FROM SELF-TALK TO GRAMMAR
The emergence of multiple paradigms from self-quoted questions in Korean

HYUN JUNG KOO, SEONGHA RHEE
SANGMYUNG UNIVERSITY, HANKUK UNIVERSITY OF FOREIGN STUDIES

Abstract – Korean has a large inventory of sentence-final particles and connectives whose origins are ultimately traceable to quotative constructions. Certain self-quoted questions which appear in the form of a direct quote, i.e. those without any linkers to the host clause, developed into modal markers in conjunction with adjacent verbs in the main clause, thus becoming far removed from their original quotative function. Most of these modal markers also began to develop into clausal connectives simply by having their collocational sentence enders replaced with connectives. In a more dramatic fashion, the self-quoted questions formed a paradigm of connectives, dramatic in that they appear in bare form with no host verbs. The question markers were structurally reinterpreted as connectives and acquired functions from pragmatic inference in relation to a context. This development is largely due to the role of discursive strategies and also involves functional change, attributable to analogy. The development of these constructions triggered the development of multiple forms in other paradigms through analogy by virtue of their semantic and morphosyntactic resemblances. These constructions grammaticalized into grammatical markers in the semantic domains of evidentiality, epistemicity and emotional stance, such as inferential evidentiality, speaker's tentativeness in volition, evaluation of states of affairs, apprehensive emotion, etc., as well as the more discursive functions of dramatizing a narrative or engaging the audience by means of feigned interactivity, i.e. posing self-raised questions and volunteering answers to these. This paper analyzes the grammaticalization processes based on the data taken from a historical corpus.

Keywords: self-talk; grammaticalization; multiple paradigms; stance; feigned interactivity.

1. Introduction

Korean has a large number of quotative and reportative constructions that have grammaticalized into diverse functions in the domains of text and discourse. In particular, it has a large inventory of sentence-final particles and connectives whose origins are ultimately traceable to quotative constructions. Quotative constructions typically involve complementizers (COMPs) which

introduce a quoted utterance as the complement of a verb. Another type of quotative construction involves self-quotation in the form of direct quotation, i.e. one in which the main clause directly embeds the speaker's utterance or thought as a complement.

Quotative constructions involving complementizers have received considerable attention from linguists mainly because complementizers explicitly occur in a sentence and the complementizers display developmental trajectories in history (Rhee 2008; Sohn 2011; Sohn, Park 2003). In addition to the quotative constructions involving complementizers, there are the quotative constructions involving self-quoted questions by the speaker (SQCs, hereafter). The use of questions thus marked characterizes a 'dialogue' between the speaking self and the thinking self. This type of feigned interactivity makes a text more dramatic and vivid as compared to the texts that do not employ such rhetorical devices. Recent research reveals that many instances of grammaticalization in Korean are triggered by the speaker's desire to increase interactivity by making use of rhetorical, thus non-genuine, interaction.

Unlike such quotative constructions involving complementizers, SQCs have not yet received attention to date, presumably because they lack explicit markers, being directly embedded without other linguistic exponents. The quotative function is not associated with a specific form, but rather exists in the configuration of juxtaposed clauses. Therefore, this grammaticalization involves no formal changes but functional reinterpretation of existing forms, with no observable trajectories of change. This research intends to explore this phenomenon.

The objectives of this paper are threefold: to describe how SQCs emerged historically; to exemplify the functions of SQCs across various grammatical categories; and to analyze the role of analogy, pragmatic inference and functional reinterpretation involved in their development.

The research methodology involves using historical data for a diachronic investigation. The historical data are taken from a corpus, the 15-million word historical section of the 20th Century Sejong Corpus, a 200-million word corpus developed by the Korean Ministry of Culture and Tourism and the National Institute of Korean Language (1998-2006). The texts in the historical section, dating from 1446 through 1913, are available in the text format, and are searchable with the UNICONC concordance program.

2. Background

2.1. A brief note about Korean

Korean is a language largely spoken in and around the Korean peninsula by about 77.2 million speakers (Ethnologue; Simons, Fennig 2018). It is often considered an Altaic language, but its genealogy is disputed. Recently the language has been included in the group of 'Transeurasian' languages, including Japanic, Koreanic, Tungusic, Mongolic and Turkic (Johanson, Robbeets 2010, pp. 1-2). Typologically it is an agglutinating, head-final language with an SOV word order, allowing for much freedom in word order due to its pervasive use of case-markers and postpositions that help determine the thematic function of sentential arguments regardless of their surface location. These nominal morphologies may be also deleted, and such deletion may be even preferred in discourse, when the function fulfilled by an argument is contextually straightforward. Typical sentence patterns are exemplified in (1) and the relatively free word order is illustrated by (2), which shows all the possible orderings of the constituents in (1b):[1]

(1) a. *John-i*   *Mary-lul*   *salangha-n-ta*
     John-NOM   Mary-ACC   love-PRES-DEC
     'John loves Mary.'

     b. *John-i*   *Mary-eykey*   *kkoch-ul*   *cwu-ess-ta*
     John-NOM   Mary-DAT   flower-ACC   give-PST-DEC
     'John gave Mary flowers.'

(2) a. *John-i*   *Mary-eykey*   *kkoch-ul*   *cwu-ess-ta*
     b. *John-i*   *kkoch-ul*   *Mary-eykey*   *cwu-ess-ta*
     c. *Mary-eykey*   *John-i*   *kkoch-ul*   *cwu-ess-ta*
     d. *Mary-eykey*   *kkoch-ul*   *John-i*   *cwu-ess-ta*
     e. *kkoch-ul*   *John-i*   *Mary-eykey*   *cwu-ess-ta*
     f. *kkoch-ul*   *Mary-eykey*   *John-i*   *cwu-ess-ta*
     a-f: 'John gave Mary flowers.'

Complex sentences consisting of two clauses typically make use of complementizers depending on the mood value of the embedded clause, e.g.

---

[1] For the transcription of the Korean data the Yale Romanized System (Martin 1992) and the Extended Yale Romanization System (Rhee 1996) for Late Middle Korean are used. The following abbreviations are used for interlinear morphemic glossing: ACC: accusative; APPR: apprehensive; COMP: complementizer; CONN: connective; DAT: dative; DEC: declarative; END: sentence ender; FUT: future; INFR: inferential; LOC: locative; NOM: nominative; POL: polite; POSB: possibility; PRES: present; PROG: progressive; PST: past; PURP: purposive; Q: question; SFP: sentence-final particle; SQC: self-quoted construction; TAM: tense-aspect-mood-modality; TINT: tentative intentional; TOP: topic; TRNS: transferentive.

-tako/-lako for declaratives, *-nyako* for interrogatives, *-lako* for imperatives, and *-cako* for hortatives. The point is illustrated in part with the declarative complementizer *-tako* in (3a) and the interrogative complementizer *-nyako* in (3b):

(3)   a. *na-nun   ku-ka   cengcikha-**tako***   *mit-ess-ta*
         I-TOP   he-NOM be.honest-**DEC.COMP**   believe-PST-DEC
         'I believed that he was honest.'

      b. *na-nun   ku-ka   cengcikha-**nyako***   *mwul-ess-ta*
         I-TOP   he-NOM be.honest-**Q.COMP**   ask-PST-DEC
         'I asked if he was honest.'

2.2. Formal characteristics of SQCs

As briefly hinted at in Section 1, SQCs take the form of direct quote, i.e. without any linkers (such as complementizers); they are directly embedded in the matrix clause with verbs of locution, e.g. *ha-* 'say', *malha-* 'speak', etc.; of volition/cognition, e.g. *siph-* 'want/think/suppose', *sayngkakha-* 'think', *molu-* 'not know', etc.; and of perception, e.g. *po-* 'see', etc., eventually developing into grammatical constructions far removed from their original quotative function.[2] Regular interrogative sentences and SQCs may be compared in (4) and (5):

(4)   a. Interrogative sentence with Q *-na*
         kyay-ka cal   cinay-koiss-na
         he-NOM well   get.along-PROG-Q
         'Is he doing well?'

      b. SQC with *-na*
         na-nun kyay-ka   cal   cinay-koiss-na   molu-keyss-e
         I-TOP   he-NOM   well   get.along-Q(?)   not.know-FUT-END
         'I'm wondering if he is doing well.'
         (< Lit. 'I don't know, "Is he doing well?"')

---

[2] The verb *ha-* is a light verb denoting 'say' or 'do'. Its semantic bleaching has proceeded to such an extent that the meaning is often difficult to identify in Modern Korean. The verb *siph-* primarily means 'want' in contemporary Korean, but historically it (and its variants *sikpu-, sipu-, sipwu-*, etc.) meant 'feel like to think', 'be inclined to think', etc.; these earlier meanings are closer to the modal SQC meaning. An anonymous reviewer suggests its origin to be a construction involving the Sino-Korean **sik* 'form/pattern' and the verb *po-* 'see', but the hypothesis is not historically substantiated. The verb *molu-* 'not know' is a monomorphemic lexeme not morphologically derivable from *al-* 'know'.

Lingue e Linguaggi

From self-talk to grammar. The emergence of multiple paradigms from self-quoted questions
in Korean

259

(5)   a. Interrogative sentence with Q -*kka*
       nayil   *nol-le*   *ka-l-kka*
       tomorrow   play-PURP   go-FUT-Q
       'Should I/Shall we/Will she… go to play tomorrow?'

      b. SQC with -*kka*
       na-nun nayil   *nol-le*   *ka-l-kka*   *sayngkakha-koiss-e*
       I-TOP   tomorrow   play-PURP   go-FUT-Q(?)   think-PROG-END
       'I'm wondering if I should go to play tomorrow.'
       (< Lit. 'I am thinking, "Should I go to play tomorrow?"')

As shown above, the regular interrogatives in the (a) examples and the SQCs in the (b) examples involve the phonologically identical forms -*na* and -*kka*, respectively. These forms, when functioning as regular sentence-enders as in (4a) and (5a), are clearly markers of sentence-type, i.e. interrogative. However, when they occur in non-final positions as in (4b) and (5b), they are not sentence enders and consequently their function is not to mark an interrogative sentence, since the mood type markers of a sentence, which are invariably verbal morphologies, occur only sentence-finally in this verb-final language. Furthermore, the markers -*na* and -*kka* occupy the sentential position normally occupied by a complementizer -*ci* (originally a nominalizer), which can replace them in the examples without causing any semantic change, a state of affairs clearly indicating that they function as complementizers of some sort. Therefore, these forms in interrogatives and SQCs are in a relation of 'heterosemy' (Lichtenberk 1991, p. 476) or 'genetic polysemy' (Heine 1997, p. 9).

3. Development of SQC paradigms

3.1. Historical development

A historical investigation reveals that SQCs began to grammaticalize as markers of diverse functions only recently, even though some of the precursor constructions are attested as early as Late Middle Korean (LMK; 15th and 16th centuries). Before the development of complementizers for embedding a sentence, verbatim quotations were embedded. In such sentences with direct embedding, locution verbs usually occurred twice, as illustrated in example (6), in which *nil-* 'speak' occurs before the quotation and *ha-* 'say' after it.[3]

---

[3] An anonymous reviewer points to the historical fact that Late Middle Korean had *pangcem* 'tone markers'. Since their presence does not bear direct relevance to the current analysis they are not indicated in the romanized data. Tone disappeared by the end of the 16th century in Korean (only

(6) [Subject *speak* [Direct Quotation of Question] *say*-TAM/CONN]
   api   ***nil***-*otAy*   mecun   kulus-ul   musuk-ey psu-lH-ta   ***hA***-*n-tAy*...
   father   **speak**-as   ominous   vessel-ACC what-at   use-FUT-Q   **say**-PRES-CONN
   "Since his father asks what he would use the ominous vessel for, ..."
   (< Lit. Since his father speaks, saying, "What will you use the ominous vessel for?", ...)
                                                                        (1481, *Samkanghayngsilto, hyo*-13)

In the above example, the underscored part of the sentence is the direct quotation of the question asked by the 'father'. The quotation in this example is a genuine question. It occurs sentence-medially just because of the syntactic rule that requires the main clause verb to occur in the sentence-final position.

There were, however, though not very frequently, similar constructions containing structures of a different type, in which embedded quotations may not be true direct quotations. This type of constructions interestingly served as the basis of the SQC development. One of the earliest attestations of such cases is in (7), taken from a 15th century LMK text:[4]

(7) [Subject *speak* [?Direct Quotation of Question] V-TAM/CONN]
   (Buddha)   *SALPHATA-ay*   ***nil***-*otAy*   [when making a residence]
   Buddha   [name]-to   speak-as   ....
   moncye   *mul-ey   peley   is-nAn-ka*   ***po***-*tAy*...
   first   water-LOC   bug   exist-PRES-Q   see-CONN
   'Buddha says to Salphata that when making a residence (one needs to) see first if there are bugs in the well and...' (< Lit. Buddha speaks to Salphata, "When making a residence, (one needs to) see first, "Is there a bug in the well?" and...")
                                                                        (1459, *Welinsekpo* 25:57a)

In (7), the underscored part, an embedded clause, is a question 'Are there bugs in the well?', and thus the sentence may seem to be structurally similar to (6). However, it is not likely that the person who is looking for a place suitable for dwelling is truly uttering the question. In other words, the residence seeker is only 'putatively' saying it at the moment of examining a well to make sure that it is not contaminated by bugs. Thus the question did not originate from the well-examiner but rather from the speaker, i.e. Buddha. This is immediately reminiscent of the notion of a 'borrowed mouth' (Rhee 2009), through which speakers dramatize the description of a state.[5]

---

weakly surviving in certain dialects), and consequently *pangcem* fell into disuse from the 17th century in writing.

[4] Following the common practice among Korean linguists, Chinese characters in historical texts are romanized with small capitals with the sound values of Modern Korean (e.g. *SALPHATA* in (7)); thus they may not be historically correct renderings.

[5] For instance, Rhee (2009) provides a large number of adverbs of quotative origin, e.g. *cwukelako* 'desperately' from 'saying, "Die!"', *cwuknuntako* 'self-pitifully' from 'saying, "I am dying"',

It is noteworthy that the main verbs in (6) and (7) are different in kind, i.e. the one in (6) is a locution verb, whereas the one in (7) is not. In the history of Korean, most constructions involving the locution verb (as *ha-* 'say' in (6) above) combined with the connective *-ko* 'and' develop into COMP constructions; and other constructions (as *po-* 'see' in (7) above), into SQCs.[6] These differential patterns can be schematically presented as in (8):

(8)   a. [.............-Q] say-and   >   COMP
      b. [.............-Q] V...   >   SQC

3.2. SQC modal sentence-final particles (SFPs)

Throughout history, a number of modal sentence-final particles (SFPs) developed from SQCs. In Korean, SFPs are a constellation of finite-verb morphology indicating tense, aspect, modality, mood, honorification, sentence-type, politeness, etc. organized in a number of ordered slots.

Modal SFPs derived from SQCs normally occupy non-ultimate sentence-final slots (most commonly the penultimate and antepenultimate slots, as in (9) and (10)-(11), respectively) and signal diverse subjective and intersubjective meanings across such functional domains as evidentiality, boulomaicity, epistemicity, emotionality, etc. Grammaticalization of modal SFPs derived from SQCs is observed around the turn of the 20th century. For instance, *-ka po-* (1895, *Chimyengilki*) and *-na po-* (1896, *Toklipsinmwun*) are the earliest attestations, both SFPs signaling inferential evidentiality. Some of such markers are illustrated with examples and their source constructions in (9) through (11), marked as (a) and (b), respectively:

(9) Evidential (Inferential) *-napo-*
    a. *pi-ka*   *o-**napo**-a*
       rain-NOM   come-**INFR**-END
       'It seems to be raining.'

    b. (source construction) *-na po-* '-Q see-'
       pi-ka   *o-**na   po**-a*
       rain-NOM   come-**Q   see**-END
       Lit. '(I) see (saying,) "Is it raining?"'
       << Lit. '"Is it raining?" (I) see.'

---

nacalnasstako 'haughtily' from 'saying, "I am great"', *michyesstako* 'nonsensically' from 'saying, "I am insane"', etc. These words of subjectified meaning describe an event in a dramatic way. The utterances attributed to an event participant did not materialize in reality; they have been only imagined in the mind of the speaker, whence the term 'borrowed mouth'.

[6] A notable exception is the SQC connective *-nahako,* which developed from *-na ha-ko* 'Q say-and'; see 3.3.

(10) Evidential (Inferential) & Emotional (Apprehensive) *-nasiph-*
    a. *nal-i*   *etwuweci-**nasiph**-e-yo*
       day-NOM   darken-**INFR/APPR**-END-POL
       '{It seems, I'm afraid} it's getting dark.'

    b. (source construction) *-na siph-* '-Q want-'
       <u>*nal-i*   *etwuweci-**na siph**-e-yo*</u>
       day-NOM   darken-**Q   suppose**-END-POL
       Lit. '(I) suppose (saying,) "Is it getting dark?"'
       << Lit. '"Is it getting dark?" (I) suppose/want.'

(11) Boulomaic (Tentative intention) *-kkaha-*
    a. *cip-ey*   *ka-l-**kkaha**-y-yo*
       home-to   go-FUT-**TINT**-END-POL
       'I might go home (instead of waiting, etc.).'

    b. (source construction) *-kka ha-* '-Q say/do-'
       cip-ey   *ka-l-**kka   ha**-y-yo*
       home-to   go-FUT-**Q say**-END-POL
       Lit. '(I) am saying, "Shall (I) go home?"'
       << Lit. '"Shall I go home?" (I) am saying.'

As shown in the examples above, SQC modal SFPs are derived from the combination of a Q-ender and the verb in the main clause. As is clear from the comparison between the modal SFP sentences and their source constructions, there is no extensive phonological reduction in form, contra typical cases of grammaticalization in which phonological reduction is a common concomitant. Also notable is the semantics of the main verbs that participate in the formation of SQCs: they are verbs of cognition, perception and locution. Verbs of these categories are among the source lexemes that are most prone to grammaticalizing into clausal linkers across languages (Heine *et al.* 1993; Lord 1993; Frajzyngier 1996; Hopper, Traugott 2003[1993]; Heine, Kuteva 2002; Kuteva *et al.* 2019, among others). As expected, Korean SQCs indeed develop from such verbs, as shown in (12):

(12) SQC modal SFPs[7]
    a. *-napo-*   [Q.see]   modal, evidential (inferential)
    b. *-kapo-*   [Q.see]   modal, evidential (inferential)
    c. *-kkapo-*   [Q.see]   modal, boulomaic (tentative intention)
    d. *-nasiph-* [Q.suppose] modal, evidential (inferential); emotional
                                 (apprehensive)

---

[7] As an anonymous reviewer points out, the question markers, especially *-ka* and *-kka*, are historically related. Since they have diverged in form and function in contemporary Korean, they are treated as separate morphemes here without further discussion.

  e. *-kasiph-* [Q.suppose] modal, epistemic (probability); emotional (apprehensive)

  f. *-kkasiph-* [Q.suppose] modal, boulomaic (tentative intention)

  g. *-naha-* [Q.say] modal, evidential (inferential)

  h. *-kkaha-* [Q.say] modal, boulomaic (tentative intention)

  i. *-namolu-* [Q.not:know] modal, epistemic (lack of confidence); emotional (apprehensive)

  j. *-kamolu-* [Q.not:know] modal, epistemic (lack of confidence); emotional (apprehensive)

  k. *-kkamolu-* [Q.not:know] modal, epistemic (lack of confidence); emotional (apprehensive)

  l. *-cimolu-* [$^?$Q.not:know] modal, epistemic (possibility)[8]

As is common in all grammaticalization scenarios involving multiple forms in the same functional category, individual members of SQCs have differential degrees of constructionalization or 'entrenchment' (Langacker 1987, p. 59; 1991, pp. 44-45). Similarly, the verbs that occur in the list in (12) are those with a relatively higher level of entrenchment, though to various degrees, but there are other verbs of cognition and perception that are relatively less productive and less formulaic, but still render SQC interpretations, e.g. *sayngkakha-* 'think', *uyaha-* 'wonder', *ohayha-* 'misunderstand', etc.[9]

3.3. Modal connectives

Most (but not all) modal SFPs also developed into clausal connectives. This development took place simply by having their collocational sentence enders (glossed as END in the examples in (9)-(11)) replaced with connectives (CONNs), some of which, incidentally, are homophonic with the sentence ender (END). Since such a simple syntactic replacement operation can occur at any stage of language change, the development of modal SQC connectives appears to have occurred instantaneously. The earliest attestations occur around the turn of the 20th century. Some of such modal clausal connectives

---

[8] The interrogative sentence ender *-ci* is first attested in Early Modern Korean, but it is also used as a connective (Ko 2011, pp. 447-460). Its origin is controversial. Rhee (2003) hypothesizes its connection with the nominalizers *-ki* and *-ti* and Rhee (2012) elaborates on its function of marking epistemic stances such as conviction, self-assurance, prediction and exclamation. It does not exclusively specialize in interrogatives and can be used across diverse speech acts, but when it is used in combination with the present marker *-n* (i.e. *-n-ci*), as in SQCs, its function is strongly associated with the interrogative speech act.

[9] Incidentally, these mental state verbs are further analyzable as *sayngkak-ha-* 'thought-do', *uya-ha-* 'suspicion-do' and *ohay-ha-* 'misunderstanding-do'.

are illustrated with examples and their source constructions in (13)-(15), marked as (a) and (b), respectively:

(13) Epistemic (possibility) (& Emotional (Apprehensive)) -nahako
    a. *pyengina-ss-**nahako***   *yenlakha-yss-e*
       fall.sick-PST-**POSB/APPR**   contact-PST-END
       '(I) called fearing that (you) might have fallen sick.'

    b. (source construction) *-na ha-ko* '-Q say-and'
       *pyengina-ss-**na   ha-ko***   *yenlakha-yss-e*
       fall.sick-PST-**Q   say-and**   contact-PST-END
       Lit. '(I) said "Has (he) fallen sick?" and contacted (you/him..).'
       << Lit. '"Has (he) fallen sick?" (I) say and contacted (you/him..).'

(14) Epistemic (possibility) & Emotional (Apprehensive) -kkapwa
    a. *nuc-ul-**kkapwa***   *setwulu-n-ta*
       be.late-FUT-**POSB/APPR**   hurry-PRES-DEC
       '(I) hurry fearing late arrival.'

    b. (source construction) *-kka po-a* '-Q see-and'
       *nuc-ul-**kka   po-a***   *setwulu-n-ta*
       be.late-FUT-**Q   see-and**   hurry-PRES-DEC
       Lit. '(I) see (=imagine) (saying,) "Will (I) be late?" and hurry.'
       << Lit. '"Will (I) be late?" (I) see and hurry.'

(15) Epistemic (possibility) (& Emotional (Apprehensive)) -kkasiphe
    a. *ney-ka*   *o-l-**kkasiphe***   *kitali-ess-e*
       you-NOM   come-FUT-**POSB**   wait-PST-END
       '(I) waited since you might come.'

    b. (source construction) *-kka siph-e* '-Q suppose-and'
       ney-ka   *o-l-**kka   siph-e***   *kitali-ess-e*
       you-NOM   come-FUT-**Q suppose-and** wait-PST-END
       Lit. '(I) supposed (saying,) "Will (he) come?" and waited.'
       << Lit. '"Will (he) come?" (I) supposed and waited.'

In addition to the CONNs exemplified above, there are others that also originated from SQCs. Such CONNs are listed in part in (16) with the meanings of the component forms and their functions:

(16) SQC Modal connectives
    a. *-nahako*   [Q.say.and]   modal, epistemic (possibility); (emotional (apprehensive))
    b. *-kahaye*   [Q.say.and]   modal, epistemic (possibility); (emotional (apprehensive))
    c. *-nahaye*   [Q.say.and]   modal, epistemic (possibility); (emotional (apprehensive))
    d. *-nasiphe*   [Q.suppose.and] modal, epistemic (possibility)

e. *-kkasiphe*　　[Q.suppose.and]　modal, epistemic (possibility)
f. *-kasiphe*　　[Q.suppose.and]　modal, epistemic (possibility)
g. *-kkapwa*　　[Q.see.and]　　modal, epistemic (possibility); emotional (apprehensive)
h. *-kamolla*　　[Q.not:know.and] modal, epistemic (possibility); emotional (apprehensive)[10]
i. *-kkamolla*　　[Q.not:know.and] modal, epistemic (possibility); emotional (apprehensive)
j. *-kkamwusewe* [Q.be:fearful.and] modal, epistemic (possibility); emotional (apprehensive)

As shown in the list in (16), the most productive function of these SQC modal connectives is to mark the epistemic stance of possibility together with the emotional stance of apprehensive. This has to do with the close conceptual connection between questions on the one hand and uncertainty, possibility, conjecture and fear on the other hand (Rhee, Kuteva 2018). There are other closely related modal connectives denoting causality, but since they exhibit a peculiarity in terms of their form (i.e. they use question markers only), they are addressed separately in 3.5.

3.4. Discourse connectives

Some SQC connectives further developed to serve distinctive discourse functions. The distinction between the modal SQC connectives illustrated above and the discourse SQC connectives lies in the differences in selection of the participating connectives; that is, the former typically make use of the coordinating connectives *-a/e* and *-ko,* both glossed as 'and' (for the subtle functional distinction see Koo 1987), whereas the latter use subordinating connectives such as *-myen* 'if' and *-(e/a)se* 'as, since'. Some of such discourse connectives are exemplified below with their source constructions:

(17) Topic presentation connective *-kahamyen*
　　a. *kuke-y　　mwe-ø-n-**kahamyen**　wancen　　sinceyphwum-i-ya*
　　　　it-NOM　　what-be-PRES-**TOP**　　completely　new.product-be-END
　　　　'Speaking of the thing, it is a completely new product.'

　　b. (source construction) *-ka ha-myen* '-Q say-if'
　　　　*kuke-y　　mwe-ø-n-**ka　　　ha-myen**　wancen　　sinceyphwum-i-ya*
　　　　it-NOM　　what-be-PRES-**Q　　say-if**　　completely　new.product-be-END
　　　　Lit. 'If (I/one) say "What is it?" it is a completely new product.'
　　　　<< Lit. '"What is it?" if I say/one says, it is a completely new product.'

---

[10] The verb *molu-* 'not know' is inflected as *molla* when followed by the linker (or homophonic sentence-ender) *-a.*

(18) Topic presentation connective *-kohani*
 a. *keki-ka eti-ø-n-**kohani** palo wuli cip yeph-i-ya*
  there-NOM where-be-PRES-**TOP** just our house side-be-END
  'Speaking of the location of the place, it is just next to my house.'

 b. (source construction) *-ko ha-ni* '-Q say-as'
  *keki-ka eti-ø-n-**ko** **ha-ni** palo wuli cip yeph-i-ya*
  there-NOM where-be-PRES-**Q say-as** just our house side-be-END
  Lit. 'As (I/one) say "Where is that place?" it is just next to my house.'
  << Lit. '"Where is that place?" as I say/one says, it is just next to my house.'

(19) Transferentive connective *-kahamyen*[11]
 a. *pom-i o-nun-**kahamyen** palo yelum-i-ta*
  spring-NOM come-PRES-**TRNS** presently summer-be-DEC
  'No sooner does spring come than it becomes summer.'

 b. (source construction) *-ka ha-myen* '-Q say-if'
  *pom-i o-nun-**ka** **ha-myen** palo yelum-i-ta*
  spring-NOM come-PRES-**Q say-if** presently summer-be-DEC
  Lit. 'If (I/one) say "Is spring coming?" it is summer right away.'
  << Lit. '"Is spring coming?" if I say/one says, it is summer right away.'

These discourse connectives are thus named for their characteristic feature of making a description more dramatic and vivid. This is largely due to the fact that they involve a feigned interactive question-and-answer style, as compared to their non-SQC counterparts, e.g. the topic marker *-nun*, the transferentive connectives *-taka, -teni,* etc. These feigned interactions of asking a question and then answering it can arouse a sense of vividness, and for this reason it has been observed across languages that reported talks are closely related to attitude, evaluation and stance (Aikhenvald 2004; Fitzmaurice 2004; Clift 2006; Clift, Holt 2007; Spronck 2012; Rhee 2016). SQC discourse connectives are listed in (20):

(20) SQC discourse connectives
 a. *-kahamyen* [Q.say.if] topic (elaboration prelude); transferentive
 b. *-nyamyen* [Q.say.if] topic (elaboration prelude)[12]
 c. *-kohani* [Q.say.as] topic (elaboration prelude)

---

[11] The grammatical notion of 'transferentive' was introduced by Martin (1954, p. 47) for labeling the connective *-ta(ka)* in Korean, which 'indicates a change or shift of action' (1992, p. 260). Unlike the connective *-taka*, *-kahamyen* further signals that the change of the scene occurs in a fast (celerative) and unexpected (mirative) way.

[12] The discourse connective *-nyamyen* is a phonologically eroded form of *-nya ha-myen* '-Q say-if'.

3.5. SQC causal connectives

The last functional category of SQCs is the paradigm of causal connectives. This development may be said to be dramatic in that the self-quoted utterances appear in the bare form, i.e. with none of the morphological markers that normally license their appearance and with no host verbs such as 'do,' 'say,' 'want,' etc. These connectives mark the clause that denotes the cause of the event or state described by the main clause. Some of such markers are exemplified with their respective source constructions in (21) through (24):

(21)   a. Connective (Causal) -*ka*

    pi-ka   *o-nun-__ka__*   *kkamkkamha-ta*

    rain-NOM   come-PRES-**CONN**   be.dark-DEC

    'It's dark, perhaps because it's raining.'

    b. (source construction) -*ka* '-Q'

    pi-ka   *o-nun-__ka__*   *kkamkkamha-ta*

    rain-NOM   come-PRES-**Q**   be.dark-DEC

    'Lit. "Is it raining?" it's dark.'

(22)   a. Connective (Causal) -*na*

    amwu-to   *eps-__na__*   *coyongha-ta*

    anyone-even   not.exist-**CONN**   be.quiet-DEC

    'It's quiet, perhaps because there's nobody around.'

    b. (source construction) -*na* '-Q'

    amwu-to   *eps-__na__*   *coyongha-ta*

    anyone-even   not.exist-**Q**   be.quiet-DEC

    'Lit. "Is nobody here?" it is quiet.'

(23)   a. Connective (Causal & Apprehensive)

    motwu-ka *cencayng-i na-l-__kka__*   *kekcengha-koiss-ta*

    all-NOM   war-NOM   break.out-FUT-**CONN**   worry-PROG-DEC

    'Everyone is worried that a war might break out.'

    b. (source construction) -*kka* '-Q'

    motwu-ka *cencayng-i na-l-__kka__*   *kekcengha-koiss-ta*

    all-NOM   war-NOM   break.out-FUT-**Q**   worry-PROG-DEC

    'Lit. Everyone (saying) 'Will a war break out?' is worried.'

(24)   a. Connective (Causal) -*ci*

    paykakophu-n-__ci__   *aki-ka*   *wu-n-ta*

    be.hungry-PRES-**CONN**   baby-NOM   cry-PRES-DEC

    'The baby is crying perhaps because she's hungry.'

    b. (source construction) *-ci* '-Q'
       *paykakophu-n-**ci**   aki-ka   wu-n-ta*
       be.hungry-PRES-**Q**   baby-NOM   cry-PRES-DEC
       'Lit. "Is (she) hungry?" the baby is crying.'

As the causal connectives exemplified above have not undergone any change in form, they are not formally distinguishable from those used with the original function of marking interrogative sentences. Despite their formal identity, however, they have undergone changes in their function, i.e. from question marking to causality marking, as well as in their grammatical classes, i.e. from sentence-enders to connectives. A noteworthy aspect of these causal connectives is that they all encode uncertainty of the causal relation, as indicated by 'perhaps' and 'might' in the translations of the examples. This uncertainty seems to have been inherited from the 'question' associated with the source construction, since questions are inherently indeterminate. The pragmatic indeterminacy in the speech act of asking has been semanticized in the development of connectives and thus the strength of causality has been weakened.

4. Discussion

In the preceding section we have seen diverse functions of SQCs that depart from true quotations or questions. There are a number of issues that deserve in-depth discussion from a theoretical perspective. Prominent among them are the notions of sentencehood, structural bondedness, conceptual integration with functional reinterpretation and analogy.

4.1. Sentencehood

The development of SQCs, especially those that signal the causal relation discussed in 3.5 raises the issue of what constitutes a sentence. The markers *-ka, -na, -kka* and *-ci* illustrated in (21)-(24), for example, are Q-markers in both form and meaning, as they are identical with interrogative sentence-enders, and at a deeper level they mark the speech-act of asking, though self-directed. In Korean, a verb-final language, the indicators of speech-acts such as statement, question, command and proposition occur in the ultimate slot of verb morphologies, and thus the presence of such markers signals the end of a sentence. This state of affairs leads to the logical conclusion that the clauses marked with these exponents in the examples constitute erstwhile sentences. In other words, examples (21)-(24) consist of two complete sentences, one of which may be discontinuous as (23).

The location of these markers in the examples, however, is exactly the location of a connective in Korean complex sentence structures. This is well illustrated by (23), repeated here as (25), in comparison with (26), which is its closest paraphrased counterpart with a regular linker, *-lako*:

(25) (modified from (23a/b))
 motwu-ka cencayng-i na-l-kka   *kekcengha-koiss-ta*
 all-NOM war-NOM break.out-FUT-{**Q, CONN**} worry-PROG-DEC
 'Everyone is worried that a war might break out.'
 'Lit. Everyone (saying) "Will a war break out?" is worried.'

(26) *motwu-ka cencayng-i na-li-lako*   *kekcengha-koiss-ta*
 all-NOM war-NOM break.out-FUT-**COMP** worry-PROG-DEC
 'Everyone is worried that a war might break out.'

The peculiarity of (25) is that the two sentences, 'Everyone is worried' and 'Will a war break out?' are asyndetically combined, i.e. they are juxtaposed without any explicit linking device. The single-sentence interpretation of (25), which is applicable to all other SQCs, is forced in part by the fact that the clause denoting 'Will the war break out?' occurs as embedded in the other clause denoting 'Everyone is worried.' (Note that the latter's subject and predicate are separated by the embedded clause). The interpretation is also pragmatically motivated by the connection between the two clauses, i.e. 'the possibility of war breaking out' as the cause of 'everyone's worrying'.

   This phenomenon resembles, though remotely, the cross-linguistically common phenomenon variously labeled as 'comment clauses' (Brinton 2008), 'parentheticals' (Dehé, Kavalova 2007a, and papers therein), or 'theticals' (Kaltenböck *et al.* 2011; Heine *et al.* 2012; Heine 2013).[13] When inserted material appears in the form of fully autonomous clauses, the situation will be similar to that of SQCs, because such forms are "linearly represented in a given string of utterance (a host sentence), but seem structurally independent at the same time" (Dehé, Kavalova 2007b, p. 1), as is shown in the following examples, taken from Dehé and Kavalova (2007b, p. 3 and p. 8, respectively):

---

[13] An anonymous reviewer raises a concern that parentheticals are very different from SQCs in function. It is indeed true that the functional similarity is not substantial, but in certain subtypes of SQCs such as the modal connectives as exemplified in (25), the source construction of SQC is not formally integrated into the matrix clause, resembling parentheticals. It becomes a grammatical construction with a modal function only when it becomes a SQC. From this perspective, it can be said that a self-quoted question that began its life as a parenthetical has become a SQC through grammaticalization.

(27) a. It's been a mixture of extreme pleasure *I've had hundreds of letters from all sorts of people who have enjoyed the book* and considerable irritation because of being constantly interviewed (ICE-GB: s1b-046, #2)

b. The main point - *why not have a seat?* - is outlined in the middle paragraph.

In the examples, the italicized sentences are linearly placed in the middle of their host sentence. The inserted sentence and host sentence do not have any morphosyntactic devices (such as relativizers), a state of affairs similar to that of SQCs. Parentheticals of this kind, however, are different from SQCs in that the former tend to be a product of insertion typically motivated by pragmatics, whereas SQCs perform a function that is integral to the meaning of the utterance as a whole, such as signaling topic, inference, causality, apprehension, etc. in relation to the semantics of the main clause.

The development of structural compacting from multiple juxtaposed, full-fledged sentences into a single sentence, which is common, at least in Korean, points to the fact that language users do not seem to be much constrained, in language use, by the grammatical categories, such as sentence-enders (see Koo, Rhee 2013b for similar states of affairs involving a promissive developing into an imperative, and Rhee, Koo 2015 for a verbal connective developing into a marker of tepidity at various levels of grammar). Such apparent 'frivolity' in language use blurs the notion of sentential boundaries in linguistic analysis.

4.2. Structural bondedness

In much current research on grammaticalization, the degree of grammaticalization is presumed to be inferable from a number of parameters, such as semantic abstraction, increase in token frequency, morpho-syntactic compacting, phonological reduction, etc. When a multi-word construction is involved, the bond between the polylexemic forms tend to become stronger, as is widely explained with respect to the English futurity marker *be going to* into *be gonna* (Hopper, Traugott 2003[1993]).

In the case of SQCs, the polylexemic forms, such as sentence-final particles and clausal connectives, have undergone interlexical bonding to such an extent that they cannot contain intervening forms like degree modifiers inside them, as exemplified in the following with the modal connective -*kkamolla*:

(28)   a. CONN -*kkamolla* modal, epistemic (possibility); emotional (apprehensive)
        << *-kka molu-a* '-Q not:know-and'
        *hoyuy-ey   nucu-l-**kkamolla**   thayksi-lul   tha-ss-ta*
        meeting-at be.late-FUT-**CONN**   taxi-ACC   take-PST-DEC
        'I took a taxi because I might be late for the meeting.'

       b. Intervening modifier between Q and V
        *??hoyuy-ey   nucu-l-**kka**   **cengmal moll-a**   thayksi-lul   tha-ss-ta*
         meeting-at be.late-FUT-Q **really**   not.know-and taxi-ACC   take-PST-DEC
         (intended) 'I took a taxi truly because I might be late for the meeting.'
         (non-modal interpretation possible) 'I really didn't know if I would be late for
           the meeting and I took a taxi.'[14]

       c. Non-intervening modifier
        cengmal   *hoyuy-ey*   *nucu-l-**kkamolla***   *thayksi-lul tha-ss-ta*
        really   meeting-at   be.late-FUT-**CONN**   taxi-ACC   take-PST-DEC
        'I took a taxi truly because I might be late for the meeting.' or
        'I took a taxi because I might be really late for the meeting.'

This non-insertability of modifiers in between the componential formants is
applicable across all SQCs. This suggests that SQCs have undergone
grammaticalization at the morphosyntactic level.

4.3. Conceptual integration with functional reinterpretation

The development of SQCs begs the question of the role of discourse in
grammaticalization (Heine *et al.* 1991; Hopper, Traugott 2003[1993]) and of
discursive strategies (Rhee 2016, 2017; Koo, Rhee 2013a). For instance, as
briefly hinted at in 3.5, interrogative sentence enders have 'indeterminacy' as
an inherent semantic feature. Therefore, most SQCs carry, though to different
degrees, some nuance of indeterminacy, such as possibility, lack of
confidence, tentativeness, inference, etc.
      Another noteworthy aspect of the development of SQCs is that the
interrogative sentence enders occurring in these constructions are those
specializing in self-directed questions. As argued for in Rhee and Koo (2017)
in the discussion of 'audience-blind forms', these question markers do not
display direct *vis-à-vis* interaction with addressees, but their use suggests that
the question is only directed to the self, i.e. the speaker poses a question to
him/herself. Therefore, the use of questions thus marked characterizes a
'dialogue' between the speaking self and the thinking self. This type of

---

[14] Strictly speaking (28b) is not ungrammatical, since the non-modal interpretation is possible. In the
non-modal interpretation, the form denotes a literal, non-grammaticalized meaning such as "I
really didn't know and", which contrasts with the grammaticalized modal meaning of
apprehensive/possibility in (28a).

feigned interactivity brings forth an effect to make a text more dramatic and vivid as compared to the texts that do not employ such rhetorical devices. Recent research reveals that many instances of grammaticalization in Korean are triggered by the speaker's desire to increase interactivity by making use of rhetorical, thus non-genuine, interaction (Kim 2011; Koo, Rhee 2013a; Sohn 2013; Rhee 2016).

Still another aspect of SQCs relates to the nature of the participating verbs. As noted in 2.2 and 3.2, the verbs that serve as a component of SQCs are largely verbs of locution, cognition and perception, e.g. *ha-* 'say', *siph-* 'want/suppose', *po-* 'see', etc. Such verbs constitute a well-known class susceptible to grammaticalization into clausal linkers such as complementizers (cf. *inter alia* Lord 1976; Klamer 2000; Hopper, Traugott 2003[1993]).

The conceptual integration of these semantic features, i.e. 'indeterminacy', 'self-directedness' and 'locution/cognition/perception' triggers the emergence of modal meanings in the epistemic, evidential, boulomaic and emotional domains. The emergence of functions in such domains and the acquisition of membership in a different grammatical class by individual constructions is effected through pragmatic inferencing and analogy ('context-induced reinterpretation', Heine *et al.* 1991; 'invited inference', Traugott, Dasher 2002). The pragmatic inferencing involved in the development of the grammatical concept of 'causality' can be exemplified as follows with example (22), repeated here as (29c) and preceded by its source construction (a) and an analysis (b):

(29) (modified from (22))

    a. (source construction) *-na* '-Q'

        amwu-to   *eps-**na***   *coyongha-ta*

        anyone-even   not.exist-**Q**   be.quiet-DEC

        'Lit. "Is nobody here?" it is quiet.'

    b. (reinterpretation from pragmatic inferencing)

           ["Is nobody here?" It is quiet.]

      >>   [It being so quiet makes me ask myself, "Is nobody here?"]

      >>   [The quietness is (perhaps) caused by there being nobody.]

      >>   [It's quiet perhaps because there is nobody.]

    c. Connective (Causal) *-na*

        amwu-to   *eps-**na***   *coyongha-ta*

        anyone-even   not.exist-**CONN**   be.quiet-DEC

        'It's quiet perhaps because there is nobody around.'

In the above, it can be noted how language users pragmatically infer a causal relation from the given juxtaposed sentences, the conventionalization of which eventually led to the grammaticalization of a SQC causal connective.

4.4. The role of analogy in grammaticalization

We have noted in 3.2 that not all constructions involving self-directed questions have undergone comparable degrees of grammaticalization. Only a subset of such constructions with certain collocational patterns of embedded self-quoted questions developed into modal expressions manifesting themselves as verbal morphology, most prominently in the paradigm of sentence-final particles. Their development, in turn, triggered the development of multiple forms in other paradigms, such as modal, causal and discourse connectives. This process seems to be best explained by making reference to analogy.

The role of analogy in grammaticalization, however, has not been well recognized, primarily because grammaticalizationists in general subscribe to the hypothesis that "only reanalysis can create new grammatical structures" (Hopper, Traugott 2003[1993], p. 64), whereas analogy brings forth rule spread and paradigmatic leveling. It is well known that even Meillet (1912, pp. 131-132), naming analogy (*innovation analogique*) and grammaticalization (*attribution du caractère grammatical à un mot jadis autonome*) as two major sources of new grammatical forms, had claimed that analogy is not a primary source, but grammaticalization is, because analogy can only operate when there is a well-established rule; only in such case can an innovative form arise.

Recent research, however, strongly suggests that analogy can play a crucial role in grammaticalization (cf. Fischer 2008, 2011; De Smet 2010; Rhee 2014; Rhee, Koo 2015). For instance, Rhee (2014, p. 597) argues that the paradigm of concomitance connectives, e.g. *-tamyense, -lamyense, -nyamyense* and *-camyense,* emerged as the declarative-based connective *-tamyense* first developed into a full-fledged grammatical marker; other members followed the trodden path.

The development of SQCs also suggests that it is indeed a process of analogically-motivated paradigm formation. When a paradigm is formed, not all members emerge simultaneously. Instead, the most prototypical member, which is conceptually most salient and thus frequently used, acquires a new grammatical function, and other less prototypical members follow this trailblazer without necessarily being very frequently used themselves. This scenario is also argued for in Rhee (2014) with reference to the development of diverse complementizer-based paradigms. Similarly, the development of SQCs seems to have occurred through analogy by virtue of the semantic and

morphosyntactic resemblances between the forerunner and its followers, which is supported in part by the facts that the members have different frequencies and that they emerged at different times of history. This innovative analogy is triggered by structural and conceptual affinities between the trailblazer and its followers. In the case of SQCs, the relevant affinities with the source constructions are: (i) embedded questions, (ii) self-directed question enders and (iii) locution, cognition and perception verbs in the matrix verb position. The driving force of the shared source characteristics with respect to grammaticalization paths and results can be explained by the source determination hypothesis (Bybee *et al.* 1994). Depending on the grammatical properties of the participating forms, they come to form different, yet related, paradigms.

4.5. Implications for grammar

We have observed that the SQCs exemplified above, which exhibit a range of question particles and connectives, developed into grammatical markers in the semantic domains of evidentiality, epistemicity and emotional stance, such as inferential evidentiality, speaker's tentativeness in volition, causal evaluation of states of affairs, apprehensive emotion, etc., as well as the more discursive functions of dramatizing a narrative or engaging the audience by means of feigned interactivity, i.e. self-raised questions and answers to them (see *inter alia* Koo 2004, 2009; Koo, Rhee 2016 for a discussion of the role played by cognitive forces in the grammaticalization and lexicalization processes of Korean).

The development of individual SQCs shows the emergence of new grammatical forms and new grammatical functions in a local domain. Behind this exemplar-based grammaticalization scenario is a larger change in grammar in general. The local development consequently triggered the re-organization of grammar at a global level, i.e. the paradigms of sentence-final particles, modal connectives, discourse connectives and causal connectives that existed before the grammaticalization of SQCs had to be inevitably reorganized with a functional division of labor with newly arisen members of the class of SQCs. A detailed analysis of such a macroscopic grammatical change, however, should await further research.

5. Summary and conclusion

Korean has a number of sentence enders and connectives that originated from self-quoted question constructions. These SQCs typically involve embedded questions and verbs of locution/cognition/perception, and as a result of

grammaticalization they have strong internal bondedness and behave as single grammatical morphemes. It is argued that the conceptual integration of 'indeterminacy' from the question speech-act, 'self-directedness' from the use of audience-blind interrogative SFPs and 'locution, cognition and perception' from the semantics of the participating verbs triggered the emergence of modal meanings in epistemic, evidential, boulomaic and emotional domains, and that the change was enabled through analogy by virtue of the structural and conceptual affinities with the source constructions. The grammaticalization of certain SQCs involves discourse strategies of dramatizing a narrative or engaging the audience by means of feigned interactivity, i.e. self-raised questions and answers to these. It is argued further that multiple paradigms developed through analogy, pragmatic inferencing and functional reinterpretation.

Bionotes:
Hyun Jung Koo is Professor of Korean Linguistics at Sangmyung University, Korea. She received her Ph.D. in linguistics from Konkuk University, Korea in 1989. She served the Korean Association of Speech Communication (president, 2015-2017). She has published a number of book chapters including one in *Pejoration* (2016, John Benjamins) and research articles in journals including *Lingua, Terminology, Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* and *Language Sciences,* among others. The fields of her primary research interest are semantics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, cognitive linguistics and teaching Korean as a foreign language.

Seongha Rhee is Professor of Linguistics at Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Korea. He received his Ph.D. in linguistics from the University of Texas, Austin in 1996. He served the Linguistic Society of Korea (president, 2013-2014) and the Discourse and Cognitive Linguistic Society of Korea (president, 2009-2011). He has published book chapters in *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization* (2011, OUP), *Shared Grammaticalization* (2013, John Benjamins), etc. and research articles in journals including *Journal of Pragmatics* and *Language Sciences*. His primary research interest is to identify cognitive and discursive mechanisms that enable language change from the cross-linguistic and typological perspectives.

Authors' addresses: hyunjkoo@smu.ac.kr; srhee@hufs.ac.kr

*Lingue e
Linguaggi*

References

Aikhenvald A. 2004, *Evidentiality*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Brinton L.J. 2008, *The Comment Clause in English: Syntactic Origins and Pragmatic Development,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Bybee J.L., Perkins R. and Pagliuca W. 1994, *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*, Chicago University Press, Chicago.

Clift R. 2006, *Indexing Stance: Reported Speech as an Interactional Evidential,* in "Journal of Sociolinguistics" 10 [5], pp. 569-595.

Clift R. and Holt E. 2007, *Introduction*, in Holt E. and Clift R. (eds.), *Reporting Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 1-5.

De Smet H. 2010, *Grammatical Interference: Subject Marker* for *and Phrasal Particles* out *and* forth*, in Traugott E.C. and Trousdale G. (eds.), *Gradualness, Gradience and Grammaticalization*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 75-104.

Dehé N. and Kavalova Y. (eds.) 2007a, *Parentheticals*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Dehé N. and Kavalova Y. 2007b, *Parentheticals: An introduction,* in Dehé N. and Kavalova Y. (eds.), *Parentheticals*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 1-22.

Fischer O. 2008, *On Analogy as the Motivation for Grammaticalization,* in "Studies in Language" 32 [2], pp. 336-382.

Fischer O. 2011, *Grammaticalization as Analogically Driven Change?,* in Narrog H. and Heine B. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization,* Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 31-42.

Fitzmaurice S. 2004, *Subjectivity, Intersubjectivity and the Historical Construction of Interlocutor Stance: From Stance Markers to Discourse Markers*, in "Discourse Studies" 6 [4], pp. 427-448.

Frajzyngier Z. 1996, *Grammaticalization of the Complex Sentence: A Case Study in Chadic*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Heine B. 1997, *Cognitive Foundations of Grammar,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Heine B. 2013, *On Discourse Markers: Grammaticalization, Pragmaticalization, or Something Else?,* in "Linguistics" 51 [6], pp. 1205-1247.

Heine B., Güldemann T., Kilian-Hatz C., Lessau D., Roberg H., Schladt M. and Stolz T. 1993, *Conceptual Shift: A Lexicon of Grammaticalization Processes in African Languages,* Universität zu Köln, Köln.

Heine B. and Kuteva T. 2002, *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Heine B., Claudi U. and Hünnemeyer F. 1991, *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Heine B., Kaltenböck G., Kuteva T. and Long H. 2012. *An Outline of Discourse Grammar,* in Bischoff S. and Jeny C. (eds.), *Reflections on Functionalism in Linguistics,* De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, pp. 155-206.

Hopper P.J. and Traugott E.C. 2003[1993], *Grammaticalization*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Johanson L. and Robbeets M. 2010, *Introduction*, in Johanson L. and Robbeets M. (eds.), *Transeurasian Verbal Morphology in a Comparative Perspective: Genealogy, Contact, Chance,* Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, pp. 1-5.

Kaltenböck G., Heine B. and Kuteva T. 2011, *On Thetical Grammar,* in "Studies in Language" 35 [4], pp. 848-893.

Kim A.H-O. 2011, *Rhetorical Questions as Catalyst in Grammaticalization: Deriving*

Korean Discourse Marker ketun *from Conditional Connective,* in "Journal of Pragmatics" 43, pp. 1023-1041.

Klamer M. 2000, *How Report Verbs Become Quote Markers and Complementizers*, in "Lingua" 110, pp. 69-98.

Ko E.S. 2011, *Kwuke Uymwunpep Emiuy Yeksacek Pyenchen* [Historical change of Korean interrogative endings], Hankook Publisher, Seoul.

Koo H.J. 1987. *Ssikkuth* -a, -key, -ci, ko-*uy Ssuimkwa Uymi* [The usage and semantics of suffixes, *-a, -key, -ci* and *-ko*], in "Konkuk Emwunhak" 11-12, pp. 167-188.

Koo H.J. 2004, *A Cognitive Analysis of Lexicalization Patterns of (Dis-)Honorification in Korean,* in "Korean Semantics" 14, pp. 97-120.

Koo H.J. 2009, *Force Dynamics as a Variational Factor: A Case in Korean*, in "LACUS Forum" 33, pp. 201-210.

Koo H.J. and Rhee S. 2013a, *On an Emerging Paradigm of Sentence-Final Particles of Discontent: A Grammaticalization Perspective,* in "Language Sciences" 37, pp. 70-89.

Koo H.J. and Rhee S. 2013b, *"I will do it... but I'm asking you to do it": On the Emergence of Polite Imperative from Promissive,* in "Procedia–Social and Behavioral Sciences" 97, pp. 487-494.

Koo H.J. and Rhee S. 2016, *Pejoratives in Korean*, in Finkbeiner R., Meibauer J. and Wiese H. (eds.), *Pejoration*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 301-323.

Kuteva T., Heine B., Hong B., Long H., Narrog H. and Rhee S. 2019, *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization* (2nd, extensively revised and updated ed.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Langacker R.W. 1987, *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Vol. 1, Theoretical Prerequisites,* Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Langacker R.W. 1991, *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Vol. 2, Descriptive Application,* Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Lichtenberk F. 1991, *Semantic Change and Heterosemy in Grammaticalization,* in "Language" 67 [3], pp. 475-509.

Lord C. 1976, *Evidence for Syntactic Reanalysis: From Verb to Complementizer in Kwa*, in "Chicago Linguistic Society" 12, pp. 179-191.

Lord C. 1993, *Historical Change in Serial Verb Constructions*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Martin S.E. 1954, *Korean Morphophonemics,* Waverly Press, Baltimore.

Martin S.E. 1992, *A Reference Grammar of Korean,* Charles E. Tuttle, Singapore.

Meillet A. 1912, *L'évolution des forms grammaticales,* in "Scientia" 12, Reprinted in Meillet A. 1948, *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale 1,* Edouard Champion, Paris, pp. 130-148.

Rhee S. 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, Seoul.

Rhee S. 2003, *When Stop Goes Further: From Malta 'Stop' to Auxiliary Verbs in Korean,* in "Korean Language Research" 13, pp. 309-339.

Rhee S. 2008, *Subjectification of Reported Speech in Grammaticalization and Lexicalization,* in "Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics" 12, pp. 590-603.

Rhee S. 2009, *Through a Borrowed Mouth: Reported Speech and Subjectification in Korean,* in "LACUS Forum" 34, pp. 201-210.

Rhee S. 2012, *Stance-Taking and Sentence Types in Korean.* Paper presented at the First Int'l Conference of Homo Sensus: Perception, Emotion and Semiosis, Hankuk Univ. of Foreign Studies, Seoul, June 8-9, 2012, Conference Handbook, pp. 53-70.

Rhee S. 2014, *Analogy-Driven Grammaticalization: A Case of Grammaticalization of Sentence-Final Markers from Concomitance-Connectives,* in "Linguistic Research" 31 [3], pp. 591-614.

Rhee S 2016, *From Quoting to Reporting to Stance-Marking: Rhetorical Strategies and Intersubjectification of Reportative,* in "Language Sciences" 55, pp. 36-54.

Rhee S. 2017, *What Happens When the Will Withers: The Case of Hortative in Korean,* in "Lingua" 189-190, pp. 46-65.

Rhee S. and Koo H.J. 2015, *Analogy-Driven Inter-Categorial Grammaticalization and (Inter)subjectification of* -na *in Korean,* in "Lingua" 166, pp. 22-42.

Rhee S. and Koo H.J. 2017, *Audience-Blind Sentence-Enders in Korean: A Discourse-Pragmatic Perspective,* in "Journal of Pragmatics" 120, pp. 101-121.

Rhee S. and Kuteva T. 2018, *Apprehensive Markers in Korean*. Paper presented at the 51st Annual Meeting of Societas Linguistica Europaea, Tallinn University, Estonia, August 29 - September 1, 2018.

Simons G.F. and Fennig C.D. (eds.) 2018, *Ethnologue: Languages of the World* (21st ed.), SIL International, Dallas. www.ethnologue.com (11.102019).

Sohn S.O. 2011, *Historical Development of Quotative Constructions in Korean*, in "Japanese/Korean Linguistics" 18, pp. 126-143.

Sohn S.O. 2013, *Dialogic Contexts for the Emergence of New Grammar: The Case of Final* -ketun *in Korean*, in Sohn S.O., Cho S. and You S.H. (eds.), *Studies in Korean Linguistics and Language Pedagogy*, Korea University Press, Seoul, pp. 185-199.

Sohn S.O. and Park M.J. 2003, *Indirect Quotations in Korean Conversations*, in "Japanese/Korean Linguistics" 11, pp. 105-118.

Spronck S. 2012, *Minds Divided: Speaker Attitudes in Quotatives*, in Buchstaller I. and Van Alphen I. (eds.), *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and Cross-disciplinary Perspectives,* John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 71-116.

Traugott E.C. and Dasher R.B. 2002, *Regularity in Semantic Change,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.