

## **From False Promises, Fake Quotations, and Feigned Questions into Grammar: Grammaticalization of Manipulative Discourse Strategies**

### **1. Introduction**

- General agreement: Discourse is where grammaticalization is triggered, or that 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 rhetorical & discourse strategies to fulfill intended persuasion.
- Korean: many instances of grammaticalization in which rhetorical and discursive strategies played crucial roles
- This presentation: false promises, fake quotations, and feigned questions.

### **2. Preliminaries**

#### **[Grammaticalization]**

- change from lexical > grammatical, or less grammatical > more grammatical (Kuryłowicz 1975[1965])
- change whereby lexical terms and constructions in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions (Hopper & Traugott 2003)

#### **[DM as a grammatical marker]**

- DM's status as to being 'grammatical' is controversial (Waltereit 2006 vs. Diewald 2006, 2011)
- Present study: DM is a grammatical marker (Diewald 2006, 2011, Dostie 2004, Wischer 2000, Traugott 1995, Rhee 2014)

#### **[Rhetoric in discourse]**

- 'rhetoric': language for persuasion; "the study of producing discourses and interpreting how, when, and why discourses are persuasive" (Keith & Lundberg 2008: 4; see also Leech 1983, Leith and Myerson 1989, Wales 2001: 344-346)
- Rhetorical strategies are expected to surface among the most researched subjects of grammaticalization.
- Certain grammatical markers have discourse-pragmatic origins, e.g. Givón (1979b), Herring (1991) for clause subordinators, Hopper (1982) and Herring (1988) for perfective aspect markers.
- Motivations for adopting rhetorical strategies: to increase illocutionary force of the statement by making it more dramatic and vivid (Rhee 2008b)

### **3. Case studies**

#### **3.1 False Promises: Disguised Imperative**

- The speech act of command is often avoidable across languages (Narrog (2010).
- The Korean language, which shows fastidious concern in marking interpersonal relationship, presents itself as one of the languages that avoid to the extreme level the impositive speech act, i.e. imperative (Koo 2004a,b).
- Alternative speech acts are well developed, e.g. using hortative 'let's' marked with honorification, using pseudo-monologue questions marked with politeness thus signaling its non-monologic intention, using future-marked declaratives, 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.

(1) Imperative SFPs in Korean (PDK)

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,	general ender
Connective-Derived Forms	<i>-key</i>	Informal	(< <sup>?</sup> <i>-key</i> : mode-marker)
	<i>-keyna</i>	Informal	(< <sup>?</sup> <i>-key</i> : mode-marker)
	<i>-ci</i>	Informal	(< <sup>?</sup> <i>-ci</i> : non-finite; nominalizer)
	<i>-lyem</i>	Informal	(< <sup>?</sup> <i>-lye</i> : intentional)
	<i>-lyemwuna</i>	Informal	(< <sup>?</sup> <i>-lye</i> : intentional)

(2) Promissive SFPs in Korean (Sohn 2001)

- intimate level: *-lkey*
- polite level: *-lkeyyo*      ☞ (-yo: POL)
- plain level: *-ma*      (slightly archaic)
- familiar level: *-(u)msey*      (archaic)

- Polite promissive *-lkeyyo* is being innovated as polite imperative (often harshly denounced by prescriptivists).
- Polite imperative is modulated with honorification, i.e., *-lkeyyo* [-HON] and *-silkeyyo* [+HON] for request and command.

(3) Promissive

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>a. (to a friend in need of help)<br/>                     [(내가) 도와줄게.]<br/> <i>(nay-ka) tow-acwu-lkey</i><br/>                     (I-NOM) help-BEN-PROM<br/>                     'I promise I will help you.'</p> | <p>b. (to parents after flunking a test)<br/>                     [더 열심히 공부할게요.]<br/> <i>te yelsimhi kongpwuha-lkey-yo</i><br/>                     more earnestly study-PROM-POL<br/>                     'I promise I will study harder.'</p> |
|---|---|

(4) Imperative (Polite Request)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>a. (a nurse to a young patient at a dental clinic)<br/>                     [자 입 좀 크게 벌릴게요.]<br/> <i>ca ip com khukey pelli-lkey-yo</i><br/>                     now mouth a.little wide open-IMP-POL<br/>                     'Now, please open your mouth wide.'</p> | <p>b. (a nurse to an adult patient)<br/>                     [여기 침대에 누우실게요.]<br/> <i>yeki chimtay-ey nwwu-usi-lkey-yo</i><br/>                     here bed-at lie.down-HON-IMP-POL<br/>                     'Please lie on your back on the bed over here.'</p> |
|---|--|

(5) Imperative (Polite Command)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>a. (the head-nurse to a trainee)<br/>                     [정리는 나중에 할게요.]<br/> <i>cengli-nun nacwung-ey ha-lkey-yo</i><br/>                     cleanup-TOP later.time-at do-IMP-POL<br/>                     'Clean up later, please.' (Do something else first.)</p> | <p>b. (a head-beautician to her assistant)<br/>                     [3번 손님 먼저 도와드리실게요.]<br/> <i>3-pen sonnim mence tow-atuli-si-lkey-yo</i><br/>                     3-number client first serve-BEN-HON-IMP-POL<br/>                     'Serve the client #3 first, please.'</p> |
|--|--|

- In PDK, promissive-turned imperatives are commonly used by service-providers.

(6) English adhortative from HORT *let's*

- Lets wash your hands. (Cole 1975: 268)
- Lets eat our liver now, Betty. (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 11)

## 3.2 Fake Quotations

### 3.2.1 Borrowed Mouth

(7) COMPs (for embedding quoted/reported speech) (COMP grammaticalization, Sohn 2011)

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’ ( <i>-lako</i> for copula, Retros <i>-te-</i> )
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’

(8) Functional extension of COMP-based grammatical forms

a. DEC-COMP *-tako*

[그는 하와이 간다고 자랑했다.]

*ku-nun hawai ka-n-tako calangha-n-ta*  
he-TOP Hawaii go-PRES-COMP boast-PRES-DEC

‘He boasts that he is going to Hawaii.’

(< lit. He, saying, “(I) go to Hawaii,” boasts.)

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

[그는 바쁘다고 서두른다.]

*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* [의사라고 병을 다 고치는 게 아니다.]  
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* [토마토냐고 되게 작네.]

tomato-PT very be.small-INTJ

‘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?* [소문나라고 왜 그래?]

rumor-exit-PURP why do.so-END

‘Are you trying to stir up a rumor?’ (< lit. Why 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* [내가 너 손해 입히자고 이러는 거 아냐.]  
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!”)

(9) COMP-based Adverbial Lexicalization: Patterns illustrated (Rhee 2009)

a. *ku-nun sal-apo-keys-tako*

*pamnac-ulo ilha-n-ta.*

[그는 살아보겠다고 밤낮으로 일한다.]

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.*

[그는 죽어라고 앞을 향해 달렸다.]

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

‘He ran forward desperately (with all his might).’

< (Lit.) ‘He ran forward, saying, “Die!”’

c. *ku-nun a-l-ke-y-mwue-nyako*

*caleka-ss-ta.*

[그는 알 게 뭐냐고 자러 갔다.]

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.* [그렇게 나 편하자고 가만있지 마라.]  
 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.”’

(10) DEC-COMP-based adverbial lexicalization (examples) *-tako*

a. <i>kulehtako</i>	[그렇다고]	‘still; nonetheless’	< ‘saying, “It is so.”’
b. <i>cwuknuntako</i>	[죽는다고]	‘self-pitifully’	< ‘saying, “I am dying.”’
c. <i>salkeysstako</i>	[살겠다고]	‘desperately’	< ‘saying, “I will live.”’
d. <i>nacalnasstako</i>	[나 잘났다고]	‘haughtily’	< ‘saying, “I am great.”’
e. <i>michyesstako</i>	[미쳤다고]	‘nonsensically’	< ‘saying, “I am insane.”’
f. <i>calhaypokeysstako</i>	[잘해보겠다고]	‘earnestly’	< ‘saying, “I will try to do it well.”’
g. <i>salapokeysstako</i>	[살아보겠다고]	‘effortfully’	< ‘saying, “I will try to live.”’
h. <i>mossalkeysstako</i>	[못 살겠다고]	‘in frustration’	< ‘saying, “I can’t live.”’
i. <i>cwukkeysstako</i>	[죽겠다고]	‘desperately’	< ‘saying, “I will die.”’

(11) INT-COMP-based adverbial lexicalization (examples) *-nyako*

a. <i>ikeyweynttekinyako</i>	[이게 웬떡이냐고]	‘gladly’	< ‘saying, “What kind of cake is this?”’
b. <i>alkeymwenyako</i>	[알게 뭐냐고]	‘nonchalantly’	< ‘saying, “What should I know?”’
c. <i>mwusuncisinyako</i>	[무슨 짓이냐고]	‘protestingly’	< ‘saying, “What kind of act is it?”’
d. <i>mwusunsolinyako</i>	[무슨 소리냐고]	‘protestingly’	< ‘saying, “What kind of sound is it?”’
e. <i>kukeyetinyako</i>	[그게 어디냐고]	‘appreciatively’	< ‘saying, “Where is it?”’

(12) IMP-COMP-based adverbial lexicalization (examples) *-lako*

a. <i>nalsallilako</i>	[날 살리라고]	‘desperately’	< ‘saying, “Save me!”’
b. <i>sallyetallako</i>	[살려달라고]	‘begging mercy’	< ‘saying, “Please save me!”’
c. <i>ttwulhecyelako</i>	[뚫어져라고]	‘attentively’	< ‘saying, “Let it be bored a hole!”’
d. <i>pwatallako</i>	[봐달라고]	‘begging mercy’	< ‘saying, “Please be considerate!”’
e. <i>cwukelako</i>	[죽어라고]	‘desperately’	< ‘saying, “Die!”’
f. <i>taliyanalsallilako</i>	[다리아 날 살리라고]	‘desperately’	< ‘saying, “Feet, save me!”’
g. <i>nalcapamekulako</i>	[날 잡아먹으라고]	‘indifferently’	< ‘saying, “Kill and eat me!”’
h. <i>payccaylako</i>	[배 찢라고]	‘non-committedly’	< ‘saying, “Cut open my belly!”’

(13) HORT-COMP-based adverbial lexicalization (examples) *-cako*

a. <i>nacohcako</i>	[나 좋자고]	‘selfishly’	< ‘saying, “Let’s make me (feel) good!”’
b. <i>cwukcako</i>	[죽자고]	‘enthusiastically’	< ‘saying, “Let’s die!”’
c. <i>cwukcasalcako</i>	[죽자살자고]	‘obsessively’	< ‘saying, “Let’s die, let’s live (together)!”’
d. <i>necwukkonacwukcako</i>	[너죽고 나죽자고]	‘irrationally’	< ‘saying, “Let’s make you die and me die!”’
e. <i>ecceccako</i>	[어쩌자고]	‘why’	< ‘saying, “Let’s (do it) somehow!”’
f. <i>naphyenhacako</i>	[나 편하자고]	‘selfishly’	< ‘saying, “Let’s make me comfortable!”’

### 3.2.2 Pseudo-Quotative/Reportative for Stance Marking

- Among the QUOT/REPT forms is *-tanta* originated from a construction with the COMP *-tako*. (*-tay* carries a similar function, cf. Sohn & Park 2003; reported thoughts often carrying evaluation/assessment-marking function, Kim 2014)

(14) *-tako ha-n-ta* >> *-tanta*  
 COMP say-PRES-DEC QUOT/REPT  
 ‘(x) says that …’ ‘(x) says that…/ it is said that…’

- The QUOT *-tanta* becomes the REPT *-tanta*, without involving formal change (cf. Japanese *-to/tte* QUOT/REPT, Oshima & Sano 2012).

(15) QUOT/REPT sentence-ender *-tanta*  
*ku-ka kot o-keyss-tanta* [그가 곧 오겠단다.]  
 he-NOM soon come-FUT-QUOT/REPT  
 QUOT: ‘He says that he will come soon.’  
 REPT: ‘They say that he will come soon.’

(16) REPT *-tanta*  
*twi-s-cip kim-tolyeng-i cyuk-ess-tanta* [뒷집 김 도령이 죽었다.]  
 back-GEN-house [name]-bachelor-NOM die-PST-REPT  
 ‘They say that the young bachelor Mr. Kim the neighbor in the back died.’ (Late 19<sup>th</sup> c., *Akpwu* 1)

- Originally a QUOT/REPT marker, *-tanta* further develops into a stance marker (SM), without formal change, as it becomes recruited for rhetorical effect.

(17) Attitudinal stance of friendliness [A child and his mother on a weekend]  
 Child: [How come Daddy is not playing with me today, Mom?]  
 Mother: [아빠는 요즘 돈 버시느라 무척 바쁘시단다.]  
*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.’

- *-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)

(18) [숲속 마을에 꾀 많고 영리한 여우가 살았단다.]  
*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*)

- The SM *-tanta* is a marker of friendliness and of inviting the addressee (the child) into the vivid story-line.
- The SM *-tanta* 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, Chapter 10); the reported evidential for children’s ‘pretend’ games, Goddard (1983).
- *-Tanta* is also used for emphasis, feigned mirativity, news-breaking and boastful talks.

(19) Emphasis from borrowed validity  
 a. [어디서 감히... 너 같은 건 눈에 안 차. 난 꿈이 크단다.]  
*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)

(20) 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.)  
 [이 언니도 잘 하는 게 있긴 있단다.]  
*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.)  
 [내가 의외로 결벽증 같은 게 있단다.]  
*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.)  
 [그리고 좋은 소식이 하나 더 있단다. 니들 동생 생길 거야.]  
*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 of (20) displays pejorative attitude toward the man or toward the proposition that he has presumptuously come to see her daughter.

(21) Pejoration (with QUOT/SM)

(A woman to her daughter with regard to her long-awaited-for would-be son-in-law who returned with an appearance of a wretched beggar)

[네 셔방 니도령이 너랄 보라 왔단다.]

*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.’ (19<sup>th</sup> c., *Namwenkosa* 212)

- two factors in pejorativity encoding: (i) the distancing effect and (ii) the multiple perspectives

(22) (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.

### 3.3 Feigned Questions

#### 3.3.1 Approximative Derivational Morphemes

- Korean has a number of interesting derivational morphemes involving question forms (Rhee 2008a).
- They defy any neat and tidy formal treatment (thus, avoided/neglected or treated as idiomatic expressions, cf. Lee & Lee 2010)

(23) Approximatives (adapted from Rhee 2008)

Function	Form	Source Meaning
Approximative Adjectivizer	<i>V-lkkamalkkaha(nu)n-</i> <i>N-manhalkkaha(nu)n-</i> Measure.Noun- <i>toylkkamalkkaha(nu)n-</i>	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	<i>V-lkkamalkka</i>	‘Shall I V or not?’

(24) a. *V-lkkamalkkaha-* ‘with a quality bordering on V-ing’

*po-i-lkka-ma-lkka-ha-nun sem* [보일까 말까 하는 섬]  
 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*      [오렌지만 할까 한 우박]  
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 에이커 될까 말까 하는 숲]  
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*      *komim cwung-i-ta* [그녀는 결혼을 할까 말까 고민 중이다.]  
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.’)

- grammaticalization of ‘indeterminacy’ in the semantics of question markers

### 3.3.2 Indefinite Pronouns & Indefinite Adverbs

(25) 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>way-nka</i>	why-Q	why is it?	for some reason
<i>way-nci</i>	why-Q	why is it?	for some reason

(26) a. *wuli cwung-ey nwukwu-nka*      *pemin-i iss-ta*      [우리 중에 누군가 범인이 있다.]  
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* [그는 어제 가게에서 뭔가를 샀다.]  
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*      [그 사람 왜가 맘에 안 들어.]  
that person why-Q mind-at not enter-END  
‘I don’t like the person for some reason.’ (lit. He doesn’t **why-is-it** enter into (my) heart.)

### 3.3.3 Discourse Markers

- Korean has many DMs that originated from question constructions.

(27)

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

(28) a. Pause-filler

*ku salam-un ku hoysa-uy ku mwe-nya isa-la-te-la* [그 사람은 그 회사의 그 뭐냐 이사라더라.]  
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

[그 사람은 기인이랄까 좀 이상한 데가 있어.]  
*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* [거 왜 김 박사 말이야.]  
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* [어디! 전혀 안 똑똑해.]  
where (=DM) at.all not be.smart-END  
‘Absolutely not. He’s not smart at all.’ (lit.: Where! He’s not smart at all.)

- “parentheticals” (Dehé & Kavalova 2007), “comment clauses” (Brinton 2008), “theticals” (Heine 2013, Kaltenböck et al. 2011, Heine et al. 2017)

(29) a. When I was going to my school in Great Dunmow a couple of well last week there was a place that had loads of these uhm what do you call them <,> rails for sale (ICE-GB, Kaltenböck 2007:41)

b. She had spent a fear-filled night beneath a stone slab in the meat cellar and, what was more, completely alone (1991 Elgin, BNC, Brinton 2008: 204)

c. “Wy [sic] did you come at all?” “To see my lord and master, what else?” she laughed. (1990 McGrath, Brinton 2008: 214)

- interjective *why?*, relativizer *what?*, filler pro-form placeholder *whatchamacallit*

(30) a. And to conceale it, why it doubled her griefe. (1590 Rosalynde, OED)

b. to ymbhycggannae ... huaet his gastae godaes aeththa yflaes / aefter deothdaege doemid ueeorthae. [to consider ... what his soul by way of good or evil/ may be deemed, after the death-day] (735 Bæda Death-song)

c. I need a—a whatchamacallit—one of those things that you can caramelize sugar with. (*Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary & Thesaurus*)



### 3.3.4 Feigned Audience-blindness & Feigned Monological Questions

- Four forms of SFPs of Discontent (SFPDs) (Koo & Rhee 2013, Rhee 2016, Rhee & Koo 2017)

- (31) a. *-tam* [-ta + -m]                      b. *-lam* [-la + -m]  
 c. *-nam* [-na + -m]                      d. *-kam* [-ka + -m]

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

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

(33) 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. ABFs are exceptional. (INT ABFs: *-ka, -na, -lkka, -lci, -nci*)
- 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 monological questions, or ‘feigned’ monological questions.
- 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?’

(34) a. *na-n caconsim-to eps-na mwe* (> *-nam*) [난 자존심도 없나 뭐. >> ... 없남]  
 I-TOP self-esteem-also not.exist-SFP DM(=what) (> SFPD)  
 '(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*) [내가 그렇게 한가한가 뭐. >> ... 한가한감.]  
 I-NOM like.that be.leisurely-CR-SFP DM(=what) (> SFPD)  
 '(Do you think) I am not busy (like that)?' (Lit. Am I that leisurely, what?)

- 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. (see also Kuteva et al., forthcoming)

(35) [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**.

- Sentence-final positions are often favored by stance particles in Korean (cf. H. Sohn 1994, S. Sohn 1995, 2015, Sohn & Park 2002, Kim & Sohn 2015, Ahn 2016)

## 4. Issues for Discussion

### 4.1 Discourse Strategies

#### 4.1.1 Attitudinal Stance Display

- [Imperative] Solidarity building: 'I will clean up later.' (PROM) for 'Clean up later.' (IMP); The speaker is strategically saying it as if s/he intended to do it himself/herself.
- [Imperative] Politeness strategy: When the command takes the form of a promise, the face-threatening becomes mitigated because the utterance *prima facie* is not addressed to the discourse partner.
- [SFPDs] Pseudo-monological, pseudo-blind form use displays attitudinal stance of discontent, challenge, etc.

- [**Stance-marking Pseudo-QUOT/REPT**] SM signals the speaker's pejorative attitude (attitudinal stance), or friendliness (emotional stance), distancing attitude (epistemic stance). (cf. evidential > epistemic development) (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)
- [**Stance-marking Pseudo-QUOT/REPT**] SM carries the addressee-oriented stance functions, e.g. signaling emphasis, mirativity, news-breaking, or boastful talk.

#### 4.1.2 Interactivity Modulation

- [**Stance-marking Pseudo-QUOT/REPT**] SM *-tanta* carries the function of marking the speaker's intention to negotiate/seek common ground. It also functions as a mirative, which creates 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 2003)
- [**Indefinite Pronouns/Adverbs**] [**INT-based DMs**] Use of question forms, though not directed, creates engaging effect and enhances interactivity. Question words are susceptible to grammaticalization in Korean (T. Kim, 2002; H. Lee, 1999; Koo, 1999, 2000, Rhee 2008, Kim 2010).
- [**Borrowed-mouth COMPs & ADVs**] Use of feigned other-originated utterances enhances 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).
- [**SFPDs**] SFPDs are built on non-interactional SFPs (ABFs) and non-interactional utterance types ('feigned monologues'). ABFs feign audience-blindness and monoguality, thus strategically lowering the visibility of the audience. Feigned monologues: the speaker intends to have his or her utterance heard by the discourse participant (these utterances are often uttered with sufficient audibility for the discourse participant). They also serve as a strategic loophole to avoid blames, if confronted.

### 4.2 Rhetorical Strategies

#### 4.2.1 Dramatizing Presentation

- [**Approximatives**] [**Indefinite Pronouns/Adverbs**] [**Borrowed-mouth COMPs & ADVs**] [**INT-based DMs**] These developments seem to have been motivated by the desire to use dramatic/graphic means to be creative (cf. 'creativity': Heine et al. 1991, Heine & Stolz 2008)
- [**Stance-marking Pseudo-QUOT/REPT**] The use of quotations for validity borrowing, feigned mirativity to dramatize the information, and rejection of accommodation of the on-going situation. The 'self-reporting' may create 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'.

#### 4.2.2 Perspective Management

- [**Borrowed-mouth COMPs & ADVs**] [**Approximatives**] [**Promissives**] [**SM of Pseudo-QUOT/REPT**] These developments show shifted perspective (Some borrowed-mouth forms still carry the vestiges of the old perspective encoding).
- [**Stance-marking Pseudo-QUOT/REPT**] 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 SM *-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. SM *-tanta* as a signal of refusal of 'accommodative process' (cf. Giles 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."
- [**Imperative**] The development of the innovative imperative goes beyond the speaker-addressee intersubjectification, i.e., it was strongly motivated by the consideration of the people present in the scene (attention to the audience within earshot). Its use 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 co-opted to encode a more potentially face-threatening speech act, i.e. imperative.

## 5. Summary & Conclusion

- Grammaticalization of certain grammatical markers involves discursive and rhetorical 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).
- It calls for the necessity of analyzing language use and grammatical change from multiple perspectives.

## Abbreviations:

ACC: accusative; ADN: adnominal; BEN: benefactive; CAUS: causal; COMP: complementizer; CT: concessive topic; DEC: declarative; DGR: degree-marker; DM: discourse marker; END: sentence-ender; FUT: future; GEN: genitive; HON: honorific; IMP: imperative; INST: instrumental; INT: interrogative (=Q); INTEN: intentional; INTJ: interjective; MN: measure noun; NOM: nominative; NOMZ: nominalizer; PASS: passive; POL: polite; PRES: present; PROH: prohibitive; PROM: promissive; PST: past; PT: pejorative topic; PURP: purposive; Q: question (=INT); QUOT: quotative; REAS: reason; REPT: reportative; RETRO: retrospective; SFPD: sentence-final particle of discontent; SM: stance-marker; TOP: topic; TRL: trial.

## References

- Ahn, Mikyung. 2016. Surprise in discourse: The mirative meanings of *ta(ha)*-derived sentence final particles in Korean. *Language and Linguistics* 71: 95-114.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: OUP.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. (Ed. by Michael Holquist, trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1986. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. (Ed. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, trans. by Vern W. McGee. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Brinton, Laurel J. 2008. *The Comment Clause in English: Syntactic Origins and Pragmatic Development*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Buchstaller, Isabelle. 2014. *Quotatives: New Trends and Sociolinguistic Implications*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Cole, Peter. 1975. The synchronic and diachronic status of conversational implicature. In Peter Cole & Jerry L. Morgan (Eds.), *Speech Acts*, 257-288. New York: Academic Press.
- Dehé, Nicole, & Yordanka Kavalova, 2007. Parentheticals: an introduction. In: Nicole Dehé & Yordanka Kavalova (Eds.), *Parentheticals*, 1-22. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Diewald, Gabriel. 2006. Discourse particles and modal particles as grammatical elements. In: Kestin Fischer (Ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, 403-425. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Diewald, Gabriel. 2011. Pragmaticalization (defined) as grammaticalization of discourse functions. *Linguistics* 49.2: 365-390.
- Dostie, Gaétane. 2004. Pragmaticalisation et marqueurs discursifs. Analyse sémantique et traitement lexicographique. Brussels: De Boeck.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2006. A view with a view: Towards a typology of multiple perspective constructions. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 31: 93-120.
- Floyd, Rick. 1999. *The Structure of Evidential Categories in Wanka Quechua*. Dallas: SIL and the University of Texas at Arlington Press.
- 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: CUP.
- 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: Benjamins.
- Gvozdanović, Jadranka. 1996. Reported speech in South Slavic. In: Theo A. Janssen, & Wim van der Wurff (Eds.). *Reported Speech: Forms and Functions of the Verb*, 57-71. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Heine, Bernd. 2013. On discourse markers: Grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, or something else? *Linguistics* 51.6: 1205-1247.
- 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. 2017. Cooptation as a discourse strategy. *Journal of Linguistics* 55.4: 813-856.
- Heine, Bernd, & Thomas Stolz. 2008. Grammaticalization as a creative process. *STUF* 61.4: 326-357.
- Herring, Susan C. 1988. Aspect as a discourse strategy in Tamil. *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 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; 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: Benjamins.
- Hopper, Paul J., & Elizabeth C. Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: CUP.
- 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: 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, Jong-Hyun. 2000. The attitudinal force of quasi-quotation sentences in Korean. *Eneohag: Journal of the Linguistic Society of Korea* 26: 75-104.
- Kim, Mary Shin. 2014. Reported thought as a stance-taking device in Korean conversation. *Discourse Processes* 51.3: 230-263.
- Kim, Mary Shin. 2015. A distinct declarative question design in Korean conversation: An examination of turn-final *ko* questions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 79: 60-78.
- Kim, Stephanie Hyeri, & Sung-Ock S. Sohn. 2015. Grammar as an emergent response to interactional needs: A study of final *kuntey* 'but' in Korean conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 83: 73-90.
- Kim, Tae-Yeop. 2002. A study on the grammaticalization of discourse marker. *The Korean Language and Literature* 26: 61-80.
- Koo, Jong-Nam. 1999. On the discourse 'eodi'. *Linguistics* 7.3: 217-234.
- Koo, Jong-Nam. 2000. Tamhwaphyoci *mwe-uy mwunpephwawa tamhwa kinung* [On grammaticalization of the discourse marker *mwe* and its discourse functions]. *Kwukemwunhak* 35: 5-32.
- Koo, Hyun Jung, & Seongha Rhee. 2013. On an emerging paradigm of sentence-final particles of discontent: A grammaticalization perspective. *Language Sciences* 37: 70-89.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1975[1965]. The evolution of grammatical categories. Reprinted in J. Kuryłowicz, *Esquisses linguistiques*, vol.2, 38-54. Munich: Fink.
- 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 et al. (Eds.) *Issues in English Linguistics*, 50-67. Seoul: Hankook Publisher.
- Kuteva, Tania, Seongha Rhee, Debra Ziegeler, & Jessica Sabban. forthcoming. On sentence-final "what" in Singlish: Are you the queen of England, or what? *Journal of Language Contact*. (to appear in 2018)
- 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.
- Lee, Han-gyu. 1999. The pragmatics of the discourse particle *mwe* in Korean. *Discourse and Cognition* 6.1: 137-157.
- 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 Closs Traugott, & Bernd Heine (Eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, 2 vols., Vol. I, 37-80. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Maynard, Senko. 1996. Multivoicedness in speech and thought representation: The case of self-quotation in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 207-226.
- Narrog, Heiko. 2010. (Inter)subjectification in the domain of modality and mood--Concepts and cross-linguistic realities. In:

- Kristin Davids, Lieven Vandelanotte, & Hubert Cuyckens (Eds.), *Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization*, 385-429. Berlin: Mouton.
- 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: 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.
- 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. 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 International 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.
- Rhee, Seongha, & Hyun Jung Koo. 2017. Audience-blind sentence-enders in Korean: A discourse-pragmatic perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics* 120C: 101-121.
- 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. 1994. *Korean*. London: Routledge.
- Sohn, Ho-Min. 2001. *The Korean Language*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Sohn, Sung-Ock S. 1995. On the development of sentence-final particles in Korean. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 5: 219-234.
- Sohn, Sung-Ock S. 2011. Historical development of quotative constructions in Korean. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 18: 126-143.
- Sohn, Sung-Ock S. 2015. The emergence of utterance-final particles in Korean. In: Sylvie Hancil, Alexander Haselow, & Margje Post (Eds.), *Sentence-Final Particles*, 181-195. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Sohn, Sung-Ock S., & Mee-Jeong Park. 2002. Discourse, grammaticalization, and intonation: The analysis of *-ketun* in Korean. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 10: 306-319.
- Sohn, Sung-Ock S., & Mee-Jeong Park. 2003. Indirect quotations in Korean conversation. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 11: 105-118.
- 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 and Culture* (Hanyang University) 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: Berkeley Women and Language Group.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1995. The role of the development of discourse markers in a theory of grammaticalization. Paper presented at the 12th International Conference on Historical Linguistics. Manchester, UK.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2003. From subjectification to intersubjectification. In: Raymond Hickey (Ed.), *Motives for Language Change*, 124-139. Cambridge: CUP.
- Vološinov, Valentin N. 1930. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (Trans. 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.
- Waltherit, Richard. 2006. The rise of discourse markers in Italian: a specific type of language change. In: Kerstin Fischer (Ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, 61-76. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Watters, David E. 2002. *A Grammar of Kham*. Cambridge: CUP.
- 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: Benjamins.

## Acknowledgment:

This research was supported by the Research Fund of Hankuk University of Foreign Studies.