

Processes Underlying the Development of Korean Intensifiers: the Cases of "nemwu", "nemwunemwu" and "nem".*

Hijeon Kim

(Cyber Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)

Kim, Hijeon. 2008. Processes Underlying the Development of Korean Intensifiers: the Cases of "nemwu", "nemwunemwu" and "nem". *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, 16(3), 163-192. The Korean adverb "nemwu" has changed from a negative degree to a positive emphasis, being often used in pragmatic situations (Lim 2002). The present paper reevaluates "nemwu" in a usage-based approach to grammaticalization (Bybee 2001, 2006; Bybee & Hopper 2001) by providing semantic, functional and collocational evidence based on Korean corpora. In terms of scope, we concentrate on the relations between "nemwu" and the recent variants. Of particular interest is the recent emergence of various discourse functions of "nemwu," which can be associated with increasing circulation of the reduplicated form "nemwunemwu" (listed as an independent word on the modern dictionary) and the reduced emphatic form "nem" in spoken Korean. The question raised is, how and why the semantic extension and formal diversity of "nemwu" have come about. This article claims that the whole progress of "nemwu" is in accord with the universal grammaticalization path of discourse markers: decategorization, increase of pragmatic function, phonological reduction, persistence and increase in scope. Evidence suggests that the diversities in form and semantics can be explained through the correlations between frequency and degree of grammaticalization.

Key words: Grammaticalization, Usage-based Approach, Frequency Effects, Collocation Pattern, Semantic Extension, Degree Adverb.

1. Issues and the Corpora

* An earlier version of this paper was presented at The Third Seoul International Conference on Discourse and Cognitive Linguistics, held at Korea University, July 5-7, 2007. The author is indebted to Hwang, Yongjoo and Rhee, Seongha for comments and suggestions that led to improvements in the content and form of the paper. Also, this work was supported by Cyber Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Research Fund of 2007.

Observations of the Korean adverb "nemwu," have centered around its degree semantics. Its pragmatic functions have been briefly touched on, with little empirical data, but mainly limited to intensifying functions (Lim, 2002). Until now, little attention has been paid to its reduplicated form "nemwunemwu," and its reduced form "nem". More specifically, the question that needs to be answered is how and why these formal diversity or semantic polysemy have come about in the use of "nemwu." Among several intensifying adverbs in Korean such as "maywu," "acwu," or "cengmal," the adverb "nemwu" bears several distinctive features. That is, its reduplicated form "nemwu-nemwu" has been registered as an independent lexeme, "nemwunemwu," in the Korean dictionary (Modern Korean Dictionary 1999, The National Institute of the Korean Language). Along with the reduplication, the phonological reduction process can also be detected as seen in the "nem" variant, starting to gain circularity among younger people.

This issue questions how to accommodate such creation of a reduplicated lexeme or reduced form within a general framework of grammaticalization.¹⁾ Also raised is the question of why the reduplicated "nemwunemwu" has been registered as an independent lexeme while other duplicated Korean intensifiers such as "maywu-maywu," "acwu-acwu," or "cincca-cincca" have not undergone any univerbation²⁾ Responding to these queries, let us consider the various readings³⁾ of "nemwu" extracted from the present-day Korean corpus (Spoken Corpus in Sejong Balanced Corpora, 2004).

["nemwu1" : manner adverb ("nemwu")]

(1) nemwu yak-ul mekese pwulssang-hay

1) Different scholars have slightly different ideas about what kinds of language change constitute grammaticalization. Here, grammaticalization is defined as the process whereby lexical items and constructions come in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions and once grammaticalized, continue to develop new grammatical functions (Hopper and Traugott 1993).

2) Bybee (2001) defines univerbation as the diachronic process of combining a fixed expression of several words into a new single word.

3) Transliteration of the Korean data follows the Yale Romanization System.

- '(They) excessively took medicine ,(so I) feel sorry for them'
 ["Nemwu₂": degree adverb] ("nemwu")
- (2) Namphyen-i nemwu casang-hay
 'My husband is very sweet.'
 ["Nemwu₃": Discourse particle (maximizer)]
 ("nemwu"/"nemwunemwu"/"nem")
- (3) Wa, nemwunemwu caymi - iss -ta.
 'Wow, it's just so fun'
- (4) Ungungung, -huk, nem hayngpok-hay...
 (sobbing) '(I am) insanely/utterly happy!'

These different readings can be understood by the exposition of Geeraerts (1997) in which synchronic variations reflect diachronic changes. Given these various readings, two questions are at the heart of this study:

- a. How has "nemwu" been changed semantically or functionally?
- b. Is it possible to accommodate such various phenomena of "nemwu" within a usage-based approach to grammaticalization?

In order to find the diachronic pathways of its variants, we have employed the Korean historical corpus (Sejong Balanced Corpora) which contains 2.5 million eojuls.⁴⁾ For the present-day Korean data, the most recent spoken corpus in Korea (Spoken Corpus in Sejong Balanced Corpora, 2004), containing 0.88 million eojuls has been used.

2. The Developmental Path of "nemwu"

This chapter will examine the historical development of "nemwu". In general, it will discuss whether the present-day variations of "nemwu" are reflected historically or not. It will observe, more specifically, how apparently odd forms such as "nem" or 'nemwunemwu' can be systematically related with the original "nemwu" in terms of a diachronic

4) An 'eojul' refers to the morphosyntactic combination of one word and particle(s), or one word and ending(s), or one word alone. It can be identified in term of spacing. Thus, 'eojul' in Korean is different from the 'word' in English.

perspective. Figure 1 illustrates the historical appearance of these variants in the historical corpus (text data from the 15th to the 20th).

Figure 1. Variants of "nemwu" in the historical corpus

	MID KOREAN		EARLY MODERN KOREAN		MODERN KOREAN		
	15C	16C	17C	18C	19C	20C	21C
(1443) 너무(<i>ne-mwu</i>)							(2007)
(1443) 너므(<i>ne-mu</i>)				(1798)			
(1588) 넌오(<i>nem-o</i>)						(1913)	
(1443) 넌우(<i>nem-wu</i>)						(1934)	
(1443) 너모(<i>nem-o</i>)						(1975)	
너무너무 (<i>nemwunemwu</i>)							...>
넌 (<i>nem</i>)							...>

With more than six hundred years of recorded Korean history, "nemwu" (exceedingly/excessively) can be easily found in different historical texts, though it had several phonological variants such as "ne-mu" (너므), "ne-mo" (너모), "nem-wu" (넌우), "nem-o" (넌오). The first attested occurrence of "nemwu" (너무), "ne-mu" (너므), nem-wu" (넌우), and "nemo" (너모) constructions dated back to the middle of the 15th century when the Korean alphabet was invented. During the 16th to 18th centuries, all five variants coexisted. Among these variants, the "nemwu" variant comprised one of the oldest layers, outliving the rest of the variants. It is only "nemwu" which has survived the 21st century. In addition, the data suggest that "nemwunemwu" and "nem", the most recent variants have emerged from the 21st century. The following sections deal with the development of "nemwu" which will be divided into three stages according to its meanings or functions.

2.1. Stage I "nemwu₁" : [NEGATIVITY] [EXTREMITY]

Let us consider early uses of "nemwu":

- (5) pilom mAchAsyamAn hay pilomAl nilkwup cipuy nemwu anihAsyam kAthAni chilkain swui chAketun nAoynamAn cipuy kati anihAsilssila. < 1464 Kumkangkyeng, 05>
'When you beg, do not ask for more than 7 houses (do not beg

excessively). If he has completed the seventh begging, he never continues his begging.'

- (6) seykanay cwunghAni sinmyengey nemuni epsuni posali pepul wihAya mwulyangkep cwungey sinmyengul pAlye. SihAya ilchey cwungsayngngAl cwunAni <1464 Kumkangkyeng, 71>
'There is nothing which could exceed the importance of one's life (which is more important than one's life) in the world. For the teaching of Buddhism, Bodhisattva sacrificed his life in immeasurably long ages and granted it to mankind'.

The examples in stage I unveil the historical origin and core semantics of "nemwu." It has been generally accepted that the degree adverb "nemwu" was derived from the verb "nem" (verb stem meaning "going over the limit or exceed) plus adverbial suffix "wu", analyzed as "nem" (verb stem) + "wu" (suffix). However, the 15th century corpus data as seen in (5) show that the early examples also originate in "nemwum" (verb stem) + "i"(noun suffix) : "nemuni" (너므니), becoming shortened and lead to the emergence of the "nemu"(너므) variant starting from 1432, as shown in (6). Between 1588-1798 all five variants ("nem-wu," "ne-mu," "ne-mwu," "ne-mo," "nem-o") seemed to coexist competing for a specialization into a grammaticalization path, as seen in figure 1. We can ascribe the critical grammaticalization stage for the "nemwu" construction to the first half of the 20th century because the "ne-mwu" type begins to greatly outnumber the "ne-mo" type, leveling out "ne-mu," "nem-wu" and "nem-o" as obsolete forms. Nonetheless an in-depth investigation of the relations among these variants awaits further study.

In the examples above, "nemwu" denotes 'excessively' (do not beg excessively) in (5) and 'exceeding' (not exceed the importance of one's life) in (6). "Nemwu" is associated with a definite/extreme boundary (limit or norm), presupposing the appropriate norms of begging in (5) and the limit in the importance of one's life in (6). Therefore, it conveys the original [EXTREMITY] meaning. Still now, the semantics of 'exceedingly' with a negative implication constitute the core meaning of "nemwu" as defined in the dictionary (Modern Korean Dictionary, The National Institute of the Korean Language, 1999).

With regard to the elements modified by "nemwu", table 1 demonstrates how much descriptive predicates and evaluative predicates take up in all tokens.

Table 1. Collocation patterns of "nemwu" in the 15th-16th centuries(from the Historical corpus of 2.5 million eoju)

	15-16C [nemwu]
<negative device> -not [ani, mot] -others	47.37%(N=18) 52.63% (N=20)
<modified element> I. evaluative predicate -negative predicate -positive predicate II. descriptive predicate	15.78%(N=6) -83% (N=5) -17%(N=1) 84.21(N=32)
total	100% (N=38)

Seen from table 1, predicates modified by "nemwu" are descriptive (84.21%), by far outnumbering evaluative predicates (15.78%). This means that, frequent collocations are descriptive predicates implying inherent negativity such as "thohata" (vomit), "nipta" (be taken in), "ccochkita" (be chased), "tanghata" (be taken in), "epta" (carry on one's back), "pokta" (fry) and "cita" (lose). The proportion of descriptive predicates can be significant since descriptive predicates involve objective description of situations, thus not implying subjective degree meaning. Nonetheless, the table shows that evaluative predicates such as "sulphuta" (sad), "tepta" (hot), "keyuluta" (lazy), also comprise 15.78%. Even though the detailed description of the modified predicates of "nemwu" in the historical corpus will be presented in the following subsection, this finding indicates that even earlier uses of "nemwu" could involve degree meaning. These dual functions attest ambiguity or polysemy between the original [EXTREMITY] and degree function.

Also manifested is the significance of [NEGATIVITY]. The negative devices such as "mot" (not) or "ani" (not), take up 47.37%. By way of its content [EXTREMITY] and the attendant implication of [NEGATIVITY], "nemwu" occurred far more frequently (83%) with

negative collocates.

The data we have seen imply that during the 15th and 16th centuries, "nemwu" or other phonological variants had served primarily as manner adverbs meaning "excessively" or "going beyond the acceptable norm."

2.2 Stage II "nemwu₂": [HIGH DEGREE]

The stage II discusses how "nemwu" had generalized more from [NEGATIVITY], [EXTREMITY] to [HIGH DEGREE], [POSITIVITY] during the 17th-20th centuries. That is, "nemwu" underwent gradual semantic change, mostly derived from the specific linguistic context, turning into a positive degree intensifier. This might be observed by the increasing rate of positive evaluative predicates collocated with "nemwu."

We have seen that [NEGATIVITY] was prevalent during the 15th and 16th centuries. Only one occurrence of 'positive degree' semantics of "nemwu" was detected in the 15th and 16th centuries, in the year 1481, as demonstrated in (7). This was more than a hundred years later than the earliest instances of "nemwu."

- (7) hoki i pcochiita homAl tutnon tAshAyoni nemwu kiskesyeyewuls
ilAl mutnola (1481 Tusienhay, 55)
'Hearing the news that the army of the invaders was being chased,
he was very happy so he asked about the capital news'.

This positive meaning seems to have spread more widely in the early 20th century, as shown in (8)-(10).

- (8) hephansyeka I ketongul poko skelskel wusumye we-kulya ung
nemwu pankawa kulihAci (celhaci)
<1932 Chwuphwungkampyelkok, 34>
'Minister He laughing loudly seeing the situation- Yes, I am doing
this because I am just so happy to see you.'
- (9) (lopwuin) kukesun nAyka calmoshAyaski nAyka netAlye syacoylul
aninAnunya nAyintul esci hyekyungika muywesye kulihAyeskAys
nunya ta nelul nemwu salanghAnAn skAtAlki aninya.

<1912 Twukyenseng, 28>

'I am apologizing because I know what I have done wrong. 'Would I have done it because I hated Hye-gyung?, It's just because I love her so much'.

- (10) pwuin cyungey hAn pwuni wusumye malhAkilAl wuli mAAmi
nemwu kispwukilo tyohwahAya tAytapul moshAn kesila hAteita

<1901 Sinhakwelpo, 01,317>

'One of the ladies laughed and said, we were speechless.'because we were really happy and liked it so much'.

Examples (8)-(10) exhibit that on-going grammaticalization of "nemwu₁" ("nemwu₂") that took place within particular linguistic contexts: ["nemwu"+ positive evaluative predicates] structure. For instance, "nemwu heyngpokhata" (very happy) found in (8) and (10) and "nemwu salanghata" (love so much) in (9) predominantly contribute semantic generalization to a positive degree while other contexts, e.g., ["nemwu" + negative predicates] as in "nemwu tanghata" (extremely suffered) do not trigger positive emphasis meaning. In other words, in "nemwu tanghata" (extremely suffered), its original meaning [being excessive (beyond the appropriate norm)], was able to imply only negativity. In contrast, the contexts "nemwu heyngpokhata" (very happy) and "nemwu salanghata" (love her very much) could lead to positive degree semantics since they encode a 'high degree of being happy' or a 'high degree of loving her' rather than the negative implication of 'the feeling of happiness goes beyond the appropriate norm' or 'My love for her is excessive'. As "nemwu" is extended to [being high in degree] without necessarily exhibiting negativity, it begins to be used in far wider contexts due to its neutrality (\pm positivity) in semantics.

In addition to the specific context, the inherent scalar meanings found in gradable adjectives such as "heyngpokhata" (very happy) found in (8) and (10), or stative predicates with a gradable implication such as "salanghata" (love so much) appears to make a contribution to invoke [DEGREE] readings. Predicates based on scale schema [SCALARITY] lead "nemwu" to develop grammatical degree-reinforcing functions applicable to both

negative and positive contexts. In the case of "nemwu" as a reinforcer, the schematic function of degree and subjective stance has emerged, since the scalar meaning is always subjective.

This observation supports Bybee's hypothesis of grammaticalization (2001) in which new meaning emerges from a specific context and is beginning to spread into other contexts. When "nemwu" functions as a degree reinforcer, it has undergone a semantic generalization from propositional content [EXTREMITY] to an exponent of an abstract notion of [DEGREE]. However, this semantic generalization appears to have taken place mostly during the period of the 1900s-1930s, approximately 500 years after the first instances of "nemwu."

In order to further substantiate the [DEGREE] reading of "nemwu", we apply the following tests. First, the role of "nemwu" can be replaced by other intensifying degree adverbs such as "acwu" (very), "maywu" (very).

(11) ung acwu / maywu pankawa kulihaci (celhaci)

<1932 Chwuphwungkampyelkok, 34>

'Yes, I am doing this (bowing) because I am just very happy to see you.'

Replacing "nemwu" with "cokum" (a little), seen in (12) which has a minimizing function in the scale, brings about the opposite meaning without causing any pragmatic breakdown.

(12) ung cokum pankawa kulihaci(celhaci)

<1932 Chwuphwungkampyelkok, 34>

'Yes, I am doing this (bowing) because (I am) a little happy to see you.'

On the contrary, paraphrasing it into an extreme adverb in Korean "cinachikey"(too much) makes the sentence sound strange, suggesting that "nemwu₂" is diverged from its original propositional meaning of [NEGATIVITY], [EXTREMITY].

(13) ung nemwu pankawa kulihaci(celhaci)

<Chwuphwungkampyelkok 1932, 34>

'Yes, I am doing this (bowing) because (I am) exceedingly* happy to see you.'

On this basis, it can be argued that "nemwu" had gained the primary

effect of degree intensifying during the early 20th century. This claim is also supported by the corpus data as demonstrated in table 2⁵⁾.

Table 2. Collocation patterns of "nemwu" from the Historical corpus (2.5 million eoju)

	15-16C [nemwu]	1900-1930 [nemwu]
<negative device> -not [ani, mot] others	47.37%(N=18) 52.63% (N=20)	21.92%(N=25) 78.08% (N=89)
<modified element> I. evaluative predicate -negative predicate -positive predicate II. descriptive predicate	15.78%(N=6) -83% (N=5) -17%(N=1) 84.21(N=32)	30.70%(N=35) -71.4%(N=25) -28.6%(N=10) 69.29%(N=79)
total	100% (N=38)	100% (N=114)

The increasing ratio of evaluative predicates is significant since evaluative predicates are inherently gradable and subjective, contrary to descriptive predicates. By comparing the data between Middle Korean and the early 20th century, we see that the positive association of "nemwu" had increased from 17% to 28.6%. Conversely, the gradual weakening of its inherent [NEGATIVITY] is also observed by the decreased rate of negative sentences (21.92%) in the usages of 1910-1930, compared to 47.37% during the 15-16th century. In summation, we can assume that [HIGH DEGREE] function started as early as Middle Korean and was more generally accepted in the early 20th century.

As mentioned before, the details of the modified elements in table 2 will be provided in table 3 in which the frequent adjectives or verbs that co-occurred with "nemwu" are compared between the 15-16C and 1900-1930.

5) The data of the 15-16th century and 1900-1930 are all extracted from the same corpus. Thus, what counts here is not the absolute frequency rather the comparative ratio of the collocational patterns of "nemwu" between the 15-16C and 1900-1930.

Table 3. modified elements of "nemwu" in the 15-16C and 1900-19630 (historical corpus)

	15-16C(N=38)[nemwu]	1900-1930 (N=114) [nemwu]
collocation	[mekta] eat(N=19) [sulphuta]sad(N=4) [tepta] hot(N=3) [thohata] vomit(N=3) [hata] do (N=2) [keyuluta] lazy(N=2) [cekkey] little(N=2) [ccochohata]be chased(N=1) [tanghata]be taken in (N=1) [epta]carry on one's back(N=1) [pokta]fry,(N=1) [alta]know(N=1) [cital]lose(N=1)	[manhta] many(N=16) [kwahata] excessive (N=13) [elyepta] difficult(N=11) [mwusepta] scary(N=9) [kekcehata]worry(N=6) [sangsimhata]distress(N=2) [simhata] exceedingly (N=2) [nathanata] appear (N=1) [mitta] believe(N=1) [pota] look, (N=1) [canta] sleep(N=1) [patta] take(N=1)

In terms of the collocational patterns of "nemwu" shown in table 3, the combination of "nemwu" with the adjective 'excessive' ("nemwu" + "kwahata" (too much) and "nemwu" + "simhata" (beyond the norm) comprises the second most frequent collocation pattern even in the early 20th century. A general suggestion from this is that its earlier meaning still dominated up until the early 20th century. Nonetheless table 2 and 3 suggest the spread of [DEGREE] meaning which can be indicated by the frequency of collocating evaluative degree predicates (30.7%) such as "elyepta" (difficult), "mwusepta" (scary), "kekcehata" (worry), "sangsimhata" (distress), "simhata" (exceedingly) and "mitta" (believe). They had about doubled compared to the 15-16th century data (15.78%).

From this evidence it is safe to say that from the middle Korean up until the early 20th century, the original semantics have undergone changes which is partly reflected by the drastic increase of evaluative predicates and positive collocates. That is, [being excessive] in "nemwu" has been increasingly extended to take up [being high in degree] up until the early 20th century. Without necessarily exhibiting negativity, it begins to be used in far wider contexts due to its neutrality (\pm positivity) in semantics.

3.3. Stage III "nemwu"/"nemwunemwu"/"nem": Discourse Markers

With the development of "nemwu" to a degree intensifier, observed up until the early 20th century, "nemwu" has come to be used much more generally in contexts, owing to its neutral value (\pm positivity). Following the expositions of context expansions within grammaticalization, this would contribute the drastic frequency increase of "nemwu". In the 21th century, 1879 hits of "nemwu" were found out of a 0.96 million eoju corpus. This extremely high frequency seems to act as the major driving force, activating "nemwu" to have undergone further grammaticalization, following a usage-based model (Bybee 2001, 2003). Assuming the strong correlations between frequency and degree of grammaticalization, stage III investigates whether "nemwu" has progressed to more advanced grammaticalization, developing further into discourse functions.

Table 4. Functions of "nemwu" variants in the present-day corpus
(Spoken Korean corpus 2004)

	[nemwu]	[nemwunemwu]	[nem]
Types of function			
-adverb(exceedingly)	-10.91%(N=205)	-7.4%(N=2)	-0% (N=0)
-degree intensifier	-80.20%(N=1507)	-22.22%(N=6)	-33.33%(N=5)
-discourse marker	-8.89%(N=167)	-70.37%(N=19)	-66.67%(N=10)
total	N=1879	N=27	N=15

The present-day corpus data shown in table 4 clearly illustrate that the functions of "nemwu" have been extended to serve for discourse strategies. The above present-day spoken data demonstrate that speakers have increasingly used "nemwu" or newly emerged forms, "nemwunemwu," "nem," as discourse markers⁶ which is well manifested in table 4. In particular, the innovative variants ("nemwunemwu", "nem") seem to contribute predominantly to the evolutionary path of "nemwu" development from degree meaning into discourse-pragmatic uses. Table 4 discloses that discourse functions account for the overwhelming majority (70.37% and 66.67%) of uses of "nemwunemwu" and "nem" whereas the older form "nemwu" shows as low as 8.9% of discourse functions. On the other hand, with regard to the ratio of original adverb meaning, the "nemwu" variant

6) For details of the discourse markers, see Brinton (1996, 2002), Fraser (2006) and Schiffrin (1987).

reveals the highest ratio, 10.91% while newer forms show 7.4% and 0%.

This chapter looks into the correlations between frequency and degree of grammaticalization found in *nemwunemwu*,"nem" and "nemwu". As with the development of these formal diversities of "nemwu", this section discusses several discourse marker functions in turn. "Discourse markers" refer to expressions indicating a coherence relation between clauses (Fraser 2006) and a speaker's interpersonal (pragmatic) functions (Brinton 1996). It is widely accepted that the main characteristics of discourse markers are summarized by prosodic independence, syntactic independence and semantic polyfunctionality. However, concerning "nemwu" variants, it is often difficult to distinguish a degree intensifier from a discourse marker. Due to their flexibility, there is a need to set criteria to explain the discourse marker status of "nemwu". Building on Brinton (1996) and Aijmer (2002), we propose criteria to describe the status of discourse markers:

- a. syntactic clues: syntactically detachable, loosely attached optional part
- b. collocational clues: co-occur with other discourse markers
- c. prosodic clues: separate tone unit

2.3.1 Emphatic marker

Consider the data below that comprise the function of *emphasizer*, exploited by the speaker to put what follows in emphasis subjectively. The present-day data detect that "nemwu" and newly emerged innovative variants ("*nemwunemwu*," or "nem") convey emphatic meanings, as seen in (18)-(27).

- (18) a *nemwu kwichanha cincca*
'Ah! it's really annoying, indeed.'
- (19) *cincca solumtotkwu... nemwu, nemwu, nemwu, nemwu, silhe*
'It really gives me the goose bumps... I really, really, really, really hate it.'

In (18), both interpretations are possible: 'very bothering' and 'utterly (absolutely) bothering.' Even when "nemwu" is used emphatically, an inherent [NEGATIVITY] derived from the original meaning still remains, especially when it modifies the negative predicates such as "hate," "get pissed" and "bothering." With the development of the discourse marker, we

still can observe traditional meaning potentials, which might fit within Traugott's criteria (1998) of grammaticalization, persistence.⁷⁾ However, in ["nemwu"+ positive predicate ("adorable," "pretty," "envy," "love," "gorgeous," "excited")] contexts, [NEGATIVITY] is almost bleached. Table 5 displays the ratio of syntactic negativity, which has gone down to 2.5%, compared to 21.92% from 1900–1910. Also, we can observe an increase in subjectification, since the proportion of objective or descriptive modified predicates has gradually dipped to 50% from 69.2% found between 1900–1910, to 30% and further to 26.66% as "nemwu" has expanded into "nemwunemwu" and "nem." In contrast, emotional predicates that reflect meaning grounded in the speaker's attitude to the discourse have increasingly gone up from 30.70 % to 49%, 70% and further to 73.33%.

Table 5. Sentence and Predicate Types in present-day corpus
(Unpublished Spoken Korean corpus 2004)

	[nemwu]	[nemwu] [nemwu]	[nemwunemwu]	[nem]
Sentence Types	2.5%(N=47)	0%(N=0)	0%	6.66%(N=1)
-Negative	93.13(N=1750)	86%(N=32)	85.18%(N=23)	60%(N=9)
-Affirmative	2.66%(N=50)	10.8%(N=4)	11.11(N=3)	26.66%(N=4)
-Exclamative	1.7%(N=32)	2.7%(N=1)	3.7%(N=1)	6.66%(N=1)
-Interrogative				
Predicate Type				
I Emotional predicate	49%(N=921)	62%(N=23)	70%(N=19)	73.33(N=11)
--positive	-50.27(N=463)	-65%(N=15)	-89%(N=17)	-54.5%(N=6)
--negative	-49.7%(N=458)	-35%(N=8)	-11%(N=2)	-45.5%(N=5)
Predicate Type				
II. descriptive predicate	50%(N=958)	38%(N=11)	30%(N=8)	26.66%(N=4)
total	N=1879	N=37	N=27	N=15

The data also suggest that with the development of "nemwu₂" > "nemwu₃" ("nemwu", "nemwunemwu", "nem"), the modified predicates

7) Even with the development of new functions, we still find traditional meaning potentials which is called 'persistence.' (Hopper 1991).

have become more positive and attitudinal. This diachronic tendency suggests the semantic extension or generalization of "nemwu". Table 6 further evidences increasing subtivity by demonstrating common collocating verbs or adjectives:

Table 6. Common collocation patterns of "nemwu" variants:
20C and present-day corpus (2004)

	[nemwu] 1900-1910 (N=114)	[nemwu] 2004 (N=1879)	[nemwunemwu] 2004 (N=27)
col- locate type	[manhta]many(N=16) [kwahata]excessive(N=13) [elyepta]difficult(N=11) [mwusepta]scary(N=9) [kekcenghata]worry(N=6) [mopsi]very(N=5) [sangsimhata]distress (N=2) [simhata]excessive (N=2)	[manhta]many(N=136) [cohta]good(N=76) [silhta]don't like(N=46) [wuskita]funny(N=45) [khuta]big(N=26) [himtulta]painful(N=26) [caymiissta]fun(N=24) [elyepta]difficult(N=19) [simhata]excessive(N=17) [yeypputa]pretty(N=14) [kanghata]strong(N=14) [hwangtang]absurd(N=10)	[cohta]good(N=3) [caymiissta]fun(N=2) [hayngpok/hungpwun]hap piness/excitement(N=2) [sulphuta]sad(N=2) [nollata/ttellita]be surprised/shiver(N=2) [kwungkumhata]be curious(N=1) [calanghata] /akkita]brag(N=1) [cwungyohata]important(N=1) [kwiyepta]cute(N=1) [silhta]don't like(N=1) [caymiepsta]not fun(N=1)
	Many/excessive [manhta/simhata] 15.78% (N=18) good/fun [cohta/caymiissta] 0.8%(N=1) Don't like/difficult/painful [silhta/elyepta/himtulta] 9.6% (N=11)	Many/excessive [manhta/simhata] 8.14% (N=153) Good/fun [cohta/caymiissta] 5.32% (N=100) Don't like/difficult/painful [silhta/elyepta/himtulta] 4.84% (N=91)	Many/excessive [manhta/simhata] 0% (N=0) Good/fun [cohta/caymiissta] 33.33% (N=5) Don't like/difficult/painful [silhta/elyepta/himtulta] 3.7% (N=1)

In other words, the newly extended meaning appeals much less to the [HIGH DEGREE] in "nemwu₂" as found in the decreasing rate of the

quantity adjectives 'many' and 'excessive.'⁸⁾ Its prime function appears to signal speakers' emphatic involvement in the situation or planning in a discourse, through the drastic increase in the exclamative sentences and collocations with evaluative predicates especially 'happy,' 'exciting,' 'funny' and 'surprised.' Let us consider "nemwunemwu," "nem" and "nemwunemwu":

- (20) wiyewe, a nemwu kwiye! i sacin poyecwe, ippe.
'Cute, oh! it's so cute! Show me this picture, it's pretty'.
- (21) oppa mak hungpwunhay makoo. cincca nemwu coa, nemwu.
'honey, I'm awfully excited Ah Ah I like it so much, really'.
- (22) kunyang, mak- nemwu yeyppe nemwu pwuleptela, cincca, mak.
'She was, simply, just, awfully beautiful (that) I felt envious, just really.'
- (23) kulay nanun, nemwunemwu, cincca, nemwu michikeyssnunkeya.
'Yeah, I'm really, really so really just about to get crazy'.
- (24) cenhwalul hanuntey mak. Nemwunemwu yeli patase nwnmwuli nanun keya.
'I was just talking on the phone and I was so so angry that I started to cry'.
- (25) awu nem mesisse cincca, cincca.
'Wow, he is totally gorgeous really, really'.
- (26) wa kulem ton pelko nem, cohta.
'Wow, he's utterly happy to make money.'
- (27) Kuntey nemwu, com, cakisikan chayngkinun ke kathunikka.
'But it is because he really sort of seems to consider only his time to be precious'.

In (20)-(24), speakers use a high involvement style (Aijmer 2002) characterized by interjections or exclamatives, prosodic boosters

8) However, the extended "nemwu₃" still carries its degree meaning. Thus, [HIGH DEGREE] and discourse semantics are not mutually exclusive rather overlap in some sense,

(lengthen the vowel when pronouncing "nemwu"), repetition and extreme words. In (23), (24), "nemwunemwu" occur before extreme words ("get crazy", "get pissed off") suggesting that the speakers are exaggerating. In the highly emotional contexts in (20), (21), (25), (26), "nem" or "nemwu" collocates with exclamatory "ah," "oh," and "wow."

Putting all this into consideration, the newly extended meaning appeals less to the [HIGH DEGREE] and begins to dramatize a speaker's subjective feeling. Often the emphatic "nemwu" occurs in expressive contexts with intensifying meaning (cf. Quirk et al. 1985:583 *emphasizer*). This means that means its degree function begins to expand into discourse functions such as rhetorical emphasis or Maximizer (cf. Paradis 1997). Its function here is similar to English adverbs such as "absolutely," "utterly" and "totally" which have undergone grammaticalization from totality adverb into maximizers by acquiring discourse functions over time (cf. Paradis 1997).

In expressions where "nemwu" has an emphatic effect on an utterance, often it takes scope over the whole proposition. We can relate the frequent collocation patterns: ["nemwu" + "mak"], ["cincca" + "nemwu"] ["cengmal" + "nemwu"] to exaggeration and positive politeness (Brown and Levinson 1987:104). The use of hyperbolic collocations, underscores the speakers' emotional bond with the hearer, create common ground and contribute to a friendly atmosphere.

To distinguish the emphatic use of "nemwu³" from degree meaning of "nemwu²," we will apply certain criteria such as collocation pattern⁹, and syntactic scope. The examples (18)-(26) evidence that "nemwu³," "nem" or "nemwunemwu" frequently co-occur with other discourse markers such as "kunyang" (just), "mak" (just), "com" (sort of), "a" (ah)", "toykye" (really) and "cincca" (really) which are boldfaced in the examples.

Another typical feature of discourse functions can be seen here:

9) According to Brinton (1996) the co-occurrence with other discourse markers is characterized as one of the features of discourse functions. Collocation patterns are relatively neglected areas in connection with discourse markers, but the balanced spoken corpus equips us with the tool to observe the collocation of "nemwu" through its concordance lines.

variable scope. Sentence (21) provides a striking example of "nemwu" occurring in the clause-final position. This means "nemwu₃" can take scope over the whole sentence or discourse whereas the degree semantic "nemwu₂" was restricted to pre-scalar predicates, taking scope over the scalar elements. In the utterance initial position, seen in extract (27) the scope spans at least the whole sentence. Scope has extended from AP, or VP, into the discourse, which is a typical feature of grammaticalization.¹⁰⁾

2.3.2. Hedge (collocation: "nemwu" + "mwe", "nemwu" + "ani", "nemwu" + "kulikwu")

Let us look at further discourse interpretations of "nemwu₃":

- (28) a nemwu kulikwu mak mwe. Mwehamyen, mwehana calmoshamyen honnakwu.
'Ah, really, and, just, what, if I do something, if I make one little mistake I get scolded'.
- (29) E... nemwu ani mweyengekwento aniko mwe,, yulepintey.
'Ah, just, no, well,.. this place isn't even an English-speaking [world] place? anyways,, it's Europe'
- (30) Kuntey hancokman ilehhey nemwu mollyeissumyen nemwu kukesto kulekey tto manhi caphicanhayo.
'But it is all in one side, I mean, and, so, it will be caught a lot.'

Instances of "nemwu" in (28)–(30) are not followed by the modified predicate, but the speaker continues with other fillers or hedges such as "kulikwu" (and), "mak" (just), "mwe"(well), "e"(umm)" and "kulekey" (so). "nemwu₃" appears to fulfill the function of a prospective hedge. Here, the main purpose of uttering "nemwu" is to signal a speaker's ongoing claim to the floor and allow more planning time. The use of

10) Thus this increase in scope of "nemwu₃" is in accordance with Traugott's (1998) criteria of grammaticalization. As Brinton (1996) notes, this flexibility to combine with various levels of syntax has given support to the view that discourse markers occur either outside the syntactic structure or loosely attached to it and hence have no clear grammatical function.

filled pauses and the repetition of other hedges suggest that a speaker has difficulty in finding the right words under time pressure.

In the above examples, degree meaning ("nemwu₂") is only marginal. The implausibility of degree interpretation can be shown by replacing "nemwu" with the degree intensifier "maywu" (very) which creates a strange sentence in pragmatics, seen in (31).

- (31) ? A maywu kulikwu mak mwe. Mwehamyen, mwehana calmoshamyen honnakwu.
'Ah, very, and, just, so, if I do something, if I make one little mistake I get scolded.'

On the contrary, typical hedges like "kulikwu" (and), or "mwe" (I mean) could be a paraphrase of "nemwu" with a near-synonymous effect:

- (32) A kulikwu mwe kulikwu mak mwe. Mwehamyen, mwehana calmoshamyen honnakwu.
'Ah, and, I mean, and, just, so, what if I do something, if I make one little mistake I get scolded'.

This hedging function of "nemwu" differs very little from the other discourse fillers found in the extracts, which strongly attests to the fact that "nemwu" takes on interaction-specific functions. Thus, the development of the discourse use of "nemwu" corresponds with an increase in the level of pragmaticalization (Krug 2000), typical of more grammaticalized constructions. What's worth mentioning is, within our data, the hedging function could be detected only in the uses of "nemwu."¹¹⁾

2.3.3. Politeness marker (collocation: ["nemwu" + "com"])

In addition to the discourse functions mentioned before, "nemwu" also implies politeness, which can be seen in the collocational patterns of

¹¹⁾The findings, here, is that "nemwu" serves diverse discourse functions while innovative forms ("nemwunemw"/"nem") are limited to emphatic particle deserve our attention.

"nemwu." Frequent sequence ["nemwu" + "com"] marks indirectness and expresses politeness.

- (33) Kyayka com yakkan nemwu mestayloin kyenghyangi isski ttaymwuney.
'Because he sort of tends to act , too much, however, he likes to.'
- (34) Ne nemwu com eika epsnun ke kathay
'You excessively seem to be sort of absurd.'
- (35) Nemwu com ccaney
'It's a bit too salty.'
- (36) Nemwu com kulecima
'Please don't excessively do that.'
- (37) Kuntey nemwu com cakisikan chayngkinun ke kathunikka.
'But it is because he excessively sort of seems to consider his time to be only precious.'
- (38) Solcikhi pwumonimtul nemwu com kapwucangcekintey aciktwu issnun kes kathay.
'Honestly, our parents still sort of seem to too, sort of, have the paternalistic way of thinking.'

"Nemwu" collocates with "com" (sort of) and "yakkan" (sort of), conveying a similar effect to other downtoners such as "sort of," "I guess," and "well." The discourse markers "com" (sort of) and "yakkan" (little bit) are literally associated with something very small and unimportant, often used as mitigators in Korean. "Nemwu" sometimes involves the risk of the speaker making too direct a request, asserting something without simultaneously using redressive action whenever s/he makes an assertion. This is a way of avoiding or softening the potentially face-threatening act of the imperative in "don't do that" (36), and criticism in "too salty" (35) "too selfish" (37), "too authoritative in one's own way" (38), and the assertion in "too absurd" (34). On the contrary "nemwu" can convey the speaker's authority as to the truth of or attitude to the proposition similar to the discourse function of "just" (Erman 2001) as in "That's just a fact."

- (39) Nemwu kulecima
'Just don't act like that'.

- (40) Kuntey seykyeyisa sensayngnim nemwu cayswuepsi anhnya?
'By the way, don't you think our world history teacher is getting on our nerves indeed?'
- (41) Wense ilknunke nemwu koylopci anhayo?
'Isn't it just painful reading, the original text?'

In (39)–(41), "nemwu" serves as a negative politeness marker, conveying the necessity of accepting a state of affairs. In argumentative contexts the emphasizer "nemwu" is rhetorical and strongly persuasive in the sense of trying to get the hearer to accept the speaker's point of view.

In summation, this section claims that with the increasing frequency, the new forms have emerged and uses of "nemwu" and other variants (including "nem", "nemwunemwu") have acquired emphatic pragmatic functions. What seems interesting is, only "nemwu", the most frequent form, has further extended to other discourse functions such as hedge or politeness marker. It can be hypothesized that "nemwu" is a strong candidate for having undergone active grammaticalization since "nemwu" has the highest frequency among "nemwu" variants.

3. Discussion: as a case of grammaticalization

As touched on in the previous chapter, "nemwu" went through semantic extension from [being excessive] to [high in degree] and subsequently also to discourse meanings. We now turn to how and why these changes have been made in a usage-based grammaticalization model. In particular, focus will be given to the following: Firstly, how is it that "nemwu" can condition drastic phonological reduction, i.e., [wu] deletion as seen in "nemwu" > "nem", while other similar intensifiers such as "maywu", "acwu", "cincca" have not undergone any phonological reduction? Another question is how the concomitant changes of "nemwu" can be accounted for via grammaticalization. Lastly, why has the string "nemwu" + "nemwu" been changed into a single word (univerbation), while other reduplicated Korean intensifier such as "maywu" "maywu," "acwu" "acwu" have not undergone any univerbation?

3.1. Usage-based approach to grammaticalization

To address the issues mentioned above, the model of usage-based grammaticalization (Bybee 2001, 2006; Bybee & Hopper 2001) is exploited as it attests frequency effects on the phonological shortening, functional extension, and syntactic reanalysis. The fundamental importance of frequency sharply distinguishes usage-based models¹²⁾ from other models that is, higher frequency of a unit or pattern results in cognitive routinization, which affect processing of the unit and ultimately leads to language change. In this vein, the usage-based approach to grammaticalization provides an account of the pattern of lexical diffusion in which high frequency items change more readily than low frequency ones. It involves at least the following three tenets (Bybee 2006).

- a. How and why language change is expressed in terms of usage. High frequency items undergo grammaticalization process which produce further change.
- b. Sound change has a permanent storage effect on the lexical representation.
- c. Phonological changes are associated with functional and syntactic changes, e.g. the reduced variant of "I don't know" represents both the special discourse function (hedge) and deviant syntax (parenthetical particle).

3.2. Grammaticalization

3.2.1 Frequency effects

In the preceding chapter, we raised the significance of frequency involved in the changes of "nemwu." Table 5 showed that "nemwu" occurs 1879 times while "nemwu-nemwu"/"nemwunemwu" and "nem" occur 64 and 15 times respectively, out of a 0.88 million eojul

12) The usage-based framework shares a number of characteristic assumptions, summarized in Barlow and Kemmer (2000). Some of its tenets are: 1)The intimate relation between linguistic structure and instances of use of language 2)The importance of frequency 3)Linguistic representatives as emergent rather than fixed stored entities 4)Importance of actual usage data (corpus) in theory construction 5)The intimate relation between synchronic variation and diachronic change.

contemporary Korean corpus. The extreme high frequency of "nemwu" (1879 hits) appears to speed up grammaticalization process which in turn seems to trigger the emergence of new forms such as "nemwunemwu" and "nem." This gives rise to the presumption that use frequency affects the degree of grammaticalization (Bybee 2001, 2003). As seen in the previous section, the most frequent form "nemwu" illustrated the various pragmatic functions such as emphasis, hedge, or politeness while the far less frequent variants, "nemwunemwu" and "nem" disclose only one pragmatic function (emphasis). From this observation, it can be postulated that "nemwu" with the highest frequency has undergone the most advanced grammaticalization among several variants.

Of particular interest with reference to frequency is the question as to why "nemwu" can develop into new variants and condition drastic phonological reduction, i.e., [wu] deletion as seen in "nemwu" > "nem", while other similar intensifiers such as "maywu", "acwu" and "cincca" have not lead to new forms with any phonological reduction. Again, the role of frequency casts light on the different degree of grammaticalization among degree adverbs. The total of 1,958 hits of "nemwu" variants, is by far higher than other degree adverbs such as "jengmal" (599 hits), "acwu" (426 hits), "maywu" (31 hits) or "cham" (53 hits). This finding agrees with the proposal presented by Bybee (2006): high frequency items undergo a grammaticalization process which produces further change. High frequencies of a unit result in cognitive routinization, or so called entrenchment which affects processing of the unit and ultimately leads to language change (Bybee 2001). In this approach, with repetition and routinization, phonological reduction, semantic bleaching or syntactic reanalysis can be caused. Thus, frequency effects permeate every aspect of language.

3.2.2. Grammaticalization of discourse markers

The next discussion addresses whether or not the development of "nemwu" can be applied to grammaticalization tenets found in the general development of discourse markers. The grammaticalization tendencies involved in discourse marker development (Traugott &

König1991) and those involved in "nemwu" will be compared:

(i) Decategorization: Elements stemming from adverbs are increasingly decategorized into the less central grammatical category of discourse markers. This process also holds for the development of "nemwu": manner adverb ("nemwu1") > degree adverb ("nemwu2") > discourse marker ("nemwu3"/"nem"/"nemwunemwu"). From the point of semantic expansion, the decategorization from manner adverb into degree meaning and further into pragmatic meaning has undergone a process of bleaching.

(ii) Phonological reduction: Even though discourse markers become syntactically disjunct, and thereby may be used with special stress, they may be phonologically reduced. This is the case with "nemwu" > "nem". Then, why has "nemwu" undergone phonological reduction while other Korean degree adverbs have not? The answer comes from the extreme frequency of "nemwu" (total 1958 hits out of 0.88 million eujol corpus). This finding agrees with the effects of token frequency presented by Bybee (2001, 2006): reduced alternations only occur in highly frequent items.

(iii) Increase of pragmatic function: With the development of discourse markers, we can observe an increase in pragmatic function: "meaning tend to become increasingly situated in the speaker's attitude toward the situation" (Traugott & König 1991:205). Also in the case of "nemwu", we can observe an increase in discourse-pragmatic function such as maximizer, hedge and politeness marker, while losing much of its original semantic content of [EXTREMITY] or [NEGATIVITY].

(iv) Increase in scope: With the development of discourse marker, syntactic scope increases. This increase in scope can also be observed in "nemwu." As mentioned in 3.3.1, the grammaticalized variants of "nemwu", that is, "nemwunemwu" and "nem" come to have scope over stretches of discourse. Degree reinforcing "nemwu" takes scope over a scalar property denoted by an adjective or VP. But discourse marker "nemwu" scope has extended from AP or VP into the sentence or discourse. The most recent context expansion concerns the position of "nemwu" in discourse marker uses. Degree reinforcing "nemwu" is usually placed before the modified adjectival or VP which has degree intensifying functions. As grammaticalization proceeds, it has more

flexibility or syntactic freedom. It can occur in pre-front fields (sentence initially) or clause finally as well as pre-modified elements (see the discussions in 3.3.1). "Nemwu" in the clause final position is still considered incorrect by prescriptive grammarians. Yet this type of structure is commonly used in present day Korean.

(v) Persistence: Even with the development of new functions, we still find traditional meaning potentials. In the case of "nemwu" original meaning potentials of [EXTREMITY] or [NEGATIVITY], are still present. The modern Korean dictionary allows this original [NEGATIVITY] semantic as the only correct grammar. However, we find a wide spread of positive degree implications and discourse functions of "nemwu" in the synchronic data. This might converge to the mismatch between the prescriptive grammar and usage-based grammar.

Based on the evidence mentioned here, it is safe to claim that the progress of "nemwu" agrees with the universal grammaticalization path of discourse markers.

3.2.3. Duplicated Variant "nemwunemwu"

Contrary to the grammaticalization process of "nemwu" mentioned before, the emerging duplicated variant does not appear to fit for phonological reduction, one tenet of grammaticalization. Nonetheless we claim that the process where the repetition of "nemwu-nemwu" grew into a single word (lexeme), "nemwunemwu," can be accommodated within a general grammaticalization. The reason might come from the fact that both the lexicalized lexeme "nemwunemwu", and the grammaticalized lexemes "nemwu₃" or "nem" have similar functions at the discourse-pragmatic level as observed in (23)-(26). In that regard, "nemwunemwu" can serve as input for further grammaticalization because this kind of formal diversity serving for a similar meaning activates the token frequency, which in turn corresponds to a higher degree of grammaticalization (Bybee 2003). Recall that the univerbation (single word) of "nemwunemwu", reflected in the deletion of orthographic space between the two duplicated words, has been recently shaped over the past 30 years. The evidence comes after 1990 by the registering of

"nemwunemwu" in the dictionary. By contrast, the diachronic data suggest that semantic expansion or decategorization –the critical features of grammaticalization– had been going through changes for a long time. In addition, the emergence of "nemwunemwu" can correspond to the classical principle of grammaticalization (Hopper 1991), i.e., layering: the older variants "nemwu" and further grammaticalized innovative variants ("nem" and "nemwunemwu") coexist serving as similar discourse functions. Taken together, the emergence of diverse variants of "nemwu" can be embraced within a broad view of grammaticalization.

Then, the last question is why "nemwunemwu" has been lexicalized while other duplicated Korean intensifier such as "maywu maywu", "acwu acwu" and "cengmal cengmal" have not undergone any univerbation.. String frequency (Boylund 1996, Bybee 2001) can be one possible contributing factor, since high string frequency triggers the bonding (bondedness) of the adjacent items. Here, the frequency with which two words co-occur in a sequence can be exploited for predicting the likelihood of their coalescence. This phenomenon is called String Frequency Factor (Bybee 2001, 2003, 2006).¹³⁾ She has demonstrated that string frequency has explanatory power for phonological erosion in longer stretches such as "I don't know." As for "nemwu" + "nemwu", its string frequency (n=64) in the present-day Korean corpus is much higher than the string frequency of other duplicated sequences of degree adverb: "cengmal"–"cengmal" (n=6), "acwu"–"acwu" (n=1), "maywu" –"maywu" (n=0). From this observation, it can be concluded that the duplicated sequence can be developed into a lexeme only in the cases of "nemwu" among Korean degree adverbs, which is primarily due to the string frequency factor.

4. Conclusion

This paper observes the development of "nemwu" in order to explore how and why its semantic and formal diversities have come out within

13) In view of the recent focus on usage, it is important to note that language change or grammaticalization seem to extend beyond the level of individual words.

the usage-based framework of grammaticalization. We proposed functional, semantic, phonological and collocational evidence in favor of the hypothesis that "nemwu" undergoes semantic extension and functional/formal changes through frequency effect. This finding agrees with the proposal presented by Bybee (2006): high token frequency plays a pivotal role in the grammaticalization process. The central claims of this paper can be stated as follows:

a. It was observed that the most frequent form "nemwu" illustrated the various pragmatic functions such as emphasis, hedge, or politeness while the far less frequent variants, "nemwunemwu" and "nem" disclose only one pragmatic function (emphasis). Assuming a strong correlation between token frequency and degree of grammaticalization (Bybee 2001), it can be postulated that "nemwu" with the highest frequency has undergone the most advanced grammaticalization among several variants. That is, the variants of "nemwu" go through an evolutionary path of grammaticalization: verb stem (nem) + suffix (e) > manner adverb ("nemwu") > degree adverb ("nemwu") > maximizer/hedge/politeness marker ("nemwu"/"nemwunemwu"/"nem").

b. Coupled with functional changes, semantic extensions proceeds: its original [NEGATIVITY], [EXTREMITY] drawn from the manner adverb "nemwu" or verb "nemta" has been extended, gaining a neutral value (\pm positivity) of 'high in degree.' This semantic neutrality could lead to wide application which in turn stimulates high frequency. Extreme high frequency in the present-day Korean, finally activates ongoing grammaticalization. The result is, the reduplicated "nemwunemwu" has been settled in as a standard word and the newer form "nem" has emerged, starting to gain circularity in spoken Korean. From this perspective, the [HIGH DEGREE] usages further grow into more subjective, expressive meanings, functioning in discourse levels which foreground the speaker's emphatic stance or serve as a hedge associated with positive and negative politeness. To sum up, the semantic development proceeds as follows: EXCESSIVITY > DEGREE > DISCOURSE-PRAGMATIC. Taken together, the whole progress is in

accord with the tendencies applied to discourse markers (Traugott & Ekkehard 1991): decategorization, phonological reduction, increase of pragmatic function and increase in scope and persistence as seen in 3.2.2.

c. Among several Korean degree intensifiers, only the reduplicated form of "nemwu" ("nemwunemwu") has been lexicalized which was accounted for via Bybee's (2001) string frequency factor. As for the repetitive form, this does not seem to be in consonance with phonological reduction. Though seemingly contradictory to the grammaticalization, this corresponds to the classical principle of grammaticalization (Hopper 1987), i.e., layering: the older variants "nemwu" and further grammaticalized innovative variants ("nem" and "nemwunemwu") coexist serving as similar discourse functions. In this regard, the emergence of diverse variants of "nemwu" can be embraced within a broad view of grammaticalization.

d. The polysemy or multifunctionality found in contemporary Korean uses of "nemwu" reflects the development from its source lexeme: manner adverb "nemwu.". If this hypothesis is born out, it parallels with the general grammaticalization path of discourse particles: manner adverb > degree adverb > discourse particle as seen in the examples of English totality adverbs: "awfully" and "totally" which have undergone grammaticalization from totality adverb into maximizers by acquiring discourse functions over time (Paradis 1997).

Considering all these factors, we argued that frequency affects the degree of grammaticalization in the development of "nemwu," (more specifically, in semantic extensions and formal diversity of "nemwu"), following usage-based tenets. In this vein, various functions of "nemwu" can be placed on a grammaticalization cline. One end-point of it is original adverb and the other end-point is occupied by discourse functions.

References

- Aijmer, K. (2002). *English discourse particle: Evidence from a corpus*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Boyland, J. T. (1996). *Morphosyntactic change in progress*. PhD

- dissertation*, University of California at Berkeley.
- Brinton, L. J. (1996). *Pragmatic markers in English: Grammaticalization and discourse functions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brinton, L. J. (2002). Grammaticalization versus lexicalization reconsidered: On the late use of temporal adverbs. In T. Fanego, J. Prez-Guerra & M. J. López-Couso (Eds.), *English historical syntax and morphology* (pp. 67-97). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Brinton, L. J. & Elizabeth, C. T. (2005). *Lexicalization and language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P. & Stephen, L. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Bybee, J. L. (2001). *Phonology and language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bybee, J. L. (2003). Mechanism of change in grammaticalization: the role of frequency. In R. Janda & B. Joseph (Eds.), *A handbook of historical linguistics* (pp. 602-623). London: Lawrence.
- Bybee, J. L. (2006). *Frequency of use and the organization of language*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bybee, J. L. & Hopper, P. (2001). *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Erman, B. (2001). Pragmatic markers revisited with a focus on 'you know' in adult and adolescent talk. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, 1337-1359.
- Fraser, B. (2006). Towards a theory of discourse markers. In K. Fisher (Ed.), *Approaches to discourse particles* (pp. 189-205). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Geeraerts, D. (1997). *Diachronic prototype semantics: a contribution to historical lexicology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Himmelmann, N. (2004). Lexicalization and grammaticalization: opposite or orthogonal? In W. Bisang, N. Himmelmann & B. Wiemer (Eds.), *What makes grammaticalization?* (pp. 21-45). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hopper, P. & Elizabeth, C. T. (1993). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Kim, H. J. (2004). A Usage-based Phonology Approach to the recent changes of [in fact] > [fact]. *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 29(2), 199-212.
- Krug, M. G. (2000). *Emerging English modals: a corpus-based study of*

grammaticalization. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Lehmann, C. (1995). *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. Revised and Expanded Version. first published edition [Lincom Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 1], Lincom europa: Munchen.
- Lim, G.-H. (2004). On the characteristic of the word formation and co-occurrence of Korean degree adverb 'nemwu'. *The Korean Language and Literature* 32, 76-100.
- Paradis, C. (1997). Adjectives and boundedness. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 12, 47-64.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Traugott, E. C. (1982). From propositional to textual and expressive meanings: some semantic-pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization. In W. P. Lehmann & Y. Malkiel (Eds.), *Perspectives on historical linguistics* (pp 245-271). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Traugott, E. C. (1989). On the rise of epidemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language* 65(1), 31-55.
- Traugott, E. C. (1998). The role of pragmatics in semantic change. In J. Verschueren (Ed.), *Pragmatics in 1998: Selected papers from the 6th international pragmatics conference*. vol. II (pp 93-102). Antwerp: International Pragmatics Association.
- Traugott, E. C. & Ekkehard, K. (1991). The semantics -pragmatics of grammaticalization revisited. In E. C. Traugott & B. Heine (Eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization* (pp. 189-218). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hijeon Kim
English Department
Cyber Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
270 Imundong, Dongdaemungu
Seoul 130-791, Korea
Phone: 82-2-2173-2377
Email: hijean@cufs.ac.kr

Received: 30 June, 2008

Revised: 25 August, 2008

Accepted: 7 September, 2008