

<http://doi.org/10.17002/sil..56.202007.1>

The Power of the Unspoken: Ellipsis and Grammaticalization in Korean and Beyond*

Seongha Rhee

(Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)

Seongha Rhee (2020), The Power of the Unspoken: Ellipsis and Grammaticalization in Korean and Beyond. *Studies in Linguistics* 56, 1-36. Korean has a large inventory of sentence-final particles (SFPs) in contemporary Korean, many of which originated from connectives through the so-called insubordination. This paper addresses the grammaticalization of such connective-turned SFPs and discourse markers from two source categories, i.e., connectives and complementizers. Unlike regular SFPs that encode grammatical notions related to politeness, honorification and speech-act types, these innovative ends signal the speaker's stance. Based on these developments, some theoretically prominent issues are discussed from the perspective of grammaticalization theory, such as discursive motivations, pragmatic inferences, intersubjectification and interactivity, and structure-based functional innovation. Of particular importance is the

* Earlier versions of this paper were presented as invited lectures at Nagoya University (Feb. 2014), Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf (Jun. 2016), Chinese Three Gorges University (Jun. 2017), Linguistic Society of Korea (Nov. 2017), Pragmatics Society of Japan (Dec. 2017), University of Manchester (Mar. 2019), and Joongwon Linguistic Society of Korea (May 2019). This work was supported by the host institutions and organizations, the 2020 research fund of Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, and the National Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean Government (NRF-2014S1A5B1065578).

emergence of intersubjective, stance-related functions in the existing grammatical formants, which occur at the utterance-final position. Based on the insubordination phenomenon widely attested across languages, this paper intends to show how ‘silence’ becomes grammar, i.e., how the addressees try to infer the withheld information by relying on the situational and linguistic context and how repeated inferences create entirely new meanings, a process that can be labeled as linguistic *creatio ex nihilo*. **(Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)**

Key Words: ellipsis, insubordination, grammaticalization, connective, sentence-final particle

1. Introduction

Korean has a large inventory of *cosa* (nominal morphology; postpositional particles) and *emi* (verbal morphology; endings for connection and termination). Lee & Lee (2010) list 2,056 such grammatical forms. Even though the large number is partly due to listing allomorphs as separate entries, still the sheer number reflects the extraordinary multiplicity of grammatical forms in Korean. Also noteworthy is the fact that Korean grammatical markers signal not only garden-variety grammatical notions but also diverse stance-related notions simultaneously, the latter being often difficult to pinpoint or label (cf. ‘elaborateness’, ‘semantically elaborate categories’ Kuteva & Comrie, 2005; Kuteva, 2009), a situation reminiscent of the notion of ‘esoteric languages’ (contra ‘exoteric languages’), which defy the conceit of analyzability (Thurston, 1988; Grace, 1997; Crowley, 2000; Wray & Grace, 2007; Rice, 2017, 2019). The ‘esoteric’ nature of Korean grammatical forms is partly due to the fact that numerous and diverse pragmatic inferences are involved in their grammaticalization.

Grammaticalization of sentence-final particles (SFPs) has received much

attention among Korean researchers (Kim, 1997, 1998, 2000, 2001; Sohn, 1995, 2003; Park & Sohn, 2002; Koo & Rhee, 2001; Rhee, 2002, 2008, 2012; Koo, 2005, among many others). The grammaticalization studies have contributed to a better understanding of the semantico-functional characteristics, morpho-syntactic behavior, source semantics, conceptual network, among others of these innovated SFPs. As an addition to this body of research, the present paper addresses a group of grammatical forms that emerged through ellipsis, or a process often labeled as ‘insubordination’ (Evans, 2007, 2009; Evans & Watanabe, 2016) (see §2.1).

The objectives of this paper are twofold: (i) to exemplify grammatical markers that emerged from insubordination, and (ii) to discuss select aspects of the process that bear theoretical significance. This paper is organized in the following way: Section 2 briefly presents some useful notions and aspects relevant to the present analysis; Section 3 exemplifies insubordination-based grammatical forms and functions; Section 4, as an extension from the Korean data, briefly illustrates insubordination in other languages; Section 5 discusses pragmatic inferences, intersubjectification, and purely structure-based functions; and Section 6 summarizes the findings and concludes the paper.

2. Preliminaries: Notions and Issues

We address a few notions and issues to facilitate the discussion, e.g. silence, connectives, sentence-enders, and insubordination.

2.1. Silence in interaction

In vis-à-vis interactions, silence is generally avoided, yet it frequently occurs for various reasons. Silence is of variable nature and the instances of silence may signal diverse stances among the interlocutors. Silence has been categorized by Rhee (2008) in global and local contexts, as in (1) and (2), respectively:

(1) Silence in global context (“Silence”)

A. Non-initiation of dialogue

- (a) Cognitive/Epistemic Silence: “I don’t have anything to speak to you about.”
- (b) Conative/Affective Silence: “I don’t want to speak to you.”
- (c) Affective/Interactional Silence: “I don’t need to speak to you.”

B. No response (to implicit/explicit solicitation)

- (a) Cognitive/Epistemic Silence: “I have no information to add to what you say.”
- (b) Interactional/Conative/Affective Silence: “I don’t want to interact with you.”

C. Discontinuation of exchange

- (a) Cognitive/Epistemic Silence: “I have no more to say.”
- (b) Conative/Affective Silence: “I don’t want to say any more.”
- (c) Cognitive/Epistemic/Interactional Silence: “I don’t need to tell you the rest.”

(2) Silence in local context (“Ellipsis”)

[I don’t need to tell you the rest]

- a. Cognitive Ellipsis: “You already know this (from some sources).”
- b. Cognitive/Interactional Ellipsis: “I already said this.”
- c. Cognitive/Inferential/Interactional Ellipsis: “You can figure it out now.”

As is evident from above, ellipsis is a type of silence, which refers to the occurrence of silence in a local context, i.e. when, to the addressee, the speaker does not complete an utterance. In such cases, the speaker in fact has completed the utterance but the addressee only heard an incomplete sentence. This unusual discourse situation is the locus of grammaticalization and the affected linguistic form is the utterance-final formant, typically a

connective.

2.2. Connectives and Sentence-Enders

In Korean, connectives do not constitute a category among the parts of speech, largely due to the fact that they are formally heterogeneous (Lee, 2008). Connectives consist of diverse constructions often involving nominals, adnominals, locative particles, etc. Connectives, as a functional category, include nominal connectors (e.g. *-ø*, *-(k)wa*, *-na* (*-na*), *-hako*, *-lang* (*-lang*), *-tunci* (*-tunci*), etc.) and verbal connectors (e.g. *-ko*, *-se*, *-(u)n/(u)l/-nun/-ten*, *-tunci*, *-na*, *-kena*, *-nikka*, *-myen*, etc. and also the forms for complementation).

Sentence-enders or sentential endings comprise numerous SFPs (verbal morphologies), marking TAM. Among the ultimate SFPs are the sentence-type markers (speech-act markers) such as declarative (e.g. *-ta*, *-supnita*, *-suptita*, etc.), interrogative (e.g. *-nya*, *-ni*, *-supnikka*, etc.), imperative (e.g. *-la*, *-ela*, *-sipsio*, etc.), and hortative (e.g. *-ca*, *-psita*, *-sey*, etc.). These sentence-type markers are modulated via differential levels of honorification and politeness, at four to seven levels (for more information, see Sohn, 2001[1999]: 355; Song, 2005).

2.3. Insubordination

The notion of ‘insubordination’ refers to a type of local ellipsis (see (2) above), in which the main clause is elided, i.e. a structural change from $[_s[\text{Sub.Clause-CONN Main.Clause}]]$ to $[_s[\text{Clause-CONN}]]$ and further to $[_s[\text{Clause-SFP}]]$, of which in the last stage, the connective is reinterpreted as a SFP (see §3 below).

There have been a number of terminologies referring to this type of ellipsis, e.g. ‘insubordination’ (Evans, 2007, 2009; Evans & Watanabe, 2016), ‘inconsequential clauses’ (Haiman, 1988), ‘syntactic upgrading’ (Heine, Claudi, & Hünnemeyer, 1991; Rhee, 2012), ‘suspended clause’ (Ohori,

1995; Iguchi, 1998; Higashiizumi, 2006), ‘main-clause ellipsis’ (Rhee, 2002; Sohn, 2003), ‘insubordinated clauses’ ‘thetical constructions’ (Heine, Kaltenböck, & Kuteva, 2011; Kaltenböck, Heine, & Kuteva, 2011), and ‘disruption’ (Davis, n.d.), among others.

In the history of Korean a large number of innovative SFPs arose from connectives through insubordination (Sohn, 1995; Park & Sohn, 2002; Jung, 2001; Rhee, 2002, 2012; Koo & Rhee, 2001; Koo, 2005). The multiplicity of SFPs thus-formed is well reflected in the inventory of SFPs in contemporary Korean. For instance, Kim (2001: 174-151) lists a total of 381 SFPs (183 declaratives, 154 interrogatives, 27 imperatives, and 17 hortatives), and a vast number of these forms are the product of insubordination. In many cases, the connective function of the connectives still survives, rendering the utterance ambiguous between the two opposing functions of connecting clauses and ending sentences.

There are many instances of discourse markers (DMs) that evolved from the insubordination as well. Furthermore, the strong pragmatic effect of ellipsis seems to motivate other strategic uses of non-final forms as SFPs (see Horie, 2011, 2012; Kim & Horie, 2006, 2008, for nominalizers and modifiers changing into sentential endings). Other cases of SFP development include nominalized clauses ending with a nominalizer, i.e. stand-alone nominalizations functioning as bullet-point sentences (e.g. *-l.kes*, *-ki*, *-m* sentence-enders) or with an accusative marker (e.g. *-l.kel* regret and conjecture sentences) are among those that have undergone similar processes (Rhee, 2008, 2011). When insubordination occurs, inferential meanings become semanticized on the utterance-final formants (i.e. connectives), a state of affairs aptly labeled as a process ‘from silence to grammar’ in Rhee (2002).

3. Exemplary Cases

3.1. From a contingency connective

The first example is that of the contingency-marking connective *-nun tey*

[-ADN place] (*-n tey*, if the host is an adjective), obviously originated from the defective nominal *tey* ‘place’. The progression of the related changes is as exemplified in the following:¹

(3) a. *tey* n. ‘place’

ilha-nun tey-ka eti-y-a?

work-ADN place-NOM where-be-END

‘Where do (you) work?’ (lit. ‘Where is the place (you) work at?’)

b. *-nuntey* CONN ‘while’

ilha-nuntey(*-ey) cenhwa-ka o-ass-ta

work-while(*-at) telephone-NOM come-PST-DEC

‘While (I was) working, the phone rang.’

c. *-nuntey* CONN ‘while, even though’

ilha-nuntey il-i an toy-n-ta

work-CONN work-NOM NEG become-PRS-DEC

‘Even though I’m trying, there is no progress with the work.’

(lit. ‘While/Even though (I) work, work does not occur.’)

d. *-nuntey* SFP ‘elaboration request’

ne encey yulep ka-nuntey?

you when Europe go-SFP

‘When are you leaving for Europe (tell me more...)?’

e. *-nuntey* SFP ‘agreement (common-ground) solicitation’

nal-i ceypep chwuwu-ntey

weather-NOM pretty.much be.cold-SFP

‘It is pretty cold, isn’t it!’

¹ In the gloss the following abbreviations are used: ACC: accusative; ABS: absolutive; ADN: adnominal; ADVZ: adverbializer; BEN: benefactive; COMP: complementizer; COND: conditional; CONN: connective; DEC: declarative; END: sentential-ending; FUT: future; HON: honorific; IMP: imperative; INF: infinitive; NEG: negative; NF: non-finite; NOM: nominative; NOMZ: nominalizer; OBJ: objective; PASS: passive; PDK: present-day Korean; PL: plural; POL: polite; PRES: present; PROH: prohibitive; PST: past; PURP: purposive; REFL: reflexive; SFP: sentence-final particle; SG: singular; SBJV: subjunctive; and TOP: topic.

- f. *-nuntey* SFP ‘mild disagreement/discontent’
 na-to khwukhi cohaha-nuntey
 I-too cookie like-SFP
 ‘I too like cookies! (How come I am the one who doesn’t get one?)’
- g. *-nuntey* SFP ‘counterexpectation, mirativity’
 wa wuli ttal nolay cal ha-nuntey
 wow our daughter song well do-SFP
 ‘Wow, our daughter really sings well! (I’m surprised)’

As shown above, *-nuntey* in (3a) through (3c) is a connective, whereas the self-same form in (3d) through (3g) is a SFP. When the main clause is elided, the connective occurs at the utterance-final position, and thus becomes reinterpreted as a SFP. The progression of the semantic/functional change can be diagrammatically presented as (4):

- (4) a. *-tey* ‘place’
 b. > ‘at the place where’
 c. > ‘while’
 d. > ‘even though’
 e. > ‘tell me more’
 f. > ‘I have something to say’
 g. > ‘I’m surprised’

3.2. From a conditional connective

Korean has a number of conditional connectives (Koo, 1989a,b,c), and some of them have undergone insubordination. We look at the functional extension of the conditional-*ketun* (Koo, 1989a,b,c; Koo & Rhee, 2001; Rhee, 2002), as exemplified in (5):

(5) a. *-ketun* CONN ‘if’

ku-ka o-ketun i ton-ul cwu-ela
 he-NOM come-if this money-ACC give-IMP
 ‘If he comes, give him this money.’

b. *-ketun* SFP ‘reason’

A: [Why does he look so down?]
 B: ayin-i ttena-ss-ketun
 sweetheart-NOM leave-PST-SFP
 ‘(It’s) because his sweetheart left him.’

c. *-ketun* SFP ‘topic presentation’

na-ø ecey caymiiss-nun chayk-ul
 I-NOM yesterday be.interesting-ADN book-ACC
 sa-ss-ketun.
 buy-PST-SFP
 ‘(You know what?) I bought an interesting book yesterday.’

d. *-ketun* SFP ‘turn-yielder, common-ground solicitation’

A: cikum ayki-ka tases-sal-i-ketun-yo
 now baby-NOM 5-year-be-SFP-POL
 ‘My child is now five years old. (You’re with me, right?)’

B: ney ‘yes’

A: kuntey caknyen-ey lcha noyyemcwusa-lul
 then last.year-at first encephalitis.vaccination-ACC
 macchwu-ess-ketun-yo
 give-PST-SFP-POL
 ‘And (I) got her the first encephalitis vaccination shot last year.
 (You’re with me, right?)’

B: ney ‘yes’

A: kuntey olhay-ey-to tto macchwu-eyaha-nunci
 then this.year-at-too again give-must-if
 kwungkumha-ketun-yo
 wonder-SFP-POL
 ‘And (I’m) wondering if we should get her another shot this

year. (You're with me, right?)" (Adapted from Lee, 1996, re-cited from Koo & Rhee, 2001: 15)

- e. *-ketun* SFP 'turn-yielder, common-ground solicitation, mildly apologetic reluctance'

A: [Hello? Who is this calling and where are you calling from?]

B: *ney pongchentong-i-ntey-yo. ilum-un*

yes [place.name]-be-SFP-POL name-TOP

malha-kosiph-cianh-ketun-yo

say-want-NEG-SFP-POL

'Yes, (I'm calling from) Bongcheondong. (But) I don't want to tell you my name. (Please understand.)'

A: *ney, kulentey sengham-un*

yes but name-TOP

malssumha-ycwu-sy-eyaha-ketun-yo

tell-BEN-HON-must-SFP-POL

'Yes, but you need to kindly tell (us) your name. (Please understand.)'

B: *kulay-yo? kuntey com chayngphiha-ketun-yo*

be.so-POL but a.little be.ashamed-SFP-POL

'Is that so? But I would be embarrassed (if my name becomes known) (Please understand.).' (Koo & Rhee, 2001: 16)

In the above lengthy excerpts, we see the functional change from a 'pure' conditional-marking connective to a SFP with diverse discourse functions, which can be summarily presented as in (6):

- (6) a. *-ketun* 'if'

b. > 'because'

c. > 'topic presentation' 'background'

d. > 'common-ground solicitation' 'reluctance' 'apology' 'turn-yielding'

3.3. From a complementizer

Korean has a number of complementizers (COMPs) depending on the clause-type of the embedded clause, i.e. *-tako*, *-lako*, *-nyako* and *-cako*. These COMPs grammaticalized from the sentence-type-marking endings (*-ta*, *-la*, *-nya*, and *-ca*), the verb of locution *ha-* ‘say’, and the connective *-ko* ‘and’ (for detailed description of the process, see Rhee, 2008). Interestingly, all these COMPs have undergone insubordination and developed into SFPs, as illustrated in (7) with the declarative-based complementizer *-tako*, and (8) with the hortative-based complementizer *-cako*:

(7) a. *-tako* DEC.COMP

ne ches welkup tha-ss-tako tul-ess-ta
 you first salary receive-COMP hear-PST-DEC
 ‘I heard that you got your first salary.’

b. *-tako* SFP ‘confirmation-seeking’

ne ches welkup tha-ss-tako
 you first salary receive-PST-SFP
 ‘You got your first salary? (Is that true?)’
 (lit. That you got your first salary?)

c. *-tako* SFP ‘emphatic’

na-to cengmal cwuk-keyss-tako.
 I-also really die-FUT-SFP
 ‘I am really hard-pressed, too. (Stop pressing me.)’
 (lit. That I’m really hard-pressed, too.)

d. *-tako* ‘emphatic, mirative’

wuli emma-ka elmana yeypu-tako!
 we mom-NOM how be.pretty-SFP
 ‘My mom is really pretty.’ (You’ll never know!)
 (lit. How beautiful mother is!)

(8) a. *-cako* HORT.COMP

ku-nun tosekwan-ey kathi ka-cako colu-ass-ta
 he-TOP library-to together go-COMP press-PST-DEC
 'He begged me that I go to the library with him.'

b. *-cako* SFP 'confirmation-request'

pap-pwuthe mek-cako?
 meal-from eat-SFP
 'Are you suggesting that we eat first?'
 (lit. That we eat first?)

c. *-cako* SFP 'emphatic suggestion'

A: icey pap-mek-ule ka-cako. B: kule-cako.
 now food-eat-PURP go-SFP do.so-SFP
 'Let's go eat now.' 'OK, let's.'

d. *-cako* SFP 'emphatic suggestion/demand' 'irritation' 'discontent'

A: com pikhi-cako-yo. B: mil-cimal-cako-yo
 a.little step.aside-SFP-POL push-PROH-SFP-POL
 'Step aside, please. 'Stop pushing me, please.
 (You're in my way!)' (Don't you have manners?)'

When the complementizer-turned SFPs are used in interrogative sentences, as in (7b) and (8b), the sentences are ambiguous as to genuine ellipsis with the COMP or an innovated sentence structure with the SFP. For instance, (7b) can be interpreted as an ellipsis of "(Is it true) that you got your first salary?" and (8b), of "(Are you suggesting) that we eat first?", in which the COMP occurs utterance-finally. This is because utterances ending with innovative SFPs are COMP-headed clause (fragment) in appearance. Alternatively, the same utterances can be interpreted as full-fledged sentences involving innovative SFPs, with the meanings indicated in the examples.

When the innovative SFPs are compared with conventional SFPs, it is immediately obvious that the innovative SFPs carry a stronger illocutionary force (with the nuance of emphasis, irritation, insistence, etc.), as contrasted in (9) and (10):

- (10) a. ppalli com o-a/ala. (Conventional)
 b. ppalli com o-lako. (Innovative)
 quickly please come-SFP
 a/b: ‘Come quickly.’

3.4. From a concomitance connective

Korean has a number of concomitance connectives which originated from a COMP-construction, e.g. *-tamyense* (from declarative), *-lamyense* (from imperative), *-nyamyense* (from interrogative), and *-camyense* (from hortative). These *-{ta}myense* SFPs carry diverse nuances such as ‘(re)confirmation’ ‘challenge’ ‘derision’, etc., as exemplified below:

- (11) a. *-tamyense* Concomitance CONN
 inmin-ul pohohA-yacwu-n-tamyensye ile-n
 people-ACC protect-BEN-PRS-CONN like.this-ADN
 kes-ul pAlkhy-ecwu-cian-nAn kes-un
 thing-ACC clarify-BEN-NEG-ADN thing-TOP
 ‘While claiming that they [as civil servants] are protecting the
 people, that they do not clarify this kind of matter [taxes imposed
 on Koreans by Chinese] is... [neglecting their job] (It’s despicable!)’
 (1896, *Toklipsinmwun* 1858)
- b. *-tamyense* SFP ‘challenge’
 A: [I’m going to the movies.]
 B: mwe? ne aphu-tamyense
 what you be.sick-SFP
 ‘What? Didn’t you say you are sick? (What’s wrong with you?)’

- c. *-tamyense* SFP ‘confirmation request’
 ipen 3wel-ey yengkwuk ka-n-tamyense?
 this March-at England go-PRS-SFP
 ‘You are going to England coming March, right?’

Example (11a) is taken from a late 19th century data source in which one of the earliest uses of *-tamyense* is attested. When the form undergoes insubordination, it transforms into a SFP with more discursive and interactive functions, e.g. challenge, confirmation request, etc.

3.5. From a cause/reason connective

Still another example is the cause/reason connective, which itself originated from a COMP construction, i.e. *-tani* (< *-tako hani*), consisting of the reduced COMP *-ta* and the cause/reason connective *-ni*. Thus, the change can be summarized as [*-ni* ‘because’ > *-tani* COMP-based connective > *-tani* SFP]. Its uses at different stages are exemplified below:

- (12) a. *-ni* CONN (‘cause/reason’)

pi-ka o-ni chwup-ta
 rain-NOM come-CONN be.cold-DEC
 ‘It is cold because it’s raining.’

- b. *-tani* CONN (‘cause/reason’)

ku-ka cwuk-ess-tani mit-eci-ci-ka
 he-NOM die-PST-CONN believe-PASS-NOMZ-NOM
 anh-nun-ta
 NEG-PRS-DEC

‘I can’t believe that he died. (lit. As they say that he died, it can’t be believed.)’

- c. *-tani* SFP (‘mirative’)

ku-ka cwuk-tani
 he-NOM die-SFP

‘That he dies/died! (I can’t believe it)’

A very similar series of change is attested with *-tanikka*, i.e. [*-ni* ‘because’ > *-nikka* Emphatic causal connective > *-tanikka* COMP-based causal connective > *-tanikka* SFP], as shown in part in (13):

(13) a. *-nikka* CONN (‘cause/reason’)

pi-ka o-nikka chwup-ta
rain-NOM come-CONN be.cold-DEC

‘It is cold because it’s raining.’

b. *-tanikka* CONN (‘reported cause/reason’)

pi-ka o-keyss-tanikka wusan kac-ko ka-la
rain-NOM come-FUT-CONN umbrella take-and go-IMP

‘As they say it would rain, take an umbrella with you.’

c. *-tanikka* SFP (‘emphatic’)

yeksi caki-pakkey eps-tanikka
indeed self(you)-except not.exist-SFP

‘Indeed you are the only one that cares for me. (I can always count on you!’)

d. *-tanikka* SFP (‘emphatic’ ‘common wisdom’)

salam-i kule-myen mos ssu-n-tanikka
person-NOM do.so-if cannot use-PRS-SFP

‘A (respectable) person should not do such things! (Everybody knows that!’) (lit. (People) cannot use the person if he/she does something like that.)

Examples (12) and (13) are based on the causal CONN *-ni* and its derived forms involving a COMP. It is obvious that SFP functions are much more intersubjective and stance-related as compared to their source functions.

3.6. From a conditional to a DM

(14) a. *kulem* CONN-adverbial ‘if so / then’

B: kulay? coh-a. kulem mwusun yayki-lul
be.so be.good-END then what.kind talk-ACC
ha-keyss-ta-nun ke-y-a?
sav-FUT-DEC-ADN NOMZ-be-END

'Is that so? Good. Then, what are you going to talk to me about?' (PDK, KORTERM #3617)

A: [Since that guy was doing that again and again I became angry.]

‘Right!’ (< Lit. ‘If (it is) so’)

SO...

Since the connective adverbial *kulem* originated from a structure encoding 'if (it is) so', the function of the DMA 'Right!' is based on this literal meaning. Its development involved insubordination, whereby the final formant, i.e. the conditional connective *-myen*, has come to occur utterance-finally, and then through phonological reduction from *-myen* to *-m*.

its conditional function has become unavailable. Thus, the change can be diagrammatically presented as (15):

- (15) kuleha-myen >> kulemyen >> kulem >> kulem
 be.so-if then then right
 'if (it is) so'

4. Insubordination across Languages

As alluded to earlier, Korean has a large number of grammatical forms that resulted from insubordination (Rhee, 2002; Sohn, 2003, among many others). Grammatical change influenced by insubordination is also attested across many other languages (cf. Haiman, 1988 in Hua; Davis, n.d., in Hua and Alabama; Ohori, 1995; Iguchi, 1998; Higashiizumi, 2006; in Japanese; Evans, 2007, 2009; Evans & Watanabe, 2016; Heine et al., 2011, 2013, 2016; across languages; for other languages, see Evans & Watanabe, 2016 and works therein). For the interest of space we will look at some prominent cases in a few languages just in order to take a glimpse of the (near-)universality of insubordination, or more generally, ellipsis. First of all, the Japanese language, which is structurally similar to Korean, has a number of SFPs developed from insubordination, as shown with *-te* in (16):

- (16) Japanese
 a. Tyotto kotti ki-te-kudasai/kure/tyoodai
 a.little(?) here come-TE-give[BEN]
 'Will you please do the favor of coming here now?'
 b. Tyotoo kotti ki-te
 a.little(?) here come-TE
 'Come here now.' (Ohori, 1995: 205)

Japanese SFPs from insubordination involve a (pseudo-)logical connective of reason or concession, such as *kara*, *kedo*, and *noni* (Ohori, 1995: 207-213;

Evans, 2007; see also Haugh, 2008). Incidentally, Korean connectives, particularly *-a*, *-key*, *-ci*, and *-ko* (similar to the Japanese *-te*) have been extensively involved in the grammaticalization of SFPs (Kim, 1997, 1998, 2000; Rhee, 2002). Korean exhibits more widespread ellipsis-based grammaticalization than Japanese, since Korean allows more than reason/concession connective markers.

Germanic languages also show similar developments. For instance, they have independent clauses headed by a COMP, e.g. *dat* (Dutch), *dass* (German), *that* (English), *att* (Swedish), *at* (Danish), as illustrated in the following, taken from Evans (2007) and Verstraete & D’Hertefelt (2016):

(17) a. English *that* (Evans, 2007)

That I should live to see such ingratitude!

b. Dutch *dat*

Dat iemand zo hard kan zijn.

COMP someone so hard can.PRS be

‘[I can’t believe] that anyone can be so cold-hearted.’

c. German *dass*

Mensch, dass das überhaupt erlaubt ist.

Man COMP that even allowed is.PRS

‘Man, [I can’t believe] that something like that is even allowed.’

d. Danish *at*

At noget så katastrofalt kan ende så godt.

COMP something so catastrophic can.PRS end so well

‘[I can’t believe] that something so catastrophic can end so well.’

e. Swedish *att*

Att du hann med tåget!

COMP you make.PST with train.DEF

‘[I’m surprised] that you caught the train!’

In the examples above, COMP-headed clauses are now functioning as complete sentences, with a more intersubjective and interpersonal meanings.

Also well-known are English *if*, *if only*, *as if*, etc., as illustrated by the following examples:²

(18) English *if* (Evans, 2007; Verstraete & D’Hertefelt, 2016)

- a. (I wonder)If you could give me a couple of 39c stamps please.
- b. If you could give me a couple of 39c stamps please, (I’d be most grateful).
- c. If you (dare) touch my car!
- d. If you could take your seats, please.

(19) English *if only* (cf. López-Couso & Méndez-Naya 2012, Brinton, 2014)³

- a. If only he were here, I would be very happy.
- b. If only he were here!

(20) English *as if* (Brinton, 2014)

- a. He acts as if he didn’t know that.
- b. As if you didn’t know that.
- c. As if!

Similarly, Romance languages also exhibit a number of constructions developed from insubordination, as exemplified in the following:

(21) French *si* (Evans, 2007: 380)

Si on allait se promener?
if one went REFL walk-INF
‘What if we went for a walk?’

² Developments very similar to English *if* constructions are also attested with the German *ob* ‘if’ (Buscha, 1976; Evans, 2007).

³ The Korean optative/desiderative construction (with *-tamyen*) also involves an insubordinated conditional analogous to the English *if only*; as in *ku-ka yeki iss-tamyen* [he-NOM hear exist-COND/OPT] ‘If only he were here.’

- (22) Spanish *si, que...* (Schwenter, 2016: 93; Gras, 2016: 124)
- a. Si pudiera sentarse...
 if can:IMP.SBJV:3SG sit:INF
 ‘If you could sit down...’ (said to a crowd that is milling around)
- b. Si aún tenéis hambre...
 if still have:2PL hunger
 ‘If you’re still hungry...’ (speaker points to a pot full of food)
- (23) Spanish *que*
- a. ¡Que aprovech-e!
 que enjoy-3SG.PRS.SBJV
 ‘Have a nice meal!’
- b. ¡Que te mejor-es!
 that 2SG.OBJ get.well-2SG.PRS.SBJV
 ‘[I hope] you get better soon!’
- (24) Italian *se...* (Vallauri, 2016: 147)
- ecco se vedete che avete bisogno di altro eh?
 there if see:2PL that have:2PL need of else
 ‘Well if you see that you need something else, ok?’

In addition to the two large language groups, Germanic and Romance, other languages also have insubordination-based grammaticalization. For instance, Indonesian, an Austronesian language, and Basque, a Vasconic language spoken in Spain, show the following usages of insubordinated clauses:

- (25) a. Indonesian *supaya...* (Evans, 2007: 388)
- supaya di-baca halaman lima puluh
 in.order.that PASS-read page five ten
 ‘If you could read page fifty.’

b. Basque *-ela* (Evans, 2007: 419)

- | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------|---------|
| A: Jon | d-a-tor | B: Zer? |
| | John 3SG.ABS-PRS-come | what |
| | ‘John is coming.’ | ‘What?’ |
| A: Jon | d-a-tor-ela | |
| | John 3SG.ABS-PRS-come-SBJV | |
| | ‘(I said) That John’s coming.’ | |

As shown in (25), the purpose-marking subordinated clause is innovated as a construction for polite imperative in Indonesian and the subjunctive-marked clause is innovated as a full-fledged reportative/quotative marking sentence.

5. Issues in Grammaticalization Theory

We have seen various innovations through insubordination in Korean (§3) and, though cursory, other languages (§4). Now we turn to the discussion of select issues, i.e. pragmatic inferences in the elliptical contexts, intersubjectification in interpersonal contexts, and purely structure-based functions as an extension from insubordination.

5.1. Insubordination and Pragmatic Inference

Interlocutors in discourse employ a wide range of strategic uses of linguistic forms and structures, and the forms and structures subjected to these strategic uses often develop into markers of grammatical notions. Many grammaticalization researchers have proposed diverse mechanisms and principles (Lehmann, 2015[1982]; Heine et al., 1991; Hopper & Traugott, 2003[1993]; Bybee, Perkins, & Pagliuca, 1994; Heine & Kuteva, 2002, Kuteva et al., 2019; among others. For instance, Heine & Kuteva (2002) and Kuteva, Heine, Hong, Long, Narrog, & Rhee (2019) propose four major mechanisms, i.e. Desemanticization, Extension, Decategorialization, and

Erosion, which are closely interrelated and operate gradually. Of these, desemanticization (semantic generalization) and extension (host-class expansion) are particularly relevant to the grammaticalization via insubordination.

Insubordination is among those strategic uses of linguistic forms, and grammaticalization of the affected forms proceeds in gradience, in which pragmatic inferences operate. Thus, at the onset of the development of grammatical markers through insubordination, i.e., when such a grammaticalization process has not sufficiently proceeded, the utterance seems to be an elliptical structure similar to utterances in English that end with such connectives as *and*, *or*, *but*, *though*, etc. (Mulder & Thompson, 2006, 2008; Mulder, Thompson, & Williams, 2009; Barth-Weingarten & Couper-Kuhlen, 2002; Couper-Kuhlen & Thompson, 2000, among others).

Similarly, DMAs in Korean, particularly when used for back-channeling, historically originated from discourse segments that end with connectives, thus reflecting elliptical structures (see §3.6). One crucial pragmatic factor in this process is that what has been elided is strategically withheld by the speaker to show that it is so obvious that it does not need to be explicitly expressed (see (2), and in particular (2c), above). The high degree of its being obvious warrants its ellipsis and at the same time serves as an endorsement of the truthfulness or firmness of what the previous speaker has just said (Rhee, 2015: 20).

From the interactional perspective, insubordination involves an intricate ‘guessing game’ between the interlocutors. In short, the roles of the speaker and the addressee can be presented as (26):

(26) Strategic ellipsis and interlocutors

A. The speaker

Strategy: Elide the main clause

Effect: (a) Economy; (b) No commitment to the (elided) detail;

(c) Enrichment by the addressee

B. The addressee

- Problem: (a) The speaker ended his/her utterance with a connective, so I can wait for the main clause.
 (b) The intonation contour suggests utterance closure.
 (c) Now the discourse reached the TRP.

Problem solving strategy: Inferences (see below)

As shown above, the speaker's employment of elliptical strategy has three-fold effects or benefits. On the other hand, the addressee, realizing that it is obvious that the speaker is not going to complete his/her utterance, initiates a series of pragmatic inferences. For example, we noted in §3.2 that the connective *-ketun* has been grammaticalized as an emphatic SFP to mark cause/reason. Pragmatic inferences in the functional change from conditional connection to emphatic termination can be summarized below, based on (5b) above, which is repeated here as (27) for convenience:

(27) (= (5b))

A: [Why does he look so down?]

B: ayin-i ttena-ss-ketun
 sweetheart-NOM leave-PST-CONN/SFP?

'Because his sweetheart left him.'

[His sweetheart left him]-*ketun* 'if'

[Inferences]

- (a) I heard: [His sweetheart left him]-KETUN ('if')
 (b) The speaker did not complete the sentence.
 (c) If the speaker had completed the sentence, it must have been
 [If his sweetheart left him, how can he not be down?]
 (d) It is impossible for him not to be sad in such a situation.
 (e) The speaker seems to have not completed the sentence because
 what remained unsaid is very straightforward.
 (f) Then the embedded proposition [His sweetheart left him] is a
 strong cause of his sadness.

- (g) The apparent conditional marker -KETUN is better interpreted as ‘because’ rather than ‘if.’
- (h) [‘If’ his sweetheart left him] in fact means [‘Because’ his sweetheart left him].

Similarly, we have seen in §3.5 that the causal connective *-tanikka* has become a SFP of emphatic assertion, and the pragmatic inferences involved in the development can be presented as (28), based on (13d):

(28) (=13d)

salam-i kule-myen mos ssu-n-tanikka
 person-NOM do.so-if cannot use-PRS-CONN/SFP

‘A (respectable) person should not do such things!’

[A respectable person should not do such things]-TANIKKA

[Inferences]

- (a) I heard [A respectable person should not do such things]-TANIKKA (‘because’ ‘while’ ‘despite’)
- (b) X did not finish the sentence. But the prosody indicated completion of utterance.
- (c) If X had completed the sentence it would have been: [A respectable person should not do such things]-TANIKKA (‘despite’), [you are doing or did such things.]
- (d) I did such things.
- (e) X thinks that my doing such things goes against what X (or someone else) said.
- (f) X is protesting against what I did.
- (g) X is reiterating what X said before (or something that is well-known).
- (h) X is emphatically restating what X said before (or something that is well-known).
- (i) -TANIKKA may not simply mean ‘because’ ‘while’ ‘even though’; its meaning is more felicitous when interpreted as an

emphatic assertion marker.

- (j) Then, what I heard may be: [A respectable person should not do such things]-TANIKKA ('emphatic assertion')

The pragmatic inferences involved in the development of SFPs from a conditional connective (27) and from a causal connective (28) are spelled out in a rather lengthy and complex series. However, the initiation of the inference is spontaneous and the progression is instantaneous. Through these pragmatic inferences various kinds of grammatical functions arise. It has been observed that insubordinated constructions perform diverse functions (Heine, Kaltenböck, & Kuteva, 2016; Evans, 2007: 387ff; Mithun, 2008: 106), e.g. (a) indirection and interpersonal control, (b) requests, (c) politeness, (d) threats, (e) warnings and admonitions, (f) evidential meanings, and (g) epistemic meanings. It is beyond the scope of this paper to evaluate these proposed functions individually, but even with just two examples exemplified above, it is evident that the emphatic SFP functions are related to interpersonal control, warnings/admonitions, evidential and epistemic meanings, and, potentially in the case of *-tanikka*, threats.

5.2. Intersubjectification & Interpersonality

Intersubjectification in essence refers to the increase in the attention to the addressee's face (Traugott & Dasher, 2002), and thus is basically a interpersonal notion. Intersubjectification is prominent in the development of SFPs from connectives. Since they originated from a discourse situation where the ellipsis is strategically used by the speaker, SFPs are necessarily highly interpersonal and intersubjective. For instance, they are frequently used in emotive interactions, often with an intonation typical of sentences uttered by irritated speakers. We already briefly noted this aspect in §3.3 (see examples (9) and (10) above), and the emotionality such as irritation, discontent, protest, etc. is unambiguously present in the following:

- (29) A: com coyonghi ha-lanikka
 a.little quietly do-SFP
 ‘Please keep quiet!’ (Can’t you be quiet?)
 B: al-ass-tanikka
 know-PST-SFP
 ‘Alright, alright!’ (I say I will, OK?)

In the exchange in (29) A and B are addressing each other with high emotionality, which can be clearly contrasted with the conventional general ender *-e* (for A and B), or the conventional imperatives *-sio*, *-sipsio*, *-ela*, etc. (for A), or the formal declaratives *-supnita*, *-ta*, etc. (for B). Generally speaking, new SFPs indicate the speaker’s acknowledgment of, and response to, the addressee’s attitude/stance. It is also notable that the attitudes in these situations are different from those typically encoded by the modality markers for the speaker’s epistemic stance, since they are attitudes toward the addressee (e.g., irritation), rather than toward the proposition.⁴

5.3. From structure to function

We have seen in the preceding discussion how insubordinated structures give rise to new functions to the existing forms. In this section, we extend our view to a peculiar kind of grammaticalization, i.e. functions derived “purely” from the structure. This new category also involves ellipsis but the affected class is not subordinating connectives but other types of connectives.

Before we address such a new category, we will first look at the insubordination cases from a different perspective. We have seen in a number of places that COMPs develop into emphatic SFPs, e.g. (7c,d) and (8c,d) in §3.3). From one perspective, the use of COMPs for a non-embedded

⁴ The epistemic vs. emotional stance difference is prominent in the contrast of (a) *pio-nunkeskath-ta* [rain-seem-DEC] ‘It seems to be raining.’ (epistemic; proposition-oriented attitude) and (b) *pio-n-tanikka* [rain-PRS-SFP] ‘It’s raining, (didn’t I tell you!’) (emotive; interlocutor-oriented attitude).

proposition is an instance of borrowing the meaning of the structure. For instance, let us look at (7c), repeated here as (30) for convenience, supposedly spoken in response to someone's request of lending money:

- (30) *-tako* SFP 'emphatic'
 na-to cengmal cwuk-keyss-tako.
 I-also really die-FUT-SFP
 'I am really hard-pressed, too. (Stop pressing me.)'
 (lit. That I'm really hard-pressed, too.)

The emphatic meaning of (30) is partly due to the fact that *-tako* is a form traditionally used to introduce someone else's utterance, which is the primary function of a COMP. The irritation or annoyance meaning of (30) is derived from the nuance of *-tako*, by virtue of its being a COMP in origin, that the speaker is presenting his/her statement "as if" it had been said before or it had been made clear in one way or other, and that the speaker is irritated by the addressee disregarding the clear message and repeating the request. In other words, the speaker is saying in effect "I'm really hard-pressed and have no money available for you. I said it before, but you are ignoring what I said before. And I'm angry at you." This "I said it before" nuance is the semantic residue of the COMP, which the speaker is taking advantage of, even though the information has never been said before.

In addition to subordinating structures, coordinating structures also go through similar development, e.g., *-ko* is a coordinating connective 'and' but is often used utterance-finally with a true utterance-terminating prosody (cf. 'incoordination' Kuteva, Austin, Vuillemin, & Niclot, 2015). This is exemplified in the following:

- (31) a. (To a boy chasing a rabbit on the campus lawn)
 nolaykhi-cimal-ko.
 scare-PROH-and
 'Don't scare the rabbit.' (Lit. Don't scare the rabbit and.)

- b. (A man to his girl-friend at break-up)
 pap cal chayngki-e mek-ko.
 meal well gather.up-NF eat-and
 ‘Don’t skip meals.’ (Lit. Don’t skip meals and.)
- c. (A man to his friend’s child)
 apeci-nun phyenanha-si-ko?
 father-TOP be.peaceful-HON-and
 ‘Is your father doing well?’ (Lit. Is your father doing well and?)
- d. (A man to a departing friend)
 tochakha-myen yenlakha-ko.
 arrive-if communicate-and
 ‘Call me when you arrive.’ (Lit. Call me when you arrive and.)

Utterances like those illustrated in (31) are in common use in everyday life. Utterances ending with *-ko*, thus formally coordinated clauses but functionally incoordinated sentences, carry friendly, mitigated overtone. This is an intriguing situation and the main question is why a form with the “and” meaning brings forth such stance-related functions. The answer seems to have to do with the pure structural function of the coordinator, i.e. adding new information. The derivation of the functions from the structure seems to go through, as illustrated in (32):

(32) a. ‘connective’

- b. > “Something follows.”
 c. > “This is not all.”
 d. > “Take this statement as non-definitive and non-final.”

In other words, the man in (31b) is showing his concern for his girlfriend at the break-up, by saying “Don’t skip meals and”, in which the final “and” is a signal that ‘not skipping meals’ is not the only thing in his mind; rather there is a lot more to say at this mutually heart-breaking moment. Therefore, the open-endedness of this “and” meaning and all other things the speaker

could have said give rise to the non-finality of the message and, consequently, the friendly and mitigated overtone. In other words, purely structural marker *-ko* ‘and’ is interpreted as “There are many other things to be spoken.”

In addition to insubordination and incoordination, similar states of affairs are observed with other grammatical markers that have shifted their functions. Some of them are listed in (33):

- (33) a. *-key*: mode-adverbializer > indirectness, non-assertiveness
- b. *-a/e*: consolidating NF > friendliness, intimacy, suggestiveness
- c. *-tanun*: adnominalizer > friendliness, intimacy, solidarity
- d. *-ci*: nominalizer > determinativeness, conviction
- e. *-lkel*: nominalizer-accusative > regret, uncertainty, conjecture

It is beyond the scope of this paper to address each of the forms listed in (33), and suffice it to say that in each instance, the purely structural functions are shifted to a more interpersonal, intersubjective, and emotive functions. The transition from the structural characteristics to the grammatical notions seems to be motivated by the ‘category iconicity’ (Kuteva, 1994). The phenomena supporting the grammaticalization ‘from pure structure to function’ seem to be widespread, at least in Korean, and warrant future in-depth research.

6. Conclusion

This paper has addressed grammaticalization through insubordination. Korean has a large number of SFPs developed from connectives as well as DMAs from the source structures involving connectives, through ellipsis. In these cases ellipsis is strategically used by the speaker in discourse, and the addressee actively seeks the elided information in the missing main clause. Repeated inference patterns may be conventionalized and the resultant grammatical functions may become fixed to the forms.

Noticeable aspects are that the inferred meanings are often intersubjective and that such meanings often become semanticized on the utterance-final

materials, mostly connectives. Since pragmatic inferences are not deterministic, meanings that arise from inferences tend to be multiple and often hard to pinpoint, thus creating semantically ‘elaborate’ and ‘esoteric’ grammatical markers (cf. Kuteva, 2009; Kuteva & Comrie, 2005 for the notion ‘semantically elaborate’ category; and Grace, 1997; Crowley, 2000; Wray & Grace, 2007; Rice, 2017, 2019 for the notion of ‘esotericity’). The crucial involvement of pragmatic inferencing is in consonance with the claims that the extent of grammaticalization may be fundamentally constrained by the limit of pragmatics (Hopper & Traugott, 2003[1993]) and that pragmatic inferences shape the routes of semantic changes in grammaticalization (cf. Heine et al., 1991).

Through pragmatic inference based on ellipsis, language users take non-existing (only hypothesized) forms, calculate its relationship to the existing locution, and attribute the relevant meaning to the existing forms. Thus, the innovative meaning becomes fixed at the utterance-final formants, which are reinterpreted as SFPs. We have also noted that some forms created through insubordination have become highly unitized expressions serving discourse marker functions.

We have also seen that some meanings of grammatical markers may come from ‘purely’ structural characteristics, noticeably the SFPs resulting from incoordination. This under-researched topic warrants future research, which will help identify the elaborate working of ellipsis in grammaticalization from insubordination and beyond.

References

- Barth-Weingarten, D. and E. Couper-Kuhlen. 2002. On the development of final *though*: A case of grammaticalization? In Wischer, I. & G. Diewald (eds.), *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 345-361.
- Brinton, L. J. 2014. The extremes of insubordination: Exclamatory *as if!* *Journal of English Linguistics* 42(2), 93-113. doi: 10.1177/0075424214521425.

- Buscha, A. 1976. Isolierte Nebensätze im dialogischen Text. *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 13, 274-279.
- Bybee, J. L., R. Perkins, and W. Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. and S. A. Thompson. 2000. Concessive patterns in conversation. In Couper-Kuhlen, E. and B. Kortmann (eds.), *Cause, Condition, Concession, and Contrast: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 381-410.
- Crowley, T. 2000. Simplicity, complexity, emblematicity, and grammatical change. In Siegel, J. (ed.), *Processes of Language Contact: Studies from Australia and the South Pacific*. Montréal: Les Éditions Fides, 175-193
- Davis, P. W. n.d. The semantics of syntactic complexity. <<http://www.owl.net.rice.edu/~pwd/sosc.html>>.
- Evans, N. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In Nikolaeva, I. (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 366 - 431.
- Evans, N. 2009. Insubordination and the grammaticalisation of interactive presuppositions. Paper presented at Methodologies in Determining Morphosyntactic Change Conference, Museum of Ethnography, Osaka, March 2009.
- Evans, N. and H. Watanabe (eds.). 2016. *Insubordination*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Grace, G. W. 1997. On the changing context of Austronesian historical linguistics. In Odé, C. and W. Stokhof (eds.), *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi, 15-32.
- Gras, P. 2016. Insubordinate *que*-constructions in Spanish. In Evans, N. and H. Watanabe (eds.), *Insubordination*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 113-143.
- Haiman, J. 1988. Inconsequential clauses in Hua and the typology of clauses. In Haiman, J. and S. Thompson (eds.), *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 49-71.
- Haugh, M. 2008. Utterance-final conjunctive particles and implicature in Japanese conversation. *Pragmatics* 18(3), 425-451. doi: 10.1075/prag.18.3.04hau.
- Heine, B., U. Claudi, and F. Hünemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Heine, B., G. Kaltenböck, and T. Kuteva. 2011. Accounting for insubordinated clauses. Typescript.
- Heine, B., G. Kaltenböck, and T. Kuteva. 2016. On subordination and cooptation. In Evans, N. and H. Watanabe (eds.), *Insubordination*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 39-63.
- Heine, B. and T. Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, B., G. Kaltenböck, T. Kuteva, and H. Long. 2013. An outline of discourse grammar. In Bischoff, S. and C. Jany (eds.), *Functional Approaches to Language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 175-233.
- Heine, B., G. Kaltenböck, T. Kuteva, and H. Long. 2017. Cooptation as a discourse strategy. *Linguistics* 55(4), 813-855. doi: 10.1515/ling-2017-0012.
- Higashiizumi, Y. 2006. *From a Subordinate Clause to an Independent Clause*. Hituzi Syobo Publishing, Tokyo.
- Hopper, P. J. and E. C. Traugott. 2003[1993] *Grammaticalization* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horie, K. 2011. Versatility of nominalizations: Where Japanese and Korean contrast. In Yap, F. H., K. Grunow-Härsta and J. Wrona (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 473-495.
- Horie, K. 2012. Percept and concept in Korean and Japanese grammatical constructions: A semiotic and typological perspective. Paper presented at the First International Conference on Homo Sensus: Perception, Emotion, Semiosis, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Seoul, June 8-9, 2012.
- Iguchi, (Higashiizumi) Y. 1998. Functional variety in the Japanese conjunctive particle *kara* 'because'. In Ohori, T. (ed.), *Studies in Japanese Grammaticalization: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives*. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers, 99-128.
- Jung, Y.-H. 2001. Grammaticalization of Korean Clause Connectives. Ph.D. dissertation. Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Korea.
- Kaltenböck, G., B. Heine, and T. Kuteva 2011. On thetical grammar. *Studies in Language* 35(4), 852-897. doi: 10.1075/sl.35.4.03kal.
- Kim, J.. and K. Horie. 2006. Sentence final nominalization in Korean: A contrastive study with Japanese. *Inquiries into Korean Linguistics II*. Seoul: Thachaksa, 27-34.
- Kim, J. and K. Horie. 2008. The emerging sentence-final 'Attributive' quotative

- construction in Korean web-based communication: A contrastive pragmatic study with Japanese. Paper presented at New Reflections on Grammaticalization 4, Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium, July 15-19, 2008.
- Kim, T.-Y. 1997. Kwuke congkyelemiuy hyengthayloncek yuhyeng [On morphological typology of Korean sentence-final particles]. *Emwunhak* 60, 61-82.
- Kim, T.-Y. 1998. Kwuke picongkyelemiuy congkyelemihwaey tayhaye [The functional shift of functional shift of endings from nonfinal to final]. *Enehak* 22, 171-189.
- Kim, T.-Y. 2000. Kwuke congkeylemihwaey mwunpephwa yangsang [On grammaticalization of Korean sentence-final particles]. *Emwunyenkwu* 33, 47-68.
- Kim, T.-Y. 2001. *Kwuke Conkyelemiuy Mwunpep* [Grammar of Korean sentence-final markers]. Seoul: Kwukhakcalyowen.
- Koo, H. J. 1989a. Cokenuy wenhyengthaywa *-ketun*. [On the proto-form of conditionals and *-ketun*]. *Festschrift for Dr. Ceyhyo Lee Yong-Ju*. Seoul: Hansaem Publishing, 117-131.
- Koo, H. J. 1989b. Speech act of conditional sentences. *Kwukehak* 19, 453-472.
- Koo, H. J. 1989c. Conditionals and Topic. Ph.D. dissertation, Konkuk University, Korea.
- Koo, H. J. 2005. Conditional markers in speech context: From conditional to politeness. *Discourse and Cognition* 12(2), 1-22.
- Koo, H. J. and S. Rhee. 2001. Grammaticalization of sentential end marker from a conditional marker. *Discourse and Cognition* 8(1), 1-19.
- Kuteva, T. 1994. Iconicity and auxiliatation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 22, 71-81.
- Kuteva, T. 2009. Grammatical categories and linguistic theory: Elaborateness in grammar. In Austin, P. K., O. Bond, M. Charette, D. Nathan, and P. Sells (eds.), *Proceedings of Conference on Language Documentation and Linguistic Theory 2*. London: SOAS, 13-28.
- Kuteva, T., P. Austin, M. Vuillermet, and D. Niclot. 2015. Insubordination and incoordination as steps towards grammaticalization. Paper presented at A Workshop on Grammaticalization: Newly Identified Paths of Grammaticalization in Meso- and South American Languages, Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen, the Netherlands, Sep. 28, 2015.
- Kuteva, T. and B. Comrie. 2005. The typology of relative clause formation in African

- languages. In Voeltz, F. K. E. (ed.), *Studies in African Linguistic Typology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 209-228.
- Kuteva, T., B. Heine, B. Hong, H. Long, H. Narrog, and S. Rhee. 2019. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, G.-H. 2008. Hankwukeuy cepsokphyohyen [Connectives in Korean]. In Song, K. A. and K.-G. Lee (eds.), *Eneyuhyenglon* [Linguistic Typology] vol. 2, 571-581.
- Lee, H.-Y. 1996. Relationship between the Meaning of Verbal Endings and Boodam-jooligi in Modern Korean. Doctoral Dissertation, Ehwa Womans University.
- Lee, H. and J.-H. Lee. 2010. *Emi Cosa Sacen* [A dictionary of endings and particles]. Seoul: Hankook Publisher.
- Lehmann, C. 2015[1982]. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization* (3rd ed.). Berlin: Language Science Press.
- López-Couso, M. J. and B. Méndez-Naya. 2012. On the use of *as if*, *as though*, and *like* in Present-Day English complementation structures. *Journal of English Linguistics* 40(2), 172-195. doi: 10.117/0075424211418976.
- Mithun, M. 2008. The extension of dependency beyond the sentence. *Language* 84(1), 69-119. doi: 10.1353/lan.2008.0054.
- Mulder, J. and S. A. Thompson. 2006. The grammaticization of *but* as a final particle in English conversation. In Allan, K. (ed.) *Selected Papers from the 2005 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*, 1-18.
- Mulder, J. and S. A. Thompson. 2008. The grammaticization of *but* as a final particle in English conversation. In Laury, R. (ed.), *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining: The Multifunctionality of Conjunctions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 179-204.
- Mulder, J., S. A. Thompson, and C. P. Williams. 2009. Final *but* in Australian English conversation. In Peters, P., P. Collins, and A. Smith (eds.), *Comparative Studies in Australian and New Zealand English: Grammar and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 337-358.
- Ohori, T. 1995. Remarks on suspended clauses: a contribution to Japanese phraseology. In Shibatani, M. and S. A. Thompson (eds.), *Essays in Semantics and Pragmatics in Honor of Charles J. Fillmore*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 201 - 218.
- Park, M.-J. and S.-O. S. Sohn. 2002. Discourse, grammaticalization and intonation:

- An analysis of *ketun* in Korean. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 10, 306-319.
- Rhee, S. 2002. From silence to grammar: Grammaticalization of ellipsis in Korean. Paper presented at the New Reflections on Grammaticalization II, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands, April 3-6, 2002.
- Rhee, S. 2008. Ellipsis and functional shifts. *Studies in Modern Grammar* 52, 169-194.
- Rhee, S. 2011. Nominalization and stance marking in Korean. In Yap, F. H. and J. Wrona (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 393-422.
- Rhee, S. 2012. Context-induced reinterpretation and (inter)subjectification: The case of grammaticalization of sentence-final particles. *Language Sciences* 34(3), 284-300. doi: 10.1016/j.langsci.2011.10.004.
- Rhee, S. 2015. On the emergence of Korean markers of agreement. *Journal of Pragmatics* 83, 10-26. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2015.04.005.
- Rice, S. 2017. Phraseology and polysynthesis. In Fortescue, M., M. Mithun, and N. Evans (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Polysynthesis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 203-214.
- Rice, S. 2019. Cognitive linguistics and the study of indigenous languages. Plenary lecture at the 15th International Cognitive Linguistics Conference (ICLC-15): Cross-linguistic Perspectives on Cognitive Linguistics, Kwansei Gakuin University, Nishinomiya, Japan, August 6-11, 2019.
- Schwenter, S. A. 2016. Independent *si*-clauses in Spanish: Functions and consequences for insubordination. In Evans, N. and H. Watanabe (eds.), *Insubordination*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 89-111.
- Sohn, H.-M. 2001[1999]. *The Korean Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sohn, S.-O. S. 1995. On the development of sentence-final particles in Korean. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 5, 219-234.
- Sohn, S.-O. S. 2003. On the emergence of intersubjectivity: an analysis of the sentence-final *nikka* in Korean. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 12, 52-63.
- Song, J. J. 2005. *The Korean Language: Structure, Use and Context*. New York: Routledge.
- Thurston, W. R. 1988. How exoteric languages build a lexicon: Esoterogeny in West New Britain. In Harlow, R. and R. Hopper (eds.), *VICAL I: Papers from the Fifth International Conference on Austronesian Languages*. Auckland: Linguistic Society of New Zealand, 555-579.

- Traugott, E. C. and R. B. Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vallauri, E. L. 2016. Insubordinated conditionals in spoken and non-spoken Italian. In Evans, N. and H. Watanabe (eds.), *Insubordination*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 145-169.
- Verstraete, J-C. and S. D'Hertefelt. 2016. Running in the family: Patterns of complement insubordination in Germanic. In Evans, N. and H. Watanabe (eds.), *Insubordination*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 65-87.
- Wray, A. and G. W. Grace. 2007. The consequences of talking to strangers: Evolutionary corollaries of socio-cultural influences on linguistic form. *Lingua* 117(3), 543-78. doi: 10.1016/j.lingua.2005.05.005.

Seongha Rhee

Professor, Department of English Linguistics and Language Technology
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
107 Imun-ro, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul 02450, Korea
02-2173-3171
srhee@hufs.ac.kr

Received: June 14, 2020

Revised: July 8, 2020

Accepted: July 15, 2020