Recursive ι-phrasing and Yo-particle in Korean: A Derivational Approach

CLAIM The distribution of yo-particle in Korean has resisted a principled account in the study of generative grammar. We argue that it can be best accounted for in terms of prosody. The distributional facts indicate that yo-attachment targets the right edge of phonological phrase (φ) while its prosodic facts indicate that a yo-phrase corresponds to intonational phrase (ι) given its boundary tone. This puzzle is resolved in a derivational approach to prosodic category formation (Pak 2008), and the apparent exceptions in the previous studies receive a straightforward account. Furthermore, given its ι status, yo-attachment constitutes evidence for prosodic phrase recursion (Ito and Mester 2012).

DATA & EXPLANATION The yo-particle usually follows the verb at the end of a sentence, conveying politeness toward the addressee. However, it may optionally spread over the sentence-medial non-verbal elements (Lee and Park 1999):

(1) Kim-i(-yo) ecey(-yo) kkaphey-eysye(-yo) Lee-lul(-yo) mannsse-yo.
    ‘Kim saw Lee at the café yesterday.’

Only on the presence of the sentence-final yo may optional sentence-medial yo’s occur. The phrases containing medial yo are ι’s given the boundary tone (HL%), being a distinctive property of ι (Jun 1998). As in (2), ι (the whole sentence) contains another layer of ι’s (yo-phrases). That is, yo-attachment is involved with recursive prosodic phrasing (Ito and Mester 2012).

(2)

We further argue that while yo-phrases carry the ι boundary tone, yo-attachment applies to φ rather than ι. Consider (3a) where there is no medial -yo:

(3) a. [φ{Kim-i} φ{Lee-lul} φ{mannsse-yo}]  b. Kim-i(-yo) Lee-lul(-yo) mannsse-yo.

A structural Case-marked NP forms φ, and the entire sentence forms an ι. At first sight the possible yo-attachment site, shown in (3b), corresponds to the right edge of a φ, but the actual yo-phrase constitutes an ι. That is, we have a ‘prosodic size’ discrepancy.

The discrepancy can be resolved if we assume that the prosodic categories are created in a derivational manner (Pak 2008): ι is formed by combining φ’s. On this assumption we propose that yo-attachment takes place after φ-phrasing and before ι-phrasing.

(4) a. φ{Kim-i} φ{Lee-lul} φ{mannsse-yo}  ≤ φ-phrasing
    b. φ{Kim-i-yo} φ{Lee-lul-yo} φ{mannsse-yo}  ≤ yo-insertion
    c. dφ{Kim-i-yo} dφ{Lee-lul-yo} dφ{mannsse-yo}  ≤ (minimal) ι-phrasing
    d. dφ{Kim-i-yo} dφ{Lee-lul-yo} dφ{mannsse-yo}  ≤ (maximal) ι-phrasing

Once φ-phrasing ends (4a), yo-insertion applies (4b). Subsequently, ι-phrasing takes place for the yo-phrases (4c) and in turn for the entire sentence (4d). Note that φ containing yo turns into ι under this derivational approach to prosodic phrasing.

The proposed analysis accounts for apparent “exceptions” observed in the previous studies (Lee and Park 1991). Thus, adverbs such as ‘immediately’ usually resist yo-attachment whereas they allow it in an elliptical context like fragment answers (Yim 2012).
(5) a. Ikes-ul tangcang(*-yo) chelihase-yo. this-Acc immediately(*-yo) handle-yo ‘Have this done immediately.’
   b. \[\phi\{Ikes-ul\} \phi\{tangcang(*-yo)\} chelihase-yo\]  
   c. Tangcang-yo! (as a response to a question like ‘By when must I have this done?’) 
   d. \[\phi\{Tangcang\} \rightarrow \phi\{Tangcang-yo\} \rightarrow [\phi\{Tangcang-yo\}]\]  

The ill-formedness of (5a) with the particle on the adverb follows from the fact that there is no \(\phi\) boundary between ‘immediately’ and ‘handle’, as given in (5b). However, sentences like (5c) are acceptable since the adverb alone forms a \(\phi\), so that yo-attachment gets applicable. Moreover, yo-attachment is allowed in the context where a \(\phi\)-boundary is forced:

(6) a. \(\ast\)kapcaki-(yo) pwuthakhaysse-yo  
suddenly-(yo) requested-yo ‘(someone) asked (something) all at once.’
   b. kapcaki-(yo) kosonhi pwuthakhaysse-yo  
suddenly-(yo) politely requested-yo ‘(someone) asked (something) politely all at once.’

Although kapcaki ‘suddenly’ resists -yo when it immediately precedes the verb as in (6a), it allows -yo when another adverb intervenes and a prosodic boundary is forced to be created between the two adverbs. The contrast in (6) clearly shows that yo-attachment is not specific to a certain syntactic category but it is a prosodic phenomenon.

A similar account carries over to various yo-resistant categories that have been considered exceptional in the previous studies; e.g. relative clauses, preverbal classifiers, degree phrases modifying adjectives, NPs without a Case particle, the first verbs in the serial verb constructions, and so forth (Lee and Park 1991, Yim 2012).

We also argue that the same line of analysis applies to the Japanese particle ne:

(7) Taro-ga(-ne) Hanako-ni(-ne) atta-yo.  
    Taro-Nom(ne) Hanako-Dat(-ne) met-yo ‘Taro met Hanako.’

Like Korean yo, ne is optional, and when it shows up, the use of the sentence final yo is strongly preferred. The particle ne, once attached, requires a pause after it, indicating the presence of an \(\iota\)-phrase boundary, while it apparently attaches to the right edge of the so-called bunsetsu (which roughly corresponds to accentual phrase/minor phrase). We show that the distribution of ne is also accounted for straightforwardly in terms of the proposed derivational prosodic analysis.
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