

The Role of Rhetorical Strategies in Grammaticalization: The Case of Fake Quotes 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-Claudi-Hünemeyer. 1991, Heine-Kaltenböck-Kuteva-Long. 2013, forthcoming, 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 conjunction and 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**, and **pseudo-questions**.
- Generalization in grammaticalization processes across languages can benefit from individual as well as typological considerations (Heine-Narrog-Long 2016).

2. Preliminaries

- The term ‘rhetoric/rhetorical’ has been used in various senses in different disciplines.
- ‘rhetoric’ in general: an art of persuasion, “the study of producing discourses and interpreting how, when, and why discourses are persuasive” (Keith & Lundberg 2008: 4)
- Rhee (2008): 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 perlocutionary effect of the statement by making it more dramatic and vivid

3. Case studies

3.1 Forged Quotation: Borrowed Mouth

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

Embedded Clause Type	Complementizer	Example	
Declarative	<i>-tako</i>	<i>-ka-n-tako</i>	‘that (he) goes’
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 (we/they) should go together’

e.g. a. *na-nun ka-n-tako ha-yss-ta*
 I-TOP go-PRES-COMP say-PST-DEC
 ‘I said (to him) **that** I would go.’

b. *na-nun ka-nyako ha-yss-ta.*
 I-TOP go-COMP say-PST-DEC
 ‘I asked (him) **if** (he) was going.’

(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. 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.)

c. 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!?"')

d. 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 you suffer loss!"')

(3) COMP-based adverbs: 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 cwuk-elako 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-mwe-(i)-nyako caleka-ss-ta.*

he-TOP know-PRES-NOMZ-NOM-what-be-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 adverbs (examples) (Note: Forms end with *-tako*)

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|---|
| a. <i>kulehtako</i> | 'still; nonetheless' | < 'saying, "It is so.'" |
| b. <i>cwuknuntako</i> | 'self-pitifully' | < 'saying, "I am dying.'" |
| c. <i>salkeysstako</i> | 'desperately' | < 'saying, "I will live.'" |
| d. <i>nacalnasstako</i> | 'haughtily' | < 'saying, "I am great.'" |
| e. <i>michyesstako</i> | 'nonsensically' | < 'saying, "I am insane.'" |
| f. <i>calhaypokeysstako</i> | 'earnestly' | < 'saying, "I will try to do it well.'" |
| g. <i>salapokeysstako</i> | 'effortfully' | < 'saying, "I will try to live.'" |
| h. <i>mossalkeysstako</i> | 'in frustration' | < 'saying, "I can't live.'" |
| i. <i>cwukkeysstako</i> | 'desperately' | < 'saying, "I will die.'" |

- (5) INT-COMP-based adverbs (examples) (Note: Forms end with *-nyako*)
- | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------|--|
| a. <i>weynttekinyako</i> | 'gladly' | < 'saying, "What kind of cake is this?"' |
| b. <i>alkeymwenyako</i> | 'nonchalantly' | < 'saying, "What should I know?"' |
| c. <i>mwusuncisinyako</i> | 'protestingly' | < 'saying, "What act is it?"' |
| d. <i>mwusunsolinyako</i> | 'protestingly' | < 'saying, "What sound is it?"' |
| e. <i>kukeytinyako</i> | 'appreciatively' | < 'saying, "Where is it?"' |
- (6) IMP-COMP-based adverbs (examples) (Note: Forms end with *-lako*)
- | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| a. <i>taliyanalsallilako</i> | 'desperately' | < 'saying, "Leg! Save me!"' |
| b. <i>sallyetallako</i> | 'begging mercy' | < 'saying, "Please save me!"' |
| c. <i>ttwulhecyelako</i> | 'attentively' | < 'saying, "Let it be bored a hole!"' |
| d. <i>pwatallako</i> | 'begging mercy' | < 'saying, "Please be considerate!"' |
| e. <i>cwukelako</i> | 'desperately' | < 'saying, "Die!"' |
| f. <i>nalsallilako</i> | 'desperately' | < 'saying, "Save me!"' |
| g. <i>nalcapamekulako</i> | 'indifferently' | < 'saying, "Kill and eat me!"' |
| h. <i>payccaylako</i> | 'unyieldingly' | < 'saying, "Cut my belly!"' |
- (7) HORT-COMP-based adverbs (examples) (Note: Forms end with *-cako*)
- | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------|---|
| a. <i>nacohcako</i> | 'selfishly' | < 'saying, "Let's make it good for me!"' |
| b. <i>cwukcako</i> | 'enthusiastically' | < 'saying, "Let's die!"' |
| c. <i>cwukcasalcako</i> | 'obsessively' | < 'saying, "Let's die, let's live (together)!"' |
| d. <i>necwukkonacwukcako</i> | 'irrationally' | < 'saying, "Let's make you die and me die!"' |
| e. <i>ecceccako</i> | 'why' | < 'saying, "Let's (do it) somehow!"' |
| f. <i>naphyenhacako</i> | 'selfishly' | < 'saying, "Let's make me comfortable!"' |

3.2 False Promises: Feigned Imperative

- The speech act of command is often avoidable across languages, and 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 acts 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. (note: *-si-* is the honorification marker.)
- 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 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. (Koo & Rhee 2013)

(8) Imperative SFPs in Korean

Specializing Forms	<i>-sipsio</i>	Formal,	Polite, H-Honorific
	<i>-ela</i>	Formal,	Polite
	<i>-(u)la</i>	Formal,	Audience-Blind
	<i>-(u)sila</i>	Formal,	H-Honorific, Audience-Blind
Declarative-Derived Forms	<i>-o</i>	Formal,	M-Honorific, Archaic/poetic
	<i>-seyyo</i>	Informal,	H-Honorific, Polite
	<i>-eyo</i>	Informal,	Polite
	<i>-sye</i>	Informal,	L-Honorific
	<i>-e</i>	Informal	
Connective-Derived Forms	<i>-key</i>	Informal	(< <i>-key</i> : mode-marker)
	<i>-keyna</i>	Informal	(< <i>-key</i> : mode-marker)
	<i>-ci</i>	Informal	(< <i>-ci</i> : non-finite; nominalizer)
	<i>-lyem</i>	Informal	(< ² <i>-lye</i> : intentional)
	<i>-lyemwuna</i>	Informal	(< ² <i>-lye</i> : intentional)

(9) Promissive SFPs in Korean (Sohn 2001)

- a. intimate level: *-lkey*
- b. polite level: *-lkeyyo* ㄹㄱㅛ
- 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]

(10) Promissive

- a. (to a friend in need of help) b. (to parents after flunking a test)
- (nay-ka) tow-acwu-lkey* *te yelsimhi kongpwuha-lkey-yo*
- (I-NOM) help-BEN-PROM more earnestly study-PROM-POL
- 'I promise I will help you.' 'I promise I will study harder.'

(11) Imperative (Polite Request)

- a. (a nurse to a young patient at a dental clinic) b. (a nurse to an adult patient)
- ca ip com khukey pelli-lkey-yo* *yeki chimtay-ey nwwu-si-lkey-yo*
- now mouth a.little wide open-IMP-POL here bed-at lie.down-HON-IMP-POL
- 'Now, please open your mouth wide.' 'Please lie on your back on the bed over here.'

(12) Imperative (Polite Command/Request)

- a. (the head-nurse to a trainee) b. (a head-beautician to her assistant)
- cengli-nun nacwung-ey ha-lkey-yo* *3-pen sonnim mence tow-atuli-si-lkey-yo*
- cleanup-TOP later.time-at do-IMP-POL 3-number client first serve-BEN-HON-IMP-POL
- 'Clean up later, please.' (Do something else first.) 'Please, serve the client at #3 first.'

3.3 Pseudo-Questions

3.3.1 Indefinite Pronouns & Indefinite Adverbs

(13) Indefinite pronouns from pseudo-questions

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

- (14) a. *wuli cwung-ey nwukwu-o-nka pemin-i iss-ta*
 we middle-at who-be-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-ø-nka-lul sa-ss-ta*
 he-TOP yesterday store-at what-be-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-ø-nci mam-ey an tul-e*
 that person why-be-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.)

3.3.2 Discourse Markers

- Korean has many DMs that originated from question constructions.

(15) *mwe* < *mwe?* 'what?' (mitigator)
way < *way?* 'why?' (attention-attractor)
eti < *eti?* 'where?' (emphatic negator)

(16) a. Mitigator

ku salam-ø mwe com isangha-y
 that person-TOP what (=DM) a.little be.strange-END
 'The person is somewhat weird.' (lit. The person is, **what?**, a little strange.)

b. 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.)

c. 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.)

3.3.3 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).

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

(18) *kukey X-nyamyen* topic presenters

- kukey nwukwu-nyamyen* 'If you ask who it is'
- kukey encey-nyamyen* 'If you ask when it is'
- kukey eti-nyamyen* 'If you ask where it is'
- kukey mwe-nyamyen* 'If you ask what it is'
- kukey ettehkey-nyamyen* 'If you ask how it is'
- kukey way-nyamyen* 'If you ask why it is'

(19) 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, and 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).

4. Question Forms and Grammaticalization in Other Languages

4.1 Question words > Connectors (relativizers/connectives/complementizers/subordinators)

[English *who*, *which*, *what*...]

(20) *I met the man. **Who?** He came yesterday.*

>>> *I met the man **who** came yesterday.* (Rhee 2016[1998]:332)

(21) a. *I know the man **who** she loves.*

b. *This is a book **which** I bought in China.*

c. *I believe **what** you said.*

[German *was* 'what', *welch* 'which'] (Heine & Kuteva 2002: 250)

(22) *Ich weiss nicht, **was** er will*

I know not what he wants

'I don't know what he wants.'

[Tamil TRQ (Thematicizing Rhetorical Question)] (Herring 1991)

(23) a. *Oru nālu puruṣaṅkāraṅ **eṇṇa** ceṅcirukṅāṅ;*

one day husband what do-PERF-PR3MS

'One day, what did the husband do?'

b. *Āka inta poṅṅu **eṇṇa** āyirutu; karppamā*

thus this girl what become-PFV-PR3NS pregnant

ākutu inta poṅṅu.

become-PR3NS this girl

'And so what happens to the girl? She gets pregnant, the girl (does).'

- c. *Oru nālu puruṣaṅkāraṅ enna ceñcirukkṛāṅ,*
 one day husband what do-PERF-PR3MS
 “*Nāṅ vēṭṭaiṅku pōkaṅum*” *nṇu pōyīṭṭāṅ.*
 I hunt-DAT go-be-necessary QUOT go-PFV-P3MS
 ‘One day, what did the husband do?’
 Saying, “I must go hunting”, he went off.’
- d. *Avāṅ iṅkē illai ēṅṅā avāṅ ūrukku pōṅāṅ.*
 he here NEG CONJ he town-DAT go-P3MS
 ‘He is not here because he went to his village.’

[Other languages] (Heine & Kuteva 2002; Heine et al. in preparation)

- (24) a. French: qui? ‘who’, que? ‘what’... > relative clause markers
 b. Albanian: *kush* ‘who?’ > relative clause marker (Buchholz-Fiedler-Uhlisch. 1993: 265).
 c. Romani: *kon* ‘who?’, *so* ‘what?’, *kaj* ‘where?’, *kana* ‘when?’, *sar* ‘how?’.. > markers of complement clauses, adverbial clauses, and relative clauses (Matras 1996; Heine and Kuteva 2006: 212-3)
 d. Georgian: *ray* ‘what?’ > *raytamca* complementizer (Harris and Campbell 1995: 298) (Heine et al. in preparation)

4.2 Question words > Comparison standards and Similes

[Hungarian *mint* ‘how’ > comparison standard] (Halász 1988: 542; cited from Heine & Kuteva 2002)

- (25) *nagy-obb, mint a fia*
 tall-er than his son
 ‘He is taller **than** his son.’

[Colloquial German *wie* ‘how’ > comparison standard] (Heine & Kuteva 2002)

- (26) *Er ist größer wie sein Sohn*
 he is taller than his son
 ‘He is taller **than** his son.’

[German *wie* ‘how’ > simile] (Heine & Kuteva 2002)

- (27) *Sie sieht aus wie eine Schauspielerin.*
 she looks out like a actress
 ‘She looks like an actress.’

[Seychelles *koma* (< French *comment* ‘how?’) > simile] (Heine & Kuteva 2002)

- (28) *ban koma u*
 people like you
 ‘people like you’

4.3 Question words > Indefinite pronouns

[Mandarin *shénme* ‘what’ > ‘something’; *shéi* ‘who?’ > ‘someone’] (Haspelmath 1997: 171; Heine & Kuteva 2002)

- (29) *Tā bǎ shénme shū diū le.*
 she ACC what book throw PFV
 ‘She threw away a certain book.’

[Other languages] (Heine & Kuteva 2002)

- (30) a. Yindjibarndi: *ngana* ‘who?’ > ‘someone’ ‘anyone’ (Wordick 1982: 76)
 b. Kiowa: *hōn-dé* ‘what?’ > ‘something’ (indefinite); *há.-cò* ‘how?’ > ‘in some manner’ (indefinite) (Watkins 1984: 183-4)
 c. Acoma Keresan: *háu* ‘who?’ > ‘some’ (indefinite) (Maring 1967: 48)

- d. Acoma: *cíí* 'what?' > 'some' (indefinite); *háca* 'how much?' > 'some' (indefinite) (Maring 1967: 48)
- e. Plains Cree: *kī kway* 'what' > 'something', 'a thing', 'an entity', indefinite pronoun (Wolfart 1973: 35-6)
- f. Classical Greek: *tís* 'who?' > 'someone' (Haspelmath 1997: 170).
- g. Newari *su* 'who?' > 'nobody' (with verbal negation); *chu* 'what?' > 'nothing' (with verbal negation) (Haspelmath 1997: 170)
- h. Khmer *qwəy* 'what?' > 'something'; *naa* 'where?' > 'somewhere' (Haspelmath 1997: 170).

5. Issues for Discussion

5.1 Rhetorical Strategies

[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 (Kim, 2002; Lee, 1999; Koo 2000, 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 demanding cognitive responses (i.e. attention).

5.2 Discursive Strategies

[Imperative]

- **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 she intended to do it 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.

[RQTP]

- The intersubjectification (Traugott & König 1991; Traugott 2003, 2010; Traugott & Dasher 2002) is prominent with all stance-marking functions, since employment of stance presupposes the presence of the discourse partner.
- 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.

5.3 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).

6. 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: topic; TRI: trial; VOC: vocative

References

- Buchholz, Oda, Wilfried Fiedler, & Gerda Uhlisch. 1993. *Wörterbuch Albanisch-Deutsch*. Leipzig: Langenscheidt Verlag Enzyklopädie.
- 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.
- Halász, Előd. 1988. *Magyar-Német Szótár I*. Akadémiai Kiado.
- Harris, Alice C. & Lyle Campbell. 1995. *Historical Syntax in Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite Pronouns*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, & Friederike Hünemeyer. 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.
- Heine, Bernd, Gunther Kaltenböck, Tania Kuteva, & Haiping Long. 2017 (forthcoming). Cooptation as a discourse strategy. *Journal of Linguistics*.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, Bernd, & Tania Kuteva. 2006. *The Changing Languages of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, Bernd, Tania Kuteva, Bo Hong, Haiping Long, Heiko Narrog & Seongha Rhee. In preparation. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization* (2nd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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, 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. "I will do it... but I'm asking you to do it": On the emergence of polite imperative from promissive. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 97: 487-494.
- 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. 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, Han-gyu. 1999. The pragmatics of the discourse particle *mwe* in Korean. *Discourse and Cognition* 6.1: 137-157.
- 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.
- Maring, Joel Marvyl. 1967. *Grammar of Acoma Keresan*. Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Matras, Yaron. 1996. Prozedurale Fusion: Grammatische Interferenzschichten im Romanes. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 49.1: 60-78.
- 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.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2008. 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. 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[1998]. *Mwunpephwaui Ihay* [Understanding Grammaticalization]. Seoul: Hankook Publisher.
- 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.
- Sohn, Ho-Min. 2001. *The Korean Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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.
- Wales, Katie. 2001. *A Dictionary of Stylistics*. New York: Longman.
- Watkins, Laurel. 1984. *A Grammar of Kiowa*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.
- Wolfart, 1973. Wolfart, Christoph. 1973. *Plains Cree: A Grammatical Study*. (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society. Vol. 63, Part 5.) Philadelphia.
- Wordick, F. J. F. 1982. *The Yindjibarndi Language*. Canberra: Department of Linguistics Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.

■ Special thanks go to Professor Haiping Long for his constant inspiration and kind support.