

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 2010 Seoul International Conference on Linguistics (SICOL-2010), June 23-25, 2010, Korea University, Seoul, Korea. Its abstract was published in *Conference Abstract Handbook*, edited by Young-Se Kang, Jiun-Shiung Wu, Dong-Ho Choi, Jong-Yurl Yoon, Seongha Rhee, Kee-Ho Kim, Jongseon Hong, Kyoung-Ae Kim, and Hye-Kyung Kang,. 38-39, and the full-paper version was electronically published in the Conference E-publication, edited by Young-Se Kang et al. 1-9.

This paper is an extended and revised version of the Conference paper.

Subjectification in Grammaticalization Revisited*

Seongha Rhee

(Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)

Rhee, Seongha. 2010. *Subjectification in Grammaticalization Revisited*. *Studies in Modern Grammar* 61, 249-274. In grammaticalization studies, the notion of 'subjectification' has attracted much attention as a descriptive term or an enabling mechanism of semantic change contingent upon grammaticalization processes. Subjectification, largely referring to the phenomena where the semantics of a grammaticalizing source lexeme changes into one that describes the speaker's internal state or subjective attitude, is often considered to be one of the strong tendencies attested in grammaticalization processes. The cognitive strategy in the opposite direction is objectification, whereby a more abstract notion is treated as a more concrete object. This paper reviews these notions in grammaticalization studies, and presents examples of typical instances of such cognitive operations. It also presents the cases that can be either interpreted as instances of subjectification or of objectification, and those that do not exhibit such cognitive strategies with a definite directionality. Based on these examples, this paper claims that characterization of grammaticalization processes in terms of subjectification and objectification requires considerations including the levels of analyses, such as the lexical level where the semantics of the grammaticalizing form is focused, or the levels of encoding strategies whereby the language user is treating a target concept in linguistic representation.

Key words: grammaticalization, subjectification, subjectivity, objectification, objectivity, bi-directional change, non-directional change

* This research was supported by the 2010 Hankuk University of Foreign Studies research grant. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 2010 Seoul International Conference on Linguistics (SICOL-2010), June 23-25, 2010, Korea University, Seoul, Korea. The author wishes to thank the audience for their criticisms and suggestions. Thanks also go to the three anonymous reviewers of the Journal. All remaining errors, however, are mine.

1. Introduction

1.1 Research Objectives

This paper reviews the instances of subjectification and objectification phenomena and evaluates the unidirectionality claim. The cases reviewed are connectives and aspectual markers as typical instances of subjectification; nominalizers, and verbs of transference, ingestion, and action as typical instances of objectification; attenuative modals as exhibiting bi-directionality between subjectification and objectification; and sentence-final particles for a discussion of non-directionality.

Further, focusing on the grammaticalization phenomena exhibited by certain verbs that grammaticalized into attenuative modals discussed in Rhee (2005), this paper intends to show that interpretation of a process as either subjectification or objectification largely depends on the levels and domains of the investigation. For instance, it is claimed that the directional tendency of cognitive strategies is not necessarily unidirectional from less subjective to more subjective, and that the direction may in fact be a complicated one involving both subjectification and objectification depending on the levels of analyses, i.e. lexical levels or levels of encoding strategy. It draws a conclusion that subjectification is a tendency, contra a principle, that operates at the level of semantic change, contra at the level of encoding strategy. It also claims that there are instances of semantic change that cannot be characterized as either subjectification or objectification.

This paper is organized in the following manner: it presents an explication on such key notions and subjectification and objectification in the following introductory subsection; in Section 2, exemplars of subjectification are presented in such categories as connectives and aspect markers; in Section 3, exemplars of objectification are presented in such categories as nominalizers, transference verbs, ingestion verbs and action verbs; in

Section 4, diverse theoretical issues are discussed focusing on the directionality making reference to bi-directional and adirectional changes, and on levels of analysis to identify the directionality of subjectification and objectification.

1.2 Preliminaries

The notion 'subjectification' was first proposed by Traugott (1982), followed up by Traugott (1988, 1989, 2003), Traugott and König (1991), and Traugott and Dasher (2002).¹ It is largely referring to the historical process whereby a word signals the speaker involvement, as is well illustrated in the following statement:

- (1) "[M]eanings tend to come to refer less to objective situations and more to subjective ones (including speaker point of view), less to the described situation and more to the discourse situation." (Traugott 1986: 540)

This was later extended to include the semantic change that involves text-relations as is illustrated in Traugott and König (1991: 189), who said that subjectification refers to:

- (2) "...the shift ... from meanings grounded in more or less objectively identifiable extralinguistic situations to meanings grounded in text-marking ... to meanings grounded in the speaker's attitude to or belief about what is said."

This type of semantic change is well illustrated by English preposition/connective *after* as shown in (3) below, where its semantic designation

¹ For an exposition and discussion of subjectification and other notions under focus see Rhee (2005). The summary preview in Section 1 of the present paper is largely due to Rhee (2005: 242-246).

involves spatial, temporal and causal relations via stages, thus forming a continuum along which subjectification occurs.

- (3) a. Shut the door after you. [Spatial]
 b. Brush your teeth after breakfast. [Temporal]
 c. After we heard the lecture we felt greatly inspired. [Causal]

Instances of subjectification are also available in Korean as shown in the following examples, all involving *tey*, which was formerly a full-fledged noun but displays chimerical features in contemporary Korean (taken from Rhee 2005: 244):²

- (4) Korean *tey*
- a. ilha-nun tey-ka eti-y-a?
 work-Adn place-Nom where-be-Q.SFP
 'Where do you work?' (Lit. 'What is the place where you work?')
- b. ilha-nun-tey(-ey) pwulphyenha-n-tey eps-e?
 work-Adn-place(-at) be.inconvenient-Adn-place not.exist-Q.SFP?
 'Is there any inconvenience while you are working?'
 (Lit. 'Is there any place that is inconvenient in the place of work?')
- c. ilha-nun-tey(*-ey) cenhwa-ka o-ass-ta
 work-Adn-place(*-at) telephone-Nom come-Pst-Dec
 'The phone rang while working.'
 (Lit. 'Telephone came at the place of working.')

² For glossing the Korean data the following abbreviations are used: Acc: accusative; AddRecon: addressee reconfirmation; Adn: adnominal; Advz: adverbializer; Benef: benefactive; Caus: causative; Comp: complementizer; Conn: connective; Cop: copula; Dec: declarative; Dir: directional; Fut: future; Hort: hortative; Imp: imperative; Neg: negative; NF: non-finite connective; Nom: nominative; Nomz: nominalizer; Perf: perfective; Poss: possessive; Pres: present; Proh: prohibitive; Prom: promissive; Pros: prospective; Pst: past; Purp: purposive; Q: interrogative; SFP: sentence-final particle; Top: topic; and TP: topic presenter.

- d. ilha-nu-ntey il-i an toy-n-ta
 work-Pres-Conn work-Nom Neg become-Pres-Dec
 'Even though I'm trying, there is no progress with the work.'
 (Lit. 'While/At the place where (I) work, work does not occur.')

In the above examples, (4a) is an instance of nominal use of *-tey*, while it is not clear whether *-tey* in (4b) is the nominal usage or conjunctive usage. In (4c) it is a conjunctive with the 'background' meaning, whereas in (4d) it is a conjunctive with the 'contrastive' or 'adversative' meaning. The progression from (4a) through (4d) clearly illustrates that the direction of the semantic change of *-tey* is toward increasing subjectivity.

An interesting aspect of this notion of subjectification is that this process is claimed to be unidirectional, i.e., the extension of meaning of a grammaticalizing item is predictably away from objective, referential meaning towards subjective attitude and points of view, as has been observed by Herring (1991: 254) in her critical review of directionality.

The notion 'objectivity' has been conceived of in a number of different ways depending on the disciplines where the notion is adopted. In the logical, philosophical, and computational traditions, for instance, objectivity has been linked to truth and information structure (Traugott and Dasher 2002: 21). Certain registers, such as scientific writing, tend to be maximally objective, and it has been also thought that active, declarative assertions in which the speaker's viewpoint is not explicitly coded are exemplars of an objective language. In this regard, the notion is adopted in a macroscopic conception of language use, i.e. information or rhetorical structure of a text or discourse.

In the present discussion, however, the term 'objectification' is used to refer to a process whereby something of subjective meaning is likened to an objective entity. For example, if a linguistic form *x*, be it a word or a sentence, that encodes the language user's viewpoint such as evaluation

or subjective judgment, or refers to a subjectively construed event, is used as comparable to a more objective, real-world entity, that particular language usage is considered as an instance of objectification. Therefore, this notion, widely construed, shall include figures of speech that involve mapping any abstract entity to a concrete entity as well, since they represent processes whereby 'abstractness' is demoted and 'concreteness' is promoted. In this regard, objectification is inseparable from, or at least closely related with, 'concretization'. In the line of this conception, the ontological categories of metaphorization, i.e. Person, Object, Process, Space, Time and Quality, as proposed by Heine et al. (1991) are useful notions. These ontological categories can be used to contrast metaphorization and objectification in terms of their direction of operation, as shown in (5):

(5) Ontological Categories of Metaphorization

PERSON	>	OBJECT	>	PROCESS	>	SPACE	>	TIME	>	QUALITY
>>>		>>>		>>>		>>>		>>>		>>> Metaphorization (Abstraction)
<<<		<<<		<<<		<<<		<<<		<<< Objectification (Concretization)

In the above cline, the usual direction of metaphor is from left to right, which is expected because metaphorization typically involves a concrete entity as the vehicle and an abstract entity as the tenor (topic). Since we assume a close relation between objectification and concretization, a process characterizable as objectification should involve the reversed direction of metaphorization, i.e. from right to left in the above cline, if the ontological categories are applicable indeed. One caveat, however, is that adopting the metaphorization cline does not entail that the progression from left to right is an instance of subjectification, because the increase in the degree of abstractness does not warrant subjectification. In other words, abstract meanings are not necessarily subjective meanings.

2. Exemplars of Subjectification

With the background of the exposition of the key concepts of subjectification and objectification in the preceding section an exploration into individual cases of subjectification and objectification is in order. In this section, exemplars of subjectification connectives and aspect markers are presented.

2.1 Connectives

Certain connectives show that their development involves attribution of apprehensive emotion to non-humans. Judging from the semantic features, the use of the verb *mwusep-* 'be fearful of' should be restricted to humans or at least sentient beings. However, when it becomes a part of a clausal construction, its function shifts to a grammatical marker of immediacy connective, as exemplified below:

(6) a. For Humans:

na-nun paym-i mwusep-ta
I-Top snake-Nom be.fearful.of-Dec

'I am afraid of snakes.'

b. For non-humans: *-ki-ka-mwusep-key* 'as soon as; immediately following'

[Nomz-Nom-be.afraid.of-in.the.mode] 'in a manner that X is afraid of Y' > Immediacy Connective

pom-i kkuthna-ki-ka mwusep-key yelum-i
spring-Nom end-Nomz-Nom be.fearful.of-Advz summer-Nom

o-ass-ta

come-Pst-Dec

'As soon as the spring was over, the summer came.' (Lit.: The summer came, fearing the end of the spring./ The summer came in such a

manner that the spring feared its own ending.)

In the above example, the immediacy of two events are conceptualized as if one event was fearing the occurrence of the other event. Due to the idiosyncrasy in Korean grammar, where sentential arguments are easily omitted (in the present case, the experiencer), the original structure of example (6b) is compatible with two different interpretations depending on the supposed experiencer; one where the 'fearer' is the summer and the other, the spring. In the first interpretation, the summer fears the end of the spring so it comes in hastily, an 'action' resulting in the two seasons being one after the other without a time lag. In other words, people hardly see the end of the spring before they experience the summer heat. In the other interpretation, the spring fears its own end because the summer follows it in an aggressive manner. Therefore, the spring can hardly enjoy its own closing.

Either way, the transition of the two seasons is very speedy and unexpected. Emergence of immediacy meaning from sensation of fear (attributed to non-sentient entity such as seasons) depends crucially on subjectification of the conceptualizer.

Furthermore, there are numerous connectives developed from a nominal the 'ground' (*theh* in Late Middle Korean). The nominal *theh* in the early data (LMK) has lexical meaning of 'ground/lot for construction of a building,' which still survives into Present Day Korean in an eroded form *the*. Among such connectives derived from *theh* are the markers of causality, contingency, concessivity, and adversativity, as exemplified below (taken from Rhee 2009):

(7) a. Causality/Reason *-ltheyni(kka)* 'as, since, because'

pantusi	tolao-ltheyni	kekcheng	ma-ø
surely	return-as	worry	stop-SFP

'Don't worry since I will surely come back.

- b. Contingency *-ltheyko* 'while; the situation being...'

ku kakey-nun tat-ass-ultheyko talu-n kakey-lo ka-ca
 that store-Top close-Perf-as different-Adn store-Dir go-Hort
 'Let's go to a different one, the situation being that the store is likely
 to be already closed...'

- c. Concessivity *-ltheyciman* 'even though'

pappu-ltheyciman phathi-ey kkok o-ala
 be.busy-even.though party-to without.fail come-Imp
 'Come to the party, even though you should be busy.'

- d. Adversativity *-ltheyntey(to)* 'despite'

mwuchek pappu-ltheynteyto ilehkey o-acwu-ess-ney
 very be.busy-even.though like.this come-Benef-Pst-SFP
 'You kindly came despite that you must be very busy.'

The development of such grammatical notions as causality, contingency, concessivity, and adversativity is a typical instance of subjectification widely attested across languages. In a similar fashion, Korean *the* 'ground' started its life as a concrete noun denoting the physical ground. The semantics of the word in metaphorical usages is extended to that of an abstract noun denoting a situation. Then, the meaning of 'situation' further changes into one involving intention, prediction, etc. through subjectification.

In terms of the formal construct of the connectives, the lexeme combined with mostly prospective adnominal, the copula, and a connective generated diverse grammatical markers, a process where the future meaning of the adnominal and the semantics of particular particles involved played important roles.

2.2 Aspect Markers

The next category is the development of aspect markers which involves

attribution of intention to non-humans. The grammatical marker that comes into focus is *-lye*, a conative marker typically rendered as 'in order to' in English translation. Diverse grammatical markers arose from the constructions where this conative morpheme *-lye* participated, one of which is the proximative aspect marker as is shown below (taken from Rhee 2009):

(8) a. For humans:

ku-nun hakkyo-ey ka-lyeko cip-ul nao-ass-ta
 he-Top school-to go-Purp house-Acc exit-Pst-Dec
 'He left home in order to go to school.'

b. For non-humans: *-lye-ko-ha* [-in.order.to-and-do] 'try to do X and'
 > Proximative Aspect

kenmwul-i mwuneci-lyeko ha-n-ta
 building-Nom collapse-Purp do-Pres-Dec
 'The building is about to collapse. [With reference to a tilted building]
 (Lit.: The building does (something) in order to collapse.)

In the above example (8b), the 'intention' of the building to collapse exists in the mind of the conceptualizer. Through this conceptualization the notion of intention is subjectified into that of immediacy. In this process human intention is conceptualized as being accompanied by an executing action which should make the intended event come true soon. This type of subjectified conceptualization of chain of events is also attested in the development of English futurity marker *be going to* which marks imminent future in modern English. The basic logic in the mind of the perceiver is largely teleological and conative, and can be represented as 'if X intends to do Y, Y will soon occur.'

3. Exemplars of Objectification

Objectification as a process of semantic change or as one of grammaticalization mechanism, has been largely ignored as a topic of research. However, there are ample instances that can be claimed as exemplars of objectification as shown in the following discussion. Examples involve grammaticalization processes in the development of nominalizers, transference verbs, ingestion verbs, and action verbs.

3.1 Nominalizers

One of the most productive nominalizer in modern Korean is *kes*, whose original meaning was 'skin, surface, thing' (Hong 1983), which later became a defective noun from middle Korean (Huh 1983, Jeong 1987, Lee 1988). In modern Korean, when *-kes* is used to nominalize a proposition, among others, we are claiming an identity relation between the proposition and a thing, by virtue of the adnominalizers that connect a proposition with the nominalizer *-kes*, which in many instances still retains its lexical semantics 'thing' (see for example, Simpson and Wu 2001).

As is evident from (9) below, the 'thing' as a substitute of an entity, event or a proposition is expressed as one existing in the present or the past. This state of affairs, i.e. regarding the nominalized entity as something in existence not as one of future possibility must have contributed to the creation of such emphatic meanings as emphasis, conviction, etc. and of the speaker's present psychological states such as intention, commitment, etc. This type of an objectification or reification process can be illustrated by such a simple example as "It will rain" in (9).

- (9) pi-ka o-l-kes-i-ta
 rain-Nom come-Pros.Adn-thing-Cop-Dec

'It will rain.' (Lit. (It) is the thing that the rain will come.)

The complex morphemic gloss of *-l-kes-i-* in (9), i.e. [Prospective Adnominal-'thing'-Copula], is considered a single future tense marking morpheme in Modern Korean. This is evident in that according to Korean orthographic rules, there must be inter-lexical space between *o-l* and *kes-i-ta* because these two clusters of morphemes constitute an adnominal phrase and a nominal in the predicate but that most writers write them without an orthographic space.

Incidentally, this is an excellent example of syntactic upgrading, where the subject of the embedded clause becomes the main clause subject through reanalysis (Heine et al. 1991: 169-170).³ The objectification or reification process can be diagrammatically presented as in (10).

(10) "It will rain"		"a thing"
Proposition	IDENTITY	Entity
Abstract	RELATION	Tangible
Subjective Judgment	----->	Objective
		Description of existence

The diagram in (10) shows that what the speaker wants to say is that according to his/her judgment, it will rain. But in the real world, the future belongs to the unknown, existing only as a world of possibility, and thus nothing that belongs to the future is a reality, so it is not certain if it will truly rain. Here, the speaker objectifies the abstract situation as if it were a concrete, tangible object that could be referred to as 'a thing'. The

³ This type of reanalysis changes a sentence like *'It is not Peter (who) wants a dog'* into *'Peter does not want a dog'* in Teso, an Eastern Nilotic language. In exact parallelism, Korean sentence denoting 'It is that he will come' [originally: Ø is the thing that he will come] has been reanalyzed as 'He will come,' as shown in the present discussion. Syntactic upgrading refers to the status change of the embedded subject into the main clause subject, or the shift from the subordinate clause to the main clause.

emphasis effect is obtained from the act of regarding a proposition as a concrete entity, i.e. objectification.

3.2 Transference Verbs

The next category is that of transference verb, *cwu-* 'give' being its representative form. This verb is well grammaticalized into an auxiliary marking benefaction. This is well illustrated in the following examples:

- (11) a. I kimpap com mek-ecwu-e
 this rice-roll please eat-Benef-SFP
 'Please eat this rice-roll for me.'
- b. nay-ka silh-umyen ka-øcwu-lkey
 I-Nom be.dislikable-if go-Benef-Prom
 'If you don't like me, I'll go away for you.'
 (Lit. If you find me dislikable I will leave for you.)
- c. pi-s-kil-ey ancen wuncen ha-ycwu-si-ki-lul
 rain-Poss-road-at safety driving do-Benef-Hon-Nomz-Acc
 tangpwu-tuli-pnita
 entreaty-give:Pol-Dec
 'We ask you to drive safely.'

In the above examples, it is evident that the theme of transfer, i.e. the object of the verb *cwu-* is not an entity. Example (11a) is typically uttered when the speaker does not want to see the left-over rice-rolls wasted and thus asks the addressee to consume them. A strict literal interpretation of the construct *mek-ecwu-e* is 'eat and give,' since the embedded non-finite connective *-e-* implies sequentiality of the two events. In this example, however, the addressee cannot give the rice-roll to anyone to his or her benefit once it is eaten. The benefaction is derived from the event of eating

the rice-roll (by satisfying the speaker who does not want to waste the left-over).

Likewise, in (11b), the theme is not present. This is more obvious because the main verb is intransitive. Therefore, the theme of transfer is not an entity but the event as a whole, i.e. 'the speaker's going away.' In the development of the benefactive marker, the inherently intangible, abstract event is treated as a tangible, concrete entity, i.e. an act of objectification.

Example (11c) is the kind of request often heard on a radio weathercast where the weather-caster warns a slippery road condition due to rain. The speaker's benefit from the audience-driver's safe driving is a very indirect and subtle one, because the motorist's safety does not directly contribute to the welfare of the speaker, the weather-caster. The overtone is of stylistically feigned benevolence in that it suggests that the weather-caster or the meteorological staff or the institution itself cares for the welfare of the motorists. At this level, it is more like a politeness marker rather than a benefactive marker.

In all cases of the 'give'-auxiliaries what is given is not restricted to a material object as it was the case when 'give' was a lexical verb, but is more commonly used with the abstract entities such as propositions, an extension enabled by the cognitive strategy of treating an abstract object as a concrete object that can be transferred between parties.

3.3 Ingestion Verbs

Korean ingestion verbs are grammaticalized into auxiliary verbs that encode speaker's evaluative viewpoint of contemptibility toward a proposition they predicate of, as shown in the following examples:

- (12) a. caysan-ul ta nalli-e mek-ess-ta
 fortune-Acc all lose-NF eat-Pst-Dec

'(He) lost his fortune altogether. (How stupid he is!)

- b. os-ul ccic-e mek-ess-ta
 clothes-Acc tear-NF eat-Pst-Dec

'(He) had his clothes torn. (How careless he is!)

- c. nolli-e mek-cima-la
 ridicule-NF eat-Proh-Imp

'Don't make fun of (him/me...) (How mean you are!)

The development of 'eat' into viewpoint-marking auxiliaries in Korean suggests that Koreans largely view/viewed an eating action as contemptible, or at least indecent (for elaboration of cultural aspects motivating the development of contemptibility-auxiliaries from ingestion verbs, see Rhee 2003). Also interesting is the fact that the theme of the 'eating' action is not a concrete entity but an abstract event denoted by the proposition. In other words, the language user is treating an event as an object that can be 'eaten.' This is another instance of objectification.

3.4 Action Verbs

Another category involves the verbs of action, i.e. the verbs denoting placement and displacement. The verbs of placement include *twu-* 'put' and those of displacement *pe-* 'throw away', both well grammaticalized in modern Korean, as shown in the following examples:

- (13) a. ney sacang-eykey cal malha-e twu-ess-ta
 your boss-to well talk-NF put-Pst-Dec

'I have talked to your boss'

(so that everything would go well with you.)

- b. ku-ka pyelankan cwuk-e peli-ess-ta
 he-Nom suddenly die-NF throw.away-Pst-Dec

'He died unexpectedly.'

Examples in (13) show that, very much like the transference and ingestion verbs discussed above, the theme of placing or displacing action is not a concrete entity but an abstract event that is reified. The objects of the 'putting' action in (13a) and of 'throwing away' action do not surface in the sentences. The reconstructed object in (13a) is the speaker's having talked with the addressee's supervisor.

Reconstruction of the object of the 'throwing away' action in (13b) is more difficult. The 'throwing away' as a marker of undesirability according to the assessment of the speaker makes reference to unavailability of 'him' due to his unexpected, sudden death. If we are to adhere faithfully to the semantics of 'throw away,' we can say that what he threw away is a normal, desirable situation in which he is alive and available.

In either case, what the sentential subject did in the examples is not placing or displacing an object but an event or a situation. In other words, the speaker is treating abstract entities as concrete entities that can be placed or displaces, a clear instance of objectification.

4. Discussion

We have seen that not only subjectification but also objectification is found in grammaticalization. The implication of this state of affairs is that we need to investigate the matter with respect to directionality and the levels of analysis.

4.1 Bi-Directional Change

In terms of directionality it is noteworthy that one and the same phenomenon is amenable to two different interpretations. This is well illustrated by the grammaticalization of certain attenuative epistemic markers, as shown in the examples below (taken from Rhee 2005):

- (14) a. ku-ka cwuk-ess-na po-ta⁴)
 he-Nom die-Pst-Comp see-Dec
 'He seems to have died.' (Lit.: '(I) see if he died.)
- b. ku-ka aphu-n-ka po-ta
 he-Nom be.ill-Pres-Comp see-Dec
 'He seems to be ill.' (Lit.: '(I) see if he is ill.)

The development can be interpreted as an instance of either subjectification or objectification as diagrammatically presented below:

- (15) Subjectification Process of "He seems to be ill."

"He is ill."

Assertion of State-of-Affairs

Attenuative Modal Function

Real-World Description

Speaker's Stance

Objective

----->

Subjective

- (16) Objectification Process of "He seems to be ill."

"He is ill."

Proposition

Visual Object

Intangible

----->

Objective

4.2 Non-Directional Change

The next category is a group of grammatical forms that developed from connective forms but the processes do not exhibit clear directionality in terms of subjectification or objectification. For instance, such connectives as *-ketun* of hypothetical conditionality and comparative conditionality (Koo and Rhee 2001, Rhee 2002), *-nikka* of cause, reason, contingency,

⁴ One peculiarity associated with these 'see'-related modal expressions is that they are defective in that the TAM marking, which is mandatorily required on the sentence-final verb, i.e. *po-*, is absent. I.e., the examples lack tense marking and since their use is so tightly linked to the present and has the 'on-the-spot' semantics that the use of these examples is strictly restricted to the present, spontaneous utterances.

and adversity (Lee 1993, Sohn 1996, Rhee 2002), *-myense* of concurrence and contrast (Jung 2001) etc. developed into sentence-final particles as partly shown in the following:

(17) *-ketun*:

a. Hypothetical Conditional

ku-ka o-ketun i Iton-ul cwu-ela
 he-Nom come-if this money-Acc give-Imp
 'If he comes, give him this money.'

b. Topic Presentation

nay-ka ecey caymiiss-nun chayk-ul sa-ss-ketun.
 I-Nom yesterday be.interesting-Adn book-Acc buy-Pst-TP
 '(You know what?) I bought an interesting book yesterday.'

(18) *-nikka*:

a. Cause

palam-i pwu-nikka nalssi-ka chwup-ta
 wind-Nom blow-Cause weather-Nom be.cold-Dec
 'It is cold because it is windy.'

b. Addressee Reconfirmation/Protest

X: (Do you really have no money?)
 Y: eps-ta-nikka.
 not.exist-Dec-AddRecon
 'I don't. (Didn't I say that?)'

The mechanism of changes operative in all these cases is the pragmatic inferences in discourse, where the speaker chooses the strategic ellipsis of intended utterance. I.e, the speaker employs omission of the main clause, thus leaving only the subordinate clause still marked with a connective at the end. This intentional ellipsis gives the speaker certain benefits: utterance economy, relief from commitment to the elided proposition, and the addressee's enriched interpretation from the subordinate clause, which

is the only available data from the utterance.

On the other hand, this intentional ellipsis exerts a strong challenging effect on the addressee: an utterance ended in a connective places the addressee in a quandary as the linguistic signal, i.e. the use of a connective, forces the expectation of a main clause; while the intonation clearly signals the completion of the utterance. It is at this stage that the addressee actively seeks the elided information in the missing main clause. In this process diverse meanings are pragmatically inferred. These new meanings form certain patterns depending on the available inference types derived from the semantics of the connective markers (Rhee 2002).

However, the changes manifested in these examples, egs. [conditional > topic presentation], [cause > addressee reconfirmation], etc., are not amenable with an analysis with respect to subjectification or objectification. The extent of the newly emerging grammatical notions is only constrained by that of human's pragmatic inference.

4.3 Levels of Analyses

The next issue involves levels of analysis. In 4.1, it has been shown that a single instance of a grammaticalization process can be analyzed either as an instance of subjectification or as one of objectification. This phenomenon warrants a little more detailed investigation with reference to levels of analyses.

It is indeed true that there are many instances that present different analyses depending on the levels of analyses. For instance, most cases of subjectification reported in grammaticalization studies are those that were analyzed at the level of the grammaticalizing lexeme with respect to its semantics, as shown below (taken from Rhee 2007):

- (19) a. *after*: Spatial > Temporal > Causal
 b. *while*: Temporal/Nominal > Temporal/Textual > Concessive
 c. *for*: Spatial > Temporal > Visibility > Prospect > Superiority
 > Preference
 d. *before*: Spatial > visibility > Noteworthiness > Preference

If grammaticalizing forms are looked at from a different perspective, such as at the level of interpretation strategies (e.g. pragmatic inference), or at the level of encoding strategies (e.g. constituent structure), very different characterizations should be also available. For instance, the semantic change of nominalizer *kes*, i.e. [skin > tangible entity > abstract entity], is a good example of subjectification, but treating a proposition as a 'thing' is a good example of objectification, as it can be diagrammatically represented in the following:

- (20) *kes*:
 a. semantic designation:
 skin > tangible entity > abstract entity (subjectification)
 b. encoding strategy:
 tangible entity = thing >> situation = thing (objectification)

In the same fashion, the semantic change pattern of the 'ground' exhibits the ambivalent nature as well, as shown below:

- (21) *the*
 a. semantic designation:
 ground > contingency > cause/reason > concessivity > adversity
 (subjectification)
 b. encoding strategy:
 building plot = ground >> adversative situation = ground
 (objectification)

An exact parallel can be shown by the 'give'-auxiliary, whose lexical origin was tied to the material transfer but with grammaticalization the object of transfer has been extended to abstract entities as shown below:

(22) *give*

a. semantic designation:

give > benefit (subjectification)

b. encoding strategy:

material transfer = give >> non-material transfer = give
(objectification)

A slightly different, and more complex pattern of interpretation can be given by the intentional marker *-lye*, which later became a marker of proximative aspect.

(23) *-lye*

a. semantic designation:

intention > future (subjectification)

b. encoding strategy:

animate's volition = intention >> situational immediacy = intention
(subjectification)

animate's mental state = intention >> inanimate's state = intention
(objectification)

The change in semantic designation of *-lye* above may be characterized as subjectification since future is a 'subjectified' situation realized by the intention of an agent. This type of [intention > future] semantic change is widely attested across languages including English (see Heine et al. 1991, Bybee et al. 1994, Heine 1997, Heine et al. 1993, Heine and Kuteva 2002 for examples across languages).

The encoding strategy of (23) that enabled the grammaticalization process of the marker of intention into a marker of proximative aspect is to treat a situational immediacy as a result of intention. As discussed in Section 2 with reference to a run-down building about to collapse, the 'intention' of the building to collapse exists only in the mind of the conceptualizer. Immediacy is a subjectified, perhaps teleologically motivated, version of intention. At the same time, however, treating the state of an entity such as a building as associated with intention as if it were akin to human volition is a change toward the direction of objectification. This process is also metaphorization, more specifically, personification.

All these instances point to the fact that whether certain conceptual operation is a result of subjectification or objectification largely depends on the level of analyses.

5. Conclusion

This paper reviewed the notions of subjectification and objectification in grammaticalization studies, and presented examples of typical instances of such cognitive operations. This paper also presented the cases that can be either interpreted as subjectification or objectification, and those that do not exhibit such cognitive strategies with a definite directionality.

Based on these examples, this paper has claimed that characterization of grammaticalization processes in terms of subjectification and objectification requires considerations of levels of analyses, such as the lexical level where the semantics of the grammaticalizing form is focused, or the encoding strategies whereby the language user is treating a target concept in terms of linguistic representation. In other words, semantic change may typically involve subjectification in the sense that more concrete and external meanings change into more abstract and mental-state meanings, whereas the encoding strategies may often recruit objectification by treating an

abstract, intangible entity as if it were a concrete, tangible entity. This is a typical state of affairs associated with the subjectification-objectification directionality as the two sides of a same coin, but as has been illustrated with the example of the intentional marker *-lye*, it is not necessarily so.

Furthermore, there are cases that do not exhibit directionality in terms of subjectification and objectification. Such cases typically involve the development of highly abstract meanings from already abstract meanings. Some of such cases may be amenable to intersubjectification, which has not been addressed in the present investigation, but suffice it to say that the change from 'grammatical' to 'more grammatical' concepts may not clearly exhibit directionality since the source and target concepts may both belong to highly subjective semantic domains.

This shows that the notion of subjectification should be understood as referring to the tendency of semantic change patterns of a lexeme involved in grammaticalization processes, rather than as a strategy that enables linguistic encoding of the concepts that participate in grammaticalization processes. In other words, in the use of the concept of subjectification, a caveat to employ is to acknowledge its being a tendency in, rather than an absolute principle of, semantic change, as has long been suggested by Traugott's earlier works (Traugott 1982, Traugott and König 1991, *inter alia*); and its being applicable to the level of semantics of the lexemes, rather than the level of encoding strategies, where, incidentally, objectification is more common.

References

- Bybee, Joan L., Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, and Friederike Hünemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Heine, Bernd, Tom Güldermann, Christa Kilian-Hatz, Donald A. Lessau, Heinz Roberg, Mathias Schladt, and Thomas Stolz. 1993. *Conceptual Shift: A Lexicon of Grammaticalization Processes in African Languages*. AAP 34/35, Universität zu Köln.
- Heine, Bernd, and Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herring, Susan. 1991. The Grammaticalization of Rhetorical Questions in Tamil. Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds.) *Approaches to Grammaticalization Vol. 1*, 253-284. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hong, Jongseon. 1983. Myengsahwa Emiuy Pyenchen [Historical Change of Nominalizing Particles]. *Kwukekwukmwunhak* [Korean Language and Literature] 89, 31-89.
- Huh, Woong. 1983. *15-seyki Wuli Yeysmalpon* [15th Century Korean Grammar]. Seoul: Saem Publishing.
- Jeong, Howan 1987. *Hwuki Cwungseykwuke Uyconmyengsa Yenkwu* [A Study on Defective Nouns in Late Middle Korean]. Seoul: Hakmunsa Publishing.
- Jung, Yonhee. 2001. *Grammaticalization of Korean Clause Connectives*. Doctoral dissertation, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies.
- Koo, Hyun Jung, and Seongha Rhee. 2001. Grammaticalization of a Sentential End Marker from a Conditional Marker. *Discourse and Cognition* 8, 1-19.
- Lee, Jae Hyun. 1993. Yenkyelemi '-nikka'uy Uymithongsacek Thukcing [On Semanticsyntactic Characteristics of Connective *-nikka*]. Ki Sim Nam (ed.) *Kwuke Yenkyelemiuy Ssuim* [On Usage of Korean Connectives].

Seoul: Seokwang Academic Resources Publishing.

- Lee, Ju-Haeng. 1988. *Hankwuke Uyonmyengsaury Thongsicek Yenkwu* [A Diachronic Study on Korean Defective Nouns]. Seoul: Hansaem Publishing.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2002. From Silence to Grammar: Grammaticalization of Ellipsis in Korean. Paper presented at the New Reflections on Grammaticalization II Conference. The University of Amsterdam.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2005. At the Crossroad of Objectification and Subjectification: A Case of *kathta*, *siphta*, and *pota* in Korean. *Language and Linguistics* 35, 241-258.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2007. What is it for if it's before me?: Subjectification and Grammaticalization of *for* and *before*. *Studies in British and American Language and Literature* 84, 209-231.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2009. Attribution of Human Qualities to Non-humans: A Look into Human Construal of Events. *Studies in Modern Grammar* 56, 123-148.
- Simpson, Andrew and Xiu-Zhi Zoe Wu. 2001. The Grammaticalization of Formal Nouns and Nominalizers in Chinese, Japanese and Korean. Thomas E. McAuley (ed). *Language Change in East Asia*, 250-283. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon.
- Sohn, Sung-Ock. 1996. On the Development of Sentence-Final Particles in Korean. N. Akatsuka, S. Iwasaki, and S. Strauss. (eds.). *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 5, 219-234. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1982. From Propositional to Textual and Expressive Meanings: Some Semantic-Pragmatic Aspects of Grammaticalization. W. Lehmann and Y. Malkiel (eds). *Perspectives in Historical Linguistics*, 245-271. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1988. Pragmatic Strengthening and Grammaticalization. Shelley Axmaker, Annie Jaisser, and Helen Singmaster (eds). *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 14, 406-416.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1989. On the Rise of Epistemic Meanings in English: An Example of Subjectification in Semantic Change. *Language* 57: 33-65.

- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2003. From Subjectification to Intersubjectification. Raymond Hickey (ed). *Motives for Language Change*, 124-142. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, and Richard Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, and Ekkehard König. 1991. The Semantics-Pragmatics of Grammaticalization Revisited. Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds). *Approaches to Grammaticalization Vol. 1*, 189-218. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Department of English Linguistics
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
270 Imun-dong, Dongdaemun-gu
Seoul, 130-791, Korea
(02) 2173-3171, srhee@hufs.ac.kr

Received: August 10, 2010
Revised Version: September 03, 2010
Accepted: September 10, 2010