

### When declaratives become evidentials: a case in Korean

The Korean question ending *-tani* is usually analyzed as an abbreviated form of a quotation form *-tako hani*, consisting of the ending *-ta* (having the same form as the declarative ending), the complementizer *-ko*, the light verb *ha-* (usually translated into *do*, and used here instead of the verb *say*), and the question marker *-ni* (so both 1a and 1b are usually considered as having the interpretation as 1c).

- (1) a. John-un            nwukwu-lul            salangha-n-ta-ko ha-ni?  
       John-Top            who-Acc                love-Pres-Decl-Comp do-Q  
 b. John-un            nwukwu-lul            salangha-n-ta-ni?  
       John-Top            who-Acc                love-Pres-Decl-Q  
 c. (lit.) ‘Who (do people say that) John loves?’

This analysis overlooks two crucial facts: i) Unlike *-tako hani*, *-tani* does not allow an additional topic-marked phrase (see 2), and ii) when used in adjunct questions, like *why* questions, *-tani* has the implication that the speaker expected the questioned proposition is unlikely to be true (see 3, where the *why* question with *-tani* is felicitous only when the speaker does not previously know about the truth or falsity of the questioned proposition).

- (2) a. Bill-un            John-i                Mary-lul                salangha-n-ta-ko ha-ni?  
       Bill-Top            John-Nom            Mary-Acc                love-Pres-Decl-Comp do-Q  
       ‘Does Bill say that John loves Mary?’  
 b. ??Bill-un        John-i                Mary-lul                salangha-n-ta-ni?  
       Bill-Top        John-Nom            Mary-Acc                love-Pres-Decl-Q
- (3) a. (I thought John hates Mary. One day Bill came to me and said “John loves Mary.”  
 Surprised by the fact that John loves Mary, contrary to my expectation, I asked Bill...)  
 Way    John-i                Mary-lul                salangha-n-ta-ni?  
 Why    John-Nom            Mary-Acc                love-Pres-Decl-Q  
 ‘Why does John love Mary?’  
 b. (John and Mary secretly meets each other, and I thought I am the only one who  
 knows that. One day Bill came to me and said “John and Mary are meeting each  
 other.” Surprised by the fact that Bill knows that, and wondering how Bill came to  
 know that, I asked Bill...)  
 #Way    John-i                Mary-lul                manna-n-ta-ni?  
 Why    John-Nom            Mary-Acc                meet-Pres-Decl-Q  
 ‘Why does John meet Mary?’

We might be tempted to analyze *-ta* in *-tani* in parallel with Faller(2002)’s analysis of the reportative evidential marker *-si* in Cuzco Quechua (CQ). According to Faller, the reportative evidential marker *-si* may combine with a question, and the question may be ‘anchored’ either to the speaker (evidential meaning i) or to the hearer (evidential meaning ii), as shown in (4):

- (4) Pi-ta-s                Inés-qa                watuku-sqa?  
       who-acc-si        Inés-top                visit-pst2  
       ‘Who did Inés visit?’

ev= (i) speaker indicates that somebody else is asking (ii) speaker expects hearer to  
 have reportative evidence for his or her answer (Faller 2002: 230)

We cannot apply Faller’s analysis to Korean *-ta-*, however, because, unlike *-si* in CQ, Korean *-tani* questions only have evidential meaning like (4ii) and not (4i), and because, it is unclear in Faller(2002)’s analysis how we can derive the ‘surprise’ implication in the wh-adjunct questions from the reportative evidential marker.

In this paper we claim that the declarative marker *-ta* in *-tani* questions has to be analyzed as a reportative evidential marker involving epistemic certainty, whose lexical entry is (5) (adopted and slightly rephrased from the lexical entry for present-perfect evidentials in Izvorski 1997):

- (5) The lexical entry for non-sentential-final *-ta-*:  
 a. Assertion: p is epistemically necessary in view of the speaker’s knowledge state

b. Presupposition: speaker has reportative evidence for p

To account for the question with *-ta*, we also assume the followings: (i) a question is derived by a covert question morpheme, which derives a set of possible answers from a given proposition (just like what is assumed in Karttunen 1977) and (ii) the evidential marker *-ta* always takes narrow scope with respect to the question morpheme, which is supported by the fact that the question marker *-ni* always take wide scope over the evidential marker *-ta*, based on Baker(1985)'s mirror theory and head-final status of Korean. In this analysis the LF of the question (6a) will be (6b), and the extension of the question will look like (6c). Then when answering, the hearer of (6a) will be the speaker of the answer, and therefore it is expected that the hearer of (6a) will answer the question (6a) based on his/her reportative evidence:

- (6) a. Nwuka Mary-lul manna-ess-ta-ni?  
 Who-Nom Mary-Acc meet-Past-Decl-Q  
 'Who did meet Mary?' (implication: the answer is based on hearer's reportative ev.)  
 b. LF: [Who<sub>1</sub> I [Q (i) [-ta [t<sub>1</sub> met Mary]]]  
 c. {It is necessary in the speaker's reportative evidence that John met Mary,  
 It is necessary in the speaker's reportative evidence that Bill met Mary,  
 It is necessary in the speaker's reportative evidence that Paul met Mary, ..... }

To account for the 'surprise' implication in wh-adjunct questions with *-ta*, we assume that, unlike wh-argument questions, wh-adjunct questions also presuppose that the asked question is true. Then the surprise implication in (7a) can be accounted for by the following reasoning: since the questioned proposition *p* is already added to the conversational ground (as presupposition), in the usual conversation it is expected for the speaker to ask the hearer to answer the question based on his/her best possible ground. However, the reportative evidence presupposed in *-ta* is not the best possible ground with respect to the direct evidence. Therefore using *-ta* in wh-adjunct questions can be considered an unnecessary meta-conversational move (7c), and this unnecessary movement may be justified only when the speaker think it is epistemically unlikely for the asked proposition to be true in his/her epistemic knowledge, contrary to the presupposition introduced by the wh-adjunct questions (7b).

- (7) a. Way John-i Mary-lul salangha-n-ta-ni?  
 Why John-Nom Mary-Acc love-Pres-Decl-Q  
 'Why does John love Mary?'  
 b. Presupposition: (It is the case that) John loves Mary  
 c. Principle of Economy: Do not use a meta-conversational move unless necessary (to resolve epistemic conflict or to ensure Quality) (from Romero and Han 2004: 629).

Our account of *-tani* has the following implications. 1) Comparing *-tanta* (8) with *-tani*, we claim *-ta* in *-tanta* should be identified as a reportative evidential independent of *-nta* (contrary to Chung 2005, who analyzed *-tanta* in (8a) as a single reportative evidential morpheme). 2) By analyzing *-ta* as an epistemic necessity modal, we can analyze *-ta* in parallel with English epistemic necessity *must*, which also has the 'surprise' effect in wh-adjunct questions like (9).

- (8) John-i cip-ey wa-ess-ta-n-ta.  
 John-Nom home-Loc come-Past-Decl-Pres-Decl  
 '(It is said that) John came home'  
 (9) (scenario: someone said to me, "It is raining outside." Since I knew it was forecasted that it was sunny today, and I never expected that it would rain, I asked...)  
 a. Why? Why must it be raining outside?  
 b. #Why? Why is it raining outside?

Selected references: Baker, M.(1985), *The Mirror Principle and Morphosyntactic Explanation*, LI 16. CHUNG, K.-S.(2005), *Space in Tense*, Doctoral Diss., Simon Fraser. FALLER, M.(2002), *Semantics and Pragmatics of Evidentials in Cuzco Quechua*, Doctoral Diss., Stanford. KARTTUNEN, L.(1977), *Syntax and Semantics of Questions*, L&P 1. ROMERO, M. & HAN, C.-H.(2004), *On negative yes/no questions*, L&P 27.