

From connectives to sentential endings: Insubordination and grammaticalization in Korean

1. Introduction

1.1 Korean in Brief

- About 80 million speakers (Ethnologue 2015)
- SOV word order; Verb-final, relatively free-order

(1) *John-i Mary-lul salangha-n-ta*
John-NOM Mary-ACC love-PRES-DEC
'John loves Mary.'

(2) a. *John-i Mary-eykey kkoch-ul cwu-ess-ta*
John-NOM Mary-DAT flower-ACC give-PST-DEC
'John gave Mary flowers.'

b. *Mary-eykey John-i kkoch-ul cwu-ess-ta*

c. *Mary-eykey kkoch-ul John-i cwu-ess-ta*

d. *kkoch-ul John-i Mary-eykey cwu-ess-ta*

e. *kkoch-ul Mary-eykey John-i cwu-ess-ta*

- Agglutinating morphology (strong preference for suffixation; sometimes extensive fusion)

(3) a. *ku-nun caki kyoswu-nim-tul-hanthey-kkaci-to mwulyeyha-ta*
he-TOP self professor-HON-PL-DAT-LMT-ADD be.rude-DEC
'He is rude even to his professors. (lit. ... rude even as much as to self's honorable professors)'

b. *pelsse kanguy-lul kkuthna-y-e.peli-si-ess-keyss-ta-te-kwun-yo*
already lecture-ACC finish-CAUS-PERF-HON-PST-FUT-COMP-RETRO-EVID-POL
'(I) recall (they told me) that (the professor) must have finished the lecture (by then).'

(4) *(i)-la-ko-ha-nun-kes-un* > *-(i)lan*
(COP)-DEC-CONN-say-ADN-thing-TOP identificational topic (Rhee 2011a: 766)
'as for the thing about which people say' 'the so-called x is'

- Genealogical classification debated: Altaic (Ramstedt 1939) vs. Isolate (Song 2005, Sohn 2001)
- Limited language contact, but much Chinese influence in lexicon through socio-political influence, religious literature, etc.
- Writing systems: phonograms and semantograms with Chinese characters (OK & EMidK); Hankul (1446~)

(5) Hankul is a feature-based alphabetical system written in syllabic blocks

ㄱ	ㅋ	ㆁ	k	kh	kk	ㅏ	ㅑ	a	ya	각	k	a	k	'angle'			
ㄷ	ㅌ	ㆁ	t	th	tt	ㅓ	ㅕ	ə	yə	독일	t	o	k	ø	i	l	'Germany'
ㅈ	ㅊ	ㆁ	c	ch	cc	ㅗ	ㅛ	o	yo	한국	h	a	n	k	u	k	'Korea'
ㅍ	ㅑ	ㆁ	p	ph	pp	ㅜ	ㅠ	u	yu								

1.2 Grammaticalization

- the development from lexical to grammatical forms and from grammatical to even more grammatical forms (Kuryłowicz 1975[1965]: 52, Heine et al. 1991: Heine & Kuteva 2002: 2)
- *hesahwa* “(lit.) the process of becoming empty words” (Lee 1956, Yu 1962); now *mwunpephwa* “(lit.) the process of becoming grammar/grammatical”

2. Preliminaries

- Korean has a large inventory of *cosa* (nominal morphology; postpositional particles) and *emi* (verbal morphology; endings for connection and termination).
- Lee & Lee (2010) list 2,056 grammatical forms (*emi* & *cosa*).
- Korean grammatical markers signal not only garden-variety grammatical notions but also diverse stance-related notions simultaneously, the latter being often difficult to pinpoint or label (‘elaborateness’, ‘semantically elaborate categories’ Kuteva & Comrie 2005, Kuteva 2009).

2.1 Connectives

- not a category among the parts of speech (formally heterogeneous)
- diverse constructions often involving nominals, adnominals, locative particles, etc.

2.2 Sentential Endings

- Sentential endings comprise numerous sentence-final particles (verbal morphologies), marking TAM.
- Among the ultimate sentence-enders are the sentence-type markers.

(6) Sentence-Type Markers

Declarative: *-ta, -supnita, -suptita, -ney, -ui, -lsey, -e, -ci, -uo, -so, -ketun, -ntey...*

Interrogative: *-nya, -ni, -supnikka, -suptikka, -na, -nka, -lkka, -e, -ci, -uo, -so...*

Imperative: *-la, -ela, -sipsio, -key, -e, -ci, -uo, -kwulye, -lyem, -lyemuna, -sose...*

Hortative: *-ca, -psita, -sey, -e, -ci, -uo, -kwulye...*

- Sentence-type markers are modulated via honorification and politeness. (4-7 levels)

(7) Sentence Enders by Speech Levels (Sohn 2001[1999]: 355)

	Declarative	Interrogative	Imperative	Propositive
Plain	<i>-(n)-ta</i>	<i>-ni?/-nu-nya?</i>	<i>-ela/-ala</i>	<i>-ca</i>
Intimate	<i>-e/-a</i>	<i>-e?/-a?</i>	<i>-e/-a</i>	<i>-e/-a</i>
Familiar	<i>-ne-y</i>	<i>-na?/-nu-nka?</i>	<i>-ke-y</i>	<i>-se-y</i>
Blunt	<i>-(s)o</i>	<i>-(s)o?</i>	<i>-(u)o</i>	<i>-(u)p-si-ta</i>
Polite	<i>-e.yo/-a.yo</i>	<i>-e.yo?/-a.yo?</i>	<i>-e.yo/-a.yo</i>	<i>-e.yo/-a.yo</i>
Deferential	<i>-(su)p-ni-ta</i>	<i>-(su)p-ni-kka</i>	<i>-(u)si-p-si-o</i>	<i>-(u)si-p-si-ta</i>
Neutral	<i>-(n)-ta</i>	<i>-nu-nya</i>	<i>-(u)la</i>	<i>-ca</i>

2.3 Insubordination

- A large number of innovative SFPs in Korean arose from connectives through insubordination (Sohn 2003, Rhee 2012).
- Inferential meanings become semanticized on the utterance-final formants (i.e. connectives). (‘from silence to grammar’ Rhee 2002)

(8) Marker	Connective Function	Sentence-Final Function
<i>-(nu)ntey</i>	adversative	surprise/reluctance/reason
<i>-ketun</i>	conditional	topic-presentation/reason
<i>-nikka</i>	reason/cause	addressee-confirmation/contingency
<i>-myense</i>	concurrence	addressee-confirmation/challenge/derisive

3. From Connectives to Sentential Endings: Case Studies

3.1 Contingency/Conditional connectives:

- contingency-marking connective *-nun tey* [-ADN place] (*-n tey*, if the host is an adjective)
- *tey*: ‘place’ > ‘at the place where’ > ‘while’ > ‘even though’ > ‘tell me more’ > ‘I have something to say’ > ‘I’m surprised’

(9) a. *tey* n. ‘place’

ilha-nun tey-ka eti-y-a?
 work-ADN place-NOM where-be-END
 ‘Where do you work?’ (lit. ‘Where is the place that you work at?’)

b. *tey* n. ‘place’/ *-nun-tey* CONN ‘while’

ilha-nun-tey(-ey) pwulphyenha-n-tey eps-e?
 work-{ADN-place(-at), ?while} be.inconvenient-ADN-place not.exist-END?
 ‘Is there any inconvenience {in the place where, ?while} you are working?’

c. *-nuntey* CONN ‘while’

ilha-nuntey(-ey) cenhwa-ka o-ass-ta*
 work-while(*-at) telephone-NOM come-PST-DEC
 ‘The phone rang while (I was) working.’

d. *-nuntey* CONN ‘while, even though’

ilha-nuntey il-i an toy-n-ta
 work-CONN work-NOM NEG become-PRES-DEC
 ‘Even though I’m trying, there is no progress with the work.’
 (Lit. ‘While/At the place where (I) work, work does not occur.’)

e. *-nuntey* SFP ‘elaboration request’

ne encey tokil ka-nuntey?
 you when Germany go-SFP
 ‘When are you leaving for Germany (tell me more...)?’

f. *-nuntey* SFP ‘agreement request’

nal-i ceypep chwuwu-ntey
 weather-NOM pretty.much be.cold-SFP
 ‘It is pretty cold, isn’t it!’

g. *-nuntey* SFP ‘mild disagreement/discontent’

na-to khwukhi cohaha-nuntey
 I-too cookie like-SFP
 ‘I too like cookies! (How come I don’t get one?)’

h. *-nuntey* SFP ‘counterexpectation, mirativity’

wa wuli ttal nolay cal ha-nuntey
 wow our daughter song well do-SFP
 ‘Wow, our daughter really sings well! (I’m surprised)’

- Conditional connective: *-ketun* (Koo 1989a,b,c; Rhee 2002)

- *-ketun* attested in Old Korean (*-ke-tA-un* [UNPERCEIVED-place/thing/time-TOPIC]) (Koo 1989a,b, cf. Yoo 1980)

- ‘if’ > ‘because’ > ‘background’ ‘reason’ ‘common ground’ ‘reluctance’ ‘now it’s your turn’

(10) a. *-ketun* CONN ‘if’

ku-ka o-ketun i ton-ul cwu-ela
 he-NOM come-if this money-ACC give-IMP
 ‘If he comes, give him this money.’

b. *-ketun* SFP ‘reason’

A: [Why does he look so down?]
 B: *ayin-i ttena-ss-ketun*
 sweetheart-NOM leave-PST-SFP
 ‘(It’s) because his sweetheart left him.’

c. *-ketun* SFP ‘topic presentation’

nay-ka ecey caymiiss-nun chayk-ul sa-ss-ketun.
 I-NOM yesterday be.interesting-ADN book-ACC buy-PST-SFP
 ‘(You know what?) I bought an interesting book yesterday.’

d. *-ketun* SFP 'turn-yielder, common ground solicitation'

A: *cikum ayki-ka tases-sal-i-ketun-yo*
 now baby-NOM 5-year-be-SFP-POL

'My child is now five years old. (You're with me, right?)'

B: *ney* 'yes'

A: *kuntey caknyen-ey Icha noyyemcwusa-lul macchwu-ess-ketun-yo*
 then last.year-at first encephalitis.vaccination-ACC give-PST-SFP-POL

'And (I) got her the first encephalitis vaccination shot last year. (You're with me, right?)'

B: *ney* 'yes'

A: *kuntey olhay-ey-to tto macchwu-eyaha-nunci kwungkumha-ketun-yo*
 then this.year-at-too again give-must-if wonder-SFP-POL

'And (I'm) wondering if we should get her another shot this year. (You're with me, right?)'

(Adapted from Lee 1996, re-cited from Koo & Rhee 2001: 15)

e. *-ketun* SFP 'turn-yielder, common ground solicitation, mildly apologetic, reluctance'

A: [Hello? Who is this calling and where are you calling from?]

B: *ney pongchentong-i-ntey-yo. ilum-un malha-kosiph-cianh-ketun-yo*
 yes [place.name]-be-SFP-POL name-TOP say-want-NEG-SFP-POL

'Yes, (I'm calling from) Bongchundong. (But) I don't want to tell you my name. (Please understand)'

A: *ney, kuntey sengham-un malssumha-ycwu-sy-eyaha-ketun-yo*
 yes but name-TOP tell-BEN-HON-must-SFP-POL

'Yes, but you need to kindly tell (us) your name. (Please understand)'

B: *kulay-yo? kuntey com chayngphiha-ketun-yo*
 be.so-POL? but a.little be.ashamed-SFP-POL

'Is that so? But I would be embarrassed (if my name becomes known) (Please understand).'

(Koo & Rhee 2001: 16)

3.2 Complementizer-based Connectives

[Grammaticalization of Complementizers]

- The complementizers *-tako*, *-lako*, *-nyako* and *-cako* grammaticalized from the sentence-type-marking endings (*-ta*, *-la*, *-nya* and *-ca*), the verb of locution *ha-* 'say', and the connective *-ko* 'and'.
- COMPs retain the sentence-type markers.

(11) *-ta/nya/la/ca* + *ha* + *ko* >>> *-{ta/nya/la/ca}-ko*
 Sentence-type marker say Connective Complementizer

(12) Complementizers in Modern Korean (Rhee 2008: 593)

Embedded Clause Type	Complementizer	Example
Declarative	<i>-tako</i>	<i>-ka-n-tako</i> 'that (he) goes'
	<i>-lako</i>	<i>John-i-lako</i> 'that it is John'
Interrogative	<i>-nyako</i>	<i>-ka-nyako</i> 'if (he) goes'
Imperative	<i>-lako</i>	<i>-ka-lako</i> 'that (he should) go'
Hortative	<i>-cako</i>	<i>-ka-cako</i> '(suggest) that (they) should go together'

(13) a. *ku-ka ka-n-ta-ha-ko malha-yss-ta* >>> *-tako* (Declarative) 'that he was going'
 he-NOM go-PRES-DEC-say-CONN say-PST-DEC COMP
 'He said that he was going (=leaving).'
 (lit. He said "(I) am going" and said.)

b. *ka-nya-ha-ko* ... >>> *-nyako* (Interrogative) 'if he was going'

c. *ka-la-ha-ko* ... >>> *-lako* (Imperative) 'that he should go'

d. *ka-ca-ha-ko* ... >>> *-cako* (Hortative) 'that they should go together'

[COMP to SFP]

(14) From Declarative COMP to SFP *-tako*

a. *ne ches welkup tha-ss-tako tul-ess-ta*
 you first salary receive-COMP hear-PST-DEC
 'I heard that you got your first salary.'

b. *ne ches welkup tha-ss-tako?*
 you first salary receive-PST-SFP?
 'You got your first salary? (Is that true?)'
 (lit. That you got your first salary?)

c. *na-to cengmal cwuk-keyss-tako.*
 I-also really die-FUT-SFP
 'I am really hard-pressed, too. (Stop pressing me)'
 (lit. That I'm really hard-pressed, too.)

d. *wuli emma-ka elmana yeyppu-tako!*
 we mom-NOM how be.pretty-SFP
 'My mom is really pretty.' (You'll never know!)
 (lit. How beautiful mother is.)

(15) From Imperative COMP to SFP *-lako*

a. *ku-nun ppalli o-lako solichye-ss-ta*
 he-TOP fast come-COMP yell-PST-DEC
 'He yelled (at me) to come quickly.'

b. *na-ltele kekceng mal-lako?*
 I-DAT worry stop-SFP
 'I shouldn't worry? (How can't I?)'
 (lit. That I shouldn't worry?)

c. *hwangtangha-n mal com kumanha-lako*
 be.absurd-ADN word a.little stop-SFP
 'Please stop talking nonsense! (I cannot stand it any more.)'

d. *ppali com o-lako!*
 quickly a.little come-SFP
 'Come quickly, please! (We are getting delayed because of you.)'

(16) From Interrogative COMP to SFP *-nyako*

a. *kyay-ka yocum kongpwu cal ha-nyako mwul-ess-ta*
 he-NOM these.days study well do-COMP ask-PST-DEC
 '(I) asked if he was studying well these days.'

b. *nay-ka kuke-l cal ha-lswuiss-nyako?*
 I-NOM it-ACC well do-can-SFP
 'I can do it well? (Don't you know me?)' (lit. Whether I can do it well?)

c. *kuke-y pothong elyew-un il-i-nyako!*
 that-NOM normal be.difficult-ADN matter-be-SFP
 'Isn't it extremely difficult! (What a difficult job it is!)

d. *ney-ka totaychey salam-i-nyako!*
 you-NOM at.all human-be-SFP
 'Are you a human? (to do such a thing!)

(17) From Hortative COMP to SFP *-cako*

a. *ku-nun tosekwan-ey kathi ka-cako colu-ass-ta*
 he-TOP library-to together go-COMP press-PST-DEC
 'He begged me that I go to the library with him.'

b. *pap-pwuthe mek-cako?*
 meal-from eat-SFP
 'Are you suggesting that we eat first?'

c. A: *icey pap-mek-ule ka-cako.*
 now food-eat-PURP go-SFP
 'Let's go eat now.'

B: *kule-cako.*
 do.so-SFP
 'OK, let's.'

d. A: *com pikhi-cako-yo.*
 a.little step.aside-SFP-POL
 'Step aside, please. (You're blocking my view.)'

B: *mil-cimal-cako-yo*
 push-PROH-SFP-POL
 'Stop pushing me, please.
 (Don't you have manners?)'

- Conventional SFPs vs. innovative SFPs derived from COMPs
- Utterances ending with innovative SFPs are COMP-headed clause in appearance.
- Innovative SFPs carry a stronger illocutionary force (with nuance of emphasis, irritation, etc.)

- (18) a. *na-to cengmal cwuk-keyss-ta.* (Conventional)
 b. *na-to cengmal cwuk-keyss-tako.* (Innovative)
 I-also really die-FUT-SFP
 a/b: 'I am really hard-pressed, too.'
 b. << (I (already) said) that I'll really die.
- (19) a. *kuke-y pothong elyewun il-i-nya?* (Conventional)
 b. *kuke-y pothong elyewun il-i-nyako?* (Innovative)
 that-NOM normal be.difficult matter-be-SFP
 a/b: 'Isn't it extremely difficult? / What a difficult job it is!'
 b. << (I (already) asked) if it is of regular difficulty.
- (20) a. *ppalli o-ala.* (Conventional)
 b. *ppalli o-lako.* (Innovative)
 quickly come-SFP
 a/b: 'Come quickly.'
 b. << '(I (already) told you) to come quickly.'
- (21) a. *icey pap-mek-ule ka-ca* (Conventional)
 b. *icey pap-mek-ule ka-cako* (Innovative)
 now food-eat-PURP go-SFP
 a/b. 'Let's go eat now.'
 b. << '(I (already) said) that we should go to eat.'

[Concomitance Connective > SFP]

- (22) COMP-based Concomitance connectives
 -*ta/la/nya/ca* + *-myense*
 (from COMP) Concomitance connective
- (23) Concomitance-based SFPs: The *-{ta}myense* type
 a. From Declarative origin: *-tamyense*
 b. From Imperative origin: *-lamyense*
 c. From Interrogative origin: *-nyamyense*
 d. From Hortative origin: *-camyense*

- The *-{ta}myense* forms developed from the constructions involving COMPs.
- The *-{ta}myense* SFPs carry diverse nuances '(re)confirmation' 'challenge' 'derisive', etc.

- (24) a. *alasya kongkwan-ey chyulniphA-n-tako hA-myensye liyengsil kangAyung-ulpoko*
 Russia embassy-at come.and.go-PRES-COMP say-CONN [name] [name]-DAT
hA-nAn mal-i
 say-ADN word-NOM
 'While claiming that he regularly goes to the Russian Embassy, what he said to Lee Youngsil and Kang Jaeung is that...' (1896, *Toklipsinmwun* 523)
- b. *inmin-ul pohohA-yacwu-n-tamyensye ile-n kes-ul pAlkhy-ecwu-cian-nAn kes-un*
 people-ACC protect-BEN-PRES-CONN like.this-ADN thing-ACC clarify-BEN-NEG-ADN thing-TOP
 'While claiming that they [as civil servants] are protecting the people, that they do not clarify this kind of matter [taxes imposed on Koreans by Chinese] is... [neglecting their job] (It's despicable!)' (1896, *Toklipsinmwun* 1858)

- (25) A: [I'm going to the movies.]
 B: *mwe? ne aphu-tamyense*
 what? you be.sick-SFP
 'What? Didn't you say you are sick? (What's wrong with you?)'
- (26) *ipen yelum-ey yulep ka-n-tamyense*
 this summer-at Europe go-PRES-SFP
 'You are going to Europe this summer, right?'

[COMP-based Cause/Reason Connective > SFP]

- *-ni* 'because' > *-tani* Comp-based connective > *-tani* SFP

- (26) a. *pi-ka o-ni chwup-ta* (from Late Middle Korean to Present)
 rain-NOM come-CAUS be.cold-DEC
 'It is cold because it's raining.'
- b. *ku-ka cwuk-ess-tani mit-eci-ci-ka anh-nun-ta*
 he-NOM die-PST-CONN believe-PASS-NOMZ-NOM NEG-PRES-DEC
 'I can't believe that he died. (lit. As they say that he died, it can't be believed.)'
- c. *ku-ka cwuk-tani*
 he-NOM die-SFP
 'That he dies/died! (I can't believe it)' (w/ tense-ambiguity)

- *-ni* 'because' > *-nikka* Emphatic causal connective > *-tanikka* COMP-based causal connective > *-tanikka* SFP

- (27) a. *pi-ka o-nikka chwup-ta* (From the late 19th century to present)
 rain-NOM come-CAUS be.cold-DEC
 'It is cold because it's raining.'
- b. *pi-ka o-keyss-tanikka wusan kac-ko ka-la*
 rain-NOM come-FUT-CONN umbrella take-and go-IMP
 'As they say it would rain, take an umbrella with you.'
- c. *yeksi caki-pakkey eps-tanikka*
 indeed self(you)-except not.exist-SFP
 'Indeed you are the only one that cares for me. (I can always count on you!)
- d. *salam-i kule-myen mos ssu-n-tanikka*
 person-NOM do.so-if cannot use-PRES-SFP
 'A (respectable) person should not do such things! (Everybody knows that!)' (lit. (People) cannot use the person if he/she does something like that.)

3.3 Insubordination Extended: DMA (thetical)

- Korean has a number of discourse markers of agreement (DMAs).
- Most of them emerged from ellipsis, and many of them from insubordination (Rhee 2015).

(28)

Source Category	Form	Source Meaning
Conditional	<i>kulem</i>	'if so'
	<i>amwulyem</i>	'if it is whatsoever'
Quotative	<i>kulehkomalko</i>	'that it is so and not so'
	<i>kulehtamata</i>	'that it is so; it is not so'
Causal	<i>kulenikka</i>	'because it is so'
	<i>kulekey</i>	'at it being so'
	<i>kulssey</i>	'at it being so'

(29) a. Textual function of *kulem* 'if so / then'

A: [I'm not here to ask for money.]

B: *kulay? coh-a. kulem mwusun yayki-lul ha-keyss-ta-nun ke-y-a?*
 be.so be.good-END then what.kind talk-ACC say-FUT-DEC-ADN NOMZ-be-END
 'Is that so? Good. Then, what are you going to talk to me about?' (PDK, KORTERM #3617)

b. DMA function of *kulem* 'Right!'

A: *kyay-ka cakkwu kule-nikka hwa-ka na-nun ke-y-a*
 that.guy-NOM repeatedly do.so-because anger-NOM exit-ADN NOMZ-be-END
 'Since that guy is doing that again and again I became angry.'

B: *kulem*
 'Right!' (< Lit. 'If (it is) so')

A: *kulayse....*
 so...

(30) *kuleha-myen >> kulemyen >> kulem*
 be.so-if then right
 'if (it is) so'

(31) a. Textual function of *kulenikka* 'because it is so / therefore'

Mr.Kim-un maynnal cikak-i-ya kulenikka sungcin-to mos ha-ci
 Mr.Kim-TOP everyday tardy-be-END therefore promotion-also cannot do-END
 'Mr. Kim is always tardy. So, he doesn't get a promotion.'

b. DMA function of *kulenikka* 'Right!'

A: *Mr.Kim-un maynnal cikak-i-ya*
 Mr.Kim-TOP everyday tardy-be-END
 'Mr. Kim is always tardy.'

B: *kulenikka*
 'Right!'

A: *kulenikka acik sungcin-to mos ha-ci*
 {because.it.is.so, right} yet promotion-ADD cannot do-SFP
 'Right, That's why} he still can't get a promotion.'

(32) *kuleha-ni >> kuleha-nikka >> kulenikka >> ku(le)nikka*
 be.so-CAUS/CONT be.so-because so/therefore right
 'while (it is) so' 'because (it is) so'

4. Issues in Grammaticalization Theory

4.1 Motivations & Mechanisms

- strategic use of linguistic forms and structures
- 4 major mechanisms (Heine & Kuteva 2002): Desemanticization, Extension, Decategorialization, Erosion

(33) a. Desemanticization: Present instances involve grammatical markers (not lexical items) from the beginning, thus, desemanticization, though present, is not prominent. The semantics of the verb of locution *ha-* 'say' is completely bleached in development of COMP.

b. Extension: Use context is generalized to a great extent with functional extension.

c. Decategorialization: Present instances do not involve major categories at the outset, but they exhibit loss of categorial features of connectives.

d. Erosion: The extent of erosion varies. The locution verb *ha-* 'say' disappeared.

4.2 Insubordination

- Terminology: ‘inconsequential clauses’ (Haiman 1988), ‘syntactic upgrading’ (Heine et al. 1991, Rhee 2012), ‘suspended clause’ (Ohori 1995), ‘insubordination’ (Evans 2007), ‘main-clause ellipsis’ (Rhee 2002), ‘insubordinated clauses’ (Heine et al. 2011, Kaltenböck et al. 2011), ‘disruption’ (Davis n.d.)
- Certain SFPs and DMAs in Korean developed from insubordination.
- The strong pragmatic effect of ellipsis seems to motivate other strategic uses of non-final forms as sentential endings (Horie 2011, 2012; Kim & Horie 2006, 2008, nominalizers and modifiers into sentential endings).
- Insubordination is very common in grammaticalization in Korean. (Sohn 1995, Park & Sohn 2002, Jung 2001, Rhee 2002, 2012).
- Grammatical change influenced by ellipsis is attested across languages (cf. Haiman, 1988 ‘inconsequential clauses’ in Hua; Davis, n.d. ‘disruption’ in Hua and Alabama; Ohori, 1995, Iguchi 1998, Higashiizumi 2006, ‘suspended clause’ in Japanese; Rhee, 2002, Sohn, 2003 ‘main clause ellipsis’ in Korean; Evans, 2007, 2009 ‘insubordination’ across languages; Heine et al. 2011, Kaltenböck et al. 2011, ‘thetical constructions,’ and ‘insubordinated clause’ for German).
- The connective function of the connectives still survives, rendering the utterance ambiguous between the two opposing functions of connecting clauses and ending sentences.

4.3 Ellipsis & Pragmatic Inference

- At the onset of the development of grammatical markers through insubordination, i.e., when such a grammaticalization process has not sufficiently proceeded, the utterance seems to be an elliptical structure similar to utterances in English that end with such connectives as *and*, *or*, *but*, *though*, etc. (Mulder & Thompson 2008, Mulder et al. 2009, Barth-Weingarten & Couper-Kuhlen 2002, Couper-Kuhlen & Thompson 2000, Mulder & Thompson 2006)
- DMAs (for back-channeling) historically originated from discourse segments that end with connectives, thus suggesting that they are also of elliptical structures.
- What has been ellipsed is strategically withheld by the speaker to show that it is so obvious that it does not need to be explicitly expressed.
- The high degree of its being obvious warrants its ellipsis and at the same time serves as an endorsement of the truthfulness or firmness of what the previous speaker has just said (Rhee, 2015: 20).

(34) Strategic ellipsis and interlocutors

A. The speaker

Strategy: Elide the main clause

Effect: (a) Economy; (b) No commitment to the (elided) detail; (c) Enrichment by the addressee

B. The addressee

Problem: (a) The speaker ended his/her utterance with a connective, so I can wait for the main clause.

(b) The intonation contour suggests utterance closure.

(c) Now the discourse reached the TRP.

Problem solving strategy: Inferences

(35) = (10b) Inferences

A: [Why does he look so down?]

B: *ayin-i ttena-ss-**ketun***

sweetheart-NOM leave-PST-SFP

‘Because his sweetheart left him.’

[His sweetheart left him]-**ketun** ‘if’

- (a) I heard: [His sweetheart left him]-KETUN ('if')
- (b) The speaker did not complete the sentence.
- (c) If the speaker had completed the sentence, it must have been [If his sweetheart left him, how can he not be down?]
- (d) It is impossible for him not to be sad in such a situation.
- (e) The speaker seems to have not completed the sentence because what remained unsaid is very straightforward.
- (f) Then the embedded proposition [His sweetheart left him] is a strong cause of his sadness.
- (g) The apparent conditional marker -KETUN is better interpreted as 'because' rather than 'if.'
- (h) [If his sweetheart left him] in fact means [Because his sweetheart left him].

(36) = (27d) Inferences

salam-i kule-myen mos ssu-n-tanikka
 person-NOM do.so-if cannot use-PRES-CONN

'A (respectable) person should not do such things!'

[A respectable person should not do such things]-TANIKKA

- (a) I heard [A respectable person should not do such things]-TANIKKA ('because' 'while' 'despite')
- (b) X did not finish the sentence. But the prosody indicated completion of utterance.
- (c) If X had completed the sentence it would have been:
 [A respectable person should not do such things]-TANIKKA('despite'), [you are doing or did such things.]
- (d) I did such things.
- (e) X thinks that my doing such things is against what X (or someone else) said.
- (f) X is protesting against what I did.
- (g) X is reiterating what X said before (or something that is well-known).
- (h) X is emphatically restating what X said before (or something that is well-known).
- (i) -TANIKKA may not simply mean 'because' 'while' 'even though'; its meaning is more felicitous when interpreted as an emphatic assertion marker.
- (j) Then, what I heard may be:
 [A respectable person should not do such things]-TANIKKA (**emphatic assertion**)

- Insubordination/Ellipsis in other languages: the English conditional marker *if* in hypothetical conditional sentences (cf. López-Couso & Méndez-Naya 2012, Brinton 2014), and the request marking function from idiom fragments involving *-te* of a connective function in Japanese benefactive constructions (Ohori 1995)

- (37) a. ***If only*** *he were here, I would be very happy.*
- b. ***If only*** *he were here!*
- c. *He acts **as if** he didn't know that.*
- d. ***As if*** *you didn't know that.*
- e. ***As if!***

- (38) a. *Tyotto kott iki-te-kudasai/kure/tyoodai*
 a.little(?) here come-TE-give[BEN]
 'Will you please do the favor of coming here now?'
- b. *Tyotoo kott iki-te*
 a.little(?) here come-TE
 'Come here now.' (Adapted from Ohori 1995: 205)

- Korean connectives, particularly *-a*, *-key*, *-ci*, and *-ko* (similar to the Japanese *-te*) were extensively involved in the grammaticalization of SFPs (Kim 1997, 1998, 2000; Rhee 2002).
- Other cases of SFP development: nominalized clauses ending with a nominalizer (standalone nominalization as bullet-point sentences) or with an accusative marker (regret sentences) are among those that underwent similar processes (Rhee 2008, 2011b)
- Korean exhibits more widespread ellipsis-based grammaticalization than Japanese, in which a suspended clause is marked by a (pseudo-)logical connective of reason or concession, such as *kara*, *kedo*, and *noni* (Ohori 1995: 207-213; see also Haugh 2008).

4.4 Intersubjectification & Interpersonality

- Intersubjectification is prominent in the development of SFPs from connectives. (e.g., REASSERTION and EMPHASIS associated with SFPs *-{ta}nikka*).
- Since they originated from a discourse situation where the ellipsis is strategically used by the speaker, SFPs are necessarily highly interpersonal and intersubjective.
- They are frequently used in emotive interactions, often with an intonation typical of sentences uttered by irritated speakers.

- (39) A: *com coyonghi ha-lanikka*
 a.little quietly do-SFP
 ‘Please keep quiet!’ (Can’t you be quiet?)
 B: *al-ass-tanikka*
 know-PST-SFP
 ‘Alright, alright!’ (I say I will, OK?)

- SFPs indicate the speaker's acknowledgment of, and response to, the addressee's attitude/stance.
- The attitudes in these situations are different from those typically encoded by the modality markers for the speaker's epistemic stance, since they are attitudes toward the addressee (e.g., irritation), rather than toward the proposition.

4.5 Cooptation and Theticals

- ‘thetical grammar.’ (Heine et al. 2010, 2011, Kaltenböck et al. 2011)
- Theticals (= thetical constructions) originate from a construction type [main clause - subordinate clause] and enter the plane of thetical grammar, where the matrix clause is implied but not formally expressed.
- A linguistic unit that belongs to sentence grammar is ‘coopted’ to become a thetical element.
- The functions of these theticals are determined by various variables of thetical grammar, such as the utterance, source of information, attitudes of the speaker, speaker-hearer interaction, situation of discourse, and world knowledge (Heine et al. 2011: 7).
- Some of the innovative SFPs have relative autonomy.
- Since their use context is highly interactive and emotive, the utterances tend to be short. (The Korean idiosyncrasy of argument-omissibility may also be a contributing factor.)

- (40) a. *kulehtanikka!* ‘That’s right!’ b. *anilanikka!* ‘That’s not so!’
 c. *silhtanikka!* ‘I don’t want it!’ d. *alasstanikka!* ‘All right, all right!’
 e. *moluntanikka!* ‘I don’t know!’ f. *kwaynchanhtanikka!* ‘I’m OK, all right?’
 g. *wuskintanikka!* ‘It’s ridiculous!’ h. *hwangtanghatanikka!* ‘It’s embarrassing!’
 i. *ke polanikka!* ‘See, I told you!’ j. *celehtanikka!* ‘Look what’s going on!’
 k. *twaysstanikka!* ‘That’s OK!’

(Note that all these expressions carry the overtone of the speaker’s irritation (and/or contempt, sarcasm, disrespect, disappointment, unwarranted disparaging attitude, etc. Most of them look like DMs.)

- Co-optation with respect to *-nikka*: (Heine p.c., as cited in Rhee 2012: 298)
 - (i) the development of SFP-constructions took place in a remarkably short period of time;
 - (ii) the type of functional shift as illustrated in the pragmatic inferences is the one recurrently found when information units are moved from sentence grammar to thetical grammar;
 - (iii) these examples concern the situation of discourse rather than the logical relations, the typical relations marked by the sentential constituents in sentence grammar

4.6 From Structural Function to Meaning

- *-ko* is a connective ‘and’ but is often used utterance-finally (with true utterance-terminating prosody).
- *-ko*-final utterances carry friendly, mitigated overtone.
- ‘connective’ > ‘something may follow’ > ‘this is not all’ > ‘take this statement as non-definitive and non-final’ (cf. ‘category iconicity’ Kuteva 1994).

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>(41) a. (To a boy chasing a rabbit on a campus lawn)
 <i>nolaykhi-cimal-ko.</i>
 scare-PROH-and
 ‘Don’t scare the rabbit.’</p> | <p>b. (A man to his girl-friend at parting/break-up)
 <i>pap cal chayngki-e mek-ko.</i>
 meal well gather.up-NF eat-and
 ‘Don’t skip meals.’</p> |
| <p>c. (A man to his friend’s child)
 <i>apeci-nun phyenanha-si-ko?</i>
 father-TOP be.peaceful-HON-and
 ‘Is your father doing well?’</p> | <p>d. (A man to a departing friend)
 <i>tochakha-myen yenlakha-ko.</i>
 arrive-if communicate-and
 ‘Call me when you arrive.’</p> |

- Similar states of affairs are observed with other grammatical markers that shifted functions.

- | |
|--|
| <p>(42) a. <i>-key</i> mode-adverbializer indirectness, non-assertiveness,
 b. <i>-a/e</i> consolidating NF friendliness, intimacy, suggestiveness
 c. <i>-tanun</i> adnominalizer friendliness, intimacy, solidarity
 d. <i>-ci</i> nominalizer determinativeness, conviction
 e. <i>-lkel</i> nominalizer-accusative regret, contrition, uncertainty</p> |
|--|

5. Conclusion

- Korean has a large number of SFPs developed from connectives through ellipsis.
- Ellipsis is strategically used by the speaker in discourse.
- The addressee actively seeks the elided information in the missing main clause. Repeated inference patterns may be conventionalized.
- The inferred meanings are often intersubjective and they often become semanticized on the utterance-final materials (mostly connectives), thus creating ‘semantically elaborate’ grammatical markers (Kuteva 2009, Kuteva & Comrie 2005).
- The extent of grammaticalization may be fundamentally constrained by the limit of pragmatics.
- The pragmatic inferences shape the routes of semantic changes in grammaticalization (cf. Heine et al. 1991).
- Some forms created through insubordination have become theticals, i.e., highly unitized expressions serving discourse marker functions.
- Some meanings of grammatical markers may come from ‘purely’ structural characteristics.

Abbreviations: ACC: accusative; ADD: additive; ADN: adnominal; BEN: benefactive; CAUS: causal; COMP: complementizer; CONN: connective; DAT: dative; DEC: declarative; END: sentential-ending; FUT: future; HON: honorific; IMP: imperative; NEG: negative; NF: non-finite; NOM: nominative; NOMZ: nominalizer; PASS: passive; POL: polite; PRES: present; PROH: prohibitive; PST: past; PURP: purposive; SFP: sentence-final particle; TOP: topic

References:

- Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar, & Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen. 2002. On the development of final though: A case of grammaticalization? In: Ilse Wischer & Gabriele Diewald (Eds.), *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*, 345-361. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Brinton, Laurel J. 2014. The extremes of insubordination: Exclamatory *as if!* *Journal of English Linguistics* 42.2: 93-113.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, & Thompson, Sandra A. 2000. Concessive Patterns in Conversation. In Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen & Bernd Kortmann (Eds.), *Cause, Condition, Concession, and Contrast: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives*, 381-410. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Davis, Philip, W. n.d. The semantics of syntactic complexity. <<http://www.owl.net.rice.edu/~pwd/sosc.html>>.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In: Nikolaeva, Irina (Ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*, 366-431. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, Nicholas, 2009. Insubordination and the grammaticalisation of interactive presuppositions. Paper presented at Methodologies in Determining Morphosyntactic Change Conference, Museum of Ethnography, Osaka, March 2009.
- Haiman, John, 1988. Inconsequential clauses in Hua and the typology of clauses. In: John Haiman & Sandra Thompson (Eds.), *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*, 49-71. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haugh, Michael. 2008. Utterance-final conjunctive particles and implicature in Japanese conversation. *Pragmatics* 18.3: 425-451.
- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, & Frederike Hünemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Heine, Bernd, Gunther Kaltenböck, & Tania Kuteva. 2010. On thetical grammar. Typescript.
- Heine, Bernd, Gunther Kaltenböck, & Tania Kuteva. 2011. Accounting for insubordinated clauses. Typescript.
- Heine, Bernd, & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Higashiizumi, Yuko. 2006. *From a Subordinate Clause to an Independent Clause*. Hituzi Syobo Publishing, Tokyo.
- Horie, Kaoru. 2011. Versatility of nominalizations: Where Japanese and Korean contrast. In: Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Härsta & Janick Wrona (Eds.), *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*, 473-495. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Horie, Kaoru. 2012. Percept and concept in Korean and Japanese grammatical constructions: A semiotic and typological perspective. Paper presented at the First Int'l Conference on Homo Sensus: Perception, Emotion, Semiosis, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Seoul, June 8-9, 2012.
- Iguchi, (Higashiizumi) Yuko. 1998. Functional variety in the Japanese conjunctive particle *kara* 'because'. In: Toshio Ohori (Ed.), *Studies in Japanese Grammaticalization: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives*, 99-128. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.
- Jung, Yonhee. 2001. Grammaticalization of Korean Clause Connectives. Ph.D. dissertation. Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Korea.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther, Bernd Heine, & Tania Kuteva 2011. On thetical grammar. *Studies in Language* 35.4: 852-897.
- Kim, Joungmin, & Kaoru Horie. 2006. Sentence final nominalization in Korean: A contrastive study with Japanese. *Inquiries into Korean Linguistics II*, 27-34. Seoul: Thaeaksa.
- Kim, Joungmin, & Kaoru Horie. 2008. The emerging sentence-final 'Attributive' quotative construction in Korean web-based communication: A contrastive pragmatic study with Japanese. Paper presented at New Reflections on Grammaticalization 4, Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium, July 15-19, 2008
- Kim, Tae Yeop. 1997. Kwuke congkyelemiuy hyengthayloncek yuhyeng [On morphological typology of Korean sentence-final particles]. *Emwunhak* 60, 61-82.
- Kim, Tae Yeop. 1998. Kwuke picongkyelemiuy congkyelemihwaey tayhaye [The functional shift of functional shift of endings from nonfinal to final]. *Enehak* 22, 171-189.
- Kim, Tae Yeop. 2000. Kwuke congkyelemihwaey mwunpephwa yangsang [On grammaticalization of Korean sentence-final particles]. *Emwunyenkwu* 33, 47-68.
- Koo, Hyun Jung. 1989a. Cokenuy wenhyengthaywa *-ketun*. [On the proto-form of conditionals and *-ketun*]. In: *Festschrift for Dr. Ceyhyo Lee Yong-Ju*, 117-131 Seoul: Hansaem Publishing.
- Koo, Hyun Jung. 1989b. Speech act of conditional sentences. *Kwukehak* 19: 453-472.
- Koo, Hyun Jung. 1989c. Conditionals and Topic. Ph.D. dissertation, Konkuk University, Korea.
- Koo, Hyun Jung, & Seongha Rhee. 2001. Grammaticalization of sentential end marker from a conditional marker. *Discourse and Cognition* 8.1: 1-19.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1975[1965]. the evolution of grammatical categories. In: Eugenio Coseriu (Ed.), *Esquisses Linguistiques II*, 38-54. Munich: Fink.

- Kuteva, Tania. 1994. Auxiliation and iconicity. *Journal of Pragmatics* 22: 71-81.
- Kuteva, Tania. 2009. Grammatical categories and linguistic theory: Elaborateness in grammar. In: Peter K. Austin, Oliver Bond, Monik Charette, David Nathan, & Peter Sells (Eds.), *Proceedings of Conference on Language Documentation and Linguistic Theory 2*, 13-28. London: SOAS. www.hrelp.org/eprints/ldlt2_03.pdf
- Kuteva, Tania, & Bernard Comrie. 2005. The typology of relative clause formation in African languages. In: F. K. Erhard Voeltz (Ed.), *Studies in African Linguistic Typology*, 209-228. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lee, Hai-Young. 1996. Relationship between the Meaning of Verbal Endings and *Boodam-jooligi* in Modern Korean. Ph.D. dissertation, Ehwa Womans University, Korea.
- Lee, Hee-Seung. 1956. Concaysa 'issta'ey tayhaye: ku hyengthayyosolouy palceney tayhan kochal [On the verb of existence 'issta': On its development into a morpheme]. *Seoul National University Journal* 3: 17-47.
- Lee, Heeja, & Jong Hee Lee. 2010. *Emi Cosa Sacen* [A dictionary of endings and particles]. Seoul: Hankook Publisher.
- López-Couso, María José, & Belén Méndez-Naya. 2012. On the use of *as if*, *as though*, and *like* in Present-Day English complementation structures. *Journal of English Linguistics* 40.2: 172-195.
- Mulder, Jean, & Sandra A. Thompson. 2006. The grammaticization of *but* as a final particle in English conversation. In: Keith Allan (Ed.) *Selected Papers from the 2005 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*, 1-18.
- Mulder, Jean, & Sandra A. Thompson. 2008. The grammaticization of *but* as a final particle in English conversation. In: Ritva Laury (Ed.), *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining: The Multifunctionality of Conjunctions*, 179-204. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mulder, Jean, Sandra A. Thompson, & Cara Penry Williams. 2009. Final *but* in Australian English conversation. In: Pam Peters, Peter Collins, & Adam Smith (Eds.), *Comparative Studies in Australian and New Zealand English: Grammar and Beyond*, 337-358. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ohori, Toshio, 1995. Remarks on suspended clauses: a contribution to Japanese phraseology. In: Masayoshi Shibatani & Sandra A. Thompson (Eds.), *Essays in Semantics and Pragmatics in Honor of Charles J. Fillmore*, 201-218. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Park, Mee-Jeong, & Sung-Ock S. Sohn. 2002. Discourse, grammaticalization and intonation: An analysis of *ketun* in Korean. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 10: 306-319.
- Ramstedt, Gustaf John. 1939. *A Korean Grammar*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2002. From silence to grammar: Grammaticalization of ellipsis in Korean. Paper presented at the New Reflections on Grammaticalization II, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands, April 3-6, 2002.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2008. Subjectification of reported speech in grammaticalization and lexicalization. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* 12: 590-603.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2011a. Grammaticalization in Korean. In Bernd Heine & Heiko Narrog (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. pp. 764-774. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Rhee, Seongha. 2011b. Nominalization and stance marking in Korean. In: Yap, Foong Ha, Grunow-Harsta, Karen, Wrona, Janick (Eds.), *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives, Korean, Japanese, and Austronesian Languages*, 391-422. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2012. Context-induced reinterpretation and (inter)subjectification: The case of grammaticalization of sentence-final particles. *Language Sciences* 34.3: 284-300.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2015. On the emergence of Korean markers of agreement. *Journal of Pragmatics* 83: 10-26.
- Sohn, Ho-min. 2001[1999]. *The Korean Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sohn, Sung-Ock S. 1995. Sohn, Sung-Ock S. 1995. On the development of sentence-final particles in Korean. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 5: 219-234.
- Sohn, Sung-Ock S. 2003. On the emergence of intersubjectivity: an analysis of the sentence-final *nikka* in Korean. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 12, 52-63.
- Song, Jae Jung. 2005. *The Korean Language: Structure, Use and Context*. New York: Routledge.
- Yoo, Chang Don. 1980. *Ehwisa Yenkwu*. [A Study on Historio-lexicology]. Seoul: Iwoo Publishing.

Special thanks go to Professors Tania Kuteva and Bernd Heine for their constant inspiration and kind support. Thanks also go to the Korea Research Foundation for financial support.