

Rhee, Seongha. 2003. When stop goes further: From malta
'stop' to auxiliary verbs in Korean. Korean
Language Research 13: 309-339.

When Stop Goes Further:
From *Malta* 'stop' to Auxiliary Verbs in
Korean*

Seongha Rhee

□ Contents

1. Introduction
2. Grammaticalization into Auxiliary Verbs
 - 2.1. Prohibitive
 - 2.2. Determinative
 - 2.3. Completive
 - 2.4. Cessative
3. Discussion
 - 3.1. On Semantic Change Mechanisms
 - 3.2. On Particles
 - 3.3. On Crosslinguistic Patterns
4. Conclusions

* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 5th High Desert Linguistics Society Conference at the University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, November 1-2, 2002. I thank the audience who gave me comments and criticisms. All remaining errors, however, are mine.

1. Introduction

1.1. Issues

In Korean, the verb *malta*¹⁾ denoting cessation or 'stop' displays some peculiarities in synchronic and diachronic aspects. Synchronically, for example, it can be rarely used as a main verb and rather it is predominantly used as an auxiliary verb; and it is an irregular verb in inflection whether it is used as a main verb or an auxiliary verb, even though it is certainly true that it is not the only irregular verb in Korean. From a diachronic perspective, the verb has been grammaticalized into numerous kinds of auxiliaries, a fact by no means peculiar in itself, but some of these grammaticalized auxiliaries are auxiliary adjectives despite their transparent verbal status. This peculiarity is such that some Korean grammarians as well as linguists are reluctant to acknowledge the existence of such a grammatical category in Korean. Another kind of peculiarity is that the verb, despite its moribund state as a main verb, survives in numerous fossilized forms whose exact meaning, however, is hard to define. The processes that lead the verb to the genesis of these forms raise interesting issues with regard to grammaticalization and lexicalization.

In this paper, largely due to space limitations, we shall confine our discussion to the issue of grammaticalization of auxiliary verbs only and leave the other issues for a separate discussion (See Rhee, forthcoming).

1) The ending *-ta* in *malta* is merely the infinitive ending and is not an inherent part of the verb. Therefore, the verb may appear as *mal-* or *ma-*, the latter as a result of /l/-deletion due to phonologically controlled inflectional irregularity.

1.2. Semantics of *Malta*

The verb *malta* seems to have been in use for a long time. As a matter of fact, most uses of the verb, lexical or grammatical, in contemporary Korean are attested as early as in Middle Korean, which is the earliest time period with the records available in Korean orthography. Therefore, it is hard to pinpoint the main semantics of the verb before its grammaticalization from the historical data. For a discussion of grammaticalization of this verb, however, it is necessary that we attempt to find the core meaning from extant data. The following are the lexical meanings attested in Middle Korean.²⁾

- (1) a. malssAm-i thongtal-khetun mal-olttienAl
words-Nom go:through-if stop-even:though
'Even though (he) had to stop (speaking) if the message was
successfully understood...'
(Pephwakyeng 1:9; 15th c.)
- b. kwanyen-ul eculewum-ul mal-lilosoni
office:connection-Acc complication-Acc stop-should:as
'As you stop getting involved with the complication of
government official interests...'
(Twusienhay 20:48; 15th c.)

As seen in the above, the verb *malta* meant 'stop' from the early history of the usage of this verb. In both cases of the examples above, the verb was used as a transitive verb, thus meaning 'stop something' or 'withdrawal from a previously on-going activity'.

2) For transliteration of the Korean data, the Extended Yale Romanization System as proposed by Rhee (1996) is used.

In modern Korean the transitive lexical verb use is rather limited, and is found in highly entrenched forms as in the following examples.

(2) a. *kulen malssum ma-si-o*
such talk:Hon stop-Hon-Pol:End
'Don't say so.' (Lit. Stop such talk.)

b. *silh-umyen mal-a*
dislike-if stop-Imp:End
'Quit on it if you don't like it.' (Lit. If (you) dislike, stop.)

It is interesting to note that in normal uses, the theme argument of the verb, normally accusative case-marked in Korean, prefers omission of the case-marker as in (2a) (cf. (1b) above); or even without explicit sentential argument, leaving its retrieval to the addressee as in (2b).

From the historical data and current uses, we can define the semantics of *malta* as 'stop something' or 'withdraw from something'. Now we turn to a discussion of how this lexical verb was changed into a grammatical marker.

2. Grammaticalization into Auxiliary Verbs

One of the most frequent uses of the verb *malta* is its use as auxiliary verbs. Since these auxiliary verbs are formed by serial verb constructions that contain two or more verbs connected by particles, they occur with a main verb which is in non-finite form with a non-finite marker attached to it. And the differential uses of these grammatical functions are products of the interaction of the verb with the particles in the construction (see 3.2 below for discussion). There

are three main auxiliary verbs: Prohibitive, Determinative, and Cessative.

2.1. Prohibitive

The prohibitive auxiliary verb is formed by a verb and the connective *-ci*, which is sometimes considered a nominalizer (see following discussion), and also homophonous with sentential end-marker with speaker's determinative attitude toward the proposition. It appears in the form of [-ci mal]. And its source construction is [Verb+Connective+mal], which literally means 'stop Verb-ing'. Its grammatical meaning is 'don't Verb', as illustrated in the following examples.

(3) a. o-ci mal-ayo

come-Proh-Pol:End

'Don't come.' (Lit. Stop coming.)

b. cenyek mek-ci mal-ko o-seyo

dinner eat-Proh-and come-Pol:End

'Come without eating dinner.' (Lit. Stop eating dinner and come.)

As seen in the above examples, since *-ci mal* is a prohibitive auxiliary it is only used in negative imperative sentences. More specifically it is only used with the verb whose denoted action is being prohibited by the speaker. Therefore, if a verb in a negative imperative sentence does not bear the illocutionary force of prohibition by the speaker it cannot be used with this auxiliary as shown in the following examples.

- (4) a. kongpwu ha-ci anh-ko nol-ci ma.
 b. *kongpwuha-ci mal-ko nol-ci ma.
 study-Conn {*anh, mal*}-and play-Proh
 Intended: 'Don't play without studying.'
 (b acceptable, though awkward, if intended interpretation is: 'Don't study; don't play (either)').'

One notable aspect of this prohibitive function is that in previous historical data, there were other particles that were used as connectives in the formation. For example, in addition to *-ci* (*=-ti* in Middle Korean) discussed above,³⁾ there were *-keŷ*, which denoted the mode (or futuristic mode, *a la* Rhee 1996); *-lye*, which denoted intention; *-yang*, which was a defective noun denoting figure or appearance; *-e* (*=-a*), which was a regular non-finite connective marker with sequentiality sense,⁴⁾ and *-ki*, which was a nominalizer, as shown in the following examples from the 1517 Nokeltay Text.⁵⁾

- (5) a. olhA-ni oy-ni nilA-ti mal-la
 right-thing wrong-thing say-Conn stop-Imp
 'Don't argue it's right or wrong.' (I: 43a)
- b. kim na-key mal-la
 steam come:out-Mode stop-Imp

3) Historically *-ci* was *-ti*, which later became palatalized because of the following high front vowel /i/.

4) Rhee (1996, 2003) and Koo (1987) call this non-finite particle as consolidating connective. The connective *-e* showed phonologically controlled alternation with its allomorph *-a*.

5) This Nokeltay Text is entitled *Penyek Nokeltay* [Translated Nokeltay] and its publication date is uncertain. However, historical linguists attribute it to prior to 1517. For convenience, disregarding the dating controversy, we refer to it hereafter as 'The 1517 Nokeltay Text'.

'Don't let the steam come out.' (I: 19b-20a)

c. kantaylo kaps-ul pato-lye mal-la
recklessly price-Acc receive-Inten stop-Imp
'Don't try to sell it at an unreasonable price.' (II: 10b)

d. nehAy son touy-n yang mal-ko
you:Pl guest become-Adn appearance stop-and
'Don't show formalities.' (Lit. 'Stop appearance as if you are
guests.') (I: 42b)

e. kwuthuyye nohAy-a mal-la
without:reason get:angry-Conn stop-Imp
'Don't be angry without reason.' (II: 19b)

f. ney kAcang il ka-ki mal-la
you very early go-Nomz stop-Imp
'Don't go too early.' (I:26b)

Of these historically available options, the most frequently used option in contemporary Korean is (5a), i.e. one with *-ci* (= *-ti*). The option (5b) is only marginally acceptable, and those who consider it acceptable tend to assume that it is an elliptical structure, i.e. from [kim na-key ha-ci mal-la] to [kim na-key mal-la]. In other words, they consider it a case of omission of semantically weak *hata* 'do' verb with the particle *-ci*, the normal particle for prohibitive auxiliary formation. The same applies to (5c) and (5d). Example (5e), where connective particle *-e* (= *-a*) is used, is no longer acceptable in modern Korean.⁶⁾ Example (5f) is also unacceptable in modern Korean.

6) However, this has certain bearings with the development of auxiliary adjectives (See Rhee, forthcoming).

However, *malta* was often used in this 16th century text with these clearly nominalized forms such as *ka-ki* [go-Nomz] 'going' above, *twɥpo-ki* [excrete-Nomz] 'excretion', or *niLA-ki* [speak-Nomz] 'speaking', etc.; or with defective nouns such as *-yang* 'figure, appearance' (as in (5d) above), or with full-fledged nouns denoting actions, e.g. *hemwul/hemul* 'criticism', *tocAk* 'theft', *calang* 'boasting', etc., and for that reason it is suspected that the connective particle *-ci* has a certain connection with the nominalizing function. This possible connection is supported by two independent pieces of evidence.

The first evidence comes from the phonological motivation between the connective *-ci* and nominalizer *-ki*, whose respective phonemic values are /ci/ and /gi/. It has been attested in historical data there was a sound change that occurred in the direction of [gi] > [ci]. For example, *kilkyengi* [gilgyɔŋi] 'plantain' in the 16th-18th century has been changed to *cilkyengi* [cilgyɔŋi].⁷⁾ More productively, dialectal variations show greater degree of connection between the two sounds as shown below.⁸⁾

(6) 'Standard' Korean ⁹⁾	Dialectal variations	
kikkepta	cikkepta	'glad'
kilta	cilta, cita	'long'
kitalita	citalita, citalkwuta	'wait'
kyetulangi	citulayngi	'arm pit'

7) The data sources are *Sikyengenhay* (1588, 1613) and *Mwulmyengko* (1773, 1837)

8) These exemplars were taken from *Wulimal Khunsacen* (1996 [1992]).

9) The term 'Standard Korean' is as used by grammarians. The Official Korean Orthographic Regulation states that the variety used by the educated middle class in the Seoul area is considered the Standard Korean. However, in this paper, no value judgment is assumed in the use of this term.

kili	cili	'length'
kilum	cilum	'oil'
kiluta	ciluta	'nurture'
kilita	cilita	'honor'

The above examples are not isolated cases but rather a widely spread phenomenon. In fact, the list can be extended to a considerable length.

Another piece of more important evidence is that the nominalizer *-ki* is attested to appear as *-ci* in dialectal variations, as e.g. shown in the following example of the Jeju dialect taken from *Wulimal Khunsacen*,

- (7) pap mek-ci silphu-ta
 food eat-Nomz dislike-Dec
 'I don't want to eat.'

Still another piece of evidence comes from the fact that the prohibitive *-ci malta* shows greater tolerance of insertion of accusative marker *-lul*. It is often cited that Korean allows the insertion of *-lul* to an argument that is not a complement that is usually marked with an accusative, such as theme, patient, recipient, etc. However, the case of *-ci* is somewhat different in that the resultant string *-cilul* is not only natural but also usually even preferable. If so, this suggests that Verb-*-ci* may be either historically related to nominalization or at least it is conceived of as such in the mind of the contemporary Korean speakers.¹⁰⁾

The preceding discussion addressed the diversity of prohibitive

10) Such insertion is common in emphatic constructions or often in poetry. In the latter case some rhyming effect may be suspected as well. However, we shall not go into a detailed discussion here.

constructions making use of *malta*, and possible connection between the nominalizer and the connective. The historical diversity of these cooccurring forms suggests that the verb was used with the forms that form a continuum of 'nouniness', as shown in (8), and that when the complement of *malta* is clearly noun the verb seemed to be a fully lexical main verb; while where the nouniness is absent or its presence exists only as a possibility, the verb is a fully grammatical auxiliary verb.

(8)

Characterization	Exemplar	Grammatical Status of <i>malta</i>
Fully Noun	<i>hemwul</i> 'criticism'	Main Verb
Defective Noun	<i>yang</i> 'appearance'	Main Verb
Derived Noun	<i>ka-ki</i> 'go-ing'	Main Verb / (Auxiliary Verb)
Possible connection with Noun	<i>malha-ci</i> 'speak-Conn'	(Main Verb) / Auxiliary Verb

The historical diversity of the prohibitive constructions all utilizing the verb *malta*, and the relative rigidity of the construction in particle selection in modern Korean where only *-ci* is allowed suggest that the grammaticalization of the prohibitive marker underwent specialization (Hopper 1991, Hopper & Traugott 2002 [1993]), whereby the forms and constructions formally carrying identical or similar grammatical function are gradually ruled out in the course of competition among them and consequently one of the forms comes to assume the primacy in use, which, in this case, is the construction with the particle *-ci*.

Another implication from this former diversity and variation with

their connection with nouniness is that there is a possibility that the contemporary connective particle may have arisen from the nominalizer, and that, therefore, the grammaticalization of the prohibitive construction may be a result of gradual change of the nature of the complement: from the fully main verb taking a noun as a complement to the auxiliary verb with a connective particle still bearing the old vestige of the nominalizing function. This implication invites a future research encompassing diverse uses of *-ci* in connective functions as well as sentential ending functions.

If the relation between the connective particle *-ci* in the prohibitive and the nominalizer *-ki* can be established, it amounts to saying that the grammaticalization of the prohibitive was more syntactically motivated. However, there seem to be some semantic reasons as well. Unlike other connective particles, *-ci* seems to encode the speaker's determinative attitude or exclusiveness of other options. It is no accident, then, that only the connective *-ci* is used for the complement of negation. A piece of indirectly supporting evidence is that when *-ci* is used as a sentence end marker, it seems to create a similar effect: more of speaker emotion, belief, or determinative attitude to the proposition than other options.

2.2. Determinative

The verb *malta* forms a determinative auxiliary with a different particle from those used in the formation of the prohibitive auxiliary, as shown in the following examples.

(9) a. ku san-ul olu-ko mal-keyss-ta

the mountain-Acc climb-Detm-Inten-Dec
'I will surely climb the mountain.'
(Lit.: I will climb the mountain and then stop.)

b. sihem-ey pwuth-ko mal-keya
test-at attach-Detm-Dec
'I will surely pass the exam.'
(Lit.: I will attach to the exam and then stop.)

As shown in the examples above, *-ko malta* is used to encode 'determinative' attitude of the speaker. The source construction is [Verb-ko *malta*] 'Verb-Connective(and)-stop'. Sometimes if the speaker wants to encode even stronger determinative behavior, a conditional marker is added, as shown in (10).¹¹⁾

(10)a. sihem-ey pwuth-ko-ya mal-keya
exam-at attach-Conn-if stop-Dec
'I will surely pass the exam.'
(Lit.: I will stop only if/after I pass the exam.)

b. ne-lul iki-ko-ya mal-keya
you-Acc defeat-Conn-if stop-Dec
'I will defeat you.'
(Lit.: I will stop only if/after I defeat you.)

The motivation for the development of this auxiliary seems semantically straightforward. The statement that one is going to stop

11) It is worthwhile to note that more commonly used conditional marker *-myen* is not used for this purpose. A conditional marker of stonger conditionality *-ya*, similar to the logical operator 'if and only if', is used to strengthen the determinative meaning.

after (or only if) he or she accomplishes something is a statement of his or her determination to accomplish it. If so, the source structure can be said to have been preserved because there is no phonological erosion with this marker and that it is semantically still transparent, and thus the grammatical meaning is merely a concatenation of the semantics of the source components.

This seems to raise a question if this is can be viewed as an instance of grammaticalization after all. In addition, this structure does not even show orthographic contraction, i.e. the source structure contains a space according to the Korean orthographic rules, a fact indicating that they are still perceived as a combination of source components. However, this surely qualifies as an instance of grammaticalization, though not extensive, for following reasons.

One of the most decisive parameters used in diagnosing grammaticalization is decategorialization, i.e. if there is any change in terms of the status of the grammatical categories to which the source item belonged and the resultant item now belongs. The verb *malta* in the source structure seems to be clearly lexical, denoting 'stop', thus belonging to the open class category 'verb'. However, in the resultant state, *malta* ceases to be a lexical verb, in terms of the speaker's perception and of its syntactic behavior. The native speakers of Korean, for example, do not 'see' the original meaning 'to stop' in the construction. The following examples illustrate the point.

(11)A: na-n hapkyekha-ko mal-keya
 I-Top pass:exam-Detm-Dec
 'I will surely pass the exam.'

B: a. na-to hapkyekha-lkeya

I-too pass:exam-Fut.Dec 'Me, too.'

- b. *na-to mal-(l)keya
I-too stop-Fut.Dec (Intended) 'Me, too.'

From the differing grammaticality of (11Ba) and (11Bb) above, we can see that *malta* 'to stop' is not the main verb of (11A) but *hapkyekhata* 'to pass an exam' is. In other words, the semantic focus is on *hapkyekhata*, and *malta* is adding the speaker's attitude that that is his or her intention.

However, as briefly touched on in previous discussions, the formal transparency suggests that the grammaticalization of this marker does not have a long history. As a matter of fact, this form is not attested in any of six Nokeltay Texts¹²⁾, even though it is elsewhere in historical data.

2.3. Completive

The verb *malta* has been grammaticalized into a different grammatical function, i.e. completive marking, from the source construction of the connective *-ko* and the verb *malta*, thus literally meaning 'Verb and then stop', as shown in the following examples.

- (12) a. ku-nun cwuk-ko mal-ass-ta
he-Top die-Compl-Pst-Dec
'He died.'

12) These Nokeltay Texts are *Penyek Nokeltay* (1517), *Nokeltay Enhay* (1670), *Phyengankamyeng Nokeltay* (1745), *Chenge Nokeltay* (1765), *Monge Nokeltay* (1790), and *Cwungkan Nokeltay* (1795).

b. ku-nun pwulhaynghay-ci-ko mal-ass-ta
he-Top unhappy-Pass-Compl-Pst-Dec
'He became unhappy.'

c. khun cencayng-i na-ko mal-ass-ta
big war-Nom break:out-Pst-Dec
'A big war broke out.'

One notable aspect of this completive marking is that they tend to be used with certain events that are undesirable. The following examples illustrate the point.

(13) a. */?ku-nun sengkongha-ko mal-ass-ta
he-Top succeed-Compl-Pst-Dec
(Intended: 'He succeeded.')

b. ku-nun silphayha-ko mal-ass-ta
he-Top fail-Compl-Pst-Dec
'He failed.'

As contrasted above, this completive marker has a speaker's attitude associated with it, signalling that the proposition being predicated of is not desirable from the speaker's point of view. This undesirability seems to have been a result of pragmatic inference that something is completed and is irreversible, and therefore it is undesirable.¹³⁾ As a matter of fact, one of the senses associated with this form is 'helplessness': native speakers often say that this form is used for an

13) A similar inference pattern seems to have operated with the grammaticalization of the verb of displacement *pelita* 'throw away' into a perfective auxiliary, which acquired an undesirability sense en route. See Rhee (1996) for more details.

event which the speaker could not control and occurred irrevocably. Acquisition of this undesirability sense seems to be a recent development because there are instances in historical data where this completive marker was used in contexts that are not compatible with undesirability, such as a desiderative construction, as shown in the following 17th century example.

- (14) *suyhwenkh-o hwenchulhA-n seykyey-lAltasi po-ko mal-wala*
 refreshing-and clear-Adn world-Acc again see-Compl-Desid
 'I wish I could see the beautiful world again by all means.'
 (Lit.: I wish I see the beautiful world again and then stop.)
 (Songkangkasa 23; 1690)

If we compare this completive marker with the previously discussed determinative marker, they seem to be closely related to other. First of all, the formal relationship is indisputable because they are in fact of an identical form. Furthermore, there exists certain semantic relationship as well.¹⁴⁾ It cannot be established which of the two were developed first. However, the relationship can be relatively easily reconstructed. If this completive marking function preceded the determinative marking function, the semantic transition can be understood as a case of subjectification, whereby simple completion sense acquired the meaning of speaker's intention. This could have been facilitated by the two syntagmatic factors that characterize the determinative constructions, i.e. the first-person subject, and the future tense. It is often the case that the two different meanings are the result of the interaction of these forms with the subject and/or tense of the sentence, as shown below.

14) For a discussion of semantic change, see 3.1.

- (15) a. ku-nun New York-ey ka-ko mal-ass-ta
 he-Top New York-to go-Conn stop-Pst-Dec
 'He went to New York.' (Completive, Negative)
- b. na-nun New York-ey ka-ko mal-(l)keya
 I-Top New York-to go-Conn stop-Fut:Dec
 'I will definitely go to New York.' (Determinative, Neutral)

On the other hand, if the development of the determinative marking function preceded that of the completive marking function, the emergence of this new meaning may be attributable to semantic bleaching or generalization whereby the volition sense was eliminated, and to subjectification, whereby the speaker's negative attitude was added. The latter process may have involved pragmatic inferencing as briefly mentioned above.

2.4. Cessative

Another grammatical function this verb came to acquire in the course of grammaticalization is cessative marking, which developed from a source structure of [-taka malta], where the particle *-taka* marks stoppage of one event and transfer to another. This particle itself is a grammaticalized form from a fully lexical verb *takuta* 'get close to' (Rhee 1996). There are two variant forms of this cessative marking: *-taka malta* and *-ta malta*. The latter is a phonologically eroded form from the former, fuller form. However, there are no discernible semantic differences between the two. Some of the examples are as follows:

(16) a. ku-nun tayhak-ul tani-ta(ka) mal-ass-ta
 he-Top college-Acc attend-Cess-Pst-Dec
 'He quit college on the way.'
 (Lit.: 'He attended college and then stopped.')

b. mek-ta(ka) mal-ko eti-l ka-(a)?
 eat-Cess-and where-Acc go-Q:End
 'Where are you going in the middle of eating?'
 (Lit.: 'Where are you going, after stopping eating?')

c. kongpwuha-ta(ka) mal-ko mwusun sayngkakha-ni?
 study-Cess-and what think-Q:End
 'What are you thinking about in the middle of studying? / What
 thought are you distracted by from studying?'
 (Lit.: 'What are you thinking, after stopping studying?')

As seen in the above, *-ta(ka) malta* means that an activity is unexpectedly interrupted by another activity. Normally the sentential subject is responsible for such a change of activity. Therefore, this kind of construction is often used for reproach for unexpected and often undesirable change, thus the examples (16b) and (16c) are more commonly interpretable as 'Finish your meal!', and 'Concentrate on studying!', respectively, which bear close resemblance with the English expression 'Why don't you...?'. It is notable that the verbal meaning *malta*, i.e. 'stop', is what the speaker construes as such, not necessarily what the sentential subject intentionally chooses to do. For example, in (16c) above, it is likely that the sentential subject, i.e. 'you' the addressee, did not purposefully choose to entertain a thought that came to him or her. These aspects show that the auxiliary *-ta(ka) malta* encodes the speaker's attitude, thus qualifying to be a speaker-oriented modality marker (*a la* Bybee *et al.* 1994), normally

developed from an agent-oriented modality marker. This process is a result of speaker's subjectification, whereby the speaker, not explicitly represented on the surface, imposes his or her judgment and evaluation on the proposition, specifically the agent's action denoted by the verb. This kind of subjectification is even more intensified in such examples as shown below.

- (17) a. chayk-i pwul-ey tha-ta(ka) mal-ass-ta
 book-Nom fire-at burn-Cess-Pst-Dec
 'The book is half-burned / not burned completely.'
 (Lit.: 'This book burned in fire and then stopped.')

- b. pi-ka o-ta(ka) mal-ko kuchi-ess-ta
 rain-Nom come-Cess-and stop-Pst-Dec
 'The rain stopped.'
 (Lit.: 'The rained stopped coming and stopped.')

The above examples show that non-agentive sentential subjects such as a book or a rain can be used with the verb *malta*. One thing of note is that the verb *malta* 'to stop', *per se*, is an agentive transitive verb unlike English intransitive 'stop' in 'The rain stopped.', rather it means 'intentional withdrawal from an activity'. The intransitive counterpart to *malta* is *kuchita* in (17b) above. This is illustrated in (18).

- (18) a. pi-ka kuchi-ess-ta
 rain-Nom stop-Pst-Dec
 'The rain stopped.'

- b. *pi-ka mal-ass-ta

rain-Nom stop-Pst-Dec
Intended: 'The rain stopped.'

Since the lexical verb usage of *malta*, though rarely used in contemporary Korean, survives, the auxiliary usage and the main verb usage form a divergence phenomenon (Hopper 1991, Hopper & Traugott 2002 [1993]) with the emergence of the auxiliary usage from the transitive lexical verb usage, which still survives in limited contexts.

3. Discussion

In the foregoing discussions we have seen various grammaticalized uses of the verb *malta*. There are many issues that may be raised from the theoretical perspective of grammaticalization. In the following, we will discuss some of such issues.

3.1. On Semantic Change Mechanisms

There has been abundance of research on mechanisms of semantic change in grammaticalization in literature, among which are metaphor, metonymy, inference, generalization, etc. For morphosyntactic changes reanalysis and analogy are often held responsible for grammaticalization. However, as Bybee *et al.* correctly point out, "it should be emphasized [...] that grammaticalization changes are complex and comprise many small steps" and that "Close analysis of changes in progress may reveal a complex network of mechanisms applying together or in sequence" (Bybee *et al.* 1994: 282), it is difficult to establish that a particular single mechanism was responsible for one

grammaticalization phenomenon. There are also many competing principles operating in language use and language change in the course of meaning negotiation in discourse. If we acknowledge multiplicity of grammaticalization mechanisms, then there comes into question how many independent mechanisms of change must be recognized. Since we are not in the position of deciding how many mechanisms are needed or of evaluating each of such mechanisms, we will discuss some mechanisms that seem to have operated in the grammaticalization of the verb *malta*.

As discussed above, we can say that *-ci malta* has traveled a relatively short journey, though it may not be so in terms of absolute time depth, as the formal characteristics of non-extensive phonological erosion suggests, and as the semantics of the construction is still not entirely opaque for analysis. According to Bybee *et al.* (1994), Rhee (1996), among others, the semantic mechanism that commonly operates at the incipient stage of grammaticalization is metaphor (see e.g. Bybee *et al.* 1994: 297), though it is not the only one. However, in the case of grammaticalization of *malta*, there is no much room for metaphor interpretation. The semantic change in the course of grammaticalization, if we assume that all auxiliaries were developed from the lexical meaning, i.e. not sequentially among them, can be summarized as follows:

- (19) a. stop >> Do not Prohibitive
- b. stop >> By all means Determinative
- c. stop >> Completely Completive
- d. stop >> Discontinue Cessative

As seen above, it is hard to conceptualize the semantic change of

this kind as one as a result of metaphor, metonymy, generalization, or other commonly invoked mechanisms, because the resultant meanings are so diverse and do not seem to have a common denominator.

However, at the individual level, the instances in which we can relatively easily conceive of semantic relation are prohibitive, i.e. (19a) and cessative, i.e. (19d). If one says "Stop doing A" to mean "Do not A", this involves certain amount of subjectification (*a la* Traugott 1982, Traugott & König 1991, Traugott 2003 [1999], Traugott & Dasher 2002) because such encoding suggests that the speaker is viewing the addressee in connection with an event that can be possibly realized, regardless of the existence of factual connection. For example, "Stop spending money" is amenable, only if the addressee, by implicature, is engaged in an activity of spending money; whereas "Do not spend money" does not require that the addressee be currently in such money-spending activity. Therefore, the change from "stop" to "do not" involves the speaker's subjective evaluation of the addressee situation as one involving relevance to the act to be prohibited by the speaker.

In the case of the change from 'stop' to 'discontinue' (cessative), the semantic change seems straightforward or the two senses seem to be even synonymous. This semantic relationship seems to be attributable to its original semantics of 'withdrawal' (see 1.2 above). However, this apparent synonymy is due to the oversimplification of the metalinguistic labeling. Unlike its lexical meaning 'stop', the grammaticalized cessative meaning is built upon the background of speaker's counter-expectation. For example, in the following example, the speaker expresses that the cessation of the rainfall is rather unexpected.

- (20) pi-ka o-ta(ka) mal-ass-ta
rain-Nom come-Cess-Pst-Dec
'The rain stopped.'

As seen in the above, the development of the cessative meaning from 'stop' also involves subjectification of the speaker.

The semantic change can be more easily understood if we take into consideration the roles of particles that participate in the formation of these grammatical markers (as illustrated in Rhee 1996, 2003), to which now we turn.

3.2. On Particles

In Rhee (1996, 2003), it was argued that in Korean the roles of particles participating in the formation of grammatical markers such as past, progressive, future, etc are crucial in understanding why an identical lexical item takes up multiple, and semantically diverse, grammaticalization paths.

This thesis seems to find additional support from our current case of grammaticalization of *malta*. The particles recruited in auxiliary formation processes here are *-ci*, *-ko*, *-ya*, and *-taka*. We have discussed previously on the semantic functions of *-ci*, where we explored the possibility of relation with the nominalizer. The characteristic of the particle *-ko* is that in addition to its regular connective sense like 'and', it has an isolating function of the meaning of the verb it attaches to from the meaning of the verb that follows it (Rhee 1996, 2003). The particle *-ya* denotes strong conditionality. The particle *-taka*, on the other hand, was developed from the verb of

approximation, i.e. *takuta*. As was illustrated before (see 2.4), the basic meaning of this particle is transference, i.e. abrupt change from one action to another.¹⁵⁾ Therefore, if we consider the semantics of particles, the semantic change pattern can be summarized as in (21).

(21)

Source Particles	Literal Meaning	Grammatical Meaning
a. determinative/nominalizer	definite entity + stop	Prohibitive
b. isolating connective isolating connective & conditional	and + stop	Determinative
c. isolating connective	and + stop	Completive
d. transferentive connective	transfer + stop	Cessative

As we can see in the above, the prohibitive function in (21a) was developed from a structure where a nominalized constituent played a role of the theme of the transitive verb 'stop' (see 2.1 for detailed discussion). The prohibition sense seems to be especially in consonance with the theme because the nominalized constituent was formed by use of a particle that had the semantics of turning a verbal event into a determinative, definitive entity. It should be conceptually more effective in imperative sentences if the event or action is pinpointed clearly and presented as if it is a well-delineated entity. For this reason, the previously discussed multiplicity of prohibitive constructions in the Middle Korean and the specialization phenomenon, where this particle with strong determinative effect, are by no means a coincidence.

The development of the determinative function as in (21b) is based

15) Since the source verbal meaning of *takuta* is approximation, i.e. 'get close to', there is a different meaning of this particle 'locative' with special emphasis on the location. However, we will not go into a discussion of this issue. See Rhee (1996) for more discussion.

on the source construction [Verb+and+stop] or [Verb+and+only:if+stop]. Note that since in Korean the conditional marker appears clause-finally, this [Verb+and+only:if+stop] in fact means 'only after Verb-ing then stop'. From this configuration, the development of determinative function seems to be a natural outgrowth. If someone says that he or she will stop only after an event comes about, it is tantamount to saying that he or she is determined to make the event come about.

The development of the completive function from the configuration of [Verb+and+stop] can be interpreted similarly. However, this rather different function from the previously discussed determinative marking may seem strange, considering that they are in fact built on the identical source structure. However, this difference is largely due to semantic bleaching of the verb *malta*: from the agentive, transitive meaning to non-agentive, intransitive meaning. Therefore, when the 'stop' came to have an intransitive meaning, even taking inanimates as its subject, the structure simply came to mean that the verbal event occurred and stopped, thus the event occurred completely. However, since the completive and determinative markers use identical forms, the selection of the two possible interpretations largely depends on the contextual cues.

Finally, the development of the cessative marking function from the verb *malta* is based on the source construct making use of the transferentive particle. Since the transferentive particle basically adds the meaning to the attached verb that the action denoted by the verb was unexpectedly interrupted and the sentential subject now engages itself to the action of 'stopping'. From this basic structure, it is natural for a cessative meaning to develop. The motivation for the

emergence of such meaning from the source structure is so obvious that there seems to be no explanation needed for the process.

As we have seen above, the emergence of new grammatical function seems to be straightforward if we consider the semantics of the particles, not just the lexical item which might appear to be the main entity from which all meanings are derived. The importance of particles has also been observed in Eom (2003) in grammaticalization of certain modal auxiliaries. A similar account is found with the development of futurity-marking by English *be going to*. For example, Hopper & Traugott (2002: 89) hypothesize that "the future meaning of *be going to* was derived by the semanticization of the dual inferences of later time indexed by *go* and purposive *to*, not from *go* alone." Similarly, Bybee *et al.* (1994), discussing the Kuliac verb of motion *ac* 'come' that grammaticalized into a future tense marker and a venitive aspect marker, suggest that the different paths of grammaticalization are due to the verb's context, and argued that what grammaticalizes is not a word but a construction.

3.3. On Crosslinguistic Patterns

The verb denoting 'stop' seems to be a frequently attested source for the grammaticalization of the prohibitive function. For example, Heine & Kuteva (2002) presents Welsh and Teso as well as numerous Kru languages, such as Bassa, Klao, Tchien Krahn, Sapo, and Wobé, where the verb 'stop' grammaticalized into prohibitive markers. The following are some of such examples.

(22)

- a. Welsh (William 1960: 78; as cited in Heine & Kuteva 2002: 283)
- | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|---|-------|-------|
| Paid | | â | | mynd! |
| stop:Imp:2:Sg | and | | go:VN | |
| 'Don't go!' | | | | |
- b. Klao (Marchese 1986: 191; as cited in Heine & Kuteva 2002: 283)
- | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------|-------------|--|--|
| bə | də | di-di-də | | |
| stop | thing | eat-eat-Nom | | |
| 'Don't eat anything!' | | | | |
- c. Teso (Hilders & Lawrance 1956: 30; as cited in Heine & Kuteva 2002: 283)
- | | | | | |
|--------------|------|------|--------|--|
| Ki- | nyek | a- | losit! | |
| 2:Sg- | stop | Inf- | go | |
| 'Do not go!' | | | | |

As shown in the above example, the development of prohibitive in Korean is by no means an isolated example but has certain universality.

It is also worthwhile to note that Heine *et al.* (1993) show that Portuguese *parar* 'stop, halt' developed into a cessative marker, or conclusive auxiliary which means 'stop doing something', as illustrated in the following example.

- (23) Portuguese (Schemann & Schemann-Dias 1983: 49; as cited in Heine *et al.* 1993: 208)

a	buzina	parou	de	tocar
the	horn	stops	to	hoot
'The horn does not hoot any longer.'				

The above example showing the grammaticalization of cessative

marker in Portuguese is exactly reminiscent of the previously discussed grammaticalization process of the Korean cessative marker *-ta(ka) malta*. However, the detailed processes behind this Portuguese cessative marker have not yet been made available, and must await future research to confirm if the grammaticalization in the two languages shows any parallelism.

4. Conclusions

In this paper we have seen how the Korean verb *malta* which means 'to stop' as a lexical verb grammaticalized into auxiliary verbs that acquired such functions as prohibitive marking, determinative marking, completive marking, and cessative marking. We have seen that subjectification was prominent in the grammaticalization of completive and cessative functions.

It is also argued that in grammaticalization, at least in the cases of the grammaticalization of the verb *malta*, the semantics of the participating particles is of crucial importance.

There are other grammaticalized functions of auxiliary adjectives, postpositional particles, and adverbializers that were developed from this verb. And this verb also shows certain lexicalization patterns that may shed light on the interrelatedness of lexicalization and grammaticalization processes, which shall remain for future research.

<Lecture & Research Professor,
Linguistics Department &
Stanford Language Center,
Stanford University>

□ Abbreviations

Acc: accusative; Adn: adnominal; Cess: cessative; Compl: completive; Conn: connective; Dec: declarative; Desid: desiderative; Detm: determinative; End: ending; Fut: future; Hon: honorific; Imp: imperative; Inf: infinitive; Inten: intentional; Lit: literal meaning; Nom: nominative; Nomz: nominalizer; Pass: passive; Pst: past; Pl: plural; Pol: polite; Proh: prohibitive; Q: interrogative; Sg: singular; Top: topic; VN: verbal noun.

□ References

- Bybee, Joan L., Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar. Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Eom, Su Jin. 2003. A comparative analysis of grammaticalization of English and Korean modal auxiliaries. Paper presented at the Second Seoul International Discourse Cognitive Linguistics Conference, June 6-7, 2003. Korea University, Seoul, Korea.
- Heine, Bernd, & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, and Friederike Hünemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A conceptual framework*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Heine, Bernd, Tom Güldermann, Christa Kilian-Hatz, Donald A. Lessau, Heinz Roberg, Mathias Schladt, & Thomas Stolz. 1993. *Conceptual Shift: A Lexicon of Grammaticalization Processes in African Languages*. University of Cologne.
- Hilders, J. H. & J. C. D. Lawrance. 1956. *An Introduction to the Ateso Language*. Kampala: The Eagle Press.
- Hopper, Paul. 1991. On some principles of grammaticalization. In Elizabeth

- Closs Traugott & Bernd Heine (eds.) *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. 2 vols. Vol. 1: 17-35. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hopper, Paul, and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2002 [1993], *Grammaticalization*. (2nd Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Koo, Hyun Jung. 1987. Ssikkuth {-a, -key, -ci, -ko}uy ssuimkwa uymi 'The usage and semantics of suffixes, -a, -key, -ci, and -ko.' *Konkuk Emwunhak* 11-12: 167-168. (In Korean)
- Marchese, Lynell. 1986. *Tense/aspect and the Development of Auxiliaries in Kru Languages*. (Summer Institute of Linguistics. Publications in Linguistics. 78) Summer Institute of Linguistics & The University of Texas at Arlington.
- Rhee, Seongha. 1996, *Semantics of Verbs and Grammaticalization: The development in Korean from a cross-linguistic perspective*. The University of Texas at Austin Ph.D. dissertation. Seoul: Hankuk Publisher.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2003. Particle selection in Korean auxiliary formation. Paper presented at LASSO XXXII Conference, October 17-19, 2003, The University of Texas-Pan American.
- Rhee, Seongha. Forthcoming. Grammaticalization of *malta* into auxiliary adjectives. ms. Hankuk University of Foreign Studies. Seoul. Korea.
- Schemann, Hans & Luiza Schemann-Dias. 1983. *Die portugiesischen Verbalperiphrasen und ihre deutschen Entsprechungen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1982. From propositional to textual and expressive meanings: Some semantic-pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization. In Lehmann & Malkiel (eds.) *Perspectives in Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 245~71.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2003 [1999]. From subjectification to intersubjectification. In Raymond Hickey (ed.) *Motives for Language Change*. 124-139. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Paper presented at the Workshop on Historical Pragmatics, Fourteenth International Conference on Historical Linguistics,

- Vancouver, Canada, July 1999.)
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs & Richard B. Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in semantic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs & Ekkehard Knig. 1991. The semantics-pragmatics of grammaticalization revisited. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott & Bernd Heine. (eds.) *Approaches to grammaticalization*. 2 vols. Vol. 1: 189-218. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- William, Urien. 1960. *A Short Welsh Grammar*. Llandybie: Llyfrau'r Dryw.
- Wulimal Khunsacen*. 1996 [1992]. 'Big Dictionary of the Korean Language'. Hankulhakhoy. Seoul: Emungak Publishing.