When 'No' Does not Mean 'No': Grammaticalization of Discourse Markers and Auxiliaries from Rhetorical Negations*

Seongha Rhee (Hankuk Univ. of Foreign Studies· Stanford Univ.)

Rhee, Seongha. 2003. When 'No' Does not Mean 'No': Grammaticalization of Discourse Markers and Auxiliaries from Rhetorical Negations. *Journal of Linguistic Science* 27, 269-290. Grammaticalization research has been predominantly concerned with analyzing fully grammaticalized items, and studies dealing with the items that are at the incipient stages have been largely underrepresented. Since grammaticalization is a result of meaning negotiation in discourse, rhetorical strategies constitute important research issue, because these are often central in discourse. This paper deals with rhetorical negations, i.e., those with which the speakers do not literally 'negate' a meaning of a linguistic sign, but instead use for strategic effects. Of diverse negation words, four lexical negatives were selected: *anita* 'not:be', *epsta* 'not:exist', *moluta* 'not:know', and *malta* 'not:continue'. Based on real life data, this analysis presents grammaticalization phenomena displayed by these rhetorically used lexical negatives currently in the course of changing into discourse markers, auxiliary verbs and auxiliary adjectives. There are diverse discourse markers resulted from this grammaticalization process, carrying special discourse functions such as attention-attracting, attenuating, etc. Likewise, there are auxiliary verbs that takes a verb as their complements and add diverse modal

---

meanings. There is also an instance of auxiliary adjective, which, however, is in decline in use frequency, gradually being replaced by auxiliary verbs with similar semantics. **(Hankuk University of Foreign Studies·Stanford University)**

Key words: grammaticalization, rhetorical negations, discourse markers, auxiliary verbs, auxiliary adjectives.

1. Introduction

In the linguistics discipline, the grammaticalization scholarship caught considerable attention of the linguists in recent years, and it contributed significantly to the understanding of language in many aspects, notably the understanding of its dynamics with reference to human cognition. This advancement is largely due to the panchronic and crosslinguistic approaches assumed by the grammaticalization scholars, because such approaches do not confine the research scope to synchronic or diachronic aspects of grammar but adopt a wider scope in terms of temporal aspect of language, and because such approaches also tend to look at wide range of languages for universalities as well as language-specific peculiarities. Such approaches with no doubt are more successful in reaching more meaningful and stronger generalizations on the nature of language and language change.

However, as has often been pointed out, a large body of research has been focusing on the items that have undergone relatively a long path of grammaticalization processes, which, therefore, are easy to identify as grammaticalized items. With recent trends of grammaticalization research where such topics as unidirectionality, borderline phenomena, (inter-)relationship between grammaticalization and lexicalization, etc. have been major issues of research, the notion of paths of grammaticalization processes has emerged with renewed significance (see e.g. Wischer & Diewald 2002, Ramat & Hopper 1998, and paper presentations at 2002 New

Reflections on Grammaticalization Conference II). With emphasis on grammaticalization paths more research was brought forth, comparing clustered items on a continuum with reference to grammatical status or degree of grammaticalization.

From the early studies, and more prominently in recent years, the importance of discourse has been emphasized (see e.g. Hopper & Traugott 2002 [1993]), and the actual use with differing levels of frequency has also been given emphasis (see e.g. Bybee & Hopper 2001, Barlow & Kemmer 2000, *inter alia*). Emphasis on actual language usage is in line with our understanding that language change occurs in the course of active meaning negotiation processes in discourse. To that effect Hopper (1987) even proposed a thesis that there is no *a priori* grammar but that there is only a continuous movement toward discourse structures, and he presented the notion of 'emergent grammar', which thereafter came to be widely referred to in grammaticalization scholarship. Emergent grammar is thus called a "radicalized discourse-based approach to grammar" (cf. Himmelmann 1992: 12, as cited in Lessau 1994).

Recently, in a series of research Rhee (2003a, b, c) explores the rhetorical structures in Korean that exhibit such movement to grammar, i.e. grammaticalization phenomena displayed by rhetorical questions, rhetorical negations and rhetorical negative questions. This paper is in continuation of such discourse-based exploration, and addresses a discourse phenomenon which is at the very incipient stage of grammaticalization, i.e. the grammaticalization of rhetorical negations.

The term 'rhetoric' has been used in various senses in different disciplines. Following Leech (1983) and Leith & Myerson (1989), among others, we use the term from a broad pragmatic perspective, i.e. a means of public persuasion, producing a social discourse with affective meaning, or a perlocutionary effect on the addressee (cf. Wales 2001). Assuming such a perspective, for a working definition, rhetorical negations are defined as the negations in strategic use, where negatives are used merely for discourse

effect, without reference to their lexical content of 'negating something'. This amounts to saying that 'rhetorical negations are the negations that do not really mean negations'.[1]

These rhetorical negations show wide range of emergent-grammar phenomena by forming constructions that are entrenched, and non-analytically used by the discourse interlocutors. The range of negations used in discourse may be quite wide, because it should encompass morphosyntactic negations and lexical negations, but this paper focuses on only four negation words that are inherently negation-marked, i.e. lexically-determined negative words, as follows:[2]

(1) a. *anita*[3]   not:be
    b. *epsta*   not:exist
    c. *moluta*   not:know
    d. *malta*   not:continue

The above lexical negatives display grammaticalization as well as certain lexicalization processes, to which we now turn.

---

1) This is analogous to the concept of rhetorical questions, i.e. the questions which are not intended to elicit answers, but to create certain discourse effects (See Rhee 2003a).

2) Since the notion of lexical negation is hard to define, and because all the marked items in polar antonymy such as 'short' (vs. unmarked 'long'), 'low' (vs. unmarked 'high'), 'hate' (vs. unmarked 'like'), etc. may also qualify as lexical negation at certain conceptual level, the selection of these items is rather arbritrary. However, these four words are non-derived lexical items that are intuitively considered prominent negative exemplars in Korean.

3) For transliteration of the Korean data, the Yale Romanization System is used. In each word, the final *-ta* is a lexicographic device to indicate that it is an infinitive form (for dictionary entries), and is not an inherent part of the word. Therefore, each of these words may appear as *ani-, eps-, molu-/mol-* and *mal-/ma-,* the last two being subject to phonologically controlled alternations. *Anita* may be further broken down as [an+ita] 'Neg+be', but since the word is synchronically taken as a monolexemic word as evidenced by separate dictionary entry, and there is also a possibility that the negation may have been derived from this word, instead of the reverse, we include it as an exemplar of lexical negatives.

2. Grammaticalization of Discourse Markers

Uses of negation in real life discourse are diverse, and strategies of persuasion are inherent parts of discourse. It is hard, therefore, to differentiate a strategic use of negations and a more lexical use of negations, because there are always varying degrees of fossilization into constructions from mere strings of lexical items containing negations on one extreme and fully grammaticalized items or constructions containing semantically bleached negations on the other. For this reason, some discourse markers to be discussed hereafter resemble more lexical uses, while some are more formulaic uses, constituting devices for discourse organization, thus more grammatical.

Rhetorical negations involving lexical negatives show grammaticalization processes that produced diverse grammatical markers. Of notable categories thus created are discourse markers, auxiliary verbs, auxiliary adjectives, connectives, sentential endings, and adverbializers. Of these grammaticalized functions, this paper addresses grammaticalization of discourse markers and auxiliaries.

The most prominent category that results from the grammaticalization of the rhetorical negations is discourse markers. This is not surprising, considering that discourse is where the rhetorical negations most productively used, and where the grammatical markers arise. Some of the discourse markers are as follows:

(2) a. Attention-Attracter *ani* [not:be]
    b. Uncommitative *molu-ci* [not:know-Determinative:End]
    c. Emphatic *kuleh-ko-mal-ko* [so-and-not:continue-and]
                       kuleh-ta-ma-ta [so-Dec:End-not:continue-Dec:End]

2.1 Attention-Attracter

As seen in (2) above, *ani* derived from *anita* 'not:be' is used as a discourse marker used to attract the attention of the addressee. The form is peculiar in that it is not properly inflected as e.g. *ani-ya* for the [-Polite, -Formal] register, *ani-o* for the [+Polite, -Formal] register, *ani-pnita* for the [+Polite, +Formal] register, and *ani-ta* for the [-Polite, +Formal] register. This form exists along with *ani-ya* for [-Polite, -Formal] register. However, when this form is used as a discourse marker, it loses its ability to inflect at all. Therefore, *ani* as a discourse marker may appear in other registers such as the [+Polite] register without style-clash.

Since this is one of the forms that correspond to 'No!', frequently used as an answer, some clarification is in order. This form used for its attention-attracting function is used not as a negation to any immediately preceding question or remark. It is often used discourse-initially or after a long silence or pause. It is often observed that people use *yey* 'Yes!' as an attention-attracter by using it when there was no yes-no question in preceding discourse. However, the use of ani 'No!' seems unusual. The context of use is often when the general on-going situation is not satisfactory to the speaker. For example, if someone is malcontent with a certain development at work about which he or she heard but does not have first-hand knowledge, the person upon arrival at work is likely to use this discourse marker (DM) and say something like this:[4]

---

4) Abbreviations used in the gloss are as follows: Acc: accusative; Adn: adnominal; Atten: attenuative; Caus: causative; Cess: cessative; Compl: completive; Conn: connective; Cop: copula; Dec: declarative; Detm: determinative; DM: discourse marker; Emph: emphatic; End: sentential end-marker; Epis: epistemic; Fut: future; Hon: honorific; Imp: imperative; Neg: negative; Nom: nominative; Pol: polite; Proh: prohibitive; Pst: past; and Top: topic;

(3) ani,   totaychey   ettehkey   toy-n   ke-pnikka
    DM   in:the:world how   become-Adn   thing-Pol:End
    'Well, what on earth happened?'
    (Lit.: No, how in the world has this become of?'

More interestingly, even when the dissatisfaction has been caused by someone else, absent in the discourse scene, the malcontent speaker may begin the discourse to a third-party addressee with something like this:

(4) ani,   ku salam   cengmal   wus-ki-nun   salam-i-eyyo
    DM   the person truly   laugh-Caus-Adn   person-be-Pol:End
    'Look, he is surely ridiculous.'
    (Lit.: 'No, the person makes people laugh.')

People seem to use this 'No!' as a discourse marker to express the negative feeling toward the situation (either the discourse situation, or the situation being meditated or talked about), and to attract the attention of the addressee by using this conceptually marked form, i.e. negation word. As has been indicated earlier, the level of fossilization of this form as a discourse marker is such that it does not inflect according to the formality and politeness parameters and this form identical with [–polite] answer does not create stylistic clash in sentences like (4) where the main verb signals that this utterance belongs to the [+polite] register. If it inflects, it is not a discourse marker, but a regular [–polite] answer 'No!' Furthermore, this discourse marker is never used in the [+formal] register in such forms as *anipnita* or *anita.* This, again, shows that this form has undergone considerable fossilization.

Interestingly enough, the level of grammaticalization of this item varies according to individual idiolects and this variation can cause discursive conflict between interlocutors. For example, some people, who think they are in a position of rightfully honorified by the other interlocutor and thus they

should be spoken to with properly politeness-marked language forms, may take offence from the other interlocutor's use of *ani*, which, on the face of it, is not appropriately marked. In particular, the context where the form is interpretable either as a discourse marker, or as a negative answer, is subject to such confusion.

2.2 Uncommitative

The next category of discourse markers developed from rhetorical negations is uncommitative, as shown in the example below, where *molu-ci* 'not:know-End' developed from *moluta* 'not:know' is used as a discourse marker.

(5) moluci, mwusun   pangpep-i   iss-keyss-ci
    DM   what:kind   means-Nom   exist-Fut-End
    'Well, there may be some solutions.'
    (Lit.: 'Don't know. There shall be certain means (for it).')

One caveat in interpreting the example above is that the latter part of the utterance is not a subordinated clause of 'don't know', i.e. the sentence does not mean "I don't know if there will be any solutions", but 'don't know' is independent from the remainder of the utterance. In fact, it is not clear whether the implicit subject is the speaker or people in general.

The main function of this discourse-marker is to detach the speaker himself or herself from the statement that follows, and thus does not commit himself or herself to the veracity or probability of the statement. This uncommitative speaker attitude is also exhibited in the English speakers' uses of epenthetical 'I don't know' often in phonologically reduced forms (cf. Bybee 2001).

Unlike previously discussed *ani,* this form must be inflected according to the right level of politeness, thus diverging into two variant forms: [-polite]-marked *moluci* and [+polite]-marked *moluciyo.* This suggests that

this discourse marker has undergone less fossilization than *ani* has. However, even this form is rarely used in the [+formal] register, i.e. in such forms as *molupnita* and *molunta*.

2.3 Emphatic

The last category of discourse markers is the emphatic marker as shown in the following examples.

(6) A: kusalam   calsayngkyess-ney-yo
       he   handsome-Epis-Pol:End
       'He is handsome.'

    B: a. kulehkomalko
           DM
           'Surely so!'
       b. kulehtamata
           DM
           'Surely so!'

The emphatic markers shown above have complex internal structure: *kulehkomalko* can be broken down as *kuleh-ko-mal-ko* 'So-and-not:continue-and'; and *kulehtamata* as *kuleh-ta-ma-ta* 'So-Dec:End-not:continue-Dec:End'. Both include an adjective *kulehta* 'so', followed by particles and the lexical negation word *malta* 'not:continue'. The development of these discourse markers has to do with the development of colloquial sentential endings with elliptical structure. A brief description on the genesis of these markers from their original structures is as shown below.[5]

---

5) In Korean connective particles are often repeated after co-ordinated arguments as in:
      pap-ina ttek-ina: rice or cake
      pap-hako ttek-hako: rice and cake

(7) a. kuleh-ko   mal-ko   malha-l   philyo-to   eps-ta
       so-and   not:continue-and   say-Adn   need-even   not:exist-Dec
       'There is no need to say/argue that it is so or it is not so.'

       ==> kulehkomalko

   b. kuleh-ta   ma-ta   malha-l   philyo-to   eps-ta
       so-Dec   not:continue-Dec   say-Adn   need-even   not:exist-Dec
       'There is no need to say/argue 'it is so' 'it is not so'.'

       ==> kulehtamata

In (7b) above, *kulehtamata* is actually composed of two sentences, which were complements of *malhata* 'say'. Stringing together these two sentences without an explicit connective was possible because the two sentences were introduced as direct quotations. Therefore, in literal terms the two emphatic discourse markers are: "So or not so" and "So. Not so." This is an instance that shows how even highly complex constructions can become functioning, and even getting perceived, as a single linguistic form. This type of process whereby a complex linguistic sign becomes a single unit is referred to as univerbation (Lehmann 1995[1982]).

   This type of sentential ending developed from elliptical structures is highly productive. And for these two forms to qualify for the discourse marker status is due to the predicate it involves, i.e. *kulehta,* which is pro-adjective substituting adjectives previously introduced in the discourse and to the fact that, therefore, they are highly frequently used to become entrenched. However, since the two strings *-komalko* and *-tamata* are in fact elliptical

_____

   pap-to ttek-to: rice and cake /neither rice nor cake

sentential endings, there is a close, and often inseparable, connection between the discourse marker and the elliptical sentential endings.[6]

3. Grammaticalization of Auxiliary Verbs

The rhetorical negations are also grammaticalized into numerous auxiliary verbs as shown in the following list.[7]

(8) a. Prohibitive   *-ci malta*   [-Conn not:continue]

    b. Determinative   *-ko(ya) malta*   [-and(if) not:continue]

    c. Completive   *-ko(ya) malta*   [-and(if) not:continue]

    d. Cessative   *-ta(ka) malta*   [-Transferentive not:continue]

    e. Attenuative   *-ci moluta*   [-Conn not:know]

    f. Emphatic   *-ko ha-ci anhul swu epsta*

                              [-Comp do-Conn Neg-Adn way not:exist]

3.1 Prohibitive

The prohibitive auxiliary verb is formed by a verb and the connective *-ci,* which is sometimes considered a nominalizer (see Rhee, 2003c for more discussion), and also homophonous with sentential end-marker with speaker's determinative attitude toward the proposition. It appears in the form of [-ci malta]. And its source construction is [Verb+Connective+*malta*], which literally means 'not continue Verb-ing'. Its grammatical meaning is 'don't Verb', as illustrated in the following examples.

---

6) More investigation on this issue should await separate research.

7) For an extensive discussion of grammaticalization of auxiliary verbs from the verb *malta*, see Rhee (2003c).

(9) a. o-ci mal-ayo[8]

　　　come-Proh-Pol:End

　　　'Don't come.' (Lit. Do not continue coming.)

　　b. cenyek　　mek-ci mal-ko　　　o-seyo

　　　dinner　　eat-Proh-and　　　come-Pol.End

　　　'Come without eating dinner.' (Lit. Do not continue eating dinner and come.)

3.2 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.

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

　　　　the　　　mountain-Acc　climb-Detm-Fut-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*]

---

8) Following the convention, the word-group spacing in these examples and hereafter is given in accordance with the Korean orthographic spacing. However, since many of the grammatical items under discussion here form a unit across word-group boundaries, and thus contain spaces, the interlinear morphemic gloss may appear as unaligned. We used minimal space between such word-group boundaries, and wider spaces between true word-group boundaries.

'Verb-Connective(and)-stop'. Sometimes, if the speaker wants to encode even stronger determinative behavior, a conditional marker is added, as shown in (11).[9]

(11) a. sihem-ey   pwuth-ko-ya   mal-keya
          exam-at   attach-Conn-if   not:continue-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 not:continue-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 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.

3.3 Completive

The verb *malta* has been grammaticalized into a different grammatical

---

9) It is worthwhile to note that more commonly used conditional marker -*myen* is not used for this purpose. A conditional marker of stronger conditionality -*ya*, similar to the logical operator 'if and only if', is used to strengthen the determinative meaning. This seems to have to do with the fact that -*myen* encodes simultaneity (Koo 1999), and thus is incapable of forming a conceptual juncture between two events, which is essential to generate the 'completion' sense. Furthermore, the basic semantics of -*ko* is isolation (cf. Koo 1987, Rhee 1996) which is incompatible with simultaneity.

function, i.e. completive marking, from the source construction of the connective *-ko* and the verb *malta*, thus literally meaning 'Verb and then not continue', as shown in the following examples.

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

     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.[10] As a matter of fact, one of the strong senses associated with this form is 'helplessness': native speakers often say that this form is used for an event which the speaker could not control and occurred irrevocably.

3.4 Cessative

Another grammatical function the verb *malta* 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/takta* '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:

(14) 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.')

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 activities. However, this auxiliary may be used even when the sentential subject did not actively withdraw from one activity to go on to another. This shows that the auxiliary *-ta(ka) malta* encodes the

---

10) 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.

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 (cf. Traugott 1982, 2003, Traugott & Dasher 2002), 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, where the subjects are inanimate and thus incapable of carrying out or stopping an action.

(15) 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.')

3.5 Attenuative

Another category of grammaticalized functions of the rhetorical negation is the attenuative modal auxiliaries, in the form of [-ci molukeyssta] literally meaning 'will not know if', as shown in the following examples.

(16)   a. umsik-i   ip-ey   mac-usi-l-ci molukeyss-eyo
            food-Nom   mouth-at   fit-Hon-Adn-Atten-Pol:End
            'I hope you like the food.'
            (Lit.: 'I will not know if the food will fit your mouth.')

b. senmwul-i   mam-ey   tu-si-l-ci molu-keyss-eyo

    gift-Nom   heart-at   enter-Hon-Adn-Atten-Pol:End

    'I hope you like the gift.'

    (Lit.: 'I will not know if this gift will enter your heart.')

c. pwulphyenha-si-ci   anh-usi-ess-nun-ci molukeyss-eyo

    uncomfortable-Hon-Conn   Neg-Hon-Pst-Adn-Atten-Pol:End

    'I hope you were comfortable.'

    (Lit.: 'I will not know if you were not uncomfortable.')

As seen in the above, the speaker's real message is hidden behind the round-about expressions utilizing negative expressions. These expressions share common aspects with dubitatives, which express true doubts. This rhetorical strategy is becoming increasingly fixed and these expressions are moving toward fossilized constructions.

3.6 Emphatic

Another kind of grammaticalized function of the negation is emphatic marking. The source construction is [-ci anh-ul-swu-epsta] '-Conn Neg-Adn-way-not:exist', which literally means 'there does not exist a way of not doing X', thus involving two negations. Some of such examples are as follows:

(17)   a. ike-n   hansimha-n   il-i-lako haci anhulswu eps-eyo

         this-Top   deplorable-Adn   matter-Cop-Emph-Pol:End

         'This is truly a deplorable matter.'

         (Lit.: 'There is no way of not saying that this is a deplorable matter.')

b. ku   salam-un   elisek-tako haci anhul swu eps-eyo
    the   person-Top   foolish-Emph-Pol:End
    'The person is very foolish.'
    (Lit.: 'There is no way of not saying that he is foolish.')

This is a complex structure but this is by no means extraordinary in grammaticalization as illustrated in the changes undergone by the modal auxiliary *-l swu issta* 'there exists a way of', the counterpart of English 'can'; and *-l swuto issta* 'there exists even a way of', the counterpart of English 'may'. The fact that this is becoming increasingly fixed is shown in that certain lexical replacement renders the sentences unacceptable, or marginally acceptable. For example, if the verb *epsta* 'not:exist' is replaced with *issta* 'exist' for an intended opposite meaning, the sentences are pragmatically, albeit not syntactically, unacceptable. However, there are, in fact, minor variations available: the construction-final verb *epsta* 'not:exist' may be replaced by an affirmative counterpart *issta* 'exist' if only the sentence changes into a rhetorical question, which is effectively a negation in declarative.

4. Auxiliary Adjective

In the preceding discussions we have seen the grammaticalization phenomena displayed by the rhetorical negation expressions that developed into auxiliary verbs. There are auxiliary adjectives that were also products of grammaticalization from those rhetorical negations, to which we now turn.

As was the case with auxiliary verbs, the auxiliary adjective category also includes prohibitive auxiliary, in the form of [-e malta] '-Connective not:continue', as shown in the following example.

(18)   a. twulyew-e mal-a
            afraid-Proh-Imp
            'Don't be afraid.'
            (Lit.: 'Stop being afraid.')

        b. koylow-e mal-a
            agonized-Proh-Imp
            'Don't be agonized.'
            (Lit.: 'Stop being agonized.')

The use of prohibitive auxiliary adjective is very infrequent in Modern
Korean. It only occurs with emotion adjectives such as *twulyepta* 'be afraid',
mwusepta 'be scared', *sulphuta* 'be sad', *kipputa* 'be glad', etc. This use
seems to have been more popular in historical Korean, but its use scope has
shrunk considerably in modern Korean. In fact, most Korean speakers strongly
prefer verbalized counterpart of these emotion adjectives, such as
twulyewehata, mwusewehata, sulphehata, and *kippehata,* respectively, whose
meanings, however, largely remain unchanged. When these verbs are used
with the verb *malta,* the connective is changed to *-ci,* and the rhetorical
negative becomes an auxiliary verb, not an auxiliary adjective in accordance
with the change of the categorial status of the item it modifies.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we addressed grammaticalization phenomena of lexical
negation expressions that are rhetorically used in discourse. We focused on
development of diverse discourse markers and auxiliaries. These discourse
markers exhibit varying degrees of grammaticalization, and for this reason
some of the forms, being at the incipient stage, do not appear to be
grammaticalized items. However, considering their movement toward formulaic
expressions, becoming increasingly frozen in form, they are considered

grammaticalizing, if not yet grammaticalized, forms. This study shows that grammaticalization occurs most actively in discourse, especially by the interlocutors who strategically use linguistic forms, notably rhetorical structures. Though we addressed discourse markers, auxiliary verbs and auxiliary adjectives, other grammatical forms developed as a result of high exposure to discourse meaning negotiations must be also taken into consideration in a broader perspective, which should remain as an issue to be addressed in future research.

References

Barlow, Michael & Suzanne Kemmer. (eds.) 2000. *Usage Based Models of Language.* Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Bybee, Joan L. (2001) *Phonology and Language Use.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bybee, Joan L. & Paul Hopper. (eds.) 2001. *Frequency and the Emergence of Linguistic Structure.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bybee, Joan L., Revere Perkins, & William Pagliuca. (1994) *Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World.* Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. (2002 [1993]) *Grammaticalization.* (2nd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus. (1992) *Grammaticalization and Grammar.* Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

Hopper, Paul J. 1987. Emergent Grammar. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 13: 139-157.

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)

Koo, Hyun Jung. (1999) Grammaticalization of Conditionals in Korean. Paper presented at the 5th International Conference on Languages of Far East, Southeastern Asia and West Africa, Sep. 7-9, 1999, St. Petersburg University, Russia.

Leech, Geoffrey N. (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics.* Harlow, UK: Longman.

Lehmann, Christian. 1995[1982] *Thoughts on Grammaticalization: A Programmatic Sketch.* vol. 1. Arbeiten des Kölner Universalien-Projekts (AKUP) 48. Cologne: Universität zu Köln. Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

Leith, D. & G. Myerson. (1989) *The Power of Address: Explorations in Rhetoric.* London: Routlege

Lessau, Donald A. (1994) *A Dictionary of Grammaticalization.* Bochum: Brockmeyer.

Ramat, Anna Giacalone & Paul J. Hopper. (eds.) (1998) *The Limits of Grammaticalization.* Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Rhee, Seongha. (1996) *Semantics of Verbs and Grammaticalization.* Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin. Seoul: Hankuk Publisher.

Rhee, Seongha. (2003a) From Discourse to Grammar: Grammaticalization and Lexicalization of Rhetorical Questions in Korean. Paper presented at Linguistic Association of Canada and United States 30th Forum. July 29 – August 2, 2003. University of Victoria, Canada.

Rhee, Seongha. (2003b) From Rhetoric to Grammar: Grammaticalization of Rhetorical Strategies in Korean. Paper presented at the 12th Japanese/Korean Linguistics Conference. August 1-3, 2003. Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Rhee, Seongha. (2003c) When Stop Goes Further: From *Malta* 'stop' to Auxiliary Verbs in Korean. To appear in *Hanmalyenkwu* 13.

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.

Wales, Katie. (2001 [1990]) *A Dictionary of Stylistics*. (2nd edition). Harlow, UK: Longman.

Wischer, Ilse & Gabriele Diewald. (eds.) (2002) *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

이성하
130-791 서울특별시 동대문구 이문2동 270
한국외국어대학교 영어학부
Tel.: (02) 961-4797
E-mail: srhee@hufs.ac.kr   Fax: (02) 959-4581

Seongha Rhee
Stanford University
Linguistics Department &
Stanford Language Center
Building 260 Room 239
Stanford, CA 94305-2005
Tel.: (650) 799-7264
E-mail: shrhee@stanford.edu