On Multiplicity of Discourse-Cognitive Strategies in Grammaticalization: The Case from Simultaneity to Cause to Surprise

1. Introduction

- Korean has a number of clausal connectives that developed through a fusion of complementizers (COMP), signalling that they originated from marking quoted speech.
- These COMP-based connectives underwent diverse semantic-functional changes reflecting the speaker’s attitude toward the quoted speech.
- Many of the COMP-based connectives developed into sentence final particles (SFPs) through a process of main-clause ellipsis (‘insubordination’).
- This paper addresses the grammaticalization processes that were involved in the development of one such SFP, -tamyense.

(1) a. Clausal Connective (CONN)
    ku-ka pappu-tamyense an manna-cwu-n-ta
    he-NOM be.busy-CAUS not meet-BEN-PRES-DEC
    ‘He refuses to see (me) because he is busy (Lit.: ..., while saying that he is busy).’

    b. Sentence-Final Particle (SFP)
    ne yocum pappu-tamyense
    you these.days be.busy-SFP
    ‘I hear you are busy, aren't you!’

(1a): clausal connective for marking causality
(1b): sentence-final particle for signalling subjectivity/intersubjectivity (i.e. addressee-confirmation, challenge, derision, surprise, etc.).

[Research Objectives]

- This paper intends:
  (i) to investigate how the SFP -tamyense was grammaticalized
  (ii) to analyze how multiple factors interplay in emergence of a grammatical function, which splits out of an older function and eventually forms a ‘heterosem’ (Lichtenberk 1991) relation.
  (iii) to illustrate that extensive semantic bleaching, ellipsis of the main clause, pragmatic inferencing, intersubjectification, and reanalysis play a role in the development of certain sentential endings that arose and are presently arising in Modern Korean.

2. Grammaticalization of -tamyense

2.1 Source Construction of -tamyense

- The SFP -tamyense developed from a direct quotation construction.
2.2 Development of Complementizer -tako

- The COMP -tako developed from the declarative sentence-type marker -ta (SFP), the verb of saying ha- ‘say’, and the connective -ko ‘and’.

(4) Developmental Stages of the COMP -tako (modified from Rhee 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage I</th>
<th>&gt;&gt;</th>
<th>Stage II</th>
<th>&gt;&gt;</th>
<th>Stage III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated Structure</td>
<td>Subordinated Structure</td>
<td>Phonological Reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...ta]-ha]-ko</td>
<td>...ta]-hako</td>
<td>...tako</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...SFP]-say]-and</td>
<td>...SFP]-QUOT.CONN</td>
<td>...COMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Development of Simultaneity Marker -myense

- Connective -mye started its life as one denoting concomitance in Old Korean.
- It was one of the most frequently used connectives in Middle Korean, marking various senses of concomitance, i.e. Simultaneity, Contingency, Background, Contrast, Enumeration and Alternation.
- From around the 15th c. -mye came to occur with the sequentiality marker -se (and its variant -sye).
• In the 19th century -mye comes to form its semantically and phonologically reinforced variant -myense, which is highly polyfunctional: Simultaneity, Background, Contrast and Adversativity.

(5)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-mye</th>
<th>-myense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneity</td>
<td>Simultaneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>Contingency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>Contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumeration</td>
<td>Adversativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Grammaticalization of Clausal Connective -tamyense

3.1 Clausal Connective of Simultaneity -tamyense

• From around 1890s, -myense underwent further syntagmatic fusion with declarative-based complementizer -tako, and becomes -tamyense [-tako ha-myense > -tamyense].
• The function of -tamyense that first occurred is to mark simultaneity: ’while saying that...’.

(6) Source Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>alasya</th>
<th>kongkwan-ey</th>
<th>chyulniphA-n-tako</th>
<th>hA-myensye</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>embassy-at</td>
<td>come.and.go-PRES-COMP</td>
<td>say-CONN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>liyengsil</th>
<th>kangcAyung-ulpoko</th>
<th>hA-nAn</th>
<th>mal-i...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[name]</td>
<td>[name]-DAT</td>
<td>say-ADN</td>
<td>word-NOM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘While saying (claiming) that he regularly goes to the Russian Embassy, what he said to Lee Youngsil and Kang Jaeung is that...’ (1896, The Toklipsinmwun Daily 523)

3.2 Clausal Connective of Cause -tamyense

• Around the turn of the 20th c., -tamyense began to cease to function as a true quotation-introducer, even though it originated historically from a complementizer construction.

(7) ku-ka | pappu-tamyense an manna-cwu-n-ta |
          | he-NOM | be.busy-CAUS  not meet-BEN-PRES-DEC |

‘He refuses to see (me) because he is busy (Lit.: ..., while saying that he is busy).’

3.3 Clausal Connective of Concessivity -tamyense

• Around the turn of the 20th c. the most common function of -tamyense was to mark concessivity ‘despite that...’.

(8) inmin-ul | pohohA-yacw-n-tamyensye ile-n | kes-ul |
          | people-ACC | protect-BEN-PRES-CONN | like.this-ADN | thing-ACC |
          | pAlkhy-ecwu-cian-nAn | kes-un... |
          | 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... (to neglect their job)' (1896, The Toklipsinmwun Daily 1858)
4. Grammaticalization of SFP –tamyense

• In the 20th century, the incomplete form became widely used with the main clause ellipsis (or ‘insubordination’ Evans 2007, or ‘suspended clause’ Ohori 1995), whereby the connective acquired the function of a sentence-ender (SFP).

4.1 SFP of Addressee-Confirmation

• The SFP -tamyense is used for addressee confirmation either with a question or statement intonation. This can often be in a discourse-initial utterance.

(10) ne yocum pappu-tamyense
    you these.days be.busy-SFP
    ‘You are busy these days? (So I heard.)’

4.2 SFP of Challenge

• The SFP –tamyense strongly carries the speaker’s challenging attitude when statements or situations are incongruous.

(11) A: (I’m going to the movie.)
    B: mwe? ne aphu-tamyense
        what? you be.sick-SFP
        ‘What? Aren’t you sick? (Didn't you say so?)’

(12) (to a corrupt and cruel nobleman)
    hakcyay mwunha-ey chyulip-ul ha-yas-tamyensye....
    scholar circle-at come.and.go-ACC do-PST-SFP
    yepo nA-s-kap-ina com ha-si-o
    look! age-GEN-value-PRT please do-HON-IMP
    ‘You were educated at a scholarly circle?!... Look, act like a man of your age!’
    (1911, Lee Haejo Hwaughyel 7)

4.3 SFP of Derision

• The SFP –tamyense signals the derisive attitude of the speaker.

(13) (To someone who failed a course)
    ani ne ipeney cangakkum tha-n-tamyense
    no you this.time scholarship earn-PRES-SFP
    ‘What? Weren’t you going to win a scholarship? (Didn’t you say so?)

4.4 SFP of Surprise

• The incongruity meaning develops into surprise, counterexpectation, mirativity.

(14) kyay-ka sicipka-n-tamyense!
    she-NOM marry-PRES-SFP
    ‘(Is it true that) she is going to marry?’
5. Discussion

5.1 Insubordination (Main-Clause Ellipsis)

- In the 20th century, the SFP –tamyense developed from the main clause ellipsis, in which situation the addressee tries to reconstruct the elided main clause, a phenomenon found to be often responsible for many instances of semantic changes through inferences in Korean (Koo 1999, Rhee 2002, 2008, 2010, 2012, Sohn 2003)

(15) A: [Let’s go shopping!]
B: ton eps-tamyense syophingha-le ka-ø? money not.exist-CONN go shopping-PURP go-SFP?
‘Go shopping while you say you have no money?’

(16) A: [Let’s go shopping!]
B: ton eps-tamyense? money not.exist-SFP(Challenge)
‘What? Didn't you say you have no money?’
(Lit. ‘While you say you have no money...?’)

5.2 Pragmatic Inference and Semantic Change

- The SFP/CONN –tamyense has many meanings, but their new meanings are not random.
- Semantic innovation is gradual because a new meaning arises out of the old one.

(17) In ellipsis, i.e., when the main clause is missing, the addressee is compelled to reconstruct the elided main clause, a process where context-induced reinterpretations (Heine et al. 1991), or invited inferences, actively take place.
- Such reinterpreted meanings are actively being conventionalized to become a part of the semantics of the newly emerging SFP.
(18) Inferring ‘Confirmation’ and ‘Challenge’ from Connective -tamyense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Connective Meaning</th>
<th>What Addresssee Hears</th>
<th>What Addresssee (Re)constructs</th>
<th>What Usually Follows When Used as Connective</th>
<th>What Addresssee Infers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Concurrence/Background</td>
<td>• while A</td>
<td>• in that time frame B</td>
<td>• concurrent event</td>
<td>• [B is the concurrent event of A]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contrast</td>
<td>• in contrast with A</td>
<td>• in contrast, B</td>
<td>• contrasting event</td>
<td>B is the current state bearing relevance to A;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A was already known to the speaker through a channel other</td>
<td>&gt;&gt; mild protest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>than the addressee</td>
<td>&gt;&gt; Addresssee Confirmation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[B is the contrasting event of A]</td>
<td>• [B is the contrasting event of A]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B is an event contrasting with A;</td>
<td>B is an event contrasting with A;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>speaker thinks the two events must be reconciled;</td>
<td>speaker thinks the two events must be reconciled;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>speaker demands addressee's emendation</td>
<td>speaker demands addressee's emendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;&gt; Challenge</td>
<td>&gt;&gt; Challenge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(19) A’s Inference of Challenge from the ‘go-shopping’ example (16)

(i) I heard B say “[You have no money]-TAMYENSE(Concurrent)?”.
(ii) B did not finish the sentence.
(iii) If B had completed the sentence it would have been:

   “[You have no money]-TAMYENSE(Concurrent), [[how can we go shopping at the same time?]]”

(iv) Having no money and going shopping are not compatible.
(v) B thinks that I should either revoke my claim (having no money) or my current proposal (going shopping).
(vi) Y is challenging my proposal.
(vii) -TAMYENSE may not be ‘while’; its meaning is more felicitous when interpreted as 'challenge'.
(viii) What I heard is: [You have no money]-TAMYENSE(Challenge)

5.3 Analogy-Driven Grammaticalization

• The grammatical forms follow the most frequently-used form that spearheads the change.
• For instance, those forms incorporated with the imperative, interrogative, and hortative markers follow the one with DEclarative marker -tamyense: i.e., -lamyense (imperative), -nyamyense (interrogative), -camyense (hortative).
• According to a quantitative analysis, such change is enabled purely by their semantic and morphosyntactic similarities, i.e. their paradigm membership, despite their extremely low token frequencies.
• This is contra two important hypotheses: that analogy is not a decisive mechanism of grammaticalization and that the high frequency is as essential as a prerequisite to set a condition for grammaticalization. (cf. Bybee and Hopper 2001 and works therein; Krug 2001; Bybee 2003, 2007, 2011; Torres Cacoullos and Walker 2011)
(20) Frequency of -{ta}myense Source Constructions (c. 1890-1920, The Sejong Corpus)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Forms</th>
<th>Token Frequency</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>-tako ha-myense</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-tako X-myense</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38 (86.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>-lako ha-myense</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-lako X-myense</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (9.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>-nyako ha-myense</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-nyako X-myense</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (2.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hortative</td>
<td>-cako ha-myense</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-cako X-myense</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (2.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ha-myense: 'while saying'
X-myense: X is a verb (mostly of cognition and locution)

(21) Frequency of -{ta}myense forms (c. 1890-1920, The Sejong Corpus)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Forms</th>
<th>Token Frequency</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>-tamyense</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>-lamyense</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>-nyamyense</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hortative</td>
<td>-camyense</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Formal Change and Reanalysis

- From a formal point of view, phonological erosion gives rise to opacity of the internal morpho-syntactic structure of the given form, resulting in an awkward situation where a constellation of multiple linguistic forms cannot be appropriately analyzed through traditional morpho-syntactic rules.
- The COMP -tako had the verb of saying ha- in it, but after its disappearance, speakers added another ha- to it, which eventually eroded again.
- Formal opacity triggers reanalysis whereby the remnants are construed as single grammatical units.
- Clausal ellipsis triggers the structural reanalysis of the connective into a sentential ending.

5.5 Subjectification and Intersubjectification

- Traugott (1982): semantic-pragmatic change in the initial propositional (ideational) content can gain either textual (cohesion-making) and expressive (interpersonal, and other pragmatic) meanings, or both: Propositional > ((textual) > (expressive)).
- The changes of CONN -myense from Simultaneity > Contingency > Background > Contrast > Adversativity are instances of subjectification.
- The changes of CONN -tamyense from Simultaneity > Cause > Concessivity are instances of subjectification.
- The pragmatic inference that operates in the process of main-clause reconstruction tends to involve intersubjectification (Traugott & Dasher 2002), because this type of main-clause ellipsis is often strategically employed in vis-a-vis dialogues, where the interlocutors have relatively a low level of risk since they can rescue the interaction once misinterpretation is detected.
- The changes of SFP -tamyense from Addressee-Confirmation > Challenge > Derision > Surprise are instances of intersubjectification.
6. Summary and Conclusion

- The grammatical change, as exemplified here, is not a local isolated phenomenon. Rather, numerous forms have followed, and are presently following, the same pattern, thus creating a massive heterosemy between connective and sentential ending functions.
- Even though the latter developed out of the former, the extent of pragmatic inference is such that there is no perceived semantico-functional affinity between them and they are considered as homophonous grammatical forms.
- Drawing upon historical data, this paper showed that orchestration of multiple grammaticalization mechanisms and discourse-cognitive strategies brings forth a large-scale effect in grammar, creating multiple functional paradigms derived from existing paradigms.
- Of significant findings in the analysis of the functional shift from Connectives > SFPs are:

(22) (i) The functional shift of -tamyense from Concomitance to Surprise is not abrupt but gradual along the conceptual continuum.
(ii) The development of the SFP -tamyense is triggered by main clause ellipsis.
(iii) The emergence of the SFP meanings is due to the ‘context-induced reinterpretation’ and pragmatic inferences.
(iv) (Inter-)subjective pragmatic inferences used to fill the information gap in elliptical structures become conventionalized comprising the semantics of the emerging function.
(v) Grammaticalization can be triggered by analogy, i.e., by the structural similarity and paradigm membership, rather than by virtue of high frequency and concomitant conceptual changes.

Abbreviations:

| ACC: | accusative | ADN: | adnominal | BEN: | benefactive | CAUS: | causative |
| COMP: | complementizer | CONN: | connective | DAT: | dative | DEC: | declarative |
| GEN: | genitive | HON: | honorific | IMP: | imperative | NEG: | negative |
| NOM: | nominative | PRES: | present | PRT: | particle | PST: | past |
| PURP: | purposive | SFP: | sentence-final particle | TOP: | topic |
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