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Abstract

This study is an examination of a corpus of computer mediated Korean discourse (i.e., e-mail), based on a folk-cultural category, *nunch’i*. *Nunch’i* is actively involved in linguistic feature use in terms of [+age] and [+distance] of human relationships. Many Koreans think that the world has an inherent hierarchy according to age. This idea has been reflected through *nunch’i*, a culture-specific system for maintaining harmonious social relationships especially between [+age] and [–age] people. *Nunch’i* has a function of foresight, in that it is part of the way that people read the situations and the faces of addressers and addressees. Like oral and written language, Korean e-mail discourse shows that when a younger writer communicates with an older recipient, s/he perceives *nunch’i* and then uses grammatical and lexical forms to communicate deference. The experiment was based on one occasion and three different social relationships, and between one sender and three different receivers. Fifteen Korean participants were asked to send three e-mails: to a senior professor, an equal aged close friend, and a younger aged close friend. Results of the experiment in e-mail language use show that there is a normative honorific system between [+age] and [–age]. However, the results of the experiment did not completely overlap with the findings in the application, which involved real-life e-mail data. The application shows that the normative honorific system can be modified by the level of [+distance] relationship between the addresser and the addressee. Thus, if a younger addresser does not perceive the pressure of *nunch’i* in a close relationship with an older recipient, the younger addresser does not change his or her language forms honorifically. Therefore, the results of this study argue that Koreans vary their Korean language use in systematic but not always traditional ways.
Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 The Research Questions

Studies of computer-mediated discourse constitute a relatively new field, and e-mail is one of the venues that have been actively studied only in recent years (Bjørge, 2007; Graham, 2007; Hatipoğlu, 2007; Chen, 2006). E-mail discourse is expressed in written form according to the nature of spoken language, so it can be a good source for researchers to study cultural features in language. Indeed, researchers (Bjørge, 2007; Chen, 2006) have found important cultural factors in language and language use in studies of e-mail discourse. This study focuses on the discussion of lexical and grammatical features of Korean language use in a corpus of e-mails written in Korean with the following research questions: (1) Is Korean nunch’i culture connected to the use of Korean language based on [+age] complex in Korean e-mail discourse? (2) Do the results of the current experiment support the assumption that Korean nunch’i cultural behavior and the usage of Korean honorifics are significantly related to each other according to [+age] difference? (3) Is the assumption still supported by application to the real-life data in this study?

1.2 Language and Culture

Culture exists in a close relationship with language, in that culture helps the users of a language govern and define the conditions and circumstances under which various messages may or may not be sent, noticed, or interpreted; indeed, cultural patterns and customs are sometimes explicitly encoded in a language. Communication can be difficult when conversationalists do not share the same knowledge of the subtle rules governing conversation. Nonnative speakers often fail in using a foreign language because they do not recognize the target culture reflected in the linguistic patterns of the language typically used by native speakers.
Kaplan (1966) claims that neither logic nor rhetoric is universal because rhetorical logic is culturally constructed. Rhetoric varies from culture to culture and over time within a given culture. According to Kaplan’s analysis, the oriental (Asian) writer is likely to circle around a subject, showing it from a variety of tangential views, but not looking at it directly. For that reason, Japanese or Korean speakers prefer to go around and around a point, which can be frustrating to U.S. speakers of English with their preference for getting to the point quickly. The English rhetorical style is just as frustrating to East Asians, such as Korean and Japanese, who do not understand why Americans have to be so “logical” all the time (Harris, 1986). Kaplan’s claim (1966) is that all English writers have a linear rhetorical structure, and that all other languages such as Romance, Russian, Semitic, and Oriental have digression in their rhetorical structure. Bander (1983) supports Kaplan, claiming that differences exist because each culture has its own special way of thinking. In specific application to English as Second Language (ESL) learners, he advises that in order to write well in English, a student should first understand how English speakers usually arrange their ideas. Bander (1983) calls this arrangement of ideas a thought pattern, which can be relatively different among people in different cultures (p. 5).

However, there is a pitfall that we need to be careful to avoid in discussion of cultural phenomena. Kaplan’s over-generalization does not acknowledge the complexities of the relationship between culture and language. Brody (2003) states that the ways that language represents culture and culture is manifested through language involve the nature of the relationship between language and culture as mutual reflection and influence. She criticizes Kaplan’s oversimplification of cultural notions. Brody (2003) claims that the term culture, specifically from the anthropological perspective, involves at least two different concepts of culture: 1) “Culture,” which is the greatly appraised products of “Civilization,” and 2) a specific culture which is related to a particular group of people and their way of life, as in the Korean
culture. As Boas (1911) argued, it is important to acknowledge that references to particular
cultures tend to assume homogeneity of the target culture and often take a superficial form. Each
culture must be understood on its own terms, without imposing upon it the values and structures
of other cultures or bias from the culture of the observer. Therefore, during this comparative
analysis of discourses in different groups, it is crucial for the observer not to be involved with the
participants, but to stand outside of the interaction of the members of different groups and to
provide an analysis of how the participants negotiate their cultural differences embedded in their
language.

This study will discuss the relationship between Korean cultural and linguistic
phenomena as shown in a computer mediated discourse, e-mail, where primarily spoken forms of
language are used to accomplish conversational communication in the absence of direct physical
and contextual signs such as facial expressions or gestures. E-mail discourse provides a good
data source to see both written and spoken cultural behaviors at the same time (Bjørge, 2007). E-
mail discourse is engaged in by a great number of users in a huge worldwide network (Crystal,
2005, 2001, 1997). Examining e-mail discourse within the scope of different linguistic and
cultural traditions provides a means to explore communication patterns that demonstrate diverse
cultural thought patterns and linguistic patterns in use.

Cultural differences in verbal communication can reveal intercultural miscommunication
or cultural incommensurability. Cultural disparity is not just a problem of one or two words in a
spoken or written conversation. It can extend to a sentence, a paragraph, or even an entire text, in
terms of being reflected in the ways of language use and behavior of interlocutors. When
speakers are unaware of cultural differences, communication can break down due to different
uses of language in intercultural or cross-cultural communication. Although there is no
widespread agreement on the terms *intercultural* and *cross-cultural*, we take *intercultural*
communication to signal the focus on distinct cultural or other groups in interaction with each other (Scollon, 2001).

1.3 Korean in Comparison with English

In the examination of the distinctive cultural behaviors of Korean language users, the present study brings out Koreans’ folk-cultural category, *nunch’i*, which I argue is a key to Korean culture, encoded in Korean language and reflected in Korean’s use of language. *Nunch ’i* is literally “eye measure” in that *num-* means “eye” and *-chi* means “measure”. *Nunch ’i* can be defined as a pragmatic tool in Koreans’ use of language that is often used towards a [+power] person by a [−power] person. It is interesting that this study has found that the *nunch ’i* mechanism is closely related to [+age] complex. For example, English speakers also consider the hearers’ age in their conversation, but these considerations are very differently demonstrated in their grammar and lexicon from those of Korean speakers. Koreans show grammatical and lexical change in their language use according to different [+age] recipients, considering [+age] as social power among the interlocutors, in more highly nuanced ways than available to English speakers. Thus, although Korean *nunch ’i* is used in verbal communication across various social relationships, the present study focuses specifically on the relation between *nunch ’i* and [+age] differences among Korean interlocutors. Using *nunch ’i*, Koreans need to find proper linguistic forms of expression according to the age-related social statuses of their interlocutors. Therefore, when they use the chosen forms, the cultural values behind those forms are revealed.

1.4 HC/LC and Confucian Social Hierarchy

According to Hall (1976, 1983), Korean culture represents collectivism and high-context (HC) cultural communication behavior, and American culture represents individualism and low-context (LC) cultural communication behavior. For Koreans, information is either in the physical context or internalized in the person, while very little is in the coded, explicit, transmitted part of
the message. Hall (1983) calls this particular tendency HC communication. Unlike Koreans, many of Americans show LC communication, which has a tendency to convey mass information vested in the explicit code.

Anderson (2003) claims that HC cultures are generally more collectivistic and less individualistic than LC cultures. People in collectivistic cultures are likely to live together as a large family unit or tribe, whereas people in individualistic cultures tend to live alone or in smaller groups such as the nuclear family. Group decisions are not as important as personal judgments in the U.S., while the opposite is true in Korea. Specifically, Korean collectivism has been nurtured by Confucianism - the teaching of Confucius, who stressed the importance of social harmony through hierarchical social relationships. For that reason, Korean juniors are encouraged to be good listeners to their seniors rather than good communicative speakers. When the junior interlocutor does speak to the senior, the speech that the junior uses should contain honorifics which linguistically encode Koreans’ socio-cultural structures.

For more than 2000 years after Confucius’ teaching, many Koreans have continued to believe that their social world is hierarchical; this belief constitutes an important aspect of their culture which is reflected in their language. Korean language encodes social structure through honorifics, and Koreans habitually use honorific expressions reflecting their habitual thoughts about social power, especially relative “age”. Koreans are very conscious of the age hierarchy of interlocutors. In organizations such as the army, schools, businesses, and even professional sports teams, Koreans are likely to make clear the order among soldiers, students, players and employees according to age. The person who joins a group earlier, called seonbae (senior), is usually older than the person who joins the group later, called hubae (junior). If there is a hubae who is older than a seonbae, a very uncomfortable relationship in the group can ensue. Therefore, in many Korean companies and schools, the age factor is considered very strongly before hiring
a new person. Among Koreans, even one year difference means a gap in hierarchy among school students. At the same time, among a homogenous age groups, there is a strong bond of camaraderie – these groups are called them **dongkee**, which means “same order” or “same rank.” They often lower their level of **nunch’i** to each other. But towards **seonbae** of one or two years, they have to show a great level of deference with many [+nunch’i] features.

The concepts of **Seonbae** and **Hubae** are semantically and culturally different from the concept of Senior and Junior in the U.S. **Seonbae** prototypically refers to a schoolmate ahead in years, or a co-worker in the company or in society who has more experience. However, the difference of a year or even a month’s seniority can be huge in the **Seonbae** and **Hubae** relationship in Korea, which may be incomprehensible to Americans who do not habitually categorize people using their age, but rather focus on abilities. Also, once a man becomes a **seonbae** to others, this relationship lasts to the end of their lives in Korea. In short, Koreans have a habitual tendency to clarify relative rank in relation to **seon-hubae** or age among interlocutors as well as among the people they talk about.

It is interesting that the tendency to divide people according to age to find the hierarchical social order is fundamental to Korean expression. For example, Korean has all the following expressions from 1) to 4) below.

1) a. George W. Bush is the forty third President of the United States of America.
   b. Chochidubliubushinun mikukuy 43ddae
      George W. Bush-NOM the United States of America-PPar the forty third
daetongryungida.
president-be-RE

2) a.*How **many-th** president of the United States of America is George W. Bush?
   b. Chochidubliubushinun mikukuy *myut-ddae*
      George W. Bush-NOM the United Sates of America-PPar *how-manyth*
daetongryungini?
      President-be-RE?

3) a. George is the first son of the former American President, George H.W. Bush.
b. Chochinun chun mikuk daetongryung chochieichibushuy
   Geoge-NOM the former America president George H. Bush-PPar
   chut-chae ardulida.
   the first son-be-RE.

4) a. *How many-th son is George W. Bush among the children of the former American
   President, George H.W. Bush?
   b. Chochidubliubushnun chun mikuk daetongryung chochieichibushuy
   George W. Bush-NOM the former America president George H. Bush-PPar
   charyudulchung myut-chae ardulini?
   Children-among how-manyth son-be-RE?

Among them, 2) and 4) are commonly used in Korean conversation to determine a
hierarchical seon-hubae or older-younger relationship. In Korean, even among brothers, there is
a hierarchical relationship. In the English meaning of the words “brothers” or “sisters,” there is
no connotation of hierarchy according to age, whereas the Korean words hyungchey (brothers)
or charmae (sisters) clearly divide their hierarchical relationship as older brother and younger
brother and older sister and younger sister respectively. hyung- means an older brother and -chey
means a younger brother, just as char- means an older sister and -mae means a younger sister. It
is always important for Koreans to know first who is older among interlocutors or people
discussed in a topic. The appropriate linguistic forms must be chosen according to the hierarchy.
On the other hand, it is not so important to know who is older among siblings in English
speaking culture. English speakers do not encode “age” of interlocutors or people, unless age is
itself a topic of conversation.

Because of this cultural and linguistic difference, it is difficult to translate Koreans’ ideas
of ordinal sequential human hierarchical status into English. Korean-English translators often
paraphrase those expressions when a Korean speaker asks questions like 2) and 4). The
paraphrased expressions can go like this: “How many presidents preceded George W. Bush in
the United States of America?” or “Where does George rank in the children of the former
American President, George H.W. Bush, in terms of age?” However, such paraphrasing does not
convey the exact meaning of the Korean *myut-chae* or *myut-ddae* (*how or what many-th*), which is related to the ordinal sequential status of an entity, which is considered more important in Korean than in English.

**1.5 Honorifics**

This entrenched, hierarchical social relationship is reflected in Korean linguistic patterns that feature a complex honorific system that reinforces a normative type of politeness – a sort of a socio-cultural indexing. Gumperz (1996) argues that uses of specific linguistic forms in conversation serve as “contextualization cues” to the presuppositions and ideologies that are inherent in any conversation exchange. Korean normative politeness can be expressed with grammatically and lexically encoded forms, honorifics, which are lexico-grammatical patterns that encode relations between the speaker and the addressed recipient. The Korean term for honorifics is *chondaemal* (words of honorable treatment), while non-honorific or plain forms of expression are called *banmal* (half-talk) in Korean.

One articulation of the age-graded culture that honors elders involves pronoun usage. As Oh (2007) claims, Koreans use Zero anaphora (more specifically the omission of “I” or “you”), which refers to a morphologically unrealized form of reference because Zero anaphora is an unmarked referential option, especially for references to people (Chang, 1978). However, the anaphora cannot be completely zero in e-mail discourses because e-mail communication is written and therefore carries less contextual background than face-to-face speech in which Korean interlocutors can easily retrieve the missing personal pronouns from the context of the situation. In e-mail discourse, appropriate linguistic forms are chosen and expressed according to the various levels or ranges of social status among the interlocutors. Because of the relative social hierarchy between the speaker and the recipient, there is more than one pronominal term for the speaker and the addressed recipient in Korean (Oh, 2007; Sohn, 2001).
1.6. Pronouns and Avoidance of Second Person Pronoun

Korean personal pronouns encode traditional Korean social hierarchy. For example, there are two different first person pronouns in Korean: *cher/chey* and *nah*. Both of them mean “I” in English, but the former is to be used by a younger person to an older person to be polite. The latter is mostly used by an older person to a younger person. However, the latter case is a little bit more complicated than the former because it can also be used among equal-aged interlocutors and by a younger person to an older person in a close relationship or a younger person to an enemy in an extremely distant relationship. It is assumed that along with [+power] relationship, [+distance] relationship may be related to use of *nunch‘i* in the use of (dis)honorifics in that in [−distance] relationship or in extreme [+distance], the younger speakers may opt out of *nunch‘i* and instead use the plain form of the first person pronoun, *nah* (I). Although the notion of the Korean [+distance] relationship is too delicate and complicated to describe in a single word, the concept behind is akin to the brotherhood/sisterhood relationship. When Koreans have [−distance] relationship with non-family members, they perceive and build up brotherhood or sisterhood relationships with non-family members who were in [+distance] relationship before they become closer. Once they are in a [−distance] relationship, Koreans have a tendency to allow the [−distance] opponent to use the first person pronoun *nah* (I) regardless of their social power, as will be discussed in detail in chapter 3.

Korean second-person pronominal forms are more complicated than the first-person forms. For example, *erusin* (an elder) can be used to address an elderly person, while *nuh* (you) can be used plainly to a much younger person. There are four second person pronouns (e.g. *nuh/ney, dangshin, chaney*, and *chaki*), but none of them are used in addressing an elder. The address form, *erusin* (elder), is not originally a pronoun but a noun, although it is now used as a pronoun. One of the salient features of Korean second-person pronouns is that there is no
appropriate pronominal form for a recipient who is older than the speaker. In such cases, pronouns are frequently replaced by other Noun Phrases (nominal substitutes) such as kinship terms, including *samchon* (uncle), *halmuhni* (grandmother), and *ahburchi* (father), or professional titles such as *seonsaeng-nim* (honorable teacher), *sachang-nim* (honorable company boss), and *koyswu-nim* (honorable professor). Therefore, speakers of Korean must be very careful in using honorifics so as not to be rude, especially to any elders or older hearers; many Koreans use such honorifics very habitually or automatically.

Korean honorifics also include a set of hierarchical address-reference terms which should be sensitively chosen and used according to differences in age and/or social status between the speaker and the addressed recipients and/or referents, as seen in 5) where only seven levels are demonstrated out of 10 levels (which will be discussed later). To address a professor or a father honorably, Koreans have to call him *kyoswunim* (honorable professor) or *ahburnim* (honorable father). These terms comprise the general title *kyoswu* (professor) or kinship term *ahburgi* (father) + the highest honorific title, *-nim*, which means honorable. A lower honorific for a teacher is *seonsaeng* (teacher) and, for a father, *ahburgi* (father); these eliminate the highest honorific title *-nim*. Surname *Lee* + Professional title like *parksa* (Ph.D) is a less exalted honorific expression than the previous expressions. In this case, the speaker may be an older person than the recipient or around the same age as the addressee. Stepping down to the next level of honorific address is the use of a person’s full name *Hyunwook Kim* + the second-level honorific title *-ssi* (Mr.–although even the English honorific titles, Mr./Mrs./Ms., are not hierarchical, indicating instead gender roles and marital status). Below this is Surname *Kim* + the third-level honorific title *kwun* or *yang*, for which there is no obvious English equivalent. Less honoring still is Surname *Kim* + Given name *Hyunwook*. The least honoring expression is Given name *Hyunwook* + plain vocative particle *-a/ya*, which does not have an English counterpart.
Speakers must select among these hierarchical expressions, taking into consideration the age and social status of both the speaker and the recipient. As seen in 5) below, when the level of honor goes up, the apparent age or social power of the speaker, as reflected in language, goes down. According to the speaker’s choice, the recipient can engage the same habitual system to determine whether he or she has been honored or dishonored by the speaker, regardless of the speakers’ real thoughts.

5) Korean hierarchical address-reference terms based on the relation of speaker/writer to addressed recipient

Level 1: General/Kinship Title + the highest honorific title -nim
Ex) kyoswunim (an honorable professor) and ahburnim (an honorable father)

Level 2: General/Kinship Title
Ex) seonsaeng (teacher) and ahburgi (father)

Level 3: Surname + Professional title
Ex) Surname Lee + Professional title like parksa (Ph.D)

Level 4: Full name + the second-level honorific title
Ex) Full name Hyunwook Kim + the second-level honorific title -ssi (Mr.)

Level 5: Surname + the third-level honorific title
Ex) Surname Kim+ the third-level honorific title kwun or yang

Level 6: Surname + Given name
Ex) Surname Kim+ Given name Hyunwook.

Level 7: Given name + plain vocative particle
Ex) Given name Hyunwook + plain vocative particle -al/ya

The two main bodies of Korean honorifics consist of addressee honorifics (the perspective of the speaker/writer toward the addressee) and referent honorifics (the perspective
of the speaker/writer toward the referent). Addressee honorifics are usually marked in the address term and predicate suffixes. Referent honorifics can be divided into subject, object, and oblique features such as dative, locative, goal, and source honorifics. The nominals that function grammatically as subject, object, and oblique can have deferential forms that generate deferential predicates. Korean has various speech levels of subject and addressee honorification in relation to the predicates. The representative speech levels are “plain,” “intimate,” “polite,” and “deferential,” arranged from the lowest to the highest level of the addressee or subject honorification.

For example, the verb *murkda* (eat or have) is a plain predicate appropriately directed toward a younger recipient, which should be changed into the corresponding deferential predicate like *chapsw-usi-pni-da* toward an older recipient. It is interesting that many Koreans habitually add the honorific suffixes *(u)si* and *(p)ni* into the deferential predicate *chapswusda*, which does not require any affixes because the verb itself already has honor meaning. But through inserting the suffixes *(u)si* and/or *(p)ni* the verb can indicate even greater respect toward a subject or an addressee. Thus, these honorific suffixes *(u)si* and *(p)ni* are powerful. Any plain verb can be made deferential by inserting honorific suffixes associated with the addressee or the subject that the speaker wants to honor.

Like number agreement in English, Korean has honorific agreement which is a system of using the honorific suffixes *(u)si* and/or *(p)ni* in relation to their triggers (Sohn, 2001). For example, as in 6) below, these suffixes must be attached to the predicate if the subject or addressee of the predicate is a person who deserves the speaker’s deference. This is illustrated through the subject *ahburnim* (father) and the addressee *kyoswu-nim* (professor) in 6) - when these persons are honored by the speaker, the suffixes *(u)si* and *(su)pni* should be inserted in the plain predicate form, *chapswuda* (eat or have) without omission:
Unlike the subject honorific suffix -(u)si, the addressee honorific suffix -(su)pni- can be replaced by a polite form of predicate like chapswuseyyo where -(su)pni- is somewhat reshaped into sey. Concurrently, the ender of the sentence is transformed into a deferential form like -usipnida in 6) from the plain predicate ender form -da.

When a speaker of Korean uses honorific markers in his/her speech to a recipient who is older than the speaker, the speaker shows honor to the recipient by honorific. Thus, Korean speakers habitually and unconsciously use these honorifics with the assumption that all people in the world share the same ideas. Although the honorific system is complex, Korean speakers and recipients are accustomed to automatically considering aspects such as relative [+age] and/or [+power]. The one exception to this rule hinges on the intimate [+distance] among interlocutors. The assumption that the degree of nunch’i level may be reduced in [−distance] relationships will be discussed in detail in chapter 3. Even if Korean speakers know information such as the ordinal sequential status of age, they will allow a speaker to use plain forms of predicates if the level of intimacy is high enough. However, even in the situation of close human relations, Korean speakers are conscious of properly using addressee honorification such as addressee titles, even when they drop the deferential forms of predicates. Otherwise, it can be considered rude toward an older recipient even in a close relationship. When an older recipient does not hear the level of honorific expression that s/he expects, there can be a conflict with a younger speaker because the older recipient perceives, through nunch’i, that s/he is not respected by the younger speaker. It is often very serious.

However, elder Korean speakers/hearers are not always free to use honorifics, especially in [−distance] relationships where even older speakers are not likely to use non-honorific
expressions to younger, grown-up recipients. As the relationship becomes closer, they lower their nunch’i levels and honorific levels toward their younger recipients. They may ask the younger hearers whether they can lower the level of deference, saying “mal nahnchuedo dogetnunka? or mal nachueodo doenah?” (May I lower the words?). Or when the younger speakers/hearers perceive nunch’i from the older speakers/hearers, they also may ask the older speakers/hearers to lower their level of honorifics to help them be free of nunch’i pressure, sometimes revealing their real age toward the older speakers/hearers.

Thus, given the cultural relations cultivated within a collectivist social background, Koreans, especially younger persons, have developed a peculiar communication style. Along with the culturally proper expression of honorifics in their lexico-grammatical use, Koreans also take care to use polite rhetoric, building “shared context,” rather than speaking their main points directly, as has become the typical behavior of high context cultural communication. The assumption of this study is that the phenomenon of cultural language behavior may appear in Korean e-mails, too, especially if the topic is unpleasant to the receivers. Specifically, this tendency or pattern of indirect communication has generated a unique Korean communication culture called “nunch’i”. Koreans often give (or use) and receive (or perceive and see) nunch’i among interlocutors. In Koreans’ speaking and writing habits, we can see nunch’i behavior that is implicit, non-verbal, and non-directive – that features, in other words, unique expressions of politeness in linguistic and rhetorical structures not found in English of which culture does not emphasize hierarchical communication under [+nunch’i] pressure according to [+age] of interlocutors.

Consequently, this study will show that Korean nunch’i, a folk-cultural category, indicates Koreans’ thoughts about age as reflected in Koreans’ linguistic features in terms of [+age] relationship, which may or may not be found in those of speakers of other languages.
1.7 The Tasks of This Study

This present study consists of two main tasks, experiment and application, to build the argument that Korean nunch’i and Korean language use affect each other in a close relationship. For this study, Korean e-mails will be analyzed based on two collected e-mail corpuses that were written in Korean and in English among Koreans. The first corpus of 45 e-mails was collected through a Discourse Completion Test (DCT) from 15 Korean native speakers based on three different situations. Situation #1 was to write an e-mail to an older person. Situation #2 was to write an email to an equal aged person, and Situation #3 was to write an e-mail to a younger person. The main target of the experiment was to examine how language use in e-mail discourse changes according to each differently-aged person. The results of the three different sets of e-mails are compared with each other, with the initial assumption that there would be clear differences in language use.

This study will not discuss gender difference, although it is interesting that this study did not find much difference between females and males in terms of use of honorifics in e-mail discourse. Korean males are still influenced by the hierarchical socio-cultural environment even in modern days. In some ways they are in more strict hierarchical social systems than ever, due to compulsory military service and the hierarchical atmosphere of Korean companies. In contrast, the lives of females take place in a less hierarchical social atmosphere, due to both exemption from compulsory military service and the development of a democratic political system that supports the rights of females in society. This socio-cultural environment may have made Korean females less involved in nunch’i than before the days of compulsory military service and the democratic political system, which started around the 1950’s. Based on Confucianism, the social status of the female had been substantially lower than that of males in Korea. But with the
change of social systems, Korean women are in a transitional period, at least in terms of language use.

Crucially, the experiment was based on imagined situations and people. These e-mails were not actual correspondence. The assumption was that if there were two different aged persons who corresponded through sending and receiving e-mails, those e-mails should show clear different use of language. For example, the result of situation #1, in which a writer sends an e-mail to a senior professor, should be an example of a maximum nunch’i case. The result of sending e-mails to an equal-aged person should be neutral nunch’i case. The result of sending e-mails to a younger-aged person should be the minimum nunch’i case. The second task of this study was to apply the results of the experiment to real-life e-mail data as a calibration standard. This task was to examine various nunch’i levels in real life e-mail correspondence among various aged groups of Korean people. We would see how Koreans actually negotiate their e-mails when dealing with different aged people in their daily life. This study assumed that there would be clear differences in use of language based on [+age] between younger Korean e-mailers and older Korean e-mailers.

In conclusion, this study is based on the interdependent relationship between culture and language as reflected in the different uses of language among Korean [+age] groups of people. Therefore, the present study will contain four interrelated but distinct chapters. Chapter 2 presents discussion of Korean culture as reflected in Korean language use. It also features a more detailed description of the grammar of honorifics, focusing on the function of Korean nunch’i culture in honorific usage, as well as an introduction to computer mediated discourse. Chapter 3 will discuss research methods and present analysis of the data from the experiment and its application to real-life data. Chapter 4 features discussion of the research findings and concluding remarks.
Chapter 2. Korean Language and Culture

2.1. Language and Culture

Regarding the relationship between language and culture, Gumperz and Levinson (1996) argue that each culture fosters its own, unique pattern-system of a language. Sherzer (1987) has paid attention to language use in the analysis of discourse that is rooted in social and cultural contexts. He views culture as symbolic behavior and language as something both social and cultural because it is used in actual social and cultural contexts. He claims that cultural behavior is typically manifested in or shared by groups of individuals.

I view culture as symbolic behavior, patterned organizations of, perceptions of, and beliefs about the world in symbolic terms...Language is both cultural and social...Language includes grammar, but goes beyond grammar...Individuals feel about their language as it is used in actual social and cultural contexts. This takes us to discourse....Optional grammatical categories...reflect a different way of expressing meaning from “our” ways, and perhaps, a different unconscious patterning of thought and provide speakers with conscious or unconscious decisions, choices, ways of expressing meaning, which, I would say, are actualized in discourse (Sherzer, 1987, p.295-297).

As Hymes (1972 &1974) stated, there are further differences in patterns of usage when we compare diverse linguistic communities. Hanks (1996) claims that some conversational meanings arise through pragmatic processes, such as Gricean implicature, “contextualized” inference and illocutionary acts, while others involve indexicals, discourse structure, pragmatic presupposition and so on. One common way of describing context dependency is to say that literal meanings are overlaid in speech by contextual factors. An utterance can convey much more pragmatically-derived information than is literally encoded in its semantic structure because utterances are made up of semantics and context. Thus, we can assume that there can be a difference between those meanings encoded in the language, and those derived from context.
outside it. If so, then we can cautiously assume that semantic structure is part of grammar, and grammar is a conventional system organized by its own inner logic.

Clark (1996) focuses on convention in relation to habitual language use. Without shared knowledge of the lexicon, communication can break down even within a speech community. Furthermore, even if speakers share the same lexical meanings, if the words are not conventionally organized or arranged, this also may lead to failure of conversation. In other words, there should be collaboration between speakers and addressees. Clark (1996) gives us the following example:

Anne: that wasn’t the guy I met was it—
Burton: *u:m*
Anne: *when we* saw the building—
Burton: saw it where—
Anne: When I went over to Chet*wynd road*
Burton: *yes-* (p.329).

Clark (1996) explains this. When Anne produced “that wasn’t the guy I met was it” she was presenting a referent for Burton to consider. Both of them realized that her presentation was not enough by itself to establish what she meant. Burton indicated as much by hesitating and saying “u:m” instead of giving an answer. That led Anne to expand on her reference with “when we saw the building”. When Burton indicated that he still did not understand, by asking “saw it where,” Anne expanded once more with “when I went over to Chetwynd Road”. Only then did Burton believe he understood, as he implied by going on to answer her original question “yes”.

Here, Clark (1996) argues that meaning is often not established in one utterance, but over time in many conversations. Also, meaning is created jointly by participants establishing commonalities of thought. What speakers mean can be narrower than what they say. The man Anne was referring to was not uniquely specified by the phrase “the guy I met.” She depended on Burton narrowing in on the right man through the very process of grounding the referent. Therefore, both speakers and addressees must take the extra step and ground what is said in order
to establish that the addressees have understood, well enough for the current purpose, what the speakers meant.

Clearly, the importance of building common ground between speakers and addressees is very high, especially in intercultural communication. Interlocutors need to share mutual knowledge, beliefs, and assumptions to achieve successful communication. Interlocutors can be seen as a diverse set of cultural groups, systems, or networks that Clark (1996) calls “cultural communities” (p. 332). Within each community, there are facts, beliefs, and assumptions that every member believes almost everyone in that community takes for granted, including syntax, semantics, phonology, word meanings, idioms, and even politeness formulas. This communal common ground is obviously similar to the concept of convention.

According to Lewis (2002), all languages are conventional signaling systems. English, for example, is a system of signaling conventions such as this: *dog* can be used to denote the domesticated canine mammal. Likewise, when speakers of a certain language speak a sentence in their speech community, they must use the language in a certain way. The members of the speech community must give to utterances the interpretations which are assigned to them by the language. There can be no communication without commonalities of thought. Meanings, however, can be relative to contexts, and contexts can be relative to shared networks or communities. To put the matter in another way: differences in the use of language imply differences in meaning or interpretation, especially in the case of conversational analysts’ approach to the sequential organization of speech exchange.

Slobin (2003&1996) has argued that human beings encounter the contents of the mind in a special way when they are being accessed for use. That is, he claims that there is a process of “thinking for speaking” in which human cognition plays a key role within the framework of linguistic expression. According to him, through the activity of thinking, one fits one’s thoughts
into available linguistic forms, even in a momentary time frame of constructing utterances in discourse. Interlocutors conceptualize certain events and readily encode what they conceptualize into the language that they use. Therefore, using a particular language may lead the users to think of particular conceptual characteristics. Although Slobin’s main focus is on cognition and language, he also argues that communication is embedded in culture, and much of culture is carried by language. This is because acts of communication always take place in a cultural context, and cultural practices are part of the processes that include thinking and speaking. He assumes that use of a language, as a whole, may invoke the cultural norms and practices in which it is embedded.

Gumperz (1996) notes that cultural knowledge is acquired, specifying that “culture is the term to refer to locally specific, taken-for-granted, knowledge of background information and verbal forms, acquired through communicative collaboration with others in and outside of home environments” (p.402). Discourse and conversation have their own forms of organization, established in part by what Gumperz calls contextualization cues that distinguish them from random strings of sentences or clauses. Such cues include verbal signs and culturally specific background knowledge. According to Gumperz, established communicative conventions foster a sense of group identity and belonging, even though group boundaries tend to change rapidly and to be somewhat vague. Thus, communication is not just a question of translating ideas into lexically and grammatically meaningful utterances. Interlocutors must think about what to say as well as about how and when to say it in a particular context.

In addition, when we participate in intercultural communication, we can see different behavior patterns that affect writing or speaking. Koreans’ writing shows that they have a strong preference for conveying information indirectly (Harris, 1986). Kaplan (1966) states that logic
stems from particular cultures; it is not universal, but varies from culture to culture; hence, language and culture are inseparably connected.

Culture helps govern and define the conditions and circumstances under which various messages may or may not be sent, noticed, or interpreted. Your entire repertoire of communicative behaviors depends largely on the culture in which you have been raised. Remember, you are not born knowing how to dress, what toys to play with, what to eat, which gods to worship, or how to spend your money and your time. Culture is both teacher and textbook…It is the foundation of communication, and when cultures are diverse, communication practices may be different (Samovar & Porter, 2003, p. 7).

In the present study, we understand that when a Korean speaker uses the Korean language, s/he articulates distinctive cultural understandings. This study can be understood to be about the relationship between language and socio-cultural life. That is to say, the argument will show how use of language can yield interpretive strategies that depend on cultural transmission of different meaning systems (Gumperz, 1996). Although there are marked differences among languages in speakers’ pragmatic or expressive qualities, by no means has it been obvious how to approach the study of these differences in a systematic way that allows us to center on the cultural development of a specialized communicative mode. Even though there is a growing body of research on language use, there has been little systematic evaluation in terms of the pragmatic study of Korean e-mail discourse. In the present study, my detailed analysis of Korean language structure and the cultural factors (obligatory categories) that inform its use in e-mail contexts will provide grounding for comparison with the English e-mails by Koreans.

2.2 Korean Culture in Comparison with American Culture

Korean culture has strictly fostered the spirit of “age before beauty”. Even before Koreans received Confucius’s teaching 2500 years ago from China, they had developed the spirit of politeness towards older persons. Indeed, Korea has been called the most polite country in the east (dong-bang-yeui-chikuk 東方禮儀之國), after Convhin (孔斌), one of Confucius’ great-
grandsons, called it so in his book “東夷烈傳” (Dong-ui-youl-chun) 2300 years ago. For many years, Koreans have built up an extended family and kinship system in the context of a traditional agricultural society in which dwelling together is necessary to build up a collectivist culture. Their long-term cultural behaviors and norms have affected and appeared in their linguistic patterns which are different from those of English. The Korean language is not communicable without using the linguistic forms of politeness, called honorifics, which are deeply embedded in Korean language. This section provides a comparison of Korean and U.S. languages and cultures.

Edward T. Hall (1983) differentiated and classified various cultures, in the process finding a particular form of communication among many English-speaking Americans that is much different from that of people in Korea. According to him, the European form of communication comes from a Low-context (LC) cultural background, while the Asian way comes from a High-context (HC) cultural background. Hall (1983) notes that those people who have the LC tendency may assume that much of what they think and mean cannot go without verbal expression. However, many people who live in the HC culture may reduce extra verbal expression in their communication because of an extensive information network among families, friends, coworkers, and clients, who keep each other informed to build up necessary contexts. Hall lists examples of HC cultures: France, Spain, Italy, the Middle East, Japan, and Korea. According to Hall, the examples of LC cultures are Americans and northern Europeans such as Germans, Swiss, and Scandinavians. Thus, Hall explains that in intercultural communication, many German people would seek detailed, explicit information, while some Japanese or Koreans would be likely to feel uneasy if they were being too direct.

Anderson (2003) also claims one clear difference in communication behavior between HC culture and LC culture: HC encourages implicit and non-verbal communication and LC
prefers to use explicit and verbal communication. HC communication is likely either to be informed by the physical context or internalized in the person, while very little is in the coded, explicit, transmitted parts of the message. There is a strong emphasis on nonverbal codes because information is integrated from the environment, the context, the situation, and non-verbal cues that give the message meaning unavailable in the explicit verbal utterance (Anderson, 2003; Hall, 1976). On the other hand, LC messages are mostly communicated via explicit code, usually via verbal communication. LC messages must be detailed, unmistakable, and highly specific. Americans often complain that the Japanese never get to the point, but they fail to recognize that HC culture must provide a context and setting and let the point evolve (Hall, 1983). Therefore, HC culture does not value verbal communication the same way that LC cultures do. Elliot et al. (1982) found that more verbal people are perceived as more attractive in the U.S., but less verbal people are perceived as more attractive in Korea, where verbal communication and other explicit codes are less prevalent than in the U.S.

HC is strong in collectivist cultures such as Korea, while LC is dominant in individualistic cultures such as the U.S. Generally speaking, Korean culture is based on collectivism while American culture is supported by individualism. Similarly, people from individualistic cultures are more remote and distant proximally. Collectivistic cultures are interdependent: as a result, the members work, play, live, and sleep in proximity to one another. Individualists are responsible for their relationships and their own happiness, whereas collectively oriented people regard compliance with norms as a primary value, and personal or interpersonal happiness as a secondary value (Anderson, 2003).

H. Douglas Brown (2000) describes a comparison and contrast of individualism and collectivism. According to Brown,

…individualist cultures assume that any person looks primarily after his/her own interest and the interest of his/her immediate family (husband, wife, and children).
Collectivist cultures assume that any person through birth and possible later events belongs to one or more tight “in-groups,” from which s/he cannot detach him/herself. The “in-group” (whether extended family, clan, or organization) protects the interest of its members, but in turn expects their permanent loyalty, which can establish relatively high context communication system with others. So, a collectivist society is tightly integrated in its social network; an individualist society is loosely integrated (p. 190).

For this reason, the communication style of collectivist cultures has developed differently from that of the individualist communication style. People in collectivist cultures are likely to distinguish in-group members from out-group members through their use of language. Specifically, in use of pronouns or by naming practices, they show that they treat in-group [-distance] members as family members and out-group [+distance] members as non-family members. Korean people prefer “we” over “I.” A Korean woman always refers to her family members as “our husband” (oori nampyon in Korean), “our mother,” “our father” and so on. In English, you can’t imagine saying, “our husband.” To the Korean, “our mother” means a connection to home, family, and all that is related. In English, “our father” is rarely heard except in the Lord’s Prayer. Moreover, like the Japanese culture, Korean collectivist culture has fostered an elder-centered communication system with very strict ways of using honorific expressions. This is very different from the American English communication system where all interlocutors are linguistic equals regardless of age difference.

Jeanne E. Martinelli (1998) points out different attitudes in the classroom between American and Korean students. She draws on her teaching experience in a California high school where many students were resistant to authority and skeptical about new information delivered by their teacher. She remembers, however, that Korean students seemed to be (by American standards) passive and almost too ready to believe and obey their teacher who has [+age], considering age a social power. Holtgraves and Yang (1992) also claim that Korean students show a peculiar tendency to give more conscious or unconscious consideration to interpersonal
features of politeness than North American students do. Koreans articulate low consideration for their own face, but give higher concern for the other’s face. This reflects the collectivist culture that nurtures a greater degree of conformity than individualist cultures. In America, people see uniqueness as desirable, whereas in Korea it is often seen as deviant; in America conformity is sometimes seen as undesirable, but in Korea it is seen as harmony (Triandis, 2000, p. 21).

Furthermore, Triandis (2000) notes the following example: “Content analyses of advertisements from the United States and Korea show different frequencies of uniqueness and conformity themes. Conformity themes were used by 95% of the Korean and 65% of the American advertisements; uniqueness themes were used by 89% of the American and 49% of the Korean advertisements” (p. 21).

Against the backdrop of non-verbal communication habits in HC cultural environments, along with different usage of expressions according to ages and in-group/out-group differentiation, Korean has developed a unique form of communication. It is nunch’i—literally “measure of the eye” which is used to size up age and/or power, such as the educational, social, and professional positions of interlocutors. Through nunch’i, Korean speakers manage social relationships with addressees and choose whether they have to use an honorific expression, the pronoun “you,” or proper names. In this way, nunch’i can be used and understood reciprocally among Korean addressers and addressees. Therefore, Korean students’ outward politeness and obedience do not necessarily reflect lack of thought, but carry a cultural message that they expect will be recognized or perceived by their teachers or other addressees through nunch’i. Koreans do not judge the message as deceptive so long as the cultural message carried by nunch’i is interpretable and appropriate to a situation (Kim & Levine, 2007). In short, this distinguishing Korean behavior tells us that collectivist culture is embedded in nunch’i.
Furthermore, Korean collectivist society is Confucian-based. Koreans are educated according to Confucian philosophy. The main point of Confucianism is for social harmony to build an ideal state through people’s ethical conduct, such as filial piety, allegiance to the king, and honor to the master because, according to Confucius, “king,” “master,” and “father” are one body. This teaching greatly influences Korean relationships between older and younger (or senior and junior) people. Koreans know consciously or unconsciously that the younger should humbly listen to and learn from the older. Even Buddhists and Christians in Korea emphasize the harmony that comes from piety and obedience as key virtues in their religions. As a result, this Confucian-based collectivism has built up present-day Korean society such that patriarchal authority and hierarchical human relationships are emphasized everywhere.

Hierarchical social relationships further complicate Korean communicative culture. In a group conversation or even in dialogue between two persons, there is a hidden hierarchy. Whenever Korean people meet and talk with others, they perform an initial survey to learn who is older than the other, asking the following questions: “What grade are you in? How old are you? What year did you get into college?” Then the older one usually has hegemony over the dialogue. When Koreans have a social problem, they solve it following the opinion of the older persons. In doing so, younger people usually avoid conflict or disagreement with older people because this may spoil social harmony. Although being passive listeners seems to be disadvantageous to younger people, in reality, they can benefit from this system because after the older people finish talking, they often pay for food, drink, or tea in a restaurant or a pub. In short, Koreans are very interdependent.

Unlike Koreans, after 20, many Americans view themselves as equal to one another based on a “you-and-I” relationship; hierarchically, not many people are willing to be beneath others. This system could be viewed as more egalitarian than that of Korea. No one has more
power to speak than anyone else, even between two differently-aged persons. When Americans have a social problem, they solve it together, sometimes arguing and debating about how to solve the problem regardless of age differences. After conversations, the older person does not usually pay for food, drink or tea in a restaurant or a pub. Instead, younger and older people pay respectively for their own portions. This reflects the American characteristic of independence.

In school in Korea, learners know that their positions are lower than that of the teacher (master), so they should not contradict the teacher in class. Individual students will only speak up in class when called upon personally by the teacher. On the other hand, individual American students will speak up in class in response to a general invitation by the teacher (Brown, 2000). Because of their hierarchically-based dialogue system, some Koreans believe that direct verbal expressions are much more aggressive than indirect non-verbal expressions, especially when a younger person disagrees with an older person. Therefore, Koreans have developed nonverbal behaviors, concomitantly discouraging verbal exchanges between the younger and the older. For example, in the junior-senior relationship, juniors are not likely to express their disagreement directly to seniors, and they avoid using the word *no* because it seems rude.

Furthermore, if a younger person dares to argue or debate with an older person, then the older one will feel that s/he is losing face because the hierarchical social structure is being overturned. This is the reason why Koreans consider losing face one of the most tragic events in their social lives. On the contrary, loss of face to an American is not that serious: the younger person often argues with the older person, and the older occasionally accepts the suggestions of the younger. The older person does not usually think of it as a tragic event or a loss of face. So the concept of loss of face by an American must be clearly distinguished from loss of *cheemyoun* (face) by a Korean. The Korean term has a much more serious meaning than that of the American words. It means also that Korean people are very sensitive to others’ views (Kim,
That is why, in the Korean cultural environment, people are encouraged to save both the faces of the younger and the older persons.

Specifically, the nunch’i mechanism is closely related to Koreans’ way of building up a harmonious society or nation. To keep harmonious human relationships, the younger person needs to show honor to the older person in his/her use of language through honorifics. Koreans do not often directly express honor or respect towards an older person in words; instead, the lexicons and grammars that a younger speaker uses reveal his/her honor and respect towards the older person. The older person can also notice the degree of the younger person’s honoring or dishonoring of him/her through nunch’i. As previously stated, it is necessary for interlocutors to be able to size up a conversational situation in order to use appropriate honorification in human relations. This “foresight” is a considerate behavior accomplished by reading a situation or the interlocutor’s face in advance in order to know the proper honorific form for any specific social interaction.

For example: when a Korean e-mails to request something to [+age] person, s/he may cautiously use the function of foresight followed by appropriate honorification in the use of language, especially in senior-junior dyads. Accordingly, a seonbae (senior) uses informal-impolite language (banmal in Korean) to his or her hubae (junior), including the second person pronoun “you,” when the seonbae has judged it safe to do so through foresight; whereas a junior often uses polite-formal language to a senior for the same reason. Thus, Koreans are encouraged to have a quick sense of nunch’i in their social interactions. In most cases of unequal status, individuals have to use nunch’i to read the minds of others, to manipulate the situation and escape any negative repercussions. To Koreans, nunch’i is a tactic for gathering data, a means to analyze that data, and a means of keeping one’s own secrets (Choi, 1980).
In this way, *nunch’i* is a mechanism that is a critical variable in the maintenance of harmonious social relationships in Korea, especially in Koreans’ traditional *seonbae-hubae* relationships. Its function is not only involved in the speakers’ behavior, but also in the hearers’ behavior, to read minds, motives, or facial expressions. More figuratively, *nunch’i* could be translated as “eye sense or playing things of eyes” that helps to determine what an opponent’s inner thoughts are (Robinson, 1996, p. 129). According to Song (1971) and Kang (1972), *nunch’i* can have both positive and negative aspects. Through false foresight, a speaker can overuse honorifics. Similarly, sometimes, through failure in foresight, a hearer can be disappointed by the speaker’s insufficient use of honorifics.

Among the positive cases of *nunch’i* in relation to foresight, a Korean mother predicts misbehavior by a child and praises the child for good behavior before the child has a chance to misbehave (Choi, 1980). Sometimes, an American husband is surprised at his Korean wife’s unexpected behavior; what he wants or needs is often provided before even asking. To a younger person, if an older person often uses honorifics in their first meeting, it can work to create a warm and friendly atmosphere among people of unequal status.

But there is also a negative side of *nunch’i*. For example, foresight can often frustrate non-Koreans. When a Korean visits an American friend to ask to borrow some money, the Korean friend is likely to spend time talking about other topics for about one hour before requesting to borrow money. This time is not useless among Koreans, because it builds up both fellowship and a context in which s/he can give a hint about the reason for the visit. However, the American friend, who might not foresee or recognize why the Korean friend came to him, might try to close the conversation. Finally, the Korean friend likely will ask for the money. Actually, in many cases, Koreans are reluctant to hurt anyone’s feelings with the truth as long as they can preserve harmony as well as face. When Koreans are offered food, they like to decline...
the first or even the second offer of food, even if they are hungry, which can confuse American
friends. Robinson (1996) provides another example:

One American teacher tells us about Korean students’ idiosyncratic behaviors as follows.
….They make an appointment, but when they arrive for what was supposed to be
an important decision or argument, the student talks of trivialities and leaves
before coming to the point. The teacher may wonder what happened: with nunch ’i,
the student foresaw that it was not a good time to raise an important issue. (p.130)

Therefore, in the individualist’s view, nunch ’i may look silly. This anecdote shows that, in terms
of intercultural communication, Koreans are different from Americans, who are more direct and
to the point.

Under the Confucius-based collectivist society, Korea has been molded into a different
shape from many Western countries, and specifically the U.S. As a form of social
communicative interaction, negotiation often involves direct confrontation in America, but
Koreans usually carry it out indirectly through third parties, often people who are older than the
parties involved. Many Korean parents advise their children just before they go to school in the
morning, saying “Listen carefully to your teacher!” They do not often encourage their children
by saying “Ask your teacher a question!” like American parents. Listening to the teacher is the
most important attitude for Korean students. In the case of speaking, they are educated to be as
polite as they possibly can, including in their honorific use of language toward their teachers.
American ways of requesting may be seen as an aggressive or undesirable speech acts in many
Koreans’ eyes.

Written communication also demonstrates such differences. Harris (1986) states that
English-speaking readers will expect transition statements to be provided by the writer so that
they can piece together the threads of the writer’s logic. In Japanese or Korean discourse, such
contextualization cues may be absent or attenuated because it is the reader’s responsibility to
determine relationships between any one part of an essay and the essay as a whole. Transition
statements do exist in Japanese and Korean, but they require a more active role on the reader’s part.

Consequently, even though modern day media systems have made correspondence nearly instantaneous in spite of geographical distances, it should still be expected that different cultural behaviors in language use will exist in e-mail discourses. This study assumes that mechanisms of nunch’i would be reflected in e-mail discourse, although e-mail is a text-based communication system which is therefore different from face-to-face communication. If e-mail communication is habitually used in people’s lives, traces of nunch’i would be expected in Korean e-mail discourses. Koreans are culturally educated to avoid social conflict with others, especially with [+age] persons. I seek to show that nunch’i influences Koreans’ language use in e-mail correspondence. First, I will describe the nunch’i mechanism of the Korean honorific system that is normatively used with various linguistic forms from lexical patterns to syntactic patterns. I will specifically examine linguistic features in use in terms of [+age] as [+power] source in Korean society. Then I will discuss how Koreans use these normative linguistic forms in real-life situations, assuming that [+age] complex may be affected by [+distance] speaker-recipient relationship.

2.3. Korean Language and the Structure of Honorifics

One difference between the Korean language and Western languages is that Korean has a complex system of honorifics. The honorific words are called chondaemal or kyungeo, which mean words of honorable or deferential treatment. The opposite meaning is banmal which literally means half-talk or incomplete words. Korean honorifics have been constructed grammatically in a systematic way, reflecting Koreans’ style of discernment in that they automatically observe honorifics as a socio-cultural agreement or rule in a manner that may not be found in other socio-cultural environments (Hill et. al., 1986). Wang (1984) claims that,
although honorifics are a significant and integral part of the grammatical system, they also play an important role in socio-cultural interaction because honorific usage is closely related to social networks and cultural values. In his study of Korean rural people’s cultural convention of honorific usage, he found that there are conventionally expected or ascribed sociolinguistic rules of honorific speech which function alongside the ideal pattern of honorific usage that is shared by most competent speakers in the speech community. He points out that the individual speaker strategically manipulates his/her knowledge of sociolinguistic norms and may even violate the normative sociolinguistic conventions for social purposes.

Among the early researchers of politeness/deference in linguistic systems, Brown and Gilman’s (1960) investigation of second person pronoun usage in French, German, and Italian in relation to society and language has been influential. According to two social dimensions - power and solidarity - more powerful individuals use tu (T) and receive, in return, the deferential form vous (V) from less powerful individuals in French; the same for the German du (T) and Sie (V). Between people with equal power, the more powerful people use V mutually, the less powerful people use T reciprocally. Power is derived from a variety of sources such as age, social class, sex, wealth, or institutional role. Through their investigation of those two second person pronouns, Brown and Gilman conclude that T comes to have a common definition as “the pronoun of either condescension or intimacy,” and V is defined as “the pronoun of reverence or formality” (1960, p. 258). And Brown and Ford replace power and solidarity with status and intimacy respectively, finding that address by title and last name expresses “both distance and deference” and address by first name expresses “both intimacy and condescension” (1964, p. 239).

Although Hudson (1996) simply argues that honorifics can be used to explain power-solidarity semantics, the honorific system of deference/politeness in relation to sociocultural
perspective is so intricate that the Korean honorific system can show much more complicated relations to cultural patterns than other politeness/deference systems in terms of [+age]. The term honorifics, which was originally developed from grammatical analysis, constitutes a part of the general category of polite speech: that is, grammatical and lexical distinctions which express different levels of respect or deference. Honorifics, along with other basic elements of linguistic structure, form a systematically elaborated domain of polite speech. The morphological and lexical encoding of degrees of deference toward addressees or referents in a speech event encodes the close relationship of honorifics with socio-cultural relationships among speakers of Korean. The Korean system subdivides deference expressions into strata from honorific to plain, with more delicately embedded deference in lexicon and sentence structure. For English speakers, it can be unfamiliar to take relative age as the first principal as in Korean deference expressions.

The strong Korean cultural convention of honoring older people is embedded in a morphologically and syntactically constructed linguistic system used to express politeness. Structurally, Korean honorifics are expressed in two ways: by changes in nominal elements and by changes in predicate elements. Furthermore, there are two kinds of honorifics. One involves the socio-cultural positioning of the nominal referent, including both power variables such as age and/or social status and solidarity variables such as different degrees of intimacy/distance and the formality of the situation. The other kind of honorifics involves linguistic structures that are grammatically expressed under strict, normative rules. But honorifics can also be used pragmatically and volitionally according to the speakers’ judgment in various situations. However, this study is related to e-mail discourse. This requires mostly written text communication rather than non-verbal behaviors of normative honorific expressions which are not dealt with in this description of honorifics.
2.3.1 Lexical-suffix Patterns of Honorifics

A sentence in Korean cannot be uttered appropriately without the speaker’s indicating approximate knowledge of his/her social relationship with the addressee and/or referent in terms of age. If the speaker lacks this knowledge, the result can be socially dangerous: the hearers may consider themselves dishonored or overhonored. Some nouns that refer to people or objects take different forms according to the hearers’ relative age. Verbs or predicates can undergo morphological modification when the referents and/or addressees are considered worthy of the speaker’s respect or deference. In other words, according to the speaker’s socio-culturally appropriate regard towards the addressee and/or the referent, the speaker must select the appropriate speech form for both addressee honorification and referent honorification. Therefore, in every utterance that addresses or refers to a person, Korean speakers must articulate a precise level of deference.

In other words, in Koreans’ language use, the cultural convention of honoring elders is deeply entrenched. These cultural conventions are reflected in Korean lexical, morphological, and syntactic forms of language. Korean speakers can convey not only whether they respect a hearer or not, but also the precise degree to which they honor the hearer. This evaluation is accomplished through the use of lexical and morpho-syntactic elements without recourse to actually saying, “I do or do not respect you this much or that much.” The use of honorifics has been habitual or unconscious in Korean society. Koreans use honorifics habitually in their daily lives. Their use of them is so automatic that they often mistakenly think that people who speak other languages also make the same social calibrations when they speak.

2.3.2 Personal Pronouns

The complex forms of personal pronouns in Korean can be used both as address forms and as the nominal elements of sentences such as subjects and objects. Particularly, Korean
Pronouns contain and reflect strict cultural rules to be used according to the speakers’ and the hearers’ relative age and/or power. The first person pronoun is used in two different ways: plain and humble. The plain form of the first person pronoun is *nah/nae* (I). It is used to refer to a speaker when s/he talks with a child, a younger adult, or a person as young as the speaker’s younger brother/sister. The humble form of the first person pronoun is *cher/chey* (I). It is used when a speaker talks with people whose age is around that of the speaker’s parents. Or it can be used to people in a high social position like a teacher, a company boss, or a medical doctor.

The Korean second-person pronouns are more complicated than the first. Basically, they are divided into 5 different forms of use: plain, familiar, intimate, blunt, and deferential. The plain form of second person pronoun is *nuh/ney* (you). It is used to call a child or younger sibling, or among close friends. The familiar form is *cha-ney* (you). It is used among school chums, as well as by an older person addressing a young adult. The intimate form is *chaki/dangshin* (you). *Dangshin* is used as the formal pronoun *you*, but it can be misconstrued if used carelessly. When *dangshin/chaki* is used by a woman to call a husband/boyfriend who is considered an in-group member, it can be a term of endearment. But if *tayk/dangshin* (you), which is the blunt form, is used by a stranger, it can be a fighting word. When you say to a stranger, “Who the hell are you?” in English, the pronoun *you* in this interrogative sentence is similar to the word *dangshin* when used to refer to an out-group member. As the deferential form, *erusin* is used to respected males of over sixty years of age. However, it is originally a noun meaning “an elder.” So, we had better say that there is no Korean second person pronoun that is used to address older persons. Even though there is one, *gwiha* (you), which means “Your Excellency” and “your honor” and is used to address a person in a high position, the pronoun *gwiha* is rarely used.
Although there are 5 different forms of the second person pronoun, one of the distinctive habitual and cultural phenomena occurring in Korean writing and speaking is avoidance of second person pronoun use, especially the Korean plain form *nuh/ney* (you). Instead, Koreans make very extensive use of nominal substitutes such as *seon-saeng-nim* (you), which literally means a teacher, to address an unfamiliar person; or *achurssi* (you), which refers to an uncle. The main reason that Koreans are not likely to use the second person pronoun is that speakers who use the second person pronoun, especially the plain form, *nuh/ney* (you), know consciously or unconsciously that they may give the pressure of *nunch’i* to their hearers; Secondly, even if the speakers do not use the second person pronoun or other personal pronouns, Korean hearers are not confused as to their references. Koreans habitually use zero anaphora, a morphologically unrealized form of reference. As Oh (2007) claims, zero anaphora is an unmarked referential option in Korean, unlike in English grammar which generally requires the presence of overt arguments. When the second person pronoun *you* is omitted, it can achieve special interactional functions in English (Oh, 2007). Korean speakers are likely to leave out the first-and second person pronouns without leaving any trace on the surface and retrieve them from their speech situations. In other words, in Korean writing/speaking, the absence of the pronoun *you* shows culturally and pragmatically different uses of language from English.

Therefore, in real-life situations, Koreans are very cautious about which second person pronouns to use, if use them they must. Korean addressers and addressees have shared knowledge as to when, where, or to whom a Korean speaker/writer uses or does not use the second person pronoun, especially the plain form *nuh/ney* (you). In Korean, the overt use of second person pronoun *you* requires a careful social calibration in both writing and speaking.

The Korean third person pronouns are less complicated than the second person pronouns. There are four different usages of third person pronouns: for referring to a child, a familiar adult,
an adult bluntly, and an adult politely. D-ae/ay is used to refer to a child. D stands for a definite demonstrative such as this or that in English. A familiar adult is referred to as D-saram, if the addressee is relatively younger/lower than the person who is referred to as D-i. The latter is used to refer bluntly to a person who is relatively older/higher than the person who is referred to as D-saram. For example, a husband refers to his wife with cher saram (that person), whereas a wife refers to her husband with cher-i (that person). Cher saram (that person) is a little more intimate than cher-i (that person). However, this case does not always happen and is not even required. Unlike the Japanese honorific system, in which gender is a factor in differentiating the use of honorifics, there is no separate form of women’s honorifics in Korean language use. Lastly, D-pun is used to refer to a person politely. Here, pun means an esteemed person so that it should be used to people who are older or of higher status than the speaker. Overall, it is important to note that third person pronouns are rarely used in Korea, often being replaced by noun phrases as in the case of the second person pronouns.

Table 1. Korean Pronominal Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronouns &amp; Age relations</th>
<th>1st person pronoun</th>
<th>2nd person pronoun</th>
<th>3rd person pronoun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plain nah/nae:</td>
<td>[+age] to [−age]</td>
<td>[+age] to [−age]</td>
<td>D-ae/ay [+age] to [−age]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humble cher/chey:</td>
<td>[−age] to [+age]</td>
<td></td>
<td>D-saram [=age] to [=age]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person pronoun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain nuh/ney:</td>
<td>[+age] to [−age]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar cha-ney:</td>
<td>[=age] to [=age]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate chaki/dangshin:</td>
<td>[+age] to [−age]</td>
<td></td>
<td>D-i [=age] to [=age]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferential erusin:</td>
<td>[−age] to [+age]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(This table is extended from the original version by Sohn [2001])
2.3.3 Address-reference Terms

Korean address-reference terms are also influenced by and sensitive to degrees of age and/or power between speakers, addressees, and/or referents. For English speakers, there are address terms such as doctor, professor, father, Mr. President, sir, madam, etc., especially emphasized in institutional interactions, e.g., the military. However, the English alternatives are impoverished when compared to the Korean. In Korean, all kinds of professional roles have titles, including taxi or bus driver, division chief, company boss, nurse, and student. There are also extensively diversified kinship terms, which can be used as address terms and can also replace the pronoun you.

Because Korean makes extensive use of other kinds of nominals, Korean pronouns are habitually replaced by noun phrases. The main reason comes from Koreans’ intentional avoidance of using the second person pronoun toward older recipients or recipients who are assumed to be older than the speaker. This is likely due to the nunch ’i complex. The second reason is that there are no appropriate pronominal forms of second person pronouns for use toward any recipients older than the speaker, as discussed above (Oh, 2007). Koreans prefer to use the many non-pronominal forms that come from various kinship terms, professional titles, or other interpersonal relations. Nevertheless, speakers still have to consider the age status of addressees because Korean address-reference terms are so hierarchical that they must be used appropriately according to age difference between the speakers and the hearers, as seen in table 2.

Here is a brief explanation of abbreviation of the address-reference terms. FN: Full Name; SN: Surname; GN: Given name; GT: General title (e.g. puin “madam”, paksa ‘Dr.’); KT: Kinship term (e.g. hyung “older brother”); PT: professional or occupational title (e.g. moksa “pastor”, sachang “company president”); HTa: First-level honorific title (-nim “honorable”); HTb: Second level honorific title (-ssi “Mr/Mrs/Ms”). However, we need to notice that English
honorific titles such as Mr., Mrs., Miss, and Ms. are used primarily to indicate gender roles and marital status and are not hierarchical. But Korean HTs are absolutely hierarchical. HTc: Third-level honorific title (-kwun for a boy or -yang for a girl which does not have a counterpart in English, but it can be closer to the word ‘dear’ in English); Vocative: -a/ya (plain), ZERO/i (intimate); and hon.; honorable. The following patterns are arranged orderly from the high deference address forms to low deference address forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Patterns</th>
<th>[age] relations</th>
<th>examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>FN/SN+GT/PT+HTa</td>
<td>[−age] to [+age]</td>
<td>Baik (hachin) Daesanim (hon. Ambassador (hachin) Baik)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>FN/SN+GT/PT</td>
<td>[+age] to [−or=age]</td>
<td>Kim seonsaeng (teacher Kim) Baik (hachin) paksu (Dr. (Hachin) Baik)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>FN+HTb</td>
<td>[+age] to [+or=age]</td>
<td>Kim mansusii (Mr. Kim Mansu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>GN+HTb</td>
<td>[+age] to [or=age]</td>
<td>Mansusii (Mr. Mansu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 6</td>
<td>SN+HTb</td>
<td>[+age] to [−or=age]</td>
<td>Kimssii (Mr. Kim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 7</td>
<td>FN/SN+HTc</td>
<td>[+age] to [−age]</td>
<td>Kim mansukwun (Dearly Mansu Kim) Lee myungyang (Dearly Myung Lee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 8</td>
<td>GN+HTc</td>
<td>[+age] to [−age]</td>
<td>Mansukwun (Dearly Mansu) Myungyang (Dearly Myung)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 9</td>
<td>(SN)+GN</td>
<td>[+age] to [−or=age]</td>
<td>(Kim) Mansu (Mansu (Kim))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 10</td>
<td>GN+vocative particle -a/ya</td>
<td>[+age] to [−or=age]</td>
<td>Mansuyap (Mansu!)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The table of Address-reference patterns is extended from the example in Sohn [2001]).

From Level 1 to Level 2, speakers use the highest honorific title, -nim (honorable), which functions to honor the hearers. The ages of the speakers are usually younger than the hearers. But there may be older speakers who want to show deference toward younger hearers. Nevertheless, the addressees’ ages are not usually less than 40 years old. Both the speakers and the hearers of Level 3 should be more than 40 years to be generally accepted for that pattern. In the cases of Level 1 and Level 2, it can be assumed that the speakers and hearers may give and take munch’i that comes from unbalanced power relationships. From level 4, the speakers use the second highest honorific title, -ssi (Mr/Mrs/Ms). The average age of the speakers and the hearers should be less than 40 years old. Unless a speaker does not know the exact age of a hearer, the
speaker may not call the hearer whose age is over 40 by this pattern. Whenever the pattern “Full Name” is used, it can be assumed that the speaker has more power than the hearer. Acquaintances who are in a close relationship may often overcome such nunch’i complex, using the hearers’ full names in Korean unless the speakers are angry with the hearers. So, Level 5 is mostly used between a boyfriend and a girlfriend in an equal age relationship. Level 6 is also a friendly way of a grown-up person addressing another grown-up in an equal age status. From Level 7 to Level 8, the speakers use the third honorific title, -kwun/yang (dear), towards the hearers. The hearers are mostly around 20 years old or younger and the speakers are more than 30 years old. From Level 9 to Level 10, the speakers do not use any titles towards the hearers. This pattern, which Koreans think of as one of the lowest honorifications, can be used to address a senior professor to show the friendliness of the addresser in English. There is not much difference in thought from Level 7 to Level 10 in English. Furthermore, Level 8, Level 9, and Level 10 can be also be used for addressing a [+age] and/or [+power] person, such as a professor or a father, in English. On the contrary, in Korean, unless the addressee is an enemy or a person that the addresser should despise, the addresser must not refer to any older or more powerful addressees using Level 7 and over, unless the addressee is a child or much younger person than the addresser. Also, using the patterns from Level 7 to Level 10 in Korean can mean that the speakers are older than the hearers, which is a very approach from that of English speakers. Here, we can see a considerable difference in thought patterns between Korean speakers and English speakers, particularly in the use of linguistic patterns of address by older persons. Thus, it can be assumed that the thought differences between two cultures can originate in cultural differences that are
reflected in language. In pronoun usage as well as in nouns, predicates, and particles, Korean language shows the traces of cultural norms/rules of honoring elders, as we will see below.

2.3.4 Nouns, Predicates, and Particles

Certain Korean nouns, predicates (verbs), and particles have variants that can be used to show deference toward [+age] people by [−age] people as well as to show the humility of the speaker. Although those honorific nouns, predicates, and particles exist only in a limited set, they are used regularly in communication between younger people and older people in Korea. For example, as we see in Table 3, Korean has the noun *mal*, which means *word*. This noun is available for use in any conversation between equal aged people or toward a younger person by an older person. However, when a younger person wants to use this noun toward an elder, it should be changed into *malssseum*, which still means *word* in English.

The usage of Korean predicates is in the same vein. For example, among same-aged, close friends or toward a younger addressee, speakers may use the predicate *murkda*, which means *eat*. The subject of this predicate should be a person who is either younger than or of equal status to the speaker. If the subject of this verb is older than the speaker, then this predicate should be changed into *chapswusida*. There are also humble predicates that are transitive, like *mosyeoda*, which means *bring*. The plain form of this verb is *deryeohda*. The direct or indirect object of the humble predicate should be an elder. The subject of the predicate or the speaker should be younger than the direct object of the predicate, and should express him/herself as *cher/chey* (I), which is the humble form of the first person pronoun.

The three related particles - nominative, source, and dative-locative-goal - function according to the speakers’ cultural behavior of honoring elders who are involved in a conversation. For example, if the subject of a sentence should be referred to by the speaker as an elder, the noun or pronoun that refers to the subject often requires an honorific particle like -
**kkeyseo**, to indicate the source **-eykeyseo**, which means *from*, and for dative/locative/goal, **-kkey**, which means *to*. Otherwise, in the case where an equal age person or a younger person is the subject of a sentence, then one of the plain forms of nominative is chosen and arranged at the end of the noun or pronoun that refers to the younger subject, like **-un/nun/i/ka**; for the source, **hanteyseo** (from) is used, and for the dative/locative/goal, **-hantey** (to) is used. However, the highest honorific title **-nim** often goes together with the initial vowel sounds of the plain nominative particles **-un** or **-i**, instead of the honorific particle, **-kkeyseo**, but not with the initial consonant sounds of the plain nominative particles **-nun** or **-ka** like kyoswu-**nim-un/i** and *kyoswu-**nim-nun/ka**. This is especially true among the younger generation.

Table 3 Nouns, Predicates, and Particles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Honorific</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Meaning/case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>malsseum</td>
<td>mal</td>
<td></td>
<td>word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byungwhan</td>
<td>byung</td>
<td></td>
<td>sickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chinchi</td>
<td>bop</td>
<td></td>
<td>meal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seongham</td>
<td>irum</td>
<td></td>
<td>name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ahburnim</td>
<td>ahburchi</td>
<td></td>
<td>father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chapswusida</td>
<td>murkda</td>
<td></td>
<td>eat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chwumusida</td>
<td>chada</td>
<td></td>
<td>sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malsseumhasida</td>
<td>malhada</td>
<td></td>
<td>speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mosieoda</td>
<td>deryeoda</td>
<td></td>
<td>bring (a human)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>durida</td>
<td>chwuda</td>
<td></td>
<td>give</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boypda</td>
<td>boda</td>
<td></td>
<td>see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yechwupda</td>
<td>mutda</td>
<td></td>
<td>ask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kkeyseo</td>
<td>-un/nun/i/ka</td>
<td>nominative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-eykeyseo</td>
<td>-hanteyseo</td>
<td>from/source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kkey</td>
<td>-hantey</td>
<td></td>
<td>to/dative/locative/goal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.5 Subject-and Addressee-honorific Suffixes

Korean has a very productive suffixal device for subject honorification that appears right after a predicate stem. The suffix **-(u)si** indicates that the speaker shows deference to the subject, as in 8) below. The suffix **-(u)sey** is the same subject honorific suffix as **-(u)si**, but it appears only before the polite ender, **-yo**, as seen in 9). When the subject referent does not deserve the
speaker’s deference, as in 10), the subject honorific suffix is left out. Korean also has an
inflectional suffixal device for addressee honorification. The addressee honorific suffix -(su)p (-
\textit{sup} after a consonant; -p after a vowel) appears only with the deferential speech level as in 11).
The sentence 11) is spoken to show deference toward the addressee by the speaker. The subject
of this sentence is not honored because the subject of the sentence is the speaker’s son. The
sentence 12) is spoken to an older person by a younger speaker to make the case that both the
addressee and the subject deserve the speaker’s deference. In this sense, 10) is the case in which
the speaker does not give deference either to the addressee or to the subject and 9) is the case in
which the speaker gives deference to the subject referent, being polite to the addressee.

8) \textit{Oori Kyoswu-nim-un} \textit{cham choeon pun-i-si-da}.
   Our professor-HTa-NOM very good person-be-SHSF-RE.
   Our professor is a very good person.

9) \textit{Oori Kyoswu-nim-kkeseo Choeon Malssum-ul ha-sey-yo}.
   Our professor-HTa-HNOM good words-OBJ does-SHSF-PE.
   Our professor speaks good words.

10) \textit{Oori ahdul-un mal-ul charm chal han-da}.
    Our son-NOM words-OBJ very well does-RE.
    Our son speaks words very well.

11) \textit{Oori ahdul-un mal-ul charm chal ha-pni-da}.
    Our son-NOM words-OBJ very well does-AHSF-DE.
    Our son speaks words very well.

12) \textit{Oori Kyoswu-nim-un cham choeon pun-i-si-pni-da}.
    Our professor-HTa-NOM very good person-be-S&AHSF-DE.
    Our professor is a very good person.

Korean has a systematic set of six speech levels represented by sentence enders. Each
has its own message or meaning, including plain, intimate, familiar, blunt, polite, and deferential.
Out of the six, the following describes only four speech levels because the familiar and blunt
enders are becoming obsolete, especially in e-mail discourse, while the plain, intimate, polite and
deerential enders are still actively used. They are interwoven with the four major sentence types
in suffixal realizations in Table 4. For example, among the following 16 enders, to make a declarative sentence imply a plain relationship with the addressee, the sentence will go with the sentence ender -\textit{da}; to imply an intimate relationship, with -\textit{e/a}; to imply a polite relationship, with -(\textit{ur})\textit{yo}; and for a deferential relationship, -(\textit{su})\textit{pnida}. All four are declarative enders.

\textbf{Table 4 Korean Four Speech Levels}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>Propositive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>-\textit{da}</td>
<td>-\textit{ni}?/-\textit{(nu)}\textit{nya}?</td>
<td>-\textit{kera}/-\textit{ura}</td>
<td>-\textit{cha}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td>-\textit{e/a}</td>
<td>-\textit{e/a}?</td>
<td>-\textit{e/a}</td>
<td>-\textit{e/a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>-(\textit{ur})\textit{yo}</td>
<td>-(\textit{ur})\textit{yo}?</td>
<td>-(\textit{ur})\textit{yo}</td>
<td>-(\textit{ur})\textit{yo}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferential</td>
<td>-(\textit{su})\textit{pnida}</td>
<td>-(\textit{su})\textit{pnikka}?</td>
<td>-(\textit{sipsio}</td>
<td>-(\textit{u})\textit{sipsida}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13) Declarative:

Plain: Nah-nun hakyo-eye gan-\textit{da}.
I-NOM school-to go-RE.
I go to school.

Intimate: Nah-nun hakyoey \textit{ga}.
I-NOM school-to go-IE.
I go to school.

Polite: Cher-nun hakyoey ga-\textit{yo}.
I-HFPP-NOM school-to go-PE.
I go to school.

Deferential: Cher-nun hakyoey ga-\textit{pni}-\textit{da}.
I-HFPP-NOM school-to go-AHSF-DE.
I go to school.

As seen in 13), a Korean declarative sentence can convey four different messages and meanings through four different speech levels that can be constructed by using four different declarative enders: regular plain ender (RE), intimate ender (IE), polite ender (PE), and deferential ender (DE). The regular plain form can be used to a person younger than or junior to the speaker, indirectly meaning that the speaker is [+age] to the addressee or may be in a [−distance] relationship with the addressee. The intimate form of ender is good to use towards an equal-aged person or younger friend. In [−distance] relationship, it is often found that a [−age] person uses this intimate form even to a [+age] addressee as an in-group member who has a
kinship relationship. Unlike the deferential ender, the polite ender is used to imply that although
the speaker does not give deference toward the addressee, the speaker is polite towards the
addressee, revealing the message that the speaker perceives relatively more [−distance]
relationship than when s/he uses the deferential ender.

There is an important rule for constructing polite and deferential forms. The plain first
person pronoun, *nah*, (I) must be changed into the humble first person pronoun *cher* (I) to
prevent misunderstanding among addressees who may expect humbleness from the addresser.
This is a rule of grammar called *honorific agreement*. Dunn’s (2005) study of the pragmatic
functions of humble forms in Japanese found that the humble forms conventionally index
deference to the person who is the recipient or beneficiary of the action. The use of humble
forms to describe one’s own actions thus “humbles” the writer/sender by expressing deference to
someone else. This phenomenon is not found in English sentences. All the counterpart English
sentences of the four Korean speech levels show changes of forms and meanings of the sentences.

14) Interrogative:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>Nuh-nun hakyoey ga-<strong>ni(nunka)</strong>?</td>
<td>Do you go to school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td>Nuh-nun hakyoey ga?</td>
<td>Do you go to school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>Samchon-un hakyoey ga-<strong>yo</strong>?</td>
<td>Do you (Uncle) go to school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferential</td>
<td>Kyoswu-nim-un hakyoey ga-<strong>si-pni</strong>-kka?</td>
<td>Do you (Professor) go to school?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, an interrogative sentence can convey four different meanings or messages by
using the four different interrogative enders toward the addressee to whom the speaker may or
may not want to express deference, politeness, or intimacy. In this interrogative sentence, the interesting parts to point out are in the polite and deferential forms. Koreans prefer not to use the plain second person pronoun form *nuh* (you) to [+age] and/or [+power] persons. Instead, they must use a polite or deferential form for the second person such as the addressee’s professional (*kyoswunim* [professor]) or kinship (*samchon* [uncle]) title, which replaces the second person pronoun, as we discussed in detail earlier in this study.

15) Imperative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Intimate</th>
<th>Polite</th>
<th>Deferential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School-to</td>
<td>go-RE.</td>
<td>go-IE.</td>
<td>go-PE.</td>
<td>go-S&amp;AHSF-DE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Go to school.</td>
<td>Go to school.</td>
<td>Go to school.</td>
<td>Go to school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16) Propositive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Intimate</th>
<th>Polite</th>
<th>Deferential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hako-ey</td>
<td>ga-cha.</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>ga-yo.</td>
<td>ga-si-psi-da.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-ey</td>
<td>go-RE.</td>
<td>go-IE.</td>
<td>go-PE.</td>
<td>go-S&amp;AHSF-DE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Let’s go to school.</td>
<td>Let’s go to school.</td>
<td>Let’s go to school.</td>
<td>Let’s go to school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both the imperative and propositive sentences can also convey four different messages and meanings toward addressees through the four different sentence enders. Korean imperative sentences have different morpho-syntactic forms and meanings according to the addressees’ relative age. In other words, semantically, the truth value is not changed, but cultural meaning is added into the Korean imperative and propositive sentences through morphological differences reflecting each different thought.

In Koreans’ everyday conversation, the polite sentence style is broadly used by both males and females. The Korean honorific system does not have different sentence forms according to gender. However, most female Koreans use a polite sentence ender like -yo, which is less formal than the deferential style, toward a stranger or an acquaintance who is older than the female speaker. Even in a formal situation, the deferential and polite styles are intermixed without dropping the suffix, -yo, by the same interlocutors in the same discourse. But males prefer to use deferential styles to address a [+age] person, keeping the relationship in [+distance], especially in a formal situation. Only when the distance of interlocutors is closer do both polite and deferential enders appear in males’ discourses. In contrast, news reports, public lectures, and public prayers to the gods use only the formal deferential styles. This suggests that Koreans think that the gods and the public have the same sort of [+power] that they observe toward elders, and thus their thoughts are demonstrated by their use of language. Their thoughts and behaviors are closely related to their cultural norms.

In summary, the following are simplified examples of Korean honorifics that appear in morpho-syntactic patterns as seen in 17).

17) The examples of Korean Honorification

1. \textit{Hyuna, Myung-i \texttt{pap muknun-da.}}
   \begin{tabular}{llll}
   & Hyun-GN-VP & Myung-GN-NOM & meal & eat-RE
   & Hyun, Myung & is & having & a & meal.
   \end{tabular}
   Kim-SN-HTb Lee-SN-HTc-NOM meal eat-PE
   Mr. Kim, (dear) Lee is having a meal.

   Kim-SN-HTb Park-HTb-NOM meal-HN does-SHSF-PE.
   Mr. Kim, Mr. Park is having a meal.

   Kim Hyunook-FN-HTb mother-HTa-HNOM meal-HN does-SHSF-PE
   Mr. Hyunook Kim, my mother is having a meal.

   Professor-HTa, father-HTa-NOM food-HN eat-HPre-S&AHSF-DE
   Professor, my father is having a meal.

The example 17) shows the simple demonstration of general Korean honorification. The exemplary sentences are arranged from the lowest form to the highest form of honorification. As we can see in sentence 1, the addressee referent is expressed using the direct first name - not even the full name - with a vocative particle, -*a/ya*, which is one of the lowest forms of address toward a recipient. The subject referent is not also honored, as we can see through the plain nominative particle -*i*. The noun used to express a meal, *pap*, is also the plain form of the word. The predicate, *muknunda*, is the plain form of the verb, *mukda* (eat). The particle, -*nun*-, located inside the verb *mukda*, is not related to honorifics. It functions as part of a sentence ender after a consonant. The addressee referent in the sentence 2, **Kim-ssi**, is a little more honored than the addressee in sentence 1 as reflected in the replacement of the vocative particle, -*a/ya*, to the second highest honorific title, -*ssi*. The subject referent **Lee kwun** is also a little more honored than the subject referent in sentence 1, through attaching the third honorific title, -*kwun* (dearly), at the end of the given name, **Lee**. But still the noun for meal is used in the plain form of *pap* (meal). However, the sentence ender is changed into a polite form to honor the grown-up addressee, **Kim-ssi**, through attaching the polite ender, -*yo*. 
Sentence 3 is an example of honoring both the addressee and the subject referents through the second highest honorific title, -ssi. The noun used for the meal also goes a little bit higher - siksa (meal) is a polite form of the plain form, pap. The predicate is also changed into an honorific form through inserting –sey, which is a different form of the same subject honorific suffix, -(u)si, but used before the polite ender, -yo, for giving honor to the addressee. Sentence 4 is an example of a slightly higher version of honorification than the example of sentence 3. The addressee referent is called by his full name along with the second highest honorific title, -ssi. The addressee referent, uhmu-nim ([my] mother), is honored through adding the highest honorific title, -nim. The noun for meal is still the same honorific noun, siksa (meal), instead of the plain form, pap (meal). Both addressee and subject referents are honored by adding the subject and addressee honorific suffixes in the predicate in sentence 4 as seen in sentence 3.

The example of the highest honorification is shown in sentence 5. The addressee referent, kyoswnim (hon. professor), and the subject referent, ahburnim (hon. father), are honored by the same addresser according to the rules of honorification. The plain noun, kyoswu (professor), is embellished by adding the honorific title, -nim, and through inserting the honorific suffix, -pni-, as in a declarative sentence ender. At the same time, the subject referent in sentence 5 is honored by using ahbur-nim (father) in place of the plain noun ahhurchi (father). Honor is also communicated through inserting the subjective honorific suffix, -(u)si, at the end of the declarative sentence ender. The particle -kkeyseo, which functions as a nominative particle, is also added to honor the subject referent, ahburnim (father).

Honorable forms are used throughout a sentence in Korean. The distinction between the perspectives of speaker-addressee and speaker-referent is structurally so fixed that even when the addressee is co-referential to the subject referent, the two are grammatically differentiated, as in 18).
Both the subject and addressee honorific suffixes often occur for one person. In short, there is an explanation of the term, “honorific agreement”. The subject honorific suffix -usi in sentence 5 is not used in sentence 1, which is a non-honorific sentence. The honorific suffix -usi is triggered by the subject noun denoting a respected person. From sentences 1 to 5, the sentences are lengthened, increasing the level of deference: at the same time, this indicates decreasing the addressee’s age and/or social status toward the addressee.

As we discussed, the phenomena of Korean honorifics demonstrates a cultural norm revealed through language forms and uses. A Korean who learned English expressed relief that the English you is egalitarian: she exclaimed, “It made me free” (Kang, 2006). Koreans consider the concept of age a social power to be treated honorably and respectfully, which is consolidated as a cultural norm reflected on their lexical and syntactic linguistic forms. We can assume that these different uses of language should appear even in computer mediated communication as long as language is involved. Although e-mail discourse is not face-to-face communication, e-mail communication is written language in the style of verbal texts exchanged between e-mail senders and receivers. In short, we may assume that unique Korean cultural behavior should be demonstrated in e-mail texts/discourse.

2.4 Computer-mediated Communication–E-mail Discourse

Computer-mediated communication that gives birth to e-mail discourse is supported by contemporary global technology. E-mail has become a popular communication method among many internet users regardless of geographical setting. Because e-mail discourse is carried on mainly through text-based correspondence, we can reasonably assume that it may be influenced
by local cultures in the use of language; thus, email discourse may be a useful site for studying
the relationships between language and culture.

Crystal (2001) suggests that we are at the beginning of an era of “Applied Internet
Linguistics” (p. 231), arguing that the Internet, as a medium of communication, needs to be
understood in terms of its formal character, which differs in fundamental respects from
traditional conversational speech and from writing. Crystal (2001) argues that the arrival of the
Internet has had such an impact on language that the time is right to recognize and explore the
scope of the future “Internet Linguistics” (p. 224). Herring (2001) shares this view of Computer
Mediated Discourse as the communication which is produced when human beings interact with
one another by transmitting messages via networked computers. She states that the study of
computer-mediated discourse (CMD) is a specialization within the broader interdisciplinary
study of computer-mediated communication, distinguished by its focus on language and
language use in computer networked environments, and by its use of methods of discourse
analysis to address that focus.

Most CMD currently in use is text-based; that is, messages are typed on a computer
keyboard and read as text on a computer screen, typically by a person or persons at a different
location from the message sender. E-mail communication is a revolutionary new form of human
communication in terms of speed and cost. It is much faster than the postal system, with much
lower costs than the postal mail. It has a convenience that even a telephone does not have. While
participants cannot typically review the exact text of a phone conversation after it is over
(Obviously, phone conversations can be audio-recorded or transcribed, but this is not an everyday
practice), e-mail discourse is recheck-able anytime, just like a regular postal mail letter is. E-mail
correspondence has quickly spread into human lives with a great number of users. Many people
have their own e-mail addresses or accounts to facilitate prompt correspondence with their acquaintances (Herring, 2001).

There are several types of computer-mediated discourses, such as discussion groups, real-time chats, and virtual reality role-playing games. E-mail is produced when people interact with one another by transmitting messages via the internet system. The text-based e-mail system was originally designed in the United States in the late 1960s to facilitate the transfer of computer programs and data between remote computers in the interests of national defense. Later on, in the early 1970s, this computer network was used first as a means of interpersonal communication among computer scientists, then among academic and business users in elite universities and organizations in the 1980s. From there it spread into popular use through the rise of commercial Internet service providers in the 1990s (Herring, 2001).

As Johnstone (2002) states, e-mail discourse is an attractive source for analyzing intercultural communication in that e-mail has characteristics of both spoken and written communication. In other words, e-mail discourse can be analyzed in new terms, as a so-called spoken-written communication discourse. People interacting in e-mail often attempt to create the feel of face-to-face talk. For instance, to display aspects of interpersonal involvement that might be expressed visually in face-to-face interaction, such as emotional affect or irony, some people employ creative transformations of the writing system to express emotion in e-mails to their friends. To make e-mail more like speech, e-mail messages may take the form of pseudo-conversation with subject headers like “LOOOOOOVE COFFEE!” informal closings such as “stay well” or “peace,” and informal grammatical choices, emoticons, and disregard of typing errors. Thus, through manipulating orthography of letters, e-mailers represent intonation and supply other paralinguistic cues.
In addition to the analysis of e-mail discourse in terms of spoken communication, analysis of the written rhetoric of e-mail can also focus on intercultural communicative features. For instance, when e-mails that are sent and received by people in non-U.S. cultures are analyzed, one can see different behavioral patterns, perspectives, ways of delivering information, and other cultural filters that can affect communication (Harris, 1986). Many Koreans display a strong preference for conveying information indirectly and dealing with important matters according to the speaker’s use of foresight through nunch’i. For example, when a Korean wants to ask how his/her friend is hurt or if s/he is all right after a disaster, s/he is not likely to ask directly, “How is everything going? Tell me what happened!!”, as Americans do. S/he might be more cautious than an American, sharing fellowship and talking about other topics first before asking if the friend is hurt or alright, especially when s/he already assumes that the friend must be in a difficult situation due to events with which the writer is familiar. Also, when a Korean student asks a professor for an extension on a paper, s/he is not likely to ask the favor in the beginning part of the e-mail, but tries to share fellowship first and raise the main issue a little later in the e-mail. In that way, in Americans’ eyes, a Korean’s written request – whether in Korean or English – might look diffuse, wordy, or unclear.

In this study of e-mail discourse in relation to culture and language, we will discuss how Koreans use language in e-mail communication in status-unequal and status-equal sender and receiver relations. Since internet communication is modern and originated in the west, we might expect that Korean internet communication would not exhibit distinctive and intricate aspects of Korean grammar, such as its honorifics system. According to the case study that Chen (2006) has done, an L2 English learner has to struggle to overcome L1 cultural influence until s/he acquires a proper level of L2 e-mail communication, especially with [+age], [+power], and [+distance] people such as her professor. As an Asian, the L2 English learner revealed several pragmatic
problems such as unclear and delayed purpose statements with many irrelevant details. One of the conclusions that Chen (2006) made is that the development of the L2 learner’s language use in e-mails with a status-unequal person takes a long time because it is neither an easy nor a simple process.

Bjørge (2007) studied the level of formality shown in the e-mails that international students sent to academic staff. She argues that factors such as age, position of authority, and gender come into play in e-mail discourses. The starting point of her study is to revisit Hofstede’s previous empirical study of national average scores concerning attitudes towards asymmetry of power (2001). Hofstede’s concept of power distance (PD) is “the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally,” and particularly, the extent to which older people are respected and even feared by younger people in a high PD culture (2001, p. 98). Hofstede (2001) relates his PD dimension to educational systems. According to him, high PD educational situations demonstrate a teacher-centered mode where a teacher is not criticized by students. In contrast, in low PD educational situations, teacher-student relationships approach equality, such that the teacher can be challenged by students at any time. Bjørge (2007) applies the theory of PD dimension into her study to explain linguistic behaviors shown in e-mails written by members of these two kinds of cultural groups.

Specifically, Bjørge (2007) examines the forms of address and complimentary closes used in English e-mails by international students at the Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration. According to her classification of low and high PD countries, the US belongs to low PD culture, whereas Korea is a high PD culture. She compares and contrasts levels of formality/informality between those two different cultural groups. In terms of the range of formality and informality, she considers Dear+Honorific/Title+Surname, or Dear Sir/Madam.
as formal and Hi (+First Name) or First Name only as informal while Dear+First Name is neutral. The results show that students from high PD culture are considerably more likely to include a formal greeting than those from low PD cultures. In choice of formal greeting, Korean students show formality 100% of the time, while US students show it only 58% of the time. The results of the complimentary close in the formal/conventional to informal/personal range are similar. Korean students show formality 100% of the time once again, while the US students show it 33% of the time.

Bjørge’s (2007) conclusion is that there is considerable variation when it comes to the choice of greetings and closings in e-mail discourses among these two different cultural groups. She claims that national culture in terms of relatively high or low PD can be seen to influence how students handle greeting and compliment styles. In other words, she claims that cultural background may influence how the student and professor roles are perceived for both parties. She points out that Native English speakers should be aware of cultural differences that influence the use of English in various intercultural communications, as non-native speakers communicating in English do not necessarily share the rhetorical conventions of native speakers. Lastly, she suggests further research of e-mail discourse based on gender and age differences.

Bjørge’s study (2007) has an interesting finding, namely, that there is a cultural factor that causes speakers to use language differently, especially when that language is English. However, her study does not explain clearly why and how the cultures of non-native English speakers can cause them to use English differently than English native speakers. For example, except for the explanation that Korean language belongs to High PD culture, she does not discuss how High PD culture affects the way that the Korean e-mailers think and how their different thought processes affect their different use of Korean language in email correspondence. Her study is about Koreans’ use of English, not Koreans’ use of Korean in e-mail discourse.
Moreover, because her study is confined to only the choice of greeting and closing in e-mail discourse, it is too narrow and partial to provide a full picture of the relationship between cultural patterns and linguistic patterns.

This present study moves forward from Bjørge while attending to her suggestions for further research, especially that the age factor has a huge influence on Korean culture and linguistic property; that Korean language use depends on social and cultural context, and that Korean culture is embedded in particular instances of use, as shown when e-mail senders and receivers are involved in an unequal-status communication. Therefore, even though this present study of e-mail discourses focuses only one factor, age, as a [+power] source based on Korean hierarchical cultural behaviors, the depth and the range of this study will be much deeper and wider than the previous study. In particular, I will discuss that Koreans share unique concepts about age that are built up into cultural patterns reflected in language use. For instance, this present study brings out Koreans’ nunch’i cultural behavior as it affects their use of language, including linguistic forms in e-mail discourses written among various age groups of people.
Chapter 3. Methods

The main task of this study was to deal with Korean’s nunch’i cultural behavior. We assumed that Korean honorification is culturally embedded in Koreans’ use of linguistic forms, reflecting their concept of [+age] as [+power] as displayed in the delicate and complex honorific system. The connections between age, human relationships, and language use were assumed to be handled by nunch’i in Koreans’ daily life. To illustrate this, I undertook an experiment and an application to examine the relationship between language use and nunch’i mechanisms. The concept of [+age] will be discussed in relation with [+distance] relationships in terms of nunch’i complex; this is not dealt with in the experiment itself but in the application that follows. The experiment was designed to elicit the ideal use of nunch’i, demonstrated by the usage of honorifics and rhetorical strategies in Korean e-mails that were sent to [+age], [=age], and [−age] people respectively. This experiment elicited maximum nunch’i, because the sender would experience nunch’i pressure in two ways: the normative cultural pressure that came from writing an e-mail to a [+age] and/or [+power] person like a senior professor, and the face-threatening task of the message – making a request. In Korea, one of the hardest tasks for younger people is to ask older people to do something for them. On the other hand, the minimum nunch’i case would be seen in the e-mails sent to close, younger friends. When the age of a requestee is younger, the Korean senders might perceive much less pressure to use nunch’i than when addressing an older person.

Note that the e-mails used for the experiment were not real-life correspondence, but were written according to the specifications of the task. Fifteen Korean college students were asked to write three e-mails to imaginary acquaintances: their professor, a close equal-aged friend, and a younger friend. The contents of the e-mails contained an impositive request that would likely cause the senders to use nunch’i mechanisms when writing in Korean to Korean speakers. The
participants could write their email messages down on paper and submit the paper to the researcher, or they could type them on a live e-mail system through their own e-mail accounts and then directly sent them to the researcher.

The hypothesis underlying the experiment was that we would find mechanisms of Korean nunch’i in the email messages that would reveal the close relationship between Koreans’ hierarchical socio-cultural system and their choice of language use in e-mails. I would then closely examine Koreans’ usage of lexical and grammatical forms of honorifics in terms of language use, especially in situations of request from a senior professor to a younger friend, assuming that such cases of request might stimulate the senders to use nunch’i mechanisms even at a minimum level. Next, the results from this experiment would be compared to real-life e-mail discourse as a calibration, measuring the different degrees of nunch’i in a corpus of actual Korean e-mails from diverse situations and among diverse people. The results of the experimental e-mails sent to an imaginary senior professor would be set up as the case reflecting the maximum level of nunch’i, and the results of the e-mails sent to an imaginary younger friend would be set up as the case of minimal nunch’i.

These standards of maximum to minimum nunch’i would then be applied to the real-life e-mails that were collected to measure the various degrees of nunch’i used in actual Korean e-mails. For the task of this application, 141 e-mails that were written either in Korean or in English by Koreans in various real-life situations were collected to analyze the influence of nunch’i, especially in relation to the concept of [+distance] human relationship that is assumed to reduce the pressure of nunch’i from [+age] and/or [+power] person. The relative status of senders varied from a 10 years old youth to a 50 year old adult. The content of these e-mails was also varied from requests to simple, non-request based conversation. Therefore, factors to consider include whether Koreans used honorifics even when they did not request anything of an
older person; in other words, when they only perceive cultural normative *nunch’i* coming from the pressure of hierarchy and not from imposing on older persons in their e-mails. In addition, I would examine how various [+distance] relationships, especially the relationship between family members [−distance] and non-family members [+distance] among the real-life participants, affected the degree of *nunch’i* in their language use. The ultimate purpose of the experiment and the application was to discuss how language would reflect the thought processes involved in negotiating a Korean cultural tradition involving age, power, and honor. In other words, Korean users might think that [+age] could be [+power] that might be influenced by [+distance] relationship, as had been ingrained in their culture.

Again, in the experiment, the case of the relationship between a senior professor and a student and the relationship between a student and his/her equal age or younger friends might show two extreme levels of *nunch’i*. I assumed that there could be a different result in real-life data because the real-life data came from people in various kinds of relationship. We will pay attention to [+distance] relationships among the various senders and receivers in terms of kinship or non-kinship, examining how kinship affects [+age] complex. For example, I would examine how the result would be different from the experiment in the case of Korean kinship relations that might be closer than the relationship between a student and his/her close equal age or younger friends. Or if a senior professor, as in the experiment, perceived a different degree of distance from a student sender, would the results still be the same? Therefore, while the experiment was manipulated and based only on senders’ constructed messages to different-aged people, the application would allow me to examine reciprocal correspondence among various aged people with various relationships and degrees of imposition. This meant that both initial messages and the responses to them would be examined in most cases, except in a few cases in which there was no responding email. I assumed that if there was a [+distance] relationship or
different degrees of imposition, these factors might affect the degree of *nunch’i* that a speaker used for honorifics, as reflected in the linguistic forms and rhetorical expressions used in the e-mail discourses.

### 3.1 Experiment

#### 3.1.1 Method and Data Collection

For the experiment, variables were manipulated to be the same for all participants. The task assigned to all participants was to write an e-mail in Korean to [+age] recipients. Fifteen Korean e-mailers (9 females, 6 males) wrote a total of 45 e-mails. All 15 Korean participants were college students in the age range of 21-25 years old. They were asked to write three e-mails according to a written discourse completion test (DCT) with 3 different situations. The 3 different situations were controlled to examine the senders’ language use towards 3 different status people: [+age], [=age], and [−age] people, as follows.

- **Situation#1** – asking a senior professor for an extension [+age]
- **Situation #2** – asking a friend to come to a library with a class-note [=age]
- **Situation #3** – asking a younger friend for help in moving [−age]

One of the three situations involved a person of younger status asking someone of [+age] status, one situation involved a person of equal status asking someone the same age [=age], and the last situation involved an older person asking someone of a younger status. Note that all three senders in the three different situations were the same person; there were no replies for the senders’ e-mails because the receiver was not a real person. I would examine how differently each person used his/her language towards those different aged receivers. The lexical and grammatical *nunch’i* features reflecting Korean honorific culture in the e-mails were as follows: personal pronouns, address-reference terms, honorific nouns, honorific predicates, honorific
particles, subject-and addressee-honorific affixes, polite ender -yo, deferential enders, plain enders, and abnormal enders.

The following is one of the three situations for which the participants were supposed to write an e-mail:

상황#1: 황진웅박사님은 지금 듣고 있는 강의를 담당하고 있는 교수님입니다. 그리고 다음 주까지 기말 페이퍼를 제출하여야 합니다. 그러니, 이번 주 도무지 페이퍼 쓸 시간이 없습니다. 어떻게든지 노(老) 교수님을 잘 설득하여 페이퍼 제출 마감시 간을 늘려야 하는 상황입니다. 그렇다면, 어떻게 부탁의 메시지를 담은 이메일을 쓸 수 있을까요?

Situation #1: Please, imagine that Dr. Walter Smith is a senior professor who gives a lecture in your class. You have a paper due in his class next week. However, you will be very busy this week and don’t have any time to write it. You may really want to request an extension. So, you may have to write an e-mail to him right now. How do you request an extension through e-mail?

(Full text of the three situations appears in Appendix B.)

I expected that all Korean e-mails sent to [+age] persons would show differences in lexical and grammatical levels from those sent to [−age] or [=age] persons. For example, in the case where senders e-mail their senior professor, they would use a personal pronoun such as cher or chae, but they would use something like nah in the case where they e-mailed their equal-aged friends or younger friends. When they addressed their older professor, they would use the form Kyoswunim: GT/PT + HTa, but it would be changed into FN + -a/ya for their equal or younger receivers. A younger Korean sender might use a noun like pap (meal) to his or her younger or equal status friend, but might change it to Chinchi or at least siksa for an older receiver; similarly, the predicates would be changed to chapswusida from mukda when addressing the older person, with the word mukda being used to younger people or equal aged friends. The particles should be kkey or kkeyseo, not ekey or un/nun/i/ka, to older receivers. The subject-and addressee-honorific affixes would also appear with -(u)si or -(su)p inserted as suffixes when the senders addressed a senior professor. At the end of honorific suffixes, deferential enders should be attached to complete the expression of honoring older people, as follows: -(su)pnida (for a
declarative sentence), -(su)pnikka? (interrogative sentence), -sipsio, (imperative) and -(u)sipsida (suggestive). At the very least, the polite ender -yo should be attached to show politeness to older people; this could replace the deferential enders among the four speech levels of “deferential,” “polite,” “intimate,” and “plain.” Regardless of the total number of uses of these cases in an e-mail, it would be counted as one occurrence. For example, even if the subject-and addressee-honorific suffixes -(u)si or -(su)pn could be seen several times in one e-mail, it would be counted as only one occurrence in terms of frequency.

In addition, I assumed that all Korean e-mail discourse might show distinctive forms of Korean rhetorical expression. For example, many Korean e-mail senders were not likely to request or ask something of a [+age] person without first moving through the sharing fellowship stage, the topic change stage, or the context building stage. Characteristic of the sharing fellowship stage is an indirect use of language in communication. The sharing fellowship stage does not contain any information directly related to the main point, especially in a request e-mail. But it is assumed to work as mitigation of the degree of nunch ’i pressure or imposition. If a younger sender makes a direct request without the sharing fellowship stage, it could be considered an insult or an impolite way of communicating. In the same vein, Koreans are likely to change topics in a request e-mail before delving into the main point, building a context that hints toward the main point before the speaker directly touches the main point. Building a context is similar but not identical to the “ grounder” that goes with a request. Before or after a request, English speakers often give reasons, explanations, or justifications for the request. However, in this experiment, it is assumed that unlike Koreans, Americans are likely to deal with one main topic directly without bringing up other topics, and are likely to use fewer context building habits than Koreans regardless of the age differences between senders and recipients. In contrast, Koreans may show these phenomena more often when they send e-mails to older
recipients than when they write to younger recipients. In the Korean culture, the human relationship could be relatively more important than any other issue following, which was in accordance with their style and thought pattern (Kaplan, 1966).

3.1.2 Results and Analysis

As we see below, Table 5 is based on situation #1, in which the senders of the e-mails were younger than the imaginary receivers. The average sender’s age was in the 21 to 25 age group, and the imaginary receiver could be assumed to be over 40, because the prompt suggested that senders consider the recipient a “senior professor.” The situation is that the [−age] student senders had to request an extension of their paper due date from the [+age] professor. Therefore, the results of situation #1 below will demonstrate that a [−age] person may express nunch’i towards a [+age] person.

Table 5
Situation 1: asking a senior professor for an extension [+age]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nunch’i Features</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>personal pronoun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First person pronoun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humble form : Cher/chey (I)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plain form : Nah/Nae (I)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omission</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second person pronoun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain form; Nuh/Ney (you)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement by GT/PT + HTa (you)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address-reference term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal: (Dear) + GT + FN/SN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN + GT/PT + HTa:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT + HTa (Kyoswu-nim [hon. professor])</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT + HTa (Paksa-nim [hon. Dr.])</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal: Hey + GT + FN/SN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorific Nouns:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorific Predicates:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>durida (give)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheychulhada(submit)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorific Particles:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As seen in the **personal pronoun** section in Table 5, when the Korean senders made a request to a senior professor, they used *nunch’i*, choosing humble forms in their use of personal pronouns. Out of a total of 15 participants, 13 people used the humble forms of the **first person pronoun** (FPP), *cher/chey* (I), to the professor in their e-mails, which is 87%. None of the senders used the plain form of first person pronoun to their professor, although there were 2 persons who did not use either the plain or humble form of first person pronoun: 13%. However, none of them used even the plain form of **second person pronouns** (SPP) such as *nuh/ney* or *dangsin* (you): 0%. Instead of using the second person pronoun, the senders used a title such as *paksanim* (hon. Dr.) or Professional title *Kyoswunim* (hon. Professor): 100%. Many Koreans used this replacement of pronominal terms by other NPs (Noun Phrase) for the second person pronoun habitually, not even consciously, because this behavior is a deeply rooted and ingrained cultural habit in Korean. Thus, Professional title + -nim is a typical Korean way of addressing a second person instead of using the second person pronoun, *you*, as many Americans do, although Koreans have a diversified set of second person pronominal terms (e.g. *nuh/ney, chaney, chaki/dangsin, and gwiha*). In the Korean cultural environment, people think that the person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(table 5 con’d.)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kkey (dative/locative/goal)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kkeseo (nominative)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omission of both</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**subject-and addressee-honorific affixes**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subject honorific suffix –*(u)*is (sy or sey)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addressee honorific suffix –(su)p</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polite ender –yo.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deferential enders:**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-(su)pnda, -(su)pnikka?, -sipsio, -(u)sipsida</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rhetorical nunch’i features**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Fellowship stage</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic change</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context building</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F: Frequency; %: percentage
who uses the second person pronoun, *you*, is older or of a higher rank than the person who hears it. The addressee is often of a lower rank than the addressee. If Koreans do not want to offend the addressee, they must use the second person pronoun very cautiously.

In the case of **Address-reference terms (ART)** used toward the senior professor, only 40% of the Korean senders used the name of the professor. However, they did not use only General Title or name alone (0%). When they used the name of the professor, it was the form of the full name plus General Title/Professional Title (GT/PT) plus the highest honorific title -nim. They did not habitually drop the first level honorific title, -nim, which is like a suffix of GT/PT, as long as they had deference toward the professor. In contrast, 60% of Korean senders did not even use the name of the professor, addressing him as PT + -nim (Kyoswunim) without putting his name. This was specifically Korean behavior which contrasts with Americans who freely use their professors’ names with GT/PT title. The Korean younger senders might choose to follow their home culture, knowing that the American way of addressing a professor can be used only among school colleagues or to a junior scholar by a senior scholar in an academic field in Korea.

HNs such as **choeysong** (apology), **durim** (giving), **malsseum** (words), **cheychul** (submission) were actively used among participants 100% of the time. The plain form of **choeysong** was **miyan**. Even though English has formal and informal words that express similar meanings, like *apology* and *sorry*, it is acceptable for a younger person to say *I am sorry* to an older person in the US. But in Korea, it is not appropriate for a younger college student to use **miyan** (sorry) or **miyan hadnada** (I am sorry) to a professor because it can imply that the speaker is not inferior to the hearer in a situation where the student is obviously younger or lower than the professor. The student risks being considered impolite and someone who does not have nunch’i. Also, the word **choeysong** linguistically requires honorific affixes and enders on the predicate, while the word **miyan** is mostly followed by plain forms of sentence enders. This rule is not only
controlled by grammar itself, but also by culture. The honorific noun, *Durim* (giving), is in the same vein. The formal word *durim* should be followed by honorific sentence enders, unlike its plain form *chum*. Many Sino-Korean words such as *choesong* (apology) or *cheychul* (submission) that are borrowed from ancient Chinese have been used primarily among educated or aristocratic people Koreans, while *durim* (giving) and *malsseum* (words) are not borrowed words but originated in Korea to be used toward an older person by a younger person or toward a master by a lower class of people to connote deference.

The plain verb forms of the honorific nouns (HN) *durim* and *cheychul* that were used 100% of the time in the experiment were *chwuda* and *neyda*, respectively. However, when they were used by a younger student to address an older professor, their shape was changed into the honorific predicates *druida* and *cheychulhada* 100% of the time. The enders of the honorific verbs *druida* and *cheychulhada* were automatically changed into honorific enders through *nunch‘i* mechanism when the younger sender perceived the pressure of *nunch‘i* toward the older addressee, as will be discussed below along with honorific affixes. In the usage of honorific predicates, affixes, and enders, Korean demonstrates the complex honorific system ingrained in its language, a system that European languages, including English, do not have. In the case of a young student sending an e-mail to a senior professor in Table 5, honorific particles (HPar) appeared as either *kkey*, which was used for indication of a dative/locative/goal with deference, or *kkeseo*, which was used for the nominative 67% of the time. This meant 10 out of 15 participants used either *kkey* or *kkeseo* in their e-mail, because there were 5 people who omitted both (33%). Even though there was 33% of omission of both, this did not mean that the senders failed to show deference towards the older professor. They just decided that those sentences did not need those honorific particles in their e-mails.
Even when the senders did not use honorific particles, all the sentences that the younger senders wrote in their e-mails contained **subject-and addressee-honorific affixes** (SAHA) to show deference to the older professor, as the senders were under pressure of *nunch ’i* that came from the age difference. In this way, the younger senders could save the older person’s face and could keep harmony with the older receiver. As was expected, 100% of Korean e-mailers used the subject honorific suffix (SHSF) *-(u)si (sy or sey)*, as in the following sentence: “Kyoswunim, yozoom kunkangeun urtter-si-nchi-yo?” (Professor, how is your health recently?). Also, the addressee honorific suffix (AHSF) *-(sup(ni)-* was used by 100% of participants. For example, there was a sentence, “Kyoswunim, chung-yohan putaki itt-supni-da.” (Professor, I have an important asking.) Along with subject-and addressee-honorific suffixes, all the e-mails written based on situation #1 had deferential enders that came after the subject- and addressee-honorific suffixes (S&AHSF). Those deferential enders were as follows: *-(su)pnida* (declarative), *-(su)pnikka?* (interrogative), *-sipsio*, (imperative) and *-(u)sipsida* (suggestive).

Interestingly, 73% of the younger e-mail senders chose the polite ender, *-yo*, out of four representative speech levels - plain, intimate, polite, and deferential - along with the deferential enders. Although they did not use any plain or intimate forms of sentence enders, they chose to use at least polite enders which meant that the senders reduced the level of *nunch ’i* and showed that they were in a closer relationship with the receivers. 90% of all female participants in the study used polite enders, and 50% of all males in the study did this. This study has not found any other significant gender differences based on honorific usage, but the usage of the polite ender (PE), *-yo*, showed a significant difference between female and male e-mail senders. It was assumed that the female students had a tendency to be friendly to the senior professor, using the polite enders, while the male students tried to keep distance from the professor, using mostly “deferential enders” (DE).
Example 1 below is typical of the 15 Korean e-mails sent to a senior professor by a student under the pressure of *nunch'i* because he had to make a request.

Example 1—a sample of Korean e-mails based on situation #1

1. 존경하는 황진웅 교수님
   
   *chonkyunghanau* hwang chinwoong *kyoswunim*
   
   Respectful Hwang chinwoong-FN professor-HTa
   Respectful professor Chinwoong Hwang

2. 해주 교수님의 강의를 잘 듣고 있습니다.
   
   Maychoo *Kyoswunim*-uy kang-uyrul charl dutuko itsupnida.
   Everyweek professor-HTa-FPar lecture-OBJ well taken have-AHSF-DE.
   I have taken your lecture well every week.

3. 그리고 강의 내용이 아주 유익하고 도움이 되고 있습니다.
   
   Kurigo, kangyu naeyongi aehchu yuikhako doumi mani doeko itsupnida.
   And lecture content-NOM very beneficial-and help much been have-AHSF-DE
   And your lecture has been much beneficial and helpful.

4. 교수님께서 내주신 Paper를 지급하고 있습니다.
   
   *Kyoswunimi* naechusin paperul chikum hako itsupnida.
   *Professor-HTa-NOM* give-SHSF-HPre paper-OBJ now do being-AHSF-DE
   I am working on the paper that you assigned to us.

5. 교수님이 내주신 paper를 다루고 학계에 대해 실제로 기업을 방문할 예정이었습니다.
   
   *Kyoswunimi* naechusin paperul derwook wanbyukhakey haki wihaeseprofessor
   *Professor-HTa-NOM* give-SHSF-HPre paper-OBJ more perfectly do to
   Silchaero kiupal pangmunhal yechunguttsupnida.
   Actually organization-OBJ visit-to plan-Past-AHSF-DE
   To write the paper that you assigned to us more perfectly, I was actually planning to visit an organization.

6. 그러하여, 제가 방문할 회사가 갑자기 이번 주 Strike가 발생하였습니다.
   
   Kurundae, *che-y-ka* pangmung-hal hoseaka kapchaki ipunchu
   However, I-HFPP-NOM visit-to company-NOM suddenly this week
   strikei palsaeng-hayeotsupnida.
   Strike-NOM occur-Past-do-AHSF-DE.
   However, suddenly a strike occurred to the company that I was planning to visit this week.

7. 따라서 회사방문이 일주일 연기 되었습니다.
   
   Tiaraseo, hoesa pangmunhi ileul yeonki douteutsupnida.
   Accordingly, company visiting-NOM one week postpone do-Past-AHSF-DE.
   Accordingly, company visiting has been postponed to next week.

8. 그래서 제가 paper를 완전히 끝낼 수 없게 되었습니다.
   
   Kuraeso, *che-y-ka* paperul wanchunhe kkutnael su upkeye doeuttsupnida.
   Therefore, I-HFPP-NOM paper-OBJ completely finish-able to not do-Past-AHSF-DE.
   Therefore, it turns out not to be able to finish writing the paper completely.

9. 그래서, 교수님께 이와 같은 상황을 여러 말씀드리고 기말 paper를 다음주 까지 제출해도 되는지 문의드리고자 합니다.
   
   Kuraeso, *kyoswunim-k-key* iwa kattun sanghwangul miri *malsseum duriko*
   Therefore, professor-HTa-HPar this like situation-OBJ in advance word-HN give-HPre-and
   kimnal paperul daum chukkachi *chechul*aedo doenunchi munuyrul durikochajapnida.
   Final paper-OBJ next-week-by submit-HN-do possible question-HN-OBJ give-HPre-to do-AHSF-DE.
   So, I like to ask you whether I can submit the final paper by next week through telling you this situation in advance.

10. 주일간 마련해진 기간을 연기해 주시면 말씀드리고 기말 paper를 작성하여 제출하도록하겠습니다.
   
   Il-chuihl makamechechul kikanul yeonkihae chusirmyun sanhakhapdongguyo
   One-week-length due-submit days-OBJ postpone give-SHSF-HPre-if industry-academy-union-by
   chungsilhan paperul chaksunghayeo *chechul*aedorok haketteutsupnida.
   Productive paper-OBJ write-and then submit-HPre-do do-Future-AHSF-DE.
   If you extend the paper due just a week, I will submit a productive paper that is written in both views from industry and academy.

11. 도움 주시기를 바라겠습니다.
   
   Doun *chusikrul* parakettsupnida.
   Help give-SHSF-HN-OBJ wish-Future-AHSF-DE.

I wish you could do me a favor. (Full E-mail Data appears in Appendix C)
This e-mail shows all the features used in situation #1. As we see in line #1 of Example 1, the pattern of address belongs to the highest rank of honorification, Full Name + Professional Title + the highest honorific title. The sender uses the full name of the professor preceded by the honorary expression *Chonkyunghanun* (respectful). It is comparable to the way English speakers may put (dear) + General title (Dr.) + Given name (GN). This is a typical way of addressing a professor in the U.S. However, this study shows that Korean students do not address a senior professor this way unless the sender is almost equal-aged with the receiver.

As we see from line #2 to line #11 of Example 1, all lines have deferential declarative enders *(su)pnida*, and addressee honorific suffixes like *(su)p*, as seen in lines #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, #9, #10, and #11. There are subject honorific suffixes such as *(u)s*i in lines #4, #5, and #11. These suffixes and enders imply the extra-cultural meaning that the senders are younger and the receivers are older or that the sender considers the receiver as someone of higher status than the sender. Moreover, line #4 has an honorific nominative particle, *-kkeyseo*, and line #9 shows an honorific dative/locative/goal particle, *-kkey*. Line #6 and line #8 contain the humble form of first person pronoun (FPP), *chey* (I). The first person pronoun *chey* is a humble form that is used by a younger person to an older person; the nominative particle of *chey* has the plain form *-ka*, not a deferential form such as *-kkeyseo*, as seen in lines #6 and #8.

Note that the plain form of nominative particles such as *-un/nun/i/ka* is not changed into a deferential particle like *-kkeyseo* at the end of FPP after either a deferential form of FPP like *cher/chey* or an indeferential form of FPP like *nae/nah*. The case of SPP is the same as in FPP. However, when SPP is replaced by noun phrases like *koswunim* or *ahburnim*, the honorific (deferential) nominative particle (HPar), *-kkeyseo*, appears to be used, as in line #4. So, the nominative particles *-un/nun/i/ka* should be carefully used towards an older receiver in Korean e-mails. For example, *kyoswu (-nim)-kkeseo* can be used by a student or among same-aged
colleagues but Hwang *kyoswu-ka* is used often with GN by an older professor who does not want to use *nunch’i* to a younger professor or by anybody who does not want to show respect to the addressed professor. On the other hand, *kyoswunimkkeseo* may be used by undergraduate students who want to use *nunch’i* maximally, while *kyoswunimi*, as in line #5, is used by graduate students or higher. It is also possible, though, that the plain form of the nominative particle, *-i*, in line #5 has been used mistakenly by the graduate student writer. The plain form of nominative particles needs to be used carefully, and many Koreans simply avoid using them toward any older addressed recipient in real-life situations.

As I mentioned above, in this entire e-mail group, we do not see any plain form of SPP like *nuh/ney* (you). Instead, the Korean writers used an address-reference form like *kyoswunim*, because the Korean address-reference form works in the same way as the English second person pronoun, as can be seen in lines #1, #2, #4, #5, and #9 of Example 1. Koreans dared not use the plain form of the second person pronoun, *nuh/ney* (you), to an older addressee. Their particular choice of nouns and predicates for the older addressee was also shown in Example 1 in line#9: *malseum duriko* (literally, giving words and). The plain form of this phrase might be *malhae chuko* (literally, giving words and). In Korean, there is a huge difference between these two choices. The former case should be used by a younger speaker who perceives the pressure of *nunch’i* towards an older recipient, and the later case can be used by an older speaker who does not perceive the pressure of *nunch’i* towards either a younger or an equal status recipient. If e-mailers fail to observe these Korean cultural norms, communication can break down. Simply by skimming the Korean sentences, we can recognize or assume who is the eldest among the interlocutors. In other words, the sentences include social information about age differences among e-mailers, unlike in English. Koreans are very sensitive to human relationships in their communications, especially in terms of the relative age of interlocutors.
In addition to lexico-grammatical *nunch’i* features, we can also see rhetorical examples of *nunch’i* mechanism in Example 1. After the greeting in line #1, the Korean e-mailer initiates the **sharing fellowship stage** (SFS) in lines #2 and #3. This sharing fellowship stage was used by all of the participants. Many American English speakers, who are used to seeing the main idea in the early part of a paragraph, might not understand that these sentences are not the main point of the e-mail. For Koreans these lines are used as a cushion for the impositive pressure that will be brought up in the later part of an e-mail, and which is the main point of the e-mail. After this sharing fellowship stage, **the topics** that are dealt with in the sharing fellowship stage are completely **changed** (TC) in line #4. Yet the topics that are dealt with in line #4 are still not the main point, though the sender does start to discuss the real issue here. These cases of topic change in Example 1 were used 87% of the time, as seen in Table 5. Only two participants out of 15 addressed the main point right after a short sharing fellowship stage. The topics that the e-mailers used in the sharing fellowship stage—or other topics brought up in the early part of the e-mail—were likely to be developed into a source of **building context** (BC), which was used 100% among the 15 participants as seen in lines #4, #5, #6, #7, and #8 of Example 1. Each of these lines could be an independent topic, but they work together to build a context around the main topic, located in the later part of the e-mail in line #9.

Through BC, the sender in Example #1 approached the main point step by step, beginning with line #4 saying that the sender is working on the paper. Again, this information is not the main point of the e-mail. Line #5 is only a hint. Line #6 carries a slightly stronger message, but it is still not the main point. Lines #7 and #8 are still not the main point but if the receiver, the senior professor, has *nunch’i*, he might have already deduced that the sender might not make the deadline. The writer finally brings up the main point in lines #9 and #10, directly requesting an extension. Because of *nunch’i* culture, it is hard for Koreans to raise the main point
directly and/or early in their communication. They know it could be viewed as overly bold or impolite behavior, especially by the senior professor.

According to Dell Hymes (1972), languages are not functionally equivalent because the role of speech varies from one speech community to the next. As Deborah Tannen (2005) mentions, each person’s individual style is a combination of features learned through interaction with others (hence social) plus features developed differently in each culture. Perhaps the impression of individual style results from the unique combination and deployment of socio-culturally learned features in America and Korea respectively. For example, to a Korean receiver, an American e-mail can be problematically impolite, whether it uses an indirect speech act or not. This is mostly due to the American style of speech/writing, which is different from the Korean style. Furthermore, a Korean writer’s style is not likely to feature talk about the most important issue first when that issue imposes a burden on the receiver by (taking the case of Example #1) asking the receiver to extend the paper’s due date. For Koreans, there is a hierarchy between the senders and receivers of e-mails according to [+age]. This tendency often appears habitually in Koreans’ style of writing and speaking, as we see in their e-mail discourse.

According to Tannen’s view (2005), *style* is not a sophisticated skill learned late or superimposed on previously acquired linguistic forms. Rather, it is learned as an integral part of linguistic knowledge and patterns associated with use in specific social contexts. Speakers regularly and intentionally refrain from saying what they mean in service of the higher goal of politeness in its broadest sense; that is, to fulfill the social function of language. For example, Lakoff (1973) introduced the conversational-maxim *perspective of politeness*, which relies on the work of Grice (1968). According to Lakoff, there are three principles of politeness called Rules of Politeness: 1. Don’t impose (distance). 2. Give options (deference). 3. Be friendly (camaraderie). In choosing the form of an utterance, speakers observe one or another of these
rules, showing a preference for honoring one or another of these politeness principles, which results in a communicative strategy that encompasses style. Based on Lakoff’s view, Koreans may prefer to use “Don’t impose” (distance) or “Give options” (deference), especially to an older recipient.

The results of situation #2 showed many differences from those of situation #1 in the Korean e-mails. In other words, we can confirm the assumption that Koreans have cultural ideas about [+age] people that English speakers or others may not share. The way that Koreans sent e-mails to [+age] people and the way that Koreans sent e-mails to [= age or – age] people were different. When they sent e-mails to [+age] people, they behaved as if the [+age] person had social power, so the language that they used towards the [+age] person contained honorific markers, words, and forms that they put away when they sent e-mails to [−age] or [=age] people. This move implies that the writers perceived the younger or same aged receivers as powerless.

As we have discussed throughout this study, Koreans have nunch ‘i when they send e-mails to [+age] people but they do not or do not want to have that stress when they send e-mails to [−age or =age] people. Therefore, when they sent e-mails to their same-aged friends, they wrote e-mails as if they were more powerful than their friends were by not perceiving nunch ‘i.

In Table 6, where the situation involved a sender asking his or her equal-aged friend to come to a library with a class-note, I assumed that there would be a little bit of nunch ‘i pressure. But the level of nunch ‘i pressure would likely be much less than that of situation #1 (writing a request e-mail to a senior professor). The results are shown as follows.

**Table 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation 2: asking a friend to come to a library with a class-note</th>
<th>[=age]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nunch ‘i Feature</strong></td>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal pronoun</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humble form : Cher/chey (I)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plain form : Nah/Nae (I)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this situation, there was a change of the first person pronoun into the plain form *nah/nae* 100% of the time. All 15 participants used the plain form of FPP as seen in Table 6. The usage of the second person pronoun was also changed to *nuh/ney* in situation #2 by 100%, showing no replacement of GT/PT + HTa address form for the second person pronoun.
In the address-reference term section, the deferential formal address pattern, “dear + GN” was used by 0% among 15 participants. Rather, 7% of the e-mails showed the pattern, “Hey + GT(friend) + a/ya.” Overall in situation #2, 93% of participants used informal address-reference terms such as, “(Hey) +GN + (a/ya).” The vocative particle -a/ya was popularly used in the e-mails; it implied an intimate relationship between sender and receiver, whether among close friends or when an older person addressed a younger person in a friendly manner. But this form can also have condescending connotations, because someone who uses this vocative particle might be of a higher status. Therefore, this form might not be used toward strangers or toward older persons in Korea, as will be discussed more in the application section of this study.

In situation #2, the e-mails did not show use of “honorific nouns” (0%). There were a couple of cases of using Sino-Korean terms in these e-mails, but the senders did not show deference with them As a result, no honorific predicates were followed. There were also no honorific particles like -kkey or -kkeseo in the e-mails. In situation #2, we see that the senders did not show deference to equal aged receivers; the senders used plain particles like -eykey/hantey for dative/locative/goal or -un/nun/i/ka for nominative by 100%. The subject-and addressee-honorific affixes were also absent in the e-mails and neither the deferential ender or polite ender “-yo” appeared in any of the emails.

As we see in Table 6, plain enders were used in the e-mails sent to equal aged friends by 100%. These sentence enders imply a cultural message related to [+age] that Koreans may not share with other language speakers. The users of deferential enders in a Korean e-mail should not be older than the receivers; if they are, it may mean that the users want to give respect to the receiver regardless of age difference or because the sender does not know how old the receiver is. On the other hand, if a sender uses plain enders, the sender’s e-mail implies the extra non-verbal meaning that the exchange is free of nunch’i pressure, showing an intimate relationship with the
receiver regardless of age difference. It may, however, also imply that the sender is condescending to the receiver.

In addition, there were interesting findings in the e-mails’ sign-offs in situation #2. There were abnormal plain enders by 100% and casually contracted forms of words or phrases by 80% in the e-mails that the senders sent to their equal-aged close friends. The abnormal plain enders ended sentences improperly or incompletely, for example using -maliya, -haseo or -deun. More than 20 different examples of abnormal enders were found in the e-mails written based on situation #2. These abnormal sign-offs were morphologically different from the plain enders, which were -da, -ni/-nu)(nya? -kera/ura, and -cha, although the abnormal enders share the same meaning as these plain enders. The use of these abnormal enders can mean more than just that the users perceive the exchange to be free from the pressure of [+age] complex nunch ’i. It implies, rather, more of either a condescending or an intimate attitude toward the younger or equal aged receivers. Koreans dare not use any of these abnormal enders to [+age] people unless they are purposely trying to anger the older receiver, because these enders are viewed as disrespectful - as banmal (half-talk) - in Korean.

Also, there were many casual forms of contraction typically found in spoken language in the e-mails based on situation #2. They included the use of -haenwatseo instead of haenouwatseo (have done), -hanundey instead of handa kureondey (do but), and -duluttsum instead of duluttsumyun (if you listened to). Technically, this language use is ungrammatical. But their use in the emails does not mean that the senders are illiterate people who do not know the correct grammatical expression. Only when they sent their e-mails to equal-aged or younger persons did they choose these forms of expression, because they were released from the pressure of nunch ’i. None of the people who wrote these expressions to their equal aged friends wrote the
same ways in their e-mails to older professors. This fact shows another aspect of language use in relation to Korean nunch’i culture.

As we can see in the example based on situation #2 below, Example 2 shows many differences from Example 1 based on situation #1.

Example 2—a sample of Korean e-mail based on situation #2

1. 선희~
Sunhee~
Sunhee-GN~
2. 기말고사 준비는 잘 하고 있는지 모르겠네요….
Kimalkosa chunbeenun chal hako ittunchi morugetney…. Final test preparation-NOM well done been-if wonder-RE.  
I am wondering if your preparation for the finals has been done well….  
3. 나도 나름 열심히 하고는 있는데….
Nahdo narum yeolshimhee hagonun ittundey…. I-FPP-also rather hard work being-AE
Even if I am also working hard but….  
4. 너도 알다시피 지난 주 내내 병원에 있어서 수업을 제대로 못 들었잖아.
Nuhdo aldashipee chinan chu neyney byungwoney itsuseo suepul You-SPP-also know-as last week throughout hospital-at being-because class-OBJ cheydeyro motulutchanah. properly not-taking-AE.  
As you know, I could not take the class properly because I was hospitalized all through the last week.  
5. 노트필기도 당연히 제대로 안되어 있고…
Notepilkeedo dangye onhee ahndeyuh ittko…. Notewriting-also consequently not-done been-and-AE  Consequently, my class-note has not been ready and….  
6. 그래서 그런데….
Kureyseo kurundey…. Therefore, so…..  
7. 내일 시간 괜찮으면 도서관에서 내가 공부하는 것 좀 도와 줄 수 있을까?
Neyil shikan koenchanumyun doseokwan-eyseo naeka Tomorrow time good-if library-at I-FPP-NOM kongbuhanunkt chom dowa chulswu itsulkk? Study-do-to a-little-bit help give-able-to be-Future-AE  
If your time is o.k, then could you help me a little bit study at the library, tomorrow?  
8. 너의 완벽하게 정리된 노트도 함께 발려주면 더 더욱 잘구—^^
Nuhuy wanbyughakey chungridoen notedo harmkkey bilyeo You-SPP-PPar perfectly writtedown note-also together lending Chumyun derderwook choikk~—^^ It couldn’t be better, if you can lend me your class-note that is perfectly written.  
9. 나중에 좋은 결과 나오면 한 틀 거하게 쓰 테니까…
Nachungey choun kyuilikwa nahomyun hantuk guhakey ssol tehnykka… Later on good result out treat pretty much shoot do-Future-AE…  
If I get a good score later on, I will definitely treat you well with great amount.  
10. 부탁 좀 할게~
Butak chom harlkey~ Ask a-little-bit do-future-AE.  
Let me ask you a favor a little bit~
11. 그럼 내일 도서관 앞에서 보자~
Kurum neyil doseokwan ahpeyseo pocha~
Then tomorrow library in front see-RE~
Then, let’s meet in front of the library tomorrow~
12. 멘스~ㄹ
Ttangs~kuh
Thanks~haha

First, the sender of Example 2, which was an e-mail sent to an equal-aged friend, shows that the sender uses a different FPP than that of Example 1, like nah (I) in line #3 and nae (I) in line #7 of Example 2. The sender does not use cher/chey (I), which is a humble form of FPP that is shown in Example 1. Additionally, the second person pronoun (SPP) appears in Example 2 as nuh (you) in line #4 without replacement of SPP with GT/PT + HTa. Also, the sender directly uses the receiver’s given name, which can imply that the sender does not perceive the pressure of nunch ’i from the receiver.

There are also no examples of honorific nouns, predicates, or particles in Example 2. However, the examples of plain nominative articles in line #2, like –un, and in line #7, like –ka, also may indicate that the sender is reducing the pressure of nunch ’i from herself toward the receiver, although this does not always mean that the receiver feels the same as the sender, which will be discussed in depth in the application section. The sender of Example 2 also drops all subject-and addressee-honorific affixes and deferential enders from the e-mail. Instead, the sender uses regular plain enders, like -cha in line #11. But almost all of the lines in Example 2 have abnormal plain enders, while the regular plain ender is used only one time, in line #11. There is also one casual contraction of a phrase in line #3, –ittnundey (being doing but), and contraction of a word in lines #7 and #10, the word chom that is shortened from chokum (a little bit).

However, interestingly, the rhetorical nunch ’i features of situation #2 were not much changed compared to situation #1, as we see in the results in Table 6. The Sharing fellowship stage (SFS) was reduced to 80% in situation #2 from 100% in situation #1. Topic change (TC)
changed to 47% from 87% and **Context building** (CB) changed to 73% from 100%. But compared to Table 7, which we will discuss a little later, the results of Table 6 were exactly in the middle. In other words, the degree of rhetorical *nunch’i* pressure in Korean e-mails lessened when the receivers were younger. So, I conclude that the relationship between the age of receivers and the degree of *nunch’i* pressure perceived by senders is directly proportional. As we see in Example 2, lines #2 and #3 do not contain the main point that the sender really wants to deliver to the receiver. Before the sender delves into the impositive request, which is the main task of asking the equal aged receiver to come to the library with her class notes, the sender may have to use *nunch’i*, as she may often do in her daily life. The topics of lines #2 and #3 in Example 2 are changed at line #4 to come a little closer to the main point, though the main point is not clearly stated until line #7. The lines from #2 to #6 are used by the sender for context building, to give a hint about why she needs to study with the receiver and why she needs the receiver’s class notes. In Example 2, the sender uses *nunch’i* much as she may use it habitually in daily communication with others. It is interesting that this behavior is also shown in e-mail discourse, which is written discourse that shows conversational interactive features.

As we examine the results of Table 7, based on situation #3 where the senders wrote e-mails to ask a younger friend for help in moving, we see clear similarities among the results of situation #2 and situation #3. When older persons ask their younger friends for help, the older senders might also be constrained to use honorific expressions under the pressure of *nunch’i* to the younger receivers. Nonetheless, according to the results of situation #3, the older senders did not change their lexico-grammatical forms of expression in a deferential way, something that we also saw to be true in the e-mails sent to equal aged interlocutors in situation #2. This means that even in the impositive situation of making a request, the honorific expression was not used to be polite or to reduce the degree of face threatening towards same aged or younger receivers in
Korea. Korean Honorifics were normatively used between [+age] and [−age] people. Because of this hierarchical social system, it may be easier for an older person to ask a favor of a younger person than vice-versa in Korean society. *Nunch’i* that comes from [+age] hierarchical cultural pressure is the main factor that elicits honorific expressions in Korea.

Table 7
Situation 3: asking a younger friend for help in moving [−age]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nunch’i Feature</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal pronoun</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First person pronoun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humble form : Cher/chey (I)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plain form : Nah/Nae (I)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement by KT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuna(elder sister)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyung (elder brother)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second person pronoun:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain form: Nuh/Ney (you)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement by GT/PT + Ha(you)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address-reference term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal: (Dear) + GN + (SN)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN + GT/PT + HTa:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT + HTa (Kyoswu-nim [hon. professor])</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT + HTa (Paksa-nim [hon. Dr.])</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal: (Hey) + GT (friend) + a/ya</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hey) + GN + (a/ya)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No address-reference term</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Honorific Nouns:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>durida (give)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheychulhada(submit)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Honorific Predicates:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Honorific Particles:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorific:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kkey (dative/locative/goal)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kkeseo (nominative)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eykey(seo)/Hanthey (dative/locative/goal)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un/nun/i/ka (nominative)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of them</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>subject-and addressee-honorific affixes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject honorific suffix –*(u)s (sy or sey)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addressee honorific suffix –*(su)p</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deferential enders:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(su)pnida, -(su)pnikka, -sipsio, -(u)sipsida</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polite ender –yo.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regular plain enders:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-da –ni/- (nu)nya –kera/ura –cha</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abnormal plain enders:</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Casual Contractions of word or phrase:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhetorical nunch’i features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Fellowship stage</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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First of all, the usage of FPP was similar in situations #2 and #3. *Nah/nae* (I) was used by 87% of the writers in situation #3. Thirteen out of 15 participants used the plain form of FPP. In addition, the interesting finding about FPP usage in situation #3 was that FPP was also replaced by NPs, such as Kinship Title (KT) like *nuna* (elder sister)/*hyung* (elder brother), just as SPP was replaced by NPs in Table 5 based on situation #1. Forty-six percent (46%) of 15 participants who directed e-mails to younger close friends used the NP replacement of FPP. The plain form of SPP *nuh/ney* (you) was still used by 93% in the e-mails based on situation #3. Even though only 7% of the e-mails in situation #3 dropped the pronoun, this does not mean that these senders showed deference to the younger receiver. However, avoiding the form could make their relationship softer and cushion the request.

None of the older senders used HNs, HPres, or HPars in Table 7 in their e-mails. But 20% of older senders used plain particles like *-eykey/hantey* (dative/locative/goal), and 93% used *-un/nun/i/ka* (nominative), and 13% used both. So the total number of particle users in Table 7 was actually 100%. We can assume that none of the older senders used the subject-and addressee-honorific affixes along with deferential enders. However, regular plain enders were used by 87%, which means 13 out of 15 participants used regular plain enders, while abnormal plain enders were used by 100%, which means all of the older e-mailers used at least one abnormal plain ender in their e-mails sent to younger receivers. The casual contractions of words or phrases were used 87% of the time. None of the Koreans in situation #1 used either plain enders or abnormal enders; but in situations #2 and #3, the majority of the senders used either plain enders or abnormal enders by more than 80%. This result may show that Koreans who send
e-mails to older people use honorifics under *nunch'i* pressure, while Koreans who send e-mails to younger or equal aged people rarely use honorifics when under less *nunch'i* pressure.

The following is an example of e-mails that were directed to a younger receiver by an older sender in Korean based on situation #3. Again, this e-mail shows that there are similarities between those e-mails written based on situations #2 and #3. Thus, Example 3 has some common points with Example 2, which was written based on situation #2 where a sender wrote an e-mail to a person of the same age.

Example 3-a sample of Korean e-mails based on situation #3

1. 하이~대영~!!!
   Hai~ daeyoung!!!
   Hi~ daegyoung-GN!!!
   Hi Daeyoung!!!

2. 잘 지내지?
   Chal chinaechi?
   Well stay-AE?
   How are you doing?

3. 현숙이한테 들으니 너무 잘 지내서 탈이라고 하던데?
   Hyunsookhanne duleony nuhmu chal chinaesoe talirago hadeondey? Kuh
   Hyunsook from hear too well stay-because problematic say-Past-AE? Kuh
   I heard from Hyunsook that, because you are doing too well, it is a problem? hehe

4. 예전엔 가끔 만나 밥도 먹고 영화도 보고 그랬는데…
   Yechunen kakkum mana bapto mukko youngwhado poko kuratnumdey…
   Long time ago, often meet meal-also eat-and movie-also-watch-and do so-Past-AE…
   In the past, we often met, ate something, watched a movie and so on….

5. 요새는 어떻게 그럴 기회가 좀처럼 안 생기네…
   Yoseynun urttukkye kurul kiwheyka chomchurum ahnsaengkinney…
   Recent time-NOM somehow do so chance-NOM rarely happen-AE…
   Recently, somehow we have never had that chance….

6. 현숙이랑 자리 한 번 만들테니 그때 볼게 하여서 알았지?
   Hyunsookirang chari hanbun mandul teyni kuttae kkok pocha-alattechii?
   Hyunsook-with occasion one time make do-Future-because then surely see-RE-got it-AE?
   I will make an occasion to get together with Hyunsook, then let us see each other at the time~got it?

7. 다른게 아니구...다음 주 주말에 우리 집 가구를 좀 옮겨야 하는데…
   Darunkey ahniku...daum chu chumaley woori chip kakurul omkyuya hanundey…
   By the way next weekend-on our house furniture move must-AE…
   By the way…on the next weekends, I have to move my furniture but…

8. 나 혼자선 어떻게 해도 안되고…
   Nah honchason urttukey haedo ahndoeko….
   I alone how do-although not-done-and-AE
   I cannot make it by myself.

9. 내 주위에 그런 일도 wow 만큼 편하고 편하면서 황도 센 사랑을 없어서 말이지...
   Naeh chuwiey kurun il towa chul mankum chinhako pyunhamyunseo
   Me around such work help giving as much as friendly dependable-and so
   himdo ssen sarami upseoseo malichi…
   power strong man-NOM not be so-AE…
Around me, there are none of the people who are kind, gentle, and powerful enough to help me move...

10. 네 누나 베스트 프랜드의 간만의 부탁인데.. 좀 들어줘라 =

Ney nuna beysut freynduy kanmanuy putakinuy chom dulerch ura=kuh
Your oldersister best friend-PPar rare asking-because a little bit accept-RE=kuh
Because this is a rarely asked help from your sister’s best friend, please, help me.

11. 그럼 도와주는 걸로 알고 있다는다~

Kurum dowa chunun kulro alko ittnunda~
Then help giving do-as know-and be-RE.
Then, I will believe you’ll help me~

12. 그 날 까지 힘이나 많은 비축해 두고~ = =

Kunal kkachi hymina mani bichukhae duko=kukukuh
The day until power much save do-and-AE=kukukuh
Until the day, save your energy a lot~ hahaha

13. 다음 주 금요일쯤해서 내가 전화할게~

Daum Chu kumyoil chumhaeso naeka chunwhahal key~
Next week Friday around-or so I-NOM telephone-do-Future-AE~
Around next Friday or so, I will call you~

14. 그 날 까지 잘 지내고~ 안녕~

Kunal kkachi chal chinae ko~anyoung~
Until the day well stay-and-AE=bye~
Until the day, take care of yourself well=bye~

As we discussed, in speech between age cohorts, Koreans are likely to use the plain form of FPP just as shown in Example 3 with nah/nae (I) in lines #8, #9 and #13. Also, in line #10, the plain form of SPP is shown as ney (you). The address form is also the same among the Korean e-mails for situations #2 and #3. As we see in Example 3, there are no honorific nouns, predicates, and particles, and there is only one case of using plain particles like -hantey (dative/locative/goal) in line #3 and nominative particles, nun in line #5, i in lines #9 and #12, and -ka in line #13. The interchangeable usage of these Korean plain and honorific forms of particles may mean that Korean e-mailers are under pressure of nunch’i to use honorific particles to show deference to older receivers, but not to those of equal or younger age, to whom they use plain forms of particles.

In addition, in comparison to Example 2, subject-and addressee-honorific affixes are also not used in Example 3; nor is any other deferential sign-off. Although we see regular plain enders such as -cha in line #6, -ura in line #10, and -da in #11; again, as in Example 2, there is a higher frequency of abnormal enders such as -chi in lines #2, #6, and #9, -dey in lines #3, #4, and #7, -ney in line #5, -ko in lines #8, #12 and #14, and -key in line #13. Through the use of these
abnormal enders, we can conclude that the senders perceive themselves to be free of nunch’i and even superior to the younger receiver. The sentences look and sound incomplete; if received by an older hearer, they might sound a little insincere. However, these expressions can be used broadly by an older sender to a younger receiver in Korean e-mails. Among younger-aged friends, such expressions can help the e-mails feel friendly and free of nunch’i pressure.

The Korean nunch’i mechanism is also shown through rhetorical nunch’i features in Example 3. As we might expect, the percentage of use of the sharing fellowship stage (SFS) was reduced to 60% from 80% in Table 6 and 100% in Table 5. The instances of SFS stage in Example 3 are in lines #2, #3, #4, #5, and #6. Before delving into the main topic of requesting help in moving furniture, the sender might perceive the pressure of nunch’i due to the imposing request that she has to make to the younger receiver. Although the nunch’i pressure that comes from the high imposition does not cause the sender to use honorifics, because the receiver is a younger person than the sender is, the sender is still very careful in approaching her main message through the sharing fellowship stage. As we see, the sender does not reach the main point until line #10: asking for help in moving furniture. Between lines #7 and #9, the sender does not dare to say the word help; rather, she builds up a context to explain why she has to ask for help. Before the main message or main topic, the seemingly irrelevant topics in the sharing fellowship stage and topic change stage are cooperating together in what we understand to be a Korean rhetoric of e-mails. This style of rhetoric might seem strange to an American.

Fifty-three percent (53%) of the participants in situation #3 used the strategy of topic change in their e-mails, which means 47% of the participants reached the main point directly after the sharing fellowship stage or even without SFS. Although the senders who wrote the e-mails based on situation #1 changed their topics by 87% under harder pressure of nunch’i, the e-
mails based on situation #3 reduced the ratio to 53% and the e-mails for situation #2 to 47%. We can assume that senders were under less pressure of nunch 'i in situations #2 and #3.

The author of Example 3 showed that she was building context. Right before directly asking for help in moving furniture, the senders in situation #3 used the strategy of CB in their e-mails by 33%. This number was greatly reduced from 73% in situation #2 and 100% in situation #1. In the context building stage, the receiver might intuit the main point through nunch 'i, because the nunch 'i mechanism is reciprocal. It is not a one-sided phenomenon: both the sender and the receiver use nunch 'i in dynamic negotiation with each other.

The rhetorical features of nunch 'i can be summarized as follows. First, there is SFS, which occurs before going directly to the main point. For example, a sender often perceives the pressure of nunch 'i, especially in requesting a favor via e-mail of an older person, and s/he has the tendency to begin by expressing honor toward the older receiver through a greeting, by asking about personal matters such as health, business, or studies, or by giving acknowledgement or a compliment. Such comments are often not related to the main topic. Second, there is a TC. A sender who uses nunch 'i is likely to touch on multiple points before s/he reaches the main point in order to distract the receiver’s focus from the main point. Therefore, if there is at least one other topic that is not the main topic following the sharing fellowship stage, it was counted as a topic change in this experiment. Third, there is CB. A sender who uses nunch 'i often builds up context, as if the sender is giving hints of the main point before the receiver finally reaches it. This stage is a politeness strategy of grounding that makes excuses. The multiple topics that are used in the TC stage, as well as the topic in SFS, are often indirectly related to the main point to build up context, but not always. These three rhetorical strategies are related to the actions of foresight in nunch 'i.
There are a number of conclusions to be drawn based on the preceding experiment. First, we find that the language use for situation #1 is extended and similar to standard written language, while the language use for situations #2 and #3 is simpler, shorter, and of relatively casual spoken variety. These findings were true among all the e-mails written based on the three different situations. Second, the e-mails to an older person from a younger person show various grammatical and lexical forms that reflect a close relationship between Korean language and culture. The younger senders are more likely to use nunch’i in their e-mail correspondence with older receivers under the pressure of a hierarchical relationship, and this complex is reflected on their use of language. So, according to the results of the experiment, age difference among interlocutors can stimulate Koreans’ nunch’i mechanism and push younger addressers to honor older addressees in their written e-mails. Even in a heavily impositive relationship between older and younger people, the level of imposition does not affect the older people’s use of honorifics toward the younger people. Yet the honorifics are always used by the younger people toward the older people. In other words, only nunch’i pressure that comes from [+age] complex triggers Koreans’ use of honorifics. The following application will demonstrate whether this phenomenon, shown so clearly in the manipulated experiment, is be replicated in real-life situations.

3.2 Application

3.2.1 Method and Data Collection

Note that the e-mails used for the experiment were one-sided, while the e-mails that will be examined in the application feature messages with responses. The results of the manipulated experiment show the importance that Korean culture gives to [+power] and [+age], and how that importance is embedded in Korean language use. In other words, according to the results of the experiment, speaking to a person who is older causes a Korean younger person to use nunch’i to
honor the older person. It is interesting to apply this result to real-life e-mail data. The application part of this study examines a different e-mail corpus to analyze the close relationship between culture and language use among acquaintances in real life.

In the real-life data, the age of the correspondents was not strictly controlled, as it was in the experiment. For example, there were e-mails that were written to a 50 year old person by a 10 year old, a 20 year old, a 30 year old, a 40 year old, a 50 year old, and even older. Another difference between the two data sets is that there were not always requests in the real-life data. The application also allows us to look at relationships that feature varying levels of intimacy, and to examine the effect these varying levels of closeness have on language use in terms of [+distance] human relationship. Koreans are likely to divide people into two groups, such as in-group [−distance] and out-group [+distance] members. Family members and relatives are generally considered in-group members in Korea. It is assumed that there is a correlation between [+distance] relationship and nunch’i that, along with the age effect, may also affect Korean language use. I will explore how these real-life e-mails engage the nunch’i features calibrated in the experiment.

The first task to be carried out was to sort the Korean e-mails collected from among the researcher’s acquaintances, who were asked to provide e-mail texts and age information with the understanding that their names would not be used. Some of these acquaintances lived in Korea and the others were undergraduate or graduate students in the U.S. A total of 170 personal e-mails were collected from these native Korean speakers. Out of the 170 e-mails, several were eliminated from consideration for the following reasons: some had only one sentence or less, some were sent to people whose age was not known to the author, and others were sent to multiple people. A total of 83 native Korean speakers participated as authors of the collected e-mails; more than one e-mail correspondence was collected from some of the participants. Among
the 83 participants, 31 were direct participants who provided e-mails they had sent to their friends and relatives, along with the replies to those emails. The other 52 participants were those people who corresponded with the 31 direct participants; their e-mail messages and age information were provided to the researcher by the direct participants. I call those 52 people indirect participants.

As mentioned previously, there were cases in which one direct participant corresponded with more than one indirect participant in the data set. However, if the same indirect participant corresponded more than twice with the direct participant, the surplus e-mails from that direct participant to the same indirect participant were not used. If some senders appear more than one time in the data set, this is because they corresponded with different age groups of people. In this way, all e-mail data collected in this study were “friend-of-a-friend” e-mail data. The majority of e-mail data consisted of both sides of each correspondence, which means almost all e-mails had replies, so that we could see how two different age groups of people responded to their e-mails in real-life. Because some of the Koreans in the application write and speak English, there were some examples of e-mails that Koreans sent to other Koreans written in English to avoid nunch’i complex. A total of 4 cases of this occasion have been found in the data set.

The remaining 141 collected e-mails were sorted according to age group. The e-mails were classified into seven age groups of senders and receivers. That is, groups of senders and receivers were arranged into [10-20], [21-25], [26-30], [31-36], [36-40], [41-45], and [46-100] as shown in Table 8, the chart of Korean E-mailer Age Groups.

**Table 8: Korean E-mailer Age Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R* [10-20]</th>
<th>[21-25]</th>
<th>[26-30]</th>
<th>[31-35]</th>
<th>[36-40]</th>
<th>[41-45]</th>
<th>[46-100]</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S** [10-20]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[21-25]</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(table 8 con’d.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R: Receiver’s age groups</th>
<th>**S: Sender’s age groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[26-30]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[31-35]</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[36-40]</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[41-45]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[46-100]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*R: Receiver’s age groups **S: Sender’s age groups

Each age group was divided along 5-year increments, based on the assumption that participants within five years of each other in age might not change their deferential level much among one another. At the same time, all the groups were divided into two sub-groups, which were the senders’ age group and the receivers’ age group. In the table, we can see how many e-mails were sent and received among the different age groups. For example, according to Table 8, the total number of received e-mails in the senders’ age group [26-30] is 59, and the total sent number of e-mails among this group is also 59. The [10-20] and [46-100] age groups were arranged in greater than 5 year increments. The first reason for this is that there were not many people from these age groups in this second data set. As seen in Table 8, there were 9 e-mails sent and received in the [10-20] group, and 8 e-mails sent and 10 received in the [46-100] group. Also, it was assumed that language behavior in terms of honorifics among the 10 to 20 year old age group might be similar because, in Korean society, this age group generally comprises people under parental care before they enter college. At the other end, all the people in the 46 and older age group are considered senior members of Korean society in schools, companies, and sports clubs.
The examination and analysis were carried out as follows. Ten e-mails were received from the [46-100] age group, as seen in Table 8. These 10 e-mails were examined and analyzed according to the age relationship with the senders’ age group [26-30], which sent a total of 59 e-mails to all age groups of people. Among those 59 sent e-mails from the [26-30] age group and the 10 received e-mails by the [46-100] group, there are 4 e-mails where the sender and receiver groups overlap. The results of the examination and analysis of these 4 e-mail exchanges will be compared with results that coming from other age groups in Table 8.

The nunch’i features to be examined in this application were: First Person Pronoun (FPP), Second Person Pronoun (SPP), Address-Reference Term (ART), Honorific Nouns (HN), Honorific Predicates (HPre), Honorific Particles (HPar), Subject-and Addressee Honorific Affixes (SAHA), Deferential Enders (DE), Sharing Fellowship Stage (SFS), Topic Change (TC), and Context Building (CB). For example, I examined the 4 e-mails that were at the intersection of the senders’ age group [26-30] and the receivers’ age group [46-100] in Table 8. If one of those four e-mails contained at least one case of the humble form of FPP, as we saw in Table 5, then FPP for this e-mail would be marked as [+N] in Table 12, reflecting that the sender used nunch’i that came from [+age] complex toward the older receiver. If, in the e-mail, FPP was used at least one time in the plain form as seen in Tables 6 and 7, it would be marked as [−N] in Table 12, reflecting that the sender did not use nunch’i of [+age]. If FPP was not used at least once, then FPP in the e-mail would be marked as “NA” which means “Not Applicable.” Not using either case would also be considered less nunch’i than [+N] and more nunch’i than [−N] in this application analysis. However, if the e-mailer used both the plain form and the honoring form, so that it was not clear whether the sender showed honor or dishonor, then it would be marked as [+N] which meant that the sender used more nunch’i than NA but less than [+N].
The hypothesis driving this study was that the Koreans’ use of certain linguistic features indicates different levels of nunch’i according to [+age]. In other words, all e-mails sent by Koreans demonstrate nunch’i features related to [+age].

3.2.2 Results and Analysis

In discussing the analysis based on collected e-mail correspondences, we will refer to Example #4 and Example #5 below. These e-mails were chosen from among the 141 e-mails collected for the application because of their comparability with the e-mails that were written in the experiment based on situation #1.

Example #4 reflects a situation similar to situation #1, in which a younger student made a request to an older professor. We can examine how the real-life e-mail is different from or similar to the e-mails written for the experiment. Also, Example #5 provides a reply from the older professor to the younger student, which the experiment lacks.

Example #4.
1. OOO 교수님, 안녕하세요.^^
   OOO kyoswunim, anyoungearseyo.^^
   OOO-FN professor-HTa, peace-have-SHSF-PE.^^
   Professor OOO, how are you?^^
2. 저는 교수님께 수리경제학과 응용경제학을 들었던 졸업생 OOO 입니다.
   chernun kyoswunimkkey eungyong kyungcheyharkul
   I-HFPP-NOM professor-HTa-from-HPar applied economics-OBJ
   duludun cholupsaeng OOOipnida.
   Take-Past graduate OOO-AHIP-DE.
   I am OOO, a graduate, who took the applied economics from you.
3. 저는 지금 미국 YYY 주에 있는 University of XXX에 다니고 있습니다.
   chernun chikum mikuk YYY chuey itnun University of XXXey danigo itsupnida.
   I-HFPP-NOM now the U.S. YYY state-at being University of XXX-at attend be-AHSF-DE.
   Now I attend University of XXX in YYY state in the U.S.A.
4. 처음에 장학금을 받지못해서 고민을 했는데, 이곳에 와서 장학금도 받고 적응도 잘해서 지난학기에 좋은 성적을 받았습니다.
   cheoumey changharkumul bartchi mothaeseo kominul haetnundey, ikoteyseo
   First-at scholarship-OBJ receive not-do-so worrying-OBJ do-Past-AE-and then, this place-at
   changharkumdo bartko chukeungdo charhaeseo chinarn harkkittey
   Scholarship-also receive-and adjust-also well-do-Past-and so last semester-in
   choun sungchurkul bartartsupnida.
   Good scores-OBJ receive-Past-AHSF-DE.
   Although I was worried at first because I could not receive scholarship, now I receive scholarship and have well adjusted myself so that I received a good school grade last semester.
5. 그런데 이번에는 전공을 경영학으로 바꾸셔 지원을 하라고합니다.
   kurundae iburneynun chunkongul kyungyongharkuro barkkueseo chiwonul haryukko hapnida.
By the way, this time, major-OBJ Management-to change-and apply-to try-Future do-AHSF-DE.
By the way, this time, I am planning to apply to Management field after changing my original major.

6. 지나번에도 부탁을 드리서, 죄송스럽지만 다시 한 번 부탁을 드리고자 용기를 냈습니다.

chun narnunkey butarkul duryeodo. cheysongsurupchimarn
Last time also asking-OBJ giving-HPre-because apology-HN-ish-although
butarkul durikkokchar youngkirul natsupnida.
asking-OBJ give-HPre-to courage bring-Past-AHSF-DE.
Although, because I asked you before, I feel sorry to ask you again, I dare to ask you boldly again.

7. 저는 전공을 Manufacturing Management로 바꿔서 Ph.D. 공부를 하려고 합니다.

chernun chonkongul “Manufacturing Management”roh barkkuerseo
I-HFPP-NOM major-OBJ “Manufacturing Management” to change-and
Ph.D kongbu-rul haryekeyo hapnida.
Ph.D study-OBJ try do-AHSF-DE.
I am planning to change my major into Manufacturing Management to study in Ph.D course.

8. 한국에 이 분야에서 공부한 사람이 많지 않아서 전망이 좋아 보입니다.

harnkukey ipunayeseye kongbuharn sarami marnchi arnaseo chunmang itseo boipnida.
Korea-at this field-at study-Past man much not-because prospective be look-AHSF-DE.
This field seems to promise because not many people have studied in this field in Korea.

9. 저는 지금 이 곳 교수님 두 분으로부터 추천서를 받았고, 다른 하나는 교수님께 받고 싶습니다.

chunun chikum itot kyoswunim du punuro puter chunchunseorul bartartko
I-HFPP now fthis place professor-HTa two persons from recommendation-OBJ receive-Past-and
daran harnahun kyuswunimkkkey bartkkoseupnida.
The third one professor-HTa from receive-wish-to-AHSF-DE.
I received two recommendation letters from two professors in here and I want to receive the third one from you.

10. 부탁을 드리도 되겠는지요?

Butarkul duryeodo doeyketchunhiyo?
asking-OBJ give-HPre-although acceptable-be-PE?
Is it okay for me to ask you a favor?

11. 교수님의 연락을 기다리겠습니다.

Kyuswunimkey yeolarkul kiddariketsupnida.
Professor-HTa-PPar reply-OBJ wait-do-Future-AHSF-DE.
I will wait for your reply.

12. XXX에서 OOO드림.

XXXeysseo OOODurim.
XXX from OOGiving-HN
OOO, from XXX

E-mail #5.
1. 잘내고 있단니 든기 좋구나.

charl chinaekot idani tutki choktunah.
Well stay-and be-heard hear-to good-be-AE.
I am glad to hear that you are doing o.k.

2. 세해 복 많이 받아라.

Saehae bok marnie bartarah.
NewYear blessing a lot receive-RE
Be blessed a lot in New Year!

3. 여기 성적증명서장 그 곳 성적증명서장 부쳐 주면 추천서를 써 줄 수는 있는데, 기왕이면 그 곳 근황을 잘
아는 미국 교수님이 추천하는게 나을 것 같구나.

Yeki sungchuckcheongmyunseorahng ku kot sungchuck cheongmyunseorahang
Here transcript-and there transcript-and
Butchigey chunnumy chunchunseorul sseo chulsunun ittnundey, kwiwangmyun ku
send give-if recommendation-OBJ write give-able to be-although possible-if that
kot kunwhangul charl arnun mikuk kyoswunimi chunchun
Place situation-OBJ well know the US professor-HTa-NOM recommend
harnunkey nahul kut kartkunah.
Do-to better thing seem-AE.
If you send to me your transcript in Korea and the transcript in the U.S.A, I may be able to write a recommendation letter for you, but it would be better for an American professor who knows what’s going on around there to recommend you.

4. 그래도 내가 추천서를 써 주는데 필요한 서류보내거라. OOO

Nevertheless, I-FPP-NOM recommendation-OBJ write give-to necessary is-if

document send-RE. OOO-FN

Nevertheless, if it is necessary for me to write a recommendation letter, then send those documents to me. OOO

As we see in Example #4 above, this e-mail is well decorated with sincerely expressed honorifics, or chondaemal (polite/deferential words). We can see that the sender used nunch’i in several ways. He used FPP to show deference to the receiver, specifically cher (I) in lines #2, #3, #7, and #9. We see a similar use in Table 5. In both cases, the sender humbled himself to the older receiver. He used nunch’i of hierarchy toward the older receiver, whether consciously or unconsciously. This case would be marked [+N] in Table 9 below.

The second person pronoun (SPP) was also used as a humble form: Kyoswunim (professor) in lines #2, #9 and #11. Again, this was also true in Table 5. This case would also be marked [+N]. The address reference term (ART) can also be marked [+N], as we see the example in line #1. The sender used not only the professor’s name, but also his professional title, kyoswu (professor), along with –nim, which is the highest honorific title and particle. This e-mail also showed the use of honorific nouns (HN) like butark (asking a favor) and cheysong (apology) in lines #6 and #10; these are mostly used by younger people to older people under the conscious or unconscious pressure of nunch’i of hierarchy in Korea. These cases would be marked as [+N].

Honorific predicates (HPre) were also used in Example #4 to honor the receiver: in line #6 and line #10, durida (give) to be marked as [+N]. Honorific particles (HPar) were also used, as seen in lines #2 and #9 (Kyoswunimkkey [to professor]); this should be marked as [+N] because this expression contains very high deference. The subject-and addressee –honorific affixes (SAHA) were also used in lines #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, #9, and #11, such as -(su) or (i) p-, which is an
addressee honorific suffix, and in line #1, a subject honorific suffix such as -sey- to express
honor toward the older receiver, as seen in Table 5. Overall, this sender showed the highest honor
toward his older professor in that almost all sentences in e-mail #4 had addressee honorific
affixes or polite enders. So, the email should be marked as [+N].

There were also examples that reflect the rhetorical nunch’i features that were apparent in
Example #4. As in lines #1, #2, #3, and #4, the sender stepped into SFS. Instead of directly
dealing with his main topic - that he wants the receiver, an older professor, to write a
recommendation letter for him - the sender preferred to share fellowship first with the older
professor. Many Koreans go through this stage consciously or unconsciously, because sometimes
the foresight of nunch’i requires this stage of sharing fellowship and honoring the receiver. So,
SFS in this e-mail would be marked as [+N].

In this example, the sender also uses TC. Right after SFS, the sender changed the topic,
moving into the main point with the transition word kurundae (by the way) in line #5. But still,
lines #6, #7, and #8 do not directly raise the main point that the sender originally intended to
deliver. Those lines are fractions of separate topics related to the main topic of a request for
recommendation. In short, after line #5, although the sender changed the topic, this did not mean
that the sender delved into the main point right away. Rather, he approached the main point
cautiously, giving hints to prepare the receiver for the main idea. This is a case of CB around the
main point, to be marked as [+N]. If the receiver was not older, this stage might not have been
carried out so seriously and carefully. The sender used the foresight of nunch’i toward the older
professor, to be marked as [+N] for TC.

Finally, starting in line #9, the sender moved into the main topic— that he wanted the
receiver to write a recommendation letter for him—as shown in lines #9, #10, and #11. The sender
finished his message with a leave-taking at the end of the e-mail.
There were some differences in language use between e-mail #4 and e-mail #5, which was the reply from the older professor to the younger receiver. In e-mail #5, FPP was used in a plain form of Korean “I,” as in line #4 nae (I), which is a non-honorific expression, unlike cher (I), which was used by the younger sender to the older receiver in e-mail #4. Therefore, according to Tables 6 and 8, FPP in this e-mail should be marked as [−N]. Judging by age, SPP in this e-mail should have been used in a dishonorable way, but the sender of this e-mail showed that even if he is an older person, he uses nunch’i toward a student who is now a grown person. The sender of e-mail #5 did not use SPP, but this does not mean that he showed deference toward the younger receiver. So, it should be marked “NA” or “Not Applicable.” In the same vein, ART was also not used. Even though the sender was an older professor, he might perceive [+distance], and not perceive completely free of nunch’i. Therefore, ART should be also marked “NA.” However, HN is [−N] because not all of the words the older sender used toward the younger receiver were honorable words. Also, not all predicates that the sender used were honorable, so the HPre of this e-mail should be marked [−N]. However, because the sender did not use SPP and ART, HPar could not be used because HPar is always used behind a word indicating an addressee or a subject. So, it should be marked “NA”. However, the sender used all verbs without SAHA, which mean not showing deference to the sender; this would be marked [−N]. Also, as seen with -nah and -rah in lines #1, #2, #3, and #4, not all the predicate enders used in this e-mail were deferential, just as in Tables 6 and 8. So I marked [−N] on DE.

However, just as the sender expressed nunch’i by not using SPP and ART boldly (which would show that he was a higher person), his rhetorical approach was also cautious. Even if it was not as extended as the approach in e-mail #4, the sender of e-mail #5 also used SFS in lines #1 and #2 before moving onto the main idea. So SFS should be marked [+N]. It was interesting to see that even if a sender was older than a receiver, he might not always perceive himself as
free from *nunch’i*, especially in the case that the receiver was also a grown person. The older sender might choose to attend to the receiver’s social age, especially in a [+distance] relationship, since the sender is no longer his student and since the professor has not shared a personal relationship with the sender in the several years since the sender graduated from the college. TC was also seen in line#3, moving to a suggestion that could be context building after the SFS stage. The sender’s suggestion to the receiver was to ask a native English speaking professor for the recommendation letter. This did not mean that he refused to write a recommendation letter, but that he humbled himself as a recommender toward the receiver, who had already finished a Master’s degree in the U.S. In other words, the professor’s response showed that he expressed *nunch’i*, approaching this matter very cautiously, changing the topic and building context so as not to offend the sender. Therefore, TC should be marked as [+N] along with CB as seen in Table 9 below. For the privacy of the providers of e-mail data, the names of places and the names of the e-mailers were marked as XXX and OOO respectively.

**Table 9: An example of different performance of *nunch’i***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Nunch’i</em> Features</th>
<th>E-mail #4 E-mail #5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[26-30] age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPP</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HN</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPre</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPar</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAHA</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFS</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As seen in Table 9 above, these two Korean e-mails were compared in terms of *nunch’i* features. It was found through Table 9 that when the Korean sender and receiver were in different age groups, the e-mailers’ thoughts and their use of language were not the same. The younger person used 11 [+N] features while the older person used 3 [+N] features.

In this way, the Korean speakers’ e-mail *nunch’i* features were examined and analyzed as seen in Tables 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 below. Each chart within the 7 tables consisted of one sender group, located on the left of the chart, and 7 different receiver age groups, located on the right side of the chart. The age groups were [10-20], [21-25], [26-30], [31-35], [36-40], [41-45] and [46-100]. For example, Table 10 consisted of one [10-20] sender age group and 7 different receivers’ groups. Table 11 consisted of one [21-25] sender age group of people and 7 different receivers’ groups. The 5 other tables were also set up in this way. Under the sender age group, 11 *nunch’i* features were arranged to examine how a specific sender group used these *nunch’i* features toward the 7 different receivers’ age groups. There were a few e-mails among the real-life data that did not have replies, but since I could at least see how these senders used *nunch’i* features in their e-mails, I did not discard them as long as I was informed of the sender’s and receiver’s ages. All 141 e-mails were examined and analyzed in the same way that I analyzed e-mails #4 and #5 above; then I put the used frequency of [−N], NA, [+N], and [+N] features under each receiver’s group and calculated these frequencies as percentages in order to compare receivers’ numbers for each group.

### Table 9 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[+N]</th>
<th>[+N]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: *nunch’i*, NA: Not Applicable
Some of the results for the real-life emails were the same as in the experiment but there were also some different findings. Drawing on Table 10 to Table 16, we see that the assumption that [+age] was the trigger of nunch’i in using polite expressions in Korean was, overall, demonstrated in application. According to the application of the experiment results to the real-life Korean e-mail data, there was a correlation between the age of receivers and the number of [+N] in nunch’i features by senders. The frequency of [+N] features is in constant proportion to the receivers’ age. In other words, younger senders used nunch’i more to older receivers, while older senders used less nunch’i to younger receivers.

However, throughout the application of the experiment to the real-life data, there were also a few unexpected findings. First of all, Korean older senders did not always use [−N] toward younger receivers. This phenomenon appeared most noticeably when the older senders wrote e-mails to the [26-30] age group of receivers and older. Furthermore, the older senders often used [+N] toward their younger receivers who were older than the [21-25] age group. In particular, when senders and receivers were older than the [26-30] age group, regardless of age differences, they were likely to use [+N] feature, thus keeping each other in a [+distance] relationship. There is also another unexpected finding, in that there were a few younger persons who used the [−N] feature toward some older receivers. The receivers were neither in an inferior social status to these senders nor in an enmity relationship with the younger senders. In short, there were very young Korean senders who belonged to the [10-20] age group but used [−N] features toward someone in the [26-30] age group and toward a much older receiver in the [41-45] age group; in these cases, it was found that there was a close relationship such as kinship among the senders and receivers.

An additional way that the application findings differed from those of the experiment was that even among the same age group of people, some people used a very high level of [+N]
features, even if the actual age gap between those sender and receiver was very small. This finding contradicted the assumption that I drew from the experiment that a wide age gap between senders and receivers would trigger the *nunch’i* mechanism to use honorific expressions. However, it was the case in some specific human relations like *seonbae* and *hubae* relationship which holds Koreans at a [+distance].

Consequently, in terms of the use of Korean honorifics, an argument could be made that Koreans’ *nunch’i* is connected to the receiver-senders’ [+age] power relationship, but can be modified through the [+distance] relationship. The more the age of the receiver increases, the more the [+N] features increase; and the less the distance of the human relationship, the less the senders use [+N] features. It should be pointed out that Korean honorific usage is not strongly related to the level of imposition. Even if there was no pressure of imposition, Koreans often used *nunch’i* as the trigger of honorifics toward [+age] people in their language use. On the other hand, even if there were a case in which an older sender perceives the pressure of imposing *nunch’i* toward a younger receiver, the older sender may not be likely to use honorific expressions toward the younger receivers. It is much more likely that rhetorical expressions will be used strategically to reflect deference according to the level of imposition.

Table 10: *Nunch’i* used by [10-20] age group to other groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAG</th>
<th>RAGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[10-20]</td>
<td>[10-20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nunch’i Features</strong></td>
<td>[+N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FPP</strong></td>
<td>3[-N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPP</strong></td>
<td>3[-N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ART</strong></td>
<td>3[-N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HN</strong></td>
<td>3[-N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H Pre</strong></td>
<td>3[-N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H Par</strong></td>
<td>3[-N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAHA</strong></td>
<td>3[-N]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 above shows the results of how the [10-20] age group of senders demonstrates their [+N] features towards the 7 different age groups of receivers. As seen in the second column from the left of Table 10, there were 3 e-mailers who belonged to the [10-20] age group and who sent e-mails to people in their own age group; their e-mails showed that they used strictly [−N] features towards the same-aged group of people. In other words, the young senders did not use any nunch ’i towards the equal-age group of people. But although we did not check the results of the [10-20] age group of people sending to the [21-25] age group of people because there was no collected data, according to Table 10, it is evident that the [10-20] age group started to express the pressure of nunch ’i towards the [26-30] age group. When the youngest age group sent e-mails to older age groups such as [26-30], they showed significantly more [+N] features than towards their own [10-20] age group, as we expected.

However, in the application of the experiment to the real-life data, there were a few unexpected findings. I needed to carefully look at the findings because there were still two cases where the [10-20] age group used [−N] features towards the [26-30] receiver age group. The ratio of [−N] feature to all features in the column of [26-30] receivers’ group was 49%. This means that, among a total of 55 used nunch ’i features, [−N] features were used 27 times and [+N] was used 28 times out of 55 (51%). In addition, even if there was only one collected e-mail, there was another case in the same table where a person in the [10-20] age group showed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DE</th>
<th>3[-N]</th>
<th>2[-N]</th>
<th>2[+N]</th>
<th>-N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFS</td>
<td>3[-N]</td>
<td>2[-N]</td>
<td>3[+N]</td>
<td>-N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>3[-N]</td>
<td>2[-N]</td>
<td>3[+N]</td>
<td>-N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>3[-N]</td>
<td>2[-N]</td>
<td>3[+N]</td>
<td>-N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[-N] & [+N] ratio

| 100% | 49% | 51% | 91% | 9% |

*SAG: Sender’s Age Group; RAGS: Receivers’ Age Groups; ➔: sending bound; The number beside [+N], [-N], [+N] and NA means frequency.
dominant [-N] features by 91% to an older person in the [41-45] age group. In other words, even if there was a big age gap, certain Korean e-mailers used [-N] features toward their older receivers, which was an interesting finding given the assumptions I drew based on the previous experiment. This will be further discussed later when we turn our attention to the effect of close kinship relations on nunch ’i behavior.

Table 11: Nunch ’i used by [21-25] age group to other groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAG</th>
<th>RAGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[21-25]→</td>
<td>[10-20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunch ’i Features</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPP</td>
<td>8[N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP</td>
<td>6[-N],NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>6[-N],NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HN</td>
<td>9[-N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Pre</td>
<td>9[-N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAHA</td>
<td>9[-N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>9[-N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFS</td>
<td>10[-N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>8[-N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>9[-N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-N] &amp; [+N] ratio</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SAG: Sender’s Age Group; RAGS: Receivers’ Age Groups; →: sending bound; The number beside [+N], [-N], [±N] and NA means frequency.

In Table 11, the [21-25] sender age group also showed an increase in the frequency of [+N] usage according to the increasing age of the receivers. To the [21-25] receiver group, the [21-25] sender group used mainly [-N] features, by 87%. Interestingly, among those senders in the [21-25] age group, they used [+N] features by 13% even toward the same age group of people. This will also be discussed later on, focusing on the Seon-Hubae relationship. The senders in the [21-25] age group increased the frequency of [+N] feature usage toward the next oldest [26-30] age group from 13% to 45%, and then to 87% toward the [31-35] age group. To
the receivers in the [41-45] age group, the [21-25] sender age group used [+N] features by 91%. On the other hand, the [21-25] age group reduced the ratio of [−N] feature use toward the same [21-25] age group by 87%. This was reduced to 55% toward [26-30], to 23% toward [31-35], to 9% toward [41-45], although they used [−N] 36% toward the [46-100] age group. I assume that among them there were people in a close kinship relationship that would be discussed in detail later.

**Table 12: Nunch’i used by [26-30] age group to other groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAG</th>
<th>RAGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[26-30]</td>
<td>[10-20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunch’i Features</td>
<td>[−N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>2[−N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[−N] &amp; [+N] ratio</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SAG: Sender’s Age Group; RAGS: Receivers’ Age Groups; →: sending bound; The number beside [+N], [−N], [±N] and NA means frequency.

In Table 12 above, the original assumption that younger senders use nunch’i more to older receivers was still accurate. The [26-30] sender age group showed mostly [−N] features towards the younger receiver group [10-20] by 76%, by 82% toward the [21-25] age group, and by 78% towards the same age [26-30] receiver group, although they used [+N] features to the
equal and younger groups of people by 24%, 18% and 22% respectively. The [26-30] sender age group started to show substantially more [+N] features toward older receivers in the [31-35] age group by 62%, in the [36-40] age group by 66%, in the [41-45] age group by 86%, and then in the [46-100] age group by 80%.

Here was the issue found in Table 11 and Table 12. First of all, the Korean [21-25] sender age group showed cases of non-deferential language use in that they used [−N] features toward their own age group, which was understandable according to Tables 6 and 8 in the previous experiment. However, the finding that the [21-25] sender age group used [+N] features toward people of the same [21-25] age group in Table 11 was unexpected. This phenomenon was also found in the [25-26] sender age group, which used [+N] features towards their same age group, as shown in Table 12. The interesting point here is that some people in the same age groups, especially people in the groups [21-25] and [26-30], showed a very high level of deference or a high level of nunch’i complex toward people in their own age groups, compared to the [36-40] and [41-45] sender age groups. Generally, the people who are in [+distance] relationships among [36-40] and [41-45] age groups are often involved in ritual politeness or formality due to business, political activities, religious activities, or maintenance of social status and position. Therefore, it is understandable that they have to give deference even to people of their own age with a high level of [+N], as seen in Table 14 by 91% and Table 15 by 53%. However, it needs to be explained for the people who belong to the [21-25] or [26-30] age groups because they used a relatively high level of [+N] features to their own age group by 13% and 22% respectively, although they were not involved in any business, political, or religious activities because most of them were undergraduate or graduate students.

To understand this phenomenon, we need to recall the Korean seonbae and hubae (senior and junior) relationship (see chapter 1). All the people in the [10-20] sender and receiver age
group in Table 10 had *dongkee* relationships, but many people in the groups [21-25] and [26-30] were mixed among *seonbae*, *hubae*, and *dongkee*. The people who are in the *hubae* status have to increase the level of honorification in their language use caused by a high level of *nunch’i*, while they often keep the *seonbae* in [+distance]. This is a typical *seonbae* and *hubae* relationship in Korea.

The following two e-mails are selected as examples from the [26-30] age group. E-mail #6 is sent to a school *seonbae* by a *hubae* and e-mail #7 is sent to the *hubae* by the *seonbae*. Actually, they both have already graduated from college. When they were in the [21-25] age group, they met each other as a *seonbae* and a *hubae* in the same department in a college in Seoul, Korea. Having met as a *seonbae* and a *hubae*, this relationship will continue throughout their lives. Unless their relationship becomes significantly closer than it had previously been, their strong hierarchichal relationship—which affects their honorific language use—might not be easily lowered, although their actual age difference is within 2 years.

**E-mail #6**

1. 형 추천서 어느 분들에게 받으셨어요?
   Olderbrother recommendation whom persons-from-HPar receive-Past-SHSF-PE?

2. 저는 석사를 한학기도 안하고 바로 군대를 가버려서, 잘 아는 교수님들이 저희과 교수님들 밖에 안계세요.
   Chernun suksarul harnharkido annharko baroh kundeyrul kahberyuseo, I-HFPP Master-OBJ one-semester-even not-finish right away army-OBJ went-Past-because, charl ahnun kyoswunimidul *cherhee* kkaw kyoswunimidul barkke ahnyeyesyo. Well know professors-HTa-NOM our-HN department professors-HTa except not-be-SHSF-PE. Because I went to military service without finishing even one semester of Master course work, I do little Know professors except those in our department.

3. 어느 분들에게 받는게 제일 좋을까요?
   Uhnu pundul*kkkey* bartunkeh cheil choul *kkayo*?
   Who persons-from-HPar receive-to best good-be-PE?

4. 그리고 어떻게 부탁드렸어요?
   Kuriko uhttuckeh butark *durisietseoyo*?
   And how asking give-HPre-Past-S&AHSF-PE?

5. 교수님들께 감사히 부탁드리려 좀 면망해요.
   Kyoswunimidul*kkkey* karpharkhi butarkul*durinee* chom minmanghaeyo. Professor-HTa-to-HPar suddenly asking-giving-HPre-because a little bit awkward-be-PE. I feel a little awkward because I had to ask professors on a sudden.
6. 그리고 이럴때 선을 걸은건 드리는게 예의겠죠?
Kuriko irultae suhnmul katumul durinunke yeui ketchyo?
And this moment gift-OBJ something giving-HPre-to-also polite be-PE?
And in this moment, isn't it polite to give a gift stuff?
7. 이제 SOP와 추천서에 목숨을 걸어야 한것 같으나.
Ichey SOPwa chuchunseow moksumul kuleoyah harkut kartupsnid.
Now SOP-with recommendation-to life-OBJ risk-for do-thing seem-AHSF-DE.
It's time to risk my life for SOP and recommendation letter.
8. 유학생활 어렵지 않을까?
Yuhark saengwhal uhterseyo?
School-abroad life how be-SHSF-PE.
How is your life of school abroad?
9. 한국은 휴가시와 같이 날리합니다.
Harnkukun taepungi waseo narnrira.
Korea-NOM typoon-NOM come-because turmoil-be-AHSF-DE.
Korea is crazy due to Typhoon.

E-mail #7
1. 추천서 잘 받고 싶으면 OOO 선생님께로 한 편.
Chuchunseok charb bartko shipupmyun OOO seonsaengnimkkeh harn pyo.
Recommendation well receive want-if OOO teacher-HTa-to-HPar one vote-AE.
One vote for the teacher OOO, if you want to receive a good recommendation letter.
2. 가장 중요한 것은 네 수학실력이 상위 1%에 있다고 추천해 줄 수 있는 사람을 찾는 거다.
Kahcharng chungyoaharn kuseon ney suharksilyuki sangwui 1%eh
The most important thing-NOM you-PPar mathematic skill-NOM top 1%-at
ittako chuchunha chulsu itnun sahramul chartnu kerhda.
be-and recommend able be person-OBJ find do-RE.
It is the most important thing for you to find a person who can recommend that your
Math skill is on top 1%.
3. OOO 선생님도 나름 강력하다.
OOO seonsaengnimndo naruhm kangryuk kahda.
OOO-FN teacher-HTa-also somewhat strong-be-RE.
The teacher OOO is also strong in a way.
4. 여려바라...그런데 쌓주겠다 혹은 다른 본 찾아봐라 하실 거다.
Yuzzuerin harboarah kurummyun seechuketda hokeon dahun pun
Ask-HN-try-RE...then write-Future-RE or other person
Charzahboarah harsil kerhda.
Find-try-RE say-Future-do-RE.
Ask him...then he will say to you either I will or find others.
5. 추천서에 이 지원자의 영어실력이 좋다하는 추천서는 양!도!적!이다.
Chuchunseok ee chivonchahui younguh silyuki chotdahrnun
Recommendation-at this applicant-PPar English knowledge good-be-RE
chuchunseonun ahp! Do! Cheok! ida.
Recommendation absolute-be-RE.
The recommendation letter that says this applicant’s knowledge of English is good is Ab! Sol! Ute!
6. 유학생활에 나름 해를도 많다...개다가 머리까지 나쁘나...
Yuhark saengwhalehn nahrum awhando marntahnda...
School-abroad life-at somewhat agony-difficulty-also much-be-RE...
Kehdahkah mariekkachi narppui...
in addition head-even bad-be-AE.
There is also much agony and difficulty in the life of school abroad...because to make matters worse my
intelligence is bad.
7. 내가 못해서 고생하는 것이니....
Nae ka mothaeseo kosaengharnuhn kusini...
I-NOM not-do-well-because suffering-doing be-AE.
Suffering comes because I myself am not doing well….

Well you-with-NOM relation-not-being possibility-NOM much-be-but-AE ….

Well it might not possibly be the case of you.

You may even have scholarship, when you are accepted.

You may even have scholarship, when you are accepted.

First, in e-mail #6, HFPP is clearly used as a humble or lower form in line #2. This shows that the hubae used nunch ’i significantly toward the seonbae receiver. SPP and ART are [+N], as in line #1 when the seonbae is addressed as hyung (KT), or older brother. This address form cannot be changed into a lower form, no matter how what the [−distance] relationship. HN is also used, as with cherhee (our) - of which the plain form is oorie (our) - in line #2. If the hubae does not use nunch ’i that comes from [+age] hierarchical complex, he does not have to use that word.

HPre is also shown in this e-mail in line #2 with kyesidah(eyo) (exist), of which the plain form is itdah (exist). We also see HPre used with duridah (give), of which the plain form is chudah (give), in lines #4, #5, and #6. Although the sender does use HPar, -kkey, in lines #1, #3, and #5, it is not directed at the receiver but at a third person who is assumed to be honored by the sender. So, HPar is marked “NA” because even though there are some examples where the sender uses the nominative plain particles -un/nun/ika, like cher + -nun in line #2, as long as an address form that refers to the receiver is not used as a nominative form, it is considered neither polite nor impolite in modern Korean. However, SAHA is definitely marked as [+N], because of the use of -si-, which is a subject honorific suffix used in lines #1 and #4 after the root of the polite verb duri, although the subject reference is omitted. DE is ubiquitous in all sentences of this e-mail, including lines #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, and #8 along with a polite ender, -yo, and in lines #7
and #9 as the deferential ender, -(su)pnida. One interesting behavior in this e-mail is that SFS is shown at the end of the e-mail in lines #8 and #9. This may suggest that modern day Koreans are used to a westernized writing style, since many colleges in Korea use textbooks written in English and teach western style rhetoric at school. This sender does not build up context, even though he changes topics when he moves to SFS at the end of this e-mail.

On the contrary, e-mail #7 is full of condescending banmal (literally half-talk), dishonorific words toward the receiver under the absence of strong nunch’i pressure, although the receiver is not much younger than the sender. FPP is the plain form as expected in line #7, nae (I). SPP is also a plain form as in line #2, ney (you), and num (you) in lines #8 and #9. ART is “NA” because the e-mail does not contain any examples of addressing the receiver. HN is [−N], which means that none of the nouns in the email signal honor or respect. HPre is also [−N] because all verbs are banmal (half-talk) in this e-mail, containing no deferential connotations. In the same vein, SAHA is absolutely [−N], although HPar is NA because no address forms indicating the receiver are used. There are also no deferential enders (DE). Some enders are plain, like -kerhda in lines #2 and #4, -hahda in line #3, -ida in line #5, -da in line #6, -kehda in line #9, and -binda in line #10. The other enders are abnormal, like -pyo in line #1, -ni in lines #6 and #7, and -marn in line #8. Interestingly, e-mail #7 also has SFS at the end of the message, just as e-mail #6 has. There is TC, but CB is not evident.

Table 13: Nunch’i used by [10-20] age group to other groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAG</th>
<th>RAGS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[31-35]→</td>
<td>[10-20]</td>
<td>[21-25]</td>
<td>[26-30]</td>
<td>[31-35]</td>
<td>[36-40]</td>
<td>[41-45]</td>
<td>[46-100]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunch’i Features.</td>
<td>[−N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td>[−N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td>[−N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td>[−N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 13 con’d.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3[-N]</th>
<th>4NA</th>
<th>2[-N]</th>
<th>[+N]</th>
<th>2[+N]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAHA</td>
<td>3[-N]</td>
<td>2[+N]</td>
<td>3[-N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3[-N]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2[-N]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>3[-N]</td>
<td>2[+N]</td>
<td>3[-N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFS</td>
<td>4[-N]</td>
<td></td>
<td>2[-N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>2[-N]</td>
<td>6[+N]</td>
<td>3[-N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>3[-N]</td>
<td>5[+N]</td>
<td>4[-N]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SAG: Sender’s Age Group; RAGS: Receivers’ Age Groups; →: sending bound; The number beside [+N], [-N], [±N] and NA means frequency.

In Table 13, the nunch’i usage of the senders simply reflects the general tendency that the frequency of [+N] features increases according to increases in the receivers’ age. The [31-35] sender age group uses mostly [-N] features toward the younger [26-30] receiver group by 64%.

It is not surprising that the [31-35] sender age group shows [+N] features primarily toward the older receiver age groups, such as [36-40] by 49%, [41-45] by 82%, and [46-100] by 82%. If we put aside rhetorical features, nunch’i was used almost 100% of the time.

The [31-35] sender age group, however, shows an interesting aspect of +nunch’i features embedded in their language use. Unexpectedly, the older people in this [31-35] age group use [+N] features by 36% towards the younger [26-30] receiver group. In other words, almost half of the [31-35] sender age group is not free from nunch’i pressure even toward younger people.

Interestingly, many of the people in the [31-35] sender group who use [+N] features toward the younger receivers have [+distance] relationships with the younger receivers. However, there is a common characteristic among all relatively older sender age groups, including [31-35], [36-40], [41-45], and [46-100] – members of these groups often show [+N] features toward their younger receivers. In this case, the younger people who received [+N] from their older senders are generally in the [26-30] age group of people or older.
It might be assumed that most Koreans in the [26-30] age group would be independent of their parents. Actually, according to Confucious’s teaching, a man who is older than 15 years old should be treated as an adult. But in modern Korea, until reaching the [21-25] age group, the majority of Korean people are college students finishing their required military service. Therefore, Korean people, especially males, consider people in the [26-30] age group adults. So in their e-mails, the older Korean senders are very conscious of the fact that the younger receivers - especially in the [26-30] age group - are also grown people and college graduates. It is often the case that treating a person as a grown-up in Korea can mean establishing a [+distance] relationship with him/her; this can raise the intensity of nunch ’i.

That is why people in the [31-35] age group, and even older groups, are very cautious about using [−N] toward people older than the [26-30] age group, unless they have a close relationship with those people. It is true that we have cases in which the older senders use [+N] toward the [26-30] receivers by 36%, and toward their equal age group [31-35] by 16%; this result differs from the previous experiment. Yet until the moment when a [−distance] relationship is established, none of the senders use [−N] features freely, even to their younger receivers among the people who are in [26-30] or older.

Because of this peculiar situation, many Koreans are likely to remain maintaining distance for a period of time, using nunch ’i for a while and then embarking on the process of honorific negotiation in order to lower their nunch ’i and honorific levels toward their younger receivers. Even when people become closer, older people cannot lower the degree of deference in their words right away; they have to figure out the right timing through the foresight of nunch ’i. Another option is for the elders to ask the younger people whether they can lower the level of deference, saying mal nahchuerdo doegtnunka? or mal nachueodo doenah?, which means literally “May I lower the words?” Actually, this request is asking whether they can be free from
the pressure of nunch’i toward the younger recipients. At the same time, younger people also
often try to humble themselves by asking the older people to lower their level of deference,
saying, malsseum nahchusiedo doepnida or malsseum nahchuseyo, which literally means “You
may lower the words.” This means that the older person is free from the pressure of nunch’i from
that time on.

After the agreement, older people use [−N] freely to younger people, and most Korean
men and women are likely to address older people with a kinship title like hyung or hyungnim
(older brother) or uhni (older sister), as if they were biological family or in-group members. In
short, Korean e-mail senders are likely to use [+nunch’i] to those adults with whom they are in
[+distance] relationships until they build up a closer, more kinship-like relationship. Thus, we
understand that older senders who have [−distance] relationships with their younger receivers
can reduce the pressure of the complicated [+age] Korean hierarchical complex.

This explanation helps us understand why the senders in the [36-40] age group use [+N]
towards receivers in the younger age groups [26-30] by 17% in Table 14. It means that the [36-
40] people who use [+N] toward the [26-30] people are in [+distance] relationships with the
younger receivers. Therefore, we can understand the following phenomenon from Table 14: there
are some in the [36-40] sender age group who show mostly [−N] features toward both the
younger [26-30] receiver group and the same age [36-40] receiver group; this is because the
receivers are younger or equal aged friends in [−distance] relationships. We can summarize this
understanding of nunch’i usage by saying that there are some older senders who use [+N] toward
younger people because they have [+distance] relationship with them; in addition, we have a few
cases in which older senders use [+N] toward younger receivers in order to honor the receiver’s
grown-up status. This occurs toward people in [26-30] age group and higher, as we discussed
above.
In Table 14, there is also interesting evidence that [−distance] relationship can reduce nunch’i pressure among Korean e-mailers, even when a younger sender writes to an older receiver. There is one particular example in the [36-40] sender age group that supports the idea that [−distance] relationship can elude the nunch’i hierarchical complex. There is a person who belongs to the [36-40] age group and who uses many [−N] features toward a person who belongs to an older [41-45] age group. Based on the findings of the experiment, this should not happen. The central explanation for this situation is the [+distance] relationship among Koreans, such that these particular users of [−N] towards older people have [−distance] relationship with the older receivers. In short, it can be generalized that Koreans who have [−distance] relationships are often able to avoid the pressure of nunch’i age complex. The experiment in this study was not designed to reveal or explain this phenomenon, as it was a manipulated and limited experiment with only one case of a relationship between a younger sender (a student) and an older receiver.

### Table 14: Nunch’i used by [36-40] age group to other groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAG</th>
<th>RAGS</th>
<th>[10-20]</th>
<th>[21-25]</th>
<th>[26-30]</th>
<th>[31-35]</th>
<th>[36-40]</th>
<th>[41-45]</th>
<th>[46-100]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[36-40]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunch’i Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPP</td>
<td>6[-N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP</td>
<td>4[-N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>2[-N]</td>
<td>6NA</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HN</td>
<td>6[-N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Pre</td>
<td>6[-N]</td>
<td>2[-N]</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Par</td>
<td>6[-N]</td>
<td>2[-N]</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAHA</td>
<td>6[-N]</td>
<td>2[-N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>6[-N]</td>
<td>2[-N]</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFS</td>
<td>6[-N]</td>
<td>2[-N]</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>6[-N]</td>
<td>2[-N]</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>6[-N]</td>
<td>2[-N]</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td>[+N]</td>
<td>[-N]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-N] &amp; [+N] ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SAG: Sender’s Age Group; RAGS: Receivers’ Age Groups; →: sending bound; The number beside [+N], [-N], [+N] and NA means frequency.
(a senior professor). This student/professor situation is a typical [+distance] relationship in Korea in which the younger sender is supposed to use [+N] toward the older receiver 100% of the time, although there are some exceptions with the rhetorical *nunch'i* features. Also, the older professor in the experiment was not a real person with whom the student might have an actual relationship. Therefore, the student participants might have perceived more [+distance] in the relationship than I expected. The e-mails in the application section of the study, collected from various real-life situations, allowed me to observe communication within a variety of human relationships, and therefore to find the case below that suggests that *nunch'i* complex can be reduced in a close relationship.

The following e-mails #8 and #9 are examples of this phenomenon. E-mail #8 was sent by an older brother in Korea to a younger brother in the U.S. E-mail #9 was the younger brother’s response. In other words, the writers have a [−distance] kinship relationship. Although not all kinship relationships allow interlocutors to use [−N] features freely, in [−distance] kinship relationships, [−N] features are often used freely by younger people toward older people.

**E-mail #8**
1. Subject: 그곳 사정은?
Kukot sarcheongeun?
There situation?
How is the situation there?
2. 서울 형인데 잘 지내고 있는지 모른다.
Seoul hyungsindey charl chinaeko itnunchi moruketeda.
Seoul elderbrother-be-and then well stay-and be-whether not-know-do-RE.
I am your Seoul elder Brother: I am wondering if you are doing o.k.
3. OOO가 그곳으로 공부하러 간다고 하네요.
OOOika kukoturoh kongbuharuhy kandakho harnunde:
OOO-FN-NOM there-to study-to go-Future-and say-AE.
I heard that OOO will go there to study.
그곳 뉴올리안스가 물난리가 난뒤 상황이 어떤지 모르겠습니다.
Kukot new olreansa mulnarinrika namduy sargwhangi urttunchi moruketeda.
There New Orleans-NOM waterdisaster-NOM occurred and then situation-NOM how-is not know-do-RE.
I am wondering how the situation is after the water disaster in New Orleans.
4. 너의 거실 상황이 안 좋아졌는데 뭔말인지 모르겠구나.
Nuhn kisuksah sargwhangi ahnhcoah chiotdarnunde:
mummalinchi moruketkunah.
You-NOM domitary situation not good be-Past-and-then what words-whether not know-AE.
I do not understand what you are talking about that your dormitory situation is getting worse.
5. 그리고 년 언제 공부가 끝나고 그리고 무엇 활건지도 궁금하다.
Kurikoh nuhn unchey kongbuka kkutnarko kuriko muel harl kunchido kungkumharda.
And you-NOM when study-NOM finish-and and what doing be-also wonder-de-RE.
And I am also wondering when your study is finished and what you are going to do.

6. 나라 집사랑도 공부하다는데 무슨 공부인지 알리바라워라 하는데 잘 모르겠구.

nih chipsahramdo kongbuhandarunyeyu munson kongbunchee
You-PPar houseperson-also study-Future-and-then what study-whether
uhmmaka mührah hamunyey charl moruketku.
Mother-NOM talk-Past- do-and-though well not-know-AE.
(I heard that) your wife is also studying; (I do not) know what she studies (even though) your mom talked about it.

7. 내가 완전히 안정을 찾아야 알아가 걱정을 덜 할텐데 이글 받는데로 너의 근황을 적어보내와라.
Nihka wanchunyeyu chakayah yuuhmaka kukchungul duhl harltendey
You-NOM completely dwelling find-do-then mother-NOM worrying-OBJ less do-Future
igul burtunyeyu Nihuy kuhnwhangul chukeye bonaeboahrah.
This writing receive-and then you-PPar situation-OBJ write-and-then send-try-RE.
(When) you completely settle down, mom will worry less; write and send your recent situations right away after you receive this writing.

E-mail #9
Subject: Re: 그곳 사정은?
How is the situation there?
1. 사랑하는 형님아
Sahrahngharnun hyungnimah
Dear olderbrother-HTa-VPar
Dear older brother
2. OOO 누나가 OOO를 미국에서 공부시키는 것이 좋겠다고 결정했어.
OO nuhahaka OOOirul mikuyekeyeo kongbuul skihun kutsi
OO-GN eldersister-NOM OOO-FN-OBJ the US-in study-OBJ make thing-NOM-
choketahko kyulchung haet
Good-be-Future-and deciding do-Past-IE.
Older sister OO decided to let OOO study in the U.S.
3. 원래 호주에서 하기로 했는데, 호스텔 비용도 만만치 않고, 학교도 거기 별무구,
Wonrae hochyseoyo harko haetundey, homstey biyongdo
Originally Australia-in do-Future do-Past-and then homstay cost-also
Marmnarnchi ahanko, harkyodo kuki byulruko,
affordable not-be-and school also there not-good-and
장래를 위해서는 미국에서도 하는 것이 낫을 것 같고, 좋은 대학이 외전 더 많으니까.
changraerul bohaesonun mikuyekeyeo harnun kutsi narul kut kartko,
future-OBJ looking-when the US-in do thing-NOM better thing be-and,
choun daeharki hwolsin duh marmuhninkakah.
Good college-NOM far more many-be-AE-because.
(She) originally planned to study in Australia, but home-stay cost is not affordable at all, and schools there are not great, in consideration of his future, to do in the U.S. seems to be better because there are far more good colleges.
(……………………………………………………………………)
4. 또 한 얘기 해봐 되지……
tto mun yaeki haeya doechi……
else what story do have to-AE…
What else story do I have to tell…
5. 왜 갑자기 우리 형님이 공부하게 많아 지셨나 내가 궁금하네.
Woe kapcharki oori hyungnimih kungkumharnkey marnah
Why suddenly our olderbrother-HTa-NOM wondering-thing-NOM many
chisietsnahan naekah kungkumgharney.
be-SHSF-AE 1-NOM wonder-do-AE.
I am wondering why suddenly our brother has many questions.
6. 아, 히든, 오늘은 얘기 까지하고 안녕……
Ahmutun, Onuhlun yeki kkachi harko... ahnyung….
Anyway, today-NOM this much do-and-AE…bye…
Anyway, let's do this much today… bye……

The overall content of e-mail #8 is that the sender was wondering how his younger brother was doing, specifically after Hurricane Katrina. As an elder brother of a family, the
sender of e-mail #8 does not perceive the pressure of nunch’i from his close younger brother. The older brother uses banmal (non-deferential words), as reflected in the use of [−N] features in his e-mail. In line #2, his FPP is replaced by a noun phrase, the address form hyung (elder brother), to be marked [±N]. But SPP shows [−N] nuh or nih (you) as seen in lines #4, #5, #6, and #7. This older sender’s ART is not used for his younger brother, so it is “NA.” In a way, he does not have to use it because he has already called himself hyung, which implies that the receiver is his younger brother. The older brother also uses a little nunch’i toward his now-adult brother: the older sender does not address his grown-up younger brother directly by name, as he used to do when they were children in Korea.

Nonetheless, e-mail #8, sent by the older brother to his younger brother, contains many other [−N] features. HN, Hpre, Hpar, and SAHA are not used deferentially, and so are [−N]. Specifically, the enders that the older sender uses are not only non-deferential but are in fact quite abnormal—they literally represent half-talk. The ender -indey in the phrase “Seoul hyungindey” (Seoul elder brother then) in line #2 is a spoken version of the following written phrase, which is a little more formal: “Nahnun seouley sahnun hyungida kurundey…” (I am your elder brother living in Seoul and then…). The particle -indey in the phrase “Seoul hyungindey” is a combination of the predicate -ida and the transition word kurundey, which is similar to and then in English. Such casual usage of shrunken sentence enders is common in the e-mails sent by Korean older senders to their younger or equal aged receivers. This combined expression can be defined as non-honorific because the predicate -ida is used for non-honorific, plain half-talk expressions. The original formal expression is contracted into a two-word, non-honorific phrase. This expression is not usually used to a [+age] person by a [−age] person in Korea because it can be considered extremely impolite, unless the younger person is in a [−distance] relationship to
the older person. So, DE of E-mail #8, sent by an older sender to a younger receiver, is definitely $[-N]$. However, the reply that the younger brother sent to the older brother is interesting. His e-mail contains many $[-N]$ features. His FPP is $[-N]$ nae (I) in line #5, although SPP is not used either deferentially or nondeferentially, and is thus marked “NA.” HN, HPre, and Hpar are all $[-N]$; in particular, DE is $[-N]$ because all of the enders in E-mail #9 are abnormal, as shown in the older brother’s e-mail. SAHA is $[+N]$ because of one sentence containing the subject honorific suffix -(us)i- (in “chisietnah” in line #5); none of the other sentences contain either subject honorific suffixes or addressee honorific suffixes. In addition, all sentences contain abnormal enders, except line #2, which features an intimate ender in a declarative sentence. Therefore, DE of this e-mail is marked $[-N]$. In the rhetorical features, although the older brother shows $[+N]$ for all three items, the younger brother shows only one $[+N]$, for TC. SFS and CB are $[-N]$. Consequently, we can conclude that the younger brother is free from nunch’i complex in this $[-distance]$ brotherhood relationship. However, there is one element that the younger brother cannot use toward his older brother unless he wanted to build up a hostile relationship. It is Address-reference term (ART). Just as the older brother identified himself as hyung, the younger brother also confirmed the hierarchical relationship in line #1 through the word hyungnim (elder brother), an honorific kinship title + the highest honorific title. So, ART is $[+N]$. Among intimate $[-distance]$ members, then, we see that Koreans often break with both formality and honorifics to reflect and reinforce close relationships among siblings, friends, and parents and children, perceiving themselves free from the nunch’i complex. However, there is a normative rule even in this case. The younger sender must not use the plain SPP you and the name of the $[+age]$ receiver, especially GN. Instead they use only a kinship title, as in line #1’s “older brother (honorific kinship title) + the highest honorific title,” although many of them will
omit the highest honorific title -nim. This is a fine line for brothers to be unable to trespass in Korean hierarchical culture. It is clear that among siblings who are in [−distance] relationship, certain non-nunch’i behaviors can often be seen regularly in their e-mails. Even if he/she uses a half-talk expression, the younger sender is safe because the older receiver will not consider this behavior face-threatening as long as the younger sender maintains the hierarchy by not using the plain second person pronoun you or the direct name of the older receiver – instead, the younger brother can confirm the hierarchical relationship by addressing the older brother as hyung or hyungnim.

This discussion of E-mails #8 and #9 explains the phenomenon that we identified in Table 10, in which a younger age group [10-20] showed overwhelmingly [−N] features toward their older receiver groups, aged [26-30] and [41-45] respectively. Of the 5 of [10-20] age group senders, there were 2 who used [−N] features toward older receivers in age group [26-30] and 1 who used [-N] features toward the [41-45] receiver age group. The first two [10-20] age group senders have a close kinship relationship [−distance] with the older receivers from the [26-30] age group. The younger senders are nephews and the older receivers are their uncles. The other young sender also has a very close kinship relation with the older [41-45] age group recipient. These two are father and son. FPP, HN, HPre, HPar, SAHA, and DE are all [−N] in these exchanges. However, the SPP feature that the [10-20] age group used was not the second person pronoun you, and none of young senders used the direct names of the older receivers. ART is also a kinship title in each of these instances; in one case the title used is samchon (uncle) and in the other case, ahppah (daddy). Even if they do not attach -nim at the end of the kinship title, the young senders clearly confirm who is higher in terms of [+age] relationship.

| Table 15: Nunch’i used by [41-45] age group to other groups |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| SAG         | RAGS        |             |             |             |             |             |
| [41-45]     | [10-20]     | [21-25]     | [26-30]     | [31-35]     | [36-40]     | [41-45]     | [46-100]    |
Again, in Table 15, the general notion that an increase in the receivers’ age can bring an increasing degree of *nunch’i* toward the younger senders is demonstrated. The [41-45] sender group shows [−N] toward the [10-20] age group by 91%, toward the [21-25] age group by 82%, toward the [26-30] age group by 86%, and toward the [36-40] age group by 68% (these percentages include the rhetorical *nunch’i* features). Thus, the senders increased the frequency of [+N] as the ages of the receivers increased. However, towards their own age group, the [41-45] age group senders show [−N] features by 47%, while they used [+N] features by 53%. It is possible that some of these senders are in [−distance] with their same-aged receivers while some are not. Interestingly, in terms of the SAHA and DE *nunch’i* features, all 8 people who belong to the [41-45] sender age group used [+N] toward their equal age group recipients (100%). They also did not use any overt SPP or ART. Otherwise, the rest of people used [+N] features for SPP and ART. So, we can assume that their relationships are growing closer, but are not close enough yet to allow complete freedom from *nunch’i* pressure.
In Table 16, we can also see that when the receivers’ ages increase, the senders’ [-N] decreases and [+N] increases. The [46-100] age group used [-N] features toward the [10-20] age group by 100%, toward [21-25] by 88%, toward [26-30] by 86%, and toward [31-35] by 77% (including the rhetorical nunch’i features). This means that the frequency of [+N] increases according to an increase in the age of the receivers, although the percentage of increase is small (12%, 14% and then 23%). Again, in the case that the [46-100] age group used [+N] toward a person in the [31-35] age group, we can assume that they are in a [+distance] relationship.

Consequently, for this application section, we can conclude that [+age] and the frequency of nunch’i features in e-mails are not always in constant proportion, which is a different finding from the experiment. We have identified an issue in the precise analysis of nunch’i behavior that must be taken into consideration, regarding [+distance] relationship between the senders and the receivers of e-mails. In other words, even if there is a big age gap between a sender and a
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receiver, as long as their relationship is in [−distance], the *nunch’i* complex that comes from age hierarchy can be reduced in Korean e-mails.

Throughout this study, I argue that Korean speakers have a unique concept of [+age] as reflected in their daily language use. They give and receive cultural messages that are attached to their language and language use, as seen in their e-mail discourse in terms of age difference. Koreans perceive more pressure of *nunch’i* toward older recipients, and therefore raise the level of deference towards older recipients. Only [−distance] relationship can reduce the intensity of *nunch’i* pressure regardless of age, just as [+distance] relationship can raise *nunch’i* pressure.
Chapter 4. Conclusion

4.1 [+age], [+distance], and [+nunch’i] in Use of Korean Language

This study examines a corpus of computer mediated discourse (i.e. e-mail) to explore how nunch’i, which belongs to the Korean folk-cultural category, is reflected in Korean e-mail language use. In both an experiment and an application, this study documented and analyzed Korean e-mailers’ linguistic indications of human relationships between [+age] and [−age] people who are affected by [+distance] and [−distance] relationships. Korean culture is strongly hierarchical between [+age] and [−age] people. This is substantially different from U.S. culture, and that difference is reflected in differences in language use. Korean culture affects Korean language in use, especially as it relates to relationships among [+age] people. This reflection of [+age] social hierarchies in language is one of the things that makes Korean different from English.

The present study carried out two tasks: one, an experiment and the other, an application. These two tasks are distinct but related, as they were used together to build the central argument that Korean nunch’i culture reflects Koreans’ unique language use pattern. The experiment was based on one occasion and three different social relationships, and between one sender and three different receivers. The 15 participants were asked to send three e-mails: to a senior professor, an equal aged close friend, and a younger aged close friend. The content of the e-mails involved the asking of a favor. Although the experiment was not based on real-life e-mail correspondence, the results still demonstrated that there were lexical, grammatical, and rhetorical differences in the use of language according to the different ages of the receivers, with the most extreme differences to be seen when comparing e-mails to the imaginary younger receivers and to the imaginary older receiver (an older professor).
Through the experiment, it was demonstrated that Koreans are actively involved in using *nunch’i* both consciously and unconsciously. This is especially true among younger people who, in their e-mails to older recipients, utilize a sort of secret art of communication. As an example of the *nunch’i* mechanism, the e-mailers in the experiment used FPP and SPP systematically in two different ways toward older people and toward equal-aged or younger people. Koreans perceived the pressure of *nunch’i* to use the humble form of FPP toward older receivers. When they did not perceive the pressure of *nunch’i*, while writing to younger and same aged receivers, they used the plain form of FPP. This finding shows that Koreans have a peculiar concept of age that is distinct from other cultures, and that this concept is reflected in language use.

Through the experiment, it was also found that when Koreans used SPP toward older recipients, they were more sensitive to the [+age] complex that causes Koreans to use *nunch’i* toward older recipients. Participants did not use even the plain form of SPP to older receivers, perceiving it as an impolite behavior. Instead, many if not all of the senders used an address form for the SPP, especially toward older receivers. But even in the usage of the ART toward older receivers, it was confirmed that Korean e-mailers did not use the older receivers’ GNs or FNs directly, as this is also considered impolite. Instead, a general title and a professional title, which are NPs, were used interchangeably as SPP, with the highest honorific title *nim* often added to the end of the titles, according to the degree of *nunch’i* that the senders perceived.

*Nunch’i* also guided the senders’ choice to use either specific HNs or plain form of nouns, along with HPre or non-HPre. Just as the e-mailers chose different lexico-grammatical forms for younger and older receivers according to the perceived pressure of *nunch’i*, the usage of SAHA was also used or not according to perceived *nunch’i* pressure. This was also true regarding the various sentence enders among the four representative speech levels, like plain, intimate, polite, and deferential enders (DE) in the declarative, interrogative, imperative, and propositive
sentences. In the experiment, it was also found that the younger senders used mostly deferential or at least polite enders like -yo by 100% toward older receivers, but toward younger or same aged receivers, the senders chose many abnormal enders, reflecting a freedom from nunch’i pressure. Again, the results of this experiment suggest that there is a relationship between Korean culture and linguistic patterns. This relationship is reflected in computer mediated discourse (i.e. e-mail), where language takes both written and spoken forms in the absence of direct physical and contextual signs such as real facial expressions or gestures.

However, the results of the experiment did not completely overlap with the findings in the application, which involved real-life e-mail data. The application findings clearly confirmed that Koreans use more honorifics toward older people than toward younger or same aged people. In other words, the Korean nunch’i mechanism governed the e-mailers’ conventional use of grammar and lexicon in a simple [+age] and [−age] relationship. There were also findings in the application that differed from those of the experiment. According to the application data, there were some cases in which younger e-mailers did not perceive the pressure of nunch’i to use honorifics toward older receivers, even though the age gap was more than 30 years. In all of the cases in which the younger senders reduced the frequency of [+N] and used strong [−N] toward the older senders, there was a [−distance] relationship between sender and receiver, like a close kinship relationship such as father/son, uncle/nephew, and older brother/younger brother. This finding explains that Koreans are likely to allow their in-group members (or family members) to drop honorifics, releasing them from the pressure of nunch’i that comes from [+age] complex. Even if a younger sender did not have an actual kinship relationship with an older receiver, as long as the younger sender built up a [−distance] relationship with the older recipient, it was possible to lower the frequency of [+N] in use of honorifics. Therefore, it is clear that the [−distance] relationship may help the senders perceive less pressure of nunch’i toward older
receivers. However, there was still a fine line between a younger person and an older person in the Korean e-mail discourse: there was no evidence in the data of a younger sender using the plain form of SPP and Name (GN or FN) toward older receivers, even in a [-distance] relationship.

On the other hand, it was interestingly and unexpectedly found that even among e-mailers who were very close in age, there was occasionally a maximum use of honorifics, of the sort commonly found in the relationship between an old professor and a young student, producing a [+distance] relationship in their e-mails. In other words, even with a small age gap, if the senders were under great pressure of nunch ’i stemming from [+distance] relationship, they used honorification up to the maximum level (the seonbae and hubae relationship). Therefore, it can be claimed conclusively that Korean nunch ’i mechanism is affected not only by [+age] difference but also by [+distance] human relationship. The findings can be summarized and understood as follows: if a receiver is [+age] toward and [+distance] with a sender, it can produce a maximum [+nunch ’i] complex requiring more and/or higher levels of honorifics, while [-age] + [-distance] can produce a minimum [−nunch ’i] complex requiring fewer and/or lower levels of honorifics.

4.2 Examples of Nunch ’i Avoidance through Using English by Koreans

The following are a few examples of Korean and English e-mails selected to compare and contrast differences in language use between English and Korean. The Korean English writers, who lived in the U.S. as international students, wrote the e-mails to correspond with their acquaintances and chose English to avoid nunch ’i pressure. Korean E-mail #10 below was excerpted from the early and later parts of a long original e-mail written in Korean by a person who belonged to the [26-30] age group. E-mail #11 was written in reply to E-mail #10 in English to avoid nunch ’i by a person in the [36-40] age group. The senders of E-mail #10 and E-mail #11
used to attend the same church in Korea together before the receiver of E-mail #10 moved to the U.S., 10 years before the senders of E-mail #10 and E-mail #11 wrote their e-mails below.

**E-mail #10**

1. Subject: 안전하게 잘 계시다는 소식 들었습니다.
   Ahnchunharkey charl **keysidarnun sosik dulutsupnida.**
   In safe well being-SHSF news hear-Past-AHSF-DE
   I heard the news that you are well and safe.

2. OOO 선교사님 안녕하세요?
   OOO sunkywosarnim ahnyunghaseyo
   OOO-FN missionary-HTa ok-be-SHSF-PE
   How are you, Missionary OOO?

3. 저 XX 목자입니다.
   *Cher* XX mokchaipnida.
   I-HFPP XX shepherd-be-AHSF-DE.
   I am a shepherd XX.

4. 안전하시다는 소식을 들었습니다.
   Ahnchunharsidanun sosikul dulutsupnida.
   Being-safe news-OBJ hear-Past-AHSF-DE
   I heard the news that you are safe.

5. 구체적인기도제목 한글로 보내주세요. 기도하겠습니다.
   Kucheychukin kidocheymok hankulro bonaechu semyo.
   Kidohaket supnida.
   Concrete prayer-topics Korean-in send-SHSF-PE. Pray-will-AHSF-DE
   Please, send me your concrete prayer topics in Korean. I will pray for you.

6. OOO 드림
   OOO **durim**
   OOO-FN giving-HN
   OOO giving

**E-mail #11.**

Subject: A letter
1. How are you? Shepherd OOO.
2. Thank God for raising you into such a Man of faith.
3. I praise his fathomless love and care upon your life of faith.
4. I have been very busy doing many things down here.
5. But when I saw your letter in my mail box, I could not wait.
6. I always thank God for His Love upon you.
7. Still we are in the aftermath of Katrina, we are getting over and moving on.
8. In Baton Rouge, too many people suddenly gathered together for many reason, we are running out of food and oil and something necessary for living.
9. Most of all, I want to share this word we, LSU, coworkers were impressed and encouraged.
10. I hope you may also be cheered up through reading this manuscript….

(a Sunday message is attached.)

The sender of E-mail #10 showed deference under the pressure of *nunch’i* complex as a younger sender toward an older receiver, using the honorific forms of Korean language. He used FPP in a deferential way with *cher* (I) in line #3 to show his humbleness and respect toward the
older receiver. Instead of using an SPP, he replaced it with the humble form NP *sunkywosanim* (missionary+the highest honorific title-*nim*) in line #2, using the ART honorifically. HN was also used honorifically with *durim* (giving) in line #6, along with the HPre *keysida* (be), of which the plain form, *itda* (be), appears in line #1. All sentences of E-mail #10 contain SHSF - *(u)si* or -(u)sey and AHSF -(u)sup as in lines #1, #2, #3, #4, and #5. Therefore, all sentence enders of E-mail #10 were either DE, like -(su)pnida in lines #1, #3, #4, and #5, or PE, like -yo in line #2. The young sender of E-mail #10 did not raise his main topic—which was asking the prayer topics of the older receiver—in the early part of his e-mail, but only in line #5, after SFS in lines #1, #2, #3, and #4.

In contrast, there were many instances of using the English second person pronoun (SPP) *you*, which Koreans might consider the English counterpart of the plain Korean SPP *nuh* (you), which is free from *nunch ’i* as seen in lines #1, #2, #3, #5, #6, and #10 in E-mail #11. Neither SPP, FPP, nor other Korean honorific expressions (such as HN, ART, SAHA, HPre, and DE) were used in the English e-mail, suggesting that the older sender of English E-mail #11 was under less *nunch ’i* complex than the younger, Korean language writer. However, the English E-mail did show the same rhetoric as Korean E-mail #10 by locating the main topics at the end of the e-mail in lines #9 and #10 and using heavy SFS in the early part of as the e-mail in lines #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, and #6.

Even though the older sender of English E-mail #11 speaks the same Korean as the younger receiver, the sender of E-mail #11 chose to use English for his reply to the younger but adult receiver who has now graduated from college, gotten married, and had a child. Avoiding the Korean honorific forms, the sender of Email #11 put himself in the free zone of *nunch ’i* complex by opting to respond in English. The older sender freely used the English second person pronoun *you*, the nuance of which is similar to the Korean plain second person pronoun *nuh*.
(you). This is how the older writer would have addressed the younger recipient 10 years prior, before he left Korea for the U.S. In other words, even though the sender of E-mail #11 was in a [+age] position, he might have perceived [+distance] with the younger recipient after a 10 year lapse in their relationship due to geographical distance. Although this situation could make the older sender perceive nunch'i pressure to use honorifics, the older sender of E-mail #11 avoided the pressure by choosing to respond in English, in which he could speak as though the relationship remained [−distance] as it was 10 years ago, and with which he could avoid nunch'i complex and the use of honorifics toward the grown-up, younger receiver.

Here is another example of an e-mail in which a Korean used English to avoid nunch'i complex toward a younger Korean receiver. The following English E-mail #14 was written by a Korean seonbae (senior) who began studying Mathematics at a prestigious college in the southern U.S. five years earlier than the hubae (junior). The sender belonged to the [36-40] age group, while the hubae was in the [26-30] age group. Before he wrote this English E-mail #14, the sender wrote a Korean E-mail (#12) to the unfamiliar [+distance] hubae, who had just arrived at the school as a student from Korea. The two had never met each other in Korea. At first, the seonbae sender chose to write a Korean e-mail to the younger hubae receiver, as many Koreans might do in Korea to initiate a new relationship:

E-mail #12

1. 안녕하세요!
   Ahnyunghaseyo!
   o.k.-be-AHSF-PE!
   How are you!
2. 한번 만나보고 싶어요.
   Harnbun marnaboko siputseyo.
   One-time meet-and want-AHSF-PE
   I wish I could see you once.
3. 혹시 시간이 되면 월요일에 한번 보죠.
   Hoksi sikani doemyun walyoiley harnbun boseyo.
   Perhaps, time-NOM available-if Monday-on one-time meet-AHSF-PE.
   Perhaps, if you have time, let’s meet each other on Monday.
4. 아마도 오전에는 제 오피스에 있을 거예요.
   Ahmado ochuneynun chey ofisoey itsul kuyeyo.
Maybe morning-I-HFPP office be-Future thing-AHSF-PE
Maybe, I will be in my office in the morning.

5. 그리고 연락처 있으면 알려주세요.
   Kuriko yeolrakcher itsumyun arlyeochuseyo.
   And contact-information have-if tell-give-AHSF-PE.
   And let me know your contact information, if you have.

6. 전화를 부탁드린다면, 텔레비전 시간을 말씀해도 되구요.
   Chunwharul chusideonchi, mailtro sikanul ma.rlsseomharsieodo doekuyo.
   Phonecall-OBJ give-SHSF-or mail-by time-OBJ word-HN-say-SHSF-also be-o.k.-PE.
   Give me your phone call or it will be o.k. to say the time through e-mail.

7. 그리고 연락 기다립니다.
   Kurum yeolrak kidaripnida.
   Then, contact-OBJ wait-AHSF-DE.
   Then, I will wait for your contact.

E-mail #13
1. 더 일찍 답장을 드리지 못해 죄송합니다.
   Duh ilchik darphangul durichi mothae choesongharpnid.
   Much earlier reply-OBJ give-HPre not-do apology-HPre-AHSF-DE
   I apologize not to give you a reply much earlier.

2. 간박했습니다.
   Kkarmbarkhaet supnida.
   Forget-Past-AHSF-DE.
   I forgot.

3. 월요일 오전에 시간이 되시는 지요?
   Walyoil owchuney sikani doesinun chiy?
   Monday Morning-on time-NOM be-SHSF-available whether-PE?
   Are you available on Monday morning?

4. 가능한 시간 알려 주시면 제가 오피스로 찾아 뵙겠습니다.
   Karnungheun sikan arlyu chusimyun cheyka ofisoero charja boepketsupnida.
   Possible time tell give-SHSF-if I-HFPP-NOM office-to search-and see-Future-AHSF-DE.
   If you tell me any possible time, I will visit your office to see you.

5. 신경 써 주셔서 감사합니다.
   Sinkung ssur chusteseo kamsarhapnida.
   Care take give-SHSF-because thank-AHSF-DE.
   Thank you for taking care of it.

E-mail #14
1. Hi !!!
2. What about 12:30 pm?
3. We can eat lunch together.
4. If you’re o.k, just let me know.
5. See you then.
6. OO

Due to [+distance] relationship with the newcomer, even if the sender of E-mail #12 thought that he was older than the receiver as a seonbae, he was under pressure of nunch’i.

Therefore, he used the language honorifically. All sentences contained PE, like -yo in lines #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, and #6. Line #7 even contained DE like -ipnida, along with SHSF in line #6 and
AHSF in line #7. E-mail #12 also contained HFPP like cher in line #4 and HN like marlsseom, of which the plain form is marl in Korean. Interestingly, only the rhetoric of E-mail #12 is similar to the typical English writing style, which puts the main idea in the first line without using SFS, TC, and CB. This is assumed to be an influence of English language culture on a Korean language text.

The Korean E-mail #13 was the reply of the hubae. The hubae sender of E-mail #13 used more DE than was found in E-mail #12, as seen in lines #1, #2, #4, and #5. Only line #3 contained PE along with other honorific expressions, which means E-mail #13 was a bit humbler than E-mail #12. E-mail #13 contained HPre and HN, like durida and choesongharda in line #1. AHSF is in lines #1, #2, #4, and #5. SHSF was also in lines #3 and #5. HFPP was in line #4. Although short, SFS was used in lines #1 and #2, and TC was used in line #5. So E-mail #13 is a typical Korean honorific e-mail under nunch ’i complex written by a hubae toward the seonbae who had just approached him for the first time.

After beginning the relationship, it is interesting to see the next e-mail written in English by the seonbae toward the hubae. Even if E-mail #14 was short, it had a very important message that the sender wanted to deliver—that he was a seonbae over the newcomer hubae, which he demonstrated by using the second person pronoun you in lines #3 and #4. However, the seonbae sender was still not completely free from the pressure of nunch ’i. The seonbae sender could not use the hubae receiver’s name freely for his greeting in line #1, instead leaving three exclamation markers, “!!!” In addition, he did not create any sentences that contained the English first person pronoun (FPP), “I,” in a subjective position, though there is one in the objective position in line #4. Instead, he used the plural form of FPP, “we,” in line #3 to show friendliness toward the hubae, who would be an in-group member at the school. A Korean seonbae often uses a plural form of FPP to a hubae, as when s/he suggests that they go out to a
restaurant together in Korea, and the seonbae often pays for the food of the hubae, especially in the case that the seonbae was the one who suggested the hubae go out to eat.

As seen in E-mail #14, the seonbae chose to use English to the hubae, with whom he was becoming closer, and sent an e-mail back arranging to meet the hubae for the first time when he arrived at the seonbae’s current school. If the seonbae used Korean again for this reply, he would be obliged to succumb to the pressure of nunch ’i because even if the receiver was a younger person, he was an adult and he was still in a non-intimate [+distance] relationship. So, the seonbae sender chose English to express his perceived role as an older seonbae who wanted to become closer with the Korean hubae who would study Mathematics with him at the same school from then on.

The following E-mail #16 is also written in English by another Korean speaker who wanted to meet the newcomer hubae after he assisted the hubae by arranging his dormitory room in advance of the hubae’s arrival. The sender of E-mail #16 was another seonbae in the same department of the same school as the sender of E-mail #14. Though they knew each other through studying in the same department, they did not know that they both used English in e-mailing the same newcomer hubae. The E-mail #16 sender was also in the [36-40] age group, although he was one year hubae to the writer of E-mail #14. Before he wrote E-mail #16, he received a Korean E-mail #15 from the same newcomer hubae, who had learned that a room was already arranged for him in the dormitory.

E-mail #15
1. 신경 써 주신 덕분에…OOO 기숙사에 들어와 있습니다.
   Sinkyung ssur chusin dukbuney…OOO kisuksaey duleowa itsupnida.
   Care take give-SHSF thanks-to….OOO dormitory come-in be-AHSF-DE
   Thanks to your taking care of me….I have come in OOO dormitory.
2. 수학과가 정말 가깝더군요..
   Suharkwaka chungmarl gakapddukunyo...
   Math-department really close-be-PE….
   The Math department is really close….
3. 정말 감사합니다.
   Chungmarl kamsaharpnida.
Really thankful-be-AHSF-DE
I am really thankful.

4. 오자마자 연락 드렸어야 하는데....
   Really-thankful-duripeotseoya harnunde..-
Right-after-come contact give-HPre-Past should-do....
I was supposed to contact you right after I came here...

5. 학교 내에 있는 전화기 사용법을 몰라서 이럴게 편지를 드립니다.
   Harkywo naeey itnum chunhwaki sayongbupul molraseo eerukey
School in-at being telephone usage not-know-because this-like
punchirul duripnida.
letter-OBJ give-HPre-AHSF-DE
I send a letter like this because I don’t know how to use the (public) telephones in this school.

6. 수학과에서 주의해야 될 것은 무엇인가요?
   Suharkwaeyseo chuuyaeya doel kutson mueosinchiyoo?
Math-department-at careful-be shoud thing-NOM what-be-PE?
What should I be careful in the Math department?

7. 내일 학과 사무소를 방문할 예정이지만, 영어가 짧아서 걱정입니다.
   Naeil harkkwa samusorul bangmunharl yeochungichiman, youngeoka
Tomorrow department office-OBJ visit-to plan-although English-NOM
charlbateo kukchungipnida.
short-because worry- AHSF-DE.
Although I am planning to visit the department office, I am worrying about my lack of English knowledge.

8. 많은 지도 편달 부탁드리오며... 항상 건강하십시오.
   Many guides-HN encouragements-HN ask-give-HPre-and always good-health-be-PE.
I ask you for many guides and encouragements...may you be always in a good health!

E-mail #16
1. Hello,
2. Would you come to my office today?
3. I’ll be in my office until 4:30pm.
4. My office is located in YYY Hall, and the number is XXX-A.
5. See you then.

E-mail #17
1. I check[ed] the letter after 4:30 p.m.
2. Sorry, M[m]ay I visit tomorrow?
3. If it is possible, I will go to your office.
3. Thank you.

Each sentence of E-mail #15 was equipped with AHSF and DE in lines #1, #3, #5, and #9.

PE was in lines #2, #6, and #8. Even if the sender did not show any honorific ARTs and personal pronouns, the receiver could perceive that he was highly honored by the sender, especially in line #8 which honored the receiver impressively by using the “extreme honorific expression” of the infixial particle “-o-” in butarkdriomyu, which rarely appears in modern Korean language. In Korean historical movies, this expression is often used by retainers toward their king by
attaching it at the end of the HPre, “-dri-”. HNs like chido and pyundal are also often used by disciples toward a highly respected teacher in Korea. Therefore, the sender of E-mail #15 showed that he was under nunch’i pressure and line #8 showed that the sender increased the level of his nunch’i to a maximum level, humbling himself and honoring the receiver who had already provided practical help and would continue to be a good helper in the same department.

The sender of E-mail #16, who was extremely honored by the newcomer hubae, chose to use English instead of Korean. Korean would require honorifics toward a person whom he was meeting for the first time. He seemed to enjoy using the English second person pronoun (SPP) you freely in lines #2 and #5, along with the first person pronoun which was in the subject position in line #3 with a couple of possessive forms of “I” in lines #2, #3, and #4, unlike the English e-mail #14. If he were to write this e-mail in Korean, he would have to change all sentence enders, insert subject and addressee suffixes, drop the second person pronouns, and reduce the number of uses of first person pronouns for a more careful rhetorical approach. However, even in English there was still one thing that the sender of E-mail #16 could not overcome. It was the younger receiver’s name in line #1, which he could not use for his greeting after writing the informal greeting, “Hello”. This shows that the older sender was still under a little bit of nunch’i pressure toward the new person whom he would meet for the first time.

It is interesting to examine the following English E-mail #17, which was written as a reply to English E-mail #16 by the Korean hubae. To the seonbae who experienced such extreme honorification by the hubae in E-mail #15, E-mail #17 might have been a surprise or disappointment. It was not clear why the hubae suddenly chose to write his e-mail in English instead of Korean. It is possible that he thought he had to use English because all of his seonbaes in the school used English in their e-mails, or it could have been a natural response to the seonbae who did not use Korean e-mails with honorifics, as adults in Korea did. It might have
been a little bit offensive to the adult hubae, who may have expected a little bit of honoring from the unfamiliar seonbae at first. Therefore, he might also have wanted to reduce the degree of nunch’i from what he used toward the sunbae at first. This demonstrates the stress created by nunch’i for Koreans who have to decide whether, how much, and when to use it.

At any rate, E-mail #17 contained potential challenges to the seonbae in the use of the SPP you in lines #3 and #4, with several FPPs in the subject position in lines #1, #2, and #3. If this were a Korean e-mail, there should be an honorific FPP without use of SPP. The word sorry in line #2 would be in Korean an honorific noun or predicate, and the sender would have to make sure that all sentences were equipped with deferential enders. So, with all these details incorporated, if this e-mail were translated into Korean, it would be a very polite form of e-mail writing. But as written in English, it is potentially somewhat offensive to the older Korean receiver, who might expect another Korean reply full of honorifics. The seonbae’s reply to E-mail #17 was, interestingly, very short. It read, simply, “yes”. This reply was discarded for analysis in chapter 3 because it was too short to examine, containing primarily “NA’s”.

In conclusion, the e-mail data in this experiment and application shows that Koreans change the degree of nunch’i in the use of honorifics according to [+age] of and [+distance] with recipients. The data collected from the experiment demonstrated that the [+age] factor of recipients was the dominant cause for the [-age] e-mail senders to use honorifics under the pressure of nunch’i. No matter how heavy an imposition was requested, no older senders used honorifics toward their younger receivers, even when they used rhetorical devices such as SFS, TC, and CB under nunch’i complex coming from the impositive request. Therefore, it was argued that the [+age] factor was dominant in requiring [+nunch’i] of the younger senders to use honorifics toward the older recipients. In this way, [+age] that requires nunch’i works as a social power on younger e-mailers.
However, the real-life data showed us that conventional usage may vary from the experimental findings. We saw cases in which even [+age] factor lost power in driving the use of honorifics when the e-mailers were in a [−distance] relationship, especially kinship relations such as a son and a father, a nephew and an uncle, and a younger brother and an older brother. Nevertheless, we also found unexceptional cases showing that no younger Korean sender can completely escape from the pressure of nunch’i complex in the use of honorifics toward older receivers. These inescapable honorific features were the use of the plain form of SPP and the direct use of names (GN or FN) of the older receivers in the data. Consequently, it can be argued that [+age], [+distance] and [+nunch’i] are closely involved in the use of Korean language, especially in the case of honorifics which is different from English language in terms of language use. Again, nunch’i can be increased by the [+age] factor of recipients to require the [−age] senders to use honorifics actively, but it can be lessened by a [−distance] relationship between the younger senders and the older receivers in Korean e-mail discourse.
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Appendix A: Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used to label the linguistic terms, especially for morphemes, employed in this study.

*: ungrammatical
AHSF: addressee honorific suffix
AE: abnormal ender
ART: address-reference term
CB: context building
DE: deferential ender
FN: full Name
FPP: first person pronoun
Future: future tense
GN: given name
GT: general title
HC: high context culture
HF: humble form
HFPP: humble form of first person pronoun
HN: honorific noun
HNOM: honorific nominative particle
hon.; honorable.
HONSF: honorific suffix
HPar: honorific particle
HPre: honorific Predicate
HSPP: humble form of second person pronoun
HTa: the first level honorific title/particle
HTb: the second level honorific title/particle
HTc: the third level honorific title/particle
IE: intimate ender
KT: kinship term
LC: low context culture
N: nunch’i
NA: not applicable
NOM: nominative particle
OBJ: objective particle
Par: regular plain particle
Past: past tense
PE: polite ender
PPar: possessive particle
PT: professional or occupational title
RE: regular plain ender
SFS: sharing fellowship stage
SAHA: subject-and addressee-honorific affixes
S&AHSSF: subject and Address honorific Suffixes
SHSF: subject honorific suffix
SN: surname
SPP: second person pronoun
TC: topic change
VPar: vocative particle
Appendix B: Questionnaire

Place of interview ___________________________ Date _______________________

Name: _____________________________________ Email: _____________________________

Gender: Female ____________ Male ____________

Age group: Under 14 ____________ 15-20 ____________ 21-25 ____________ 26-30 ____________
31-35 ____________ 36-40 ____________ 41-45 ____________ 46-50 ____________ Over 51 ____________

Education Level: Elementary ______ Secondary ________ Technical/Vocational ________
University ________ Other ____________________

Your Social Position(status): Student _____ Professor _____ others_____________________

____________________________________________________

Your Native Language: ____________________ Second Language: ____________________

Question

#1. Would you tell me about the content of the e-mails (ex. Invitation to my birthday party)?
E-mail #1______________________________________________________________
E-mail #2______________________________________________________________
E-mail #3______________________________________________________________
E-mail #4______________________________________________________________
E-mail #5______________________________________________________________

#2. What relationship do you have with the sender (or the receiver)?
________________________________________________________________________

#3. The sender (or the receiver) is older than you are or in an equal status?
________________________________________________________________________

#4. The sender (or the receiver) is on a higher social position than you are or in an equal status?
________________________________________________________________________

After you fill in the blanks, move to the next page.
Thank you for your cooperation! Please answer the following question. It is like writing e-mails to someone you have known well. If you can type your answer and e-mail them to me, it couldn’t be better. However, you can write it down on another paper given. It would be still great to me. My E-mail address is jkim19@lsu.edu or kwilliam67@yahoo.com

Now, you may start.

Situation #1:
Please, imagine that Dr. Walter Smith is an old professor who gives a lecture in your class. You have a paper due in his class next week. However, you will be very busy this week and don’t have any time to write it. You may really want to request him of an extension. So, you may have to write an e-mail to him right now. How do you request an extension through e-mail?

Situation #2:
Sunhee/Chunsuk is your classmate. You are preparing for the final exam. You think that you need Jane/David’s help along with her/his notebook for the test preparation. So, you want to send an e-mail to ask her/him to study together and to bring the notebook on a day to the library. What do you say on your e-mail to your friend?

Situation #3:
James is a younger brother of your friend Julie. We imagine that you are planning to move furniture next week. You need some hands, especially from James because you know he is a
strong and big guy. You may want to send an e-mail to him right away. How do you ask the young boy to help you move furniture next week?

상황 #1:
Situation #1

상황#2:
Situation #2

상황#3:
Situation #3
Appendix C: E-mail Data

E-mails based on Situations #1

E-mail #1
1. 존경하는 교수님

Chonkyunghanun kyoswunim
Respectful professor-HTa
Respectful professor
2. 교수님 수업을 듣고 있는 홍길동이라고 합니다.

Kyoswunim suheopeul dutko ittun hongkildongirahko harpnidah.
Professor-HTa class-OBJ listen to being Hongkildong-FN is-AHSF-DE.
I am Hongildong who is taking your class.
3. 이럴게 교수님께 메일을 드리는 이유는 페이퍼 마감 시간을 연장해 주셨으면 해서 드리는 겁니다.

Irukey kyoswanimkkey meilul drinun eeyounun payper markam
Like this professor-HTa-to-HPar mail-OBJ giving-HPre reason-NOM paper dead-
sikanul yunchanggae chusitseomyun haeseo drinun kupnida.
Line-OBJ extending giving-SHSF-HPre hope-because giving-HPre do-AHSF-DE
The reason that I send a mail to you like this is because I hope you give me an extension of paper due.

E-mail #2
1. 교수님 안녕하세요.

Kyoswunim ahnyunghaseyo.
Professor-HTa well-be-SHSF-PE.
Professor, how are you?
2. 교수님 수업을 듣고 있는 길동이입니다.

Kyoswunim suheopul dutko ittun kildongie ipnida.
Professor-HTa class listening to is Kildong-GN am-SHSF-DE.
I am Kildong who is taking your class.
3. 다름이 아니라 기말페이퍼 기간을 좀 늘려주셨으면 해서요.

Darumi ahnirah kimalpayper kikanul chom nulryeo
Different not-be-but finalpaper due a-little-bit extension
chusitseomyun haeseoyo.
Giving-SHSF-HPre hope-because-PE.
By the way, (I am sending this e-mail) because I hope you give a little bit of extension for the final paper due.
4. 제가 수술을 해서 현재 병원에 입원중인데 담주에 퇴원을합니다.

Cheyka susulul haeseo hyunchae byungwoneypunchungindey
I-HFPP surgery do-because at present hospital-at hospitalized-being-and
darmchuey twaywonal harpnidah.
Next week discharge-OBJ do-Future-AHSF-DE.
I am hospitalized at the hospital due to surgery at present and I will be discharged next week.
5. 퇴원 후 3일 간 시간을 주시면 3일 이내로 기말 페이지를 제출하겠습니다.

Tweywon hu samil kan sikanul chusimyun samil inaero
discharge after 3 days length time-OBJ give-SHSF-Hpre-if 3 days within
kimal payperul cheychuhalhaketsupnida..
Final paper-OBJ submit-HN-Future-AHSF-DE.
After the discharge from the hospital, if you give me 3 days length of time,
I will submit the final paper within 3 days.
E-mail #3
1. 존경하는 황 진웅 교수님

chonkyunghanun hwang chinwoong kyoswunim
Respectful Hwang chinwoong-FN professor-HTa
Respectful professor Chinwoong Hwang
2. 매주 교수님의 강의를 잘 듣고 있습니다.
Maychoo Kyoswunim-uy kang-uyrul charl dutko itsupnida.
Everyweek professor-HTa-PPar lecture-OBJ well listening to have-AHSF-DE.
I have taken your lecture well every week.
3. 그리고 강의 내용이 아주 유익하고 도움이 많이 되고 있습니다.
Kurigo, kanguy naeyongi achu yuikhako doumi mani doeko itsupnida.
And lecture content-NOM very beneficial-and help much been have-AHSF-DE
And your lecture has been much beneficial and helpful.
4. 교수님께서 내주신 Paper를 지금 하고 있습니다.
Kyoswunim-kkeseo naechusin paperul chikum hako itsupnida.
Professor-HTa-HNOM give-SHSF-HPre paper-OBJ now do being-AHSF-DE
I am working on the paper that you assigned to us.
5. 교수님이 내주신 paper를 더욱 완벽하게 하기 위해서 실제로 기업을 방문할 예정이었습니다.
Kyoswunimi naechusin paperul derwook wanbyukhakey haki wihaesoe
Professor-HTa-NOM give-SHSF-HPre paper-OBJ more perfectly do to
Silchaero kiupul pangmunhal yechungiutta supnida.
Actually organization-OBJ visit-to plan-Past-AHSF-DE.
To write the paper that you assigned to us more perfectly, I was actually planning to visit an organization.
6. 그러던데, 제가 방문할 회사가 갑자기 이번 주 Strike이 발생하였습니다.
Kurundae, chey-ka pangmung-hal hoesaka kapchaki ipunchu
However, I-HFPP-NOM visit-to company-NOM suddenly this week
strikei palsaeng-hayeosupnida.
Strike-NOM occur-Past-AHSF-DE.
However, suddenly a strike occurred to the company that I was planning to visit this week.
7. 따라서 회사방문이 일주일 연기 되었습니다.
Ttaraseo, hoesa pangmuni ilchuil yeonki doeutt supnida.
Accordingly, company visiting-NOM one week postpone do-Past-AHSF-DE.
Accordingly, company visiting has been postponed to next week.
8. 그래서 제가 paper를 완전히 끝낼 수 없게 되었습니다.
Kuraeseo, chey-ka paperul wanchunheee kkutnael su upkey doeutt supnida.
Therefore, I-HFPP-NOM paper-OBJ completely finish-able to not do-Past-AHSF-DE.
Therefore, it turns out not to be able to finish writing the paper completely.
9. 그래서, 교수님께 이와 같은 상황을 미리 말씀드리고 기말 paper를 다음주 까지 제출해도 되는지 문의를 드리고자 합니다.
Kuraeseo, kyoswunimkkey iwa kattun sanghwangul miri malsseum duriko
Therefore, professor-HTa-to-HPar this like situation-OBJ in advance word-HN give-HPre-and
Kimal paperul daum chukkachi chechulhaedo doenunchi munuyryul durikocha hapnida.
Final paper-OBJ next week-by submit-HN-do possible question-HN-OBJ give-HPre-to do-AHSF-DE
So, I like to ask you whether I can submit the final paper by next week through telling you this situation in advance.
10. 1 주일간 마감제출 기간을 연기해 주시면 산학 협동으로 총실한 paper를 작성하여 제출하도록겠습니다.
Il-chuil-kan makamecheul kikanul yeonkihae chusimyun sanhakhapdongyuro
One-week-length due-submit days-OBJ postpone give-SHSF-HPre-if industry-academy-union-by
chungsilhan paperul chaksunghayeo chechulhardorok hakette supnida.
Productive paper-OBJ write-and then sumbit-HPre-do do-Future-AHSF-DE.
If you extend the paper due just a week, I will submit a productive paper that is written in both views from industry and academy.
11. 도움 주시기를 바라고겠습니다.
Doum chusikru parakettesupnida.
Help giving-SHSF-HPre-HN-OBJ wish-Future-AHSF-DE.
I wish you could do me a favor.

E-mail #4
1. 존경하는 황진웅 박사님.
Chonkyunghanun hwangchinwoong parksanim
Respectful Hwanchinwoong-FN Dr.-HTa
Respectful Dr. Chinwoong Hwang.
2. 박사님의 열정적인 강의 잘 들고 있습니다.
Parksanimuy yulchungchurkyn kanguyrul charl duttko ittupnida.
Dr.-HTa-PPar energetic lecture-OBJ well listening to is-ASIF-DE.
I am well taking your energetic lecture.
3. 어려운 학문을 쉽게 풀어 주셔서 한 학기동안 정말 많은 것을 즐거이 배울 수 있었습니다.
Eoryuwn harkmunul shipkey puleo chusiseoseo harn harky dongahn
Difficult study-OBJ easily solving giving-SHSF-HPre-because one semester during
chungmarl marnun kutsul chulkuy paewulsu itsusupnida.
Really many things happily learnable is-Past-AHSF-DE.
I was able to learn happily real many things during one semester because you easily explained difficult subjects.
4. I want to show how much I liked and learned hard the lecture
Chuyka ulmarna ku kanguyrul chowahako yulshimhee
I-HFPP how much the lecture-OBJ like-and hard
Kongpuhaentunchie poyeo driko shipnaeyo.
Learn-Past showing give-HPre want to-PE.
I want to show how much I liked and learned hard the lecture
5. 그린테 다음 주까지 기말 페이퍼를 내지 못하는건 너무 억울합니다.
Kurukae yulshimhee kongpu haetnundey             payperul
Although I studied that hard, if I could not submit the paper, I may feel tight.
6. 두개 전공을 하고 봉사활동까지 겹쳐버렸어요.
Togae chunkongul harko bongshahwalongkkachie kyupchioho beryukudenyo.
Managing two majors with community service, I came to be swamped.
7. 박사님. 조금만 시간을 주시성요.
Parksanim, chokuman sikanul chusipsio.
Dr.-HTa, a little bit-even time-OBJ give-AHSF-HPre-DE.
Dr., please, give me even a little bit of time.
8. 그리고 열심히 공부했는데 재화를 내지 못하는건 너무 억울합니다.
Kurukae yulshimhee kongpu haetnundeyp payperul
Submit not-able to do too-much feel-tight-AHSF-DE.
Although I studied that hard, if I could not submit the paper, I may feel tight.
9. 박사님. 제게 기회를 주시성요.
Parksanim, cheykewi kihweyrul chusipsio.
Dr. me-HFPP-to opportunity-ruI give-AHSF-HPre-DE
Dr. please, give me an opportunity.

E-mail #5
1. 안녕하세요. 교수님.
Ahnyunghaseyo. Kyoswunim.
Well-be-SHSF-PE. Professor-HTa.
How are you? Professor.
2. 교수님의 강의는 지급 잘 들고 있습니다.
Professor-HTa-PPar lecture-NOM now well listening to is-AHSF-DE.
I am well taking your lecture now.
3. 처음에는 호기심으로 신청 했는데, 들음수록 많이 배우고 있어서 신청하기를 참 잘했다고 생각됩니다.
Cheoumenun hokishimeoro sinchung haetnundae, dulusurok marnie
At first curiosity-by register do-Past-and then listening to much
paewuko itsoseo sinchung charm chari haetdako saengkarkdoepnida.
Learning-and is-because register truly well do-Past-and think-AHSF-DE.
Although I registered your class out of curiosity at first, because the more I am attending your class, the more I am learning much, I think that I registered your class truly well.
4. 많은 문제의식을 갖게 하고 공부와 삶의 방향도 얻어서 좋습니다.
Murnun muncheyuysikul kartkey harko kongpuwa sarlmuy
Many critical-minds-OBJ have make-and study-with life-PPar
barnghayngdo uteoseo chotsupnida.
Orientation-too acquire-because good-is-AHSF-DE.
It is good that (your lecture) makes me have many critical minds and also acquire the orientation of study and life.
5. 그런데 교수님 중요한 부탁이 있습니다.
Kurundae kyoswunim chungyohan putarkie ittsupnida.
By the way professor-HTa important request is-AHSF-DE.
By the way, would you do me a huge favor?
6. 다음 주까지 기말 페이지를 제출하는 것이 있습니다.
Daum chukkarchie kimal payperul chechulharnun kutsi ittsupnida.
Next week-by final paper-OBJ submit-doing thing is-AHSF-DE.
There is something like final paper to submit by next week.
7. 그 주에도 잘 받아서 여러 자료를 찾고 많은 생각을 하고 있습니다.
Ku chucheydo charm choarseo yeoreo charyorul
The subject-too truly good-because various data-OBJ
chartko marnun saengkarkul hako ittsupnida.
Searching many thought-OBJ doing am-AHSF-DE.
Because the subject is also good, I am searching for various data and thinking of many things.
8. 그 자료를 정리하고 술 시간이 수업 후 3일 정도 걸릴 것입니다.
Ku charyorul chungriehako ssuyl sikannie
The data-OBJ sorting-and to write time-NOM
sueuphu samil chungdo kulil kut katsupnida.
class-after 3 days more or less take thing seem-ASIF-DE.
It may take three days or so to sort the data and to write about after class.
9. 여러 자료를 찾고 분석 비교하고 싶은데, 이번 주 도무지 페이지 술 시간이 없습니다.
Yeoreo charyorul chartko bunsukbikyohako sipeondey,
Various data-OBJ search-and compare and analyze wish-but
eepun chu domuchie payper ssuyl sikannie upsupnida.
This week utterly paper to write time-NOM not-is-ASIF-DE.
I wished to search for various data to compare and analyze but, is utterly no time to write the paper this week.
10. 교수님 죄송하고 부탁이 있는데, 기말 페이지 제출하는 시간을 늦려주시면 어떨까요?
Kyoswunim choisonghako putakie ittnundy, kimalpayper
Professor-HTa apology-HN-and asking-HN is-and then, final paper
chechulharnun sikanul nulyeo chusimyun etteosinkayo?
Submit-HN-doing time-OBJ extending give-SHSF-HPre-if how-is-SHSF-PE?
Professor, I am sorry but I have a request to you; how about extending the time of submitting the paper?
11. 그러면 밤을 세서라도 일심히 해서 꼭 제출하겠습니다.
Kureomyun, barmul saeseorado yulsimhie haeseo
then-if, night through-even hard do-and
kkok chechulhakesupnida.
Surely submit-NN-Future-AHSF-DE.
If then, I will surely submit it even working all night through.
12. 부탁드립니다.
Putarkdrippnida.
E-mail #6
1. 황진웅 교수님께.
HwangChinwoong kyoswunimkey
Chinwoong Hwang-FN professor-HTa-to-HPar.
To Professor Chinwoong Hwang.
2. 안녕하세요, 교수님의 수업을 듣고있는 영문학과 홍수정이라고 합니다.
Ahnyunghaseyo. Kyoswunimuy sueopul dutkoitnun
Okay-is-SHSF-PE. Professor-HTa-PPar class-OBJ listening to
youngmunharkkwa hongsujeongirako harpnida.
English major Sujeong Hong-FN am-AHSF-DE.
How are you, I am an English major, Sujeong Hong, who is taking your class.
3. 교수님께서 실무적인 이야기도 많이 해주시고 이론적인 부분도 이해하기 쉽게 잘 설명해 주셔서 교수님
의 수업을 지난 학기 때부터 놓치지 않고, 열심히 듣고 있습니다.
Kyoswnimkkeseo silmjukjin eeyakido marnie haechusiko
Professor-HTa-HNOM practical story many do-give-SHSF-HPre-and
eeronjkin bubundo eehaehaki shipkkey charl seolmyunghae
theoretical part also understand-to easily well explain-do
chusinoseo kyoswunimuy sueopul chinan harki ttaeputer
give-SHSF-HPre-because professor-HTa-PPar class-OBJ last semester time-from
notchiji ahrnko yulsimhee dutko itsupnida.
Losing not-and sincerely listening to is-AHSF-DE.
I have sincerely taken your class without missing from the last semester because you taught me with many practical
stories and also explained well theoretical parts to understand.
4. 다름이 아니라, 교수님께서 이번 수업시간에 내주신 페이퍼와 관련하여, 제출기한을 다음 주까지 연장하
는 것이 가능하지 않다고 싶습니다.
Darumie ahnirah, kyoswunimkkeseo eebun sueopsikaney
different not-be-but professor-HTa-HNOM this class-time-at
naechusin payerperwah kwunyreonyhayeo, chechulikanful
give-SHSF-HPre paper-with relation due-day-OBJ
daum chukkaji yeonjangharnun kutsi kanung harnchi arko sipsupnida.
Next week-by extending thing possible is-whether know want-AHSF-DE.
By the way, I want to know if it is possible to extend the due day in relation to the paper that you assigned to us
during the last class.
5. 교수님께서 내주신 과제를 위해서 자료를 수집하는데 최소 5일이 소요될 예정이어서 페이퍼를 작성하는
데 다소 시간이 걸릴 것 같습니다.
Kyoswnimkkesseo naechusin kwajeyrul wiehaseo charyorul
Professor-HTa-HNOM give-SHSF-HPre assignment-OBJ for data-OBJ
sujipharnundeo choiso ohile soyodoeel yejungieoseo payerul
collect-to at least 5days take plan-because paper-OBJ
charsunghanundeo darso sikanie kulri kut katsupnida.
Writing-in more or less time-NOM take thing seem-AHSF-DE.
It will be somewhat late to finish writing the paper because it is expected to take at least 5 days to collect data for the
assignment that you assigned.
6. 보다 완벽한 페이퍼 준비와 작성을 위해서 페이퍼 제출 기한을 다음 주로 연장해 주시면 정말 감사하겠습니다.
Boda wanbyukhan payer chunbiewa charsungul wiehaseo payerul chechul
due-OBJ next week extend-do give-SHSF-HPre-if really thankful-is-AHSF-DE.
I will really appreciate if you extend the paper due to next week for more perfect preparation and writing the paper.
7. 그림 단면 부탁 드리겠습니다.
Kurum darpyunul butak drigetsupnida.
Then reply asking-HPre give-HPre-Future-AHSF-DE.
Then, I am asking you to give me your reply.
8. 오늘 하루도 즐겁게 보내십시오, 수업시간에 벌겠습니다.
Onul harudo julgupkey bonaesiko, suepsikankey boepketsupnida.
Today a day-also joyfully spend-SHSF-and class time-at see-HPre-Future-AHSF-DE.
I hope you have a joyful day, today, and I will see you at the classtime.
10. 안녕히 계세요, 영문과 홍수정 올림
Ahnyungie koeseyo. Youngmunkwa hongsujung olrim.
Well be-HPre-SHSF-PE. English major Hong Sujeong-FN sending.
Good-bye. The English major, Sujeong Hong.

E-mail #7
1. 안녕하세요니가? 교수님
Ahnyunghasipnikka? Kyuswunim
Well-be-AHSF-DE? Professor-HTa
How are you? Professor
2. 저는 교수님의 강의하시는 마케팅을 듣고 있는 4학년 박정아입니다.
Chernun kyuswunimim kanguyhasinun marketingul
I-HFPP-NOM professor-HTa-NOM lecture-do-SHSF-HPre marketing-OBJ
dutko ittnun sahharknyun parkjeongahipnida.
Listening to be senior Park Jeongah-FN-am-AHSF-DE.
I am a graduating senior, Jeongah Park, who is taking Marketing that you are giving lectures.
3. 저는 다음 주까지 기말페이퍼 제출하여야 하나, 제출기한까지 기말페이퍼 제출이 어려울 것 같아 교수님께 양해를 구하고자 이렇게 메일을 보내게 되었습니다.
Chernun daum chulkacie kimalpayperul chechulhayeoah hamah,
I-HFPP-NOM next week-by fina-paper-OBJ sumbit-HN-have-to do-but,
chechul kihkkachie kimalpayper chechuli eoryuwoolkut kattah kyuswunim
submission due-day by final-paper submission-NOM difficult seems professor-HTa-HPar
yanghaerul kuhakochar eerukkey meiulf bonaekkey doetsupnida.
Concent-HN-OBJ ask-to like this mail-OBJ send-to come-Past-AHSF-DE.
I come to send an e-mail like this to ask your consent because it seems to be difficult to submit the final paper by next week, although I have to do so by the due day.
4. 저는 현재 회사에 취업중이며, 수업에 출석하지 못하고 있습니다.
Chernun hyunjiae hoesahey chiuieopjungimyu,
I-HFPP-NOM now company-at working-and
sueopey chulseokhaji mothako itsupnida.
Class-at attending-can not-do be-AHSF-DE.
I am working for a company and I cannot attend the classes.
5. 지난 중간고사에 썼던 것처럼, 이번 기말고사도 페이퍼를 제출하는 것으로서 시험을 대체하고자 하였으나, 이번주부터 다음주까지 회사 연수기간이라 페이퍼 작성 및 제출이 어렵게 되었습니다.
Chihan chungkankosahey haetdunkut cherum, eeburn kимвkosalado
Last midterm-at do-Past as this final test-also
payperul chechulharnun kuseoroseo sihumul deychaeharkochar
paper-OBJ submiting doing-through test replace-do-to
haryeoeseona, eeburn chuputer daum chimalkkarchie hoesah
try-Past-but, this week-from next week-to company
yeonsukikaneerah payper charksung mit chechulie uryupkey doetsupnida.
Training-period-at paper writing-HN and submit-HN-NOM difficultly become-AHSF-DE.
I tried to replace the final test with a paper as I did for the midterm exam, but it has become difficult for me to write
and submit the paper due to the company training from this week to next weekends,
6. 그래서, 최종하지만 3-4일 정도 제출기한을 연장해주시면 연장해주신 기한까지 최신을 다해 페이퍼를 작성하여 제출하도록 하겠습니다.
Kuraeseo, choesongharchiemann 3-4il jeongdo chechulihanul Therefore, apology-HN-do-but 3-4 days more or so submit period-OBJ yeonchanghaechusimyun yeonchanghaechusim kihakkarchie choisunul extentention-give-HPre-SHSF-if extentention-give-HPre-SHSF due day-until best darhae payperul charsinkhangyoeo chechulhardorok harketsupnida.
All-do paper-OBJ writing-do-and submitting do-Future-AHSF-DE.
Therefore, I am sorry but, if you extend the paper due to 3-4 days, I will do my best to write and submit the paper until the extended day.
7. 매일 송부후 교수님 연구실로 전화 드리도록 하겠습니다.
Mail songbuhu kyoswunim kyoswunim choi drideorok harketsupnida.
Mail sending-HN-after professor-HTa office-to calling give-HPre-to do-Future-AHSF-DE. After sending e-mail, I will call you to the phone in your office.
8. 안녕히 계십시오.
Ahnyunghee keyshipio.
Well be-AHSF-DE.
Good-bye.

E-mail #8
1. 교수님, 요즘 건강은 어떠신지요?
Kyoswunim, yozoom kunkangeon eottursinchiefyo?
Professor-HTa, recently health-NOM how-be-SHSF-PE?
Professor, how is your health recently?
2. 신생님 강의를 통해서 배우고 깨닫는 바가 많습니다.
Seonnaengnim kangyurul tonghaeso baewuko kkadatnun barkah marnsupnida.
Teacher-HTa lecture-OBJ through learning-and realizing aspect-NOM many-be-AHSF-DE.
There are many things of learning and realizing through your lecture.
3. 특히 교수님을 통해서 지성인이 가져야 할 자세를 많이 배우고 있습니다.
Tuykhee kyoswunimul tonghaesu chisungnie kajieoya harl Particularly, professor-HTa-OBJ through intellectual-NOM have-should do charseyrul marnie baewuko itsupnida.
Attitude-OBJ much learning-and be-AHSF-DE.
Particularly, I have learned a lot the attitude through you that an intellectual should have.
4. 이번에 죄송한 부탁 말씀을 드리야 할 것 같습니다.
Eeburney choesongharn patarkul drieoya harlkut katsupnida.
This-time-at sorryful-HN asking-OBJ give-HPre do-should seem-AHSF-DE. It seems like a situation that I have to ask you a sorrowful favor.
5. 다음 주까지 기말 페이퍼를 제출해야 하는데 제가 그때까지 페이퍼를 제출하지 못하게 되었습니다.
Daum chulkarchie kimal payperul chechulhaeya harnundey Next-week-by final paper-OBJ submit-should do-but, cheatka kuttaekkachie payperul chechulharchie motharkey doetsupnida.
I-HFPP-NOM the-time-by paper-OBJ submit not-do-to come-AHSF-DE.
I am supposed to submit the paper by next week, but I come not to be able to submit by the time.
6. 낮체에 맞추어서 대충 내용을 작성한다면 그때까지 내는 것이 가능하기는 합니다.
Narlzzaey marchueoseo daechung naeyongul charsinkhangndamyun Date-at accordingly clumsily content-OBJ writing-do-if kuttaekkachie naenun kusie karrungharkinun harpnida.
The time-by submit thing possible-being-NOM is-AHSF-DE. It could be possible to submit if I would write the paper clumsily according to the due day.
7. 그러나 제 양심상 그렇게 하는 것이 허락하지 않습니다.
Kuranah chey yangshimsang kurutkey harrun kusi hurakhzarie ahnsupnida.
However, my-HFPP consciousness so do thing-NOM allowing not-do-AHSF-DE. However, my consciousness does not allow me to do so.
8. 교수님께서 시간을 조금 더 주신다면 편지 주제에 맞는 내용을 성실하게 조사하고 연 구하여 제출하도록 하겠습니다.
   Kyosuwnimkkeso sankanul chokum dur chusindamyun payper jujeyey martnun
   Professor-HTa-HNOM time-OBJ a little bit more give-SHSF-HPre-if paper topic-at fit
   naeyongul sungsilharkey chosaharko yeonkuharyeo chechulhadorok harketsupnida.
   If you give me a little bit more time, I will sincerely research and study and then submit.

9. 먼저 학생으로서 성실한 자세를 보이지 않는 저를 용서해 주십시오.
   Munchur harksaengeoroseo sungsilharkey chasreyrul boichie ahunun cherul
   First, student-as sincere attitude-OBJ show not-do me-HFPP-OBJ
   yongseohae chusipsio.
   Forgive me.

10. 한편으로는 편지 주제에 해당한 내용을 갖추기 위해 연구하는 자세를 잃지 않으리라 하는 저의 몽부럽도 이
    해 해주시 감사하겠습니다.
   Harmpyuneorun payper chucheyey harpdangharn naeyongul katchuki wehaye yeonkuharn
   On-the-other-hand, paper topic suitable content-OBJ equip-to for studying
   Chasreyrul ilchie ahneoryunun cherul mounburimdo eehaehae chusimyun kamsaahaksupnida.
   Attitude lose-to not-do my struggle-also understand give-SHSF-HPre-if thank-Future-AHSF-DE.
   On the other hand, I will appreciate if you understand my struggle not to lose sincere academic attitude to equip the
   content of the paper with a suitable topic.

11. 교수님 다른 날에 건강하십시오.
   Kyosuwnim durwun narsieey kunkangharsipsio.
   Professor, be healthy in this hot weather.

E-mail #9
1. 교수님 안녕하세요.

E-mail #9
2. 저는 교수님 강의를 듣고 있는 사회학과 김수경 학생입니다.

E-mail #9
3. 며 앞자리에서 초등초등한 눈으로 강의를 들었는데 기억하실지 모르겠습니다.^^
   Maen apcharieyeyo chorong chongharn nuneoro kangyurul
   The most front seats twinkling twinkling eyes-by lecture-OBJ
   Dulutundey kieokharsilchicie morketsupnida.
   Listening to remember-SHSF-whether know-not-AHSF-DE.
   I was taking your class sitting on the front line of seats with the eyes twinkling but I am not sure whether you remember me or not.

4. 지난 한 학기 동안 교수님의 명강의를 듣게 된 것이 얼마나 감사한지.
   Chinarn harn harki dongahn kyuswnimuy myungkanguyurul
   Last one semester during Professor-HTa-PPar famous-lecture-OBJ
   dutkey doen kutsi eolmarna kamsaharnchiyo.
   Listen-to come thing how-much thankful-is-AHSF-PE.
   How much was it thankful for me to take your famous lecture during last one semester?

5. 매 강의를 열정적으로 해 주셔서 감사하는 것이 가슴이요 즐거움이었습니다.
   Mae kangyurul yuljeonchurkeoro hae chusieoseo kangy
   Every lectur-OBJ passionately do-Past give-SHSF-HPre-because lecture
dutnun kutsi kibbumiyo chulkeowumieotsupnida.
   Listening-to thing-NOM pleasure-is-and joy-be-Past-AHSF-DE.
It was pleasure and joy to listen to your lecture beause you gave us every single lecture passionately.

6. 좋은 강의를 해주셔서 감사합니다.
Chon kanguyurul hae chusieoseo kamsah harmnida.
Good lecture-OBJ do-Past give-SHSF-HPre-because thankful am-AHSF-DE.
I am thankful for your giving us the good lecture.

7. 그런데 최승한 부탁을 드리아 할 일이 있어 이렇게 메일을 드리게 되었습니다.
Kurundae choesongharn putarkul drieya harl ili itseo
By-the-way sorryful asking-_OBJ give-HPre have-to work is-because
eerukey mailul driye doetsupnida.
Like-this mail-OBJ give-HPre-to come-Past-AHSF-DE.
I came to send an e-mail like this because I have something that I have to ask you with sorryful heart.

8. 다음주까지 기말 레포트를 내야 하는데 제가 사정이 생겨서 제출 기한을 조금 연장해 주셨으면 해서요.
Daum chukkachie kimal riportrul naeya harnundey cheyka sarchungie
Next week-by final paper-OBJ submit have-to-but I-HFPP-NOM some-reason
sangkieoseo chechul kiharnul chokum yeonchanhae chusiotseomyun haeseoyo.
Happen-because submitting-HN due-day a-little-bit extension-do give-SHSF-HPre-if want-AHSF-PE.
I want you to extend a little bit the paper due day because something happened around me when I had to submit the paper by next week.

9. 이번에 레포트를 ‘10대들의 소비 성향’에 대한 주제를 가지고 쓰고 있습니다.
Eeburney raeportrul ‘sipdaeduluy sobisunghyang’ey daeharn chuje
This time, paper-OBJ ‘teenagers-PPar propensity to consume’ to in-relation topic-ul
Kachieko sseoko itsupnida.
Having writing be-AHSF-DE.
This time, I am writing the paper in relation to the topic, “Teenagers’ propensity to consume.”

10. 중 고등학교를 대상으로 설문지를 작성하긴 했는데 이들을 만들 자료를 작성하는데 조금 시간이 걸립니다.
Chung-kodungharkyorul daesangyo sulmuncheo charksungharkin haetnundey eedulul
Middle-highschool-OBJ target-as surveyryul making-although do-Past-and these-OBJ
manah charyorul charksungharrundey chokum sikanie kuleel kut katsupnida.
meeting data-OBJ making and a-little-bit time-NOM thing-seem-AHSF-DE.
I made the survey based on Middle and Highschool students as the target, but it will take a little bit long time.

11. 시간을 조금 연장해 주시면 좋은 레포트로 보답해 드릴 것을 약속드립니다.
Sikanul chokum yeonjanghae chusimyun choun raeportro bodarphae
Time-OBJ a-little-bit extend-do give-SHSF-HPre-if good paper-by return-do
Dril kutseol yeandokdripnida.
Give-HPre thing-OBJ promise-give-HPre-AHSF-DE.
If you extend the time a little bit, I will promise to write a good paper in recomense for that.

12. 그림 안녕히 계세요!
Kurum ahnyunghyee kyeseoyo.
Then well be-SHSF-PE.

E-mail #10

1. 존경하는 황진응박사님께
Chonkungunharn hwangchinwoong parksarnimkkey
Respectful Hwang Chinwoong Dr.-HTa-to-HPar
Respectful Dr. Chinwoong Hwang
2. 교수님 안녕하세요.

Kyoswunim ahnyungharseoyo.
Professor-HTa well-be-SHSF-PE.
Professor, how are you?
3. 저는 교수님 수업을 듣고 있는 이제동이라고 합니다.
Chunun kyoswunim sueopul dutko ittnun leecheydongeerako harpnida.
I-HFPP-NOM professor-HTa class-OBJ listening-to being Lee Cheydong-FN-called be-AHSF-DE.
I am called Cheydong Lee who is taking your class.

4. 한 학기 동안 많은 가르침을 주시고 수업을 통해 새로운 학문에 대한 눈을 갖게 되었습니다.
Harn harkidongah marnun kareochimul chusiko sueopul tonghae
One semester-during much teaching-OBJ give-SHSF-HPre-and class-OBJ through
saeroun harkmunye daeharn nunul gotkey doetsupnida.
New academ-to towards eyes-OBJ have-to come-AHSF-DE.
I have come to open my eyes towards academy through the class that you gave a lot of lessons.
5. 이제 마지막 기말 페이퍼를 지금 준비중인데 제가 정한 주제에 대한 자료조사는 다 끝내었지만 어떻게 쓸 것인지에 대해 고민하고 있습니다.
Eecheey marchimark kimal payerul chikum chunbichungin indey cheyka chungcharyo
Now last final payer-OBJ now preparing and then 1-HFPP-NOM decided topic-to
daeharn charyochosanun dar kkutnaeotchiemarn utterkey sseol kusincheeey
about data-survey-NOM all finish Past-but how write-to or not
daehae kominharko itsupnida.
About poindingover am-AHSF-DE.
Now, I am pondering over how to write the paper although I have finished all collecting the data for the topic that I
decided for the last final paper.
6. 좀 더 좋은 결과를 내고 싶은 욕심으로 시작하였는데 시간이 정말 모자라다는 것을 느끼고 있습니다.
Chom dur choun kyulkwarul naeko sipeun yorkshimeoro
A-little-bit more good conclusion-OBJ down want-to desire-through
sicharkharyeotmundae sikanie chungmarl mocharandanun kutseol neokkipnida.
Start Past but time-NOM realy short-be thing-OBJ feel-AHSF-DE.
7. 그래서 가능하다면 이번 주말까지 꼭 할 수 있도록 시간을 허락해 주실 수는 없는지요?
Kuaraeseo kanunghardamyun eeburn chumarkkachie kkutnael su itdorok
Therefore possible is-if this weekend-by finish able
sikanul hurakhao chusil sunun upnunchieyo?
time-OBJ allow HPre Give-SHSF-HPre able-NOM not-is-PE?
Therefore, couldn’t you allow me to have time to be able to finish by this weekend as possible as I can?
8. 잘 완성된 페이퍼를 저는 정말 내고 싶은데 꼭 허락해 주시면 감사하겠습니다.
Charl wansungdoen payerul chernun cheongmarl naeko
Well completed paper-OBJ 1-HFPP-NOM really give
sipeondey kkok hurakhao chusimyun kamsaharketsupnida.
Want-to and surely allow give-SHSF-HPre if thankful-am-Future-AHSF-DE.
I will be thankful if you surely allow me because I really want to submit a completed paper.

E-mail #11
1. 황진웅 박사님, Parksarnim,
Hwanchinwoong Hwang Chinwoong-FN Dr.-Hta,
Dr. Chinwoong Hwang
2. 저는 교수님의 경영학 전공수업을 듣고 있는 경영학과 3학년 이정숙이라고 합니다.
Chernun kyoswunimuy kyunghyurkhang chunbichungin deukdo ditnum
I-HFPP-NOM professor-HTa-PPar management major-class-OBJ listening-to am
kyungkhangcharyo sarmharknyun rheejeongsookirako harpnida.
Management-major third-academic year Rhee Jeongsook-FN called am-AHSF-DE.
I am called Rhee Jeongsook a Management major in junior year, taking your Management class.
3. 지난 수업 시간에 교수님께서 내주신 과제와 관련하여 양해의 말씀을 드리고자 이렇게 이메일을 보냅니다.
Chinarn sueop sikaney kyoswunimkkesexo naechusin kwajeywa kwanryunharyeo
Last class time-at professor-HTa-HNOM assigne-SHSF assignment-and in-relation-to
Yanghaeuy marlaseomul dikochar eemeul eemeul bonapnida.
Comprehension-HN word-HN-OBJ give-HPre-to like-this e-mail-OBJ send-AHSF-DE.
I send an e-mail to you to tell the word of comprehension in relation to the assignment that you assigned last classtime.
4. 알고 계시리라 생각합니다만, 이번 주 목요일 강당에서 학생회에서 주최하는 자선바자회 행사가 있습니 다.
Arlo kyesirirah saengkarkharpnidaman, eeburn chu mokyoil kandangeyseo
E-mail #12
1. 교수님 안녕하세요?
   Kyoswunim ahnyungharseyo?
   Professor-HTa well-be-SHSF-PE?

   2. 교수님 수업을 듣고 있는 권험회입니다.
   Kyoswunim sueopul dutko ittun kwonnamheepnida.
   Professor-HTa class-OBJ listening-to am Kwon-Namhee-FN-am-AHSF-DE.
   I am Namhee Kwon who is taking your class.

3. 교수님께서도 아시아시대 기말페이퍼 데드라인이 다음 주임니다.
   Kyoswunimkkeyeodo ahsidesipppee kimalpayper dredrainee daum chuipnida.
   Professor-HTa-HNOM also know-SHSF-as final-paper deadline-NOM next week-is-AHSF-DE.

   4. 아마도 제 생각에는 몇몇 독특한 상황을 제외하고는 현 시점에서 데드라인을 연기하는 것이 어렵다는 것을 알고 있습니다.
   Ahmardo chey saengkarkeyun myeotmyeot tukshaharn sanghwangul cheywayharkonun
   Perhaps, I-HFPP thought-NOM a-few special situation-OBJ except-and then
   hyun sijemeyseseo dredrainul yeonkharhun kutsi eoryudpamun kuteol ahlo isupnida.
   Present time-point-at deadline-OBJ extend thing difficult thing-OBJ know am-AHSF-DE.

   At the present point of time, I also know that it is difficult for you to extend the deadline except a few special situations.

   5. 하지만 현재 제 상황을 이해하신다면 교수님께서 저의 기말페이퍼 데드라인을 몇일더 연장해 주는 것이 결코 한 학생만을 위한 특혜가 아니라고 생각 하실겁니다.
I am Cheydong Kim a student who is ardently listening to your lecture.

Kim

2. How are you? Professor.

Because I will struggle hard to write the best final paper.

To do so, perhaps I may need more or so more prepare-to time-NOM need thing seem-AHSF-DE.

To do so, perhaps I may need 3~4 days more to prepare.

I also want to add this topic.

Kureoki wehaseounun ahmardo 3~4 jeongdo dur chunbiharl sikanie pilyoharl kut katsupnida.

So do-to –NOM perhaps 3-4 more or so more prepare-to time-NOM need thing seem-AHSF-DE.

To do do, perhaps I may need 3-4 days more to prepare.

Understanding-OBJ ask-HN-give-HPre-Future-AHSF-DE.

Because I will struggle hard to write the best final paper, I ask your favor of understanding.
This-like mail give-HPre-AHSF-DE.
By the way, I send an e-mail to you to ask your favor in relation to the final paper.
5. 기말페이퍼의 제출기한이 다음주까지인 것으로 알고 있지만 개인적인 사정으로 제출기한을 맞추지 못할
것 같습니다.
Kimalpayperu chechul kiharnie daum chukkachiein kutseoro arlko itchimarn
Final-paper-PPar submit-HN \ due-day-NOM next week-by-be thing-as know am-but
Kaeincherkin sarjeongeoro chechul kiharnul marchuchie motharl kut katsupnida.
Personal matters-with submission-HN due-day-OBJ keep not-Future thing seem-AHSF-DE.
Although I know that the due day of final paper is by next week, I may not make it on time for some reason.
6. 비롯없이 이렇게 메일로 말씀드리는 점 정말 죄송하게 생각합니다.
Burutupsi eerukey meliro martsesomdrinun chum joengmarl
Impolitely this-like mail-by word-HN-giving-HPre-NOM aspect really
choesongharkey saengkarkharpnida.
Sorfully-HN think-AHSF-DE.
I feel sorry about impolitely asking you by an e-mail like this.
7. 그러나 제가 너무 급한 사정이 생겨 다큰히 메일 드림니다.
Kurunah cheykey nurmu kupharn sarjeongie saengkyu darkuphie meil
However, I-HFPP-to too urgent situation-NOM happen-Past-because hurriedly mail
drippida.
give-HPre-AHSF-DE.
I send an e-mail in a hurry to you because too urgent situation happened to me.
8. 조급한 쪽에게 시간을 얻어서 주시면 감사하겠습니다.
Chokummnar cherekey sikanul yeonchanghagae chusimyun kamsaharketsupnida.
a-little-bit-only I-HFPP-to time-OBJ extend give-SHSF-HPre-if thankful-am-Future-AHSF-DE.
I will be thankful if you extend a little bit of time for me.
9. 부탁드립니다. 교수님.
Putarkdrippida. Kyoswunim.
Asking-HN-give-HPre-AHSF-DE. Professor-HTa.
Please, do me a favor. Professor.

E-mail #14
1. 교수님 안녕하세요.
Kyoswunim ahnyunghaseyo.
Professor-HTa well-be-SHSF-PE.
Professor, how are you?
2. 제자 신성혜입니다.
Chechar shinsunghyeipnida.
Disciple Shin-Sunghye-FN-am-AHSF-DE.
I am a disciple, Sunghey Shin.
3. 다름이 아니오라 교수님께 얕해 드릴 일이 있어서 이렇게 이메일 보냅니다.
Darumie ahniroh kyoswunimkkey yanghae dril ilie itseseoseo
Different not-be-but professor-HTa-to-HPar understanding-HN give-HPre work be-because
iruk ey-mail bonapnida.
This-like e-mail send-AHSF-DE
By the way, because I need your understanding, I am sending an e-mail to you.
4. 교수님께서 이번주까지 기말 페이퍼를 제출하라고 하셨는데 제가 도저히 기말 페이퍼를 이번주까지
내는 것이 어려울것 같습니다.
Kyoswunimkkeseyo eeburn chukkachie kimarl payerul chechulharahko harsietnundey
Professor-HTa-HNOM this week-by final paper-OBJ submit-have-to say-Past-but
cheyka dochurhee kimarl payerul eeburn chukkachie naenun kutsie eoryeoul kut
I-HFPP-NOM possibly final paper-OBJ this week-by submit thing-NOM difficult thing
katsupnida.
Seem-AHSF-DE.
Although you asked us to submit the final papers by this week, it seems difficult for me to submit the final paper by
this week.
5. 교수님도 아시다시피 저에게 두아이들이 있는데 두아이가 다 아름답니다.

Kyoswunim do ah sidahisppe cherekey duaidul ittunkey duaiika dah ahpunida.
Professor-HTa also know-as I-HFPP-to two-children are-but two-children all sick-are-AHSF-DE.
As you know, I have two children, but they both are sick.

6. 도저희 아이들 간호와 살림을 하면서 기말 페이퍼를 쓸 시간이 없습니다.

Docherhee aidul kanhowa salrimul harmanyunseo kimal payperul sseol sikanie
Possibly children nursing-and housekeeping doing final paper-OBJ write-to time-NOM upseopnida
Not-is-AHSF-DE.
I do not possibly have time to write the final paper nursing and housekeeping.

7. 한주간만 더 시간을 주신다면 정말 최선을 다해서 기말 페이퍼를 쓰겠습니다.

Harn chukanmarn dur sikanul chusindarmyun chungmarl choesunul dahaeseo kimal
One week-only more time-OBJ give-SHSF-HPre-if really best-OBJ do-and final payperul sseoketsupnida.
Paper-OBJ write-Future-AHSF-DE.
If you give me just one more week, I will do my best to write the final paper.

8. 교수님의 말씀으로 양해를 부탁드립니다.

Kyoswunimuy nulbusin yanghaerul putarkdripnida
Professor-HTa-PPar broad-is-SHSF comprehension asking-HN-give-HPre-AHSF-DE.
I wish you could have a broad comprehension.

E-mail #15
1. 황진웅 교수님께.
Hwangchinwoong kyoswunimkkey
Hwang Chinwoong professor-HTa-to-HPar
To professor Chinwoong Hwang
2. 안녕하세요?

Ahnyungharseyo?
Well-be-SHSF-PE?
How are you?

3. 저는 교수님 강의를 듣고 있는 학생입니다.

Chernun kyoswunimuy kanguyrul dutko ittun harksaengipnida.
I-HFPP-NOM professor-HTa-PPar lecture-OBJ listening-to being student-am-AHSF-DE.
I am a student who is listening to your lecture.

4. 다음이 아니라 다음주까지 내야 하는 기말 페이퍼에 관하여 문의드립니다.

Darumie ahnirah daum chukkarchie naey a harmsun kimal payper ey kwanharyeo
Different not-be-but next week-by submit-have-to do final paper-about relation-to
munuy dripnida.
Query-HN give-HPre-AHSF-DE.
By the way, I have a query in relation to the final paper that I am supposed to submit by next week.

5. 본의 아니게 제가 지금 편지 못할 사정으로 인해 페이퍼를 쓸 시간을 가지지 못하고 있습니다.

Bonuy ahmikey cheyka chikum piechie motharl sarjongeoro inhae payperul sseol
My-will not-be I-HFPP-NOM now escape not-able situation-with due-to paper-OBJ write-to
sikanul karjiejie motharko itsupnida.
Time-OBJ have not-do am-AHSF-DE.
Against my will, I do not have time to write the paper due to an unescapable situation.

6. 당연히 다음주까지 제출해야겠지만 혹시 교수님께서 허락하신다면 주말까지 제출하고 싶습니다.

Darngyeonhee daum chukkarchie chechulhaeyakechtemarn horksi
Rightfully next week-by submit-have-to-but perhaps

kyoswunimkkeyseo hurarkharsindarmyun chumarlkkachie chechulharketsupnida.
Professor-HTa-HNON allow-SHSF-if weekends-by submit-Future-AHSF-DE.
Although I am supposed to rightfully submit by next week, if you happen to allow, I want to submit the paper by this weekend.

7. 나그램게 이해해 주신다면 감사하게 생각하겠습니다만 허락하지 않으시면도 팝하신다.

Nurgupkey eehaeae chusindarmyun karmsaharkey saengkarkharketseopnidarn
Generously understand give-SHSF-HPre-if thankfully think-Future-AHSF-DE-but

\textit{hurakhasichie ahneosieodo kwoencharnsupnida}.

Allow-SHSF not-do-SHSF-although alright-is-AHSF-DE

If you understand generously, I will think it is thankful, but even if you do not allow, it will alright.

8. 교수님의 답변을 기대하겠습니다.

9. 그럼, 안녕히 계십시오.

10. 제자드림.

Cheychar drim.

Disciple give-HN

Your disciple sending.

15 E-mails based on Situation #2

E-mail #16
1. 안녕!
Ahnyung!
Well!
Hi!
2. 나 홍길동이야…

\textit{Nah Hongkildongiya…}

I-FPP Hong Kildong-FN-am-AE
I am Kildong Hong.
3. 내가 공부를 하는데 도저히 내 머리로는 이해가 안가는구나…

\textit{Naeka kongburul harnundey docherhee nae marieroneon eehaeka}

I-FPP-NOM study-OBJ do and then possibly I-FPP-PPar head-by understanding-NOM

\textit{ahnharneonkuna…}

not-go-AE
I do study but I cannot possibly understand by my brain.
4. 머리가 명청한 것은 어쩔 수 없나와…

Marieka mungchungharn kutseon uzzulsu upnarbwa.
Head-NOM unclear-is to-NOM avoidable not-is-AE.
That my head is unclear is unavoidable.
5. 또 수업시간에 졸기도 많이해서 노트 필기도 엉망인데 너의 도움이 좀 필요해서…..

\textit{tto sueopsikaney zolkido marniehaesoe noteo pilkido ungmarngindey also class-time-at nodding-also many-did-because note writing mess-up-and then}

\textit{nahuyou doumie chom pilyohaesoe…}

you-SPP-PPar help-NOM a-little-bit needed-because-AE…
Also, I nodded many times during the class time, and because note writing is also messed up, I need your help…
6. c 학점의 위기에 있는 나를 구해줄 수 있겠니?

Ssi harkchumuy weekiuy ittun nahrul kuhaechul su \textit{itketni}?
C letter-grade-PPar danger-at be I-FPP-OBJ rescue able be-Future-RE.
Can you rescue me in danger of “c” letter grade?

E-mail #17
1. 선희야 나 길동이야

\textit{Sunheeya nah kildongiya}

Sunhee-VPar I-FPP Kildong-am-AE.
Sunhee, I am Kildong.
2. 시험준비 잘 되고있나?

Sihamchunbie charl doekoitni?
Test-preparation well be-good.RE.
3. 공부도중에 막히는 부분도 있고해서 같이 공부하면 서로 도움이 될까해서 말이야.
Kongbudochuney markeenun bubundo *itkohaeseo* katsi kongbuharmyun
Study-while blocking part-also is-because together study-if
seoro doumi *doelkghaeseo* marliya.

Each other help-NOM be-Future-because say-AE.

While I study, because there are also difficult parts to me, I like to suggest you to study together to be helpful to each other.

4. 이번주 토요일날 시간 어때?
Eeburn chu toyoinalr sikan *eottae*?
This week Saturday time how-is-AE.

How is some time on this Saturday?

5. 내가 너네 집앞으로 차 가지고 갈까~~

_Naeka_ nuhney chip-apeoro char kachieko karlkkey^^
I-FPP-NOM you-SPP-PPar house-front-to car with-and go-Future-AE ^^

I will go to the front part of your house with my car.

6. 노트랑 노트북도 같이 가지고 오리무나~~~
Noterang notebookdo katsi kachiko *oryeomuna~~~*
Note-and notebook-also together hold-and come-AE

Come with the note and a notebook (computer).

7. 저녁은 내가 쓰마~~
Churnyukun *naeka* ssomar~~
Evening-OBJ I-FPP-NOM shoot-Future-AE~~

I will pay for dinner.

**E-mail #18**

1. 준석아! 기말고사 열심히 준비하고 있니?
_Chunseoka!_ Kimarlkosaeysyo choun sungjeok kurdurkuriul *baranda*!
Chunseok-VPar! final-test earnestly prepare-and be-RE?
Chunseok! Are you preparing earnestly for the final test?

2. 이번에도 내가 기말고사에서 좋은 성적거두기를 바란다!
Eeburneydo _neyka_ kimarlkosaeysyo choun sungjeok kurdurkuriul baranda!
This-time-also, you-SPP-NOM final-test-from good grade reap-to-OBJ hope-RE!

I hope that you may reap again a good grade from this final test.

3. 내가 앞으로 이번 학기에 집안에 문제가 많아서 수업에 2주간 빠지지 않았니.
_Neyka_ arldasipie eeburn harkieey chipahney muncheeyka marnarseo
You-SPP-NOM know-as this semester-in home-at problem-NOM many-because

Sueopey 2chukan bbarchiechie ahnartni.
Class-at 2weeks absent not-am-Past-AE.

As you know, I was absent from the classes for 2 weeks this semester because there were many problems at home.

4. 그래서 강의 시간에 빠져서 기말고사를 준비하고 있는데 이해가 되지 않았아.
Kuraeseo kanguy sikaney bbarjyeoseo kimarlkosarul chunbieharko
Therefore lecture time-from absent-because final-test-OBJ prepare-and

Itundey eehaeka doechie ahnah.
Am-but understood get-to-be not-AE.

Therefore, due to the absence from the lectures, I do not get to be understood while I am preparing for the final test.

5. 혹시 내가 좀 도와줄수 있니?
Horkse _neyka_ chom dowachulsu ittini?
Perhaps you-SPP-NOM a-little-bit help-can be-RE?

Do you happen to be able to help me?

6. 내가 좀 가르쳐 주면 기말고사 준비를 잘 할 수가 있을 것 같아!
_Neyka_ chom kareochyeo (*chunmyun* kimalkosa chunbieurul
You-SPP-NOM a-little-bit teach give-if final-test preparation-OBJ
charl harl suka itsel kutt _katah_!
Well do able be-Future thing seem-AE!
My lovely friend, Sunhee.

Because there are still a few days remaining, I can not give up yet.

Due to severe cold, I have been sick for a long time which have dropped concentration along with my careless character that made me lose my note, hu~

I have not well prepared for the final test this time.

Whenever I see you studying minutely, I am very respectful to you.

Do you earnestly prepare for this final test again?

Pyungsoey kkomkkomharkey kongbuharnun ney moseop bomyun charm chonkyungsrupda. Usually minutely studying you-SPP figure see-if truly respectful-is.RE.

If you teach me, I may well be able to prepare for the final test!

If you happen to have something that you don’t know, then I will also willingly help you.

This final test-also earnestly prepare-and be-Future-AE?

When I see you studying minutely, I am very respectful to you.

If you happen to have something that you don’t know, then I will also willingly help you.

If you happen to have something that you don’t know, then I will also willingly help you.

If you teach me, I may well be able to prepare for the final test!

If you happen to have something that you don’t know, then I will also willingly help you.

If you teach me, I may well be able to prepare for the final test!

If you happen to have something that you don’t know, then I will also willingly help you.

If you happen to have something that you don’t know, then I will also willingly help you.

If you teach me, I may well be able to prepare for the final test!

If you happen to have something that you don’t know, then I will also willingly help you.
8. 나 좀 도와 주겠니?

Nah chom dowa chuketni?
I-FPP a-little-bit help give-Future-RE?
Will you help me a little bit?

9. 내가 학사 시험 방향을 알 수 있게 나의 빌려준 노트를 빌려준다면 잘 할 수 있을 거 같아.

Neyka kyuteyseo shihum banghnyangul ahlyeochuko nuhuy mutchinn noutrul
You-SPP-NOM nearby test direction-OBJ tell-give-and you-SPP-PPar great note-OBF
biryuchundamyun charl harl su itseol kur kah.
Loan-give-if well do able be thing seem-AE.
If you are telling the direction of the test beside me and loan your great note to me, I might be able to do well.

10. 아주 잘 할 수는 없어도 최선을 다할 수는 있으니까.

Ahchu charl harl sunun upseodo chosesunul dahnharl sunun itseonikka.
Perfectly well do able not-be-although best all-do able be-because-AE.
Even though I may not be able to make it perfect, it is because I can do my best.

11. 연락 기다리겠거.

Yeonrak kidarilkkkey
Communication wait-Future-AE.
I will wait for your reply.

E-mail #20

1. 선화야, 어제 잘 들이겠어?

Sunheeya, echoh charl deoleokartseo?
Sunhee-VPar, yesterday well enter-Past-AE?
Sunhee, did you go home safe yesterday?

2. 요새 정신이 잘 되나?

Yosey chunshin upchie?
Recently mind not-is?
Recently, you are so out of mind?

3. 나도 기말 시험기간이라 정신 없다.

Nahdo kimarl siumkikanirah chungsin upda.
I-FPP-also, final test-period be-because mind not-have-RE.
I am also out of my mind during this final test period.

4. 나 중간에 빼앗은 게 몇 가지 있어서 내 노트값기 보고 참고 좀 할 수 있음까.

Nuh horksi chunkongkwamok pilkinun dah haetni?
You-SPP perhaps major-class note-writing all do-Past-RE?
Do you happen to write all down on the note of the major class?

5. 나 중간에 빼앗은 게 몇 가지 있어서 내 노트값기 보고 참고 좀 할 수 있음까.

Nah chunkaney bbachink key meoyt karchie itseseo ney noutpilki
I-FPP middle-at missing part some things are-because you-SPP note-writing
boko charmko chom harl su itsulkka?
See-and refer-to a-little-bit do able be-Future-AE
Because there are missing parts on my note, I am wondering if I can see your note to refer to a little bit.

6. 열심히 한다고 하긴 했는데 교수님들 말씀이 빠르다 보니가 놓친 게 몇 가지 있는데.

Yeolshimhee harnadako harkin haetmundey kyoswunimdul marlsseomi
Earnestly do-to do-Past do-Past-but professor-HTA-Plural word-HN-NOM
wanarkbabeosidah bonikka notchin kei meoyt karchie itney.
Too-fast-SHSF because missing things a-few kinds are-RE.
Although I tried hard to write down, there are missing parts because the speed that professors spoke was too fast.

7. 그리고 내가 이번 학기 과목이 좀 어렵다고 했던 것 기억나?

Kuriko naeka eeburn harki kwamoki chom eoryudahko haedun kut kieoknah?
And I-FPP-NOM this semester subject-NOM a-little-bit difficult-is do-past thing remember-RE
And do you remember my saying that the subject is a little bit difficult this semester?

8. 나 공부하다 보니까, 몇 가지 이해가 안가는 부분이 있어서 좀 널 설명을 들었음 해.

Nah kongbuharda bonikka, meoyt karchie eehaeka ahkarneon bubuni
I-FPP study-while see-because several kinds understand-NOM not-go parts-NOM itseoseo chom ney sulmyungul deoleotsum hae. Are-because a-little-bit you-FPP explanation-OBJ listen-to-want do-AE.
While I study, I found there are some parts that I don’t understand, so I want you to explain about it.
9. 내가 이번 학기 과목에 소질있어요.
Neyka eeburn harki kwamokey sojilizarnah.
You-SPP-NOM this semester subject-at able-are-because.
It is because you are good at the subjects this semester.
10. 너 내일 학교 몇 시에 와?
Nuh naeil harkyoey meoyt shiey wah?
You-SPP tomorrow school-at what time come?
What time will you come to school tomorrow?
11. 학교 수업 끝나고 도서관에서 같이 공부하자.
Harkyo suep kkeotnahdo dosenkwaneyseo katchi kongbuharcha.
School class finish-and library-at together study-RE (propositive sentence).
After school classes are over, let’s study together at the library.
12. 너도 내가 필기 한 것 참고해서 빠진 부분이나 확인도 하고 그래.
Nuhdo naeka pilki harneorah kut charmkohaesoeo pparchin bubun
You-SPP-also I-FPP-NOM write do-Past thing refer-to missing parts ittnah hwarkindo harko kurae.
Are-whether confirm-also do-and do-so.
You also confirm whether your note has some missing parts referring to my note.
13. 알았지?
Ahlartchie?
Know-AE?
Got it?
14. 연락 취, 내일 보자. 안녕.
Communication give-AE. tomorrow let’s see-RE. well-be-AE.
Send an reply to me. Let’s meet tomorrow. Bye,

E-mail #21
1. 안녕, 선데이 시험공부 하느라 바쁘지?
Ahnyung, sunheeya sihumkongbu harneorah barbbeodhie?
Well, Sunhee-VPar test-study do-because busy-are-AE?
Hi, Sunhee, you must be busy studying for the test?
2. 시험공부 열심히 해서 좋은 성적 있기를 기도할께.
Sihumkongbu yeolshimhee haeseo choen sungjerk itkiroleol kidoarlkye.
Test-study earnestly do-and good grade being-OBJ pray-Future-AE.
I will pray that you may study hard and have a good grade.
3. 그런데 부탁이 있는데 패칠겠니?
Kurundey butarki ittnunde oy kwencharnktemi?
By-the-way asking-NOM is-then alright-is-RE?
By the way, is it o.k. to ask you a favor?
4. 내가 머리가 많이 아파서 노트필기를 못해.
Naeka merika marnie ahparseo noutpilkirul mothaeetseo.
I-FPP-NOM head-NOM much painful-because note-writing-OBJ not-do-Past-AE.
Because I had headache, I could not make note-writing.
5. 너의 노트필기를 참고해서 보고 싶어.
Nuhuy noutpilkirul charmkohaesoeo boko sipeo.
You-SPP-PPar note-writing-OBJ refore-to see-and want-AE.
I want to see your notewriting as a reference.
4. 나와 함께 내일 도서관에서 함께 공부하고, 너의 노트도 참고해서 보고 싶은데 노트 가져오지 오면 좋겠다.
Nahwa harmkkey naeil dosenkwaneyseo harmkkey kongbuharko, nuhuy noutdo
I-FPP-with tomorrow library-at together study-and you-SPP-PPar note-also
Charmkohaseo boko sipoe ndey nout kajyeo omyun choketnun dey kwenci charnkket?
Reference-as see-and want-and note bring come good-be-Future-and alright-is-RE.
Are you o.k. if you study with me tomorrow at the library and if you show me your note as a reference?
5. 맞는 것은 짐을 사주고, 나가 어려워하는 다른 과목의 필기를 내가 열심히 했는데, 내 필기를 보여주게 할래요?

Marsintheon chumsimul sarchuko, nurka eoryeowurharnun darun kwamokuy
Delicious lunch-OBJ buy-and, you-SPP-NOM feel-difficult other subject-PPar
pilkirul naeka yeolshimhee haetneondea, nae pilkirul boyeochulkey
(note)writing-OBJ I-FPP-NOM earnestly do-Past-and, I-FPP-PPar writing show-Future
charmkohaseo bomyun eotterni?
Reference-as see-if how-is-RE.
I will buy you a delicious lunch and I will show you my other note writing that I wrote earnestly, especially for the subject that you feel difficult so that you can see that as your reference.

E-mail #22
1. 준석야.
Chunseok
Chunseok-GN-VPar.
Chunseok.
2. 나 정아야.
Nah jeongahya.
I-FPP Jeongah-GN-VPar.
I am Jeongah.
3. 시험공부 열심히 하고 있나?
Sihumkongbu yeolshimhee harko itnya?
Test-study earnestly do-and are-RE?
Are you studying hard for the test?
5. 아. 철학강의를 몇 번 빼쳤더니 웨들어 죽겠다.
Ah, chuhlark kanguyurul meoyt burn bbarzieotderni himduleo chukeda.
Ah, philosophy lecture-OBJ several times absent-was difficult-so dying-am-RE.
Ah, I feel difficult to die after I was absent several times from the Philosophy lecture.
6. 당장 다음주 시험인데 난감하네.
Darngharng daum chu shuminidey narnkarmharney.
Right-now next week test-because frustrated-am-RE.
Right now, I feel frustrated because there is a test next week.

7. 너 이번 주말에 공부 어디에서 할까야?
Nuh eeburn chumarley kongbu eodieyseo harlkkeoya?
You-SPP-NOM this weekend study where do-Future-RE
Where will you study this weekend?
8. 별다른 계획 없으면 주말에 도서관에 와라. 같이 하자.
Byuldareon kyeohon upseomyun chumarley doseokwaney warah. katschi harcha.
Special plan not-is-if weekend-on library-to come. together do-RE.
Come to the library to study together this weekend, if you do not have a special plan. Let’s do together.
9. 철학강의 노트도 좀 빌려주고.ㅋㅋㅋ
Chuhlark- kanguy notdo chom bilyeochouko. Hahaha.
Philosophy lecture note-also a-little-bit lend. Hahaha.
And also lend me your Philosophy lecture note. Hahaha.
10. 대신 너 다음 주에 사회학수업 시험도 있지? 나 그거 패기 잘 해봤어.
Daeshin nah daum chuey sahoehark sueop sihumdo itchie?
Instead, you-SPP-NOM next week-on sociology class test have-RE
Nah kukeo philki charl haenoartseo.
I-FPP-NOM that writing well do-Past-RE.
Instead, you have a sociology test next week? I made the class note very well.
I will borrow some books that we need for the final test from the library in advance.

I have also anticipated-questions for the test that I will lend it to you so let’s do together at the library this weekend.

**Sunhee**, as you know, I was absent from the classes several times recently because

You are not identical with me who do hurriedly only after the test time comes?

Because you do usually well, you will not worry about even when the finals come.

That part is very important

Par, you are preparing well for the final test?

Let me know. If you come, surely bring the sociology lecture note. Got it?

Sunhee, you do do hospital for treatment?

Sunhee, you do also know-as I-FPP-NOM this-time-at treatment-for hospital-to go-Past

Il taemuney sueopey myeot burn ppachietcharnie?

Work because class-from a-few times absent-be-Past?

Sunhee, as you know, I was absent from the classes several times recently because I went to hospital for treatment?

That part is very important, which I did not do note writing.

That part is very important, which I did not do note writing.

Therefore you-SPP-Ppar help-NOM desperately need-RE.

Therefore, I need your help desperately.

I will borrow some books that we need for the final test from the library in advance.

9. 교수님이 참고 문헌으로 알려준 목록은 내가 갖고 있으니까.

**Kyoosunimi** charmko munhuneoyo ahryeochun mokrokeon naeka katko itteonikka. Professor-HTa-NOM refereee literature-as tell-Past-give list I-FPP-NOM have-and am-because-RE.
It is because I have the list of the reference books that the professor told us.
10. 내가 너의 노트를 참고하는 동안 나는 내가 빌려온 책을 먼저 잊고 있음.

\textit{Naeka nhuhuy noutul charmkoharnun dongahn nhunun}
I-FPP-NOM you-SPP-PAR note-OBJ refer-to while you-SPP-NOM

\textit{naeka biyeeoon chaekul meoncher ilko iseryum.}
I-FPP-NOM borrow book-OBJ ahead read be-AE.

While I use your note, read the books that I borrow ahead of me.

11. 물론 점심과 커피는 내가 살게.
Molon chumshimkwla kurpeenun \textit{naeka sarlkei}.
Of course, lunch-and coffee I-FPP-NOM buy-Future-AE.

Of course, I will buy lunch and coffee for you.

12. 수업 끝나고 우리가 늘 가던 그 장소로 와라.

Sueop kkunahako oorieka nul kahdern ku charngsoro \textit{wara}.
Class end-and we-NOM usually go that place-to come-RE.

Come to the place where we usually go after the class.

13. 그때 보자 안녕.

Ku tae \textit{boza ahnyung}.
That time see-RE well-be-AE.

Let's see on that time. Bye.

\textbf{E-mail #24}

1. 준석이 잘지내니?

\textit{Junseokah charchinaeni}?
Junseok-GN-VPar well-live-RE?
Junseok, how are you doing?

2. 기말고사 준비한다고 바빠지?

Kimarikosa chunbieharnadako \textit{barppeochie}?
Final-test prepare-because busy-be-AE?

You are busy due to the final exam preparation?

3. 어디서 공부하는지 모르지만 몇 분지 오래되었구나.

Urdiseo kongbuharnunchie moreochiemarn mot bonze \textit{oraedoeulkuna}.
Where study-do- not-know-but not see long-be-AE.

Because I do not know where you study, it has been a long time not to see you.

4. 난 도서관에서 공부하고 있어.

\textit{Nahn doseokwaneyseo kongbuharko iseo}.
I-FPP-NOM library-at study and be-AE.

I study at the library.

5. 공부하면서 평상시에 공부를 열심히 하지 않았는지 후회도 하면서 말이야.

Kongbuharyunseo pyungsansiey kongbural yeolsimheey harchie
Studying normal-times-at study-OBJ earnestly do
Ahnartneonchue huoeodo haryunseo \textit{marleya}.
Not-do-Past regret doing word-AE.

Studying alone, I am regretting why I do not study hard at normal times.

6. 난 혼자 공부하면서 알아가는 내용들이 맞는지 너무 함께 공유하고 싶어.

\textit{Nahn honchah kongbuharyunseo ahlarkarneon naeongdulie}
I-FPP-NOM alone studying knowing contents-NOM
martnunchie nhuhwa harmkkey kongyuharko \textit{siphur}.
Right-or-not you-SPP-with together share want-to-AE.

I want to share whether it is right or not that I have learned alone.

7. 몇몇 내용들은 내가 필기한 노트에 명확하지 않아서 내가 이해한 것이 틀림 것 같은 생각이 들기도 해.

Myeotmyeot naeongdulun \textit{naeka} pilkiharn noutey myungwharkharchie ahnarseo
Some contents I-FPP-NOM write-Past note-PAR clear Not-be-because
\textit{naeka eehaeharn kutsi tulil kut kateon saengkarki dulkido hae}.
I-FPP-NOM understand to-NOM wrong thing seem thought-NOM come-in-also do-AE.
Because some contents are not clear in my note that I wrote, I think what I understood seems to be wrong.
8. 난 도서관 1층에서 공부하고 있어 주말에도 계속 도서관에 있을 거야.

Nahn doseokwan ilcheongeuyseo kongbuharko itseo chumarleydo
I-FPP-NOM library first-floor-at studying am-AE weekend-also
kyesok doseokwaney iseolkkurya.
Continuously library-at be-Future-AE.
I study at the first floor of the library and I will be there continuously during weekends, too.

9. 같이 와서 공부하면 좋겠다. 올 때 너가 쓴 노트도 들고 오면 좋겠다.

Katchie waseo kongbuharnyun choketda.
Together come-and study-if good-be-Future-RE.

E-mail #25
1. 선희야, 일어났니?
Sunheeya, ileonartni?
Sunhee-GN-VPar, get-Past-up?
Sunhee, did you get up?
2. 어제 공부 많이 했어?
Eochey kongbu marnie haetseo?
Yesterday study much do-Past-AE?
Did you study a lot yesterday?
3. 어제 기말고사가 정말 코앞으로 다가왔구나.
Eechey kimarlkosaka jeongmarl koapeoro dakawatkuna.
Now final-test-NOM really nose-front come-Past-AE.
Now, the final test came up closer.
4. 어제 나는 피곤해서 도서관에서 일찍 와서 그냥 자버렸단다.
Eochey nahnuh seseon noutdo dulko ohmyun choketda.
Yesterday time you-SPP-NOM write-Past note-also bringing come-if good-be-Future-RE.
It will be great if you come and study together. When you come, if you bring with you the note that you wrote, it will be great, too.

Sunhee, did you get up?

Yesterday study a lot yesterday?

Now, the final test came up closer.

Yesterday, I came back early from the library and just fell into sleep because I was tired.

Although the test is just out there.

Just sleep throw-RE.

Yesterday, I came back early from the library and just fell into sleep because I was tired.

Although test be-FP-front-although.

Although the test is just out there.

Ahmuraedo honchar kongbuharnun kun muriein kut katala.
By-no-means, alone study thing-NOM overstraine thing seem-AE

By no means, studying alone seems to overstrain.

If you do together, it will be great.

If you do together, it will be great.

If you do together, it will be great.

If you do together, it will be great.
E-mail #26

1. 선화~
Sunhee~
Sunhee-GN~

2. 가밀고사 준비는 잘 하고 있는지 오르겠네…. Kimalkosa chunbeenun chal hako itnunchi morugetney…. Finaltest preparation-NOM well done been-if wonder-RE. I am wondering if your preparation for the finals has been done well….
3. 나도 나름 열심히 하고는 있는데…. Nahdo narum yeolshimhee hagonun itnundey…. I-FPP-also rather hard work being-AE. Even if I am also working hard but…. 4. 너도 알다시피 지난 주 내내 병원에 있어서 수업을 제대로 못 들었잖아. Nuhdo aldashipee chinan chu neyney byungwoney itsuseo suepul You-SPP-also know-as last week throughout hospital-at being-because class-OBJ cheydeyro motulutchanah. properly not-taking-AE. As you know, I could not take the class properly because I was hospitalized all through the last week.
5. 노트필기도 당연히 제대로 안 되어 있고… Notepilkeedo dangyeonhee ahndeyuh ittiko…. Notewriting-also consequently not-done been-and-AE. Consequently, my class-note has not been ready and….
6. 그래서 그런데… Kureyseo kurundey….
Therefore, so……
7. 내일 시간 편할으면 도서관에서 내가 공부하는 것을 도와 줄 수 있을까?
Neyil shikan koeanchumunyeu dopeokwan-eyseo naeka
Tomorrow time good-if library-at I-FPP-NOM
kongbuhanunkt chom dowa chulsu itsulkka?
Study-do-to a-little-bit help give-able-to be-Future-AE
If your time is o.k, then could you help me a little bit study at the library, tomorrow?
8. 너의 완벽하게 정리된 노트도 함께 빌려주면 더이상 줄구--
Nuhuy wanbyughakey chungriidoen notedo harmkkey bilyeo
You-SPP-PPar perfectly wriiten-down note-also together lending
Chumyun derderwook chotkku--
It couldn’t be better, if you can lend me your class-note that is perfectly written.
9. 나중에 좋은 결과 나오면 한 툭 거하게 쓰 테니가…
Nachungey choun kyulkwa nahomyun hantuk guhakey sso tehnykkka…
Later on good result come out treat pretty much shoot do-Future-AE…
If I get a good score later on, I will definitely treat you well with great amount.
10. 부탁 좀 하기도~
Butak chom harlkkey~
Ask a-little-bit do-future-AE.
Let me ask you a favor a little bit~
11. 그럼 내일 도서관 앞에서 보자~
Kurum neyil dopeokwan ahpeyseo pocha~
Then tomorrow library-in in fron of see-RE~
Then, let’s meet in front of the library tomorrow~
12. 멕스~⇒
Tangs=kuh
Thanks=haha

E-mail #27
1. 선희야 나야. 공부 잘 돼나?
Sunheeyा nahya, kongbu charl doenya?
Sunhee-GN-VPar I-FPP-VPar, study well become-RE?
Sunhee, how is your study going?
2. 이번 주말에 도서관에서 같이 시험공부 하는게 어떻겠냐?
Eeburn chumarley dopeokwan-eyseo katchie shihumkongbu harnun kei urtturketnya?
This weekend-on library-at together test-study do to how-is-RE?
How about studying together at the library on this weekend?
3. 물론 나의 노트 팔기�이 받아 나오지.ㅋㅋㅋ
Mulron nuhuy nout pilkika tarmi narseochie. Hahaha.
Of course, you-SPP-PPar note writing covet do-because. Hahaha.
Of course, it is because I covet your note.
4. 중간고사 때 너의 노트 팔에 시험을 잘 본것 같아서 이번에도 혹시나 하고 생각하고 있다.
Chungkankosa tae nuhuy nout durkey shihumul charl bonkut katarseo
Midterm time you-SPP-PPar thanks-to test-OBJ well see-Past seem-becaue eeburneydo horkinsa harko saengkarkharko itda.
This-time-also perhaps do-and thinking am-RE.
I am thinking again to use your note because it seemed that I took the midterm exam well thanks to your note.
5. 우리 사이에 신한 한번 더지자.
Oorie saiy shinsey harnburn dur jicha.
We between burden one time more debted-be-RE.
Let me have a favor once more between you and me.
6. 대신 내가 심혈을 기울인 교양과목 노트 팔기는 보여줄께.
Daeshin naeka simhyeooul kiwulin koyankwamok nout pilkinun boyeochulkkey.
Instead, I-FPP-NOM heart and bloodul puring liberal-art-class note writing show-give-Furute-AE.
E-mail #28

1. 준석야~~ 정마다.
Junseoka~~ Jeongminida.
Junseok-GN-VPar Jeongmin-GN-NOM-RE.
Junseok, I am Jeongmin.

2. 한번만 도와줘~~ 너무 급하다.
Harnburnmarn dowachur~~ nurmu kupharkharda.
One-time-only help-give-AE. Too urgent-is-RE.
Help me only one time~~ it is too urgent.

3. 기말시험이 코앞인데 학계 너무 많아~
Kimarlishumi koarpindey harldei nurmu marnah~
Final-test-NOM nose-frond-although do-something too many-be-AE~
I have too many things to do when the final test is right there.

4. 공부 잘하는 나가 좀 도와줘~~
Kongbu charlarnun nika\~ chom dowachur~~
Study well-do you-SPP-NOM a-little-bit help-give-AE~
You help me because you are good at studying~~

5. 친구 좋아하는게 뭐나~ 이럴때 도와 주고 그는 거지...
Chinku chotdanunkei murnya-eeulttue dowachukho kurnun kurchie….
Friend good-mean what-is-RE-this-time help-give do something-is-AE…
What is a friend good for~~ at this moment like this, giving help or does something like that.

6. 너 노트 빌기 좀 보자~ 도서관에서 같이 공부도 하고~~ 아라계?

Nuh nout pilki chom bocha~ doseokwaneyseo katchie kongbudo harko~~ ahrazzi?
You-SPP note writing a-little-bit see-RE library-at together study-also do-and got-it-AE?
Let me see your note-also study together at the library~~ Got it?

7. 그리고 노트북도 들고와. 내가 시험 끝나고 한턱낼게!!!
Kuriko notebookko dulkowa. Naeka sihum kkutnako harnturknaelkkey!!!
And notebook-also bring-come-AE. I-FPP-NOM test end-and a treat-pay-Future-AE.
And bring your notebook. I will pay to give you a treat!!

8. 부탁할게 친구야...
Butarkharkkey chinkuya….
Asking-do-Future-AE friend-VPar….
Hey buddy, I am asking you a favor.

E-mail #29

1. 안녕 선화야? 기말고사 준비 잘 되고있니?

Ahnyung sunheeya? Kimarlsosa chunbie charl doeoko iti?
Well-be Sunhee-GN-VPar? Final-test preparation well have-done be-RE?
Hi, Sunhee! How is your preparation for the final test going?

2. 언제나 난 수업도 성실히 듣고 학습도 공부해왔으니까 벌 어리움 없으리라 믿는다.
Unjeynah nuhn sueopdo sungsilheee dutko charksilheee kongbuhae watseu
Always you-SPP-NOM class-also sincerely listening-to diligently study-do and come-because
byul eoryeom upseorirah mitunuda.
particular difficult not-be-Future believe-RE.
Because you always have taken the class sincerely and studied diligently, I believe that you may not have any
particular problem for the test.

3. 난 큰일이다.

Nahn kunilida.
I-FPP-NOM big-trouble-RE.
I am in a big trouble.
4. 정말 이번 기말고사준비를 하나도 못했는데.
Jeongmarl eeburn kimarkosachunbirul harnard mothaetseo.
Really this-time final-test-preparation-OBJ one-even not-do-Past-AE.
Really, I have not prepared even one thing for the final test.
5. 그러니 도움 좀 받으려고.
Kuraeso ni doun chom barteoryeoko.
Therefore, you-SPP help a-little-bit receive-Future-AE.
Therefore, I am planning to receive your help.
6. 도서관에서 만나서 함께 공부도 하고, 
Library-at meet-and-then together study also do-and, you-SPP note writing a-little-bit show-AE.
Meet me at the library and study together and then show me also your note writing.
7. 이번 한번만 좀 도와줘라.
Eeburn harburnmarn chom dowachura.
This-time one-only a-little-bit help-give-RE.
Only this one time, help me up a little bit.
8. 친구가 다 F 학점 받기를 바라지 않으면
Chinkuka dah F harkchum bartkirul barachie ahnundamyun marlya.
Friend-NOM all F grade receive-Future hope not-do-if word-be-AE.
I mean if you don’t want me to have all “F” grades.
9. 도와줄래?
Dowachulkurchie?
Help-give-Future-AE?
Will you help me?
10. 그럼 도와줄걸 알고 연락가다랗게.
Kurum dowachuljul ahlko yeonrakidarilkey.
Then help-give-Future knowing communication-wait-Future-AE.
Then, I will wait for your call, believing that you will help me.

E-mail #30
1. 친구야.
Chinkuya.
Friend-VPar.
Hey, buddy.
2. 잘 지내나?
Charl chienaenya?
Well live-RE?
Are you doing good?
3. 나도 잘 지내다.
Nahdo charl chienaenda.
I-FPP-also well live-RE.
I am also doing good.
4. 다름이 아니라 이번 기말 시험 같이 공부하자구.
Darumi ahnirah eeburn kimarl sihum katchie kongbu harchaku.
By the way, this-time final test together study do-AE.
By the way, to say let’s study together for the final test.
5. 내가 이번에 몇번 강의를 놓쳐서 다시 나도 모른 것이다.
Naeka eeburney myeotburn kangurul ppajetairmun noute yellow dot bin kotsi marnkuna.
I-FPP-NOM this-time-at a-few-times lecture-OBJ absent-from note-at empty spots many-are-AE.
There are many empty spots on my note because I was absent a few times from the lecture.
6. 네 도움 좀 받아.
Ney doun chom bartcha.
You-SPP help a-little-bit receive-RE.
Let me have your help a little bit.
7. 도서관 자리랑 음료수는 내가 준비하마.
Doseokwan seastrang eomryosunun naeka chunbi harma.
Library-seat-and drink I-FPP-NOM preparation do-Future-RE.
I will prepare for the seat of library and drink.
8. 참올 때 노트북 가져오는 거 잊지 마라.
Charm olttae noutbuk kachieonunkut itchiemara.
Say coming-time notebook bringing forget-not-RE.
9. 아님 프린트 해오던가.
Ahnim, print hae odurnka.
Not-if, print do come or so AE.
10. 그럼연락해 친구 고마워.^^
Kurum…yeonrakhae chinku, komarwur.^^
Then…communication-do AE. Friend, thankful-be-AE.^^

15 E-mails based on Situation #3

E-mail #31
1. 안녕 대영아..

Ahnyung, deayounga.
Well-be Deayoung-GN-VPar.
Hi, Deayoung..
2. 나 길동이야.

Nah kildongiya.
I-FPP-NOM Kildong-GN-VPar.
I am Kildong.
3. 사실은 내가 너의 도움이 필요해서 메일을 쓴다.

Sarsileon naeka nhuuy douni pilyohaseo mailul sseonda.
In-fact I-FPP-NOM you-SPP-PPar help need-because mail-OBJ write-RE.
In fact, I write this e-mail because I need your help.
4. 내가 다음주에 가구를 좀 옮기려고 하는데 마땅한 사람이 없구나..

Naeka daum chuey karkurul chom omkiryeoko hameondey
I-FPP-NOM next week-on furniture-OBJ a-little-bit move-to do-Future
marttangharn sarami upkuna.
Suitable person not-be-AE.
I am planning to move furniture but there is not a suitable person.
5. 부피가 좀 크고 무거워서 말이야..

Bupika chom keogo mugurwaseo marly.
Volume-NOM a-little-bit big-and heavy-because to-say-AE.
It is because volume is a little bit big and heavy.
6. 그래서 나는 도움이 필요하구나…

Kuraeseo nhuuy douni pilyoharkuna…
Therefore, you-SPP-PPar help need-AE.…
Therefore, I need your help…..
7. 내가 나중에 술 한잔 삼아 다음주 와줄수 있겠지?

Naeka machungey sul harncharn sal teyni daum chu wachul su itchie?
I-FPP-NOM later liquid one-glass buy will-because next week come able be-AE?
I will pay for you in a pub, you can come, right?

E-mail #32
1. 대영아 나 길동이다

Daeyounga nah kildongida.
Deayoung-GN-VPar I-FPP Kildong-GN-RE.
Deayoung, I am Kildong.
2. 다음주 토요일 뭐하나?
Daum chu toyoil murharnya?
Next week Saturday what-do-RE?
What are you going to do on next Saturday?
3. 아르바이트하지 않음래?^^
Arbaitharchie ahneolrae?AE.
Part-time-job not-do-Future-AE.
Won't you want a part time job? ^^
4. 뭐냐하면… 우리집 가구를 옮겨야 되는데 힘 좋은 니가 필요하구나
Murnyaharmyun oorie chip karkureol omkyeoya doenundey hym choeun nika pilyoharkuna
To-say-what-is…..our house furniture-OBJ move have-to-because strength good you need-AE.
To say what it is…. I need you because you are strong enough to move our furniture.
5. 일당 5만원 어때?
Ildarng 5marnwon urttae?
Daily pay 50dollars how-is-AE?
How about 50dollars for a daily pay?
6. 요즘 용돈 궁하다면서 ~^^
Yozeom yongdon kunghardamyunseo.^^
Recently, pocket-money lack-as-you-say-AE.^^
Recenly, you said that you lack of pocket money. ^^
7. 점심으로 짜장면 사주마~~~
Chumshimeoro zzacharngmyun sarchuma~~~
Lunch-as black-noodle buy-Future-AE~~~
For lunch, I will buy you Korean black noodle.

E-mail #33
1. 대영아 잘 있었니?
Daeyounga charl iseoitni?
Daeyoung-GN-VPar well be-Past-RE?
Daeyoung, how have you been?
2. 나 데 누나 원숙이 친구 Sunny 아!
Nah ney nuna hyunsooki chinku Sunnya!
I-FPP-NOM you older-sister-KT Hyunsook-GN friend Sunny-GN-am-AE!
I am Sunny your older sister, Hyunsook’s friend.
3. 내가 원숙이 만나리 갈때마다 집에서 내가 운동하고 있는 것 봤어.
Naeka hyunsooki marnareo karlttaemarda chipeyseo neyka
I-FPP-NOM Hyunsook meet-to go-whenever house-at you-NOM
wundonghako itneon kut bwatseo.
Excersising be thing see-Past-AE.
Whenever I visited Hyunsook, I saw you excersising at home.
4. 운동도 아주 잘하고 부모님 심부름도 아주 잘 하던데!
Wundongdo achu charlharko bunomim simprundo achu charl hardeondey!
Excersise-also very well-do-and parents’ errand-also very well do-past-AE!
You not only excersized very well, but also very well did errands of your parents.
5. 부모님께서 내가 훌륭하게 잘 자라서 좋아하시겠다.
Bumonimkkoseo neyka hulryungharkkey chararseo choohharsiketda.
Parents-HTa-HNOM you-NOM wonderfully grow-Past like-SHSHF-RE.
Parents may like to see you growing wonderfully.
6. 사실은 다음주 내가 이사를 하거는.
Sarsileon daum chu naeka eesarul harkeodeon.
In fact, next week I-FPP-NOM moving-OBJ do-Future-AE.
In fact, I will move next week.
7. 지금 하숙하고 있는집에서 하숙비를 올리달라고해서 다른 집으로 옮길려고해.
Chikum harshookharko iteon chipeyseo harshookbirul olyeodarlarkohaeseo
Present rent-do being house-at rent-fee-OBJ raise-Past-because
dareon chipeoro omgilyeoko hae.
Other chipeoro planning to move do-AE.
The present rent house raised the rent fee so that I am planning to move to other house.
8. NULL 혼자가 자취하고 있기에 접은 것까지 읽었는데 컴퓨터하고 책하고 혼자 들기엔 좀 무리야.
Mulron honchar jarchihako itkey jimeon keoree marnchie ahneondey
Of-course, alone live-and being load that many not-are-but
Kumpyuturharko chaekharko honchar dulkien chom muriya.
Computer-and books alone lifting a-little-bit impossible-be-AE.
Of course, I don't have many stuffs to move because I live alone, but computer and books are too heavy for me to move alone.
9. 그래서 생각되는데 가까이 사는 현숙동생 대영이 내가 생각났어.
Kuraeseo saengkarkda motha garkkai sameon hyunsook dongsang daeyoungi neyka
Therefore, thinking-all not-do nearby living Hyunsook brother Daeyoung you
saengkark notseo.
Thinking come-Past-out-AE.
Therefore, while I was thinking. Hyunsook's brother you, Daeyoung, who lives nearby me, occurred to my mind.
10. 혹시 내일 토요일인데 시간되나?
Horski naeil tayoilindey sikan doen이?
Perhaps, tomorrow Saturday-on time good-be-RE?
Do you happen to have time on Saturday tomorrow?
11. 시간되면 한 시간만 하셔 겨울거는 것 좀 도와줄래?
Sikandoemyun ham sikanmarn waseo jim omkineon kut chom dowachulrae?
Time-good-be-if one hour-only come-and package move thing a-little-bit help-give-AE?
Will you come and help me to move just for one hour, if you have time?
12. 도와주면 끝나고 나서 맛있는 저녁 사줄게!
Dowachumyun kkeonako narseo martsitneon yeoburul sarjulkkey!
Help-give-if finish-and after delicious dinner buy-you-Future-AE.
If you help me, I will buy you a delicious dinner after moving.
13. 그럼 가능 jakie 여부를 연락해!
Keorum karneong harsoncyeoburul yeonrakhur!
Then possibility is yes or no communication-give-AE.
Then, let me know whether you can come or not .

E-mail #34
1. 안녕, 나 한숙이 친구...경남이야.

Ahnyung, nah hyunsooki chinku, kyungnamia.
Well-be, I-FPP-NOM Hyunsook friend, kyungnam-VPAR-AE.
Hi, I am Kyungnam, a friend of Hyunsook.'s.
2. 요즘 동생이 모습이 아주 남자답고 멋지더라.
Yozeom daeyoungi moseopi ahchu namchadarpko mutchiedura.
Recently, Daeyoung figure very manly-and gorgeous-be-AE.
Recently, Daeyoung's figure looks very manly and gorgeous.
3. 두근두근 운동한 보람이었다.
Kkuchunhi wundongharn boram itketa.
Constant exercise fruit be-Future-RE.
There will be fruit of constantly exercising.
4. 너희 친구는 좋겠다.
Ney yeochar chinkunun choketa.
You-SPP girl friend good-be-Future-RE.
Your girl-friend will like it.
5. 다음 아니라 부탁이 있어.
Darum ahnira butarki its eo.
By-the-way, asking-NOM is-AE.
By the way, do me a favor.

6. 담주에 집안 가구를 좀 줄였으면 하거든.

Darmchey chipahn karkurul chom omkyeotseomyun harkurdeon.
Next-week-on house-in furniture-OBJ a-little-bit move-want do-Future-AE.
I am planning to move a little bit of furniture in my house next week.

7. 근데 여자 혼자 사니가 도저히 혼자 그 일을 할 수가 없어.
Kundey yeochar honchar samnikka docheohi honchar ku ileol harl suka upseo.
However, female alone live-because possibly alone that work-OBJ do able not-be-AE.
However, I am not able to possibly move alone because I, a female, live alone.

8. 나는 왜서 도와주면 금방 끝낼 수 있을텐데.
Neyka waseo dowachumyun kumbarg kkutnael su iskeolindey.
You-SPP-NOM come-and help-if in-a-short-time finish able be-Future-AE.
If you come and help, it would be finished in a moment.

9. 누가 대영이 좋아하는 음식 만들어줄게.
Nunaka daeyoungi choaharneon umsik marndeolurchulkei.
Older-sister KT-NOM Daeyoung-GN like food make and give-Future-AE.
I will fix some food that you like.

10. 왜 줄 수 있었니?
Wa chul su itketni?
Come give be-Future-RE?
Will you be able to come?

E-mail #35
1. 안녕, 대영아 잘 지내고 있니?
Ahnyung, daeyoungah charl chineako itni?
Well-be, Daeyoung-GN-VPar well live-and be-RE?
Hi, Daeyoung, how have you been?

2. 나 혼자 친구 만정이다.
Nah hyunsooki chinku minjeongiya.
I-FPP Hyunsook friend Minjeong-VPar-be-AE.
I am Minjeong, a friend of Hyunsook's.

3. 요즘 하고 있는 공부는 잘 되고가지 궁금하다.
Yozeom harko itneon kongbuneon charl doekarneonchi kungkeomharda.
Recently doing be study well done-or-not wonder-RE.
I am wondering how the study is going that you are working on.

4. 누나에게 너의 소식을 종종 들고 있고 있어.
Nunaeykey nhuhyu sosikul jongjong dutko isseo.
Older-sister KT-Par-from you-VPar news-OBJ often hear be-AE.
I often hear of you from your sister.

5. 대영아 다음 주 우리 집에 놀러 오면 좋겠다.
Daeyounga daum chu oorie chiphey noler omyun choketda.
Daeyoung-GN-VPar next week our house-at play-to come-if good-be-Future-RE.
Deayoung, it would be great if you come to our house to play with us.

6. 사실 너의 도움이 필요하다.
Sasil nhuhyu doumi pilyoada.
In-fact, you-VPar-PPar help need-RE.
Frankly speaking, I need your help.

8. 이사를 안 하지만데, 이사짐 나르는 아저씨를 부르는 것도 혼들도, 아는 사람 중에 너가 도움을 잘 줄 것 같아

Isarul ahn harneondey, isajim nareonun ahjeossirul bureonun kudo himdeolkko, ahneon
Moving-OBJ not do-because, moving delivery uncle-OBJ call thing-also difficult-and, known
saram chungey nhuha doumeol charl chul kut karta nhuekey doumul churnggae.
person among you-VPar-NOM help-OBJ well give thing seem you-Par-to help-OBJ asking-do-AE.
Because I do not move, it is not also reasonable to call a moving center man and among my acquaintances, I ask you
for the help because you are the one who can help me well.
10. 바쁘겠지만, 다음 주 시간 날 때 한번 와서 가구옮기는 것 도와 주면 감사하겠습니다.

**Barppuketchimahn.** daum chu sikan nal tae harn burn waseo kakuomkineon
Boxy-be-Future-although, next week time come moment one time come-and furniture-moving
ting help, give-if appreciate-Future-AE.
Although you may be busy, if you come and help me to move furniture when you have time next week, I will appreciate that.

11. 그러면 맛있는 식사를 대접할께.

**Kureomyun, marsitnun siksarul daechurpharlkkey.**
If so, I will treat you with some delicious food.

12. 꼭 너의 도움이 필요해.

**Jokok nhu dowe, chumyun karmsarharketseo.**
I just need your help.

13. 좋은 답변 있기를 바래.

**Ghoeon darpyun itkireol barae.**
I hope there will be a good answer.

14. 잘 지내라.

**Charl chinaera.**
Well live along.

E-mail #36
1. 대영아, 안녕?

**Daeyounga. ahnyung?**
Daeyoung-GN-VPar, well?
Hi, Daeyoung?

2. 나 수정이 누나.

**Nah sujeongi nuna.**
I-FPP Sujeong-GN older-sister-KT-AE.
I am sisiter Sujeong.

3. 네 누나 친구, 기억하지?

**Ney nuna chinku, kieokharchie?**
You-SPP older-sister-KT friend, remember?
I am your sister’s friend, remember?

4. 요새 잘 지내니?

**Yosaey charl chienaeni?**
Recently well live-along-RE?
How are you doing, recently?

5. 지난번 현숙이 생일 때 보고서는 한번도 못봤네.

**Chienarnburn hyunsooki saengil tae bokoseonun hamburndo motbwatney.**
Last-time Hyunsook-GN birthday time see-past-then one-time-even not-see-RE.
Since I saw you on Hyunsook’s birthday, I have never seen you even one time.

6. 현숙이를 통해서 가끔씩 내 얘기가 듣고 있어.

**Hyunsookirul tonghaeseo karkkeomsik ney yaekinun dutko itseo.**
Hyunsook-GN-OBJ through on-and-off you-SPP story hearing be-AE.
I have heard of you on and off through Hyunsook.

7. 아직도 운동 열심히 한다면서?

**Abijkdo wundong yeolshimhi harndamyunseo?**
Still exercise earnestly do-heard-AE.
I heard that you still exercise hard.

8. 꾸준히 하는 모습이 보기 좋다.

**Kkuchunhi harneon moseopi boki chotda.**

Constantly do figure see good-RE.  
I like to see you exercising constantly. 
9. 다름이 아니라, 누가가 다음주에 이사를 가거든, 근데 누가가 가구를 옮기기에에는 너무 무거워서 내 도움을 줄 받을 수 있나 해서.
Darumi ahnira, nunaka daum chuey eesarul karkurdeon, kundey nunaka 
Different not-but, oder-sister-KT-NOM next week-on move go-and, and-then older-sister-KT-NOM karkurul omkikieyun nurmu mukurwurseo ney doumul chom bartul su 
Furniture-OBF move too heavy-because you-SPP help-OBJ a-little-bit receive able itna haeseo. 
be do-because-AE.
By the way, I move out next week, but furniture is too heavy for me to move; I am wondering if you can help me.
10. 의나하면 내가 내 친구들 중에서 제일 건강하고 힘도 센 것 같아서 말이지.
Waenyaharmyun neyka nae chinkudul chungeyseo cheil kunkangharko 
Because you-SPP-NOM I-FPP friends among-at best healthy-and 
hynde ssen kut katarseo marlichie. 
power-also strong thing seem-because word-be-AE.
The reason that I say so is because you are mostly healthy and strong in power among my friends. 
11. 그래서 말인데, 혹시 다음 주에 시간 넣 수 있어?
Kuraeseo marlindy, horksi daum chuey sikan nael su itseo? 
Therefore say so, perhaps next chu-on time down able be-AE? 
That is why I say, can you happen to make some time next week?
12. 현숙이도 도와주러 온다고 했는데 들이 같이 왔으면 좋겠다.
Hyunsookido dowachurur ondarko haetnund dulie katchi watseomyun choketda. 
Hyunsockudo also help-give-to come say-do-Past both together come-if good-be-RE. 
It would be great if both you and Hyunsook come together since she said that she would come.
13. 내가 도와준 대가로 맛있는 저녁사줄게.
Neyka dowachun daetkaromartstineon churnyeok sarchulkkey. 
You-SPP-NOM help-give price-as delicious evening buy-will-AE. 
For the price that you help me, I will buy you some delicious dinner. 
14. 연락 기타릴게, 안녕.
Yeonrark kidarilikkey. Ahnyung. 
Communicaton wait-Future. Well-be. 
I will wait for your reply. Bye.

E-mail #37 
1. 대영상..
Daeyeonag. 
Deayoung-GN-VPar. 
Deayoung.
2. 나 정아누나야.
Nah jeonga nunaya. 
I-FPP Jeonga-GN older-sister-KT-AE. 
I am sister Jeonga.
3. 잘 지내지?
Charl chinaechie? 
Well live-along
4. 이전에는 현숙이랑 같이 우리 집에 잘 놀러오다니 요즘은 통 얼굴 못봤는데.
Eechurneyun hyunsookirang katchi ooriechipye charl noler odurni 
Before Hyunsook-GN-with together our-house-at well play-to come 
yozeom tong eolgul motbawtney. 
Recently at-all face-OBJ not-see-RE.
You used to come over my house to spend time with Hyunsook but recently, I have never seen you at all.
5. 바쁘가와.
Barpeonkabwa. 
Busy-are-AE.
You must be busy.
6. 다름이 아니고 대영야 다음 주에 누나 좀 도와줄 수 있나요?
Daeyoung ahniko Daeyoung daum chuey nuna chom dowachul su ini?
Differen not-but Deayoung-GN-VPar next week older-sister-KT a-little-bit help-give able be-RE?
By the way, Deayoung, can you help me out next week?
7. 누나방을 공사하게 되시, 가구랑 이것저것 집기를 좀 옮겨야 하거는.
Nunabarn gul kongsarharkey dwesoe, karkurang eektjurkut chipkirul
Older-sister-KT-room-OBJ renovate come-to, furniture-with this-and-that tool
chom omkyeoya harkurdeon.
a-little-bit move have-to-AE.
Because my room came to be renovated, furniture and some other tools are supposed to be moved.
8. 혼자할 업두가 나지 않네.
Honcharharl umduka narcie ahnney.
Alone-do initial-trial come-out not-do-RE.
I can not even think of doing alone.
9. 그래서 다음 주에 가구 옮기는 거 좀 도와줬으면 하는데 괜찮겠니?
Kuraeseo daum chuey karku omkinun ku chom dowachwaseomyeon
Therefore, next week-on furniture move thing a-little-bit help-give-want
harneondey kwencharnkenni?
Do-because-AE; o.k.-is-RE?
Therefore, I want you to help me to move furniture next week; is it o.k. to you?

10. 맞있는거 사줄게 부탁하자..^^
Marstitneokur sarchulkkey butarkharcha.^^
Delicious-something buy-Future-because ask-RE.
I will buy you some delicious fool; let me ask you for that.
11. 메일보고 연락해줘..앙녕~
Meilbok yeonlarkhaechur. ahnyung~
Mail-see-and communication-give-AE. Well-be~
See the mail and let me know; bye~

E-mail #38
1. 대영야, 안녕 은정 누나야.
Daeyoung, ahnyung eonjeong nunaya.
Daeyoung-GN-VPar, well-be Eonjeong older-sister-KT-AE.
Daeyoung, hi, I am sister Eonjong.
2. 저번에 현숙이 집에 갔을 때 일급 보고는 봐 오랫동안 못 만났네.
Churburney hyunsook chihey gotseol ttae eolgul bokonun kkoel
The-other-day, Hyunsook-GN house-at go-Past time face see-Past-and pretty
Oraettongahn motmartnartney.
Long-days not-meet-Past-RE.
Since I saw you when I visited Hyunsook the other day, I have not seen you for a pretty long time.
3. 떨탈하고 성실한 니가 어디를 가든 잘 지내고 있다고 믿어.
Turturlharko sungsilharn nuhye eodirul gardeon charl chinaeko itdarko minteo.
Free-and-easy-and sincere you wherever go-though well live-along being believe-AE.
Because you are a free and easy and sincere person, wherever you go, I believe you will well live along.
4. 대영야, 다름이 아니라 나한테 부탁 좀 하려고 연락했어.
Daeyounga, darumi ahnirah nuhharntey butark chom haryeoko
Daeyoung-GN-VPar, different not-be-but you-SPP-Par butark a-little-bit do-Future
yeonrankhaetseo.
communication-do-Past-AE.
Daeyoung, by the way, I sent this e-mail to ask you for a help.
5. 나도 알다시피 내가 사는 집이 정리가 잘 안되고 어수선했답니다.
Nuhdo ahldasipi naeka sameon chipi jeongrika charl ahndweitko
You-SPP-also know-as I-FPP-NOM live house arrange well not-done-and
K 3. Do you wonder what happened to me who usually does not send an e-mail? What happened?

P 2. Daeyoung, I am sister Sukyung.

E 1. If your time is o.k., then come and help me to move furniture on your comfortable time, then I will appreciate that.

O N 1. I hope you may understand me who suddenly ask you for a help without considering your schedule.

M 1. It feels comfortable no matter how people ask you to do.

A C N 9. As you know, the house where I live in was not arranged and chaotic.

W H E O D T E 어 6. As you know, the house where I live in was not arranged and chaotic.

H E O D T E 어 6. As you know, the house where I live in was not arranged and chaotic.

E sosunhaetcharnie.

Chaotic-be-Past-AE.

As you know, the house where I live in was not arranged and chaotic.

6. 이번에 헤무 날 잡아서 깨끗하게 정리하라고 하는데 다른 것은 물라도 가구 정리는 내 힘만으로는 안되겠어.

E eeburney haru narl charpseseo kkaekkeotharkey cheongriharyeoko harnunde

This time, one-day day catch-and clearly arrange-to do-and-then

D dareon kuseon molardo karku jeongrinun naehymmaneoronun ahndweketseo.

Other things not-knowing-though furniture arrangement I-power-only-through not-done-AE.

Although I am planning to arrange my house for all day long on a certain day, I don’t know other things, but only furniture arrangement will not be done for myself.

7. 어떻게 할까 생각하다가 너가 떠올랐어.

E eottukey harlkka saengkarkhardaka nuhka tturolrateo.

How to-do think-and-then you-SPP-NOM occur-Past-AE.

While I was think love how to do, you occurred to my mind.

8. 다른 사람의 일이란면 잘 도와주고, 무엇보다 무엇을 부탁하는 상대방의 마음을 편하게 해주는 너가 생각 나는 것은 우연의 일치가 아니겠지?

D dareon saramyun iliranyun charl dowachuko, mueotboda mueotseol butarkhardeon Other person-PPar work-if well help-and, most-of-all whatever ask-although

sangdaebanguy maehomal pyunharkey haechunun nuhka saengkark nahmun kuseon opponent-PPar heart-OBJ comfortably make-give you-SPP-NOM occur out to-NOM wuyeony ilchieka ahniketchie.

Coincident match not-is-AE.

It’s not a coincident for you to occur to my mind because you are the person who help others well and make people feel comfortable no matter how people asked you to my mind.

9. 너의 스케줄도 고려하지 않고 이렇게 끼UCCESS 도움을 청하는 나는 이해해 주기 바란다.

N unhuy skeuludo koryeoharchie ahnko eeukey bulssuk doumul You-SPP-PPar schedule-also consider not-do-and this-like suddenly help-OBJ

Chungharun nahrul eehaehae chukie baranda.

Asking I-FPP-OBJ understand give hope-RE.

I hope you may understand me who suddenly ask you for a help without considering your schedule.

10. 만약 시간이 뜨다면 너의 편한 시간에 와서 가구 옮기는 일을 도와주면 고맙겠다.

M marnyak sikani dwendarmyun unhuy pyunharn sikaney waseo karku Maybe time is o.k-if you-SPP-PPar comfortable time-at come-and furniture omkun ilul dowachumyun komarpketa.

Moving work-OBJ help-give-myun thankful-be-Future-RE.

If your time is o.k., then come and help me to move furniture on your comfortable time, then I will appreciate that.

11. 누나한테 안부전해주고 조만간 만나자.-

Nunahartney ahbhu churnhaechuko chomarkn marnarcha.-

Older-sister-KT-Par-to. regard deliver-give-and soon meet-RE.

Give my regards to your sister and let’s meet soon.

E-mail #39

1. 대영아! 수경누나다.^^

Daeyoung! Sukyung nunada.^^

Daeyoung-GN-VPar! Sukyung-GN older-sister-KT-be-RE.^^

Daeyoung, I am sister Sukyung.

2. 평소에 이별이라고는 한번도 보내지 않던 누나가 왜일이나구?ㅋㅋ

Pyungsoey eemeilirkonun harnburndo bonaechie ahturn nunahka

Usually e-mail-something one-time-even send not-doing older-sister-KT-NOM wemilinyako? Haha

what happen-AE? Haha

Do you wonder what happened to me who usually does not send an e-mail?

3. 글쎄 왜 보냈을까?

Kulssae, wey bonaeseolkk?
Well, why send-Past-RE?
Well, why do I send?
4. 원가 불결한 느낌~~ 맞아...
Munka bukilharn neokkim~~martcha…
Something ill-omen feeling ~~~-right-AE…
Feeling something about ill omen~~~right.
5. 갑작히 부탁할 일이 있어서..
Kankokhee butarkhar ilie isseo...
Desperately asking work be-because-AE…
Because I have something to ask you desperately…
6. 그동안 누나 집 리모델링 공사했던 거 현숙이를 통해 알고 있나?
Kudongh nuna chip rimoungling konsahaedurn ku hyunsookirul
For-a-while, older-sister-KT house remodeling construct-Past thing Hyunsook-OBJ tonghae ahlik ini?
Through know being-RE?
Do you know through Hyunsook that my house has been under remodeling construction?
7. 지난 주에 공사가 끝나고 집 정리를 하라고 계획을 세웠거던.
Chienarm chuey kongsarka kkeotmarko jin jeonghirul haryeoko
Last week-on construction end-Past-and load arrangement-OBJ do-to
kyehw eag keoseondeon.
Plan-OBJ establish-Past-AE.
I made a plan to rearrange things after finishing remodeling last week.
8. 근데 연약한 누나가 혼자 그 많은 짐을 다 옮기려고 하니가 병원비용이 만만치 않게 나온것 같아서…
Kundey yeonyarkharn nunaka honchar ku marneo jinmul dah omkiryeoko
By-the-way, tender-weak older-sister-KT alone that many load all move-to
harnikka byungwonbyeeyongie marnmarnchie ahnkey nahlku kahsseo...
try-because hospital-payment small not come-out seem-AE…
However, it is because when I think to move all those things alone, hospital treatment fee may come out a lot.
9. 어떻게 할까 혼자 고민하고 있는데 갑자기 걱정하고 협도 좋은 니가 생각나는거야.
Eoturkey harkka honchar kominharko itnudey karpcharki kunchanghai
How-to do alone ponder be-and suddenly robust-and
hymecho nika saengkarknarneon kuya.
Strength-also good you-SPP-NOM occur-Past thing-is-AE.
When I think over how to do for it alone, suddenly you who are robust and strong occurred to my mind.
10. 그래서 용기를 내어 이렇게 멈치없이 메일을 보낸다.
Keoae soo yongkirul nreae eeruky yeomchiusi meul bonaenda.
Therefore courage-OBJ pluck-up this-like shamelessly mail send-RE.
Therefore, I send an e-mail to you plucking out my courage, although I feel sorry.
12. 누나가 맛있는 거 사줄께!!
Nunahka martineon ku sarchulkkey!!
Older-sister-KT delicious thing buy-Future-AE!!
I will buy you some delicious food!!
13. 시간 내 주면 참 고맙겠구나. 연락 주렴~
Sikan nae chumyun charm komarpetkuna. Yeonrak churyum~
Time make give-if truly thankful-be-Future-AE. Communication give-AE.
If you make some time for me, it will be really thankful. Let me know.

E-mail #40
1. 대영아 잘 지내고 있니?
Daeyounga charl chinae ko ini?
Daeyoung-GN-VPAR well live-along be-RE?
Daeyoung, how are you getting along?
2. 나 정훈이 형이다.
Nah jeonghooni hyungida.
I-FPP Jeonghoon older-brother-KT-be-RE.
I am brother Jeonghoon.
3. 요즘도 열심히 운동하고 있니?
Yozeomdo yeolshimhhee wundongharko itni?
Recenly-also hard exercise being-RE?
Are you still working out hard?
4. 너의 건강한 모습을 보면서 이 형도 열심히 운동해야겠다는 생각은 하는데 공부한다고 그런지 시간을 내기 가 쉽지가 않네.
Nuhuy kunkangharn moseopul bomyunseo ee hyungdo yeolshimhhee
You-SSP-PPsr healthy figure-OBJ see-when this older-brother-KT-also earnestly wundonghaeyakadanun saengkarkun harnundey konbuharndako kurunchie sikanul naekika exercise-have-to think do-although study due-to time make-to suipi jikakun.
Easy not-be-RE.
Although when I see your healthy figure, I also think of exercising hard, due to study, it is not easy for me to make some time.
5. 형이 말이야 너의 도움이 필요해.
Hyungi marliya nuhuy doumi pilyohae.
Older-brother-KT-NOM say you-SSP-PPPar help need-AE.
Let me tell you something: I need your help.
6. 뭐냐하면 우리집에 있는 큰 가구알지?
Murnya harmyun oorichipey itnun kun kaku ahlchie?
What say-if our-house be big furniture know?
To say what it is, you know the big furniture in our house?
7. 혼자 움직이기에는 역부족인 것 같아서 너가 와서 잠시 도와주면 고맙겠어
Honchar umchikikeynun yeokbuchokin kut katahseo nuhka waseo
Alone move lack-of-power thing seem-because you-SSP-NOM come-and charmso dowachumyun komarkhetaeo.
a-short-time help-give-if thankful-be-AE.
It will be thankful if you come and help me for a second because moving it alone seems beyond my strength.
8. 저녁때 꼭 금방 같이 옮기고 같이 식사하자
Churnyuk ttae zzeom omyun keombang kati omkiko katchie siksa harcha.
Evening time around come-if quikly together move-and together eating-do-RE.
If you come around evening time, after moving it in a moment, let’s share meal together.
9. 너의 스케줄이 어떻게 되는지 모르겠는데 아뿔든 연락해줘
Nuhuy skejuli eotteokeo dweneonchie moreokteondea ahmutun
You-FPP-PPPar schedule-NOM how it-is not-know-though anyway yeonrakhae chur.
Communication give-AE.
I don’t know how your schedule is, anyway, let me know.

E-mail #41
1. 하이~~대영~!!!
Hai~~ daeyoung!!!
Hi~~ daegyoung-GN!!!
Hi Daeyoung!!!
2. 잘 지내지?
Chal chinaeachi?
Well stay-AE?
How are you doing?
3. 현속이랑테 들으니 너무 잘 지내서 탈이라고 하던데?=”
Hyunsook’han tey dyeoney nhu mu chal chineso talirago hadeondey? Kuh Hyunsook from hear too well stay-because problematic say-Past-AE? Kuh I heard from Hyunsook that, because you are doing too well, it is a problem? hehe
4. 에전엔 가끔 만나 밥도 먹고 영화도 보고 그랬는데...
Yechunen kakkum mana baptto mukko youngwhado pokokuratnun dey...
Long time ago, often meet meal-also eat-and movie-also watch-and do so-Past-AE…
In the past, we often met, ate something, watched a movie and so on…
5. 요새는 어 Gül게 그림 기회가 종처럼 안 생기네…
Yoseyun
urtukkey kurul kiwheyka chomchurum ahnsaengkiney…
Recent time-NOM somehow do so chance-NOM rarely happen-AE…
Recently, somehow we have never had that chance….
6. 현숙이랑 자기 한 번 만들 데니 그 때 께 보자~ 알았지?
Hyunsook-biurang chari hanbun mandul teyni
kuttae kkok pocha~alattchi?
Hyunsook-with occasion one time make do-Future-because then surely see-RE~got it-AE?
I will make an occasion to get together with Hyunsook, then let us see each other at the time~got it?
7. 다른게 아니구… 다음 주 주말에 우리 집 가구를 좀 옮겨야 하는데…
Darunkey ahniku… daum chu chumaley woori chip kakurul omkyuya hanundeuy…
By the way next week weekends-on our house furniture move must-AE…
By the way… on the next weekends, I have to move my furniture but…
8. 나 혼자선 어떻게 해도 안되고…
Nah honchasun urttukey haedo ahndoe ko….
I alone how do-although not-done-and-AE
I cannot make it by myself.
9. 내주위에 그런 일이 도와줄 만큼 흔하고 편하면서 함도 센 사람이 없어서 알아서 하이지…
Nae chuwikey kurun il towa chul mankum chinhako pyunhunyeunseo
Me around such work help giving as much as friendly dependable-and so
himdo ssen sarami upseoseo malichi…
power strong man-NOM not be so-AE…
Around me, there are none of the people who are kind, gentle, and powerful enough to help me move…
10. 네 누나 베스트 프렌드의 간만의 부탁인데… 좀 들어줘라~
Ney nuna beyeot freynduuy kanmanuy putakindey chom dulerchura~kuh
Your older-sister-KT best friend-PPar rare asking-because a little bit accept-RE~kuh
Because this is a rarely asked help from your sister’s best friend, please, help me.
11. 그럼 도와주는 걸로 알고 있는니~
Kurum dowa chunun kulro alko ittunda~
Then help giving do-as know-and be-RE.
Then, I will believe you’ll help me~
12. 그 날 까지 힘이나 않이 비축해 두고~
Kunal kkachi hymina mani bichukhake duko~kukukuh
The day until power much save do-and-AE~kukuku
Until the day, save your energy a lot~ hahaha
13. 다음 주 금요일 편해서 내가 전화할게~
Daum chu kumyoil chunhaeseo naeka chunwhahalkey~
Next week Friday around-or so I-NOM telephone-do-Future-AE~
Around next Friday or so, I will call you~
14. 그 날 까지 잘 지내고~ 안녕~
Kunal kkachi chal chinaecko~anyoung~
The-day until well stay-and-AE~bye~
Until the day, take care of yourself well~bye~

E-mail #42
1. 대영아. 형이다,
Daeyounga, hyungida.
Daeyoung-GN-VPar, hyung-KT-RE.
Daeyoung, it’s me.
2. 적번에 보니 몸 많이 좋아졌더라.
Cherburney bonie mom marnie choajietdura.
Other-day-on see body many good-become-AE.
When I saw your body other day, it looked much better.
3. 이번주말에 나하고 혼한번 쓰자.
Eeburn chumarley nahharko hymharnburn sseo.ah.
This-time weekend-on I-FPP-with power-one-time use-RE.
Let’s use power one time this weekend.
4. 형 이사해야 하거든?
Hyung eesarhaeya harkudeon?
Older-brother-KT move have-to-AE?
I have to move.
5. 나 이삿짐 좀 도와줄 수 있겠나?
Nah eesartjip chom dowachul su itket?
I-FPP moving-load a-little-bit help able be-RE?
Can you help me move a little bit?
6. 시간때면 연락해라.
Sikandwemyun yeolrakhaera.
Time-able if communication-do-RE.
If time is available, let me know.
7. 밥한번 사마.
Barpharnburn sarma.
Meal-one-time buy-Future-AE.
I will buy a meal for you.

E-mail #43
1. 대영아--안녕
Daeyounga-- ahnyoung
Daeyoung-GN-VPar-- well-be-AE
2. 너의 누나 현숙이 친구 안정이 다.
Nuhuy nuna hyunsooki chinku ahnjeongida.
You-FPP-PPar older-sister-KT Hyunsook-GN friend Ahnjeong-be-RE.
I am Ahnjeong, a friend of your sister Hyunsook.
3. 부탁이 있어서 이렇게 메일 보낸다.
Butarki itseoseo eerukey meil bonaenda.
Asking be-because this-like mail send-RE.
Because I have some to aske, I send this mail.
4. 이번에 우리 집에 가구를 좀 옮길게 있는데
Eeburney oorie chikey karkurul chom omkilkey itneondey
This-time we house-at furniture a-little-bit move-something be-and-AE.
5. 내가 혼자 살다보니 혼자 옮기기가 힘들어서 힘 좀 드라주면 좋을거 같다.
Naeka honchar saridaboni honchar omkikika hymduleoseo hym
I-FPP-NOM alone live-because alone move power-spending-because power
choeon nika chom dowachumyun choulkur katda.
Good you-SPP-NOM a-little-bit help-give-if good seem-RE.
It would be great if you a strong man help me a little bit because it is difficulte for me to move alone since I live alone.
6. 팬같으면 꼭 도와줘~~내가 맛있는거 사줄게!!!
Kwencharneomyun kkok dowachueo-- naeka marsineonku sarchulkey!!!
Okay-if just help-give-AE-- I-FPP-NOM delicious-thing buy-FUTURE-AE!!!
If it is o.k., just help me--I will buy you something delicious.
7. 답 주기 바래~~
Darphuchie baae--
Answer-give hope-AE--
I hope you answer me.

E-mail #44
1. 대영아 안녕?
Daeyounga ahnyoung?
Daeyoung-GN-VPar well-be
2. 잘 지내고 있지가?  
Charl chinaeok *itchie*?  
Well live-along be-AE?  
You are doing good?  
3. 내가 다음주에 집에 있는 가구들을 옮겨야 하는데 도저히 여자 혼자 혼으로는 옮길수가 없을것 같아.  
Naeka daum chuey chipiey itneon karkudulul omkyeoya harneondey dojeohee I-FPP-NOM next week-on house-at being furniture-OBJ move have-to-and possibly yeochar honcharuy hymeeonrun omkyulsuka upseolkkut *kata*.  
Woman alone power-with move-able not-be-Future-thing seem-AE.  
Although I have to move furnime in my house next week, it will seem to be just difficult to move with the power of a woman.  
4. 좀 도와줘~누나의 가장 친한 친구 부탁이니까 도와줄거지?  
Chom dowachur~ *nuna* kacharng chinharh chinku butarkinikka a-little-bit help-give-AE~ older-sister-KT-PPar best close friend asking-because dowachulkkurchie!  
Help-give-Future-AE?  
Help me a little bit~ You will help me because this is an asking of your sister’s closest friend?  
5. 어릴림 날도 너처럼 든든한 남동생 하나 있었으면 좋겠다.  
Eerulltaen *nado* nahcherum deondeonharn namdonsaeng harna itseotseomyun This moment, I-FPP-also you-SPP-like dependable younger brother one be-Past-if choketda.  
Good-be-Future-RE.  
It might be good if I were to have a dependable brother like you in this moment. .  
6. 그대신 근사하게 한턱 넬께.  
Kudaesin, kunsaharkey harnturk *naelkkey*.  
Instead, greatly a-treat pay-Future-AE.  
For the help, I will buy you a great treat.  
7. 그림 연락해줘~  
Kureom *yeonrakhaechur*~  
Then communication-do-give-AE~  
Then, let me know.

E-mail #45  
1. 대영야. 형이다. 잘 지내지가?  
*Daeyounga. Hyungida.* Well live-along-AE?  
Daeyoung-GN-VPar. Older-brother-be-RE. Charl *chimaechie*?  
Daeyoung. I am your brother. Are you doing good?  
4. 다음이 아니라 다음 주 아무때나 시간 좀 내줄 수 있나 해서.  
Darumi ahnirah daum chu ahmuttaena sikan chom naechul su itna haeseo.  
different not-but next week any-time time a-little-bit down-give able be do-because-AE.  
By the way, I was wondering if you are available next week anytime.  
5. 형 집 가구 몇 개를 옮겨야 하는데…  
*Hyung* chip karku meoyt kaerul omkyeoya harneondey…  
Older-brother-KT house furniture a-few things move have-to-AE.  
I have to move a few pieces of furniture in my house.  
6. 나 혼자서는 안될 것 같아 도움을 청한다.  
*Nah* honcharseonun ahndwel kut katah doumul churmharnda.  
I-FPP alone not-working thing seem-because help-OBJ asking-do-RE.  
I ask you for a help because it will not be done by myself.  
7. 아무리 생각해도 너무 큰 힘도 성격도 좋은 후배가 없는 것 같아서 맘.  
Ahmury saengkarkhaedo nuhmarnekom hymdo sungkukdo No-matter-how think-although you-as-much-as power-also personality-good-also  
Choeon *hubaeka* upneon kut katahseo *marlya*.  
Good junior-NOM not thing seem-because say-AE.  
No matter how I think, there is no other junior who is as strong as you are with a good personality.
8. 너 시간에 맞추면 될 것 같고, 가구 옮기고 같이 식사나 함께 하자.

Nuh sikaney martchumyun dwel kut katko, karku omkiko katchie
You-SPP time-at fit-if become thing seem furniture move-and together
Siksarna harmkkey harcha.
Meal together do-RE.
It will be good to me anytime when you are available, and let’s have meal together after moving furniture.
9. 그럼 건강하구.

Kurum, kurkangharku.
Then, healthy-be-AE.
Then, be healthy.
10. 답변 채라. 부담 갖지 말구. 안녕.

Answer give-RE. Burden have not-AE. Well-be.
Answer me. Don’t feel burden. Bye.
**Vita**

In Seoul, Korea, in 1967, Mr. Kim came into this world. As a young man, he liked to read, think, and write. In 1989, he entered the Department of English at Dongguk University in Seoul, Korea. For him, literature has always been a crucial key to his life. As an undergraduate, he developed an interest in William Blake, the English Romantic poet. Mr. Kim was deeply influenced by Blakean imagery in his own works of art. In 1997, he left Korea for the U.S. to enter graduate school at Long Island University (LIU) in order to pursue his study of William Blake. As a developing poet, he also shared his work with other poets in the school. Among his poems written in English, two appeared in *Down Town Brooklyn #9*, which is the literary magazine of the Brooklyn Campus of LIU.

In 2000, Mr. Kim acquired a master’s degree with a thesis based on William Blake and his works of art. However, suffering from the difficulty of acquiring English as a second language, his interest gradually shifted to the study of language acquisition and language itself. In 2003, he entered New York University to study second language acquisition, focusing on the teaching of English to speakers of other languages. At NYU, Mr. Kim realized for the first time that there is a close relationship between language and culture in the field of language acquisition. He decided to study the relationship between language and culture in-depth at the doctoral level. In 2004, he entered the interdepartmental program in linguistics at Louisiana State University (LSU). In May 2009, he is planning to graduate from LSU with the dissertation titled, *Descriptive Study of Korean E-mail Discourse* that discusses mainly the close relationship between Korean language and culture in terms of language use.