

## What Korean Promissives tell us about Jussive Clause Types

Miok Pak, Paul Portner and Raffaella Zanuttini  
Georgetown University

Sentences like (1) in Korean exemplify a clause type that is cross-linguistically rare, promissives:

- (1) Nayil      nay-ka cemsim-ul sa-**ma**  
Tomorrow I-NOM lunch-ACC buy-PRM  
'I will buy lunch tomorrow.'

Sentence (1) can only be used with the force of promising. The type is marked by the sentence-final particle *-ma*, analogous to the sentence final particles in imperatives, exhortatives, declaratives, and interrogatives in (2)-(5):

- |                                       |                                   |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| (2) IMPERATIVE                        | (3) EXHORTATIVE                   |
| Cemsim-ul mek- <b>ela</b> .           | Icey cemsim-ul mek- <b>ca</b> .   |
| Lunch-ACC eat-IMP                     | Now lunch-ACC eat-EXH             |
| 'Eat lunch!'                          | 'now, let us eat lunch.'          |
| (4) DECLARATIVE                       | (5) INTERROGATIVE                 |
| Na-nun cemsim-ul mek-ess- <b>ta</b> . | Cemsim-ul mek-ess- <b>ni/nya?</b> |
| I-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PAST-DEC          | Lunch-ACC eat-PAST-INT (Q)        |
| 'I ate lunch.'                        | 'Did you eat lunch?'              |

In this paper, we will argue that an analysis of promissives gives us a better insight to the understanding of the more common clause types, imperatives and exhortatives. In particular, we argue the following:

1. Promissives, imperatives, and exhortatives are actually all members of a single clause type, which we label 'jussives'.
2. These types differ in the semantic values of their subjects: promissive subjects are associated with the speaker, imperative subjects with the addressee, and exhortative subjects with the speaker+addressee.
3. There is a syntactic projection, the Participant Phrase, that is headed by jussive particles (i.e., *-ma*, *-ela*, and *-ca* for promissives, imperatives, and exhortatives, respectively) and encodes speaker features in promissives, addressee features in imperatives, and both speaker and addressee features in exhortatives. These features bind the clause's subject or a variable within the subject, accounting for point 2.
4. The Participant Phrase is independently motivated as it plays a role in explaining another prominent aspect of Korean grammar, the speech style particles.

Promissives share a significant number of similarities with imperatives and exhortatives: (i) when embedded, they do not allow an overt subject, (ii) they do not allow mood particles, e.g. *-te* (retrospective), *-kwun* (apperceptive), and *-ney* (apprehensive), (iii), they allow a special negative marker *-mal* in negative formation, (iv) they do not allow tense markers, and (v) they can be conjoined by *-ko* 'and', the same clause coordinator.

Besides the common characteristics above, promissives, imperatives, and exhortatives are similar in another aspect. Promissive subjects must refer to the speaker(s) or quantify over the set of speakers:

- |                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| (6) Cemsim-ul sa- <b>ma</b>  | (7) Nayil      wuliy motwuta tasiy o- <b>ma</b> |
| Lunch-ACC buy-PRM            | Tomorrow we      everyone      again come-PRM   |
| 'I will buy lunch tomorrow.' | 'Everyone of us will come back tomorrow.'       |

Similar constraints hold with the other jussive sub-types, with imperatives being associated with the addressee(s) and exhortatives with the group consisting of the speaker(s) and addressee(s) (Mauck et al. 2005). We can make sense of these facts by viewing if we think of their functions: promissives are used to place a requirement on the speaker, while imperatives place a requirement on the addressee, and exhortatives on both the speaker and addressee. We can model this notion of 'placing a requirement' formally (cf. Han 1998, Portner & Zanuttini 2002, Potts 2003, Roberts 2004, Portner 2004), though not in this abstract.

We explain the range of possible values for the subject in (6)-(7) by proposing that the head of the Participant Phrase in the left periphery of the clause encodes features that identify

the subject with either speaker or addressee or both the speaker and addressee. Specifically, in promissives, this head encodes the feature [speaker]; this feature must bind a variable in the subject, restricting it to only refer to the speaker. This results in a property which can be added to the speaker's To-do List. If the subject position contains nothing but this variable (either a pronoun or pro), we get the interpretation in (6). Alternatively, the variable can be part of a quantifier, representing its domain of quantification (Stanley & Zsabo 2000), resulting in a reading like (7). This derivation can be semi-formally represented as in (8)-(9):

- (8)a  $[_{\text{ParticipantP}} [\text{speaker}]_i [_{\text{IP}} x_i [_{\text{VP}} \text{buy lunch}]]]$   
 (8)b  $[\lambda x_i : x = \text{speaker}(c) . \text{buy-lunch}(x_i)]$   
 (9)a  $[_{\text{ParticipantP}} [\text{speaker}]_i [_{\text{IP}} [\text{every one of } x_i] [_{\text{VP}} \text{will come back tomorrow}]]]$   
 (9)b  $[\lambda x_i : x = \text{speaker}(c) . \forall y \in x [\text{buy-lunch}(x_i)]]$

The Participant Phrase receives independent motivation in Korean from a class of sentence-final particles known as 'speech-style particles'. Some are illustrated in (10) for declaratives:

- (10) Na-nun cemsim-ul mek-ess-**e/eyo/so/supnita**.  
 I-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PAST-*Intimate/Polite/Semiformal/Formal*  
 'I ate lunch.'

The intimate style, which is sometimes called half-talk style, for example, is most commonly used by children or adults alike to family members, or between close friends. In Korean, knowing with which speech style particle to end a sentence is essential, as one cannot produce an utterance without a speech style particle. This knowledge is based on the awareness of the relationship between speaker and addressee. So the speech style particles linguistically encode and reflect the relationship between speaker and addressee. We note that jussive particles also serve this speech style function, in addition to marking the participant feature of the subject. We propose that both of these functions are represented in the Participant Phrase.

As there is further evidence for syntactic encoding of speaker and/or addressee in the literature (Cinque 1999, Speas 2005, Tenny 2000, among others), an analysis of jussives along these lines seems to be on the right track. However, certain questions arise. (i) Given the claim that promissives, imperatives and exhortatives form a single clause type characterized by the presence of a Participant Phrase, why are promissives cross-linguistically rare? That is, why do most languages exhibit imperatives and exhortatives but not promissives? (ii) Also how does the notion of speaker and/or addressee relate to that of person agreement? As for the former question, we speculate that the value "Addressee" is less marked than the value "Speaker" and therefore more commonly available across languages. A hypothesis along these lines seems to be supported by evidence from the agreement system, in particular in the case of subject clitics, where it has been observed that second person subject clitics are less marked than first person subject clitics (Renzi and Vanelli 1983). This idea only works, however, if our [speaker] and [addressee] features can be identified with the person features which show up in agreement systems. We leave these open questions for further research.

#### Selected references:

- Potts, C. (2003) "Keeping world and will apart: A discourse-based semantics for imperatives." Talk delivered at the NYU Syntax/Semantics Lecture Series, October 17, 2003. Handout available at <http://www-unix.oit.umass.edu/%7Epotts/>
- Renzi, L. and L. Vanelli (1983) "I pronomi soggetto in alcune varietà romanze." In *Scritti linguistici in onore di Giovan Battista Pellegrini*. Pisa, Pacini: 121-145.
- Speas, M. (2005) "Evidentiality, logophoricity and the syntactic representation of pragmatic features." Ms., University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Stanley, J. and Z. Szabo. (2000). "On Quantifier Domain Restriction." *Mind and Language* 15, 2&3, 219-261.
- Tenny, C. (2000) "Core events and adverbial modification." In *Events as grammatical objects*, edited by C. Tenny and J. Pustejovsky. CSLI Publications. pp. 285-334.