Heinrich Heine Universität Düsseldorf
June 22, 2016

Seongha Rhee
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
srhee@hufs.ac.kr

Rhetorical and Discursive Strategies in Grammaticalization in Korean

1. Introduction

- General agreement: Discourse is where grammaticalization is triggered, or discourse and grammar are in mutual feeding relationship in their formation (Givón 1979a&b, Lichtenberk 1991, Heine et al. 1991, inter alia).
- Discourse is the locus of active meaning negotiation filled with various kinds of discourse strategies to fulfill intended persuasion.
- Rhetorical strategies are expected to surface among the most researched subjects of grammaticalization.
- Certain grammatical markers are reported to have discourse-pragmatic origins, e.g. Givón (1979a) for clause subordinators, Hopper (1982) and Herring (1988) for perfective aspect markers, etc.
- Herring (1991): Tamil rhetorical questions grammaticalized into markers of clausal subordination.
- Korean: In many instances of grammaticalization rhetorical and discursive strategies played crucial roles.
- This presentation introduces some of such cases: forged quotation, false promises, disguised self-derogation, pseudo-questions, pseudo-reportative/quotative, feigned audience-blindness & feigned monologue.

2. Preliminaries

- The term 'rhetoric/rhetorical' has been used in various senses in different disciplines.
- 'rhetoric': an art of persuasion, "the study of producing discourses and interpreting how, when, and why discourses are persuasive" (Keith & Lundberg 2008: 4)
- Rhee (2008b): a broad pragmatic perspective, i.e. a means of persuasion, producing a social discourse with affective meaning, or a perlocutionary effect on the addressee (Leech 1983, Leith and Myerson 1989, cf. Wales 2001: 344-346 for discussion of the notion).
- Motivations for adopting rhetorical strategies: to increase illocutionary force of the statement by making it more dramatic and vivid
- Discursive strategies include marking statements with stance, politeness, audience-blindness, etc.

3. Case studies

3.1 Forged Quotation, False Promises & Disguised Self-Derogation

3.1.1 Forged Quotation: Borrowed Mouth

(1) COMPs (for embedding quoted/reported speech)

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

(2) Functional extension of COMP-based grammatical forms (mostly into 'elaborate' markers, Kuteva & Comrie 2005, Kuteva 2009)

   a. DEC-COMP *-tako* > Reason marker (REAS)

     *ku-nun   pappu-**tako**   setwulu-n-ta*

     he-TOP   be.busy-REAS   hurry-PRES-DEC

     'He hurries because he is busy.' (< lit. He, saying, "(I) am busy," hurries.)

b. DEC-COMP -*lako* > Concessive Topic marker (CT)

    uysa-__lako__   *pyeng-ul*   *ta*   *kochi-nun*   *ke-y*   *ani-ta*

    doctor-CT   illness-ACC   all   cure-ADN   NOMZ-NOM   be.not-DEC

    'Even doctors cannot cure all illnesses.' (< lit. Saying, "(he) is a doctor," (he) cannot cure all illnesses.')

c. INT-COMP -*nyako* > Pejorative Topic marker (PT)

    thomatho-__nyako__   *toykey*   *cak-ney*

    tomato-PT   very   be.small-EXCL

    'What a small tomato!' (< lit. Saying, "(Is it/Are you) a tomato?", (it is/you are very small.')

d. IMP-COMP -*lako* > Purposive marker (PURP)

    somwun-na-__lako__   *way*   *kul-ay*

    rumor-exit-PURP   why   do.so-END

    'Are you trying to stir up a rumor?' (< lit. Are you doing so, saying, "Let there be a rumor!"?)

e. HORT-COMP -*cako* > Intentional/Purposive marker (INTEN)

    nay-ka   *ne*   *sonhay-ip-hi-__cako__*   *ile-nun*   *ke-ø*   *ani-ya*

    I-NOM   you loss-suffer-CAUS-INTEN do.this-ADN   NOMZ-NOM   be.not-END

    'I'm not doing this in order to make you suffer loss.' (< lit. I'm not doing this, saying, "Let's make <u>you</u> suffer loss!")

(3) COMP-based Lexicalization: Patterns illustrated (Rhee 2009)

   a. *ku-nun*   **__sal-apo-keyss-tako__**   *pamnac-ulo*   *ilha-n-ta.*

    he-TOP   **live-TRL-FUT-COMP (=desperately)** night.day-INST   work-PRES-DEC

    'He works desperately day and night (to make a living).'

    < (Lit.) 'He works day and night, saying, "(I) will try to live."'

   b. *ku-nun*   **__cwuke-lako__**   *aph-ulhyanghay talli-ess-ta.*

    he-TOP   **die-COMP (=desperately)**   front-towards   run-PST-DEC

    'He ran forward with all his might.'

    < (Lit.) 'He ran forward, saying, "Die!"'

   c. *ku-nun*   **__a-l-ke-y-mwue-nyako__**   *caleka-ss-ta.*

    he-TOP   **know-PRES-NOMZ-NOM-what-COMP (=nonchalantly)**   go.to.bed-PST-DEC

    'He went to sleep nonchalantly.'

    < (Lit.) 'He went to sleep, saying, "What is it that (I) should know?"'

   d. *kulehkey*   **__na-phyenha-cako__**   *kamaniss-cima-la.*

    that.way   **I-be.comfortable-COMP (=selfishly)** remain.quiet-PROH-IMP

    'Don't selfishly remain quiet like that.'

    < (Lit.) 'Don't remain quiet like that, saying "Let me be comfortable."'

(4) DEC-COMP-based lexicalization (examples) (Note: Forms end with -*tako*)

   a. *kulehtako*   'still; nonetheless'   < 'saying, "It is so."'

   b. *cwuknuntako*   'self-pitifully'   < 'saying, "I am dying."'

   c. s*alkeysstako*   'desperately'   < 'saying, "I will live."'

   d. *nacalnasstako*   'haughtily'   < 'saying, "I am great."'

   e. *michyesstako*   'nonsensically'   < 'saying, "I am insane."'

   f. *calhaypokeysstako*   'earnestly'   < 'saying, "I will try to do it well."'

   g. *salapokeysstako*   'effortfully'   < 'saying, "I will try to live."'

   h. *mossalkeysstako*   'in frustration'   < 'saying, "I can't live."'

   i. *cwukkeysstako*   'desperately'   < 'saying, "I will die."'

(5) INT-COMP-based lexicalization (examples) (Note: Forms end with *-nyako*)
    a. *weynttekinyako*   'gladly'   < 'saying, "What kind of cake is this?"'
    b. *alkeymwenyako*   'nonchalantly'   < 'saying, "What should I know?"'
    c. *mwusuncisinyako*   'protestingly'   < 'saying, "What act is it?"'
    d. *mwusunsolinyako*   'protestingly'   < 'saying, "What sound is it?"'
    e. *kukeyetinyako*   'appreciatively'   < 'saying, "Where is it?"'

(6) IMP-COMP-based lexicalization (examples) (Note: Forms end with *-lako*)
    a. *taliyanalsallilako*   'desperately'   < 'saying, "Leg! Save me!"'
    b. *sallyetallako*   'begging mercy'   < 'saying, "Please save me!"'
    c. *ttwulhecyelako*   'attentively'   < 'saying, "Let it be bored a hole!"'
    d. *pwatallako*   'begging mercy'   < 'saying, "Please be considerate!"'
    e. *cwukelako*   'desperately'   < 'saying, "Die!"'
    f. *nalsallilako*   'desperately'   < 'saying, "Save me!"'
    g. *nalcapamekulako*   'indifferently'   < 'saying, "Kill and eat me!"'
    h. *payccaylako*   'unyieldingly'   < 'saying, "Cut my belly!"'

(7) HORT-COMP-based lexicalization (examples) (Note: Forms end with *-cako*)
    a. *nacohcako*   'selfishly'   < 'saying, "Let's make it good for me!"'
    b. *cwukcako*   'enthusiastically'   < 'saying, "Let's die!"'
    c. *cwukcasalcako*   'obsessively'   < 'saying, "Let's die, let's live (together)!"'
    d. *necwukkonacwukcako*   'irrationally'   < 'saying, "Let's make you die and me die!"'
    e. *eccecako*   'why'   < 'saying, "Let's (do it) somehow!"'
    f. *naphyenhacako*   'selfishly'   < 'saying, "Let's make me comfortable!"

3.1.2 False Promises: Feigned Imperative

- The speech act of command is often avoidable across languages.
- Strong obligation markers are crosslinguistically not very common. (Narrog 2010)
- The Korean language which shows fastidious concern in interpersonal relationship, fully equipped with multi-layered honorification- and politeness-marking grammatical devices, presents itself as one of the languages that avoid to the extreme level the impositive speech act, i.e. imperative (Koo 2004a,b).
- The impositive nature of imperative speech act is so great that even the honorification-marking does not rescue the speech act from the negative force. e.g. [+Hon] *Haseyo!* (< *ha-**si**-e-yo*) 'Do it' can be face-threatening.
- Alternative speech acts are well developed, e.g. using hortative 'let's' marked with honorification, using pseudo-monologue question marked with politeness thus signaling its non-monologic intention, etc.
- Korean seems to have continually developed alternative strategies in history, and these idiosyncrasies in Korean seem to be responsible for the development of imperative with the disguise of promissive in PDK.

(8) Imperative SFPs in Korean

Specializing Forms	*-sipsio*	Formal,	Polite, H-Honorific	
	-ela	Formal,	Polite	
	-(u)la	Formal,	Audience-Blind	
	-(u)sila	Formal,	H-Honorific,	Audience-Blind
Declarative-Derived Forms	*-o*	Formal,	M-Honorific,	Archaic/poetic
	-seyyo	Informal,	H-Honorific,	Polite
	-eyo	Informal,	Polite	
	-sye	Informal,	L-Honorific	
	-e	Informal		
Connective-Derived Forms	*-key*	Informal	(< *-key*:	mode-marker)
	-keyna	Informal	(< *-key*:	mode-marker)
	-ci	Informal	(< *-ci*:	non-finite; nominalizer)
	-lyem	Informal	(< ?*-lye*:	intentional)
	-lyemwuna	Informal	(< ?*-lye*:	intentional)

(9) Promissive SFPs in Korean (Sohn 2001)
  a. intimate level: *-lkey*
  b. polite level: *-lkeyyo* ☜
  c. plain level: *-ma*
  d. familiar level: *-(u)msey*

- Polite promissive *-lkeyyo* is being innovated as polite imperative (often harshly denounced by prescriptivists).
- Modulated with honorification: *-lkeyyo* [-Hon] and *-silkeyyo* [+Hon] for request and command

(10) Promissive
  a. (to a friend in need of help)
  *(nay-ka) tow-acwu-**lkey***
  (I-NOM) help-BEN-PROM
  'I promise I will help you.'

  b. (to parents after flunking a test)
  *te yelsimhi kongpwuha-**lkey-yo***
  more earnestly study-PROM-POL
  'I promise I will study harder.'

(11) Imperative (Polite Request)
  a. (a nurse to a young patient at a dental clinic)
  *ca ip com khukey pelli-**lkey-yo***
  now mouth a.little wide open-IMP-POL
  'Now, please open your mouth wide.'

  b. (a nurse to an adult patient)
  *yeki chimtay-ey nwuw-**si-lkey-yo***
  here bed-at lie.down-HON-IMP-POL
  'Please lie on your back on the bed over here.'

(12) Imperative (Polite Command)
  a. (the head-nurse to a trainee)
  *cengli-nun nacwung-ey ha-**lkey-yo***
  cleanup-TOP later.time-at do-IMP-POL
  'Clean up later, please.' (Do something else first.)

  b. (a head-beautician to her assistant)
  *3-pen sonnim mence tow-atuli-**si-lkey-yo***
  3-number client first serve-BEN-HON-IMP-POL
  'Please, serve the client at #3 first.'

3.1.3 Disguised Self-Derogation: the *makilay* DMs

- Korean has one peculiar type of mitigating discourse markers (DMs) that came into existence around the turn of the 21st century and is widely used among the young generation, especially young girls: *makilay* and its variants *makyolay, makcelay, makilayyo, makcelayyo,* etc. (the *makilay*-DMs, Rhee 2013).
- They constitute a unique type of DMs displaying meta-discursive strategies and discourse pragmatics.
- Through their use, the discourse stances of the interlocutors are constantly evaluated and negotiated, and the initially attendant discourse function becomes fully grammaticalized.
- DM developments are regarded as instances of grammaticalization (Diewald 2011, Wischer 2000, Traugott 1995; contra Waltereit 2006; see, Norde 2009, Frank-Job 2006 for 'pragmaticalization'; Heine 2013, Heine et al. 2013 for 'cooptation' of theticals as an alternative)

(13) Morphemic analysis of *makilay*
  makwu ilehkey ha-e   >>   makilay
  recklessly like.this say-SFP   DM
  '(He/She) recklessly says something like this.'

(14) a. *na-n cengmal chakha-ko ttokttokha-ko ippu-e makilay*
   I-TOP really be.nice-and be.smart-and be.pretty-SFP DM
   'I am really nice, smart and pretty, *makilay*.' (DM: (She) says this recklessly.)

   b. *oppa na-ø onul cemsim-ø sa-cw-e makilay*
   big.brother I-(DAT) today lunch-(ACC) buy-BEN-SFP DM
   'Big brother (=Boyfriend), buy me lunch today, *makilay*.' (DM: (She) says this recklessly.)

3.2 Pseudo-Questions

3.2.1 Approximative Derivational Morpheme

- Korean has a number of interesting derivational morphemes involving question forms (Rhee 2008a,b).
- They defy any satisfactory formal treatment (thus, avoided, or treated as idioms, cf. Lee & Lee 2010).

(15) Approximatives (adapted from Rhee 2008b)

Function	Form	Source Meaning
Approximative Adjectivizer	V-*lkkamalkkaha(nu)n-* N-*manhalkkaha(nu)n-* Measure.Noun-*toylkkamalkkaha(nu)n-*	that says 'shall I V or not?' that says 'shall I be the size of N?' that says 'shall I become MN or not?'
Approximative Adverbializer	V-*lkkamalkka*	'Shall I V or not?'

(16) a. V-*lkkamalkkaha-* 'with a quality bordering on V-ing'
    *po-i-**l-kka-ma-l-kka-ha-nun***   *sem*
    see-PASS-FUT-Q-not.do-FUT-Q-say-ADN   island
    'a barely visible island' (lit. 'an island that is saying, "Shall I be seen or not?"')

    b. N-*manhalkkaha-* 'with a quality bordering on being N'
    *oleynci-**man-ha-l-kka-ha-n***   *wupak*
    orange-DGR-do-FUT-Q-say-ADN   hail
    'hail about the size of an orange' (lit. 'hail that said, "Shall I be the size of an orange?"')

    c. MN-*toylkkamalkkaha-* 'with a degree close to MN'
    *30   acre-**toy-l-kka-ma-l-kka-ha-nun***   *swuph*
    30   acre-become-FUT-Q-not.do-FUT-Q-say-ADN forest
    'a forest that is about 30 acres' (lit. 'a forest that is saying, "Shall I become 30 acres or not?"')

    d. V-*lkkamalkka* 'hesitating about V-ing'
    kunye-nun   kyelhon-ul   *ha-**l-kka-mal-kka***   *komin cwung-i-ta*
    she-TOP   marriage-ACC   do-FUT-Q-not.do-Q   worry middle-be-DEC
    'She is wondering if she should marry.' (lit. 'As for her, "Shall (I) marry or not marry?," (she) is
    wondering.')

3.2.2 Indefinite Pronouns & Indefinite Adverbs

(17) Indefinite pronouns from pseudo-questions

Form	Source Construct	Source Meaning	Pro-form Meaning
nwukwu	who	who?	someone
nwuka	who-NOM	who is?	someone
nwukwu-(i)-nka	who-(be)-Q	who is it?	someone
nwukwu-(i)-nci	who-(be)-Q	who is it?	someone
mwe	what	what?	something
mwe-(i)-nka	what-(be)-Q	what is it?	something
mwues-ey-(i)-nka	what-at-(be)-Q	at what is it?	at/to/by something
encey	when	when?	some time
encey-(i)-nka	when-(be)-Q	when is it?	once, some time
eti	where	where?	somewhere
eti-nka	where-Q	where is it?	somewhere
eti-ey-nka	where-at-Q	(at) where is it?	(at) somewhere
eti-lo-nka	where-to-Q	to where is it?	to somewhere
ettehkey	how	how?	somehow
ettehkey ettehkey	how how	how how?	somehow (with difficulty)
way-nka	why-Q	why is it?	for some reason
way-nci	why-Q	why is it?	for some reason

(18) a. *wuli cwung-ey* **nwukwu-nka** *pemin-i iss-ta*
we middle-at who-Q (=someone) culprit-NOM exist-DEC
'There is someone who's a culprit among us.' (lit.: There's who-is-it a culprit among us.)

   b. *ku-nun ecey kakey-eyse* **mwe-nka**-*lul sa-ss-ta*
he-TOP yesterday store-at what-Q(=something)-ACC buy-PST-DEC
'He bought something at the store.' (lit.: He bought what-is-it at a store.)

   c. *ku salam* **way-nka** *mam-ey an tul-e*
that person why-Q(=for some reason) mind-at not enter-END
'I don't like the person for some (unknown) reason.' (lit. He does'nt why-is-it enter into (my) heart.)

3.2.3 Discourse Markers

- Korean has many DMs that originated from question constructions.

(19)

Function	Form	Source Construction	Source Meaning
Pause-Filler	X-*la-te-la* *mwe-la-l-kka* *(ku) mwe-la-l-kka* *(ku)* X-*nya*	X-COMP-RETRO-Q [X: *wh*-word] what-COMP-FUT-Q (that) what-COMP-FUT-Q (that) X-Q [X: *wh*-word]	'what/who... did (they) say?' 'what shall I say?' 'what shall I say it is?' 'what/who... is it?'
Mitigator	X-*(i)-la-l-kka* *eti* *mwe*	X-be-COMP-FUT-Q where what	'shall I say it is X?' 'where?' 'what?'
Attention-Attracter	X-*i-nka* X-*i-te-nka* X-*i-l-kka* *way*	X-be-Q X-be-RETRO-Q X-be-FUT-Q why	'Is it X?' 'Was it X?' 'Will it be X?' 'why?'
Emphatic Affirmative Emphatic Negative	*way* *eti*	why where	'why?' 'where?'

(20) a. Pause-filler
     ku salam-un ku hoysa-uy **ku mwe-nya** *isa-la-te-la*
     that person-TOP the firm-GEN that what-Q (=DM) executive-COMP-RETRO-DEC
     'They say he is ... an executive of the firm.' (lit. He is the firm's **what-is-it** executive, I recall.)

   b. Mitigator
     ku salam-un **kiin-*i-la-l-kka*** *com isangha-n tey-ka iss-e*
     that person-TOP eccentric-be-COMP-FUT-Q (=DM) a.little be.strange-ADN place-NOM exist-END
     'The person is strange in some respects, sort of an eccentric, maybe.' (lit. The person is,
     shall-I-say-an-eccentric, (he) has some places that look strange.)

   c. Attention-attractor
     ke **way** *kimpaksa mal-i-ya*
     that why (=DM) Dr.Kim talk-be-END
     'Look, (I am going to talk about) Dr. Kim.' (lit.: That **why** it's about Dr. Kim.)

   d. Emphatic negator
     A: [Isn't he really smart?]
     B: ***eti?*** *cenhye an ttokttokha-y*
     where (=DM) never not be.smart-END
     'Absolutely not. He's not smart at all.' (lit.: **Where?** He's not smart at all.)

3.2.4 RQTPs (Rhetorical Question functioning as a Topic Presenter)
- There is a group of topic presenters originated from rhetorical questions (RQTPs).
- The rhetorical questions are embedded in a conditional protasis (thus, conditional clauses with embedded hypothetical questions) and contain *wh*-words.
- The rhetorical questions are recruited to preface the speaker's intention to elaborate on certain aspect of the larger topic (thus, 'micro-topic presenters' Rhee 2014).

(21) kukey X-nyamyen   (X = *wh*-word)
     'if (you) ask (me) what/who/where/when/why/how it is'

(22) *kukey X-nyamyen* topic presenters
     a. ***kukey*** *nwukwu-**nyamyen***   'If you ask who it is'
     b. ***kukey*** *encey-**nyamyen***   'If you ask when it is'
     c. ***kukey*** *eti-**nyamyen***   'If you ask where it is'
     d. ***kukey*** *mwe-**nyamyen***   'If you ask what it is'
     e. ***kukey*** *ettehkey-**nyamyen***   'If you ask how it is'
     f. ***kukey*** *way-**nyamyen***   'If you ask why it is'

(23) Developmental path of RQTPs
     a. *-nya ha-ko*   > *-nyako*
        -Q   say-and   COMP
     b.   > *-nyako ha-myen* > *-nyamyen*
                            -COMP say-if   Hypothetical Conditional
     c.   > *ku kes-i   X-nyamyen*   > ***kukey X-nyamyen***
                                           that thing-NOM X-COND.COMP   RQTP
                                                                                'if you ask what/who... it is'

(24) a. *what*-RQTP (*kukey mwe-nyamyen*; *mwe* 'what')
        [Around this time the nano-technology came to attract the attention of the industry.]
        kukey mwe-nyamyen   *wancen*   *sinkiswul-i-ntey...*
        RQTP(what)   completely   new.technology-be-CONN
        'Speaking of it, it is a completely new technology, and ...' (Lit.: 'If (you) ask (me) what it is, it is···')

     b. *who*-RQTP (*kukey nwukwu-nyamyen*; *nwukwu* 'who')
        [I came across a very funny guy in the street this morning.]
        kukey nwukwu-nyamyen   *nay*   *chotunghakkyo*   *tongchang-i-ntey...*
        RQTP(who)   my   elementary.school classmate-be-CONN
        'Speaking about him, he is my elementary school classmate, and ...'
        (Lit. 'If (you) ask (me) who he is, (he) is...')

- The source constructions of RQTPs occur from around the turn of the 20th century.
- RQTPs are presently in active innovation in PDK.
- The embedded sentence in the protasis of the hypothetical conditional clause is an interrogative sentence (no direct illocutionary force; 'self-directed question')
- RQTP as a 'reading the addressee's mind' signal: asking on behalf of the addressee (effectively saying, "I know what you're wondering, so I will ask it to myself on your behalf and answer it for you.")
- By this strategic 'kind' act of the speaker, the addressee is relieved of asking a question, or can avoid exposing his/her inattentiveness, i.e. being not fully caught up with the content of what is being said, or obtains a clue as to what aspect of the topic is noteworthy.
- The friendliness promotes the sense of solidarity between the interlocutors. (cf. attitudinal stance).

(25) RQ.TP frequency (Google search hits, 08/2012, Rhee 2014)
    a. 'what'   *kukey mwenyamyen*   for entity   320,000
    b. 'who'   *kukey nwukwunyamyen*   for person   47,300
    c. 'where'   *kukey etinyamyen*   for place   42,500
    d. 'when'   *kukey enceynyamyen*   for time   16,900
    e. 'why'   *kukey waynyamyen*   for reason   14,000
    f. 'how'   *kukey ette(hkey)nyamyen*   for manner   40

3.3 Pseudo-Quotative/Reportative (QUOT/REPT)

- Korean has a number of evidentiality markers ('scattered' system, Aikhenvald 2004, Kwon 2012)
- Among the QUOT/REPT forms is -*tanta* originated from a construction involving the COMP -*tako*.
- The QUOT -*tanta* becomes the REPT -*tanta,* without involving formal change (cf. Japanese -*to/tte* QUOT/REPT, Oshima & Sano 2012).
- Originally a QUOT/REPT marker, -*tanta* further develops into a stance marker (SM), without formal change, as it becomes recruited for rhetorical effect.

(26) a. -*tako*   *ha-n-ta*   >>   -*tanta*
      COMP   say-PRES-DEC   QUOT/REPT
      '(x) says that ···'   '(x) says that···/ it is said that (= they say that)···'

      b. QUOT/REPT sentence-ender -*tanta* (ambiguous)
        ku-ka   *kot*   *o-keyss-tanta*
        he-NOM   soon   come-FUT-QUOT/REPT
        QUOT: 'He says that he will come soon.'
        REPT: 'They say that he will come soon.'

(27) REPT -*tanta* (unambiguous)
      twi-s-cip   *kim-tolyeng-i*   *cyuk-ess-tanta*
      back-GEN-house   [name]-bachelor-NOM   die-PST-REPT
      'They say that the young bachelor Mr. Kim, the neighbor in the back, died.' (Late 19th c., *Akpwu* 1)

(28) Attitudinal stance of friendliness
      a. [A child and his mother on a weekend]
        Child: [How come Daddy is not playing with me today, Mom?]
        Mother: *appa-nun yocum*   *ton*   *pe(l)-si-nula*   *mwuchek*   *pappu-si-tanta*
                dad-TOP these.days   money earn-HON-because   very   be.busy-HON-SM
                '(Son,) Daddy is very busy making money (for us) these days.'

      b. [A boy with his father and uncle; The boy is happy to see his father come home; his uncle, their cohabitant, is fond of the boy but does not like him, the boy's father and his own brother.]
        Boy: [Dad, did you eat dinner?] (in order to hold him with him, even for a short while)
        Father: [Me? No, not yet.] (in order to stay with him while eating)
        Uncle: *Unpin-a*   *appa*   *pappu-si-tanta*
               [name]-VOC   dad   be.busy-HON-SM
               'Eunbin, your dad is busy.' (to make the boy's dad leave)
        Father: [No, I'm not busy, Big Brother.] (2006, Drama *Pyelnan yeca pyelnan namca,* Episode #149)

- -*Tanta* is commonly used in child-directed language (cf. Son 1998, Kim 2000) (children's books or even an impromptu stories (cf. Quecha, Aikhenvald 2004)

(29) *swuph-sok-maul-ey   kkoymanh-ko   yengliha-n   yewu-ka sal-ass-tanta*
forest-inside-village-at be.cunning-and be.clever-ADN fox-NOM live-PST-SM
'(Once upon a time,) there lived a cunning and clever fox in a village deep in a forest.'
(PDK, Narrated fairy-tale, *Yewuwa twulwumi,* http://www.mnet.com/album/392086)

- The SM -*tanta* is a marker of friendliness and of inviting the addressee (the child) into the vivid story-line about to be unfurled, and engages the addressee in the joint construction of a representation (cf. 'negotiation of common ground' (Jucker and Smith 1998: 172).
- Aikhenvald (2004: 137, 313): reported evidential as 'a stylistic token of folk tales and narratives' in Kham, Quechua, Baniwa, Achagua, Piapoco (see also Watters 2002 for Kham, Hockett 1948 for Potawatomi, Oswalt 1986 for Kashaya, Schlichter 1986 for Wintu, among others; Aikhenvald 2004); the reported evidential for children's 'pretend' games, Goddard (1983).
- -*Tanta* is also used for emphasis, feigned mirativity, news-breaking and boastful talks.

(30) Emphasis from borrowed validity
a. *etise kamhi ··· ne-kathun ke-n   nwun-ey   an cha-ø   na-n   kkwum-i   khu-tanta*
where daringly··· you-like   thing-TOP eye-at   not fill-END I-TOP   dream-NOM   be.big-SM
'How dare you (ask me out)! I have no eyes for someone/something like you. I do have a great dream (yes, I sure do).' (2005, Drama *Pimil namnye* Episode #1)

(31) Feigned mirativity, news-breaking, & boastful talk
a. (Context: The speaker, a female prosecutor, mends a ripped doll by hand-sewing and proudly returns it to a young befriended girl, the owner of the doll.)
i   enni-to   cal ha-nun   ke-y   iss-ki-n   iss-tanta
this   big.sister-also well do-ADN   thing-NOM exist-NOMZ-TOP exist-SM
'There is a thing or two that I (your 'big sister'), too, can do well. (Aren't you surprised!)' (2010, Drama, *Kemsa phulinseysu,* Episode #5)

b. (Context: The speaker is giving 'instructions' to her male friend who is about to move in.)
nay-ka   uyoylo   kyelpyekcung-kath-un   ke-y   iss-tanta
I-NOM   unexpectedly germaphobia-be.like-ADN   thing-NOM exist-SM
'(You know what?) Surprising it may be, I have something like germaphobia.' (2007, Drama, *Talcauy pom,* Episode #10)

c. (Context: The speaker is announcing to his children that their mom is pregnant.)
kuliko cohun sosik-i   hana te   iss-tanta. ni-tul tongsayng   sayngki-lkey-a
and   good news-NOM one   more exist-SM.   you-PL baby.sibling   get-FUT-END
'(Guess what?) There is one more piece of good news. You guys will have a baby boy/girl.' (2008, Drama, *Wekhingmam* Episode #14)

- -*Tanta* sometimes signals a strong attitude of discontent, and further the speaker's pejorative attitude.
- The speaker displays pejorative attitude toward the man that he has presumptuously come to see her daughter.

(32) Pejoration (with QUOT/SM)
(A woman to her daughter with regard to her long-waited-for would-be son-in-law who returned with an appearance of a wretched beggar)
ney   syepang ni-tolyeng-i   ne-lal   po-la   o-ass-tanta
your   boyfriend [name]-Mr.-NOM   you-ACC   see-PURP   come-PST-QUOT/SM
  (i) 'Your boyfriend Mr. Ni (who has become a beggar) says he came to see you.'
  (ii) 'Your boyfriend Mr. Ni (who has become a beggar) has impudence to come to see you.' (19th c., *Namwenkosa* 212)

- two factors involved: the multiple perspectives and the distancing effect
- **Multiple perspectives:** Reported speech is inherently a 'multiple-perspective construction' (Evans 2006), 'speech within speech and speech about speech' (Vološinov 1930: 115), 'multivoicedness' or 'polyphony of voices' (Bakhtin 1986; for similar observations, see Jakobson 1959, Maynard 1996, Talbot 1992, Buchstaller 2014).
- The voices of the two speakers may completely concur or differ.
- With *-tanta,* the original speaker may not exist at all, and thus it is a kind of 'hypothetical discourse' (Golato 2012); the two tiers of voices consist of the voice of a hypothetical speaker and that of the current speaker.
- **Distancing effect:** the speaker's discontented and consequently pejorative attitude toward the original source of information or the information itself (cf. Quechua & Bulgarian, Floyd 1999: 72; 'otherness' Bakhtin 1981: 339; "unwilling to bear the responsibility for claiming that the event has occurred" (Gvozdanović 1996: 63 as cited in Aikhenvald 2004: 138) (Bulgarian epistemic distancing; Korean attitudinal distancing)
- *-tanta* as a signal of refusal of 'accommodative process' (cf. Gile et al. 1991, see also 'footing' Goffman 1981, 1986[1974]), cf. Goffman (1986[1974]: 512): reduced personal responsibility, "[h]e [the speaker] splits himself off from the content of the words by expressing that their speaker is not he himself or not he himself in a serious way."

(33) (An unhappy partyer to friends about John who obstinately insists on leaving)
    a. Hey, guys, John is leaving.
    b. Hey, guys, John says he is leaving.

- Koo and Rhee (2016): Pejoration is a fundamentally pragmatic notion; the development of morphological pejorative *-tanta* is an excellent example of grammaticalization of 'morphopragmatics' (cf. Meibauer 2013, 2014).

3.4 Feigned Audience-blindness & Feigned Monologue
- Four forms of SFPs of Discontent (SFPDs) (Koo & Rhee 2013)
(34) a. *-tam* [-ta + -m]
    b. *-lam* [-la + -m]
    c. *-nam* [-na + -m] ☞
    d. *-kam* [-ka + -m] ☞

(35) a. (One who was not aware of the passing of time)
    sikan-i   *way*   *ilehkey* *ppalli*   *ka-nun-__kam__*
    time-NOM   why   like.this fast   go-PRES-SFPD
    'How fast is time passing?' [Oh, no! It's getting late!]

    b. (A parent whose child is not serious about studying)
    paywu-ese *nam-ø*   *cwu-__nam__*
    learn-and   others-(ACC) give-SFPD
    '(Do you think) studying will benefit others?' [No! It will benefit YOU!]

(36) Source constructions of SFPDs *-kam* and *-nam*
    a. *-nam*: INT? mwe? 'Q? What?'
    b. *-kam*: INT? mwe? 'Q? What?'

- Sentence-final particles are, by default, marked with sentence-type, levels of honorification and politeness.
- There are exceptional cases, i.e., audience-blind forms (ABFs).

(37) ABFs (adapted from Rhee 2016)
    DEC: *-(n)ta*
    INT: ***-ka, -na,*** *-lkka, -lci, -nci,*
    IMP: *-(u)la*
    HORT: *-ca*
    EXCL: *-ney, -kwun, -kwuna, -kwumen, -ala, (-tota, -lota)...*

- Audience-sensitivity/blindness is closely related to 'allocutivity' (Bonaparte 1862: 19-21) and 'subjectivity' (Iwasaki 1993).
- ABFs are used either for marking the embedded clause-end or for "feigning" audience-blindness as SFPs.
- INT ABFs as SFPs *-na* and *-ka* are used for monologue questions.
- Speakers sometimes strategically use utterances that are monologues in form but are intended to be heard by the addressee ('feigned monologue').
- All SFPDs are built on ABFs and monologue sentence types.
- SFPDs *-nam* and *-kam* are formed with INT ABF *-na* and *-ka* followed by the DM *mwe* 'what?'

(38) a. *na-n   caconsim-to   eps-**na**   **mwe***   (> ***-nam***)
        I-TOP   self-esteem-also not.exist-<u>SFP   DM(=what)</u> (> <u>SFPD</u>)
        '(Do you think) I don't have a sense of self-esteem?' (Lit. Do I not even have self-esteem, what?)

    b. *nay-ka   kulehkey   hankaha-n-**ka** **mwe***   (> ***-kam***)
       I-NOM   like.that   be.leisurely-<u>CR-SFP DM(=what)</u>   (> <u>SFPD</u>)
       '(Do you think) I am not busy (like that)?' (Lit. Am I that leisurely, what?)

- Similar phenomena are attested in other languages.
- Smith (1985: 110, as cited in Kuteva 2012: 57) presents the sentence-final emotive particle *what* in Singapore English that is realized with intonation drop plus low pitch, functioning to indicate that the speaker objects to something in the context.

(39) [Context: Discussion of a student who is going overseas for one month and missing classes.]
    A: He'll never pass the third year.
    B: It's only for one month **what**.   (Smith 1985: 110, as cited in Kuteva 2012: 57)

4. Issues for Discussion

4.1 Rhetorical Strategies

- [SFPD] Two special strategies: the use of non-interactional SFPs (ABFs) and the use of non-interactional utterance types ('feigned monologues').
- Feigned monologues: the speaker intends to have his or her utterance heard by the discourse participant (these utterances are normally uttered with sufficient audibility for the discourse participant).
- [SM] The development of the SM *-tanta* involves rhetorical strategies, e.g., the use of quotations for validity borrowing, feigned mirativity to dramatize the information, and rejection of accommodation of the on-going situation.
- One of the rhetorical effects of this 'self-reporting' is the connotation of mirativity (cf. Aikhenvald 2004: 185, 195-215). 'You may be surprised to hear this, and in fact I was surprised at this, too'.
- Mirative-marked sentences create a strong engaging effect on the part of the addressee. (the speaker's desire to 'share' the information as well as the feeling it arouses; 'intersubjectification' Traugott & König 1991, Traugott 2003, 2010, Traugott & Dasher 2002)

- [RQTP] Formal inclusion of a pseudo-question (i.e. the embedded question in conditional clauses) produces a strong engaging effect, simply because questions *per se* constitute an intrusive and impositive speech act.
- The use of RQTPs is motivated by the speaker's desire to feign interactivity.
- The speaker expresses the desire for the addressee's active engagement (cf. 'involvement' Lee, 2001) by saying something "through a borrowed mouth" (Rhee, 2009). (the question originates from the speaker but is presented as if it had been spoken by the discourse partner or a third party and were being reported).
- Question words are susceptible to grammaticalization in Korean (T. Kim, 2002; H. Lee, 1999; J. Koo 2000, H.J. Koo 2008, Rhee 2008, Kim 2010).
- The speaker attempts to accomplish two potentially contradictory goals: a politeness strategy not demanding verbal responses (i.e. reply) & an impositive strategy in that it demands cognitive responses (i.e. attention).

4.2 Discursive Strategies
- [Imperative] A number of discourse strategies are involved in the emergence of imperative from promissive.
- **Solidarity-building strategy:** 'I will clean up later,' in order to convey the intended meaning of command, 'Clean up later,' the speaker is strategically saying it as if the he/she intended to do it him/herself.
- The addressee infers the intended meaning only based on the conversational situation (unless marked [+Hon]).
- **Politeness strategy:** Using an established imperative marker unavoidably brings forth potential face-threatening. When the command takes the form of a promise, the face-threatening becomes mitigated because the utterance *prima facie* is not impositive to the discourse partner.
- [DMs, SM, RQTP] The intersubjectification is prominent with all stance-marking functions, since employment of stance presupposes the presence of the discourse partner.
- [SM] With the development of the addressee-oriented stance functions, e.g. friendliness, emphasis, mirativity, news-breaking, boastful talk, pejoration, etc., the sentences that previously carried the reportative evidentiality have acquired the functions of marking the attitudinal and emotional stances.
- [RQTP] From the perspective of intersubjectification, the use of hypothetical conditionals is like 'reading the addressee's mind,' i.e. asking on behalf of the addressee, and thus a gesture of considerateness ("I know what you're wondering, so I will ask it to myself on your behalf and answer it for you.")
- The friendliness promotes the sense of solidarity between the interlocutors.
- [DM] The development of the DM *makilay* involves elaborate intersubjectification in that the speaker is attenuating the illocutionary force of the self's talk by protecting the face of the addressee as well as that of the speaker in a potentially face-threatening act.

4.3 Meta-Discursive Strategies & Perspective Shift
- [DM] The grammaticalization processes of the *makilay*-DMs involve meta-discursive strategies (the speaker is monitoring the self's utterances and making an evaluative judgment about them).
- This phenomenon is immediately reminiscent of such notions as 'parentheticals' (Thompson & Mulac 1991), 'comment clauses' (Brinton 2008), or 'theticals' (Heine & Kuteva 2010, Kaltenböck et al. 2011, Heine et al. 2013), Corum's (1975: 135) 'parenthetic adjuncts' for speaker evaluation, softening, and a "sneaky" or deceptive use "to seduce the addressee into believing the content of the proposition."
- The DM *makilay* is not propositionally bound to the host utterance; it belongs to a different linguistic plane, i.e. in the thetical grammar (Heine et al. 2013, Heine & Kuteva 2010, Kaltenböck et al. 2011).
- The speaker is employing the strategy of expressing a hypothetical third-party's potential response to or evaluation on his/her utterance (the discourse is typically dyadic, and, therefore, this act of adopting the third-party perspective is highly abstract in nature).
- The absence of the explicit quotative marker suggests a feigned speaker-shift ("She/He says this recklessly," in effect, is "I know I am shameless to say this (so you don't need to blame me for that.))."

- The main strategy of employing the addendum-like DM is to tone down the illocutionary force of assertions or requests, by saying that someone might well say that the speaker is arrogant or impudent to say so.
- This act relieves the addressee's burden in his/her response to the speaker's utterance.
- Shifted perspective: The speaker adopts the imaginary third-person's evaluative viewpoint, makes an evaluation about his/her utterance, calculates the burden on the part of the addressee, and attempts to mitigate the illocutionary force by downplaying the significance of the remark.
- This is an excellent example of the speaker's linguistic manipulation for discursive needs, analogous to the comments made by the omniscient narrator in fictions and short stories. (Palacas 1989: 514, second-order reflection, commentary, or evaluation upon the anchor)
- Parentheticals in Palacas (1989) & Dehé and Kavalova (2007 and the works therein) may not switch the perspectives, but *makilay* does.

4.4 Attention to Third Party

- [Imperative] Intersubjectification is conceptualized largely between the speaker and the addressee.
- The development of the imperative *-lkeyyo* from promissive goes beyond the speaker-addressee intersubjectification, i.e. it was strongly motivated by the consideration of the people present in the scene. (i.e., attention to the audience within earshot).
- The use of this promissive-turned imperative is particularly often observed among service providers especially in businesses catering to high-class clientele. (a service-providers' in-group discourse strategy employed while clients are present in the scene).
- The rationale behind this is that employers (or high-ranking employees) issuing a command to their low-ranking employees in the presence of their clients may negatively affect the atmospheres of classy and posh businesses patronized by high-profile clients.
- The desire to avoid issuing commands in the presence of clients seems to have strongly motivated this grammatical change in which a mild form of speech act (i.e. promissive) has been recruited to encode a more potentially face-threatening speech act (i.e. imperative).

5. Summary & Conclusion

- Grammaticalization of certain grammatical markers involves rhetorical and discursive strategies.
- Speakers use available linguistic forms often manipulating them to solve communicative problems to be attentive to the addressee or even the people who are present in the discourse scene.
- Grammaticalization is indeed a multi-faceted process influenced by many ambient linguistic and extra-linguistic, situational factors that are present in individual instances of language use.
- Language speakers use available language materials to fulfill immediate discursive needs; "speakers of a language are not mere consumers of linguistic forms but are active manipulators of the existing forms, and thus creators and innovators of language" (Rhee & Koo 2014: 334).
- Therefore, it calls for the necessity of analyzing language use and grammatical change from multiple perspectives.

Abbreviations: ABF: audience-blind form; ACC: accusative; ADD: additive; ADN: adnominal; BEN: benefactive; CAUS: causative; COMP: complementizer; COND: conditional; CONN: connective; CR: current relevance; CT: concessive topic; DAT: dative; DEC: declarative; DM: discourse marker; DRG: degree; END: sentential-ending; EXCL: exclamative; FUT: future; GEN: genitive; HON: honorific; HORT: hortative; IMP: imperative; INT: interrogative; INTEN: intentional; NEG: negative; NF: non-finite; NOM: nominative; NOMZ: nominalizer; PASS: passive; PDK: Present-Day Korean; PL: plural; POL: polite; PRES: present; PROH: prohibitive; PROM: promissive; PST: past; PT: pejorative topic; PURP: purposive; QUOT: quotative; REAS: reason; REPT: reportative; RETRO: retrospective; RQTP: rhetorical question topic presenter; SFP: sentence-final particle; SFPD: sentence-final particle of discontent; SM: stance-marker; TOP: topicTRL: trial; VOC: vocative;

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2004. *Evidentiality.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays.* (Edited by Michael Holquist, translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1986. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays.* (Edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, translated by Vern W. McGee). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bonaparte, Louis-Lucien. 1862. *Langue basque et langues finnoises.* London: Strangeways & Walden.

Buchstaller, Isabelle. 2014. Quotatives: New Trends and Sociolinguistic Implications. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Corum, Claudia. 1975. A pragmatic analysis of parenthetic adjuncts. *CLS* 11: 133-141.

Dehé, Nicole, & Yordanka Kavalova. 2007. Parentheticals: An introduction. In: Nicole Dehé & Yordanka Kavalova (Eds.), *Parentheticals,* 1-22. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Diewald, Gabriel. 2011. Pragmaticalization (defined) as grammaticalization of discourse functions. *Linguistics* 49.2: 365-390.

Evans, Nicholas. 2006. A view with a view: Towards a typology of multiple perspective constructions. *BLS* 31: 93−120.

Floyd, Rick. 1999. *The Structure of Evidential Categories in Wanka Quechua.* Dallas: SIL & the University of Texas at Arlington Press.

Frank-Job, Barbara 2006. A dynamic-interactional approach to discourse markers. In: Kerstin Fischer (Ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles,* 359-374. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Giles, Howard, Nicholas Coupland, & Justine Coupland. 1991. Accommodation theory: Communication, context, and consequence. In: Howard Giles, Nicholas Coupland, & Justine Coupland (Eds.), *Contexts of Accommodation: Developments in Applied Sociolinguistics,* 1-68. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Givón, Talmy. 1979a. *On Understanding Grammar.* New York: Academic Press.

Givón, Talmy. 1979b. From discourse to syntax: Grammar as a processing strategy. In: Talmy Givón (Ed.), *Discourse and Syntax,* 81-112. New York: Academic Press.

Goddard, Cliff. 1983. A Semantically-Oriented Grammar of the Yankunytjatjara Dialect of the Western Desert Language. Ph.D. dissertation. Australian National University, Canberra.

Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of Talk.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goffman, Erving. 1986[1974]. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience.* York, PA: Northeastern University Press.

Golato, Andrea. 2012. Impersonal quotation and hypothetical discourse. In: Isabelle Buchstaller & Ingrid Van Alphen (Eds.), *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and Cross-disciplinary Perspectives,* 3-36. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gvozdanović, Jadranka. 1996. Reported speech in South Slavic. In: Theo A.J.M. Janssen & Wim van der Wurff (Eds.), *Reported Speech: Forms and Functions of the Verb,* 57-71. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Heine, Bernd. 2013. On discourse markers: Grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, or something else? *Linguistics* 51.6: 1205-1247.

Heine, Bernd, & Tania Kuteva 2010. On thetical grammar. Typescript.

Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, & Friederike Hünnemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Heine, Bernd, Gunther Kaltenböck, Tania Kuteva, & Haiping Long. 2013. An outline of discourse grammar. In: Shannon Bischoff & Carmen Jany (Eds.), *Functional Approaches to Language,* 175-233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Herring, Susan C. 1988. Aspect as a discourse strategy in Tamil. *BLS* 14: 280-292.

Herring, Susan C. 1991. The grammaticalization of rhetorical questions in Tamil. In: Elizabeth C. Traugott & Bernd Heine (Eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization.* 2 vols. Vol. 1: 253-284. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hockett, Charles F. 1948. Potawatomi. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 14: 139−149.

Hopper, Paul J. 1982. Aspect between discourse and grammar. In: Paul J. Hopper (Ed.), *Tense-Aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics,* 3-18. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Iwasaki, Shoichi. 1993. *Subjectivity in Grammar and Discourse: Theoretical considerations and a case study of Japanese spoken discourse.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jakobson, Roman. 1959. On linguistic aspects of translation. In: Reuben A. Brower (Ed.), *On Translation,* 232-239. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Jucker, Andreas H. & Sara W. Smith. 1998. And people just you know like 'wow': Discourse markers as negotiating strategies. In: Andreas H. Jucker & Yael Ziv (Eds.), *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory,* 171-201. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kaltenböck, Gunther, Bernd Heine, & Tania Kuteva. 2011. On thetical grammar. *Studies in Language* 35.4: 848-893.

Keith, William M. & Christian O. Lundberg. 2008. *The Essential Guide to Rhetoric.* Boston: Bedford/St. Martins.

Kim, Alan Hyun-Oak. 2010. Rhetorical questions as catalyst in grammaticalization: Deriving Korean discourse marker *ketun* from conditional connective. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 1023-1041.

Kim, Il-ung. 2000. The sequence and fusion of sentence ending markers. *Hanguk Minjok Munhwa* (Journal of the Korean Studies Institute, Pusan National University) 15: 1-39.

Kim, Jong-Hyun. 2000. The attitudinal force of quasi-quotation sentences in Korean. *Eneohag: Journal of the Linguistic Society of Korea* 26: 75-104.

Kim, Tae-Yeop. 2002. A study on the grammaticalization of discourse marker. *The Korean Language and Literature* 26: 61-80.

Koo, Hyun Jung. 2004a. A study on aspects of politeness strategy. *Discourse and Cognition* 11.3: 1-23.

Koo, Hyun Jung. 2004b. Conditional markers in discourse context: From conditional to politeness. Paper presented at 2004 Fall Conference of Society of Modern Grammar, Nov. 2004.

Koo, Hyun Jung. 2008. Grammaticalization of negation markers in Korean. Discourse and Cognition 15 (3), 1-27.

Koo, Hyun Jung, & Seongha Rhee. 2013. On an emerging paradigm of sentence-final particles of discontent: A grammaticalization perspective. *Language Sciences* 37: 70−89.

Koo, Hyun Jung, & Seongha Rhee. 2016. Pejoratives in Korean. In: Rita Finkbeiner, Jörg Meibauer, & Heike Wiese (Eds.), *Pejoration,* 301-323. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Koo, Jongnam. 2000. Tamhwaphyoci mwe-uy mwunpephwawa tamhwa kinung (On grammaticalization and discourse functions of the discourse marker mwe). Kwukemwunhak 35, 5--32.

Kuteva, Tania. 2001. *Auxiliation: An Enquiry into the Nature of Grammaticalization.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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. 2012. On the cyclic nature of grammaticalization. (Invited lecture at the First World Congress of Scholars of English Linguistics, Hanyang University, June 26-30, 2012). In: Ik-Hwan Lee, Young-Se Kang, Kyoung-Ae Kim, Kee-Ho Kim, Il-Kon Kim, Seongha Rhee, Jin-Hyung Kim, Hyo-Young Kim, Ki-Jeong Lee, Hye-Kyung Kang, & Sung-Ho Ahn, (Eds.), *Issues in English Linguistics,* 50-67. Seoul: Hankook Publisher.

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.

Kwon, Iksoo. 2012a. Viewpoints in the Korean Verbal Complex: Evidence, Perception, Assessment, and Time. Ph.D. dissertation. University of California, Berkeley.

Lee, Han-gyu. 1999. The pragmatics of the discourse particle mwe in Korean. *Discourse and Cognition* 6.1: 137-157.

Lee, Heeja & Jong-Hee Lee. 2010. *Emi Cosa Sacen* [The dictionary of particles]. Seoul: Hankook Publisher.

Lee, Won Pyo. 2001. *Tamhwapwunsek* [Discourse Analysis]. Seoul: Hankook Publisher.

Leech, Geoffrey N., 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics.* New York: Longman.

Leith, Dick & George Myerson. 1989. *The Power of Address: Explorations in Rhetoric.* London: Routledge.

Lichtenberk, Frantisek. 1991. On the gradualness of grammaticalization. In: Elizabeth C. Traugott & Bernd Heine (Eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization,* 2 vols. Vol. I: 37-80. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Maynard, Senko. 1996. Multivoicedness in speech and thought representation: The case of self-quotation in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 207−226.

Meibauer, Jörg. 2013. Expressive compounds in German. *Word Structure* 6.1: 21−42.

Meibauer, Jörg. 2014. Word-formation and contextualism. *International Review of Pragmatics* 6.1: 103−126.

Narrog Heiko. 2010. (Inter)subjectification in the domain of modality and mood - Concepts and cross-linguistic realities. In: Kristin Davidse, Lieven Vandelanotte, Hubert Cuyckens (Eds.), *Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization,* 385-429. Berlin: Mouton.

Norde, Muriel 2009. *Degrammaticalization.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Oshima, David Y. & Shin-ichiro Sano. 2012. On the characteristics of Japanese reported discourse: A study with special reference to elliptic quotation. In: Isabelle Buchstaller & Ingrid Van Alphen (Eds.), *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and Cross-disciplinary Perspectives,* 145-171. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Oswalt, Robert L. 1986. The evidential system of Kashya. In: Wallace Chafe & Johanna Nichols (Eds.), *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology,* 29-45. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Palacas, Arthur L. 1989. Parentheticals and personal voice. *Written Communication* 6: 506-27

Rhee, Seongha. 2008a. Subjectification of reported speech in grammaticalization and lexicalization. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* 12: 590−603.

Rhee, Seongha. 2008b. From rhetoric to grammar: Grammaticalization of rhetorical strategies in Korean. *Japanese Korean*

Linguistics 13: 359−370.

Rhee, Seongha. 2009. Through a borrowed mouth: Reported speech and subjectification in Korean. *The LACUS Forum* 34: 201−210.

Rhee, Seongha. 2013. "I know I'm shameless to say this": Grammaticalization of the mitigating discourse marker makilay in Korean. (Paper presented at the 9th Int'l Conference on Cognitive Science). *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 97: 480-486.

Rhee, Seongha. 2014. "I know you are not, but if you were asking me": On emergence of discourse markers of topic presentation from hypothetical questions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 60: 1-16.

Rhee, Seongha. 2016. "I cannot see you there": Audience-blindness and related strategies in discourse and narrative. Paper presented at the 3rd Int'l Conference of Semiosis Research Center (ICSRC-2016), Narrativity and Beyond: Transmedia-Experience-Mediation, Hankuk Univ. of Foreign Studies, April 29, 2016.

Rhee, Seongha & Hyun Jung Koo. 2014. Grammaticalization of causatives and passives and their recent development into stance markers in Korean. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 50.3: 309-337.

Schlichter, Alice. 1986. The origin and deictic nature of Wintu evidentials. In: Wallace Chafe & Johanna Nichols (Eds.), *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology,* 46-59. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Smith, Ian. 1985. Multilingualism and diffusion: A case study from Singapore English. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11.2: 105-128.

Sohn, Ho-Min. 2001. *The Korean Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Son, Se-mo-dol. 1998. {-*(nun/n)tanta*}uy emihwa [Development of -*(nun/n)tanta* into an ending]. *Hankwuk Enemwunhwa. Journal of the Society of Korean Language & Culture* (Hanyang Univ.) 16: 105–130.

Talbot, Mary. 1992. A synthetic sisterhood: False friends in a teenage magazine. In: Kira Hall, Mary Bucholtz, & Birch Moonwoman (Eds.), *Locating Power: Proceedings of the Second Berkeley Women and Language Conference,* 573-580. Berkeley Women and Language Group, Berkeley.

Thompson, Sandra A. & Anthony Mulac. 1991. A quantitative perspective on the grammaticization of epistemic parentheticals in English. In: Elizabeth C. Traugott & Bernd Heine (Eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, 2 vols, vol. 2: 313-29. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1995. The role of the development of discourse markers in a theory of grammaticalization. In: Paper presented at the 12th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Manchester, August 13-18, 1995.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2003. From subjectification to intersubjectification. In: Raymond Hickey (Ed.), *Motives for Language Change,* 124-139. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2010. (Inter)subjectivity and (inter)subjectification: A reassessment. In: Kristin Davidse, Lieven Vandelanotte, & Hubert Cuyckens (Eds.), *Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization,* 29-71. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs & Richard B. Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in Semantic Change.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs & Ekkehard König. 1991. The semantics-pragmatics of grammaticalization revisited. In: Elizabeth C. Traugott & Bernd Heine (Eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization,* 2 vols. vol. 1, 189-218. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Vološinov, Valentin N. 1930. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (Translated by L. Matejka, I. R. Titunik from Russian Marksizm i filosofija jazyka, in 1973). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wales, Katie. 2001. *A Dictionary of Stylistics.* New York: Longman.

Waltereit, Richard. 2006. The rise of discourse markers in Italian: a specific type of language change. In: Kerstin Fischer, (Ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles,* 61-67. Oxford: Elsevier.

Watters, David E. 2002. *A Grammar of Kham.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wischer, Ilse. 2000. Grammaticalization versus lexicalization. 'Methinks' there is some confusion. In: Olga Fischer, Anette Rosenbach, & Dieter Stein (Eds.), *Pathways of Change: Grammaticalization in English,* 355-370. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.