



OVERVIEW

This poster presents two puzzles concerning the interaction of speaker bias and **the direct evidential** $[-te-]$ in Korean *Long Negation* (LN) Polar Questions (PQs). The biclausal structure of LN-PQs allows for two tense loci, the matrix of which can be occupied by $-te-$.

- Using polarity direction of bias and sentence-final particles, I show that evidential LN-PQs deviate from the predictions of current theories on biased PQs ([4, 12]); syntax is not enough to explain bias polarity.
- Drawing upon formal pragmatic models ([5]), I argue that while p -biased LN-PQs are derived from (negative) polar *interrogatives*, $\neg p$ -biased LN-PQs are in fact negative *declarative questions*.

The current work not only expands the empirical scope of biased PQs to *evidential* biased PQs, but also attempts to provide a full picture of the formal theory of evidential questions (cf. [1]).

Tense and bias

Korean LN-PQs can be matrix- or embedded-tense marked. Matrix LN-PQ, 1, is the default case: its interpretation is ambiguous between p -biased and $\neg p$ -biased readings; [6, 11, 10]. Embedded LN-PQ is more marked and only paraphrasable as p -biased, 2 (see [9]).

- (1) **Matrix LN-PQ** (tense in the matrix clause if present)

John-i phathi-ey o-ci anh- $\overline{ass}$ -ni?
John-NOM party-to come-COMP NEG.do-PST-Q
 $\approx$ 'Didn't John come to the party?' (p -biased);
 $\approx$ 'Did John not come to the party?' ($\neg p$ -biased)

- (2) **Embedded LN-PQ**

John-i phathi-ey o- $\overline{ass}$ -ci anh- $(\overline{ass})$ -ni?
John-NOM party-to come-PST-COMP NEG.do-(PST)-Q
 $\approx$ 'Didn't John come to the party?' (only p -biased)

A direct evidential ($-te-$; see [2, 8]) tense-marked LN-PQ is $\neg p$ -biased:

- (3) **Evidential LN-PQ**

John-i phathi-ey o-ci anh- $\overline{te}$ -ni?
John-NOM party-to come-COMP NEG.do-TE-Q
 $\approx$ 'Did (you see) John not come to the party?' ($\neg p$ -biased)

Puzzle 1: negative bias with evidential tense

Contrary to the obligatory p -biasedness of Embedded LN-PQs, 2, Evidential LN-PQs *with embedded tense marking* is $\neg p$ -biased, 4, illustrated by answering patterns in 5.

- (4) John-i phathi-ey o- $\overline{ass}$ -ci anh- $\overline{te}$ -ni?
John-NOM party-to come-PST-COMP NEG.do-TE-Q
 $\approx$ 'Did (you see) John not come to the party?' (still $\neg p$ -biased)
- (5) Yes, he [$\#$ came / didn't come]. / No, he [did come / $\#$ didn't come].

Puzzle 2: no evidential rising declaratives

Changing the sentence-final particle from the Q-particle ($-ni$) to a plain declarative ($-e$) with a final rise ($\uparrow$) retains the speaker bias. However, $-la\uparrow$, *-te-compatible declarative rise ending* (DEC $\uparrow$), is much degraded.

- (6) a. John-i phathi-ey o- $\overline{ass}$ -ci anh- $(\overline{ass})$ - $\overline{e}\uparrow$?
 $\approx$ 'Didn't John come to the party?'
b. ??John-i phathi-ey o-ci anh- $\overline{te}$ - $\overline{la}\uparrow$?
 $\approx$ (Intended) 'Did (I see) John not come to the party?'

Proposal

- I argue that Evidential LN-PQs (and *any* $\neg p$ -biased LN-PQs) are (negative) **declarative questions** (DQs) and the speaker- and p -biased LN-PQs are derived from **polar interrogatives**. These formal differences lead to differences on COMMITMENTS and their SOURCES ([5, 1]).
- p -bias: The speaker (SPK) raises an issue (update Table; [3]), but does not assume any sourcehood and only marks the ADR's prospective commitment set (update DC $_{ADR}^*$). E.g. **Embedded LN-PQs**.
 - $\neg p$ -bias: By virtue of the declarative form, **DQs** make commitments that are *contingent* on ADR's ratification, hence the questioning effect.

Felicity conditions for DQs:

- (i) SPK takes a *dependent* stance on ADR's (prospective) sourcehood (update DC $_{SPK}^*$, DC $_{ADR}^*$, Table*), not an *independent* sourcehood.
(ii) *Contextual evidence condition* in [5] (CEC: question interpretation of DQs is conditioned by assuming ADR's biased commitment).

To shift the commitment to ADR, the LN (*anh-*) is trivially composed into the prejacent, hence $\neg p$ -bias. E.g. **Evidential LN-PQs**.

Solutions: DQs with Interrogative Flip

In 3, ADR's *evidential requirement* (ER; [7]) is imposed by $[-te-Q]$:

- Interrogative Flip (IF): a discourse effect of anchoring the evidentiality to ADR in inquisitive speech acts;
- [1]'s formal account: $Q > \text{evidential}$; and the independent source set (ss_{SPK} , updated by the evidential) converts to a dependent one (ss_{ADR}) to repair the incompatibility of updating both ss_{SPK} and DC $_{ADR}^*$;
- IF guarantees a systematic satisfaction of the ER $_{ADR}$.

Components	Embedded LN-PQ	Evidential LN-PQ (DQ)
(a) DC $_{SPK}^*$	{}	{ $\neg p$ }
(b) ss_{SPK}	{}	{ $\neg p$ } (IF)
(c) DC $_{ADR}^*$	{ p }	{ $\neg p$ }
(d) ss_{ADR}	{}	{ $\neg p$ } (IF)
(e) Table	<{ p }>	< $\neg p$ >
(f) Table*	<>	< $\neg p$ >

(For Evidential LN-PQ, when ADR construes it as a question, then Table = Table*.)

$[-te-DEC\uparrow]$ lacks IF, failing to encode ADR's relative epistemic authority; it violates the CEC ($\uparrow$ updates DC $_{SPK}^*$, and not DC $_{ADR}^*$).

Previous accounts on Biased PQs

1. The VERUM approach ([12]) posits the syntactic ambiguity between two semantic operators VERUM and $\neg$. With the identical syntax of LN-PQs, 7, Puzzle 1 constitutes a hard counterexample:

$$(7) [\text{Matrix} [\text{Embedded} \dots T (\rightsquigarrow p) \text{COMP}] [\neg/\text{VERUM}] \text{Evidential} (\rightsquigarrow \neg p) Q]$$

2. Consistent $\neg p$ -bias in Evidential LN-PQs are hard to capture for the SPEECH ACT approach. For [4], how does the evidential intervention between LN and the speech act operator (Q.OP) forces $\neg p$ -bias?

$$(8) [\text{Matrix} [\text{Embedded} \dots T (\rightsquigarrow p) \text{COMP}] \sqsupset \text{Evidential} (\rightsquigarrow \neg p) \text{Q.OP}]$$

IF typology

Korean PQs counter [1]'s IF typology ('bias and IF cannot co-occur'):

- An *IF-type language*: both the evidential and the Q operator mark discourse dependency (update ss_{ADR} , DC $_{ADR}^*$, *crucially not* ss_{SPK})
- Also, an *intonational language* (with ability to mark a neutral PQ with declarative syntax + $\uparrow$, updating DC $_{SPK}^*$): $[-e\uparrow]$ ending is felicitous in contexts where SPK lacks evidence for the prejacent:

- (9) A has been sitting in a windowless room. B enters, A asks B:
pakk-ey pi-ka o-a?
outside-at rain-NOM come-DEC $\uparrow$
'Is it raining outside?'

Contra [1], **bias** and **IF** in Korean evidential PQs *can* co-occur.

- (10) A token from a dialogue corpus (2023)
Silingpayn koayncanh-ci anh-te-na? (*I thought it was nice.*)
ceiling.fan be.fine-COMP NEG.do- $\overline{te-Q}\uparrow$
 $\approx$ '(According to your experience,) Isn't the ceiling fan nice?'

To accommodate this hybrid behavior, one can think of modifying [Q] to be a uniform function from proposition to CCP:

$$(11) \begin{aligned} \llbracket \uparrow \rrbracket &= \lambda p . \lambda C . [DC_{SPK}^* + \{p\} \wedge \text{Table}^*(C) + \{p\}] \\ \llbracket Q \rrbracket &= \lambda q . \lambda C . [DC_{ADR}^* + \{q\} \wedge \text{Table}_T], \\ &\text{where } \text{Table}_T = \text{Table}_T^*(C) \text{ or } \text{Table}(C) + \{q\} \end{aligned}$$

References

- [1] Bhadra (2020). "The semantics of evidentials in questions". J. Sem.
- [2] Chung (2007). "Spatial deictic tense and evidentials in Korean". Nat. Lang. Sem.
- [3] FarkasBruce (2010). "On reacting to assertions and polar questions". J. Sem.
- [4] Goodhue (2022). "Isn't there more than one way to bias a polar question?" Nat. Lang. Sem.
- [5] Gunlogson (2008). "A question of commitment". Belgian Journal of Linguistics;
- [6] KimKimNam (2024). "Variations in answering negative polar questions in Korean: An experimental study". Lingua;
- [7] Korotkova (2020). "Evidential meaning and (not-) at-issueness". Sem. & Prag.
- [8] Lee (2013). "Temporal constraints on the meaning of evidentiality". Nat. Lang. Sem.
- [9] Park (2020). "Canghyeng pwucenguymwunmwunuy phyenhyangceng uymiey tayhaye [Bias in Korean Negative Polar Questions] (written in Korean)". Korean Semantics (한국어 의미학);
- [10] ParkDubinsky (2019). "The syntax and semantics of negative questions and answers in Korean and English". Proceedings of the LSA;
- [11] Park (2023). "Long-form Negation Questions in Korean and their Two Parses and Speech Acts".
- [12] RomeroHan (2004). "On negative yes/no questions". Ling. & Phil.