

# Bare Direct Quotation and Speaker's Stance in Korean\*

Seongha Rhee

(Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)

**Seongha Rhee. 2007.** Bare Direct Quotation and Speaker's Stance in Korean. *The Journal of Linguistic Science* 43, 189-211. Quotation has attracted attention from diverse disciplines for its inherent higher-order nature. The quotation typology is complex in Korean, presumably as in any language, and this paper addresses one unique type of quotation, i.e. 'Bare Direct Quotation (BDQ)', unique in that it formally appears as a direct quotation, yet is stripped off of many socio-pragmatic morpho-syntactic devices that should have appeared in actual utterances. Thus, BDQs are a type of pseudo-quotations. This research explores how stance-marking is associated with BDQs. The existence of BDQ brings forth diverse implications in the studies of grammar that merit a special attention. It sheds light on the questions of what constitutes the 'essential' elements in grammar; and what relationships there are among the functionally similar grammatical forms. More importantly, it shows how different stances of the speaker are represented, since BDQs are often employed in the narration of confrontation episodes or other emotive contexts, where such stance-marking is prominent. In so doing, this research presents a useful ground-work for future research on quotation-related linguistic structures, most prominently from grammaticalization perspectives. (**Hankuk University of Foreign Studies**)

**Key words:** bare direct quotation, speaker's stance, subjectification, grammaticalization

---

\*This research was supported by the 2007 Hankuk University of Foreign Studies research fund. This is a part of a larger scale study on reported speech addressing quotation, grammaticalization of complementizers, subjectification, and lexicalization. For some related works, cf. Rhee (2007b, 2007c). Special thanks go to three anonymous reviewers. All remaining errors, however, are mine.

## **1. Introduction**

Quotations are meta-representations in the sense that they are representations of representations, i.e. higher-order representations with lower-order representations embedded within them (Wilson 2000). Since all humans are egocentric by nature, all linguistic utterances are inherently subjective. In particular, reported speeches, or quotations, are of special importance with respect to subjectification, because in reporting, the actual utterance being reported is subject to modification at varying degrees by the reporter. The variable degree of modification creates a continuum of quotation from the simple juxtaposition of the main clause and the reported verbatim speech at one end, to the indirect quotation which is subject to the most extensive editing work by the speaker/reporter at the other. The speaker's decision on the level of modification of the speech being quoted is directly related to the degrees of the speaker's subjectification.

This research addresses how speaker's stance is reflected in reported speech in Korean from the grammaticalization and lexicalization perspectives, and show how subjectification works in linguistic metarepresentation of quotation. This paper is organized in the following manner: Section 2 briefly introduces two notions instrumental in discussing the issues presented here, i.e. quotation and subjectification; Section 3 illustrates the phenomenon of bare direct quotation; Section 4 discusses the BDQ in the light of subjectification; and Section 5 summarizes the findings and arguments and concludes the paper.

## **2 Preliminaries**

In order to expedite the discussion, a brief exposition on two main

concepts addressed in this paper is in order: quotation and subjectification.

## 2.1 Quotation

Wilson (2000), as noted earlier, states that the theory of metarepresentation involves a higher-order representation with a lower-order representation embedded within it, where three main types of lower-order representation may be public representations (e.g. utterances), mental representations (e.g. thoughts), and abstract representations (e.g. sentences, propositions). In this metarepresentation theory, then, quotation is an instance of metarepresentation that involves a higher-order representation involving a locution verb, with a lower-order representation of an utterance.

According to the traditional notion of grammatical 'speech', reported speech is seen to be linguistically presented as direct quotation or indirect quotation. However, there are other types of quotation as well. For instance, Wilson (2000) presents four different types of quotation discussed in the literature as in (1):

(1)a. Direct Quotation

Mary said to me, "You are neglecting your job."

b. Indirect Quotation

Mary told me I was not working hard enough.

c. Mixed Direct & Indirect Quotation

According to Mary, I am "neglecting" my work.

d. Free Indirect Quotation

Mary was pretty rude to me. I am neglecting my job!

Even though it seems that the four-way typology is a reasonable categorization, there in fact can be many other variations. For

instance, the Indirect Quotation type in (1b) is, in essence, a paraphrase, and thus, compatible with such renderings as "Mary told me I was neglecting my job," "Mary told me I was negligent of my work," "Mary told me I was not paying as much attention to my work as necessary," etc. The key element in Indirect Quotation is whether the chosen words well represent the original speaker's intended meaning. In case of Mixed Quotation, the variability can also be as high, and the utterances that contain 'direct' and 'indirect' elements should rightfully belong to this type. The variability of Free Indirect Quotation can be even greater, as the name "free" suggests.

The diversity of quotation types, and the variability of choice of linguistic forms for representation provide room for speaker's subjective decisions, and thus, projecting subjectification on linguistic representation. The speech act of Bare Direct Quotation to be discussed in this paper is made also possible due to this variability.

## 2.2 Subjectification

Subjectification, as proposed in Traugott (1982), is widely attested in grammatical and lexical change across languages (Traugott 1982, 1989, Stein & Wright 1995, Traugott & König 1991, Traugott & Dasher 2002).

The close relationship between subjectification and grammaticalization has often been addressed in the literature. For example, Traugott (1982, 1989) and Traugott & König (1991) show how the meaning of English *after* is subjectified as in (2), more specifically, from space to time to cause.

(2) *after*

a. Shut the door after you.

- b. Brush your teeth after breakfast.
- c. After we heard the lecture we felt greatly inspired.

Likewise, Rhee (2007a) shows how English prepositions *for* and *before* were subjectified. Considering that the two forms originated from a single source lexeme *\*fora* denoting 'front', their respective meanings in contemporary English are rather startling. Rhee (2007a) argues that such diverged developments are due to differential inference patterns in which subjectification played a crucial role, as exemplified in (3).

- (3)a. *for*: (< "front")  
 [frontal location > temporal anteriority > representation >  
 cause/reason > support/benefit > purpose > destination >  
 fitness > advantage/disadvantage]
- b. *before*: (< "front")  
 [frontal location > temporal anteriority > visibility >  
 prospect > superiority > preference]

Lexicalization often involves subjectification as well (Traugott & König 1991, Traugott & Dasher 2002). For instance, English *prefer* and *rather* now carry the preference meaning as a consequence of subjectification from the mere 'carry before' and 'more quickly' meanings, respectively.

### 3 Bare Direct Quotation

#### 3.1 Quotation Typology and BDQ

As indicated earlier, reported speech is linguistically presented as one of such forms as direct quotation, indirect quotation, mixed direct and indirect quotation, and free indirect quotation. Korean has

another unique type of pseudo-direct quotation, which I propose to label as Bare Direct Quotation (BDQ, henceforth; see below for the characteristic justifying the nomenclature). The formation of BDQs involves fleshing of morpho-syntactic devices that should have appeared in actual utterances, and of substitution of certain elements largely consisting of socio-practical markers, as shown in the simplified quotation typology in (4), in a hypothetical situation where an employee is reporting to his colleague what he said to his employer.<sup>1)</sup>

(4) a. Direct Quotation

nay-ka "Kimsacang-nim, sacangnim-kkeyse  
 I-Nom Kim.President-Hon president-Hon.Nom  
 ettehkey ce-hanthey kule-si-lswukaissu-si-pnikka?"  
 how I-to do.so-Hon-can-Hon-Q.End  
 ha-ko ttaci-ess-ci.  
 say-and protest-Pst-End  
 'I protested (to President Kim) saying, "Mr. President Kim, how can you do that to me?'"

b. Indirect Quotation

nay-ka Kimsacang-nim-i ettehkey na-hanthey  
 I-Non Kim.President-Hon-Nom how I-to  
 kule-(si)-lswukaissu(-si)-nyako ttaci-ess-ci.  
 do.so-Hon-can-Hon-Q.Comp protest-Pst-End  
 'I protested to Mr. President Kim how he could do that to me.'

---

1) Abbreviations used in the gloss are as follows: Adn: adnominal; Benef: benefactive; Comp: complementizer; Cop: copula; Dec: declarative; End: sentential ending; Fut: future; Gen: genitive; Hon: honorific; Nom: nominative; Nomz: nominalizer; Pres: present; Pst: past; Q: interrogative; and Top: topic.

c. BDQ

nay-ka ttaci-ess-ci, Kimsacang tangsin  
I-Nom protest-Pst-End President.Kim you  
ettehkey na-hanthey kule-lswuiss-nya?  
how I-to do.so-can-Q  
'I protested. President Kim, how can you do that to me?'

As shown in the examples above, BDQ is unique in that it formally appears as a type of direct quotation,<sup>2)</sup> yet it is stripped off of many morpho-syntactic devices that should have appeared in actual utterances. Such states of affairs justify its characterizations of being 'bare' direct quotation and 'pseudo-direct' quotation: 'bare' in that it lacks diverse morpho-syntactic marking that originally occurred in the actual utterance, and 'pseudo-direct' in that it does not represent the verbatim utterance but only pretends to do so.<sup>3)</sup>

Major differences between Direct Quotation and Indirect Quotation, and between Direct Quotation and BDQ include the use/non-use of vocatives, possible variation with the use of honorification morphemes, case-markers, and pronouns. (cf. next section for a more detailed discussion on these issues.)

### 3.2 Multi-Planedness of BDQ

In the preceding discussion BDQ was presented as if it were of a single uniform construction, but this is a simplistic representation.

---

2) The "direct" nature of BDQ is obvious in such a joke where the addressee asks back to this reporter, "Did you really say *netangsin* to your boss?" This is humorous because both parties know well that this is just the way of reporting (i.e. BDQ) and is not intended to be a verbatim quotation.

3) It is notable that the context of BDQ consists of two sentences: the reporting sentence and the reported sentence. In the transcription these two sentences are given with a comma, but this punctuation mark may be replaced either with a period, or a semi-colon.

As a matter of fact, BDQ can assume diverse formats in surface representation. This can be seen in the following variations of BDQ, in a replicated situation as in (4), i.e. an employee reporting what he said to his employer.

(5)a. *nay-ka ttaci-ess-ci, Kimsacang tangsin-(i)*  
 I-Nom protest-Pst-End President.Kim you-(Nom)  
*ettehkey na-hanthey kule-lswuiss-nya?*  
 how I-to do.so-can-Q.End

b. *nay-ka ttaci-ess-ci, Kimsacang ne(y-ka)*  
 I-Nom protest-Pst-End President.Kim you-Nom  
*ettehkey na-hanthey kule-lswuiss-nya?*  
 how I-to do.so-can-Q.End

a/b: 'I protested. President Kim, how can you do that to me?'

Examples in (5) show that the pronoun referring to the addressee is variable between *tangsin* and *ne*, the former more formal, yet, often used in confrontation situation, and the latter non-polite and casual, often used to a social inferior.<sup>4)</sup> Furthermore, the nominative case marking exhibits variation among the highly honorific form *-kkeyse* (in original utterance)<sup>5)</sup>, the neutral form *-i*, and complete

---

4) *Tangsin* is a Sino-Korean form literally translatable as 'the concerned body'. Its usage is diverse and often contradictory because it can be used to refer to the addressee in confrontational situation, or refer to a spouse, or a lover in poetry, or even to refer to a third person with formality and respect. The use in BDQ is unequivocally confrontational. On the other hand, *ne* is characterizable as a second person pronoun that lacks any formality and respect. For this reason, if this is used for a social superior, it not only lacks such respect, but also is very provocative due to its characteristic impoliteness.

5) The use of highly honorific case-marker in BDQ is unnatural. This will be discussed later in 4.2.



omission.

(6)a.   nay-ka   ttaci-ess-ci,           Kimsacangnim   tangsin-kkeyse  
          I-Nom    protest-Pst-End,   Mr.President.Kim   you-Hon.Nom  
          ettehkey na-hanthey       kule-lswuiss-nya?  
          how     I-to               do.so-can-Q.End

      b.   nay-ka   ttaci-ess-ci,           Kimsacang       tangsin-i  
          I-Nom    protest-Pst-End,   President.Kim   you-Nom  
          ettehkey na-hanthey       kule-lswuiss-nya?  
          how     I-to               do.so-can-Q.End

      c.   nay-ka   ttaci-ess-ci,           Kimsacang       tangsin  
          I-Nom    protest-Pst-End,   President.Kim   you  
          ettehkey na-hanthey       kule-lswuiss-nya?  
          how     I-to               do.so-can-Q.End

      a/b/c: ‘I protested. President Kim, how can you do that to me?’

## 4 Discussion

### 4.1 BDQ and Subjectification

As is obvious the use of BDQ is closely related to subjectification in the sense that it is reporting an utterance in a highly subjective and emotive way. This subjectification is generally applicable to reported speech in that the reported speech does not have to be an utterance of the reporter: it may be that of someone else's. This is well shown in the following examples of father-son confrontational dialogue in (7) and its report by the father to someone else in (8).

(7) Son: apeci apeci-kkeyse ce-hanthey ha-ycwu-si-n  
 father father-Nom I-to do-Benef-Hon-Adn  
 ke-y mwe iss-eyo?  
 Nomz-Nom what exist-Q.End  
 "Father, what is it that you have done for me?"

Father: ya i-nom-a nay-ka ne-hanthey ha-ycwu-n  
 look this-fella-Voc I-Nom you-to do-Benef-Adn  
 ke-y way eps-nya?  
 Nomz-Nom why not.exist-Q.End  
 "Look, my (young) fella, what makes you say that  
 there's none that I did for you?"

(8) Father reporting Son's utterance in (7):  
 i-nom-i na-hanthey ttaci-nunkeya, apeci apeci-ka  
 this-fella-Nom I-to protest-End father father-Nom  
 na-hanthey ha-ycwu-n ke-y mwe iss-nya/so?<sup>6)</sup>  
 I-to do-Benef-Adn Nomz-Nom what exist-End/End  
 "This (young) fella is protesting to me. Father, what is it that  
 you did for me?"

As was pointed out earlier with respect to Wilson's (2000) quotation typology, the speech act of quotation is variable. In this context the choice of diction in examples in (1) brings forth an interesting issue (cf. "neglecting your job" in original utterance vs. "not working hard enough" in quotation). The comparison of "neglecting" and "working" shows that the act of quoting inherently involves the question of whether the reporter agrees with the value

---

6) There is a subtle difference depending on the choice of the ending. For instance, the *-nya*-ending seems inappropriately rude, whereas the *-so*-ending seems more acceptable. There seem to be ranges of acceptable level fluctuation in terms of fleshing or replacing the politeness/formality markers.

judgment, either as part of the semantics or as connotation, associated with the words used by the original speaker. This is so because once an utterance is reported by the reporting speaker in the form of indirect quotation, the linguistic forms employed becomes "attributable" to the reporter as well as to the original speaker. The burden thus created on the reporter motivates the reporter to use appropriate diction in place of the original words, and the formal variation results from this selective decisions.

It becomes clear, then, that a thorough study on quotation should involve an extensive exploration into affective and evaluative lexicon, which is beyond the scope of ordinary research. Suffice it to say that the lexical aspect may not be easily investigated to a fine-grained detail with respect to BDQ and that the grammatical aspect (including variations in the choice of grammatical markers and sentential structures) that contributes to the creation of subjective meanings must be the research focus.

A very interesting aspect of BDQ in actual usage is that BDQ is also often used in formal newspaper articles describing interviews, for the purpose of increasing 'objectivity' of the content. It is ironical that in casual reported speech, BDQs are used to indicate extreme subjectivity (or emotiveness), whereas in formal articles they are used to indicate objectivity (by way of canceling the intersubjectivity associated with the language used in actual interviews).

Actual interviews with journalists are not carried out with the use of BDQs. However, when they appear in print, BDQs are often employed. It is more likely that an authoritative media, such as nationally distributed daily newspapers, may employ BDQ as opposed to, for example, a small interest group periodical. The following is a common type of BDQ report of an interview host (H) and a guest (G):

(9)H: aph-ulo-uy kyeyhoyk-un mwues-i-nka?  
front-to-Gen plan-Top what-Cop-Q.End  
'What is (your) plan for the future?'

G: molu-n-ta. kunyang yelsimhi ha-keyss-ta  
not.know-Pres-Dec just hard do-Fut-Dec  
'I don't know. I will just work hard.'

As shown in the above example, what is conspicuously missing is the grammatical devices marking honorification, by means of either lexical choice or grammatical marking. It is also likely that the corresponding real-life utterance (i.e., non-BDQ) employed vocatives, and politeness marking, among others. Since honorification, vocatives and politeness are based on the speaker-addressee relationship, it is inherently intersubjective. Neutralizing these intersubjective elements in reporting is an act of counter-intersubjectification.

From this particular perspective, the speaker's act of opting for the use of BDQ is a subjectification, whereas the nature of BDQ is inherently counter-intersubjectification. In other words, the reporter subjectively decides to employ BDQ to carry emotive/evaluative tone of the reporter, not of the original speaker, and in so doing, intentionally cancels intersubjectivity associated with the original utterance.

#### **4.2 Bareness and Grammar**

As was shown in the examples in the previous discussion, the missing elements largely consist of socio-pragmatic markers of politeness, honorification, vocatives, etc. These markers are required in Korean (to a lesser extent in the case of vocatives) because in Korean such notions are highly grammaticalized. The elided

components also include grammatically ‘peripheral’ elements like case-markers, pronouns and others. This is particularly so in the case of spoken BDQ, as opposed to written BDQ (as in journalism discussed in the previous section). This is expected in view of the fact that the spoken language *per se* is more subject to ellipsis, because of the shared knowledge between the interlocutors and the presence of paralinguistic elements accompanying the utterances.

From this perspective, BDQ is analogous to a deep-structure that encodes the speaker's intended core meanings without any utterance scene considerations, such as socio-pragmatic considerations, even though the boundary between these two is by no means straightforward. Real-life utterances, then, are representations of the speaker's intended core meanings (i.e. BDQ) with the socio-pragmatic ornaments added. The speech act of BDQ may be an undoing of socio-pragmatic embellishing by removing such linguistic ornaments. Therefore, BDQs are linguistically bare and help us understand the nature of bareness in grammar.

However, the notion of bareness becomes complicated when substitution (in contrast with omission) of linguistic forms is considered. For instance, such intersubjective forms are sometimes replaced with simpler forms that in fact were not used in actual utterances (this again suits the characterization of ‘pseudo-directness’ of BDQ). The substitutes carry the same function with different illocutionary forces. BDQ is a highly emotive and subjective means of presenting an utterance, and thus is often employed in quoting a confrontational discourse. For instance, the intersubjective nominative case marker *-kkeyse* (intersubjective in the sense that it is used when the speaker is aware of the relative social status of the addressee and acknowledges such difference in linguistic encoding) may be replaced by a neutral nominative marker *-i/-ka*.

This type of substitution of grammatical markers (again as opposed to lexical words) in journalism BDQ merits special

attention. The style of BDQ journalism as a linguistic genre is peculiar in the way that it employs only a set of grammatical markers and not others. The following is a non-exhaustive listing of such grammatical markers.

(10) Grammatical Markers in Journalism BDQ

Category	Favored	Disfavored
Declarative Ending	<i>-ta</i>	<i>-e, -eyo, -supnita</i>
Interrogative Ending	<i>-ka</i>	<i>-e, -eyo, -supnikka, -nya, -kka</i>
Hortative Ending	<i>-ca</i>	<i>-e, -eyo, -upsita</i>
Imperative Ending	<i>-la<sup>7)</sup></i>	<i>-e, -eyo, -sipsio, -ela</i>
1st Person Pronoun	<i>ponin<sup>8)</sup></i>	<i>na, ce</i>
2nd Person Pronoun	<i>tangsin, ponin (kwiha)</i>	<i>ne, kutay</i>
Benefactive Modal in Imperative	<i>-etalla</i>	<i>-etao, -ecwe, -ecwueyo, -ecwusipsio</i>
Nominative Case	<i>-i/ka</i>	<i>-kkeyse</i>
Dative Case	<i>-eykey</i>	<i>-hanthey, -kkey</i>
Topic Marker	<i>-(n)un</i>	<i>-kkeysenun</i>

In the context of substitution of grammatical markers, a fundamental question arises: Are those grammatical markers favored in BDQ necessarily more basic than those that are disfavored? In other words, the issue in point here is whether 'bareness' in BDQ is identical with 'basicness' in grammar.

---

7) The use of imperative sentential end marker *-la* (and its allomorph *-ula*) is unique in that it has a closely related ending *-ela* (and its allomorph *-ala*). The former has somewhat archaic flavor and its use is limited to special registers, including BDQ. In terms of functional differences, *-la* belongs to the audience-blind style, whereas *-ela* belongs to the audience-sensitive style (e.g. used to intimate addressees or social inferiors). This again is consonant with the counter-intersubjective nature of BDQs.

8) One peculiarity with *ponin* is that it can be used either as the first person singular pronoun or the second person singular pronoun. A word of Sino-Korean origin, it can be literally translated as 'the main person', and thus, depending on the perspective in interpreting what "main" is, this form may have contradicting references.

Basicness in grammar needs to be discussed in view of the notion of markedness (where basicness should correlate with unmarkedness), which, in turn, is closely related to naturalness. The naturalness of a form in language use is inseparable with its high frequency of use (Bybee et al. 1994). If this line of reasoning is reasonable, the issue brought up here must consider the token frequency in natural production. Thus viewed, some of the BDQ-favored grammatical forms, it must be noted, do not occur in high frequency. As a matter of fact, *ponin* (1SG, 2SG) and *tangsin* (2SG) are far less frequent in their pronominal uses than other pronominal options. Furthermore, the dative case marker *-hanthey* 'to' is style-sensitive, i.e. it is more frequently used in colloquial and informal genres. These states of affairs suggest that the forms favored in BDQ are favored not only for basicness of their grammatical concept, but also for their appropriateness in register despite their lack of basicness.

#### **4.3 BDQ and Clausal Connection**

Another aspect of BDQ to be addressed is its syntagmatic realization, i.e. clausal connection. BDQs tend to occur outside the reporting main clause, i.e. they occur as separate sentences from the reporter's lead-in clause, unlike the indirect quotations where BDQs are embedded in the main clause. The typical realization of BDQs involves juxtaposition of a lead-in sentence and a BDQ.

The question that arises here is: Why is it that BDQ, which bears formal resemblance with direct quotation in which a lead-in main clause has the directly quoted utterance in subordination, either is unable to, or prefers not to, occur in such embedded sentential structure?

The answer to this question has to do with BDQ's functional characteristic, i.e. delivery of quoted speech in a subjective way. As

colloquial BDQs (as opposed to journalism BDQs) are most frequently used to report a confrontational dialogue, BDQs are usually spoken in a dramatic way to make its presentation realistic and emotionally charged. Furthermore, in order to increase its emotive value, BDQ is generally spoken with strong, widely varying, emotional contour. Therefore, BDQs tend to be realized with prosodic qualities distinct from the main lead-in sentence, and thus often likened to a dramatic and exaggerated act-out of the original discourse by the reporter.<sup>9)</sup>

In terms of clausal connection, then, BDQs are very loosely incorporated with the main clause (i.e. the lead-in sentence). Since they occur without any overt clausal linkers, with low level of integration, and low level of dependence, the degree of clausal connection between BDQs and main clauses can be said to be even lower than parataxis, the lowest level clause-combining type in the parataxis-hypotaxis-subordination cline (cf. Hopper and Traugott 2003[1993]: 179). The only aspect that licenses their juxtaposed occurrence is semantico-functional, i.e. the lead-in sentence introduces an utterance being reported.

#### **4.4 BDQ Across Languages**

BDQ is a very interesting phenomenon rarely observed in other languages. The rarity of BDQs in other languages has to do with their being "bare" in formal appearance and counter-intersubjective in their formative processes. In order for a linguistic construction to be bare, the language should have a reasonable inventory of socio-pragmatic devices that may embellish "bare" structures. Likewise, in order for a linguistic construction to be able to

---

9) As an anonymous reviewer points out, the clausal/sentential connection involving BDQ seems to be related to prosody. A detailed study on this issue should await future research, due to space limitation in this paper.



undergo a counter-intersubjective process, the language should have the grammaticalized intersubjective forms in the first place, in addition to their corresponding regular forms (i.e. non-intersubjective forms).

Even though it is true that all languages have some sets of socio-pragmatic markers, including dictions of politeness (which is deemed a language universal; cf. Brown and Levinson 1987, Leech 1983, Lakoff 1973, inter alia), not all languages have these markers at the comparable level of grammaticalization. For instance, Korean nominative case marker has the honorific vs. non-honorific contrast (i.e. *-i/ka* vs. *-kkeyse*; see preceding discussion), but this distinction is not frequently attested across languages.

In a similar manner, there is a wide variation as to whether a language has a grammaticalized intersubjective markers. For instance, Traugott and Dasher (2002) contrast differential honorific social deictics such as T/V pronouns. It is widely known that some languages have split pronominal system for honorific (the V-form) and non-honorific (the T-form) references for the second person, e.g. French *tu-vous*, German *du-sie*, Spanish *tu-Usted*, etc. The former distinction of *thou* vs. *ye* (for polite singular reference) in English pronominal systems has leveled to *you* in modern English. Therefore, English example, *I will give you a ride*, does not tell a reader about the social relationship between *I* and *you*; whereas the corresponding sentences in other T/V languages reveal such information.

If the discussion extends to lexical choices as well, the intersubjectification and counter-intersubjectification issue will become very complex, because it should include discussions of diverse address terms, affective and evaluative dictions, etc. However, even within the limit of grammatical forms, the variation is not at all impossible and thus it seems plausible that there are some languages that utilize BDQ. This can be illustrated with the

following example in Spanish.<sup>10</sup>

- (11) a. Si no le es molesto a usted, ¿me podría hacer un prestamo, por favor?  
'Could you lend me some money?' (Lit. If it does not bother you, could you do me a lending, please?)  
b. Deme dinero.  
'Give me money.'

In terms of intended meaning, the two sentences in (11) are not much dissimilar. In other words, both utterances are a request speech act asking for money. The differences in illocutionary force in these two utterances may be due to strategic use of indirect speech act in (11a) and its absence in (11b).

A similar state of affairs is observed in English, as illustrated in the following examples.

- (12) a. Would you mind putting out the cigarette?  
b. Would you please put out the cigarette?  
c. Please put out the cigarette.  
d. Do you mind not smoking here?  
e. Would you kindly stop smoking?
- (13) a. Put out the cigarette.  
b. Stop smoking.

The examples in (12) and (13) are utterances for the same intended meaning to bring about the stopping of smoking of the addressee. Again, the difference between (12) and (13) lies in the fact that the examples in (12) are indirect request in the interrogative sentence type, whereas those in (13) are more direct, and thus less polite, command sentences.

The examples in Spanish and English as presented above, and presumably in many other languages, suggest that these languages

---

<sup>10</sup> Thanks go to Professor Jeong Hwan Shin for the Spanish data. However, only the author is responsible for the data interpretation.

tend to use formulaic expressions for realization of politeness. As a matter of fact, there are set politeness formulae in many European languages as shown in (14) (taken from Rhee 2007d).

(14) a. English

*Would you...?*

*Could you...?*

*I wonder if...*

b. Spanish

*¿Le importaría...?* ‘Would be important to you?’

*¿Podría...?* ‘Could you...?’

*Le agradecería...?* ‘I would be grateful to you...?’

c. German

*Könnten Sie...?* ‘Could you...?’

*Würden Sie...?* ‘Would/could you...?’

*Wäre es möglich...?* ‘Would it be possible...?’

What seems immediately relevant with this observation is whether the extensive use of formulaic speech for politeness in actual utterance, and deletion of such formulae in reported speech can constitute BDQ. This question should be addressed in the following discussion.

On the other hand, Japanese seems to be a good candidate of BDQ phenomenon since there are, for example, multiple personal pronouns that diverge according to honorific and non-honorific references, and honorification system seems to be relatively more grammaticalized in this language than other languages. For instance, Japanese second person pronouns consist of *temae*, *omaesan*, *otaku*, *yu-*, *maro*, etc. and the first person pronouns are also variegated as *honin*, *warawa*, *watashi*, *watakushi*, *ore*, *ware*, *en*, etc. Furthermore, Japanese has diverse grammatical markers that have to be used to indicate honorification and politeness. Likewise, Chinese has honorific vs. non-honorific distinction with the second person pronouns *nǐn* and *nǐ*, and numerous first person pronouns such as

*bǐrén, wǒ, wú, yú, zhèn*, etc. This is a perfect condition in which BDQ can occur.

It is time, then, to return to the issue of whether the usage of politeness and honorification devices in actual utterance and non-usage of such features in reporting should be identified as BDQ. For the purpose of the current research, the answer should be in the negative. What must be considered in this context is whether this particular type of the reported speech style has a level of currency among the language users to the extent that warrants a special status to this particular style in the language concerned. In other words, the question is not merely "Is it possible?", but "Do they do it?"

Since politeness is universal, it is likely that all languages have politeness-marked utterances, and the cancellation of politeness marking in reported speech is also possible (considering that politeness-marking involves use of additional features to unmarked forms). However, whether all languages utilize BDQ as a communication strategy is a separate matter. According to a cursory survey, it seems that Japanese has a quotation strategy that vaguely resembles BDQ, but not as one of common reported speech styles. Likewise, in Chinese, where grammaticalization of politeness and honorification seems far less extensive as compared to Korean (and Japanese), BDQ does not seem to occur with any reasonable frequency. At the moment, BDQ seems to be a unique linguistic strategy attested in Korean and is rarely, if not never, attested in other languages. A more in-depth investigation with respect to other languages, however, should await future research.

## **5 Conclusion**

This paper looked at a special type of quotation labeled as Bare Direct Quotation (BDQ). BDQ is unique in that it formally appears as a direct quotation, yet is stripped off of many socio-pragmatic and morpho-syntactic devices that should have appeared in actual utterances. Thus, BDQs are a type of pseudo-quotations. This

research explores how stance-marking is associated with BDQs. The existence of BDQ brings forth diverse implications in the studies of grammar that merit a special attention. It sheds light on the questions of what constitutes the 'essential' elements in grammar that has to do with basicness of grammatical structure; and what relationships there are among the functionally similar grammatical forms. More importantly, the use of BDQ shows how different stances of the speaker are represented, since BDQs are often employed in the narration of confrontation episodes or other emotive contexts, where such stance-marking is prominent. The two different categories of BDQ, i.e. colloquial BDQ and journalism BDQ have distinct characteristics in that the former carries a highly emotive and evaluative stance of the reporter, whereas the latter carries a (feigned) objectivistic stance of the reporter. Even though it is true that all languages have a linguistic means of realizing politeness, very few languages, if any, other than Korean, seem to exploit BDQ as a fully-established discourse strategy.

## References

- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen Levinson. 1987. *Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, Robin. 1973. The logic of politeness, or minding your P's and Q's. *Proceedings of Ninth Regional Meeting of Chicago Linguistic Society*, 292-305.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Rhee, Seongha 2007a. What is it for if it's before me?: Subjectification and Grammaticalization of English *for* and *before*. *Studies in British and American Language and Literature* 84: 209-231.

- Rhee, Seongha. 2007b. Through a Borrowed Mouth: Reported Speech and Subjectification in Korean. Paper presented at the 33rd Linguistic Association of Canada and the United States Conference, July 24-28, 2007, Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond, Kentucky.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2007c. Subjectification of Reported Speech in Grammaticalization and Lexicalization. Paper presented at the 12th Harvard Biennial International Symposium of Korean Linguistics, August 3-5, 2007, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2007d. Interpersonal vs. Intrapersonal Orientation in Request Speech Act: A Cross-Cultural Exploration. Paper presented at SoLLs.INTEC.07, Language and Nationhood: Discourses Across Disciplines and Cultures Conference, May 15-17, 2007, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Stein, Dieter & Susan Wright, eds. 1995. *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation in Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1982. From Propositional to Textual and Expressive Meanings: Some Semantic-Pragmatic Aspects of Grammaticalization. Lehmann, Winfred & Yakov Malkiel (eds) *Perspectives in Historical Linguistics*. 245-271. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1989. On the Rise of Epistemic Meaning in English: An Example of Subjectification in Semantic Change. *Language* 57: 33-65.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. & Richard Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. & Ekkehard König. 1991. The Semantics-Pragmatics of Grammaticalization Revisited. Traugott, Elizabeth C. & Bernd Heine (eds) *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. 2 volumes. Vol. 1: 189-218. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wilson, Deirdre. 2000. Metarepresentation in Linguistic Communication.  
Sperber, D. (ed) *Metarepresentations: An Interdisciplinary  
Perspective*, 411-448. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Seongha Rhee  
Department of English Linguistics  
College of English  
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies  
270 Imun-dong Dongdaemun-gu  
Seoul 130-791 Korea  
Phone: +82-2-2173-3171  
Fax: +82-2-959-4581  
E-mail: srhee@hufs.ac.kr

Received: , 2007  
Revised version: , 2007