

A study of the discourse-functional properties of truth-related expressions in English and Korean*

Taeho Kim

(Pusan National University)

Kim, Taeho. 2013. A study of the discourse-functional properties of truth-related expressions in English and Korean. *Linguistic Research* 30(2), 195-215. This study discusses discourse-pragmatic characteristics of truth-related expressions in English in comparison with those of Korean. It examines how they become to acquire a variety of discourse-pragmatic functions such as an emphatic marker, a hesitation marker, an attention getter, an agreement marker and a specificity indicator. In this study, we propose that truth-related lexical expressions in English, originally analyzed as an adverb or noun, acquire a new grammatical function denoting various things from their corresponding lexical items as a noun or an adverb through grammaticalization. We find that truth-related expressions may be found anywhere in a clause (clause-initial, clause-medial or clause-final position), but where they appear in a clause mostly depends on the meaning of their corresponding lexical items as well as their communicative functions. We also show that the most distinctive communicative function that a truth-related expression of any kind can have is that of an emphatic marker, because its lexical meaning is associated with truth-value. Finally, this study points out that truth-related expressions in English share many similarities with those of Korean in their structural and functional properties, but they differ in a few respects because of differences in language use between two languages. (Pusan National University)

Keywords corpus study, discourse-pragmatic functions, emphatic marker, grammaticalization, successful communication, truth-related expressions

* An earlier version of this study was presented at the first international conference of Korean Association of Corpus Linguistics (KACL 2012), and was published early as Kim and Jeong (2012). The author is very grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and suggestions. This work was supported by Pusan National University Research Grant 2011.

1. Introduction

The primary goal of human communication is to deliver what is in the speaker's mind to the listener and to make the listener understand what is being stated. Both the speaker and the listener cooperate with each other to facilitate successful communication, and human language helps facilitate successful communication (Kim 2008). Discourse, often referred to as talk exchange, is considered as a rational cooperation between interlocutors to facilitate successful communication (Grice 1975). That is to say, discourse is a goal oriented activity, with which the speaker tries to deliver his or her thought to the listener and at the same time, the listener seeks to interpret what is being stated. In the sense that both the speaker and the listener cooperate with each other to successfully communicate, discourse is regarded as a cooperative effort between interlocutors. Grice (1975) explains this communicative process introducing the Cooperative Principle, from which a set of conversational maxims is derived concerning what should be said and how it should be said in a conversation. Grice's conversational maxims are the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relation and the maxim of manner.

The cooperative principle describes how people interact with one another through discourse, and according to the principle, the speaker needs to make his or her contribution such as it is required, at the stage where it occurs, by the accepted purpose or the direction of the talk exchange in which the speaker is engaged (Grice 1975).¹ All of interlocutors who are engaged in conversation make endeavors not to violate any of the four Gricean maxims, so successful communication can be facilitated as a result. Nevertheless, it is notable that these conversational maxims are not always fulfilled, and it is often the case that the speaker intentionally violates some of the maxims, in which case the listener needs to infer what the speaker implies with his or her utterance.² Therefore, not only grammatical competence but also communicative competence is essential to interpret the speaker's utterances correctly (Mey 1994).

It is often the case that the speaker intentionally violates Gricean maxim of quality to deliver his or her message to the listener in an implicit way (Kim and Jeong 2012). According to the maxim of quality, what the speaker says is supposed

¹ See Grice (1975) for the detailed description of the cooperative principle.

² See Mey (1994) for the definition of conversational implicature and inference.

to be true, so he or she does not need to overtly mention what he says is true. Yet, it is not uncommon that the speaker uses truth-related expressions like *honestly*, *truly*, or *really* in a conversation to achieve his or her goals.³ In fact, the speaker uses a truth-related expression in a speech for a variety of discourse-functional reasons, for example to emphasize a certain thing in a conversation (Kim and Jeong 2012). Consider the following example, which illustrates the use of a truth-related expression.

- (1) Pamela Andrews is *really* and *truly* thy lawful wife without sham, deceit or double meaning.

In (1), two instances of truth-related expressions, *really* and *truly*, are reported, and they both are used as emphasizing the speaker's thought or opinion about Pamela Andrews, not as indicating the truth-value of the statement itself. In short, both of the truth-related expressions found in (3) are used as an emphatic marker representing the emphasis on what is being stated in a given utterance. Now consider the examples below which show the discourse-pragmatic uses of truth-related expressions in Korean (excerpted from Kim and Jeong 2012: 455).

- (2) *sokam-ul ceytaylo malha-l swu eps-ess-ul ppwun,*
 opinion-acc properly speak-comp way not.exist-pst-acc only
ce-n cincca yelsimhi ilk-ess-ta-koyo.
 1sg-top **really** eagerly read-pst-dec-sem
 "I read (it) very carefully. I just couldn't express my opinion."
 (3) *cham-ko tto cham-umyense na-nun chammallo hanta-ko*
 endure-and again endure-while 1sg-top **truly** do-comp
hay-ss-ta.
 do-pst-dec
 "I **truly** did my best, while enduring (many things)."

In (2) and (3), the truth-related expressions *cincca* 'really' and *chammallo* 'truly'

³ Kim and Jeong (2012) used 'truth-related expressions' as a term referring to these expressions, but considering their formal varieties, the use of 'truth-related expressions' appears to be more plausible, and is thus adopted as the term referring to such expressions in this study.

have nothing to do with their truth value, but they are used as an emphatic marker denoting the speaker's emphasis on the statement that is being stated in a speech. Similarly, truth-related expressions in English can also function as a discourse marker representing the speaker's emphasizing a certain thing.

The goal of this study is to examine truth-related expressions in English and Korean, and to compare them for their structural and discourse-functional differences. More specifically, this study discusses how truth-related expressions become to have discourse-pragmatic functions such as *denoting emphasis*, *getting attention from the listener* or *marking hesitation*.

This paper is structured as follows. Section 2 provides a brief review of previous analyses of the truth-related expressions used as a discourse marker. Section 3 discusses how this study collects and analyzes the data, and Section 4 examines discourse-pragmatic functions of truth-related expressions in English, and compares them with those of Korean, incorporating corpus findings into the analysis. Finally, Section 5 concludes the study summarizing its findings and suggesting future research topics.

2. Previous analyses of truth-related expressions

As was noted in the preceding section, both grammatical competence and communicative competence are required to make human communication successful. As a matter of fact, our day-to-day communication does not always proceed as expected, and the use of a discourse marker in a communication as well as its proper interpretation is often an essential part of successful communication among interlocutors. Discourse marker is defined as a word or phrase that is relatively structure-independent and usually does not change the meaning of a given sentence or statement. It has a somewhat empty meaning but a specific discourse-pragmatic function in a communication (Carol Lynn and Martinovic-Zic 2003: 117). Therefore, it is important to understand the discourse-communicative functions of a discourse marker in a communication, in order to correctly interpret the speaker's intention and further to facilitate a successful communication.

Due to its frequent occurrence in a communication and its importance, discourse markers have been the locus of linguistic and non-linguistic researches across

different languages. As a result, some communicative functions of discourse markers are revealed, and the definitions are given to them (Lee 1996, Lim 1998, Schiffrin 1987).⁴ Discourse markers commonly found in English include expressions like *you know*, *I mean*, *like*, *actually*, *well*, *so* or *because*, and they are all used for various discourse functions. Yet, not all discourse markers are the same in their functions, but each has its own discourse-pragmatic function when it is used in a speech (Lim 1998, Schiffrin 1987).

Truth-related expressions like *actually*, *truly*, *for real* or *in fact* were originally an adverb and a prepositional phrase respectively, but over time they become to acquire various communicative functions through the grammaticalization process that led from a free construction to a discourse marker (see Kim and Jeong 2012)⁵. Thus far, much research interest has been given to the discourse-pragmatic properties of truth-related expressions, and it is revealed that truth-related expressions differ in their discourse-pragmatic functions (Jeon 2002, Kang 2000, Kim and Jeong 2012, Schiffrin 1987). For example, some truth-related expressions may be used as an emphatic marker, and some others may function as an attention getter (see Kim and Jeong 2012). Different kinds of truth-related expressions went through different grammaticalization process, which is why they differ from one another in their communicative functions (Kim and Jeong 2012).

Despite many researches on discourse markers, as well as the discourse-pragmatic aspects of truth-related expressions in a variety of languages, only few studies seem to have been done on classifying the truth-related expressions into subgroups based on the differences in their structural and communicative functional properties. Furthermore, to the best of our knowledge, no study has investigated cross-linguistic differences between truth-related expressions in English and Korean. For this reason, this study investigates the differences which may exist between the two languages. More specifically, it examines where and how frequently the truth-related expressions of English appear in a discourse, and then it compares them with those of Korean for the discussion of cross-linguistic differences between the two languages.

⁴ See Kim and Jeong (2012) for the various ways of defining discourse markers.

⁵ The term *grammaticalization* refers to a process by which lexical expressions become to function as a newly developed grammatical item or a more grammatical item (Hopper and Traugott 2003, Kim 2009).

3. Data

The truth-related expressions in English were obtained from the well-established corpus database of BYU-BNC and BYU-COCA, and those in Korean were collected from Sejong Korean corpus database respectively.⁶ The truth-related expressions in English were obtained from both British English and American English to reduce any possible noise effect from the dialectal difference to the minimum level. Truth-related expressions in Korean were already discussed in Kim and Jeong (2012) in somewhat detail, and we resort to their findings and discussions for the comparison of the structural and discourse-functional aspects of truth-related expressions in English with those in Korean. In short, this study will focus on discussing the structural and functional aspects of the truth-related expressions in English, and then compare them with Kim and Jeong's (2012) findings.

For the discussion of cross-linguistic similarities and differences between truth-related expressions in the two languages, this study mostly follows the methodology that Kim and Jeong (2012) adopted. Basically, this study searches for truth-related expressions in two different ways; those appearing as an adverb and those appearing as a prepositional phrase. Truth-related expressions taken as an adverb include *honestly*, *actually*, *truly*, *really*, *authentically*, *sincerely*, *surely*, and *indeed*, and those regarded as a prepositional phrase include *as a matter of fact*, *for real*, *in fact*, and *in actuality*. For its purpose, this study looks at only the first fifty tokens that are randomly collected from each of the two English corpus: BYU-BNC and BYU-COCA. Simply put, this study obtains 100 tokens for each of the truth-related expressions used, except the one whose total instances only amount to 77 tokens, and examine them for their structural and functional characteristics.

⁶ The data is freely available on the Internet, so refer to <http://corpus.byu.edu/bnc> and <http://corpus.byu.edu/coca> for truth-related expressions in English and <http://kkma.snu.ac.kr> for those in Korean. The data from BYU-BNC (British National Corpus) represents British English, whereas those from BYU-COCA (Corpus of Contemporary American English) represents American English.

4. The structural and functional properties of truth-related expressions in English

This section is devoted to the discussion of the structural and functional properties of truth-related expressions in English, in comparison with those of Korean. In this section, we first discuss the structural pattern of truth-related expressions, namely, where they appear in a discourse. A total of 1,177 instances of truth-related expressions in English are collected and analyzed for the purpose of this study. More specifically, they are sorted out into three different groups based on the place where they appear in a clause; clause-initial, clause-middle, and clause-final.⁷ Then, the truth-related expressions collected are discussed with respect to their discourse-pragmatic functions, following the methodology adopted in Kim and Jeong (2012).

4.1 The structural characteristics of truth-related expressions

In this section, we discuss the structural characteristics of truth-related expressions in English using the collected corpus data. Consider the following examples which illustrate the occurring patterns of truth-related expressions in English.

- (4) *Honestly*, I'm as fit now as I was during the World Cup.
- (5) *Surely* her old bones deserve upholstered pillows.
- (6) I *sincerely* hope so.
- (7) before the bladder is *actually* full.
- (8) She was very pleasant *as a matter of fact*.
- (9) For the chances of nineteenth century, Siamese seeing such a thing were rare *indeed*.

In (4) and (5), the truth-related expressions *honestly* and *surely* appear at the beginning of a clause, and they both function as attracting the listener's attention or

⁷ Since two or more truth-related expressions may appear in a complex sentence, the term *clause-boundary*, instead of sentence-boundary, is adopted for counting the frequency of truth-related expressions.

emphasizing what is going to be stated. Therefore, these two instances are classified into the group of truth-related expressions occurring clause-initially. On the other hand, the truth-related expressions *sincerely* in (6) and *actually* in (7) appear in a clause-medial position, both functioning as an emphatic marker, and thus they are sorted out into the group of truth-related expressions appearing in a clause-medial position. Likewise, the truth-related expressions *as a matter of fact* in (8) and *indeed* in (9) are found in a clause-final position, functioning as an agreement or admission indicator, and they are thus categorized accordingly into the group of truth-related expressions occurring clause-finally.

Table 1 below shows the general structural patterns of truth-related expressions in British English (BNC) and American English (COCA).

Table 1. The structural pattern of truth-related expressions in English

Corpus	BNC			COCA			Total
	cl.-initial	cl.-middle	cl.-final	cl.-initial	cl.-middle	cl.-final	
<i>honestly</i>	12 (24%)	26 (52%)	12 (24%)	14 (28%)	27 (54%)	9 (18%)	100
<i>actually</i>	11 (22%)	36 (72%)	3 (6%)	9 (18%)	41 (82%)	0	100
<i>truly</i>	5 (10%)	43 (86%)	2 (4%)	10 (20%)	39 (78%)	1 (2%)	100
<i>really</i>	2 (4%)	38 (76%)	10 (20%)	5 (10%)	42 (84%)	3 (6%)	100
<i>authentically</i>	0	27 (100%)	0	3 (6%)	34 (68%)	13 (26%)	77
<i>sincerely</i>	0	44 (88%)	6 (12%)	2 (4%)	40 (80%)	8 (16%)	100
<i>surely</i>	21 (42%)	27 (54%)	2 (4%)	15 (30%)	33 (66%)	2 (4%)	100
<i>indeed</i>	16 (32%)	16 (32%)	18 (36%)	24 (48%)	24 (48%)	2 (4%)	100
<i>as a matter of fact</i>	23 (46%)	14 (28%)	13 (26%)	27 (54%)	9 (18%)	14 (28%)	100
<i>for real</i>	0	7 (14%)	43 (86%)	3 (6%)	1 (2%)	46 (92%)	100
<i>in fact</i>	15 (30%)	26 (52%)	9 (18%)	19 (38%)	31 (62%)	0	100
<i>in actuality</i>	7 (14%)	39 (78%)	4 (8%)	23 (46%)	24 (48%)	3 (6%)	100
Total	112 (19%)	343 (59%)	122 (21%)	154 (26%)	345 (58%)	101 (17%)	1,177

Table 1 above shows that truth-related expressions in English are most likely to occur clause-medially, and this tendency holds for both British English and American English (59% for BNC, 58% for COCA). Interestingly, this pattern differs from the one reported for truth-related expressions in Korean, because those in Korean appear

most frequently in a clause-initial position, as is noted in Table 2. That is, what is characteristic of discourse markers in one language is not necessarily the case with that of another language, as is suggested by the comparison of findings from two different studies. Nevertheless, it should be noted that in both languages, many of truth-related expressions are found in a clause-medial position. This cross-linguistically similar pattern may be a simple reflection on the general communicative-functional aspects of truth-related expressions. On the other hand, this strong tendency may be taken as an evidence against the previous claim that in general, a discourse marker is not likely to occur clause-medially or clause-finally due to its primary function of connecting discourses (Lim 1998).

Table 2. The occurring pattern of truth-related expressions in Korean (from Kim and Jeong 2012: 463)

truth-related expressions	cl.-initial	cl.-middle	cl.-final	total
<i>sasil</i> 'fact'	23(46%)	21(42%)	6(12%)	50
<i>solcik</i> 'honest'	31(62%)	12(24%)	7(14%)	50
<i>cengmal</i> 'true'	26(52%)	19(38%)	5(10%)	50
<i>cincca</i> 'real'	25(50%)	18(36%)	7(14%)	50
<i>cham</i> 'actual'	20(40%)	29(58%)	1(2%)	50
total	125 (50%)	99 (40%)	26 (10%)	250

Not much difference is observed between adverbial type of truth-related expressions and prepositional phrase type of truth-related expressions, in that both types of the truth-related expressions are most likely to occur in a clause-medial position. Yet, they differ from each other in that unlike the former, only the latter type of truth-related expressions appear clause-initially (*as a matter of fact*: 46% in BNC and 54% in COCA) and clause-finally (*for real*: 86% in BNC and 92% in COCA respectively) somewhat as frequently as clause-medially.

What is also interesting in Table 1 is that some truth-related expressions show different occurring patterns than other expressions. For example, truth-related expressions such as *surely* and *as a matter of fact* tend to appear clause-initially relatively more frequently than clause-medially or clause-finally. On the other hand, truth-related expressions like *for real* are more likely to occur clause-finally (86% for BNC, 92% for COCA) than clause-initially or clause-medially. This tendency is

analogous to Kim and Jeong's (2012) findings of truth-related expressions in Korean.

Furthermore, there is a slight difference observed between different language varieties, in that tendencies reported in British English are not always observed in American English. For instance, the number of truth-related expression *in actuality* in a clause-initial position is much higher in American English (COCA) than in British English (BNC). Also, the truth-related expression *indeed* is unlikely to appear clause-finally in COCA (4%), while it occurs clause-finally as frequently as clause-medially or clause-initially in BNC (36%). In fact, the number of the truth-related expression *actually* found at the clause-final position remains at zero in BNC. This surely indicates that the speakers of different dialects of the same language, not to mention the speakers of different languages, seem to use truth-related expressions in different ways.

The discourse-pragmatic functions of truth-related expressions, both in English and in Korean, may differ depending on where they appear within a clause. When they appear clause-medially, truth-related expressions function most frequently as an emphatic marker. When they occur clause-initially, truth-related expressions are often viewed as a cue to mark the speaker's hesitation or reluctance.

4.2 The communicative functions of truth-related expressions

Some studies have pointed out and discussed the various communicative functions of truth-related expressions that are used in a discourse (Kang 2000, Kim 2007, Kim and Jeong 2012, Schiffrin 1987). For instance, truth-related expressions in Korean often function as a discourse marker placing an emphasis on a certain part of the statement or attracting attention from the listener (Jeon 2002, Kim 2004, Kim and Jeong 2012). Kang (2000) also discusses the communicative functions of truth-related expressions in Korean, and he compares truth-related expressions functioning as a discourse marker with those being analyzed as an adverb or a noun.

Kim and Jeong (2012) observe that truth-related expressions in Korean differ in their communicative functions, as well as in their structural characteristics, and they classify them into the five different groups based on their functional properties: emphatic marker, attention getter, hesitation marker, surprise marker and agreement marker. They claim that truth-related expressions used as a discourse marker are simply the results of grammaticalization process (*noun* or *adverb* > *discourse*

marker). They further state that a different kind of truth-related expressions went through a different process of grammaticalization, which led to the differences in their communicative functions.⁸ They also point out that not all truth-related expressions in Korean can have all of the five discourse-pragmatic functions.

In this study, we learn from the data that similar to Korean, truth-related expressions in English also differ in their discourse-communicative functions. Some truth-related expressions function most frequently as an emphatic marker, while others most often function as a hesitation marker or an attention attractor. In this section, we categorize truth-related expressions into smaller groups in terms of their discourse-communicative functions, and discuss their discourse-functional properties in comparison with those of Korean.

4.2.1 As an emphatic marker

According to the data, the most distinctive communicative function of truth-related expressions in English is to place an emphasis onto a particular expression or the entire statement of a given clause. We propose that this strong discourse-pragmatic tendency may be attributed to the grammaticalization process, through which truth-related expressions become to have a variety of communicative functions. That is, according to Grice's maxim of quality, the speaker says what he believes is true, and the listener interprets the speaker's speech in the belief that the speaker does not tell a lie. Since what he or she says is supposed to be true, the speaker does not need to explicitly mention, using a truth-related expression, that he says the truth. Yet, the speaker intentionally uses a truth-related expression not to point out his telling the truth but to emphasize a specific expression in a clause or the entire statement he or she seeks to make. Therefore, it is not surprising to learn that truth-related expressions function most commonly as an emphatic marker, as was already pointed out in Kim and Jeong (2012).

Some may argue that truth-related expressions, either as a noun or an adverb, basically have emphatic meaning, so truth-related expressions used as an emphatic marker should not be analyzed as a discourse marker. To them, some of the truth-related expressions in the following examples may simply be an adverb with

⁸ See Kim and Jeong (2002: 465) for the quantitative analysis of truth-related expressions in Korean.

emphatic meaning. Yet, the emphatic function of a truth-related expression is a discourse-pragmatic function of the expression, which was clearly derived from its original meaning of truth-value. Consider the following examples.

- (10) I *honestly* think there is no sign of things getting better.
- (11) If you are a “reader” and wish to *actually* read these legal documents before signing them,
- (12) It seems to leave you in a state where the highs and lows are *really* extreme.
- (13) I’m very and *sincerely* pleased that you did.
- (14) Well, at the Family Leader, we say that we are *authentically* conservative.
- (15) and the gracious style of the rooms, terrace and extensive gardens is *truly* relaxing.
- (16) *Truly*, I don’t think there is any difference.
- (17) Winning the title has made my special day very special *indeed*.

As you can see from the examples above, a variety of truth-related expressions may be used as an emphatic marker in a discourse. The truth-related expressions, as was noted in the previous section, come largely into the three different places in a clause: clause-initially, clause-medially, clause-finally. Yet, when they function as an emphatic marker, truth-related expressions are more likely to appear clause-medially than clause-initially or clause-finally. As a matter of fact, a truth-related expression occurring in a clause-initial position is likely to function as a hedge like an attention attractor, hesitation marker rather than as an emphatic marker.

The communicative function of truth-related expression, *honestly*, in (10) is to emphasize, not just the verb *think*, but the entire statement, “no sign of things getting better.” On the other hand, the truth-related expression, *actually*, in (11) functions as emphasizing only the immediately following verb *read*, not the entire statement. Similarly, the truth-related expressions, *really*, *sincerely* and *truly*, in (12)–(15) are used to emphasize the following expressions, *extreme*, *pleased*, *authentically*, and *relaxing* respectively, by modifying them from an immediately preceding position. In fact, this is the most common way for truth-related expressions in English functioning as an emphatic marker. In (16), the truth-related

expression, *truly*, at the beginning of the clause, emphasizes the entire proposition of the following clause, thus being analyzed as an emphatic marker. Lastly, the truth-related expression, *indeed*, in (17) comes at the final position of the clause, and it serves to emphasize what was just stated, being regarded to as an emphatic marker.

Notably, all of the truth-related expressions in above examples can be ellipped without greatly affecting the overall meaning of the clause. This may be taken as a good indication that truth-related expressions in English can function as an emphatic marker. In fact, the emphatic function of truth-related expressions in English is quite analogous to those of Korean, except that how truth-related expressions in English become to acquire such a communicative function differs from those of Korean. More specifically, truth-related expressions in Korean get the emphatic function through the contrastiveness between the preceding proposition and the following proposition, as was stated in Kim and Jeong (2012), whereas those of English acquire the emphatic function even without such propositional contrastiveness.

It is now clear that the truth-related expressions discussed above have not much to do with their truth-value. They are expressions originally denoting the truth-value of each expression, but as shown in above examples, they become to function as a discourse marker emphasizing the particular word or entire statement they modify. The shift in their grammaticality, i.e., from an *adverb* or *noun* representing truth-value to an *emphatic marker*, is surely the result of the grammaticalization process, as was already addressed in Kim and Jeong's (2012) study of the discourse-pragmatic functions of truth-related expressions in Korean.

4.2.2 As a hesitation marker or a mitigating device

This study finds that truth-related expressions in English may be used to show that the speaker is hesitant or reluctant to say what is going to be said next. Since the speaker often utilizes a truth-related expression to show his or her hesitation, and even feeling of regret, truth-related expressions in English may function as a kind of mitigating device when they are used in a discourse. Consider the following examples.

- (18) There were. There were. *As a matter of fact*, when I'm talking about,

let me see, fifty years ago, there was one up at every backyard, that's the truth.

(19) A: How are you doing?

B: *Honestly*, I'm doing pretty awful.

(20) I did four tours in Iraq. You know, I love my job. I tell you, I would do it again. I had a great time. But *for real*, that last tour, was a real blast.

(21) but I mean that in, in, *in actuality* you know, if it was you doing the training.

(22) I mean there are a couple of those words I don't know what you're talking about *quite honestly*.

The above examples show that truth-related expressions in English often function as a mitigating device that denotes the speaker's hesitation or reluctance to speak about what was stated just before or what is to follow immediately after. For instance, the truth-related expression in (18), *as a matter of fact*, is used as a way of marking the speaker's hesitation or as a device to mitigate its face-threatening effect. The speaker expresses his hesitation, or even reluctance, by repeating the expression *there were*, and then he says the expression *as a matter of fact* before he initiates the statement to follow as a clear indication of his being hesitant about the statement to be said next. In (19), the speaker B needs to respond to the speaker A's question with a negative message, so he strategically uses the truth-related expression, *honestly*, as a mitigating device to reduce the possible face-threatening effect that the negative message may cause. In (20), the speaker first says that he enjoyed all the tours he took in Iraq, and he then specifies the last tour that he liked the most. The speaker uses the truth-related expression *for real* before the last statement to mitigate the semantic contrastiveness existing between the two statements. The truth-related expressions *in actuality* in (21) and *quite honestly* in (22) function as a hesitation marker, or a mitigating device, for the similar reason, occurring clause-initially and clause-finally respectively.

Overall, truth-related expressions occur most commonly in a clause-initial position when functioning as a hesitation marker. In fact, there are only few instances of truth-related expressions functioning as a hesitation marker are found clause-initially or clause-medially. This tendency may be attributed to the basic

characteristic of a hesitation marker. That is, the speaker needs to show his or her hesitation before expressing a contrasting idea to the prior proposition, so that he can alleviate a negative face-threatening effect possibly imposed on the listener to some degree.⁹ Interestingly, truth-related expressions appearing in a clause-medial or clause-final position do not function as a hesitation marker as often as those in a clause-initial position. This supports Lee's (1996) claim that a discourse marker appears in a position between clauses because its primary function is to help connect two or more separate clauses by relating them to one another.

4.2.3 As an attention attractor

There may be a variety of ways of attracting attention from the listener. For example, the speaker may utilize suprasegmental features such as stress or pitch.¹⁰ This study finds that truth-related expressions in English may function as a kind of attention attractor in a discourse, as those in Korean do. English and Korean are similar to each other in this way. Consider the following examples which include truth-related expressions functioning as an attention attractor.

- (23) “**Really**, both issues are stupid, given what we are wrestling with as a country,” said Patricia Warne.
- (24) **Actually**, even if we hadn't wanted to see each other again, she would have got the flowers.
- (25) **In fact**, a growing community of VI photographers takes and shares photos of family and friends, of objects, and of locations they have visited.

In (23), the truth-related expression *really* in a clause-final position functions as a kind of attention attractor, having nothing to do with its truth value. More specifically, the primary function of the truth-related expression *really* in this example is to attract the listener's attention, and therefore the speaker explicitly says

⁹ See Mey (1994) for the detailed explanation of the term *face-threatening act*.

¹⁰ The suprasegmental feature in phonetics is referred to as a speech feature such as phonetic stress, pitch, tone or intonation that is extended over consonants and vowels. These suprasegmental features are not limited to single sounds but extend over a series of syllables, words or phrases (Ladefoged and Johnson 2010).

the expression in an attempt to catch the listener's attention before she speaks the rest of the statement in her mind. In general, a topic shift happens between clauses, and the listener's attention needs to be brought to the newly shifted topic. Naturally, many instances of truth-related expressions functioning as an attention getter are found in a clause-final position. Also, the truth-related expressions, *actually* in (24) and *in fact* in (25), appear at the beginning of a clause, and they both function as a device to attract the listener's attention to the message the speaker wishes to deliver.

Nevertheless, it is not that truth-related expressions functioning as an attention attractor do not have an emphatic function at all. As a matter of fact, truth-related expressions of any kind may have an emphatic function to some degree, regardless of what communicative function they mainly have. This tendency is also applicable to truth-related expressions in Korean.

4.2.4 As an agreement indicator

It was previously pointed out that truth-related expressions could be used in a clause to denote the speaker's agreement to the prior statement or to indicate the speaker's admission that the prior statement is right. Below are the examples of truth-related expressions in English used as an agreement marker.

- (26) A: "Wow! That sounds really heavy."
 B: "Yeah. It feels really heavy *as a matter of fact*."
- (27) A: Do we have anything, Catherine, on that tonight?
 B: Yes, yes we do *actually*.
- (28) A: Also he is in the process of setting up a business.
 B: He is *in fact*.
- (29) People do not necessarily have anything to do with visual impairments paper you know. Yes, *indeed* it was quite fun.
- (30) A: Is it not one part of your honesty to be dutiful and grateful to your master?
 B: *Indeed*, sir, it is impossible I should be ungrateful to your honor or disobedient.
- (31) That's right. She is *in fact* unavailable at all times.

In (26), the truth-related expression, *as a matter of fact*, appears at the end of the clause, and it denotes that the speaker B agrees to the speaker A's opinion or admits that the speaker B is right. In this sense, this discourse-pragmatic use of the truth-related expression can be analysed as an agreement marker. Similarly, the truth-related expressions in (27) and (28), *actually* and *in fact*, also function as marking the speaker's agreement with what was stated in the prior utterance.

Notably, truth-related expressions such as those listed above tend to be presented at the end of a clause when they denote the speaker's admission of the prior statement. Yet, it is by no means that truth-related expressions functioning as an agreement marker can only appear in a clause-final position. Truth-related expressions in English are also found in a clause-initial or clause-medial position, denoting the speaker's agreement with the other interlocutor's thought, though not as frequently as in a clause-final position. For example, the truth-related expressions, *indeed* in (30) and *in fact* in (31), appear clause-initially and clause-finally, and they serve the same communicative function as those found in a clause-final position. This tendency is analogous to the one reported for truth-related expressions in Korean. Even these expressions used as an agreement marker are not completely free from being an emphatic marker, but they also serve an emphatic function to a certain degree.

4.2.5 As a specificity indicator

Truth-related expressions are often used as an indication that the speaker wishes to introduce a specific example of the thing that is mentioned in his or her prior statement. Consider the following examples.

- (32) Discretion meant nothing to her. *Indeed*, at times she even seemed to go out of her way to draw attention to herself.
- (33) They know perfectly well that if they ask they will get transport, and *indeed* in the past they have asked, and they have got transport.
- (34) "I am optimistic," said Kevin Gaw, director of career services at GSU. "*Actually*, I am rather excited."
- (35) This week, *in fact* tomorrow, I'm going to splash out an unbelievable amount of money and buy a transcription machine.

(36) He thought they deserved a bit of cash. Rolls of it, *in fact*.

In (32), the speaker comments about her personality in the first clause, and then he gives a specific reason why he thinks so in the next clause. The truth-related expression *indeed* is placed immediately before the second clause, as an indication that the specific example is given in the following statement. The similar justification may be given to the following examples where the truth-related expressions *indeed* in (33) and *actually* in (34) are used as an indicator that a specific reason or example is proposed in the second clause. In (35), the speaker uses the truth-related expression *in fact* before he specifically points out which day of this week he refers to. In (36), the speaker first mentions only the brief amount of cash, and then he suggests a specific amount of cash. Therefore, it may be said that the truth-related expression *in fact* in (36) also serves the same discourse-pragmatic function of the specificity indication, occurring in a clause-final position. In summary, truth-related expressions in English are often used when the speaker introduces a specific reason or example for the prior statement, serving as a kind of specificity indicator.

In a certain sense, this use of a truth-related expression as a specificity indicator may also be analyzed as an instance of a truth-related expression functioning as an emphatic marker, in that the emphatic function is the most distinctive and primary use of truth-related expressions in English, as was noted earlier. In fact, a variety of discourse-pragmatic functions of truth-related expressions are developed through the process of grammaticalization, and thus it is not unlikely to observe a bit of emphatic function in many instances of truth-related expressions, regardless of the languages investigated.

5. The grammaticalization process of truth-related expressions

To facilitate successful communication, interlocutors seek to comply with the maxim of quality when they carry out communication, and therefore, the speaker does not need to literally say that he or she is telling the truth (Kim and Jeong 2012). Nevertheless, we encounter a variety of truth-related expressions in our day-to-day communication all the time. It is only natural to ask why it is so, and we

argue that the answer to this question lies in the maxim of quality, which Grice (1975) suggested as one of the four conversational maxims. Kim and Jeong (2012) argue that the communicative use of truth-related expressions as discourse marker is the result of grammaticalization process from lexical expression to discourse marker. Interestingly, only truth-related expressions, among various expressions, may be used as a discourse marker serving several different communicative functions.

This study also finds that truth-related expressions in English acquire a variety of discourse-communicative functions in the similar process of grammaticalization. Simply put, truth-related expressions in English, just like those of Korean, receive various discourse-pragmatic functions from their original truth-value, and this process of grammaticalization can be simplified as follows.

- (37) representation of truth-value > truth-value/discourse-pragmatic functions > emphatic marker; hesitation marker; attention attractor; agreement marker; specificity indicator

As shown in (37), truth-related expressions in English used to represent the truth-value of the expression only, and it starts to have a discourse-pragmatic function in addition to denoting the truth-value, through the process of grammaticalization. Then, truth-related words have communicative functions only and they no longer represent the truth-value, completing the grammaticalization process.

6. Conclusion

The purpose of this study is to examine discourse-pragmatic functions of truth-related expressions in English in comparison with those of Korean. In this study, we claim that a variety of truth-related expressions in English become to serve several kinds of different communicative functions such as emphatic marker, hesitation marker, attention attractor, agreement marker and specificity indicator. This study seeks to account for the grammatical shift from lexical expression of truth-value to discourse marker using the term *grammaticalization*, and it argues that grammaticalization is responsible for such a functional and grammatical shift. Simply put, we argue that truth-related lexical expressions in English, originally analyzed as

an adverb or noun, acquire a new grammatical function as discourse marker from their corresponding lexical items as a noun or an adverb through the process of grammaticalization. This study also finds that truth-related expressions functioning as a discourse marker can appear anywhere in a clause (clause-initial, clause-medial or clause-final position), and where they appear in a clause tends to depend on the meaning of the corresponding lexical items which they are derived from, as well as their communicative functions. This study also demonstrates that the most distinctive primary discourse-pragmatic functions of a truth-related expression of any kind is that of emphatic marker, due to its truth-value associated meaning.

Not all truth-related expressions serve the same function, but they differ in their communicative functions. Also, truth-related expressions in English differ in the place where they appear in a clause, and their clausal position seems to depend on the discourse-pragmatic function they serve in a discourse. Last but not least, truth-related expressions in English share many similarities with those of Korean in their structural and functional properties on the one hand, but they also differ in several respects, perhaps due to the differences in language use existing between the two languages on the other hand.

It is clear that truth-related expressions in English as well as in Korean have discourse-pragmatic functions which help facilitate successful communication. Yet, it is difficult to claim that truth-related expressions acquire the new grammatical function as a discourse marker from its original lexical item which used to denote the truth-value only. This is partly because the clear definition has not been given to the term discourse marker, especially when it comes to the discussion of discourse-pragmatic functions of truth-related expressions. In this sense, this study is considered as rather incomplete, and therefore future researches need to be done on this matter.

References

- Carol Lynn, Moder, and Aida Martinovic-Zic. 2004. *Discourse Across Languages and Cultures*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Grice, Paul H. 1975. Logic and conversation. In P. Cole, and J. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts*, 41-58. NY: Academic Press.

- Hopper, Paul H., and Elizabeth C. Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*, 2nd edition. Cambridge, UK & New York, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Jeon, Young-ok. 2002. *Hankwuke tamhwaphyociuy thukcing yenkwu*. "A study of discourse markers in Korean." Seoul, Korea: Yeoklak Publication.
- Kang, Woowon. 2000. *Tamhwaphyoci 'cham'kwa eccimal 'cham'uy pikyoyenkwu*. "A comparative study of discourse marker 'cham' and lexical expression 'cham'." *Language Science* 1: 5-26.
- Kim, Taeho. 2008. Subject and object markings in conversational Korean. Doctoral dissertation. State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Kim, Taeho. 2009. Negation in Korean: its grammaticalization and lexicalization process. *Language Research* 24(4): 685-705.
- Kim, Taeho, and Seon-yeong Jeong. 2012. *Hankwukeey nathananun 'cinsil' phyohyen ehwiuy tamhwaphyoci kinung yenkwu*. "A corpus-based study of the truth-related words in Korean used as discourse markers." *Cross-cultural studies* 29: 453-477.
- Ladefoged, Peter, and Keith Johnson. 2010. *A Course in Phonetics*, 6th edition. Independence, USA: Cengage Learning.
- Lim, Gyu-hong. 1998. *Kwuke tamhwaphyociuy thukcing yenkwu*. "The discourse meaning of the adverb 'cengmal'." *Korean Semantics* 2: 237-254.
- Lee, Han-gyu. 1996. *Hankwuke tamhwa phyocie 'kulay'uy yumi yenkwu*. "A study on Korean discourse marker *kulay*". *Discourse and Cognition* 3: 1-26.
- Mey, Jacob L. 1994. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Schiffirin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Taeho Kim

Department of Language and Information
College of Humanities, Pusan National University
63 Busandaehak-ro, Geumjeong-ku
Busan, 609-735, South Korea
E-mail: taehokim@pusan.ac.kr

Received: 2013. 08. 06

Revised: 2013. 08. 27

Accepted: 2013. 08. 27