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Grammaticalization in Japanese and Korean

HEIKO NARROG, SEONGHA RHEE, AND JOHN WHITMAN

9.1 INTRODUCTION

9.1.1 JAPANESE AND KOREAN AS LANGUAGES OF NORTHEAST ASIA

In this volume that is organized along mainly areal groupings of languages, this chapter on Korean and Japanese represents Northeast Asia. It also represents part of a group of languages traditionally labelled as Altaic and more recently as Transeurasian, which share many structural characteristics, whether they are genetically related or not. These structural characteristics are further shared with a broader areal grouping of Northeast Asian language families including Amuric (Nivkh), Yukaghir, and Ainu, which are not normally included in Altaic/Transeurasian (TE).

Historical/comparative research has tended to focus on the relationship between Japanese and Korean and the putative ‘core’ Altaic families: Mongolic, Tungusic, and Turkic. From a typological perspective, this may obscure the salient commonalities between Korean and Japanese and the three NEA families mentioned. Most of the typological features shared by Japanese and Korean with Turkic, Mongolic, and Tungusic are shared with these three NEA families as well. Such features include head-final verbal and nominal syntax and a high index of agglutination (section 9.1.2), pervasive use of nominalization for clausal subordination, rich use of converbs with grammatical functions (section 9.2.1; Mattissen 2003 for Nivkh, Maslova 2003 for Yukaghir), pervasive use of mermaid constructions (section 9.2.2; Bugaeva 2013; Nedjalkov and Otaina 2013; Maslova 2003), a deep inventory of deverbal postpositions (section 9.2.3), and accusative alignment. Some of these features set TE/Altaic and the three families apart from immediately adjacent language groups. For example Chukotko-Kamchatkan, although in areal contact with Tungusic and Nivkh, shows...
sharply divergent typological properties: ergative alignment, direct/inverse morphosyntax, and freer word order, even between NPs and their adjectival modifiers.

Some notable typological features of Japanese and Korean not shared with some or all of the TE/Altaic languages are shared with members of this broader set of NEA languages. For example Korean and earlier Japanese (Whitman 2016) share with Nivkh and Yukaghir and arguably Ainu (Shibatani 1990) the property of RTR (retracted tongue root)-dominant vowel harmony (Ko, Joseph, and Whitman 2014). This property is also shared with two members of core Altaic, Mongolic, and Tungusic, but not with most Turkic varieties. In terms of other phonological commonalities, Ainu, Japanese, and Korean are the only languages in the region originally lacking a two-way contrast in laryngeal features for obstruents and displaying lexical pitch accent. From the standpoint of morphosyntax, earlier Japanese, many Ryukyuan varieties, and Yukaghir display the type of focus concord pattern known in premodern Japanese as kakarimusubi (Maslova 2003). This pattern is not found in Korean or any of the Altaic languages. In terms of other grammaticalization patterns, Korean, Japanese, and Nivkh are the only language groups in Northeast Asia with inflecting adjectives, which in the case of Korean and Nivkh are essentially indistinguishable from stative verbs. Korean, Japanese, and Nivkh also share the property of having numeral classifiers (9.2.4).

The point of listing these areal/typological similarities is not to deny the validity of one or the other linguistic grouping, but rather to alert the reader to the existence of areal patterns that extend beyond and in some cases cross-cut better-known groupings such as Transeurasian/Altaic. As in other linguistic areas, some typological isoglosses pick out distinct subsets. Japanese, Korean, and Ainu group together with respect to a number of phonological features (lack of a laryngeal distinction in consonants, lack of an r/l distinction, pitch accent), while Japanese, Korean and Nivkh group together with regard to morphosyntactic features distinctive in the region such as numeral classifiers and inflecting adjectives. Against the backdrop of typological parallels with other languages of Northeast Asia, we focus in this chapter on Japanese and Korean because of their relatively long documented histories and extensive research traditions.

9.1.2 TYPOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS AND HISTORICAL DOCUMENTATION OF THE TWO LANGUAGES

Korean and Japanese have been a strictly head-final SOV language with accusative alignment, and with frequent omission of argument NPs, throughout their documented history. Morphologically, Japanese is agglutinating, and given the head-final nature of the language, clear cases of grammaticalization typically lead to the suffixation of formerly independent morphemes (i.e. lexemes). Prefixation is much less common, confined to a small number of categories, mostly honorification and negation (cf. 9.2.4.2). For Japanese, relatively large amounts of texts are available with some gaps from the 8th century until now. However, the accessibility of texts for
non-specialists also varies period by period,¹ and no comprehensive historical corpora have been published yet.²

As is the case with Japanese, suffixation is much more common than prefixation in Korean. Prefixation, though less common in general, is often used to derive honorific or pejorative terms from value-neutral words (Koo 2004). For Korean, the historical depth of texts written in Hangeul, the Korean alphabet, goes back to the 15th century, and a large body of texts has been compiled through government-led projects such as the 21st-Century Sejong Project. Identifiably Korean texts written in Chinese characters date back to the 5th century CE (Nam 2012; Whitman 2015). Prior to the invention of Hangeul, several different writing systems were used, such as Itwu, Hyangchal, and Kwukyel, that made use of Chinese characters for their meaning (semantogram) or sound (phonogram) to represent Korean words, thus creating a problem for modern scholars in translating such texts. Recently many advances have been made in deciphering such texts found in poems, tombstone inscriptions, ledgers, administrative reports, pedigrees records, and the like.

Note that the structural characteristics of Japanese and Korean mentioned here are shared across Transeurasian languages as well as Nivkh, Yukaghir, and for the most part Ainu. Within the larger grouping, however, Ainu is an outlier, with substantial prefixation and features of polysynthesis, such as extensive noun incorporation (Shibatani 1990). This raises the possibility that Ainu descends from an ancestor with a substantially different typological profile, but has converged with the languages discussed here through contact with Japanese.

9.2 SOME REPRESENTATIVE PROCESSES OF GRAMMATICALIZATION IN THESE LANGUAGES

In this section we will provide a brief overview of processes of grammaticalization that should be representative for the languages discussed in this chapter. While it is difficult to quantify what is representative, we focus on changes that are (a) recurring, i.e. several morphemes or constructions have undergone the same kind of grammaticalization, at various periods of time, (b) not commonly found in the well-known European languages, and (c) recorded in historically documented times and not merely a matter of historical reconstruction. Furthermore, we are primarily interested in grammaticalizations that are found in Northeast Asian languages and so-called Transeurasian languages beyond Korean and Japanese. This is especially true of the grammaticalizations presented in sections 9.2.1 and 9.2.2, while those presented in

¹ The following historical period labels are used here: OJ: Old Japanese (6th–8th c.); LOJ: Late Old Japanese (9th–11th c.); MIDJ: Middle Japanese (12th–18th c.); EMJ: Early Modern Japanese (18th–19th c.); MEK: Modern Japanese (late 19th c. –); OK: Old Korean (–9th c.); MK: Modern Korean (–20th c. –).
² See, however, the University of Virginia’s Japanese Text Archive, http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/japanese/, and a historical corpus project at NINJAL (http://pj.ninjal.ac.jp/corpus_center/en/kotonoha.html), which includes a parsed corpus of Old Japanese released in March 2018 (http://oncoj.ninjal.ac.jp/).
9.2.3 and 9.2.4 seem to be specific to Japanese and Korean, apparently motivated by the need or desire to accommodate Chinese loan vocabulary.

**9.2.1 CONVERBS WITH GRAMMATICAL FUNCTION**

Cross-linguistically, in sequences of two verbs, one verb may lose its semantic independence and modify the other, providing information on grammatical categories such as tense and aspect, and directionality, or changing argument structure. There are three major constructions in which this happens, and in which the modifying verb still morphologically retains lexeme status (i.e. does not become an affix): (a) serial verb construction (SVC), (b) converbs, and (c) compound verbs. In (c), the two verbs form one phonological and morphological word, while they remain two words in (a) and (b). Thus, (a) and (b) can be considered sub-cases of the same phenomenon. The difference between (a) and (b) is that in serial verb constructions, there is no overt coordination/subordination within the construction, while in verb constructions, one verb is marked as subordinate and typically shows restrictions on marking for other verbal categories. That is, there is a clear formal asymmetry between the two verbs (cf. Bisang 1995: 141; Ansaldo 2006: 261). It has been suggested that SVCs tend to occur in languages with little morphology or little obligatoriness of marking of grammatical categories, and that the distribution of SVCs vs converbs is an areal phenomenon (see Bisang 1995: 170–6; Ansaldo 2006: 260–61). But this does not mean that one language cannot have both constructions, or all of them, including compound verbs. Northeast Asian languages, and beyond them so-called Altaic languages including Turkic, have been treated as languages typically having converbs (see e.g. Haspelmath and König 1995). Korean and Japanese fall squarely within that type. Note that we find converbs (e.g. gerunds) and to a lesser extent serial verb constructions (*Go get it!* in the well-known European languages, too, but they have not grammaticalized into paradigms expressing grammatical categories. The following tables and short descriptions of grammaticalizations give a glimpse of how they have grammaticalized in Japanese and Korean. Note that Chapter 8 in this volume, by Johanson and Csató, additionally contains descriptions of the grammaticalization of converbs in Turkic languages.

Table 9.1 shows common converb constructions in Standard Modern Japanese. The dates for grammaticalization here and in Table 9.3 are taken from the NKD.

Below, we give two examples. (1) shows the benefactive *mora(w)*- as a lexical verb ‘receive’, and (2) as a benefactive. The event *kuturog*- event does not involve actual transfer of anything. It merely indicates a vague relationship of benefit, such as that the writer was happy about many people being able to relax in the facility.

1. *Sapuraizu=de ko-inu=wo morat.ta#*
   surprise-ESS kid-dog-ACC receive-PST
   ‘I received a puppy as a surprise.’

2. *Syukuhaku sisetu=de ooku=no gesuto=ni kuturoi.de morat.ta#*
   lodging facility-ESS many-GEN guest-DAT relax-GER receive-PST
   ‘I had many guests relaxing in the lodging facility.’
TABLE 9.1. Common converb constructions in Modern Japanese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Original meaning</th>
<th>Grammatical function</th>
<th>Date of grammaticalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BENEFACTIVES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Te kure-</td>
<td>GER give</td>
<td>General benefactive</td>
<td>14th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Te yar/-age-</td>
<td>GER give</td>
<td>Other-benefactive</td>
<td>10th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Te mora(w)/itadak-</td>
<td>GER receive</td>
<td>Self-benefactive</td>
<td>17th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASPECTUALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Te i-</td>
<td>GER be</td>
<td>Continuative</td>
<td>13th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Te ar-</td>
<td>GER be</td>
<td>Stative resultative</td>
<td>8th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Te sima(w)-</td>
<td>GER finish</td>
<td>Completive</td>
<td>17th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Te ok-</td>
<td>GER put</td>
<td>Action result</td>
<td>8th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIRECTIONAL/ ASPECTUALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Te k-</td>
<td>GER come</td>
<td>Directional; continuative</td>
<td>8th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Te ik-</td>
<td>GER go</td>
<td>Directional; continuative</td>
<td>19th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONATIVES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Te mi-</td>
<td>GER see</td>
<td>Conative</td>
<td>10th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Te mise-</td>
<td>GER show</td>
<td>'Show/prove being able '</td>
<td>12th c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) and (4) present the case of the directional/aspectual ik- ‘go’. (3) shows ik- in its literal sense, and in its aspectual reading, which denotes a continuous development towards a goal, not any actual movement.

(3) $Arubedo=wa\ kasei=ni\ it.ta#$
    PN-TOP Mars-DAT go-PST
    'Alvedo went to Mars.'

(4) $Arubedo=wa\ zyozyoni\ kyooki=ni\ katamui.te\ it.ta#$
    PN-TOP little.by.little madness-DAT verge-GER go-PST
    'Alvedo descended little by little into madness.'

Korean has a number of converb markers. First introduced in Ramstedt (1997[1939]: 'converbum/converbalia’) in his description of Korean verbal morphology, the notion of ‘converb’ received little attention from Korean linguists until recently (cf. pwutongs; Ko 2013). According to Ramstedt (1997[1939]: 87), converbs signal

³ Converbs as a grammatical category have not been established in Korean linguistics and thus cannot be neatly delineated from related grammatical categories of diverse linking functions. Ramstedt
that ‘the sentence is not finished’ but a [sic] the main verb is following’ (emphasis original). Among the converb markers, -e (and its allomorph -a) figures as the most frequently used form, which forms diverse constructions that often developed into auxiliary verb constructions. Because of extensive semantic bleaching, -e is generally labelled as a non-finite (NFIN) marker. Some of the common converb constructions formed with the linker -e are exemplified in Table 9.2.

The verb of locomotion -ka ‘go’ has a long history as a lexical verb attested in earlier Korean. Along with its lexical use exemplified in (5), it developed into a marker of continuative aspect as shown in (6).

(5) icy etule ka-nan-ta
    now where go-PRS-Q
    ‘Where are you going now?’ (Penyeknokeltay, c.1517, I: 1a)

(6) hanal-to hama palk-a ka-na-ta
    sky=also already be.bright-NFIN go-PRS-DEC
    ‘The sky is already becoming bright now (the day is breaking now).’ (Penyeknokeltay, c.1517, I: 58a)

(1997[1939]) lists as many as 16 subcategories of converbalia in Korean. Similarly, Johanson (1995) and König (1995) include a large number of linkers under this label, in which case the category would be a large collection of heterogeneous markers. In a more restrictive sense, the linkers -a/e, -key, -ci, and -ko, traditionally known as adverbializers, constitute converbs.
The verb of giving tuli- is inherently marked with the [+HON] feature, contrasting with the neutral cwi-, and thus was used to describe a transfer in the direction from a social inferior to a social superior, e.g. from a student to the teacher or from a child to the parent. Around the end of the 18th century, it was grammaticalized into the benefactive marker, still retaining the upward directionality, as shown in the following examples.

(7) wuli pwumo=i thayca=skuy tuli-zava-si-ni
our parents-NOM prince-to give(+HON)-HON-HON-CONJ
‘…as my parents gave [me] away to prince [=Buddha] (as his wife)…’
(Sekposangcel, 1447, 7a)

(8) etop-ketun ca-si-l cali=lul tolpow-a tuli-ko
be.dark-if sleep-HON-ADN place-ACC take.care-NFIN give-and
‘When it is dark, [a dutiful son’s job is] to prepare the place for [his parents] to sleep in, and…’ (Cengsokehay, 1792, 2b)

The converb patterns in Tables 9.1 and 9.2 show a good deal of overlap, but there are some important differences. Korean lacks a counterpart to the Japanese V-te mora(w)-‘have/get V’ pattern in (2), which has the structure of a causative in that the subject of the converb is distinct from the subject of the second verb. Both languages have completive or perfective patterns involving a predicate of disposal as the second verb, but these have distinct sources: Korean peli- ‘discard’ and Japanese sima(w)- ‘put to an end’.

The forms of the converb also show interesting similarities and differences. In both languages the infinitive (to adopt the term used by Martin 1987, 1993) is the older converbal pattern. In earlier Japanese the infinitive in -i was the chief converbal form, e.g. kapyer-i ko-sa-mu return-INF come-HON-FUT ‘will come home’ (MY 3774), sukup-i tambap-a na save-INF give-IRR DESID ‘please save (us)’ (Bussokusekika, 753). In modern Japanese the infinitive is largely confined to compounds (see following paragraph) and other bound usages, replaced in its converbal function by the gerund in -te shown in Table 9.1. In Korean the infinitive in -e/a is still the dominant converb form, but it has undergone univerbation in the formation of the modern past -e/ass- from -e/a + iss- ‘be, exist’, which coexists with the non-univerbated stative resultative in Table 9.2. Modern Korean has developed converb patterns formed with the gerundive suffix -ko, as in progressive V-ko iss- V-GER be ‘be V-ing’ and desiderative V-ko siph- V-GER want ‘want to V’. Both languages have developed a past tense from an aspectual (resultative or perfective) pattern involving converb plus ‘be’: Japanese V-te ar- V-GER be > V-tar- > V-ta V-PAST (see Table 9.8) and Korean V-e/a iss V-INF be > V-e/ass- V-PAST.

Compound verbs also play an important role in Japanese vocabulary and grammar. Compounding is an area which is primarily associated with lexicalization rather than grammaticalization, but some verbs such as hazime- ‘begin’ and tuduke- ‘continue’ can be productively added to a large range of other verb stems in aspectual function, as in tabe-hazime- ‘begin to eat’ (cf. Matsumoto 1996).

Similarly, verb compounding is among the most productive means of lexicalization in Korean. Word formation involving multiple verbs may involve asyndetic connection of multiple verbs, a true V-V compound pattern, resembling serial verb formation in other languages in appearance, as in ttwinol- ‘romp about’ (<ttwi ‘jump’-nol ‘play’), khaymwut- ‘interrogate’ (<khay ‘dig’-mwut ‘ask’), etc. This type of compounding, however, is not productive. A much more productive pattern is one making use of the
converb marker -a/e to connect the participating verbs (see section 9.2.1). Incidentally, using the converb -a/e is also the most common pattern of verb serialization and auxiliary verb formation in Korean. Owing to the superficial similarity in patterns, it is often difficult to determine whether the resultant forms are compound verbs, SVCs, or auxiliary verb constructions. The distinction between SVCs on the one hand and compound verbs and auxiliary verb constructions on the other largely depends on the interpretation of the single/multiple event interpretation, and on whether the verb of secondary meaning (typically V2) encodes a grammatical notion, e.g. pokk-a mek- ‘roast-NFIN eat’ denotes two events, whereas ttwi-e ka ‘run-NFIN go’ (= ‘run, go running’) and cwul-e tul- ‘diminish-NFIN enter’ (= ‘shrink, become shrunk’) denote single events; ka- ‘go’ in ttwi-e ka- ‘run, go running’ denotes physical locomotion whereas tul- ‘enter’ in cwul-e tul- ‘shrink, become shrunk’ marks the grammatical notion of inchoative. However, there are ambiguous cases that allow multiple interpretations, as in tol-a po- ‘turn-NFIN see’ between ‘turn and see’ and ‘reminisce’, and kkwulh-e anc- ‘genuflcct-NFIN sit’ between ‘kneel and sit’ and ‘kneel down.’

As this discussion implies, while Japanese has a clear formal distinction between converbs (formed with gerundive -te) and V-V compounds (formed with infinitive -i), Korean does not. Infinitive -e/a is used on the first verb of the converbal constructions in Table 9.2, ‘object sharing’ V-V sequences referred to in the Korean descriptive tradition as serial verb constructions such as kkakk-a mek- ‘peel-INF eat’ (Chung 1993), and V-V sequences denoting a single event. Although some earlier studies refer to the latter two types as V-V compounds (e.g. Sohn 1976), none of the Korean patterns is as tightly bound as Japanese compound verbs. As shown in (9a) and (9b), Korean V-e/a V sequences can be split by a focus or delimiter particle, while this is never possible with Japanese V-V compounds:

(9) a. Mina=nun sakwa=lul kkakk-a (=man) mek-nun-ta. (Korean)
Mina-TOP apple-ACC peel-NFIN (-only) eat-PRS-DEC
‘Mina eats only peeled apples.’ (lit. ‘Mina only peels apples and eats (them)’)
Or: Mina=nun sakwa=lul kkakk-a (=to) mek-nun-ta. (Korean)
Mina-TOP apple-ACC peel-NFIN (-only) eat-PRS-DEC
‘Mina eats peeled apples, too.’ (lit. ‘Mina also peels apples and eats (them).’)

b. Mina=wa suber-i(*=mo) oti-ta. (Japanese)
Mina-TOP slip-INF(*-even) fall-PST
‘Mina slipped and fell.’

The looser juncture between Korean V-INF V sequences may give a hint as to the status of V-INF V sequences in earlier Japanese, when the infinitive could still function as a converbal ending: it would be hasty to assume that such sequences were already compounds simply because their modern Japanese counterparts are (cf. Frellesvig et al. 2010).

The asyndetic V-V pattern in Korean noted above is a true V-V compound pattern that has no counterpart either in Japanese or in Altaic: it is a bare root compounds where the first verb is completely unaffixed. Thus together with kkulh-e olu- boil-INF rise ‘come to a boil’ we find LMK kul-talh- boil-get.reduced ‘boil down’ and others, as shown in (10) (the bare root compound retains the original unreinforced initial, and simplifies the stem final cluster).
(10) *ttwi-e nol*-jump-INF *ttwi-nol*-‘jump around’; *tol-a po*-turn-INF *tol-po*-‘turn and see, reminisce’; *pwuth-e sal*-attach-INF *pwuth-cap*-‘catch

Martin (1997) cites about 200 examples of this type, already present in LMK. They are more highly lexicalized than V-e/a V sequences: they are not productive, they typically denote a single event, their meaning is sometimes non-compositional, and they cannot be separated by a particle.

### 9.2.2 Grammaticalization of Nouns as Markers of Verbal Categories (‘Mermaid Constructions’)

A phenomenon virtually unknown in core European languages but common across languages formerly labeled as Altaic and now as Transeurasian, including Japanese and Korean, comprises nouns grammaticalizing to markers of modal, evidential, and other categories in the verbal complex of the main clause. Tsunoda (2013) has provided a survey of this phenomenon across Asian languages. The noun in predicate-modifying position loses some of its categorical features but also retains some. Especially, it can be followed by a copula like other nouns serving as predicates. Thus, a clause with one of these grammaticalized nouns has the syntax of an ordinary clause with a verbal predicate to the left, while it ends on a copula like a copular clause with a nominal predicate to the right, without having the syntax of a copular clause. Hence the label ‘mermaid construction’.

Table 9.3 contains a list of nouns commonly used in mermaid constructions in Modern Japanese.

Below, we give an example. (11) shows the noun *wake* in its lexical function, and (12) as a predicate modifier. In (11), *wake* functions as a regular noun, and an argument of another verb. In (12) it indicates a logical relationship between two clauses, namely that the state of affairs depicted in the clause marked by *wake* is the consequence of a state of affairs depicted in the preceding clause. This logical relationship is not always as clear as in ex. (12). *Wake* simply indicates that the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Original meaning</th>
<th>Grammatical function</th>
<th>Approximate date of grammaticalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>hazu</em></td>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>Epistemic necessity</td>
<td>17th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wake</em></td>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>Conclusion, or reason for previous clause</td>
<td>19th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mono</em></td>
<td>Thing</td>
<td>Obligation, habituality etc.</td>
<td>~ 18th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>koto</em></td>
<td>Thing</td>
<td>Mandative; others</td>
<td>~ 8th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tokoro</em></td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Temporal conjunction</td>
<td>11th c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
state-of-affairs stands in some logical relationship to something else in the linguistic or non-linguistic context.

(11) \textit{Kimi=no sini-ta.i wake=o kik-ase.te kure#}
\\you-GEN die-BOU-NPS reason hear-CAU-GER give

'Tell me the reason why you want to die.'

(12) \textit{Watasi-wa nan=to=ka iki-ta-kat.ta=node ikkei=o anzi, hikooki=de}
\\I-TOP what-QUO-Q go-BOU-VBZ-PST-CAS plan-ACC think plane-ESS
\\hi~gaeri~si.ta wake=des.u#
\\day-return-do-PST wake-POL-NPS

'Since I wanted to go there by any means, I thought out a plan and went there on a day trip by aeroplane.'

Korean has a large inventory of nouns that can form mermaid constructions. The nominals in mermaid constructions range from those with nearly completely bleached semantics amounting to 70 (Kwon 1985) to those that show a split phenomenon, with one lexical noun with full semantic content and one devoid of such content (Ahn 1997; Rhee 2008, 2011; Kim 2013). The nouns with no semantic content, thus labeled as dependent nouns or defective nouns, invariably occur in mermaid constructions, as illustrated in part in Table 9.4. (NB: The approximate dates of grammaticalization in the table are inconclusive since the semantics of lexical nouns vs. that of mermaid constructions cannot be sharply delineated.)

Examples (13) and (14) show the noun \textit{cikyeng (tikyeng)} 'domain' before and after grammaticalization.

(13) \textit{cikyeng=i niz-e sahom ani ho-n nal ep-te-ni}
\\domain-NOM connect-CONJ war NEG do-ADN day not.exist-RETR-CONJ

'Since [the Wu and Han Kingdoms] shared a boundary, not a day passed without a war, and . . .' (Nayhwun, 1475, 2:89b)

(14) \textit{yempyeng=ey keuy cwuk-ul tikyeng-i-la}
\\typhoid.fever-at nearly die-ADN domain-be-END

'[A devout man] was nearly dead with typhoid fever.' (Cyunyenchyemlyeyk-wangik, 1865, 20a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9.4. Some nouns commonly used in mermaid constructions of Modern Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cikyeng (= tikyeng)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nolus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.2.3 DEVELOPMENT OF DE-VERBAL POSTPOSITIONS

The last example differs from the previous one, in that it concerns a construction that has thrived in Japanese and Korean, but not in many geographically close Transeur-asian languages. One major motivation for the formation of these postpositions seems to be contact with (mostly written) Chinese, and the need to translate prepositions or verbs with prepositional function (cf. Djamouri and Paul 2009) from that language. With their variegated contents, only some of them corresponded to simple case particles in Korean and Japanese, so that new constructions had to be put into service to render them. This was achieved through verbs and verbal nouns assuming postpositional function. Their basic structure is represented in (1). 'PV' stands for 'postpositional verb'.

(15) Kor. N=ey/ul PV+-ko/a/e
Jap. N=ni/o PVb/Vb+Te

Ey and ul in Korean are locative-dative and accusative case particles, respectively, and ni and o their Japanese counterparts. There are a few cases of de-verbal postpositions with different case on the preceding noun and in a different inflectional form that will be listed individually in the tables on each language. Given that these semi-grammaticalized verbs govern the case of the noun phrase preceding it, they correspond structurally closely to adpositions in Indo-European languages.

Table 9.5 lists a selection of the most common de-verbal postpositions in Japanese according to descriptions as Suzuki (2007) and Tanaka (2010). Those marked with percentage symbol '%' are based on a Sino-Japanese morpheme. The Chinese character is given in the next row without brackets.

It is worth noticing that the postpositional verb constructions listed here are not all inherited from proto-Japanese but are the result of historical developments from Late Old (Early Middle) Japanese on. As mentioned above, it is reasonable to assume that the development of the class as a whole has been motivated to a large degree by the practice of transposing Chinese into Japanese. Some of these constructions (e.g. o motte, ni oite) may be entirely calques (cf. Yamada 1935; Chen 2005).

Korean has a large number of de-verbal postpositions. Table 9.6 lists a selection of the most common de-verbal postpositions in Korean. Those marked with a percentage symbol % are based on a Sino-Korean morpheme.

As shown in the morphological breakdown in Table 9.6, PVs typically follow a postpositional particle and are followed themselves by the NFIN markers -ko or -e/a (the latter become y or ye if preceded by the light verb ha-).

There are cases of PVs involving Sino-Korean morphemes fitting into the general template of [case particle V-NFIN]. However, the cases listed in Table 9.6 (and a few more) constitute a unique class, in that the Sino-Korean verbs at the V position contain a monosyllabic Chinese word that is never used by itself.

Besides the PVs which are similar to Japanese in their structure, Korean has a smaller group of native verb-derived particles with adpositional-like functions, as shown in Table 9.7.
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### Table 9.5. De-verbal postpositions in Japanese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postpositional verb</th>
<th>Sino-Japanese source</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Lexical source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ni atatte</td>
<td>常</td>
<td>in the course of</td>
<td>atar- (V) ‘to hit upon’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni oite</td>
<td>於</td>
<td>at/concerning</td>
<td>ok- (V) ‘to put’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ni kassite</td>
<td>平</td>
<td>concerning</td>
<td>kass- (V) ‘be related to’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ni saisite</td>
<td>平</td>
<td>at the occasion of</td>
<td>sai (N) ‘occasion’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni sitagatte</td>
<td>往</td>
<td>following</td>
<td>sitagaw- (V) ‘to follow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ni taisite</td>
<td>對</td>
<td>towards, against</td>
<td>tais- (V) ‘to face’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni tuite</td>
<td>關</td>
<td>about</td>
<td>tuk- (V) ‘to attach to’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni tuki</td>
<td>關</td>
<td>concerning</td>
<td>tuk- (V) ‘to attach to’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni turete</td>
<td>隨</td>
<td>accompanying</td>
<td>ture- (V) ‘to accompany’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni totte</td>
<td>限</td>
<td>as for</td>
<td>tor- (V) ‘to take’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni tomonatte</td>
<td>限</td>
<td>accompany</td>
<td>tomonaw- (V) ‘accompany’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni yotte</td>
<td>由、因</td>
<td>by, because of</td>
<td>yor- (V) ‘to come near, depend on’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o megutte</td>
<td>关</td>
<td>about</td>
<td>megur- (V) ‘to circle around’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o motte</td>
<td>以</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>mot- (V) ‘to hold’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o toosite</td>
<td>通</td>
<td>through</td>
<td>toos- (V) ‘to pass through’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9.6. De-verbal postpositions in Korean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postpositional verb</th>
<th>Sino-Korean source</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Lexical source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ey ttal-a</td>
<td>隨</td>
<td>according to</td>
<td>ttalu- (V) ‘to follow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ey tak-a</td>
<td>隨</td>
<td>onto</td>
<td>taku- (V) ‘to draw near’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ey tay-ko</td>
<td>隨</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>tay- (V) ‘to touch’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo/eyse pwuth-e</td>
<td>依</td>
<td>from</td>
<td>pwuth- (V) ‘to adhere’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ey tayha-y</td>
<td>對</td>
<td>regarding, about</td>
<td>tayha- (V) ‘to encounter’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ul wiha-y</td>
<td>依</td>
<td>for</td>
<td>wiha- (V) ‘to serve, take care of’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ey uyha-y</td>
<td>依</td>
<td>by</td>
<td>uyha- (V) ‘to rely on’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ey piha-y</td>
<td>比</td>
<td>as compared to</td>
<td>piha- (V) ‘to compare with’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ey kwanha-y</td>
<td>依</td>
<td>regarding, about</td>
<td>kwanha- (V) ‘to relate to’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ey hanha-y</td>
<td>依</td>
<td>restricted to</td>
<td>hanha- (V) ‘to restrict’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unlike the PVs in Table 9.6, these postposition-like PVs do not govern case-marked nouns but directly follow the unmarked noun as suffixes. They have thus further grammaticalized into particles as as marker either of case or of information structuring and scalarity. This is the most prominent difference from the PVs listed in Table 9.6, which still depend on the presence of particles on the preceding noun such as ey, ul. There are items that show a minimal pair relationship in terms of function in that the same lexical item diverges in its functions depending on the use and non-use of a postpositional particle preceding it, e.g. ey ttala and ul ttala for ‘according to’ vs ttala for adversative, both from ttalu- ‘follow’.

Japanese has a smaller inventory of postpositions derived from original native converbs, but the examples that exist provide instructive comparisons with Korean. Among delimiter/focus particles, –sape ‘even’ is usually held to be derived from sop-e ‘attach, accompany-INF’. Locative =ni and dynamic locative =de < ni-te are taken to be derived from the infinitive and gerundive forms respectively of a defective copula nV-. The clause-coordinating particle =si most likely originates from the infinitive of su ‘do’, although details are obscure. Like the Korean examples in Table 9.7, all of these verb-derived postpositions attach directly to their host, without an intervening case marker. All but the last (which dates to LMJ) are already intact by OJ. These facts again show that Japanese converbs in infinitive -i are involved in an older layer of grammaticalization. However, as shown in Table 9.5, many of the complex postpositions (PVs) calqued from Chinese sources allow both the infinitive ending -i/-e or gerundive -te; in these cases it is the gerundive form in -te that shows more properties consistent with grammaticalization as a postposition (Ikegami 2006).

### 9.2.4 NOUN CLASSIFICATION

Lastly it should be mentioned that another prominent grammatical category grammaticalized prolifically in Korean and Japanese—at least partially under the influence
of Chinese, but not necessarily in other Northeast Asian or Transeurasian languages—is numeral classification.

Korean has about three dozen numeral classifiers, about half of which are of Chinese origin. The most widely used classifier is kay (個) for individuated non-human objects. Other common classifiers include tay (臺) for vehicles and mechanical units, myeng (名) for humans, can (盞) for liquids in a glass, kwen (卷) for books, and cang (張) for sheets.

Since half or more of the numeral classifiers in both languages are derived from Chinese, it is tempting to think that numeral classifiers in Korean and Japanese are the result of Chinese influence. (Note that in Chinese itself numeral classifiers have increased in number and obligatory over time; in Old Chinese, numeral quantification was possible with bare numerals.) Within Northeast Asia, numeral classifiers are only marginally attested in Altaic (Janhunen 2000), but they are robustly present in Nivkh (Nedjalkov and Otaina 2013). Across these languages, specific quantified expressions (e.g. expressions for numbers of days, or numbers of persons) tend to be highly lexicalized and have no Chinese or other external source. This may indicate that numeral classifiers are an archaic trait in Northeast Asia, as suggested by Janhunen, best preserved in the peripheral languages Nivkh, Korean, and Japanese.

9.3 WHAT IS SPECIAL ABOUT GRAMMATICALIZATION IN JAPANESE AND KOREAN

After presenting a number of grammaticalization processes that are common and thus representative for Japanese and Korean, or even the larger language area to which these languages belong (sections 9.2.1, 9.2.2), as compared with typical European languages, this section broaches three aspects of grammaticalization in Korean and Japanese that may be of some value in critically examining various theories of grammaticalization, and which, again, are not found to the same degree in typical European languages. First, both languages offer good examples for ‘reductionist’ approaches to grammaticalization (section 9.3.1). Second, both languages abound in examples of grammaticizations in the interpersonal domain (section 9.3.2). Third, a fair amount of grammaticalization in both languages has taken place under the influence of written language (section 9.3.3).

9.3.1 GOOD FIT WITH RESPECT TO TRADITIONAL REDUCTIVE CRITERIA OF GRAMMATICALIZATION

In traditional approaches to grammaticalization, especially those prominently espoused by Lehmann (2002) and Bybee (2003a, 2006b), grammaticalization is taken mainly as a reductive process, leading to the loss of autonomy of some linguistic units. Setting up the three parameters of weight, cohesion, and variability in a paradigmatic and syntagmatic dimension, Lehmann (2002: 110–46) posited six processes of grammaticalization: (1) loss of integrity (weight), i.e. attrition, desemanticization, and decategorialization; (2) increasing paradigmaticity (cohesion), i.e. paradigmaticization; (3) loss of
paradigmatic variability (variability), i.e. obligatorification; (4) shrinking of the morphological scope of a sign (weight), i.e. condensation; (5) increase in bondedness (cohesion), i.e. coalescence (also ‘univerbation’); and (6) loss of syntagmatic variability (variability), i.e. fixation. All these processes may have morphological, syntactic, and semantic aspects, but in Lehmann’s description, the morphological aspects are foregrounded. Bybee (2003a, 2006b) espouses a concept of grammaticalization as habituation and automatization through frequent repetition, which leads to phonetic and phonological reduction, fusion, and semantic bleaching.

Morphology and phonology are the areas to which the ideas of reduction and loss of autonomy can be most clearly and unambiguously applied. Heine and Reh (1984) proposed a catalogue of related changes in African languages. With respect to phonology, they distinguish adaptation, erosion, fusion, and loss, and with respect to morphology permutation, compounding, cliticization, affixation, and fossilization. Here, Japanese and Korean fit the bill very well, even better than from what we know of the typical European languages in historically documented times.

Morphologically, head-final Korean and Japanese are prevalently agglutinating, and grammaticalization typically leads to the suffixation of formerly independent morphemes. Assimilation and some fusion between stem and suffixes is not uncommon.

To start with Japanese, one can distinguish three distributional classes of suffixes: (i) inflections (only on verbs and adjectives), (ii) particles, and (iii) derivative suffixes (cf. Rickmeyer 1995 for details). Particles are more loosely bound to stems than the other two classes. Derivative suffixes do not necessarily change word class, but simply derive enlarged stems. Particles and derivative suffixes can themselves inflect (in this case, traditional school grammar classifies them as jodōshi ‘auxiliary verbs’). Based on historical evidence, the following cline of grammaticalization between these morpheme classes can be posited.

\[
(16) \text{word/construction} > (\text{particle}) > \text{suffix} > \text{inflection}
\]

(c.f. Narrog and Ohori 2011: 777)

‘Particle’ is put into parentheses because this step can be (and frequently is) skipped. Two salient accompanying tendencies are, first, loss of inflection with inflecting words and, second, loss of phonological substance (attrition). Furthermore, frequently two or more morphemes fuse into one. Table 9.8 shows some examples of morphological reduction in the course of grammaticalization.

While these are not the only examples of phonological erosion, fusion, affixation, etc., the number of such examples is limited, and the two politeness markers -mas- and des- are probably already the two examples in Standard Modern Japanese that exhibit the greatest extent of phonological reduction. Furthermore, it deserves to be noted that significant phonological fusion and reduction are only found in verb-attached material.

In Korean, examples of rather dramatic phonological and morphological reduction accompanying grammaticalization involving multiple morphemes seem to be even more plentiful than in Japanese. Some reductive changes are listed in Table 9.9.

It is noteworthy in Table 9.9 that the honorific nominative case marker -kkeye/ developed from two different sources, i.e. verbal and nominal sources (Yi 1993:
### Table 9.8. Examples of reductive changes accompanying grammaticalization in documented Japanese language history

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Morphological category</th>
<th>Meaning/function</th>
<th>Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mawi-ir.as-</td>
<td>Compound verb with suffix verb</td>
<td>'let come'</td>
<td>-mas-</td>
<td>Suffix verb</td>
<td>Politeness</td>
<td>Phonological erosion and morphological fusion; affixation, bleaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de gozai.mas-</td>
<td>Humble verb of existence preceded by particle</td>
<td>'be' (humble)</td>
<td>des-</td>
<td>Particle verb</td>
<td>Politeness</td>
<td>Phonological erosion and morphological fusion; affixation, bleaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka sir-an(.u)</td>
<td>Verb with negative suffix preceded by interrogative particle</td>
<td>'I don't know whether'</td>
<td>kasira</td>
<td>Particle</td>
<td>Doubt (interrogation)</td>
<td>Phonological erosion and morphological fusion; affixation, bleaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(a)m.u</td>
<td>Suffix verb</td>
<td>Future, intention</td>
<td>-(y)oo</td>
<td>Inflection</td>
<td>Hortative</td>
<td>Morphological and phonological fusion; paradigmaticization, bleaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tar.u</td>
<td>Suffix verb</td>
<td>Resultative</td>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>Inflection</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Phonological erosion and morphological loss; paradigmaticization, bleaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9.9. Examples of reductive changes accompanying grammaticalization in documented Korean language history

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Morphological category</th>
<th>Meaning/function</th>
<th>Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) kyesi-e</td>
<td>(a) exist(+HON)-NFIN</td>
<td>(a) honoured subject exists and (b) x exists at x’s place and</td>
<td>kkeyse</td>
<td>Case marker</td>
<td>NOM (+HON)</td>
<td>Phonological erosion and morphological fusion; affixation, bleaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) -s-kuy-sy-e</td>
<td>(b) GEN-place-at-exist-NFIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la-ko-ha-</td>
<td>SFP-CONN-say-ADN-thing-TOP</td>
<td>a thing that (people) call x is</td>
<td>lan</td>
<td>Identificational TOP</td>
<td>as for ...</td>
<td>Phonological erosion and morphological fusion; affixation, bleaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nun-kes-un</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta-ha-ko</td>
<td>SFP-say-CONN</td>
<td>says x and</td>
<td>-tako</td>
<td>CPL</td>
<td>that (CPL)</td>
<td>Phonological erosion and morphological fusion; affixation, bleaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tako-ha-n-ta</td>
<td>CPL-say-PRS-SFP</td>
<td>x says that</td>
<td>-tanta</td>
<td>Reportative EVID SFP</td>
<td>It is said that...</td>
<td>Phonological erosion and morphological fusion; affixation, bleaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-salv-ni-ta</td>
<td>say-IND-SFP</td>
<td>(I) say that</td>
<td>-supnita</td>
<td>Formal polite DEC SFP</td>
<td>It is that...</td>
<td>Phonological erosion and morphological fusion; affixation, bleaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


58–60; Sohn 2002). As the reductive processes proceeded, the formal distinction became gradually lost, resulting in an identical form for an identical function in Modern Korean (see 9.3.2 for more discussion). Another feature observable in the changes listed is the loss of ha- ‘say’ and -ko-ha ‘CONN-say’, a widespread change in Korean that affected hundreds of formerly periphrastic constructions (Rhee 2011: 766). When forms become eroded, the resultant string is often morphologically ill-formed—a state of affairs that prompts the language users to reanalyse it and rename its grammatical category.

The question arises why phonological reduction and morphological fusion is more common in Korean than in Japanese. One possible reason is prosodic structure (cf. Schiering 2010), but both languages are usually classified as moraic, and therefore do not appear to differ fundamentally. The causes are probably more complex. One factor may be the chronology of language standardization. Standard Japanese (so-called hyōjun-go ‘standard language’) was fixed in the late Meiji period, with the consequence that reduced forms such as the quotative particle =tte < to it-te CPL sayer did not make it into the written standard, although they were already present in colloquial Tokyo speech in the Meiji period. In contrast, standardization in Korean has been more fluid: although Korea possessed an ‘ŏnmun ilch’i 言文一致 ‘write as you speak’ movement parallel to the one in Japan, language standardization efforts in Korea continued through the 1930s, with the constant interruption of the Japanese colonial regime, and continue to this day, with significant divergences between the DPRK and ROK.

Despite the apparent differences, one salient similarity between Korean and Japanese is the opposition between postnominal and postverbal elements. In Japanese the former have clitic status, as observed above. In Korean the distinction is at first blush less clear; thus the postvocalic subject marker =ka is regularly voiced [ga], like word-internal obstruents in general. But closer examination shows that postnominal particles in Korean too have clitic, not suffix status. This is shown by the contrast in (17a,b):

\[(17) \quad \text{a. } /kaps=i/ \quad [\text{kap}i], [\text{kabi}] \]
\[
\text{price=NOM} \\
\text{b. } /\text{eps-i/} \quad [\text{ap}i], *[\text{abi}] \\
\text{not.be-ADV 'not existing, without'}
\]

While the consonant cluster /ps/ may undergo the reduction normally found at word boundaries (and subsequent intersonorant voicing) before a postnominal particle as in (a), verbal suffixes do not allow this possibility. These facts support the view that in both Korean and Japanese, postverbal particles remain clitics, rather than suffixes. The consequence is that phonological reduction in the postverbal domain can result in the development of full-flavged inflectional morphology, while similar reduction in the postnominal domain does not. This is a salient shared property of grammaticalization in Japanese and Korean: grammaticalization has contributed to the stock of verbal inflection but nouns have remained non-inflecting.
Intersubjectification is a concept primarily espoused by Traugott (2003, 2010; Traugott and Dasher 2002), and while Traugott portrays intersubjectification as much less common than subjectification, her primary source of examples is Japanese. This is no coincidence. She writes that ‘[i]ntersubjectification intersects less extensively with grammaticalization […] It is strongly grammaticalized, in the sense of being expressed morphologically, in only a few languages, e.g., Japanese’ (Traugott 2010: 41). Furthermore, ‘genuine cases of intersubjectification as opposed to intersubjective uses of items are hard to identify outside of languages like Japanese’ (p. 42).

Examples from Japanese cited by Traugott include benefactive verbs like itadak- and kudasar-, discourse-organizing adverbs like sate (Traugott 2003), and the Middle Japanese politeness marker sōro (Traugott 2010). Honorifics in general are a fertile ground for observations on intersubjectification. Traugott suggests that ‘Japanese and other languages with addressee-honoricific systems will inevitably evidence more overt intersubjectification than languages that do not have such a system’ (2003: 135).

One more salient class of intersubjectified grammatical markers consists of final particles. Onodera (2004) presented an extensive study on ne and na.

Since this feature of Japanese is very well known from the extant literature, the rest of this section will focus on the phenomenon in Korean. As briefly illustrated in section 9.3.1, the Modern Korean honorific nominative case marker -keyse originated from two sources. One is a verbal origin involving the verb kyesi- ‘(an honourable person) exists’ from which the [+honification] feature was inherited in its grammaticalization in the 18th century. The other source is a nominal origin involving kuy ‘place’, but the honorific feature was not with this noun but the genitive marker -s, an MidK [+HON] counterpart of the plain -uy. In the 16th century, -skuy, the predecessor of the MK –kkey, emerged (Hong 1994: 639). The grammaticalization from the nominal origin seems to have been motivated by the honorific feature of the genitive marker and the metonymic association of a place and a person who occupies it.

The place-for-person metonymy is systematically utilized in the development of honorific address terms which involve an edifice or architectural structure associated with the honourable. For example, there are borrowings from Chinese, such as cenha ‘below the palace’ for a monarch, kakha ‘below the pavilion’ for a head of state, phyeyha ‘below the staircase’ for an emperor, ceha ‘below the mansion’ for a crown prince, etc. The x-ha ‘below x’ combination is semantically motivated, because the speaker may be prostrated before a palace building, pavilion, etc.

The most widely used honorific title suffix in MK is -nim, which was phonogrammatically represented in OK with the Chinese character 主 ‘lord, master’. MidK data show that professional titles such as wang ‘king’, pwuthye ‘Buddha’, seycon ‘Buddha’ were not suffixed with -nim, but kinship terms such as father, mother, etc. were. This suggests that the honorific suffix was first used in close familial relationship to show respect, and later spread to other areas.
An area in which intersubjectification is often attested is sentence-final particles, because they constitute the grammatical category for marking mood and modality. In Korean many clausal connectives were innovated as sentence-final particles through main-clause ellipsis (often called 'insubordination': Evans 2007). All instances of the development in this category show the intersubjectification process, but we can look at the development of the clausal connective -ni(kke) that originally marked cause which later became a sentence-final particle when the main clause was elided. According to Rhee (2012), the form developed diverse functions such as cause, reason, ground, contingency, contrast, adversativity when it was used as a clausal connective. When the form came to occur at the end of an utterance due to the main-clause ellipsis, it acquired an interpersonal, intersubjective function of marking reassertion and emphasis through pragmatic inference. This well illustrates that a form can semanticallyize the pragmatic inferences when they are frequently associated with it.

As the preceding discussion suggests, intersubjectification is a prominent feature of both languages, but the domains where it emerges are not necessarily the same. In the addressee honorific systems of both languages, the most formal level results from grammaticalization of a deferential (humble) suffix: Japanese -mas- from ma(w)ir-as- go(DEF)-CAUS(DEF)- and Korean -supni- from the LMK object honorific suffix -sop-fused with the addressee honorific suffix -ngi-. But Korean has a far more articulated system, with four levels of addressee politeness in everyday Seoul speech, while Japanese has only two. On the other hand, in the system of benefactive verbs and their converbal extensions (see section 9.2.1), Japanese has an in-group/out-group distinction among donatory verbs which is absent in Korean. Perhaps the most salient difference between the two languages in the domain of intersubjectivity is in the distribution of sentence-final particles. As observed above, in Korean sentence-final markers of intersubjectivity arise from the verbal system, through devices such as insubordination. In contrast, Japanese sentence-final particles such as na and ne do not arise from the verbal system. They have clitic status (like postnominal particles), and attach to nouns and postnominal phrases as well as inflected verbs (although when they attach to NPs and PPs they induce a strong prosodic break, similar to interjections). In this respect Japanese sentence-final particles more closely resemble counterparts in Southeast Asia.

9.3.3 GRAMMATICALIZATIONS FROM WRITTEN LANGUAGE

It is generally (and correctly) assumed that the roots of grammaticalization are found in conversation, in the interaction of speaker and hearer. For example, in Traugott’s model of grammaticalization, pragmatic inferences—and especially conversational implicatures—trigger the process of grammaticalization (cf. Hopper and Traugott 2003: 81–5). In Japanese, however, we find cases where grammaticalization came through written language, especially through translation, i.e. written language contact. We find evidence of intensive study and translation activity from Chinese as early as we have documented language history—which is a trivial observation, since Japanese started out writing their language in Chinese script. However, it is unlikely
that large sections of Japanese society immediately participated in reading and writing. This situation presumably arose in Middle Japanese, mainly through the continuous spread and pervasive influence of Buddhism. A medium for the absorption of Chinese lexica and grammatical patterns common to both Korea and Japan was the practice of hanmun hundok/kanbun kundoku, translated by Whitman et al. (2010) as ‘vernacular reading’. According to this practice, learners of literacy were taught to read Chinese texts (most commonly aloud) in the Korean or Japanese vernacular. The following phenomena can be taken as evidence of influence from (primarily written) Chinese:

- the grammaticalization of de-verbal postpositions, many of which correspond to Chinese prepositions or preposition-like verbs, already discussed in section 9.2.3;
- the grammaticalization and spread of numeral classifiers, as discussed in 9.2.4;
- the development of mermaid constructions incorporating large numbers of Chinese borrowings, mentioned in 9.2.2.

All three phenomena are not exclusively associated with language contact but are also supported by indigenous structures. However, many items involved are clearly borrowings or translations, and the spread of these structures in contrast to many other Northeast Asian and Transeurasian languages that do not have them is difficult to explain without influence from (written) Chinese.

A second group of grammaticalizations are individual adverbs and adnominals, collocations between adverbs and specific verb forms, and some phrases with grammatical function that have come into being, or have gained their current meaning and function, as translations of Chinese function words and phrases. Yamada (1935) is a classical study of this topic (even if he does not use the term ‘grammaticalization’). Table 9.10 is a short list of grammatical words and phrases that have gained their form and function through translation.

Other borrowings from strictly written language occurred in the late 19th–early 20th-century Meiji era, when a new standard was created to unify written and spoken language. Some of the grammatical elements of this new style that were borrowed from Sino-Japanese and pseudo-classical writing eventually made it into the spoken language through formal registers. Examples are the suffixes beki for deontic necessity and rasi- for inferential evidentiality. Both suffixes were productive from Old to Early Middle Japanese (be-, rasi), but then became obsolete. Modern beki has a much narrower meaning than its Old Japanese predecessor (cf. Narrog 2005), while rasi- has a broader meaning, which is also different. An extended use of the passive, and more frequent subject marking, in (written) Modern Japanese are attributed to the influence of translations from European languages (cf. Kinsui 1992).

A similar state of affairs is observed in Korean. There are a number of adverbials of Chinese origin that carry grammatical function. Table 9.11 is a short list of grammatical words that have gained their form and function through translation.

Most of the Chinese source words of the adverbs listed in Table 9.11 are attested in MldK, mostly in legal and religious texts. As indicated in Table 9.11, some adverbs
are suffixed with the native morphemes for adverbialization, but many of them are used without such derivational processes. This seems to be attributable to the influence of translation from Chinese texts.

### 9.4 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, we have tried to present (1) what are typical processes of grammaticalization in Japanese and Korean, and (2) what are processes that may particularly contribute to the discussion of theoretical aspects of grammaticalization. For (1), we
picked out the grammaticalization of converbs, of de-verbal postpositions, and of nouns marking categories in the verb phrase. For (2), we first discussed the morphological properties of grammaticalization in the two languages, and then the high frequency of grammaticalization into interpersonal domains. Both features support extant ideas about grammaticalization rather than contradicting them. In contrast, the third point—that grammaticalizations may enter the language through writing rather than conversation—may be a challenge for ideas about grammaticalization that seek the source of grammaticalizations solely in spoken speaker-hearer interaction. It goes without saying that many more processes could have been cited, especially for (1), and that the picture might be quite different if we focused on grammaticalization from a micro perspective, rather than the macro overview that was provided here. Nevertheless, we hope that some characteristics of grammaticalization in the two languages as compared with the core European languages that are often the focus of research have emerged. Some but not all of them may even be characteristic of the Northeast Asian language area and/or Transeurasian languages in general.
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