The Construction of Norms of Linguistic Politeness:
Valorizations of Korean honorification in language how-to manuals

by

EUN SEON KIM

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

The Faculty of Graduate Studies

(Asian Studies)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
(Vancouver)

October 2010

Abstract

This thesis aims to examine metapragmatic discourses on linguistic politeness illustrated in Korean language how-to literature. The primary task lies in contextualizing the native awareness of *ene yeycel* (linguistic politeness in Korean) within the interests or values of certain social groups. The first group, South Korean government-sanctioned agencies, led a linguistic campaign promoting a new standard speech model in 1992. Language professionals, the second group of social actors, produced popular language how-to literature, especially after the establishment of the hegemonic standard speech model. Both language standardizing policy and the participants in the how-to industry represent the cultural process of constructing language and social conventions. The "normative" culture of *ene yeycel* can be empowered and widely circulated, gaining wider social practice.

Standardization of honorification came to the surface as a public issue along with a new "cultural policy" of the Ministry of Cultural Affairs in 1990. In this cultural-political circumstance, the social meaning of standardized honorification was rediscovered as indigenous culture, a group identity shared by Korean speakers. Positively valorizing honorification as linguistic and cultural tradition, the standardized model preserves the sophisticated use of honorifics and reinforces superior-inferior relationships. However, the standard model of *ene yeycel* can be subjective and arbitrary. Moreover, different styles are too easily proscribed as errors made by sloppy speakers.

Language how-to literature produces more diversified interpretations than the standard speech manual. As language users are confronted with the challenges of finding the proper level of honorification, language how-to manuals provide justifications to help

speakers prioritize linguistic norms when internalizing social relationships. Positive valorizations of honorification derive from a speaker's respect for the interlocutor's social status or personality. Negative valorizations of honorification view deferential politeness as a kind of discriminatory behaviour indexing power-difference. The positive or negative values of honorification are based on different concepts of *ene yeycel* and on different identifications of social relationships. Such conceptualizations rationalize whether speakers should support honorification or not, and lead them to discuss language use in current society.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

CI   Cosen Ilposa (The Chosun Ilbo newspaper)

KY   The Research Centre of the Korean Language (Kwuke Yenkwuso)

MCA   The Ministry of Cultural Affairs

NIKL   National Institute of the Korean Language

ROK   Republic of Korea

SD   Standard Diction

Glossary

Adrs	Addressee
COM	Imperative
DECL	Declarative
DIR	Directional
FN	Family Name
FOR	Formal
HON	Honorific
HUM	Humilific
Q	Interrogative
LN	Last Name
LOC	Locative
NOM	Nominative
POL	Polite
POSS	Possessive
Spkr	Speaker
SUF	Suffix

Introduction

Outline of the research

This thesis aims to examine metapragmatic discourses on linguistic politeness (*ene yeycel*[1] in Korean) in contemporary South Korean society. Discussions of what linguistic politeness means and how it works in the Korean language revolve around the issue of how to articulate honorifics[2] in social interactions. This thesis will illustrate how the functions of honorification are formulated, reinforced, and contested by different groups. In doing so, I suggest that the social meanings of honorification are fluid and vary according to language users' awareness, interpretations, and evaluations of language behaviors.

This thesis focuses on explaining the context in which certain interpretations of honorification become conspicuous and rationalized in relation to social interactions and society. The primary task lies in contextualizing the native awareness(es) of *ene yeycel* within the interests or values of certain social groups. From this perspective, it is useful to remember the question posed by Wetzel (2004:43), "How do linguistic forms and use connect to notions of persons and social groups (identities), to socialization, or to the nation-state?"

---

[1] For the transcription of Korean forms, this thesis follows the Yale Romanization, for which see Martin (1992).

[2] Honorifics (honorific registers) are usually identified as a conventionalized linguistic system that involves special lexical or morpho-syntactic alternants (Brown and Levinson 1978:281; Irvine 1998/1992:51; etc.). The grammatical encodings express deference between participants of relative social status in the communicative event (Brown and Gilman 1960; Ochs 1990: Irvine 1998; Agha 1993; Koyama 1997, 2004; Choo 2006).

It is intriguing to observe how native Korean speakers understand and use

honorific registers (i.e., honorification[3]) differently, and also how their opinions about

this language practice differ. While some run campaigns urging Koreans to use honorifics

better (and more), others claim that honorifics are a social emblem of authoritarianism

and discrimination[4]. Speakers are aware of the ambivalence of honorifics: honorifics can

have a *positive value* as an honorific index; or they can have a *negative value* when

treating people on different levels according to their social status. My research questions,

then, are: what do different social groups of speakers consider "correct" or "proper" *ene*

yeycel, and why?

My approach for this purpose is a metalinguistic investigation into the discussions

about the functions of honorifics in social interactions as illustrated in popular language

how-to literature. Different groups of participants produce different linguistic accounts of

how to use honorifics "appropriately." This thesis analyzes the major social actors into

two groups. The first group, the ROK (Republic of Korea) government-sanctioned

agencies, led a linguistic campaign for the standard speech model in 1992. Language

professionals[5], the second group of social actors, produced many different genres of

language how-to literature, especially after the establishment of the hegemonic standard

speech model.

---

[3] The Korean terms for linguistic honorification (e.g., *taywu-pep* or *kyenge-pep*) often refer to the use of both honorific forms and non-honorific forms. For definitions of the various terms for honorification, see Ceng Kil-nam (2003).

[4] Students from Sindang elementary school in Seoul participated in a public campaign in 2007 to encourage honorification. (source: http://soon1991.tistory.com/entry/   -   -   ) On the other hand, Pak No-ca, a naturalized Korean and scholar of Korean history, argues for reform of Korean address terms in his column ("Hoching-pep mincwu-cek kayhyek nasel ttay" [Democratic reform needed on forms of address], Internet Hankyeley(3 April 2001) for a major newspaper in Korea (source: http://www.hani.co.kr/section-001030000/2001/001030000200104032241030.html)

[5] In this thesis, language professionals include professional linguists and who are considered to have more expert knowledge than lay speakers.

My analysis of the social phenomena pertaining to linguistic politeness derives from the theoretical framework of Silverstein's semiotic approach to the study of language structure and function (Silverstein 1979, 1981, 1992, 1993, 2003). In particular, Silverstein's notion of "indexical order" is a useful concept for analyzing the meanings of the micro-social in relation to macro-social frames (Silverstein 2003). Speakers' perceptions or valuations of the interactional context reveal the functions of "indexicality" (Ochs 1992; Silverstein 1976)—the creation of semiotic links between linguistic forms and social meanings. Linguistic signals have indexical properties on the pragmatic dimension—the indexical functions of form-in-context. While the indexical facts point to contexts of occurrence in one way or another (first-order indexicality), certain indexical values can be discernible through pragmatic and ideological processes and have social-indexical forces. For example, making or achieving text (entextualization) presupposes or regiments certain aspects of sign-context according to interested positions or perspectives on social life. Such mediating metapragmatic activities create yet another potential order of effective indexicality (*n*-th order indexicality) through which "appropriateness" of its usage in that context is constituted. Metapragmatic activities also entail "creative" effect or the "effectiveness" of the indexical token in a pragmatic dimension[6].

The evaluated functions of honorification present a close relationship with ideological changes in the social structure. In the case of Japanese, which is similar in many ways to Korean, there are three types of linguistic devices that lay speakers believe to have social-indexical forces of deference: respectfulness (*sonkei*), humbleness (*kenjō*),

---

[6] Silverstein (1993:33) notes that indexical sign phenomena (i.e., pragmatics; the indexical meaning of signs connected with the speech context) inherently include the process of "framing" or "regimenting" in specific use of linguistic forms with respect to the indexical meaning, that is, metapragmatic functions.

and politeness *(teinei)* (Koyama 2004:2039-40)[7]. Deferential entitlement, then, is an example of first-order indexicality. The fact that the social-indexical value of deference is seen as something linguistically valuable comprises a second-order indexical phenomenon, which points to the sociocultural identity of speakers (speaker-focused identity)[8]. Here, the role of metapragmatic discussions of the indexical facts (whether addressee- or speaker-focused) conceptualize or construct indexically-meaningful variability (register phenomena) (Silverstein 2003:211-6). From this perspective, metapragmatic discourses of honorification reveal positive and negative ideologizations of the pragmatic functions of honorification, as well as of the possessors or wielders of these honorifics, who are perceived to hold this valuable linguistic commodity (Koyama 2004).

While exploring the indexicality of Korean honorifics, this thesis will demonstrate the ideological aspects of honorification. As Silverstein (1992:314) points out, the process of explaining or rationalizing the pragmatics of language use uncovers the two aspects of language ideologies[9]. Firstly, as seen from the concept of "indexical order,"

---

[7] Koyama (2000, 2004) has elegantly discussed the correlations between the social indexical functions of Japanese honorifics and linguistic ideologies of modernity. The social-emblematic character of honorifics was initially framed during the modern nationalist movement in the later Meiji period (1897-1912). Ueda Kazutoshi (1867-1937) played a leading role in standardizing and regularizing Japanese honorifics (Koyama 2004b: 415-6). Koyama associates the simplification and evaluation of honorifics with modern ideologies such as egalitarianism, agentive individualism, referentialism, and rationalism (Koyama 2004b: 418). On the other hand, he argues that capitalism and commercialism are related to the positive ideologization, associates this with the values of modernity and rationality in urban life. As a result, and as represented by the increase in donatory honorification (polite types; *teinei*), the social use of honorifics in Japanese has acquired second-order indexicality, indexing the speaker as an educated, cultured, refined, and urban person.
[8] Silverstein (1992:317) mentions deference and demeanor as the two indexical orders of honorific registers. Unlike deference (first-order indexicality), demeanor is an ideological component operated by the speaker-focused context, as it expresses the metapragmatics of the appropriateness of the addressee-focused context. For instance, a statistical analysis shows that native Japanese speakers tend to judge the use of honorifics (*keigo* in Japanese) to be associated with intelligence, education, and capability (Wetzel 1994b).
[9] According to Irvine (1998:54), ideologies of language refer to the complex systems of ideas and interests through which people interpret linguistic bahaviours. Similarly, Silverstein (1979:193) defines ideologies about language or linguistic ideologies as "sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a

language ideologies play a mediating role in a dialectic process of abstraction and in many distinct orders of sociality and of social process[10]. They give ideas of determinate contextualization for indexicals which are shared by different groups of interests or concerns. In other words, the *awareness* of the indexical meanings of language use is ideologically biased (Silverstein 1981, 1992:314-20). The other aspect of language ideology is the special position of certain institutional sites of social practice (Silverstein 1992:320-2). The framing of indexical meanings of language use reveals the special position of certain institutional sites of social practice.

This thesis will proceed as follows. I will begin the discussion by introducing the major issues in honorification for lay speakers and their expressed need for prescriptive ideologies. Chapter 1 draws attention to the process of establishing norms of *ene yeycel* in two public dimensions: state-led speech standardization and the language how-to industry. Chapters 2 and 3 deal with the details of the norms of *ene yeycel* constructed by certain social activities, especially those concerning the primary values operative in contextualizing the indexicality of honorifics. Chapter 4 provides an analysis of the motivations underlying the standardized or popularized norms of *ene yeycel* in their socio-political context. Lastly, I conclude by suggesting the cultural significance and the effects of "normative" discourses of *ene yeycel*.

---

rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use." For more on language ideologies, see Woolard and Schieffelin (1994).

[10] This mediating role is prevalent throughout society. Cameron (1995) examines the social phenomenon of language intervention, which she defines as "attempts on the part of outside agencies to affect speakers' linguistic bahaviour through overt commentary or instruction and the construction of common knowledge."

Why do people think honorification matters?

In social relationships, language is more than a mere tool for communication. The way one uses language reveals not only one's personality but also one's attitude toward others. The significance of honorifics in interactions guides language users to the inevitable question: What do speakers need to consider about honorification? Honorifics have been shown to signify a relationship between communicative participants (power and solidarity), the conversational scene (formal vs. informal), or the strategic expression of a speaker (Brown 2008:274-7).

Among these variables, one of the essential factors for a speaker to be conscious of is determining an appropriate level of honorifics for the interlocutor. Though the nature of a relationship is changeable according to communicative circumstances or personal goals, whatever the given conditions, a speaker must ultimately keep in mind the question: which level or type of honorifics would be proper for the addressee or referent?[11] If native speakers have intuitions about honorification, in what way are they still concerned about *ene yeycel*? In fact, many questions about grammatical or lexical choices in honorification are associated with the matter of appropriate levels of politeness in social interactions, rather than with grammaticality *stricto senso*.

The proper level of politeness—propriety—is indeed the essential issue in honorification (Cf. APPENDIX A[12]). Propriety in terms of address is one of the most

---

[11] A speaker's task in choosing proper honorific forms requires understanding of an interpersonal relationship. Although honorific forms (i.e., addressee honorifics) sometimes include stylistic variations, Se Cengswu (1984:12) notes that a speaker's choice of honorifics is restricted to a certain level of speech style set by the relative relationship of the participants. That is, a speaker may choose honorifics revealing a stylistic variation such as solidarity or formality after a certain scope of speech style is determined by a given social factor.

[12] English translations of exemplary questions (numbers in brackets in the text) are given in the appendix at the end of this thesis. I have summarized the questions because of space limitations.

common sources of interpersonal conflict caused by honorification. Speakers call into question linguistic choices that turn out to neglect to show a respectful attitude toward the referent. Nor does showing *too much* respect necessarily guarantee propriety [1-3], and some people argue that too much politeness or courtesy can make the interlocutor feel uncomfortable. The traditional dictum "*kwalyey* (   ) *nun pilyey* (   )" (literally, 'over-politeness is impolite') is often mentioned in accounts of ungrammatical over-honorification[13](National Institute of the Korean Language 1992b:93, NIKL hereafter). Therefore, speakers want to verify unnecessary over-honorification at the levels of grammar or language use [4-5].

The dilemma of propriety is particularly challenging if one's position in a kinship hierarchy does not correspond with one's age. In such situations, speakers need to decide whether to use honorifics or not. If, for instance, a brother-in-law is older by age but lower by descent, the normative term of address *maypu* or LN + *sepang* indicates that the (younger) speaker is superior to the referent by descent [6]. However, the form of address may not be proper because it signifies an impolite attitude on the part of the younger speaker toward the older referent. If a referent is younger by age but higher by descent, an older speaker confronts an uncomfortable situation where he/she needs to use the polite term of address to the younger referent [7].

---

[13] Examples of incorrect over-honorification are as follows (NIKL 1996b:75; Nam Kisim and Kim Haswu 1995:57-8):

a. Over-honorification

malssum-i	*kyeysi-ta*
speech:HON-NOM	exist:HON-DECL

'[Someone] speaks' (literally, 'someone's speech exists')

a'. Correct honorifiction

malssum-i	*iss-ta*
speech:HON-NOM	exist-DECL

'[Someone] speaks'

b. Over-honorification

cehuy	*nala*
our:HUM	country

'my (humble) country'

b'. Correct honorification

wuli	*nala*
our	country

'my country'

In addition, speakers should be careful when deciding on a target for honorification between a referent and an addressee. According to traditional "suppression of respect" rules (hereafter, *apcon-pep*[14]), an inferior speaker is supposed to drop honorifics for the superior referent if the addressee is superior to the referent [8]. The speaker, however, may call into question the propriety, because dropping honorifics toward the inferior referent (inferior, that is, in comparison to the addressee, but not the speaker) may signify a disrespectful attitude toward the referent.

Speakers go through similar problems in dealing with honorification for an in-group referent and an addressee [9-11]. Speakers may drop honorifics to the in-group referent as they are conscious of the social norm of modesty (*kyemyang-pep*[15]). However, this 'anti-honorification' shows an insufficiently respectful attitude toward the superior referent. For instance, if speakers keep honorifics for the in-group referent, this may indicate the speaker's superiority to the addressee. In other words, humility as *ene yeycel* toward the addressee conflicts with honorification as *ene yeycel* for the superior referent.

---

[14] *Apcon-pep* (; 'suppression of respect') refers to honorification for the highest superior referent, by suppressing honorification for the second-highest superior addressee, even though both are superior to the speaker (Cang Thaycin 2000:85; Se Cengswu 1984:20). According to Cang Thaycin (2000:88-9), *apcon-pep* is strictly maintained, especially in kinship relationships—e.g., among family members. For instance, a grandson should speak to his grandfather about his father as follows:

> *Halapeci,   apeci cip-ey   ka-ss-supni-ta*
> Grandfather, father home-DIR   go-PAST-POL-DECL
> 'Grandfather, my father has gone home'

If the addressee is not superior to the speaker's father, the speaker (grandson) should use honorifics for his father as in "*ka-si-ess-supni-ta*" (with honorific marker -*si*-). For more about the social history of *apcon-pep* in Korean, see Cang Thaycin (2000).

[15] *Kyemyang-pep* ('self-deprecation') refers to the linguistic norm of humility in traditional Korean society, whereby inferiors are required to drop honorifics for the speaker(s) or for in-group members (relevant to the speaker(s)) so as to express modesty. Family members or one's place of work are often the referents in self-deprecation as in: *yesik* (my little daughter;   ), *colko* (my unworthy manuscript), or *phyeysa* (my ruined firm).

In order to resolve such confusion in language use, language prescriptions from educational sources can play a key role as an authorized standard for lay speakers. According to Milroy and Milroy (1999:1), prescriptivism is an ideology (or set of beliefs) about language use which requires that things be done in the right way. Linguists and other language professionals commonly express prescriptive attitudes about language use (Cameron 1995; Milroy and Milroy 1999). Termed "prescriptive ideologues" by Pullum (1996:6), educated people tend to prescribe for others on behalf of the prestige dialect, that is, the standardized language[16]. Regulative rules are accompanied by various arguments to justify the choice of one construction over others[17] (Pullum 2006:14).

Besides government-sanctioned standardization projects, linguistic groups and broadcasters provide a wide range of educational sources to the public. Many language research organizations or broadcasting stations operate online Q&A bulletin boards[18]. Some major newspapers, company newsletters, and broadcasters have language columns or run language-related programs[19]. Such a linguistic market—"a system of rewards and

---

[16] Language guardians, known as "shamans," "mavens," or "Jeremiahs," play an influential role as public guardians of usage in commenting on supposed misuse of language and lamenting supposed linguistic decline (Bolinger 1980:1-10; Pinker 1994:370-403, cited in Milroy and Milroy 1999:8-10).

[17] Pullum (2006:7) suggests the following preliminary list of prescriptive ideologies: nostalgia, classicism, authoritarianism, aestheticism, coherentism, logicism, commonsensism, functionalism, and asceticism. In a similar vein, Milroy and Milroy (1999:13) note that linguists impose judgments about superiority/inferiority, beauty/ugliness, or logicality/illogicality, as far as language use is concerned.

[18] Here are some Korean language research organizations:
Pusan National University [Wulimal Paywumthe] < http://urimal.cs.pusan.ac.kr/urimal_new/ >; National Institute of the Korean Language [Onlain Kanata] <http://www.korean.go.kr/08_new/index.jsp>; KBS [Hankwuke Sangtamso] <http://korean.kbs.co.kr/board.php?act=BrdList&mcd=108410029001>; etc.

[19] A. Some newspaper columns dealing with language use:
 [Wulimal kul palossuki 'correct use of spoken and written Korean'] (*Hankyeley*) <http://hangul.hani.co.kr/>,[Ene yeycel 'language etiquette'] <http://www.hani.co.kr/arti/opinion/column/319014.html>;[Totpoki colpoki 'glasses for short-sighted and far-sighted'](*Hankwuk kyengcey*) <http://www.korean.go.kr/>; [Wulimal yehayng 'Journey into Korean'] (*The Sewul sinmwun*)<http://www.seoul.co.kr/news/newsList.php? section=koreanTravel>; [Wulimal Palwuki'Rectifying Korean'](*Cwungang ilpo*) <http://bbs.joins.com/list.asp? bysort=time&page=5&tb_name=korean>; etc.
 B. Language programs of broadcasting stations:

sanctions that endows particular forms of language with greater or less values" (Bourdieu 1991, cited in Wetzel 2004: 44)—possesses authority based on linguistic expertise. These sources with authority offer normative language usages for lay speakers who are unsure about notions of correctness.

On the other hand, Pullum (2006:9) attributes linguists' prescriptive ideologies concerning grammaticality to linguistic conservatism on behalf of the standard language, which advocates order, continuity, tradition, discipline, self-control, and authority in linguistic theories. Similarly, Milroy and Milroy (1999:22) have attributed prescriptive judgments to "a need for uniformity" in standard language.

Nevertheless, prescriptivism from the how-to literature is consistent with prior assumptions about linguistic and social behaviors becoming a normative reality (Wetzel 2005:102). Various educational means are powerful and regulative enough to naturalize the social reality of linguistic norms in the form of popular beliefs about the convention of language (Milroy and Milroy 1999:3). As a result, people tend to believe that language is enshrined in these books rather than in the linguistic and communicative competence of the millions who use the language every day (Milroy and Milroy 1999:22-3).

[Wulimal Natuli 'Korean language excursion'](iMBC)
<http://www.imbc.com/broad/tv/culture/hangul/board/
index.html>; [Wulimal Kyelwuki 'Korean Competition'](KBS) <http://www.kbs.co.kr/1tv/sisa/woorimal/>;
etc.

Chapter 1 Honorification and Sociolinguistics

1.1 Research review

As a first step toward understanding native metalinguistic discourse, I review South

Korean sociolinguistic discourse and clarify what sorts of social ideologies we associate

with honorification. Particularly with the growth of sociolinguistics in the late 1970s,

sociolinguists and linguists have analyzed the interrelationship between society and

language. It is in this context that Korean linguists began to contextualize linguistic

changes in the honorific system and usages in their socio-historical contexts, especially in

postwar South Korean society. Empirical as well as theoretical studies have often linked

modern-western ideological stimuli such as egalitarianism and/or self-centrism with

linguistic changes[20].

Nam Kisim (1981), for example, notes several changes in honorification and

relates them to socio-political changes as follows:

> All changes in honorification as such can be summarized as simplification—a tendency to use
> honorifics with persons who are in a primary and direct relation with the speaker as well as the
> use of informal styles, etc. This inclination is considered to have something to do with changes
> in social structures: a flexible social stratum and nuclearization of interpersonal relationships
> centering on the self, as well as horizontality, which is different from past times when social
> classes were relatively fixed. (Nam Kisim 1981:16)

Above, Nam suggests two opposite changes in honorifics which he tries to connect to

changes in the social structure. As for the linguistic changes, the "simplification" of

---

[20] In the case of Japanese, Koyama (1997, 2004b) examines the sociolinguistic history of polite language
(*keigo*) and reveals a relationship between linguistic ideologies and linguistic forms. First, he points out that
egalitarianism, agentive individualism, referentialism, etc. are conducive to interpreting honorification
negatively and thus to simplifying honorifics (Koyama 1997:50-2; 2004b:417-8). On the other hand, he
mentions capitalism and commercialism, which are conducive to a positive valorization of honorification in
urban contexts (Koyama 1997:52-3; 2004b:418-20).

honorification includes two subchanges. Firstly, "informalization" refers to the inclination to use honorifics less. Secondly, quite contrary to this, he points out the tendency to overuse honorifics recklessly, particularly for referents whose relationship is close to the speaker. With regard to these linguistic changes, he suggests two ideological variables. The former can be named as *egalitarianism*, which Nam identifies as "the weakened awareness of social stratification and the increase in horizontal relationships" (16). The latter is *self-centrism*, which can be driven by speakers' desire to be linguistically respectful of those who are within the pragmatic boundaries of the speakers' social relationships.

The linguistic consequence of this is that, whether they use honorifics more or less under certain contexts, the sophistication of honorifics has been simplified in modernized society. Although Nam's speculation is not based on in-depth historical or sociological research, other linguists have provided similar frameworks. All in all, many Korean linguists seem to agree that the influx of modern-western ideologies has caused honorific repertoires and honorification to become "less strict" and "simpler" (Kim Hyeyswuk 2000:115-6). In other words, contemporary speakers in modernized society feel less need to signal different levels of deferential or polite attitudes.

In addition to the analysis of speakers' linguistic behaviors, historical events provide a "factual" background for *de facto* social ideologies. Indeed, the socio-political process of modernity (e.g., industrialization and democratization) in post-war Korean society seems to be integrally related to the increasing social values of egalitarianism and self-entrism. Specific examples of linguistic change in honorification support the ideological correlationship with linguistic evidence. For example, the "breakdown of

social stratification" and the "support of horizontal relationships" in the passage above can easily remind us of the democratic movement in South Korea from the 1960s to the 1980s. The next sections will provide details as to how sociolinguistic discourses associate these socio-ideological changes with referential functional changes in honorification.

1.1.1 Egalitarianism and the decreasing use of honorifics

Firstly, one of the most salient linguistic changes associated with socio-political ideologies in South Korea has been the casualization or informalization of honorification[21]. The key claim here is that in order to adapt language use for the increase in horizontal relationships in society, honorifics and their usage were casualized and informalized in the direction of indexing more solidarity and less power-difference. To put it differently, the indexical functions of honorifics such as power-difference and formality have lost their effects because speakers in modern society value horizontality and solidarity in social interactions.

For example, Seng Kichel (1999) observes the simplification of addressee honorification (speech levels) in his examination of Korean fiction. Seng notes that Korean speech levels in the early twentieth century consisted of the dual system as summarized in Table 1[22]:

---

[21] Many empirical studies have examined the dominant use of the so-called informal styles in *hay* (*yo*) (i.e., Polite Style *hay yo* and Intimate Style *hay*, following the terminology of Samuel Martin) (Aoyama 1970; Yi Mayngseng 1973; Pak Yengswun 1976; Se Cengswu 1979a, 1979b, 1980; Kim Caymin 1998: 342; Seng Kichel 1970, 1999; Yun 1994; etc.).

[22] The English translations of Korean terms for speech levels are from Lee and Ramsey (1999: 250).

Verbal endings	Speech level I	Verbal endings	Speech level II
hapsyo *hao* *hakey* *hayla*	*acwu nophim* (Formal Style) *yeysa nophim* (Authoritative Style) *yeysa nacchwum* (Familiar Style) *acwu nacchwum* (Plain Style)	*hayyo* *hay*	*twulwu nophim* (Polite Style) *twulwu nacchwum* (*Panmal* Style)

Table 1 Dual-speech levels in the early twentieth century (Seng Kichel 1999:98)

According to Seng, the *hao-hakey* Styles have contracted drastically and are being replaced by the *hayyo-hay* Styles in texts ever since the 1960s (99). Accordingly, the preexisting four speech levels (i.e., *hapsyo-hao-hakey-hay* Styles) were simplified to two levels. He describes this transformation in relation to the social awareness of "democratic citizen consciousness" (*mincwu simin uysik*) and "equality consciousness" (*phyengtung uysik*) (98-100). In a similar vein, Se Cengswu (1979a, 1980) finds that the simplified system of addressee honorification among native speakers in the late 1970s results from reduced power-difference, in addition to the increasing relative weight of horizontal or informal interpersonal relationships[23]. In other words, since the *hay yo-hay* Styles are less power-oriented and more informal, speakers began to shun the *hao-hakey* Styles which were tied to a more stratified social structure and higher levels of formality[24] (Seng Kichel 1999:98-9).

This casualization or informalization of honorification can also be observed with subject and object honorification and terms of address (Se Cengswu 1979a, 1979b; Kim

---

[23] Se Cengswu (1978, 1979b) claims that the decline of the *hakey-hao* Styles accentuated the *hayyo-hay* Styles as major forms along with the *hapnita-hanta* Styles as minor forms. (Note that the latter forms are the declarative endings of the *hapsyo-hayla* Styles.) Although he acknowledges *haney* (the declarative form of *hakey* Style) used among certain kinship relationships, he understands the overall transformation of addressee honorification as reflecting a social trend toward a more horizontal society.

[24] He mentions that the four-level (*hapsyo-hao-hakey-hayla*) system reflects a rigid linguistic treatment toward addressee(s) based on social status (96). By contrast, he goes on to say that the increase in *hay yo-hay* Styles was largely at the expense of the styles in *hapsyo-hao* and less so in the case of the *hakey-hayla* Styles (97). Therefore, he describes *hay* (Intimate or *Panmal* Style = 'half speech') as less strict in distinguishing speech levels, thus rendering it more informal (97).

Caymin 1998). Kim Caymin (1998:341) demonstrates that younger generations show a preference for less honorific or plain language to honorific expressions than do older generations do[25]. Kim argues that solidarity carries more weight than power variables (e.g., age, status), a fact that compels speakers to prefer less honorific forms over more honorific ones (343-51). In addition, the prevalent use of informal and intimate terms of address/reference among kinship members has been understood as another example of the casualization of honorification within horizontal social relationships (Se Cengswu 1979a, 1979b)[26].

Linguistic and social changes of this nature have been documented in the case of Western European languages by the famous sociolinguistic work by Brown and Gilman (1960) on the "personal pronouns of power and solidarity." Just as the plain pronoun *tu* predominates over the polite form *vous*, Korean sociolinguistic discourse illustrates a similar tendency toward decreased use of honorifics in support of less power-driven but more intimate social relationships. Some Korean linguists have even advocated reducing authoritative honorification and equalizing honorific levels in order to keep pace with the increasingly egalitarian society (e.g.,Yang Insek 1980).

So far, then, honorification appears to undergo casualization or informalization in accordance with changes in the social structure. That is, since language users in the increasingly egalitarian society desire to avoid encoding power-difference and formality, they tend to use honorifics less. In doing so, the linguistic changes accommodate more

---

[25] According to Kim, younger generations do not recognize the highest honorific verb *capswuta* 'to eat'. In other words, three honorific levels (i.e., *mekta* [plain], *tusita* [medium high], and *capswuta* [highest]) merge/simplify into just two levels without the top level.
[26] According to his survey, speakers (although the ratio of each term varies) address their (grand)parents, brother or sisters without the honorific suffix -*nim* (46). Se conjectures that the less formal and more intimate speech levels will continue to increase in use as social relationships become more horizontal (41).

egalitarian social relationships, and give more weight to the preferable pragmatic effect of casualness and/or solidarity, while diluting the unfavorable indexical function of using honorifics.

1.1.2 Self-centrism and the increasing use of honorifics

Less obvious than egalitarianism, self-centrism (or "agentive individualism[27]") is the other modern ideology which accounts for the opposite change in honorification. Although Korean linguists rarely use the term self-centrism (or individualism), they refer to the self-oriented identification of interpersonal relationships as the primary motivation to use honorifics. As a linguistic phenomenon in support of self-centrism, linguists often mention the speaker's tendency to use honorifics for interlocutors closely (in both the pragmatic and psychological senses) related to the speaker, including a speaker himself or herself.

For example, Kim Hyeyswuk (2000) explains the weakening of *apcon-pep* with regard to a speaker's identification of interpersonal relationships. According to Kim, speakers nowadays would rather just use honorifics if *any* interlocutor (referent or addressee) is worthy of honorific entitlement from the speaker's point of view. Her key argument with regard to self-entrism lies in her indication that the suppressed honorification requires speakers to consider power-relations between the referent and the addressee, in isolation from the speaker. That is, according to convention, the speaker

---

[27] Koyama (2004b:417) refers to "*agentive individualism*" as "the belief that the personal identities of, and power-relations between, individuals should be constructed *independent* from pre-supposable power-relationships." He discusses this as one of the ideologies which negatively valorize power asymmetry between interlocutors. In the case of Japanese honorifics (*keigo*), Koyama (ibid.) notes that the rise of and symmetricization of addressee honorification may serve as the "linguistic manifestation of *agentive individualism*."

should use honorifics only for the highest superior speaker even if the addressee is superior to the speaker.

However, her claim is that, since speakers identify or define their relationships with their interlocutors individually or atomistically, they simply use honorifics for the superior or inferior interlocutors (129). In other words, since both the addressee and referent are superior to the speaker anyway, the speaker does not bother to differentiate between high or low linguistic treatment. In doing so, speakers can set themselves free from using the more complicated suppressed honorification, whereby the speaker needs to calculate relative power-relations among the addressee and referent. Therefore, Kim seems to take the newer, simplified honorification as a linguistic reflection of increasingly individual-oriented social behaviors in contemporary Korean society.

Similarly, Nam illustrates the linguistic phenomenon of over-deferential entitlement for interlocutors who are directly or closely related to the speaker because they are either *inside* the speech event or *within* the boundaries of the speaker's private relationships:

1) Over-honorification (Nam Kisim 1981:15):
  a. (Spkr=friend, Adrs=friend)
   *Ne, sensayng-nim-i   o-**si**-lay*
   You, teacher-SUF:HON-NOM come-HON-COM
   'You, the teacher wants you to come.'

  b. (Spkr=grandchild, Adrs=grandfather)
   *Halapeci,   apeci o-**sy**-ess-eyo.*
   Grandfather, father come-HON-PAST-POL:DECL
   'Grandfather, my father has come.'

  c. (Spkr=teacher's student, Adrs=teacher)
   *Sensayng-nim,   ai   appa-to   ili-lo   o-**si**-l ke-yeyyo.*
   Teacher-SUF:HON child daddy-NOM here-DIR come-HON-FUTURE-POL:DECL
   'Teacher, my child's father will come here soon, too.'

In 1a), the speaker (i.e., student) probably meant to express his or her deferential entitlement to the referent (i.e., teacher), but the verb with the referent honorific marker -*si*(*y*)-, in fact, refers to the deferential action of the addressee (i.e., friend). Nam Kisim views this confusion as a kind of addressee-related constraint: a speaker's awareness of the relationship with the person who is *in front of* the addressee (He Wung 1951, cited in Nam Kisim 1981:15). Although Nam does not go into detail, his claim seems to hint that the use of honorifics is induced by the speaker's awareness of being polite in the presence of the addressee, his or her friend.

On a similar note, he ascribes the breakdown of the suppression of honorifics (*apcon-pep*) in 1b) and humilifics or self-deprecation (*kyemyang-pep*) in 1c) to the speaker's self-oriented perception of social relationships. In these examples, he explains that speakers use honorifics for referents because the relationships between the speakers and the addressees are more primary than those with superior addressees. However, these referents (i.e., father in 1b), husband in 1c)) should be referred to without honorifics because they either are inferior to the addressee or belong to the speaker's side (i.e., insider). Therefore, Nam tries to link the individual-oriented awareness of social relationships to a speaker's tendency to be polite to (relatively) inferior referents that are close to the speaker.

The self-oriented identification of a speaker's relationship can also be applicable to the use of honorifics for a speaker. For instance, Se (1979a) points out the reduced awareness of expressing self-deprecation in reference to a speaker oneself. His statement below shows that speakers are actually encouraged promoting a self-oriented identity in order to survive in modern Korean society:

[I]n modern society, self-deprecation may even cause an unfair treatment of oneself....[I]t is reasonable to say that [people] need to show off their capability in order to survive in modern society, rather than showing it moderately or lowering themselves. It is in this context that this modern society is called the era of self-PR (self-promotion; *caki pial*). In this perspective, linguistic expressions of and the awareness of modesty cannot help but decline. (Se Cengswu 1979a:593-4)

In addition, Kim Hyeyswuk (2000:116) says that "the younger generation that likes to show off itself" takes for granted the breakdown of the humilifics or suppressed honorification with regard to speaker-related (including the speaker him- or herself) or inferior referents. Thus, these young speakers prefer using the plain pronoun *na* 'I' instead of the humble form *ce* or the honorific particle *kkeyse* (nominative) instead of the plain form *ka* in reference to a speaker's husband. Here, the over-use of honorifics seems to derive from the assumption that the conventional humilification does not appeal to the young generations who grew up in the modern-western society.

To sum up, the self-oriented awareness of social relationships (i.e., individualism) appears to have brought about the over-use of honorifics. This linguistic phenomenon is often understood as a socio-ideological consequence, for speakers nowadays are inclined to show respect to themselves or to interlocutors related to them rather than to less-related interlocutors. We see a paradox: the increasing use of honorifics seems contradictory to the decreasing use of honorifics under the influence of egalitarianism. In this case, however, the use of honorifics is driven by a speaker's positive valorization that the use of honorifics encodes a speaker's polite attitude to interlocutors, rather than a relative power-difference.

1.1.3 Linguistic change and ideology

So far, we have observed the relationship between society and language as one in which social structure influences (or determines) linguistic structure and the behaviors of speakers. Indeed, social ideological changes have much to do with the ways in which language users identify their interpersonal relationships and their positions in them.

However, similar linguistic phenomena can be interpreted within different social contexts. First, the linguistic phenomenon of using honorifics where speakers are not supposed to use them can be seen as resulting from a decrease of speakers' awareness of power-relationships. For example, lexical honorification to express humilifics—speakers' humble attitudes (*kyemyang-e*)—such as *ce* 'I,' *tulita* '[+HON] to give' or *yeccwuta* '[+HON] to question,' has decreased and been replaced by plain (non-honorific) forms. Se Cengswu (1979a:584) interprets this as a manifestation of the decreased "awareness of linguistic modesty" (*kyemyang uysik*).

Similarly, Se (1979a) argues that speakers these days are no longer keen on the low/high linguistic distinction since they do not pay attention to expressing modesty or distinguishing power-differences. What he observes from the breakdown in more traditional honorific usages such as humilifics/self-deprecation (*kyemyang-pep*) and suppressed honorification (*apcon-pep*) is that some speakers tend to perform deferential entitlement to whomever is involved in the speech context, *regardless* of power-difference. As he concludes, speakers in modern Korean society are likely to pay less linguistic respect toward superior referents, but to express more politeness toward inferior referents (including the speaker) than they used to in the past.

By contrast, the same honorific phenomenon has been analyzed in the context of

vertical social relationships in modern Korean society. For instance, Se Cengswu

(1979b:52) and Kim Hyeyswuk (1995) have discussed the decline in suppressed

honorification (*apcon-pep*) in families within the context of power-relations. That is, due

to the increased economic and social power of the father, the power-relation between a

child (the speaker) and a father (the referent) becomes more influential than the

relationship with the grandfather.

By the same token, Se (1979a, 1979b) says that the overuse of honorific terms of

address and other honorific markers for referents in the workplace indicates speakers'

desires to perform deferential entitlement for superior referents within the context of

power-relations (e.g., social position), as shown in 2) below:

2) The overuse of referent honorification (Se Cengswu 1979a:617):
    a. (Spkr=subordinate, Adrs=boss)
       Sacang-nim-uy   *elin*   *tta-nim-i*   *yeyppu-si-pni-kka*?
       Boss-SUF:HON-POSS young daughter-SUF:HON-NOM pretty-HON-FOR-Q
       'Boss, is your daughter pretty?'

    b. (Spkr=subordinate, Adrs=boss)
       Pucang-nim-kkeyse-nun   *sikan-i*   *kyeysi-pnik-ka*?
       Manager-SUF:HON-NOM:HON-NOM time-NOM have:HON-FOR-Q
       'Manager, do you have time?'

    c. (On the phone)
       Mianhaci-man, keki-ka   *eti-si-nkayo*?
       Sorry-but   there-NOM where-HON-POL-Q
       'I'm sorry, but who is this speaking?'

Se's analysis of excessive honorification shows that speakers are actually quite

conscious of the modern version of power-relations, and that it is different from the

social-status system in pre-modern Korean society[28]; they want or need to show a

---

[28] According to Se (1979a:615), this power-relation is based on material and mental influence that one can
exert over the other—for example, seller-customer, student-teacher, or boss-subordinate relationships. He

respectful attitude for superiors in order to pursue their interests in the relationship. The relationship between the conversants would be characterized by a temporary power-relation which the speaker created on purpose, by deploying honorific markers, not some pre-existing objective/real difference in social positions. Again, Se seems to be trying to show that the deployment of honorifics can occur in a modern version of power-relations motivated by personal benefits/self-interest.

However, Se (1979a) offers the opposite analysis of the honorific suffix *-nim* for people who are not necessarily in a high social position, as in 3):

3) The overuse of *-nim* in terms of address (Se Cengswu 1979a:616):
   kisa-nim 'driver,' *swuwi-nim* 'janitor,' *cwupu-nim* 'housewife,' *camay-nim* 'sister,'
   yolisa-nim 'chef,' *cokyo-nim* 'TA,' etc.

Se (1979a) acknowledges this as either speakers' "consideration" (*paylye*) so as not to offend the interlocutor under a merit-based relation, or as the decreased "consciousness of the relative lowness/highness of occupations" (*cikep kwichen uysik*). That is, a more egalitarian-based respect irrespective of social positions. Se's statement reminds us of the social egalitarianism that he observes in other forms of honorification.

1.2 The relationship between society and honorification

The sociolinguistic discourse on Korean honorification appears to reach the conclusion that broad-stroke modern-western ideologies have evoked the simplification of linguistic structure and the usages in social interactions. Under changing social conditions, people

---

also points out that these interpersonal relationships are distinctive in modern society in the sense that they are relative and temporary according to situations, but the foundation for their relationships is merit-based.

perceive their interpersonal relationships differently:

Social/linguistic changes	Korean-traditional	⇒ Modern-western
Social structure/relationships	Hierarchical	Egalitarian/individual-oriented
Honorification (linguistic and pragmatic)	Elaborated	Simplified (less low/high linguistic distinction)

Table 2 Modern Western Ideologies and Korean Honorification

There are two presupposed ideas about honorification and the role of language users underlying the analysis. First, the more sophisticated linguistic structures and usages of honorifics derive from the hierarchy in traditional Korean society. This assumption is a prerequisite for linguists to that the decline in the distinction of high/low linguistic treatment has resulted from a "westernized" society where various morpho-syntactic forms are less needed to express linguistic politeness. Secondly, speakers react according to western-modern ideologies in their language practice. Here, language-users are passive receivers of social changes, and their language-use manifests an automatic reaction. Under this assumption, we may say that the linguistic evidence of the ideological influence (e.g., egalitarianism and self-centrism) can be seen from speakers using honorifics in more simple ways, either by simply deploying honorifics or simply taking out honorifics.

Nevertheless, a clear-cut and inevitable cause-and-effect relationship between society and language-use (i.e., the claim that language structure/use is determined by society), seems too strong a position. Korean metalinguistic discourse shows conflicting evaluations of language practice (i.e., both positive and negative valorizations of honorification). For instance, in spite of the casualization and simplification of

honorification practices, speakers in (merit-based) social relationships need to express a respectful attitude toward their interlocutors, and expect positive effects from their linguistic behaviors (e.g., effective persuasion or amicable relationships)[29]. Besides, showing linguistic respect equally (e.g., the reciprocal use of honorifics or the uniform deployment of personal name + honorific suffix *nim*), does not necessarily go against the speakers' need to use honorifics. For these positive pragmatic functions of honorification, honorification would have social meaning even in a completely egalitarian society.

Likewise, self-centrism does not necessarily derive language users inexorably to self-oriented use of honorifics. Speakers will still use honorifics with interlocutors who are influential, even though the relationship has been horizontalized, because they care for their own identity (education, politeness) in front of an addressee. Furthermore, speakers express their personal affection (i.e., friendly attitude) toward intimate interlocutors through less- or non- use of honorifics, particularly in informal contexts. By contrast, they may try to show self-deprecation (that is, respect for others) in order to index their own identity as a humble or polite speaker.

Here it is crucial to note that language users who *internalize* socio-cultural ideologies differently can nonetheless make those opposing discourses and language uses meaningful to them. The coexistence of contradictory values in honorification may lead speakers to use honorifics more dynamically and/or strategically, rather than simply guarantee some inevitable linguistic consequences of social ideologies. Indeed, language users can manipulate the pragmatic functions of honorification by using or dropping honorific markers.

---

[29] As a matter of fact, many sociolinguistic studies have recently examined the overuse of honorifics, particularly in public life (as opposed to personal life) and in commercial contexts where speakers have a stake in the relationship with the interlocutor(s) (Yi Huytwu 1998; Se Una 2008; cf. Koyama 1997).

In this regard, it is too early to conclude that the simplified linguistic structures and flattened or casualized use of honorifics derive somehow mechanically from the influences of modern western ideologies as Korean society has undergone the process of modernization. Rather, the socio-pragmatic functions of honorification in modern Korean society are dynamic and changing, allowing various evaluations of honorification. Therefore, the actual linguistic variations in honorification indicate that ideological factors can bring out various internalizations of the language users in their language practice, rather than social ideologies leading language use inexorably in a certain direction.

At this point, it would be timely to consider an alternative perspective to explain the correlation between language and society—the useful suggestion by Cameron (1990:85) that "people's use of language reflects group norms"[30]. Linguistic norms are the evaluated aspects of language consisting of notions of correctness in society as "good" or "bad" (Errington 1984:18). They reveal how members of a community view language and social relations (ibid.). Cameron argues that the clues to understand people's linguistic behaviors and attitudes and changes in the linguistic system derive from the behaviors and attitudes of the actual speakers (88). From this perspective, this thesis examines how language users construct and negotiate the meanings of their language use in various social contexts.

---

[30] Bartsch (1987:4) roughly defines norms as the social reality of correctness notions that have objectivity above or outside individuals in various degrees of formality, from providing models of correctness to providing codifications of norms.

1.3 Makers of linguistic politeness norms

1.3.1 The formation of norms of *ene yeycel*

Korean speakers are conscious of the norms of linguistic politeness, which can be generally termed as *ene yeycel* ('linguistic politeness'). *Ene yeycel* often involves how to use honorific registers "properly" and "politely" in language practice. This sociolinguistic norm is certainly a major concern for Korean speakers. From early childhood, Koreans learn how to deploy honorifics to express deference toward others.

Honorification is more than a means of communication; it is a medium of identity as well as of the relationship of speakers toward conversants or interpersonal relationships. Pragmatic functions of honorific language are known to express a degree of deference, politeness, or social distance towards conversants (Seng Kichel 1991:11-2; Irvine 1998/1992:53). Honorification can also signify (or index) speakers' polite manners and culturedness—e.g., level of education or social status[31]. That is to say, speech is often perceived as reflecting or indexing one's identity (personal attitude or culturedness). Errors in honorification can possibly be disgraceful for the speaker, leaving negative impressions of himself or herself as a rude or uneducated person. Likewise, non- or less honorification can index disrespect toward conversants, which often leads to conflict in interpersonal relationships. These indexical values are crucial for speakers in maintaining amicable social relationships.

If speakers care about language politeness in their social interactions, the following question arises: What is considered polite in a linguistic sense? On the one

---

[31] Koyama (2000, 2004b) explores the indexical values of honorifics in Japanese, based on Silverstein's theoretical treatment of indexicality (Silverstein 2003). For Japanese lay speakers' awareness of Japanese honorification, see Wetzel and Ide (1994).

hand, honorification is highly conventionalized in Korean[32]. Traditionally, honorification is seen as having its roots in the Confucian value of respecting one's superiors or out-group members but lowering inferiors or in-group members related to a speaker (Hong Cinok 2006). Thus, honorific registers are more applicable to someone superior (usually in age or social position) than to someone inferior. Honorific registers—i.e., addressee-related honorifics—are also preferred among speakers with low solidarity or in formal/public situations (Lee and Ramsey 2000:206-62; Choo 2006:138).

Although speakers have a general idea about to whom and when to convey their respectful attitudes in communication, the next challenge is how to deploy honorific registers proficiently. Manipulation of honorifics is a complex issue in practice even for native speakers, because it involves various ambiguities with regard to conversants or conversational scenes[33]. Korean terms of address and personal reference are manipulated in various ways in different social contexts. Moreover, language communities that differ by region, generation, or gender can show variation in honorification (Kim Caymin 1998; Seng Kichel 1999; etc.). In addition, different speech levels are known to index different degrees of personal psychological distance or style differences, usually depending on the content of conversation or on the conversational context (Lukoff 1978). Lastly, we should remember that ungrammatical uses of honorifics are nevertheless often accepted in spoken language[34].

The complexity of deploying honorifics in practice raises the question of "notions of correctness" or "correctness conditions"—speakers' perceptions of (in)correct

---

[32] For an overview of the Korean honorific system, see Choo (2006).

[33] For pragmatic variables in Korean honorification, see Yi Mayngseng (1975), Hwang (1975), Yi Cengpok (2001), Kim Cengho (2004), and Brown (2008).

[34] Han Kil (2002:53-9) notes that deviant usages are associated with "acceptability" rather than grammaticality.

language use (Bartsch 1987:1; Pullum 2006:1). Bartsch (1987:72-5) suggests two levels of development in formatting a linguistic norm[35]. According to her, the first level is characterized by the contents of a linguistic norm made up of notions of correctness (72). Speakers are involved in formulating the concepts by abstracting relevant features from typical contexts, but the concepts are still polystructured and unsystemized (72, 74).

At the next level, the learned-primary correctness concepts lead to systemization, making generalized rules and categorical structures. This process usually occurs with qualified people or groups involved with authority, enforcement, or codification (72). The force of norms provides models and correct speech behaviors for systemizing speakers' correctness conditions (74-5). In doing so, the correctness conditions in public action have a social reality and objectivity beyond the individual level (4).

The two constituents above—the correctness conditions and the systemization of correctness concepts—comprise the pivotal parts of a linguistic norm. What do language users who are interested in correct and polite language use do if they come across a usage that they are not sure of? It is often the case that they look for more reliable and authentic references. Written by language "experts," authoritative language aids assist lay speakers in learning normative language usage. Thus, ordinary people rely on language aids as the adjudicatory grounds for their notions of correctness.

Cameron (1990:87-8) also claims that social institutions play a powerful role in producing and regulating language use. She argues that individuals' relations to groups and their norms cannot be sufficiently explained by the theory of individual psychology,

---

[35] A norm refers to a general code which is expected or accepted in society (Kim Haswu 2002:150). Bartsch (1987:4) roughly defines norms as the social reality of correctness notions which have objectivity above or outside the individuals in various degrees of formality, from providing models of correctness to providing codifications of norms.

which focuses on how actors make rational decisions in the domain of linguistic behaviors. As she notes, social agents are not *free* agents (88). From this perspective, it is important to question who or what produces the conventions. Indeed, individuals are surrounded by many resources or aids available or accessible to them, particularly through various types of education.

In the case of Korean society, the family (e.g., parents) has traditionally been in charge of children's education in *ene yeycel*. As children learn how to speak, their speech undergoes a period when their parents or older family members correct their speech and teach them how to use honorifics correctly. Parents often believe that such discipline should be exercised in early childhood before children get into the habit of speaking like a rude child without a proper family education.

However, the traditional role of instilling knowledge of *ene yeycel* now continues well beyond family education. *Ene yeycel* is no longer confined to moral education; it is language education about how to articulate honorific registers politely and correctly. In fact, *ene yeycel* is a central interest of language policy, institutional education or self-help language aids through popular media. Norms of language politeness have been widely accessible to the public through a multitude of channels. These are all common resources associated with the force of norms—i.e., authority, enforcement, and codification. In order to maximize efficiency for linguistic norms, these means can be utilized conjointly.

This research examines two social activities of norm-making: the state-led speech standardization project and language experts' participation in popularizing certain evaluations of *ene yeycel*. Judgments made through these activities are

accessible to individuals through popular publications targeted at a general audience. The authority embedded in their knowledge or political power can create linguistic norms among individual speakers, educating them formally or informally.

1.3.2 Social activities in the construction of norms of ene yeycel

1.3.2.1 State-sanctioned language standardizing project

Phyocwun Hwapep (Standard Diction; SD hereafter) is the speech standardization project led by NIKL along with a major Korean newspaper company, Chosun Ilbo (the Chosun Ilbo), from October 1990 to February 1991[36]. The language standardization was carried out systematically with the collaboration of language experts and media as a government project (NIKL 1992b:3-5). First, note that NIKL is the central language planning academic organization under ROK governmental administration. NIKL conducted research on historical and contemporary language use in order to "harmonize tradition with reality" (NIKL 1992b:5).

Meanwhile, the Chosun Ilbo newspaper took charge of propagating standardized models to the public under the slogan "for correct and refined Korean" (wulimal ul paluko alumtapkey, NIKL 1992b:4). Chosun Ilbo organized an advisory committee represented by renowned personages from society at large and from academic circles (NIKL 1992b:4). Whenever the committee had drafted new portions of SD, the newspaper featured the decisions once or every twice a week from 26 October, 1990 to 19 February, 1991.

---

[36] In the case of Japanese honorifics, Wetzel (2004) has examined the construction of the "story" of *keigo* (　　; polite language) through Japanese standardization and modernization.

At the end of this process, NIKL published its *Draft of Standard Diction* (Phyocwun Hwapep Sian) in order to listen to public opinion. This first publication of a standardized speech model, *Wulimal uy yeycel* (Korean language etiquette) was co-published with Consen Ilposa. After the Korean Language Council (Kwuke Simuyhoy) in 1992 (19 October) ratified SD, the project produced a series of publications for the public under the name of NIKL, the newspaper, or the Ministry of Culture and Sports (munhwa cheyyukpu). The following are the titles of handbooks and reports about the standard *ene yeycel*:

4) Handbooks and reports on standard *ene yeycel*
NIKL & Consen Ilposa (1991), *Wulimal uy yeycel* [Korean language etiquette]
NIKL (1992b), *Phyocwun hwapep haysel*[37] [Standard Diction Manual]
NIKL & Consen Ilposa (1993a), *Wulimal uy yeycel* [Korean language etiquette] *revised
    edition
NIKL & Consen Ilposa (1993b), *Manhwa lo ilknun wulimal uy yeycel* [Korean language
    etiquette through comics]
NIKL & Consen Ilposa (1996), *Wulimal uy yeycel (Sang, Ha)* [Korean language etiquette I, II]
Ministry of Culture and Sports (1996), *Palun mal kowunmal*[38] [Correct Speech Refined
    Speech]
NIKL (1999, 2001a, 2001b), *Kwuklipkwukewen ey mule pwasseyo*[39] [Questions submitted to
    NIKL]
NIKL (1992a; 1995~7), *Kanata sangtam cenhwa calyocip*[40] [Annual report of Kanata phone
    service]

---

[37] *Phyocwun hwapep haysel* is a language manual about SD. This final report of the language standardization project covers practical issues in day-to-day language use, such as: 1) terms of address and reference used in families, at work and in society; 2) honorification; and 3) polite expressions in everyday life or on special occasions.

[38] *Palun mal kowun mal* deals with common corrections of language errors regarding linguistic politeness based on SD. Almost half of this booklet covers language errors related with *ene yeycel*. Some sections deal with standard language use over regional dialects, foreign lexicon, or slang.

[39] *Kwuklipkwukewen ey mulepwasseyo* (1999) documents cases of suggestions or frequently asked questions in regard to language use received by NIKL from 1993 to 1999. The report in 2001, however, is more like the collected reports of NIKL phone line service since 1991, and there is much overlap in content with the previous reports in *Kanata sangtam cenhwa calyocip* (Annual report of Kanata phone service, 1992, 1995~7).

[40] The *Kanata sangtam cenhwa calyocip* is a collection of sample questions to and answers by the phone service of NIKL (since 1992). They do not contain all of the received questions, but provide examples from lay speakers in several categories, such as: standard orthography; word spacing; word usage; pronunciation; linguistic politeness; etc. The latest publication in 1997 provides examples collected from 1991 to 1997.

These are based on common mistakes or tricky issues involving linguistic politeness. Popular manuals gained great public interest, and several reprints were made. Even a cartoon version came out. The new edition of *Korean language etiquette* was published in two volumes. The Ministry of Culture and Sports also issued a handbook and distributed it to public organizations for education purposes. This was a part of the government's major policy for the improvement of daily life. Starting in 1992, NIKL began a phone service and reported sample questions of lay speakers with standardized answers[41].

This wide variety of educational channels can construct the social reality of linguistic norms, which have regulative power over lay speakers. Pullum (2006:1) notes that correctness conditions *per se* are constitutive and do not regulate the use of language. He also says that judgments claimed by linguistic professionals play a major role in providing the right correctness conditions. Representatives of public organizations and authors of language how-to manuals take part in commenting on public attitudes and educational policies.

The whole process of making linguistic norms is deeply embedded in the collaborative work of public organizations and educational materials. Publicity and authority provide favorable conditions for the relevant constitutive correctness conditions to gain prestige status as "higher-level claims" (Pullum 2006:2). Of course, lay speakers also argue their own ideas about honorification. However, comments and stipulations by language experts are respected as a reliable source. In other words, "reliable" speech models and advice from authorities serve as the grounds for linguistic

---

[41] These reports provide standard answers by NIKL concerning not only honorification but also pronunciation and orthography.

judgments about right or wrong uses of language. Therefore, norms of language with regulative power such as standardized language, can prescribe linguistic behaviors, suggesting how people should speak.

1.3.2.2 Language how-to publications

Known as "how-to materials" (Wetzel 1994:70) or "advice literature" (Cameron 1995), popular self-help books have recently drawn the attention of both lay speakers and scholars. From the latter's perspective, in particular, books about linguistic matters show "a whole popular culture of language, in which many people participate to some degree" [42] (Cameron 1995:ix). Wetzel (2004) also notes that popular literature on language matters serve as a valuable linguistic discourse resource for observing how speakers view social conventions and norms and how customs are formulated (Wetzel 2004).

Language how-to publications are issued for a general audience, and most of the authors are linguists, journalists, writers, broadcasters, educationists, etc. When it comes to language use, they are often considered "professionals." If we examine just the titles, it is not difficult to guess the writers purpose: critical essays, etiquette manuals, error corrections. In this paper, I have reviewed 42 popular publications for lay speakers in dealing with language use and correction, mostly published within the last 15 years[43].

The literature was selected at random based on accessibility to the author. This research might not provide a comprehensive context for the contemporary usage and pragmatic meanings of Korean honorifics. Nevertheless, it is certain from more recent

---

[42] Noting popular interest in language, Cameron has investigated the prevalent phenomenon of language intervention behind what and why people say about better use of language in her book, *Verbal Hygiene* (1995).
[43] The list of the books is attached in the appendix B.

available sources that these linguistic issues are an ongoing phenomenon. In order to back up the validity of my primary sources, more recent resources from mass media and online communities will be drawn on as well.

As we will see in detail later, these are primarily non-academic and lay people-oriented personal essays, critiques, or handbooks. The prefaces or titles of the books include issues relevant to language use or linguistic phenomena such as: etymology and language culture, language purification and protection, linguistic errors and advice on language usage, or criticism of language use and policy. According to the report of NIKL in 2001, it seems that the contents of the books contain popular linguistics in general[44]. NIKL (1992a:14) reports that common questions regarding language courtesy (speech) involve the following in order of popularity: 1) address/reference terms[45] (70.4%); 2) honorifics (14.2%); and greetings for various events (9.8%).

---

[44] The statistics of NIKL (2001a) note that questions regarding language use from the public to NIKL through its telephone service (*Kanata cenhwa*) from 1991 to 2001 are concerned with: 1) linguistic norms (73%) such as orthography; 2) vocabulary (18.1%) such as meaning, usage, or etymology; 3) language courtesy (4.2%) such as terms of address; etc.

[45] As Wang (2005: 18-9) notes, terms of address or forms of address (Kor. *hochinge*) refers to words, phrases, or expressions which a speaker uses to refer to the communicative interlocutor. Terms of address different from summonses or calls refer to terms to draw a referent's attention, while the participants in the former situation are already in the same conversation. However, the majority of Korean terms of address (*hoching*) also have the function of calling someone, and summonses are usually considered as terms of address (e.g., *yepo* 'you (spouse)' as summon). As honorifics are involved with a referent as well an addressee, terms of address (including summonses) and terms of reference are related to addressee honorifics and referent honorifics, respectively.

Chapter 2 State-Sanctioned Norms of Linguistic Politeness

Standard *ene yeycel* is based on socially and linguistically conservative prescriptivism. This prescriptive ideology is characterized by a priority on formal or literary speech as polite and normative honorification. Distinctive linguistic forms and stipulations of honorification in SD preserve the sophisticated use of honorifics and reinforce superior-inferior relationships. However, setting up a standard model of *ene yecel* can be subjective and arbitrary. Moreover, linguistic conservatism does not take into account language variations that exist in practice; rather, these different styles are too easily proscribed as errors made by sloppy speakers. As a result, careless lay speakers are expected to have better knowledge of how to use honorifics.

2.1 Privileging of cultural and linguistic tradition

As guidance for "careless speakers" like these, SD provides techniques that privilege honorification in the traditional context. The majority of normative *ene yeycel* tend to preserve the linguistic as well as cultural tradition of honorification because honorification has its origins in the traditional vertical society. This "nostalgia"[46]—a general faith in traditional usages of language as proper or polite models—hints at the "*socially* motivated choice" of particular forms (Milroy and Milroy 1999:14-5).

---

[46] According to Pullum (2006:7), nostalgia in language use involves believing in "the past glory of some vanished golden age, an imagined linguistic utopia in which people spoke correctly."

2.1.1 Linguistic model of *ene yeycel*

The privileging of the traditional use of honorifics recommends certain language usages as the standard model for *ene yeycel*. Firstly, standardized honorification gives prestige to formal styles or literary expressions as indicating more politeness. Taking the example of speech levels, the formal sentence-ending form -*supnita* is prescribed as polite speech (NIKL 1996b:68). SD proscribes the general preference for casual ending -*yo* or plain style endings as incorrect or un-recommended usages. In this regard, it is proper politeness for students to use the formal -*supnita* style to their teachers (70).

Accordingly, vernacular expressions often end up being corrected as "errors" on the part of lay speakers, as in Table 3:

Referent	husband	husband's younger brother	husband's older sister	father's older brother
SD	*yepo*	*tolyen-nim, sepang-nim*	*hyeng-nim*	*acwupe-ni(m)*
Non-SD	*appa* 'daddy'	*samchon* 'uncle'	*komo* 'aunt'	*khun-appa* 'uncle'

Table 3 Terms of address (for wives) borrowed from children's terms (NIKL 1996b:56)

According to SD, normative honorification recommends that speakers (wives) use their own terms of address. However, the non-SD expression that uses the formula child's name + kinship term seems to derive from borrowing the terms of address of one's child with deletion of the name of the child (which is assumed). Since these terms are not the speakers' own terms of address, SD does not approve of the use of these terms but instead recommends the literary forms as the correct standard usage.

2.1.2 Superior-oriented honorification

The traditional notion of politeness—honorification of the older person—has been the fundamental ideology of prescriptive judgments. For example, normative honorification in SD is strict in distinguishing superiors from inferiors. Table 3 shows different terms of address varying in superior-inferior relationships between interlocutors. In addition, grammatical honorifics such as *-si-* (the honorific marker) also depend on the relative position of the referent at work:

Referent	Honorification	Relative relationships	
Parents of one's son (or daughter)-in-law	*saton elun*/*saton* (S=R) *sacang elun* (S<R)	by descent	S=speaker A=addressee R=referent
Addressee's husband	*pakkath elun* (S<A), *pakkath yangpan* (S=>A)	by age/social position	
Colleague	*-si-* (R>S; R(older)=S>A)	by work position	
	Ø (R=<S; R(older)=S<A)		

Table 4 The use of *-si-* and the positions of referents (NIKL 1996b:58-59, 61, 97)

Similarly, SD reminds speakers of detailed conditions as to when to use honorifics. One of the fundamental principles of traditional honorification is to express respect to superiors while lowering inferiors. For instance, in referring to his wife, the husband is supposed to use *emem* or *emi* (humble forms of 'mother') to his parents, because a child's name + *emma* 'mommy' does not sound humble; but he may use this less humble term to his parents-in-law (his wife's parents) (NIKL 1996b:55). Thus, terms of address for a referent depend on the relative status of the addressee.

SD prescriptions are strict about expressing respect to superiors. Here, there is a taken-for-granted attitude of SD toward *ene yeycel*: superiors are primarily eligible for honorifics. The superior-oriented honorification allows anti-honorification (dropping of

honorifics) only when a speaker is superior to the addressee. For example, linguistic self-deprecation (*kyemyang-pep*) depends on the relative social position of a referent or a speaker. When referring to a mere staff member (in-group) to someone from another company, a speaker is not supposed to insert the verbal honorific marker *-si-*, but when referring to a referent (in-group) whose rank is equal or superior to an addressee (out-group), a speaker is supposed to use *-si-* for the in-group member (NIKL 1992b:98). In other words, an in-group member is eligible for self-deprecation *only if* the referent's title is relatively low.

Additionally, when a wife refers to her husband (in-group) at his work, she is supposed to refer to him with name + *ssi* (the polite suffix) or mere title; however, if she talks with his subordinate, she is able to use more honorific referent words or the honorific suffix *-nim* attached to his title (NIKL 2001a:237-8). This means that she does not need to care about the self-deprecation due to the superior position of her husband to his subordinate (out-group). Lastly, an old lady can use the honorific marker *-si-* to refer to her husband in public, whereas a young wife is not recommended to use honorifics for her husband (NIKL 2001a:263). Thus, superior speakers are often exempted from dropping honorifics for their in-group referent.

2.1.3 Concerns about lay speakers: prescriptive ideology

As examined above, SD values honorification from traditional society as the model of *ene yeycel*. Critical examinations of SD have also argued that SD is based on a traditional standard that fails to reflect current colloquial usages (Kim Seycwung 2003; Cen Yengwu 2003).

If one takes the linguistic and cultural tradition as the model of linguistic politeness, the current transformations in honorification usage are often understood as a "collapse of politeness = collapse of the honorific system" (NIKL & CI 1993a:235). The alleged decline of honorification is often supported by citing the prevalent use of the casual style (verb-ending *-yo*) and preference for plain language over honorifics[47]. It is usually the younger generation who is accused of lacking skills in using honorifics (CI & NIKL 1993a:232-9; Pak Kapswu 2001:17-23).

Some people conclude that the decline of language politeness results from the emergence of social ideologies such as egalitarianism and individualism (CI & NIKL 1993a:234-5). These social ideologies are associated with lack of awareness of superior-inferior relationships or lack of respect toward superiors, which discourage the use of honorifics. In other words, in the face of collapsing honorification habits due to a lack of consciousness of politeness, lay speakers should learn how to express linguistic deference according to hierarchical relationships.

Accordingly, governmental assistance is meant to "help out" confused and careless lay speakers about the standard language. Errors from lay speakers' speech are often considered as a sign of lack of knowledge of language use (Milroy and Milroy 1999:3). This attitude can be found in the SD manuals:

> The confusion and difficulty that speakers had to go through was indeed enormous. … Nevertheless, there have not been any linguistic norms which we can rely on for daily use. … NIKL has considered the issue of standardization of daily language use very important and urgent so as to correct the current confusion and relieve the difficulty of lay speakers in

---

[47] The examples cited are as follows (NIKL 1992b:93-4):

mal hata 'talk'	versus	*aloyta*/*malssum tulita*; *mut.ta*, *yeccwupta* [HUM]
cwuta 'give'	versus	*tulita* [HON]
yatan macta 'get scolded'	versus	*kkwucilam*/*kkwucwung tutta* [POL]

everyday life. (NIKL 1992b:3)

> These days, it has become more common to hear coarse and vulgar language use around us. Thus, some prudent people are wary of this tendency…. Considering the current situation unfortunate, the government last year decided to promote "refined speech" (Kowun Mal Ssuki) as one of the three key missions for improving everyday life, and launched a public campaign with nationwide participation. This booklet is drafted as an educational resource for community learning centres, newspapers, department stores, and enterprises. (NIKL 1996b: preface)

The prefaces above explain that the publications are motivated to suggest a standard model so as to control linguistic confusion and degeneration. According to the passages, current language usage has been muddled, and some speakers are unaware of how to use language properly. It goes almost without saying that NIKL has the authority to define the standard and is the driving force behind spreading SD.

2.2 Challenges to standard honorification

With the vision of serving as an effective guideline for "confused" lay speakers, SD does not remain solely a part of tradition separate from the vernacular reality. In fact, NIKL takes into account the contemporary practice of adding honorifics for the referent (NIKL 1992b:97). For instance, the honorific particles *kkeyse* (nominative) or *kkey* (dative) are not usually used in colloquial Korean except in formal situations or with someone who deserves full respect (NIKL 1996b:63). The traditional honorification style called *apcon-pep* has also been broadened to include ways of speaking that show respect to a younger as well as an older addressee or speaker because speakers are often uncomfortable with this traditional norm, lest they act disrespectfully to the younger referent. The flexibility to accept language use nowadays reflects the current phenomenon of casualization.

However, the agenda of NIKL to "harmonize tradition with the vernacular reality"

(NIKL 1992b:5) causes a dilemma in designing the standard model of *ene yeycel*. How can the standard model of honorification help determine when to accept current usages or to maintain tradition? Here, the concept of *ene yeycel* pertaining to honorification involves a grey area between tradition and reality.

Sometimes, judging the level of politeness seems to be justified only if we accept traditional usage as the standard for polite speech. For example, SD prescribes only terms such as *cinci* 'meal' and *annyenghi* 'pleasantly' as standard expressions, while other variations in practice are considered nonstandard or impolite, as follows: *siksa* 'meal' < *cinci*; *cal* 'well' < *phyenhi*, *phyenganhi* 'comfortably, peacefully' < *annyenghi* 'pleasantly.' Possible accounts for the difference in politeness would be that both *cinci* and *annyenghi* used to be more "traditional" usages than the other expressions[48].

However, traditional usage is not always privileged as a polite form. SD modifies traditional honorification for a referent whose age is not correspondent to his/her rank by descent, but such negotiations with vernacular reality occur only to a limited extent. For example, SD allows a younger uncle to use honorifics to an older nephew or niece if the age gap is more than five years, by modifying the traditional *ene yeycel*, which prioritizes kinship hierarchy over age[49] (NIKL 1996b:57). In other words, the older addressee in age but inferior by descent is now eligible to expect linguistic respect for his age. Nonetheless, SD prescribes that older female speakers should refer to a younger sister-in-law (the wife

---

[48] In terms of politeness, however, *siksa* 'meal' also seems to carry politeness to some extent, as speakers do not use it with a younger or intimate referent. Rather, *siksa* is considered to be a Japanese loan, which stigmatizes and discourages the usage. As for *phyenganhi~phyenhi* 'peacefully,' these expressions show regional variations rather than different levels of politeness.
[49] According to traditional *ene yeycel*, a younger uncle is eligible for linguistic politeness from his older nephew, but not *vice versa*.

of her husband's older brother) using *hyeng-nim* 'older brother-honorific suffix'

according to the male-oriented kinship hierarchy.

Furthermore, standard *ene yeycel* can also be created *without* tradition, by

modifying tradition or by compromising with the vernacular reality. The terms of address

for referring to brothers- or sisters-in-law did not traditionally exist, probably because

their interactions rarely occurred in person due to the social custom of separating men

and women. However, SD has adopted lay speakers' common expressions from recent

days, such as *chenam uy tayk* 'wife of brother-in-law' or *acwupeni* 'wife's older brother,'

as the standard forms (NIKL 1996b:57).

In fact, prescribing a certain linguistic form as a model of *ene yeycel* can be

arbitrary in its standard. For example, *apeci* 'father,' an intimate address form for a father-

in-law (*ape-nim* or *cangin elun*), is professed to be the non-standard expression in spite of

its common use. By contrast, *emeni*, the intimate form for a mother-in-law (*emenim* or

cangmo-nim), is the standard "affectionate" term of address (CI & NIKL 1993b:45-6).

Similarly, "suppressed honorification" is applied in families but not at work (66). In other

words, the criteria for standard *ene yeycel* are inconsistent across different situations.

Likewise, some speakers are familiar with foreign terms of address for their

spouses, such as *misu*, or *waiphu*, but none of these terms belong to SD because they are

not "native" language[50] (NIKL 1996b:59). Literal translations from English, such as

---

[50] In spite of the purification of native language, the husband in a married couple nowadays strategically uses the English-loan word *waiphu* in reference to his wife. This phenomenon is presumably due to the modernistic and fair (from a gender perspective) image of the English word 'wife.' For example, once married man posted his personal images of *waiphu* and *anay* on an online community (source: http://cafe.naver.com/nuke928.cafe?_iframe_url=/ArticleRead.nhn%3Farticleid=196863). He says, "For some reason, my *waiphu* sounds like a professional, young, stylish, and confident married woman. When it comes to my *anay*, I picture an ordinary married woman with an apron and rubber gloves." In fact, it is widely acknowledged by native Korean speakers that the native terms of address for a wife, such as *cipsalam* or *ansalam*, which literally means "a person (*salam*) who stays at home (*cip*) or inside (*an*)," is

cohun achim(*ipnita*) 'good morning' are unauthorized as well. Gender-reversed terms of

address are excluded from SD in order to preserve the original usages:

> 5) Gender-reversed terms of address (NIKL 1996b:59, 61)
>   a. Speaker: male customer; addressee: female clerk:
>   *enni* 'literally, (a female's) sister' should be corrected to *akassi* 'lady' according to SD.
>   b. Speaker: female undergraduate; addressee: male older undergraduate:
>   *hyeng* '(a male's) brother' should be corrected to *oppa* '(a female's) brother' according
>   to SD

In addition, standard *ene yeycel* shows limits in its linguistic capacity. Prescriptions of SD

may be different from what ordinary people would say in their everyday lives. For

example, the following expressions are not "normative" in their literal meaning: e.g.,

*yekiyo 'here' → *yeposeyyo* 'hello' to a clerk; **swukohasipsiyo*/*haseyyo* 'keep working

→ *annyenghi kyeyseyyo* 'good-bye' (NIKL 1996b:62, 71).

     Taking all these situations into account, we should not take for granted the

objectivity of the science of language, or linguists' attitudes toward it, at least at the level

of social use (Milroy and Milroy 1999:16-7). Linguists' prescriptions do not guarantee

the normativity or politeness in honorification of a wide range of variety in spoken

language. Nonetheless, as lay speakers query whether they are linguistically polite and

correct[51], they often turn to language prescriptions from educational sources.

---

based on the traditional (or pre-modern) concept of a wife. Another native term *anay* is also known to have
a similar origin, which is *anhay* (*anh* 'inside' + *ay* 'locative particle'). Thus, these native terms can make
some wives feel that they are old or disregarded as wives were in the old days.

[51] According to statistics from NIKL (1992a:16), frequent questions to NIKL phone service regarding
language courtesy (February 1991 to February 1992) include: terms of address and reference (66.1%),
followed by grammatical and lexical honorifics (13.3%), polite expressions for various events (9.2%), and
so on.

2.3 Lay speakers' interactions with standard *ene yeycel*

SD plays a key role as an authorized and official linguistic model for lay speakers in society. Below I provide a glimpse of lay speakers' reactions to SD, based on their questions to NIKL. I have reviewed the following publications: *Kwuklip kwukewen ey mule pwasseyo* 'Questions submitted to NIKL' (1999, 2001a, 2001b) and *Kanata sangtam cenhwa calyocip* (Kanata phone service report; 1992, 1995~7) (APPENDIX C).

2.3.1 As a source of information or verification

First, even though speakers are willing to use honorifics in a polite and correct manner, they are not sure how to use honorifics "properly." Thus, lay speakers get help from SD as a source of information: this type of question usually starts with: "How can I say…?" These questions show that speakers come across linguistic restrictions or variables while finding a way to speak politely. In order to tackle these problems, lay speakers learn from a reliable model, that is, SD.

Frequent questions to NIKL show that native speakers ask questions because they don't know suitable honorific registers for a specific situation. For instance, some terms of address are uncommon or unknown to general speakers, e.g., distant kinship members or formal expressions for special occasions [1-2]. Sometimes, speakers cannot find suitable terms of address because no conventional usages have existed before [3-4]. It is often difficult to figure out how to address an unfamiliar older referent because neither personal name nor specific social status is available with older strangers [5].

Some questions derive from the uncertainty associated with multiple linguistic variables. Kinship terms often have varied linguistic forms for one and the same referent

in different situations [6-7]. Terms of address may vary across individual speakers as well [8]. Some words have both honorific and non-honorific usages in one linguistic form [9]. Moreover, the majority of questions are meant to verify the propriety of their language use through the assistance of professionals. As native speakers, most people are able to make use of honorific registers even if they are sometimes unsure about their propriety. Moreover, prescribed norms from language educational sources urge speakers to be conscious of what they say and to correct their misuses. Thus, language users confirm the normativity of their language use according to standard honorification. Such questions often start with "Is it correct to use …?"

Ordinary people often speak in casual -*yo* style to their family members, and they wonder whether their choices are normative or not [10-1]. Speakers wonder if imperative or non-grammatical forms are inappropriate to use with the addressee [12-3]. Linguistic and regional variations for the same referents put normativity into question [14-5]. Lay speakers also attempt to prescribe the normativity of others' honorification, based on SD [16-18].

2.3.2 Disputes over standard *ene yeycel*

Some speakers debate the suggested norms, posing questions such as "Why should 'A' be the standard?" or "Shouldn't standard 'A' be 'B'?" They try to justify usages they deem to be more correct.

Some people disagree with the normative honorification prescribed by SD because they are not comfortable with the traditional practice of honorification. If a term of address for a referent does not correspond to his/her age or marital status, some

speakers feel awkward using the mismatched kinship terms such as *tolyen-nim* 'unmarried brother-in-law' to a brother-in-law old enough to get married, or *akassi* 'literally, unmarried lady' to a married referent [19-20]. Insofar as the traditional kinship terms follow the hierarchy of the male side, some people point out the gender discrimination inherient in normative honorification—e.g., the female term of address *hyeng-nim* 'older brother-honorific suffix' to a younger referent[52] [21].

Some speakers also show a critical view of dominant linguistic norms. They demand further explanation for the suggested norms and question why other forms (e.g., regional variations) cannot be eligible for standard honorification [22]. They criticize the negative functions of traditional honorification [23]. On the other hand, lay speakers can be even more conservative and principle-oriented in language use than linguists. People are conscious of the literal meaning of linguistic forms or the grammaticality of honorification [24-5]. Interestingly, they often criticize the overuse of honorifics for its impropriety [26].

These questions or requests are illustrated as a means to provide the institutional answers. However, disputes over standard *ene yeycel* allow us to observe that language users do not passively accept SD. Lay speakers also have passionate beliefs about language and want to justify their usages.

---

[52] SD expects a female speaker to use *hyeng-nim* to a younger relative, but a male speaker is not expected to do so the same. According to the tradition of following one's husband's descent, a female speaker should address the wife of her husband's older brother as *hyeng-nim* (lit. 'older brother'-honorific suffix) even if the addressee is younger than the speaker; however, in the case of a male speaker, he can switch the term of address to the older brother of his wife from *hyeng-nim* to *che-nam* (lit. 'a male relative of one's wife') if the referent is younger than the speaker (NIKL 1999:161).

2.4 Disregarded functions of non-standard honorification

One of the SD manuals, *Korean language etiquette through cartoons*, consists of episodes showing people confused about honorification, probably based on reports of language users. The idea is basically to illustrate the models of standard honorification so speakers can tackle confusing or challenging situations in language practice. What is interesting, however, is that they provide us with accounts of speakers who choose non-standard linguistic forms. As Milroy and Milroy (1999:15) point out, people continue to use non-standard varieties. I will discuss speakers' awareness of the following two anti-normative usages: non- or less honorification (e.g., omitting honorifics or using casual speech) and over-honorification.

2.4.1 Non- or less honorification

First, casual speech is more effective than standard styles for expressing intimacy in interpersonal relationships because it shortens the emotional distance between conversants (Okamoto 1998). A polite or formal style with honorifics, even though the linguistic forms are normative, may entail psychological distance between conversants. For instance, the cartoon edition of SD (CI & NIKL 1993a:16-7) illustrates the addressee's emotional gap between herself (the daughter-in-law) and her father-in-law caused by formal, polite expressions. The daughter-in-law feels distant from her father-in-law as her father-in-law switches his term of address for her from FN (casual form) to children's FN + *emi* 'mother' (formal kinship term). In this context, non- or less honorification does not signal impolite behavior, especially in a friendly relationship.

Another anecdote demonstrates a mother-in-law who wants to increase intimacy with her daughter-in-law by using casual address form (CI & NIKL 1993a:37). The mother-in-law asks her daughter-in-law to address her with the intimate address term *emma* 'mommy' instead of the formal form *eme-nim* 'mother-honorific suffix' because she wants to have an intimate relationship like a mother and daughter. The agreement soon works out for them to establish intimacy. The daughter-in-law even tells her mother-in-law that she is a "modern" person who prefers friendliness over traditional authority and formality[53].

We often observe that speakers prefer non-standard forms even though they *know* their choices are not normative, as below:

Speaker→referent	Terms of address	
	Non-standard forms	Standard forms
Daughter-in-law→father-in-law	*appa* 'daddy'	*apeci/ape-nim* 'father'
Wife→husband	*caki* 'dear' (lit. myself)	*yepo/yepwa-yo* 'darling' (lit. hello)
Friend→ friend's wife	*ceyswu-ssi* 'sister-in-law'	LN+*ssi, acwumeni* 'ms. LN, madam'

Table 5 Non-standard terms of address in casual speech

The non-standard terms of address in Table 6 have a friendlier, more intimate nuance than their normative counterparts. Some grown-up speakers continue to use the children's term *appa* 'daddy' because it connotes intimacy between a child and a father; the formal terms *apeci/ape-nim* 'father (-honorific suffix)' are polite enough to be used with someone else's father or father-in-law. *Caki* is the personal, intimate term of address between unmarried couples, whereas *yepo* is a formal form for spouses that can be used in front of parent-in-laws. Addressing the kinship term *ceyswu-ssi* 'sister-in-law' to a

---

[53] It is often the younger generation who associates honorification with the old-fashioned formality of pre-modern society (CI & NIKL 1993a:235).

friend's wife connotes the speaker's friendly attitude towards the non-kinship member, increasing intimacy like that between kinship members.

Normative terms of address such as *yepo* 'darling' or *acwupe-nim* 'madam' may signal a psychological distance between the conversants, probably engendered by the formal attitude of the speaker. By using children's terms, speakers can evade using the formal terms of address with which they feel unfamiliar (or awkward). Moreover, speakers can simulate children's friendly nuance by borrowing their terms. Preference for casual style can occur not only with terms of address, but also with speech levels or grammatical devices: e.g., *appa, na paykcem macass<u>e</u>*! 'Daddy, I got a perfect score!' or *emma*, *wasse*? 'Mommy, you're here?'[54].

Anti-honorification can also exhibit the inferiors' discontent with a disrespectful attitude toward them. For example, the cartoon edition of the SD illustrates a sister-in-law who addresses her husband's younger brother with the children's term *samchon* 'uncle' (NIKL & CI 1993a:157). She finds the normative and polite address form *sepang-nim* 'literally, young master-honorific suffix' humiliating to her because she doesn't want to use the honorific term with the brother-in-law, who has been demanding of her. In this case, the inferior speaker uses the children's term in order to avoid deference to the superior referent rather to express intimacy.

Thus, authoritarianism and disrespectful attitudes toward inferiors can be major factors behind calls for the reform of honorification[55]. From inferiors' point of view,

---

[54] Note that children may use the intimate style sentence-ending *-a/e* or drop the honorific infix *-si-* for their parents, instead of using the polite *-yo* ending or the humilific verb form with *-si-*. Linguistic choices may vary depending on solidarity or conversational situations.

[55] For instance, Choy Pongyeng (2005) criticizes Korean honorification for instigating authoritarianism in Korean society. According to him, many Koreans prefer being referred to with honorific titles, such as *sensayngnim* or *pucangnim*, because authority in official titles can deliver speakers' respect and formality better than personal pronouns (199).

honorification can be interpreted as an unfair or discriminatory attitude toward them, because inferiors are fundamentally ineligible for honorification. For example, a daughter-in-law can be discontented with the term of address used to her as she perceives *yay* or *ne* 'you' as the terms heard when her mother-in-law is displeased with her (CI & NIKL 1993a:35).

2.4.2 Over-honorification

Lastly, it is ironic that negative aspects of anti-honorification as seen above can provoke speakers to express their respectful attitude strategically through honorification. Since anti-honorification may signal a speaker's antagonistic feeling or lack of respect toward the referent, speakers attempt to use honorifics to maintain amicable social relationships. The increased awareness of respect toward human beings also encourages speakers to use polite speech as a token of respect, regardless of social status. Over-honorification, so-called "address form inflation (*hoching inphuleyisyen*)" or "obsession with honorification (*nophim kangpak kwannyem*)," is often observed in commercial areas where the respectful attitude is expected to flatter customers[56].

For example, a MC often introduces a pastor by using the honorific verb form *kyeysita* 'to be (exist)': "Shortly, there will be a speech (sermon) by pastor ○○○" (CI & NIKL 1993a:244). In this case, the speaker intends to show his deference to the pastor, by

---

[56] For example, Nam Yengsin (2005:268-9) notes that Korean speakers often use terms of address with a desirable social status for a middle-aged referent, such as *sacangnim*, *sensayngnim*, or *samonim*, even if the speaker is not sure about his/her social title. He goes on to say that excessive honorification in commercial contexts is ungrammatical because the honorific marker *-si-* cannot take an inanimate subject (272).

using the honorific verb form for the subject *malssum* which is related to the referent (*kancep contay*[57], 'indirect honorification').

According to normative honorification, however, the speaker should use another honorific form, *issu<u>sita</u>* 'to be (honorably) present', with the honorific marker -*si*- or simply the non-honorific form *issta*[58]. In order to avoid the indirect honorification here, NIKL (2001a:266) suggests *malssum <u>hasikeyss.supnita</u>* 'there will deliver his honorable speech' instead of *malssum <u>i iss.keyss.supnita</u>* 'will be an honorable speech.' The normative answer stipulates that *malssum* is neither an existing (*issta* or *kyeysita*) subject nor an animate noun suitable for deference entitlement. In any case, the lay speaker's usage is anti-normative in that the inanimate noun is not supposed to be respected in the way that an animate noun (person) is. Therefore, the speaker's intention to signal his polite attitude cannot be reflected in this case.

As discussed so far, non-standard honorification occurs with good reasons in daily practice. We often hear public criticism that "careless" speakers do not pay attention to what they say, primarily due to the reckless use of the Internet; however, there is another perspective to be considered. Some studies have noted speakers' expressive or strategic use of honorification to express their emotions or achieve their goals[59]. From the

---

[57] *Kancep contay* (indirect honorification) refers to a method of honorification whereby a speaker uses honorifics for a sentence subject that is related to a respectful referent (Seng Kichel 1984). That is, the subject (of a sentence) can be accompanied by an honorific verb in the predicate so as to indirectly honor the respectful referent related to the subject. For more details about indirect honorification, see Kim Sektuk (1976), Se Cengswu (1984), Seng Kichel (1984), Im Hongpin (1990a), and Nam Kisim and Kim Haswu (1995:131-2).

[58] Language how-to materials present different accounts as to whether the honorific form *malssum* 'speech' is eligible for referent honorification. Some argue for the plain form *issta* because the sentence subject *malssum* is not closely related enough to the referent to be his possession (Cf. *emeni nun cacenke ka issu<u>sita</u>*; literally, 'a bicycle exists to my mother'). Others claim that the honorific form *issusita* indicates the speaker's deference toward the referent who gives the speech.

[59] Lukoff (1978:270) introduces the "expressive use," focusing on the mixing or shifting of styles of address forms by speakers "to convey what the speaker really wants to say, the personal meaning." Sells and Jeong-Bok Kim (2007) have discussed a similar function, "expressive (i.e., emotive) meaning," in

prescriptivists' point of view, these speakers are careless speakers lacking both a respectful attitude and proper linguistic knowledge. Lay speakers' preference for casual speech articulates intimacy between conversants or dissatisfaction with the formality and authoritarianism of honorification. Furthermore, speakers still strive to express their respectful or favorable attitudes through over-honorification in order to avoid possible conflicts caused by lack of respect for a referent. Far from being careless about *ene yeycel*, speakers are nothing if not highly conscious of pragmatic functions in dealing with honorification.

Japanese and Korean honorification. Yi Cengpok (2002:56-7) understands the speakers' "expressive" use of honorification as "strategic usage" for a speaker's specific purpose and intention different from normative/ordinary usage.

Chapter 3 Popularized Norms of Linguistic Politeness

This section examines metalinguistic discourses in the popular culture. Language how-to literature produces more diversified interpretations than the SD manual. I analyze the producers of their discourse into three groups: traditionalists, anti-traditionalists, and utilitarianists[60]. The authors do not identify themselves explicitly, but it is evident that they discuss the positive or negative values of honorification based on different concepts of *ene yeycel* deriving from various pragmatic contexts. I examined how the authors rationalize whether speakers should support honorification or not and their views on the functions of honorification in society. Such conceptualizations justify whether they should support honorification or not, and lead them to discuss language use in current society.

3.1 Traditionalists

The first group of people is those who value the use of honorifics as a deferential attitude towards superiors, often elders. I will call them "traditionalists" because they valorize honorification positively as a cultural norm or linguistic form. Below I examine the metalinguistic discourse on the positive values of honorifics and honorification in the traditional context.

---

[60] I made three classifications to demonstrate distinctive values of honorification. Although they sound as if there are actually groups of advocators; but, these popularized norms of *ene yeycel* are just a practical guide that I came up with to illustrate some of the evaluated aspects of honorification.

3.1.1 Positive valorization: unique and admirable tradition

A positive evaluation of honorification originates with the positive evaluation of relationships in traditional society. For instance, Kim Kyeykon (1994:109) notes that honorification reflects "fine customs and good manners" (*miphwung yangsok*) which show respect for elders (or superiors), and holds dear younger acquaintances. Taking the example of using names between intimate friends, he understands casual speech as an expression of intimacy rather than non-respect (109-10). While Kim shows only the positive side of honorification, it can be seen as language discrimination against the young.

We can also see that the complexity of Korean honorifics is often understood in association with a sense of linguistic superiority. Taking honorifics as an uncommon linguistic feature in many languages, Kim Tongso (1999) acknowledges the "uniqueness" of honorific markers in Korean. The Korean honorific system is often considered "sophisticated" or "intricate" in comparison with "simple" English (Pak 2001:33-4). A common example can be found in the conjugation of verb endings in various levels of honorification. The following comparison between Korean and English shows rhetorical differences in requests to sit down (Chen Soyeng 2005:45-6):

Korean: *anca*! > *ancala* > *ancayo* > *ancusyeyo* > *ancusipsio* > *cwacenghasipsio*
English: "Sit down" or "Sit down, please (or sir)."

The complexity in manipulating honorific markers in different speech levels is often understood in association with a sense of the cultural superiority of the Korean linguistic tradition. O Tonghwan (2003:6) supposes that any language without honorific

distinctions is a "barbarian language," such as English[61]. He describes Korean as follows:

> As for Korean, not to mention having the greatest number of descriptive verbs among the languages of the world, how rich and precise it is, how refined, elegant, and superb! (O Tonghwan 2003:6)

Positive evaluations of honorification often involve high praise of the Korean language, as in set phrases such as "language of the courteous people in the East" (   ) (Chen Soyeng 2005:45). For traditionalists, honorification is valuable as a sophisticated marker of the politeness inherent in traditional Korean culture.

3.1.2 Normative use: asymmetric honorification

Most of the how-to manuals still enjoin readers to follow the traditional honorification rule of modesty for themselves (inferior) but respect for others (superiors). Publications on language errors and courtesy fundamentally stick to the principle of using humble forms for oneself, while showing respect to others (Yi Otek 1992:311). This regulation is acknowledged in attaching the honorific suffix -*nim* to forms of address towards outsiders, but not for one's own family members[62]. Likewise, Co Tongo (2003:106) reminds speakers of the formal honorific Sino-Korean terms *catang* or *cachin* used to address the parents of others only. He also warns against addressing one's own offspring using titles in front of others because it sounds like bragging. Since they give the

---

[61] Similarly, Co Tongo (2003:6) professes a negative impression of English for not having honorific distinctions for elders, as in *tolakasita* [+HON], which is the honorific counterpart for *cwukta* [-HON] 'die' in Korean. However, this claim also shows his lack of English in that he does not cite the more gentle expression for 'die': 'pass away.'

[62] E.g., *apeci* '(my) father' versus *ape-nim* 'father (of my friend or spouse)'

traditional honorific practice the benefit of the doubt as orthodox, traditionalists are often

prescriptivists in dealing with language usages.

Traditional honorification has been strict about using an informal style (less or

non- honorification to inferiors). Co Tongo (2003:115) notes that the honorific marker *-si-*

is not applicable in principle when the referent has a lower title than the speaker. Most of

the how-to manuals still enjoin readers to follow the traditional honorification rule of

modesty for oneself (inferior) but respect for others (superior). Such a vertical

relationship is applied to interlocutors who are superior to a speaker: according to

convention, one should drop honorifics about a superior referent when the listener is

superior to both the speaker and referent (the suppression of respect).

Recently, normative honorification such as the above shows a tendency to be

simplified. How would traditionalists or prescriptivist speakers perceive changes in the

use of honorifics? They observe that speakers from the younger generation prefer to use a

more informal style, and they denigrate those speakers who are less conscious of

lowering themselves or elevating others in speech[63]. In particular, the young generation is

criticized for being impolite youths who lack skills in using honorifics (Pak Kapswu

2001:17-23). It is usually orthodox language professionals and tradition-oriented people

who moralize about the recent "endangered honorifics" phenomenon (Kim Tongso

1999:185; Co Yenghuy 1998:140; etc.).

In this regard, traditionalists seem to be skeptical about non-traditional use of

honorifics. Rather than acknowledging what speakers attempt to convey in their

---

[63] The following examples show confusion with honorification and corrections (Pak Kapswu 2001:36; Co Tongo 2003:110-2; etc.): the plain form *na* 'I' instead of the humble form *ce*, the plain word *swul* 'alcohol' instead of the polite form *yakcwu*, and the decreasing use of honorific particles (e.g., *kkeyse*, *kkey*) and the honorific marker *-si-*.

utterance, traditionalists and prescriptivists value linguistic and cultural norms as orthodox in the matter of deployment of honorifics. For example, Ko Yengkun (1996:25-7) points to the increasing use of the honorific suffix *-nim* attached to personal names as a non-grammatical usage, judging by the fact that this usage cannot be found in historical sources. He notes that this phenomenon echoes the speaker's desire to find a honorification level midway between the honorific title *sensaynim* (literally, 'teacher') and the plain address term *ssi* (25). However, he does not delve further into possible pragmatic values behind the speaker's choice of *-nim*. Instead, proper name+*-nim* is viewed as a deviant usage which has probably originated from computer-mediated communication.

Traditionalists, thus, try to keep the language tradition pure, and put down non-traditional usages. Normative language experts tend to correct the use of honorifics deployed according to a speaker's volition. In order to keep the language tradition pure or intact, traditionalists' or prescriptivists' evaluations of this phenomenon often overlook the fact that speakers consciously *choose* a non-traditional usage. In other words, a speaker's willingness to speak in a more friendly and informal manner is moralized and regulated by those who value honorification and the concept of *ene yeycel* as a language tradition.

3.1.3 Negotiation with social reality

On the other hand, the conventional *apcon-pep* in modern Korean is not as strict as it used to be in the past. Speakers seem to prefer using honorifics toward a referent, sometimes on purpose, regardless of the power relationship between the addressee and

the speaker. Thus, the conventions of superior-centered honorification such as *apcon-pep* have become difficult to apply to honorification in modern society (Nam Yengsin 2005:277). Note that the SD manual published by NIKL (1993a:176) also admits that honorification for an inferior relative in kinship hierarchy can be allowed if the referent is older than the speaker by more than five years.

Thus, the majority of the linguistic discourse concerning honorification is likely to agree that relationships have changed very much. Why do even traditionalists accept the use of honorifics to inferiors, despite the fact that it goes against tradition? Lack of honorification toward inferiors comes under criticism in contemporary society. Unlike in conventional use, however, the transformation of *apcon-pep* allows speakers to show respect to the referent. Here we observe the traditional respectful attitude toward superiors extended to inferiors, as *apcon-pep* transforms to express a respectful attitude toward all interlocutors, regardless of power-differences.

The tolerant attitude toward changes in traditional honorification indicates what people value most in traditional honorification. It is likely that contemporary Korean speakers valorize *only* the respecting function of conventional honorification. Conventional language politeness by means of honorific markers is applied only to superiors, not to inferiors who are in a lower position within their hierarchical relationships. This discriminatory attitude embedded in honorification can be inappropriate in modern society. Therefore, the conventional practice of dropping honorifics toward inferiors tends to succumb to this social change.

3.2 Anti-traditionalists

While positive evaluations of honorification derive from the traditional custom of respecting a superior interlocutor, the same tradition provides clues to negative evaluations of honorification. Originating from the hierarchy inherent in a status-based society, the asymmetric use of honorifics has unfair treatment as a pitfall. As far as social hierarchy is concerned, the asymmetric honorification is a superior's discrimination toward inferiors. For this group of people, I will use the term "anti-traditionalists" because they criticize the custom of using honorifics in traditional society.

3.2.1 Negative valorization: discrimination and linguistic violence

Anti-traditionalists often share the same ideas with people who speak for the inferiors' position, pursuing respect for them equal to the respect shown to those who receive honorification. Choy Pongyeng, who received his PhD in Chosŏn Dynasty Confucianism, criticizes conventional honorific studies for being too attached to the "respect" function:

> Even though the honorific system is language discrimination exalting one side while subordinating the other, [Korean linguists] have prescribed it as 'language usage exalting the one side' and have coined terms such as *taywu-pep* (language system of interpersonal treatment), *kyenge-pep* (polite language system), or *conkyeng-pep* (language system for respecting others). (Choy Pongyeng 2005:147)

Choy goes on to say that the deferential function results from understanding the honorific system primarily from the positions of those who have been discriminated against and oppressed. He also notes that negative valorization of the traditional value of honorification—respect—has resulted in a lack of analysis of the negative and pernicious influences of honorification on interpersonal relationships in Korean society (147). In this

respect, those who represent the position of inferiors can be also considered "egalitarians."

Criticism of the honorific system also arises from the use of the honorific system in creating social hierarchy by language users who take advantage of honorifics for the sake of their own authority. Choy Pongyeng (2005:194-200) illustrates different levels of Korean address forms, such as honorific titles, derogatory terms and different suffixes according to types of work[64]. He argues that "exemplary honorification" demonstrates a discriminatory demeanor on the part of language users[65] (201). Hence, he claims that this kind of honorification have a negative impact upon human dignity.

Choy (2005:129) states that pre-modern Korean society with its vertical relationships did not bring into question the side-effects of the honorific system, but that modern society seems no longer to take the traditional etiquette for granted. However, he say, modern society seems no longer to take the traditional etiquette for granted. Instead, the social changes toward a more egalitarian society support requests for a fair attitude toward inferiors. Thus, Choy claims that contemporary society judges the honorific system as unfair and inefficient language formalism (*hyengsik-cek kwenwicwuuy*) (16, 161).

Within this context, the social use of honorific registers—e.g., by those who are in a superior position in a relationship—may be linked to "linguistic violence" toward and oppression of inferiors, because honorification in the traditional context reminds inferiors of the authority of the privileged group. Those who are against the honorific system

---

[64] Note that I provide the address terms according to the level of treatment based on the account in the original text: title + *nim* (honorific suffix) > name + *ssi* (neutral suffix)> *tangsin* (you) > *ne* (you) > *i cakca* (this fellow) > *inom* (wretch) > *i casik* (this brat) > *i saykki* (son of a bitch).

[65] Suffixes such as *chi*, *i*, or *pu* are attached to menial, low-status jobs such as *yang'achi* (beggar), *taycangcang'i* (blacksmith), and *capyekpu* (handyman); suffixes such as *wen*, *kwan*, or *sa* can be found in more worthy jobs such as *yenkuwen* (researcher), *thongyekkwan* (interpreter), *pyenhosa* (lawyer). Note that the words that Choy uses—'menial' and 'worthy'—imply speakers' value judgment about what people do.

understand that an unfair relationship encoded in honorification sanctions such violence on the part of superiors (Nam Yengsin 1998:201; Choy Pongyeng 2005:133). Nam gives an example of senior-junior relations in schools and military groups:

> [I]n schools, even though seniors wield language violence over the juniors simply because they are older by one year, juniors are strictly enjoined to use honorifics to them; those who came earlier by one month bully the latecomers in a military community; the latecomers cannot dare act against them, saying "yes, yes" using honorifics. (Nam Yengsin 1998:201)

Similarly, Yi Otek (2004:101-3) points out that forcing children to use honorifics restricts their liberal thought and behaviour.

3.2.2 Normative use: simplified honorification

Asymmetric honorification can bring up the question of equality for inferiors as they are not eligible to expect honorification toward themselves. In order to eliminate discrimination, anti-traditionalists argue that address terms and honorifics need to be simplified for more effective communication and unity in society.

Egalitarian politeness between interlocutors has a close correlation with the simplification of the honorific system. Different levels of honorific forms signify different levels of deference to an addressee or a referent, a state of affairs which interferes with mutual respect and fair honorification toward each other. Thus, unification or standardization in honorific practices is imperative for establishing language advancement and a culture which befits a modern egalitarian society (Co Yenghuy 1998:142).

Anti-traditionalists suggest that unification or standardization in honorification is imperative in the contemporary society (Co Yenghuy 1998:142). For example, Wu

Caywuk (1997:146) and Yi Ungpayk (2001:90-4) argue that conventional honorific usages, such as excessive modesty and self-deprecation, or honorary titles, need reform in a democratic society. On a similar note, Li Uyto (1993:122) suggests that speakers in a horizontal relationship need a standardization of various address forms applicable regardless of gender. Nam Yengsin (2005) also argues that address terms and honorifics need to be simplified for more effective communication and unity in society[66]. Equal linguistic treatment through using identical or reciprocal levels of honorifics has more persuasive power, and is not just a demand originating in the discontent of a certain group of people in society.

In fact, many people in the younger generation derogate honorification as an evil custom which needs to be discarded. The negative impact of linguistic discrimination leads to social problems. For example, Choy (2005:103-4) asserts that the honorific system causes conflicts and creates obstacles to horizontal relationships in a democratic society. Why do Koreans experience difficulty in communication between different members and generations? According to Choy (2005:133), it is the honorific system that reminds speakers of social hierarchy variables such as age, rank, and title. Choy believes that the attendant psychological burden is an obstacle to human relationships and social progress.

---

[66] Quoting professional advice in international trade and the labor market, Nam (2005:278-81) notes: a) the substantial costs of drinking sessions after work for unity among employees; b) severe losses in the exchanging of ideas due to different titles for address forms; c) avoidance of cooperation with other groups due to possible burdens or risks involving address forms; and d) low flexibility in the labor market caused by interpersonal challenges for newcomers.

3.2.3 The quasi-authoritarianism inherent in honorification

The simplification of honorification suggested above seems to aim to achieve egalitarian respect, regardless of relative power difference. Anti-traditionalists believe that this reform is appropriate in an egalitarian society. However, anti-traditionalists do not think that honorification is the appropriate language practice. Unlike traditionalists, anti-traditionalists are still antagonistic to honorification because of its function in indexing power-difference in tradition.

Even though modern society pursues egalitarian respect, discrimination is inherent in honorification due to asymmetric use. Conventionally, it has been acceptable for superiors not to use honorifics to inferiors. Choy (2005:102) finds the origin of this convention in the status-based society of the Chosŏn Dynasty (1392-1910). According to him, the ruling class took advantage of the honorific system in order to solidify the ruler-subordinate relation because honorification was a duty only for people from the lower classes (102-3). In light of this consideration, the phenomenon of using honorifics does not indicate mere "politeness." Rather, the honorific system embodies a "quasi-status relationship" even in current society, serving as a means of discrimination and suppression for those utilizing it[67] (116).

For instance, Choy Pongyeng (2005:165-7) argues that the phenomenon of preferring honorific address terms exists because Korean society encourages its speakers to reveal a respectful attitude while submitting themselves to superiors[68]. He

---

[67] For more information, see Chapter 3, "Purpose and function of the honorific system," in Choy (2005: 107-40).

[68] So-called "address form inflation" (Choy Pongyeng 2005:198-205; Nam Yengsin 1993:202-6; 2005:268-9) refers to the social phenomenon among Koreans speakers whereby honorific address terms. According to Choy (2005:199), Koreans prefer using titles such as *sensayngnim* or *pucangnim* because authority in official titles can deliver speakers' respect and formality better than personal pronouns.

criticizes how both sides—inferiors and superiors—take advantage of the use of honorific markers and accept linguistic discrimination: superiors expect a respectful attitude toward their authority, and inferiors expect to be seen as polite persons by their superiors through their honorification. Similarly, the asymmetric use of honorifics in vertical social relationships provokes an association with authoritarianism. Nam Kisim (1998:199-201) argues that "authoritarianism in the Korean language" is evidenced by the fact that people expect to receive honorification as a token of respect and submission from others.

Therefore, the indexical value of honorification in a traditional context can be under criticism, according to the notion of politeness in an increasingly egalitarian Korean society. The negative evaluation of honorification attributes discrimination and authoritarianism in society to the language practice itself. On the flip side, anti-traditionalists or egalitarians seem to overlook the fact that speakers value politeness in honorification regardless of their social status. That is, the general eligibility for honorification has become more flexible than it used to be in the vertical society. Nonetheless, anti-traditionalists judge the socio-pragmatic functions of honorification *only* within vertical social relationships.

3.3 Utilitarianists

 Lastly, speakers I describe as "utilitarianists" promote honorification in horizontal relationships. Modernistic valorization of honorification is rather positive. Utilitarianists value linguistic politeness in the context of an egalitarian society where people are eligible for politeness regardless of their social status. The motivations for

supporting "correct" honorification come from individual purposes, as utilitarianists believe in the advantages of honorification in maintaining amicable social relationships.

3.3.1 Honorification as a personal strategy

While politeness can result from an affirmative reaction to the traditional social norm, utilitarianists appeal to speakers' desire to give a positive impression in relationships between participants[69]. Words such as "*concwung*" (respect) and "*paylye*" (consideration for others) are often associated with language courtesy. Here it is crucial to recognize that "courtesy" comes from a speaker's consideration for others rather than from traditional status hierarchies. Honorific markers contain a speaker's "respect for the personal dignity of others" (*inkyek concwung*) (Kim Wuyeng 2002:126).

Unlike traditionalists or anti-traditionalists, utilitarianists have individual, strategic motivations for using honorifics, particularly for the polite image of a speaker and amicable interpersonal relationships. What we learn from a speaker's use of honorifics is closely connected with the speaker's identity: the image of a speaker as a polite speaker and cultured person. That is, the recipients of the benefit of politeness not only include the addressee or referent but also the speaker. In fact, it is not uncommon for people to believe that the proper use of honorifics indexes the speaker's personality (Co Tongo 2003:103; Kim Wuyeng 2002:126-8; etc.).

> We can evaluate a person's growth background and cultural level from how properly (s)he can use address terms and honorifics…. By using impolite speech, one can damage his/her own dignity and bring contempt upon one's family by extension (Co Yenghuy 1998:137-8).

---

[69] Noting that recent honorification relies more on solidarity or personal interest than on power relationships, Nam Yengsin (2005:270) states that "[I]n addition to accepting power relationships with superiors, honorification has been given another characteristic as a means to help speakers' amicable social relationships."

Likewise, the polite and respectful image of a speaker towards others can lead to a positive impact upon relationships:

> As the Korean proverb says, 'Nice words for nice words (*kanun mal i kowa ya onun mal i kopta*)'; impolite speech from using the wrong honorific words or address terms arouses the same attitude in one's interlocutor, which leads to unnecessary conflicts (Co Tongo 2003:103).

The honorific effect plays a role in maintaining favorable relationships. The motivations to learn honorification thus appear to have more individual reasons and do not necessarily follow traditional custom. In this regard, utilitarianists' use of honorifics serves as a speakers' strategy for smoother relationships.

3.3.2 Normative use: reciprocal and flexible honorification

Utilitarianists are different from traditionalists: their usages of honorific registers are reciprocal and available to a broader range of recipients, including inferiors. They give a positive evaluation of the honorific system with the ideological value of egalitarianism. If honorification encodes respect for human beings, both speakers and listeners are supposed to be polite to each other. In other words, egalitarian politeness requires reciprocal honorification[70].

For example, Nam Yengsin (2005:281) suggests using honorifics with respect for human dignity, so that Koreans can learn how to lead cultivated lives and show respect for human beings in the twenty-first century. Nam Kisim and Kim Haswu (1995:110-1)

---

[70] I found a casual debate over honorification on an online community. The discourse began with an anecdote: a man was offended by his conversant because he did not use honorifics, even though the speaker did to the listener. This means that the listener failed to maintain mutual respect. Participants in the discussion reached the conclusion that people should use honorifics as a respectful gesture toward each other.

also put emphasis on egalitarian honorification, saying that people can use polite endings to strangers, children, and in formal situations, not due to the power of the listener, but as a token of respect for all mankind.

Since honorificiation serves as a personal strategy, utilitarianists put speakers' choices before tradition in dealing with specific usages. Nam Yengsin (2005:278) considers honorific agreement as a recommendation rather than an unconditional obligation. He leaves the choice to speakers who internalize a relationship (278). Li Uyto (1997:304) also acknowledges different effects of address terms for, e.g., a mother-in-law: a) *emenim* to receive friendly treatment; b) *cangmonim* to receive reliable treatment. It seems that speakers' choices for proper honorification can be flexible as long as a favorable relationship remains between the interlocutors.

On a similar account, since the evaluation of honorification derives from the traditional context, utilitarianists express a tolerant view of the transformation of *apcon-pep*, as a result of speakers' interest in the positive image of a polite speaker. Yi Ungpayk (2001:90-4) notes that the individualism and egalitarianism of current society provide unfavorable conditions for maintenance of the tradition of *apcon-pep*. Yi claims that speakers would feel awkward dropping honorifics for a referent even if (s)he is superior to a listener (93-4). Thus, rather than following the linguistic convention (i.e., *apcon-pep*), speakers may keep honorific markers for both the listener and referent. In doing so, they display both the speaker's identity as a polite speaker and his/her polite attitude toward the interlocutor.

Under these tolerant views, less honorification does not necessarily signify an

impolite gesture toward an addressee/referent[71]. For example, Pak Kapswu (2001:35)

notes that speakers today prefer using the informal style to express their friendly,

informal attitude, relieving the psychological distance between participants. His view

tells us that non-honorification can play a meaningful role in expressing solidarity in an

intimate relationship. Kim Wuyeng (2002: 145) also points out a similar tendency among

speakers who prefer to use the plain markers *i* (nominative) and *hanthey* (indirect

objective) rather than their honorific counterparts *kkeyse* and *kkey*, without being

considered rude in most cases. From a traditional perspective, simplified honorification or

confusion in honorifics usage leads to a morally confused society. However, Kim Sulong

(1999:149) sees the simplified use of address terms as a result of language efficiency,

since language is apt to change as occasions demand[72].

3.3.3 Honorification as cultural capital

Nevertheless, allowing a speaker's volition in articulating honorific registers does not

mean an underestimation of normative usage. Along with increasingly high expectations

for language skills in English, Koreans are expected to be competent speakers of their

own mother tongue. Accordingly, it has become more common to consider honorification

as serving as a kind of personal "cultural capital" (Bourdieu 1986).[73] In these

circumstances, mistakes in honorification are attributed to a lack of knowledge.

---

[71] E.g., *emenim* (respect ↑, intimacy↓) versus *emma* (respect↓, intimacy↑)
[72] Li Uyto (2001:87) opposes replacing plain words with polite words for practical reasons. Taking an example from *yakcwu* 'booze; alcoholic beverage'[+HON] versus *swul* [-HON], he claims that the division between plain style and honorific style in this case only causes confusion, because the honorific version literally refers to a medicinal wine.
[73] For instance, the Korea Broadcasting Station (KBS) has introduced the Korean Proficiency Test for laypeople in 2005; this test has been used as one of the assessment materials to judge applicants' qualifications for employment in firms and public organizations (Kim Kyengwen and Kim Chelho 2008:9) .

Indeed, many of the language etiquette manuals support the normative honorific system (Co Yenghuy 1998:40-1). Kim Wuyeng (2002:128) suggests that "standard oration" (*phyocwunhwa-pep*) provides an elegant standard speech model for speakers who wish to lead a polite language life[74]. Mastering language manners, which is "a must for modern speakers" (*hyentayin uy philwsuphwum*), means using honorifics "correctly" and "elegantly" according to the standardized linguistic norm.

The individualized, strategic motivation toward honorification is bound up in normative usages. Because modern speakers are well aware of the risks to the identity of a speaker and amicable relationships, they are keen to learn how to use honorifics "properly." Hence, if a speaker fails to use honorifics "properly" as seen above, the consequence may leave a negative image of the speaker as lacking education or culturedness (Kim Tongso 1999:184-5; Kim Wuyeng 2002:145-51).

A good example can be found in the overuse of honorifics—a quandary between strategic politeness and normative usage. Unilitarianists believe that an educated, polite speaker should not fall into the obsession of using honorifics all the time. Nam Yengsin (2005:272) claims that excessive honorification in commercial contexts is ungrammatical because the honorific marker *-si-* cannot take an inanimate subject (Nam Kisim and Kim Haswu 1995:131). He interprets this phenomenon as a strategic use to show a respectful attitude to customers, simply by overusing the honorific marker *-si-*. He goes on to say that modern speakers would not use improper honorification if they had even a slight knowledge of language usage (272-3).

The consequences sometimes backfire against the speaker's strategy to maintain a

---

[74] For instance, *manwula* does not count as elegant speech although the address form is considered standard language (Kim Wuyeng 2003:128).

favorable relationship with listeners. Ungrammatical uses are regarded as impolite

manners even if the overuse of honorification is meant to express a speaker's polite

attitude toward a referent or a relationship. Wu Caywuk (1997:147) claims that using

polite or humble words carrying authoritative connotations from previous generations can

be a disgrace to the interlocutor because it may cause a negative emotion. Moreover,

excessive honorification often bothers people because the crude flattery resulting from a

lack of knowledge and from ulterior motives to gain benefits from honorification.

Therefore, learning proper honorification is important as people often say *kwalyey nun*

pilyey 'over-politeness is impolite.' Both over-honorification for an addressee (referent)

and under-honorification for a speaker can be considered "inappropriate" manners.

Chapter 4 *Ene Yeycel* as a Meaningful Social Practice

4.1 *Ene yeycel* as the main issue of language policy

This section aims to examine why and how the ROK government initiated the Standard Diction (hereafter, SD) campaign in 1990. On the surface, SD is an extension of language standardization and purification. However, language policy for SD came to the surface as a public issue along in the context of specific cultural-political circumstances. In particular, the "cultural policy" (*munhwa cengchayk*) of the Ministry of Cultural Affairs (hereafter, MCA) led the standardization of *ene yeycel* and the public campaign with the assistance of NIKL. In these cultural-political circumstances, the social meaning of standardized honorification was rediscovered as indigenous culture, a group identity shared by Korean speakers.

4.1.1 *Ene yeycel* before standardization

How was it that *ene yeycel* escaped the control of governmental language policy before the 1990s? As reviewed in Chapter 1, the confusion between conventional honorification and the new usages was apparently an agreed-upon idea and a constant topic in sociolinguistics since the 1970s. Such concerns are also observable from the articles in the quasi-academic journal *Kwuke Saynghwal* [Korean Life] issued by the Kwuke Yenkwuso (The Research Centre of the Korean Language, which later became NIKL, KY hereafter). In particular, the KY published a special issue with a section entitled "*Kwuke*

saynghwal uy yeycel" [Politeness in linguistic life][75] in 1987 (Vol.10, autumn).

It is apparent that the KY regarded confusion in *ene yeycel* as a public problem because of its social implications. In the volume mentioned above, Kim Tongen notes in the epilogue that

> We should not just admire the excellence of the Korean Script (*hankul*), but we should also pay particular attention to investigating/organizing non-Koreanish uses of our language. [paragraph] It is probably *ene yeycel* for which this task is urgently needed. We are in a very chaotic situation now: while traditional *ene yeycel* is not used often in present days, new *ene yeycel* has not settled down yet. (Kim Tongen 1987:144)

This passage implies a sense of crisis toward the native linguistic culture, which is threatened by the chaotic situation. *Ene yeycel* is endangered by non-Korean language and by the rapidly changing society. Here, Kim's comment suggests a legitimate reason for language intervention in order to settle the confusion between old *ene yeycel* and the new one.

Similarly, *ene yeycel* sometimes involves concerns about underlying moral degeneration. For instance, Yi Ungpayk (1987) expresses his frustration in searching for *ene yeycel* in the contemporary chaotic society at the beginning of the same issue:

> Our language, which suffered from serious illness through the Japanese invasion, was thrown into excessive chaos by confusions after Liberation and the 6.25 civil war…. It hard to even think where I should look for *ene yeycel* nowadays when objects of respect and hierarchical order have become so jumbled. (Yi Ungpayk 1987:4)

Here, what frustrates Yi is moral disruption and the apparent loss of respect and social order, not simply the language's suffering from social turmoil. He adds the following in the discussion on "*Kwuke saynghwal uy yeycel*" [Polite linguistic life]:

---

[75] This volume offers an excerpt of a discussion about the problems of the current linguistic culture of politeness, along with several articles concerning the topic.

> In order to rectify such *ene yeycel*, we are faced with the situation of 'correcting' quite artificially. If we just let things happen as now, [*ene yeycel*] will be corrupted even worse. (Yi Ungpayk 1987:9)

Yi's note is decidedly cautionary: the "corruption" in *ene yeycel* will continue unless we "rectify" or "correct" it. Of course, the "corruption" also includes negative impacts on society, and such a sensation of crisis can be a driving force to justify or even urge language intervention.

As observed above, problems concerning *ene yeycel* do not simply arise from changes in language practice. Rather, it would be more precise to say that *ene yeycel* gives rise to arguments when there is heightened social awareness of and understanding of the situation accompanied by prognostications as to the social implications for society.

Nonetheless, simply acknowledging the breakdown of conventional *ene yeycel* norms as a sociolinguistic issue could not automatically bring forth language standardization and education. One of the challenges in stipulating *ene yeycel* norms is the fact that language practice is difficult to formalize. As an example, the Ministry of Education issued *Saynghwal Yeycel* [Manners for life] in 1972. However, as Yi, Ungpayk (1987:5) noted, the contents were not sufficient to serve as a practical guideline. Back then, *ene yeycel* was regarded as no more than a matter of language usage for greetings, telephone conversations, and letter-writing, which seemed a far cry from something specifically in need of codification or standardization.

Therefore, *ene yeycel* seems to have received attention only insofar as it could be included in family-based moral education, and was not deemed suitable for inclusion in formal education. Practical education about *ene yeycel* (e.g., how to use honorifics or terms of address) remained confined as a part of family education, and was not

considered to fall under the jurisdiction of the school curriculum. According to Yi

Ungpayk, it was not until the fifth revision of the school curriculum (July 1987) that

listening and speaking began to be included as a part of the "national language"

education[76] (Yi Ungpayk 1987:16-7).

In this context, it is not surprising that the KY, which was the official research

organization for language policy under the Ministry of Education, tried to find desirable

solutions to deal with this social concern. This is what led the KY to organize the

discussion on the polite linguistic life as part of contribution to the topic of the journal

issue in 1987[77]. The members of the meeting seemed to agree that the way forward in

coping with the current disorder in *ene yeycel* norms lay not in reviving the old tradition,

but in adjusting traditional customs to the present age. The other important result to note

is that the meeting pointed out two things in need of attention when coping with the

disorder in *ene yeycel*: the establishment of official standards and systematized education.

After the special issue on "Polite Linguistic Life'" in 1987, the journal *Kwuke

Saynghwal* delved into the same topic in later issues, focusing on more specific uses of

language forms with regard to politeness—e.g., "Terms of Address and Terms of

Reference" (1989, winter) and "Honorifics" (1991, autumn). The linguistic elements of

ene yeycel placed more emphasis on lexicon and grammar. Considering the political

---

[76] The Ministry of Education prepared the new textbooks for elementary school and allocated two hours for speaking and listening, three hours for reading, and two hours for writing as part of the national language curriculum (KY 1987:16-7). As an example related to honorification, the fifth revision of the school curriculum for the Korean language in middle school includes the meanings and functions of grammatical forms with regard to high/low personal treatment (Pak Yengswun 1988:44).

[77] According to the excerpt (KY 1987:8-29), this discussion was held on 22 July, presented by prestigious scholars (who had PhDs from Seoul National University), and had participated in the language projects of the KY. The members of the discussion and their academic affiliation were also presented as follows: Kim Minswu (professor in Korean linguistics at Korea University), chair; Yi Ungpayk (professor in Korean linguistics at Seoul National University); Cha Cwuhwan (professor in Chinese literature at Tankwuk University); Hong Sungo (professor in French literature at Seoul National University), and Ceng Yangwan (professor in Classical Chinese literature at the Academy of Korean Studies). The purpose of the discussion was "to diagnose the disorder of linguistic politeness in reality and to seek a desirable direction."

status of the KY under the Ministry of Education, such advances in the KY served as a step forward in standardization and public education at the state level.

Furthermore, the KY also suggested a blueprint for language policy for the government. The journal *Kwuke Saynghwal* introduced a series of articles about language policies and national language research institutes in other countries[78]. After these precursory steps, the KY unveiled its vision for national language policy in the spring issue of *Kwuke Saynghwal* (Vol. 20, 1990). This issue mostly deals with standard orthography, but it nonetheless indicates that the KY was preparing to take charge of language policy in a more comprehensive and well-planned way than before.

Nevertheless, *ene yeycel* norms had not been on the agenda for the state's language policy. Clearly there already existed sufficient reasons to justify standardizing *ene yeycel* norms—they had been changing and causing confusion in language use without any detailed standard norms. As the discussion group had proposed, there was a need to develop and codify *ene yeycel*, and to educate the public in linguistic etiquette through public education. Yet, language projects of the KY had focused entirely on language purification and standard orthography until the end of the 1980s. The major themes covered in *Kwuke Saynghwal* reflect this trend[79].

---

[78] The issue titled "Language Purification" (1988, summer, Vol. 14) featured language purifying policies in the U.K., Germany, France, Turkey, and Japan. The following national language research institutes have also been featured in *Kwuke Saynghwal*: Finland (Ko Song-mu 1989), France (Ceng Ciyeng 1990), Japan (Shibu 1990), Taiwan (1990, summer, Vol. 21), and China (He Pyek 1990).
[79] For instance, the next issue on language purification (1988, autumn) focused on promoting native language as opposed to Sino-Korean or other loan words (e.g., Japanese and English). The contributions of intellectuals to the issue did not mention linguistic politeness, although they did express their opinions about how language policy should be done, such as: "love for indigenous things," "a pan-national movement," "collaboration with the mass media," etc.

4.1.2 Why in 1990?

How did *ene yeycel*, which had been considered challenging to regularize and codify, come into the limelight? Firstly, the critical force came from the political interest in culture, or, to be more precise, the socio-indexical values of language practice. *Ene yeycel* was suitable as a target of cultural policy for the MCA because it was part of the group identity of the linguistic community. Secondly, the MCA empowered the KY to take part in academic research as a collaborative project for the cultural policy of the state. Finally, *ene yeycel* came to be regularized and propagated under the slogan, "cultural administration" (*munhwa hayngceng*), which was the new ministry's activist role.

The year 1990 is a good point to look into the political changes within the ROK governmental administration and the KY. This was the year when the MCA was founded (January, 1990) as a governmental organ in charge of cultural administration (*mwunhwa hayngceng*) (NIKL 2000:34-5). This new governmental organization gave the impetus to establishing a professional national language institute like those in Japan and France[80]. Soon thereafter, preparations began for expanding the KY into a national research institute, but the MCA was still in charge of language policy.

The first Minister of the new MCA, Yi Elyeng, is the most influential figure who supported the standardization of *ene yeycel* at the state level. As a cultural critic and a professor, Yi made public his vision to lead the cultural policy for the citizens and society

---

[80] Yi Elyeng said in his congratulatory address on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of NIKL that one of his goals as the first Minister of the MCA in 1990 was to set up a national institute in charge of language policy. According to him, he intended to forge ahead with the launching of a language purifying project with a national institute like that of France (NIKL 2000:19). In this regard it is important to note Professor Yi Elyeng's background in French language and literature and his sympathies with the state-led, dirigiste, and elitist orientations of the Academie Francaise.

in general[81] (e.g., *Kyenghyang* 11, April, 1990, p.8). Language was one of his interests

because it is embedded in people's daily lives. He identified language use as "group

culture" or "life culture" (Yi Elyeng 1990:291). Yi believed that public support in the

form of administration, regulations, and funding was necessary for group culture to

prosper. With such justification for government mediation, Yi expressed a strong will to

conduct language standardization in an interview with a major news magazine:

> "[T]he cultural areas where strong authority should be imposed, such as the regulation of computer software codes or language standardization, conversely were neglected, so they fell into chaos. I think this should be the opposite. In particular, one cannot accomplish language standardization policy without willingly entering the swamp of death (laugh)…. Standardization should be done in any way, and, in order to do it, someone should sacrifice him or herself anyway…. So even if I become a devil's advocate, I am determined to achieve our long-cherished standardization at all costs. (Yi Elyeng1990:289)

Yi's interest in promoting culture imposes cultural value upon *ene yeycel* as

language practice in society. *Ene yeycel* is now worthy of paying serious attention to as a

cultural policy of the MCA because it has been muddled. Also, *ene yeycel* is related to the

aim of the cultural movement to restore "cultural homogeneity" (*munhwa-cek*

tongcilseng). Yi finds the task more urgent than autonomy and pluralism in society,

despite his support for these values (288-9). For instance, Yi said in his address in

commemoration of the tenth anniversary of NIKL that "reviving traditional culture begins

with cherishing our language and script" (NIKL 2000:35). Indeed, his vision in restoring

the cultural homogeneity of the ethnic group acknowledged the cultural implication of

language standardization as the preservation of cultural norm and tradition (289).

---

[81] Within several months, the MCA advanced sixty-five projects, including *Kkachi Soli Cenhwa* ('Magpie's Hotline'; MCA's hotline for listening to public opinions), *Wuli mas cikhiki wuntong* 'campaign to keep our taste,' *Kwukmin Mwunhwa Wuntong* 'citizens' cultural movement,' and *Phyocwunhwa Saep* 'standard diction.' The MCA also had interests in developing traditional cultural assets.

When the Ministry of Cultural Affairs was created, the standardization of speech was the bottom line for the MCA's language projects at the beginning of the 1990s. The "proposal for speech standardization and language purification" (*Hwapep Phyocwun-hwa Mich Ene Swunhwa Kyeyhoykan*) presented by the MCA considered the overuse of loanwords and the disregard for linguistic politeness as forms of "serious pollution in linguistic culture" (*Tonga Ilbo* 07 February, 1990, p. 8). The proposal also noted that it was for this reason that the MCA intended to develop a language purification project and announce a standard manual. Accordingly, the KY carried out the necessary academic research from the early 1990s (NIKL 2000:70).

Thus, the MCA had a close engagement with the KY, which was still a research centre under the MCA (03 January 1990 to 23 January 1991). The KY, for its part, lobbied the government for a state-level language policy. The first issue of *Kwuke Saynghwal* (1990, spring) was devoted to the theme of "language policy for cultured citizens" (*munhwa kwukmin ul wihan*). Six months after its establishment, the MCA organized a new Council of the Korean Language (*Kwuke Simuyhoy*) to discuss important agenda items for concrete policy directions[82]. Two subcommittees—the department of *hankul* (Korean script) and the department of language purification—were set up first out of a total of five subcommittees, in order to undertake the SD and language purifying projects (*Mayil Kyengcey*, 05 July 1990, p.19).

---

[82] According to the Regulations of the *Kwuke Simuyhoy* (Presidential Decree No. 8279; 15 November 1976), it consisted of five subcommittees, with total members numbering no more than sixty: *hankul* (Korean script), purification of the national language, orthography, Chinese characters, and academic terminology. The newly organized *Kwuke Simuyhoy* was arranged in order to review matters regarding *hankul*, loan word orthography and Romanization, Chinese characters, academic terminology, and any new matters proposed by the Minister of the MCA or the committee chairman (*Mayil Kyengcey*, 05 July 1990, p.19).

Yi elevated the administrative state of the KY on 14 November, 1991 (Presidential

Decree No. 13163), whereby it became an official government agency. Although the

Department of Language (*emunkwa*) of the MCA still designed the basic directions of

language policies, this political change gave NIKL authority as the professional research

institute for the language policy of the state. The SD (from October 1990 to December

1991) was one of the very first projects and the only standardization enterprise for NIKL.

The MCA initiated the SD and championed the project in public. The MCA's joint

projects with the mass media and with the KY were two parts of its far-reaching plan.

4.1.3 Honorification for the restoration of cultural homogeneity

Thus, it would be reasonable to relate SD to the government policy to improve the

citizens' standard of culture, in particular by centering on daily life and tradition. If this is

the case, how does honorification fit into this grander purpose[83]? Generally speaking,

many Koreans consider the Korean language as one of the primary icons of traditional

culture (e.g., Park 2010). *Ene yeycel*, too, has an inseparable relationship with traditional

culture. Thus, the fact that honorification is "highly developed" in Korean is seen to

manifest the importance of interpersonal relationships in traditional Korean society (Seng

Kichel 1991). In this context, the MCA pushed ahead with the SD and with its language

purifying projects simultaneously, at the beginning of 1990.

A discussion of the minister of the MCA with a group of intellectuals gives more

---

[83] In dealing with the similar case in Japanese, Wetzel (2004:44) points out two things about Japanese honorific language (*keigo*) underpinning the Meiji government's effort to standardize language. Firstly, it is native to Japanese *vis-à-vis* foreign scripts (Chinese *kanji*); secondly, it is a spoken phenomenon for gauging the language capability of the general public. In this regard, Wetzel (*ibid.*) examines the historical process of standardization of *keigo* in the social context of identifying its place in the world—i.e., as the response of social institutions to social transformations.

clues about the cultural discourse regarding the SD[84]. The Minister of the MCA, Yi

Elyeng, led the discussion. In this discussion, Yi expressed his opinion on the cultural

values of standardizing *ene yeycel*:

> Some people seem to oppose the standardization of speech, saying, "Why do we need to
> standardize speech which is naturally different among speakers?" However, the problem is
> that our speech is too confusing to advocate individuality and diversity. Taking an example
> from greetings in the morning, we used to have many great expressions in Korean, but the
> young people are not trying to hone [the native expressions] and use *cohun achim* [Good
> morning, calqued on English] openly, just as they see on TV dramas. This expression is
> different from English, not to mention that its origin is unknown. Besides, when we propose a
> toast at a drinking party, North Koreans say *chwukpay*, and Japanese say *kenpay* (*kanpai* in
> Japanese); but we often hesitate because there is no suitable term in Korean. Some people
> would say *wihaye*, while others would say *kontuley mantuley*. If any Korean goes abroad and
> gets asked questions like 'How do Koreans greet each other in the morning?" or "What do they
> say to propose a toast?, "how would he answer? Cultural diversity is good, but what I am
> saying is that we need a minimum level of norms in speech. (*Cosen Ilpo*, 24 October 1990)

This statement seems to represent the assumption that *ene yeycel* represents

Koreans' cultural identity. He also considered problems with speech differences between

different generations or regions as resulting from losing their "common cultural base":

> Speech can settle down properly when speakers and listeners have a common cultural base,
> but our society has lost this in the process of rapid industrialization. I think what causes
> problems in speech lies in this point. (*ibid*.)

These passages indicate that the SD project began with a cultural motivation to develop

native culture and to promote group identity with regard to *ene yeycel*. In other words, the

effects of the SD are expected to have social repercussions beyond simply resolving

linguistic confusion or inconvenience. Professor An Pyenghuy (first director of the KY at

---

[84] The newspaper *Cosen Ilpo* featured a series about special articles of the SD project from 24 October
1990 to 19 February 1991. Before dealing with actual language practice, it presented excerpts from the
discussion to draw public attention to the purposes and plans for the upcoming project (*Cosen Ilpo* 24
October 1990). The members of the discussions included: Yi Elyeng (Minister of the MCA), Yi Ungpayk
(professor at Seoul National University), Cen Thaykpu (emeritus leader of YMCA), Cen Yengwu
(professor at Swuwen University), An Pyenghuy (director of the KY from 2 April, 1990 to 31 December
1990 and director of NIKL from 10 January 1991 to 31 December 1994).

that time), one of the member of the discussion with Yi Elyeng, noted that Korea was far behind to Japan, since Japan had created a normative guide for *ene yeycel* "Honorifics from now on" (*kore kara no keigo*) already in 1952 (*Cosen Ilpo*, 24 October 1990).

Insofar as traditional *ene yeycel* had been disregarded and had become muddled in modern Korean society, standardization of these language practices could be imbued with cultural meaning, and could distinguish native Korean linguistic culture from "foreign" culture. A conscious effort to cultivate and inculcate native culture and traditional virtue can be observed in the process of standardizing *ene yeycel*, including honorifics, terms of address/reference, and greetings.

For example, there were heated discussions over coming up with native Korean expressions for proposing a toast, and there were a number of suggestions such as *wihaye* or *cihwaca* (*Cosen Ilpo*, 20 January 1991, p.10). A similar problem was pointed out with birthdays, as traditional expressions were declining (*ibid.*: 5 February 1991). There were also suggestions for creating a native song for birthdays to replace the common foreign song "Happy Birthday." The illustration provokes affection for native culture by personifying a native song crying in the corner when people are singing the foreign "Happy Birthday" (*ibid.*)

Nevertheless, it is unlikely that the government's valorization of traditional native culture could have been the only or main purpose of the SD. The virtue of Korean tradition itself could not be the sole value of the public campaign; rather, it needed to be "harmonized" with contemporary reality. Even though weakened linguistic conventions could cause concerns about disorder in society and endangered linguistic culture, the "pre-modern" features of the custom were not expected to appeal to speakers in modern society.

Furthermore, the primary purpose of the cultural project was to disseminate standard models of *ene yeycel* to ordinary people. So the government intended to receive feedback from various speakers through the MCA's hotline and contributions to newspapers (e.g., the "Magpie's Hotline' and the page for "My Experience/Opinion" in *Cocen Ilpo*). Such attempts elicited active reactions from the public[85]. The SD successfully managed to arouse social awareness of *ene yeycel* and to popularize the standardized norms. After the mid-1990s, the revisited significance of *ene yeycel* seemed to settle down and *ene yeycel* came to be regarded as one of the emblamatic characteristics of the Korean language in the era of globalization[86].

4.2 *Ene yeycel* in individual life

As many Korean sociolinguists have assumed (see Chapter 1), self-centrism and egalitarianism in interpersonal relationships can change the way a speaker treats the person spoken of and spoken to. However, the conclusion that the simplification of honorification is a rational consequence of the modern ideologies needs to be reexamined. In this section, I argue that valorizations of honorification are related to speakers' orientations toward modern ideologies.

---

[85] The hotline to NIKL (*Kanata Cenhwa*; 'Kanata Hotline') turned out to be one of the most successful services. By late August 1991 this hotline had received 2,909 questions and requests concerning standard language, honorification, and pure Korean naming (*Tonga Ilpo*: 19 September 1991, p.13). Corporations also participated actively in the SD campaign, featuring its materials in their company magazines (*Mayil Kyengcey*, 06 July 1991, p.8).
[86] For example, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism (the former MCA) published another popular book, W*ulimal palo alki* (Knowing our language correctly, 1998), based on the state's major language projects such as orthography, the SD, and language purification. In this volume, Yi Iksep, director of NIKL from January 1997 to January 1999, noted that the systematic and sophisticated use of honorifics demonstrates the richness of the Korean language (4-5).

4.2.1 Concerns of lay speakers

> "Modernity radically alters the nature of day-to-day social life and affects the most personal aspects of our experience. Modernity must be understood on an institutional level; yet the transmutations introduced by modern institutions interlace in a direct way with individual life and therefore with the self. (Gidden 1991:1)

What is the relation between modern-western ideologies and honorification in individual life? From lay speakers' perspectives, what is at stake in language practices such as honorification involves a positive or negative impact on interpersonal relationships and self-identity.

The changes in social ideologies in modern Korean society, however, have rendered lay speakers confused in terms of honorification. On the one hand, honorifics are less needed as many speakers prefer more simplified and less authoritarian linguistic politeness. On the other hand, speakers are not able to completely disregard honorification because they are still concerned about being polite and not offending their interlocutors. Therefore, ordinary speakers are interested in solutions for dealing with dilemmas of honorification in their social relationships.

Finding a suitable level of linguistic forms is integrally related to a speaker's perception of the interpersonal context. In other words, one of the essential characteristics of linguistic norms regarding honorification is that speakers' identities inevitably become embedded in the complex array of possible linguistic forms available to them. Identity in social interactions can be broadly understood as "the social positioning of self and others"[87] (Bucholtz and Hall 2005:586). Honorification encodes speakers' different

---

[87] A clarification of some aspects of identity (origin, position, indexicality), based on the analytic framework of identity proposed by Bucholtz and Hall (2005) is in order. First, identity is a relational and socio-cultural phenomenon that emerges from specific linguistic interactions (588). Secondly, the interactional positions of the social actors may build up ideological associations with more large-scale identities, shaping who does what and how in interactions, though never in a deterministic fashion (591).

understandings of their positioning of self and others in social interactions; in other words, it is a component of identity.

Speakers decide whether or not to follow the conventional form. Some politeness theories and studies on honorifics have taken into consideration a speaker's will in expressing politeness. In order to distinguish individually motivated politeness from that of social norms, the theories or studies suggests two modes of politeness, expressed variously as: discernment versus volition (Ide 1986), deference versus politeness (Hwang 1982:42-55), and politeness as social indexing versus strategic politeness (Kasper 1990:193-218). Yi Kikap (1997) reviews them as follows: a) modes in which honorification mark a power difference and b) modes in which honorification indicates the speaker's strategy. Yi observes that the former approach (the social normative approach) derives from the fact that speakers are expected to follow certain social norms such as age, gender, or social status in their interpersonal relationships; the second, strategic or volitional view, recognizes an individual-oriented demeanor calculated to conduct more friendly interpersonal relationships (660-1).

Therefore, finding a suitable level of linguistic forms is not an easy task even for native speakers: it depends not only on speakers' perceptions of the interpersonal context but also on their choice as to whether to follow the conventional form or not[88]. Language users, the social agents of the valorizations of language use, are confronted with the

---

Thirdly, identity positions are indexed by linguistic forms, and the social meanings associated with linguistic forms implicate identity in certain cultural beliefs and values (594).

[88] Kim Cengho (2005:5) includes a step in which the speaker's own analysis is applied to figure out a suitable honorific level for his/her relationship (Step 3). The process includes four steps, as follows:

Step 1: A speaker comes up with an abstract level of honorifics based on a given social condition and common knowledge.
Step 2: The speaker applies the abstract honorifics to his/her specific situation.
Step 3: The speaker determines whether to follow the level or to take another condition into account.
Step 4: The speaker adjusts with the interlocutor to establish the most appropriate level of honorifics.

challenges of prioritizing speakers' linguistic norms in internalizing social relationships.

4.2.2 Identification of social relationships and honorification

From the socio-cultural perspective, an interpersonal relationship can be identified by two dimensions: equality and self-position. Singelis et al. (1995) suggest a theoretical framework for conceptions of social relationships linked to different socio-cultural contexts. This research posits four cultural patterns of interpersonal relationships. Each category consists of two dimensions (243-4). The major attributes can be summarized as follows:

Level of Equality	Self-positioning	
	Dependent (group oriented)	Independent (individual oriented)
Low	Vertical collectivism	Vertical individualism
High	Horizontal collectivism	Horizontal individualism

Table 6 Distinctive conceptualizations of social relationships (Singelis et al. 1995)

The first criterion is related to the level of self-identification in social interactions. Collectivists define themselves as part of a group and put group interest and relationship harmony before personal goals or benefits. Their behaviors is influenced by social conventions and understood as duties or obligations. Individualists perceive themselves as independent from a group and tend to behave according to their individual agreements. The second criterion shows the perception of power relations. People who are more experienced with vertical relationships tend to accept inequality, while equality is the key concept of horizontal relationships.

The dispositions of self within a group and power relations as above do not exist

merely as typological characteristics of cultural patterns in general. These multiple

dimensions of identity can coexist within a society where a number of groups support

different values as they internalize social interactions differently. In other words, various

interpretations of socio-pragmatic contexts can suggest the relative importance of values

(e.g., individual versus group and hierarchy versus horizontality) in effecting divergent

internalizations of their social relationships.

Speakers who believe that they should use or who want to use honorifics can

positively valorize honorification in social relationships. Firstly, respect for one's

superiors, e.g. elders, is still held up as a worthy value in contemporary Korean society.

The traditional value of honorification—deferential entitlement as a matter of linguistic

and cultural tradition—is embedded in a social hierarchical structure. Though modern

Korean society values equality, this traditional concept of respect based on power-

difference retains a traditional social convention[89]. Those who are conscious of traditional

social norms display politeness by conforming to social hierarchical relationships.

Speakers have another reason—a "modern" value—to use honorific markers: as a

token of respect for other people. Regardless of equality in an interpersonal context,

honorification encodes a speaker's polite attitude, either to his/her superiors or to other

people in general. This value is as useful as ever in a horizontal society. Moreover, if

speakers strategically deploy honorific registers, those who are in a relatively inferior

position can nevertheless be eligible for honorification in a horizontal context[90]. In this

---

[89] In his book *Hyotoene* [Filial Language], Lye Cungtong (1999) provides detailed information on how to speak politely from the traditional context.
[90] Nam Yengsin (2005:176) notes that some speakers prefer using honorifics for *all* interactants, regardless of power relationships. As an example, he (2005: 275) observes the manipulation of honorific level by a father-in-law. According to Nam, the speaker (father-in-law) uses the honorific word *tusita* '[+HON] to eat' instead of the plain style form *hata* 'do' in order to offset the relatively low plain speech level interrogative

way, honorification is not simply a traditional social norm that speakers are obliged to follow blindly.

Although the contexts are quite different, the social norms are often labeled "*elun kongkyeng sasang*" (the ideology of respecting elders) or "*inkan concwung sasang*" (the ideology of respecting other people) even in contemporary Korean society. In any case, polite behaviour may derive from a speaker's respect for the interlocutor's social status or personality. Speakers may feel obliged to use honorific registers. Or, some speakers may use them because they want to do so, not because they feel obliged to conform to the socio-linguistic norms. Regardless of self-positioning as collectivists or individualists, the social values of honorification as above can bring about four different pragmatic contexts.

On the other hand, honorifics can be interpreted as a negative bahaviour toward other people. Negative valorizations of honorification indicate a transitional stage between "traditional" and "modern" contexts. Speakers in this group view deferential politeness as a kind of discriminatory bahaviour indexing power-difference. In this perspective, social inequality is encoded in honorification.

This group of people criticizes honorification in the context of the traditional social hierarchy, but what they seek are horizontal relationships. Using honorifics can be interpreted as a flattering or distant disposition of the speaker. What is assumable here is that the interlocutors are on the side of horizontal and intimate relationships. This evaluation of equality in a social relationship reveals the side-effects of honorifics in modern society and explains why honorification can be commonly considered "old-fashioned" or "authoritarian" among the younger generation and progressively-minded

---

verb-ending in "*swul com ha-si-keyssnunka*?" This example shows that the superior's honorification toward the inferior encodes some degree of respect.

people.

A request to eliminate discrimination recognizes the rise of individuality, especially for those in inferior positions. People who value this are individualists in that they prioritize individuals over others, trying to be independent from traditional norms. On the other hand, they are also collectivists who identify themselves as a part of a group. They find politeness in social convention, whereby superiors are eligible for linguistic politeness because of their social position. Being conscious of the social norm, they negatively valorize honorification as the emblematic characteristics of authoritarianism, discrimination, or even violation.

4.2.3 Multiple norms of linguistic politeness

As Cameron (1990:90) notes, speakers do not automatically react to the norms of their culture, nor do they all accept them in the same manner. Korean metalinguistic discourse shows that language users do not just react to what is going on in society but actively fashion conflicting evaluations of language. Language users who *internalize* socio-cultural ideologies differently can nonetheless make those seemingly opposing discourses and language uses meaningful to themselves. Therefore, the social meanings of honorification are not self-evident, but can be justified, depending on what sorts of values people impose upon their internalized relationships.

Positive and negative valorizations of honorification in language how-to literature portray different conceptualizations of social relationships. Which option speakers follow depends on how speakers identify themselves and their relationships in social interactions and on what sorts of values or beliefs they impose on their language practice. They may

or may not use honorifics, based on their valorization of certain aspects of honorification. In any case, the positive or negative pragmatic functions are backed up by different contexts of sociolinguistic ideology.

Multiple norms of linguistic politeness seem to make sense under such metalinguistic justifications of the positive versus negative functions of honorification. Even though the internalizations might be different, what is claimed as "proper honorification" in how-to language publications is expected to help speakers with "polite" bahaviours and/or "knowledge" in dealing with honorifics. Metalinguistic discourse can provide us with accounts of different interests and values of different groups of people. The three popularized views (traditionalists, egalitarians, and utilitarianists) in how-to industry manuals serve as a snapshot of the linguistic ideologies of honorification. Each of them is related with a speaker's value and interest in identifying social relationships. Furthermore, the speakers' honorification indexes the second-order indexicality, such as a speaker's own identity as an educated or polite person. All of these indexical functions serve as the rationale or normative ground for speakers' linguistic bahaviour.

For this particular aim, how-to books are potentially more impactful on lay speakers as effective and useful references than the limited linguistic models advocated by the government-sponsored propagation. Because the main goal of the ROK government was to establish a unified speech norm for the general population, the SD campaign itself does not appear to have triggered linguistic debates on the pragmatics of honorification. Or at least such debates were not the main concern of the standardization

campaign[91].

However, popular how-to books focus on lay speakers' matters or interests in dealing with language use (e.g., "correct" language usages) in order to appeal to as many readers as possible and to make a profit. These linguistic guides are generally meant to be practical and comprehensive so as to encompass a wide range of readers. Moreover, because similar linguistic matters can be published in various genres, readers can simply grab a book in line with their interests and purposes. From this perspective, the language how-to industry provides us with metalinguistic sources of social convention and the formulation of customs.

---

[91] Of course, the SD project made a conscious effort to reflect actual usage and opinions from a wide range of speakers. The regular sections for the SD project in the *Cosen Ilpo* typically allocated space for reporting the contemporary linguistic reality and personal experiences or opinions from various readers. Eight out of nine topics of *ene yeycel* constitute two series of articles: one concerning overall observations of language use on relevant topics (e.g., issues and problems) and the other being a summary of the draft of standard speech discussed by the committee of the SD (*Phyocwun Hwapep Camun wiwentan*). Once those contributions were mentioned as the background information for establishing the standard linguistic norms, however, some usages were prescribed as 'non-standard.' For example, terms of address for one's own husband show over twenty variations, depending on generation (*Cosen Ilpo* 31 October 1990, p.10), but some usages (such as *appa*, *caki*, *FN*, *hyeng*, etc.) were excluded from the standard speech models in the follow-up article (see *ibid.*).

Conclusions: Linguistic Politeness as Normative Culture

In conclusion, I wish to suggest the cultural significance and the effects of standardized or popularized discourses of *ene yeycel*. Both the SD project and the how-to industry represent the cultural process of constructing language and social conventions. The "normative" culture of *ene yeycel* can be empowered and widely circulated, gaining wider social practice. Among others, there are two elements in these cultural activities which play a significant role in constructing "normative" culture: the institutional participation and the utility of a text. These two constituents of norms of *ene yeycel* are worthy of examination in that: a) the pragmatics are evaluated by authority (or those who have authority); and b) texts are the effective medium to justify their evaluations and make them accessible to actual language users.

First, who are the participants in the process? I want to point out the institutional mediation in constructing social meanings of language practice. Both the SD project and the how-to literature are institutionalized forms of metalinguistic or metapragmatic discursive social activities. Although *ene yeycel* has been considered the linguistic-cultural norm in Korean society, governmental agencies and professional expertise can have influential "voices" in defining and redefining the conventional features of *ene yeycel* as/when cobbled together for application in modern society. In this sense, the "voiced" social actors take part in the cultural process of "normative" culture as interpreters or formulators.

Of course, speakers in a linguistic community have certain regimented frameworks for understanding the pragmatic functions of honorifics (i.e., the sign-context relationships in pragmatics), which we might call linguistic norms. Using a

91

certain linguistic form is susceptible to certain types of interpretations of the indexical effects; for example, such-and-such honorifics in a certain context can be "deferential," "authoritative," "formal," and so forth. Based on such background knowledge of the principles of the pragmatic functions of honorifics, speakers try to characterize what is "proper" or "polite" honorification in everyday discourse. In this regard, institutionalists' participation in making texts can be regarded simply as formal activities for contextualizing linguistic forms with the proper or effective context-of-use.

Nevertheless, not all speakers are able to produce formal text publications, even though they can articulate their metalinguistic/pragmatic discourses in day-to-day language-use. Those involved in standardizing or popularizing specific modes of honorification are considered to be more influential (experienced, intelligent, or authoritative). As we often see in the prefaces in language how-to publications, they humbly or even openly wish to provide "guidance" for lay speakers. Because there is a suppositional authority granted to those social actors, institutional participation in making text can predominate over individual activities.

Secondly, the act of giving voice is transformed through textual interactions. This process can take place in a wide range for social practices. A text is an influential medium of framing and regimenting the socio-pragmatic functions of speech-in-contexts. At the heart of en- and contextualization, "normative" discourse is being rationalized, circulated, and reanimated as sociolinguistic norms of interactional practice.

Popular literature on honorification and its pragmatic meanings as *ene yeycel* is the site of, as well as the powerful medium for, such reflexive activities where linguistic

norms are formulated, justified, and circulated in society. Moreover, the "inscriptional"

process of textuality is a critical component of the "normative" culture of *ene yeycel* as

the key mediating instrumentality. As Silverstein and Urban (1996:3) note, text is a

metadiscursive structure which participants in a culture utilize as a way of creating a

shareable, transmittable culture[92].

Once the event-frameworks are entextualized by "voiced" social actors (e.g.,

standard speech models), the "normative" models can be widely replicated, separated

from the actual speech-in-context (Urban 1996). Regardless how individuals' ideas may

vary, there is a remarkable level of consistency and agreement concerning what is

illustrated as "acceptable" or "proper" use of honorification in the how-to books. Tracing

stylistic norms, Cameron (1995:54) describes the process of constructing "common

usage" as "the feedback loop" or "endless circle," whereby decisions made by a small

number of people are found in yet other texts as authoritative or acceptable usage. Such

agreed-upon decisions are circulated among the general public and are likely to gain

credibility as the "facts of usage."

This revolving process of entextualization and contextualization can help us to

construe how the alleged "normative" models of honorification achieve the status of

social conventions or norms in society[93]. The institutionalization of metalinguistic or

metapragmatic activities precipitates "normative" models of *ene yeycel* into the actual

---

[92] Silverstein and Urban (1996) have proposed two simultaneously ongoing phases of text: entextualization and contextualization. The former process involves the de-centering of a framework of social-interaction detachable from its local context, as well as the re-centering and re-embedding of such a text in another discursive context (15). Entextualization serves to create the regular models of social-interactions. Simultaneously, "contextualization" enables the entextualized ensemble of shared symbols and meanings to be effective in the actual speech-context and applicable in other (con)text.

[93] Silverstein and Urban (1993:13) point out the complementary work of these two processes of achieving a cultural status: "the entextualized discourse can maintain its status as emblematic culture only if there are periodic reperformances or re-embeddings in actual discourse context that count as projectively 'the same' or the creation of new and distinctive texts on each successive occasion, obviating the need for a 'canon'."

speech-contexts of individual speakers. In order to appeal to lay speakers (and in order to sell as many books as possible), the standardized or popularized norms of *ene yeycel* are not limited to language in the professional linguistic sense. From a functional point of view, the whole point of metapragmatic discourses is to "assist" speakers with their linguistic skills or at least raise metapragmatic awareness of language-use in the pragmatic dimension.

Thirdly, the "normative" culture of *ene yeycel* is integrated into social actions prevalent in both public and private domains. The institutionalized forms of metalinguistic or metapragmatic discourse do not unilaterally bring forth "normative" linguistic culture. Even though the "voicing" has authority and decides the entextualized contents, the feedback (e.g., comments and questions) from actual language-users is the other significant side of constructing shared linguistic symbols and meanings. Here, the institutionalists and the lay speakers have common interests and beliefs in "proper" use of language between readers and authors.

Confronting alleged linguistic confusion, some want to share their knowledge with the public while others are eager to learn from them. Both sides expect that normative honorification might resolve interpersonal problems in dealing with linguistic forms and rectify the "confused" linguistic order. This interrelationship is the interface between the "voiced" social actors' meta-pragmatic/linguistic discourse and individual speakers' voluntary compliance with the views projected independently by the actual experiences of individual speakers.

Taylor (1990) reminds us of the two participants in the normative culture of *ene*

yeycel and their roles in it[94]. As Taylor (1990:10) clearly states, metalinguistic activities can take effect only if individual agents are willing to submit their linguistic freedom to the constraints of norms. In that case, what makes such voluntary conformity to institutionalized forms of metalinguistic discourse possible? From individual speakers' perspectives, they rely on the experts' opinions and suggestions as a means of improving their communication skills in practice. Or at least, entextualized metalinguistic discourses can serve to "develop" the meta-pragmatic/linguistic awareness of the actual language-users. By extension, the entextualized contents can appeal to readers who care about their images as polite and well-educated speakers.

In response to the demand for such references for communication, institutionalists' "voicing" in popular literature on language issues can thrive with the legitimate purposes of "assisting" or "guiding" lay speakers. Their statements do not sound outspokenly prescriptive or authoritative; but the covert message underlying their normative models of honorification compels voluntary conformity on the part of individual readers: "...You may use it any way you wish. Although not to use it according to this definition amounts to making a mistake" (Taylor 1990:25). "Normativity" in honorification may sound contradictory because this linguistic practice is influenced by contexts rather than grammaticality. However, it is precisely for this reason that the institutional initiatives in forging normative discourses of *ene yeycel* attain legitimacy:

---

[94] Taylor (1990) gives an account of two metalinguistic approaches to language in a historical context. According to Taylor (1990), voluntarists, who consider communication as an individual agents' action, turn to prescription as a rational guidance to mutual communication (9). By contrast, institutionalists turn to specialists' (descriptive) investigations of language, which Taylor characterizes as "citation of norms"—a statement normatively enforced by some group in some context (24). They (either openly or covertly) support the "normativity" of language in communicative interactions. One thing in common between voluntarists and institutionalists comes from the linguistic ideology of normativity (e.g., prescriptions or authoritative or influential statements projected by experts) in order to overcome frequent miscommunication of ideas (17).

the need for a sharable linguistic model to resolve the current linguistic disorder.

If a certain "normative" discourse of *ene yeycel* elicits voluntary conformity from individual speakers (i.e., from a general audience), will the "normative" culture promise or guarantee mutual communication in practice? The standardized norms of *ene yeycel* gave rise to the growth of the language how-to industry, but this transition also produces even more diverse interpretations. The same phenomenon applies to the actual context of language-in-use, raising another question: how do the metapragmatic functions interpreted by the "voiced" social actors influence individual speakers in the pragmatic dimension? It seems questionable whether a "normative" linguistic structure and its meaning can be transmitted intact to another (con)text and be absorbed just as it was projected.

Thus, lastly, the last point of this paper is to pose a question about the consequences for "normative" linguistic culture. In fact, constriction of the diverse pragmatics is an inevitable result of the "normative" culture of *ene yeycel*. The standardized and/or popularized models of honorification take control of the pragmatic dimension of honorification. The contextualized pragmatic forms with appropriate language-in-use can exert a regulating power over the framework of human experiences in communicative interactions because the actual language users turn to them as a linguistic resource. In other words, the regimented "normative" usages supply (or determine) characterizations of the indexical sign-function as the "proper" and "polite" norms of *ene yeycel*.

The following episode demonstrates how "normative" usages can compel a speaker to follow them:

One might observe in radio or TV programs that most hosts or guests say in unison '*chwukha tulipnita*' (congratulations; lit. I humbly give my congratulations) with utmost politeness. This is exactly what is wrong. The correct expression is '*chwukha hapnita*' (lit. I give my congratulations.) not the polite "*chwukha tulipnita*." [paragraph]...... [I] still find it difficult to say '*chwukha hapnita*' in the face of elders at their birthday parties or celebratory occasions. It is because I still feel like I'm speaking in half-talk somehow, and that the old person might consider me rude. Nevertheless, I bravely try to say '*chwukha hapnita*.' (Ceng Cayhwan 1999:32-3)

The author advocates using the standard linguistic form even though he has difficulty following it himself. As he probably knew, *chwukha hata* 'to congratulate' is the "right" standard usage according to the SD. However, his experience tells us speakers are easily tempted to use the "wrong" or non-standard usage (which sounds more polite) as they are conscious of the social norm of showing respect for elders. Ceng is afraid of being seen as a rude speaker. Even so, why does he still support using the plain form despite his concern about offending his superior?

What gives him the "courage" to use the standard form is his trust that this is the "normative" usage authorized by the SD. As Ceng Cayhwan (1999:33) notes, the standard linguistic norm is what speakers sometimes should "try to repeat and get used to." If the next SD project accepts this suggestion for revision, the approval from institutional authority will render the majority usage acceptable. On the flip side, the new linguistic norm may force speakers like Ceng Cayhwan to support the new standard and to use as he originally wanted. Language users have different norms which need to be negotiated in social interactions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agha, Asif, 1993. Grammatical and indexical convention in honorific discourse. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 3(2): 131-63.

Agha, Asif, 1994. Honorification. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23: 277-302.

Agha, Asif, 2003. The social life of cultural value. *Language and Communication* 23: 231-73.

Agha, Asif. 1998. Stereotypes and registers of honorific language. Language in Society 27: 151-93.

Aoyama, Shigeo, 1970. Gendai Chōsengo no keigo to keigo isiki [Awareness of honorification in modern Korean]. *Chōsen gakuho* 57: 13-34.

Bartsch, Renate, 1987. *Norms of language: theoretical and practical aspects* [Trans. of *Sprachnormen, Theorie und Praxis*]. London and New York: Longman.

Bolinger, Dwight, 1980. *Language – the loaded weapon: The use and abuse of language today*. London and New York: Longman.

Bourdieu, Pierre, 1986. The forms of capital. In: Richardson, J. G. (ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Greenwood Press, New York, pp.241-58.

Bourdieu, Pierre, 1991. *Language and symbolic power*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Brown, Lucien, 2008. "Normative" and "Strategic" Honorifics Use in Interactions Involving Speakers of Korean as a Second Language. *Archiv Orientalni* 76:269-97.

Brown, Penelope and Levinson, Stephen C., 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, Roger and Gilman, Albert, 2003/1960. The pronouns of power and solidarity. In: Paulston, C. B., and Tucker, G.R. (eds.), *Sociolinguistics: The Essential Readings*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bucholtz, Mary and Hall, Kira, 2005. Identity and interaction: a sociolinguistic approach. *Discourse Studies* 7 (4-5): 586-614.

Cameron, Deborah, 1990. Demythologizing sociolinguistics: why language does not reflect society. In: Joseph, J.E. and Taylor, T.J. (eds.), *Ideologies of Language*, London: Routledge, pp.79-93.

Cameron, Deborah, 1995. *Verbal Hygiene*. London and New York: Routledge.

Cang, Thaycin, 2000. Apconpep ey tayhan sahoy enehak-cek yenkwu [A sociolinguistic study of *Apconpep*]. *Tongpang hakci* 109: 85-125.

Cen, Yengwu, 2003. Phyocwun hwapep uy muncey wa kaysen panghyang [Problems of Standard Diction and its improvement]. *Kwuke saynghwal* 13 (1). Retrieved from http://www.korean.go.kr/nkview/nklife/2003_1/13_3.html

Ceng ( ), 1991 (February 04). Enesaynghwal uymun sayngkimyen 'Kwukwu yengkwu' lul toliseyyo Kwukeyenkwuwen ey 'Kanata Cenhwa' [Press '9909' when you have questions about linguistic life; 'Kanata Phone Service' by Kwukeyenkwuwen], *Mayil Kyengcey*, p.10.

Ceng Kilnam, 2003. *Kwuke olyu pwunsek* [Error analysis in Korean]. Sewul: Hankwuk munhwasa.

Ceng, Cayhwan, 1999. *Cacangmyen i maca yo, campong un?* [Is "*cacangmyen*" correct? How about "*camppong*"?]. Sewul: Sen.

Ceng, Cayto, 2004. *Wuli malkul uy kal kil* [The way forward for Korean speech and writing]. Sewul: Cisiksanepsa.

Ceng, Chelswu, 1990 (April 11). "Munhwa uy silmul" iltan poyecwun seym. *Kyenghyang Sinmun*, p.8.

Ceng, Chelswu, 1991 (January 12). Inthepyu Kwuklipkwukeyen chotaywencang An Pyenghuy kyoswu "nampwuk ene icilhwa kukpok tung nolyek" [Interview with the first Director of Kwuklipkwukeyen, professor An Pyenghuy]. *Kyenghyang Sinmun*, p.8.

Chen, Soyeng, 1994. *Pwukkulewun alilang* [Shameful Alilang]. Sewul: Hyenamsa.

Chen, Soyeng, 2005. *Hankwuke wa hankwukmwunhwa* [The Korean language and Korean culture]. Sewul: Wulichayk.

Chen, Soyeng, 2007. *Wulimal uy munhwa chacki* [Searching for the culture of the Korean language]. Sewul: hankwuk munhwasa.

Choo, Miho, 2006. The structure and use of Korean honorifics. In: (ed.) Sohn, Ho-min, *Korean Language in Culture and Society*. Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i Press, pp. 132-145.

Choy, Kwusik, 1991 (January 22). Kwuklipkwukeyenkwuwen (NIKL) (ed.), 1991 (January 05). Wulimal ul paluko alumtapkey: Ponsa-Kwukeyenkwuso kongtong khaympeyin <13> [For correct and refined Korean: The joint campaign of Cosun Ilbo and Kwukeyenkwuwen <13>]. *Cosen Ilpo*, p.10.

Choy, Pongyeng, 2005. *Hankwuk sahoy uy chapyel kwa ekap: conpie cheykyey wa hyengsik–cek kwenwicwuuy* [Discrimination and oppression in Korean society: the honorific system and the formal authoritarianism]. Sewul: Cisiksanepsa.

Choy, Yongki, 2003. *Kwuke swunhwa calyocip* [Annual report on Korean language purification]. Sewul: Kwuklipkwuke Yenkwuwen. Retrieved from http://www.korean.go.kr

Co, Hangpem, 2003. Onul-nal uy ene hyensil kwa phyocwun hwapep uy cwungyoseng [Current language practice and the significance of Standard Diction]. *Kwuk.e saynghwal* 13(1). Retrieved from http://www.korean.go.kr/nkview/nklife/2003_1/13_1.html

Co, Tongo, 2003. *Mal un muneciko, palum un mungkayciko* [Collapsing speech, crushed pronunciation]. Sewul: Tio.

Co, Yenghuy, 1998. *Wulimal ul palo alko palo ssuca* [Knowing and using Korean correctly]. Cencwu: Sina chwulphansa.

Cosenilposa and Kwuklipkwukewen (CI & NIKL) (eds.), 1991 [1993]. *Wulimal uy yeycel: Hwapep uy silcey wa phyocwun* [Korean language courtesy: reality and standard of speech]. Sewul: Cosenilposa.

Cosenilposa and Kwuklipkwukewen (CI & NIKL) (eds.), 1993a. *Manhwa lo ikhinun wuli mal uy yeycel* [Korean language etiquette through cartoons]. Sewul: Cosenilposa.

Cosenilposa and Kwuklipkwukewen (CI & NIKL) (eds.), 1993b. *Manhwa lo ikhinun wuli mal uy yeycel* [Korean language etiquette through cartoons]. Sewul: Cosenilposa.

Cosenilposa and Kwuklipkwukewen (CI & NIKL) (eds.), 1996. *Wulimal uy yeycel sang* [Korean language etiquette I]. Sewul: Cosenilposa.

Cosenilposa and Kwuklipkwukewen (CI & NIKL) (eds.), 1996. *Wulimal uy yeycel ha* [Korean language etiquette II]. Sewul: Cosenilposa.

Cwungang Ilpo. Wulimal Palwuki [Rectifying Korean]. Retrieved from http://bbs.joins.com/list.asp?bysort=time&page=5&tb_name=korean

Errington, J. Joseph, 1984. *Language and social change in Java*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Center for International Studies.

Gal, Susan, 1998. Multiplicity and contention among language ideologies. In: Schieffelin, B., Woolard, K., and Kroskrity, P. (eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Gidden, Anthony, 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Goffman, Erving, 1956. The nature of deference and demeanor. American Anthropologist 58(3): 475-99.

Han, Kil, 2002. *Hyentay wulimal uy nophim-pep yenkwu* [A study on modern Korean honorifics]. Sewul: Yeklak.

Hanks, William. 2001. Indexicality. In: Duranti, A. (ed.), *Key Terms in Language and Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp.102-5.

Hankwuk kyengcey. Totpoki colpoki [glasses for short-sighted and far-sighted]. Retrieved from http://www.korean.go.kr

Hankyeley, Ene yeycel [language etiquette]. Retrieved from http://www.hani.co.kr/arti/opinion/column/319014.html

Hankyeley. Wulimal kul palossuki [correct use of spoken and written Korean]. Retrieved from http://hangul.hani.co.kr/

Harris, Roy, 1980. *The Language Makers*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Haviland, J.B., 1979. How to talk to your brother-in-law in Guugu Yimidhirr. In: Shopen, T. (eds.), *Languages and Their Speakers*, Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Publishers, pp.160-239.

He, Cwunhuy, Co, Cwunhyeng, and Pak, Sengswun, 2003. *Chotung haksayng i kkok alaya hal mal, kul calhakey hanun kwuke iyaki* [Stories about Korean for primary schoolers who want to improve their Korean speech and writing]. Sewul: Cohunpes.

Kwukeyenkwuwen, 1990. Thukcip: penyek [Special issue: translation]. *Kwuke saynghwal* 21 (Summer), Sewul: Kwukeyenkwuwen.

Hideki, Noma, 1996. Hyentay hankwuke uy taywu-pep cheykyey [Speech Levels in Contemporary Korean]. *Oykwuke loseuy hankwuke kyoyuk* 21: 15-54.

Hijirida, K., Sohn, H., 1986. Cross-Cultural Patterns of Honorifics and Sociolinguistic Sensitivity to Honorific Variables: Evidence from English, Japanese, and Korean. *Papers in Linguistics*: 365-401.

Hill, JH., Hill, K., 1978. Honorific Usage in Modern Nahuatl: The Expression of Social Distance and Respect in the Nahuatl of Socil Distance and Respct in the Nahuatl of the Malinche Volcano Area. *Language* 54 (1): 123-55.

Hong, Chansik, 1990 (August 19). Hankwuk-in cintan <28> Yeycel ul an cikhinta [Dignosis Korean people <28> etiquette is ignored]. *Tonga Ilpo*, p.5.

Hong, Jin-ok, 2006. The functional notion of Korean honorific usages reflecting Confucian ideologies. *Modern English Education* 7 (1): 73-100.

Hwang, Juck-Ryoon, 1975. Role of Sociolinguistics in Foreign Language Education with Reference to Korean and English Terms of Address and Levels of Deference, Ph. D. Dissertation, Univ. of Texas at Austin.

Hwang, Juck-Ryoon, 1982. Deference versus politeness in Korean speech. In: Harald Haarmann and Hwang Juck-Ryoon (eds.). *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. New York: Mouton De Gruyter.

Ide, Sachiko, 1986. Universals of linguistic politeness: Quantitative evidence from Japanese and American English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 10: 347-71.

Ide, Sachiko, 2005. How and why honorifics can signify dignity and elegance: The indexicality and reflexivity of linguistic rituals. In: Lakoff, R.T. and Ide S. (eds.), *Broadening the horizon of linguistic politeness*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Im, Hongpin, 1990a, "Taywu-pep" [honorification/ politeness] In: *Kwuke yenkwu eti kkaci wassna* [How far has Korean linguistics come?]. Sewul: Tonga Chwulphansa.

Im, Hongpin, 1990b. Ehwi-cek taywu wa taywu-pep cheykyey uy muncey [Lexical honorification and problems of the Korean honorific system]. *Kwukehak nonmun-cip—Kang Sinhang kyoswu hoykap kinyem* [Korean linguistics articles—in commemoration of Prof. Kang Sin-hang's 60th birthday]. Sewul: Thayhaksa, pp.705-41.

iMBC. Wulimal Natuli [Korean language excursion]. Retrieved from http://www.imbc.com/broad/tv/culture/hangul/board/index.html

Irvine, Judith T. and Gal, Susan, 2000. Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In: Paul V. Kroskrity (eds.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press, pp. 35-84.

Irvine, Judith T., 1998/1992. Ideologies of Honorific Language. *Pragmatics* 2(3): 251-262; Reprinted in: Schieffelin, B., Woolard, K., and Kroskrity, Paul (eds.), *Language ideologies: practice and theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 51-67.

Irvine, Judith T., 2001. "Style" as distinctiveness: The culture and ideology of linguistic differentiation. In: Eckert, Penelope & Rickford, John R. (eds.), *Style and sociolinguistic variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.21-43.

Kasper, Gabriele, 1990. Linguistic politeness: Current research issues. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 193-218.

KBS (Korean Broadcasting Station). Hankwuke Sangtamso [Counseling centre for Korean language]. Retrieved from http://korean.kbs.co.kr/board.php?act=BrdList&mcd=108410029001

KBS (Korean Broadcasting Station). Wulimal Kyelwuki [Korean Competition]. Retrieved from http://www.kbs.co.kr/1tv/sisa/woorimal/

Kim, Caymin, 1998. Kyengepep sayong uy seytay-kan chai ey kwanhan sahoy enehak-cek yenkwu [A sociolinguistic comparative study of Korean honorifics]. *Enehak* 6 (2): 337-57.

Kim, Cengho, 2004. Kwuke nophim-pep ey tayhan cheykyey-cek in sahoyenehak-cek cepkun [A sociolinguistic approach to Korean honorification]. *Kyeley emunhak* 33: 31-52.

Kim, Cengho, 2005. 1920 nyen-tay chengca nophim-pep uy sahoy enehak-cek yenkwu [A sociolinguistic study of addressee honorification in the 1920s]. *Wulimalkul* 34: 69-98.

Kim, Hankwen, 1995. *Sengkonghanun cikcangin uy 53 kaci yeycel* [53 types of etiquette for the successful business man]. Sewul: Cosenilposa.

Kim, Huycin, 2003. Phyocwun Hwapep uy yoken kwa pokup pangan [Requisites for Standard Diction and its Popularization]. *Kwuke saynghwal* 13 (1). Retrieved from http://www.korean.go.kr/nkview/nklife/2003_1/13_4.html

Kim, Hyeyswuk, 1991. *Hyentay Kwuke uy sahoy enehak-cek yenkwu* [A sociolinguistic review of modern Korean honorification]. Sewul: Tayhaksa.

Kim, Hyeyswuk, 1995. Hyentay Kwuke saynghwal ey nathanan nophnaci malssi senthayk uy pyenhwa yangsang: 'apcon-pep'ul cwungsim ulo [Linguistic changes on modern Korean honorification: focusing on *apcon-pep*]. *Sahoy enehak* 3 (1): 17-34.

Kim, Hyeyswuk, 2000. *Hyentay kwuke uy sahoycek mosup kwa ssuim* [Social aspects and uses of the Korean language]. Sewul: Welin.

Kim, Kyengwen and Kim, Chelho, 2008. *Kwukesillyek i pap mekye cwunta-nathmalphyen 1* [Your Korean capability feeds you 1: vocabulary]. Sewul: Yuthopia.

Kim, Kyeykon, 1994. *Wuli mal, kul un wuli el ul tamnun kulusini* [The Korean language is a vessel for the Korean spirit]. Sewul: Emunkak.

Kim, Sektuk, 1977. Te nacchwum-pep kwa te nophim-pep (Eng. title: A Study on Korean Honorifics). *Ene wa Enehak* 5: 41-57.

Kim, Sektuk, 1983. *Wulimal yenkwusa*. Sewul: Cenumsa.

Kim, Seyceng, et al., 2004. *Mal i olla ya nala ka olunta* [The nation rises when the language rises]. Sewul: Hankyeley sinmunsa.

Kim, Seycwung, 2003. Hyenhayng phyocwun hwapep uy mipicem [Deficiencies in current Phyocwun Hwapep]. *Kwuke saynghwal* 13 (1). Retrieved from http://www.korean.go.kr/nkview/nklife/2003_1/13_2.html

Kim, Sikwang, 1996. *Hankwuk insa yeycel* [Korean greeting courtesy]. Tayku: Cwungmun.

Kim, Sulong, 1999. *Ku kel mal ilako hani* [Do you think that makes sense?]. Sewul: Talunwuli.

Kim, Tekkyeng, 1998. *Cikcangin uy yeycel* [Etiquette for the businessman]. Sewul: Hyengsel chwulpansa.

Kim, Thayik, 1990 (October 31). Wulimal ul paluko alumtapkey: Ponsa-Kwukeyenkwuso kongtong khaympeyin <1> [For correct and refined Korean: The joint campaign of Cosun Ilbo and Kwukeyenkwuwen <1>]. *Cosen Ilpo*, p.10.

Kim, Thayik, 1991 (January 10). Wulimal ul paluko alumtapkey: Ponsa-Kwukeyenkwuso kongtong khaympeyin <11> [For correct and refined Korean: The joint campaign of Cosun Ilbo and Kwukeyenkwuwen <11>]. *Cosen Ilpo*, p.10.

Kim, Thayik, Pak, Thayhyen, 1990 (October 24). Ponsa-Kwukeyenkwuso kongtong kihoyk Hwapep Phyocwunhwa Saep: olpalun eneyeycel [The joint project of Cosun Ilbo and Kwukeyenkwuwen, speech standardization: desirable linguistic politeness]. *Cosen Ilpo*, p.10.

Kim, Thayyep. 2007. *Hankwuke taywu-pep* [Korean Honorific System], Sewul: Yeklak.

Kim, Tongen, 1987. Phyencip hwuki [epilogue]. *Kwuke saynghwal* 10 (Autumn): 144.

Kim, Tongso, 1999. *Kim Tongso uy ssamppakhan wulimal iyaki* [Kim Tongso's outspoken tales about the Korean language]. Taykwu: Cenglimsa.

Kim, Wuyeng, 2002. *Wulimal sanchayk* [A walk in the Korean language]. Sewul: Chenwu.

King, Ross, 2006. Korean kinship terminology. In: Sohn, Ho-min (ed.), *Korean Language in Culture and Society*. Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i Press, pp. 101-117.

Ko, Misek, 1991 (September 19). Kwukeyenkwuwen wunyeng 'Kanata' cenhwa 'palun wulimal' ikkunta ['Kanata' phone service by Kwukeyenkwuwen leads the 'correct Korean']. *Tonga Ilpo*, p.13.

Ko, Songmu, 1989. Thukcip: hankul [Special issue: Korean Alpabet]. *Kwuke saynghwal* 18 (Autumn). Sewul: Kwukeyenkwuso.

Ko, Yengkun, 1974. Hyentay kwuke uy cwonpi-pep ey tayhan yenkwu [On speech style in modern Korean], *Ehak yenkwu* 10 (2): 66-91.

Ko, Yengkun, 1996. *Wuli ene mwunhwa uy ppwuli lul chaca* [Searching for the roots of Korean language culture]. Sewul: Hansinmunhwasa.

Koyama, Wataru, 1997. Desemanticizing pragmatics, Journal of Pragmatics 28: 1-28.

Koyama, Wataru, 2000. Dishonorable Honorifics. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 33 (2): 45-57.

Koyama, Wataru, 2004a. Honorifics in Critical-historic pragmatics: the linguistic ideologies of modernity, the national standard, and modern Japanese honorifics. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36 (11): 2023-54.

Koyama, Wataru, 2004b. The linguistic ideologies of modern Japanese honorifics and the historic reality of modernity. *Language & Communication* 24: 413-35.

Kwen, Hyekcong, 1990 (November 28). Wulimal ul paluko alumtapkey: Ponsa-Kwukeyenkwuso kongtong khaympeyin <5> [For correct and refined Korean: The joint campaign of Cosun Ilbo and Kwukeyenkwuwen <5>]. *Cosen Ilpo*, p.10.

Kwen, Hyekcong, 1991 (February 05). Wulimal ul paluko alumtapkey: Ponsa-Kwukeyenkwuso kongtong khaympeyin <15> [For correct and refined Korean: The joint campaign of Cosun Ilbo and Kwukeyenkwuwen <15>]. *Cosen Ilpo*, p.10.

Kwen, Owun, 2002. *Almanhan salamtul i calmos ssuko issnun wulimal 1234kaci* [1234 types of Korean that knowledgeable people misuse]. Sewul: Munhakswuchep.

Kwukeyenkwuso (KY) (ed.), 1985. Kwukeyenkwuso sellip kyengwi [The process of the establishment of KY]. *Kwuke saynghwal* (Changkanho, October): 93-101.

Kwukeyenkwuso (KY) (ed.), 1985. Kwukeyenkwuso saep pemwi wa 84 nyento saep kyeyhoyk [The scope of KY's projects and the plan in 1984]. *Kwuke saynghwal Changkanho* (October): 105-6.

Kwukeyenkwuso (KY) (ed.), 1985. Kakkwuk uy cakwuke yenkwu kikwan [Research centres for national languages in countries]. *Kwuke saynghwal* (changkanho, October): 105-6.

Kwukeyenkwuso (KY) (ed.), 1987. Cwatam: yeycelpalun ene saynghwal [Discussion: polite linguistic life]. *Kwuke saynghwal* 10 (Autum): 9-26.

Kwukeyenkwuso (KY) (ed.), 1988. Thukcip: kwuke swunhwa [Special issue: language purification]. *Kwuke saynghwal* 14 (Spring), Sewul: Kwukeyenkwuso.

Kwukeyenkwuso (KY) (ed.), 1989. Thukcip: Hoching-e [Special issue: terms of address]. *Kwuke saynghwal* 19 (Winter), Sewul: Kwukeyenkwuso.

Kwukeyenkwuso (KY) (ed.), 1990 (December 08). Wulimal ul paluko alumtapkey: Ponsa-Kwukeyenkwuso kongtong khaympeyin <6> [For correct and refined Korean: The joint campaign of Cosun Ilbo and Kwukeyenkwuwen <6>]. *Cosen Ilpo*, p.10.

Kwukeyenkwuso (KY) (ed.), 1990 (December 22). Wulimal ul paluko alumtapkey: Ponsa-Kwukeyenkwuso kongtong khaympeyin <8> [For correct and refined Korean: The joint campaign of Cosun Ilbo and Kwukeyenkwuwen <8>]. *Cosen Ilpo*, p.10.

Kwukeyenkwuso (KY) (ed.), 1990 (November 10). Wulimal ul paluko alumtapkey: Ponsa-Kwukeyenkwuso kongtong khaympeyin <2> [For correct and refined Korean: The joint campaign of Cosun Ilbo and Kwukeyenkwuwen <2>]. *Cosen Ilpo*, p.10.

Kwukeyenkwuso (KY) (ed.), 1990 (November 24). Wulimal ul paluko alumtapkey: Ponsa-Kwukeyenkwuso kongtong khaympeyin <4> [For correct and refined Korean: The joint campaign of Cosun Ilbo and Kwukeyenkwuwen <4>]. *Cosen Ilpo*, p.10.

Kwukeyenkwuso (KY) (ed.), 1990. Thukcip: emun cengchayk [Special issue: language policy]. *Kwuke saynghwal* 20 (Spring), Sewul: Kwukeyenkwuso.

Kwuklipkwuke Yenkwuwen (NIKL) (ed.), 1992a. *Kanata sangtam cenhwa calyocip* [Annual report of Kanata phone service]. Retrieved from http://www.korean.go.kr

Kwuklipkwuke Yenkwuwen (NIKL) (ed.), 1992b. *Phyocwun hwapep haysel* [Standard Diction Manual]. Retrieved from http://www.korean.go.kr

Kwuklipkwuke Yenkwuwen (NIKL) (ed.), 1995. *Kanata sangtam cenhwa calyocip* [Annual report of Kanata phone service]. Retrieved from http://www.korean.go.kr

Kwuklipkwuke Yenkwuwen (NIKL) (ed.), 1996a. *Kanata sangtam cenhwa calyocip* [Annual report of Kanata phone service]. Retrieved from http://www.korean.go.kr

Kwuklipkwuke Yenkwuwen (NIKL) (ed.), 1996b. *Palun mal kowun mal* [Correct and refined speech]. Retrieved from http://www.korean.go.kr

Kwuklipkwuke Yenkwuwen (NIKL) (ed.), 1997. *Kanata sangtam cenhwa calyocip* [Annual report of Kanata phone service]. Retrieved from http://www.korean.go.kr

Kwuklipkwuke Yenkwuwen (NIKL) (ed.), 1999. *Kwuklip kwukewen ey mule pwass.eyo* [Questions to NIKL]. Retrieved from http://www.korean.go.kr

Kwuklipkwuke Yenkwuwen (NIKL) (ed.), 2000~2003. *Emun kyupem cwunswu silthay cosa* [Annual report on the observance of normative use]. Retrieved from http://www.korean.go.kr

Kwuklipkwuke Yenkwuwen (NIKL) (ed.), 2001a. *Kwuke yenkwuwen ey mulepoasseyo: ilpan-yong* [Questions to NIKL: for general speakers]. Retrieved from http://www.korean.go.kr

Kwuklipkwuke Yenkwuwen (NIKL) (ed.), 2001b. *Kwuke yenkwuwen ey mulepoasseyo: chotung-yong* [Questions to NIKL: elementary school]. Retrieved from http://www.korean.go.kr

Kwuklipkwuke Yenkwuwen (NIKL) (ed.), 2003. *Kwuke swunhwa silchen pangan malyen ul wihan hakswul tayhoy* [Proceedings of the conference for practical plans for the language purification of Korean]. Retrieved from http://www.korean.go.kr

Kwuklipkwukeyenkwuwen (NIKL) (ed.), 1991 (February 02). Wulimal ul paluko alumtapkey: Ponsa-Kwukeyenkwuso kongtong khaympeyin <14> [For correct and refined Korean: The joint campaign of Cosun Ilbo and Kwukeyenkwuwen <14>]. *Cosen Ilpo*, p.10.

Kwuklipkwukeyenkwuwen (NIKL) (ed.), 1991 (February 17). Wulimal ul paluko alumtapkey: Ponsa-Kwukeyenkwuso kongtong khaympeyin <16> [For correct and refined Korean: The joint campaign of Cosun Ilbo and Kwukeyenkwuwen <16>]. *Cosen Ilpo*, p.10.

Kwuklipkwukeyenkwuwen (NIKL) (ed.), 1991 (January 05). Wulimal ul paluko alumtapkey: Ponsa-Kwukeyenkwuso kongtong khaympeyin <10> [For correct and refined Korean: The joint campaign of Cosun Ilbo and Kwukeyenkwuwen <10>]. *Cosen Ilpo*, p.10.

Kwuklipkwukeyenkwuwen (NIKL) (ed.), 1991 (January 20). Wulimal ul paluko alumtapkey: Ponsa-Kwukeyenkwuso kongtong khaympeyin <12> [For correct and refined Korean: The joint campaign of Cosun Ilbo and Kwukeyenkwuwen <12>]. *Cosen Ilpo*, p.10.

Kwuklipkwukeyenkwuwen (NIKL) (ed.), 1991. Kwuklipkwukeyenkwuwen sosik: 5. 'Kanata Cenhwa' wunyong saep uy hyenhwang [Kwuklipkwukeyenkwuwen News: 5. Survey on 'Kanata Phone Service']. *SayKwuke saynghwal* 1 (2): 178-9.

Kwuklipkwukeyenkwuwen (NIKL) (ed.), 1991. Kwuklipkwukeyenkwuwen sosik: Hwapep Phyocwunhwa Saep. *SayKwuke saynghwal* 1 (2): 155-68.

Kwuklipkwukeyenkwuwen (NIKL) (ed.), 1991. Thukcip: Kwuke uy kyenge-pep [Special issue: Korean honorifics], *SayKwuke saynghwal* 1 (3). Sewul: Kwukeyenkwuso.

Kwuklipkwukeyenkwuwen (NIKL) (ed.), 1998. *Wulimal palo alki* [Knowing our language correctly]. Sewul: Munhwa kwankwangpu.

Kwuklipkwukeyenkwuwen (NIKL) (ed.), 2000. *Kwuklipkwukeyenkwuwen 10nyensa* [Ten-year history of Kwuklipkwukeyenkwuwen], Sewul: Kwuklipkwukeyenkwuwen.

Lakoff, Robin T. and Ide, Sachiko (eds.), 2005. *Broadening the Horizon of Linguistic Politeness*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing.

Lee, Iksep and Ramsey, Robert, 2000. *The Korean Language*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Lee, Maengseng, 1973. "Variations in Speech Levels and Interpersonal Social Relationships in Korean." In: *Hansan Yi Cong-swu paksa songswu kinyem nonchong* [Commemorating the Sixtieth Birthday of Dr. Yi, Cong-swu]. Sewul: Samhwa Chwulphansa.

Lee, Uyto, 1997. *Mal ul calhako kul ul cal ssulyemyen kkok alaya hal kes tul* [Things to know to become a better speaker and writer of Korean]. Sewul: Sekphil,

Li, Uyto, 1993. *Wuli malkul uy hyensil kwa isang* [The reality and ideal of the Korean language]. Sewul: Emunkak.

Li, Uyto, 1997. *Mal ul calhako kul ul cal ssulyemyen kkok alaya hal kes tul* ["Must Knows" for speaking and writing Korean better]. Sewul: Sekphil.

Lukoff, Fred, 1978. Ceremonial and expressive uses of the styles of address of Korean. In: Chin-W. Kim (ed.), *Papers in Korean Lingusitics*, Columbia: Hornbeam, pp. 269-96.

Luna Phakhu, 2008 (Decermber 8). Retrieved from http://lunapark.co.kr/zb41pl7/bbs/zboard.php?id=diary01&write_no=867&abs_date=200811&write_date=20081108

Lye, Cungtong, 1999. *Hyoto ene* [Filial language]. Sewul: Munumsa.

Lyu, Caypong, 1997. *Hoching kwa ciching yeycel* [Courtesy in terms of address and reference]. Sewul: Yeyyeng khemyunikeyisyen.

Lyu, Kwanswu, 2004. Pikyo munhwa kwancem eyes pon hanmi uy ene mwunhwa wa kongson phyohyen ey tayhan thamsayk [A comparative review on language culture and politeness expressions in Korean and American society]. *Piphyeng Munhak* 18: 117-40.

Martin, Samuel E., 1992. *A reference Grammar of Korean*. Singapore: Turtle Publishing.

Militheli kwunsa muki khaphey. Retrieved from http://cafe.naver.com/nuke928.cafe?iframe_url=/ArticleRead.nhn%3Farticleid=196863

Milroy, James and Milroy, Lesley. 1999/1985. *Authority in Language: Investigating Language Prescription and Standardization*. New York: Routledge.

Min, Hyensik, 1984. Kayhwa-ki kwuke uy kyenge-pep yenkwu [Study on the Korean honorifics during the Englightenment Period]. *Kwanak emwun yenkwu* 9: 124-49.

Minkan Cwuto ene swunhwa wuntong [Private-led language purification movement], 1990 (February 07), *Tonga Ilbo*, p.8.

Munkyopu [Ministry of Education], 1972. *Saynghwal yeycel* [Manners for life], Sewul: Kolye Secek cwusik hoysa.

Nam, Kisim and Kim, Haswu, 1995. *Tangsin un wuli mal ul saylopko palukey ssuko isssupnikka?* [Do you use Korean language in a correct, fresh way?]. Sewul: Saymthesa.

Nam, Kisim, 1981. Kwuke contay-pep uy kinung [The function of the Korean honrific system]. *Inmun Kwahak* 45: 1-17.

Nam, Yengsin, 1998. *Kwuke chennyen uy silphay wa sengkong* [One thousand years of failures and successes of Korean]. Sewul: Hanmatang.

Nam, Yengsin, 2005. *4 cwukan uy kwuke yehayng* [A 4-week journey through Korean]. Sewul: Sengantang

NIKL, 1990. Onlain Kanata. Retrieved from http://www.korean.go.kr

O, Tonghwan, 2002. *Wulimal cwukiki wulimal salliki* [Killing and Reviving the Korean language]. Sewul: Seysi.

O, Tonghwan, 2003. *O Tonghwan uy wulimal sayngkak* [O Tonghwan's thoughts on Korean]. Sewul: Seysi.

Ochs, Elinor, 1990. Indexicality and socialization. In: Stigler, J.W., Schwerder, R.A. and Herdt, G., (eds.), *Cultural psychology: Essays on comparative human development*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.287-308.

Okamoto, Shigeko. 1998. The Use and Non-Use of Honorifics in Sales Talk in Kyoto and Osaka: Are They Rude or Friendly? *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 7: 141-57. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Pak Yengswun, 1976. Kuke kyenge-pep uy sahoy enehak-cek yenku [A sociolinguistic review on Korean honorification]. *Kuke Kukmwunhak* 72, 73: 47-65.

Pak, Hayhyen, 1990 (December 25). Wulimal ul paluko alumtapkey: Ponsa-Kwukeyenkwuso kongtong khaympeyin <9> [For correct and refined Korean: The joint campaign of Cosun Ilbo and Kwukeyenkwuwen <9>]. *Cosen Ilpo*, p.10.

Pak, Hayhyen, 1990 (December 25). Wulimal ul paluko alumtapkey: Ponsa-Kwukeyenkwuso kongtong khaympeyin <17> [For correct and refined Korean: The joint campaign of Cosun Ilbo and Kwukeyenkwuwen <17>]. *Cosen Ilpo*, p.10.

Pak, Hayyen, 1990 (November 14). Wulimal ul paluko alumtapkey: Ponsa-Kwukeyenkwuso kongtong khaympeyin <3> [For correct and refined Korean: The joint campaign of Cosun Ilbo and Kwukeyenkwuwen <3>]. *Cosen Ilpo*, p.10.

Pak, Kapswu, 1984. *Wulimal uy oyong kwa swunhwa* [Errors in and purification of the Korean language]. Sewul: Hankwuk pangsongsaeptan.

Pak, Kapswu, 2001. *Alumtawun wulimal kakkwuki* [Cultivating beautiful Korean]. Sewul: Cipmuntang.

Pak, Kumca, Cang, Sowen, and Sin, Ciyeng, 2003. *Ene yeycel* [Language courtesy]. Sewul: Hankwuk pangsongthongsin tayhakkyo chwulpanpu.

Pak, Noca, 2001 (April 3). Hoching-pep mincwu-cek kayhyek nasel ttay' [Democratic reform needed on forms of address], Internet Hankyeley, Retrieved from http://www.hani.co.kr/section-001030000/2001/00103000020010403224041030.html

Pak, Sekcwun, 2002. Ye.kyek-e lul contayhanun kes chelem poinun '-*si*-' muncang uy thongsa kwuco [Syntactic structure of sentences with -*si*- which appears to associate with a dative noun]. *Paytalmal* 31: 59-77.

Pak, Seni, 1990 (December 11). Wulimal ul paluko alumtapkey: Ponsa-Kwukeyenkwuso kongtong khaympeyin <7> [For correct and refined Korean: The joint campaign of Cosun Ilbo and Kwukeyenkwuwen <7>]. *Cosen Ilpo*, p.10.

Pak, Yangkyu, 1975a. Conching chey.en uy thongsa-cek thukcing [Syntactic properties of honorific nouns]. *Cintan Hakpo* 40: 81-108.

Pak, Yangkyu, 1975b. Soyu wa socay [Possession and location]. *Kwukehak* 3: 93-117.

Pak, Yengswun, 1988. Palamcikhan kwuke kyoyuk [Desirable Korean language education]. *Kwuke saynghwal* 12 (Spring): 42-5.

Park, Joseph Sung-Yul, 2010. Language games on Korean television: between globalization, nationalism and authority. In: Johnson, Sally and Milani Tommaso M. (eds.), *Language Ideologies and Media Discourse*. London; New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, pp. 61-78.

Park, Mae-Ran, 1990. Conflict Avoidance in Social Interaction: A Sociolinguistic Comparison of the Korean and Japanese Honorific Systems. In: Hoji, Hajime, et. al. (eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*. Noriko Akatsuka: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Pinker, Steven, 1994. *The Language Instinct*. New York: W. Morrow and Co.

Pullum, Geoffrey K., 2006. Ideology, power, and linguistic theory. Retrieved from http://people.ucsc.edu/~pullum/MLA2004.pdf

Pusan National University. Wulimal Paywumthe. Retrieved from http://urimal.cs.pusan.ac.kr/urimal_new/

Schieffelin, B.Bambi, Woolard K., and Kroskrity Paul V. (eds.). 1998. *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Se, Cengswu, 1979a [1995]. Sahoy kwuco uy pyentong kwa hankwuke kyenge-pep uy chwui [Changes of Korean honorifiation and changes of Korean social structure], In: *Hankwuk sahoy enehak nonchong*, Sewul: kwukhak calyowen, pp.573-621.

Se, Cengswu, 1979b. Contaymal un etteh.key tallaciko issnunka? (I): Pwulum mal kwa kalikhim mal [How has polite language been changing? (I): Summons and terms of address]. *Hankul* 165: 33-71.

Se, Cengswu, 1980. Contaymal un etteh.key tallaciko issnunka? (II) [How is polite language changing? (II)]. *Hankul* 167: 357-87.

Se, Cengswu, 1984. *Contay-pep yenkwu* [A study of Korean Honorification]. Sewul: Hansin mwunhwasa.

Se, Cengswu, 1994 [2006]. *Kwuke Munpep* [Korean Grammar]. Sewul: Ppuli kiphunna mwu.

Se, Tek-hyen, 1996. *Kyenge-pep kwa kwuke kyoyuk yenkwu* [Honorification and Korean language education]. Sewul: Kwukhakcalyowon.

Se, Un-a, 2008. Kongik kwangko theyksuthu ey nathananun nophim-pep yenkwu [A study of honorification in the texts of public service advertisements]. *Kyeley Emwunhak* 4: 81-98.

Sells, Peter and Kim, Jong-Bok, 2007. Korean Honorification: A Kind of Expressive Meaning. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 16 (4): 303-36.

Seng, Kichel, 1984. Hyentay kwuke cwuchey taywu yenkwu – cwuchey contay lul cwungsim ulo [A review of Korean subject honorification – focusing on referent honorification]. *Hankul* 184: 81-112.

Seng, Kichel, 1991. Kwuke kyenge-pep uy ilpan-cek thukcing [General characteristics of Korean honorification]. *Say Kwuke saynghwal* 1 (3). Sewul: Kwuklipkwuke Yenkwuwen.

Seng, Kichel, 1999. 20 seyki chengca taywu-pep uy pyenchen – hwakyey uy sahoy enehak-cek pyenchen kwa kwanlyen haye – [Changes of addressee honorification in the 20th century – regarding the sociolinguistic changes of speech-levels], In: *The 9th International Conference*, pp. 93-101.

Seng, Kichel, 2007. *Hankwuke taywu-pep kwa hankwuke kyowuk* [Korean honorifics and Korean language education], Sewul: Kulnwulim.

Shin, Gi-hyen, 2001. Apjonpeop and an emerging new politeness strategy in contemporary Korean. *KAREC discussion papers* 2 (3): 287-95.

Silverstein, Michael and Urban, Greg, 1996. The natural history of discourse. In: Silverstein, Michael and Urban, Greg (eds.), *Natural Histories of Discourse*, Chicago: The University of Chicago, pp.1-20.

Silverstein, Michael, 1979. Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology. In: Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks, and Carol L. Hofbauer (eds.), *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society, pp.193-247.

Silverstein, Michael, 1981 [2001]. The limits of awareness. In: Duranti, A. (ed.), *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publisher, pp.382-401.

Silverstein, Michael, 1992. The uses and utility of ideology: some reflections. *Pragmatics* 2 (3): 311-23.

Silverstein, Michael, 1993. Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function. In: John A. Lucy (ed.), *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.33-58.

Silverstein, Michael, 2003. Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication* 23(3-4): 193-229.

Sim, Cayki, 1985. 'Appa' wa 'pwukwun' (   ), *Kwuke saynghwal* (changkanho, October): 78-80.

Sin, Cenghuy, 1990 (July 05). Munhwa-pu 'Kwukesimuywi(   )' katong [The Ministry of Cultural Affairs launches the 'Council of the Korean Language']. *Mayil Kyengcey*, p.19.

Sin, Cenghuy, 1991 (July 06). Ilum ciski tung 1,900 yeken munuy: kaywen 6 kaywel macnun Kwuklipkwukeyen [Naming and so forth, approximately 19,00 inquiries: 6-month after the opening of Kwuklipkwukeyen]. *Mayil Kyengcey*, p.8.

Sin, Kyengchel, 2001. *Nalamal kwa kul* [Korean speech and writing]. Sewul: Thayhaksa.

Singelis, M. Theodore, Triandis Harry C., Bhawuk, Dharm P. S. and Gelfand, Michele J. Gelfand, 1995. Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement Refinement, *Cross-Cultural Research* 29 (3): 240-75. Retrieved from http://ccr.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/29/3/240 (accessed May 11, 2009)

Sohn, Ho-min (ed.), 2006. *Korean Language in Culture and Society*. Honolulu, Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i Press.

Song, Min, 1990 (November 05). "*Samo-nim*" kwa "*kyoswu-nim*" kwa "*~hyeng*" ["*Samo-nim*" and "*kyoswu-nim*" and "*~hyeng*"]. *Kyenghyang Sinmun*, p.17.

Taylor, Talbot J., 1990. Which is to be master? The institutionalization of authority in the science of language. In: Joseph, J.E. and Taylor, T.J. (eds..), *Ideologies of Language*, London: Routledge, pp.9-26.

The Sewul sinmwun. Wulimal yehayng [Journey into Korean]. Retrieved from http://www.seoul.co.kr/news/newsList.php?section=koreanTravel

Urban, Greg, 1996. Entextualization, replication, and power, In: Silverstein, Michael and Urban, Greg (eds.), *Natural Histories of Discourse*, Chicago: The University of Chicago, pp. 21-44.

Verchueren, Jef., 2004. Notes on the role of metapragmatic awareness in language use, In Adam Jaworski, Nikolas Coupland and Dariusz Galasiński (eds.), *Metalanguage: Social and Ideological Perspectives*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 53-73.

Wang, Hansek, 1986, Kwuke chengca contaye cheykyey uy kiswul ul wihan pangpeplon-cek kemtwo [Review on the methodologies for the description of the Korean speech-level system]. *Ehak yenkwu* 22 (3): 351-73.

Wetzel, Patricia J., 1984. *Uti and soto [in-group and out-group]: Social deixis in Japanese.* Doctoral dissertation. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

Wetzel, Patricia J., 1994. Contemporary Japanese attitudes toward honorifics (*keigo*). *Language Variation and Change* 6: 113-47.

Wetzel, Patricia J., 2004. *Keigo in modern Japan: polite language from Meiji to the present*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Wetzel, Patricia J., Inoue, Miyako, 1999. Vernacular Theories of Japanese Honorifics. *The Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese* 33 (1): 68-101.

Woolard, Kathryn A. and Bambi Schieffelin. 1994. Language Ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23: 55-82.

Wotuli Happen, 2007 (December 28). Nophim-mal ul ssumyen nay ka nophacyeyo [I will be respected if I use honorifics]. Retrieved from http://soon1991.tistory.com /entry/ %20 - - -

Wu, Caywuk, 1997. *Ppippi wa kkamppaki: calmos ssunun wuli malkul 90 kaci* [A beeper and blinker: 90 errors in Korean speech and writing]. Sewul: Salmkwakkwum.

Yang, Insek, 1980. Hankwuke mal kkuth malssi uy kansohwa [Simplification of speech levels in Korean]. *Ene wa Enehak* 6: 99-114.

Yang, Myenghuy ed., 2005. *Kwukmin uy ene uysik cosa* [A survey of the linguistic awareness of Korean speakers]. Sewul: Kwuklipkwuke Yenkwuwen. Retrieved from http://www.korean.go.kr/

Yenpyen kyoyukhakhoy and Yenpyen tongsepangmunhwa yenkwuhoy (eds.), 2002. *Wuli mal kwa kul ul palukey kopkey* [Using correct and beautiful Korean]. Yenpyen: Yenpyen kyoyuk chwulphansa.

Yi Cengpok, 2007. *Hankwuke kyenge-pep, him kwa keli uy mihak* [Korean honorification: the aesthetics of power and distance]. Sewul: Sothong.

Yi, Cengpok 2001. *Kwuke kyenge-pep sayong uy cenlyak-cek thukseng* [Strategic features of Korean honorification]. Sewul: Yayhaksa.

Yi, Cengpok, 2002. *Kwuke kyenge-pep kwa sahoy enehak* [Korean honorification and sociolinguistics]. Sewul: Welin.

Yi, Cengpok, 2006. *Kwuke kyengepep ey tayhan sahoy enehak-cek cepkun* [A sociolinguistic study of Korean honorifics], *Kwukehak* 47: 407-48.

Yi, Cwuhayng and Kim, Sangcwun, 2004. *Alumtawun hankwuke* [Beautiful Korean] Sewul: Cikwu munhwasa.

Yi, Elyeng, 1990 (February 1). Simchung taytam: wuli munhwa sallinun kil—sinim munhwa-pu cangkwan uy sinhankwukmunhwalon [In-depth discussion: the way to revive our culture—the theory of the new Korean culture of the first minister of Ministry of Cultural Affairs]. Interviewed by Kwen Yeng-pin. *Welkan Cwungang* 169, pp.286-97.

Yi, Huytwu, 1998. *Kwuke conching hyengthay uy pyenhwa ey tayhan yenkwu* [A study on the changes of Korean honorific styles], Ph.D. dissertation, Cenlapukto: Wusek University.

Yi, Iksep, 1974. Kwuke kyenge-pep uy cheykyeyhwa muncey [Problems of the systematizing the Korean honorific system]. *Kwukehak* 2: 39-64.

Yi, Kikap, 1997. *Taywu-pep kaynyem cheykyey ey tayhan yenkwu* [A study on the notion of Politeness]. *Sahoy enehak* 5 (2): 645-69.

Yi, Mayngseng, 1975. Hankwuke congkyel emi wa tayin kwankyey yoso uy sangkwan kwankyey ey kwanhan yenkwu (1) [Variation of Sentence-final endings in Korean and interpersonal social relationships]. *Inmun Kwahak* 33, 34: 263-88.

Yi, Muyeng, 1994. *Yeycelpalun wulimal hoching* [Polite Korean address terms]. Sewul: Yekang.

Yi, Otek, 1992. *Wulikul palossuki* [Using Korean right]. Sewul: hankilsa.

Yi, Otek, 2004. *Wuli mal sallye ssuki hana* [Giving life to the Korean language 1]. Sewul: Alilang Nala.

Yi, Ungpayk, 1987. Kwuke yeycel [Korean linguistic politeness]. *Kwuke saynghwal* 10 (Autumn): 1-8.

Yi, Ungpayk, 2001. *Alumtawun wulimal ul chacas*e [In search of beautiful Korean]. Sewul: Hyentay silhaksa.

Yi, Yunha. 2001. *Hyentay kwuke uy taywupep yenkwu*. Sewul: Yeklak.

Yim, Tonghwun, 2006. Hyentay kwuke kyenge-pep uy cheykyey [The system of modern Korean honorifics]. Kwukehak 47: 287-320.

Yoon, Kyung-Joo, 2004. Not just words: Korean social models and the use of honorifics. Intercultural Pragmaticsn1(2): 189-210.

Yun, Huywen, 1988. Malhaki wa tutki kyoyuk [Speaking and listening education]. *Kwuke saynghwal* 12 (Spring): 16-21.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Questions about the Proper Level of Politeness

1. I address my father-in-law as *appa* 'daddy,' but my relatives speak against the term. What would be the proper term of address? (NIKL 1997:186)
2. I address my parents-in-laws as *ape-nim* 'father-honorific suffix' and *eme-nim* 'mother-honorific suffix,' but I was told by my parents that this is wrong. What would be the proper terms of address? (NIKL 2001:256)
3. I feel offended when my colleague addresses me as *misu* 'miss' + LN.' What would be the proper term of address at work? (NIKL 2001:264)
4. Should I use honorifics once or several times with verbs in a predicate? I am curious because schools and self-study guides provide different answers. (NIKL 1999:173-4)
5. At the civic service centre, we answer a phone call with *kamsahapnita* 'thank you.' Can you advise as to the correct standard expression for us? (NIKL1999:175-176)
6. My younger sister got married to a senior from my school. I used to address him as *hyeng-nim* 'brother-honorific suffix.' How should I address him, now that he is my younger sister's husband? (NIKL1992b:88)
7. My husband is the youngest son of a family with five sons. How should I address my oldest nephew who is one-year older than me? (NIKL1997:191)
8. When talking about my son to my grandson, should I use the honorific marker *-si-* for my son? (NIKL 1997:206)
9. When talking about my husband to others, should I use honorifics for him or not? (NIKL 2001:262)
10. When addressing or talking about my parents to others, should I add *-nim* 'honorific suffix' or not? (NIKL 1992a:79)
11. I need to phone my son's work place. I am not sure how to refer to my son to his colleague. Should I use just my son's name, add *ssi* 'Mr.,' or add his title to his name? (NIKL 1992a:80)

APPENDIX B: Titles of Language How-to Publications

1. Ceng Kilnam, 2003. *Kwuke olyu pwunsek* [Error analysis in Korean]. Sewul: Hankwuk munhwasa.
2. Ceng, Cayhwan, 1999. *Cacangmyen i maca yo, campong un?* [Is "*cacangmyen*" correct? How about "*camppong*"?]. Sewul: Sen.
3. Ceng, Cayto, 2004. *Wuli malkul uy kal kil* [The way forward for Korean speech and writing]. Sewul: Cisiksanepsa.
4. Chen, Soyeng, 1994. *Pwukkulewun alilang* [Shameful Alilang]. Sewul: Hyenamsa.
5. Chen, Soyeng, 2005. *Hankwuke wa hankwukmwunhwa* [The Korean language and Korean culture]. Sewul: Wulichayk.
6. Chen, Soyeng, 2007. *Wulimal uy munhwa chacki* [Searching for the culture of the Korean language]. Sewul: hankwuk munhwasa.
7. Choy, Pongyeng, 2005. *Hankwuk sahoy uy chapyel kwa ekap: conpie cheykyey wa hyengsik–cek kwenwicwuuy* [Discrimination and oppression in Korean society: the honorific system and the formal authoritarianism]. Sewul: Cisiksanepsa.
8. Co, Tongo, 2003. *Mal un muneciko, palum un mungkayciko* [Collapsing speech, crushed pronunciation]. Sewul: Tio.
9. Co, Yenghuy, 1998. *Wulimal ul palo alko palo ssuca* [Knowing and using Korean correctly]. Cencwu: Sina chwulphansa.
10. He, Cwunhuy, Co, Cwun-hyeng, and Pak, Seng-swun, 2003. *Chotung haksayng i kkok alaya hal mal, kul calhakey hanun kwuke iyaki* [Stories about Korean for primary schoolers who want to improve their Korean speech and writing]. Sewul: Cohunpes.
11. Kim Sikwang, 1996. *Hankwuk insa yeycel* [Korean greeting courtesy]. Tayku: Cwungmun.
12. Kim, Hankwen, 1995. *Sengkonghanun cikcangin uy 53 kaci yeycel* [53 types of etiquette for the successful business man]. Sewul: Cosenilposa.
13. Kim, Kyeykon, 1994. *Wuli mal, kul un wuli el ul tamnun kulusini* [The Korean language is a vessel for the Korean spirit]. Sewul: Emunkak.
14. Kim, Seyceng, et al., 2004. *Mal i olla ya nala ka olunta* [The nation rises when the language rises]. Sewul: Hankyeley sinmunsa.
15. Kim, Sulong, 1999. *Ku kel mal ilako hani* [Do you think that makes sense?]. Sewul: Talunwuli.
16. Kim, Tongso, 1999. *Kim Tongso uy ssamppakhan wulimal iyaki* [Kim Tongso's outspoken tales about the Korean language]. Taykwu: Cenglimsa.
17. Kim, Wuyeng, 2002. *Wulimal sanchayk* [A walk in the Korean language]. Sewul: Chenwu.
18. Ko, Yengkun, 1996. *Wuli ene mwunhwa uy ppwuli lul chaca* [Searching for the roots of Korean language culture]. Sewul: Hansinmunhwasa.
19. Kwen, Owun, 2002. *Almanhan salamtul i calmos ssuko issnun wulimal 1234kaci* [1234 types of Korean that knowledgeable people misuse]. Sewul: Munhakswuchep.
20. Li, Uyto, 1993. *Wuli malkul uy hyensil kwa isang* [The reality and ideal of the Korean language]. Sewul: Emunkak.

21. Li, Uyto, 1997. *Mal ul calhako kul ul cal ssulyemyen kkok alaya hal kes tul* ["Must Knows" for speaking and writing Korean better] . Sewul: Sekphil.
22. Lye, Cungtong, 1999. *Hyoto ene* [Filial language]. Sewul: Munumsa.
23. Lyu, Caypong, 1997. *Hoching kwa ciching yeycel* [Courtesy in terms of address and reference]. Sewul: Yeyyeng khemyunikeyisyen.
24. Nam, Kisim and Kim, Haswu, 1995. *Tangsin un wuli mal ul saylopko palukey ssuko isssupnikka?* [Do you use Korean language in a correct, fresh way?]. Sewul: Saymthesa.
25. Nam, Yengsin, 1998. *Kwuke chennyen uy silphay wa sengkong* [One thousand years of failures and successes of Korean]. Sewul: Hanmatang.
26. Nam, Yengsin, 2005. *4 cwukan uy kwuke yehayng* [A 4-week journey through Korean]. Sewul: Sengantang
27. O, Tonghwan, 2002. *Wulimal cwukiki wulimal salliki* [Killing and Reviving the Korean language]. Sewul: Seysi.
28. O, Tonghwan, 2003. *O Tong-hwan uy wulimal sayngkak* [O Tong-hwan's thoughts on Korean]. Sewul: Seysi.
29. Pak, Kapswu, 2001. *Alumtawun wulimal kakkwuki* [Cultivating beautiful Korean]. Sewul: Cipmuntang.
30. Pak, Kumca, Cang, Sowen, and Sin, Ciyeng, 2003. *Ene yeycel* [Language courtesy]. Sewul: Hankwuk pangsongthongsin tayhakkyo chwulpanpu.
31. Pak, Yongswun, 1992. *Lyeycel kwa insa* [Courtesy and greetings]. Phyengyang: Sahoy kwahak chwulphansa.
32. Wu, Caywuk, 1997. *Ppippi wa kkamppaki: calmos ssunun wuli malkul 90 kaci* [A beeper and blinker: 90 errors in Korean speech and writing]. Sewul: Salmkwakkwum.
33. Yi, Cwuhayng and Kim, Sangcwun, 2004. *Alumtawun hankwuke* [Beautiful Korean] Sewul: Cikwu munhwasa.
34. Yi, Muyeng, 1994. *Yeycelpalun wulimal hoching* [Polite Korean address terms]. Sewul: Yekang.
35. Yi, Otek, 1992. *Wulikul palossuki* [Using Korean right]. Sewul: hankilsa.
36. Yi, Otek, 2004. *Wuli mal sallye ssuki hana* [Giving life to the Korean language 1]. Sewul: Alilang Nala.
37. Yi, Ungpayk, 2001. *Alumtawun wulimal ul chacase* [In search of beautiful Korean]. Sewul: Hyentay silhaksa.
38. Cosenilposa and Kwuklipkwukewen (CI & NIKL) (eds.), 1991 [1993]. *Wulimal uy yeycel: Hwapep uy silcey wa phyocwun* [Korean language courtesy: reality and standard of speech]. Sewul: Cosenilposa.
39. Cosenilposa and Kwuklipkwukewen (CI & NIKL) (eds.), 1993a. *Manhwa lo ikhinun wuli mal uy yeycel* [Korean language etiquette through cartoons]. Sewul: Cosenilposa.
40. Cosenilposa and Kwuklipkwukewen (CI & NIKL) (eds.), 1993b. *Manhwa lo ikhinun wuli mal uy yeycel* [Korean language etiquette through cartoons]. Sewul: Cosenilposa.
41. Cosenilposa and Kwuklipkwukewen (CI & NIKL) (eds.), 1996. *Wulimal uy yeycel sang* [Korean language etiquette I]. Sewul: Cosenilposa.
42. Cosenilposa and Kwuklipkwukewen (CI & NIKL) (eds.), 1996. *Wulimal uy yeycel ha* [Korean language etiquette II]. Sewul: Cosenilposa.

APPENDIX C: Lay Speakers' Reactions to Standard Honorification

GROUP I: As a source of information

A) Uncommon honorification or lack of suitable honorification

1. I have cousins from my father's brother and sister. How should I refer to their sons? I'd also like to know how they should refer to me. (NIKL 2001:233-5)
2. How can I greet my teacher at his retirement ceremony? What should I write on the envelope of my small present? (NIKL 2001:277-8)
3. How should I address the husband of my teacher? (NIKL 2001:248-9)
4. What are the terms for the wife of my wife's brother? (NIKL 2001:259-60)
5. When I ask for directions, I hesitate about how to address an old person. What is the proper address form in this situation? (NIKL 1992a:96-7)

B) Linguistic variables

6. How should I refer to my wife to my parents and others? (NIKL 2001:250)
7. How can I know the differences among the terms *sepang-nim*, *tolyen-nim*, *acwupe-nim?* (NIKL 2001:238)
8. I am confused about various terms of address. Professors refer to their teaching assistants as LN + *sensayng* 'teacher' or LN + *cokyo* 'teaching assist'; students use terms such as (LN) *cokyo-nim* 'teaching assistance-honorific suffix'/ *hyeng* 'brother'/ *enni* 'sister'/ *senpay-nim* 'senior-honorific suffix'. Which ones are correct? Which one is the correct term of address for professors: *kyoswu-nim* 'professor-honorific suffix' or *sensayng-nim* 'teacher- honorific suffix'? (NIKL 1999:157-60)
9. Isn't *malssum* the polite form of *mal* 'speech' for one's superior? But some people say *malssum* for their own speech. Isn't it wrong? (NIKL 1992a:99-100)

C) Verification of one's speech

10. Can I address the wife of my younger brother with ○○ *emma* 'child's name + mom'? (NIKL 2001:240)
11. Would LN+ *hyeng* 'older brother' be a proper term of address to use at work? (NIKL 2001:264)
12. Can I say "Have my bow, please" or "Sit down, please" to elders before making my New Year's bow? (NIKL 2001:276)
13. Would it be improper to use *sensayng-nim kwiha* 'lit. teacher (generic honorific title)-honorific suffix Mr(s)' for a receiver's name on an envelope? (NIKL 2001:283)
14. My son-in-law's parents have passed away. His older sisters address me with *saton elun*. Is it a correct term of address? Also, can I use the term of address *sapwuin* with those who are about my age? (NIKL 2001:243)
15. I (male speaker) address my parents-in-laws with *pingcang elun*, *pingmo-nim*. Are they correct? (NIKL 1997:192-193)
16. Is *sensayng* (generic honorific title) an acceptable social title for the inscription of a man who made his fortune with a casino business in Japan after 1945? (NIKL1999:167)
17. My husband addresses me as children's name + *emem* '[-HON] mother' in front of others. I wonder if it is the correct term of reference for a wife. (NIKL 1997:198)

18. Is it correct for a TV program host to address the guest's husband with *namphyen* 'husband'? Shouldn't the term of address be *pukwun* or *pakkath elun*? Also, newspapers and broadcasters refer to someone's deceased father as *senchin*. Is it correct? Isn't that a term of address for the speaker's own deceased father? (NIKL 1999:165-6)

GROUP II. Disputes over standard honorification
19. Should I still address my 45-year-old unmarried brother-in-law as *tolyen-nim*? (NIKL 2001:246)
20. Is it proper to address a married husband's younger sister as *akassi* 'miss'? (NIKL 2001:241)
21. Why is a female speaker supposed to address the younger wife of her husband's older brother with *hyeng-nim* 'older brother-*nim*,' whereas a male speaker can address the younger husband of his wife's older brother with *chenam* but not *hyeng-nim*? I think it as an anachronism. (NIKL 1999:160-5)
22. In my region, only the oldest brother deserves the address term *hyeng-nim* 'brother-honorific suffix' as the responsible descendent of a family. The mainstream use does not necessarily mean that it is correct. I think we'd better acknowledge the root of the term. (NIKL 199:160-5)
23. Korean has linguistic discrimination due to (non)honorific language. I'd like to suggest to the president that we should adopt English as the second language. (NIKL 1999:170-3)
24. I think *mayhyeng* (   ) in reference to an older sister's husband is an incorrect use of the original Chinese character   'younger sister.' (NIKL 2001:241-2)
25. I don't think the use of humble infix -*o*- with the imperative ending -(*u*)*sipsio* is incorrect. (NIKL 1999:168)
26. Today I often see examples of honorification such as *sacang-nim sil* 'president-honorific suffix room' or *cenmwu-nim sil* 'executive manager-honorific suffix room.' Are they correct? (NIKL 2001:267-268)