‘This is love’ is composed of 172 (of which I examined 139) episodes. Each episode lasts 35 minutes.

The rural-based drama *Taychwu namwu salang kellyessney* ‘Love has been hanging on the jujube tree,’ which is also family and community oriented, has been broadcast on KBS every Wednesday for several years; it employs different storylines and a changing supporting cast along with the main characters. The length of an episode of this drama is 50 minutes without commercial break. For this dissertation, I examined five episodes.

In the process of analyzing the data, I obtained transcripts from the televised dramas. I compared the conversations as reflected in the transcripts to the actual broadcast. It occurs very frequently that actors interpolate pragmatic markers on their own without reference to the script. The employment of pragmatic markers by actors
without reference to the script is actually quite predictable after ascertaining the setting of the particular scene.

One of the merits of collecting data on pragmatic markers from these dramas is that the full range of permutations of these markers is employed. This can be accounted for by the fact that these dramas cover the entire gamut of social interaction. In other words, these three dramas realistically convey the rigid hierarchical relationships in Korean society through portrayals of formalized interactions at various workplaces, as well as the flexible and intimate interactions in the home environment between family and intimates. The characters in these dramas portray a variety of individual types, comprising various age groups and social rankings of education and employment.

McCarthy and Carter (1994: 118) describe the excellent value of drama-based data in the following way:

Data for everyday linguistic genres such as favor seeking are not always easy to obtain, since such events take place in intimate personal settings. But dramatized data such as plays and soap operas not written with any intention of displaying or teaching language forms are often an excellent source of data considered by consumers to be 'natural.'

The following is from Janes (2000: 1834) concerning the validity of data from drama in examining Japanese language use:

Television drama is an abundant source of data ... It has been widely noted that sentence particles are essential in face-to-face interaction, informal relationships and contexts (Oishi 1985; Uyeno 1971), and television drama enables us to examine language use in a variety of situations, by different people on a multitude of topics.
Table (1.1) below describes the information on audio-taped data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification Number</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Nature/Place</th>
<th>Time Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Yuli (Y), Jung-ran (J)</td>
<td>International phone call</td>
<td>43:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Miswun (M), Jung-ran (J)</td>
<td>International phone call</td>
<td>45:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Kyengguk (K), Jung-ran (J)</td>
<td>Long-distance phone call</td>
<td>35:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Yuli (Y), church members (S, M)</td>
<td>Home (Yuli’s sister), Seoul</td>
<td>115:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Sengwu</td>
<td>Local phone message</td>
<td>00:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Kyengguk’s wife (W), Jung-ran (J)</td>
<td>Long-distance phone call</td>
<td>25:45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The identification numbers in Table (1.1) will be employed in the analysis of given data in Chapter (3).

1.3.3 Data Analysis

For the Middle and Early Modern Korean texts (SS, PN, NO, CN), I will compare the frequency of use and the diachronic development of the forms and functions of the selected pragmatic markers among the texts. As mentioned, because the historical texts of PN, NO, and CN are translated from the same source in different centuries, comparison of the frequency and forms of the selected pragmatic markers from these texts is a productive method for ascertaining developmental paths of these markers in the Middle and Early Modern Korean eras.

Concerning Late Modern and contemporary Korean data analysis, I will utilize the ethnographic microanalysis method (Erikson 1996). This method comprises and is influenced by several research methodologies, such as conversation analysis, that emphasize the sequential relationship of turns and utterances and the interactional
sociolinguistic and ethnographic aspects of communication that produce variation within speech contexts. Through employment of this method, I will scrutinize speech contexts and situated social identities that are manifested multi-dimensionally in a given speech context and moment. It is these contexts and situated social identities that directly influence the employment of linguistic forms, so that interlocutors express implicit epistemic, affective, and interpersonal stances in verbal as well as non-verbal modes.

Large-scale social structures and social order affect linguistic realization to a certain extent. However, there is great lability incurred in local framing and situated context through the indexing of multidimensional and contextualized social meanings. Ethnographic microanalysis heavily weights the mutual influence of interlocutors. Throughout my analysis, I will focus on the interpersonal and interactional functions of the selected pragmatic markers. In this process, the selected pragmatic markers are analyzed with two specific variables in mind: the nature of the specific speech events, and the social and hierarchical rankings and relationship that exists among the speech participants.

Regarding the transcription method, I followed three steps. First, I romanized the conversations using the Yale system, then translated the resulting text morpheme by morpheme. Finally, I effected a translation into natural English. However, for general conversations I did not follow the second step. I am completely responsible for all translations. In the transcription, I do not follow a detail-oriented phonetic method,
instead employing a broader transcriptional method. Refer to the transcribing code\(^1\) for further explanation.

### 1.4 Organization of Dissertation

Let me now briefly present the organization of this dissertation. Following the Introduction, in Chapter 2 I will provide an overview of the theoretical frameworks of pragmatic markers and grammaticalization while applying some of these approaches to Korean. Since the selected pragmatic markers are frequently employed followed by the polite interactional particle –yo, I will also briefly introduce the Korean interactional particles/speech level system.

In Chapters 3 and 4, I will deal with the contemporary functions and uses of the pragmatic marker ceki(yo) (Ch. 3) and its diachronic development process (Ch. 4).

Chapters 5 and 6 will look at the pragmatic marker (ke)pwa and the epistemic modal affix –ikkapwa ‘because.’ In addition, in Chapter 5, attention-getter ipwa and address form yepo that are derived from the same perceptive verb pota as the pragmatic marker (ke)pwa(yo) will be examined while comparing their contemporary functions with those of the pragmatic marker ceki(yo). This comparison is based on the deictic system; i.e., proximal vs. distal deictic elements. In Chapter 6, the diachronic development of these pragmatic markers, attention-getter, and address form will be presented.

Lastly, in Chapters 7 and 8 the pragmatic markers issci/isscanha will be examined in regard to their contemporary functions (Ch. 7) and their historical development (Ch. 8).

\(^1\) See page xx.
In the Conclusion, I will summarize my findings and present limitations and proposed further areas of research based on this study.
CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS: PRAGMATIC MARKERS,
GRAMMATICALIZATION, AND KOREAN UTTERANCE-FINAL PARTICLES

2.1 Introduction

In contemporary Korean, usage of a selected group of pragmatic markers, namely ceki, (ke)pwa, ipwa, and issci/isscanha, is becoming conspicuously prevalent. However, the corpus of studies involving Korean pragmatic markers is relatively meager in comparison to English counterparts. Let me briefly point to some extant studies of Korean pragmatic markers: Y.O. Park (1997) analyzes Korean contrastive connectives such as nuntey ‘but’; the study of Y. Kawanishi and S.O. Sohn (1993) concerns the grammaticalized negation form –canha as a politeness marker; H.S.Yi (1999) deals with the interactional particle ci as a committal particle; J.R. Park (2001, 2002) analyzes multifunctional aspects of ceki and its diachronic development.

As will be discussed below, the heterogeneous terms and definitions and the non-unified taxonomy of pragmatic markers attest to the context-sensitive nature of these elements. Thus, without taking account of contextual features, there are inevitable limitations in capturing the multifunctional characteristics of these elements. An approach that takes into account functionalities that are textually-oriented (discourse coherence) as well as interpersonally-oriented (social cohesion) is essential in the interpretation of pragmatic marker characteristics. Throughout this dissertation, I will endeavor to examine Korean markers focusing on their multifarious functions dependent
on local contexts integrated with a recognition of grammaticalization processes and typological characteristics such as agglutination and postposition.

Before delving into the functionalities of pragmatic markers in the following chapters, I will present herein extant approaches to the study of pragmatic markers. I will describe the general characteristics of grammaticalization as well as the principles that are employed to ascertain the state of grammaticalization of a linguistic item. I will also present some general mechanisms behind the grammaticalization process.

Finally, I will propose a classification of Korean pragmatic markers on a continuum scale by assessing semantic transparency, a key concept in grammaticalization. One of the main purposes behind this classification is to present a big picture of the Korean pragmatic marker system before going on to examine the individual markers selected for this dissertation: issci/isscanha, ceki, ipwa, yepo, and (ke)pwa. Lastly, Korean speech levels will be discussed, specifically the half-talk utterance-final particle ci and the polite utterance-final particle yo, since the most common forms of Korean pragmatic markers are both half-talk and half-talk followed by yo, as in cekiyo.

2.2 Pragmatic Markers

2.2.1 Characteristics and Multifunctionality

The lack of a unified nomenclature and taxonomy for pragmatic markers (PM) is indicative of the elusive and context-sensitive characteristics of these elements. The diverse terminology used to refer to these elements (e.g., pragmatic markers-Brinton 1996; discourse markers-Schiffrin 1987; discourse operators-Redeker 1991; discourse connectives-Blakemore 1987; pragmatic expressions-Erman 1987; pragmatic operators-

The typical attributes of pragmatic markers as laid out by Brinton (1996: 33) are as follows: Pragmatic markers are phonologically reduced and unstressed and are typically short items that consist of one to three syllables. They form a separate tone group. Morpho-syntactically, pragmatic markers occur either outside the main syntactic structure or loosely attached to it, and generally occur in the sentence-initial position. Since they constitute a heterogeneous set of forms, for example phrase (*I mean, you know, etc.*), adverb (*actually, now, etc.*), and interjection (*oh, aha, etc.*), it is difficult to identify pragmatic markers as such in a standard dictionary.

On the semantic level, pragmatic markers are known for having null propositional meaning; that is, they do not contribute to the truth-condition of an utterance or sentence. However, the non-use of PMs may produce unnatural, stilted, and impolite sentences. Also, since PMs principally occur in spoken rather than in written language, they have a tendency to occur as a separate tone group from the main body of the utterance regarding prosody, accent, and intonation. In oral discourse, pragmatic markers are highly productive, occurring with high frequency.

In the sections to follow, I will present current research approaches to defining and classifying pragmatic markers. Following this, I will describe Korean pragmatic markers and will attempt to classify them by utilizing characteristics of Korean typology.
such as agglutination and postposition. I will employ characteristics of grammaticalization throughout the classification process.

**2.2.2 Current Research Approaches**

The heterogeneous terminology used for pragmatic markers, discussed above, is a manifestation of the various research approaches used to classify and define the functions of these markers. For example, Schiffrin (1987) employs the term *discourse markers* and includes in her taxonomy interjections such as *oh*. On the other hand, in the taxonomy of Fraser (1996, 1999), interjections are excluded, even though his perspective on PMs is in general similar to that of Schiffrin. In other words, both of these approaches to pragmatic markers can be filed under the category of “structural coherence” and “discourse organization” (Schiffrin 1987, 1994; Fraser 1996, 1999; Lenk 1998).

Following are some definitional excerpts from the discourse coherence/organization approach:

- Pragmatic markers can have either a local or a global orientation in the discourse, expressing a local (between two adjacent utterances) or global (between discourse segments further apart) connection for the hearer. They are thus vitally important for the establishment of an understanding of coherence in conversation (Lenk 1998: 52).
- I have defined PMs as a pragmatic class, lexical expressions drawn from the syntactic classes of conjunctions, adverbials, and prepositional phrases. ... they signal a relationship between the segment they introduce, S2, and the prior segment, S1. They have a core meaning, which is procedural, not conceptual (Fraser:1999: 950).
- ... sequentially dependent elements that bracket units of talk (Schiffrin 1987: 31).

The above definitions underlie the fact that the functional aspects of PMs are principally oriented around discourse coherence and sequential coordination. Signaling turn-taking
or floor-yielding and functioning as verbal fillers for conversational continuity are all functional aspects utilized in discourse relation and coherence.

To illustrate: the PM you know performs the following functions that are contributory to discourse organization and conversational continuity: turn-taking signal, intra-textual coherence (Holmes 1986:16), floor-yielding device (Ostman 1981:21). The pragmatic marker well also presents the following functions of structural/sequential coordination and coherence: signaling topic change (Svartvik 1980), turn-taking, insufficient response (Lakoff 1973), and insufficient relevance for the interpretation of the impending utterance (Jucker 1993). Schiffrin (1987: 102) refers to well as a response marker that “anchors its user in an interaction when an upcoming contribution is not fully consonant with prior coherence options.”

As Ostman (1981, 1995) notes, the functions of pragmatic markers that contribute to structural organization, discourse coherence, and relevance (such as indicating a topic change or turn-taking/turn-yielding and insufficient/irrelevant response, etc.) can be subsumed under the interpersonal rubric, in that these markers index the speaker’s stance while indicating a new topic or turn change as well as indexing the speaker’s desire to mitigate the illocutionary force of an upcoming utterance such as disagreement, insufficient/irrelevant response, apology, request, etc.

For example, you know signals that the following utterance does not contribute to general discourse organization and structural coherence as it appeals for the ‘hearer’s cooperation’ by claming common ground (Ostman 1981). It also signals an interpersonal stance by claiming intimacy and solidarity based on mutual knowledge and/or background (Holmes 1986). Brown and Levinson (1987) termed you know a hedge that
has a 'positive politeness' function.\(^1\) Another example: The PM *well* conveys interpersonal meaning by indexing the speaker's polite attitude and desire to avoid or mitigate face-threatening acts in the Brown and Levinson (1987) sense. Brown and Levinson (1987: 61) define the notion of face, the cornerstone of politeness theory, in the following way: "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself."\(^2\) Thus, face-threatening acts are utterances or actions that threaten a person's public self-image. By prefacing speech acts that threaten interlocutors' face, such as apology, disagreement, refusal, rejection, etc., *well* functions to weaken the illocutionary force of what follows (Owen 1981, Watts 1986).

The foregoing approaches all utilize the interpersonally oriented perspective (Ostman 1981, 1995, Ariel 1999, Brinton 1996, Mascheler 1998, Holmes 1986, among others). This perspective covers the interpersonal functions (e.g., epistemic and affective stances, polite attitude, expressing social distance such as intimacy and indirectness, etc.) as well as the textual function (discourse coherence) that pragmatic markers signal. By contrast, below are definitional excerpts from the interpersonally oriented approach:

- pragmatic particles can now be defined as verbal elements in language which have as their primary function to implicitly anchor utterances vis-à-vis the communicative restraints of a culture and society, the demands of aspects of interactive politeness, and the prevalent norms of affect and involvement (Ostman 1995:100).

---

\(^1\) B & L's face is composed of two Janus-like face aspects (B & L 1987: 61): One is the negative face: "the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction, i.e., to freedom of action and freedom from imposition." The other is positive face: "the positive consistent self-image or 'personality' (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants." Positive politeness attends positive face.

\(^2\) Goffman's (1967: 5) face concept is expressed in the following way: "... the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. Face is an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes – albeit an image that others may share ..."
Pragmatic particles index the speaker’s epistemic and/or affective stances, they can mitigate face-threatening acts (Cook 2001: 177).

... vehicles for the establishment and maintenance of interpersonal relations between interlocutors (James 1983: 193).

From this perspective, pragmatic markers have been studied as devices for the implementation of a politeness strategy used to lessen the force of face-threatening acts such as request and apology and as a mitigative device working on the illocutionary force of an utterance (Brown and Levinson 1987, House and Kasper 1981, James 1983, Ostman 1995, J. Park 2001, 2002). These markers have also been studied in the context of negotiating strategies (Jucker 1998) and as positive politeness markers and solidarity markers that lay claim to a mutual or common background between interlocutors (Cook 1993, Holmes 1986, Meyerhoff 1994, Wouk 2001).

Let me illustrate the approach of Holmes (1986) regarding the pragmatic marker *you know* from this perspective. On the textual level, *you know* functions as a turn-taking and/or floor-yielding device for intratextual coherence. On the interpersonal level it functions as a positive politeness marker. Also, *you know* functions as a verbal filler in the midst of the speaker’s cognitive processing while searching for a word or engaged in constructing a turn. However, even when functioning as a verbal filler for the speaker’s cognitive processing, *you know* operates within the interpersonal domain. Holmes’s approach encompasses functionalities covering intratextual coherence as well as interpersonal cohesion.

The Korean pragmatic marker *ceki* (J.R. Park 2001) also operates in a similar multifunctional manner, starting conversation and signaling an upcoming topic change on
the textual level while indexing the speaker's interpersonal stances. I will go into detail regarding the multifunctional aspects of this pragmatic marker in the following chapter.

2.2.3 Taxonomy of Pragmatic Markers

Let me now briefly turn to the classification of the heterogeneous class of pragmatic markers. As pointed out, there is no consensus among researchers regarding taxonomy. Depending on the researcher, a pragmatic marker may either be included or excluded from the category of pragmatic markers. In classifying diverse pragmatic markers, characteristics of grammaticalization are noted as a critical criterion (Brinton 1996, Maschler 1998, Ariel 1999, Brown & Levinson 1987).

Mascheler (1998: 14) envisions pragmatic markers as being “situated along a continuum of fixedness.” Thus, on one end of the continuum are placed the most prototypical pragmatic markers, adduced at the outset of the chapter, that have the frozen items having the highest number of PM characteristics. At the other end of the continuum are placed emerging pragmatic markers, less prototypical when examined on the basis of the characteristics of PM. Brown & Levinson (1987) also illustrate pragmatic markers on a continuum scale of diachronically-motivated politeness strategies. For example, some markers (e.g., I guess, I suppose) are placed at one end of the continuum; some other markers (e.g., O.K.) are placed at the other end of the continuum, with others (e.g., you know) placed somewhere between the two poles.

In most cases, pragmatic markers have homonymic counterparts that contain propositional meaning. Hence, the original forms of some markers can be traced to co-
existent counterparts that, in contrast to the PM, do indeed affect the truth-condition of the sentence.

Ariel (1999) also presents a continuum scale of pragmatic markers based on the semantic transparency between the PM and its original source item. Ariel classifies conjunctions such as *and*, *but*, *so*, etc., as ‘transparent operators.’ Most pragmatic markers such as *you know*, *now*, *then*, etc., are classified as ‘intermediate operators.’ Ariel classifies as “opaque operators” interjections such as *oh* and the PM *well*.

Concerning the continuum phenomenon of pragmatic markers, Ariel (1999: 3252) writes: “A reasonable explanation for the constant development of these operators might be that such uses begin as conversational implicatures, but frequency of use with specific forms (e.g., obviously but not surely) freezes them into conventional implicatures.”

Prior to presenting the classification of Korean markers, utilizing grammaticalization characteristics coupled with typological characteristics such as agglutination and postposition, I will introduce some principles and mechanisms of grammaticalization.

### 2.3 Grammaticalization

#### 2.3.1 Grammaticalization and Pragmatic Markers

The following definition of grammaticalization by Kurylowicz (1965: 52: cited in Heine et al. 1991) is the basis of the core unidirectionality principle of grammaticalization: "Grammaticalization consists in the increase of the range of a morpheme advancing from a less grammatical to a more grammatical status, e.g., from a derivative format to an inflectional one." This basic definition is used throughout the
work of Heine et al. (1991). Most noteworthy among the numerous contributions of this volume is that it lays the foundation for the view that cognitive factors in language serve as a motivation for subsequent structural language change. As a cognitive process, grammaticalization progresses in a continuous manner based on certain key principles, such as unidirectionality. In other words, less grammatical elements, such as concrete lexemes, are employed to solve the problems of expressing an abstract concept, such as moral values, qualities, etc. This process is accomplished principally through the employment of metaphor. In this view, the human faculty for creativity is fully engaged throughout the process of grammaticalization.

There are several processes that may act upon a source element in the process of its development to a target form (Hopper and Traugott 1993; Bybee, Pagliuca, and Perkins 1994: 4-9); Diessel 1999: 116-117). Regarding grammaticalization, there are three main linguistic levels at which this process may occur. First, some phonological or phonetic features may change through reduction, coalescence, complete loss, etc. Second, on the morpho-syntactic level, distributional restriction occurs in the grammaticalized lexeme. In other words, the more a lexeme is grammaticalized, the less its freedom of distribution. Most pragmatic makers are context-dependent and appear only in certain slots, e.g., the sentence-initial position. Lastly, on the semantic and functional level, the source lexeme may acquire a new function and as a result generate a homonym.

As introduced in Section (2.2.1), pragmatic markers have the following primary attributes: First, they are predominantly a feature of spoken discourse rather than of written discourse. Second, they occur frequently in language use. Third, they have little or no propositional and referential meaning. Fourth, as mentioned at the outset, they are
grammatically but not pragmatically optional. Lastly, they may operate multifunctionally and simultaneously on different levels, such as the textual as well as the interpersonal (see Brinton 1996: 33).

Among the aforementioned characteristics, the attribute of pragmatic markers having little or no propositional and referential meaning is most reflective of the grammaticalization process on the semantic and functional levels. That is, through the grammaticalization process, a PM is established as the result of a transformed function from a proposition embodying concrete and lexical meaning. This process results in pragmatic markers being grammatically, but not pragmatically, optional. The core concept here is that the original referential meaning of the source lexeme undergoes semantic loss in the process of acquiring a pragmatically reanalyzed new function through the grammaticalization process.

The co-existence of non-grammaticalized and grammaticalized homonyms on different levels, the so-called “divergence” phenomenon (Hopper 1991), should not be viewed as unusual. As will be examined in the following chapter, the Korean pragmatic marker ceki operates on both the propositional level as a demonstrative pronoun denoting location and on the interpersonal level as a PM expressing the speaker’s polite and indirect attitude. The non-grammaticalized and grammaticalized elements independently undergo linguistic changes during the course of their diachronic development.

Let us now consider the aforementioned first and second characteristics of pragmatic markers. The informal features of spoken vis-a-vis written discourse and the frequent occurrence of pragmatic markers in spoken contexts, which manifest less rigidity of usage and more informality than do written contexts, indicates that these
markers have undergone subjectivity. Finegan (1995) defines subjectivity as 'expression of self.' The effect of the expression of self and of the speaker's attitude toward the speech event or the addressee can be exerted in spoken discourse though paralinguistic cues such as accent, intonation, gesture, facial expression, etc., all of which are unavailable in written discourse. These paralinguistic cues may effectively assist in expressing the speaker's attitude and perspective regarding oral output.

Traugott (1995: 46) argues that subjectification is characteristic of all domains of grammaticalization:

The reason for the apparent ubiquity of subjectification presumably lies in the speaker's attempts to communicate the relevance of what is being uttered to the communicative event, which includes hearers as well as the speaker. For the speaker's communicative purposes to be achieved, forms are constantly being recruited from lexical domains expressing concrete, objective meanings, and are construed in terms of the perspective of the speaker, the speech event, and the discourse context.

The impetus for grammaticalization is thus seen as being based in the speaker's need for expression. In other words, as noted by Traugott (1995) and Finegan (1995) among others, the speaker's cognitive need for increasing the information content through discourse coherence coupled with the speaker's social need for expressing interpersonal attitudes and beliefs underlie the grammaticalization process.

The starting point for the historical development of pragmatic markers can be found in concrete lexemes, as indicated in Traugott's (1995: 46) argument above on subjectification. Even though some counterexamples are reported to this unidirectional characteristic of grammaticalization (see Hopper and Traugott 1993, Matsumoto 1988), as a rule abstract and functional elements such as pragmatic markers denoting the
speaker's perspectives, attitude, solidarity, distance, etc., and other grammatical elements denoting mood, aspect, tense, case markers, etc., derive from concrete lexemes containing a propositional lexical meaning.

2.3.2 Principles and Mechanisms of Grammaticalization

The dynamic interconnections among different linguistic levels, as well as non-linguistic influence such as socio-cognitive factors, can be observed in the process of grammaticalization. Put another way, there are several processes that may act upon an ungrammaticalized lexical item (the source element) in the process of its development into the target form, a grammaticalized grammatical marker (Hopper and Traugott 1993, Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins 1994: 4-9, Diessel 1999).

As mentioned above, some phonological or phonetic features may change through attrition and/or loss of phonological subsistence. On the morphemic level, coalescence occurs across morphemic boundaries. These processes increase bondedness while decreasing the autonomy of a given lexeme. Morphological fusion and agglutination, illustrated later, are examples of such processes. On the syntactic level, distributional restriction (fixation) occurs in the grammaticalized lexeme. On the semantic and pragmatic level, the source lexeme may acquire a new function while the referential meaning of the source lexeme is lost.

Along with these general characteristics, Hopper (1991: 23) presents five principles of grammaticalization that are especially helpful for ascertaining the status of emerging grammatical elements. The first principle is termed layering: "Within a broad functional domain, new layers are continually emerging...the older layers are not
necessarily discarded, but may remain to coexist with and interact with the newer layers.”

For example, there are several functional elements for denoting the English future tense: 

*be going + to, be + -ing, be + to*. These historically layered elements denote the same grammatical function. Thus, when a new grammatical marker evolves it may co-exist with the old one. In the above case, the most recently layered forms, i.e., *be + -ing* and *be + to*, are co-existent with the older grammatical elements.

Secondly, the *divergence* principle is frequently observed in the process of grammaticalization. The source item (lexical element) and a target item that is grammaticalized from this lexical element diverge and autonomously undergo linguistic change. Thus, homonyms derived from the same etymology frequently appear. For instance, the ungrammaticalized lexical item *well* is used as an adjectival predicate (e.g., I am doing *well*); its homonym, having undergone grammaticalization, is utilized as a pragmatic marker (e.g., *well*, I do not think like that).

Let me now illustrate Hopper’s third principle, *specialization*: “Within a functional domain, at one stage a variety of forms with different semantic nuances may be possible; as grammaticalization takes place, this variety of formal choices narrows and the smaller number of forms selected assume more general grammatical elements.”

Hopper (1991: 26) discusses this principle with the French negation marker *pas* as one of the specialization cases. Among the many elements of French negation construction in Old and Middle French, only *pas* remained as a true negator by the modern period, owing to its high discourse frequency and semantically non-emphatic and unmarked neutrality. As will be discussed in the following section, the semantically unmarked and neutral
characteristic of the Korean distal deictic element (*ce* ‘that’) in a similar fashion served as the driving force behind its grammaticalization to the pragmatic marker *ceki*.

As Traugott (1995) notes concerning the semantic relevance between source and target items, grammaticalized elements can be traced to their source lexical item owing to Hopper’s fourth principle: *persistence*. Grammaticalized elements are to some degree semantically transparent and relevant to their original lexical items. It is this characteristic that allows one to trace the source of the grammaticalized item. However, at the end of the grammaticalization stage, the semantic transparency between the two concepts, source and target, becomes opaque.

Hopper (1991:22) also suggests the fifth principle, *decategorization*, as a criterion for ascertaining the grammaticalization status of an emerging grammatical element: “Forms undergoing grammaticalization tend to lose or neutralize the morphological markers and syntactic privileges characteristic of the full categories noun and verb and to assume attributes characteristic of secondary categories such as adjective, participle, preposition, etc.” During the process of decategorization from major grammatical category such as noun and verb to minor category, lexical elements lose morpho-syntactic privileges such as inflection and freedom of distribution. As will be shown later, grammaticalized items have no capability to inflect and tend to occur in certain limited positions.

Among the above characteristics adduced by Hopper (1991) dealing with grammaticalization principles, phonological reduction, coalescence, loss of propositional meaning, divergence, persistence, and decategorization all form aspects of
unidirectionality, the key principle of grammaticalization. I will return this matter in the following section.

Finegan (1995:1) defines subjectivity as “expression of self” together with the speaker’s attitudes and beliefs (Lyons 1982, Traugott 1995). Finegan (1995) points out that the notion of subjectivity is central to human interaction and “an emerging view of discourse as an instrument not solely, perhaps not centrally, designed for communicating ready-made content, but as an expression of self and in part, its creation.” Along with this notion of subjectivity, Traugott (1995: 46) argues that subjectification is characteristic of all domains of grammaticalization. In this view, the driving force for grammaticalization is seen as being based on a socio-cognitive foundation expressing the speaker’s perspective/attitude and increasing discourse coherence by drawing attention from the interlocutor to the upcoming speech events and discourse context.

It is these socio-cognitive factors that influence the process of grammaticalization through conceptual transference between two conceptual domains; in other words, a shift from the concrete to the abstract domain. As Heine et al. (1991) note in their problem-solving construct of grammaticalization, abstract and functional elements, including pragmatic markers, and other grammatical elements are developed from concrete lexical items. This process is accomplished principally through the employment of metaphor that is linked to analogy. According to Heine et al. (1991: 48), typical metaphoric manipulation occurs in the following direction:

Person > Object > Activity > Space > Time > Quality

There is another linguistic mechanism that underlies the grammaticalization process: metonymy. Hopper and Traugott (1993: 81) describe conceptual metonymy as
"meaning changes arising out of contiguity in linguistic (including) pragmatic contexts."

Semantic transfer through metaphor is "analogical and iconic"; on the other hand, semantic transfer through contiguity is "indexical" (Anttila 1989: 141-2: cited in Hopper and Traugott [1993: 82]) based on reanalysis. In this view, metonymy points to ("indexes") relations in context (Hopper and Traugott 1993: 82).

It can be seen, then, that Hopper and Traugott (1993) greatly emphasize the role of pragmatic inferencing in the process of grammaticalization. Pragmatic inferencing denotes the conventionalization of conversational implicatures. Through conventionalizing conversational implicatures, grammaticalized referential meaning is pragmatically strengthened so that the speaker can express his or her interpersonal attitudes and beliefs. Heine et al. (1991) refer to this type of change as "context induced reinterpretation." Traugott (1995) argues that conventionalizing conversational implicature can be regarded as "pragmatic reanalysis."

Heine et al. (1991) and Traugott acknowledge that both metaphor and metonymy operate in the process of grammaticalization. Traugott (1988: 409-410) puts forth the following three semantic/pragmatic tendencies:

(a) Tendency I: Meanings situated in the externally described situation > meanings situated in the internal (evaluative/perceptual/cognitive) situation.
(b) Tendency II: Meanings situated in the described external or internal situation > meanings situated in the textual situation.
(c) Tendency III: Meanings tend to become increasingly situated in the speaker's subjective belief state/attitude toward the situation.

Among the above tendencies, Trougott (1988) considers tendencies I and II to be metaphorically motivated; on the other hand, tendency III she considers to be
metonymically motivated. Heine et al. (1991: 182) illustrate the metaphoric nature of
tendency II, utilizing metaphoric transference, in this way:
Spatial deixis > (Temporal deixis) > Textual deixis.

2.3.3 Unidirectionality and Regularity in Semantic Change

Let us now explore further the principal characteristics of unidirectionality
introduced in the above sections. The diachronic change of a lexical element
encompasses form and structure together with meaning. In the process of
grammaticalization, the shift from a general basic lexeme to a grammatical element, but
not vice-versa (observing the principle of unidirectionality), starts from the generalization
of meaning and grammatical function.

First, about the generalization of grammatical function: Millet (cited in Hopper
and Traugott 1993: 94-95) envisages this phenomenon of increase in grammatical status
in the following way: “lexical items or phrases come through use in certain highly
constrained local contexts to be reanalyzed as having syntactic and morphological
functions.” The following path (Hopper and Traugott 1993: 95) can be adduced from
Millet’s proposal:

Lexical items used in specific linguistic contexts > Syntax > Morphology
As well, Givon (1973: cited in Hopper and Traugott 1993: 96) points to this regarding
generalization: “… grammatical meaning develops out of lexical meaning by a process of
generalization or weakening of semantic content.”

Thus, generalization of grammatical function centers on the increased
grammatical status effected by functional shift from a lexical to a grammatical item
and/or from the less grammatical to the more grammatical. Interestingly, this reflects a central definition of grammaticalization by Kurylowicz (1965: 52): “an increase of the range of a morpheme advancing from a lexical to a grammatical or from a less grammatical to a more grammatical status.”

Also, one of the grammaticalization principles proposed by Hopper (1991), i.e., decategorization, mirrors the process of generalization of grammatical function, or functional shift from major to minor grammatical categories. The major category is lexically open, such as a noun and verb. These major categories apply cross-linguistically; on the other hand, the minor categories are lexically closed (e.g., preposition, particle, auxiliary verb, conjunction) and are variable across languages.

Hopper and Traugott (1993: 106-112) proposed the following paths of functional shifts from noun and verb both of which belong to the major lexical category:

- **Noun to affix cline:**
  - Relational noun > Secondary adposition > Primary adposition > Agglutinative case affix > Fusional case affix

- **Verb to Affix cline:**
  - Full verb > (Vector verb » Auxiliary > Clitic > Affix

According to Craig (1991), there is another path, namely the polygrammaticalizational path, through which a lexical element develops in multiple directions. Such development into different grammatical domains also conforms to the principle of unidirectionality in that the later-developed grammatical and functional elements are more generalized and abstract than elements that developed earlier. I will illustrate this phenomenon in the following chapters with the selected Korean pragmatic markers.
Through the process of generalization of grammatical function, a major nominal lexical item undergoes loss of properties such as capability of inflecting with the following grammatical markers: case, number, and gender markers. As well, a verbal element undergoes loss of its properties in inflecting or agreeing with the following markers: tense or aspect markers, person/number agreement. As a consequence, the characteristics of a major lexical category decrease while the grammatical status of the item increases.

Let us now look at the regularity/unidirectionality concept in lexical change; that is, the generalization of meaning of a lexical item. Traugott (1982: 257) proposed the following path of generalization of meaning:

- Propositional > Textual > Expressive

In this developmental path, concrete referential meanings develop toward more abstract and subjective meanings. Thus, while semantic content decreases in the process of grammaticalization, pragmatic meaning, which indexes the speaker's subjective attitudes and beliefs, is strengthened (Traugott 1989, 1995; Traugott and König 1991; Traugott and Dasher 2002). Such speaker-based semantic pragmatic change also conforms to the principle of unidirectionality; i.e., from less to more subjective but not vice-versa. In other words, subjectification mirrors the regularity seen in semantic change.

As already introduced in Section (2.3.2), the two mechanisms of grammaticalization, metaphor and metonymy, underlie the generalization of lexical meaning. Traugott and König (1991: 213) point out the interconnection of the two mechanisms in the process of semantic generalization in the following way:
Metaphor is largely correlated with shifts from meanings situated in the external described situation to meanings situated in the internal evaluative, perceptual, cognitive situation, and in the textual situation. Metonymy is largely correlated with shifts in meanings situated in the subjective belief-state or attitude toward situation, including the linguistic one ... while metaphor is correlated primarily with solving the problem of representation, metonymy and conventionalizing of conversational meanings are associated with solving the problems of expressing speaker attitudes.

In the following section, I will classify the class of Korean pragmatic markers utilizing the grammaticalization principles and mechanisms introduced above.

2.3.4 Korean Pragmatic Markers on a Continuum Scale

As mentioned at the outset, there is a dearth of available studies dealing with Korean pragmatic markers. The full gamut of Korean pragmatic markers, to my knowledge, has to date not been studied in a comprehensive manner. Thus, classification is here intended to provide a broad picture of Korean pragmatic markers before looking at the selected group of markers in the following chapters. As well, the basis for the selection of the group of pragmatic markers for this study will be introduced through the discussion of classification.

Organization of the elements of Korean pragmatic markers and their functions can be achieved by examining the agglutinative characteristics of the language. For this, I will utilize the polite utterance-final particle -yo and the topic particle -nun. I posit that the particle -yo was originally agglutinated only onto the sentence final verb, denoting informal polite interaction. Its use has been extended to allow for agglutination onto nouns (N), noun phrases (NP), adverbs, and conjunctions. Thus, it is now distributed in both sentence/clause final and sentence/clause internal position, as shown below:
yesterday-yo  Tom-NOM-yo  John-with school-at-yo  went-yo
‘Yesterday Tom and John went to school.’

and-yo  certainly-yo hospital-at-also  went-yo
‘And then (they) went to the hospital too.’

The topic particle –nun, on the other hand, I posit was originally agglutinated only to N and NP. It later extended its agglutinative domain in discourse contexts to adverbs and conjunctions, as shown below:

(2) na-nun kunye-nun caseyhi-nun moluciman ... kulayse-nun
i-nun her-nun  very well-nun  do not know-but ... so-nun
‘Even though I do not know her in detail ... so’

The following table illustrates the distributional differences of the topic particle –nun and the polite particle –yo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.1. Distribution of Particles: –nun and –yo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Particles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–nun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–yo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Let us now look at some pragmatic markers derived from conjunctions and adverbs that allow agglutination with the particle –nun to see some common characteristics of such combinational forms.

(3) kyelkwacekulo-nun-(yo) ‘consequently’
    kulikonase-nun-(yo) ‘and then’
    kulehcima-nun-(yo) ‘but’
    kulayse-nun-(yo) ‘so’
    sasil-un-(yo) ‘in fact’
    cenghwakhakey-nun-(yo) ‘clearly’
    pwunmyenghi hacamye-nun-(yo) ‘make it clear’
    taycocekulo-nun-(yo) ‘in contrast’
    ilpancekulo-nun-(yo) ‘in general’
    hanphyenulo-nun-(yo) ‘on the other hand’

Contractional forms, composed of the PM and the particle –nun, occur more than non-contractional forms in spoken contexts, as in kyelkwacekulo-n ‘consequently.’

Markers agglutinated with the topic particle –nun can be classified as textually-oriented pragmatic markers. In other words, they function principally for discourse coherence by foregrounding topical and given information with emphasis, and thus have a procedural but not propositional function (Fraser 1996). Furthermore, the source meanings from adverbs and conjunctions are relatively easy to discern (i.e., transparent).
A point of note is that the polite particle -yo can also be agglutinated onto the topic marker. In (3), this is indicated by parentheses around the particle -yo. This suggests that even though classified as textually-oriented pragmatic markers, the combinational forms (i.e., PM + nun) also possess an interactional function to some degree. In other words, these forms function to foreground textual coherence and at the same time background interactional and interpersonal social indexing, especially when agglutinated with the interactional/polite utterance-final marker -yo preceded by the topic marker -nun.

The reader should also note the ordering of particles: PM+nun+yo. As an utterance-final particle that functions in illocutionary acts such as ordering, requesting, questioning etc., the interpersonal-interactionally oriented particle -yo agglutinates onto the end of the grammatical unit. This is also reflected in the postpositioning of the particle -yo preceded by the particle -nun, as in PM+nun+yo.

Let me now turn to the agglutination of the polite particle with the PM. Some pragmatic markers agglutinate with the particle -yo but not with the topic particle -nun, as shown below:

(4)  *ceki-nun vs. ceki-\textit{yo} 'excuse me'  
*issci-nun vs. issci-\textit{yo} 'you know'  
*isscanha-nun vs. isscanha-\textit{yo} 'you know'  
*kuci-nun vs. kuci-\textit{yo} 'right'  
*kulssey-nun vs. kulssey-\textit{yo} 'well'  
*kukespwa-nun vs. kukeskepwa-\textit{yo} 'you see'  
*ceypal-nun vs. ceypal-\textit{yo} 'please'
This suggests that these are socio-interactionally oriented markers that index the speaker's desires, perspectives and beliefs. While textually-oriented markers function for discourse coherence and have procedural meaning, the pragmatic markers listed in (4) function for social-interactional cohesion and have pragmatically strengthened non-propositional meaning. In other words, these markers developed to facilitate expression of the speaker's social-interpersonal desire to manifest social distance and perspectives and seek cooperation by claiming common ground with the hearer(s).

A signal difference between the pragmatic markers in (3) and (4) is the degree of semantic transparency from the source. Textually-oriented markers, as in (3), have a clear semantic relationship from their source meaning, even though their propositional meaning is empty (propositional meaning is transformed into procedural meaning through diachronic development). On the other hand, interactionally-oriented markers, as in (4), evince much less semantic transparency. In some cases they have an essentially opaque relationship from their source; that is, without serious linguistic reflection the source is not identifiable (Ariel 1999).

Let me illustrate this phenomenon with Table (2.2):
### Table 2.2. Functional Differences of PM Arrayed on Continuum Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agglutination (PM+particle(s))</th>
<th>Continuum</th>
<th>Less prototypical PM</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Prototypical PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Discourse coherence</td>
<td>Toward social interaction</td>
<td>Social interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nun</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>*ceki-nun</td>
<td><em>excuse me</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*kulsssey-nun</td>
<td><em>well</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*kepwa-nun</td>
<td><em>you see</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nun-yo</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>*issci-yo</td>
<td><em>you know</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*ceki-yo</td>
<td><em>excuse me</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*kullessey-yo</td>
<td><em>well</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*kepwa-yo</td>
<td><em>you see</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-yo</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>*ceki-yo</td>
<td><em>excuse me</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*kulsssey-yo</td>
<td><em>well</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*kepwa-yo</td>
<td><em>you see</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table (2.2) above, PMs are organized based on typological characteristics of agglutination and postposition. Their diachronic development suggests their functional differences. This classification illustrates the PM continuum and supports the notion of subjectification by Traugott (1989, 1995): Linguistic elements tend to evolve toward interpersonal-interactional markers.
The following table illustrates the general characteristics of PMs on a continuum scale:

**Table 2.3. Characteristics of Pragmatic Markers on Continuum Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Continuum</th>
<th>Less prototypical PM</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Prototypical PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agglutination</td>
<td>-nun</td>
<td>-yo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postposition</td>
<td>PM + nun + yo</td>
<td>*PM + yo + nun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic transparency</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>vague</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>discourse coherence</td>
<td>social interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic-functional level</td>
<td>textual</td>
<td>interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some authors include interjections under the category of pragmatic marker (Schiffrin 1987). However, in Korean one of the major differences between interjections and pragmatic markers is that interjections do not allow for agglutination of any interactional or textual particles, including the topic marker -nun. That is, they do not manifest agglutinative characteristics. The following are the most frequently employed interjections in spoken Korean: um, eh, ku (that), ce (that), oh, aha. These interjections do not allow for any agglutination:

Another difference between interjections and pragmatic markers lies in their distributive and repetitive characteristics. Interjections are more likely to occur utterance-internally, while pragmatic markers occur utterance-initially. Furthermore, interjections tend to occur repeatedly in an utterance, whereas pragmatic markers are limited in their repetitive occurrence.

This functional difference between PMs and interjections derives from the fact that interjections are employed in information processing. Thus, they are more likely to occur in the realm of cognition rather than of social interaction, although certainly interjections can and do occur during social interactions as well as in self-reflection.

The interjections *um, eh, ku,* and *ce(ki)* all function to process and retrieve information preserved in the speaker's memory. The interjections *ku* and *ce* are distal deictic elements that function as elements manifesting deictic characteristics. These elements are utilized when the speaker stalls in order to recall and retrieve a word, name, incident, time, space, etc., and occur repeatedly in spoken discourse. The interjections *um* and *eh* are mostly employed in monologue information processing. On the other hand, *ce(ki)* is used in dialogue while maintaining consciousness of the addressee. In this sense, *ce(ki)* is similar to the English pragmatic marker *you know* in that both function as a verbal filler for information processing while remaining in the social-interactional domain (Holmes 1986).

The utilization of a continuum scale, based on the semantic transparency characteristic of grammaticalization together with characteristics of typology such as agglutination and postposition, has much merit in the classification of Korean pragmatic markers. First of all, utilizing this approach, functionally heterogeneous markers can be
classified in a consistent manner. In addition, this approach captures the attested principle of unidirectional subjectification. That is, the classification shown in Tables (2.2, 2.3) clearly indicates that pragmatic markers consistently evolve toward expressing the speaker's subjective attitude for social cohesion.

However, with this approach there is no clear applicability to classifying interjections, since interjections do not allow agglutination or postposition; the core property of interjections is found in information processing while occurring as verbal fillers. Given that some interjections have been grammaticalized, the concept of semantic transparency can be utilized in classifying interjections, as put forth by Ariel (1999). Following this criterion alone, interjections would be classified as interpersonally-oriented pragmatic markers that show opaque semantic relevance between source and target items.

As shown, the principal reason for the selection of the group of pragmatic markers for this dissertation is based on their commonality. That is, the selected pragmatic markers ceki(yo), ipwa(yo), issci(yo), and (ke)pwa(yo) can all be agglutinated with the particle yo and their primary functionality can be found in socio-interpersonal and interactional ground.

2.4 Korean Speech Level Markers

As mentioned at the outset, the most dominant forms of the pragmatic markers under consideration are half-talk, as in (ke)pwa, and half-talk followed by the polite utterance-final particle yo, as in (ke)pwayo. Thus, in the following sections I will elaborate on these speech level particles. Speech level particles can be considered as
interactionally-oriented particles between interlocutors. Their usage is based on social variables such as social status, distance, age, etc., between speech participants.

Korean is a language that evinces a very sophisticated and elaborate honorific system, employing various speech levels in its syntactic structure along with lexical and morphological devices. However, as Sohn (1986) indicates in his discussion of the shift of speech levels, the traditional six different levels are becoming more simplified. He presents several pieces of evidence on the shift of the Korean honorific systems based on the aspects of power and solidarity, in essence toward a solidarity-oriented system from power-oriented one. First, the historical simplification of the speech levels is in itself noteworthy. The six speech levels (\(-naita, -supnita, -yo\) (so), \(-ney, -a/e,\) and \(-ta\))\(^3\) have been simplified in the following way: \(-naita\), and \(-ney\) have been obliterated or at least the contexts of their usage have grown more limited. On the other hand, usage of the speech levels \(-yo\) and \(-a/e\) (panmal 'half-talk') has seen a marked increase. The highly productive usage of these speech levels would seem to parallel a gradual transformation of social aspects of Korean society: solidarity-oriented intimacy and informal characteristics are spreading.

The agglutinative linguistic characteristics of Korean allows for pragmatic markers to be combined with various speech level morphemes, as in \(ceki-yo\), and also with the assumed grammaticalized form \(mali\) and speech level markers, as in \(ceki-mali-ya\). The following table describes these characteristics:

\(^3\)Sohn (1999) classifies the six speech levels in the following way: deferential \((-supnita)\), polite \((-yo)\), blunt \((-s[ə]f)\), familiar \((-ney)\), intimate \((-a/e)\), and plain \((-ta)\).
However, the combinational form of the deferential speech level—upnita and ceki—does not occur at all in my data, as will be illustrated at the following chapter.

Han (1991) indicates that usage of half-talk—\(-a/e, -ci, \) and half-talk+yo became established by the middle of the 20th century and has become predominant in contemporary Korean. In the following sections, I will examine the half-talk speech level marker and the polite particle yo.

### 2.4.1 Half-Talk

Wang (1990) points out the historical change in honorifics, more specifically the change in speech levels, in the process of examining the usage of speech levels in a speech community called Cihwali in the southern Kyengsangto area of Korea. He observes that the usage of half-talk is gradually spreading especially because of its attribute of unclassified, ambiguous, and vague interpersonal status marking the social relationship between interlocutors. As observed by Wang (1990), “panmal [half-talk] conveys an “ambiguous” meaning, nondeferential and noncondescending (p. 32).” He also adds that “extended usage of panmal [half-talk] may well be derived from its ambiguous meaning: the form conveys relatively ‘soft’ and ‘intimate’ feelings to the addressee by not clearly presenting the function of ‘talking down’ (p. 36).”
This study sheds light on the fact that the usage of pragmatic markers is very similar to that of half-talk, both having the following attributes: intimate, noncondescending, and unclassified. Through the process of data collection, I have observed another interesting phenomenon: the frequency of the two forms is all but completely dominant. That is, the forms of half-talk and half-talk followed by yo are employed almost exclusively in various social interactions, regardless of variations based on power, age, intimacy, distance, etc.

In Korean, in informal contexts, there are two half-talk speech level markers: a/e and ci. The latter marker was introduced early in the 20th century according to my data and was established by the middle of the century (Han 1991). The particle ci has drawn substantial interest from Korean linguists (H.S.Yi 1999, Sohn 1999, Han 1991, Se 1989, Wang 1988, Cang 1986). The characteristics of the particle ci have been categorized in different ways: as a marker of supposition (Sohn 1999, J.S. Chang 1973: cited in Han 1991), intimacy and softening (Han 1991), the speaker’s subjective already-known knowledge (K.H. Chang 1986), and committal suffix (H.S. Yi 1999), among others.

Such diverse characteristics stem from the original sense of the particle ci. In Middle Korean the particle ci was not palatalized until the 16th century; until then, the particle was rendered as ti as a bound form of a defective noun. According to Wang (1988), the original sense of ti in Middle Korean was the description of situation, time, and psychological state. As mentioned earlier, the utterance final particle ci was established by the middle of the 20th century. In contemporary Korean, the pragmatic markers issci/isscanha, within which the particle ci is suffixed, appear with high frequency of use, especially among the younger generations. I will examine further
semantic characteristics of \( ci \) in Chapter 8 in discussing the pragmatic markers \( issci/isseanha \) (8.2.1).

2.4.2 The Polite Utterance-Final Particle \( yo \)

Along with the half-talk speech level, the polite particle \( yo \) preceded by half-talk is conspicuously dominant in contemporary Korean. As shown in Section (2.3.3) above, pragmatic markers that are on the left side of the continuum are not agglutinated with this particle; on the other hand, prototypical pragmatic markers that are on the right side of the continuum, such as (e.g., \( ceki \), \( (ke)pwaw \), and \( issci \)) can all be agglutinated with \( yo \). The primary focus of this particle is for social-interactional cohesion with the function of mitigation and politeness. Hence, the functions of selected PMs agglutinated with the polite particle –\( yo \) are here posited as promoting politeness, solidarity, and intimacy. The following definition of the particle \( yo \) is from a dictionary entry (1998)\(^4\) that is based on usages culled from various texts. It supports the above mentioned primary function of \( yo \):

1. Denoting intimate politeness by following half-talk speech level.
2. Employed to end an utterance through attaching onto a phrase (e.g., ppalli-yo ‘please be hurry.’)
3. Verbal filler utilized while searching for a word, or for expressing hesitation when occurring in the middle of an utterance. In this case, the sentence is not completed and \( yo \) has a rising intonation.
4. In dialect, \( yo \) is used as an addressee honorific morpheme followed by the deferential speech-level marker \( pnita \) (e.g., \( Kapnita-yo \) ‘I’m coming’).

Figure 2.1. Polite Interactional Particle \( yo \)

---

\(^4\) Sacensik theyksuthu pwunsekeek kwuco cosa uy yenkwu [A Study of Case Markers Based on Analysis of Texts for Dictionaries]. Translation into English from Korean by the author.
The third entry above concerns the function of *yo* as an interjection/verbal filler for retrieving a word or for expressing hesitation. This usage was applied in an earlier illustration (1b). Let me return to this illustration below:

(1b) Kuliko-*yo* pwunmyenghi-*yo* pyengwen-ey-to kasse-*yo*.

and-*yo* certainly-*yo* hospital-at-also went-*yo*

‘And then (they) went to the hospital too.’

The particle *yo* was introduced in the late 19th or early 20th century and was established by the middle of the century (see Sin 1984, C.T. Kim 1992, Ko 1974, C.S. Se 1984). In Early Modern Korean literature, called Sin Sosel or Kayhawki Sosel, changes in social structure and values brought about by the influence of Western culture are reflected in lexicon and interactional markers and speech levels, such as the introduction of *yo* (see C.T Kim 1992: 101).

Concerning derivation and origin, C.T. Kim (1982: 119) states that *yo* is derived from *io*. In other words, *yo* is the contracted form of *io*. K.M. Ko (2000) and Jeong (2002) also hold that *yo* is derived from *io*. In this study, I assume this line of argument.

An interesting point to be observed from the usage of *yo* is that there is no gender-oriented differentiation. Usage of the particle –*yo* was traditionally employed principally by children and women. However, the use of –*yo* is gradually spreading into male speech and in contemporary language use there is no discernible gender difference in the employment of –*yo*. Through analysis of the uses of *yo* by gender in my data, I observed no differences in gender usage.
Further, the particle -yo is productively employed even in formal broadcast program speech settings in place of the deferential speech level form supnita, as in the following excerpt from an interviewee’s response to a reporter on a sports news program:

(6) 2-kwun eyse yelsimhi hamyense 1-kwun mwutayey olla kanunkeey mokphyokwuyo. calilul capkeytoymyen 10sung isangtoynun thwuswuka toyko sipheyo.

‘While I am working hard in the second line, I am aspiring to move into the first line. That is my vision. Then, I would like to be a pitcher who wins more than 10 games.’

2.5 Conclusion

The characteristics and multifunctionality of pragmatic markers have been analyzed through two major research approaches: the discourse organization and textual coherence-oriented perspective and the social-interactional and interpersonal-oriented approach. For the purposes of this dissertation, I will take both approaches into account in order to capture multifarious functions of the group of Korean pragmatic markers that are covering intra-textual coherence as well as interpersonal cohesion dependant upon local speech context. Concerning the classification of pragmatic markers, the merit of an approach utilizing the theory of grammaticalization, specifically the concept of semantic transparency, is also discussed.

To examine how the contemporary functions of the selected group of pragmatic markers have evolved, major principles and mechanisms of grammaticalization were
introduced. As well, the notions of unidirectionality and semantic regularity in the process of grammaticalization were also introduced.

Lastly, I adduced the emergent simplified Korean speech level system: half-talk and half-talk followed by the polite utterance-final particle yo. In contemporary spoken Korean, these two speech levels are predominantly used. The group of pragmatic markers selected for this study can all be agglutinated with the particle yo denoting the speaker’s interpersonal and affective stances.
3.1 Introduction

The pragmatic marker *ceki* is derived from the distal deictic element *ce*, the original form of which was *tye*. The deictic *ce* is employed to designate a referent distant from both the speaker and the addressee. The marker *ceki* is composed of *ce* and *eki*, which has the lexical meaning of “place” (see also An and Yi 1991; Sohn 1994: 294).

*Ceji* results from the coalescence of *ce* and *eki* and has the referential meaning of “over there.” The spatial deictic *ceki* underwent further grammaticalization (discussed in the following chapter) to obtain a non-referential and abstract usage as a pragmatic marker. Through the grammaticalization process the lexical form evolved to obtain another non-referential and abstract usage. It is this null referential status that allows *ceki* to so effectively mark various and multiple functions at the interactional level.

In contemporary spoken Korean, *ceki* is highly productive across gender and generational boundaries, regardless of power difference. The following illustration (1) shows uses of the pragmatic marker *ceki* across generations and its homonymic spatial pronoun containing the referential meaning of “over there.” The dialogue excerpt is from a contemporary urban-based Korean television drama.¹

The participants (S) and (O) are unknown to each other. The scene takes place in a poor village at rush hour as follows: On the way back to the house, (O), who is 72 years

¹ *Wulika eti naminkayo?* ‘Are we strangers?’ For a detailed synopsis, see pages 9-10.
old, passes by a young woman (S) together with her child. The woman (S) is
admonishing the child to go back inside the house, as she is about to leave for work. (O)
apprehends the situation and approaches the young woman to introduce herself,
suggesting that she (O) would like to take care of the child during the daytime.

(1) [S, O: 1-2]

1. S Naoci mallayssci? ese MOS tuleka!
   'Didn’t I tell you to stay inside? Get inside.’

2. O Ceki ... (pragmatic marker) ayki emma, na ceki (spatial locative: over there) ce (deictic form: pointing out) kkoktayki cipey saylo isaon salamintey, nayka ayki pwa cwlükkeyyo. Nayil pwutthen wuli cipulo ponayyo.
   ‘Ceki ... child mom, I moved over there (pointing to the house located on top). I’ll take care of your child. So bring your child to me from tomorrow.’

Noteworthy here are the uses of the homonyms of ceki. The second use of ceki is
as a locative pronoun having the spatial sense of ‘over there.’ The first use of ceki is as a pragmatic marker. Here, (O) is interrupting a stranger while the stranger is directing her child to go inside the house. The speaker (O) employs the pragmatic marker ceki in order to draw the attention of the addressee and intercede in the ongoing interaction between the young woman and her child with a hesitant tone of voice, as indicated by the pause following ceki. Thus, it can be seen that ceki when used as a pragmatic marker is distinct
from its original lexical sense of physical space or location. Instead, it serves to create
textual coherence by linking independent discourse events and propositions. By drawing
the addressee's attention to the upcoming speech event, the pragmatic marker also serves
to move discourse forward. In addition, the pragmatic marker *ceki* indexes the speaker's
hesitant and empathetic stance toward what the speaker is going to talk about, in this case
offering daycare for the unrelated child to the speaker.

In the following sections, after briefly introducing the treatment of *ceki* in
contemporary Korean dictionaries, I will examine the multifunctional uses of the
pragmatic marker in a variety of speech contexts, including variant forms that are
agglutinated with speech level markers, by scrutinizing the local contexts in which the
pragmatic marker occurs.

### 3.2 Functions and Usage of *ceki*

Let me first illustrate how contemporary Korean dictionaries define the pragmatic
marker *ceki*:

1. 1958 *Kwuke say sacen*
   CE [interjection]: sound that is produced when one tries to retrieve something in her
   memory (e.g., *ce kukey mwetela* 'ce what is it.‘)

2. 1972 *Phyocwun saykwuke sacen*
   CE [interjection]: sound that is produced when one tries to retrieve something in her
   memory (e.g., *ce kukey mwetela* 'ce what is it.‘)

3. 1997 *Han kwuke sacen*
   CE [interjection]: sound that is produced when one tries to retrieve something in her
   memory (e.g., *ce kukey mwetela* 'ce what is it.‘)

*Figure 3.1. Senses of the Pragmatic Marker *ce(ki)* in Korean Dictionaries*
In the above dictionary entries, the shortened form of *ceki* has been defined without modification throughout a forty-year interval as an interjection produced during the process of retrieving a word, name, etc. However, this rather cursory definition does not capture the multifarious functions that the pragmatic marker *ceki* evinces in various local contexts.

In the following sections, I will examine these multifunctional aspects of the pragmatic marker *ceki*, including its use as an interjection in the cognitive process of retrieving a word or name from the speaker’s memory. The pragmatic marker *ceki* mostly occurs in turn-initial positions. However, when it functions as an interjection for information processing, it also occurs turn-medially.

### 3.2.1 Conversation-Start/Topic Change/Discourse Transition Signals

The pragmatic marker *ceki* functions to gain the attention of the addressee and to propel discourse forward accordingly, as shown in the above illustration (1). As well, the pragmatic marker serves to mark discourse transition, as shown in illustration (2). The following excerpt from a contemporary Korean drama occurs between unknowns: Cengswuk (C) and a housekeeper (H). The speaker (C) is waiting alone for a landlady in the hostess’s living room. After moving into a house owned by the landlady through a real estate agency, the speaker comes unannounced to the landlady’s house to discuss a problem. After her arrival, the speaker is informed by the housekeeper (H) of the hostess’s absence, and decides to wait for the landlady in the living room:

---

2 I consider usage of *ceki* preceded by an address form or other pragmatic marker to be in the turn-initial position, inasmuch as address forms and pragmatic markers are loosely attached to the rest of the syntactic structure.
1. C  (Ancaissnun) Cinca ileta pam saykeyssney.
(Sitting on the sofa) ‘It’s going to be forever.’ (very soft voice)
(cwupangccokulo ka ilhako issnun yeacaeykey) ceki enceyccum osilkkayo?
(walking toward the kitchen and inquiring of a housekeeper who is cleaning) ‘ceki
around what time do you think (the hostess) is coming?’

2. H  Ol sikan toysseyo (pyek sikyey chyeta pomye). hangsang i sikaneyn
swuyengcangey kasstaka kotcang tuleoseyyo.
‘It’s about the time (while looking at the clock on the wall). She is coming around
this time, right after swimming in a pool.’

3. C  = (Mangselitaka) ceki pakkath pwunun mwehasinun pwuniseyyo?
(Hesitant) ‘ceki what is the host doing for a living?’

4. H  I kenmwul ichung soakwa wencangnimiseyyo.
‘(He) is a physician in this building on the second floor.’

The speaker in the line (1) is talking to herself by saying ‘It’s going to be forever’
while waiting for the landlady; she then walks toward the kitchen, where the housekeeper
is cleaning. By employing the pragmatic marker ceki, the speaker first draws the
housekeeper’s attention and opens conversation followed by a question about the
hostess’s arrival time. Upon hearing the response from the housekeeper in the 3rd line, the
speaker once more employs the pragmatic marker ceki with a hesitant tone of voice. The

3 Wulika eti naminkayo? ‘Are we strangers?’ For a detailed synopsis, see pages 9-10.
pragmatic marker *ceki* in this line marks discourse transition: from the hostess’s arrival time to the occupation of the host.

In this position, *ceki* evinces multiple functions: the marking of discourse transition to the new topic and the linking of independent discourse propositions. Thus, the pragmatic marker here serves in the creation of sequential coordination. In addition, *ceki* indexes the speaker’s hesitant stance on what she is about to ask; i.e., the occupation of the host, in relation to the interlocutor. In this sense, the pragmatic marker *ceki* functions simultaneously for intra-textual coherence and for indexing the speaker’s hesitant stance.

The Japanese *ano* is similar to the Korean pragmatic marker *ceki* in that the homonymic counterpart of *ano* is the distal demonstrative, which is used to point to a referent that is distant from both the speaker and the hearer (see Cook 1993, Diessel 1999). Cook (1993: 23) points out that occurrences of the marker *ano* are in the context of initiating a conversation or a new turn, getting attention, starting a new topic, and disagreeing with others. As illustrated (2), the environments in which *ceki* occurs are similar to those of *ano*. The following illustration shows the function of *ano* as a device for starting a new turn (Cook 1993: 24 [number 1]). For clarity, *ano* is highlighted in bold:

(3) (Up to this point, Mr. Inoko, an opposition party member, has been proposing a new sport policy and asking the Prime Minister to consider it).

*Inoki*: ... *Arigatoo gozaimashita*.

‘Thank you very much.’

*Chair*: Kaifu Naikaku Soori Daijin
‘Prime Minister Kaifu.’

Kaifu: *Anō*, sekkaku keiken ya taiken kara motozuita (teigen) puran o otsukurii-omochi to iu koko de gozaimasu kara, watakushi mo itadaimashite, kentoo o sasete itadakimasu.

‘Since you have a plan based on your experiences, I receive it and will (humbly) consider it.’

Cook (1993) points out that the marker *ano* (the vowel of the last syllable is lengthened in the above illustration) functions to start a new turn while also functioning as an interpersonal tuning device between interlocutors. I would add that, besides the functions posited by Cook (1993), *ano* can also be seen in the above as a device for sequential coordination through the marking of discourse transition from the proposal of a new sport policy to the response to it.

Let me now turn to another illustration of the pragmatic marker *ceki*. The following excerpt is from a long distance phone conversation between (W), my senior friend’s wife who is older than I, and the author (J). After moving to Indiana, I placed a call to my senior friend in order to ask him about something related to a research paper. At the time of the phone call, he was writing his dissertation in the same linguistics program in which I had been enrolled. When I called, his wife (W) received the phone call. In this excerpt, there are two instances of the pragmatic marker *ceki*, in the lines (3) and (6):
1. W  Kasyesstanun yayki tulessnuntyey …

   ‘(I) heard that (you) moved out of (state).’

2. J =Coysonghayyo. kaki ceney insalul tulilyeko

   hayssesnuntyey …

   ‘I’m sorry. (I) should have stopped by for good-bye

   before leaving …’

3. W  ANIeyyo. ceki cenhwa hasyesstako … hehehe (laughing).

   ‘Not at all. ceki (I) heard you gave us a call … (laughing)’

   (exchanging small talk about Indiana, school, etc.)

4. J  Aytulun?

   ‘How about your children?’

5. W  Yey calisseyo.

   ‘They are doing well.’

6. W  Eh kunacena ceki cehuy namphyeni cikum …

   ‘Eh anyhow ceki my husband now …’

7. J =Ah kulayyo. … kulem senpaynim

   encyeccum tule osyeyo?

   ‘Ah, I see. When does he then come back?’

8. W  Mwe ittakayo yeki sikanulo han twu sikan hwu ccumeyna …

   ‘A little bit later in a couple of hours in (state) time …’
In the above exchange, the two interactants exchange greetings for the New Year before (W) mentions my move to Indiana in the first line. Upon hearing an apology, (W) rejects it by uttering a negational word loaded with emphatic stress in the 3rd line, followed by the pragmatic marker ceki. Ceki here functions for floor-holding, in order to afford (W) the opportunity to add her justification for rejecting my apology (i.e., my phone call to say good-bye before departure).

After exchanging small talk about children in lines (4-5), in line (6) speaker (W) employs the pragmatic marker ceki, preceded by another pragmatic marker kunacena (anyhow, anyway), before implying her husband’s absence. Thus, the presence of the pragmatic marker ceki here signals discourse transition from the prologue of the call to the main topic of the call concerning her husband. This in consequence creates sequential coordination. Noteworthy in the adjacent pair of lines (6-7) is that (J) understands the conventionalized conversational implicature of the employment of ceki. As indicated by the ellipsis, (W) does not finish the utterance concerning her husband’s absence; however, (J) understands the implied signal, responding and inquiring about the expected arrival time.

In addition, the pragmatic marker ceki indexes the speaker’s affective stance vis-à-vis what she is about to bring up; i.e., the absence of her husband, in relation to the interlocutor. In other words, by prefacing her utterance with the pragmatic marker, she delivers her stance on the unavoidable situation: I will miss the chance to talk with the speaker’s husband owing to his absence at the time of the phone call. The foregoing usages of ceki evince the multifunctional aspects of the pragmatic marker.
Let me illustrate another speech event between adult male friends, from a contemporary Korean drama set in a rural area. The speech situation is as follows: Since the wife of speaker (F) seems to be troubled, all family members are concerned about her; they attempt to find the cause of her preoccupation. (F) stops by the house of his friend (M) to see if he can obtain any information on his wife’s visits to town, since he has heard that his wife and (M)’s wife went to town together. Before the introduction of the main reason of the speaker’s visit, the speech participants talk about small matters related to agriculture inside the bedroom while drinking. Since (M) is in charge of taking care of the forest in his village, he has generally abstained from alcohol. In this situation, (F) suggests that M can drink a little bit, as he has finished his duty for the day. After rejecting the offer several times, finally (M) accepts:

(5) [F, M: 1-3]

1. F Chamasstaka masinikka acwu kkwulmasici?
   ‘That is so delicious, isn’t it? Since you have not drunk for a while ....’

2. M Tale tale kunmwu sikaney swulul mos masinikka kyentiki himtultulako
   AIKWU CHAM!
   ‘Good taste, it is great! It has been so difficult since I cannot drink during work hours.’

3. F Ani cēk̄i ... kuken kulehko maliya ku cayswussinun upnayey mwusun illo nakasyessna?’
   ‘Ani cēk̄i ... anyhow, what brought your wife to the town?’

---

4 Taychwu namwu salang kellyessney ‘Love is hanging on the jujube tree.’ For a detailed synopsis, see pages 9-10.
The speech participants are close friends in a rural village. It seems that they have been friends since they were young. This presumption is inferred from the usage of the half-talk speech level, as in (F)'s first line (… kkwulmasici) and in (F)'s response (i.e., tale). As Sohn (1986) points out, unless friendship between adults has been extant since childhood, it is rare to observe the usage of the intimate and soft half-talk speech level in adult usage.

After exchanging small talk, (F) attempts to bring up the reason for his visit by prefacing his utterance with the pragmatic marker ceki in line (3): ani ceki kuken kulehko maliya ku cayswussinun upnayey mwusun illo nakasyessna? The speaker employs several supportive devices for this abrupt topic change. First, the homonym ani (grammaticalized, I assume, to a pragmatic marker from the negative lexical element ani that has the referential meaning of ‘not’) is utilized at the beginning of the utterance. Following this element, the pragmatic marker ceki prefaces the new topic. In addition, another pragmatic marker kuken kulehko (anyhow) is followed by ceki.

An interesting phenomenon to note in this arrangement is that the pragmatic marker kuken kulehko can be located between ceki and maliya. The introduction of other pragmatic markers (e.g., kuna cena in example [4] or kuken kulehko with the usage of ceki, as in example [5]), intensifies discourse transition to a new topic and as such creates intra-textual coherence by linking independent discourse states. In the above speech context ceki, followed by a perceptible pause, also indexes the speaker’s hesitant stance on his intrusive question about a trip to the town by his friend’s wife.

---

5 Half-talk usage denotes intimacy and softness toward the interlocutor during social interactions. For more detail, see pages 46-47.
The foregoing three illustrations bring into clear focus the function of *ceki* as a discourse transition marker. The presence of the pragmatic marker *ceki* brings about intra-textual coherence through sequential coordination. As well, the pragmatic marker *ceki* indexes the speaker’s interpersonal and affective stances in relation to the interlocutor regarding the upcoming utterance. In this sense, *ceki* evinces multifunctional aspects in marking discourse boundaries.

### 3.2.2 Information Retrieval Device/Interjection

The pragmatic marker *ceki* also functions to process and retrieve information preserved in the speaker’s memory on the cognitive level. It is utilized in this manner when the speaker stalls in order to recall and retrieve a word, name, incident, time, space, etc., while holding the floor.

The marker *ceki* can be used for cognitive processing in monologue; in addition, it is also used in dialogue while maintaining consciousness of the addressee. In this sense, *ceki* is similar to the English pragmatic marker *you know* in that both function for information processing while maintaining the speaker’s position during social interaction (Holmes 1986). For this, let me cite Holmes (1986: 16):

> ... all occurrences of *you know* quite clearly function as verbal fillers. ... *you know* gives the speaker linguistic planning time. But, then, so do many other lexical items, such as *sort of, I guess,* and *I think.* What distinguishes *you know* is its interactive meaning. Instances of *you know* are addressee-oriented: It is an essentially interactive pragmatic device ... and this clearly differentiates between *you know* and fillers such as *sort of,* which is content-oriented, and *I guess* or *I think,* which are speaker-oriented forms.

The interaction below is from an international phone conversation between the author (J) and a very close friend (M), who is a school teacher:
(6) [J, M: II: 1-5]

1. M Icey calito capasse?
   'Have you settled (in Indiana) by now?'

2. J Eh cokumssik kulen seymici ... Miswuna kulenteu nayka pwuthak hal key hana isse.
   'Eh little by little ... hey Miswun, by the way I have to ask you a favor.'

   'Sure, (what) is it?'

4. J a. Mwenamyenun ku nonmwun ttaymwuney eh nayka calyoka philyohaketen ... 
   'Because of my dissertation, I need (language) data ...'

   b. kuntey yekinun hankwukintuli keuy epse.
   'but there are not many Koreans around here.'

   c. kunikka nayka cikum philyo hanun kesun hankwuke calyoketun.
   'because what I need is Korean data.'

   d. eh hoksi ceki mweya ... eh NOKUMKI issni?
   'eh by any chance ceki mweya ... eh do (you) have a cassette tape recorder?'

5. M =NOKUMKI?
   'A cassette tape recorder?'

After greeting and exchanging small talk, the speaker (J) in line (2) introduces the reason for the phone call: a request for an audio-tape recording of naturally occurring conversations between (M) and her students. The request is conducted in a direct manner without employing any pragmatic marker to downgrade its illocutionary force. The use of
ceki in line (4-d) is for information retrieval; i.e., the name of a thing, while allowing the speaker to hold the floor. In order to recall the Korean lexeme for a cassette-tape recorder from my memory, I utilized ceki followed by the interrogative pronoun phrase mweya ‘what is’ followed by a noticeable pause. These adjoining elements, ceki mweya ... ‘what is that ...?’ work as if they together are an embedded utterance as a “thinking-out-loud” monologue in the speaker’s turn, so it may be heard by the addressee. This structure can be illustrated in the following way:

[[ceki mweya “thinking-out-loud” monologue] speaker’s turn in dialogue]

It can be seen, then, that such cognitive processing, in this case to retrieve the Korean word for cassette-tape recorder, remains in the socio-interactional domain while maintaining consciousness of the addressee.

The interaction below (7) is from a long distance telephone call between my senior friend (K), who at the time was writing his linguistics dissertation, and the author (J). Thus, the common ground between the interlocutors is manifest. The main reason for my call to (K) was to ascertain the style guidelines for a working paper. After exchanging small talk, I introduce the main topic of the call, inquiring about the format for the working paper:

(7) [J, K: III: 1-12]

1. J Senpaynim ... ku format un ettehkey hayya toyyo? ku eh

‘Senpaynim ... ku how about the format (of working paper)? ku eh’
2. K  = Eh working paper naylttay format iyo?

Working paper format-i, eh wuli ttaynun kuksi epsessten kes kathko. ... wulika pothong paper ssun kes chelem ssesscyo.

‘Eh do you mean a working paper format? It seems there was no required format for a working paper when I submitted. ... We wrote it in the same way as a regular paper.’

3. J  = Ku

‘The’

4. K  = Cey ... kiekulonun

‘From (my) memory.’

5. J  Kuntey kuke working paper-ka ku publish toyci anhnayo? hakkyo ceki ...

‘But the working paper is published, isn’t it? The school (university) ceki ...’

6. K  = Hakkyo ey

publish toyyo.

‘(It)’s published through (the university press).’

7. J  Kulemyenun etten format-i...

‘Then, a format …’

8. K  = Eh

‘Eh’

9. J  Kunikka mwe ilehkey header myechseynchi mwe kulen kes tul ttalo cenghaycye issnun kesun anikwuyo?

‘So are there any guidelines, such as a centimeter for a header or something?’

‘Ah that’s right! It seems there’s (a style guideline).’

11. J/K (laughing)

12. K  a. Eh nayka kuke natwu kieki cal anhnakacikwu …

   ‘Eh I didn’t remember (at the beginning of the phone call) …’

   b. MACE! kulen key issessten ke kathayo natwu kulayse ….

   ‘That’s right! It seems that (we) had to follow (a guideline) and I was also ….’

   c. kuntey cikumun ceki … Stampe ka kikel mathko issketunyo.

   ‘but now ceki … (Dr.) Stampe is in charge of (handling working papers).’

In line (2), (K) responds to the speaker by mentioning his own experience; i.e., no style guideline for his working paper. Owing to the non-compliant response of (J), (K) searches his memory with no result, as indicated in lines (3-4). In line (5), (J) tries to solicit the agreement of (K) by employing a tag question positing that a working paper must be published. In the same line, followed by hakkyo ‘school/university,’ ceki is used together with a noticeable pause. In order to retrieve the Korean word for ‘press/publisher,’ I employed the marker ceki without success in attempting to recall the word as indicated by the pause in the line.

Upon hearing agreement from (K), (J) continues to press her belief that there should be a style guideline for the publication of a working paper through the university press. In line (9), (J) gives an example of such a guideline. To this, (K) finally recalls his experience of following a guideline, as indicated by the lexeme mace ‘that’s right’ loaded with emphatic stress along with exclamatory intonations in line (10). In line (12), (K) continues to probe his memory and realizes that there have been changes in the handling
of working papers by the time of the phone call. In the line (12-c), such change is marked by the pragmatic marker kuntey followed by the time deixis cikum 'now.' Followed by the time deixis, (K) continues his turn by employing ceki followed by a noticeable pause prior to the mention of Dr. Stampe’s name, and adds that Dr. Stampe is in charge of handling working papers. The function of ceki in K’s turn (12-3), then, is for information retrieval while allowing holding of the turn.

The pragmatic marker ceki as used in the above illustrations serves to afford the speaker time during cognitive processing for information retrieval, at the same time allowing the speaker to hold her turn while maintaining consciousness of the addressee on the interactional level. In this sense, ceki functions for structuring upcoming discourse. As mentioned, ceki occurs turn-medially, as in the above illustrations, when it functions to allow time for the retrieving of a word, name, etc.

3.2.3 Attention-Getting Device

In Korean society, addressing someone by name is tightly restricted to members of one’s peer group, or between a superior and subordinate in a unidirectional way. Thus, when the social relationship between the speaker and hearer in a given situation is not clear insofar as the propriety of addressing by name or by a special address term such as teacher, mother, sister, etc., ceki can be utilized to draw the other party’s attention. These situations may occur when interlocutors lack clues regarding the proper manner to address the hearer. Uncertainty regarding the proper term of address almost certainly would exist in the following situations: between strangers; between interlocutors who
belong to mutually exclusive social groups; when stopping someone to ask for directions; etc.

In this section, I will only briefly touch upon this phenomenon. In Chapters 5 and 6, I will compare the attention-getting device *ceki(yo)* with *ipwa* ‘hey/look’ and *yepo* ‘honey,’ coalesced forms of the proximal deictic element *i* ‘this’ and the visual perceptual verb *pota* ‘see/look at.’

The following dialogue is from a contemporary television drama set in an urban background. The discourse participants are virtual strangers, since they were not introduced to each other at their short first meeting. As their relationship develops, the address forms they employ at each stage emerge and change accordingly. They start as strangers, the attention-getter *cekiyo* being employed at the starting point of their relationship. They then become acquainted, and the older woman (C) employs the younger women’s name, as in Yuncwu-ssi (Ms. Yuncwu). When the younger woman becomes the older woman’s (Y) daughter-in-law, the younger woman addresses the older woman by *emeni* (mother-in-law).

The following excerpt reflects the relationship at the beginning stage, as virtual strangers:

(8) [C, Y: 1-5]

1. C *Cekiyο? …*

   ‘*Cekiyο? …*’

---
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2. Y (Turns around)
3. C (Walks toward Y with curiosity)
4. Y (Looks at C)
5. C Wuli encey mannci anhasseyo?
   'We have met, haven’t we?'

The interactants in the above excerpt meet each other in a parking lot when (C) gets out of her car at the same time that (Y) is getting into her car. When they encounter each other, (C) attempts to call (Y) by employing cekiyọ. (Y) then turns around, even though (C) does not address her by name or use another address term such as sensayngnim (teacher) or akassi (Miss), which are in wide use (as Sohn [1986] points out, use of the term sensayngnim [teacher] is common, often being employed to one who is not actually a teacher).

In the case of speakers who lack any clue for determining the nature of the relationship, what types of linguistic forms can be employed? As illustrated in (8), ceki(yo) is an ideal candidate for use as an attention-getter in such speech situations. The source characteristics of the original lexical element of the pragmatic marker ceki, specifically its neutrality and vagueness concerning physical distance toward a reference point, make it especially suitable for usage in such a situation. Source characteristics of the pragmatic marker ceki will be discussed in the following chapter.

Interestingly, other languages contain similar distal deictic elements that serve to support the above finding. In Maya, locative deictics that are similar to the Korean ceki are commonly used in utterances that initiate interactions (Hanks 1994: 67). Also, in
Mizutani and Mizutani’s list (1987) of linguistic devices used in address situations in Japanese, *ano* (similar to the Korean *ceki*) is adduced as the most common address term (cited in Cook 1993: 24). As mentioned, Cook (1993: 25) also points out that *ano* functions as an attention-getter.

### 3.2.4 Excuses/Apologies/Disagreements

Let me now turn to the usage of the pragmatic marker *ceki* in the speech contexts of making excuse, apology, and disagreement. The following is from interaction among participants (approximately fifteen, including S and M) before a fellowship meeting of church members in a home setting. The fellowship is held in Uncwu’s home. At the time the church members are engaging in small talk in her living room, the hostess Uncwu, the sister of (Y), is not home:

(9) [S, Y, M: IV: 1-3]

1. **S** Uncwu camay etisse?
   ‘Where is sister Uncwu?’

2. **Y** =Ah *ceki* pansanghoy CAMKKAN naylye kasseyo.
   ‘Ah, *ceki* (she) went to the meeting of tenants for a just little while.’

3. **M** Pancangilay.
   ‘I heard that she is a leader.’
A church member (S) inquires of (Y), Uncwu’s younger sister, as to the whereabouts of Uncwu, inasmuch as the fellowship is being held in Uncwu’s home. In response, (Y) explains her sister’s absence by utilizing the pragmatic marker ceki prior to her response. What is the function of ceki in this illustration? The pragmatic marker ceki in line (2) serves to index the speaker’s empathetic interpersonal stance, which can be phrased as I hate to say this but ... or I wish she would be here with us, vis-à-vis what is about to be broached, i.e., her sister’s unavoidable absence. This in consequence contributes to softening the impact of the excuse; i.e., the sister’s absence. Such a downgrading effect is also achieved though the use of the temporal adverb camkkan ‘for a just little while’ loaded with emphatic stress.

Such an empathetic interpersonal stance is successfully delivered to the discourse participants; in other words, upon hearing (Y)’s response, (S) did not ask for further information on what types of responsibilities the hostess has. However, the bystander (M) further develops and clarifies (Y)’s response by adding her role as hostess in the tenants’ meeting in his line: Pancangilay ‘she’s a leader.’ In other words, the hostess is the leader in this tenant’s meeting; thus, her participation is necessary, even though this results in her absence at the fellowship meeting in her home.

Let us consider from the above utterance the pragmatic marker ceki and the temporal adverb camkkan ‘for a just little while’ used in (Y)’s line: pansanghoy naylye kasseyo. Because (S) is older than both (Y) and her sister Uncwu, (Y) properly employs the polite speech level ending -yo and, as a further indication that Uncwu is younger than the hearer (S), speaker (Y) does not employ the subject honorific marker -si. Thus, there would be no problem in syntactic structure owing to honorific usage in this hypothetical
utterance. However, such an otherwise perfectly employed utterance would be seen as lacking a certain pragmatic cue for social interaction, especially for a speech context for implying an excuse; i.e., the utterance sounds too direct and stilted.

The following monologue in its entirety is from a recorded telephone message. A fellow church member who is younger than I left the message on my answering machine to let me know about the cancellation of a plan previously made to go to Chicago the next morning. The caller explains the reason for the cancellation: the weather is not suitable for driving. I was supposed to wait for the van in front of the university library in order to join the church members. Because of the cancellation, the speaker advises me not to wait:

(10)  [Sengwu: V]

_Yeposeyyo._ yeki hankul hakkyonteyyo. _ceki_ ... Chicago kakilo haysscanhayo.

kuntey eh ... nalssika pyello an cohase eh .. an kakilo haysseyo. nwunaka com ihayhay cwusyessumyen cohkeysskwuyo. eh, 9:00 siey tosekwan apheyse kitalil philyoka epsupnita. kulem annyenghi kyeyseyyo.

‘Hello, here is Korean school. _ceki_ ... we are supposed to go to Chicago. But we canceled the plan because of the weather condition. I hope you (sister) can understand this situation. Eh, you do not have to wait at 9:00 a.m. in front of the library. Then, see you later.’
The speech acts employed in this message are an implied apology for the cancellation of the plan and a request for understanding of the cancellation. The speaker identifies himself by stating the name of the organization to which he belongs instead of stating by his name. After that, the speaker brings up the plan to go to Chicago for a workshop. Interestingly, he employs the pragmatic marker *ceki* followed by noticeable pause indicated by the ellipsis marker before bringing up the main purpose of his call. In this illustration, the pragmatic marker *ceki* marks discourse transition from the prologue of the phone message; i.e., a greeting and identification of the caller, to the main body of the message; the marker concomitantly links these independent propositions so that the pragmatic marker brings about local coherence through sequential coordination.

In addition, by prefacing the utterance with the pragmatic marker *ceki* followed by a noticeable pause, the speaker expresses his hesitant and apologetic interpersonal stance, which could be phrased as *'I hate to say this but ...'* toward what he is about to broach; i.e., cancellation of the trip to Chicago. Because of the presence of *ceki*, I assumed before hearing the rest of the message that the plan for attending the workshop had been canceled. Thus, owing to the presence of the pragmatic marker *ceki* in the above context, the hearer may assume that the message following the marker *ceki* will be about an excuse, explanation, or apology, along with a concomitant request for understanding of certain acts or states. After announcing the cancellation, the speaker asks for my understanding: *Nwuna ka com ihayhay cwusyessumyen cohkeysskwuyo* 'I hope you (sister) can understand this situation.' In this request, another pragmatic marker/hedge is used: *(com)*, which has been grammaticalized from the degree adverb *cokum* having the literal
semantic sense of 'small/a little.' The employment of this hedge attenuates the illocutionary force of the requestive speech act.

In the above illustration, the pragmatic marker ceki also evinces one of the principal characteristics of pragmatic markers: multifunctionality. In other words, on the textual level ceki functions for local coherence by marking discourse transition and by linking independent propositions. At the same time the pragmatic marker indexes the speaker’s hesitant interpersonal stance in relation to the hearer.

Another item of note regarding the discourse opener of this phone message, yoposeyyo ‘hello’: Yeposeyyo (discussed in Chapters 5 and 6) is composed of the proximal deictic element i ‘this’ and the perceptual verb pota ‘see/look at.’ It is used almost exclusively as the discourse opener in phone conversations in contemporary Korean.

Let me now briefly turn to an illustration of a speech context involving disagreement. The following interaction is from an urban-based contemporary television drama. The interaction occurs in a living room where the speaker’s wife (CE) and grandson (P) are engaged in schoolwork at the time the speaker (C) returns from work. Since his mother works late, the grandson often goes to the (CE)’s house to play and study with his grandmother. After responding to the grandson’s greeting, (C) advises his grandson to return to his house (close by C’s house) by mentioning that his mother might be looking for him:

---
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(11) [C, P, CE: 1-3]

1. C Ney emma chachusieyssta. ellun kapwayaci?
   ‘Your mom must be looking for (you). Get ready to go home?’

2. P Ney.
   ‘Yes.’

3. CE =Ceki ... cenyekh mekye ponayl keeyyo. sang chalinikka ellun tulekase os kalaipko naoseyyo.
   ‘Ceki ... (I)’m going to let him go after dinner. Please get ready for dinner after changing (your) clothing since (it)’s ready.’

Immediately upon hearing the grandson’s (P) compliance to (C), the speaker’s wife (CE) intercedes in the interaction, utilizing the pragmatic marker ceki followed by a perceptible pause. By utilizing ceki, (CE) initiates her turn by drawing attention from the discourse participants (C and P). The pragmatic marker ceki followed by a perceptible pause also indexes her hesitant and affective stance, which could be phrased as I hate to do this but ..., vis-à-vis what she is about to broach: i.e., disagreement with her husband’s advice to their grandson. This in consequence softens the illocutionary force of the disagreement. In other words, by prefacing her utterance with the pragmatic marker ceki, (CE) manages to express her hesitant stance concerning the implied disagreement with her husband and her affective stance toward her grandson, inasmuch as she will let her grandson have dinner with them before sending him home.

According to Cook (1993:31), the Japanese ano functions for topic change and gaining attention: “ano functions as a positive politeness marker, redressing the face-
threatening act of disagreement.” Cook (1993: 31) argues this on the following basis: “the function of ano in discourse is to obtain the addressee’s cooperation by evoking the feeling that the interlocutors are on the same side with respect to the subsequent utterance. … interpersonal rapport is created by using ano.”

The following is from Cook (1993: 30-31 [number 8]): The dialogue excerpt is taken from a Japanese parliament (Diet) debate concerning a sales tax bill:

(12) Minister of Finance Hashimoto:

1. Mushiroo. Rongi oo (2.0) ichioo, zeiseichoosakai toshite, omatome o itadaita mono ga, koo yuu katachi de ikaga deshoo ka to (1.5)
   ‘Rather, what is presented based on the discussion by the tax system commission, how about this format?’

2. sorotte kokumin ni oshimeshi no dekiru koto ga watakushi wa nozomashii sugata da to kangaete orimasu. (2.0)
   ‘I think it is ideal to show such a thing to the nation.’

   ‘Mr. Konishi.’

Konishi:

4. Ee, sootoo ano, watashi domo no kangae to zure ga aru yoo de arimasu ga,
   ‘It seems that your view is quite different from ours.’

In line (4), by prefacing the utterance with ano, of which the vowel of the final syllable is lengthened, Konishi, who is an opposition party member opposed to
Hashimoto, expresses partial disagreement with Hashimoto's opinion. Cook (1993: 35) points out that "in the speech act of disagreement, not only *ano* but also hedging is used as a device for redressing face-threatening acts. ... the filler *ee* and *yoo de arimasu ga* 'it seems that' in line (4). These expressions make the disagreement rather indirect." As examined in illustrations (9-11), the employment of other verbal and non-verbal devices in addition to the pragmatic marker *ceki* is similar to the above usage (12) of *ano*.

As shown in the foregoing illustrations, *ceki* functions as a signal to communicate and deliver certain conventionalized conversational implicatures related to the speaker's interpersonal and affective stances. In other words, in the speech contexts of apology, excuse and disagreement, the pragmatic marker *ceki* indexes the speaker's hesitant and empathetic affective stance in relation to interlocutors on matters that she is about to broach. This in consequence contributes to downgrading the illocutionary force of these speech acts. Even in these speech contexts, the pragmatic marker *ceki* serves to contribute to local coherence through sequential coordination. In this sense, *ceki* also evinces multifunctionality, the principal characteristic of pragmatic markers.

3.2.5 Requests

In the above section, I dealt with functions of the pragmatic marker *ceki* that occur in the speech contexts of making excuse, apology, and disagreement. The pragmatic marker *ceki* also occurs at the beginning of a turn in the speech context of request; that is, in a non-response slot. In this section, I will examine how the pragmatic marker *ceki* occurring at the beginning of a speaker's turn functions in the context of making a request.
Before examining ceki in this context, let me briefly touch upon Schiffrin’s (1987) analysis of the English marker well. Schiffrin (1987: 102-127) covers well as a marker of response through examining occurrences of well in question/answer and request/compliance adjacency pairs that “provide[s] coherence through its relation to the immediately prior utterance” as well as occurrences of well that do not occur in adjacency pairs and “have little to do with pairwise coherence (1987: 119).” In the instances of well that occur in request/compliance pairs, Schiffrin points out that instances in which the respondent finds herself to be in non-compliance with a request, or is unable to offer requested confirmation to a previous statement, often call for well as a response marker. An example from Schiffrin (1987: 117 [number 33]):

(13) Debby: How much education do you think a young man needs nowadays to get a job?

       Henry: College. Definitely.

       Zelda: Well, I think even more than the four years.

Another context of request that Schiffrin (1987) examines are the occurrences of well outside of adjacency pairs. Schiffrin (1987:120, 122) points out that “because requests typically seek, rather than provide, a response, we would not expect well to precede requests.” But the discourse marker well occurs under the following condition as a response marker: “locations in which requests are simultaneously information-seeking and information-providing, and it is such locations that well occurs with requests.” The interaction below illustrates such an occurrence (Schiffrin 1987: 120 [number 38]):
Debby: How did you get the name of the doctor you’re using now? Where’d y’find him?

Zelda: Well y’mean our family doctor?

Debby: Yeh, **Well** how did y’find him?

The above request occurs in a manner of series: After completing a clarification sequence for Zelda, the speaker revisits the original question. **Well** marks the dependency of the question on clarification. Also, **well** prefaces a request that simultaneously seeks and provides a response.

However, in my data the pragmatic marker **ceki** occurs at the beginning of the speaker’s turn in the context of a request that only seeks a response. Let me illustrate this with the following interactions (15-17):

The brief interaction below comes from an urban-based contemporary Korean drama.⁸ The discourse participants are an older couple (both in their 60s): wife (CE), a housekeeper and husband (C), an officer for the government. The wife (CE) receives household expenses on a regular basis from her husband, who is extremely frugal. The following interaction occurs when (C) is preparing to leave for work in the morning while the wife (CE) is helping him:

(15) **CE** **Ceki.** yepo onul ton com ssey toynuntey CCOKKUMman cwukwu nakaseyyo?
'Ceki, honey can you give me a small amount of money before leaving because I need to use today?'

C Panchanun seykacimyen toy te philyo epse.

'As for side dishes, it is not necessary to have more than three.'

In this illustration, by employing the pragmatic marker *ceki*, the speaker (CE) opens discourse. As in the speech contexts of making excuse, apology, and disagreement (3.2.4), in the above context the pragmatic marker *ceki* indexes the speaker's (CE) hesitant interpersonal stance, which could be phrased as *I hate to ask you but* ... regarding what she is about to bring up, i.e., asking for money. By doing so, the use of *ceki* also serves to lessen the illocutionary force of the request. Unlike the English *well*, as in (14), the pragmatic marker *ceki* occurs in the context that seeks a response from the hearer upon the speaker's request.

In this illustration, besides the pragmatic marker *ceki*, there are other supportive devices employed to modify the requestive illocutionary force. First, there is another pragmatic marker/hedge employed: *com*, which has been grammaticalized from the degree adverb *cokum* that has the literal semantic sense of 'small/a little.' The emphatic stress onto the degree adverb *cokum* that results in the fortis sound, as in CCOKKUM 'a little,' suffixed by the particle *man* denoting the semantic sense of 'only,' also contributes to downgrading the requestive illocutionary force of the utterance.
Let me turn to another illustration that evinces a complex speech event. The following speech event is taken from an urban-based contemporary drama. It occurs during interaction between a stepmother (C) and her stepdaughter (Y). Their relationship is close but both of them have maintained a certain degree of distance. The speech situation is as follows: The stepdaughter (Y) has received her retirement compensation and her stepmother (C) is in need, as she is preparing for her son’s marriage expenses. (C) knows that (Y) has the retirement compensation money, and for the purpose of her son’s marriage, plans to attempt to borrow the money from her stepdaughter when she returns from work. (Y) comes home from work for dinner and her stepmother greets her in the living room, followed by the statement “dinner is ready.” The stepdaughter responds to her stepmother, while walking to her room, that she will be right back after changing clothing.

(16) [Y, C: I:1-6]

1. Y Os kala ipko naolkkeyyo.

   ‘I will be right back after changing my clothing.’

2. C =Ceki ... Yuncwuya?

   ‘Ceki ... Yuncwu?’

3. Y (Turns around toward her mother Cengswuk.)

4. C Cekimalita ... ne tangcangey kyelhon hal sayngkak epstamyen maliya ....

---

9 Wulika eti naminkayo ‘Are we strangers?’
'Cekimalita ... if you do not have a plan to marry right at this moment ....'

5. Y  (Yuncwu looks at her mother.)


'Ayu! never mind. Come out after changing your clothing.'

Upon hearing the response of (Y) in line (2), (C) calls to her stepdaughter, using name preceded by the pragmatic marker ceki with hesitation. (Y) turns toward her stepmother with expectation. In line (4), by prefacing her utterance with the pragmatic marker cekimalita\(^\text{10}\) followed by a noticeable pause indicated by the ellipsis, (C) proceeds to ask her stepdaughter if she is about to marry in the near future, before broaching the topic of the retirement compensation funds that (Y) has received. Eventually, (C) stops her plan to ask stepdaughter to borrow money, employing the negative element anita 'never mind' in the last line.

The above dialogue excerpt illustrates two aspects of the pragmatic marker ceki. First, in line (2), the function of ceki is for opening discourse by drawing attention from

---
\(^{10}\)The agglutinative characteristics of Korean are clearly manifested in the usage of the pragmatic marker ceki. In addition to the polite speech ending –yo, there are other forms that agglutinate onto the pragmatic marker: ceki- mali-ta and mali-ya and mali-(yo). Let me illustrate this with the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech levels</th>
<th>Deferential</th>
<th>Polite</th>
<th>Moderately lowering</th>
<th>Half-talk</th>
<th>Most lowering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combinational forms</td>
<td>ceki-mali-pni</td>
<td>ceki-mali-ye</td>
<td>ceki-mali-ney</td>
<td>ceki-mali-ya</td>
<td>ceki-mali-ta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I assume that mali is a grammaticalized form. Speech level markers are employed in combination with mali, as follows (speech level markers are underlined): the most lowering speech level –mali, the intimate speech level half-talk –maliya, the moderately lowering speech level –maliney, or the polite form –maliyo. In the case of –maliye, ceki can be combined with the polite ending –yo without mali, as in ceki-ya.
the speaker's stepdaughter regarding what the speaker is about to talk about.

Subsequently, *ceki* functions to engage the involvement of discourse participants vis-à-vis the upcoming discourse, necessary for moving the discourse forward. The marker *ceki* also links two independent discourse states; i.e., closing the discourse for departing from other discourse participants, and reopening the discourse. In both functionalities, intra-textual coherence is maintained.

Upon achieving her stepdaughter's attention, as indicated in line (4), the speaker once more employs the pragmatic marker combined with the grammaticalized form *mali* and a speech level marker *ta: cekimalita*. The pragmatic marker in line (4) introduces a new topic related to (Y)’s retirement compensation. This is indicated by the negative conditional clause followed by a perceptible pause, as in *ne tangcangey kyelhon hal sayngkak epstamyen maliya ... ‘if you do not have a plan to marry right at this moment ....’* Such implicature is cancelled in line 6 by the speaker's utterance of the negative word *anita* 'never mind.' In other words, the speaker decides not to proceed with her plan to borrow her stepdaughter’s retirement compensation, and in consequence, not to seek a response from the hearer.

Besides marking a new topic, the pragmatic marker *cekimalita* in line (3) indexes the speaker’s hesitant and indirect stance vis-à-vis the interlocutor concerning the speaker’s plan to ask to borrow money. In this requestive speech act, the speaker (C) also expresses her indirect and hesitant stances through various verbal and non-verbal devices in addition to use of the pragmatic marker, such as the use of a negative conditional clause in line (4), a negative element in line (6), and several noticeable pauses.
Let me now briefly turn to the last illustration. The following interaction is from an international phone call between my close friend, who is five years my junior, and me. When I called (Y) at her cell phone number, she was engaged in a project at the church and my phone call interrupted her ongoing activities. Owing to this, I heard some background noise during the initial portion of the conversation with (Y). She eventually asked me to hold for a few minutes so that she could go outside the church for clearer conversation:

(17) [Y, J: 1-6]

1. Y  
   *Ceki* camkkanmanyo.
   
   'Ceki hold on just a second.'

2. J  
   =Ung.
   
   'Yeh.'

3. (J waits for Y for a short period of time.)

4. Y  
   Yeposeyyo? kuntey thonghwapi manhi naokeyssta.
   
   'Hello? By the way, this phone call must be causing you high cost.'

5. J  
   =Ung
   =ani ani kwaynchanha.
   
   Yeh
   
   'no, no it’s O.K.'

6. J  
   *Ceki* Yuliya, talumi aniko eh pwuthakul halkey isse nayka.
   
   'Ceki Yuli, eh there’s something for which I need your favor.'

In the first line, the speaker (Y) asks for me to hold for a moment by prefacing her utterance with the pragmatic marker *ceki*. The pragmatic marker *ceki* in this slot functions
to mark discourse transition from ongoing conversation to holding the conversation. At the same time, it indexes the speaker’s interpersonal empathetic stance regarding what she is going to ask for; an inevitable holding results in relation to the interlocutor. After waiting for a short time and having a brief conversational exchange in lines (3-4), in line (6), I present the reason for the phone call by prefacing my utterance with the pragmatic marker *ceki* followed by address by name.

The presence of *ceki* in this line, which occurs in the context of seeking a response from the hearer, signals a topic shift. As well, by prefacing with the pragmatic marker *ceki* prior to the requestive speech act of asking a favor, the speaker delivers her hesitant stance, which could be phrased as ‘*I hate to ask but ...* or *I hope you don’t mind ...,*’ regarding her upcoming utterance; i.e., the asking of a favor. Doing so contributes to attenuation of the impact of the requestive illocutionary force.

As shown, the pragmatic marker *ceki* occurs in the speaker’s turn position in which the speaker seeks the hearer’s response in the speech context of a request. In this position, in the same way as in speech contexts of making an excuse, apology, and disagreement, *ceki* indexes the speaker’s affective and interpersonal stances in relation to the interlocutor toward what she is about to ask (for). In this sense, the Korean pragmatic marker is dissimilar to the English marker *well* in the speech context of a request, as shown in Schiffrin’s (1987) illustration (14). In addition, the multifunctionality of the marker *ceki* is also observed in the context of making a request.
3.3 Conclusion

As mentioned, ceki has obtained a non-referential abstract meaning through the process of grammaticalization from a concrete and referential concept denoting a physical distance equidistant from both the speaker and the hearer (discussed further in the following chapter). The grammaticalized form ceki lacks such a physical referential meaning. It has instead acquired a non-referential abstract meaning as a pragmatic marker allowing it to effectively mark multifarious functions dependent on local speech context on the interactional level.

Deferential expressions incorporating the honorific system, on both the morphosyntactical and lexical levels, are unidirectionally employed in social situations, such as by a son to his mother or by students to their teachers. Contrariwise, the pragmatic marker ceki can be utilized in a bi-directional manner. In other words, as illustrated in examples (1, 2, 7, 16, 17), an older person or superior can utilize a device such as ceki to a younger person or to an inferior. Thus, the pragmatic marker ceki, in contrast to honorifics, can be utilized bi-directionally regardless of differences in age, gender, or social status. Owing to this characteristic, in contemporary Korean this marker is the most frequently used, across differences of gender, education, age, region, etc. However, the cursory treatment of usage of the pragmatic marker ceki in contemporary Korean dictionaries does not capture the multifunctional characteristics that ceki evinces in creating and constructing coherent text and in indexing the speaker's interpersonal and affective stances.

As illustrated in the foregoing sections, the pragmatic marker ceki mostly occurs at the beginning of an utterance. However, when it functions as an information retrieval
device for retrieving a word, name, etc., from the speaker's memory, it also occurs turn-
medially. The pragmatic marker *ceki* signals topic change and marks discourse transition.
As well, by linking independent propositions, states, and events, *ceki* brings about
sequential coordination and intra-textual coherence (3.2.1). This marker also functions
for the structuring of text while allowing the speaker to hold the floor by affording the
speaker time during the process of information retrieval (for a word, name of object, etc.
[3.2.2]). In addition, *ceki* functions as an attention-getter and is an ideal candidate for
initiating discourse, especially with the unknown in various public places such as a
department store, airport, etc. (3.2.3).

In the speech contexts of making excuse, apology, disagreement, and request, the
pragmatic marker *ceki* indexes the speaker’s interpersonal and affective/empathetic
stances toward upcoming discourse in relation to the interlocutors, while contributing to
softening the effect of the illocutionary force of these speech acts. As illustrated in
sections (3.2.4, 3.2.5), in these speech contexts the pragmatic marker frequently
accompanies noticeable perceptible pauses. As well, in these speech contexts *ceki* co-
occurs with other verbal and non-verbal devices, such as the intensified adverb loaded
with emphatic stress and other pragmatic markers with or without adjacency. These
devices also contribute to downgrading the illocutional force of the utterance of these
speech acts. As well, even in these speech contexts the pragmatic marker *ceki* functions
for intra-textual coherence by marking and linking discourse transitions.

In conclusion, the pragmatic marker *ceki* evinces multifunctionality during social
interaction. Depending on the local speech context, the marker *ceki* may function
simultaneously to create intratextual coherence through sequential coordination in the
textual domain; in the interpersonal domain, it indexes the speaker's interpersonal and affective/empathetic stances in relation to interlocutors vis-à-vis the upcoming utterance.
CHAPTER 4

THE EVOLUTION OF THE KOREAN PRAGMATIC MARKER CEKI

4.1 Introduction

Pragmatic markers are known for having null referential meaning, since they do not contribute to the truth-condition of an utterance or sentence. However, the elimination of pragmatic markers results in awkward, impolite, and unnatural utterances. Thus, these markers must be considered obligatory elements on the pragmatic level. The Korean pragmatic marker ceki can be thus classified. That is, the presence of this marker contributes indispensably to the natural and suitable speech act.

As mentioned at the outset, in contrast to studies of pragmatic markers in English, studies of Korean pragmatic markers are relatively scarce. To the best of my knowledge, not only have the synchronic functions of the Korean pragmatic ceki not been studied at all, neither has its diachronic development. In this sense, this study has faced a challenge and at the same time reaped rewards in exploring an untapped area of linguistic study.

As Brinton (1996: 33) notes, pragmatic markers may operate simultaneously on different linguistic levels. This simultaneous or multifunctional operation results in homonymic uses. The Korean pragmatic marker ceki functions as a spatial/locative demonstrative pronoun as well as a pragmatic marker. Concerning the textual and interpersonal levels, I follow the general sense of unidirectionality/subjectivity as put forth by Traugott (1989, 1995): Propositional material evolves in discourse situations to meet the purposes of creating text and indicating the speaker’s attitudes. In other words, the concrete and lexical form having a propositional meaning evolves to serve in creating
text and in “expressing self and representing the speaker’s subjective belief state/attitude toward the proposition (Traugott 1995:31; Finegan 1995).”

As examined in Chapter 3, the synchronic uses of the pragmatic marker ceki manifest multifunctional aspects: conversation starter, attention-getter, signaling topic change, and indexing interpersonal and affective stances. This chapter is devoted to tracing the source and origin of the Korean pragmatic marker ceki from a diachronic linguistic perspective. The generation of homonyms on two linguistic levels, on the propositional level as a spatial demonstrative pronoun and on the interpersonal level as a pragmatic marker, is the result of historical development from one lexeme.

I will discuss the various evolutionary pathways of ceki by examining its grammaticalization processing. Grammaticalization may exert effects on various linguistic levels (e.g., phonologically, phonetically, in morpho-syntactic distribution, and on pragmatic aspects). I will also examine semantic transparency between the source form of ceki and the target concept, which has been subjectivized and pragmatically strengthened. For this, I will examine the characteristics and attributes of the source in relation to its suitability in performing the synchronic functions of a pragmatic marker. The mechanism involved in the grammaticalization processes of ceki will also be examined.

4.2 Diachronic Development of the Pragmatic Marker ceki

4.2.1 The Korean Deictic System as a Source of ceki

As one of the sources for a wide variety of abstract and functional elements including pragmatic markers, deixis has been well studied as a force behind

Many types of signs beyond the classical person-, place-, and time-related ones have over the course of time been judged to be deictic, either by single authors or more generally. To list but a selection: articles, mood, voice, verbal aspect, sentence accent, word order variation, conjunctions, discourse markers (oh, well, anyway, besides, in conclusion), and even stylistic register.

Diessel (1999:118) puts forth the criteria involved in the grammaticalization of demonstratives. These criteria can be classed into syntactic, morphological and phonological changes, as shown in Figure 4.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Occurrence is often restricted to a particular syntactic context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- They are often obligatory to form a certain grammatical construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphological change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- They are usually restricted to the distal or, less frequently, the proximal form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- They may have lost their ability to inflect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonological change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- They may have undergone a process of phonological reduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- They may have coalesced with other free forms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.1. Criteria: Grammaticalization of Demonstratives**

Among these criteria, the first dealing with morphological change and the second dealing with phonological change are applicable to Korean pragmatic markers that are comprised of deictic elements. The contemporary Korean form of the pragmatic marker *ceki* likewise is derived from a distal deictic element. I will return to this issue in the next section on the diachronic development of the marker *ceki*. In addition to the pragmatic marker *ceki*, I assume that in Korean a deictic element also serves as the source for grammatical categories such as conjunctions (e.g., *kuliko* 'and,' *kulayse* 'so,' *kulena*...
‘but,’ etc.) as well as for interjections such as *ilen* ‘alas’ and *celen* ‘oh my God,’ as well as for various pragmatic markers such as *kulsey* ‘well’ or *ilek celek* or *kulek celek* ‘so so.’ These connectives and interjections, along with *ceki*, consist of a deictic element (underlined in the examples shown) with appended suffixes.

Most of these elements consist of the distal deictic elements *ku* or *ce*. As will be shown in Chapters 5 and 6, the Korean proximal deictic element *i* ‘this’ also participates in grammaticalization, as in *ipwa*, *yepo*, and *yeposeyyo*. However, as Diessel (1999) has argued, the distal deictic elements *ku* and *ce* more frequently participate in grammaticalization than does the proximal. As in the case of the distal deictic, *ce* is coalesced with the free form *ekuy* ‘place.’ I will illustrate this matter in later sections.

Before examining the historical development of the pragmatic marker *ceki*, let me first outline the deictic system in Korean. Korean employs a triad deictic system, as shown below (Sohn 1994, K.H. Cang 1980, S.C. Cang 1972):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deictic</th>
<th>Sense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>close to speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku</td>
<td>close to hearer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>distant to both hearer and speaker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Korean deictic elements are based in a person-oriented system utilizing spatial orientation. Thus, the deictic element *i* is used to designate a person or thing close to the speaker; the deictic element *ku* is employed to designate a person or thing close to the hearer; and the deictic *ce* is utilized when a person or thing is distant from both hearer and speaker. However, this triad deictic system can be lexically categorized into a dual system: proximal (*i* ‘this’) and distal (*ku* ‘that’ and *ce* ‘that’).
In Middle Korean, deictics could be inflected by case markers. In addition, the unbounded deictics in Middle Korean were historically used as demonstrative as well as personal pronouns. These stand-alone deictics underwent grammaticalization and became bounded forms in the process of coalescing with other lexemes. This conforms to Diessel’s observation (1999: 118) regarding the grammaticalization of deictics: loss of inflective capability concomitant with coalescence with other free forms.

In contemporary Korean usage, in order to be used as a personal or demonstrative pronoun, deictic elements require free lexemes having semantic meaning such as person, time, place, and manner, etc. Deictic types based on categories such as person, time, place, and manner all share the same root, as in the case of i, ku, and ce. In other words, deictic types consist of deictic markers together with a separate lexeme for each type of category. For example, cesalam ‘that person’ is composed of the distal deictic ce and a lexeme that has the semantic meaning of ‘person.’ Let me illustrate this in the table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Deictic</th>
<th>Lexeme as suffix</th>
<th>Combinational form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Ku Ce salam, pwun, nom</td>
<td>isalam, kusalam, cesalam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thing</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Ku Ce Kesz ikes, kukes, cekes</td>
<td>ikes, kukes, cekes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Ku Ce Ttay ittay, kuttay, cettay</td>
<td>ittay, kuttay, cettay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Ku Ce kos, eki ikos, eki, kukos, cekos; yeki, keki, ceki</td>
<td>ikos, kukos, cekos; yeki, keki, ceki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Ku Ce Lehkey ilehkey, kulehkey, celehkey</td>
<td>ilehkey, kulehkey, celehkey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, all of the above deictic types are rooted in the same deictic elements (i, ku, ce). Also, the point of designation concerning person, time, place, and manner is based on the senses of i, ku, and ce.
The reader may have taken note of the number of suffixes that can be attached onto the person deictic. The lexemes used to denote a person reflect the speaker’s attitude toward the addressee. In other words, a speaker wishing to express respect toward an addressee would employ the person deictic forms *ipwun, kupwun, cepwun*. On the other hand, a speaker looking down on an addressee would utilize the person deictic forms *inom, kunom, cenom*. The difference between the two lies in the different suffixes: One, *pun*, has an honorific lexical meaning, while the other suffix *nom* has a denotation of contempt. Employment of the person deictic forms *isalam/kusalam/cesalam* is highly productive in daily language use, since the suffix *salam* is neutral, denoting neither respect nor disdain toward the addressee or a third person.

In Korean, unlike English, use of the second person pronoun *ne* ‘you’ as an address form is rather uncommon. The reason for this lies in the fact that if the status of the addressee, based on factors such as age, social status, etc., is higher than that of the speaker, employment of the second person pronoun is prohibited. The use of the second person pronoun is thus limited to use by friends having the same social status and to children’s speech. This prohibition against address by the second person pronoun may indeed have served as an impetus for the grammaticalization of the person deictic element.

The following is from a contemporary television drama. The speech event occurs as the mother-in-law (C) and daughter-in-law (Y) are preparing dinner for the family. As an illustration of the grammaticalization phenomenon of the person deictic forms, presented below is an excerpt of dialogue utilizing the deictic form *cesalam* ‘that person’:

---

1 *Wulika eti naminkayo?* ‘Are we strangers?’
(1) [Y, C: 1-4]

(Y is setting the dinner table with an unpleasant mood.)

1. C Eti aphuni?
   ‘Are you tired/sick?’

2. Y =Anieyyo apenimunyo?
   ‘No, where is father?’

3. C Eh yensupcang kasyesse.
   ‘Eh (he) went to a golf course.’

4. Y Kulem cesalam hako emeni tusyeyo. cen sayngkaki epseyo.
   ‘Then, would you have dinner with that person (Yuncwu’s husband). I do not feel like eating.’

The husband of (Y) is in his study. From their conversation, it can be gathered that the father-in-law is also not in the kitchen but at a golf course. After listening to her mother-in-law’s (C) response concerning the absence of her father-in-law, (Y) suggests that (C) have dinner with her son, indicated by the underlined form cesalam (that person) in the last line.

K.H. Cang (1980:182) points out that “the deictic forms ku, kuyeca have been grammaticalized as the third person pronoun in use in fiction and written language.”2 Let me illustrate this phenomenon through another dialogue excerpt from an urban-based contemporary drama.3 The following interaction between father and son concerns the

---

2 Translation from Korean into English by the author for the purpose of this dissertation.
3 Wulika eti naminkayo? ‘Are we strangers?’
son's wife Yuncwu. The speaker (son) is concerned about his wife's health since Yuncwu is holding a job during her pregnancy. He refers to his wife in conversation with his father by the deictic form *kusalam* (that person):

(2) ... Yuncwussi ai mos kacinun cwul alasseyo. ... *kusalam* hantheyn aika kkok philyohayyo. ... cengsangcek inimsi elyeptanun yaykilul tulessul ttay ... *kusalami* elmana celmanghayssnunci mollayo.

'I thought that Yuncwu cannot have a baby. To *that person* (her), our baby is desperately needed. ... When (she) heard news about (she) could not have a baby in a normal method ... *that person* (she) has been so desperate.'

Sangho: (listening)

According to S.C. Cang (1972), if the deictic element *ku* is prefixed to *salam* (person), then it possesses the third person pronoun function as well as the designating function. On the other hand, S.C. Cang (1972) also points out that if the deictic element *ce* is prefixed, it possesses only a deictic function. However, as illustrated in Dialogue (1), Cang's latter statement concerning *ce* would seem to no longer be valid, as the person deictic (i.e., *cesalam*) is seen to be employed as a third person pronoun in the same way as *kusalam*, as shown in (2). Thus, it can be argued that the deictic element *cesalam* has been grammaticalized, thus extending its function to use in third person pronoun substitution together with the deictic element *kusalam*, as pointed out by as K.H. Cang (1980).
Another difference among deictic forms can be adduced: While the deictic elements *i* and *ku* possess an anaphoric reference function (equivalent to the English *the*), allowing them to designate things (e.g., *kukes i maliya* ‘that is ... I mean’), *ce* possesses no such anaphoric function (S.C. Cang 1972, K.H. Cang 1980). However, *ce* does possess a function apart from that of *i* or *ku*: It can serve as an attention-grabber. Let me cite K.H. Cang (1980:169) to illustrate:

(3) A Cesalam com capacweyo.
   ‘Please hold that person.’

   B Phalan campa ipun ce salam maliya?
   ‘Are you talking about the person wearing a blue jacket?’

   ‘Yes, *that person* hit me.’

(4) A Ceki com poseyyo. acessika acwummalul mak ttayleyeo.
   ‘Please take a look over there. Uncle is viciously beating Aunt.’

   B a. (Chyetapomye) *celel* swuka...
      (Looking) ‘Oh my...’

      b. (Chyetapoci anhko) *kulelli* ka issna?
      (Without looking) ‘Are you sure?’

K. H. Cang (1980) explains the difference in usage of the deictic elements *i, ku,* and *ce:* If a person or thing is redesignated by *i* or *ku* in response to the speaker, as *ku* in (3a) and
(4Bb), the addressee does not pay attention to the person or thing. On the other hand, if a person or thing is redesignated by ce in response to the speaker, as in (3B) and (4B:a), the addressee pays particular attention to what has been said.

One observation of the grammaticalization of deictics made by Diessel (1999: 118) is that grammaticalization is more likely to be restricted to the distal deictic. If this be the case, what properties triggered the grammaticalization of ce as opposed to ku, even though both are distal deictics? While the deictic element ku possesses an anaphoric reference function, which ce does not have, ce possesses a function apart from that of ku; i.e., as an attention-grabber. I posit that it is this attention-grabbing function that triggered the grammaticalization of the deictic element ce instead of the other distal deictic element ku.

The attention-grabbing function of the distal deictic element ce is still relevant to the pragmatic marker ceki, which functions to index the speaker’s interpersonal stance while drawing the attention of an addressee to a speech event. This attribute is especially useful in serving to gain the attention of strangers, as shown in a dialogue excerpt from a contemporary drama below:

(5) [C, S: 1-4]

1. C CeKIyo ... ilen wuntong pok eti kamyen sal swu isseyo?
   ‘Cekiyo ... where can I buy this type of exercise clothing?’
2. S Yeki maycangey kamyen isseyo. onul cheum osinkeeyyo?

---

4 Wulika eti naminkayo? ‘Are we strangers?’
‘You can buy it in a store inside this gym. Are you here for the first time today?’

3. C

Ney.

‘Yes.’

4. S

Cal hasyesseyo, wuntongyangi manhase salto ccwakccwak ppacikwuyo. silnayeyse hanikka hayspyethto thal kekcengto epskwuyo.

‘Good, because of all the indoor exercise, we do not have to worry about suntan.’

The above interaction occurs inside a gym for sports dancing. Speaker (C), who is interested in exercise, enters the gym and observes people participating in exercise. She engages a participating female (S) in conversation by employing cekiy0. The pragmatic marker cekiy0 is composed of the distal deictic element ce and ekuy ‘place’ together with the polite speech level marker/interactional particle –yo. The attention-grabbing function of the deictic element ce served as an impetus for the grammaticalized use of the spatial demonstrative pronoun ceki as a pragmatic marker expressing the speaker’s indirect stance. I will trace the diachronic development of the deictic element ceki in the next section.

Another principal difference between ku and ce can be found in spatial/physical distance and personal territory. The element ku is employed to designate a person or thing that is close to the hearer and consequently inside of the hearer’s territory. On the other hand, ce is neutral on physical/spatial distance since it is employed to designate a person
or thing equally distant from the speaker and hearer and thus out of the territory of both. This neutrality of ce also served as a primary impetus for its grammaticalization.

In the following section, I will trace the diachronic development of ceki, a coalesced form of the distal deictic element ce and ekuy ‘place.’ I will examine the original form of the Korean pragmatic marker ceki and its functional transformation in acquiring subjectivity and functioning to strengthen the speaker’s interpersonal and affective stances on upcoming discourse in relation to the interlocutors in spoken contexts. I will also examine the semantic transparency between source and target concept.

4.2.2 The Grammaticalization Process of ceki

The original form of the deictic element ce was tye in Middle Korean. As a pragmatic marker as well as a locative adverb and demonstrative pronoun, ceki historically consists of two elements: the distal deictic element tye and the defective noun ekuy [ŋkuy] ‘place.’ The original form tyeekuy underwent several historical processes, discussed later, to emerge as the contemporary pragmatic marker ceki.

The form tyeekuy also underwent competition with two other demonstrative pronouns. In Middle Korean, there were three types of demonstrative pronouns (S.N. Yi 1981: 224-225), as can be seen in the table below (only the distal deictic form [distant from both speaker and hearer] is illustrated):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.3. Three Types of Demonstrative Pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant from both speaker and hearer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The common feature of the pronouns shown above is that all are derived from the same root: *tye*. The demonstrative pronoun *tye* has zero suffix; *tye-ey* has the suffix *e][y; tye-ekuy* has the suffix *e][kuy*. The suffixes *-ey* and *-ekuy* share the same semantic feature; that is, denoting space/place/location and direction.

Based on SS (1447), the form *-ekuy*, which later formed *tyeekuy* through coalescence with the distal deictic *tye*, was not dominant. Rather, the *-ey* form appears significantly more frequently. However, this phenomenon evinces gradual change in PN (16c.), NO (17c.) and CN (late 18c.), in which the *-ekuy* form becomes increasingly dominant over the *-ey* form. In 20\textsuperscript{th} century literature (e.g., *Hyel uy nwu*: 1906), the *-ey* form is virtually non-existent. Thus, linguistic competition between the two forms ceased about the beginning of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, when the demonstrative pronoun *tye*, which has a zero suffix, completed the transformation of its functionality into that of modifier, its major role in contemporary Korean.

I posit that these changes stemmed from competition from several historical factors. First, there existed the above cited multiple forms for the same function. The resultant redundancy would have led to competition. Phonetic weight might also have engendered competition. That is, the *-ey* form became shortened owing to the loss of the phoneme [ŋ] in the initial syllable, which became one syllable (*tyey*) in the 16c. Such loss of phonetic weight forced the *-ey* form into a functional shift from demonstrative pronoun to case marker, which is a bound form (T.Y.Yi 1988:16-17, He 1973: 51). This functional shift followed a unidirectional path in the grammaticalization process: from a concrete lexical item having a free form to a bound and grammatical element.
Table (4.4) below illustrates the competition between uses of the 
\(-ey\) and \(-ekuy\) forms from SP (15c.), PN (16c.), NE (17c.) and CN (late 18c.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>SS (15c.)</th>
<th>PN (16c.)</th>
<th>NO (17c.)</th>
<th>CN (18c.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total of (-ey) form</td>
<td>38 (29.7%)</td>
<td>42 (32.8%)</td>
<td>29 (22.6%)</td>
<td>19 (14.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of (-ekuy) form</td>
<td>8 (7.4%)</td>
<td>22 (20.1%)</td>
<td>29 (27.1%)</td>
<td>48 (44.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of uses of the \(-ey\) form in SS does not represent actual uses, since in SS the distal deictic forms \(tyeey\) and \(tyeekuy\) occur insignificantly owing to the narrative genre. Except for this, the trend of decreasing usage of the \(-ey\) form and concomitant increasing usage of the \(ekuy\) form is clearly illustrated above. This trend continues in the examples of 19th century literature that I selected for this study. In 20th century literature, usage of the \(-ey\) form is virtually nil. This is indicative of the fact that competition between the two forms ended in the early 20th century.

Let me now illustrate diachronic changes of the \(-ekuy\) form, since this form continues to function as both a demonstrative pronoun as well as adverb. In addition, the distal form \(tyekuy\) has been grammaticalized and gained a new function as a pragmatic marker.

Historically, Korean was a language that had tonal features. In SS (15c.), \(tye\) retains tone. However, by the time of NO (17c.), all tonal features had been lost. Thus, the loss of tone can be seen to start at the end of the 16c.; by the 17c., tonal features have been completely lost (W.C. Kim 1988). Together with the loss of tone, by the 16c., the phoneme [ŋ] has been restricted to the syllable-final position, having been available in the
syllable-initial position prior to that time. This resulted in coalescence between the distal deictic forms *tye* and *ekuy*, from *tye[n]kuy* to *tyekuy*, starting in the 16th century.

Interestingly, in SS (15c.), *tye* was completely unpalatalized. Palatalization (*ti>ci* or *tye>cye*) occurs in the 16c.; by the 17c., it is prevalent. In CN (18c.), unpalatalized *tye* occurs only twice, the balance of *tye* being rendered as *cye*. After palatalization, neutralization between *cye* and *ce* occurs early in the 20th century according to my data.

An & Yi (1991: 74) point out that neutralization occurs about the 19th century.

Monophthongization from *uy>i* (as in *cekuy>ceki*) occurs in the 19th century (W.C. Kim 1988: 150-153).

The table below illustrates the morpho-phonemic changes of *ceki*, including uses of *ceki* as a pragmatic marker, in the early 20th century:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone [ŋ] in syllable initial position</th>
<th>SP (15c.)</th>
<th>PN (16c.)</th>
<th>NO (17c.)</th>
<th>CN (18c.)</th>
<th>19c.</th>
<th>1910-</th>
<th>1930-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ŋ] in syllable initial position</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>(restricted)</td>
<td>(syllable-final)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalescence</td>
<td>partially Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatalization</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutralization</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monophthongization (uy&gt;i)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td><em>tyee[n]kuy</em></td>
<td><em>tye.kuy</em></td>
<td><em>tyekuy</em></td>
<td><em>cyekuy</em></td>
<td><em>ceki</em></td>
<td><em>ceki</em></td>
<td>(PM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

. = Tone, R = retained, L = lost, N = no, Y = yes, PM = pragmatic marker

In Middle Korean (PN 16c.), *tyekuy* was already functioning as an adverb. Thus, zero modification occurs in form, as shown below (tone and other phonemic features not indicated):
Thus, as a demonstrative pronoun and as an adverb tyekuy underwent several historical processes. In my data, it appears as a pragmatic marker about the early 20th century, as shown above. This needs to be confirmed with more data, even though data from PN (16c.), NO (17c.) and CN (late 18c.) reflect characteristics of spoken Korean at those times owing to the conversational nature of the genre. Below are illustrative usages of the pragmatic marker ceki in the early 20th century in making a request (7) and making an excuse (8):

(7) Ce ... enmwun sse cwusyeyo?  
_Mwuceng_ (1917)
‘Ce … please write Korean alphabet for me?’

(8) a. Etuy kasilyenayo, yey? _Inkan mwuncey_ (1934) 
‘Are you going to go somewhere?’

b. Um ceki ton patule.
‘Ceki, to get some money back.’

There are certain characteristics of ceki when employed as pragmatic marker that are distinctive from its usage as a demonstrative pronoun and a locative adverb: As a pragmatic marker, ceki lost all propositional and referential meaning. In other words, as a demonstrative pronoun and as a locative adverb, ceki possesses space-oriented referential meaning, while ceki as a pragmatic marker is devoid of such spatial meaning. Rather, as
mentioned earlier, the pragmatic marker *ceki* has acquired the new function of speaker-based interpersonal meaning through subjectification, and functions to express the speaker’s interpersonal and affective stances, such as hesitation, empathy, affection, etc.

As illustrated in dialogues (7) and (8) above, the pragmatic usage of *ceki* serves to express the speaker’s interpersonal stances while considering the addressee’s situation and drawing the addressee’s attention to the speaker and/or speech event. As mentioned earlier, the motivation for grammaticalization stems from the speaker’s cognitive as well as social needs. In the case of the grammaticalization of *ceki*, the basis for acquiring a new pragmatic function can be found in the speaker’s needs to maximize relevancy and information content by drawing the addressee’s attention to a speaker and speech event while at the same time satisfying the speaker’s social desires to manifest her interpersonal and affective stances.

On the morpho-syntactic level, the pragmatic marker *ceki* underwent processing to acquire another feature distinct from the locative adverb or demonstrative pronoun *ceki*: fixed positioning. The distribution of the locative adverb and demonstrative pronoun is non-restricted; that is, it can occur in the sentence-initial, sentence-medial and sentence-final positions as illustrated below:

(9)  

a.  *Ceki* Yengswuka oneyyo.  

   ‘*Over there* Yengswu is coming.’

b.  Yengswuka *ceki* oneyyo.  

   ‘Yengswu is *over there* coming.’

c.  Yengswuka oko issneyyo *ceki*.  

   ‘Yengswu is coming *over there*.’
The distribution of the spatial adverb *ceki* in (9) is without restriction in that it can occur in sentence-initial position (9a), sentence-medial position (9b), as well as in sentence-final position (9c). However, the pragmatic marker *ceki* occurs morpho-syntactically in the fixed clause or sentence initial position, as shown in dialogue excerpt (1).

It can be seen that the diachronic developmental processes of *ceki* as a pragmatic marker reflect the general characteristics of the grammaticalization path. That is, on the semantic-functional level, development from a concrete lexeme denoting spatial and physical distance to a subjectivized abstract meaning denoting the speaker’s interpersonal and affective stances in mental space reflects the overarching grammaticalization principle of unidirectionality. Fauconnier (1997: 35) defines mental space in the following way: “Mental spaces are the domains that discourse builds up to provide a cognitive substrate for reasoning and for interfacing with the world.”

Throughout this dissertation, I follow Fauconnier’s definition of mental space. Hopper (1991) notes that decategorization from major to minor category (e.g., from demonstrative pronoun to locative adverb and further to pragmatic marker) conforms to the principle of unidirectionality. Also important to note is that as a pragmatic marker, *ceki* also underwent several diachronic processes such as phonological erosion and coalescence, morpho-syntactic fixation, and semantic extension while acquiring pragmatic functions.

---

^5 For details, see Fauconnier (1997), Chapter 2.
Subjectification: The Combinational Forms of *ceki*

I will now turn to the one of the more interesting phenomena concerning the uses of the pragmatic marker *ceki*: its combinatorial use with speech level markers. The combinational forms of *ceki* with speech level markers are shown in Table 4.6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech levels</th>
<th>Deferential</th>
<th>Polite</th>
<th>Moderately lowering</th>
<th>Half-talk</th>
<th>Most lowering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combinational forms</td>
<td><em>ceki-mali-pniita</em></td>
<td><em>ceki-mali-yeyyo</em></td>
<td><em>ceki-mali-ney</em></td>
<td><em>ceki-mali-ya</em></td>
<td><em>ceki-mali-ta</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noteworthy here is the marked degree of subjectification shown. As Traugott (1995: 45) notes, the speaker’s interpersonal stance toward the addressee and/or speech events can be further subjectified by employing the combinational forms of *ceki* together with the speech level morphemes. Such subjectification is based on the speaker’s perception of the relationship with interlocutors. For instance, by employing the bare form *ceki*, which denotes the sense of half-talk, speakers may express their stance of intimacy and casualness toward the speech situation as well as toward the addressee.

Devices for marking subjectivity are cross-linguistically divergent. Some languages, such as Korean and Japanese, highly exploit the morphological system, while other languages may mark subjectivity through other devices such as prosody and word order. Maynard (1993:4) sees subjectivity in Japanese in the following way:

When speaking Japanese, one simply cannot avoid expressing one’s personal attitude toward the content of information and toward the addressee. Such a personal voice echoes so prominently in Japanese...
communication that often ... rather than information-sharing, it is subtextual emotion-sharing that forms the heart of communication. In Korean, the speech level morphemes as shown in Table (4.6) are suitable candidates for use as subjective markers, in the same way as in Japanese. This is based on the fact that the choice of speech level in language use is governed by the speaker’s subjective perception of the social relationship, speech situation, etc., during interaction with interlocutors. For example, it is a common phenomenon to observe two adult Korean interlocutors mutually employing the polite speech level to each other in normal conversation, while they employ the most lowering speech level marker when engaged in argument. Thus, the employment of a specific speech level represents the speaker’s attitude and perspective toward what is being said and toward the speech situation. In addition, as illustrated above, the pragmatic marker ceki itself possesses subjectivity through grammaticalization.

Usage of the combinational forms of ceki with speech level markers subjectivizes and strengthens the speaker’s perspective. This argument can be supported by an analysis of the usage of the combinational forms. The combinational forms of ceki with speech level markers are employed to express the speaker’s perspective in a more indirect manner than is the case with ceki. Thus, as illustrated in Chapter 3, the more weight carried by communication goals such as request, disagreement or excuse, the more frequently combinational forms such as cekiy, cekimaliya, and cekimalita are employed. As an illustration, when observing the routine use of ceki between spouses in a contemporary television drama, the polite form cekiy is observed to occur instead of ceki, which otherwise is most consistently employed by a husband to his wife in the specific case of delivering a major excuse to his spouse.
Let me illustrate usage of combinational forms employing the most lowering speech level marker, as in *cekimalita*. The following speech event taken from an urban-based contemporary drama occurs during interaction between stepmother (C) and her stepdaughter (Y). Their relationship is close but both of them have maintained a certain degree of distance. The speech situation is as follows: The stepdaughter (Y) has received her retirement compensation and her stepmother (C) is in need, as she is preparing for her son’s marriage expenses. (C) knows that her stepdaughter (Y) has the retirement compensation money and, for her son’s marriage, plans to borrow that money from her stepdaughter when she returns from her work. (Y) comes home from work for dinner and her stepmother (C) greets her in the living room, followed by the statement of “Dinner is ready.” The stepdaughter responds to her stepmother that she will be right back after changing clothing while walking toward her room:

(10) [Y, C: 1-6]

1. Y Os kala ipko naolkkeyyo.
   ‘I will be right back after changing my clothing.’

2. C =Ceki ... Yuncwuya?
   ‘Ceki ... Yuncwu?’

3. Y (Turns around toward her mother Cengswuk.)

4. C *Cekimalita ... ne tangcangey kyelhon hal sayngkak epstamyen maliya ...*
   ‘*Cekimalita ... if you do not have a plan to marry right at this moment ...*’

---

6 For a detailed exposition of the functions and speech event of this illustration, see pages (81-83) in Chapter 3.
7 *Wulika eti naminkayo* ‘Are we strangers?’ For a detailed synopsis, see pages 9-10.
5. Y (Yuncwu looks at her mother.)
   ‘Ayu! never mind. Come out after changing your clothing.’

In the 4th line, upon achieving her stepdaughter’s attention as indicated, the speaker employs the pragmatic marker cekimalita combined with the grammaticalized form mali and the speech level marker ta. The usage of cekimalita, the most lowering speech level, in this example is significant. This form represents a subjectified speaker’s stance that achieves the goal of maximizing relevancy and informativeness vis-à-vis the speaker’s request. The speaker’s perspective of the hierarchical social relationship and the social relationship between the interlocutors is reflected by the usage of ceki together with the lowest speech level (i.e., cekimalita).

The pragmatic marker ceki, then, results from grammaticalization processes on the phonological, morpho-syntactic, and functional levels. Motivation for such grammaticalization can be found in the speaker’s cognitive need to maximize information content by drawing the addressee’s attention as well the social need to evince interpersonal and affective stances. Thus, the combinational forms of ceki with speech level markers furthers and strengthens subjectification by indexing the speaker’s interpersonal stance in relation to the interlocutors.
4.2.4 Principles and Mechanisms of Grammaticalization

Differences among the Korean deictic forms *i, ku,* and *ce* were examined earlier. In this section, I will examine *ceki* regarding the principles and mechanisms of its grammaticalization. First, let me touch on the relationship between source and target concepts, which partakes of the principle of persistence as proposed by Hopper (1991). That is, what are the characteristics of the distal deictic *ce* that make it an ideal component of the pragmatic marker *ceki,* and what is the semantic relevance between the two?

An interesting study exists concerning differences in deictic elements. Glover (2000: 918-922) points out the difference between proximal and distal deictic elements in negotiation talk:

Proximally marked deictics (this, these, here) reflect a negotiable orientation in that the object of reference is recognized as a problematic or unresolved issue. In this way, the choice of proximal reference is predictably used when introducing a feature into the talk. … distal references (that, those, there) reflect a received orientation to the issue being addressed. In this case, the object of references is encoded as an established context, even though it may still be a disputed one. As such, its occurrence may exhibit face address by signaling recognition of the other party’s candidate outcome as a politeness strategy, particularly at the beginning of a turn … distal has a politeness function relating to its sequential property of coming at the beginning of the turn unit.

As mentioned at the outset, the pragmatic marker *ceki* is multifunctional, used in request, apology and excuse, disagreement, as a conversation starter and discourse transition marker, and as an attention-getter. Given that the distal deictic element has a politeness strategy function, especially at a turn-taking point, the function of the pragmatic marker *ceki* in expressing the speaker’s indirect and hesitant stances in the
speech contexts of making excuse, apology, disagreement, and request can be traced from the original concept.

According to Diessel (1999: 51), writing about the reference point of the discourse deictic component of *ceki*, analysis on the pragmatic level can be seen thus:

First, on the basis of use it is non-emphatic, non-contrastive, and vague; i.e., the reference precision is not clear-cut. Let me illustrate these characteristics of the discourse deictic through a dialogue excerpt from an urban-based contemporary television drama: 8

(T) has been looking for his brother-in-law, (Y). When (Y) returns, the speaker asks where he has been. In response, (Y) does not give a clear-cut answer. Instead he responds to his brother-in-law (T) by employing *ceki*. In this case, *ceki* reflects all the characteristics of the reference point of the discourse deictic, i.e., non-contrastive, non-emphatic, and vague.

Since the deictic form *ce* is utilized when both the speaker and addressee are distant from a referent, it inherently does not indicate a clear reference point. This neutral

---

8 *Ikey salangiya* 'This is love.'
characteristic served as a trigger for the grammaticalization of the pragmatic marker ceki, conveying avoidance and vagueness in a non-emphatic mode.

The semantic relevance of a grammaticalized linguistic element can be traced from its source concept, as Traugott (1995: 46-47) notes:

For the speaker's communicative purposes to be achieved, forms are constantly recruited from lexical domains expressing concrete, objective meanings, and are construed in terms of the perspective of the speaker, the speech event, and the discourse context. But such recruitment is far from arbitrary; the original meanings and the inferences that can be drawn from them that made the terms eligible for recruitment in the first place constrain the linguistic domains in which they can be used and the subjective functions they can perform. ... the tendency for subjectification is, to a large extent, correlated with the early grammaticalization of elements; this presumably follows, at least in part, from the greater accessibility of the original meaning to speakers and hearers before this has been obscured by frequent reanalysis.

Traugott's arguments (1995) validate the existence of semantic relevance between the source concept of the Middle Korean deictic form tye and the contemporary form of the pragmatic marker ceki, composed of the distal deictic element tye and ekuy 'place.' The distal deictic element ce, the contemporary form of the Middle Korean tye, is neutral regarding physical and spatial distance since it is employed to designate a person or thing equally distant from the speaker and hearer and thus out of the territory of both. This characteristic served as a primary impetus for its grammaticalization in much the same way that the French negator pas is specialized owing to its unmarked/neutral characteristics (Hopper 1991).

According to Diessel (1999), the selection of the pragmatic marker ceki for grammaticalization, from the deictic element tye, was not arbitrary. This is in line with
the principle of persistence as posited by Hopper (1991); namely, that the semantic property of the source concept persists in its target concept. As mentioned above, the source concepts of neutrality and vagueness, which are the principal characteristics of the distal deictic form *tye*, served as a trigger for the grammaticalization of the contemporary form of the pragmatic marker *ceki*. The transformed target concept characteristically manifests indirectness during social interaction between interlocutors. In this sense, selection of a source element for grammaticalization is not arbitrary. Consequently, the source concept remains persistent in the target concept. As well, the very accessibility of the original meaning of the target concept of *ceki* from the deictic element *tye* indicates that the grammaticalization of *ceki* is at a position before the final stage of reanalysis, at which point there would exist opacity between source and target.

Put another way, the original property of neutrality and vagueness held by the distal deictic form made it ideal as a source concept for the pragmatic marker *ceki*. Owing to such characteristics, speakers can deliver a hesitant and indirect interpersonal stance by employing this marker, especially in speech contexts that potentially threaten interlocutors' face, such as request, apology, disagreement, getting attention from strangers, etc. Indirectness, the target concept of the pragmatic marker *ceki*, can thus be seen to be derived from the original source concept of neutral physical distance.

This semantic extension, from physical neutral distance to psychological distance denoting indirectness, is brought about through metaphoric transference. As mentioned, the core semantic property of the original source concept of *ceki* is physical distance that is neutral from both the speaker and the hearer. This physical distance property was metaphorically extended and then transferred into the psychological distance component
of the target concept. This metaphorical transformation results in pragmatic strengthening through conventionalization of the transferred meaning, in this case indirectness. By employing ceki, the speaker can bring about smooth social interactions especially in the speech contexts of making excuse, apology, disagreement, and request. This is based on the function of the marker ceki which serves to lessen the impact of the given illocutionary force while indexing the speaker’s interpersonal and affective stances toward upcoming discourse in relation to the interlocutors.

In summary, semantic transparency between source and target concept is indicative of the fact that recruitment of a grammaticalized form is not arbitrary and that the original source is traceable before the final stage of reanalysis owing to the semantic relevance between the two concepts. In this sense, the Korean pragmatic marker ceki clearly exemplifies Hopper’s persistence principle (1991). As well, the metaphoric transference from a concrete lexical item denoting the referential meaning of physical distance to an abstract target concept (psychological distance) denoting indirectness reflects the overarching grammaticalization principle of unidirectionality. Decategorization from major to minor category, as from demonstrative pronoun to locative adverb and further to pragmatic marker, also conforms to the general path of grammaticalization (Hopper 1991).

### 4.3 Conclusion

An analysis of the diachronic development process from origin to target and the motivation for grammaticalization clearly shows that the characteristics of the pragmatic marker ceki, which occurs in informal spoken contexts with high frequency, reflects
communicative and social needs on the speaker’s part. As well, the characteristic of being pragmatically indispensable reflects the fact that as a pragmatic marker, *ceki* is the result of a historical process from a concrete lexical form having a propositional meaning toward a pragmatic marker that indexes the speaker’s interpersonal and affective stances.

The original referential meaning of *ceki* designating distal space was transferred to the pragmatic function of expressing the speaker’s subjective interpersonal stance toward the addressee and speech event through subjectification. Such metaphoric transference, from a distal deictic element denoting neutral physical distance to a pragmatic marker denoting psychological distance, reflects the overarching grammaticalization principle of unidirectionality, as does decategorization from major to minor category. As a pragmatic marker, *ceki* first occurs early in the 20th century, according to the sources in my data. However, this does not necessarily mean that *ceki* did not occur earlier. The pragmatic marker *ceki* acquired distinctive features apart from the homonymic demonstrative pronoun and locative adverb: morpho-syntactic fixation in the initial utterance position together with pragmatically-strengthened interpersonal functions.

In parallel with other grammaticalized functional and pragmatic markers, *ceki* has undergone several historical processes. Phonetic-phonemically, it went through several processes. Morpho-syntactically, its distribution was restricted to the sentence/clause-initial position. On the semantic-pragmatic level, *ceki* acquired a new function: Its original referential meaning designating distal space was transformed to strengthen the pragmatic function of indexing the speaker’s interpersonal and affective stance on upcoming discourse in relation to the interlocutor. By employing the pragmatic marker
ceki, the speaker can achieve the social goal of smooth interaction while at the same time drawing the addressee’s attention to what is being said.

The characteristics of the deictic element ce, which originated from tye in Middle Korean, ideally served as the source for the pragmatic marker ceki. In contrast to the proximal deictic form i (this), the deictic form ce functions to draw the addressee’s attention to what is being said. It is this characteristic that made tye ideal as a trigger for the grammaticalization of the pragmatic marker ceki. In other words, the characteristic of neutrality and vagueness as well as the attention-grabbing characteristic of the distal deictic element triggered the grammaticalization of ceki.

This indicates that in addition to social needs for expressing the speaker’s interpersonal and affective stances on the speaker’s part, communicative needs for increasing information content are also motivational forces behind grammaticalization. As well, it can be seen that semantic relevance between source and target concepts is not arbitrary: the element of indirectness manifested by the pragmatic marker ceki originates from its source concept as a distal deictic. Moreover, the level of semantic accessibility to the source concept indicates that the grammaticalization process has not yet reached the final stage of reanalysis. In other words, the semantic transparency between the original meaning and its grammaticalized functional concept has not yet been obscured by frequent reanalysis.

The usage of the combinational form of ceki with speech level markers, as in ceki-ya, ceki-mali-ney, and ceki-mali-ya, implies that the speaker’s interpersonal stance toward an interlocutor and speech event has been engaged. As Maynard (1993) points out, in Japanese the expression of a personal and subjective attitude is morphologically
encoded. This is also the case with Korean speech level markers used together with other devices, including the pragmatic marker *ceki*. In essence, the diachronic development of the pragmatic marker *ceki* suggests that a linguistic element evolves to encode and express a speaker’s cognitive-social desires.
5.1 Introduction

The visual perceptual verb is a fundamental lexical item across languages owing to its basis in elementary human experience, as Heine et al. (1991) note. In contemporary Korean the visual perceptual verb pota 'see/look at' and its derivative linguistic elements illustrate various usages beyond the sense of physical sight of tangible concrete objects. The following illustration is one such usage:

(1) Nay cengsin com pw-a.
    my mind (ACC) please look at-END

'Where’s my mind/ look at my mind.'

The above can be uttered when a speaker suddenly realizes that she has forgotten to do something at some past point. In this usage the bold-typed verb pwa, which is a fused form between the verb stem po- and the imperative ending -a, has an intangible and abstract object; i.e., the mind.

This phenomenon is also found in English. For example, the standard expression I see denotes a sense of cognitive apprehension rather than the activity of physical sight. Sweetser (1990: 6) points out that “see is a well-motivated choice for extension to the sense of knowledge.” This extension owes much to the metaphorical connection between
the physical visual domain and the intellectual domain. I will deal with this mechanism in more detail in Chapter 6.

In the following sections, I will provide an overview of the contemporary uses of the perceptual visual verb *pota* and its derivative grammatical and functional elements. I will also examine the contemporary uses of the epistemic modal affix –*pwa* in the utterance-final position in a matrix clause or in the connective-ending position in a complex clause. The functions of the pragmatic marker *(ke)* *pwa* ‘you see’ will then be presented. The perceptual verb *pota* also derives the function of getting attention and of address through fusion with proximal deictic elements such as *i* ‘this’ and *yeki* ‘here’ as in *ipwa* ‘hey/look’ and *yepo* ‘honey,’ respectively. I will look at this issue as well.

The epistemic modal affix, pragmatic marker, attention-getter, and address form that are derived from the visual perceptual verb *pota* have not yet been studied in depth, to the best of my knowledge, even though C.Y. Yi (1998) briefly deals with the address form *yepo* ‘honey’ and the pragmatic marker *(ke)* *pwa* ‘you see’ as cases of fusion. However, her analysis of *(ke)* *pwa* does not capture the epistemic function of this pragmatic marker. I will examine Yi’s (1998) study in the following chapter dealing with the diachronic developments of the pragmatic expressions that are derived from the perceptual visual verb *pota*.

### 5.2 Conceptual and Grammatical Network of the Perceptual Verb

*pota* ‘see/look at’

In this section, I will sketch an overview of the conceptual and grammatical network of the perceptual visual verb *pota*. The following are the lexical senses of *pota*
listed in a contemporary Korean dictionary by Nam (1997). For the purposes of this
dissertation, I translated the senses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive verb</th>
<th>1. something with eyes</th>
<th>2. take care of</th>
<th>3. discern</th>
<th>4. earn interest, daughter-in-law, etc.</th>
<th>5. considering situation</th>
<th>6. experience</th>
<th>7. meet</th>
<th>8. excrete/discharge</th>
<th>9. in charge of</th>
<th>10. preparing something</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Figure 5.1. Polysemous Senses of the Verb pota ‘see/look at’**

Among the above polysemous senses, the following should be noted: *discern*,
*considering situation*, and *experience*. These senses are not related to the function of
physical perception but rather are associated with the process of psychological perception.
In relation to psychological perception, the following illustration presents the
contemporary uses of grammatical and functional elements that are derived from the verb
pota:

(2) A Na-to ku chayk ilke pa-ss-e.

i-also that book (ACC) read see-PST-END

'I also *tried to* read that book.'

B Phikonha-likka-pwa an kKayw-ess-ci.

tired-will be-see not wake-PST-END

'I didn’t wake you up *because* you would be tired (if you got up early).'

C. Pwa-yo. chek poni nwu-ka ponayssnunci al-keyss-ta.

see-END. at a glance who-NOM send know-MOD-END

'**You see.** I can see who sent (the flower) with a glance.'
In (2A), the reduced form -e pwa, between the verb stem po- and the past tense morpheme -ass, is an auxiliary verb that denotes a sense of experience. In (2B), the epistemic modal affix -lkka denotes the speaker’s subjective belief and certainty regarding the proposition. The grammatical elements of (2A) and (2B) are bound forms in that they are bound by the preceding host verb suffixes -e and -lkka, respectively; on the other hand, the pragmatic marker pwa in (2C), denoting the speaker’s strong degree of epistemic certainty, is a free form. The epistemic sense of the modal affix and pragmatic marker is related to the original polysemous sense of the perceptual visual verb; i.e., considering situation, in Figure (5.1). On the other hand, the auxiliary verb is associated with the sense of experience. I will look at the contemporary uses of the epistemic modal affix in (2B) and the pragmatic marker (2C) in the following section.

The original sense of the perceptual verb pota further permeates into contemporary uses of getting attention (3A) and address form (3B), as in the following:

(3) A  

I-pwa.

proximal deictic element-look at

‘Hey, look.’

B  

Ye-po.

here look

‘Honey.’

It can be seen, then, that owing to the inherent semantic sense of the visual perception verb (i.e., our ability to focus our visual and mental attention), the verb pota is able to
function productively as both an attention-getter and an address form (Sweetser 1990). I will examine this in some detail in a later section.

The visual perceptual verb *pota* is also employed to encode semantic case relationships, as shown below:

(4) A Yengswu khi-ka ne-*pota* te khun kes kathta.
Yengswu hight-NOM you-COM more tall seems
‘It seems that Yengsu’s height is more than yours.’

B (Tangsin) nwukwu-*poko* ipwa ipwa hanun keya.
(you) who-DAT hey hey say
‘To whom are you saying hey hey.’

The use of the comparative case marker, as in (4A), is listed in contemporary Korean dictionaries. However, the usage of the dative case marker, as in (4B), was not recorded until issuance of the recent dictionary by Nam (1997), even though such usage is attested in early 20th century text, as shown below:

(5) Ne-to na-*poko* haylahanun kesi cahun ilini (Hyel uy nwu 1906)
you-also me-DAT half-talk thing good thing
‘It is good for you to use half-talk speech level to me.’

Diagrammatically, the grammatical and conceptual network of the perceptual visual verb *pota* can be represented as follows:
5.3 Uses of Pragmatic Markers Derived from \textit{pota}

5.3.1 Epistemic Modal Marker \textit{-pwa}

5.3.1.1 Definitions and Forms

Epistemic modality concerns non-propositional meaning that centers on the speaker's viewpoint, commitment of the truth value of the proposition, and assessment leading to conclusions about the situation (Palmer 1986, Sweetser 1991, Heine et al. 1991, Bybee et al. 1994). Let me introduce some definitions of epistemic modality. Bybee et al. (1994: 179) define it in the following way: "Epistemic modality applies to assertions and indicates the extent to which the speaker is committed to the truth of the proposition. ... The commonly expressed epistemic modalities are possibility, probability, and inferred
certainty.” Let me now introduce the definition of Heine et al. (1991:175-177) on epistemic modality:

... concerned with reasoning processes, beliefs, and conclusions reached by the speaker ... the world of epistemic modality is essentially static. In this world, ... what is presented are assessments, beliefs, conclusions about states, or actions conceived as states, and the concern is essentially with what a situation is like rather than with what happens.

The following brief definitions from contemporary Korean dictionaries of the epistemic modal affixes –nka/lkka/-na pota reflect the above definitional characteristics of epistemic modality. Note the speaker’s low degree of commitment (i.e., supposition) and subjective intention regarding the proposition. For purposes of this dissertation, I translated senses of the epistemic modal affix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POTA [poco hyengyongsa]: denotes supposition when employed followed by a verb or adjective suffix –nka or -lkka</td>
<td>POTA [poco hyengyongsa]: denotes supposition or subjective intention, followed by a verb or adjective suffix -lkka</td>
<td>POTA [poco hyengyongsa]: 1. denotes supposition, followed by the suffix -nka, -nunka, -unka, -lkka, or -ulkka 2. denotes (speaker’s) will, intention followed by the suffix -lkka or -ulkka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.3. Senses of the Epistemic Modal Affix in Korean Dictionaries**

Noteworthy in the above definitions in relation to the form of this epistemic modal affix are two different types of connective morphemes, as in –nkapwa and –lkkapwa. The two connective morphemes denote different pragmatic functions; that is, the pair -lkka or -ulkka denote a sense related to future possibility; on the other hand, -nka or -nunka
denote a sense related to the speaker’s certainty (He 1989, 1995). In this sense, both morphemes present characteristics of epistemic modality. Thus, fusion between these connective morphemes evincing epistemic modality and the epistemic modal affix –pwa follows the principle of semantic relevance as a factor in fusion (Hopper and Traugott 1991).

5.3.1.2 Uses

Heine et al. (1991: 201) note that “one of the most common channels of conceptual transfer leads from visual perception to causal interpretation,” involving roughly the following stages:

I. Visual perception e.g., X sees Y and does Z
II. Intellectual perception e.g., X understands Y and does Z
III. Cause/Reason e.g., Because of Y, X does Z

This observation applies to the function of the epistemic modal affix that is derived from the perceptual visual verb pota ‘see/look at.’ Through assessing and reasoning over discourse situations that occur either prior to or after the epistemic modal affix, the speaker can be drawn to a conclusion with a strong degree of commitment and certainty regarding the truth-value of the proposition. In other words, the speaker justifies her conclusive acts or states by assessing and reasoning over the discourse situation at hand. The following example from an urban-based contemporary drama¹ illustrates this process:

¹ Ikey salangiya ‘This is love.’
'So, why didn’t you wake me up? You by yourself got up and went out to exercise.' (with an annoyed tone while looking at B unpleasantly)

‘(I) didn’t wake you up, because you slept very late and you might have been tired if I woke you up.’

The above occurs between a wife (Y) and husband (K). The wife (Y) has been scolded by her mother-in-law for not preparing breakfast for the family. She then complains to her husband with an argumentative tone, pointing out that he should have woken her up earlier when he arose. In response, the husband justifies his action by presenting the reasoning he used in assessing the situation: his wife went to bed very late and he thought with confidence his wife would have been tired if she got up early. Thus, he did not wake her when he himself got up earlier that morning.

It is clear from the above description that use of the epistemic modal affix is concerned with the speaker’s subjective certainty and strong commitment regarding the propositional truth value of the particular utterance, derived from assessing and reasoning over the discourse situation. This reasoning process can be represented as follows:

Presenting justification ——> -lkkapwa (certainty) ——> Conclusion (act/state)
The ordering shown above can be reversed. In other words, the presenting conclusive acts can be preceded by the modal affix -lkkapwa, as the example below illustrates:

(7) Amwulayto hakwenul tanye ya halkkapwa, hanato moluyeysney.

'I should go to a private computer institute because I don’t know anything about it.'

In (7), the conclusive state is followed by the bold-typed modal affix -lkkapwa denoting certainty of the future act of enrolling in the private computer institution; the justification then follows. The following illustrates this reasoning process:

Conclusive state → -lkkapwa (certainty) → Presenting justification

In this sense, it is clear that the epistemic modal affix -lkkapwa can occur either before or after the speaker’s evaluation and assessment of the situation. Put another way, the presenting validation of the speaker’s assessment leading to the conclusive acts or states can be either inductive or deductive, as Sweetser pointed out (1990).

In all of the above illustrations, ellipsis of the conclusion or presenting justification is possible. Without uttering the conclusive act, the addressee can accurately predict the conclusive acts or states, since the speaker’s assessment is preceded by the modal marker -lkkapwa denoting the speaker’s certainty and strong degree of commitment about what is being talked about. Thus, the epistemic modal affix -lkkapwa
strengthens the speaker's evaluative ground and subjectivized argumentative supposition or commitment, based on assessment of the discourse situation. As well, this modal affix delivers the speaker's epistemic certainty or commitment of the discourse situation to the addressee.

Thus, this epistemic modal affix can occur with an argumentative tone owing to its function of indicating a strong degree of certainty on the part of the speaker. The following illustration from an urban-based drama² clearly shows this aspect:

(8) Daughter (with strong and determined voice) ce Hanpi amwuteyto mos ponayyo.
... halmeni cipey mathkye nohwu mam nohwu kapocitwu moshakwuyo.
myethpensik appahanthey malssum tulikwu cipulwu teylye okwu siphessciman
appa chwungkyek patusiikkapwa chamkwu tto chamkwu onuleyseyaka kathi isskey
toyneeyyo.

'I'll not send Hanpi (her son) anywhere. ... After returning from the U.S. with Hanpi, (I) let Grandmother take care of (Hanpi) at her place and I couldn't go over to Grandma's home to see him. I wanted to bring him to our place after talking to you about my son but I've been enduring not to do so because it might shock you. So after long suffering, we (speaker and her son) finally got together.'

The above situation involves a father and daughter. The daughter as a single mother brought her son from the U.S. without informing her parents and decided to let her son stay at her grandmother's house until she could talk to her father. Her father then

² Ikey salangiya ‘This is love.’
happened to learn about the situation and brought his daughter’s son to his house. However, the father has told his daughter that he could not accept her son. To this, she as a single mother strongly argues that she will not send her son anywhere. Through employing the epistemic modal marker, she presents her reasoning regarding why she had her son stay at her grandmother’s place when she returned from the U.S.: Even though she wanted to bring her child home, she worried that this might have shocked her father. Thus, she decided to endure the suffering of not seeing her son.

The principal drawback of definitions of the epistemic modal affix -ikkapwa that are listed in contemporary dictionaries (Figure 5.3) is that the definitions, i.e., supposition and speaker’s intention, do not capture the aspects of the speaker’s subjective certainty and strong degree of commitment regarding the propositional truth value based on an assessment of the discourse situation. It can be seen that the epistemic modal affix strengthens the speaker’s argumentative ground, as in the above illustration (8).

Let me now illustrate a variant form of the epistemic modal affix: -napwa or -nkapwuta. The following from an urban-based contemporary drama ⁴ occurs after the speaker tastes some food:

(9) U  (To her daughter) Kipemi emenika umsik somssika cohusinkapwuta. ACWU masisskey toyssse. (To her daughter) ‘Kipem’s mother must be very good at cooking. (Because) It’s very delicious.’

---

³ *Ikey salangiya* ‘This is love.’
Speaking to her own daughter, (U) compliments the cooking skills of Kipem’s mother. In this context, the mental assessment leading to the speaker’s conclusive compliment derives from the direct experience of tasting food. Like the form -lkkapwa, -nkapwuta denotes the speaker’s strong commitment concerning what is being talked about. In other words, the epistemic modal marker anchors the speaker’s certainty regarding her judgment. Following this utterance, the speaker also presents justification of her compliment by pointing out that the food is delicious. The causal relationship of this structure can be illustrated in the following way:

Conclusion/evaluation \(\rightarrow\) -nkapwuta \(\rightarrow\) Justification/presenting reason

As in the preceding example (9), justification through presenting reason can be omitted without causing difficulty in the addressee’s mental processing (in this case, decoding the speaker’s conclusive assessment of the cooking skill of Kipem’s mother.) This is owing to use of the epistemic modal marker -nkapwuta, denoting the speaker’s certainty about the proposition.

Heine et al. (1991: 194-196) present a very interesting phenomenon in the African language Ewe that is related to the pragmatic functions of the Korean perceptual verb:

Ewe uses the verb kpo ‘see’ in order to express counterexpectation. The verb has the function of expressing strong doubt. … It is used to present counterexpectative assertions and, when employed in questions, to express DOUBT.

Employment in Ewe of the pragmatic function of kpo is similar to the epistemic modal affix -lkkapwa when it is used in rhetorical questions. This can be seen in the example
below from an urban-based drama, in which counterexpectative assertions are coupled with the speaker’s doubt, encoded by the epistemic modal affix –lkkapwa, which is analogous to kpo in Ewe:

(10) T (Showing her concern) kuntey onul eti kalkkeeyyo?
    (Showing her concern) ‘by the way, where are you going to go today?’
S EYHYU kaltey epsulkkapwa? (rhetorical question with rising tone)
    ‘Are you concerned because you think I don’t have any place to go?’
T Tangsin kwaynhi chuwunxey pakkulo tolatanici malayyo. i kihoyey caychwungcen hantakwu sayngkakhakwu tangsin cohahanun chaykto sa pokwu, yenkuk kathun kestwu pokwu kulayyo.
    ‘Please don’t go out because it is cold. Take advantage of not having a job and read books and go to theater.’

In these rhetorical questions, the epistemic modal marker -lkkapwa in the response of (S) denotes a counterexpectative or unexpected assertion; that is, instead of denoting the meaning there is no place to go, do not worry since there are many places to go. In the addressee’s response to speaker (S) can be seen the counterexpectative assertion coupled with a strong degree of certainty.

The following from an urban-based drama illustrates a speaker’s (P) argumentative assertion.

4 Ikey salangiya ‘This is love.’
5 Ikey salangiya ‘This is love.’
(11) [P, K: 1-4]

1. P  (While trying to sit) Enni. Hwunswuki wayo?  
(While trying to sit) 'Sister. Is Hwunswuk coming?'

2. K  =Ney.  
'That's right.'

3. P  SEYSANGEY, seysangey kulehkey cohen sosikul eccem nahantheyn  
iptwu kkwumceek anhawu? nayka almyen konghangeyse Hwunswuki  
napchilatwu halkkapwa kulayyo? (rhetorical question)  
'Oh my goodness why didn’t you tell me such good news? (Because) Do  
you think if I knew I could kidnap Hunsuk at the airport?' (rhetorical  
question)

4. K  Komotwu cham echaphi omyen altheyntey mwel kulayyo.  
'You don’t have to be hurt/angry since you’ll know when (Hwunswuk)  
arrives.'

This conversation occurs between sisters-in-law. Sister-in-law (P) has heard that,  
unexpectedly, her niece will arrive in Korea from the USA. In the third line, (P)  
complains with an argumentative tone to her sister-in-law about this lack of notice  
through employment of a rhetorical question. As in the illustration in (10), the epistemic  
modal marker in rhetorical questions denotes the speaker’s strong certainty of  
counterexpectation. In the above illustration, (P) patently does not have any intention to  
kidnap her niece and speaker (K) obviously knows this.
In summary, the principal pragmatic function of the epistemic modal marker is manifestation of the speaker's certainty of the truth-value of the proposition derived through an assessment of the discourse situation.

5.3.2 Pragmatic Marker *(ke)pwa* 'you see'

In contemporary Korean, the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa* 'you see' is also derived from the perceptual visual verb *pota*. Contrary to the epistemic modal affix, which is a bound form, the pragmatic marker has distributional privileges and can thus appear as a free form at the beginning of the utterance.

In this section, I will examine the functions of the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa* in comparison with those of the epistemic modal affix –*lkkapwa* or –*nkapwa*.

5.3.2.1 Forms

Let me begin by illustrating definitional senses of the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa* culled from contemporary dictionaries. The sense of the pragmatic marker is translated into English for the purpose of this dissertation:
1. 1958. *Kwuke say sacen*
KE-PWALA [Interjection]. Expression of saying to inferior when the speaker’s claim became true. (e.g., See, I told you so.)

2. 1972. *Phyocwun say kwuke sacen*
KE-PWALA [Interjection]. Expression of saying to inferior when the speaker’s claim became true. (e.g., See, I told you so.)

3. 1997. *Han kwuke sacen*
KE-PWALA [Interjection]. Expression of saying to inferior when the speaker’s claim became true. (e.g., See, I told you so.)

Figure 5.4. Senses of the Pragmatic Marker *ke-pwala* ‘you see’ in Korean Dictionaries

Interestingly, there is no change in the definition and form of the pragmatic marker in three dictionaries covering an approximately forty-year time interval. However, the above definitional sense and form of the pragmatic marker does not capture the entire gamut of contemporary usage or form. That is, the above definitional sense of the pragmatic marker has the potential to mislead regarding the pragmatic function of the marker, since the function of “expression of saying to inferior …” has nothing to do with the pragmatic marker but does have something to do with the interactional particle –a/e la. As with other pragmatic markers such as *ceki*, the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa* can be employed across gender, power, and age gradients when agglutinated with interactional particles, such as the politeness marker –yo in the case of asymmetrical power relationships.

In other words, contrary to the above definitional sense, the pragmatic marker can be utilized by a younger/inferior individual to an older/superior individual, as shown in the following illustration from an urban-based drama: 6

---

6 *Ikey salangiya* ‘This is love.’
This conversation occurs among family members. (K), the younger brother, gives a hint to his mother (C) and sister-in-law (T) that his brother (CU) has a girlfriend. Initially, (CU) denies this assertion while scolding his younger brother (K) about his hint. After listening to his mother’s suggestion that he invite his girlfriend home, (CU) demurs by indicating that their relationship is only at the beginning stage. To this, T (sister-in-law) comments that it is certain (CU) has a girlfriend. Upon hearing this, (K) strengthens his argumentative point that his brother has a girlfriend by employing the pragmatic
marker, which serves to express epistemic certainty. In this illustration, the youngest (K) employs the pragmatic marker to elders, contrary to the cited dictionary definitions.

As well, contrary to the dictionary form as shown in Figure 5.3, pwa can function as a pragmatic marker by itself, as shown the following illustration from an urban-based contemporary drama: 7

(13) (K [wife] is driving; P [husband] is sitting next to her.)

P Cha Ceng-nami manhi nulkessney.
‘Cha Ceng-nam got (appeared) old a lot.’

K Kulekeyyo. tangsinpota yelsalun te tule poyeyo.
‘That’s right. He looks ten years older than you.’

P **Pwa**, tangsin na cal capassci?
‘**Pwa**, you are lucky for choosing me at that time, right?’

(A [wife] looks at B [her husband] and smiles.)

After meeting a mutual friend for the first time in several years, the couple talk about him while driving home. The friend and (K) liked each other at one time but (K) eventually chose (P) to be her husband. (P) comments about the friend’s appearance by saying that he got (appeared) old to a great extent. To this, (K) agrees by commenting that their mutual friend looks much older than does her husband. (P) responds to his wife by employing the pragmatic marker **pwa** ‘you see,’ appending a rhetorical question signifying that ‘you are lucky for choosing me at that time.’

7 *Ikey salangiya* ‘This is love.’
Illustrations (12) and (13) clearly delineate some limitations in the entries of the pragmatic marker (ke)pwa ‘you see’ in the dictionaries cited in Figure 5-3, especially in relation to the form of the pragmatic marker. The dictionaries provide a very cursory definition of the pragmatic marker as an “expression (of saying to inferior) when the speaker’s claim became true.” In the following section, I will examine the functions of the pragmatic marker in comparison with the epistemic modal affix.

5.3.2.2 Interconnection between Pragmatic Marker (ke)pwa and Epistemic Modal Affix –lkkapwa

The principal function of the pragmatic marker (ke)pwa ‘you see’ is to convey the speaker’s epistemic certainty. In this sense, it is very much similar to the epistemic modal marker –lkkapwa. This pragmatic marker can be differentiated by a degree of subjective certainty that is stronger than that of the epistemic modal marker -lkkapwa. In fact, owing to such strong subjective certainty, the pragmatic marker (ke)pwa can only be employed by familiars and intimates whose relationship is based on common ground. However, the epistemic modal affix does not hold to such a restriction in usage.

Let me refer again to the situation illustrated in example (13). Owing to common experiences, the participants in (13) can develop communication: (A) and (B) have not met their mutual friend for several years; (A) got on well with him before marrying (B). In the speech context of this scene, there is no indication of this information. In this sense, expression of the speaker’s certainty concerning the truth value of the proposition of the following statement “you are lucky for choosing me at that time instead of him” is premised on intimate common ground attained through life experience. The degree of
abstract reasoning involved in the mental processing leading to the speaker’s conclusive states or acts is larger than the degree of influence of the epistemic modal marker.

Thus, there is a tripartite differentiation between the pragmatic marker *pwa* ‘you see’ and the epistemic modal marker. First, as pointed out earlier, *pwa* has distributional privileges that the epistemic modal marker does not have; i.e., free form vs. bound form. Second, as a pragmatic marker, only the fused form is allowed. In other words, as shown in the above section, as an epistemic modal marker there are several co-existent variants, such as -na *pwuta*, -lkkapwa, -nkapwa, etc. The forms -na#pwuta and -lkka#pwuta have not undergone fusion of the two morphemes (indicated by the morpheme boundary mark #). It is safe to say, then, that the fused form *pwa* underwent further development as a pragmatic marker. I will develop this aspect further in the following chapter.

Lastly, the degree of certainty and abstractness regarding reasoning, and assessment toward such certainty, is deeper than that of the epistemic modal marker. In other words, the degree of epistemic perception derived from physical perception for the pragmatic marker *pwa* ‘you see’ extends further than that of the epistemic modal marker. This accounts for the fact that *pwa* can be employed without causing difficulty for the addressee in processing and understanding the speaker’s certain viewpoint even when there is seemingly no substantive provision for decoding what the speaker is talking about, as in (13).

As pointed out in the above section, the epistemic modal marker is used with proximate justification or reasoning regarding the discourse context for the speaker’s following acts or states.

Let me refer again to the examples presented earlier:
Y Kulekey ilccik ilenassumyen kkaywuci, caki honcaman ssok wuntonghale naka kacikwu.

‘So, why didn’t you wake me up? You by yourself got up and went out to exercise.’ (with annoyed voice while looking at B unpleasantly)

K Saypyek ta toyseya cassunikka phikonhaalkapwa an kkaywessci.

‘(I) didn’t wake you up because you slept very late and you might have been tired if I woke you up.’

Presenting justification ——> -lkka pwa (certainty) ——> Conclusion (act)

The justification (because you slept very late you might be tired if I woke you up) is provided adjacent to the epistemic modal marker. The following illustration also presents reasoning and justification regarding the speaker’ epistemic certainty, again adjacent to the epistemic modal marker -nkapwuta.

(15) (To her daughter) Kipemi emenika umsik somssika cohusinkapwuta. ACWU masisskey toyse.

(To her daughter) ‘Kipem’s mother must be very good at cooking. (Because) It’s very delicious.’

Conclusion/evaluation ——> -nkapwuta ——> Justification/presenting reason
The immediate provision of logical justification and reasoning for the speaker’s assessment of the surrounding discourse context contributes to an unburdening of the decoding on the part of the addressee. Owing to this characteristic, the social relationships among participants of a given speech event in which the epistemic modal marker occurs, as in the above illustrations, do not necessarily entail common ground of knowledge and experiences.

However, concerning usage of the pragmatic marker *pwa* ‘you see,’ as illustrated in (13), in order to understand the speaker’s viewpoint the addressee has to stretch into remote memory as well as the surrounding discourse context. The social relationships of the participants of the speech event in which *pwa* appears are based on the common ground of experiences and knowledge. As much as the speaker’s viewpoint is stronger regarding the certainty of the truth value of the proposition, for the addressee the burden of intellectual processing for understanding the speaker’s claim is heavier vis-à-vis the epistemic modal marker in that it may require the addressee to probe for unprovided information in a given speech context.

Brinton (2001:180) points out that the English pragmatic marker *look*, which is similar to the Korean *pwa*, represents interpersonal meaning in the following way:

... ‘pay attention,’ ‘heed me,’ or ‘listen up.’ It functions as an appeal to the listener to pay attention to (‘listen carefully to me when I say ...’), accept the premise of (‘believe me when I say ...’), or perform the action requested in the following proposition. It expresses epistemic certainty and strengthens the argumentative position of the speaker, thus operating both on a scale of epistemic commitment and on a scale of rhetorical strength.
Brinton's analysis of the pragmatic functions of *look* is analogous to the functions of the pragmatic marker *pwa*, especially in epistemic commitment of the propositional truth value on the part of the speaker, based on a strengthened point of view.

Let me present another use of the pragmatic marker that illustrates the above. The following illustration is from an urban-based drama: 8

(16) [A, B, H: 1-6]

1 A WUWA cangmikkochiney!

‘Wow, it’s rose.’

Kkochsongi hanpen thamsulepkwu cohta.

‘It’s so beautiful.’

2 B Nan nwukwuhanthey kkochkathun ke ponay pon cektwu epskwu patapon cektwu epstanmaliya.

‘I don’t have experience either to send flowers to others or receive from others.’

3 A Kulenikka samonimhanthey maynnal kulkhisicyo.

‘That’s why you’re all the time hearing complaints from your wife.’

Namcan (pointing out flowers) ilen masi isseya yecatuli cohahantanikkayo.

(Pointing out flowers) ‘Women like when men have such manners.’

4 B Namcaka ponaysstan CUNGKE isse?

‘Do you have any evidence that a man sent the flowers?’

5 H (picking a card from the flowers designed in the form of a heart)

8 *Ikey salangiya* ‘This is love.’
This speech event occurs inside an office among colleagues who are very close to each other through years-long work experience. When (H) receives a flower delivery, (A) compliments her about the flower; (B), a married male, shares his lack of experience in sending or receiving flowers. To this, (A) points out the reason (B) is so often hearing complaints from his wife and adds, while pointing out the flowers, that women like when men have the manner of sending flowers. To this, (B) asks with an argumentative voice whether there is any evidence that a man sent the flowers. At this point, (H) picks a card from the flowers that is designed in the form of a heart.

As soon as (A) sees the card, she employs the pragmatic marker *pwayo* ‘you see’ to her colleague (B) with a reassuring, somewhat triumphant, voice. In this example, the pragmatic marker evinces the speaker’s epistemic certainty and strengthened argumentative position, as put forth by Brinton (2001). In other words, during the course of this dialogue, (A) consolidates her strong point of view regarding the impact of flowers on the relationship between spouses. In the 5th line when (A) sees the card that can support her argumentative ground, in the next line (6th) (A) exclaims with the pragmatic marker *pwayo*, signifying ‘believe me when I say …’ coupled with a confirmation of what was just said.

The epistemic certainty signified by *(ke)pwa* is analogous to the English pragmatic marker *you see*. Erman (1987) cites *you see* as a pragmatic expression (PE) in
a class with others such as *you know* and *I mean*, and compares the functional differences between *you see* and *you know* in the following way:

... the discourse surrounding *you see* as a connective element is more argumentative (the PE is frequently preceded by booster) than that of *you know*; the speaker when using *you see* seems to try to make the addressee accept her/his ideas and explanations more overtly... (p. 118)

In parallel with Heine et al. (1991: 201), Erman (1987:82-83) also points out the causal relationships between propositions in which *you see* occurs. Such causal relationships between propositions can be illustrated with the covert semantic link:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative order</th>
<th>Covert causal link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. C (cause) - R (result)</td>
<td>which means/this is why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. R – C</td>
<td>this is so because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. R – C</td>
<td>I claim this because</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning typing of the covert semantic links “this is why” and “this is so because” in (1) and (2) above, Erman (1987: 90) explicates the differences from the type “I claim this because” in the following way:

... when the covert semantic links ‘this is why’ and ‘this is so because’ are implied the propositions are more closely related to one another and also mutually more dependent than when the semantic link ‘I claim this because’ apply. The closeness of the logical relation between two propositions in the former case may be explained by the fact that they permit reversal; this is not possible in connection with ‘claim/assertion + justification’ without considerable rephrasing ...
semantic link of the epistemic modal marker –lkkapwa in that the propositions between justification and conclusive acts or states are both adjacent and closely related. Let me refer again to the example:

(17) (To her daughter) Kipemi emenika umsik somssika cohusinkapwuta. ACWU masisskey toysse.

(To her daughter) ‘Kipem’s mother must be very good at cooking. (Because) It’s very delicious.’

Conclusion/Evaluation \[\rightarrow\] -nkapwuta \[\rightarrow\] Presenting Reason

Conforming to Erman (1987), the dependent relationship between the two propositions allows them to be reversed, as shown below:

(18) (To her daughter) Acwu masisskey toysse. Kipemi emenika umsik somssika cohusinkapwuta.

(To her daughter) ‘It’s very delicious. Kipem’s mother must be very good at cooking.’

Presenting Reason \[\rightarrow\] -nkapwuta \[\rightarrow\] Conclusion/Evaluation

The pragmatic marker (ke)pwa is of the covert semantic link type ‘I assure/confirm what I said.’ Instead of introducing justification for the claim, as in the case of the English pragmatic marker you see in the type of covert semantic link ‘I claim
this because,' *(ke)pwa* functions as a confirmation/assurance of the speaker’s point of view. That is, *(ke)pwa* is employed when the speaker comes upon evidence that serves to confirm and assure her claim, as in (13) and (16). Thus, the use of this pragmatic marker signifies that the speaker’s epistemic certainty regarding a proposition, claim, or point of view has been strengthened and/or confirmed.

In summary, the pragmatic marker *(ke)* pwa ‘you see’ and the epistemic modal marker –lkkapwa are to a large degree juxtaposed in function vis-à-vis the establishment of epistemic certainty regarding the speaker’s personal stance on the truth value of a proposition. However, these markers behave in a disparate manner as a function of the reasoning process used to establish epistemic certainty. That is, epistemic certainty can be derived both inductively as well as deductively in the case of the modal marker –lkkapwa. However, in the case of the pragmatic marker ke(pwa) the speaker’s certainty is produced solely by way of deduction after presentation of all justifications for the speaker’s claim. The principal difference between the two functional elements is that the pragmatic marker presents a much stronger degree of epistemic certainty than does the modal marker, manifesting in an increased sense of assurance and confirmation on the part of the speaker.

5.3.3 Attention-Getters

Across languages, perceptual verbs serve to gain attention from the alter (Keller and Warner 1979, Stenstrom 1995, Trillo 1997). In Korean, the perceptual verb *pota* likewise functions as an attention-getting marker as well as a component of address form through coalescence with the proximal deictic elements *i* ‘this,’ *ipwa* ‘hey/look,’ and
yepo ‘honey’ (J.R. Park 2002). It should be noted that as one of the sources for a wide variety of abstract and functional elements, deixis has been well studied as a force behind functional change (Fuchs 1993; Perkins 1992: 92; Diessel 1999: 115).

Address forms function to encode social distance, to open discourse, to signal turn-yielding/holding, and to express the speaker’s subjective attitude. In this section, I will determine complementary functions of the Korean address form and attention-getters that are derived from the perceptual visual verb pota and the deictic elements enumerated below. I will examine functional change from the original source meanings in the following chapter. In this section, analysis focuses on the dimensions of social and psychological distance in informal social contexts.

The following is an analysis of the morphemes of attention-getters (ipwa(yo) and ceki(yo) and address form yepo:

- **ipwa(yo)** ‘hey/look’ [i ‘this’: proximal deictic element, po-: perceptual visual verb stem ‘look at,’ -a: imperative ending, -yo: polite interactional particle]
- **yepo** ‘honey’ [yeki ‘here’= (i ‘this’: proximal deictic element, -eki: spatial defective noun), po-: perceptual visual verb stem ‘look at’ -o: blunt imperative ending]
- **ceki(yo)** ‘hello’ [ce-‘that’: distal deictic element, -eki: spatial defective noun, -yo: polite interactional particle]

In the following section, I will examine the contemporary functions of the attention-getter ipwa and address form yepo. After this, the attention-getter ceki, derived from the distal deictic element, will be discussed while comparing its functions with those of the attention-getter ipwa and address form yepo.
5.3.3.1 Speaker-Oriented Attention-Getter *ipwa* ‘hey/look’ and Address Form *yepo* ‘honey’

5.3.3.1.1 Cross-Linguistic Perspective

The address forms enumerated above are composed of the following deictic elements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1. Korean Deictic System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deictic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ‘this’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku ‘that’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce ‘that’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proximal deictic element *i* is speaker-oriented; i.e., it is employed to point out a referent close to the speaker. In this sense, it is directly tied to the speaker’s psychological perception. On the other hand, the distal deictic element *ce* is neutral in orientation in that it is used to refer to a referent that is distant from both speaker and hearer. The attention-getter *ipwa* and address form *yepo* are the result of the coalescence of the perceptual verb *pota* and the proximal deictic element *i* ‘this.’ I will examine this coalescence process in the following chapter.

Keller and Warner (1979: 8) describe *look, lookit, you see* and *listen*, all of which are derived from visual and auditory perception verbs, as casual attention-getting openers. Stenstrom (1994: 39-40, 74) classifies both *look* and *listen* as principal elements of the communicative act of “alert” that function to attract the other party’s attention. Fraser (1988: 27-28) classifies *look, listen, see,* and *here* as topic markers that function to refocus the topic. It is interesting that in Fraser’s inventory of attention-getting markers, the proximal deictic element *here* is included.
Trillo (1997) presents pragmatic mechanisms used for attention-getting while comparing English perceptual verbs such as *look* and *listen* and similar Spanish verbs such as *mirar*, *fijarse*, *oir*, and *escuchar*. Spanish perceptual verbs can be categorized into two classes: auditory perception (*oir* ‘hear’ and *escuchar* ‘listen’) and sight perception (*mirar* ‘look’ and *ver* ‘see’). (Interestingly, the Korean auditory verb *tuta* ‘listen’ does not serve as a mechanism for attention-getting.) By employing Hopper and Traugott’s (1993) theoretical framework, Trillo argues that the Spanish sight perceptual continuative (pragmatic marker) *mirar* is productively used as an attention-getting element instead of the auditory perception verbs *oir* and *escuchar*. In Spanish, the frequency of use of these attention-getting elements is quite high, with the usage of the inflected *mira* ‘look’ being significantly higher than that of the two auditory-based verbs (p. 218).

According to Trillo’s study (1997), in English *look* is principally employed (16.9%) in pragmatic functions, significantly outpacing the similar use of *listen* (0.7%). Spanish overall makes more use of the perceptual visual elements than does English. Trillo (1997: 220-221) hypothesizes that English is a more prosody-oriented language and as such is able to focus the attention of the addressee onto the most important pieces of information by means of tonality features, whereas Spanish needs lexical expressions to highlight the most relevant information.

The greater frequency of use of *look* in English, *mirar* in Spanish, and *ipwa* and *yepo* in Korean suggests that verbs of visual capacity fulfill an important pragmatic role in the process of speaking. Verbs signifying visual actions would seem to be better suited to securing attention than verbs signifying auditory activities.
5.3.3.1.2 Synchronic Functions

H.S. Kim (1990) presents a list of address forms used between spouses culled from interviews of Korean family members. In this list, Kim (1990: 179) includes attention-getters and address forms that are composed of the visual perceptual verb pota and the proximal deictic element i ‘this.’ According to Kim, “some husbands and wives draw attention of their spouses by uttering look ... examples: ye ‘here,’ yepoa ‘look here,’ ipola ‘look here’ in an imperative way.” Sohn (1999: 212) points out the use of ipwa as an ‘intimate’ address form.

Owing to the element of directness derived from components that serve to command direct visual attention (i.e., the proximal deictic element i ‘this,’ the perceptual visual verb stem po-‘see,’ and the half-talk imperative ending form -a), ipwa can be utilized between intimates such as a married couple, siblings, close friends, colleagues, etc., whose relationships are based on a certain degree of common life experiences, as shown the following illustrations from an urban-based drama:9

(Husband (C) is entering a kitchen in which his wife (CE) is cleaning dishes).

(19)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>Ipwa?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Hey/look?’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CE</th>
<th>(While cleaning kitchen) ney?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Yes?’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Ikey salangiya ‘This is love.’
By employing the attention-getter *ipwa* ‘hey/look,’ the husband (C) in (19), and the supervisor (A) in (20) are able to smoothly open discourse and begin interaction with wife and colleagues, respectively.

Owing to the aforementioned characteristics of directness, the usage of *ipwa* has a connotation of rudeness and expression of anger. Consequently, this form is also observed in confrontational speech events such as fighting and arguments between unfamiliars, as illustrated below:

(20) A  *Ipwa*. kutongan hakswu kotayhaten wuli thim censa wasse!

‘*Hey*. The new employee we’ve so badly been looking forward to meeting came today!’

H  Anyenghaseyyo?

‘How do you do?’

The above speech events occur between spouses in (19) and among colleagues in (20).

(21) A.  *Ipwa*? (speech event: argument)

‘*Hey*?’

B  (Ne/tangsin) nwukwu-poko *ipwa ipwa* hanun keya.

(you) who-DAT *hey hey* say

‘To whom are you saying *hey hey*,’
Thus, depending on the speech context and the attitudes of the interlocutors, \textit{ipwa} can denote diametrically opposite social meanings between interlocutors; i.e., intimacy/solidarity vs. rudeness/tension.

This duality of usage is very similar to that of the English usage of \textit{look}, as Brinton (2001: 180) points out while quoting a discussion of \textit{lookit} on the American Dialect Society (ADS) on-line news group. A \textit{New York Times Magazine} (1999) language column written by William Safire also addresses this issue:

\begin{quote}
... there is an exasperated or even aggressive tone to \textit{look (it)}. This subjective/expressive aspect can be seen in the dictionary definitions, such as those of the \textit{COD} (Canadian Oxford Dictionary) which point to the \textit{look} forms demanding rather than merely asking for, attention.
\end{quote}

Keller and Warner also observed that \textit{look} has the sense of 'fighting back' (1979: 24).

Let me now turn to another address form that is derived from the visual perceptual verb \textit{pota} and the proximal deictic element \textit{i}. In contemporary Korean, the address form \textit{yepo} 'honey,' which is composed of \textit{yeki} 'here' (can be reanalyzed into the proximal deictic element \textit{i} 'this' and the spatial defective noun \textit{eki}), the perceptual visual verb stem \textit{po-} 'look at,' and the imperative ending \textit{–0}, is mostly employed between spouses. However, in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century \textit{yepo} was also employed to address strangers (22a) as well as spouses (22b), as shown below:

\begin{itemize}
\item[(22a)] To a stranger (1906 \textit{Hyel uy nwu})

\begin{quote}
\textit{Yepo} mal com mwule popsita. ce cipi Kim Chosi cipiyo?

\textit{Excuse me}, I'd like to ask you some directions. Is that the house of Kim Chosi?
\end{quote}
\end{itemize}
To husband (1908 *Kwi uy seng*)

**Yepo,** Chimmokkaci thami nana pokwulye. hanalul taylyeoteni tto hana te twuko siphunka pokwulye.

‘*Honey,* it seems you want to have Chimmo. Since you brought a woman to our home, it seems you want to have another one.’

In a Korean dictionary published mid-twentieth century, the deference form of *yepo,* i.e., *yeposio,* is listed as an acceptable address form for strangers, as can be seen in the excerpt below. Note that the address form *yepo* is listed as plain form of *yeposio* without indicating any functional difference from the deference form (translation into English is by the author for the purpose of this dissertation):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YePO [Interjection] lower word (plain form) of YEPOSIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YEPOSIO [Interjection] address form that is employed to address a friend or a stranger with respect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5.5. 1958 Kwuke Tay Sacen*

However, actual usage of this form had changed by the late 20th century. It is listed solely as term of endearment in a dictionary published in 1972:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YePO [interjection] endearment term that is employed between couples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YEPOSIO [interjection] address term for strangers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5.6. 1972 Phyocwun Say Kwuke Sacen*

The deference form of *yeposio* is reserved for addressing strangers, as indicated. However, in contemporary Korean actual usage has progressed even further so that even this deference form is obsolescent, usage being limited to the oldest generation. In contemporary Korean, then, *yepo ‘honey’* is employed exclusively between couples. It is
my view that function as an address term for strangers was lost owing to the emergence of the attention-getter ceki ‘excuse me/hello’ that appeared early in the 20th century and was firmly established by the middle of the century, according to my data.

5.3.3.2 Contrastive Functions: ceki(yo) ‘excuse me/hello’

As pointed out earlier, while the proximal deictic element i is speaker-oriented, the distal deictic element ce, from which the attention-getter ceki is derived through coalescence with the spatial defective noun eki, is neutral in orientation in that it is used for a referent that is distant from both speaker and hearer. This characteristic underlies the contemporary function of the attention-getter of ceki.

Let me refer again to the example of the attention-getter ceki that I introduced earlier in Chapter 3 (number 8). The following usage excerpt illustrates a relationship in the initiation stage, as of strangers.

(23) [C, Y: 1-5]

1. C Cekiyo? …
   ‘Cekiyo? …’
2. Y (Turns around)
3. C (Walks toward Y with curiosity)
4. Y (Looks at C)
5. C Wuli encey manaci anhasseyo?
   ‘We have met, haven’t we?’
Participants (C) and (Y) have met each other in a parking lot when (C) gets out of her car at the same time that (Y) is getting into her car. When they cross each other, (C) attempts to call (Y) by employing *cekiyo*.

The distal deictic element *ce* is neutral regarding physical/spatial distance, since it is employed to designate a person or thing distant from both speaker and hearer and thus out of the territory of both. This inherent property of neutrality and vagueness held by the distal deictic form made it ideal as a source concept for an attention-getter that is utilized by strangers whose relationships are based on certain degrees of social distance.

The prevalent utilization of *ceki* to open discourse among familiars, especially in service-oriented public settings such as department stores, restaurants, airports, etc., suggests its strategic usage as an expression of the speaker’s indirect stance, owing to a neutral and vague semantic characteristic that is extended from the distal deictic element *ce*. In the following chapter, I will examine the emergence and functional shifts of the address forms *ipwa, yepo*, and *ceki*.

### 5.4 Conclusion

In summary, the perceptual visual verb *pota* ‘see/look at’ contributes to the encoding of diverse and complex grammatical and pragmatic functions in contemporary Korean. The conceptual and grammatical network diagrammed in Fig. 5.2 (Grammatical and Functional Network of the Verb *pota* ‘see/look at’) clearly illustrates the capacity of this lexical verb. As shown in the Ewe *kpo*, the Spanish *mira*, and the English *look* and *you see*, the perceptual visual verb shows interesting common characteristics across languages regarding complicated functional diversity.
In this chapter, I examined pragmatic categories that are derived from the perceptual visual verb *pota*, such as the epistemic modal affix *-lkapwa*, the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa*, and the attention-getter *ceki* that show complementary functions in their manifestation as the attention-getter *ipwa* and address form *yepo*. In the process of examining these elements, I referred to definitions listed in contemporary Korean dictionaries covering a forty-year interval, comparing the definitions with the usage of these pragmatic categories in my data. The limitations of the dictionary definitions regarding lack of correspondence to actual usage in each functional category were made clear.

After examining the epistemic modal affix *-lkapwa* and its variant forms in section (5.3.1) and the characteristics of the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa* in (5.3.2.1), I dealt in depth with the interconnection between the two functional elements in section (5.3.2.2). The major commonality between the two is expression of the speaker’s epistemic certainty regarding the truth-value of the proposition.

The principal difference between the two can be found in the reasoning process used to arrive at such epistemic certainty. Specifically, in the case of the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa*, epistemic certainty is derived from a deductive reasoning process based on justification that is presented in the immediate discourse, as in illustration (16), as well as in abstract conceptual mental space, as in illustration (13). On the other hand, in the case of the epistemic modal marker *-lkapwa*, the speaker’s epistemic certainty can be derived from both inductive as well as deductive modes of reasoning based on justification that is provided in the immediate discourse contexts. The epistemic certainty that the pragmatic marker delivers is in the form of assurance and confirmation. Thus, the
degree of the speaker’s certainty is much stronger with the pragmatic marker than with the epistemic modal marker -lkkapwa.

In addition, the pragmatic marker (ke)pwa has distributional privileges that the epistemic modal marker does not have; i.e., free vs. bound form, respectively. Regarding form, as a pragmatic marker only the phonologically reduced form pwa, a fused form between the verb stem po- and the imperative ending -a is allowed. However, there are variants of the epistemic modal affix such as -na pwuta, -lkkapwa, -nkapwa, etc.

In section (5.3.3), I dealt with the attention-getters ipwa and ceki and the address form yepo based on commonality of their compositional elements: the perceptual visual verb pota and the deictic elements. Owing to the characteristic of directness, dependent on the speech context ipwa can denote opposite social meanings between interlocutors: intimacy/solidarity vs. rudeness/tension. In contemporary Korean, the address form yepo ‘honey’ is employed almost exclusively between couples. The attention-getter ceki ‘hello/excuse me’ presents a complementary function to the address form yepo and attention-getter ipwa in that it is utilized between unfamiliars whose relationship is based on social distance. This is owing to its source characteristic, i.e., the distal deictic element denoting neutrality vis-à-vis the physical distance between the speaker and the addressee.
6.1 Introduction

Heine et al. (1991: 33) argue that source concepts used for grammaticalization refer to some of the most elementary human experiences. They are typically derived from the physical state, behavior, or immediate environment of man and are frequently referred to in human thought and communication. Bybee et al. (1994:10) maintain that it is the reference plane of irreducible notions in human experience—whether they concern existence or movement in space or psychological or social states, perspectives, and events—that serves as the basis for grammatical meaning in human languages.

Perceptual and sensory verbs such as pota 'look/see' are good examples of this representation of the most elementary human experiences. In this sense, they provide solid ground for the development of grammatical markers. The Korean verb pota shows multidirectional grammaticalization owing to its general and elementary semantic sense. Such divergent paths of grammaticalization phenomena are represented in various grammatical elements such as case marker, auxiliary verb, modal marker, pragmatic marker, attention-getter, address form, etc. To see these multiple paths more clearly, let me refer again to the following figure:
The above elements did not emerge arbitrarily. That is, the perceptual visual verb *pota* evinces development along various different clines. Hopper and Traugott (1993: 6) define the concept of cline in the following way: “From the point of view of change, forms do not shift abruptly from one category to another, but go through a series of gradual transitions, transitions that tend to be similar in type across languages.” The perceptual visual verb *pota* developed into a case marker/affix in the nominal domain. According to Yu (1980: 241), as a comparative case marker/affix in the nominal domain, *pota* emerged at the end of the 18th century as a form of *potaka*, as shown below:
(Maynghyelchenchuk 1783)

(1) Nayye palinan kes-i pyengtun kes potaka tewuk kinkuphani.

throw away defective noun-ACC become sick defective noun COM more impend

‘What is being thrown away (burial) is more impending than what is becoming sick.’

According to my data, pokō, a dative case marker/affix, seems to have emerged much later than the comparative case marker, at a point in the early 20th century, as shown below:

(Hyel uy nwu 1906)

(2) A. Ne-to na-poko haylahanun kes-i cohun ilini

you-also me-DAT use half-talk thing-NOM good thing

‘It is good for you to use half-talk speech level to me.’

(Kwi uy seng 1908)

B. Ney-ka akka koykkori-poko phalmaycil hayess-ci?

you-NOM a while ago bird-DAT throw a stone-Q

‘You threw a stone at the bird a while ago, is that right?’

In the verbal domain, grammaticalization follows a cline from full verb to auxiliary to clitic to affix. Interestingly, in the development of address form, attention-getter, and pragmatic markers, this would seem to suggest different types of cline; that is,
from matrix clause to functional elements such as attention-getter/address form and/or pragmatic markers.

In the following section, I will first examine differences in semantic and morpho-syntactic characteristics of the grammatical elements derived from the perceptual visual verb *pota* 'see.' Following this, I will present the diachronic development of these grammatical elements, focusing on the cline in verbal domain (full verb > auxiliary > clitic > affix) and the emergence of pragmatic markers and address forms that are derived from the verb *pota*.

6.2 Semantic and Morpho-Syntactic Characteristics

6.2.1 Semantic Characteristics

The perceptual visual verb *pota* in the following illustration denotes the physical visual sense and is in the physical domain.

(3) Khetalan koyangi-lul *po*-ass-e.

big cat-ACC *see*-PST-END

'(I) saw a huge cat.'

On the other hand, the illustration (4), from an urban-based contemporary drama, indicates psychological perception/vision and is outside of the physical domain:

1 *Ikey salangiya* 'This is love.'
within a day  Yenga and mother *considering*

‘Within a day. After considering Yuna and Mom.’

hey, such thing VLF Yuna *consider* mother consider you-NOM a child-Q

‘Hey, why do you consider the situation of Yuna and your mom with such a thing. Are you a child?’

The speech context: it is the Christmas season and the speech participants are an unmarried young couple (Y and K). (K) suggests to his girlfriend that they should take a skiing trip on Christmas day. In response to her boyfriend, (Y) shows hesitation by mentioning that she needs to consider her family (sister Yuna and mother) on Christmas. For this, (Y) employs the phonologically reduced form of the perceptual verb *pwa* ‘consider a situation.’ In this, the reduced form of the verb is out of the physical domain since the sense of the verb concerns the discourse situation. In other words, it conveys the meaning of the mental state; that is, consideration of a person’s situation.

Let me illustrate another use of this verb:

‘Why are you thinking only that way?’

‘Then how should I interpret, considering this situation?’
The above illustration from an urban-based contemporary drama occurs between husband (S) and wife (T). (S) asks a rhetorical question to his wife concerning his wife’s attitude and thoughts on a certain situation, employing the reduced form of the verb. Interestingly, in (S)’s response to (T), the actual phrases ‘considering this discourse situation’ and ‘interpretation of the situation’ are employed. This suggests that the sense of the verb is in the mental rather than the physical domain. Sweetster (1990) refers to this phenomenon as the “mind-as-body” metaphor.

The conceptual and grammatical network of the verb *pota*, as illustrated in section (5.2), through an extension of sense from the physical domain as a perceptual visual verb, instantiates the creative use of language. This creativity is accomplished through exploiting the clearly delineated concrete and lexical meaning in the physical domain for the expression of less delineated abstract concepts such as pragmatic markers and other grammatical elements.

During the process of extension to other grammatical elements, the concrete referential meaning of the perceptual visual verb *pota* in the physical domain undergoes generalization and abstraction, as shown in illustrations (4) and (5). The meanings of the grammatical elements become context-dependent and generalized compared to the original lexical meaning of the verb.

A noteworthy common semantic feature among grammaticalized elements derived from the perceptual visual verb *pota* is that all grammatical and functional elements are grammaticalized from a perceptual visual verb that has a non-honorific semantic feature. As is well known, Korean has one of the most highly elaborated
honorific systems among languages in the structures of lexicon and morpha-synta. As with many other Korean lexical verbs, the perceptual visual verb consists of two forms: the non-honorific form *pota* and the honorific form *poyta*. The following is an illustration of the honorific verb:

(6) Ecey sensayngnim-ul poy-ess-eyo.

yesterday teacher-ACC see-PST-END

‘(I) saw (our) teacher.’

The perceptual visual verb *poyta*, which has a marked feature, i.e., honorific sense, does not participate in the process of grammaticalization in any of the following grammatical and functional elements: comparative and dative case marker, epistemic modal affix, pragmatic marker, and address forms. This phenomenon is anchored in the characteristic of the source concept for grammaticalization, i.e., semantic generality. I will return to this matter in the following chapter in dealing with the emergence of the pragmatic marker *issci* ‘you know,’ which evinces the same phenomenon.

6.2.2 Morphy-Syntactic Characteristics

The perceptual visual verb *pota* ‘see’ is a transitive verb and thus takes a direct object and/or a nominal that-clause, as in (7A) and (7B) respectively:

(7) A Ecey (na) yenghwa (lul) pwa-ass-e.

\[Ikey\ salang\]i\ya ‘This is love.’
In the above illustrations, the verb retains the characteristic of transitivity. The semantic sense of the verb is physical perception/vision regarding the direct object and activity, ‘movie’ in (7A) and ‘eating meal’ in (7B). With this sense, the verb retains the ability to inflect with the past tense marker –ess, as shown in the above.

However, when the verb is used outside of the physical domain, it behaves differently regarding its morpho-syntactic aspects. Let me refer again to the illustrations that were employed in the preceding chapter:

(8) A Han pen ipe pwa.

‘Try to put on.’

B Saypyek ta toyseya cassunikka phikon halkkapwa an kkaywessci.

‘I didn’t wake you up because I thought that you must be tired since you were up almost all night.’

C Pwa. tangsin na cal capassci?

‘Pwa. You made a good choice of me?’
As presented in Chapter 5 regarding the synchronic functions of pragmatic markers derived from the perceptual visual verb \textit{pota}, the epistemic modal marker in (8B) and the pragmatic marker in (8C) do not retain the morpho-syntactic characteristics of inflection with the tense marker. They are also neutralized in transitivity; that is, these markers have lost transitive identity, since they are no longer associated with the direct object. It can be said, then, that the above pragmatic markers have undergone syntactic decategorization.

Another morpho-syntactic characteristic of the auxiliary verb and the modal marker is that while the lexical verb \textit{pota} is a free form, when the verb is used as an auxiliary and modal marker it is no longer free. In (8A), as an auxiliary the verb is bound to the main verb V1 with the affix \textit{-a/e}, as in the V1 + V2 construction. Also, as a modal marker, the verb is bound to affixes such as \textit{-nka} and/or \textit{-lkka}, as in \textit{-nka pota/-lkka pwa}.

These same morpho-syntactic characteristics can be found in other languages. For example, Ewe is an African language that uses the verb \textit{kpo} ‘see’ in order to express counterexpectation. The verb has the function of expressing strong doubt (Heine et al. 1991:194-95). It is also employed to denote counterexpectative assertions. The characteristics of the verb when used to mark counterexpectation (CE) are as follows:

One of the major typological characteristics of Ewe is that its morpho-syntax is dominated by a structure of verb serialization. The emergence of the CE marker \textit{kpo} is a consequence of the fact that in a series of two verbs (V1-V2), the second verb (V2) has developed into a grammatical morpheme. This development has led to the effect that (V2) has lost all verbal characteristics, such as the ability to be marked for tense/aspect, negation, or person, or to take an object complement. Indeed, it now behaves like an adverb; that is, as a word that is invariable following the verb (V1) it qualifies (Heine et al. 1991:199).
6.3 Diachronic Development of Pragmatic Markers and Attention-Getter/Address Form Derived from the Perception Verb *pota*

6.3.1 Emergence of Epistemic Modal Marker/Affix

6.3.1.1 Morphologization: From Auxiliary to Clitic to Affix

The grammaticalization cline in the verbal domain (auxiliary > clitics > affix) involves morphologization. According to Hopper and Traugott (1993: 130), morphologization is the process of “compacting—the fusing of erstwhile independent elements with each other, most especially the development of clitics into inflections.” In other words, morphologization is about the creation of a bound morpheme, such as the Korean epistemic modal marker/affix, from an independent word through a gradual process of cliticization. Hopper and Traugott (1991: 133) present clitics in the following way:

Clitics are typically restricted to certain positions in the clause. One of these is next to a specific host; ... auxiliaries may be constrained to occurring adjacent to the lexical verb ... the host belongs to a specific word class and the clitic has a functional affinity for just that class and no other.

The perceptual visual verb *pota* occurs as an auxiliary in the early 16th century, specifically in *Penyek Nokeltay*:

*(Penyek Nokeltay 1510 sang: 18)*

(9) A Neos mitti moshaya haketur talun tyemey uylonhaya *pola* katuyye.

‘If you don’t believe the price of your clothing, let us *try* other stores.’

*(Penyek Nokeltay 1510 sang: 63)*

B Tyohan swulini ney meke *pola*.

‘It is good alcohol so *try* to drink.’
The transition from full verb to auxiliary is the initial stage of morphologization that leads to establishment as a bound affix in the final stage of the process. As in the above illustration, as an auxiliary the verb has some restriction in that it occurs followed only by a main verb with the affix *ale*, as in *meke pola* in (9B). Auxiliary verbs tend to be finite, that is, to carry tense, mood or aspect markers, as shown below:

(10) Na Hawai'i ka po-ass-e.

I (NOM) Hawai'i (LOC) go see-PST-END

'I have had the experience to go to Hawai'i.'

Concerning auxiliary functions of the perceptual visual verb *pota*, there are a substantial number of studies (Choy 1965, M.S. Kim 1971, C.H. Pak 1981). The major common semantic sense of the auxiliary that emerges from these studies is that of experience and trial, a product of semantic generalization from the sense of physical vision.

Ono (2000) briefly presents the grammaticalization of the Japanese perceptual verb *miru* 'to see something concrete,' which is categorized under the term 'experientials.' Interestingly, the grammatical network of the Japanese verb *miru* shows a degree of similarity to the Korean verb *pota* 'see/look at.' The following examples are excerpted from Ono (2000:60):

(11) A Kyooto wa *miru* basyo ga ooi.

Kyooto TOP see places NOM many
'Kyoto has many places to see.'

B Rooraa koosutaa notte mi-nai?

Roller coaster riding see-NEG

'Why don’t (we) try the roller coaster?'

In (11A), the bold-typed *miru* signifies ‘to see something concrete’ and the lexical verb belongs in the physical domain. On the other hand, in (11B) the bold-typed *te miru* is analogous to the Korean auxiliary verb *a/e pata*. Ono (2000: 61) explains that *te miru* "carries the more generalized meaning of to try doing something to find out what it is like." As in the case of Korean, the Japanese auxiliary *te miru* has lost the characteristic of the lexical verb *miru*, i.e., transitivity.

Ono (2000: 62) points out that in the process of semantic generalization functional shift occurs from "the truth value of the proposition to the speaker’s attitudes." Thus, even in the case of development of the auxiliary verb, subjectification arises. Interestingly, according to Ono (2000) in contemporary Japanese *miru* does not undergo further subjectification through transformation into a clitic or affix. However, Ono presents other lexical verbs that have undergone cliticization in Japanese, such as the verb *oku* ‘to place.’

Let me now turn to the clitic form of the Korean perceptual verb *pata*. The clitic form occurs in the early 20th century, as in the following:

(Hyel uy nwu 1906)

(12) Nenun Il-Cheng cencayngul ne honca tanghantusi alko issna#potamanun, …
'It sounds' to me that you are experiencing by yourself the war between Japan and China but ....'

(#denotes morpheme boundary.)

(Kwi uy seng 1908)

(13) Kulenkesi ta puwinkwa Cemswunika cengnyeng sin macun ilinxka#pota.

'It seems' to me that Madam and Cemsun really plan the scheme, considering all those things.'

In the above, as Hopper and Traugott (1991) point out, the clitic occurs as a form attached to its host, that is, the main verb + na/nka or lkka. In this sense, clitics have undergone distributional restrictions, since the clitic occurs mainly with the host of a verb but not with any other sentence elements. Thus, clitics can be said to be more context-dependent.

In the early 20th century, as shown in illustrations (12) and (13), a clear boundary appeared between the two forms, i.e., host and the perceptual verb pota, as in –nka#pota or –na#pota. This is the predominant form. The advanced fusional forms that appeared between the two morpheme boundaries, such as –napwa/~lkkapwa, occur very rarely, two examples of which are shown below:

(Kwi uy seng 1908)

(14) Kilswuninun natulilul kassnapwa.

'It seems' that Kilswun went out.'

(Chaypongchwun 1913)
(15) Kamchwuessten kesi thanloka nalkkapwa kulehciyo.

‘It’s because I’m worrying that everything that I’ve hidden could be disclosed.’

However, by the late 20th century the morphological boundary became fused. I suspect that the advancement of morphologization from clitic to modal affix began early in the century and was firmly established by the end of the century. As presented in the previous chapter, in contemporary Korean the epistemic modal marker is routinely employed, as in the following forms: -napwa, -nkapwa, -lkkapwa, -napwuci, -nkapwuta/-nkapta.

The clause internal changes, from auxiliary to clitic and further to affix, accompany morphological coalescence of the morpheme boundary, phonological reduction through phoneme loss, assimilation of the adjacent phonological segments, and phonological attrition. In the above affix forms, phonological attrition of the perceptual visual verb stem and its utterance-final ending morpheme evinces an interesting phenomenon: When the sentence-final ending morpheme begins with a vowel, as in -napo[ə]-a[a], the two vowels become merged into [wa]. On the other hand, when the sentence-final ending morpheme begins with consonants [c] and [k], a [u] vowel as in -napwu-ci or -nkapwu-ta, or a complete loss as in -kap-ta, is observed in the perceptual visual verb stem instead of the low and round vowel [o], which is a marked phoneme.

According to Hopper and Traugott (1993: 145), one of the two tendencies in the process of phonological attrition is a “qualitative reduction”:

The remaining phonological segments of the form are drawn from a progressively shrinking set. This smaller set of phonemes tends to reflect the
universal set of unmarked segments. They tend especially to be apical (tongue tip) consonants such as [n], [t], and [s], the glottal consonants [?] and [h], and common vowels such as [a], [u], [i], and [o]. The result is that from a synchronic perspective grammatical morphemes tend to be composed of unmarked segments.

Thus, in Korean the phenomenon of phonological attrition in the process of transformation to modal affix supports the above cited tendency; that is, when an utterance final ending starts with consonants, as in –napwu-ci or –napwu-ta, the unmarked vowel [u], instead of [o], is employed. This ‘qualitative reduction’ is frequently observed in other contemporary Korean lexical elements. For instance, in oral Korean the conjunction kuliko [o] ‘and’ is dominantly pronounced as kulikwu [u] instead of with the low and round vowel [o].

6.3.1.2 Morpheme Order

As a result of morphologization, the epistemic modal affix behaves differently from its source. In other words, the autonomous and independent lexical verb pota does have flexibility in its distribution. On the other hand, the modal affix results in a fixed order of morphemes.

According to Bybee (1985), semantic relevance influences morpheme order in relation to the verb stem. In other words, morpheme order is correlated with the degree of semantic relevance to the verb. Hopper and Traugott (1993: 143) point out that “aspect is most relevant to the verb, tense less so, since it relates the time of the situation to some other time, and mood least so since it expresses speaker’s point of view on the situation.”
This observation is also applicable to the order of the Korean epistemic modal affix, as shown below:

(16)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(Twullepomye) sonnimun ka-si-ess-<em>napwu</em>-cyo?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>(looks around) guest go-HON-PST-Modal-END</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(looks around) ‘It looks like she left, right?’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B Ung. Kassta.  
‘Yes (she) left.’

This conversation occurs between a son (A) and his mother (B). Before going to work, (A) learns that his brother’s girlfriend will stop by to meet his family in person. After returning from work, (A) looks around and finds that there is no indication that she (the girlfriend) is still at the house. After realizing this, he says to his mother that it looks as if his girlfriend has left (using a rising intonation indicating a turn-yielding). As presented in the previous chapter, the pragmatic function of the epistemic modal affix is expression of the speaker’s epistemic certainty of the truth-value of the proposition; such certainty is based on a mental assessment of the discourse situation. In this sense, the interrogative intonation in (16A) is not directed toward soliciting the hearer’s response; rather, it is used to solicit agreement from the hearer and to yield the turn.

Noteworthy in the above illustration is the morpheme order. As Bybee (1985) predicted, the modal affix follows the honorific marker –*si* and the past tense marker –*ess*, as in *ka-si-ess-*napwu*-cyo*, based on semantic relevance to the verb stem *ka-* ‘go.’ As Hopper and Traugott (1993) point out, the modal affix has the least semantic relevance to
the verb, owing to characteristics expressing the speaker’s point of view. In consequence, it occupies a fixed position in which it is not adjacent to the verb stem when other grammatical morphemes such as tense and aspect markers occur with the modal marker, as these markers evince greater semantic relevance to the verb stem.

6.3.2 Emergence of the Pragmatic Marker *(ke)pwa* ‘you see’: From Matrix Clause to Pragmatic Marker

According to my data, the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa* first appears in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century, becoming firmly established by late in the century. This marker is independent and has relatively free distributional privileges, in contrast to the epistemic modal affix that is dependent on the host and occurs in a fixed slot, as shown in the preceding section. Interestingly, in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century the pragmatic marker *poala* ‘guess what/look’ occurs only once in the same text (1913 *Chaypongchwun*) in which the modal affix *-1kkapwa/-nkapwa* occurs only rarely, as in the following excerpt:

*(Chaypongchwun 1913)*

(17) Ipttaykkaci kamchwuessten kesi thanloka *nalkkapwa* kulehciyo.

‘It is because I’m worrying that everything that I have hidden could be disclosed.’

(18) A Kulentey akka manimkkeyse mwuesilako hasitunya?

‘By the way, what did the man tell you?’

B (No response.)

A (Appears to know what the man said) Way taytapi epsni? nayka ala naykkey. *poala.*
'Why don’t you answer me? I am going to guess. *look/see.*'

pyelmal epsi Kim Champhantayk cakun assi malssumisici, kulehci
anihanya?

'It is just about the lady of Mr. Kim, right?'

The above interaction (18) occurs between two servants. Servant (A) asks servant (B) what their superior told (B). Servant (B) does not respond to (A). To this, (A), with a sense of confidence regarding what the superior said, indicates that she will guess about it. Following this, (A) employs the pragmatic marker *poala*, denoting the sense of ‘see and accept what I am going to present as the right answer.’ As presented in the previous chapter on the contemporary functions of the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa* ‘you see’, the marker *poala* denotes the speaker’s epistemic certainty.

C.Y. Yi (1998) differentiates between simple and complex fusion in Korean thus: the term fusion can be used interchangeably with the term internal coalescence of the morpheme boundary. If a linguistic form undergoes fusion without functional change, it is simple fusion. On the other hand, if the form undergoes linguistic as well as functional change, the result is complex fusion. As an example of simple fusion, C.Y. Yi (1998: 157) briefly mentions the form *kepwa*. She contends that *kepwa* is a fused form from *kukes pwa* ‘look at it’ and that there is no functional change from the original meaning.

However, such a contention overlooks naturally occurring language use of the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa*. As examined in the previous chapter, this pragmatic marker does not represent the referential meaning of seeing a physical object; rather, it denotes the expression of the speaker’s viewpoint and perspective, as in illustration (18A).
Even though C.Y. Yi’s (1998) observation regarding the functional status of (ke)pwa is thus incorrect, her observation on its formation is noteworthy. She states that (ke)pwa is derived from the clause kukes pwa [(subject) + object + verb]. Thomson and Mulac (1991) state that the English epistemic parenthetical I think is formed from a matrix clause through a reversal between the matrix clause and the complex clause as shown below:

(19) A. I think that Tom is tall.
    B. I think Ø Tom is tall.
    C. Tom is tall, I think.

According to Emonds (1969, 1976; cited in Thomson and Mulac [1991]), the above (19C) can be categorized as complement preposing in that the complement clause is promoted to the main clause. In (19B), the deletion of that resulted in syntactic reanalysis of the main clause. According to Underhill (1988: cited in Thomson and Mulac [1991]), the deletion of that is governed by a discourse factor: “That is deleted when the subject of the complement clause is the topic of the discourse; that is retained when the subject of the main clause is the topic.” Following Underhill’s study, in (19B) the subject Tom in the complement clause is the topic of discourse and in consequence that is deleted. In succession, this process causes syntactic reanalysis of the main clause into an epistemic parenthetical.

The pragmatic marker (ke)pwa behaves in a similar way to the English epistemic parenthetical you see in that it denotes the speaker’s certainty and assertion on what is
being talked about and is formed from internal coalescence of morpheme boundaries, as in the following:

\[
\text{[ku-kes-(ACC)#po-a] > [kukespo-a] > [kukespwa] and [kespwa] > [kepwa] > [pwa]}
\]
that thing-(ACC) see-IMPE

(# denotes morpheme boundary).

**Figure 6.2. Developmental Paths of (ke)pwa**

As in the case of the formation of the epistemic modal affix –ikkapwa, internal coalescence within the construction occurs in the process of development of the pragmatic marker (ke)pwa. In other words, the morpheme boundary between object and verb has become opaque and obliterated owing to the fact that in oral Korean the case affix, such as the accusative marker in the above, is frequently dropped. This in consequence contributes to internal coalescence. Phonological reduction between verb stem and imperative ending (e.g., po-a then pwa) occurs, followed by the loss of morpheme boundary, as in kukespwa.

As well, the demonstrative pronoun kukes ‘that’ gradually underwent phonological reduction through segment loss, as in CVCV(C) in kuke and further C(V)(C)V(C) in ke and even further complete loss of the syllable (C)(V) in kes. However, in contemporary Korean variants of phonologically reduced forms of the demonstrative pronoun kukes ‘that thing’ co-exist in the following way: [kukespwa], [kespwa], [kepwa], and [pwa], as presented in the previous chapter.

The development of the case of the Korean pragmatic marker (ke)pwa has proceeded differently from that of the formation of English epistemic parentheticals (such
as I think) in that the Korean pragmatic marker has been formed through internal coalescence (fusion) of morpheme boundaries and within constituents, rather than through reversal of matrix and complex clauses, as Thomson and Mulac (1991) suggested.

Interestingly, Brinton (2001: 177) argues that the English pragmatic marker look and its variants forms, such as lookit, developed from the matrix clause through internal coalescence.

... interpersonal pragmatic marker ‘look’ ... are shown to be the result of originally free matrix clauses which become syntactically fixed, are reanalyzed as sentence adjuncts, and undergo internal coalescence, a process which began in the 17th century. A new grammaticalization cline is proposed to account for the unidirectionality of the development.

Brinton (2001: 189-190) presents the processes involved in the formation of the English pragmatic marker look:

In the first stage, these are free collocations of imperative verb + complement clause or imperative verb + prepositional phrase. However, they are semantically polysemous, with concrete/perceptual and non-concrete meanings. In the second stage (which occurred in the 17th century), they became fixed syntactically (i.e., restricted to second person subjects or to it complements) and reduced morphologically. There is also fixing of the order as VS. Reanalysis of the matrix clause as a sentence adjunct also occurs. In the third stage, the syntagms form single words (are univerbated perhaps with further phonological reduction) and are restricted syntactically to extrapositional position, thus functioning as prototypical pragmatic markers.

The above described processes are similar to those of the Korean pragmatic marker (ke)pwa, except for the fact that the Korean perceptual visual verb pota ‘see/look at’ also was subject to the development of the epistemic modal affix -lkkapwa as well as the pragmatic marker (ke)pwa. While the epistemic modal affix underwent a widely attested typical case of grammaticalization processing (fixation, bound form, and loss of
syntactic scope), the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa* retained a relatively free distribution and form, and a concomitant increase in its structural scope to the entire speech event.

6.3.3 Emergence of the Attention-Getter and Address Form

6.3.3.1 From Matrix Clause to Attention-Getter and Address Form

Address forms function to encode social distance, to open discourse, to signal turn-yielding, and to express the speaker’s subjective attitude, which is related to social distance. As presented in the previous chapter, the attention-getter *ipwa* ‘hey/look’ and address form *yepo* ‘honey’ are composed of the proximal deictic element *i* ‘this,’ the perceptual visual verb *po-* ‘see/look at,’ and the half-talk imperative ending *-a*. Pragmatic forces that demand direct visual attention to the speaker as well as metaphorical extension of physical distance into psychological distance underlie the functional changes of the attention-getter and address form.

As an attention-getting marker, *ipwa* first appears in the 17th century to get attention from strangers both with and without the expression of anger, as in (20A) and (20B), respectively. It was also used as an attention-getter to address a familiar, as in (20C) below:

To a stranger (*Pakthongsa enhay* 1677)

(20) A Tye kwusul phal li-a *ipa.*

that pearl sell person-Vocat *look*

‘Look, salesman for that pearl.’

B Teleon nom-a *ipa.*
bad person-Vocat *look*

‘Look, jerk.’

C *Ipa* tye pap-ul askiti malko

*look* that meal-ACC spare do not

‘Look, don’t spare that meal.’

Of note in the usage shown above is that *ipa* was used as a summons in the 17th century. The main function of a summons is to secure attention rather than as a form of address. In other words, after addressing an unfamiliar by employing his or her title (salesman) in (20A), and by employing a defective noun for denoting a person followed by the vocative affix –*a* in (20B), *ipa* is employed to gain further attention from a stranger. In (20C), *ipa* is fully used as an attention-getter to a familiar in the same way as in contemporary Korean usage.

As shown in Chapter 5, in contemporary usage *ipwa* is employed to getting attention from familiairs whose relationship is based on a certain degree of intimacy and solidarity, such as spouses, friends, colleagues, etc. However owing to characteristics of the source elements, *ipwa* can also connote rudeness and the manifestation of the speaker’s anger and annoyance. Thus, it is also employed to getting attention from the unfamiliar with an angry tone of voice. This function has been attested since the 17th century, as in (20B). However, the function of a summons, as in (20A), was no longer applicable by the early 20th century owing to the emergence of the marker *ceki*, which assumed the function of securing attention as from strangers with indirect stance.
This phenomenon is also true of the functions of the address form ye po, which is composed of the locative adverb ye ki (can be reanalyzed into the proximal deictic element i and the spatial defective noun e ki), the perceptual visual verb po-, and the blunt imperative ending -o. As presented in Chapter 5, in contemporary Korean ye po is mostly employed between spouses. However, in the early 20th century it was also employed to address strangers. Let me refer again to an example of this usage:

(21) To a stranger (Hyel uy nwu 1906)

Ye po mal com mwule popsita. ce cipi Kim Chosi cipiyo?

‘Ye po, I’d like to ask you some direction. Is that the house of Kim Chosi?’

Addressing strangers through employment of the address form ye po ceased by the end of the 20th century owing to the emergence of ce ki. An interesting vestige of the former usage: the honorific form ye poseyyo ‘hello’ is exclusively employed as the predominant opening marker in telephone conversation in contemporary Korean.

Let me now turn to the development of forms. The evolution of ipwa and ye po proceeded from matrix clauses to attention-getter and address form through internal coalescence, as shown below. The original senses of ipwa and ye po before internal coalescence occurs can be translated as ‘look at me’ and ‘look here,’ respectively.
In Korean oral discourse, the omission of case markers is common. In the address forms shown above, the accusative case marker \(-lui\) is omitted in the accusative case marker slot; that is, before the morpheme boundary mark \(\#\). Such omission of case marker in oral discourse contributes to the process of internal coalescence. The morphological boundary between the proximal deictic element \(i\) and the perceptual visual verb stem \(po\) ‘see’ became opaque and eventually resulted in the internal coalescence of the two morphemes. This in turn caused syntactic reanalysis of the matrix clause.

Discourse frequency and the similarity of the semantic properties of directness contained in constituents of the attention-getter and address form contribute significantly to internal coalescence and further syntactic reanalysis. The speaker-oriented proximal deictic element \(i\) that demands direct attention to the speaker; the visual perceptual verb \(pota\) ‘see’ in which the direct visual attention-getting sense is retained; and the imperative ending \(-a\) that also contains directness of command are all important elements in this process. The perceptual visual stem \(po\) - and the imperative ending \(-a\) phonologically reduced to \(pwa\) as the process of internal coalescence continued. The erosion of phonological segments through the loss of the syllable CV \((ki)\) from \(yeki\) in the case of
the address form *yepo* also occurred, followed by the fusion of two morpheme boundaries, as Heine & Reh (1984: 25) point out in a discussion of the process of erosion. As well, phonological reduction continued between the visual perceptual verb stem vowel *po*- and the imperative ending *-o*, as in *poo > po*.

As presented in the preceding section, Brinton (2001) has argued that the English pragmatic marker *look* is grammaticalized from a matrix clause. C.Y. Yi (1998:165) also points out that the address form *yepo* is a case of clause-internal fusion. The diachronic processes of the attention-getter *ipwa* and address form *yepo* also suggest a new cline of grammaticalization from a matrix clause to a functional element, as suggested by Brinton (2001).

6.3.3.2 **Attention-Getter for Strangers: *ceki(yo)* ‘hello/excuse me’**

As presented earlier in Chapter 4, *ceki* first occurs early in the 20th century as a pragmatic marker as well as an attention-getter, dependent on speech context. The following is an example of *ceki* as an attention-getter for a stranger:

(22)  

*Ce(ki), halwupam caywe cwuseyyo.*

‘*Ce(ki), please let me stay here tonight.*’

In contemporary Korean, *ceki* is employed as an attention-getter for strangers. As mentioned above, before the emergence of *ceki* the attention-getter *ipwa* and address form *yepo* were employed to gain the attention of strangers. However, the function of
these forms vis-à-vis getting attention from strangers is now confined to marked usage such as the expression of anger and annoyance.

As shown below, the evolution of the attention-getter ceki followed a path from demonstrative pronoun to adverb to attention-getter by undergoing a process of internal coalescence and phonological reduction, in the same way as the attention-getter ipwa and address form yepo.

\[
\text{tye#ekuy} \rightarrow \text{tyeku}y \rightarrow \text{ceki}
\]

Demonstrative pronoun > Adverb > Attention-Getter

Figure 6.4. Developmental Paths of ceki(yo)

Let me refer again to the following Table (6.1): this table illustrates the morphophonemic changes of ceki, including uses of ceki as a pragmatic marker as well as an attention-getter in the early 20th century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.1. Grammaticalization processes of ceki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP (15c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ŋ] in syllable initial position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monophthong-ization (uy&gt;i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(=\) Tone, R = retained, L = lost, N = no, Y = yes, PM = pragmatic marker
6.3.4 Subjectification

The developments of the epistemic modal affix, the pragmatic marker, and attention-getter/address form clearly suggest that these elements are involved with and in subjectification. As mentioned earlier in Chapter 2, subjectification can be defined as “structures and strategies that languages evolve in the linguistic realization of subjectivity (Finegan 1995:1).” Subjectivity, then, can be seen as the expression of the speaker’s point of view, perspective, and attitude in the world of discourse (Traugott 1995, Finegan 1995, Lyons 1982).

Finegan (1995: 4-5) categorizes three main areas of studies of subjectification: 1) agent’s perspectives as shaping linguistic expressions; 2) agent’s expression of affect towards the propositions; 3) agent’s expression of the modality or epistemic status of the propositions. In English, adverbs are one of the grammatical categories that contribute to the expression of the speaker’s epistemic certainty, as shown below:

(23) Frankly speaking, I haven’t had a chance to read your paper.

The modal adverb *frankly* qualifies the speaker’s point of view of the truth-value of the proposition. Thus, it serves to modulate the epistemic status of the proposition.

In Chapter 5, I stated that the principal commonality between the epistemic modal affix and the pragmatic marker is the expression of the speaker’s epistemic certainty (related to the third category of Finegan). In fact, in the process of morphologization, the later-developed modal affix presents a higher degree of subjectification and advancement of the speaker’s point of view than do the earlier forms. Thus, the cline lexical verb >
auxiliary > clitic > affix has a direct correlation to the degree of subjectification. As well, the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa*, which emerged later than the modal affix, presents the speaker’s epistemic certainty in the form of confirmation, assurance and even aggressive assertion. In this sense, the epistemic status of the truth-value of the proposition is much more certain and stronger than that of the modal affix.

The covert causal semantic links between the propositions indicate the epistemic status of the truth-value of the proposition. In other words, the covert semantic links for the epistemic modal affix, i.e., ‘this is why’ and ‘this is so because,’ suggest that the speaker’s epistemic certainty and judgment regarding the truth-value of the proposition are derived through a logical reasoning process. As well, the covert semantic link for the pragmatic marker, i.e., ‘I assure/confirm what I said’ indicates the speaker’s certain and clear perspective on the truth-value of the proposition.

Let me now briefly turn to the case of subjectification of the address form *yepo* ‘honey’ and the attention-getters *ipwa* ‘hey/look’ and *ceki* ‘hello/excuse me.’ These forms are used to encode social distance and the speaker’s affect, the second category of Finegan (1995). The address form *yepo* and attention-getter *ipwa* indicate expression of the speaker’s emotive closeness and proximity when they are employed to spouses and intimates. On the other hand, owing to their source characteristics of directness, their use can also serve to encode the speaker’s negative attitude such as exasperation, anger, and annoyance. This is also true of the usage of the attention-getter *ceki* in that it delivers the speaker’s indirect interpersonal stance by encoding neutral social distance between interlocutors.
In conclusion, the above grammaticalized pragmatic and functional categories are all involved with subjectification as a way of expressing the speaker’s epistemic certainty or affect i.e., proximity and rudeness, as well as and social distance.

6.4 Metaphoric Extension and Grammaticalization Principles

The pragmatic functions conveyed by the grammaticalized forms discussed above such as the epistemic modal marker, the pragmatic marker, and attention-getter/address form can all be seen as semantic extensions from the original sources. Put another way, the processed and pragmatically strengthened functions have been derived through metaphoric transference from the original source meaning. Thus, it can be seen that metaphoric transference involves connection of two domains. One domain is physical space as the origin and source of the connection, as with the perceptual visual verb *pota*, which is in the physical domain and provides a source for divergent grammatical and functional elements. The other domain is the mental space serving as a target of the connection. As Heine et al. (1991) suggested, this process is a denotation of the human creative capacity for solving the problem of expressing an abstract idea.

Traugott (1991: 391, 396) notes the characteristic of the source element of the perceptual visual verb in the following way:

Most speech act verb categories include members that have been derived from terms related to the field of vision, specifically terms for seeing, showing, ... Advise<Lat. Advisare “watch, observe”<videre “see” Regard<OF regarder “look at” (<guard, watch”) ... Verbs of seeing (and also hearing) in general tend to be extended to the field of intelligence. Thus, I see = I understand. That verbs related to visual perception are sources of SAVs (Speech Act Verbs) suggests that there is a very widespread belief, however unconscious, that seeing is believing and understanding.
As well, Sweetser (1990: 21) clearly suggests a metaphorical connection between the perceptual visual verb and abstract concepts related to mental activities such as understanding, knowledge, intellectuality, epistemic certainty, attention-getting, etc., in the following way:

Physical sight → knowledge, intellection. The basis for this metaphor is to be found in the primacy of the sense of vision as a source of information about the world around us. Not only does English have expressions such as “I saw it with my own eyes” to indicate certainty, but studies of evidentials in many languages show that direct visual information is considered to be the basis of the most certain kind of knowledge. Physical vision → mental vision. This metaphor is probably based on the strong connection between sight and knowledge, and also on the shared structural properties of the visual and intellectual domains—our ability to focus our mental and visual attention and to monitor stimuli mentally and visually.

Noteworthy from the above is that Sweetser (1990) points out that the metaphorical connection between physical activities and mental activities does not occur arbitrarily but occurs with motivational ground; that is, “shared structural properties” between the two domains. In the case of the connection between the perceptual visual verb and concepts in the mental domain, it is “our ability to focus our mental and visual attentions.”

In the case of the Korean attention-getter ipwa ‘hey/look’ and address form yepo ‘honey’ that are derived from the speaker-oriented proximal deictic element i ‘this’ and the imperative form of the perceptual visual verb poa, the element of visual attention inherent in the perceptual visual meaning is exploited to hold mental and psychological attention from the alter. Further, the physical distance that is the original determinant of proximal and distal deictic element has been transformed into psychological distance
through metaphoric transference, as in *ipwa* and *yepo* from a proximal deictic element indexing intimacy and directness and, contrastively, in *ceki* from a distal deictic element denoting indirectness.

Thus, semantic relevance of the source and the target concepts can clearly be recognized (Hopper 1991, Traugott 1995). As well, the direction of the connection between the two domains is unilateral in that the transference occurs from the concrete physical domain to the abstract mental domain but not the reverse. Such regularity in semantic change, or, unidirectionality, is widely recognized across languages (Traugott 2002).

The grammaticalized pragmatic functional elements of Korean mentioned above also conform to various grammaticalization principles that Hopper (1991) proposed for the purpose of diagnosing the status of grammaticalization of a certain functional element in a given language. As stated earlier, semantic relevance, or “persistence” as Hopper (1991) terms it, between source and target elements is clearly shown in the epistemic modal marker, the pragmatic marker, and in attention-getter/address form. That is, the original semantic properties of the source meaning, physical vision and attention-getting, are transparent in these grammaticalized forms. More specifically, the epistemic modal marker *-lkapwa* and the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa* denote the degree of the speaker’s epistemic certainty which is located in the domain of mental vision; the attention-getter *ipwa* and address form *yepo* denote an attention-getting device from the alter. In the case of the attention-getter *ipwa*, owing to the characteristic of the speaker-oriented proximal deictic element *i* that is fused with the imperative form of the perceptual visual verb *poa*,
there is an inherent connotation of rudeness and manifestation of the speaker’s exasperation or anger, owing to persistence from the source meaning.

As well, these grammaticalized elements conform to the principle of decategorization in that the development of the epistemic modal marker follows the path from full verb to auxiliary to clitic and further to affix. In the case of the pragmatic marker (ke)pwa, the attention-getter ipwa, and the address form yepo, they developed from matrix clause to functional pragmatic elements. Thus, all these elements follow the path from major (noun or verb or clause) to minor categories.

The principle of divergence is also clearly observed in all the above functional elements in that the source perceptual visual verb pota has independently undergone linguistic changes, while divergent grammatical elements such as case marker, epistemic modal affix, and pragmatic marker have also independently undergone linguistic changes. Thus, homonyms that share the same origin appear in the case of the pragmatic marker (ke)pwa and the lexical verb pwa, which is a phonologically reduced form of the verb stem po- and the imperative ending –a.

As well, the above grammatical elements abide by the principle of layering in that the epistemic modal marker, which developed earlier, and the pragmatic marker coexist even though their functions overlap in the expression of the speaker’s epistemic point of view. In the case of attention-getter ipwa and address form yepo coexist in getting attention from intimates. Thus, even though old layers are already fully formed, new layers emerge and interact with old layers in an indiscrete overlap of functions.
6.5 Conclusion

In this chapter I examined semantic and morpho-syntactic characteristics of the lexical verb *pota* and grammaticalized elements that are derived from this verb. Semantic generalization and pragmatically strengthened functional meanings result in the process of grammaticalization. Expression of the speaker’s epistemic and social meaning is the product of the processes of semantic abstraction and subjectification. The epistemic certainty delivered by the modal affix –*lkkapwa* and the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa*; proximity/intimacy and exasperation/anger encoded by attention-getter *ipwa*; and social distance with an indirect stance presented by the attention-getter *ceki* are all instances of subjectification; that is, the expression of self by the speaker. Interestingly, older layers show a stronger degree of subjectification in the case of the development of the epistemic modal marker. In this sense, the grammaticalization cline, from perceptual visual verb to auxiliary to clitic and further to affix, correlates with the degree of subjectification.

Morpho-syntactic fixation, bound form, and reduced syntactic scope are not necessarily the final manifestations of grammaticalization, as pragmatic markers do not represent such characteristics. In contrast, pragmatic markers show a rather flexible distribution, free form and increased scope to the speech event. Tabor and Traugott (1988) pointed out that grammaticalization should be understood as encompassing phenomena manifested by the pragmatic marker, such as increased structural scope. As well, Brinton (2001) claims that the pragmatic marker *look* not only follows the general principles of grammaticalization proposed by Hopper (1991) but also shows peculiar characteristics such as syntactic freedom owing to its nature of internal coalescence.
The emergence of the epistemic modal affix involves morphologization; on the other hand, the development of the pragmatic marker and attention-getter/address form suggests a new grammaticalization cline; that is, from matrix clause to functional elements. However, regardless of divergent paths, all grammaticalized forms are involved with internal coalescence, syntactic reanalysis, and phonological reduction through phoneme attrition or segment loss.

The principal mechanism of the development of grammaticalized elements is metaphoric extension from the concrete lexical source meaning to the abstract target concept. This semantic shift and transference shows regularity; in other words, developmental direction is regular and unidirectional in two domains from basic and general lexical items such as the perceptual visual verb in the physical domain to abstract and functional items such as the epistemic modal marker in the mental domain. This connection is founded on the shared properties of the two domains and is conditioned by discourse and pragmatic forces, since transference between the two domains occurs in context-bound situations.

The following figure diagrammatically represents the chronological development of divergent grammatical and pragmatic elements in my data:
Figure 6.5. Chronological Development of Functional Elements of the Verb pota
CHAPTER 7

CONTEMPORARY USES OF THE PRAGMATIC MARKERS issci/isscana

7.1 Introduction

As shown in the case of the perceptual visual verb pota ‘see/look at’ in Chapters 5 and 6, the Korean existential verb isssta ‘there is/to be (at a place)’ presents interesting diversity in its conceptual and grammatical network. The concept of existence underlies the sense of location that is related to both space and time. Lyons (1967: 390) claimed that “in many, and perhaps in all, languages existential and possessive constructions derive (both synchronically and diachronically) from locatives.” Hintikka (1968, 1969; cited in Clark 1978: 89) has also argued that for an object “to be” (i.e., to exist) normally means that it is to be found somewhere in space. He claimed therefore that in natural languages, one should expect concepts of existence to be expressed in locative terms.

Owing to this conceptual characteristic, the existence verb isssta contributes to the multiple categories of time and space-related grammatical elements, as shown in Figure (7.1):
1. Time-related grammatical elements:

-itta ‘in a while’ (adverb)
  
  itta nolle kalkey.  
  in a while play come  
  ‘(I) will in a while stop by (you) to play.’

-koko iss ‘continuous duration of time’ (aspect)
  
  pi-ka kyeysok nayli-ko issney.  
  rain-NOM continuously come-continuous duration of time—be  
  ‘It’s continuously raining.’

-ess/ass ‘a point of past time’ (tense)
  
  na pap mek-ess-e.  
  (I) meal eat-PST-END  
  ‘I had a meal.’

-se ‘and then’ (sequential particle)
  
  pap mekkwu-se kongpwuhaca.  
  meal eat-sequential particle study  
  ‘Why don’t we study after having a meal?’

2. Space-related grammatical elements:

-eyse ‘at/in’ (locative case)
  
  Tom-i hakkyo-eyse nol-ko isse.  
  Tom-NOM school-locative case play-continuous duration of time be  
  ‘Tom is playing at school.’

-eyseepwuthe ‘from’ (direction)
  
  ku men kos-eyseepwuhte kele wasstanmali-ya?  
  that remote area—from walk came-Q  
  ‘Did you walk from that distant area?’

3. Causal particle:

- a/ese ‘because’
  
  mom-i an coh-ase hakkyo-ey kaci anhasse.  
  body-NOM not good-causal particle school-LOC go NEG  
  ‘Because (I) wasn’t feeling well, (I) didn’t go to school.’

4. Pragmatic marker:

-issci/isscanha ‘you know’
  
  issc-yo han kaci mwulepwato toy-yo?  
  pragmatic marker-END one thing ask okay-Q  
  ‘Isscyo, can (I) ask you something?’

Figure 7.1. Grammatical Elements Derived from the Existence Verb Issta
Among the categories laid out in Figure 7.1, in this chapter I will only examine contemporary functions of the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha* and variant forms that agglutinate with utterance-final particles such as –*yo*. The following, from an urban-based contemporary drama, illustrates one such use of this pragmatic marker:

(1) 1. A … *Isscyo* han kaci mwulepwato toyyo? kyeysok kwungkumhan key issnuntey.

‘… *Isscyo* can (I) ask you something? There’s a thing I’ve wanted to know for a long time.’

2. B (While trying to drink a cup of coffee) Ney, mwetunciyo.

‘Yeah, anything.’

3. A Cinanpeney hyencang kasstaka cothoyhakwu kuphi pyengweney kassesscyo. keki nwuka ipwenhayssesseyo?

‘The last time when we were trying to go to the construction site together, you went to the hospital in a hurry in taking your leave. Had somebody been hospitalized there?’

As mentioned previously, the semantic sense of the existence verb *issta* is based on that of location related to the dimensions of time and space. However, in the above illustration, the pragmatic marker *isscyo*, a fused form composed of the stem of the existence verb *iss-* and the particle –*cyo*, does not concern physical location or space. Instead, the space and

---

1 *Ikey salangiya* ‘This is love.’
time of location in the case of the pragmatic markers *issei/isscanha* and variants concerns the world of discourse and the mental space of discourse participants.

Thus, in the above illustration the use of the pragmatic marker underlies a common experience of the interlocutors that exists in the participants’ mental space. Such common experience between interlocutors can be seen in the third line: e.g., the two participants have had a shared job experience as architects who work together as a team (the addressee [B] went to a hospital on the way to construction site with the speaker [A]). In addition, the pragmatic marker presents multifold aspects such as functioning as a turn-taking signal, indicating the speaker’s interpersonal attitude, mitigating illocutionary force, etc.

The existence verb *issta* has attracted a substantial amount of attention in studies that have examined grammatical elements (shown in Figure 7.1) that are derived from the verb *issta* (T.Y. Yi 1988, S.H.Yi 1996, H.H.Yi 1994, Hong 1994, Se 1991, among others). The particles *ci* and *canh* that are suffixed to the stem of the existence verb *iss-* have also attracted the interest of a significant number of scholars (H.S.Yi 1999, Sohn 1999, Han 1991, C.M.Se 1989, Wang 1988, K.H.Cang 1986, among others). However, the pragmatic markers *issci* and *isscanha*, composed of the stem of the existence verb *issta* and the particles *ci* and *canh* have not been studied, to the best of my knowledge, in spite of their high frequency of use in contemporary Korean especially among the younger generation.

In the following sections, I will present the uses and functions of the pragmatic markers *issci* and *isscanha* in contemporary Korean. The semantics of the existence verb
issta and the particles ci and canh will be dealt with in detail in the following chapter in relation to the process of grammaticalization of the pragmatic markers issci/isscanha.

7.2 Uses of the Pragmatic Markers issci/isscanha

As in the case of many pragmatic markers, the pragmatic markers issci/isscanha are not listed in contemporary Korean dictionaries, even though the frequency of use of these pragmatic markers is quite high in spoken discourse, especially among the younger generation. Issci/isscanha can be categorized as phonologically short in that they are comprised of two or three syllables. The distribution of these pragmatic markers is typical; i.e., utterance-initial and nominal unit-final positions. Since the usage of these markers is based on the shared common ground of experience in the real discourse world between interlocutors, they are mainly employed between familiars.

As presented in Chapter 2, one of the principal characteristics of the pragmatic marker is multifunctionality on different semantic and functional levels. On the textual level, pragmatic markers contribute to discourse organization and coherence by linking independent propositions, states, and events. As well, pragmatic markers serve to mark discourse boundaries and transitions and to move discourse forward. For the sake of the addressee’s comprehension, pragmatic markers also contribute to decoding upcoming propositions, states, and events. By capitalizing on pragmatic markers, speakers also plan and organize their thoughts for discourse coherence.

Pragmatic markers are employed to signal discourse participants to take or yield turns in ongoing interaction. In addition, by employing pragmatic markers, speakers express their interpersonal attitudes and affective stances. Pragmatic markers are also
mitigating devices for face-threatening speech acts. Thus, on the interpersonal level, the primary function of pragmatic markers concerns the metamessage; that is, they underscore the illocutionary force of the message itself.

Pragmatic markers can perform these functions simultaneously on both the textual and interpersonal levels. As well, the markers *issei/isscana* also function for discourse organization and to indicate interpersonal attitude simultaneously. However, depending on the specific context and distribution, one of the two principal functions, either discourse organization or manifestation of interpersonal attitude on the textual and interpersonal levels, is more salient than the other.

In the following section, I will examine the functions of *issei/isscanha* and variants by comparing their uses in the nominal unit-final and utterance-initial positions. Concerning the variant forms, it should be reiterated that the utterance-final half-talk ending/speech-level markers *-ci* and *-a*, which constitute the endings of the pragmatic markers *iss-ci* and *isscanh-a* respectively, are one of the most prevalent categories of utterance-final endings in contemporary Korean. In addition to this half-talk, the combination of half-talk followed by the polite ending *-yo*, as in *issei-yo*, or *isscyo*, which is a phonologically reduced form of *issei-yo* and *isscanha-yo*, is also one of the most common types of utterance-final ending in contemporary Korean.

### 7.2.1 Nominal Unit-Final Positions

In nominal unit-final positions, the pragmatic marker *issei/isscanha* and variants typically follow a nominal or nominal phrase/clause, as shown below:
(2)  a. I-yay issci
    this-baby about/concerning

b. Ku-ttay isscanha
    that-time about/concerning

c. John issci
    John about/concerning

d. Na-nun issci
    i-Topic marker about/concerning

e. Ne isscanha
    you about/concerning

f. I-ke issci
    this thing about/concerning

g. I-khomphyuthya isscanhnya
    this computer about/concerning

h. Halmeni isscyo
    grandmother about/concerning

i. Way ... pwupwuchelem isscanha
    way ... as if a couple about/concerning

j. Way ... kulennal isscanhayo
    way ... such a day about/concerning

k. [...]ke issci
    [...] nominalizer about/concerning
Regarding position, when the pragmatic marker occurs followed by the nominal and nominal phrases, as in (2a) through (2h), it primarily functions for discourse organization through the marking of discourse transitions and the linking of independent propositions and states in the textual domain. In (2i) and (2j), the pragmatic marker co-occurs with another pragmatic marker (way) that is derived from the original interrogative question marker and/or conjunction approximated by the English why. With this co-occurrence, the pragmatic marker functions as a device for appealing to the addressee by anchoring and indexing shared knowledge of the general world. At the same time, by indexing such shared knowledge, the use of the pragmatic marker preceded by the co-occurring marker way enhances the hearer’s decoding process of upcoming statements. In (2k), the pragmatic marker followed by the nominal clause functions to seek cooperation and empathy from the addressee by claiming common ground in mutual life experience. At the same time, it signals the yielding of turn to the addressee (see 7.2.1.3).

Thus, in the nominal unit-final position, the pragmatic markers issci/isscanha function on two levels: on the textual level for textual coherence and discourse organization and on the interpersonal level for effecting social cohesion by appealing to shared knowledge and by seeking empathy from the addressee. In the following sections, I will explore in detail the functions of the pragmatic marker when it occurs in nominal unit-final positions.
7.2.1.1 Topic Marker

Let me begin with the following example from an urban-based contemporary drama.²

(3) (A mother-in-law is entering her daughter-in-law’s room while the daughter-in-law is getting dressed after returning from work.)

1. Yay, yay ne cal wassta.
   'Hey, hey you came back at the right moment.'

2. I khomphyuthya (computer) isscanhnya? (rising tone).
   'Isscanhnya/about² this computer (I’m going to talk about this computer/ as far as this computer) you know?'

3. Ni-ka ike kkulttay yeki cekhin taylwu an kkumyen kocangnanta kulaysscanhnya?
   'You said that if one doesn’t shut the computer following this instruction it is going to be broken, right?'

4. Kuntey, nuy sipecika tuleocomaca cekel HWAK capappayse kkamkkamhaycyessta.
   'But/well, because your father-in-law pulled out the cord as soon as he entered, this (monitor) became dark.'

5. Kulaytwu amwu isang epsnya?
   'With such a condition, is there any problem?'

6. Ike kocangnan ke anya?'
   'Is this broken?'

² Ikey salangiya ‘This is love.’
³ English about was also derived from a locative in the same way as the Korean existence verb issta (personal communication with Dr. William O’Grady).
The above speech event occurs between mother-in-law and daughter-in-law. The speaker (mother-in-law) proffers a greeting by saying “you came back at the right moment,” and then continues her talk to her daughter-in-law.

By employing a variant form of the pragmatic marker *isscanha*, i.e., *isscanhnya*, followed by a nominal argument, the speaker (mother-in-law) opens a new discourse focusing on a specific topic, i.e., the computer. The notion of topic here can be understood as referring to “aboutness” in discourse. In this sense, the pragmatic marker marks a discourse transition from a greeting to the new topic. Following introduction of the new topic, the speaker in the 3rd line speaks concerning what her daughter-in-law had previously mentioned, employing the reported speech mode. In this sense, the pragmatic marker also links two discourse modes: direct speech and reported speech. As mentioned earlier, pragmatic markers serve to unfold and move discourse forward in the textual domain. Likewise, the pragmatic marker *isscanhnya* contributes to discourse coherence and progression by marking transitions of independent propositions and by linking different speech modes.

In addition to these typical characteristics, the pragmatic marker in the 2nd line introduces and focuses on the nominal, i.e., the computer. This focused nominal is information already known to the interlocutors, since the hearer (daughter-in-law) was instructing on computer usage to the speaker (mother-in-law) in the previous discourse. This shared information about the computer is indicated by the speaker’s reported speech mode in line (3):
‘You said that if one doesn’t shut the computer following this instruction it is going to be broken, right?’

In other words, the pragmatic marker serves to distinguish new information from given or already-known information by introducing and marking the topic as such. In this sense, the pragmatic marker *issci/isscanha* functions as a topic marker.

According to Schiffrin (1987:268, 290), the English pragmatic marker *you know* functions similarly to the Korean *issci/isscanha*, especially vis-à-vis the topic marker function:

... *you know* is a marker of meta-knowledge about what speaker and hearer share ... particular background information (items, processes, locations, etc.)... a marker of meta-knowledge about what is generally known. ... *you know* leads a hearer to focus attention on a piece of information (either prior or upcoming) being presented by a speaker.

Erman (1987: 115) also points out this function:

*You know* mainly functions as a device for differentiating old and new information and for introducing more background information related to the current topic of the conversation. This PE (pragmatic expression) consequently tends to be used in the presentation of given information or information that the speaker assumes to be known to the addressee.

By delivering shared information, the speaker gains the hearer’s attention to the topic. At the same time, by drawing the addressee’s attention to the topic, the speaker
also induces the hearer’s participation and involvement in the particular discourse. Let me illustrate this with the following example:4

(4) [K, Y: 1-8]

1. K Ne akkapwuthe sonul way kulehkey kulke? (while looking at Y’s hand) ne son way ilay?
   ‘Why are you scratching your hand like that? (while looking at the hand) Why is your hand like this?’

2. Y Akka twayci koki sonulo mwuchyessteni kumsay ilehkey toysse.
   ‘(My hands) have so quickly become like this because a while ago (I) cooked pork using my hand.’

3. K Yakun pallasse?
   ‘Have you used some medicine for that?’

4. Y Pallasse, kumsay kwaynchanhacye.
   ‘(I) did, (It) will be okay shortly.’

5. K (Looking at Y’s hand with concern)

6. Y Kipemssi … kuttay isscanha? (rising tone)
   ‘Kipem … at that time isscanha?’

7. K Encey?
   ‘When?’

---

4 *Ikey salangiya* ‘This is love.’
8. Y Kuttay wuli kyelhonhaki ceney apeci mannavyekwu hayssulttay kuttay, wuli apeci mannavyen mwusun mal halyeko haysse?

‘What were you going to say to my father when we tried to meet him before our marriage?’

The above interaction occurs between spouses. The couple is talking about allergy symptoms manifested by Y (wife) caused by touching uncooked pork with her hand. To this, K (husband) shows his concern while asking his wife whether she has taken any medicine to treat the symptoms.

In line (6), the speaker (Y) addresses her husband by using an address form; i.e., name plus title (Mr. Kipem), in order to gain his initial attention. Following this, the speaker employs the pragmatic marker illscanha preceded by the nominal argument kuttay ‘that time.’ This shifts the topic from the allergy that the speaker currently has to a past event. The pragmatic marker introduces and marks the past event (kuttay ‘that time’) that is already-known information or experience to the interlocutors. By opening up background information for upcoming discourse, the pragmatic marker orients the hearer’s involvement to the speech event. In the next line (7), the hearer responds to the speaker and participates in the transition of the discourse by reiterating the past event (encey ‘when’). Further, the employment of the pragmatic marker illscanha functions to secure both the hearer’s comprehension and involvement in the ongoing discourse. This can be seen in (Y)’s clarification of the shared time (kuttay ‘that time’) in line (8) upon (K)’s inquiry in line (7). In line (8), the speaker begins with the time deixis kuttay ‘that
time,’ followed by further elaboration of the time; i.e., the motivation for trying to meet her father before their marriage.

This comprehension-securing function of the pragmatic marker *isscanha* is similar to that of English pragmatic marker *you know*, as in the following:


Zelda: Y’know that, eh, orthopedic doctor?

   Y’know that took care of Henry when he had his back problems?

Irene: Who, that Chinese doctor?

Zelda: No, the Italian. Bonzi!

Irene: Oh yeh.

Henry: He was not Italian, Zelda, he was Spanish.

Erman (2001: 1346) presents the comprehension-securing function of the pragmatic marker *you know*, illustrated above, in the following way:

In the American corpus there is quite a close-knit relationship between the participants and in the recorded conversations they frequently recall past events and shared experiences in life. What seems to determine the comprehension-securing function of *you know* is rather the relationship between the speakers, the type of discourse, and the subject matter being discussed.

Another noteworthy aspect from illustration (4) is that the speaker manifests hesitation by employing the pragmatic marker *isscanha*. This is indicated by the ellipsis mark in line (6), after gaining the initial attention of the speaker’s husband by addressing
him by name. In other words, the pragmatic marker anchors the speaker’s hesitation vis-à-vis the upcoming discourse. According to Erman (1987: 201), the English pragmatic marker *you know* most often also functions as “a marker of hesitation” as well as “a boundary marker” in the organization of information.

As mentioned, the primary functions of pragmatic markers on the textual level center on textual coherence. However, multifunctional characteristics of the pragmatic marker appear on both the textual and interpersonal levels simultaneously. In other words, the pragmatic marker *isscanha* encodes the speaker’s interpersonal attitude in the sense that the speaker appeals to the hearer by seeking intimacy based on common and shared ground in their lives. As well, the marker serves to express the speaker’s hesitant stance vis-à-vis the upcoming discourse and accordingly mitigates the illocutionary force of soliciting recall of shared past events.

The past event (*kuttay* ‘that time’) involves meeting with the speaker’s father, who has been estranged from her (the speaker) since her teenage years, after a painful divorce. By employing the pragmatic marker *isscanha*, the speaker attenuates the illocutionary force of soliciting recall of a past event that may evoke unpleasant memories and emotions on the part of one or both interlocutors. Thus, the pragmatic marker *isscanha* presents multifunctional aspects on two different semantic-functional levels: on the textual level, it marks the topic, which is given/known information, and links discourse transitions that facilitate structural coherence and discourse organization. It also secures the addressee’s comprehension as well as involvement necessary for moving the discourse forward. Additionally, on the interpersonal level, *isscanha*
functions for social cohesion by appealing to common ground and by mitigating a potentially face-threatening act.

Let me present another example from an urban-based contemporary drama⁵ that illustrates the multifunctional characteristics of this pragmatic marker:

(6) (Y and O are sitting at a kitchen table while preparing vegetables for dinner.)

Y ... Emma ... halmeni isscyo. pakkeyse sayngsin hanun ke pyellwu an cohahasinun ke kathay.

‘... Mom ... isscyo Grandma. (She) doesn’t seem to like the idea of her birthday party at a restaurant.’

O Nepokwu mwela kulesye?

‘Did (she) say something to you?’

The above illustration (6) involves daughter (Y) and mother (O), who are engaged in preparing dinner at the kitchen table. They are talking about their activities during the day. The daughter (Y), with a hesitant tone of voice, changes their conversation by employing the pragmatic marker isscyo preceded by a nominal topic; i.e., halmeni ‘grandmother.’ Thus, the pragmatic marker serves to introduce and mark the topic, which is shared and known information between the two interlocutors.

Following this adducement of old information, new information is presented: the grandmother seems not to care for a party at a restaurant on the occasion of her 70th
birthday. As in the case of the previous illustration (4), the pragmatic marker here not only marks the topic on the textual level but also lessens the illocutionary force of the upcoming message on the interpersonal level, at the same time facilitating discourse organization through affording planning time to the speaker necessary for structuring upcoming discourse.

As well, the introduction of a topic that is shared information between the interlocutors, through the pragmatic marker isscanha, enhances the comprehension process concerning the upcoming discourse for the benefit of the hearer. It can be seen, then, that the pragmatic marker involves the speaker’s discourse production as well as the hearer’s discourse comprehension.

A comparative study by Erman and Kotsinas (1993: 81) looking at the English you know and the Swedish ba shows similarity of their functions to the Korean issci/isscanha, especially concerning facilitating the encoding and decoding of information on the textual level as well as the role of marking old or known information:

The overall function of the markers (you know and ba) ... is to bring some order to the discourse structure and to facilitate the decoding as well as the encoding of the message transmitted. ... the discourse marker may be used in the information structure whereby the speaker urges the hearers to accept part of the information as already known or given; in other words the discourse marker functions in connection with thematisation or topicalization.

\[^5 \text{Ikey salangiya ‘This is love.’}\]
7.2.1.2 Indexing Shared Knowledge of the General World

The following illustration from an urban-based contemporary drama\(^6\) shows an idiomatic-like structure of the pragmatic marker *issci/isscanha*. In order to introduce shared knowledge of the general world, *issci/isscanha* can co-occur with another pragmatic marker, *way*, which is positioned at the beginning of the combinational structure. The marker *way* is derived from the interrogative adverb *way* ‘why.’

(7) (H, K: 1-5)

1. H (Holding her mother’s hands) *emma pole wasstanikkayo.*
   ‘I stopped by to see you.’

2. K *Nan ... way? sitaykeyse mwusun il issesse?*
   ‘Me ... why? Has something happened at your mother-in-law’s house?’

3. H *=ll issul key mwe isseyo.*
   ‘It has been as usual.’

4. H *Kulentey emma, way kulen nal *isscanhayo.*
   ‘By the way Mom, such a day *way isscanhayo.*’

5. H *Pyelankan emmaka sayngkaknakwu pokwu siphun nal, amwu iyu epsi achimpwuthe emmaka pokwu siphun nalyo.*
   ‘A day that (one) suddenly misses one’s mother, a day that, without any reason, from the morning (one) misses (one’s) mother.’

\(^6\) *Ikey salangiya* ‘This is love.’
The above interaction occurs between a married daughter (H), who lives at her mother-in-law’s house, and her mother (K). The speaker (H) unexpectedly comes to visit her mother early in the morning; this causes her mother concern about her daughter. In line (2), (K) asks her daughter if any unpleasant event has occurred. To this, (H) demurs—no unpleasant event has occurred. In line (4) speaker (H) continues her turn by shifting the topic through employing the conjunction *kulentey* ‘by the way,’ followed by a kinship address form, *emma* ‘Mom.’

Continuing this line of discourse in (4), the speaker next employs the idiomatic structure of the pragmatic marker *isscanhayo* co-occurring with the pragmatic marker *way* at the beginning of her utterance. As mentioned, in this idiomatic structure *way* is not the same interrogative question marker used in line (2), i.e., ‘*nan* ... *way* ‘me... why?’ This idiomatic structure [*way* + nominal phrase + *isscanhayo*] in line (4) marks a topic, i.e., *kulen nal* ‘such a day,’ while introducing an elaboration of the topic that is shared knowledge among members of a society who share a certain life background such as gender, generation, education, region, culture, etc.

Let me illustrate another use that involves shared cultural knowledge. The following illustration is from an urban-based contemporary drama:7

(8)  1.  *Isscanha* nanun

‘*Isscanha* me’

2.  Apeci (while trying not to weep) manyak kuttay manyasstamyen,

manyakey kuttay pokey toytamyen,
'If (I) had met my father (trying not to weep) at that time, if (I) had met (him) at that time.'

3. Nan amwulehcito anhun elkwullo kunyang hayngpokhasilako malhayyaci sayngkakhayssessta.

'(I) had thought that (I) should say to (him) in this way: (I) wish your happiness.'

4. (While trying to smile with effort) way oykwuk yenghwaey naonun ihonhan pwupwuchelem isscanha.

'As if way isscanha a foreign actor/actress who has been divorced.'

5. Iceyn wuli kacokhakonun sangkwanepsnun pwuninikka kuccok kacokhako hayngpokhasilako kulehkey malhako siphesse.

'I wanted to say this: since (you) don’t have anything to do with me, (I) wish (you) happiness with your family (through remarriage).'


'Kipem, but I am not like that anymore.'

7. Manyakey nay aphey nathanantamyen na mwulepoko siphe.

'If (he) is in front of me, I want to ask (him).'

8. Way kuttay kulehkey wuli ttenassnunci.

'Why at that time (he) left (my) family like that.'

The above interaction continues the interaction in (4) between the young couple.

The speaker is talking to her husband, who avoids interrupting his wife. In the earlier
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interaction (4), the speech participants were engaged in conversation concerning meeting with the speaker’s father. In the above (8), the speech mode is narration. Thus, the pragmatic marker *isscanha* in line (1), preceded by the address form *Kipemssi*, marks discourse transition from conversational to narrative discourse while focusing on the topic *nanun* ‘about me.’

The speaker here describes her thoughts on meeting with her father, using the reported speech mode in lines (2) and (3). In the next line (4), the speaker employs an idiomatic construction *[way + nominal phrase + isscanha]* to facilitate delivering her thoughts more effectively to the addressee. In line (4), the pragmatic marker *isscanha* marks the nominal phrase *oykwuk yenghwaey naonun ihonhan pwupwuchelem*, which is the topic of discourse as well as being shared knowledge between the interlocutors. The shared background in this illustration is that both interlocutors are from the generation that watches Western movies and is familiar with Western culture. As mentioned, the pragmatic marker *way* in the idiomatic construction is not the same marker as in line (8), which is the interrogative question marker *way* ‘why.’

By indexing shared general background knowledge, the pragmatic marker in this idiomatic construction contributes to facilitating the hearer’s comprehension through the decoding process and at the same time emphasizes the message that the speaker is trying to deliver to the addressee.
According to Erman & Kotsinas (1993), the English *you know* and the Swedish *ba* present functions of confirmation-seeking and appealing to the hearer’s empathy. The following illustrates usages of the English pragmatic marker *you know* and the Swedish *ba*:

(9) … coming from my own depths, *you know*. (example [19] in Erman & Kotsinas 1993: 89)

(10) de va tre killar i en buss a vi stog a vanta pa en annan buss, sa borja rom vinka liksom, kasta slangkyssar a allting, *ba*.

‘there were three guys in a bus and we were waiting for another bus, and then they started to wave to us like, threw us kisses and everything, *only*.’ (example [20] in Erman & Kotsinas 1993: 89)

Erman & Kotsinas (1993: 88-89) explain the confirmation-seeking function of the above examples thus:

… *you know* … could be paraphrased as ‘do you follow what I am telling you’ or ‘do you agree with what I am saying’ … The confirmation-seeking function is further underlined by *know* being pronounced with a rising tone. … Similarly, *ba* in the turn-final position has retained some of its original sense as a focusing adverb by drawing the listener’s attention to what has just been said, rather like an exclamation mark, conveying something like ‘how about that’ or ‘can you imagine.’
In addition to the above confirmation-seeking function, the Swedish *ba* conveys other meanings, such as appealing to the addressee for empathy, as in the following illustration:

(11) sparkad fran arbetsløshetskassan *ba*

‘kicked from the dole *only’* (example [21] in Erman & Kotsinas 1993: 89)

By employing the above pragmatic marker *ba*, “the speaker tries to make the listener picture the difficult situation the speaker might find himself in the future. ... The function of *ba* is equivalent to that of an exclamation marker (Erman & Kotsinas 1993: 89).”

In a similar fashion, the Korean *issci/iisscanha* functions by appealing for the hearer’s empathy and seeking confirmation while signaling turn-yielding, as shown below. The illustration is from an urban-based contemporary drama:

(12) [O, C: 1-3]

(O and C are sitting inside a subway car and talking to each other.)

1. O Emena, kulayse ettehkey toysse?
   ‘Oh my gosh, so what happened?’

2. C Kulssey pam 12-sika toytwu annwacwunun ke *isseyo* (rising tone).
   ‘Oh my, (he) didn’t let me go until midnight *isseyo*’ (rising tone).

3. O Paksacang insangun cham hoinitentey kukey aniney.
   ‘President Pak looks like a very good person, but that is not true.’
The above interaction occurs between co-workers. Both interlocutors sell insurance for a living; they are talking inside a subway car during rush hour about their work experience. Speaker (C) is talking about a customer’s misbehavior after the person bought insurance from the speaker. In response to a question, in line (2) the speaker employs the pragmatic marker isscyo with a rising tone in the nominal unit-final position.

The marker isscyo behaves similarly to the Swedish ba in that it functions like an “exclamation mark, conveying ... ‘can you imagine’ (Erman, Kotsinas 1993: 89).” Delivered with a rising tone focused on the preceding information, the pragmatic marker describes the speaker’s disturbed psychological state and at the same time appeals to the hearer’s empathy while yielding the speaker’s turn to the hearer. Thus, it also serves to signal the addressee’s involvement and participation.

Let me now turn to another illustration that is from the same drama as in (12)⁹:

(13) (Inside a kitchen)
1. Kulekeyyo. enni tekpwuney hokanghakey sayngkyesseyo.
   ‘That’s right. Owing to sister, it looks like I’ll be very well-treated.’
2. Imolang imopwuka chayngkyecwusinikka NEMWU tuntunhan ke isscyo (rising tone).
   ‘Since my aunt and her husband are taking care of me, (I) feel very much secure, isscyo.’
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3. (The speaker’s husband enters the kitchen; while looking at her husband) eh, Kipemssi way? mwe kacile wasse?
   ‘Eh Kipem why? Did you come to bring something?’
4. =Ung, swuli ttlecyese.
   (going out with a new beverage bottle while smiling) ‘Yeh, because (we) finished this beverage.’
5. (To her sister-in-law) enni, nanun tuntunhan ppayki twulina toyntanikka,
   ‘Sister-in-law, as for me, there are two rocks.’
6. Halmeninun unsanimisila apenimi kkomccak moshakwu, imopwunun
cwukmakowunikka cal pwacwusilkekwu, tekwuntana (while trying to hold Hwnswuk’s hand) ilehkey tuntunhan phyentwu isskwu.
   ‘Since (my) grandmother is (my) father-in-law’s teacher, (he) is going to listen to my grandmother, and since (my) aunt’s husband is (my) father-in-law’s dear friend, (he) is going to take care of me, and further (while trying to hold her sister-in-law’s hand) I have somebody like you whom I can rely on.’
7. Kuchi enni?
   ‘Am I right, sister?’

The above interaction occurs among family members. The speaker has two sisters-in-law who live together with their parents-in-law. One of the sisters-in-law is a daughter of the speaker’s aunt. The other sister-in-law is complimenting the speaker on the gifts the speaker’s aunt has given them. To this, the speaker agrees with her, and in the second line she expresses her feeling of security by employing the pragmatic marker
isseyo with a rising tone of voice. However, right after the utterance of the pragmatic marker *isseyo* in line (2), the speaker is interrupted by her husband’s entrance to the kitchen in line (3). The adjacent pairs (3) and (4) are thus speech events disconnected and separated from the original discourse episode; i.e., a description of the speaker’s psychological state.

Owing to this interruption, the speaker lost a chance to yield her turn in line (2); in consequence, the speaker lost a chance to receive confirmation and empathy from the speech participants. Hence, in line (5) the speaker regains attention from the hearer by employing a kinship address term (*enni ‘sister-in-law’*) and elaborates further on why she feels secure in her mother-in-law’s house together with other extended family members. Interestingly, after elaboration, the speaker in line (7) adds a tag question (*kuchi enni ‘Am I right, sister?’*) in order to re-elicit confirmation that she was not successful in securing in line (2) owing to interruption by her husband.

The following example, from the same drama, also presents an interesting phenomenon in relation to seeking confirmation from the addressee.

(14) (In the kitchen of the speaker’s mother)

1. Wulitwuyo “ipaci umsik tollye ponay” kulesilkapwa ttelkwu issessketunyo. ‘We were also nervous because (my) father-in-law said like this: return the food.’

---
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2. Kulayssnuntey kunyang honnakiman hayssayo, umsikinikka tolyye mekumyen
toyntakwuyo.

‘But (the couple of brothers-in-law) simply got scolded. (My father-in-law) said
that since it is food it is acceptable to share (with others).’

3. Cheumeyn apenimi cinachikey kwutwusoyta sayngkakhayssnunteyoyo.

‘At the beginning, I thought that (my) father-in-law is too stingy.’

4. Halmeni, cemcem kukey tangyenhatako sayngkaki tunun ke isscyo (rising tone).

‘Grandma, I’ve gradually been thinking that (my father-in-law’s frugal life) is the
way to go, isscyo.’

5. Celyak cengsintwu olmnunkapwayo.

‘It seems that the frugal spirit is also being contaminated.’

The speech mode of the above illustration is narrative. The speaker describes her
experience to her grandmother regarding her father-in-law’s frugal life attitude. As can be
seen in line (3), the speaker has been critical of her father-in-law’s frugal lifestyle: she
considers him overly stingy. In the next line (4), however, the speaker expresses her
understanding and support for her father-in-law, utilizing the pragmatic marker isscyo
with a rising tone. The employment of the pragmatic marker with a rising tone signifies
seeking and appealing for the addressee’s agreement. However, the speaker fails in
securing agreement from the addressee and yields her turn to her grandmother, as the
speaker perceived distraction of the addressee during her narration. To this, as in (13), the
speaker elaborates on her understanding of her father-in-law’s frugal lifestyle, as shown
in line (5).
In summary, in the nominal unit-final position, the pragmatic marker serves as a topic marker that marks old and new information. As well, it functions to index shared general background information in order to facilitate the decoding process. Lastly, the pragmatic marker functions to elicit the addressee's confirmation and to appeal for empathy from the addressee. In the following, I will examine uses of the pragmatic marker when it occurs in the utterance-initial position.

7.2.2 In the Utterance-Initial Position: Mitigating Device

In the utterance-initial position, the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha* typically occur alone, as shown in examples (15 a-d) below, or followed by address forms, as in example (e), and with conjunctions (h) with a falling intonation. I consider the syntactic distribution of the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha* to be utterance-initial even when preceded by address forms and conjunction-like pragmatic markers such as *kuntey* ‘by the way.’ This is based on the fact that address forms are loosely attached to the rest of the syntactic structure in much the same way as are pragmatic markers.

(15)    a. ... *Isscyo*, hankaci mwulepwato toyyo?

        ‘... *Isscyo*, can I ask you one thing?’

    b. ... *Issci* na sasilun malya.

        ‘... *Issci*, I am in fact’

    c. *Issci* wuli halmenika kulesinuntey.

        ‘*Issci*, according to my grandma.’
d. **Isscanha** … na hoysa kumantwuko umsikcem kayephamyen ettelkka?

‘**Isscanha** … how about opening a restaurant after quitting my (current) job?’

e. Joan-a **issei**, pissan pancinun…

‘Joan **issei**, as for an expensive ring …’

h. Kuntey ... **isscyo** …

‘By the way ... **isscyo** …’

As illustrated in the previous chapter, address forms function to open discourse and gain attention from the addressee. The commonality among uses of the pragmatic marker in the utterance-initial position with or without address forms or with a conjunction is that in this position the marker signals the speaker’s hesitation regarding upcoming discourse, owing to the fact that the upcoming discourse consists of potentially face-threatening speech events such as request, apology, sudden topic change, etc. By prefacing such face-threatening acts, the pragmatic marker mitigates the illocutionary force of such speech acts.

The state of existence of a being or thing, which is the original semantic sense of the existence verb **issta** ‘there is (at some place),’ has been metaphorically extended into the psychological existence of common background, including experiences and knowledge between interlocutors. I will explore this phenomenon further in the next chapter. By employing the pragmatic marker **issci/isscanha**, the speaker appeals to common background and signals that the upcoming discourse is based on the
presupposition of given or previously known information gained through shared experiences or knowledge between the interlocutors.

As well, through employment of this pragmatic marker, the speaker signals social distance. That is, by positioning the marker before potentially face-threatening acts, the speaker manages to mitigate the illocutionary force of such speech acts by appealing to a common background based on social proximity and intimacy between the interlocutors. Usage of `issci/isscanha`, then, is mainly confined to social contexts involving familiars whose relationships are based on a certain degree of shared experiences in life. Thus, in the vast majority of cases in my data, this marker occurs between family members, friends, co-workers, etc.

The Swedish `ba`, cited in an earlier section, and the English `you know` are similar to the Korean pragmatic markers `issci/isscanha` in that all these markers similarly indicate in-groupness and signal solidarity (Erman and Kotsinas 1993, Holmes 1986, Ostman 1981). Erman (2001: 1356-57), examined the disparate uses of `you know` in adult and adolescent talk by comparing the London-Lund Corpus (LLC) recorded between 1960 and 1975 to the Bergen Corpus of London Teenager (BCOLT) recorded in 1993. He explains the different functions of `you know` thus observed in the following way:

The main modal function of `you know` is that of an emphaser, not of any particular part of the proposition, but of the illocutionary force of the utterance as a whole. The fact that `you know` in the young corpus is used to convey the speaker’s attitude, rather than organize the text and ensure coherence, points to the phrase moving in the direction of being further pragmatalized.

According to Ostman (1981), `you know` functions by appealing for the “hearer’s cooperation” through the claiming of common ground. It also signals an interpersonal
attitude by claiming intimacy and solidarity based on common knowledge and/or background (Holmes 1986). Brown and Levinson (1987) termed you know a hedge that has a “positive politeness” function.

The Korean pragmatic markers issci/isscanha in the utterance-initial position mainly function to reduce the illocutionary force of potentially face-threatening acts by indexing the proximal social relationship (i.e., solidarity and intimacy) of the interlocutors on the interpersonal level. By employing these markers, the speaker appeals for the hearer’s involvement and expresses interpersonal affect. However, to a certain degree, even in the utterance-initial position, these markers function as turn-taking signals for intratextual coherence. In the following sections, I will illustrate how issci/isscanha, by prefacing potentially face-threatening acts such as request, apology, and sudden topic change, mitigate the illocutionary force of such acts.

7.2.2.1 Requests

Let me begin with the following illustration from an urban-based contemporary drama:11

(16) [K, C, CE, CU: 1-6]
(In a room with family members)

1. K Yengaka ... ce(ki) kulenikka kantanhi malssum tulicamyen soncwu ...
   posinuntye pwumonimkkeyse towacwusil ili issketunyo.
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‘Yengaka … well, to make a long story short, there is something that you can help us with for you … to see a grandchild.’

2. C Towacwe? mwel towacwe?
‘Help? what kind of help?’

3. CE =AIKWU seysangey towul ili ttalo issci! nitul ay kacnun kel wulika ettehkey towa? nitul canun tongan wuli nayoyka pakkeyse mwusun ungwenkalato pwululya?
‘Oh my goodness, there are things that (we) can help with that are different (from what you are saying). How can we help when you are going to have a baby?
While you are sleeping, do you want us to sing a cheer song outside your room?’

4. K Kukey anilayo … (while touching his hair)
‘That’s not it …’

5. CU Mwusun mwunceyka issnuntey kulay? malhaypwa.
‘What problems make you do like this? Try to talk.’

6. K … Isscyo apeci, wuli twu salam welkupeyse saynghwalpi paykmanwenssik tteykwunamyen namnun key elma epskellangyo. …
‘… Isscyo Dad, there is not much left after giving (you) $1000 for living expenses. …’

The above speech event occurs among family members comprising three generations: parent, children, and grandchildren. Their relationship is very close. As a house rule, except for the grandchildren, everyone pays monthly living expenses (ca. $500.00) to his
or her father (C). Speaker (K), who is married, wants to have a baby but his wife (Yenga) rejects his desire owing to financial considerations.

After dinner, speaker (K) tries to initiate conversation with his father by saying that “there is something for you to help us with for you to see a grandchild.” To this, his father (C) responds to (K) by asking “what do you want me to help you with?” The kinesics that accompanies line (4) involve speaker (K) touching his hair to signal hesitation. To this, his older brother (CU) encourages him to speak up. In line (6), speaker (K) opens the discourse with a hesitant tone of voice, employing the pragmatic marker isceyo. Following this, the speaker presents the reason he and his wife have postponed having a baby; that is, owing to expenses remanded to the father, they are financially unable to justify having a baby. Thus, the speaker (K) implicitly requests a lowering of expenses remanded to the father to free up funds to have a child.

As in other speech request acts, in the above the speaker employs various linguistic devices before making the head act: a request about lowering living expense in line (7). The tactical maneuvers employed by the speaker come into focus: proffering background information in line (1) as ground; then signaling hesitation with body language in line (4); followed by employment of a pragmatic marker in line (6) in conjunction with the indirect speech mode (instead of direct request); followed by another use of a pragmatic marker. These linguistic and non-verbal devices function together to mitigate a requestive speech act that contains a potential threat to the interlocutors’ face.

The use of the pragmatic marker with a hesitant tone of voice appeals especially to the hearer’s empathy concerning the upcoming request while at the same time
lessening the effect of its illocutionary force by claiming intimacy and common ground between the interlocutors. The use of the pragmatic marker *isscyo* represents the speaker’s interpersonal affect and proximity to the hearer. As presented earlier in Chapter (3), the pragmatic marker *ceki* ‘well’ can be employed interchangeably with the marker *isscyo*, as shown in line (6). The major difference between the two pragmatic markers lies in their marking of social distance. While *isscyo* anchors proximity, and accordingly solidarity, between interlocutors, *ceki* indexes neutral distance, and accordingly indirectness. Following the terminology of Brown and Levinson (1987), *isscyo* is a linguistic device for positive politeness, while *ceki* serves as a device for negative politeness.

Let me illustrate another speech context from the same drama:¹²

(17) [W, Y: 1-6]

(Y, smiling, offers W a cup of coffee.)

1. W Ne mwusun pwuthak halyemyen khephi (coffee) cwumyense sayngkkus wustela.
   ‘You’re smiling while giving me a cup of coffee whenever you’re trying to ask something.’

2. Y Tulkhyessney … (laugh)
   ‘(You) got it …’

3. W =Mwentey?
   ‘What is it?’
4. **Y** Wencangnim *isscyo* salamtuliyo, saynghwal selkyeyey tayhayse cal molutulakwuyo.

‘Director *isscyo* it seems that people don’t know well about planning life.’

5. **Y** Kuntey, wencangnim aphulwu Saypyeli khiwusilaymyen kyoyuktwu khun mwunceyketunyo. kyoyuk pohem hana tulusillayyo?

‘But, by the way director, education is a big matter if you are going to raise your daughter, Saypyel. Would you please sign up for education insurance?’

6. *(Y) then hugs (W) after the latter’s acceptance of offer to sign up for education insurance.*

The above interaction occurs at in a workplace between a supervisor and a subordinate whose close relationship is based on long-term work experience. Such proximity in social distance is physically indicated in the last line (6), when speaker (Y) hugs her supervisor (W). In Korean culture, this is possible only between intimates. The speaker (Y) initiates conversation while handing a cup of coffee to her supervisor (W) with a smile. In the first line, the supervisor correctly interprets the semantic implications of the kinesics of the speaker: the asking of a favor. Correct reading of body language of the other party is indicative of the intimate relationship between the two interlocutors. The speaker’s non-verbal expressions thus serve to signal the type of upcoming discourse: a requestive speech act. In the next line (3), the supervisor asks what favor the speaker is requesting.
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By employing the pragmatic marker *isscyo* followed by an address term, the speaker appeals to shared knowledge regarding the necessity to secure insurance for the education of one's children, before asking the supervisor to sign the insurance application form. The speaker's mother is an insurance salesperson; the supervisor knows that the speaker's request is for the benefit of the speaker's mother. In this speech event, the use of *isscyo* lessens the illocutionary force of the requestive speech act and in consequence mitigates the potentially face-threatening act by indexing the intimate social relationship and appealing to a shared base of common knowledge between the interlocutors.

The following occurs between the same speaker (Y) as in the previous illustration, and her boyfriend. This speech event is illustrative of how the pragmatic marker *issci* can co-occur with another pragmatic marker *ung*, which is a hedge similar to 'please':

(18) [Y, K: 1-6]
(Y) is waiting for her boyfriend (K), who is walking toward her holding a cup of coffee.)

1. K Mweya?
   'What is this?'

2. Y (Smiling) ike masye. nayka ACWU: masisskey thassta.
   'Drink this. I made it very delicious.'

   'I'm busy. Tell me quickly.'

4. Y (Trying to put cup into K's hand) iltan patusiwayo. (smiling while looking at K)
   'first take this.'

5. K (Taking the cup while turning around his head so as to try not to see B)
6. Y  

\textit{Issci} … apecihanthey hanpenman te kihoy tallakwu pwuthak tulyepwa \textit{ung}?  

Kipemssi…  

‘\textit{Issci} … would you please ask (your) father to give us one more chance, \textit{ung}  

Kipem?’

After a previous argument between the two interlocutors owing to speaker (A) unintentionally offending her boyfriend’s father before their marriage, the speaker’s boyfriend (K) comes to (Y)’s office. With the same non-verbal technique that she employed with her supervisor in illustration (17), speaker (Y) in line (5) smilingly hands a cup of coffee to her boyfriend. However, the boyfriend (K) signals his hardened attitude by craning his neck to try to avoid (Y)’s gaze. His posture indicates rejection of his girlfriend’s friendly signals in lines 2 and 4. In this situation, the speaker employs the pragmatic marker \textit{issei} followed by a pause in line (6), and then opens a requestive speech act. Following use of the pragmatic marker, speaker (Y) implores her boyfriend to ask his father again for another meeting in preparation for their marriage. The proposed topic for the meeting with (K)’s father constitutes the shared ground between the interlocutors.

A noteworthy aspect of the above interaction is that in line (6) the speaker appeals to the hearer’s empathy by utilizing the pragmatic marker \textit{ung} ‘please will you,’ accompanied with a rising tone, in the nominal unit-final position after the requestive speech act, followed by the pragmatic marker \textit{issei}. The addition of the marker \textit{ung} highlights the intimacy and solidarity between the interlocutors and serves to further express the speaker’s affective stance. At the same time, \textit{ung} further modifies the
The illocutionary force of the requestive speech act. The co-occurrence of the two pragmatic markers (issei and ung) indicates a shared semantic force: solidarity and intimacy. Since the interlocutor in the above illustration is the speaker's boyfriend, the degree of intimacy is much greater than in the interaction with the speaker's supervisor in (17). The addition of the marker ung in the above illustration (18) represents this increased degree of intimacy.

7.2.2.2 Apologies

Let me now illustrate uses of the pragmatic marker in speech acts of apology. The following interaction, from the same drama as in illustration (18), occurs between a boyfriend (K) and girlfriend (Y):

(19) [Y, K: 1-3]

((Y) is sitting with her eyes closed.)

1. K (Putting a ring on B's finger) toysse. posiwayo.
   'It is done. Look at this.'

2. Y (Looking at the ring while opening her eyes) EME ike cinanpeney wulika pwassten ke canha! nayka ipputanun ke! (rising tone).
   'Oh my, this is what we saw last time, you know! What I said is it is pretty!'

‘Yenga … issei (you) can have an expensive ring when we marry. So I bought an inexpensive one.’

The above interaction occurs between the same couple as in illustration (18); i.e., between girlfriend and boyfriend. As an engagement ring, the boyfriend (K) proffers a ring that is inexpensive. In line (3), by prefacing an explanation for the cost of the ring with the pragmatic marker issei, followed by an address form, speaker (K) signals an apology for the quality of the ring, coupled with the justification that he is going to present an expensive ring on the occasion of the wedding.

Noteworthy here, as in previous examples, is that the use of the pragmatic marker is based on shared experience or knowledge. In line (2), the speaker’s girlfriend offers an indication that the engagement ring is given information, as the couple had previously shared the experience of looking at the ring while browsing. In other words, the interlocutors in the above example had broached the subject of an engagement ring before this speech event.

Thus, it can be seen that the function of the pragmatic marker concerns an attenuation of the illocutionary force of the speech act, rather than a marking of given information and introduction of new information for discourse continuation. By prefacing the potentially face-threatening act (an apology) with the pragmatic marker issei, the speaker effectively delivers the sincerity of his affective stance and attitude while at the same time mitigating the illocutionary force of the speech event.
The following illustration, from the same drama as in the above illustration (19), presents a use of the pragmatic marker *issei* that underlies and implies the speech act itself:

(20) [CU, K: 1-6]

(CU, brother of K, is making his bed.)

1. K (As he is entering the room) Nayka halkkey. nayka halkkey.
   ‘I’ll make (your bed). I’ll do.’

2. CU
   =Casik …
   ‘Kido …’

3. K ‘… Hyeng? (rising tone)’
   ‘… Brother?’

4. CU (Tapping K’s shoulder) toysse imma.
   ‘(I) got it, kido.’

5. K (Looking at CU) … Hyeng … *issei* …
   (Looking at CU) ‘… Brother … *issei* …’

6. CU Toysstanikka kulay?
   ‘(I) got it, okay?’

This interaction occurs between brothers who share a room. In Korean culture, it is the usual practice that the younger sibling postpones marriage until the older sibling is married. But in the speech context illustrated above, speaker (K), who is younger than (CU), officially arranges his marriage before that of his older brother. The younger
sibling (K) in this illustration is attempting to apologize for this upsetting of cultural convention. In the first line he prepares the ground for his intention by offering to make his brother’s bed. In line (3), by addressing his brother utilizing a kinship term, the speaker takes his turn and opens the discourse with hesitation. Owing to the shared familial background between the interlocutors and the intimacy of their relationship, the addressee (CU) correctly perceives his brother’s intention, as is indicated in line (4).

However, in line (5), younger sibling (K), still with a hesitant tone of voice, continues the discourse by employing the pragmatic marker issci, preceded by a kinship address form, in order to anchor and emphasize the delivery of the apology. Even though the speaker here is interrupted and does not get to complete the objective of the discourse, his brother (CU) correctly comprehends the speaker’s intention to apologize, as is indicated in line (6).

This example illustrates the fact that the provision of the pragmatic marker issci in and of itself can serve to imply, indeed signal, a given speech act. In the above case, the pragmatic marker implies the speech act of apology. As well, this illustration suggests that the speaker’s successful delivery and the addressee’s accurate comprehension of the message pivots on the felicitous use of issci, which is permitted in this context based on shared background held by the interlocutors.

7.2.2.3 Softening Upcoming Propositions

As mentioned earlier, according to my data speech interactants utilizing the pragmatic markers issci/isscanha are virtually all familiars who share experience and
knowledge in life. When the pragmatic marker is employed between unfamiliars, as in the following illustration, the pragmatic marker does not occur by itself but is accompanied by either a conjunction or another pragmatic marker such as *ceki* ‘well/excuse me.’

The following interaction, from the same drama as in (20), occurs in a wedding dress shop between customers and a clerk:

(21) [Y, K, C: 1-5]

1. Y Iwang wassnuntey mwel. han yel kay ipe pokwu kucwungeyse kolulkeya. ‘Since (we) are already (here), (I) will choose (one) after trying about ten dresses.’

   (To a clerk) talun ke ipe pwatwu toycyo?
   ‘Can I try another one?’

2. K (While laughing) an toynta kuleseyyo.
   ‘Tell her that (you) won’t let her try (another one).’

   ‘It is okay to try another one (smiling). (looking at Y) Any dress would be good because you are pretty.’

   ‘That’s right, owing to my Mom.’

5. Y ... kuntey *isscyo*, ike pillinuntey elmaeyyo?
 Speaker (Y) stops by a wedding dress store with her boyfriend (K) and proceeds to try on a dress. After trying on a dress, the speaker asks a clerk (C) if she can try another one. To this, the clerk in line (3) accedes to the request, adding the compliment that “Any dress would be good because you are pretty.” To this comment, the speaker agrees with the clerk in a somewhat joking manner, laughingly commenting that her outward appearance is owing to her mother.

After engaging in the above discourse (question/request, followed by a response with compliment/agreement), the speaker proceeds to change the conversational topic to the rental price of the dress by employing the pragmatic marker *iscyo*, preceded by the conjunction *kunty* ‘by the way.’ The conjunction in and of itself is a device typically utilized for discourse organization and continuation on the textual level. The conjunction in the above illustration contributes to moving the discourse forward by linking independent propositions.

When the conjunction is coupled with the pragmatic marker, as it is in the above illustration, it serves to deliver the speaker’s interpersonal attitude, in this case softness and proximity, toward the addressee in tandem with the accompanying message, even in the case of unfamiliars as in the above (see also Holmes 1986, Meyerhoff 1994).

The following interaction, from the drama *ikey salangiya* ‘This is love,’ takes place between two adult brothers and is illustrative of how the pragmatic marker *issci/isscanha* expresses the speaker’s interpersonal attitude and softens the upcoming discourse:
(22) [S, CU: 1-7]

(Speaker [S] is entering his brother’s room.)

1. S Canya?
   ‘Are (you) sleeping?’

2. CU (Trying to sit up in bed) Ung, way?
   ‘Yeah, why?’

3. S Na nehanthey sanguy com halkey issese tule wasse.
   ‘I came in because I have something to discuss.’

4. CU Mwentey?
   ‘What?’

5. S Na cikum insayngeyse cwungtayhan kyelceng halyeko hanuntey uynon sangtay
   com hay tallakwu. ni uykyen com tutko siphta.
   ‘I want to talk with you because I am going to make a very important decision in
   life. I want to hear your opinion.’

6. CU (Softly) Malhay pwa.
   ‘Tell (me).’

7. S Isscanha ... na hoysa kuman twuko umsikcem kayep hamyen ettelkka?
   ‘Isscanha ... how about opening a restaurant after quitting (my) job?’

After a brief opening exchange, in line (3) the speaker presents the reason for
visiting his brother around bedtime: he indicates that he needs to discuss something
important, yielding his turn to elicit the addressee’s response. In line (5), following the
addressee’s acceptance of his visit, the speaker elaborates on the importance of
discussing with his brother his decision on something, again yielding his turn by indicating his desire to listen to his brother’s opinion. The addressee in the next line (6) takes his turn by asking his brother about his decision. Thus, the adjacency pair (5-6) is an elaborated repetition of a prior pair (3-4).

The presence of the pragmatic marker in line (7) marks new information on the textual level regarding the speaker’s decision. However, at the same time the pragmatic marker serves to deliver the speaker’s interpersonal feelings, in this case proximity and solidarity, toward the addressee based on familial affinity. As well, by employing the pragmatic marker *isscanha*, the speaker appeals to the addressee’s empathy and support regarding his decision to open a restaurant after quitting his position at the company. In the same way as in (21), the pragmatic marker here also softens the impact of the upcoming message.

The above illustration highlights one of the principal characteristics of pragmatic markers: their inherent multifunctionality. On the textual level the pragmatic marker *isscanha* introduces new information for moving discourse forward; on the interpersonal level it indexes the speaker’s attitude toward both the addressee and the proposition. However, as mentioned, depending on distribution and speech context, one of the two principal functions, i.e., discourse organization on the textual level and manifestation of interpersonal attitude on the interpersonal level, is more salient. In other words, in the preceding illustration in which *isscanha* occurs in the utterance-initial position, the primary function is expression of the speaker’s emotive affect coupled with modification and softening of the upcoming proposition on the interpersonal level.
7.3 Conclusion

Owing to the semantic generality of the existence verb *issta*, which subsumes reference to time and space, a significant number of grammatical and functional elements have been derived from this verb (see Figure 7.1). Among these elements, the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha*, composed of the stem of the existence verb *issta* and the particles *ci* and *canh*, present multifunctional aspects in contemporary Korean usage. In the same way as with other pragmatic markers, the original propositional sense of the verb *issta*; i.e., existence, is not retained in the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha*. Instead, the original semantic sense of existence in physical space at a given time has been metaphorically extended into the psychological realm, existing experientially in the mental space of interlocutors in the discourse world. I will explore this further in the following chapter.

The principal characteristics of the uses of the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha* underlie the common ground between discourse participants. Owing to this, usage of the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha* is mostly restricted to familiars whose relationships are based on a certain degree of social proximity and shared or common knowledge and experience. In this sense, the Korean markers are similar to the English *you know* and the Swedish *ba*, as illustrated throughout sections of this chapter. The common properties of these pragmatic markers are found in the indexing of solidarity and intimacy and in the signaling of social proximity and affinity.

As in the case of other pragmatic markers, *issci/isscanha* present complex functionalities that are context-bound. The morpho-syntactic distribution of this pragmatic marker is typical in that it occurs in both the utterance-initial and nominal unit-
final positions. The typical morpho-syntactic structure in the nominal unit-final position is [nominal arguments + *issei* or *isscanha*, including variants], as shown in illustration (2). In the nominal unit-final position, the pragmatic marker behaves as a topic marker (7.2.1.1) that marks old and known information to the interlocutors. This is similar to the functionality of the English *you know*, as Erman and Kotsinas (1993) account for.

By drawing the addressee’s attention to shared information through the pragmatic marker, the speaker manages to appeal for the addressee’s involvement. As well, by marking discourse boundaries and linking independent propositions, the pragmatic marker contributes to overall textual coherence and organization. *Issci/isscanha* are also involved in speech production and comprehension. In other words, by employing the pragmatic marker, the speaker plans and organizes her thoughts in the process of unfolding discourse. Likewise, these markers function to index shared general background information in order to facilitate the decoding process necessary for the addressee’s comprehension (7.2.1.2). The markers *issci/isscanha* also function to elicit the addressee’s confirmation and to appeal for empathy from the addressee (7.2.1.3). In sum, the principal function of the pragmatic markers *issei/isscanha* in the nominal unit-final position is for textual coherence by marking old and new information, linking discourse transitions, and affording planning time for upcoming discourse, as well as by facilitating the decoding process. Secondarily, these markers serve to present other aspects that are found in the interpersonal domain, such as appealing for the addressee’s empathy.

In the utterance-initial position, the pragmatic marker indexes the speaker’s epistemic and affective stance toward upcoming discourse. In other words, by prefacing
potentially face-threatening speech events such as request, apology, etc., the pragmatic marker functions to mitigate and attenuate the illocutionary force of such speech acts. By appealing to a common and or shared background through employing the pragmatic marker, the speaker also signals interpersonal affect such as social affinity and solidarity to the addressee. Thus, in the utterance-initial position the pragmatic marker functions to underscore the illocutional force of the utterance and for interpersonal cohesion. However, multifunctional characteristics of the pragmatic marker are also manifested in this position, since *issci/isscana* function as turn-taking signals and verbal fillers for planning upcoming discourse. Thus, *issci/isscanha* function simultaneously for intratextual coherence and discourse organization in the textual domain and for interpersonal cohesion in the interpersonal domain.
8.1 Introduction

In contemporary Korean, the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha* ‘you know’ present a variety of multifunctional aspects that denote context-sensitive characteristics in the same way as do other pragmatic markers. The existential verb *issta*, the original source of the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha*, denotes the semantic sense of existence and state of being in a given space at a given time. However, as shown in Chapter 7, the contemporary uses of the pragmatic markers do not represent the original semantic sense but rather index common experience and knowledge between interlocutors based on common ground in any discourse situation.

Thus, the original sense of the existential verb describing a state in a physical space at a given time has been semantically extended into the sense of psychological experiences and knowledge through metaphoric transference from the original source. Owing to this pragmatically strengthened and reanalyzed characteristic, *issci/isscanha* signal the speaker’s intimate attitude and manifest the speaker’s desire to secure the hearer’s understanding and cooperation by claiming common ground. However, the semantic extension from the original sense of existence to pragmatic function is not arbitrary as is the case with other pragmatic markers, since the original semantic sense is persistent in diachronically developed pragmatic functions.
The principal condition of semantic extension in the process of grammaticalization is textual frequency based on semantic generality. The semantic sense of physical existence and state is cross-linguistically attested as a typical source for grammaticalization (see Heine et al. 1993; Bybee et al. 1994:10). Heine et al. (1991: 33) argue that source concepts used for grammaticalization refer to some of the most elementary human experiences; they are typically derived from the physical state. Existence in space and in a given time denotes the basic human condition as in the case of other basic activities such as eating, sensing/feeling, and experiencing. Thus, it can be said that the existential verb is one of the universal categories in natural languages (see also Clark 1978, Lyons 1967).

In Korean, there are three verbs that denote the semantic sense of existence. One is Sino-Korean in origin (concayhata) and has not taken part in diachronic development. The other two are differentiated by only one semantic feature: the honorific. The Sino-Korean lexical item concayhata is mostly used with the formal register, as in formal writing. In this sense, textual frequency is much less attested than the other two lexical items. On the other hand, the existence/state verb, which retains the semantic feature of the honorific, i.e., kyeysita, participates in the grammaticalization processes. However, compared to its non-honorific counterpart isssta it presents much less complex diachronic development. In addition, the honorific existence verb kyeysita does not participate in the development of pragmatic markers at all. Instead, its plain form isssta has been selected for the development of the pragmatic markers issci/isscanha. The unmarked semantic feature of isssta in relation to the honorific signifies the highest degree of semantic generality and in consequence the highest textual frequency among the above three
lexical items that denote the propositional sense of existence/state. I will tackle this matter in the following section in relation to the polygrammaticalization phenomenon.

The figure below illustrates the diverse grammatical categories that are derived from the non-honorific counterpart of the existence verb *issta*:

![Diagram]

Figure 8.1. Grammatical and Functional Network of the Non-Honorific Existence Verb *issta*

Among these elements, in this chapter I will examine the diachronic development only of the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha*.

After examining the characteristics of the source element of the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha*, focusing on semantic and morpho-syntactic properties (8.2.1 and 8.2.2), I will compare the developmental paths of the honorific existence verb *kyeysita* and its non-honorific counterpart *issta* (8.2.3). I will then look at the grammaticalization
principles and mechanisms incident to issci/isscanha and the diachronic path followed by these markers in the process of their development (8.3.1 and 8.3.2).

8.2 Sources of the Pragmatic Markers issci/isscanha

8.2.1 Semantic Characteristics of the Existence Verb isssta and the Particles ci/canha

8.2.1.1 Existence Verb isssta

Let me start with a dictionary definition of the existence verb isssta 'there is/to be (at a place).'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSTA 1. state/existence (e.g., salangi issnun kosey yongseka isssta 'Where there is love, there is forgiveness.') 2. happen, appear (e.g., sayngkikena pelecita 'something happens or appears.') 3. stay (in relation to time) (e.g., nayka yeki issul ttay ... 'When I am here ...') 4. delay (in relation to time) (e.g., cokum issumyen ... 'in a while') 5. possess (material, non-material thing) (e.g., thukchwilhan mwuesi issessta 'There was something distinguished [to him]). 6. wealthy (e.g., issnun salamun ... 'Somebody who is wealthy ...') 7. live</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 8.2. Semantic Senses of the Existence Verb isssta 'there is (at a place)'

As listed under entries 1 and 5 in the above figure, the existence verb isssta denotes both existence and possession. The same verb can also be used for the existential, locative, and possessive constructions (cf. Lyons 1967). Thus, the parallel relation among the senses of existence, location, and possession is clear in Korean, as shown below:


   table-LOC book-NOM there is

---

1 From Han Kwuke Sacen 1997. Translation into English from Korean by the author.
‘There is a book on the table.’

b. Location: Chayk-i  theyipul-ey  issta.
book-NOM  table-LOC  there is

‘The book is on the table.’

c. Possession: Tom-hanthey  chayk-i  issta.
Tom-DAT  book-NOM  there is

‘Tom has a book.’

Y.C. Park (1975) writes concerning the semantic relationship between possession and existence, and in this study he pointed out that the basic meaning of the verb issta centers on location. He also argues that the sense of possession is derived from the primary meaning of location in real speech events: "As for possession, it is discoursal meaning that is created via speech participants, i.e., speaker and/or addressee, in real discourse. Thus, there is no grammar that distinguishes the meaning of possession from that of location or experience (Y.C. Park 1975: 116\(^2\))."

As mentioned earlier, the sense of existence is based on that of location that includes the references of space and time. The following example is from the first sense, i.e., state/existence, of the dictionary entry shown in Figure 8.2:

\(^2\) The original text written in Korean is translated into English by the author for the purpose of this dissertation.
(2) Salang-i iss-nun kos-ey yongse-ka iss-ta.

love-NOM there is-MODE place-LOC forgiveness-NOM there is-END

‘Where there is love there is forgiveness.’

The reference to space that is inherent in the verb issta is further specified by the locative case marker –ey, as in the bold-typed nominal phrase, i.e., kos-ey ‘place-Loc (where).’ Clark (1978: 113) points out that “in many languages, this nominal is also marked by a locative case ending and by a preposition or postposition that specifies further the exact locative relation between the Nom and the place denoted by the Loc.” Anderson (1971: cited in Clark 1978: 114) has further argued that “all case endings and prepositions are locative in origin: language is built on a spatial metaphor.”

The following example from dictionary entry (3) from Figure 8.2 illustrates the relation to both time and space of the existence verb issta:

(3) nay-ka yeki iss-ul ttay

i-NOM here there is (to be at a place)-MODE when

‘when I am here’

As shown in the nominal phrase in (2), the locative case marker –ey can be inserted in order to specify location, followed by the locative pronoun yeki ‘here,’ as in yeki-ey. Dictionary examples (3) and (4) from Figure 8.2 consolidate inherent semantic characteristics of the existence verb issta. That is, location that has reference to space and
time is the basis of the semantic senses of existence and state, as claimed by Lyons (1967: 390):

... existential be-copula does not normally occur in English without a locative or temporal complement; and it might appear reasonable to say that all existential sentences are at least implicitly locative (the term ‘locative’ being taken to include both temporal and spatial reference).

Let me now turn to dictionary entry (5), denoting the sense of possession:

(4) Thukchuwulhan mwues-i iss-ess-ta. distinguished something-NOM there is-PST-END

‘There was something distinguished (to him/her).’

‘(He/She) had something distinguished.’

In this illustration, the spatial nominal phrase, ku/kunye-eykey ‘to him/her,’ carrying the semantic features of animation and humanness, can be inserted before the existence verb in the following way:

Thukchuwulhan mwues-i ku/kunye-eykey iss-ess-ta.

According to Clark (1978), who examined the locative nature of syntactic constructions, including existential, possessive, and locational aspects covering thirty languages, the spatial nominal phrase ku/kunye-eykey ‘to him/her’ above can be termed “animate place/location.” In other words, the possessor of the verb is “human location.” When the reference point of the verb isssta involves human location, the semantic sense of possession can be extended into the discourse world to include the discourse participant’s
subjective evaluation of the speaker's possession. As the object of possession in (4) is a non-physical intangible thing, i.e., *thukchwulhan mwues* 'something distinguished,' the object of possession of the existence verb *issta* can be the subject's experience, knowledge, characteristic quality, etc., that is evaluated and assessed by discourse participants in the discourse world.

Lyons (1967: 391) argues that "existential statements are logically equivalent to pointing, or deixis." The existence verb has a function that is similar to deixis in that the verb functions to point and describe locations, states, and situations, as in the dictionary entry in Figure 8.2. According to Lin (1981: 179-184), the Chinese existence verb 在 has the following usages: pointing to the location of an action, indicating existence of the subject, denoting a time-when expression, describing circumstances, and describing the speaker's emotion and thoughts. This existence verb thus has the potential for further development as a pragmatic marker, since the original semantic sense retains the meaning of pointing out location (including temporal), state, and experience that is an extended sense from indication of possession and description of circumstances and states in the discourse world.

8.2.1.2 Semantics of the Particles *ci/canha*

Let me briefly discuss the particles *ci* and *canha*. Below are entries from the same contemporary dictionary utilized in the previous section:
1. [Noun] time period from what has been done to so far (e.g., kohyangul ttenan cika pelsse 10-nyen uy seyweli hullessta ‘When (I) left (my) home town it’s been over ten years.’) 2. [Suffix (defective noun)] such a place/space (e.g., poncek-ci ‘born place,’ mokcek-ci ‘target/goal place’) 3. [Ending] a. ending for emphasizing a proposition while presenting a different proposition (e.g., kunun cakka-ci cengchikanun anita ‘He is a writer but not a politician.’) b. with a subjective feeling/attitude certifying the proposition (e.g., kyewulpamey meknun yakpapiya cengmal pyelmi-ci ‘Concerning the sweet rice that is eaten at night in winter, it is really great tasting, right?’ c. for a question (e.g., cikumi etten ttayci? ‘What’s the time of these days?’)

Figure 8.3. Semantic Senses of the Particle ci

As shown above, ci serves to denote various semantic senses and morpho-syntactic categories. First, as a defective noun ci denotes time and space-related states, as shown below, which illustrates entries 1 and 2 above:

(5) a. kohyang-ul ttena-n ci-ka ...
    hometown-ACC leave-MODE time-NOM
    ‘since (I) left (my) home town …’

b. poncek-ci; mokcek-ci
    born-place; goal-place

Second, as an ending suffixed onto a predicate, ci serves to describe subjective mental states (as in 6a below) and epistemic modalities that denote the speaker’s subjective feeling or evaluation (as in 6b). Let me illustrate this usage:

---

3 From Han Kwuke Sacen 1997. Translation into English from Korean by the author.
(6) a. Ku-nun cakka-
he-TOP writer-END cengchika-nun politician-TOP anita.
NEG
‘He is a writer but not a politician.’

b. Kyewulpamey mek-nun yakpap-i-ya cengmal pyelmi-
winter night eat-MODE sweet rice-NOM-Emph really great taste-END
‘Concerning the sweet rice that is eaten at night in winter, it is really great tasting, right?’

c. Cikum-i ette-n ttay-
now-NOM what-MODE when-Q
‘What’s the time of these days?’

In (6c), ci serves for a question ending.

The following is a dictionary entry for the particle canha:

| Ending (short form of ci aniha-) for seeking the addressee’s agreement while emphasizing the preceding predicate. It must be followed by a final ending (e.g., I cengtomyen cohcanha ‘If this is so, that is decent, isn’t it?’) |

Figure 8.4. Semantic Senses of the Particle canha

As indicated above, the particle canh is a fused form composed of the particle ci and the negative pro-verb ani ha ‘do not.’ The semantic sense of this fused form has shifted from the sense of negation to that of an epistemic modal. According to the above dictionary definition, the particle canh denotes a sense of seeking the addressee’s agreement while

---

4 From Han Kwuke Sacen 1997. Translation into English from Korean by the author.
asserting the truth value of the proposition contained in the speaker’s utterance, as shown in the following:

(7)  I -cengto-myen coh canha?
    this-much/degree-Eval good
    ‘If this is so, that is decent, isn’t it?’


The commona element of these two particles centers on the fact that both denote the semantic sense of epistemic modality. In relation to this common characteristic, an interesting phenomenon can be found in the coalesced form of the contemporary pragmatic markers *issei* ‘you know’ and *isscanha* ‘you know,’ in which the existential verb *issta* is coalesced with the particle *ci* as well as *canha*: Since the particle *canha* is a pre-final ending particle, it requires the final utterance particle --a, which is a half-talk utterance final particle.
Coalescence of the stem of the existential verb *iss* and the above two particles underlies the commonality of their semantic features. In other words, the existence verb *issta* denotes state/existence and possession, including intangible possession such as experience and knowledge in relation to the concept of location/space in a given time. As well, the semantic senses of the particles *ci* and *canha* overlap that of the existence verb *issta* in that these particles concern state, including psychological and epistemic states in relation to time and space. Thus, coalescence of the pragmatic markers *issci* and *isscanha* is not arbitrary but rather based on common semantic features describing and pointing to states of existence, experience, and knowledge in space in a given time.

### 8.2.2 Morpho-Syntactic Characteristics

The existence verb *issta* has also attracted a significant amount of interest dealing with its morpho-syntactic categorization. The verb *issta* simultaneously evinces partly verbal characteristics and partly adjectival characteristics. Owing to this idiosyncratic nature, controversy and arguments centering on how to grammatically categorize the verb have occurred (see H.P. Choy 1965, H.S. Yi 1955, Y.K. Pak 1975, Seng 1976, K.T. Yi 1978, C.S. Se 1996). For the purposes of this study, I employ verbal categorization, since *issta* behaves more like a verb, even though it manifests adjectival characteristics depending on discourse context.

In this section, I will examine how the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha* morpho-syntactically differ from their original source, the existential verb *issta*. For this, let me first present several examples that illustrate verbal characteristics of *issta*:
(8) a. Co-occurring with an epistemic adverb

Ney tongsayng cal iss-ci?

your brother well be-Q

‘Your brother is well, isn’t he?’

b. Co-occurring with an Imperative ending

Camkkan iss-ela.

a while be-END

‘Wait/stay (for me) for a while.’

c. Co-occurring with a propositive ending

Camkkan yeki iss-ca.

a while here stay- END

‘Let’s stay here for a while.’

d. Co-occurring with a modal particle

mom-i an coh-ase cip-ey kunyang iss-keyss-e.

body-NOM not good-CAP home-LOC just be-MOD-END

‘(I) will be home because (my) condition is not good.’

The above illustrations reveal that *issta* indeed belongs to the verbal category, since it can co-occur with grammatical elements that generally co-occur with verbs, such as the epistemic adverb *cal* ‘well’ as in (8a), the imperative ending *a/e la* as in (8b), the propositive ending as in (8c), and the modal particle *keyss*, denoting the speaker’s will and desire, as in (8d).
Let me bring back an example from Chapter 7 concerning use of the pragmatic marker *issei* to illustrate how it behaves differently from the verb in (8):

(9) …*Issci* na sasilun malya.

‘… *Issci*, I am in fact.’

In contrast to the existential verb *issei* in (8a), a form homonymic to the pragmatic marker *issei* above, the pragmatic marker does not retain the capability to inflect with the modal particle *keyss*, the imperative ending *ela*, the propositive ending *ca*, or to co-occur with epistemic adverbs. The pragmatic markers *issei*/*isscanha* also do not retain agglutination capabilities with honorific morphemes (e.g.,-*si*), tense markers (e.g.,-*ess*), and modal particles (e.g.,-*keyss*). In this sense, the pragmatic markers *issei*/*isscanha* have undergone morphological decategorization from the verbal category.

Let me now turn to one of the adjectival characteristics of *issta*:

(10) Co-occurring with the declarative ending –*ta*

Ku-eykey-nun enehakcek cisik-i manhi *iss-ta*.

him-DAT-TOP linguistic knowledge-NOM a lot have-END

‘He has a lot of linguistic knowledge.’

‘To him there is a lot of linguistic knowledge.’

The principal characteristic of the adjectival category is that an adjective can co-occur with the declarative ending *ta*. In the above illustration (10), *issta* denotes the sense of
possession rather than that of existence or state. As examined in Section (8.2.1.1), the
sense of possession inherent in *issta* is derived from the sense of location. In the above
illustration (10), the location concerns “human place,” i.e., *ku-eykey* ‘to him,’ as pointed
out by Clark (1978).

The pragmatic marker *issei* in (9), however, does not retain the capability of co­
occurring with the declarative ending –*ta*. Instead, the pragmatic markers are only fused
with the half-talk utterance final endings -*ci* and –*a*, as in *iss-ci* and *isscanh-a*,
respectively. This also indicates that *issci/isscanha* have undergone diachronic processes
in that they do not comport with either verbal or adjectival characteristics.

In relation to syntactic distribution, the pragmatic markers evince distributional
restrictions not shared by the verb *issta*. That is, as shown in Chapter 7, *issci/isscanha* are
restricted to the beginning or end of the utterance. When they occur in the nominal unit­
final position, they can co-occur only with nominal arguments. Even though the
pragmatic markers undergo restricted syntactic distribution, the syntactic scope of
*issci/isscanha* becomes expanded even into the entire speech event.

8.2.3 Polygrammaticalization: Comparison of Non-Honorific Verb (*issta*)
and Honorific Verb (*kyeysita*)

Heine et al. (1993: 24-26, 79-80) list a variety of languages that have undergone
grammaticalization of copular and existential verbs; cross-linguistically, verbs denoting
existence and state are sources for semantic extension. According to Ono (2000),
Japanese existential verbs are also the sources for various grammatical elements such as
aspect and mood. This signifies that the concepts of state and existence are semantically
generalized across languages so that such concepts inherently contain the potential for high textual frequency, a requisite condition for a lexical item to undergo diachronic development into a range of grammatical and functional elements. Likewise, existential verbs possess the capability of development into multiple elements.

For instance, Heine (1992: 354-355) accounts for this phenomenon of polygrammaticalization with the Ewe existence verb, which developed into the auxiliary *le* 'be at':

... polygrammaticalization, that is, that one and the same morpheme is the source of more than one chain. The Ewe auxiliary *le* 'be at' has been grammaticalized in two ways. On the one hand, it has given rise to a multi-purpose preposition whose main function is to introduce adjuncts or oblique case roles. ... On the other hand, the auxiliary *le* has been employed in periphrastic locative constructions which have developed into verbal aspect categories, and it has assumed the function of a present progressive and a present ingressive aspect marker.

The characteristic of polygrammaticalization is also observed in the Korean existential verb *issita* 'to be (at a place)' and its honorific counterpart *kyesita* 'to be (at a place).' Owing to this, Korean existential verbs present polygrammaticalizational phenomena in a much more complex manner than does the existence verb of the Ewe language. To examine this, let me illustrate again the multidirectional paths of the non-honorific existence verb *issita*:
Figure 8.5. Grammatical Network of the Non-Honorific Existence Verb

The grammatical network shown in Figure 8.5 is associated with various paths. First, the time-related path, as in aspect *a/e iss* or *ko iss*, tense *ass/ess*, adverb *itta* ‘in a while,’ and sequential particle *se* ‘and then, after that’; Second, the space-related path, as in the locative marker *eyse* ‘at,’ the dative marker *eykey* ‘to,’ and the directional marker *eylo* ‘toward’; Third, the quality-related path, such as in the causal particle *se* ‘because,’ which is further developed from the sequential particle *se* and the pragmatic marker *issci/isscanha* ‘you know.’

T.Y. Yi (1988) examined how the existence verb *issta* has been decategorized in multiple directions: case marker, tense/aspcet marker, and the connective particle labelled sequential particle *se* in the above figure. As well, Rhee (1996) has examined in detail

---

the multi-directional grammaticalization phenomena of *issta*. However, the formation of the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha* from the existence verb *issta* has not been studied at all, to the best of my knowledge.

The following developmental path of the existence verb *issta* is taken from Rhee (1996: 154):

-TAM (tense, aspect and modal) path:
Resultative/state-persistence > perfect/past
Progressive > imperfective

-Particle path:
Locative > ablative > sequential > causal/conditional

Rhee (1996: 142) examined the development of the particle *se* by comparing quantitative uses of this particle in a single text (*Nokeltay*) that has been translated repeatedly in different centuries, as shown below:

**Table 8.1. The Diachronic Change of the Semantics of *–se* in the *Nokeltay* Texts (Rhee 1996: 142)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1517 text</th>
<th>1670 text</th>
<th>1741 text</th>
<th>1995 text</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locative (essive/inessive)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional/causal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noteworthy from the development of these elements as shown in Figure 8.5 and in the above Table (8.1) from Rhee's study is that they both follow the unidirectional path posited by Heine et al. (1991: 48), which can be diagrammed thus:

Person > Object > Activity > Space > Time > Quality
Following this model, the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha*, which concern quality in that they function to denote social cohesion by marking distance and proximity among other pragmatic functions, developed at the latest stage of the grammatical elements that are derived from the verb *issta*.\(^6\) For comparison between grammatical elements that denote time and quality, let me present the following illustration:

(11) **Istakam** nilotoy. \(\textit{Kumkangkyeng Samkahay 1482}\)

'Tell (me) in a while.'

The above time-related adverb *istakam* (>ittakum) 'in a while,' also derived from the existence verb *issta*, occurs in the 15th century. However, as mentioned earlier, the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha* do not occur until the late 20th century in my data. This supports the above developmental path model by Heine et al. (1991:48).

As mentioned, in addition to the diachronic developments of the non-honorific existential verb *issta*, its honorific counterpart *kyeysita* has also been grammaticalized. T.Y.Yi (1988) examined how *kyeysita* has evolved into the honorific nominative case marker *kkeyse*. According to Rhee (1996: 153-154), *kyeysita* has also been grammaticalized into a resultative/state-persistence marker, perfect/past marker, and progressive/imperfective marker in the TAM (tense, aspect and modal) path. It also developed into a particle that has a variety of grammatical and pragmatic functions such as locative marker and subject (honorific nominative) case marker *kkeyse*. The following

\(^6\) For the diachronic development of other grammatical elements, see T.Y. Yi (1988), Han (1986), Rhee (1996), among others.
list from Rhee (1996: 154) illustrates the above-mentioned grammatical elements that are derived from the honorific existential verb *kiyeysita*:

-TAM (tense, aspect, and modal) path:
Resultative/state-persistence (>perfect)
Progressive > imperfective
-Particle path:
(Locative>) > subject

If we look at the Figure 8.5 and the list shown above for comparison, it can be seen that the developmental paths of *kiyeysita* are not as diverse as those of *issta*. As stated earlier, for a lexeme to be grammaticalized, its semantic sense should be sufficiently general in order to warrant high textual frequency. Owing to the semantic generality of the existence verb, even though the source *kiyeysita* is the honorific counterpart of the existence verb *issta*, it has also been grammaticalized into various grammatical elements. However, the added semantic features [+human, +honorific] caused limitations in textual frequency compared to that of the non-honorific counterpart *issta*. Rhee (1996: 154-158) clearly accounts for this phenomenon in relation to its diachronic developments. *Kyeysita* [+human, +honorific] blocks the developmental paths of case particles such as locative, ablative (directional), sequential, causal since its semantic characteristics of marking [[+human, +honorific] are attached invariably to an animate noun. In addition, as Rhee (1996) pointed out, phonological subsistence of the non-honorific counterpart *issta* is simpler than that of *kiyeysita*. This also limited the capability of *kiyeysita* in its developments into various grammatical elements.

The semantic features onto the verb *kiyeysita*, i.e., [+human, +honorific], also interfere in its diachronic development into pragmatic marker. This is also true in the case
of the evolution of the pragmatic marker (ke)pwa 'you see' in Chapter 6. In other words, 
poyta, which is the honorific counterpart of the visual perceptual verb pota 'see/look at,'
retains the same semantic features as kyeysita, i.e., [+human, +honorific]. However, it did
not develop into the pragmatic marker (ke)pwa. Instead, for the development of the
pragmatic markers (ke)pwa and issci/isscanha, non-honorific counterparts of the
existence verb isssta and the visual perceptive verb pota are selected accordingly.

Therefore, except for semantic generality in relation to textual frequency, what
characteristic of the class of pragmatic markers forbids honorific lexical elements from
being grammaticalized into pragmatic markers? As examined in earlier chapters,
pragmatic markers present multifunctional aspects that simultaneously work on both the
textual and the interpersonal levels. In other words, on the textual level pragmatic
markers function for text coherence and discourse organization through the marking of
discourse boundaries and/or the propelling forward of discourse. Pragmatic markers on
this level also function as verbal fillers for discourse planning. On the interpersonal level,
pragmatic markers in general function for expression of the speaker's attitude,
perspectives, and epistemic stance. They also function for claiming the addressee's
cooperation and involvement, and for turn-yielding.

Thus, pragmatic markers, especially on the interpersonal level, concern speakers’
desire and need for social cohesion. In this sense, pragmatic markers are speaker-oriented
and subjectivised according to the speaker's perspective and attitude. On the other hand,
the usage of honorific lexical elements is addressee/hearer-oriented, since the use of
honorific lexical elements is dependent upon honorable features of the hearer such as age,
social status, or gender (in certain societies) in relation to the speaker. Such honorable
features do not possess feasibility for the speaker's subjectification because they are inflexible and are not multifaceted in contrast to features such as the speaker's attitude and perspective. Thus, in addition to semantic features such as [+human, +honorific], honorific lexical elements are hindered from being grammaticalized, especially into pragmatic markers, owing to hearer-oriented characteristics and inflexibility toward subjectification.

8.3 Diachronic Development of the Pragmatic Markers *issei* and *isscanha*

*Isssei/isscanha* as pragmatic markers seem to have been introduced and established by the late 20th century; these markers do not occur at all in Middle Korean to Middle Modern Korean (1960) literary texts of the conversational genre, according to my data. As mentioned, the utterance final particle *ci* was established by the middle of the 20th century and its coalescence with the existential verb logically occurs after the establishment of the particle.

The uses of the pragmatic markers *issei/isscanha* underlie social structural change from hierarchical to horizontal structure. Such social change started in the early 20th century, dramatically advancing by the end of the century. The simplified speech level\(^7\) is one of the key criteria that clearly is suggestive of social structural changes (see Yang 1980, C.S. Se 1984, 1995, Hwang 1990). Uses of the half-talk speech level, mainly with the particles *ci* and *a/e* and the combinational uses of half-talk followed by the polite speech level *yo*, also became increasingly popular starting in the middle of the 20th century, and gradually became dominant in contemporary Korean usage. In familiar and

---

\(^7\) For details, see Chapter 2.
intimate social relationships, such as between a mother and a daughter, older brother and younger sister, between spouses, etc., the half-talk speech level is dominant regardless of age and gender differences.

In the 15th century, in addition to the honorific counterpart kyeysita, there were three variants of the existence verb: isita when followed by a vowel suffix, sita when preceded by a word that ends with the vowel i, and ista when followed by a consonant suffix. However, sita disappeared in the 15th century. The simplification and unification of both isita and ista into the single form ista and further to the contemporary form issta, seems to have begun in the 19th century, being established in the 20th century according to my data9 (see also P.H. An 1988: 201-202). As already examined in section (8.2.3), owing to the textual frequency warranted by the unmarked semantic element in relation to the honorific and semantic generality of the semantic sense, the existential verb issta is selected in the process of the development of the pragmatic marker, approximately by the middle of the 20th century.

In the following sections, I will delve into the issues related to the grammaticalization mechanisms and principles followed by issci/isscanha. I will also examine the grammaticalization path followed by issci/isscanha.

---

8 For details, see T.Y. Yi (1988) and H.H. Yi (1994).
9 In Hyel uy nwu (1906), iss frequently occurs; e.g., Yopo, na yeki issso ‘Honey, I am here.’ (p. 14).
8.3.1 Grammaticalization Mechanisms and Principles of issci/isscanha

As attested across languages, the first stage of diachronic development of a lexical item is based on semantic generalization. Both metaphoric and metonymic mechanisms intervene upon this semantic extension or generalization. As examined earlier concerning semantic characteristics of the existence verb issta and the particles ci and canha (8.2.1), the existence verb issta concerns existence or state in a physical space at a given time. The particle ci also concerns describing state in relation to time and space as well as describing psychological state. The particle canh is a fused form of the particle ci and the negative morpheme anh. Thus, all of the elements constituting the pragmatic markers issci/isscahna retain the concept of describing the state in space at a given time.

As Heine et al. (1991) note in their problem-solving construction of grammaticalization, abstract and functional elements such as pragmatic markers that denote social intimacy, solidarity, distance, etc., are derived from concrete lexemes that contain propositional lexical meanings. This process is accomplished principally through the employment of metaphor. In other words, between two conceptual domains, as shown in the figure below, metaphoric transference occurs unidirectionally from the concrete to the abstract conceptual domain.
The concrete lexical feature of the existence verb *issta* has been extended to the abstract psychological domain; i.e., psychological existence of common knowledge and experience that the speaker believes that she shares with the addressee in their mental space. Thus, the first stage of grammaticalization of the pragmatic marker *issei* is the semantic extension of its source concept through metaphor.

According to Hopper and Traugott (1993: 81), there exists a metonymic mechanism that involves “meaning changes arising out of contiguity in linguistic including pragmatic contexts.” They conceptualize that “metonymy points to, or indexes, relations in context (Hopper and Traugott 1993: 82). Semantic transfer from contiguity is based on pragmatic reanalysis in contexts. In other words, by conventionalizing conversational implicatures through frequent use, non-propositional pragmatic meanings are produced. Heine et al. (1991) and Traugott (1988) point out that both metaphoric and metonymic mechanisms underlie the process of semantic generalization.

According to Traugott (1988: 409-410), the following three semantic or pragmatic tendencies can be observed in the process of semantic generalization:

![Figure 8.6. Metaphoric Transference](image)
(a) Tendency I: from meanings situated in the external described situation to meanings situated in the internal (evaluative/perceptual/cognitive) situation
(b) Tendency II: from meanings situated in the described external or internal situation to meanings situated in the textual/metalinguistic situation
(c) Tendency III: to meanings increasingly situated in the speaker’s subjective belief/state/attitude toward the situation

Among these, Traugott (1988) considers tendencies I and II to be metaphorically motivated; on the other hand, she considers tendency III to be metonymically motivated.

I have adduced the fact that pragmatic markers are speaker-oriented in their functions, especially on the interpersonal level. In addition to the higher text frequency of non-honorific lexical items vis-à-vis their honorific counterparts, it is this aspect of speaker-orientedness that is the principal reason that non-honorific lexical items are selected in the grammaticalization process, since the usage of honorific items is hearer-oriented. As examined in the previous chapter, on the interpersonal level issci/isscanha function to express the speaker’s attitude and perspective by indexing or pointing out common ground between interlocutors. In this sense, semantic generalization of the pragmatic markers issci/isscanha is also intervened upon by the metonymic mechanism.

In addition to semantic generalization, in the process of grammaticalization a source item undergoes several processes on various linguistic levels. In other words, the pragmatic markers issci/isscanha underwent morphological fusion between the stem of the existence verb iss and the utterance final particles ci and canha. As already examined in section (8.2.1.2), such fusion is based on their common semantic feature; i.e., describing and pointing out the state of existence, including experience and knowledge, in space at a given time.
In the process of this morphemic fusion, it is noteworthy that the stem of the existence verb *iss*- is fused only with the utterance-final particles *−ei* and *−a*, as in *issei* and *isscanha*, respectively. That is, only half-talk utterance final particles are selected for the grammaticalization process. As well, on the morphological level, the pragmatic markers underwent loss of verbal characteristics such as inflectional ability, as presented in section (8.2.2).

On the phonological level, the suffix ending of the existence verb *−ta* has been dropped and fused with the particles *ci* and *canha*. Phonologically, the pragmatic markers *issei/isscanha* became "short-syllabialized," typical in the process of the development of the pragmatic markers. As well, on the syntactic level *issei/isscanha* underwent distributional restriction since they occur in nominal unit-final and utterance-initial positions as illustrated previously in Chapter 7. In nominal unit-final positions, the pragmatic markers are also under a restriction in their co-occurrence with a lexical category. In other words, they can only co-occur with nominal arguments (see Ch.7).

Let me now briefly turn to the grammaticalization principles adduced by Hopper (1991) to ascertain how the pragmatic markers *issei/isscanha* proceed in the process of their diachronic development. The divergence principle applies in the case of the pragmatic markers *issei/isscanha* in that the source item; i.e., the existential verb *issta* and the utterance-final particle *ci*, and the target item that is grammaticalized diverge and independently undergo linguistic changes. In consequence, homonyms that are based in the same etymology are observed in natural language uses, as shown below:
(12) A. Ney tongsayng cikum etiey iss-ci?
   your brother now where be-Q
   ‘Where’s your bother now?’

B. Issci ... apecihanthey hanpenman te kihoy tallakwu pwuthak tulyepwa ung Kipemssi?
   ‘Issci ... would you please ask (your) father to give us one more chance, please Kipem?’

In (12A), the ungrammaticalized lexical item issci is employed as an existential verb, followed by the utterance-final half-talk particle functioning as an interrogative morpheme. As mentioned, the sense of existence includes a reference to space and time. In (12A), these references are clearly presented, as in cikum ‘now’ and etiey ‘where’ (8.2.1.1). On the other hand, in (12B: from Chapter 7 [18:6]) the homonym issci functions as a pragmatic marker that modifies the requestive illocutionary force by indexing solidarity based on common ground between interlocutors. Thus, the source item issci in (12A) and the target item, which is a grammaticalized form of issci, as in (12B) have diverged and independently undergone linguistic changes.

The principle of decategorization also applies in the process of the diachronic development of the pragmatic marker issci/isscanha. Let me turn again to the definition of Hopper (1991:22):

Forms undergoing grammaticalization tend to lose or neutralize the morphological markers and syntactic privileges characteristic of the full categories noun and verb and to assume attributes characteristic of secondary categories such as adjective, participle, preposition, etc.
As examined earlier in section (8.2.2), the pragmatic markers \textit{issei/isscanha} have lost the verbal characteristics retained by the ungrammaticalized existential verb \textit{issei}. In other words, the pragmatic markers \textit{issei/isscanha} cannot agglutinate with the following morphemes: the past tense marker \textit{ass/ess}, the modal marker \textit{keyss}, and the honorific morpheme \textit{si}. As well, the pragmatic markers \textit{issei/isscanha} underwent fixation in that their distribution is confined to the utterance-initial and nominal-unit final positions. In short, the pragmatic markers \textit{issei/isscanha} have been decategorized from the major grammatical category. It can be seen, then, that categorical membership changes in the process of diachronic development from major category (e.g., existence verb) to minor functional category (e.g., pragmatic marker).

Lastly, the principle of persistence: grammaticalized items are to some degree semantically relevant to their source items. Owing to this semantic transparency, before the end of the grammaticalization stage, the source concept of the grammaticalized item can be traced. This principle is also applicable to the pragmatic markers \textit{issei/isscanha}. The following illustration presents this aspect:

(13) A. Ceki ... \textit{isscyo} ... sensayngnim.
    ‘Ceki ... \textit{isscyo} ... teacher.’

B. \textit{Isski-n} \hspace{1cm} mwe-\textit{ka} \hspace{1cm} iss-e?
    \textit{there is}-MODE \hspace{1cm} what-NOM \hspace{1cm} there is-Q
    ‘Is there what/something?’
The above interaction occurs between a student (A) and a teacher (B). The student employs both pragmatic markers (*ceki* and *isscyo*) to initiate conversation with her teacher before asking a favor. To this, even though the teacher understood the speaker’s intention owing to the usage of the pragmatic markers *ceki* and *isscyo*, he pretends he did not understand the speaker’s intention by interpreting the use of pragmatic marker *issci* as an existential verb that contains propositional meaning of state or existence. This indicates that semantic relevancy between the source concept, i.e., existence or state, and the grammaticalized concept of the pragmatic marker *issci* is clear and transparent. In addition, such semantic relevancy between the two concepts suggests that the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha* are in the initial stage of grammaticalization, since in the final stage the two concepts, i.e., source and target, become opaque, and semantic persistence between the two concepts cannot be traced.

### 8.3.2 Emergence of the Pragmatic Markers *issci/isscanha*: From Matrix Clause to Pragmatic Marker

As examined previously in Chapter 6, the development of the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa* ‘you see,’ which is derived from the perceptive verb *pota* ‘see/look at,’ signifies a new cline of the grammaticalization path, since it emerges from a matrix clause (see Brinton 2001). Let me illustrate the developmental path of the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa*:
Figure 8.7. Developmental Paths of (ke)pwa

The above figure illustrates morpho-phonemic fusion among separate morphemes in the process of the emergence of the pragmatic marker (ke)pwa 'you see.' Prior to the internal coalescence between morpheme boundaries, the original form of the pragmatic marker (ke)pwa, i.e., [ku-kes-(ACC)#po-a], shows the following syntactic structure: [(subject) + object + verb].

As stated earlier, the pragmatic markers issci/isscanha do not occur at all in Middle and Modern Korean literature. The emergence of the pragmatic markers issci/isscanha seems to have occurred in the late 20th century after the establishment of the utterance-final half-talk particle ci in the middle of the century. As the pragmatic marker (ke)pwa is formed through internal coalescence and phonological reduction through segment loss from a matrix clause of the syntactic structure [(subject) + object + verb], the emergence of the pragmatic marker issci/isscanha is also intervened upon by internal coalescence between the morpheme boundaries of a matrix clause. However, unlike the pragmatic marker (ke)pwa, issci/isscanha are derived from the syntactic structure [subject + verb].

Let me start with the following illustration from Chapter 7 to examine the process of the developmental paths of the pragmatic markers issci/isscanha. As presented in the previous chapter, issci/isscanha mainly occur in the nominal unit-final and initial

---

10 From chapter 6: Figure 6.2.
positions. In the following illustration, the pragmatic marker occurs at the nominal unit-final position.

(14) O and C are sitting inside a subway car and talking to each other.

1. O Emena, kulayse ettehkey toysse?
   ‘Oh my gosh, so what happened?’

2. C Kulssey pam 12-sika toytwu an nwacwunun ke istringstream (rising tone).
   ‘Oh my, (he) didn’t let me go until midnight istringstream (rising tone).’

In the above illustration, the second line in which the pragmatic marker istringstream is employed is composed of the following syntactic structure:

\[
[(S) + (O) + V] \text{ke (Nominalizer) istringstream}
\]

The nominalizer \text{ke} in the above illustration is phonologically reduced from its original form \text{kes} due to loss of the segment \text{s}. The nominalizer \text{ke} modifies the embedded sentence and functions as a subject of the complex sentence structure. In oral Korean discourse, case markers such as the nominative case marker \text{i} followed by the nominalizer \text{ke} are frequently dropped. In the above embedded sentence structure, the slots of the nominative and accusative arguments are empty, as indicated by parentheses, since they can be understood within the given discourse context.

The scope of this nominalizer concerns the entire embedded utterance, since it indexes and modifies the utterance itself. In this sense its function is similar to that of an anaphor. Owing to this characteristic, it occurs by itself while indexing already known or mutual knowledge and experience between discourse participants, as in the following:
(15) K. Kulem Twunginunyo?
   ‘Then how about Twungi?’
J. Ung mwe?
   ‘Uh what?’
K. Ke isscanhayo Twungi.
   ‘Ke isscanhayo Twungi.’

The interlocutors (K and J) above are talking about cartoon characters. After the
speaker (K) realizes that the addressee (J) is aware of the cartoon program and characters
of the program, (K) asks about a character named Twungi. To this, (J) yields her turn by
signaling that she is not aware of the character and needs more information about it. In
the third line the speaker (K) employs the pragmatic marker isscanhayo preceded by a
phonologically reduced form of nominalizer ke. This nominalizer indexes mutual or
shared knowledge about the cartoon characters, including Twungi. Through the previous
discourse indicated by the discourse marker/conjunction kulem ‘then’ in the first line, the
speaker assumes that the hearer shares the information about the character Twungi. Thus,
instead of providing more information on the character, the speaker emphasizes the
shared knowledge about the character.

It can be seen, then, that the speaker indicates through the employment of ke
isscanhayo that the addressee does not need further information since the speaker
believes that the addressee already is aware of the character Twungi. Noteworthy from
this illustration is that the co-occurrence of the nominalizer ke and the pragmatic marker
isscanha(yo) underlies their common pragmatic feature. In other words, both the
nominalizer *ke* and the pragmatic marker *isscanhayo* index common knowledge and experience that exists in the mental space of both interlocutors.

The following figure illustrates how the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha* emerge from the matrix clause in which the original form of the nominalizer, i.e., the distal demonstrative pronoun *kukes* ‘that thing,’ functions as a nominative argument of the clause:

```
[ku-kes-(Nom)#issci/isscanha] > [kuke# issci/isscanha] > [ke#issci/isscanha] >
issci/isscanha
that-thing-(Nom)#you know
(# denotes morpheme boundary)
```

**Figure 8.8. Developmental Paths of *issci/isscanha***

The developmental paths illustrated above are similar to those of the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa* ‘you see,’ especially because of the phonological erosion of the demonstrative pronoun. The demonstrative pronoun *kukes* ‘that’ underwent phonological reduction through segment loss, as in CVCV(C) in *kuke* and further C(V)(C)V(C) in *ke*. In the case of the formation of *(ke)pwa*, omission of the accusative case marker in oral discourse greatly contributes to internal coalescence and further syntactic reanalysis (see Ch. 6). In other words, the morpheme boundary between the two arguments has become obliterated owing to their adjacency followed by the omission of an accusative case marker.

In the process of the development of the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha*, the demonstrative pronoun indexing common experience between the interlocutors has undergone phonological erosion to CV (i.e., *ke*) and further to complete loss. In my data
it very frequently occurs as complete loss. In other words, the pragmatic markers
issci/isscanha occur singly, without co-occurrence with ke. This is due to redundancy;
that is, both ke and the pragmatic marker retain a common pragmatic feature: indexing
mutual experience in the discourse participants' mental space. By frequent use (discourse
frequency) and owing to the principal characteristic of the pragmatic marker
issci/isscanha, i.e., indexing shared common ground between interlocutors, without the
presence of the distal demonstrative pronouns ke or kukes, issci/isscanha alone indexes
common ground, as in the following:

(16) a. ...Isscyo. hankaci mwulepwato toyyo?
   ‘... Issyo, can I ask you one thing?’

b. ... Issci na sasilun malya.
   ‘... Issci, I am in fact.’

c. Joan-a issci pissan pancinun ...
   ‘Joan issci as for an expensive ring ... .’

Thus, unlike the English epistemic parentheticals you know or I think the Korean
pragmatic markers issci/isscanha are produced through internal coalescence from a
matrix clause. As introduced in the formation of the Korean pragmatic marker (ke)pwa
‘you see’ (see Chapter 6), the English pragmatic marker I think is formed through
reversal between matrix and subordinate clauses after the process of that complement
deletion (see Thomson and Mullac 1991, Hopper and Traugott 1993), as in the following:
a. I think that Tom is tall.

b. I think Ø Tom is tall.

c. Tom is tall, I think.

However, as discussed in Chapter 6, Brinton (2001: 177) argues that the English pragmatic marker *look* developed from the matrix clause through internal coalescence.

... interpersonal pragmatic marker ‘look’ ... are shown to be the result of originally free matrix clauses which become syntactically fixed, are reanalyzed as sentence adjuncts, and undergo internal coalescence, a process which began in the 17th century. A new grammaticalization cline is proposed to account for the unidirectionality of the development.

In summary, the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha* have emerged by undergoing several diachronic processes in the following ways: The first stage of diachronic development of the pragmatic markers is semantic extension through metaphorical and metonymic mechanisms (8.3.1). In this stage, textual frequency intervenes in the process of semantic extension owing to higher textual frequency through the unmarked semantic feature concerning honorific feature. The plain form of the existential verb *issta* is selected rather than the honorific counterpart *kyeysita* for its diachronic development toward becoming pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha*. As Brinton (2001) points out, in this stage the lexical item *issci* can be semantically polysemous in the homonymic form. In other words, depending on context, *issci* can denote both a concrete lexical sense of existence or state in physical space and an abstract sense of shared experience or knowledge in the discourse interlocutors’ mental space, as illustrated in the manner of comparison between (8a) and (9).
Following semantic generalization, on the morpho-syntactic level the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha* underwent fixation. That is, they can occur in the nominal unit-final position only with nominal arguments. They also underwent the loss of verbal characteristics (e.g., the capacity to agglutinate with tense, honorific, or modal markers) through decategorization. Syntactic reanalysis from a matrix clause to a pragmatic marker occurs in this stage. In the last stage, as in the case of prototypical pragmatic markers, *issci/isscanha* occurs in the utterance-initial position, syntactically an extra-sentential position.

Divergence in the process of the development of grammatical and pragmatic markers that are derived from the perceptive verb *pota* and the existential verb *issta* is based in the fact that a variety of pragmatic markers such as *pwa, ipwa, yepo*, etc., are derived from the perceptive verb *pota* through morphemic fusion between morpheme boundaries. Similarity in semantic features among morphemes and adjacency between morpheme boundaries underlie the process of morphemic fusion. On the other hand, rather than pragmatic markers, a variety of grammatical elements that denote tense, aspect, case relations, etc., are derived from the existential verb *issta*. The commonality between the two sources of the pragmatic markers can be seen thus: when the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha* are developed through internal coalescence, in the same way as pragmatic markers that are derived from the perceptual verb *pota*, adjacency between morpheme boundaries and similarity in semantic features of the adjacent morphemes are the essential conditions for the diachronic processes (see also C.Y. Yi 1998).
8.4 Conclusion: Unidirectionality, Subjectification, and Regularity in Semantic Change

Owing to the attribute of semantic generality, the Korean existential verb *issta* and its honorific counterpart *kyeysita* have undergone semantic extension and have developed into a variety of grammatical and functional elements (8.2.3). The dynamic interconnections among various linguistic domains are also observed in the process of diachronic development of the existential verb *issta* ‘to be (at a place).’

For instance, on the semantic level, semantic extensions of a lexical item occur at the beginning of its diachronic developments while its propositional meaning undergoes semantic loss in the formation of the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha*. The semantic extensions occur conceptually in two domains. In other words, the conceptual transference occurs from the lexical source domain to the abstract target domain through metaphoric intervention. The original source meaning (i.e., existence/state in a physical space in a given time) is conceptually transferred to common experience and knowledge in the mental space of speech participants in the target domain. This semantic shift and transference are regular and unidirectional in two domains from a concrete lexical element to a functional and abstract element. As well, such transference does not occur arbitrarily, since this semantic shift is based on shared properties of the two domains. Metaphorically transferred sense is pragmatically strengthened and reanalyzed so that it can be employed to express the speaker’s beliefs and subjective attitudes on social proximity and distance in her social relationships. This process is intervened upon by the metonymic mechanism. Thus, both metaphoric and metonymic devices influenced the development of the pragmatic markers *issci/isscanha.*
Following semantic generalization and extension, morpho-phonemic changes of the original source item occurred in the form of phonological reduction and morphological coalescence between morphemic boundaries. Also, on the syntactic level the lexical item underwent fixation to a certain distribution. That is, the pragmatic markers \textit{issci/isscanha} occur only in the nominal unit-final and utterance-initial positions.

The pragmatic markers \textit{issci/isscanha} also conform to several principles of grammaticalization such as decategorization (from a major category [verb] to a minor category [pragmatic marker]), divergence, i.e., co-existence with ungrammaticalized lexical verbs as well as grammaticalized grammatical markers including the pragmatic marker, and persistence between the source and target concept (8.3.1).

The above processes on different linguistic levels, the grammaticalization principle of decategorization, and the process of semantic generalization all follow the key grammaticalization concept of unidirectionality. Semantic generalization does not occur in the opposite direction from an abstract grammatical item to concrete lexical item. As well, the principle of decategorization from a major grammatical category (e.g., verb) to a minor functional category (e.g., the pragmatic markers \textit{issci/isscanha}) underlies the principle of unidirectionality (8.2.2 and 8.3.1).

The developmental path of the pragmatic marker from matrix clause through both internal coalescence and syntactic reanalysis accordingly suggests the new cline of grammaticalization (8.3.3), as Brinton (2001) suggested in examining the development of the English pragmatic marker \textit{look}. This is also supported by the development of the Korean pragmatic marker \textit{(ke)pwa} ‘you see’ (Chapter 7).
Lastly, I pointed out that the formation of the pragmatic markers issci/isscanha concerns a principal notion of grammaticalization in addition to textual frequency based on semantic generality; that is, the notion of subjectivity dubbed the “expression of self” (Finegan 1995:1). The concept of subjectivity underlies the reason that the non-honorific lexical item issta served as the source for the pragmatic markers issci/isscanha, rather than its honorific counterpart kyeysita. On the interpersonal level, issci/isscanha function to express the speaker’s subjective perspectives and attitudes. In this sense, pragmatic markers are speaker-oriented and denote the speaker’s epistemic stance. However, honorific lexical items contain an inherent limitation in expressing such subjectivity, principally because uses of honorific lexical elements such as kyeysita are dependent upon addressee attributes such as age, gender, status, etc., in relation to those attributes of the speaker, rather than dependent upon the speaker’s epistemic perspectives.

In conclusion, the key notions in the diachronic development process of a lexical item (i.e., unidirectionality, regularity in semantic change, and subjectivity) all underlie the formation of the Korean pragmatic markers issci/isscanha. The following figure may make clearer to the reader the chronological development of the divergent grammatical and pragmatic markers of the verb issta:
Figure 8.9. Chronological Development of Functional Elements of the Verb *issta*
CHAPTER 9
CONCLUSION

As stated in the Introduction, the pragmatic markers selected for study under this dissertation have not previously been examined, to the best of my knowledge. Owing to this, I faced hindrances in determining the synchronic functions and diachronic development of the selected pragmatic markers. At the same time, this situation afforded me an opportunity to uncover an unexplored area of linguistic study. It is my aim, then, that this dissertation contributes an original perspective to the study of pragmatic markers. I will recapitulate below the overall findings of this study, followed by a synopsis of each chapter.

The primary outcomes of this study can be stated as follows: First, verification of the multifarious functions of the pragmatic markers ceki(yo) ‘excuse me/hello,’ issci(yo) ‘you know,’ ipwa(yo) ‘hey/look,’ (ke)pwa(yo) ‘you see,’ together with exposition of the diachronic development and subjectification of this group of pragmatic markers. In the process of examining the evolutionary pathways of these markers, I focused on the following aspects: verifying the source of the pragmatic markers and the characteristics of this source; determining the semantic transparency between source and target concepts; establishing grammaticalization mechanisms and principles as well as the motivation that impelled the grammaticalization process; and sketching the developmental cline for the markers.
Let me now turn to a brief summary of each chapter: In Chapter 1, presented is an overview of the dissertation involving objectives, research questions, historical and contemporary data and data analysis.

In Chapter 2, the theoretical framework of pragmatic markers, the grammaticalization process, and Korean speech level markers including the characteristics of the particle yo are discussed.

In Chapter 3, aspects of the Korean pragmatic marker ceki(yo) are delineated. The pragmatic marker ceki most commonly occurs in the utterance-initial position. However, when it functions as an information retrieval device for retrieving a word, name, etc., from the speaker’s memory, ceki can also occur turn-medially. The pragmatic marker ceki serve to initiate conversation as a starter, to signal a topic change, and to mark discourse transitions. As well, by linking independent propositions, states, and events, the pragmatic marker ceki contributes to intra-textual coherence through sequential coordination. As well, the marker serves to structure upcoming discourse by affording speakers time for information processing for retrieving a word, name, etc., while allowing the speaker to hold her turn. As well, the marker ceki functions as a device for drawing attention from interlocutors.

In addition, in the speech contexts of making excuse, apology, disagreement, and request, the pragmatic marker ceki indexes the speaker’s interpersonal and affective stances in relation to interlocutors vis-à-vis the speaker’s upcoming utterance, while at the same time contributing to a softening of the effect of the illocutionary force of these speech acts. Thus, ceki evinces multifunctionality: dependent on the local speech context, the marker may function simultaneously for the creation of intra-textual coherence
through sequential coordination and for the indexing of the speaker’s interpersonal and affective/empathetic stances toward upcoming discourse in relation to interlocutors.

Chapter 4 traces the origin and grammaticalization process of the Korean pragmatic marker *ceki* from a diachronic linguistic perspective. As a pragmatic marker, *ceki* first occurs early in the 20th century according to my data; historically this lexical item has undergone several morpho-phonemic processes. For more detail, see Table (4.5).

As a pragmatic marker, the syntactic distribution of *ceki* was restricted to the sentence/clause-initial position. On the semantic-pragmatic level, through the process of subjectification, the original referential meaning designating distal space was conceptually transferred to the pragmatic function expressing the speaker’s indirect and polite attitude (Traugott 1995:31; Finegan 1995).

In regard to grammaticalization principles, the decategorization of *ceki* from major to minor category, i.e., from demonstrative pronoun to locative adverb and further to pragmatic marker, is a ramification of its altered application. As well, *ceki* and its homonymic forms designating demonstrative pronoun and locative adverb underwent separate and independent linguistic changes. This also conforms to one of the general principles of grammaticalization, that of divergence. Neutrality and vagueness from the original source, the distal deictic element *ce*, persist into the use of *ceki* as a pragmatic marker owing to conceptual metaphoric transference to the target concept of indirectness. Thus, it can be said that the persistence of semantic relevance between source and target concepts applies to the pragmatic marker *ceki*. It can be seen, then, that during the process of diachronic development, the pragmatic marker *ceki* follows several general grammaticalization principles (Hopper 1991; Traugott 1995).
The diachronic developmental processes of *ceki* reflect the principal characteristic of grammaticalization. That is, development from a concrete lexeme denoting spatial and physical distance to a pragmatic marker denoting psychological distance through metaphoric transference conforms to the overarching grammaticalization principle of unidirectionality. Impetus for the grammaticalization of *ceki* stemmed from Korean speakers' cognitive as well as social needs. It is based in the need for maximization of relevancy and information content by drawing the addressee's attention to the speaker and speech event while at the same time satisfying the speaker's social desires to manifest interpersonal and affective stances toward the upcoming discourse in relation to the interlocutors.

Let me now turn to the grammaticalization process of the attention-getter *ipwa* 'hey/look,' discussed in Chapters 5 and 6, in comparison with that of *ceki*, which has the function of getting attention from the unfamiliar to the speaker. The attention-getters *ceki* and *ipwa* evolved from distal and proximal deictic elements, respectively, serving complementary functions based on characteristics of the source meanings. The attention-getter *ipwa* is composed of *i* 'this'(proximal deictic element), *-po* 'look at' (perceptual visual verb stem), and *-a* (imperative ending). In contrast to the distal deictic *ce*, the proximal deictic *i* is speaker-oriented in that it is employed to point to or index a referent that is close to the speaker. In this sense, the proximal deictic element is directly tied to the speaker's psychological perception.

The attention-getter *ipwa* is employed among intimates such as spouses, friends, colleagues, etc., whose relationships are based on solidarity and intimacy. Owing to the characteristics of directness and speaker-directed orientation of the proximal deictic
element $i$, the form *ipwa* is also observed in speech events such as fighting, arguments, etc. Thus, dependent on speech context and the attitudes of the interlocutors, *ipwa* can denote nearly opposite social meanings between interlocutors: for example, intimacy/solidarity vs. rudeness/tension.

On the other hand, owing to the characteristics of the distal deictic *ce*, the attention-getter *ceki* can be utilized to address unfamiliars whose relationships are based on certain degrees of social distance. Unlike the proximal deictic *i*, which is speaker-perspective oriented, *ce* is neutral and vague in its orientation in that it is used to refer to a referent that is distant from both speaker and hearer. Owing to the neutral and indirect characteristics of the source meaning, *ceki* is quite productively employed especially in service-oriented public settings such as department stores, restaurants, airports, etc.

The pragmatic functions conveyed by these two address forms can be seen as semantic extensions from the original sources. That is, the processed and pragmatically-strengthened functions have been derived through metaphoric transference from the original source meaning. This is effected through the transformation of the physical distance referent, the original determinant of the proximal and distal deictics, into psychological distance through the process of metaphoric transference (*ipwa* from a proximal deictic element indexing intimacy and directness; *ceki* from a distal deictic element denoting indirectness).

Chapter 5 dealt with pragmatic markers that are derived from the perceptual visual verb *pota* 'see/look at,' including the previously mentioned attention-getter *ipwa* 'hey/look.' Across languages, the visual perceptual verb contributes significantly to complicated grammatical and functional diversity (see Heine et al. 1991). Likewise, the
Korean perceptual verb *pota* was a prime contributing factor in the historical development of divergent grammatical and functional elements. This chapter examined the contemporary functions and uses of the following markers: the epistemic modal affix *−lkkapwa,* the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa* ‘you see,’ the attention-getter *ipwa* ‘hey/look,’ and the address form *yepo* ‘honey.’

The major common element linking the epistemic modal affix *−lkkapwa* and the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa* ‘you see’ is expression of the speaker’s epistemic certainty regarding the truth-value of the proposition. On the other hand, the principal difference between the two can be found in the reasoning process used to arrive at such epistemic certainty. In the case of the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa,* epistemic certainty is derived from a deductive reasoning process based on justification. The justification can be found in the immediate discourse context as well as in abstract conceptual mental space. On the other hand, in the case of the epistemic modal marker *−lkkapwa,* the speaker’s epistemic certainty can be derived from both inductive as well as deductive modes of reasoning based on justification that is provided in the immediate discourse context. The epistemic certainty that the pragmatic marker delivers is in the form of assurance and confirmation. As a consequence, the degree of the speaker’s certainty is much stronger with the pragmatic marker than with the epistemic modal marker *−lkkapwa."

As well, the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa* has distributional privileges that the epistemic modal marker does not have. That is, *(ke)pwa* as a free form typically occurs in the utterance-initial position. On the other hand, the epistemic modal marker occurs only as a suffix onto a bound form. Regarding differences in relation to form, as a pragmatic marker only the phonologically reduced form *pwa,* a fused form between the verb stem
po- and the imperative ending –a, is allowed. However, there are variants of the epistemic modal affix, such as -na pwuta, -lkkapwa, -nkapwa, etc.

In contemporary Korean, the address form yepo ‘honey,’ composed of the reduced form (ye) of yeki ‘here’ (i ‘this’: proximal deictic element, -eki: spatial defective noun), po- ‘look at’ (perceptive visual verb stem), –o (imperative ending), is employed almost exclusively between couples. The attention-getter ceki ‘hello/excuse me’ presents a complementary function to the attention-getter ipwa and the address form yepo in that it is utilized between unfamiliars whose relationship is based on social distance. This is owing to its source characteristic, i.e., the distal deictic element denoting neutrality in relation to the physical distance between speaker and addressee.

Chapter 6 the examined semantic and morpho-syntactic characteristics of the lexical verb pota and the diachronic processes of the pragmatic elements, i.e., (ke)pwa, lkkapwa, ipwa, and yepo, that are derived from this verb. Expression of the speaker’s epistemic and social meaning of these elements is the result of the processes of semantic generalization and abstraction arrived at through subjectification.

Another manner in which to view the above is that the epistemic certainty delivered by the modal affix –lkkapwa and the pragmatic marker (ke)pwa, the characteristics of proximity/intimacy and exasperation/anger encoded by the attention-getter ipwa dependent on speech context, and the proximate social distance coupled with the speaker’s intimate attitude presented manifested by the address form yepo are all instances of subjectification; that is, the expression of self. Interestingly, in the case of the developmental process of the epistemic modal marker, i.e., auxiliary>clitic>modal affix, newer layers denote a stronger degree of subjectification. In this sense, the
grammaticalization cline, from perceptual visual verb to auxiliary to clitic and further to epistemic modal affix, correlates with the degree of subjectification.

The emergence of the epistemic modal affix *lkapwa* involves morphologization, as indicated above; on the other hand, the development of the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa*, the attention-getter *ipwa*, and the address form *yepo* suggest a new grammaticalization cline; that is, from matrix clause to functional elements. However, regardless of different grammaticalization paths, all grammaticalized forms have undergone internal coalescence, syntactic reanalysis, and phonological reduction through phoneme attrition or segment loss.

As in the case of other pragmatic markers, the diachronic development of the pragmatic elements that are derived from the perceptive visual verb *pota* follow general grammaticalization principles such as persistence, decategorization, and divergence. As well, their pragmatic functions are derived from the principle of metaphoric transference from the concrete lexical source meaning to the abstract target concept. This semantic shift and transference evidences regularity; in other words, the developmental direction is regular and unidirectional from basic lexical items such as the perceptual visual verb in the physical domain to abstract and functional items such as the epistemic modal marker in the mental domain, but not vice-versa.

The process of the development of the epistemic modal affix *-lkapwa* follows typical grammaticalization process such as morpho-syntactic fixation, bound form, and reduced syntactic scope. However, pragmatic markers, including *(ke)pwa*, do not evince such characteristics. On the contrary, pragmatic markers show a rather flexible distribution, free form, and increased scope to the speech event. As Tabor and Traugott
(1988) pointed out, grammaticalization should be understood as encompassing phenomena manifested by the pragmatic marker, such as increased structural scope. Morpho-syntactic fixation, bound form, and reduced syntactic scope are not necessarily the final manifestations of grammaticalization (see also Brinton 2001).

Chapter 7 dealt with the pragmatic markers *issei* and *isscanha*, which appear with high frequency especially among the younger generations in contemporary Korean. Owing to the semantic generality of the existence verb *issta*, a significant number of grammatical and functional elements have been derived from this verb in the same way as with the perceptual visual verb *pota* ‘see/look at.’ The pragmatic markers *issei/isscanha*, composed of the stem of the existence verb *issta* and the particles *ei* and *canh*, present multifunctional aspects in contemporary Korean usage.

The principal characteristics of the uses of the pragmatic markers *issei/isscanha* are an outgrowth or manifestation of the common ground between discourse participants. Owing to this, the pragmatic markers *issei/isscanha* are mostly confined to usage between familiars whose relationship is based on a certain degree of social proximity and shared or common knowledge and experience. This marker also signals the speaker’s intimate attitude and manifests the speaker’s desire to secure the hearer’s understanding and cooperation by claiming common ground between them. The main properties of these pragmatic markers are found in their indexing of solidarity and intimacy and in the signaling of social proximity and affinity.

The morpho-syntactic distribution of this pragmatic marker is over both the utterance-initial and nominal unit-final positions. The principal functions of the pragmatic markers *issei/isscanha* in the nominal unit-final position is for textual
coherence through the marking of both old and new information, the linking of discourse transitions, the affording of planning time for upcoming discourse, and the facilitation of the decoding process. Secondarily, these markers evince other aspects that are found in the interpersonal domain, such as presenting an appeal for the addressee’s empathy.

In the utterance-initial position, the pragmatic marker indexes the speaker’s epistemic and affective stance toward upcoming discourse. In other words, by prefacing potentially face-threatening speech events such as request, apology, etc., the pragmatic marker functions to mitigate and attenuate the illocutionary force of such speech acts. By appealing to a common or shared background through employment of the pragmatic marker, the speaker also signals interpersonal affect, such as social affinity and solidarity, to the addressee. Thus, in the utterance-initial position the pragmatic marker functions to both underscore the illocutionary force of the utterance and for interpersonal cohesion.

However, multifunctional characteristics of the pragmatic marker are also manifested in the utterance-initial position, inasmuch as issci/isscana function as turn-taking signals and verbal fillers for planning upcoming discourse. Thus, issci/isscanha function simultaneously for intratextual coherence and discourse organization in the textual domain and also for interpersonal cohesion.

Chapter 8 examined the diachronic development of the pragmatic markers issci/isscanha. As adduced, according to my data, these markers were introduced and established by the late 20th century. The coalescence between the existential verb isssta and the palatalized particle -ci in the process of the grammaticalization of the pragmatic marker issci signifies that the morphological fusion between the two forms is based on common semantic features, i.e., description of the speaker’s psychological state.
As in the case of the group of pragmatic markers selected for this dissertation, this marker conforms to several principles of grammaticalization such as decategorization, divergence, and persistence between the source and target concept. As pragmatic markers, issci/isscanha underwent loss of verbal characteristics, such as agglutination capability with honorific morphemes (e.g., -si), tense markers (e.g., -ess), and modal particles (e.g., -keyss). On the semantic level, semantic extension of a lexical item occurs in the initial stage of its diachronic development through the intervention of conceptual metaphoric and metonymic processes. Followed by semantic generalization and extension, the pragmatic marker underwent morpho-phonemic changes as well as change in its syntactic distribution and scope.

The grammaticalization principle of decategorization and the process of semantic generalization follow the key principle of grammaticalization: unidirectionality. As well, the developmental path of the pragmatic markers issci/isscanha, from a matrix clause through both internal coalescence and syntactic reanalysis, reflects the cline of grammaticalization from a matrix clause to pragmatic marker. As illustrated in Chapter 6, this is also supported by the development of the Korean pragmatic marker (ke)pwa ‘you see,’ the attention-getter ipwa ‘hey/look,’ and address form yepo ‘honey.’

I also pointed out that the formation of the pragmatic markers issci/isscanha concerns a major notion of grammaticalization in addition to that of textual frequency based on semantic generality; i.e., the notion of subjectivity or “expression of self (Finegan 1995:1).” It is this notion of subjectivity that in effect selected the non-honorific lexical item issia for the development of the pragmatic markers issci/isscanha rather than its honorific counterpart kyeysita.
The common functionalities of the pragmatic markers *ceki, (ke)pwa, ipwa, yepo*, and *issci/isscanha* concern expression of the speaker’s subjective affective and interpersonal stances on the interactional level. Multifunctionalities are the result of null referential meaning through the grammaticalization process; such diverse functions may run simultaneously on different functional domains. In other words, on the textual level pragmatic markers function for discourse organization and coherence; on the interpersonal level they index the speaker’s subjective epistemic and affective stances in relation to interlocutors regarding upcoming discourse.

In summary, the major processes constituting the grammaticalization of the above selected group of Korean pragmatic markers run parallel to the major paths of grammaticalization: phonological, morpho-syntactic, and semantic-functional. The diachronic development of these pragmatic markers also underlies a key principle of grammaticalization: unidirectionality and regularity in semantic change and subjectification. This group of pragmatic markers is semantically transparent as to their source concepts. The contemporary functions of these markers are derived through metaphoric transference from source to target concept. The subsequent loss of referential meaning results in pragmatic strengthening, especially through subjectification in Traugott’s (1995) sense. The developmental paths of the pragmatic markers *(ke)pwa* and *issci/isscanha*, the attention-getter *ipwa*, and the address form *yepo* suggests a new cline of grammaticalization: from a matrix clause to a pragmatic marker through the process of internal coalescence.

One limitation of this study is that differences between the pragmatic markers *issci* and *isscanha* were not explored in this dissertation. The ascertaining of such
differences is deserving of a separate study. Another limitation involves dealing with pragmatic elements that are derived from the perceptual visual verb *pota* ‘see/look at.’ I intentionally circumscribed the scope of my research to the epistemic modal marker *lkkapwa*, the pragmatic marker *(ke)pwa*, the attention-getter *ipwa*, and the address form *yepo*. For future study, other pragmatic markers, including *pwacwuta* ‘give a special consideration/forgive,’ derived from this verb need to be explored.
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[Contemporary Spoken Korean]

-natural conversation (audio-taped)

-telephone conversation (audio-taped)

-selected contemporary television dramas based on a variety of social relationships (downloaded from the Internet together with transcripts):

*Wulika eti naminkayo* [Are we strangers?] (urban background)  
http://www.kbs.co.kr/drama/nam/vod.htm

*Taychwu namwu salang kellyessney* [Love is hanging on the jujube tree.] (rural background) http://www.kbs.co.kr/drama/daechu/

*Ikey salangiya* [This is love.] (urban background)  
http://www.kbs.co.kr/drama/love_is/love/
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