EVIDENTIALITY IN KOREAN CONDITIONAL CONSTRUCTIONS

1. INTRODUCTION

[1] Target: Korean firsthand evidential marker -te in counterfactual conditional constructions (CCC, henceforth)

(1)a. chelswu-ka kong-ul cha-ess-ta
    Chelswu-Nom ball-Acc kick-Ant-Decl.ending
    ‘Chelswu kicked a ball.’

b. chelswu-ka kong-ul cha-te-la
    Chelswu-Nom ball-Acc kick-te-Decl.ending
    ‘(I saw that) Chelswu kicked a ball.’

(1`)a. [ney-ka o-ass-te-la-myen] (ku-ka) kippe-ha-ess-(u)-theyntey
    you-Nom come-Ant-Evid-End-if he-Nom be.happy-do-Ant-Fut-end
    Lit. If you had come, he would be happy.
    ‘If you had come, he would have been happy.’

‘[E]videntials are normally used in assertions (realis clauses), not in irrealis clauses, nor in presuppositions…’ (Anderson 1986: 274-275).

[2] Research Question: How are evidentials licensed in counterfactual conditional constructions, which seem to be conceptually incompatible?

[3] The aims of the paper
(a) To show that the firsthand evidential marker appears in Korean CCCs as a conceptually optimal tactic for the speaker to distance herself from the focal event,
(b) To argue that it is the marker’s extended function, its distancing and space presupposing function (Mental Spaces Theory; Fauconnier 1997, Dancygier and Sweetser 2005, Kwon 2009), not its firsthand evidential marking function, that licenses the marker to be utilized as such, and
(c) To model how the marker fits the CCCs, proposing that distancing layers be represented in the Mental Spaces diagrams.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. KOREAN CONDITIONAL CONSTRUCTIONS

- Agglutinative morphology
- Conditional marker -myen is attached directly to a verb stem or to tense complex in the protasis

[1] Predictive CCs; Neutral epistemic stance ([] protasis)

(2) [ney-ka o-myen / o-n-ta-myen] (ku-ka) kippe-ha-l-theyn-tey
    you-Nom come-if / come-Imperf-Decl-if he-Nom be.happy-do-Fut-ending
    Lit. If you come/ If it is said that you come, he will be happy. [Neutral]
    ‘If you come, he will be happy.’

(3) [ney-ka ttena-myen / ttena-n-ta-myen] (kunye-ka) sulphe-ha-l-theyn-tey
    you-Nom leave-if / leave-Imperf-Decl-if she-Nom be.sad-do-Fut-end
    Lit. If you leave/ If it is said that you leave, she will be sad.
    ‘If you leave, she will be sad.’

(a) Tense morphology in the protasis
- a null morpheme: implicates imperfective and non-past as default
- a morpheme complex (imperfective marker -n- + declarative marker –ta)¹

[2] CCCs; Negative epistemic stance

¹ The morpheme complex yields a semantic ambiguity in that an utterance containing it can also be interpreted as a quotative conditional construction. The quotative reading is licensed as Noh (2007) claims that -ta functions as a metarepresentational marker. This paper will not be concerned with the metarepresentation of the marker any further.
(4) \[ \text{[ecey} \quad \text{ney-ka} \quad o-\text{-ass-umyen} / o-\text{-ass-ta-}\text{myen}] \quad (\text{ku-ka}) \quad \text{kippe-ha-ess-l-theyntey} \]
\[
\quad \text{yesterday you-Nom come-Ant-if} / \text{come-Ant-Decl-if} \quad \text{he-Nom be.happy-do-Ant-Fut-end}
\]
Lit. If you came yesterday, he would be happy.

‘If you had come yesterday, he would have been happy.’

(5) \[ \text{[ecey} \quad \text{ku-ka} \quad ttena-\text{-ess-umyen} / ttena-\text{-ass-ta-}\text{myen}] \quad (\text{kunye-ka}) \quad \text{sulphe-ha-ess-(u)l-theyntey} \]
\[
\quad \text{yesterday he-Nom leave-Ant-if} / \text{leave-Ant-Decl-if} \quad \text{she-Nom be.sad-do-Ant-Fut-end}
\]
Lit. If he left yesterday, she would be sad.

‘If he had left yesterday, she would have been sad.’

(a) Tense morphology in the protasis in CCC
- Anterior marker -ess\* or a morpheme complex (-ess + -ta): implicates perfective and past

[3] CCCs with pluperfect tense; “Distanced” Negative epistemic stance

(6)a. \[ \text{[ney-ka} \quad o-\text{-ass-te-la-}\text{myen}] \quad (\text{ku-ka}) \quad \text{kippe-ha-ess-(u)l-theyntey} \]
\[
\quad \text{You-Nom come-Ant-Evid-End-if} \quad \text{he-Nom be.happy-do-Ant-Fut-end}
\]
Lit. If you had come, he would be happy.

‘If you had come, he would have been happy.’

*b. \[ \text{[ney-ka} \quad o-\text{-ass-te-la-}\text{myen}] \quad (\text{ku-ka}) \quad \text{kippe-ha-l-theyntey} \]
\[
\quad \text{You-Nom come-Ant-Evid-End-if} \quad \text{he-Nom be.happy-do-Fut-end}
\]
Lit. If you had come, *he will be happy.

(a) Tense Morphology
- Pluperfect tense marker -esste- (J.-W. Park 2006: 125-126; if the protasis contains the tense morpheme complex, it will always convey negative epistemic stance)
- Anterior and future morpheme complex in the apodosis
- Tense clash in (5b): Past in the protasis, future in the apodosis

[4] CCC with the speaker’s regret (Contrary-to-fact wishes (Fleischman 1989: 7), Negative epistemic stance; only if or I wish constructions in English)

(7) \[ \text{[ku-ka} \quad o-\text{-ass-te-la-}\text{myen}] \quad \ldots \]
\[
\quad \text{he-Nom come-Ant-Evid-Decl-if}
\]
Lit. Only if he had come…

‘If he had come… (it would have been great)’

(a) Construction-specific meaning: Only with a protasis clause that contains the pluperfect, the speaker’s regret toward the past event can be expressed.

2.2. THE FIRSTHAND EVIDENTIAL MARKER


(a) Retrospective firsthand evidential: the speaker’s acquisition of information in the past (see (1)).
(b) The semantic properties of the morpheme’s encoding firsthand evidential and epistemic modality are indefeasible (p.c. Lev Michael).

- Firsthand evidential function

(8)* \[ \text{chelswu-ka} \quad \text{kong-ul} \quad \text{cha-te-la}, \quad \text{kulentey} \quad \text{chelswu-lul} \]
\[
\quad \text{Chelswu-Nom ball-Acc kick-te-ending but Chelswu-Acc}
\]
\text{po-ci-mos-ha-ess-ta}
\[
\quad \text{see-Conn-Neg-do-Ant-Decl.ending}
\]
\text{*“(I saw that) Chelswu kicked the ball, but I didn’t see him.”}

- Epistemic modality

(9)* \[ \text{amato} \quad \text{chelswu-ka} \quad \text{kong-ul} \quad \text{cha-te-la} \]
\[
\quad \text{Probably Chelswu-Nom ball-Acc kick-te-ending}
\]
\text{“*(I saw that) Probably, Chelswu kicked a ball.”}

Following H.-S. Lee (1991: 176-177), it is assumed that the marker -ess/-ass is an anterior marker, because it functions either as a past tense marker or as a perfective aspect marker depending on context.
(c) Interaction between its evidential function and choice of a grammatical subject (first-person vs. non-first person) is grammaticalized into constraints, which are (Non-)Equi-Subject-Constraints (Yang 1972, Kwon 2009)

(10) Chelswu-ka kong-ul cha-te-la
    Chelswu-Nom ball-Acc kick-te-ending
    Lit. Chelswu kicked the ball
    ‘(I saw that) C kicked the ball.’

(11) ?nay-ka kong-ul cha-te-la
    I-Nom ball-Acc kick-te-ending
    Lit. I kicked the ball
    ‘(I saw that) I kicked the ball.’

2.3. PROBLEM RAISED
[1] Conceptual incompatibility?
- Factivity via its firsthand evidential and epistemic modal vs. irrealis character in CCCs
[2] Evidentials in other languages
(a) Tariana (Aikhenvald 2006:259): No evidential marker can appear in CCs.
(b) Western Apache (Anderson 1986), Tucano (Aikhenvald 2002), and Mangarayi (Merlan 1981: 182): Some evidential does occur in CCs.

[Western Apache a quotative lek’eh (Reuse 2003: 90)]

(12) Dihayu ni’ ánanilji goza thékheyvoghi tsist’ii ik’an la’ nasilnii doolel ni’ nláh, tsistíi hidágí bihga its’i’ biil, doolel ni’.
    ‘If there were a place that had a kitchen, I would have bought some tortilla flour, because we would have eaten tortillas, with meat.’
- Its quotative function is not in focus.
- Uplegger (1945: 13): ‘as it is to be seen in mind though belonging to the past or to circumstances not actually present.’

[3] Implication: It has never been unexpected that evidentials appear in conditional constructions in languages.

3. EVIDENTIALS IN KOREAN CCC AS A CONCEPTUALLY OPTIMAL TACTIC
[1] Two supporting evidences
(a) The firsthand evidential function of the marker is not in focus in CCCs.
(b) The evidential marker conveys space presuppositional characteristic and distancing functions (Kwon 2009)

3.1 RETROSPECTIVITY OF -TE
[1] The firsthand source marking property of the marker is not functioning or not in focus.

(13)a. ecey ku (?nay)-ka kunye-lul chac-ass-te-la
    yesterday he (?I)-Nom he-Acc look.for-Ant-te-Decl
    ‘(I saw that) He (?I) found her yesterday.’

b. [ecey ku (nay)-ka kunye-lul chac-ass-te-la-myen]
    yesterday he (I)-Nom she-Acc look.for-Ant-te-Decl-if
    motunkes-i cal-toy-ess-ul-thentey
    everything-Nom well-get-Ant-Fut-ending
    ‘If he (I) had found her yesterday, everything would have been fine.’

(14)a. ku (?nay)-ka ttena-ass-te-la
    He (I)-Nom leave-Ant-te-ending
    ‘(I remember that) He (?I) had left.”

b. [ku (nay)-ka ttena-ass-te-la-myen] wuyhem-ha-ess-ul-thentey
    he (I)-Nom leave-Ant-te-ending-if dangerous-do-Ant-Fut-ending
    ‘If he (I) had left, it would have been dangerous.’

(a) Indicatives ((13a) and (14a)): Encodes the speaker’s firsthand source of evidence
(b) CCCs ((13b) and (14b)): The function is not in effect (Notice that first person subject can be licensed naturally).

[2] The evidential marker cannot be licensed without anterior marker -ess/-ass in CCCs:

(15)a. ecey ku-ka kunye-lul chac-te-la
    yesterday he-Nom she-Acc look.for-te-Decl

    ‘(I saw that) He was looking for her yesterday.’

b. *[ecey ku-ka kunye-lul chac-te-la-myen]
    yesterday he-Nom she-Acc look.for-te-Decl-if

    motunkes-i cal-toy-ess-ul-thentey
    everything-Nom well-get-Ant-Fut-ending

    ‘If he looked for her yesterday, everything would have been fine.’

(16)a. ku-ka ttena-te-la
    he-Nom leave-te-ending

    “(I remember that) He was leaving.”

b. *[ku-ka ttena-te-la-myen]
    he-Nom leave-te-ending-if

    wuyhem-ha-l-thentey
    dangerous-do-Fut-ending

    ‘If he left, it would be dangerous.’

(a) Indicatives ((15a) and (16a)): Firsthand evidence
(b) Conditionals ((15b) and (16b)): Not licensed.

- It is an anterior marker -ess, not an evidential marker -te that determines perfectivity of the described event and thus, that licenses CCCs.

[3] Implications
(a) In order for the evidential marker to be licensed in CCCs, the perfectivity of the event should be presupposed with an anterior marker.

“…[In languages such as English, where evidential marking is optional,] when it is necessary or desirable to indicate a speaker’s lack of commitment to the truth of a predication at time ‘now’, one strategy for accomplishing this task is through use of a tense more past than the time reference of the predication itself” (Fleischmen 1989: 8).

(b) By expressing the speaker’s stance toward the event whose counterfactuality is already marked with the anterior marker, the utterance with the evidential marker is forced to be a “distanced” CCC.
(c) The marker’s retrospectivity can only maximize reading of counterfactuality, but does not provoke it.

3.2 Presuppositional Characteristic of -TE

[1] Presupposition Accommodation: The marker’s function to encode the speaker’s epistemic stance toward the past event presupposes the objectivity of the event from which factivity of the event can be inferred.

(17) ku-ka pap-ul mek-te-la
    he-Nom rice-Acc eat-te-Decl

    ‘(I saw that) he ate rice.’

[2] Subject usage asymmetry resulted from the presupposed objectivity:

(18) nay-ka pap-ul mek-te-la
    I-Nom rice-Acc eat-te-Decl.

    ‘(I saw that) I ate rice.’

- Kwon (2009): In order to license the utterance, the speaker is capable of creating distance between the cognizer and the observed subject, i.e. conceptual discontinuity between the speaker and the observed subject in the event (in this case, the speaker’s self) in the given context. If she is successful in creating the conceptual discontinuity with rich inferences exploitable in the given context, utterances like (18) can be licensed.

- Mediative property of evidentials (Lazard 2001:362): Evidentials are ‘mediative’ in a sense that they imply...
- The marker’s presuppositional character enabled the author to describe an imagined event as if she had physically observed the focal event objectively in the past.
- What the interlocutors have in common is not a presupposition of existence of the historical figure, but the mental representation of the figure in the presupposed mental space (implied in Lambrecht 1996:78). The question of whether the speaker observed the figure or not is infelicitous to talk about.

3.3 THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS: TWO POSSIBILITIES
[1] The firsthand marker’s primary function encoding the firsthand source is bleached out while undergoing grammaticalization.
[2] The primary function of the marker is suppressed in the CCCs. (✓)

4. MENTAL SPACES IN EVIDENTIALITY OF CCCs
[1] Objectives
(a) To explain and model how the evidential marker’s distancing function conceptually fits in Korean counterfactual conditional in a more intuitive way.
(b) To propose that distancing strategy in the CCCs should be represented by layering blocks, in addition to Dancygier and Sweetser’s way of darkening blocks in Mental Spaces diagrams.

4.1 MENTAL SPACES IN KOREAN CONDITIONAL CONSTRUCTIONS
[The speaker does not have to presume either that the addressee will come or not.]
(21) ney-ka o-ass-ta-myen, chelswu-ka kippeha-ass-ulthe-i-ntey
you-Nom come-Ant-Decl-if Chelswu-Nom be.happy-Perl-Epis-Cop-Ending
“If you had come, Chelswu would have been happy.” [Counterfactual]

BASE/PRESENT
‘You’ didn’t come.
Chelswu is not happy.

IF/PRESENT or PAST
Negative Stance

You come

EXT
Chelswu is happy

ALT/PRESENT or PAST
(Positive Stance)

You don’t come

ALT/EXT
Chelswu is not happy

The morpheme complex is interpreted as a past perfective tense marker.
- No layer is present at the if space, but it is simply darkened (Dancygier and Sweetser 2005).

(21’) ney-ka o-ass-(u)myen chelswu-ka kippeha-ess-ulthe-i-ntey
you-Nom come-Ant-if Chelswu-Nom be.happy-Ant-Epis-Cop-Ending
“If you had come, Chelswu would have been happy.” [Counterfactual]

4.2 -Te- IN CCCs
[1] Its distancing function is taken advantage of in the constructions. Since the marker’s distancing function is presuppositional in nature, the marker’s appearance in the protasis can also be represented by creating a layer in the diagram.

(22) ney-ka o-ass-te-la-myen, chelswu-ka kippeha-ass-ulthe-i-ntey
you-Nom come-Ant-Decl-if Chelswu-Nom be.happy-Ant-Epis-Cop-Ending
“If you had come, Chelswu would have been happy.” [Counterfactual]

BASE/PRESENT
‘You’ didn’t come.
Chelswu was not happy.

IF/PAST
Negative Stance
Firsthand Evidential Space
Presuppositional Stance

The Speaker perceived that…

You came

EXT/PAST
Chelswu is happy

ALT/PAST
(Positive Stance)

The Speaker perceived that

You didn’t come

ALT/EXT
Chelswu is not happy
- The speaker’s negative epistemic stance toward the focal event is encoded and at the same time, the negative space is further distanced by the firsthand evidential marker’s presuppositional character.
- The fact that the focal event space, not the firsthand evidential space, is negated in the ALTERNATE space (“You didn’t come.”) supports the claim that the firsthand evidential marker functions only as a presuppositional distancing item.

[the speaker’s regret toward an event in the past]

You did not come.
The speaker is not happy about it.

"If only you had come…” [Counterfactual]

- The evidential marker creates conceptual distance between the speaker and the conjectured focal event of the addressee’s coming. Then, implied extension of the protasis which is potentially given in the context will follow afterwards and finally, the utterance will encode the speaker’s regret.

5. CONCLUSION

[1] This paper argues that the seemingly non-canonical appearance of Korean firsthand evidential marker in CCCs is in fact, an optimal strategy of yielding “distanced” counterfactuality.
   a. The marker’s retrospectivity facilitates it to be licensed in CCCs.
   b. The marker’s firsthand evidential marking is not in focus by showing that it is the anterior morpheme, not the marker, that licenses the CCCs.
   c. The marker’s retrospective marking function and its extended function, which is its distancing and space presupposing function (Kwon 2009), is in focus and thus, makes the marker best-fit in CCCs.

[2] Within the Mental Spaces Theory, representing layers created by the tense morphology will be useful in grasping varying degrees of counterfactuality in a more fine-grained sense.
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