

Allocutive agreement in Korean under cyclic Agree

Sanghee Kim*

Abstract. Korean is a language known to lack agreement, but there is one salient agreement that happens: honorific agreement. A basic example is that whenever the subject is suffixed with an honorifying nominal form, *-kkeyse*, it agrees with a verbal suffix, *-si*. The condition for honorific agreement is that the subject must have an honorifying feature [+hon] and has to be [+human]. Nevertheless, I newly introduce a case where honorifying verbal suffix *-si* is used even when the subject does not have a [+hon, +human] feature. I suggest that this is a type of allocutive agreement (i.e., morphosyntactic agreement with the hearer). Based on Speech Act projection suggested by Haegeman & Hill (2013), I propose a structural representation that integrates discourse participants into syntactic representation. I also predict the phenomenon by adopting the framework of cyclic Agree proposed by Béjar & Rezac (2009).

Keywords. allocutive (hearer/addressee) agreement; cyclic Agree; Speech Act projection; honorifics; Korean

1. Introduction. Harada (1976) categorizes honorifics into two types: *propositional* (i.e., argument-oriented) and *performative* honorification. The categorization is also dubbed as *content-oriented markers of politeness* and *utterance-oriented markers of politeness* in some literature (Portner et al. 2019). Propositional honorification is related to a morphosyntactic realization of honorification with the subject or the object. In contrast, performative honorification is not related to the denotation of the argument but rather to the politeness of speech. The distinction can be applied to Korean as the following example in (1).¹ Sentences (1-a) and (1-b) are the cases of propositional honorification in Harada’s term. Sentence (1-a) is a case of subject honorification: the subject, *apeci* (‘father’), is being honorified with a verbal suffix *-si*. Sentence (1-b) is a case of object honorification: the object, *halmeni* (‘grandmother’), is being honorified by changing the non-honorified light verb to an honorified light verb.² In the meantime, sentence (1-c) is an instance of performative honorifics, where honorifics is not related to the subject or the object of the argument but to the hearer/addressee.

- (1) a. *apeci-kkeyse o-*(si)-ess-ta*
 father-NOM.HON come-*(HON)-PST-DECL.PLAIN
 ‘Father came.’ (Honorifying ‘father’)
- b. *apeci-kkeyse halmeni-lul to-wa-[*cwu /*
 father-NOM.HON grandmother-ACC help-CONN-[*LV /
tuli]-si-ess-ta
LV.HON]-HON-PST-DECL.PLAIN

*I am grateful to Karlos Arregi for an extensive discussion for this topic. I thank Heejeong Ko for helpful comments, and to Jackie Lai and University of Chicago Language Processing Lab members for suggestions. I also appreciate all the comments and questions from the audience at the poster session at the LSA Annual Meeting 2019. All errors and mistakes are mine. Author: Sanghee Kim, University of Chicago (sangheekim@uchicago.edu).

¹I followed the Leipzig glossing rules. Other glossing rules are as the following: ADN=adnominal, AL=allocutive agreement, CONN=connective particle, DFLT=default, EVID=evidential, HON=honorific, REL=relativizer, LV=light verb. A detailed description on the declarative marker is introduced in Section 3.3.

²There is no ACC.HON in Korean.

- ‘Father helped grandmother.’ (Honorifying ‘grandmother’ (as well as ‘father’))
- c. nwun-i o-n-eyo
 snow-NOM come-PRS-DECL.POLITE
 Int. ‘It is snowing.’ (Speaking in a polite manner)

In this paper, I introduce a case in Korean where propositional and performative honorifics have the same verbal suffix but are used differently and realized under different syntactic process. One key data I examine is as below (2).

- (2) a. kokayk-nim-kkeyse o-chung-ey [*issu / kyey]-*(si)-eyo
 customer-HON-NOM.HON five-floor-at [*exist / exist.HON]-*(HON)-DECL.POLITE
 ‘The customer is on the fifth floor.’
 (Honorifying ‘customer’ and speaking in a polite manner)
- b. namsengpok-i o-chung-ey [issu / *kyey]-si-eyo
 men’s.wear-NOM five-floor-at [exist / *exist.HON]-AL-DECL.POLITE
 ‘Men’s wear is on the fifth floor.’ (Speaking in a polite manner)
- c. Mina-ka o-chung-ey [issu / *kyey]-(*si)-eyo
 Mina-NOM five-floor-at [exist / *exist.HON]-(*HON)-DECL.POLITE
 ‘Mina is on the fifth floor.’ (Speaking in a polite manner)

Sentence (2-a) can be categorized as propositional honorification. The subject (‘father’) and the verb (‘exist’) agree in honorification. Therefore, the verb changes into an honorified form, and an honorifying verbal suffix *-si* is attached. Meanwhile, the subject cannot have the verbal suffix *-si* in (2-c) even though the speaker is talking in a polite manner. This is because ‘Mina’ is not an honorified subject. It then appears that the use of *-si* hinges on the honorifiability of the subject. However, an unexpected phenomenon is observed in (2-b). No argument has a honorifying feature. Nonetheless, the verbal suffix, *-si*, is used for agreement. The morphosyntactic realization in (1-b) seems to be a propositional honorification but the cause seems to be purely performative. It appears to be a mixture of propositional and performative honorification. Moreover, unlike sentence (2-a) the verb root in (2-b) does not change. Given that the *-si* is used for honorification agreement, it is a puzzle how this suffix is used even without a valid argument.

I provide a general sketch on Korean morphosyntax of honorification (Section 2). In Section 3, I elaborate what the current puzzle is. Section 3.1 further demonstrates the mismatch of the use of *-si* with the arguments. I further show how two uses of *-si* differ in negation 3.2. In Section 3.3, I illustrate the restricted use of sentence final particles for one type of *-si*. I provide an analysis in Section 4. I then propose that there are two types of *-si*: honorification agreement and allocutive agreement (Section 4.1). I also predict the the phenomena by adopting Speech Act projection by Haegeman & Hill (2013) (Section 4.2). I demonstrate how allocutive agreement is realized under cyclic Agree (Béjar & Rezac 2009) and where it is probed (Section 4.3). I conclude in Section 5.

2. Background on Korean morphosyntax of honorification. Korean is generally known to lack morphological agreement. However, one prominent agreement observed in Korean is honorification agreement, where there is morphological agreement between the subject and the

verb (Ahn 2002; Choe 2004; Choi 2010).³ I introduce relevant rules in Korean honorification agreement.

First, when a subject is marked with an honorifying nominal suffix, *-kkeyse*, or an honorifying topical suffix, *-kkeyse^{nun}*, it must agree with a verbal suffix, *-si*. The absence of *-si* induces ungrammaticality when the subject has an honorifying nominal/topical suffix (3-a). The use of honorification *-si* for a subject without an honorifying suffix is also ungrammatical (3-b). ‘Seri’ is a proper noun that does not have an honorifying feature.

- (3) a. *apeci-[kkeyse / kkeyse^{nun}] o-*(si)-ess-ta*
apeci-[NOM.HON / TOP.HON] come-(HON)-PST-DECL*
 ‘Father came.’ (Honorifying ‘Father’)
- b. *Seri-[ka / nun / *kkeyse / *kkeyse^{nun}] o-*(si)-ess-ta*
*Seri-[NOM / TOP / *NOM.HON / *TOP.HON] come-*(HON)-PST-DECL*
 ‘Seri came.’

Second, honorification agreement triggers some verbs to change the root form (4-b). The honorification verbal suffix is still obligatory even when the root is changed. In the case of (4-c), the verb *cata* (‘to sleep’) changes to *cwumusita* (an honorified version of ‘to sleep’) because the subject has an honorified nominal suffix.

- (4) a. *Seri-ka ca-ss-ta*
Seri-NOM sleep-PST-DECL
 ‘Seri slept.’
- b. **hoycang-nim-kkeyse ca-si-ess-ta*
chairman-HON-NOM.HON sleep-HON-PST-DECL
 Intended: ‘The chairman slept.’ (Honorifying ‘chairman’)
- c. *hoycang-nimkkeyse cwumu-*(si)-ess-ta*
chairman-NOM.HON sleep.HON-(HON)-PST-DECL*
 ‘The chairman slept.’ (Honorifying ‘chairman’)

Third, honorification agreement *-si* appears before tense (5-a). Moreover, honorification agreement *-si* comes after the light verb but not after the main verb (5-b) (Kim & Sells 2007). When there is no light verb, *-si* simply affixes to the verb.

- (5) a. *apeci-kkeyse kong-ul capu-*(si)-ess-ta*
father-NOM.HON ball-ACC catch-(HON)-PST-DECL*
 ‘Father caught the ball.’ (Honorifying ‘father’)
- b. *apeci-kkeyse kong-ul cap-*(si)-a-*(si)-po-*(si)-ess-ta*
father-NOM.HON ball-ACC catch-(HON)-CONN-*(HON)-LV-*(HON)-PST-DECL*
 ‘Father gave it a try to catch the ball and he caught the ball.’ (Honorifying ‘father’)

Fourth, there can be multiple occurrences of *-si* in negation (Choi & Harley 2017). There are two ways to negate a sentence in Korean. One way is to have a negation, *an*, before the verb: *short negation*. The other way is to have a negation, *an*, and a *do*-support, *ha*, after the verb: *long negation*. When short negation is used, *-si* is suffixed after the head verb and before the tense marker (6-a). When long negation is used, *-si* can occur multiple times, either after

³See Boeckx & Niinuma 2004 for honorific agreement in Japanese. But for a different argument on honorific agreement, see Bobaljik & Yatsushiro 2006.

the head verb or after the negation *anh(u)* (6-b), or both. However, it is ungrammatical if *-si* is absent in any of the positions, as in (6-c). The multiple uses of *-si* is permissive restrictively to negations. As seen in (6-d), the use of *-si* is blocked for the head verb when there is a light verb following the head verb. Hence no multiple uses of *-si* is allowed in (6-d).

- (6) a. *apeci-kkeyse kong-ul an capu-*(si)-ess-ta*
 father-NOM.HON ball-ACC NEG catch-*(HON)-PST-DECL
 ‘Father did not catch the ball.’ (Honorifying ‘father’)
- b. *apeci-kkeyse kong-ul cap-(si)-ci an-ha-(si)-ess-ta*
 father-NOM.HON ball-ACC catch-(HON)-CONN NEG-do-(HON)-PST-DECL
 ‘Father did not catch the ball.’ (Honorifying ‘father’)
- c. **apeci-kkeyse kong-ul cap-ci an-ha-ss-ta*
 father-NOM.HON ball-ACC catch-CONN NEG-do-PST-DECL
 ‘Father did not catch the ball.’ (Honorifying ‘father’)
- d. *apeci-kkeyse kong-ul cap-(*si)-a-po-(si)-ci*
 father-NOM.HON ball-ACC catch-(*HON)-CONN-LV-(HON)-CONN
an-ha-(si)-ess-ta
 NEG-do-(HON)-PST-DECL
 Int. ‘Father has not caught a ball.’ (Honorifying ‘father’)

Fifth, the target of honorification should be honorifiable (i.e., [+hon]) and should be [+human]. Even if the speaker wants to express awe of the subject, it is unacceptable to have an honorifying nominal suffix, *-kkeyse*, and an honorifying verbal suffix, *-si* (7).⁴

- (7) a. *kangaci-[ka / *kkeyse] alamtawu-(*si)-ta*
 dog-[NOM / NOM.HON] beautiful-(*HON)-DECL
 ‘The dog is beautiful.’ (Praising ‘dog’)
- b. *i kulim-[i / *kkeyse] alamtawu-(*si)-ta*
 this painting-[NOM / NOM.HON] beautiful-(*HON)-DECL
 ‘This picture is beautiful.’ (In awe of ‘painting’)

In this section, I showed the basic morphosyntactic features of honorification agreement in Korean. In the following section, I discuss a puzzling phenomenon, where the use of *-si* is different from the way that honorification agreement *-si* is represented as above.

3. Puzzle. I showed five morphosyntactic features regarding Korean honorification agreement. First, whenever the subject has an honorifying suffix, verbal suffix *-si* must be used. Second, at times, this honorification agreement accompanies verb root change along with the verbal suffix *-si*. Third, the verbal suffix *-si* appears after the head verb and the light verb but before the

⁴However, in Korean, there are cases where there is a verbal suffix *-si* even though the matching subject does not have the honorifying nominal suffix *-kkeyse*. It is usually the case where the noun is a or a concept of a possession of the honorified noun. In the following example, it is *swuyem* (‘beard’) that is described to be *kil-ta* (‘long’). Interestingly, this predicate has a verbal suffix, *-si* even though the sentence does not mean that ‘the grandfather is long’; it is the ‘grandfather’s beard’ that is long. I do not further discuss this case of honorification agreement as it is beyond the current discussion.

- (i) *halapeci-kkeyse swuyem-i kil-si-ta*
 grandfather-NOM.HON beard-NOM long-HON-DECL
 ‘Grandfather’s beard is long.’

tense marker. Fourth, *-si* can appear in any places among the possible options, but absence of *-si* is ungrammatical. Fifth, the subject must have a [+hon, +human] feature.

However, there are instances that cannot be simply accounted for by honorification agreement. Recent studies have extensively shown the use of *-si* even in cases where the agreeing subject is [-hon, -human] (e.g., Baek 2017; Kim 2016; Ko & Kwu 2008; Lee 2010, 2012; Mok 2013). I introduce these cases in the following subsections.

All the instances of *-si* in this section are glossed as ‘HON.’ However, uses that are deviant from the general subject-verb honorification agreement will be marked with a bold-faced ‘HON.’ I will later demonstrate that this type of HON is an allocutive agreement *-si*.

3.1 NO AGREEMENT OF POLITE *-si* WITH THE INTERNAL ARGUMENT. I introduce cases that cannot be simply explained by honorification agreement. A regular case of honorification agreement *-si* is exemplified in (8-a). There is a nominal suffix, *-kkeyse* and a verbal suffix, *-si*, and the verb ‘exist’ undergoes suppletion. In contrast, in (8-b), there is a verbal suffix, *-si*, even though the subject does not have [+human] and [+hon] feature. The verb root does not change either. It is ungrammatical to have *-si* even though the subject is [+human]. This is a puzzle that cannot be predicted from an honorification agreement *-si*.

- (8) a. kokayk-nim-kkeyse o-chung-ey [*issu / kyey]-*(si)-eyo
 customer-HON-NOM.HON five-floor-at [*exist / exist.HON]-*(HON)-DECL.POLITE
 ‘The customer is on the fifth floor.’
 (Honorifying ‘customer’ and speaking in a polite manner)
- b. namsengpok-i o-chung-ey [issu / *kyey]-**si**-eyo
 men’s.wear-NOM five-floor-at [exist / *exist.HON]-**HON**-DECL.POLITE
 ‘Men’s wear is on the fifth floor.’ (Speaking in a polite manner)
- c. Mina-ka o-chung-ey [issu / *kyey]-(*si)-eyo
 Mina-NOM five-floor-at [exist / *exist.HON]-(*HON)-DECL.POLITE
 ‘Mina is on the fifth floor.’ (Speaking in a polite manner)

In the embedded clause, only when the subject has [+human] and [+hon] features can it agree with *-si* (9-b). However, when the subject without these features are in the main clause, as in (9-a), it is possible to have *-si* as a verbal suffix. Even though *ikes* (‘this’) is the subject, it is acceptable to have *-si* as a verbal suffix.

- (9) a. ikes-i [kokayk-nim-tul-kkeyse malssumha-*(si)-te-n] ceyil
 this-NOM [customer-HON-PL-NOM.HON say.HON-*(HON)-EVID-REL] most
 yumyengha-n ceypwum-i-**si**-eyo
 popular-ADN product-COP-**HON**-DECL.POLITE
 ‘This is the most popular product that the customers were talking about.’
 (Speaking in a polite manner)
- b. kokayk-nim-tul-kkeyse [i ceypwum-i ceyil
 customer-HON-PL-NOM.HON [this product-NOM most
 yumyengha-(*si)-ta-ko] malssumha-si-eyo
 popular-(*HON)-DECL.PLAIN-C] say.HON-HON-DECL.POLITE
 ‘Customers say that this product is the most popular.’ (Speaking in a polite manner)

The examples demonstrate that there is a different morphosyntactic use of *-si* regarding the target of agreement. In particular, it showed that *-si* can be used even when a subject that

does not have a [+hon] and [+human] feature. The irregular verb root change also does not happen.

3.2 USE OF POLITE *-si* IN NEGATION. As I showed earlier on the use of *-si* in negation, it is ungrammatical not to have any of the *-si* (10-b) but it is grammatical if there is at least one *-si* (10-a). This is also the case for (10-c) and (10-d). It is ungrammatical if there is no *-si* at all.

- (10) a. kyoswu-nim-kkeyse han pwun-to namu-(si)-ci
 professor-HON-NOM.HON one CL.HON-even remain-(HON)-CONN
 an-ha-(si)-ess-eyo
 NEG-do-(HON)-PST-DECL.POLITE
 ‘Not a single professor stayed.’
 (Honorifying ‘professor’ and speaking in a polite manner)
- b. *kyoswu-nim-kkeyse han pwun-to nam-ci
 professor-HON-NOM.HON one CL.HON-even remain-CONN
 an-ha-ess-eyo
 NEG-do-PST-DECL.POLITE
 ‘Not a single professor stayed.’
 (Honorifying ‘professor’ and speaking in a polite manner)
- c. kyoswu-nim-kkeyse pyek-ey pwutic-hi-(si)-ci
 professor-(HON)-NOM.HON wall-LOC bump-PASS-(HON)-CONN
 an-ha-(si)-ess-eyo
 NEG-do-(HON)-PST-DECL.POLITE
 ‘Professor did not bump into the wall.’
 (Honorifying ‘professor’ and speaking in a polite manner)
- d. *kyoswu-nim-kkeyse pyek-ey pwutic-hi-ci an-ha-ess-eyo
 professor-HON-NOM.HON wall-LOC bump-PASS-CONN NEG-do-PST-DECL.POLITE
 ‘Professor did not bump into the wall.’
 (Honorifying ‘professor’ and speaking in a polite manner)

Unlike the honorification agreement demonstrated in (10), it is unacceptable to have *-si* after the verb, *namu* (‘remain’) (11-a). But it is acceptable to have *-si* after negation and ‘do’ (i.e., *an-ha-si*). However, it is unacceptable to have *-si* after the verb and the passive suffix, but it is acceptable to have *-si* before the sentence final particle (11-b). It is curious why the use of *-si* in (11) is accepted at all when the subject does not have a [+hon, +human] feature.

- (11) a. caylyo-ka hana-to namu-(*si)-ci an-ha-si-ess-eyo
 ingredient-NOM one-even remain-(*HON)-CONN NEG-do-HON-PST-DECL.POLITE
 ‘Not a single ingredient is left.’ (Speaking in a polite manner)
- b. ku pheyn-i cal sse-ci-(*si)-ci an-ha-si-eyo
 that pen-NOM well write-PASS-(*HON)-CONN NEG-do-HON-DECL.POLITE
 ‘That pen does not write well.’ (Speaking in a polite manner)

3.3 RESTRICTED USE OF POLITE *-si* WITH SENTENCE FINAL PARTICLES. There is an extensive use of sentence final particles in Korean. The particles vary depending on the clause type (i.e., declarative, interrogative, imperative, exhortative, and promissive) and speech style (i.e.,

intimate, familiar, polite, plain, formal, semiformal, and superpolite) (Pak 2008).⁵ Speech style is affected by a number of factors, including age, social status, and speech context. For instance, declarative intimate particles are used between friends. Friends can be of the same age or a different age, but it should be agreed between two people somehow that both are willing to use the declarative intimate particle form. Declarative familiar particles are used among close acquaintance but not as close as those whom to use declarative intimate particles. Declarative polite particles are commonly used in daily situations, for example, when you are in a clerk-customer relationship or are asking a direction to a stranger. This particle is also used between parent-child, teacher-student, and advisor-advisee. Declarative plain particles are mostly seen in newspapers, books, and official documents. Declarative formal particles can be heard by an announcer in a news report, or a spokesperson from the government.

Sentences in (12) show five different ways to say ‘It rained a lot yesterday’ depending on the speech style. I only discuss declarative sentences.

- (12) a. ecey pi-ka manhi nayli-ess-e
yesterday rain-NOM many fall-PST-DECL.INTIMATE
‘It rained a lot yesterday.’
- b. ecey pi-ka manhi nayli-ess-ney
yesterday rain-NOM many fall-PST-DECL.FAMILIAR
‘It rained a lot yesterday.’
- c. ecey pi-ka manhi nayli-ess-eyo
yesterday rain-NOM many fall-PST-DECL.POLITE
‘It rained a lot yesterday.’
- d. ecey pi-ka manhi nayli-ess-ta
yesterday rain-NOM many fall-PST-DECL.PLAIN
‘It rained a lot yesterday.’
- e. ecey pi-ka manhi nayli-ess-pnita
yesterday rain-NOM many fall-PST-DECL.FORMAL
‘It rained a lot yesterday.’

There are also somewhat archaic sentence final particles as in (13). These are not commonly used these days but are usually heard in dramas that sketch historical facts about at least 100 years ago. For the interest of discussion, I only deal with sentence final particles in (12).

- (13) a. ecey pi-ka manhi nayli-ess-so
yesterday rain-NOM many fall-PST-DECL.SEMIFORMAL
‘It rained a lot yesterday.’
- b. ecey pi-ka manhi nayli-ess-naita
yesterday rain-NOM many fall-PST-DECL.SUPERPOLITE
‘It rained a lot yesterday.’

As shown in (14-a), any sentence final particles can be used depending on the speech style and whom you are talking to. However, there is a restriction on the use of the sentence final particle in (14-b), namely that only the declarative polite form, *-eyo*, can be used.⁶ Sentence in

⁵The distinction varies by people. See Pak 2008 for a discussion in depth and also see Portner et al. 2019.

⁶I put a question mark for *-pnita*, a declarative formal form, as some native speakers of Korean find this option plausible at some situations.

(14-b) is different from (14-a) in a way that the subject does not have an honorifying nominal suffix, *-kkeyse*, and does not have a [+hon, +human] feature.

- (14) a. hoycang-nim-kkeyse o-*(si)[-eyo / -pnita /
 chairman-HON-NOM.HON come-*(HON)[-DECL.POLITE / -DECL.FORMAL /
 -e / -ney / -n-ta]
 -DECL.INTIMATE / -DECL.FAMILIAR / -PRS-DECL.PLAIN]
 ‘The chairman is coming.’ (Honorifying ‘chairman’)
- b. ikes-i hodu-si[-eyo / (?-pnita) / (*-e) /
 this-NOM walnut-HON[-DECL.POLITE / (?-DECL.FORMAL) / (*-DECL.INTIMATE) /
 (*-ney) / (*-ta)]
 (*-DECL.FAMILIAR) / (*DECL.PLAIN)]
 ‘This is walnut.’

Hence, it is a puzzle that only a certain type of sentence final particle is acceptable for the use of *-si* of a different use of honorification agreement. In other words, it is curious what makes the grammaticality be different in (14-a) and (14-b).

4. Proposal. In this section, I argue that the puzzling use of *-si* is a realization of allocutive agreement. I further show how this agreement can be syntactically represented.

4.1 ALLOCUTIVE/HEARER AGREEMENT. The working definition of *allocutive agreement* is the presence of verbal inflection that is related to the hearer (Antonov 2015). Allocutive agreement has also been referred to as hearer agreement or addressee agreement. A representative case of allocutive agreement is illustrated in the following example:

- (15) Basque (Oyharçabal 1993)
- a. Pette-k lan egin di-zü
 Peter-ERG worked AUX.3ERG-AL.VOUVIEMENT
 ‘Peter worked.’ (Talking to a person in a polite manner)
- b. Pette-k lan egin di-k
 Peter-ERG worked AUX.3ERG-AL.M
 ‘Peter worked.’ (Talking to a familiar second person male)
- c. Pette-k lan egin di-n
 Peter-ERG worked AUX.3ERG-AL.F
 ‘Peter worked.’ (Talking to a familiar second person female)
- d. Pette-k lan egin dü
 Peter-ERG worked AUX.3ERG
 ‘Peter worked.’

In Basque, the verbal inflection changes depending on whom the speaker is talking to. The gender or the degree of familiarity influences the choice of the morpheme. Although the suffix changes depending on the hearer, the sentence meaning does not change.

I propose that the puzzle I demonstrated in the case of honorification agreement in Korean is also a type of allocutive agreement. This is different from subject-verb honorification agreement. For example, recall the example where there was no verbal root change but only a morphological suffix *-si*, repeated in (16-a). The sentence final particle shows that the speaker is showing politeness to the hearer. It can then be first assumed that the use of *-si* is a realization

of agreement with the hearer. Hence, the use of *-si* for (16-b) can be understood as allocutive agreement. I now gloss this type of *-si* as AL for *allocutive agreement*.

- (16) a. kokayk-nim-kkeyse o-chung-ey [*issu / kyey]-*(si)-eyo
 customer-HON-NOM.HON five-floor-at [*exist / exist.HON]-*(HON)-DECL.POLITE
 ‘The customer is on the fifth floor.’
 (Honorifying ‘customer’ and speaking in a polite manner)
- b. namsengpok-i o-chung-ey [issu / *kyey]-si-eyo
 men’s.wear-NOM five-floor-at [exist / *exist.HON]-AL-DECL.POLITE
 ‘Men’s wear is on the fifth floor.’ (Speaking in a polite manner)

The suggestion that the use of *-si* in cases such as (16-b) is different from the cases as (16-a) and that the difference is due to hearer agreement can further be supported by the restrictive use of sentence final particles. Recall the following sentences:

- (17) a. hoycang-nim-kkeyse o-*(si)[-eyo / -pnita /
 chairman-HON-NOM.HON come-*(HON)[-DECL.POLITE / -DECL.FORMAL /
 -e / -ney / -n-ta]
 -DECL.INTIMATE / -DECL.FAMILIAR / -PRS-DECL.PLAIN]
 ‘The chairman is coming.’ (Honorifying ‘chairman’)
- b. ikes-i hodu-si[-eyo / (?-pnita) / (*-e) /
 this-NOM walnut-AL[-DECL.POLITE / (?-DECL.FORMAL) / (*-DECL.INTIMATE) /
 (*-ney) / (*-ta)]
 (*-DECL.FAMILIAR) / (*DECL.PLAIN)]
 ‘This is walnut.’

The use of *-si* in (17-a) does not depend the type of the sentence final particle. In contrast, the type of the particle is a consideration for the case of (17-b), and only the polite marker is acceptable. This further indicates the use of *-si* in these two sentences is of different use, and more specifically, that the use of *-si* in cases as (17-b) is a realization of allocutive agreement.

4.2 FUNCTIONAL PROJECTION WITH DISCOURSE PARTICIPANTS. In the wake of Speas & Tenny 2003, recent studies have discussed theoretical framework to incorporate discourse participants into syntactic representation. The initial Speech Act structure has undergone reformation that includes different types of speech particles and reflects previously unnoticed typological differences (e.g., Akkuş & Hill 2018; Haegeman & Hill 2013; Miyagawa 2012; Zu 2015). Here I adopt the version suggested by Haegeman & Hill (2013), where they set a higher speaker act projection for the speaker, *saP*, and a lower speaker act projection for the hearer, *SAP* (18). The structure I demonstrate here is right-headed given that Korean is a head-final language (18). I suggest that allocutive agreement in Korean can also be explained by this framework. Phrase boundary is marked on each side of the bracket. The utterance is in TP.

- (18) [_{saP} SPEAKER [_{SAP} HEARER [_{TP} vP T]_{TP} SA]_{SAP} sa]_{saP}

To understand the position of *-si*, it is noteworthy to examine where the tense marker is located relative to *-si*. First, both the honorific and allocutive suffix *-si* appear before the sentence final particle and after the verb (19).

- (19) a. pothong kyoswu-nim-kkeyse namu-*(si)-eyo
 usually professor-HON-NOM.HON remain-*(HON)-DECL.POLITE

Int. ‘Usually, the professor stays.’
 (Honorifying ‘professor’ and speaking in a polite manner)

- b. pothong sikan-i namu-**si**-eyo
 usually time-NOM remain-**AL**-DECL.POLITE
 ‘Usually, there is time left.’ (Speaking in a polite manner)

Second, both honorific and allocutive *-si* take the same position in past tense sentences (20). The suffix *-si* comes after the verb but before the tense marker.

- (20) a. kyoswu-nim-kkeyse namu-*(si)-ess-eyo
 professor-HON-NOM.HON remain-*(HON)-PST-DECL.POLITE
 ‘The professor stayed.’ (Honorifying ‘professor’ and speaking in a polite manner)
- b. sikan-i acik namu-**si**-ess-eyo
 time-NOM still remain-**AL**-PST-DECL.POLITE
 ‘There is still time left.’ (Speaking in a polite manner)

Third, I further examine whether multiple occurrences of *-si* is possible. It is the case that honorific and allocutive *-si* cannot co-occur (21). It is noteworthy that even when a sentence such as (21-a) is spoken in a polite way, it is impossible to have multiple occurrences of *-si*. Restriction on multiple occurrences of *-si* is also observed in (21-b).

- (21) a. kyoswu-nim-kkeyse namu-*(si)-(***si**)-ess-eyo
 professor-HON-NOM.HON remain-*(HON)-(***AL**)-PST-DECL.POLITE
 ‘The professor stayed.’ (Honorifying ‘professor’ and speaking in a polite manner)
- b. sikan-i namu-(*si)-**si**-ess-eyo
 time-NOM remain-(*HON)-**AL**-PST-DECL.POLITE
 ‘There is time left.’ (Speaking in a polite manner)

The observation so far suggests that honorification agreement *-si* and allocutive agreement *-si* take the same syntactic position. And this serves as evidence to consider both types of *-si* to be in the same functional phrase. However, it is unresolved yet how there is allocutive agreement *-si* even when the subject lacks a [+hon, +human] feature. I explain this by showing allocutive agreement takes place under cyclic Agree.

4.3 CYCLIC AGREE (BÉJAR AND REZAC 2009). In order to understand how the feature is valued for the probe for allocutive agreement in Korean, it is worthwhile to examine the case of cyclic Agree. Consider the case in Basque:

- (22) Basque (Béjar & Rezac 2009: 37)
- a. ikusi **z**-in-t-u-da-n
 seen **2**-X-PL-have-1-PST
 ‘I saw **you**.’
- b. ikusi **n**-ind-u-en
 seen **1**-X-have-PST
 ‘He saw **me**.’
- c. ikusi **n**-ind-u-zu-n
 seen **1**-X-have-2-PST
 ‘You saw **me**.’

- d. ikusi **n-u-en**
 seen **1**-have-PST
 ‘I saw him.’

This is a phenomenon in Basque, where agreement happens based on the bold-faced entity. In most cases (22-a)-(22-c), the internal argument serves as the controller for agreement. In (22-d), however, the external argument serves as the controller for agreement. Béjar & Rezac (2009) explains that the internal argument gets the priority to have agreement, but not when it is a 3rd person. When the initial round for agreement with internal argument fails because the argument is a 3rd person, the external argument becomes the next possible controller of the agreement. As such, once the internal argument does not succeed in controlling Agree in the initial cycle, *cyclic expansion* happens, and the search for Agree expands to the next local and feature-matching domain. Béjar & Rezac (2009) refer to this step-by-step agreement as *cyclic Agree*.

Hence, it can be understood that only the 1st person and the 2nd person can serve as the controller. In other words, T in Basque targets DP that has a [+participant] feature. The morpheme differs depending on the feature of DP whether it has [+speaker] or [-speaker] feature. Important is that a DP that has [-participant] feature does not play a role to value the feature at T. This is why when a 3rd person, [-participant], is in the internal argument, cyclic expansion takes place in search for a DP that has [+participant] feature for feature valuation. The categorization in (23) simplifies this mechanism.

- (23) The feature probed at T in Basque
- a. [+participant, +speaker]: 1st person controller
 - b. [+participant, -speaker]: 2nd person controller
 - c. [-participant]: not eligible as the controller

The same analogy can be made for Korean. I propose that the allocutive agreement in Korean is also a configuration of cyclic Agree. I also suggest that the probe for honorification agreement is comparatively highly articulated in that it is valued with a feature [+hon, +human]. The following is the proposed structure for allocutive agreement in Korean (24).⁷

- (24) [_{SAP} HEARER_[ϕ] [_{ForceP} [_{TP} [_{vP} DP_[ϕ] v]_{vP} T_[uϕ]]_{TP} Force]_{ForceP} SA]_{SAP}

The probe at T is valued by the feature of the most local DP. This is the initial search step for Agree. The DP in the most local domain is the candidate for feature valuation. And following Chomsky’s (2000) framework on Agree, the locality considers the closest c-commanding domain.⁸ As shown in (24), the subject is in the c-commanding domain of T. I show how we can tell that both types of *-si* is probed at T, and how allocutive agreement has *-si* even when the subject lacks the right feature to value T.⁹

⁷I do not make claims on the hierarchy between the saP and SAP. I adopt the framework in (Haegeman & Hill 2013) that SPEAKER is head is higher than HEARER head. The current focus is on the functional projection of the HEARER.

⁸One might ask the possibility of T being valued by an object, which is also in the c-commanding domain of the probe. As far as the data are concerned, I do not know a case where the subject is [-human] and the object is [+human].

⁹Miyagawa (2012) argues that the structure for agreement with the hearer/addressee in Japanese is as follows: [_{saP} SPEAKER sa [_{SAP} [_{CP} [_{TP}] C] HEARER SA]]. He suggests that the probe is related to C and then the

Let us recall the following cases (25). First, the subject, *kokaynimkkeyse* (an honorified form of ‘customer’), in (25-a) has the feature of [+hon, +human] and is in the c-commanding domain of T. The subject thus becomes the controller for honorification agreement. As the feature is valued, *-si* is successively spelled out.

- (25) a. kokayk-nim-kkeyse o-chung-ey [*issu / kyey]-*(si)-eyo
customer-HON-NOM.HON five-floor-at [*exist / exist.HON]-*(HON)-DECL.POLITE
‘The customer is on the fifth floor.’
(Honorifying ‘customer’ and speaking in a polite manner)
- b. namsengpok-i o-chung-ey [issu / *kyey]-**si**-eyo
men’s.wear-NOM five-floor-at [exist / *exist.HON]-AL-DECL.POLITE
‘Men’s wear is on the fifth floor.’ (Speaking in a polite manner)
- c. Mina-ka o-chung-ey [issu / *kyey]-(*si)-eyo
Mina-NOM five-floor-at [exist / *exist.HON]-(*HON)-DECL.POLITE
‘Mina is on the fifth floor.’ (Speaking in a polite manner)

In contrast, consider the case in (25-b). The subject, *namsengpok* (‘men’s wear’), is predicted to be the controller for Agree because it is in the c-commanding domain of T. However, Agree fails as this DP does not have the feature the probe is searching for because the subject, *namsengpok* (‘men’s wear’), is [-hon, -human]. Hence, this DP cannot be the controller for honorification agreement. The failure thus leads to the second cycle of Agree. In this second cycle, Hearer becomes the candidate to be the controller since it has a [+hon, +human] feature. This is verified by the restricted use of sentence final particle in (26-b). I earlier showed that the polite form (and possibly the formal form) is (are) the only plausible sentence final particle(s). The other forms, such as intimate, familiar, and formal forms, are not plausible as these cannot be used targeted to a Hearer of [+hon, +human] feature. This indicates that the Hearer is a target that the speaker is showing politeness to, and thus, it can be analyzed that Hearer has a feature [+hon, +human].

- (26) a. hoycang-nim-kkeyse o-*(si)[-eyo / -pnita /
chairman-HON-NOM.HON come-*(HON)[-DECL.POLITE / -DECL.FORMAL /
-e / -ney / -n-ta]
-DECL.INTIMATE / -DECL.FAMILIAR / -PRS-DECL.PLAIN]
‘The chairman is coming.’ (Honorifying ‘chairman’)
- b. ikes-i hodu-**si**[-eyo / (?-pnita) / (*-e) /
this-NOM walnut-HON[-DECL.POLITE / (?-DECL.FORMAL) / (*-DECL.INTIMATE) /
(*-ney) / (*-ta)]
(*-DECL.FAMILIAR) / (*DECL.PLAIN)]
‘This is walnut.’

More importantly, it is ungrammatical to have *-si* in (25-c). This is because the feature of the subject is [-hon, +human]. What is crucial is that while it is allowed in (25-b) to have cyclic expansion to search for a feature matching DP, it is not in (25-c). In other words, al-

particle is raised to the higher SA head position. Meanwhile Alok (2018) discusses addressee agreement in Magahi and proposes that allocutive agreement is related to T. But he argues that Magahi has a different configuration from Basque, Japanese, and Korean since it allows allocutive agreement even in embedded clauses. I do not discuss further about the cross-linguistic variation of the addressee agreement as it is beyond the scope of the current study.

though subjects in both cases fail in the initial search to value the feature that T is probing for, it is only in (25-b) that cyclic expansion and cyclic Agree happen. The underlying difference is the feature of the subject. The subject in (25-a) has [+hon, +human] feature; the subject in (25-b) has [-hon, -human] feature; the subject in (25-c) has [-hon, +human] feature. The possible controller for honorification agreement can then be understood as the following:

- (27) The feature probed at T for honorification agreement in Korean
- a. [+human, +hon]: honored human
 - b. [+human, -hon]: non-honored human
 - c. [-human]: not eligible as the controller

In Korean, the subject must have a [+human] feature to agree with T. When the subject has a [+human, +hon] feature, *-si* is spelled out (25-a). When the subject has a [+human, -hon] feature, *-si* is not spelled out; it is ungrammatical if it is spelled out (25-c). The presence and absence of *-si* according to the feature of the subject indicates that agreement is related to T. Furthermore, when the subject is [-human], it cannot serve as a controller for agreement (25-b). As a consequence, cyclic expansion happens and the next possible DP becomes the controller. In case of (25-b), the Hearer, which has [+human, +hon] feature, serves as the controller. When T is valued by the feature of the Hearer, *-si* is spelled out.

In short, both honorification and allocutive agreement are probed at T. Yet, allocutive agreement involves cyclic Agree, where the failure of initial search for matching feature leads to the second search process in the next local domain. The feature matching DP of Hearer makes feature valuation successful in the second cycle. And this is how allocutive agreement happens in Korean.

5. Conclusion. I newly introduced the case of allocutive agreement *-si* in Korean. I first compared the different uses of *-si* and argued that there are two distinct types of agreement with *-si*: honorification agreement, and allocutive agreement. I then demonstrated that the two types of agreement is probed at T. I also argued that the subject must have a [+human] to value the feature at T for honorification agreement. When this subject is [-human], the initial Agree fails. I showed that allocutive agreement is a result of the failure of the initial Agree, hence a realization of cyclic expansion and agreement with the Hearer. I illustrated how this can be captured in syntactic representation. I consider this study as a manifestation of cyclic Agree and a support for an integration of discourse participants into syntactic representation.

References

- Ahn, Sung-Ho. 2002. Honorification and AgrP. Handout at Linguistics Society of Korea, Seoul National University.
- Akkuş, Faruk & Virginia Hill. 2018. The speaker in inverse vocatives. In *35th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL 35)*, 49–58. Cascadilla Proceedings Project. <http://www.lingref.com/cpp/wccfl/35/paper3374.pdf>.
- Alok, Deepak. 2018. The morphosyntax of Magahi addressee agreement. Manuscript, Rutgers University.
- Antonov, Anton. 2015. Verbal allocutivity in a crosslinguistic perspective. *Linguistic Typology* 19(1). 55–85. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lingty-2015-0002>.
- Baek, Sooyeon. 2017. The politeness strategy of the Korean honorific pre-final ending ‘-si’ and

- its manipulative expansion of usage: Focusing on the sales discourse [In Korean]. Master's of Arts thesis, Seoul National University. <http://s-space.snu.ac.kr/handle/10371/131964>.
- Béjar, Susana & Milan Rezac. 2009. Cyclic agree. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40(1). 35–73. <https://doi.org/10.1162/ling.2009.40.1.35>.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David & Kazuko Yatsushiro. 2006. Problems with honorification-as-agreement in Japanese: A reply to Boeckx & Niinuma. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 24(2). 355–384. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-005-1511-4>.
- Boeckx, Cedric & Fumikazu Niinuma. 2004. Conditions on agreement in Japanese. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 22(3). 453–480. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:NALA.0000027669.59667.c5>.
- Choe, Jae-Woong. 2004. Obligatory honorification and the honorific feature. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 14(4). 545–559. <http://scholar.dkyobobook.co.kr/searchDetail.laf?barcode=4010017119093>.
- Choi, Jaehoon & Heidi Harley. 2017. Node sprouting and root suppletion in Korean verbal morphology. Talk at Generative Linguistics in the Old World (GLOW) Asia XI. <http://glowlinguistics.org/asia11/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2016/11/choi-harley.pdf>.
- Choi, Kiyong. 2010. Subject honorification in Korean: In defense of Agr and Head-Spec agreement. *Language Research* 46(1). 59–82. <http://s-space.snu.ac.kr/bitstream/10371/86451/1/3.%202223072.pdf>.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In Roger Martin, David Michaels & Juan Uriagereka (eds.), *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*. 89–155. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. <https://doi.org/mitpress.mit.edu/books/step-step>.
- Haegeman, Liliane & Virginia Hill. 2013. The syntacticization of discourse. In Affaella Folli, Christina Sevdali & Robert Truswell (eds.), *Syntax and its limits*, vol. 48. 370–390. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199683239.001.0001>.
- Harada, Shinichi. 1976. Honorifics. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *Syntax and semantics*, vol. 5: *Japanese Generative Grammar*. 499–561. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Kim, Jong-Bok & Peter Sells. 2007. Korean honorification: A kind of expressive meaning. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 16(4). 303–336. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10831-007-9014-4>.
- Kim, Youngil. 2016. A comprehensive assessment of the hearer honorific ‘-si’ [In Korean]. *Journal of Language Sciences* 23(1). 53–87.
- Ko, Yeng-Kun & Pon-Kwan Kwu. 2008. *wulimal mwunpeplon [Our (Korean) grammar theory]*. Cipmwentang.
- Lee, Jeong-Bok. 2010. The diffusion of honorific encoding ‘-si’ for the situation subject and its backgrounds [In Korean]. *Journal of Linguistic Science* 55. 217–246.
- Lee, Soo-Yeon. 2012. Aspects of language use on department stores clerks [In Korean]. *Emwunyenkwu* 2. 79–97.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2012. Agreements that occur mainly in the main clause. In Lobke Aelbrecht, Liliane Haegeman & Rachel Nye (eds.), *Main clause phenomena: New horizons*, 79–111. Netherlands: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.190>.

- Mok, Jung-Soo. 2013. On the prefinal ending ‘-si’ in Korean: As a subject indicator [In Korean]. *Kwukehak* 8. 63–105.
- Oyharçabal, Bernard. 1993. Verb agreement with nonarguments. In José Ignacio Hualde & Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), *Generative studies in Basque linguistics*, 89–114. Amsterdam: Benjamins. <http://artxiker.ccsd.cnrs.fr/artxibo-00000076>.
- Pak, Miok. 2008. Types of clauses and sentence end particle in Korean. *Korean Linguistics* 14(1). 113–156. <http://dx.doi.org/doi.org/10.1075/kl.14.06mdp>.
- Portner, Paul, Miok Pak & Raffaella Zanuttini. 2019. The speaker-addressee relation at the syntax-semantics interface. *Language* 95(1). 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2019.0008>.
- Speas, Peggy & Carol Tenny. 2003. Configurational properties of point of view roles. In Di Sciullo & Anna Maria (eds.), *Asymmetry in grammar*, 315–344. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.57.15spe>.
- Zu, Vera. 2015. *Discourse participants and the structural representation of the context*. New York, NY: New York University dissertation. <http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/003884>.