On Jussive Clauses in Korean

This paper investigates clause-typing jussive particles in Korean (Pak2006). I propose that jussive clauses involve allocutive agreement (AA), and thus should be embedded under SpeechActPhrase (Miyagawa2012).

AA in Basque arises as a result of agreement with the non-argument addressee (Oyharcabal1993; Miyagawa2012). Also, AA encodes the speaker-hearer relationship: (1a) and (1b) are respectively used to talk to a male and female friend, while (1c) is used when the hearer is someone higher in status. Moreover, AA inflection is related to C⁰, and thus is disallowed to occur in interrogatives (2).

(1) a. Pettek lan egin dik.  
   Peter.ERG work.ABS do.PRF AUX-3S.ABS-2S.C.MSC.ALLO-3.S.ERG  
   ‘Peter worked.’ [hearer: a male friend]

   b. Pettek lan egin din.  
   Peter.ERG work.ABS do.PRF AUX-3S.ABS-2S.C.F.ALLO-3.S.ERG  
   ‘Peter worked.’ [hearer: a female friend]

   c. Pettek lan egin dizü.  
   Peter.ERG work.ABS do.PRF AUX-3S.ABS-2S.F.ALLO-3.S.ERG  
   ‘Peter worked.’ [hearer: someone higher in status]

(2) Lan egiten duia/*dina hire lagunak?  
   work AUX.3E.Q/ALLOfem.Q your friend.ERG  
   ‘Does your friend work?’

Interestingly, jussive particles—PROM(issives)/IMP(eratives)/EXH(ortatives)—behave in a parallel way to AA. First, jussive particles provide information about the discourse participants: PROM/IMP/EXH are respectively associated with speaker/addressee/speaker+addressee (Zanuttini et al.2012). I also observe that jussive particles encode information about the speaker-hearer relationship: the speaker must be at the same level as (not for PROM), and/or higher level than the hearer. For instance, (3) are infelicitous if uttered by a student to a teacher when the subject is a pronoun or unexpressed. Also, humble/honorific pronoun subjects are disallowed with jussive particles (4). Lastly, jussive particles are related to C⁰ and thus cannot co-occur with a DECL/INT particle (3).

(3) a. (Nay/Emma) cemsim-ul sa*-ma/*-ss-ta/*-ss-ni.  
   I/mother-NOM lunch-ACC buy-PROM/PST-DECL/PST-INT  
   ‘I/Mother will buy lunch.’

   b. (Ney/Inho-ka) cemsim-ul sa*-la/*-ss-ta/*-ss-ni.  
   you/Inho-NOM lunch-ACC buy-IMP/PST-DECL/PST-INT  
   ‘(You/Inho) Buy lunch.’

   c. (Wuri/Emma-hako Inho-ka) cemsim-ul sa*-ca/*-ss-ta/*-ss-ni.  
   we/mother-and Inho-NOM lunch-ACC buy-EXH/PST-DECL/PST-INT  
   ‘Let’s buy lunch./Mother and Inho will buy lunch.’

(4) a. *Cey-ka cemsim-ul sa*-ma.  
   I/HUMBLE-NOM lunch-ACC buy-PROM  
   ‘I(HUMBLE) will buy lunch.’

   you/HONORIFIFIC-NOM lunch-ACC buy-IMP  
   ‘You(HONORIFIC) buy lunch.’

   c. *Cehuy-ka cemsim-ul sa*-ca.  
   we/HUMBLE-NOM lunch-ACC buy-EXH  
   ‘Let’s (HUMBLE) buy lunch.’
Given the above similarities between AA and jussive particles, and the syntactic properties of jussive particles (Zanutttini et al.2012), I adopt the syntax of discourse (5) (Haegeman&Hill2010); CP is embedded under the SpeechActPhrase (saP/SAP), which provides discourse-related information about speaker/hearer. This approach is in line with Miyagawa2012, who adopts (5) in order to account for the Japanese politeness marking *-des*-l-mas-* whose person feature is valued to be second via agreement with HEARER in SpecSAP.

(5) \[ \text{[sap SPEAKER} \text{sa}^0 \text{[SAP HEARER} \text{SA}^0 \text{[CP} \text{C}^0 \text{[tp ...]]]} \]

Applying (5) to jussive clauses would result in (6). Following Miyagawa2012, I assume that C^0 head-moves upto SA^0 via sa^0. However, unlike Miyagawa, I assume that C^0 obtains its person feature in Spec-Head configuration: C^0_PROM agrees with SPEAKER, C^0_IMP with HEARER, C^0_EXH with both SPEAKER and HEARER (cf. Zanutttini et al.2012).

(6) \[ \text{[sap SPEAKER} \text{C}^0+\text{SA}^0+\text{sa}^0 \text{[SAP HEARER} \text{C}^0+\text{SA}^0 \text{[CP} \text{C}^0_{\text{PROM/IMP/EXH/DECL/INT}} \text{[tp ...]]]} \]

The present analysis treats jussive clauses on a par with DECL/INT clauses (contra, Pak2006;Zanutttini et al.2012). Pak2006 argues that jussive clauses should be distinguished from DECL/INT clauses. Some plausible differences are: (i) tense marking can co-occur with DECL/INT particles (7a), but not with jussive particles (7b); (ii) mood particles (retrospective -te, apperceptive -kwun, suppositive -ci, apprehensive -ney) can co-occur with DECL/INT particles (8a), but not with jussive particles (8b).

In fact, these arguments are far from convincing. First, the complementarity between tense marking and jussive particles is due to the future-oriented temporal property of jussive clauses. This property blocks other tense markings/interpretations. Second, the complementarity between mood particles and jussive particles is attributed to the semantic incompatibility. Such mood particles are used for politeness, so only polite form of DECL/INT particle -yo can be used with the mood particles (8a), but not the politeness-neutral -tal-ni (7c). As discussed above, jussive particles are not used for politeness.

   lunch-ACC  eat-PST-DECL/INT  lunch-ACC  eat-PST-PROM/IMP/EXH
   ‘John ate lunch/Did John eat lunch?’

   lunch-ACC ate-RETO/JUS-APPR/APP-DECL.POL
   lunch-ACC eat-RETO/JUS/APP-PR-DECL/IMP/EXH
   lunch-ACC ate-RETO/APP-PR-DECL/INT

The current analysis incorporates the speaker-hearer relationship, which has not been taken up in the literature, and provides a unified analysis of the clause-typing particles.
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