Incorporation of Some Pragmatic Aspects of Jussive Clauses into Syntax

INTRODUCTION This paper investigates jussive clauses in Korean. I argue that jussive clauses resemble the Basque allocutive agreement (AA) and thus must be embedded under Speech Act Phrase. I then propose that the jussive particle locally binds and agrees with the subject of jussive clauses and pragmatic argument(s). The proposed analysis can account for (i) the correlation between the vocative, the subject, and the jussive particle, and (ii) the polite form of the jussive particle.

AA=Jussive AA is a syntactic phenomenon that arises as a result of agreement with the pragmatic argument ADDRESSEE (Miyagawa 2012). AA encodes information about the speaker-addressee 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 is related to C°, and thus is disallowed to occur in interrogatives (2).


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

Interestingly, the phenomena observed in jussive clauses—PROM(IVES), IMP(ERATIVES), EXH(ORTATIVES)—are similar to AA in three respects. First, jussive particles provide information about the discourse participants: PROM, IMP and EXH are respectively associated with speaker, addressee and speaker-addressee (Lee 2004; Zanuttini et al. 2012). Second, I observe that jussive particles encode information about the speaker-addressee relationship: the speaker must be at the same level as (not for PROM), or higher level than the addressee. For instance, (3) is infelicitous if uttered by a student to a teacher when the subject is pronominal or unexpressed. Related to this, humble/honorific pronoun subjects are disallowed in jussive clauses as in (4). Lastly, jussive particles are related to C° and thus cannot co-occur with a declarative and interrogative particle as in (3).

(3) a. Nay/Emma-ka cemsim-ul sa-∅-ma/*-ss-ta/*-ss-ni? 
   I/mother-NOM lunch-ACC buy-FTR(Prom)PST-DECL/PST-INT ‘I/Mother will buy lunch.’ (emma = speaker)
   b. Ney/Inho-ka cemsim-ul sa-∅-la/*-ss-ta/*-ss-ni? 
   you/Inho-NOM lunch-ACC buy-FTR-IMP/PST-DECL/PST-INT ‘(You/Inho) Buy lunch.’ (Inho = addressee)
   c. Wuli/Emma-hako Inho-ka cemsim-ul sa-∅-ca/*-ss-ta/*-ss-ni? 
   we/mother-and Inho-NOM lunch-ACC buy-FTR-EXH/PST-DECL/PST-INT ‘Let’s buy lunch./Mother and Inho will buy lunch.’ (emma = speaker; Inho = addressee)

(4) a. Cey-ka cemsim-ul sa-∅-yo/*-ma. 
   L.HUMBLE-NOM lunch-ACC buy-FTR-PROM.POLITE/-PROM
   b. Tangsin-i cemsim-ul sa-∅-yo/*-la. 
   you.HONORIFIC.FORMAL-NOM lunch-ACC buy-FTR-IMP.POLITE/-IMP
   c. Cehuy-ka cemsim-ul sa-∅-yo/*-ca. 
   we.HUMBLE-NOM lunch-ACC buy-FTR-EXH.POLITE/-EXH

PROPOSAL Given the above similarities between AA and jussive particles, I assume (5) as the clause structure in which ForceP (=utterance; minus TopP and FocP) is embedded under the Speech Act Phrase (saP/SAP), which provides discourse-related information regarding speaker-addressee relationship (Haegeman & Hill 2010; cf. Miyagawa 2012).

(5) [saP SPEAKER sa° [sap ADDRESSSE SA° [ForceP Force° Jussive° [TP SUBJECT T° [...]]]]]

I propose that agreement & binding relationship is directly/indirectly established between Jussive°, the subject, and the pragmatic argument(s) (SPEAKER/ADDRESSEE), and thus they share the person feature and become co-referential to one another. The derivation is illustrated in (6). Both Jussive° and the subject enter the syntactic derivation with unvalued person (cf. Zanuttini et al. 2012). Jussive°
binds and agrees with the subject and they share unvalued person, which will be eventually valued by further agreement in the saP shell. Jussive head-moves up to sa° through the intermediate heads in order to bind and agree with the pragmatic argument(s) in a Spec-Head configuration (cf. Miyagawa 2012). As a result, a binding and agreement relationship is indirectly established between the subject and the pragmatic argument(s): the person which Jussive° obtains via agreement with the pragmatic argument(s) is automatically shared with the subject due to the already established Jussive°-subject agreement.

CONSEQUENCES The restriction between the subject and the jussive particle in terms of politeness/honorification shown in (4) receives an adequate explanation. That is, Jussive° obtains the speaker-addresssee relationship information when it moves to saP shell. This additional information provided by the saP shell enables a jussive particle to be realized accordingly in its normal non-polite forms (-mal/-lal-ca) or polite form (-yo).

The proposal, assuming the vocative to be an overt ADDRESSEE (Haegeman & Hill 2010), correctly captures the correlation (i) between the vocative and the jussive subject, and (ii) between the vocative and the jussive particle. As for (i), there is a strict binding relation between the vocative and the subject of the jussive clause. That is, the vocative cannot be co-referential with the subject in the imperative as in (7a), must be co-referential with the subject in the imperative as in (7b), and must be partially co-referential with the subject in the exhortative as in (7c). As for (ii), in (8a), for example, when the speaker is senior to the addressee, -ma is used. When the speaker-addresssee relationship is reversed as in (8b), -yo is used.

(7) a. ⚖i

Inho-ya, nay/emma/*Inho-ka cemsim-ul sa-∅-ma.
S(PEAKER) Inho-VOC I/mother/Minho-NOM lunch-ACC buy-FTR-PROM
‘Inho, (I)/mother will buy lunch.’ (*emma = speaker)

b. ⚖i

Inho-ya, ney/Inho/*Minho-kacemsim-ul sa-∅-la.j.
S Inho-VOC you/Inho/Minho-NOM lunch-ACC buy-FTR-IMP
‘Inho, (you)/Inho Buy lunch.’

c. ⚖i

Inho-ya, wulij-emma-hako Inho/*emma-hako Minja-ka cemsim-ul sa-∅-ca+i.j.
S Inho-VOC we/mother-and Inho/ mother-and Minja-NOM lunch-ACC buy-FTR-EXH
‘Inho, let’s buy lunch./Inho, mother and Inho will buy lunch.’ (*emma = speaker)

(8) a. Inho-ya, halmeni-ka tangcang ka-∅-ma/*-yo.
Inho-VOC grandmother-NOM right.away go-FTR-PROM/-PROM.POL
‘Grandson, grandma will come to you right away.’ [uttered by a grandmother to her grandson]

b. Halmeni-∅, sonsuw-ka cikum ka-∅-yo/*-ma.
grandmother-VOC grandson-NOM now go-FTR-PROM.POL/-PROM
‘Grandma, grandson will come to you.’ [uttered by a grandson to his grandmother]

The current account predicts complementarity of the non-polite jussive particles and an addresssee-honorific suffix -(s)up-. This prediction is borne out by the ungrammatical *sa-∅-sup-ma/-la/-ca.

CONCLUSION I have proposed to syntactically encode the pragmatic aspects of jussive clauses. I have shown that the current analysis correctly captures the fact regarding jussive clauses with respect to the subject, vocative, jussive particle, and -(s)up- suffix.
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