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1. Introduction
[1] Evidentiality in Korean seems to have received little attention, because it is often subsumed under the category of modality (H.-S. Lee 1991, Strauss 2005:441).

[2] The aim of this paper is
a. To put a full spotlight on Korean evidentiality markers and to explore their functions and distributions,

b. To claim that modern colloquial Korean has a ‘scattered’ evidentiality system (Aikhenvald 2004:80) with three choices, consisting of the firsthand evidential -te- (retrospective), the inferential evidential -napo-, and the reportive/quotative -ay,

(1) pi-ka o-n-ta ‘It rains.’
    rain-Nom come-Non.past.Impf-DeclarativeEnding

(2) pi-ka o-te-la ‘[I remember that] it was raining.’
    rain-Nom come-Firsthand.EV-DE

(3) pi-ka o-napo-ta ‘[I guess] it rains.’
    rain-Nom come-Inferential.EV-DE

(4) pi-ka o-n-t-ay ‘[I was told that] it rains.’
    rain-Nom come-Non.past.Impf-Decl-Rep/Quot.EV

c. To offer a compositional constructional account of the typologically unique system, which is to mark multiple modes of access to linguistic content.

(5) Inho-ka manhi aphy-ess-t-ay-napo-te-la
    Inho-Nom much be.sick-Ant-Decl-Rep/Quo.EV-Inf.EV-Firsthand.EV-DE
    ‘(I directly experienced that I made an inference in the past from what I had been told. Based on this, I can tell you that) Inho suffered much from illness.’

2. Backgrounds
2.1. Evidentiality
[1] Definition: linguistic devices coding information source
“In about a quarter of the world’s languages, every statement must specify the type of source on which it is based – for example, whether the speaker saw it, or heard it, or inferred it from indirect evidence, or learnt it from someone else. This grammatical category, whose primary meaning is information source is called ‘evidentiality’” (Aikhenvald 2004: 1).

 a. Visual: covers information acquired through seeing
 b. Non-visual sensory: covers information acquired through hearing, and is typically extended to smell and taste, and sometimes also to touch.
 c. Inference: based on visible or tangible evidence, or result.
 d. Assumption: based on evidence other than visible results: this may include logical reasoning, assumption, or simply general knowledge.
 e. Hearsay: for reported information with no reference to those it was reported by.
 f. Quotative: for reported information with an overt reference to the quoted source.
2.2. Types of Evidentiality over Languages

[1] According to Aikhenvald (2004, Chapter 2), language groups differ with regard to the number of terms that mark modes of access in each language. They vary from systems with two choices to those with five or more choices.

Table 1. Aikhenvald’s (2004, Chapter 2) Evidentiality Systems over Languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1. Firsthand and Non-firsthand: Cherokee, Yukaghir, etc.</td>
<td>B1. Direct (or Visual), Inferred, Reported: Wanka Quechua, Shilluk, Qiang, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. Reported (‘hearsay’) versus ‘everything else’: Lezgian, Kham, Estonian, etc.</td>
<td>B3. Visual, Non-visual sensory, Reported: Oksapmin, Maricopa, Dulong, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4. Sensory evidence and Reported (or ‘hearsay’): Ngiyambaa, Diyari, Latundê, etc.</td>
<td>B4. Non-visual sensory, Inferred, Reported: Nganasan, Retuar, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5. Auditory (acquired through hearing) versus ‘everything else’: Euchee, etc.</td>
<td>B5. Reported, Quotative, ‘everything else’: Comanche, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2. Direct (or Visual), Inferred, Assumed, Reported: Tsafiki, Shipibo-Konibo, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3. Direct, Inferred, Reported, Quotative: Cora, Northern Embera, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Korean Evidentiality as a Three-Term System

3.1. Firsthand Evidentiality -Te- (Kwon 2009)

[1] -Te- indicates
a. The speaker perceived the focal event, an unbounded one directly,
b. The speaker conveys the information to the addressee, and
c. The speaker accesses her own subjective memory.

(6)  
pi-ka
rain-Nom come-te-DE
[I remember that] it was raining.

(7)  
kwuk-i
soup-Nom be.salty-te-DE
[I remember that] The soup was salty.

(8)  
ak-i-uy
baby-Gen cheek-Nom be.soft-te-DE
[I remember that] The baby's cheek was soft.

(9)  
pakk-i
outside-Nom too be.noisy-te-DE
[I remember that] It was too noisy out there.

a. There should be spatial and temporal discontinuity between the past event in question and the temporal and spatial configuration where the speaker’s utterance takes place (Kwon 2009, Chung 2006, 2007: the speaker’s perceptual field)

(10) [Seeing that it is raining outside through the window,]
*ci̞kum pi-ka manhi o-te-la
now rain-Nom heavily come-te-DE
Lit. Rain comes much now (‘It’s raining much now.’)

(11) [Remembering that it rained outside yesterday,]
ecey pi-ka manhi o-te-la
yesterday rain-Nom heavily come-te-DE
Lit. Rain came much yesterday (‘It rained much yesterday.’)

b. ‘psychological distance,’ ‘weakened reliability’ (Shin 1980); ‘lack of responsibility’ (Kim 1981)

(12) [The speaker, who knows that the addressee had hung out her laundry outside, enters the room and says,]
pakk-ey pi-ka o-te-la
outside-Loc rain-Nom come-te-DE
‘(I perceived that) it was raining outside.’

3.2. Inferential Evidential Marker -napo- (Kwon 2010)

3.2.1. Inferential Evidential Marking

[1] -napo- indicates that
a. The speaker perceived an event or a state,
b. The speaker infers the causing event from her perception of the target event or state,
c. The speaker conveys the inference to the addressee.

a. Polymorphemic: a complementizer -na ‘whether’ and po- ‘see’.

(13) -na po-
whether see ‘see whether’

b. When the -na po- construction is used in an imperative utterance, the utterance indicates ‘see whether X is doing Y’:

(14) Chelswu-ka o-na po-a
Chelswu-Nom come-whether see-Indic
‘See whether Chelswu is coming.’

c. The grammaticalized marker -napo-: the speaker infers that the described event occurs or has occurred or will occur (depending on the coded relation between the event time and the speech act time), based on her observation of the consequence which she thinks has happened because of the event.

(15) [Seeing that he is preparing to go out to eat (Pres/Fut) or finding him absent (Past)]
(ku-ka) pap-mek-ule ka-ø/lkes/ess-napo-a
he-Nom rice-eat-in.order.to go-Ø/Fut/Ant-napo-Indic
"(I can infer that) It seems that he goes (will go)/went to eat."
3. Inferential Semantics
a. Marking an Inductive Reasoning Process
(16) [A person sees someone with a wet coat coming into the room,]
\[\text{pakk-ey} \quad \text{pi-ka} \quad \text{o-napo-a}\]
outside-Loc rain-Nom come-napo-Indic
"(I can infer that) It seems that it is raining outside."

4. Conceptual Distance Marking
a. Mirativity: to express the unexpectedness of the focal event (Delancey 1999), without any inferential semantics.
(17) [Contrary to the expectation that it’s not raining, looking out the window and seeing it’s raining,]
\[\text{pakk-ey} \quad \text{pi-ka} \quad \text{o-napo-a}\]
outside-Loc rain-Nom come-napo-Indic
"(Oh/ Apparently/ I guess, I can infer that) It seems that it is raining outside."

(18)a. \[\text{cip-ey} \quad \text{koyangi-ka} \quad \text{iss-e}\]
house-Loc cat-Nom be-Indic
"There is a cat in the house." [an unidentified cat or a pet cat]

b. \[\text{cip-ey} \quad \text{koyangi-ka} \quad \text{iss-napo-a}\]
house-Loc cat-Nom be-napo-Indic
"(Oh) Wow, there is a cat in the house." [an unidentified cat]

b. Politeness: To enable the speaker to avoid a face-threatening act.
(19) [When a bartender politely tells a drunken customer, who is demanding more drinks, to stop drinking and to go home]
\[\text{cip-ey} \quad \text{ka-si-eya-ci-yo.} \quad \text{manhi} \quad \text{chwiha-stess-\#(napo)-e-yo.}\]
home-Loc go-Hon-Conn-Commit-Hon.end much be.drunk-Hon-Ant-napo-Decl-Hon
"You should head yourself home. (It seems that) You’re very drunk."

Pragmatic tactic of flouting: although the bartender has perceived the customer’s obvious drunken state, he pretends not to have directly perceived what is referred to and also pretends to indirectly infer it from some other evidence (to avoid a FTA).

3.3. Reportive/ Quotative/ Hearsay Evidential –Ay (Kwon 2011)
[1] -Ay- indicates that
a. The speaker obtains the focal information via a hearsay or a report or indirect means,
b. The speaker conveys the information to the addressee.
(20)a. \[\text{nayil} \quad \text{pi-ka} \quad \text{o-n-ta}\]
tomorrow rain-Nom come-Impf-Decl
Lit. Rain comes tomorrow. “It will rain tomorrow.”

b. \[\text{nayil} \quad \text{pi-ka} \quad \text{o-n-ta-(ko)-ha-n-ta}\]
tomorrow rain-Nom come-Impf-Decl-Comp-say-Impf-Decl
Lit. (Someone is saying that) Rain comes tomorrow.
“(I heard that someone is saying that) It will rain tomorrow.”

c. \[\text{nayil} \quad \text{pi-ka} \quad \text{o-n-t-ay-n-ta}\]
tomorrow rain-Nom come-Imperf-Decl-ay-Impf-Decl
Lit. (Someone is saying that) Rain comes tomorrow.
“(I heard that someone is saying that) It will rain tomorrow.”

(21) Target Construction: Indicative ending + -ay (J.-Y. Chung, In preparation)

[3] Functional Properties: In Korean, reportive evidentiality and quotative evidentiality are covered by the single construction -ay, although they are usually covered by separate constructions in other languages (Aikhenvald 2004).
   a. Reportive: the mode of access by which the speaker obtains information is not direct or firsthand, but an indirect report or hearsay without specifying the exact source/origin (Aikhenvald 2004:177).

(22) nongcang-i kyengchal-uy supkyek-ul pat-ass-t-ay
    farm-Nom police-Gen assault-Acc receive-Ant-Decl-ay
    ‘(It is said that) the farm is under attack from the police.’

(23) ppalkan masukhu-ka tto yeca-lul ewuk-i-ess-t-ay
    red mask-Nom again woman-Acc die-Caus-Ant-Decl-ay
    ‘(It is said that) the ‘red mask’ killed another woman.’

The speaker is simply conveying the obtained information from an unknown source of information, without any responsibility for the conveyed information, to the addressee.

b. Quotative: the mode of access by which the speaker obtains information is quotation, which introduces the exact author of the quoted report (Aikhenvald 2004:177), i.e. an explicit information source in constructions.

(24) wuli wangcho-ka koaynchanh-umyen sa-keyss-t-ay
    our boss-Nom be.okay-if buy-Presump.modal-Decl-ay
    ‘Our boss said that he will buy it if it is okay.’

(25) kimpwucang-nim-i kyetlon-ha-ci mal-l-ay
    ‘Chief Kim told me not to marry.’

[4] Marking further conceptual distance: when -ay is reduplicated and when the two tokens/instances are bridged by a morpheme of temporal grounding (so to speak, imperfective -nun- and anteriority -ess-), the utterance conveys thirdhand information.

(26) Chelswu-ka Yenghuy-lul cohaha-n-t-ay1-ess-t-ay2
    CS-Nom YH-Acc like-Imperf-Decl-ay1-Ant-Decl-ay2
    a. ‘I was told by Y, who had been told by X, that CS likes YH.’
    b. ‘I was told by X, who had been told by CS, that CS likes YH.’

4. Multiple Evidentiality Markers Licensed in a Single Syntactic Clause
[1] In Korean, more than two evidentials are licensed in a single clause, which is rare according to Aikhenvald (2004:93).
(27) pyengo-ka hoycang-nim-hako tamphan-ul
Pyengo-Nom CEO-Hon-with talk.table-Acc
ci-ess-t-ay-napo-te-la
decide-Ant-Decl-Rep-Inf-Firsthand-DE
‘(I directly experienced that I made an inference in the past from what I had been told. Based on this, I can tell you that) Pyeongo settled the issues with the CEO.’\(^1\)

[2] Combinations of Two Evidentiality Markers

(28) coki-congyeng pantay-ka iss-umyen kyeysok
early-shut.down objection-Nom be-if continuously
ha-n-t-ay-napo-e-yo
do-Impf-Decl-ay-napo-Indic-Hon.ending
‘If there are objections to the early closing (of the TV show), (I inferred from what I had been told that) they will keep doing it (producing the episodes).’\(^2\)

(29) imyongkosa-nun mwue tases-myeng-to
exam.for.recruiting.teachers-Top what.DM five-counter-even
an ppop-nun-t-ay-te-la
Neg select-Impf-Decl-ay-te-DE
‘(I remember that I was told that) well, they pick no more than 5 people.’\(^3\)

(30) ney yenlakche al-lyeko mwutenhi
your point.of.contact know-desiderative very.hard
nolyekha-ess-napo-te-la
attempt-Ant-napo-te-DE
‘(I remember that I inferred from some evidence that) (he) tried hard to find out your contact information.’\(^4\)

\(^\circ\) This observation is typologically meaningful in that this study reports Korean to be another rare case where more than two evidentials are in use.

5. Discussion

[1] Does Korean have a stand-alone category of evidentiality?
- No, there is a ‘scattered’ system of evidentiality.
  - The three evidentiality markers do not belong to the same grammatical position in the Korean Verbal Complex: -te- and -napo- are located at the non-terminal suffix position, whereas -ay- is located at the terminal suffix position.

- The Evidentiality System in Korean Non-Terminal Suffixes as a Three-Term Distinction
  - As a result of the complex grammaticalization processes in the KVC, contemporary colloquial Korean seems to have come to have systematized evidentiality that consists of the three evidentiality markers (B1 system in table 1),

\(^1\) http://moodeungilbo.co.kr/searchview.php?no=60158&read_temp=20020416&section=12
\(^2\) http://kin.naver.com/qna/detail.nhn?d1id=3&dirId=3010101&docId=54644134&qb=7ZWc64yA64KY67SQ&enc=utf8&section=kin&rank=25&search_sort=0&spq=0
\(^3\) http://kin.naver.com/qna/detail.nhn?d1id=11&dirId=1104050&docId=123200495&qb=64yA642U6528&enc=utf8&section=kin&rank=3&search_sort=0&spq=0
\(^4\) http://www.dema.mil.kr/service/BlogMain/gagora/C999?pageno=10
One of the well-attested patterns of evidential system in languages such as Aymara (Hardman 1986), Wanka Quechua (Floyd 1997:71, 1999:48) etc. (Aikhenvald 2004).

b. The ‘scattered’ evidentiality system has been discussed in Aikhenvald (2004:80):

“A language may have grammatical expression for a number of evidential meanings but the actual markers may not form one coherent category. … The expression of evidentiality may itself be obligatory – but different evidentiality specifications ‘scattered’ throughout the verbal system by no means make up a unitary category. They still, however, qualify as grammatical evidentials.”


7. Conclusion

[1] This paper argued that the Korean Verbal Complex has a scattered system of Evidentiality, which consists of three choices, each of which marks conceptual distance between the experiencing origo and the focal event:

Table 2. The Korean Evidentiality System with Three Choices (B1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firsthand</th>
<th>Inferential</th>
<th>Reported/Quotative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-te- (retrospective),</td>
<td>-napo-</td>
<td>-ay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[2] The Korean Evidentiality system is typologically unique in that it allows multiple modes of access to appear simultaneously in a syntactically single clause.
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**Abbreviation**
Acc = Accusative  Address = Address Term  Ant = Anterior
Caus = Causative  Commit = Committal  Comp = Complementizer
Conn = Connective  DE = Declarative Ending  Decl = Declarative
DM = Discourse Marker  EV = Evidentiality  Fut = Future
Gen = Genitive  Hon = Honorific  Hon.end = Honorific Ending
Impf = Imperfective  Indic = Indicative  Inf = Inferential
Pres.Modal = Presumptive Modal  Loc = Locative  Nom = Nominative
Rep = Reportive  Top = Topic  Quot = Quotative