



Funded by  
the European Union



European Research Council  
Established by the European Commission

# The semantics of *ky* particle in Tundra Nenets

Petr Kusliy | Ekaterina Vostrikova | University of Göttingen | SULA-TripleA 2026, May 12 - 15, 2026

Unpacking  
Paradigmatic  
Gaps



## Data and puzzles

## Proposal

## Proposal (continued)

**INTRO:** Matrix *ky*-marked clauses have two readings:

(i) possibility modal statements; (ii) polar questions

(1) Vanja to.na.ky?  
*Vanja came.PART.ky*  
'Did Vanja come?'

(2) Vanja to.na.ky.  
*Vanja came.PART.ky*  
'Vanja may be/possibly came.'

When embedded, they give rise to puzzles:

**PUZZLE 1: \*know ky vs. ✓not know ky**

(3) \*Anja tjenjeva, Vanja to.na.ky. [**\*know ky**]  
*Anja knows Vanja came.PART.ky*  
Int.: 'Anja knows whether Vanja came.'  
*Comments from speakers:* 'You said she knows. But *ky*  
means she is in doubt. This is a contradiction.'

Speaker ignorance does not improve (3).

Similar facts obtain for other factive verbs.

However:

(4) Anja ni tjenjeva, Vanja to.na.ky. [**✓not know ky**]  
*Anja NEG know, Vanja came.PART.ky*  
'Anja doesn't know whether Vanja came.'

**PUZZLE 2: think ky >> only the possibility reading**

(5) Man' yibidorjadm<sup>q</sup>, Vanja to.va.ky.  
*I think Vanja came.PastPART.ky*  
'I think that Vanja possibly came.'

**PUZZLE 3: ky-clauses under factives >> only questions**

(6) a. Xibjaxart<sup>q</sup> jexjera, Vanja tonaky. b. Man' ibedorjam<sup>q</sup>, pyda nivv tu.  
*Nobody not.knows V. cameKY. I think he NEG came*  
'Nobody knows whether Vanja came. I think he didn't come.'

If (6)a presupposed that V. possibly came, (6)b would have been infelicitous.

No general ban on embedding possibility modals under *know*.

**PUZZLE 4: ✓must know ky**

(7) A. tjenjeva.bta tara V. tjukoxona ile.na.ky.  
*A. know.X must V. here lives.PART.ky*  
'Anja must know / maybe knows whether Vanja lives here.'

### EXPLAINING PUZZLE 1

*Ky*: - a question op. mapping  $p_{\langle s, t \rangle}$  to  $\{p, \neg p\}$   
- sensitive to a perspective parameter  $\langle P_{\text{individual}}, P_{\text{world}} \rangle$   
- presupposes that  $p$  is possible for  $P_{\text{individual}}$  in  $P_{\text{world}}$

(8)  $[[ky]^{w, \langle P_{\text{sp}}, P_{\text{w}} \rangle}] = \lambda p_{\langle s, t \rangle} : \exists w' [wR^{Sp, w'} \& p(w')]. \lambda q_{\langle s, t \rangle} . q = p \vee q = \neg p$

This derives (1) as a question:

(9)  $[[ (1) ]^{w, \langle Sp, w \rangle}]$  is **def. only if**  $\exists w' [wR^{Sp, w'} \& V. \text{ came in } w']$   
 $= \lambda q_{\langle s, t \rangle} . q = \text{Vania came} \vee q = \text{Vania didn't come}$

Factives obligatorily shift the perspective parameter of their prejacent to the attitude holder and evaluation world:

(10)  $[[\text{know } \varphi]^{w, \langle P_{\text{sp}}, P_{\text{w}} \rangle}] = \lambda x : \lambda w' . [[\varphi]^{w', \langle P_{\text{x}}, P_{\text{w}} \rangle}(w)]. \forall w'' [wR^{x, w''} \rightarrow \lambda w''' . [[\varphi]^{w', \langle P_{\text{x}}, P_{\text{w}} \rangle}(w''')]$

With a strong answerhood operator, ANS, sentence (2)

- presupposes: A.'s evidence is compatible with the possibility that V. came  
- asserts: A. believes in the true answer to "Did V. come?"

(11)  $[[A \text{ know Ans } ky \ V \text{ came}]^{w, \langle P_{\text{sp}}, P_{\text{w}} \rangle}]$  **def. only if**  $\exists w' [wR^{A, w'} \& V \text{ came } w']$ , and  
**= T iff**  $\forall w'' [wR^{A, w''} \rightarrow \lambda w''' . V \text{ came in } w''(w') = \lambda w''' . V \text{ came in } w'''(w)]$

This is consistent only if A. knows that V. came and is thus ruled out by Maximize Presupposition in favor of (12):

(12) Ania knows (that) Vania came.

In (4), *not know KY*, MP is not triggered:

(13)  $[[\neg A \text{ know Ans } ky \ V \text{ came}]^{w, \langle P_{\text{sp}}, P_{\text{w}} \rangle}]$  **def. only if**  $\exists w' [wR^{A, w'} \& V \text{ came } w']$ , and  
**= T iff**  $\neg \forall w'' [wR^{A, w''} \rightarrow \lambda w''' . V \text{ came in } w''(w') = \lambda w''' . V \text{ came in } w'''(w)]$

### EXPLAINING PUZZLE 2.

The possibility reading of *ky* arises via:

- Existential closure ( $\exists$ ) over sets of propositions  
- B-operator turning a presupposition into assertive content (Beaver & Krahmer 2001):

(14)  $[[\exists]^{w, \langle P_{\text{sp}}, P_{\text{w}} \rangle}] = \lambda p \langle s, t \rangle . \exists p [p \in P \& p(w) = 1]$  (15)  $[[B]^{w, \langle P_{\text{sp}}, P_{\text{w}} \rangle}] = \lambda p . 1$  if  $p(w) = 1$ , 0 if not

Predicting the possibility reading for (2):

(16)  $[[B \exists Ky \text{ Vanja came}]^{w, \langle P_{\text{sp}}, P_{\text{w}} \rangle}] = T$  iff  $\exists p [p \in \{\lambda w' . V \text{ came in } w'; \lambda w' . \neg V \text{ came in } w'\} \& p(w) = 1] \& \exists w' [wR^{Sp, w'} \& V \text{ came } w']$

For (5), we propose that

- *B  $\exists Ky$  Vanja came* is under *think*;  
- *think* shifts the perspective to the *origo* and *dox.* alt:

(17)  $[[\text{think } \varphi]^{w, \langle P_{\text{sp}}, P_{\text{w}} \rangle}] = \lambda x . \forall \langle y, w'' \rangle [wR^{x, w''} \rightarrow \lambda w''' . [[\varphi]^{w', \langle P_{\text{y}}, P_{\text{w}} \rangle}(w''')]$

Predicting an embedded modal interpretation for (5):

(18)  $[[ (5) ]^{w, \langle P_{\text{sp}}, P_{\text{w}} \rangle}] = T$  iff  $\forall \langle y, w'' \rangle [wR^{Sp, w''} \rightarrow \exists w' [w'R^{y, w'} \& V \text{ came } w']$

### EXPLAINING PUZZLE 3

Predictions for *know + B  $\exists Ky$  Vanja came*:

(19) [Anja knows [B  $\exists Ky$  Vanja came]]

(20)  $[[ (19) ]^{w, \langle P_{\text{sp}}, P_{\text{w}} \rangle}]$  **defined only if**  $\exists w' [wR^{A, w'} \& V. \text{ came in } w'] \& \exists p [p \in \{\lambda w . V \text{ came in } w; \lambda w' . \neg V \text{ came in } w'\} \& p(w) = 1]$

**= T iff**  $\forall w'' [wR^{A, w''} \rightarrow \exists w' [wR^{A, w'} \& V \text{ came in } w'] \& \exists p [p \in \{\lambda w . V \text{ came in } w; \lambda w' . \neg V \text{ came in } w'\} \& p(w) = 1]$

The presupposition entails the assertion: the structure is ruled out.

B-operator cannot be applied at matrix level to give the interpretation in (22):

(21) \*[B [Anja knows [B  $\exists Ky$  Vanja came]]]

(22) Anja's evidence is compatible with the possibility that Vanja came.

The reading in (22) will arise with all factives and should thus be ruled out by pragmatics (cf. Buccola and Spector's 2016 Pragmatic Economy Constraint).

### EXPLAINING PUZZLE 4

**Intuition:** in (7), it is the speaker and not Anja whose evidence is compatible with the possibility that Vania came.

**Goal:** make *ky* in (7) dependent on the speaker-parameter.

**Strategy:** allow modal operators above *know* to introduce the speaker as the perspective-parameter in addition to the attitude holder (adapting Bäuerle's 1983 and Percus's 2020 Index Storage Approach).

**Implementation:**

- a modal operator overwrites the default perspective parameter of its prejacent

- non-default perspective parameters are stacked

- an accompanying covert  $Op^n$  allows *ky* to get access to any parameter in the stack of perspective parameters ( $\mu$ )

(23)  $[[Op^n X]^{w, \mu}] = [[Op^n X]^{w, n(\mu)}]$  where  $n(\mu)$  stands for the  $n^{\text{th}}$  number of  $\mu$

Prediction for (7), *Anja must know whether Vanja came*:

(24)  $LF$ : [NEC [Anja knows [ANS [[Op<sup>2</sup> Ky] Vanja came]]]]

(25)  $[[NEC \text{ know } \varphi]^{w, \langle P_{\text{sp}}, P_{\text{w}} \rangle}] = 1$  iff

necessarily  $w'$ :  $[[\text{know } \varphi]^{w', \langle P_{\text{sp}}, P_{\text{w}} \rangle}]$  iff

necessarily  $w'$ : Anja knows  $w''$ :  $[[\varphi]^{w'', \langle P_{\text{Anja}}, P_{\text{w}} \rangle, \langle P_{\text{sp}}, P_{\text{w}} \rangle}]$

(25)  $[[ (24) ]^{w, \langle P_{\text{sp}}, P_{\text{w}} \rangle, g}] = 1$  **defined only if**  $\exists w' [wR^{Sp, w'} \& V. \text{ came in } w']$ , and

**= T iff**  $\forall w'' [wR^{Sp, w''} \rightarrow \forall w''' [w'R^{Anja, w'''} \rightarrow \lambda w'''' [[ANS [Op^2 ky] V \text{ came}]]]^{w''', \langle P_{\text{Pa}}, P_{\text{w}} \rangle, \langle P_{\text{sp}}, P_{\text{w}} \rangle}(w''')]$

With  $Op^1$  instead of  $Op^2$  in the LF, we get a stronger reading *in addition to* the weaker one predicted with  $Op^2$ . Its presence is thus empirically difficult to identify.