

KOREAN PARTICLES AND CLAUSE TYPES

1. Introduction

People use the sentences of their language in various communicative tasks such as making a statement, asking a question, ordering someone to do something, expressing one's emotions such as surprise, dismay, and/or excitement, giving permission for someone to do something, making a promise, reporting what they heard or experienced, and so on. Some of these uses of sentences sometimes coincide with specific syntactic structures, or morphosyntactic forms involving things like special particles, affixes, word order, intonations, missing elements, or phonological alterations. Sadock and Zwicky (1985) call such pairing a sentence type. That is, when a grammatical system conventionally pairs a certain grammatical form with a given conversational use, or force, the form and use pair is called a sentence (or clause) type.

As for the different mechanisms used to mark clause types, English and German, for example, use word order to differentiate declaratives from interrogatives. There are also languages such as Welsh, Hidatsa, and Korean that use special particles to mark certain clause types. Korean, specifically, is known to have special particles for several clause types, including declaratives, interrogatives, imperatives, and exclamatives. Korean, being a typical agglutinative language, has several hundred particles which agglutinate with each other in a fixed order. They have various syntactic and semantic functions, e.g., expressing case relations, coordination, relativization, verbal complementation, passivization, causativization, honorification, tense and aspect, and mood and modality, among others. Marking clause types is known to be one of these functions. The particles that mark clause types occur at the end of sentences, and they have the function of ending sentences, hence are sometimes called 'sentence enders' or 'sentence end particles' in the literature (Sohn 1999).

The Korean literature provides considerable amount of descriptive work on the syntax of Korean sentences and this paper might be considered as just another such descriptive work. But it aims to differ. Rather than just listing clause types and sentence enders, it distinguishes the sentence enders into three main classes: speech style particles, special mood particles, and (potential) clause typing particles. In doing so, this paper aims to provide the detailed descriptive background (basis) which is necessary for any discussion of the syntactic and semantic role of clause typing particles.¹ More specifically, by applying the criteria proposed to determine clause types in Sadock and Zwicky (1985) (to be discussed below), this paper aims to identify the clause typing particles among the many sentence enders.² Such ground work is necessary because it allows us to focus our attention on a limited number of particles which may play a role in clause types. Moreover, it enables us to determine whether all of the clause types

¹ The role of particles that are taken to mark clauses in Korean is currently under investigation as a part of broader research on clause types.

² We use the term "(potential) clause typing particles" in a pure descriptive sense to refer to those particles which may serve to mark the clauses they occur in as a member of a certain clause type.

proposed in the Korean literature (which is not a small number; in fact, it has been proposed that there are as many as ten clause types in Korean) can actually be recognized as clause types or not.

This draft is organized as follows: Section 2 briefly discusses what it means to be a clause type in view of Sadock and Zwicky's (1985) criteria for clause types with a brief introduction of Korean clauses discussed in the literature. Section 3 is devoted to the discussion of Korean clause types and sentence enders in detail. Section 4 contains a detailed discussion of the sentence enders and classifies them into three classes: special mood particles, speech style particles, and clause typing particles. Finally, section 5 considers some facts that cast doubt on the analysis of clause typing particles as markers of illocutionary or sentential force.

2. What is a clause type?

In the Korean literature, many scholars have proposed different numbers of clause types in Korean. The following gives a brief idea of the claimed clause types:

- (1) - School (prescriptive) Grammar: Declaratives, Interrogatives, Exclamatives, Imperatives, Exhortatives (Propositives)
- Choi (1937): Declaratives, Interrogatives, Imperatives, Exhortatives (Propositives)
- Hong (1947): Declaratives, Interrogatives, Imperatives, Promissives, Exclamatives
- Kim (1960): Declaratives, Interrogatives, Permissives, Imperatives, Optatives, Premonitives, Exhortatives (Propositives), Presumptives, Exclamatives (Kim divides interrogatives into two kinds, hence claims that there are 10 clause types, though I list only nine here).
- Ko (1974): Declaratives, Interrogatives, Exclamatives, Imperatives, Permissives, Exhortatives (Propositives), Promissives, Premonitives
- Nam (2001): Declaratives, Interrogatives, Imperatives, Exhortatives (Propositives)
- Sohn (1999): Declaratives, Interrogatives, Imperatives, Exhortatives (Propositives), Promissives, Premonitives, Permissives, Apperceptives, Exclamatives
- Suh (1996): Declaratives, Interrogatives, Imperatives, Exhortatives (Propositives), Promissives

Summarizing the clause types proposed in (1), there are as many as eleven different clause types in Korean. Examples of these purported clause types are given below:

- (2) a. DECLARATIVE
Na-nun cemsim-ul mek-ess-ta.
I-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-DEC
'I ate lunch.'
- b. INTERROGATIVE
(Ne-nun) cemsim-ul mek-ess-ni/nya?

- (You-TOP) lunch-ACC eat-PST-INT (Q)
 ‘Did you eat lunch?’
- c. IMPERATIVE
 Cemsim-ul mek-**e-la**.
 Lunch-ACC eat-IMV
 ‘Eat lunch!’
- d. EXHORTATIVE (PROPOSITIVE)
 Icey cemsim-ul mek-**ca**.
 Now lunch-ACC eat-EXH
 ‘now, let us eat lunch.’
- e. PROMISSIVE
 Nay-ka nayil cemsim-ul sa-**ma**.
 I-NOM tomorrow lunch-ACC buy-PRM
 ‘I will buy you lunch tomorrow.’
- f. PREMONITIVE
 Tachi-**lla**
 Get hurt-PRE
 ‘(Be careful.) You may get hurt.’
- g. PERMISSIVE
 A. Kwaca mek-eto toy-yo?
 Cookie eat-? okay-INT
 ‘Is it okay to eat the cookies?’
 B. eung, mek-**ulyum(una)**.
 Yes. Eat-PER
 ‘Yes. It is okay to eat.’
- h. EXCLAMATIVE
 Ahyu, coyonghay-**ela**.
 Oh, quiet-EXC
 ‘Oh, it’s quiet!’
- i. OPTATIVE
 Wuli-lul yongsehay cwu-**sose**.
 Us-ACC forgive give-DEC
 ‘Forgive us.’
- j. PRESUMPTIVE
 Nayil pi-ka o-**kess-ta**.
 Tomorrow rain-NOM come-PRE-DEC
 ‘It may rain tomorrow.’
- k. APPERCEPTIVE
 John-I cip-ey ka-ass-**kwun-a**.
 John-NOM home-to go-PST-APE-DEC
 ‘John went home.’

While some scholars have proposed as many as 8 to 10 clause types (e.g., Kim 1960, Ko 1974, Sohn 1999), there are others who have proposed as few as 4 or 5 clause types (e.g., Choi 1937, Nam 2001, Hong 1947, Suh 1996). Then, what are the grounds for the proposed number of clause types? Nam (2001), on one hand, suggests the possibility

of the sentence enders occurring in embedded clauses as the criterion for clause type and claims that there are only four clause types in Korean, namely declarative, interrogative, imperative, and exhortative (propositive). That is, if they can occur embedded, then he counts them as clause types. Suh (1996), on the other hand, considers syntactic and morphological characteristics and semantic functions of clauses to determine clause type and proposes five clause types, declarative, interrogative, imperative, exhortative, and promissive. Hence, if a sentence has a sentence ender that is distinct in form (i.e., morphologically distinct), carries a distinct semantic function and also the syntactic characteristic of occurring in embedded clauses, then it is taken to be a member of a certain clause type. He claims that the syntactic characteristic is the most important criterion, in keeping with Nam's proposal. In all these discussions the sentence end particles are taken to mark clause types.

The characteristics which these authors use to identify clause types are language particular, however. Not all languages employ particles to mark clause type. As a salient universal feature of clause type, Sadock and Zwicky (1985) propose 'closed system': Sentence types form a system in that (i) "There are sets of corresponding sentences, the members of which differ only in belonging to different types."; and (ii) "The types are mutually exclusive, no sentence being simultaneously of two different types." (Sadock and Zwicky 1985: 158) To further explicate what it means for a language to have a closed system, consider the following (Sadock and Zwicky 1985: 159 (23)):

- (3) a. You caught the speckled geese.
- b. Did you catch the speckled geese?
- c. Catch the speckled geese!

The English data in (3) are just some of the endless examples that can be constructed of corresponding declaratives, yes-no questions, and imperatives. The sentence types are mutually exclusive in that there is no sentence that is simultaneously of the declarative type and of the interrogative type, or of the interrogative type and of the imperative type.

Sadock and Zwicky further claim that there are certain sentence types that can be found in every language: declarative, interrogative, and imperative, which form the major types. In addition to these major types, there are also minor types such as exclamatives, imprecatives, and optatives, which are not present in all languages. Clause types are associated with a sentential force (or sentence mood) (Chierchia & McConnell-Ginet (1990)), where the sentential force refers to the pragmatic force conventionally associated with a given form. The sentential force should be distinguished from the notion of illocutionary force which is based on the speaker's intention. That is, a speaker can use a declarative to get information; for example, by saying 'I wonder if John came home already', the speaker may convey a desire to gain information from the addressee. In such a case, the illocutionary force of the sentence is that of asking. When discussing the force of sentence types, we are not dealing with illocutionary force, but rather sentential force or sentence mood, each of which refers to the pragmatic force conventionally associated with a given form. In what follows, I will examine Korean sentences from the view point of Sadock and Zwicky's criteria for determining clause types with a particular attention to the sentence enders.

3. Clause types and ‘Sentence end’ particles in Korean

In the discussion of clause types in Korean, I dismiss optatives, presumptives, and apperceptives and restrict my attention to the others in (2) because the sentence enders in these three types are not distinct from that in declaratives, as we will see in later discussion.

3.1. Clause types with distinct sentence enders

In (4) below (data in (2a-c) repeated), the particles occurring at the end of the sentences, *ta*, *ni*, and *e-la* (boldfaced), are argued to mark declarative, interrogative, and imperative, respectively.

- (4) a. DECLARATIVE
Na-nun cemsim-ul mek-ess-**ta**.
I-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-DEC
‘I ate lunch.’
- b. INTERROGATIVE
(Ne-nun) cemsim-ul mek-ess-**ni/nya?**
(You-TOP) lunch-ACC eat-PST-INT (Q)
‘Did you eat lunch?’
- c. IMPERATIVE
Cemsim-ul mek-**e-la**
Lunch-ACC eat-IMV
‘Eat lunch!’

One can observe that the sentences in (4) are minimally different in having different sentence end particles, and that this results in different sentence types. Hence, these sentence end particles have been argued to be clause typing particles, in that they mark sentence/clause types. Korean is rich in this type of particles and besides those introduced in (4), there are exhortative (propositive), promissive, premonitive, permissive, and exclamative, as already introduced in (2) above. I repeat the relevant data in (2) below:

- (5) a. EXHORTATIVE (PROPOSITIVE)
Icey cemsim-ul mek-**ca**.
Now lunch-ACC eat-EXH
‘now, let us eat lunch.’
- b. PROMISSIVE
Nay-ka nayil cemsim-ul sa-**ma**.
I-NOM tomorrow lunch-ACC buy-PRM
‘I will buy you lunch tomorrow.’
- c. PREMONITIVE
Tachi-**lla**
Get hurt-PRE
‘(Be careful.) You may get hurt.’
- d. PERMISSIVE

- A. Kwaca mek-eto toy-yo?
Cookie eat-too okay-INT
'Is it okay to eat the cookies?'
- B. eung, mek-ulyem(una).
Yes. Eat-PER
'Yes. It is okay to eat.'
- e. EXCLAMATIVE
Ahyu, tew-ela.
Oh, hot-EXC
'Oh, it's hot!'

3.2. Speech styles (levels) and sentence enders

Korean is an honorific language in that it employs many particles to express the relationships between speakers and hearers and also referents in sentences. The honorific particles appear in nouns, verbs, the pronoun paradigm, a few case particles, and verbal suffixes. Korean, being an honorific language, also has various speech styles (or levels). There are about six styles: *plain*, *intimate*, *familiar*, *polite*, *semiformal*, and *formal*.³

- The plain style is used typically by adults to children, to one's younger sibling, and by children among themselves. This style is used between intimate adult friends. It also is employed in written texts and newspapers.
- The intimate style, which is sometimes called half-talk style, is most commonly used by children or adults alike to family members, or between close friends. This style is frequently intermixed with the plain or the familiar style.
- The familiar style is slightly more formal than the intimate style, and is more commonly used by a male adult to an adolescent or to one's son-in-law, or between two close male adult friends who are not quite close enough to use the intimate style. This style is less widely used by women.
- The polite form is normally used among adults, and perhaps is the most common style used by both adults and children. Adults who are not close friends or relatives use this style and children use it to address adults in a polite way. The polite style is the informal counterpart of the formal style. It is used widely by both males and females in daily conversations and also used to address a socially equal or superior person.
- The semiformal style is not used very commonly nowadays; it is gradually disappearing from daily usage. It is normally used when there is a conflict among politeness factors: a husband speaking to his wife, a younger supervisor to an older supervisee, or a superior officer to an older inferior.

³ Different numbers of speech styles have been proposed in the literature but the most common number of speech styles proposed is six. I also claim that there are six speech styles in Korean, adopting Martin (1992)'s terminologies for the different styles. The following gives a brief idea of speech styles discussed in the literature: Kwon (1992) has proposed three, Hierarchy 1,2, and 3, and Nam (2001) has proposed four speech levels, very polite, polite, low, and very low. Martin (1992) notes six styles; plain, formal, semiformal, familiar, intimate, and polite. Sohn (1999) argues for six also; plain, intimate, familiar, polite, blunt, and deferential. Suh (1996) claims that there are six speech styles as well; very high, general high, high, low, general low, and very low.

- The formal style is used to someone to whom a certain reserve is in order: a high official, a professor, one's employer or superior person, etc. It is commonly intermixed with the polite style. In formal occasions as oral news reports and public lectures, only the formal style is used. (Martin 1992, Sohn 1999)

Depending on the addressee, the speaker can use one of the six speech styles, which are marked by the particles that occur at the end of the sentence. The six speech styles for declaratives are as shown in (6).

- (6)⁴ **DECLARATIVE**
- a. **PLAIN**
Na-nun cemsim-ul mek-ess-**ta**.
I-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-DEC
'I ate lunch.'
 - b. **INTIMATE**
Na-nun cemsim-ul mek-ess-**e**.
I-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-DEC
'I ate lunch.'
 - c. **FAMILIAR**
Na-nun cemsim-ul mek-ess-**ney**.
I-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-DEC
'I ate lunch.'
 - d. **POLITE**
Na-nun cemsim-ul mek-ess-**eyo**.
I-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-DEC
'I ate lunch.'
 - e. **SEMIFORMAL**
Na-nun cemsim-ul mek-ess-**o**.
I-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-DEC
'I ate lunch.'
 - f. **FORMAL**
Na-nun cemsim-ul mek-ess-**sup-ni-ta**.
I-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-DEC
'I ate lunch.'

There is another speech style, the form used to address a person who is very high in status, such as kings, queens, princes, and princesses in the past. It is also used in religious prayers in the present. Let us call this *superpolite* style.⁵

- (7) **SUPERPOLITE**
Na-nun cemsim-ul mek-ess-**nai-ta**.

⁴ Some of the sentence end particles have allomorphic variants depending on the phonological environment. For example, the final *-e* in (6b) has the variant *-a* after the vowels *a* or *o* but is *-e* elsewhere. *-o* in (6e) occurs after a vowel, but *-so* occurs after a verb or adjective ending in a consonant (e.g., *mek-so*, *coh-so*), and *-uo* (as a free variant of *-so*) only after a verb ending in a consonant.

⁵ Sohn (1999) also discusses this style but does not give it a name.

I-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-DEC
 ‘I ate lunch.’

As Martin (1992) and Sohn (1999)’s distinctions of speech style are the most fine-grained distinctions, I use their distinctions of speech styles and build on them to give a more comprehensive list of particles and speech styles. The sentence enders in declaratives can be summarized as in table (8):

(8)

Speech level	Declarative Particles
PLAIN	-ta
INTIMATE	-a/-e
FAMILIAR	-ney
POLITE	-a-yo/-e-yo
SEMIFORMAL	-o/-uo/-so
FORMAL	-(su)p-ni-ta,
SUPERPOLITE	-na-i-ta

We can have the same distinctions for interrogatives and imperatives. Sentence enders for these two constructions in different speech styles are as in (9):⁶

(9)

Speech level	INTERROGATIVE	IMPERATIVE
PLAIN	-ni, -nya	-(a/e)-la, ulyem
INTIMATE	-a/-e	-a/-e
FAMILIAR	-na, ((n)-u)n-ka	-((u)si)key(na)
POLITE	-a-yo/-e-yo, -na-yo, -(nun) ka-yo,	-((u)si)a-yo/-e-yo
SEMIFORMAL	-o/uo/so	-o/uo/so
FORMAL	-(su)-p-ni-kka	-(si-p)-si-o
SUPERPOLITE	-nai-kka	-(si-op)-so-se

These particles are exemplified in (10) and (11):

(10) **INTERROGATIVE**

- a. PLAIN
 Ne-nun cemsim-ul mek-ess-**ni/-nya?**
 You-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-INT
 ‘Did you eat lunch?’
- b. INTIMATE
 Ne-nun cemsim-ul mek-ess-**e?**
 I-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-INT
 ‘Did you eat lunch?’

⁶ I use slashes to note allomorphic variants and commas for different sentence end particles in the table (9); in (10) slashes are used to note different sentence end particles.

- c. FAMILIAR
Ne-nun cemsim-ul mek-ess-**na/-nun-ka?**
You-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-INT
'Did you eat lunch?'
- d. POLITE
Tangsin-un cemsim-ul mek-ess-**e-yo/nayo/-nun-ka-yo?**
You-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-INT
'Did you eat lunch?'
- e. SEMIFORMAL
Tangsin-un cemsim-ul mek-ess-**o?**
You-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-INT
'Did you eat lunch?'
- f. FORMAL
Tangsin-un cemsim-ul mek-ess-**sup-ni-kka?**
You-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST- INT
'Did you eat lunch?'
- g. SUPERPOLITE
Cenha, cemsim-ul tu-si-ess-**na-i-kka?**
King, lunch-ACC eat (honorific form)-SH-na-ID-PST- INT
'King, did you eat lunch?'
(SH-subject honorific marker, ID-indicative morpheme)

(11) **IMPERATIVE**

- a. PLAIN
Cemsim-ul mek-**e-la/ulyem.**
Lunch-ACC eat-IMV
'Eat lunch!'
- b. INTIMATE
Cemsim-ul mek-**e.**
Lunch-ACC eat-IMV
'Eat lunch!'
- c. FAMILIAR
Cemsim-ul mek-**key (-na).**
Lunch-ACC eat-IMV
'Eat lunch!'
- d. POLITE
Cemsim-ul mek-**e-yo.**
Lunch-ACC eat-IMV
'Eat lunch!'
- e. SEMIFORMAL
Cemsim-ul mek-**uo.**
Lunch-ACC eat-IMV
'Eat lunch!'
- f. FORMAL
Cemsim-ul tu-**u-si-p-si-o.**
Lunch-ACC eat-IMV

- g. 'Eat lunch!'
 SUPERPOLITE
 Cemsim-ul tu-**si-op-sose**.
 Lunch-ACC eat- IMV
 'Eat lunch!'

As both the sentence typing particles and the speech style particles appear at the end of sentences, it is not easy to tell whether a given particle at the end of a sentence is marking clause type or speech style. This can be observed in (4a) and (6a) where *-ta* is used in both sentences. Hence, Sohn (1999) claims that sentence end particles denote not only one of the sentence types but also one of the speech styles and that they frequently form so-called *portmanteau morphemes*.

We find many sentence end particles for exhortative (propositive) (EXH), promissive (PRM), premonitive (PRE), permissive (PER), and exclamative (EXC) too. They are shown in the following table:

(12)

Speech level	EXH	PRM	PRE	PER	EXC
PLAIN	<i>-ca</i>	<i>-(u)ma</i>	<i>-l-la</i>	<i>-(u)lyem</i> <i>(-u-na)</i>	<i>e-la</i>
INTIMATE	<i>-a/-e</i>	<i>-l-kkey, -a/e</i>	--	<i>-a/-e</i>	--
FAMILIAR	<i>-sey (-na)</i>	<i>-(u)m-sey</i>	--	--	--
POLITE	<i>-a-yo/-e-yo</i>	<i>-l-kkey-yo,</i> <i>-a-yo/-e-yo</i>	--	<i>-a-yo/</i> <i>-e-yo</i>	--
SEMIFORMAL	<i>-p-si-ta</i>	<i>-li-ta/</i> <i>-kess-o</i>	--	<i>-o/-uo</i>	--
FORMAL	<i>-(u)-si-p-si-ta</i>	<i>-o-li-ta/</i> <i>-kess-nai-ta</i>	--	<i>-si-p-si-o</i>	--

The following data illustrate these sentence types in different speech levels/styles:

(13) **EXHORTATIVES**

- a. PLAIN
 Wuli icye cemsim(-ul) mek-**ca**.
 We now lunch(-ACC) eat-EXH
 'Now, let's eat lunch.'
- b. INTIMATE
 Wuli icye cemsim(-ul) mek-**e**.
 We now lunch(-ACC) eat-EXH
 'Now, let's eat lunch.'
- c. FAMILIAR
 Wuli icye cemsim(-ul) mek-**sey(-na)**.
 We now lunch(-ACC) eat-EXH
 'Now, let's eat lunch.'
- d. POLITE
 Wuli icye cemsim(-ul) mek-**e-yo**.

We now lunch(-ACC) eat-EXH
'Now, let's eat lunch.'

e. SEMIFORMAL
Wuli icye cemsim(-ul) mek-**u-p-si-ta**.

We now lunch(-ACC) eat- EXH
'Now, let's eat lunch.'

e. FORMAL
Wuli icye cemsim(-ul) mek-**u-si-p-si-ta**.

We now lunch(-ACC) eat- EXH
'Now, let's eat lunch.'

(14) **PROMISSIVE**

a. PLAIN

Nay-ka nayil cemsim-ul sa-**ma**.
I-NOM tomorrow lunch-ACC buy-PRM
'I will buy you lunch tomorrow.'

b. INTIMATE

Nay-ka nayil cemsim-ul sa-**a/l-kkey**.
I-NOM tomorrow lunch-ACC buy-PRM
'I will buy you lunch tomorrow.'

c. FAMILIAR

Nay-ka nayil cemsim-ul sa-**sey**.
I-NOM tomorrow lunch-ACC buy-PRM
'I will buy you lunch tomorrow.'

d. POLITE

Nay-ka nayil cemsim-ul sa-**a-yo/l-kkeyo**.
I-NOM tomorrow lunch-ACC buy-PRM
'I will buy you lunch tomorrow.'

e. SEMIFORMAL

Nay-ka nayil cemsim-ul sa-**li-ta/kess-o**.
I-NOM tomorrow lunch-ACC buy-PRM
'I will buy you lunch tomorrow.'

f. FORMAL

Nay-ka nayil cemsim-ul sa-**o-li-ta/kess-nai-ta**.
I-NOM tomorrow lunch-ACC buy-PRM
'I will buy you lunch tomorrow.'

(15) **PREMONITIVE** ((5c) repeated)

PLAIN

Tachi-**l-la**

Get hurt-PRE

'(Be careful.) You may get hurt.'

(16) **PERMISSIVE**

a. PLAIN

A. Kwaca mek-eto toy-yo?

- Cookie eat-? Okay-INT
‘Is it okay to eat the cookies?’
- B. Kulay, mek-**ulyem**.
Yes. Eat-PER
‘Yes. It is okay to eat.’
- b. INTIMATE
- A. Kwaca mek-eto toy-yo?
Cookie eat-? Okay-INT
‘Is it okay to eat the cookies?’
- B. Kulay, mek-**e**.
Yes. Eat-PER
‘Yes. It is okay to eat.’
- c. FAMILIAR
- A. Kwaca mek-eto toy-yo?
Cookie eat-? Okay-INT
‘Is it okay to eat the cookies?’
- B. Kulay, mek-**ulyum-una**.
Yes. Eat-PER
‘Yes. It is okay to eat.’
- d. POLITE
- A. Kwaca mek-eto toy-yo?
Cookie eat-? Okay-INT
‘Is it okay to eat the cookies?’
- B. Ney, mek-**e-yo**.
Yes. Eat-PER
‘Yes. It is okay to eat.’
- e. SEMIFORMAL
- A. Kwaca mek-eto toy-yo?
Cookie eat-? Okay-INT
‘Is it okay to eat the cookies?’
- B. Ney, mek-**uo**.
Yes. Eat-PER
‘Yes. It is okay to eat.’
- f. FORMAL
- A. Kwaca mek-eto toy-p-ni-kka?
Cookie eat-? Okay-AH-ID-INT
‘Is it okay to eat the cookies?’
- B. Ney, tu-si-p-si-**o**.
Yes. Eat-SH-AH-RQ-PER
‘Yes. It is okay to eat.’
- (AH – addressee honorific morpheme, RQ-requestive mood morpheme)

(17) **EXCLAMATIVE** ((5f) repeated)

PLAIN

Ahyu, tew-**e-la**.

Oh, hot-EXC

‘Oh, it’s hot!’

4. Decomposing sentence enders

As Sohn (1999) observes, it seems difficult to separate clause typing particles from other sentence enders such as speech style particles, since they all occur at the end of sentences. However, a closer examination of the sentence enders allows us to distinguish them into three different classes: special mood particles, speech style particles, and (potential) clause typing particles depending on their nature and distributional properties. In what follows, we examine these particles in detail.

4.1. Special mood particles

Some sentence enders are peculiarly different from others. Consider the following data:

- (18) a. John-i cemsim-ul iceyya mek-**te-la**.
John-Nom lunch-Acc now eat-RPT-DEC
‘John is eating lunch now.’
- b. John-i cemsim-ul mek-ess-**tey-(yo)**.
John-Nom lunch-Acc eat-Past-RPT-DEC
‘John ate lunch.’
- c. John-i cemsim-ul mek-ess-**sup-ti-ta**.
John-Nom lunch-Acc eat-Past-Hon-RPT-DEC
‘John ate lunch.’

The sentence end particles in (18) are *-te-la*, *-tey (-yo)*, and *-ti-ta*. Although in the literature, these particles are treated the same as the sentence enders discussed in (5) and (6) (cf. Sohn 1999 and Suh 1996, among others), they are to be distinguished. The sentences in (18) express more than just declarative meaning. Specifically, they express so-called *reportive mood* (RPT). (18a) is used when the speaker saw John eating lunch and is reporting it to the hearer. (18b) is said to report what the speaker has heard (may be directly from John or somebody else). (18c) is used only when the speaker has seen or verified the fact that John has already eaten lunch. All in all, the reportive mood denotes the speaker’s past perception, observation, or experience. Analyzing each morpheme that makes up the sentence enders in (18a-c), one is led to the conclusion that the reportive mood is expressed by the morpheme *-te*. This is because *-te* is the only common element in the three sentence enders and other sentences that only have *-la*, which is an allomorphic variant of *-ta*, as we will discuss in detail later, *-yo*, and *-ta* without *-te* do not express reportive mood meaning, as shown in (19) below:

- (19) a. Na-nun taum kyengki-lul kkok iki-li-**la**.
I-TOP next game-ACC sure win-FUT-DEC
‘I will win the next game no matter what.’
- b. John-un cemsim-ul mek-ess-**ta**.
John-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-DEC

- c. John-un cemsim-ul mek-ess-**e-yo**.
 John-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-DEC
 ‘John ate lunch.’

The reportive mood morpheme *-te* is sometime referred as the retrospective mood morpheme in the literature and also as the ‘evidential mood’ particle by Cinque 1999.⁷ These particles can also be classified according to their speech levels.

(20)

Speech level	RPT
PLAIN	<i>-te-la</i>
INTIMATE	<i>-tey</i>
FAMILIAR	--
POLITE	<i>-tey-yo</i>
SEMIFORMAL	<i>-ti-ta</i>
FORMAL	--

Let us consider more sentences:

- (21) a. John-i cemsim-ul mek-ess-**ci-yo**.
 John-NOM lunch-ACC eat-PST-SUP-DEC
 ‘(Of course,) John ate lunch.’
- b. (Ne-nun) cemsim-ul mek-ess-**kwun-a/yo**
 (You-TOP) lunch-ACC eat-PSY-APE-DEC
 ‘You ate lunch.’
- c. John-i cemsim-ul mek-ess-**ney-yo**.
 John-NOM lunch-ACC eat-PST-APR-DEC
 ‘(Of course,) John ate lunch.’

(21a) is used when the speaker presupposes that the hearer already knows or agrees with the proposition expressed by the utterance; this is called *suppositive mood* (SUP). Here again, the suppositive meaning is expressed by the morpheme *-ci* rather than *-yo*, since *-yo* can be deleted and *-ci* at the end of the sentence retains this special meaning. (21b) expresses so-called *apperceptive mood* (APE). Apperceptive mood is used when the speaker realizes some fact that s/he was not aware of until the time of the utterance. This mood is represented by the morpheme *-kwun*. It is referred to as ‘evaluative mood’ by Cinque (1999).⁸ *-Ney* in *-ney-yo* (21c) also has a special meaning. It is used when the speaker comes to the realization of a certain fact at the time of the utterance and assumes that the hearer does not know about that fact. I will call this *apprehensive mood* (APR). The meaning of *-ney* in *-ney-yo* is very similar to the apperceptive *-kwun*. The only difference is that while *-kwun* is used regardless of the hearer’s pre-knowledge of the

⁷ For more explanation on this morpheme, see Cinque 1999, p. 53.

⁸ This is my reason for excluding apperceptives in the discussion of clause types in Korean in section 3. Note that the sentence enders used with the apperceptive morpheme *-kwun* are declarative enders.

fact, *-ney* is used only when the speaker assumes that the hearer does not have a pre-existing knowledge. (Nam 2001)

Note that all these moods can and need to be distinguished from sentence mood which refers to sentence/clause types such as declaratives, interrogatives, imperatives, and so on. The reason these particles are sometimes regarded in the same way as the other sentence enders is because they can be used at the end of sentences with no other particles as shown in (22):

- (22) a. John-i cemsim-ul iceyya mek-**tey**.
 John-NOM lunch-ACC now eat-RPT
 ‘John is eating lunch now.’
- b. John-i cemsim-ul mek-ess-**ci**.
 John-NOM lunch-ACC eat-PST-SUP
 ‘(Of course,) John ate lunch.’
- c. (Ne-nun) cemsim-ul mek-ess-**kwun**.
 (You-TOP) lunch-ACC eat-PST-APE
 ‘You ate lunch.’
- d.⁹ John-i cemsim-ul mek-ess-**ney**.
 John-NOM lunch-ACC eat-PST-APR
 ‘(Of course,) John ate lunch.’

In such cases, one can take them to mark clause type at first glance. However, as discussed above, these particles carry a special mood meaning that should be distinguished from sentential forces, or moods. Moreover, some of these particles can co-occur as illustrated in the following data:

- (23) a. John-i cemsim-ul mek-te-kwun-yo
 John-NOM lunch-ACC eat-RPT-APE-DEC
 ‘John was eating lunch.’
- b. John-i cip-ey ka-ass-te-kwun-a
 John-NOM home-to go-PST-RPT-APE-DEC
 ‘I see that John went home.’

In (23), the reportive mood morpheme *-te* and the apperceptive mood morpheme *-kwun* occur together, the fact that characteristically distinguishes them from clause typing particles. For these reasons, we classify them separately from other sentence enders that can potentially be clause typing particles.

4.2. Declaratives

Declaratives have the sentential force of asserting. They are used to state a conclusion, make a statement, tell a story, and so on. It was mentioned above that it seems declaratives are marked through a class of particles that occur in sentence final position in

⁹ It should be noted that the *-ney* used in (22d) is different from the familiar sentence end particle *-ney*. While (22d) carries the apprehensive meaning, the familiar *-ney* does not have this special meaning; it is a pure speech style that encodes a special register.

Korean. Consider the following table in which sentence enders for declaratives, interrogatives, imperatives, exhortatives, and promissives are listed:

(24)

Speech level	DEC	INT	IMV	EXH	PRM
PLAIN	-ta	-ni -nya	-(a/e)-la	-ca	-(u)ma
INTIMATE	-a/e	-a/e	-a/e	-a/e	-l-kkey, -a/e
FAMILIAR	-ney	-na, ((n)- u)n-ka	- ((u)si)key(n a)	-sey (-na)	-(u)m-sey
POLITE	-a-yo/-e- yo	-a-yo/-e-yo -na-yo -(nun) ka- yo,	-((u)si)a- yo/-e-yo	-a-yo/-e-yo	-l-kkey-yo, -a-yo/-e-yo
SEMIFORMAL	-o/-uo/-so	-o/uo/so	-o/uo/so	-p-si-ta	-li-ta/ -kess-o
FORMAL	-(su)p-ni- ta,	-(su)-p-ni- kka	-(si-p)-si-o	-(u)-si-p-si- ta	-o-li-ta/ -kess-na-i- ta
SUPER- POLITE	-na-i-ta	-nai-kka	-(si-op)-so- se	--	--

Looking at the particles in (24), one can instantly note that some of the particles in declaratives appear across the board. That is, they appear not only in declaratives, but in other constructions too. They are *-a/e*, *-a-yo/-e-yo*, and *-o/-uo/-so*. These across-the-board particles cannot have anything to do with clause types according to the Sadock & Zwicky's (1985) criteria that "[clause types] are mutually exclusive, no sentence being simultaneously of two different types." (Sadock and Zwicky 1985: 158)

What are these particles, then? I argue that they are best viewed as speech style particles. Among the speech style particles, *-yo* is the most typical speech style particle that marks politeness. Note that it appears in all five constructions in table (24). Furthermore, it appears not only across the board but also in many speech styles too. Specifically, it can attach not only to the intimate style sentence ender *-a/e* but also to the familiar style sentence ender *-ney* and the deferential style *-(su)p-ni-ta* to become *-a-yo/-e-yo*, *-ney-yo*, and *-(su)p-ni-ta-yo*, respectively. Once *-yo* is attached, these particles mark politeness and become polite speech style particles. Let us refer to *-yo* as the *politeness particle*.

I argue that this politeness particle can attach to any sentence ender to end the sentence politely as long as there is no clash in speech style. Therefore, as mentioned already, it can attach to the intimate, familiar, and formal style sentence enders to turn them into polite speech particles. However, it cannot attach to the semiformal style particles *-o/-uo/-so*. This is predicted because it was mentioned that semiformal speech style is adopted when there is a conflict in politeness. As such, the politeness particle *-yo* cannot be used in the semiformal speech style. The politeness particle cannot be attached to the plain style particle *-ta* because there is no polite sense involved when *-ta* is used. Therefore, it is normally not compatible with the politeness particle *-yo*. Interestingly,

children occasionally use the politeness particle *-yo* with *-ta*, as in the following example:

- (25) *Emma, na onul 100 cem pat-ass-ta-yo.
 Mom, I today 100 point receive-PST-DEC-POL
 ‘Mom, I got 100 points today (on my exam).’

There are two possible explanations: first, if a child consistently uses this combination of sentence enders, that is, *-ta* with *-yo*, it can be taken to mean that s/he has not yet learned that *-ta* in colloquial speech has a blunt sense; second, it could be that the child has already learned that *-ta* expresses bluntness when used colloquially, and has begun to use *-ta* to end the sentence, then realized that s/he needs to use a polite speech style, and therefore uses *-yo* to end the sentence politely. Either way, uses of *-yo* as in (25) by children strongly suggest that they have learned that *-yo* is a politeness particle.

The above discussion predicts that *-yo* can attach to the deferential sentence ender *-(su)p-ni-ta* to become *-(su)p-ni-ta-yo*, the sentence ender which was often used in the past in Korea. *-Yo* can attach to this sentence ender despite the presence of *-ta* because of the presence of the addressee honorific suffix *-(su)p* as honor or deference is compatible with politeness.¹⁰

Besides *-yo*, the particles *-o/-uo/-so* and *-a/-e* are pure speech style particles as well. The table (24) shows that these sentence enders appear in interrogatives and imperatives as well as in declaratives. The relevant data are (6b,e), (10b,e) and (11b,e) above. They are repeated below for convenience:

- (6) Declaratives
- b. INTIMATE
 Na-nun cemsim-ul mek-ess-e.
 I-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-DEC
 ‘I ate lunch.’
- e. SEMIFORMAL
 Na-nun cemsim-ul mek-ess-o.
 I-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-DEC
 ‘I ate lunch.’
- (10) Interrogatives
- b. INTIMATE
 Ne-nun cemsim-ul mek-ess-e?
 I-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-INT
 ‘Did you eat lunch?’
- e. SEMIFORMAL
 Tangsin-un cemsim-ul mek-ess-o?
 You-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-INT
 ‘Did you eat lunch?’

¹⁰ The addressee honorific suffix in all its occurrences has two forms: *-p* after a vowel and *-sup* after a consonant.

- (11) Imperatives
- b. INTIMATE
 Cemsim-ul mek-**e**.
 Lunch-ACC eat-IMV
 ‘Eat lunch!’
- e. SEMIFORMAL
 Cemsim-ul mek-**uo**.
 Lunch-ACC eat-IMV
 ‘Eat lunch!’

Hence, it can be concluded that these particles are pure speech style particles, and the sentence type of sentences containing them has to be determined by other means.

Let us now peruse the other particles appearing in declaratives. Considering *-(s)u**p-ni-ta* first, as mentioned above already, the morpheme *-(s)u**p* is an addressee honorific affix denoting speaker’s deference toward the addressee, and the morpheme *ni* is an indicative morpheme. Then, only *-ta* is left. We can also analyze the superpolite form *-na-i-ta* in the same way. *Na* is an archaic morpheme which is no longer used in modern Korean. Whatever it may be, it certainly is not restricted to declaratives (cf. *-na-i-kka* in superpolite interrogative style) and *-i* is an allomorphic variant of the indicative *-ni*. This again leaves us only with *-ta*. The use of *-ta*, however, is not restricted to declaratives; it occurs in the semiformal and formal speech style particles of exhortatives and promissives. As *-ta* appears across the board, should we classify it as a speech style particle? It is not that simple. As I will argue in more detail in the discussion of exhortatives, there is reason to believe that the particles in the semiformal and formal speech styles of exhortatives and promissives listed in the table (24) do not actually belong to exhortatives or promissives but belong to declaratives. If so, then *-ta* is restricted to declaratives and it remains a potential clause typing particle.

Then, there is the familiar *-ney*. The use of *-ney*, just as that of *-ta*, is also restricted to declaratives. Applying Sadock & Zwicky’s criteria, we can classify *-ney* as a clause typing particle, though it is not as neutral as *-ta* in that it is a special register form marking familiar speech style.¹¹ However, the following data, in which *-ney* co-occurs with *-ta*, seems to be problematic if we classify both *-ta* and *-ney* as sentence typing particles:

- (26) Na-nun cemsim-ul mek-ess-**ta-ney**.
 I-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-DEC-NEY
 ‘I ate lunch.’

If both *-ta* and *-ney* are sentence typing particles, (26) is not expected. Note that having only one of these suffices to mark the sentence a declarative.

- (27) a. Na-nun cemsim-ul mek-ess-**ta**.
 I-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-DEC
 ‘I ate lunch.’

¹¹ As mentioned in the footnote 9, there is no apprehensive meaning in the familiar *-ney*. Hence, it is not a special mood morpheme.

- b. Na-nun cemsim-ul mek-ess **-ney**.
 I-TOP lunch-ACC eat-PST-NEY
 ‘I ate lunch.’

We leave this as an open issue for further research.

Summarizing what we have discussed so far, the sentence enders for declaratives in Korean can be grouped into two classes (besides the special mood particles); this is shown as in table (28). As the status *-ney* not clear, I will mark it with the question mark:

(28)

Class	Particles
Sentence Typing Particles	<i>-ta, -ney(?)</i>
Speech Style Particles	<i>-a/-e, -yo, -o/-uo/-so</i>

4.3. Interrogatives

Interrogatives have the sentential force of asking, seeking answers to the question asked. The sentence end particles occurring in interrogatives are given in (24) above; I repeat the relevant part below in (29):

(29)

Speech level	INTERROGATIVE
PLAIN	<i>-ni, -nya</i>
INTIMATE	<i>-a/-e</i>
FAMILIAR	<i>-na, ((n)-u)n-ka</i>
POLITE	<i>-ayo/-eyo, -na-yo, -(nun) ka-yo,</i>
SEMIFORMAL	<i>-o/uo/so</i>
FORMAL	<i>-(su)-p-ni-kka</i>
SUPERPOLITE	<i>-na-i-kka</i>

Applying the same kind of decompositional approach we used in 4.2, we can distinguish two kinds of particles in (29), clause typing particles and speech style particles. The same speech style particles as in declaratives are involved in interrogatives; *-yo*, *-a/-e*, and *-o/uo/so*. These particles occur across the board. *-Na* is also a speech style particle given Sadock & Zwicky’s criteria because it appears in imperatives and exhortatives.

- (30) a. IMPERATIVE (FAMILIAR)
 Cemsim-ul mek-key (**-na**).
 Lunch-ACC eat-IMP
 ‘Eat lunch!’
- b. EXHORTATIVE (FAMILIAR)
 Wuli icye cemsim(-ul) mek-sey (**-na**).
 We now lunch(-ACC) eat-EXH
 ‘Now, let’s eat lunch.’

The particles *-(su)-p-ni-kka* and *-na-i-kka* receive the same kind of decomposition as *-(su)p-ni-ta* and *-na-i-ta*. The morpheme *-ka*, along with *-ni*, *-nya*, *-kka* is possible only in interrogatives, hence we classify them as sentence typing particles for interrogatives for the time being.¹² The following table summarizes the discussion of the particles in interrogatives:

(31)

Class	Particles
Sentence Typing Particles	<i>-ni, -nya, -ka, -kka</i>
Speech Style Particles	<i>-a/-e, -yo, -o/-uo/-so, -na</i>

4.4. Imperatives

Imperatives have the sentential force of ordering, sometimes called ‘directive force’ (Han 1998). They are marked by sentence end particles. The sentence end particles in imperatives are shown in the following table:

(32)

Speech level	IMPERATIVE
PLAIN	<i>-(a/e)-la, (u)lyem</i>
INTIMATE	<i>-a/-e</i>
FAMILIAR	<i>-((u)si-)key-(na)</i>
POLITE	<i>((u)si-)-a-yo/-e-yo</i>
SEMIFORMAL	<i>-o/uo/so</i>
FORMAL	<i>-(si-p)-si-o</i>

Again, the particles *-a/-e*, *-a-yo/-e-yo*, and *-o/uo/so* are not unique to imperatives. That is, they occur in other sentence types such as declaratives and interrogatives. Therefore, we classify them as speech style particles. Since the addressee functions as the subject of imperatives, the subject honorific suffix *-(u)si* may precede the polite and familiar enders. Decomposing the formal speech style particle *-(si-p)-si-o* leads us to conclude that *-o* is the same *-o* as the semiformal style particle, and therefore a speech style particle. This is because *si-p* are honorific morphemes; *-si* is a subject honorific morpheme and *-p* is an addressee honorific morpheme. The second *-si* in *-(si-p)-si-o* is another special mood morpheme, a requestive mood morpheme. Hence, the morpheme *-o* in *-(si-p)-si-o* is the same *-o* in semiformal speech style, which we have classified as a speech style particle already. *-(U)lyem* in plain style occurs not only in imperatives but also in permissives as shown in (5d) above. Though many scholars (e.g, Suh 1996, Sohn 1999 among others) have claimed that *-(u)lyem* occurs only in permissives and not in imperatives, consider the data below:

(33) a. Younghee-ya, swukcey-lul ha-e-la.

¹² It's not quite clear whether *-ka* and *-kka* are two different particles. It seems like *-kka* occurs only after the indicative morpheme *-ni* (*-i* is the allomorphic variant of *-ni*). There is a good possibility that *-kka* and *-ka* are allomorphs of same particle. We leave this for further research.

- Younghee, homework-ACC do-IMV
 ‘Younghee, do homework.’
- b. Younghee-ya, swukcey-lul ha-lyem.
 Younghee, homework-ACC do-IMV
 ‘Younghee, do homework.’

Both (33a) and (33b) have the directive force. The only difference would be that (33b) is a nicer way of ordering Younghee to do her homework. Hence, I take the particle *-(u)lyem* to be a plain particle of imperatives as well as of permissives. If so, as it occurs in more than one clause type, it cannot be a clause typing particle, but a speech style particle.

Then, *-(a/e)-la* and *-((u)si)-key-(na)* seem to be the only candidates for typing imperative clause. As for *-(a/e)-la*, almost all the literatures on imperatives take the particle *-(a/e)-la* to be an imperative particle but this is not correct. Consider the following data:

- (34) From the Ten Commandments
- a. Todukcil-ha-ci mal-(*-a) la
 steal-do-NMN NEG-IMV
 ‘Do not steal.’
- b. Salin-ha-ci mal--(*-a) la
 Kill-do-NMN NEG-IMV
 ‘Do not kill.’

In (34), the imperative particle *-la* appears without any vowel preceding it. This strongly supports our claim that *-a/-e* is a speech style particle. That is, when there is no one specific to whom the sentence is addressed, there cannot be any speech style particle because one does not know which speech style particle to use. Hence, *-a/e* cannot be a part of the particle that marks the sentence imperative and only *-la* is. As for *-(u)si*, it is the subject honorific affix, and *-na* is a speech style particle that also occurs in interrogatives. Hence, we have only *-la* and *-key* as possible clause typing particles as in table (35):

(35)

Class	Particles
Sentence Typing Particles	<i>-la, -key(na)</i>
Speech Style Particles	<i>-a/-e, -yo, -o/uo/so, -na</i>

4.5. Exhortatives (Propositives)

The sentential force of exhortatives is that of proposing. It is used to urge or propose to someone to do something together with the speaker. The particles occurring in exhortatives are as follows:

(36)

Speech level	EXHORTATIVES
--------------	--------------

PLAIN	<i>-ca</i>
INTIMATE	<i>-a/-e</i>
FAMILIAR	<i>-sey (-na)</i>
POLITE	<i>-a-yo/-e-yo</i>
SEMIFORMAL	<i>-p-si-ta</i>
FORMAL	<i>-si-p-si-ta</i>

Again *-a/-e* and *-a-yo/-e-yo* are speech style particles as they also occur in other constructions. The semiformal and formal style particles, *-p-si-ta* and *-si-p-si-ta*, are composites of many morphemes. *-P-si-ta* is the composite of the addressee honorific affix *-p*, the requestive mood morpheme *-si*, and the declarative particle *-ta*. *-Si-p-si-ta* is the composite of the subject honorific affix *-si*, the addressee honorific affix *-p*, the requestive mood morpheme *-si*, and the declarative particle *-ta*. Given this, we can think of two possibilities; one is that *-ta* is not a declarative typing particle and the other is that sentences with *-p-si-ta* and *-si-p-si-ta* belong to the declarative clause type (which amounts to viewing these speech styles of exhortatives as a sub-type of declaratives). Between the two possibilities, I believe the latter is correct. This is because one cannot use exhortatives to address a social superior (even if honorifics are used) in a direct way since their use implies that the speaker is imposing a requirement on the addressee on an equal basis. Hence a roundabout way or indirect speech act is adopted instead, namely the use of declaratives with honorific morphemes. This amounts to saying that there is no special grammatical form for the semiformal and/or formal style of exhortatives; sentences with these sentence enders are declarative clauses with the illocutionary force of exhortatives.¹³

The familiar style particle *-sey (-na)* occurs in promissives (to be discussed in the next section), and therefore, is a speech style particle. Then, the plain style *-ca* is the only particle that can be classified as the exhortative typing particle, as it is restricted to exhortatives only. The table in (37) summarizes the above discussion:

(37)

Class	Particles
Sentence Typing Particles	<i>-ca</i>
Speech Style Particles	<i>-a/-e, -yo</i>

4.6. Promissives

The sentential force of promissives is that of promising. The particles occurring in this construction are the following:

¹³ Having said this, the same argument could be extended to the semiformal and formal styles of imperatives too, as it would seem even more unlikely for there to be semiformal and formal imperative forms. From this perspective, we may conclude that *-o* in the semiformal and formal speech style *-si-p-si-o* of imperative is actually the declarative semiformal *-o*, and sentences with these are actually declaratives. Again, an indirect speech style is adopted for the semiformal and formal speech style.

Tomorrow you-with lunch-ACC buy-PRM-SEY
 ‘Today I’m busy. I promise to eat lunch with you tomorrow.’

(39) shows that the exhortative and promissive differ minimally. The presence of the *-m* morpheme makes the sentence in (39B) promissive. Furthermore, the *-sey* of the familiar speech style occurs also in exhortatives; hence, it can be classified as a speech style particle. Also, the *-a* in the plain style particle seems to be the intimate speech style *-a* that occurs in many other sentence types.¹⁶ Then, *-m* and *-l-kkey* are the only possible promissive typing particles.

(40)

Class	Particles
Sentence Typing Particles	<i>-m, -l-kkey</i>
Speech Style Particles	<i>-a/-e, -yo, -sey</i>

4.7. Premonitives

As discussed above, there is only one sentence end particle for premonitives; the plain style *-l-la*, which is used as in (41).

(41) PLAIN ((15) repeated)
 Tachi-**I-la**
 Get hurt-PRE
 ‘(Be careful.) You may get hurt.’

Though some scholars propose premonitives as an independent sentence type in Korean, I argue that they should be analyzed as a subtype of declaratives. Consider (42):

(42) a. Nay-ka taum kyengki-lul kkok iki-li-**la** (or **-ta**)
 I-NOM next game-ACC sure win-Presumptive-DEC
 ‘I will be sure to win the next game.’
 b. Nay-ka taum kyengki-lul kkok iki-**l-kes-i-ta**
 I-NOM next game-ACC sure win-Presumptive-COP-DEC
 ‘I will be sure to win the next game.’

In traditional grammar, the morpheme *-la* is claimed to be an allomorphic variant of *-ta* as seen in (42a), though *-ta* sounds more archaic and *-la* sounds more like it is spoken to one’s self. When *-la* is used with the presumptive mood particle *-li*, it marks future tense. Future can also be expressed by using *-l-kes* as in (42b). In such case, not *-li* but *-ta* is used. That *-la* is the variant of *-ta* is also seen in the following embedded sentence:

(43) a. Na-nun nayil-un Nay-ka ili-**l-kes-i-la-ko**
 I-NOM Tomorrow-TOP I-NOM win-Presumptive-Copula-DEC-Comp
 sayngkak-ha-n-ta.

¹⁶ However, there is also a possibility that it is simply a phonological epenthesis that takes place at the end of a sentence.

think-do-PRS-DEC

‘I think I will win tomorrow.’

- b. Na-nun ecey John-i iki-ess-**ta**-ko sayngkak-ha-n-ta.
 I-NOMyesterday J.-NOM win-PST- -DEC-Comp think-do-PRS-DEC
 ‘I think John won yesterday.’

When (42b) is embedded, the particle *-ta* becomes *-la*, but notice this is true only in the future tense. If the embedded clause is past, only *-ta* can occur. Hence, *-la* is a variant of *-ta* which is restricted only to future tense. More specifically, it can co-occur only with *-li* the presumptive particle to denote future tense. It looks, therefore, like the sentence end particle *-l-la* in (41) is the composite of premonitive *-li* plus declarative *-la* (a variant). Hence I conclude that premonitives are not an independent sentence type but a subtype of declaratives.

4.8. Permissives

(44)

Speech level	PERMISSIVE
PLAIN	-(u)lyem (-u-na)
INTIMATE	-a/-e
FAMILIAR	--
POLITE	-a-yo/-e-yo
SEMIFORMAL	-o/-uo
FORMAL	-si-p-si-o

The sentence end particles for permissives are just like those of imperatives except that for the imperative, there is one more plain style particle *-la*, and the familiar permissive style particle is missing. The plain style particle *-uleym*, intimate, polite, semiformal, and formal style particles are the same; hence, they are speech style particles. In fact, there are considerable similarities between imperatives and permissives, as Suh (1996) also notes. First, both the imperative and the permissive particles occur only with non-stative verbs. Second, in both constructions the hearer is the actor. Third, negation in permissives patterns same way as in imperatives: the negative verb *-mal* is used for both imperatives and permissives. This is shown in (45):

- (45) a. IMPERATIVE
 Mek-ci *mal-a-la*
 Eat-Nominalizer not-IMP
 ‘Do not eat!’
- b. PERMISSIVE
 Mek-ci *mal-(u)lyem (-u-na)*
 Eat-Nominalizer not-PER
 ‘Do not eat!’ or ‘You are not allowed to eat.’

And finally, the particle *-(u)lyem (-u-na)* cannot appear in embedded clauses; it is changed to the imperative particle *-la* (46b).

- (46) a. *Emma-ka kwaca-lul mek--(u)lyem (-u-na)-ko ha-ess-ta
 Mom-NOM cookie-ACC eat-PER-Comp say-PST-DEC
 (Intended Meaning) ‘Mom said it’s okay to eat the cookies.’
- b. Emma-ka na-ekey [kwaca-lul mek-u-la]-ko ha-ess-ta
 Mom-NOM me-to cookie-ACC eat-IMP-Comp say-PST-DEC
 ‘Mom said to eat the cookies.’

Moreover, as already mentioned, the intimate, polite, semiformal, and formal style particles are exactly same as those of imperatives. Given these facts, I categorize permissives as a subtype of imperatives.

4.9. Exclamatives

Just as with premonitives and permissives, there seems to be no distinct grammatical form for exclamatives in Korean. Let us consider the exclamative construction introduced above:

- (47) EXCLAMATIVE
 Ahyu, tew-**ela**.
 Oh, hot-EXC
 ‘Oh, it’s hot!’

The particle *-la*, as argued above, is a variant of the declarative particle *-ta*. Given this, there seems to be insufficient evidence to claim that exclamatives are an independent clause type of their own. Of course, exclamative expressions are often found in Korean but they are exclamative by illocutionary force, not by sentential force. Consider the following data:

- (48) a. John-i manhi ku-ess-kwun-**a!**
 John-NOM a lot grow-PST-APE-DEC
 ‘John grew a lot!’
- b. Mary-ka cham yeppu-**ta!**
 Mary-NOM very pretty-DEC
 ‘Mary is very pretty.’
- c. Ikes-i elmana yeppu-**nya!**
 This-NOM how much pretty-INT
 ‘How pretty this is!’

While above sentences can be interpreted as exclamative in their illocutionary force, their grammatical forms are that of declaratives and interrogatives: (48a,b) are grammatically plain declaratives and (48c) is grammatically an interrogative. Hence, it is only context that can trigger exclamative interpretation. Therefore, I claim that exclamatives in Korean are a subtype of declaratives and/or interrogatives.

5. Theoretical implications and concluding remark

In section 4, we have discussed 8 kinds of sentences and the sentence enders occurring therein. In the process of exploring these sentences in detail, I have made two claims:

(i) Not all sentence enders are clause typing particles. Although there are many sentence enders, by applying Sadock & Zwicky's criteria for clause type, many of them are classified as speech style particles or special mood particles. Only a few particles remain which are classifiable as clause typing particles.

(ii) There are at most 5 clause types in Korean, instead of 8 (or 9 or 10, as some have argued). I have discussed 8 clause types to start with: declaratives, interrogatives, imperatives, exhortatives, promissives, permissives, premonitives, and exclamatives. Among these, I have argued that permissive is a subtype of imperative, premonitive a subtype of declarative, and exclamative a subtype of either declarative or interrogative. Hence, declarative, interrogative, imperative, exhortative, and promissive are the only clause types in Korean. The following table lists the clause typing particles for these five clause types:

(49)

Clause types	(Potential) clause typing particles
Declaratives	<i>-ta, -ney(?)</i>
Interrogatives	<i>-ni, -nya, -ka, -kka</i>
Imperatives	<i>-la, -key</i>
Exhortatives	<i>-ca</i>
Promissives	<i>-m, -l-kkey</i>

From Sadock & Zwicky's point of view, Korean has three major clause types, namely declarative, interrogative, and imperative, and two minor ones, exhortatives and promissives. They form a 'closed system' in that the types are mutually exclusive and there are sets of corresponding sentences, the members of which differ only in belonging to different types. Each of these clause types is associated with a sentential force, i.e., a pragmatic force conventionally associated with it.

What theoretical implications does this discussion on sentence end particles in Korean have? From a theoretical point of view, an important question arises: What is the role of the clause typing particles? More specifically, what does it mean for them to be clause typing particles? Does it mean that they mark force? That is, are they the syntactic encoding of sentential force?

Within the GB/Minimalism framework it is proposed that force is directly represented in the syntax. The prominent idea is that there is a force indicating feature or operator present in the syntax. Specifically, for imperatives and interrogatives it is claimed that there is a feature or operator that resides in a high position of grammatical structure, usually in the CP layer of the syntactic structure (Chomsky & Lasnik 1977, Cheng 1991, Han 1998, Rizzi 1996, 1997, and Rivero & Terzi 1995, among others). These elements in the syntax play the role of marking the clause in which they occur as a member of a certain clause type.

Because Korean is known to mark clause types with particles, Korean data, especially sentences that employ what I have categorized as clause typing particles, can either render support for or rejection to such view. Note that it is very tempting to consider the clause typing particles as force markers as the sentences they occur in differ minimally as shown below:

- (50) a. DECLARATIVE
 (Na-nun) cemsim-ul mek-ess-**ta**.
 (I-TOP) lunch-ACC eat-PST-DEC
 ‘I ate lunch.’
- b. INTERROGATIVE
 (Ne-nun) cemsim-ul mek-ess-**ni**?
 (You-TOP) lunch-ACC eat-PST-INT (Q)
 ‘Did you eat lunch?’
- c. IMPERATIVE
 Cemsim-ul mek-**e-la**.
 Lunch-ACC eat-IMV
 ‘Eat lunch!’
- d. EXHORTATIVE (PROPOSITIVE)
 Cemsim-ul mek-**ca**.
 Lunch-ACC eat-EXH
 ‘Let’s eat lunch.’
- e. PROMISSIVE
 (Nay-ka) cemsim-ul mek-u-**ma**.
 (I-NOM) lunch-ACC eat-U-PRM¹⁷
 ‘I promise to eat lunch.’

The sentences in (50) differ in having different sentence end particles only. Then, from the viewpoint of those GB/Minimalists’ mentioned above, the clause typing particles could be considered as the spell outs of difference force in the syntax. For example, the imperative particle *-la* would be the spell out of the feature encoding directive force in imperatives (cf. Han 1998) and the interrogative particle *-ni* would be the spell out of the operator marking questions (cf. Chomsky & Lasnik 1977). Indeed, proposals along this line have been put forward in the literature; for example, Ahn & Yoon (1989) and Whitman (1989), among others, have proposed that the clause typing particles in Korean mark ‘sentential mood’, i.e. declarative, interrogative, imperative, etc., and have argued that they head a MoodP positioned higher than IP. This MoodP corresponds to ForceP in Rizzi (1997). Hence, in that framework, the clause typing particles would be the head of the functional projection ForceP, which encodes the force of the type of clause.

If this were true that the clause typing particles were force markers, then this would render support for the view that advocates the presence of a single force bearer in the syntax represented either as a feature or an operator. However, there are certain facts that prevent us from committing ourselves to this approach. Consider the data in (51):

- (51) a. John-i cemsin-ul mek-ess -**ta** -ko mal-ha-ess-ta.

¹⁷ *U* is a phonological epenthesis, as mentioned already.

- J.-NOM lunch-ACC eat-Past -DEC-Comp say-do-PST-DEC
 ‘John said that he ate lunch.’
- b. * John-i cemsin-ul mek-ess **-e/e-yo/-ney/-o** -ko mal-ha-ess-ta.
 J.-NOM lunch-ACC eat-PST -DEC -Comp say-do-PST-DEC
 (Intended meaning) ‘John said that he ate lunch.’
- c. John-i “cemsim-ul mek-ess **-e/e-yo/-ney/-o**” -la -ko mal-ha-ess-ta.
 J.-NOM lunch-ACC eat-PST -DEC QP-Comp say-do-PST-DEC
 ‘John said “I ate lunch.”’
 (QP-Quotative Particle)

(51) shows that some of the particles in (49) occur in embedded clauses. For example, *-ta* appears in embedded declarative clauses in Korean. In fact, none of the other particles that we have mentioned in connection with declaratives -- those I have classified as speech style particles and/or special mood particles -- can appear in embedded declarative clauses, as shown in (51b). They can only appear in direct quotation clauses as illustrated in (51c). So, it is only the clause typing particles that appear in embedded clauses.

If *-ta* is a clause typing particle that carries the sentential force of asserting for declaratives, the embedded clause in (51a) should have the force of asserting. However, it is generally assumed that embedded clauses do not express their own force. The same problem arises for the interrogative particle *-nya*, imperative *-la*, exhortative *-ca*, and promissive *-m*, since they all appear in embedded clauses.

(52) Interrogative

- a. Emma-ka John-i cemsin-ul mek-ess **-nya** -ko mul-ess-ta.
 mother-NOM J.-NOM lunch-ACC eat-PST -INT-Comp ask-PST-DEC
 ‘Mother asked if John ate lunch.’
- b. * Emma-ka John-i cemsin-ul mek-ess **-e/e-yo/-na/-o/-ni/-nun-ka** -
 mother-NOM J.-NOM lunch-ACC eat-PST -INT
 ko mul-ess-ta.
 -Comp ask-PST-DEC
 (Intended meaning) ‘Mother asked if John ate lunch.’

(53) a. Imperative¹⁸

¹⁸ In root clauses, the imperative typing particle *-la* occurs either as *-a-la* or *-e-la* depending on the phonological environment. But in embedded clauses, it occurs only as *-u-la*. For this reason, some scholars have argued that *-u-la* in embedded contexts is not the same particle as *-a-la/-e-la* in root clause. But rather they are two different particles and the one in embedded contexts is not an imperative particle at all (Han 2003, among others). Hence, there is no embedded imperative. However, this is incorrect as I have discussed already in the text. Consider the following data again, (34) repeated:

- (i) From the Ten Commandments
- a. Todukcil-ha-ci mal-(*-a) la
 steal-do-NMN NEG-IMV
 ‘Do not steal.’
- b. Salin-ha-ci mal-(*-a) la
 Kill-do-NMN NEG-IMV
 ‘Do not kill.’

- Emma-ka mek-**u-la**/*-**key**-ko mal-ha-si-ess-ta
 Mom-NOM eat-IMV-Comp say-do-SH-PST-DEC
 ‘Mom told (me) to eat.’
 (SH – subject honorific morpheme)
- b. Exhortative
 Emma-ka mek-**ca**-ko mal-ha-si-ess-ta
 Mom-NOM eat-EXH-Comp say-do-SH-PST-DEC
 ‘Mom told me to eat together.’
- c. Promissive
 Emma-ka cenyuk-ey o-**ma**-ko mal-ha-si-ess-ta
 Mom-NOM evening-at come-PRM-Comp say-do-SH-PST-DEC
 ‘Mom promised that she would come in the evening.’

The clause typing particles can occur in noun complement clauses too. (54) provides the relevant data:

- (54)¹⁹ a. Cip-ul phal-keyss-**ta**-nun na-uy kyelceng
 House-ACC sell-FUT-DEC-TNS my-GEN decision
 ‘My decision that I will see the house’
- b. Pap-ul mek-keyss-**nya**-nun emma-uy cilmwun
 Meal-ACC eat-FUT-INT-TNS mom-GEN question
 ‘Mom’s question whether I would eat’
- c. Cip-ey ka-**la**-nun sensayngnim-uy myenglyeng
 Home-to go-IMP-TNS teacher-GEN order
 ‘Teacher’s order to go home’
- d. Yenghwa-lul po-**ca**-nun chinkwu-uy ceyan
 Movie-ACC see-EXH-TNS friend-GEN suggestion
 ‘Friend’s suggestion to watch a movie’

The data in (54) exemplify the use of the clause typing particles, e.g., *-ta*, *-nya*, *-la*, *-ca*, in noun complement clauses. If it were the case that these particles encode force of each clause types, then the noun complement clauses in (54) would carry force, which is

I have said that the data in (i) strongly suggest that *-a/-e* is a speech style particle and only *-la* is the imperative particle. This is because when there is no one specific to whom the sentence is addressed, there cannot be any speech style particle because one does not know which speech style particle to use. I believe the same thing happens in embedded contexts as well. When an imperative clause is embedded, it is not the embedded clause that carries the burden of expressing the relation between the speaker and the hearer, so no speech style particle is necessary in the embedded clause. In fact, the embedded clauses must be without any speech style particles. Hence, *-a/-e* cannot appear before *-la* in embedded imperatives. Then, why does *-u* precede *-la* in embedded imperatives? I argue that it is a mere phonological epenthesis that is inserted between two consonants. In conclusion, the *-la* in embedded imperatives and root imperatives is the same *-la*.

¹⁹ There is no noun complement clause with promissives. A promissive in such constructions is replaced with a declarative as shown below:

- (i) Nayil o- n -**ta** -nun yaksok
 Tomorrow come-PRES-DEC-TNS promise
 ‘A promise to come tomorrow’

clearly undesirable. Just as it does not make sense to think that embedded clauses express their own force, it does not seem plausible for noun complement clauses to express force.

Given these facts, it seems the clause typing particles are not to be identified with force indicators, or the syntactic encoding of force. If this conclusion is correct, then the Korean data do not lend support for the view that force is encoded in a single feature/morpheme in the syntax. A couple of questions that need to be addressed at this point are as follows:

- (a) What is the role of the clause typing particles?
- (b) How is force encoded in the syntax?

Though I do not have answers to these question and they ought to be researched further more, I will try to give some insights that may be helpful.

I have argued that the clause typing particles are not force indicators in Korean. Then, what is their role? Why are we calling them clause typing particles? The term ‘clause typing particles’ is purely descriptively used in the sense that they are unique to a certain clause type. That is, the imperative particle *-la* is unique to imperatives. It signals the sentence it occurs in as a member of imperatives by merely being present. Hence, it marks a clause type but does not encode the directive force. The grammatical role of these particles is not very clear at this point and frankly I do not have a satisfactory answer to the question (a). To briefly sketch an idea being investigated in an ongoing research as vague and inconclusive as it may be, these particles, at least some of them, seem to play the role of marking persons involved in a sentence. This may be a surprise to those who know that Korean does not mark persons at all. That is, it is a non-agreement language. It is true that Korean does not encode persons such as first, second, or third person which trigger agreement on verbs grammatically, however, in the view that it does have honorific agreement which is grammatically encoded, it is not so surprising to think that it employs a way to represent persons such as speaker and hearer (or addressee) (which are the concepts that are relevant in marking honorifics) in the grammar. At least for the clause typing particles of imperatives, exhortatives, and promissives, they seem to mark persons such as speaker, addressee, and speaker + addressee (inclusive first person). This idea is contemplated within the view that imperatives, exhortatives, and promissives are sub clause types under a meta clause type called ‘jussives’ (I refer the reader to Pak, Portner, & Zanuttini 2004).

Turning to the question (b), the Korean data show that force is not encoded in a morpheme or a feature in the syntax. That is, force is not directly represented in the syntax. This calls for an alternative view on the representation of force. If force is not directly encoded in the syntax, then may be it is derived from semantic primitives (elements) that is syntactically expressed and these primitives combining in such a way to yield a certain clause type. Such a view is introduced by Zanuttini and Portner (2003) where exclamatives are thoroughly investigated. Specifically, they argue that a clause type is determined through abstract syntactic properties that represent the defining semantic properties of exclamatives. These syntactic properties encode the essential semantic components and together they yield the meaning of an exclamative. Though Korean data discussed in this paper do not provide direct support for this kind of approach to the representation of force, it suggests that direct encoding of force in the

syntax in a morpheme or feature has serious problems and certainly necessitate other approaches to the issue.

References

- Ahn, Hee-Don and Hang-Jin Yoon. 1989. Functional Categories in Korean. In Susumo Kuno et al. (eds.), *Harvard International Studies on Korean Linguistics III*. 79-88. Hanshin. Seoul. Korea.
- Chierchia, Genarro and Sally McConnell-Ginet. 1990. *Meaning and Grammar: An Introduction to Semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Choi, Hyun-Bae. 1937. Yuktay Hankwuk Mwunbep Taykye (Generation after Generation Korean Grammar Plan). *Wuli Malbon (Korean Grammar)*. 1- 45. Top Press. Seoul. Korea.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Han, Chung Hye. 1998. The structure and interpretation of imperatives: mood and force in Universal Grammar. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Han, Chung-Hye and Chungmin Lee. 2003. Morphological constraint on negation in imperatives in Korean. *Japanese/ Korean linguistics*. Vol. 13. CSLI. Stanford.
- Hausser, R. 1980. Surface Compositionality and the semantics of mood. In J. Searle, F. Kiefer, & M. Bierwisch, eds., *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics*. Dordrecht & Boston: D. Reidel. 71-95.
- Hong, Ki-Mun. 1947. *Chosen Mwunpep Yenkwu (Korean Grammar Research)*. Seoul Press. Korea.
- Kim, Min-Soo. 1960. *Kwuke Mwunpep Yenkwu (Korean Grammar Study)*. Tongmwunkwan. Seoul. Korea.
- Ko, Young-Keun. 1947. Hyentay kwuke-uy chongkyel emi-ey tayhan kwucocek yenkwu (A Structural Research of Modern Korean Sentence End Particles). *Ehak Yenkwu (Language Research)*. Vol. 10-1. Seoul University Ehak Yenkwuso.
- Kwon, Jae-Il. 1992. *Hankwuke Tongsalon (Korean Verb Theory)*. Minumsa. Seoul. Korea.
- Martin, Samuel. E. 1992. *A Reference Grammar of Korean: A Complete Guide to the Grammar and History of the Korean Language*. Charles E. Tuttle Company. Rutland, Vermont, & Tokyo, Japan.
- Nam, Ki-Sim 2001. *Hyentay Kwuke Tongsalon (Modern Korean Verb Theory)*. Tayhaksa publishing company.
- Pak, Miok, Paul Portner, and Raffaella Zanuttini. 2004. Deriving Clause Types: focusing on Korean. In the proceedings of Linguistic Society of Korea 2004 Conference.
- Portner, Paul. 1999. The Semantics of Mood. *Glott International*, Vol. 4.1: 3-9.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Haegeman, L., ed., *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Sadock, Jerald M. and Arnold Zwicky. 1985. Speech act distinctions in syntax. In Shopen, T., ed., *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 155-196.
- Slenker, Philippe. 2003. A Plea for Monsters. *Linguistics and philosophy*. vol. 26.1: 29-

120.

Sohn, Ho-Min. 1999. *The Korean Language*. Cambridge and New York, Cambridge University Press.

Suh, Cheong-Soo. 1996. *Korean Grammar*. Hanyang University Press. Seoul. Korea.

Whitman, John. 1989. Topic, Modality, and IP Structure. In Susumo Kuno et al. (eds.), *Harvard International Studies on Korean Linguistics III*. 341-356. Hanshin. Seoul. Korea.

Zanuttini, Raffaella and Paul Portner. 2003. Exclamative Clauses: At the Syntax-Semantics Interface. *Language*. vol. 79.1: 39-81.