

# The Korean hortative construction revisited

## Prototypical and extended functions

Ahrim Kim and Iksoo Kwon

Myongji University | Hankuk University of Foreign Studies

This paper revisits the hortative *-ca* construction in Korean from a usage-based perspective, examining its functions in natural interactional spoken data. The examination of the actual occurrence of *-ca* reveals its various functions: *-ca* indicates that the performer of the focal-event encoded in the utterance may be 1st person plural subject, i.e., the speaker and other interlocutors; 2nd person, i.e., the addressee(s); 1st person, i.e., the speaker; and 3rd person. Our findings provide direct evidence for the different degrees of prototypicality among these functions, which are reflected in their different frequency counts. Furthermore, this study proposes two novel functions of *ca*, the accordant imperative (to demand that the addressee agree with the speaker that the addressee perform the focal-event) and the speaker hortative (to ask the addressee to perform an action so that the speaker him-/herself can perform the focal-event).

**Keywords:** hortative construction, *-ca*, usage-based approach, spoken Korean, accordant imperative, speaker hortative

### 1. Introduction

Hortative constructions direct interlocutors to take part in a joint activity because hortative utterances typically urge the addressee(s) to make the purported idea come true together with the speaker. Korean has an utterance-final marker *-ca*, which has the hortative function. Its primary and extended functions have been addressed by numerous scholars (Doh 2016; Park 2012; Lim 2011; Na 2002; *inter alia*). A prototypical example of hortatives is shown in (1).

- (1) *sayngkak-ha-y-po-ca*.  
 thought-do-CON-try-HORT<sup>1</sup>  
 'Let's think (about it).'

This made-up utterance urges both the speaker (S, henceforth) and the addressee (H, henceforth) to do the focal-action (i.e., to think). Because in spoken Korean, subject and object are frequently omitted (as in (1)), the use of *-ca* alone is often sufficient to invoke both interlocutors as the intended-performers.

It is well known, however, that hortative constructions cover other kinds of directive speech acts cross-linguistically (Aikhenvald 2016; Mauri and Sansò 2011; Traugott and Dasher 2002; *inter alia*). For example, the intended-performer can be S, or H, as in the made-up examples in (2) and (3), respectively.

- (2) (Context: A husband is responding to his wife's complaint about his failure to help with the housework.)  
*na-to com swy-ca*.  
 I-also a.bit have.a.rest-HORT  
 'Let's me have some rest, okay?'
- (3) (Context: A teacher is speaking to her students.)  
*icey kwaceymwul ceychwulha-ca*.  
 now assignment submit-HORT  
 'Let's you turn in your assignments, now.'

In (2), only S is the intended-performer of the action (having a rest). It is the consent of both parties, which is what S is asking of H, that constitutes a joint activity and thus licenses the hortative marker. In (3), the focal-event (i.e., turning in an assignment) is to be done solely by Hs, which makes the utterance equivalent to an imperative.

Although *-ca* has received much attention, its varied functions deserve a thorough re-investigation with attested data of interactional discourse. As the hortative function, by its significant illocutionary nature, necessarily invokes the presence of an addressee, the nature of hortative constructions cannot be fully understood by examining isolated sentences; it is necessary to investigate its uses in the dynamic meaning negotiations that take place in naturally occurring interactional discourse. As contextual information reveals interlocutors' intersubjective intentions, studies based on researchers' intuitive judgments of decontextualized sentences can entirely miss the logical grounds for the usages of linguistic forms.

---

1. Example glossing follows the Leipzig Glossing Rules with additional glosses listed in Appendix A.

To fill this gap, we revisit the hortative *-ca* construction in Korean from a usage-based perspective, examining its functions in natural interactional spoken Korean data (the 21st Century Sejong Corpus). This paper's investigation accounts for the various functions of the construction, addressing collocational uses of *-ca*. Furthermore, it argues that whether the performer of the action is explicitly mentioned in an utterance or not (e.g., *wuli* 'we', *kathi* 'together') can have an effect on the construction's functional properties.

This paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 provides some background on different types of hortatives and terminology issues in the general and the Korean linguistics literature. Section 3 briefs on information on the corpus data and explicates various functions of the *-ca* construction with attested examples. Section 4 summarizes.

## 2. Preliminaries

This section first clarifies the uses of relevant terminology and then summarizes prior research regarding the functions of the utterance-final *-ca*.

### 2.1 The hortative and related notions

In general, the notion *hortative* refers to a type of utterances with directive illocutionary force.<sup>2</sup> Similar to imperatives, hortatives refer to a situation where S directs H to do a certain action that S wishes to be realized. Unlike imperatives, hortatives usually involve situations where the commanding expressions are addressed to someone other than or besides H(s), often to a first person such as *me/us* (Aikhenvald 2016, 144). S urges H to perform an action together with S so that the focal-state to which S refers in the utterance can be achieved. Due to the similarity to imperatives, hortatives frequently have been regarded as one kind of directive (Aikhenvald 2016; Ammann and van der Auwera 2001).

The term *hortative* is, however, far from having a unified definition (van der Auwera et al. In press, 5–6; Ammann and van der Auwera 2001). For instance, according to Aikhenvald's (2016), hortatives are a type of commanding expression that is addressed not to Hs, but to a first person *us*. Strictly speaking, however, this is contradictory because the first-person plural may include H(s). Moreover, the seemingly prototypical situation of the hortative, i.e., the realization of a certain

---

2. For detailed information on directives (imperatives and their sub-types), see Aikhenvald (2016). For a discussion of the notion of hortativity in relation to grammatical categories of modality, see Palmer (2001, 10ff).

situation via a joint activity of S and H, does not necessarily hold in the following version of its definition:

- (4) The *hortative* is a construction used both with third persons and with first person plural, which has as a core meaning the expression of the speaker's wish and an appeal to the targeted person(s) to carry out the wish.

(Ammann and van der Auwera 2001, 344)

According to this definition, example utterances such as *Let him clean up the mess they made!* and *Let us try to understand!* make relevant examples for the category, only the latter of which would make a typical example according to Aikhenvald's definition.

Moreover, it is noteworthy that the only difference from imperatives stems from who is targeted by the appeal of the utterance: imperatives address a second person, singular or plural, whereas hortatives can address third persons and plural first persons (Ammann and van der Auwera 2001, 344; Mauri and Sansò 2011, 3491). This definition leads to two sub-types of hortatives: exhortatives (5) and cohortatives (6) (Ammann and van der Auwera 2001, 345).

- (5) The *exhortative* is a construction used with third persons, but not with the first person plural, which has as a core meaning the expression of the speaker's wish and an appeal to the targeted person(s) to carry out the wish.
- (6) The *cohortative* is a construction used exclusively with the first person plural, which has as a core meaning the expression of the speaker's wish and an appeal to the targeted person(s) to carry out the wish.

The notion of exhortative can be illustrated by the French utterances, *Qu'il(s) soi(en)t content avec ça!* 'Let him (them) be pleased with that!' (cf. *Soyons contents avec ça!* 'Let's be pleased with that') (Ibid. 2001, 345). Because the performer/experiencer targeted by the appeal is a third person, singular or plural, this type of utterance deviates from the typical joint activity of S and H (equivalent to Palmer's (2001, 81) *jussive*). The notion of cohortative is closer to what would be the general idea of hortativity, referring to a situation in which the appeal targets only the first-person plural (e.g., *Let's go*).

The fuzzy boundaries of the notion of hortative allow further possibilities. For example, a speaker can use the hortative form to convey imperative illocutionary force with a polite tone, as exemplified in *Let's you go first* (Traugott and Dasher 2002, 177). The situation encoded in the utterance targets H, but S strategically employs the hortative to mitigate the strong assertiveness of the utterance, by speaking as if she were joining the activity. This deviant use partially intersects with the function of imperatives in that the actual performer in the given context

will be the second person subject even though the locution indicates otherwise. van der Auwera et al. noted their functional similarity:

Imperatives and hortatives both have to do with the expression of a wish of the speaker about a future state of affairs. [...] they convey an appeal to the addressee(s) to help make the future state of affairs true. In case the person in control of the desired state of affairs is the addressee or addressees, we speak of an imperative. In any other case, we speak of a hortative.

(van der Auwera et al. 2003, 294)

We propose that the hortative category be further classified depending on whether H is the intended-performer of the focal-action or not. For example, in Korean, the hortative construction is employed when the intended-performer is exclusively S, as in (2) above, meaning that S appeals to H to cooperate to make the situation happen. To our best knowledge, this notion has not been formally described. Hence, we suggest the following definition of what we call the *speaker hortative*:

- (7) The *speaker hortative* is a construction used exclusively with the first person, which has as a core meaning the expression of the speaker's wish and an appeal to the interlocutor(s) to cooperate with the speaker to enable the speaker to carry out the wish.

In a nutshell, depending on the performer of the focal-action, there are subtypes of hortatives such as exhortatives (third person, but not first person plural), cohortatives (first person plural), and speaker hortatives (first person, but not non-first person), and sometimes they are used as (polite) imperatives (second person).

## 2.2 Hortatives in Korean grammar

Thanks to the grammaticalized honorification system in Korean, there are three endings *-psita* (deferential), *-sey* (familiar), and *-ca* (plain) that convey the hortative function in accordance to the relevant degree of formality (for more details, see Sohn 1999, 355). Among the three hortative endings, this study focuses on *-ca* of Plain style where S does not take a deferential stance toward H, as it is the most unmarked hortative marker in informal spoken Korean.<sup>3</sup>

Some so-called non-canonical uses of *-ca* have been observed and discussed in the Korean linguistics literature (Doh 2016; Park 2012; Lim 2011; Na 2002; *inter*

3. Because *-psita* is a highly deferential form and *-sey* is obsolete, they have very low token frequencies in spoken Korean data.

*alia*). The following examples illustrate the non-canonical uses that most scholars argue *-ca* can encode (Lim 2011, 353)

- (8) *wuli aka yak mek-ca.*  
 we.GEN baby medicine eat-HORT  
 'Let's you have a pill.'
- (9) *yay-ya mal com mwul-epo-ca.*  
 this.child-VOC word a.bit ask-try-HORT  
 'Hey kid, let's me ask you a question.'

Other than its cohortative use, *-ca* in (8) indicates that the intended-performer of the focal-action is only H. Functionally speaking, this is equivalent to an imperative *Have a pill*, but the hortative marker *-ca* conveys a friendly tone to encourage a child to do something he/she does not want to do. Because H is the sole performer of the focal-action, (8) illustrates a non-canonical hortative construction. (9) illustrates another non-canonical use, where the sole performer of the focal-action would be S (speaker hortative). Because the hortative construction is highly interactional in nature, full comprehension of its various functions requires a re-examination of its use in actual conversational interaction.

### 3. Data analysis

The data for this study are from the 21st Century Sejong Corpus.<sup>4</sup> First launched in 1998, this corpus is a nationally-funded project (the 21st Century Sejong Project), comprising data from various written and spoken genres. Because the utterance-final *ca* has a higher tendency to occur in spoken than in written Korean due to its interactive nature, only spoken data are used for this study. The selected data include naturally occurring conversations, lectures, and speeches, all recorded in 2001–2005. The total number of *ecel*<sup>5</sup> used in this study is 805,646.

*-Ca* occurred 549 times in the selected data. Twelve tokens were excluded due to lack of context, which made the function of *-ca* difficult to analyze. The remaining 537 cases of *-ca* and their contexts were thoroughly examined. Unless otherwise mentioned, this paper's examples are all from these 537 cases.

An examination of the occurrences of *-ca* in our data revealed that *-ca* is used to convey various functions and speech acts. Table 1 shows the various functions of *ca* categorized by type of intended-performer of the focal-event, along with their frequency in the data.

4. Available at: <http://www.sejong.or.kr>.

5. An *ecel* is a unit that is unique to Korean. It is roughly similar to a word in English.

**Table 1.** Types of intended-performer of the focal-event described in *-ca* utterances, and their frequency

intended-performer(s) of focal-events in <i>-ca</i> utterances		Frequency
(i)	1st person(s) (not including H)	21
	1st person / 1st and 2nd person (1st person plural)	6
(ii)	1st and 2nd person (1st person plural)	422
	1st and 2nd person (1st person plural) / 2nd person	42
	1st and 2nd person (1st person plural) / 1st person / 2nd person	2
(iii)	2nd person(s)	43
(iv)	3rd person(s)	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>537</b>

Table 1 shows that *-ca* can convey at least four different types of speech act in spoken Korean. The intended-performer of the focal-event in a *-ca* utterance could be: (i) solely the 1st person, (ii) both the 1st and 2nd person, (iii) solely the 2nd person, and (iv) solely the 3rd person. The unshaded rows in Table 1 show ambiguous cases. For instance, in the six cases of '1st person / 1st and 2nd person' the *-ca* utterance could be interpreted as having the intended-performer of the focal-event be solely the 1st person (i.e., S only) or both the 1st and 2nd person. Table 2 shows the results of combining all the ambiguous cases and reordering them by frequency.

**Table 2.** Types of intended-performer of the focal-event described in *-ca* utterances and their frequency with ambiguous cases combined

intended-performer(s) of focal-events in <i>-ca</i> utterances	Frequency
1st and 2nd person (1st person plural)	472
2nd person(s)	87
1st person(s) (not including H)	33
3rd person(s)	1

The frequency counts may be strong evidence for the degree of prototypicality of the function. As Table 2 illustrates, the most frequent function refers to both 1st and 2nd person, suggesting that this is the most prototypical use. The least frequent use was when the intended-performer was the 3rd person, strongly suggesting that this particular usage is least prototypical.

In the following sections, the sub-types of *-ca* will be described in detail, focusing on their colloquial uses, the characteristics of their speech acts, and their constructional characteristics.

### 3.1 Cohortative *-ca*: 1st person plural performers of the focal-event

The data suggest that the most frequent, prototypical function of *-ca* in spoken Korean is the *cohortative* function, in the term suggested by Ammann and van der Auwera (2001). The cohortative construction is used when S directs a first-person plural referent to carry out the wish described in the utterance. In the data, the cohortative *-ca* was often used by speakers to include H(s), as participants in the described event.

(10) (Context: Two speakers are having lunch together at a restaurant.)<sup>6</sup>

- 1 P<sub>2</sub> *liphilhay cwunikka*.  
'You can get refills, so.'
- 2 P<sub>1</sub> *a=*,  
'Ah,'
- 3→ *kunyang manhi mek-ca <X>*.  
just a.lot eat-HORT  
'Let's just eat a lot <X>.'

In (10), the two speakers are the sole participants in the conversation, which makes it clear that when P<sub>1</sub> uses *-ca* (line 3), he is attempting to include H (P<sub>2</sub>), as well as himself, in the suggested action. In other words, P<sub>1</sub> is suggesting to H that they carry out P<sub>1</sub>'s wish (to eat a lot) together. This is a clear example of *-ca* used with a cohortative function.

#### 3.1.1 *-Ca* in internal monologues

*-Ca* is often observed in spoken internal monologues, when S speaks as if he/she is addressing him-/herself. *-Ca* in internal monologues is used particularly when S is describing a situation in which he/she was processing a specific thought. In these cases, S commonly self-quotes, as in (11).

- (11) (Context: P<sub>6</sub> is explaining to others that the only thing he thinks about at night is going to sleep.)
- 1 P<sub>6</sub> *cenyek mekumyen amwu sayngkak epse*.  
'After dinner, I don't think about anything.'

---

6. Due to the limited space, morpheme-by-morpheme glossing has been provided only for the relevant part of the data throughout the manuscript.



- 2     *iltanun nayil achimey ilenayatoycanha.*  
       ‘You know, first of all, I have to get up early in the morning the next day.’
- 3     P2 *mace.*  
       ‘Right’
- 4→ P6 *ppalli ca-ca.*  
       quickly sleep-HORT  
       ‘Let’s get to sleep quickly.’
- 5→ *ppalli ca-ca.*  
       quickly sleep-HORT  
       ‘Let’s get to sleep quickly.’
- 6     *i sayngkakpakkey an na.*  
       ‘This is my only thought.’

In lines 4–5, P6 uses *-ca* utterances to describe how his mind works each night. The context suggests that the performer of the focal-event, getting to sleep quickly, can only be S himself. Thus, S is depicting the situation as if he were having a conversation with himself, and suggesting that this split-self join together in the described event. We categorize this specific use of *-ca* in internal monologues as another type of cohortative construction, because S is still suggesting H to join with S in the focal-event, despite H in this case being the same person as S.

### 3.1.1.1 Idiomatic expression: *Eti poca* ‘let’s see’

The expression *eti poca* is an idiomatic expression, frequently used in spoken Korean, which can be translated in English as ‘let’s see’. The construction consists of the discourse marker *eti* (often translated as ‘well’ in English, but originally derived from the interrogative pronoun ‘where’), the verb *po-* ‘to see’, and *-ca*. *-Ca* in the construction suggests that it is used to ask H to join the activity of ‘seeing’ something together; literally, the construction would mean *well, let’s see* (for its historical change and its functions, see Rhee (to appear)). However, in actual usage, it is usually only S who would be performing the action, as in (12).

(12) (Context: A teacher, P1, is conducting an origami class with young children and their mothers.)

- 1     P1 *ca=yeyppukey ta mantulepoasseyo?*  
       ‘Alright, are you all done making it pretty?’
- 2→ *eti po-ca,*  
       DM see-HORT  
       ‘Let’s see.’
- 3     *he=!*  
       ‘Huh!’

- 4 *eti nukwu napika yeypunka*=,  
‘Well, whose butterfly is pretty?’
- 5 P2 *sengun-i po-a-cwu-sey-yo*=,  
Sengun-NOM see-CON-give-HON-HON.END=  
‘Please take a look at Sengun’s.’

*Eti poca* is used by the teacher (P1) in line 2. The focal-event of the expression is looking at the origami butterflies made by the students. Although it is possible that P1 is asking all the students and mothers to join in the activity of looking at the butterflies, the context suggests that P1 is the sole performer of the focal-action. In particular, P2, a mother, asks P1 to take a look at her son’s butterfly in line 5, suggesting that the action is performed exclusively by P1. Hence, we argue that the idiomatic expression *eti poca* is another instance of cohortative *-ca* used in internal monologue, where S treats her split-self as her addressee, and asks her to perform the described action together.

### 3.1.1.2 Idiomatic expressions: *-Cako and -cani*

Oftentimes, *-ca* is suffixed with the endings *-ko* or *-ni*. These were both originally connective markers, which are used to connect two clauses. In Contemporary Korean, *-cako* as a whole is one of the set of complementizers (for its historic development, see Rhee (2016, 38)). As Rhee (2016) explained, the complementizer has a quotative/reportative function indicating the hortative modality of the subordinate clause. The excerpt in (13) illustrates an instance of *-cako*.

- (13) (Context: The speakers are talking about a friend’s wedding, which they all attended.)
- 1 P1 *salam cincca manhasse*.  
‘There were so many people.’
- 2 P6 *nayka polttay ku cengtomyen*,  
‘From my perspective, that amount of people,’
- 3 P2 *manhasstako*.  
‘I’m saying that there were so many.’
- 4 P6 *manhun phyenintey*,  
‘You can say that it is a lot,’
- 5 P1 *e*.  
‘Yeah.’
- 6 P6 *wenak umsiki pissase*.  
‘But the food was too expensive in the first place.’

- 7→ *mwe= kyelhonsik-i mwe= ton pel-cako,*  
 DM wedding.ceremony-NOM DM money earn-HORT.COMP  
 ‘You know, a wedding ceremony is not, you know, something that you do to earn money,’
- 8→ *ton nam-cako ha=nun hayngsa-nun NEG-CIRCUM*  
 money be.left-HORT.COMP do-ATTR(RL) event-TOP *ani-ntey,*  
 ‘It’s not an event that you do to make a profit, but,’
- 9 P2 *kuntey ccokum nam- namnuntamye?*  
 ‘People say you do make a bit of profit, though?’

Because *-cako* is typically used to report/quote a hortative utterance, the literal translation of lines 7–8 would be ‘A wedding ceremony is not something that you do by saying “let’s earn money” or “let’s make a profit”’. *-Ca* can be said to have a cohortative function; the host of the wedding is speaking to him-/herself (treating his/her split-self as H) and is suggesting to the other self to join in the action of earning money and making a profit by inviting many guests to the wedding.<sup>7</sup> However, *-cako* in lines 7–8 in (13) can hardly be interpreted as truly imagined indirect speech. *-Cako* in (13) seems to have lost its literal meaning but functions instead as an idiomatic expression, simply conveying intentionality, and thus can be translated as ‘something (that you do) to PREDICATE’.

*-Cani* functions in a similar way. *-Cani* is the shortened form of the construction [*ca*(HORT)-*ha*(‘say’)-*ni*(CON)]. The clausal connective *-ni* can be translated as ‘because’, ‘after’, ‘when’, and so on. Scholars including Jeon (1999) and Ahn (2016) all argued that *-ni* originally functioned to mark temporal relations and causality.<sup>8</sup> Due to the omitted speech verb *hata* ‘say’, the entire construction *-cani* can function to quote/report someone else’s hortative utterance, in a very similar way as *-cako*. An example of *-cani* is given in (14).

- (14) (Context: The speakers are in a restaurant. P1, P2, and P3 have just expressed their surprise at the small amount of food taken by P4. P4 is now explaining her eating habit.)
- 1 P4 *a kuntey [namki-] namkiko kal cengtolo toymyen*  
 ‘But, if I leave- leave that much amount of food,’
- 2 P1 *[an tusi]neyyo,*  
 ‘You don’t eat,’

7. In Korean culture, wedding guests usually give congratulatory money to either the bride or the groom, or to their family members.

8. In the *Phyocwunkwuketaysacen* (1999, ‘The Standard Korean Dictionary’), the other function of *-ni* is described as ‘to connect two clauses where the second clause provides information that is related to but different from the event described in the first clause.’

- 3 P4 *com akkapko*,  
‘I feel like it’s too good to be wasted,’
- 4 P1 *yey*.  
‘Yeah.’
- 5→ P4 *kuleh-ta-ko mek-ca-ni*,  
be.such-DECL-CONJ eat-HORT-CON  
‘But if I eat it, on the other hand,’
- 6 *ttohan pwutamsulep-ko*,  
also feel.uncomfortable-CONJ  
‘It would be too much for me,’

In lines 1–6, P4 explains how she feels whenever she has leftover food, using *-cani* in line 5. The literal translation of lines 5–6 would be ‘But after having said (to myself) “Let’s eat it,” I feel uncomfortable.’ This suggests that S is assuming a situation where she fictively invites her split-self to join her in the activity of eating what is left, thus using *-ca* cohortatively (for a similar argument, see Lim 2011): the entire construction has lost its literal meaning and is used idiomatically as a conditional, and thus can be translated as ‘if’.

### 3.1.2 Co-occurrence of explicit references to participants

Because *-ca* alone typically implies the participation of both the 1st person and 2nd person interlocutors, an explicit subject such as *wuli* ‘we, us’ or expressions such as *hamkkey* ‘together’ or *kathi* ‘together’ are not necessary to convey cohortative function. The excerpt in (10) above clearly shows that the absence of these expressions does not affect the cohortative function of *-ca*. However, our data include several cases in which expressions such as *wuli* ‘we, us’, *hamkkey* ‘together’, and *kathi* ‘together’ are explicitly used with *-ca* with the cohortative function. If it is sufficient to use *-ca* alone to convey the cohortative function, then must there be a specific reason for the co-occurrence of such expressions? An examination of the discourse data, such as (15), reveals that this is indeed the case.

- (15) (Context: P1 is telling P2 about the day he spent at his friend Sinyeng’s house.)  
1→ P1 *simsimhakey ettehkey honca ca-nya-kwu kathi*  
boringly how alone sleep-INTER-CONJ together  
*ca-ca-kwu mak kule-nun-ke-y-a*.  
sleep-HORT-CONJ DM be.such-ATTR(RL)-thing-COP-IND  
‘(Sinyeng told me,) how can you sleep alone, it’s no fun, (he said) let’s  
go to sleep together.’

In (15), *-ca* is used in Sinyeng’s utterance as quoted by P1. According to P1, Sinyeng suggested P1 join him to perform an action together (to go to sleep), which is

a typical cohortative function. In this specific example, however, the utterance would sound infelicitous if the expression *kathi* ‘together’ were not used. This is because S makes a contrast between an event that can be performed individually (sleeping alone) and another event that can be performed jointly (going to sleep together). *Kathi* is needed to accentuate the contrasted inclusion of H in the action described. Similarly, the use of such expressions is also needed when a speaker wants to invite H to join actions that are typically conceived of as performed individually, to avoid any potential ambiguity. For instance, the absence of *kathi* could have led to ambiguity between two meanings: an invitation to P1 to go to bed (alone) at the same time as Sinyeng himself went to bed and an invitation to P1 to join Sinyeng in going to bed together. These corpus data provide evidence that expressions such as *kathi* or *hamkkey* co-occur with cohortative *-ca* whenever there is contrast or a potential ambiguity in the interpretation between an action performed jointly and another performed individually.

Our data also include some cases of *wuli* ‘we, us’ co-occurring with cohortative *-ca* such as (16).

(16) (Context: Speakers are talking about a college course that P2, P3, and P4 are planning to take during the upcoming semester. P1, who has already taken the course, has just explained that he got a good grade on his presentation with the help from students in the film department.)

1 P3 *ya wulito yenghwahakkwalang phyen mekumyen toykey cohkeyssta kuchi.*

‘Hey, it would be really great if we could also form a group like that with those in the Film Department, right?’

2 P1 *kuke <name> sensayngnimhanthey chingchan patasse.*

‘Our presentation received compliments from Professor <name>.’

3 P3 *a=,*

‘Ah=,’

4 P1 *yeksi kwukmwunkwalakwu.*

‘(The professor said,) You’re from the Korean Literature department, indeed.’

5→ P4 (3.7) *wuli oppa-lang tokkathi ha-ca.*

we elder.brother-COM exactly.same do-HORT

‘Let’s do it in exactly the same way as he (P1) did.’

In (16), cohortative *-ca* can be seen in line 5, where P4 is suggesting to Hs to join her in preparing a presentation. However, unlike in the previous excerpts, *-ca* in (16) is used to invite only some of Hs to join in the described action. P4’s invitation obviously excludes P1, who has already taken the course. Because *-ca* can

potentially invite all of Hs to join in the described action, a specific linguistic device is required in such a case of only partial inclusion. That is, by uttering *wuli* 'us', speaker P4 can signal (possibly with additional nonverbal cues such as eye gaze) which of Hs she wants to include in her invitation, and which she wants to exclude.

In addition, *wuli* is sometimes strategically used when S wants to change the topic of the conversation by suggesting H(s) join in the action described in her utterance, such as in (17).

(17) (Context: P1 and P2 are taking a walk and talking about courses in Teacher Education.)

- 1 P1 *kulen pi ihanun* <@ *an naocanha* @> [@@]  
'Normally you don't get <@ a grade below B @> @@.'
- 2 P2 [*a*,]  
'Ah,'
- 3 P1 @@ [[*kukeey ancengkamun*]] *kacikoissnuntey!*  
'@@ That makes me feel relieved!'
- 4 P2 [[*cincca tto kulay*.]]  
'It does, indeed.'
- 5 P1 *kulayto?*  
'Still,'
- 6 @@ *ayu*.  
'@@ Hmm.'
- 7 *ku= ku= way= key iwang tutnun kemyenun kyocikinikka kukenun eyilul patayaci* <@ *ttalun ke-ka*, @>  
'Um... um... if I have to take that class, I must get an A because it's a course for teaching, and <@ it's the other classes (that I'm worried about), @>'
- 8 @@  
'@@'
- 9→ P2 *ya wuli han pakhwi tol-ca*.  
voc we one lapse go.around-HORT  
'Hey, let's take a walk here, one lap.'
- 10 P1 *han pakhwi tol-ca-ko?*  
one lapse go.around-HORT-COMP  
'(Did you just say) let's go around one lap?'
- 11 P2 *chwuwunka?*  
'Is it too cold?'

From line 1 to 8, the talk is about classes and grades. In line 9, P2 suddenly changes the topic, inviting P1 to join her in walking one lap around the place they are conversing. P2's *-ca* utterance in line 9 is an abrupt topic change. Because P1 and P2 are the only participants of the conversation, P1's use of *-ca* is sufficient to convey a cohortative meaning, hence both *wuli* and *ya* (a vocative marker used to attract attention from an addressee of the same or lower status) are used to attract H's attention. Hence, the explicit use of both *wuli* and *ya* is a discourse strategy, which P2 uses to induce P1 to engage in the new topic.

### 3.1.3 Markers of the conditional: *-Chi-ca* and *-ca-myen*

In our data, the cohortative *-ca* also helps conjure a hypothetical situation in conjunction with linguistic items that mark conditionality. *-Ca* is often found within idiomatic, conventionalized expressions such as *-chi-ca* and *-ca-myen*, which both function as conditional markers in spoken Korean. First, the construction *-chi-ca* is the combination of the verb *chita* 'to count' and the hortative *-ca*, which would be translated in English as 'Let's count that...'. The excerpt in (18) provides an example of *-chi-ca* as a conditional marker.

- (18) (Context: P1 is tutoring P2 in math.)
- 1 P1 *yonomi cikum*,  
'Now, this one,'
  - 2 *eymikwu*,  
'Is M and then,'
  - 3 *yonomi*,  
'This one,'
  - 4 *ssikumaka toykeyssci?*  
'Becomes sigma, right?'
  - 5 P2 *ney*.  
'Yes.'
  - 6 P1 *kuci?*  
'Doesn't it?'
  - 7→ *ssikuma ceykop-i-lako chi-ca.*  
sigma square-COP-COMP assume-HORT  
'Let's assume that it's sigma square.'
  - 8 *yekkaci ta hayse*,  
'We count everything up to here and,'
  - 9 *kulayse khukinun*,  
'So the size should be...'

- 10 *ikey cikum eymiko*,  
 ‘This is M,’  
 (P1 continues.)

In lines 1–4, P1 (the tutor) explains that the value of a certain equation is sigma. In line 7, however, P1 expresses that he wants to assume that sigma is in fact sigma square. Doing so, he uses the construction *-chi-ca*. Literally, P1 is inviting his student to join him in an event of counting, but hypothetically inviting P2 to join him in assuming sigma to be sigma square. Hence, this is a cohortative function of *-ca*. P1’s utterances in lines 7–9 and beyond form a conditional construction, in which *-chi-ca* marks the protasis (‘If this is sigma square (and if we count everything up to here),’) and the utterances from line 9 represent the apodosis (‘then the size should be ...’).

*-Ca-myen* is a similar case. This expression is the reduced form of *-ca-ko ha-myen* (-HORT-COMP ‘say’-COND).<sup>9</sup> Within the original construction, the complementizer *-ko* functions to quote the other interlocutor’s use of cohortative *-ca*, and the use of the conditional *-myen* tells us that the entire quote is a hypothetical situation. The literal translation would be ‘If (you) say “let’s do ...”’. However, in spoken Modern Korean, its literal meaning seems to be lost, and the reduced construction *-ca-myen* functions as a conditional marker. (19) is such an example.

- (19) (Context: P4 and P2 are having a discussion on North Korea and nuclear weapons.)
- 1 P2 *kunikka hanmatilo ssomyen an toykwu*,  
 ‘So, in brief, they should not launch and,’
- 2 *pwukhanun haykul mantuletwu an toyntakwu=*.  
 ‘North Korea should not even build nuclear weapons, either.’
- 3 *ku= sso- ssomyen etilo ssolkka= kaynyemun imi*,  
 ‘Um, the matter of to where they would launch the weapon already means...’
- 4 *ku= cacheyeyse*,  
 ‘Um, by itself,’
- 5 *mincokilan kaynyemul kyeysook nika koswuhako issnun kelakwu*.  
 ‘...(it means) that you keep considering them (the North Koreans) as the same nation (as ours).’
- 6 P4 *ani kuntey*,  
 ‘But,’

9. For the discussion on the historical development from *-cako ha-myen* to *-camyen*, see Koo and Rhee (2008).



- 7→ *kulehkey ttaci-ca-myen-un,*  
 such quibble.over-HORT-COND-TOP  
 ‘If we think critically about it in that way,’
- 8 *haykul mantuleto an toynta kulenuntey,*  
 ‘Then (people say that) they should not even build nuclear weapons,  
 but...’
- 9→ *kulem imi poyu- kuleh- kulehkey*  
 then already possession such in.such.a.way  
*ttaci-ca-myen-un,*  
 quibble.over-HORT-COND-TOP  
 ‘Those who already possess- if we put it like that,’
- 10 *e=,*  
 ‘Um,’
- 11→ *kulehkey ttaci-ca-myen-un,*  
 in.such.way quibble.over-HORT-COND-TOP  
 ‘If we put it that way, then,’
- 12 *kiconey kackoissten aytuli e=,*  
 ‘Those who already possess (nuclear weapons), um,’
- 13 *kiconey haykul kackoisnun aytuli seykyey phyenghwalul wihay ta*  
*epsaypelieyaci,*  
 ‘Those who already have nuclear weapons should be discarding all of  
 them for world peace, huh,’

In (19), P<sub>4</sub> uses the *-ca-myen* construction three times. The construction’s literal translation would be, in line 7, for instance, ‘If you say, “Let’s think critically about it in that way”’. In other words, S is assuming a situation where H is inviting S to join (cohortatively) to think critically about the topic being discussed at the moment together. P<sub>4</sub>’s uses of *-ca-myen* are similar in lines 9 and 11. Nevertheless, P<sub>2</sub>’s utterances from line 1–5 do not suggest that she is explicitly suggesting P<sub>4</sub> join her in thinking critically about these issues. Furthermore, P<sub>2</sub> remains silent while P<sub>4</sub> expresses her own thoughts on North Korean nuclear weapons from line 6–13. This exchange suggests that *-ca-myen* no longer indicates the hypothetical quotative, but instead functions as a conditional marker, which can be translated into English as a simple ‘if’ clause.

### 3.2 Imperative *-ca*: 2nd person performer(s) of the focal-event

The second most frequent use (87 occurrences) of *-ca* in spoken Korean is when the intended-performer is solely the 2nd person, singular or plural, hence H(s)

(see Table 2). That is, the speech act of *-ca* in this case would be imperative rather than hortative. Two different types of imperative speech act were found in the examples of *-ca* with 2nd person sole performer(s) of the focal-event: the polite imperative function, and the *accordant imperative* function.

### 3.2.1 Polite imperative *-ca*

Speakers can strategically use a hortative construction to perform an imperative speech act, requesting H(s) to perform an action. This is the *polite imperative* function, as the hortative construction's implication of joint action serves to mitigate the strong assertiveness of an imperative.<sup>10</sup> (20) is such an example.

(20) (Context: A discussion is taking place between a teacher (P1) and her students.)

1 → P1 *hakchang-sicel-ey kacang cohahay-ss-te-n                      sensayngnim-ul*  
 school-time-LOC most like-ANT-FH.EV-ATTR(RL) teacher-ACC  
*han-pen yayki-ha-y-po-ca.*  
 one-time story-do-CON-try-HORT

'Let us talk about the teacher you liked the most during your school years.'

2 *enu sensayngnimul way cohahayssnunci,*  
 '(For instance.) Which teacher you liked, and why you liked him/her,'  
 ((several lines omitted))

3 *kulem kulay niney elin noney ku,*  
 'In that case, alright, when you were young, when you were, um,'

4 *chotung hakkyo ke cwung- ttaywa [cwunghakkyo ttay] yuchiwen ttaylul thonghule,*

'During elementary school, um, your middle school years, and when you were in kindergarten, all combined,'

5 P2 *[a=,]*  
 'Ah=,'

6 P1 *ca,*  
 'Alright=,'

7 *sicak,*  
 'Start,'

8 P6 *chotunghakkyo ttay ohaknyen ttay sensayngnim.*  
 'The teacher I had when I was in elementary school, when I was in fifth grade.'

10. The *polite imperative* is elsewhere called *adhortative* (Rhee 2017).

- 9 P1 *way?*  
‘Why?’
- 10 P6 *ku sensaygnimiyo,*  
‘That teacher is,’
- 11 P4 *a=,*  
‘Ah=,’
- 12 P6 *cehuy oppa yukhakneyn ttay tamimiessketunyo?*  
‘She was my older brother’s home room teacher when he was in sixth grade, you know?’  
(P6 continues)

-*Ca* in line 1 makes the utterance sound as if P1 is inviting Hs, the students, to join her in talking about favorite teachers, as if with the cohortative function. However, P1’s utterances from line 3 clearly show that her actual intention is to make Hs talk about their favorite teachers, without joining in the action herself. Expressions such as *niney* and *neney* (line 3), both meaning ‘you guys’, and the imperative form of the verb *sicak* ‘to start’ (line 7) make this intention evident: P1 is appealing to her students to make a future state of affairs true. The students are well aware of P1’s true meaning that the suggested action is solely theirs to perform, as seen in P6’s response from line 10, where he carries out the targeted action without question. -*Ca* in (20) is therefore used in a very different manner from the hortative -*ca* described in Section 3.1. It represents a strategic use of the hortative for a polite imperative function, and is an example of an ‘ostensible communicative act’ (Clark 1996): by pretending as if S will be joining in making the future state of affairs true, S tries to mitigate the strong assertive power of a direct imperative speech act.

### 3.2.2 Accordant imperative -*ca*

The second sub-type of imperative function that -*ca* shows is what we call the *accordant imperative*; it is used to ask H to consent to a proposition, as in (21).

- (21) (Context: P1 has just asked P3 if she would be willing to go on a blind date and P3 refuses.)
- 1 P3 *a silheyo.*  
‘Oh, I don’t want to do it.’
- 2 *an hayyo.*  
‘I’m not going to do it.’
- 3 P1 *way?*  
‘Why?’

- 4 P3 <@ *namca sayngkyeseyo* @>@@  
 ‘<@ I have a boyfriend now. @> @@’
- 5 P1 *cinccaya?*  
 ‘Is it true?’
- 6 *cincca sayngkyesse ?*  
 ‘Do you really have a boyfriend now?’
- 7 P3 *kitalyepoayo.*  
 ‘Wait a second, though.’
- 8 *acik acik sengsatoyñ ken anintey @@*  
 ‘It (our relationship) is not confirmed yet @@.’
- 9 P1 *um nenun?*  
 ‘Hmm, how about you?’
- 10 *ne epse?*  
 ‘You don’t have one (a boyfriend)?’
- 11→ *ne ha-ca [kulem].*  
 you do-HORT then  
 ‘Let’s you do it (then).’
- 12 P3 *[yayto] sayngkil keeyyo.*  
 ‘She is about to have a boyfriend as well.’
- 13 *icey nayka haycwul keeyyo.*  
 ‘I’ll get her one.’
- 14 P1 *[a kulay?]*  
 ‘Oh, is that right?’
- 15 P4 *[ce sokaything] sokaything kathun ke an hayyo.*  
 ‘I don’t do such things as blind dates.’

When P3 refuses P1’s suggestion of a blind date, P1 redirects his attention to P4 (line 9). He first asks P4 if she is currently seeing someone in line 10, but then, without waiting, demands in line 11 that she go on the blind date, using *-ca*. The function of *ca* (line 11) is never cohortative, as it is clear that P1 intends only P4 to engage in the proposed action; in short, it is an imperative. However, the use of *-ca* here is different than in the previous excerpt in (20), where it was used in a polite imperative. In (20), the speaker P1 uses *-ca* pretending she would join in the focal-event, but the context makes it clear that only Hs would perform it. In (21), however, it is evident that P1 has no intention of participating in the blind date himself. Unlike the polite imperative *-ca* in (20), *-ca* in (21) does not reduce the degree of assertiveness. Rather, P1’s utterance (line 11) is a demand, as he does not even wait for P4’s response to his own question (‘You don’t have a boyfriend?’

in line 10) before urging her to participate in the blind date. Thus, *-ca* in (21) functions to request H (P4) to join with S in consenting to a proposition, which is that H will perform the focal-event. As in this example, the accordant imperative *-ca* functions to demand that H accord with S that he /she will perform the focal-event.

One distinction between the imperative *-ca* (polite and accordant imperatives) and the cohortative *-ca* is in their co-occurrence with hedges or other restrictive expressions such as *com* 'a little', *han* 'one', *han pen* 'once', and *-man* 'only'. In our data, the percentage of cases of co-occurring hedges and other restrictive expressions was notably higher with the imperative *-ca* (29.9%) than with the cohortative *-ca* (15.3%). Considering that hedges mitigate or soften assertive force to a certain degree (Brown and Levinson 1987, 145), it is natural that they often co-occur with *-ca*. Because the nature of *-ca* is to convey directive illocutionary force that can potentially threaten the hearer's 'negative face' (Brown and Levinson 1987, 61), these hedges can function as politeness strategies in both cohortative and polite imperative uses of *-ca*. The higher frequency of co-occurring hedges with the polite imperative *-ca* can be attributed to the higher degree of directive assertiveness in imperative than in cohortative uses. (20) shows an example of the co-occurring expression *han pen* 'once' with the imperative use of *-ca* (line 1). The expression does not literally mean 'once', but functions as a mitigator that reduces the assertive force.

Another difference between imperative *-ca* and cohortative *-ca* lies in the co-occurrence of explicit references to participants. Explicit participant references co-occur with 12.6% of the corpus data's tokens of imperative *-ca*, and with 17.8% of the tokens of cohortative *-ca*. This difference is not great, but there are also notable differences in both the type of participants referred to and the motivations for these explicit references. First, *ne* 'you' co-occurs with the imperative function while *wuli* 'we', *na-lang* [I-with] 'with me', and *kathi* 'together' co-occur with the cohortative function. As described in Section 3.1.2, explicit reference to participants co-occurs with cohortative *-ca* when S wants to delimit the number of the participants in the invitation, or when S changes the discourse topic by making an invitation to join a suggested action. The situation is different with the polite imperative *-ca*. The excerpt in (21) shows an example of accordant imperative *-ca* co-occurring with the explicit subject *ne* 'you', which points to one of Hs, P4. Here, the co-occurring subject pinpoints the person whose attention S wishes to draw in order to direct that person to perform the focal-action.

It is noteworthy to mention that even among the imperative uses of *-ca*, the two subfunctions (polite and accordant imperatives) showed significant differences with each other in terms of their constructional characteristics. First of all, out of 87 imperative uses of *-ca*, 49 were polite imperative uses, and 35 were

accordant imperative uses (3 ambiguous cases combined). The co-occurrence of hedges or restrictive expressions was higher with polite imperative (24.5%) than accordant imperative (14.3%), which can be accounted for the higher degree of politeness in the polite imperative type. Besides co-occurring hedging expressions, 16.3% of polite imperative *-ca* co-occurred with the discourse marker *ca* (for example, see the excerpt in (20), line 6), whose main function is to urge or to encourage H to do something (Kim 2008), similar to the discourse markers *now* and *come on* in English. Accordant imperative *-ca*, on the other hand, never occurred with the discourse marker *ca*. This difference correlates with the fact that accordant imperative has higher degree of assertive force than the polite imperative, and that the latter has more encouraging, soothing tone than the former. Moreover, not only was the percentage of co-occurring explicit subject quite considerable, being 22.9% for accordant imperative and 6.1% for polite imperative, the types of co-occurring subjects were different in each subtype as well. While the explicit subjects co-occurring with the accordant imperative were mostly vocative terms and expression denoting to the 2nd person such as *ne* 'you', polite imperative often co-occurred with *wuli* 'us'. This difference can be attributed to the fact that the speakers of polite imperative *-ca* strategically pretend to join in the described action, to reduce the strong assertive force of imperative speech act.

### 3.3 Speaker hortative *-ca*: 1st person performer(s) of the focal-event

The third most frequent use (33 occurrences) of *-ca* (see Table 2) is when the performer of the focal-event is the 1st person, which always includes S of the utterance: it is often the case that S is using *-ca* as a means to warn H about his/her own future action, as in (22).

(22) (Context: P1 has been accepted for early admission to a university, meaning he does not have to take the national college entrance exam. P1 is now talking about the jealous reaction of his classmates, who had not believed that he would get early admission.)

1 P1 *Sinkaka swunung polkkenya?*

'(They asked me,) Hey, Sinkak, are you going to take the college entrance exam?'

2 *kuttaykkacinun pollako kulaysseyo.*

'At that time, I was going to take the test,'

3 *poaya toyci anhulkka kulayssteni,*

'So I said, I guess I should take it, don't you think? and then they were like,'

- 4 *ssipal ham poatwunta ikeci?*  
‘Fuck, now you’re just gonna take it for fun, right?’
- 5 <@ *mak ilen pwunwuykiya=,@>*  
‘<@ The atmosphere was like that=, @>’
- 6 <@ *kulay= ham ponta ikeci, @>*  
‘<@ Alright= you’re just gonna take it for fun, huh? @>’
- 7→ <@ *Ung kulay elma-na cal po-na po-ca, @>*  
yes right how.much-ADD well see-NCOMT see-HORT  
‘<@ (They were like,) Alright then, let us see how well you do on the exam.’ @>’
- 8 <@ *mak ilen pwunwuykiya, @>*  
‘<@ The atmosphere was just like that, @>’

In line 7, P1 quotes a classmate using a *-ca* utterance. At least superficially, *-ca* in line 7 functions to invite H (P1) to join S (the quoted classmate) in the action of seeing how well H (P1) does on the exam. However, this utterance is not an actual invitation, but a rhetorical one; it is unlikely that P1 would have to intentionally watch his own performance on the exam, and it is S alone who intends to watch whether P1 does well in the exam or not. The underlying true intention of S in line 7 is to threaten H, by warning that S will be watching how well P1 does in the exam.

Another function of *-ca* with a 1st person performer of the focal-event is to convey S’s intention to ask H to perform a different action (not explicitly mentioned) so that S him-/herself can perform the focal-event. (23) is such an example.

(23) (Context: P1 and P2 are examining a recording machine and the functions of its speaker and microphone.)

- 1 P1 *nanun,*  
‘For me,’
- 2 P2 *toynun keya?*  
‘Is it working?’
- 3 P1 *cal toyko isse.*  
‘It’s working well.’
- 4 *yeki twilo tullye.*  
‘I can hear from back here.’
- 5 *a a a a a.*  
‘Ah-ah-ah-ah-ah.’

- 6→ P2 *na-to han pen tul-e-po-ca.*  
 I-ADD one time hear-CON-try-HORT  
 ‘Let’s me listen to it for once.’
- 7 *malha-y-po-a.*  
 say-CON-try-IND  
 ‘Try to say something.’
- 8 P1 *cal tullye?*  
 ‘Can you hear me well?’
- 9 P2 *e cal tullye.*  
 ‘Yeah, I can hear you well.’

In line 6, the explicit subject, *na* ‘I’, is used to let H know that the performer of the focal-action would be solely S herself, and not H. Hence, *-ca* in (23) is clearly not used cohortatively. Nevertheless, the *-ca* utterance is still an invitation for H to perform a joint action: S is asking H (P1) to join her in creating the situation in which she (P2) listens to the recorder. Hence, P2 is indirectly demanding that P1 perform an action so that the focal-event (P2 listening to the recorder) becomes true. Although the action that P2 wishes P1 to perform is not explicit in line 6, P2 reveals the implicit request overtly in the following utterance by using an imperative utterance, ‘Try to say something’. We call this specific use of *-ca* the *speaker hortative*, as S is asking H to join in making it possible for S to perform the focal-event.

The speaker hortative *-ca* co-occurs with an explicit reference to a 1st person subject such as *na* ‘I’ in 13.8% of its occurrences in our data. Moreover, the speaker hortative *-ca* co-occurs with hedging expressions such as *han pen* ‘once’ or *com* ‘a little’ in more than half of the cases (51.7%). (23) shows an instance of the co-occurrence of *han pen* ‘once’ with the speaker hortative *-ca* (line 6), and (24) shows an instance co-occurring with *com*.

- (24) (Context: Six friends are meeting in a pub after work. They are exchanging their name cards)
- 1 P2 *ttak sey cang.*  
 ‘(I have) Exactly three (name cards).’
- 2→ P3 *ahyu eti acwumma<sup>11</sup> myengham com pat-a-po-ca.*  
 DM DM married.woman name.card DM receive-CON-try-HORT  
 ‘Hey, let’s me (us) receive your *acwumma*’s name card.’
- 3 P2 <@ a *acwumma acwumma haney cincca.*@>  
 ‘<@ Ah, stop calling me *acwumma.* @>’

11. In Korea, *acwumma* refers to any married woman. Prior to the conversation in (24), the speakers talked about P2’s wedding. Thus, *acwumma* in line 3 is used to make fun of P2’s new marital status.



It is evident that *-ca* (line 2) in (24) is not used to invite H (P<sub>2</sub>) to join the focal-event described in the utterance, ‘receive, or have, P<sub>2</sub>’s name card’, as it is not very likely that P<sub>2</sub> would be receiving her own name card from herself. Hence, the participant who would be performing the focal-event is solely the 1st person (either S only or S and other participants of the conversation). Similar to (23), *-ca* in (24) is used to invite P<sub>2</sub> to perform a joint action: P<sub>3</sub> is asking P<sub>2</sub> to join her in bringing about the event of P<sub>3</sub> receiving P<sub>2</sub>’s name card. This is another instance in which S is indirectly demanding H to perform an action (that P<sub>2</sub> hand over her name card) so that the focal-event (P<sub>3</sub> receiving P<sub>2</sub>’s name card) becomes true.

In (24), *com* ‘a little’ is found within the same utterance as the speaker hortative *ca*. The highly frequent co-occurrence (51.7%) of hedging expressions with speaker hortative *-ca* is related to the underlying assertiveness of the construction. The intention underlying this use is to demand that H act to change the current state of affairs so that S can perform the intended focal-event, although the speaker hortative *-ca* is formulated as an invitation to H to perform a joint action. A hedging expression can mitigate the strong assertiveness of the construction, which can potentially threaten H’s negative face.

### 3.4 Exhortative *-ca*: 3rd person performer(s) of the focal-event

The least frequent use of *-ca* (Table 2) is when the intended-performer of the focal-event is solely the 3rd person, with a single occurrence. Ammann and van der Auwera (2001, 345) call this function the *exhortative* (see Section 2.1) and only one example was found in our data as in (25).

(25) (Context: Three people are discussing their disappointment with the current president of their club.)

- 1 P<sub>3</sub> *phaycang XX tasi ppopaya toyl ke kathay*,  
‘We need to elect the head of the club again.’
- 2 P<sub>1</sub> *e?*  
‘What?’
- 3 P<sub>3</sub> *hoycang tasi tasi nawaya toyl ke kathtako*,  
‘I’m saying that a new president needs to be elected.’
- 4 *twul ta an tway*,  
‘Neither of them is qualified.’
- 5→ P<sub>1</sub> *wuli seys cwung-eyse ha-ca-ko?*  
we three middle-LOC do-HORT-COMP  
‘What you’re saying is, “Let’s one of us three do it”?’
- 6 P<sub>3</sub> *kum nwuka hay?*  
‘Who else is going to do it, then?’

When P<sub>3</sub> expresses his unhappiness with the current president of their club, P<sub>1</sub> uses *ca* (line 5) to suggest what P<sub>3</sub> is implying: ‘What you’re saying is, “Let’s one of us three do it”?’: *-Ca* is used exhortatively because the performer of the focal-event described in the utterance (‘one of us’) is not a specifically denoted person. Although the performer is neither S nor Hs, but a yet-unknown person, *-ca* is still used to invite Hs to perform a joint action with S (P<sub>3</sub>). The joint action that S wishes to perform is to reach an agreement that can make the yet-unknown person (one of us) become the new president.<sup>12</sup>

#### 4. Conclusion

We have argued that the varied functions of the Korean *-ca* hortative construction deserve a thorough re-investigation with attested data of interactional discourse, because of the significant illocutionary nature of the hortative. To this end, the study has revisited the uses of the hortative *-ca* in naturally occurring conversational data. Our findings show that *-ca* has various functions: the marker indicates that the performer of the focal-event encoded in the utterance may be (i) the 1st person plural subject, i.e., S and other interlocutors (cohortative); (ii) the 2nd person, i.e., H(s) (polite imperative/accordant hortative); (iii) the 1st person, i.e., S (speaker hortative); and (iv) the 3rd person (exhortative). Our findings from this usage-based approach are significant in that they provide clear, direct evidence for the different degrees of prototypicality among these various functions, which are supported by the detailed frequency counts of each function.

Furthermore, this study identified two new functions, the *accordant imperative* and the *speaker hortative*. These two proposed functional categories should be useful in investigating utterances within the family of constructions with direc-

---

12. Anonymous reviewers pointed out that the example in (25) is not an exhortative use because the performer of the action is one of the speakers in the context, and also that a single occurrence would not validate a functional category. However, this performer is not yet specified, and the explicit subject *wuli seys cwung* ‘one of us three’ is clearly a third person subject, not *us*, *you*, or *me*, which makes a valid example of ‘exhortative’ category. Moreover, a single occurrence does not necessarily indicate that the category is not valid. As a matter of fact, the exhortative subfunction of *-ca* has elsewhere been reported by a number of scholars. For instance, Park (n.d.,1) provides a made-up sentence such as *ipen-ey-nun Inho-ka ka-ca* [this.time-LOC-TOP Inho-NOM go-HORT] ‘Let’s Inho go this time’. The occurrence of exhortative *-ca* in actual usage can be extremely rare, as it can only be used in a very specific situation: one in which the future state of affairs can be changed by a 3rd person, and must be primarily based on agreement between S and H. The rare occurrence would indeed indicate the highly specified function of the exhortative *-ca*.

tive illocutionary force, allowing more descriptive granularity. The *accordant imperative* is concerned with the functional territory between imperative and polite imperative in that S seeks his/her counterpart's consent with some degree of assertiveness, rather than directing H to do something. The *speaker hortative* involves an imperative speech act, although what S intends H to do is not described in the utterance, but rather is indirectly implied in relation to the focal-event. In this respect, this investigation contributes to typological studies of utterances with directive illocutionary force.

This usage-based approach has also revealed that although all the subfunctions employ *-ca*, one differs from another depending on whether or not it co-occurs with a hedging expression and/or an explicit subject within the utterance, and on the type of the explicit subject it co-occurs with. The discussion can be summarized as follows:

- Cohortative *-ca*: mostly without explicit subject, only 17.8%, but for discourse strategic purposes,
- Polite Imperative *-ca*: higher tendency to co-occur with hedges/restrictive expressions and discourse marker *ca*,
- Accordant Imperative *-ca*: higher tendency to co-occur with explicit subject denoting 2nd person, such as *ne* 'you'
- Speaker hortative *-ca*: higher tendency to co-occur with hedges/restrictive expressions, higher tendency to co-occur with explicit subject denoting 1st person, such as *na* 'me',
- Exhortative *-ca*: co-occurrence of explicit subject denoting 3rd person, such as *wuli seys cwung* 'one of us three'

These formal and functional differences qualify each of them to be a distinctive construction, which is the rationale behind this paper's proposal of the two newly proposed constructions.

## Funding

This work was supported by 2020 Research Fund of Myongji University to Ahrim Kim and by Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Research Fund to Iksoo Kwon.

## References

- Ahn, Mikyung. 2016. "Emotion in Interaction: A Diachronic and Pragmatic Analysis of the Sentence-Final Particle *-Tani* in Korean." *Studies in Language* 40(4): 872–893.  
<https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.40.4.04ahn>
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2016. "Sentence Types." In *The Oxford Handbook of Modality and Mood*, ed. by Ian Nuyts and Johan van der Auwera, 141–165. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ammann, Andreas, and Johan van der Auwera. 2001. "Complementizer-Headed Main Clauses for Volitional Moods in the Languages of South-Eastern Europe: A Balkanism?" In *Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today* 67, ed. by Olga Mišeka Tomić, 341–362. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813085>
- Clark, Herbert H. 1996. *Using Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620539>
- Doh, Jae Hak. 2016. "On the Strategies and Grammatical Categories that Denote a Concept of 'Wish' in Korean." *Emwunnoncip* 78: 361–390.
- Du Bois, John W., Schuetze-Coburn, Stephan, Cumming, Susanna, and Paolino Dane. 1993. "Outline of Discourse Transcription." In *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research*, ed. by Jane A. Edwards and Martin D. Lampert, 45–89. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Jeon, Byung-yong. 1999. *Cwungsekykwueuy Emi -Niyey Tayhan Yenkwu* [A Study on the Ending -Ni in Middle Korean]. Seoul: Cheongtongkewul.
- Kim, Young-cheol. 2008. "A Study on the Discourse Function of 'JA' to Discourse Marker in Korean language." *Kwukemwunhak* 45: 5–23.
- Koo, Hyun Jung and Seongha Rhee. 2008. "Manipulated Hypotheticality in Conditionals: A Journey in Search of Strength and Diversity." Paper presented at the 4th New Reflections on Grammaticalization Conference, Catholic University of Leuven, July 16–19, 2008.
- Lim, Dong-Hoon. 2011. "Sentence Types and Uses in Korean." *Journal of Korea Linguistics* 60: 323–359.
- Mauri, Caterina, and Andrea Sansò. 2011. "How Directive Constructions Emerge: Grammaticalization, Constructionalization, Cooptation." *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 3489–3521. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.08.001>
- Na, Eun-mee. 2002. "The Function of the Korean Utterance-Final Marker '-Pstita' with Focus on its Directive Function." *Icwungenehak* 20: 93–110.
- Palmer, F.R. 2001. *Mood and Modality (2nd edition)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139167178>
- Park, Sook-young. 2012. "Studies on Behaviors Accompanied by Hortative Utterances: A Case Study of '-(U)psita, -Ca'." Paper presented at the 16th Fall Korean Language Culture Education Conference. Yonsei University, Seoul, October 20.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2016. "From Quoting to Reporting to Stance-Marking: Rhetorical Strategies and Intersubjectification of Reportative." *Language Sciences* 55: 36–54.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2016.02.003>
- Rhee, Seongha. 2017. "What Happens When the Will Withers: The Case of Hortative in Korean." *Lingua* 189–190: 51.

- Rhee, Seongha. (To appear). "Pseudo-Hortative and the Development of the Discourse Marker *Eti Poca* 'Well, Let's See' in Korean." *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 21(1) (2020).
- Sohn, Ho-Min. 1999. *The Korean Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C., and Richard B. Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van der Auwera, Johan, Nina Dobrushina, and Valentin Goussev. In press. "A Semantic Map for Imperative-Hortatives." In *Points of Comparison in Linguistics: from Morphology to Discourse*, ed. by Dominique Willems, Timothy Coleman and Bart Defrancq, 1–20. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Van der Auwera, Johan, Nina Dobrushina, and Valentin Goussev. 2003. "Imperative-Hortative systems." In *World Atlas of Language Structures*, ed. by Matthew Dryer, Martin Haspelmath, David Gil, and Bernard Comrie, 294–297. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

## Appendix A. Abbreviations

ADD	Additive	HORT	Hortative
ANT	Anterior	HON	Honorific
ATTR(RL)	Attributive (Realis)	HON.END	Honorific ending
CIRCUM	Circumstantial	IMPF	Imperfective
COMT	Committal	INTER	Interrogative
CON	Connective	NCOMT	Non-committative
CONJ	Conjunction	NECESSZ	necessitative
DM	Discourse marker	SPF	Sentence final particle
FH.EV	First hand evidential		

## Appendix B. Transcription Conventions

The transcription conventions used by the 21st Century Sejong Corpus have been slightly modified to follow transcription conventions developed by Du Bois et al. (1993).

.	Final transitional continuity
,	Continuing transitional continuity
?	Appeal or rising intonation
!	Booster: Higher than expected pitch on a word
–	Truncated word
=	Lengthening of a segment
[ ]	Speech overlap
( )	Vocal noises
(( ))	Transcriber's comment
<X>	Uninterpretable syllable
<@ @>	Laughing voice quality

## **Publication history**

Date received: 22 April 2019

Date accepted: 15 January 2020

Published online: 3 July 2020