



with each of the elements in this set via PFA, and the outcome is a set of two characters corresponding to the affirmative and the negative answer. The evidential presupposition is anchored to the context variable  $c$  that is bound in each answer it is contained in, rather than to  $c^*$ . Since uttering a question does not amount to uttering directly any of its answers, but rather to present their collections from which the answerer is expected to choose, the questioner of (6b) does not utter either of the characters in (7), but expects the answerer to utter one of them. Therefore, the context relative to which the evidential is ultimately interpreted is the answerer's. Hence, the shift.

**Evidentials in declaratives.** The LF for (1a) is (8), and for any context  $c^*$  it is computed as (9):

(8) [-te- [John voted for me]]]

(9) a.  $[[me]]^{c^*} = s^*$   $[[John\ voted\ for\ me]]^{w,c^*} = \lambda w. \text{John voted for } s^* \text{ in } w$   
b.  $[[8]]^{c^*} = \lambda c. \lambda w. s^c \text{ has direct evidence that John voted for } s^*, J. \text{ voted for } s^* \text{ in } w$

The meaning of (8) is the character in (9b). Uttering (8) in  $c^*$  amounts to an application of (9b) to  $c^*$ . As a consequence the evidential presupposition, the indexical ends up being interpreted relative to  $s^*$ .

**Previous approaches.** Although previous approaches to evidential perspective shifts in other languages exist (Faller 2002, McCready 2007, a.o.), none of them extends to the Korean facts in this paper because they make one or both of the following predictions: i) questions with evidentials are ambiguous between shifted and non shifted readings and ii) in the shifted reading indexical pronouns should also shift.

**Optional perspective shifts.** Evidentials in other languages, utterance-modifying adverbials (*honestly...*) and expressives (*damn*) are akin to Korean evidentials in that they are anchored to the speaker and exhibit perspective shifts in questions, but unlike Korean evidentials, they only optionally shifts in questions:

(10) John-i ku pilemekul il-ul kumantwu-ess-ni?  
John-Nom that damn job-Acc quit-Past-Ind.Q 'Did John quit that damn job?'  
Implication (ambiguous): the questioner / the answerer thinks the job is pretty bad.

The paper analyzes this difference as follows: *honestly*, expressives etc. introduce a context-anchoring variable, just like *-te-*, but, unlike in *-te-*, this variable is free and can take either the value of the questioner's context or of the answerer's context.

**Evidentials and epistemic modals.** Finally, this paper also gives us insights into the question of the similarities and differences between Korean epistemic modals, such as *-keyss-*, and Korean evidentials. The noticeable difference between the epistemic modal (e.g., *-keyss-*) and the evidential (e.g., *-te-*) is twofold: i) the epistemic modal shows the optional shift in questions (see 11) whereas the evidential shows the obligatory shift (see 3), and ii) the epistemic modal can be embedded whereas the evidentials cannot (see 12). This difference can be accounted for by assuming that the epistemic modal is the function from a proposition and conversational backgrounds (the modal base and the ordering source: see Kratzer 1977) to a *proposition*, whereas the evidential is the function from a proposition to a *partial character*, as shown in (4). Then (11) can be accounted for by assuming that the conversational backgrounds for epistemic modals are either from the speaker or the speaker and the addressee (see Papafragou 2006), and (12) can be accounted for by assuming that the matrix predicate only takes propositions as its arguments: applying evidentials to a proposition, we get a character, resulting in type mismatch.

(11) Mary-ka cip-ey iss-keyss-ni?  
Mary-Nom home-Loc be-Mod-Q 'May Mary be at home?'

(12) Mary-nun John-i cip-ey iss-keyss-ta-ko / \*iss-te-la-ko sayngkakha-ess-ta.  
Mary-Top John-Nom home-Loc be-Mod-Decl-Comp / be-te-Decl-Comp think-Past-Decl  
'Mary thought John may be / \*was at home'

**Selected references.** CHUNG, K.-S. 2005. *Space in Tense*. PhD Thesis. Simon Fraser. FALLER, M. 2002. *Semantics and Pragmatics of Evidentials in Cuzco Quechua*. PhD Thesis, Stanford. HAMBLIN, C. L. 1973. Questions in Montague Semantics. *Foundation of Language*. 10. IZVORSKI, R. 1997. The Present Perfect as an Epistemic Modal. *Proc. of SALT 7*. KAPLAN, D. 1989. Demonstratives. *Themes from Kaplan*. KIM, N.-K. 2001. Reportative evidential in Korean. *Journal of ICKL* 10. Kratzer, A. 1977. What 'must' and 'can' must and can mean. *L&P* 1. MATTHEWSON, L., et al. 2007. Evidentials as epistemic modals. *Ling. Variation Yearbook* 7. MCCREADY, E. 2007. Context Shifting in Questions and Elsewhere. *Proc. of SuB* 11. PAPAFRAGOU, A. 2006. Epistemic modality and truth conditions. *Lingua* 116.