Hyun Jung Koo Sangmyung University hyunjkoo@smu.ac.kr

Seongha Rhee HUFS srhee@hufs.ac.kr

# From Self-Talk to Grammar:

# Emergence of Multiple Paradigms from Self-Quoted Questions in Korean

#### 1. Introduction

- Korean has a large number of quotative and reportative constructions that grammaticalized into diverse textual and discursive functions.
- In particular, it has a large inventory of sentence-final particles and connectives whose origins are ultimately traceable to quotative constructions involving complementizers (Rhee 2008, 2016; Sohn 2011; Sohn & Park 2003).
- Unlike such constructions that involve complementizers, which received relatively much attention from linguists, there are certain constructions involving self-quoted questions (SQCs) of the speaker, which have not received much attention to date.

#### [Objectives]

This presentation:

- (1) a. describes how SQCs emerged historically;
  - b. describes the functional categories of SQCs;
  - c. analyzes the role of analogy, pragmatic inference, and functional reinterpretation involved in the SQC development.

### [Data Sources]

• Historical corpus (The Seiong Historical Corpus for diachronic investigation): A 15-million word, historical section of the Sejong Corpus, a 200-million word corpus developed as part of the 21st Century Sejong Project by the Korean Ministry of Culture and Tourism and the National Institute of Korean Language (1998-2006). The texts in the historical section date from 1446 through 1913.

### 2. Formal Characteristics of SOCs

(2) Interrogative sentences

• These self-quoted questions take the form of direct quote, i.e., without any linkers, such as complementizers, but they are directly embedded in the matrix clause with the verbs of locution 'say', volition/cognition 'want/think/not.know', and perception 'see', eventually developing into grammatical constructions far removed from their original quotative function.

내일 놀러 갈까?

```
밖에 바람이 부나?
                               рwи-па
                                                   b. navil
                                                                nol-le
                                                                           ka-lkka
    a. pakk-ey
                 palam-i
                                                                play-PURP
      outside-at wind-NOM
                               blow-o
                                                     tomorrow
                                                                           go-O
      'Is it windy outside?'
                                                     'Should I go to play tomorrow?'
(3) SQCs
      밖에 바람이 부나 몰라.
                                          mol-la
    a. pakk-ey
                 palam-i
                               pwu-na
      outside-at wind-NOM
                              blow-Q(?)
                                          not.know-END
      'I'm wondering if it is windy outside.' (< Lit. "Is it windy outside?" (I) don't know.')
      내일 놀러 갈까 생각하고 있어.
    b. navil
                 nol-le
                               ka-lkka
                                          sayngkakha-koiss-e
                                          think-PROG-END
      tomorrow play-PURP
                               go-Q(?)
      'I'm wondering if I should go to play tomorrow.'
      (< Lit. "Should I go to play tomorrow?" (I) am thinking.')
```

### 3. Development of SQC Paradigms

### 3.1 Historical Development

- A historical investigation reveals that SQCs began to grammaticalize as markers of diverse functions only recently, even though some of the precursor constructions are attested as early as in Late Middle Korean (15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> c.).
- Before the development of complementizers (COMPs) for embedding a sentence, verbatim quotations were embedded. Locution verbs usually occurred twice (e.g., *nil* 'say' before and *ha* 'say/do' after the quotation).
  - (4) [Subject say [Direct Quotation of Question] say-TAM/CONN]

```
아비 닐오디 머즌 그르슬 므스게 쁧다 훈대
```

api nil-otAy <u>mecun kulus-ul musuk-ey psu-lH-ta</u> hA-n-tAy...
father say-as ominous vessel-ACC what-at use-FUT-Q say-PRES-CONN

"Since his father asks what he would use the ominous vessel for, ..."

(< Lit. Since his father says, saying, "What will you use the ominous vessel for?", ...)

(1481, Samkanghayngsilto Hyo-13)

- However, there were, though not very frequent, similar constructions with different structures, in which embedded quotations may **not** be true direct quotations.
  - (5) [Subject say [Direct Quotation of Question?] V-TAM/CONN]

薩婆多애 닐오디 住處룰 밍그로리라 홇딘댄 몬져 므레 벌에 잇눈가 보디

(1459, Welinsekpo 25:57b)

- Most constructions involving the verb *ha* 'say' like (4) develop into COMP constructions; and other constructions like (5), into SQCs.
  - (6) a. [.....-Q] say-and > COMP b. [....-Q] V... > SQC

### 3.2 SQC Modal Sentence-Final Particles (SFPs)

- A number of modal sentence-final particles (SFPs) develop from SQCs.
- SFPs are a constellation of finite-verb morphology indicating tense, aspect, modality, mood, honorification, sentence-type, politeness, etc. in a number of ordered slots.
  - (7) a. Evidential (Inferential) -na.po- [<< -Q.see-]

비가 오나 봐. pi-ka o-**na.po**-a 비가 오나 보아.

<< <u>pi-ka o-na</u> po-a rain-NOM come-Q see-END

rain-NOM come-<u>MOD</u>-END 'It seems to be raining.'

Lit. '(I) see (saying,) "Is it raining?"

<< Lit. "Is it raining?" (I) see."

b. Evidential (Inferential) & Emotional (Apprehensive) -na.siph- [<< -Q.want-]

날이 어두워지나 싶어.

날이 어두워지나 싶어.

nal-i etwuweci-<u>na.siph</u>-e day-NOM darken-**MOD**-END

'I'm afraid it's getting dark.'

<< <u>nal-i etwuweci-na</u> siph-e day-NOM darken-Q want-END

Lit. '(I) want (saying,) "Is it getting dark?""

<< Lit. "Is it getting dark?" (I) want."

(The verb siph- 'want' means 'feel like to think', 'be inclined to think', etc.)

c. Boulomaic (Tentative intention) -lkka.ha- [<< -Q.say-] 집에 갈까해.
cip-ey ka-lkka.ha-y
home-to go-MOD-END
'I might go home (instead of waiting, etc.).'

Cip-ey ka-lkka ha-y
home-to go-Q say-END
Lit. '(I) am saying, "Shall I go home?"'

<< Lit. "Shall I go home?" (I) am saying.'

- SQC modal SFPs consist of a Q-ender and a verb of cognition/perception.
  - (8) SQC modal SFPs

a. -napo [Q.see] modal, evidential (inferential) b. -lkkapo [Q.see] modal, boulomaic (tentative intention) modal, evidential (inferential); emotional (apprehensive) c. -nasiph [Q.want] modal, epistemic (probability); emotional (apprehensive) d. -nkasiph [Q.want] modal, boulomaic (tentative intention) e. -lkkasiph [Q.want] f. -namolu modal, epistemic (lack of confidence); emotional (apprehensive) [Q.not-know] g. -nkamolu modal, epistemic (lack of confidence); emotional (apprehensive) [O.not-know] h. -lkkamolu [Q.not-know] modal, epistemic (lack of confidence); emotional (apprehensive) i. -cimolu [PQ.not-know] modal, epistemic (possibility)1)

(and other less productive, less formulaic forms with similar verbs, e.g., sayngkakha- 'think', uyaha- 'wonder', ohayha- 'misunderstand', etc.)

### 3.3 Modal Connectives

- Most (but not all) modal SFPs also began to develop into clausal connectives simply by replacing their collocational sentence ender (END in the examples in (7)) with connectives (CONN), some of which, incidentally, are homophonic with END.
- (9) Modal clausal connectives

  - b. Epistemic (possibility) (& Emotional (Apprehensive)) -na.ha-ko [<<-Q.say.and] 병이 났나 하고 연락했어. 병이 났나 하고... pyengina-ss-<u>na.ha.ko</u> yenlakha-ss-e << pyengina-ss-na ha-ko ... fall.sick-PST-CONN contact-PST-END fall.sick-PST-Q say-and ... 'L called fearing that you might fell sick' Lit '(I) said "Has be fallen sick?" an
    - 'I called fearing that you might fell sick.'

      Lit. '(I) said "Has he fallen sick?" and contacted.'

      << Lit. "Has he fallen sick?" (I) say and contacted.'
  - c. Epistemic (possibility) -lkka.siph-e [<< -Q.want.and] 네가 올까 싶어 기다렸어.

'I waited since you might come.'

Lit. '(I) wanted (saying,) "Will he come?" and waited.'

<< Lit. "Will he come?" (I) wanted and waited.'

<sup>1)</sup> The interrogative sentence ender -ci is first attested in Early Modern Korean, but it is also used as a connective (Ko 2011: 447-460). Its origin is controversial.

### (10) SQC Modal connectives

```
    a. -lkkapwa [Q.see.and] modal, epistemic (possibility); emotional (apprehensive)
    b. -nahako [Q.say.and] modal, epistemic (possibility); (emotional (apprehensive))
    c. -nasiphe [Q.want.and] modal, epistemic (possibility)
    d. -nkasiphe [Q.want.and] modal, epistemic (possibility)
```

e. -lkkasiphe [Q.want.and] modal, epistemic (possibility)

f. -lkkamolla [Q.not-know.and] modal, epistemic (possibility); emotional (apprehensive)

### 3.4 Discourse Connectives

• Some SQC connectives came to serve distinct discourse functions.

#### (11) SQC discourse connectives

a. Topic presentation connective -nkahamyen [<< -Q.say.if]

그게 뭔가 하면 완전 신제품이야.

kuke-y  $mwe- ext{$\phi$-$\underline{nka.ha.myen}$}$  wancen sinceyphwum-i-ya << kuke-y  $mwe- ext{$\phi$-$nka}$  ha-myen... it-NOM what-be-CONN completely new.product-be-END it-NOM what-be-Q say-if

'To speak of it, it is a completely new product.'

Lit. 'If (I/one) say "What is it?" it is...'

<< Lit. "What is it?" if (I/one) say, it is...'

그게 뭔가 하면...

b. Transferentive connective -nkahamyen [<< -Q.say.if] (Transferentive: a marker of change of scenes) 봄이 오는가 하면 바로 여름이다. 봄이 오는가 하면

pom-i  $o-nu-\underline{nka.ha.myen}$  palo yelum-i-ta << pom-i o-nu-nka ha-myen...  $spring-NOM come-\underline{CONN}$  soon summer-be-DEC spring-NOM come-CR-Q say-if

'As soon as spring comes, it becomes summer.'

Lit. 'If (I/one) say "Is spring coming?" it is..'

</ Lit. "Is spring coming?" if (I/one) say, it is..'

c. Topic presentation connective -nkohani [<< -Q.say.as]

거기가 어딘고 하니 바로 우리집 옆이야. 거기가 어딘고 하니...

keki-ka eti-ø-<u>nkohani</u> palo wuli cip yeph-i-ya << keki-ka eti-ø-**nko ha-ni** there-NOM where-be-CONN just our house side-be-END there-NOM where-be-Q say-as

'To speak of the place, it is just next to my house.'

Lit. 'As (I/one) say "Where is that place?" it is..'

<< Lit. "Where is that place?" as (I/one) say, it is..'

• These discourse connectives are more dramatic and vivid since they involve a feigned interactive question-and-answer style, as compared to their non-SQC counterparts, e.g. -nun TOPIC; -teni, -taka, etc. TRANSFERENTIVES.

(12) SQC discourse connectives

a. -nkahamyen [Q.say.if] topic

b. -nkahamyen [Q.say.if] transferentive

c. -nkohani [Q.say.as] topic; elaboration prelude

## 3.5 SQC Causal Connectives

• In a more dramatic fashion, the self-quoted questions formed a paradigm of connectives, dramatic in that they appear in bare forms, i.e., with no morphological trappings that normally license their appearance in their syntagma and with no host verbs such as 'do,' 'say,' 'want,' etc.

(13) a. Connective (Causal) -nka [<< -Q]

비가 오는가 깜깜하다. 비가 오는가...

pi-ka o-nu-nka kkamkkamha-ta << pi-ka o-nu-nka...
rain-NOM come-CR-CONN be.dark-DEC rain-NOM come-Q

'It's dark perhaps because it is raining.' 'Lit. "Is it raining?" it's dark.'

```
b. Connective (Causal) -na [<<-Q]
                                                          아무도 없나...
  아무도 없나 조용하다.
                                 coyongha-ta
                                                     << amwu-to
  amwu-to
               eps-na
                                                                       eps-na ...
  anyone-even not.exist-CONN
                                 be.quiet-DEC
                                                          anyone-even not.exist-Q...
                                                          'Lit. "Is nobody here?" it is quiet.'
  'It's quiet perhaps due to there being nobody.'
c. Connective (Causal) -nci [<< -Q]
  배가 고픈지 아기가 운다.
                                                          배가 고픈지...
  paykakophu-nci
                    aki-ka
                               wu-n-ta
                                                     << paykakophu-nci...
  be.hungry-CONN
                    baby-NOM cry-PRES-DEC
                                                          be.hungry-O...
  'The baby is crying perhaps because it's hungry.'
                                                          'Lit. "(Is the baby) hungry?" it is crying.'
```

• A peculiarity with the forms in this paradigm is that the change occurs in their functions, i.e., causality marking, as well as their grammatical classes, i.e., connectives.

### 4. Discussion

### [Sentencehood]

- The markers -nka, -na, and -nci in (13) are undoubtedly Q-markers in form and meaning, being identical with question sentence-ender and marking the speech-act of asking at a deeper level.
- The location of the question enders, i.e. -nka, -na, and -nci in (13), is exactly the location of a connective in complex sentence structures in Korean.
- The peculiarity with the examples in (13) is that the two sentences are asyndetically combined, i.e., they are juxtaposed without any explicit linking devices. This phenomenon, which is common, at least in Korean, blurs the notion of sentential boundaries in linguistic analysis.

### [Structural Bondedness]

 Polylexemic forms (sentence enders and clausal connectives) cannot contain intervening forms such as degree modifiers inside.

```
(14) a. -lkkamolu- modal, epistemic (lack of confidence); emotional (apprehensive)
      회의에 안 늦을까 몰라.
      hoyuy-ey
                 an
                        nucu-lkka.molu-a
      meeting-at not
                        be.late-MOD-END
      'I'm worried if I would be late for the meeting.'
    b. Intervening modifier
       *회의에 안 늦을까 정말 몰라.
                                          molu-a
      *hoyuy-ey an nucu-lkka cengmal
       meeting-at not be.late-Q really
                                          not.know-END
       (intended) 'I'm really worried if I would be late for the meeting.'
    c. Non-intervening modifier
      회의에 정말 안 늦을까 몰라.
      hoyuy-ey
                 cengmal an nucu-lkka.molu-a
      meeting-at really
                          not be.late-MOD-END
      'I'm really worried if I would be late for the meeting.'
```

### [Conceptual Integration & Functional Reinterpretation]

- The development of SQCs suggests the role of discourse in grammaticalization (Heine et al. 1991; Hopper & Traugott 2003[1993]) and of discursive strategies (Rhee 2016, 2017; Koo & Rhee 2013).
- Interrogative sentence enders have 'indeterminacy' as an inherent semantic component.
- The sentence enders in SQCs are those specializing in self-directed questions (cf. 'audience-blind forms'; Rhee & Koo 2017).

- The finite verbs that serve as a component of SQCs are largely the verbs of locution, cognition, and perception.
- The conceptual integration of 'indeterminacy', 'self-directedness', and 'locution/cognition/perception' triggers the emergence of modal meanings in epistemic, evidential, boulomaic, and emotional domains.
- The acquisition of these functions and membership in different grammatical class is through pragmatic inferencing and analogy ('context-induced reinterpretation' Heine et al. 1991; 'invited inference' Traugott & Dasher 2002).
  - (15) Reinterpretation of causality (cf. (13b))
    - ["Is nobody here?" It is quiet.]
    - >> [It being so quiet makes me ask myself, "Is nobody here?"]
    - >> [The quietness is (perhaps) caused by there being nobody.]
    - >> [It's quiet perhaps because there is nobody.]

### [Role of Analogy in Grammaticalization]

- Certain collocational patterns of embedded self-quoted questions developed into modal expressions in the verbal morphology and their development triggered the development of multiple forms in other paradigms.
- The role of analogy in grammaticalization has not been well recognized primarily because many grammaticalizationists subscribe to the hypothesis that "only reanalysis can create new grammatical structures" (Hopper & Traugott 2003[1993]: 64) whereas analogy brings forth rule spread and paradigmatic leveling.
- However, the development of SQCs is a process of analogically motivated paradigm formation. (cf. Fischer 2008, 2011, De Smet 2010, Rhee 2014, Rhee & Koo 2015).
- This development occurred through analogy by virtue of their semantic and morphosyntactic resemblances.
- The analogy is triggered by the structural/conceptual affinities in the source constructions: (i) embedded questions, (ii) self-directed question enders, and (iii) locution/cognition/perception verbs in the main verb position (cf. Source Determination Hypothesis, Bybee et al. 1994).
- Depending on the grammatical properties of the participating forms, they come to form different, yet related, (modal) paradigms.

### [Implication in Grammar]

- The SQCs exemplified above and their formal/functional relatives, with a range of question particles and connectives, developed into grammatical markers in the semantic domains of evidentiality, epistemicity, and emotional stance, such as inferential, speaker's tentativeness in volition, causal evaluation of states of affairs, apprehensive emotion, etc., as well as the more discursive functions of dramatizing a narrative or engaging the audience by means of feigned interactivity, i.e., self-raised questions and answers to them (see Koo 2004, 2009, Koo & Rhee 2016, inter alia, for discussion of the role of cognitive forces in grammaticalization (and lexicalization) in Korean).
- The development of SQCs shows the emergence of new grammatical forms and new grammatical functions at a local level.
- The development consequently triggered re-organization of grammar at a global level, i.e., the paradigms of sentence-final particles, modal connectives, discourse connectives, and causal connectives.

### 5. Summary & Conclusion

- Korean has a number of sentence enders and connectives that originated from self-quoted question constructions.
- · SQCs have strong internal bondedness and behave as single grammatical morphemes.
- SQCs typically involve embedded question and verbs of locution/cognition/perception.
- The conceptual integration of 'indeterminacy', 'self-directedness', and 'locution/cognition/perception' triggers the emergence of modal meanings in epistemic, evidential, boulomaic, and emotional domains.
- The grammaticalization of certain SQCs involves discourse strategies of dramatizing a narrative or engaging the audience by means of feigned interactivity, i.e., self-raised questions and answers to them.
- Multiple paradigms developed through analogy, pragmatic inferencing and functional reinterpretation.
- The analogy is largely triggered by the structural/conceptual affinities in the source constructions: (i) embedded questions, (ii) self-directed question enders, and (iii) locution/cognition/perception verbs in the main verb position.

#### **Abbreviations**

ACC: accusative; COMP: complementizer; CONN: connective; CR: current relevance; DEC: declarative; END: sentence-ender; FUT: future; MOD: modal; NOM: nominative; PRES: present; PST: past; PURP: purposive; Q: question-ending; SQC: self-quoted question construction; TAM: tense-aspect-modality

#### References

- Bybee, Joan L., Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- De Smet, Hendrik. 2010. Grammatical interference: Subject marker for and phrasal particles out and forth. In Elizabeth C. Traugott & Graeme Trousdale (eds.), *Gradualness, Gradience and Grammaticalization*, 75-104. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fischer, Olga. 2008. On analogy as the motivation for grammaticalization. *Studies in Language* 32.2: 336-382. doi 10.1075/sl.32.2.04fis
- Fischer, Olga. 2011. Grammaticalization as analogically driven change? In Heiko Narrog & Bernd Heine (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*, 31-42. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, & Friederike Hünnemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth C. Traugott. 2003[1993]. Grammaticalization. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ko, Eunsook. 2011. Kwuke uymwunpep emiuy yeksacek pyenchen [Historical change of Korean interrogative endings]. Seoul: Hankook Publisher.
- Koo, Hyun Jung. 2004. A cognitive analysis of lexicalization patterns of (dis-)honorification in Korean. *Korean Semantics* 14: 97-120.
- Koo, Hyun Jung. 2009. Force dynamics as a variational factor: A case in Korean. LACUS Forum 33: 201-210.
- 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. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.263
- Koo, Hyun Jung & Seongha Rhee. 2016. Pejoratives in Korean. In Rita Finkbeiner, Jörg Meibauer, and Heike Wiese (eds.), *Pejoration*, 301-323. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/la.228.13koo.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2008. Subjectification of reported speech in grammaticalization and lexicalization. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* 12: 590-603.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2014. Analogy-driven grammaticalization: A case of grammaticalization of sentence-final markers from concomitance-connectives. *Linguistic Research* 31.3: 591-614. DOI: 10.17250/khisli.31.3.201412.008
- Rhee, Seongha. 2016. From quoting to reporting to stance-marking: Rhetorical strategies and intersubjectification of Reportative. *Language Sciences* 55: 36-54. doi: 10.1016/j.langsci.2016.02.003
- Rhee, Seongha. 2017. What happens when the will withers: The case of hortative in Korean. *Lingua* 189-190: 46-65. doi: 10.1016/j.lingua.2016.11.005
- Rhee, Seongha & Hyun Jung Koo. 2015. Analogy-driven inter-categorial grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification of -na in Korean. *Lingua* 166: 22-42. doi: 10.1016/j.lingua.2015.08.007
- Rhee, Seongha & Hyun Jung Koo. 2017. Audience-blind sentence-enders in Korean: A discourse-pragmatic perspective. Journal of Pragmatics 120: 101-121. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2017.09.002
- Sohn, Sung-Ock S. 2011. Historical development of quotative constructions in Korean. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 18: 126-143.
- Sohn, Sung-Ock S. & Mee-Jeong Park. 2003. Indirect quotations in Korean conversations. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 11: 105-118.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. & Richard B. Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.