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0. Introduction

Grammaticalization comes to be recognized as a persuasive methodology to account for various linguistic phenomena—especially linguistic changes. Breaking away conventional approaches which focus mostly on synchronic phenomena, it provides a synthesized template to account for linguistic changes synchronically and diachronically. One of its pertinent generalizations over linguistic phenomena is Unidirectionality Principle (Bybee et al. 1994). In other words, grammaticalization is a gradual diachronic process which is characterized as unidirectional and there exists a cline of changes, which yields directionality generalized from regularities, namely Unidirectionality during the process. However, this is not an absolute principle which doesn’t have any counter example. Hopper and Traugott argued, [although] there is extensive evidence for regularly recurring directional changes, grammaticalization should not be thought of as a “theory,” in the sense of an explanation of a subject of study (2003 [1993]: 132).

Korean has several kinds of the counter examples against Unidirectionality Principle (UP). According to Ahn (2001), words such as pota ‘to see’ (particle > adverb), ttaymunye ‘because’, nalumtaylo ‘somewhat’, ttanun ‘the thing is that…’ (bound noun > adverb) are accounted for as counter examples in Korean. In the similar vein, I would like to consider pronouns in Korean as counter examples of UP in Korean. Generally, pronouns which belong to closed categories are known to be rarely productive, whereas nouns and verbs which belong to open categories to be very productive. Unexpectedly, the relatively high productivity in Pronouns, however, can be accounted for in Korean, especially 2nd person pronouns (Park & Chae 2005). Among them, I will focus on the pronoun caki which shows an irregular pattern of grammaticalization against UP.

In section 1, I will introduce theories of Unidirectionality succinctly and existence of counter-examples against UP. Previous research on the pronoun caki will be provided in section 2, concerning with items which show similar patterns of change in Korean pronouns. In section 3, general analysis about the reversed directionality of the transition of the pronoun is given. Also, the motivation of the cognitive process concerned to the transition of viewpoint in discourses is to be given in terms of mappings in Mental Spaces model (Fauconnier 1993), which provides elaborated accounts for the changes concerning viewpoint. In addition, to increase the plausibility of the attested process cross-linguistically, the similar way of construal accounted for in Japanese will be provided in the section. Finally, the general conclusion about the reversed pattern of the transition based upon the discussion will be provided in section 4.

1. Unidirectionality

Grammaticalization is generally defined to be ‘a linguistic shift from content or lexical forms which
belong to open class to functional or grammatical forms which belong to closed class or a shift from
grammatical items to more grammatical ones’ (Kuryłowicz 1975[1965]). One of its characteristics is that
it shows a certain tendency of shifting patterns through regularities. Then, there exists a cline of
grammaticalization, which entails that there is a certain direction in which a linguistic form tend to
change. For example, when a content word ‘go’, the famous example, is used in a phrase ‘be going to’, it
is simultaneously losing its original meaning of ‘movement’ and is assuming characteristics of a function
word, namely a future tense marker. It shows the typical pattern of the directionality of
grammaticalization (A content word > A function word). Moreover it extends its range to the scalar
domain, grammaticalization includes the change from the less grammatical items to the more grammatical
ones as well.

However, this unidirectionality is said not to be an absolute principle. Scholars believe that some
counter-examples do exist and that their existence helps define the notion of prototypical
grammaticalization (Hopper and Traugott 2003[1993]: 132). Nichols and Timberlake brought Russian
instrumental case as a counter-example (1991). Ahn also provided Korean counter-examples, such as pota
‘to see > than’, ttaymunye ‘because’, nalumtaylo ‘somewhat’, ta'ini ‘the thing is that…’ (particle >
adverb). Though the category which the items belong to has fuzzy boundaries, it is notable that there is a
certain tendency of reversing the general pattern, namely, unidirectionality. Since grammaticalization is
based on the process of abduction and on inferences is likely to happen in nature, it is true that UP
provides us with abundant predictability and explicability in seeing linguistic phenomena. However, if
counter-examples and such reversing patterns exist, there could be two possibilities. The first case is that
the diachronic order of the examples in question is reversed as suggested above by some authors. If then,
UP might lose its predictability and explicability as its logical ground more or less, even though we are
keeping it in our mind that UP is not an absolute principle, but a tendency. The other one is that the order
is not reversed in fact, but simply the examples co-exist, so-called layering\(^1\). Among various changed or
changing items which are opaque in their origins, it is possible that we are lost in tracking them and infer
the order of the items in question as reversed to UP simply considering the co-existence of them. In this
paper, I suggest that there exist a counter-example which supports the first case of the two. It is the
grammaticalization of Korean pronoun caki as the third person reflexive to as the second person pronoun.

2. Previous Research on Caki

Previous researches conducted on caki focused on its function as 3\(^{rd}\) person reflexive mostly in the
frame of generativists. Some of them simply referred that caki could be used as 2\(^{nd}\) person pronoun
limitedly (Kim 1984, Chang 1984, and Yang 1986). However, Park (1992) said that caki is to be
prescribed as 2\(^{nd}\) person pronoun basically, which is occasionally used among young lovers. Park and
Chae (2005) also said that caki is 2\(^{nd}\) person pronoun which emerges around 1970’s in Korea. These facts

\(^{1}\) Hopper (1991); quoted by Rhee (2000[1998]: 173)
show that the pronoun *caki* shows fluctuation in its use and it is in the grammaticalization process of transition from 3rd person reflexive to 2nd person pronoun. The interesting thing is that if the change is plausible, it shows an unusual pattern of directionality compared with other grammaticalization process. Since the pronoun *caki* is transferring from the status as 3rd person reflexive pronoun, which is to be bound by its antecedent in the sentence or by context it belongs to, to as 2nd person pronoun, which is relatively freer than its former usage, its directionality of change reverses (dependent > independent or more grammatical > less grammatical), to one of the major principles in grammaticalization, the University Principle.

The diachronic changes of the other pronouns in Korean provide us with helpful evidence. Park (1992) showed that other than *caki*, there are several other third person pronouns which show similarities to *caki* in that they originally transferred from the third person to the second person pronoun. They are *tangsin* and *caney*.

Both of usages of the forms *tangsin* and *caney* are relevant to the Korean honorific system\(^2\), which is closely related to the viewpoint\(^3\). *Tangsin* is the term used when one says about his/her senior and *caney* is the term used when one speaks to his/her junior with relevant respect. Firstly, I will present the pronoun *caney* which shows the transition.

[Situation: when one shows his/her friend his/her gloves that his/her mother makes for himself/herself,]

(1a)  
\[\textit{tangsin}-kkeyse\quad \textit{sonswu mandul-e-cwu-sin}\quad \textit{cangkap-iya}\]
\[\textit{tangsin-NOM} [+HON] \quad \textit{hand} \quad \textit{make-CONN-give-CONN} [+HON] \quad \textit{glove-DECL}\]

‘This is the glove that *tangsin* makes for me by her bare hand.’

(1b)  
\[\textit{*tangsin}-i\quad \textit{sonswu mandul-e-cwu-n}\quad \textit{cangkap-iya}\]
\[\textit{tangsin-NOM} \quad \textit{hand} \quad \textit{make-CONN-give-CONN} [-HON] \quad \textit{glove-DECL}\]

‘This is the glove that *tangsin* makes for me by her bare hand.’

Since Korean pronoun *tangsin* denotes his/her mother in (1a) and (1b), it should be used with honorific markers. Therefore (1a) is correct, but (1b) is not. The interesting thing is that *tangsin* in (1b) can function as the second person pronoun without honorific markers. But in that case, the sentence carries a very humble usage. The reason seems to be the fact that the directness of pointing or facing ‘you’, specifically a senior, undermines politeness which should be accompanied with relevant honorific items\(^4\). Anyway it

---

\(^2\) Honorific systems in language can be accounted for among Asian countries such as Korea, Java, Tibet, and Japan (Crystal 1987). It is insisted that especially Korean has its highly developed honorific systems as grammaticalized forms (Han 2003)

\(^3\) The Viewpoint is to be dealt with in section 3.

\(^4\) Honorific items should be used in the right place at the right time. When honorific items are used where they are not supposed to be used, it evokes rudeness through the mechanism of irony. When honorific items are not used where they are supposed to be used, it also evokes rudeness through the same
is noteworthy that tangsin shows usages as both the 3rd-person pronoun and the 2nd-person one with relevant honorific markers respectively.

[Situation: when a professor lets his/her student who is not very close do something, ]

(1c) caney/*ne-ka han pen kukes-ul hay po-key
    caney/ne-NOM one time it-ACC do see-DECL [HON]
    ‘Will thou/you do it?’

Caney in (1c) is another example of honorific items, which denotes a counterpart who is not as high as speaker’s social or conventional status. However it is not as a humble form as ne ‘you’. On the other hand, Korean honorific systems can show the relationship of solidarity among interlocutors. As seen above, caney cannot be used in solid relationship. I won’t deal with honorific systems concerning powerfulness and solidarity further here, but the thing is that honorific systems have a huge influence on changes in pronouns.

We can conclude that considering the examples above, to account for the usages of tangsin and caney is impossible without the honorific system. Since the honorific system is basically melted into the Korean expressions as a grammaticalized form, the transition of them (from 3rd person to 2nd person) is much influenced by the pragmatic factors such as shared information among speakers and hearers, hierarchical relationship among them in terms of honorific systems and other colloquial inferences—which can also be applied as vital clues to the motivation of caki’s grammaticalization. In other words, context and semantic negotiation in colloquial frames are vital in grammaticalization of Korean pronouns.

As seen below <table 1>, each level has a relevant honorific expression considering the relationship with the counterpart, namely a second-person pronoun. The interesting thing is that similar transitions from third-person and second-person pronouns can be accounted for in several Korean pronouns other than caki. That is, tangsin and caney spread their range of usage to the second-person pronouns.

---

5 Parenthesis in ‘(caney)’ means that its origin is opaque. However Park (1992) suggests that it should be transited from the third-person pronoun because of the similarity of the pattern to other pronouns like tangsin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First person Deictic</th>
<th>Third Person Nondeictic</th>
<th>Second Person Deictic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>tangsin → tangsin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>(caney) → caney, caki → caki, casin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>ce</td>
<td>ce</td>
<td>ne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<Table 1> The Development of Some First- and Second-Person Pronouns (Park 1992)

However, the spread and transition of the usage to as the second person pronoun seem to be bound by their lexical meanings and analogical transition. See the following examples:

(2a) [situation: when one asks his/her senior]

*<tangsin> ence cha pakkwu-si-ess-supnikka?*

*tangsin* when car change-HON-PAST-INTE

‘when did you change your car?’

(2b) [situation: when one asks his/her friend or someone who are in his/her age]

*tangsin* ence cha pakkwu-ess-e?

*tangsin* when car change-PAST-INTE?

‘when did you change your car?’

(2c) [situation: when one asks his/her junior]

*tangsin* ence cha pakkwu-ess-e?

*tangsin* when car change-PAST-INTE?

‘when did you change your car?’ (Kim 1995: 100)

Seen above, the usage of the pronoun is bound by the honorific system. Historically, the third-person pronoun *tangsin* which is used as a highly honorific form has its origin as a Sino-Korean word. However *tangsin* as a second-person pronoun is discovered to be used as a plainly honorific form in the examples (2b) and (2c) above. What makes it degraded from the highly honorific form to the plainly honorific one?

Kim (1995) explained this problem in terms of lexical origins. The phonemic part of the word corresponding to ‘tang’ denotes ‘face to something or somebody’ and ‘sin’ denotes a ‘body.’ Accordingly,
tang could be abused when being used in junior-senior relationship. In other words, if tangsin is used as a second-person pronoun, it could yield an atmosphere in which the senior counterpart might feel offended by the speaker due to the directness and irrelevant symmetry which it implicates. Returning to our topic caki, if caki which is attested to have a similar way of transferring to tangsin in <table 1>, shows the similar pattern to tangsin, then it could be explained that caki also transfers from the third person pronoun to the second person one apparently. However, this is nothing more than a mere descriptive statement of the historical development of the pronouns, not a plausible explanation of motivation of the changes. In other words, there seems to be a logical jump in the way of explaining the pronouns, which is that there is no overt motivation suggested in that process. Why does caki, the third-person pronoun become to be used as a second-person one like example (3a) and (3b)? That is the main goal of this paper.

(3a) "caki-nun kecitmal anh hayss-tay. caki?ku-to kecitmal ha-vess-umyen-se"  
caki-NOM lie not do-PAST-Evidential. caki-NOM lie do-PAS-CON-though  
(Lit: ‘(he told me that) caki didn’t lie. caki did lie though’)  
‘(he told me that) he didn’t lie though he did lie.’ [3rd person reflexive]

In (3a), the third party ‘he’ is not involved in the conversation. But both the speaker and the hearer do have information about ‘him’ at least as long as the conversation goes on.

(3b) "caki/*ku-to kecitmal ha-vess-umyen-se ”  
caki-NOM lie do-PAS-CON-though  
(though caki lied’)  
though he/you did lie.” [3rd person reflexive ⇒ 2nd person pronoun]

Compared to (3a), the function of caki in (3b) is uttered by the speaker with or without intention to make the hearer catch the phrase, which makes the meaning of caki in this sentence ambiguous. That is, the meaning of the sentence depends on involvedness of ‘he’ in the conversation. This shows that caki is undergoing its changing process and the boundary of its category is being fuzzy. As another account for this, in terms of politeness again, caki in (3a) is used in order to neutralize the directness of the second-person pronoun ‘ne (you)’, which might make the counterpart feel offended if it were used. In this vein, the previous research on caki, which focuses mostly on its synchronic and fixed aspect, needs to be reconsidered, especially focusing of the motivation of the changes in its usages—politeness. Politeness, in turn, is to be accounted for through viewpoint basically because honorific systems itself originated from the asymmetry of status or viewpoint. In the next section, I will borrow the mapping model of Mental Spaces (Fauconnier 1997) to present relevant data effectively.
3. Analysis

3.1 Caki as a 3rd person reflexive pronoun

Apparently functions of items which belong to the category of pronoun seem to be complementarily distributed. For example, in English, the usage of a third person pronoun ‘he’ and its reflexive pronoun “himself” show complementary distribution. See examples below:

(4a) John loves *him/himself.
(4b) He/*Himself loves John

In Korean, the third person pronoun and the third person reflexive pronoun seem to be showing similar distribution as English considering examples (5a) and (5b):

(5a) ku-nun kecitmal haci anh-ass-ta
he-NOM lie do not-PAST-DECL
(Lit: he did not lie)
‘he didn’t lie.’
(5b) *caki-nun kecitmal haci anh-ass-ta
   caki-NOM lie do not-PAST-DECL
   (Lit: caki did not lie)
   ‘*himself didn’t lie.’

In (5a) the third person pronoun ‘ku (he)’ is correct in subject position whereas ‘caki (himself)’ is not. Caki is to be bound by its antecedent in texts.

A. Fluctuation across the boundary between the 3rd person pronoun and the reflexive.

However, in Korean, the distinction in using a third person pronoun ‘ku’ and one of its reflexive forms ‘caki’ is not as clear as that in English.

(6a) Inho-nun ku-ka kecitmal han cek-i epta-ko ha-yess-ta
   Inho-NOM he-NOM lie do time-NOM never be-CON say-PAS-DECL
   (Lit. ‘Inho said there have never been the time that he lied’)
   ‘Inho said he’d never lied.’ [3rd person pronoun]
(6b) Inho-nun caki-ka kecitmal han cek-i epta-ko ha-yess-ta
   Inho-NOM himself-NOM lie do time-NOM never be-CON say-PAS-DECL
   (Lit. ‘Inho said there have never been the time that caki lied himself’)
   ‘Inho said he’d never lied.’ [3rd pers reflexive]
Sentences (6a) and (6b) are grammatical even though the third person pronoun ‘ku’ and the third person reflexive pronoun ‘caki’ are posited at the same position—the subject position in embedded clauses. What makes both sentences grammatical? One possible answer is ① that ‘caki’ is not a third person reflexive pronoun in fact and the other is ② that there is some factor having an effect on and a limitation on the usage of caki.

The possible answer ①, above all, seems to be quite restrictive in its plausibility because there are lots of evidences that show the characteristic of ‘caki’ as a reflexive pronoun such as examples (5a) and (5b). So neither the alternative that ‘caki’ is exactly same as ‘himself’ in English, nor the other that it doesn’t show the characteristic of a third-person reflexive pronoun at all, is persuasive because this can also be the simple description of homonymous characteristics of caki.

The alternative ② suggests that there should be another affecting factor in using caki in Korean, which is, I suggest, the pragmatic force, specifically viewpoint. The fact that caki develops only in colloquial frame as other functions than 3rd person reflexive proves that the pragmatic factor has a great influence on the grammaticalization of caki. As discussed in section 2, pragmatic inference or shared information including politeness in terms of honorific systems participates in the process and accordingly, the viewpoint which is crucial in politeness plays an important role in determining or distinguishing an ambiguity or vagueness in colloquial conversations. In addition, it plays a vital role as a criterion on which we depend to understand or track opacity or transparency of sentences in questions. First of all, I will present how the viewpoint works in sentences:

(7a) Inho-nun ku-ka kecitmal ha-yess-tako malha-yess-ta
Inho-NOM he-NOM lie do-PAST-CONN say-PAST-DECL
(Lit: Inho said that he lied) ‘Inho said that he lied.’ [viewpoint: speaker; opaque]

(7b) Inho-nun caki-ka kecitmal ha-yess-tako malha-yess-ta
Inho-NOM caki-NOM lie do-PAST-CONN say-PAST-DECL
(Lit: Inho said that himself lied) ‘Inho said that he lied himself.’ [viewpoint: Inho]

The two sentences above denote the same proposition truth-conditionally. There is subtle difference among the two, however. In sentence (7a), opacity or transparency matters in sentence meaning regarding to the pronoun ‘ku’. But excluding the possibility that ‘ku’ denotes another person rather than Inho, it seems to have the same meaning as (7b) apparently. On the other hand in (7b), the way of construing through caki is different from that in the previous example. The sentence (7b) focuses more on his volitional action in the subject’s stance, whereas (7a) focuses more on evidential aspect of speaker’s utterance in the speaker’s point of view. In short, we found that the reason why caki and pronoun ku in the
sentences show a subtly different meaning is that the viewpoint transferred in the context which is mostly colloquial one. *Caki* can only be uttered when viewpoint in speaker’s point of view transit into *Inho*’s.

As mentioned before, we can account for the transition of viewpoints in discourses through mapping models of Mental Spaces. According to Fauconnier (1997), in order to track or understand the meaning of sentences, three dynamic notions are crucial: **Base, Viewpoint**, and **Focus**. The Viewpoint space is the one from which others are accessed and structured or set up; the Focus space is the one currently being structured internally or the one upon which attention is currently focused; the Base space is a starting point for the construction to which it is always possible to return. Basically Mental spaces are evoked by **space-builder**, the verb ‘say’, and in the very space, the hearer can track the element presented in the space. I will employ his mapping mechanisms to account for the transition of usage of *caki*.

![Figure 1. Mapping of *ku* ‘he’](image)

![Figure 2. Mapping of *caki* ‘himself’](image)

Sentences (7a) – (7b) can be schematized in terms of diagrams like <Figure 1> and <Figure 2>. The way of construing the propositions of (7a) can be mapped like <Figure 1> in that *Inho* or *ku* can be linked to the antecedent which is outside of the embedded clause, here *Inho*’s mental space directly, unless the 3rd person pronoun *ku*, denotes another person rather than *Inho*. On the other hand, (7b) in which *caki* is used can be mapped like <Figure 2>. Because it internally links to *Inho* in *Inho*’s space with transferred Viewpoint. In both figures, Focus still remains *Inho*’s space because the embedded event, that is ‘he lied’, is mainly talked about and given attention to. However, Viewpoint transferred from Speech space to *Inho*’s space and the transferred Viewpoint enables *caki* to be used in (7c). This doesn’t mean that it shows a process of grammaticalization, but that it provides a possibility to change to the second person pronoun *caki*. Then what triggers Viewpoint transfer? The suggestion will be dealt with in next section.

3.2 *Caki* as the 3rd person pronoun

*Caki* includes various kinds of meanings. Kim (1995) said that the pronoun *caki* could be defined with four major characteristics, which are binding, activeness, contrastive, and viewpoint. Considering
her examples which illustrate each characteristic, it is not difficult to find that the ones which belong to the first two categories fall into the typical reflexive category. On the other hand the examples of the others, which are contrastive and viewpoint, show that the pronoun caki used in them functions closer to the third person pronoun rather than the reflexive even though it still retains semantic links with the antecedent.

[Activeness]

(8a) chelswu-nun yenghui-ka caki-lul tayly-ess-ul-ttay
   chelswu-NOM yenghui-NOM caki-ACC beat-PAST-CONN-time (when)

   hwa-lul nay-ess-ta
   anger-ACC put-PAST-DECL
   (Lit: chelswu got angry when yenghui hit caki)
   'chelswu got angry when yenghui hit him.'

(8b) *chelswu-nun yenghui-ka caki-lul tayly-ess-ul-ttay
   chelswu-NOM yenghui-NOM caki-ACC beat-PAST-CONN-time (when)

   imi cwuk-e iss-ess-ta
   already die-CONN is-PAST-DECL
   (Lit: chelswu was dead when yenghui hit caki)
   'chelswu was dead when yenghui hit him.' (Kim 1995: 164)

In (8a) caki seems to be a regular reflexive. However, comparing with (8b), it is not hard to find that caki should include the meaning of activeness in that the antecedent of caki is active, which in turn makes natural the context including other relevant events such as hitting. This shows that it is not free enough to be used independently even in discourses because it still requires the semantic link with the active antecedent. When the antecedent becomes inactive before the Viewpoint in speaker’s frame transits into Chelswu’s frame, caki loses its ground for being treated as reflexive.

[Contrastive]

(9a) celswu-nun yengswu-eykey yengi-lul miweha-myen antoynta-ko
    celswu-NOM yengswu-ACC yengi-ACC hate-CONN not be-COMP
    'Celswu told yengswu not to hate yenghi

    ha-kose-nun caki-ka yengi-lul miweha-yess-ta
do-CONN-CNTR *caki-NOM yengi-ACC hate-PAST-DECL
and he himself hated her.’

(9b) *celswu-nun yengi-to miweha-ko caki-nun yengswu-to miweha-yess-ta
celswu-NOM yengi-also hate-CONN caki-NOM yengswu-also hate-PAST-DECL
‘celswu also hates yengi and he also hates yengswu’ Kim (1995: 122)

The covert semantic link with the antecedent can also be accounted for in (9a) and (9b). In this case, *caki includes contrastive meanings, which literally means that there has to be something opposite to the overt event. In other words, the contrastive meaning of *caki presupposes that an unexpected event will follow. If the same event as the first overt one that ‘X hates Y’ follows next, its meaning will clash with the contrastive meaning of *caki and the meaning of the marker ‘-to (also)’ in (9b). On the other hand, *caki in (9a) includes the contrastive meaning which supports the use of *caki. Not only cases of (8a) and (8b), but also (9a) and (9b) have the semantic link with the overt antecedents in common. However, it seems that the one in (9a) is weaker than (8a) in a sense that its coordinated structure, not embedded one, provides a relatively freer link than the embedded one. The link is getting weakened and gradually grammaticalized into the context:

[Viewpoint]

(10) mwunkiswuk sensayng-un kyocang sensayng-ui nwunci-lul kyesok
mwunkiswuk teacher-NOM principal teacher-GEN mood-ACC continuously

salpi-ko iss-ess-ta. Hwaksilhi caki-nun iki-ko iss-ess-ko
care-CONN is-PAST-DECL clearly caki-NOM win-CONN is-PAST-CONN

kyocang sensayng-un ci-ko iss-nun kes-I pwunmyengha-yess-ta
principal teacher-NOM lose-CONN is-PROG thing-NOM clear-PAST-DECL

‘The teacher keeps watching on the principal how he feels, and it is obvious that the teacher was winning and that the principal was losing’ Kim (1995: 122)

In (10), the weakened link between *caki and its antecedent is easy to find. As the Viewpoint of description transits covertly to the author, the antecedent, either syntactically or semantically, melted into the contextual frame. It is even freer than the cases of (8a) and (9a). We can also test to identify the characteristic of *caki in examples. If we replace *caki in both sentences with *ku (3rd person pronoun), there is no problem in acceptability. In short, the 3rd person reflexive *caki comes to be in use as the 3rd person
pronoun in support of pragmatic factors and contexts.

In conclusion of this section, the process above shows that the function of caki extends its range of meaning toward the 3rd person pronoun in support of inferences or contexts. In other words, the binding of caki is so gradually weakened that it can be used as long as its antecedent can be tracked down from inferences, namely, not strictly bound within the domain of its antecedent. In addition, the covert shifting of viewpoint in the contextual frame in (10) can be another reason of the grammaticalization of caki. Because it also provides the possibility that tracking its antecedent, namely binding caki could be blocked by the shift. This also shows that the 3rd person reflexive is losing its characteristic as bound.

3.3 Caki as 2nd person pronoun

In the socio-linguistic point of view, Park and Chae (2005) accounted for the fact that caki as 2nd person pronoun emerged around 1970’s in Korea, providing evidence that most of caki-users are females in their thirties or above now. They provided the statistical data getting from the actual field work of establishing database through interviewing phoning and surveying. The result shows that 88 percent of respondents who are 20 to 54 years old are familiar with the term as 2nd person pronoun (2005: 225). In addition, Park (1992) has already mentioned that caki be a 2nd person pronoun which is proved by the position occupied in the following sentences. He said the function of caki is similar to that of the second person pronoun:

(11a) caki-to Inho-lul manna-ass-e?
caki-also Inho-ACC meet-PAST-INT
‘Did you also meet Inho?’
(11b) ce pwun-l caki apeci-ya?
that person-NOM caki father-be-INT
‘Is that person over there your father?’
(11c) Inho-ka ecey caki-lul po-ass-tay
Inho-NOM yesterday caki-ACC see-PAST-Evidential
‘(Someone told me that) Inho saw you yesterday. [Park (1992)]

First of all, there is no antecedent of caki in the sentences (11a) and (11b). Even though caki is used in (11c), it is used with accusative marker -lul, which the antecedent of caki could hardly be Inho in embedded clause. Second, all the positions that are occupied by caki can be replaced with the second person pronoun ne (ney/nehui ‘your’ for (11b)). Even though it could be different in the nuance due to the degrading honorific systems (caki → ne), but the basic proposition will remain the same. Therefore the pronoun caki can be defined as one of the second person pronouns in this vein.

Considering the sentences in which caki used above, there is one thing to be extracted in common.
That is, *caki* is likely to be used in a spoken frame, not likely in a written one. Pragmatic inference and shared information melted in contexts are vital to understand and to track the meaning of it. Therefore, I suggest that the transition of frame from written one, which requires rather fixed and bound in nature, to spoken or colloquial one triggers replacement of the third person pronoun *ku* with *caki* and then makes it happen further grammaticalization of the pronoun *caki* from its function as the third person pronoun to the one as the second person pronoun.

(12=3a) \[ \text{“caki-nun kecitmal anh hayss-tay. caki-to kecitmal ha-yess-umyen-se”} \]
\[ \text{caki-NOM lie not do-PAST-Evidential. caki-NOM lie do-PAS-CON-though} \]
(Lit: ‘(he told me that) caki didn’t lie. caki did lie though’)
‘(he told me that) he didn’t lie, though he did lie.’

(13=3b) \[ \text{“caki-to kecitmal ha-yess-umyen-se”} \]
\[ \text{caki-NOM lie do-PAS-CON-though} \]
(Lit: though caki lied’)
though he/you did lie.’ [3rd person reflexive \( \Rightarrow \) 2nd person pronoun]

(14) \[ \text{“caki-to kecitmal ha-yess-e?”} \]
\[ \text{caki-also lie do-PAST-INTE} \]
(Lit: caki also lied?)
‘Did you lie, too?’

Considering the sentences which are underlined in (12) and (13), the token has the same form. However, upon the context, *caki* in (13) can be used as denoting the third party or the hearer in the conversation. Accordingly, the meaning of *caki* in (13) is fluctuating upon the context, which means that there is a possibility of undergoing grammaticalization. Moreover there is some case that the function of *caki* in question seems not to be clear. For example, when one wants to reprove the hearer by minimizing negative face threatening act, in other words neutralizing the directness toward the hearer, he or she might use *caki* as if it denoted the third party, not the hearer, outside the conversational environment, even though the target is obviously involved\(^6\). In this process, *caki* survives in support of politeness mechanism and honorific system in Korean to denote the second-person pronoun. Furthermore, *caki* used in (14) cannot denote the third party because there is an inference enough to be recognized between the speaker and the hearer. The conventionalized meaning of *caki* as the second person pronoun can be accounted for in following examples:

(15) \[ \text{“Inho, ne kecitmal an hanchek ha-ci-ma. caki-to kecitmal ha-yess-umeyen-se”} \]

---

\(^6\) On the other hand, this use of *caki* can further develop, namely trying to give sarcastic or ironic remarks to the target.
Inho, you lie not pretend do-CON-IMP. caki-NOM lie do-PAS-CON-though

'Inho, don’t pretend not to lie, though you lied.' [2nd pers pro]

(16) “Inho-ssi, na onul caki tongsayng manna-ass-e”
Inho-ADD, I today caki brother meet-PAS-DEC

‘Inho, I met your brother today.’ [2nd pers pro]

Then, why are the changes likely to occur in conversations, not in texts? Because spoken frame fully entails situations, intentions, viewpoints, foci, and inferences around the interlocutors. Like Figure 3, the colloquial part of the conversational environments can be extracted separately at a certain moment of ongoing discourses and can be undergoing further changes as if it were a base space. The extracted space becomes to be foregrounded and the links are getting so weakened to be vanished eventually, because the very current event itself, other than inferences and information which are melted as definite pragmatic factors, matters at the moment (See Figure 3). Then, from the hearer’s point of view, he or she interprets the locutions without any anomaly and doesn’t doubt that caki’s position as subject without any antecedent is wrong, at least in the conversation. In other words, in conversations, Inho’s mental space functions as if it were a base space which is anchoring for further discourse development and, in turn, this enables the pronoun caki to be used as the second person pronoun. Since there is no overt antecedent, no overt link to it, and no overt transition of any kind of element in mental space, it functions as the independent item which can occupy the subject position freely as if it originally carried the meaning and function of 2nd person pronoun as seen in <Figure 4>.

This process is similar to the one called short-hands by Clark (1978). The point is that the ordinary use of referring expressions involves calculations of retrievability, which takes account of contextual information (Saeed 2003[1997]). In other words, we have a tendency to communicate so cooperatively that we try to understand at our best at the cost of tracking covert inferences melted into the conversation,
eventually re-setup the Base like Figure 4 because there is no need for to explain the inferences and information concerned in detail. I suggest that this re-setup of Base space be the motivation of caki’s shifts.

3.4 The Order of Changes

Up to now, we accounted for the fact that caki shows characteristics as a 3rd person reflexive, a 3rd person pronoun and a 2nd person pronoun. Then, can we infer the order of the three stages? Only with the data above we can figure out only the possible order of caki between as 3rd person reflexive and as 2nd person pronoun. Caki originally functions as 3rd person reflexive pronoun and then it come to change and could be functioning as a 2nd person pronoun used frequently in spoken frame as seen above. However, it is opaque to figure out the relation or the directionality of stages, namely, the 2nd person pronoun and the 3rd person pronoun.

Above all, it is natural tendency to think that reflexives are grammaticalized forms of pronouns and are derived from their pronoun forms basically, which means the existence of pronouns precedes that of reflexives. The problem is that there seems to be two occurrences of the same category, the 3rd person pronoun, on the continuum of grammaticalization of caki (see Figure 5). It is not obvious to figure out whether the items discussed as 3rd person pronouns in the previous section belong to the original 3rd person pronoun category (the first box on the left in Figure 5) or a newly emergent category originated from the 3rd person reflexives (the second box on the right in Figure 5) in support of pragmatic factors. The answer for the question remains in question. Nevertheless, one thing obvious is that 2nd person pronoun is derived from the 3rd person reflexive which is used in discourse and leaves the possibility to be imposed by pragmatic inferences. We’ve already treated this in section 3.3.

Anyway, it is noted that pragmatic factors which are melted and replaced the syntactic factors—antecedent and binding triggers the meaning shift of caki. If it is true that 2nd person pronoun develops from the 3rd person reflexive, then we can hypothesize that caki reverses the process which grammaticalization usually proceeds, namely unidirectionality principle. In addition, as attested above, if the category of the 3rd person pronoun emerges newly from the 3rd person reflexives, there will be no need of presenting parentheses in Figure 5. In other words it would show the mirror image like the schematization of the attested process below, which means genuine counter-example of unidirectionality:
This pattern can be accounted for not only in Korean but also in another language. In other words, there seems to be the similar way of conceptualization of pronoun grammaticalization cross-linguistically. In fact, the similar case of *caki* can be accounted for in Japanese in a certain form—*jibun*.

### 3.5 Cross-linguistic evidence—*jibun* in Japanese

(17) 太郎は自分がうそをついたと言った。

\[
\begin{align*}
Taro-wa & \quad jibun-ga \quad uso-wo \quad tsu-i-ta-to \quad i-tta \\
\text{Taro-NOM} & \quad \text{jibun-NOM} \quad \text{lie-ACC} \quad \text{make-PST-CONN} \quad \text{say-PAST (DECL)}
\end{align*}
\]

’Taro said that he lied.’ \[3^{rd}\text{ person reflexive}\]

(18) 太郎は自分もうそをつきながら花子にうそをつくなと言う。

\[
\begin{align*}
Taro-wa & \quad jibun-mo \quad uso-wo \quad tsuk-i-nagara \\
\text{Taro-NOM} & \quad \text{jibun-also} \quad \text{lie-ACC} \quad \text{make-PAST-CONN} \\
Hanako-ni & \quad uso-wo \quad tsuk-u-na-to \quad iu \\
\text{Hanako-to} & \quad \text{lie-ACC} \quad \text{make-not-CONN} \quad \text{say (DECL)}
\end{align*}
\]

’Taro said Hanako not to lie though he himself lied.’

\[3^{rd}\text{ person reflexive pronoun} \Rightarrow 3^{rd}\text{ person pronoun}\]

(19) “君、うそついてないふりするな。自分もついたくせに。”

\[
\begin{align*}
Kimi, & \quad uso-tsui-te-nai \quad hurisuru-na. \quad jibun-mo \quad tsu-i-ta \quad kuse-ni. \\
\text{You,} & \quad \text{lie-make-CONN-not} \quad \text{pretend-not} \quad \text{jibun-also} \quad \text{made-PAST though-CONN}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Don’t pretend not to lie, even though you did lie.’ \[3^{rd}\text{ person pronoun} \Rightarrow 2^{nd}\text{ person pronoun}\]
The interesting thing is that the element functioning almost same as caki is accounted for in Japanese—jibun. The example (17) shows that jibun plays a role of the third person reflexive pronoun in the exactly same way as Korean caki. The example (18) also shows that contrastive meaning of jibun, which is said to be accounted for in Korean such as example (9b). At last, the fact that jibun in spoken frame functions as 2nd person pronoun shows that there are similar ways of construing either through caki or jibun cross-linguistically. These show that the pronoun caki in Korean and jibun in Japanese share its characteristics as 3rd person pronoun reflexive and as some of 2nd person pronoun.

3.6 Summary

In sum, caki shows that there is a certain pattern of grammaticalization. It is originally used as the third person reflexive. It extends its range to the extent that it can cover the function of the third person pronoun which is mostly used in embedded clauses and coordinated clauses, which focuses mostly on the volitional nuance of the covert or untraceable antecedent. Also, it shows fluctuation in its usage in discourse due to the contrast and the transfer of Viewpoint, which means that it gradually loses its linking to its covert antecedent. In other words, as caki is frequently used in conversations, its meaning becomes to change upon contexts. The relevant information and inferences are getting melted in the contexts and get increased freedom from its earlier discourse context. At a certain point, the context-induced reinterpretation of caki is not needed any more in the very discourse because it is already anchored in the meaning negotiation process of the speaker and the hearer. In other words, based on the shared cumulative information and inferences, the antecedent and other links which connect to caki in question can be removed to observe Quantity Maxim (Grice 1975). Eventually the space containing caki comes to be functioning as Base, which allows caki to be directly used as 2nd person pronoun in conversations. In short, benefited from the inferences that the conversations include, we can infer and use caki as the second person pronoun which carries more definite reference than the third person one.

Therefore, we can describe the grammaticalization process of caki in scalar as follows, which reverses the Unidirectionality Principle consequently:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage I. caki as the third person pronoun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage II. caki as the third person reflexive pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Stage III. caki as the third person pronoun)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 However, there is also a difference that caki cannot function as a 1st person pronoun whereas jibun can. Considering that the meaning of ‘jì(り)’ in jibun and ‘ca(り)’ in caki are ‘self’ in common—which is represented by the same Chinese character ‘り’, it is quite unpredictable to account for the usage of them.
4. Conclusion

Grammaticalization is a linguistic shift from less grammatical items to more grammatical ones. The process in this paper concerned the relationship among categories of reflexives and pronouns. Upon the definition of grammaticalization, it is natural that the direction of change is from pronouns, which is less grammatical, to reflexives, which is more grammatical, observing Unidirectionality Principle. Of course both of them are relatively more grammaticalized forms than other major categories. Nevertheless, among those, it is reasonable to say that the latter is more grammatical because it is close to the category of function words in that it is more bound and independent than the former. Since this principle is not an absolute principle but strong tendency which provides predictability of changes, there could exist counter-examples. In this paper I showed the Korean pronoun caki as another counter-example against UP.

In section 1, this paper referred the concept of grammaticalization and unidirectionality with introduction of Korean pronoun caki as a counter-example against UP. I referred to the tendency of previous research on caki, mostly focusing on its reflexive functions and suggested that the explanation of the motivation of changes be needed in Section 2. We discussed the motivation of grammaticalization in section 3.

Caki is originally used as 3rd person reflexive pronoun which is bound by overt antecedent. However its link is weakened gradually, in turn, it is diverged into 3rd person pronoun, as caki is used in a certain environment where it is undergoing categorical changes effected by the sentential environment such as contrastive construction, viewpoint shifting etc. Also, caki is occasionally accounted for in conversation as 2nd person pronoun as it is getting richer inferences and more information from the conversation. In other words, pragmatic factors replace syntactic markers and undergo their functions with shared inferences or through short-hands. The element which shows similar grammaticalization processes in Japanese, that is jibun. The cross-linguistic evidence shows that this change of caki is not a language specific one, which in turn increases its naturalness of conceptualization. If we use the scalar model provided in <Figure 5> as a continuum of changing process of caki, it is interesting that Korean caki is in more grammaticalized stage than Japanese jibun. The former recently shows the pattern of being frozen as nouns, which can be modified adjectives and can be used as vocative with vocative case marker ‘-ya’ in (20), whereas the latter doesn’t show any further changes in (21). Comparative research between caki and jibun is to be discussed further later.

(20) caki/*ku-ya, pap mek-ess-e?
   caki/*he-VOC meal eat-PAST-INTR
   ‘Honey/Darling, did you eat?’
One more point, generally, the relationship between frequency and grammaticalization is interconnected. The more frequently one morpheme is used, the more grammaticalized they are (Rhee 2000 [1998]: 216). However, Park (1992) said that [even though caki undergoes grammaticalization,] caki as the second-person pronoun has restrictions on its use in both the power and solidarity dimensions, which means that the frequency of caki as the second-person pronoun is relatively low. He also mentioned that it is likely to be used reciprocally between young lovers, between young married couples, and between two women in a symmetrical dyad; and non-reciprocally for the subordinate addressee in an asymmetrical dyad of two women. Caki is also regarded as an item showing an abnormal phenomenon in that caki can be grammaticalized regardless of its limited frequency. The criteria upon which we define the frequency of a certain item as high or low are not a fixed notion but it is true that it shows original characteristics with regard to frequency.

In conclusion, Korean pronoun ‘caki’ shows reversed patterns of grammaticalization in that it’s binding to the antecedent is replaced by pragmatic factors, in other words, caki turns into a freer form. Therefore this paper suggests that Korean pronoun caki be a sore spot against Unidirectionality Principle, which might be help pay attention to its logical pervasiveness.
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