

# Negotiating common ground in discourse: The role of pragmatic marker *maliya* in Korean

Mikyung AHN & Foong Ha YAP  
*Hankuk University of Foreign Studies*  
& *Hong Kong Polytechnic University*

## Abstract

Using a combined diachronic and discourse framework, this paper examines the development of a lexical noun *mal* ‘word’ in Korean into a pragmatic marker *maliya* with the following functions: emphatic marker, marker of shared discourse topic, pragmatic hedger, counterexpectation marker, and marker of speaker’s negative feeling. Our analysis identifies that pragmatic marker *maliya* comes to acquire these various subjective and intersubjective (i.e. interactional) through the persisting influence of common ground marker *ya*, a sentence ender that merged with lexical noun *mal* and the copula predicator *i* to form the emphatic common ground marker *maliya*. The findings in this study contribute to our understanding of how markers of common ground develop over time, and expand the range of their affiliative and disaffiliative uses in naturally-occurring discourse.

## 1. Introduction

Common ground—defined as knowledge, beliefs, and assumptions that are mutually shared by interlocutors in a conversation (see Clark 1981, 1996; Schiffrin 1987)—is shaped by various linguistic cues in discourse. Which is to say, numerous cues contribute in some measure to the shared understandings that are achieved among discourse participants, and thus helps in the maintenance and negotiation of each evolving communicative process. It is generally believed that common ground in turn also influences our interpretation of each interlocutor’s utterance. For example, the use of definite reference in the utterance *Have you seen the movie showing at the Roxy tonight?* presupposes mutual knowledge on the part of both speaker and hearer about (i)

the fact that a film is playing at the Roxy that evening, (ii) which particular film is being shown, and (iii) what the Roxy is (Clark 1981).

Discourse markers are among the linguistic cues that interlocutors use to negotiate their common ground. Representations of common ground in discourse are necessarily dynamic, and discourse markers need to include assumptions about explicitly stated information that are shared among interlocutors. These markers thus need to include the speakers' assumptions about the inferences their conversational partners are expected to draw from the information given (Jucker & Smith 1998). For instance, the discourse marker *you know* is a device used by the speaker to involve the addressee in the joint construction of a representation, regardless of whether or not it marks information already known to the addressee (Jucker & Smith 1998: 196). Somewhat equivalent to English *you know* (e.g. Schiffrin 1987; Ford & Thompson 1996; Jucker & Smith 1998), Korean discourse marker *maliya* is also deployed to negotiate common ground in the conversation, as shown in (1). The aim of this paper is to examine the interactive use of *maliya* as a common ground marker. More specifically, this paper will investigate how and where the speaker employs this marker as a strategic device to signal that common ground among interlocutors is being negotiated.

(1) A: *kulentey, Minsu maliya, ipen-ey sungcin ha-yss-e*  
by.the.way Minsu DM this.time-PRT promotion do-PST-DEC  
'By the way, Minsu, **you know**, he was promoted this time.'

B: *nemwu cal-toy-ss-ta!*  
very well-become-PST-DEC  
'Wow, it's wonderful!'

There have been a number of studies on the meaning and the usage of Korean discourse marker *maliya*. Sin (1988) analyzes *maliya* as an interjection, while Noh (1996) regards *maliya* as an expletive. However, Lee and Park (1991) claim that *maliya* is a hedger. On the other hand, J.H. Ahn (1992) associates *maliya* with discourse topic initiation. Lim (1998) identifies *maliya* as an emphatic marker that both highlights preceding topical elements and attracts attention to the following information. Although there have been attempts to identify the usage of *maliya* in discourse, there have not

been any notable attempts to discuss the interactional functions of *maliya* fully, and to investigate the salient function of *maliya* as a common ground marker. In addition, previous studies have largely resorted to intuition-based analyses. To fill this gap in the literature, the present study will examine the interactive uses of *maliya* as a common ground marker on the basis of naturally occurring data.

We will also focus on the semantic extensions of *maliya*. More specifically, we will trace the diachronic development of discourse marker *maliya* from a lexical noun *mal* meaning ‘word’. Previous studies have tended to focus either mainly on diachronic change or mainly on interactive discourse functions; in this study we will combine these two research traditions. With this combined diachronic discourse approach, we will better identify the grammaticalization pathways and the intricate semantic factors and morphosyntactic mechanisms that at times slowly nudge while at other times impatiently propel a lexical item to develop into a pragmatic marker.

This paper is organized as follows: section 2 examines the various discourse functions of *maliya* and their distributional frequencies in contemporary Korean; section 3 then traces the grammaticalization of *maliya*, and includes historical data on the distributional frequency of *maliya* across Middle and Modern Korean, focusing in particular on its extension to subjective and intersubjective uses;<sup>1</sup> section 4 concludes the discussion.

## 2. Negotiating common ground: the discourse functions of *maliya*

Common ground between interlocutors in discourse is far from static, it is also neither absolute nor complete; rather, it is an interactive and ongoing process in which assumed mutual beliefs and mutual knowledge are accumulated and updated (Clark & Brennan, 1991). The negotiation of common ground is also an attempt for each interlocutor to make their private understanding of the other explicit and to provide as well as receive feedback so as to reach some shared premise upon which meaningful communication

---

<sup>1</sup> The term *intersubjective* is used here in the sense of Traugott and Dasher (2002), i.e. a pragmatic function that takes into consideration the relationship between the speaker and the addressee. Intersubjective uses often involve affiliative interactional moves to avoid or mitigate potential face-threatening situations, and *maliya* in particular is often used as a hedger or pragmatic softener. However, intersubjective uses can also involve disaffiliative moves, such as disagreeing or even challenging the prior speaker. As we shall see in this paper, *maliya* is used to signal both affiliative and disaffiliative moves. This is interesting, as we see common ground markers being further deployed not only to serve affiliative purposes but to also engage in disaffiliative work that allows the speaker to point out a breach in common ground and thereby open the way for possible re-affiliation to prior or desired or communally-shared common ground.

can take place (Bromme et al., 2001). Many languages have linguistic devices to enhance the establishment of common ground among interlocutors. In Korean discourse, *maliya* has developed into a pragmatic marker that is frequently used to signal that the speaker intends to interactively negotiate common ground.

In this section, we will first investigate the distributional frequency of the various functions of *maliya* (2.1), and we will then closely examine how common ground marker *maliya* is used in various contexts (2.2). More specifically, we will examine its use as a common ground marker that also serves as an emphatic marker (2.2.1), a marker introducing a topic that is new to the conversation but familiar to, and hence to some extent shared between, the interlocutors (2.2.2), a pragmatic hedger (2.2.3), a counterexpectation marker (2.2.4), and a marker of the speaker's negative feeling (2.2.5). Crucially, we will highlight the special role of *maliya* as a pragmatic device to either establish or re-establish common ground between interlocutors.

## 2.1 Quantitative Analysis

The best way to find out how Korean common ground marker *maliya* behaves is to look into their actual use by native Korean speakers. Corpus analysis is a practical tool to investigate actual language use, and fits well into our purpose to examine the meanings and functions of *maliya* within a discourse context. The analysis of common ground marker *maliya* in present-day Korean is largely based on data from the *Sejong* spoken corpus, which consists of 4,204,082 words. This spoken corpus consists of 200 naturally occurring daily conversations collected from various settings such as college students' conversations on campus, church parishioners' gatherings, high school students' conversations, dialogues in a restaurant, etc. A total of these conversations were transcribed by researchers participating in the 21st Century *Sejong* Project.

All tokens of *maliya* in the corpus were analyzed for their meanings and functions. Each token of *maliya* was first analyzed within a discourse frame of up to 50 words preceding and following it. In this way, we could have the entire sentence containing *maliya* and also some surrounding elements, which helped us to better understand the discourse context. When necessary, as in the case of some tokens, we went back to the original text to analyze a longer stretch of discourse beyond the initial 101-word discourse frame. Token frequencies for the various functions of *maliya* were tabulated, with the numerical figures also converted into percentages.

**Table 1. Frequency distribution of the functions of common ground marker *maliya***

Functions of <i>maliya</i>	Frequency of use of <i>maliya</i>	
	<i>No. of tokens</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Emphatic marker	140	69.7%
Counterexpectation marker	24	11.9%
Negative emotion marker	21	10.4%
Topic introduction marker	11	5.5%
Pragmatic hedger	5	2.5%
<i>Total no. of tokens</i>	201	100.0%

The frequency distribution of the various functions of common ground marker *maliya* is given in Table 1 above. *Maliya* occurs as an emphatic marker most frequently (69.7%), but has also developed additional functions, namely, as a counterexpectation marker (11.9%), negative emotion marker (10.4%), topic introduction marker (5.5%), and pragmatic hedger (2.5%). These results imply that *maliya* is most frequently used to emphasize the speaker's thoughts or feelings, and as our qualitative analysis in section 2.2 will show, to also evoke the participation and empathy of the addressee.

**Table 2. Frequency distribution of addressee's responses (if any) to prior speaker's utterances with *maliya***

Types of addressee response	Frequency of use	
	<i>No. of tokens</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Agreement (or empathy)	110	68.4%
Confirmation-seeking	15	9.3%
Continuation of prior speaker's discourse topic	22*	13.7%
Others:		
Mild disagreement	6	3.7%
Laughter	7	4.3%
Silence	1	0.6%
<i>Total no. of responses</i>	161	100.0%

As shown in Table 2, the addressee frequently acknowledges the speaker's appeal for participation in the interaction, and frequently gives an immediate response, for

example, by saying ‘ah’ or ‘yes’ (68.4% of addressee responses). The addressee also takes part in the joint construction of the conversation by seeking confirmation of the speaker’s utterance (9.3%) or continuing the discourse based on the topic presented by the speaker (13.7%). We thus see affiliative and engaging moves constituting an appreciable (91.4%) of addressee responses.

## 2.2 Qualitative Analysis

In this section, each of the above interactional functions of *maliya* will be analyzed with reference to the various ways in which speakers use it as a strategic device for managing and negotiating common ground. Based on corpus analysis of the uses of *maliya* in contemporary Korean as discussed in section 2.1, we identified five major functions, namely, emphatic marker, pragmatic hedger, counterexpectation marker, a marker of speaker’s negative feeling, and a marker signaling that a new discourse topic is shared information between speaker and hearer. We elaborate on each of these functions below, rearranging the sequence of discussion according to their relatedness of functions, rather than to frequency of use shown in Table 1 above. In particular, we will highlight the subjective and interactional (i.e. intersubjective) aspects of each of these functions of *maliya* in conversational discourse. This will help us better understand how *maliya* is used as a common ground marker in both affiliative and disaffiliative moves in discourse.

### 2.2.1 Emphatic marker

Sentence final particle *maliya* is often used to emphasize the whole utterance, and evoke the participation of the addressee in the discourse. As seen in (2), the speaker uses *maliya* to highlight the fact that a particular professor had donated 10 million won to the university. Her use of *maliya* in this context signals that she considers the professor’s generous act as highly astonishing and noteworthy. At the same time, the speaker also invites the addressee to recognize the implication of the information marked by *maliya*. This not only encourages the addressee to reflect upon the generosity of the professor, but also provides an opportunity for the addressee to take the next turn on the conversational floor.

- (2) A:    *ku kyoswunim-i*  
          the professor-NOM

- ‘The professor=’
- B: *ung*  
 ‘=Yes’ (backchanneling)
- A: *hakkyo-eyta chen man-wen-ul kicungha-yss-ta-n maliya*  
 school-to 10 million-won-ACC donate-PST-DEC-ADN SFP  
 ‘The professor donated 10 million won (i.e. Korean dollars) to the university!’
- B: *a!*  
 ‘Ah!’

*Maliya* also often co-occurs with emotion adjectives to emphasize the speaker’s feelings, in addition to sharing information. As seen in (3), the speaker uses *maliya* to express her nervousness about her unsettled future in times of high unemployment, and to elicit empathy from the addressee. The addressee then responds with an expression of empathy toward the speaker by agreeing with the speaker’s utterance. Recall from Table 2 that affiliative addressee responses occur with very high frequency following prior speaker utterances with *maliya* (91.4% of the time), and these affiliative responses often express the addressees’ agreement and empathy (68.4% of the time). We thus see a strong correlation between the use of *maliya* and addressee’s empathy alignment. *Maliya* therefore is a very useful and strategic device for speakers to elicit the addressee’s empathy.

- (3) A: *wuli-n dothay an toy-na? Pwulanhata-n maliya*  
 1PL-NOM weed.out NEG become-Q nervous-ADN SFP  
 ‘Are we weeded out? I am nervous about it, **you know.**’
- B: *um*  
 ‘Maybe, you are right’

*Maliya* is also used to confirm the shared knowledge between interlocutors, as in (4) and (5), where in both cases the speaker uses *maliya* to express strong agreement with the previous utterance. In (4), the preceding discourse marker *kuleke* signals agreement, and *maliya* further intensifies this agreement. In (5), interestingly, whereas discourse marker *kulssey* ‘well’ is typically associated with a speaker’s attempt to avoid giving an opinion or to express uncertainty about a previous utterance, the additional presence of *maliya* instead identifies the previous utterance as shared belief, and thus drowns out the hesitation associated with *kulssey*.

- (4) A: *ettehkey kuke-l ta paykpeseynt ihayha-kwu-hay?*  
 how it-ACC all 100% understand-and-do  
 ‘How can we understand it 100%, and do it?’
- B: *kuleke maliya*  
 DM DM  
 ‘Yes, indeed.’
- (5) A: *wuli-ka yenlak-ul ceytaylo an-ha-yss-canha*  
 1PL-NOM contact-ACC properly not-do-PST-DEC  
 ‘We didn’t contact them properly.’
- B: *wuli onul ta cenhwaha-kilo ha-yss-nuntey,*  
 1PL today all call-supposed do-PST-SEQ  
 ‘We were supposed to call them all today...’
- A: *kulssey maliya*  
 well DM  
 ‘Yes, indeed.’

Essentially, then, common ground marker *maliya* is often employed to highlight the whole utterance, and to evoke the participation of the hearer in the discourse. The speaker uses *maliya* to invite the hearer to recognize the implication of the information that is being shared. *Maliya* also often co-occurs with emotion adjectives to emphasize the speaker’s feelings, and to elicit the addressee’s empathy. In addition, *maliya* is also deployed to confirm the shared knowledge between the speaker and the hearer; that is, the speaker uses *maliya* to express strong agreement with the previous utterance.

### 2.2.2 Marker of a new but shared discourse topic

*Maliya* is also at times used when the speaker wishes to introduce a new discourse topic and at the same time signal to the addressee that this topic is familiar to both of them. Introducing a new topic is sometimes problematic because it can suggest disengagement from the prior speaker and thus be ‘face-threatening’ (see, for example, Brown & Levinson 1978; Goldberg 1981), and one of the communicative strategies often employed by the speaker is to use the ‘intimacy ploy’ (Schegloff 1968: 1078) to alleviate the face threatening potential of an obvious and abrupt topic change. The



speaker thus goes about presuming some shared ground, which amounts to asserting the existence of a shared orientation (cf. Suh 2002). *Maliya*, as a common ground marker, is specifically designed for such a task.

Consider example (6) below, in which two female college students are having a conversation about love relationships. Speaker A wants to introduce the topic on first love, which is of common interest to both of them, and she initiates by talking about her own first love experience. The speaker employs *maliya* to signal that she is introducing a topic of common interest and shared background knowledge, and at the same time to also signal an appeal for the involvement and cooperation of the addressee in the discourse.

- (6) A: *ches-salang maliya, cal-toy-la-kula-yss-nuntey,*  
 first-love DM well-become-intend-do-PST-and  
*yay-ka kuceney sakwi-ess-ten yeca-ka natana-nikka*  
 3SG-NOM before date-PST-ADN woman-NOM appear-as  
*kapeli-te-la, kunang.*  
 leave-EVID-DEC without reason  
 ‘First love, **you know**, I almost succeeded in my first love,  
 but he left me as he met again the woman whom he dated previously.’
- B: *kulay, salam an mitke-toy-n-ke thllimepse*  
 yes man NEG trust-become-ADN-NOM must.be  
 ‘Yes, you must have distrusted a man (since then).’

In (7), two of Myengpin’s friends are having a conversation about her youngest sister, though not in her presence. One of the two friends, Speaker A, is interested in Myengpin’s sister and tries to bring up the topic. Here, the use of *maliya* allows Speaker A to begin talking about Myengpin’s sister as someone known to both the speaker and the hearer, and at the same time to also elicit the hearer's attention to the topical referent. And as is often the case with *maliya* tokens, in (7) we see a response token from the addressee, i.e. Speaker B, in the form of an acknowledgment and continuation of the discourse topic.

- (7) A: *Myengpin-i maknay nwui maliya*  
 Myengpin-NOM youngest sister DM  
*nay-ka yelhan sal ttay*  
 1SG-NOM eleven years.old when  
*thayenanun wul-um soli-l tul-ess-ketun*  
 born cry-NMLZ sound-ACC hear-PST-PRT  
 ‘Myengpin’s youngest sister, **you know**, when I was eleven years old,  
 I heard her cry soon after she was born.’
- B: *acik nai-ka eli-kunyo*  
 still age-NOM young-PRT  
 She is still young, I see.’

*Maliya* is also employed in word searches, often flanked by *ku(ke)* and *ce(ke)*, both meaning ‘that’. As shown in (8), *kuke maliya* is used to communicate difficulties encountered by the speaker in recalling the appropriate word, and to encourage the addressee to participate in the search for the relevant word. Supposing that the addressee is familiar with what she wants to talk about, the speaker uses the pronoun *kuke* ‘that’ to search for the identity of the referent, while *maliya* is used to further imply that the new topical referent is known to both speaker and hearer. Thus, *maliya* helps to solicit the hearer’s participation in a word search. The appearance of *maliya* in this case makes it explicit that the new referent, even though not explicitly identified, is to be the topic of the conversation. Speaker B acknowledges that she recognizes Speaker A’s implication, namely, that the upcoming topic is one of common interest, by responding with an appropriate information-seeking question *mwe* ‘what’ to express her interest in the referent *kuke* ‘that’ mentioned earlier by Speaker A.

- (8) A: *emma, kuke maliya*  
 Mommy that DM  
 ‘Mommy, that, **you know**.’
- B: *mwe?*

‘What?’

Thus, *maliya* is employed to initiate a topic in the discourse, and to imply that the topic is shared knowledge between the speaker and the hearer. *Maliya* is also used to elicit the hearer’s participation in word searches, where the appearance of *maliya* makes it explicit that the new referent, although not always explicitly identified, is to be the topic of the conversation, and thus the common ground between the interlocutors in the discourse.

### 2.2.3 Pragmatic hedger

*Maliya* can also at times function as a pragmatic hedger to mitigate the strength of an utterance. As a pragmatic hedger, *maliya* is associated with expressing the speaker’s uncertainty concerning the addressee’s attitude or likely response in the interaction (see Caffi 1999, 2007; Holmes 1993; Watts 2003). In this regard, the use of *maliya* makes what could be direct or rather embarrassing for the addressee somewhat more polite and less face-threatening.

In (9), the speaker was not sure about the addressee’s response when he showed his affection towards her. So the speaker employs *maliya* to avoid a direct commitment toward his own utterance, and thus avoid embarrassment in case the addressee comes up with an unexpected or unwelcome response. The speaker also uses *maliya* to express politeness by softening what could be direct or embarrassing for the addressee. While deploying *maliya* as a pragmatic hedger in parenthetical (i.e. clause-medial) position prior to the speaker’s comment in the main clause, the speaker at the same time focuses on the shared belief or common ground between the speaker and the addressee.

- (9) A:     *ne kelul-ttay-pwute maliya nay cham cohkey pwa-ss-ta*  
          2SG walk-time-since HEDGE 1SG really good see-PST-DEC  
          ‘Since you were a toddler, **you know**, I have had a good feeling  
          (affection) toward you.’
- B:     *ye*  
          ‘Yes.’

In this sense, we see an extension from the more speaker-oriented use of *maliya* as an emphatic marker that highlights a topic of concern by the speaker, and one which the

speaker often seeks the agreement or empathy or shared interest of the addressee, to a more addressee-oriented use of *maliya*, where the speaker modulates his (or her) utterance by taking into account the addressee's possible reaction. This shift from greater emphasis on speaker-orientation to addressee-orientation represents a move toward greater attention to the face-wants of both interlocutors.

#### 2.2.4 Counterexpectation marker

*Maliya* is also used as a 'counterexpectation marker' (CE), which as defined by Heine, Claudi & Hunnemeyer (1991: 194) expresses a contrast between what is asserted by the speaker on the one hand and what is either presupposed or assumed to be the norm by the addressee on the other. In (10), speaker B uses *maliya* as a counterexpectation marker to seek clarification about an apparent discrepancy between the prior speaker's utterance and what speaker B assumes to be common ground, namely, that adults do not offer alcoholic drinks to teenagers. In this particular case, speaker B uses *maliya* in the interrogative context to express surprise caused by the discrepancy, and to seek confirmation from speaker A because the latter's utterance is still surprising and unbelievable to speaker B.

- (10) A:     *cwunghakkyo ttay swul-ul paywe-ss-ci-mwe*  
middle school when alcohol-ACC learn-PST-DEC-though  
'When I went to middle school, I learned to drink though.'  
*sensayngnim-tul-i cwu-canha wenlay.*  
teacher-PL-NOM give-PRT generally  
'Generally, teachers give alcohol to the students.'
- B:     *inkan-i cwunghakkyo ttay swul-ul cwunta-n maliya?*  
man-NOM middle.school when alcohol-ACC give-ADN CE  
'A man giving alcohol to middle school kids?!'

Interestingly, while the pragmatic hedging function of *maliya* is used to mitigate potential face-threatening situations, its counterexpectation function shows less attention to the face-needs of either interlocutor. This is understandable, given that expressions of surprise or shock is often non-volitional and uncontrollable for most

people on most occasions.

### 2.2.5 Marker of speaker's negative feeling

In situations involving counterexpectation to common ground, *maliya* can also be used to represent the speaker's negative feeling, especially to express a complaint or some annoyance. In (11), Speaker A's remark that he has not studied for a very long time contradicts Speaker B's expectation, and Speaker B then rebukes Speaker A with an utterance marked by *maliya*. Here, *maliya* serves as a strategic device to urge speaker A to recognize the implication of Speaker B's prior utterance, and at the same time to express annoyance toward A for his failure to conform to the expected norm that students should study hard.

- (11) A: *kelssi na-to cincca ay-ka peyn cap-en ci*  
well 1SG-also really child-NOM pen catch-ADN NMLZ  
*olay toy-ss-kuna nukky-ess-canha*  
long become-PST-EXCL feel-PST-DEC  
'Well, I too felt it has been a really long time since I didn't study!'
- B: *kongpwu com ha-ci maliya, kongpwu-to an-ha-ko*  
study please do-IMP DM study-also not-do-CE  
'Please study! (**I'm annoyed that you didn't study**). Why don't you study?'

Contextualized examples such as (11) help us see how common ground marker *maliya* comes to further serve as a marker of speaker's negative feeling as well. Essentially, *maliya* helps to point out to the addressee that there has been a violation of some shared assumptions and expected norms, which could be expressed explicitly or left unsaid, and this violation of common ground is the reason for the frustration, annoyance and negative reaction of the speaker.

### 2.3 Summary of the functions of common ground marker *maliya*

We have thus far examined the various functions of *maliya* in discourse. More specifically, we have seen *maliya* used in a variety of contexts where the speaker draws upon or presumes common ground between interlocutors. Based on conversational data from the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Sejong Corpus, we have identified five types of contexts where the use of *maliya* negotiates common ground. First, in contexts where *maliya* is used as

an emphatic marker, the speaker works to bring about a change in information status. That is, the speaker uses *maliya* not only to emphasize the information, but also to invite the addressee to recognize both the relevance and the implication of the utterance marked with *maliya*. Second, *maliya* is deployed to mark information reasonably believed to be of common interest and shared background knowledge, often in contexts where the speaker initiates a topic. Third, *maliya* as a pragmatic hedger is employed by the speaker to avoid a direct commitment toward his or her own utterance; nevertheless, *maliya* still has the function of highlighting the shared belief or common ground between the speaker and the addressee. Finally, when *maliya* is used either as a counterexpectation marker or as a marker of speaker's negative feeling, it helps to contradict earlier claims made by the addressee, essentially by signaling either explicitly or implicitly that the addressee needs to attend to expected norms and common ground.

The above five pragmatic functions of *maliya*—namely, emphatic marker, marker introducing a new discourse topic that is of mutual interest to both interlocutors, pragmatic hedger or softener, counterexpectation marker, and marker of speaker's negative feeling—demonstrates that the use of *maliya* is not limited to marking shared information. What *maliya* often does, in effect, is to help the speaker in his or her effort to engage and sometimes convince the addressee to agree with the speaker's assessment, essentially by assuming that the addressee would or should agree with the speaker's own belief (which often is couched in terms of social norms and expectations). This helps explain how *maliya* also comes to be used in contexts where common ground appears to be (potentially) lacking, with *maliya* coming in handy as a means to help re-establish common ground. Thus, the use of *maliya* is not so much concerned with whether the relevant information is genuinely known and shared, but its function lies in its role as a strategic device to involve the addressee in the joint construction of a representation by inviting the addressee to recognize both the relevance and the implications of the utterance marked with *maliya* (cf. Suh 2002).

### **3. Grammaticalization of *maliya***

In the previous section, we have investigated the discourse functions of *maliya* in contemporary Korean focusing on the role of *maliya* as a common ground marker in naturally-occurring discourse. In this section, we will examine the diachronic development of *maliya* to better understand how it extends from its lexical origins to become a pragmatic marker. We will first focus on the semantic extensions of *maliya*

from propositional use to subjective and intersubjective uses (3.1), then follow up with quantitative evidence on frequency of use over time (3.2).

### 3.1 Semantic extensions of *maliya* across time

Korean *maliya* was derived from a combination of a lexical noun *mal* meaning ‘word’, followed by copula *i* and common ground sentence final particle *ya* (i.e. N. *mal* ‘word’ + COP *i* ‘be’ + SFP *ya*). Such lexical uses of *maliya* were attested from as early as the 18<sup>th</sup> century, as seen in (12).

- (12) *ikes-i            wen    mal-i-ya?*  
 this-NOM    what    word-COP-SFP  
 ‘What does this mean?’ (*Chwunhyangcen*, 18<sup>th</sup> century)

From a diachronic perspective, it is worth noting that earlier use of *mal* as a lexical noun meaning ‘word’ was followed by copula *i* and declarative sentence ender *ta* rather than common ground marker *ya*. As shown in (13), constructions involving lexical uses of *malita* were attested some two centuries earlier (i.e. in the 16<sup>th</sup> century). Note that lexical noun *mal* ‘word’ could function as the head noun of a prenominal relative clause construction, as in *cwungsayng-ul ilkheth-nun mal* (‘**word** referring to all mankind’).

- (13) *Hamsayng-un        cwungsayng-ul        ilkheth-nun        mal-i-ta*  
 Hamsayng-NOM    all mankind-ACC    refer.to-ADN    word-be-DEC  
 ‘Hamsayng is the **word** referring to all mankind.’ (*Anlakukthaycacen*, 1576)

As a highly versatile general noun, *mal* ‘word’ was also used as a complementizer, as in (14), where *mal* is functionally equivalent to English factive complementizer *that*. As a complementizer, *mal* could further combine with copula *i* and declarative sentence ender *ta* to form a new sentence final particle *malita*, often with an emphatic reading.

- (14) *i        kicip-a,    an-doy-l            mal-i-ta*  
 this    girl-VOC    NEG-become-ADN    COMP-be-DEC

Lit. ‘This, girl, is that which is not be possible.’

or ‘This, girl, is something that will not be possible.’

Intended meaning: ‘This will not be possible!’ (*Chwunhyangcen*, 18<sup>th</sup> century)

Parallel developments can be seen with sentence final particle *maliya*. That is, the development of *maliya* as an emphatic marker largely followed a grammaticalization trajectory similar to *malita*. In focus constructions such as (15), which closely parallels (14) above, *mal* could combine with copula *i* and sentence ender *-ya*, a common ground marker, to give rise to another new sentence final particle *maliya*, which like *malita* also often has an emphatic reading. This development was attested in the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

- (15) *sinpyeng-i kiph-ess-ni i-ul cangcha esci ha-ca-n*  
illness-NOM deep-PST-as this-ACC in.the.future what do-HOR-ADN

***mal-i-ya***

NMLZ-be-DEC

‘As (my brother’s) illness is serious, what is it that I will do in the future?’

(*Kiminhyangcen* 18<sup>th</sup> century)

As attested in 18<sup>th</sup> century texts, as seen in (16), in addition to facilitating an emphatic interpretation (as in the case of the cleft focus construction ‘It *indeed* is that Mrs Yang is very beautiful!’), the presence of *maliya* could also be used to highlight a common basis for both speaker and hearer to share a mutual evaluation—in this case conveying the meaning ‘*as both you and I would agree*, on the basis of what we know, say for example, from what we hear from others’. Thus, *maliya* was often used not only as an emphatic marker but also as a common ground marker.

- (16) *pilok celsAyk-i mos-toy-na makpwuin yangnyey*  
although rare.beauty-NOM NEG-become-but Mrs. Yang

*kahi kopta mal-i-ya.*

very beautiful COMP-be-SFP

Lit. ‘Although she is not a rare beauty, it is that Mrs. Yang is very beautiful.’

‘Although she is not a rare beauty, Mrs. Yang is indeed very beautiful!’

(*Pingpingtyen*, 18<sup>th</sup> century)



By the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, *maliya* has also developed into a discourse marker to signal the introduction of a new but shared topic. In this respect, *maliya* functions somewhat like Korean topic marker *-nun*. However, in contrast to topic marker *-nun*, which focuses on establishing the topic as common ground to both speaker and hearer, *maliya* further invites the hearer to participate in the discourse. Moreover, as seen in (17), topic marker *maliya* could already begin to also express the speaker's emotion such as annoyance or complaint toward the addressee. This illocutionary usage of *maliya* appears to stem from its strong emphatic marking function, and its ability to single out the topical referent for censure as the speaker expresses incredulity or disbelief that the addressee would consider doing something contrary to the speaker's expectation. However, as we shall discuss later in this section (and also in section 4.2 with reference to Table 3), the use of *maliya* as a marker of speaker's negative feeling had not yet become entrenched and recognizable until later in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

- (17) *canay maliya conay-manun kule-khi-ka swi-wulswu-nka*  
 2SG DM good-though so.do-NMLZ-NOM easy-can-Q  
 Lit. 'You! Though it is good, is it easy to do so?'  
 'Though it is good, is it easy for you to do so?' (*Sukungka*, 19<sup>th</sup> century)

A contemporary example of *maliya* as a topic marker that presumes common ground can be seen in (18) below. Here, *maliya* is employed to initiate a new but shared discourse topic. Speaker A uses *maliya* to introduce *moktoli* 'scarf' as a topical referent that is known to both the speaker and the addressee, and elicits the addressee's attention to it. Identifiability of the referent *moktoli* 'scarf' is also facilitated via the prenominal relative clause construction *cepeney enni-ka ttu-ten moktoli* 'the *moktoli* (scarf) that you knitted the other day'. The addressee reciprocates with an expression of interest via an information-seeking question about the referent *moktoli* 'scarf'. In responding with the echo-question '*moktoli?*' ('The scarf?'), the addressee is in effect politely expressing a desire to continue with the topic introduced by Speaker A.

- (18) A: *enni, cepeney enni-ka ttu-ten maktoli maliya*  
 older.sister the.other.day older.sister-NOM knit-ADN scarf TOP  
 ‘Older sister, the scarf **you know** which you knitted the other day?’
- B: *maktoli?*  
 ‘The scarf? (Yes, what about it?)’

In the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, *maliya* further developed into a pragmatic hedger. That is, *maliya* was used as a politeness marker to defuse any potentially offending bluntness in the speaker’s utterance, or in the words of Watts (2003: 169), to “weaken the illocutionary force of a statement.” The pragmatic hedging function of *maliya* may be derived from the topic marking function. As seen in (18) above, topic marker *maliya* is employed to establish common ground, in this case by introducing the topic as a matter of common interest, and to focus on the topic explicitly.

Pragmatic marker *maliya*, on the other hand, works more subtly to further signal that the speaker recognizes the social aspects of common ground, in particular the need to take into consideration the face needs of both interlocutors. As exemplified in (19), the speaker is uncertain about the addressee’s attitude or likely response when he refers to the difficult situation that the addressee has encountered. In addition to signaling an attempt to establish rapport and common ground, the speaker employs *maliya* to also mitigate any offending assertion in his utterance, and thus avoid impoliteness and threat to the face-needs of the addressee.

- (19) A: *maliya ney-to ele was-keys-ney*  
 HEDGE 2SG-also hard PST-may-PRT  
 ‘*Maliya*, you also may have had a hard time.’  
*na-to yeksi ...*  
 1SG-also too  
 ‘(Yes) I (had a difficult time) as well.’ (*Cwukselwu*, early 20<sup>th</sup> century)

In Contemporary Korean, sentence final *maliya* has also developed a confirmation-seeking function in interrogative contexts, often with a counterexpectation reading, and associated with emotions such as surprise or disbelief as in (20) below.

- (20) A: *skicang ka-ss-taka*  
 ski go-PST-CONN

- ‘I went skiing, and’
- B: *ya! ne oppa-hantey ayaki-to an ha-ko*  
 INTJ 2SG older.brother-to talk-even NEG do-CONN  
*skicang ka-ss-tan maliya?*  
 ski go-PST-ADN CE  
 ‘Hey! Did you say that you went skiing without even a word?’
- A: *ye*  
 ‘Yes.’

*Maliya* has also developed into a marker of negative emotions such as annoyance or complaint as in (21), where Speaker A was annoyed with Speaker B’s response that she would come to the dinner after she had finished reciting an 840-word poem, and Speaker A employed *maliya* to express anger or complaint against Speaker B.

- (21) A: *elmana kel-lye?*  
 how.long take-Q  
 ‘How long does it take?’
- B: *kentey palpaysasip ca-ya*  
 by.the.way 840 word-SFP  
 ‘By the way, it is 840 words.’
- A: *Um*  
 ‘Um’
- B: *palpaysasip ca ta oywu-ko*  
 840 word all recite-CONN  
 ‘After reciting the entire 840-word poem , (I will come).’
- A: *ay-tul pap mek-nuntey na an mek-ko iss-ta-n*  
 kid-PL rice eat-while 1SG NEG eat-CONN exist-DEC-ADN  
***maliya***  
 DM  
 ‘While other friends are eating, I am not eating and waiting for you!’

From the 18<sup>th</sup> century to present-day Korean, we thus see a semantic extension in which *maliya* initially develops an emphatic marking function and then later acquires a topic marking function and pragmatic hedging function, and in more recent times a counterexpectation marking function as well. Given the affiliative nature of common

ground sentence ender *ya*, it is not surprising that sentence final particle *maliya* has developed into a marker of affiliation and co-involvement between speaker and addressee, and is thus often used to signal assumed shared knowledge or shared interest between interlocutors. In counterexpectation contexts, *maliya* is often deployed to help re-establish common ground, for example, by reminding the addressee to refrain from engaging in potentially disaffiliative moves, as when the speaker checks with his friend by using *maliya* in the sense of ‘Didn’t you earlier say X’ or ‘Are you then saying X, (which by the way you are not supposed to be doing)?’

### 3.2 Frequency distribution of *maliya* across time

Thus far we have discussed the historical development of the various functions of *maliya*. In this section, we will examine the distributional frequency of each of these functions over time. Our historical analysis of *maliya* is based largely on the UNICONC (Korean historical corpus), which is comprised of 6,606,332 words from 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century texts and 2,209,352 words from 20<sup>th</sup> century texts. Our analysis also includes uses of *maliya* in present-day Korean, with data from the *Sejong* spoken corpus, which consists of 4,204,082 words.

**Table 3. Frequency distribution of *maliya* (18<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> century) based on tokens from the UNICONC (historical) corpus and the *Sejong* (contemporary) corpus**

Period	Lexical uses of <i>mal</i> ‘word’ in <i>mal-i-ya</i> (word-COP-SFP)	Functions of pragmatic marker <i>maliya</i>	
Late 18 <sup>th</sup> to 19 <sup>th</sup> century	54	<b>emphatic marker</b>	<b>14</b>
		topic introduction marker	1
Early 20 <sup>th</sup> century	58	<b>emphatic marker</b>	<b>57</b>
		topic introduction marker	3
		hedger (pragmatic softener)	2

Contemporary Korean ( <i>Sejong</i> corpus)	5	<b>emphatic marker</b>	<b>140</b>
		topic introduction marker	11
		<i>pragmatic hedger</i>	5
		<i>counterexpectation marker</i>	24
		<i>negative emotion marker</i>	21

As shown in Table 3, *maliya* was used as an emphatic marker and a marker to introduce a new but shared topical reference in the late 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century. In the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the hedging function of *maliya* was added. It is worth noting, as seen in Table 3, that in the late 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century, *maliya* occurred as a lexical expression (N. *mal* ‘word’ + COP *i* ‘be’ + SFP *ya*) more frequently than as a pragmatic marker (a ratio of about 3:1, or more specifically 54 tokens of lexical use (72%) to 15 tokens of pragmatic use (28%) respectively). The usage of *maliya* as a pragmatic marker increased significantly to 48% in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, with its lexical use reduced to 52%.

In contemporary Korean, *maliya* now is mostly used as a pragmatic ‘common ground’ marker, with *maliya* retaining a lexical use of *mal* ‘word’ only in the single expression *mwusun maliya?* (‘What is said?’ < ‘What is that which is said?’) in the data we analyzed. As highlighted in Table 1, in contemporary Korean, *maliya* occurs as an emphatic marker (69.7%), far more frequently than as a pragmatic hedger (2.5%), or as a counterexpectation marker (11.9%) or a marker of speaker’s negative feeling (10.4%), or as a marker to signal that a discourse topic is known or familiar to both speaker and hearer (5.5%).

The high frequency usage of *maliya* as an emphatic marker appears to be linked to its earlier reportative use within a cleft construction involving complementizer *mal*. The emphasis is derived from the speaker’s presentation of a proposition as if it had been previously uttered. That is, the original meaning of *maliya* within the cleft construction (in the sense of ‘It is that X ...’) comes to be subjectively interpreted to mean ‘*I (already) said that X ...*’, which can be further interpreted in the sense of ‘It is that X ..., (and indeed the situation is so obvious that it is as if I had said this before.)’ (see Rhee 2008). The emphatic nuance (or lack thereof) associated with the presence vs. absence of *maliya* is well contrasted in (21). The sentence without *maliya* (21a) does not retain the emphatic nuance in contrast to the sentence with *maliya* (21b). The latter (21b) conveys the meaning ‘It is that my mom is very sick’, and this can further be subjectively interpreted as ‘*I (already) said that my mom is very sick.*’ This subjective reinterpretation can further give rise to the emphatic meaning ‘*The situation that my*

mom is very sick *is so obvious that it is as if I had said this before.*'

- (21) a. *Emma-ka manhi aphu-ta*  
Mother-NOM very sick-DEC  
'My mother is very sick.'
- b. *Emma-ka manhi aphu-ta-n-maliya*  
Mother-NOM very sick-DEC-ADN-SFP  
(i) 'My mother is very sick.'  
(ii) 'It is that my mom is very sick.'  
>> '(I already said), "my mom is very sick".'  
>> 'My mom is very sick!'

As seen in Table 3 above, in the late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> century, *maliya* was used to introduce a referential NP as the topic of an utterance, but *maliya* in present-day Korean can now also be used to introduce an entire discourse. Our diachronic findings thus show that *maliya* came to be used as a pragmatic marker in the 18<sup>th</sup> century and is now a highly developed common ground marker in present-day Korean. These results are consistent with our earlier analyses in sections 2 and 3, where we found that *maliya* is increasingly used to emphasize the speaker's thoughts or feelings, and at the same time evoke the participation and empathy of the addressee. In other words, speakers now employ *maliya* as a strategic device to involve the addressee in the joint construction of the evolving discourse by common-grounding the information at hand.

### 3.3 Subjectification and intersubjectification of *maliya* across time

With respect to meaning change, subjectification and intersubjectification play an important role in the development of Korean discourse marker *maliya*. According to Traugott (1982, 1989), there are three general tendencies of semantic change, which affect how the grammatical and pragmatic functions evolve during the process of grammaticalization. Traugott identifies three functional-semantic components which she labels propositional, textual, and expressive, and proposes that grammaticalization will proceed from the propositional to the expressive level, not in the reverse direction. Traugott (1995) further claims that *subjectification*, as a type of human cognitive activity, is related to the process of strengthening the speaker's subjective stance. Via subjectification, forms and constructions expressing at first concrete, lexical, and objective meanings become increasingly abstract, pragmatic, and (inter)subjective



#### 4. Conclusion

In this paper, we investigated the discourse functions of *maliya*: emphatic marker, a marker signaling that a given topic is shared knowledge between speaker and hearer, and a pragmatic hedger, counterexpectation marker, and marker of speaker's negative feeling. Emphatic marker *maliya* has the function of emphasizing speakers' beliefs or feelings and at the same time eliciting the empathy of the addressee. It is also used to signal the speaker's assumption of shared knowledge or common interest between the participants in the discourse. As a marker to introduce a new discourse topic, *maliya* again simultaneously signals that this topic is familiar to the addressee as well. As a pragmatic hedger, *maliya* is used to mitigate assertions that might otherwise come across as being impolite, intrusive and face-threatening to the addressee. This pragmatic softening function of *maliya* is often deployed in situations where the speaker is uncertain about the addressee's attitude or response to his or her utterance. As a counterexpectation marker, *maliya* is used to express a contrast or discrepancy between what is asserted and what is assumed to be the norm or shared belief between speaker and hearer. Finally, *maliya* is also used to express speaker's strong emotion, especially complaint or annoyance when the speaker's utterance is not acknowledged as common ground. Regardless of whether its function is emphatic or mitigative, *maliya* invites the addressee to be involved in the joint construction of the discourse representation by formulating the information at hand as the focus of mutual orientation. In this sense, *maliya* has the function of interactively managing and negotiating a common ground.

In this paper, we also examined the development of Korean *maliya* beyond its lexical use into a pragmatic marker. In the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, lexical noun *mal* merged with the copula *i* 'be' and common ground sentence *ender ya* within a focus structure, and *maliya* was formed as a common ground marker with an emphatic interpretation. In the late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> century, emphatic marker *maliya* also developed into a marker introducing a new but shared discourse topic, and in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, it further developed a pragmatic hedging function. This extension from pragmatic strengthening (emphasis) to pragmatic softening (hedging) was facilitated by a shift from a focus on speaker-orientedness toward addressee-orientedness. In semantic terms, *a la* Traugott, this represents a shift from a focus on subjective meaning to intersubjective ones, initially in an attempt to elicit speaker involvement, and later in consideration for the



face-needs of the addressee. In more recent times, toward the latter part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, *maliya* has further developed into a counterexpectation marker and negative emotion marker. These two functions signal disaffiliative moves, as the speaker reacts to what he or she perceives to be a deviation from presupposed or expected norms. Disaffiliative moves (in this case, involving counterexpectation marking and negative emotion marking) are likewise intersubjective in nature, and in the case of common ground marker *maliya*, we often see attempts to use disaffiliative moves such as rebukes and challenges to once again re-establish common ground. Thus, over the past two centuries (from the late 18<sup>th</sup> century to the late 20<sup>th</sup> century), we have seen a diachronic development in which *maliya* has developed into a pragmatic marker with increasingly subjective and intersubjective uses. From a morphosyntactic perspective, it is interesting to note that the mechanisms of change are not unique to *maliya* but have often been recycled time and again within the language (as in the case of *malita* and *kesita* in Korean) and also across languages (see Yap, Grunow-Harsta & Wrona 2011 on the extension of nominalizers and complementizers to sentence final particles in Asian languages). What contributes to greater variation, however, is the etymological sources for each pragmatic marker, and *maliya* is different from the others in this sense in that it is intrinsically coded for common grounding.

### **Acknowledgement**

We wish to gratefully acknowledge support from the National Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean Government (NRF-2010-361-A00013) to the first author and from the Research Grants Council of Hong Kong (General Research Fund, PolyU 5513/10H) to the second author. We also wish to thank the following for their valuable insights and for extensive discussions: Bernd Heine, and Seongha Rhee, and Vivien Ying Yang.

### **References**

- Ahn, C. H. 1992. Hankuke tamwha pyoci pwunsek [An analysis of Korean discourse markers]. *Mal* 17: 21-38.
- Bromme, R., Rambow, R., and Nückles, M. 2001. Expertise and estimating what other people know: The influence of professional experience and type of knowledge. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied* 7(4): 317–330.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. 1978. Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena. In Goody, E. N. (ed.) *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction*, pp. X-280. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Caffi, C. 1999. On mitigation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31: 881-909
- Caffi, C. 2007. *Mitigation*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Clark, H. H., Schreuder, R., & Buttrick, S. 1981. Common ground and the understanding of demonstrative reference. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 22: 139
- Clark, H. H., and Brennan, S. E. 1991). Grounding in communication. In L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine, & S. D. Teasley (eds), *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition*, 127–149. Washington DC, USA: American Psychological Association.
- Goldberg, Julia A. 1981. Hey, y'know, have I got a topic for you. Unpublished paper.
- Holmes, Janet. 1986. Functions of you know in women's and men's speech. *Language in Society*, 15: 1-22.
- Holmes, Janet. 1993. New Zealand women are good to talk to: an analysis of politeness strategies in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 20: 91-116.
- Ford, Cecilia E. & Thompson, Sandra A. 1996. Interactional units in conversation: Syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the projection of turn completion. In Ochs, Elinor, Schegloff, Emanuel & Thompson, Sandra A. (Hrsg.) (1996), *Interaction and Grammar*, 134-84. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fraser, B. 1990. An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 383-395.
- Heine, B., Ulrike, C., and Hünemeyer, F. 1991. From cognition to grammar: evidence from African languages. In E. C. Traugott and B. Heine (eds), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, Vol. 1: 149-187. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jucker, Andreas H. and Sara W. Smith. 1998. And people just you know like wow: Discourse markers as negotiating strategies. *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory*, In Andreas H. Jucker and Yael Ziv (eds.), 171-201. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lee, C. M., and Park, S. H.. 1991. The structure and function of the mid-sentential-*yo* construction: Especially its functions of major constituent break and of hedge, *Linguistic Journal of Korea* 16(2): 361-389.
- Lim, G. H. 1998. Meanings and functions of Korean discourse marker *marinya*, *Discourse and Cognition* 5(2): 159-179.
- Lu, Louis Wei-lun and Lily I-wen Su. 2009. Speech in interaction: mandarin particle *le* as a marker of intersubjectivity. *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht Didaktik und Methodik im Bereich Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 14(1).
- Noh, D.K. 1996. *Hankukeuy ipmalkwa kulmal [Korean Spoken and Written Discourse]*,

- Seoul: kukhakcalyowen.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1968. Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist* 70: 1075-95.
- Sin, H. S. 1991. *Hankuke hyensang-uymi pwunseok [An Analysis of Meanings and Forms in Korean]*, Sangmyeong Women's Publisher.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Suh. K. H. 2002. The Korean sentence-final marker *cianha* in conversational discourse. *The Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea* 10(2): 283-309.
- Suh. H. C. 2010. A study on the discourse marker 'malida' in Korean language education, *Bilingual Research* 43: 217-246.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1982. From propositional to textual and expressive meanings: some semantic pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization. In: Lehmann, Winfred P., Malkiel, Yakov (eds), *Perspectives on Historical Linguistics*, 245–272. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1989. On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language* 65 (1): 31–55.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1995. The role of the development of discourse markers in a theory of grammaticalization. Paper presented at the Twelfth International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Manchester.
- Traugott Elizabeth C. and Richard Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yang, Changyong. 2001. A discourse marker and topic-related talk: a case of *isscanha* in Korean. *Discourse and Cognition* 8(2): 113-138.
- Watts, Richard. J. 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.