Please Confirm What I inferred: On the Korean Evidential Marker –Napo–

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. PHENOMENA IN FOCUS

(1) [A normal utterance that does not contain the marker]

\[ ku-ka \ hakkyo-ey \ ka-ess-a \]
he-Nom school-Loc go-Past-Ending

“He went to school.”

- Simple description: when the speaker talks about him to a third party person after the speaker saw him have left for school (direct evidence) or after the speaker was told that he went to school etc. (indirect evidence).

(2) [Finding him not in the room; with the marker –napo–]

\[ ku-ka \ hakkyo-ey \ ka-ess-na-po-a \]
he-Nom school-Loc go-Past-na-po-Ending

“(I can infer that) It seems that he went to school.”

- Inferential statement: when the speaker cannot see him going to school at present or could not see him going to school in past.

(3) [Contrary to the interlocutors’ shared knowledge that he is not going to school, seeing that he is on his way to school on the street.]

\[ ku-ka \ hakkyo-ey \ ka-o-na-po-a \]
he-Nom school-Loc go-o-na-po-Ending

“(Oh/ Apparently/ I guess, I can infer that) It seems that he goes (will go) to school.”

- Surprise/Unexpectedness: Extended usage of the marker

(4) [When a student explained what happened last night to his advisor, who was too drunk to remember anything last night.]

\[ ecey \ sensayingnim-kkeyse \ manhi \ chwiha-si-ess-*(na-po-)-e-yo. \]
yesterday teacher-Nom [Hon] much be.drunk-Hon-Past-na-po-Ending-Hon

“(I can infer that) It seems that you were drunk too much.”

- Politeness Strategy

1.2. THE AIMS OF THE PAPER

[1] To introduce –Napo– as an inferential evidential marker by showing its major characteristics, which has not been studied previously.

[2] To show that the marker also encodes a mirative function (DeLancey 1999) that releases new information to the addressee and that can be used as a politeness strategy.

[3] By looking into its grammaticalization process, to argue that the various semantic functions of the marker are cognitively interrelated and that in the core of the interrelation lies pragmatic tactic using the speaker’s inference, and

[4] To discuss relevant issues regarding mirative/inferential distinction, relationship with the other mirative marker -kwun, and its distancing strategy.
2. Background: Evidentiality in General and in Korean

2.1. Evidentiality in General

[1] Definition: Linguistic devices that mark and specify type of the evidence on which a statement is based—whether the speaker saw it, or heard it, or inferred it from indirect evidence, or learnt it from someone else (Aikhenvald 2003: 1).

The semantic ‘core’ of evidential is source of information.

   a. ‘Broad sense’ by Chafe’s (1986: 271) as marking speaker’s attitude towards his/her knowledge of reality
   b. ‘Narrow sense’ as marking the source of such knowledge.

[3] Typology
   a. Two broad types (Aikhenvald 2003: 3)
      [a] Indirectives: Those which state the existence of a source for the evidence without specifying it; ‘by reference to its reception by a conscious subject.’ (e.g. Turkic and a number of Iranian and Finno-Ugric languages and possibly Korean).
      [b] Directives: Those which specify the kind of evidence—be it visually obtained, based on inference, or reported information.

2.2. Evidentiality in Korean

[1] Controversy: Does zero-evidential exist?
   “An analytic problem that arises in these cases is whether the zero marked form should be considered a term in an obligatory system, or whether the system (including no zero term) should be said to apply optionally” (Aikhenvald 2003: 7).

Chung (2006, 2007) argued that Korean evidential system is obligatory


[3] Tentative Evidential System of Korean (including periphrastic expressions; parameterized by source of information)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect (Inferred)</th>
<th>Reported/Hearsay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-tela (retrospective), -ney (simultaneity)</td>
<td>-napo-, -n moyang-, -n kes kath-, -kathi + perception verbs, -chelem + perception verbs</td>
<td>-ko ha-, -lay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[4] Problems
   a. There have been no systematic accounts covering an overall picture of its evidential system.
   b. There even seems to be an undiscovered evidential marker: an inferential evidential marker –napo.
2. –NAPO- AS AN INFERENTIAL EVIDENTIAL MARKER
2.1 BASIC PROPERTIES OF –NAPO-

[1] Construction

(5) –na po- (usually followed by an imperative marker)
whether see ‘see whether’

a. The speaker seeks an agreement on the validity of the information from the addressee or urges the addressee to pay attention to it.
b. Pragmatic tactic? The speaker urges the addressee to confirm what the speaker suggests is crucial to understand inferential semantics of this marker.

[2] Inferential: The speaker infers that the referred event occurs or has occurred (depending on the event time), based on her observation of the consequence that the speaker thinks it does because of the event.

(6) [Seeing that he is packing his backpack (Pres/Fut) or finding him not there (Past)]
ku-ka hakkyo-ey ka-o/let/ess-naPO-a
he-Nom school-Loc go-o/Fut/Past-naPO-Ending
“(I can infer that) It seems that he goes (will go)/went to school.”

a. The event should result from the speaker’s inference (Indirect source).
b. The marker goes with any tense.

[3] The marker does not necessarily require the information source should be visual.

(7a) [When the speaker was told by the third party that he was not there,]
ku-ka hakkyo-ey ka-ess-naPO-a
he-Nom school-Loc go-Past-naPO-Ending
“(I can infer that) It seems that went to school.”

(7b) [When the speaker tasted salty food,]
yolisa-ka sokum-ul manhi neh-ess-naPO-a¹
cook-Nom salt-Acc much put.in-Past-naPO-Ending
“(I can infer that) It seems that the cook put too much salt in it.”

¹ If the speaker strongly believes that it happened, i.e. if she concluded that her inference is definitely right, we need another evidential marker –ney right after –naPO-. The marker –ney is the marker encoding the speaker’s high degree of certainty of the event’s occurrence based on the consequence at present that is thought to result from the event.

(7a’) [When the speaker was told that he was not there and concluded that he went to school,]
ku-ka hakkyo-ey ka-ess-naPO-ney
he-Nom school-Loc go-Past-naPO-ney
“(I’m pretty sure that my inference is correct that) It seems that he went to school.”

The combinations of the evidential markers are a topic of much interest. They are, however, beyond the range of this paper’s coverage and for now, it would be enough to mention that if the speaker wants to increase the degree of the certainty, another evidential marker can be used in a single sentence. The combinations and distributions of various evidential markers in Korean call for further research.
(8) [Seeing one coming into the room, whose coat is wet,]
\[pakk-ey \ pi-ka \ o-na-po-a\]
outside-Loc rain-Nom come-na-po-Ending
“(I can infer that) It seems that it is raining outside.”

[3] Since the marker encodes the speaker’s inference based on the consequence that the speaker thinks was brought about by the event, this marker can be specified to be an inferential evidential marker.

2.2 LIMITATION ON PRONOUN USAGE

[1] This marker shows its limitation of pronoun usage, since its evidential function requires the speaker’s inference based on her objectified observation:

a. “Evidentiality systems often interact with the grammatical person of the subject or experience” (Aikhenvald 2003: 16).

\[(9) \ ku(\ nay)-ka \ hakkyo-ey \ ka-ess-na-po-a\]
I-Nom school-Loc go-Past-na-po-Ending
“(I can infer that) It seems that he (I?) went to school”

b. Intentionality?
“[T]he use of indirectives when speaking of oneself then necessarily implies lack of awareness, volitionality, consciousness or control due to inattention, sleep, drunkenness, coma, etc.” Johanson (2003: 285).

c. If (9) is used in the context where the speaker got drunk and did not remember anything happened yesterday and where she finally found herself to have been to school somehow, then it can be licensed.

(10) [When the speaker has just realized that she broke the vase last night, which she cannot remember]
\[nay-ka \ ha-ess-na-po-a\]
I-Nom do-Past-na-po-ending
“(Apparently) I did it.”

[2] The first person pronoun is not likely to be licensed:

(11)? \[nay-ka \ hakkyo-ey \ ka-ess-na-po-a\]
I-Nom school-Loc go-na-po-a
“(I remember that) It seems that I went to school”

a. However, the limitation is resolved when an adverbial phrase that creates a separate domain is added so that the speaker can objectify herself by viewing herself from the third party’s point of view:

(11’) \[ku-u-y \ kkwum \ sok-eyse \ nay-ka \ hakkyo-ey \ ka-ess-na-po-a\]
he-Gen dream inside-Loc I-Nom school-Loc go-Past-na-po-ending.
“(I remember that) It seems that I went to school in his dream.”
b. When an adverbial phrase *in my dream* is added, the grammaticality judgment still remains marginal:

(11") na-uy kkwum sok-cyse nay-ka hakkyo-ey ka-ess-napo-a
I-Gen dream inside-Loc I-Nom school-Loc go-Past-napo-ending.
“(I remember that) It seems that I went to school in his dream.”


[4] Mirativity? (11’) can be licensed in some cases where the speaker thinks that the event referred to is unexpected.

2.3 UNIQUE PROPERTIES

2.3.1 MIRATIVES


(12) [Contrary to the interlocutors’ shared knowledge that he is not going to school, seeing that he is on his way to school on the street,]
ku-ka hakkyo-ey ka-ø-napo-a
he-Nom school-Loc go-ø-napo-Ending
“(Oh/ Apparently/ I guess, I can infer that) It seems that he goes (will go) to school.”

(13) [Contrary to the expectation that it’s not raining, looking out the window and seeing it’s raining,]
pakk-ey pi-ka o-napo-a
outside-Loc rain-Nom come-napo-Ending
“(Oh/ Apparently/ I guess, I can infer that) It seems that it is raining outside.”

a. The marker can be licensed only when the event that is talked about is unexpected.
b. Notice that mirativity is more emphasized in (13) than in (12).

(14) [When the speaker has just inferred and realized that the addressee will receive a prize,]
ney-ka sang-ul tha-ess-napo-a
you-Nom prize-Acc get-Past-napo-ending
“(Apparently, it seems that) You got the prize!”

[2] Contrastive Examples regarding specificity of the referred entity:

(15a) cip-ey koyangi-ka iss-e
house-Loc cat-Nom be-ending
“There is a cat in the house.” [specific]

(15b) cip-ey koyangi-ka iss-napo-a
house-Loc cat-Nom be-napo-ending
“There is a cat in the house.” [non-specific]

na ‘whether’ and po- ‘see’ > napo

a. For instance, (12) originally means ‘See whether he is going to school.’
b. It seems that the original function of the construction remains, an inducement for the hearer to confirm the event referred to, especially when the event is unexpected (Persistence; Hopper 1991).

2.3.2 POLITENESS STRATEGY

[1] The marker can be used in politeness strategy neutralizing the speaker’s assertiveness:

(16) [When a student explained what happened last night to his advisor, who was too drunk to remember anything last night,]

ecey sensayingnim-kkeyse manhi chwiha-si-ess-*(napo-)e-yo.
yesterday teacher-Nom [Hon] much be.drunk-Hon-Past-napo-Ending-Hon

“(I can infer that) It seems that you were drunk too much.”

a. Pretending not to directly perceive what is referred to and making the addressee check it, even though she has certainty about the information.
b. Part of the pragmatic tactics is related to the marker’s inferential function and the other part of it is related to the marker’s mirative function here.

[2] Reminder of the purpose: Marking indirect source of information and inferring new information based on the indirect source via a pragmatic tactic inducing the addressee to determine validity of the information.

3. GRAMMATICALIZATION OF –NAPO

3.1. THE FIRST STAGE: ‘SEE WHETHER’

[1] Lexical meanings of the two morphemes in –napo- are preserved: the utterance will ask the addressee to see whether the event occurs or not:

(17) ku-ka hakkyo-ey ka-na po-a
he-Nom school-Loc go-whether see-Imp

“See whether he goes to school.”

a. A pragmatic tactic: If the speaker asked the addressee to see and to confirm whether the event really occurs, responsibility for the validity of the information shifts from the speaker to the addressee.
b. Notice that -na ‘whether’ and po- ‘see’ are used when the speaker has a neutral stance toward occurrence of the referred event and is to strongly induce the hearer to confirm it.


[3] Hanpen [one.time] ‘once’ can be inserted between them. This shows that –na and po- are not amalgamated yet and they did not enter into the grammaticalization yet.
3.2. THE SECOND STAGE: CONTEXT INDUCED REINTERPRETATION

[1] Grammaticalization process kicks in at this stage, which is supported by the fact that this particular stage includes some cases where Context Induced Reinterpretation (Heine et al. 1991) occurs.

(18) (a) [The speaker asks the addressee to monitor her presentation.]

\[nay-ka \quad cal \quad ha-na \quad po-a\]

I-Nom well do-whether see-Imp

“See whether I’m doing well.”

(b) [The speaker is confident that she will be doing a great job, invites the addressee to look at her, and proves that her inference is right]

\[nay-ka \quad cal \quad ha-na \quad po-a\]

I-Nom well do-whether see-Imp

“See how well I’ll do.”

a. (18b), the speaker’s stance toward the event becomes positive, gets stronger and the strong inducement which is implied by (18a) gets bleached, i.e. the addressee does not have to respond to the utterance.

b. Pragmatic inference is still in effect and the speaker tries to invite the addressee to look at how well she will do and to prove that her inference is right. Thus, inferential property is more or less involved in this stage.

[2] A tag-question still cannot be licensed at the end of the sentence, since the utterance is used with an imperative marker.

[3] Since the two morphemes are not completely grammaticalized yet, \textit{hanpen} [one.time] ‘once’ can mark the edge between them.

3.3. THE COMPLEX STAGE: INFERENCE VS. MIRATIVITY

[1] The pragmatic tactic catalyzes the grammaticalization process: The speaker disclaims direct responsibility for the truth of the statement by inducing the addressee’s confirmation of what is referred to, even though the inferred information originates from the speaker.

(19) [After discovering that his car was parked on the street first, the speaker is talking to her friend, who can have a visual access, but didn’t discover it yet]

\[ku-ka \quad o-ass-na-po-a\]

he-Nom come-Past-napo-Ending

“(I can infer that) It seems that he has come.”

- The speaker did not see his presence directly, but provides the addressee with the inferred information, i.e. the utterance encodes immediate revelation of the discovered event by the speaker (mirative) via pragmatic inferencing.

[2] A tag-question can be naturally licensed at the end of the sentence.
‘Once’ cannot be inserted between them.
Notice that the lexical meaning of verb po- gets bleached: The source of information does not have to be visual.

3.4 PRAGMATIC EXTENSION: POLITENESS TACTICS NEUTRALIZING ASSERTIVENESS

The pragmatic mechanism employed in mirative/inferential marking enables the speaker to express something in a euphemistic way, which also can be employed as politeness strategy.

(20) [The speaker is euphemistically saying that he is sleepy (the counterpart tried to explain something to him very hard, but the speaker couldn’t concentrate on what she said because he is sleepy and feel sorry about that).]

\[
\text{I-Nom be.sleepy-whether see or napo-Imp}
\]

“See whether I’m sleepy” (via Flouting “It seems that I’m sleepy”)

“[… ] indirective inflectional markers may represent events in a complexive, experiential, summarizing way, frequently with nuances of modesty” (Johanson 2003: 384)

4. DISCUSSION

The grammaticalization process of the marker is possible because of its underlying pragmatic tactic of flouting: the speaker pretends not to know what is referred to and making the addressee check it, even though she knows it.

Each stage shows different degree of the speaker’s belief that the event will occur and of the inducement for the addressee to confirm what has been mentioned by the speaker.

The lexical meaning of verb po- gets bleached, when it undergoes the grammaticalization.

Subjectivity (Traugott and Dasher 2002)? Subjectification bridges the gap between the indirect reference and the speaker’s inference

“The indirect way of referring may create uncertainty concerning the realization of the event and be interpreted as non-testimonial reference. Indirectives, in particular reポートive items, can be used to disclaim direct responsibility for the truth of the statement, suggesting that the speaker is not the originator of the information or does not vouch for it.” (Johanson 2003: 283).

It conforms to Aikhenvald’s stipulation of mirativity

“Semantically broad evidential categories involve creating a conceptual distance which results in the overtones of ‘unprepared mind’ involving unexpected, new (and surprising) information, and also ‘noncommitment’ of the speaker to the truth of the utterance (as in Kalasha and Khowar: Bashir 1988), and caution and modesty” (Aikhenvald 2003: 12).
4.1 WHICH ONE OF THE TWO, INFERENTIAL AND MIRATIVE, COMES FIRST?

[1] Difficulty in separating Inferential and Mirative

a. The unexpectedness or the novelty of the information might be a consequence of our inferences.

b. The combination of mirative marking and perfective aspect will naturally tend to be interpreted as inferential, since an event in the past will ordinarily be new information to the speaker only if his or her knowledge of it derives from secondary evidence rather than from direct perception (DeLancey 1999: 369).

[2] Directionality: Either from Inferential to Mirativity or from Mirativity to Inferential is possible, but it seems that inferential is default by positing a schematic directionality as shown below (DeLancey 1999: 378-379):

(21) Mirative extension of an evidential: Lack of firsthand information → speaker’s non-participation and lack of control → unprepared mind and new knowledge → mirative reading (Aikhenvald 2004: 208)

[2] Implications from Korean examples

a. There seems to be no concrete examples showing that either of the stages is more grammaticalized than the other; the marker involves inferential properties more or less when it is regarded as a mirative marker.

4.2 Comparison to another mirative –kwun

[1] The only mirative marker that has been argued to exist in Korean is –kwun in the previous literature (Sohn 1994, Aikhenvald 2004):

(22) kwuk-ey sokum-ul manhi neh-ess-kwun-a
    soup-Loc salt-Acc much put.in-Past-kwun-ending
    “(Apparently) (you/someone) put much salt in it.”

(23) kwuk-ey sokum-ul manhi neh-ess-napo-a
    soup-Loc salt-Acc much put.in-Past-napo-ending
    “(Apparently) (you/someone) put much salt in it.”

- It seems that –kwun can be interchangeably used when an utterance contain it is about information regarding the speaker’s inference and mirativity

[2] Intriguing Contrast

(24) kwuk-i com cca-kwun-a
    soup-Nom a.little be.salty-kwun-ending
    “(Apparently) this soup is salty.”

(25) kwuk-i com ccan-kapo²-a
    soup-Nom a.little be.salty-napo-ending
    “(Apparently) this soup is salty.”

² -kapo is an allomorph of morpheme –napo-, which appears after adjectives in principle.
a. When we are talking about a consequence, not a cause of the consequence, (24) is a more prototypical mirative than (25).

b. (24) encodes the speaker’s assertive and conclusive attitude toward the information.

c. (24) can be used as a soliloquy something like self-exclamation, whereas (25) should have an addressee for the speaker to interact with.

[3] Even though -napo can encode mirativity as well as inferences just like the other marker, it is not as specialized as the other marker –kwun in terms of mirativity.

Different degree of the speaker’s belief that the markers encode:

a. -Kwun encodes the speaker’s stronger belief about the inferred information

b. –Napo encodes less stronger belief about it by employing a pragmatic tactic of inducement of the addressee.

4.3 UNDERLYING COGNITIVE MECHANISM: DISTANCING STRATEGY

[1] Cognitive Functions

a. The speaker has indirect access to the information and the validity of the information is determined by the addressee (Mirativity; Subjectification).

b. The speaker invites the addressee to look at the information and shows/proves that what the speaker believes about the information is right (Politeness Strategy).


(26) [The speaker is scheduled to meet her friend, but she feels sick. She feels sorry about not being able to keep the promise and tries to apologize her friend for that and saying: ]

nay-ka aphu-n-kapo-a
I-Nom be.sick-Conn-napo-a
“(I can infer that) It seems that I’m sick.”

a. The speaker objectifies himself/herself for some reason: the speaker tries to excuse himself/herself for the case politely. It involves a flouting tactic aiming to hedge the speaker’s assertiveness.

b. Cognitive mechanisms underlying the usages of the marker –napo- stem from the speaker’s effort to distance herself/himself from the event in question exploiting the indirective semantics originated from the original lexical items and the speaker’s pragmatic tactic.

c. It is never unexpected: “Evidentials in Turkic, and in Abkhaz, can be used to animate the discourse; or as means of ‘distancing’ oneself from what is being narrated” (Aikhenvald 2003: 18).
5. Conclusion


[2] The marker can have a mirative function that releases new information to the addressee and can be coupled with inferential characteristics that can be employed in politeness strategy in Korean.

[3] This paper argued that all the functions are cognitively interrelated, following DeLancey’s assumption that inferentials, evidentials, and miratives are semantically related, and that in the core of the interrelation lies pragmatic tactic using the speaker’s inference and distancing based on indirective meanings of the morpheme.

[4] There is no straightforward stage in Korean where inferentials and miratives exist distinctively and thus, the marker –napo is not a pure mirative marker yet, since the marker still keeps its inferential semantics relatively more saliently.
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