

Grammaticalization of Adpositions: An Introduction*

Seongha Rhee

(Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)

Seongha Rhee, 2018. Grammaticalization of adpositions: An introduction.

Language and Linguistics 81, 1-20. This paper introduces the notion of adpositions as a grammatical category, their classification by means of function and form, and their grammaticalization across languages. It highlights the fact that the boundary between case and adposition is fuzzy because their concepts are not well delineated and, in addition, because there is no consensus as to their classification typology. It also discusses the relevance of adpositional concepts to human cognition, which renders support to the claim that the general similarity of linguistic systems is due to the overall universality of the ways human cognition operates. It further addresses some typological issues that cause different manifestations of adpositions in individual languages. The last section of the paper provides an overview of the individual contributions to this special issue and briefly discusses the theoretical imports of the findings and generalizations each contribution makes.

Keywords : Grammaticalization, Adpositions, Simple adpositions, Complex adpositions, Typological implications

* This work was supported by the research fund of Hankuk University of Foreign Studies and by the National Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean Government (NRF-2014S1A5B1065578).

1. Introduction

Since sentences are not random strings of words but have internal cohesive structures, all languages seem to have grammatical devices to encode the relationship among nominal constituents in a sentence, be they structural (such as word order) or morphological (such as inflection) or lexical (such as adpositions). Our primary interest in this issue relates to the last category, i.e., adpositions.

Grammaticalization theory has attracted the attention of researchers across languages who investigate the diachronic paths of grammatical forms and their synchronic effects. In addition to research on individual grammatical forms, recent contributions from cognitive linguistics, language typology, corpus linguistics, discourse analysis, and related fields have helped to better understand how linguistic forms arise, how they interact with other grammatical forms, how they change through space and time, and how they become fossilized or even lost eventually.

The contributors to this issue are the researchers whose research interests lie in the development of adpositions, either individually or holistically. The developmental paths of individual adpositions and the resultant paradigm formation by such adpositions reveal plenty of intriguing features in terms of individual instances of language change as well as the overall system of argument linkage in language.

This special issue grew primarily out of the Workshop on Grammaticalization of Adpositions, organized by the author at the 2017 Fall Joint Conference of the Discourse and Cognitive Linguistic Society of Korea and the HUFS Language Research Institute in November 2017. A few more solicited articles were added. A large number of submissions, all addressing fascinating

aspects of grammaticalization of adpositions in a number of languages, were received and screened through rigorous peer-review processes, and only a small portion of the original contributions came to be included in this issue. The 2017 workshop explored the synchronic manifestations and diachronic emergence of adpositions in English, Spanish, Chinese, Thai, Japanese and Korean. In this issue, however, no articles on Thai prepositions could be included.¹⁾

2. Cases and Adpositions

Case is “a system of marking dependent nouns for the type of relationship they bear to their heads” (Blake 2004: 1). Case may be realized by means of inflection, morphological case markers, word order, adpositions, among others. Case is among the primitive notions in linguistics. The system of case-marking shows considerable variation across languages. For instance, there are languages in which grammatical case is not morphologically marked (e.g. Thai, Chinese), whereas there are languages in which extensive case systems are utilized (e.g. Sanskrit, Ancient Greek, Latin, Russian). Even within a specific language, the system exhibits multiple layers of conceptual domains such as (non-local) case, grammatical case and local case, even though they do not form discrete, mutually exclusive, categories. For instance, even in languages where grammatical cases are not morphologically marked, there are diverse case-related adpositional markers with various semantic specifications. The three domains in the case-related system can be exemplified as follows (cf. Lehmann 2004:

1) The paper addressing the grammaticalization of Thai prepositions presented at the said workshop was published elsewhere. See Park (2017) and Park and Rhee (2018) for grammaticalization of Thai prepositions. One contribution on German (Shin, this issue) is a new addition through a general call of manuscripts.

1845-1851: Blake 2004, Chs 2 & 3):²⁾

- (1) a. Grammatical case (= core case: nuclear case: non-local case):
nominative, accusative, dative, genitive, absolutive, ergative
- b. Local case: ablative (*from*), adessive (*on*), adelative (*from*),
allative (*to*), delative (*off*), destinative (*to*), illative (*into*),
inessive (*inside*), locative (*at, in*), mediative (*between*),
perlative (*through*), postessive (*behind*), prolative (*along*),
subessive (*under*), superessive (*above*), terminative (*up to*),
- c. (Non-local) Case: benefactive (*for*), comitative (*with*),
directional (*to*), equative (*like*), instrumental (*with*),
motivative (*by*), partitive (*of*), referentive (*about*), vocative

Grammatical case typically indicates the role of a syntactic argument in the sentence (Sylak-Glassman et al. 2015: 83). Local case designates the relationship of two entities in terms of relative positions in space, such as the English prepositions *from*, *between*, *through*, *behind*, etc. do. Case, on the other hand, marks the general relationship of the argument with respect to the referenced event.

3. Simple vs. Complex Adpositions

Simple adpositions may refer to the adpositions whose composition is formally simple, i.e., those that involve monolexemic or monomorphemic forms. Complex adpositions, on the other hand, are those that involve multi-lexemic or multi-morphemic forms. This distinction is generally applicable across languages, and can be easily illustrated with the following examples:

2) The forms in the parentheses are only representative forms in English. Since the English prepositional system is not maximally fine-grained and thus does not show an isomorphism between all adpositional concepts and prepositions, some forms carry multiple functions, e.g., *from* for ablative and adelative.

- (2) Korean (Narrog & Rhee 2013)
- a. Simple postposition (=primary): *-ey/lo/kkaci* (allative), *-wa/kwa/hako* (comitative), *-pwuthe/eyse* (ablative), *-lo* (instrumental), *-ey/lo* (causative), *-wa/kwa/ey/hako/hamye* (enumerative), *-pota* (comparative), *-chelem/kathi* (similiative)...
 - b. Complex (=secondary) postposition: *-ul hyanghay* (aditive), *-ey aphse* (antessive), *-ul twuko/-ul nohko* (topic), *-ul kalocille* (perlative)...
- (3) Spanish
- a. Simple prepositions: *a* 'to', *en* 'in', *de* 'of', *por* 'by, for', *para* 'for', *entre* 'among', *sin* 'without', *con* 'with', *hacia* 'to, toward', *hasta* 'till', *bajo* 'from (up)', *sobre* 'about, on', *que* 'than', *excepto* 'without', *salvo* 'except'...
 - b. Complex prepositions: *cerca de* 'near to', *junto a* 'together with', *a menos de* 'without, except for', *a causa de* 'because of', *en virtud de* 'because of', *debido a* 'because of', *por razón de* 'because of', *por parte de* 'because of', *a fuerza de* 'because of', *a base de* 'because of', *acerca de* 'with regard to', *en cuanto a* 'with regard to', *con/en referencia a* 'with reference to', *con relación a* 'in relation with', *en relación con* 'in relation with', *relacionado con* 'related to', *en torno a* 'with regard to', *en lo tocante a* 'with regard to'...
- (4) English
- a. Simple preposition: *of, in, to, for, at, on, for, by*...
 - b. Complex preposition: *according to, ahead of, as for, away from, as far as, as part of, at odds with, by means of, by virtue of, by way of, for want of, in accordance with, in common with, in favor of, in relation to, in view of, on behalf of, with regard to*...
- (5) Thai
- a. Simple prepositions: *hây* (<give), *kææ* (<to) 'to': *khǎŋ, hæŋ* 'of'; *hây* (< give) 'for': *kâp* (<with) 'with': *càak* (< leave) 'from': *khâŋ* (< side, flank), *yaŋ* (<to), *sùu* (<move to), *thaŋ* (<road, way) 'to'...
 - b. Complex prepositions: *dooy klây kâp* (<by near to), *tít kâp* (<attached with) 'near': *núuwaŋ cāk* (<caused by, related from) 'because of'...

As can be seen in the above, complex adpositions tend to encode more fine-grained configurational notions as compared to simple adpositions, a state of affairs seemingly universal across languages (cf. Blake 2004: 10; Rohdenburg 1996).

4. Grammatical Categories in Cognition

A survey of adpositions reveals certain relationship between grammatical categories and human cognition. Even though adpositions border on, and often blend into, case markers, thus creating fuzzy functional boundaries, it is observed that languages seem to have a relatively limited set of concepts that they choose to encode with adpositions. This suggests that the types of inter-nominal relations are tied to the commonality in human cognition and event conceptualization.

Across languages, grammatical cases, such as nominative, accusative, genitive, etc., tend to be either unmarked (e.g. English and Spanish nominative, accusative; Thai nominative, accusative, etc.) or minimally marked (e.g. Spanish dative, Korean nominative, genitive, accusative, dative, etc.). Since these notions seem to be fundamental in human conceptualization of events or states of affairs denoted by a clause (e.g., *Who does what to whom?*) as they are closely related to the participants of an event, they seem to be grammatical primitives, regardless of their linguistic realization patterns on the level of surface structure. If grammatical case is more closely tied to the grammatical structure than adposition, the event-related notions are expected to surface as case rather than adposition.

Case (or non-local case, as opposed to local case) tends to mark diverse relationship in general rather than local, spatial relations. The

members in this category seem to make reference to such binary distinctions as presence/absence, proximity/distance, association/dissociation, similarity/dissimilarity, or to other, non-binary yet prominent relationships such as accompaniment, cause, benefit, etc. These seem to form primary cognitive categories as well.

Local case marks the local/positional relationship between two or more referenced entities in space. Local relationship makes reference to axial relationship such as front-back, top-down, left-right, in-out, etc. or to direction, source, path, destination, etc. These seem to be common notions in conceptualization of positionality of entities occupying space.

However, it is noteworthy that there are a large number of complex adpositions whose meaning still bears the lexical meanings of the participating formants. For instance, there are large inventories of complex adpositions across languages with semantic vestige of the source constructions, as exemplified, in part, as follows:

- (6) Adversative complex adpositions
 - a. Korean: *-eyto pwulkwuhako, -ey panhay...*
 - b. Spanish: *a fuerza de, a pesar de, contrario a*
 - c. Thai: *máe já mee, ...*
 - d. English: *in spite of, contrary to, in face of, up against...*

- (7) Substitutive complex adpositions
 - a. Korean: *(-uy) taysin(ey)*
 - b. Spanish: *en vez de, en lugar de*
 - c. Thai: *taen tée, nai naam kǒng*
 - d. English: *instead of, on behalf of, in lieu of...*

5. Typological Issues

Despite commonalities across languages, there exist clear differences depending on their typological characteristics (Dryer 1980, Hawkins 1983). Above all, it has long been observed that languages exhibit preference of one over the other in terms of prepositional vs. postpositional systems. For instance, in a discussion of language universals, Greenberg (1966[1963]: 78-79) states that “[l]anguages with dominant VSO order are always prepositional” (Universal #3), and the Language Universal 4 states that “[w]ith overwhelmingly greater than chance frequency, languages with normal SOV order are postpositional” (Universal #4). He further states that “a definite majority of languages of type II [i.e., SVO word order] have prepositions” and that “the preponderant majority of languages which have type III [i.e., SOV word order] have postpositions, with but a handful of exceptions” (Greenberg 1966[1963]: 98).

Furthermore, isolating languages, such as Thai and Chinese, make it very difficult to delineate the prepositions from their lexical formants, since they tend to strongly retain syntactic, phonological and semantic characteristics throughout their development. In Thai, for example, a number of prepositions originated from the primary word classes such as verbs and nouns, and they still function in their source categories, as shown in part in the following:

- | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| (8) | a. <i>aw</i> ‘take’ | › with, take |
| | b. <i>càak</i> ‘leave’ | › from, leave |
| | c. <i>hây</i> ‘give’ | › for, give |
| | d. <i>taam</i> ‘follow’ | › along, follow |
| (9) | a. <i>khâaŋ</i> ‘side’ | › by, side |
| | b. <i>klaaŋ</i> ‘middle’ | › in the middle of, middle |

c. <i>lǎŋ</i> 'back of body'	› behind, back of body
d. <i>nâa</i> 'face'	› in front of, face
e. <i>nay</i> 'inside'	› in, inside
f. <i>thaaŋ</i> 'passage'	› by way of, passage
g. <i>thii</i> 'place'	› at, place
h. <i>theŋ</i> 'line'	› around, line

Spanish, on the other hand, which is an inflecting language, has a large number of complex prepositions (while the primary prepositions form a relatively small inventory, e.g., *en, a, de, por, con, sin, como, sobre*, etc.), most of which developed from a limited set of source patterns, as shown, in part, as follows:

- (10) a. Prep + Noun + Prep Pattern: *a menos de, a causa de, en virtud de, por causa de, por parte de, por razón de, a fuerza de, a base de, a excepción de, con respecto a, en cuanto a, con referencia a, en referencia a, con relación a, en relación con, en torno a, acerca de, en dirección a, con rumbo a, a partir de, alrededor de, delante de, enfrente de, acerca de, debajo de, con destino a, dentro de, a través de, después de, detrás de, por medio de, debajo de, encima de, en torno a, a diferencia de, a pesar de, enfrente de, aparte de, en base a, en lugar de, en caso de, a favor de, a cargo de...*
- b. Prep + Art + Noun + Prep Pattern: *al lado de, a lo largo de, a la izquierda de, a la derecha de, alrededor de, al norte de, al sur de...*
- c. Participle + Prep Pattern: *debido a, referente a, tocante a, relacionado con, junto a, destinado de, diferente de, además de, aparte de...*
- d. Noun + Prep Pattern: *hacia, antes de, frente a, fuera de, frente a, contrario a*

The situation of the Spanish complex prepositions illustrated in the above is very much similar to the one in English (see Quirk et al. 1985, Ch. 9; Klégr 1997).

6. Overview of the Contributions

This issue well represents balance across linguistic, typological and areal distribution: two contributions representing English and Japanese each, one representing Korean, Chinese, Spanish and German each: three contributions for inflecting languages (English (formerly), Spanish and German), two for agglutinating languages (Korean and Japanese), and one for isolating language (Chinese); and four for Asian (Korean, Japanese and Chinese) and Western languages (English, Spanish and German).

Kim and Rhee discuss the Spanish prepositional system. They review the overall prepositional system encompassing simple and complex prepositions, illustrating how they have been treated in prescriptive traditions, and show how individual forms, many of which are descendants of Latin prepositions, developed from a macroscopic perspective. The grammaticalization patterns of Spanish prepositions are largely consonant with the grammaticalization principles and mechanisms. They propose a cycle of prepositions based on formal characteristics and claim that there is no privileged state at which all newly arising forms enter the system. This is a new insight considering the traditional assumption that (possibly) all simple prepositions, their Stage 1 prepositions, begin their life as complex prepositions, their Stage 2 prepositions, which over time undergoes semantic, phonological and structural reduction and loss.

Long and Ursini discuss the relationship between spatial nouns and adpositions. It is widely known that spatial nouns are among the primary sources of spatial adpositions across languages, and thus the grammaticalization patterns of Chinese adpositions from spatial nouns may render support to the widely attested crosslinguistic patterns that exist between the source and the target of grammaticalization. They

further show that spatial nouns participate in constructions, mediated via the presence of the possessive marker *de*. This situation is analogous to the grammaticalization patterns where possessive or genitive forms are commonly recruited as a linker (cf. English *of*, Spanish *de*, Korean *-uy*, Japanese *-no*, etc.). The authors reveal that the adpositional phrases are constrained in distribution by virtue of the morpho-syntactic properties of the participating spatial nouns. Based on this state of affairs, they advance a claim that spatial nouns and 'localisers' are subtypes of a category that can be labeled as 'place word' nominal category.

Park addresses the grammaticalization of the Japanese postposition *yori* co-occurring with negatives (thus, a negative polarity item (NPI) or alternatively, a negative sensitive item (NSI) in the author's term), a linguistic formant whose status between postposition and adverbial particle is still debated. Japanese has a long tradition of classifying postpositions into eight sub-classes based on their function (Hashimoto 1969). The author compares *yori* with its functional competitor *sika*, an item he extensively researched in his earlier studies (Park 2014, 2015, 2017), and advances the claim that the grammaticalization paths of the two items are dissimilar. Park explains the differential grammaticalization with respect to dialect contact, specialization and frequency. This study provides an insight into the roles of diverse external forces impinging on grammaticalization.

Shin discusses the grammaticalization and lexicalization of German complex adpositions. He notes that complex prepositions in German can be formed through multiple channels and claims that the formation of complex prepositions, traditionally considered as an instance of grammaticalization, may in fact be an instance of lexicalization, albeit the distinction between the grammatical and the lexical is not straightforwardly clear. The author focuses on the initial stage of the

'univerbation' (Lehmann 1995[1982]) of multiple linguistic forms, after which the univerbated form may or may not advance along the grammaticalization path. The notions of 'lexicalization' and 'grammaticalization' are by no means monolithic concepts and have long been a point of controversy in much discussion of grammaticalization (see, e.g., Givón 1979, Lehmann 2002; Brinton and Traugott 2005, Ch. 3; Rhee 2007, 2011) and this article will contribute to a better understanding of the interplay between lexicalization and grammaticalization.

Yae discusses the grammaticalization of various PNPs involving the lexeme *regard* in English, such as *with regard to*, *in regard to*, and *in regard of*. Drawing upon the corpus data, the author claims that the grammaticalization processes of these *regard*-PNPs are enabled by analogy rather than high frequency. Analogy has long been rejected as a mechanism of grammaticalization since Meillet (1912), who ruled out analogy as a primary source of new grammatical forms, even though it, along with grammaticalization, is one of the two processes whereby new grammatical forms are constituted (as cited in Hopper and Traugott 2003[1993]: 22). However, recent studies (e.g., Bisang 1996, 1998, Ahn 2007a, 2007b, Fischer 2007, 2008, 2011, De Smet 2009, 2014, Delbecq and Verwekken 2014, Rhee and Koo 2015, Ahn 2015, Yi 2018, among numerous others) make proposals in favor of analogy as a trigger of structural reanalysis leading to grammaticalization. This study will further support the claim that analogy needs to be reevaluated in terms of its role in grammaticalization.

Lee addresses the development of the English prepositions that indicate the subject, or SIPs, i.e., *concerning*, *respecting*, *regarding*, *touching*, *relating to*, etc., all originating from present participial forms. From a diachronic investigation of these SIPs the author supports the Source Determination Hypothesis as proposed by Bybee et

al. (1994) in that they all have the lexical origin of 'relatedness'. She further claims that their development is associated with the borrowing from French and Latin, thus addressing the influence of language contact in grammaticalization. The role of language contact in grammaticalization have received growing attention among grammaticalizationists (e.g., Bisang 1998, Heine and Kuteva 2003, Hoffmann 2005, Bisang 2006, De Smit and Luraghi 2016, Baik 2018, among others). This study provides an additional support to the pro-analogy analysis.

Jung investigates the development of the postpositional particles *-ttala* and *-ey ttalумыen* in Korean, which originated from the verb of motion *ttalu-* 'follow'. The development of *-ey ttalумыen* 'according to' from 'follow' seems well motivated. The development of the particle *-ttala*, however, is intriguing considering the conceptual distance between the lexical 'follow' and the grammatical 'of so many days to pick', and has attracted some speculations of grammaticalizationists, e.g., Rhee (1996, 2002), Baik (2011). The author examines diverse mechanisms and principles, such as unidirectionality, subjectification, and decategorialization, and confirms that the development is largely consonant with the generalization with respect to such theoretical notions.

Ha addresses the Japanese postpositions of conditional verb form, such as *sureba*, *suruto*, *shitemo*, etc. Among the constraints of these postpositions is that the sentences involving these forms for causal connections should not involve the speaker's conation, such as intention, determination or desire. Tracing the development of these postpositions back to their verbal origin, the author identifies decategorialization, whereby forms lose their verbal characteristics en route. He also analyzes the development with such mechanisms as metonymy, metaphor and reanalysis, and confirms that they are indeed

operative in the development (for principles and mechanisms see Heine et al. 1991, Hopper and Traugott 2003[1993], Heine and Kuteva 2002). This study confirms the widely-subscribed premises that the use of grammatical formants is restricted to certain contexts (e.g., those lacking the speaker's conation) and that grammaticalization processes are largely enabled by the general cognitive mechanisms such as metaphor and metonymy, among others.

7. Conclusion

As the overview of the contributions to this special issue suggests, grammaticalization of adpositions definitely merits in-depth investigation in order to shed light on the nature of linguistic paradigms, such as adpositions here, as well as the universal role of human cognition in language use and language change. It is hoped that these research findings serve as the basis of further grammaticalization studies extending the scope into other forms within the paradigm and across other closely related paradigms, such as connective adverbials, conjunctions, etc.

References

- Ahn, Kyou-Dong (2015) "A usage-based approach to grammaticalization of non-gradual complex prepositions in English". Ph.D. dissertation, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Korea.
- Ahn, Mi-Kyung (2007a) "English causal complex prepositions: A grammaticalization perspective". Ph.D dissertation, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Korea.
- Ahn, Mi-Kyung (2007b) Grammaticalization of causal prepositions: With reference to *because of*, *on account of*, and *by reason of*. *Discourse and Cognition* 14(2): 99-115.
- Baik, Junghye (2011) From 'follow' to 'counter-expectation' concepts: A case of Korean postposition 'ttala(se)'. *The Journal of Linguistic Science* 58: 93-110.
- Baik, Junghye (2018) On the motivative particle *by virtue of*. *Language and Linguistics* 78: 51-74.
- Bisang, Walter (1996) Areal typology and grammaticalization: Processes of grammaticalization based on nouns and verbs in East and mainland South East Asian languages. *Studies in Language* 20(3): 519-597.
- Bisang, Walter (1998) Grammaticalisation and language contact: Constructions and positions. In Anna Giacalone Ramat and Paul J. Hopper, (eds.), *The Limits of Grammaticalization*, 13-58. Benjamins.
- Bisang, Walter (2006) Contact-induced convergence: Typology and areality. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, vol. 3: 88-101. Elsevier.
- Blake, Barry J. (2004) *Case* (2nd edition). Cambridge University Press.

- Brinton, Laurel J. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott (2005) *Lexicalization and Language Change*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bybee, Joan L., William Perkins, and Revere D. Pagliuca (1994) *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago University Press.
- De Smet, Hendrik (2009) Analysing reanalysis. *Lingua* 119: 1728-1755.
- De Smet, Hendrik (2014) Does innovation need reanalysis? In Evie Coussé, Ferdinand von Mengden, (eds.), *Usage-Based Approaches to Language Change*, 23-48. John Benjamins.
- De Smit, Merlijn, and Silvia Luraghi (2016) Contact induced change in the languages of Europe: The rise and the development of partitive cases and determiners. Paper presented at the 2016 Societas Linguistica Europaea, Naples, Italy, August 31-September 3, 2016.
- Delbecque, Nicole and Katrien Verveckken (2014) Conceptually-driven analogy in the grammaticalization of Spanish binominal quantifiers. *Linguistics* 52(3), 637-684.
- Dryer, Matthew (1980) The positional tendencies of sentential noun phrases in universal grammar. *The Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 25(2): 123-195.
- Fischer, Olga (2007) *Morphosyntactic Change: Functional and Formal*. Oxford University Press.
- Fischer, Olga (2008) On analogy as the motivation for grammaticalization. *Studies in Language* 32(2): 336-382.
- Fischer, Olga (2011) Grammaticalization as analogically driven change? In Heiko Narrog and Bernd Heine, (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*, 31-42. Oxford University Press.

- Givón, Talmy (1979) *Discourse and Syntax. Syntax and Semantics* 12. Academic Press.
- Greenberg, Joseph (1966[1963]) Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In Joseph Greenberg, (ed.) *Universals of Language* (2nd edition), 73-113. The MIT Press.
- Hashimoto, Shinkichi (1969) *Joshi/jodōshi-no Kenkyū* [A Study of Particles and Auxiliary Verbs]. Iwanami Shoten.
- Hawkins, John A. (1983) *Word Order Universals*. Academic Press.
- Heine, Bernd, and Tania Kuteva (2002) *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, and Friederike Hünemeyer (1991) *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Heine, Bernd, and Tania Kuteva (2003) On contact-induced grammaticalization. *Studies in Language* 27(3): 529-572.
- Hoffmann, Sebastian (2005) *Grammaticalization and English Complex Prepositions: A Corpus-Based Study*. Routledge.
- Hopper, Paul J., and Elizabeth C. Traugott (2003[1993]) *Grammaticalization* (2nd edition). Cambridge University Press.
- Klégr, Aleš (1997), English complex prepositions of the prepositional phrase type, *Acta Universitatis Carolinae - Philologica* 5, *Prague Studies in English* 22: 51-78.
- Lehmann, Christian (1995[1982]) *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. Lincom Europa.
- Lehmann, Christian (2002) New reflections on grammaticalization and lexicalization. In Ilse Wischer and Gabriele Diewald, (eds.), *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*, 1-18. Benjamins.

- Lehmann, Christian (2004) Interlinear morphemic glossing. In Herbert Ernst Wiegand, (ed.), *Morphologie: Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft*, Band 172. 1834-1857. Walter de Gruyter.
- Meillet, Antoine (1912) L'évolution des formes grammaticales. *Scientia* 12 (Reprinted in Meillet. 1948. *Linguistique Historique et Linguistique Generale*. 1, 130-148. Edouard Champion).
- Narrog, Heiko, and Seongha Rhee (2013) Grammaticalization of space in Korean and Japanese. In Martine Robbeets and Hubert Cuyckens, (eds.), *Shared Grammaticalization: With Special Focus on the Transeurasian Languages*, 287-315. Benjamins.
- Park, Kang-Hun (2014) A contrastive study of Japanese and Korean negative sensitive items: a grammaticalization approach. *Language Sciences* 45:152-172.
- Park, Kang-Hun (2015) A discrepancy in the degree of grammaticalization of Korean and Japanese negative sensitive items: a corpus-based study. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 22: 149-164.
- Park, Kang-Hun (2017) Negative concord vs. negative polarity in Japanese. *Linguistic Research* 34(2): 225-246.
- Park, Kyungeun (2017) A study on the grammaticalization of Thai prepositions of locative relationship. Paper presented at the 2017 Fall Joint Conference of the Discourse and Cognitive Linguistic Society of Korea and the HUFSS Language Research Institute, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, November 18, 2017.
- Park, Kyungeun, and Seongha Rhee (2018) A comparative study on the grammaticalization of Korean and Thai adpositions:

- From macroscopic and typological perspectives. *The Journal of Linguistic Science* 86: 69-95.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Longman.
- Rhee, Seongha (1996) "Semantics of Verbs and Grammaticalization: The Development in Korean from a Cross-Linguistic Perspective". Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin. Hankook Publisher.
- Rhee, Seongha (2002) A morphosyntactic analysis of postpositions grammaticalized from verbs of movement in Korean. *Language and Linguistics* 29: 205-225
- Rhee, Seongha (2007) What's Grammatical in Grammaticalization? *Studies in Modern Grammar* 48: 109-143.
- Rhee, Seongha (2011) On terminology issues in grammaticalization studies. *Studies in Modern Grammar* 66: 167-198.
- Rhee, Seongha, and Hyun Jung Koo (2015) Analogy-driven inter-categorial grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification of *-na* in Korean. *Lingua* 166: 22-42.
- Rohdenburg, Gunther (1996), Cognitive complexity and increased grammatical explicitness in English, *Cognitive Linguistics* 7(2): 149-182.
- Sylak-Glassman, John, Christo Kirov, Matt Post, Roger Que, and David Yarowsky (2015) A universal feature schema for rich morphological annotation and fine-grained cross-lingual part-of-speech tagging. In Cerstin Mahlow, and Michael Piotrowski, (eds.), *Systems and Frameworks for Computational Morphology*, 72-93. Springer.

Yi, Hye-Won (2018) "Grammaticalization of Complex Conjunctive Adverbials". Ph.D. dissertation, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Korea.

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

Received: Aug. 31. 2018

Revised: Oct. 12. 2018

Accepted: Oct. 19. 2018