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1 Introduction

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). The aim of this paper is to put a full spotlight on Korean evidentiality markers and to explore their functions and distributions. Specifically, this paper claims that modern colloquial Korean has a three term evidential system, consisting of the retrospective firsthand evidential -te-, the inferential evidential -napo-, and the reportive/quotative -ay. Furthermore, Korean marks multiple modes of access to linguistic content. I offer a compositional account of this typologically unique system.

The organization of this paper proceeds as follows: in Section 2, I provide background knowledge of evidentiality in general including types of sources of information that are frequently accounted for across languages. Section 3 explores functions and distributions of each of the three Korean evidentiality markers in detail. Then, Section 4 shows that more than one information source are licensed in a single syntactic clause and discusses the typologically unique compositionality of multiple information sources in detail. Section 5 discusses status of the Korean Evidentiality system and its significance in a typological context.

2 Backgrounds

Evidentiality refers to the grammatical category whose primary meaning is information source (Aikhenvald 2004:1). Following this definition, this study assumes that the function of marking source of information lies in the semantic core of evidentiality.

Types of information sources that are coded by evidentiality cross-linguistically are well-summarized in Aikhenvald (2004: 63-64). According to Aikhenvald (2004), there are six major types of information source accounted for across languages. The first and foremost type is vision. Since one’s perception by default relies on his/her vision, it is natural that a visual source of information be
regarded as one of the significant types. On the contrary, other ‘secondary’ senses other than vision such as olfactory, tactile, taste, and auditory are grouped into a non-visual sensory. Next, inference and assumption function as other types of the source. Note that they differ from the other sources in that they rely on the origo’s knowledge, not on the origo’s perception, strictly speaking. In this respect, their identity is often contested between evidentiality and epistemic modality (William F. Hank, p.c. August 2011). Hearsay is another significant type of source of reportive evidentiality. It indicates that 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). In contrast, quotative signals that 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.

In addition, according to Aikhenvald (2004), 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. As nicely summarized in Chapter 2 (Aikhenvald 2004:60), there are four major language groups depending on how many choices of information source can be encoded by their grammatical system. Each of the major groups has its sub-groups depending on what kinds of sources languages are capable of encoding with their grammatical system. For instance, languages such as Abkhaz, Turkish, and so forth belong to a sub-group, which grammatically have two-way distinction, non-firsthand and everything else. My claim in this study is basically that the contemporary colloquial Korean belongs to another sub-group which consists of direct, inferred, and reported/quotative sources of information.

3 Korean Evidentiality as a Three-Term System

My claim is that modern colloquial Korean has come to have a set of markers that indicate source of information in a given context, which form a three-term system of evidentiality. Among the elements that comprise the system, there are multimorphemic elements that are consequences of grammaticalization from the tense and aspect inventory. This section explores the evidential elements in question, which are specialized in their own functional territories: -te- (firsthand experience), -napo- (inference), and -ay (reportive, quotative, hearsay).

3.1 Firsthand Evidentiality Marker -Te-

The first item on the list is the firsthand evidentiality marker -te-. When -te- by itself is licensed in a clause, it indicates that (a) the focal event was unbounded, that (b) the speaker perceived it directly, and that (c) the speaker is accessing her
own subjective memory to convey the information to the addressee.

3.1.1 Marking Firsthand Evidentiality

The primary function of -te- is to signal that the information that is being talked about relies on the origo’s firsthand experience. In the following example, it is presupposed that the speaker directly observed that it was raining:

(1) pi-ka o-te-la
    rain-NOM come-te-DE
    ‘(I remember that) it was raining.’

The sources of information referenced by the -te- construction can include many kinds of direct experience. Use of -te- is compatible with all of the first-hand senses of the speaker, just not vision; it can involve taste, tactile sensing, auditory sensing, and olfaction. This flexibility is demonstrated as follows:

(2) kwuk-i cca-te-la
    soup-NOM be.salty-te-DE
    ‘(I remember that) The soup was salty.’

(3) aki-uy pol-i pwtulep-te-la
    baby-GEN cheek-NOM be.soft-te-DE
    ‘(I remember that) The baby’s cheek was soft.’

(4) pakk-i nemwu sikkulep-te-la
    outside-NOM too be.noisy-te-DE
    ‘(I remember that) It was too noisy out there.’

In (2), the speaker remembers that she tasted some salty food; in (3), the speaker remembers that the cheek of the baby felt soft to her; and in (4), the speaker remembers that she heard too much noise out there. Because the target events were perceived by the speakers firsthand, the -te- construction is licensed (Kwon 2009).

3.1.2 Conceptual Distance Marking

-Te- evokes an epistemic discontinuity, based on the observation that when the evidential marker -te- is used in an utterance, there must be spatial and temporal discontinuity between the past event described and the temporal and spatial location in which the speaker’s utterance occurs. This constraint seems natural,
when we consider that the marker encodes the semantic primes firsthand evidentiality, past tense, and retrospectivity: cognitive discontinuity is construed where firsthand and non-prototypically firsthand experiences meet. For example, a sentence such as that in (5) would never be acceptable, while (26) is grammatical.

(5) [Seeing that it is raining outside through the window,]

*cikum pi-ka manhi o-te-la
now rain-NOM heavily come-te-DE
Lit. Rain comes much now (‘It’s raining much now.’)

(6) [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.’)

The only difference between these two utterances is whether they contain the time adverbial cikum ‘now’ or ecey ‘yesterday,’ which implies that the semantics of the marker requires a separation between the time frame in which the event of raining occurs and is experienced and the time frame in which the speaker describes that event. If, as in (5), those time frames are not separate, the utterance is unacceptable.

-Te- can also indicate speakers’ attitudes such as ‘psychological distance,’ ‘weakened reliability’ (Shin 1980), or ‘lack of responsibility’ (Kim 1981). It is sometimes used to indicate that what the speaker observed is not her responsibility, she is just reporting it to the addressee. This would seem to be incompatible with the marker’s firsthand evidential function, as firsthand evidentiality usually implies a speaker’s direct experiential “vouching” and a firsthand evidential marker should therefore convey that the proposition in question is more reliable and trustworthy (Chung 2006). The marker generally indicates that the speaker feels certain about the proposition (Willett 1988), in other words, the marker conveys a high degree of epistemic certainty.

If we consider that the marker also conveys past tense reference, however, it would not be impossible to explain the distanced attitude of the speaker. In other words, since the speaker’s perception and assessment is prior to ST, it would be no surprise that subjectivity arising from the temporal relation enhances a ‘distanced’ interpretation.

(7) [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.’
In (7), the speaker simply reports what she has perceived and implies that she is not responsible for any consequence of the event. The utterance can be rephrased as follows: “I have perceived that it was raining when I was entering this building and I can vouch for what I have perceived, but I am not sure whether it is still raining outside or not.” The temporal gap between the focal event that the speaker has perceived and the speech act event at the coding time enables the utterance to encode conceptual distance or deictic distance and thus, it makes room for subjective semantics such as lack of responsibility to arise.

In sum, -te- indicates the speaker’s distanced stance towards the focal event as well as its firsthand evidentiality (Kwon 2009). This is possible because the marker conveys complex semantics such as firsthand evidentiality, strong epistemic modality, and past tense reference.

3.2 Inferential Evidential Marker -Napo-

As part of the proposed three-term system of evidentiality in Korean, I argue that the contemporary colloquial Korean has come to have -napo- as its inferential evidentiality marker (Kwon 2010). The marker is licensed when the experiencing origo has perceived some evidence available in context, then makes an inference from the perceived evidence.

3.2.1 Inferential Evidential Marking

I argue that in contemporary colloquial Korean, -napo- indicates that the speaker conveys the focal information based on her inference, coupled with the epistemic modal suffixes. The marker is not monomorphemic: -napo-consists of a complementizer -na ‘whether’ and po- ‘see’. Note that the original construction (-na po-) corresponding to the grammaticalized marker (-napo-) is still used in contemporary Korean. The internal structure of the marker can be shown as follows:

(8)  

\[-na \quad po-\]  
\[\text{whether} \quad \text{see} \]  
\[\text{‘see whether’}\]

When the -na po- construction is used in an imperative utterance, the utterance indicates ‘see whether X has happened or not’:

(9)  

\[Chelswu-ka \quad o-na \quad po-a\]  
\[Chelswu-NOM \quad \text{come-whether} \quad \text{see-IN}\]  
\[\text{‘See whether Chelswu is coming.’}\]
This particular construction is used when the speaker wants to draw the addressee’s attention to the focal event and to induce the addressee’s confirmation of the information.

Based on this background knowledge about the origin of the marker -napo-, let us consider how the marker functions as an inferential evidential marker by exploring utterances containing the marker. With the marker, the speaker infers that the described event occurs or has occurred or will occur (depending on the coded temporal relation between the event and the speech act), based on her observation of the consequence which she thinks has happened because of the event:

(10) [Seeing that he is preparing to go out to eat (Pres/Fut) or finding him absent (Past)]

(\text{ku-ka}) \ pap-mek-ule \ ka-o/kes/ess-\text{napo-a}

\text{he-NOM} \ \text{rice-eat-in.order.to} \ \text{go-o/FUT/ANT-\text{napo-IN}}

“(I can infer that) It seems that he goes (will go)\text{went to eat}.”

As shown in (10), when the marker -napo- is used in it, the meaning of the sentence is restricted to being inferential. This qualifies -napo- as an inferential evidential marker.

The marker conveys the following properties. First, the event that is talked about in the utterance that contains -napo- should result from the speaker’s inference. Second, the marker specifically involves the speaker’s inductive reasoning process, i.e. it depicts a situation where the speaker infers a cause from its effect. Third, the marker conveys a weak epistemic modal semantics. That is, when the marker is used, the degree of validity of the information that the speaker vouches for is weak and thus, utterances with the marker are compatible with weak epistemic adverbs such as \text{amato ‘probably’}.

In sum, since the marker -napo- encodes the speaker’s inference based on the consequence that the speaker thinks was brought about by the event, it is an inferential evidential marker.

3.2.2 Conceptual Distance Marking
3.2.2.1 Mirativity

The marker -napo- sometimes is licensed in a context where the speaker intends to express the unexpectedness of the focal event, without any inferential semantics. Following Delancey’s (2001) terminology, this paper will use \text{mirative} for the functional category encoded by the marker. Mirativity is described in Aikhenvald (2004:197) as follows: “… [t]he use of a non-firsthand evidential implies the lack of control and, more generally, the ‘unprepared mind’ of the speaker.” At the utterance point, if an event occurred and if the speaker is
surprised by the focal event, her utterance encoding the unexpectedness constitutes an example of mirativity.

(11) [Contrary to the expectation that it’s not raining, looking out the window and seeing it’s raining.]

\textit{pakk-ey pi-ka o-napo-a}

outside-LOC rain-NOM come-napo-IN

“(Oh/ Apparently/ I guess, I can infer that) It seems that it is raining outside.”

(11) is clearly not an example of inferential uses of the marker, since this case is a situation where the speaker has direct visual access to the event. By definition, the inferential property should be filtered out in (11), since the knowledge that it is raining should not be a result of the speaker’s inference, but a consequence of the speaker’s observation of the event through the window. Thus, \textit{-napo-} functions as a mirative marker.

The mirative function can be shown by comparing the following two sentences differing in the specificity of the referred entity:

(12) \textit{cip-ey kayangi-ka iss-e}

house-LOC cat-NOM be-IN

“There is a cat in the house.” [an unidentified cat or a pet cat]

(13) \textit{cip-ey kayangi-ka iss-napo-a}

house-LOC cat-NOM be-napo-IN

“(Oh) Wow, there is a cat in the house.” [an unidentified cat]

Comparing (13) to (12), which is a normal statement without the inferential evidential marker, we can learn that in (13), the cat should not be a pet cat that is already identifiable to the speaker, whereas (12) could refer to either a specific or a non-specific cat. For instance, in a situation where the speaker does not know a cat is in the house and she just found that a cat is touching her leg, (13) would be used. Since the marker functions as a mirative marker, (13) cannot be used when the speaker knows that a cat is in the house.

In sum, considering the given examples above that are not prototypical examples of inferential semantics, we can learn that the marker \textit{-napo-} can encode mirativity as well as inferential evidential semantics.

3.2.2 Politeness

Another extended property of the marker is its strategic usage for politeness. The marker’s function of creating conceptual distance between the experiential origo and the focal event enables the marker to be employed as a politeness strategy,
especially when the speaker makes an attempt to avoid a face-threatening act. In other words, the marker neutralizes the speaker’s assertiveness, which can be seen in the following example:

(14)  [When a bartender politely tells a drunken customer, who is demanding more drinks, to stop drinking and to go home]

cip-ey ka-si-eya-ci-yo. manhi
home-LOC go-HON-CONN-CMT-HE much
chwiha-si-ess-#(napo-)-e-yo.
be.drunk-HON-ANT-napo-DECL-HON
“You should head yourself home. (It seems that) You’re very drunk.”

As shown in (14), the utterance would have been rude without -napo-. The utterance involves the speaker’s 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. Again, this usage of the marker is not prototypical inferential marking: the speaker has made an observation, he has certainty about the information, and thus, inferential marking is not needed, logically speaking.

The marker’s inferential marking function is thus pragmatically extended. Part of the pragmatic tactics involved is related to the marker’s inferential function and the other part of it is related to the markers’ mirative function. That is, in the case of (14), the speaker should not assert directly that her customer is drunk, since doing so would threaten her customer’s face. Thus, the speaker employs the inferential marker in order to distance herself from the focal event, i.e., in order to pretend not to know what she observed, as if she had not perceived the scene directly. Also, the speaker employs it as if she had just recognized that her customer is drunk. The shorter the period of time during which the customer has been “obviously” drunk, the less face threat is involved in telling the customer about it.

I argue that even though the functions of the marker above – encoding an inferential property, encoding mirative semantics, and exploitation in politeness strategies – do not seem to be related to each other, a common cognitive mechanism underlies them: cognitive distancing. The cognitive distance naturally configures the contexts where the markers are licensed to encode mirative semantics, since unexpected information also presupposes cognitive discontinuity between what the speaker knows and the focal information. Furthermore, the cognitive distance naturally explains the fact that the markers can be employed as a politeness strategy, because it neutralizes the speaker’s assertiveness that might threaten the addressee’s face.

3.3 Reportive/ Quotative/ Hearsay Evidential -Ay
The third evidentiality marker on the list is -ay, which encodes the speaker’s obtainment of secondhand information via an indirect mode of access such as a report, a quotation, or hearsay (Kwon 2011).

3.3.1 Constructional Properties of -Ay

To begin with, let us look into its constructional properties by exploring examples of the construction:

(15) nayil pi-ka o-n-ta
    tomorrow rain-NOM come-IMPF-DE
    Lit. Rain comes tomorrow. “It rains tomorrow.”

(16)a. nayil pi-ka o-n-ta-(ko)-ha-e
    tomorrow rain-NOM come-IMPERF-DECL-(COMP)-say-IN
    “(I heard that someone is saying that) It rains tomorrow.”

b. nayil pi-ka o-n-t-ay
    tomorrow rain-NOM come-IMPERF-DECL-ay
    “(It is said that) It rains tomorrow.”

(15) is a simple depictive utterance, whereas (16) shows original construction of the reportive/quotative construction (16a) and its grammaticalized form (16b). (16b) makes an example of reportive construction, since it does not have an explicit information source grounded in the given context. Originally, the reportive EV is a periphrastic expression ta-(ko)-ha ‘Decl-complementizer-say.’ Thus, literal translation of (16a) is something like “It is said that it rains tomorrow.” The periphrastic expression is contracted and underwent phonological attrition process (tako-ha-e [taghæ] > ta-ha-e [tahæ] > lay [tæ]). The attrition process takes place in other types of utterances as well such as -cay (hortative), -lay (imperative), and -nyay (interrogative) (For details, see J.-Y. Chung In preparation).

3.3.2 Reportive

To begin with, the marker is employed in reportive evidential contexts:

(17) nongcang-i kyengchal-uy supkyek-ul
    farm-Nom police-GEN assault-ACC
    pat-ass-t-ay
receive-ANT-Decl-ay
‘(It is said that) the farm is under attack from the police.’

In (17), the speaker spread information about the focal event that the farm was assaulted by the police to others, but the source is not explicitly indicated. Since there is no explicit source of information, there is no one who is responsible for the validity of the mentioned information. Thus, (17) could imply that since the information is not from the speaker’s own observation, the speaker is not sure about the factivity of the focal event, but the speaker wants to spread the information anyway. Hence, the speaker is simply conveying the obtained information, without any responsibility for the conveyed information, to the addressee.

3.3.3 Quotative

-ay constructions can be employed in quotative constructions where a source of information is explicitly spelled out on the surface. Examples can be shown as follows:

(18) wuli wangcho-ka koynchanh-umyen
    our boss-NOM be.okay-if
    sa-keyss-t-ay
    buy-PRES.MOD-DECL-ay
    ‘Our boss said that he will buy it if it is okay.’

In (18), the source of the information is explicitly spoken as a grammatical subject in the utterances, i.e., our boss. From the given example, we see that -ay signals as well that the conveyed information is obtained from the overt source in the utterance.

3.3.4 Marking Further Conceptual Distance: Thirdhand Evidential Marking

There is a case where we can see the marker’s function to encode conceptual distance, as the other evidentiality markers do: when -ay is reduplicated and when the two tokens/instances are bridged by a morpheme of temporal grounding (e.g. imperfective -nun- and anteriority -ess-), the utterance conveys thirdhand information. The recursivity is not surprising, because the marker is grammaticalized from its original form that contains a complementizer. The thirdhand evidentiality example is shown below:
(19)  

\[ Chelswu-ka \quad Yenghuy-lul \]

Chelswu-NOM  Yenghuy-ACC

\[ cohaha-nt-ay_1{-}ess-t-ay_2 \]

like-IM-DECL-ay_1{-}ANT-DECL-ay_2

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.’

(19) is ambiguous, because as shown above, the -\( ay \) construction itself is ambiguous between reportive and quotative readings. The candidate readings are two. One is the case in which both -\( ay \) constructions are reportives, which do not specify information source (19a). In this case, there are six participants when the utterance is spoken: Chelswu (CS), Yenghuy (YH), X, Y, the speaker and the addressee. The situation is as follows: Y obtains from X the information that CS likes YH (X somehow has the information from the beginning). Y tells the speaker that Y heard the focal information. Then, the speaker conveys the information that has been handed down from X via Y to the addressee. This is the context in which (19a) is licensed. The other possible reading of (19) is the case in which one of the constructions (\( ay_1 \)) is quotative and the other (\( ay_2 \)) is reportive (19b). In this case, we need five participants for the construal: CS, YH, X, the speaker and the addressee. This time, CS himself told X that he loves YH and X let the speaker know this information. Then, the speaker conveys the information that has been handed down from CS via X to the addressee. This is the context in which (19b) is licensed.

The properties that have been discussed above qualify -\( ay \) to be an evidentiality marker that employs reportive and quotative sources of information.

4 Multiple Evidentiality Markers Licensed in a Single Syntactic Clause

In Korean, more than two evidentials are licensed in a single clause, which is rare according to Aikhenvald (2004:93). She argued that only one such example has been found in Tsafiki (Dickinson 2000:408, cited in Aikhenvald 2004:93), where the reported evidential is repeated to indicate up to three sources ‘between the speaker and the original event’ (cited in Aikhenvald 2004:93). The following example shows us that Korean is another example of this kind, licensing three evidential markers in a single clause:

(20)  

\[ pyengo-ka \quad hoycang-nim-hako \quad tamphan-ul \]

Pyengo-NOM  CEO-HON-with  talk.table-ACC

\[ ci{-}ess-t-ay{-}napo{-}te-la \]

decide-ANT-DECL-REP-INF-Firsthand-DE

‘(I remember that I made an inference in the past from what my friend
said. The inference is that my friend (A) seems to have been told by another person (B) that Pyeongo had settled issues with the CEO and based on this reasoning, I can tell you that Pyeongo settled the issues with the CEO.'

In (20), the three evidential expressions are employed at the same time in a row, and to my understanding, this is an example that contains the maximum number of markers between the two declarative markers -t- and -la in the Korean Verbal Complex. As shown in the gloss, their functions converge into a complex meaning that indicates that the conveyed information comes from someone else, neither the speaker nor the speaker’s friend (A) (-ay), and that the linkage between the source (B) and the speaker’s friend (A) is inferred by the speaker (-napo-). Finally, the inference is what the speaker remembers for sure (-te). This compositional nature of the markers’ functions is not surprising, since it is the case that when two evidentials are in use, they either confirm or complement each other (Shipino-Konibo, Aikhenvald 2004:88). Utterances with two evidential markers are also easily found:

(21) coki-congyeng pantay-ka iss-umyen
early-shut.down objection-NOM be-if
kyeysok ha-n-t-ay-napo-e-yo
Continuously do-IMPF-DECL-REP.EV-INF.EV-IN-HON
‘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).’

(22) imyongkosa-nun mwue
exam.for.recruiting.teachers-TOP what.DM
tases-myeng-to an
five-counter-even NEG
ppop-nun-t-ay-te-la
select-MPF-DECL-REP.EV-Firsthand.EV-DE
‘(I remember that I was told that) well, they pick no more than 5 people.’

(23) ney yenlakche al-lyeko
your point.of.contact know-desiderative
mwutenhi nolyekha-ess-napo-te-la
very.hard attempt-ANT-INF.EV-Firsthand.EV-DE
‘(I remember that I inferred from some evidence that) (he) tried hard to find out your contact information.’

In each of the examples above, the two markers’ functions do not conflict with each other, but are accumulated and construed in a compositional way. In (21), reportive/quotative and inferential evidentials are utilized as shown in the
interpretation (*I heard and inferred that...*); in (22), reportive/quotative and firsthand evidentials are used (*I directly heard that..., I remember that...*); and in (23), inferential and firsthand evidentials are in use (*I remember that I inferred that...*).

5 Discussion

Does Korean Have a Category of Evidentiality? The answer to this question is yes and no. No, there seems to be no ‘stand-alone’ paradigmatic grammatical category that accommodates the three evidentiality markers in Korean. So to speak, the Korean language, unlike languages with typologically common evidential systems (e.g. Quechua; Faller (2003), inter alia), is consistent with the claim that Korean does not employ a stand-alone category of evidentials. Hence, it can be seen why some linguists claim that the way the Korean language construes reading of evidentials is significant from a typological perspective: an evidential meaning is not necessarily marked by independent morphemes, but it can be expressed by interactions with other temporal categories (J.-M. Lee 2008:18, 22).

The answer can also be yes, because Korean employs a ‘scattered’ system of evidentiality. As we have shown, there are three evidentiality markers -te-, -napo-, and -ay, which clearly encode firsthand, inferential, and reportive/quotative sources of information, respectively. It is noted, however, that the three evidential linguistic items do not belong to the same paradigm or grammatical category. -Te- and -napo- are located at a non-terminal suffix position, whereas -ay normally occupies a terminal suffix position originally. In other words, evidentiality specifications are scattered in the verbal complex, not forming a single grammatical category (for more discussion, see Aikhenvald 2004:80).

Then, what is the status of the Korean Evidentiality System in Typology? As discussed above, Korean utilizes three evidentiality markers: -te- as a firsthand evidentiality marker, -napo- as an inferential evidential marker that encodes the speaker’s inference, and -ay- to convey the speaker’s indirect access to the source of information. My claim is that among Aikhenvald’s (2004) categorization of language groups, Korean belongs to the language group that has an evidentiality system with three choices: Direct (or Visual), Inferred, and Reported (Quotative) (Contra K-S Chung 2006, 2007, J-M. Song 2007).

6 Conclusion

In this study, I have shown that in the contemporary colloquial Korean, there are
three evidentiality markers exploring their functions and distributions in detail: -te- as a firsthand evidentiality marker, -napo- as an inferential evidential marker that encodes the speaker’s inference, and -ay- to convey the speaker’s indirect access to the source of information. Then, I claimed that the three evidentiality markers consist of the Evidentiality system in contemporary colloquial Korean. This study also discussed a typologically unique characteristic of the Korean Evidentiality system. That is, multiple sources of information are licensed within a single syntactic clause in a compositional way.

Based on the observations, this paper raised two questions: does Korean have a grammatical system of evidentiality?; what is the status of the Korean Evidentiality system in a typological context? My claim is that although it does not seem to have a stand-alone grammatical category of Evidentiality, the Korean verbal complex has a ‘scattered’ system of Evidentiality, which encodes three types of information source.

References


Abbreviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>ADD</th>
<th>ANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC = Accusative</td>
<td>ADD = Address Term</td>
<td>ANT = Anterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>CMT</td>
<td>Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS = Causative</td>
<td>CMT = Committal</td>
<td>Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>CONN</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP = Complementizer</td>
<td>CONN = Connective</td>
<td>DE = Declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>EV</td>
<td>FUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM = Discourse Marker</td>
<td>EV = Evidentiality</td>
<td>FUT = Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN = Genitive</td>
<td>HON = Honorific</td>
<td>INF = Inferential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IMPF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE = Honorific Ending</td>
<td>IN = Indicative</td>
<td>IMPF = Imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>NEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM = Nominative</td>
<td>LOC = Locative</td>
<td>NEG = Negativizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES.MOD</td>
<td>QUOT</td>
<td>REP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES.MOD = Presumptive Modal</td>
<td>QUOT = Quotative</td>
<td>REP = Reportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP = Topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Iksoo Kwon  
Department of Linguistics,  
1203 Dwinelle, University of California, Berkeley  
Berkeley, CA 94720, U.S.A.  
e-mail:kwoniks@berkeley.edu