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Abstract

The current thesis examines pragmatic effects of first and second person subjects expressed overtly in spoken Korean. While many studies have focused on the syntactic mechanism of subject omission in Korean as a pro-drop language, relatively little attention has been given to factors conditioning subjects to be not omitted but overtly expressed.

In this study, I focus on pragmatic and sociolinguistic interpretations of overtly expressed subjects, specifically first and second person that are not just an agent of a predicate in a sentence but also an active participant of spoken discourse. By analysing spoken Korean corpora, I test the actual use of overt first and second person subjects.

The distribution of first and second person subjects in the corpora reveals that the rates of subject expression are 31% for first person and 22% for second person and the expressed subjects are in various referential forms rather than simply in first or second person pronouns. Since unexpressed subjects are found more frequently in spoken Korean, I argue that the overt expression of first and second person subjects is marked and involves M-implicature (Levinson, 2000) that is raised by a marked expression while there is an unmarked alternative.

As claimed in certain studies on Korean linguistics (e.g., Jung, 2007; H. Kim, 1999; W. Kim, 1996; S. Oh, 2007), an overt subject tends to appear in the context of contrast or turn shift in this study’s data. I confirm that overt first and second person subjects are widely and actively engaged in displaying contrast and discourse organisation in spoken discourse. For instance, an overt first or second person subject plays an important role in maintaining a contrastive status between different referents in the discourse. In organising discourse, an overt first or second person subject is often used to indicate the speaker’s intention to take a turn or give a turn to the interlocutor, respectively.

I also find that overt first and second person subjects have emphatic and interpersonal functions. For the emphatic function, an overt first or second person subject is used to attract extra attention to the subject of the particular speech act. Overt first or second person subjects with emphatic function are frequently found in certain speech acts that include recalling information to confirm, taking responsibility and giving credit. The interpersonal function is in effect when an unusual referential choice for a first or second person subject is used and implies a marked
meaning. Speakers are found to choose different referential forms from those normally expected in the context to deliver interpersonal attitudes, such as intimacy or (im)politeness.

In spoken Korean discourse, an overt subject can raise multiple effects that are not conveyed by an unexpressed alternative. Applying extensive discourse analysis on empirical data, this research attempts to shed light on explaining the phenomenon of subject expression that has been less well understood in the literature on the grammar of subject omission.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 Aim and Research Questions

The aim of the current study is to clarify the mechanisms by which first and second person subjects are overtly expressed in modern Korean. Korean is known as one of the ‘pro-drop’ or ‘null-subject’ languages along with Japanese, Chinese and Spanish (H. Ahn & Kwon, 2012; Huang, 1984; Y. J. Kim, 2000; N. Kwon & Sturt, 2013; H. B. Lee, 1993; S. Oh, 2007). In fact, utterances with the subjects unexpressed are frequently observed in spoken Korean, as exemplified in the following conversation between two university students:

(1)  
1 S: pap mekesse?
   ‘Have (you) eaten?’
2 J: ani, an mekesseyo.
   ‘No, (I) haven’t eaten.’
3 S: na ka pap mekko wasnentey.
   ‘I-pronoun ate and came.’

[S3:50–52, between a junior and senior at university]  

In this dialogue, the senior (S) asks the junior (J) if she has had a meal (line 1), and J answers that she has not eaten yet (line 2). In asking the question, the subject (i.e., the second person) is not overtly expressed. The answer in line 2 is also deployed without the subject (i.e., the first person).

In S’s additional comment in line 3, the subject, na (the plain form of first person singular pronoun) is overtly expressed with the topic marker -n affixed. If it were omitted, that is, pap mekko wasnentey ‘(lit.) ate and came’, the utterance would lose coherence from the previous context and be regarded as inappropriate. Some questions can be raised: When may the subject be omitted and when must it be overtly expressed? If the overt expression of subject is optional, how does the meaning of an utterance with the subject differ from that without the subject? What motivates speakers to choose whether to express the subject overtly?

In our corpus, approximately 70% of first person subjects and 80% of second person subjects in spoken Korean are not phonetically realised (See Chapter 5). Since the subject ellipsis appears to be a prevalent and natural phenomenon in Korean, it has attracted attention from
several researchers, particularly from a syntactic approach (e.g., H. Ahn & Kwon, 2012; H. Im, 1985; H. B. Lee, 1993; K. Y. Lee, 2010; K. Nam & Ko, 2013; W. Nam, 1994; Ryu, 1997; D. Yang, 1986). In the literature, which I will review in detail in the next chapter, attention has been paid to the ‘dropping’ or ‘omitting’ of subjects from the perspective that a subject is one of the essential elements in a sentence. In other words, every sentence is supposed to have a subject and sentences without a subject are regarded as dropping or omitting the subject in most literature.

For example, J. Kwon (2012:135) defines a subject as an element of a sentence that displays the agent of the predicate. Hence, the subject is a fundamental requirement of the sentence in his explication. K. Nam and Ko (2013:250) also state that a subject is an essential component of a sentence although it can be omitted depending on the context. In their account of subjects, explanations about the context in which subjects can be omitted are left to realms other than grammar.

To provide explanations for the ellipsis of the crucial element of a sentence, many previous studies in Korean linguistics attempted to demonstrate the grammatical recognition of ‘omitted’ subjects. As we will discuss intensively in the following chapter, they approach this issue from various fields in linguistics: syntactic analysis by the majority (e.g., H. Ahn & Kwon, 2012; H. Im, 1985; H. B. Lee, 1993; W. Nam, 1994; D. Yang, 1986); language acquisition perspective (e.g., Clancy, 1997; J. T. Kim, 2003; Y. J. Kim, 2000); cognitive linguistic approach (e.g., S. Cho & Kim, 2006; H. Song & Yun, 2007); statistical analysis (e.g., M. W. Kim, 2010; S. Kim & Choi, 2013; C. Park, 2012); and the perspective of discourse analysis and information structure (e.g., K. Choi, 1999; H. Jeong, 1999; Jung, 2007; Y. Kang, 2005; H. Kim, 1999; M. K. Kim, 1999; W. Kim, 1996; W. P. Lee, 1989; S. Oh, 2007; M. Yang, 1998). Despite differences in their focuses, most of them are primarily based on the syntactic description of the subject omission.

Since the majority of previous studies have focused on the ‘omission’ of the subjects, it follows that these have paid limited attention to the cases where the subjects are overtly expressed. As a result, the meaning of the overt subjects has not been fully explored. The overt expression of subjects would not randomly occur but be linguistically well motivated, similar to most linguistic phenomena. I assume that the speakers intend to deliver certain meanings by overtly expressing subjects instead of omitting them in Korean discourse where subjects are frequently unexpressed and yet the listeners could decode the meaning without problem. Therefore, I begin
my research with the assumption that the overtly expressed subjects convey certain pragmatic meanings in Korean discourse.

For instance, in the following conversation between a prosecutor (P), her legal assistant (M; titled as a manager here) and the accused (A), the overtly expressed subjects appear to have some pragmatic functions:

(2) 1  P:  
\textit{cekiyo, kyeycangnim, cikumpwuthen nayka halkeyyo.}
\textit{‘Hey, Manager, I-pronoun will do (it) from now on.’}

2  A:  
\textit{tangsin mwe ya?}
\textit{‘What are you-pronoun?’}

3  M:  
\textit{sekemsanimi cikcep simmwunal hasillakwuyo?}
\textit{‘Are you-title going to do the questioning yourself?’}

4  A:  
\textit{kem, sa?}
\textit{‘A prosecutor?’}

[D6:131–134, between a prosecutor, a legal assistant and the accused]

In line 1, P says that she wants to conduct the inspection by herself from the time of the utterance and uses \textit{na} (the plain form of first person singular pronoun) as first person subject affixed with the subject marker -\textit{ka}. If she omits the first person subject in this utterance, the sentence would still be regarded as complete—that is, the omitted subject would be naturally and commonly understood as indicating the first person.

However, the pragmatic meaning of the utterance is changed. An utterance with the first person subject unexpressed, namely, \textit{cikumpwuthen halkeyyo} ‘(lit.) from now on, will do,’ would be interpreted as though she puts emphasis on ‘from now on’: ‘I have not done it so far, but I will do it myself from now on.’ In the given context, the emphasis on ‘from now on’ does not make sense, since the speaker’s intention is to express that she is going to perform the work, not the manager. To convey her intention to emphasise ‘I myself, not you’, the first person subject must be overtly expressed. The overt first person subject in this particular utterance functions to highlight the change of the agent of the predicate: ‘I, not you or someone else, will do the work, which is supposed to be someone else’s or yours and has been done by someone else or you, from now on.’

Conversely, in line 3, M asks P if she wants to perform the questioning herself, confirming the utterance in line 1. Here, the second person subject \textit{sekemsanimi} (P’s surname \textit{Se} + \textit{kems}a ‘prosecutor’ + the honorific suffix -\textit{nim} + the subject marker -\textit{i}) is overtly expressed in this utterance. It would still be natural and clear in the meaning of ‘Are you going to do the
questioning yourself?’ without the second person subject overtly expressed, that is, cikcep simmwnunl hasillakwuyo? As such, the overt expression of the second person subject is optional here, and the utterance would be acceptable without the subject in this context. Then, why does M choose to express the second person subject overtly when he could have omitted it since there is no confusion occurring, unlike in the case of the utterance in line 1? Further, why does M particularly use sekemsanim, ‘Prosecutor Se’, for referring to the second person instead of using a generic second person referent, such as the second person pronoun tangshin ‘you’ used by A in line 2? What pragmatic effects may the different referents involve?

If an utterance with the subject unexpressed is comprehended as naturally as an utterance with the subject overtly expressed within the given context, the factor differentiating the two utterances is the pragmatic effects that the overt subject conveys. As aforementioned, possible occurrences or changes of the pragmatic effects of an utterance by the overt expression of subjects have not been the main topic of discussion in the literature. Even though some researchers (e.g., H. Kim, 1999; W. Kim, 1996; W. P. Lee, 1989; S. Oh, 2007) have discussed contrast, emphasis or turn shifts as concepts to explain the motivation of subject expression, the analyses are limited to some grammatical cues, such as subject particles, or the data are insufficient to describe spoken Korean discourse.¹

The objective of this study is to appreciate the pragmatic effects of the overtly expressed subjects in Korean discourse. To clarify this objective, I seek to address the following research questions:

(i) If a subject is more likely to be unexpressed in Korean, when is it overtly expressed?
(ii) When a subject is overtly expressed, what reference form is the overt subject represented with and why?
(iii) What differences do overtly expressed subjects make in discourse, compared with unexpressed subjects?

By answering these questions, the current thesis attempts to shed light on the pragmatic effects of the overt expression of the first and second person subjects in modern Korean.

¹ We discuss the relevant literature in Chapter 2 in detail.
1.2 Scope of the Study

In this section, I discuss the scope of the current study. The study focuses on (i) the overt expression of (ii) the first and second person subjects in (iii) modern spoken Korean.

First, I approach the phenomenon of ‘subject omission’ in terms of the ‘non-omitted’ subjects. In many cases, the literature has considered the overtly expressed subject just as an argument that fills its original position, which accordingly makes the overt expression of subject merely natural and ordinary and the omission of subject special and interesting. The meaning of overt subjects has not been examined in the syntactic analyses, while it is a valid approach to the phenomenon of overt expression of subjects in the pragmatic point of view as discussed in the previous section. Therefore, in this study, I have the overtly expressed subjects as the target of analysis instead of the omitted subjects.

Second, as briefly mentioned in the previous section, I focus on the first person subject (1PS) and second person subject (2PS). These subjects are distinct from the third person subject in the sense that they not only function grammatically as the subjects in sentences but also represent the speakers themselves in a conversational setting. As noted by Benveniste (1966) and many other researchers, the first and second persons are the participants of the conversational discourse whereas the third person is only addressed by the first and second persons in dialogues. Therefore, the first and second persons of the discourse take part in the interaction and lead the development of conversation into diverse directions.

In particular, the way the speakers recognise and address the participants of interaction is reflected in various person references in Korean discourse. This is connected directly to the objective of the study since I aim to examine the variety of expressions of 1PS and 2PS compared with their alternatives and clarify the sociocultural background of the referential choices. In this connection, it is worthwhile distinguishing 1PS and 2PS in utterances as the participants of interaction, specifically on the grounds of discourse analysis as the methodology of the current study.

---

2 I use the term ‘argument’ for referring to a complement required in a sentence for a verb to be activated, which is widely used in linguistics including generative grammar (e.g. Haegeman and Gueron, 1999).
3 I adapt the presentation of 1PS for first person subject and 2PS for second person subject from D. Lee and Yonezawa (2008) throughout the current thesis for convenience.
Finally, the current study concentrates on the synchronic understanding of the overt expression of 1PS and 2PS in the sociocultural contexts of modern Korean. Certain studies have explored the historical changes in the personal pronouns in Korean linguistics (e.g., M. Hwang, 2001; H. Kang, 2007; H. C. Kim, 1983), but not many of them specifically pay attention to the overtly expressed 1PS and 2PS in modern Korean discourse. In this study, I focus on the expression of 1PS and 2PS in Standard Korean, Phyocwune (lit. ‘Standard Language’), which is based on a language commonly used by ‘educated people in Seoul region’. The study will thus exclude the cases of Old Korean or particular regional dialects in Korean and historical changes.

Further, spoken Korean specifically becomes the target of analysis. As addressed previously, the literature has mostly dealt with grammatical explanations of the subject omission in Korean, which are to a large extent based on self-constructed sentences. Such sentences are mainly used to exemplify the possibility that some sentences may have no subject, as presented in (3) and (4):

(3) chelswunun pelphanul kalocille kassta. Kuliko palaten swuphey ilulessta.
‘Chulsu went across the field. And (he) arrived at the forest (he) wished.’

(K. Nam & Ko, 2013:250, transcribed and translated from example in Korean)

(4) Speaker A: Bill -i nuku -lul po -ass -ci?
-NOM who -ACC see -PAST -Q
‘Who did Bill see?’

Speaker B: e5 John -ul po -ass -o.
-ACC see -PAST -DEC
‘[He] saw John.’

(H. B. Lee, 1987:263)

In analysing the grammaticality of the mere sentence with the subject omitted, these studies do not necessarily consider the context, including preceding or following utterances, the type of person references or the sociocultural background of the speakers.

In attempting to examine the pragmatic effects of the overt 1PS and 2PS in Korean discourse, I focus on spoken Korean as regards contexts. That is, I pay attention to pragmatic meanings

---

4 According to the Phyocwune Kyuceng, ‘the rules of Standard Korean’, declared by the Ministry of Education of Korea in 1988, Standard Korean is defined as ‘the modern Seoul language that is commonly used by educated people.’ Although the definition of Phyocwune has been critically discussed (see J. Song, 2005; K. W. Nam, 2010; S. W. Han, 2011; K. B. Choi, 2011), it is still actively used by many researchers (e.g. Jun, 1998; Jo, 2001; Silva, 2006) to refer to the ‘common modern Korean’ in contrast to dialects, archaic language, vulgarism or ungrammatical forms.

5 ‘e’ stands for ‘empty’ in the example of H. B. Lee (1987) as in many other syntactic analyses. We will see more examples and explanations on this in Chapter 2.
raised by overtly expressed 1PS and 2PS in the process of spoken discourse and the sociocultural factors that would affect the generation of pragmatic effects in the particular context. A written discourse as in (3) does not accompany a direct, dynamic interaction between collocutors that is built spontaneously through spoken discourse. Accordingly, it is difficult to observe the use of overt 1PS or 2PS in referring to the speakers in the interaction and/or in conveying pragmatic effects caused in the context while reacting to each other’s utterance. Conversely, spoken discourse enables us to study active interactions between participants, as briefly seen in the example of (2). By focusing on spoken Korean, we can investigate the pragmatic meanings conveyed by overt 1PS and 2PS that speakers create while reacting to the context and interlocutor. We will examine the characteristics of spoken discourse in detail in the next section as well as in Chapter 3.

1.3 Methodology

In this section, I introduce the methodology that I adopt for this study. First, to find the pragmatic effects of overtly expressed subjects, the study approaches the phenomenon on the level of discourse analysis. Second, I survey the distribution of the overt 1PS and 2PS to discover the actual frequency and the context in which the 1PS and 2PS are expressed overtly. Through the two different research methods, we can ‘achieve an elaborate and comprehensive understanding’ of the phenomenon of overt expression of subjects by ‘looking at it from different angles’ (Dornyei, 2007:164).

1.3.1 Discourse analysis

The present study discusses the pragmatic effects of the overt expression of 1PS and 2PS in Korean discourse in the frame of discourse analysis. Discourse analysis has different meanings in different disciplines inside and outside linguistics, since ‘discourse’ is widely, collectively and rather vaguely used in various fields. For instance, Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics (1998:225) defines ‘discourse’ as ‘language use’ or ‘language-in-use’ and ‘a discourse’ as a ‘relatively discrete subset of a whole language, used for specific social or institutional purposes’.

In a like manner, discourse analysis is described to investigate the uses of language (Brown & Yule, 1983) or to cover a range of disciplines, including pragmatics, speech act theory and conversation analysis as an umbrella term (Simpson, 1998). Brinton (2001:139) also notes that discourse analysis is ‘concerned with the level above that of the individual sentence: with inter-
sentential connections, with global rather than local features, and with those forms that serve to bind sentences’. Even though it seems possible to interpret discourse analysis in many different ways, there is a common ground that we study naturally occurring connected language, pay attention to language above the level of the sentence and finally investigate how discourse is developed (Simpson, 1998).

In addition, Schiffrin (1994) elucidates the substance of discourse analysis with the viewpoint of ‘language as social interaction’. In other words, discourse analysis refers to meta-pragmatic analysis, which covers both analysis of the conversation itself and analysis of language use in particular social contexts (Mey, 2001). Schegloff (2001:231) also notes that it is critical to pay attention ‘not only to the propositional content and information distribution of discourse units, but also to the actions they are doing’. Similarly, LoCastro states:

> Discourse analysis is both a product and a process. As a product, it is the analysis of situated speaker-hearer interactions and accomplishments. The term is also frequently used as a synonym for extended text. For example, doctor-patient talk is one kind of discourse. As a process, it is more than an examination of linguistic forms across clausal and sentential boundaries; it is the study of the choices made by the speakers and hearers and the patterns observed in their choices within the context of utterance. DA is retrospective and engages in thick or grounded description of the circumstances of the context to enlighten the analyst about the patterns of interaction. (2003:24)

That discourse analysis examines both linguistic forms in discourse and the patterns made by the participants of discourse in the social context is highly relevant to the current study. As will be clarified in different chapters, I discuss the overt 1PS and 2PS not only as linguistic components of discourse, but also as a means by which the speakers express their social relationships with other participants of discourse. In particular, I investigate whether there is a different pragmatic effect raised by using different reference terms for the overt subject and whether there is a certain relationship between the overt expression of subjects and the sociocultural relationships among participants.

To summarise, the current study examines the pragmatic effects of overt expression of 1PS and 2PS in the frame of discourse analysis. Discourse analysis can provide the answers to the question ‘Why do the speakers choose to explicitly express the subjects in which contexts?’, which is the research question in the present study. Further, I discuss the definition of discourse analysis in depth and its application to the concept of ‘politeness’ and ‘intimacy’ in Chapter 3.
1.3.2 Quantitative analysis of corpora

In addition to discourse analysis, this study includes quantitative analysis of spoken corpora as a method to consider the distribution of subject expression. Distribution analysis, as a form of quantitative analysis, deals with ‘how much/many’ while qualitative analysis is responsive to the questions of ‘how’ (Rasinger, 2008). For the current study, I analyse the frequency with which overt 1PS/2PS appear and the related forms in the utterances by gender or age as well as ways the overt expression of 1PS and 2PS is related to the sociolinguistic features of the discourse. Nevertheless, the two analyses are not independent or irrelevant to each other, but strengthen the outcome as outlined in Angouri (2010):

Mixed methods designs arguably contribute to a better understanding of the various phenomena under investigation; while quantitative research is useful towards generalizing research findings, qualitative approaches are particularly valuable in providing in-depth, rich data. (p. 33)

Hence, analysing specific ratios that display the frequency with which Korean speakers use the overt 1PS and 2PS and the types of words they use it with provides a solid base to pursue the qualitative analysis for deeper, fuller interpretation of the difference than in other studies.

I observe the distribution of overt 1PS and 2PS with regard to the demographic factors of the speakers as well as the reference terms used in each case. The results will present, specifically in Chapter 6, the frequency of overt expression of 1PS or 2PS, the relative age or gender of interlocutors using overt 1PS or 2PS and the type of reference term used as overt 1PS and 2PS in our corpora. For example, if a higher frequency is found of using overt subjects in certain conditions in relation to relative age, such as while younger speakers talk to older interlocutors, it becomes a guide to develop the analysis on the relationship between certain sociolinguistic motivations raised by the relative age and the overt expression of 1PS or 2PS.

In short, the integration of distribution analysis and qualitative analysis will allow the current study to maintain ‘diversity of views’ and ‘stronger inferences’ (Tashakkorii & Teddlie, 2003:674). The detailed method of the distribution analysis is described in Chapter 6 along with the results and discussion. In the following section, I introduce the data used in the study.
1.4 Data

1.4.1 The Korean corpora

A theoretically ideal corpus is supposed to be ‘representative’ and ‘balanced’ and the amount of texts and the balance between them are significant (Gries, 2009). I adopt multiple corpora, rather than using one corpus, to increase the representativeness of the data as modern spoken Korean. Moreover, having more than one corpus can optimally adjust the balance between factors or variants in the data to be closer to the actual balance in the language. The data used for the current study consist of three different types of corpora: Sejong Spoken Korean Corpus, CallFriend Telephone Speech Corpus for Korean and some Korean TV drama scripts, as shown in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1. Spoken Korean corpora as data of the current research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Number of words, speakers and contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sejong Spoken Korean Corpus</td>
<td>11,957 ecel&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;  Mostly university students speaking to their friends on daily lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A tutor speaking with a pupil, a child speaking with a parent and a doctor speaking with a patient in some conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CallFriend Corpus</td>
<td>4,218 ecel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends known from church talking about daily lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents and children talking about daily lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean TV drama scripts</td>
<td>28,697 ecel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Various topics spoken between family members, colleagues, friends and strangers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, Sejong Spoken Korean Corpus is the largest corpus of spoken Korean at present and possesses approximately 100 million ecel. The Korean Ministry of Culture and Tourism and the National Institute of the Korean Language established this Corpus under the project of ‘21<sup>st</sup> Century Sejong Plan’ between 1998 and 2007. Since Sejong Spoken Korean Corpus

---

<sup>6</sup> As defined by Kilgarriff and Grefenstette (2003:334), a corpus is ‘a collection of texts when considered as an object of language or literary study.’

<sup>7</sup> Ecel is a unique linguistic unit of Korean based on the word spacing and combination of morpheme(s). It usually includes one word or two; for instance, a verb or an adverb becomes an ecel but also a combination of a noun and a particle becomes an ecel (J. Kwon, 2012).
incorporates a wide range of words from various conversations, it has become a ‘representative’ corpus in the Korean language (J. Jeon, 2010; Seo et al., 2013). In fact, the Corpus has been utilised in numerous studies (e.g., Bae, 2012; Y. Cho, 2010; J. Jeon, 2010; B. Jeong, 2010; H. Y. Kim, 2011; C. H. Lee, 2006; E. Lee, 2013; Mok & You, 2007; K. I. Nam, 2006), and the current research also finds it a suitable and useful resource for observing naturally occurring discourse between Korean speakers.

I adopt 22 conversations from Sejong Spoken Korean Corpus in which we can observe a wider range of age of the speakers and more diverse topics than in other conversations in the Corpus. On average, 531 ecells are included for analysis from each conversation and the total number of ecells analysed from the Corpus is 11,956. Sejong Spoken Korean Corpus has the largest number of words among the spoken Korean corpora although it has limitations as reviewed by a few researchers: It lacks variety in terms of topics and the speakers’ demographic background (E. Ahn, 2014; Bae, 2012). The majority of conversations in Sejong Spoken Korean Corpus are between university students, as friends, and it has only a small number of conversations between those in other relationships, such as family members, or customers and salespersons or doctors and patients.

Since the current study attempts to examine the phenomenon of subject expression in the sociocultural context including the speakers’ age or their relationships in discourse, I also include CallFriend Korean Corpus and some Korean TV drama scripts in the data. Similar to Sejong Spoken Korean Corpus, CallFriend Korean Corpus is a reliable resource of linguistic research since it has been thoroughly compiled and distributed by a national linguistic organisation, the Linguistic Data Consortium, in 1997. The description in the Corpus specifies itself as produced to support a project on language identification (LID) that was sponsored by the U.S. Department of Defense.

The Corpus consists of 60 telephone conversations between native Korean speakers. This Corpus is particularly convenient for analysis since the demographic details of the participants are also presented in the Corpus. The caller and recipient were both aware that their conversation was being recorded and were told to speak freely and naturally on any topics in their conversations. The conversations in CallFriend Korean Corpus occur in natural circumstances between family members or friends with age difference and cover a greater
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8 There are also other forms of spoken data, such as monologues or presentations, in the Corpus but I take conversations between at least two or more participants to observe the interactive aspects spoken discourse.
variety of topics than Sejong Spoken Korean Corpus. I analyse 4,218 ecels from six conversations in this Corpus.

To vary the data in terms of styles, I also make use of some Korean TV drama scripts that were broadcasted since 2010 in Korea. These scripts are chosen for analysis because they provide detailed contexts of the narratives and backgrounds of the characters and hence we can monitor the sociocultural and discursive features specifically and adequately with respect to the overtly expressed subjects. Moreover, TV dramas with storylines of modern society tend to reflect aspects of contemporary languages and include more dynamic story settings and varied speakers than other spoken corpora, which enable us to observe various features of the phenomenon and obtain understanding that is more comprehensive.

It might concern some readers to use TV drama scripts for discourse analysis since they are written by particular authors and may not display the naturalness of actual dialogues. However, I found no significant difference in the frequency of the subject expression among the data from Sejong Spoken Corpus, CallFriend Korean Corpus and the TV drama scripts analysed for the current study. Similarly, J. Hong (2014) finds that the proportions of clauses with a verb containing an overt subject in Korean conversations are similar in actual conversations and in radio and TV drama scripts. Nariyama (2004) also confirms by analysing Australian TV dramas that sentences from these dramas are perceived as natural by native speakers of Australian English when investigating the subject ellipsis in English.

Even if there are some dialogues more dramatic or extreme in TV drama scripts compared to naturally occurring conversations, they are plausible and reasonable in terms of subject expression. In other words, dialogues in TV dramas are not linguistically unacceptable; rather, they provide discourse settings that are probable in our lives but are hard to be recorded as data for discourse analysis. Both drama viewers and script writers are aware that settings in TV dramas can be dramatic or extreme but the language in the dramas still reflect reality, so I choose TV drama scripts as our data without worrying about whether they could decrease the validity of the spoken discourse.

The TV drama scripts analysed in the current research are 10 episodes in total: two episodes are from five dramas each and the number of ecels from 10 episodes is 28,697. The titles of the dramas and the year they are broadcasted are as follows: Ocakkyo hyengecytul (‘The Brothers of Ocakkyo,’ 2011–2012), Chengtamtong Ayllisu (‘Alice in Chengtamtong,’ 2012–2013), Neuy
moksolika tullye (‘I hear your voice,’ 2013), Nay ttal seyeng-i (‘My daughter, Seyeng,’ 2012–2013) and Ceyppangwang Kimthakkwu (‘Baking King, Thakkwu Kim,’ 2010).

1.4.2 Data presentation

In the current study, the conversation data are presented with the information about the speakers and corpus. For instance, a marker such as [S1:1–10, between classmates at university] is used to indicate that it is a dialogue between classmates at university transcribed from the first line to the tenth line (1–10) in the first dialogue in Sejong Spoken Corpus (S1). Since the relative age and social relationships of speakers are the main factors under consideration in the sociolinguistic analysis of the conversations, I mark each dialogue with this information so we can easily notice the demographic characteristics of the discourse by the marker.

The excerpts are numbered consecutively in each chapter, and some of them are presented more than once for discussion of different aspects. In addition, the speakers are indicated with an English alphabet that stands for the social relationships of speakers, for example, ‘M’ for a mother, ‘T’ for a teacher and ‘Y’ for a younger speaker. Overt 1PS and 2PS in excerpts are marked in bold and the English translations are underlined and in bold with their category of reference form, such as na ‘I’ in the Korean transcription and I:pronoun in the English translation.

To represent the data in Korean, I adopt the Yale Romanisation system, followed by an English translation in each excerpt. The overt subjects are highlighted in bold font and underlined for easily capturing their occurrence. When the subjects are not expressed overtly in the example, I use brackets in the English translation to indicate that there is ellipsis of subject and to what the unexpressed subject refers. When examples are taken from other studies, I adopt the original transcription and translation as in the literature. For using examples written in Korean from the literature, I indicate that the examples are transcribed and translated from Korean.

1.5 Organisation of the Study

In Chapter 1, I have outlined the aim, research questions and scope of the current research. I further specified the adoption of discourse analysis as a methodology in addition to distribution
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9 CF is used to represent CallFriend Korean Corpus and D is used for TV Drama scripts.
analysis and introduced the Korean corpora and some Korean TV drama scripts as the data of the study.

In Chapter 2, I review the literature on the ‘omission’ or ‘expression’ of subjects in Korean linguistics. By exploring the previous studies, I suggest that different approaches to the phenomenon provide a broader understanding of the overt subjects in modern spoken Korean. To reassess the phenomenon and explain the pragmatic analyses, Chapter 3 discusses some main concepts dealt with in the study: M-Principle (Levinson, 2000), spoken discourse, person reference and politeness.

Chapter 4 introduces expressions for first and second person reference in Korean, and Chapter 5 shows the distribution of referential forms for the overt 1PS and 2PS as well as the frequency of overt 1PS and 2PS in the data. By examining the referential choices for 1PS and 2PS and their distribution in spoken discourse, we are able to understand better the Korean language in the sociocultural context.

In the subsequent chapters, I examine linguistic and sociocultural contexts where overt 1PS and 2PS appear and investigate their possible pragmatic effects. Chapter 6 analyses the function of overtly expressed 1PS and 2PS based on the notion of ‘contrast’, and Chapter 7 studies how overt 1PS and 2PS explicitly indicate discourse organisation in terms of turn/floor shifts. Chapter 8 discusses expressive effects of overt 1PS and 2PS in spoken discourse, including emphatic and interpersonal functions.

In conclusion, Chapter 9 summarises the findings of the study and reviews the linguistic implications.
Chapter 2. Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews previous studies on subject expression or omission in modern Korean.¹ I categorise the previous studies practically by their theoretical framework as follows:

(i) **Formal syntactic approach**


(ii) **Language acquisition**


(iii) **Psycholinguistic and cognitive linguistic approach**


(iv) **Quantitative analysis**


(v) **Information structure/ Discourse analysis**


In the following sections, studies from each approach are discussed. Although the focus of the current study is on the pragmatic effects of overt 1PS and 2PS in spoken Korean, I adopt the terms an individual study uses in referring to the same concept. For instance, most of literature deals with the phenomenon in terms of the subject omission and employs certain terms to refer

¹ Cross-linguistic research on overt subject expression is reviewed in relevant chapters while discussing key notions (Chapter 3), overt 1PS/2PS in contrast (Chapter 6), overt 1PS/2PS in discourse organisation (Chapter 7) and pragmatic effects of overt 1PS/2PS (Chapter 8).
to the omitted element, such as ‘pro,’ ‘zero anaphora’ or ‘empty category’. In the current chapter, I will follow the terms that each study uses.

2.2 Formal Syntactic Approach

A group of researchers describe the syntactic role of a subject within a sentence, by noting that a subject is a core element of a sentence in Korean (e.g., Kim-Renaud, 2009; J. Kwon, 2012; I. Lee & Ramsey, 2000; K. Nam & Ko, 2013). For instance, J. Kwon (2012) illustrates that a subject is the main agent of a predicate and is required in every sentence. As regards the instances of a sentence without a subject, the literature states that speakers and listeners are both aware of what the subject would be (K. Nam & Ko, 2013). The descriptive explanations of Korean grammar do not further account for the optional occurrences of subjects and leave it in the realm of ‘interlocutor’s awareness of information’ in the context.

Numerous other linguists (e.g., H. Ahn & Kwon, 2012; Huang, 1984, 1989; H. Im, 1985; H. B. Lee, 1987, 1993; K. Y. Lee, 2010; G. Moon, 2010; W. Nam, 1994; Ryu, 1997; Um, 2011) have studied the phenomenon of subject omission in Korean in terms of Government and Binding Theory (Chomsky, 1981, 1982) and analysed the omitted subject in the name of ‘empty category’ or ‘zero anaphora’. To introduce briefly the terms as explained in Chomsky (1981, 1982), I take the following examples from H. B. Lee (1993):²

(1) a. John would prefer [e meeting Mary].
   b. John would prefer [e to meet Mary].

   (p. 337)

(2) a. John saw that film.
   b. *e saw that film.

   (p. 337)

(3)  John-i [e Mary-lul manna -ss- tako] malhae ssta.
    NOM ACC meet PAST QT say PAST
    ‘John said that (he) met Mary.’

   (p. 346)

The two sentences in (1) are grammatically correct despite missing the subjects of non-finite clauses (‘meeting Mary’ or ‘to meet Mary’). They have the e mark as a trace of omitted subject. The missing subjects in the non-finite clause in (1a) and (1b) are called PRO by the definition of Chomsky (1982). Conversely, the subject ‘John’ in (2a) cannot be omitted because it is in a

² In these examples, e indicates ‘empty category.’
finite clause, that is, a tensed clause, and the sentence becomes ungrammatical with the subject omitted as in (2b). When a subject is allowed to be omitted in a finite clause, the ‘empty subject’ is called pro by the definition of Chomsky (1982).

In the case of Korean as in (3), the sentence remains grammatical without having an overt subject of the finite clause, although it becomes ungrammatical to omit the subject ‘he’ in the finite clause (‘met Mary’) in the English equivalent sentence. Since Korean allows a subject to be omitted in a finite clause, it has been categorised as a pro-drop language along with Italian, Spanish, Chinese and Japanese. A few researchers argue that the pro-drop languages should be recognised differently from each other (e.g., Huang, 1984, 1989; H. Im, 1985; H. B. Lee, 1993). The main reason behind this argument is that Italian and Spanish have rich agreement markers, while the other languages in the category have few or no agreement markers. In other words, pro in Spanish or Italian and pro in Korean, Japanese or Chinese need to be treated differently, since the syntactic environments of subject omission are different in the two kinds of pro-drop languages. For example, in Spanish, the agreement between subject and verb is strict. For different persons, either first, second or third, sex and number of the subject, distinctive agreement markers are affixed to the verb in Spanish. Therefore, even if a subject is omitted, it is easy to notice which subject is omitted according to the agreement marker affixed to the verb, whether the subject is a first person singular, third person plural and so forth.

While Romance languages have grammaticised verbal agreement, other pro-drop languages, such as Korean, have not. Specifically, Korean has very few markers that show the person, gender or number of the subject. Null subjects are still apprehended without agreement markers in most cases of subject omission. Namely, the omitted subject of the sentence, such as hakkyoey ka ‘Ø go to school’ can be conjectured to be na ‘I’, ne ‘you’, wuli ‘we’ or kyayney ‘they’ in the case of Korean when no other type of information is available, because there is no agreement marking.

Several approaches have been attempted to sub-categorise or re-classify pro-drop languages. First, Huang (1984, 1989) describes Korean as one of the ‘cool’ languages along with Chinese and Japanese, following Ross’s (1982) classification. In a cool language, such as Korean, pronouns are easily omissible and to understand a sentence, readers or hearers need to use
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3 Ross (1982) classifies languages by the standard that McLuhan (1964) classifies media. As illustrated by McLuhan (1964) a ‘hot’ medium like a movie hardly lets audience participate in the communication process. Meanwhile, communication through a ‘cool’ medium like the telephone heavily relies on the participation by the hearer.
‘inference, context, and knowledge of the world’ (Huang, 1984:531). In a ‘hot’ language, such as English, pronouns are not omitted in sentences and understanding a sentence is usually possible by reading or hearing content that is explicitly written or said in the sentence. Huang (1984) then classifies Spanish and Italian as ‘medium’ languages, since they allow a zero subject but leave agreement markers to the verb.

In addition to the metaphoric description of pro-drop languages, Huang (1984) also defines the cool languages, including Chinese, Japanese and Korean, as ‘discourse-oriented’ languages and the hot languages as ‘sentence-oriented’ languages. The classification apparently admits the needs of considering pragmatic factors when comprehending omitted subjects in discourse-oriented languages, even though Huang (1984, 1989) continues to discuss the syntactic mechanism. His research emphasises more integrated and developed syntactic solutions to the problem of pro-drop, rather than focusing on how the discourse factors function to subject omission in ‘discourse-oriented’ languages. One solution is called the Generalized Control Rule (Huang, 1989):

Generalized Control Rule (GCR)

An empty pronominal is controlled in its control domain (if it has one). (p. 193)

By the GCR, Huang (1989:194) restricts the investigation to considering that an omitted pronoun in the discussion has to have a ‘local, unique, non-arbitrary antecedent’. We are not going to explore the syntactic explanation of the Rule, but it can be roughly understood that an antecedent of an omitted subject of a verb should be found in the clause as in (1) or in the matrix clause (3). The omitted subjects in (1) and (3) are called ‘zero pronoun’ in the GCR, and the omitted subject in a sentence, such as (2), which is only possible in the cool languages or discourse-oriented languages, is identified as a ‘zero topic’ in the GCR. Huang (1989) mainly discusses zero pronoun and does not consider zero topic further in the discussion. The analyses of subject omission according to the GCR make substantial progress from that in the literature, and Huang (1984, 1989) raises a critical point: We need to differentiate subject omission in
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4 Huang (1984) borrows the terms ‘discourse-oriented’ and ‘sentence-oriented’ from Tsao (1977), in which Chinese was mainly discussed as ‘discourse-oriented’ distinctively from other languages like English.

5 Huang (1989:204) clarifies that this does not apply to objects: ‘A pro/PRO is excluded precisely where it has a control domain but is not controlled in that domain. This includes the object position of a sentence (except where there is verb-object Agr as in Pashto) and the subject position within a finite clause in English-type language, or a non-finite clause under a raising verb.’
Spanish or Italian from that in Chinese or Korean, since their dependency on contexts is unequal.

While agreeing with most of the arguments of Huang (1984, 1989), H. B. Lee (1993) attempts to adjust the GCR for further generalisation and proposes the Predication Principle:

**Predication Principle**

Predicates must be closed (within the sentence to which they belong). (p. 359)

H. B. Lee (1993) notes that certain instances in Korean are not explained by the GCR and the Predication Principle can be an alternative. One example mentioned by H. B. Lee is as follows:

(4) *John-i, Mary-i eykey [e, ej salangha-n -ta-ko] malhau-ss-ss-ta.*

NOM DAT love PRES QT say PAST

‘John said to Mary that (he) loves (her).’

(p. 353)

The sentence in (4) has the subject and object omitted in the embedded clause. If we apply the GCR by Huang (1989) in this example, we must be able to find the antecedent of *ej* (omitted subject ‘he’) in the matrix clause, which we can find as ‘John’. Huang (1989) rules out the case that an object is omitted in an embedded clause having an antecedent in the matrix clause in the GCR. However, the sentence in (4) is a grammatical sentence in Korean when the object ‘her’ is omitted, *ej*, and the antecedent ‘Mary’ is in the matrix clause. Therefore, H. B. Lee (1993) claims that the GCR does not fully explain the Korean sentences with an omitted object, but that the Predication Principle can. According to the Predication Principle, a predicate is ‘saturated by an argument outside the sentence’ in pro-drop languages, while a predicate has to be ‘completed with a sentence-internal argument’ in non-pro-drop languages (H. B. Lee, 1993:359).

Although H. B. Lee (1993) and other scholars (e.g., H. Ahn & Kwon, 2012; Um, 2011) suggested some modifications, the fundamental notion and application Huang (1984, 1989) offered in the consideration of optional expression of subject has been influential. H. Im (1985) confirms Huang’s (1984, 1989) classification of Korean as a discourse-oriented language and further interprets Korean as a ‘pragmatically oriented’ language. He divides the omitted subject (referred to as empty category in Im [1985]; EC hereafter)

6 The Empty Category Principle (Chomsky, 1981) introduces four types of empty categories: NP-trace, Wh-trace, PRO and pro. H. Im (1985) uses the term ‘empty category’ as to represent a subject that is not realised phonetically, so it includes both PRO and pro.
EC and syntactic EC. Stylistic EC appears in relation to preceding discourse and can be replaced by pronouns or other reference expressions depending on the speaker’s intention, as in the following example (H. Im, 1985):

(5)  
   a. Speaker A: Where did Chelswu go?  
   b. Speaker B: Ø went to school.  
   c. Speaker B: Chelswu went to school.  

(p. 333, transcribed and translated from example in Korean)

The subject omitted in (5b) is predicted by the preceding utterance by speaker A in (5a) and it can be replaced with other reference expressions, for example, by the name of the person used in the preceding utterance (i.e., Chelswu as in 5c), a pronoun ‘he’ or a noun phrase (NP) such as ‘the man.’

Conversely, syntactic EC in Korean is rather exceptional since it is sometimes hard to find the omitted subject in the context. Consider the following sentences:

(6)  
   a. pita!  
      ‘(It) is rain!’  
   b. pwuliya!  
      ‘(It) is fire!’  
   c. totwukiya!  
      ‘(It) is a thief!’  

(H. Im, 1985:333, transcribed and translated from example in Korean)

The sentences in (6) are grammatically correct without a subject overtly expressed, and it is not simple to recover a possible subject of the sentences. While accepting the premise that every predicate in Korean must have a subject, H. Im (1985) eliminates the possibilities that the sentences of (6) should not be treated as general or normal Korean sentences, as maintained by H. Sohn (1981). Instead, H. Im (1985) approaches this syntactic EC in regard to the semantic characteristics of the predicates and illustrates the condition that an EC appears where a predicate can fully confirm the content of the subject or the topic.

Thus, H. Im (1985) is an important study that links syntactic perspective and semantic perspective in discussing subject omission and expands its view to semantic qualities of the omitted subject and its environment, while the syntactic literature focuses on only syntactic analysis of subject omission. H. Im (1985) integrates the cases disregarded in the literature because of the ambiguity of the definition of subject in the analysis. In addition, he confirms
that Korean is not a language with a simple structure of ‘subject + verb’ but a ‘topic-prominent’ language (Li & Thompson, 1976) and emphasises the significance of topic in Korean particularly when dealing with subject omission.

Yet, H. Im (1985) confines the analysis to syntactic EC, which is relatively infrequent compared with stylistic EC, and the study stays in the syntactic boundary like many other syntactic approaches do. Stylistic EC depends on the context as H. Im (1985) highlights, and deeper research on the cases is again left to pragmatic research. I find it a hint and an opportunity to develop my research topic that there are discourse-related aspects in subject omission. Where subjects are omitted and recalled by the context and non-omitted subjects that are replaced by more than one alternative bring different nuances (H. Im, 1985:335), various pragmatic analyses can possibly be made.

Similarly, more recent studies on formal syntax continue accounting for the issue of subject omission in the boundary of a sentence. The factor that distinguishes them from each other is their different theoretical backgrounds. For instance, G. Moon (2010) attempts to explain null subject in Korean in line with ‘pro’ in English whereas Um (2011) claims that null subject or null object in Korean should be recognised as NP ellipsis instead of pro. H. Ahn and Kwon (2012) agree with Huang (1984, 1989) that Korean is categorised as a topic-prominent language but argue that Korean only allows topic-drop, not pro-drop, adopting the feature checking system in the minimalist programme and the process of Agree in Chomsky (1995, 2001).

In summary, most formal syntactic research attempts to view the phenomenon of subject omission strictly in the frame of sentence, not in discourse. These studies also pay specific attention to the grammatical mechanism of subject omission, not its pragmatic effects. As we will review in the following chapters, there are many more aspects of subject omission to be revealed and reconsidered. The aim of the current study is to clarify the pragmatic meanings of subject omission at a discourse level, which remains unexplored thus far because much attention has been paid to its syntactic reasons.

2.3 Research in Language Acquisition

Some studies on language acquisition display interest in subject omission. These studies mainly note the frequency of subject drop in first or second language acquisition: when and how children acquire the ability to express a subject as adult speakers do in Korean and other

Clancy (1996, 1997) is influential in language acquisition research and referenced in many other studies for her theoretical framework and methodology. In particular, Clancy (1997), on collecting longitudinal records from two Korean-speaking children for a year, analyses their utterances with respect to expression of subjects and objects. The results reveal that the children show different distributions of ellipsis, pronouns and nouns. Clancy (1997) points out that certain discourse contexts affect the choices of certain reference forms and that the children somehow learn the relationships between discourse contexts and reference forms. Y. J. Kim (2000) and H. R. Lee (2004) perform similar empirical surveys, and they emphasise consideration of contexts when children learn to choose appropriate references for subject position in different discourse contexts.

The basic notion Clancy (1997) claimed is that the grammatical knowledge of Korean children is believed to be innate, but the children also learn referential choices by contextual situations. While the literature has put more weight on initial grammatical settings—that all humans are born with the grammar (e.g., Hyams, 1986) or that the grammar emerges gradually (e.g., O’Grady, Peters & Masterson, 1989)—Clancy (1997) argues that some grammatical choices are learned from experiences of encountering different contexts. More specifically, Clancy (1997) notes:

The pro-drop parameter equips children with innate, a priori expectations pertaining to ellipsis vs. overt reference, but leaves them to discover the differences between overt pronouns and noun phrases on the basis of experience. (p. 656)

Clancy (1997) further explicates that there is an inseparable link between learning argument structure and learning the importance of discourse motivations for choosing appropriate references. Notably, the study imports the significance of context into understanding referential choices in subject expression. Clancy (1997) tackles the dichotomy of subject expression (i.e., omitted or not omitted) and stresses the importance of discourse motivations for referential choice, which is also considerably appreciated in the data analysis of the current research.

Y. J. Kim (2000) confirms Clancy’s (1997) findings with cross-linguistic comparison between Korean, English, Chinese, Japanese and other languages. According to her data, Korean children initially produce only predicates when they begin to speak and their use of overt subject increases rapidly until it reaches an adult’s level before they become three years old. From the
cross-linguistic perspective, she argues that all children acquiring different native languages naturally know in very early stages of language acquisition whether their language is a null-subject language and how often subjects are omitted in that language.

H. R. Lee (2004) also provides empirical data on the development of subject expression, focusing on the use of subject particles. She also conducts a longitudinal survey on the acquisition of subjects by two-year-old children, similar to Clancy (1997). H. R. Lee (2004) finds that Korean children produce all forms of subject expression in early stages of language acquisition, identical to those adult speakers produce, that is, at the age of 24 months, they already utilise null subjects, bare nominal, pronouns and subjects with particles to express subjects in sentences. Further, she finds that the children tend to speak a null-subject sentence when the subject is previously referenced in the context.

Clancy (1997), Y. J. Kim (2000) and H. R. Lee (2004) investigate the acquisition of subject expression by Korean children. They discover that Korean children become able to use subjects in the same way as Korean adult speakers do in early stages of language learning; namely, before the children turn three years old, they develop the frequency of subject omission, the use of subject particles and the use of pronoun or lexical reference. The studies agree that the acquisition of subject expression by children is affected by the caregiver’s input and context, as well as the fundamental and universal grammar being inherent.

By contrast, J. T. Kim (2003) observes the use of null subjects by an adult learner of Korean for six months. The use of null subjects in second language acquisition appears at a very early stage, according to the results. In fact, the frequency of null-subject sentences is dominant in the participant’s utterances in Korean, and it is suggested that her first language, English, does not affect the second language, Korean, in terms of subject omission, considering that English is not a pro-drop language unlike Korean. J. T. Kim (2003) interprets the results to mean that a learner assumes simple and economical grammar in language learning, and pro-drop is the economical choice in the syntactic operation of subject expression.\(^7\) Thus, even if a native speaker of a non-pro-drop language learns a pro-drop language, she resets her grammatical setting of subject expression to the more economical option (i.e., pro-drop) in very early stages

\(^7\) The theory of minimalist grammar (Chomsky, 1995) is described more systemically and delicately in J. T. Kim (2003), but I will leave it as simple as summarised here since the syntactic explanation is not our concern in this thesis.
of learning. Namely, the characteristics of the first language are not transferred into second language learning as far as the subject omission is concerned.

To summarise, J. T. Kim (2003) offers an interesting point of view that hypothesises and proves that the minimalist framework (Chomsky, 1995) of syntax is applicable to second language acquisition with regard to pro-drop. As discussed earlier, Clancy (1997), Y. J. Kim (2000) and H. R. Lee (2004) are also valuable studies that investigate the process and nature of language acquisition as well as subject expression. The studies in language acquisition support the validity of our argument on the recognition of the meaning of subject omission beyond the syntactic perspective, the consideration of contexts when dealing with subject omission and the purposeful choices among reference forms for overtly expressed subjects. Nevertheless, the main discussions in the literature continue to focus on how a language learner acquires the use of subject expression at a regular or normal level, either in the first language or in the second language. They already have a level that is set to be of an adult speaker or a native speaker and suspend examination of pragmatic meanings of subject expression.

### 2.4 Psycholinguistic and Cognitive Linguistic Approaches

With regard to the topic of subject expression, studies in psycholinguistics and cognitive linguistics mainly discuss what occurs in the mind when sentences are spoken without an overt subject and the sentences are surely comprehended in conversations.

S. Cho and Kim (2006) examine how native speakers of Korean process a narrative text with null subjects. They provide the participants sentences in two different settings in their experiment: one with discourse topic and person-specific verb modals consistently maintained and the other with no discourse topic or morpho-syntactic information provided. The first case is displayed in (7):

(7) Stimulus A-1 (strong coherence, first person agreement, antecedent na ‘I’)

S1 phiano hakweneynun kyengsek, yuncwu, songika isseyo.

‘Kyengsek, Yuncwu and Song-i are at the piano school.’

S2 kyengsekinun onul nahako umakchayk sale kyopomwunkoey kasseyo.

‘Kyengsek went to the Kyopo bookstore with me to buy a music book today.’

S3 Ø cohahanun umak chayki epsese Ø talun chaykpangulo kasseyo.

‘Because there was no book (I/we) liked, (I/we) went to other bookshop.’

S4 tahaynghtio, Ø kukoseyenun umakchaykul sal swu issesseyo.

‘Fortunately, (I/we) could buy the music book from there.’
S5  
Ø taum cwueynun saylowun kokulo phianolul yensuphallayyo.
‘(I) will practice with the new song from next week.’

(S. Cho & Kim, 2006:110, transcribed and translated from example in Korean)

The discourse in (7) has an explicit narrator displayed, that is, first person pronoun na (‘I’ or ‘me’) in S2. The omitted subjects in S3 and S4 are assumed to be either first person singular or first person plural according to the regular modality markers describing ‘went’ (kasseoyo in S3) and ‘be able to’ (swu issesseyo in S4), without any other markers affixed, which can entail that the speaker is quoting or reporting someone else’s action. Thus, the reader is likely to expect the subject of S5 to be first person, whether singular or plural, and is actually able to confirm that the omitted subject in S5 is certainly first person by noting the modality marker –lay– (‘willingness’). The modality marker –lay– indicates willingness or intention only of the speaker, and accordingly, it is only used in cases where the speaker is the subject of the predicate, namely, in first person sentences.

Narratives in (8) have the same discourse pattern except for some modifications in detail:

(8) Stimulus B-2 (weak coherence, third person agreement, antecedent Kyengsek)

S1  phiano hakweneynun kyengsek, yuncwu, songika isseyo.
‘Kyengsek, Yuncwu, and Song-i are at the piano school.’
S2  kyengsekinun onul nahako umakchayk sale kyopomwunkoey kasseyo.
‘Kyengsek went to the Kyopo bookstore with me to buy a music book.’
S3  chaykpangeynun salamtulkwa cayminan chayktuli manhi issesseyo.
‘There were many people and interesting books at the bookstore.’
S4  tahaynghito, yele cakkokkatulay cakphwumi sekaey kkoehye issesseyo.
‘Fortunately, various composers’ pieces were at the bookshelf.’
S5  Ø taum cwueynun saylowun kokulo phianolul yensuphantayyo.
‘(He says that he) will practice with the new song from next week.’

(S. Cho & Kim, 2006:110, transcribed and translated from example in Korean)

With the modifications, the narratives result in the difference from (7) in the way of recovering the omitted subject in S5, according to the analysis of S. Cho and Kim (2006). The discourse of (8) begins with the same introduction as in (7), and the reader can recognise the subject of the discourse as first person since there is an explicit presentation of first person pronoun, na ‘I’ or ‘me’, again in S2. However, it is different from the case of (7) in that neither first person, na ‘I’, nor Kyengsek is the subject of the sentences in S3 and S4 of (8). S5 does not have an overt subject, but the reader would recover the omitted subject as third person, Kyengsek, because of the modality marker -tay– (‘hearsay’) used in S5. The modality marker -tay– (‘hearsay’) signifies that the subject of the predicate is third person.
Another clue for the reader to notice that the subject of S5 in (8) is third person is that there is no constant topic in the discourse to remain in the reader’s mind. Although first person singular na ‘I’ or ‘me’ is introduced in S2 with Kyengsek, the subjects of S3 and S4 are neither of them. Since the discourse topic changes, the reader may have no particular expectation on the subject of S5 in (8). As a result, the two discourses of (7) and (8) are similar to each other except for the discourse topic consistency and the modality markers replaced in S5, -lay- (‘willingness of the speaker’) in (7) and -tay- (‘hearsay’) in (8).

The settings of the experiment are to see if discourse topic and morpho-syntactic information affect the resolution of null subjects. Based on their findings, S. Cho and Kim (2006) conclude that both discourse topic and person-specific verb modals affect the process of interpreting null subjects. Their study’s theoretical background is in the Construction-Integration theory (Kintsch, 1988, 1998) and a resonance-based model (Gillund & Shiffrin, 1984; O’Brien & Myers, 1999). In particular, the resonance-based model views that the comprehension of text is processed by both peripheral information (i.e., morph-syntactic factors) and overall information (e.g., reader’s pre-acquired knowledge, pragmatic context and inferences) at the same time, as illustrated by O’Brien and Myers (1999):

> Although it is difficult to specify the reader’s general world knowledge, we assume that it is activated in parallel with information in the discourse representation, and that resonance based on these two sources is processed simultaneously. (p. 46)

This is a different approach to understanding of text processing from the minimalist hypothesis (McKoon, Gerring & Greene, 1996; McKoon & Ratcliff, 1992), which argues that only easily accessible information in reader’s memory or knowledge is used in addition to textual cues in text processing. As analysed in S. Cho and Kim (2006), native speakers of Korean appear to utilise both textual cues and contextual or inferential information in the resolution of omitted subjects.

H. Song and Yun (2007) also conduct reading experiments with native speakers of Korean and examine the effects of grammatical role of the antecedent of null subject in comprehension of sentences that have null subjects. The results show that it takes shorter time for the participants to understand an omitted subject when the omitted subject refers to the subject in the preceding sentence than when it refers to other elements in the preceding sentence, such as an object. That is, it is easier for native speakers of Korean to interpret a null subject as referring to a subject in the preceding sentence.
The experiments of H. Song and Yun (2007) are based on the hypothesis of ‘discourse prominence’ (Gordon, Grosz & Gilliom, 1993; Gordon & Hendrick, 1997, 1998): Each entity in a discourse has different discourse prominence and ambiguous referents are processed to refer to an entity with higher discourse prominence in a particular discourse. For example, ‘Words appearing early in a sentence are more accessible, as measured by probe tasks, than words appearing later in the sentences’ (Gordon et al., 1993:344). Therefore, in many languages that generally have a subject in the first position in a sentence, the subject is argued to be a prominent entity in discourse, compared with other entities in the sentence.

The results and their interpretation in H. Song and Yun (2007) confirm that a subject in a sentence is a prominent entity in discourses in Korean and that the recovery of omitted subjects depends on the discourse. This is an important reminder when we discuss subject omission in Korean in the horizon of discourse analysis and attempt to find its pragmatic meanings, even though H. Song and Yun (2007) focus more on the methodological implications of text reading and the verification of high discourse prominence of subjects.

Another significant study to review in the cognitive linguistic analysis that deals with subject expression is by N. Kwon and Sturt (2013), which offers a more extensive explanation on the way of interpreting pro-drop in Korean. They stress the effects of discourse in the case of Korean, comparing it with other pro-drop languages, such as Spanish, as the following illustrates:

An analysis of pro drop was based on the issue of recoverability; the possibility of pro drop often correlates with rich inflectional morphology (Taraldsen, 1978) and in Spanish or Italian, subjects can be omitted because it can be easily recoverable from a rich subject-verb agreement (Chomsky, 1981). This analysis, however, cannot be applied to pro drop language without verbal agreement such as Chinese, Japanese, and Korean. These latter types of languages were suggested as discourse-oriented languages, in which to understand a sentence, language users actively make inferences based on contextual information and world knowledge (Huang, 1984). (N. Kwon & Sturt, 2013:385)

The authors display particular interest in the timing of pro interpretation in Korean, whether it is processed immediately when being read or is delayed, and in the effects of discourse cues to understand pro, that is, to which referent it refers. N. Kwon and Sturt (2013) set four experimental conditions with or without context and a reflexive pronoun caki ‘self’, that is, using a 2 x 2 design, to observe the effects of context in recovery of pro. The reflexive pronoun caki is used to provide a morpho-syntactic cue for pro, and the reading time of caki is assumed
to be longer in the case than its alternative. For example, a condition with context and *caki* is as in (9):

(9) [Context sentence]

\[ I \text{ kanhosanun maywu chincelhata.} \]

| This nurse-TOP very be.kind |

[Target sentence]

\[ Enjeyna caki hwancatul-ul cengsengsulepkey kanhohay-se always self patients-ACC with.care took.care-as na-nun ipen sisangsik-eyse kanhosa-ka choywuswu |

I-TOP this ceremony-at nurse-NOM best cikwonsang-ul pata-ya hantako cwucanghayssata. worker.award-ACC should-be.awarded claimed |

‘Because (she) took care of self’s patients with much care, I claimed that the nurse should be awarded the best employee award at this ceremony.’

(N. Kwon & Sturt, 2013:381)

When reading sentences in (9), first, a participant is given the information, that is, [Context sentence], that there is a nurse who is very kind. Then, in the next sentence, N. Kwon and Sturt (2013) presume that it would be relatively easy for the reader to figure out who takes care of the patients, whether the nurse or the speaker ‘I’, since *caki* generally refers to a second or third person singular antecedent in Korean. The other three conditions are: (i) a condition with the context sentence and without *caki*; (ii) a condition without the context sentence and with *caki*; and (iii) a condition with neither the context sentence nor *caki*. For the conditions without the reflexive pronoun *caki*, N. Kwon and Sturt (2013) replace *caki* with an adjective *aphun* ‘sick’.

The results reveal that the presence of context significantly reduces reading time, and the presence of *caki* makes the reading time even shorter. This means that readers find discourse with background information and a reflexive provided easier to process. Moreover, when there is no context for the omitted subject, the reading time was found to be longer in the condition of *caki* than in the condition of no *caki*. According to N. Kwon and Sturt’s (2013) analysis, it is because the reader attempts to find an antecedent of the referent for the unexpressed subject while there is no preceding context provided. In the process of reading, the reader first binds *caki* with the omitted subject and then tries taking *na* ‘I’ following in the sentence as a referent of the omitted subject. Owing to the mismatch between person feature of ‘I’ and *caki*, the reading time increases in this condition. Meanwhile, this slow-down does not occur when
context is given, and N. Kwon and Sturt (2013) explain that it supports their hypothesis that readers immediately link pro with the noun in the context.\(^8\)

Studies taking this psycholinguistic and cognitive linguistic approach are inspirational since they re-examine linguistic phenomena in relation to the language users’ mind. They also highlight the importance of discourse in understanding omitted subjects and scrutinise the cognitive process behind it. Specifically, these studies will be strong support for the current study that attempts to change the view towards subject omission from those in the majority of the literature, which strictly focus on syntax, to discourse analysis. However, while this approach can confirm that native speakers of Korean are affected by the discourse when reading, understanding and recovering omitted subjects, it does not provide an answer to the question ‘What are the pragmatic meanings of subject expression?’

2.5 Quantitative Analysis

Studies that investigate the phenomenon of subject omission with quantitative methodology mostly demonstrate the frequency of subject omission. There is a study that analyses Korean textbooks and applies the results into Korean teaching (M. W. Kim, 2010), one that compares the subject omission ratio of Korean and English (C. Park, 2012), and another that classifies overtly expressed subjects in the text from a Korean novel (S. Kim & Choi, 2013). Since we have been told and have accepted in the literature that Korean is a pro-drop language or that subjects are frequently omitted in Korean, the studies with actual numerical evidence on subject omission play a significant role to support the premise strongly.

M. W. Kim (2010) examines the frequency of subject ellipsis in Korean textbooks. She collects 1,386 sentences from a series of Korean textbooks and checks how often subjects are omitted in the sentences. The results show that 57% of sentences from the textbooks have zero subjects. The results are categorised by types of sentences, persons and honorific level; for example, sentences without a subject include 64% of declarative sentences, 19% of interrogative sentences, 13% of imperative sentences and 4% of requests. The distribution of omitted subjects

---

\(^8\) There are other studies (e.g. Mazuka (1991)) that argue that the interpretation of an omitted subject is delayed until the sentence reading is finished in discourse-oriented languages.
also appears differently by persons: First person takes 48% of omitted subjects, second person takes 33% and third person takes 5% of omitted subjects.\(^9\)

The focus of the study is on the pedagogical implication: to teach students how to recover omitted subjects by understanding their general distribution in textbooks. It is meaningful to have empirical results of analysis of written Korean texts as well as to learn about the frequency of subject omission and the grammatical category of ‘subjectless’ sentences. Nevertheless, the data used by M. W. Kim (2010) are limited to the cases of some Korean textbooks and the analysis takes little consideration of the linguistic nature of subject omission or its sociocultural attributes.

C. Park (2012) shows another quantitative approach to subject omission. Two English movie scenarios and their equivalents translated in Korean are taken as data.\(^10\) C. Park (2012) counts the number of omitted subjects and omitted objects from each sentence in the scenarios and compares the results from English and Korean texts. According to the results, the frequency of omission in Korean text is 68% in the case of subject and 14% in the case of object. For English text, 32% of subjects and 8% of objects are omitted. As the results show, subject omission and object omission both occur significantly more frequently in Korean than in English. The reason for this phenomenon, interpreted by C. Park (2012), is that the context or situation of discourse is considered important in Korean, and ellipsis occurs primarily for economy of expression, especially in spoken texts. That is, efficiency takes priority over structure in Korean, whereas English has a strict word order and is structure oriented. Therefore, subjects and objects can be omitted easily in Korean when context helps them be understood without being expressed. In addition, C. Park (2012) notes that the suffixes to verbs in Korea, including honorifics, make speakers perceive the omitted subject or object.

The characteristic of Korean that a subject or an object is frequently omitted is well presented in C. Park (2012) by analysing actual texts from movie scenarios. Not only is the characteristic of the Korean language empirically investigated, but also the distinct contrast between Korean and English, in terms of the frequency of subject and object omission, is shown when the texts

\(^9\) M. W. Kim (2010) indicates that the interpretation of an omitted subject is ambiguous depending on the context for 3% of subject omission. The rest, i.e., 11% of omitted subjects, refers to objects rather than a person or abstract concepts.

\(^10\) C. Park (2012) explains that the scenario of Love Actually (a movie in English released in 2003; Korean translation analysed in the study published in 2006) is chosen as data because the movie includes a number of ordinary characters and their mundane life stories so we can observe ordinary discourses. Similarly, the scenario of Dead Poets Society (movie in English released in 1990; Korean translation analysed in the study published 2006) is chosen to be analysed since the movie has a common and plain background and diverse characters.
in two languages are originally extracted from the same movie scenarios. However, the explanation that C. Park (2012) offers is bound in analysing data from two movie scenarios and is limited in its treatment of the linguistic implications of subject omission, as with M. W. Kim (2010) in quantitative analysis. C. Park (2012) adopts the theoretical background of ellipsis in linguistics and attempts to apply it to Korean and English, but it appears to be still limited and suppositive in interpreting particular data.

Lastly, S. Kim and Choi (2013) take a novel, *Three Days in That Autumn* by W. Park (1985), and analyse whether a subject overtly appears or not, and if it appears overtly, whether with a subject particle or without a particle. The contexts are also divided into two groups, one with no referent prior to the subject, and the other with a referent displayed prior to the subject. Overall, the frequency of subject omission is higher when there is a referent introduced before a subject (57%) than when there is no referent before a subject (17%), as generally assumed. In other words, a subject that is being first introduced cannot be easily omitted whereas a subject that is already mentioned is more easily omitted.

S. Kim and Choi (2013) more specifically classify the group of sentences with a precedent referent, depending on the position of precedent referent. If the precedent referent is in the same paragraph as the subject, it is easier for the subject to be omitted than in the case where they are not in the same paragraph. That is, if a subject refers to a referent in one of the previous paragraphs, the subject overtly appears more likely than when a subject refers to a preceding referent in the same paragraph.

This research also illustrates that a subject is omitted in the context where the referent of the subject is presented as a topic in a preceding sentence; further, even if it is not a topic in a preceding sentence, a subject can be omitted when it does not cause a problem to be understood in the context. In addition, S. Kim and Choi (2013) argue that even when a subject has no precedent referent at all in a text, there is still a possibility that the subject is omitted. This possibility is demonstrated to be one of the following cases: (i) The subject is the speaker of the novel himself/herself. (ii) It is not significant to clarify the subject to understand the sentence. (iii) The sentence describes time, distance, place or situation. (iv) There is a figurative purpose to omit the subject.

While presenting a distribution analysis of subject omission in a written text, S. Kim and Choi (2013) also attempt to expand the study to discourse analysis. This is shown in that they focus
on the forms of overt subject rather than on the grammatical reasons for subject omission. By categorising the appearances of subjects with their forms (i.e., omitted or overtly expressed with different kinds of suffixes) and finding possible explanations for the different appearances, the attempt seems to be successful to a certain extent.

Yet, the explanations S. Kim and Choi (2013) provide in their discourse analysis are rather limited and vague. As admitted in their study, the results are quantitatively limited to be representative of Korean written text, since the data are from one piece of novel. More importantly, when discussing the relationship between a subject that is omissible and the fact that it has an antecedent in the same paragraph, the description is insufficient. For example, it is simply mentioned that the subject is possibly omitted because it is ‘in a contrastive situation’ or ‘beyond expectation.’ If we examine the data in context thoroughly, there must be a more reasonable algorithm found in the effects of context to subject expression or vice versa.

In Section 2.5, we have reviewed the literature that uses quantitative methods to explore the problem of subject omission or expression. Although the quantitative studies support the general idea that subjects are easily and frequently omitted in Korean with empirical analyses, the range of data is narrow and accordingly the interpretations of the results is insufficient to explain subject omission or expression in general. To understand the omission or overt expression of subject in Korean discourse comprehensively, we need to analyse a larger set of data and clarify the concrete linkage between the phenomenon and its explanation.

2.6 Studies in Information Structure and Discourse Analysis

In this section, I review the studies that are based on the idea that old information can be omitted while new information cannot and that the distinction between old and new information is made according to the context. In general, studies based on discourse and information structure presume that discourse carries out a significant role in answering many questions in linguistics, including the unanswered questions about subject omission. Moreover, these studies agree that Korean is a discourse-oriented language and that discourse has to be considered one of the primary factors to analyse linguistic phenomena in Korean.

For instance, J. Kim (1982) notes that a subject is not an essential element in Korean and that a sentence without a subject is understood by linguistic context. It might be a rather radical argument from the perspective in the formal syntax literature, and the description requires further explanation, but the point is valid in that it highlights the impact of discourse in the
interpretation of subject expression or omission. It is also distinct from predominating formal syntactic viewpoints to the phenomenon as reviewed in Section 2.2.

Most researchers in discourse analysis and pragmatics point out that focus, emphasis and contrast are the reasons for not omitting a subject (e.g., Chang, 1985; Jung, 2007; H. Kim, 1999; W. Kim, 1996; S. Oh, 2007). Specifically, Chang (1985:108) gives a brief, general description about expression of reference to interlocutors in discourse as follows:

A speaker and listener in discourse are deictic factors, and it is normal to perform zero-anaphora on them in actual utterances unless we refer to them with first or second person pronouns. Unlike in English, there is no syntactic restriction to have a subject (in Korean), so reference to a speaker/listener is omitted except when a speaker/interlocutor is required to be uttered for being focus of information in discourse or being contrastive. (p. 108, translated from Korean)

Even if the studies introduced in this section may have varied points of view on the essentiality or definition of subject in Korean, they are similar in that they regard discourse as a powerful tool to understand subject expression.

In particular, M. K. Kim (1999) states that ellipsis, along with free-order phenomenon, is an important index to categorise Korean as a discourse-oriented language. If we simply conclude that omission of old information occurs owing to stylistic choices, it will be hardly possible for us to discover the reason that old information is omitted sometimes and is not omitted at other times in Korean sentences. According to the analysis of M. K. Kim (1999), old information in Korean is not omitted when it is given a new informational function in a subsequent context. In other words, old information is omitted only when it remains old in the subsequent context, because it becomes redundant in that case. Consider the examples in (10), drawn from M. K. Kim (1999):

(10) A:  
swunika tolul tencyessni?
‘Did Sooni throw the stone?’

B:  
ung, tencyesse.
‘Yes, (she) threw (the stone).’

C:  
ung, tolun tencyesse.
‘Yes, (she) threw the stone (not something else).’

D:  
ung, swuninun tencyesse.
‘Yes, she (not someone else) threw (the stone).’

(p. 79, transcribed and translated from example in Korean)

In this short dialogue, speaker A asks whether Sooni threw the stone and speakers B, C and D answer, which can all be translated as ‘Yes, she did’ but with a different emphasis or nuance
from each other. The difference between these three answers is in the element that is omitted in each sentence. Both the subject and object are omitted in the utterance of B, who says ‘yes, threw’. This utterance is natural enough for native speakers of Korean to understand with no difficulty in the context, since the omitted elements are given in the preceding question. Conversely, C in (10) keeps the object tol ‘stone’ in her utterance, to put emphasis on the object that was thrown by the subject. It is not new information that the subject threw the stone, in C’s utterance as well in B’s, but it is new information that the stone was thrown while no other objects were. Similarly, by overtly saying the subject Sooni, which is old information and accordingly possible to be omitted in the answer, D is giving extra information that the subject throwing the stone is not someone else but Sooni. Namely, speakers C and D put emphasis on the object and subject respectively and retain these in their utterances even though these are already-known information and hence omissible.

As noted in M. K. Kim (1999), when two sentences have an identical syntactic structure, they can have different information structures by being re-constructed, depending on their value as information. The process is called ‘information packaging’ (Vallduvi, 1992), and by this process, we can partially understand how old information is sometimes not omitted. However, despite the possibility of information packaging and its consequence of maintaining old information in sentences, certain questions remain unanswered. For example, concepts such as emphasis are not sufficiently discussed although they are closely related to the phenomenon of subject expression in the research.

M. Yang (1998) argues that ellipsis in Korean linguistics has not been explained with much clarification, for example, whether it occurs at grammar or discourse level. She classifies ellipsis in Korean into two large categories: (i) ellipsis in linguistic contexts and (ii) ellipsis in non-linguistic situations. According to her definition and analysis, ellipsis of first and second person subjects occurs in the non-linguistic situation. This case is divided further into ‘on-the-spot’ ellipsis and ‘conceptual’ ellipsis. An example in (11) that is drawn from M. Yang (1998) presents the types of ellipsis categorised:

\[(11) \quad \begin{align*}
A_1: & \quad \textit{Hyeysengi etiey kassni?} \\
& \quad \text{‘Where did Hyeyseng go?’} \\
B_1: & \quad \textit{(Hyeysenginun, kuaymun) pwusaney (kasse).} \\
& \quad \text{‘To Pusan’} \\
A_2: & \quad \textit{(kukes) isanghanney (nayka) ecekkey hakkyoeyse (hyeysengilul, kuaylul) pwassnuntey.} \\
& \quad \text{‘(It) is strange because (I) saw (her/him) yesterday at school’}
\end{align*}\]
(neyka) (hyeysengilul, kuaylul) hakkyoeysye pwasstani (kuken) malto antway.
‘(It) does not make sense that (you) saw (her/him) at school.’

(p. 210, transcribed and translated from example in Korean)

In the dialogue between two speakers in (11), not only subjects of the sentences but also objects or predicates are omitted. As pointed out by M. Yang (1998), the omitted elements are old information in either the linguistic or non-linguistic context. For example, the omitted subject Hyeysengi in B1 is the same subject as in A1 and the omitted verb kasse ‘went’ in B1 is the same verb as in A1, kass ‘went’; these ellipses are based on the linguistic context and they have specific forms of antecedents. Meanwhile, the first person subject nay ‘I’ omitted in A2 or the second person subject ney ‘you’ omitted in B2 has no explicit linguistic forms of antecedents. They are omitted in the non-linguistic context; the omitted subjects refer to the speakers themselves in the dialogue ‘on the spot.’ Thus, this kind of contextual ellipsis is possible in Korean when both speakers are aware of the state of the information.

Another type of non-linguistic contextual ellipsis is analysed to rely on the conceptual common ground between speakers as in (12):

(12) A: Ø Ø kacye wasse?
‘Did (you) bring (it)?’

B: Ani, Ø Ø mos kacye wasse.
‘No, (I) could not bring (it).’

(M. Yang, 1998:216, transcribed and translated from example in Korean)

In this short dialogue, A and B are omitting both subjects and objects in their utterances. As discussed, the omitted subjects ‘you’ and ‘I’ are supposed to be the speakers themselves and are omitted because they are understandable on the spot in the conversation. In the case of objects, since A does not know whether B brought the object and B answers that she did not bring it, the object is not on the spot. When the object is not on the spot, the speakers can still talk about it without explicitly referring to it. The referent of the object is neither in their utterances as a linguistic form nor in the non-linguistic context as a physical form. Rather, the referent is in both speakers’ cognition, which stands on their shared experiences or previous utterances.

As argued in M. Yang (1998), issues considered in grammatical points of view are always good topics in discourse analysis, since the two are not separable. Further, the perspective of
discourse analysis often suggests original solutions to questions that are difficult to answer from grammatical grounds. Since the literature reviews the niche in Korean linguistics that has focused mostly on grammar, M. Yang’s (1998) study is a useful starting point for drawing out the problem of subject omission in the frame of discourse analysis.

However, the cover of recovering omitted subjects shows some limitations. Specifically, one possibility is missing in the discussion that an omitted subject can be interpreted as neither first nor second person—it is possible for the omitted subjects in (12) to be recovered as third person. Even if we postulate that the omitted subjects in (12) refer to a person whom speakers A and B both share in their mind, the dialogue still makes sense.\footnote{It would be like as follows in particular context, e.g. Speaker A asks B whether a friend of theirs brought an item they asked while A was away:
A: (Did he) bring (the item we asked)?
B: No, (he) couldn’t bring (it).} Even in this case, the ellipsis occurs based on the speakers’ common understanding of the referent.

We need much more structure to build upon the analysis of M. Yang (1998) since there are abstract concepts to be clarified further, such as ‘conceptual’ ellipsis, and problems to be solved with regard to ‘overtly expressed subjects’, in addition to omitted subjects. The current research will try to specify the meanings of subject omission with more varied factors, such as sociocultural influences and politeness, by examining the relationship between subject expression and demographical and contextual information from actual spoken discourse and expand the spectrum of the topic to subject expression, both in overt and covert forms, in the following chapters.

W. Kim (1996) provides an interesting comparative study of subject omission in Spanish and Korean. As also pointed out in earlier studies (e.g., Chang, 1985; I. Kim 1984), W. Kim (1996) notes that the subject omission occurs at the discourse level in Korean, while it occurs at the sentence level in Spanish. This is because verb conjugation in Spanish is strict and person and number of a subject are reflected in the verb even if the subject is omitted. Thus, overt expression of a subject often becomes redundant in Spanish since the referent information of the omitted subject, including person and number, is obviously indicated in the form of verb. When a subject is overtly expressed in spite of the clear clue of verb conjugation, it is an intention to emphasise the subject, as in the meaning of ‘this person, not any other’, according to W. Kim (1996).
A subject in Korean is omitted when speakers in discourse ‘naturally’ have the referent of the subject in their mind; an overt subject is required if the sentence becomes unnatural, incomplete or vague with the subject omitted (W. Kim, 1996:280). More specifically, the overt expression of a subject is necessary to pinpoint one person as a subject in contrast to other persons in discourse. W. Kim (1996) uses the following as an example of a subject that cannot be omitted because it is in contrast:

(13)   A:  keki sayngsenhoy hanpen sijinghan kes naytayyo. a, ceyka sayo, ceyka. hyengnim pokwu ton naylan soli anhayyo.
   ‘They serve very fresh raw fish. Oh, I am paying, I am. (I) wouldn’t tell you to pay.’

   B:  silhe, nan kulenteyse mekumyen paythal na.
   ‘No, I get a stomach-ache if having eaten at such a place.’

(p. 282, translated and transcribed from Korean)

The 1PS in speaker A’s utterance in (13), cey ‘I,’ is required to be overtly expressed to show its contrastive status to other participants in the discourse, as the author notes. In this case, the sentence with the subject omitted becomes incomprehensible. The analysis of W. Kim (1996) is valid because it maintains that overt or covert subject expression in Korean is to be understood better at a discourse level rather than at a sentence level. He also adopts the concepts of emphasis and contrast for the analysis of overt subjects, which seem to be commonly recognised as significant notions for understanding overt subjects in the literature on discourse analysis.

However, the descriptions in W. Kim (1996) are too brief and the examples are insufficient to embrace general tendencies of subject expression. The pragmatic reasoning for an overt subject stays at ‘to make a sentence natural, complete or clear’, and it is not specified with adequate actual spoken data. Additionally, the analysis can be deepened by comparing the pragmatic meanings raised by optional subject expression, such as an overt subject that can be omitted without having the utterance incomplete but adding another pragmatic function.

Jung (2007) focuses on the impact of ‘contrast’ on subject omission. He states that a subject cannot be omitted when it is a contrastive factor in a sentence; although subject omission is frequent in Korean, subjects should not be omitted when they include contrastive meanings in sentences. An example from Jung (2007) follows:
Two subjects, Swumi and Inswu, in (14) are in different situations; Swumi went to Pusan while Inswu went to Seoul, and the speaker contrasts the two different situations by expressing the two subjects overtly. In this case, we can hardly resolve who is going to which place if either subject is omitted.

Another example (Jung, 2007) makes an interesting comparison with (14), since the analysis involves the speaker’s understanding of the previous utterance and intention to show the understanding:

(15) A:  Ø payka kophunteyyo.
   ‘(I) am hungry, (you know).’
B:  nanun/?? Ø moki malunteyyo.
   ‘I am thirsty, (you know).’

Speaker A says that she is hungry and speaker B says that she is thirsty in (15). We can identify who is hungry and who is thirsty without the subjects overtly expressed because the speakers express about themselves with the person-related suffix -teyyo (‘you know’). However, na ‘I’ in B’s utterance is required to show the contrast that B intends to address: ‘I understand that you are hungry and in contrast, as for me, I am thirsty.’ B makes an effort to interact with A by adding the overt 1PS, acknowledging her understanding of A’s utterances, and expressing her own status is different from A’s status, according to Jung (2007). This appreciation of contrastive meaning expressed by an overt subject is possible in the consideration of discourse context, rather than in a single sentence, as also noted in Jung (2007).

Another interesting analysis in Jung (2007) is that an overt subject can be evidence of the speaker’s intention to differentiate herself from other speakers, as in the following excerpt:

(16) (In a situation that acquaintances are ordering food at the same table in a restaurant)
A:  mewl tusikeysseyo?
   ‘What would (you) like to eat?’
B:  nanun cacangmyen cwuseyyo
   ‘I will have cacangmyen.’

12 English translations in (14) and (15) are drawn from Jung (2007).
C:  
\textit{nanun wutong cwuseyyo}

‘I will have \textit{wutong}.’

(p. 111, transcribed and translated from example in Korean)

Speaker A is an employee taking orders from the table at a restaurant and speakers B and C are ordering in (16). Jung (2007) describes that both B and C are using an overt 1PS since they know each other well and accordingly show that they are related. According to the analysis, they would not express 1PS \textit{na} ‘I’ overtly when on their own at the table or sharing the table with someone they do not know. The author argues that it would be interpreted as inappropriate or even impolite in Korean discourse if the speakers say \textit{na} ‘I’ in this circumstance.

Notably, Jung (2007) recognises the significance of considering discourse in understanding more of subject expression. Moreover, he focuses on explicitly expressed subjects, while the majority of literature has been interested in the subjects that are omitted. Nevertheless, the study rarely spells out the distinctiveness of discourse compared with sentence. Discourse is obscurely identified as ‘appropriate situation’ or ‘given presumption’ in Jung (2007:106). It is also imprecisely mentioned that subjects are not omitted when speakers want to explicitly show that they are ‘engaged’ with other speakers in the discourse and that similarly, speakers omit subjects to show that they are ‘disengaged’ with other speakers (Jung, 2007:110).

Among the analyses of subject expression in the perspective of information structure analysis and discourse analysis, S. Oh (2007) seems to have the approach most similar to that of the current research although the scope is different. S. Oh (2007) collects data on naturally occurring conversations among native speakers of Korean and analyses the use of personal pronouns to refer to the speakers. The overt references S. Oh (2007) analyses are divided by whether a pronoun is followed by a particle (e.g., a grammatical particle, such as the subject marker \textit{i/ka}, or a discourse particle, such as the topic marker \textit{(n)un}) or no particle of any type. For example, first person pronoun followed by the subject marker \textit{i/ka} is used when speakers want to praise themselves or blame themselves. The topic marker \textit{(n)un} used with first person pronoun presents disagreement and first person pronoun without any particle is found in telephone conversations to introduce the speaker herself to the interlocutor in the analysis of S. Oh (2007). Similar analysis is performed for the cases of overt second person pronoun used with or without particles.

S. Oh (2007) is insightful in the sense that she discusses pragmatic aspects of this phenomenon in detail, which have not been discussed elsewhere in the literature. Nevertheless, as admitted
by S. Oh (2007), the data are limited to a few dialogues between a few interlocutors. The range of reference forms for 1PS and 2PS and particles are also narrowed to the majorities observed in her data, such as the cases of overt reference forms with either of two main particles (-i/ka or -i(n)un) or with no particle. As clarified in Chapter 1, the aim of the current thesis is to shed light on the pragmatic intentions of Korean speakers’ use of overt 1PS and 2PS in the sociocultural background. Therefore, in our corpora, I incorporate a number of speakers, dialogues and situations to find more varied cases, which, in turn, provide a broader range of implications to explore.

Despite the limitations of smaller data and scope of data analysis, the conclusion that S. Oh (2007) makes concerning the overt use of person references in Korean discourse should be an applicable rationale for the current study to enhance its analysis:

> There is indeed an accountable systematic orderliness in Korean speakers’ practices for referring to themselves or addressees overtly, which has significant interactional relevance. On the other hand, the preceding discussions indicate that there is no single overarching account for what is accomplished by the speaker’s overt reference to oneself or to recipient in Korean. (p. 486)

### 2.7 Summary

The topic of subject omission in Korean has received much attention for decades from each subfield of linguistics, such as syntax, language acquisition research, psycholinguistics, cognitive linguistics, quantitative analysis and discourse analysis. The most significant issue in the previous studies has been the syntactic mechanism that a subject is phonetically not realised in a sentence. The syntactic mechanism of subject omission is now elucidated fairly well, but the opposite aspect, that is, overt subject expression, has been given little attention. While a few researchers attempted to consider overtly expressed subjects at a discourse level, the analyses are limited in the range of data or explanation for comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon.

Since the pragmatic interpretation of subject expression has many issues to be resolved, the current research project tackles this problem by testing theoretical analyses in the literature, such as emphasis or contrast, and filling the gap between them. As noted in Chapter 1, this thesis begins from the hypothesis that an overtly expressed subject in Korean conveys pragmatic meanings where an unexpressed subject is predominant in terms of frequency of appearance in discourse. By adopting useful concepts from cross-linguistic research that are discussed in the
following chapter, I aim to examine possible pragmatic meanings and sociocultural functions of overt subjects in Korean.
Chapter 3. Key Notions

3.1 Introduction

The majority of arguments on subject expression in Korean are based on syntactic explanations of subject omission and the analyses also focus on written texts, as discussed in Chapters 1 and 2. This results in the lack of discussion and analysis on the other side of subject omission. That is, overtly expressed subjects are not much considered in the literature in terms of their meanings, rather than the syntactic rules. The present thesis adopts a different view from the literature and explores overtly expressed subjects with a focus on their pragmatic meanings in respect to the characteristics of spoken discourse and sociocultural background of the Korean language.

In the current chapter, I will introduce key notions that help us gain a clear idea of the perspective and approach to the overt expression of 1PS/2PS that this research adopts. First, Section 3.2 briefly discusses the concept of a subject in Korean grammar and discourse analysis and present the way the current study recognises a subject. Section 3.3 outlines the M-Principle by Levinson (2000) to redirect our attention to the significance of pragmatic interpretation of overt 1PS/2PS in Korean. In Section 3.4, the distinctive properties of spoken discourse are explored, as a suitable ground to analyse our data of 1PS and 2PS, which are presented with various reference terms addressing the speakers of discourse in Section 3.5. In Section 3.6, I discuss the theories of politeness in relation to reference terms for 1PS and 2PS. Section 3.7 summarises the chapter.

3.2 Subject

The recognition of a subject in Korean has drawn attention from many researchers (e.g., Huang, 1984; H. Im, 1985; Y. Kim, 2009; J. Kwon, 2012; Mok, 2013; H. Lee, 1987; Li & Thompson, 1976; K. Nam and Ko, 2013; C. Park, 2013), not only because it is often unrealised phonetically but also because it is confused with at topic of a sentence. According to some Korean grammarians (J. Kwon, 2012; K. Nam and Ko, 2013), a subject is recognised with the particle -i/ka attached to a noun, and a topic has the particle -(u)nun attached to it. K. Nam and Ko (2013) specifically define a subject to be a noun or a pronoun that is attached with the subject
particle -i/ka while the particles can be omitted in spoken text. However, this viewpoint can be argued that the particle -i/ka does not always indicate the noun as a subject and there are cases that the topic marker -(u)nun is attached to a noun that is the subject of the sentence. If the particle -i/ka is not an indicator of a subject of the sentence, we have a problem in finding a subject solely by the particle attached to it.

In other studies (Huang, 1984; H. Im, 1985; H. Lee, 1987; Li & Thompson, 1976), Korean is discussed as not a language with a simple structure of ‘subject + predicate’ but as a ‘subject-prominent and topic-prominent language’. Li & Thompson (1976) provides a distinction between a subject and a topic as follows:

… we note that seven criteria have been established. These criteria are not intended to constitute a definition of either notion, but are rather designed to serve as guidelines for distinguishing the topic from the subject. We may single out three basic factors underlying theses criteria: discourse strategy, noun-verb relations, and grammatical processes. The subject has a minimal discourse function in contrast with the topic. Hence, the topic but not necessarily the subject is discourse-dependent, serves as the center of attention of the sentence, and must be definite. As for noun-verb relations and grammatical processes, it is the subject rather than the topic that figures prominently. Thus, subject is normally determined by the verb, and is selectionally related to the verb; and the subject often obligatorily controls verb agreement. These properties of the subject are not shared by the topic. In conclusion, the topic is a discourse notion, whereas the subject is to a greater extent a sentence-internal notion. The former can be understood best in terms of the discourse and extra-sentential considerations; the latter in terms of its functions within the sentence structure. (p. 466)

It is critical in the current thesis to point out that a subject is recognised at the sentence level while a topic is understood at the discourse level, because we are analysing the overt expression of 1PS and 2PS in discourse, not in sentences. I use the term ‘subject’ in this study, but it does not only include a noun with the subject particle -i/ka attached but includes any forms of noun referring to the first or second person in the conversation that is the base of the situation the predicate describes. In fact, as Mok (2013) claims, both a subject and a topic come from the same concept that refers to ‘what is put underneath’ and being the base of description or narration.¹

I put more focus on the semantic role of a subject as an agent or a patient of a predicate in an utterance, rather than their distinction as a subject or a topic by the particles attached to them. I included subjects overtly expressed in any form and with any particle attached, as long as it

¹ Mok (2013) explains that ‘subject’ is originated from a Latin word ‘subjectum’ that is transcribed from a Greek word ‘ηυποκειμενον’, which refers to the base of materials. Thus, a subject means ‘being put underneath’ and it becomes the base of narration. It is an equivalent to the concept of ‘topic’ in the structure of ‘topic + comment’ by Prague school.
takes the thematic role as an agent/patient of the predicate. This enables us to see the data with a wider view so we could find pragmatic effects of overtly expressed subjects that might not have been categorised as a subject at the sentence level because of the particle affixed although what it does in the utterance, i.e., being described or narrated about, is the same as a subject.

### 3.3 The M-Principle

The analyses and arguments in the literature have been mainly on whether or not a subject is omitted in a sentence. Thus, the difference in the pragmatic implications of two cases, that is, when a subject is omitted and when it is overtly expressed, has not been much explored in the literature. The literature (e.g., H. Im, 1985; Jung, 2007; H. B. Lee, 1993; K. Nam & Ko, 2013; Ryu, 1997) agrees that a subject completes the sentence since it plays an essential grammatical role or contains irreplaceable information in some cases, while in other cases, a subject is omitted because it would be redundant, in terms of information, if overtly expressed. The latter case is regarded as ellipsis (Salkie, 2006:56), meaning that we ‘leave out a word or phrase rather than repeat it’ for coherence.

However, the solid premise that a sentence with a subject is natural and complete may prevent the idea that there are pragmatic intentions to express deliberately the subject overtly when it is grammatically or semantically omissible. Similarly, Nariyama notes (2004:239) that a sentence without a subject may ‘give rise to connotations different from those given by the corresponding full sentences’. Moreover, when a subject is overtly expressed, it is often chosen among multiple candidates (e.g., Hong Kiltong-ssi ‘Mr Gildong Hong’, Hong kwacang-nim ‘Manager Hong’ and appa ‘dad’, for a man named Hong Gildong), and the choice could result in a big difference from the pragmatic or sociolinguistic point of view.

While the referential choices for a subject vary and can convey different pragmatic meanings, the most common form of 1PS/2PS is omission in Korean, according to the quantitative studies (e.g., M. W. Kim, 2010; S. Kim & Choi, 2013; C. Park, 2012) that we discussed in Chapter 2.² If a subject is omitted more frequently than it is overtly expressed in a language, the overt subject becomes a distinct or ‘marked’ case while an omitted subject is ordinary or ‘unmarked’.

---

² The results of distribution analysis of our data reveal that approximately 69% of 1PS and 78% of 2PS are omitted in spoken Korean, as will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5.
Levinson (2000) introduces the M-Principle in which marked expressions give rise to a pragmatic effect, M-implicature, as follows:

**The M-Principle**

*Speaker’s maxim:* Indicate an abnormal, non-stereotypical situation by using marked expressions that contrast with those you would use to describe the corresponding normal, stereotypical situation.

*Recipient’s corollary:* What is said in an abnormal way indicates an abnormal situation, or marked messages indicate marked situation, specifically:

Where $S$ has said “$p$” containing marked expression $M$, and there is an unmarked alternate expression $U$ with the same denotation $D$ which the speaker might have employed in the same sentence-frame instead, then where $U$ would have I-implicated the stereotypical or more specific subset $d$ of $D$, the marked expression $M$ will implicate the complement of the denotation $d$, namely $\overline{d}$ of $D$. (p. 137)

M-implicature is one of the Generalised Conversational Implicatures Levinson (2000) proposed, and the author outlines M-Principle as ‘What is said simply, briefly, in an unmarked way picks up the stereotypical interpretation; if in contrast a marked expression is used, it is suggested that the stereotypical interpretation should be avoided’ (p. 38). He also demonstrates that marked expressions are ‘more morphologically complex and less lexicalized, more prolix or periphrastic, less frequent or usual, and less neutral in register’ than their unmarked equivalents on the formal side. In relation to meaning, marked expressions tend to imply ‘some additional meaning or connotation’ that is not found in their unmarked counterparts (Levinson, 2000:137).

Applying the M-Principle for the case of overt subjects, the overt expression of 1PS/2PS also shows the traits of marked forms that Levinson illustrates. Overt subjects are more complex in the morphology than a zero subject since there is at least one morpheme in an overt subject whereas a zero subject has no morpheme. Correspondingly, overt subjects are verbose in comparison to a zero subject, and they are less neutral in register than omitted ones. As a result,

---

3 The author notes that ‘markedness’ in the description of M-Principle is a generalised notion employed from the Prague school concept, as in Jakobson (1939), Greenberg (1966) and Horn (1989).

4 Levinson (2000:11) describes a generalised implicature as ‘a default inference, one that captures our intuitions about a preferred or normal interpretation.’ The three types of Generalised Conversational Implicatures are Q-implicature (e.g. ‘some students’ implies ‘not all students’), I-implicature (e.g. saying ‘write a book and sell the rights’ implies ‘write a book and then sell the rights’), and M-implicature. First two implicatures are based on the maxims of Quantity by Grice (1989) and M-implicature is based on the maxims of Manner by Grice (1989).

5 Considering that the frequency of subject omission in Korean is overwhelmingly higher than overt cases and that there are a variety of referential choices for an overt subject, overt subjects are distinctive and diverse in register compared to a null subject. We will specifically discuss the characteristic of being less neutral of overt 1PS and 2PS in Chapters 5 and 8.
overt subjects appear to bring certain pragmatic meanings that are absent in the case of subject omission. If both the speaker and recipient perceive the omitted subjects as normal and stereotypical, the use of an overt subject supposes that the situation denoted by the speaker is neither normal nor stereotypical. We can then presume that the use of a marked expression, an overt subject, signifies the existence of M-implicature: It is not a usual situation for omitting the subject, but a special situation for expressing the subject overtly. In summary, since the M-Principle suggests that there is an implicature raised by the use of an overt subject while subject omission is more common in Korean, the present study attempts to identify the pragmatic implications and their sociocultural backgrounds.

3.4 Spoken Discourse

The current research aims to shed light on the pragmatic effects of overt subject expression, and discourse analysis can provide the answers not sought by the previous research focused on syntactic analysis of subject omission. Discourse analysis primarily involves pragmatics in addition to syntax and semantics (Brown & Yule, 1983:26), and it is a suitable frame for this study since we are particularly interested in the use of overt 1PS/2PS for pragmatic intentions of speakers, with regard to its sociocultural motivations and discursive contexts.

Discourse has been a favoured term or notion for scholars from various fields, including anthropology, sociology and communication studies, in past few decades. It has a vast and possibly vague definition while employed in many different areas, but at the same time, it becomes a very useful and critical key to the analyses from different fields. Some linguists treat discourse simply as a higher level of sentence and focus on finding the structural relationships between the linguistic units, such as morphemes, clauses, sentences and discourses (e.g., Harris, 1951; Stubbs, 1983). However, as Schiffrin (1994) notes, we need to view discourse as not just a collection of individual utterances, but a ‘collection of inherently contextualized units of language use’ (1994:39), because it gives us a chance to identify the meanings and implications carried between sentences in a discourse.

Brown and Yule’s (1983) recognition of discourse provides a clear image of discourse analysis, which enables exploration of a linguistic phenomenon more extensively than in other disciplines:

The analysis of discourse is, necessarily, the analysis of language in use. As such, it cannot be restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purpose of functions
which those forms are designed to serve in human affairs. While some linguists may concentrate on determining the formal properties of a language, the discourse analyst is committed to an investigation of what that language is used for. (p. 1)

As noted, discourse analysis helps us gain a perspective on the use of a language, beyond the formal aspects of a language, and this methodology can be apt to broaden our understanding of subject expression that has stayed in the realm of grammar.

We discussed in Chapter 2 that subject expression has been investigated mainly in the frame of formal syntax (e.g., ‘whether or not an omitted subject has its antecedent in the same sentence’), and several questions, in regard to the reason and meaning of the optional appearance of subjects, have been disregarded or left to future studies beyond syntax. When the range of investigation expands to discourse, the reasons of optional subject expression can be inferred from the contexts, relationships between participants, psychological status of the speakers and so forth. For example, since 1PS and 2PS refer to the immediate participants in the conversation, we can sometimes observe that certain referential expressions for 1PS/2PS bring out the relationship of speakers and their emotions towards each other.⁶

We will particularly deal with spoken discourse since it has distinctive attributes from written discourse, which allows us to observe the effects of overt 1PS/2PS more clearly. The distinction between spoken and written discourse is not simply whether a discourse has phonetic features or not. Rather, the critical difference between spoken and written discourse is whether a discourse is spontaneous interaction (Chafe, 1979, 1982, 1984; Klein-Andreu, 1989; Tannen, 1980, 1982; van Dijk, 1997), and it is a crucial point since the spontaneity of discourse leads to noticeable characteristics.

Specifically, Chafe (1982) distinguishes spoken discourse as ‘fragmentation’ and written discourse as ‘integration’. In written discourse, such as a news article, a column or an essay, a participant is able to delete texts that are already written and add extra expressions before other participants take part in the discourse (‘integration’), whereas utterances in spoken discourse are delivered in real time and once spoken are not withdrawable (‘fragmentation’).⁷ Thus, participants in a written discourse are rather detached from the discourse, while participants in

⁶ It also applies to the cases of third person subject that the referential expressions reflect the social relationships between the speaker and referent or psychological status of the speaker toward the referent although we will focus on the cases of first and second person subjects.

⁷ As an instance of the ‘integration’ and ‘fragmentation’ of written and spoken discourse respectively, Tannen (1982) presents empirical data of written narratives and their spoken equivalents by the same subjects. It was shown that written narratives are much shorter than their spoken equivalents, and Tannen (1982) explains that written narratives are more integrated than their spoken counterparts and accordingly shorter in length.
a spoken discourse are more involved in the communication, in a deeper dimension, as Tannen (1982) notes.

In a similar fashion, Klein-Andreu (1989) describes that spoken language is ‘unplanned’ because its participants are co-present in discourse, and it results in their becoming the contents of the conversation. In addition, van Dijk (1997) notes that spoken discourse is ‘linear’ or ‘on-line’. In spoken discourse, participants are supposed to react to each other’s utterances and thus to be ‘engaged in immediate interaction’ (van Dijk, 1997:4). This is the reason we characterise spoken discourse as spontaneous. The spontaneousness is represented with pauses, repetitions and overlaps in spoken discourse. Conversely, written discourse is unlikely linear or on-line, since participants can return to previous text and rewrite these before other participants read them.

As a result, as D. Lee (2002) notes, spoken discourse shows dynamic interaction among speakers, and the dynamic interaction can instantly reflect emotional status or social relationship between speakers. In written discourse, participants’ emotional or interpersonal reaction to the discourse can arise but it is not immediate, unlike in spoken discourse. For instance, readers of an essay would have emotional reactions to it and could write another essay about their thoughts as though they were conversing with the author of the original essay they read. Although the second essay would include emotional or interpersonal status of the writer, the written discourse will not be not on-line and accordingly not spontaneous. Immediate and spontaneous interaction in spoken discourse can provide more abundant resources of the participants’ social relationships and emotional statuses in the process that they build up the discourse by reacting to each other in real time. Thus, the participants’ involvement becomes far more natural, transparent and dynamic in spoken discourse than in written, which is reflected in the discourse in various ways.

The analysis of overt 1PS/2PS can be meaningful evidence of dynamic interaction in spoken discourse. As discovered in the literature and in the current study, the distributions of overt 1PS/2PS are different in written and spoken discourse.\(^8\) In written texts, omission of 1PS/2PS occurs at lower frequency and the referential forms chosen for overt 1PS/2PS differ from those in spoken discourse (See S. Kim & Choi, 2013; C. Park, 2012), owing to the difference between

---

\(^8\) Subject omission in written discourse is 50% (S. Kim & Choi, 2013) while it is 68% in spoken discourse (C. Park, 2012), as noted in Chapter 2. Our data also shows that approximately 70% of 1PS and 80% of 2PS are omitted in spoken discourse.
written and spoken discourse as well as the characteristics of 1PS/2PS. The spontaneousness and dynamicity of spoken discourse that we have discussed can affect the choice between overt expression of 1PS/2PS and omission or diversify the reference terms for overt 1PS/2PS.

For example, a relationship might exist between the facts that a discourse is spoken, not written, and that a speaker in the spoken discourse chooses an overt 1PS expressed with a kinship term instead choosing other reference terms or omitting the 1PS. It is also presumable that the speaker of the kinship term for 1PS has certain pragmatic intentions in choosing the particular reference term. It is also possible that a speaker chooses an overt 1PS/2PS instead of omitting it, intending to emphasise the contrastiveness between speakers in the discourse, who are represented by 1PS/2PS, or to ensure who maintains the floor of the discourse. We will specifically examine the functions of overt 1PS/2PS in relation to the attributes of spoken discourse in following chapters.

### 3.5 Referential Choices for 1PS and 2PS

The discussion of overtly expressed subjects relates to the choice of reference forms, because there are multiple alternative expressions for addressing the same referent (Allerton, 1996; Brown & Yule, 1983; Chang, 1983; Enfield, 2007; Guldel, Hedberg and Ron, 1993; S. Hwang, 1991; Strauss & Eun, 2005). In particular, referential choices for 1PS/2PS address the speakers themselves in spoken discourse; that is, 1PS and 2PS are the very speaker and hearer of discourse, and the discursive circumstances involve social, cultural, interpersonal and emotional characteristics of the participants, as discussed in the previous section. Brown and Yule (1983:28) describe the particular aspect of reference in discourse analysis as to be ‘treated as an action on the part of the speaker/writer’. While the traditional treatment of reference is limited in the link between a referring word and its referent in the world, Brown and Yule (1983) agree with Lyons (1977) that discourse analysts need to consider the role of the speaker who takes an action of referring, and they stress that referring is performed by the speaker using an expression, not by the expression itself (Strawson, cited in Brown & Yule, 1983:28).

By its definition, ‘reference’ includes all instances of referring to a referent in written or spoken discourse in general. It usually engages the assumption that there are a speaker/writer, a hearer/reader and a referent. Some studies (e.g., Brown & Ford, 1961; S. Hwang, 1991; M.

---

9 Lyons (1977:175) borrows an example of the definition by Ogden and Richards (1923): “‘referent’ for any object or state-of-affairs in the external world that is identified by means of a word or expression …, and ‘reference’ for the concept which mediates between the word or expression and the referent.”
Kim, 2015; Kroger, Wood and Kim, 1984) specifically deal with ‘address terms’ that indicate the referring expressions particularly for the hearer in spoken discourse. It is possible for a speaker to ‘self-address’ with address forms, but address terms seem to be more generally understood and used for only addressing the listener as second person in discourse (S. H. Lee, 2002; J. S. Suh, 1984; C. Son, 2010; Wang et al., 2005). More generally, it is true that reference terms and address terms have been interchangeably used in discourse, but we need to define what we mean by ‘reference terms’ or ‘address terms’ before we begin our analysis.

An example to distinguish address terms from reference terms is provided by Dickey (1997:256): ‘Love in its referential meaning is used of a strong emotion or a person towards whom such strong emotion is felt, but it can be a neutral form of address in some parts of England, used for example by train conductors to passengers’. Similarly, a few Korean studies have tried to identify address terms differently from reference terms (e.g., C. W. Na, 1988; C. Son, 2010, Yu, 1998). Address terms hochinge refer to the words used to address the addressee directly, while reference terms cichinge refers to the words used to address referents other than the immediate participants of the conversation.

C. Son (2010) gives an example of sachon ‘cousin’ that is used as a reference term, but not as an address term.\(^\text{10}\) To address the hearer who is a cousin of the speaker, native speakers of Korean would use an address term hyeng ‘older brother’ or sachonhyeng ‘older male cousin’ instead of addressing him sachon ‘cousin’ (C. Son, 2010).\(^\text{11}\) Some words, such as hyeng, can be both an address term and a reference term in Korean; it can be used to address a person to whom the speaker is speaking as well as a person who is not the hearer, that is, third person, according to C. Son (2010).

To avoid confusion, I will use the term ‘reference terms’ to indicate any referring expressions, including first and second person subject, throughout the current study, since it includes the concept of ‘address terms’ in the broad meaning. When a reference terms is indicated as an ‘address term’ in the study, I specifically pinpoint a reference term that can be used as vocative.

Previous studies on person reference in general have agreed that it is not only a linguistic concept but also a sociocultural product (Allerton, 1996; Brown & Gilman, 1960; Dickey, 1997;  

---

\(^{10}\) It is possible and natural to say “ce salami wuli sachoniya ‘The person is my cousin’” or “ce salami wuli sachonhyengiya ‘The person is my older male cousin’,” but the speaker normally does not address the cousin as second person with the term in Korean.

\(^{11}\) In using hyeong ‘older brother’ as an address term, the speaker and the addressee are both male and the addressee is older than the speaker. We will explore the kinship terms in Korean in Chapter 4.
Stivers, Enfield & Levinson, 2007) and a reflection of cognitive status (Chafe, 1994; Givon, 1983; Gundel, Hedberg & Zacharski, 1993). Allerton (1996) describes that the choice of an appropriate referring expression is likely to depend on the social and psychological viewpoint of the speaker. Thus, the choice between ‘Mary’, ‘Mary Jones’ and ‘Mrs Jones’ in addressing the same person can reflect the relationship between the speaker and the addressee, as Allerton (1996) noted.

Pronouns also suggest that their use is associated with the understanding of social relationships, that is, ‘the dimensions of power and solidarity’, as Brown and Gilman (1960) noted. Their well-known descriptions $T$ and $V$ clarify that power and solidarity are represented in the semantics of second person singular pronouns in European languages, such as French, Italian, Spanish and German. $V$, from the Latin vos, is used to address a second person who has more power, ‘superior’, than the first person. The one with more power uses $T$, from the Latin tu, to the counterpart with less power, ‘inferior’. When the power of the two individuals is equal, they use $T$ to express solidarity and $V$ to express lack of solidarity.12

While the choice of second person reference is dichotomous in most European languages, Korean has more options. The reference system in Korean is clearly more complicated than in English and considerably sensitive to social factors, especially age (H. Sohn, 1999).13 Researchers agree that it is because of the social and cultural customs that explicitly and implicitly acknowledge the age and social status of the members of the society in relationships (e.g., H. Kim, 1999; K. Kim, 1992; P. Lee, 1987; C. W. Na, 1988; M. Oh, 2011; H. Sohn, 1981). C. W. Na (1988) specifically illustrates that reference terms are not fixed in Korean and they change according to the social relationship between the addressor and addressee and the interpersonal attitude, such as friendliness or politeness. It is sometimes the case that the reference terms change first, and the feelings of closeness or respectfulness change accordingly (C. W. Na, 1988:59). The changes also apply in first person reference although the degree of changes is relatively smaller than in the case of second person reference, as we will see in detail in the following chapter.

---

12 Power may seem to be a too strong word in modern society where most cultures do not have a strict or visible hierarchy in the social class, but it is true that we have asymmetry of power in any forms in our lives. For example, as Brown and Gilman (1960) note, there are different sources of power, including physical, economical, professional or institutional status, gender and age; e.g. Parents and children have unequal power in family.

13 H. Sohn (1999:408) describes that the strategy of using honorifics in Korean is ‘the most systematic among all known languages.’
The categorisation of the reference terms for 1PS and 2PS in Korean has been considered by researchers (Chang, 1974, 1983; Y. Han, 2003; K. Kim, 1992; M. J. Kim, 1995; I. Lee, 1994; P. Lee, 1987; S. H. Lee, 2002; K. Nam & Ko, 2013; K. Park, 1989; J. Park, 1997; C. Son, 2010), although the overall organisations are compatible. Since we will observe the varieties and qualities of Korean reference terms in the following chapter, I present only a brief introduction in this section.

Most commonly, pronouns are used for both first and second person. There are two kinds of personal pronouns in modern Korean, a casual form and an honorific from, and there were more sub-classifications based on social hierarchy in Old Korean (H. C. Kim, 1983; M. H. Kim, 2001). In addition to using pronouns, native speakers of Korean use personal names, kinship terms and professional titles in referring to themselves and the addresses. There is also the choice of not using any of the reference terms and omitting 1PS or 2PS. The selection of a reference term for 1PS or 2PS among semantic equivalents, that is, referring to the same referent, is based on the difference of pragmatic effects of each reference term. One of the most intrinsic pragmatic effects I notice is politeness, which is discussed in the following section.

3.6 Politeness in Reference

Reference engages the social contexts of discourse, particularly ‘power and solidarity’ as Brown and Gilman (1960) specify. When referring to a person, speakers can choose from a set of reference terms and they need to consider their relationship with the referent for the choice, such as whether they are close friends or whether they are first meeting in a business conference. While selecting an appropriate term of reference from several, the speaker has multiple factors to consider, depending on the cultural norm. For example, age becomes the priority determinant when choosing a referring expression in some cultures, such as those of Korea and Japan (Hijirida & Sohn, 1983; S. Hwang, 1991). In the Japanese language, the gender of the speaker also affects the choice of proper reference terms. In most languages, the formality of conversation settings tends to decide the reference terms. The factors involved in the decision of reference terms are related to what we suppose as politeness.

Scollon, 2001; Spencer-Oatey, 2000, 2002; Watts, 1989, 1992, 2003) and discussions are still ongoing. While the definition of politeness neither is in accord nor explicitly defined, a shared understanding of politeness is that it is not an innate characteristic of humans but acquired, and learned over the course of socialisation. In addition, it seems to be agreed that linguistic politeness is used to reduce conflicts in communication, as Reiter (2000:5) states.

For example, Lakoff (1973, 1975), who is known as the first linguist adopting and explaining politeness in the frame of linguistics, presumes that politeness is developed to ‘reduce friction in personal interaction’ (1975:64). She attempts to define the properties of politeness by introducing the rules for Pragmatic Competence, such as ‘be clear’ and ‘be polite’, that describe the strategies for a speaker to be polite, based on the Cooperative Principle by Grice (1967, published in 1975). As Grice proposes the Maxims of Conversation with supporting rules of being a ‘cooperative’ speaker, Lakoff (1975) suggests sub-maxims for the rules of Pragmatic Competence, which include ‘formality (keep aloof)’, ‘deference (give options)’ and ‘camaraderie (show sympathy)’. Similarly, Leech (1983) introduces the Politeness Principle, which is also based on Grice’s Cooperative Principle: ‘minimise (other things being equal) the expression of impolite beliefs’ and ‘maximise (other things equal) the expression of polite beliefs’. He introduces six maxims for the Politeness Principle—tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement and sympathy.

Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) accommodate the concept of ‘face’ in politeness, which the sociologist Goffman (1955, 1967) developed, and attempt to present a universal model of linguistic politeness. The gist of their politeness model is that people have their own ‘face’, as ‘the public self-image that every member [of a society] wants to claim for himself’ (Brown & Levinson, 1987:61), and they want to be appreciated, ‘positive face’, and not disturbed, ‘negative face’. During social interaction, the faces are threatened by certain acts, and Brown and Levinson (1987) name the acts ‘face-threatening acts (FTAs)’. For example, requests can be an FTA to ‘negative face’ since the addressee can feel burdened to perform the request (1987:67); apologies can be an FTA to ‘positive face’ because the speaker has to show her regrets to the addressee (1987:68). A speaker can be polite by avoiding or minimising FTAs, and the authors introduce five strategies for FTAs:

1. without redressive action, baldly

Do the FTA on record with redressive action

2. positive politeness
Brown and Levinson (1987:77) also suggest three variables that affect FTAs, with a formula that calculates the degree of FTAs: social distance (D), relative power (P) and absolute ranking (R); \[ W = D \times (S, H) + P \times (H, S) + R. \] It is the notable part of their research that politeness is explicitly assessed with numerical values, and the theory of politeness is more specified and systematised than in any current studies, whether or not the calculation is accurate and definite.

Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) argue that their politeness strategies are universally applicable, having examples collected from Tamil, Tzetal and English and applied in their model. However, many researchers claim that their argument does not explain the linguistic politeness, especially of non-Western cultures (e.g., Gu, 1990; Ide, 1982, 1989, 1992; Ide et al., 2005; Janney & Arndt, 1993; Kiyama, Tamaoka and Takiura, 2012; Matsumoto, 1988, 1989; Mao, 1994). The overall criticism is placed on the universality of the theory,¹⁴ and provides counterexamples from various cultures. For example, Ide (1989) and Matsumoto (1988) maintain that ‘negative face’ is not applicable in Japanese culture; that is, it is not the most crucial part of politeness that an individual is not disturbed or burdened in social interaction. Rather, being related to other people in a society and accepted by them is perceived more important in Japanese culture.

It is similar in the case of Chinese culture, according to Gu (1990) and Mao (1994). They both claim that what is understood as ‘face’ is different among cultures and ‘positive face’ and ‘negative face’ cannot cover the politeness in Chinese culture. In addition, as Fraser (1990) points out, the variables of FTAs, that is, social distance, relative power and absolute ranking, can change consistently between speakers during interaction, even in a short period, and accordingly, the assessment of politeness needs to be much more context-dependent and culture-specific. It is also a valid point that Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) and other earlier politeness researchers do not include impoliteness in their theories (Elen, 2001; Fraser, 1990;

---

¹⁴ There are also studies that criticise other aspects of Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987). For example, Watts (1992) argues that the concept of ‘face’ in Brown and Levinson posits is private and social, and it cannot be applied in public and societal context. S. Lee (2015) also claims that the dynamics of interaction between speakers needs to be assessed while the degree of an FTA in Brown and Levinson (1987) is determined by a single utterance of speech act, not at the discourse level.
Fraser & Nolen, 1981). Specifically, there are often situations in which speakers choose not to be polite that consequently violate the politeness rules and revoke the principles; also, utterances scolding or denouncing impolite behaviours are actually spoken out with phrases such as ‘That is rude’, and they are not acknowledged in the early studies on politeness, including that of Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987).

Despite ongoing criticism and discussion on Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987), their theory of politeness presents a comprehensive guideline for the present study and their contribution to the establishment of politeness theory is exceptional. It is true that every language has its own cultural background and different aspects of linguistic politeness, but it is also true that politeness is omnipresent. There might be no single rule for us to be universally polite, but there is one universal principle that speakers try to be polite in using their languages unless they intentionally try to be impolite in particular situations.

In this sense, the politeness model Brown and Levinson provide is an illustrative hypothesis for us to examine, either for a particular culture or for any language in general, as numerous researchers do currently. In addition to the philosophical idea of ‘face’ that people try to maintain in social interaction, the factors of politeness, such as social distance, rank and power, are the fundamental resources to build an argument on politeness. Since we analyse the pragmatic effects of person reference in the present study, our discussion leads to social or interpersonal factors that help to decide reference terms in discourse, which also are part of politeness. Stivers et al. (2007) specifically note the relationship between person reference and politeness as follows:

Person reference is one among many domains in language and interaction where we see the inextricable integration of informational and affiliational concerns. While it is often imagined that social-affiliative practices serve the transfer of information by clothing the delivery in politeness or ‘procedural’ trimmings, we think it likely that the opposite is true. The case of person reference suggests that, if anything, practices of information transfer are in the service of social-affiliative action. (p. 19)

reflect that the Korean language has a complicated system of person reference with regard to sociocultural characteristics.

That is, native speakers of Korean are educated to use proper reference terms culturally and linguistically. The range of reference terms that they can use to a group of addressees is clearly noted by the speakers, and it is almost at the level of ‘sociolinguistic grammar’, considering the complexity of variables and contexts. The research on the honorific system aims attention at the grammatical classifications of honorific expressions, including address terms, pronouns and nominal and verbal inflection, and stresses the complication and uniqueness of the Korean honorific system that is based primarily on age and social status. Since age and social status underlie the honorific system, the system is biased to express politeness towards the superior, who is also older usually. Namely, linguistic politeness in this manner entails using correct honorific expressions to elderly people, which is a substantial impact of the culture (J. Jeon, 2004:72).

By contrast, the research adapting politeness theories in Korean argues that the studies on the honorific system stay within the analysis of grammatical elements of politeness whereas there are certainly other forms of politeness, such as indirect speech act and ellipsis, at the pragmatic level and it is possible to explain them by employing the aforementioned politeness theories. For instance, K. Moon (2017:29) explains the notion of kongson, a combined word of konggyeng ‘respect’ and kyemson ‘modesty’, that it protects the addressee’s face with respectfulness and modesty. Namely, kongson is an attitude of a speaker towards an addressee.

I argue that politeness should be seen within a bigger boundary so we could understand the phenomenon of overt 1PS/2P in Korean better as it relates all the notions discussed so far, such as, not threatening interlocutors’ face and using correct linguistic forms to show respect. In fact, by adapting different politeness theories from the use of honorifics to superior or older people, we can extend the target of politeness to any member of society, including the inferior and the younger, because the politeness theories begin from the Cooperative Principle of Grice (1967, published 1975), which explains that participants in a conversation cooperate. Thus, participant of a conversation are all involved in politeness to avoid conflicts and to be sympathetic, according to the Principle. This is the idea of politeness I want to start from when I analyse the data; whether speakers are being respectful to each other, how they utilise overt 1PS/2PS in the expression of their respect and politeness and what reference forms they use in order to show their politeness or impoliteness. In Chapter 8, we discuss politeness in specific
in the use of overt 1PS/2PS in Korean as one of interpersonal strategies to convey politeness in discourse.

3.7 Summary

In this chapter, I introduced the key notions related either theoretically or methodologically to the analysis in the current thesis. According to the M-Principle (Levinson, 2000), a pragmatic implication is raised, ‘M-implicature’, in the use of irregular or marked expressions while there are regular or unmarked alternatives. Correspondingly, I presume a native speaker of Korean is likely to intend an M-implicature by using an overt 1PS or 2PS when it is more usual or stereotypical to omit it.

I also discussed the characteristics of spoken discourse as a methodological ground for the analysis of implications of overt 1PS and 2PS. The observation and interpretation of overt 1PS and 2PS seem easier and more effective in spoken discourse, because the references to both in spoken discourse directly address the speakers and actively reflect their interpersonal status as the dialogue proceeds. That is, spoken discourse is characterised as spontaneous and dynamic, since the speakers readily participate in the interaction, which does not occur in written discourse. Since it is naturally occurring, not going backward and being edited, spoken discourse tends to represent contextual aspects, such as social relationships and emotional states between interlocutors, much more vividly and abundantly than written discourse.

Contextual aspects are the factors with which speakers make a decision on the reference terms for 1PS and 2PS. The reference terms refer not only to the subject in the sentence, but also to the speakers themselves in the conversation. Before referring to oneself or to the addressee, speakers compute their social status and closeness with the addressee, as Brown and Gilman (1960) stated. In particular, age makes a significant difference in the choice of reference terms in Korean where the cultural background has a considerable influence on the complicated linguistic politeness.

Politeness in Korean may indicate using appropriate honorifics to an older addressee as many Korean linguists have focused on, but the present study attempts to find the linguistic politeness in the way native speakers of Korean manage the person reference terms to express their intention to be polite or impolite. In doing so, I adopt politeness theories from the literature (e.g., Blum-Kulka, 1987; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Ide, 1989; Watts, 2003). I will also examine
the honorifics in Korean, which already incorporate social aspects in the form,\textsuperscript{15} in the following chapter. Chapter 4 will introduce lexical resources of politeness that may be utilised pragmatically depending on contexts.

\textsuperscript{15} Some may argue that this is a fixed linguistic custom and there is no pragmatic intention for using a designated term, but the speaker still has a choice not to use the term or to use other terms in order to display her intention of not following the custom. In the current analysis, I will examine the sociolinguistic rules or expectations of politeness in Korean or the pragmatic intentions of disobeying them.
Chapter 4. Reference Terms for First and Second Person in Spoken Korean

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I introduce reference terms for first and second person in Korean, based on the results of distribution analysis of our data from spoken Korean corpora. By reviewing the categories of reference terms in the literature and outlining the types according to their actual use in spoken discourse, we can have a clearer understanding of the variety and characteristics of overt 1PS/2PS before we discuss their pragmatic meanings.

In referring to a person in a conversation, speakers have multiple referential choices in English, as Givon (1983) notes, such as zero anaphora, various pronouns and NPs. Native speakers of Korean also have more than one option of reference terms when referring to a participant in discourse. However, the referential choice in Korean has more complex conditions and stricter restraints to be used in a conversation than in many other languages, including English (K. Kim, 1992; C. W. Na, 1988; S. Oh, 2010; H. Sohn, 1994, 1999; C. Son, 2010; Wang et al, 2005; J. Yoon, 1995). For example, while speakers naturally address the counterpart in a conversation with a second person pronoun ‘you’ or with their names in English, this is not the case in Korean. There is certain information to collect before choosing a proper reference term for second person in Korean. Age is a primary factor to know, and the degree of closeness of the relationship is also important in deciding how to refer to each other. The formality of discourse is another factor that may change the reference term for second person. Even if a reference term is settled with the information obtained, it can still change depending on the speaker’s emotional status. When the situation is stable or unchanged, the use of other reference terms can cause awkwardness, fun or austerity depending on the context (C. W. Na, 1988).

---

1 For instance, in a phone conversation between close friends, the recipient does not know if the caller is alone in a private place or s/he is in public, such as on a radio show where the conversation may be recorded or broadcasted. If it is the case of latter, as often seen on TV or radio shows, the recipient may have started addressing the caller with first name or nickname but change the address term to something more formal or polite after realising there is other audience or the conversation is on air.

2 C. W. Na (1988:42) also argues that the range of reference terms a speaker may use toward an addressee represents their relationship. Namely, if the speakers are close, the restriction on the use of reference terms tends to be less strict whereas the stricter restriction possibly means the more distant the speakers are in their relationship.
Age and social status are dominant factors in the decision of a reference term in Korean as stressed in the literature (e.g., Chang, 1983; H. Kim, 1999; K. Kim, 1992; P. Lee, 1987; C. W. Na, 1988; M. Oh, 2011; J. Park, 1997; C. Son, 2010; B. Song, 1982; Wang et al., 2005). Specifically, the sociocultural factors affect grammatical agreement between reference forms and particles in utterances. For example, when two speakers of different social statuses, such as an employer and an employee, speak to each other the inferior speaker is supposed to use an honorific verbal suffix (e.g., –yo or -(s)upnita), an honorific verbal infix (e.g., –si–), an honorific subject marker (e.g., -kkeyse) or an honorific suffix to the title (e.g., –nim), as well as to choose a proper reference term for himself/herself and the collocutor. Strauss and Eun (2005:612) provide a simplified representation of linguistic elements in the Korean honorific system in the following diagram:

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 4.1: The Korean honorifics system (Strauss & Eun, 2005:612)**

With respect to the reference terms in Korean, S. Oh (2010) provides a summary of the general attributes of person reference in Korean as follows:

Korean has a large set of address-reference terms that are sensitive to the degrees of social hierarchy and solidarity between the speaker and the addressee and/or the referents. All kinds of professional titles (including section or division chief, company president, nurse, and taxi or bus driver), as well as extensively diversified kinship terms, are used both as address and reference terms. Personal names can also be used, but not as often (and not in the same way) as in English, because using a name (either as an address term or a reference term) is considered appropriate only if the speaker is as old as or older than the referent. Used otherwise, a name would convey a serious affront or insult. Also included in the category of full noun phrases (NPs) are simple nouns modified by a possessive pronoun (e.g., *nay tongsayng* ‘my younger sibling’), attributive adjective (e.g., *kwiyewun ai* ‘(a) cute child’), or relative clause (e.g., *nayka ecey mannan salam* ‘the person whom I met yesterday’). (p. 1221)

As aforementioned, Korean speakers generally use professional titles, kinship terms, personal names and NPs for personal reference terms. The categorisation of reference terms in the following sections is based on the distribution analysis of reference terms in our corpora. Various studies suggest their own categorisation of reference terms with some differences from each other. For instance, researchers’ categorisations of second person pronouns differ, with
their recognition of some nouns as pronouns, and most researchers do not pay much attention to nouns or NPs used for second person reference other than kinship terms or professional titles. Nor does the literature consider any reference terms other than pronouns for first person. However, I attempt to include any possible forms of person reference that a speaker uses for 1PS/2PS in our analysis so that we can have an opportunity to find a pragmatic motivation or implication of using the particular form of reference among several equivalents, which we will discuss in the following chapters.

In the current chapter, I first introduce pronouns that appeared in our corpora and display them in the contexts in Section 4.2. Other pronouns discussed in the literature are also reviewed in the same section. In Section 4.3, I examine personal names used in referring to 1PS/2PS in spoken Korean, and in Section 4.4, discuss kinship terms used as 1PS/2PS along with their contexts where they appear. We see the use of professional titles used as 1PS/2PS in Section 4.5 and the use of other noun or NPs used as 1PS/2PS in Section 4.6. Lastly, Section 4.7 summarises the discussions in the current chapter on reference terms for 1PS/2PS in spoken Korean.

4.2 Personal Pronouns

Pronouns may be defined in various ways by their morphological, syntactic or semantic properties. For example, M. H. Kim (2001:2) notes that a pronoun is a word that simply and easily refers to a noun or NP that already appeared in the context and saves repetition. More specifically, J. H. Suh and Kim (2012) suggest ‘substitution’, ‘deixis’ and ‘generality’ as the main three qualities of a pronoun. It means that a pronoun replaces a noun in a context without misinterpretation (substitution), a pronoun refers to a different referent corresponding to the speaker, hearer and context (deixis) and a pronoun can be used for most objects in discourse (generality). Based on the definitions, which help us understand the grammatical and semantic features of a pronoun, we will further discuss the sociolinguistic characteristics of personal pronouns in Korean in this section.

3 For example, Pae (1974) includes ne, caney, tangsin, kutay, caki, imca, tayk, elun and elusin into the category of second person pronoun, while J. Hwang (1975) categorises only ne, caney and tangsin in second person pronoun.

The pronominal system of Korean is relatively complex since it considers ‘speech level’ or speech style as well as person, number and distance, and it is because the pronouns are affected substantially by the honorific system (W. P. Lee, 1989:62). In particular, first and second person pronouns can be the tools to express politeness or solidarity as regards the relationship between speakers since they are more closely involved in the discourse than third person pronouns (M. Oh, 2011). Namely, power and solidarity in the $T$–$V$ system presented by Brown and Gilman (1960) can be applied the Korean language—a superior uses $T$ form to an inferior and the inferior uses $V$ form to the superior. When two speakers are equal in their social statuses, they both use $T$ form to show their solidarity unless they deliberately use $V$ form to each other in a formal setting (Brown & Gilman, 1960:257).

One notable fact in the $T$–$V$ system in Korean is that there is no $V$ form of pronoun. Instead, speakers use other nouns, such as kinship terms and professional titles, and they often use no overt form to address a superior. Helmbrecht (2013) also observes this in a survey of politeness distinctions in pronouns. Among 207 languages examined in the research, 136 languages have second person pronouns with no politeness distinction, and 64 languages have two or more politeness distinctions in their second person pronouns. Only the remaining seven languages are labelled ‘pronoun avoidance’, and Korean is one of them along with Japanese, Burmese and Thai. Helmbrecht (2013) notes that the seven languages are very sensitive to politeness in terms of grammar as well as pragmatics and that as a politeness strategy, speakers should avoid addressing people directly.\(^6\)

While the $T$–$V$ system of Brown and Gilman regards the choice of second person pronouns that project power and solidarity of the relationship, Korean also has choices of first person pronouns in the same sense. The first and second person pronouns are complementary, so a superior says the plain first person pronoun $na$ and the plain second person pronoun $ne$. An inferior says the honorific first person pronoun $ce$ and no overt second person pronoun.\(^7\) Between peers, the plain form $na$ (1sg) and $ne$ (2sg) are usually used for both speakers when they know each other. However, in a formal setting, speakers tend to use the honorific form $ce$.

---

\(^5\) H. Sohn (1994, 1999) introduces six speech levels that include deferential, polite, semi-formal, familiar, intimate and plain, which is broadly accepted by Korean linguists. On the other hand, Y. Ko and Nam (1985) recognise four speech styles with deferential, semiformal, familiar and plain. Paek (1999) maintains five speech styles excluding semi-formal style as it is not much in use in modern Korean.

\(^6\) The description is generally acceptable, except for some cases that second person pronouns can bring politeness or solidarity depending on the context, which we will discuss in Chapter 8.

\(^7\) I simply name $ce$ and $cehuy$ ‘honorific’ pronouns, but they elevate not first person but second person. To be more accurate, $ce$ and $cehuy$ need to be named ‘humble’ forms, but we will keep using the term honorific following the convention that includes any honorifics used for expressing politeness.
(1sg) and no second person pronoun even if they are peers. Table 4.1 below shows the plain and honorific forms of first and second person pronouns in modern Korean.

**Table 4.1: First and second person pronouns in modern Korean**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First person</th>
<th>Second person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>na/nay</td>
<td>ne/ney, caney, caki, tangsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>wuli</td>
<td>nuhuy(-tul), caney(-tul), tangsin(-tul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>ce/cey</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>cehuy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.1, the plain form for first person singular is *na*, and it changes to *nay* when affixed with the subject marking particle *-ka*, which looks like *nay-ka* ‘I-SUB’ after the affixation. This transformation also applies to *ce*, the honorific first person singular, and *ne*, the plain second person singular, so they become *cey-ka* ‘I (hon)-SUB’ and *ney-ka* ‘you-SUB,’ respectively, as a subject in a sentence. For first person plural, *wuli* is used in casual settings or when the speaker is equal or superior to the listener whereas *cehuy* is used in formal settings or when the speaker is inferior to the listener. I include the second person pronouns observed in our data in Table 4.1, but it is not that they can simply replace the second person pronoun ‘you’ in English. As briefly mentioned, the use of a second person pronoun is very limited and restricted. We will examine the types of pronouns and their actual usage in spoken discourse more specifically in the following sections.

**4.2.1 First person singular pronouns: na and ce**

The plain form of first person singular pronoun *na* is generally used between same-aged friends, by both speakers. Between speakers with age difference, the older speaker uses *na*, and the younger speaker is expected to use *ce*, the honorific form. It is also likely that a younger speaker uses the plain form *na* while speaking to an older speaker when they are intimate, such as family members or close friends with age difference. Thus, as P. Lee (1987) states, the speakers of *na* may be in the most relaxed state, in terms of choosing a self-reference term, since they are

---

8 The change of forms only occurs when the three pronouns are affixed with the subject marking particle *-ka*, presumably due to phonological reasons as there is no semantic change. It does not apply to other pronouns or other particles like a topic marking particle or an object marking particle.
speaking to close friends, family members or younger speakers whom they have known for some time. See an example of using *na* between two friends from high school in (1):

(1) 1 A: *na* sacikse naylyeko.
    ‘I-pronoun am going to hand in my letter of resignation.’
  2 B: *way? hoysaeyse kulelay?*
    ‘Why? Does the company tell you so?’
  3 A: *ani, kukaen aniko,*
    ‘No, it is not that,’
  4 B: *sin thimcang com, hintulci?*
    ‘Manager Shin is hard, isn’t she?’
  5 A: (silence)
  6 B: *sasil wuli sinwuiya. nato cheumeyn kosayng com hayssse, cal an macase.*
    ‘To be honest, (she) is my sister in law. I-pronoun also had hard time at first, because (we) didn’t get along.’
  7 kuntey.. akayun epse. wenak caki kicwuni nophun salamila kulehei.
    ‘But, (she) does not mean badly. (It) is that (she) is a person with a high standard herself.’
  8 9
 10 A: *ani, kukey anila, nayka cal hal swu issnun ili anin kes kathase kulay.*
    ‘No, it is not that, (it) is that the work is not something I-pronoun can do well.’

[D4:117–131, between two friends]

Speakers A and B in (1) are friends who attended the same high school and currently work at the same company. Speaker A discusses that she plans to leave her job, using *na* as 1PS. Speaker B consoles A by saying that she also had hard time with A’s boss, *sin thimcang* ‘Ms Shin, team manager’, in her family, using *na* as 1PS. While using *na* for 1PS, B adds the particle –*to* for the meaning of ‘also’, since she assumes that A is trying to leave her job because of the strict boss, *sin thimcang*. Speaker A then says that it is not because of the boss but because of herself, who is not likely to be eligible for the job, using *na* for 1PS.

The honorific form *ce* is typically used by inferior speakers when speaking to a superior, as a way to lower themselves and be humble. In conversation (2), the junior (J) uses *ce* for 1PS while speaking to the senior (S) at university:9

---

9 The distinction between a junior and senior does not follow the terms that indicate the years at university, such as freshmen, sophomore, junior and senior. I use junior/senior in the current study to refer to the relative status between two students or colleagues or the social hierarchy in a school or company.
S in (2) says that she made a phone call to another person, Sunghuy, and the person did not answer. J says that she also called the person, but the person did not answer. In saying ‘I also called’, J uses ce for 1PS as well as neyJ ‘yes’ and the sentence final –yo, which are honorific forms, in her utterances.

In some situations, speakers use na despite their age difference. When the speakers are very intimate, such as family members or old friends with only few years of age gap, we can observe na is said by younger speakers as well as older speakers. In dialogue (3), a daughter (D) in her twenties, uses na when speaking to her father (F):

The father says that one should read books, but he did not read much himself and has no stories to tell, using na for 1PS. The daughter says that she is not a good speaker, using na for 1PS.

It is also possible that an older speaker talking to a younger counterpart uses ce when they are not acquaintances or are in a formal setting. That is, the formality of discourse can be a factor for speakers to decide which pronoun to use. See the following excerpt for an example where a speaker named Payk Ca-un (P) speaks to her class and her friends in the class, F1 and F2, respond to her speech:
Speakers P, F1 and F2 in (4) are friends at university, and P is making a speech to her classmates during a break. In usual conversations, P uses na speaking to her friends, but she is using the honorific form cey for speaking to the whole class in a serious tone. While using the honorific form, P also uses corresponding honorifics to the speech style in her utterance: the honorific sentence finals –supnita and –yo; the honorific words ney (‘yes’) and yelepwn (lit. many people) in the first utterance.

4.2.2 First person plural pronouns: wuli(-tul) and cehuy(-tul)

Wuli is a plural form of na and it can be used with a plural marker –tul but is mostly used without it. The use of wuli as 1PS is in two ways as it is for ‘we’ in English: (i) inclusive of the hearer or (ii) exclusive of the hearer. When the first person plural pronoun wuli includes the hearer, both the speaker and hearer become the subject of the utterance as in (5):

Speaker J, the junior, and speaker S, the senior, in (5) talk about a dish that they are eating and that is cooked by someone else who is not in the conversation. While giving a compliment to
the dish that has consistent taste, S humorously says that a dish tastes different whenever they, that is, S herself and J, cook. Wuli here indicates both the speakers in the conversation. The use of wuli with inclusive meaning is not limited by the age difference between them.

Meanwhile, wuli with the exclusive meaning needs to be used more carefully, in terms of relative age between speakers or formality of context. The following excerpt has an example of the exclusive wuli:

(6) 1 M: nayil tansin sayngilphathinun cipeyse hakilo haysseyo.
  2 ocen yelhansipwuthe katunphathilo hakilo hayssuni
  3 kulehkey aseyy.
  ‘(I) am going to throw a party for your birthday at home tomorrow. Remember that it will be from eleven in the morning in our garden.’
  4 D: enma, kalem wuli nayil hakkyo ankato toynunkeyeyyo?
    ‘Mom, can we-pronoun not go to school tomorrow then?’

[D8:1143–1446, between parents and children]

The mother (M) in (6) is speaking to her husband that she is going to hold his birthday party on the following day. Hearing this utterance, the daughter (D), asks whether she and her sister can skip the school in that case, using wuli. Wuli here refers to D herself and her sister and does not include the hearer, the mother. When speakers use the exclusive wuli, they consider the age difference, closeness and formality rule, as they do in the use of na, the first person singular pronoun.

In short, wuli is a single form with two different meanings, that is, inclusive and exclusive. The inclusive wuli refers to the speaker and the hearer, and possibly third person, at the same time and there is no need for a consideration of an honorific expression (K. Nam & Ko, 2013). The exclusive wuli refers to the speaker and someone else, but not the hearer, and there is a need for an honorific form of first person plural if the hearer is older or distant.10 The dialogue in (7) shows the instance of using cehuy as 1PS:

(7) 1 P: nwuka kulenkepnikka? wuli ay, ilehkey mantun salami
  2 nwukwupnikka?
    ‘Who did it? Our child, who made like this?’
  3 T: coysonghapnita. cehuyto nolyekhayssciman moschacasssupnita.
    ‘Apologies. We-pronoun (hon.) also tried but could not find.

10 The distinction between inclusive and exclusive first person plural pronoun is studied vastly by some researchers both in Korean and English (e.g. Goddard, 1995; Hyland, 2005; C. Kim, 2009; M. Yang, 1998) as the strategic use of inclusive or exclusive wuli may result in certain pragmatic effects such as indirectness or solidarity. We will see examples from our corpora in Chapter 8.
There were more than twenty kids that were snow-fighting."

Speaker P in (7) is a father of a student who was hit by a stone during a snow fight among students at school and asks who threw the snowball with a stone inside. Speaker T, a teacher of the school, answers that she could not find the person because there were too many students participating in the snow fight. While saying that the teachers were not able to determine whose fault it was, the teacher uses cehuy to refer to the teachers, including herself. Cehuy is the honorific form of the exclusive wuli and it is normally observed that a teacher uses cehuy to represent the school when speaking to parents or that an employee uses it to represent the company when dealing with clients.

4.2.3 Second person pronouns: ne/nehuy(-tul), caney, caki and tangsin

Several pronouns can be used for 2PS, but their use has various restrictions. As noted earlier in this chapter, the most distinctive restriction is that there is no second person pronoun referring to a superior speaker in Korean. Instead, other reference terms, such as kinship terms or professional titles, replace these pronouns in the place of 2PS when the addressee is superior. In most cases, speakers omit 2PS.

What are the pronouns that are actually in use, and what are the restrictions? First, ne is the most generally used second person pronoun to younger speakers or friends of same age (K. Nam & Ko, 2013; J. Park, 1997; S. Sohn, 2005; C. Son, 2010; J. S. Suh, 1996). J. Park (1997:516) particularly states that ne is generally used to a young speaker like a child, but it can be used between adults who have been friends for a long time as well. P. Lee (1987) points out that the users of ne have the least psychological pressure in terms of addressing the counterpart in discourse, in comparison with using other reference terms for 2PS. The following conversation displays the use of ne between two male adult friends:

(8)  
1  A: nenun, ku, cinanpeney malhan, ku, ssicyichelem, kulehkey, ku, lipelihakey wumcikinuneyka cohtanun keya? kuntey, motun yenkwusoka, ku, ssi, ssicyichelem wumcikinun kenun anticanha?

11 Based on the sensitivity to age difference of the Korean culture in terms of politeness, being chinkwu ‘a friend’ in fact means being born in the same year or sharing the same school year. This is fairly strict in everyday life, and even a month difference in their birthdays in different years (e.g. one born in December 2017 and the other born in January 2018) makes speakers technically no friends but senior and junior at school.
‘Are you saying that you like, the, as you mentioned the other day, the places where working liberally like CJ? But, not all research institutions do not work like, the, CJ, do they?’

4 B: *kulehi. a, kuntey, nanun, kunkka, honcase kulehkey kwacwunghakey epmwulul hacin anhassumyen cohkeysse.*

‘No, they don’t. Ah, but, I wish, like, not to be overloaded with tasks as an individual.’

[S7:91–102, between two friends]

In dialogue (8), speaker A is asking whether B likes a liberal working environment, using *ne* for 2PS, and B answers he does, using *na* for 1PS. Between two friends who have known each other since university, the use of *na* and *ne* is ordinary as in (5).

_Caney_ is a second person pronoun an adult speaker uses address younger adults or same-age friends (J. Kwon, 2012; K. Nam & Ko, 2013; M. Oh, 2011; J. Park, 1997); the use of _caney_ is considered more polite and decent than the use of _ne_ (J. Kwon, 2012; B. Song, 1982). Namely, the speaker of _caney_ is expected to be mature and respectful in speaking to a younger addressee since he or she does not use _ne_. However, _caney_ is treated as obsolete and dialectic, and in fact, it does not appear frequently in modern spoken Korean (S. Sohn, 2005), nor in our corpora. One of the few occurrences of _caney_ in our corpora is in the following conversation between a middle-aged woman, called _samonim_ ‘Ma’am’ (S), and her butler (B):

(9) 1 S: _caney nun nwukwuuy phyeninka?_ ‘Whose side are _you-pronoun_?’

2 B: _cenun oloci kesengkalul wihay ilhapnita, khun samonim._ ‘I- _pronoun (hon..)_ only work for Keseng family, Big Ma’am.’

[D7:640–645, between an employer and an employee]

In excerpt (9), S asks B on whose side he is, using _caney_ for 2PS, and B answers that he works for her family, _Kesengka_, using _ce_ for 1PS and _khun samonim_ ‘Big Ma’am’ as an address term for S.¹³

Some studies note that _caney_ is a masculine pronoun and a female speaker using _caney_ is either a woman acting like a man or a woman in a professional position that is traditionally regarded

---

¹² H. Kang (2007) surveys the use of _caney_ focused in Jeolla Province and the results reveal that it traditionally had a vast range of speakers in terms of age when referring to their older siblings or relatives, but currently only the regional elderly speakers use _caney_.

¹³ _Samonim_ ‘ma’am’ is usually used to refer to a wife of a superior and it functions as a pseudo title in Korean discourse. S in (9) is the mother of the president of the company, so B refers to her _khun samonim_ and he refers to the wife of the president _cakun_ (‘small’) _samonim_ or _samonim_.
as a man’s job, such as a president of a corporate (J. Park, 1997; J. Park & Chae, 1999). Currently, female adult speakers use *caki* as an equivalent of *caney* according to the researchers.  

14 Although the Korean Standard Dictionary defines *Caki* as a third person reflexive pronoun, meaning ‘oneself’, C. Son (2010) suggests that it has several potential functions as a second person pronoun in modern spoken Korean as an intimate reference term between: (i) a couple in a relationship, (ii) middle-aged women and (iii) close friends. From our corpora, we have examples of *caki* as the reflexive pronoun and the extended meaning of (i), and I include them in the analysis if they are used as 2PS.

In excerpt (10), a girlfriend (G) uses *caki* to refer to her boyfriend (B):

(10)  
1  G:  *way tto kulay? natwu himtuntey.*  
   ‘Why are (you) like this? I am tired, too.’  
2  B:  (silence)  
3  G:  *i kapang mwusun tonulo sassnya thapakhayse kulay?*  
   ‘Is it because (I) blamed (you) asking with what money (you) bought this bag?’  
4  B:  *kulen ke anya.*  
   ‘It is no that.’  
5  G:  *anim, hwanpwulhala kulayse? caki ka mammekko cangmanhan kentye?*  
   ‘Or, is it that (I) told (you) to refund? Although you-pronoun made a big decision and bought (it)?’

[D3:739–745, between a girlfriend and a boyfriend]  

Speaker B in (10) is upset, and his girlfriend, G is trying to resolve the reason he is upset. G asks whether B is angry because she told him to return the bag he bought for her, using *caki* as 2PS.

*Tangsin* is an interesting second person pronoun as it has two very different usages. One is to address the speaker’s spouse as second person, as in (11):

(11)  
1  W:  *tangsin ankasimyen natwu ankallayyo. cipcenglina hamyense cipey issultheynikka tanyeoseyyo.*  
   ‘If you-pronoun (hon.) don’t go, I-pronoun won’t go either. (I) will be home and clean the house, so go to work.’  
2  H:  *kuleci malko ka. tangsin hancham kolphumas alakanun cwungicanha.*

---

14 *Caki* has steadily changed the function as a second person pronoun among young couples first and then female adult speakers in modern Korean, according to J. Park and Chae (1999). The authors label *caki* as ‘the female second person pronoun.’
‘Don’t say so and go. **You-pronoun (hon.)** are just learning the fun of golfing.’

[D1:363–367, between a married couple]

Speaker W, the wife, says that she will stay home if her husband (H) is not going to golf with her, using *tangsin* for 2PS. H tells W to go because she is beginning to enjoy golfing, using *tangsin* for 2PS as well. As described in literature, *tangsin* is normally used between married couples to refer to each other in a respectful, intimate manner (J. Park, 1997; J. Park & Chae, 1999; S. Sohn, 2005; C. Son, 2010). The other usage of *tangsin* is to address second person in an argumentative or unfavourable utterance, as in (12):

(12) 1 F: *sengpini mwucoyya.*

‘Sengpin is innocent.’

2 L: *mwe?*

‘What?’

3 F: *kulenikka tangsin mwucoylan ke palkhyenay!*

‘So **you-pronoun (hon.)** prove that (he) is innocent!’

4 L: *ne mweni? mwahanun castkinkey ileykey makmwiukanayya?*

‘What are **you-pronoun**? Who are you being so abrupt?’

[D6:971–974, between a lawyer and a friend of the accused]

Speaker F in (12) is a high school student and his friend *Sengpin* is the accused in a legal case. Speaker L, who is the lawyer of *Sengpin*, has never met F before. F suddenly approaches L and says that *Sengpin* is innocent and that she should prove it, using *tangsin*. L is startled and scolds F for being rude and rough, using *ne*. It is certainly unfavourable to address the older collocutor with *tangsin* as in (12), but this second usage of *tangsin* still has some meaning of respect towards second person, compared with other reference terms, such as *ne* (M. H. Kim, 1990; M. Oh, 2011).15

Some studies include *kutay* in the category of second person pronoun (e.g., K. Nam and Ko, 2013; M. Oh, 2011), but no example is observed in our corpora. *Kutay* is rarely used in spoken discourse and may be found in some literary works in modern Korean. *Tayk* is also recognised as a second person pronoun that is hardly spoken and shows limited use in some written text, such as poetry, in contemporary Korean (J. Kwon, 2012).

---

15 In addition to the two usages, *tangsin* can be found in advertisement or poetry addressing public in a polite tone (C. Son, 2010). It is also observed in translated texts of foreign movie transcripts, novels or articles, but the written usage of *tangsin* is not included in our analysis.
4.3 Personal Names

Addressing to someone using their name is common in English,¹⁶ but in Korean, it is delimited to the case that the addressee is older than the addressee, or they are same-aged and close, as it is in the use of the second person pronoun ne. Even in English, it is unusual to use a personal name as 1PS/2PS instead of pronouns. For example, if we hear that Mary says ‘Mary is hungry’ instead of saying ‘I am hungry’, and Tom asks Mary ‘Is Mary hungry?’ instead of asking ‘Are you hungry?’, we are likely to presume that Mary is a little child and Tom is her father or her peer.

As such, the use of personal name for 1PS/2PS is rarely observed in English as well as in Korean and if used, it is considered child-like since children refer to themselves with their own names in the early stage of language acquisition (Clark, 1978; Langacker, 2007; Qi, di Biase and Campbell, 2006; Smiley, Chang and Allhoff, 2011; Tanz, 2009). According to the literature, young language learners appear to have difficulty understanding the shift among referents and to make use of them because of the relative quality of a personal pronoun that refers to the roles in interaction, not particular people (Smiley et al, 2011).

Conversely, a personal name as a proper noun normally refers to a particular person, so children tend to use personal names for 1PS and 2PS, as in ‘Mary is hungry’ and ‘Is Mary hungry?’, to address themselves and addressees in a conversation.¹⁷ The dialogue between a primary school student and her private tutor in (13) shows the use of personal name for 2PS:

(13) 1  T:  *phalansayk pheynulo phyosihay non ken mweya?*  
      ‘What is the mark with the blue pen?’
  2  S:  *nato mollu.*  
      ‘I-pronoun don’t know.’
  3  T:  *cinaka molumyen ettuhkey hay.*  
      ‘What could (we) do if you-name don’t know?’
  4  S:  (silence)
  5  T:  *ca yensupcang phyep wpa wpa.*  
      ‘Open the notebook.’

¹⁶ Brown and Ford (1961) survey the different semantic meanings of names as address terms and note that the use of first name shows more intimacy than the use of a title with the last name. The two major forms of address terms are used differently depending on the relative age and occupational status of the speakers. It is similar in Korean, but there are even more variety of the forms, which is discussed in Section 4.5.

¹⁷ It is not specifically mentioned in the literature why not only children but also parents often use their children’s names for 2PS instead of ‘you’ as well as referring themselves with ‘Mummy’ or ‘Daddy’. Yet, Smiley et al (2011) analyse that the mixed use of pronouns, names and kinship terms referring to the same referent helps children establish the meanings of pronouns better than simply referring with pronouns.
While speaking about a mark that the student (S) made on her book, the tutor (T) addresses S with her name, Cina, in the third utterance. T also refers to herself as enni ‘older sister’ in the last utterance and refers to S with her first name again with the vocative suffix –ya.\(^{18}\)

A child’s name may ordinarily be used for 1PS/2PS in Korean, but the use of personal names as 1PS/2PS between adults would be regarded unnatural, which can carry particular meanings like immaturity, mockery or objectification.\(^{19}\) However, personal names with suffixes or titles make a significant difference, since it is a common way for adult speakers in a formal setting to refer to second person with their names with a suffix or title in Korean. In the dialogue (14), a manager (M) uses the junior (J)’s name with a suffix –ssi ‘Mr/Miss’ as 2PS:

\begin{align*}
\text{(14)} & \quad 1 \quad \text{J:} & \quad \text{cengmal, cengmal, coysonghapnita thimcangnim,} \\
& \quad 2 & \quad \text{pocungsenun ceyka etehkeytun chacaokeyssupnita.} \\
& \quad 3 & \quad \text{chaykimciko, tasi chaca.}
\end{align*}

‘Very, very, sorry, Ms Manager. I-pronoun (hon.) will definitely find the certificate no matter what. (I) will take responsibility and find again.’

\begin{align*}
& \quad 4 \quad \text{M:} & \quad \text{hanseykyengssi, seykyengssinun way (pause) ilen ilul hayyo?} \\
& & \quad \text{‘Miss Seykyeng Han, why do you-name do this kind of work?’}
\end{align*}

\[\text{[D3:1152–1156, between a manager and a junior staff]}\]

Speaker J made a serious mistake at work and apologises to her manager, speaker M, addressing her as thimcangnim (Team + ‘Manager’ + the honorific suffix -nim) and referring to herself with cey, the honorific first person pronoun, for 1PS. Speaker M uses J’s first name, Sekyeong, with the suffix, –ssi, as 2PS while asking why she chose the job. It is a typical way of referring to a junior and senior at professional settings, that is, a name with the suffix –ssi to the inferior and a title to the superior with the honorific suffix –nim, and it is also typical to use the reference

---

\(^{18}\) The suffixes –al/ya are generally used in the vocative form with personal names. We eliminate the vocative forms from our data analysis and focus on the use of personal names as 1PS and 2PS.

\(^{19}\) We have three utterances with personal names used as 1PS by adult speakers in our corpora. Although the number of cases is small to be represented as a general pattern to use of personal names as 1PS, I believe there is a similar pragmatic intention to using a kinship term as 1PS between adult speakers and will discuss the effects in Chapter 8.
terms as 2PS. The suffix –ssi is not honorific although it is a name suffix that is most frequently used in formal settings,\(^{20}\) but it is not intimate either.\(^{21}\) When speakers are close enough, they use pronouns and personal names. Meanwhile, the suffix –nim is honorific, but it is narrowly used with personal names in certain settings, such as to patients in hospitals or to clients in receptions. It appears more frequently with professional titles towards superiors, as seen in (14).

It is common to combine a personal name and a kinship term or a personal name and a professional title with a suffix following. They have different degrees of deference or distance corresponding to the forms of the combination (J. Park, 1997; C. Son, 2010). The most deferential and likely distant form is ‘full name + title + nim’, but this form is not frequently used as 2PS in everyday conversations. As seen in excerpt (14), ‘first name + ssi’ is the most typical form in addressing an inferior or peer, and the ‘full name + ssi’ form can express more distance between speakers. On the use of ‘surname + ssi’ form as 2PS, J. Park (1997) states that the speaker is likely to be a male in the working class and C. Son (2010) notes that the speaker shows less respect to the addressee. This form is not observed in our corpora and is rarely used in actual spoken discourse at present. The pattern of using a name, that is, full name or first name, also applies in the earlier case of bare names as 1PS or 2PS between adults and children. A full name as 2PS tends to show distance while a first name as 2PS is more ordinary and intimate (W. P. Lee, 1989:300).

4.4 Kinship Terms

Kinship terms are primarily used among family members and relatives, but they are also widely used outside a family as fictive terms, where there is an age difference between speakers and the relationship is informal and close (H. Kang, 2002; J. Park, 1997; K. Park, 1989; Wang, 2000; Wang et al, 2005). For example, a junior at university usually addresses a senior as older brother (hyeng by male speakers and oppa by female speakers) or older sister (nwuna by male speakers and enni by female speakers). Female serving staff at a restaurant are often called aunt (imo or acwumma) and female staff in service industry, such as department stores or cafes, are frequently addressed as enni (H. Kang, 2002).

The kinship terms in Korean are recognised commonly as two types (J. Park, 1997; Wang et al, 2005): (i) one shows the relative status of the speaker and the addressee in a family and (ii) the

---

\(^{20}\) Other name suffixes like –kwun ‘Mr’ or -yang ‘Miss’ are discussed in the literature (e.g. J. Park, 1997), but they are not much in use in contemporary Korean as well as in our corpora.

\(^{21}\) L. Brown (2011:40) describes that –ssi displays ‘a certain degree of separation.’
other has a medium person and the speaker uses a kinship term that displays the relative status of the medium speaker and the addressee. In what follows, we will examine each type in detail. First, there are three further forms in the first type of kinship terms: basic, honorific and intimate. For instance, young children use appa ‘dad’, the intimate form of father, as a reference term to their father. When growing up, they tend to use the basic form apeci ‘father’, and some of them use the honorific form apenim ‘father + the honorific suffix –nim’ when older. The honorific suffix –nim can also be an affix to other kinship terms as in hyengnim ‘hyeng (older brother for male speakers) + nim,’ or in nwunim ‘nwuna (older sister for male speakers) + nim’, and they are used normally by adult speakers with a sense of being gentle and well mannered.

The fundamental rule of using kinship terms in a family is that a younger speaker should always use kinship terms for 2PS, even between twins (J. Park, 1997:513), whereas an older speaker is relatively free to use any reference terms, normally among pronouns, personal names and kinship terms, for both 1PS and 2PS. Not only do children say kinship terms to their parents, grandparents, uncles and aunts, but also younger siblings use kinship terms to their older siblings and cousins. It is inappropriate and rude for the younger to call their older siblings’ name or refer to them with the pronoun ne. It is a common scene in a Korean family that parents scold a younger child because of the child addressing his or her older sibling with the name or ne during a quarrel.

The following two excerpts show the use of kinship terms between parents and children. In (15), a female adult speaker refers to her father with the intimate form appa and the father refers to himself with aypi, another variant form of the basic form apeci:

(15) 1 F: nami, yakihamyen tuleto, aypi kalahmyen celtay, ‘(He) would listen to others saying, but would never if I-kin term talk to (him),’

22 The extensive terminological and ethnological descriptions of kinship terms in Korean are discussed in other studies as well (e.g. K. K. Lee and Harvey, 1973), but I find the analyses in J. Park (1997) and Wang et al (2005) clearly show the use of kinship terms as reference terms in contemporary Korean, which has a particular relevance to the current study. As for the terminology of the ‘medium kinship term’ by J. Park (1997), Wang (2000) use the term ‘pseudo kinship term’ and ‘fictive kinship term’, respectively, and Y. S. Park (2001) uses the term ‘metaphorical use of kinship term.’

23 Male speakers address their older brother with hyeng and their older sister with nwuna. Female speakers address their older brother with appa and their older sister with enni. If they have more than one older brother or sister, younger speakers differentiate them by adding an adjective khun- ‘big’ or cakun- ‘small’ before each kinship term or add their first names before the kinship term to avoid confusion.

24 Aypi is usually used as a self-referent term by the father himself or a reference term used by the parent of his. That is, a man can humbly refer to himself as aypi speaking to his child, who are usually adults. His parents can also refer to him with aypi or apem, and apem is only used by the grandparents. Eymi and emem are the equivalent forms of aypi and apem, respectively, for mother.
The father (F) in (15) is talking about his son who does not listen to what F says to him, using aypi as 1PS. The daughter (D) suggests that F could give her brother a book with a kind note, using appa, the intimate and casual form of father, as 2PS.

Similarly, the son in (16) refers to his mother with the intimate form emma ‘mom’ for 2PS while the mother uses na for 1PS and atul ‘son’ for 2PS:

(16)  
1 S:  
emma kamki kellisyessyo?  
‘Did you-kin term catch a cold?’
2 M:  
‘Pardon?’
3 S:  
kamki?  
‘A cold?’
4 M:  
na kamki cokum tulun kes kaiha. khossoli hac com, ung?  
‘I-pronoun guess I got a cold a little. (I) make nasal sounds, right?’
5 S:  
ung, ung.  
‘Yes, yes.’
6 M:  
ke pwa. taypen alcanha wuli atul.  
‘See. You-kin term notice at once.’

The son (S) in (16) asks whether his mother (M) has caught a cold, using the intimate form emma ‘mum’ for 2PS in the first utterance. M admits that she seems to have a cold, using na for 1PS (line 4), and acknowledges that S immediately notices it, using wuli atul ‘lit. our son’ as 2PS (line 6). As shown in (15) and (16), children generally use the intimate form of ‘father’ or ‘mother’ as 2PS to their parents even if they become adults. We also find examples of basic and honorific forms of kinship terms in our data and discuss their use in Chapter 8 in relation to politeness and intimacy.

---

25 Parents sometimes address their children with atul ‘son’ or ttal ‘daughter’ and grandparents address their grandchildren with sonca ‘grandson’ or sonnye ‘granddaughter’. I argue that the use of kinship term displays the speaker’s intention to show their affection toward the addressee, especially when they switch the reference terms between pronouns and kinship terms. See more discussion in Chapter 8.
The second type of kinship term, the ‘medium kinship term’, has two sub-categories, according to J. Park (1997), while both types represent not the relationship between the speaker and addressee but the relationship between the medium person and the addressee. The first kind of medium kinship term indicates that the speaker associates herself with a medium speaker and uses the kinship term with which the medium speaker refers to the referent; for example, a woman refers to her brother-in-law as samchon ‘uncle’ since her child, the medium speaker, addresses him using samchon. The second kind is teknonymy: the speaker takes a child as a medium speaker and refers to his or her parents with the name, such as cina emma ‘Cina’s mom’. In the following conversation between two female neighbours, the speakers use kinship terms for 2PS in their utterances:

(17) 1 O:  
  hanaemma? onulun siktang annakasse?
  ‘Hana’s mom? Did (you) not go working at the restaurant?’

2 Y:  
  kyeysyesseyo? noltho kkin cwunalun hana ttaymwuney swieyo.
  ‘Were (you) at home? (I) don’t work every second weekend because of Hana.’

3 O:  
  kuleem, hanato hanaciman, hanaemmato swiekanye hayyaci.
  ‘Sure, not only for Hana, but also you-teknonym should work with regular rest.’

4 siktangili ulmayna kotoyko tungkkol ppacinun ilintey. (pause)

5 kuke anhaypon salamon molle.
  ‘Works at the restaurant are so hard and laborious. One does not know if not have done.’

6 Y:  
  hayposyesseyo?
  ‘Have (you) done?’

7 O:  
  haypwassci kulam...celmese anhaypon il epsi manhi haypwasse
  ‘Of course, I have… (I) have done all kinds of works when young.’

8 Y:  
  acwumeni kowusyese kulen kosayng anhayposyessulkke
  kathuntey.
  ‘You-kin term look delicate and seem like not having done such hard works.’

[1:491–500, between two female neighbours]

The older woman (O) uses a teknonym, hanaemma ‘Hana’s mom’, to address the younger woman (Y) in the first utterance in (17) above. O knows that Y works at a restaurant and asks whether she is not working that day since she is at home. Y answers that she takes a day off on every second Saturday. O agrees that Y should rest properly, again using hanaemma as 2PS. While Y omits 2PS in her previous utterances (lines 2 and 6), she uses a fictive kinship term,

---

26 Addressing someone by his or her child’s name is labelled as teknonymy (Tylor, 1889). K. K. Lee and Harvey (1973) provide a detailed study of teknonymy and ‘geononymy’ (defined as ‘the practice using place names’ as reference terms by the authors, 1973:31) in Korean.
acwumeni ‘aunt’, as 2PS in line 8, saying that O seems not to have done hard work since she is elegant. Both teknonyms and acwumeni are widely found in spoken discourse in Korean as well as acessi ‘uncle as a distant relative’ that is a fictive kinship term similar to acwumeni.

The most common fictive use of kinship terms is observed between close friends or colleagues with a few years of age difference in informal settings. The younger speaker uses kinship terms for 2PS while the older speaker uses personal pronouns or first name with the suffix –ssi. For 1PS, both speakers use personal pronouns; the older uses the plain form na, and the younger uses the honorific form ce. If the speakers are close enough, the younger speaker can also say na for 1PS. The following excerpt contains a dialogue between a senior and a junior from university, and the junior uses a fictive kinship term:

(18) 1 S: kulay yelsimhi hakwu.
‘Okay, work hard.’
2 J: e, kulay. oppatwu mayil kyelkwa pokoko com hay pwa nahanthey.
‘Yes, okay. You-kin term also try reporting the results to me tomorrow.’

[S1:99–103, between a senior and a junior from university]

After discussing their assignment, the senior (S) encourages the junior (J) to work hard. J suggests that S report the results the next day to her in a humorous tone, using the kinship term oppa ‘older brother (by female speakers)’ for 2PS. She also uses the verb hay pwa ‘try doing’ in the intimate speech level, and the plain form of first person pronoun, na, which reflects the close relationship between the speakers using fictive kinship terms.

4.5 Professional Titles

 Speakers in a professional relationship generally use their professional titles as reference terms, including the level of the job and the responsibilities of the position. J. Park (1997) describes the use of professional titles as follows: Speaking to a superior, inferior speakers always need the suffix –nim to the title of the superior as an address term. Professional titles with a full name

27 Acwumeni is originated from a kinship term for a distant female relative, e.g. a male speaker referring to his wife’s brother’s wife (Shim, 2013; N. Cho, 2009), but it is now more often used to refer to a middle-aged woman with the form changed to acwumma and with additional sociocultural meanings. See Shim (2013) and N. Cho (2009) for further illustration of acwumeni.

28 As described in Figure 4.2 in the first section of this chapter, speakers use the polite suffix -yo or the deferential suffix -(s)upnita to the predicate as listener honorification, which is categorised as polite or deferential speech level, respectively (H. Sohn, 1994; 1999). Predicates with neither honorific suffixes and with -e or -a vowel ending become the intimate speech level. The verb phrase hay pwa ‘try doing’ by Speaker B in (18) has the -a vowel ending, so the speech level of the verb conjugation is categorised as intimate speech level.
or surname are also used when there is more than one addressee with the same title, and a ‘title + nim’ form brings more deferential nuance than the form with a name. A ‘title + nim’ form can be used between peers, which has the effect to elevate the addressee. Titles without –nim are usually used with the addressee’s name, for example, ‘surname + title,’ between peers or by a superior. Superior speakers are basically free to use any form of reference terms, but the suffix –nim is rarely used to an inferior speaker unless the speakers are in a very formal setting, such as a presentation to clients.29

S. Chae and Yoo (2008) and I. Yoo and Chae (2011) develop the description and specify that the professional titles as reference terms in Korean are created by combining a title with surname, first name or the honorific suffix –nim. There are five levels in the use of a professional title that the authors exemplify with the case of pyenhosa, ‘attorney’: pyenhoanim (title + nim) – kimyenghopyenhoanim (full name + title + nim) – kimpyenhoanim (surname + title + nim) - kimyenghopyenhoa (full name + title) – kimpyenhoa (surname + title) (2011:164).30 The authors note that the first form, ‘title + nim’, is at the most deferential level and the degree of deference decreases moving to the last form, ‘surname + title’, which is the least deferential. The level of deference or distance expressed by a combination of name and title in Korean is considerably intricate compared with the case of English, which has two levels, that is, first name being intimate and ‘title + surname’ being distant and polite (Brown & Ford, 1961).

In the following dialogue between a superior an inferior at work, the superior speaker uses the ‘surname + title’ form for 2PS while the inferior speaker uses the ‘title + nim’ form for 2PS:

(19) 1 J: hanaman mwortyo. kulem thimcangnimilamyen ettehkey 
   hasyaskeyssupnikka?
   ‘(I) will ask a question. What would have you-title done?’
2 nyey calalkeysssupnita. helakanhasintani eccel swu epsneyyo.
3 kongsonhakey twuson mwukoko tusinchelem phokihayo?
   ‘Would (you) have given up with your hands tied like a fool saying
   ‘Yes, well noted. If (you) disprove, (I) cannot help’?’
4 kulaysseya hapnikka?
   ‘Should (I) have done so?’
5 S: nalamyen kuthkkaci setukhlay intepyuy hayssse. hwangkican
6 moshaysseto. nanun hay!!!

29 J. Park (1997) states that a superior speaker using the suffix –nim for an inferior speaker intends to treat the addressee politely and this is the case of negative politeness (Brown and Levinson, 1987). The author also notes that a superior does not use the suffix –nim to an inferior speaker in respect to positive politeness.
30 The authors find the reason of the complicated ways to form a professional title as a reference term from the sociocultural backgrounds of the Korean language. We will further look at the sociolinguistic analyses of reference terms in Korean in Chapter 8.
‘I-pronoun’ would have kept persuading and interviewed. You-title couldn’t but I-pronoun do!’

[D2:355–359, between two journalists]

The dialogue in (19) is between a senior journalist (S) in the position of manager, thimcang ‘team leader’, and a junior journalist (J), hwangkica, ‘surname + ‘journalist’. Speaker J is upset because his boss, speaker S, criticised that he conducted an interview without an agreement with the interviewee. J asks what S would have done in the situation, saying thimcangnim, ‘team leader’ + nim, as 2PS. S answers that she would have achieved an agreement even though J could not have done so, saying hwangkica ‘Journalist Hwang’ as 2PS. As seen above, an inferior speaker continues using the honorific suffix –nim to a superior speaker even if they are arguing.31 Conversely, the superior in (19) uses ne to the inferior in a previous utterance while blaming the junior for working without principles.

The following dialogue includes an example of using title as 1PS:

(20) 1 T: a, sensayngnim cincca kkamccak nollassney cincca, kulel lika epsnuney ike sensayngnimi,
‘Ah, I-title was so surprised, it shouldn’t be so. I-title.’
2 3 S: yeki mak, amwu kes tungi mak, penho swunsetaylo mak, holswunun mak, chilsip cem ccakswunun phalsip cem mak, ilayyo.
‘Here, just, anything and so on, just, in the numerical order, just, odd numbers are scored 70 and even numbers are scored 80.’
3 4 T: (laugh) kulem wungpem paneyse myech tung myech tung hayssye?
‘Then, which rank did you-name take for each subject?’
5 6 [S19:152–158, between a private tutor and a student]

Speaker T in (20), the private tutor, says that she was surprised hearing about the low marks of the student, Speaker S, for the midterm examination and is relieved after seeing the score report and realising that he lied, using sensayngnim ‘teacher + nim’ for 1PS. T also uses S’s name wungpem as 2PS in the following utterance. As seen in the previous sections, older speakers have multiple choices of reference terms for 2PS, and they frequently choose personal names

31 It is often observed that an inferior speaker does not add the suffix –nim to the title of his/her superiors when they are not around. The inferior speaker in (19) also refers to the superior thimcang as third person when he speaks to his colleagues in other dialogue. It may cause a problem if a superior hears an inferior dropping –nim for the superior’s title in Korean discourse as it is a social norm to add the suffix –nim to superiors as an expression of politeness.
when the younger speaker is a child as in (20). For 1PS, reference terms other than the first pronoun na or ce are rarely used, but the exceptions mainly occur when the addressee is a child.

In addition to the kinship terms such as appa ‘dad’ and emma ‘mom’, sensayngnim ‘teacher + nim’ is the example of non-pronoun used for 1PS. In the case of sensayngnim as 1PS, the speaker even adds the honorific suffix –nim for referring to herself, which is never seen in other reference terms. It may because of the same reason that parents use the kinship term referring to themselves as 1PS while speaking to a small child; teachers who teach the under-aged tend to refer to themselves in the way the students address them, that is, with sensayngnim. In contrast, professors at university do not use kyoswunim ‘professor + nim’ as 1PS when speaking to their students, who are adults.

4.6 Other Forms of Noun or Noun Phrase

In addition to the reference terms covered in the current chapter, a variety of nouns and NPs are used for 1PS/2PS in spoken Korean, including our corpora. Since they are not categorised in one type, some might be concerned that the discussion of the nouns and NPs for 1PS/2PS can be in vain because they are unbounded and indefinite. However, I am trying to interpret the pragmatic intentions of the speakers deliberately using a particular noun/NP to refer to themselves or their collocutors in interactions where there are relatively more common and conventional choices of pronouns, names, kinship terms, professional titles or omitting the subject.

As noted in Chapter 3, the choice of marked expressions instead of unmarked equivalents implies that the speaker intends to convey certain meaning by choosing the particular expression, which Levinson (2000) labels M-implicature. The use of overt 1PS/2PS can cause the M-implicature while their omission occurs much more frequently and is regarded unmarked. In this regard, the referential words for 1PS/2PS, which are not categorised in the previous sections, are presumably more marked than the others are.

When examining the examples of noun/NPs as 1PS/2PS from our corpora, we often find noun/NPs that specify the role of the speakers in certain settings (e.g., phikoin ‘the accused in

---

32 This should be one of the reasons the literature on reference terms or overt subjects does not include other nouns/NPs than ‘regular’ reference terms in the discussions. Studies overlook the noun/NP reference terms for 1PS/2PS, as ‘it is rare that speakers encode themselves with a full NP’ (W. P. Lee, 1989:155), or the literature simply acknowledges that ‘it is possible to think of as many non-pronominal forms for the recipient as there are social positions and kin or other interpersonal relations.’ (S. Oh, 2007:465)
court of law’) or derogate the identity (e.g., *ilen key* ‘a thing like this’). They attach specific meanings to the reference terms depending on the context while other regular reference terms seem to have comparatively expected and fixed meanings to refer to a person. I present some examples of noun/NPs used for 1PS/2PS from our corpora in this section and more examples in Chapter 8 along with a discussion of their possible expressive effects.

The speakers in (21) are in the court of law and the judge (J) refers to the defendant (D) as *phikoin* ‘defendant’:

(21)  
1  J:  
   *phikoinun ce haksayngul pon cek isssupnikka?*  
   ‘Have you-nominal ever seen the student?’  

2  D:  
   *anyo. sayngeen cheum popnita.*  
   ‘No. (I) see (her) for the first time in my life.’

[D5:1248–1249, between a judge and a defendant]

In the question asking whether the defendant has ever seen *ce haksayng* ‘that student’, who is a witness of the criminal case, Speaker J, the judge, uses *phikoin* ‘defendant’ for 2PS. It is a legal custom both in Korean and English that participants in the court of law are addressed with their professional roles or statuses in the particular case, such as the judge, prosecutor, advocate, defendant and witness. However, the reference to the role and status is rarely used as 2PS in English, and pronouns usually take the part of subjects (Bogoch, 1999). Meanwhile, the legal statuses in the court are used as 2PS in Korean as other reference terms such as professional titles or kinship terms are in usual conversations. This may result from the fact that there is no general second person pronoun to refer to an addressee regardless of their relative age or closeness. Thus, native speakers of Korean perhaps find a job title or social status to be a useful reference term for 2PS, including the relative statuses in a legal environment.

Speaker B in (22) uses an NP *ilen key* (*ilen kes* + subject marker –i) ‘a thing like this’ as 1PS while condemning himself:

(22)  
1  B:  
   (cry) *ilen key* (pause) *salaminya? nika ceneey altern soinchanun salamiessnunci mollato cikum nan* (pause) *koymwuliya.*  
   ‘Am you-nominal a person? So Ichnan you-pronoun knew might have been a person, but I-pronoun am now a monster.’

---

33 The excerpts from the courtroom discourse in Bogoch (1999) show that the legal statuses of discourse participants in courtroom discourse, such as a judge, laywer or the defendant, are used to address them but not used as a subject of the predicate, i.e., 1PS/2PS.
In the dialogue (22), the boyfriend (B) cries and asks his girlfriend (G) to leave him, saying that he is devastated like a monster, koymwul. He refers to himself ilen kes (‘a thing like this’) for 1PS, asking a rhetorical question whether he is a human, in the first sentence. He also uses his own name So Inchan and the first person pronoun na as 1PS in the following sentences, comparing him in the past and present.

Our corpora have more examples of noun/NPs other than those introduced so far. For instance, twul ‘two’ is used referring to two collocutors as 2PS, and yupwuye ‘a married woman’ is used referring to a friend as 2PS while speaking about her recent marriage life. Phihayca ‘victim’ is also used referring to oneself as 1PS, and kahayca ‘assailant’ is used referring to the counterpart as 2PS in an accident. There are NPs such as tangsnilan salam ‘a person as known as you’ for a wife referring to her husband as 2PS while arguing. We will see their use in the context and discuss their pragmatic effects in subsequent chapters.

4.7 Summary

The current chapter provided reference terms used as 1PS/2PS from the spoken Korean corpora by their grammatical and semantic categories. The use of reference terms in Korean is heavily influenced by the social norm engaging the relative age and social status of speakers, as noted earlier.

The majority of the reference terms in Korean discourse are pronouns for both 1PS and 2PS. First person pronouns include the plain form singular na, honorific form singular ce, plain form plural wuli and honorific form plural cehuy. Speakers use na when speaking to younger speakers or peers and they are close. Younger speakers are expected to use ce when speaking to older speakers, but they can also use na when they are very close to the older addressee, such as children to parents, or when the age difference is small. Wuli can be either inclusive or exclusive...
of the addressee. When it excludes the addressee and the addressee is superior to the speakers, *cehuy* replaces *wuli*.

Second person pronouns have more forms than first person pronouns, but the use of each has specific constraints. The second person singular pronoun *ne* is most widely used as 2PS when an older speaker talks to a younger speaker in a close relationship or when same-aged friends address each other. *Caney* is used by an older adult speaker to a younger adult speaker, and *tangsin* is used between a married couple or during an argument in an unfavourable manner. *Caki* is recognised as a female second person pronoun and is used between female adult speakers or a couple in a relationship. There are also *kutay* and *tayk* as second person pronouns that only appear in literary works such as poetry.

Personal names as 1PS give the impression of being childish since young children refer to themselves with their own names before they comprehend the concept of pronouns. Parents also often use names as 2PS while speaking to children. Personal names are actively used by adult speakers in official settings strictly with the suffix *-ssi*, professional titles or the suffix *-nim*. The level of deference and distance differs in the combinations of name, title and the suffixes.

Native speakers of Korean make use of kinship terms as 1PS/2PS between close friends or colleagues as well as family members. Older speakers can choose among pronouns and kinship terms for 1PS/2PS whereas younger speakers use pronouns for 1PS and kinship terms for 2PS in a family. Outside a family, fictive kinship terms are used when addressing seniors at university, older people in neighbours, employees in service industry and so on.

In a professional context, the name of occupations and positions is actively used as 1PS and 2PS. In particular, inferiors are always supposed to use a title with the honorific suffix *-nim* as 2PS when speaking to a superior while superiors can refer to inferiors with personal names, titles or pronouns, depending on the context. For 1PS, *sensayngnim* ‘teacher + *nim*’ is the only professional title used by the speakers referring to themselves.

Other forms of reference terms are also used as 1PS/2PS. The noun/NPs are not labelled in a single category but will be included in the analysis of current research since they may deliver the speakers’ pragmatic intention to choose the particular noun/NP when there are more ordinary alternative reference terms.
Chapter 5. Distribution of Overt 1PS and 2PS

5.1 Introduction

The current chapter examines the distribution of overt 1PS and 2PS in modern spoken Korean with respect to the age difference between speakers, their gender and the reference terms they use as overt 1PS/2PS. Following this introductory section, I present the data and method used for distribution analysis in Section 5.2. I provide the analysis results in Section 5.3: the distribution of overt 1PS/2PS by the age difference between speakers in Section 5.3.1, the distribution by the gender of speakers in Section 5.3.2 and the distribution of reference terms for overt 1PS/2PS in Section 5.3.3. In Section 5.4, I discuss the overall results of the distribution analysis. Finally, in Section 5.5, I present a summary of the findings in this chapter.

5.2 Data and Method

To examine the distribution of overt 1PS/2PS in modern spoken Korean, I took three spoken Korean corpora as data: Sejong Spoken Corpus, CallFriend Korean Telephone Conversations and some TV drama transcripts. Since the current study considers the relative age and gender of speakers as variables that affect the use of overt 1PS/2PS and the choice of reference terms, I adopted conversations in various settings and attempted to keep the data balanced in social factors of the discourse.

For instance, dialogues have diverse participants, in terms of age and gender—the younger, same-aged and older; male speaking to male, female speaking to female and male speaking to female. As noted in Chapter 1, presentations or monologues are excluded from the data to focus on the observation of active interactions among the speakers and its consequential effects on the use of overt 1PS/2PS. The final set of discourse includes 22 conversations from Sejong Spoken Corpus, six sets of conversations from CallFriend Corpus and 10 episodes of TV dramas (two episodes each from five different TV dramas). The topics of discourse also vary: for example, university students talk about their daily life; a private tutor teaches a primary school student; a parent and an adult child talk about going to a dentist; a woman deals with her superiors at a new job; and a middle-aged man argues with his old friend.
I recognised a subject for every predicate and coded the gender and age of the speaker for each subject in the data analysis. I excluded the cases that had a subject in an incomplete utterance, that is, without a predicate. In addition to the information of speakers, I noted the gender and relative age of the addressee for each utterance: female or male for gender; and older, younger, peer or unknown for relative age. When there is a conflict or ambiguity between relative age and social status, such as a younger speaker being in a higher social status, I prioritised age over social status. Social status might outweigh age in particular contexts, such as the army or extended family in Korean custom, but age is more concrete and absolute information particularly in data analysis, whereas social status can be a relative and unstable concept to be determined or described. In our corpora, the inversion of age and social status was rarely found, except in few situations. Despite its infrequent occurrence and complexity in description, the examples bring remarkable implications and I will discuss them in detail in Chapter 8.

The following sections show the results of the distribution analysis. I sorted the overt 1PS/2PS by the age difference between speakers, their gender and the reference terms with which they expressed overt 1PS/2PS. The number of tokens, namely, subjects that are either overtly expressed or are omitted, is presented with the ratio over the total number of subjects for each result.

5.3 Results

The overall distribution of 1PS/2PS in our corpora becomes an empirical analysis that shows the exact rate of subject omission in spoken Korean as a pro-drop language. In addition, recalling that the proportion of subject omission is 50% in an analysis of a novel (S. Kim & Choi, 2013) and 43% in an analysis of a series of Korean textbooks (M. W. Kim, 2010), the omission frequency of 1PS/2PS in spoken Korean is substantially high, as shown in Table 5.1.

---

1 I. Lee (1994) points out that the hierarchy in kinship is the most influential factor in determining speech level and the hierarchy at work, age and personal closeness follow in order. On the other hand, G. Han (1996) notes that age plays the most fundamental and important role in the choice of honorifics among age, social level, gender, closeness, kinship and context.

2 In one situation, two speakers are friends from high school but meet again as a junior employee and the wife of the president of the company. As the speakers are equal in terms of age and social status in the beginning, I marked them as peer even though one speaker changes her reference terms for 1PS/2PS to the other, depending on the contexts.
Table 5.1: Rate of overt expression of 1PS and 2PS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overtly expressed</th>
<th>Unexpressed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1PS</td>
<td>868 (31%)</td>
<td>1,904 (69%)</td>
<td>2,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PS</td>
<td>613 (22%)</td>
<td>2,209 (78%)</td>
<td>2,822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In our data, there are 2,772 1PSs and 2,822 2PSs in total. Approximately 31% of 1PS (868 tokens) are overtly expressed and the rest, about 69% (1,904 tokens), of 1PSs are omitted. The overt rate of 2PS is 22% (613 tokens) and the rest, 78% (2,209 tokens), of 2PSs are omitted.

5.3.1 Age difference and the use of overt 1PS and 2PS

As noted in Chapters 3 and 4, the use of reference terms in Korean heavily depends on social factors, such as relative age and social status of speakers. For example, when the addressee is older, the speaker chooses an honorific form of reference terms or avoids using any reference terms, presumably because there is no appropriate option. Accordingly, I propose a hypothesis that age difference between speakers greatly affects the use of overt 1PS/2PS as well as the use of appropriate reference terms.

Table 5.2 shows the distribution of overt 1PS by the relative age of speakers, that is, whether the speaker is speaking to an older, younger or same-aged person or to an addressee whose age is unknown.3

Table 5.2: Age difference and rate of overt 1PS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative age of addressee</th>
<th>Overt 1PS</th>
<th>Unexpressed 1PS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Older</td>
<td>310 (31%)</td>
<td>697 (69%)</td>
<td>1,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>298 (35%)</td>
<td>559 (65%)</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>235 (30%)</td>
<td>560 (70%)</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>25 (23%)</td>
<td>85 (77%)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>868 (31%)</td>
<td>1,904 (69%)</td>
<td>2,772</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 The instances of ‘unknown’ age in the data are all from the drama corpus and comprise instances in which characters have never met before. In contrast, the speakers in other corpora are either family or friends, and there are no instances of people who have met for the first time. When the relative age is unknown, there is no social relationship established yet and it is hard to predict the relative age from their appearances as they look being in the same age group.
When speakers speak to an older person, the number of tokens for 1PS is 1,007 and 31% (310) of them are overt. In the case of speaking to a younger person, the proportion of overt 1PS is 35% (298 out of 857), and the percentage is 30% (235 out of 795) when speaking to the peer. The number of tokens is not as many as the others are, but when speaking to the unknown age, the share of overt 1PS is significantly lower as 23% (25 out of 110), in comparison to the case of speaking to the younger (p < 0.05, Fisher’s exact test).

Similarly, if we compare the overt 1PS proportion of speaking to the younger (35%) and speaking to the peer (30%), the difference is statistically significant (p < 0.05). That is, speakers use more overt 1PS when they speak to a speaker whose relative age is known than when it is unknown, and they use more overt 1PS when they speak to a younger speaker than to a peer.

The distribution of overt 2PS shows more notable differences among the relative ages of speakers than the distribution of overt 1PS, as in Table 5.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative age of addressee</th>
<th>Overt 2PS</th>
<th>Unexpressed 2PS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Older</td>
<td>149 (20%)</td>
<td>592 (80%)</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>283 (21%)</td>
<td>1,054 (79%)</td>
<td>1,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>160 (27%)</td>
<td>425 (73%)</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>21 (14%)</td>
<td>132 (86%)</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>- (0%)</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>613 (22%)</td>
<td>2,209 (78%)</td>
<td>2,822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportion of overt 2PS is highest when the addressee is same-aged for 27% (160 out of 585). The overt 2PS rates of speaking to an older speaker (20%) and speaking to a younger speaker (21%) do not display much difference, while the overt 2PS appears at the lowest frequency when the addressee’s relative age is unknown (14%). Statistically speaking, the percentage of speakers using overt 2PSs to the peer (27%) is more than the overall percentage of speakers using overt 2PS (22%) and of those using it to persons of an older age (20%) and an unknown age (14%; p<0.005). In addition, the percentage of speakers using overt 2PSs to those of an unknown age is less than the overall percentage of those using overt 2PS and the percentage of those using it to persons of a younger age and of a same age (p < 0.05).
In short, the relative age of speakers seems to influence the use of overt 1PS/2PS to some extent. Speakers use overt 1PS more frequently when their collocutor is younger than when they are same-aged. Moreover, if they do not know the relative age of their addressee, they tend to omit 1PS more often than when speaking to the younger. It is similar in the case of 2PS; speakers do not use an overt 2PS when they do not know the relative age of their addressee as much as they do overall. In addition, the percentage of overt 2PS is significantly higher when speakers are same-aged than when they speak to the older or unknown age. We will discuss the findings further in Section 5.4.

5.3.2 Gender and the use of overt 1PS and 2PS

Person reference terms in Korean, including pronouns, generally do not distinguish the gender of subject, except kinship terms that exhibit the gender and relative status of the addressee in the words themselves. However, I assume that gender of speakers may affect the use of overt 1PS/2PS or certain reference terms, since gender becomes a meaningful factor to explain some phenomena in sociolinguistic research. For instance, Lakoff (1975:53) claims that women are more polite by using ‘women’s language’ more frequently, such as tag questions, hedges and polite expressions. I test whether gender of speakers affects the use of overt 1PS/2PS, in terms of frequency, in this section. Further, I present the distribution of reference terms for overt 1PS/2PS by the gender and relative age of speakers in Section 5.3.3 and we can observe the relationship between the gender of speakers and the use of reference terms.

The distribution of overt 1PS by the gender of speakers is shown in Table 5.4. Female speakers do not show much difference in the use of overt 1PS by the gender of their interlocutors, except when they have both female and male as their addressees. In that case, female speakers use more overt 1PSs (47%) than the overall rate of overt 1PS for all speakers (31%; p < 0.05). By contrast, the share of overt 1PS for male speakers is significantly different depending on the gender of addressees. When male speakers speak to the same gender, they show higher frequency of overt 1PS (37%) than when speaking to the different gender (25%; p < 0.05). On comparing the percentages for female and male speakers, the difference becomes more noticeable. When speaking to the different gender, namely, female to male and male to female, male speakers use much less overt 1PS (25%) than female speakers do (31%; p < 0.005). The distribution of overt 2PS by gender is less distinct than in the case of 1PS.
Table 5.4: Gender difference and rate of overt 1PS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Overt 1PS</th>
<th>Unexpressed 1PS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>471</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>1,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>227</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>397</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>1,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>868</td>
<td>1,904</td>
<td>2,772</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5 shows that the rate of overt 2PS does not differ significantly by the gender of speakers. Female speakers use overt 2PS to the speakers of the same gender slightly more (24%) than to speakers of the different gender (21%). Male speakers also use more overt 2PSs to the speakers of the same gender (22%) than to speakers of the different gender (21%).

Table 5.5: Gender difference and rate of overt 2PS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Overt 2PS</th>
<th>Unexpressed 2PS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>1,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>263</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>1,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>613</td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>2,822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only difference that is statistically significant is found between female speaking to both genders (0%) and female speaking to female (24%), and thus, we can say that the percentage of
overt 2PS is higher when female speakers speak to a female than when they speak to both a female and a male ($p < 0.05$).

Nevertheless, it is difficult to generalise that female speakers use overt 2PSs more frequently when they speak to both a male and a female than when speaking to only a female or only a male since a variety of factors affect the result. For example, the number of addressees might affect the use of overt 2PS; that is, speaking to more than one addressee can make the speaker use more overt 2PS to address one person directly or use less overt 2PS to deliver a statement for all addressees. Moreover, the number of tokens that female speak to both genders is still small for us to see it as a general pattern although the dissimilarity against female speakers speaking to a female is statistically significant.

### 5.3.3 Age and gender difference in the use of overt 1PS and 2PS

In this section, we have both age and gender factors to examine the distribution of overt 1PS/2PS. I sorted the speakers by gender and the addressees by relative age and attempted to find whether a specific gender uses more or less overt 1PS/2PS to addressees in different groups of relative age, as shown in Table 5.6. The ratio of overt 1PS is highest when male speakers speak to younger persons (36%). The percentage is distinctively high compared with when male speakers speak to the older (28%; $p < 0.05$) and to the peer (26%; $p < 0.005$). Recalling that male speakers use more overt 1PS to the same gender than to different gender, it is an interesting finding that they are sensitive to both gender and relative age of their addressee in using overt 1PS.

That is, male speakers tend to use more overt 1PS to male speakers than to female speakers and more overt 1PS to the younger than to the older or same-aged persons. Conversely, the overt 1PS ratios by female speakers are found to be indifferent between the groups of addressees by relative age, as in Table 5.6. This is similar to the insignificant differences between the ratios of overt 1PS by female speakers to different and to same gender speakers. Female speakers use overt 1PS to males and females with similar frequencies, and they also show similar frequencies of overt 1PS on speaking to an older, same-aged and younger speaker.
Table 5.6: Age and gender difference in the use of overt 1PS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Overt 1PS</th>
<th>Unexpressed 1PS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>471 (32%)</td>
<td>983 (68%)</td>
<td>1,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>180 (33%)</td>
<td>364 (67%)</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>148 (32%)</td>
<td>314 (68%)</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>131 (34%)</td>
<td>259 (66%)</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>12 (21%)</td>
<td>44 (79%)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>397 (30%)</td>
<td>921 (70%)</td>
<td>1,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>130 (28%)</td>
<td>333 (72%)</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>87 (26%)</td>
<td>246 (74%)</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>167 (36%)</td>
<td>300 (64%)</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>13 (24%)</td>
<td>41 (76%)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>868 (31%)</td>
<td>1,904 (69%)</td>
<td>2,772</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7 displays the rates of overt 2PS for female and male speakers speaking to the older, same-aged, younger, unknown age or multiple addressees with mixed relative ages. For both female and male, speaking to the peer shows the highest overt 2PS share and speaking to those of unknown age displays the lowest overt 2PS percentage.

Specifically, the difference between female to the older (19%) and female to the peer (27%) is significant ($p < 0.005$); female speakers use more overt 2PSs when speaking to the peer and less overt 2PSs when speaking to the older. The ratios of male speakers are more distinct. Male speakers use significantly fewer overt 2PSs while not knowing the addressee’s relative age (10%), considering the overall overt 2PS share for male speakers (22%; $p < 0.05$) and the percentages of overt 2PS when they speak to the peer (27%; $p < 0.005$), the older (21%; $p < 0.05$) and the younger (20%; $p < 0.05$). The difference between speaking to the peer (27%) and the younger (20%) is also significant ($p < 0.05$).
Table 5.7: Age and gender difference in the use of overt 2PS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Overt 2PS</th>
<th>Unexpressed 2PS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>77 (19%)</td>
<td>327 (81%)</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>101 (27%)</td>
<td>268 (73%)</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>159 (22%)</td>
<td>566 (78%)</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>13 (17%)</td>
<td>63 (83%)</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>- (0%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>263 (21%)</th>
<th>982 (79%)</th>
<th>1,318</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>72 (21%)</td>
<td>265 (79%)</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>59 (27%)</td>
<td>157 (73%)</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>124 (20%)</td>
<td>488 (80%)</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>8 (10%)</td>
<td>69 (90%)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>- (0%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up, male speakers tend to use more overt 2PSs to the peer and less overt 2PSs to the younger, and they use the least overt 2PSs to those of unknown age.

5.4 Distribution of Referential Expressions for Overt 1PS and 2PS

We discussed in Chapter 4 that there are several options of reference forms for overt 1PS/2PS in Korean and that the choice of a reference term is based on social contexts including interpersonal relationships. Thus, it is crucial to discover the reference forms used for overt 1PS/2PS by analysing the distribution of overt 1PS/2PS and its relationship to the speakers’ age difference and gender.

Table 5.8 shows the distribution of reference forms for overt 1PS by the relative age of the addressee, and we can see that the majority of overt 1PS is expressed with pronouns (92%; 800 out of 868).
Table 5.8: Distribution of reference forms for 1PS by age difference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference term</th>
<th>Older</th>
<th>Peer</th>
<th>Younger</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wuli</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cehuy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne + Na</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangsin + Na</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin term</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin term</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title + Nim</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cehuy + Noun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wuli + Noun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deixis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na + Kin term</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na + Name</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The plain form of the singular pronoun *na* is used to either the younger (201) or peer (195) for 71% (396 out of 559) and to the older (153) for 27%. As discussed in Chapter 4, speakers do not use the honorific pronoun *ce* even if their addressee is older than themselves when they are close or intimate with the addressee, such as parents or grandparents, a close *senpay* ‘senior’ at university, the boyfriend, the husband or older siblings.
In one situation in the data, a female speaker exceptionally uses *na* to an elderly addressee while she orders him to make her a talisman and pays an enormous amount of money. Using *na* to an older addressee who is not close to the speaker may be considered incorrect or inappropriate from the sociocultural customs in Korean, but it is often observable in spoken discourse and brings out some pragmatic meanings, such as disrespect, boldness or arrogance. When speaking to an older person, *ce* is generally used, especially when the speakers are not too close. *Ce* is mostly used to older speakers, but speakers also use *ce* to a younger speaker or a peer if they are (i) in a professional relationship, such as a client and a lawyer, (ii) not very close in a personal relationship, for example, a friend’s wife or (iii) speaking to a group of younger persons or peers.

Kinship term is the second most frequent reference term for overt 1PS (6%; 48 out of 868) as in Table 5.8, and the speakers of kinship terms are mainly older speakers speaking to the younger in their family if we examine the data. Titles follow with eight tokens, and seven out of eight tokens are used with the honorific suffix –*nim* in referring to oneself. As noted in Chapter 4, the titles used with –*nim* for 1PS in our data are all *sensaygnim* ‘teacher’. The non-categorised nouns or NPs for 1PS are found in seven utterances. For the NPs, a speaker says *nahako apeci* ‘I and father’ (*na* + kin term’ in Table 5.8), which could have been replaced by *wuli* ‘we’, and another speaker says *wuli namcatul* ‘we men’ (*wuli* + noun’ in Table 5.7) while he could have said either *wuli* or *namcatul*. Compared with using their alternatives, I argue that the speakers deliberately choose the particular NPs with a pragmatic intention. This will be discussed further in Chapter 8, and we see the distribution of reference terms for 1PS in more detail here with regard to the gender of speakers.

Table 5.9 shows the distribution of reference forms for 1PS by the gender of speakers and relative age of addressees. Since the majority of overt 1PS is expressed with pronouns, the distribution of pronouns for overt 1PS in Table 5.9 resembles the results in Table 5.6, which displayed the distribution of overt 1PS by the gender of speakers and relative age of addressees. What is noticeable from the results in Table 5.9 is the gender difference in the frequency of using a pronoun to each addressee group.
Table 5.9: Distribution of reference forms for 1PS by gender and age difference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Kin term</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>435</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>365</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Female speakers use the most pronouns to the older (177 out of 180), while male speakers use the most pronouns to the younger (140 out of 167). In addition, when speaking to the peer, female speakers use pronouns more frequently (34%; 146 out of 435) than male speakers do (24%; 86 out of 365; p < 0.005). Speaking to the younger, male speakers use pronouns more frequently (38%; 140 out of 365) than female speakers do (23%; 102 out of 435; p < 0.005). In the use of kinship terms, there is no gender difference, and other reference terms have an insufficient number of occurrences to compare.

The distribution of reference forms for 2PS by age difference between speakers is as presented in Table 5.10. Reference terms for 2PS are distributed more widely and evenly compared with overt 1PS that is concentrated in pronouns. The proportion of pronouns is 67% (410 out of 613), and it is followed by kinship terms at 15% (94 out of 613). The plain form of singular pronoun ne takes the majority of pronouns (352 out of 410), and most of them are used to the younger (195) and the peer (145).
Table 5.10: Distribution of reference forms for 2PS by age difference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference term</th>
<th>Older</th>
<th>Peer</th>
<th>Younger</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pronoun</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ne</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tangsin</em></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nehuy(tul)</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Caney</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Caki</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tangsinneytul</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kin term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin term</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Wuli</em> + Kin term</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teknonym</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nay</em> + Kin term</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulgar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deixis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun phrase</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name + <em>Ne</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Yelepwun</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title + <em>Nim</em></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo title</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ne used towards the older appears in two situations. One is that a younger brother speaks to his older sister in a friendly and playful manner, and the other is that a girlfriend argues with her boyfriend while she usually addresses him with caki. Tansin is mostly used between a married couple, except for three utterances, where a younger speaker addresses an older speaker with tangsin three times in an aggressive and hostile tone. Some elderly speakers use caney speaking to the younger in somewhat formal contexts, such as an older lawyer giving professional advice to a younger lawyer. The speakers of caki are either a girlfriend addressing her boyfriend or a speaker indicating the addressee whom she barely knows, with the meaning of ‘oneself’ in an argument, which may convey distance or criticism.4

The majority of kinship terms for 2PS are used to the older (81 out of 94), and when one is used to the younger, it is combined with a possessive pronoun wuli ‘our’5 or nay ‘my’. Four cases of kinship terms used to the age unknown include a supermarket owner speaking to a middle-aged male customer when she knows his daughter and addresses him apeci ‘father’. In another case, a female university student addresses a female employee at a shop with enni ‘older sister’ (for female speakers). Acwumma ‘aunt’ is used by a speaker when he speaks to a female addressee whom he encounters in the street. Teknonyms, such as a child’s name + emma ‘mom’, are also used between neighbours, once to an older speaker and once to a younger speaker. When the addressee is older, the speaker uses the basic form emeni ‘mother’ instead of the intimate form emma ‘mom’, which is considered more polite.5

The forms of NPs for 2PS are more varied than in the case of 1PS. For a simple noun, phikoin ‘defendant’ is repeatedly used as 2PS by lawyers to the defendant in the court, regardless of their age differences. For NPs, a wife uses i yangpan (lit. this aristocrat) to address her husband, and two female speakers who met at the church address each other with camaynim ‘sister’ affixed with the honorific -nim. While an adult is scolding children, i nyesek ‘this fellow’, aytul ‘kids’ and yay (the shortened form of i ai) ‘this kid’ are used. Swear words are also observed as 2PS when the speakers are very close friends addressing each other with sanaycasiktul ‘blokes’, saykkitul ‘brats’ and sengkonghantanun nyen ‘a bitch wishing to be successful’ or parents.

---

4 Further discussion on the expression of distance or criticism using overt 1PS/2PS will be included in Chapter 8.
5 In expressing one’s belonging to or possession of home, family, school, company or country, it is normally ‘our’ instead of ‘my’ in Korean practice. There are several attempts to clarify the reason, and many cultural studies (e.g. J. N. Kim, 2003; H. G. Lee, 2007; J. H. Yoon, 2003) find it from the Korean culture that emphasises the importance of community and the language reflects it in the expression of shared possession of the family and community they belong.
6 We discussed the classification of kinship term into basic, intimate and honorific forms in Chapter 4.
addressing their children with *kicipay* ‘girl (derogatory)’ or *atulilanun numtul* ‘chaps who are known as sons’.

Deictic words like *ku ccok* ‘that side’ are used when the speaker does not know the relative age of the addressee or there is no relationship established at all. A speaker also addresses his own father with *ku ccok* while he tries to ignore his father because the father abandoned him in the past. Three speakers use *twul* ‘two’, *twu salam* ‘two people’ and *twu pwun* ‘two people (honorific)’ when they have two addressees to refer as 2PS. The combination of a name and *ne* is used when there is more than one addressee, and the speaker specifically points at one addressee by using the NP as 2PS. There can be expressive effects generated by saying both name and *ne* for 2PS, instead of saying either a name or *ne*, and this will be covered in Chapter 8. Other NPs such as *han twu phwun pelki hintun ke anun salam* ‘a person who knows that making small money is hard’ or *tangsinilanun salam* ‘a person who is known as you’ are particularly used in the context that the speakers blame or criticise the addressee. *Yelepwn* ‘you (pl.)’ is once used by a speaker addressing his audience in a formal meeting.

Names are used as 2PS especially to the younger (31). Most cases are of parents addressing their children, teachers addressing their students or a boss addressing her junior staff, except one case in which a male senior at university addresses his female junior with her name. Peers, that is, same-aged friends or peer colleagues, use names for 2PS in two utterances, and two speakers who are younger in each conversation use their older interlocutors’ names in a particular tone of sarcasm. For example, a speaker says *chenhauy hwangthayhuy* ‘Hwang Thayhuy on earth’ to his senior at work while jeering that the senior had to speak like a child to his grandmother on the phone, and the speakers are close to each other. One speaker also addresses her neighbour with *i-ssi* ‘Mr Lee’ with his age unknown. As pointed out in the previous chapter, the combination of surname and the suffix *-ssi* is not frequently spoken, and the level of politeness and formality is not high.

---

7 The literal meaning of *yelepwn* is ‘many people’ in honorific. It is categorised as a second person plural pronoun by some researchers (e.g. K. Nam & Ko, 2013). Although they find *yelepwn* has the quality of a pronoun that it frequently substitutes a reference term for 2PS (See Chapter 4 and J. H. Suh & Kim (2012) for the three qualities of a pronoun). However, I include *yelepwn* in NPs in our analysis as it is morphologically a compound noun and lacks the quality of ‘generality.’ If we categorise *yelepwn* as a pronoun, we might also need to consider recognising other NPs like *ku ccok* ‘that side’ or *i ccok* ‘this side’ used for 1PS/2PS as pronouns since they include the deictic adjectives *ku* ‘that’ and *i* ‘this’ while substituting a reference term for 1PS/2Ps. The categorisation of pronouns is not in accord among Korean linguistics as stated in Chapter 4, and I try to keep the definition of a pronoun as strict as possible so we can discuss the particular meanings of nouns or NPs that contain additional connotations beyond the indexing functions of pronouns.
Titles are used to an older speaker with the honorific suffix –*nim* and to a younger speaker without a suffix. Even if the speakers do not know who is older or younger between them, once their titles are known, they use titles to address each other. Pseudo titles in Table 5.10 include *samonim* ‘ma’am (lit. one’s teacher’s wife)’ and *senpay* ‘senior’. Since both nouns are often used as address terms and refer to a social status acquired by meeting certain criteria (i.e., married the teacher or boss of the speaker to be a *samonim*; started working earlier than the speaker to be a *senpay*), I categorise them under pseudo title, not NPs that are more descriptive and boundless than titles.

The following table compares the distribution of reference forms for 2PS by female and male speakers.

**Table 5.11: Distribution of reference forms for 2PS by gender and age difference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Kin term</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>246</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>410</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 5.11, the patterns of using pronouns as 2PS are not significantly different by the gender of speakers. Female speakers use 121 out of 246 (49%) pronouns speaking to the younger and 95 pronouns to the peer (39%). Male speakers use 98 out of 164 (60%) pronouns to the younger and 55 (34%) pronouns to the peer. The distribution of kinship terms is also similar for female and male speakers since most of them are used to the older, and none is used between peers. Female speakers use more NPs to the older whereas male speakers use more NPs to the younger, which is not a valid comparison since the number of tokens is too small.
The concentration of names to the younger by female speakers is also distinct, but this too cannot be generalised because of the small number of tokens. The situations of using names as 2PS to the younger by female speakers include two conversations between private tutors and students, in which the teachers are women. The total number of titles used as 2PS is 30, and male speakers use 13 among them to the older while female speakers use only seven to the older. Although this is also an insufficient number of tokens to allow us to draw a conclusion about a general pattern, each reference term in specific contexts, including gender and relative age of speakers, has its own purposes to be used and we will discuss their expressive effects and potential implications in Chapter 8.

5.5 Discussion

The overall occurrence of 1PS/2PS in our corpora presented in Table 5.1 provides specific numbers in supporting the account that subject omission is ‘frequent’ in Korean or that Korean is a pro-drop language. As seen in Table 5.1, the overt expression rate is approximately 31% for 1PS and 22% for 2PS. The percentages are lower than the rates of overt 1PS/2PS in written discourse, which is surveyed as 43% in a series of Korean textbooks (M. W. Kim, 2010) and 50% in a novel (S. Kim & Choi, 2013).

I hypothesised that the use of overt 1PS/2PS is related to social aspects of discourse, which include age difference and gender of speakers. The distributions of overt 1PS and 2PS by age difference between speakers in Tables 5.2 and 5.3, respectively, show that there is a certain relationship between the use of overt 1PS/2PS and relative age of speakers. Specifically, it is crucial for speakers to know the relative age between interlocutors so that they can choose an appropriate reference term for 1PS/2PS. This is proved partly by the distinctively low frequency of overt 1PS/2PS when a speaker does not know the relative age between herself and her addressee.

In addition, the overt 1PS proportion is higher when speakers speak with the younger than when speaking with the peer or with the older. The distribution of reference terms for 1PS provides a clue to find a reason for this difference. As seen in Table 5.8, speakers mostly use pronouns for 1PS to the peer (303 out of 310) while the reference terms vary when speaking to the younger, such as pronouns (242 out of 298), kinship terms (43), titles (8), other NPs (3) and names (2). One possible interpretation is that certain kinship terms and titles, such as emma ‘mom’, appa ‘dad’ and sensaygnim ‘teacher’, are fixed as 1PS in some contexts where an older speaker
speaks to a younger speaker who is their child or pupil. The speakers can use the plain form of first-person pronoun na for 1PS since they speak to the younger, but they seem to deliberately or habitually choose using a kinship term or their professional title sensayngnim instead. If it is the case, there is presumably a particular pragmatic meaning occurring by changing the reference term from a pronoun to a kinship term or title.

Whether a kinship term or a professional title is used for 1PS intentionally or habitually, it obviously affects the frequency of overt 1PS in our data. A good piece of evidence is that the percentage of overt 1PS to the younger (35%; 298 out of 857) becomes similar to that of other cases (i.e. to the older, at 31%, and to the peer, at 30%) once we eliminate the instances of kinship term (43) and title (8) from speaking to the younger (298), which becomes 31% as in Table 5.8. In other words, the use of kinship term and title for 1PS while speaking to a younger speaker affects the difference among the distributions of 1PS to older, same-aged and younger speakers. One of the most noteworthy findings in the distribution analysis of overt 1PS by age difference is that kinship term and title as 1PS appear with higher frequency when speaking to a younger speaker. By contrast, pronouns take the majority of reference terms as 1PS regardless of the age difference between speakers. When relative age between interlocutors is not known, the overt 1PS rate drops significantly. The results relate to the choice of appropriate reference term for 1PS and the pragmatic characteristics of reference terms, including pronouns, in Korean.

Speakers also use the least of overt 2PSs when they do not know whether their addressee is older or younger than they are. Since 2PS directly refers to the counterpart and generally represents the relative age or social status in the reference term, speakers must be more cautious when choosing reference terms for 2PS than when choosing for 1PS. This may be one reason that the frequency of overt 2PS is lower than that of 1PS. According to the distributions of overt 2PS in Table 5.3 and of reference terms for 2PS in Table 5.9, apparently a peer is the addressee for whom a speaker can decide the reference term for 2PS most simply. Speakers use pronoun for 94% (150 out of 160) speaking to the peer. When speaking to the younger, pronouns are used for 78% (219 out of 282) and names for 11% (31 out of 282). To the older, predictably,

---

8 The tokens of 1PS to the younger are originally 857 in total and 298 among them are overtly expressed. If we remove the cases of kinship term (43) and title (8) from the total number of 1PS and overt 1PS, the total number of 1PS becomes 806 and the overt tokens become 247. Therefore, the overt 1PS rate without kinship term and title becomes 31% (247/806).

9 Names and professional titles clearly direct the addressee in the reference term itself. Pronouns in Korean and kinship terms contain the relative age or relationship in the terms.
kinship terms, titles and other NPs take the majority whereas pronouns are used only for 21% (32 out of 150). As noted in Chapter 4, there is no adequate second person pronoun for the older in contemporary spoken Korean. The plain form *ne* is the most common, and probably the only, second person singular pronoun to be generally used to the peer and younger.

Although it is a pronoun, *ne* is likely to have a different function from the corresponding first-person singular pronoun, *na*. As discussed in Chapter 4, if a speaker is older than or peer to the addressee, there are fewer restraints in the choice of a reference term and in the use of a pronoun for 1PS/2PS, compared with the case of speaking to the older. However, the use of *ne* for 2PS is not as dominant as the use of *na* for 1PS even when speaking to the peer or younger. Speakers in our corpora choose a pronoun for 1PS in most cases, but their choice diverges for 2PS depending on the relative age of addressee.

The difference between the use of first and second person pronouns could result from various factors and I assume one of them is the very attributes of 1PS/2PS and pronouns in Korean, as aforementioned. In many languages, such as English, a subject is what the utterance is about (Gundel, 1976, 1999; Lambrecht, 1987, 1994; Reinhart, 1982), and when an utterance is about the speaker (i.e., 1PS) or the addressee (i.e., 2PS) in the discourse, the speaker uses a pronoun to indicate one of the interlocutors.

Although pronouns for both 1PS and 2PS perform referring to the immediate speakers in the discourse, a first-person pronoun has more ‘stability’ than a second person pronoun as regards the function of identification because the speaker knows about herself better than she knows about the second person. If the stabilities of pronouns for both 1PS and 2PS were identical, their appearance frequency could have been similar. For instance, the degree or way of identifying 1PS of a first person pronoun, such as *na*, is broader and more general whereas a second person pronoun, for example, *ne*, identifies 2PS with a more specific and narrow definition. The rest of 2PS that are not indicated with a pronoun are identified with other reference terms, such as a kinship term or title that reveals the social relationships between speakers.

Since age difference affects the distribution of overt 1PS/2PS, gender provides us another interesting view into the data. Overall, male speakers show more sensitivity in the use of overt 1PS/2PS with regard to the gender and age difference of speakers. They use overt 1PS more frequently when they speak to the same gender than to the different gender. Male speakers also show different frequency in the use of overt 1PS/2PS depending on the relative age of addresses.
They use more overt 1PS to a younger speaker than to an older speaker or to a peer. In particular, male speakers use the most of their 1PS pronouns (38%; 140 out of 365) to the younger and the second most to the older (34%; 126 out of 365).

Meanwhile, the ratios of overt 1PS/2PS for female speakers are not very different by the gender or age difference of speakers. Female speakers use most of their 1PS pronouns to the older (41%; 177 out of 435) and second most to the peer (34%; 146 out of 435). In short, male speakers use more 1PS pronouns to the younger while female speakers use more 1PS pronouns to the older and peer. In the use of overt 2PS, both male and female speakers use more overt 2PSs to the peer than to the older or to the younger. The reference terms used for 2PS are similar for female and male speakers; pronouns are mostly used to the younger and peer, and kinship terms are used to the older.

Overall, speakers are affected by the relative age between speakers in the use of overt 1PS/2PS. They use more overt 1PSs to younger speakers and less overt 2PSs while not knowing the age of addressee. Male speakers are more sensitive to age difference and gender of addressee. They show higher frequency of overt 1PS when speaking to the younger and same gender than other cases. They also show significantly lower frequency of overt 2PS while speaking to those of unknown age than when they know the relative age of addressees. Female speakers do not show much difference in the use of overt 1PS whether they speak to older or younger speakers or to the same or different gender. Their proportions of overt 2PS are also relatively similar among the groups of addressees, except that they use more overt 2PS to the peer than to the older. Notably, pronouns are mostly used for overt 1PS while more diverse reference terms are used for overt 2PS.

**5.6 Summary**

In the current chapter, I have presented the results of distribution analysis of overt 1PS/2PS in the spoken Korean corpora. They include the distributions of overt 1PS/2PS in accordance to age difference between speakers, gender of speakers and reference terms used for overt 1PS/2PS. The distribution of overt 1PS/2PS by the relative age between speakers exhibits that native speakers of Korean tend to be affected by the relative age between speakers. The rate of overt 1PS is highest when they speak to the younger and lowest when they do not know the relative age of addressee. The percentage of overt 2PS is highest when they speak to a peer, and it drops when they do not know the relative age of addressee.
Male speakers are more influenced by the age and gender factors. They show higher frequency in the use of overt 1PS when speaking to the younger and to male speakers. The frequency of using overt 1PS that female speakers show is not affected by the relative age and gender of addressee as much as the frequency of male speakers. For 2PS, both male and female speakers use the most overt 2PSs to the peer and the least overt 2PSs to the age unknown, but the overt rate of 2PS is much lower for male speakers in the case that the relative age of addressee is unknown.

The distribution of reference forms for 1PS/2PS reveals that overt 1PS is expressed with pronouns in most cases whereas overt 2PS has more diversity in the reference terms. Overt 1PSs that are not expressed with pronouns appear with kinship terms or professional titles when parents speak to their children or teachers speak to their pupils. Overt 2PSs are expressed with more diverse reference terms, including pronouns, kinship terms, professional titles, personal names or NPs. Speaking to the older, speakers use kinship terms and professional titles for 2PS, and they use pronouns and names to the younger or peer. NPs are used to the older and the younger in particular settings, underlining the social role of the addressee or the relationship between the speakers.

Based on the results of distribution analysis from the current chapter, in the following chapters we explore linguistic and contextual conditions where overt 1PS/2PS occurs. Chapter 6 examines contrastiveness as one of the most frequently and significantly discussed aspects of overt 1PS/2P in the literature. As another important condition of overt 1PS/2PS, we also investigate turn/floor shifts in Chapter 7. In special regard to speaker’s relative age and social relationship, Chapter 8 deals with expressive effects of overt 1PS/2PS.
Chapter 6. Overt 1PS and 2PS in Contrast

6.1 Introduction

We have noted from the distribution analysis in the previous chapter that approximately 70% of 1PS and 80% of 2PS are unexpressed in spoken Korean. The results are empirical evidence for the linguistic categorisation of Korean as a pro-drop language. As discussed in the introduction of the current thesis, I explore the motivations of native speakers of Korean to use overt 1PS and 2PS for 30% and 20%, respectively. The portion is smaller than that of the unexpressed case but crucial for understanding the pragmatic mechanism of the use of 1PS and 2PS in Korean.

Only a few researchers (e.g., Jung, 2007; H. Kim, 1999; W. Kim, 1996; W. P. Lee, 1989; S. Oh, 2007) have paid attention to the overtly expressed subjects, as reviewed in Chapter 2. What the studies claim as one of the most crucial factors that make a subject overtly expressed is contrast. For example, S. Oh (2007) suggests that overt 1PS is used to indicate the speaker’s contrastive opinion to the preceding utterances and overt 2PS is used to show the difference between the addressee and the speaker herself or between another referent in the context and the speaker herself. S. Oh (2007) particularly points out that the particle -(n)un attached to the reference term for first or second person signifies the contrastiveness of the referents. W. P. Lee (1989) and H. Kim (1999) also note that speakers tend to have an overt subject when it is in contrast, in focus or in emphasis in Korean discourse. W. Kim (1996:282) specifically states that the use of overt subject is mandatory when a speaker intends to emphasise the contrastive meaning of the subject (i.e., the very referent, not someone else) to other participants in the discourse.

---

1 The topic marker -n has two forms depending on a phonetic condition of the preceding noun. If the noun affixed with the marker has a final consonant, as in sensayngnim ‘Mr/Ms teacher,’ -un is used, i.e., sensayngnim-un. If the noun has no final consonant, as in na ‘I,’ -nun is used, i.e., na-nun. In spoken or casual discourse, -nun is often shortened to -n, e.g., na-n for na-nun. This phonetic rule for alternatives forms applies to some other case markers like -(i)ka the subject marker and -(l)ul the object marker.

2 Not only in Korean but also in other pro-drop languages like Japanese (Clancy & Downing, 1987; D. Lee & Yonezawa, 2008), Spanish (Mayol, 2010; Myhill & Xing, 1996; Posio, 2011), Portuguese (Silva & Lucia, 1993) and Javanese (Ewing, 2014), the notion of contrast is widely used in explaining overt subjects.
While the application of contrastiveness among overt subjects is significant in the literature, the descriptions of contrast are insufficient, and the scopes of the analyses are limited. Thus, I review the concept of contrast in terms of the information structure and discourse analysis in this chapter and test the correlation of overt 1PS/2PS and contrast from our data.

The current chapter is organised as follows. First, we define the meaning of contrast and divide it into explicit and implicit contrast for our analysis in Section 6.2. Sections 6.3 and 6.4 examine overt 1PS/2PS in explicit contrast and in implicit contrast, respectively. Finally, Section 6.5 summaries this chapter.

6.2 Contrast and Contrastive Candidates

While a general meaning of contrast may be easily captured in our mind, a clear and unified definition of contrast is yet to be reached in the literature. It is because contrast takes a relative status in information structure, and as Lambrechts (1994) notes, contrast is a gradient, and not on one level. The identification of contrast has been correspondingly varied, such as contrast, contrastive focus or contrastive topic, because focus, topic and contrast are alike in nature. Analysing the data in the current research, I also observe different kinds or levels of contrast with regard to the existence or certainty of contrastive alternatives in the utterance. Specifically, for some overt subjects in contrast, it is easy to nominate their contrastive counterparts in the conversation. Conversely, other overt subjects seem somehow contrastive or comparative, but it is difficult to identify a particular counterpart with which these are contrasted or compared.

Chafe (1976) provides a useful exemplification of contrast. He clarifies that underlying a contrastive sentence is background knowledge of the addressee. That is, when a speaker says a contrastive sentence, such as ‘Ronal made the hamburgers’, with the subject stressed and high-pitched, she expresses her knowledge that Ronald, not other candidates that might be in the addressee’s mind, is the right choice for the subject role. The speaker presumes that the addressee is aware of the fact that someone made the hamburgers, which Chafe (1976) names background knowledge, and that the addressee has a set of possible candidates in her mind. The set of candidates, that is, persons who might have made the hamburgers, normally has a limited range rather than an unlimited set of possibilities, according to the author. Namely,

---

3 It is not my intention to provide a new definition of contrast in the current research. I look at previous definitions of contrast and limit the meaning of contrast so that we can have a clear norm for analysing overt 1PS/2PS in contrast.
contrastiveness of a sentence is achieved by ‘the assertion of which candidate is the correct one’ (Chafe, 1976:34).

Following Chafe (1976), Umbach (2004) confirms that the limited number of candidates distinguishes contrast from focus. For instance, when the addressee of the sentence ‘Ronald made the hamburgers’ has no specific candidate in her mind or an endless list of them, we can say that Ronald is in focus. Conversely, if the addressee has a particular person who could have made the hamburgers, as well as Ronald, in her mind and it is confirmed by the speaker’s utterance that Ronald is the one, we can say that Ronald is in contrast. Repp (2010) also notes that a contrasted item has alternatives in a limited range and an explicit relationship with the alternatives, whereas a focused item has an unlimited range of alternatives and they can be implicitly related. It is lucidly stated, ‘We have focus on an item but contrast between items’ (Repp, 2010:1335).

More specifically, D. Lee (2002) explains the difference between contrast and topic as regards the way that NPs are marked by grammatical particles. According to D. Lee (2002), the Japanese focus particle -wa has two functions: one is contrastive and the other is topical. While the contrastive -wa indicates an explicit contrastive relationship between the NP with -wa affixed and its candidates, the topical -wa implicitly shows reference to possible candidates. A simple and straightforward example is taken from D. Lee (2002) as follows:

(1) a. \textit{Watashi \ wa \ kyoo \ kaisha ni iku.}  
\textit{I \ TOP \ today \ office \ to \ go.}  
\textit{‘I will go to the office today.’}

b. \textit{Watashi \ wa \ kyoo \ kaisha ni iku \ kedo, \ Murata san \ wa \ ikanai \ yo.}  
\textit{I \ TOP \ today \ office \ to \ go \ CN \ Murata \ go-NEG \ FP}  
\textit{‘I will go to the office today, but Mr Murata will not.’}

(p. 657)

The marker -wa has ‘exclusiveness’ in nature and topical –wa in (1a) indicates that the speaker has chosen the subject \textit{watashi} ‘I’ by excluding other possible candidates he/she could have chosen. The contrastive -wa in (1b) contrasts the two different actions taken by two subjects, namely, going to work of ‘I’ versus not going to work of Mr Murata. D. Lee (2002) points out

\footnote{Many studies discuss the distinction of focus and topic (e.g., Gundel &leve Fretheim, 2006; Wee, 2010), but we put more weight on distinguishing them from contrast. Both focus and topic have vague or unlimited candidates whereas candidates of contrast are apparent and definite.}
that the contrastive -wa explicitly indicates the contrastive relationship in the discourse while the topical -wa implicitly conveys that the NP with -wa affixed is chosen among possible choices. On translating the Japanese example in (1) into Korean as in (2), the same explanation can be applied:

(2) a. na nun onul hoysa ey ka.
   I TOP today office to go
   ‘I am going to the office today.’

   b. na nun onul hoysa ey ka ciman, mwulatha ssi
   I TOP today office to go CN Murata Mr
   nun an ka yo.
   TOP NEG go FP
   ‘I am going to the office today, but Mr Murata is not.’

The topic marker -nun in (2a) drags attention to the preceding 1PS, na ‘I,’ while excluding any other candidates that the speaker may have possibly selected to comment. Conversely, the two uses of -nun in (2b), explicitly make the contrastiveness between the two persons, one going to the office and the other not going, along with the contrastive connective -ciman ‘but’. It is true that many examples of overt 1PS/2PS in contrast are affixed with the particle -(n)un in our data or in the literature (e.g., Jung, 2007; W. Kim, 1996; S. Oh, 2007). However, not all 1PS/2PS in the contrastive relationship are marked by -(n)un. We also observe contrastive 1PS/2PS affixed with other particles in our data, and I include them in the analysis, since they can be good examples of overt 1PS/2PS in contrast.

In terms of terminology, the division of ‘explicit’ and ‘implicit’ in this analysis is different from that of D. Lee (2002). Explicitness in D. Lee (2002) indicates the explicit reference of comparative -wa to other candidates whereas implicitness indicates the implicit reference of topical -wa to possible candidates. I exclude the cases of ‘implicitness (i.e., topical relations)’ but only deal with the cases of ‘explicitness (i.e., contrastive relations)’ in this chapter. I further divide the contrastive relationship into explicit and implicit, depending on the realisation of contrastive candidates in the discourse. Overt 1PS/2PS in implicit contrast still is counted as

5 D. Lee (2002) also discusses that the zero particle, i.e. a particle without any phonetic realisation, removes the relation indicated by -wa and merely refers to the NP without relating other objects or events. Namely, the zero particle conveys ‘absolute specification’ while other particles like -wa conveys contrastive or topical relationship between objects or events. See D. Lee (2002) for details.
contrast, not as topic, because the contrastive counterpart is definite and obvious in the discourse although it is not expressed.  

As regards the difference between contrast and focus, as noted earlier, it is not that the two are always in a clear distinction, but in the current analysis, I discern contrast by finding a concrete contrastive counterpart in the discourse. One of the examples that are in the boundary between focus and contrast is as in (3). An older sister (S) says that she will pass the bar exam after studying for a half year even if it seems impossible, while her younger brother (B) doubts it:

(3)  
1   B: *pannyen kongpwuhamyen saepkosi pwithnuntako nwuka kulay?*  
2   ‘Who says that (one) passes the bar exam after studying for a half year?’
3   S: *nanun pwuhe. kulikwu ne colephamyen inthen welkup pan, na cwuntamye.*  
4   ‘1-pronoun pass. And, (you) said you are going to give me a half of the intern salary when graduated.’

[D9:194–195, between a younger brother and an older sister]

In the previous part of the discourse, S says that she will study for the bar exam in the next semester, and B teases her that a semester is not enough for passing the exam, by asking who says that one passes the bar exam after studying for a half year (lines 1 and 2). S affirms that she does, using the plain 1sg pronoun *na* as 1PS affixed with the marker *-nun*. The rhetorical utterance of B means that no one can pass the bar exam with such a short period of preparation, and S makes an exception of herself from ‘no one,’ which consequently brings a focus on *nanun*. According to the characteristics of contrast described above, the 1PS *na* by S has no contrastive candidates, either specified or enumerated in the context. *Na* in (3) is contrastive to indefinite candidates, so it is focused, and focused 1PS/2PS with indefinite candidates is excluded from the current analysis of the overt 1PS/2PS in contrast.

---

6 As noted in the paragraph, this term of ‘implicit’ is different from D. Lee (2002), in which it is used to refer to the implicitness of contrastiveness and topical relations. In the current analysis, ‘implicit’ contrast indicates not topical but contrastive relations that have definite contrastive candidates with one candidate unrealised in the discourse. The concept of ‘implicit contrast’ is in fact used in the literature of contrast (e.g., Mayol, 2010) for the same definition as in this thesis.

7 It can convey additional pragmatic interpretations, such as the speakers’ confidence or arrogance in passing the exam. We will discuss possible pragmatic meanings raised by overt 1PS/2PS in Chapter 8.

8 Some researchers include a referent with indefinite or unclear contrastive candidates in the categorisation of contrast, with the label of ‘contrastive topic’ (Büring, 1999; Hara & van Rooij, 2007) or ‘weak contrast’ (Mayol, 2010), as long as it conveys ‘exclusiveness’ or ‘contrastivness’ to other referents despite the lack of definiteness. I only include contrastive referents with definite candidates in the chapter and separately analyse the overt 1PS/2PS that is ‘emphatic’ in Chapter 8.
As mentioned above, the analysis of overt 1PS/2PS in contrast in this chapter will be twofold: analyses of explicit contrast and of implicit contrast. The overt 1PS/2PS of explicit contrast have both candidates of contrast expressed in the discourse. However, implicit contrast indicates that only one of the contrastive candidates appears in the discourse while the other candidate can be specifically retrieved by the contextual cues. Explicit contrast stands out and is easily picked up from the surface of discourse whereas implicit contrast may be overlooked if we do not carefully find it. Although implicit contrast has one of its contrastive candidates unrealised in the discourse and might not be seen as contrastive, it is important that we recognise and count it as a contrastive candidate. It is because an overt 1PS/2PS in implicit contrast shares the same properties of an overt 1PS/2PS in explicit contrast; that is, an overtly expressed 1PS/2PS is used to display contrastiveness in the discourse.

Even though we do not analyse prosodic features of our data,9 we can recognise explicit and implicit contrast from what has been said before an utterance and what is said after the utterance, namely, context or general knowledge.10

6.3 Overt 1PS and 2PS in Explicit Contrast

Speakers in our corpora often use overt 1PS/2PS when they create an explicit contrastive relationship between referents in their utterances. By explicit contrast, I mean that two or more referents are in contrast, and for the sake of our analysis of 1PS/2PS, at least one of the referents is overt 1PS/2PS in the discourse.11 I count them as explicit contrast, by extending the interpretation of contrast to pragmatic meanings from sentence structure or semantic meanings. Detailed descriptions are presented with corresponding examples in the following subsections.

I further divide explicit contrast into two in the analysis: one that has both contrastive candidates in the utterance by one speaker, and the other that has contrastive candidates not in one utterance.

---

9 A number of literature (e.g., Bolinger, 1961; Steedman, 1991; Wee, 2007, 2010) reveal that prosodic features like pitch is involved in expressing contrast as well as focus and topic.

10 It is also confirmed in previous studies (e.g., Clancy & Downing, 1987; D. Lee, 2002; Maynard, 1980) that context becomes a significant factor to distinguish contrast and topic.

11 Chafe (1976) suggests the notion of ‘double contrast’ that refers to a pair of contrastive items and this is adopted in many empirical studies that test subjects in contrast (e.g., Mayol, 2010; Myhill & Xing, 1996; Travis & Cacoullos, 2012). Travis and Cacoullos (2012) specifically redefines it as to have two differences: ‘one difference must be in the subjects, and the second in the predicates, which must be related, but in some sense converse.’ Although this characteristic of double contrast gives a clear recognition of subjects in contrast, it actually limits the observation of contrastive subjects and misses some instances of contrastive candidates that do not meet the strict criteria of having different subjects and different predicates. For instance, a contrastive pair can have the same subject with different predicates or different subjects with the same predicates. We will see the examples in this section.
but in different utterances in the discourse, whether spoken by one speaker or spoken by different speakers. The division is based on the different degrees of contrast that the two types of explicit contrast have. The first type of explicit contrast is simple and obvious to notice because the contrast between contrastive candidates occurs in a single utterance. The second type of explicit contrast is, in general, less noticeable and tends to be found in a longer term than the first type since the contrast is completed in one of the subsequent utterances, not in the initial utterance, as the discourse develops. Let us consider examples of each case in the following sections.

6.3.1 Contrastive candidates in a single utterance

A good example of explicit contrast with contrastive candidates in one utterance is shown in the example of the Japanese focus particle -wa in (1b), that is, *watashiwa kyoo kaishani ikuedo, murata sanwa ikanaiyo* ‘I will go to the office today, but Mr Murata will not’, and its Korean version in (2b). For convenience, I redisplay it as (2b)’:

(2b’) *nanun onul hoysaey kaciman, mwulatha ssinun ankayo.*
   ‘I am going to the office today, but **Mr Murata** is not.’

As a similar case, the speaker in (4) makes explicit contrast between first and second person in the last sentence while she compares that she could have done a task that her junior employee could not:

(4) 1 S: _nalamyen kkuthkkaci seltukhay intepyu haysse._
   ‘I would have persuaded until the end and done the interview.

2 _hwangkican moshaysseto, nanun hay!_
   Even though **you-title** can’t, **I-pronoun** do.’

[D2:364–365, a senior journalist to her junior at work]

S criticises a junior journalist that he conducted an interview without acquiring the interviewee’s consent, because the interviewee did not agree on the interview. She says that she would have conducted the interview after successfully persuading the interviewee (line 1). She then adds that although the interlocutor, _hwangkica_ ‘Journalist Hwang,’ could not do it, she could have herself. In the contrastive utterance, she juxtaposes the 2PS _hwangkica_ and the 1PS _na_ with both affixed with the contrastive particle -(n)un. Although the use of -(n)un can be a clear clue for contrastive candidates, it is not always the case. That is, it is possible to show explicit contrast between two or more referents with other particles, including zero particle, rather than the contrastive particle.
For example, in the following excerpt in (5), a girlfriend (G) makes explicit contrast between herself and her boyfriend (B) while saying that B was successful in finding a job, but she was not in the past. The sentence format is similar to the examples seen in (2) and (3), that is, the candidates of explicit contrast are both in one utterance of G, but not both particles affixed to the contrastive candidates are the contrastive marker -(n)un. One candidate is affixed with -(n)un as in nan ‘I’ and the other is affixed with the limitation marker -man ‘only’ as in cakiman ‘only you’:

(5) 1 B: *iken ne hato chwiep an toyntako cingcingtaye ssecwun keta.*
‘This is the one (I) wrote since you were whining so much that (you) failed finding a job.’

2 G: *kuttayn cakiman toyko nan ttelecyessunikka kulehci.*
‘(It) was because only you-pronoun passed, and I-pronoun failed at that time.’

[D4:1387–1388, between a boyfriend and a girlfriend]

B in (5) talks about a note that he gave G when she complained much about her struggle finding a job in the past. G then gives an excuse for her complaint, saying that only B passed the recruiting process while she failed. In her utterance, she makes explicit contrast between the 2PS caki who was successful and the 1PS na who was not, by using the limitation marker -man ‘only’ for the 2PS and the topic marker -n for the 1PS, respectively.

Another example of explicit contrast in one utterance in (6) shows an interesting choice of reference forms for the contrastive candidates as well as particles other than -(n)un. While 1sg and 2sg pronouns are used for contrasting 1PS and 2PS, respectively, in (5), two general nouns with contrastive meaning are used in (6).

(6) 1 K: *mwulcekulo sonhaylul kkichyessumyen, kyengceycek posangul hanun key tangyenhayyo.*
‘If (one) made physical damage, it is natural to give financial compensation.’

2 P: *mwulcek sonhaylul mwulcek posangulo patko siphunci, kyengceycek posangulo patko siphuncinun phihaycaka kylecenghanun kecyo. kahaycaka hanun key anila.*
‘As for receiving either physical compensation or financial compensation for physical damage, a victim-nominal decides. Not an assailant-nominal does.’

[D10:4–12, between two speakers unknown each other]
K’s car splashed water from the road on P’s dress, and K tries to give P money as compensation. P refuses the money, expecting K to apologise first. K explains that the money is reasonable compensation for the physical damage (lines 1 and 2). P then criticises that an attacker (kahayca) does not decide on the compensation, but a victim (phihayca) should (line 3 to line 5). In her utterance, P uses general nouns for explicit contrast between two opposite sides, phihayca ‘attacker’ and kahayca ‘victim’, but the nouns in fact refer to K, that is, an attacker, and to herself, a victim. In addition, the subject marker -ka is affixed to each subject and supports the contrastiveness.

The subjects in this utterance are required to maintain the meaning of the sentence. The contrast between the two subjects is also lost if they are unexpressed. Specifically, P could have said ‘I decide on the kind of compensation. You do not’, where the pronouns for 1PS and 2PS simply indicate the speakers who are in two different statuses, one in making the decision and the other in not making the decision. However, she chooses general nouns as 1PS and 2PS that specify the speakers’ different statuses in the situation, which they are currently facing as ‘an attacker’ and ‘a victim’. By the use of the general nouns for 1PS/2PS, far sharper contrast is realised between the speakers compared with the use of pronouns, owing to the specific meanings that the general nouns convey.

Both subjects are required to be overt to keep the semantic meaning of the utterances as well as the contrastiveness between the subjects in the contrastive utterances in (4), (5) and (6). It may seem that contrastive 1PS/2PS must be overt to convey the contrastiveness. Previous studies on overt subjects in contrast (e.g., Jung, 2007; W. Kim, 1996; S. Oh, 2007) argue that a subject is hardly unexpressed when it has contrastive meaning. Nevertheless, we can find cases that an utterance does not lose its contrastiveness between two referents even if one of the contrastive candidates is unexpressed.

In the following excerpt in (7), a high school student (S) makes explicit contrast between himself using na ‘I’ and the interlocutor using ne ‘you’, while speaking to his classmate. Although both contrastive candidates are overt in this utterance, it is possible to have ne unexpressed, that is, taykelleyunayka haltheynikka changmwun takka ‘As for the mop, I will do, so wipe the window’, and keep the contrastiveness between the two referents as well as the meaning of the utterance:
S tells his classmate to wipe the window while he will mop. In the two sentences connected in one utterance, he makes explicit contrast between 1PS and 2PS using the 1sg pronoun na and the 2sg pronoun ne, respectively, while he allocates different tasks for himself and his classmate. It would be a natural sentence with the same meaning if nen (ne + topic marker -n) ‘you’ is unexpressed in the utterance, that is, taykellynun nayka haltheynikka changmwun takka, while nayka (modified form of na + subject marker -ka) ¹² needs to be overt to make the sentence comprehensible.¹³

The speaker in (7) expresses his intention in the predicate haltheynikka ‘as will do’ that indicates the modality of willingness of first person or conjecture about third person. The sentence needs a clarification of the subject, namely, who is willing to do or who is assumed to do,¹⁴ and S uses the plain form of 1sg pronoun na as a reference form for 1PS. By contrast, the 2PS ne can be unexpressed without changing the meaning of the utterance. It is because the second sentence is imperative, and in imperative sentences, the subject, that is, 2PS, is generally unexpressed in Korean like in English. In other words, it is not always the case that contrast guarantees 1PS/2PS to be overtly expressed, contrary to the claim that a contrastive 1PS/2PS needs to be overt (e.g., H. Kim, 1999; W. Kim, 1996).

Despite its redundancy in expression, the overt 2PS nen in (7) adds the meaning of ‘as for you’, which explicitly strengthens the contrastiveness to the preceding 1PS in the utterance where the speaker divides his labour and that of the interlocutor. If ne was unexpressed in (7), the overt 1PS na in the utterance would be categorised as to be in implicit contrast, not as topic, since the

¹² The plain form of 1sg pronoun na changes its form to nay when it has the subject marker i/ka affixed to it.
¹³ This can be an example displaying the distinction between double contrast and explicit contrast. According to Travis and Cacoullos (2012), double contrast requires both the subject and predicate to be different while explicit contrast can come into existence even if the predicate is the same or the same kind. That is to say, predicates in (7) are ‘to do (the mop)’ and ‘to wipe (the window)’ are similar kinds rather than converse as in (4), (5) and (6). The similar predicates in (7) may not be categorised as double contrast but the utterance in (7) certainly shows explicit contrast between the two referents and the contrastiveness is unambiguously conveyed by the overt 1PS na and overt 2PS ne.
¹⁴ Some relationship between modality verbs and overt 1PS/2PS is recognised in the current research. It is not definite, i.e., willingness modality always makes the subject overt, but is likely that overt 1PS/2PS appears more often with some modality verbs.
contrastiveness between the 1PS and 2PS in the utterance remains and the contrastive candidate of the overt 1PS, namely, 2PS, is definite although it is not phonetically realised.

6.3.2 Contrastive candidates in different utterances in the discourse

We have seen the candidates of explicit contrast appear in the same utterance while the speaker contrasts two referents in opposite or different situations. They are easier to recognise as contrastive owing to the symmetrical sentence forms as well as the short distance between candidates. The following examples also show contrastiveness between two or more candidates, but they are not in contrast at first as only one candidate is introduced earlier in the discourse. These become contrastive later as the other candidate(s) is/are introduced in subsequent utterances in the discourse. In addition, the sentence forms vary or the predicates are the same in some cases, but the overt 1PS/2PSs are still in contrast.

Let us consider an example in which speakers use overt 1PS contrastively to show their different opinions. A son (S) and his father (F) talk about Korean pop singers in (8) and they use overt 1PS contrasting whom they like:

(8) 1 S:  *appa, nan hyolika nay suthailinkapwa. wusul tay cinca ippe.*
‘Dad, *L-pronoun* guess Hyoli is my type. (She) is so pretty when smiling.’

2 F:  *wusul tayman ippuci. cengsaykhal tay sengkkalisse poituntey.*
‘Pretty only when smiling. (She) looks testy in a serious face.’

3  *nan yulika te cohtula. moksolika ttak ni emmaya.*
*L-pronoun* like Yuli more. The voice is just like your mom.’

[D5:93–98, between a son and a father]

S says that he likes a member of a Korean pop girl group (line 1), using *na* as 1PS, and F says that he likes another member of the group (line 3), using *na* as 1PS as well. *Na* affixed with the topic marker -*n* is used in S’s utterance while stating his preference, and the utterance has no contrastiveness in itself. In the following utterance, F also says *nan* while expressing his own preference with disagreement to A’s utterance (‘Pretty only when smiling. (She) looks testy in a serious face’). The use of *nan* by F evokes contrastiveness between the preferences of S and F, and it cannot be unexpressed in the utterance.

While speakers in (8) use 1PS to express that they have different opinions, speakers in the following example in (9) use overt 2PSs to appoint counterparts in argument. The excerpt for (9) is shown in parts, in (9a) and (9b), so that the formation of contrastiveness is seen more
effectively along with the development of discourse. In (9), a senior journalist (S) argues with her junior journalist (J) on their problems. S in (9a) first criticises that J has an issue (line 1) and describes the issue that he only pursues exclusive news disregarding principles (lines 1 to 3):

(9a) 1 S: *nen kukey mwunceyya.*

‘You-pronoun have that problem.

2 *kunomuy thukcong thukcong. annumli thukecongpyengey kellye*

That exclusive, exclusive. Even though (you) are so much obsessed with that exclusive and overreacting, (you) should have followed the least principles!’

[D2:345–347, a senior journalist to her junior at work]

S uses the plain 2sg pronoun *ne* as 2PS of the first sentence with the topic marker -*n* affixed to *ne*. While she claims that J has a problem of being obsessed with exclusive news and of disregarding principles, the 2PS *ne* does not have a contrastive candidate mentioned in the utterance. There is no contrastive candidate to be assumed in the context yet, so it cannot be implicit contrast either. The 2PS *ne* is topical, not contrasted, with which S particularly appoints J to criticise him.

In his response in (9b), J criticises S in return, saying that she has an issue (line 1), and he describes the issue that she only considers principles (lines 1 and 2) and has poor achievement in the viewing rating (lines 2 and 3):

(9b) 1 J: *thimcangnimun kukey mwunceypnita.*

‘You-title have that problem.

2 *kunomuy wenchik, wenchik. kulayse wuli phuloka cemcem*

That principle, principle. That is why the viewing ratings of our programme continue dropping. Are (you) not furious and embarrassed with losing like this?’

[D2:348–350, a junior journalist to his senior at work]

J in (9b) begins his utterance with *thimcangnim* as 2PS along with the same topic marker -*un* that S used for 2PS in her sentence (line 1). By doing so, explicit contrast between *ne* and *thimcangnim* is created. That is, the focused 2PS *ne* spoken by S in (9a) lacks the definiteness

---

15 The contrast could have been even more discernible if the utterances are in English, of which the subjects would be both the second person pronoun ‘you’, and if we have phonetic information, such as a high pitch or stress on
and certainty of its contrastive candidate(s), whereas the thimcangnim spoken by J in (9b) confidently has a contrastive candidate, which is the preceding 2PS ne by S. It is an interesting fact of discourse analysis that an utterance with no contrastiveness in itself can be contrastive in relation with other utterances. Moreover, the same predicate can be interpreted contrastively because the subjects are different and the connotations of the predicate are different. To maintain the contrastiveness that both the speakers have problems and the problems are different from each other, it is essential that the 2PSs in (9) are expressed overtly.

Similarly, the overt 2PS in A’s utterance in (10) is not contrastive on its own, but it becomes contrastive with the overt 2PS in the following utterance by B, which completes a contrastive pair:

(10) 1 A:  *way antuleka ne?*  
     ‘Why aren’t you-pronoun going in?’

2 B:  *kulenun nenun, way antulekanuntey?*  
     ‘Why aren’t you-pronoun going in while saying so?’

Two classmates, A and B, are standing outside the door to the teachers’ office and hesitating to go in after being summoned by the teacher. A finds B in front of the door and asks why she is not going in (line 1), using *ne* as 2PS. In this utterance, the 2PS is not in contrast and it can be in fact unexpressed in the utterance. That is, the interrogative utterance *way antuleka?* ‘Why aren’t (you) going in?’ without the overt 2PS can still convey the same meaning as in the original utterance with *ne*. By using the overt 2PS, A adds pragmatic meanings like distancing or pestering.\(^\text{16}\) B also uses *ne* as 2PS with the topic marker -nun affixed and asks why A does not go inside herself, asking the same question.

With the repeated question in line 2, B reminds that A is not going in while she is supposed to, and the reminding question with *ne* makes explicit contrast to the first question by A. The 2PS *ne* by B may be unexpressed together with the modifying phrase *kulenun* ‘while saying so.’ If the entire phrase including *nenun* is unexpressed, that is, *way antulekanuntey?* ‘Why aren’t (you) going in?’ the utterance would sound odd in this context because the contrastive nuance B tries to emphasise, namely, ‘Why are YOU not going in?’ or ‘How about YOU?’ is lost. Thus, the 2PSs. In spite of the absence of morphological similarity or phonetical marks, we can still perceive the contrastive meaning between the two 2PSs since the utterances are part of discourse and has context.

\(^\text{16}\) Possible pragmatic meanings vary for the use of the second person pronoun *ne*, and I argue them in Chapter 8. The sentence without *ne* maintains the same sentence meaning as the sentence with *ne*, but the speaker deliberately uses the pronoun for a pragmatic purpose.
the overt 2PS is necessary in B’s utterance for highlighting the contrastiveness between the speakers. As pointed out in the case of (9), it is also noteworthy that contrast can be defined even if the predicates of contrastive candidates are the same. The contrastiveness in (10) stems from the difference in the agents of the predicates, not from the difference in the predicates themselves, while predicates for the contrastive 2PSs are the same.

The explicit contrast in (8), (9) and (10) occurs on the subjects while what the subjects do is the same for the contrastive utterances, for example, 1PSs liking a singer in (8), 2PSs having problems in (9) and 2PSs not going in the teacher’s office in (10). That is, the sentences with the contrastive 1PS/2PSs are in symmetry in respect to the syntax, semantic meaning of predicates and information structure. This symmetric feature of overt 1PS/2PS in contrast is also the same in the case where contrastive candidates appear in a single utterance as shown in (4) to (7). Interestingly, it is also possible that contrastive candidates are in asymmetrical situations. For example, the 1PSs in (11) seem unrelated to each other because they have dissimilar information structure if seen separately. One is in ‘I will be finished with classes at four’, and the other is in ‘I have an appointment in the evening, so (I) cannot’. Nevertheless, the two 1PSs make an explicit contrastive pair in the context:

(11)  1  D:  itta konghangey kathi kasilkkecyo?
      ‘Would (you) go to the airport together later?
2  l-cec will be finished with classes at four.’
3  M:  ilnyeney sumvwupento nemkey kanun chwulcangiya. kal
      ‘(He) goes on a business trip more than twenty times a year.
4  taymata kulehkey yunanul tteleyakeysse? (pause)
      Every time should (you) make a fuss?
5  nanun cenyekey yaksoki issese antway.
      l-pronoun have an appointment in the evening, so (I) cannot.’
6  D:  kulem, senmwul cwunphaynonke issusimyen ceyka taysin
      ‘Then, if (you) have prepared a gift, shall I give it (to him)?’
7  cenhaytulilkayo?
8  M:  (pause) nena alase hay. nanun nayka alase haltheynikka.
      ‘(You) mind your own business. l-pronoun will take care of mine.’

[119]

The daughter (D) in (11) above asks her stepmother (M) whether she wants to go to the airport to see off her father later (line 1). She adds that she finishes her class at four (line 2), using the deferential 1sg pronoun ce as 1PS with the topic marker -nun affixed, and expects that M would respond with her own availability. However, M says that she has an appointment in the evening
(line 5) after scolding her for making a fuss about her father’s business trips that are frequent (lines 3 and 4). M uses the plain 1sg pronoun na as 1PS with the topic marker -nun affixed in her utterance, while saying that she has an appointment, which becomes the reason that she is not available for the send-off.

Like the contrastive pairs in (8), (9) and (10), the two contrastive candidates in (11), that is, ce by D and na by M, are not in the same utterance. The contrastiveness is created when the second candidate na is said by M in line 5, which expresses her unavailability contrary to D’s availability (‘I will be finished with classes at four’). The difference of (11) from (8), (9) and (10) is that the predicates of contrastive 1PSs in (11) are not alike. While the contrastive sentences in (8) to (10) are in symmetry, for example, nen kukey mwunceyya ‘You-pronoun have that problem’ and thimcangnimun kukey mwunceypnita ‘You-title have that problem’ in (8), those in (11) are not similar at the sentence level. The contrastiveness in (11) is more indirect than in the previous examples and the pragmatic interpretation of ‘I have an appointment in the evening’ (line 5), namely, ‘I am not available’, becomes contrastive to the pragmatic meaning of the first contrastive utterance ‘I will be finished with classes at four,’ namely, ‘I am available’.

What is noteworthy here is that the overt 1PS na in M’s utterance in line 5 underlines the contrastiveness between herself being unavailable for D’s suggestion and D being available. The utterance with the 1PS unexpressed, that is, cenyeyekey yaksoki issese antway ‘(I) have an appointment in the evening, so (I) cannot’ would make sense on its own. However, considering that she criticised D on making a fuss previously in the utterance and gives an answer that she is unable to go to the airport with D, the use of overt 1PS makes a critical difference. If the 1PS na was not said in this particular context, the degree of contrastiveness would have been much lower as well as the signalling impact of returning to the original question, which is availability to go to the airport, after adding comments on D’s suggestion to go to the airport. Further, M confirms the contrast between the availabilities of herself and D more clearly in her last utterance, by having another overt 1PS na and its implicit contrastive candidate in the imperative: ‘(You) mind your own business, I will take care of mine.’

As noted earlier, explicit contrast in the discourse is created as the discourse proceeds, and there can be more than a pair of contrastive candidates. In the following dialogue in (12), children talk about their preferences for bread and make a series of contrastive utterances in turns:
Speaker A begins the conversation with describing a specific kind of bread he likes (lines 1 and 2). B then says that he wants to eat another kind of bread (line 3), using na as 1PS with -nun affixed. This raises the first contrast between different preferences for bread of A and B, which is implicit as the first candidate 1PS is unexpressed in A’s utterance. After the contrast between two different kinds of bread A and B like is formed, C says that he wants to eat either kind until he feels full (lines 4 and 5), using na as 1PS again with -nun affixed. The use of nanun by C creates the second contrast between the wish for a specific taste and the wish for eating an enormous amount of bread regardless of the kind. A and B agree with C, stating that they also want to have as much bread as possible (lines 6 and 7). Finally, D makes another contrast to the previous utterances, by saying that he can eat like that, namely, as much as he wants (line 8), using na as 1PS affixed with -n. The third contrast occurs between being unable to eat bread and being able to eat bread as much as wanted.

As seen in the example of (12), contrastiveness can develop and extend as discourse carries on because of the characteristic that it requires a candidate. While the forms of contrastive candidates in (12) are identical, that is, na, except the unexpressed 1PS by A in lines 1 and 2, the contrastiveness of each contrastive pair are in different forms. The first contrast is between the unexpressed 1PS in favour of a kind of bread and na in favour of another kind of bread (A versus B). The second contrast is between na having a preference for specific kinds of bread and na wishing to eat any kind of bread until full (A and B versus C). The third contrast appears between na unable to eat bread and na able to eat bread (A, B and C versus D). Each contrast is created when the second candidate in the pair is uttered. The contrastiveness is strengthened.
by the use of overt 1PSs that indicate the speakers’ different statuses or opinions. The utterances without an overt 1PS would be not only unnatural themselves but also less interactive owing to losing contrastiveness. That is, the overt 1PSs in this example function as a powerful indicator of contrast, which is one of the ways to connect utterances in discourse and to display interaction, while multiple speakers express different opinions, preferences or abilities.

To summarise, what I want to highlight from the examples in this section is that contrastiveness can be created through the discourse and that explicit contrast is not always captured in one utterance. The first candidate of explicit contrast is not contrastive itself, but it becomes contrastive when the second candidate is uttered. What is contrasted depends on what the speaker of the second candidate sees as contrastive from the two candidates. In many cases, the contrasted predicates are in the same forms as in ‘You-ne have the problem’ and ‘You-thimcangnim have the problem’ in (8). In other cases, pragmatic meanings of utterances with overt 1PS/2PS contribute to the contrastiveness as in ‘I will be finished with classes at four’ and ‘I have an appointment in the evening’ in (11). While the utterances may look completely irrelevant to each other, the use of overt 1PS in the second utterance is required to create contrastiveness in addition to relevance to the preceding utterance. Namely, overt 1PS/2PS explicitly and tightly connects contrastive utterances that are apart in the discourse regardless of the forms of sentences.

6.4 Overt 1PS and 2PS in Implicit Contrast

In this section, I discuss overt 1PS/2PS in implicit contrast that has definite candidates with one of the candidates unrealised. To be specific, there is an overt 1PS/2PS as a contrastive candidate, and we can enunciate another contrastive candidate in the discourse even though it is not uttered.

For example, in (13), speaker B makes a contrast between herself and her friend, A, with only the 2PS overtly expressed. The two speakers were friends at high school and both were summoned as witnesses for a crime scene. Since speaker A ran away because she was scared,

17 This distinguishes explicit contrast from double contrast that is suggested in the literature (e.g., Travis and Cacoullos (2012)), as noted earlier. While double contrast is defined to have different predicates as well as different subjects, it is possible that two syntactically and/or semantically identical sentences are in explicit contrast as long as the speakers are different. The overt 1PS/2PS in the utterance refers to different referents and the contrastiveness is given to the speakers, so what the utterances mean finally become contrastive. I argue that the definition of explicit contrast in the current research enables us to look at the use of overt 1PS/2PS as contrastive indicators multilaterally whereas double contrast is relatively flat and misses the characteristics of overt 1PS/2PS as reference of active participants in spoken discourse.
B attended the court by herself. They now encounter again at the court after 10 years passed, as this excerpt shows:

(13) 1 A: *akka nollase ceytaylo insato moshayssney.*

‘(I) was surprised earlier and couldn’t say hello properly.

2 *elmamanici wuli?*

How long have we been (not seeing)?’

3 B: *sipnyenmaninka? pepcengeye ponkey macimakinke kathuntye.*

‘Been 10 years? Seeing at the court was probably the last.’

4 *kiekna? kuttay nen pecengmwun apheyse to mangchyeesscanha.*

Do (you) remember? *You-pronoun* ran away in front of the gate to the court.’

5

6 A: *kelayssna?*

‘Did (I)?’

[D6:1095–1100, between two female friends]

B recalls that A ran away from the court in the past (lines 4 and 5), using *ne* as 2PS with the topic marker -*n* affixed. It would become ambiguous who ran away from the court if the 2PS is unexpressed, that is, *kuttay pecengmwun apheyse to mangchyeesscanha*, so B specifies the subject of running away with the overt 2PS. In addition, the topic marker -*n* affixed to *ne* clearly conveys the contrastiveness that the interlocutor ran away while someone else did not.

The context shows that the contrastive candidate of *ne* by B (line 4) is apparently B herself. B pinpoints the fact that A escaped as opposed to herself who did not run away and attended the court with the utterance with *ne*. Although the contrastive candidate of the 2PS *ne* is not realised in (13), it is unambiguously the speaker herself from the shared context. Thus, this can be an example of contrast, and as one of the contrastive candidates is not realised, it is implicit contrast.

Similarly, the overt 1PS *na* in (14) is in implicit contrast, but in this case, there are two contrastive candidates realised. Speaker H talks about herself being inexperienced in relationships, whereas her friends, M and Y, are experienced (lines 10 and 11), while drinking alcohol:

(14) 1 M: *pyenghoka nahanthey ilel swun epsnun keya, ilel swun epsnun keya.*

‘Pyengho can’t do this to me, can’t do this.’

2

3 H: *kunikka, nika elmana pyengholul salanghayssnutey.*

‘That is so. After you loved Pyengho so much.’

(pouring alcohol to M)
Speakers in (14) are drinking alcohol after Miyen (M) has broken up with her boyfriend, Pyengho. Hoceng (H) tries to console M, but Yengun (Y) says that H does not know what love is but pretends to know (line 9). H then admits that she does not know what love is (line 10) and has no experience of crying over a man herself (line 11).

The last utterance by H may seem that it merely describes the subject of not knowing love. However, considering the previous utterance by Y, that is, criticising that H does not know love, and the context that M is crying because her relationship with Pyengho has ended, we can discover that the overt 1PS na in H’s last utterance highlights the contrastiveness between herself and the other two interlocutors. H makes contrast between herself being ignorant of love and her friends being experienced and knowledgeable about love, by using overt 1PS. As the contrastive candidates are not overtly said, for example, nehuy ‘you (pl.),’ we categorise this case as implicit contrast.

The use of na as 1PS in H’s utterance in (14) makes it clear that there is contrastiveness between herself and the other interlocutors as well as that the subject is first person. If the 1PS was unexpressed in the utterance, namely, yenguna, namca ttaymwuney wunceki epsta ‘Yengun, (I) have never cried because of a man’, the meaning would become incomplete because of the absence of the subject of ‘being inexperienced’. Moreover, the speaker’s pragmatic intention to emphasise the contrastiveness between herself and the interlocutors is lost if the overt 1PS is unexpressed.
Let us consider another example of implicit contrast in (15). While the overt 1PS in (14) is used to contrast the speaker’s ignorance and inexperience to the interlocutors’ knowledge and experience, the overt 1PS in (15) is used to confirm the speaker’s understanding of the interlocutor’s intention:

(15) 1 F: silhemsileyse, na cheum tule wassul ttay. nayka cengul mos pwuthinun keya.
   ‘In the lab, when I first came here, I was not really settled.’
  2 M: a!
   ‘Ah!’
  3 F: kulayse, kuken nauy maummekkiy, hayethun, tallyesstako
   sayngkaki tulmyense, hayethun. kulayya silihemo ecom, cal
   toykwu, kunkka silihemsiley olay isskika silhwu, ppalli
   cipeymman oko siphwu, mak, kulayssul ttayka issessnuntey, ku
   ttay han ke katha.
   ‘So, it seemed to be up to my mindset anyway, the experiment
   would go smoothly that way, (I) didn’t like to be in the lab for long
   and wanted to go home early, things were like that some time ago,
   I probably did it back then.’
  4 M: cengul pwuthyeya toynta, ku cengiya?
   ‘Affection as in ‘having (lit. attach) affection towards a thing’?’
  5 F: ung.
   ‘Yes.’
  6 M: a! ani, nan nahanthey cengul cweya toy, (laugh)
   ‘Ah! Well, I-pronoun (understood) (it) as in ‘giving affection to
   me’.’
  7 F: (laugh) cengul cwe.
   ‘(One) gives affection.’

[S7:30–51, between two friends from university]

Speakers in (15) talk about the word ceng ‘affection’ that the female speaker (F) used in her online profile in the past. The male speaker (M) asked about F’s intention to use the word in her profile in the preceding part of the discourse. Speaker F answers that she had a hard time at first in her current job (lines 1 and 2) and tried to have affection towards the work (line 4 to line 8), which is one of the meanings ceng has. After listening to F’s first utterance in (15), M realises (saying ‘Ah!’ in line 3) that he misinterpreted F’s use of the word ceng. He asks to confirm the intended meaning of the word saying ‘Affection as in ‘having affection towards a thing’?’ (line 9) and talks about his different understanding of the word saying ‘affection towards herself’ (line 11), using na as 1PS with the particle -n affixed.

The contrastive candidate of na in M’s utterance is second person, F, whose intention is to mean ‘affection towards her work’ with the word ceng whereas the meaning M initially understood
is ‘affection towards herself’. Although the contrastive candidate is not overtly said in the discourse, the overt 1PS na makes clear contrast between the two different interpretations of the word ceng. This contrastiveness of different interpretations of a word may be more implicit than in the examples of implicit contrast in (13) and (14) where the contrastiveness is on the actions or experiences.

In addition, M does not finish the sentence but laughs, and the verb is unexpressed while it is predictable. We can recover the verb as -tanun cwul alasse ‘understood as’ after nan (na ‘I’ + –n ‘(topic marker)’) ‘I’ and nahanthey cengul cweya toyn- ‘giving affection to me’. Without having the sentence finished with an epistemic verb, the utterance is well comprehended that the speaker had different understanding from what he just confirmed in the previous utterance. It is because the overt 1PS na begins the sentence and signals that the utterance is about the speaker himself and is contrasted to the previous utterance that is about the interlocutor’s intention on using the word ceng. If the overt 1PS is unexpressed, that is, nahanthey cengul cweya toyn- ‘giving affection to me’, the utterance could suggest another meaning of the word ceng, but it would not convey that M’s initial understanding is different from the meaning F intended.

The overt 1PSs in (13), (14) and (15) contribute to the contrast with other referents in the context and the contrastive candidates are implicit in their realisation. What is contrasted in each case varies, but speakers commonly use overt 1PS/2PS to emphasise their contrastive status to other referents. Although the contrastive candidates are not explicitly said, they can be definitely nominated. From the examples in this section, we find that overt 1PS/2PS plays a role in creating contrast even though their contrastive candidates are not explicitly shown in the discourse. By including implicit contrast as contrast in our analysis, we could observe more examples of overt 1PS/2PS functioning as a marker of contrast in discourse.

**6.5 Summary**

I have discussed the aspect of overt 1PS/2PS as an indicator of contrast in our data. Contrast premises a set of candidates that is limited and tangible, as described in the literature (Chafe, 1974; Lambrecht, 1994; Repp, 2010; Umbach, 2004). For our analysis, we only include overt 1PS/2PS that have definite and concrete contrastive candidates to be nominated in the context, whether explicit or implicit. For instance, a sentence like nanun pwuthe ‘I pass’ in (3) has the contrastive feature since the preceding utterance has possible contrastive candidates, for
example, people who fail the exam. The speaker differentiates herself from other test takers, and accordingly, contrast is formed between them. However, it is not enough to be defined as contrast since the set of candidates is indefinite and vague. We left out a kind of contrast, that is, contrast with an unlimited set of candidates, and focused on the contrastive 1PS/2PS with definite candidates.

Contrastive candidates of overt 1PS/2PS are sometimes in the same utterance, and other times, contrastiveness is completed as the discourse proceeds and the counterparts are uttered in a following turn. As long as contrastive candidates are explicitly uttered in the discourse, I categorised the overt 1PS/2PS as in explicit contrast. For example, the contrast between 1PS and 2PS in the utterance taykelleynun nayka haltheynikka nen changmwun takka ‘As for the mop, I will do, so you wipe the window’ in (7) is explicit. It is also possible to have one 1PS/2PS appear first and another 1PS/2PS follow with contrastiveness to the former 1PS/2PS. The example in (9a), nen kukey mwunceyya ‘You-pronoun have that problem’, showed that a speaker uses an overt 2PS to point out that the interlocutor has a problem, and the 2PS is not contrastive as there is no contrastive candidate. The interlocutor then uses an overt 2PS to point out the speaker’s problem, thimcangnimun kukey mwunceypnita ‘You-title have that problem’, which makes contrast with the first overt 2PS. That is, speakers can make contrast between overt 1PS/2PSs by adding contrastive candidates as discourse develops.

From the example in (9), we observe another interesting aspect of overt 1PS/2PS in explicit contrast. Unlike double contrast, explicit contrast includes contrastive utterances with the same predicates. While double contrast is defined to have different subjects and different predicates, I observe that utterances with the same predicates can be also contrastive because the referents of the subjects are different and accordingly the utterances can be contrastive. We need to note that the contrastiveness emerges by the use of overt 1PS/2PS. In fact, overt 1PS/2PS in explicit contrast spotlights the contrastiveness between the utterances as well as the subjects, which disappears or dims when the 1PS/2PS is unexpressed.

However, when an overt 1PS/2PS is contrastive, that is, has a set of candidates that can be specifically and limitedly listed, but the candidate is not explicitly uttered, I categorised the 1PS/2PS as in implicit contrast. The commonality of overt 1PS/2PS in explicit and implicit contrast is that the use of overt 1PS/2PS is critical in the utterance to maintain the contrastiveness. In some cases, overt 1PS/2PS can be unexpressed and the sentence meaning is retained, but the contrastiveness the overt 1PS/2PS accents is lost.
In this chapter, I have discussed contrast being one of the common reasons that speakers choose to use overt 1PS/2PS in spoken Korean discourse. Overt 1PS/2PS that is in contrast has its contrastive candidate(s) in the discourse, but it is also possible to have an implicit candidate. In either case, the overt 1PS/2PS plays a significant role to convey contrastiveness of the utterance. In the following chapters, we discuss other possible functions of overt 1PS/2PS: the role of overt 1PS/2PS in turn/floor changes (Chapter 7) and expressive effects of overt 1PS/2PS (Chapter 8).
Chapter 7. Overt 1PS and 2PS in Discourse Organisation

7.1 Introduction

Not many researchers have considered discourse organisation as one of the main conditions of using overt 1PS/2PS. However, as S. Oh (2007) points out, overt 1PS/2PS appears to play a distinct role in exchanging turns in spoken discourse. Shifts of turns or floors continuously occur in ordinary spoken discourse while the two often overlap, that is, occur simultaneously, or one shifts and the other does not. The current chapter shows how overt 1PS/2PS takes part in discourse organisation by shifts of turn/floor in our corpora.

We will first examine the definitions of turn and floor in discourse analysis and review the literature that discusses overt 1PS/2PS as a marker of turn shift in Section 7.2. We examine the cases of overt 1PS and 2PS from our corpora that occur during taking turn/floor and giving turn/floor in Section 7.3 and Section 7.4, respectively. In Section 7.5, I summarise the discussion in this chapter.

7.2 Turn and Floor in Spoken Discourse

As recognised in several conversation analysis studies (e.g., Duncan, 1972; Goffman, 1955, 1971, 1976, 1981; Edelsky, 1981; Hayashi, 1987, 1991; Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 1968; Yngve, 1970), participants in an ordinary verbal interaction organise the conversation by following certain sets of practices and rules. Among the practices or conventions, ‘one party at a time’ becomes one of the most fundamental rules in conversation analysis (Schegloff, 1968:1076). Based on the rule, speakers exchange turns and continue conversing in any spoken interactions. Yngve (1970) and Goffman (1955) independently suggest the term ‘turn-taking’, which helps us grasp the mechanism of a conversation in which speakers avoid bumping into each other and successfully continue a conversation, as Duncan (1972) reviewed.

Sacks et al. (1974) develop the understanding of turn-taking and introduce a set of rules of turn construction as follows:
1. For any turn, at the initial transition-relevance place of an initial turn-constructional unit:

   a. If the turn-so-far is so constructed as to involve the use of a ‘current speaker selects next’ technique, then the party so selected has the right and is obliged to take next turn to speak; no others have such rights or obligations, and transfer occurs at that place.

   b. If the turn-so-far is so constructed as not to involve the use of a ‘current speaker selects next’ technique, then self-selection for next speakership may, but need not, be instituted; first starter acquires rights to a turn, and transfer occurs at that place.

   c. If the turn-so-far is so constructed as not to involve the use of a ‘current speaker selects next’ technique, then current speaker may, but need not continue, unless another self-selects.

2. If, at the initial transition-relevance place of an initial turn-constructional unit, neither 1a nor 1b has operated, and, following the provision of 1c, current speaker has continued, then the rule-set a-c re-applies at the next transition-relevance place, and recursively at each next transition-relevance place, until transfer is effected. (p. 704)

As Hutchby and Wooffitt (2009:51) note, the turn-taking rules are not something speakers readily have in mind. Rather, it is a natural practice that is ‘learned and tacitly known’ in the process of every ‘talk-in-interaction’. Accordingly, a speaker starting a conversation takes the first turn, and she identifies the next speaker in many different ways, and the turn shifts to him/her. If the first speaker does not make a selection, any speaker can self-select himself/herself and become the next speaker. It is also possible and common that other speakers try to claim their turns while the former speaker is still in her turn, which results in overlapping.

Some scholars (e.g., Edelsky, 1981; Erickson, 1982; Goffman, 1976, 1981; Hayashi, 1987, 1991) elaborate the concept of floor that is interchangeably used with turn in other studies. They consider floor as control over a conversation and characterise it as related to topic. Edelsky (1981:403) particularly defines turn to be an ‘on-record “speaking” (which may include nonverbal activities) behind which lies an intention to convey a message’. Thus, a trivial utterance said to only some participants in the conversation, not to all participants, is not a turn, but a ‘side talk’ in Edelsky’s (1981) definition of turn. Meanwhile, Edelsky (1981:405) sees floor as the ‘acknowledged what’s-going-on within a psychological time/space’. The author argues that ‘what’s going on’ is extension of topic or function, such as ‘what the speaker is talking about’ or ‘the speaker is making a suggestion’.

---

1 The definitions of turn differ by researchers. For example, Sacks et al. (1974) count a turn when the speaker changes, regardless of the length or contents of the utterances, while Duncan (1973) and Edelsky (1981) distinguish a short feedback like mmhm or yeah to be no turn but an ‘encourager’ (Edelsky, 1981:404).
Similarly, Erickson (1982:47) defines floor as a ‘sustained focus of cognitive, verbal, and nonverbal attention and response between speaker and audience’ and Hayashi (1991:2) identifies floor as a ‘competence that is developed in the cognitive space’. In other words, a turn refers to a unit of actual speech that a speaker speaks to other speakers and is heard by the majority of the participants in the conversation. However, a floor, being at a higher level of a conversation, refers to the orientation of a shared psychological awareness of what is being communicated. Thus, as Edelsky (1981) notes, a speaker can take a turn without holding the floor; that is, the second speaker takes a turn of speaking, but the cognitive attention is still towards the first speaker. In this case, the first speaker holds the floor even when not talking.

I highlight that both turn and floor are critical factors to analyse how speakers keep or change the flow of the discourse. More importantly, in the process of managing the flow of the discourse, speakers seem to make use of overt 1PS/2PS to secure the continuation or the shift of turn/floor. It is argued in other pro-drop languages, such as Japanese (e.g., D. Lee & Yonezawa, 2008), Spanish (e.g., Davidson, 1996; Travis & Cacoullos, 2012) and Javanese (e.g., Ewing, 2014) that there is correlation between the occurrence of overt 1PS/2PS and turn/floor shifts. For example, D. Lee and Yonezawa (2008) find examples in their Japanese corpus that a speaker uses overt 1PS to express her commitment to take the floor and overt 2PS to display her intention to hand over the floor. Travis and Cacoullos (2012) also confirm in their quantitative analysis of overtly expressed pronouns in Spanish that the 1sg pronoun yo combined with cognitive verbs appears more frequently in turn shifts than within a speaker turn.

Some Korean linguists (e.g., H. Kim, 1999; S. Oh, 2007) also attempt a similar approach, but their discussions are brief and the range of analysis is limited. For instance, S. Oh (2007) provides an example of the second person pronoun ne used for selecting the next speaker among several participants in the conversation as in (1):

(1) 1 H: *kulehkiyi ke mwe, com swuulul hako ecceko*  
‘Like that, well, we had it repaired, and all’

2 T: (unclear)?

3 H: *eng.*  
‘Yes.’

4 (pause)

5 H: *ne* (pause) *com ettay.*  
‘How are *you-pronoun* feeling?’

6 P: *yevey kwayanchanhayo.* (overlap)  
‘Yes, I’m alright.’
While there are four speakers in the conversation in (1), H, the uncle, asks P, the niece, how she is (line 5), using the plain 2sg pronoun ne as 2PS. Since P answers that she is all right (line 6), H adds that he heard that she is sick (line 7), using ne as 2PS again.

S. Oh (2007) notes that a speaker can select an interlocutor and expect her to respond, with a ‘recipient-referring bare NP,’ that is, reference form for 2PS with no particle affixed. It is a manifest example of overt 2PS that relates its value to giving turn/floor. Nevertheless, as S. Oh (2007) admits, the example in the literature is limited to the 2sg pronoun ne ‘you’ as categorised as a ‘recipient-referring bare NP’. There are many more possible forms for overt 2PS than ne; it is also possible for a second person reference form affixed with a particle to perform the turn-giving function. Moreover, S. Oh (2007) only includes overt 2PS as a turn-giving marker, but I find examples of overt 1PS that marks the speaker’s intention to take a turn. Accordingly, in the current analysis, I include examples of overt 1PS/2PS in any form, whether or not affixed with a particle, that are observed in the course of discourse organisation. While doing so, we will find the interrelationship of the overt 1PS/2PS and the shifts of turn/floor.

The division of the analysis in this chapter is straightforward because of the nature of taking/giving and 1PS/2PS. That is, a speaker claims a turn or the floor by talking about herself and the utterance about the speaker herself involves 1PS. After taking a turn or the floor, the speaker can continue on her speech, namely, take another turn and keep the floor. It is also possible that the speaker gives a turn to another speaker by talking about the person, which involves 2PS. In the process of shifting turn/floor, overt 1PS/2PS contributes to displaying the
intentions of the speakers. Thus, I divide the analysis in the following sections by 1PS and 2PS, which is in accordance with their interactional roles in discourse: taking turn/floor (Section 7.3) and giving turn/floor (Section 7.4), respectively.

7.3 Taking Turn/Floor and Overt 1PS

As outlined in the previous section, shifts of turn or floor continuously occur in a conversation since it is a basic mechanism of discourse organisation. In the instances of turn/floor shifts introduced in this section, overt 1PS is used to signpost the speaker’s intention to take a turn or the floor. Turn-taking or floor-taking can be performed while other speakers are speaking, that is, other speakers taking a turn and/or holding the floor, or when the speaker is currently speaking but wants to keep the turn/floor.

As a good example of taking a turn using overt 1PS, let us see the following excerpt in (2). It is a phone conversation between a girlfriend and her boyfriend, and the girlfriend begins the conversation by taking the first turn with overt 1PS:

(2) 1 G: ung, cakiya, na hapkyehaysse! ciaynuuylu!
‘Yes, Honey, I-pronoun passed! The GN Fashion!
2 twuko pwa. nato yeki chengtamtongysey syap nayko,
3 sengkonghako, kuliko yekise sal keya.
‘Watch me. I will also have a shop here at Chengtamton, succeed and live here.’

[D3:123–128, a girlfriend to her boyfriend on the phone]

The girlfriend (G) begins her first utterance in (2) with ung ‘yes’ (the plain form of yey ‘yes’) in a phone conversation with her boyfriend. She then says caki ‘you’ with the vocative particle -ya that conveys informality and intimacy when attached to address terms while the addressee is younger or peer (S. Hwang, 1991; J. Park, 1997; S. Yoo, 2001). By attracting the interlocutor’s attention to her by addressing him as cakiya, that is, making him listen, G says that she passed the recruitment process of ciayneylyu ‘GN Fashion’, using na as overt 1PS

---

2 Many speakers directly begin their phone conversation since they have the technology that displays caller information on their phone nowadays, unless the speakers do not have each other’s private phone numbers. Thus, instead of recognising the caller, speakers start a phone conversation by acknowledging that they answered the call with ‘yes’ or by addressing the caller immediately. We discover more implications of this change in this section. See Hutchby and Barnett (2005) for a comprehensive analysis of mobile phone conversations.
1) and that she wants to open a shop (line 2) and settle in the suburb, a well-known fashion
district in Seoul (line 3).

Although the interlocutor is not introduced in the discourse yet, the utterance of na hapkyekhaysse ‘I passed’ in (2) becomes a turn-taking act since it opens a conversation. The utterance not only makes the first turn in the dialogue but also forms the floor that the speaker talks about herself, namely, the success in getting a job and resolution to be even more successful in her career. The use of overt 1PS na here makes sure that the speaker intends to talk about herself in addition to clarifying the subject of ‘passing the recruitment process’. It would be possible that the speaker uses nonverbal signs such as pointing at herself instead of saying na ‘I’ and that the verbal speech of hapkyekhaysse ‘passed’ perfectly makes sense if the conversation occurs in person. Even in a phone conversation, the utterance with the 1PS unexpressed could be said and communicated where both speakers share the contextual understanding that G has been through the recruitment process and has waited for the results. However, the use of na in (2), clearly indicates the speaker’s initiative to lead the phone conversation by taking a turn to begin the discourse and directing the flow of the discourse towards herself.

Beginning a dialogue with overt 1PS can be prototypical in a phone conversation as in (2), because of the characteristics of a phone conversation. As Schegloff (1997) notes, there are fewer contextual cues about who are participating in the discourse, compared with a face-to-face interaction, and a phone conversation tends to begin with identifying and recognising the speakers. When speakers identify themselves, they often use overt 1PS as S. Oh (2007) discusses with the following example in (3):

(3) 1 M: yey kamsahapnita cengpo sisutheym Kimmyengswuipnita?
    ‘Yes, thank you, this is Kimmyengswu at the Information
    System Department.’

   2 T: (laugh) ung, na apeciya.
    ‘Yeah, this is your father.’

   3 M: yey.
    ‘Yes’.

(p. 476, (8) [Father & Son]; transcription simplified)

The two speakers in (3) above are a father and a son. The father (T) calls his son at his work, so he knows who his interlocutor is going to be. The son (M) answers the phone, introducing
himself with his name and his department (line 1), as a protocol to receive a phone call at his work. T then says that he is M’s father (line 2). S. Oh (2007) reminds that only the caller uses the overt 1PS *na* in the self-introduction when both speakers identify themselves. When using overt 1PS in a phone conversation, the caller is likely to call the interlocutor’s attention to his/her existence or identity, according to S. Oh (2007). This is a valid explanation of the occurrence of overt 1PS for the identification of the caller in phone conversations, but it limits the analysis to fewer instances.

As discussed, speakers use overt 1PS to take the floor in the discourse in addition to identifying themselves in a phone conversation. Moreover, the caller identification sequence is disappearing in personal phone conversations as in (2), owing to the development of technology. Speakers nowadays have the service of caller information display and do not answer the phone by asking who is calling and do not make a call by introducing themselves. Instead, as the speaker directly goes into her point in (2), they immediately begin the conversation without the protocol of identification and recognition. I claim this use of overt 1PS to be the ‘confirmation of floor holder’ in a phone conversation.³ Strictly speaking, the utterance of G in (2) does not identify the speaker, so the overt 1PS *na* in the utterance differs from *na* in (3). Nevertheless, it certainly signals the beginning of the discourse with overt 1PS and calls the interlocutor’s attention to the speaker’s status.

As we can easily anticipate, the confirmation of floor holder does not occur only in the beginning of a phone conversation. Speakers in a phone conversation use overt 1PS to take a turn and/or the floor in the middle of the discourse. Let us consider an interesting example of taking a turn and the floor, which is ensured by the use of overt 1PS while two friends talk on the phone:

(4)  
1 O: *tekseng yeca tayhakey. e, kyoyang kwacengpwuey*  
   ‘Tekseng Women’s University. Yeah, at the School of Liberal Arts.’

2 Y: ye.  
   ‘Yes.’

3 O: *ku kyoyang kwacengpwuey kulyay sayngmwlhak kulyay nwasse.*  
   ‘At the School of Liberal Arts, (they) said biology.’

³ This confirmation of floor holder takes place when the speaker attempts to give the floor to second person using overt 2PS and we will see the examples in Section 7.4.
The younger speaker (Y) who recently finished his PhD in an American university is talking on the phone with O who is an older friend. After finding a newspaper advertisement for a lecturer position at a university in Korea, O describes the position to Y (lines 1 and 2). Y listens and responds with yey ‘yes’ in line 2 and says molukeysseyo ‘(I) don’t know’ in line 4. O continues that the university looks fine as it is located in Seoul (lines 5 and 6). Until line 6, O holds the floor trying to provide information on a job opportunity for Y, and Y responds with yey ‘yes’ one more time in line 7.

Considering the overlap that Y makes in line 9 while O attempts to continue speaking (line 8), Y might have intended to keep saying something in his previous turn in line 7. As O tries to continue speaking with ku ‘that’ (line 8), Y interrupts with the overt 1PS na ‘I’ and indicates that he wants to take a turn. He actually repeats what he said in line 6, that is, that he does not know’, so his utterance in line 9 does not deliver new information. Rather, by repeating the
overt 1PS *na* in the utterance, he makes it clear that he wants to say something in what follows. He then adds his concerns that it takes time even if he goes to another university (lines 10 and 11). While O confirms Y’s statement by taking two turns to ask *kulay* ‘Is that so?’ (line 12) and *palo mos kanun keya* ‘Can you not go right away?’ (line 14), Y remains the floor holder and continues to talk about his status and the conditions to move to another university (lines 15 and 16).

What is noteworthy in this conversation in (4) is that the use of *na* for saying ‘I don’t know’ strongly supports the speaker in taking the floor. Y says *molukyeseyo* ‘(I) don’t know’ once in line 4 and says *nanun molukyeseyo* ‘I don’t know’ one more time in line 9. Both utterances show Y’s uncertainty about the job opportunity that O mentions in the discourse. When Y first says *molukyeseyo*, it is more likely an instant response to O bringing up the topic than a genuine intention to take the floor. It is proved in the subsequent utterances by O (lines 5 and 6), in which Y lets O speak and responds with *yey* ‘yes’ (line 7). Conversely, when he says *nanun molukyeseyo* ‘I don’t know’ in line 9, Y interrupts O who is beginning a sentence (line 8)\(^4\) and continues giving his opinion on O’s suggestion (lines 10 and 11). That is, the use of *na* ‘I’ in line 9 shows the speaker’s intention to take the floor while the same utterance without *na* in line 4 was rather weak in terms of expressing the initiative to lead the discourse. It would be possible to take the floor if there is no overt 1PS in line 9, but the use of overt 1PS *na* clearly shows the speaker’s intention that now ‘*na*’ wishes to speak, in conjunction with the overlap.

Another example of using overt 1PS for taking a turn and the floor in a phone conversation is shown as follows. What is different from (4) is that the speaker of overt 1PS in (5) tries to secure the floor while she is already holding the floor in the discourse:

\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{(5)} & 1 \quad \text{O:} \\
& \quad \text{kulehyo, ipeney kuloseli, cakun kuloseli khun kuloseli hayethun} \\
& \quad \text{kuloselitulun caymilul pwasstaycanhayo, nwun wa kacko.}
\end{array}\]

‘That is so, grocery stores, whether small grocery stores or big grocery stores, all grocery stores have been benefited because of the snow this time.’

\[\begin{array}{ll}
& 3 \quad \text{Y:} \\
& \quad \text{e.}
\end{array}\]

\(^4\) In the use of the term ‘interruption,’ I do not intend to differentiate it from ‘overlap,’ which is distinguished by Sacks et al. (1974). The authors claim that ‘overlap’ occurs when speakers simultaneously speak by accident whereas ‘interruption’ is done on purpose when the second speaker begins her turn on during the first speaker’s turn. However, as discussed in some studies (e.g., Bennett, 1981; Lim, 2001; S. Kang, 2017; W. P. Lee, 1999), it is sometimes ambiguous to tell whether the first utterance is interrupted by the second or the first utterance just discontinues when the second begins. In the current analysis, I use ‘interruption’ to emphasise the speaker’s intention to interrupt and ‘overlap’ to simply describe that the co-occurrence of two utterances by different speakers.
‘Oh.’

4 O: salamtuli kunyang kuloseliman manhi sata nohko mekko kulaykac (overlap)
‘People just bought a lot of groceries and ate’

5 Y: (overlap) yey.
‘Yes.’

6 O: kuloselitulun caymi pokon talun picinisunun ta sullowuko.
‘Only grocery stores have been benefited and other businesses have been all slow.’

7 Y: ku yeychukul mos hayssten salamun acwu himtulesskeyssneyyo, cinaykika.
‘Someone who couldn’t predict it must have been hard to live.’

8 O: yey, kulaykacko, ceneun talkyali ttelecyessessketunyo. wenak talkyalul cal an mekkin hanuney.
‘Yes, so, I ran out of eggs. (I) don’t eat eggs much normally, though’

9 Y: yey. (laugh)
‘Yes.’

10 O: talkyali ttelecyessnuney il cwuil tongan talkyalul mos sasseyo.
‘(I) was out of eggs, but couldn’t get eggs for a week.’

11 Y: yey.
‘Yes.’

[CF5:56–77, between two female friends with age difference]

The older speaker (O) complains that only local grocery stores in her city have been benefited from the recent heavy snow (lines 1 and 2) since people bought more groceries to store them (lines 4 and 5). The younger speaker (Y) responds with e ‘oh’ (line 3) and yey ‘yes’ (line 6) until she adds some comments that people who could not predict would have experienced hardship (lines 8 and 9). Then, O responds with yey ‘yes’ and continues her utterance saying ceneun talkyali ttelecyessessketunyo ‘I ran out of eggs’ (line 10). Between ‘yes’ and ‘I ran out of eggs’, she says kulaykacko ‘so’ and connects this utterance to her previous utterances.

Speaker O could have planned to say that she was out of eggs from the beginning of the conversation and started the conversation with the background information about the impact of the heavy snow on the local businesses and people stocking up on groceries. Alternatively, she could have just come up with herself running out of eggs as an example of people affected by the bad weather. In either case, O has held the floor from the first utterance in (5) talking about the weather and its impact. When Y attempts to extend the discussion by adding her comment (lines 8 and 9), O shows her intention to continue her speech on the consequence of the situation.
described, by saying *kulaykacko* ‘so’. She then keeps the floor by talking about her experience of running out of eggs.

In the utterance of *cenun talkyali ttelecyessessketunyo* ‘I ran out of eggs’ (line 10), the speaker uses the overt 1PS *ce* with the topic marker -*nun* affixed, which could be unexpressed and would not cause misunderstanding or ambiguity of the utterance. By saying *cenun* in this utterance, the speaker signals that the topic is being narrowed down from the overall impact of the heavy snow to her personal experience. In addition, the overt 1PS indicates the speaker’s intention to maintain the floor and to give a relevant personal example of what has been described, namely, ‘I’ wish to talk about what ‘I’ experienced, along with the connective *kulaykacko* ‘so’.

Now, let us consider examples from face-to-face conversations. In terms of taking a turn and/or the floor, the pattern of using overt 1PS appears to be similar to phone conversations. Speakers take a turn with overt 1PS, and this explicitly indicates their intention to take the floor in many cases. The overt 1PS may be unexpressed in the utterance without changing or losing the meaning of the utterance. It can be observed that speakers deliberately use overt 1PS from a pragmatic motivation, which I interpret as an expression of the intention to take or keep the floor. A speaker in the following conversation gives an exemplary use of overt 1PS in taking the floor:

(6) 1 M: *ku yekkyengul yupwunyeka molla cwumyen ettekhalan maliya.*
    ‘What should (I) do if a married woman doesn’t understand the hardship?’

2 F1: *kuntey nanun cincca pyello silkami an nanta,*
    ‘By the way, *I-pronoun* don’t feel like it’s real.’

3 F2: *wenlay silkam an na.*
    ‘(It) normally doesn’t feel real.’

4 F1: *cal molukeysse. kuntey tatul kulehkey yaykihatela, ayna com ayna nahayaci.*
    ‘(I) don’t know. But, people say so, only if you have a baby,’

5

6 F2: *e, ay nahato silkam an na.*
    ‘Oh, (it) doesn’t feel real even after having a baby.’

[S15:118–125, among three friends, one male and two females]

---

5 As a discourse marker, *kulaykaciko* (a shortened and colloquial form of *kulaykaciko*) connects a precedent and antecedent utterance with the relation of cause and effect (S. Kang, 2005; E. Kim, 2015). Moreover, as E. Kim (2015) notes, it can be used as a signal to express the speaker’s intention to provide relevant information to the previous utterance.
Three speakers in (6) above are friends and gathered to congratulate a female speaker (F1) who recently married. They talk about the changes they experience after marriage, and the male speaker (M) just described the hardship he faced in his marriage in the preceding part of the discourse. Since other speakers have not shown agreement with his difficulties, M complains that a married woman (i.e., his female friends in the dialogue) does not understand his hardship (line 1). F1 then says that she does not feel real about being married (line 2), using na as an overt 1PS. F2 responds to F1 that it is normal to feel unreal (line 3). F1 continues that people say they feel real about their marriage when they have a baby (lines 4 and 5), and F2 responds again that it does not feel real even after they have a baby (line 6). The conversation goes on with the topic of feeling real about marriage in the subsequent part of the discourse in (6).

With the utterance of kuntey nanun cincca pyello silkami an nanta ‘By the way, I don’t feel like it’s real’ in line 2, F1 changes the topic of the discourse from ‘having difficulties in marriage’ to ‘feeling real about marriage’. Further, she changes the floor holder, and certainly the turn taker as well, of the discourse from M to herself. Before she begins the utterance describing her feelings, F1 inserts the conjunctive kuntey ‘by the way’ between the previous utterance by M and her own utterance. The conjunctive kuntey actually ends the previous flow of the discourse and creates a new current in the discourse. The overt 1PS na ‘I’ then displays who is going to lead the new flow.

Again, na in F1’s utterance in line 2 is not necessary in defining the subject of the predicate ‘feeling unreal about the marriage’. A predicate describing emotion like silkamnata ‘to feel real’ is normally used for first person in a declarative sentence by its nature that only one can express one’s feeling.\(^6\) Thus, subjects of emotion verbs are often unexpressed since these are obviously first person unless there is a quotation marker or question marker. The subject of the utterance is recognised as first person even if the subject is unexpressed. The use of overt 1PS in the utterance despite its redundancy in the sentence meaning makes it clearer that the floor

---

\(^6\) When a speaker asks, assumes or quotes someone else’s feelings, including second person, there are certain grammatical markers in Korean, such as assumptive or quotative particles affixed to the predicate. For instance, the suffix -tay is attached to the predicate for quoting third person’s utterances (S. Chae, 2015; S. Ko, 2008). When a speaker assumes how other person would feel, a predicate of feelings is used with the infix -keyss-. (D. Im, 2001; S. Ko, 2008; M. Koo and Lehmann, 2010). If a speaker asks someone else’s feelings, she makes a question with a rising intonation at the end of the utterance. For assumed questions or quotative questions, both the affixation of a particle and rising intonation are used.
of the discourse shifts to F1 because it evidently presents about whom the following utterance is going to be.

As the last example of overt 1PS that signals the speaker’s intention to take the floor, the conversation in (7) is different from other examples thus far in that the speakers are having a discussion on a topic. While four friends with age difference have discussion on the university culture, each speaker tries to take the floor by talking about their own experience and opinion. Interestingly, the occurrences of turn-taking with overt 1PS and overlap in (7) are much more frequent than other conversations in this section:

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S1:</td>
<td>ceytayhako nanikka,</td>
<td>‘After discharged from the military service,’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S2:</td>
<td>(unclear) kwunkika ppacyesse, (unclear)</td>
<td>‘Lost the military discipline,’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S1:</td>
<td>ceytay, ceytayhaki, kwuntay tulekal taymun, ung, (overlap)</td>
<td>‘Discharged, discharged, when beginning the military service,’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>J1:</td>
<td>(overlap) natwu tayhak mwunhwa (overlap)</td>
<td>‘-pronoun also (think) the university culture’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>S1:</td>
<td>(overlap) (unclear) haykin haysscimanun, ceytayhako nase,</td>
<td>‘Although did so, after discharged,’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>J1:</td>
<td>kulay kackwu, cenum solcikhi wa kackwu, uytocekulwu kyeysok phissipangal an kassesseyo. (pause) kunyang camkkan kato, kkeyim an hako, amwuthun.</td>
<td>‘So, frankly, -pronoun came out and intentionally kept not going to the internet cafe. Even if just stopped by, no games, anyway.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>J2:</td>
<td>yeca aytulul cwuchwukulo, neka kulaysscanha, (laugh) cinhuyka (unclear) aytuli (unclear) nikka, (laugh) namca aytuli ohily, (unclear) kaci (unclear) mallakwu nolkeya, ‘But, but, you-pronoun said that Cinhuy said girls are (unclear), so boys stopped (unclear) from going and played,’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>J1:</td>
<td>cenum cham wuskin key, icy cincca, (unclear) khaymphesu (unclear)uy cengcheysensi wancenhi epsecye pelin ke kathayyo. kunikkkan thukhi (overlap) ‘-pronoun find it funny that, now really, the identity of campus seems to have completely disappeared. That is, especially,’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>S1:</td>
<td>(overlap) kulen, kulen yaykinun,</td>
<td>‘That, that kind of talk,’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>S2:</td>
<td>(unclear) kwanchalhan ke kathay. ung,</td>
<td>‘It is likely to observe (unclear). Yes,’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>S1:</td>
<td>ku yaykinun, kulehci, kunikka, (laugh) ceytayhako nase, (laugh) ceytay, ku, yeypiyektuli, cwulo hanun yaykika mwenyamyen, nukkyecinun kes cwungey hanaka, wa, cincca, manhi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘That means, so, that is, after discharged from the army, discharged, what the discharged usually say is that things have changed a lot, wow, really, yes, that is, ah, it is different from the past. The way of using words, vocabularies were also different. The, right’

’ve really, because I go to the internet cafe every day after discharged from the military service,’

‘Ah, right, right.’

‘When I first entered (the university), when I just got in,’

There are four male speakers in (7): two seniors (S1 and S2) and two juniors (J1 and J2) at university. When given the university culture as the topic of discussion, each speaker tries to take a turn to speak about the changes in the university culture that they have experienced since discharge from the military service. They keep interrupting while other speakers are speaking, and some of the overlaps include utterances with overt 1PS that introduces the speaker’s personal opinion or experience.

The first attempt of floor-taking with overt 1PS is by J1 (line 4) where he interrupts S1 who appears to be the current floor holder, using the plain 1sg pronoun na. Before J1 finishes his utterance with a predicate in line 4, S1 interrupts J1 and continues his turn from line 3 (line 5), that is, keeps the floor, talking about the experience of serving in the army. After failing in his first attempt to take the floor, J1 attempts again in line 6, saying kulay kackwu, cenun solcikhi wa kackwu ‘So, honestly, I came out (of the army) and’, using the deferential 1sg pronoun ce as overt 1PS. This time he is not interrupted and continues, saying that he did not go to the internet cafe (lines 6 to 8). J2 takes the next turn and recalls an event that occurred among the

---

7 Although the overt 1PS is said in this utterance, the predicate is not uttered, so I excluded this kind of instance, i.e., an overt 1PS/2PS with no predicate expressed, from the count of overt subject in the distribution analysis in chapter 5.
friends in the past (lines 9 to 12). Yet, this is more likely to support J1’s utterance in lines 6 to 8 rather than to take the floor himself, because it explains the reason J1 did not go to the internet cafe. The following turn by J1 seems to prove that the floor is still held by J1 after the utterance of speaker J2 in lines 9 to 12. That is, J1 develops the discussion from his own experience of not going to the internet cafe to the general tendency of the university culture (lines 13 to 15), using ce as overt 1PS again.

While J1 tries to keep the floor by generalising the university culture, S1 interrupts him by saying kulen yaykinun ‘That kind of talk’ in line 16, and S2 adds his comment in line 17, which supports S1’s judgement on J1’s utterance. S1 then takes the floor back and talks about the changes they experience after discharge from the army (lines 18 to 24). After a long description by S1, J2 takes a turn and says that he goes to the internet cafe every day after discharge from the army (lines 25 and 26), using na as 1PS. S2 agrees with J2, using mace ‘Right’ (line 27). S1 takes the floor again and recalls the time when he entered the university (lines 28 and 29). In his utterance, S1 repeats the same clauses ‘when I entered the university’, using na as overt 1PS in both clauses. It seems that the first clause is said hastily to take a turn and the floor and that the second clause repeats the first to actually begin the story after confirming that he is not interrupted but given the floor.

The discourse in (7) displays consecutive occurrences of floor-taking that accompany overt 1PS. All of the overt 1PSs in (7), namely, na by J1 (line 4), ce by J1 (lines 6 and 13), na by J2 (line 25) and na by S1 (line 28), are not mandatory to keep the meaning of the utterances. Instead, they are all used to spotlight the speakers themselves as turn-takers. Some of them (e.g., ce by J1 in lines 6 and 13) are successful in floor-taking since the speaker of the overt 1PS could hold the floor and have the focus of the discourse on themselves, whereas others (e.g., na by J1 in line 4) fail to take the floor and only take the turn. Such competitive pursuit for taking or holding the floor can be observed since the discourse in (7) is a discussion with a topic provided.

---

8 J2’s utterance in line 9 to 12 does not show overlap, but in terms of turn-taking, it is an interruption as the former speaker has not finished his speech on his experience. The interruption can be seen as a ‘rapport type interruption’ (Goldberg, 1990), ‘favourable intervention’ and specifically ‘co-construction’ of discourse (W. P. Lee, 1999). That is, J2 takes a turn to add relevant examples or supporting ideas to the current flow of the discourse, rather than to actively lead the floor.

9 Lim (2001) actually categorises this kind of interruption as a ‘floor-taking’ interruption. In this case, a speaker interrupts another speaker who says something incoherent in the discourse or speaks too long. Through the interruption, the speaker ends the first speaker’s turn and takes the floor, as S1 took the floor from J1 in (7).

10 This is another example of a ‘favourable interruption’ (Bennett, 1981) and ‘co-construction’ of discourse (W. P. Lee, 1999) as J2’s utterance in line 9 to 12.
A discussion is supposed to be a field for showing the speakers’ opinions, so turn-taking and floor-taking seem to appear more frequently and aggressively than in other private discourse (S. Kang, 2017). I also argue that in the cultural context of Korea and the application of politeness in the linguistic strategy, discussions among participants of a similar age can be even more aggressive than among participants with a larger age difference, because the speakers tend to avoid arguing against older interlocutors.\textsuperscript{11}

Another distinctive aspect of the discourse in (7) is that the floor-taking attempts and the use of overt 1PS reflect the collocutors’ relationship. The most frequent use of overt 1PS for floor-taking is endeavoured by J1, who is one of the juniors in the discourse. While the senior speakers, S1 and S2, take a turn and the floor without using overt 1PS except when S1 uses na in line 28, the junior speakers, J1 and J2, tend to use overt 1PS on almost every attempt of turn/floor-taking. It might be interpreted that a younger speaker needs to give a sign to participate in a talk with speakers of different ages, while an older speaker can take the floor without notifying the interlocutors. The interpretation needs to be confirmed with more examples and further analysis, but it yields an idea of examining the use of overt 1PS/2PS in discourse organisation in relation to the politeness or sociocultural context.

The consideration of age in using overt 1PS as an indicator of floor-taking is also found in the choice of the 1sg pronoun in (7). The junior speakers choose na and ce in the discourse where the interlocutors include both a same-aged friend and seniors. By choosing the plain form na, the juniors show that they take a turn but do not intend to take the floor of the entire discourse.\textsuperscript{12} J1 in line 4 talks to his friend, J2, using na, and the utterance is actually not responded and is overlapped by S1. J2 in line 25 also talks to his friend, J1, using na as 1PS although his senior S2 agrees with him in the following turn. When J1 tries to take the floor of the discourse and have all collocutors as audience, including the seniors, he uses the deferential form ce as 1PS.

We have seen examples of overt 1PS used as an indicator of floor-taking and/or turn-taking in this section. Speakers use overt 1PS to take the floor in face-to-face interactions as well as in

\textsuperscript{11} There are few studies that investigate the relation between the frequency of turn-takings and speakers’ relative age. Pattrawut (2014) finds that native speakers of Thai use a lot less turn-takings in arguments with their teachers, whereas native speakers of English use more turn-takings while disagreeing with their teachers. The author analyses the result that the speakers from different culture have different politeness strategies in the same context, and the strategies can be realised through the frequency and activeness of turn-takings.

\textsuperscript{12} As reviewed in 7.2, a floor refers to a shared awareness of what is being communicated in the discourse. Thus, although a turn is heard by all collocutors, it does not mean that the turn-taker takes the floor.
phone conversations. Speakers sometimes take a turn by overlapping the interlocutor’s utterance; overt 1PS is often observed in the process of turn-taking and stressing the intention to take the floor as well. Overt 1PS is also used to narrow down the discourse to the speaker herself from background discourse. When multiple speakers discuss a topic, turn-taking using overt 1PS occurs more frequently than in other cases, such as one-to-one conversations or private talks.

7.4 Giving Turn/Floor and Overt 2PS

In this section, I introduce examples of overt 2PS used for giving turn/floor in our data. Similar to the cases of overt 1PS, speakers make use of overt 2PS as an explicit signal of giving a turn to their interlocutor or changing the floor holder from themselves or another speaker in the discourse to a particular participant.

Let us consider the excerpt in (8), which shows a simple and clear example of using overt 2PS as a marker of giving turn and floor. As seen in the example in (1) that S. Oh (2007) analyses, the overt 2PS used in giving a turn has the form of ‘bare NP’ in (8). While speakers are talking about an event that just occurred, the speaker of overt 2PS asks a question to another speaker, *ne akka way kulenkeya* ‘Why did you do that a little while ago?’ as follows:

(8) 1 M: *mwenya, ikey?* (breath) *ueyk.*
    ‘What is this? Eww.’

    2 F: *aseythoniya. pontu mwutunke ikello ciwe.*
    ‘It is acetone. Remove the glue on (you) with this.’

    3 M: *ikello pontuka ciwecye?*
    ‘Glue is removed with this?’

    4 F: *e. kuntey, pakswaha. ne akka way kulenkeya? way ssangkho nollinunke cholul chye?*
    ‘Yes. By the way, Pak Swuha. Why did you interrupt on bullying Ssangkho?’

    5 M: *ssangkho nollinunkeyesse? nan mollassmuntey.*
    ‘Was (it) bullying Ssangkho? I didn’t know.’

    6 F: *ppengchisiney. alko kulenkecanha.*
    ‘(You) are lying. (You) knew and did that.’

    7 M: *mollasstanikka. e? cincca ciweciney?*
    ‘(I) didn’t know, (I) said. Oh, (it) is really removed, isn’t (it)?’

[D5:172–183, between two high school students]
Two classmates, one male (M) and one female (F), talk about an event that just happened in their classroom in (8). M helped a classmate who was being bullied by other classmates and had glue on himself during the event. F gives M acetone that she uses for removing nail colour and says that it removes glue (line 2). M reconfirms whether glue is removed by acetone (line 3), and F says ‘yes’. She then changes the topic of the conversation to the reason M helped the classmate, Ssangkho, by asking ne akka way kulenkeya ‘Why did you do that a little while ago?’ (line 4). F also specifies the question by adding ‘Why did (you) interrupt on bullying Ssangkho?’ M pretends that he did not mean to help Ssangkho, saying nan mollasnuntey ‘I didn’t know (that they were bullying Ssangkho)’ (line 6), but F does not believe it (line 7). M confirms that he did not know and then tries to attract F’s attention to the acetone and glue, by saying that the glue is really removed by acetone (line 8).

There is tension between M and F in (8) that F tries to give the floor as well as a turn to M and M tries to refuse it. In the question asking why M interrupted his classmates bullying Ssangkho, F adds a ‘redundant’ overt 2PS ne (line 4), which we found in the examples of overt 1PS in the previous section that could be unexpressed without changing the meanings of the utterances. Instead, ne in the question of F conveys a pragmatic meaning, such as blaming or confirming M’s responsibility, by explicitly addressing him. Further, it is clear that F attempts to give not only a turn but also the floor to M using ne, considering the use of kuntey ‘by the way’ as well as drawing M’s attention by addressing him with his name, Pak Swuha (line 4), with which she indicates her intention to change the flow of the conversation. In response to her attempt to give the floor to him, M takes the floor, saying nan mollasnuntey ‘I didn’t know’ (line 6). The use of overt 1PS in his utterance can be evidence that he now holds the floor.

The overt 2PS ne in (8) can be another supporting example of Oh’s (2007) argument that a bare NP is used to select the next speaker in discourse. However, as discussed earlier, I find further examples of overt 2PS that indicate the speaker’s intention to pass on the turn/floor even if the overt 2PS is not a bare NP but has a particle suffixed to it. Each particle performs its own semantic function, but at a discourse level, the NP suffixed with a particle can also play a role

---

13 We further discuss the cases of overt 1PS/2PS used for indexing speakers as the subject of being responsible or praiseworthy in Chapter 8.

14 Previous studies (e.g., H. Kim, 1999; W. Kim, 1999; S. Oh, 2007) focus on the semantic functions of particles affixed to overt 1PS/2PS in the analysis of pragmatic meaning of them. For instance, the topic marker -(n)unj is affixed to overt 1PS/2PS and creates a contrastive relation between referents, and the subject marker -i/ka is affixed to overt 1PS/2PS and makes a meaning of attributing responsibilities (S. Oh, 2007).
as an indicator of giving turn/floor. In addition, we observe various referential choices for overt 2PS from our corpora, which the literature lacks. For example, a speaker in (9) uses a kinship term, apeci ‘father’, as overt 2PS when he gives a turn and the floor to his father with the topic marker -(n)un affixed to it:

(9)  
1 F: mwehale wasenun, myech sikanul mwusun kosayngiya?  
   ‘Why did (you) come and get into this hardship for hours?’
2 S: apecin i menteyse cipey ettehkey olyeko saypyek neysikkaci ilul hayyo?  
   ‘How would you-kin term come home after working this far?’
3 F: samsippwunman kitalimyen ches cha tanil ke anya.  
   ‘The first bus in the morning runs if (I) wait only thirty minutes.’
4 S: tangcang kwantwuseyyo. kuke hal cis mostwayyo.  
   ‘Quit immediately. That is not something to do.’
5 F: (pause) nen kutongan cipey ettehkey kasse? panghakmata tayli alpahaysstamyense.  
   ‘How did you-pronoun go home for that time? (You) have done the part-time chauffeur for every break, (I) heard.’
6 S: cip kunche khol kitalyessta kasscyo.  
   ‘(I) waited for a call going near home and went.’

[D10:764–773, between a father and a son]

The son (S) came to the place where his father (F) works at late night. F says that S should not have come and helped him for such long hours since it is hard work to do (line 1). S then asks how F has come back home after finishing work at four in the morning when there is no public transportation, using apecin (‘father’ + the topic marker -n) as 2PS (lines 2 and 3). F answers that he waited for the first bus in the morning (line 4), and S asks him to quit the job immediately since the work is too hard (line 5). F then takes a pause and asks how S has come back home while he works as a tayli (‘lit. deputy; substitute’) ‘chauffeur’ during night hours, using nen (ne + the topic marker -n) as 2PS (lines 6 and 7). After answering his son’s question, during the pause, F is likely to realise that his son has been in the same situation, that is, finishing work late and having no public transportation to return home, and gives S a turn and the floor to talk about himself.

The use of overt 2PS with the topic marker -(n)un by the two speakers, namely, apecin by S (line 2) and nen by F (line 6), makes explicit contrast as we discussed in Chapter 6. Not only do apecin and nen in (9) create contrastiveness, but also explicitly mark that the speaker wants the other to take a turn and talk about himself. When asked to take the floor and a turn, both F
and S respond with their answers (lines 4 and 8, respectively), so the attempts of turn/floor-giving are successful in (9). It is also notable that the kinship term apeci is used as overt 2PS to give turn/floor as well as the pronoun ne. Reference to second person always reflects the social relationship between speakers, more specifically than reference to first person because 2PS directly points at the interlocutor. That is, the expression of 2PS can perform multiple functions at multiple levels, such as expressing semantic roles of the subject along with affixed particles at a sentence level, indicating turn/floor-giving at a discourse level and revealing social relationships and pragmatic intentions at a pragmatic level.

Another example of using a kinship term as overt 2PS in giving floor/turn is shown in (10). Unlike in (9), the overt 2PS is affixed with the particle -to ‘also’ that displays shared aspects between different entities.\(^{15}\) The conversation is among a family, including a grandmother, father, mother and two sons, but only the utterances of two speakers, the father and the eldest son, appear in (10). While being criticised by his grandmother that he is too selective in his choice of a wife, the son (S) makes excuses and asks for agreement from his father (F), using apeci as 2PS. This time, the attempt to give turn/floor fails, since F remains silent after he is asked to agree:

\[(10)\]

1  S:  halmeni, ce cincca inmwul kulehkey anttacyeyo. kunyang kiponman toymyen toynuntey. ‘Grandma, I am not really fussy about appearance. (I) am okay if (she) is just average.’

2  apecito kukan asicanhayo, wuli namcatulun sikakcek nukkimi cwungyohanke? (To father) You-kin term too know that we men take visual impression seriously, don’t (you)?

3  (silence)

4  S:  kulaytwa ayto nahko phyengsayng kathi sal salamintey cheum ttak pwassul ttay choysohan kiponun twayya (overlap) ‘(She) needs to be at least average at first sight as (I) am going to have children with the person and live the life together’

5  F:  (overlap) nika kiponi antoymyense mwusun kiponul ttacye?

6  F:  nika imma cikum nai cikep mwe hana kipon isangi toynunkey isse?

\(^{15}\) The particle -to ‘also’ is studied by a number of scholars with different viewpoints. In the grammatical analyses (e.g., W. Chae, 1977; J. Kwon, 2012; Sung, 1979), it is categorised as pocosa ‘auxiliary particle’ or ‘special particle,’ whereas pragmatic analyses label it as a ‘cohesive marker’ (e.g., S. Hong, 2002; M. Hwang, 2002). The meaning of -to that is agreed in the literatures is ‘also’ and I adopt the basic meaning here.
‘How do (you) talk about average when you are below average? Are you, buster, above average for age, occupation, or whatever?’

[D1:310–337, between a son and his father]

In the first utterance in (10), S speaks to his grandmother that he is not really picky about women’s appearance but just expects an average woman (lines 1 and 2). He then seeks F’s agreement, saying that visual impression is important to men (lines 3 and 4). In the utterance, he uses a kinship term, apeci ‘father’, with a particle -to ‘also’ affixed and attempts to give F a turn and the floor, thinking that F would agree with him as a man. However, F does not speak (line 5), that is, the turn/floor-giving fails, since he does not agree with S and is actually upset with him. In the previous part of the discourse, F shows his criticism towards S’s view on marriage. S then continues talking about his viewpoint on the appearance of his prospective wife (lines 6 and 7), and F finally expresses his resentment and interrupts S, overlapping his utterance (lines 8 to 10). He scolds S that S should not judge a woman in terms of whether or not she is above average while he is not above average himself, using overt 2PS ne two times in the utterance.

Expecting that F would agree with his idea that any man considers appearance important, S uses the particle -to ‘also’ affixed to the overt 2PS apeci in asking ‘Don’t you know that?’ (line 3). Not only does the use of -to express S’s wish to gain F’s agreement, but the reference form for plural 1PS, namely, wuli namcatul ‘we men’, also shows that S intends to bind F within the same gender group and to appeal that they can share his idea. Had F agreed to S, F could have held the floor, and S could have avoided holding the floor since he has been a target of his grandmother’s criticism. However, F takes neither turn nor floor by staying silent (line 5), and S takes a turn again and remains holding the floor (lines 6 and 7). As S continues making excuses, F interrupts and takes the floor to blame him (lines 8 to 10). The blaming is in the form of rhetorical questions with ne as 2PS, so F scolds S and shortly gives the floor back to S so that S would become the target of the criticism again.

The example in (11) shows another referential choice for 2PS that helps indicate turn/floor-giving and a different pattern of discourse flow from previous examples. While speakers in previous examples in this section were at equal status in terms of taking and giving turn/floor, the allocation of turn-taking is skewed to one speaker in (11). That is, the number of turn-taking
is almost equal for the two speakers, but the duration of each turn is much longer for one speaker who is younger. The younger speaker (Y) mainly keeps the floor and takes his turns for longer time, whereas the older speaker (O) responds with backchannelling (Yngve, 1970) or encouragers (Edelsky, 1981), such as yey ‘Yes’ or a ‘Ah’, with which he leaves the floor to Y. After keeping the floor with frequent use of overt 1PS through several turns, Y gives the floor to O using overt 2PS in the later part of the discourse in (11):

(11) 1 Y: ku, ceyka yo peney hankwukul kassta wa kaciko,
   ‘Well, **I-pronoun** went to Korea this time and,’
2 O: yey.
   ‘Yes.’
3 Y: ku, ceki, hankwuk makheysthingi koyngcanghi cikum
   pappaciketunyo.
   ‘Well, the marketing in Korea gets very busy now.’
4 O: a.
   ‘Ah.’
5 Y: kulenikka, incey, ceyka yekise ili manhacyesscyo.
   ‘So, **I-pronoun** ve got more work here.’
6 O: yey.
   ‘Yes.’
7 Y: kulenikka, incey, nanun ku, ceneyun ceyka timoin wassta
   kassta hayssul trayynu ili com, com manhinun epsesseyo.
   ‘So, well, **I-pronoun** didn’t have work that much when going
   back and forth to Demoine.’
8 O: a.
   ‘Ah.’
9 Y: ilnyeney kulenikka kum, kum, kumpang malssum hasitusi yuk
   kayweley hanpen cengto,
   ‘In a year, so as (you) said right before, about once every six
   months,’
10 O: a.
   ‘Ah.’
11 Y: kulehkey issesseyo ili ku tangsi.
   ‘(I) had work like that at that time.’
12 O: a.
   ‘Ah.’
13 Y: kulena celena, ku, ku, kulena celena, ettehkey, ku, **kim hyengun**
   kyeysok kathun il hako kyeyseyyo?
   ‘By the way, by the way, well, are **you-kin term** still doing the
   same work?’
14 O: ttokkathayo mwe. (laugh) maynnal hanun key (distortion)
   ttokkathayo.
   ‘(It) is the same, well, (you) know. The thing (I) do all the time is
   the same.’
For the most part of the conversation (line 1 to line 15), Y talks about his recent trip to Korea and his business, and O listens to him and shows his feedback by saying *yey* ‘Yes’ and *a* ‘Ah’. Thus, Y holds the floor throughout 12 turns exchanged by the two speakers and uses overt 1PS three times, that is, *ce* in lines 1, 6 and 8. By saying *ce* in line 1, Y takes a turn and begins the discourse with a topic that is about himself, that is, takes the floor. Other two *ces* are more to maintain the floor on Y himself rather than to take the floor again, considering that O does not show willingness to take the floor competitively but only passively backchannels. In particular, the third use of *ce* comes after Y already begins his utterance with *na* and restarts the sentence in line 8. This may imply that the speaker habitually uses overt 1PS for turn-taking even when he is holding the floor, based on the perception that an overt 1PS signifies that the speaker wants to talk. Additionally, there seem to be other pragmatic effects, such as showing self-confidence of the speaker, unless contrastive.\(^\text{16}\)

When Y finishes speaking about himself having been busy for work (line 14), he tries to give the floor as well as a turn to O by asking about O’s business (lines 16 and 17). Before he gives the floor to O, Y says *kulena celena* ‘by the way’ as a discourse marker that indicates his intention to change the topic from his own business to something else. He uses a question as a device to give turn/floor, that is, ‘Are you still doing the same work?’ as it was the case in (8) to (10) as well. For the overt 2PS, Y uses *kim hyeng*, which is a unique form of reference that combines the surname *Kim* with the kinship term *hyeng* ‘older brother (for male speakers)’ and a form that he usually uses to address O.\(^\text{17}\) Following Y’s attempt to change the topic and floor holder at the same time, O takes the floor and begins to talk about his work (lines 18 and 19).

The examples presented in this section show that a speaker uses overt 2PS to give a turn and the floor to another speaker in the discourse. The examples that follow have a different pattern of turn/floor shift since the speakers give a turn and the floor to another speaker but expect that the floor is going to be given back to them. That is, the floor is clearly given to the interlocutor.

---

\(^{16}\) I discuss possible expressive effects of this sort of additional use of overt 1PS/2PS in Chapter 8.

\(^{17}\) The reference form of ‘surname + kinship term’ like *kim hyeng* in (11) is much less in use in the modern Korean discourse than in the past. When used, a younger speaker uses it to refer to a close friend who is a couple of years older. While a single kinship term or ‘first name + kinship term’ is widely used by speakers in all age and gender groups, ‘surname + kinship term’ is used by old male speakers who are likely to be in middle age.
with overt 2PS and the interlocutor takes the floor. However, in a longer term, the initial speaker takes the floor back, and he/she designs this. Let us consider the examples in (12) and (13):

1. **A:** kotingttay alapokin hayssciman, cinccaw mwusewun ay aninya?
   ‘(I) noticed at high school, but isn’t (she) really scary?’

2. **B:** nanca cal mwulese hanpangey insaying yekcen han ke anya.
   It is that (she) met a rich man and changed the life at once.

3. **A:** tokhata, tokhay.
   (She) is headstrong.’

4. **B:** icwungsengceenta.
   ‘(Her) duplicity is ridiculous.’

5. **A:** kuchi?
   ‘Isn’t (it)?’

6. **B:** ne maliya, tauni kyelhonsik kasen pwulewe nanliteni, seyuncwunun way yokhay?
   ‘You-**pronoun**, by the way, why do (you) criticise Se Yuncwu while (you) were so jealous at Taun’s wedding?’

7. **A:** ya, kuken (overlap)
   ‘Hey, that is’

8. **B:** (overlap) yayyamallo kkwum ilwun keci. ikey ci nunglyekiko sillylekilaten aycanha.
   ‘She is the one who really made her dream come true since (she) used to say that this is all her ability and skill.’

9. **A:** hakin, kuttayn hansimhay poyessnuntey, yocumeyn ikesto nunglyekici.
   ‘Right, (it) looked pathetic then, but it is also an ability now.

10. **B:** (pause) ya, ne kuney, soinchani-lang ettehkey twysses?
    Hey, by the way, how did you-**pronoun** end up with So Inchan?’

11. **A:** soinchan, onul mwutankylkunhayssketun.
    ‘So Inchan was absent at work without notice.’

   [D4:404–426, between two female friends]

The two speakers in (12) above are close friends from high school and talk about their friends who married rich men. A criticises that a friend named Se Yuncwu has been pursuing her life to be changed by meeting a rich man since high school and finally achieved it (lines 1 to 3). B agrees (line 4) but points out that A criticises only Se Yuncwu while she envied another friend, Taun, who also married a rich man, by asking why A criticises only Se Yuncwu (lines 6 and 7). A admits that she thought the idea of wanting to meet a rich man was pathetic in the past although it is treated as a skill these days (lines 11 and 12). She then changes the topic with
kuntey ‘by the way’ to the recent state of B’s relationship with her boyfriend, So Inchan, by asking how B ended up with him (line 13).

When pointing out that A criticises only Se Yuncwu while there is another friend in a similar situation (lines 6 and 7), B begins her utterance with ne maliya ‘you, by the way’. After both speakers agree that Se Yuncwu is headstrong, B recognises that A is particularly unhappy about the friend. B slightly changes the topic from criticising Se Yuncwu to discovering the reason A is unhappy especially about her. Ne maliya specifies the transition of topic and explicitly points at A as the next speaker. A tries to take a turn to explain (line 8), but B interrupts her and rebuts that Se Yuncwu actually has the skill and ability to make her dream come true (lines 9 and 10). Given that B interrupts A after asking her a question, B did not intend to give the floor to A and expect her to answer. A only takes a short turn (line 8) and could not successfully take the floor. Instead, B becomes the floor holder again, so the use of ne as 2PS in her question (lines 6 and 7) is more like a ‘fabricated’ floor-giving indicator than a genuine intention of floor-giving.

We can see another example of this fabricated floor-giving in line 13. A agrees with B that Se Incwu has the ability to achieve her goal, and then she changes the topic to B’s relationship with her boyfriend, So Inchan (line 13). In the utterance, similar to the previous utterance by B in line 6, A uses ne as 2PS with a discourse marker kuntey ‘by the way’, which collectively function to change the flow of the discourse towards B now. In addition, she addresses B ya ‘hey’ in the beginning of the utterance and obtains her attention. After the unmistakable sign that she wants to talk about B now, A gives the floor to B in the form of question. B takes a turn but gives the floor back to A by asking what she means by the question (line 14) since there is indeed nothing changed between her boyfriend and herself. B then shortly takes the floor and says that So Inchan, who is B’s coworker, was absent at work (line 15).

Considering the sentence final -ketun in her utterance, A presumes that B does not know about her boyfriend’s absence at work, but she first confirms her presumption by asking how their relationship is (line 13). When it is confirmed by B’s question ‘What do (you) mean?’ that there is no certain change in the relationship, A provides the reason she asked the question, which shows that So Inchan is in trouble. In other words, A intentionally gives a turn to B, asking

18 The sentence final -ketun is used when the speaker provides a piece of information that she thinks is a cause or reason for what is previously said in the discourse (Y. Chae, 1998; J. C. Lee, 2002; S. H. Han, 2016). That is, Speaker A says her last sentence ‘So Inchan was absent at work today without notice’ in (10) as a reason she asked the question ‘How did you end up with So Inchan?’ in her previous utterance.
‘how did you end up with him?’ and observes whether B is aware of her boyfriend’s situation.
In the case that B does not know, as in (12), A can expect that B will return to her with a
question, such as ‘what do you mean?’ and consequently gives her a turn to answer.
Alternatively, if B knows that her boyfriend is having a problem and would have been absent
at work, A could expect B to take the floor and explain. Thus, the overt 2PS in A’s question
(line 13) does not simply indicate A’s intention to give the floor to B. It is fabricated since the
speaker gives a turn to the interlocutor and prepares for both floor-giving and floor-taking,
depending on the interlocutor’s response.

In the following excerpt, a speaker shows a similar pattern as the speaker in (12), in giving a
turn with an expectation to hold the floor. The fabricated floor-giving in (13) is by a senior (S)
at work, and she asks questions with overt 2PS while she already knows the answers. When the
junior worker (J) tries to answer, S takes the floor back and says what she planned to say from
the beginning of the discourse:

| (13)  | J:            | cengmal, cengmal, cozonghapnita thimcangnim, pocungsenun |
|       | ceyka ettehkeytun chacaaokeysupnita. chaykimciko, tasi chaca |
|       | (overlap)    |
|       | ‘Really, really, sorry, Chief. I will find the certificate by doing
|       | whatever. (I) will find on my responsibility’ |
|       | (overlap)    | hanseykyengssi (pause) seykyengssinun way, ilen |
|       | ‘Miss Han Sekyoung. Why do you-first name this kind of work?’ |
|       | (pause) yey? |
|       | ‘Pardon?’    |
|       | seykyengssi hakcem cohko, kongmocen ipsang kyenglyekto |
|       | hwullyunghako, cakyekcungto manhko, kuntey, way ilen |
|       | ‘You-first name have high grades at school, excellent records on
|       | the awards from competitions and many certificates, but why are
|       | you doing this kind of assistance?’ |
|       | (silence)    |
|       | seykyengssi, ticaineka kkwam anieyyo? |
|       | ‘Miss Sekyoung, isn’t a designer (your) dream?’ |
|       | (pause) ney, ticaineka kkwumipnita. (pause) kulayse, pilok |
|       | cikumun kyeeyakcikiciman, yelsimhi nolyekhayse, ilnyen twiyei |
|       | cengciwkyn toymyen, (pause) te yelsimhi hayse, onyenitun |
|       | sipnyenitun, yeki ciaynuulyuyeyse ticainelo sengkonghay |
|       | (overlap)    |
|       | ‘Yes, a designer is my dream. So, although (I) am a casual
|       | employee now, (I) will try hard, and if (I) become a full-time |
employee, (I) will do harder, and whether five or ten years, here at
GN Fashion, (I) will be successful as a designer, and’

17 S: (overlap) kakey toykeysseyo?
‘Would it work?’

18 J: (pause) yey?
‘Pardon?’

19 S: hanseykyengssinun, tocehi ticainelo ssul swu epsnun
salamieyyo.
‘You-full name are not a person who can be used as a designer at
all.’

20 J: yey?
‘Pardon?’

[D3:1152–1172, between a senior and a junior at work]

In (13), J made a mistake at work and is apologising to S for the mistake (lines 1 to 3). S
interrupts J’s apology and asks why J has chosen the work (lines 4 and 5), using J’s first name
seykyeng suffixed with -ssi ‘Miss’ as 2PS. Because S first addresses J with her full name with
the suffix -ssi, that is, hanseykyengssi, in the beginning of her utterance (line 4), the use of the
overt 2PS would be inessential in defining the subject of the question. The overt 2PS
seykyengssi is likely to highlight S’s intention to let J think and talk about the reason she does
what she is doing now. Since it is an unexpected question, seemingly irrelevant to the current
topic, namely, J’s mistake, J asks what S means by the question with yey ‘Pardon me? (lit. yes?)’
(line 6). S enumerates J’s excellent specifications on her resume, again with seykyeng (lit.
yes?)’
(line 6). S enumerates J’s excellent specifications on her resume, again with seykyengssi as 2PS,
and asks again why she is performing assistance work while she wished to become a designer
(lines 7 to 9). J agrees that she wanted to be a designer but ended up being an assistant now and
adds that she will try hard to become a designer in the future (lines 12 to 16). S interrupts J
again and asks a rhetorical question ‘Would it work?’ (line 17). She also says that it is
impossible for J to be a designer because she has a poor taste (lines 19 and 20), using the overt
2PS hanseykyengssi.

From the beginning of the dialogue in (13), S seems to have planned to tell J that J is not eligible
to be a designer since she has a poor taste for fashion. However, S first asks J why she is
performing assistance work with seykyengssi as 2PS (lines 4 and 5), which I see as the first

---

19 The suffix -ssi usually corresponds to the suffixes ‘Mr/Mrs/Ms/Miss’ in English, but there is difference in the
sociocultural application. While the suffixes in English are honorific and can be used for someone older than the
addressee, -ssi is formal and polite but avoided for an older addressee. Thus, it is normal that a senior at work refers
to a junior with (full name/ first name) -ssi and a junior refers to a senior with their position or title, such as
thimcangnim ‘chief + honorific suffix -nim’ used by J in (13).
fabricated floor-giving. S then asks the same question one more time after listing J’s excellent achievements as a reason that she would have not chosen the current work, using *seykyengssi* as 2PS again (lines 7 to 9). This is the second fabricated floor-giving S shows before she takes the floor herself in lines 19 and 20, saying that J is not a person who can be a designer. Before S directly advises that J has no talent as a designer, she gives a turn to J so that she can self-prove that she is not eligible. That is, S already knows that J is a diligent worker and expects that her answers would be such in (13), so she plans that J explains it herself and S can finally confirm that a designer needs taste rather than diligence.

It would have been brief had S directly said that J is not to be a designer, but by using the fabricated floor-giving that is more explicit with overt 2PS, S gives opportunities that J can realise the reality clearly and somewhat brutally. As noted in the description of (12), this pattern of giving turns with overt 2PS may be seen as giving the floor to a second person for a short term, but the speaker has an expectation or plan that she will have been holding the floor. In the case of (12), the speaker was relatively less certain about the chance that the floor will come back to her since she did not know whether the interlocutor already has the information that she is about to share. However, the speaker in (13) is certain about the interlocutor’s reactions to her questions from experiences, so she makes full use of the fabricated floor-giving questions. Regardless of the speaker’s certainty, a fabricated floor-giving utterance helps the speaker give a turn to the interlocutor while potentially keeping the floor. Interestingly, fabricated floor-giving using overt 2PS seems to be brutal as it makes the interlocutor realise that she was mistaken by the turn given to explain herself.

**7.5 Summary**

The current chapter discussed the overt 1PS/2PS used in discourse organisation. To organise discourse, speakers exchange turns and the floor. A turn is the basic unit of utterance, and the floor is related to what is being said in the discourse as many conversation analysts describe. That is, once a speaker speaks, we say that the speaker has his/her own turn. However, it does not guarantee that the speaker also takes the floor when taking a turn. We need to examine the contents of what the speaker talks about, such as whether the utterance changes the flow of the discourse to a different topic or the speaker simply agrees with the previous utterance and lets it be in the original flow of the discourse. In the former case, the floor shifts with the turn from the previous speaker(s) to the current speaker, and in the latter case, the previous speaker
remains the floor holder. Thus, a turn-taking takes place when the floor shifts, but it does not work in the reverse direction.

In our data, I found many examples of overt 1PS that appear in the course of taking a turn and the floor. Shifts of floor seem particularly related to overt 1PS whereas turn-takings occur frequently without overt 1PS. As discussed, floor-taking occurs when the leader or attention of the discourse changes, and it should be associated with the nature of overt 1PS. To be the floor holder, speakers draw attention to themselves, and overt 1PS becomes an effective tool in doing so since it tends to clarify that the utterance is going to be about or towards the speaker. It is, of course, possible that a speaker does not intend to take the floor and simply gives a response to previous utterances with overt 1PS, but more commonly, an utterance with overt 1PS outweighs an utterance with the 1PS unexpressed, in terms of the emphasis on self-orientation. In short, overt 1PS can be used in signifying that a speaker intends to keep or take the floor, which normally accompanies a turn-taking.

For overt 2PS appearing in discourse organisation, the distinction of turn and/or floor shift is more intriguing than in the case of overt 1PS. Overt 2PS is used either in giving both a turn and the floor or in giving a turn but keeping the floor. It is clearly noticeable in the former case that a speaker gives a turn as well as the floor to another speaker in the discourse, expecting that the interlocutor would take a turn and the floor and lead the discourse. In the process, overt 2PS explicitly displays the floor-giver’s intention to hand over the floor along with a turn. As for the latter case, we find instances in which the speaker of overt 2PS wants to give a turn to another speaker while holding the floor. By giving a turn with overt 2PS, it may appear like giving the floor as well to the interlocutor, but in consideration of the context in a longer term, it is found that some speakers give a turn by asking a question that the interlocutor could hardly answer or to which the speaker predicts the answer. If this is the case, the speaker anticipates that she will argue with the interlocutor’s answer in the later part of the discourse, that is, take the floor and convey the message she initially planned to convey. Since the floor-taking is designed but delayed by giving a turn to the interlocutor, I called it a fabricated turn-giving in the analysis.

We have seen the use of overt 1PS/2PS for highlighting contrastiveness between referents in discourse in Chapter 6 and for signalling turn/floor shifts in the current chapter. In the following chapter, I will discuss possible pragmatic meanings of overt 1PS/2PS in our data, which include emphatic function and interpersonal function.
Chapter 8. Expressive Effects of Overt 1PS and 2PS

8.1 Introduction

As Schegloff (1996:439) notes, reference to a person in discourse does ‘nothing but referring’ in some cases and it does ‘something else in addition to referring’ in other cases. Our aim in the current chapter is ascertaining what is performed in addition to referring in the latter cases. In particular, this chapter focuses on expressive effects that overt 1PS/2PS conveys where we have discussed contrast and turn/floor shifts as pragmatic effects of overt 1PS/2PS in general. The expressive effects are derived from the presumption that there is a form of 1PS/2PS generally expected and understood. When the generally expected form of 1PS/2PS is replaced with another form, while the form still refers to the same referent, a pragmatic meaning arises. As introduced in Chapter 3, the pragmatic meaning by the alternation between forms of 1PS/2PS can be explained by M-implicature (Levinson, 2000) that occurs when a marked expression replaces an unmarked expression.1

Based on the functions of 1PS/2PS in utterances, I further divide the expressive effects into two categories in our analysis: emphatic and interpersonal functions. First, an emphatic function is found when overt 1PS/2PS plays an important role to specifically index a participant in the discourse and to add ‘weight’ on the speaker’s subjectness on the activity or status of the predicate.2 That is, an overt 1PS/2PS could have an emphatic function, which an unexpressed 1PS/2PS does not have. For instance, a speaker can ask for forgiveness by blaming herself and say calmoshaysse ‘(I) did (it) wrongly’, but she can also add overt 1PS and say nayka calmoshaysse ‘I did (it) wrongly.’ The sentence meaning does not change by overtly expressing the 1PS, but the speaker explicitly points at herself by saying the 1PS nayka (the plain 1g pronoun na + the subject marker -ka).3 It conveys the pragmatic intention that she wants to emphasise her feeling of responsibility or guilt. The overt 1PS in this case manifests that the

---

1 The notion of M-Principle and M-implicature (Lecinson, 2000) was reviewed in detail in Chapter 3. I will briefly describe them later in this chapter again for readers’ convenience.
2 Davidson (1996:543) introduces the concept of ‘pragmatic weight,’ which indicates the emphasis given to an overt subject pronoun in Spanish when it signals ‘utterances as “less abstract” or “more personally relevant”.’ This notion can be initial explanation of pragmatic intention of overt 1PS/2PS in Korean as well.
3 As noted in previous chapters, nay is a form that replaces na when it is affixed with the subject marker -ka. There is no change in the meaning for the transformation.
subject of being responsible or guilty is not anyone else but the speaker herself and that the speaker intends to show her feeling of responsibility. In a similar fashion, S. Oh (2007:471) explains that speakers of overt self-reference intend to ‘accomplish certain interactional projects, such as seeking recognition/appreciation of, or assuming responsibility for, his/her conduct’. I categorise that this use of overt 1PS has an emphatic function.

Second, an interpersonal function includes pragmatic effects, such as politeness and intimacy. This function is triggered by the alternation between different forms of reference for overt 1PS/2PS, where there is an unmarked form that is normally expected and a marked form that brings a marked meaning. For example, if the speaker of *nayka calmoshaysse* ‘I did (it) wrongly’ replaces the plain 1sg pronoun *na* with another reference from, such as a kinship term or professional title, there are pragmatic meanings conveyed by the overt 1PS in addition to the emphatic function. Additional pragmatic meanings occur according to the form of reference that replaces the pronoun. For example, a father could apologise to his child saying *appaka calmoshaysse* ‘Dad did (it) wrongly’ instead of *nayka calmoshaysse* ‘I did (it) wrongly’. The meaning of the utterance does not change because both *na* and *appa* refer to the same person, that is, first person in the discourse, and the rest of the sentence remains identical. What is conveyed by the use of a kinship term like *appa* is a pragmatic meaning, such as intimacy, which is not expressed by the alternative pronoun *na*. By expressing intimacy in his apology, the father might intend to express his sincerity in the apology that he believes is secured by accentuating their relationship with the reference form. The pragmatic effects are surely subject to change depending on the context.

In the following sections, we will discuss emphatic and interpersonal functions of overt 1PS/2PS and explore their expressive effects generated in the contexts. Specifically, Section 8.2 discusses various expressive effects that overt 1PS/2PS conveys while explicitly indexing the speaker as the very agent/patient of the predicate in the utterance. The expressive effects discussed in the section include recalling for confirmation, claiming/avoiding responsibility and taking/giving credit. In Section 8.3, we focus on the interpersonal function of overt 1PS/2PS. For the expressive effects in the section, I include (im)politeness that can be also represented as authority and intimacy that can be reversely represented as estrangement, according to the alternation of reference forms. Lastly, 8.4 summarises the chapter and discusses implications of the analyses in this chapter.
8.2 Emphatic Function

Overt 1PS/2PS can be used to explicitly index the speaker or the interlocutor as an agent or a patient of doing an action or being in a status that the predicate in the utterance denotes. With the emphatic function of overt 1PS/2PS, the speaker can attract attention to the subject of the speech act and show her intention to make it clear that it is she who does the act in the case of 1PS or her interlocutor in the case of 2PS, not anyone else. The overt 1PS/2PS becomes a signpost itself of indexing the subject of the sentence and overt 1PS/2PS with the emphatic function can have various subsequent expressive effects depending on the act denoted by the predicate.

While there is an unlimited list of speech acts that can be emphasised by the use of overt 1PS/2PS, I introduce the most distinctive effects in our data that emphatic 1PS/2PSs convey in this section as follows: recalling for confirmation, claiming or avoiding responsibility and taking or giving credit.

8.2.1 Recalling for confirmation

We observe a significant number of instances in our corpora in which speakers make use of overt 1PS/2PS when they recall an event or a piece of information from the shared knowledge. Through the recalling, it is confirmed that either the speaker or the interlocutor is the agent of the action or status denoted by the predicate. That is, overt 1PS/2PS used in recalling explicitly points at the speakers and confirms that they are the very agents doing a certain action or being in a particular status. In addition, as what is recalled is related to the current discourse, emphasis is put on the relevance between the recalled event or fact and the current discourse. In the examples analysed in this section, speakers recall their speech, experience or identity so they can relate their current utterances to what occurred or is occurring.

Let us examine a simple example of recalling a past event in the following excerpt in (1). Speaker F in (1) recalls that she previously mentioned what she is saying now, using the plain 1sg pronoun na as 1PS:

(1) 1 F:  
     *kuntey, onulto naonuntey, yokumi tto ollasci anhkeysni? eceynka? kuceckkeynka?*  
     ‘But, (I) was coming out (and heard), hasn’t the (taxi) fare increased? Yesterday? The day before yesterday?’

2  

3 M:  
     *chenyukpayk wenulo kruwel ililpwuthe ollasci.*  
     ‘(It) has increased to 1,600 won from the first of September.’
While talking about public transport, the female speaker (F) complains that taxi services have not changed (lines 5 and 7) although the fare has recently increased (line 1). She recalls that she said it before that taxi drivers do not welcome passengers, saying *ceneytwu nayka hanpen malhayssci* ‘I also said (it) once before’ (line 4). The plain 1sg pronoun *na* is used as 1PS and to maintain the clarity of the meaning of the utterance, the 1PS in the utterance cannot be unexpressed. In addition, the overt 1PS explicitly indexes the speaker as the subject of having said the same thing in the past. The recall with overt 1PS not only strengthens the relevance of the current utterance because it is repeated but also attracts the interlocutor’s attention to the current utterance by overtly marking the change of tense and subject in the development of discourse.

Similarly, speaker M in (2) uses the plain 2sg pronoun *ne* in recalling the interlocutor’s utterance in the past:

(2) 1 M:  *kuntey, ci, kuntey* (laugh) *solcikhi malhayse*, (laugh) *ku ttay yeca aytulul cwuchwukulo, neka kulaysscanha*, (laugh) *cinhuyka* (unclear) *aytuli* (unclear) *nikka*, (laugh) *namca aytuli ohilye*, (unclear) *kaci* (unclear) *mallakwu nolkeya*, ‘But, but, **you-pronoun** said that Cinhuy said the girls are (unclear), so the boys stopped (unclear) from going and played,’

M in (2) speaks to his friends at university about the university culture. He begins his utterance with recalling an event that happened among his friends in the past that the girls did something about getting along with the boys (lines 1 and 2). He then says *neka kulaysscanha* ‘you said that’ (line 2) to one of the interlocutors to recall and confirm that the interlocutor said something
in the past. The sentence would be vague without an overt subject. Additionally, the overt 2PS ne indexes the interlocutor as the subject of having said it while the speaker makes a relevant connection between his current utterance and a previous utterance by the interlocutor. The recollection and confirmation of the previous utterance by the interlocutor supports his current utterance describing the past event among their friends.

What is recalled in (3) is relatively complicated, yet the overt 1PS also functions to index the speaker as the subject of having an experience in the past, as in (1) and (2):

(3)  
1 B:  
   cuswu epse! ku chonnom casik!  
   ‘Bastard! That country bumpkin is!’
2 D:  (silence)
3 B:  
   taychev kulen chonnom casikhantheye mweka cohtako
   ppangkkaci ponaynkeya, apecinun?  
   ‘What on earth did father like about that country bumpkin to send bread (to him)’?
4 D:  
   kulen chonnomhantheye nen way kulehkey sinkyengul
   ssumunkentey?
5 B:  
   ‘Why do you bother about the country bumpkin so much?’
6 D:  
   nan, thayenase hanpento apeciuy kulen elkwalul ponceki
   epsessee. tan hanpento apecilang kulehkey wusumyense yaykil
7 B:  
   nanweponseki epsesstakwu. kulentey ku chonnomun kulehkey
   haysscanha. nayka haci moshankel ku nyeseki haysscanha!
   ‘I-pronoun have never seen dad’s face like that since born. (I)
8 have never talked and laughed with dad like that. But the country
9 bumpkin did so. That chap did what I-pronoun couldn’t do!’
10
[D8:895–902, between a boy and his driver]

B in (3) is a 10-year-old boy and speaks to his driver about another boy whom B’s father praises. Since B speaks ill of the boy and calls him a country bumpkin (lines 1, 3 and 4), D asks why B bothers so much if the boy is just a country bumpkin (lines 5 and 6). Using na as overt 1PS, B answers that he has never seen his father’s face, presumably a happy face, as when the father talked with the boy (lines 5 and 6). It may be obvious that the subject is first person even if it is unexpressed in the utterance, because it describes the speaker’s own experience. Moreover,
the subject can be predicted even if unexpressed, since B is answering the question about a reason that he takes the trouble about the bumpkin boy, which he is likely to answer with describing his feelings or reasons. The overt 1PS \textit{na} explicitly indexes B as the subject that remembers his father as a cold person to him. In particular, compared with an unexpressed 1PS in the utterance, \textit{na} puts more weight on the expression of his miserable feeling by recalling that he has no memory of having a happy moment with his father.

We can also observe many instances in our corpora in which overt 1PS/2PS functions to recall the identities of the speakers and to stress the speakers’ awareness of the identities. The utterances in this case are likely to affirm simply who the subject is, but this should be differentiated from the cases in which a speaker introduces herself or acknowledges who the second person is, as in their first encounter. Speakers in this case already know each other, so such introduction is unnecessary. The overt 1PS/2PS here recalls the identities of the speakers and reassures who they are supposed to be or what they are supposed to do being the person.

A speaker in the following excerpt shows a typical example of using emphatic 1PS for recalling the speaker’s identity. Her name is \textit{Payk Caun} and she uses the plain 1sg pronoun \textit{na} as 1PS while she says to her friends that she is who she is, as in ‘I am \textit{Payk Caun}’:

\begin{quote}
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\hline
\textbf{(4)} & 1 S: \textit{kuke ton issstako amwuna sal swu issnun ke anya}. (pause) \textit{The bag is not something that anyone can buy with money.}\textit{.}'
\hline
& 2 \textit{paykhwacem puiapih kokaykey hanhaysemant yeyyak}\textit{.} \textit{Reservations are only for VIP customers of department stores by reservation. That is, (they) mean to sell to those with the corresponding value with the bag.}\textit{.}'
\hline
& 3 \textit{phanmayhako issketun. hanmatilo, kapanguy kachiey}\textit{.} \textit{(It) is limitedly sold to VIP customers of department stores by reservation. That is, (they) mean to sell to those with the corresponding value with the bag.}\textit{.}'
\hline
& 4 \textit{cwunhanun salameykeyman phalkeystanun keci} \textit{.} \textit{(It) is limitedly sold to VIP customers of department stores by reservation. That is, (they) mean to sell to those with the corresponding value with the bag.}\textit{.}'
\hline
& 5 C: \textit{kulay?sungli ni mal tulunikka ike kkok sako siphecinta} \textit{.} \textit{‘Is that so? After hearing what you say, (I) definitely want to buy the bag.}\textit{.}'
\hline
& 6 (looking at other speakers) \textit{kaca yaytula, kapang sale} \textit{.} \textit{‘Let’s go, guys, to buy the bag.}\textit{.}'
\hline
& 7 S: \textit{amwuna sal swu issnunkey anilanikka} \textit{.} \textit{‘(I) said it is not something anyone can buy.}\textit{.'}
\hline
& 8 C: \textit{isungli, na amwuna anya. na paykecauniketun} \textit{.} \textit{‘I Sungli, \textbf{I-pronoun} am not anyone. \textbf{I-pronoun} am Payk Caun.’}
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
\end{quote}

[D2:844–852, between classmates at university]

thought, opinion or experience, the 1PS tends to be overt. The distribution of overt 1PS/2PS by verb types in our corpora is not our main focus of the current thesis, but it is one of the future research I may propose.
Two friends in (4), *I Sungli* (S) and *Payk Caun* (C), argue on a luxurious bag in a magazine. S points out that the bag is only sold to a limited range of customers by reservation (lines 1–2), and C says that she definitely wants to buy the bag, especially after hearing what S says (line 5). S then confirms that not anyone can buy the bag (line 7), and C addresses S with her full name, *isungli*, and says that she is not ‘anyone’ herself but *Payk Caun*, which is her full name, using the pronoun *na* as 1PS (line 8). In this utterance, C is upset that she is considered not capable of buying a luxurious bag and affirms that she is not one of ‘anyone’ who cannot afford the bag. She simply says that she is *Payk Caun*, but the connotation of this utterance is that *Payk Caun* is an extraordinary person, who is capable of purchasing a luxurious item.

The utterance by speaker C in line 8 is not a mere self-identification that normally appears in a conversation between people who do not know one another. While speakers in (4) are well aware of each other and do not need to introduce themselves, C intensifies the distinctiveness of her identity by saying that she is not anyone but herself. In addition, since there is no further modifier to the name, such as ‘*Payk Caun* the rich’ or ‘*Payk Caun* who is a VIP at all department stores’, C expects that her own name would represent someone who is wealthy and deserves to be treated importantly at department stores. While asserting that she is not ‘anyone’ but *Payk Caun*, C in (4) uses the pronoun *na* as 1PS (line 8), which is perfectly normal in a conversation between same-aged friends, as discussed in Chapters 4 and 5.6 If the 1PS were unexpressed, the utterance would be incomplete. Even if an unexpressed 1PS in the utterance is comprehended by speakers in the particular context, the overt 1PS explicitly connects the subject *na* and the complement *Payk Caun* and seeks recognition on the speaker’s identity.7

In following two excerpts, we consider similar examples as in (4), that is, an overt subject recalling certain characteristics or identity expressed in the predicate nominal, but for 2PS this time. The customer (C) in (5) asks a rhetorical question about the employee (E)’s identity, using pronouns as 2PS:

(5)  I C:  *kuntey, tangsini hoycangiya, mweya?*

---

6 For overt 1PS, the majority of pronouns, particularly *na*, are used to younger speakers or peers (Chapter 5). It is a usual pattern in Korean that speakers use different first person pronouns depending on the relative age or social status among speakers (Chapter 4).

7 Furthermore, the use of *na* among possible candidates for overt 1PS increases the seriousness of the statement. As argued in the previous research on reference terms (e.g. Brown & Ford, 1961; H. S. Kang, 2002; J. Park, 1997; K. Park, 1989; Wang, 2000; Wang et al, 2005) and in Chapter 4 of the current thesis, personal names and kinship terms can display intimacy or closeness whereas a pronoun does not. Specifically, speakers who are arguing as in (4) would use pronouns even if they have other reference forms for 1PS. We will discuss the pragmatic functions based on interpersonal relationships between speakers, which occur by the choice of reference terms for 1PS/2PS in Section 8.3.
‘By the way, are you the chairperson, or what?’

E: *mwe?*

‘What?’

C: *hoycango animyense hanun cisina, malina wancen cakika hoycangiya, hoycang.*

‘(You) are not the chairman, but (considering) the acting and speaking, you are totally the chairman.’

[D4:1108–1110, between an employee and a customer]

C in (5) is a customer of the company and argues with E, who is an employee of the company. C is upset about E’s arrogant and disrespectful attitude from the previous part of the discourse. She then asks whether E is the chairperson of the company (line 1), using the 2sg pronoun tangsin as 2PS, although she is already well aware that he is not the chairman. Namely, her utterance rhetorically asks whether the interlocutor is the chairperson, cynically confirming that he is not the chairperson. C uses the overt 2PS tangsin ‘you’ with the subject marker -i affixed to explicitly index E as the subject of being the chairperson in the question. The use of tangsin here not only clearly indexes the 2PS as being inquired to be in the professional position. Additionally, tangsin represents the speaker’s resentment towards the interlocutor with regard to the characteristics of the pronoun tangsin where she could have chosen other reference forms for 2PS.\(^8\)

In response, E says *mwe* ‘What?’, which is more of an expression of perplexity than a real question since C’s prior rhetorical question asking about E’s identity appears to be abrupt in the middle of their argument. In the subsequent utterance in lines 3 and 4, C rewords that E acts and speaks as if he is the chairperson himself, using the reflexive pronoun caki as 2PS. By using another overt 2PS, C verbally points at E and describes in a sarcastic tone that he is almost like the chairperson of the company considering his behaviour and speech. C also specifically chooses caki for the overt 2PS in line 3 and displays her emotional discourtesy and antipathy towards speaker E.\(^9\)

The following excerpt in (6) includes the emphatic function of overt 2PS as in (5), but its effect can be more interestingly compared with the overt 1PS in (4), where the speaker said ‘I am

---

\(^8\) As reviewed in Chapter 4, tangsin is an interesting pronoun that has two distinct, almost contrary, usages: (i) it is used between spouses in a respectful and mature manner; (ii) it is used to refer to second person in a quarrel or argument in a hostile, yet less insulting than the plain 2sg pronoun ne, tone.

\(^9\) Caki is a 3sg reflexive pronoun in most cases, but speakers occasionally use it to refer to second person and add certain interpersonal pragmatic meanings (e.g. intimacy or estrangement) in addition to indexing the person (see Chapter 4 for more details). We will find various examples of 2PS that show speakers’ intention to show their interpersonal relationship in Section 8.3.
That is, as in (5), a chairperson as a social position or title can be interpreted with characteristics commonly understood by any speakers. Conversely, the speaker of overt 1PS in (4) expects that there are agreed characteristics in her identity when saying her name as the complement of the sentence and indexing herself as the 1PS of being identified as the complement. In the case of (6), the speaker of overt 2PS expects that there are agreed characteristics in the second person’s identity when using the name of second person as 2PS. While the pronoun na as 1PS in (4) indexes the speaker herself as the subject of being the person with the name, a name Hwang Thayhuy as 2PS in (6) already embeds the characteristics of the identity in it and connects the speaker to the complement of the sentence:

(6)  
1 H: *kuntey halmeni na icey kkunheya hayyo.*  
‘But, Grandma, I have to hang up now.’

2 G: *kulye. halmito naysaykki pwassunikkey toyyasse. nay saykki nwakwu saykki?*
‘Okay. I am also done as having seen you. Whose baby are you?’

3  
4 H: *halmenisayaykki.*  
‘Your baby.’

5 J: *ya, chenhauy hwangthayhuyka, kukel tto sikhintako hayyo?*
‘Wow, do wordly you-full name do it just because (you) are asked?’

6 H: *wuscima. ilayya wuli halmeni simkika phyenhasiko,*
‘Don’t laugh. By doing so, my grandmother feels stable,

7 *wuli halmeni simkika phyenhayya on cipani phyenhako.*
and if my grandmother feels stable, my entire family is stable.

8 *mwuespota wulemmaka phyenhaycisiketun.*
More than anything, my mom feels easy.’

[D1:164–168, between a senior and a junior at work]

Hwang Thayhuy (H) is a senior journalist and working with a junior journalist (J) in (6). While they are in a car, H answers a phone call from his grandmother (G). Since H answers that he is his grandmother’s baby (line 3) to G’s question (line 2), J is startled and asks a rhetorical question ‘Do you do it even though you were asked to do?’ to H (line 4). In the question, J uses H’s full name hwangthayhuy ‘Hwang Thayhuy’ for 2PS with a modifier chenhauy ‘wordly’. The utterance in line 4 without overt 2PS would still convey the meaning of ‘It is unbelievable that you did it even considering that you were asked to do so’. Nevertheless, the utterance with overt 2PS adds the meaning of ‘you whom I know would not do it’. In particular, J as a junior usually refers to H with his professional title, senpay ‘senior’ or senpaynim ‘senior’ with the honorific suffix -nim. Referring to one’s senior with his/her name is regarded inappropriate and rude. However, the particular context of (6) gives an opportunity for a junior to refer to his
senior with his name, in which the senior has embarrassed himself and they are close enough to tease each other. Moreover, the name is modified by *chenhauy* ‘wordly’, which underlines that *Hwang Thayhuy* is someone too cool or charismatic to be compliant and affectionate.

Both overt 2PSs in (5) and (6) are used in rhetorical questions identifying the interlocutors; whether the interlocutor is the chairperson of the company in (5), and whether the interlocutor is someone who would be obedient in (6). Similar to the speaker of overt 1PSs in (4), the speakers of overt 2PS in (5) and (6) have a certain expectation that there is common understanding and expectation about the interlocutors’ identity and their characteristics. For example, *tangsin* and *caki* as 2PS explicitly index E in (5) as the subject of being not the chairman but an employee. Similarly, *Hwang Thayhuy* as 2PS explicitly indexes H in (6) as the subject of being unexpected to be obedient and affectionate. Overall, we can find commonality among the overt 1PS/2PSs in (4) to (6) that they are used to recall the speakers’ identities. Since there is shared understanding of the identities in the contexts, the speaker expects to convey messages corresponding to the identities, such as claiming that the speaker can afford an expensive bag since she is herself, arguing that the interlocutor should not behave like the chairman since he is not the chairman and mocking that the interlocutor is not supposed to be obedient since he is himself.

To summarise, speakers can use overt 1PS/2PS in indexing themselves or their interlocutors as the subject of an action or status. By the indexing, the speaker recalls an action or a status of the speakers. The recall confirms the characteristics of the event or status, such as ‘You mentioned it before, so I am not saying something absurd or untrue’ or ‘I am Pak Caun, so I can afford an expensive bag’. It also supports the speaker’s current utterance by relating the characteristics of what is recalled to the speakers in the current discourse.

### 8.2.2 Claiming/avoiding responsibility

Most previous studies on overt subject expression in Korean note that it is related to the subject’s responsibility or credit (e.g., Jung, 2007; W. Kim, 1996; W. P. Lee, 1989; S. Oh, 2007). In particular, S. Oh (2007) specifies the tendency of using *nayka* (1sg pronoun *na* + subject marker *ka*) when speakers want to be recognised for what they have done:

---

10 As noted earlier in this chapter, the plain 1sg pronoun *na* adds -y in the form and sound when affixed with the subject marker -ka. The addition also occurs when the honorific 1sg pronoun *ce* and the plain 2sg pronoun *ne* are affixed with the subject marker -ka, so they become *ceyka* and *neyka*, respectively.
When speakers seek recognition and/or appreciation from the recipient for what they have done, they tend to use *nayka* more often than is necessary from a cognitive point of view (i.e., for resolving ambiguity) in describing their conduct. What speakers try to get credit for is often what they have achieved through their talk. (p. 467)

I also find a number of examples of *nayka* in our data that deal with the speaker’s responsibility, and one of the examples is shown in (7) below.

(7) 1 M: *icey nayka* sayaci ton penuntey.
   *I-pronoun* should buy now as (I) am making money.’

   [CF6:80, a son to his mother]

The speaker in (7) uses *nayka* while saying that he is responsible for buying his clothes since he makes money now when his mother offers him to buy clothes.

However, the overt use of 1PS/2PS for this function is not limited to *nayka* but extended to a wide range of other reference terms or a pronoun affixed with –*ka*. I include in the current analysis any reference forms of 1PS/2PS as well as any particles affixed to them, as long as the overt 1PS/2PS is used in claiming or avoiding speakers’ responsibility.11 For example, speaker R in (8) uses *na* with the topic marker -*nun* as 1PS, and I see that the overt 1PS is used to show the speaker’s strong determination about his responsibility:

(8) 1 O: *icey nongcang tolyecwela. icey sipnyen twaysscancha.*
   ‘Give back the farm now. (It) is almost ten years now.’

2 R: (pause) *acik hantal namasscanha.*
   ‘There is still a month left.’

3 O: (silent)

4 R: *tolakasin ni apecika sinsintangpwu hasyesstanikka, man sipnyen toyki ceneynun nika wase kwulmeuwkunftako hayto tolyecewuci mallako.*
   ‘Before he died, your father made it sure that (I) shouldn’t give it back to you before exactly ten years pass, even if you come and say that (you) starve.’

7 O: (pause) *kyewu hantaliya. apeci ttusun kumankhum nongcangul cal cikhyenaylanun ttusiessci (overlap)*
   ‘(It) is only a month. What he meant was to preserve the farm as such.’

9 R: (overlap) *hayekan nanun, apenimkwauy yaksok mwucoken cikhyeya tway.*
   ‘Anyway, *I-pronoun*, have to keep the promise with (your) father no matter what.’

---

11 By responsibility in this analysis, I mean to include duties, commitments, obligations or burdens in general that speakers may feel responsible for and be criticised when not fulfilled.
The speakers in (8) are old friends and argue on the ownership of a farm that O owns but R has been running on behalf of speaker O. Since O now asks R to return the farm to him (line 1), R refuses since there is one month left to reach the promised 10 years (line 2). O then tries to persuade R that one month is such a short time and that his father just said so to have R operate the farm well (lines 7 and 8). However, R does not compromise and confirms that he has to keep the promise anyway (lines 9 and 10). In the last utterance in (8), R reassures that he is responsible for the promise with speaker O’s father by saying nanun apenimkwa yaksok mwucoken cikhyeya tway ‘I have to keep the promise with (your) father no matter what’, using the pronoun na as 1PS.

As discussed in Chapter 6, overt 1PS/2PS is often used to contrast the subject with others explicitly or implicitly, and nanun in line 9 in (8) is one of the examples. By overtly saying nanun, R differentiates himself from O who wants to break the promise, and he affirms that as for him, he will keep the promise. The topic marker -nun attached to the pronoun na apparently indicates that the status or activity of the predicate, namely, keeping the promise anyhow, applies to the subject na as opposed to the interlocutor. In addition, the overt 1PS na here explicitly shows the speaker’s strong determination about his responsibility to keep his promise, which would not have been emphasised at the same level in the utterance without overt 1PS. R uses the overt 1PS na to index himself as a person who has a firm commitment to the promise, which is also presented in the auxiliary verb -eya tway ‘have to’ attached to cikhi-, the stem of the verb cikhita ‘to protect’.

Another example of overt 1PS indexing the speaker herself as being responsible for the action or status in the predicate is shown in (9). While the overt 1PS in (8) shows the speaker’s determination about his responsibility and contrastive perspective to the interlocutor’s suggestion, the overt 1PS in (9) is more likely to admit her negligence and regret about it. In her utterance, the speaker uses na when she describes what she regretfully keeps doing and implicitly apologises:

(9) 1 O: kuntey senhuynun cikum myech haknyenila kula?ssci?
   2 nay cakkwu tuleto (overlap)12

12 Nay in line 2 is a shortened form of nayka, the plain 1sg pronoun na affixed with the subject marker -ka. It does not frequently appear in modern spoken Korean, but it can represent an ‘obsolete’ and ‘written’ speech style if used in spoken discourse. It actually reflects that Speaker O in (9) is an elderly woman with her children all grown up.
‘By the way, what school year is Senhuy in (you) said?’

1-pronoun hear several times but

3 Y: (overlap) chil haknyeniyo.
‘In the seventh year.’

4 O: ice pelinun key. chil haknyen? acikto melessneyyo.
‘Keep forgetting. Seventh year? (It) is still far to go.’

[CF5:110–113, between female friends (with age difference)]

Speakers in (9) are friends with age difference; O is a few years older than Y. O asks about the school year of Y’s child (line 1) and admits that she heard it before (line 2). Y promptly answers that her child is in the seventh grade (line 3) before O finishes her utterance that she keeps forgetting even though she hears it several times (line 4).

With asking about the child’s school year in the discourse, O blames herself that she keeps forgetting and asking the same question, saying nay cakkwu tuleto ice pelinun key ‘Even though I hear several times, (I) regretfully forget’. The overt 1PS nay is unnecessary in the utterance in terms of conveying the meaning that the speaker keeps forgetting the school year. Despite its redundancy in the meaning, the overt 1PS has a powerful pragmatic function to express the speaker’s regret about not keeping her responsibility. O blames herself that she has a responsibility to remember the information Y gave her in the past, especially about her child, and shows her regret that she could not keep the responsibility. Although she does not apologise explicitly, O admits that she heard the information before and it shows that she regrets forgetting the information.

As a result of indexing the speakers themselves with overt 1PS in the utterances of confirming their responsibilities, the speaker in (8) shows his commitment to the responsibility, and the speaker in (9) shows her regret that she could not keep the responsibility. Conversely, the speaker of overt 1PS in (10) indexes himself as the subject of avoiding a responsibility:

(10) 1 F: nayka mwel kulehkey calmoshayssnya?
‘What have 1-pronoun done so wrongly?’

2 nayka cenchelem cipul phalamekesse kakeylul malamekesse

3 sakilul tanghay tonul nallyesse?
Have 1-pronoun happened to sell the house, failed a business or got scammed and lost money like in the past?

13 It is often regarded favourable and amiable to remember personal interests or family news, such as parents’ well-being or children’s ages, between friends.
tanci nay nongcangi anilanunke, kuke ttak hanmati anhanke
ppwunintey, nayka mwel kulehkey calmoshayssstako
atultulilanun nomtuli tancheylo nwuney ssangsicilul khyeko
aypilul capamekulye tule?
Except for not saying only one thing that the farm is not mine, what have I-pronoun done so wrongly, and punks who are my sons are all being so aggressive and hostile to me?
kulayto nayka aypiya. nayka nitul nahacwuko mekyecwuko
imankhum killecwun nitul aypilako.
However, I am the father. I am your father who gave you birth and fed and raised you.’

[D2:949–956, a father to his sons]

A father (F) in (10) has hidden for many years that the farm his family has been running is not his but his friend’s. He confesses it to his sons, and they react offensively and aggressively in the previous dialogue. F is then upset and asks what he has done so wrongly (line 1) and makes excuses that hiding the fact is not the worst compared with other events in the past (lines 2 to 5). He criticises the sons that they are being too rude (lines 6 to 7) and recalls that he is still their father who gave them birth and raised them (lines 7 to 9).

In his first utterance in (10), F asks nayka mwel kulegkey calmoshayssnya ‘What have I done so wrongly?’, using na as 1PS, by which he tries to say that he is not as much at fault as the interlocutors accuse. He repeats na as 1PS in expressing his feeling under a false accusation in lines 2 and 5. Both utterances are in the form of rhetorical questions like the first utterance. While asking whether he made terrible mistakes like in the past (line 2) and what he has done so wrongly (line 5), he intends to say that this is not significant misconduct and he has not done so wrongly. Although it is obvious that the subjects of the utterances in lines 1, 2 and 5 are first person, so he could have not said it overtly, F repeatedly uses na 1PS in the three utterances. Considering that the overt 1PSs in F’s utterances in (10) are less of a necessity, in terms of clarifying the subject of each sentence, there should be pragmatic motivations. The main expressive effects of na here seems to be the speaker’s desperate appeal to avoid criticism by indexing himself as the subject of being not responsible. A rhetorical question with 1PS asking

---

14 F in (10) uses na as 1PS to recall his identity as a father. As discussed in the previous section, he recalls his identity and confirms the attributes of the identity, which is specifically listed in this case (line 8 and 9). That is, he reminds that he is the interlocutors’ father who they should appreciate and show respect.
whether the speaker is guilty works as an effective device to display his willingness to claim
that he is not guilty or responsible.

Let us now examine the cases of overt 2PS in claiming responsibilities. In the following
eamples in (11) and (12), speakers use overt 2PS when they confirm the interlocutor’s
responsibility. A tutor (T) in (11) talks to her student (C) whose name is Cina. T uses C’s name
as 2PS when scolding her:

(11) 1 T:  i cholok, choloksaykun mweya cinaya.
       ‘What is this one marked in green, Cina?’
  2 C:  (silence)
  3 T:  ung? (pause) i choloksaykun, i, phalansayk pheynulo phyosihya
       non ken mweya?
       ‘Huh? This green, this, what is this one marked in blue?’
  4 T:  nato moll.
       ‘I don’t know, either.’
  5 C:  (pause) cinaka molumyen ettuhkey hay?
       ‘What do (we) do if you-first name don’t know?’

[S21:16–24, between a private tutor and a pupil]

Speaker T asks the meanings of the marks that C made on her book (line 1), and C does not
answer (line 2). Since T asks the same question again (lines 3 and 4), C says that she does not
know either (line 5). T then asks cinaka molumyen ettuhkey hay ‘What do (we) do if you don’t
know?’ with C’s first name Cina as overt 2PS (line 6). Although the utterance is in the form
of a question, T actually scolds C that she should know what the marks mean since she made
them herself. By asking the question in line 6, T clearly indexes that C, not someone else, is
responsible for knowing the meanings of the marks and criticises her for saying bluntly that she
does not know. By using overt 1PS, T makes it far clearer that C has the responsibility for
remembering the meaning of the marks she made herself while the utterance can be understood
with the 1PS unexpressed.

Similarly, speaker Y in (12) uses overt 2PS to blame speaker O of being an irresponsible brother
to his younger sister:

(12) 1 Y:  a, kulentey naika, ani way kulenyamyenun tto hoksi alayo
       nayka com sikhakoe nato pali nelpcanhayo.
       ‘Ah, but I, you know, why I say so is, (we) never know what if, I
       also have many friends in Chicago.’

15 The use of a personal name has another pragmatic effect in addition to the emphaptic function here, but we will
discuss it in relation to the pragmatic effects conveyed by a reference form the speaker uses for 1PS in Section 8.3.
In the previous part of the discourse, the younger speaker (Y) recalls that the older speaker (O)’s mother is worried that her daughter is not married and not interested in marriage. Y gives a reason that he brought up the topic, which is that he has many friends in the region (line 1). After O responds with simple back-channelling a ‘ah’ (line 2), Y continues that he can introduce someone if they share that kind of information, with a laugh (lines 4 and 5). He then asks a rhetorical question *kimhyengun tongsayngul way sicipul an ponayko com oppaka toysye kaciko* ‘Why have you not let the younger sister marry?’ (line 6), using *kimhyeng* ‘Kim (O’s surname) + hyeng (older brother for male speakers)’ as 2PS with the topic marker -un affixed. Y also adds *oppaka toysye kaciko* ‘while (you) are her older brother’ (line 7).

By asking the rhetorical question and reminding about O’s identity as an older brother, Y blames that O has not helped his sister marry yet. It is unlikely that it is an older brother’s responsibility to have his younger sister married in the common sense, and both speakers understand that Y is not critically blaming O, considering that they both laugh (lines 5, 7 and 8). Instead, Y asks O’s responsibility as an older brother in a humorous manner, and O gives an excuse that it is not supposed to be done as how he wishes (lines 8 and 9). Thus, the claim of responsibility in (12) is rather jocular than serious, but the use of *kimhyeng* as 2PS plays an important role to convey the ‘blaming’ tone that is weaker in the utterance with no overt 2PS.

---

This can be a counter-example of S. Oh (2007) that claims that the subject marker -ka is used to indicate the subject’s responsibility whereas the topic marker -un is used to display contrast. Many examples in our data show that overt 1PS/2PS can be used in recognising the subject’s responsibility regardless of the marker.
Overt 2PS in (11) and (12) are used in criticising and blaming the interlocutors by explicitly indexing them as the subject of being responsible for the given action or status (i.e., not knowing the meaning of the marks she made on her book and not helping his sister marry, respectively). In both examples, the reference terms are other than pronouns, and it could have brought other expressive effects in addition to indexing the interlocutors with having relevant responsibilities. For instance, the plain 2sg pronoun ne could replace the personal name Cina in (11), and it may reduce the degree of intimacy and consequently increase the emotional distance between the speakers. It can also lead to increasing the objectivity of the criticism.

The examples we have seen in (7) to (12) show that speakers take or avoid responsibilities with overt 1PS or attribute responsibilities to their interlocutors. In the process, overt 1PS/2PS is used to index the speakers as the agent of conducting the activity that is blameable. The utterances may be understandable with the 1PS/2PS unexpressed in some cases, but the overt expression of them clarifies where the responsibilities are placed.

8.2.3 Taking/giving credit

Speakers in our corpora often use overt 1PS/2PS when they want to praise their own or their interlocutor’s act. With overt 1PS/2PS, they index the speakers as the subject of conducting a particular action and give emphasis on their participation in the action that is praiseworthy (S. Oh, 2007). When overt 1PS/2PS is used for indexing the speaker as the subject of a creditable action, the utterances are to be a boast in the case of 1PS and a compliment in the case of 2PS.

In the following excerpt, a patient says that he came to the place where the conversation occurs to be served by a therapist using na as overt 1PS:

(13) 1 P: ye! hwangsilcang issesskwuman.
‘Hey, you were here.’
2 T: osyesseyo isanim.
‘(You) came, Mr Director.’
3 P: nayka hwangsilcanganthey patullyekwu ilpwule sikanmacchwe wasse.
‘I-pronoun intentionally came at this hour to be served by you.’
4 5 T: kulesyesseyo? (pause) manhi cohacisyesscyo?
‘Did (you)? (You) probably feel better, don’t you?’
6 P: kulem. tekpwuney manhi cohacysesse. camcal tlayto phyenhako.
‘Sure. Thanks to (you), (I) feel much better. It feels better even when (I) sleep.’

[D2:754–762, between a patient and a physiotherapist]
When a patient (P) enters a physiotherapist’s office and sees his therapist (T), he expresses his gladness saying ‘You were here’ in the first utterance in (13), while addressing the therapist hwangsilcang (the therapist’s surname Hwang + silcang ‘head of office’). T greets back and addresses P isanim (isa ‘Director’ + the honorific suffix –nim; line 2). P then says that he intentionally (ilpwule) visited at the particular hour, that is, during T’s work hours, where presumably more than one physiotherapist works there, to receive a treatment from T, using na as 1PS (lines 3 and 4). The utterance by P in lines 3 and 4 would make sense without na overtly expressed, but the overt 1PS stresses that P came to the place purposely to see T at the particular time. P uses na and takes credit that he put effort into visiting specifically T among other physiotherapists. By doing so, P shows his favour to T and possibly implies that T is good at his work. It is supported by the following utterance of P in line 9 that he feels better thanks to T’s treatment.

Since overt 1PS is used in taking credit as in (13), overt 2PS can also perform a similar emphatic function when a speaker appreciates her interlocutor’s act and gives credit as in (14):

(14) 1 F: nika kiponi antoymyense mwusun kiponul ttacye? nika imma
cikum nai cikep mwe hana kipon isangi toyunke isse? (pause)
ni hyencay checiwa cwaphyolul hanpen sayngkakhaypw, ni
checilul.
‘How dare (you) talk about average when you are below the average? Are you punk above the average for age or job? Think about your current status and position, your circumstances.’

2 3

5 S: appa, hyeng checika ettayse? hyengun wulicip calangsulepko
tuntunhan cangnamiyyo.
‘Dad, what is wrong with his circumstances? He is the proud and confident eldest son in our family.’

6 7 M: kulam. onul wuli maknay macnun mal henta.
‘Of course. You-nomina are saying correct words today.’

[D1:335–342, between parents and children]

The father (F) criticises his eldest son for being picky about woman while he is not in a great status himself (lines 1 to 4). In the utterance, we observe that F uses the plain 2sg pronoun ne for pointing out the interlocutor’s defect and irresponsibility. In the subsequent turn, the youngest son (S) disagrees with F and says that his brother is the proud and confident eldest son of the family (in lines 5 and 6). The mother (M) then agrees with S saying ‘Of course. You are saying correct words today’ in line 7. M uses wuli maknay ‘our youngest’ as 2PS, which could be unexpressed or replaced with ne while keeping the sentence meaning. Nevertheless, M uses wuli maknay as 2PS and indexes her youngest son as the subject of saying correct words.
Additionally, her affection towards S is expressed by choosing a kinship term in particular as 2PS. Throughout the conversation from which the extract (14) is taken, F admonishes his eldest son, and M tries to stop him, saying that the eldest son may feel unconfident if criticised too much. At that time, S takes his brother’s side, and M happily agrees with him in the last utterance in (14) in the form of compliment using the kinship term as 2PS.

Overt 2PS for giving credit to the interlocutor does not necessarily appear within agreement as in (14). The excerpt in (15) shows the use of overt 2PS by an older speaker (O) giving credit to a younger speaker (Y) while the older speaker makes an implicit contrast between the younger speaker and herself:

(15) 1 O: ceki, sinkyeng ssesi siksalul sam si sey kki hay tulilyemyenun, ‘So, if (you) try to serve three meals a day with care,’
2 Y: yey, yey, sam si sey kki. (laugh)
   ‘Yes, yes. Three meals a day. (laugh)’
3 O: kukesto pothong ili anil theynteyyo.
   ‘It must not be an easy work.’
4 Y: (laugh) kulssey ani kuliko mwe ilul an hasiko cipeyman
5 kyeysinikka.
   ‘(laugh) (I) know. Well, (s/he) only stays at home, not working.’
6 O: yey. (overlap)
   ‘Yes.’
7 Y: (overlap) kunyang siksaman hanun key aniko halili pyello
8 epscanhayo.
   ‘Not only (s/he) eats, but also there is nothing much to do.’
9 O: yey.
   ‘Yes.’
10 Y: kulenikkunun ikes cekes mwe kansik kathun ke,
    ‘So, things like snacks,’
11 O: yey.
    ‘Yes.’
12 Y: kulen ke mwe cakkwu sinkyeng ssukey toyko,
    ‘Things like that, (I) tend to care about that.’
13 O: ung. (pause)
    ‘Yes.’
14 Y: kunyang kulaykackonun mwe halwu congil mwuley son tam-
15 son tamkakko iss, isskey kulehkey toytelakoyo.
    ‘So, (I) happened to have (my) hands in the water all day.’
16 O: kulenikka campaynimun yolilul cal hasinikka mak ikes cekes
17 mantusinula kulaysskeystyczay.
    ‘Because you-nominal are a good cook, (you) are busy to make
    various dishes.’

[CF5:1–6, between two female speakers who know each other from the church]
Speakers in (15) are female friends from the church and talk about a person who is presumably a parent or a parent-in-law of Y and currently staying at her house. O expresses her compassion that it would be hard to serve the person three meals a day (lines 1 and 3), and Y agrees with a laugh (line 2). She then says that the person at her house only stays home, so she has to keep cooking for the person (lines 4 to 15). O consistently responds to Y with ‘yes’ and finally adds that Y is busy making various food items since she is a good cook (lines 16 and 17).

In her utterance, O uses camaynim (camay ‘sister’ + the honorific suffix -nim) as 2PS when giving a compliment that Y is a good cook. At the same time, by using the topic marker -un, O makes the 2PS contrastive to herself, accordingly implying that she is not a good cook herself. By contrasting Y to O, the compliment O gives is augmented since Y is relatively elevated in terms of being a good cook, which does not occur when it is not contrasted. In addition, if the 2PS is unexpressed, the utterance loses not only the contrastiveness but also the emphasis given to the interlocutor as the subject of being a good cook although the unexpressed subject can be interpreted as second person.

We have seen examples of overt 1PS indexing the speaker himself as creditable in (13) and overt 2PS indexing the interlocutor as laudable in (14) and (15). As such, speakers appear to use an overt 1PS/2PS while indexing themselves or the interlocutor as being praiseworthy. As pointed out previously, it is possible that other expressive effects, such as interpersonal functions, occur in addition to the emphatic function by the choice of referring expressions.

The expressive effects of overt 1PS/2PS discussed in this section may vary beyond recalling for confirmation, attributing responsibility or giving credit depending on the speech act of each utterance. Yet, it is in common that they are based on the emphatic function of overt 1PS/2PS, which clearly defines the subject of the utterance and accentuates the subjectness of the utterance.

8.3 Interpersonal Function

Person reference is not a mere linguistic process but involves consideration of sociocultural and interpersonal relationships (e.g., Brown & Gilman, 1960; Hijirida & Sohn, 1983, 1986; J. Lee,

---

17 As discussed in Chapter 6, overt 1PS/2PS in contrast is understood to be either explicit or implicit. When overt 1PS/2PS is in explicit contrast, we can find the contrastive candidate(s) in the discourse whereas there is no overt contrastive candidate of overt 1PS/2PS in the case of implicit contrast. In the case of the 2PS in (15), we do not see an explicit contrastive counterpart of the 2PS in the discourse, but it is implied by O that she wants to praise Y by contrasting herself, i.e., who is not a good cook, to speaker Y being a good cook.
1999; Levinson, 1987; Ono & Thompson, 2003; Wierzbicka, 1991). For example, Hijirida and Sohn (1983, 1986) state that there are cultural differences in the use of reference forms that display interpersonal relationships. The authors compare that American English is sensitive to intimacy when choosing a reference form whereas Korean and Japanese are more sensitive to power. Levinson (1987) also discusses that there are pragmatic differences in the use of lexical NP, pronoun and zero anaphora. According to Levinson, the degree of co-referencing is highest for zero anaphora and lowest for a lexical NP. That is, a lexical NP disjoints referencing more easily than a pronoun or zero anaphora does, but speakers still choose a lexical NP for referring to a person from time to time and it brings about pragmatic effects.

More specifically, Schegloff (1996) illustrates that the use of non-pronoun overt form for 1PS/2PS can relate the referent to a feature of the speakers as follows:

When speakers use a ‘third person reference form’ to refer to self or addressed recipient (in place of ‘I’ or ‘you’), they select such terms to display (or constitute) the current relevance with which the referent figures in the talk – whether it is ‘the President’, ‘the doctor’, ‘daddy’, ‘mom’, the personal name of one being referred to as a public figure (‘Richard Nixon’, ‘Bo Jackson’, etc.), and the like. That these terms can serve to display the relevance which the referent has to the ongoing talk points up a significant but otherwise hidden feature of ‘I’ and ‘you’, namely, that they mask the relevance of the referent and the reference at that point in the talk. (p. 447)

As discussed, a non-pronoun reference form for 1PS/2PS, namely, a ‘third person reference form’, can convey pragmatic effects that an equivalent pronoun for the same referent does not carry. We also have a number of examples in our Korean data that show such pragmatic effects occurring by alternation of reference forms for 1PS/2PS.

Such pragmatic effects are observed not only when a lexical NP replaces a pronoun but also when a pronoun replaces a lexical NP. For instance, the use of a kinship term for 1PS/2PS where a pronoun is more likely expected may be an expression of intimacy as pointed out by Schegloff (1996). A kinship term reminds about the social relationship between the speakers whereas an equivalent pronoun for 1PS/2PS would eliminate the possibility of recalling the relationship. However, if a speaker uses a pronoun for 1PS/2PS while she normally uses a kinship term or a professional title in the relationship, we can assume that the speaker intends to express her

18 Wierzbicka (1991) disagrees with Hijirida and Sohn (1983, 1986) that English is particularly insensitive to intimacy as its speakers use ‘you’ indiscriminately to anyone.

19 Levinson (1987:402) introduces I-Principle in relation with slogan “the less you say, the more you mean” while explaining the pragmatic motivation of using a lexical NP when zero anaphor or a pronoun functions better in co-referencing. As a lexical NP is a more specific piece of information compared with a pronoun or zero, a lexical NP is more informative than a pronoun or zero. Being informative here can motivate speakers to choose a lexical NP for pragmatic meanings that may be conveyed the specificity of the lexical NP.
interpersonal attitude to the interlocutor, such as estrangement or politeness. For instance, an older speaker who usually refers to herself as *enni* ‘older sister’ (for female speaker) while talking to her younger friends can express politeness or distance by using the honorific 1sg pronoun *ce* if one of the younger friends becomes her boss.

This two-way act of pragmatic effects by alternation of reference forms can be explained in terms of M-Principle (Levinson, 2000), as reviewed in Chapter 3. Let us revisit the gist of the principle:

> What is said simply, briefly, in an unmarked way picks up the stereotypical interpretation; if in contrast a marked expression is used, it is suggested that the stereotypical interpretation should be avoided. (p. 38)

According to this principle, a speaker chooses a marked expression when there is a more usually used, unmarked alternative, to convey a marked meaning. The listener also comprehends that a marked expression would have a marked meaning where an unmarked expression is normally used and the speaker has not said the unmarked one. In our case, reference forms expected and used normally in a social setting, e.g., plain pronouns between same-aged friends, are unmarked and what is unexpected and rarely used is marked. From the data, I found numerous overt 1PS/2PS have interperson function, which I categorise in two main patterns, (im)politeness and authority, and intimacy and estrangement.

### 8.3.1 (Im)politeness and authority

(Im)politeness and authority are not identical concepts, but I include the two together in this section since there is a commonality between them when we discuss the pragmatic intentions of speakers using overt 1PS/2PS. To be specific, speakers can express politeness with a particular reference term for 1PS/2PS, but it can also lead to an expression of authority and accordingly, expectation of politeness, owing to the characteristics of politeness. The examples for expression of authority appear in (18) and (19), and we consider two characteristic examples that show dynamic changes of reference terms in (16) and (17). Since the shifts of reference terms occur over several different segments of the discourses, I present them in the same number with letters in a series, in the format of (16a) to (16c) and (17a) and (17b), rather than in separate numbers.

---

20 Refer to Chapter 3 for the discussion on politeness *kongson* as a key notion in the current research.
Speaker E in (16) is an employee at a fashion company, and S is her boss and also the samonim (‘the wife of a teacher/manager/director/president’ + the honorific suffix -nim) of the president of the company. They were friends at high school, but did not get along because E was a diligent student whereas S criticised E for being naive. In the present time, they are introduced as an employee and the samonim and talk as though they are still friends as in (16a) using the plain pronoun na as 1PS:

(16a) 1 S: kekceng ma. pocungseey kwanhaysen, nayka cal malhalkey.
‘Don’t worry. In regard to the certificate, 1-pronoun will speak well.’
2 E: anya. kulel philyo epse.
‘No. (You) don’t need to.’
3 S: (silence)
4 E: wusen ku iley kwanhaysen sakwalalkey. nay silswuin ken
pwunmyenghanikk. (pause) kuntey na, sacikse naylyeko.
‘Firstly, (I) apologise about the matter. (It) is obviously my mistake. But, 1-pronoun plan to resign.’
5 S: sacikse? way, hoysaeyse kulelay?
‘Resign? Why? Did the company ask (you) to do so?’
6 E: ani, kaken aniko.
‘No, it is not that.’

[D4:117–119, between two female friends]

E made a mistake at work and S tries to help her by speaking to E’s direct boss (line 1). E says that there is no need to do so (line 2) and adds that she wants to quit the job (lines 4 and 5). Throughout the dialogue in (16a), both speakers speak at the informal speech level as same-aged friends would normally do, using the informal sentence final (-e form) and the plain pronoun na for 1PS.

However, in another dialogue between them, E changes her speech level to the deferential (-upnita form) and polite level (-eyo form) as well as using the deferential pronoun ce for 1PS and the pseudo title samonim for 2PS as in (16b):

(16b) 1 S: sekyeng, wasse?
‘Seykyeng, you came.’
2 E: (silence)
3 S: namacwese komawe. sasil, ipen mithing, nayka honca
4 cwukwanhanun keketun. cwungyohan ilintey, nika
towacwuntako hayse elmana maumi nohinunci molla.
‘Thanks for staying. Actually, this meeting, 1-pronoun am hosting it on my own. (It) is important and (I) am so relieved that you-pronoun agreed to help.’
E initially tried to quit her job as in (16a) but realises that she needs the work for financial reasons and decides to confront difficulties at work professionally. In (16b), S talks about the importance of the meeting for which she asked E to assist and expresses gratefulness for the help (lines 3 to 5). E then responds with *anipnita* ‘No worries’ in the deferential form (*ani* ‘no’ + the deferential sentence ending -*pnita*) along with an addressing term *samomin* (line 6). She also uses the deferential pronoun *ce* for 1PS in line 8 while adding that she is just doing what she is supposed to do (line 8). S is surprised at the change of speech level by E and asks her to continue the usual way, which is the casual speech level (line 9). E then describes a hypothetical situation that S has an alumni from high school as a boss at work, suggesting that it would be hard to maintain the casual speech to the friend (lines 10 to 13). In the utterance, E makes use of the honorific pronoun *ce* for 1PS and the pseudo title *samomin* for 2PS. Meanwhile, S continues on the informal speech level throughout the discourse; for example, *alasse* (*alass-*)
'understood' + the informal sentence ending -e) in line 14 and the plain pronoun ne for 2PS in line 17.

Intriguingly, E changes her speech level again as well as reference terms for 1PS and 2PS in the following excerpt as the circumstance and her emotional status change:

(16c) 1 S:  
   sëkyëng, tulesni?
   ‘Sëkyëng, did (you) hear?’

2 E:  
   mwusun malssumiseyeyo, samonim? (pause)
   ‘What do (you) mean, Ma’am?’

3 cën mos alatutkeyssnunteyyo. te hasil malssumepsusimyen,
   kapokeysssupnita.
   I-pronoun don’t understand. If (you) don’t have anything more to say, (I) will leave.’

5 S:  
   hakin, cikum ni checika kulehkito hakeyssta. kuchi?
   ‘Well, your current position should be so, right?’

6 E:  
   yecenhi, mos twayssta, ne. (pause) kutoongan caymissessci. ni
   simpwulumhanye tongpwunsecwuhanun na pomyense.
   ‘Still, mean, you-pronoun are. (It) must have been fun while (you) watch me busy running your errands.’

8 S:  
   sëkyënga.
   ‘Sëkyëng’

9 E:  
   ilehkey hayselato poyecwuko siphesse? ni pangsiktyalo salase,
   ne ilehkey sengonghaysstanun ke? (pause)
   ‘Did (you) want to show by even doing this? That you-pronoun are successful now after living in your way?’

11 kuntye ettekhanya? nen nika sengkonghan ke kathci?
   But, what should (you) do? Do you-pronoun think you-pronoun are successful?

12 nayka pol tayn aniketun. ne, yeysnalhako ttokkatha.
   I-pronoun don’t think so. You-pronoun are the same as in the past.’

[D4:834–876, between two female friends]

E realises that S was involved in her job interview and passed her to have her as a junior employee at the company. S confirms that E knows the situation now (line 1), and E tries to ignore it saying ‘I don’t understand’ (lines 2 to 4), still using the deferential pronoun ce as 1PS. S then evokes that E has to conform her position as a junior (line 5). E angrily responds that S is malicious, having intentionally hired her and watched her working so hard (lines 6 and 7). In this utterance, E uses the plain pronoun ne for 2PS along with informal sentence endings. S calls out E’s name, Sëkyëng (line 8), which expresses her surprise at the sudden change of speech level and reference term that E uses. E continues that she does not think that S is
successful even though S could think so herself (lines 9 to 12). In this utterance, she keeps using the plain pronouns na and ne for 1PS and 2PS, respectively.

The dialogues in (16) show the shifts of reference terms for 1PS/2PS according to the change of social relationship between interlocutors and their interpersonal strategy to it. When there is no tension between friends as in (16a), they use plain pronouns for 1PS/2PS. Once E determines to be formal after realising the disparity in their relationship as in (16b), she uses honorific forms, such as the deferential pronoun ce as 1PS and samonim as 2PS, as a junior would towards her boss. Finally, when the speaker becomes emotionally disturbed and intends to express her rage and criticism as in (16c), she reverts to the informal level of speech and uses plain pronouns, such as na for 1PS and ne for 2PS.

By changing reference forms for 1PS/2PS along with a corresponding speech level, the speaker manages the degree of politeness and impoliteness. To be specific, the use of ce for 1PS and samonim for 2PS displays the employee’s willingness to maintain distance from the samonim who is also her friend and to be formally polite. If there was no such intention, she could have continued using the plain pronouns for both 1PS and 2PS. Conversely, if the employee consistently used the plain pronouns, it would have been hard to notice her willingness to acknowledge their formal and distant relationship.

Similarly, E changes reference forms again for 1PS and 2PS for the same referent, her friend/boss, and we can observe another expressive effect. Since the employee has used the honorifics for 1PS/2PS since (16b), her use of plain forms in (16c) breaks the samonim’s expectation. The norm between the two speakers was one being inferior and the other being superior from (16b), but the employee suddenly violates the norm and becomes impolite using ‘inappropriate’ reference forms and speech level as an inferior in the inferior–superior relationship. The change is caused by her emotional turnaround when she discovers the samonim’s wicked plan about her employment. While sharply criticising her boss, E chooses to return to the informal speech. She accordingly shows her critical thoughts about S, instead of remaining ‘appropriate’ and polite in the relationship.

A speaker in (17) following shows a different aspect of reference change for 1PS/2PS when she does not know her interlocutor. The male speaker (M) in (17) was driving his car on a small road, and he accidentally splashed muddy water on the female speaker (F). Since M was not
aware of this event, F threw her bag towards the car to alarm him. M then stops the car and walks to F with her bag:

(17a) 1 M: *hoksi i kapang cwuin?*  
‘Did (you) happen to be the owner of this bag?’

2 F: (silence; taking the bag)

3 M: *i kapang, nay chaey tencin ke macsupnikka?*  
‘This bag, did (you) throw to my car?’

4 F: *ney.*  
‘Yes.’

5 M: *wayyo?*  
‘Why?’

6 F: *an seko kumyang kassunikkayo.*  
‘Because (you) didn’t stop and just went.’

7 M: *na alayo? wuli anun sainka?*  
‘Do (you) know me? Do we-pronoun know each other?’

8 F: *nwun ttun cangnimiseyyo?*  
‘Are (you) blind?’

9 M: (silence)

10 F: (pointing at the stain on her dress)

11 M: *ikey mwe, (pause) nayka kulen kepnikka?*  
‘What about this, did I-pronoun do this?’

12 F: *tanki kieksangsilcungieyeyo?*  
‘Do (you) have short term amnesia?’

13 M: *a. eeyka silswulul haysskwunyo.*  
‘Ah. I-pronoun made a mistake.’

[D9:1217–1229, between two strangers both in their 20s]

M does not realise that he ruined F’s dress by splashing water on it while driving until F points at her dress and tells him that he drove by her a moment ago (lines 1 to 10). Since he did not understand why F is upset and stopped his car by throwing her bag towards his car, he is rather unkind and less polite in his utterances. The use of plain pronouns, such as *wuli ‘we’ and na ‘I’, partially proves his casual and nonchalant attitude towards F, which may be considered impolite, especially between speakers of similar ages, unless M is older than F and both speakers know it. After realising what happened, M changes the reference form for 1PS from the plain pronoun *na* to the deferential pronoun *ce* (in line 13). The change in referring expression can show the change in his attitude to the situation and F, for example, from nonchalant to serious, and from casual and disrespectful to polite, respectively.

---

21 The female speaker (F), in fact, constantly avoids using overt 2PS in her utterances in (17a) for the reason.
The same speakers from (17a) continue their conversation in (17b) and discuss the compensation for the damage to F’s dress. F has avoided any reference terms that could demonstrate age difference, but she uses particular nouns for 1PS/2PS that reflect their relationship in the specific situation as follows:

(17b)  
1. M: *mwulcekulo sonhaylul kkichyessumyen, kyengceycek posangul hanun key tangyenhayyo.*  
   ‘If (one) damages (the other) physically, it is natural to compensate economically.’
2. F: (returning the bank cheque) *mwulcek sonhaylul mwulcek posangulo patko siphunci, kyengceycek posangulo patko siphuncinun phihayaka kyelcenghanun keyo. kahayaka hanun key anila.*  
   ‘Whether to receive physical compensation or economical compensation for a physical damage is something a victim-nominal decides. Not something an assailant-nominal does.’
3. M: (silence)
4. F: *ppalacwul ke animyen, kwantwulakwuyo.*  
   ‘Unless (you) are going to wash (the dress), (I) mean forget it.’

[D10:4–14, between two strangers both in their 20s]

M gives a bank cheque to F as compensation for her dress that he ruined, but F shows a gesture of refusal in the previous part of dialogue in (17b). M claims that there should be economic compensation for physical damage (lines 1 and 2), and F rebuffs that it should be the victim, not the assailant, who decides on whether the compensation should be either economic or physical (lines 3 to 6). In this utterance, F uses nouns, *phihayca* ‘victim’ and *kahayca* ‘assailant’, when describing the relation of the two speakers, F and M. Both *phihayca* and *kahayca* are not actually referring to the two speakers in the conversation but referring to categories that the speakers can identify with. Yet, it is obvious that F is the victim and M is the assailant from what happened in (17a), so M should be able to connect the reference with the referent in the context.

It would have been possible for F to say ‘I should decide, not you’ instead of using the juridical nouns as in her utterance in (17b). The use of the nouns clearly shows the contextual relationship of the interlocutors, namely, a victim and an assailant. More importantly, it also provides a way that F can explicitly indicate the speakers as 1PS and 2PS in the utterance and contrast them, without loss of politeness where there is no ‘appropriate’ reference term in such relationships, that is, strangers of similar age. If she uses plain forms of pronouns like *na* for 1PS and *ne* 2PS,
it can be interpreted as extreme antagonism and impoliteness, merely because of using the plain forms when the interlocutors are not in the relationship to use the forms. Conversely, if she uses honorific reference terms, such as deferential pronouns ce for 1PS and sensayngnim ‘Sir’ for 2PS, it would be hard to convey her discontent about M’s attitude. Moreover, both plain and honorific reference forms certainly do not display their relative status as a victim and an assailant.

Similar to the use of nouns for 1PS/2PS as in (17) above, a kinship term can also bring a expressive effect that is not conveyed by an equivalent pronoun or unexpressed subject. In the following excerpt in (18), a father scolds his sons for fighting each other. While he could use the plain pronoun na for 1PS, he refers to himself as apeci ‘father’ saying ‘I am speaking’:

(18) 1 F: kumantul twe. kumantul twuko anculanikka. (pause)
     ‘Stop. (I said) stop and sit down.’
 2 kumantul twulamyen kumantul twe icasiktula. (pause)
     ‘Stop when (I say) to stop, these brats.’
 3 ikestul apecika malssumhasinuntey macaya cengsinul chalillyena. (pause)
     ‘You-nominal, I-kin term am speaking but, would listen after beaten.’
 4 macaya cengsinul chalilkkeya? kumantul mostwe?
     ‘Will (you) behave if beaten? Won’t (you) stop?’

[D1:1007–1011, a father to his sons]

Since the sons are fighting each other, the father (F) tells them to stop and sit (lines 1 and 2), addressing them icasiktul ‘these brats’, but they do not listen to him and continue fighting. F becomes upset and says ‘I am speaking but (you are not listening). You would listen after beaten’ (lines 3 to 5), using apeci ‘father’ as 1PS and ikestul ‘these things’ as 2PS. He also uses the polite form malssumhasi- ‘(hon.) speak’ for the verb (line 3) for himself, instead of the informal form malha- ‘speak’. It would be the same utterance if he used na and nehuytul instead of apeci and ikestul, respectively, in terms of indexing first and second person in the discourse. Nevertheless, F expresses his anger more effectively by referring to his sons with ikestul ‘these things’ and uses his authority as a father to make his children listen to him by referring to himself with apeci ‘father’ along with the honorific form of the verb for 1PS.

As seen in the utterance of the speaker using a kinship term to display his authority as a father in (18), speakers choose to use other reference terms than pronouns to emphasise their social and interpersonal relationships with interlocutors. The lexical reference terms recall relevant
social norms, such as ‘be polite to your senior’. In (19), a junior journalist (J) argues with his senior (S) and the senior speaker uses her title at work, thimecang ‘team head’, for 1PS in the argument:

(19) 1 J:  
      eccey cey kisa hwancensang inthepyu way 
      phyenciphasyesssupnikka?  
      ‘Why did (you) cut out the interview of a money broker from my report yesterday?’

3 S:  thimecangi phyencip kwenhan kacko issnunke alko 
      issultheyntey.
      ‘(You) are probably aware that I-am authorised for editing.’

5 J:  
      kukey ettehkey tian inthepyuntey kukek tulenaynikka?
      yongyacalul yuilhakey mokkyekhan salamiesstakuyo.
      ‘How could (you) cut that out after (I) worked so hard to get it?
      (She/he) was the only person who witnessed the suspicious.’

7kulentye kukek thongulo tulenayyo? thimecangnim; cey kisas
8  elmana engmangulo mantulessnunci asipnikka?! cey ilum kelko 
9  nakanun cey kisapnita!
      ‘(You) nevertheless cut the whole thing out? Do (you) know how badly vou-title 
      destroyed my report? (It) is my article with my name on it.’

[D2:320-329, between a senior and junior at work]

J finds out that an interview in his news report has been edited by S and asks S the reason (lines 1 and 2). S says that she has the authority to edit news reports (lines 3 and 4), using thimecang ‘team leader’ as 1PS, rather than giving him a direct answer. The utterance by S can be seen as a general description of the rules at their work, with the subject being a title of a position. However, it is obvious that the title is used as a reference term for 1PS in the discourse, which also appears as 2PS in the following utterance by speaker J (line 7).\textsuperscript{22} S could have used the plain pronoun na for 1PS saying ‘I have the authority for editing’, but she deliberately says that a team leader has the authority where she is a team leader herself. Although a professional title is barely used as 1PS unless it is sensayngnim (‘teacher’ + the honorific suffix -nim) speaking to pupils, it brings out an expressive effect when it is used as 1PS. Similar to the use of apeci ‘father’ for 1PS by a father in (18), a senior using his or her title as 1PS when speaking to junior can overtly show his or her authority in their profession.

\textsuperscript{22} It is also notable that the junior speaker keeps using the senior’s title with the honorific suffix -nim even when they are arguing. Professional titles in a workplace are the most common choice for a reference term and they are usually used as 2PS by junior speakers talking to their seniors.
As discussed earlier, the relationships between interlocutors primarily affect the decision of a reference term. Therefore, speakers hardly have a reference term for 1PS/2PS, especially 2PS, when there is no relationship established yet. In the following excerpt in (20), two speakers first meet in a waiting room for a job interview and the male speaker (M) uses the deferential pronoun ce for 1PS and a deictic expression kuccok ‘that side’ for 2PS:

(20) 1 M: toykey ttellinta. cen kwuksencentampyenhosaka toynunkey
2  
kkwumissketunyo. kuccokto kulayyo?
‘(I) am so nervous. I-pronoun have dreamt to become a public
defender. Have you-deictic, too?’
3 F: cenhyeyo.
‘Not at all.’

[D5:312–315, between two applicants for an interview]

M and F in (20) are applicants for the post of public defender and meet at the interview. Although they are of similar age from their appearance and the particular setting of a job interview, M uses ce for 1PS (line 1) since it is socially expected to speak in the formal speech level when the speakers do not know their relative ages and have not decided on their reference terms.23 Thus, strangers are likely to use less overt 1PS/2PS as seen in the distribution of overt 1PS/2PS by relative ages of speakers in Chapter 5.

Nevertheless, the 2PS in M’s utterance (line 2) needs to be overt because of the semantic value of the particle -to ‘also’ attached to the subject. For M to ask whether F also has dreamt to become a public defender, he should say an overt reference form for 2PS since using the particle -to is the most common and almost the only way to convey the comparative meaning of ‘also’. There is no kinship term to be chosen, since they are neither family members nor close friends with age difference; no professional title decided because they are applying for the job; and no pronoun to be considered since they are not same-aged friends to use ne and not arguing to use tangsin. In this kind of situation, that is, when no appropriate reference form is available, but one is required for the semantic meaning conveyed by a particle affixed to the reference form,

---

23 It actually happens often that speakers discuss how to address each other when it is not simple or straightforward because of conflicts of norms. For example, a senior at university who is younger than a junior can ask the junior to address him/her with his/her name instead of a kinship term. Normally, a junior is younger, and a senior is older, and the younger addresses the older with a kinship term at schools. When the age and school year do not match, speakers tend to negotiate and decide on the address terms in the beginning of their relationships.
deictic expressions like *kuccok* ‘that side’ or *keki* ‘there’ for 2PS and *iccok* ‘this side’ or *yeki* ‘here’ can be chosen.

I see this as a sort of politeness, not for an older speaker but for a speaker of an unknown age. Although deictic forms for 1PS/2PS are not honorific, it is one way to fill the gap between honorifics and plain forms and the gap between complete strangers and acquaintances. Speakers sometimes cannot use either relative age or social status as a barometer to determine a reference form because the information is not shared or is vague in the context. In that case, if we need an overt 1PS/2PS to secure certain semantic meanings, a deictic form may be a solution. Unless the addressee is clearly older or younger from their appearance, speakers maintain neutrality, without being rude or unnaturally polite, by using deictic forms. Deictic forms are usually temporary since the relationship develops as the discourse develops and speakers come to settle on a steady reference term based on their relationship. Alternatively, they can be genuinely temporary if the speakers do not proceed with the discourse as well as the relationship.

In sum, the speakers in our data use pronouns, kinship terms, professional titles and other NPs for 1PS/2PS and they show shifts among the reference terms in accordance with the change of situations and their responses to it. Overall, the use of honorific pronouns, kinship terms and professional titles instead of plain pronouns display politeness and/or authority. Expressive effects are created by using each reference term. In reverse, the use of a plain pronoun where an honorific pronoun, a kinship term or a professional title is expected can convey impoliteness. In addition, when speakers have not settled on appropriate reference terms, NPs that reflect their temporary relationship or deictic expressions can be used as 1PS/2PS without threatening politeness.

### 8.3.2 Intimacy and estrangement

In addition to politeness and authority, overt 1PS/2PS can be used to express intimacy or estrangement. Personal names and kinship terms tend to express intimacy whereas pronouns replacing names or kinship terms can function as a representation of estrangement. As noted earlier as regards M-implicature (Levinson, 2000), an interpersonal function of overt 1PS/2PS occurs based on the fact that there are alternative reference forms that are more likely to be expected.

In (21), for example, a tutor (T) uses a kinship term for 1PS, which could be replaced with the plain pronoun *na*, while speaking to her student whose name is *Cina* (C):
(21) 1 T: *ca, ennika yensani mwela kulaysse, cinaya?* ‘So, what did *I-kin term* say arithmetic function is, Cina?’

2 C: (silence)

3 T: *ung?* ‘Huh?’

4 C: *pwunswu.* ‘Fraction.’

5 T: *kuchi, etten, etten pangsiikkiliuy yaksokila kulaysscii?* ‘Right, (I) said that (it) is a promise among some functions, didn’t (I)?

6 *kulayse ilehan yensanun ilehtalakwu cenguyul naylye*

7 *cwumyen? ilen yensaney macchwese swuscalul itaylwu,*

8 *kutaylwu phwule cwumyen toynun keci. ca, kulemyenun,*

So, if (we) define that an arithmetic function is like this? According to this arithmetic function, (we) input a number and calculate as such. So, then,’

9 (pause) *hangtungwenun tto mweko yekwenun tto mwela kulayssse?*

‘What did (I) say an identity element is and an inverse element is?’

10 C: (silence)

11 T: *hangtungwenun mwela kulayssse?*

‘What did (I) say an identity element is?’

12 C: *tehayse, caki casinul naonun ke.* ‘After adding, something that becomes itself.’

13 T: *tehayse caki casini naonun kela kulayssna? hangtungweni?*

(pause) *ennis kulehkey an allye cwessnuntey.* ‘Did (I) say that (it) is something that becomes itself after adding? *I-kin term* didn’t teach like that.’

[S21:29–46, between a female private tutor and a female student]

Speaker T tries to remind C about the definition of arithmetic function, but C struggles to answer. T uses *ennis* ‘older sister (for female speakers)’ when asking ‘What did I say an arithmetic operation is?’ in her first utterance in (21) and when saying ‘I didn’t teach like that’ (line 15). For both utterances, the plain pronoun *na* could be a complete replacement to deliver the meaning of the current sentences. While the two equivalents, *na* and *ennis*, function as 1PS with the same indexical values, T chooses *ennis* to refer to herself. *Enni* brings out a kinship even though they are not real family, and it adds intimacy to the utterance, which would be lacking in the same sentence with *na* as 1PS. As another example that T chooses a reference form that adds intimacy to the utterance, she used the student’s name *Cina* for 2PS in a different part of the dialogue in (11) in 8.2.2. Instead of using *ne*, speaker T uses *Cina*, speaker C’s name, as 2PS in (11), as well as addresses her with her name (line 1) in (21).
Similarly, a different tutor (T) in (22) speaks to her student and uses sensayngnim (‘teacher’ + the honorific suffix -nim) as 1PS and the student’s name for 2PS:

(22) 1  T:  a, sensayngnim cincca kkamccak nollassney cincca. kulel lika epsnutney, ike sensayngnimi, (overlap) ‘Ah, I-title was so surprised, really. (It) shouldn’t be, but teacher,’
2
3  W:  (overlap) yeki mak, amwu kes tungi mak, penho swunsetaylo mak, holswunun mak, chilsip cem ccakswunun phalsip cem mak, ilayyo. ‘Here, like, things are like anything, in any order, odd numbers are 70 and even numbers are 80.’
4
5  T:  (laugh) kulem wungpemi paneyse myech tung myech tung haysse? (pause) kulen ke molla? ‘Then what ranks do you-first name take for each in the class? Do (you) not know such things?’
6
7  W:  mollayo. ‘(I) don’t know.’
8
[S19:152–160, between a female private tutor and a male student]

The student whose name is Wungpem (W) has lied about test results from school, and T just realised that the low scores W showed to her was not real. T says that she was very surprised since she expected higher scores, using sensayngnim ‘teacher’ as 1PS. T in (22) could have said no overt 1PS at all or chosen na as 1PS, without changing the meaning of her utterance. The pronoun na as 1PS would have neutrally indexed the speaker herself as the subject of being surprised. She could have also chosen a kinship term like nwuna ‘older sister (for male speakers)’ for 1PS, as the tutor used enni in (20) did, and it would have conveyed intimacy if she intended to do so.

What T in (22) actually chooses for 1PS is sensayngnim, and this can bring another expressive effect. Although the expressive effect that sensayngnim as 1PS conveys should be not fixed but varied by the context, it is based on the expression of intimacy towards pupils. As discussed in Chapter 4, sensayngnim is one of the rare professional titles used as 1PS, and the participants of the discourse in which sensayngnim is used are limited to a teacher and pupils. Teachers might want to emphasise their authority or expertise by referring to themselves sensayngnim, but there is still emotional or interpersonal engagement remaining in the use of such a lexical reference form instead of a pronoun as 1PS.

According to what is being said in the discourse in (22), such as T’s relief that W’s score is not low, it does not seem that T tries to display her authority as a teacher using sensayngnim as 1PS.
She also uses W’s name Wungpem as 2PS, which can be a common way to express intimacy to children or between a couple, so sensayngnim as 1PS by T is seemingly an expression of intimacy because the title can recall the role of teacher to be caring and attentive. One could argue that T does not intend to express intimacy every time she says sensayngnim as 1PS since she may always use the reference form for herself like a personal linguistic habit. Still, we can think about the differences that each reference form makes to the pragmatic meaning when replacing each other as 1PS. For example, if a teacher uses na as 1PS to pupils while another teacher always uses sensayngnim as 1PS, it is highly possible that the use of different reference terms can affect the formation of impression on their speech styles or even personalities. That is, a teacher using na as 1PS can be seen cold, impersonal or objective whereas another teacher using sensayngnim as 1PS can be seen friendly, amiable or didactic.

As shown, teachers use reference terms other than pronouns as 1PS/2PS, and it appears to give rise to intimacy by recalling the relationship of the interlocutors, which is not found in the use of pronouns. In the following examples, we see how kinship terms for 1PS by family members convey intimacy where pronouns keep the tone of utterances less intimate, or in other words, estranged. In the excerpts in (23), a mother (M) speaks to her son (S), using emma ‘mum’ and na as 1PS and wuli atul ‘my son (lit. our son)’ as 2PS. For convenience, two parts of a phone conversation are presented in (23a) and (23b) as in the previous examples:

(23a)  
1 S: mwe, kulayto nayka, mwe, philyo hanyen sacyo, mwe.  
‘Well, still, I-pronoun will buy (clothes) myself if needed.’
2 M: (laugh)
3 S: icey nayka sayaci ion penuntee.
‘Now I-pronoun have to buy as (I) make money.’
4 M: ani, kulayto, e, emmaka sa cvuko siphese kulenikka.
‘No, but, (I) say so because I-kin term want to buy (you).’

[CF6:78–82, between a mother and a son]

Earlier in the dialogue, M said that S would need more clothes for an event and offers to buy new clothes. S says that he will buy them himself if needed (line 1) since he makes money now (line 3), using na as 1PS. M says that she still wants to buy him new clothes (line 4), using emma ‘mum’ as 1PS.

As shown in (23a), even after children are adults, many parents keep using a kinship term for 1PS, but they can alternately use the plain pronoun na for 1PS as in (23b):

(23b)  
1 S: emma kamki kellisyesseyo?
‘Did you-kin term catch a cold?’

2 M: ung?
‘Pardon?’

3 S: kamki?
‘A cold?’

4 M: na kamki cokum tulun kes katha. khossoli haci com, ung?
‘I-pronoun probably got a cold slightly. (I) sound a little nasal, right?’

5 S: ung, ung.
‘Yeah, yeah.’

6 M: ke pwa. taypen alcanha wuli atulun.
‘See, You-nominal notice at once.’

7 S: (laugh)

8 M: ku wuwuvu, appanun kuke cal molunta. kulayse nayka cikum
kamkiyak mekulyeko kulay.
‘That, um, Dad does not know well. So, I-pronoun am trying to take some medicine now.’

[CF6:132–139, between a mother and a son]

In the same phone conversation, S asks whether M has caught a cold (line 1), and M answers that she probably did (line 2). In his question, S uses emma ‘mum’ as 2PS, where a kinship is the only option for a child to refer to his or her parent. However, M has more options than that and can use a pronoun or a kinship term at least. She uses emma as 1PS when expressing her wish to offer clothes to her son in (2 3a) but uses na as 1PS when describing herself having a cold in (23b).

It is possible to see that the use of kinship term as 1PS is affected by the content of the utterance, more specifically, by the speech act, from this instance. That is, if a mother uses both a pronoun and a kinship term for 1PS while speaking to her son, it is likely that she uses a pronoun when her utterance is unrelated to the second person, for example, about her being sick. Meanwhile, she uses a kinship term that exhibits the relationship between the interlocutors when her utterance is related to the second person, such as her wish to offer something to him. This perhaps does not apply to all cases of alternate use of pronouns and other reference terms. Notwithstanding, it is a legitimate account, considering the patterns that lexical reference forms replace pronouns as well as the nature of lexical reference forms as 1PS/2PS that evokes the

---

24 Younger speakers in a discourse have a rigidly restricted range of referential choices for 2PS as observed in the distribution analysis in Chapter 5 and discussed to be one reason of high rate of 2PS omission in the literature (e.g. C. W. Na, 1988; H. Sohn, 1981; Wang et al., 2005). We have one example that a son uses kuccok as 2PS while arguing with his own father, and the father becomes furious about the referential choice of his son. As the restriction on the reference terms for 2PS by younger speakers are strict with almost no exceptions acceptable, the pragmatic effects of violating the norm, which is basically impoliteness, seem to be extreme.
interpersonal relationships among participants in addition to explicitly indexing them as subjects of the sentences. In other words, the speakers ‘mask the relevance of the referent and the reference at that point in the talk’ by replacing pronouns with lexical reference forms, as noted earlier in this section (Schegloff, 1996:447).

We have a distinct example in which a daughter uses a kinship term for 1PS presupposing intimacy but ultimately conveying irony and sarcasm. The speakers in (24) are a mother (M) and a daughter (D) and talk about the daughter’s career:

(24) 1 M: nenun kot aipissiy kanphan ayngkhevumeni toyl salamianun kelt icci mallanikka. encey etisena phwumkyekkwa kiphwum.
‘Don’t forget that you-pronoun are someone who is going to be a representative anchorwoman of IBC. Dignity and nobility anytime and anywhere.’

2

D: nwukayo? emmattal choykun inyenkan thukcong hana epsi pilpiltayko isstanunyey.
‘Who is? I-nominal have been struggling last two years without an exclusive news report.’

[D2:279–281, between a mother and a daughter]

M tells D that D is someone who is going to be a representative anchorwoman at the broadcasting station she works (line 1), using ne as overt 2PS. Since D is careless and clumsy in her behaviour and speech, M also advises D to have dignity and nobility always (line 2). D then asks who is going to be a representative anchor (line 3), which rhetorically says that she is not someone to be a representative anchorwoman herself. She adds, as a supporting idea, that she has been struggling with poor achievements at work (lines 3 and 4), using emmattal ‘your daughter (lit. mum’s daughter)’ as 2PS. It is clear that D refers to herself with emmattal, but she does not simply say na or ce as 1PS. It would have still conveyed her self-mocking tone about having no outstanding professional achievement if she said na. The use of emmattal, nonetheless, dramatises the daughter’s disagreement with the mother and enlarges the sarcasm by bringing out their relationship.

To be specific, D disagrees with M by providing a reason that she has struggled at work and hence her becoming a famous anchorwoman is only the mother’s wish. If D had used a pronoun such as na, her utterance would have made it seem that the 1PS na is separate from the 2PS ne in D’s utterance, which is about someone going to become a famous anchorwoman. Meanwhile, emmattal brings out their relationship, along with the mother’s expectation, into the role and connects the 1PS who is struggling at work to the 2PS who is a future anchorwoman from the
mother’s perspective. By connecting the two subjects, the mother’s wish and the daughter’s reality are evidently contrasted, and accordingly, the sarcasm becomes more effective. Further, the kinship term *emmattal* can be a very intimate expression when used to refer to an interlocutor, including self-reference, although the frequency of use is low. Because the level of intimacy is higher, the level of sarcasm can grow when it is used in criticism since the difference increases between the literal or expected evaluation of the reference form and the evaluation of the referent in the reality.

Different from (23) and (24), speakers in following excerpts in (25) and (26) are not in a genuine kinship but use kinship terms for 1PS. However, the expressive effects are actually similar to the expressive effect found in (24) above; there is a premise commonly understood that a kinship term as 1PS expresses intimacy, and speakers make use of it for another expressive effect. For example, a male senior at university (S) uses *oppa* ‘older brother (for female speakers)’ as 1PS while speaking to a female junior (J) in (25):

(25) 1 S: *cipey issesse*?
   ‘Were (you) at home?’
2 J: ey, ey.
   ‘Yeah, yeah.’
3 S: *twu tal tongan*?
   ‘For two months?’
4 J: *maynna nalasseyo*. (laugh)
   ‘(I) went out every day.’
5 S: *oppaka yenlak com haycwul kel kalysskwuna*. (laugh)
   ‘I-kin term should have called you.’
6 J: (laugh)
7 S: (laugh) *hakiya yenlakhayto nao ci anhasskeyssciman*. (laugh)
   ‘Well, (you) probably wouldn’t have come out even if (I) called.’

[S3:156–164, between a male senior and a female junior at university]

In the previous part of the dialogue, S asked what J had done during the school break, and J answered that she stayed home. S asks again whether J had stayed home for the whole two months of school break (lines 1 and 3); J answers ‘yes’ first (line 2) and then says she went out every day (line 4). In the previous part of the dialogue between J in (25) and her other friend participating in the discourse, J said that she stayed home during the break, but she changes her

---

25 Burgers (2011:190) defines irony as ‘an utterance with a literal evaluation that is implicitly contrary to its intended evaluation.’ Accepting sarcasm as sarcastic irony (Voyer & Vu, 2016), the utterance of speaker D in (24) can be interpreted as ironical since its literal evaluation, i.e., *emmattal* being intimate and to be proud, is contrary to its intended evaluation, i.e., struggling at work.
answer because S repeatedly asks the same question. After saying that she went out every day, J laughs (line 4) and shows that she is making a joke. S understands that it was a joke and says that he should have called her (line 5).

In his utterance in line 5, S uses oppa for 1PS, which would be normally na, as oppa is rarely used as 1PS unless the speaker intends to express intimacy to his girlfriend, own younger sister or very close female friends of younger age. Although they are not a couple, siblings or very close friends, S uses oppa as 1PS and as an expression of exaggerated intimacy. They both laugh when S says oppa since they understand that the use of oppa is to pretend to be in such a relationship. To effectively display his care about J, who only stayed at home during the break, S uses oppa instead of na when he regrets that he has not contacted her. The use of oppa brings out the special relationship between oppa and his girlfriend/younger sister/close friend, although it is not the case for the speakers in (25), and it hyperbolises his utterance about regretting not calling her.

Similarly, a kinship term is used when the speakers in (26) are not family members but same-aged friends. E uses enni for 1PS while offering to make a cushion for her friend K whose name is Kim Swuceng. The name is also used as 2PS when E asks whether K wants to receive a cushion:

(26) 1 K: toykey yeypputula. ‘(It) was very pretty.’
2 E: sipcaswu? ‘Cross-stitch?’
3 K: e. yeça chinkwuhanthey patassna pwa, ‘Yeah, (He) probably received (it) from the girlfriend.’
4 E: e, hayntuphon cwuley? ‘Yeah, a mobile phone string?’
5 K: ani, khwusyeni. ‘No, a cushion.’
6 E: khwusyen. ‘A cushion.’
7 K: toykey kokupsulepkwu, ‘(It) was very sophisticated and,’
8 E: ai, kimswuceng tto kuke patko siphun keya? ‘Hey, is (it) that you-full name also want to receive one?’
9 K: (laugh)
10 E: a. sayngil ttay tto ennika hay cwukkey. ‘Ah. On (your) birthday, I-kin term will make one.’
11 K: enceey sayngilkaci kitalye? ‘How can (I) wait until (my) birthday?’
Speaker K talks about a cushion with cross-stitch that her friend received from his girlfriend (lines 1, 3, 5 and 7). E asks whether speaker K also wants a cushion with cross-stitch (line 8), using her name Kim Swuceng as 2PS. E’s question is to confirm K’s intention behind mentioning her friend’s cushion, rather than being a simple question to ask whether she wants a cushion. It would make sense if the question has its 2PS unexpressed, but E overtly says the 2PS and claims K’s responsibility for intentionally talking about her friend’s cushion, in a teasing manner. In doing so, the reference form E chooses for 2PS is K’s full name, and it intensifies the jeering tone. Compared with a first name, which same-aged friends normally use to address each other, a full name can convey distance, formality and seriousness (W. P. Lee, 1989; J. Park, 1997; C. Son, 2010). When a friend makes fun of another, it might be done more effectively with a full name, because the use of a first name is too ordinary and banal.

Since K laughs (line 9), which can be interpreted as a positive response to the question, namely, she intentionally brought up the topic to express her wish to have a cushion with cross-stitch, E says that she will make one for her birthday (line 10). In her utterance, E says enni for 1PS, and this use of kinship term resembles the use of emma ‘mum’ as 1PS when the mother offers clothes to her son in (23a). It is also similar to the use of oppa ‘older brother (for female speakers)’ for 1PS when the male senior talks about a phone call he could have made to the female junior in (26). The difference is that enni in (26) is used between friends whereas emma in (23a) and oppa in (25) are used between speakers with age difference. For either case, it seems plausible to say that speakers make use of a kinship term as 1PS when they offer something and speak with generosity or at least pretend to be benevolent to their family members or friends. The ‘offering’ utterances can have pronouns as 1PS, but the use of kinship terms advertises such intention of the speaker to offer and express generosity.

To sum up, speakers in our data use kinship terms, professional titles or personal names as 1PS/2PS instead of pronouns or unexpressed 1PS/2PS in certain contexts in which they display intimacy or estrangement with their interlocutors. In particular, kinship terms as 1PS/2PS
emphasise the close relationship between the speakers, whether or not a kinship is real, while equivalent pronouns neutralise the utterance and relatively reduce the intimacy. Speakers perceive that a kinship term replacing a pronoun expresses intimacy, and they employ the expressive effect in sarcasm or jokes by using a kinship term for 1PS/2PS where the context is not supposed to be intimate. For professional titles, sensayngnim ‘teacher’ is specifically used as 1PS by teachers towards pupils and gives rise to intimacy. Teachers also use their pupils’ first name as 2PS, which can convey more intimacy than the 2sg pronoun ne. As discussed about the occurrence of politeness and authority in Section 8.3.1, intimacy and estrangement as expressive effects of overt 1PS/2PS occur relatively; for example, intimacy is expressed by a kinship term where a pronoun is expected, or estrangement is expressed by a pronoun where a professional title is expected.

8.4 Summary

The current chapter discussed expressive effects of overt 1PS/2PS, which I divide into two functions: an emphatic function and interpersonal function.

For an emphatic function, speakers make use of overt 1PS/2PS in stressing the subjectness of the speech act, such as recalling for confirmation, claiming/avoiding responsibility and taking/giving credit. For instance, a speaker can emphasise that she is a person with certain attributes by recalling her identity with overt 1PS. A speaker can also blame an interlocutor by indexing her/him with overt 2PS. Likewise, a speaker can take credit by indexing herself with overt 1PS as the subject of benign behaviours. Although the speech act that the subject accomplishes in this function may vary, it is consistent that the overt 1PSs/2PSs make it clear that they index the speakers as the subjects of the speech act. In addition, it appears to be difficult to replace emphatic overt 1PS/2PS with unexpressed forms, and the overt 1PS/2PS performing emphatic function tends to be in a default or unmarked reference form. If an emphatic overt 1PS/2PS is in a marked form, an additional expressive effect occurs because of the interpersonal effect that the marked reference term retains.

For the interpersonal function of overt 1PS/2PS, we observed examples of politeness/authority and intimacy/estrangement. This function arises when there are equivalent reference forms for the referent, marked and unmarked, and a speaker shifts a reference form to another. For example, it is possible for a speaker to use a professional title as 1PS to her junior colleague and displays authority more effectively than when using a pronoun as 1PS. Similarly, if kinship
terms, personal names or some professional titles, such as sensayngnim ‘teacher’, are used as 1PS/2PS, it is presumable that the speaker intends to express intimacy towards the interlocutor more effectively than when using a pronoun.

As it always depends on context, pragmatic effects of a linguistic phenomenon may not be completely categorised. However, this chapter is an attempt to identify possible expressive effects that overt 1PS/2PS conveys by dividing them into two types. The emphatic function includes any pragmatic meaning occurring through overt 1PS/2PS in contrast with unexpressed 1PS/2PS. The emphasis that overt 1PS/2PS creates disappears when the 1PS/2PS is unexpressed. The interpersonal function includes any pragmatic meaning caused by shifting reference forms for 1PS/2PS among equivalents. This function accordingly engages diverse referential choices for 1PS/2PS that are tightly related to the social relationships between interlocutors and the psychological stance towards each other. By adding expressive effects of overt 1PS/2PS in this chapter, I believe we have covered most of possible analyses of overt 1PS/2PS in modern spoken Korean, including previous studies and the gap between them.
Chapter 9. Conclusion

The present study explored overtly expressed 1PS and 2PS in spoken Korean with special focus on their pragmatic and sociocultural meanings. We observed that subject omission or subject expression can be not only a grammatical topic but also an interesting issue in discourse analysis that accommodates pragmatic roles of reference, discourse organisation and social relationships between interlocutors.

As discussed in the literature (e.g., M. W. Kim, 2010; S. Kim & Choi, 2013; C. Park, 2012) and confirmed in our data, overt 1PS/2PS occurs with significantly less frequency (i.e., 31% for 1PS and 22% for 2PS), compared with unexpressed equivalents. Based on the lower frequencies of overt 1PS/2PS compared with unexpressed 1PS/2PS, our premise was that M-implicature is raised by the use of overt 1PS/2PS. According to M-Principle (Levinson, 2000), uncommon and marked expressions may give rise to extraordinary and marked meanings as opposed to common and unmarked expressions conveying common and unmarked meanings. That is, a speaker choosing overt 1PS/2PS presumably intends to express a marked meaning that is not conveyed by unexpressed 1PS/2PS.

To examine the mechanism of using overt 1PS/2PS, I adopted spoken Korean corpora; I examined the distribution of overt 1PS/2PS in the data and discussed the distinctive aspects of the conditions under which overt 1PS/2PS appears. The conditions include contrast, discourse organisation by turn shifts, indication of the subject as the agent of speech act and expression of interpersonal attitudes. Notably, the findings show that overt 1PS/2PS plays an important role in conveying certain pragmatic meanings regardless of the necessity of using the overt 1PS/2PS for the utterance to make sense.

This chapter concludes the current thesis by presenting a summary and discussion. Section 9.2 summarises the main findings of each chapter, and Section 9.3 discusses their implications. Section 9.4 first suggests directions for future research and then provides concluding remarks.
9.1 Summary of the Findings

In Chapter 1, I presented research questions, which specified the aim and scope of the current thesis, and stated that we would examine the mechanism of subject expression in spoken Korean and its pragmatic effects. I also introduced discourse analysis as the methodology of this study and three spoken Korean corpora as the data sources.

Chapter 2 reviewed the literature on the phenomenon of subject omission from various linguistic disciplines and methodologies, such as formal syntax, language acquisition, cognitive linguistics, quantitative studies and discourse analysis. As detailed in the chapter, the majority of the literature has focused on the formal syntactic explanation of subject omission, neglecting the cases of overtly expressed subjects. Moreover, the literature has paid less attention to elucidating the meanings of overtly expressed subjects from a pragmatic perspective, although most linguists admitted that the cases of subject expression are not fully resolved in the realm of syntax. I suggested that subject expression can be explained in great detail at the discourse level and proceeded to do so in the current research.

Chapter 3 was devoted to discussing key notions that provide theoretical and methodological background for this research project on the pragmatic effects of overt 1PS/2PS. I adopted the theory of M-implicature (Levinson, 2000), which elaborates a pragmatic implication that occurs when a marked expression, namely, overt 1PS/2PS, is used instead of an unmarked alternative, that is, unexpressed 1PS/2PS. Thus, M-implicature became an important signpost for us to shift our viewpoint towards the markedness of overt 1PS/2PS, in terms of its meaning as well as its expression. Acknowledging that unexpressed 1PS/2PS is ordinary and unmarked in spoken Korean, we could regard overt 1PS/2PS as marked and scrutinise the intention and effects of choosing a marked alternative.

I also introduced spoken discourse as a methodological base of the current study. As noted in the chapter, spoken discourse has characteristics distinct from those of written discourse, such as being spontaneous and dynamic. It is particularly useful for this study because we examine the social context of discourses and interpersonal interactions between discourse participants who are the referents of 1PS and 2PS in a sentence.

The diversity of referential choices for 1PS/2PS was also noted as a significant concept. Since 1PS/2PS is speakers themselves in a discourse as well as subjects of a sentence, speakers need to consider contextual aspects when deciding on the reference form for 1PS/2PS. As well
presented in Brown and Gilman (1960), notions of ‘superior’ and ‘inferior’ are recognised in referring to second person in some European languages, and the recognition becomes much more complicated in Korean discourse (H. Sohn, 1981). In addition to age, which is the most crucial factor in referential choices, social relationships considerably affect such choices. Further, different from the distinction about second person reference that Brown and Gilman (1960) addressed, the social rules of person reference apply to first person reference in Korean.

In a similar fashion, the concept of politeness was discussed in the chapter. I reviewed ongoing arguments on politeness in linguistics and compared them with a specific definition of politeness in Korean culture. Politeness in Korean, kongson, literally means ‘respect’ and ‘modesty’ but practically indicates using appropriate honorifics to an older addressee (H. Koo, 2004; J. Lee, 1999, 2006, 2011; W. K. Lee, 1991; K. Moon, 2017). I clarified that the present study adopts the broader concept of politeness from the literature (e.g., Blum-Kulka, 1987; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Ide, 1989; Watts, 2003) and attempts to find how Korean speakers make use of reference forms for 1PS/2PS in managing their social and interpersonal relationships.

Chapter 4 summarised referential expressions that are used for overt 1PS and 2PS in spoken Korean with relevant examples from our corpora. The referential choices were not simple but extremely varied, including first and second person pronouns, personal names, kinship terms, professional titles and other forms of noun or noun phrase. We discussed that the varied referential choices are a result of the complex way of defining social relationships in the culture and its direct reflection in the language. Namely, the choice of a reference form for 1PS/2PS depends on the social norm that is based on relative age and social status of speakers.

For example, the choice of a pronoun is not as simple as in English, and the speaker needs to know the relative age and interpersonal relationship between the interlocutors to find an appropriate pronoun in Korean discourse. Even if the relationship is settled and the relative age is known, there are still restrictions on using particular pronouns, such as ne ‘you (plain)’ or tangsin ‘you (honorific/hostile)’. In addition, the use of nominal forms is extensive in Korean, and hence, kinship terms, professional titles or personal names are commonly used as overt 1PS/2PS. This use seems to be closely related to the restrictions on using a pronoun and discovery of an alternative reference form for overt 1PS/2PS.
Chapter 5 showed the results of quantitative analysis of our corpora. We examined the rates of overt 1PS/2PS in different settings, that is, by the relative age and gender of speakers, and the distribution of referential choices for overt 1PS/2PS. The overall expression rate was 31% (868/2,772 tokens) for overt 1PS and 22% (614/2,822 tokens) for overt 2PS. The results imply that speakers tend to use fewer overt 1PS/2PS when they do not know the addressee’s relative age than when they know it. They also used more overt 1PS to younger interlocutors than to peers and more overt 2PS to peers than to older interlocutors. The tendency was stronger for male speakers than for female speakers.

As for the distribution of reference forms, we confirmed that the majority of reference forms for overt 1PS/2PS are pronouns, but 2PS displays more variety in the choice of reference forms. More specifically, speakers mostly used pronouns for 1PS to older or equal-aged interlocutors, whereas older speakers talking to their younger family members, close friends or pupils also used kinship terms or some professional titles such as sensayngnim ‘teacher’. The proportion of pronouns used was much lower in the case of 2PS since using a 2sg pronoun, either the plain form *ne* or the honorific form *tangsin*, is limited to younger or same-aged interlocutors in the sociocultural context, as noted in Chapter 4. Despite the sociolinguistic restriction, some speakers used these forms to display impoliteness, hostility or intimacy.

In Chapter 6, I analysed contrastiveness as one of the most distinctive aspects that overt 1PS/2PS shows in spoken Korean. As commonly noted in the literature, many of overt 1PS/2PSs in our corpora tended to have a contrastive candidate in the discourse, whether in the same utterance or in a different utterance. For a more detailed and exhaustive analysis, I categorised the overt 1PS/2PSs in contrast into two kinds: one in explicit contrast and the other in implicit contrast.

Overt 1PS/2PS in explicit contrast had its contrastive counterpart overtly expressed in the discourse. In some cases, a contrastive pair was said in a single utterance and it was easily captured as contrastive. In other cases, one referent was uttered and the other referent in contrast was uttered in another turn. Contrast in the latter case was created when the second contrastive candidate was uttered. Conversely, overt 1PS/2PS in implicit contrast had its contrastive counterpart unuttered in the discourse while it could be definitely named. I excluded examples that seem somewhat contrastive but do not have a specific counterpart of contrast in the discourse. For both cases of explicit and implicit contrast, overt 1PS/2PS strengthened contrast...
between candidates while the contrastiveness may have disappeared if the 1PS/2PS was unexpressed.

As another significant aspect of overt 1PS/2PS, the role of overt 1PS/2PS in discourse organisation was considered in Chapter 7. Overt 1PS was often found to be engaged in turn-taking as well as floor-taking in our data. Using overt 1PS, speakers appeared to indicate their intention to claim a turn and additionally to draw attention to themselves in the discourse, namely, take the floor. Without the overt 1PS, the utterance could still be understood but the emphasis on self-orientation of the speaker and intention to show it would be much diminished or removed.

In contrast, overt 2PS was frequently used to give a turn and/or the floor to the interlocutor. Similar to the case of overt 1PS, a speaker could use overt 2PS and give both a turn and the floor to the interlocutor. Interestingly, in some examples, overt 2PS signified the speaker’s intention to give a turn to the interlocutor but not the floor. The intention could be verified by the pattern showing that the interlocutor who was given a turn with overt 2PS could not complete the turn or shortly gave a turn back to the speaker. In this case, speakers devised the dialogue as such, anticipating a certain reaction from the interlocutor when giving a turn with overt 2PS, taking a turn when the interlocutor gave the anticipated response and consequently holding the floor of the discourse. Overt 2PS for turn-giving and/or floor-giving sometimes seemed redundant in conveying the meaning of the utterance, but an unexpressed 2PS could not have indicated the intention of giving a turn and/or the floor.

In Chapter 8, I divided expressive effects that I found from overt 1PS/2PS into two categories based on emphatic and interpersonal functions. For the emphatic function, overt 1PS/2PS was used to index the interlocutors plainly as the agent of the speech act. The alternation between overt 1PS/2PS and unexpressed 1PS/2PS made a significant difference in emphasising the action occurring and the person involved in the action or status. Commonly observed speech acts in the emphatic function included recalling for confirmation, claiming responsibility and taking/giving credit. For example, some speakers confirmed an action or status of 1PS/2PS by recalling it with overt 1PS/2PS. It was also often found that speakers indicated who is to be blamed or credited by establishing the agent with overt 1PS/2PS.

For the interpersonal function, I analysed examples of overt 1PS/2PS used in expressing politeness, authority, intimacy or estrangement. This function was effective by using a distinct
reference form in place of a regular form expected in the context. For instance, the use of a kinship term for 1PS/2PS instead of a pronoun could give rise to intimacy. Further, using a professional title for 1PS/2PS where the speaker would normally use a pronoun in the relationship could express authority. As a result, the interpersonal function showed the relativity of expressive effects of overt 1PS/2PS that depend on social relationships and context.

9.2 Implications

In the introduction of this thesis, the following three research questions were specified:

(i) If a subject is more likely to be unexpressed in Korean, when is it overtly expressed?
(ii) When a subject is overtly expressed, what reference form is the overt subject represented with and why?
(iii) What differences do overtly expressed subjects make in discourse, compared with unexpressed subjects?

I have addressed these research questions throughout the chapters of this thesis, but let us briefly review each in this section.

First, while a subject is more likely to be unexpressed in Korean than to be overtly expressed in term of frequency, as the results of our quantitative analysis revealed, an overtly expressed subject appears when a pragmatic meaning is to be conveyed in the utterance. We surveyed possible pragmatic functions of overt 1PS/2PS and observed that the functions include highlighting contrast, marking turn shifts, indexing the subject as the agent of a specific speech act and expressing interpersonal attitudes. In other words, subjects tend to be overtly expressed when speakers have certain pragmatic intentions even if an unexpressed subject could replace these without changing or losing the meaning of the utterance.

Second, the distribution analysis of reference forms for overt 1PS/2PS shows that overt expression of 1PS/2PS is not uniform. Many of the reference forms for overt 1PS/2PS are pronouns, but there are a variety of other forms as well. Noticeably, interesting correlations are found between the choice of reference forms and the sociolinguistic context, which is deeply engaged with the concept of politeness. For instance, speakers need to know the relative age between collocutors to choose an appropriate reference form, and a younger speaker is not supposed to use the plain form of 2sg pronoun ne ‘you’ to an older speaker. It means that not all overt 1PS/2PS can be represented with one reference form and multiple factors must be
considered when choosing a form. The use of a reference form that is not expected or supposed to be inappropriate could cause a pragmatic effect, despite its grammatical suitability in referring to the same person. Namely, expressing 1PS/2PS overtly is not a simple grammatical operation but a complex sociocultural and pragmatic process.

Lastly, compared with unexpressed counterparts, overtly expressed 1PS/2PSs are used in spite of their redundancy in conveying the same meaning of the utterance. Even if an utterance makes sense without its subject overtly expressed, the speaker may deliberately choose an overt 1PS/2PS to produce a pragmatic meaning. By adding an overt 1PS/2PS, the utterance can underline the contrastiveness of the subject to another referent in the discourse. The utterance can also explicitly mark the intention of turn shift with an overt 1PS/2PS. It can draw attention to the speech act by stressing the agent with an overt 1PS/2PS. The utterance can also express the speaker’s interpersonal stance towards the interlocutor through a particular form of 1PS/2PS. As a result, overt 1PS/2PS adds pragmatic meanings to the discourse that might not be seen at the sentence level.

I believe the current research contributes to the study of subject expression in Korean by resolving the specific research questions on the mechanism of subject expression. This thesis attempts to see the phenomenon of subject expression in Korean from a pragmatic and sociocultural perspective, which the literature has rarely covered. Several studies have explored the complicated honorific system and forms of address in Korean, but linguists have not paid much attention to ways in which the referential forms appear in the position of a subject in an utterance, as an unexpressed subject. This lack of attention may also be caused by the syntactic focus on subject omission that has been predominant in Korean linguistics.

In many cross-linguistic studies, more varied approaches than formal syntax have been applied in the overt expression of subjects in a pro-drop language (e.g., Clancy & Downing, 1987; Ewing, 2014; D. Lee & Yonezawa, 2008; Mayol, 2010; Posio, 2011; Silva & Lucia, 1993; Travis & Cacoullos, 2012). The current thesis is an attempt to vary and expand the research on subject expression in Korean to the extent of the cross-linguistic studies. Further, the quantitative analysis of spoken Korean corpora in the current research provides substantial evidence of the distribution of overt 1PS/2PS in spoken Korean discourse. The number of tokens of the corpora in this study is large enough to observe general patterns of overt 1PS/2PS.
9.3 Concluding Remarks

This PhD research project began from the question regarding the functions of overtly expressed subjects in Korean spoken discourse where utterances without a subject are prevalent and perfectly natural in the discourse. By analysing spoken Korean corpora, I examined the following in relation to overt 1PS/2PS: their actual frequency, their pragmatic meanings in discourse and the sociocultural effects of their reference forms. This thesis sheds some light on the pragmatic interpretation of overtly expressed 1PS/2PS in spoken Korean, whereas the literature has focused on the formal syntactic analysis of subject omission in Korean and treated the linguistic settings of overt 1PS/2PS with less seriousness. Considering the significant amount of data analysed and the attempt to categorise the pragmatic functions of overt 1PS/2PS in spoken discourse, I hope that this study expands the range of the research on subject omission and deepens our understanding of the phenomenon within the sociocultural spectrum.
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