# CLIPP

## Christiani Lehmanni inedita, publicanda, publicata

| titulus | |
|---|---|
| | **(cum Myung-Chul Koo editus:)** |
| | **Modality in the Korean suffix –*kess*** |
| huius textus situs retis mundialis | |
| | http://www.christianlehmann.eu/publ/koo_lehmann_kess.pdf |
| dies manuscripti postremum modificati | |
| | 25.06.2010 |
| occasio orationis habitae | |
| | – |
| volumen publicationem continens | |
| | *Language Research* 46 |
| annus publicationis | |
| | 2010 |
| paginae | |
| | 83-102 |

# Modality in the Korean suffix *-keyss*

Myung-Chul Koo and Christian Lehmann
(Seoul National University and University of Erfurt)

The modal suffix *-keyss* has two contextually conditioned readings: In one set of contexts, it codes volition, in the complementary set of contexts, it codes a supposition. The study investigates the conditions under which the two readings appear and identifies four relevant semantic parameters: control of the subject, speech act participant role of the subject, sentence type and aspect. The suppositive meaning is the default, while the volitive reading appears only in a specific constellation of the values of these parameters, in which the notion of modal origo is of special relevance. The same rules apply if the clause marked by *-keyss* is a dependent clause.

## 1   Introduction

For a modal verb to have more than one modal meaning is an everyday phenomenon. For example, the English modal verb *may* expresses permission and supposition. The German modal verb *können* 'can' expresses possibility, capability and supposition. In Korean, where modality may be expressed by a suffix on a verb stem, the suffix *-keyss* has two different modal meanings, as shown in (1) and (2).

(1)    a.    na-nun   cip-ey       ka-n-ta.
             I-TOP     home-LOC   go-PRS-DECL
             'I go home.'

       b.    na-nun   cip-ey       ka-keyss-ta.
             I-TOP     home-LOC   go-INCERT-DECL
             'I intend to go home.'

(2)    a.    Swuni-nun   cip-ey       ka-n-ta.
             Swuni-TOP    home-LOC   go-PRS-DECL
             'Swuni goes home.'

       b.    Swuni-nun   cip-ey       ka-keyss-ta.
             Swuni-TOP    home-LOC   go-INCERT-DECL
             'I think that Swuni goes home.'

The two meanings may be brought out by the following paraphrase test:

If a verb form V-*keyss*- may be replaced by V-*lyeko ha*- (V-ADVL do-) 'intend to V' without change in meaning, the modality is volitive; if instead such a verb form may be

replaced by V-*l kes-i-* (V-ADJL thing-be-) 'think/guess that V' without change in mean-ing, then the modality is suppositive.[1]

Thus, (1b) can be paraphrased with *-lyeko ha-*, as in (1b)'; sentence (2b) may be paraphrased with *-l kes-i-*, as in (2b)':[2]

(1)' 　b. 　na-nun 　cip-ey 　　ka-lyeko 　ha-n-ta.
　　　　　　I-TOP 　　home-LOC 　go-ADVL 　do-PRS-DECL
　　　　　　'I intend to go home.'

(2)' 　b. 　Swuni-nun 　　cip-ey 　　　ka-l 　　　kes-i-ta
　　　　　　Swuni-TOP 　　home-LOC 　go-ADJL 　　thing-be-DECL
　　　　　　'I think that Swuni goes home.'

As may be seen, *-keyss* expresses the intention or at least willingness of the speaker in (1b), whereas it expresses the supposition of the speaker in (2b). As English has neither verbal mood nor modal particles, the only modal devices available for rendering the meaning of Korean modal suffixes are modal verbs or even full verbs. This is what we will do in the example translations, rendering vo-litive *-keyss* by 'intend' and suppositive *-keyss* by 'think'. We will apply these translations mechani-cally, disregarding the fact that in several examples volitive *-keyss* is rendered more closely by 'be

---

[1] We ignore here the difference of temporal meanings between V-*l kes-i-* (V-ADJL thing-be-) and V-*keyss* (V-INCERT). On this topic cf. PK Lee (1997).

[2] Some Korean linguists such as K-m Ko (2002) and JY Park (2004) argue that *-keyss* can also be used to express 'prearragement', as in ex. #a, and 'possibility', as in ex. #b:

　　a. 　chongcangnim-uy 　　insa-ka 　　　　　　　　iss-keyss-supni-ta
　　　　　rector-GEN 　　　　　　address of welcome-NOM 　exist-INCERT-ADDR.HON-DECL
　　　　　'The rector's talk is coming soon.'

　　b. 　kukes-un 　　na-to 　　ha-keyss-ta
　　　　　that-TOP 　　I-also 　　do-INCERT-DECL
　　　　　'That I could do, too.'

According to H-M Sohn (1999:361), *-keyss* in sentences like #a "denotes immediate futurity when a sen-tence describes that an animate subject referent is scheduled to take action". Prearrangement can be distin-guished from 'intention' and 'supposition' by the criterion of control of the subject referent (on this distinc-tion cf. section 2.1). Possibility can be regarded as a variety of supposition. The closeness of possibility and supposition is shown in #c, where *–keyss* can have both of these meanings (cf. DH Im 2001: 123):

　　c. 　na-nun 　　thongcung-i 　karaac-uni 　　　/ 　chelsu-ka 　　wumciki-nun 　kes-ul 　　　po-ni
　　　　　I-TOP 　　pain-NOM 　　be.relieved-because / chelsu-NOM 　move-ADJL 　　thing-AKK 　see-because
　　　　　ice 　　mwuel 　　　　com 　　　　　mek-keyss-kwuna
　　　　　now 　　something(ACC) 　little 　　　eat-INCERT-EXCL
　　　　　'Since my pain is being relieved, I can now eat something.' /
　　　　　'Since Chelsu is seen to move, I think that he will eat something.'

Examples #b and #c as well as the example of fn. 7 and (11) below have it in common that the four condi-tions for a volitive reading of *-keyss* to be discussed below are fulfilled, and nevertheless the reading may be suppositive or potential. While we are at present unable to systematize the contextual factors responsible for this, we may say that these exceptions are in conformity with our general hypothesis that the suppositive meaning is the default and the volitive meaning requires special conditions.

willing to'. However, it should be born in mind that such translations are far too explicit and cumbersome to match the textual effect of the Korean affixal marker.[3]

Generally, thus, *-keyss* suffixed to the verb stem marks an attitude of the modal origo towards the proposition or situation. The modal origo of a sentence is the reference point, or the source, of its modality. By default, it is occupied by the speaker; but as we shall see in sections 2.3 and 3, it may also be occupied by the hearer or even an actant of a matrix clause. However, the question arises as to what determines the modal sense of *-keyss*. The analysis below will show that the modal meaning of *-keyss* depends on the following parameters:[4]

- control of the subject referent
- speech act participant role of the subject
- sentence type
- aspect.

Thus, our study addresses the modality and deixis of the Korean suffix *-keyss* with respect to these four parameters.

## 2   Interaction of the modality of *-keyss* with other parameters

### 2.1 Control of subject referent

Some Korean linguists such as J-s Mok (2000: 161) and JY Park (2004) found out that the semantic type of the verb – agentive verb vs. non-action verb – plays an important role in determining the modal meaning of *-keyss*. If *-keyss* is suffixed to an agentive verb, it expresses the speaker's intention, as shown in (1b) and (3) (J-S Se 1978: 92, 97):

(3)     a.     na-nun   nayil          ttena-keyss-ta.
            I-TOP    tomorrow    leave-INCERT-DECL
            'I intend to leave tomorrow.'

        b.     nay-ka   ku     yeca-lul          manna-keyss-ta.
            I-NOM   D2     woman-ACC     see/meet-INCERT-DECL
            'I intend to see her.'

Again, if the verb is stative, *-keyss* always marks a supposition of the speaker, as in (4):

(4)     a.     nay-ka   ci-keyss-ta.
            I-NOM   lose-INCERT-DECL
            'I think I will lose (the game).'

        b.     nay-ka   michi-keyss-ta.
            I-NOM   be.insane-INCERT-DECL
            'I think I will become insane.'

---

[3] German *wohl* comes pretty close to the suppositive sense of *-keyss*. It may also be used in most of the volitive examples, although it is not always clear whether it actually makes a volitive sense there.

[4] H-J Jeon (1995) shows that speech act participant role and sentence type play an important role in determining the modal meaning of *-keyss*.

However, this is not always the case. Some combinations of *-keyss* and non-action verbs, such as *mit-* 'believe, trust', bring about the modal meaning 'intention' (s. H-P Im 1980: 160; JY Park 2004: 22). See the verbs in (5).

(5)    a.   na-nun   siin-i        toy-keyss-ta
                I-TOP    poet-NOM   become-INCERT-DECL
                'I intend to become a poet.'

        b.   na-nun      kkuth-kkaci       hayngpokha-keyss-ta
                I-TOP       end-to            be.happy-INCERT-DECL
                'I intend to be happy forever.'

        c.   na-nun   ne-man-ul       mit-keyss-ta
                I-TOP    thou-FOC-ACC    trust-INCERT-DECL
                'I intend to trust only you.'

Even in passive sentences such as (6), *-keyss* can express the intention of the speaker (s. H-P Im 1980: 161):

(6)    a.   na-nun   ne-eykey    cap-hi-keyss-ta.
                I-TOP    you-DAT     grasp-PASS-INCERT-DECL
                'I intend to be grasped by you.'

        b.   na-nun   i       kos-ey      mwut-hi-keyss-ta
                I-NOM   D1    place-LOC   bury-PASS-INCERT-DECL
                'I intend to be buried here.'

The sentences of (5) have no agentive verb, and in (6), the subject is not an actor. Nevertheless in both example sets, the subject has some control over the situation (cf. H-P Im 1980: 160 and JY Park 2004: 22). There are a couple of test frames to ascertain whether the subject X in [ [X]$_{NP}$ [Y]$_{VP}$ ]$_S$ controls the situation whose core is represented by Y. The best established among these are the following three (cf. Lehmann 1991, § 3.6.2):

    a)  X hesitates to Y.

    b)  X Y deliberately.

    c)  (X,) Y !

Since one can only hesitate over what one can control, if a# makes sense, then Y is a control predicate. Similarly, to deliberate over Y or to do Y on purpose implies that one can control Y, so again, if #b makes sense, then Y is a control predicate. In test frame #c, it does not suffice for the imperative construction to make sense: only if it can express a true command is Y necessarily a control predicate. In what follows, we will demonstrate application of test #b to (5) and (6) by using *ilpwule* 'on purpose' as an adverbial:

(5)'   a.   na-nun   ilpwule-lato      siin-i        toy-keyss-ta
                I-TOP    deliberately-FOC   poet-NOM   become-INCERT-DECL
                'I intend to become a poet on purpose.'

        b.   na-nun   ilpwule-lato      kkuth-kkaci   hayngpokha-keyss-ta
                I-TOP    deliberately-FOC   end-to       be.happy-INCERT-DECL
                'I intend to be happy forever on purpose.'

    c.  na-nun  ilpwule-lato      ne-man-ul       mit-keyss-ta
       I-TOP    deliberately-FOC  thou-FOC-ACC   trust-INCERT-DECL
       'I intend to trust only you on purpose.'

(6)'  a.  na-nun  ilpwule-lato      ne-eykey    cap-hi-keyss-ta.
       I-TOP    deliberately-FOC  you-DAT    grasp-PASS-INCERT-DECL
       'I intend to be grasped by you on purpose.'

    b.  na-nun  ilpwule-lato      i     kos-ey      mwut-hi-keyss-ta
       I-NOM   deliberately-FOC  D1    place-LOC  bury-PASS-INCERT-DECL
       'I intend to be buried here on purpose.'

Although (5)' and (6)' are a bit clumsy, they are not self-contradictory, which proves that their predicates are compatible with a controlling subject.

Korean has two preverbal negative particles, *an* and *mos*, whose distribution correlates with control of the subject: if the subject referent does control the situation, *an* is used as in (7a), while if it has no control, *mos* is used as in (7b).[5]

(7)    a.  na-nun  onul    cip-ey      an    ka-n-ta.
       I-TOP   today    home-LOC  NEG  go-PRS-DECL
       'I won't go home today.'

    b.  na-nun  onul    cip-ey     mos  ka-n-ta.
       I-TOP   today    home-LOC  NEG  go-PRS-DECL
       'I can't go home today.'

If *-keyss* is attached to the verbs in (7), different modal meanings result, as in (7)' (cf. H. Lee 1983):

(7)'  a.  na-nun  onul    cip-ey     an    ka-keyss-ta.
       I-TOP   today    home-LOC  NEG  go-INCERT-DECL
       'I don't intend to go home today.'

    b.  na-nun  onul  cip-ey    mos  ka-keyss-ta.
       I-TOP   today home-LOC  NEG  go-INCERT-DECL
       'I think that I can't go home today.'

As may be seen, the combination of *-keyss* with the negator *an* triggers a volitive reading, whereas its combination with *mos* brings about a suppositive reading.[6]

There are a couple of examples like (8) that show ambiguity with respect to the modal meaning of *-keyss*.[7]

---

[5] Cf. Y-K Koh and B-K Koo (2008), where *an* is regarded as a volitive, *mos* as a potential negative marker.

[6] In special contexts, the combination of *-keyss* and *mos* does have a volitive meaning (cf. H. Lee 1983: 47):

    kulay, (na-nun)   mos  ka-keyss-ta
    yes    I-TOP      NEG  go-INCERT-DECL
    'Yes, I am willing not to go.'

As the sentence without *kulay* (*na-nun mos ka-keyss-ta*) is rather suppositive, the volitive meaning of the example may be related to conflicting scope properties of *kulay* and *mos*.

[7] The following sentence also shows ambiguity as the subject of *phwul-* may or may not have some control (cf. J-s Mok 2000: 161):

(8)       na-nun   cwuk-keyss-ta.
          I-TOP     die-INCERT-DECL
          'I intend to commit suicide.' / 'I think that I will die.'

In such cases, the ambiguity is usually caused by the ambiguity of the verb. For example, *cuk-* is originally intransitive and means 'to die'. In this case, the subject of the sentence has no control and *-keyss* expresses the speaker's supposition. However, *cuk-* may also designate the act of committing suicide; and in this case its combination with *-keyss* brings out the volitive meaning. The two senses may be disambiguated by the context as shown in (8)' and (8)" (s. H-J Kim 1994: 64).

(8)'      (*casal-ul       kitoha-mye*)   na-nun   cuk-keyss-ta.
          suicide-ACC      commit-CONJ I-TOP      die-INCERT-DECL
          '(By committing suicide) I intend to die.'

(8)"      (*phikonha-yese*)   na-nun   cwuk-keyss-ta.
          be.tired-because    I-TOP     die-INCERT-DECL
          '(As I am tired) I think I will die.'

The net result of this analysis is that the volitive reading of *-keyss* is rendered possible if the sentence predicate is agentive, i.e. it allows its subject to control the designated situation; and otherwise the meaning is suppositive.

## 2.2 Speech act participant role of the subject

In section 2.1, we saw that the control of the subject referent plays an important part in determining the function of *-keyss*. However, *-keyss* also expresses different modal meanings according to the speech act participant (SAP) role of the subject. We should premise here that the relevant factor is not the grammatical category 'person'. First of all, person is not a category of the Korean verb, so that no intra-verbal constraint is possible, as in the case of aspect, to be discussed in section 2.4. Moreover, while person is a category of pronouns appearing in subject position, such pronouns are syntactically optional. The semantic interdependency to be discussed here holds irrespective of the presence or absence of an overt subject (which might code person) and of its grammatical person. What matters is the referent whose semantic role is born by the verbal subject. This is shown clearly by (12) below.

Secondly, the relationship between the present criterion of SAP role of the subject and the previous criterion of subject control should be clarified. Subject control is a property of the predicate, while SAP role of the subject is a property of the subject. Thus, the subject of a control verb (or a non-control verb) may or may not be a SAP; and a SAP (just like any other referent) in subject position may or may not control the situation. It is true that a predicate can impute control only to such referents who are in principle capable of exerting it and that those referents who are highest on the empathy hierarchy (viz., the SAPs) are best capable of controlling situations. So to that extent there is some conceptual and syntagmatic interdependence between the two properties. This, however, does not undermine their methodological independence in the present context.

---

          ney-ka     ku     mwunce-lul     phwul-keyss-nunya?
          thou-NOM D2     question-ACC     solve-INCERT-INT
          'Do you intend to solve the question?' / 'Do you think you can solve the question?'

In the present section, we limit ourselves to declarative sentences. If the speaker occupies the position of a controlling subject in such a sentence, *-keyss* expresses the speaker's intention, as shown in all of the examples of section 2.1. If instead the subject is the hearer, as in (9), or a Non-SAP, as in (10), *-keyss* adds the modal meaning 'supposition' to the sentence/verb, regardless of the agentivity of the latter (present in (9a), absent in (9b)).

(9)   a.   myencep-ey        hapkyekha-yess-uni      ney-ka       keki-ey       ka-keyss-ta.
           interview-LOC     pass-PRFV-because       thou-NOM   there-LOC   go-INCERT-DECL
           'Since you have passed the interview, I think that you will go there.'

      b.   sihem-ey          hapkyekha-yess-uni      ne-nun       kippu-keyss-ta.
           examination-LOC   pass-PRFV-because       thou-TOP    be.happy-INCERT-DECL
           'I think that you are happy because you have passed the exam.'

(10)       nwun-i          kot    nayli-keyss-ta.
           snow-NOM        soon   fall-INCERT-DECL
           'I think that it will snow soon.'

In (11), *-keyss* also expresses a supposition, although the subject position is taken by the first person (with control).

(11)       nay-ka   ne-lamyen   na-nun   i      kes-ul       sa-keyss-ta.
           I-NOM    thou-if      I-TOP    D1    thing-ACC   buy-INCERT-DECL
           'If I were you, (I think that) I would buy this thing.'

Since the sentence in (11) is in irrealis modality, the speaker does not really control the proposition. As a result, *-keyss* does not express the intention of the speaker but his supposition. This can be verified by paraphrasing with *-l kes-i-* and with *-lyeko ha-*, respectively. As (11)' shows, the former paraphrase satisfies the original meaning, whereas the latter one makes no sense.

(11)'      nay-ka   ne-lamyen   na-nun   i      kes-ul
           I-NOM    thou-if      I-TOP    D1    thing-ACC

           sa-l          kes-i-ta           /   *sa-leko      ha-n-ta.
           buy-ADJL   thing-be-DECL /   buy-ADVL    intend-PRS-DECL
           'If I were you, I would buy this thing.'

There are also opposite cases to (11) (volitive reading despite non-first person in subject position), like (12):

(12)       philca-ka        olywu-lul     cikcep       swucengha-keyss-supni-ta.
           author-NOM     mistake-ACC   personally   revise-INCERT-ADDR.HON-DECL
           'The author intends to revise the mistakes personally.'

*philca* 'author', which is grammatically in the third person, refers to the speaker if (12) appears, for instance, in a preface. Hence, *-keyss* here marks volition, as proved by the paraphrase in (12)':

(12)'      philca-ka        olywu-lul     cikcep
           author-NOM     mistake-ACC   personally

           sucengha-leko     ha-pni-ta                          / sucengha-l   kes-i-pni-ta.
           revise-ADVL        intend-ADDR.HON-DECL / revise-ADJL   thing-be-ADDR.HON-DECL
           'The author intends to / I think the author will revise the mistakes personally.'

The first version, with *-leko ha-*, is synonymous with (12); i.e. here the subject NP refers to the speaker. In the version with *-l kes-i-*, instead, the subject NP must refer to some third person. To

repeat, this proves that the factor relevant here is a semantic one, viz. the SAP role of the subject referent, rather than a grammatical one.

## 2.3 Sentence type

The modal meaning of *-keyss* also changes according to sentence type (cf. S-O Sohn 1995: 46). If (1b) is transformed into an interrogative sentence, as in (13), *-keyss* no longer expresses the speaker's intention.

(13)      ilen  sanghwang-eyse      nay-ka  cip-ey      ka-keyss-e?
          this  situation-LOC       I-NOM   home-LOC  go-INCERT-INT
          'Do you think that I will go home in this situation?'

Although the sentence has a controlling subject representing the speaker, *-keyss* in (13) marks a supposition of the hearer. In interrogative sentences, the perspective on the proposition is reversed in comparison with declarative sentences: the modal origo, i.e. the instance controlling modality (Lehmann 2011), is the speaker in declarative sentences, but the hearer in interrogative sentences. Consequently in (13), the modal origo is the hearer; hence, the speaker is not mentioning his intention but inquiring about a supposition of the hearer.

(14) as an interrogative sentence may be compared with (9a) as a declarative sentence. In contrast to (13), the controlling subject of (14) is the hearer. The modal origo in (14) is the hearer, too, and the speaker thus inquires about the latter's intention.

(14)      ney-ka          keki-ey      ka-keyss-ni?
          thou-NOM      there-LOC   go-INCERT-INT
          'Do you intend to go (there)?'

Simmilarly, *-keyss* in (15a) marks the intention of the hearer. However, just as before, irrealis modality can withdraw control from the subject, as in (15b), and therefore this sentence expresses the hearer's supposition.

(15)  a.  ne-nun      etten      kes-ul      sa-keyss-ni?
          thou-TOP   which    thing-ACC  buy-INCERT-INT
          'Which one would you like to buy?'

      b.  ney-ka        na-lamyen, ne-nun      etten      kes-ul        sa-keyss-ni?
          thou-NOM   I-if            thou-TOP   which     thing-ACC  buy-INCERT-INT
          'If you were in my place, which one do you think you would buy?'

If their subject referent – being whichever SAP – has no control, interrogative sentences with *-keyss* always express a supposition of the hearer, as in (16):

(16)  a.  kulehke ha-myen    nay-ka  kippu-keyss-ni?
          so         do-if          I-NOM   be.happy-INCERT-INT
          'In that case, do you think I will be happy?'

      b.  kulehke ha-myen    ney-ka          kippu-keyss-ni?
          so         do-if          thou-NOM      be.happy-INCERT-INT
          'In that case, do you think you will be happy?'

If the subject is a third person, *-keyss* always codes supposition, independently of sentence type and of subject control. Declarative sentences ((17a), (18a)) and interrogative sentences ((17b), (18b))

then only show one difference: the former express the speaker's supposition, while the latter express the hearer's supposition.

(17)  a.  swuni-nun    cikum    cip-ey      ka-keyss-ta.
          Swuni-TOP    now      home-LOC    go-INCERT-DECL
          'I think that Swuni goes home now.'

      b.  swuni-ka     cikum    cip-ey      ka-keyss-ni?
          Swuni-NOM    now      home-LOC    go-INCERT-INT
          'Do you think that Swuni goes home now?'

(18)  a.  nwun-i       kot    nayli-keyss-ta.
          snow-NOM     soon   fall-INCERT-DECL
          'I think that it will snow soon.'

      b.  nwun-i       kot    nayli-keyss-ni?
          snow-NOM     soon   fall-INCERT-INT
          'Do you think that it will snow soon?'

The result of this analysis is the following: In interrogative sentences, the contrast between volition and supposition remains as before. However, since shift of sentence type is accompanied by a shift of the modal origo from the speaker to the hearer, in interrogative sentences we are faced with volition and supposition of the hearer, not of the speaker. As a consequence, the condition for volition, viz. that the subject position be occupied by the modal origo, also shifts from the speaker to the hearer.

## 2.4 Aspect

Finally, aspect plays an important role in determining the sense of *-keyss*. If *-keyss* is appended to a verb bearing the perfective marker *-(e)ss*,[8] its modal meaning is always suppositive, regardless of all the other parameter settings. ((19a) = (3a))

(19)  a.  na-nun   nayil       ttena-keyss-ta.
          I-TOP    tomorrow    leave-INCERT-DECL
          'I intend to leave tomorrow.'

      b.  na-nun   nayil-imyen   ttena-ss-keyss-ta.
          I-TOP    tomorrow-if   leave-PRFV-INCERT-DECL
          'I think that I will have left tomorrow.'

(20)  a.  ney-ka        keki-ey      ka-keyss-ni?
          thou-NOM      there-LOC    go-INCERT-INT
          'Do you intend to go there?'

      b.  mili          malha-yess-umyen   ney-ka       keki-ey      ka-ss-keyss-ni?
          in.advance    say-PRFV-if        thou-NOM     there-LOC    go-PRFV-INCERT-INT
          'Do you think that you would have gone there if I had said it in advance?'

(19) and (20) show that the volitive meaning of a sentence with *-keyss* is changed to the suppositive meaning if the perfective marker *-(e)ss* is added. Likewise, where a non-perfective sentence with -

---

[8] The perfective marker has the allomorphs *-yess* ~ *-(e)ss*. It also codes past time reference; cf. H-M Sohn 1999: 362.

*keyss* already expresses supposition, *-(e)ss* does not change that modal meaning. (4)' – (18)' are the perfective counterparts to examples seen in the preceding sections:

(4)'  a.  nay-ka   ci-ess-keyss-ta.
          I-NOM   lose-PRFV-INCERT-DECL
          'I think I have lost (the game).'

(9)'  a.  myencep-ey        hapkyekha-yess-uni    ney-ka      keki-ey      ka-ss-keyss-ta.
          interview-LOC     pass-PRFV-because     thou-NOM   there-LOC   go-PRFV-INCERT-DECL
          'Since you have passed the interview, I suppose you have gone there.'

      b.  sihem-ey           hapkyekha-yess-uni    ne-nun      kippu-ess-keyss-ta.
          examination-LOC    pass-PRFV-because     thou-NOM   be.happy-PRFV-INCERT-DECL
          'I guess you were happy because you had passed examination.'

(13)'     ilen  sanghwang-eyse     nay-ka   ka-ss-keyss-e?
          this  situation-LOC      I-NOM   go-PRFV-INCERT-INT
          'Do you think that I really went there in this situation?'

(16)' a.  kulehke ha-yess-umyen    nay-ka   kippu-ess-keyss-ni?
          so       do-PRFV-if       I-NOM   be.happy-PRFV-INCERT-INT
          'Do you think that in that case, I would have been happy?'

      b.  kulehke ha-yess-umyen    ney-ka       kippu-ess-keyss-ni?
          so       do-PRFV-if       thou-NOM     be.happy-PRFV-INCERT-INT
          'Do you think that in that case,  you would have been happy?'

(17)' a.  swuni-nun     cikum  cip-ey        ka-ss-keyss-ta.
          Swuni-TOP     now    home-LOC      go-PRFV-INCERT-DECL
          'I think that Swuni has gone home now.'

      b.  swuni-ka      cikum  cip-ey        ka-ss-keyss-ni?
          Swuni-NOM     now    home-LOC      go-PRFV-INCERT-INT
          'Do you think that Swuni has gone home now?'

(18)' a.  nwun-i        nayli-ess-keyss-ta.
          snow-NOM      fall-PRFV-INCERT-DECL
          'I think that it has snowed.'

      b.  nwun-i        nayli-ess-keyss-ni?
          snow-NOM      fall-PRFV-INCERT-INT
          'Do you think that it has snowed?'

The result of this analysis is that the volitive reading of *-keyss* is not available if the clause is in perfective aspect; here *-keyss* always triggers the suppositive meaning.


## 2.5 Interim summary

We may now summarize the functions of *-keyss* in T1. Downward shading symbolizes the speaker, upwards shading the hearer. Dark cells symbolize volition, light cells symbolize supposition. In this way, each cell shows the modal meaning of *-keyss* and moreover recalls the relevant examples.

T1.    *Functions of* **-keyss**

| SAP role of subject | sentence type control | declarative | | interrogative | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **imperfective** | **perfective** | **imperfective** | **perfective** |
| **speaker** | + | speaker's intention (1b), (3a), (5), (6), (7a) | (19b) | (13) | (13)' |
| | - | (4), (7b) | (4a)' | hearer's supposition (16a) | (16a)' |
| **hearer** | + | speaker's supposition (9a) | (9a)' | hearer's intention (14), (15a) | (20b) |
| | - | (9b) | (9b)' | (16b) | (16b)' |
| **third person** | + | (2b), (17a) | (17a)* | (17b) | (17b)' |
| | - | (18a) | (18a)* | (18b) | (18b)' |

For the proper understanding of T1, the reader may be reminded of the following translation equivalents:

| | |
|---|---|
| speaker's supposition: | I think … |
| hearer's supposition: | do you think …? |
| speaker's intention: | I intend … |
| hearer's intention: | do you intend …? |

From the representation in T1, it is visible that the meaning of *-keyss* is volitive only if special parameter settings coincide, namely:

> *-keyss* is volitive if all of the following conditions are fulfilled:
> • the aspect is not perfective
> • the subject has control
> • the subject refers to the modal origo, i.e. to the speaker in declarative, to the hearer in interrogative sentences.
> Otherwise, *-keyss* is suppositive.

For descriptive purposes, we may represent the relevant parameters by the following features: [± prfv], [± control], [± origo]. The third feature is shorthand for particular value combinations of two more elementary features, viz. [± interrog] and [n SAP]: [origo] has the plus value in the combinations [- interrog, 1 SAP] and [+ interrog, 2 SAP]; otherwise it has minus value. The above rule then amounts to the assertion that *-keyss* modality is volitive on the feature combination [- prfv, + control, + origo], and suppositive otherwise. In the following, we will demonstrate by some of the above examples that the application of this rule yields the correct results.

(1) b. na-nun cip-ey ka-∅-keyss-ta.
I-TOP home-LOC <u>go</u>-PRS-INCERT-<u>DECL</u>
[+origo] ⟵————[+control][-prfv]                           ⇒ volitive

(9) a. myencep-ey hapkyekha-yess-uni ney-ka keki-ey ka-∅-keyss-ta.
interview-LOC pass-PRFV-because <u>thou</u>-NOM there-LOC <u>go</u>-PRS-INCERT-<u>DECL</u>
[-origo] ⟵———— [+control][-prfv]
                                                  ⇒ suppositive

b. sihem-ey hapkyekha-ess-uni nenun kippu-∅-keyss-ta.
examination-LOC pass-PRFV-because <u>thou</u>-NOM <u>be.happy</u>-PRS-INCERT-<u>DECL</u>
[-origo] ⟵ [-control][-prfv]        ⇒ suppositive

(10) nwun-i kot nayli-∅-keyss-ta.
<u>snow</u>-NOM soon <u>fall</u>-PRS-INCERT-<u>DECL</u>
[-origo] ⟵———— [-control][-prfv]                        ⇒ suppositive

(13)' ilen sanghwang-eyse nay-ka ka-∅-keyss-e?
this situation-LOC <u>I</u>-NOM <u>go</u>- PRS-INCERT-INT
[-origo] ⟵ [+control][-prfv]               ⇒ suppositive

(15) a. ne-nun etten kes-ul sa-∅-keyss-ni?
<u>thou</u>-TOP which thing-ACC <u>buy</u>-PRS-INCERT-INT
[+origo] ⟵———————— [+control][-prfv]                       ⇒ volitive

(16) b. kulehke ha-myen ney-ka kippu-∅-keyss-ni?
so do-if <u>thou</u>-NOM <u>be.happy</u>-PRS-INCERT-INT
[+origo] ⟵ [-control][-prfv]               ⇒ suppositive

(17) b. swuni-ka cikum cip-ey ka-∅-keyss-ni?
<u>Swuni</u>-NOM now home-LOC <u>go</u>-PRS-INCERT-INT
[-origo] ⟵—————————— [+control][-prfv]               ⇒ suppositive

(19) b. na-nun nayil-imyen ttena-ss-keyss-ta.
<u>I</u>-TOP tomorrow-if <u>leave</u>-PRFV-INCERT-<u>DECL</u>
[+origo] ⟵———— [+control][+prfv]               ⇒ suppositive

(20) b. mili (...) ney-ka keki-ey ka-ss-keyss-ni?
in advance (…) <u>thou</u>-NOM there-LOC <u>go</u>-PRFV-INCERT-INT
[+origo] ⟵———— [+control][+prfv]               ⇒ suppositive

The maximum generalization that we can attain on this state of affairs is the following: The difference between the two modalities of *-keyss* dwells on the control parameter: If the modal origo wants or intends the proposition that modality operates on, he exerts more control on it than if he guesses at or thinks of that proposition. This higher modal control depends on the constellation [+ control, -prfv, + origo] in the modalized sentence. The first of these features concerns the control inside the proposition itself. The second feature specifies that aspect which is more closely associated with subject control, because once a situation is terminated, control of it terminates, too. Finally the last feature says that the modal origo is himself the controller of the situation designated. All of this amounts to the condition that the modal origo can control the situation which is the operand of his modal operation. And it is under this condition that the modal operation itself becomes one of control. The rationale thus appears to be the following: The modal operation 'x supposes p' changes into 'x intends p' if x controls p, because if x controls p, then whether or not p is realized is not a matter of x's supposition, but instead a matter of his volition.

## 3 Complex sentences

The question remains how the rule of §2.5 applies if the clause marked by *-keyss* is a complement clause depending on some verb of communication. It turns out that it applies in a completely analogous way. Observe the following examples with matrix verbs *malha-* 'say' and *mwut-* 'ask'.

(21)  a.  swuni- nun na-hante (...)    nay-ka    keki-ey     ka-∅-keyss-tako      malha-yess-ta.
            Swuni-TOP I-DAT    (...)    <u>I</u>-NOM    there-LOC    <u>go</u>-<u>PRS</u>-INCERT-CONJ    <u>say</u>-PRFV-DECL
                             [-origo] ⟵————— [+control][-prfv]        ⇒ suppositive
            'Swuni said to me that she thinks that I will go there (...).'

       b.   swuni- nun na-hante  (...) caki-ka     keki-ey    ka-∅-keyss-tako      malha-yess-ta.
            Swuni-TOP I-DAT   (...) <u>self</u>-NOM    there-LOC    <u>go</u>-PRS-INCERT-CONJ    <u>say</u>-PRFV-DECL
                             [+origo] ⟵————— [+control][-prfv]        ⇒ volitive
            'Swuni said to me that she was willing to go there (...).'

(22)  a.   swuni-nun na/ku-hante (...)(nay/ku-ka) keki-ey     ka-∅-keyss-nyako     mwul-ess-ta.
            Swuni-TOP I/D2-DAT   (...) <u>I/D2</u>-NOM there-LOC    <u>go</u>-<u>PRS</u>-INCERT-CONJ    <u>ask</u>-PRFV-DECL
                       [+origo] ⟵————— [+control] [-prfv]        ⇒ volitive
            'Swuni asked me/him if I/he intended to go there (...).'

       b.   swuni- nun    na-hante (...)    caki-ka    keki-ey     ka-∅-keyss-nyako     mwul-ess-ta.
            Swuni-TOP    I-DAT    (...)    <u>self</u>-NOM    there-LOC    <u>go</u>-PRS-INCERT-CONJ    <u>ask</u>-PRFV-DECL
                          [-origo] ⟵————— [+control][-prfv]       => suppositive
            'Swuni asked me if I think that she will go there (...).'

The sentence type of the *-keyss*-clause is here determined by the matrix verb. If it is a verb of assertion, as in (21), its agent becomes the modal origo for the dependent proposition, which will be a declarative clause. If it is a verb of asking, as in (22), its addressee becomes the modal origo for the dependent proposition, which will be an interrogative clause. Thus, a dependent clause draws its modal origo from its matrix clause; and that then determines the meaning of the modal operator *-keyss* on the verb of the dependent clause.

## 4 Conclusion

The two main functions of the Korean modal suffix *-keyss*, volition and supposition, depend on the combined values of four semantic parameters: control of the subject, speech act participant role of the subject, sentence type and aspect. It signals volition of the modal origo only if the modal origo is also in control of the situation designated by the modalized proposition; otherwise it codes supposition. If a clause modalized by *-keyss* is embedded in a main clause, then the modal origo shifts towards the relevant participant of the matrix speech act verb: it is the agent of a verb of saying, but the addressee of a verb of asking. This then provides the reference point for the subject of the embedded *-keyss* clause, so that the main clause rules can apply analogously. In this way, the semantics of *-keyss* in independent and in dependent clauses can be brought on a common denominator.

## Abbreviations

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ACC | accusative | ADJL | adjectival marker |
| ADDR.HON | addressee honorific | ADVL | adverbial marker |

| CONJ | conjunction | INCERT | incertive |
|------|-------------|--------|-----------|
| DAT | dative | INT | interrogative |
| DECL | declarative | LOC | locative |
| D1 | proximal demonstrative | NOM | nominative |
| D2 | distal demonstrative | PASS | passive |
| EXCL | exclamatory marker | PRFV | perfective |
| GEN | genitive | PRS | present tense |
| FOC | focus | SG | singular |
| HON | honorific | TOP | topic |

## References

Im, Hong-Pin. (1980). -*keyss*-kwa taysangseng (-*keyss*- and its objectivity). *Korean* 170, 587-190.

Im, Dong Hun. (2001). '-keyss-'uy yongpepkwa ku yeksacek paykyeng (The uses of -*keyss*- and historical interpretations of it). *Journal of Korean Linguistics* 37, 115-147.

Jeon, Hye-Young. (1995). hankuke kongson hyensangkwa '-keyss-'uy hwayonglon (Korean honorific forms and the pragmatic study on -*keyss*-). *Journal of Korean Linguistics* 26, 125-146.

Kim, Hye-Jeong. (1994). -keyss- *pyohenuy hwahayngloncek pwunsek siko (A pragmatic study on the* -keyss-*expression*. Master's thesis of Seoul National University.

Kim, Yong-Kyung. (2002). mwunpephwauy tankyeysenge tayhan yenkwu (A study on the steps of grammaticalization). *Korean* 256, 45-68.

Ko, Kwang-mo. (2002). '-keyss-'uy hyengseng kwacengkwa ku uymiuy paltal (The development of prefinal -*keyss*- in Korean). *Journal of Korean Linguistics* 39, 27-47.

Ko, Yong-Kun and Bon-Kwan Koo. (2008). hnakwuke mwunpep (*Korean Grammar*). Seoul: Thayhaksa.

Lee, Heeja. (1983). *'-keyss-'uy enphyonaycek hyoryek pwunsek (An analysis of the illocutionary effect of -keyss-)*. Yonsei University.

Lee, Pyeng Ki. (1997). Miray sicey hyengtayuy yenkwu (A diachronic study on the future tense forms). *Kwukeyenkwu* (*Studies on Korean*) 146.

Lehmann, Christian (1991). "Predicate classes and PARTICIPATION." Seiler, Hansjakob & Premper, Waldfried (eds.), *Partizipation. Das sprachliche Erfassen von Sachverhalten*. Tübingen: G. Narr (Language Universals Series, 6); 183-239.

Lehmann, Christian. (2011). 'The modal origo'. Defrancq, Bart & Rawoens, G. & De Sutter, G. & Tobback, E. (eds.), *Discourse, information and grammar*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: J. Benjamins; 000-000.

Mok, Jung-soo. (2000). senemalemiuy mwunpepcek ciwi cenglipul wihan hyengthay, thongsacek kochal (Grammatical status of the prefinal endings). *Linguistics* 26, 137-165.

Nam, Ki-Shim and Young-Gun Ko. (1985). *Phocun Kwuke Mwunpeplon* (*Standard Korean Grammar*). Seoul: Tower.

Park, Jae Yon. (2005). insik yangtaywa uymwunmwunuy sangkwankwankyeyey tayhaye (On the correlation of epistemic modality and interrogative). *Language research* 41, 101-118.

Park, Ji Young. (2004). '-keyss-'*uy hyengseng kwacengkwa uymi kinungey kwanhan yenkwu* (*A study on a formative process and the function of* -keyss-). Kyungsang University.

Sohn, Ho-Min. (1999). *The Korean language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sohn, Sung-Ock S. (1995). *Tense and aspect in Korean*. University of Hawai'i Press.

Se, Jeong-Su. (1978). '-l kes'ey kwanhaye (on -*l kes* – in comparison with -*keyss*-). *Journal of Korean Linguistics* 6, 85-110.