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1. Introduction

The construal of linguistic expressions relies on conceptual structures that are tapped in the interlocutor’s mind by linguistic constructs (Dodge 2010; Lakoff 2008). As the constructs are used repeatedly over time, they are semantically
bound to the corresponding conceptual structures. Language users thus often systemically make one choice over another when expressing and construing a certain type of meaning. Given the tight relationship between linguistic expressions and conceptual structures, looking at speakers’ systematic choice of a lexical item helps us understand the concept that is evoked in its construal. In this respect, the linguistic study of the meaning and use of causal connectives may give us some insight into the human cognitive categorization of the concept of causality (Sanders and Sweetser 2009: 1).

Since the concept of causality is fundamental and necessary in human reasoning, it has received much attention in the literature. However, efforts have only recently been made to look into how its relationship with cognition is embodied (Sweetser 1990; inter alia). Sweetser (1990: 81) convincingly argues that there are three domains that the construal of causal conjunction relies on: the Content, Epistemic, and Speech act domains. Causal conjunction in the content domain marks the “real-world” causality of an event; that in the epistemic domain marks the cause of a belief or a conclusion; that in the speech-act domain marks the causal explanation of the speech act being performed. She further argues that “[c]onjunction may be interpreted as applying in one of (at least) three domains and that the choice of a ‘correct’ interpretation depends not on form, but on a pragmatically motivated choice between viewing the conjoined clauses as representing content units, logical entities, or speech acts(1990: 78)”.

Based on Sweetser’s observations, this paper aims to show that these three causal domains are also relevant to the construal of Korean forward causal constructions as implied in Sohn (1993) and Oh (2005). Particularly, I focus on the forward causal connectives -ese and -nikka (among many other causal connectives in Korean). I show that Korean tends to linguistically distinguish the Content domain from the others and that the distinction is clearly shown in the choice between -ese and -nikka. -Ese tends to encode content causality; the speaker using this construction intends to foreground the causing event. -Nikka tends to encode epistemic causality; the focal information is likely to be the main clause that expresses the speaker's epistemic judgment. Speech act causality is also marked with -nikka.1) This paper further aims to model the

---

1) This paper assumes that the construal of causality relies on conceptual structures, not on linguistic constructs, although a given conceptual structure will be more frequently paired with some particular linguistic construct than with others in language. This paper aims to shed light
construal of the target constructions – the *ese* construction and the *nikka* construction – within the framework of Basic Communicative Space Networks (Sanders et al. 2009) to enhance our understanding of the conceptual structures that are evoked in the construal of the causal constructions.

The organization of this paper is as follows: Section 2 introduces the three dimensions that the construal of causal connective constructions relies on and provides an overview of the framework that this paper employs, namely, Basic Communicative Spaces Networks (BCSN). The following section describes the target phenomena, the Korean causal connective *-ese* and *-nikka* constructions, and discusses their functional attributes in detail. Section 4 argues that BCSN enhances our understanding of the Korean forward causality constructions by clearly representing which domain the causal relationship of two clauses is construed in. Section 5 concludes the discussion.

2. Preliminaries

This section firstly addresses Sweetser’s (1990) three domains that construal of causal relations relies on: the Content, Epistemic, and Speech-act domains. Cognitively oriented cross-linguistic works on causal connectives are briefly mentioned. Then, I show that the construal of causality does not rely directly on some particular set of specialized forms, but on which of the three relevant domains the causality is construed in by the speaker. The following sub-section introduces BCSN, which this paper employs for analyses, and addresses how effectively it represents the construal of forward causality constructions (those with the structure Cause + [Connective] + Consequence).

2.1. Three Domains of Causality

Defining causal relationships seems to be simple. Causal connectives adjoin at least two events: one event that causes another event and the other that is induced by the first event. When we look into how causal connectives are construed in detail, however, the causal relation encoded by connectives is

---

on tendencies of such pairing with regard to forward causality constructions in Korean. As one of the reviewers has pointed out, the observation that this paper makes is not a strict formal rule *per se*, but relates to a tendency of pairings. (For corpus research on this topic, see Oh 2005.)
more complex than it looks. Take some English backward causal examples (with the structure Consequence + [Connective] + Cause) from Sweetser (1990: 77):

(1) John came back because he loved her.
(2) John loved her, because he came back.
(3) What are you doing tonight, because there’s a good movie on.

In (1), causality is construed in the content domain: John's love was the real-world cause of his coming back. (2) encodes causality in the epistemic domain, whose direction causality would appear to be reversed when compared to (1). However, (2) is normally understood as meaning that the speaker’s knowledge of John’s return (as a premise) causes the conclusion that John loved the person he came back to. The last example involves causality in the speech act domain; the because-clause triggers a speech act in the ensuing clause. It can be paraphrased as, “I ask what you are doing tonight because I want to suggest that we see this good movie.” The three types of causality can thus be summarized as:

“[C]ausal conjunction in the speech-act domain, then, indicates causal explanation of the speech act being performed, while in the epistemic domain a causal conjunction will mark the cause of a belief or a conclusion, and in the content domain it will mark “real-world” causality of an event” (Sweetser 1990: 81).

In this respect, we can see that there are at least three kinds of causal readings. The construal depends on which domain the causal relation is construed in, even though all three meanings can be expressed with a single backward causal connective: because.

It should be noted, however, that there are languages whose vocabularies make clearer distinctions between the three domains than is the case in English (Sweetser 1990: 82). German (den; Gunthner 1993; Keller 1995), French (puisque, Sweetser 1990), and Dutch each have a more differentiated repertoire of connectives than English does (Pit 2003; Sanders 2005; Risselada and Spooren 1998; Spooren and Risselada 1997; Knott, Sanders, and Oberlander 2001; cited in Sanders and Sweetser 2009: 3). That is, languages cut up the domain of causality by employing different constructs for different relations.
(Sanders and Sweetser 2009: 3). For instance, distinctions between the domains of causality are found in Dutch (Sanders and Sweetser 2009: 21):

(4) *De zon scheen. Daardoor steg de temperatuur.*

‘The sun was shining. **As a result** the temperature rose.’

(5) *Her licht bij de burden is uit. **Dus** ze zijn niet thuis.*

‘The neighbors’ lights are out. **So** they are not at home.’

(6) *Het was een warme dag. **Daarom** ging Jan zwemmen.*

‘It was a hot day. **That’s why** Jan went swimming.’

According to the authors, *daardoor* in (4) expresses a simple *cause-consequence* relation between the mentioned events (cause: the sun was shining; consequence: the temperature rose) in the content domain. In (5), *dus* expresses an epistemic causal relation, in which the state of affairs leads to an epistemic conclusion. Lastly, *daarom* in (6) expresses the reason for an intentional action encoded by the event in the following clause (for further discussion, see Sanders and Sweetser 2009). Taken together, we see that the Dutch lexicon divides up forward causality; however, it is still the case that the construal of causality depends on which domain the causal relation is construed as pertaining in.

The rationale underlying this paper is as follows: examining the divided domains of causality in a non-Indo-European language backs up the claim that the different domains exist, and thus that the domains are distinct and distinguishable (Sweetser 1990: 81-82). Before describing forward causality constructions in Korean in more depth, I will introduce the theoretical tool that I employ to better represent the different construals of causality, namely, *Basic Communicative Spaces Networks* (Sanders et al. 2009).

2.2. Framework: **Basic Communicative Spaces Networks**

Connectives signal that the adjoined clauses are semantically coherent, and thus that the meanings of the clauses should be bound to each other in a specific type of relationship specified by the connectives (Sanders and Spooren 2001, 2007, cited in Sanders et al 2009: 22-23). Connectives thus function
either adversatively, as elements that block certain inferences or as elements that elaborate inferences. Sanders et al. (2009) argue that Mental Spaces Theory (MST) (Fauconnier 1997; Fauconnier and Turner 2002; Dancygier and Sweetser 2005) is a right tool for describing such connectives. MST provides an intuitive and motivated way to represent the interlocutor’s interaction/elaboration of relevant inferences by means of space builders and/or space elaborations. The strength of the framework is also found in work related to causal connectives such as conditionals (Dancygier and Sweetser 1997, 2000, 2005). For this reason, this paper employs MST, particularly the idea of Basic Communicative Spaces Networks (BCSN), which has been utilized in analyzing Dutch forward causality (Sanders et al. 2009), for the Korean forward causality constructions.

The fundamental assumption of BCSN is that there are certain mental spaces that are inherently readily accessible when any speech event takes place: the Content, Epistemic, and Speech Act spaces (Sweetser 1990, 1996; Dancygier 1998; Dancygier and Sweetser 2000, 2005). Any communicative use of language necessarily presupposes that the speaker has mental states, and that she is expressing some part of the content of her mental states. It uses some set of linguistic forms in some speech act setting, and thus presupposes those three mental spaces (Sanders et al. 2009: 25). These three mental spaces constitute the basic conceptual network of mental spaces; this paper argues that the network is also evoked when the Korean forward causality construction is uttered. The configuration is represented in <Figure 1> below.

As described by Sanders et al. (2009:26), a Basic Communicative Spaces Network is a specification in mental spaces terms of the minimum basic structures involved in a speech-interaction ground. The ground includes the Base Space assumed by the speaker as reality, the content of the speaker’s epistemic states, and the content of the communication. Note that in <Figure 1>, the three spaces I have been discussing – Content, Epistemic, and Speech Act – are inherently posited, since they are evoked “for free” along with the presumed Base Space of the speaker’s reality (Sanders et al. 2009: 24). The spaces are automatically accessible as potential “domains of interpretation” for connectives here.

The linguistic and conceptual levels are distinguished vertically in the figure: the former represents linguistic constructs that are explicitly spoken, whereas the latter represents knowledge of relevance for the speech event. Notice that the conceptual level is the Knowledge Base (Sanders et al 2009: 28). “[I]t
contains the adult language user’s representation of encyclopedic knowledge, pragmatic knowledge and human reasoning, as well as the lexicon of the language that is used to express the causal relations.” It also contains Fauconnier’s (Fauconnier 1985, 1997; Fauconnier and Sweetser 1996) Base Space, “[t]he speaker’s general conceptualization of the world around her.” The linguistic content and the speaker’s epistemic stance towards the content are divided horizontally. The content domain is thus located at the left grid in the representation, whereas the epistemic and speech-act domains are at the right grid. The viewpoint that is taken for the construal is represented in the figure as the “SoC” (the Subject of Consciousness). In the content domain, the subject of the causal events is explicit, whereas in the other domains, the active perspective is the speaker herself, and is implicit. These are intuitively reflected in the BCSN, as shown in the figure. In this fundamental configuration, adjoined clauses relate to each other, and the type of relation involved is determined by which domain the relation belongs to in the representation.

<Figure 1> Configuration of a BCSN: (7) John came back because he loved her

<Figure 1> represents an English content causal example (John came back because he loved her, from (1) above). The two events adjoined by the causal connective because are expressed in the speech event, which is represented in terms of p and q in the speech act space on the right. Because the causal
relation construed in the utterance is “real-world” causality, the relation belongs to the content space on the left, which is elaborated by the causal connective. The active SoC is the protagonist in the events, John. This is represented in the figure by the notation ‘SoC = John (x).’ The representation thus indicates that the encoded causal relation is construed in the Content domain.

Based on these preliminaries, now let us examine some Korean forward causality examples.

3. Causality in Korean

As the concept of causality is pervasive in interlocutors’ reasoning processes as they use language, the Korean forward causality constructions (those with the structure Cause + [Connective] + Consequence), particularly the -ese and -nikka constructions, have received much attention in the literature (Lukoff and Nam 1982; Oh 2005; Hong in preparation; inter alia). Although they have in common that they seem to encode “causal” relationships between the events that are referred to by the conjoined clauses, their prototypical semantics differ from each other. Lukoff and Nam (1982) have argued that the concepts of ‘reason’ and ‘cause’ should be distinguished from each other and that this semantic distinction relevant in distinguishing these two lexical items; causes is expressed by constructions using -ese and reasons by constructions using -nikka. In other words, the -ese construction indicates the assertion of a cause (“B occurs after A and with some relation to it; B is caused by A”), whereas the -nikka construction indicates argumentation of discovery (“When A, one finds that B,” “A is the reason for (believing) B”). (Lukoff and Nam 1982:559). Examples are shown below:

(8) khephi-lul masi-ese2) cam-i
coffee-Acc drink-ese sleep-Nom
o-cianh-ne-yo
come-Neg-factive-Hon
‘I can’t sleep because I drank some coffee.’
(http://www.ppomppu.co.kr/zboard/view.php?id=freeboard&page=21

2) -Ese has an allomorph -use that occurs when it follows morphemes that contain certain vowels such as [a] and [o].
The example in (8) with \textit{-ese} indicates that the speaker is asserting that the cause of her not falling asleep is that she had some coffee. Lukoff and Nam have suggested that the assertion of cause is the prototypical semantic prime of \textit{-ese}. On the other hand, (9) with \textit{-nikka} indicates that the speaker is expressing her epistemic stance towards the focal event of the subject's not performing a particular course of action. This epistemic judgment or reasoning is induced by the premise that the subject has told the speaker the information.

Lukoff and Nam's observations about the prototypical semantics of these markers is valid; their analysis is consonant with the idea discussed in the previous section that causality is carved up into different domains. Their concept of the assertion of cause is related to causality construed in the Content domain; “real-world” causality tends to focus on a causing event.\footnote{Given that in some cases, the \textit{-ese} construction can also signal that the two conjoined events are merely sequential, we can predict that the kind of causality that is encoded by it is closer to “real-world” causality than to any other type of causality. A sequential example is given below:}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{(i) pap-ul ci-ese mek-ess-ta}
    \begin{itemize}
      \item meal-Acc cook-ese eat-Ant-Decl
    \end{itemize}
    \begin{itemize}
      \item ‘I cooked a meal and ate it.’
    \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

As Lukoff and Nam (1982) point it, the construal of the \textit{-ese} construction is sometimes ambiguous between sequential and causal readings. Because of limited space, however, this paper concentrates on the causal reading of the construction.
domains; Epistemic causality is conceptually related to the speaker’s subjective assessment based on her “discovery” of some piece of information; Speech-Act causality indicates that the speaker’s discovery of the causing event mentioned in one clause has induced the speaker to perform the speech act consisting of the other clause.

It is noteworthy that the semantic range of causality across the three domains seems to be divided quite clearly in the Korean lexicon: causality in the Content domain is expressed by -ese and causality in the Epistemic and Speech-Act domains by -nikka. This division is shown in the above examples; (8) would not be licensed if -ese were replaced by -nikka and (9) would not be licensed if -nikka were replaced by -ese. What has previously been accounted for in terms of so-called ‘logical formulation’ is actually a function of the distinction between the three domains that interlocutors rely on in understanding causality. In addition, the three-domain analysis is capable of explaining nicely speech-act causality, which has not been considered in most previous work (except Kim 1993 and Oh 2005):

(10) Hyenswuku-nun ttottokh-a-nikka/?ese nay-ka
    Hyenswuk-Top be.smart-nikka/?ese I-Nom
    yenge-lul kaluchieu-lkey
    English-Acc teach-will

'Since Hyenswuk is smart, I’ll teach you, English.'
(biofia.com/khs/나의-살아온-이야기/유년시절?lang=ko)

The two events that are linguistically encoded are, strictly speaking, not in a causal relationship by themselves; the fact that the addressee, Hyenswuk, is smart does not result in an event in which the speaker teaches Hyenswuk English. Rather, the fact triggers a certain type of speech act, a commissive speech act that expresses the speaker's intention to teach Hyenswuk English. This speech-act causality is encoded exclusively by -nikka.5 For this reason, this paper argues that the three-domain analysis of causality is more

5) One of the reviewers has pointed out that the utterance in (10) might be comprised of two utterances, since -nikka is frequently used with no main clause following it. I agree that it would be interesting to see how the utterance could be parsed as an intonation unit. However, this use of -nikka is more like a grammaticalized utterance-final ending marker, not a causal connective, so I believe it to be beyond the scope of this paper.
explanatorily adequate than the traditional logical approach.

In the following sub-sections, I reinterpret explanations in the previous literature (mostly from Lukoff and Nam (1982)) in terms of the three domains of causality, the Content, Epistemic, and Speech-Act domains.

3.1. Content Causality: -Ese

Content causality, i.e. “real world” cause-effect relationships are encoded by -ese. As I discussed briefly above, what Lukoff and Nam (1982) call “assertion of cause” belongs to the content domain. Examples are given below:

(11) John-i kukos-ey eps-ese??unikka wali-nun
     John-Nom there-Loc not.be-ese??nikka we-Top
     ccokci-lul namki-ki-lo ha-ess-ta
     message-Acc leave-Nmlzr-directional decide-Ant-Decl
     ‘We left a message for John because he was not there.’

(12) yeng-to-ka toy-ese??nikka mwul-i
     zero-degree-Nom become-ese??nikka water-Nom
     el-ess-ta
     be.frozen-Ant-Decl
     ‘Water froze when it gets to zero degrees.’

(13) yenghuy-lul salangha-ese??nikka chelswu-ka
     Yenghuy-Acc love-ese??nikka Chelswu-Nom
     tolao-ass-ta
     come.back-Ant-Decl
     ‘Chelswu came back because he loves Yenghuy.’

In the content causality A -ese B construction, the speaker is asserting that the cause of B is A (that A is the reason why B takes place). In terms of information structure, A is focal information and B is given information. The observation that the event referred to by A is more focal than that referred to by B is supported by the negation test, as follows:

(14) S: palam-i pwal-ese epwu-tul-i
wind-Nom blow-ese fisherman-Pl-Nom
pata-lo naka-ci anh-ass-e
sea-to go.out-Conn Neg-Ant-Indic

'The fishermen didn’t go out to sea because the wind was blowing.'

(15) H: ani-ya pay-ka kocang-na-ese
      No-Committal boat-Nom out.of.order-be.out-ese
      naka-cianh-ass-e
      go.out-Neg-Ant-Indic

      'No, they didn’t go out because the boat was out of commission.'

In the preceding set of examples, H is trying to give S a negative response to what S said. Since focal information, not given information, is the natural target of negation, (15) is a natural and felicitous response to the sentence in (14) with -ese. (15') is, however, infelicitous or at best requires more effort to find a context in which it would be acceptable.

(15') H: ani-ya palam-i pwul-ese nongpwu-tul-i
      No-Committal boat-Nom blow-ese farmer-Pl-Nom
      tul-lo naka-ci anh-ass-e
      field-to go.out-Conn Neg-Ant-Indic

      'No, the farmers didn’t go out to the field because the wind blowing.'

(15') is infelicitous because it negates the non-asserted part of the utterance (that the fishermen didn’t go out), not the asserted part (that the wind was blowing strong).6

Lukoff and Nam (1982:575) also point out the information asymmetry in the -ese construction. Borrowing one of their examples,

---

6) This informational asymmetry has also been noted in English. According to Sweetser (1990: 82-83), for example, “bound” (commaless) because-clauses presupposes the truth of the main clause, and asserts only the causal relation between the clauses:

(ii) Anna loves Victor because he reminds her of her first love.

In (ii), the speaker asserts that Anna's love of Victor is caused by her memories of her first love, while the fact that Anna loves Victor is presupposed.
(16) S: eccay nuc-usi-ess-yo?
    how be.late-Polite-Ant-Indic-Hon
‘How come you’re late?’

(17) H: cangma-ey tali-ka ttenaylyeka-ese
    storm-Loc bridge-Nom washed.away-ese
    nuc-ess-e be.late-Ant-Indic

(17') H: cangma-ey tali-ka ttenayleyka-ess-unikka
    storm-Loc bridge-Nom washed.away-Ant-nikka
    nuc-ess-e be.late-Ant-Indic
‘I’m late because the bridge was washed away in the rain.’

(17) would be a felicitous response to the question in (16), if S did not know about the focal event that is referred to by the first clause (*the bridge having been washed away*). (17') would be an unexpected response, as it would be framing the information as if S already knew it.

In sum, the -ese construction specializes in expressing content causality, i.e. real-world cause and effect relationships between the conjoined events. In the construction A -ese B, the speaker is asserting that A is the cause of B; the information status of the event encoded by A is thus focal and relatively new with regard to the information encoded by B.

3.2. Epistemic Causality: -Nikka

Causality in the Epistemic domain is marked by the construction A -nikka B. The epistemic causality construction indicates that the causing event described in the A clause has induced the speaker’s internal act of assessment or conclusion. An example in English is given below:

(18) Anna loves Victor, because she told me so herself, and besides, she’d never have proofread his thesis otherwise (I conclude that she loves him because I know the relevant data.) (Sweetser 1990: 84)
is an epistemic causal example in that the events listed after because induce an internal action in the speaker (concluding that Anna loves Victor). Because the act is speaker-internal, it cannot be assumed as common knowledge between the speaker and the hearer, and hence cannot be presupposed (Sweetser 1990: 84).

Likewise, in contrast with the content causal construction with -ese, the Korean epistemic causal construction with -nikka asserts the speaker’s internal act of epistemic judgment or conclusion, as shown below:

(19) John-i  ikos-ey  eps-??ese/unikka  cip-ey  
    John-Nom here-Loc  not.be-??ese/unikka  home-Loc  
    ka-n-ke-ney  
    go-Rtvzr-Nmlzr-Factive  
    ‘Since John is not here, he must have gone home.’

(20) mwul-i  el-ess-??ese/unikka  yeng-to-ka  
    water-Nom  be.frozen-Ant-??ese/unikka  zero-degree-Nom  
    toy-nkeney  
    become-fct.rlzn  
    ‘It is zero degrees, because the water's frozen.’

(21) chelswu-ka  tolao-ass-??ese/unikka  yenghuy-lul  
    Chelswu-Nom  come.back-Ant-??ese/unikka  Yenghuy-Acc  
    salangha-nunkeney  
    love-fct.rlzn  
    ‘Chelswu loves Yenghuy, because he came back.’

Looking at all of the examples above, we see that the events indicated in the second clause would be taken as having resulted in those indicated in the first clause if we had considered their causal relation in the content domain (‘real world’ causality). Hence, their causal relation would be reversed from what one would expect. However, as epistemic causality concerns the relationship between a premise based on the speaker’s discovery or knowledge and the speaker’s subjective judgment or conclusion, these sentences do not present any such problem. For instance, in (20), the premise that the water has gotten
frozen has caused the speaker to conclude that it has gotten down to zero degrees (Celsius).  

For this reason, it is natural that the second clause end with an epistemic modal suffix that encodes the speaker’s epistemic stance. Notice that examples (19)-(21) have -n-ke-ne? [relativizer-nominalizer-factive.realization marker] in common. This modal suffix signals that the speaker is asserting that the information that is being talked about holds as far as she knows. Lukoff and Nam (1982) also point out that the second clause in -nikka construction can also include a conjectural marker such as the presumptive/predictive modal marker -keyss-, or the future tense relativizer -ul:

(22) nayil nwun-i o-ke-nikka??ese
tomorrow snow-Nom come-Futnikka??ese
hakkyo-lul tat-ul-cwumi-lul ha-koiss-keyss-ta
school-Acc close-Rltvzr-preparation-Acc do-Prog-Mod-Decl
'Since it is going to snow, they must be preparing to close the school.' (from Hong In preparation: 16)

The example in (22) also has a linguistic device that encodes the speaker’s epistemic stance, namely, the epistemic modal marker -keyss-.  

There is another piece of evidence that shows that the second clause in the nikka construction expresses the speaker’s internal act of subjective and epistemic judgment and conclusion. That is, the second clause can never be a question to the speaker in pursuit of new information (Lukoff and Nam 1982: 571):

(23)?? ka-nal nwun-i manhi o-ess-unikka

---

7) One of the reviewers has pointed out that the acceptability of the examples in (19)-(21) would be enhanced by the addition of -(mu)+(ke)+'po' 'considering that' [-relativizer + complementizer + Acc + 'see'] before -nikka. However, my intention here is to show the prototypical functional contrast between the connectives with a set of controlled sentences. (Note that the examples in (11)-(13) use the identical A and B clauses to those in (19)-(21).)

8) As one of the reviewers has pointed out, it would be intriguing to systematically and statistically investigate how sentence ending markers such as -ai-e (informal ending), -ta (declarative), and -ci (committal) are licensed in the -ese-nikka constructions. Achieving this goal, however, would require an explanatorily adequate independent corpus study, which calls for further research.
the-day snow-Nom much come-Ant-nikka
mos ka-ess-ni?
can’t go-Ant-Interrogative
‘Couldn’t you go that day, since it was snowing heavily?’

The B clause is expected to present information that is being asserted. An interrogative speech act, however, indicates that the speaker does not have relevant information to assert. Hence, a question is not licensed after -nikka in this construction.

In sum, the $A + nikka + B$ construction encodes epistemic causality, where the speaker concludes that B has taken place because she has discovered A. Since the information encoded by the B clause is related to the speaker’s internal act of subjective and epistemic judgment or conclusion, the information in B should not be presupposed or backgrounded, but asserted or foregrounded. For this reason, the B clause is often equipped with additional linguistic devices that signal the speaker’s epistemic stance, such as a committal marker or a factive realization marker.

### 3.3. Speech Act Causality: -Nikka

The last kind of causality I will discuss is speech act causality. In Korean, it seems that the $A + nikka + B$ construction also specializes in expressing causality in the Speech-act domain. This construction signals that an event or a state described in the A clause has caused the speaker to perform a certain type of speech act (e.g. the English example. What are you doing tonight, because there is a good movie on; Sweetser 1990). The B clause thus represents the speech act being performed by the current utterance (Sweetser 1990):

(24) ne-n ttooktokha-??esে/niikk made sayngkakha-epo-a
     you-Top be.smart-??esে/niikk hard think-try-Indic
     'Since you're smart, you try to solve it!'
     (bhskrlv2.blogspot.com)

(25) wuli Paris-ey o-??esে/niikk mwe-pwuthe
     we Paris-Loc come-??esে/niikk what-from
     ka-1-kka?
do-Fut-Interrogative

‘Since we’re in Paris, what shall we do first?’

In (24) and (25), the events that are encoded by the conjoined clauses are not causally related at all in the content domain: the state of the addressee’s being smart and the event of the addressee’s solving a riddle; the fact that the interlocutors are located in Paris and thing(s) that they plan to do first. The causal relation, rather, lies between the A clause event or state and the speech act presented in the B clause. In (24), the speaker’s judgment that the addressee is smart leads her to perform the imperative speech act. In (25), the speaker’s realization that she and the addressee are located in Paris at the speech time leads her to ask the question about what they should do first.

Other kinds of speech act are also licensed after -nikka. Examples follow:

(26) pi-ka manhi o-nikka/?esse yeki-eysye kitali-e
rain-Nom much come-nikka/?esse here-Loc wait-Imp

‘Since it’s raining so hard, wait here.’

(27) nay-key wusan-i iss-unikka/?esse kathi ka-ca
1-Dative umbrella-Nom be-nikka/?esse together go-Hort

‘Since I have an umbrella with me, let’s go together.’

In (26), an imperative utterance follows a nikka clause, and in (27), a hortative speech act follows a nikka clause. And again, the conjoined events are not causally related in the content domain. Rather, -nikka signals that the event referred to by the first clause results in the speech act in the second clause: the rain results in the speaker’s imperative speech act in (26); the speaker’s having an umbrella results in the speaker’s hortative speech act in (27).

It is noteworthy that speech act causality is expressed exclusively by -nikka. As shown in (24)-(27), -esse is not licensed at all. The conjoined events in (24)-(27) are not causally related in the content domain. As that -esse is mostly concerned with the temporal sequencing of the conjoined events and/or the causal reading that arises from that sequencing, it is a natural consequence that -esse is not licensed in this context.

In sum, speech-act causality is also found in Korean. Most previous studies have not discussed this type of causal reading (except Sohn 1993, Oh 2005,
and Hong In preparation). In this sub-section, I have shown that speech-act causality is exclusively marked by -nikka and argued that it is a natural consequence of -ese’s being mostly concerned with sequentiality in the content domain and with causal readings based on that sequentiality.

The functional properties described above are critical semantic cues for Korean speakers to choose the best-fit lexical choice for a given context. It is crucial to understand the different informational structures prototypically evoked by the two causal connectives: -ese foregrounds or asserts the information in the first clause, whereas -nikka foregrounds or asserts the information in the second clause.

It should be noted that one of the reviewers raised the question of the function of -ese in the following utterance:

(28)  

\[\text{hvana-ese} \quad \text{[kuleh-nke-ci]}?\] 
be.angry-ese do.such-nominalizer-Committal 
'You did that, because you were angry, didn’t you?’

The utterance in (28) seems to be a counterexample to the categorization

9) In practice, however, language users’ practical lexical choices based on that division sometimes may not be clear-cut as described above. For instance:

(iii)  

\[\text{pom-i} \quad \text{toy-ese-unikka} \quad \text{kkoch-i phi-n-ta}\] 
Spring-Nom become-Ant-nikka flower-Nom blossom-Impf-Decl 
a. ‘The flowers are blossoming, because Spring is coming.’ 
b. ‘Spring is coming, because the flowers are blossoming.’

The utterance in (iii) is ambiguous between the content and the epistemic causal readings, although its primary reading is the speaker’s assertion of cause (iii-a) [content causality]. The epistemic causal reading is possible when the -nikka clause contains information that has been shared by the addressee. However, this is less preferred, because the second clause does not explicitly have any device that expresses the speaker’s epistemic stance. What this indicates is that the functional ranges of -nikka and -ese might overlap with each other in some context such as in the content causal domain in present-day Korean, even though the prototypical usages are clearly distinguished from each other. Oh’s (2005) corpus analysis of causal connectives shows this overlap. His corpus data show that the relationship between -ese and -nikka and their usage levels is not clear-cut. Both connectives are used in all domains, but with differing levels of preference: -nikka appears to disfavor the content domain, whereas -ese strongly favors the content domain (cited in Hong (In preparation: 3)). Even though their functional ranges overlap, this does not contradict my main claim that the construal of causality relies on its conceptual structure, not on the specific linguistic constructs.
proposed in this paper, in that -ese is licensed in a statement of the speaker's epistemic judgement with the committal marker -ci, whose conceptual structure is that the information in the first set of brackets has yielded the speaker's epistemic assessment in the second set of brackets. However, the conceptual structure of this particular sentence does not work that way. Rather, its conceptual structure is more like the following:

(29) [hwana-ese kuleh] [-nke-ci]?

The causal relationship is construed in the content domain, which includes the information in the first set of brackets in (29). The speaker is posing her epistemic stance toward the overall causal relationship by using the committal marker -ci. As Hong (In preparation: 22) has also noted, in the case of (29), although the statement as a whole is epistemic in nature, the causal relation holds in the content domain. Hence, the utterance in (29) accords with the categorization proposed in this paper.

Based on the discussion of the distinctive functional properties of the two causal connective constructions, the next sub-section aims to model causality in the three domains in terms of Basic Communicative Spaces Networks (BCSN), to provide a better understanding of causality in Korean.

4. Korean Forward Causality in BCSNs

As I explained in Section 2.2, a BCSN is employed here to represent Korean causality in a more intuitive way. This paper employs the framework because, first, the BCSN includes the three domains (content, epistemic, and speech-act) where we can play with the various construals of causality, because it assumes that the three domains are ubiquitous in every speech act. Second, it clearly shows which domain the causal relation evoked in each utterance belongs to, and thus indicates which domain the interlocutor is accessing in the construal. Third, it clearly represents from which perspective the linguistic content is viewed in terms of the Subject of Consciousness.

4.1. Content Causality with -Ese in BCSN

The Korean forward causal -ese construction carries a content causality
reading, which concerns the “real-world” cause and effect relation between the two conjoined events. This is exemplified and modeled within BCSN below:

(30) ku-nun nay-ka pwału-nun-kes-ul tul-ese
    he-Top I-Nom call-Rltvr-Nmlzr-Acc hear-ese
    o-asse-ia
    come-Ant-Decl
    ‘He came, because he heard me calling him.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>content</th>
<th>deictic center of communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>explicit SoC</td>
<td>implicit SoC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
p'(\text{he heard me calling him})
\]

\[
q'(\text{he came})
\]

S says to A

\[
p(\text{he heard I calling him})
\]

\[
q(\text{he came})
\]

\[
\text{SoC} = x
\]

linguistic level
conceptual level

| knowledge base on possible cause – consequence relations content domain |

<Figure 2> A BCSN Representation of Content Causality (-Ese) in Korean

In the actual utterance in (30), there are two clauses, designated \(p\) (he heard me calling him) and \(q\) (he came). Every utterance, including (30) is made in an act of speech: the speech act is conducted by S (speaker) and the recipient of the linguistic signal is A (addressee). The speaker is generally not linguistically expressed, but implicit. These participants are represented in a circle labeled as speech act in the right grid. \(P\) and \(q\) are causally related and conjoined in the content domain; the conjunction is represented in a circle in the left grid, labeled content. This conjunction in the content domain licenses -ese in Korean. The content causal reading arises from the conjunction made in the content domain. The SoC is the protagonist in the utterance, i.e., \(ku\) ‘he.’ The interlocutors naturally obtain this reading based on their knowledge of causality at the conceptual level.
Another crucial functional property of the -ese causal connective construction is that the speaker intends to assert that the event in the first clause is the cause of the event in the following clause. In other words, the first clause event is asserted. The asserted information is profiled, as shown in the figure above. The clause p’ in the content domain, where the content causality is construed, is profiled; it is marked in the figure in a bold-faced font.

4.2. Epistemic Causality with -Nikka in BCSN

Epistemic causality, which indicates that a certain event has resulted in the speaker making an epistemic judgment, is encoded by -nikka in Korean. An example is shown and modeled below:

(31) [JM, AR, and IS are having dinner together. AR and IS, who plan to study in a café, ask JM if she is also going to work with them. JM says, “I’m not sure. I’ll think about it. If you don’t find me or my bag in the café, I’ve gone home.” When they arrive at the café, AR and IS find that JM is not there. IS says to AR] Jangmi-ka yeki-ey eps-\textit{unikka} cip-ulo Jangmi-Nom here-Loc not.\textit{nikka} home-directional ka-n-ke-ney go-Rltzr-Nmlzr-Factive.Realization ‘Since Jangmi is not here, she must have gone home.’ ‘Jangmi is not here (-nikka) (I conclude that) she must have gone home.’

In (31), the speaker’s discovery that Jangmi is not in the café results in her conclusion that she must have gone home. Similarly to the content causal in (30), the two events to be conjoined are expressed in the utterance (31), which is represented in a speech act circle in the right grid in Figure 3>. The relation between the premise and the epistemic judgment is defined to be causal in the epistemic domain, which is represented in the upper circle. The causal relation in that domain motivates the speaker to choose -nikka; the speaker’s understanding of the causal relation is based on her knowledge about epistemicity on the conceptual level.
The **nikka** construction with epistemic causal meaning signals that the speaker is asserting the subjective epistemic judgment/conclusion in the second clause. The first clause event is the cause of this judgment. The fact that the second clause event is asserted is represented in terms of profiling, as in <Figure 2> (bold face). The SoC in this case – which is not represented in the figure – is always the speaker, because the experiencer who discovers the first clause event and makes a conclusion based on it is always the speaker, although that is implicit. The model clearly shows that the epistemic causal relation coded by **-nikka** is clearly distinguished from the content causal relation coded by **-ese** in this respect.

### 4.3. Speech Act Causality with **-Nikka** in BCSN

10) Following Sanders et al (2009), I define an implicit epistemic causal construction as one in which the SoC is not linguistically expressed, but is implicit. (vi) thus is our target construction, whereas (vii) is not. Rather, the epistemic causality in (vii) is construed in the content domain.

(vi) Since Jangmi is not here, she must have gone home.

(vii) Since Jangmi is not here, I conclude that she must have gone home.
Causality in the Epistemic domain concerns the causal relation between an event and the speaker’s speech act. In other words, the epistemic causal reading indicates that some event described in one clause is the reason the speaker says what she says in the other clause. As I state above, speech act causality is exclusively marked by -nikka in Korean. This is exemplified below:

(32)  

Since the relation between \( p \) (we’re here) and \( q \) (what shall we do) is causal in the speech act domain, the conjoined clauses are represented in the speech act circle in the right grid in the figure. Note that what -nikka actually conjoins are not two real-world events (in this case, being in Paris and doing something

---

11) Similarly to implicit epistemic causality, I define an implicit speech act causal construction as one in which there is no matrix clause that depicts the speaker’s performing a speech act (such as I ask you); it is not linguistically expressed but is implicit. (Since we’re here, what shall we do first? vs. Since we’re here, I ask you what we will do first.)
there), but the event $p$ and the speech act $q$. This represents how the event $p$ triggers the speaker’s speech act, which is encoded in the second clause of the utterance. In (32), the SoC is also always the speaker. Note that <Figure 4> does not have any profiled portion; this is because it would be infelicitous to talk about which portion of the speech is being asserted in this case. The speaker is simply performing a speech act based on the information given in the first clause.

5. Conclusion

I have discussed how the three domains – Content, Epistemic, and Speech act – that the construal of causality is said to rely on generally are specifically relevant in the Korean forward causal constructions -ese and -nikka. This paper has argued that Korean linguistically distinguishes the Content domain from the others and that this distinction motivates speakers’ choice of causal connectives between -ese (Content) and -nikka (Epistemic and Speech act).

Korean has carved up the domains of causality; the division seems to affect language users’ lexical choice between -ese and -nikka. -Ese specializes in encoding content causality in Korean. Normally, in this construction, the speaker intends to foreground the causing event, which belongs to the first clause (the -ese clause) and thus, the causing event is the target of assertion (the asserted information). -Nikka can encode epistemic causality. Since the second clause encodes the speaker’s epistemic judgment, it is usually the case that the second clause is equipped with an epistemic modal utterance final suffix. The focal information is thus that in the second clause, where the speaker expresses her subjective judgment based on the cause presented in the first clause. Speech act causality in Korean is also marked with -nikka. Based on my discussion of the data, I have modeled the target constructions within the framework of Basic Communicative Spaces Networks (Sanders et al. 2009) to provide a better characterization of the conceptual structures that are evoked in the construal of the causal constructions. The representation shows how asserted information is profiled. The BCSN representation helps to clearly distinguish the three types of causality from one another in Korean.

I have to confess that this paper utilizes mostly constructed examples. It is true that more corpus data might show a different story about speakers’ behavior (e.g. Oh (2005)). An analyst’s intuitions, however, are crucial in
developing generalizations to be tested, and I believe that only with constructed examples may we obtain certain kinds of information about what is not possible with connectives (along with Sanders and Sweetser 2009:11-12). Nevertheless, this subject is quite suitable to other approaches employing attested data, naturally occurring discourse, and experiments to provide cognitive motivation for the models proposed in this paper.
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