**Speech act operators and CALL-BACK function**

**1. Goals** I present novel data from the Korean particle *-ko* and *-nikka* illustrating what I define as CALL-BACK function. At first glance the data might suggest that these are speech act (SA) operators. However, they are stackable to other particles and induce additional presuppositions. Moreover, they 'call back' (a) propositions that were asserted in the common ground and (b) speech acts (e.g., assertion, question) that were performed in the context. My analysis extends to expressions such as 'again' or 'as previously mentioned', but differs from the previous discussion of Sauerland and Yatsushiro (2017) (henceforth SY), which cannot capture the Korean data.

**2. Data & Previous account** Consider the triplet in declaratives (1). Particle *-ya/-la* (allomorph) is a clause boundary particle. As sentences in (1)(b-c) show, *-ko* and *-nikka* can be stacked onto this clause boundary particle. Moreover, *-ko* and *-nikka* induce different presuppositions (2).

(1) Declaratives

a. ku salam-uy ilum-i Jon-i-ya
that person-GEN name-NOM Jon-COP-YA
'That person's name is Jon.'

b. ku salam-uy ilum-i Jon-i-la-**ko**
that person-GEN name-NOM Jon-COP-LA-**KO**
'That person's name is Jon.' (And I know that that person's name is shared in the common ground)

c. ku salam-uy ilum-i Jon-i-la-**nikka**
that person-GEN name-NOM Jon-COP-LA-**NIKKA**
'That person's name is Jon.' (And I am asserting this again)

(2) Hey, wait-a-minute test (e.g., von Fintel 2004)

a. When -YA is used: Hey, wait a minute. That person's name is Jon.
b. When -KO is used: Hey, wait a minute. We don't know that that person's name is Jon.
c. When -NIKKA is used: Hey, wait a minute. You didn't tell me that that person's name is Jon.

The clause boundary particle *-ya/-la* are also used in interrogatives; it is the rising intonation that distinguishes interrogatives from declaratives. Similar to declaratives, *-ko* (3-b) and *-nikka* (3-c) in interrogatives are stackable to the clause boundary particle and induce presuppositions. Yet, a question particle is obligatory in the case of (3-c). The mandatory use of this question particle is explained in the proposal.

(3) Interrogatives (Polar questions & Wh- questions)

a. ku salam-uy ilum-i {Jon / mwues}-i-ya?
that person-GEN name-NOM {Jon / what}-COP-YA
'Is that person's name Jon?' / 'What is that person's name?'

b. ku salam-uy ilum-i {Jon / mwues}-i-la-**ko**?
that person-GEN name-NOM {Jon / what}-COP-LA-**KO**
'That person's name is Jon?' / 'What is that person's name?' (And I know that that person's name is shared in the common ground)

c. ku salam-uy ilum-i {Jon / mwues}-i-*(ni)-ya-**nikka**?
that person-GEN name-NOM {Jon / what}-COP-*(Q)-YA-**NIKKA**
'Is that person's name Jon?' / 'What is that person's name?' (And I am asking you this again)

A particle comparable to Korean *-ko* (3-b) is Japanese *-kke* (4). SY discuss that particle *-kke* is only used for interrogatives and that it triggers a 'remind-me' presupposition. The use of *-kke* presupposes that 'I know that your name was discussed in the common ground.' Based on this observation, SY argue that *-kke* involves an imperative function (5).

(4) Japanese *-kke* (Sauerland & Yatsushiro 2017: 653)
namae-wa nan-da-kke?
name-TOP what-COP-KKE ('What is your name again?')

(5) IMP-2 [again [CG [what is your name?]]] (Sauerland & Yatsushiro 2017: 666)

However, SY fail to capture the Korean data, which show that (a) the particle is not restrictive to interrogatives and (b) the particle 'calls back' earlier SA as well as common ground. SY also stipulate an IMPERATIVE operator which lacks empirical motivation and is unnecessary in Korean.

**3. Proposal** The Korean data show that *-ko* 'calls back' the common ground and *-nikka* 'calls back' the previous SA. Unlike Japanese *-kke*, the Korean particles are not restrictive to interrogatives but are used in declaratives. In order to capture these phenomena, I propose the CALL-BACK function, adopting key concepts from Krifka (2015). CALL-BACK is an anaphoric function that anchors $\phi$ to the common ground ($C$), or the set of previous SA ($\sqrt{C}$ from Krifka 2015).

(6) CALL-BACK($\phi$) is defined in case one of the two worlds:
a. iff $\phi$ is a proposition, then $\phi \in C$, or
b. iff $\phi$ is a SA, then $\phi \in \sqrt{C}$

Employing this operator brings about a number of advantages. First, it captures how particle stacking is possible. This operator applies on top of other SA operators such as ASSERT or QUESTION. Second, it captures the different presupposition induced by *-ko* and *-nikka*. Particle *-ko* 'calls back' common ground ($C$) and *-nikka* 'calls back' the SA that was performed earlier ($\sqrt{C}$). Third, it captures why a question particle is required when *-nikka* is used for interrogatives. Particle *-nikka* 'calls back' the previous SA; thus, when it is used in interrogatives, a question SA must precede the use of of *-nikka* and the absence of the question particle is ungrammatical. Fourth, it captures how, unlike Japanese *-kke*, a parallel phenomenon is observed in both declaratives and interrogatives; hence, the operator has more generalizability.

**4. Theoretical implications** This work is in line with recent observations that even SA operators are embeddable (Davis 2009; Krifka 2015; Law et al. 2018, a.o). My proposal shows that a meta-operator (e.g., CALL-BACK) can be applied to an SA operator. The CALL-BACK function also captures exhortatives in Korean.

**5. References** [1] Davis, Christopher. 2009. *J. Sem* 26.4: 329-366. [2] von Fintel, Kai. 2004. *Descriptions and beyond*, vol. 5: 315-341. [3] Krifka, Manfred. 2015. In *SALT*, vol. 25: 328-345. [4] Law, Jess, H.-K., Haoze Li, and Diti Bhadra. 2018. In *SuB 22*, vol. 2: 53-70. [5] Sauerland, Uli, and Kazuko Yatsushiro. 2017. *LI* 48.4: 651-678.