

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.'
- b. ***Tangsın**-i cemsim-ul sa-**la**.
you.HONORIFIC-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 (Zanuttini 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-/-mas-* whose person feature is valued to be second via agreement with HEARER in SpecSAP.

(5) [_{saP} SPEAKER sa⁰ [_{SAP} HEARER SA⁰ [_{CP} C⁰ [_{TP} ...]]]]

Applying (5) to jussive clauses would result in (6). Following Miyagawa2012, I assume that C⁰ head-moves upto SA⁰ via sa⁰. However, unlike Miyagawa, I assume that C⁰ obtains its person feature in Spec-Head configuration: C⁰_{PROM} agrees with SPEAKER, C⁰_{IMP} with HEARER, C⁰_{EXH} with both SPEAKER and HEARER (cf. Zanuttini et al.2012).

(6) [_{saP} SPEAKER C⁰+SA⁰+sa⁰ [_{SAP} HEARER C⁰+SA⁰ [_{CP} C⁰_{PROM/IMP/EXH/DECL/INT} [_{TP} ...]]]]

The present analysis treats jussive clauses on a par with DECL/INT clauses (contra, Pak2006;Zanuttini 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 *-ta/-ni* (7c). As discussed above, jussive particles are not used for politeness.

(7) a. Cemsim-ul mek-**ess-ta./ni**? b. *Cemsim-ul mek-**ess-ma/la/ca**.
lunch-ACC eat-PST-DECL/INT lunch-ACC eat-PST-PROM/IMP/EXH
‘John ate lunch/Did John eat lunch?’

(8) a. Cemsim-ul mekess-**tey/kwun/ci/ney-yo**.
lunch-ACC ate-RETRO/APPER/SUPP/APPR-DECL.POL
b. *Cemsim-ul mek-**tey/kwun/ci/ney-ma/la/ca**.
lunch-ACC eat-RETRO/APPER/SUPP/APPR-PROM/IMP/EXH
c. *Cemsim-ul mekess-**ta/ni**.
lunch-ACC ate-RETRO/APPER/SUPP/APPR-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.

References Haegeman, L., Hill, V. 2010. The Syntacticization of discourse, Ms, Ghent University and University of New Brunswick-Sj. Miyagawa, S. 2012. Agreements that occur mainly in main clauses. *Main Clause Phenomena. New Horizons*, Lobke, A., Haegeman, L, Nye, R., (eds), 79-112. Amsterdam, John Benjamins. Oyharcabal, B. 1993. Verb agreement with non-arguments: On allocutive agreement. In *Generative Studies in Basque Linguistics*. Jose Ignacio Huaide & Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds), 89-114. John Benjamins. Pak, M. 2006. Jussive Clauses and Agreement of Sentence Final Particles in Korean. In T. Vance and K. Jones, eds., *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 14, 295-306. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. Zanuttini, R., Pak, M., Portner, P. 2012. A syntactic analysis of interpretive restrictions on imperative, promissive, and exhortative subjects. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 30(4): 1231-1274.