

**Korean Hearsay Constructions and Speech Act Phrases**  
Hailey Hyekyeong Ceong, University of Victoria

Our understanding of the interface between hearsay evidentials and Speech Acts remains incomplete: What kinds of illocutionary force are compatible with hearsay constructions? How does illocutionary force interact with hearsay markers? Past work offers competing conclusions: Faller (2002) claims that the Quechuan reportative evidential *-si* expresses an illocutionary act (Faller’s “Presentation” act), while Speas (2004) places “hearsay” at the same level of projection as Cinque’s (1999) Speech Act projection (SAP) and the logophoric predicate *say*, arguing that “hearsay is the category that is least likely to be a part of an evidential paradigm.”

This talk presents new evidence from the Korean hearsay construction indicating that hearsay markers appear higher than Force P (Rizzi 1997) and are compatible with four major clause-typing complementizers: declarative, interrogative, imperative, and exhortative. On a theoretical level, I advocate for an analysis that situates the hearsay construction within the domain of SAP; on an empirical level, I support this argument by showing how the Korean hearsay marker *-y* interacts with illocutionary force.

In the Korean hearsay construction, the functional marker *-y* provides the meaning “someone else said”. The structure of the construction affects its interpretation: An evidential interpretation emerges iff the performative feature of SAP carries a null performer and the sentence type is constative/declarative (1); a non-evidential (reportative) hearsay interpretations emerges when the performative feature of SAP carries a third-person feature and the utterance content carries an assertion, command, question, or invitation (2).

- (1) pi-ka o-ko=iss-ta-y (Evidential hearsay declarative)  
rain-NOM come-PROG-DECL-HEARSAY  
‘(Speaker was told that) it is raining.’
- (2) a. Jina-ka ne-ka yeypu-ta-y. (Reportative hearsay assertion)  
Jina-PERF you-NOM pretty-DECL-HEARSAY  
‘Jina (said) you are pretty.’
- b. pi-ka o-nya-y? (Reportative hearsay question)  
rain-NOM come-INT-HEARSAY  
‘(pro.3 said/asked) if it is raining.’
- b. celi ka-la-y. (Reportative hearsay command)  
that way go-IMP-HEARSAY  
‘(pro.3 said/asked) you to move!’

Following Ross (1970), I assume that performative sentences carry a person feature. These interpretations are schematized in (3a, b).

- (3) a. Evidential hearsay: [[ $\emptyset$ ]<sub>PERFORMATIVE</sub>, [SAP<sup>0</sup> [[DECL]<sub>TYPE</sub> ]]]  
b. Reportative hearsay:  
[[+3<sup>rd</sup> person]<sub>PERFORMATIVE</sub>, SAP<sup>0</sup> [[{DECL}, {INT}, {IMP}, {EXH}]]<sub>FORCE</sub>]]

Adapting proposals for SAP by Speas and Tenny (2003) and for Jussive Phrase by Zanuttin et al. (2012), I propose two distinct syntactic structures for the Korean hearsay constructions: in one, the SAP introduces a performer to which the illocutionary force is performed; in the other, the head of SAP (bearing a performative feature) introduces the null performer of the declarative clause. On a broader level, this study argues for a closer relationship between hearsay evidentials and illocutionary force.

## List of Abbreviations

DECL declarative	EXH exhortative	HEARSAY hearsay marker	IMP imperative
INT interrogative pronominal	NOM nominative	PERF performer	<i>pro</i> non-anaphoric null
	PROG progressive		

## References

- Cinque, G. (1999). *Adverbs and functional heads: a cross-linguistic perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Faller, M. T. (2002). *Semantics and Pragmatics of Evidentials in Cuzco Quechua*. (Doctoral dissertation), Stanford University.
- Rizzi, L. (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. M. V. Haegeman (Ed.), *Elements of grammar: handbook in generative syntax* (Vol. 1, pp. 281-337). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Ross, J. R. (1970). On Declarative Sentences. In R. A. Jacobs & P. S. Rosenbaum (Eds.), *Readings in English transformational grammar* (pp. 222-272): Waltham: Ginn.
- Speas, P., & Tenny, C. (2003). Configurational properties of point of view roles. In A. Sciullo (Ed.), *Asymmetry in grammar I: Syntax and semantics*, (pp. 315-344). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Speas, Margaret. (2004). Evidentiality, logophoricity and the syntactic representation of pragmatic features. *Lingua* 114. 255-276.
- Zanuttini, R., Pak, M., & Portner, P. (2012). A syntactic analysis of interpretive restrictions on imperative, promissive, and exhortative subjects. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 30(4), 1231-1274.