

Rhee, Seongha (2010) Many Uses of One Place: Grammaticalization of *Han-tey* 'One Place', *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 17: 581-593, ed. by Shoichi Iwasaki, Hajime Hoji, Patricia M. Clancy, and Sung-Ock Sohn. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

(Japanese Korean Linguistics 17 Conference was held at University of California, Los Angeles, from Nov. 9-11, 2007.)

Many Uses of One Place: Grammaticalization of *Han-tey* 'one place'

SEONGHA RHEE

Hankuk University of Foreign Studies

1. Introduction

It is widely believed that human conceptualization is fundamentally based on the notion of space (Heine 1997, Levinson 2003, Levinson & Wilkins 2006). This is well illustrated by localism. The main claim of localism is that spatial expressions are linguistically more basic than other kinds of expressions and, therefore, serve as structural templates for the latter (Hjemslev 1935, Anderson 1971, Lyons 1967, Pottier 1974; as cited in Heine et al. 1991: 12). Indeed, in grammaticalization studies, spatial expressions seem to be among the most common sources of grammaticalization.

In Korean, the phrase *han-tey* 'one place', a spatial expression, exhibits an intricate grammaticalization process into associative, dative, and ablative functions. The major objective of this paper is to describe the grammaticalization that *han-tey* has undergone and is currently undergoing.

* This research was supported by the Hankuk University of Foreign Studies research fund. The author wishes to thank the audience of JK-17 for their comments. Special thanks go to Sung-Ock Sohn, Marilyn Plumlee, and anonymous reviewers for reading the earlier version of this paper and kindly making suggestions and giving constructive criticism. All remaining errors, however, are mine.

This paper is organized in the following way: Section 2 presents historical data, focusing on its formal variants and diverse meanings; Section 3 describes the grammaticalization process, whereby diverse grammatical categories became associated with the form; and Section 4 discusses some of the important issues in grammaticalization theory that are relevant to the grammaticalization phenomena displayed by *han-tey*. Section 5 summarizes the findings.

2. Historical Data

The data source used for this study is a 15-million-word historical corpus comprising texts from extant Middle Korean through Modern Korean.¹

2.1. Form

The source form of *han-tey* is a noun phrase consisting of *han* 'one, same' and *tey* 'place'. The form has had many historical variants on its path to the modern Korean dative/ablative *-hanthey* as shown in (1), but it is to be noted that, despite the fact that the variants are written as single words in the list, some of them might have been written with a space in between according to modern orthographic rules.²

(1) Historical variants

15th century: *hantAy*, *hAntAy*

16th century: *hAntuy*, *hantAy*, *hAntAy*

17th century: *hAntuy*, *hAnthey*, *hantAy*, *hAntAy*

18th century: *hAntey*, *hAntuy*, *hantAy*, *hAntAy*

19th century: *hanthey*, *hantey*, *hAntey*, *hAnthuy*, *hAntAy*

20th century: *hanthey*, *hAnthyey*, *hAntey*, *hAnthey*, *hantAy*, *hAntAy*

21st century: *hanthey*

In modern Korean there coexist various forms that originated from the identical source, i.e. *han-tey*, as shown in (2).

(2) a. *han tey* (NP): 'one place'

b. *han tey(-ey)* (PP): 'at one place, at the same place'

¹ The electronic data are largely due to the 21st Century Sejong Project. Thanks go to Jin-Ho Park, Chongnan Chin, and GiSeon Park for assistance with the UNICONC program for this research. The transliteration of the Korean data follows the Extended Yale Romanization System as proposed in Rhee (1996).

² The practice of spacing and punctuation first began in 1896 in Korea's first daily newspaper *Toknipsinmwun* (*The Independent*) and was officially enforced after The First Hankul Orthographic Regulations were published in 1933.

- c. *hantey* (Adv): 'together'
- d. *hanthey* (Dat. Abl): 'to, from'
- e. *hantheyse* (Abl): 'from'

2.2. Meaning

As is evident from the list of diverse forms presented in the previous section, *han-tey* has had many different meanings, many of which still exist in modern Korean. Such meanings arose gradually across time. The historical data found in the corpus are as shown in the following examples:³

(3) Noun Phrase 'one place, same place'

i twulh-i **hAn tAy**-sye na-tAy ilhwum-i talA-ni
 this two-Nom one place-Abl be.born-but name-Nom be.different-because
 'Since these two come from one place but have different names...' (1461, *Nungemkyeng* 4:53a)

(4) Postpositional Phrase 'at one place, at the same place'

icey-za sey cwukem-i **hAntAy** motA-li-lota
 now-Emph three death-Nom at.one.place gather-Fut-Dec
 'Certainly now the three deaths will gather at one place.' (1459, *Welinsekpo* 20:112a)

(5) Adverb 'together'

stong chuyyu-li-ni wuli twul-tho **hAntAy** ho-li-la
 excrement dispose-Fut-as we two-also together do-Fut-Dec
 'As you will be taking away human waste, we two will do it together with you, too.' (1459, *Welinsekpo* 13:20b)

(6) Associative Postposition 'together with'

sekceyhwanin-i kwensok iman chenca-**wahAntAy** wa-si-mye
 (name)-Nom family 20,000 king-Asc come-Pst-and
 'Sekceyhwanin came together with his family of twenty thousand kings, and...' (1463 *Pepchwakyeng* 1:45a)

(7) Dative 'to'

- a. Direction of action

³ The following abbreviations are used in the interlinear morphemic glosses and elsewhere: Abl: ablative; Acc: accusative; Adn: adnominal; Adv: adverb; Asc: associative; Benef: benefactive; Cntp: contemptuous; Comp: complementizer; Conn: connective; Dat: dative; Dec: declarative; Emph: emphatic; Fut: future; Gen: genitive; Loc: locative; Neg: negative; NF: non-finite; Nom: nominative; NP: noun phrase; Perf: perfective; PP: postpositional phrase; Pst: past; and Top: topic.

- cehAy moncye syangkwung-**hAnthey** hA-ko
 they first court.lady-Dat say-and
 'They talked to the court lady first and...' (16xx, *Kyeythyukilki* II: 15a)
- b. Direction of motion
 nay-**hAntAy** o-nAn-i-nAn ... na-lwihAya nyempwul-ul hA-ko
 I-Dat come-Adn-person-Top I-Benef pray-Acc do-and
 'Those who come to me pray for me, and...' (1776, *Yempwulpokwenm-
 wun*, Hayinsa ed., Yemhay 38a)
- c. Location (Direction of mental activity)
 wuli-ka cey-**hAnthey** mwusun wenswu-ka is-kiyey
 we-Nom self-Dat what.kind.of grudge-Nom exist-because
 'What kind of grudge do we have about her... / what kind of grudge
 does she have about us...' (19xx, *Haynglakto*, Sinsosel)⁴
- d. Relation
 nAm-**hAnthey** ci-ci an-ulye hA-ko
 other-Dat lose-Comp Neg-Int do-and
 '(He) refused to be defeated, and...' (1923, *Twukyenseng*, Sinsosel)
- (8) Ablative 'from'
- a. Source of Transfer
 alAy-s salam-**hAnthey** loymwul pat-amek-nun kes
 below-Gen person-Abl bribery receive-Cntp-Adn thing
 'receiving bribes from their inferiors' (1923, *Twukyenseng*, Sinsosel)
- b. Source of Action/Stimulus
 hakkyo-ey tani-l cyek-ey nwukwu-**hAnthey** tul-uniska
 school-Loc attend-Adn time-Loc someone-Abl hear-as
 'As I heard from someone when I was attending the school / what I
 heard ... was' (1923, *Twukyenseng*, Sinsosel)
- c. Source of Force (Agency)
 chongkak-nom-**hAntey** sok-a ... namphyen-ul il-epeli-ko
 bachelor-fella-Abl be.deceived-NF husband-Acc lose-Perf-and
 '(She) was deceived by the bachelor and lost (her) husband, and...'
 (1913, *Masanglwu*, Sinsosel)

As shown in the examples given above, the meanings that are close to the original meaning of the source, i.e. 'one place', tend to be specific; and the semantic origin is relatively transparent. On the other hand, the meanings that arose more recently, i.e. from the 17th century, tend to be semantically complex, even though they may be subsumed under a broad category such as dative and ablative.

⁴ The year of publication of the source text is written as '19xx', if the exact year is unknown.

3. Grammaticalization

3.1. [Noun Phrase > PP] 'one place' > 'at one place'

The first stage of grammaticalization of *han-tey* represents the pre-grammaticalization phase. The original meaning of the grammaticalization source is merely a combination of the two lexemes *han* 'one' and *tey* 'place', which syntactically constitute a noun phrase.

An idiosyncrasy of Korean is such that primary postpositions, especially those that designate location, may be relatively freely omitted from their host noun phrase. Therefore, a phrase that appears to be a noun phrase may in fact be a postpositional phrase syntactically.

This idiosyncrasy is particularly applicable to *han-tey*. Particle omission, in fact, is not only permissible, but also often preferable for naturalness, especially when the ending of the syllable to which the locative particle is attached is open, and the beginning of the particle is also open. This is the phonological environment in which *han-tey* is found. In other words, there is no consonantal coda in *tey* or its historical variants *they*, *tAy*, *tuy*, etc. The beginning of the locative particle, which is postpositionally attached to the host noun, is also open. In other words, there is no consonantal onset in *ey* or its historical variants *Ay*, *uy*, etc. These are all conditions that promote particle dropping. In this environment, keeping the locative particle would result in the occurrence of vowels in succession, an awkward and often avoided combination of sounds. Moreover, the semantic function of a referenced location ('place'), such as in this case, is often straightforward from the context.

3.2. [PP>Adverb] 'at one place' > 'together'

The second stage is represented by the development from a postpositional phrase to an adverb. This change did not involve any formal changes, especially considering that there was no practice of spacing in orthography. In fact, the usage representing this stage is attested in the earliest extant *Hankul* data from the 15th century.

Though not overt in its written form, this change is significant in several ways. It involves a morphosyntactic change as a result of reanalysis of a phrase as a single word: from PP to Adverb. Semantically, there is a change from 'at one place' to 'together'. In other words, the single word acquires a unitized concept signifying 'together'. This change also involved a conceptual shift: 'togetherness' fundamentally implies spatial contiguity, but may extend to non-spatial conceptual contiguity. This type of metonymization seems to have contributed to further semantic and conceptual extension. In terms of syntactic constituent relationships, an adverb has a closer relation-

ship with the following verb than with the preceding noun in Korean syntactic configuration.

This stage of change, characterized by the creation of a unitized, relatively autonomous, lexical item in the category of adverb, may not be recognized without controversy as an instance of grammaticalization, and may instead be regarded as an instance of univerbation (Lehmann 1995[1982]). However, taking into account that the grammatical category of adverb may be plotted along the continuum between lexical categories such as nouns and adjectives and grammatical categories such as adpositions and case affixes (Heine et al. 1991: 167), this change may well be regarded as grammaticalization.

3.3. [Adverb > Associative Postposition] 'together' > 'together with'

The third stage of grammaticalization involves the change from an adverb to an associative postposition, meaning 'together with'. The meaning of the associative 'together with' is very close to that of the adverb *hantey* 'together'. It was noted that the adverb is functionally more remote from the noun than from the verb even though syntagmatically both may be juxtaposed with the adverb, often in the configuration of [NP Adverb V]. However, the associative, being a postposition, is hosted by a noun phrase. This problem is solved by recruiting a connective. In other words, in the historical data, the adverb *hantey* 'together' frequently cooccurs with the connective *-(k)wa* 'with'. A survey of the corpus data shows that paradigmatically the nominal that hosts the connective *-(k)wa* tends to belong almost exclusively to those denoting humans. Therefore, from a semantic perspective, the associative postposition often makes the NP a joint agent of an action denoted by the main clause verb.

Another aspect worth noting is that morphosyntactically the form occurs periphrastically, though written without orthographic spacing in the original texts. Still another noteworthy point is that since the connective *-(k)wa* already carries the associative meaning, the formation of *-(k)wa hantey* may involve semantic and phonological strengthening for emphasis.

3.4. [Associative Postposition > Dative] 'together with' > 'to'

The next stage of development involves a conceptual leap from the associative postposition to the dative marker. Formally, this change is characterized by the omission of the connective *-(k)wa*, which constituted part of the associative, and was critically instrumental in the emergence of the associative from an adverb. This omission of the associative connective seems to have played a significant role in losing the 'togetherness' meaning. Semantically, the loss of the connective enabled the change from the 'togetherness' meaning in the associative to the dative meaning 'to'.

The conceptual change associated with this shift seems peculiar. In other words, the notion of association is static (i.e. being together), whereas the notion of dative is dynamic (i.e. selecting an object with directionality). Though it may seem abrupt and unnatural, this type of dynamic conceptualization is frequently observed across languages (see 4.1 for more discussion on this subjectification issue).

3.5. [Dative > Ablative] 'to' > 'from'

The final stage of grammaticalization is represented by the change from dative to ablative. This change is very peculiar in that semantically the 'goal-directionality' meaning changes into the 'source-directionality' meaning. This is a drastic antonymization process. Conceptually, the focus changes from presenting 'the movement to reach the referenced object' (i.e. dative) to presenting 'the identified source of a force' (i.e. ablative).

It is not clear what triggered this type of antonymization. One possibility is that, morphosyntactically, the dative *hanthey* allows particle stacking with *-se* (or *-sye*), which signifies inessive or ablative meaning, and which was grammaticalized from the verb of existence *-is/-/isi-* (Rhee 1996). The combination of the dative marker *-hanthey* with the ablative *-se* may have created *-hantheyse* with an ablative function; then *-se* may have been optionally dropped. This scenario would be more plausible if the recruited meaning of *han-tey* were not that of dative but of lexical locative meaning. However, the probability of this path is low because such tokens are rarely attested. Considering that such tokens would need to occur with sufficient frequency to enable such changes, the low frequency of such forms simply does not support this hypothesis based solely on morphosyntactic and syntagmatic relations. Therefore, the creation of the antonymous meaning may not be attributable to particle stacking and subsequent dropping.

From a crosslinguistic perspective, the antonymization process is commonly found (Rhee 2000). Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that there is a general conceptual mechanism that enables such a change (see 4.1 for more discussion on this issue).⁵

⁵ Peter Sells (p.c.) suggests that this phenomenon, also attested in Japanese *-ni* 'to/from', may be alternatively regarded as semantic generalization rather than as antonymization. This interpretation is viable especially in view of the fact that the previous sense, i.e. dative 'to', does not disappear when the new sense, i.e. ablative 'from', emerges. It is still unclear, however, how a new sense attached to a particular form whose meaning is antonymous could develop without confusion, especially when other more seemingly congruous locative senses such as essive, inessive, superessive, etc. have not yet emerged. The development seems more likely to be due to the dynamic conceptualization of the schema of directionality associated with dative 'to', which is also a resultant development from varied conceptualizations of 'one place'.

4. Discussion

The grammaticalization process described in the preceding section warrants a discussion on some issues in grammaticalization theory. Among the issues are subjectification, the source determination hypothesis, the persistence principle and gradualness of grammaticalization, local context, and phonological change.

4.1. Subjectification

Subjectification refers to a process whereby speaker involvement is reflected in semantic change. Traugott and König (1991) say in their Semantic-Pragmatic Tendency III that meanings tend to become increasingly situated in the speaker's subjective belief-state/attitude toward the situation (see also Traugott 1982, 1989, Traugott & Dasher 2002).

Rhee (2007b) suggests that subjectification may be widely applicable and can be categorized into two major classes: egocentric subjectification (i.e. speaker-centered) and anthropocentric subjectification (i.e. human-centered). It is, in fact, very common that humans attribute diverse human properties to non-human entities and even to interpretation of states of affairs. What is relevant in the current discussion is that subjectification can be applied to the conceptualization of events and event schemas. Through subjectification, static configurations can be interpreted more dynamically. For instance, a simple reference to a physical 'place' *per se* does not have anything to do with association, direction of goal, direction of source, etc. However, through subjectification, 'one place' can be construed as having multiple entities being located in a single location (whereby the 'togetherness' meaning evolves); the particular location may be selected (whereby the 'to' meaning evolves); and, further, the location may be construed as a background of an entity (whereby the 'from' meaning evolves).⁶

Another aspect with reference to subjectification is that *hantey* was used predominantly with reference to a human subject's location. In Present Day Korean, *hantey* is exclusively used with reference to humans, or affectionately to animals. This is an instance of anthropocentric subjectification. Furthermore, attribution of movement and direction to a location is an act of subjectification (note that direction denotes the potential for movement). Attribution of an enabling force to a location, or an entity therein, is also an act of subjectification.

⁶ This type of serial change is reminiscent of the grammaticalization process exhibited by the verb of existence *-is-/isi-* 'exist': [existence > locative > ablative > sequential > causal/conditional], as elaborated in Rhee (1996: 131-142), and of the grammaticalization paths taken by the Korean instrumental: [direction > selection > association > departure], as elaborated in Rhee & Koo (2006).

4.2. Source Determination

The source determination hypothesis states that the actual meaning of the construction that enters into grammaticalization uniquely determines the path that grammaticalization follows and consequently the resulting grammatical meanings (Bybee et al. 1994). Development of antonymous meanings (e.g. 'to' and 'from') from a single source and the self-same construction would not be expected.

What we can infer from this is that language users do not seem to be mindful of the consequences of language change that occur through their strategic uses of the language. This would seem to contradict the notions of the avoidance of antonymy and the pursuit of form-function isomorphy (see also Rhee 2007a for a similar discussion on convergence of instrumental-ablative).⁷

4.3. Persistence and Gradualness of Grammaticalization

The persistence principle states that when a form undergoes grammaticalization from a lexical to a grammatical function, so long as it is grammatically viable, some traces of its original lexical meanings tend to adhere to it and details of its lexical history may be reflected in constraints on its grammatical distribution (Hopper 1991). Due to this carry-over of previous meanings, the grammaticalization process of a form is expected to be gradual. There are many cases in which the grammatical/functional status is ambiguous (cf. the overlap model; Heine et al. 1991). This type of semantic overlap which results in semantic and functional ambiguity is well illustrated by the following examples:

(9) Ambiguous Case: Postpositional Phrase / Adverb

- a. i salAm-An yelay-wa **hAntAy** ca-mye
this person-Top Buddha-with at.one.place/together sleep-and
'This person sleeps {with Buddha at the same place and..., together with Buddha and ...}' (1463 *Pephwakyeng* 4:88a)
- b. emi cwuk-kenul... api-lAlolmkye-taka **hAntAy** mwut-ko
mother die-as father-Acc move-and at.a.place/together bury-and
'As (his) mother died, (he) moved (his) father's body and buried {him at one place, them together}' (15xx, *Samkanghayngsilto* Hyo 33a)

(10) Ambiguous Case: Adverb / Dative

- a. tonglyu **hAnthuy** iss-seto tAthwu-ci Ani-hA-nAni
companion together/Dat exist-even quarrel-Comp Neg-be-Conn

⁷ This type of antonymization is found in Korean *-pwuthe* [adhere > from], Chinese *gen* [heel > follow > to > with > from], French *à* [allative > locative > comitative > ablative], English *out of* [with > without], etc. (Rhee 2000).

'As he would not quarrel even when he would be {with, placed at the location of } his companion...' (18xx, *Yesohak* 91)

- b. atAl-**hAnthey** uylon-to ani-hA-ko
 son-together/Dat discussion-even Neg-do-and
 'without even consulting (the matter) with (her) son, and' (1923, *Twu-kyenseng*, Sinsosel)

(11) Ambiguous Case: Dative of Location / Dative of Direction

hanAnim-uy nwun-i ne-**hAnthey** hAngsyang is-nAn cwul
 God-Gen eye-Nom you-Dat always exist-Adn Nomz
 'that God's eyes are always on/toward you' (1907, *Sinhakwelpo* 5: 192)

(12) Ambiguous Case: Dative of Relation / Ablative of Source of Force

kuman kepwuki-**hAntey** cye-ss-yeyo
 in.the.end (name)-Dat/Abl lose-Pst-Dec
 'As it turned out, I lost to Kepwuki / my grade wasn't as good as Kepwuki's.' (1923, *Twukyenseng*, Sinsosel)

In (13) we have a single sentence where *hanthey* occurs twice side by side with the antonymous meanings of dative and ablative.

- (13) wu-s salAm-**hAnthvey** thymhA-ko
 above-Gen person-Dat flatter-and
 alAy-s salam-**hAnthey** loymwul pat-amek-nun kes
 below-Gen person-Abl bribery receive-Cntp-Adn Nomz
 'flattering (their) superiors and receiving bribery from his inferiors' (1923, *Twukyenseng*, Sinsosel)

4.4. Local Context

It has often been pointed out that grammaticalization occurs in specific, local contexts (Hopper & Traugott 2003[1993], Kuteva 2001). In the early stages, the majority of the verbs that occur with *han-tey* are those whose semantics are largely static, e.g. denoting existence (*is-*, *kyesi-*), absence (*eps-*), living (*sal-*, *cwuk-*), sleeping (*ca-*), sitting (*anc-*), being born (*na-*), semantically devoid light-verb (*ha-* 'do, be'), etc. The gradual increase in the number of cooccurring dynamic predicates correlates with the gradual emergence of more dynamic functions (e.g. dative, ablative).

4.5. Phonological Change

Phonological weakening has many other names (e.g. loss of phonological integrity, attrition, erosion, phonetic reduction) and it has been observed that this process often accompanies grammaticalization (Lehmann 1995[1982], Heine 1981, Bybee et al. 1994).

The change in *hantey* [handɛ] to *hanthey* [hant^hɛ] involves phonological strengthening in that the alveolar stop acquires the [+aspirated] feature, even though it also undergoes devoicing. The phonological environment of the initial consonant in *tey*, i.e. following a nasal, promotes nasalization as a natural process, whereas the change of this sound in the identical phonological environment into a voiceless sound is far less natural. Therefore, the change from [-nd-] to [-nt^h-] is a doubly fortifying process.

5. Conclusion

This paper described the grammaticalization process of *han-tey* from a noun phrase signifying 'one place' to a postposition *-hanthey* for dative and ablative functions. Major findings in the paper may be summarized as follows:

A historical investigation into the developmental paths of *han-tey* reveals a series of conceptual changes:

(14)

Stage 1: Noun Phrase

han tey
'one place'

Stage 2: Postpositional Phrase

han tey(-ey)
'at a place'

Stage 3: Adverb

hantey
'together'

Stage 4: Postposition (Associative)

-(k)wa)hanthey
'together with'

Stage 5: Postposition (Dative)

-hanthey
'to'

Stage 6: Postposition (Ablative)

-hanthey(se)
'from'

Subjectification is prominent as a semantic change mechanism and is a determinant for directionality of the change. Such subjectification is particularly prominent when applied to the conceptualization of an event schema in which diverse foci engender diverse grammatical markers.

The source determination hypothesis despite its evident validity in many or most instances of grammaticalization does not seem to be in accordance with the grammaticalization process of *hanthey*, which exhibited antonymization from dative 'to' to ablative 'from'. This type of change sug-

gests that language users do not seem to be mindful of the consequences of semantic change.

Grammaticalization occurs in local contexts as evidenced by the fact that the use of *han-tey* in early Middle Korean tokens predominantly involved static existence verbs and gradually expanded to dynamic verbs of movement at the incipient grammaticalization stage.

The change exhibits 'persistence' in the cooccurrence restriction in that as a postposition it only takes a noun phrase that designates an animate entity (humans, in particular). In other words, *han-tey* was almost exclusively used in conjunction with human location or movement at the pre-grammaticalization stage.

Despite the widely supported idea that phonological reduction is concomitant with grammaticalization, the development of *hanthey* shows an additive phonological process.

References

- Anderson, J. M. 1971. *The Grammar of Case: Towards a Localistic Theory*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Bybee, J. L., R. Perkins, & W. Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heine, B. 1997. *Cognitive Foundations of Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, B., U. Claudi, & F. Hünemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hjelmslev, L. 1935. La catégorie des cas. *Acta Jutlandica* 7. no. 1: i-xii, 1-184; 9, no. 2: i-vii, 1-78.
- Hopper, P. J. 1991. On Some Principles of Grammaticization. *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, 2 volumes, eds. E. C. Traugott & B. Heine, Vol. 1: 17-35. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Hopper, P. J., & E. C. Traugott. 2003[1993]. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kuteva, T. 2001. *Auxiliation: An Enquiry into the Nature of Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lehmann, C. 1995[1982]. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization: A Programmatic Sketch*. Newcastle: LINCOM Europa.
- Levinson, S. C. 2003. *Space in Language and Cognition: Explorations in Cognitive Diversity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, S. C., & D. P. Wilkins. 2006. The Background to the Study of the Language of Space. *Grammars of Space*, eds. S. C. Levinson & D. P. Wilkins, 1-23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Lyons, J. 1967. A Note on Possessive, Existential and Locative Sentences. *Foundations of Language* 3: 390-396.
- Pottier, B. 1974. *Linguistique Générale*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Rhee, S. 1996. *Semantics of Verbs and Grammaticalization: The Development in Korean from a Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.
- Rhee, S. 2000. Frame of Focus in Grammaticalization. *Discourse and Cognition*. 7.2: 79-104.
- Rhee, S. 2007a. On Interrelation of Instrumental and Ablative. *Discourse and Cognition* 14.3: 131-153.
- Rhee, S. 2007b. What Is It For If It's Before Me?: Subjectification and Grammaticalization of English *for* and *before*. *Studies in British and American Language and Literature* 84: 209-231.
- Rhee, S., & H. J. Koo. 2006. Cognitive-semantic Networks of Instrumentals in Korean and English. Paper presented at 2006 Seoul International Conference on Linguistics (SICOL), July 24-26, 2006, Seoul National University, Seoul.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1982. From Propositional to Textual and Expressive Meanings: Some Semantic-Pragmatic Aspects of Grammaticalization. *Perspectives in Historical Linguistic*, eds. W. Lehmann & Y. Malkiel, 245-271. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Traugott, E. C. 1989. On the Rise of Epistemic Meanings in English: An Example of Subjectification in Semantic Change. *Language* 65.1: 31-55.
- Traugott, E. C., & R. Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott, E. C., & E. König. 1991. The Semantics-Pragmatics of Grammaticalization Revisited. *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, 2 volumes, eds. E. C. Traugott & B. Heine, Vol. 1: 189-218. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.