



**LACUS
FORUM
XXXIV**

Speech and Beyond



YOUR RIGHTS

This electronic copy is provided free of charge with no implied warranty. It is made available to you under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial license version 3.0

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>)

Under this license you are free:

- **to Share** — to copy, distribute and transmit the work
- **to Remix** — to adapt the work

Under the following conditions:

- **Attribution** — You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- **Noncommercial** — You may not use this work for commercial purposes.

With the understanding that:

- **Waiver** — Any of the above conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder.
- **Other Rights** — In no way are any of the following rights affected by the license:
 - Your fair dealing or fair use rights;
 - The author's moral rights;
 - Rights other persons may have either in the work itself or in how the work is used, such as publicity or privacy rights.

Notice: For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work. The best way to do this is with a link to the web page cited above.

For inquiries concerning commercial use of this work, please visit

<http://www.lacus.org/volumes/republication>

Cover: The front cover of this document is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-No Derivative Works 3.0 license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/3.0/>) and may not be altered in any fashion. The LACUS “lakes” logo and Eastern Kentucky University logo on the cover are trademarks of LACUS and Eastern Kentucky University respectively. The Eastern Kentucky University logo is used here with permission from the trademark holder. No license for use of these trademarks outside of redistribution of this exact file is granted. These trademarks may not be included in any adaptation of this work.

THROUGH A BORROWED MOUTH: REPORTED
SPEECH AND SUBJECTIFICATION IN KOREAN

SEONGHA RHEE

Hankuk University of Foreign Studies

5

PRE-PRODUCTION COPY - NOT FOR CITATION OR DISTRIBUTION

QUOTATION IS A MEANS OF REPORTING AN UTTERANCE. Since it is practically impos-
sible, and often unnecessary, to replicate in its entirety the original utterance including
such difficult elements as its physical properties, quoted utterances are subject to modifi-
cation by the reporter. Such modification occurs in various ways largely due to the report-
er's discourse strategies and subjective judgment about the state of affairs. Quotations in
Korean, as in many other languages, are linguistically realized by various devices, but most
notably by the use of complementizers. Korean complementizers, i.e., *-tako*, *-lako*, *-nyako*,
and *-cako*, historically were grammaticalized from a combination of grammatical and lexi-
cal morphemes. Very interestingly, however, some of the complementizer constructions
deviated from their course of grammaticalization, and were deflected into lexicalization.
This new development of lexicalization is a process that may be characterized as an excel-
lent example of subjectification. Despite its intriguing nature, this process has not received
attention to date, and this paper intends to fill this gap.¹

1. PRELIMINARIES. Complementizers are a means of clause combination, whereby a clause-
complement is brought into a matrix clause. Before the development of complementizers,
Korean had three types of clause combinations using direct quotations for reported speech
as in (1):

- (1) a. *Type 1: Juxtaposition of a statement and a direct quotation:* [Lead Statement]
[Direct Speech]
b. *Type 2: Non-finite main clause combination:* [say-Connective [Direct Speech]]
c. *Type 3: Embedded direct speech:* [[say-Connective [Direct Speech] [say]]]

A Type 1 quotation is, in fact, a mixed writing of the speaker's text language sentences and
the quoted meta-text language sentences. Differentiating between these two types of text is
difficult for the reader who should make use of contextual cues and linguistic signals such
as the uses of pronouns and shifts in tense, formality, etc. A Type 2 quotation is unique in
that the sentence ends with the direct speech, an extraordinary situation for a quotation in

¹ This research was supported by the 2007 Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Research Fund.
It is part of a larger scale study on complementizers. See Rhee (2007b) for a more comprehensive
description of the grammaticalization processes of complementizers. Special thanks go to the anon-
ymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions. All remaining errors, however, are mine.

this head-final language since it does not end with the main clause verb. A Type 3 quotation is the most common type of quotation used before the grammaticalization of complementizers. It is closest to an ordinary modern quotation construction, with the only difference being that it lacks a complementizer. It is from this syntagmatic configuration that the quotative complementizers were grammaticalized, as shall be discussed in more detail later.

Another notion that plays an important role in this paper is subjectification. In Traugott's terms, subjectification can be defined as a pragmatic-semantic process whereby meanings become increasingly based in the speaker's subjective belief state or attitude toward the proposition (Traugott 1982, Traugott & König 1991). Therefore, subjectification is essentially a process whereby speaker involvement is reflected in semantic change (Rhee 2007a). Traugott and Dasher (2002:30) point out that it is very wide-spread, and is the most pervasive type of semantic change identified to date. A large body of literature shows its attestation in grammatical and lexical change across languages (Traugott 1982, 1989; Stein & Wright 1995; Traugott & König 1991; Traugott & Dasher 2002; Rhee 2007a, 2007b, *inter alia*). For instance, the close relationship between subjectification and grammaticalization has often been addressed in literature. Traugott (1982, 1989) and Traugott and König (1991) show how the meaning of English *after* is subjectified as in (2), from space to time to cause;² Rhee (2007a) shows how English prepositions *for* and *before*, both developed from the same lexical source Old Teutonic and OHG *fora* 'front', were subjectified as shown by the summarized paths of semantic change in (3).

- (2) 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.

2. GRAMMATICALIZATION OF COMPLEMENTIZERS. Despite the controversy with respect to the specific first historical attestation (cf. Kim 1994 for 1637 and Ahn 1991, 2003 for 1763), it is in Early Modern Korean (i.e., the 17th and 18th centuries) that the quotative marker

² As one of the reviewers notes, presumably causative *after* retains its temporal significance. Retention of the semantics of the source structure in grammaticalized forms is common (cf. 'persistence' Hopper & Traugott 2003).

hAko came into existence. This quotative marker underwent a fusion with the sentential ending of the embedded direct speech, which varied depending on the sentence type, i.e., *-ta* for declarative,³ *-nya* for interrogative, *-la* for imperative, and *-ca* for hortative, as shown in (4). This process of morphological fusion brought forth a complete paradigm of complementizers with four members depending on the sentence type of the reported utterance.⁴ 5

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

The following examples in (5) and (6) show the use of the constructions at the early complementizer stage, before and after the morphological fusion.⁵ 10

- (5) a. *ku-ka ka-n-ta-ha-ko malba-yss-ta*
 he-NOM go-PRES-DEC-say-CONN say-PST-DEC
 (Lit.) 'He said "(I) am going" and said.'
 'He said that he was going(leaving).' 15
- b. *ku-ka ka-nya-ha-ko mwul-ess-ta*
 he-NOM go-INT-say-CONN ask-PST-DEC
 (Lit.) 'He said "(Are you) going?" and asked.'
 'He asked if (I) was going.' 20
- (6) a. *ku-ka ka-n-tako malba-yss-ta*
 he-NOM go-PRES-COMP say-PST-DEC
 'He said that he was going (leaving).'
- b. *ku-ka ka-nyako mwul-ess-ta*
 he-NOM go-COMP ask-PST-DEC 25
 'He asked if (I) was going.'

From a formal perspective, the early constructions undergo reanalysis and phonological reduction. At first, the source construction of the complementizer begins with a coordinated structure. The connective *-ko* in the construction carries the full function of a connective at this stage. It then becomes a part of a complementizer that enables clausal subordination. The structure further undergoes phonological reduction, resulting in the loss of the locution verb *ha-* 'say' (or *hA-*, its older orthographic variant), presumably 30

³ The ending *-ta* for declarative sentences participating in the development of complementizer has an allomorph *-la*, which is used with the present-tense copular *i-* 'be' only. The allomorphy relation between these two forms exists only in their complementizer function, not in the sentential ending function. 35

⁴ The verb *ha-* is polysemous with 'say' and 'do' meanings. In Present Day Korean, it is more commonly used for the 'do' meaning. 40

⁵ The following abbreviations are used in glosses: ACC: accusative; CAUS: causative; COMP: complementizer; CONN: connective; DEC: declarative; FUT: future; HORT: hortative; IMP: imperative; INST: instrumental; INT: interrogative; NMN: nominalizer; NOM: nominative; PROH: prohibitive; PRES: present; PST: past; TOP: topic; and TRL: trial. 40

because of the low phonetic salience of [h] and the overlapping of [a] with the preceding vowel (Rhee 2007b), as shown in (7).

(7) Coordinated Structure → Subordinated Structure → Phonological Reduction

- | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| 5 | a. ... <i>ta</i>]- <i>ha</i>]- <i>ko</i> | ... <i>ta</i>]- <i>hako</i> | ...- <i>tako</i> |
| | b. ... <i>la</i>]- <i>ha</i>]- <i>ko</i> | ... <i>la</i>]- <i>hako</i> | ...- <i>lako</i> |
| | c. ... <i>ca</i>]- <i>ha</i>]- <i>ko</i> | ... <i>ca</i>]- <i>hako</i> | ...- <i>cako</i> |
| | d. ... <i>nya</i>]- <i>ha</i>]- <i>ko</i> | ... <i>nya</i>]- <i>hako</i> | ...- <i>nyako</i> |

- 10 3. LEXICALIZATION. After the grammaticalization of complementizers,⁶ some of the forms involving complementizers underwent conceptual change resulting in the creation of lexical forms. On the conceptual level, the lexicalization is due to strong cohesive power among the concepts represented by the participating lexical and grammatical formants. On the formal level, it is largely due to unitization of the string that permitted its reanalysis as
- 15 a single unit (cf. ‘univerbation’ Lehmann 1995[1982]), rather than being a morphologically complex construction. This type of inter-morphemic cohesion is related to the idiosyncrasies in the Korean language, i.e., sentential arguments are quite freely omitted as long as they are contextually understood and recoverable. When sentential arguments are omitted, the string of morphemes involving the complementizer (i.e., the unit consisting of the main
- 20 verb of the reported speech and the complementizer) has higher chance of being the only sentential element surviving such an omission, and thus of becoming the sole prominent element.⁷ Furthermore, the final syllable (-*ko*) of these strings triggers the reanalysis of their being adverbials, because the connective -*ko* in its source construction is one of the productive adverbializers in Korean.
- 25 With the combination of the conceptual forces and structural idiosyncrasies, the lexicalization process gained productivity; such lexicalization processes are attested with all complementizer types.

- 3.1. LEXICALIZATION FROM DECLARATIVE COMPLEMENTIZER. The lexicalization process involving declarative complementizers can be diagrammatically presented as in (8), with an example of *cwukkeysstako* ‘desperately’.
- 30

(8) *cwuk-keyss-ta-ha-ko* → *cwuk-keyss-tako* → *cwukkeysstako*
 die-FUT-DEC-say-and → die-FUT-COMP → desperately

- 35 As is evident in (8), the adverb *cwukkeysstako* is developed from a partial coordination structure that may be translated as ‘(he) says “I will die” and’ (with the coordination reading), or ‘saying “I will die”’ (with the participial construction reading), which then became

40 ⁶ cf. Rhee 2007b for more discussion on other grammaticalization paths involving complementizers.

⁷ See, however, Section 5.3 for a discussion of multiple word strings that may undergo unitization and be lexicalized.

a complementizer construction, meaning ‘that (he) will/would die’. There is an extensive shrinkage in terms of the formal structure: from a clausal structure to a single lexical item. This type of lexicalization process is also observed in more examples as shown in (9).

(9)	<i>kulehtako</i>	‘still; nonetheless’	←	‘saying “It is so.”’	5
	<i>cwuknuntako</i>	‘self-pitifully’	←	‘saying “I am dying.”’	
	<i>salkeysstako</i>	‘desperately’	←	‘saying “I will live.”’	
	<i>nacalnasstako</i>	‘haughtily’	←	‘saying “I am great.”’	
	<i>michyesstako</i>	‘nonsensically’	←	‘saying “I am insane.”’	
	<i>calhaypokeysstako</i>	‘earnestly’	←	‘saying “I will try to do it well.”’	10
	<i>salapokeysstako</i>	‘effortfully’	←	‘saying “I will try to live.”’	
	<i>mossalkeysstako</i>	‘in frustration’	←	‘saying “I can’t live.”’	

3.2. LEXICALIZATION FROM INTERROGATIVE COMPLEMENTIZER. In an exact parallel with the lexicalization process involving declarative complementizers, some of the forms involving interrogative complementizers were lexicalized as shown in (10), with the example of *weynttekinnyako* ‘gladly’.

(10)	<i>weyn-ttek-i-nya-ha-ko</i>		→	<i>weynttek-i-nyako</i>	→	<i>weynttekinnyako</i>	20
	what.kind-cake-be-INT-say-and			good.luck-be-COMP		gladly	

In the original structure, the expression *weyn ttek* is a noun phrase with a *wh*-modifier that may be translated as ‘what kind of cake?’ inquiring about the kind of occasion that has brought forth a cake, the presence of which has been just noticed by the speaker. It is a Korean tradition that in any celebrations or commemorative events such as the one which honors a child’s 100th day from birth, the first birthday, marriage, burial, memorial, etc., cake is prepared and distributed to the neighbors. People often get to eat cake, brought by their neighbors, without knowing the nature of the occasion associated with the cake. They gladly eat the cake, asking about its background: “What kind of cake is this?” From this well-established cake-distribution tradition, the expression ‘what kind of cake?’ is equated with ‘unexpected good-luck’. When the complementizer clause is lexicalized the expression is considered as a single lexical item signifying ‘gladly’. This type of interrogative complementizer-based lexicalization is attested in more examples as follows:

(11)	<i>alkeymwenyako</i>	‘nonchalantly’	←	‘saying “What should I know?”’	35
	<i>mwusuncisinyako</i>	‘protestingly’	←	‘saying “What act is it?”’	
	<i>mwusunsolinnyako</i>	‘protestingly’	←	‘saying “What sound is it?”’	
	<i>kukeyetinyako</i>	‘appreciatively’	←	‘saying “Where is it?”’	

3.3. LEXICALIZATION FROM IMPERATIVE COMPLEMENTIZER. A similar lexicalization process is attested with complementizer constructions involving imperatives. The following is an example of *nalsallilako* ‘desperately’.

- (12) *na-l-sal-li-la-ha-ko* → *na-l-sal-li-lako* → *nalsallilako*
 I-ACC-live-CAUS-IMP-say-and → I-ACC-live-CAUS-COMP → desperately

As shown in the example above, the construction headed by the coordinator *-ko*, translatable as ‘say “Let me live.” and’ or ‘saying “Let me live.”’ changes to a complementizer construction with the meaning of ‘that (they) let me live’ and further to a lexical item signifying ‘desperately’. This type of lexicalization is also attested in the following examples.

- (13) *sallyetallako* ‘begging mercy’ ← ‘saying “Please save me!”’
 10 *ttwulbecyelako* ‘attentively’ ← ‘saying “Let a hole be bored!”’
pwatallako ‘begging mercy’ ← ‘saying “Please be considerate!”’
cwukelako ‘desperately’ ← ‘saying “Die!”’
nalsallilako ‘desperately’ ← ‘saying “Save me!”’
 15 *nalcapamekulako* ‘indifferently’ ← ‘saying “Kill and eat me!”’

3.4. LEXICALIZATION FROM HORTATIVE COMPLEMENTIZER. The final set of examples for lexicalization is that of the hortative complementizer, as shown with the example of *nacohcako* ‘selfishly’.

- 20 (14) *na-cob-ca-ha-ko* → *na-cob-cako* → *nacohcako*
 I-be.good-HORT-say-and → I-be.good-COMP → selfishly

The original structure of *nacohcako* is that of a hortative construction translatable as ‘say “Let it be good to me” and’ or ‘saying “Let it be good to me”’. It is to be noted that the first person pronoun *na* ‘I’ appears without a case marker, because the case markers are generally omissible in Korean. The missing case marker is the dative *-eykey* or *-hanthey*. Also to be noted is that the main predicate *cob-*, as used here, has the meaning of ‘be good to’ or ‘be pleasing to’. Therefore, the hortative sentence *nacohca* in the source construction has the meaning of ‘let it be good to me’ rather than ‘let me be good’. A similar lexicalization pattern is observed in the examples in (15).

- (15) *cwukcako* ‘enthusiastically’ ‘saying “Let’s die!”’
 25 *cwukcasalcako* ‘obsessively’ ‘saying “Let’s die, let’s live (together)!”’
ecceccako ‘why’ ‘saying “Let’s (do it) somehow!”’
 30 *naphyenbacako* ‘selfishly’ ‘saying “Let’s make me comfortable!”’⁸

4. SUBJECTIFICATION. In the examples of lexicalization, as illustrated in the preceding discussion, the most noteworthy aspect is that the speaker’s assessment of a situation is

40 ⁸ The hortative marker *-ca* can be used either as involving the speaker and the addressee(s), i.e. speaker-inclusively, or as simply involving the addressee(s) only in a coaxing manner, i.e. speaker-exclusively. Therefore, the embedded sentence may either mean ‘Let’s make me feel comfortable.’ or ‘Let me be comfortable.’ (Cf. Hopper & Traugott 2003 for a discussion of a similar phenomenon with English hortative *let’s*.)

presented as if it were the sentential subject's utterance. This is again well illustrated by the examples in (16), where the lexicalized complementizer-constructions (marked by under-scoring) are analytically glossed and the translations are given analytically (= literally) and lexically.

- (16) a. *ku-nun sal-apo-keyss-ta-ko pammac-ulo ilha-n-ta.* 5
 he-TOP live-TRL-FUT-DEC-and night.day-INST work-PRES-DEC
 (Lit.) 'He says "I will try to live," and works day and night.'
 'He works desperately day and night (to make a living).'
- b. *ku-nun cwuk-ela-ko apb-ulbyanghay talli-ess-ta.* 10
 he-TOP die-IMP-and front-towards run-PST-DEC
 (Lit.) 'He said "Die!" and ran forward.'
 'He ran forward with all his might.'
- c. *kulehkey na-phyenba-ca-ko kamaniss-cima-la.* 15
 that.way I-be.comfortable-HORT-and remain.quiet-PROH-IMP
 (Lit.) 'Don't say "Let me be comfortable" like that and remain quiet.'
 'Don't selfishly remain quiet like that.'
- d. *ku-nun a-l-ke-y-mwue-nya-ko caleka-ss-ta.* 20
 he-TOP know-PRES-NMN-NOM-what-INT-and go.to.bed-PST-DEC
 (Lit.) 'He said "What is it that I should know?" and went to sleep.'
 'He went to sleep nonchalantly.'

In (16)a, the speaker looks at a situation where 'he' works hard, and thinks that his enthusiasm in working is to the degree where he would say to himself 'I will try to live.' In the same manner, 'he' in (16)b runs so hard that the speaker imagines him saying to himself 'Die (in doing this)!'; and the selfishness and nonchalance that he displays in (16)c and (16)d warrants the speaker's imagination of his saying 'Let me be comfortable. (= Why bother?!)' and 'What is it that I should know? (= Why should I care?!)', respectively. All these situations can be characterized as those where the speaker is describing the situation through a borrowed mouth of the sentential subject, an extreme case of the speaker's subjectification. 30

5. DISCUSSION. The observations made in this paper may be recapitulated in the following terms: In Korean, complementizers were grammaticalized, perhaps with the necessity of linguistic representation of reported speech, and created a paradigm of complementizers. These complementizers became a part of word-groups by attaching to the end of the main predicate of the reported speech, due to the idiosyncrasy of this agglutinating head-final language. However, when these word-groups were subjected to being conceptualized as single unitized concepts, these word-groups obtained lexical status. These newly developed lexical items have highly subjectified meanings because the meanings were derived from the speaker's strategy of putting the characterization of the situation into the mouth of the sentential subject. This lexicalization phenomenon raises some interesting issues in grammaticalization and lexicalization, and further in the nature of grammar and lexis. 40

5.1. GRAMMATICALIZATION AND PARADIGMS. In grammaticalization of complementizers, it seems that it was not individual sentential endings that underwent a gradual grammaticalization, as a chance development; it is rather the paradigm of sentential endings that seems to have participated in the grammaticalization process. The absence of a considerable time lapse from the beginning to the end of the formation of the complementizer paradigm strongly suggests that the most frequent sentential ending, i.e., the declarative ending, spearheaded the process, with all others following suit.⁹ If this hypothesis 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.¹⁰

5.2. PERSPECTIVES AND LEXICALIZATION. In the preceding discussion it was shown that some instances of lexicalization include clausal arguments in the string. An interesting phenomenon with reference to these instances is that the personal pronoun in them tends to be the first person pronoun (i.e., *na*) as in *nacalnasstako* 'haughtily' (< 'saying "I am great."'), *naphyenhacako* 'for his/one's own comfort' (< 'saying "Let me be comfortable."'), *nayalpaanilako* 'nonchalantly' (< 'saying "It's not my business."'), *namollalako* 'indifferently' (< 'saying "I don't know."'), etc. This is the result of the fossilization of the reported speech, in which the imaginary speaker makes reference to himself/herself, usually as the sentential subject. The process involved in this may be said to be a direct projection of the speaker's subjective judgment on the state of affairs with the guise of the sentential subject's utterance.

More interestingly, many of these lexical items have counterparts in which the first person pronoun is replaced with the second person pronoun (*ne*). This means that the sentential subject of the reported utterance is raised into the main clause, and now is the argument of the main clause. Still more interestingly, many of these lexical items have the counterparts in which the first person pronoun is replaced with a special pronoun (*ce* < *caki*), which is the third person pronoun specifically used to refer to the person coreferential with the sentential subject, thus equivalent to 'the self', just like the second 'he' in the English example: *He_i thinks he_i is good*. Therefore, using *ce* in this context means that the reported speech was in the indirect quotation mode. In other words, the use of this pronoun is based on the speaker's perspective, not on the sentential subject's perspective. Therefore, the lexicalization process in these cases involves the pronominal argument used by the reporting speaker and the predicate of the imaginary sentential subject's verbatim utterance. It can be said, then, that the lexicalized words in these cases have mixed perspectives: those of the speaker and of the imaginary sentential subjects.

⁹ Granted that the proportion of sentence type occurrence significantly varies by the text genres, declaratives are by far the most frequently used sentence type. Some studies show that declaratives account for over 50 per cent of all sentence types (cf. Han 1998 for English).

¹⁰ See Hoffmann (2005) for a discussion of grammaticalization of English complex prepositions triggered by similarities with their counterparts in French.

5.3. GRAMMAR-LEXIS DISTINCTION. The final issue for discussion relates to the grammar-lexis distinction. All of these lexicalized forms originated from syntactic constructions. However, they are perceived, though to varying degrees, as lexical items. It is for this reason that the analyzability of some of these forms is controversial. Many forms that have been unverbated into consolidated units still have transparent, yet highly complex, syntactic structures. For instance, *taliyanalsalilako* ‘(run) with all one’s might’ still retains a transparent syntactic structure that may be translated as ‘saying, “Legs, save my life!”’¹¹ 5

As a matter of fact, many of the forms discussed in this paper may be modified with other elements such as manner adverbs or recovered arguments. For instance, *salapokeysstako* ‘effortfully’ (< ‘saying “I will try to live.”’) has a variant form, *calsalapokeysstako* ‘effortfully’ (< ‘saying “I will try to live well.”’), and *weynttekinyako* ‘gladly’ (< ‘saying “What kind of cake?”’) has *ikeyweynttekinyako* ‘gladly’ (< ‘saying “What kind of cake is this?”’). When these forms incorporate other sentential elements they are more susceptible to morpho-syntactic analysis since the complexity of the form may trigger the internal analysis, instead of the single-word perception. In these cases, the grammatical status of the multi-morphemic strings becomes even more unclear between a syntactic structure and a lexical item. This state of affairs supports the view that the distinction between grammar and lexis is by no means clear, and that the mental representation of linguistic forms may be based on connections due to semantic, phonological, and structural similarities, and reinforced by the frequency of use (cf. Bybee 1985, 2007; Barlow & Kemmer 2000). 10 15 20

6. CONCLUSION. This paper shows how subjectification affects linguistic representation of reported speech with particular emphasis on lexicalization. The lexicalization process involving the quotative complementizers was fundamentally enabled by the speaker’s strategy of using the borrowed mouth, i.e., of describing the situation by means of pretended utterance of the sentential subject. There are several notable observations discussed in this paper. First, grammaticalization may be actuated by a structural analogy whereby members of an entire paradigm may follow the one member that leads the grammaticalization process, thus creating a whole new paradigm in a short period. Lexicalization may involve diverse perspectivizations of the speaker, according to which newly lexicalized forms may have multiple variants, notably with different pronouns and referring expressions. Furthermore, grammar and lexis may not be easily distinguishable when grammaticalizing forms deflect into lexicalization. This is particularly so when syntactic constructions become unverbated into unitized lexical items with conceptually single, yet structurally complex, constructions, even though the structural simplicity is more likely to yield a lexical-item analysis, whereas the structural complexity tends to yield a syntactic construction analysis. 25 30 35

¹¹ One of the reviewers comments that this expression is evidently the Korean equivalent of that old phrase often heard in Charlie Chan movies: *Feets, git me outa here!* 40

REFERENCES

- AHN, JOO-HOH. 1991. Hwuki kuntaykwukeuy inyongmwun yenkwu [A study on quotation constructions in Late Early Modern Korean]. *Jaha Emwunnonjip* 8:359–408.
- 5 ———. 2003. A study on quotation sentence and grammaticalization of quotation markers in Korean. *Discourse and cognition* 10(1):145–65.
- BARLOW, MICHAEL & SUZANNE KEMMER, eds. 2000. *Usage-based models of language*. Stanford: CSLI.
- BYBEE, JOAN L. 1985. *Morphology: A study of the relation between meaning and form*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 10 ———. 2007. *Frequency of use and the organization of language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- HAN, KI NAM. 1998. A study of the usage of English in the Internet education networks for children. MA thesis, Yonsei University.
- 15 HOFFMANN, SEBASTIAN. 2005. *Grammaticalization and English complex prepositions: A corpus-based study*. London: Routledge.
- HOPPER, PAUL J. & ELIZABETH C. TRAUOGOTT. 2003. *Grammaticalization*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KIM, SU TAE. 1994. Wulimaluy inyongphyociey tayhaye [On Korean quotation markers]
- 20 *Journal of Korean language and literature* 31:239–72.
- LEHMANN, CHRISTIAN. 1995[1982]. *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. Newcastle: LINCOM Europa.
- RHEE, SEONGHA. 2007a. What is it for if it's before me?: Subjectification and grammaticalization of English *for* and *before*. Paper presented at 2007 Joint Conference of Linguistic Society of Korea, Linguistic Society of Jeju, and Society of English Education in Korea, June 19, Cheju National University, Korea.
- 25 ———. 2007b. Subjectification of reported speech in grammaticalization and lexicalization. Paper presented at the 12th Harvard Biennial International Symposium on Korean Linguistics (ISOKL-2007), August 3–5, Harvard University, Cambridge MA.
- 30 STEIN, DIETER & SUSAN WRIGHT, eds. 1995. *Subjectivity and subjectivisation in language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- TRAUOGOTT, ELIZABETH C. 1982. From propositional to textual and expressive meanings: Some semantic-pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization. In *Perspectives in historical linguistics*, ed. Winfred Lehmann & Yakov Malkiel, 245–71, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 35 ———. 1989. On the rise of epistemic meaning in English: An example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language* 65:31–55.
- . & RICHARD DASHER. 2002. *Regularity in semantic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . & EKKEHARD KÖNIG. 1991. The semantics-pragmatics of grammaticalization revisited. In *Approaches to grammaticalization*, vol. 1, ed. Elizabeth C. Traugott & Bernd Heine, 189–218, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 40

