

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 (SQC) 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 Sejong 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 SQCs

- 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.

(2) Interrogative sentences

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>밖에 바람이 부나?
a. <i>pakk-ey palam-i pwu-na</i>
outside-at wind-NOM blow-Q
‘Is it windy outside?’</p> | <p>내일 놀러 갈까?
b. <i>nayil nol-le ka-ikka</i>
tomorrow play-PURP go-Q
‘Should I go to play tomorrow?’</p> |
|--|---|

(3) SQCs

- 밖에 바람이 부나 몰라.
a. *pakk-ey palam-i pwu-na mol-la*
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. *nayil nol-le ka-ikka sayngkaha-koiss-e*
tomorrow play-PURP go-Q(?) think-PROG-END
‘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 (15th & 16th 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]

아버지 날오디 머즌 그르슬 므스게 뽏다 혼대

api nil-otAy mecun kulus-ul musuk-ey psu-lh-ta 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에 날오디 住處를 밍그로리라 흥딘댄 몬져 브레 벌에 잇는가 보디

(*Buddha*) *SALPHATA-ay nil-otAy [when making a residence] moncye mul-ey peley is-na-nka po-tAy...*

Buddha [name]-to say-as first water-at bug exist-CR-Q see-CONN

‘Buddha says to Salphata that when making a residence (one needs to) see first if there are bugs in the well and..’

(< Lit. Buddha says to Salphata, “When making a residence, (one needs to) see first, “Are there bugs in the well?” and..”)

(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

rain-NOM come-MOD-END

‘It seems to be raining.’

비가 오나 보아.

<< *pi-ka o-na po-a*

rain-NOM come-Q see-END

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.

nal-i etwuweci-na.siph-e

day-NOM darken-MOD-END

‘I’m afraid it’s getting dark.’

날이 어두워지나 싶어.

<< *nal-i etwuweci-na 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.)

b. Connective (Causal) *-na* [<<-Q]

아무도 없나 조용하다.

amwu-to eps-na coyongha-ta
 anyone-even not.exist-CONN be.quiet-DEC
 ‘It’s quiet perhaps due to there being nobody.’

아무도 없나...

<< *amwu-to eps-na ...*
 anyone-even not.exist-Q...
 ‘Lit. “Is nobody here?” it is quiet.’

c. Connective (Causal) *-nci* [<< -Q]

배가 고프는지 아기가 운다.

paykakophu-nci aki-ka wu-n-ta
 be.hungry-CONN baby-NOM cry-PRES-DEC
 ‘The baby is crying perhaps because it’s hungry.’

배가 고프는지...

<< *paykakophu-nci...*
 be.hungry-Q...
 ‘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.

ho-yuy-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.

**ho-yuy-ey an nucu-lkka cengmal molu-a*
 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.

ho-yuy-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 Hünemeyer. 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-categorical 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.