

Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics: Vol. 29 (2007): p. 1-32: URL: <http://hdl.handle.net/1808/1785>

A Systematic Account of Negation in Koreans from a Diachronic Point of View

Taeho Kim

1 Introduction

The objective of this study is to provide a systematic account of negation in Korean from a diachronic and synchronic point of view¹. In general, this study discusses the grammaticalization and lexicalization of negation forms in Korean. In particular, this study looks at how negation forms in Korean have become grammaticalized and lexicalized throughout the historical process, and whether there is a significant causal relation between phonological change and grammaticalization or lexicalization.

The outline of this study is as follows. Section 2 provides a brief introductory description and presents some previous studies about grammaticalization, lexicalization, and unidirectionality (Haspelmath, 1999; Traugott, 1989; Traugott, 2001; Lee, 2002; Traugott and Dasher, 2002; Hopper and Traugott, 2003; Traugott, 2004; Brinton and Traugott, 2005), including discussions of some controversial issues about grammaticalization, lexicalization, and unidirectionality, which have appeared as topics in many studies (Haspelmath, 1999; Campbell, 2001; Campbell and Janda, 2001; Newmeyer, 2001; Norde, 2001; Traugott, 2001). Section 3 presents linguistic data, which illustrate issues concerned in the study and discusses the data in detail. For instance, this study discusses the origin of negation forms in modern Korean (*ani*[a.ni] ‘not’/*an*[an] ‘not’), an issue which is still debated, and provides an explanation for their developmental process². It also discusses how negation forms in Korean have grammaticalized into other grammatical items such as an ASA or a discourse marker and lexicalized into independent lexical items diachronically. The behavioral differences between the COMPs *-ci*[ci] and *-chi*[c^{hi}] are also discussed in section 3. Section 4 concludes this study by arguing that phonological reduction has always been involved in semantic/morphosyntactic changes of negation in Korean; that pre-verbal negation has undergone neither grammaticalization nor lexicalization, while other forms of negation are the result of grammaticalization or lexicalization, as well as phonological reduction; and that the COMP *-ci*[ci] behaves somewhat differently than the *-chi*[c^{hi}]. Finally, the last section introduces some further issues, such as: what makes the behavioral differences between the COMP *-ci*[ci] and *-chi*[c^{hi}] in Korean, and why *isscanha*[is.can.a] ‘You know’ may be used as a discourse particle while *epscanha*[əp.can.a] ‘You know(???)’³ cannot. These further issues may be discussed in future studies.

¹The earlier version of this paper was published in the Journal of Cross Culture Studies 8, and it was also presented at the 17th international conference of historical Linguistics, 2003.

²It is still controversial as to which of the negations *an*[an] and *ani*[a.ni] is the original negation form in Korean (from the personal communication with Professor. Sung-ha Rhee).

³In fact, *epscanha*[əp.can.a] does not denote the meaning of ‘You know?’ at all.

2 Grammaticalization, Lexicalization, and Unidirectionality

Grammaticalization, lexicalization and unidirectionality have been used extensively as topics of interest in the research of historical linguistics.⁴ Representative works include Givón (1979), Traugott (1989), Lass (1990), Traugott and Heine (1991), Hopper and Traugott (1993), Traugott (1995), Brinton (1996), Haspelmath (1999), Geurts (2000), Campbell (2001), Campbell and Janda (2001), Newmeyer (2001), Traugott (2001), Traugott and Dasher (2002), Hopper and Traugott (2003), and Traugott (2004). Negation, in particular, has also been used for many studies of grammaticalization (Croft, 1991; Kawanishi and Sohn, 1993). However, most studies on grammaticalization, lexicalization or unidirectionality appeared to have been limited to European languages or African languages. Some works (e.g., Kawanishi and Sohn (1993), Rhee (1996), Lee (2002) or Rhee (2003)) have been done with East Asian languages, such as Korean and Japanese, but these languages still remain among the least studied with regard to grammaticalization and lexicalization, particularly when it comes to the issue of negation (Kim, 2004).

2.1 Grammaticalization

The term ‘grammaticalization’⁵ was first introduced by the French Indo-Europeanist *Antoine Meillet*, and it was typically defined as “the development of lexemes into grammatical items” (Traugott and Dasher, 2002:81). More specifically, grammaticalization may also be defined as the process by which a grammatical character is attributed to a formerly independent word, and that an independent word with an independent meaning may develop into an auxiliary word, and, if the process continues, it ends up as a grammatical marker or a bound grammatical morpheme (Traugott and Dasher, 2002). They also treat a change from a relatively free to a relatively fixed word order as an instance of grammaticalization. Based on the definition of grammaticalization, it can be said that grammaticalization alters the status of a morpheme from lexical to grammatical status or from less grammatical to more grammatical (Campbell, 2001; Traugott and Dasher, 2002).

Grammaticalization is also defined as “the increase of the range of a morpheme advancing from a lexical to a grammatical or from a less grammatical to more grammatical status, e.g., from a derivative formant to an inflectional one” (Kuryłowicz, 1975[1965]:52, cited in Brinton and Traugott (2005:24)). Geurts (2000:781) defines grammaticalization as a process of language change where an expression changes from the lexical status to the grammatical status. Geurts (2000) also mentions that this kind of change is quite common and natural. On the other hand, the opposite direction of change is practically nonexistent (Geurts, 2000).

⁴For a full discussion of the history of grammaticalization, see chapter 2 of Hopper & Traugott (2003)

⁵Note that the term ‘grammaticalization’ is sometimes called ‘grammaticization’ or ‘grammaticalisation’, but no difference exists between these terms.

Traugott (1995) says that grammaticalization is the process by which lexical material in highly constrained pragmatic and morphosyntactic contexts becomes grammatical, and grammatical material does not become lexical. This statement says, in other words, that the grammaticalization process is unidirectional; this will be discussed in further detail in the later sections of the paper. Traugott (2001) says that grammaticalization is, in fact, not a distinct phenomenon, but rather a subset of phenomena that recur cross-linguistically. These occurring phenomena include temporal correlations between semantic and morphosyntactic changes, but can also sometimes include correlations with phonological changes as well. Traugott (2001) and Hopper and Traugott (2003:1) also defines grammaticalization as the change by which lexical items or constructions function as grammatical items or grammatical items serve new grammatical functions. However, note that it can be controversial to consider the case that grammatical items serve new grammatical functions as an instance of grammaticalization due to the difficulty of judging which grammatical item is more grammatical or less grammatical. Traugott (1989) also proposes that the semantic-pragmatic shift from propositional to expressive (interactional) is an instance of grammaticalization (propositional > (textual) > expressive/interactional)). In fact, this type of semantic shift is particularly called subjectification, which is still in much debate about whether or not to treat it as a type of grammaticalization.

Some linguists (Moreno Cabrera, 1998; Haspelmath, 1999) claim that grammaticalization is an irreversible process, but others (Traugott, 2001) think that this hypothesis is far too strong (hence, it is sometimes called the Strong Hypothesis⁶). Newmeyer (2001) even claims that grammaticalization does not exist because of too many counterexamples to unidirectionality.

The question of the limits of grammaticalization should also be noted here. Giacalone Ramat and Hopper (1998:2) mention that the number of works referring to the question of the limits of grammaticalization—that is, whether a certain feature may be considered as grammaticalization or it should be treated as something else (such as lexicalization or morphologization)—have increased. Traugott (2001) also discusses similar issues in detail.

Let us take a look at an example below, which clearly illustrates grammaticalization. Based on the example below, we can tell that semantic bleaching has come into the grammaticalization process before phonological reduction has. This is, in fact, the general tendency of grammaticalization (Campbell, 2001).

- (1) *going to* (the verb encoding the meaning of physical movement) > *going to* (future tense coding ASAiliary verb) > *gonna* (future tense coding ASAiliary verb with a phonological reduction involved)

It is also said that one instance of grammaticalization may lead to another instance of

⁶See Norde (2001) for a discussion of benefits/problems with the Strong Hypothesis.

grammaticalization. In other words, an already grammatical or grammaticalized item (from a lexical or less grammatical item) can go through another grammaticalization to become another type of grammatical item. This phenomenon is labeled as *re-grammaticalization* according to Greenberg's (1991) (cited in Brinton and Traugott (2005:53))⁷.

For the purpose of this study, this study adopts the definition of grammaticalization proposed by Traugott (2001) and Hopper and Traugott (2003), that is, grammaticalization as the change by which lexical items or constructions happen to function as grammatical items or grammatical items serve new grammatical functions.

2.2 Lexicalization

Brinton and Traugott (2005:18) note that the term *lexicalization* has been used for both synchronic (“for the coding of conceptual categories”) and diachronic (“adoption into the lexicon or falling outside the productive rules of grammar”) phenomena. It has also been viewed by some as the reverse process of grammaticalization, by others as a routine process of word-formation, and by others still as the development of idiomatic meanings (Brinton and Traugott, 2005).

Lexicalization is considered to be the process whereby syntactic constructions turn into lexical items, and some instances of lexicalization are even called *degrammaticalization*⁸ (Moreno Cabrera, 1998). Brinton and Traugott (2005:32) consider lexicalization as “the process by which new items that are considered “lexical” (in terms of the theory in question) come into being.” Brinton and Traugott (2005:33-4) note that lexicalization may be considered the same as word formation in broad sense. Brinton and Traugott (2005:38) also recognize that conversion involving a shift from minor (closed, nonlexical, grammatical or functional) class to major (open, lexical, fully referential) class has been treated widely as lexicalization (and degrammaticalization). Lexicalization is also defined as “the development of a fully referential lexical item from a nonlexical or grammatical item, such as the development of the verbs *up*, *down* or nouns *upper*, *downer* from the homophonous particles *up*, *down*” (Hopper and Traugott (1993:49), cited in Brinton and Traugott (2005:38)). Also, some view degrammaticalization as a subtype of lexicalization, and treat it as the opposite of grammaticalization (van der Auwera (2002) and Ramat (2001), cited in Brinton and Traugott (2005:83)). However, Brinton and Traugott (2005:82-8) argue that degrammaticalization is in fact a distinct phenomenon from lexicalization in that “lexicalization is the fusion and coalescence of two or more morphemes”. Furthermore, Brinton and Traugott (2005:96) define the lexicalization as follows: “Lexicalization is the change whereby in certain linguistic contexts speakers use a

⁷Note that it is still in much debate whether to treat the re-grammaticalization as grammaticalization.

⁸It is important not to confuse the terms *degrammaticalization* and *lexicalization* even though certain instances of lexicalization (e.g., (Minor class:) V (*to*) *off* > (Major class:) Adv *off*) are called degrammaticalization (Brinton and Traugott, 2005:38).

syntactic construction or word formation as a new contentful form with formal and semantic properties that are not completely derivable or predictable from the constituents of the construction or the word formation pattern. Over time there may be further loss of internal constituency and the item may become more lexical.”

Idioms appear to be good examples of lexicalization in that some idioms were originally syntactic constructions (Moreno Cabrera, 1998). For instance, *forget-me-not* (a flower’s name) in English is an independent item, which was lexicalized from a whole phrase *forget me not* (Moreno Cabrera, 1998). The expression, *black market* is also an example of lexicalization in that the semantic components of the expression *black market* lose their compositionality, resulting in the new meaning. For the detailed description of lexicalization and more examples, see Brinton and Traugott (2005).

The definition of lexicalization proposed by Brinton and Traugott (2005:96) is adopted for the purpose of this study.

2.3 Unidirectionality

Hopper and Traugott (2003:100) describe the unidirectionality of change as a relation between two stages A and B, such that A occurs before B, but not vice versa.” It has been discussed that the grammaticalization process is unidirectional in that once grammaticalization begins, there is a direction that the grammaticalization is likely to follow (Givón, 1979; Hopper and Traugott, 1993; Geurts, 2000; Traugott and Dasher, 2002; Hopper and Traugott, 2003). For example, the change always occurs in the same order when there is a language change involved, namely, the “*lexical item used in a specific linguistic context > syntax > morphology*” Hopper and Traugott (2003:100). Moreno Cabrera (1998:224) says that “when a lexical item grammaticalizes as a morpheme, it is generally not possible for this morpheme to de-grammaticalize into a lexical item.” In this sense, Moreno Cabrera (1998:224) claims that grammaticalization is an irreversible process. Traugott (1989) also claims that semantic-pragmatic change in grammaticalization is unidirectional. Moreno Cabrera (1998:224) proposes that the unidirectionality issue should not be confined to grammaticalization only but should be extended to the evolution of grammar in general. However, Hopper and Traugott (1993:126) propose that unidirectionality is, in fact, a strong hypothesis that all grammaticalization involves changes from lexical items to grammatical items, from less grammatical to more grammatical items. In other words, grammaticalization is irreversible. Traugott (2001) also proposes that it is too strong to take grammaticalization as an irreversible process, although unidirectionality is a robust tendency cross-linguistically.

It has also been claimed that there exist some counterexamples to unidirectionality (Hopper and Traugott, 1993; Traugott, 2001; Hopper and Traugott, 2003). In fact, unidirectionality has been an issue which has been debated for the last few decades, particularly since the

1990s, and is still brought onto the table of discussion by many studies (Haspelmath, 1999; Geurts, 2000; Campbell and Janda, 2001; Newmeyer, 2001; Traugott, 2001; Lee, 2002; Hopper and Traugott, 2003; Brinton and Traugott, 2005). For example, Traugott (2001) takes unidirectionality as empirically supportable robust tendencies, whereas Newmeyer (2001) takes the Strong Hypothesis⁹. Furthermore, Traugott (2001) discusses some legitimate counterexamples as well as some putative ones to unidirectionality. She claims that In general, there are some counterexamples to unidirectionality, but the number of those examples is far less than that of examples supporting unidirectionality. In other words, although there are sporadic and unpatterned counterexamples to grammaticalization or unidirectionality, unidirectionality is still extremely robust cross-linguistically (Andersen, 2001, cited in Hopper and Traugott, 2003:138).

Hopper and Traugott's (2003) position that unidirectionality is a robust tendency cross-linguistically despite some sporadic counterexamples is adopted for the purpose of this study.

3 Data

Before I discuss negation in Korean in detail, I will, first, provide a brief summary of negations in Korean. Korean is typologically a verb final and agglutinative (also called agglutinating) language with S-O-V syntax (Sohn, 1999). In general, there are two different types of negation in Korean, namely, pre-verbal negation (also called short form negation) and post-verbal negation (also called long form negation) (Sohn, 1999; Kim, 2000). In detail, *an*[an] 'not' is a pre-verbal negation marker, and *anh-(ta)*[an.t^ha] 'not be' is an ASAiliary verb of pre-verbal negation (Kim, 2000). Example (2) below illustrates the use of pre-verbal negation, and example (3) illustrates that of post-verbal negation in Present Day Korean¹⁰ (henceforth, PDK). Table 1 below is a brief summary of negation forms in PDK, and those who are interested in the detailed description of negation in Korean can refer to Sohn (1999) and Kim (2000).

- (2) *Chelswu-ka onul hakkyo-ey an ka-ss-ta.*
 Chelswu-NOM today school-to NEG go-PAST-DEC
 'Chelswu did not go to school today.'
- (3) *ku-kes-un nay-key ewulli-ci anh-nun-ta.*
 That-thing-TOP I-DAT look.good-COMP NEG-ASP-DEC
 'It does not look good on me.'

⁹Recollect that Newmeyer (2001) claims that there is no such thing as grammaticalization.

¹⁰Present Day Korean here means the standard Korean that is currently spoken in Korea.

Pre-verbal	Post-verbal	Sentential adverb
<i>an</i> [an] ‘not’	<i>anh-(ta)</i> [an.t ^h a] ‘not be’	<i>ani</i> [a.ni] ‘No’ (in response to a Yes/No question)

Table 1: Negation Forms in PDK

3.1 The origin of negation forms in Korean

Basically, there have been two different arguments as to the origin of negation forms in Korean (personal communication with Dr. Sang-Oak Lee and Dr. Sung-ha Rhee¹¹). One argument, presented by Dr. Sang-Oak Lee and Dr. Sung-ha Rhee, is that the negation form *an*[an] ‘not’ in Old Korean (henceforth, OK) has become *ani*[a.ni] ‘not’ in the PDK through phonological process (henceforth, the *an* first argument). The other argument is that the change has occurred in the opposite direction, that is, the negation form *ani*[a.ni] ‘not’ in the OK has phonologically reduced into the negation form *an*[an] ‘not’ in the PDK (henceforth, the *ani* first argument) (Lee, 2000). This study acknowledges that the debate over the origin of negation in Korean is unresolved, and there should be more convincing historical data to strongly claim either argument. Table 2 below describes the brief history of pre-verbal negation in Korean, and the discussion of the origin of negation in Korean will be based on the table 2.

14-16C	17-18C	late 19C	PDK
<i>ani</i> /(an) ¹²	<i>ani</i>	<i>an/ani</i>	<i>an</i>
← OK →			PDK

Table 2: Pre-Verbal Negation In Korean

As was mentioned earlier, it may be argued that the negation form *an*[an] ‘not’ is, in fact, the original negation form in Korean, and that other negation forms were derived from it. In fact, this argument seems to be supported by several pieces of evidence, although at times the evidence, as we shall see below, can be misleading.

First, those who support the *an* first argument (*an*[an] > *ani*[a.ni]) claim that the expression *anita*[a.ni.ta] ‘not be’ is a negative form of the expression *ita*[i.ta] ‘be’ in the PDK. They claim that the negative expression *anita*[a.ni.ta] ‘not be’ was originally *an*[an] ‘not’ + *ita*[i.ta] ‘be’, but later it became *anita*[an.i.ta] ‘not be’ through the phonological coalescence, and then

¹¹Dr. Sang-Oak Lee is a professor of the department of Korean language and literature in Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea, and Dr. Sung-ha Rhee is a professor of the college of English in Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Seoul, Korea.

¹²There are only a few occurrences of *an* in this period (personal communication with Dr. Sang-Oak Lee).

it further went through another phonological process, so called re-syllabification, to become *anita*[a.ni.ta] ‘not be’ as summarized in the Table 3.¹³

Stages	Forms	Phonological Process
stage 1	<i>an+ ita</i>	← in the OK
	↓	← phonological coalescence
stage 2	<i>anita</i> [an.i.ta]	
	↓	← re-syllabification
stage 3	<i>anita</i> [a.ni.ta]	← in the PDK

Table 3: *an+ita* ‘not be’ > *anita*[a.ni.ta] ‘not be’ (in the *an* first argument)

On one hand, the *an* first argument seems to be not only plausible but also persuasive, since the original form *an+ita* ‘not be’ is the negative form of *ita* ‘be’ in the OK (e.g., *kolyanun elyuka an ita*. ‘A whale is not a fish’, excerpted from Park (1935:192), cited in Seo (1996:971). On the other hand, this argument seems to be somewhat problematic in that the expression *ani+ita* ‘not be’ was also once the negative form of *ita* ‘be’ in OK. Seo (1996:971). In fact, Seo (1996:971) claims that *anita*[a.ni.ta] in PDK is derived from *ani+ita* in OK, and provides its developmental process as summarized in Table 4.

Stages	Forms	Phonological Process
stage 1	<i>ani+ ita</i>	← in OK
	↓	← phonological coalescence
stage 2	<i>aniita</i> [a.ni.i.ta]	
	↓	← same vowel deletion
stage 3	<i>anita</i> [a.ni:.ta]	
	↓	← vowel shoring
stage 4	<i>anita</i> [a.ni.ta]	← in PDK

Table 4: *ani+ita* ‘not be’ > *anita*[a.ni.ta] ‘not be’ (in the *ani* first argument)

The expression *ani+ita* in stage 1 has become *aniita* in stage 2 through phonological coalescence (Seo, 1996:971-2). Song (1971) claims that *aniita*[a.ni.i.ta] in stage 2 became *anita*[a.ni.ta] in stage 3 through the phenomenon called same vowel deletion (cited in Seo (1996:971)). Kim (2001:76-7) points out that the same vowel deletion phenomenon frequently occurs in Korean, and the first vowel gets lengthened for compensation (*compensatory lengthening*), as a result of the same vowel deletion (e.g., *nainik*’a [na.ni:.k’a], excerpted from Kim (2001:76)). Then, the long vowel [i:] of *anita*[a.ni:.ta] in stage 3 became its corresponding short vowel [i] in stage 4, resulting in *anita*[a.ni.ta] ‘not be’ in PDK. This phenomenon is often observed in Korean in that a long vowel in a non-phrase-initial syllable in Korean is shortened into its corresponding short vowel (e.g., *hij-n nu:n*[hin.nun] ‘white snow’, excerpted

¹³Note that ‘+’ here indicates the word boundary.

from Sohn (1999:176)).¹⁴

Second, those who support the *an* first argument claim that the negation form *ani*[a.ni] ‘not’ frequently appears in the PDK, and thus *ani*[a.ni] ‘not’ cannot be the original negation form because it should not appear in the PDK if it is an older form. However, this argument does not appear to be convincing at all in that the negation form *an*[an] ‘not’ also appears as a pre-verbal negation in the PDK. Nevertheless, due to the limited available sources for evidence,¹⁵ it is not clear which one (*an*[an] vs. *ani*[a.ni]) is the original negation form in Korean.

Those who prefer the *ani* first argument (*ani*[a.ni] ‘not’ > *an*[an] ‘not’) also provide several additional pieces of evidence for their claim. For instance, Lee (2000) claims that the negation *an*[an] ‘not’ stems from *ani*[a.ni] ‘not’, because the negation form *ani* was only form that appeared in early Modern Korean (17-18C), and in the late 19th century, the negation form *ani*[a.ni] ‘not’ started being replaced with the negation form *an*[an] ‘not’, and this phenomenon frequently appeared in the *Doklipsinmwun* ‘The Newspaper of Independence’ and *Taycosen toklip hyephoy hoypo* ‘Newsletter of Association for the Independence of Great Cosen Dynasty’ (e.g., ... *ssahom an natolok* ... ‘to make the fight not happen’).¹⁶ The negation form *ani*[a.ni] ‘not’ is now scarcely found in the PDK, and it is suggested that it has now disappeared in formal or official PDK (Lee, 2000; Kim, 2004).

- (4) *Chelswu-nun haksayng-i anita/??aniita.*
 Chelswu-TOP student-SUBJ not.be
 ‘Chelswu is not a student.’
- (5) *Chelswu-ka onul hakkyo-ey an/??ani ka-ss-ta.*
 Chelswu-NOM today school-to NEG go-PAST-DEC
 ‘Chelswu did not go to school today.’

Examples (4) with the use of *aniita*[a.ni.i.ta] ‘not be’ is ungrammatical, and example (5) with *ani*[a.ni] ‘not’ sounds very old and out-dated, both to the author and other native speakers of Korean. In fact, examples (4) with *ani+ta* is not allowed in PDK, and example (5) with *ani* ‘not’ is quite unacceptable in PDK. On the other hand, examples (4) and (5) are quite good with the use of negation forms *anita* ‘not be’ and *an* ‘not’ instead.

Also, it is said that the origin of the post-verbal negation *anhta*[an.t^ha] ‘not be’ in PDK is *anihata*[a.ni.ha.ta] ‘not be’ (Kim, 2000; Seo, 1996), and this seems to be another piece of supporting evidence for the *ani* first argument that the negation form *ani*[a.ni] ‘not’, rather

¹⁴For further description of Korean phonology, see the chapter 7 of Sohn (1999).

¹⁵Brinton and Traugott (2005:147) consider Korean as a language with little recorded history.

¹⁶This example was excerpted from *Taycosen toklip hyephoy hoypo* ‘Newsletter of Association for the Independence of Great Cosen Dynasty (1896)’ available from the Sejong corpus data.

than the form *an*[an] is the original negation form. The developmental processes of *ani*+*hata* to *anhata*¹⁷ are summarized in the Table 5 (based on Kim (2000) and Seo (1996)).

Stages	Forms	Phonological Process
stage 1	<i>ani</i> [a.ni]+ <i>hata</i> [ha.ta]	← in OK
	↓	← [i] vowel deletion
stage 2	<i>an</i> [an]+ <i>hata</i> [ha.ta]	
	↓	← phonological coalescence
stage 3	<i>anhata</i> [an.ha.ta]	
	↓	← [a] vowel deletion
stage 4	<i>anhata</i> [an.t ^h a]	← in PDK

Table 5: *ani*[a.ni]+*hata*[ha.ta] ‘not do’ > *anhata*[an.t^ha] ‘not be’ (in the *ani* first argument)

It is also noted that the negation form *ani* was basically the only one which showed up in the early literature of the *Cosen* dynasty¹⁸ (personal communication with Dr. Sang-Oak Lee). However, there are a few occurrences of *an* ‘not’ in early literature before the middle *Cosen* dynasty (17-18C) such as *Kwangcwu chencamwun* ‘one thousand letters used in the Kwangcwu area’ (1575), *Itwu* ‘clerk reading’ (14C), and *Samkwukyusa* ‘history of three countries’ (from personal communication with Dr. Sang-Oak Lee). This suggests that the negation form *ani* may have started being replaced by the negation form *an* earlier than it was suggested by Lee (2000), but the serious and regular replacement might have not started until the late 19th century as Lee (2000) suggests.

This study, however, acknowledges that there is another possibility that the negation form *an* (as an original form) was initially replaced by the form *ani*, and that the form *ani* was later replaced again by the form *an* through the phonological process (in short, *an* > *ani* > *an*). Due to the limited data sources available, it cannot be decided which form is the original form, and thus further investigation needs to be done to answer this question. Nonetheless, it seems that the direction of recent change is made from the form *ani* to the form *an* as suggested in (Lee, 2000).

What should be noted here is that there are certain periods when both the negation forms *ani*[a.ni] ‘not’ and *an*[an] ‘not’ exist together (Seo, 1996; Lee, 2000). The form *ani*[a.ni] ‘not’ seems to have become less favorable once another negation form *an*[an] ‘not’, which is considered a phonologically reduced form of *ani*[a.ni] ‘not’, started to be used more frequently than the negation form *ani*[a.ni] ‘not’ did. This preference of *an* ‘not’ seems to have finally led to the disappearance of *ani* ‘not’ in the PDK (in short, *ani* > {*ani*/*an*} > *an*). The intermediate stage where a unreduced form *ani*[a.ni] ‘not’ and a reduced form *an*[an] ‘not’

¹⁷ *anhata* ‘not be’ is pronounced as [an.t^ha] by *h*-*aspiration* rule in Korean. For the detailed description of the *h*-*aspiration* rule in Korean, see chapter 7 of Sohn (1999).

¹⁸It lasts from 1392 to 1910.

co-exist is an instance of “layering”, which Hopper and Traugott (2003:49) discusses.¹⁹ Also, the reason for the phonological reduction (*ani*[a.ni] ‘not’ to *an*[an] ‘not’) seems to be resulted from the automatization to minimize the articulatory efforts, which is a natural phonological process as Newmeyer (2001:195) and Lee (2002) discuss. Note that the phonological reduction often accompanies grammaticalization (e.g., *be going to* > *be gonna*).

In summary, there are basically two different arguments as to the origin of the negation form in Korean, and it can be still argued as to which approach is more likely (*an* > *ani*; *ani* > *an*). As I discussed above, both negation forms were once in use at the same time. Nevertheless, it is generally believed that all negations in the PDK were rooted in the negation form *ani*[a.ni] ‘not’ rather than the form *an*[an] ‘not’ as described above. Seo (1996) also says that *an* ‘not’ is a phonologically reduced form of *ani* ‘not’ in Korean. To the author, the *ani* first argument (*ani* > *an*) seems to be more convincing and plausible, and thus, this study will discuss negation forms in Korean further based on the assumption that the form *ani*[a.ni] ‘not’ precedes the form *an*[an] ‘not’ historically.

3.2 Negation forms and their changing processes

So far, it has been discussed what the original or older negation forms in Korean are likely to be and why they are and are not likely to be original or older negation forms by looking at several pieces of diachronic and synchronic evidence. Based on the *ani* first argument that the negation form *ani*[a.ni] ‘not’ has become *an*[an] ‘not’ (*ani* > *an*) (Sohn, 1999; Kim, 2000), this study further discusses the process of change different types of negation in the PDK may have gone through over time.

It was mentioned in earlier sections that the negation *anh(-ta)* ‘not(-DEC)’ is used for post-verbal negation in the PDK (see *anh-a*[an.a] ‘not-SEM’ in example (6)). Kim (2000) and Kim (2004) briefly mentioned the archaic form of the negation form *anh-ta*[an(.t^ha)] ‘not-DEC’ is *ani+ha-ta*[a.ni.ha.ta] ‘not+do-(DEC)’, but they did not discuss the detailed process of change. This study suggests that post-verbal negation *anh-ta* ‘not+DEC’ was derived from the combined form *ani+ha-ta* ‘not+do-DEC’. The form *ani+ha-ta*[a.ni.ha.ta] became phonologically reduced into *an+ha-ta* [an.ha.ta], and became further reduced into *anh-ta*[an.t^ha] as summarized in Table 5. Finally, it is noted that there is also a lexicalized negative adjective *anita*[a.ni.ta] in the PDK, and it is originally derived from the old form *aniita*[a.ni.i.ta] ‘not be’ based on the approach (*ani* > *an*) that this study adopts (see Table 4).²⁰

¹⁹Hopper and Traugott (2003:49) defines a “layering” as an intermediate stage in which A and B exist together, and further says that A probably does not become B without undergoing the intermediate stage (A > {A/B} > B).

²⁰Note that the form *anita*[a.ni.ta] ‘not be’ can be categorized as an adjective while its corresponding form *-ita*[i.ta] ‘be’ as an affix, which is attached to its preceding noun, in Korean dictionary. On the other hand, Kim *et al.* (forthcoming) categorize both *-ita* ‘be’ and *anita* ‘not be’ as copular. However, it is important to

3.3 The grammaticalization of negation forms in Korean

So far, we have discussed negation forms in Korean focusing on their likelihood of being the original or older negation form and the phonological change that they may have been through. Now, let us look into the cases in which the negations have become grammaticalized. Note that negations in Korean have been grammaticalized in several different ways, and that phonological reduction was involved in most cases of grammaticalization. It should also be noted that the post-verbal negation *anh* (+*ta*) is always used together with the COMP *-ci* or *-chi* as Kim (2000) and Kim (2004) point out, and this will be discussed later in further detail.

3.3.1 The shift of semantic-pragmatic function

Let us first look at the cases where semantic-pragmatic function shift occurred via the grammaticalization process, and this is a case of subjectification, which is discussed in detail in Traugott (1989) and Traugott (1995). Observe the differences in semantic-pragmatic function between examples (6) and (7) below (see the English translation given for each example). Also, notice the phonological difference between these examples (*-ci anh-a* vs. *-canh-a*) below.

(6) *Tom-un aphu-ci anh-a.*
 Tom-TOP be.sick-COMP NEG-SEM
 ‘Tom is not sick.’²¹

(7) *Tom-un aphu-canh-a.*
 Tom-TOP be.sick-ASA-SEM
 ‘Tom is sick (, right?²²).’

Note that the assignment of *-ci*[ci] as COMP in example (6) and of *-canh*[can] as ASA in example (7) is attested in Kim (2000). It is noted that this is an example of subjectification since there is a semantic-pragmatic shift from propositional meaning to interactional meaning.²³ Remember that the post-verbal negation *anh*[an] appears always with the COMP *-ci*[ci] or *-chi*[c^hi]. Notice that the COMP *-ci*[ci] appears as a overt free morpheme in example (6), but it is fused with *anh*[an] to become *canh*[can] in example (7). Note that the only overt difference in the surface form between examples (6) and (7) is that the phonological reduction occurred only in example (7) with a corresponding shift in semantic interpretation.

note that both analyses are right, and they simply view the same thing from two different perspectives. Thus, this study adopts both approaches, and treats *ita* ‘be’ as an affixal and *anita* ‘not be’ as an adjectival copular respectively.

²¹The literal translation for this expression is “it is not that Tom is sick.”

²²Here, *right* can have two different interpretations: 1) You already know this; 2) Seek confirmation.

²³However, note that it is currently in debate whether to treat the subjectification as a type of grammaticalization in that it is difficult to say one is more grammatical or less grammatical than the other one.

Notice that the meaning of example (6) is purely negative (*anh*[an]), but that of example (7) is positive even though example (7) also contains a covert form of the negative (*canh*[can]). It is also notable that example (6) has a simple propositional function while example (7) has an interactional function, that is, *seeking agreement*. In fact, this is an instance of (inter)subjectification, which Traugott (1989), Traugott (1995) and Cacoulios and Schwenter (forthcoming) discuss in detail. Traugott (1989:31) discusses a tendency in grammaticalization, called *subjectification*, that “meanings seem to become increasingly situated in the speaker’s subjective belief state or attitude toward the position”. Traugott (1995:32) defines the subjectification as “gradient phenomenon, whereby forms and constructions that at first express primarily concrete, lexical, and objective meanings come through repeated use in local syntactic contexts to serve increasingly abstract, pragmatic, interpersonal, and speaker-based functions.”

Following Traugott’s (1989) and Traugott’s (1995) claim, it can be said that example (6) has a propositional function only, but its propositional meaning has become situated in the speaker’s subjective belief state to have an interactional or interpersonal function, *seeking agreement*, when post-verbal negation *anh* is fused with the COMP *-ci* as in example (7). In other words, *ci anh* in example (6) is simply used for negating the propositional content as shown in English translation. The propositional function of *ci anh* in example (6) contrasts with *canh* in example (7) in that the latter has the interactional function. More specifically, the use of *canh* in example (7) suggests that the speaker knows that the speaker shares the proposition with the listener, and thus the speaker tries to remind the listener of the shared proposition (*or* common ground) and even seeks the agreement from the listener. In short, the unreduced form *ci anh* simply concerns the information content while the reduced form *canh* concerns the speaker-listener interaction.²⁴ Traugott (1989) claims that the shift of semantic function always occurs from propositional to interactional (*or* expressive). In other words, this type of semantic-pragmatic change is unidirectional in that the semantic-pragmatic change occurs from propositional to interactional. This semantic-pragmatic change shown between examples (6) and (7) appears to follow this unidirectionality.

In summary, it can be said that both semantic-pragmatic shift and phonological reduction occurred as shown in the change from examples (6) and (7). In fact, this leads to a question of whether semantic-pragmatic shift or phonological reduction occurred first.

Kawanishi and Sohn (1993:558-61) claims that there exists an intermediate stage where the full form *ci anh* and the reduced form *canh* co-exist in the transitional process by claiming that the two forms *ci anh* and *canh* are sometimes interchangeable without any necessary semantic shift (e.g., *cek-ci anh-un sonhay* ‘not small loss’ = *cek-canh-un sonhay* ‘not small loss’).

²⁴Kawanishi and Sohn (1993:558-9) claims that this case of *canh* in Korean (propositional > interactional) can be treated as a case of semi-grammaticalization in that the process is still on-going in the modern Korean. See Kawanishi and Sohn (1993:558-9) for the detailed description and the evidences for this claim.

Based on this, they claim that phonological reduction occurred before semantic bleaching. In fact, it is widely believed that the general tendency in grammaticalization is that semantic bleaching occurs before phonological reduction does. In other words, semantic change comes into the process, and then phonological reduction occurs later in the process (e.g., *be going to* ‘physical motion’ > *be going to* ‘future’ > *be gonna* ‘future’). It is also said that both grammaticalization and lexicalization involve the gradual phonetic erosion in their later stage (Wischer, 2000:364-365, cited in Brinton and Traugott (2005:68)). In this sense, it can be said that phonological reduction is usually regarded as a byproduct of grammaticalization or lexicalization. However, according to Kawanishi and Sohn (1993), the grammaticalization from propositional (*ci anh*) to interactional (*canh*) seems to be a case which works against this general tendency in grammaticalization since the phonological coalescence precedes semantic bleaching (or functional shift), instead of the other way around. Kim (2004) also claims that phonological reduction came into the process of grammaticalization before semantic bleaching.

However, phonological reduction is not necessarily the cause of the semantic bleaching and further semantic-pragmatic function shift although Kim (2004) suggests that it is. The phonological reduction and the semantic bleaching or semantic-pragmatic function shift could simply be two separate but related processes. There still remains a question over whether phonological erosion should be treated as a part of the process in grammaticalization.

3.3.2 The morphosyntactic change via grammaticalization

Now let us look at cases where morphosyntactic changes have occurred. Observe the morphosyntactic difference between example (8) and (9), which is shown in the gloss of the examples below (COMP NEG vs. ASA). Also, notice the phonological difference between these two examples below (*ci anh*[ci an] vs. *canh*[can]).

(8) *ku tulaysu-nun Mary-eykey ewulli-ci anh-a.*
 That dress-TOP Mary-DAT look.good-COMP NEG-SEM
 ‘That dress does not look good on Mary.’

(9) *ku tulaysu-nun Mary-eykey ewulli-canh-a.*
 That dress-TOP Mary-DAT look.good-ASA-SEM
 ‘That dress looks good on Mary (*as you may know or isn’t it?*).’

The grammatical statuses of negation and COMP in example (8) have changed into an ASA in example (9) above. Lee (1999) says that the fused form *canh* acquires a new grammatical status of ASAiliary (glossed as ASA in this study) from the peripheral status of the NEG as shown in examples (8) and (9) above. This study treats this case as an instance of grammaticalization in that the grammatical status has changed as it is observed in examples (8) and (9) above (COMP+NEG > ASA). On one hand, it can be said that this is not a

typical instance of grammaticalization (less grammatical > more grammatical) in that it is arguable which one between NEG and ASA is more or less grammatical. On the other hand, it can be also said that *canh* may be more grammatical than *ci anh* in terms of the degree of bonding between elements in a construction (based on the parameters listed in Hopper and Traugott (2003:31)).

Also, Kawanishi and Sohn (1993:558) point out that the syntactic environment where *canh* occurs is different from that of *ci anh* based on their observation that the full form *ci anh* appears in various types of constructions whereas the reduced form *canh* limits its occurrence only to a sentence-final position. Based on this, they suggest that the reduced form *canh* acquires a new textual function as a sentence final modal marker alongside the development of the interactional function.²⁵

This study proposes, however, that they do not provide the full discussion of the grammaticalization of post-verbal negation *anh*[an] ‘not’, and there are still more aspects of grammaticalization which post-verbal negation *anh*[an] ‘not’ has gone through. Below are other instances of grammaticalizations of post-verbal negation *anh*[an] ‘not’.

- (10) (a) *Chelswu-ka onul hakkyo-ey ka-ci anh-ass-eyo.*
 Chelswu-NOM today school-to go-COMP NEG-PAST-SEM
 ‘Chelswu did not go to School today.’
- (b) *Chelswu-ka onul hakkyo-ey ka-ci anh-ass-ta.*
 Chelswu-NOM today school-to go-COMP NEG-PAST-DEC
 ‘Chelswu did not go to School today.’
- (11) (a) *Chelswu-ka onul hakkyo-ey ka-ss-canh-ayo.*
 Chelswu-NOM today school-to go-PAST-ASA-SEM
 ‘Chelswu went to School today (as you may know or didn’t he?).’
- (b) **Chelswu-ka onul hakkyo-ey ka-ss-canh-ta.*
 Chelswu-NOM today school-to go-PAST-ASA-SEM/DEC
 ‘Chelswu went to School today (as you may know or didn’t he?).’

Examples (10a, b) and (11a, b) above involve both phonological reduction and syntactic reconstruction alongside semantic-pragmatic shift as previously discussed. First, observe the locational difference of the PAST marker *-(a)ss-* in examples (10a, b) and (11a, b). It is observed that the PAST particle *-ass* is attached behind post-verbal negation *anh-* ‘not’ in example (10a, b) on the one hand. On the other hand, the PAST particle *-ss* moves to the position preceding the ASA in example (11a, b). This suggests that the location of the

²⁵Kawanishi and Sohn (1993:558) also point out that “the syntactic shift to a sentence-final modal in grammaticalization is common in modern Korean (e.g., *kkoch-i yeyppu-ci anh-a*. ‘The flower is not beautiful.’ vs. *kkoch-i yeyppu-canh-a*. ‘The flower is beautiful (isn’t it?).’; *yeyppu-ci anh-un kkoch-ita*. vs. **yeyppu-canh-un kkoch-ita*. ‘(It) is not a pretty flower.’)

PAST marker changes when there is a phonological reduction. Then, we cannot help asking what causes the PAST particle to change its position when there is a phonological reduction involved. It is noted that the post-verbal negation *anh-* is often treated as a verb because it sometimes behaves like a verb, which can be inflected (Lee, 1999; Sells, 1985). This study suggests that this is how a PAST marker may be attached to the post-verbal negation *anh-* as shown in example (10a, b) above. Yet, when post-verbal negation *anh-* is fused with the COMP *-ci* (or sometimes with *-chi*), this post-verbal negation *anh* together with the COMP becomes an ASA to be a part of the whole predicate (COMP + NEG > ASA). This causes the PAST marker to move to the preceding main verb which can have a PAST particle attached to it. This suggests that once post-verbal negation becomes the ASA, it loses its ability, to the main verb, to have a PAST marker attached. This may also be considered as an aspect of the grammaticalization since the syntactic environment where the PAST particle may be attached has been changed. This study suggests that the phonological change in the forms occurred before the grammaticalization came into the process, but this change of grammatical status (the change in the syntactic environment) and phonological reduction in the forms (*ci anh* > *canh*) are two separate sequential processes. On the other hand, it may be the case that phonological change is a part of grammaticalization process as discussed in Brinton and Traugott (2005).

Also, notice that example (11a) is acceptable with a sentence ending marker *-ayo* used at the end. On the other hand, example (11b) is not acceptable when there is the declarative marker *-ta* is used at the end. Kawanishi and Sohn (1993) suggest that the use of a reduced form *-canh* indicates a lower degree of formality as well as encodes an interactional function. This makes the use of *-canh* unacceptable with the declarative marker *-ta*, which indicates a higher degree of formality as shown in example (11b). On the other hand, a full form *-ci anh-* can be used with both a sentence ending marker and a declarative marker as shown in example (10a, b) above. In fact, this difference in formality makes the reduced form *canh* more frequently used in informal situations where the speaker and the listener are close to each other. It is also noted that the use of the reduced form *canh* tends to be avoided when speaking to his or her superiors. This seems to be due to the interactional function of establishing high solidarity which *canh* has (Kawanishi and Sohn, 1993). In this sense, it can be said that sociolinguistic factors, such as degrees of formality and power relation between the speaker and the listener, have caused this difference in acceptability between example (10a, b) and (11a, b) above as Kawanishi and Sohn (1993) and Kim (2004) suggest.

3.3.3 The COMPs *-ci[ci]* and *-chi[chi]* in grammaticalization

It is noted that the post-verbal negation *anh-[an]* always occurs along with the COMP *-ci[ci]* or *-chi[chi]* as Kim (2000) and Kim (2004) mention. Hence, this paper suggests that the

detailed and correct analysis should also be given to the COMP *-ci* or *-chi* in Korean. Kim (2000) treats *-chi* simply as a phonological variation of *-ci*. From the synchronic point of view, his analysis is in fact correct on one hand since both are treated as the COMP. On the other hand, this paper suggests that a form of the COMP *-chi* is not a mere phonological variation of another form of COMP *-ci* but a different form as far as the process of phonological change is concerned. In fact, this paper points out that the COMP *chi*[c^hi] is derived from *ha-ci*[ha.ci] (by *h*-aspiration) as shown in *katang-ha-ci anh-ta* ‘right-**do**-COMP not-DEC’ > *katang-chi anh-ta* ‘right-**COMP** not-DEC’.²⁶ In fact, this derivational difference may be why the COMPs *-ci* and *-chi* behave differently as will be discussed later in further detail. It is also of importance to understand that the COMP *-ci* or *-chi* not always appears overtly in the expression as shown in examples (13), (15), (17), and (18). In other words, the COMP *-ci* or *-chi* is not always realized in its full form on the surface. Therefore, the detailed and correct analysis needs to be given to the COMP *-ci* or *-chi* in Korean as is suggested above.

Observe the differences that the COMP *-ci* and *-chi* make from the examples below.

- (12) *Yenghi-nun aphu-ci anh-a.*
 Yenghi-TOP sick-**COMP** NEG-SEM
 ‘Yenghi is not sick’
- (13) *Yenghi-nun aphu-canh-a.*
 Yenghi-TOP sick-**ASA**-SEM
 ‘Yenghi is sick (as you may know or isn’t she?).’
- (14) *ku haksayng-un pemsang-chi anh-(ass)-ta.*
 that student-TOP ordinary-**COMP** NEG-(PAST)-DEC
 ‘That student is (was) not ordinary.’
- (15) *ku haksayng-un pemsang-chanh-(ass)-ta.*
 that student-TOP ordinary-**ASA**-(PAST)-DEC
 ‘That student is (was) not ordinary.’
- (16) *John-un sengcek-ul kayuy-chi anh-nun/ass-ta.*
 John-TOP grade-ACC care-**COMP** NEG-PRES/PAST-DEC
 ‘John does/did not care about the grade.’
- (17) *John-un sengcek-ul kayuy-chanh-*nun/*ass-ta.*
 John-TOP grade-ACC care-**ASA**-PRES/PAST-DEC
 ‘John does/did not care about the grade.’

²⁶Note that this is based on the evidences and examples found in the website of *hangul hakkoy* ‘The Korean Language Association’ (http://www.hangeul.or.kr/cgi-bin/hanboard/read.cgi?board=urm.zoom&nnew=2&y_number=98).

- (18) *John-un sengcek-ul kayuy-chi anh-nun haksayng-i-ta.*
 John-TOP grade-ACC care-COMP not-COMP student-be-DEC
 ‘John is a student who does not care about the grade.’
- (19) **John-un sengcek-ul kayuychanh-nun haksayng-i-ta.*
 John-TOP grade-ACC not.care-COMP student-be-DEC
 ‘John is a student who does not care about the grade.’

Note that the COMP *-ci* is involved in examples (12) and (13) and the COMP *-chi* is in examples (15) through (19). Examples (13), (15), (17) and (19) are examples with the phonological reduction that correspond to examples (12), (14), (16) and (18) respectively. The meaning of example (13), with phonological reduction, contrasts with that of example (12) with no phonological change. On the other hand, the meaning of example (15), which also involves phonological reduction, is exactly the same as that of example (14) as shown in their English translation. The same goes for examples (16) and (17) and examples (18) and (19) above. No semantic shift occurs between examples (14) and (15), between (16) and (17), and also between (18) and (19) even though there occurred phonological reduction in examples (15), (17), and (19). This indicates that the COMPs *-ci* and *-chi* behave somewhat differently as far as the semantics is concerned. It is also observed that the PAST particle, in examples (15) and (17), does not move to the preceding position, whereas it does, as shown in previous examples with the COMP *-ci* involved (refer to examples (10) and (11) for this). It appears that phonological reduction does not seem to be allowed in examples (17) and (19) because phonologically reduced form *chanh*[c^han] makes these examples ungrammatical (or at least unacceptable).

The COMP *-chi*[c^hi] is observed in a similar way to the COMP *-ci*[ci] in that both go through the same morphosyntactic change as shown in the examples above (COMP+NEG > ASA). On the other hand, it appears that the COMP *-ci* behaves quite differently than the COMP *-chi* in several respects as discussed above. See Table 6 for the summary of these behavioral differences. These behavioral differences suggest that the COMP *-chi* may not be a mere phonological variation of the COMP *-ci*, as is claimed in Kim (2000), but they can be two allomorphs on two clines of grammaticalization.

As previously mentioned, the COMP *-chi* is a contracted form of *-ha-ci* ‘do-COMP.’ Now let us focus our attention on the uncontracted form *-ha-ci* ‘do-COMP’, particularly on the form *-ha* ‘do’, which makes the COMP *-chi* distinct from the other COMP *-ci*. It is noted that adjectival nouns indicate stativity, and that they may be combined with a native adjective²⁷ such as *-hata* ‘be in the state of’ as in *kyemson-hata* ‘be humble’ or *-(i)ta* ‘be’ (copula) to become an adjective predicate (Sohn, 1999:206-210). Because of the predicate properties which the COMP *-chi* holds, the past particle *-(a)ss* does not have to move for the inflection when

²⁷Note that unlike English, not only verbs but also adjectives are predicates in Korean.

the COMP *-chi* is fused with post-verbal negation *anh-* as shown in previous examples. On the other hand, the past particle has to move to the preceding predicate with the COMP *ci-* involved as also shown in previous examples since the COMP *-ci* holds no properties of the predicate. In short, the COMP *-chi* still has properties of the adjectival predicate even after the contraction (*-ha-ci > -chi*), which makes it distinguished from the COMP *-ci*. It is also noted that the COMP *-chi* is attached to the preceding noun whereas the COMP *-ci* to the preceding predicate (Seo, 1996:967-70). In other words, the PAST particle cannot be attached to the noun, which has no properties of the predicate.

Recall that the COMP *-chi* is usually not fused with the NEG *anh-[an]* whereas the COMP *-ci* is fused with the NEG *anh-[an]*, as is previously discussed. This study cannot give a solid and clear explanation for this behavioral difference, but suggests a possible explanation as follows. According to the examples above, it seems that an adjective or verb, which has a [+stative, -agentive] feature (*-ci*), is more likely to be contracted than one which has a [-stative, +agentive] feature (*-chi*). The specific reason why these predicates behave differently is not known, but this behavioral difference may be related to the property of psych verbs in Korean, in which ‘*e-ha*’ plays a role, as discussed in (Kim, 1990). This study will not discuss this matter in detail due to the limit of the study.

Types	<i>-ci</i> [ci]	<i>-chi</i> [c ^{hi}]
Morphosyntactic change	COMP+NEG > ASA	COMP+NEG >
Change in Semantics	Yes	No
Fusion with <i>anh</i> [an]	Likely	Unlikely (or Less likely)
Movement of PAST particle	Yes	No

Table 6: Behavioral differences between *-ci*[ci] and *-chi*[c^{hi}]

3.4 The lexicalization of negation forms in Korean

The negation *ani* in Korean also enters into a lexicalization as part of the irreducible independent lexical item *anita* ‘not.be’ in modern Korean (Lee, 2002).

- (20) **Chelswu-nun haksayng-i ani ita.*
 Chelswu-TOP student-SUBJ NEG COP
 ‘Chelswu is not a student.’

- (21) *Chelswu-nun haksayng-i anita.*
 Chelswu-TOP student-SUBJ not.be
 ‘Chelswu is not a student.’

Note that the lexicalized negation *anita* ‘not.be’ in example (21) is originally derived from the form *ani+ita* ‘NEG+COP’ via phonological change as discussed in section (3.1). The

negation form *ani* in OK along with the copular *ita* in example (20), which is ungrammatical in PDK, is lexicalized into an adjective predicate, which becomes an independent lexical item in PDK as shown in example (21) (Kim, 1990; Sohn, 1999; Lee, 2002).²⁸ This is an instance of lexicalization by the definition given in Brinton and Traugott (2005:144) that “the change whereby in certain linguistic contexts speakers use a syntactic construction or word formation as a new contentful form with formal and semantic properties that are not completely derivable or predictable from the constituents of the construction or the word formation pattern. Over time there may be further loss of internal constituency and the item may become more lexical.” Kim *et al.* (forthcoming) categorize the form *anita* ‘not be’ as a copular along with its corresponding form *ita* ‘be’²⁹.

The following examples (example (22) through (24), and (25) through (27)) also describe lexicalization of the post-verbal negation *anh*[an] in Korean in that an original syntactic construction (e.g., *phyenhaci*[p^hjən.ha.ci] *anhusita*[an.i.si.ta] ‘feel not comfortable’ in example (22)) turns into a newly derived lexical item with alongside phonological reduction (e.g., *phyenchanhusita*[p^hjən.c^han.i.si.ta] ‘be sick’ in example (24)) as Lee (2002) discusses in detail. Lee (2002) claims that phonological reduction is actually a cause of the lexicalization. However, it may be the case that the lexicalization has occurred independently from the phonological change just like the case with the grammaticalization (e.g. see examples in section (3.3)). Hence, further investigation is still required for the claim that phonological change has caused the lexicalization.

(22) *apeci-kkeyse chimtay-ka phyenha-ci anh-u-si-ta.*
 father-NOM bed-NOM comfortable-COMP NEG-CONN-HON-DEC
 ‘Father does not feel comfortable on/with the bed.’

(23) *apeci-kkeyse phyen-chi anh-u-si-ta.*
 father-NOM comfortable/healthy-COMP NEG-CONN-HON-DEC
 ‘Father does not feel comfortable/is not healthy.’

(24) *apeci-kkeyse phyenchanh-u-si-ta.*
 father-NOM sick-CONN-HON-DEC
 ‘Father is sick.’

(25) *cheyik-i siwenha-ci anh-ta.*
 cake-NOM be.cool-COMP NEG-DEC
 ‘The cake is not cool (temperature only).’

²⁸Choi (1937) treats *anita*[a.ni.ta] as an independent negative word which corresponds to *ita*[i.ta], cited in Seo (1996:971-2). Seo (1996:971-2) argues against him in that his analysis creates an exception to the negation system in Korean whereas other analysis (i.e. *ani+ita* > *anita*) makes the negation system in Korean simple and unexceptional.

²⁹Recall that adjective and copular are two separate but correct terms which refer to the negation *ani*, but the same phenomenon is simply viewed from a different perspective (adjective vs. copular).

- (26) *cheyik-i siwen-chi anh-ta.*
 cake-NOM satisfactory-COMP NEG-DEC
 ‘The cake is not cool (temperature) or The cake is satisfactory (quality).’
- (27) *cheyik-i siwenchanhta.*
 cake-NOM unsatisfactory-DEC
 ‘The cake is not satisfactory (quality only).’

The lexicalization process involving negation *anh*[an] ‘not’ in Korean can easily be observed in the translation for each example (e.g., ‘not comfortable’ in example (22) > ‘sick’ in example (24); ‘not cool’ in example (25) > ‘unsatisfactory’ in example (27)). Observe the following examples for more evidence.

- (28) *kum-un i-kos-eyse kwiha-ci anh-ta.*
 gold-TOP this-place-in be.precious-COMP NEG-DEC
 ‘Gold is not precious in this place.’
- (29) *??kum-un i-kos-eyse kwichanhta.*
 gold-TOP this-place-in annoying
 ‘Gold is annoying in this place.’
- (30) *??hakkyo-ey ka-nun-kes-i kwiha-ci anh-ta.*
 school-to go-COMP-that-NOM be.precious NEG-DEC
 ‘It is not precious (or scarce) to go to school.’
- (31) *hakkyo-ey ka-nun-kes-i kwichanhta.*
 school-to go-COMP-that-NOM annoying
 ‘It is annoying to go to school.’

Note that examples (29) and (30) are very odd. Example (29) is very odd because the newly derived meaning of adjective predicate *kwichanhta*[kwi.c^han.t^ha] ‘be annoying’, developed through lexicalization (*kwhaci anh-ta* ‘not precious’ in example (28) > *kwichanhta* ‘annoying’ in example (29)), is semantically incompatible with the meaning of its subject *kum*[kim] ‘gold’, and example (30) is also not acceptable because the meaning of subject *hakkyoey*[hak.kjo.e] *kanunkesi*[ka.nin.kəs.i] ‘to go to school’ is not semantically compatible with that of its predicate *kwhaci*[kwi.ha.ci] *anh-ta*[an.t^ha] ‘be not precious.’ In other words, the original or initial meaning of ‘not precious’ does not exist in *kwichanhta* in example (29) any longer, but rather the newly lexicalized meaning of ‘annoying’, which was developed through lexicalization, is what is present in *kwichanhta* in example (29). This suggests that lexicalization (‘not precious’ > ‘annoying’) has already come to its end in example (29), and the lexicalized meaning of the predicate is semantically incompatible with that of the subject. This would be why example (29) is considered to be very odd. Likewise, example (30) is

strange because the lexicalization has not occurred yet, and the original or initial meaning of predicate is not semantically compatible with that of the subject in example (30), where lexicalization has taken place.

So far, we have looked at cases where the post-verbal negation *anh*[an] is lexicalized together with the COMP *-ci*[ci] or *-chi*[c^{hi}]. Although the post-verbal negation *anh*[an] can occur with either COMP *-ci*[ci] or *-chi*[c^{hi}], it seems to be more likely to be lexicalized when it occurs with the COMP *-ci*[ci]. This appears to be parallel to the likelihood of the COMP *-ci*[ci] undergoing grammaticalization alongside phonological reduction. In other words, post-verbal negation with the COMP *-chi*[c^{hi}] is less likely to be lexicalized than the one with the COMP *-ci*[ci]. Observe the following examples.

(32) *kulen sayngkak-un katangha-ci anh-ta.*
 such thought-TOP do.right-COMP NEG-DEC
 ‘Such thought is not right’

(33) *kulen sayngkak-un katang-chi anh-ta.*
 such thought-TOP right-COMP NEG-DEC
 ‘Such thought is not right’

(34) *kulen sayngkak-un katangchanhta.*
 such thought-TOP not.right
 ‘Such thought is not right’

Notice that there is no semantic difference among examples (32) through (34), despite the occurrence of phonological change. This suggests that lexicalization has not occurred in the examples above. This differs from cases with grammaticalization in that phonological change has actually come into the process in examples above. Recall that phonological reduction is not allowed in some examples with the COMP *-chi*[c^{hi}] in the grammaticalization process (e.g., examples (17) and (19) in section 3.3.3).

3.5 The negation with both grammaticalization and lexicalization

There are some cases in Korean which show that the negation forms have gone through both grammaticalization and lexicalization. The grammaticalization occurred first, and then lexicalization occurred later in the process. Let us look at following examples.

(35) *John-un celm-ci anh-a.*
 John-TOP young-COMP NEG-SEM
 ‘John is not young.’

(36) *John-un celm-canh-a.*
 John-TOP young-ASA-SEM
 ‘John is young (, right?).’

- (37) *John-un cemcanh-a.*
 John-TOP gentle-SEM
 ‘John is gentle.’
- (38) *John-un cemcanh-ci anh-ta.*
 John-TOP gentle-COMP NEG-DEC
 ‘John is not gentle.’

Example (35) is an expression that occurs without any grammaticalization or lexicalization having taken place. According to Kim (2004), example (35) turned into example (36) via grammaticalization.³⁰ The meaning of the negation of *canh*[can] is completely lost in example (36), but the meaning of example (36) is still closely related to that of example (35) in that example (35) is simply a negative corresponding expression to example (36). Later, example (36) became example (37) through lexicalization in that a new contentful form *cemcanh* ‘gentle’ appears which is no longer completely predictable from the original construction *celmcanh*[cəm.can] (or *celmci*[cəm.ci] *anh*[an]). That this is true is evidenced by the fact that the additional negation *anh*[an] ‘not’ needs to be employed to encode the negative meaning in example (38).

In contrast to the views the author sets forth in Kim (2004), the author presently proposes that the negation form *anh*[an] went through grammaticalization and lexicalization independently. More specifically, example (36) is directly derived from example (35) through grammaticalization, and example (37) is also directly derived from example (35) without the process of grammaticalization, but only through the process of lexicalization. The reason why this study claims that these two processes are independent from each other lies in the differences in semantic interpretation. It is discussed in previous sections that example (35)’s turning into example (36) is considered a case of grammaticalization even though it may not be a typical case of grammaticalization. On the other hand, it has not been discussed why the change from example (35) to example (37) could be treated as an instance of lexicalization.

Semantic shift from ‘being not young (or being an adult)’ to ‘being gentle (or being not naughty)’ seems to be only natural, since it is generally agreed among speakers that the one who is ‘not young or an adult’ is likely to be ‘gentle or serious’. On the other hand, the semantic shift from ‘being young’, in example (36), to ‘being gentle (or being not naughty)’, in example (37), does not seem to be so normal or natural. In fact, it seems to be unlikely for this direction of change to happen since ‘being young’ generally infers ‘naughty, less (not) gentle or serious’, but not the other way around. Therefore, it is more plausible to say that example (24) is derived directly from example (35) rather than from example (36). This is an instance of lexicalization in that the original syntactic construction of *celmci*[cəm.ci]

³⁰Section 3.3 discusses in detail why example (35)’s becoming (36) is an instance of grammaticalization.

anh̄ta[an.t^ha] ‘be not young’ is used as a phonologically reduced lexical form with a newly employed meaning *cemcanh̄ta*[c̄əm.can.t^ha] ‘be gentle or an adult.’³¹

Also, notice that *-l̄l̄* does not appear in *cemcah̄na* ‘be gentle’ in example (37) and *cemcanh̄ci anh̄ta* ‘be not gentle’ in (38) whereas *-l̄l̄* does appear in *cel̄mci+anh̄a* ‘be not young’ in example (35) and *cel̄mcanh̄a* ‘be young (, right?)’ in (36). Hong (2003) points out that *cyem̄ta*[c̄jəm.ta] ‘be young’ became *cyel̄mta*[c̄jəm.ta] ‘be young’ in 16C, but it is not clear how *-l̄l̄* got inserted. He suspects that it was probably affected by *-l̄l̄* in its negative corresponding word *nul̄kta*[nik.ta] ‘be old’. The difference in *-l̄l̄* between *cel̄mta* ‘be young’ and *cemcanh̄ta* ‘be gentle’ indicates that *cel̄mci+anh̄ta* ‘be not young’ is completely lexicalized into *cemcanh̄ta* ‘be gentle’.

3.6 From negation marker to discourse marker

Another interesting phenomenon which may be found in the grammaticalization of negation forms in Korean, seems to be that a negation marker becomes a discourse marker, which frequently appears in colloquial contexts (Kim, 2004).

- (39) (a) *chayk-i chayksang wi-ey iss-ci anh-a.*
 book-NOM desk on-LOC be-COMP NEG-SEM
 ‘There is not a book on the desk.’
- (b) *chayk-i chayksang wi-ey iss-canh-a.*
 book-NOM desk on-LOC be-ASA-SEM
 ‘There is a book on the desk (, right?).’
- (c) *iss-canh-a, hal mal-i iss-nun-tey.*
be-ASA-SEM say word-NOM exist-ASP-SEM
 ‘You know (what), I have something to say.’
- (40) (a) *chayk-i chayksang wi-ey eps-ci anh-a.*
 book-NOM desk on-LOC not.be-COMP NEG-SEM
 ‘There is a book on the desk.’
- (b) *chayk-i chayksang wi-ey eps-canh-a.*
 book-NOM desk on-LOC not.be-ASA-SEM
 ‘There is not a book on the desk (, right?).’
- (c) **eps-canh-a, hal mal-i iss-nun-tey.*
not.be-ASA-SEM say word-NOM exist-ASP-SEM
 ‘You know, I have something to say.’

³¹Hong (2003) discusses the etymology of *cemcanta*[cem.can.t^a] ‘be gentle’ in detail, and those who may be interested in detailed description of the etymology of this newly derived word *cemcanta* ‘be gentle’ can see Hong (2003). He summarizes the developmental process as follows: *cyem̄ti*[c̄jəm.ti] *anihata*[a.ni.ha.ta] (15c) > *cyem̄ci*[c̄jəm.ci] *anihata*[a.ni.ha.ta] > *cyem̄ci*[c̄jəm.ci] *anh̄ta*[an.t^ha] > *cyemcanh̄ta*[c̄jəm.can.t^ha] (late 19c) > *cemcanh̄ta*[c̄əm.can.t^ha] (late 19c).

The expression of *isscanha*[is'.can.a] 'You know (what?)' in example (39c) is derived from the original expression of *iss-ci*[is'.ci] *anh-a*[an.a] 'there isn't (anything).' Notice that negative meaning is present in the original unreduced form *iss-ci anh-a* 'there isn't (anything)' while it is no longer present in the phonologically reduced form *isscanha* 'you know (what?)' (or 'there is (something)' in the literal translation) as shown in example (39a). In other words, the original function of negation in example (39a) is lost when the expression is phonologically reduced as shown in example (39b). The expression of *isscanha* 'You know (what?)' in example (39c) is used as a discourse marker. This indicates that a negation marker thus changes into a discourse marker, which denotes *hesitation* or *getting attention* and has no negative meaning, and it has happened alongside phonological reduction. Some would say this is an instance of "pragmaticization"³² (rather than grammaticalization), but this should be still considered as an example of grammaticalization since a new grammatical function, namely *discourse marker*, is developed from an old grammatical function, that is, a negation marker, alongside phonological reduction (negation marker > discourse marker).³³

Turning now to the data in example (40a, b, c), example (40c) is not acceptable with the expression *epscanha*[əp.can.a]³⁴ 'You know (what?)'. The expression *epscanha*[əp.can.a] stems from the original expression *epsci*[əp.ci]+*anha*[an.a] 'It is not the case that there isn't (anything)', or in short, 'there is (something)'. Notice that negative meaning is present in the reduced form in example (40b) on the other hand. The expression *epscanha*[əp.can.a] in example (40c) cannot be used as a discourse particle, and this is why example (40c) is completely bad. To the best of my knowledge, there seems to be no studies discussing why such an example (40c) is bad and why such an expression as *epscanha*[əp.can.a] cannot be used as a discourse marker or particle. This study briefly discusses this below.

I have discussed that the polarity of semantic interpretation changes when the expressions are phonologically reduced as shown in examples (39a, b) and (40a, b) (*not be* in (39a) (before phonological coalescence) *i be* in (39b) (after phonological coalescence); *be* in (40a) (before phonological coalescence) *i not be* in (40b) (after phonological coalescence)). Based on this, it can be said that the expression *isscanha*[is'.can.a] in example (39c) has a connotation that there is something that the speaker wants to talk about. Since this signals that there is something to be talked about, this expression can be used as a discourse marker which functions to indicate the hesitation or to attract the listener's attention. On the other hand, the expression *epscanha*[əp.can.a] in (40c) has a connotation that there is nothing the speaker wants to talk about. This expression cannot be used as a discourse particle which functions as a hesitation indicator or attention getter since there is nothing that may be talked about, and thus no conversation needs to be initiated. Once again, example (39c) should be treated

³²The term 'pragmaticization' is sometimes referred to as 'pragmaticalization' with no difference.

³³This claim is based on the definition for the grammaticalization given in Hopper and Traugott (2003:1).

³⁴In fact, *epscanha*[əp.can.a] in example (40c) does not encode the meaning of 'You know (what?)' at all.

as an instance of grammaticalization because the shift in semantic interpretation has occurred alongside the functional loss as a negation marker, and it has further subsequently developed a new grammatical function as a hesitation indicator *or* attention getter (i.e., it has developed as a discourse marker). Now let us turn to more examples below.

- (41) *ani, kukeymaliya, nay-ka ecey papp-ass-e.*
well, you.know, I-NOM yesterday busy-PAST-SEM
 ‘Well, you know, I was busy yesterday.’
- (42) *ani-n key ani-la³⁵, Sue-uy oppa-ka aphu-si-tey.*
not-CONN that not-LINK Sue-GEN brother-NOM sick-HON-SEM
 ‘Indeed, Sue’s brother is sick.’
- (43) *ani-na talu-l-kka, John-i nay pizza-lul ta*
not-CONN different-CONN-LINK John-NOM my pizza-ACC all
mek-ess-ta.
 eat-PAST-DEC
 ‘Just as expected, John ate all of my pizza.’
- (44) *talum-i ani-la, nayil sikan-(i) iss-e-yo?*
difference-NOM not-LINK tomorrow time-(NOM) exist-PCT-Q
 ‘You know (*or* well), do you have time tomorrow?’

Observe that *ani*, which was originally a negation marker, is used as a discourse particle in example (41), which denotes a function of hesitation or getting attention. This is an instance of grammaticalization in that new grammatical function, namely, discourse marker, is developed from the original negative function throughout the process. Other discourse particles such as *anin*[a.nin] *key*[ke] *anila*[a.ni.ra] ‘Indeed’ in example (42), *anina*[a.ni.na] *talulkka*[ta.ril.k’a] ‘Just as expected’ in example (43), and *talumi*[ta.rim.i] *anila*[a.ni.ra] in example (44) are similar to the case with *ani*[a.ni] ‘You know’ in example (41), and they all indicate that the discourse function of hesitation or getting attention is created via the grammaticalization process.

The content meaning of the discourse particles listed above seems to constrain the new grammatical item, that is, the discourse marker. In other words, the meaning or function of the newly derived discourse particles in Korean may be understood as continuations of their original lexical meanings as Bybee and Pagliuca (1987:117, cited in Brinton and Traugott (2005:68)) point out. Although all the discourse particles above (*anin ke anila* in example (42), *anina talulkka* in (43), and *talumi anila* in (44)) have a discourse function of hesitation or getting attention, there seem to be slight differences among them as can be seen in their English translation. These slight differences among the discourse particles listed above may

³⁵The literal meaning of *anin*[a.nin] *key*[ke] *anila*[a.ni.ra] is “it is not the case that it is not.”

be understood as continuation of their original lexical meaning. This characteristic is termed “persistence” (Hopper (1991), cited in Brinton and Traugott (2005:68)).

4 Conclusion

This study brings to light a linguistic issue in Korean that has previously been rather neglected in the literature of grammaticalization and lexicalization.

Pre-verbal negation, post-verbal negation, and lexicalized negation have all gone through phonological reduction. Pre-verbal negation *an*[an] ‘not’ in PDK is a phonologically reduced form of *ani*[a.ni] ‘not’, post-verbal negation *anh*[an] ‘not’ in PDK is of *aniha*[a.ni.ha], and lexicalized negation form *anita*[a.ni.ta] in PDK is of *ani+ita*[a.ni+i.ta] ‘not be.’ We have also seen that a negation marker is grammaticalized (as a discourse marker) or lexicalized (as an independent lexical item). Phonological change is involved in the process of grammaticalization and lexicalization of the negation forms in Korean, but phonological change seems to be independent from grammaticalization or lexicalization in these cases. In fact, there is no evidence that phonological reduction has triggered either grammaticalization or lexicalization of negation in Korean. Meanwhile, this study proposes that phonological change may be considered as a sort of by-product of grammaticalization or lexicalization. Nevertheless, this study will conclude, leaving room for future studies in this regard.

The arguments of this study have been as follows: First, there are new different conflicting claims as to the origin of negation form in Korean. One is that the negation form *ani*[a.ni] rather than *an*[an] is the original negation form in Korean (the *ani* first argument), and the other one claims the opposite (the *an* first argument). This study is based on the *ani* first argument, and suggests that phonological erosion from *ani*[a.ni] to *an*[an] is the result of a natural phonological process to minimize articulatory efforts as Newmeyer (2001) and Lee (2002) have proposed. Second, phonological reduction has always been involved in semantic/morphosyntactic changes of negation in Korean, and it has come into the process before semantic changes. This seems to work against the general tendency in grammaticalization such that semantic bleaching usually comes before phonological change in the process of grammaticalization. Third, the COMP *-ci*[ci] seems to behave somewhat differently than the COMP *-chi*[c^hi], in contrast to Kim’s (2000) view, and this supports the analysis of grammaticalization of *ci+anh* to *canh*. Fourth, pre-verbal negation[an] seems to have experienced neither grammaticalization nor lexicalization, whereas other forms of negation have experienced it in several ways alongside phonological reduction, such as semantic-pragmatic shift (propositional > interactional), morphosyntactic status change (COMP+NEG > ASA), grammatical function change (negation marker > discourse marker), lexicalization, etc.

5 Further issues

Several issues may be interesting if they can be further investigated in future studies. First, due to the limited source of evidences available (particularly regarding each stage of changes of the negation forms in Korean), this study only discusses the origin of negation forms in Korean from two different perspectives (the *ani* first argument vs. the *an* first argument), and discussed negation forms in Korean based on the *ani* first argument. It may be worth investigation other perspectives in the future study. Second, this study could not discuss in detail why the COMP *-ci*[ci] behaves somewhat differently from the COMP *-chi*[c^hi] (e.g., the difference between COMP *-ci*[ci] and COMP *-chi*[c^hi] in the likelihood of being fused with the NEG *-anh*[an]). Thus, it would be interesting to further explore this difference. Finally, it would be interesting to further investigate why *isscanha*[is'.can.a] 'You know (what)?' may be used as a discourse particle while *epscanha*[əp.can.a] '??You know?' cannot, as discussed briefly in previous section.

References

- BRINTON, L. (1996) *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and discourse functions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- BRINTON, L. J., and TRAUOGOTT, E. C. (2005) *Lexicalization and Language Change*. Cambridge University Press.
- CACOULLOS, R. T., and SCHWENTER, S. A. (forthcoming) Towards an Operational Notion of Subjectification.
- CAMPBELL, L. (2001) What's wrong with grammaticalization. *Language Sciences* **23** (2-3): 113–161.
- CAMPBELL, L., and JANDA, R. (2001) Introduction: conceptions of grammaticalization and their problems. *Language Sciences* **23** (2-3): 93–112.
- CROFT, W. (1991) The Evolution of Negation. *Journal of Linguistics* **27**: 1–27.
- GEURTS, B. (2000) Explaining grammaticalization. *Linguistics* **38** (4): 781–788.
- GIACALONE RAMAT, A., and HOPPER, P. (1998) Introduction. *Typological Studies in Language* pp. 1–12.
- GIVÓN, T. (1979) *On Understanding Grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
- HASPELMATH, M. (1999) Why is grammaticalization irreversible? *Linguistics* **37** (6): 1043–1068.
- HONG, J. (2003) Cemcanhta-uy ewon ‘the etymology of being gentle’. *Newsletter of New Korean Language*. August issue.
- HOPPER, P., and TRAUOGOTT, E. C. (1993) *Grammaticalization, 1st edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HOPPER, P., and TRAUOGOTT, E. C. (2003) *Grammaticalization, 2nd edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KAWANISHI, Y., and SOHN, S.-O. (1993) The Grammaticalization of Korean Negation: A Semantic-Pragmatic Analysis of *-canh-*. In *Harvard Studies In Korean Linguistics*, ed. by S. Kuno, I.-H. Lee, J. Whitman, J. Maling, Y.-S. Kang, and Y.-J. Kim, volume 1, pp. 552–561.
- KIM, J.-B. (2000) *The Grammar of Negation: A Constraint-Based Approach*. CSLI.
- KIM, J.-B., SELLS, P., and WESCOAT, M. (forthcoming) Korean Copular Constructions: A Lexical Sharing Approach.
- KIM, S. (2001) *Umseng ene chungwiwa mwunca ene chungwiuy wisangey tayha yenkwu* ‘A study about the status of spoken language and written language’. *Enehak ‘Linguistics’*.
- KIM, T. (2004) Grammaticalization of the Negation Marker in Korean: Negation Marker to Discourse Marker. *Pikyomwunhwayenkwu ‘Journal of Cross Culture Studies’* **8**: 22–44.

- KIM, Y.-J., (1990) *The Syntax and Semantics of Korean Case: The Interaction between Lexical and Syntactic Levels of Representation*. Harvard University dissertation.
- LASS, R. (1990) How to do things with junk: exaptation in language evolution. *Journal of Linguistics* **26**: 79–102.
- LEE, H.-S. (1999) A discourse-pragmatic analysis of the committal *-ci* in Korean: A synthetic approach to the form-meaning relation. *Journal of Pragmatics* **31**: 243–275.
- LEE, H.-S. (2002) *Grammaticalization, lexicalization, and unidirectionality: with reference to the development of some adjectives in Korean*. Paper presented at “New Reflections on Grammaticalization 2,” an international symposium, held on April 4-6, 2002, at University of Amsterdam.
- LEE, N.-S. (2000) *Kayhwaki Kwukeuy Pwucengpep Yenkwu-Toklipsinmwunul Cwungsimulo* ‘A study of negation in Korean in late 19c-focusing on the Independence Newspaper’. Manuscript, Kyung Hee University.
- MORENO CABRERA, J. C. (1998) On the Relationships Between Grammaticalization and Lexicalization. *Typological Studies in Language* pp. 211–228.
- NEWMAYER, F. (2001) Deconstructing grammaticalization. *Language Sciences* **23** (2-3): 187–229.
- NORDE, M. (2001) Deflexion as a Counterdirectional Factor in Grammatical Change. *Language Sciences* **23** (2-3): 231–64.
- RHEE, S.-H., (1996) *Semantics of Verbs and Grammaticalization: The Development in Korean from a Cross-Linguistic Perspective..* University of Texas at Austin dissertation.
- RHEE, S.-H. (2003) *Grammaticalization of Rhetorical Structures*. Paper presented at 2003 Linguistics Science of Society Winter Workshop at Kyungpook National University, February 15, 2003.
- SELLS, P. (1985) Morphology from a lexical perspective. *Linguistic Inquiry* **26** (2): 277–325.
- SEO, J. (1996) *Kwuke Mwupep ‘The Korean Grammar’*. Hanyang University Press.
- SOHN, H. (1999) *The Korean Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- TRUGOTT, E. C. (1989) On the Rise of Epistemic Meanings in English: An Example of Subjectification in Semantic Change. *Language* **65** (1): 31–55.
- TRUGOTT, E. C. (1995) Subjectification in grammaticalization. *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation* pp. 37–54.
- TRUGOTT, E. C., (2001) Legitimate counterexamples to unidirectionality. Paper presented at Freiburg University, October 17th 2001.
- TRUGOTT, E. C. (2004) Exaptation and grammaticalization. *Linguistic Studies Based on Corpora* pp. 133–156.
- TRUGOTT, E. C., and DASHER, R. (2002) *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge University Press.

TRAUGOTT, E. C., and HEINE, B. (1991) *Introduction: Approaches to Grammaticalization*, volume 2, pp. 1–24. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

List of Abbreviations

I adopt the Yale romanization system in transcribing Korean examples, and use the following abbreviations in glossing data.

ACC: Accusative Marker
ASP: Aspectual Marker
ASA: ASAiliary Verb
COMP: Complementizer
CONN: Connective
DAT: Dative Marker
DEC: Declarative Marker
HON: Honorific Marker
LINK: Linking Marker
NEG: Negation Marker
NOM: Nominative Marker
PAST: Past-Tense Particle
PRES: Present-Tense Particle
PTC: Particle
Q: Question Marker
SEM: Sentence Ending Marker
SUBJ: Subject Marker
TOP: Topic Marker