

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

SEONGHA RHEE

Hankuk University of Foreign Studies

1 Introduction*

There is a general agreement among grammaticalizationists that discourse is where grammaticalization is triggered, or that discourse and grammar are in mutual feeding relationship in their formation (Givón 1979; Lichtenberk 1991; Heine et al. 1991, inter alia). Discourse is the locus of active meaning negotiation filled with various kinds of rhetorical and discourse strategies to fulfill intended persuasion. A large body of grammaticalization studies in Korean presents many instances in which rhetorical and discursive strategies

* I am thankful for the comments made by the JK 25 audience. Also thanks go to Shaun Manning for kindly reading an earlier version of the paper. This research was supported by the Hankuk University of Foreign Studies research fund.

Japanese/Korean Linguistics 25.

Edited by

Copyright © 2018, CSLI Publications

played crucial roles. This paper presents some linguistic ‘bad guys’ that may be labeled as false promises, fake quotations, and feigned questions.

2 A Note on Basic Concepts

Before we discuss the grammaticalization of manipulative discourse strategies in earnest, a brief mention on a few related concepts is in order. First of all, the notion of grammaticalization has been defined in a number of ways, notably by Kuryłowicz (1975[1965]: 52), as change of a morpheme advancing from lexical to grammatical, or from less grammatical to more grammatical status, and by Hopper and Traugott (2003: xv), as the change whereby lexical terms and constructions in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions, and, once grammaticalized, continue to develop new grammatical functions.

Discourse markers (DMs) have been a subject of controversy with respect to their status, i.e., as to whether they are ‘grammatical’ forms or not. Their status determines whether their development can be viewed as an instance of grammaticalization or not (see Waltereit 2006 vs. Diewald 2006, 2011). Following Diewald (2006, 2011), Wischer (2000), Traugott (1995), Rhee (2014), and many others, this paper takes the position that DMs are indeed grammatical forms and thus their development is rightfully considered as an instance of grammaticalization.

Another notion that bears relevance to the present paper is rhetoric. Keith and Lundberg (2008: 4) define rhetoric as the study of producing discourses and interpreting how, when, and why discourses are persuasive. From this perspective, rhetoric is concerned with language for persuasion (see also Leech 1983; Leith and Myerson 1989; Wales 2001: 344-346). Since all, or nearly all, instances of language use concern successful conveyance of the speaker’s intention, rhetorical strategies are expected to surface among the most researched subjects of grammaticalization. Indeed certain grammatical markers have been analyzed as having discourse-pragmatic origins, e.g. Givón (1979), Herring (1991) for clause subordinators, Hopper (1982) and Herring (1988) for perfective aspect markers. Discussing the role of rhetoric in grammaticalization, Rhee (2008b) argues that the motivation for adopting rhetorical strategies is to increase illocutionary force of the statement by making it more dramatic and vivid.

3 Case studies

3.1 False Promises: Disguised Imperative

The speech act of command is impositive and thus 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 an extreme level the impositive speech act, i.e. imperative (Koo 2004a,b). Thus, 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 throughout history, and these idiosyncrasies in Korean seem to be responsible for the development of an imperative in the disguise of a promissive in Present-Day Korean (PDK), which will be presented momentarily.

In PDK there are multiple sentence-final particles (SFPs) for imperatives and for promissives. These multiple forms signal different levels of formality, honorification, and politeness toward the addressee. One form specializing in the promissive speech act is *-lkey*, used at the intimate level, which has a polite-level variant *-lkeyyo*. The polite promissive *-lkeyyo* is being innovated as polite imperative, despite frequent criticism by prescriptivists. As a promissive marker *-lkey* is not compatible with subject honorification since the actor of the promise is the speaker and as a general rule a speaker cannot honorify himself or herself. When the form was innovated as a polite imperative marker, however, it can be, and is often, modulated with honorification, i.e., *-lkeyyo* [-HON] and *-silkeyyo* [+HON] for request and command.¹

(1) a. Promissive *-lkey*

nay-ka tow-acwu-lkey
 I-NOM help-BEN-PROM
 ‘I will help you.’

¹ The following abbreviations are used in glossing: ACC: accusative; ADN: adnominal; ANT: anterior; 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; SIM: simultaneous; SM: stance-marker; TOP: topic; TRL: trial.

b. Imperative (Polite Request) (a dentist to a young patient)

ca ip com khukey pelli-lkey-yo
 now mouth a.little widely open-IMP-POL
 ‘Now, please open your mouth wide.’

c. Imperative (Polite Request) (a nurse to an adult patient)

yeki chimtay-ey nwuw-si-lkey-yo
 here bed-at lie.down-HON-IMP-POL
 ‘Please lie on the bed over here.’

d. Imperative (a head-beautician to her assistant)

3-pen sonnim mence tow-atuli-lkey-yo
 3-number client first help-BEN-IMP-POL
 ‘Help the Number 3 client first.’

In appearance (1b) and (1d) are ambiguous between promissive and imperative. The addressee infers the intended imperative meaning only from the context. In terms of discursive strategy, the speaker is talking about opening the mouth and attending to a client as if she would do so, but addressee reads the speaker’s mind and acts accordingly, thus building solidarity between interlocutors. This development involves diverse discursive and rhetorical strategies (see section 4 for more discussion).

3.2 Fake Quotations

3.2.1 Borrowed Mouth

Korean complementizers (COMPs) incorporate the markers of the embedded clause type markers, e.g., *-tako* and *-lako* for declarative (DEC), *-nyako* for interrogative (INT), *-lako* for imperative (IMP) and *-cako* for hortative (HORT). However, these COMPs have undergone functional extension from embedding quoted or reported speech to diverse functions, as shown in part below:

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

ku-nun pappu-tako setwulu-n-ta
 he-TOP be.busy-REAS hurry-PRES-DEC
 ‘He hurries because he is busy.’
 (< lit. He, saying, “(I) am busy,” hurries.)

- b. DEC-COMP *-lako* > Concessive Topic marker (CT)
uysa-lako pyeng-ul ta kochi-nun ke-y ani-ta
 doctor-CT illness-ACC all cure-ADN NOMZ-NOM be.not-DEC
 ‘Even doctors cannot cure all illnesses.’
 (< lit. Saying, “(she) is a doctor,” (she) cannot cure all illnesses.)
- c. INT-COMP *-nyako* > Pejorative Topic marker (PT)
thomatho-nyako toykey cak-ney
 tomato-PT very be.small-INTJ
 ‘What a small tomato!’
 (< lit. Saying, “({Is it, Are you}) a tomato?”, ({it’s, you’re} very small.)
- d. IMP-COMP *-lako* > Purposive marker (PURP)
somwun-na-lako way kul-ay?
 rumor-exit-PURP why do.so-END
 ‘Are you trying to stir up a rumor?’
 (< lit. Why are you doing so, saying, “Let there be a rumor!”?)
- e. HORT-COMP *-cako* > Intentional/Purposive marker (INTEN)
na ne sonhay-ip-hi-cako ile-nun ke-ø ani-ya
 I 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!”)

The extended functions of the COMP-based markers given above and many others all show subjectification in that the speaker is attributing an imaginary utterance to the sentential subject as if he or she is saying so, thus a phenomenon labeled as ‘through a borrowed mouth’ in Rhee (2009). The ‘borrowed mouth’ phenomenon with complementizers is not only frequent in grammaticalization but also in lexicalization, as in *cwukelako* ‘desperately’ (< ‘saying, “Die!”’), *cwukkeysstako* ‘desperately’ (< ‘saying, “I will die.”’), *payccaylako* ‘non-committedly’ (< ‘saying, “Cut open my belly!”’), etc.

3.2.2 Pseudo-Quotative/Reportative for Stance Marking

Among the quotative/reportative (QUOT/REPT) forms is *-tanta* which originated from a construction with the COMP *-tako*. Incidentally, the SFP *-tay* carries a similar function as *-tanta* (cf. Sohn & Park 2003), and it has been observed that reported thoughts often carry evaluation/assessment-marking function (Kim 2014). The development of QUOT/REPT *-tanta* can be schematically presented as below:

- (3) *-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 QUOT/REPT *-to/tte*, Oshima & Sano 2012) as in (4). The major change in this is that the author of the reported speech is now no longer identifiable, as shown in (5):

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

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

Originally a QUOT/REPT marker, *-tanta* further develops into a stance marker (SM), again without formal change, as it becomes recruited for rhetorical effects, such as friendliness, emphasis, feigned mirativity, among others.

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

For the friendliness signaled by *-tanta*, it is commonly used in child-directed language (cf. Son 1998; Kim 2000), and thus children’s books or even impromptu stories use this SFP frequently, a phenomenon also found in other languages including Quechua (Aikhenvald 2004).

- (7) *swuph-sok-maul-ey kkoymanh-ko yengliha-n*
 forest-inside-village-at be.cunning-and be.clever-ADN
yewu-ka sal-ass-tanta
 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 in examples like (7) above, it invites the addressee (the child) into the vivid story-line. It engages the addressee in the joint construction of a representation (cf. ‘negotiation of common ground’ Jucker and Smith 1998: 172). Aikhenvald (2004: 137, 313) argues that reported evidential is used as ‘a stylistic token of folk tales and narratives’ in Kham, Quechua, Baniwa, Achagua, Piapoco, among others. Similarly, Goddard (1983) notes that the reported evidential is often used for children’s ‘pretend’ games.

In addition to the stance of friendliness toward the addressee, the SM *-tanta* is also used for marking other interactional stances such as emphasis, feigned mirativity, news-breaking, boastful talks, and even pejoration, as exemplified in part below:

(8) a. Emphasis

etise kamhi... *ne-kathun ke-n nwun-ey an cha-ø.*
 where daringly... you-like thing-TOP eye-at not fill-END
na-n kkwum-i khu-tanta
 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)

b. News-breaking

(Context: The speaker is breaking news to his children that their mother is pregnant.)

kuliko cohun sosik-i hana te iss-tanta.
 and good news-NOM one more exist-SM
ni-tul tongsayng sayngki-lkey-a
 you-PL baby.sibling be.born-FUT-END

‘(Guess what?) There is one more piece of good news. You guys will have a baby brother/sister.’ (2008, Drama, *Wekhingmam* Episode #14)

c. Pejoration

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

ney syepang ni-tolyeng-i ne-lal po-la o-ass-tanta
 your boyfriend [name]-Mr.-NOM you-ACC see-PURP come-PST-SM

c. MN-*toykkamalkkaha*- ‘with a degree close to MN’
30 acre-toy-l-kka-ma-l-kka-ha-nun swuph
 30 acre-become-FUT-Q-not.do-FUT-Q-say-ADN forest
 ‘a forest of about 30 acres’ (lit. ‘a forest that says, “Shall I become 30 acres or not?”’)

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

The development of these derivational morphemes from question forms in the above, though complex in appearance, may be analyzed as involving many conceptual manipulations, including personification, perspective shift, etc. But the most fundamental aspect of it is that the notion of ‘indeterminacy’ inherent in question forms is recruited to signal inconclusiveness or approximation in word derivation. For instance, in (9a) by attributing “Shall I be seen or not?” to an island as if it were saying the monologal question, the language user innovates a grammatical marker that describes the state of affairs of an island with approximation or inconclusiveness, i.e., the island is barely visible.

3.3.2 Indefinite Pronouns & Indefinite Adverbs

Another class of forms developed from feigned questions is that of indefinite pronouns and indefinite adverbs. These forms involve interrogative pronouns and many of them are full-fledged question sentences in appearance. For instance, personal interrogative pronoun *nwukwu* ‘who’ functions as an indefinite pronoun ‘someone’, but the interrogative constructions involving it also function as pronoun with the meaning ‘someone’, as below:

- (10) Indefinite pronouns derived from *nwukwu* ‘who’
 a. *nwukwu* ‘someone’ < *nwukwu* ‘who’
 b. *nwuka* ‘someone’ < *nwukwu-ka* [who-NOM] ‘who is?’
 c. *nwukw(i)unka* ‘someone’ < *nwukwu-(i)-nka* [who-be-Q] ‘who is it?’
 d. *nwukwu(i)nci* ‘someone’ < *nwukwu-(i)-nci* [who-be-Q] ‘who is it?’

The general patterns of using an interrogative pronoun/adverb as an indefinite pronoun/adverb and of using such interrogative forms in question constructions are productive lexicalization and grammaticalization patterns, e.g. with *nwukwu* ‘who’ (as shown above), *mwe* ‘what’, *mwues* ‘what’, *encey*

‘when’, *eti* ‘where’, *ettehkey* ‘how’, and *way* ‘why’. This pattern of rhetorically recruited pseudo-questions is exemplified in the following examples in which such indefinite pro-forms are morphologically broken down with separate glosses:

(11) a. *nwukwunka* ‘someone’
wuli cwung-ey nwukwu-ø-nka paysin-ul ha-yss-ta
 we middle-at who-be-Q(=someone) betrayal-ACC do-PST-DEC
 ‘Someone among us betrayed us.’
 (lit.: Who-is-it among us betrayed us.)

b. *mwenka* ‘something’
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. *waynka* ‘for some reason’
ku salam way-ø-nka mam-ey an tul-e
 that person why-be-Q mind-at not enter-END
 ‘I don’t like the person for some reason.’
 (lit. He does’nt why-is-it enter into (my) heart.)

The development of interrogative pronouns into indefinite pronouns is an instance of conversion and reification also attested in Classical Greek (*tís* ‘who?’ and *tís* ‘someone’, *poũ* ‘where?’ and *pou* ‘somewhere’), Chinese (*shéi* ‘who?’ ‘someone’, *shénme* ‘what?’ ‘something’), Hopi (*hak* ‘who?’ ‘someone’), Dyrbal (*wanya* ‘who?’ ‘someone’ and *minya* ‘what?’ ‘something’), etc. (Haspelmath 1997: 170). Full-fledged interrogative constructions developing into fully lexicalized indefinite pro-forms are also attested in English, e.g. *what-d’you-call-it* (Enfield 2003), *whatchamacallit* (< *what you may call it*), *dontcherknow* (< don’t you know), etc.

3.3.3 Discourse Markers

Korean has many DMs that originated from question constructions. DMs in this category are so numerous and their functions are so diverse across various domains, e.g. pause-filling, mitigation, attention attraction, affirmation, negation, etc., that discussing them in detail is beyond the scope of this paper. Thus exemplification of a few instances may suffice the purpose.

Korean interrogative pronouns, which often can stand alone as full-fledged questions, are often used as DMs, as illustrated by *way* ‘why’ and *eti* ‘where’ in (12).

(12) a. Attention-attractor *way* ‘why’
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, the talk is about Dr. Kim.)

b. Emphatic negator *eti* ‘where’
 A: [Isn't he really smart?]
 B: *eti! cenhye an tokttokha-y*
 where (=DM) at.all not be.smart-END
 ‘Absolutely not. He's not smart at all.’
 (lit.: Where! He's not smart at all.)

In a more complex fashion, certain constructions involving interrogative forms develop into DMs. In this case, the constructions comprise a structural template along with a slot, thus resembling ‘formal idioms’ in construction grammar (Fillmore et al. 1988). This is exemplified below:

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

b. Mitigator *x-(i)lalkka* ‘shall (I) say x?’ (x=NP)
ku salam-un kiin-i-la-l-kka com isangha-n
 that person-TOP eccentric-be-COMP-FUT-Q (=DM) a.little be.strange-ANT.ADN
tey-ka iss-e
 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.)

The DM *ku mwenya* ‘what is it?’ illustrated in (13a) is an instance of the *ku x-nya* DMs which can accommodate an interrogative pronoun in the *x*-slot. This DM is usually recruited to fill in the speech gap. Similarly, the expression *kiinilalkka* ‘shall I say (he is) an eccentric?’ in (13b) is an instance of *x-ilalkka*, the *x*-slot of which is filled in with a NP. The speaker usually

employs this DM to signal his or her reluctance to use a particular expression, thus mitigating the assertion. This type of discourse strategy is widely manifested across languages with the forms labeled as “parentheticals” (Dehé & Kavalova 2007), “comment clauses” (Brinton 2008), and “theticals” (Heine 2013; Kaltenböck et al. 2011; Heine et al. 2017), among others.

3.3.4 Sentence-Final Particles of Discontent

Still another category of feigned questions that triggered grammaticalization is that of sentence-final particles of discontent (SFPDs) (Koo & Rhee 2013; Rhee & Koo 2017). These SFPDs were developed from feigned monologal questions adjoined to the end of a sentence. For instance, SFPDs *-nam* and *-kam* developed from [SFP *-na* + *mwe* ‘what?’] and [SFP *-ka* + *mwe* ‘what?’], in each of which the question *mwe* ‘what?’ is fused with the preceding SFPs through erosion. Some of such uses are exemplified in (14).

(14) a. SFPD *-kam*

(One who was not aware of the passing of time utters in surprise.)

sikan-i way ilehkey ppalli ka-nun-kam
 time-NOM why like.this fast go-PRES-SFPD
 ‘How fast time is passing?! [Oh, no! It’s getting late!’]

b. SFPD *-nam*

(A parent grumbles noticing that her child is not serious about studying.)

paywu-ese nam-ø cwu-nam
 learn-and others-ACC give-SFPD
 ‘(Do you think) studying will benefit others?! [No! It will benefit YOU!’]

As indicated earlier, *-kam* and *-nam* originated from the [SFP+what?] complex. The challenging or discontent meaning in the SFPDs was inherited from the question ‘what?’ in the source structure. The source constructions are monologal questions, as evidenced by the use of the so-called ‘audience-blind’ enders, e.g., *-ka* and *-na* (Rhee & Koo 2017), but these monologues are ‘feigned’ monologues as they are spoken with the intention of being heard and thus with sufficient audibility.

(15)a. *-na mwe* > *-nam*

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

b. *-ka mwe > -kam*
nay-ka kulehkey hankaha-n-ka mwe (> -kam)
 I-NOM like.that be.leisurely-CR-SFP what (> -SFPD)
 ‘(Do you think) I am so leisurely?’
 (Lit. Am I that leisurely, what?)

Similar states of affairs are attested across languages (Mesthrie 1982; Smith 1985; Beeching 2002; Kuteva et al. 2018). In a number of languages, a short, yet complete, question ‘What?’ attached to the end of a sentence signals speaker’s emotion and attitude (Kuteva et al. 2018). This is in line with the observation that sentence-final positions are often favored by stance particles in Korean (cf. Sohn 1994; Sohn 1995, 2015; Sohn & Park 2002; Kim & Sohn 2015; Ahn 2016).

4 Issues for Discussion

The development of diverse grammatical markers described above reveals diverse discourse and rhetorical strategies. We will briefly look at some of the prominent cases from these strategic points of view.

4.1 Discourse Strategies

One of the most notable aspects of the grammaticalization instances is the development of attitudinal stance markers. For instance, the development of the imperative from the promissive shows that the speaker seeks to build solidarity with the addressee, by strategically saying something as if he or she intended to do it himself or herself. The same development also exhibits the 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.

Similarly, in the case of the development of QUOT/REPT, the speaker’s diverse stances came to be signaled by it, such as pejorative attitude (attitudinal stance), or friendliness (emotional stance), distancing attitude (epistemic stance), among others. Similar states of affairs involving evidentials developing into epistemic markers have been reported in Quechua and Bulgarian (Floyd 1999: 72). The notion of ‘otherness’ (Bakhtin 1981: 339) inherent in reported speech and the non-committal function of reported speech (Gvozdanović 1996: 63 as cited in Aikhenvald 2004: 138) are closely related to the stance function

It is also evident that the development of the SFPDs marking the speaker’s discontent is an instance of grammaticalization of the stance. The speaker’s display of affect plays a crucial role in coconstruction of attitudinal common ground among interlocutors.

4.2 Interactivity Modulation

Another aspect manifest in the development of the diverse markers described above is the strategic manipulation of interactivity. For instance, the functional extension of QUOT/REPT into stance marking brought forth such interactive stance functions as signaling emphasis, mirativity, news-breaking, and boastful talk. The same development also led to the emergence of the function of marking the speaker's intention to negotiate or seek common ground. In addition the SM *-tanta* also functions as a mirative, which creates a strong engaging effect on the part of the addressee. It signals the speaker's desire to 'share' the information as well as the feeling it arouses, an excellent instance of 'intersubjectification' (Traugott 2003).

In the case of the development of indefinite pronouns and adverbs as well as the DMs from question forms, strategic manipulation of interactivity is prominent. The use of question forms, though not directed, creates an engaging effect on the addressee and enhances interactivity among interlocutors. The inherent nature of engagement in question forms explains in part why question words are susceptible to grammaticalization of interactivity markers (for discussion in Korean, see Kim 2002; Lee 1999; Koo 1999, 2000; Rhee 2008; Kim 2010, among others).

Similarly, the functional extension of COMPs and the lexicalization of adverbs from COMPs also show the strategic interactivity modulation. The use of feigned other-originated utterances enhances interactivity. The speaker expresses the desire for the addressee's active engagement by saying something 'through a borrowed mouth' (Rhee, 2009).

In the case of SFPDs, it has been pointed out that they are built on non-interactive SFPs, i.e., audience-blind forms, and non-interactive utterance types ('feigned monologues'). SFPDs feign audience-blindness and monoguality, thus strategically lowering the visibility of the audience. When SFPDs are employed, the speaker intends to have his or her utterance heard by the discourse participant. They also serve as a strategic loophole to avoid blame, if confronted. Thus, SFPDs are excellent examples of strategic interactivity modulation in grammaticalization of discourse functions.

4.3 Dramatizing Presentation

The development of the forms described above also exhibits rhetorical strategies operating in grammaticalization, most notably, dramatizing presentation. For instance, in the case of approximatives, indefinite pronouns and adverbs, innovative COMP functions, COMP-based adverbs, and interrogative-based DMs all seem to have been motivated by the speaker's

desire to use dramatic or graphic means in order to be creative in language use (cf. ‘creativity’; Heine et al. 1991; Heine & Stolz 2008).

Similarly, the development of stance marking functions from QUOT/REPT also suggests the recruitment of rhetorical strategies. The use of quotations for validity borrowing, feigned mirativity to dramatize the information, and rejection of accommodation of the on-going situation, i.e., distancing, all share the common characteristics of employing rhetorical strategies. When the speaker reports something of his or her authorship by using the QUOT/REPT marker *-tanta*, the speaker is feigning the authorship as if the information is from a third party. Thus, the self-reporting may create connotation of mirativity (cf. Aikhenvald 2004: 185, 195-215).

4.4 Perspective Management

The last noteworthy rhetorical strategy in the development of the grammatical forms elaborated above is perspective management. It is evident that the speaker’s and the addressee’s perspectives are manipulated, i.e., shifted or mixed, in the development of the ‘borrowed mouth’ COMPs, COMP-based adverbs, approximatives, promissives, and stance markers.

Since reported speech involves multiple authors, QUOT/REPT inherently represents ‘multiple perspectives’ (Evans 2006; cf. ‘speech within speech and speech about speech’, Vološinov 1930: 115; ‘multivoicedness’ or ‘polyphony of voices’, Bakhtin 1986; for similar observations, see Buchstaller 2014). The SM *-tanta* developed from QUOT/REPT inherits such multiple perspectives from the latter. The voices of the two speakers may completely concur or differ. A peculiarity with the SM *-tanta* is that the original speaker may not exist at all, and thus it is a kind of ‘hypothetical discourse’ (Golato 2012), i.e., the two tiers of voices consist of the voice of a hypothetical speaker and that of the current speaker. Thus, it is possible for *-tanta* to function as a signal of refusal of ‘accommodative process’ (cf. Giles et al. 1991). This is in line with Goffman’s (1986[1974]: 512) observation that reported speech carries reduced personal responsibility, as “[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.”

It is also noteworthy that 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. Its use is often observed among service providers especially in businesses catering to high-class clientele. The use of the promissive-turned imperative is a service-providers’ in-group discourse strategy employed while clients are present in the scene within the earshot. 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 discursively or rhetorically in order to solve communicative problems. By doing so they try to be attentive to the addressee or even to the people who are present in the discourse scene. Thus 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, and thus, Rhee and Koo (2014: 334) assert that “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.” Involvement of diverse aspects in grammaticalization calls for the necessity of analyzing language use and grammatical change from multiple perspectives.

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: Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- Beeching, Kate. 2002. *Gender, Politeness and Pragmatic Particles in French*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Brinton, Laurel J. 2008. *The Comment Clause in English: Syntactic Origins and Pragmatic Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buchstaller, Isabelle. 2014. *Quotatives: New Trends and Sociolinguistic Implications*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

- Dehé, Nicole, and 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.
- Enfield, Nicholas. 2003. The definition of *what-d'you-call-it*: Semantics and pragmatics of recognitional deixis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 101-117.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2006. A view with a view: Towards a typology of multiple perspective constructions. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 31: 93-120.
- Fillmore, Charles J., Paul Kay, and Mary Kay O'Connor. 1988. Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions: The case of *let alone*. *Language* 64: 501-538.
- 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, and Justine Coupland. 1991. Accommodation theory: Communication, context, and consequence. In: Howard Giles, Nicholas Coupland, & Justine Coupland (Eds.), *Contexts of Accommodation: Developments in Applied Sociolinguistics*, 1-68. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Givón, Talmy. 1979. 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. 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.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite Pronouns*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Heine, Bernd. 2013. On discourse markers: Grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, or something else? *Linguistics* 51.6: 1205-1247.
- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, and Friederike Hünemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Heine, Bernd, Gunther Kaltenböck, Tania Kuteva, and Haiping Long. 2017. Cooption 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. *Berkely 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.
- 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., and Elizabeth C. Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jucker, Andreas H., and 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, and Tania Kuteva. 2011. On thetical grammar. *Studies in Language* 35.4: 848-893.
- Keith, William M., and 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, Stephanie Hyeri, and 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, and 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, Seongha Rhee, Debra Ziegeler, and Jessica Sabban. 2018. On sentence-final “what” in Singlish: Are you the queen of England, or what? *Journal of Language Contact* 11: 32-70.
- Lee, Heeja, and Jong-Hee Lee. 2010. *Emi Cosa Sacen* [The dictionary of particles]. 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, and 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.
- Mesthrie, Rajend. 1982. *English in Language Shift: The History, Structure, and Sociolinguistics of South African Indian English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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.
- Oshima, David Y., and 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.
- 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, & 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.
- 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, Sung-Ock S. 1995. On the development of sentence-final particles in Korean. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 5: 219-234.
- 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., and Mee-Jeong Park. 2002. Discourse, grammaticalization, and intonation: The analysis of *-ketun* in Korean. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 10: 306-319.
- Sohn, Sung-Ock S., and Mee-Jeong Park. 2003. Indirect quotations in Korean conversation. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 11: 105-118.
- Son, Se-mo-dol. 1998. {-(nun/n)anta}uy emihwa [Development of *-(nun/n)anta* into an ending]. *Hankwuk Enemwunhwa: Journal of the Society of Korean Language and Culture* (Hanyang University) 16, 105-130.
- 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: Cambridge University Press.
- 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.
- Waltereit, Richard. 2006. The rise of discourse markers in Italian: a specific type of language change. In: Kerstin Fischer (Ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, 61-76. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- 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.