

On the Emergence of Pragmatic Markers from Pseudo-Question Constructions in English and Korean: A Grammaticalization Perspective*

Seongha Rhee

(Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)

Seongha Rhee. 2016. On the Emergence of Pragmatic Markers from Pseudo-Question Constructions in English and Korean: A Grammaticalization Perspective. *Language and Linguistics* 70, 423–458. This paper addresses the development of a group of pragmatic markers originating from question constructions that are not used to solicit information but for their strategic effects, thus ‘pseudo-questions’. An exploration into their emergence raises a number of implications in discourse, rhetoric, and grammaticalization studies. English and Korean developed very similar functions from pseudo-questions such as gap-filling, attention-attracting, mitigating, emphasizing, stance-marking, noncommitment-signaling, etc. Crucially relying on rhetorical manipulation of question constructions for framing discourse, their development involves diverse discourse-cognitive strategies to achieve engagement, disengagement, intersubjectivity and deictic perspectivization.

Keywords: Pragmatic markers, Pseudo-questions, Discourse strategies, Engagement-disengagement, Intersubjectivity, Deictic strategy

* This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean Government (NRF-2013S1A5A2A01019751) and the 2015 Research Fund of Hankuk University of Foreign Studies. Earlier versions of this research were presented at the 2014 Winter Conference of the Linguistic Science Society, Daegu, Korea and the 2015 Polish Cognitive Linguistics Association Conference, Lublin, Poland. The author wishes to thank the conference audiences and the anonymous reviewers. All remaining errors, however, are mine.

1. Introduction

A large body of literature reveals that pragmatic markers (PMs; or discourse markers: DMs) are not only universal in language but also carry many different kinds of critical functions in discourse organization (Östman 1982; Fraser 1990; Watts 1989). Arising from diverse lexemes and constructions (Fraser 2006), PMs carry diverse meta-textual functions, e.g. structuring the text, signaling the stance, marking interpersonality, etc., which are directly or indirectly related to their source characteristics. It has also been noted that typically PMs are productively used in *vis-a-vis* informal conversation (Biber et al. 1999; Quaglio and Biber 2006) and thus their development often, albeit not always, involves subjectification and intersubjectification.

One of the prominent characteristics of PMs is related to their heterogeneity in form and meaning. The lack of homogeneity of PMs in terms of their grammatical status is largely due to their differential degrees of grammaticalization, such as fully lexicalized adverbs, periphrastic phrasal expressions, syntagmatic strings as full-fledged sentences, etc., thus exhibiting intracategorical and intercategory fluidity.

Among diverse PMs, there is one special type of PMs that form a paradigm with respect to their source characteristics, i.e., those that developed from interrogative constructions, as listed in part in (1):¹⁾

- (1) a. Korean: *eti* 'where?': *mwe* 'what?': *ku mwenya* 'what is that?'
- b. English: *what?': what is it?': who knows?': you know what? whatchamacallit, what-do-you-call-it?*

The forms illustrated in (1) originated from questions, but do not

1) The Yale Romanization System was used for transliteration of the Korean data.

impose illocutionary force of a question on the addressee. In this regard, they are not regular questions but 'pseudo-questions'. Their use is motivated not by the desire to solicit information from the addressee, but by the desire to fulfil such discourse strategic functions as gap-filling, attention-attracting, mitigating, emphasizing, etc. This paper addresses these pseudo-question pragmatic markers (PQPMs). Since PQPMs still retain their source forms, i.e. question constructions, their longitudinal depth of development is rather shallow but they formally remain in the borderland between syntactic constructions and unitized discursive forms, i.e., between 'sentence grammar' and 'thetical grammar' (Heine et al. 2011; Kaltenböck et al. 2011).

The objective of this paper is threefold: (i) to describe the functions of the PMs from pseudo-question constructions in Korean and English, (ii) to analyze the strategies involved in the development of PQPMs, and (iii) to ascertain the observance of grammaticalization principles in the course of their development.

The data comes from two major sources: the Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English (MICASE) developed by the University of Michigan, a searchable collection of transcripts of academic speech events, totaling 152 transcripts (1,848,364 words), for English, and a corpus of drama and cinema scenarios totaling 7,454 transcripts (24,260,020 words) developed by Min Li, for Korean.²⁾

This paper is organized in the following manner. Sections 2 and 3 describe the types and uses of PQPMs in Korean and English, respectively; section 4 analyzes the strategies involved in the development of PQPMs; section 5 addresses mechanisms of grammaticalization with respect to the emergence of PQPMs; and section 6 summarizes the discussion and concludes the paper.

2) The author wishes to thank Min Li for kindly sharing her corpus.

2. PQPMs in Korean

Korean has a large number PQPMs. Most PQPMs can stand alone, and thus it can be reasonably hypothesized that those that occur embedded in a sentence developed from parenthetical constructions, i.e. those that are not syntactically bound to the host sentence. One exceptional type is one that is built on the conditional connective *-myen*, which, by virtue of marking the protasis of a conditional sentence, makes its host clause occur sentence-initially, i.e. at the left periphery (see 2.1 below for more discussion). Since PMs tend to be exposed to frequent use, and thus are susceptible to formal erosion, they are prone to undergo phonological reduction as well as morphosyntactic compacting. These processes contribute to the increase of the inter-lexical consolidation (in the cases of multi-word PQPMs) and consequently the increase of the likelihood for them to occur parenthetically. Some of the common PQPMs may be listed, in part, as in <Table 1>.

<Table 1> PQPMs in Korean

Function	Form	Source Meaning
Topic Presenter	(<i>kukey</i>) <i>X-nyamyen</i> (<i>X</i> : <i>mwe</i> , <i>way</i> , <i>ettehkey</i> , <i>eti</i> , <i>nwukwu</i> , <i>encey</i>) <i>P-nyamyen</i>	"If you ask what/why/how/where /who/when... it is" "If you ask if P"
Gap Filler	<i>mwelalkka?</i> <i>kukey mwelalkka?</i> <i>ku mwenya?</i> <i>X-latela</i> (<i>X</i> : <i>mwe</i> , <i>nwukwu</i> , <i>eti</i> , <i>etc.</i>)	"What should I say?" "What should I say it is?" "What is it?" "What/how... did they say it was?"
Mitigator	<i>X-lalkka?</i> <i>eti?</i> <i>mwe?</i>	"Should I say it is x?" "Where?" "What?"

Attention Attractor	<i>ettehsupnikka?</i>	"How is it?"
	<i>x-inka?</i>	"Is it x?"
	<i>x-itenka?</i>	"Was it x?"
	<i>x-ilkka?</i>	"Will it be x?"
	<i>way?</i>	"Why?"
Emphaticals	<i>way(yo)?</i>	"Why?"
	<i>eti?</i>	"Where?"

2.1. Topic Presenters

The use of PQPMs for the topic presentation function can be exemplified with *X-nyamyen* and *P-nyamyen*, as in (2):³

- (2)a. A: [Your mother will not leave him alone.]
 maka-tal-lakwu kusalam-i **nwukwunyamyen...**
 stop-Ben-End the.person-Nom **PQPM**
 'Stop her. He is...' (Lit. "Stop her (from harming him). He is, if you ask who he is...")

B: al-a
 know-End
 'I know (who he is).'
 (2009, Drama, *Naycouy yewang*, Episode #12)

- b. A: [You said you miss me. I will let you see me, then.]
 oppa-ka na iss-nun-tey-lo teyli-le
 big.brother-Nom I exist-Adn-place-to pick.up-Purp
 o-l-lay? na cikum eti iss-**nyamyen...**
 come-Fut-End I now where exist-**PQPM**
 'Will you come here to pick me up? The place where I am now is... (Lit. "... If you ask where I am...")

3) In the interlinear morphemic gloss, the following abbreviations are used: Adn: adnominal; Ben: benefactive; Caus: causative; Comp: complementizer; Conn: connective; Cons: consequential; End: sentential-end; Fut: future; Neg: negative; Nom: nominative; Nomz: nominalizer; Pol: polite; PQPM: pseudo-question pragmatic marker; Prog: progressive; Pst: past; Purp: purposive; Rept: reportative; Retro: retrospective; Top: topic; and Tri: trial.

(2001, Drama, *Masissnun chenghon*, Episode #3)

The context of (2a) is that A, the wife of B, is worried that a man she cares for would be harmed by her mother-in-law and is asking her husband (B) to stop her. Since Speaker A thinks that her husband might not know who the person is, she tries to elaborate on his identity by prefacing her intent with the PQPM *nwukwunyamyen* 'if you ask who it is.' Incidentally, B already knows who he is. The context of (2b) is one in which Speaker A is talking to a man who loves her over the phone, while she is with someone she loves. She does so in the hope of arousing jealousy in him by letting him overhear the conversation. She is about to inform the recipient of the call of her whereabouts by prefacing the information with the PQPM *x-nyamyen* 'if you ask.'

In the above examples, the speakers raise a hypothetical question about 'who the person being talked about' and 'where I am now', respectively. In the sense that the questions selectively highlight specific aspects of the topic (i.e. the identity and location of the person concerned), these topic presenters may be labeled as 'micro-topic presenters' (Rhee 2014) in contrast with the topic presenters with a more global scope.

Elements comprising PQPMs in their developmental stages may have a long history of grammaticalization. PQPMs of topic presentation or rhetorical topic presenters, i.e. *kukey x-nyamyen*, make use of conditional *-myen* and have undergone a series of changes (Koo and Rhee 2013; Rhee 2014: 4).

(3) Developmental Path of Rhetorical Topic Presenters

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| A. coordinated structure: | ... <i>nya</i>]- <i>ha</i>]- <i>ko</i> |
| B. subordinated structure: | ... <i>nya</i>]- <i>hako</i> |
| C. interrogative complementizer: | - <i>nyako</i> |
| D. periphrastic conditional: | - <i>nyako</i>]- <i>ha</i>]- <i>myen</i> |
| E. phonological reduction: | - <i>nya</i>]- <i>ha</i>]- <i>myen</i> |

F. hypothetical conditional:	<i>-nyamyen</i>
G. rhetorical topic presenter:	<i>kukey x-nyamyen</i>

As shown in the developmental stages in (3), PQPMs of topic presentation *kukey x-nyamyen* developed from constructionalization of the periphrasis involving a question as an embedded clause, as indicated by the question particle *-nya* in the source construction. Their use in the incipient stage in the form of a rhetorical question conditional *-nyahAmyen* is first attested at the turn of the 20th century in a novel entitled *Caypongchwun* published in 1912 (Rhee 2014: 6). In contemporary Korean, their use is productive in spoken genre in oratory or lecture styles, in particular.

2.2. Gap Fillers

Korean PQPM gap-fillers are *mwelalkka*, *kukey mwelalkka*, *ku mwenya*, *mwelatela*, *nwukwulatela*, etc. The PQPMs with the gap-filling function may be illustrated with the following examples:

- (4) a. [The protagonist is eager to establish a meaningful relationship in reality.]

chamtoyn kwankyey-lan, **mwelalkka**,

meaningful relationship-Top **PQPM**

yektongcek kwankyey-ø-cyo

dynamic relationship-be-End

'A meaningful relationship is... a dynamic relationship.' (Lit. "A meaningful relationship is, what should (I) say?... it's a dynamic relationship.")

(2006, Drama, *Nen enu pyeleyse wassni?* Episode #2)

- b. A: [Where does she say she is going?]

B: wusen yehayng.tani-keyss-tako ha-te-lakwu-yo

first travel-Fut-Comp say-Retro-Rept-Pol

etilatela? (thinking) Lapland?

PQPM [place.name]

'She said that she would travel around first. The place is... (was it) Lapland?' (Lit. "... Where did (she) say it is?... (Was it) Lapland?")

(2007, Drama, *Nwunuy yewang*, Episode #13)

The main function of these PQPMs is to fill the gap when the speaker experiences difficulty in finding the words for diverse reasons. In (4a), where the speaker is with editorial board members to discuss the direction of the plot of their play, she is experiencing difficulty in finding an appropriate word to define a meaningful relationship. Likewise, in (4b), the speaker is trying to remember where the woman (A's love) said she would go to. When speakers produce speech under the pressure of being online, they tend to resort to 'place-holders' to secure the floor while looking for specific linguistic forms for production. Therefore, gap-fillers are commonly found across languages, and even their use frequencies seem to be remarkably similar in spontaneous speech across languages (Podlesskaya 2010: 12).

From a discursive perspective, this signal of seeming inability to continue may be strategically used for other functions such as showing politeness when the speaker is performing a face-threatening act (see 2.3 below). Furthermore, as seen in (4), the gap-fillers may take the form of rhetorical direct questions (the *x-lalkka*-type; (4a)), or of quotative interrogative in a monological style (the *x-latela*-type; (4b)).

2.3. Mitigators

The PQPMs with the mitigation function are *x-lalkka?*, *eti?*, and *mwe?* Their uses are exemplified, in part, as in the following:

- (5) a. A: [Sometimes I feel like I'm trapped.]
 B: [Trapped?]
 A: nay-ka coh-ase ha-nun il-i-n-ke-n
 I-Nom like-Caus do-Adn work-be-Adn-Nomz-Top
 pwunmyengha-ntey...kkok cocengtangha-ko.iss-nun
 be.clear-Conn like be.manipulated-Prog-Adn
 kipwun-i-lalkka? mwe, kkuth-kkaci
 feeling-be-PQPM what, end-till
 ka-tapo-myen mwenka poi-kyess-ci
 go-Cons-if something be.seen-Fut-End
 'Without doubt, this job is what I do because I like it, but
 I feel like I'm being manipulated.. well, when I reach the
 end, I will see something then.' (Lit. "... but should I say
 that the feeling is like one of being manipulated? well, ...")
 (2005, Drama, *Pwuhwal*, Episode #11)
- b. A: [Are you OK? Aren't you hurt?]
 B: [No, I'm not hurt.]
 A: kulaytwu... **eti** com ilena-po-l-lay?
 but... **PQPM** a.little get.up-Tri-Fut-End
 'but.. can you try and get up?' (Lit. "but.. where?.. can you
 get up a little and see (if you are alright)?"
 (2007, Drama, *Komapsupnita*, Episode #1)
- c. A: [How can that guy make excuses after impregnating her?]
 B: minkyengi mok an mayta-n ke-y
 [name] neck Neg tie.hang-Adn Nomz-Nom
 tahayngi-ney **mwe**
 be.fortunate-End **PQPM**
 'I'm sort of glad that she didn't hang herself.' (Lit. "... is
 fortunate, what?")
 (2000, Drama, *Pwulkkoch*, Episode #14)

In (5a), two detectives are discussing a case and Speaker A confides to his colleague B his strange feelings about it. He says he has the feelings of being manipulated, but since he is not sure of the appropriateness of his word choice he is showing his tentativeness by

using a PQPM. In (5b), Speaker A, a motorist, nearly ran over Speaker B, who fell down, yet unharmed, in front of the car. To make sure B is not hurt, A urges B to try to stand up. But since A is a potential inflictor of damage, he cannot demand B to stand up, and only makes a polite suggestion using the PQPM *eti* 'where' which, however, cannot be meaningfully translated in the gloss for the lack of a semantic equivalent. Similarly, in (5c) the speaker comments on her niece having been impregnated by an insincere man and having fallen into deep depression. The speaker tries to tone down her statement with the final *mwe* 'what', realizing that a mention of committing suicide could be too extreme and might be offensive to the addressee.

The mitigators take the form of questions but these questions do not carry the direct impositive illocutionary force. Their function is to reduce the illocutionary force of the claim or statement in consideration of the addressee. In this respect, the development of mitigators is directly relevant to the notion of intersubjectification (see 4.3).

Most mitigators are identical in form with gap-fillers and there may be functional overlap as well. The only difference between them may be the motivation, i.e. whether their use is merely to fill in the pause (i.e., gap-fillers) or to signal reservation or reluctance about specific word choice (i.e., mitigators). In other words, the primary function of mitigators is not to fill the gap for being unable to continue, but to show the speaker's reservation of uttering the already-determined locution. The manifestation of the utterance reservation reduces the illocutionary force, because the addressee interprets the reservation signal as a signal of the speaker's desire to be sensitive to the addressee's face needs.

The act of modulating illocutionary forces of what is said is universal, by way of word choice or formulaic language. Incidentally, markers of illocutionary modulation seem to have well developed in

Korean and Japanese, in which intersubjectivity marking is highly developed and some of such markers are fully grammaticalized.

It is also noteworthy that the PM *mwe?* 'what' is functionally ambiguous largely depending on its position. When it occurs utterance-initially or utterance-medially, it tends to carry the mitigating effect with it, but when it occurs utterance-finally, it tends to, in addition, register the negative stance of the speaker or discontent (cf. Koo and Rhee 2013, Rhee, in press). This is consonant with the studies that address the functional sensitivity of positions of pragmatic markers (Erman 1986, 1987). With respect to the utterance-final PQPM *mwe?* 'what', there exists a remarkable parallelism with the English negative stance marker *what* that occurs sentence-finally (see 3.1 below).

2.4. Attention Attractors

The PQPMs with the attention attraction function are *ettehsupnikka?*, *x-inka?*, *x-itenka?*, *x-ilkka?*, *way?*, etc. Their uses are illustrated, in part, with the following examples:

- (6) a. **ettehsupnikka?** seysang-i com talla
 PQPM world-Nom a.little differently
 poi-cianh-supnikka?
 be.seen-Neg-Pol.End
 'So.. isn't it the case that the world looks a little differently?'
 (Lit. "How is it? Isn't the world...")
 (2008, Drama, *Palamuy hwawen*, Episode #9)

- b. A: [O, by the way, mom. Do you remember the gentleman?]
 B: [Who?]
 A: **way** isscanha... yeysnaley na mwul-ey
 PQPM you.know long.time.ago I water-in

ppacyess-ul-ttay kencye-cwu-n salam
 drown-Adn-time save-Ben-Adn person
 'You see, you know, the gentleman who save me long time
 ago when I was drowning.' (Lit. "Why, you know...")
 (1999, Drama, *Kwukhi*, Episode #7)

The excerpt (6a) is the beginning of a scene in which the speaker asks the addressee for whom he bought a pair of glasses. Since this is the beginning of a scene, the question 'How is it?' cannot be effectively answered because the addressee has absolutely no clue as to the content of the question. The addressee only has to wait for continuing utterances to identify the nature of the question. In this sense this question is only a rhetorical one, the primary aim of which is to attract the attention of the addressee. The excerpt (6b) is between a mother (B) and her daughter (A). In the second turn of A, the PQPM way 'why' is used to attract the attention of her mother, rather than to ask a reason of any kind as the lexical meaning of the form might suggest.

Securing enough attention is arguably one of the most important tasks for interlocutors in *vis-à-vis* conversation, because, unlike written discourses, conversational interactants are subjected to diverse distracting factors in the scene. In conversation, therefore, numerous devices are employed in pursuit of drawing attention, be they linguistic, paralinguistic, and non-linguistic. PQPMs are linguistic means of attention solicitation. In expert shows on TV or radio, show-hosts often throw direct questions, such as the formulaic rhetorical questions like the one in (6a) as a prelude simply to obtain focused attention of the guest speakers.

2.5. Emphaticals

The PQPMs with the emphasis function are *way?* 'why' for an

affirmative emphasis and *eti?* 'where' for a negative emphasis. They are exemplified in the following putative examples:

- (7) a. A: [Wasn't it difficult?]
 B: way? kosayng cham manhi ha-yss-ci
PQPM difficulty very much do-Pst-End
 'Absolutely (Don't mention it)! I had a lot of hard time.' (Lit.:
 "Why? I had lots of hard time.")
- b. A: [He is pretty smart, isn't he?]
 B: eti? cenhye an ttokttokha-y.
PQPM not.at.all not be.smart-End
 'Not at all. He is not smart at all.' (Lit.: Where? He is not
 smart at all.)

In (7) the question words *way?* 'why' and *eti?* 'where' do not carry the function of raising a question. Rather, they have the function of PMs to signal emphasis in a form of an answer. Even though the two are quite similar in form and grammatical category in that both of them are single-word interrogative pronoun, they diverge in function drastically, i.e., *way?* 'why' functions as an affirmative emphatical, whereas *eti?* 'where', a negative emphatical. Apparently, the motivation behind the divergence seems to be that "why" is a contracted form of 'Why are you asking, when it's so obvious?' and "where" makes reference to 'What aspect (= where) of it are you talking about, when there is none applicable.' Incidentally, *eti?* 'where' is a highly productive negative response marker in the South-eastern dialect in the form of *eteyye?* with an incorporated politeness marker.

3. PQPMs in English

English has a rich inventory of PQPMs in the form of parentheticals

in their origin, a state of affairs quite similar to the Korean language. English PMs have been extensively researched, but the focus has been mostly on the primary forms e.g. *well, you know, I mean*, etc. However, more complex forms such as PQPMs have not received as much attention as a whole. The PQPMs in English addressed here are as listed in <Table 2>.

(Table 2) PQPMs in English

Function	Form
Negative Stance	<i>what?</i>
Gap-Filler	<i>what is it?</i>
Non-comittal	<i>who knows?</i>
Attention Attractor	<i>you know what?</i> <i>you know what I'm saying?</i> <i>you know what I mean?</i> <i>guess what?</i>

3.1. Negative Stance Markers

In certain varieties of English, *what?* functions as an emotive particle at the end of a sentence (Smith 1985: 110, as cited in Kuteva 2012: 57). There are special prosodic features, i.e., downward intonation and low pitch. The use is exemplified in (8).

- (8) [Context: Discussion of a student who is going overseas for one month and missing classes.]
 A: He'll never pass the third year.
 B: It's only for one month **what**.

According to Smith (1985: 117), this is outdated usage that was common in the 19th century British English to signal 'shared information and solidarity.'

- (9) But she's so beastly chic, dontcherknow - eh, what! (1891 J. Strange Lumley XV, quoted in Smith 1985, as cited in Kuteva 2012: 57)

In modern British English this is used with an upward intonation to signal contempt in reminding something obvious with the meaning of 'You are a bloody fool if you don't know that.' According to Kuteva (2012: 57), this particular usage seems to have developed from the syntagmatic/phonological reduction of "What could you say against that?!/What were you thinking?!" It has been noted in a number of studies that there are diverse extensional functions of marking obviousness, anger, irritation, preparation for persuasion, etc. by means of the sentence-final *what* (Kwan-Terry 1978, 1992; Smith 1985; Platt 1987; Platt and Ho 1989; Gupta 1992, 1999; Wong 1994, 2004; Goddard 1998; Wee 1998), as exemplified below:

- (10) [Background: A has been berated by C for spitting on the floor.
Context: A is relating the incident to B.]
A: He also spits **what!**. (Smith 1985: 112)
- (11) a. Didn't hear me **what?**
b. I donno she died or **what**.

In Singaporean English, *wut* (= *what*) is frequently used with respect to not only the preceding utterance, but also assumptions, inference, entailment, etc. to signal opposition (Wong 2004: 777-778). Similarly, Goddard (1998: 371) proposes the meaning of *wut* as in (12):

- (12) Meaning of *wut* in Singaporean English
(i) Something happened now,
(ii) because of this, I think that someone thinks something is true,
(iii) I say this because I want you to know it is not true.

3.2. Gap Fillers

Among the PQPMs, *what is it?* is among the most frequent forms that carry the gap filling function. The following examples are taken from the MICASE Corpus.⁴⁾

- (13) a. yeah i think the really interesting question is where do these, ideas conceptions come from and how are they perpetuated? **what is it**, when uh Chinese pop culture meets Western pop culture that or when Chinese traditional culture meets Western pop culture, what's this transmission process that's that's, producing this idea of what is Western? mm to me that's a very intriguing question.
- b. then um... the, **what is it** ... **what is it you**... wh- what they're trying to do is, since abatement costs of mm, greenhouse gases yeah here in the industrialized nation..
- c. for example, Article Twenty-Five defends street children, by saying that um, **what is it?** um by saying that all children shall enjoy the same, social protection.

As shown in the above examples, *what is it?*, as a PM, is not an addressee-directed question but a rhetorical self-directed question, trying to hold the floor and earn time to recall words for production, by means of filling the production gap. The fact that the speakers are not soliciting the addressee's response is evident in that the utterance of *what is it?* does not result in a turn change: they occur utterance-medially.

4) The data taken from the MICASE Corpus is presented following the format in the original transcription, i.e. lack of punctuation and capitalization, but PQPMs are bold-faced for visual clarity.

3.3. Non-committals

Among the PQPMs, *who knows?* is the one that carries the non-committal function. The following examples are also taken from the MICASE.

- (14) a. the discussion is excellent also in terms of attitudes towards sexuality in the Old Testament as opposed to the New Testament as opposed to the early Christian writers Saint Augustine and so on, so, look at it get some ideas it might help you with your paper **who knows**, and uh...
- b. we don't know what's gonna happen either in the Peten in Guatemala or in Nicaragua, who knows, they might industrialize soon i doubt it. but they might. uh **who knows**, we might even have the kind of government which will permit us to plan, land use better than the current governments do.
- c. it is God that has made us as we are but it will be God too who will raise us up again. if we bear all this suffering and if there are still Jews left when it is over, then Jews, instead of being doomed, will be held up as an example. **who knows?** it might even be our religion from which the world and all people learn good, and for that reason only do we have to suffer now.

One of the prominent characteristics of the use of the non-committal PM is that it is typically used to present a potentially conflicting, improbable scenario, to which the speaker still wants to draw the attention of the addressee. This is obvious in the examples above, in which the speaker is presenting a situation, e.g. obtaining idea from reading the Old Testament (14a), industrialization of the Peten region (14b), and the Jews being praised as a good example (14c), with the non-committal PQPM *who knows?*. This PQPM implies that there is only a remote possibility and further that the speaker is aware of its

unlikelihood. The distancing effect created by the non-committal PQPM is the objective of the strategy to avoid criticism, by signaling the speaker's admission that the situation may not be realized.

3.4. Attention Attractors

As has been alluded to in 2.4, securing the addressee's attention is among the primary tasks for a speaker for successful communication, and thus there are many PMs, the primary function of which is to attract attention. In English *you know what? guess what? you know what I mean?* and *you know what I'm saying?* are some of them, but the first two are the prominent forms for the attention attraction function. The following examples of *you know what?* are taken from the MICASE.

- (15) a. i mean it's in the same sense like as soon as someone said that as soon as she said that i thought immediately well **you know what**, women look at magazines and in a sense it hurts them because it creates all these eating disorders.
- b. do the most incredible things in France that we are not allowed to do. [PAUSE duration :04] oh **you know what**, i forgot to plug in the uh, sound thing. you need the sound. this is it isn't it? okay.
- c. [PAUSE duration :28] **you know what?** i want it. i'm taking it home...
- d. **you know what?** i actually, when i was talking to Michelle last week i asked her you know about that whole thing...

The following are the examples of the attention-attractor *guess what?*, also taken from the MICASE.

- (16) a. these receptors and they can slide along the membrane. and they do. and they slide along and **guess what** they run into every now and then. other receptors. other insulin receptors. so what'll happen is...
- b. and they're rewarding what? maintain those numbers, hit plan, deliver the paperwork, but **guess what?** we need new ideas. right? we need new ideas if we're going to survive. so, let's now take a closer...
- c. well things move on and we have a rel- revelation Manago tells us she says, **guess what?** well my husband has died i have no husband i'm husbandless. and in fact as they drink wine and...

As shown in examples (15) and (16), the speakers are presenting something that they think is noteworthy with *you know what?* or *guess what?* preceding the noteworthy information. These PMs are 'utterance launchers and attention getting devices' (cf. Freddi 2011 for *guess what?*). In the case of (15), the speakers try to secure the renewed attention of the addressee before presenting noteworthy information such as applicability of the same logic about men to women (15a), revealing some absurd mistake (15b), unexpected acceptance to use a computer program (15c), and revealing that the speaker did call Michelle, contrary to the addressee's expectation (15d). Similarly in the case of (16), the speakers try to bring the addressee's attention to some surprising behavior of receptors (16a), something that they indispensably need (16b), and notable information about the passing of her husband (16c).

It is also worth noting that the PQPM *you know what?* tends to occur predominantly initially, and *guess what?* seems to occur medially. This is well manifested by the fact that *you know what?* is often preceded by a pause, or even occurs utterance-initially, whereas *guess what?* is either embedded in an utterance-medial position or followed

by a connective. This suggests that *you know what?* scopes over a larger discourse segment (e.g. discourse topic itself), whereas *guess what?* scopes over a particular entity or an aspect of a larger whole.

Certain variant forms may occur as intermediate-stage forms (e.g. *you know what I'm saying?*, *you know what I mean?*, etc.), as exemplified in (17), taken from the MICASE.

(17) a. A: well because it's a, isn't it hard to map, like how are we gonna map zero to X. **you know what i'm saying?**

B: yeah i'm kinda confused about what she wants.

b. A: DNA is passed rather than DNA is being replicated and like, **you know what i mean** in forming two cells type of thing. you know what i mean?

B: yeah

From an interactional point of view, these intermediate-stage forms are often followed by the addressee's response, thus suggesting that they are true interrogative sentences. At the same time, however, these forms also occur embedded in an utterance without turn change. Incidentally, the latter case is seen with the first occurrence of the bold-faced *you know what I mean* in (17b). In other words, these intermediate-stage forms are functionally ambiguous between the confirmation-soliciting speech act, i.e. true questions, and the attention-attracting discourse marker, i.e., PQPMs.

It is also interesting to note that due to differing syntactic structures at the source, there may be divergent development (e.g. lexicalization of *you know what*, *what-d'you-call-it*, etc.; cf. 'recognitional deixis' Enfield 2003), as shown in the following examples, taken from Enfield (2003: 103-106):

- (18) Mary: John, where's the **what-d'you-call-it**?
 John: I put it back in the toolbox.
- (19) a. Where's the **what-d'you-call-it**?.. you know, the chuck key?
 b. Mary: John, where's the **you-know-what**?
 c. Did you bring any **you-know-what**? (e.g. 'marijuana', to a party)
 d. Look, his **you-know-what** is not on straight. (e.g. lecturer's 'hairpiece')

Enfield (2003: 106) further notes that *you know what* has a kind of 'accusing' force (contra *what-d'you-call-it*), and have both 'avoidance' and 'conspirational' functions.

These instances show that a linguistic form sharing the same source may undergo similar compacting processes (such as lexicalization and univerbation), yet can diverge functionally (such as an entity-referring expression and a pragmatic marker in discourse).

4. Cognitive-Discursive Strategies in the Development of PQPMs

In the above, we have seen various types of PQPMs in Korean and English, whose discourse functions are similar. We now turn to a discussion of the strategies involved in their development. It is proposed that there are four prominent cognitive-discursive strategies that operated in their development, even though not all of them are equally applicable to all instances of the PQPM development across the board.

4.1. Engagement Strategy

The development of PQPMs, notably the topic presenters and attention attractors, typically involves the engagement strategy, whereby the speaker tries to attract the attention of the addressee and induce the engagement of the discourse partner. This strategy is typically manifested by the use of questions or interrogative pronouns.

From an interactive perspective, however, this strategy must be tactfully used because a question is inherently an impositive speech act, i.e., a face-threatening act. The solution needs to be able to relieve the addressee from the burden of answering the question, and thus, the use of rhetorical questions serves the purpose, 'rhetorical' in the sense that the question is presented with a situational cue that it does not have to be answered by the addressee. By employing a pseudo-question (or rhetorical question), the speaker is complying with the fundamental premise for successful communication, i.e. 'Engage, but do not impose.' Thus, this operating principle naturally leads to the second strategy, i.e. the disengagement strategy.

4.2. Disengagement Strategy

Rhetorical questions disengage the discourse partners because they relieve them from the burden of answering the questions. The signal of rhetoricity is often the distinct prosody. The speaker may feel it necessary to distance himself/herself from the discourse scene as if he/she is not the direct source of the utterance. It is indeed true that prosody is a prominent cue for functional differentiation (see Brinton 2008, Song 2013, Haselow 2012, Degand et al. 2014, Degand and Simon 2009, 2014, Sohn and Kim 2014, among others).

It is noteworthy that the disengagement strategy is typically manifested by the use of monologue styles, and, in case of Korean, often coupled with retrospective forms, which inherently carries the distancing function. For the Korean topic presenters, this strategy typically involves embedding a question, also in combination with non-honorified forms. When a question is embedded, as is the case with the Korean topic presenters that make use of conditional protasis, the question illocutionary force disappears because the question is no longer a direct speech act. Similarly, the lack of honorification marker *-si-* (cf. *nwukwunyamyen* vs. *nwukwunya-si-myen*) implies that the 'quoted' hypothetical question is not of the addressee, who, by discourse convention, needs to be honorified by default unless warranted otherwise. These distancing devices further promote the disengagement effect.

4.3. Intersubjectivity-Marking Strategy

Certain forms are structurally fossilized (esp. in English) even though they are subject to phonological variation. Intersubjectivity marking that is applicable to all PQPMs is the use of question form which is interactive in nature. Even when the speakers do not have the intent to direct a question to the addressee, especially in oratory or lecture scenes, they signal with PQPMs that they are aware of the presence of the addressee and that they want the addressee to be an active participant in the discourse. This desire may be realized either non-rhetorically, e.g. seeking confirmation from the addressee, or rhetorically, e.g. seeking attention of the addressee. PQPMs are relevant in the latter case.

In addition, it is also worth noting that in Korean, a language where intersubjectivity is highly grammaticalized, intersubjectivity is subject

to modulation. Modulation of intersubjectivity is typically achieved by the use of formal/informal, polite/non-polite, honorific/non-honorific distinctions in form. For instance, certain forms may be accompanied by the politeness marker *-yo*, e.g. the attention-attractor *x-inka?* 'Is it x?' and its polite counterpart *x-inkayo?*, etc. However, this variability is not applicable across the board. For instance, the mitigators *eti?* 'where' and *mwe?* 'what' cannot be modulated by means of the politeness marker. The loss of variability is indicative of the fact that the form has been fossilized.

4.4. Deictic Strategy

The development of PQPMs involves the differential uses of deictic pronouns. In case of English, deictic pronouns in general do not surface often in discourse markers. Among PQPMs, *what is it?* seems to be the only case where deictic impersonal pronoun (*it*) is used. In other words, with the tripartite *this-that-it* distinction in English, the neutral form *it* is recruited in the development of PMs.

Selectivity of deictic pronouns is prominent in Korean. With the *i-ku-ce* distinction in Korean, the neutral form *ku* is commonly recruited in the development of PQPMs. This preference for the neutral form seems to be a general tendency in the development of discourse markers. In Korean, for example, the discourse marker built on the proximal *i* is the attention-attractor *icey* 'now' only, and those on the distal *ce* are hesitation-marker *ce* and the attention-attractor *ceki(yo)* only. On the other hand, the discourse markers based on the neutral *ku* are numerous: *kulay*, *kulaykacko* (*kulaykaciko*), *kulayse*, *kulekey*, *kulenikka* (*kunikka*, *kunkka*, *kungkka*), *kulentey*, *kulem*, *kulehkomalko*, *kulehtamata*, *kulehci*, *kuntey*, *kulssey*, etc.

The use of neutral form has to do with the perspectivization. When

the speaker refers to an entity, be it concrete or abstract, the entity has not yet become mentally visible (i.e. proximal), and since the speaker has decided to refer to it, it is not too distant (i.e. distal), either. Furthermore, not only is the deictic pronoun *ku* 'it' neutral in terms of (mental) distance but also it tends to imply the identifiability on the part of the addressee. In this sense, the use of the neutral pronoun urges the discourse partner to come into the 'common ground' (Jucker and Smith 1998: 172).

5. Grammaticalization Mechanisms of PQPMs

The development of PMs is theoretically interesting topic since the process gives rise to linguistic forms that organize a discourse with diverse cohesive forces. However, the process has been viewed differently depending on the perspectives assumed. For instance, it is controversial as to whether the development of PMs (or discourse markers) should be considered as instances of grammaticalization (Waltereit 2006 vs. Diewald 2006, 2011). 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 Brinton(1996), Diewald (2006, 2011), Dostie(2004), Wischer(2000), Traugott(1995) and many others, we take the position that the development of pragmatic markers as a subgroup of, and less prototypical case of, grammaticalization. Our position is based on the rationale that pragmatic markers carry the function of discourse organization, which may well entitle them to a grammatical category, and consequently their developmental process constitutes an instance of grammaticalization.

It has been suggested in a number of studies that grammaticalization

processes occur through a number of interrelated mechanisms (Heine et al. 1991, Traugott and König 1991, Hopper 1991, Bybee et al. 1994, Hopper and Traugott 2003[1993], Rhee 2009, Traugott 2011). Heine and Kuteva(2002) propose four such major mechanisms, i.e., desemanticization, extension, erosion and decategorialization. We now turn to discussion of each of them.

5.1 Desemanticization

Desemanticization, as a principle of grammaticalization, states that as grammaticalization proceeds, the meaning of the source form will gradually lose lexical content, thus a process characterizable as 'semantic bleaching' (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 2).

In the case of PQPMs, the original meanings, largely the interrogative meanings of the source forms, the question pronouns, in particular, are substantially bleached, though at differing degrees. For instance, in the cases of *ku mwenya?* 'what is it?' in Korean and *what is it?* in English, the semantic bleaching seems minimal, thus (still) full-fledged questions. The only difference between *bona fide* questions and these PQPMs is that the latter do not carry the illocutionary force of questions by virtue of being rhetorical forms. It can be said that in these cases the semantic bleaching occurred at the global utterance level rather than at the lexical level. On the other hand, certain PQPMs such as *eti?* 'where' and *mwe?* 'what' as mitigators, and the negative stance marking sentence-final *what?* in English have undergone considerable level of desemanticization, thus retaining no semantic trace of the source form.

5.2. Extension

Extension as a grammaticalization mechanism is conceived of as a process whereby the use of a grammaticalizing form is extended to new contexts. For this reason, it is also called 'context generalization.' This process is enabled by the change in the meaning of the grammaticalizing form often characterizable as semantic generalization. In other words, as the meaning of a form becomes more general, its use context naturally becomes more general.

In the cases of PQPMs, the extension of use context is evident, particularly with those that have undergone extensive semantic bleaching. For instance, *eti?* 'where', *mwe?* 'what', etc. in Korean and the word-final *what* (= *wut*) in English are interrogative pronouns, but their use as PQPMs is not at all restricted to the syntactic position that licenses the occurrence of an interrogative pronoun. Such occurrences in non-licensed syntactic positions may seem to be applicable only to the highly grammaticalized forms, but with respect to all PQPMs, their use has been extended to the contexts that are not associated with the force of questions. This is a noteworthy instance of extension considering that all PQPMs still preserve the morphosyntax of question sentences in appearance.

5.3. Erosion

Erosion refers to the process whereby a form loses its phonetic substance, thus equatable as 'phonetic reduction.' Most PQPMs exhibit structural transparency, i.e., their source structure is still visible, and thus it may seem unlikely that PQPMs have undergone formal erosion. However, there are at least two aspects relevant to this issue.

The first aspect is that phonetic reduction is not restricted to phonemic loss but is inclusive of reduction in diverse phonological features. With respect to the loss in suprasegmental features, the loss of stress is the most common change, as shown in cliticization of English modals e.g. *I will* vs. *I'll*; *I have* vs. *I've*; *She has* vs. *She's*, etc., where the clitic forms lose the ability to be stressed. Most PQPMs are not stressed, partly because they are frequently used in the monologue style or are embedded without phonological prominence.

The second aspect is that there are forms that are multiply layered in terms of formal reduction. In such cases of layering, the old forms, i.e., ones in more conservative forms, tend to have compositional meanings, whereas the newer forms, i.e., those that are more reduced in form, tend to have innovated (discursive) meanings. For instance, the more conservative *kukey mwenya hamyen* is more likely to be interpreted literally as 'if you ask what it is,' whereas the more reduced *kukey mwenyamyen* and *mwenyamyen* are more likely to be interpreted as carrying the PQPM function. Similarly, the more conservative *what do you call it?* is more likely to be interpreted literally as compared to its more reduced counterpart *what d'ya call it*, which is more likely to be interpreted as a PQPM.

All things considered, it can be said that the PQPMs have undergone erosion, albeit at varying degrees, i.e., the loss of suprasegmental features in some, and the loss of phonemic or morpho-syntactic material.

5.4. Decategorialization

Decategorialization as a mechanism of grammaticalization refers to the loss in morphosyntactic properties characteristic of lexical or other less grammaticalized forms (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 2). Since

deategorialization makes reference to categorial properties, it is difficult to determine whether this mechanism is operative in the development of PQPMs, as these tend to contain more than one word. Furthermore, PQPMs are a subtype of pragmatic markers, one of defining characteristics of which is, though not always, structural independence. In other words, they usually stand alone and thus they cannot be easily tested as to whether they exhibit loss of major category features. To make the situation even further complicated, the central element of PQPMs is the interrogative pronoun which is a grammatical, thus secondary, category rather than a lexical, primary category.

Despite these threefold difficulties, there are instances that suggest decategorialization in the process of the PQPM development. First of all, PQPMs are highly unitized (i.e. 'univerbated' Lehmann 2015: 89, 160) and thus tend to resist insertion of linguistic forms. For instance, a multi-word constructions such as *what is it?*, *who knows?*, etc. in English and *kukey mwenyamyen* 'if you ask what it is', *kukey mwelalkka?* 'what should I call it?', etc. in Korean may allow insertion of certain adverbial phrases such as *on earth* (in English) or *totaychey* 'on earth' (in Korean), but in that case they cease to function as PQPMs. This state of affairs suggests that, in addition to inter-lexical cohesion among the constituents of PQPMs, the ability of verb phrases to be modified by an emphatic adverbial has been lost. The same goes with the Korean interrogative pronouns in PQPMs which cannot be accompanied by the demonstrative *ku* 'that' any more, as shown by the contrast between *ku eti?* (when it is lexical) and **ku eti?* (when it is an emphatic PQPM).

6. Summary and Conclusion

We have seen in the preceding discussion that Korean and English have comparable PQPMs that originated from pseudo-questions. Their common functions are gap-filling and attention-attracting, but non-committal (and mitigating) and negative-stance marking (and discontent-signaling) are also comparable functions. Korean topic presenters in the form of a conditional clause seem to stand out of close parallelism.

Rhetorical questions are commonly recruited in the development of PMs, because rhetoricity is important in discourse. These PMs carry diverse functions: topic presentation, gap filling, mitigation, attention-attraction, emphasis, noncommitment, etc. It was argued that there are diverse strategies involved in the development: engagement, disengagement, intersubjectivity modulation and deictic perspectivization.

It was further argued that the developmental processes of PQPMs can be analyzed with respect to general grammaticalization mechanisms, i.e. extension, desemanticization, erosion and decategorialization, even though their level of grammaticalization varies at the individual level.

References

- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. and E. Finegan (1999) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Pearson Education Ltd.
- Brinton, L. J. (1996) *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brinton, L. J. (2008) *The Comment Clause in English*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bybee, J. L., Pagliuca, W. and Revere D. Perkins (1994) *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Degand, L. and E-V. Jacqueline (2012) Grammaticalization or pragmaticalization of discourse markers? More than a terminological issue. *Paper presented at the 5th New Reflections on Grammaticalization Conference*. The University of Edinburgh.
- Degand, L., Simon, A.C., Tanguy, N. and T. V. Damme (2014) Initiating a discourse unit in spoken French: Prosodic and syntactic features of the left periphery. In Salvador Pons Bordería (ed.), *Discourse Segmentation in Romance Languages*. Benjamins.
- Degand, L. and A. C. Simon (2009) On identifying basic discourse units in speech: Theoretical and empirical issues. *Discours: Revue de linguistique, psycholinguistique et informatique* 4. <http://discours.revues.org/5852>; DOI: 10.4000/discours.5852
- Degand, L. and A. C. Simon (2014) Form and function of the left periphery. *Paper presented at the 12th Conceptual Structure, Discourse, and Language (CSDL) Conference*. University of California.
- Diewald, G. (2006) Discourse particles and modal particles as

- grammatical elements. In Kerstin Fischer, (ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Elsevier.
- Diewald, G. (2011) Pragmaticalization (defined) as grammaticalization of discourse functions. *Linguistics* 49(2): 365-390.
- Dostie, G. (2004) *Pragmaticalisation et marqueurs discursifs. Analyse sémantique et traitement lexicographique*. De Boeck.
- Enfield, N. J. (2003) The definition of *what-d'you-call-it*: Semantics and pragmatics of recognitional deixis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 101-117.
- Erman, B. (1986) Some pragmatic expressions in English conversation. In Gunnel Tottie and Ingegerd Bäcklund, (eds.), *English in Speech and Writing: A Symposium*. Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Erman, B. (1987) *Pragmatic Expressions in English: A study of you know, you see, and I mean in face-to-face conversation*. Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Fraser, B. (1990) An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 383-395.
- Fraser, B. (2006) Towards a theory of discourse markers. In Kerstin Fischer (ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Elsevier.
- Freddi, M. (2011) A corpus investigation into the pragmatics of filmic speech. *Paper presented at the 12th International Pragmatics Association (IPrA-12) Conference*. Manchester.
- Goddard, C. (1998) *Semantic Analysis: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Gupta, A. F. (1992) The pragmatic particles of Singapore colloquial English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 18: 31-57.
- Gupta, A. F. (1999) Standard Englishes, contact varieties and Singapore Englishes. In Claus Gnutzmann, (ed.), *Teaching and Learning English as a Global Language: Native and Non-Native*

Perspectives. Stauffenburg Verlag.

- Haselow, A. (2012) Subjectivity, intersubjectivity and the negotiation of common ground in spoken discourse: Final particles in English. *Language and Communication* 32: 182-204.
- Heine, B., Claudi, U., and F. Hünemeyer (1991) *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Heine, B., Kaltenböck, G., and T. Kuteva (2011) Accounting for insubordinated clauses. Typescript.
- Heine, B. and T. Kuteva (2002) *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, P. J. (1991) On some principles of grammaticization. In Elizabeth C. Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization* vol. 1. John Benjamins.
- Hopper, P. J. and E. C. Traugott (2003[1993]) *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jucker, A. H. and S. W. Smith (1998) And people just you know like 'wow': Discourse markers as negotiating strategies. In Andreas H. Jucker and Yael Ziv (eds.), *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory*. John Benjamins.
- Kaltenböck, G., Heine, B. and T. Kuteva (2011) On thetical grammar. *Studies in Language* 35(4): 848-893.
- 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.
- Kuteva, T. (2012) On the cyclic nature of grammaticalization. Invited special lecture at the 1st World Congress of Scholars of English Linguistics. In Ik-Hwan Lee et al. (eds.), *Issues in English Linguistics*. Hankook Publisher.
- Kwan-Terry, A. (1978) The meaning and the source of 'la' and the 'what' particles in Singapore English. *RELC Journal* 9(2):

22-36.

- Kwan-Terry, A. (1992) Towards a dictionary of Singapore English - issues relating to making entries for particles in Singapore English. In Anne Pakir (ed.), *Words in a Cultural Context*. Unipress.
- Lehmann, C. (2015[1982]) *Thoughts on Grammaticalization* (3rd ed.). Language Science Press.
- Östman, J-O. (1982) The symbolic relationship between pragmatic particles and impromptu speech. In Nils Erik Enkvist (ed.), *Impromptu Speech: A Symposium*. Åbo Akademi.
- Platt, J. (1987) Communicative functions of particles in Singapore English. In Ross Steele and Terry Threadgold (eds.), *Language Topics. Essays in Honour of Michael Halliday*. John Benjamins.
- Platt, J. and H. Mian Lian (1989) Discourse particles in Singaporean English: Substratum influences and universals. *World Englishes* 2(8): 215-221.
- Podlesskaya, V. I. (2010) Parameters for typological variation of placeholders. In Nino Amiridze, Boyd H. Davis and Margaret Maclagan (eds.), *Fillers, Pauses and Placeholders*. John Benjamins.
- Quaglio, P. and D. Biber (2006) The grammar of conversation. In Bas Aarts and April McMahon (eds.), *The Handbook of English Linguistics*. Blackwell.
- Rhee, S. (2009) Thoughts on semantic change mechanisms in grammaticalization. *Journal of Linguistic Science* 51: 175-204.
- Rhee, S. (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, S. (in press) LP and RP in the development of discourse markers from 'what' in Korean. (To appear in) *Journal of Historical*

Pragmatics 17(2).

- Smith, I. (1985) Multilingualism and diffusion: A case study from Singapore English. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11(2): 105-128.
- Sohn, S-O. and H. S. Kim (2014) The interplay of discourse and prosody at the left and right periphery in Korean: An analysis of *kuntey* 'but'." In Kate Beeching and Ulrich Detges (eds.), *Discourse Functions at the Left and Right Periphery: Crosslinguistic Investigations of Language Use and Language Change*. Brill.
- Song, I. (2013) Functions and prosodic features of discourse marker 'mweo'. *Korean Linguistics* 58: 83-106.
- Traugott, E. C. (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.
- Traugott, E. C. (2011) Grammaticalization and mechanisms of change. In Heiko Narrog and Bernd Heine (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Oxford University Press.
- Traugott, E. C. and E. König (1991) The semantics- pragmatics of grammaticalization revisited. In Elizabeth C. Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization* vol. 1. John Benjamins.
- Waltereit, R. (2006) The rise of discourse markers in Italian: a specific type of language change. In Kerstin Fischer (ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Elsevier.
- Watts, R. J. (1989) Taking the pitcher to the 'well': Native speakers' perception of their use of discourse markers in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 13: 203-237.
- Wee, L. (1998) The lexicon of Singapore English. In Joseph A. Foley,

- Thiru Kandiah, Bao Zhiming, Anthea F. Gupta, Lubna Alsagoff, Ho Chee Lick, Lionel Wee, Ismail S. Talib, and Wendy Bokhorst-Heng (eds.), *English in New Cultural Contexts: Reflections from Singapore*. Oxford University Press.
- Wischer, I. (2000) Grammaticalization versus lexicalization. 'Methinks' there is some confusion. In Olga Fischer, Anette Rosenbach, Dieter Stein (eds.), *Pathways of Change: Grammaticalization in English*. John Benjamins.
- Wong, J. (1994) "A Wierzbickan approach to Singlish particles". MA thesis, National University of Singapore.
- Wong, J. (2004) The particles of Singapore English: A semantic and cultural interpretation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36: 739-793.

<Internet Source>

MICASE (Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English) -
<http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/micase/>

(Accessed: Feb. 2014 - Dec. 2015)

Department of English Linguistics
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
107 Imun-ro Dongdaemun-gu Seoul 02450 Korea
E-mail: srhee@hufs.ac.kr

Received: Jan. 5, 2016

Revised: Feb. 15, 2016

Accepted: Feb. 19, 2016