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Objectives (1)

- To investigate the diachronic development of evidentiality (and counterexpectation) markers -tako, -tamye, -tamyense and -tanta in Korean.

  - These markers are derived from constructions involving the initial presence and subsequent elision of the lexical verb ha ‘say’.

  - This analysis can contribute to our understanding of the relationship between evidentiality and mirativity, particularly from constructions involving ‘say’ verbs.
Objectives (2)

- To examine how evidentiality markers -tako, -tamye, -tamyense and -tanta are used to negotiate epistemic footing in Korean discourse.

  - This also addresses the question of why the Korean language develops different types of evidentiality markers that are derived from ‘say’ verbs and that draw on the same morphosyntactic mechanisms for the grammaticalization of these ‘say’-type evidential markers.

Grammaticalization of evidential marker tako

Lexical verb + CONN
V-koko
‘say-and’

Quotative
V-tako

Quotative (Complementizer)
V-tako

Evidential marker
V-tako

Counterexpectation (CE) marker
V-tako
**Grammaticalization of evidential marker tako**

- **Lexical verb + CONN**
  - *ha-ko* 'say-and'

- **Quotative**
  - V-tako–kho–ko
  - V-DEC QT

- **Quotative (Complementizer)**
  - V-tako

- **Hearsay evidential marker**
  - V-tako

- **Counterexpectation (CE) marker**
  - V-tako

- **Early 20th century tako**

- **Late 20th century tako**

---

**ha-ko ‘say-CONN’ > Quotative tako**

- The process involves the grammaticalization of *ha-ko*, a combination of the lexical verb *ha* ‘say’ and connective –*ko* ‘and’, which developed into quotative *hako ~ kho ~ ko*.

- Quotative uses of *hako* were attested as early as the 15th century (with -*kho* as an occasional phonological variant), and further phonological reduction yielded quotative -*ko* in the 17th century, a form that increased in productivity from the 18th century onward (see Kim 2003; also cited in Sohn 2009: 133).

- As its frequency of use increased significantly in the 18th century, quotative -*ko* began to often combine with the declarative particle -*ta* in the preceding complement clause to form complementizer -*tako* (see Rhee 2011).
Lexical verb *ha* ‘say’ + Connective –*ko* ‘and’

(1) wang-i nwiuchy-e pulli-si-tay [rimaniho-ita] ha-ko
king-NOM regret-and call-SH-and [apologize-DEC] say-and
ani o-nila
not come-DEC

‘The king regretted and called them (his sons) again, but they
didn’t come, saying: “We apologize.”’

(Welinsekpo 1459; cited in Sohn 2009: 129)

Quotative *hako*

(2) taycwung-tAll-i ta wuz-umye wang-to wuz-umye nilo-tA
people-PL-NOM all laugh-and king-also laugh-and speak-and
[i aki kongtek-ul teunos-ta] hAko nilo-tA
[this baby charity-ACC practice-DEC] QT say-and
nay sto samsip man nyang kum-ulo
1SG also 30 ten.thousand measuring.unit gold-with
motAn cwung-nim-nay-lAI kongyanghA-mye
all monk-HON-PL-ACC serve-and

‘Everyone laughed; the king also laughed, and said:
“This baby does (Buddhist) charity” and he said: I will also
serve all monks with three hundred thousand *nyang* of gold’

(Sekposangcel 釋譜詳節 1447; cited in Sohn 2009: 132)
Quotative -kho

At that time a wind blew and so a banner was moving; one monk said: “Wind is moving”; another monk said: “Banner is moving.” They didn’t stop arguing …

(Yuckco 1496: 57; cited in Sohn 2009: 133)

Quotative (complementizer) -ko

Since someone said that around forty people died, people were more determined not to surrender.

(Sansengilki 1636; cited in Sohn 2009: 134)
Complementizer *tako*

(5) \( \text{tang-uy} \quad \text{Hyencong-i} \quad [\text{ci-ess}]-\text{tako} \)
\( \text{Tang.dynasty-GEN King.Hyencong-NOM [write-PST]-QT} \)
\( \text{ha-nun} \quad \text{senin-ul} \quad \text{nolayha-n} \quad \text{mukok} \)
\( \text{say-ADN} \quad \text{ancestor-ACC} \quad \text{sing-ADN} \quad \text{song} \)

‘The song about the ancestor that King Hyencong of Tang dynasty was said to write’

*(Pingpingcen 18th century)*

---

Complementizer *tako*

(6) \( [\text{hAnpen} \quad \text{silseywu} \quad \text{hA-yes}]-\text{tako} \)
\( \text{once} \quad \text{mistake make-PST]-COMP} \)
\( \text{naynom-uy} \quad \text{mal-pelus-i} \quad \text{ku-l-hal-sywu-ka} \)
\( \text{2SG-GEN} \quad \text{word-way-NOM} \quad \text{that-ACC-do-possible-NOM} \)
\( \text{is-ta-n} \quad \text{malka} \)
\( \text{exist-DEC-ADN} \quad \text{SFP} \)

‘Just because I made a mistake once, how could you say such a thing!’

*(Sincayhyopansolisisel2 496, 19th century; cited in Nam 2010: 121)*
**Hearsay evidential tako**

(7) \[Ilpon-un dongpyeng cwyunpi-ka ta toy-yass]-tako
[Japan-TOP collect.army preparation-NOM all become-PST]-EVID

‘It is said that Japan finished the preparation for recruiting the army.’

(Twukeynseng 1912)

---

**Confirmation-seeking tako**

(8) A: \[Yenghuy-ka wuli-pan-eyse ceil yepp-e\.
Yenghuy-NOM 1PL-class-in most pretty-SFP
‘Yenghuy is most beautiful in our class.’

B: \[Yenghuy-ka wuli-pan-eyse ceil yepp]-tako?
Yenghuy-NOM 1PL-class-in most pretty-EVID

‘Did you say (that) Yenghuy is most beautiful in our class?’

(Jeon 1996: 901)
**Evidential takwu**

(9) A: `ttak ikey nwuwu-si-ke-ya
just like this lie-HON-ADN-NOMZ-SFP
Kuntey, salam-tul-i kulen mal isscanha,
by the way man-PL-NOM such word DM
tolaka-si-l-ttay-ka toy-myen
die-HON-ADN-time-NOM become-when
cengsin-i wa-ss-ta ka-ss-ta han-takwu
mind-NOM come-PST-DEC go-PST-DEC do-EVID`

‘He is lying just like this. By the way, people usually say
like this, you know. **It is said** that when a man is about to
pass away, the mind strays.’

B: `Ung
‘Yes.’`

**Counterexpectation tako**

(10) `[yeca-ka wucwu pihayngsa-lul ha-keyss]-tako!?
[woman-NOM astronaut-ACC do-be.willing]-CE
Lit. ‘**It’s said** a woman is willing to become an astronaut!?’`

‘How dare a woman become an astronaut!?’

(Yu 2002: 116)
Grammaticalization of *tako*

Figure 1. The grammaticalization of *tako* in Old, Middle and Modern Korean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Korean</th>
<th>Middle Korean</th>
<th>Modern Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexical <em>ha-ko</em> ‘say-and’</td>
<td>Quotative <em>hako</em> ~ <em>kho</em> (15th c.)</td>
<td>Complementizer <em>tako</em> (18th c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quotative <em>-ko</em> (17th c.)</td>
<td>Evidential <em>-tako</em> (early 20th c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirmation-seeking <em>-tako</em> (mid-20th c.)</td>
<td>Counterexpectation <em>-tako</em> (late 20th c.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grammaticalization of evidential marker *tamye*

Lexical verb + CONN

*ha-mye* ‘do/say-and when’

Quotative

*V*-tako *ha-mye* *V-COMP* say-CONN

Quotative (Complementizer)

*V*-tamye

Hearsay evidential marker

*V*-tamye

Counterexpectation (CE) marker

*V*-tamye

15th century *mye*

18th century *tamye*

Late 20th century *tamye*
Connective -mye > Evidential tamye

- Like –ko, -mye was a productive connective in Old Korean, with the temporal meaning ‘and when’.
- In combination with the declarative sentence-ender –ta of the preceding complement clause, a new complementizer tamye emerged.
- Complementizer tamye may have emerged as a phonological reduction of tako ha-my (COMP say-CONN) (see Rhee 2011).

Connective (and complementizer) mye

(11) [sayng-Al to-ha]-mye [hayng-Al niluwa-ta]-mye

[life-ACC law-do]-COMP [action-ACC say-DEC]-CONN

yong-Al niluw-at-ta hAya-si-nAl
courage-ACC say-PST-DEC say-SH-and

‘(Buddha told us) to abide by the law (lit. ‘live a life according to the law’), and when referring to action, (he) told (us) to act with courage’

(Wenkakkyeng 1465)
Quotative complementizer *tAmye*

(12) \[pwuín-uy toli-nun pwumo-ka upsu-myen\]  
[wife-GEN duty-TOP parents-NOM NEG.exist-when  
\textit{pamey tang-ey naylici anhmun]-tAmye}  
at.night house-LOC get NEG.do]-EVID.COMP  
\textit{toli-lul cikita cwuk-ess-ta}  
duty-ACC do die-PST-DEC  

‘\textit{Saying that the duty of a wife is not to get out of the house at night when there are no parents around}, she died doing her duty.’

\textit{(Pingpingdyen 18th century)}

tako \textit{ha-my Ye > tamYe}

---

Quotative complementizer *tAmye*

(13) \[amoto chinhA-n salAm-to up]-tAmye\]  
[nobody close-ADN person-also NEG.exist-\textcolor{red}{EVID.COMP}  
sikol-sa-nAn ahAy-ka mwusen poli-i]  
country.live-ADNchild-NOM what thing-NOM  
\textit{iss-y}e olna-was-nAny?  
exist-SEQ come-PST-Q  

‘\textit{While saying that there is no close friend,}  
what has brought you, the child living in the county, here?’

\textit{(Komokwha 1908)}

tako \textit{ha-my Ye > tamYe}
**Hearsay evidential *tamyetamye***

(14)  
*uh ani [cip sa-n]-tamyetamye?*  
*uh by.the.way [house buy-IMPF]-HEARSAY*

‘Uh, by the way, you’re buying a house, [I hear, is it true?]’

(Kim 2011: 439)

- Downgrades the speaker’s epistemic footing
- Acknowledges the addressee’s epistemic authority

**Elicits addressee’s alignment**

---

**Counterexpectation *tamyetamye***

(15)  
*[ku-ka manhi aphu]-tamyetamye?*  
*[3SG-NOM very be.sick]-CE*

‘I heard he is very sick, is it true?’

(Lee 2006: 248)

**Evidential + Surprise + elicitation of addressee’s epistemic knowledge**
Grammaticalization of *tamye*

![Figure 2. The grammaticalization of *tamye* in Middle and Modern Korean](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Korean</th>
<th>Middle Korean</th>
<th>Modern Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexical source unknown</td>
<td>Connective -mye (15th c.)</td>
<td>No example found in our corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quotative complementizer <em>tamye</em> (18th c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hearsay evidential <em>tamye</em> (early 20th c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– with a confirmation-seeking function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Counterexpectation <em>tamye</em> (late 20th c.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affiliative move:**
- Elicits alignment

SAY-CONN > QT > EVID > CE

---

Grammaticalization of evidential marker *tamyense*

![Diagram of the grammaticalization of *tamyense*](image)

- **Lexical verb + CONN**
  - *tamyense*  
  - 'do/say-and-when'

- **Quotative**
  - *tako ha-*myense
  - V-COMP say-CONN
  - Late 19th century

- **Evidential (Complementizer)**
  - *tamyense*
  - Late 19th century

- **Hearsay evidential marker**
  - *tamyense*
  - Late 20th century

- **Counterexpectation (CE) marker**
  - *tamyense*
  - Late 20th century
From *myense* to evidential and counterexpectation marker -*tamyense*

- Connective –*myense* is the more emphatic counterpart of connective –*mye*.
- Complementizer *tamyense* appears to have emerged via clause-combining as follows:
  - VP-*tako* + ha-*myense* (VP-COMP + say-CONN')
  - > VP-*tamyense* (VP-EVID.COMP)
- The meaning conveyed by *tako ha-*myense* is similar to that of *tamyense*, namely, it serves as a subordinator-type complementizer somewhat equivalent to English temporal connective *and when*, with reportative and evidential overtones.
- Complementizers *tako ha-*myense* and *tamyense* both occur in the same text as phonological variants.
- In Contemporary Korean, complementizer *tamyense* has also developed an evidential function, and in mirative contexts, *tamyense* yields a counterexpectation reading.

Connective *myense*

(16) syeysyok-i hwangnyen-kwa kamcho
brother-in-law-NOM oriental.medicine-and oriental.medicine
talhi-n mul-lo ahAy kAsna-*myensye*
boil-ADN water-with child give.birth.to-*when*
cyekcyek mek-y-e pAysoyk-uy
much give-let-SEQ stomach-GEN
teleon kes mek-un stongul nu-i-nAni
dirty NOMZ eat-ADN dung-ACC defecate let-SFP

‘*When* I gave birth to a child, my brother-in-law let me drink a lot of water boiled with oriental medicine, and this helped cleanse my stomach (lit. ‘let me defecate dung’).’

(*Dwuchangkyeng* 1711)
Quotative complementizer *tako hA-myensye*

(VP-EVID.COMP < VP-COMP say-CONN)

(17) 

\[ \text{[alasya kongkwan-ey chyulniphA-n]-tako hA-myensye} \]

[Russia embassy-at come.and.go-PRES]-COMP say-CONN

\[ \text{liyengsil kangeAyung-ulpoko hA-nAn mal-i} \]

Lee Youngsil Kang Jaeung-DAT say-ADN word-NOM

‘While claiming that he regularly goes to the Russian Embassy, what he said to Lee Youngsil and Kang Jaeung is that ...’

*(Toklipsinmwun 獨立新聞 523, 1896)*

---

Quotative complementizer *tamyensye*

(VP-EVID.COMP)

(18) 

\[ \text{[inmin-ul pohohA-yacw-n]-tamyense} \]

[people-ACC protect-BEN-PRES]-EVID.COMP

\[ \text{ile-n kes-ul pAlkhy-ecwu-cian-nAn kes-un} \]

like.this-ADN thing-ACC clarify-BEN-NEG-ADN thing-TOP

‘While claiming that they (as civil servants) are protecting the people, that they do not clarify this kind of matter (i.e. taxes imposed on Koreans by Chinese) is (neglecting their job)’

*(Toklipsinmwun 獨立新聞 1858, 1896)*
Hearsay evidential *tamyense*

(19) *mac-a-yo. mal-i kulekhey manh-tamyense-yo?*

Correct-IE-POL word-NOM so much-HEARSAY-POL

‘(That’s) correct. (They) talk (about others) so much like that, I hear, isn’t it true?’

Evidential -- more forceful than *tamye*

Acknowledges the addressee’s epistemic right

(Kim 2011:451)

---

Counterexpectation *tamyense*

(20) A: *yenghwa-po-le ka*

movie-see-CONV go

‘I’m going to the movies.’

B: *mwe? [ne aphu]-tamyense*

what? [2SG be.sick]-CE

‘What? Did*nt you say you are sick?’

Challenges the addressee’s prior utterance

-- tends to express more negative affect than *tamye*
### Grammaticalization of tamyense

**Figure 4. The grammaticalization of tamyense in Middle and Modern Korean**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Korean</th>
<th>Middle Korean</th>
<th>Modern Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexical source unknown</td>
<td>Connective –myense (18th c.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quotative complementizer tako-{ha-}myense (late 19th c.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quotative complementizer tamyense (late 19th c.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hearsay evidential tamyense (late 20th c.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counterexpectation tamyense (late 20th c.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disaffiliative move:**
- Appears to elicit alignment
- but often is an attempt to reintroduce alignment

**SAY-CONN > QT > EVID > CE**

### Grammaticalization of evidential marker tanta

**Lexical verb + TENSE + SFP**
- ha-n-ta
  - 'do/say-PRES-DEC'

**Quotative (Complementizer)**
- V-tako ha-n-ta
- V-COMP say-PRES-DEC

18th century: tako ha-hta-ta

**Hearsay evidential marker**
- V-tanta

19th century: tanta

*Counterexpectation (CE) marker*
- V-tanta

**Not attested**
Quotative complementizer *tako hA-n-ta*

(21) \[ cincwu \ sek-sem-ul \ \text{pearl} \ \text{three–bag-ACC} \ \text{give-and she-ACC} \]
\[ sa-ss-tako \ ha-n-ta \]
\[ \text{buy-PST-COMP she-ACC} \]

‘It is said (someone) bought her by giving three bags of pearls’

*(Pingpingcen 18th century)*

**Hearsay evidential *tanta***

(22) \[ Chunhyang-a \ sepangnim-i \ \text{husband-NOM} \ \text{come-HON-PST-EVID} \]

‘Chunhyang! I heard that your husband came.’

*(Chunhyangcen 19th century)*
Hearsay evidential *tanta*

(23) A: *hwatong hakwen ta-nye*  
    *hwatong private.institute go-DEC*  
    ‘I go to *Hwatong*, a private institute.’

B: *eti-ya?*  
    *where-Q*  
    ‘Where?’

C: *achasan-yek-ey iss-*tanta*  
    *achasan (N) station-LOC exist-EVID*  
    ‘I heard that the institute is near Achasan station.’

(Sejong Spoken corpus)

**Grammaticalization of *tanta***

Figure 4. The grammaticalization of *tanta* in Middle and Modern Korean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Korean</th>
<th>Middle Korean</th>
<th>Modern Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexical source unknown</td>
<td><em>(no connective function)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  |  |  | *Quotative complementizer tako-*ha-n-ta* (18th c.)  
  |  |  | Hearsay evidential *tanta* (19th c.)  
  |  |  | *Counterexpectation *tanta* (not attested)  

*‘SAY’ > QT > EVID*
Quotative *tanun*

To present the writer’s own experience with some details left to the reader’s imagination

(24) Yang-i *kkway* manh-tela-_kwuyo.

*volume*-NOM *pretty* much-**QT-SFP**

Twul-i *mek-taka* namkye-ss-*ta-nun* ...

two-NOM eat-while leave-PST:DEC.PRES:ATTR

‘The volume (of the food) was pretty much.
We left it while two of us ate it *(saying)* …’

(Horie 2012)

*Tanun* is used in informal written discourse such as on the internet, email, and letters between friends, but is hardly used in spoken discourse.

Diachronic distribution frequency of *tako, tamye, tamyense* and *tanta*

The historical data is based largely on the UNICONC (Korean historical corpus), which is comprised of 6,606,332 words from 18th and 19th century texts and 2,209,352 words from 20th century texts.

Table 1. Frequency of *tako, tamye, tamyense, tanta* over time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>tako</th>
<th>tamye</th>
<th>tamyense</th>
<th>tanta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18th C. ~</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 18th~19th C.</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 19th C.</td>
<td>2254</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 20th C.</td>
<td>2497</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidential tokens(N = 37)
As the frequency of quotative *ko* increased between 18th century and 19th century (See Sohn 2012), the frequency of new complementizer *tako* also increased sharply in the same period.

In the late 19th century, the frequency of *tako* increased drastically as a new colloquial style emerged in Korean literature along with modern style newspapers such as *Toklipsinmun* ‘independence.’

The vast majority of *tako* as a complementizer (with a raw token frequency of 2211 tokens) in this period are found in *Toklipsinmun*.

*Tako* was also frequently used in the early 20th century (with raw token frequency of 2497 tokens) with evidential uses of *tako* emerging (33 tokens in the headlines of *Tayhanmayilsinpo*, a Korean daily newspaper). This seems to be due to the nature of this newspaper where hearsay and reported speech style are frequently used.

*Tamye* also developed into a complementizer in the 18th century but the frequency of *tamye* was much lower than that of *tako*.

*Tanta* has also been used as an evidential marker since the 18th century, but it was seldom used in formal registers such as newspapers. Note that *tanta* occurred only once in our data from the late 19th century, where the source was mainly dependent on newspapers.

However, it is striking to note that the majority of *tamye* and *tanta* occurs in *sinsosel* ‘new novels’ which emerged in Korean literature in the early 20th century, whereas the majority of *tako* in the 19th and early 20th century is found in newspapers such as *Toklipsinmun* and *Tayhanmayilsinpo*.

There was only one token of complementizer *tamyense* in the early 20th century. Both complementizers *tamye* and *tamyense* had evidential nuance but they did not develop into evidential markers until the early 20th century.
Table 2. Frequency of discourse functions of *tako*, *tamye*, *tamyense*, and *tanta* in Contemporary Korean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EVID (confirmation-seeking)</th>
<th>CS (counterexpectation)</th>
<th>CE (counterexpectation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>tako</em></td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tamye</em></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tamyense</em></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tanta</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pathways in the development of Korean ‘say’ evidential (and often counterexpectation) markers

- Given the agglutinative nature of the Korean language, the versatile ‘say’ verb *ha* could easily combine with the connectives that follow it, and also with the complementizers that precede it, and through an iterative process of phonological reduction, semantic extension and syntactic reanalysis, this contributes to the formation of new complementizers that later develop into evidential (and often) counterexpectation markers.
- In sum, we see following grammaticalization cycles:
  - **Cycle 1:** QUOT *ha*-ko ~ *kho*-ko > COMP *ta* (ha)-ko > EVID *tako* > CE *tako*
  - **Cycle 2:** COMP *tako* *ha*-mye > *tamye* > EVID *tamye* > CE *tamye*
  - **Cycle 3:** COMP *tako* *ha*-myense > *tamyense* > EVID *tamyense* > CE *tamyense*
  - **Cycle 4:** COMP *tako* *ha*-n-ta > EVID *tanta*
Context plays an important role in preserving and even enhancing the evidential meaning of these complementizers, with or without the overt expression of the *ha* ‘say’ morpheme, and it is context too that sometimes pushes these evidential complementizers toward a mirative or counterexpectation interpretation.

In Korean, the ‘say’ grammatical markers consistently appear in utterance-final position—for example, complementizer *tako*, *tamy* and *tamyense* occur after the complement clause, and after grammaticalizing into evidential and counterexpectation markers, *tako*, *tamy* and *tamyense* also occur after the erstwhile complement clause that is now reanalyzed as the finite main clause.

The utterance-final position serves as an ideal landing site for the speaker’s utterance-final prosody and subsequent reanalyses of complementizers as speaker stance markers (inclusive of evidential and counterexpectation markers).

**Negotiating epistemic rights to information**

Participants mutually monitor one another’s epistemic rights moment by moment and shift their choices of evidential markers according to their updated assessments.

Evidential markers can function as an interactive device for redistributing the participants’ epistemic rights and reorganizing the participation framework of the moment.

1) *tako*: used by speakers to claim their epistemic rights to information (upgrading)
2) *tanta*: used by speakers to claim their epistemic rights to information (neutral; weaker than *tako*)
3) *tamyense*: used by speakers to further downgrade the strength their epistemic stance (stronger than *tamy*; often with a causal meaning (and can be used to assign blaming on the addressee)
4) *tamy*: also used by speakers to downgrade the strength of their epistemic stance

**Degree of epistemic strength to information (in decreasing order):**


tako >> tanta >> tamyense >> tamy
To claim the speaker’s epistemic rights to information (upgrading): *tako*

--- based on speaker’s thoughts and belief

Two women had a conversation about a dinner which their male colleagues had yesterday. B thinks that their male colleagues ate too much, but A claims that that is usual for men, and they didn’t eat too much based on what she has heard and knows. C agrees with A.

(25) A: *mwe-ka chwungkýek i-yeyyo?*

   what-TOP shock COP-SFP

   ‘What is striking to you?’

B: *nemwu an ccolum mek-eseyo*

too not little eat-SFP

   ‘They ate too much.’

A: *Namca-tul-un pothong seys-i ka-se pothong*

   man -PL-TOP usually Three-NOM go-SEQ usually

   *O inpwn mek - nun-tako.*

   five servings eat-PRES-EVID

   ‘It is said three of the men usually go and eat five servings.’

B: *e*

   ‘Yes’

C: *kipon-i han o-inpwun mek - ci an-ha-yo?*

   default-NOM about five-serving eat-Particle not-do-SFP

   ‘They (=three of the men) usually go and eat five servings, don’t they?’

---

To claim the speaker’s epistemic rights to information (weaker than *tako*): *tanta*

--- based on Hearsay

Two females having a conversation about themselves.

(26) A: *mwusun il iss-e? nwuka aph-untey?*

   what.thing exist-SFP who sick-SFP

   ‘What’s going on? Who is sick?’

B: *nay-ka aphu-tanta*

   1SG-NOM sick-EVID

   ‘I hear people say I am sick.’

   ‘I hear the doctor say I am sick.’
To downgrade a speaker’s epistemic right and at the same time acknowledge a co-participant’s epistemic right: \textit{tamye}

In Korean conversation, speakers are sensitive to co-participants’ epistemic rights to information. A speaker makes his/her choice of evidential marker based on an assessment of other participants’ epistemic rights, as seen in the following segments. Two females have a conversation. E proffers a topic regarding J’s plan for purchasing a house. Because J has epistemic primacy over the information regarding herself, E downgrades her own speaker’s epistemic right and simultaneously acknowledges her co-participant’s (i.e. J’s) epistemic right using \textit{tamye} (see Kim 2011: 439).

\begin{enumerate}
\item To downgrade a speaker’s epistemic right and at the same time acknowledge a co-participant’s epistemic right: \textit{tamye} \\
\item To downgrade a speaker’s epistemic right: \textit{tamyense} \\
\item Two female students have a conversation
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item To downgrade a speaker’s epistemic right and at the same time acknowledge a co-participant’s epistemic right: \textit{tamye}
\item To downgrade a speaker’s epistemic right: \textit{tamyense}
\item Two female students have a conversation
\end{enumerate}

(27) E: \textit{uh ani cip sa-n-tamye?}
\textit{uh by.the.way house buy-IMPFV-HEARSAY}
‘Uh, by the way, you’re buying a house, [I hear, is it true?]’

J: \textit{e ah kulayse kwangju pwumo-nim-i}
\textit{yes ah so (name) parents-HT-NOM}
\textit{ton-ul ponay cvu-si-nuntey, money-ACC send:for-SH-NUNTEY}
‘Yes, ah, Kwangju’s parents are sending money for (us)’

(28) A: \textit{ku namca-lul tasinun an-manna-l-ke-ya}
\textit{the man-ACC again not-meet-ADN-NOMZ-SFP}
‘I won’t meet him again.’

B: \textit{way kulay?}
\textit{why so}
‘What happened?’

A: \textit{cecy ku namca-lul tuo manna-ss-e}
\textit{yesterday the man-ACC also meet-PST-SFP}
‘I met him yesterday again.’

B: \textit{ku namca-lul tasinun an-mannan tamyense?}
\textit{the man-ACC again not-meet EVID}
‘Didn’t you say that you will never meet him again? (Why did you meet him?)’
Why does a language sometimes need more than one evidential marker?

- Some languages allow speakers to make explicit linguistic distinctions between:
  - Objective vs. subjective stance
  - Subjective vs. intersubjective uses
  - Finer calibrations of epistemic strengths
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