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1. INTRODUCTION

- Evidentiality in General
  
  (a) Definition: “[l]inguistic devices that mark and specify type of the evidence on which a statement is based—whether the speaker saw it, or heard it, or inferred it from indirect evidence, or learnt it from someone else” (Aikhenvald and Dixon 2003:1).

  (b) Normally categorized into sub-categories depending on common parameters:

  [1] Degrees of directness of access to encoded source (direct and indirect),

  [2] Kinds of modes of access to evidence (visual, auditory, sensory, hearsay, inferential etc.)
1. INTRODUCTION

- Target: Korean Reportive/ Quotative Evidential -Ay

(1)a. nayil pi-ka o-n-ta
    tomorrow rain-Nom come-Imperf-Decl
    Lit. Rain comes tomorrow. “It rains tomorrow.”

b. nayil pi-ka o-n-ta-ay
    tomorrow rain-Nom come-Imperf-Decl-ay
    Lit. (I am told that) Rain comes tomorrow.
    “(I am told by someone that) It rains tomorrow.”
1. INTRODUCTION

- **Target: Korean Reportive/ Quotative Evidential -Ay**

[1] Reportive EV -ay discussed in only a few works (H.-S. Lee 1991; inter alia), recently in terms of surface syntactic constraints (J.-Y. Chung In preparation; 2009).


“[t]he reportive EV requires that the source of information be a third-person source, whether the source is explicitly expressed or not” (J.-Y. Chung In preparation: 13; 2009).
1. INTRODUCTION

- Target: Korean Reportive/ Quotative Evidential -Ay

(2) chelswu-ka ne-lul salangha-n-ta-ay
    Chelswu-Nom you-Acc love-Non.perf-Decl-ay
    Lit. (I was told by Chelswu that) Chelswu loves you.
    ‘(I was told by Chelswu that) Chelswu loves you.’

(3) ?nay-ka ne-lul salangha-n-ta-ay
    I-Nom you-Acc love-Non.perf-Decl-ay
    Lit. (I am told by myself) I love you.
    a. ‘?(I am told that) I love you.’
    b. ‘(It is said that) I love you.’

(3a) is ruled out, not because reportive constructions require that the information source be a third-person source, but because quotative constructions require that.
1. INTRODUCTION

- Target: Korean Reportive/ Quotative Evidential -Ay

(4) \text{nay-ka ne-lul salangha-n-ta-ay-ess-ci}  
I-Nom you-Acc love-Imperf-Decl-ay-Ant-Comm  
Lit. (I was told by myself that) I love you.  
‘I told you that I love you.’

(5) \text{kkwum-sok-eyse nay-ka ne-lul salangha-n-ta-ay}  
dream-inside-Loc I-Nom you-Acc love-Imperf-Decl-ay  
Lit. In my dream, I was told (by myself) that I love you.  
‘In my dream, I heard that I was saying that I love you.’

(4) and (5) are licensed, even though they are quotative constructions that employ a first person subject as information source, which the syntactic constraint is not able to capture.
1. INTRODUCTION

- The aims of the study

[1] To discuss functional/ constructional properties of -ay constructions thoroughly as part of a long-term project targeting the overall Korean evidential system.

[2] Regarding asymmetrical usages of (non-)first person subject in the constructions, to argue that the reportive/ quotative constructions are not a matter of surface syntactic constraint per se, but rather are a matter of understanding how viewpoint semantics of subjectivity works in the construction.

[3] As an alternative, to provide a unified account of the viewpoint phenomena within the Mental Spaces framework (Fauconnier 1994, 1997)
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2. BACKGROUND: EVIDENTIALITY SYSTEM IN KOREAN

- Status of Evidentiality in Korean
  - Korean evidentiality system as three term system: Firsthand, inferential, and reportive/quotative types (Kwon 2009b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Access</th>
<th>Firsthand/ Direct</th>
<th>Inferential</th>
<th>Reportive/ Quotative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic form</td>
<td>-te-</td>
<td>-napo- (-keyss-)</td>
<td>-ay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three-parameter system can be found cross-linguistically: other languages have it such as Aymara (Hardman 1986), Wanka Quechua (Floyd 1997:71, 1999:48) and so forth.
2. Background: Evidentiality System in Korean

- Terminology Issue: Reportive vs. Quotative
  “[t]he reportive EV requires that the source of information be a third-person source, *whether the source is explicitly expressed or not*” (J.-Y. Chung In preparation:13).

[1] Reportive: the mode of access by which the speaker obtains information is not direct or firsthand, but an indirect report or hearsay *without specifying the exact authorship* (Aikhenvald 2004:177)

[2] Quotative: the mode of access by which the speaker obtains information is quotation, which *introduces the exact author of the quoted report* (Aikhenvald 2004:177)
3. Properties of -Ay Constructions

3.1. Constructional Properties of -Ay Constructions

[Simple depictive]
(6) nayil pi-ka o-n-ta
   tomorrow rain-Nom come-Imperf-Decl
   Lit. Rain comes tomorrow. "It rains tomorrow."

[Original Construction]
(7)a. nayil pi-ka o-n-ta-(ko)-ha-n-ta
    tomorrow rain-Nom come-Imperf-Decl-(Comp)-say-Imperf-Decl
    "(I heard that someone is saying that) It rains tomorrow."

[Grammaticalized -ay Construction]
  b. nayil pi-ka o-n-t-ay-n-ta
     tomorrow rain-Nom come-Imperf-ta-ay-Imperf-Decl
     "(It is said that) It rains tomorrow."
3. PROPERTIES OF -AY CONSTRUCTIONS

3.1. Constructional Properties of -Ay Constructions

[1] Went through an attrition Process:
\[\text{tako-ha-e} \ [\text{tagəhæ}] > \text{ta-ha-e} \ [\text{tahæ}] > \text{tay} \ [\text{tæ}]\]

[2] Combine with other types of mood
-\text{-cay} (hortative), -\text{-lay} (imperative), -\text{-nyay} (interrogative)
(For details, see J.-Y. Chung In preparation).

[3] when -\text{ay} construction has a candidate for information source or
for a protagonist of the focal event in question, the construction
becomes ambiguous between reportive and quotative reading:

\[\text{Chelswu-ka yenghuy-lul cohaha-n-t-ay}\]
\[\text{CS-Nom YH-Acc like-Imperf-Decl-ay}\]
\[\text{a. (It is said that) CS likes YH. [reportive]}\]
\[\text{b. (I was told by Chelswu that) CS likes YH. [quotative]}\]
3. Properties of -Ay Constructions

3.2. Functional Properties of -Ay Constructions

[1] Reportive (from KORTERM corpus)

(9) nongcang-i kyengchal-uy supkyek-ul pat-ass-t-ay
farm-Nom police-Gen assault-Acc receive-Ant-Decl-ay
‘(It is said that) the farm is under the police’s attack.’

(10) ppalkan masukhu-ka tto yeca-lul cwuk-i-ess-t-ay
red mask-Nom again woman-Acc kill-Caus-Ant-Decl-ay
‘(It is said that) the ‘red mask’ killed another woman.

☞ Reportive EV indicates reported information that may or may not be accurate, since the speaker does not fully vouch for validity of the unidentified and ungrounded information source.
3. PROPERTIES OF -AY CONSTRUCTIONS

3.2. Functional Properties of -Ay Constructions

[1] Reportive (from KORTERM corpus; Cnt’d): Proverbs/ Maxims

(11) cayu-nun chakkak-ilako nwuka kule-t-ay-yo
freedom-Top misconception-Comp someone be.such-Decl-ay-Hon
‘Freedom is nothing but a misconception, someone says so.’

(12) nwuka kule-t-ay, salang-un cwu-nun ke-lako
someone be.such-Decl-ay love-Top give-Rltvzr thing-Comp
‘Someone says so, love is to give.’

(13) kuke-i ton cal pe-nun cinli-l-ay
that-Nom money well earn-Rltvzr truth-Imperative-ay
‘That’s how you earn money well, it is said.’

Reportive for proverbs/ maxims? since it is absolutely well known as
a truth, it might be needless to specify the source.
3. PROPERTIES OF -Ay CONSTRUCTIONS

3.2. Functional Properties of -Ay Constructions

[2] Quotative (from KORTERM corpus)

(14) \textit{wuliwangcho-ka koaynchanh-umyen sa-keyss-t-ay}
\begin{align*}
\text{our boss-Nom be.okay-if buy-will-Decl-ay} \\
\text{‘Our boss told me that he will buy (it) if (it is) okay.’}
\end{align*}

(15) \textit{kimpwucang-nim-i kyelhon-ha-ci mal-l-ay}
\begin{align*}
\text{chief.Kim-Nom marry-do-Conn do.not-Imperative-ay} \\
\text{‘Chief Kim told me not to marry.’}
\end{align*}

Quotative EV indicates the information is accurate, since the information source is explicit and thus, the speaker vouches for validity of the source.
3. Properties of -Ay Constructions

3.3. Problem Raised: Validity of Syntactic Constraint

(16) emma-ka kuke nwulu-myen an-toy-n-t-ay
mom-Nom it press-if not-be.okay-Imperf-Decl-ay
Lit. I was told by my mom that I will not be okay if I press it.
‘My mom told me not to press it.’

(16')?nay-ka kuke nwulu-myen an-toy-n-t-ay
I-Nom it press-if not-be.okay-Imperf-Decl-ay
Lit. I was told by myself that I will not be okay if I press it.
‘I told myself not to press it.’
3. PROPERTIES OF **-AY CONSTRUCTIONS**

3.3. Problem Raised: Validity of Syntactic Constraint

[1] The syntactic constraint seems to hold, “the source of the embedded utterance [the perceived event] must be someone other than the current speaker and addressee” (J.-Y. Chung In preparation)

[2] Nevertheless, the syntactic constraint is nullified in contexts where so-called ‘split self’ (Lakoff 1996) is possible, i.e., where the recounting self in the evidential construction and the acting self in the focal event structure can be separated by different temporal/spatial configurations.
3. PROPERTIES OF -AY CONSTRUCTIONS

3.3. Problem Raised: Validity of Syntactic Constraint

(17) nay-ka kuke nwulu-myen an-toy-n-t-ay-ess-ci
     I-Nom it press-if not-be.okay-Imperf-Decl-ay-Ant-Comm
Lit. I’m telling you that I had been told by myself that I
would not be okay if I press it.
‘I told you not to press it’ or ‘don’t you press it!’

(18) kkwum-sok-eyse nay-ka kuke nwulu-myen
     dream-inside-Loc I-Nom it press-if
     an-toy-n-t-ay
     not-be.okay-Imperf-Decl-ay
Lit. I was told by myself in my dream that I will not be okay
if I press it.
‘I was told by myself in my dream not to press it.’
3. PROPERTIES OF -AY CONSTRUCTIONS

3.3. Problem Raised: Validity of Syntactic Constraint

- Implications

(a) The phenomena cannot be given fully plausible accounts only with a syntactic constraint.

(b) EV constructions involve multiple events: The event of the speaker’s perception, the event that has been perceived by the speaker, and the event of recounting are encoded simultaneously by a single grammatical construction. Since each of the events has a participant, it is natural that there are some syntactic patterns mirroring interaction among the participants in each of the event

(c) The phenomena are thus, a target of deep semantics of subjectivity concerning the speaker’s viewpoint and its shift.
4. REPORTIVE/ QUOTATIVE EV CXN IN THE MENTAL SPACES THEORY

4.1 Space Building vs. Presuppositional Space Accommodation

- Strength of the Mental Spaces framework:
  - Good to track where the speaker’s viewpoint anchors to and to capture subtle subjective meanings that the viewpoint shift gives rise to.

- Temporally/ spatially/ deictically different configurations are obtained by setting up separate mental spaces evoked by a space builder; for instance, *at that time, in the building, in my dream*, etc.
4. REPORTIVE/ QUOTATIVE EV CXN IN THE MENTAL SPACES THEORY

4.1 Space Building vs. Presuppositional Space Accommodation

(19) *In the picture, the woman with green eyes has blue eyes.*

![Figure 1. Space Evocation](image)

-The dashed line from Base to Picture indicates that the picture space is set up relative to Base (it is subordinate to Base in the lattice of discourse spaces; Fauconnier 1997: 43)
4. REPORTIVE/ QUOTATIVE EV CXN IN THE MENTAL SPACES THEORY

4.1 Space Building vs. Presuppositional Space Accommodation

(20)  *pi-ka on-t-ay*
    rain-Nom come-Imperf-Decl-ay’
    ‘It is said that it is raining.’

(21)  *pi-ka an-o-n-t-ay*
    rain-Nom Neg-come-Imperf-Decl-ay’
    ‘They say that it isn’t raining.’
    *‘They don’t say that it’s raining.’

- The fact that the speaker has obtained the information is out of the scope of Negation. This suggests that in using EV CXNs, the fact that the speaker has obtained the information via indirect source is necessarily **presupposed.**
4. REPORTIVE/ QUOTATIVE EV CXN IN THE MENTAL SPACES THEORY

4.1 Space Building vs. Presuppositional Space Accommodation

![Diagram of Presuppositional Space Accommodation]

- **Presupposed Space**
- **Addressee**
- **Base**
- **s**: speaker
- **x**: information source
- **E**: a focal event of raining
- **S’s Subjective Experience**

Not s’, but s!

Figure 2. Presuppositional Space Accommodation
4.2 Modeling -Ay Constructions in the Mental Spaces Framework

(22) *chelswu-ka ne-lul salangha-n-t-ay*

Chelswu-Nom you-Acc love-Imperf-Decl-ay

[Quotative] IS: 3rd ps (CS)

a. ‘(I was told by Chelswu that) Chelswu loves you.’

Figure 3. Representation of (22a) - Quotative
4.2 Modeling -Ay Constructions in the Mental Spaces Framework

(22) chelswu-ka  ne-lul  salangha-n-t-ay
    Chelswu-Nom you-Acc    love-Imperf-Decl-ay
    [Reportive] IS: Unidentified
    b. ‘(It is said that) Chelswu loves you.’

Figure 4. Representation of (22b) - Reportive
4.2 Modeling -Ay Constructions in the Mental Spaces Framework

(23) **nay-ka ne-lul salangha-n-t-ay**
    I-Nom you-Acc love-Imperf-Decl-ay

[Quotative] IS: 1st ps (I)
*(I was told by myself) I love you.

Figure 5. Representation of (23) - Quotative
4.3. Semantics Overrides a Syntactic Constraint

(24) nay-ka ne-lul salangha-n-t-ay-ess-e
I-Nom you-Acc love-Imperf-Decl-ay-Ant-Indic

[Quotative] IS: 1\textsuperscript{st} ps
Lit. (I was told by myself that) I love you.
‘I said that I love you.’

Figure 7. Representation of (24)
4.3. Semantics Overrides a Syntactic Constraint

(25) nay-ka ne-lul salangha-n-t-ay-ess-ci
I-Nom you-Acc love-Imperf-Decl-ay-Ant-Committal
Lit. (I am telling you that I was told by myself that) I love you.
‘I TOLD you that I love you!’ [Quotative] IS: 1\textsuperscript{st} ps

Figure 8. Representation of (25)
4.3. Semantics Overrides a Syntactic Constraint

(26) *nay kkwum-sok-eyse nay-ka ne-lul salangha-n-t-ay*
my dream-inside-Loc I-Nom you-Acc love-Imperf-Decl-ay

Lit. In my dream, I was saying that I love you. [Quotative]
‘In my dream, I was told by myself that I love you.’ IS: 1st ps

Figure 9. Representation of (26)
4.3. Semantics Overrides a Syntactic Constraint

- The **third-hand evidential** is also covered by the reduplicated -*ay* construction.

(27)  *Chelswu-ka Yenghuy-lul cohaha-n-t-ay₁-ess-t-ay₂*
    
    CS-Nom YH-Acc like-Imperf-Decl-ay₁-Ant-Decl-ay₂
    ‘I was told by X, who had also been told by Y, that CS likes YH.’

- The reduplicated -*ay* construction depicts a situation where the focal information (CS likes YH) is handed down from Y, who had actually heard CS, to X, and then to the speaker.
4.3. Semantics Overrides a Syntactic Constraint

(27) ‘I was told by X, who had also been told by Y, that CS likes YH.’

Prompted Reading:  
\[ ay_1 \text{ [Quotative ]; IS: Y} \]
\[ ay_2 \text{ [Quotative ]; IS: X} \]

Figure 11. Representation of (27)
5. Conclusion

[1] Having explored constructional and functional properties of Korean reportive/quotative EV marker -ay, this paper has shown that a purely syntactic treatment would require a lot of abstract syntax, which involves multiple events. It naturally gives rise to semantics of the experiential origo's subjective experience that is affected by temporal, spatial, and intentional settings for the processed events.

[2] As an alternative, within the Mental Spaces framework, I provided a unified account of the phenomena tracking the subtle semantics of subjectivity due to the viewpoint shift.
5. Conclusion (Cnt’d)

Especially, I proposed that EV constructions involve Presupposed Space Accommodation, which is to represent how presupposed knowledge – the fact that the speaker has obtained the information – is accommodated and modeled examples where implicit/explicit participants of the constructions such as a participant of the focal event (grammatical subject), a participant of the event perception (an experiential origo), and participants of recounting the event (the speaker and the source) interact under different temporal/spatial configurations.
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