Purposive interrogative adjuncts

Jooyoung Kim (University of Delaware)

This paper examines a kind of floating embedded questions in Japanese and Korean, which are interpreted as (near-)purposive clauses. An example is as follows:

(1)　**[nwu-ka　　o-nun-ci]　　-Ø**　　Paul-un　　　chang-ul　　　naytapo-ass-ta.
　　　who-Nom　come-Adn-Q　-Ø　　Paul-Top　　window-Acc　look-Past-Decl
　　　Lit. '[Who is coming], Paul looked at the window', or roughly
　　　　　'In order to find out who is coming, Paul looked at the window.'

The embedded question above, or a *purposive interrogative adverbial (PIA)* throughout the paper, lacks a clause final marker and the logical connection between the interrogative adverbial and its matrix clause is not overtly specified. This lack of the clause-final marker is not observed in the case of the other subordinate clauses in Japanese/Korean. For instance, (2) with a corresponding purposive clause (meaning 'in order to…') becomes ungrammatical when its subordinate clause does not have the purposive marker *-kiwihay*.

(2)　　[[nwu-ka　　o-nun-ci]　-(lul)　　　*(hwakinha)-*(**kiwihay**)] Paul-un　　　chang-ul
　　　　who-Nom　come-Adn-Q -(Acc)　　find.out-**PURPOSE**　　Paul-Top　　window-Acc
　　　naytapo-ass-ta.
　　　look-Past-Decl
　　　'In order to find out who is coming, Paul looked at the window.'

My aim is to show that despite their lack of overt knowledge verb and clausal marker, PIAs contribute to the at-issue entailment just as standard purposive constructions. This implies that a finite and non-declarative (hence incapable of denoting a property, proposition, or event) subordinate clause can be a semantics constituent under proper environments.

What a PIA entails

The presence of the PIA in (1) leads to the following effect onto the semantics of (1):

(3) Paul, who conducted the task of looking at the window, intended to find out the answer to 'who is coming' by doing the task.

This meaning is part of the *at-issue entailment* of the denotation of sentence (1) rather than presupposition or implicature. (3) can be the direct target of negation, as in (4); and their meaning cannot be cancelled, as illustrated in (5).

(4) A: [Paul-un　　[nwu-ka o-nun-ci]　　chang-ul　　　naytapo-nkes]-iani-ta.
　　　　Paul-Top　who-Nom come-Adn-Q　window-Acc　look-Comp　　Neg-Decl
　　　'It is not that Paul looked at the window in order to find out who is coming.'
　　B:　'I knew it! He looked at the window for some other reason!'

(5) **[nwu-ka　　　o-nun-ci]　　-Ø**　　Paul-un chang-ul　　　naytapo-ass-ta.
　　　who-Nom　　come-Adn-Q　-Ø　　Paul-Top　　window-Acc　look-Past-Decl
　　　'In order to find out who is coming, Paul looked at the window.'
　　　　a.　#...'and Paul didn't have any purpose when he was looking at the window.'
　　　　b.　#...'and Paul regret that his purpose was to ask/wonder who is coming.'

Possibility of a semantic operator

Contrasted by the corresponding (standard) purposive clauses, PIAs like the one in (1) lack the verb of knowledge 'find out' and a purposive marker, which are in shade in (2). Despite the lack of the overt marker, the relationship of the interrogative adverbial to its matrix clause is fixed: the intention of the matrix agent or the purpose of the matrix event. This paper suspects the presence of a covert semantic operator for PIAs in Japanese/Korean such as:

(6) $\lambda Q\lambda P\lambda x\lambda e.$ [event(e) & P(e)(w) & Agent(e)(x) & $\forall$ w'[w' is compatible with the goals relevant to e: x $\mathbb{R}$ Q]]

This operator will be responsible for a purposive reading and a teleological modality, similarly to the covert modal in Nissenbaum (2005) for rationale clauses in English. Additional $\mathbb{R}$ is a default predicate, which could be interpreted as *have* or a possession verb in the sense of Dowty (1979). It winds up denoting 'to find out' by pragmatic enrichment.

What PIA is not

In addition, this paper will reject the following apparent possibilities of the status of PIAs.

(7) a. An argument that is selected by the higher/matrix predicate
   b. An argument of a hidden predicate and a covert clause marker
   b. A conjunct to/with the matrix clause

Selected references:

Dowty, D.R. (1979). Word Menaing and Montague Grammar. Dordrecht: Reidel.
Nissenbaum, J. (2005). States, events and VP structure: evidence from purposive adjuncts. Presented in NELS 36.