

## The subjunctive complementizer in Korean: the interaction between inquisitiveness and nonveridicality

Arum Kang & Suwon Yoon

Korea University & University of Texas, Arlington

**Puzzle & Data.** The goal of current study is to propose a novel paradigm of subjunctive mood marking, based on the “**inquisitive**” complementizer in Korean, *(u)l-kka* ‘Mod + Q-Comp’. Traditionally, subjunctive mood selection refers to the phenomena where modal predicates expressing the weak commitment select subjunctive marking device in the embedded clauses by means of overt verbal inflections. Recently, extended spectrum of subjective has been suggested as (i) the valid types of mood trigger vary across languages (e.g. Italian *crede* ‘believe’ takes both subjunctive and indicative mood (Mari 2016; Mari & Portner 2018; Portner 2018)); (ii) subjunctive mood can be marked on the subordinator C in modern Greek (Giannakidou & Mari 2017). The phenomenon of Korean subjunctive mood also exhibits these characteristics. Korean employs two types of overt complementizer as the ordinary interrogative complementizer *ci* and “modalized” interrogative complementizer *(u)l-kka*. They are inquisitive in that they both co-occur with rogative verbs *kwungkumha* ‘wonder’:

- (1) Mina-nun      Chelswu-ka      pathi-ey      o-nun-**ci/o-l-kka**      **kwungkumha**-ass-ta.  
M.-Top      C.-Nom      party-Loc      come-Asp-**whether**      wonder-Pst-Decl  
‘Mina wondered whether Chelswu would come to the party.’

However, the differences come from two aspects: first, as shown below, *ci* and *(u)l-kka* exhibit the complementary distributions with (non)veridical responsive verbs (Lahiri 2002):

Attitude predicates		<i>ci</i>	<i>(u)l-kka</i>	
Anti-rogative		<i>mit</i> ‘believe’ (strong belief)	*	
Rogative		<i>mulepo</i> ‘ask’	√	
		<i>kwngkumha</i> ‘wonder’	√	
Responsive	Veridical	<i>al</i> ‘know’	*	
	Non-veridical	<i>hwaksinha</i> ‘be certain’	√	
		<i>siph</i> ‘think/believe’ (subjective belief)	*	√ (subjunctive)
		<i>molu</i> ‘not.know’	*	√ (subjunctive)
Evaluative Negation (EN)		<i>ani/anh</i> ‘not’	√ (subjunctive)	

For example, only *(u)l-kka* can combine with the subjective belief verbs *siph* ‘think/believe’ and yields a uncertainty or dubitative reading:

- (2) Mina-nun      Chelswu-ka      pathi-ey      \*o-nun-**ci/o-l-kka**      **siph**-ess-ta.  
M.-Top      C.-Nom      party-Loc      come-Asp-**whether**      think/believe-Pst-Decl  
‘Mina **was uncertain/doubted** whether/if Chelswu **might** come to the party.’

According to Lahiri (2002), responsive verbs express a relation between the holder of an attitude and a proposition which is an answer to the embedded question. Veridical-responsives (e.g. Mina *knows* whether Chelswu will come to the party) entail that Mari has a *true belief* as to whether Chelswu will come to the party, whereas non-veridical responsive (e.g. Mina *is certain* whether Chelswu will come to the party) is true even if Mina believes that Chelswu will come to the party while in fact it isn’t. Unlike *ci*, the verbs that *(u)l-kka* takes should be non-veridical, and they are compatible with situations where an epistemic subject/speaker is unsure about the realization of the embedded propositional content. Second, in an unembedded clause, *(u)l-kka* plays a role as a “modalized question (MQ) marker” (C. Lee 2011, 2012). MQ is a novel type of question which reports on the *speaker’s* consideration of a set of *possibilities* of the given propositional content (Kang and Yoon, to appear). By using MQ, the speaker expresses her epistemic uncertainty or conjecture on the given proposition in question.

(3) a. pi-ka o-ass-**ul-kka** (Q)? <conjectural Q, wondering> (with the modal *-ul*)  
 ‘I wonder/don’t know if it has rained.’

b.  $\llbracket(3)\rrbracket = \llbracket\text{that it is possible that it has rained}\rrbracket \cup \llbracket\text{that it is not possible that it has rained}\rrbracket$

Given the above observations, we address the following questions: First, what are the semantic-pragmatic contributions of subjunctive mood markers in inquisitive Comp? Second, how are the distinct behaviors of subjunctive in Korean and other languages related to each other?

**Proposal & Analysis.** We propose that *(u)l-kka* is a lexicalized form of the “epistemic” subjunctive mood exponent appearing in subordinator C. The semantic contribution of *(u)l-kka* is that (i) it comprises **all potential answers**; and (ii) it is sensitive to **nonveridical weakening** (cf. *inquisitive belief* (Mari 2016b)):

(4) (2) is true iff Mina believes that *p*, where *p* is a potential answer to *will Chelswu come to the party?* & Mina was undecided as to where the actual world is on the possible answer sets

The uncertainty may originate either from the subject’s presumption of the medium/low-possibility of the event given by contextually available information or from the subject’s lack of information on the matter.

In this sense, the addition of *(u)l-kka* manifests an epistemic weakening in the subject/speaker’s non-homogeneous doxastic space. We provide the analysis incorporated under the general theory of Subjective Nonveridicality (Giannakidou & Mari, to appear). Subjunctive is deeply tight to the notion of subjectivity, i.e. consideration of spaces of beliefs, doxastic, epistemic, bouletic (Farkas 1992; Giannakidou 1994 et seq, a.o.). We treat non-veridicality as a property of subjective spaces separated the monogeneity of M. Given that M be a set of worlds, compatible with what the speaker/subject knows in *w*, M is partitioned between *p* and non-*p* worlds, then *i* is in a state of epistemic uncertainty. Subjective nonveridicality of *(u)l-kka* thus means that *i* is in a state of uncertainty with respect to *p*, where M(*i*) as a whole does not support *p*, as follows:

(5) Subjective nonveridicality of *(u)l-kka* SUBJ.Q-Comp: A function *F* that takes a proposition *p* as its argument is subjectively nonveridical with respect to an individual anchor *i* and an epistemic state M(*i*) iff:  $\exists w' \in M(i): \neg p(w') \wedge \exists w'' \in M(i): p(w'')$

**Conclusions and implications.** We have examined that Korean epistemic subjunctive mood can occur in the inquisitive complement clause. As a subjunctive marker, the occurrence of *(u)l-kka* depends on the higher verbs whose subject provides nonhomogeneous doxastic space. Building on Marques (2004), we provide the crosslinguistic variation on the modal contexts and selection of indicative, interrogative or subjunctive in complement as follows:

	Context where the proposition <i>P</i> occurs				
	Veridical			Non-veridical	
	Reality		Non-reality		
	Non-epistemic	Epistemic		Non-epistemic	Epistemic
	<i>be good that p</i>	<i>know that p</i>	<i>imagine that p</i>	<i>want that p</i>	<i>be certain that/whether p</i> <i>be uncertain that/whether p</i>
Romanian, Hungarian, (Modern) Greek	IND			SUBJ	IND/INT
Portuguese	IND		SUBJ		IND/INT
Italian, Catalan, Spanish, French	SUBJ	IND		SUBJ	IND/INT
<b>Korean</b>	IND			IND/INT	<b>SUBJ</b>

Much more needs to be said to gain a full understanding of the precise nature of the relationship between inquisitiveness and subjunctive.

**Selected References.** Giannakidou & Mari. to appear. Veridicality in grammar and thought: modality, propositional attitudes and negation ♦ Mari & Portner. 2018. Mood variation with belief predicate: Modal comparison in semantics and the common ground ♦ Portner. 2018. Mood.