

Agreement and the Subjects of Jussive Clauses in Korean
Miok Pak, Paul Portner and Raffaella Zanuttini
Georgetown University

Korean has three kinds of jussives clauses: promissives (a cross-linguistically rare type), imperatives, and exhortatives. These three are marked by distinct sentence final particles: in (1), *ma* marks the sentence as a promissive, *la* as an imperative, and *ca* as an exhortative. The choice of sentence final particle co-varies with the semantics of the subject. When the sentence is marked as a promissive by *ma*, the subject is the speaker; when the sentence is marked as an imperative by *la*, it is the addressee(s); and when the sentence is marked as an exhortative by *ca*, it is a group including the speaker and the addressee(s).

Syntactic theory forces us to capture the co-variance between the sentence final particle and the subject as an agreement relation. In previous work we have argued that, in jussives, the sentence final particles head a functional projection labeled the Jussive Phrase, and that they enter an AGREE relation (Chomsky 2000) with the subject. In this talk, we explore the consequences of this view for the full range of subjects possible in Korean jussives. In particular, we examine the following cases: null subjects, as in (1); overt pronominal subjects, as in (2); referential subjects such as "mommy", (3); quantified subjects, (4); and embedded subjects, (5), which must be null in all but a few narrowly constrained circumstances.

As we try to understand this type of agreement, one issue is whether the person features originate on the particle, the subject, or both. The first two cases, null subjects (1) and pronominal subjects (2), would allow one to think that they originate on the subject: one could think that the Jussive head has an uninterpretable person feature lacking a value, and that it receives a value once it enters an AGREE relation with the subject. The third case cannot work this way, however, since *emma* ('mommy') and *Inho* are typically third person subjects, yet in promissives they are interpreted as referring to the speaker (3a), in imperatives to the addressee (3b), and in exhortatives to the speaker and addressee together (3c). Thus, we propose that jussive particles come from the lexicon complete with person features; for example, *ma* with [person:1] and *la* with [person:2]. Assuming that third person actually lacks person specification (Baker in prep), in (3a) *ma* transmits the first person feature to *emma*, and in (3b) *la* transmits the second person feature to *Inho*. As for the quantified subjects seen in (4), we propose that there is a covert variable representing the domain of quantification within the quantified phrase (e.g., Stanley & Zsabo 2000) and that it is this variable that is the target for agreement by the jussive head.

Embedded subjects force us to provide a more subtle analysis. As shown in (5), the subject of an embedded promissive co-refers with the matrix subject, and the subject of an embedded imperative co-refers with the matrix dative. Overt pronominal subjects are not in general possible, as in (7a). This pattern of facts leads us to propose that the jussive head has shiftable person features (cf. e.g. Schlenker 2003, Anand & Nevins 2004), while the overt pronouns have unshiftable person features, and that a verb like "say" in Korean is a context-shifter. Thus a null subject in (5a) ends up with a representation like (6a), where [shiftable:1] represents the shiftable first person feature of the particle. If this representation is in a root clause, the subject will refer to the speaker, since no embedding operator has shifted its reference. If embedded under "say", the matrix verb shifts the reference of the shiftable indexicals to the perspective of the reported speech act; this results in the embedded subject referring to the speaker of the reported speech act, i.e. the matrix subject. When the subject is an overt pronominal, we have the representation in (6b). If the structure is in a root clause, there is no problem. The shiftable and unshiftable features coincide, both requiring that the pronoun refer to the speaker. However, if the pronoun is embedded, there will be a conflict: [shiftable:1] says that the pronoun should co-refer with the matrix subject, while [unshiftable:1] requires that it refer to the speaker. This conflict is resolved if the matrix subject happens to be first person, and (7b) is grammatical as predicted by our analysis.

In sum, our key syntactic claim is that there is a relationship of agreement between the head of the Jussive Phrase and the subject. Our analysis involves the sharing of feature values and requires that the language have both shiftable and unshiftable person features, which may coexist on the same element. Given that Korean is typically thought of as a "no-agreement" language, our proposal might seem surprising. However, the fact that Korean exhibits no agreement in phi-features between the subject and

the finite verb (or between a determiner and its noun) does not preclude other agreement relations involving the subject. The one we propose accounts for the full range of facts concerning jussive subjects.

- (1) NULL SUBJECTS:
- a Nayil cemsim-ul sa-*ma*. (PROMISSIVE)
tomorrow lunch-ACC buy-PRM
'I will buy lunch tomorrow.'
 - b Cemsim-ul mek-e-*la*. (IMPERATIVE)
lunch-ACC eat-SSP-IMP
'Eat lunch!'
 - c Cemsim-ul mek-*ca*. (EXHORTATIVE)
lunch-ACC eat-EXH
'Let's eat lunch.'
- (2) PRONOMINAL SUBJECTS:
- a Nay-ka cemsim-ul sa-*ma*. (PROMISSIVE)
I-NOM lunch-ACC buy-PRM
'I promise to buy lunch.'
 - b Ney-ka cemsim-ul sa-*la*. (IMPERATIVE)
You-NOM lunch-ACC buy-IMP
'You buy lunch!'
 - c Wuli-ka cemsim-ul sa-*ca*. (EXHORTATIVE)
You-NOM lunch-ACC buy-EXH
'Let's you and I buy lunch.'
- (3) REFERENTIAL SUBJECTS:
- a Emma-ka masissnun kansik cwu-*ma*. (PROMISSIVE)
mommy-NOM delicious snack give-PRM
'Mommy promises to give you a delicious snack.'
 - b Inho-ka simpwurum-lul hay-*la*. (IMPERATIVE)
Inho-NOM errand-ACC do-IMP
'Inho run the errand!'
 - c Emma-lang Inho-ka kati chengso ha-*ka*. (EXHORTATIVE)
Mommy-with Inho-NOM together clean do-EXH
'Let's clean together, mommy and Inho.'
- (4) QUANTIFICATIONAL SUBJECTS:
- Motwu/nwukwu/myetmyeng na-lul towa cwu-*la*.
Everybody/somebody/few people me-ACC help give-IMP
'Everybody/somebody/a few of you help me!'
- (5) EMBEDDED SUBJECTS:
- a Kuiy-ka Inho-ekey Sooni-lul towacwu-**ma**-ko malhayss-ta. (PROMISSIVE)
He-NOM Inho-DAT Sooni-ACC help-PROM-COMP said-DEC
'He said to Inho that he promises to help Sooni.'
 - b Kuiy-ka Inho-ekey Sooni-lul towacwu-**la**-ko malhayss-ta. (IMPERATIVE)
He-NOM Inho-DAT Sooni-ACC help-IMP-COMP said-DEC
'He told Inho to help Sooni.'
- (6) a Jussive⁰_[shiftable: 1] pro ... [AGREE] → Jussive⁰_[shiftable: 1] pro_[shiftable: 1] ...
b Jussive⁰_[shiftable: 1] I_[unshiftable: 1] ... [AGREE] → Jussive⁰_[shiftable: 1] I_[unshiftable: 1] I_[unshiftable: 1] I_[shiftable: 1] ...
- (7) a *Kuiy-ka Inho-ekey [Nay-ka Sooni-lul towacwu-**ma**-ko] malhayss-ta.
He-NOM Inho-DAT I-NOM Sooni-ACC help-PROM-COMP said-DEC
'He said to Inho that I promise to help Sooni.'
- b Nay-ka Inho-ekey [Nay-ka Sooni-lul towacwu-**ma**-ko] malhayss-ta.
I-NOM Inho-DAT [I-NOM Sooni-ACC help-PROM-COMP] said-DEC
'I said to Inho that I promise to help Sooni.'