

Rhee, Seongha (2008) 'Subjectification of Reported Speech in Grammaticalization and Lexicalization', *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* 12: 590-603.

Subjectification of Reported Speech in Grammaticalization and Lexicalization*

Seongha Rhee

Hankuk University of Foreign Studies

1 Introduction

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 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 the subjectification phenomenon involving reported speech in Korean from the grammaticalization and lexicalization perspectives. It has four objectives: to describe briefly the unique type of quotation; to describe grammaticalization of and lexicalization with complementizers; to analyze the workings of subjectification in grammaticalization and lexicalization; and to discuss theoretical issues with respect to the interaction among subjectification, grammaticalization, and lexicalization.

2 Preliminaries

In order to expedite the discussion, a brief exposition on three main concepts addressed in this paper is in order: bare direct quotation, subjectification, and clause combination for quotation.

[Bare Direct Quotation] Reported speech is linguistically presented as direct quotation or indirect quotation. Korean has another unique type of pseudo-direct quotation which I call Bare Direct Quotation (BDQ). 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 quotation typology in (1).

(1) a. Direct Quotation

nay-ka "Kimsacang-nim ettehkey
I-NOM Kim.President-HON how
kule-si-lswukaissu-si-pnikka?" ha-ko ttaci-ess-ci.
do.so-HON-can-HON-QS say-and protest-PST-END
'I protested saying, "Mr. President Kim, how could you do that (to me)?"'

b. Indirect Quotation

nay-ka Kimsacang-nim-i ettehkey
I-NOM Kim.President-HON-NOM how
kule-si-lswukaissu-si-nyako ttaci-ess-ci.
do.so-HON-can-HON-COMP protest-PST-END
'I protested to Mr. President Kim how he could do that (to me).'

c. BDQ

nay-ka ttaci-ess-ci, Kimsacang tangsın ettehkey
I-NOM protest-PST-END, President.Kim you how
kule-lswuiss-nya?
do.so-can-QS
'I protested. President Kim, how could you do that (to me)?'

BDQ is unique in that it formally appears as a type of direct quotation, yet it is stripped off of many morpho-syntactic devices that should have appeared in actual utterances, thus justifying its characterizations of being 'bare' direct quotation and 'pseudo-direct' quotation. The missing elements largely consist of socio-pragmatic markers of politeness, honorification, etc. These are required in Korean because in Korean such notions are highly grammaticalized. The elided components also include grammatically 'peripheral' elements like case-markers, pronouns and others. Sometimes, such forms are replaced with simpler forms that in fact were not used in actual utterances. 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.¹ BDQ is a very interesting phenomenon rarely observed in other languages, and this should constitute promising future research.

[Subjectification] Subjectification is widely attested in grammatical and lexical change across languages (Traugott 1982, 1989, Stein & Wright 1995, Traugott & König 1991, Traugott & Dasher 2002). The cases of Korean complementizers, as shall be shown in the following discussions, are where subjectification cuts across both grammaticalization and lexicalization.

The close relationship between subjectification and grammaticalization has often been addressed in literature. For example, Traugott (1982, 1989) and Traugott & König (1991) show how the meaning of English *after* is subjectified

as in (2), from space to time to cause; Rhee (2007b) shows how English prepositions *for* and *before* were subjectified as exemplified in (3).

(2) *after*

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

(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 verbs *prefer* and *rather* now carry the preference meaning as a consequence of subjectification from the mere 'carry before' and 'more quickly' meanings, respectively.

[Clause Combination for Quotation] Complementizers are the means of clause combination, whereby a clause-complement is brought into a matrix clause. Before the development of complementizers in the late 18th century (Ahn 1991), Korean had three types of clause combining using direct quotations for reported speech: (i) Juxtaposition of a statement and a direct quotation; (ii) Non-finite main clause combination whereby a sentence ends with a direct speech; and (iii) Embedded direct speech with two verbs of locution. Since all these three types used direct speech for the reported utterance, they made use of diverse sentential endings as shown in the partial listing in (4).

(4)

Sentence Type	OK	MidK (15-16C)	EMK (17-19C)	ModK (20-21C)
Declarative	- <i>ta</i> , - <i>la</i> , - <i>tha</i> , - <i>sta</i> , - <i>tye</i> , - <i>sy</i> , - <i>o</i> , - <i>ma</i> , - <i>noy</i> , - <i>ni</i> , - <i>li</i>	- <i>ta</i> , - <i>la</i> , - <i>tha</i> , - <i>sy</i> , - <i>lye</i> , - <i>nye</i> , - <i>na</i> , - <i>ye</i> , - <i>nAy</i> , - <i>ney</i> , - <i>yey</i> , - <i>way</i> , - <i>Ay</i> , - <i>oy</i> , - <i>ci</i> , - <i>ay</i> , - <i>ey</i> , - <i>soy</i> , - <i>yo</i> , - <i>ya</i> , - <i>ya</i> , - <i>may</i> , - <i>tey</i> , - <i>key</i>	- <i>ta</i> , - <i>la</i> , - <i>ko</i> , - <i>ke</i> , - <i>man</i> , - <i>ya</i> , - <i>nAy</i> , - <i>oy</i> , - <i>tey</i> , - <i>soy</i> , - <i>ney</i> , - <i>syey</i> , - <i>cyey</i> , - <i>so</i> , - <i>o</i>	- <i>ta</i> , - <i>la</i> , - <i>ketun</i> , - <i>a/e</i> , - <i>ci</i> , - <i>key</i> , - <i>ya</i> , - <i>sey</i> , - <i>lyem</i> , - <i>tay</i> , - <i>lay</i> , - <i>tey</i> , - <i>ney</i> , - <i>kwun</i> , - <i>kwuna</i> , - <i>i</i> , - <i>la</i> , - <i>kel</i>
Interrogative	- <i>nyo</i> , - <i>kko</i> , - <i>kho</i> , - <i>kwu</i> , - <i>yo</i> , - <i>o</i> , - <i>lyo</i> , - <i>lyu</i> , - <i>ni</i> , - <i>li</i> , - <i>sko</i>	- <i>nyo</i> , - <i>nye</i> , - <i>kko</i> , - <i>kho</i> , - <i>kwu</i> , - <i>ko</i> , - <i>o</i> , - <i>yo</i> , - <i>lyo</i> , - <i>ni</i> , - <i>li</i>	- <i>nya</i> , - <i>kka</i> , - <i>ko</i> , - <i>o</i> , - <i>lyo</i> , - <i>ni</i> , - <i>li</i> , - <i>so</i> , - <i>nuy</i> , - <i>ko</i> , - <i>yo</i> , - <i>nyo</i> , - <i>lyo</i>	- <i>nya</i> , - <i>kka</i> , - <i>yo</i> , - <i>ka</i> , - <i>na</i> , - <i>ni</i> , - <i>o</i>
Imperative	- <i>la</i> , - <i>sy</i> , - <i>ssye</i>	- <i>la</i> , - <i>na</i> , - <i>lya</i> , - <i>sy</i> , - <i>so</i> , - <i>co</i> , - <i>zo</i> , - <i>o</i> , - <i>ko</i> , - <i>key</i> , - <i>lye</i> , - <i>ye</i>	- <i>la</i> , - <i>na</i> , - <i>so</i> , - <i>se</i> , - <i>sy</i> , - <i>o</i> , - <i>lye</i> , - <i>cy</i> , - <i>ta</i> , - <i>key</i>	- <i>la</i> , - <i>o</i> , - <i>key</i> , - <i>ca</i> , - <i>ta</i>
Hortative	(- <i>cy</i>)	- <i>cy</i> , - <i>ce</i> , - <i>cya</i> , - <i>ci</i> , - <i>ta</i> , - <i>say</i> , - <i>la</i>	- <i>cya</i> , - <i>ca</i> , - <i>ta</i> , - <i>say</i> , - <i>sAy</i> , - <i>sy</i>	- <i>ca</i> , - <i>se</i> , - <i>o</i> , - <i>so</i> , - <i>lye</i> , - <i>key</i> , - <i>la</i> , - <i>lyem</i> , - <i>a</i> , - <i>ta</i> , - <i>ci</i>

3 Grammaticalization of Complementizers

It is well-known that Korean uses different types of complementizers depending on the type of the embedded clause as shown in (5).²

(5)

Embedded Clause Type	Complementizer	Example
Declarative	- <i>tako</i>	<i>ka-n-tako</i> 'that (he) goes'
	- <i>lako</i>	<i>John-i-lako</i> 'that (he) is John'
Interrogative	- <i>nyako</i>	<i>ka-nyako</i> 'if (he) goes'
Imperative	- <i>lako</i>	<i>ka-lako</i> 'that (he should) go'
Hortative	- <i>cako</i>	<i>ka-cako</i> 'to go together'

As shown in (6), complementizers are built on the sentential endings. It also used the verb of locution *ha-* 'say' (which was a polysemy with 'say' and 'do' meanings, the latter being the only surviving lexical meaning in Modern Korean). The construction also uses the connective particle *-ko*. The examples in (7) show the uses of the constructions at the early complementizer stage.

(6) -*ta/nya/la/ca* + *ha* + *ko* >>> -{*ta/nya/la/ca*}-*ko*
 Sentential Ending say Connective Complementizer

- (7) a. *ku-ka ka-n-ta-ha-ko malha-yss-ta*
 he-NOM go-PRST-DC-say-CONN say-PST-DC
 (Lit) 'He said "(I) am going" and said.'
 'He said that he was going(leaving).'
- b. *ku-ka ka-nya-ha-ko mwul-ess-ta*
 he-NOM go-QS-say-CONN ask-PST-DC
 (Lit) 'He said "(Are you) going?" and asked.'
 'He asked if (I) was going.'

The early constructions undergo reanalysis and phonological reduction as shown in (8). At first, it is a coordinated structure. The connective *-ko* carries the full function of a connective. It then becomes a part of a complementizer that enables clausal subordination.

(8) Coordinated Str. > Subordinated Str. > Phonological Reduction
 ...*ta]-ha]-ko* ...*ta]-hako* ...-*tako*

The verb *ha-* 'say' (*hA-* in MidK) becomes deleted from the construction. This extreme form of reduction, i.e. deletion, seems to be due to the fact that the verb *ha-* has very low perceptive saliency: (i) [h], a glottal fricative, being a very

weak sound produced as the egressive air passes through the open glottis and pharynx; and (ii) [a] being the same as the final vowel [a] in the preceding sentential endings such as *-ta*, *-la*, *-nya* and *-ca*.

Since grammaticalization involves functional change with increased grammaticality, semantic change leading to such functional change is among the most prominent aspects of grammaticalization. There are several points that merit our attention with respect to semantic change.

First of all, the verb *ha-* 'say' in the original construction lost its locution meaning. Early examples had two verbs of locution, occurring on each side of the coordinator, eg., *malha-* 'say', *mwut-* 'ask', *kala-* 'say', *yeccwup-* 'ask', *chengha-* 'request', etc. And semantic redundancy seems to have contributed to the deletion of one locution verb, i.e. *ha-* 'say'.

Furthermore, the connective particle *-ko* in the original construction of the complementizer lost its coordinating meaning 'and'. Serialized and/or 'isolated' events are typically marked by *-ko* (Koo 1987, Rhee 2007a). However, those 'isolated' events are now conceptualized as a unified event. After grammaticalization, therefore, the serial-interpretation is no longer available.

Another point is that only one ending form in each sentence type (or two forms for declarative)³ is recruited in grammaticalization, and thus there is an extensive leveling of delicate semantic differences carried by the endings. It is noteworthy that in Korean the semantic leveling of the sentential endings, by virtue of their being the locus of speaker-stance marking including modality, results in canceling diverse semantics and losing various functions that had been associated with these forms. Therefore, this particular development is in counter with intersubjectification, since intersubjectification is attested with robust unidirectionality across languages (Traugott & Dasher 2003).⁴

4 Grammaticalization of Connective Particles

Many forms involving complementizers develop into connectives of diverse functions, such as causal, concessive, and purposive connection. The following are examples of causal connectives.

- (9) a. ku-salam nay-ka silh-tako ka-ss-e.
 the-person I-NOM dislike-CONN go-PST-DC
 'He left because he doesn't like me.'
 << 'He said he doesn't like me and left.'
- b. yeki-ka eti-lako kkapwu-nya?
 here-NOM where-CONN be.boisterous-QS
 'Where do you think you are and act so frivolously?'
 << 'Are you saying 'This is place X' and acting frivolously?'

Examples in (9) contain embedded declarative clauses, thus using

complementizers *-tako* and *-lako*. These forms function not as complementizers any more, but as causal connectives. This development largely owes to the expansion of the categories of the verbs that can follow these complementizers, i.e., the previous restriction of using the locution verbs only has now disappeared. The causality meaning is derived simply from the 'imagined' utterance of the party being described, as if such an imagined utterance was the self-justification of the act performed by the party.

The following are examples of concessive connectives.

- (10) a. *swip-tako* *yathpo-cima-la*.
 be.easy-CONN belittle-PROH-IM
 'Don' think lightly of it even though it (may) look easy.'
 << 'Don't think lightly of it just because it is easy.'
 <<< 'Don't say "It's easy!" and think lightly of it.'
- b. *kwichanh-tako* *mak* *ha-cima-la*.
 be.troublesome-CONN carelessly do-PROH-IM
 'Don't do it carelessly even though it (may) be troublesome.'
 << 'Don't do it carelessly just because it is troublesome.'
 <<< 'Don't say 'It's troublesome' and do it recklessly.'
- c. *welkup-i-lako* *elma* *an-toy-e*.
 salary-be-CONN some not-become-END
 'The salary isn't much.'
 << '(Even if people) call this a salary, it isn't much.'
 <<< '(People) say "(It's) a salary"; it isn't much.'
- d. *tomato-nyako* *nemwu* *cak-ney*.
 tomato-CONN very be.small-EX
 'This tomato is very/too small.'
 << '(People may) ask if this is a tomato; it's too small to be one.'
 <<< '(People) say "Is it a tomato?"; it's too small.'

As shown in the above examples, the concessive meanings of the newly developed connectives are derived from certain inferences that heavily rely on subjectification.

The following are examples of purposive connectives.

- (11) a. *swul-mek-cako* *wa-ss-e*.
 drink-eat-PURP come-PST-DC
 'I came to have a drink with you.'
 << 'I said 'Let's drink' and came.'
- b. *ike-y* *ta* *ne caltoy-lako* *kule-nun-keya* .
 this-NOM all you succeed-PURP do.so-PRST-DC
 'All this is just to help you succeed.'
 << 'All this (I) am doing saying "You (should) succeed."'

As we have seen in the examples of particle uses, all particles are those that encode subjective judgment or intention (i.e. emotive, conative, etc.). In particular, the semantic change from causal to concessive is enabled by subjectification, a semantic change pattern widely attested across languages (Traugott and König 1991).

5 Grammaticalization of Emphatic Endings

Complementizers develop into sentential endings with stronger illocutionary force than other existing sentential endings. Complementizers of all embedded clause types participated in this grammaticalization, as shown in the following examples.

- (12) a. na-to cwuk-keyss-tako.
 I-also die-FUT-END
 'I am hard-pressed, too.'
 << '(I (already)) said, "I'll die."'
- b. kuke-y pothong elyewun il-i-nyako.
 that-NOM normal be.difficult matter-be-END
 'Isn't it extremely difficult?!' / 'What a difficult job it is!'
 << '(I (already)) said, "Is it of regular difficulty?"'
- c. ppalli o-lako.
 quickly come-END
 'Come quickly.'
 << '(I (already)) said, "Come quickly."'
- d. A. icy pap-mek-ule ka-cako.
 now food-eat-PURP go-END
 'Let's go eat now.'
 << '(I (already)) said, "Let's go to eat."'
- B. kule-cako.
 do.so-END
 'OK, let's.'
 << '(I (already)) said, "Let's do so."'

As the translations show, the speaker presents the utterance as if it had been already said. Therefore, all these examples may alternatively be translated as "What I said is ...". As is also evident, the speaker had not done so; they are first-time utterances.

As is evident from the foregoing discussions, development of emphatic markers is enabled by subjectification. Emphasis, *per se*, is based on subjective, strategic decision. The emphasis associated with these new sentential endings is derived from the speaker's presentation of a proposition as if it had been

previously uttered, and thus as something very obvious. In other words, the speaker is saying that the situation is so obvious that his/her actual utterance is redundant, and thus this first-time utterance can be presented as if it were a reported speech. It is for this reason that this type of sentential endings tends to bring forth a nuance of irritation on the part of the speaker.⁵

6 Lexicalization and Subjectification

The forms that underwent conceptual change ended up not only in grammatical forms but also in lexical forms (cf. Rhee 2007c for more discussion on lexicalization). The lexicalization is due to strong cohesive power among the participating lexical and grammatical formants, and to unitization of the string that enabled the reanalysis of its being a single conceptual unit (cf. ‘univerbation’ Lehmann 1995[1982]). Such lexicalization is attested with all complementizer types, and such development can be diagrammatically presented as in (13).

- (13) a. From Declarative
 cwuk-keyss-ta-ha-ko >> cwuk-keyss-tako >> cwukkeysstako
 die-FUT-DC-say-and die-FUT-COMP desperately
- b. From Interrogative
 weyn-ttek-i-nya-ha-ko >> weynttek-i-nyako >> weynttekinyako
 what.kind-cake-be-QS-say-and good.luck-be-COMP gladly
- c. From Imperative
 na-l-sal-li-la-ha-ko >> na-l-sal-li-lako >> nalsallilako
 I-ACC-live-CAS-IM-say-and I-ACC-live-CAS-COMP desperately
- d. From Hortative
 na-coh-ca-ha-ko >> na-coh-cako >> nacohcako
 I-be.good-HORT-say-and I-be.good-COMP selfishly

This type of lexicalization seems to have gained considerable productivity, and those forms that are susceptible to ‘conceptually single unit’ interpretation tend to continue to become lexicalized. Since the notion of ‘conceptually single unit’ is not clear-cut and rather forms a continuum, these emerging lexical forms have different degrees of lexicality.⁶ Some of such examples with source meanings and lexicalized meanings are as listed in (14).

- (14) a. From Declarative
- | | | |
|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| <i>kulehtako</i> | 'saying "It is so"' | 'still; nonetheless' |
| <i>cwuknuntako</i> | 'saying "I am dying"' | 'self-pitifully' |
| <i>salkeysstako</i> | 'saying "I will live"' | 'desperately' |
| <i>nacalnasstako</i> | 'saying "I am great"' | 'haughtily' |
| <i>michyesstako</i> | 'saying "I am insane"' | 'nonsensically' |

<i>salapokeysstako</i>	'saying "I will try to live"'	'effortfully'
<i>mossalkeysstako</i>	'saying "I can't live"'	'in frustration'
b. From Imperative		
<i>sallyetallako</i>	'saying "Please save me"'	'begging mercy'
<i>ttwulhecyelako</i>	'saying "Let it be bored a hole"'	'attentively'
<i>pwatallako</i>	'saying "Please be considerate"'	'begging mercy'
<i>cwukelako</i>	'saying "Die"'	'desperately'
<i>nalsallilako</i>	'saying "Save me"'	'desperately'
c. From Hortative		
<i>cwukcako</i>	'saying "Let's die"'	'enthusiastically'
<i>cwukcasalcako</i>	'saying "Let's die, let's live"'	'obsessively'
<i>eccecaako</i>	'saying "Let's (do it) somehow"'	'why'
<i>naphyenhacako</i>	'saying "Let me be comfortable"'	'selfishly'
d. From Interrogative		
<i>alkeymwenyako</i>	'saying "What should I know?"'	'nonchalantly'
<i>mwusuncisinyako</i>	'saying "What act is it?"'	'protestingly'
<i>mwusunsolinyako</i>	'saying "What sound is it?"'	'protestingly'
<i>kukeyetinyako</i>	'saying "Where is it?"'	'appreciatively'

In these examples of lexicalization, we see that the speaker's assessment of a situation is presented as if it were the sentential subject's utterance. This is well illustrated by the examples in (15).

- (15) a. ku-nun sal-apo-keyss-ta-ko pamnac-ulo ilha-n-ta
he-TOP live-TRIAL-FUT-DC-and night.day-INS work-PRST-DC
'He tries to make a living desperately by working day and night.'
(Lit.) 'He says "I will try to live," and works day and night.'
- b. ku-nun cwuk-ela-ko aph-ulhyanghay talli-ess-ta
he-TOP die-IM-and front-towards run-PST-DC
'He ran forward with all his might.'
(Lit.) 'He said "Die!" and ran forward.'
- c. kulehkey na-phyenha-ca-ko kamaniss-cima-la.
that.way I-be.comfortable-HORT-and remain.quiet-PROH-IM
'Don't selfishly remain quiet like that.'
(Lit.) 'Don't say "Let me be comfortable" like that and remain quiet.'
- d. ku-nun a-l-ke-y-mwue-nya-ko caleka-ss-ta
he-TOP know-PRS-NMN-NOM-what-QS-and go.to.bed-PST-DC
'He went to sleep nonchalantly.'
(Lit.) 'He said "What is it that I should know?" and went to sleep.'

What is intriguing in this context is that grammaticalization and lexicalization occur in succession. In (16) we see that the coordinated structure grammaticalizes into a complementizer and further into a lexical item.

- (16) a. Coordinated Structure
 ku-nun cwuk-keyss-ta-ha-ko talli-ess-ta
 he-TOP die-FUT-DC-say-and run-PST-DC
 'He said '(I) will die' and ran.'
- b. Complementizer (Grammaticalized)
 ku-nun cwuk-keyss-tako malha-yss-ta
 He-TOP die-FUT-COMP say-PST-DC
 'He said that he would die.'
- c. Adverbial (Lexicalized)
 ku-nun cwukkeysstako talli-ess-ta
 he-TOP desparately run-PST-DC
 'He ran desparately.'

7 Discussions

In the preceding sections this paper tried to show with examples how complementizers of reported speech were grammaticalized and then how they further underwent lexicalization. The grammaticalization and lexicalization phenomena displayed by the forms involving reported speech raise some important issues in grammaticalization theory.

[On Subjectification and Reported Speech] We have seen that reported speech involves subjectification, particularly in the case of BDQs, where the reported speech takes the minimal morpho-syntactic devices, even though the mode of presentation *prima facie* is that of direct, thus verbatim, quotation. However, the degree of “bare-ness” in BDQ in relation to subjectification and its mode of linguistic representation are yet to be further explored.

[On Subjectification and Intersubjectification] Subjectification is prominent in lexicalization. Metaphorically speaking, the speaker's assessment of the situation is presented through a borrowed mouth, i.e., as if the sentential subject said so. Subjectification is also prominent in the grammaticalization of particles and sentential endings. De-intersubjectification, or the reversal of intersubjectification, occurs in the development of complementizers due to semantic leveling of sentential endings. This suggests that subjectification and intersubjectification may not be unidirectional.

[On Grammaticalization and Paradigms] It has been shown that in the case of grammaticalization of complementizers, the entry into grammaticalization channel is suspected to have occurred not merely by individual items but by paradigms. In other words, it seems that it is not individual sentential endings that underwent a gradual grammaticalization, as chance development: it is rather the paradigm of sentential endings that seems to have participated in the grammaticalization process. The absence of considerable time lapse from the beginning to the end of the formation of the

complementizer paradigm strongly suggests that the most frequent sentential ending *-ta* and *-la* of declarative spearheaded the process with all others following suit. This is reminiscent of the grammaticalization enabled by structural analogy as proposed by Hoffmann (2005), even though this case departs from the present case in that it involved an inter-lingual structural transfer, i.e. French-English calquing. If this is viable, it can be claimed that grammaticalization may bring forth not only individual grammatical forms but also a completely new grammatical paradigm within a short period due to functional and structural similarities.

[On Grammaticalization and Lexicalization] As has been often pointed out in literature (cf. papers in Giacalone Ramat and Hopper 1998) grammaticalization and lexicalization are often hard to be distinguished. For instance, when grammaticalization of complementizers advances into other grammatical categories such as connective particles, their further advancing into adverbial lexical items is not an expected course of progression. Therefore, the distinction between a construction involving a grammatical item and a fully lexicalized lexical form as a result of deflected grammaticalization can be easily blurred. For instance, *naphyenhacako* 'for your/my/one's own comfort' seems to be a lexical item that has gained a level of lexical status for its being conceptually a single unit as evidenced by its being written as a single orthographic unit without a space to mark the word boundary. On the other hand, its parallel form *ne phyenhacako* 'for your own comfort' seems to be more of a syntactic construction involving a hortative complementizer *-cako*. Its source construction is still transparent. It is interesting to note that even though both of them have the same meaning, these two forms have different personal pronouns: *na* 'I' in the former, and *ne* 'you' in the latter. In the case of the former, *naphenhacako*, the original first person pronoun *na* in the direct quotation is fossilized and made its way into a lexicalized word. As these two formal minimal pairs show, lexicalization and grammaticalization may be often inextricably intertwined.

[On Structural and Semantic Persistence] Certain features of pre-grammaticalization structures are retained in grammaticalization, and likewise, certain features of pre-lexicalization structures are retained in lexicalization. This is well illustrated, as was illustrated in the preceding paragraph, by the fossilized pronouns in the lexicalized forms, egs. *nacaltoycako* 'for one's own good' (< saying 'let me succeed'); *naphyenhacako* 'for one's own comfort' (< saying 'let me be comfortable'); *nalsalilako* 'desperately' (< saying 'save my life'), *nalcapamekulako* 'indifferently' (< saying 'kill and eat me'), *namollalako* 'indifferently' (< saying 'I don't know'), etc. Furthermore, early grammaticalizing forms involved only the locution verbs in the main clause, which then expanded to other types of verbs. This is consonant with the claims that grammaticalization occurs in local contexts (Hopper and Traugott 2003[1993], Bybee et al. 1994 *inter alia*). This is related to the fact that

complementizers basically involve reporting utterances. Another type of persistence relates to the formal constructions. Grammaticalized forms retain formal characteristics of the original source forms, i.e. sentence type indicators.

[On Grammar-Lexis Distinction] As was often shown in the preceding discussion, certain lexicalized forms are, or resemble, syntactic constructions. It is for this reason that the analyzability of some of these forms is controversial. Furthermore, certain forms are unverbated as consolidated units, but have transparent syntactic structures of high syntactic complexity. For instance, *taliya nalsalilako* '(run) with all one's might' still retains a transparent syntactic structure that may be translated as 'saying, "Legs, save my life!".'

8 Conclusion

This paper tried to show how subjectification affects linguistic representation of reported speech with particular emphasis on grammaticalization and lexicalization. Of notable observations are: that BDQs are exemplars *par excellence* of subjectification reflected in the choice of linguistic forms for quotation; that subjectification and intersubjectification are prominent mechanisms in semantic change but that their operation may not be unidirectional toward their increase; that grammaticalization may be actuated by a structural analogy whereby members of an entire paradigm may follow the one member that leads the grammaticalization; that grammaticalization and lexicalization may be intricately intertwined to a point that sometimes the two may not be easily distinguishable; that the forms that underwent grammaticalization and lexicalization may bear traces of old structure in terms of both form and meaning; and that grammar and lexis may not be easily distinguishable especially when syntactic constructions become unverbated into unitized lexical items with conceptually single, yet structurally complex, constructions.

Notes

* Research represented in this paper has been supported by the 2007 Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Research Fund.

¹ 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).

² Some scholars (Um 1990: 63-64) consider that these two-syllable complementizers are not single complementizers but are in fact two

mono-syllabic complementizers, one for reported speech, and the other for the now-deleted *ha-* ‘say’ clause. Since these two forms are fused due to the deletion of the locution verb *ha-*, there is no substantial difference that results from different stances as to this matter eventually.

³ The two declarative complementizers *-tako* and *-lako* are allomorphs, the use of the latter being restricted to affixing to non-finite copula *i-* ‘be’ only. Since the sentential endings *-ta* and *-la* have not in the allomorphy relation, this newly created allomorphy relation between *-tako* and *-lako* is a puzzling phenomenon.

⁴ Grammaticalization of a form involving sentential endings often renders intersubjectification undone, due to the loss of modal distinctions that had been associated with the sentential endings (cf. Rhee 2004).

⁵ Kim (2005: 116-125) states that some of these sentential endings carry an added semantic component of [+factuality] and/or added emphasis, an observation largely consonant with the claim made here. However, in the case of the hortative-based *-cako* ending, he claims that the illocutionary force may become either strengthened or weakened with its use, depending on the context. In the case of weakening, he notes that the suggestion being offered sounds more polite.

⁶ Conceptual unitization is often mirrored in the spacing practices of individual writers. The higher the level of unitization, the more likely the string of morphemes becomes written without orthographic spaces.

References

- Ahn, Joo-Hoh. 1991. Hwuki kuntaykwukeuy inyongmwun yenkwu (‘A Study on Quotation Constructions in Late Early Modern Korean’). *Jaha Emwunnonjip* 8: 359-408. Sang Myung University.
- Bybee, Joan L. 2007. *Frequency of Use and the Organization of Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bybee, Joan L., William Pagliuca, and Revere D. Perkins. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Giocalone Ramat, Anna. and Paul J. Hopper. 1998. *The Limits of Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hoffmann, Sebastian. 2005. *Grammaticalization and English Complex Prepositions: A Corpus-Based Study*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hopper, Paul J. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. *Grammaticalization*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, Su Tae. 2005. *Machimpep ssikkuthuy yunghapkwa ku hankyey* (‘Fusion of Sentential Endings and Its Limit’). Seoul: Pakiceng Publishing.
- Koo, Hyun Jung. 1987. Ssikkuth {-a, -key, -ci, -ko}uy ssuimkwa uymi [The

- Usage and Semantics of Suffixes, *-a*, *-key*, *-ci*, and *-ko*] *Konkuk Emwunhak* 11-12: 167-188. Konkuk University.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1995[1982]. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. Newcastle: LINCUM Europa.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2004. From Discourse to Grammar: Grammaticalization and Lexicalization of Rhetorical Questions in Korean. *LACUS Forum* 30: 413-423.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2007a. Particle Selection in Korean Auxiliary Formation. In *Split Auxiliary Systems*. ed. Raúl Aranovich. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 237-254.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2007b. What is it for if it's before me?: Subjectification and Grammaticalization of English *for* and *before*. Paper presented at 2007 Linguistic Society of Korea, Linguistic Society of Jeju, and Society of English Education in Korea Joint Conference, June 19, 2007, Cheju National University, Korea.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2007c. Through a Borrowed Mouth: Reported Speech and Subjectification in Korean. Paper presented at the 33rd LACUS Conference, July 24-28, 2007, Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond, KY.
- 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. In *Perspectives in Historical Linguistics*. eds. Winfred Lehmann & Yakov Malkiel. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 245-271.
- 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. and Richard Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. & Ekkehard König. 1991. The Semantics-Pragmatics of Grammaticalization Revisited. In *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. 2 vols. eds. Elizabeth C. Traugott, and Bernd Heine. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Vol. 1: 189-218.
- Um, Jung-Ho. 1990. Pomwuncawa wanhyengpomwun [Complementizers and Complementizer Clauses] *Festschrift for Professor Shin-Hang Kang on His 60th Birthday*.

Department of English Linguistics
 Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
 270 Imundong Dongdaemungu Seoul 130-791 Korea.
 e-mail: srhee@hufs.ac.kr