Self-addressed questions and indexicality — The case of Korean

Regine Eckardt, Gisela Disselkamp
Konstanz

Self-addressed questions

- marked by context (no addressee present, no answer requested)
- marked by grammar
    - Salish languages: evidential markers (Littell et al. 2010)
    - German: verb-end syntax + particle (Zimmermann 2013)
    - Italian: evidential future in questions (Eckardt & Beltrama 2018)
    - Korean: particles to mark "self-addressed questions"

Earlier theories of self-addressed questions

- Speas & Tenny (2003): speech act phrase
- Truckenbrodt (2006): feature-based account (German)
- Littell et al. (2010): semantics of conjectural questions
- Farkas & Bruce (2010): Table theory; Farkas (2017) for conjectural questions in Romanian
- Eckardt & Beltrama (2018): semantics of evidentials and conjectural questions

… to be reviewed later

Korean questions

marked with question particle: *ni* = true question
question particles *na / ka* = "self addressed question"

(1) *Mary-ka   o-ass   ni?*
     Mary-Nom   come-Past trueQ
     "Has Mary come?"

(2) *Mary-ka   o-ass   na?*
     Mary-Nom   come-Past SAQ
     "Has Mary come, I wonder"

(Jang + Kim 1998, Jang 1999): Questions with *na/ka* are described as "monological" and "used in absence of an interlocutor".

Jang + Kim (1998), Jang (1999): The bound honorific morpheme *upni* must be used in an utterance when the speaker is socially lower than the addressee. The morpheme *upni* is blocked in *na/ka* SAQ questions.

(4) *Mary-ka   o   -ass   -upni -kka?*
    Mary-Nom come   -PAST -HON   -true Q
    "Has Mary come?" (addressing a higher person)

 (5) **Mary-ka   o   -ass   -upni -ka/na?*
     Mary-Nom come -PAST -HON   -SAQ
    unavailable: "Has Mary come I wonder"

(Jang + Kim 1998:195)

4

Jang + Kim (1998:195f) Use of self-addressed questions interacts with the use of second person *ne(-ka)* "you".

(5) *nay-ka   chencay -i   -n   -ka?*
      I-Nom   genius   -be -present -SAQ
     "Am I a genius, I wonder"

(6) **ne-ka   chencay -i   -n   -ka?*
     you-Nom   genius   -be -present -SAQ
     unavailable: "Are you a genius, I wonder"

Jang+Kim: In a SAQ, speaker addresses speaker.
  a. speaker is not socially higher than self: **upni*
  b. speaker talks to speaker, thus *ne-ka* can not be a second person, hence (6).

Challenging data (I):

(7) *(?) ne-ka   chencay -i   -ess -ten   -ka?*
       you-Nom genius   -be -PAST-Recoll -SAQ
       "Were you a genius? (conjecture)"

(Jang + Kim 1998: 197)

Explanation (J+K):
- Past tense → two versions of "you" are in the air, you_{now} and you_{past}.
- this helps to dissociate the referent of "you" from the addressee.
- *ne-ka* can refer to the person and still speaker = addressee.

Challenging data (II):

(8) a. *yelsoy-ka*   *eti(-ey)*   *iss*   *-ni?*
      key-Nom   where(-Loc) exist -trueQ?
   b. *yelsoy-ka*   *eti(-ey)*   *iss*   *-na?*
      key-Nom   where(-Loc) exist -SAQ?

Situation: A and B in front of A's house. A searches bag for key.

   A: (8a) ⇔ A believes that B might know the answer.
   A: (8b) ⇔ A does not believe that B knows the answer.

Presence of second person ≠ second person is addressed (requested to answer). What counts for *SAQ?* What counts for HON?

Challenging data (III):

(9)   (?)*ne-ka   chencay -i   -n   -ka?*
        you-Nom genius   -be -PRES -SAQ
        "Are you a genius I wonder"

(9) is slightly marked but overall acceptable if

   a. uttered addressing the foto of a new student
   b. addressing a trained (but non-speaking) dog
   c. addressing a 2-month old baby

Second person pronouns in SAQ are permitted when *ne* ('you') refers to an entity or human who is not supposed to answer / not able to answer.

Challenging data (IV):

A is visiting B at her home. They see the fleurop van stop in front of the house. B is surprised. A comments

(10)   *ne-ka   kkochtapal-ul   pat   -ullye   -na?*
        you-NOM   flowers-ACC   receive -MOD.POSS -SAQ?
        "Will you perhaps get flowers, I wonder"

In this situation, A does not expect B to answer.
- (10) is conjectural.
- The use of "you" *ne* is acceptable.
- The use of HON would still be inacceptable.

Summary:

- bystanders are acceptable when they are not supposed to answer (key-example)
- bystanders are acceptable when they are not able to answer (infants, pictures, animals etc.)
- bystanders are acceptable when they lack knowledge (flowers)

- suspicion: Jang & Kim erroneously class (6) as ungrammatical because they can't imagine addressee being unable to answer "are you a genius".
- suspicion: past tense (7) is more open to a situation where addressee could be unaware of her past signs of ingenuity.

→ **Dissociate *addressee* (= communicative rôle) from *second person* (= listening other).**

A. Indexical analysis of honorific morpheme

Let c be the utterance context (Kaplan 1989) of sentence *S.* Let *sp(c)* the speaker in c, *ad(c)* the addressee in *c*.

The use of *upni* in sentence *S* adds the following pragmatic condition:

    $[[\textit{upni}\ S]]^c = [[S]]^c$ iff *sp(c)* is strictly socially inferior to *ad(c)*
    $[[\textit{upni}\ S]]^c$ undefined otherwise.

Remark: "socially inferior" can be a multi-factorial concept (e.g. McCready 2017 on Thai). We disregard the cultural issue whether *upni* defines a partial linear order on any given group of speakers. (For last-resort conditions see discussion.)

B. Who is the addressee?

Context determined by speaker's intentions.

(8) *yelsoy-ka*   *eti(-ey)*   *iss-na?/ni?*
    key-Nom   where(-Loc)   exist-SAQ? / -trueQ?

Does A intend to address B?
yes: $sp(c)$ = A and $ad(c)$ = B
no: sp(c) = A = $ad(c)$

The speaker intends the addressee in c to act as the dialogue requests: *update / object* for assertions; *answer / refuse* to questions (conversational scoreboard, e.g. Farkas & Bruce 2010).
In case $sp(c)$ = $ad(c)$: overt answering is suspended; failure to answer does not cause crisis (to be refined).

C. *ka/na* and context

(11) $[[\text{-}na/ka]]^{c}$ is defined in context *c* iff $sp(c) = ad(c)$

If defined, $[[\text{-}na/ka]]^{c} = \lambda Q_{\ll s,t>,t>}.Q$

- Self-addressed questions in Korean are "the speaker talking to herself".
- Possible in contexts where no other person is present.
- If other person is present (and even listening), the speaker does not request the person to react to the question.

Consequence: An utterance *S* with both *upni* and *na/ka* imposes contradictory requirements on context ➜ *unacceptable.

D. deictic vs. indexical 'you'

- standard interpretation of second person pronoun [[*ne*]]^c = ad(c)

Idea:
- Korean allows for indexical and deictic use of *ne*.
- Indexical *ne* = standard interpretation
- deictic *ne* = refers to the most salient bystander B in *c* if standard interpretation is blocked.

Implementation …

D. deictic vs. indexical 'you'

(SPP) $[[\textit{ne}]]^c$ presupposes: $[[\textit{ne}]]^c \neq sp(c)$
        (second person presupposition)

Every context c defines the surrounding situation $sit(c)$ of utterance, potentially including bystanders B, B', B''.
$ad(c)$ counts as bystander if different from speaker.

$[[\textit{ne}]]^c$ = B for the most salient bystander in sit(c).
   - If $sp(c) \neq ad(c)$, then $ad(c)$ counts as the most salient bystander
   - If $sp(c) = ad(c)$, then B is contextually determined to avoid violation of the second-person requirement.

→ How does this interact with *ka/na* and *upni*?

Predictions

1. *upni* and *ka/na* can not occur in the same question:
   upni S is only defined if $sp(c) < ad(c)$
   ka/na S is only defined if $sp(c) = ad(c)$.
   No person can be strictly superior to themselves.

2. *ka/na* and second person PRO^2 can only co-occur in a question if the referent of PRO^2 is not requested to answer — be it that the speaker believes that PRO^2 does not know the answer, be it that the referent PRO^2 can not answer for other reasons.

3. If second person PRO^2 is used in a question with *ka/na*, it denotes B, the most salient by-stander in *c*. B is the "hearer" in the intuitive sense but B does not adopt the obligations of addressee.

Further corroboration: Real self-talk

Korean speakers cannot address *themselves* with '*you*' in a *na/ka* marked question. (12) is only acceptable as a serious question (*ni*).

(12) a. *Ney yelsay-ka eti(-ye)   iss-   ni?*
           Your key-Nom where(-Loc) exist   -trueQ
        b. *Ney yelsay-ka eti(-ye)   iss-   *-na?*
           Your key-Nom where(-Loc) exist   *-SAQ
        speaker talking to herself: 'where is your key?'

Incompatible *na/ka*:
     $[[\textit{na}]]^c$: $sp(c) = ad(c)$
     presupposition of *ney*: $[[\textit{ney}]]^c \neq sp(c)$
→ normally avoided by interpreting *ney* as the most salient bystander B. But in this case, B = sp(c) again.

Further corroboration

Korean speakers cannot address *themselves* with '*you*' in a *na/ka* marked question. (12) is only acceptable as a serious question (*ni*).

(12) a. *Ney yelsay-ka eti(-ye)   iss-   ni?*
       Your key-Nom where(-Loc)   exist   -trueQ
    b. *Ney yelsay-ka eti(-ye)   iss-   *-na?*
       Your key-Nom where(-Loc)   exist   *-SAQ
  speaker talking to herself: 'where is your key?'

Compatible *ni*:
    [[*ni*]]^c = allows for *sp(c) ≠ ad(c)*
    real speaker *R* appears in *c* in two rôles: *R*-as-speaker ≠ *R*-as-addressee.
    R-as-addressee ≈ fictuous other, most salient bystander
    [[*ney*]]^c = *R*-as-addressee (SPP respected)

Further corroboration

Korean speakers cannot address *themselves* with '*you*' in a *na/ka* marked question. (12) is only acceptable as a serious question (*ni*).

(12)   a. *Ney yelsay-ka eti(-ye)   iss-   ni?*
         Your key-Nom where(-Loc) exist   -trueQ
       b. *Ney yelsay-ka eti(-ye)   iss-   *-na?*
          Your key-Nom where(-Loc)   exist   *-SAQ
       speaker talking to herself: 'where is your key?'

Why not allow *na* with R-as-speaker = $sp(c)$
                           R-as-speaker = $ad(c)$
                           R-as-bystander ≠ R-as-speaker
Assume: Fiction of bystander (and owner of key) less entrenched than -as-hearer, hence unavailable.

Further corroboration: Theme-setting questions

Situation: A opens a talk with a theme-setting question: "How does a solar eclipse arise? (Well, as you know the earth revolves around the sun. The moon, in turn etc etc)"

(13) *ilsik-un   ettehkey   sayngki -na?*
      solar.eclipse-TOP how   arise   -SAQ
      'How does an eclipse arise?'

The standard question particle *ni* is not used in theme-setting questions.

- $[[\, na \,]]^c$ presupposes $sp(c) = ad(c)$
- SAQ + lacking knowledge: $sp(c)$ is permitted to say nothing w.o. crisis
- SAQ + possessing knowledge, $sp(c)$ obliged to answer (theme setting)

Alternative accounts (I)

Truckenbrodt (2006) on German

Sentence type ⇔ V-to-C movement (verb-second) ⇔ features

<epist> ≈ 'having to do with knowing something'
<deont> ≈ 'issues a request to addressee'

Problem 1: syntax-semantics interface missing; *features have no meaning*
Since 2010, an interpretation in terms of Farkas & Bruce could be envisaged.

Problem 2: the stipulated correspondence between sentence type and force does not always hold. (V-end repeat questions)

Alternative accounts (II)

Speas & Tenny (2003)

- matrix clause contains speech act phrase
- extended speech act phrase with SpeakerP, HearerP
- presence/absence of HearerP ≈ type of question

Problem 1: syntax-semantics interface missing.
- SpeakerP / HearerP = reference to individuals?
- What if sentence with HearerP is uttered in soliloqui? Does it become ungrammatical? semantically odd?

Problem 2: self-addressed questions can be uttered in presence of hearer (= referent of "you" *ne*). Account does not make any predictions for this case.

Alternative accounts (III)

Table theory (Farkas & Bruce 2010), conversational scoreboard theories
Utterances define a range of possible/necessary reactions for addressee (e.g. believe assertion!, answer question!)

Farkas (2017): Romanian SAQ with *oare* ⇔ questions that allow for more reactions of addressee, including zero.

Advantage: Analysis includes an addressee. SAQ in many other languages do relate to hearer (second person); e.g. invite joint speculation (Eckardt & Beltrama 2018/subm.), e.g. allow honorifics (Japanese, see Oguro 2017)

Problem: How can the account block honorifics in SAQ in Korean?

Alternative accounts (IV)

Truth conditional accounts of self-addressed questions:
                    Denotation makes Q un-answerable

Littell et al. (2010): Salish SAQ are marked with inferential evidential markers. Denotation presupposes 'that for each possible answer q AD has inferential evidence that q'. No interlocutor can committ to this presupposition = no request to answer.

Eckardt & Beltrama (2018/subm.): German SAQ are marked with evidential *wohl*. Verb-end syntax triggers joint-evidence reading.
'Which of the answers to Q can we infer from pooled knowledge'
Before answering, Sp and Ad must pool their knowledge. Thus, Q does not issue the request to provide an immediate answer.

Problem: Both analyses assume an addressee. How can the accounts block honorifics in SAQ in Korean ?

Summary: The Special Ways of Korean Context

Korean

- SAQ are questions to the speaker
- second person bystander ≠ speaker is not in charge
- *you* can be deictic (independent of c)
- HONORIFICS rest on context
- SAQ can be theme-setting questions

Romanian, Italian, German, Japanese …

- SAQ have an addressee in *c*
- *you* refers to *ad*(*c*)
- Japanese: HONORIFICS rest on context *c*
- SAQ leave addressee more ways to react
- SAQ are not (normally) theme setting questions

References:

Eckardt, R. & A. Beltrama. 2018/subm. Evidentials and questions. Submitted to C. Pinon (ed.) : *Proceedings of CSSP 2017.* Vol. 12 of *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics.* Paris.

Farkas, D. 2017. Going beyond the prototypical : Special declaratives and special interrogatives. Paper presented at the *Stanford Colloquium,* December 2017.

Farkas, D. & K. Bruce. 2010. On reacting to assertions and polar questions. *Journal of Semantics* 27(1) : 81 – 118.

Jang, Y. 1999. Two types of question and existential quantification. *Linguistics* 36: 847 – 869.

Jang, Y. & Kim, I-K. 1998. Self-addressed questions and quantifier interpretation in Korean. *Korean Linguistics* 9: 191 – 210.

Kaplan, D. 1989. Demonstratives. In Almog, J. et al. (eds.): *Themes from Kaplan.* Oxford, OUP: 481 – 563.

McCready, E. 2014. A semantics for honorifics with reference to Thai. *Proceedings of PALIC 28:* 503 – 512.

Littell, P. et al. 2010. On the semantics of conjectural questions. In: *Evidence from Evidentiality.* Vancouver: UBC WP in Linguistics (28), 89 – 104.

San Roque, L. et al. 2017. Evidentiality and Interrogativity. *Lingua* 186/187, 120 – 143

Speas, P. & C. Tenny. 2003. Configurational properties of point of view roles. In A. M. DiScullio (ed.) *Asymmetry in Grammar* vol.1: Syntax and Semantics. New York and Philadelphia, John Benjamins: 315 – 344.

Truckenbrodt, H. 2006. On the semantic motivation of syntactic verb movement to C in German. *Theoretical Linguistics* 32: 257 – 306.

Zimmermann, M. 2013. Ob-VL-Interrogativsatz. In J. Meibauer, M. Steinbach & H. Altmann (eds.) Satztypen im Deutschen. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton, 84 – 104.