Abstract. The goal of this paper is to investigate the pragmatic meaning of the disjunction-driven anti-specificity marker inka associated with rigid designators such as proper nouns (e.g., John-inka) in Korean. Its attachability to a specific referent is unexpected in the previous accounts of inka (Choi 2011; Kang 2015, 2017, a.o.), assuming the felicity condition that the domain of referentially vague items like ‘wh-phrase’-inka should not be a singleton set with a fixed value. With a proper name, however, the referential vagueness presupposition cannot be satisfied. We argue that this particular use of inka is pragmatically accommodated by the anti-honorific connotational nuance, which is independent of the at-issue content. In particular, we propose that the derogatory sense triggered by inka is Conventional Implicature (à la Potts 2005), expressing a speaker’s negative attitude toward the target. We furthermore examine its co-occurrence patterns with other typical expressives and show how the dynamic paradigm of multiple expressives (the anti-honorific inka and others) can be predicted by the compatibility condition (Yoon 2015). Regarding the relationship between the two types, anti-specific vs. anti-honorific inka, we show that whereas the anti-specific inka contributes the semantic content of referential vagueness, the anti-honorific inka has only the pragmatic contribution of mitigation as a reflex of grammaticalization of the attitude holder’s subjective perspective. Theoretical implications of the current study thus include: (i) the conceptual connection from anti-specificity to anti-honorification is established; (ii) the identification of another case of expressive element in language lends further support to the notion of multidimensionality in meaning; and (iii) the close examination of compatibility condition reveals the systematicity of expressives as part of our grammar.
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1. Introduction
In this study, we investigate another function of the disjunction marker inka ‘or’ in Korean, examining the nature of this anti-honorific meaning and how such an anti-honorific component is derived from the conventional meaning of disjunction-driven anti-specificity. As argued earlier (Choi 2011; Kang 2015, 2017, a.o.), the meaning of inka is characterized as marking a speaker’s uncertainty. As shown in (1), when inka disjoins two DPs as a disjunctive particle, its semantic role is equivalent to a disjunction (Zimmermann 2001; Geurts 2005), which is interpreted as a list of epistemic possibilities without the help of an overt modal. It asserts that the culprit might be Kim or the culprit might be John in a world w if and only if the proposition contains at least one world that is permitted in w. The speaker does not know in which world the actual value is. In (2), when the anti-specificity marker inka is attached to the wh-word nwukwu ‘who,’ it forms an anti-specific indefinite nwukwu-inka ‘someone (I don’t know who he is).’ It conveys a speaker’s epistemic indeterminacy, forming a referentially vague indefinite (Giannakidou and Quer 2013). They never induce an epistemically specific interpretation; as evidenced by the ‘guess who?’ test (Hapelmacht 1997, Aloni 2011) below, the core semantic property of inka concerns the speaker’s knowledge, requiring the speaker to be in a state of uncertainty about the value of alternatives:

(1) a. pemin-un kim-inka con(-inka) i-ta. #nwukwu-key?
culprit-Top  Kim-INKA   John-INKA  be-Decl  who-Q
‘The culprit is maybe Kim or John (I don’t know which). #Guess who?’

(2)   mwues-inka  isangha-ta.   #mwe-ka  isangha-key?
what-INKA   be.-strange-Decl   what-Nom  be.-strange-Q
‘Something (I don’t know what it is) is strange. #Guess what?’

This leads us to expect that the occurrence of inka with a proper noun without an uncertainty reading would result in an identifiability mismatch, since a rigid designator like a proper noun is defined as the same entity in all possible worlds.

Surprisingly, however, inka is compatible with proper nouns. Furthermore, when inka combines with a proper noun like ‘John’, it conveys the speaker’s negative attitude toward John, as in (3):

(3)   Context: Bill was very riled up because he found out that his sister Kim and her boyfriend John broke his laptop. While Kim was in the bathroom, John called for her. Now Kim is asking who called her, and Bill says:
Con-inka-ka  cenhwaha-ess-ta.
John-INKA-Nom  call-Past-Decl
a. descriptive: ‘John has called.’
b. expressive: ‘I hold John in low regard.’

In exploring the pragmatic contribution of inka, we tackle issues surrounding the connection between the negative attitude and the original meaning of referential vagueness. We assume that inka here does not contribute any descriptive content to the truth-conditional meaning because the sentence is felicitous, even when the speaker can convincingly identify the caller (i.e., the speaker knows exactly who John is but hates him, for instance). We thus propose that the meaning of inka is not associated with the semantic property of referential vagueness as an anti-specificity marker on the at-issue level, but with expressive content that hints at the speaker’s negative attitude toward the host noun on another level. In this light, we suggest that the meaning of inka exists in the expressive dimension of meaning. Building on Potts’ (2005) notion of (anti-)honorifics as a subtype of expressive, we will show that the anti-honorific inka is a linguistic device for conveying a speaker’s emotional attitude.

Interestingly, the derogatory flavor of inka can be strengthened with its juxtaposition with anti-specific wh-variants: the addition of anti-specific wh-inka, as in N-inka ‘who’-inka in (4), puts an emphasis on the speaker’s non-caring attitude toward the identity of the referent, John, hence stronger pejorative effects. Furthermore, using the phrase N-inka ‘what’-inka in (5), when referring to a person, triggers an even stronger negative attitude than the form of N-inka ‘who’-inka by comparing the identity of a human, John, with the identity of a non-human:

(4)   Con-inka  nwukwu-inka-ka  cenhwaha-ess-ta.
John-INKA  someone (I don’t know)-Nom  call-Past-Decl
a. descriptive: ‘John has called.’
b. expressive: ‘I hold John in very low regard.’ (intensified)

John-INKA  something (I don’t know)-Nom  call-Past-Decl
a. descriptive: ‘John has called.’
b. expressive: ‘I hold John in extremely low regard.’ (further intensified)

Although it has been noted in the literature that the interpretation of sentences like (3)-(5) involves some kind of negative connotational nuance, the precise nature of this negative attitude and its relation to the conventional meaning of anti-specificity have not been discussed.

Another puzzle concerns the co-occurrence restriction with other expressive items. As shown below, the co-occurrence of *inka* with positive expressive items such as honorifics, e.g., the nominative honorific marker *kkeyse* in (6a), subject honorific marker *si* in (6b), and honorific title *sensayngnim* ‘Mr.’ in (6c) sounds odd due to the self-conflicting attitudes:¹

(6) a. #Con-inka mwe-inka-kkeyse cenhwaha-ess-tani!
   ‘lit. (It is unbelievable that) John (I hold in extremely low regard) has called!’

b. #Con-inka mwe-inka-ka tuleo-si-ess-ta.
   John-INKA what-INKA-Nom enter-Subj.Hon-Pst-Decl
   ‘lit. John (I hold in extremely low regard) came in.’

c. #Con-inka mwe-inka-hanun sensayngnim
   John-INKA what-INKA-called Mr.
   ‘lit. Mr. John (I hold in extremely low regard) someone or other’

On the other hand, *inka* naturally co-occurs with other negative expressive elements such as anti-honorifics, *ttawi.ka* in (7a), -*peli* in (7b), and *saykki* ‘bastard’ in (7c):

(7) a. Con-inka mwe-inka-ttawi.ka (kamhi) cenhwaha-ess-tani!
   John-INKA what-INKA-Nom.ANTI.Hon impudently call-Past-Excl
   ‘lit. (It is unbelievable;) how dare John (I hold in extremely low regard) has called!’

   John-INKA what-INKA-Nom enter.ANTI.Hon-Pst-Decl
   ‘John (I hold in extremely low regard) resentfully came in.’

c. Con-inka mwe-inka-hanun saykki
   John-INKA what-INKA-called bastard
   ‘That bastard John (I hold in extremely low regard)’

Given this data, the following questions arise: First, how can the negative attitude of *inka* toward the target be captured? Second, what is the affinity between the anti-specific *inka* and the derogatory *inka*? That is, how can we characterize the conditions under which one of the two interpretations concerning a speaker’s epistemic state and a speaker’s negative attitude arises? To answer these questions, we show that the pragmatic meaning of *inka* can be captured as a subcase of argument-oriented anti-honorification (Potts and Kawahara 2004), further developed from Kang (2018), since the speaker needs to identify the target of emotional projection in order to express her negative attitude. Terming this particular use ‘anti-honorific *inka*’, we investigate the properties of *inka* with two goals: First, we show how the negative expressive meaning of *inka* arises from the anti-specificity of *inka*, establishing a conceptual connection between anti-specificity and anti-honorification in natural language. The epistemic uncertainty attached to the

¹ This combination, however, can be allowed in a context where the speaker intends to convey certain pragmatic effects such as sarcasm, irony, hyperbole, or humor (Yoon 2015).
identity of the rigid designator gives rise to pragmatic mitigating effects akin to anti-honorification in an expressive dimension. Second, based on the Compatibility Condition between expressives (Yoon 2015), we show how the negative attitude of inka is further evidenced by its interaction patterns with other expressives in the sentence.\footnote{In this paper, we assume that anti-honorification and impoliteness can be treated alike in the sense of a negative attitude tied to rudeness.}

The organization of this paper is as follows. Section 2 establishes the conceptual connection between anti-specificity and anti-honorification, exploring the empirical split between anti-specific inka and anti-honorific inka. Section 3 offers a brief review of Potts’ (2005) system of multidimensional compositionality, and suggests how the evaluative dimension of anti-honorific inka can be represented within the system of CI logic. Section 4 discusses the compatibility condition between the anti-honorific inka and other expressive elements. We conclude with Section 5.

2 Anti-specificity vs. anti-honorification split
In this section, we discuss empirical differences between the anti-specific inka and the anti-honorific inka, showing that the latter expresses a speaker’s negative attitude toward the target. Our proposal on the conceptual split between the two types of inka and the analysis of the anti-honorific inka as a subspecies of Conventional Implicature (CI) (to be discussed in Section 3) are supported by four properties: (i) identifiability, (ii) honorific information, (iii) mitigation, and (iv) subjectification. The third property of mitigation provides a conceptual link between anti-specificity and anti-honorification in terms of grammaticalization.

2.1 Identifiability
The honorification system in language is generally regulated by various socio-cultural norms and contextual factors. A specific connotational nuance of an honorific item is thus difficult to capture out of context. Likewise, the use of inka as an anti-honorific marker requires a specific context to attain the intended meaning. The key difference between the anti-specific inka and the anti-honorific inka concerns the identifiability of the target. The use of the anti-honorific inka would be felicitous only in a context where a speaker could identify the individual in question. In a context where the speaker doesn’t know the caller, inka merely indicates the speaker’s ignorance of the identity of the referent (i.e., non-identifiability), and this illustrates a case of anti-specific inka, which does not induce a negative attitude reading:

(8) Context 1: Kim told her brother Bill that she has a boyfriend. Now Bill is giving this news to his mother. She asks what Kim’s boyfriend’s name is. Bill doesn’t remember the name exactly; he thinks that it must be John something or other. Bill says:
   Con-\text{\textbf{-}}\text{\textbf{inka}}-\text{lay}.
   John-\text{\textbf{INKA}}\text{\textbf{-anti-\textbf{SPEC}}}-\text{\textbf{Mod}}
   ‘It is John (or other).’

On the other hand, in a context where the speaker can certainly identify the caller, inka is employed as an anti-honorific device to convey the speaker’s negative attitude toward John (repeated from (3)):
(9) **Context 2:** Bill was very riled up because he found out that his sister Kim and her boyfriend John broke his laptop. While Kim was in the bathroom, John called her. Now Kim is asking who called her, and Bill says:

Con-**inka**-ka cenhwa-ess-ta.
John-INKA_{anti-HON}-Nom call-Past-Decl

a. descriptive: ‘John has called.’

b. expressive: √ ‘I hold John in low regard.’

The above examples reveal that although the speaker can identify the target value, the use of the anti-honorific *inka* is felicitous. The compatibility of the anti-honorific *inka* and these fixed identity contexts is unsurprising, since the speaker needs to know the specific identity of the target in order to express a negative attitude toward it.

### 2.2 Anti-honorification

Another crucial difference between the anti-honorific *inka* and the anti-specific *inka* comes from the compatibility condition with other honorific markers (more discussion on compatibility condition will follow in Section 4.). It is widely known that Korean is equipped with a sophisticated honorification system in which a speaker is required to choose an appropriate level of honorific morphology. For instance, when a speaker is of lower social rank than the subject *halapeci* ‘grandfather’, the relevant information is conveyed by the honorific nominative marker *kkeyse* and the subject-honorific verbal suffix *si*:

(10) **halapeci**-*kkeyse* cenhwa-si-ess-ta.

**grandfather-Nom.Hon** call-Subj.Hon-Past-Decl

a. descriptive: ‘Grandfather has called.’

b. expressive: ‘I respect Grandfather.’

Following previous analyses of honorific markers as expressives (Potts 2005; Potts and Kawahara 2004 in Japanese; Kim and Sells 2007 in Korean), we assume that their contribution is made in an expressive dimension. Now, observe the contrast between the anti-specific *inka* and the anti-honorific *inka* with respect to their compatibility with honorific markers. The anti-specific *inka* is perfectly compatible with honorifics, since it only indicates the speaker’s uncertainty of the identity of Professor Kim (translated as ‘Professor Kim or somebody’):

(11) **Anti-specific inka**

Kim kyoswu-**anka**-hanun.pwun-*kkeyse* ka-si-ess-ta.
Kim professor-INKA_{anti-SPEC-person}.Hon-Nom.Hon go-Hon-Past-Decl

a. descriptive: ‘Professor Kim or somebody (if I remember correctly) has gone.’

b. expressive: ‘I respect Professor Kim.’ (triggered by honorifics: *pwun, kkeyse, si*)

The anti-honorific *inka*, on the other hand, disallows such honorific markers:

(12) **Anti-honorific inka**

#Kim kyoswu-**inka** (nwukwu/mwue)-*inka*-kkeyse ka-si-ess-ta.
Kim professor-INKA_{anti-HON} who/what-INKA_{anti-HON-Nom}.Hon go-Hon-Past-Decl

a. descriptive: ‘Professor Kim has gone.’
b. expressive: ‘I respect Professor Kim.’ (triggered by honorifics: kkeyse, si)
c. expressive: ‘I hold Professor Kim in low regard.’ (triggered by anti-honorifics: inka)

The sentence sounds odd due to the attitudinal conflict: whereas the honorific markers kkeyse and si express the speaker’s deferential attitude toward the target, Professor Kim, the anti-honorific reading of inka reveals an opposite, disrespectful attitude.

It is important to note, however, that there are exceptional cases where such a combination of contrasting attitudes appears when the speaker intends to convey additional pragmatic effects of sarcasm, irony, or hyperbole. (We will return to this point in the discussion of compatibility condition for expressives in Section 4.)

2.3 Mitigating effect of anti-honorific inka
2.3.1 From anti-specificity to mitigation

The term mitigation has been originally introduced in the area of politeness (Brown and Levinson 1987). Mitigators can be used to soften the tone of rejection by decreasing the directness of the statement or marking a pejorative flavor, as reflected in various types of negative disjunctive or enumerative particles in Korean. For example, the disjunction marker N-na ‘lit. or (something)’ and an enumerative particle ttawi ‘lit. ilk’ can be used as expressive elements to convey a speaker’s negative attitude toward the target (Yoon 2015). As shown in (13) (Yoon 2015: (35)), the disjunction marker N-na in Korean implies that the content of N is not the most preferred choice, but rather the second-best unenthusiastic choice (Rhee 2009):

(13) Context: Lee and Kim were very excited to watch the musical Mamma Mia!, but the performance just got cancelled. They are both dismayed.

Lee: ceyncang, pap-ina mek-ca.
damn meal-or (.something) eat-Hort
‘Damn, let’s just eat or something.’

Likewise, in (14), the enumerative particle ttawi expresses a negative attitude by attaching to any type of case marker (e.g., ne-ttawi-ka/lul/eykey: you-ANTI.Hon-NOM/ACC/DAT: ‘a worthless person of your ilk’) (Yoon 2015: (29)):

(14) Slurs with anti-honorific nominative case markers
a. ppalkayngi-\textit{ttawi}\underline{.}ka tulew-ass-ta.
   commie.neg.att-Nom.anti.hon enter-Pst-Decl
   ‘The (\text{unlikable}) (\text{dishonorable}) commie came.’

b. \{kkamtwungi/\textit{kemtwungi}\-\textit{ttawi}\underline{.}ka tulew-ass-ta.
   black.person.neg.att-Nom.anti.hon enter-Pst-Decl
   ‘The (\text{unlikable}) (\text{dishonorable}) black man came.’

Yoon claims that the mitigated anti-honorific effect of the disjunction marker and enumerative particle comes from \textit{vagueness}. As she puts it, “the source of pejorative flavor of \textit{ttawi}-series case markers can be understood as a result of \textit{mitigation} (attenuation) strategy with vagueness. Recall that the anti-honorific sense of \textit{ttawi} arises from its original function as an enumerative particle, and the effects of enumeration is making the host noun vague, hence less noteworthy just like the expression \textit{N or something/whatever} in English” (Yoon 2015, p. 57).
Based on the notion of vagueness, we show how inka gives rise to a mitigating effect in anti-honorification in what follows. Before moving onto the main discussion, however, we first introduce the minimal variation as a felicity condition (i.e., referential vagueness) for the anti-specific inka (Giannakidou and Quer 2013; Kang 2015, 2017; Giannakidou and Yoon 2016). The minimal variation requirement yields a weaker form of indeterminacy because there must be at least two alternative worlds that receive distinct values, as defined below:

\[(15)\] Minimal variation and uncertainty (Giannakidou and Quer 2013)

(i) A sentence containing at least two individual disjuncts \(d\) will have a truth value iff:
\[\exists w_1, w_2 \in W: [d]^{w_1} \neq [d]^{w_2};\] where \(d\) is an individual disjunct.

(ii) The worlds \(w_1\) and \(w_2\) are epistemic alternatives of the speaker: \(w_1, w_2 \in M(\text{speaker})\), where \(M(\text{speaker})\) is the speaker’s belief state, the worlds compatible with what she believes/knows.

(iii) The speaker does not know which value is the actual value (uncertainty).

The notion of non-fixed value constraint is subject to anti-specificity, which is sensitive to the knowledge of the speaker. The speaker does not have a particular individual in mind, which reflects the epistemic judgment of uncertainty:

\[(16)\] Particular individual in mind = fixed value in \(M_B(s)\): \(w_1 \rightarrow \alpha, w_2 \rightarrow \alpha\)

\[(17)\] No particular individual in mind = no fixed value in \(M_B(s)\): \(w_1 \rightarrow \alpha, w_2 \rightarrow \beta\)

Via the individual anchor, the belief worlds are available as parameters of evaluation. Variation is modeled as different values in at least two different worlds.

Given that minimal variation crucially relies on the speaker’s epistemic state, the relevant world for assessment is assumed to come from the speaker’s belief model, \(M_B(x)\):

\[(18)\] Belief model of an individual (Giannakidou 1999: (45)):
Let \(c = <cg(c), W(c), M, s, h, w_0, f, \ldots>\) be a context.

A model \(M_B(x)\) is a set of worlds associated with an individual \(x\) representing a world compatible with what \(x\) believes.

\[(19)\] a. John won the race.

\[\text{b. } [\text{John won the race}] = 1 \text{ iff } \forall w[w \in M_B(s) \rightarrow w \in \lambda w. \text{‘John wins the race in } w’]\]

Likewise, inka is sensitive to referential vagueness constraints. When inka is used, the speaker believes that there is more than one value in the contextual domain for the inka-disjunction, and the value is therefore not fixed. The anti-specific disjunctive particle inka has individual alternatives determined within the set of worlds compatible with the speaker’s belief in the world of evaluation. The truth conditions for the inka-disjunction are as follows:

\[(20)\] Minimal variation and uncertainty of the anti-specific disjunctive particle inka (Kang 2017):
\[\text{’The winner is maybe John or Bill (I don’t know which)’} \] will be defined in \(c\), only if: \(\exists w_1, w_2 \in M_B(s): [d]^{w_1} \neq [d]^{w_2}\) where \(d\) is an individual disjunct; if defined, \[\text{’The winner is maybe John or Bill (I don’t know which)’}\] is true iff there is
some world $w$ consistent with the speaker’s desires such that in $w$: there will be a winner, which will be of value to $d$.

a. Particular individual in mind = fixed value in $M_B(s)$: $w_1 \rightarrow John, w_2 \rightarrow John$

b. No particular individual in mind = no fixed value in $M_B(s)$: $w_1 \rightarrow John, w_2 \rightarrow Bill$

The semantic variation is modeled as different values in at least two worlds of alternative relation. By employing the anti-specific disjunctive particle *inka*, which contains a minimal variation condition on the context, the speaker intends to refer to an uncertain individual in the world of utterance.

We argue that the pragmatic contribution of the anti-honorific *inka* comes from the semantic felicity condition of minimal variation. The logic is as follows: just like the anti-specific *inka*, the use of the anti-honorific *inka* alludes to the possibility of multiple individual alternatives. Although the speaker does not have epistemic uncertainty regarding the identity of a given proper noun, she intentionally expresses her feigned ignorance by employing an epistemic uncertainty marker. Incorporating such random variation blurs the identity of the referent; thus an indiscriminative depreciative reading arises. Importantly, as a reviewer pointed out, we allow for conceptual connection between anti-specific *inka* and depreciative meaning, which Haspelmath (1997) initially suggested. According to Haspelmath, non-specific indefinites convey negative depreciative meaning which can be roughly paraphrased as ‘an unimportant entity’ or ‘in a negligent manner/badly.’ Observing the correlation between non-specific functions and depreciative interpretation, Haspelmath states “given that all people are choosy, it is normal that hearers should expect the worst if they are told that the referent has been selected randomly.” This is how the anti-honorific *inka* expresses a speaker’s indifference or non-caring attitude toward the target. The prerequisite of minimal variation thus naturally explains why it functions as a mitigator. It is well known that mitigators such as diminutives, mental verbs, and syntactic devices are employed in many languages in order to soften a direct request and thus achieve politeness. In this sense, the operation of the pejorative *inka* may go beyond the general understanding of mitigation in politeness research. We argue that the mitigator *inka* is employed as a device to soften the tone of epithets. Unlike direct epithets, the rhetorical strategy of *inka* is *indirectness*, which is achieved by the comparison of the target with individual alternatives within the set of worlds, and allowing such a strategy results in weaker intensity at the negative expressive level. Accordingly, as a negative expressive element, the anti-honorific *inka* plays a role as a mitigator.

2.3.2 Subjectification

This anti-honorific sense of *inka*, we argue, has undergone a process of *subjectification* in the sense of Traugott (1982, 1986, 2007, 2010; Traugott and Dasher 2002). Subjectification is a type of meaning change in the process of grammaticalization where “meanings tend to come to refer less to objective situations and more to subjective ones (including speaker point of view), less to the described situation and more to the discourse situation” (Traugott 1986: 540). Traugott (1982: 256) notes that the change is unidirectional, typically propositional > textual > expressive, and a change in the reverse direction is very unlikely (Traugott 1989: 31). In this vein, we assume that *inka* is selected to encode the subjective stance of the speaker. Since this stance-marking is highly developed as an integral part of Korean grammar, the decision not to use one constitutes another stance-marking of the speaker.
The strong connection between the ignorance modal marker and politeness has been noted in the previous literature in terms of historical reanalysis. This connection is made based on the idea that polite attenuative forms historically arise from modal markers encoding a speaker’s ignorance to indicate a speaker’s politeness stance (Rhee 2011). Such grammaticalization chains to politeness are given in (21), in which modal markers develop into conjecturals en route (cf. universal path: Bybee et al. 1994) (Rhee 2011: (22)):

(21) Grammaticalization chains of politeness in modal markers:
    ignorance → conjecture → attenuative

By contrast, the grammaticalization of the anti-honorific inka seems to have taken a different route. Whereas an analogous fact holds in anti-honorific inka in the sense that it arises from minimal variation (i.e., a weaker form of indeterminacy) in the beginning, its path leads in the opposite way to the speaker’s negative perspective on the target. The reanalysis of inka that triggered such a change is as follows:

(22) Grammaticalization chains of the anti-honorific inka:
    minimal variation (weaker form of indeterminacy) → unnoteworthiness → weak pejorative

The ignorance modal markers and the anti-honorific inka exhibit a contrast with regard to the direction of historical change: modal markers have developed from an ignorance marker to an attenuative marker, whereas the anti-honorific inka has developed from an anti-specificity marker to a weak negative expressive.

Thus far, we have observed that the disjunctive, anti-specific uses of inka can be treated as a separate lexical item from anti-honorific inka. As a reviewer points out, however, our approach might be reconsidered from the view of Occam (and Grice)’s razor, which says we should not multiply sense beyond necessity. Although it is worthwhile to consider, it is important to note that inka has been grammaticalized from anti-specificity to anti-honofirication. Our fundamental assumption is that there is a pragmatic correlation from a grammaticalization perspective in that the latter is a reflex of the epistemic subject’s perspective. Further, our argument is further supported by empirical evidence to show that they are separate item with sortal restriction on its argument (refer back to (6) vs. (7) and (11) vs. (12)).

3. The meaning of anti-honorific inka
In this section, we first show that the semantic and pragmatic properties of the anti-honorific inka are strongly reminiscent of the core characteristics of Conventional Implicature (CI), and then suggest how its expressive dimension can be represented in the system of CI logic.

3.1. Anti-honorific inka as Conventional Implicature

CI meanings are defined to be non-truth-conditional and speaker-oriented. That is, at-issue meanings contribute to truth-conditional interpretation, but CI meanings are not part of ‘what is

3 The term conventional implicature (CI) in the present work is different from the traditional definition of CI (Grice 1975), but limited to a recently renewed notion that is proposed for a special category classified as “expressives” (Potts 2005). It is important to note, however, that there still are debate and confusion with regard to the notion of
said’. Here Potts (2005) uses ‘at-issue entailment’ as a coverterm for regular asserted content, i.e. Gricean sense of ‘what is said’. Grice’s (1975:44) defines the meaning of ‘what is said’ based on conventional meaning of each word, stating "In some cases, the conventional meaning of the words used will determine what is implicated, besides helping to determine what is said. The meaning of ‘what is said’, however, may have different meanings in philosophy-based work, hence Potts adopts the less confusing term ‘at-issue entailment’ for discussion in linguistic context. As Horn (1991) discusses, however, the term ‘at-issue entailment’ has some hitches also, which does not affect Potts’ proposal. Potts proposes that supplements (e.g., appositives, supplementary relatives, and speaker-oriented adverbs) and expressives (e.g., expressive attributive adjectives, epithets, and honorifics) should be analyzed as CIs, which carry a speaker-oriented attitudinal meaning. Likewise, we suggest that a speaker’s lexical choice of inka is a strategy to elegantly establish her emotive stance. In particular, we assume that a speaker’s manifestation on the lack of epistemic knowledge on the identity—i.e., ignorance—has prompted the original anti-specificity marker inka to develop historically into an anti-honorific marker (as discussed in Section 2.3.4). By employing the epistemic ignorance marker, the speaker reveals an uncaring and disrespectful attitude that triggers the development of the anti-honorific function of inka. In this subsection, we show that the expressive sense of the anti-honorific inka can be understood as conventionalized implicature (CI)—i.e., an utterance modifier exhibiting the core characteristics of CI (Potts 2005: 11):

(23) a. CIs are part of the conventional meaning of words.
   b. CIs are commitments and thus give rise to entailments.
   c. These commitments are made by the speaker of the utterance.
   d. CIs are logically and compositionally independent of what is ‘said.’

First, the expressive content is generally expected to be part of the conventional meaning of the words. As discussed in Section 2.4, the anti-honorific attitude of inka is derived from the original meaning as disjunction, along with other disjunctive-based pejoratives such as na ‘or’ and ttawi ‘(enumerative) ilk’ in Korean.

Second, as entailments, CIs are uncancelable: (Potts 2007b: 28):

(24) Chuck said I could have one of his lovely vases. #But they are all so ugly!

   Likewise, as a CI, the meaning of the anti-honorific inka is not cancelable. In the following example, the negative attitude in inka renders continuation with a conflicting honorific attitude that is infelicitous:

(25) Kim-un  con-inka  {nwukwu/mwue}-inka-hako  sakwi-koiss-e.
     Kim-Top John-INKA_{anti-HON}  who/what-INKA_{anti-HON}-with date-Prog sakwi-koiss -Decl
     #Sasil  con-sensayngnim-kkeyse-nun  acwu  caynthulhan-pwun-i-si-e.
‘Kim is dating with John (I hold in low regard). #In fact, Mr. John (I hold in high regard) is such a gentleman.’

Third, the anti-honorific sense of *inka* is *speaker-oriented* (Cruse 1986, Löbner 2002, Potts 2005). It can project beyond presupposition plugs such as attitude predicates, even if it is embedded under *mit* ‘believe’, hence conflicting with the honorific attitude in the second sentence:

(26) Pil-un nay-ka con-*inka* {nwukwu/mwue}·inka-hako sakwi-koiss-ta-ko
    Bill-Top I-Nom John-INKA_{anti-HON} who/what-INKA_{anti-HON}·with date-Prog-Decl-C
    believe-Past-Decl.
    #haciman con-sensayingnim-kkeyse imi kylehonha-si-ess-ta.
    But John-Hon-Nom.Hon already marry-Subj.Hon-Past-Decl
‘Bill believed that I am dating John (I hold in low regard). #But John (I hold in high regard) is already married.’

Fourth, the meaning of the anti-honorific *inka* is logically and compositionally independent of what is ‘said’. No matter how negative the speaker’s attitude toward the target is, it does not have any effect on the truth-value of the at-issue content.

Furthermore, if the anti-honorific *inka* is indeed a subcase of CIs, it is expected to conform to the following basic assumptions within CI logic:

(27) a. CIs are scopeless (always have widest scope).
    b. CIs result in multidimensional content.
    c. CIs are subject to an anti-backgrounding requirement.
    d. CIs comment upon an at-issue core.

First, the anti-honorific *inka* is *scopeless*, exhibiting nondisplaceability. As shown below, the derogatory flavor of *inka* is not negated by the matrix predicate *sasil-i ani* ‘not true’, despite the fact that it appears to be within its syntactic scope as part of the embedded clause:

    John-INKA_{anti-HON}·Nom call-Past-Decl-Rel-NMLZ-Top fact-Nom Neg-Decl
    ‘It is not true that John (CI I hold in low regard) has called.’

Second, we posit the expressive sense of the anti-honorific *inka* separately from the basic semantics of utterance based on the notion of multidimensionality (Kratzer 1999; Potts 2005), which will be supported by the independence properties discussed in Section 3.2.

Third, a CI with *anti-backgrounding* requirement conveys new information. As shown below, the anti-honorific *inka* in B’s response cannot refer back to the previously introduced anaphoric reference without agreeing with A’s negative stance toward John:

    John-INKA_{anti-HON} what-INKA_{anti-HON}·Nom call-Past-Decl
    ‘John (I hold in low regard) called.’
Finally, as a CI, the attitudinal component of anti-honorific *inka* modifies an utterance—i.e., comments upon what is said, meaning something like ‘Just so you know, I don’t like that person.’

### 3.2 Expressive dimension of *inka*

One of the hallmarks of expressives is their indication that a speaker is in a heightened emotional state: “they can tell us if she is angry or elated, frustrated or at ease, powerful or subordinated” (Potts 2007: 8). Potts calls this property *perspective dependence*, which the derogatory flavor of *inka* clearly exhibits. When a speaker decides to use an emotive element like the anti-honorific *inka*, the pragmatic effect of the utterance becomes more emphatic. The anti-honorific *inka* is chosen in a context where the speaker wants to reveal her emotive stance and, as a stance marker, it is expected to exhibit canonical expressive properties along with other (anti-)honorific markers.

Regular (anti-)honorifics in Japanese, for instance, have been treated as *expressive derivatives* (Potts and Kawahara 2004); a subject honorific marker *o* indicates that the referent of the subject *Yamada* is socially superior to the speaker (Potts 2005: (5.65)):

(30) *Yamada sensei-ga o-warai-ni nat-ta.* [Japanese]

‘Professor Yamada laughed.’

Likewise in Korean, honorific information can be encoded by the verbal suffix *si* in (31a/b) and also by the honorific nominative marker *kkeyse* in (31b/c), both of which mark the speaker’s honorific attitude toward the subject *Kim sensayng* ‘Teacher Kim’ (Kim and Sells 2007: (20)):


‘Teacher Kim has gone.’ [Honorific]

(Context: Teacher Kim is one of my colleagues, and I am being slightly polite to him/her by indicating respect to him/her relative to the hearer.)


‘Teacher Kim (I honor) has gone.’ [Extra Honorific]

(Context: Teacher Kim is one of my colleagues, and I am being more respectful towards him/her in the previous example.)


‘Teacher Kim (I honor) has gone.’ [Honorific]

(Context: This is the most respectful example.)
The use of honorific markers indicates that the speaker recognizes the social superiority of the referent. As illustrated below, the target nay atul ‘my son’ cannot take honorific forms, since ‘my son’ is not considered socially superior to the speaker:

(32) #nay atul-#kkeyse ka-si-ess-ta.
    my son-Nom.Hon go-Subj.Hon-past-Decl
intended: ‘My son (I honor) has gone.’ [Honorific]

Along with these grammatical (anti-)honorific markers, we propose that the anti-honorific evaluative sense of inka can be understood as Conventional Implicature in the sense of Potts (2005, 2007; see also Kim and Sells 2007, McCready 2010, Sawada 2010, Gutzmann 2011, Giannakidou and Yoon 2011, Yoon 2011, 2015, a.o.). Our analysis of the anti-honorific inka as expressive is supported by the following four signature properties of expressives that Potts (2007) originally suggests (adapted from Kang 2015, p. 160):

(33) a. Non-displaceability: Expressives predicate something of the utterance situation.
    b. Independence: Expressive content contributes a dimension of meaning that is separate from the regular descriptive content.
    c. Immediacy: Like performatives, expressives achieve their intended act simply by being uttered; they do not offer content so much as inflict it.
    d. Descriptive ineffability: Speakers are never fully satisfied when they paraphrase expressive content using descriptive, non-expressive terms.

First, nondisplaceability means that the expressive reveals a speaker’s attitude about the context, regardless of the propositional content. In the following example with anti-honorific inka, we can accept the assertion ‘John called’ as truthful without necessarily accepting the speaker’s pejorative characterization of John. Thus the sentence can be continued by Kim’s (the hearer’s) comment with a disagreeing attitude:

(34) Context: Bill was very riled up because he found out that his sister Kim and her boyfriend John broke his laptop. While Kim was in the bathroom, John called for her. Now Kim is asking who called her, and Bill says:
    Con-inka-ka cenhwaha-ess-ta.
    John-INKA_anti-HON-Nom call-Past-Decl
    a. at issue: ‘John has called.’
    b. CI: ‘I hold John in low regard.’
    Kim: ‘OK, thanks for the message (John called), but, since I respect John, don’t call him “John-inka!”’

Second, independence means that an expressive content contributes a meaning that is independent of the regular descriptive content; it is posited in a separate dimension, assuming the multidimensionality of meaning. The following sentence, for instance, asserts ‘John called’ in the descriptive dimension, and it also conveys ‘John is a bastard in the speaker’s opinion’ in the expressive dimension. Likewise, in the above example, the CI of inka ‘I hold John in low regard’ is posited in a separate dimension.
The bastard John called.

The independency property is further supported in that the attitudinal component in inka is objectionable by means of *metalinguistic negation* in (36) or *metalinguistic comparatives* (Giannakidou and Yoon 2011). In this case, only the pragmatic content in the expressive dimension is corrected from the negative to the positive side, while the descriptive content ‘John’ remains intact:

(36)  
ku-nun “John-*inka (nwukwu-inka)*”-ka  ani-la  “John-*ssi*-i-ta!  
he-Top John-INKA*anti-HON* who-INKA*anti-HON-Nom* Neg-Prt  John-Mr.-be-Decl  
‘He is not “John someone or other”; he is “Mr. John”!’

This reveals that the expressive component in inka indeed has the independence property, effective only in another dimension.

Third, *immediacy* means that expressives always tell us something about the utterance situation itself and hence cannot be used to report on past events, attitudes, or emotions (Potts 2007: 5). It is also shown with the anti-honorific inka:

(37)  
*Context:* John feels hatred toward Jack because he has been suspicious that his girlfriend, Jane, had a fling with Jack. John is arguing with Jane over this issue. He gets upset and shouts at Jane:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expressive Use</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cayk-<em>inka</em> mwue-<em>inka</em>-lul cinancwumaley mollay manna-ss-ci?</td>
<td>‘Did you have a tryst with Jack last weekend?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack-INKA<em>anti-HON-Acc</em> last.weekend secretly meet-Past-Q</td>
<td>a. at issue: ‘Did you have a tryst with Jack last weekend?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Well, I actually met him yesterday, and he seemed to be a nice guy.</td>
<td>b. CI: ‘I hold Jack in extremely low regard.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The speaker’s use of *inka* has an immediate impact on the context. Even when the propositional content is about the past, the speaker’s disrespect toward Jack encoded in *inka* is very imminent, hence conflicting with the continuation, for instance, ‘#he seemed to be a nice guy.’

Finally, as an expressive, the anti-honorific *inka* exhibits *ineffability*, which means it is difficult to find any equivalent non-expressive counterpart to convey the precise intended meaning carried by a particular expressive item. As with other typical expressives, the rough translation as ‘I hold Jack in low regard’ or any other paraphrase wouldn’t be able to capture the extremely delicate connotational nuance of what the use of *inka* achieves.

In sum, given the quite consistent parallels between the anti-honorific *inka* and typical expressives, it seems plausible to treat the anti-honorific *inka* in Korean as a subcase of expressive elements. The pragmatic contribution of the anti-honorific *inka* is independent of the at-issue content—i.e., it contributes non-truth-conditional meaning to the sentence. The anti-honorific *inka* thus conventionally implicates a speaker’s negative attitude toward the target (i.e., a referent that is anti-honored), contributing expressive content. The meaning of the anti-honorific *inka* can then be implemented in a separate dimension from the basic semantic at-issue dimension. Given this, we need to answer the following questions: (i) how precisely can the meaning of expressives such as the anti-honorific *inka* be incorporated in semantic composition? and (ii) what kind of CI does an anti-honorific *inka* involve? In the following subsection, after briefly reviewing the basic setup of the logic of Conventional Implicatures (CIs) and previous
theories on (anti-)honorification in Japanese and Korean, we propose an analysis of the anti-
honorific *inka*.

### 3.3. Mode of composition

Regarding the first question of how the meaning of expressives such as the anti-honorific *inka* can be incorporated into semantic composition, we adopt the logic of Conventional Implicatures (CIs) proposed by Potts (2005, 2007). Building on Karttunen and Peter’s (1979) multidimensional theory of CIs, Potts (2005, 2007) provides a novel system of multidimensional compositionality, i.e., the CI logic, by revising their rule-by-rule system into a type-driven translation system (Klein and Sag 1985). The CI logic offers a valuable tool to represent complex meaning that involves distinct dimensions. This means that both regular at-issue content and CI content hold independent truth-values (Potts 2007b: 32):

(38) Lance Armstrong, an Arkansan, has won the 2003 Tour de France!

In this example, since Armstrong is not an Arkansan but a Texan, the CI content is false, but the truth condition of the at-issue content that Armstrong won the 2003 Tour de France remains intact. To incorporate this kind of CI meaning, Potts (2005) provides a type-driven multidimensional compositional system, i.e., a CI application, as shown below:

(39) CI application (Potts 2005: 65):

\[
\begin{align*}
\beta & : \sigma^a \\
\alpha \bullet & : \gamma^c \\
\alpha : <\sigma^a, \gamma^c> & \quad \beta : \sigma^a
\end{align*}
\]

In this figure, \( \alpha \) of type \( <\sigma^a, \gamma^c> \) takes \( \beta \) of type \( \sigma^a \) and returns \( \gamma^c \). The superscript \( c \) stands for a CI type, and the superscript \( a \) stands for an at-issue type. The bullet function \( \bullet \) is defined as a metalogical device that can separate independent lambda expressions in different dimensions. This rule shows how the at-issue content is posited in a separate dimension from the expressive dimension of the adjoined CI operator. The tree-admissibility condition of the CI logic (based on Karttunen and Peters 1979) requires that “a CI meaning always applies to an at-issue meaning to produce a CI meaning” (Potts 2005: 48), which is crucial for capturing the expressive meaning when commenting upon the semantic meaning.

Now, let us turn to the second question: what kind of CI does an anti-honorific *inka* trigger? We find our answer in previous theories on (anti-)honorification in Japanese and Korean. In laying out the basic framework for capturing the meaning of CI, Potts and Kawahara (2004) and Potts (2005, 2007) show how an expressive meaning of honorification in Japanese can be included in the semantic composition: the honorific denotes a two-place relation, the ‘socially superior to’ relation that involves an expressive content. In (40), by using the honorific morpheme \( \sigma- \), realized as a bound morpheme on a nominalized verb, the speaker implies something about the speaker’s relationship to one of the verb’s arguments. This is termed
‘argument honorification’, the meaning of which is considered to be independent of the at-issue content (Potts 2005: (5.68)):

(40) Yamada sensei-ga o-warai-ni nat-a.
    Yamada teacher-Nom Hon-laugh-Dat be
    a. at-issue: laugh(yamada): t^a
    b. CI: honorific(the-speaker)(yamada): t^c
    c. laugh(yamada): t^a

Yamada: e^a  laugh: <e^a, t^a>
•
honorific(Yamada): t^c

honorific: <e^a, t^c>  Yamada: e^a

Potts and Kawahara argue that a target can be also anti-honored by using anti-honorific expressions. In the following example, the speaker’s contempt for the target is expressed by domo (Potts and Kawahara 2004: (7)):

(41) ano sensei-wa [gaki-domo-ga urusai]-koto-o shir-anai.
    that teacher-Top kids-ANTI.Hon-Nom noisy-fact-Acc know-not
    i. ‘That teacher does not know that the kids are (annoyingly) noisy.’
    ii. ‘I don’t like the kids.’

The anti-honorific marker domo is applied to the noun gaki ‘kids’ to dishonor its denotation. Such (anti-)honorific markers in Japanese are analyzed as an emotive component, and the intensity of emotion (positive or negative) is specified as the numerical index within the interval of [-1, 1], which will be discussed in Section 3.4.

Regular meanings include the individual ‘Professor Yamada’ or the set of people who laughed, while expressive meanings have emotive content like ‘the speaker shows contempt for an individual i’. Since the expressive meaning of the anti-honorific inka in Korean seems to be akin to that of such regular (anti-)honorific markers, we assume that the CI of John-inka can be schematized as the following:

(42) [John – inka]
    at-issue: ‘John’: e^a
    CI: anti-honorific(the-speaker)(John): t^c
    John: e^a
    •
    negative-attitude (John): t^c

anti-honorific: < e^a, t^c >  John: e^a
Within this system, we can see how the semantico-pragmatic meanings of John-inka can be represented. What is asserted here is the entity ‘John’ and, by means of the multidimensionality with the bullet function, we can further convey that at the CI level, ‘the speaker holds a negative attitude toward John.’ This means that the precise meaning of John-inka requires an abstract division between the expressive component for ‘negative attitude’ and the referential meaning ‘John’. Then, the expressive component with type \(< e^a, t^c >\) takes ‘John’ with type e^a, and yields a type t^c. The new type t^c indicates the expressive CI type, while the regular type e^a is an at-issue type. The at-issue term ‘John’ furthermore percolates up to the mother node and the part of the argument, and the result of the CI application is passed on to the mother node. With this composition rule, the at-issue dimension can be separated from CI operators like inka.

3.4 The Expressive Index of inka

Expressive meanings can be an output of a functional type. Expressive Indices (EI, henceforth) are the main objects manipulated by expressive denotations as defined below (Potts 2007: (37)):

(43) An expressive index is a triple \(<a I b>, \text{ where } a,b \in D_e \text{ and } I \in [-1, 1].\)

These indices encode the degree as well as the orientation of the emotional attitude, and they are schematized via numerical interval \(I = [-1, 1]\). \(<a I b>\) is read as expressing that an individual \(a\) has an emotional attitude at expressive level \(I\) for an individual \(b\). We thus can map an emotional stance onto the expressive interval, which allows flexibility in marking the gradience of emotion from very neutral (if \(I = [-1, 1]\)) to very negative or positive. That is, emotive relations appear as we narrow down \(I\) to proper subintervals of \([-1, 1]\); the more positive the numbers, the more positive the emotional attitude, and conversely, as in the following example (Potts 2007a: 177-178):

(44) a. if \(< a I = [-1,1] b \rangle\), then \(a\) has no feelings towards \(b\).
   b. if \(< a I = [-1,0] b \rangle\), then \(a\) is somewhat negative towards \(b\).
   c. if \(< a I = [-0.5,1] b \rangle\), then \(a\) feels negative towards \(b\).
   d. if \(< a I = [0.9,1] b \rangle\), then \(a\) is wild about \(b\).

\(<a I b>\) is read as follows: an individual \(a\) is at the expressive level \(I\) towards an individual \(b\) when \(a\) and \(b\) are in the domain of entities (i.e. \(a, b \in D_e\)). \(I\) represents a subinterval of the interval \([-1, 1]\).

Honorifics carry information about context with regard to the social setting of an utterance. Potts and Kawahara (2004) assume a contextual parameter for honorification, \(C_{HON}\), and suggest that the contexts are well-defined only if they have the required honorific information. The following is the main condition of honorific information:

(45) A context is admissible only if \(C_{HON}\) (a subset of \(D_e\)) contains exactly one triple \(aRb\) (from \(D_e\)) for every contextually salient \(b \in D_e\) (Potts and Kawahara 2004: 22).

The triple \(aRb\) exhibits a relation between the speaker \(a\) and the target \(b\). The target \(b\) refers to a contextually salient person from \(D_e\). As \(R\) is defined as a numerical indices, it is a continuous variable. If \(C_{HON}\) contains \(s(0.5, 1)\), this reveals a situation where the speaker \(s\) has a highly deferential attitude toward an individual \(i\). In the domain of expressive meanings \(D_e\), the relation
R is represented as an interval $I$ between -1 and +1. As shown above, [-1, 1] means a neutral attitude; [-1, -0.5] encodes a strongly negative expressive meaning; and [0,1] is a positive expressive meaning. If the context contains $C_{HON}$, this represents a situation where a speaker honors an individual $i$ to a significant degree.

Now let us look at Korean honorifics. (46a) has the meaning component in (46b)

(adapted from Kim and Sells 2007):

    Kim professor-Nom.Hon go-Subj.Hon-past-Decl
    ‘Professor Kim (I honor) has gone.’

b. Expressive meaning is defined for a context $C$ only if $C_{HON}$ contains $s[0.5, 1]i$
   expressive dimension: ‘the speaker is highly deferential to $i$’

Kim and Sells (2007) define the honorific morphemic entry for kkeyse as follows (Kim and Sells 2007: (45)):

(47) kkeyse: $s[0.5, 1]i$, where $i$ is the referent of the N, which is the morphological host of
   kkeyse intuitively: “the speaker is very deferential to $i$"

The expressive index [0.5, 1] indicates a speaker’s heightened emotional state, and the use of kkeyse conveys a highly honorific attitude toward the target.

With this background on the analysis of (anti-)honorifics under the framework of CI (Potts 2005, 2007), we are ready to see how the anti-honorific inka can be understood in line with the argument of anti-honorification, as a vehicle for a speaker-oriented evaluative comment on the target. In earlier sections, we have shown that the lexical choice of the anti-honorific inka is a reflex of the speaker’s emotive stance, which can be represented as the following:

(48) Con-inka-ka cenhwaha-(e)ss-ta.
    John-INKA-Nom call-Past-Decl
    ‘John has called.’
   a. at issue: called(John): $t^a$
   b. CI: anti-honorific(the-speaker)(John): $t^c$
   c. Expressive meaning is defined for a context $C$ only if $C_{HON}$ contains $s[-1, 0]i$ intuitively:
      “the speaker feels negative toward $i$”

Building on Giannakidou and Yoon (2011), we further propose the following EI for the anti-honorific inka and its stronger negative variants, $N$-inka ‘who’-inka and $N$-inka ‘what’-inka:

(49) Expressive indices (EI) of anti-honorific inka series:
   i. The anti-honorific inka and its variants contain expressive indices $<a I e>$, where $a$ is the
      individual anchor, $e$ the referent to which the individual anchor refers to, and $I \subseteq [-1, 0]$.
   ii. The index $I$ is an attitude towards $e$, and the indices range through negative intervals only:
      a. inka: $<e, e>$: An inka combines descriptive content $e$ (the type of entity for the referent)
         and expressive content $e$.
      b. $[inka]$: $\lambda e.e$ (identity function); $c$ is the context
      c. Expressive content of inka in $c$:...
The anti-honorific *inka* contains an expressive index (EI) <a I e>, where a is the individual anchor, e the referent the individual anchor refers to; and I may range between [-1, 0].

d. The expressive index varies among the subtypes of *inka*-series:

- e.g., strongest anti-honorific *con-inka mwue-inka* ‘John someone or what’ with approximately [-1, -0.5],
- strong anti-honorific *con-inka nwukwu-inka* ‘John someone or who’ with [-1, -0.3],
- weak anti-honorific *con-inka* ‘John someone or other’ with [-1,0],

The anti-honorific *inka* ranging over the whole negative interval (e.g., [-1,0]) such as *John-inka* thus appears to be a rather weak degree of contempt toward John, while the anti-honorific *inka* with a narrow negative interval (e.g., [-1. -5]) like *John-inka nwukwu-inka* expresses strong contempt. As such, the lexical entry predicts that the use of the anti-honorific *inka* carries a scalar negative expressive meaning towards the referent of the host noun in another dimension. Note that the variant with ‘lit. John or whatever’ conveys the strongest negative flavor due to the use of ‘whatever’ referring to a person; one with ‘lit. John or whoever’ still seems strongly negative but not as strong, and the use of simple ‘lit. John or’ carries a weaker negative feeling compared to those two wh-variants. Furthermore, it is important to note that a similar negative effect can be achieved by the juxtaposition of *wh-ever* in English (e.g. ‘John or whatever’). This raises the possibility of cross-linguistic tendency, even encompassing languages without an honorific system.

The current proposal on the CI of the anti-honorific *inka* has important theoretical implications. First, by treating the anti-honorific *inka* as another expressive element, the function of *inka* and its wh-variants may be incorporated as part of the grammar, as reflexes of grammaticalization of perspective and subjective mode in the sense of Giannakidou and Yoon (2009, 2011). This implies that we can understand them along the lines of other typical expressives and also recently identified expressive elements such as mood choice (Yoon 2011, 2013) or metalinguistic comparatives (Giannakidou and Yoon 2009, 2011).

4. *Compatibility condition between inka and other expressives*

Given that the meanings of expressives can be captured by the notion of multidimensionality of CI logic (Potts 2005), the current analysis of disjunctive *inka* as an expressive further supports the notion that Korean is equipped with a sophisticated system of simultaneously conveying multiple emotional states of an individual within an utterance. In Section 4, we discuss the compatibility of the anti-honorific *inka* with other kinds of expressives in Korean, entertaining various possible co-occurrence patterns of multiple expressives across lexical categories. Our analysis of the empirical data is based on the *Compatibility Condition Model (CCM)* for multiple expressives (Yoon 2015: Fig.1):
This model represents the co-occurrence patterns of two expressives with different degrees of emotional attitudes. Yoon notes that the attitudes of expressive lexical items exhibit a broad spectrum of emotions from the strongly negative attitude with the Expressive Index (EI; à la Potts 2007): First, a strong negative attitude with [-1,-.5] is represented as the shading of the leftmost slot in the four-squared bar: ; second, a negative attitude is with EI [-1,0] ( ); third, a neutral attitude is with EI [-1,1] ( ); fourth, a positive attitude is with EI [0,1] ( ); and finally, a strongly positive attitude is with EI [.5,1] ( ). The black squares in Figure 1 indicate the high-compatibility areas in which Compatibility Condition Index (CCI; defined below) is 100%; the dark gray squares indicate the mid-compatibility areas whose CCI is calculated to be approximately 50%; the light gray squares are low-compatibility areas where the CCI is 25%; and the white squares are the incompatibility areas due to its CCI of 0%.

Furthermore, given the parallels between the anti-honorific *inka* and other expressives, we adopt Yoon’s simplified Compatibility Condition Index (CCI) to gauge the approximate degree of compatibility between two (or more) expressive elements with different Expressive Indices (EI):

\[
(50) \quad \text{Compatibility Condition Index (CCI)} = \frac{\text{length of overlapped range of narrow Expressive Index (EI)}}{\text{length of broad Expressive Index (EI)}} \times 100(\%)
\]
Yoon’s definition of the degree of compatibility is as follows:

(51) Definition. *degree of compatibility*

Measure of the strength of the interfacial bonding between two or more emotive

By offering the measurement of compatibility, the equation allows us to predict what would be an appropriate EI for each expressive item, or how precisely the strength of each EI affects their compatibility.

4.1. Anti-honorific *inka* and expressive nouns

As Giannakidou and Yoon (GY 2009, 2011) notes, Korean is known for its extensive use of expressive elements for marking the speaker’s subtle emotional attitudes. These expressives are found across sentential categories, including frequently-used nouns, verbs, functional adverbs, case markers, complementizers, and the reflected emotions can be classified into three categories: positive/honorific, neutral, and negative/anti-honorific. For instance, nouns like ‘person’ in Korean display several synonymous variants such as *pwun* ‘person.POS’, *salam* ‘person.NEUT’, and *nom* ‘person.NEG’, which mark the positive (POS), neutral (NEUT), or negative (NEG) attitude of the speaker besides the basic meaning of the word. The speaker’s lexical choice among these variants can thus be understood as a legitimate strategy of subtly delivering their emotional attitude. GY illustrates the point with the following example of multiple noun forms for ‘figure’ in Korean (GY 2011:(67), Yoon 2015:(26)):

(52) a. kunye-nun ✓alumtawun / ✓phyengpemhan / ✓hyungchukhan
    she-Top beautiful / normal / hideous
    cathay-lul tulenayss-ta.
    figure.pos.att-Acc revealed-Decl

b. Kunye-nun ✓alumtawun / ✓phyengpemhan / ✓hyungchukhan
    she-Top beautiful / normal / hideous
    mosup-ul tulenayss-ta.
    figure.neut.att-Acc revealed-Decl

c. Kunye-nun #alumtawun / #phyengpemhan / ✓hyungchukhan
    she-Top beautiful / normal / hideous
    molkol-ul tulenayss-ta.
    figure.neg.att-Acc revealed-Decl

‘She revealed a beautiful/normal/hideous figure.’

In (52a), *cathay* ‘figure’ with a positive attitude is compatible only with positive adjectives like ‘beautiful’ unless it is modified by negative adjectives to intentionally trigger the effects of irony or sarcasm. In (52c), on the other hand, *molkol* ‘figure’ with a negative attitude may co-occur only with inherently negative adjectives like ‘hideous’. In (52b), *mosup* with a neutral attitude does not exhibit any restriction and is compatible with any kind of adjective, whether negative,
neutral, or positive. In this example, we can see at a glance how different expressives impact one another in Korean.4

The anti-honorific inka likewise interacts with the expressive nouns. For one thing, the anti-honorific inka can only co-occur with neutral and negative expressive nouns, exhibiting its negative attitude:

\[(53) \text{Con-} \text{inka}_1 (\text{nwukwu-inka})-\text{ka} \{\text{cathay/\-mosup/\-molkol}\}_2-\text{ul tulenayss-ta.} \]

John-INKA\text{anti-HON who-INKA\text{anti-HON-Nom figure.pos/neut/neg.att-Acc}} \text{revealed-Decl} ‘John (CI I hold in very low regard)_1 revealed a (CI\{positive/neutral/negative\})_2 figure.’

The anti-honorific sense of inka is what renders it incompatible with cathay, the positive option among the emotive variants of the noun ‘figure’.

The co-occurrence restriction is furthermore confirmed when the anti-honorific inka forms a compound noun with the following variants for ‘guy’, which Yoon (2015) analyzes as expressive nouns that convey different degrees of emotional attitude toward the referent: (i) saykki ‘bastard (lit. young of animals)’ is assigned the strong negative expressive index (EI) [-1,-.5]; (ii) nom or casik ‘jerk’ is assigned a weak negative attitude with the EI [-1,0]; (iii) namca ‘man, guy’ has a neutral attitude with the EI [-1,1]; (iv) ssi ‘Mr./Ms.’ has a weak positive attitude with the EI [0,1]; and (v) nim and pwun ‘sir, the honorable’ has a strong positive attitude with the EI [.5,1]. Then, our assumption about the anti-honorific inka and its wh-variants, N-inka ‘who’-inka and N-inka ‘what’-inka, with their differing negative expressive indices (EIs), leads us to predict the following compatibility pattern with the expressive nouns (including epithets) for ‘guy’: According to the CCI, weak negative items may contribute approximately half of the strong negative elements. For instance, in the co-occurrence of the strong negative anti-honorific N-inka ‘what’-inka with [-1,.-5], the EI length of which is 0.5, and nom ‘jerk’ [-1,0], the EI length of which is 1, the CCI is 50%. This indicates mid-compatibility for the interfacial bonding of the two emotive lexical items. As such, the CCI predicts the empirical co-occurrence patterns of expressives. In Table 2, we can immediately see the approximate compatibility condition indices between various emotive nouns and variants of anti-honorific inka:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>anti-honorifics epithets for ‘guy’</th>
<th>N-inka [-1,0]</th>
<th>N-inka ‘who’-inka [-1,.-3]</th>
<th>N-inka ‘what’-inka [-1,.-5]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>saykki ‘bastard’ [-1,.-5]</td>
<td>CCI: 50%</td>
<td>CCI: 63%</td>
<td>CCI: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom, casik ‘jerk’ [-1,0]</td>
<td>CCI: 100%</td>
<td>CCI: 80%</td>
<td>CCI: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>namca ‘man/guy’ [-1,1]</td>
<td>CCI: 50%</td>
<td>CCI: 40%</td>
<td>CCI: 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ssi, sensayng ‘Mr./Ms.’ [0,1]</td>
<td>CCI: 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\)GY proposes a refined version of multidimensionality of conventional implicatures (CI) in the sense of Potts (2005, 2007), showing how it can capture the attitudinal sense that is independent of the semantics of its environment.
According to the Compatibility Condition Model (CCM) in Figure 1, the degree of shading is reflective of their degree of compatibility: (i) the black squares reveal the regions of high compatibility for the combination of (expressive) lexical category 1 and (expressive) lexical category 2; (ii) the dark gray squares are the regions of mid-compatibility; (iii) the light gray squares represent the regions of low compatibility; and (iv) the white squares are the regions of incompatibility. Note that the variants of inka-series reveal a slightly more complex compatibility paradigm than the CCM Yoon (2015) suggested. This compatibility pattern supports our analysis of the anti-honorific N-inka ‘what’-inka as the strongest negative expressive element with [-1,-.5], hence most compatible with the strong negative term saykki ‘bastard’, which has the perfectly matching index of [-1,-.5]; it shows a medium level of compatibility with weak negative terms like nom or casik ‘jerk’ [-1,0]; it reveals low compatibility with the neutral term namca ‘guy’ [-1,1], and incompatibility with strong and weak positive expressive nouns.

The higher the Compatibility Condition Index (CCI), the more natural the combination of multiple expressives. We thus predict that strong negative items like the anti-honorific N-inka ‘what’-inka with [-1,-.5] will be in perfect match with strong negative terms like saykki ‘bastard’ with an identical index of [-1,-.5] (CCI: 100%). The CCI of N-inka ‘what’-inka and weak negative terms like nom or casik ‘jerk’ [-1,0] will be 50%, which means mid-compatibility, still sounding quite natural. With the neutral term namca ‘guy’ [-1,1], any kind of expressive can occur, in which case the combination is tolerable. When it comes to positive emotive terms, however, the anti-honorific inka series exhibits absolute incompatibility. In the following example, only regions with 0% compatibility give rise to oddity (or strong flavor of sarcasm):

(54) Anti-honorific inka with various epithets for ‘guy’
   Con-inka mwue-inka-hanun {/saykki/ nom/ namca/#sensayng/ #kyoswu.nim}
   John-INKAanti-HON what-INKAanti-HON-called bastard/jerk/man/Mr./Professor.Hon
   ‘{That bastard/jerk/man/Mr./Professor} John someone or other’

As a reviewer points out, the deprecative flavor of similar phrases in English like what’s his name can be understood along the lines of Gricean conversational implicature: For instance, when a speaker points at someone at whom he obviously knows well, and referring to him as what’s his name, as in “My brother, what’s his name, over there”, this speaker-distancing can invite further inferences of negativity toward the referent. A similar pragmatic effect in that noun thing in English is discussed in Salmon (2015).

What’s notable about the anti-specific N-inka in Korean, however, is that it, we argue, must have undergone grammaticalization process from such potential for conversational implicature (driven from disjunction or distancing) to lexicalized meaning of conventionalized implicature (inherent depreciation). We tried to make our case by presenting evidence such as fossilization into idiomatic expressions, “N-inka ‘who’-inka” with weak negative attitude in (4) and “N-inka ‘what’-inka” with strong negative attitude in (5). The inherently deprecative flavor in these idioms is conventionalized implicature that holds regardless of context, the offensiveness of which is irrecoverable and uncancellable, as evidenced by their incompatibility with honorific terms like sir or professor as in (54) above.
In sum, the CCI for the anti-honorific *inka* and other expressive items serves a specific requirement imposed on the emotive range of each item. We take this to argue that, just like other typical expressives, we can add the anti-honorific *inka* in Korean as another effective strategy of conveying multilayered meanings. More crucially, the interaction pattern implies that we need to treat expressives as a reflex of the grammaticalization of the attitude holder’s complex attitudinal stance, elegantly incorporating multiple subjective modes into a single utterance.

4.2. Anti-honorific *inka* and expressive case markers

It is widely known that in Korean, structural case markers are part of the honorification system: A honorific attitude is carried by the selection of honorific case markers such as *kkeyse* ‘NOM.Hon’ and *kkey* ‘DAT.Hon’ (Yoon 2005; Lee and Ramsey 2000; Giannakidou and Yoon 2011), whereas an anti-honorific attitude is conveyed by derogatory particles like *ttawi* ‘lit. ilk (enumerative particle)’ attached to any type of case marker (e.g., *ne-ttawi-ka/lul/eykey: you-ANTI.Hon-NOM/ACC/DAT: ‘a worthless person of your ilk’; Yoon 2015). Given Kim and Sells’ (2007) proposal that honorific markers in Korean are a kind of expressive element, the compatibility paradigm between these (anti-)honorific case markers and the anti-honorific *inka* is revealing.

(55) Anti-honorific *inka* with {honorific/neutral/anti-honorific} nominative case markers

John-INKA-Nom.hon/neut/anti.hon call-Past-Decl  
‘John (CI I hold in low regard) I has called.’

b. Con-*inka*-ka {nwukwu/mwe}-inka-{%#kkeyse/ka/✓ttawi.ka} cenhwaha-ess-ta.  
John-INKA-Nom who/what-INKAanti-HON-Nom.hon/neut/anti.hon call-Past-Decl  
‘John someone or other (CI I hold in low regard) I has called.’

The data further confirm our analysis of the anti-honorific *inka* by exhibiting the expected compatibility pattern: first, the inherently negative attitude encoded in the lexicalization of the anti-honorific *inka* is what makes it incompatible with honorific nominative case markers like *kkeyse*; second, *inka* is compatible with neutral case markers like *ka*, which doesn’t have any selectional restriction; and finally, *inka* is perfectly compatible with case markers with negative attitudes like *ttawi.ka*. Although we do not present examples here for reasons of space, it is important to note that the compatibility pattern reveals a precise parallel with (anti-)honorific variants of dative case markers: *kkey* ‘DAT.Hon’, *eykey* ‘DAT.NEUT’, and *ttawi-eykey* ‘DAT.ANTI.Hon’.

The proposed negative emotional indices for *inka*-series are thus strongly supported by the compatibility pattern with another interesting type of expressives, structural case markers, which is summarized below:

| Table 3. Compatibility of the anti-honorific *inka* and case markers |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| case markers                | anti-hon-values | N-*inka* [-1,0] | N-inka ‘who’-*inka* [-1,-.3] | N-*inka* ‘what’-*inka* [-1,-.5] |
| *ttawi-ka* ‘Nom.ANTI.Hon’   | 50%            | 63%            | 100% high compatibility |
The compatibility condition offers an important barometer of how each expressive element would interact with one another, while offering guidance on the appropriate Expressive Index (EI) of each expressive item such as the anti-honorific *inka* and case markers. First, the above paradigm of compatibility is in line with the previous assumption that honorific case markers such as *kkeyse* and *kkey* have an index of narrow positive range \([-1,1]\) between the attitude holder and the subject (Kim and Sells 2007), which explains why these case markers are unsuitable to all variants of the negative anti-honorific *inka*. Second, neutral (i.e., regular) case markers like *ka* and *eykey* with the index of \([-1,1]\) are expected to be compatible (albeit with differing degrees of compatibility) with any kind of expressive, including the anti-honorific *inka*. Finally, the anti-honorific case markers *ttawi-ka* and *ttawi-eykey* are assigned the index of a narrow negative range \([-1,-.5]\); hence, the strong pejorative sense makes it perfectly compatible with the strong anti-honorific *inha*. In sum, the compatibility pattern between the anti-honorific *inka*-series and case markers supports our analysis of *inka*, furthermore suggesting an appropriate approximation of the numerical index of emotional attitude for each expressive element.

### 4.3. Anti-honorific *inka* and expressive verbs

Kim and Sells (2007) analyzed the subject honorific marker *-si* on verbs as expressives with positive attitudes. Observe that *-si* is incompatible with the anti-honorific *inka*:

(56) **Anti-honorific inka with subject honorific verbs**

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Con-} \text{inka}_{1} \{ \text{nwukwu/mwue}\}-\text{inka-ka} \quad \text{tuleo-} \text{si}_{2}-\text{ess-ta}.
\\
\text{John-INKA}_{\text{anti-HON}} \quad \text{who/what-INKA}_{\text{anti-HON-Nom}} \quad \text{enter-Subj.Hon-Pst-Decl}
\\
\text{‘John (C1 I hold in {very/extremely} low regard)$_{1}$ (C1 honorably)$_{2}$ came.’}
\end{array}
\]

This implies that the honorific inflection *-si* is an expressive marker of the strong positive attitude, for which we assume a narrow positive range of \([-1,1]\).

On the other hand, the emotional attitude of the anti-honorific *inka* can be tested with verbal expressives with negative attitudes. Negative verbal inflections like *V-peli* in Korean express a speaker’s negative attitude toward the propositional content because the conventional meaning of *peli* emphasizes the completion of an action or state, and hence alludes to irrecoverability (Joe and Lee 2002, Choe 2004, Yoon 2015; Constant et al. 2009 for Japanese equivalent *chimau*). The negative attitude in verbal morphology renders it most natural with the anti-honorific *inka*:

(57) **Anti-honorific inka with negative verbs**

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Con-} \text{inka}_{1} \{ \text{nwukwu/mwue}\}-\text{inka-ka} \quad \text{tuleoa.} \text{peli}_{2}-\text{ess-ta}.
\end{array}
\]
This is predicted from the negative indices of the anti-honorific *inka*-series, which mainly overlap with the narrow negative index of the verbal inflection *peli*. The compatibility pattern so far is summarized as the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(anti-)honorific verbal markers</th>
<th>anti-honorics</th>
<th>$N$-<em>inka</em> [-1,0]</th>
<th>$N$-<em>inka</em> ‘who’-<em>inka</em> [-1, -0.3]</th>
<th>$N$-<em>inka</em> ‘what’-<em>inka</em> [-1, -0.5]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>-peli</em> ‘NEG.ATT’ [-1, -0.5]</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>100% high compatibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ ‘NEU.ATT’ [-1, 1]</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25% low compatibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>-si</em> ‘SUBJ.Hon’ [.5, 1]</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>incompatibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4. Anti-honorific *inka* and expressive intensifiers

As McCready and Schwager (2009) discuss the negative expressivity of emphatic adverbs like *zenzen* ‘totally’ in Japanese, a pejorative attitude can be marked by productive intensificational verbal prefixes to verbs such as *chye*-V or *phe*-V ‘V hard/intensively’ in Korean (Yoon 2015). In this sense, intensification seems to be a universal strategy of expressing negative emotion. The meaning of the anti-honorific *inka* can be tested with these intensified verbs:

(58) **Anti-honorific inka with intensified verbs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anti-honorific inka with intensified verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Con-<em>inka</em>₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John-<em>INKA</em>ₐnti-<em>HON</em> who/what-<em>INKA</em>ₐnti-<em>HON</em>-Nom <em>intens.prefix.neg</em>-enter-Pst-Decl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘John (<em>CI</em> I hold in low regard)₁ (<em>CI</em> resentfully)₂ invaded the fields.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, there are verbs with positive attitudes such as *V-cwu* ‘do it favorably’ or *V-cwu*-*si* ‘do it favorably by an honorable subject’, which gives rise to an oddity:

(59) **Anti-honorific inka with positive verbs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anti-honorific inka with positive verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#Con-<em>inka</em>₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John-<em>INKA</em>ₐnti-<em>HON</em> who/what-<em>INKA</em>ₐnti-<em>HON</em>-Nom <em>enter-favorably-Subj.Hon</em>-Pst-Decl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘John (<em>CI</em> I hold in low regard)₁ (<em>CI</em> hold in high regard)₃ (<em>CI</em> favorably)₂ came in.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to its strong anti-honorific sense, *$N$-inka* ‘what’-*inka* reveals a perfect match with negative intensifiers with the index ranging within the narrow negative interval [-1, -0.5], while sounding odd with the positive verbal suffix *cwu* or the subject honorific verbal suffix *si* with the positive index [.5, 1]. The co-occurrence pattern so far is summarized as follows:

| Table 5. Compatibility of anti-honorific *inka* and various verbal markers |
In exploring the compatibility patterns of the anti-honorific nika-series and other expressive grammatical components in Korean, we have achieved a more accurate characterization of the anti-honorific nika-series as strong-to-weak negative expressive items. We have furthermore shown that Yoon’s (2015) compatibility condition offers a solid testing ground for assessing to what extent the co-occurrence of multiple expressives can be constrained by grammar. The dynamic interaction paradigm between expressive elements offers an important insight into the question of how expressives are mapped onto different morphological units in Korean, and how they function in the semantic-pragmatic derivation.

Building on previous works on Korean expressives such as Kim and Sells (2007), GY (2011), and more recently Yoon (2015), we suggest that the anti-honorific nika is an expressive element—i.e., a kind of utterance modifier that adds an attitude holder’s comment on the semantic core. We further argue that the anti-honorific nika behaves along with typical CI triggers such as damn and bastard in English (Potts 2005, 2007), appositives (Potts 2005), honorifics in Japanese (Potts 2005; Potts and Kawahara 2004) and Korean (Kim and Sells 2007), ‘even’ in Greek (GY 2011), and metalinguistic comparative particles in Greek and Korean (GY 2011).

4.5. Compatibility condition for anti-honorific nika

Thus far we have examined the compatibility condition with various types of expressives, showing how precisely the negative emotional attitude in the anti-honorific nika impacts that of other expressive elements within the sentence. For one thing, the expressive component of the anti-honorific nika actively communicates with that of other elements. Furthermore, the degree of strength between nika and other expressives doesn’t necessarily have to perfectly match, but in order to be compatible, there must be a sufficient conjoint region between the EIs of two expressives. The compatibility pattern is shown to follow the compatibility condition suggested by Yoon (2015), assuming that the polarity (negative or positive axis) of expressives must match one another within an utterance, while the intensity (e.g., weak or strong negativity) at the expressive level doesn’t have to match precisely.

Regarding the pragmatic impact of multiple occurrences of expressives, Yoon 2015 raises the question of whether multiple markings of expressives should be understood as attitude agreement without significant strengthening, or as a cumulative effect with significant systematic strengthening. If the latter, the dual marking is expected to give rise to approximately doubly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verbal markers</th>
<th>anti-honorifics</th>
<th>N-inka [-1,0]</th>
<th>N-inka ‘who’-inka [-1,-.3]</th>
<th>N-inka ‘what’-inka [-1,-.5]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-peli ‘NEG.ATT’</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>100% high compatibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chye- ‘intensely’ [-1,.5]</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25% low compatibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ ‘NEU.ATT’ [-1,1]</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25% low compatibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-si ‘SUBJ.Hon’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-cwu ‘favorably’ [.5,1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
emphatic negative effects, triple marking would induce three times stronger effects, and so on. Just like the interaction between ethnic slurs and other expressive markers discussed in Yoon, the anti-honorific *inka* seems to display analogous strengthening effects. In the following example with five expressive elements, the combined effects of the anti-honorific *inka* and four other negative expressives give rise to an extremely, say, five times stronger derogatory or disrespectful attitude:

(60)  Con-inka-mwue-*inka*₁-hanun saykki₂-ttawika₃
      John-INKA₁-anti-HON-what-INKA₂-anti-HON.neg.att-called guy.neg.att-Nom.anti.hon
      chye₄-tulewapeli₅-ess-ta.
      intens.neg.att-enter.neg.att-Pst-Decl
      ‘The (CI dishonorable)₁ person called John, the (CI dishonorable)₂ (CI bastard)₂, (CI
discreditably)₄ (CI regrettably)₅ invaded the fields.’

Before we close our discussion on the *compatibility condition*, however, it is important to note that there are cases where such a combination of contrasting information on the speaker’s attitude appears. The compatibility condition is observed under normal circumstances, but in practice, it is often *intentionally flouted* as a speaker’s strategy to deliver additional pragmatic effects of *sarcasm*, *irony*, or *hyperbole*. Yoon (2015:(42)) notes that the seemingly mismatching combinations of strong derogatory racial slurs like *ppalkayngi* ‘commie (North Korean)’ and high honorific forms are in fact often employed for their sarcastic flavor:

(61)  a. Ppalkayngi-pwun: 6490 hits on Google search (June 27, 2014)
      commie.neg.att-sir.Hon

      b. Ppalkayngi-nim: 32,700 hits on Google search (June 27, 2014)
      commie.neg.att-sir.Hon
      ‘The (CI dishonorable) commie, the (CI honorable) being.’

Yoon (2015:(43)) illustrates the point with another commonly used expression for an emphatic version of ‘mind your own business!’, which has the flavor of mocking the addressee for their situation being not so great either:

(62)  Ne-na cal-ha sey-yo!
      you.anti.Hon-or.anti.Hon well-do subj.anti.Hon-Decl.Hon
      ‘Mind your own (CI bloody) business!’ (Yoon 2015:(43))

These special cases of juxtapositions of opposite attitudes are typically uttered in a sarcastic tone of voice. Noting “such deliberate flouting of the Compatibility Condition is one of the speaker’s strategies to passive-aggressively project a scornful attitude toward the target racial group or individual”, Yoon suggests that these pragmatic effects are achieved in the regions of total incompatibility with the Compatibility Condition Index (CCI) of 0%, as marked by the dotted squares:
Figure 2. Sarcasm/irony regions in Compatibility Condition Model (CCM) for multiple expressives (Yoon 2015: Fig.2)

The figure displays a dual nature of the incompatibility regions, that is, in the Compatibility Condition Model (CCM) for multiple expressives, the white dotted squares are originally assigned as the regions of incompatibility between two lexical items with the Compatibility Condition Index (CCI) of 0%. The picture, however, is not that simple: an interesting result of the mismatch of elements with opposite attitudes is that it gives rise to stronger pragmatic effects such as sarcasm, irony, or hyperbole, which are achieved in these incompatibility regions. Given this, we need to revisit our earlier example with the anti-honorific inka and honorific markers:

(63)  

Kim kyoswu-inka  (nwukwu/mwues)-inka-kkeyse  ka-si-ess-ta.  
Kim professor-INKA_{anti-HON}  who/what-INKA_{anti-HON-Nom.Hon}  go-Hon-Past-Decl  
c.  at issue: ‘Professor Kim has gone.’  
d.  CI: ‘I hold Professor Kim in high regard.’  
c.  CI: ‘I hold Professor Kim in low regard.’  
        (triggered by honorifics:, kkeyse, si)  
        (triggered by anti-honorifics: inka)

In the above discussion, we assumed this sentence to be infelicitous due to the conflicting attitudes. If it is uttered in a sarcastic tone of voice, however, the opposing emotions between the honorific attitude of kkeyse and si and the anti-honorific attitude of inka bring about the speaker’s sarcastic attitude toward the target, Professor Kim, conveying something like ‘that self-important jerk Professor Kim has gone his “honorable” way!’
5. Conclusion
We have investigated the non-truth-conditional meaning of the disjunction-driven anti-specificity marker inka. First, our discussion starts from the puzzle that the anti-specificity marker inka can be associated with rigid designators such as proper nouns (e.g., John-inka), while its attachability to a specific referent is unexpected given previous accounts of inka (Choi 2011; Kang 2015, 2017, a.o.), the felicity condition of which states that the domain of referentially vague items like wh-inka should not be a singleton set with a fixed value; then, the referential vagueness presupposition cannot be satisfied with a proper name. To resolve this puzzle, we have distinguished two types, anti-specific inka vs. anti-honorific inka, showing that whereas the anti-specific inka contributes the semantic content of referential vagueness, the anti-honorific inka makes only a pragmatic contribution as a reflex of the grammaticalization of the attitude holder’s subjective perspective. We have shown that the hallmark properties of the anti-honorific inka can be characterized in terms of fixed identity, combination with RVIs, anti-honorific information, mitigation, and its subjectification process. As such, we have established the conceptual link of anti-specificity (in referentially vague items) and negative expressivity (in anti-honorification) in natural language.

Second, we have shown that this particular use of the anti-honorific inka is pragmatically accommodated by the anti-honorific connotational nuance that is independent of the at-issue content. In particular, we have proposed that this derogatory sense triggered by inka is Conventional Implicature expressing a speaker’s negative attitude toward the target. This implies that the emotional attitude reflected in the anti-honorific inka exists in another dimension—i.e., the expressive level—and the precise emotional indices for the anti-honorific inka and its wh-variants are suggested with regard to strength and polarity of the attitude. The CI status of the anti-honorific inka has been furthermore supported by the discussion of hallmarks of CI. We have thus proposed the pragmatics and semantics of what we termed the anti-honorific inka in Korean as a novel subcase of expressive elements.

Finally, we have examined how the anti-honorific inka fits into the previous assumption regarding the dynamic paradigm of multiple expressives, the Compatibility Condition Model (CCM), and the Compatibility Condition Index (CCI) (Yoon 2015). The compatibility paradigms for the co-occurrences of the anti-honorific inka and other expressives have revealed how multiple expressive elements actively interact with one another, and how the emotive index of each expressive item plays a role in determining the degree of compatibility. Given the parallels with typical expressives discussed in the literature, we have suggested adding the anti-honorific inka to the category of expressives in Korean as a speaker’s strategy of elegantly conveying multifaceted meanings. This means that the anti-honorific inka-series can be understood as a reflex of the grammaticalization of the attitude holder’s complex attitudinal stance, incorporating multiple subjective modes into a single utterance.

Theoretical implications of the current study include the following: (i) the conceptual connection from anti-specificity to anti-honorification is established; (ii) the thorough investigation of the expressive meanings and their interaction patterns with other various expressive elements in language allows us to see the systematicity of expressives as part of our grammar; and (iii) by identifying another important case of expressive element in language, our analysis of the anti-honorific inka supports the notion of multidimensionality (Potts 2005 et seq.).
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