

A Syntax-Discourse Interface Approach to Embedded Jussives in Korean

Jong Un Park & Myung-Kwan Park

Dongguk University

Goal: This paper aims to argue that interpretive patterns of jussives—three minimally distinct clause types whose meaning is roughly to update the To-do list of the speaker and/or addressee (Portner (2007))—in embedded (as well as root) contexts in Korean can be derived by assuming not only Jussive Phrase (JussP) (Zanuttini et al. (2012)) but also Speaker/Addressee Phrase (SaP) (Tenny (2006)) in the left periphery.

Root jussives: As regards the clause structure of root jussives, Zanuttini et al. (2012) suggest that there is JussP above TP in promissives, imperatives and exhortatives (grouped as ‘jussives’) in Korean, and that the person feature of a subject of each subtype of jussive clauses is uniquely determined by inheriting a person feature from Juss⁰ via Agree. A core argument in favor of the existence of JussP is based on a distinctive jussive marker co-varying with the clause type. Building on Zanuttini et al.’s analysis, this paper further argues that as schematized in (1), there is an additional layer, SaP, above JussP, whose specifier hosts a speaker operator (Op_S), an addressee operator (Op_A), and a sum of the speaker and addressee operator (Op_{S⊕A}) depending on the clause type (cf. Park (2011)).

(1) [SaP Op_{S/A} [JussP [TP pro_i [vP t_i [vP (DP) V⁰] v⁰] T⁰] Juss⁰] Sa⁰]

The subject *pro* whose person feature is valued via Agree with Juss⁰ should be further syntactically bound by the relevant discourse participant operator: the subject of a promissive (2a) needs to be bound by Op_S, that of an imperative (2b) by Op_A, and that of an exhortative (2c) by Op_{S⊕A}.

- (2) a. [NP e] sihem-ey hapkyekha-**ma**. (PROMISSIVE)
 exam-in pass-PRM
 ‘I/we/*you_{SG,PL}/*he/*she/*they promise to pass the exam.’
 b. [NP e] sihem-ey hapkyekhay-**la**. (IMPERATIVE)
 exam-in pass-IMP
 ‘(You_{SG,PL}/*I/*he/*she/*we/*they) pass the exam!’
 c. [NP e] sihem-ey hapkyekha-**ca**. (EXHORTATIVE)
 exam-in pass-EXH
 ‘Let us/*me/*you/*him/*her/*them pass the exam.’

The Op_S, Op_A, or Op_{S⊕A} can be overtly realized, and sentence (3) is an instance where Op_{S⊕A} takes its overt form (the data and reading from Seo and Hoe (2015)). The first occurrence of *wuli* encodes the ‘point-of-viewer’ (Seo (2017)) while the second one the ‘subject.’

- (3) Mina-ya, **wuli(-*ka)** wuli-ka cemsim-ul sa-ca.
 Mina-VOC we(-NOM) we-NOM lunch-ACC buy-EXH

Intended. ‘Mina, lets’ we buy your lunch in our point of view.’

Embedded jussives: Views on the embeddability of imperatives across languages are not uniform. It was argued in the past literature that imperatives cannot be embedded (Sadock and Zwicky (1985), Palmer (1986), Platzack and Rosengren (1998), Han (2000), to name a few). A number of recent studies, however, have claimed that imperatives are embeddable in some languages (Fujii (2006) for Japanese; Pak (2006), Portner (2004, 2007) for Korean; Platzack (2007) for Old Scandinavian; Rus (2005) for Slovenian; Crinč and Trinh (2010) for English). As shown in (4) below, not only imperatives but also the other subtypes of jussives have been shown to be embedded in Korean, and those cases are argued to be an instance of Obligatory Control (OC) (Madigan (2008); Park (2011)).

- (4) a. John_i-un Mary_j-eykey [e_{i/*j} hakkyo-ey ka-**ma**-ko]
 John-TOP Mary-DAT school-to go-PRM-COMP
 yaksokhay/*myenglyenghay/*ceyanhay-ss-ta.

- promise/order/propose-PAST-DECL (SUBJECT CONTROL)
 ‘John promised/*ordered/*proposed to Mary to go to school.’
- b. John_i-un Mary_j-eykey [e*_{i/j} hakkyo-ey ka-**la**-ko]
 John-TOP Mary-DAT school-to go-IMP-COMP
 myenglyenghay/*yaksokhay/*ceyanhay-ss-ta
 order/promise/propose-PAST-DECL (OBJECT CONTROL)
 ‘John ordered/*promised/*proposed to Mary to go to school.’
- c. John_i-un Mary_j-eykey [e_{i+j} hakkyo-ey hamkkey
 John-TOP Mary-DAT school-to together
 ka-**ca**-ko] ceyanhay/*yaksokhay/*myenglyenghay-ss-ta.
 go-EXH-COMP propose/promise/order-PAST-DECL (SPLIT CONTROL)
 ‘John proposed to/*promised/*ordered Mary to go to school together.’

Following Park (2011), we suggest that not only JussP but also SaP are present in the embedded jussives, and this idea basically presupposes that speech acts can be represented in embedded context in Korean (cf. Ross’s (1970) Performative Hypothesis). Just as in the root jussives, the person feature of an embedded subject in each subtype is determined by Agree with Juss⁰ in the embedded jussives; and the embedded subject should then be syntactically bound by a speaker operator (Op_S), an addressee operator (Op_A), or a sum of the two (Op_{S⊕A}) in Spec-SaP for licensing. However, unlike the root jussives, the operators in the embedded jussives need to be bound by the closest matrix argument, not directly by Op_S, Op_A or Op_{S⊕A} in the root Spec-SaP. The fact that only a limited range of overt pronouns can be realized in an embedded jussive clause, as in (5), follows from the proposed analysis (data from Park (2011)).

- (5) a. John_i-un Mary_j-eykey [{ku_i-ka/caki_i-ka} honca hakkyo-ey
 John-TOP Mary-DAT he-NOM/self-NOM alone school-to
 ka-**ma**-ko] yaksokhay-ss-ta.
 go-PRM-COMP promise-PAST-DECL
 ‘John promised Mary that {he (John)/self (John)} would go to school alone.’
- b. *Na_i-nun Mary_j-eykey [caki_i-ka honca hakkyo-ey
 I-TOP Mary-DAT self-NOM alone school-to
 ka-**ma**-ko] yaksokhay-ss-ta.
 go-PRM-COMP promise-PAST-DECL
 Intended: ‘I promised Mary that self (I) would go to school alone.’

In the present analysis, the Op_S in the embedded Spec-SaP in (5a,b) should be syntactically bound by the matrix subject. However, this binding option is ruled out independently in (5b), unlike (5a). The LD anaphor *caki*, which must be bound by Op_S in the embedded Spec-SaP, fails to be bound by the binder *na-nun* later, since the latter is identified with the actual speaker and a non-third person element cannot license *caki* (cf. Hong (1990), Kim (1994)).

Conclusion: In a nutshell, it should be underscored that the core idea of this paper that SaP is also available in embedded jussives is one tenable way to capture Kaufman’s (2014) generalization on the embeddability of imperatives (and the other subtypes of jussives) in Korean, namely that actual context and matrix context may be different in all parameters (i.e., Speaker, Hearer and Context parameters) in the language.

Selected references: Kaufmann, M. (2014) Embedded imperatives across languages: Too rare to expect, too frequent to ban. Handout presented at Stony Brook; Park, J. U. (2011) Clause Structure and Null Subjects: Referential Dependency in Korean. Ph.D. Diss., Georgetown Univ.; Tenny, Carol. 2006. Evidentiality, experiencers, and the syntax of sentience in Japanese. *JEAL* 15, 245–288. Zanuttini et al. (2012) A syntactic analysis of interpretive restrictions on imperative, promissive, and exhortative subjects. *NNLT* 30: 1231-1274.