

담화와 인지, 제12권 1호, 2005년

Grammaticalization of Similiatives in Korean and across Languages*

Seongha Rhee

(Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)

Rhee, Seongha. 2005. Grammaticalization of Similiatives in Korean and across Languages. *Discourse and Cognition* 12.1, 85-104. This paper describes grammaticalization processes involving similiatives in Korean and across languages. Korean similiative *kath-* shows diverse grammaticalized forms in contemporary Korean, a development based on the semantic extension of the verb from identicalness to similarity. The newly emerging markers include particles of diverse functions, such as adjectivizer, adverbializer, comitative, etc.; attenuative modal and exclamative sentential endings; and hypotheticality-marking clausal connectives. Similiatives in other languages also show diverse grammaticalization phenomena in their courses of development into markers of connecting functions. This paper also shows that, even though there are apparently opposite functions, they are an outgrowth of weakening or strengthening of the identicalness meaning, which is attributable to the difference in conceptualizing identicalness between two entities with different degrees of similarity between the entities concerned. (Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)

Key words: grammaticalization, similiatives, cross-linguistic exploration, Korean similiatives

* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 2004 Linguistic Society of Korea International Conference, July 28-30, 2004, Korea University, Seoul. The analysis pertaining to the Korean data is based on a paper presented at Berkeley Linguistics Society 30 Conference, February 13-16, University of California, Berkeley, CA. The author wishes to thank the audiences for their comments and criticisms. The insightful comments from the three anonymous reviewers were very valuable and provided directions for future research. All remaining errors, however, are mine.

1. Introduction

Grammaticalization of linguistic forms denoting likeness into various grammatical markers has been attested in a number of languages (Heine et al. 1993; Heine & Kuteva 2002). Korean verb *kathta* 'to be same/similar' also joins the list, but displays much more diverse grammaticalization paths, which this paper aims to illustrate and compare it with grammaticalization phenomena in other languages.

2. Grammaticalization of Similiatives in Korean

2.1 Semantics of *kath-*

In historical data, the uses of the verb *kath-* are attested in both the 'identicalness' sense and the 'similarity' sense. A large number of available historical data are Buddhist and Confucian scripture commentaries and translations, and if we compare them with Chinese versions, we see that the corresponding Chinese characters were those signifying identicalness (*tong* or *tung*) and similarity (*ye*, *sa*, or *ilpan*).

In the contemporary data, when *kath-* is used lexically, both the 'identicalness' sense and the 'similarity' sense are attested. A robust case of 'identicalness' sense is the use of *kath-* for mathematical equation, and the use of the word in 'similarity' sense obtains when the two 'equated' entities are ontologically separate, thus different, beings. However, the typical case is where the verb means identicalness, i.e., where it is referring to the same referent as in (1), even though there are cases whose meaning is ambiguous between identicalness of the referent and similarity between the referents by virtue of their belonging to the same category as in (2).¹⁾

- (1) *kath-un* {*kohyang*, *kaps*, *seng*}
 same-Adnom hometown, price, surname

1) Following abbreviations are used in gloss: Adnom: adnominal; Asp: aspect; Conjec: conjectural; Cop: copula; Dec: declarative; Exclam: exclamative; Fut: future; Hort: hortative; Hypoth: hypothetical; Loc: locative; M: masculine; Neg: negative; NF: non-finite connective; Nom: nominative; Pcl: particle; Perf: perfective; Pros: prospective; Q: interrogative; and Retros: retrospective.

'the same hometown/price/surname'

- (2) *kath-un* {*umsik, cha, nalssi*}
 same-Adnom food, car, weather
 'the same food/car/weather' or 'similar food/car/weather'

Despite the fact that 'identicalness' and 'similarity' are both attested in the historical and contemporary data, however, there are reasons to believe that the lexical verb *kath-* was originally associated with the 'identicalness' sense.

The first comes from the frequency in the historical data, which show that when the verb is used as the main verb its meaning is predominantly 'identicalness'. On the other hand, when it is used as a postpositional particle grammaticalized from the main verb, infrequent as it is in the historical data previous to modern Korean, its meaning is often 'similarity', which suggests the semantic extension from 'identicalness' to 'similarity'. The second reason is that even in contemporary Korean the usage in the 'identicalness' sense shows fewer syntactic constraints, i.e., it occurs either attributively or predicatively, unlike the usage in the similarity sense, which occurs largely attributively and often renders sentences unnatural if used predicatively. This suggests that the 'similarity' use is new, because it has been widely accepted that syntactically, at the incipient stage of grammaticalization, grammaticalizing forms arise out of very local contexts (Hopper and Traugott 2003[1993]: 2). Still another reason is that the native speakers intuitively associate the verb *kath-* with the 'identicalness' sense and use different verbs, e.g. *pisusha-*, *yusaha-*, etc., for true 'similarity' sense.

As it will become obvious in the following discussion, the grammaticalized meanings from this verb are basically 'similarity', not 'identicalness'. If we take it for granted that 'identicalness' is semantically more specific than 'similarity', i.e., 'similarity' is more general than 'identicalness', in the sense that 'identicalness' is the extreme case of 'similarity', then the semantic development of this verb in the course of grammaticalization is in consonance with the theses that grammaticalizing words undergo semantic generalization (Bybee et al. 1994), and that such semantic generality is often a prerequisite for grammaticalization (see Heine et al. 1991, Hopper and Traugott 2003[1993], *inter alia*, for discussions on semantic generality with

respect to grammaticalization).

2.2 Grammaticalization of *kath-*

Grammaticalization is a process that often occurs in specific contexts of use. There are diverse syntagmatic configurations in which *kath-* can be used, but grammaticalization occurs only in structures where *kath-* has strong syntagmatic and semantic ties with the adjacent materials, as e.g. in the context where *kath-* occurs close to its argument marked by *-wa* 'with'. Since *kath-* takes two or more noun phrases as objects of comparisons, one of them usually being the sentential subject and the other an oblique argument marked with *-wa*, these two forms *-wa* and *kath-* frequently occur in juxtaposition. However, this is not always the case because the verb *kath-* may predicate of plural subjects, where the subject may be a plural noun or two or more noun phrases combined with *-wa* 'and'. In this case the verb *kath-* does not show any sign of grammaticalization. This reflects the fact that if two or more linguistic forms should be perceived as a single unit, there should be some kind of close relationship between them. In Lehmann's (1995[1982]) terms, the forms in a construction undergo 'coalescence' and increase the 'bondedness' as the construction grammaticalizes (see also Hopper and Traugott 2003[1993]).

In grammatical uses of *kath-*, there are two formal changes that signal that the form has departed, or is in the process of departing, from its original lexical status. The first change involves compacting of the construction, evidenced by orthographic space deletion by many people, despite the fact that Korean orthographic regulation mandates spacing between word groups, which, in this case, is spacing between *kath-* and its preceding particle *-wa*. This suggests that the word groups are reanalyzed as a single unit (cf. Lord 1973, Traugott 1980, Heine et al. 1991, Hopper and Traugott 2003[1993]). There is no change in terms of linear order but the mental bracketing by the language users becomes different ('reanalysis', Lord 1973, 1976, Hopper 1991, Langacker 1977, Lehmann 1991; 'restructuring' Myhill 1988, inter alia).

The other change involves phonological erosion. The most obvious erosion is the particle deletion from the reanalyzed construction involving a particle. This results in a syntagmatic condition where *kath-* and its oblique argument occur without intervention of the oblique marker, thus paving the

way for *kath-* to be affixed to the preceding noun phrase directly, a process called 'particularization' (Matisoff 1991). A more subtle reductive process involves suprasegmental feature, i.e. stress: *kath-*, which could be stressed as a lexical verb, cannot be stressed any longer. Phonological reduction or attrition of integrity has been widely recognized as a common concomitant of grammaticalization (Lehmann 1995[1982], Hopper and Traugott 2003[1993], Bybee et al. 1994, inter alia).

2.2.1 Particles

Two forms derived from *kath-* develop into particles denoting various concepts of 'likeness'. One is the particle *-(wa)kathun* 'like, such as, resembling, etc.' derived from *-wa kathun*, whose morphological make-up can be broken down into *-wa kath-un*, where the final morpheme *-un* is an adnominal marker. This construction becomes an adjectivizer, i.e., it affixes to a noun phrase and modifies another noun phrase. What made the form an adjectivizer is the final particle *-un* at the end of the original construction. In grammaticalizing constructions in Korean, and probably in other typologically similar languages as well, the participating particles play important roles in determining the grammatical status of the final product (Rhee 2003). It is so because, despite phonological erosion and its consequent formal opacity, the morphosyntactic configuration and function are preserved. The adjectivizing particle *-(wa)kathun* signifies various 'likeness' concepts such as MEMBERSHIP, for listing exemplars; SIMILARITY, for presenting an object of similar property; and QUALIFICATION, for naming a category to which the object concerned rightfully belongs, as shown in the examples in (3).

(3) a. MEMBERSHIP

mantwu-na	kwukswu-(wa)kathun	umsik
dumpling-or	noodle-Pcl	food
'the food, for example, dumplings and noodles'		

b. SIMILARITY

yong-kathun	pawi
dragon-Pcl	rock
'a rock resembling a dragon; a dragon-shaped rock'	

c. QUALIFICATION

mal-kathun mal

saying-Pcl saying

'a saying that may be called as a saying; a noteworthy remark'

Since 'likeness' is inherently a gradient notion, the senses can be plotted along the continuum from SAME to DIFFERENT as in (4).

- (4) SAME—————SIMILAR—————DIFFERENT
 identical >> of same kind (member) >> similar >> qualified for inclusion

The movement of senses from the left to the right of the continuum can be characterized as semantic generalization, where the last sense 'qualified for inclusion' can be said to border on the sense DIFFERENT because, even though in a sense all likeness should be based on the contrast with difference, the contrast should be more focused in this case. Figuratively, as sameness gradually fades, it takes on difference.

One thing to note here is that there still exists fluidity among these newly created 'likeness' senses. For example, the MEMBERSHIP and QUALIFICATION can be encoded by *-(wa)kathun*, as is illustrated in (5).

(5) MEMBERSHIP/QUALIFICATION ambiguity

mantwu-na	kwu ^u swu-(wa)kathun	umsik
dumpling-or	noodle-Pcl	food

MEMBERSHIP: 'the food, for example, dumplings and noodles'

QUALIFICATION: 'such food as dumplings or noodles'

Despite the fluidity allowing for ambiguity, there is a tendency of correlation between MEMBERSHIP and *-wakathun*, and QUALIFICATION and *-kathun*. Since the MEMBERSHIP sense, in contrast with the QUALIFICATION sense, resembles parenthetical use of the modifier phrase, it can be said that the syntagmatic tie with MEMBERSHIP use is weaker than that with the QUALIFICATION use. This is in line with the observation that grammaticalization largely accompanies morphosyntactic tightening.

The other particle developed from *kath-* is *-(wa)kathi* 'with, as, etc.', derived from *-wa kath-i*, where the last particle *-i* is the adverbializer. As is

the case with the previously discussed adjectivizer *-(wa)kathun*, the final particle in the original construct, i.e. *-i*, the adverbializer, plays a crucial role in determining the grammatical status of this newly developed marker, i.e., the new form carries the adverbializing function, as shown in (6).

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|
| (6) a. <i>-wa kathi</i> | COMITATIVE |
| b. <i>-(wa) kathi</i> | NON-DISSIMILARITY |
| c. <i>-kathi</i> | SIMILARITY |
| d. <i>-kathi</i> | EMPHATIC |

The comitative marker *-wa kathi* has a variant form, *-hako kathi*. The particles *-wa* and *-hako* are connective particles (equivalent to English 'and' and 'with') for nominal connection in enumeration. The newly emerging adverbial meanings can be shown again on the likeness continuum as in (7), and the examples are as in (8).

- (7) SAME—————SIMILAR—————DIFFERENT
 identical >> of same location/appearance/quality >> non-dissimilar

- (8) a. COMITATIVE
- | | | |
|---|------------|-------------|
| accessi-wakathi | kongwen-ey | ka-ss-ta |
| uncle-Pcl | park-to | go-Past-Dec |
| '(I) went to the park with (my) uncle.' | | |
- b. SIMILARITY
- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| sinsa-kathi | yeyuypalukey | hayngtonghay-la |
| gentleman-Pcl | courteously | behave-Imp |
| 'Act courteously like a gentleman.' | | |
- c. EMPHATIC
- | | | |
|--|---------|---------------|
| saypyek-kathi | talli-e | o-ass-ta |
| dawn-Pcl | run-NF | come-Past-Dec |
| '(He) came very early in the morning.' | | |

d. NON-DISSIMILARITY

<i>kwayen</i>	<i>yeysanghay-ss-te-n</i>	<i>kes-kathi</i>
indeed	expect-Past-Retros-Adnom	thing-Pcl
'as (we) expected indeed'		

The semantics of COMITATIVE is based on similarity by virtue of being in the same location. This marker seems to be one of the earliest forms that developed from *kath-*, but it has undergone least formal change in the sense that the intervening particle *-wa* cannot be omitted. Interestingly, the connective particle can function as a COMITATIVE marker, and therefore, *-kathi* is semantically redundant. This suggests that *-kathi* is semantically bleached without creating much redundancy. The SIMILARITY sense in (8b) usually refers to likeness in appearance, whereas the EMPHATIC sense in (8c) refers to likeness in quality, usually associated with time expressions and some other highly fossilized expressions. The NON-DISSIMILARITY sense in (8d), which may seem extraordinary for separate semantic designation, is recognized as such by lexicographers and is listed in major dictionaries. This sense is formed with reference to the opposing pole of DIFFERENT, and therefore, goes well with adverbs *kwayen* 'indeed' and *yeksi* 'indeed'.

2.2.2 Sentential Endings

The structure *-wa kath-* develops into two sentential endings *-keskath-* and *-kathuni-*: the former is a CONJECTURAL which marks estimated identicalness; whereas the latter is an EXCLAMATIVE which marks 'likeness' in exclamation. These two markers share the same function of sentential endings, but their source structures and syntactic behaviors are vastly different.

The CONJECTURAL marker *-keskath-* contains *kes* 'thing', a semantically-bleached defective noun modified by a preceding relative clause. Through reanalysis, however, this embedded clause becomes the main clause, and the main verb *kath-* becomes a sentential modal ending, which marks the speaker's modal attitude toward the proposition. One consequence of this syntagmatic reanalysis is that this newly emerged grammatical marker has variant forms for more fine-grained semantic designations depending on differences in aspect of the proposition, such as *-l-keskath* for prospective, *-un-keskath* for perfective, and *-nun-keskath* for progressive, with different functions of the

prefixed adnominal markers. These modal marking sentential endings attenuate the assertive force of propositions by making a statement a mere conjecture, as shown in the examples in (9).

(9) CONJECTURAL

- | | | |
|----|--|------------------------------|
| a. | pi-ka | o-l-keskath-ta |
| | rain-Nom | come-Pros.Adnom-Conjec-Dec |
| | 'It looks like rain. It seems that it will rain.' | |
| b. | ku-ka | cwuk-un-keskath-ta |
| | he-Nom | die-Perf.Adnom-Conjec-Dec |
| | 'He seems to have died. It seems that he died.' | |
| c. | cencayng-i | na-nun-keskath-ta |
| | war-Nom | come.out-Prog.Adnom-Conj-Dec |
| | 'A war seems to be breaking out. It seems that a war is breaking out.' | |

On the other hand, the EXCLAMATIVE marker *-kathuni* has a different source structure. It is directly affixed to a noun like a particle. Unlike particles, however, it marks the sentential ending, an odd behavior from a syntactic point of view. It does not inflect for tense-aspect-modality or formality-honorification level designation, another odd behavior for a sentential ending in Korean. All these oddities are due to the process it underwent in the course of grammaticalization. This EXCLAMATIVE marker *kath-* has a longer variant form, *-kathunilakwu*, which contains a constellation of connectives including *-uni*. In fact, *-uni* 'as, since, because' is a clausal connective now appearing utterance-finally due to the ellipsis of the main clause. With this structural reanalysis, these connectives become sentential endings. Korean seems to use ellipsis extensively for creation of sentential endings out of connectives, because the elided structures actively engage the addressee and invite pragmatic inferences (Rhee 2002). These EXCLAMATIVES are often used to label someone based on his/her behavioral quality with emphasis by claiming his/her qualification for inclusion in the named category, an instance of subjectification (Traugott 1980, 2003), as shown in (10).

(10) EXCLAMATIVE

celen	nappu-n	nom-kathuni!
such	bad-Adnom	fellow-Exclam

'What a wretched fellow (he is)!'

Considering that the example (10) is originally an elliptical structure, it is tantamount to saying, "Since (he) is so much like wretched fellows like that, how can I {trust him, like him, etc.}?"

2.2.3 Clausal Connectives

There are some clausal connectives developed from *kath-*, such as *-kathumyen*, *-kath(tel)ato*, *-kathasen(un)*, etc., all marking HYPOTHETICALITY with slightly different shades of meaning. All these forms are products of combination with *other connective particles such as* CONDITIONAL *-myen* 'if', CAUSAL *-ase* 'because', and CONCESSIVES *-telato* and *-ato* 'even though'. The semantics of *kath-* here is bleached and is similar to a copula, simply establishing 'likeness' connection between realis and irrealis as a ground for apodosis, as in (11).

(11) HYPOTHETICAL

ne-kathumyen	ettehkey	ha-keyss-ni?
You-Hypoth	how	do-Fut-Q

'If you were (me), what would you do?'

2.2.4 Adverb

Now we turn to the development of an adverb from the verb *kath-*. It has been controversial whether formation of adverbs should be considered a grammaticalization process, because the final product, i.e. adverb, has many characteristics of lexical items rather than of grammatical items. This paper, however, will consider the formation of adverbs from the verb an instance of grammaticalization, based on the fact that adverbs are more toward the grammatical side of the lexical-grammatical continuum as compared with verbs (see Heine et al. 1993 for a similar position).

The original structure *-wa kathi* develops into an adverb, *kathi* 'together'.

This development is due to omission of the contextually implicit *X-wa* 'with *X*', i.e. from *X-wa kathi* 'together with *X*' to *kathi* 'together'.

One notable aspect of this process is the directionality. This development is from a complex postpositional particle to an adverb. According to the general directionality involving emergence of adverbs, adverbs develop into adpositions, not the opposite. Likewise, the bondedness that existed between the host noun phrase and the complex postpositional particle is now lost with the development of an adverb, which does not host a noun phrase. An example of *kathi* is (12):

(12) ADVERB

kathi *mek-ca*

together eat-Hort

'Let's eat together. (Literally: 'Let's eat samely.')

2.3 Related Changes: Derived Lexicalization

Along with the grammaticalization discussed above, there are lexicalization processes involving *kath-* that may have to do with the grammaticalization of *kath-*. There are four verbs that come to our attention as listed in (13).

(13) a. *ttokkath-* 'be exactly same, be identical'

b. *kkokkath-* 'be exactly same, be identical'

c. *kathcanh-* 'be insignificant, be unseemly'

d. *kathniha-* 'share the situation'

Of the four verbs listed above, *ttokkath-* and *kkokkath-* are derived from a combination of the verb *kath-* with an onomatopoeic prefix *ttok-* and *kkok-* describing a hitting or pointing action with a sharp-pointed object, or a breaking noise of a brittle object. This derivation seems to be a restorative process to reinforce the bleached 'sameness' meaning originally associated with *kath-*. If this is truly the case, it is an interesting phenomenon in that the lexical verb *kath-*, unlike its grammaticalized derivatives, is still mainly denoting 'sameness', and therefore suggests that grammaticalized forms diverged from the source verb can still influence the lexical source verb, since it has been thought that diverged forms usually take independent

paths of development.

The verb *kathcanh-* incorporates a negation marker *-an-* and a light verb *ha-* 'do', rendering the combinatory meaning of the original source structure as 'be not same' or literally 'do not be same', which, however, changed to 'be insignificant, be unseemly' (see Lee 2002 for a discussion of a similar process in Korean). In this newly created word, the verb *kath-* participating as a component in it, no longer has its original meaning. In fact, the lexicalization process reached such an extent that the new word neither takes any oblique-marked argument (despite the presence of the verb *kath-*); nor does it take any accusative-marked argument (despite the presence of the transitive verb *ha-*); nor does it show contrast with non-negation-marked counterpart, i.e. *kath-*, or co-occur with a negative polarity item (despite the presence of the negative *-an-*).

The last verb, *kathiha-*, was originally a construction containing a light verb *ha-* 'do'. Its compositional meaning 'do in the same manner' or 'do together' has been changed into 'to share' such as 'share the same fate/responsibilities/pain/etc.' in the lexicalization process.

3. Grammaticalization of Similiatives in Other Languages

3.1 Quotative

Similiatives across languages tend to develop into quotatives. For example, English *like*, itself originated from OE *li:c* 'body' and has been used in comparative conjunction, is actively in the process of grammaticalizing in Present Day English as a nonverbatim quotative (Heine & Kuteva 2002: 274). Likewise, French *genre* 'kind', 'type', 'sort', 'genre', all in nominal category developed into nonverbatim quotative; as are Finnish *miinku* 'like', Swedish *liksom* 'like', Colloquial German *so* 'thus', 'so', 'in this way', and Kxoe *taá* 'be like (that)', 'thus', as shown in (14)-(19) (Examples (14)-(18) from Fleischman 1999 and (19) from Treis 2000: 15, all as cited in Heine & Kuteva 2002: 274-275).

(14) English

- a. And I'm like: 'Gimme a break, will you!'
- b. And I'm like OK, how am I gonna get her "chief complaint" out

(15) French

Quand je lui aid it que t'étais pas sûr de venire elle était vraiment pas contente, genre si vous jouez pas je chante pas.

'When I told her you weren't sure you were coming [to her party] she was really upset, like if you won't [be there to] play [the piano], I won't sing.'

(16) Finnish

Ja sit mä olin niinku että herrajumala et voi olla totta.

'And then I was like oh my God, I can't believe it.'

(17) Swedish

Jag tittade på honom och liksom inte en chans!

'I looked at him and like no way!'

(18) Colloquial German

Ich sagte ihm, dass er gehen muss. Und er so, ich werde es mir überlegen.

'I told him he had to go. And he's like I'll think about it.'

(19) Kxoe

mà- ká tcá kúùn- wà- gòè taá tí
Q- Loc 2.M.SG go- I- Fut like.that 1.SG

#'óa- ra- han.

ask- II- Perf

'I asked you where you are going.'

Grammaticalization of similiatives into a quotative marker seems to have been motivated by a robust human tendency to consider someone's utterance his or her identity, or in an extreme form, to equate someone's utterance with the speaker. This is evident in the fact that in a simplified schema, the construction of [X is like Y] encodes [X says Y], where in the former, X, the speaker, is equated or quasi-equated with Y, the utterance.

3.2 Complementizer

Another grammatical marker frequently developed from similitives is complementizer, a marker of grammatical function essentially same as quotative, in that it leads a proposition into the main clause, the only difference being the degree of directness in the manner of introduction. The development of complementizers are attested in many languages including Twi, Kode, Idoma, Buang, Tok Pisin, etc., as exemplified in (20)-(23).

(20) Twi (Lord 1993: 160)

na ama nim sɛ kofi yɛɛ adwuma no
 Pst Ama know that Kofi did work the
 'Ama knew that Kofi had done the work.'

(21) Kode (Lord 1993: 201)

n se kɛ a wā ti wonĩ
 I say that you husband Cop python
 'I say that your husband is a python.'

(22) Idoma (Lord 1989: 330, 1993: 200)

n je b- o ge wa
 1:Sg know resemble- he Fut come
 'I know that he'll come.'

(23) Tok Pisin PE (Woolford 1979: 118)

Na yupela i no save olsem em i matmat?
 And you.Pl i Neg know that it i cemetery
 'And you did not know that it was a cemetery?'

In the above examples, Twi verb *sɛ* 'resemble', 'be like', 'be equal', Kode (Baule dialect) *kɛ* 'like', Idoma *bɛ* 'resemble', Tok Pisin PE *olsem* 'thus' 'like' all function as complementizers. The motivation seems to be largely identical with the one that was involved in the development of quotatives.

3.3 Simile Marker

Since the basic semantics of the similiatives is encoding sameness or similarity between two or more objects, similiatives often develop into simile markers. This is well illustrated in Korean where simile markers primarily involve *kath-* as in *X-(wa) kathun* and *X-(wa) kathi* for modification, *X-(wa) kathta* for predication, and less frequently *-chelem* 'like', historically developed from a Sino-Korean nominal *thyey* 'body'.

This type of development, i.e. one from similiative to simile marker, is replicated in other languages. Some of the languages where grammaticalization has been attested are Twi and Tamil, as exemplified in (24), where Twi *ɛ* 'resemble', 'be like', 'be alike', 'be equal' became a simile marker 'like', 'as' and in (25), where Tamil *poola* 'be similar with', originally a stative verb became a postposition denoting 'like', 'as' (from Lord 1989: 257-259 and Lehmann 1989: 131, both as cited in Heine & Kuteva 2002: 258).

(24) Twi

<i>ɛbere</i>	<i>ɛ</i>	<i>mogya</i>
it.be.red	like	blood

'It is as red as blood.'

(25) Tamil

<i>kumaar</i>	<i>panri-y-</i>	<i>ai-p</i>	<i>poola</i>	<i>katt-</i>	<i>in-</i>	<i>aan.</i>
Kumar	pig-	Acc	like	cry-	Pst-	3.M.Sg

'Kumar cried like a pig.'

The semantic value of simile markers is so closely related to the idea of similiatives that it seems very difficult to separate the two concepts. Thus, the development of simile markers from similiatives seems to be naturally motivated.

3.4 Comparative Marker

Similiatives also develop into comparative markers, a function very similar to that of the previously discussed simile markers. This development is also attested in numerous languages including Chinese and German, as

exemplified in (26)-(27).

(26) Modern Mandarin Chinese (Sun 1996:38)

a. ta bi meimei piaoliang
 3.Sg Compar sister pretty
 'She is prettier than (her) sister.'

b. chi le xie popei chunnuo sheng ru
 eat Asp some fermented spirit better Compar
 yu xie qiongjiang
 jade liquid wine
 '(I) took some fermented wine, better than the best of wine.'

(27) Colloquial German

Inge schwimmt schneller wie ich
 Inge swims faster like I
 'Inge swims faster than I.'

In Late Archaic and Han Chinese *bi* was a verb denoting 'to compare with', 'to be like', 'to imitate', which became a comparative marker denoting 'more than'. Likewise, *ru* 'to resemble' also became a comparative marker in Early Mandarin Chinese, as shown in (26). German *wie* 'like' as shown in (27) above is now used in Colloquial German as a comparative marker. Considering that comparison requires bringing at least two entities into focus, which should have some shared properties to qualify for a comparison, the 'likeness' concept associated with similitives seems crucial. Therefore, the motivation involved in the grammaticalization of comparative markers seems straightforward.

3.5 Other Markers

In addition to the grammatical functions carried by the markers developed from similitives, there are less commonly attested functions. The German *selb-* is one of such cases, which originally meant 'same' that developed into *selbst*, the intensive reflexive. It is interesting to note that as the English similitive *like* was derived from 'body', Korean similitive

chelem was also derived from 'body', and that Korean reflexive makes use of *casin* 'self's body' of Sino-Korean origin.

Other similiatives in English, i.e. *equally* and *even*, are grammaticalizing into concessive clause marker (König 1988), and Bambara has a similiative denoting 'similar, same, equivalent' that grammaticalized into modal auxiliary.

4. Discussions

As we have seen in the preceding discussion, similiatives exhibit diverse grammaticalization phenomena across languages. Since grammaticalization is a multi-faceted process, there is no way of characterizing the grammaticalization of similiatives in simple terms. However, the development of grammatical markers from the similiatives renders the following generalizations.

Similiatives tend to develop into various connectors, such as markers of complementation, simile, standards of comparison, etc. This should be due to the fact that the semantics of the source lexeme involves two arguments to encode similarity between two entities. This is in line with the Source Determination Hypothesis that states that the kinds of the grammaticalized markers crucially depend on the semantics of the source lexemes.

However, there is an aspect that apparently raises a problem. For example, the majority of the grammaticalized forms, as is the case in Korean, involve semantic generalization, i.e. from identicalness to similarity. There are cases, however, where the semantics of the grammaticalized forms involves emphasis, as is the case with the emphatics. Metaphorically speaking, the semantics of the grammaticalizing similiatives became generalized or weakened in certain cases and it became specialized or strengthened in others. This seems to be largely due to the fact that the entities brought in for conceptualizing similarity between them can vary a great deal. And the inference patterns differ accordingly. For example, if the two entities under consideration are objectively quite dissimilar, encoding them as similar objects can weaken the identicalness sense in the process. However, if the two entities are objectively similar enough, encoding the sameness between them can result in that the compared entity is 'forcibly' equated with the standard, thus creating the emphatic function.

Another point is that in the cases of Korean, the development heavily

relies on its syntagmatic environment. This is in consonance with the claims that grammaticalization begins in a local context and that in a sense what grammaticalizes is not a single lexeme but a construction where it is embedded. Even though it is beyond the scope of this paper, it is expected that such syntagmatic dependency is suspected in the grammaticalization processes in other languages.

5. Conclusions

In this paper we have seen how the Korean similiative *kath-* 'same, identical', though still retaining the 'identicalness' meaning in lexical uses, grammaticalized into various markers of 'likeness'. The newly emerging markers include particles of diverse functions, e.g. adjectivizer, adverbializer, comitative, etc.; sentential endings, e.g. attenuative modal and exclamative; and clausal connectives marking hypotheticality. New meanings of the grammaticalized forms are varying degrees of similarity in the continuum between the polar concepts of SAME and DIFFERENT. Grammatical status and semantics of each of these markers are crucially dependent on the participating particles.

We have also seen that similiatives in other languages grammaticalized into various grammatical markers largely carrying the connector function, which is attributable to the original semantics of the source lexeme. We also noted that there are apparently opposite functions as a result of weakening or strengthening of the identicalness meaning, which is attributable to the difference in conceptualizing identicalness between two entities with different degrees of similarity between the entities concerned.

References

- Bybee, Joan L., William Pagliuca, and Revere D. Perkins. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Fleischman, Suzanne. 1999. Discourse markers across languages: Implications of a case study for historico-comparative and sociolinguistics. *Berkeley Linguistics Colloquium*.
- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, & Friederike Hünemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A*

- Conceptual Framework. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heine, Bernd, Tom Güldemann, Christa Kilian-Hatz, Donald A. Lessau, Heinz Roberg, Mathias Schladt, and Thomas Stolz. 1993. *Conceptual Shift: A Lexicon of Grammaticalization Processes in African Languages*. AAP 34/35. Universität zu Köln.
- Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, Paul J. 1991. On some principles of grammaticalization. *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, 2 vols., ed. by Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine, vol. 1: 17-35. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2003[1993]. *Grammaticalization*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- König, Ekkehard. 1988. Concessive connectives and concessive sentences: Cross-linguistic regularities and pragmatic principles. *Explaining Language Universals*, ed. by John A. Hawkins, 145-166. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1977. Syntactic reanalysis. *Mechanisms of Syntactic Change*, ed. by Charles N. Li. 57-139. Austin and London: University of Texas Press.
- Lee, Hyo Sang. 2002. Grammaticalization, lexicalization and unidirectionality: With reference to the development of some adjectives in Korean. Paper presented at *New Reflections on Grammaticalization II Conference*, April 3-6, 2002, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1989. Language description and general comparative grammar. *Reference Grammars and Modern Linguistic Theory*, ed. by Gottfried Graustein and Gerhard Leitner, 133-162. Tübingen: M. Niemeyer.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1991. Grammaticalization and related changes in contemporary German. *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, 2 vols., ed. by Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine, vol. 2: 493-535. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1995[1982]. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. München and Newcastle: LINCOM Europa.
- Lord, Carol. 1973. Serial verbs in transition. *Studies in African Linguistics* 4.3: 269-296.
- Lord, Carol. 1976. Evidence for syntactic reanalysis: From verb to complementizer in Kwa. *Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax*, April 22, 1976, ed. by S. B. Steever, C. A. Waler, and S. S. Mufwene. 179-191. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Lord, Carol. 1993. *Historical Change in Serial Verb Constructions*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Matisoff, James A. 1991. Areal and universal dimensions of grammaticalization in Lahu. *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, 2 vols. ed. by Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd, Vol. 2, 383-454. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Myhill, John. 1988. The grammaticalization of auxiliaries: Spanish clitic climbing. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 14: 352-363.

- Rhee, Seongha. 2002. From silence to grammar: Grammaticalization of ellipsis in Korean. Paper presented at New Reflections on Grammaticalization II Conference, April 3-6, 2002, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2003. Particle selection in Korean auxiliary formation. Paper presented at the 32nd LASSO Annual Meeting, October 17-19, 2003, The University of Texas-Pan American, Edinburg, TX.
- Sun, Chao Fen. 1996. Word Order Change and Grammaticalization in the History of Chinese. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1980. Meaning-change in the development of grammatical markers. *Language Science* 2: 44-61.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2003. From subjectification to intersubjectification. *Motives for Language Change*, ed. by Raymond Hickey, 124-139. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Treis, Yvonne. 2000. Komplexe sätze im Kxoe (Namibia). Magisterarbeit. Institut für Afrikanistik, Universität zu Köln.
- Woolford, Ellen. 1979. Aspects of Tok Pisin Grammar. *Pacific Linguistics*, Australian National University, Canberra.

이성하 (Seongha Rhee)
 한국외국어대학교 영어학부
 130-791 서울시 동대문구 이문동 270
 전화번호: 82-2-2173-3171
 Fax: 82-2-959-4581
 E-mail: srhee@hufs.ac.kr

이 논문은 2005년 2월 28일 투고 완료되어
 2005년 3월 1일부터 3월 27일까지 심사위원이 심사하고
 2005년 3월 31일 편집위원 회의에서 게재 결정된 것임.