

Provided for non-commercial research and education use.  
Not for reproduction, distribution or commercial use.



This article appeared in a journal published by Elsevier. The attached copy is furnished to the author for internal non-commercial research and education use, including for instruction at the authors institution and sharing with colleagues.

Other uses, including reproduction and distribution, or selling or licensing copies, or posting to personal, institutional or third party websites are prohibited.

In most cases authors are permitted to post their version of the article (e.g. in Word or Tex form) to their personal website or institutional repository. Authors requiring further information regarding Elsevier's archiving and manuscript policies are encouraged to visit:

<http://www.elsevier.com/authorsrights>



# “I know you are not, but if you were asking me”: On emergence of discourse markers of topic presentation from hypothetical questions



Seongha Rhee \*

*Department of English Linguistics, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Republic of Korea*

Received 3 May 2013; received in revised form 17 October 2013; accepted 23 October 2013

**Abstract**

Korean has a number of grammatical devices to introduce topics into the discourse. Among such markers is a paradigm of periphrastic topic presenters that are built on rhetorical questions, bringing micro-level topics into the discourse. The major strategy involved in the development of these topic presenters is feigning interactivity, whereby the speaker rhetorically asks a hypothetical question on behalf of the addressee and then answers it. This rhetorical question strategy is an intriguing discourse manipulation to create an engaging effect in that what the speaker pursues from the addressee is not a verbal response, i.e. reply, but a cognitive response, i.e. attention. A historical investigation reveals a number of important implications in grammaticalization studies. For instance, the grammaticalization process of these innovative topic markers creates a template-like paradigm of periphrastic constructions that contain slots to be filled in from another grammatical paradigm of interrogative pronouns and adverbs. Furthermore, the historical developmental pattern of the emerging paradigm strongly suggests that the formative process is enabled by analogy. In addition, the directionality of the process is from the domain of discourse, i.e. rhetoric, contra most traditional instances that undergo the process proceeding from lexical domain to grammatical domain.

© 2013 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

*Keywords:* Grammaticalization; Topic-presenter; Rhetorical question; Discourse strategy; Feigned interactivity; Intersubjectification**1. Introduction**

A large body of literature reveals that discourse markers (DMs) are not only universal in language but also carry diverse functions in discourse organization. Due to this multifunctionality it is very difficult to define DMs straightforwardly. [Schiffrin \(1987:31\)](#) operationally defines them as sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk. [Fraser \(1996, 1999\)](#), [Hansen \(1997\)](#), and others highlight their function of relating utterances as a discourse connective.<sup>1</sup> DMs arise from diverse lexemes and constructions ([Fraser, 2006](#)). One of such categories in Korean is the interrogative clausal constructions, which inherently have the engaging effect on the addressee by virtue of their containing a question ([Rhee, 2008](#)). The question occurs as a part of conditional protasis of a sentence, in the form of rhetorical questions (RQs). Such

*Abbreviations:* ACC, accusative; ADN, adnominal; COMP, complementizer; COND, conditional; CONN, connective; COP, copula; CR, current relevance; DM, discourse marker; HORT, hortative; HYP, hypothetical; NOM, nominative; PDK, present-day Korean; PST, past; Q, interrogative; QUOT, quotative; REPT, reportative; RQ, rhetorical question; SFP, sentence-final particle; TOP, topic; TP, topic presenter.

\* Correspondence to: 107 Imun-ro, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul 130-791, Republic of Korea. Tel.: +82 2 2173 3171; fax: +82 2 959 4581.

*E-mail addresses:* [srhee@hufs.ac.kr](mailto:srhee@hufs.ac.kr), [seongharhee@hanmail.net](mailto:seongharhee@hanmail.net).<sup>1</sup> For instance, [Schourup \(1999\)](#) lists connectivity, optionality, non-truth-conditionality, weak clause association, initiality, orality, and multi-categoriality as characteristics of DMs.

an engaging illocutionary effect offers a perfect quality for the forms involved to develop into topic presenters (TPs), the primary function of which is to draw sufficient attention of the addressee in order to successfully introduce a new topic into the discourse.

These TPs based on RQs (RQ.TPs), in the form of *kukey X-nyamyen* 'if (you) ask (me) X it is (where X is an interrogative pronoun/adverb denoting 'what' 'where' 'who' 'when' 'how' and 'why'),' are presently in active innovation in the grammar of Korean, beginning from around the turn of the 20th century. Despite the fact that these RQ.TPs warrant in-depth research for their emergent nature interacting with discourse rhetoric, they have not received serious attention to date, perhaps due to the more dominant research trend of focusing on patterns in the 'lexical item > morpheme' model (Traugott and Heine, 1991:2), largely addressing the development of a full-fledged lexical item into a grammatical marker. Even though the 'discourse > morphosyntax' perspective (Traugott and Heine, 1991:2–3) is of comparable significance, or rather, of more significance, in view of the fact that discourse context plays a critical role in grammaticalization, this perspective has been embraced by fewer researchers. This research intends to fill the gap. Drawing upon historical data this paper investigates how RQ.TPs developed and presents the findings with theoretical import in view of their relevance to grammaticalization mechanisms, formal idiosyncrasies, and directionality of change, among others.

This paper presents in section 2 a brief survey of grammatical devices relevant to current investigation, i.e. development of complementizers (COMPs) and hypothetical conditionals (HYP.CONDs), followed by presentation of the examples of RQ.TPs under the present investigation. In section 3 the development of TPs in three different levels is illustrated. Section 4 addresses a number of important issues in grammaticalization studies, such as the local nature of emerging context, and the role of interactivity, intersubjectivity, and rhetoricity. It further discusses the implications in grammar and grammaticalization raised by the findings such as template-nature of these grammatical forms, analogy as a mechanism, formal variability, rhetorical effect on grammaticalization, and directionality. Section 5 summarizes the findings and concludes the discussion.

## 2. Preliminaries

### 2.1. Complementizers

Korean is a head-final agglutinating language with a rich inventory of verbal morphology. Largely due to the agglutinating nature of this language, diverse markers indicating grammatical notions may be stacked in a string mostly affixed to verbs or nouns, forming layers of grammatical markers, and thus when the strings with diverse combinations are individually counted as separate grammatical markers, the inventory of sentence-final particles (SFPs) and clausal connectives is truly unparalleled by other languages.<sup>2</sup>

In the history of Korean, the development of complementizers (COMPs), which occurred around the 19th century, was a catalytic event for grammaticalization of connectives. In other words, unlike the previous period when the connectives had a limited number of enabling conditions of affixation to non-finite verbs, they now could be used with fully inflected verbs for tense, aspect, and modality modulation, with the help of COMPs. With the emergence of this newly enabling condition, particles and affixes, the verbal morphologies in particular, came to be proliferated. COMPs are directly built on the sentence-type markers shown in Table 1.<sup>3</sup>

It is noteworthy that even though there is one SFP listed for each sentence-type, there have been many sentence-type markers that arose and fell throughout history. For instance, Jang (2002) and Kwon (1992) list about 40 SFPs across the four sentence types for each period from Late Middle Korean to Modern Korean, where some SFPs remain stable in the paradigm while some have been replaced. Therefore, it is peculiar that, despite numerous sentence-type markers that had the potential of developing into COMPs, only four of them, one for each sentence type (which, incidentally are the most stable ones across time), have been recruited in the development of COMPs. Consequently, Korean has four COMPs depending on the sentence type of the subordinated clause as shown in Table 2.<sup>4</sup>

Among the four COMPs, the one that concerns us for the present discussion is the interrogative-based complementizer (Q.COMP), *-nyako*. Even though it seems, from its appearance, to have been formed through direct

<sup>2</sup> For instance, Lee and Lee (2010) list as many as 2057 grammatical markers which are verbal or nominal morphologies. Granting that many of these are in allomorphy relations, the sheer number is indicative of the richness of the verbal and nominal morphologies in Korean.

<sup>3</sup> Even though the examples are interpreted with the third person subject in the parentheses in Table 1 and elsewhere throughout this paper, the sentential subject can be any person depending on the context. This is due to the idiosyncrasy in Korean grammar that any sentential arguments may be omitted as long as they are contextually recoverable.

<sup>4</sup> Synchronically, the declarative complementizer *-tako* has its allomorph *-lako*, the latter following the copula *i-* or the retrospective *-te-* (not illustrated for simplicity). This *-ta/-la* allomorphy relation is applicable to all COMP-based forms presented throughout the paper.

Table 1  
Sentence-final particles (SFPs) as sentence-type indicators.

Sentence type	Representative SFP	Example (with <i>ka</i> - 'go')
Declarative	- <i>ta</i>	<i>ka-n-ta</i> '(He) goes.'
Interrogative	- <i>nya</i>	<i>ka-nya</i> 'Does (he) go?'
Imperative	- <i>la</i>	<i>ka-la</i> 'Go!'
Hortative	- <i>ca</i>	<i>ka-ca</i> 'Let's go!'

Table 2  
Complementizers (COMPs) by sentence types.

Embedded clause type	COMP	Example (with <i>ka</i> - 'go')
Declarative	- <i>tako</i>	<i>ka-n-tako</i> 'saying that (he) goes'
Interrogative	- <i>nyako</i>	<i>ka-nyako</i> 'asking if (he) goes'
Imperative	- <i>lako</i>	<i>ka-lako</i> 'ordering that (he should) go'
Hortative	- <i>cako</i>	<i>ka-cako</i> 'suggesting that (we) go' together'

fusion of the two juxtaposed markers, i.e. *-nya*, the representative form for marking interrogative sentence type and the connective *-ko*, the developmental path was more complex as shown in three stages in (1), in which the Q.COMP is shown to have developed from a quotative connective *-hako* which in turn originated from a verbatim direct quote of a question utterance.

- (1) Developmental Stages from Direct Quote to Q.COMP (modified from Rhee, 2009)
- |                       |                        |                        |
|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Stage I               | >> Stage II            | >> Stage III           |
| Embedded Direct Quote | Subordinated Structure | Phonological Reduction |
| <i>-nya-ha]-ko</i>    | <i>-nya]-hako</i>      | <i>-nyako</i>          |
| -Q.SFP]-say]-and      | -Q.SFP]-QUOT.CONN      | -Q.COMP                |

It is to be noted that even though (1) illustrates the development of the interrogative-based complementizer, exactly parallel developments are attested with other COMPs for different types of subordinated clauses, i.e. declarative-based *-tako*, imperative-based *-lako*, and hortative-based *-cako*.

## 2.2. Hypothetical conditionals

Hypothetical conditionals (HYP.CONDs) grammaticalized in the early 20th century based on the complementizers (Koo and Rhee, 2008). With the development of HYP.CONDs, the conditional *-myen*, formerly restricted to attachment to verbs (mostly non-finite verbs), was enabled to occur with fully inflected finite clauses in the form of *-tamyen*, *-lamyen*, *-nyamyen* and *-camyen*. In addition to the increased versatility in affixational operation, conditionals could now mark stronger hypotheticality in the form of HYP.CONDs (Koo and Rhee, 2008). HYP.CONDs from their appearance seem to have been derived directly from two juxtaposed markers, i.e. the interrogative sentence-type marker *-nya* and the conditional *-myen*, but as was the case with the COMPs briefly illustrated in the preceding discussion, the interrogative-based HYP.COND (Q.HYP.COND) *-nyamyen* is the product of more complex change as shown in (2). All the forms representing the three stages coexist in PDK.

- (2) Developmental Stages from COMP to Q.HYP.COND
- |                       |                       |                              |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Stage I               | >> Stage II           | >> Stage III                 |
| <i>-nyako-ha-myen</i> | <i>-nya-ha-myen</i>   | <i>-nyamyen</i>              |
| Q.COMP-say-COND       | -Q.COMP-say-COND      | -Q.HYP.COND                  |
| 'if (one) asks if...' | 'if (one) asks if...' | 'if (one) would ever ask...' |

As was the case with the previously discussed COMPs, HYP.CONDs also exhibit parallel developments across sentence types as illustrated in Table 3.

The RQ.TPs *kukey X-nyamyen*, under the present investigation, contain *-nyamyen* which is identical in form with HYP.CONDs. In fact, RQ.TPs, as shall be made clear in the following discussion, arose from the frequent use of HYP.COND constructions.

To sum up, the long historical processes from the direct quote to RQ.TP can be illustrated with Table 4.

Table 3  
Sentence types and HYP.CONDs (a la Koo and Rhee, 2008).

Embedded clause type	HYP.COND	Example (with <i>ka-</i> 'go')
Declarative	<i>-tamyen</i>	<i>ka-n-tamyen</i> 'if (you) say that (he) goes'
Interrogative	<i>-nyamyen</i>	<i>ka-nyamyen</i> 'if (you) ask if (he) goes'
Imperative	<i>-lamyen</i>	<i>ka-lamyen</i> 'if (you) order that (he should) go'
Hortative	<i>-camyen</i>	<i>ka-camyen</i> 'if (you) suggest that we go' together'

Table 4  
Developmental paths of RQ.TP.

Stage	Label	Form	Characteristics
Stage I	Direct Quote	"...- <i>nya?</i> " <i>ha-ko</i>	(embedded direct quote)
Stage II	Quotative CONN	<i>-nya hako</i>	(indirect quote, clausal integration)
Stage III	COMP	<i>-nyako</i>	(phonological erosion/fusion)
Stage IV	Biclausal RQ.COND	<i>-nyako ha-myen</i>	(addition of <i>-ha</i> 'say' and <i>-myen</i> COND)
Stage V	Periphrastic RQ.COND	<i>-nya-ha-myen</i>	(phonological erosion, syntactic upgrading)
Stage VI	HYP.COND	<i>-nyamyen</i>	(phonological erosion, fusion)
Stage VII	RQ.TP	<i>kukey X-nyamyen</i>	(functional innovation, clausal construction)

### 2.3. Expressions under focus

The RQ.TPs *kukey X-nyamyen* is a conditional clause (protasis), which, as was shown in the preceding illustration, includes HYP.COND *-nyamyen*, which in turn includes partially eroded Q.COMP *-nya* (< *-nyako*; see the change from Stage IV to Stage V in Table 4). The source structure of the RQ.TPs is as follows:

- (3) *ku-kes-i X-(i)-nyamyen (> kukey X-nyamyen)*<sup>5</sup>  
 that-thing-NOM X-(COP)-HYP.COND  
 'if (you) ask (me) X it is' (where X = interrogative pronoun/adverb)

As is evident in (3), RQ.TPs comprise a group of clausal constructions that may be translated into 'if (you) ask what/how/when/where/who/why it is.' RQ.TPs are illustrated in (4) with 'what' and 'who' pronouns (the same pattern is applicable to all others), where the speaker's preceding remark is given in the brackets in English for clarity.

- (4) a. *mwe* 'what'  
 [Around this time the nano-technology came to attract the attention of the industry.]  
**Kukey.mwe-nyamyen** *wancen sinkiswul-i-ntey...*  
**RQ.TP(what)** completely new.technology-COP-CONN  
 'Speaking of it, it is a completely new technology, and ...' (Lit.: 'If (you) ask (me) what it is, it is...')
- b. *nwukwu* 'who'  
 [I came across a very funny guy in the street.]  
**Kukey.nwukwu-nyamyen** *nay chotunghakkyo tongchang-i-ntey...*  
**RQ.TP(who)** my elementary.school classmate-COP-CONN  
 'Speaking about him, he is my elementary school classmate, and ...' (Lit.: 'If (you) ask (me) who he is, (he) is...')

## 3. Grammaticalization of topic presenters

### 3.1. Macro- and medial-level topic presenters

Korean is a topic- and subject-prominent language (Li and Thompson, 1976), and thus topic-marked sentences are among the basic repertoire of sentence types. It is not surprising that Korean has topic markers that are highly frequent in use.<sup>6</sup> For instance, the frequency list by the National Institute of the Korean Language (2002) shows that the primary

<sup>5</sup> Note the morpho-phonological reduction of *kukesi* into *kukey* and of the deletion of COP *i-* along the developmental path.

<sup>6</sup> It is also noteworthy that Japanese, a language similarly categorized as topic- and subject-prominent language, has many markers for topic presentation, such as *-tte*, *-tteba*, *-nante*, *-nanka*, *-shitemireba*, *-kosowa*, etc. (Maynard, 2001). Incidentally, the first three take the quotative *-(t)te* and *-shitemireba* is a conditional clause in form.



Table 5  
TPs by differential scopes.

Scope	Form	Meaning
Macro-scope	<i>X-i issessnuntey</i>	'There was (once) X'
	<i>X-i salassnuntey</i>	'There once lived X'
	<i>X-isscanha</i>	'You know, X...'
	<i>X-malya</i>	
	<i>X-malinte</i>	
Medial-scope	<i>-(n)un</i>	'Speaking of... 'As for...'
Micro-scope	<i>kukey X-nyamyen</i>	'Speaking of its X... 'In terms of its X... (X = identity, time, etc.)'

topic marker *-(n)un* ranks first among the grammatical markers.<sup>7</sup> Korean has TPs at three different scopes as shown in Table 5.

As shown in Table 5, the verbs of existence (*iss-* 'exist') and living (*sal-* 'live') are often used in periphrastic TPs (Rhee, 2008). The word *mal* 'word' is also often used to bring in a discourse topic with diverse effects including 'common ground' building, i.e., establishing and modifying the knowledge, beliefs, and suppositions the interlocutors believe they share (Clark and Marshall, 1981). These TPs are often used discourse-initially and do not carry much meaning other than signaling the speaker's intent to initiate the discourse. The degrees of grammaticalization and fossilization of these macro-scope TPs are variable and some are relatively restricted to specific genres (e.g. in story-telling), but overall they are productive to a certain degree. As these TPs are used discourse-initially, the topic introduced by them tends to scope over a considerable length of discourse.

On the other hand, *-(n)un*, which often occurs as a further reduced form *-n* in spoken language, is a medial-scope TP and its lexical origin has not been identified. As is evident from its semantic and phonological reduction of 'integrity' (Lehmann, 2002[1982]:126–132), i.e. 'erosion' or phonetic reduction (Heine and Kuteva, 2002), this TP suggests a long grammaticalization history. It is indeed a very old gram, attested in Old Korean. This TP can topicalize a bare or affixed nominal, and clauses may be topicalized with it after they are nominalized.<sup>8</sup> Unlike the macro-scope TPs, the topic introduced by *-(n)un* must be referring to old (i.e. known/given) information and thus either has an antecedent in the previous mention or has been activated by the situational context. Therefore, the topic introduced by *-(n)un* tends to stretch over as big as a considerable length of discourse segments on the one hand, and as small as the sentence it is situated in. Among the TPs in the three different scopes in Table 5, the medial-scope TP *-(n)un* is the most grammaticalized in terms of not only the historical depth but also the level of morphological fusion and phonological erosion. It is among the nominal case particles encoding not structural but informational relation (Narrog and Rhee, 2013:291). Therefore, despite its prominent discursive function, the affixal *-(n)un* does not qualify as a DM.<sup>9</sup>

The micro-scope TPs are RQ.TPs, the forms under the present focus. These TPs introduce a very local level discourse topic in that they pick up a particular aspect of an entity in the preceding discourse and highlight it. Sometimes, the highlighted aspect may not be very clear (see section 3.2), especially when the speaker uses RQ.TPs as a device simply to signal a forthcoming elaboration or paraphrase. Despite their minimal scope, RQ.TPs present interesting issues with respect to their developmental paths and strategic language use as shall be discussed more in detail in the following section.

<sup>7</sup> The frequency list by the National Institute of the Korean Language lists the allomorphic forms *-un* and *-nun* separately with token frequencies of 17,446 and 60,551 respectively. The combined figure (77,997) outnumbers the second most-frequent grammatical morpheme, the declarative SFP *-ta* (76,710) with a narrow margin.

<sup>8</sup> As an anonymous reviewer points out, TP *-(n)un* is multifunctional as it marks topic and contrastive focus as well. In these additional functions, the host of *-(n)un* does not have to be a nominal or nominalized constituent as the contrast may be applicable to practically all categories. The contrastive function is, albeit not identical with, closely related to the topic-marking function and unified or comparative accounts for the multifunctionality have been attempted in a number of studies (Lee, 1999a, 2002; Kim, 2002a, 2004; Hong, 2005, inter alia).

<sup>9</sup> As Young-Ok Lee (personal communication) points out, the distinction between the topic marker *-(n)un* and the topic presenters (as RQ.TP DMs here) may not be straightforward, especially considering that they carry a similar function of introducing a topic into a discourse. However, some of the features proposed by Brinton for DMs (1996:33–35, 'pragmatic markers' in her term) sufficiently provide lexico-phonological and syntactic criteria to distinguish RQ.TPs from the affixal topic marker, i.e., unlike *-(n)un*, RQ.TPs form a separate tone group; they occur in the sentence-initial position; and they are loosely attached to the syntactic structure, among others. For these differences, RQ.TPs are classified as DMs, whereas the affixal topic marker *-(n)un* is excluded from the DM category.

Table 6  
RQ.CONDs and their related forms in the Corpus.

	Forms	Before 1890	1890–1920 (Critical Period)	PDK
Bi-Clausal RQ.COND	<i>-nyako ha-myen</i>	0	1	96,100
Periphrastic RQ.COND	<i>-nya ha-myen</i>	0	50	521,000
HYP.COND	<i>-nyamyen</i>	0	0	1,600,000

### 3.2. RQ.TPs

As was illustrated in the preceding discussion, RQ.TPs grew out of HYP.COND constructions which were frequently used for rhetorical purposes, thus RQ.CONDs. These RQ.CONDs exist either in structurally more conservative biclausal RQ.CONDs or structurally more reduced RQ.CONDs (see Table 4 in section 2.2). These rhetorically motivated HYP.COND constructions are very widely used in contemporary Korean in the form of *X-nyamyen* ‘if (you) ask (me) if (it is) X’ (X = AP, NP, VP...), as is exemplified in (5).

- (5) a. A girl complaining about her date: [He is such an idiot and he’s so lazy... and furthermore,]  
*pwuca-ø-nyamyen wancen kananpayngi-y-a*  
 rich.person-COP-HYP.COND completely poor.person-COP-SFP  
 ‘he’s very poor, too. (Lit. ‘if (you) ask (me) if (he) is a rich person, (he) is very poor, too.’)
- b. A man complaining about a movie: [The movie was so long and the admission was so expensive... and furthermore,]  
*caymiss-nyamyen kulehkey caymieps-nun*  
 be.interesting-HYP.COND like.that be.uninteresting-ADN  
*ke-n cheum-i-ya*  
 thing-TOP first.time-COP-SFP  
 ‘I’ve never seen such an uninteresting one (Lit. ‘if (you) ask (me) if (it) was interesting, it was the first time (that I saw) such an uninteresting one.’)

As is shown in (5), HYP.CONDs raise a hypothetical question embedded in a conditional clause. In a sense, the particular aspect that came to be pointed out serves as a local topic (e.g. the person’s wealth, the movie’s content, etc.). It is indeed in consonance with the nature of RQ.TPs whose function is to introduce a micro-scope topic into the discourse.

Furthermore, the emergence of RQ.TPs seems to be related to the prolific style of embedding RQs in a sentence at the turn of the 20th century. The first attestations occur in the periphrastic RQ conditional form (RQ.COND), i.e. *-nya hamyen* (also *-nya hAmyen* in the old orthography) as shown in (6).

- (6) a. *mwusun syu-lo palmyeng-ul hA-nu-nya.hA.myen*  
 what.kind way-INST explain-ACC say-CR-RQ.COND  
*ecyey cyenyek ahop-si hwu-ey...*  
 yesterday evening 9-o’clock after  
 ‘There is a way to prove the innocence [of Lisil] because [it was I who asked her to come out to see me] after 9 p.m. last night...’ (<< Lit.: If (you) ask (me) how (I) can explain [the situation, it was I who asked...]) (1912, Lee Sanghyup, *Caypongchwun* 729)
- b. *namcA-ka syeysang-ey na-sye*  
 man-NOM world-at be.born-and  
*enyu stay-ka tyeyil tyohu-nya.hA.myen*  
 which time-NOM first be.good-RQ.COND  
*amolato cyangkaka-sye chyeshnalpam toy-nAn nal-eysye*  
 certainly marry-and first.night become-ADN day-than  
*te tyoh-un nal-i ep-ta*  
 more be.good-ADN day-NOM not.exist-COMP  
*hA-I tha-i-ntAy...*  
 say-ADN ground-COP-CONN  
 ‘The best time for a man after he is born to this world is certainly the bridal night after the wedding, so...’ (<< Lit.: If (you) ask (me) when the best time is after a man is born to this world, perhaps (I) certainly have reason to say that there is no other day that is better than the first night after he marries, so...’) (1912, Lee Haejo, *Kwuusyan* A54: 315)

Table 7

Competing forms of COND-based and CAUSAL-based constructions.

	Form	Source form and meaning	Token frequency (1890–1920)
COND-based	- <i>nya ha-myen</i>	-Q say-if 'if you ask...'	50
CAUSAL-based	- <i>ko ha-ni</i>	-Q say-because 'because I ask...'	47

A historical investigation shows that periphrastic RQ.CONDs were entrenched around the beginning of Modern Korean, i.e. 1890–1920.<sup>10</sup> The token frequencies of the related forms are shown in Table 6 (per the Korean Historical Corpus up to 1920; Google search results for PDK, August 2012).<sup>11</sup>

What is notable in Table 6 is that the periphrastic RQ.COND *-nya ha-myen* became very productive at the turn of the century (the Critical Period). It is further noteworthy that the HYP.COND *-nyamyen* (including RQ.TPs for their formal identity) exponentially increased in token frequency in PDK.<sup>12</sup>

Another investigation of a related form strongly suggests a functional competition between the conditional-based *-nya hamyen* and the causal-based *-ko hani* as shown in Table 7 (based on the Corpus).

The frequency comparison in Table 7 shows that the two forms were highly competitive with each other. A note to add is that the interrogative *-ko* is an old SFP, but still in use with archaic flavor, commonly associated with a self-directed question in monologues, whereas the interrogative *-nya* is used in highly impositive interactional situation (note the preferred translation with first- and second-person subjects in Table 7). In this respect, one of the contrasts between the two forms is the presence vs. absence of interactivity (see section 4.2.1 for a more detailed discussion on this issue).

In the 20th century, the RQ.COND *-nya hamyen* (and later, its reduced counterpart HYP.COND *-nyamyen*) tends to create a strong bond with an interrogative pronoun/adverb, and the collocated string functions as a lead-in of the topic relating to when (*encey*), where (*eti*), who (*nwukwu*), what (*mwe*), why (*way*), and how (*ette(hkey)*), thus creating such forms as *encey-nya hamyen*, *eti-nya hamyen*, *nwukwu-nya hamyen*, *mwe-nya hamyen*, *way-nya hamyen*, and *ette(hkey)-nya hamyen*, respectively. The following example exemplifies one of the first attestations of such forms dating from 1912. It is noteworthy that the interrogative pronoun 'what' occurs in the non-reduced form *mwues* (rather than its reduced counterpart *mwe*) accompanying the copula *i-*, thus *mwues-i-nya hamyen*.

- (7) *ku nolna-ko twulyewehA-nAn kokcyel-i*  
 that be.surprised-and be.afraid-ADN reason-NOM  
**mwues-i-nya.hamyen...**  
**what-COP-RQ.COND**

'The reasons of their surprise and fear are... (< Lit. 'If (you) ask (me) what are the reasons of their surprise and fear, [there are two reasons...]) (1912, Kim Kyoje, *Pihayngsen* 9)

Also in recent years, the RQ.COND *-nya hamyen* (and later, *-nyamyen* also) tends to occur with *kuke-i* ('that-NOM'), *ike-i* ('this-NOM'), *kukes-un* ('that-TOP'), and *ikes-un* ('this-TOP'), and the entire string serves to function as a TP construction. One of the first attestations, in the most conservative form of *kukes-un mwues-i-nya hamyen*, is exemplified in the following:

- (8) *kulsi-lo ssu-n kes han cang-ul olni-nAntAy*  
 letter-with write-ADN thing one sheet-ACC offer-CONN  
**kukes-un mwues-i-nya.hamyen...**  
**that-TOP what-COP-RQ.COND**

'(He) showed a sheet of paper on which letters are written, and what it is is that... (< Lit. 'If (you) ask (me) what it was...') (1912, Kim Kyoje, *Pihayngsen* 13)

<sup>10</sup> The onset of Modern Korean is around 1894, the year of the Kapo Reformation, when writers attempted to reflect spoken language in writing. Many of the language forms that existed only in spoken language came to appear for the first time in writing, most prominently in a new literary genre called *sinsosel* 'the new novel'. This period is 'the critical period' for Korean linguistics because the records from this period, due to their orality, abound with clues for diverse grammaticalization processes.

<sup>11</sup> The Korean Historical Corpus is a 15 million word historical corpus developed by a number of individual researchers and partly in conjunction with the development of the 21st-Century Sejong Corpus, a 200 million word corpus. The author wishes to express the gratitude to the developers of the Corpus for their generosity of granting free use. Google search results contain noise and do not fully represent the states of affairs, and the figures should be interpreted in relative terms only.

<sup>12</sup> As an anonymous reviewer points out, however, the exact point of time when the RQ.CONDs crossed the line into RQ.TPs cannot be determined. This is due to the absence of corpora covering the period between 1920s and 1970s. More fine-grained analyses should await future research when such corpora become available.



In PDK, highly contracted forms of HYP.CONDs, i.e. *X-nyamyen*, are very common. Even among these forms sharing the same formal construct, the token frequencies vary widely as shown by the number of Google search hits, August 2012, in (9).

(9)	a.	'why'	<i>waynyamyen</i>	5,500,000
	b.	'what'	<i>mwenyamyen</i>	937,000
	c.	'who'	<i>nwukwunyamyen</i>	102,000
	d.	'how'	<i>ette(hkey)nyamyen</i>	94,570
	e.	'when'	<i>enceynyamyen</i>	58,100
	f.	'where'	<i>etinyamyen</i>	50,900

Since HYP.CONDs carry the discourse function of selecting a particular aspect of a preceding utterance and highlighting it, their function is close to RQ.TPs. However, most of these *X-nyamyen* forms tend to be tightly tied to the sentence they occur in, because they are preceded by their sentential subjects and followed by the main clause. Therefore, these are more like a predicative part of shortened conditional clauses, thus lacking positional freedom.

Unlike the HYP.CONDs, the RQ.TPs are structurally and semantically more detached from the rest of the sentence, because HYP.CONDs may take any clause as their host by virtue of their being connective particles, whereas RQ.TPs are fixed clauses in their entirety. In other words, RQ.TPs have undergone 'univerbation' (Lehmann, 2002[1982]) with their sentential subject, i.e. *kukey* 'it is', which, however, lacks the referential value like expletive forms, a factor promoting semantic detachment. Further, the entire construction has a high degree of internal cohesion as evidenced by the inability to insert any modifiers within it, a factor promoting morphosyntactic detachment (see section 4.3 for more discussion). The detachment effect seems to have contributed to the acquisition of the 'thetical' nature of the clause (Kaltenböck et al., 2011), as is commonly found in the 'parentheticals' (Bolinger, 1989; Thompson and Mulac, 1991) and 'comment clauses' (Quirk et al., 1972:778; Brinton, 2008). The frequencies of the RQ.TPs as reflected by Google search hits (in August 2012) are as shown in (10).

(10)	a.	'what'	<i>kukey mwenyamyen</i>	for entity	320,000
	b.	'who'	<i>kukey nwukwunyamyen</i>	for person	47,300
	c.	'where'	<i>kukey etinyamyen</i>	for place	42,500
	d.	'when'	<i>kukey enceynyamyen</i>	for time	16,900
	e.	'why'	<i>kukey waynyamyen</i>	for reason	14,000
	f.	'how'	<i>kukey ette(hkey)nyamyen</i>	for manner	40

What is noticeable in (10) is that the frequencies among the RQ.TPs vary widely. The high frequency of 'what'-based RQ.TP, *kukey mwenyamyen*, seems to be due to the fact that the entity-pronoun *mwe* 'what' acts like a representative form, often without making reference to an entity. Therefore, when there is no obvious referent that can be designated as an entity, still the entity-based *kukey mwenyamyen* is used. In such cases, the RQ.TP simply functions as a preface to elaboration or a signal of the speaker's intent to paraphrase the previous utterance.<sup>13</sup>

On the other hand, another peculiarity in the frequency statistics in (10) is the extreme low frequency of the manner-based RQ.TP. Since the form is not only possible but also frequently heard in spoken discourse in PDK, its extremely low frequency on the Internet may possibly be a matter of a genre effect. It is possible to exclude the manner-based RQ.TP from the RQ.TP paradigm, but at least it lends support to the position that even the grammaticalization process of individual grammatical forms that form a paradigm and share structural properties and discursive motivations, may proceed with great variability for various reasons and show differential degrees of entrenchment (see section 4 for more discussion).

## 4. Discussion

### 4.1. Local context

It has been widely pointed out that grammaticalizing forms may arise from a local context or in specific contexts. For instance, Hopper and Traugott (2003) show that the most widely cited instance of grammaticalization in English, i.e. the

<sup>13</sup> As an anonymous reviewer points out, this extended function of the RQ.TP *kukey mwenyamyen* (slightly) deviates from its "topic presenter" function because it does not, strictly speaking, present a micro-topic but prefaces an upcoming elaboration or signals the intent of continued floor-holding. However, this RQ.TP is not further classified into another category, because it is an instance of functional extension analogous to the widely attested semantic bleaching of a grammaticalizing form. Similarly, the reason-based DM *waynyamyen* is by definition not a RQ.TP, despite its close relationship to the latter. This is an instance of syntagmatic reduction analogous to the widely attested phonological reduction. This shows that grammatical paradigms do not have rigid boundaries in terms of their forms and functions.

emergence of futurity marker from the verb of locomotion *go* is in fact an instance of the grammaticalization of *be going to* rather than of *go*.

The development of RQ.TPs shows that the grammaticalization process was very selective. For instance, among the conditional constructions involving complementizers, only the interrogative-based *-nyamyen* developed into a TP, but not the declarative-based *-tamyen*, the imperative-based *-lamyen*, and the hortative-based *-camyen*.<sup>14</sup> The reason for this may be due to the unique illocutionary force of the speech act of asking a question. In conversation, a question carries the illocutionary force of directly engaging the addressee, unlike the declarative. Imperatives and hortatives do not fit in the construction semantically, i.e. with the preceding interrogative pronouns/adverbs. This is particularly true, considering that regular HYP.COND constructions that do not involve an interrogative pronoun/adverb are very productive in use (Koo and Rhee, 2008).

Furthermore, among the question-embedding constructions, only the *-nya*-based form (*-nyamyen* from *-nya hamyen*) developed into a TP, but not numerous potential candidates such as *-ko hamyen*, *-ka hamyen*, *-nyo hamyen*, *-ni hamyen*, *-lta hamyen*, *-so hamyen*, and many others. Considering that Kim (2001:147–151) lists 153 interrogative SFPs, the development of RQ.TP solely singling out one form out of them was an extremely selective process. This preference again may have to do, among other things, with the degree of illocutionary force. For instance Kim (2001) lists interrogative SFPs by four different levels of honorification, *-nya* being in the lowest (HON-0) of four different levels, which means that it is the most intrusive, thus strongest, form of presenting a question.

Still another aspect of locality is that among the connectives, only the conditional-based (i.e. *-myen*-derived) form, *-nyamyen*, developed into a TP. Out of a large inventory of connectives in Korean, it is noteworthy that the forms involving other types of connectives, such as the mode-based *-nyakey*, the contrastive-based *-nyaci*, the enumerative-based *-nyako*, the causal-based *-nyani*, the sequential-based *-nyayse*, the additive-based *-nyayto*, the concessive-based *-nyakenman*, etc., have not been chosen. The preference of the conditional-based form over all those others seems to be due to the close connection between conditional and topic. For instance, it has been widely accepted that conditionals carry the function of marking a topic (Haiman, 1978). The use of a conditional creates a hypothetical world delineated by the protasis, which serves as the basis of the validity of the proposition denoted by the main clause. It is indeed true that the conditional marker *-myen* is historically derived from the simultaneity marker *-mye* and the topic marker *-(n)un* (Koo, 1989). It is also commonly observed in TV/radio expert shows that the host prompts the guest to answer by using a conditional-marked elliptical clause, equivalent to 'If you state your opinion on this?'. It seems that it is for this conceptual and functional affinity between conditional and topic that the conditional-based form is chosen for the micro-level topic marker, i.e. RQ.TP.

## 4.2. Interactivity, intersubjectivity, and rhetoricity

### 4.2.1. Interactivity

The development of RQ.TPs involves diverse cognitive and dialogical processes, including interactivity, intersubjectivity, and rhetoricity.<sup>15</sup> First of all, formal inclusion of a pseudo-question (i.e. question-based conditional form) produces a strong engaging effect, simply because questions per se constitute an intrusive and impositive speech act. The speaker expresses the desire for the addressee's active engagement (cf. 'involvement' Lee, 2001:254) by saying something "through a borrowed mouth" (Rhee, 2009).<sup>16</sup> In other words, the question originates from the speaker but it is presented as if it had been spoken by the discourse partner or a third party and is being reported as a reported speech (note that RQ.TPs are historically derived from COMP which in turn was derived from a direct quotation).

One intriguing aspect with this regard is that, as was pointed out in section 4.1, the embedded questions in RQ.TPs do not carry any morphological trappings to mark honorification. This strongly suggests that the embedded question is in the guise of a third party utterance being reported by the current speaker, rather than a self-quoted utterance. All these considerations point to the fact that the use of RQ.TPs is motivated by the speaker's desire to feign interactivity. This feigned interactivity is similar to the use of embedded bare stand-alone questions (i.e. without intersubjectivity marking such as politeness or honorification) in non-casual genres, i.e. the oratorical, deliberative and consultative styles

<sup>14</sup> Young-Ok Lee (personal communication) points out that the hortative-based *-camyen* is associated with *malha-camyen* ([say-HORT.COND] 'that is to say' < Lit. 'if (you) say, "let's say (it)"]'). It is indeed true that the phrase is in productive use in contemporary Korean and carries a discourse-organizing function. However, it is outside the scope of the present research since it does not involve an interrogative pronoun/adverb in its construction, a defining characteristic of the RQ.TPs.

<sup>15</sup> An anonymous reviewer brings to the author's attention the distinction between 'dialogic' (multiple viewpoint) and 'dialogual' (multiple speaker) following (Roulet, 1984; Ducrot, 1984, 1996; Schwenter, 2000, 2007; Nölke, 2006; Traugott, 2010a; Beeching, 2011). Even though the speaker may create an imaginary dialogic context in the use of RQ.TPs, the strategy is largely dialogual in nature.

<sup>16</sup> Rhee (2009) illustrates certain grammaticalization and lexicalization processes motivated by the discourse strategy of feigning the speaker's utterance as if they were verbatim quotes, hence, the speech 'from a borrowed mouth'.

according to Joos's (1967) typology of speech styles (e.g. lectures, oration, speech, debate, etc.). This type of rhetorical strategy is a flagrant violation of discourse pragmatics of honorification in Korean. This usage may make the speaker sound presumptuous, so there are other neutralizing devices employed, such as non-question intonation. Some of such examples are illustrated in (11).

- |      |    |   |                                    |
|------|----|---|------------------------------------|
| (11) | a. | <i>kulemyen kuke-y mwe-nya?</i><br>then it-NOM what-Q                       | ‘Then, what is it?’                |
|      | b. | <i>totaychey iyu-ka mwe-nya?</i><br>at.all reason-NOM what-Q                | ‘What in the world is the reason?’ |
|      | c. | <i>kulem ku-ttay-ka encey-nya?</i><br>then that-time-NOM when-Q             | ‘Then, when was it?’               |
|      | d. | <i>kulem wuli-nun ettehkey ha-yya.toy-nya?</i><br>then we-TOP how do-must-Q | ‘Then, what should we do?’         |

Examples in (11) may be said either with a regular question intonation or with a non-question intonation, but the overall contour for rhetorical questions is sufficiently distinct from the one for regular question.

#### 4.2.2. Intersubjectivity

It is widely known that subjectification and intersubjectification are common aspects of grammaticalization (Traugott, 2010b; Traugott and Dasher, 2002; Traugott and König, 1991; Rhee, 2012a). We already noted that the embedded sentence in the protasis of the Q.HYP.COND is an interrogative sentence. But as it is an embedded question, there is no illocutionary force. It is thus a ‘self-directed question.’ Its function is much similar to that of the ‘Audience-Blind’ constructions (Koo and Rhee, 2013), which are used to direct the utterance not to a particular discourse partner but to ‘the people in general out there.’ In the case of RQ.TPs, the audience-blindness largely translates into ‘if one asks’.

More importantly from the perspective of intersubjectification, the use of hypothetical conditionals is like ‘reading the addressee’s mind,’ i.e. asking on behalf of the addressee, and thus a gesture of being considerate to the addressee. By using the RQ.TPs, the speaker is saying in effect, “I know what you’re wondering, so I will ask it to myself on your behalf and answer it for you.” By this strategic ‘kind’ act of the speaker the addressee is relieved of asking a question, or can avoid exposing his/her inattentiveness, i.e. being not fully caught up with the content of what is being said. The friendliness created by the use of hypothetical conditional promotes the sense of solidarity between the interlocutors. In this sense, RQ.TPs have the attitudinal stance-marking potential.

#### 4.2.3. Rhetoricity

The rhetorical nature of the reason-based *waynyahamyen* has been noted by Lee (2001:239–274), who discusses interactive rhetoricity involved in its grammaticalization. It has also been noted that question words are susceptible to grammaticalization in Korean (Kim, 2002b; Lee, 1999b; Koo, 2000). According to Rhee (2008) and Koo (2008), rhetorical strategies of negation and question are often involved in the emergence of DMs.

In terms of rhetorical effect, it is noteworthy that the speaker using the rhetorical structures in RQ.TPs attempts to accomplish two potentially contradictory goals. From one perspective the use of RQ.TP is a politeness strategy in that it is not demanding verbal responses (i.e. reply). As the question has been embedded there is no separate illocutionary force created by the question on the part of the addressee. Furthermore, as noted above, the question that may have the potential of being raised by the addressee has been already raised by the speaker on behalf of the addressee. On the other hand, the fact that a question, whether embedded or standalone, has been uttered by the speaker suggests that the use of RQ.TPs is an impositive strategy in that it demands cognitive responses (i.e. attention). Therefore, it is necessary to pay attention to the gradient nature of illocutionary force as associated with questions, i.e. standalone questions carry the strongest illocutionary force by demanding a reply; embedded questions in RQ.TPs carry the weaker illocutionary force by demanding attention; and embedded questions elsewhere carry the weakest illocutionary force by not imposing any obligation to respond.<sup>17</sup>

#### 4.3. Propositional detachment

One of the defining characteristics of DMs in general is their propositional detachment in that they operate at a higher discursive level than at the propositional level. It is for this reason that DMs have relative positional freedom, even though

<sup>17</sup> The gradient nature of illocutionary force and the differential degrees of imposition of burden have been pointed out by an anonymous reviewer. Thus the use of RQ.TPs, located at the middle of the continuum, is both a politeness strategy and engagement strategy.

they often exhibit individual preference between right- and left-periphery and sometimes shift their functions depending on where they occur.<sup>18</sup> Among the TPs shown in section 3.1 above, the medial-scope TP *-(n)un* is unique in that unlike all others, it is an affix, which means that it is the most highly bounded form as a nominal morphology. For this high-level coalescence (Lehmann, 2002[1982]), TP *-(n)un* does not have positional freedom for its being a postpositional particle even smaller than a word, and thus is not a DM, even though it carries the information structuring function, a function highly relevant to discourse organization. The macro- and micro-scope TPs in section 3.1, on the other hand, have relative positional freedom and are not bound to a proposition, thus qualifying for the DM status.

The notion of positional freedom or 'positional mobility' (Brinton, 2008:8) is indeed a critical attribute of DMs. Their independence from the anchor is typically marked by 'comma intonation' such as pauses in speech, or actual commas in writing (Brinton, 2008:8). Similarly, Bolinger (1989:186) presents three prosodic characteristics that reflect syntactic and semantic qualities, such as lower pitch (denoting their incidentalness), set off by pauses (denoting their separation) and rising terminal (denoting their link up with the anchor). It is indeed true that RQ.TPs carry these properties, all suggesting their mobility.

In this regard, the emergence of RQ.TPs illustrates an interesting development as if they were in search of such positional freedom, or in Lehmann's (2002[1982]) terminology, 'syntagmatic variability.'<sup>19</sup> What RQ.TPs recruited for that purpose is the near-expletive subject argument *kukey*. This subject argument consists of the non-visible distal demonstrative and the nominative marker, i.e. *kukey* 'that is' (from *ku-kes-i* 'that-thing-NOM').<sup>20</sup> The non-visible and distal nature of the demonstrative *ku* 'that' makes its referent indefinite and ambiguous. With the formation of a collocated string of the subject *kukey* and the predicative conditional clause HYP.COND, RQ.TPs now attain the clausal status. Even though it is true that a conditional protasis is still bound to the apodosis in strict structural terms, the binding force between the two clauses is considerably weaker than the force between the subject and the predicate of a single clause. In the syntagmatic layout, HYP.CONDs are locked between its subject argument and the apodosis. In contrast, RQ.TPs are clausal and are detached from the rest of the proposition (i.e. apodosis) semantically and morpho-syntactically. This detachment effect is even greater when the entire string of RQ.TPs loses referential values and acquires more discursive meanings.

As may already be noticeable, the distinction between HYP.COND constructions and RQ.TP constructions is rather arbitrary, the difference being that the latter are fully clausal. It is true that HYP.CONDs do carry the TP function (see section 3.2), a state of affairs largely due to the fact that conditionals can function as topic markers. The seemingly arbitrary decision on the distinction between HYP.CONDs and RQ.TPs, however, is based on the fact that RQ.TPs, as compared to HYP.CONDs, have more positional freedom, they are more detached from the propositional content, and they carry more discursive meanings, all pointing to their DM status.

One notable aspect in this regard relates to the 'why'-based HYP.COND *waynyamyen*. It has been noted that its use frequency as reflected in the google search hits (see section 3.2 above) is extraordinarily high as compared to others. It is indeed true that from a syntagmatic point of view, a large proportion of the occurrences of *waynyamyen* tend to be in non-embedded contexts, not even preceded by the near-expletive subject *kukey*, a structural requirement to qualify as a RQ.TP. This suggests that reason-marking, the sentential element corresponding with a 'why' question, occurs more frequently as heading a clause than as a sentential argument with thematic roles. This sharply contrasts with 'who', 'what', 'where', etc. that typically correspond with such thematic roles as agent, theme, location, etc. It is for this reason, i.e. the relative freedom from the propositional content, that some studies already noted the DM nature of *waynyamyen* (e.g. Lee, 2001). In short, RQ.TPs acquired the propositional detachment by way of combining with the near-expletive clausal subject, whereas the 'why'-based HYP.COND *waynyamyen* acquired it by virtue of its inherent semantic idiosyncrasy.

As indicated earlier, if the development of DMs is an instance of grammaticalization, the direction of the change is the reverse of what is expected from Lehmann's (2002[1982]) hypothesis of syntagmatic parameter of fixation, i.e. the reduction of syntagmatic variability. It is thus controversial whether the development of DMs should be considered as instances of grammaticalization (cf. Waltereit, 2006 vs. Diewald, 2006, 2011). An alternative term proposed is 'pragmaticalization' to distinguish the process from grammaticalization. The use of this alternative term can help avoid the controversy. As Degand and Evers-Vermeul (2012) point out, the controversy stems from different conceptualizations about what constitutes grammatical functions, the rise of which is defined as 'grammaticalization.' Following Diewald (2006, 2011), Dostie (2004), Wischer (2000), Traugott (1995) and many others, this research takes the position that the

<sup>18</sup> RQ.TPs exhibit the left-periphery preference largely due to its historical origin in a conditional protasis, which invariably occurs on the left-periphery in Korean.

<sup>19</sup> Incidentally, according to Lehmann's (2002[1982]) conceptualization of grammaticalization, a form loses its syntagmatic variability as it undergoes fixation. Therefore, as an anonymous reviewer points out, the development of RQ.TPs and more generally all DMs exhibit properties that are at variance with grammaticalization in its traditional conceptualization (see, however, following discussion).

<sup>20</sup> Note that Korean has two distal demonstratives: *ku* and *ce*, the former for non-visible referents, the latter for visible referents.



development of DMs as a subgroup of, and less prototypical case of, grammaticalization. This is largely due to the fact that DMs carry the function in discourse organization, which may well entitle them to a grammatical category, and consequently their developmental process constitutes an instance of grammaticalization.<sup>21</sup>

#### 4.4. Implications in grammar and grammaticalization

##### 4.4.1. On grammatical paradigms as structure-based templates

As has been shown in the preceding discussion, RQ.TPs are constructions with replaceable 'slots' for interrogative pronouns/adverbs.<sup>22</sup> When the slots are filled in with interrogatives the constructions function as DMs. The 'template' nature of RQ.TPs suggests that they form a well-established form-based paradigm yet displaying structural plasticity.

This is a unique situation in that most grammaticalization studies address the emergence of grammatical functions in a single unverbated form. When grammaticalized forms take the form of periphrastic structures, their internal cohesion is often such that their source constructions tend to be opaque and thus invisible for grammatical operations, and further, they defy insertion of an alien material such as a modifier which would have been allowed otherwise. Insertability is indeed considered as a test to determine the degree of grammaticalization (Lehmann, 2002[1982]). RQ.TPs, however, are templates in the sense that they consist of syntagmatic strings that serve as the skeleton with a slot that may be filled in from a particular paradigm, i.e. interrogative pronouns/adverbs. As a matter of fact, this type of template-like grammatical constructions is not at all restricted to RQ.TPs. According to Rhee (2008), Korean has following template-like DMs all associated with interrogative sentences, in which Q is the slot for an interrogative pronoun/adverb and N is for a noun:

- (12) A. Pause-fillers  
 a. *ku Q-nya?* 'What/who... is it?'  
 b. *ku Q-latela?* 'What/who... did (they) say (it was)?'  
 B. Mitigator (Q = interrogative pronoun/adverb)  
 a. *Q-lalkka?* 'Should I say what/who... (it was)?'  
 B. Attention-attractors  
 a. *N-inka?* '(I'm wondering) Is it N?'  
 b. *N-itenka?* '(I'm wondering) Was it N?'  
 c. *N-ilkka?* '(I'm wondering) Will it be N?'

In view of the fact that there are (sub-)paradigms of grammatical forms that function as templates, the formative forces involved in their emergence and their intraparadigmatic dynamic relationship warrant more in-depth research (see below for discussion partially addressing this issue).

##### 4.4.2. On analogy in grammaticalization

It has been widely held that analogy is an important mechanism in language change. However, its role in grammaticalization has been controversial. For instance, Hopper and Traugott (2003:46–50) claim that, even though reanalysis and analogy are often intertwined, they are distinct processes in that reanalysis enables grammatical innovation (thus, grammaticalization), whereas analogy enables spread or actualization only. On the other hand, Fischer (2011) claims that from the perspective of synchronic processing, i.e. from a speaker-listener point of view rather than a diachronic one, analogy is the mechanism of grammaticalization.

In a series of recent studies of grammaticalization of COMPs and related forms in Korean, Rhee (2012a), and Koo and Rhee (2008) argue that there are reasons to believe that analogy was operative in their grammaticalization. Their argument is based on the disparate use frequency of grammaticalizing forms. In traditional conceptualization of grammaticalization, a form grammaticalizes as it becomes exposed to meaning negotiation more often with broader use contexts as a result of metaphor, metonymy, semantic generalization, etc. As Narrog and Heine (2011:2–3) point out, in some of the definitions of grammaticalization 'frequency is portrayed as one of the driving forces, or *the* driving force of grammaticalization' (emphasis original) (e.g. Bybee and Hopper, 2001 and works therein, Bybee, 2011, among others). Undoubtedly, frequency as a result

<sup>21</sup> For this and other related issues, see Onodera (2011), Ocampo (2006), Degand and Simon-Vandenberg (2011), Degand and Evers-Vermeul (2012). Proponents of the notion of 'thetical grammar' generally consider DMs as 'conceptual parentheticals' that have been grammaticalized to a greater or lesser extent (Heine and Kuteva, 2010). According to their position, RQ.TPs shifted their functions from sentence organization to discourse organization through a process of 'cooptation' (Kaltenböck, 2007; Heine and Kuteva, 2010; Kaltenböck et al., 2011).

<sup>22</sup> The fact that RQ.TPs have a slot that may be filled in with an item from the paradigm of interrogative pronoun/adverb suggests that they constitute 'formal idioms' as suggested in construction grammar (Fillmore et al., 1988). In this sense, the development of RQ.TPs well suits the notion of constructionalization.



of repetition is an important mechanism because it brings forth 'habituation', 'ritualization' and 'automatization' (Haiman, 1994). In the cases of COMPs and their related forms in Korean, however, the token frequencies of the individual forms in the emerging paradigms are widely varying at the incipient stage of their grammaticalization. Despite the fact that some forms were of extremely low frequency, in a very short period of time, all the members in the emerging paradigm attained the status of grammatical forms. This state of affairs suggests that the forms with the lower frequencies grammaticalized not by virtue of their high frequency but by virtue of their structural similarities.<sup>23</sup>

Similar situations are observable with respect to the grammaticalization of RQ.TPs. The differences in token frequency suggest that the members of the RQ.TP paradigm are of different status in terms of their grammaticality. Given that some forms occur at a very low frequency, their grammaticalization seems to have been enabled not by the frequency but by virtue of the source's structural similarity. The structural similarity as an enabling factor implies that the grammaticalization of RQ.TPs was enabled by analogy, most likely modeling after COMPs, HYP.CONDs, etc. The trail-blazer of RQ.TP grammaticalization seems to be *kukey mwenyamyen* (based on 'what') that enjoyed the highest use frequency.<sup>24</sup> In this sense, the development of RQ.TPs is an instance of 'paradigmaticization' (Lehmann, 2002[1982]:132–137), whereby the internal relationship among the members becomes increasingly stronger, in other words, the paradigmaticity of a grammatical paradigm increases.

#### 4.4.3. On rhetorical effects on grammaticalization

Waltereit (2006:66) observed that the development of DMs is closely related to discourse strategies and noted that DMs "arise as a consequence of speaker's strategies related to the structure of the discourse or the interaction." It is true that RQ.TPs developed from the discourse strategy of using rhetorical questions embedded in a conditional clause. The use of rhetorical conditional is reminiscent of 'speech act conditional' as discussed in Sweetser (1990), as exemplified in the following:

(13) There are biscuits on the sideboard if you want them. (Sweetser, 1990:119)

The use of the conditional protasis "if you want them" in (13) is a politeness strategy in the sense that the speaker goes beyond what is required at the moment by even considering a hypothetical world in which the addressee wants biscuits, while the addressee has not shown an explicit interest in them for one reason or another. The use of RQ.TPs is similar to the use of speech act conditionals in that both are politeness strategies. Incidentally, however, the use of RQ.TPs is more interactional because while speech act conditionals simply describe a hypothetical situation, RQ.TPs recruit question forms, which is inherently direct and interactional, as may be contrasted with a counterpart RQ.TP construction of (13): "If (you) ask (me) where it is [*kukey etinyamyen*], there are biscuits on the sideboard." For the same reason, if politeness is in general directly proportional to indirectness (Brown and Levinson, 1987), RQ.TPs may carry a lower degree of politeness.

A very similar case of rhetorical questions and their involvement in grammaticalization has been reported by Herring (1991). In a study of grammaticalization of rhetorical questions in Tamil, she presents one interesting type of RQ-based grammaticalization, i.e. 'Thematizing Rhetorical Questions (TRQs)', which combines a question and a conditional (e.g. "If (you) ask, 'How (is it) year after year?'" (Herring, 1991:258).) The function of TRQs is to establish a theme upon which the narrator elaborates by answering the question presented by himself or herself. Furthermore, Herring (1991) notes the intriguing aspect of Tamil TRQs that virtually all of the TRQs are *wh*-questions, the same state of affairs with RQ.TPs in Korean. In addition to the parallelism in the patterns of source construction and discursive psychological processes underlying the grammaticalization, there is a similarity in their variational patterns. In other words, Tamil TRQs occur in free variation with or without the verbal morphology COND marker. The pattern with the COND marker is equivalent to the Korean RQ.TPs, whereas the one without COND is formally equivalent to the Korean examples (11) given in section 4.2.1.

Considering that Korean has a large number of connectives, SFPs, and even DMs based on COMPs, which means that they are closely related to quotative constructions at the stage of incipient grammaticalization, it is important, at least in Korean, to look into the role of quotatives in the grammaticalization processes and further in the re-organization processes of grammatical paradigms (see, for instance, Rhee, 2012b for discussion of the development of evidentiality and stance markers from quotatives).<sup>25</sup>

<sup>23</sup> See also Hoffmann (2005) for discussion of grammaticalization not resulting from high frequency of the linguistic forms concerned.

<sup>24</sup> Incidentally, the Thematizing Rhetorical Questions (TRQs) in Tamil (see section 4.4.3 below for more discussion) show a similar propensity in that the two most frequently encountered TRQs in the Tamil corpus are 'what'-based: 'And then what did X do?' and 'And then what happened?' (Herring, 1991:258).

<sup>25</sup> A survey shows that there are as many as 58 quotative/reportative SFPs and 49 connectives in the declarative-based forms and a comparable number of SFPs and connective forms across interrogative, imperative and hortative paradigms as well.

#### 4.4.4. On directionality

One of the defining characteristics of grammaticalization is the directionality of change. In particular, it is widely believed among the grammaticalization scholars that grammaticalization proceeds unidirectionally. In his seminal work, Givón (1979:209) proposed a path of grammaticalization from loose to tight pole that can be summarized as the following:

(14) discourse > syntax > morphology > morphophonemics > zero

It has been shown that RQ.TPs originated from strategic uses of rhetorical structures in discursive settings. This is in consonance with the idea that discourse is the locus of grammaticalization because that is where linguistic forms come under meaning negotiation between interlocutors and thus have chances of experiencing change in general. However, when the grammaticalization processes of DMs are investigated, there arises the issue of directionality across the levels of grammar.

In most studies of grammaticalization, especially those that involve exemplar-based investigation, the typical direction of change is from a lexical category to a grammatical category or from less grammatical to a more grammatical category, a research tradition largely due to the wide subscription to Kurylowicz's (1976[1965]) definition of grammaticalization. In these cases a source word in a primary category changes into a word or affix with a grammatical function. However, when grammaticalization involves constructions whose use is motivated by discourse strategy, and when the resultant grammatical form is a DM, the directionality is not from lexis to grammar but from discourse to grammar, or in a sense, from discourse to discourse. Granting that it is true that even in the case where a lexical item is involved, the participating form is most likely a construction rather than a single lexical item, the cases of RQ.TPs present a unique situation in that there is not a single lexical item in the template and the only slot for a contentful item remains as an empty slot to be filled with an interrogative pronoun/adverb. Therefore, it is difficult to map RQ.TPs onto the cline (14) in strict terms.

## 5. Summary and conclusion

RQ.TPs are DMs that mark the micro-level topic of a discourse. From the structural perspective, the source constructions may be traced to the interrogative-based COMP, which, in turn, developed into the HYP.COND. Formerly HYP.CONDs could select any hypothesized proposition into a conditional. When syntagmatically locked HYP.CONDs gained relative freedom of a full-fledged clause by being supplemented by the expletive subject, the whole string came to function as RQ.TPs in the form of *kukey X-nyamyen*.

RQ.TPs constitute a (sub-)paradigm of rhetorically structured DMs. These DMs, as a group, stand out among grammatical markers in that they are templates rather than mutually unrelated individual DMs. The members in the paradigm share structural similarities. Considering that the frequencies of the RQ.TPs are widely varying, with the 'what'-based RQ.TP *kukey mwenyamyen* of extraordinarily high frequency as compared to other members, some of which are of extremely low frequency, it is reasonable to hypothesize that *kukey mwenyamyen* was the trail blazer for all other structurally similar strings to develop into RQ.TPs through analogy. In this respect, the development of RQ.TPs is an instance of paradigmaticization whereby a paradigm is created with the members whose relationship becomes increasingly stronger.

From the discourse perspective, RQ.TPs developed from rhetorically embedding a hypothetical question as a protasis of a sentence. Use of rhetorical strategies in grammaticalization involves the speaker's desire to be polite by asking a hypothetical question on behalf of the addressee and answering it, and, at the same time, to engage the addressee in the interaction. In this sense, the development involves interactivity and intersubjectivity in that the speaker actively considers the face of the addressee in strategic use of rhetorical questions.

It is true that individual RQ.TPs have undergone variable degrees of grammaticalization. This suggests that not all RQ.TP forms are fully entrenched as grammatical markers, even though they all undergo change in PDK while they are actively used by the discourse interlocutors in strategic and manipulative use of linguistic forms. The current states of affairs of the RQ.TPs offer an interesting window through which we can understand, at least in part, what kind of discursive and pragmatic intentions are involved and what kind of cognitive mechanisms are operative in the course of grammaticalization of communicatively-oriented linguistic forms.

## Acknowledgments

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 7th International Conference on Construction Grammar, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Seoul, Korea, August 10–12, 2012. The author wishes to thank the audience for their valuable comments and suggestions. My heart-felt thanks also go to Hyun Jung Koo, Seiko Fujii, Young-Ok Lee, and Anthony Shin for their valuable comments. All remaining errors, however, are mine. It is also acknowledged with gratitude that this research was supported by the 2013 Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Research Fund.

## References

- Beeching, Kate, 2011. The role of the left and right periphery in semantic change. In: Panel introduction for IPrA-12, Manchester, U.K. July 3–8, 2011.
- Bolinger, Dwight, 1989. *Intonation and its Uses: Melody in Grammar and Discourse*. Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Brinton, Laurel J., 1996. *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Brinton, Laurel J., 2008. *The Comment Clause in English: Syntactic Origins and Pragmatic Development*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Brown, Penelope, Levinson, Stephen C., 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Bybee, Joan L., 2011. Usage-based theory and grammaticalization. In: Narrog, Heiko, Heine, Bernd (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 69–78.
- Bybee, Joan L., Hopper, Paul J. (Eds.), 2001. *Frequency and the Emergence of Linguistic Structure*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Clark, Herbert H., Marshall, Catherine R., 1981. Definite reference and mutual knowledge. In: Joshi, Aravind K., Webber, Bonnie L., Sag, Ivan (Eds.), *Elements of Discourse Understanding*. Cambridge University Press, Chicago, pp. 10–63.
- Degand, Liesbeth, Evers-Vermeul, Jacqueline, 2012. Grammaticalization or pragmaticalization of discourse markers? More than a terminological issue. In: Paper presented at the 5th New Reflections on Grammaticalization Conference, The University of Edinburgh, July 16–19, 2012.
- Degand, Liesbeth, Simon-Vandenberghe, Anne-Marie, 2011. Introduction: grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification of discourse markers. *Linguistics* 49 (2), 287–294.
- Diewald, Gabriel, 2006. Discourse particles and modal particles as grammatical elements. In: Fischer, Kerstin (Ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 403–425.
- 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*. De Boeck, Brussels.
- Ducrot, Oswald, 1984. *Le dire et le dit*. Minuit, Paris.
- Ducrot, Oswald, 1996. In: *Slovenian Lectures/Conférences Slovènes: Argumentative Semantics/Sémantique argumentative*. Institut za humanistične studije Ljubljana, Ljubljana.
- Fillmore, Charles J., Kay, Paul, O'Connor, Mary Kay, 1988. Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions: the case of *let alone*. *Language* 64, 501–538.
- Fischer, Olga, 2011. Grammaticalization as analogically driven change? In: Narrog, Heiko, Heine, Bernd (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 31–42.
- Fraser, Bruce, 1996. Pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics* 6, 167–190.
- Fraser, Bruce, 1999. What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics* 31, 931–952.
- Fraser, Bruce, 2006. Towards a theory of discourse markers. In: Fischer, Kerstin (Ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 189–204.
- Givón, Talmy, 1979. *On Understanding Grammar*. Academic Press, New York.
- Haiman, John, 1978. Conditionals are topics. *Language* 54, 565–589.
- Haiman, John, 1994. Ritualization and the development of language. In: Pagliuca, William (Ed.), *Perspectives on Grammaticalization*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 3–28.
- Hansen, Maj-Britt Mosegaard, 1997. *Alors and donc in spoken French: a reanalysis*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28, 153–187.
- Heine, Bernd, Kuteva, Tania, 2002. On the evolution of grammatical forms. In: Wray, Alison (Ed.), *The Transition to Language*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 376–397.
- Heine, Bernd, Kuteva, Tania, 2010. *Elements of discourse grammar: an outline*. ms.
- Herring, Susan C., 1991. The grammaticalization of rhetorical questions in Tamil. In: Traugott, Elizabeth C., Heine, Bernd (Eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. 2 vols, vol. 1. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 253–284.
- Hoffmann, Sebastian, 2005. *Grammaticalization and English Complex Prepositions: A Corpus-Based Study*. Routledge, London.
- Hong, Young-Tcheol, 2005. A unified approach to the so-called topic particle 'nun'. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 15 (3), 397–413.
- Hopper, Paul J., Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, 2003. *Grammaticalization*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Jang, Yoonhee, 2002. *Cwungseykwuke Congkyelemi Yenkwu (A Study of Middle Korean Sentence-Final Endings)*. Taehaksa, Seoul.
- Joos, Martin, 1967. *The Five Clocks*. Harcourt, Brace & World, New York.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther, 2007. Spoken parenthetical clauses in English. In: Dehe, Nicole, Kavalova, Yordanka (Eds.), *Parentheticals*. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 25–52.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther, Heine, Bernd, Kuteva, Tania, 2011. On thetical grammar. *Studies in Language* 35 (4), 848–893.
- Kim, Tae-Yeop, 2001. *Kwuke Congkyelemiuy Mwunpep (The Grammar of Korean Sentence-Final Markers)*. Kwukhakalyowen, Seoul.
- Kim, Joung-Ran, 2002a. Is the contrastive *-nun* a topic? In: Iverson, Gregory K., Ahn, Sang-Cheol (Eds.), *Explorations in Korean Language and Linguistics*. Hankook Publisher, Seoul, pp. 235–242.
- Kim, Tae-Yeop, 2002b. A study on the grammaticalization of discourse marker. *The Korean Language and Literature* 26, 61–80.
- Kim, Joung-Ran, 2004. The contrastive *-nun* and the matching *-nun*: how are they different? *Journal of Language Sciences* 11 (2), 63–76.
- Koo, Hyun Jung, 1989. *A Study on Conditional Sentences in Modern Korean*. Ph.D. dissertation. Konkuk University, Seoul.
- Koo, Jongnam, 2000. *Tamhwaphyci mwe-uy mwunpepwawa tamhwa kinung (On grammaticalization and discourse functions of the discourse marker mwe)*. *Kwukemwunhak* 35, 5–32.
- Koo, Hyun Jung, 2008. Grammaticalization of negation markers in Korean. *Discourse and Cognition* 15 (3), 1–27.
- Koo, Hyun Jung, Rhee, Seongha, 2008. Manipulated hypotheticality in conditionals: a journey in search of strength and diversity. In: Paper presented at the 4th New Reflections on Grammaticalization Conference, Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium, July 16–19, 2008.
- Koo, Hyun Jung, Rhee, Seongha, 2013. On emerging paradigm of sentence-final particles of discontent: a grammaticalization perspective. *Language Sciences* 37, 70–89.
- Kurylowicz, Jerzy, 1976[1965]. The evolution of grammatical categories. Reprinted in *Esquisses linguistiques*, vol. 2. Fink, München, pp. 38–54.
- Kwon, Jae-il, 1992. *Hankwuke Thongsalon (Korean Syntax)*. Minumsa, Seoul.

- Lee, Chungmin, 1999a. Contrastive topic: a locus of the interface. In: Turner, Ken (Ed.), *The Semantics/Pragmatics Interface from Different Points of View*. Elsevier, London, pp. 317–342.
- Lee, Han-gyu, 1999b. The pragmatics of the discourse particle *mwe* in Korean. *Discourse and Cognition* 6 (1), 137–157.
- Lee, Won Pyo, 2001. *Tamhwapwunsek (Discourse Analysis)*. Hankook Publisher, Seoul.
- Lee, Chungmin, 2002. Inversion and scrambling vs. topic and contrastive topic: evidence from Korean. In: *Proceedings of the 2002 LSK International Summer Conference*, vol. 2. The Linguistic Society of Korea, Seoul, pp. 235–246.
- Lee, Heeja, Lee, Jonghee, 2010. *Emi Cosa Sacen (A Dictionary of Endings and Particles)*. Hankook Publisher, Seoul.
- Lehmann, Christian, 2002[1982]. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. Lincom Europa, München.
- Li, Charles N., Thompson, Sandra A., 1976. Subject and topic: a new typology of language. In: Li, Charles N. (Ed.), *Subject and Topic*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 457–489.
- Maynard, Senko K., 2001. Expressivity in discourse: vocatives and themes in Japanese. *Language Sciences* 23, 679–705.
- Narrog, Heiko, Heine, Bernd, 2011. Introduction. In: Narrog, Heiko, Heine, Bernd (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 1–16.
- Narrog, Heiko, Rhee, Seongha, 2013. Grammaticalization of space in Korean and Japanese. In: Robbeets, Martine, Cuyckens, Hubert (Eds.), *Shared Grammaticalization: With Special Focus on the Transeurasian Languages*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 287–315.
- National Institute of the Korean Language, 2002. Hyentay Kwuke Sayong Pinto Cosa [A survey of use frequency in Modern Korean] (NIKL Report #2002-1-17), Seoul.
- Nølke, Henning, 2006. The semantics of polyphony (and the pragmatics of realization). *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 38, 137–160.
- Ocampo, Francisco, 2006. Movement towards discourse is not grammaticalization: the evolution of *claro* from adjective to discourse particle in spoken Spanish. In: Sagarra, Nuria, Toribio, Almeida Jacqueline (Eds.), *Selected Proceedings of the 9th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium. Cascadilla Proceedings Project*, Somerville, MA, pp. 308–319.
- Onodera, Noriko O., 2011. The grammaticalization of discourse markers. In: Narrog, Heiko, Heine, Bernd (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 614–624.
- Quirk, Randolph, Greenbaum, Sidney, Leech, Geoffrey, Svartvik, Jan, 1972. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. Longman, London.
- Rhee, Seongha, 2008. From rhetoric to grammar: grammaticalization of rhetorical strategies in Korean. *Japanese Korean Linguistics* 13, 359–370.
- Rhee, Seongha, 2009. Through a borrowed mouth: reported speech and subjectification in Korean. *LACUS Forum* 34, 201–210.
- Rhee, Seongha, 2012a. Rhetorical reportatives and intersubjectification. In: Paper presented at the 5th New Reflections on Grammaticalization Conference, The University of Edinburgh, July 16–19, 2012.
- Rhee, Seongha, 2012b. Context-induced reinterpretation and (inter)subjectification: the case of grammaticalization of sentence-final particles. *Language Sciences* 34, 284–300.
- Roulet, Eddy, 1984. Speech acts, discourse structure, and pragmatic connectives. *Journal of Pragmatics* 8, 31–47.
- Schiffrin, Deborah, 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Schourup, Lawrence, 1999. Discourse markers. *Lingua* 107, 227–265.
- Schwenter, Scott A., 2000. Viewpoints and polysemy: linking adversative and causal meanings of discourse markers. In: Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, Kortmann, Bernd (Eds.), *Cause-Cognition-Concession-Contrast: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives*. Mouton, Berlin, pp. 257–281.
- Schwenter, Scott A., 2007. Dialogicity and negation. In: Paper presented at Stanford University, May 25, 2007.
- Sweetser, Eve E., 1990. *From Etymology to Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Thompson, Sandra A., Mulac, Anthony, 1991. A quantitative perspective on the grammaticization of epistemic parentheticals in English. In: Traugott, Elizabeth C., Heine, Bernd (Eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, 2 vols, vol. 2. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 313–329.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, 1995. The role of the development of discourse markers in a theory of grammaticalization. In: Paper presented at the 12th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Manchester, August 13–18, 1995.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, 2010a. Dialogic contexts as motivations for syntactic change. In: Cloutier, Robert A., Hamilton-Brehm, Anne Marie, Kretzschmar, William (Eds.), *Variation and Change in English Grammar and Lexicon*. Mouton, Berlin, pp. 11–27.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, 2010b. (Inter) subjectivity and (inter)subjectification: a reassessment In: Davidse, Kristin, Vandelanotte, Lieven, Cuyckens, Hubert (Eds.), *Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 29–71.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, Dasher, Richard B., 2002. Regularity in Semantic Change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, Heine, Bernd, 1991. Introduction. In: Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, Heine, Bernd (Eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, 2 vols, vol. 1. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 1–14.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, König, Ekkehard, 1991. The semantics-pragmatics of grammaticalization revisited. In: Traugott, Elizabeth C., Heine, Bernd (Eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, 2 vols, vol. 1. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 189–218.
- Waltereit, Richard, 2006. The rise of discourse markers in Italian: a specific type of language change. In: Fischer, Kerstin (Ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Elsevier, Oxford, pp. 61–67.
- Wischer, Ilse, 2000. Grammaticalization versus lexicalization. 'Methinks' there is some confusion. In: Fischer, Olga, Rosenbach, Anette, Stein, Dieter (Eds.), *Pathways of Change: Grammaticalization in English*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 355–370.

**Seongha Rhee** is a professor of linguistics at Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Seoul, Korea. He received his Ph.D. in Linguistics from the University of Texas at Austin in 1996. He taught and researched at Stanford University as a 2003–2004 Fulbright lecturer and researcher. Primary areas of research interest are grammaticalization, cognitive linguistics and typology. Current research involves cognitive, socio-cultural, and discursive mechanisms that enable language change. A long-term goal is to identify the cognitive strategies as driving forces of grammaticalization from the crosslinguistic and typological perspectives.