Counterexpectation, concession, and free choice in Tibetan and beyond

Michael Yoshitaka Erlewine

mitcho@nus.edu.sg

NUS
National University
of Singapore

Tibetan *yin.n'ang* ཡིན་ནའང་ appears to have <u>three distinct uses</u>:

(1) **Counterexpectational discourse particle 'however':**
བཀྲ་ཤིས་དགེ་རྒན་རེད། **ཡིན་ནའང་**སྤྱང་པོ་མི་འདུག

bKra.shis dge-rgan red. **Yin.n'ang** spyang.po mi-'dug.

Tashi   teacher   COP   YIN.N'ANG clever   NEG-AUX

'Tashi is a teacher. **However**, he isn't smart.'

Tibetan *yin.n'ang* ཡིན་ནའང་ appears to have <u>three distinct uses</u>:

(2) **Concessive scalar focus particle:**
<u>Context:</u> Don't worry, the test is easy.
དེབ་གཅིག་**ཡིན་ནའང་**ཀློག་ན་ཡིག་ཚད་མཐར་འཁྱོལ་གི་རེད།
[Dep [gcig]$_F$ **yin.n'ang** klog-na] yig.tshad mthar.'khyol-gi-red.
book one YIN.N'ANG read-COND exam succeed-IMPF-AUX
≈ '[If [you] read **even just** one book], [you] will pass the exam.'

Tibetan *yin.n'ang* ཡིན་ནའང་ appears to have <u>three distinct uses</u>:

(3) ***Wh* universal free choice item (∀-FCI):**
ཁོང་ཁ་ལག་**ག་རེ་ཡིན་ནའང་**ཟ་གི་རེད།
Khong [kha.lag **ga.re yin.n'ang**] za-gi-red.
he   food   what YIN.N'ANG eat-IMPF-AUX
'He eats (habitual) **any** food.'

Tibetan *yin.n'ang* ཡིན་ནའང་ appears to have <u>three distinct uses</u>:

(3) **Wh universal free choice item (∀-FCI):**
ཁོང་ཁ་ལག་**ག་རེ་ཡིན་ནའང་**ཟ་ཐུབ་གི་རེད།
Khong [kha.lag **ga.re yin.n'ang**] za-thub-gi-red.
he   food   what YIN.N'ANG eat-ABLE-IMPF-AUX
'He can eat **any** food.'

Yin.n'ang is also variably *yin.na.yang* ཡིན་ན་ཡང་ or *yin.n'i* ཡིན་ནའི་ and is morphologically clearly:

(4) ཡིན་   ན་   ཡང་   ཡིན་ན་ཡང་   ཡིན་ནང་   ཡིན་ནའི་
    yin   +**na**   +**yang** = yin.na.yang > yin.n'ang > yin.n'i
    COPULA **COND** **EVEN**   /yine/

Roughly, then, *yin.n'ang = even-if-it's*.

Yin.n'ang = yin + na + yang

Yin.n'ang is also variably *yin.na.yang* ཡིན་ན་ཡང་ or *yin.n'i* ཡིན་ནའི་ and is morphologically clearly:

(4) ཡིན་   ན་   ཡང་   ཡིན་ན་ཡང་   ཡིན་ནའང་   ཡིན་ནའི་
   yin   + **na**   + **yang**   = yin.na.yang   >   yin.n'ang   >   yin.n'i
   COPULA **COND** **EVEN**   /yine/

Roughly, then, *yin.n'ang = even-if-it's.*

5

Yin.n'ang = yin + na + yang

Yin.n'ang is also variably *yin.na.yang* ཨིན་ན་ཡང་ or *yin.n'i* ཨིན་ནའི་ and is morphologically clearly:

(4) **ཨིན་**   **ན་**   **ཡང་**   ཨིན་ན་ཡང་   ཨིན་ནའང་   ཨིན་ནའི་
    yin   + **na**   + **yang**   = yin.na.yang   >   yin.n'ang   >   yin.n'i
    COPULA **COND** **EVEN**   /yine/

Roughly, then, *yin.n'ang = even-if-it's*.

- I document these uses of Tibetan *yin.n'ang* from original fieldwork and develop a **compositional semantics** which derives these uses from (4).
- I highlight combinations of the same ingredients with the same range of uses in **Dravidian**, from Rahul Balusu's recent work, and motivate an extension of the analysis to **Japanese** *demo*.

- I document these uses of Tibetan *yin.n'ang* from original fieldwork and develop a **compositional semantics** which derives these uses from (4).
- I highlight combinations of the same ingredients with the same range of uses in **Dravidian**, from Rahul Balusu's recent work, and motivate an extension of the analysis to **Japanese** *demo*.

§2 Counterexpectational discourse particle

Yin.n'ang as a discourse particle

► The utterance "*Yin.n'ang q*" refers to a prior proposition *p* and
(a) requires an expectation that "if *p*, unlikely *q*" and
(b) commits the speaker to *q*.

(5) **Counterexpectation is required:**

ཁོ་ཁ་ལག་མང་པོ་ཟ་གི་རེད། **ཡིན་ན་འང་**རྒྱགས་པ་ཆགས་གི་མ་རེད།

Kho kha.lag mang.po za-gi-red.

he food a.lot eat-IMPF-AUX

   Yin.n'ang rgyags.pa chags-gi-ma-red.

   YIN.N'ANG fat become-IMPF-NEG-AUX

'He eats a lot of food. # However, he doesn't gain weight.'

Yin.n'ang as a discourse particle

► The utterance "*Yin.n'ang q*" refers to a prior proposition *p* and
  (a) requires an expectation that "if *p*, unlikely *q*" and
  (b) commits the speaker to *q*.

(5) **Counterexpectation is required:**

ཁོ་ཁ་ལག་མང་པོ་ཟ་གི་རེད། **ཡིན་ན་འང་**རྒྱགས་པ་ཆགས་གི་མ་རེད།

Kho kha.lag mang.po za-gi-red.

he food a.lot eat-IMPF-AUX

   Yin.n'ang rgyags.pa chags-gi-ma-red.

   YIN.N'ANG fat become-IMPF-NEG-AUX

'He eats a lot of food. # However, he doesn't gain weight.'

Yin.n'ang as a discourse particle

▶ The utterance "*Yin.n'ang q*" refers to a prior proposition *p* and
  (a) requires an expectation that "if *p*, unlikely *q*" and
  (b) commits the speaker to *q*.

(5) **Counterexpectation is required:**

ཁོ་ཁ་ལག་མང་པོ་ཟ་གི་རེད། **ཡིན་ན་འང་**རྒྱགས་པ་ཆགས་གི་རེད།

Kho kha.lag mang.po za-gi-red.

he food a.lot eat-IMPF-AUX

  Yin.n'ang rgyags.pa chags-gi-red.

  YIN.N'ANG fat become-IMPF-AUX

'He eats a lot of food. # However, he gains weight.'

Analysis

Yin.n'ang takes an unpronounced propositional anaphor:

(6) $[[pro_{=p}]_F$ yin-na]   =yang   *q*
                 COP-COND   EVEN
      <u>Literal LF:</u> EVEN (if it's $[p]_F$, *q*)

Analysis

(7) **Deriving counterexpectation:**

   a. Let P be a set of relevant alternatives to p — propositions p' where the conditional "if p', q" is relevant to consider.

   b. EVEN requires that the conditional "if p, q" be less likely than "if p', q" for all $p' \in P$.

   c. This scalar condition requires very low credence in "if p, q," which is incompatible with an expectation that "if p, likely q." We therefore reason that "if p, unlikely q."

(7) **Deriving counterexpectation:**

    a. Let P be a set of relevant alternatives to p — propositions p' where the conditional "if p', q" is relevant to consider.

    b. EVEN requires that the conditional "if p, q" be less likely than "if p', q" for all $p' \in P$.

    c. This scalar condition requires very low credence in "if p, q," which is incompatible with an expectation that "if p, likely q." We therefore reason that "if p, unlikely q."

Analysis

(7) **Deriving counterexpectation:**

    a. Let P be a set of relevant alternatives to p — propositions p' where the conditional "if p', q" is relevant to consider.

    b. EVEN requires that the conditional "if p, q" be less likely than "if p', q" for all $p' \in P$.

    c. This scalar condition requires very low credence in "if p, q," which is incompatible with an expectation that "if p, likely q." We therefore reason that "if p, unlikely q."

(8) **Deriving the commitment to *q*:** (via commitment to *p*)

    a. The proposition *p* was asserted prior by the same speaker or by another speaker and not denied, committing the speaker to *p*.

    b. The speaker asserts "if *p*, *q*."

    c. By Modus Ponens, the speaker is committed to *q*.

§3 On *yin.n'ang* in argument position

The puzzle

Taking the morphology of *yin.n'ang* at face value — COPULA + COND + EVEN (4) — *yin.n'ang* is a conditional clause (with EVEN).

▶ But in *yin.n'ang*'s focus particle and *wh*-FCI uses, X/*wh* =*yin.n'ang* is in an argument position! This is especially problematic in examples such as (10), with dative case:

(10) *Wh=yin.n'ang* with dative case:
Context: Pema is very friendly.
མོ་རང་སུ་ཡིན་ནའང་ལ་སྐད་ཆ་བཤད་གི་རེད།
Mo.rang [**su   yin.n'ang**]=la skad.cha bshad-gi-red.
she   who YIN.N'ANG=DAT speech   talk-IMPF-AUX
'She talks (habitual) to **anyone**.'

The puzzle

Taking the morphology of *yin.n'ang* at face value — COPULA + COND + EVEN (4) — *yin.n'ang* is a conditional clause (with EVEN).

► But in *yin.n'ang*'s focus particle and *wh*-FCI uses, X/*wh* =*yin.n'ang* is in an argument position! This is especially problematic in examples such as (10), with dative case:

(10) *Wh=yin.n'ang* with dative case:
  Context: Pema is very friendly.
  མོ་རང་**སུ་ཡིན་ནའང་**ལ་སྐད་ཆ་བཤད་གི་རེད།
  Mo.rang [**su   yin.n'ang**]=la skad.cha bshad-gi-red.
  she   who YIN.N'ANG=DAT speech   talk-IMPF-AUX
  'She talks (habitual) to **anyone**.'

13

An idea

We can think of X/*wh=yin.n'ang* as a clausal structure in an argument position which describes that argument; i.e. as a *head-internal relative* or *amalgam* (Lakoff 1974; also Kluck 2011):

(11) John is going to <u>I think it's Chicago</u> on Saturday.

(Lakoff 1974: 324)

...but many approaches to head-internal relatives and amalgams will not apply here, as the embedded clause is a *conditional* clause.

An idea

We can think of X/*wh=yin.n'ang* as a clausal structure in an argument position which describes that argument; i.e. as a *head-internal relative* or *amalgam* (Lakoff 1974; also Kluck 2011):

(11)   John is going to <u>I think it's Chicago</u> on Saturday.

(Lakoff 1974: 324)

...but many approaches to head-internal relatives and amalgams will not apply here, as the embedded clause is a *conditional* clause.

We can think of X/*wh=yin.n'ang* as a clausal structure in an argument position which describes that argument; i.e. as a *head-internal relative* or *amalgam* (Lakoff 1974; also Kluck 2011):

(11) John is going to <u>I think it's Chicago</u> on Saturday.

(Lakoff 1974: 324)

...but many approaches to head-internal relatives and amalgams will not apply here, as the embedded clause is a *conditional* clause.

Proposal

► I propose to adopt the Shimoyama 1999 anaphora approach for (Japanese) head-internal relatives: the clause is interpreted as adjoined to the main clause at LF, with its surface position interpreted as a pronoun.

(12)   a.   <u>Literal (10):</u> She talks to [even if it's who] $\implies$

     b.   <u>LF:</u> [even if it$_i$'s who], she talks to *them*$_i$ $\implies$

             EVEN [if it$_i$'s who, she talks to *them*$_i$]

Proposal

▶ I propose to adopt the Shimoyama 1999 anaphora approach for (Japanese) head-internal relatives: the clause is interpreted as adjoined to the main clause at LF, with its surface position interpreted as a pronoun.

(12) a. <u>Literal (10):</u> She talks to [even if it's who] $\Longrightarrow$

    b. <u>LF:</u> [even if it$_i$'s who], she talks to *them*$_i$ $\Longrightarrow$
         EVEN [if it$_i$'s who, she talks to *them*$_i$]

▶ I propose to adopt the Shimoyama 1999 anaphora approach for (Japanese) head-internal relatives: the clause is interpreted as adjoined to the main clause at LF, with its surface position interpreted as a pronoun.

(12) a. <u>Literal (10):</u> She talks to [even if it's who] ⟹

 b. <u>LF:</u> [even if it$_i$'s who], she talks to *them*$_i$ ⟹
     EVEN [if it$_i$'s who, she talks to *them*$_i$]

§4 Concessive scalar focus particle

Concessive scalar particles

(13) **Spanish *aunque sea* in a conditional (Lahiri 2010):**

Si lees **aunque sea** UN libro, vas a aprobar.
if you read AUNQUE SEA one book, you'll pass
≈ 'If you read **even just** one book, you'll pass.'

Concessive scalar particles…

- Alonso-Ovalle (2016: 185): "trigger a characteristic interpretation: they convey a strengthening effect in downward entailing environments, a 'settle for less' interpretation in modal contexts…" and

- Crnič (2011: 5): "The associate [of a concessive scalar particle] is the lowest element on the pragmatic scale."

Concessive scalar particles

(13) **Spanish *aunque sea* in a conditional (Lahiri 2010):**

Si lees **aunque sea** UN libro, vas a aprobar.
if you read AUNQUE SEA one book, you'll pass
≈ 'If you read **even just** one book, you'll pass.'

Concessive scalar particles…

- Alonso-Ovalle (2016: 185): "trigger a characteristic interpretation: they convey a strengthening effect in downward entailing environments, a 'settle for less' interpretation in modal contexts…" and
- Crnič (2011: 5): "The associate [of a concessive scalar particle] is the lowest element on the pragmatic scale."

Concessive scalar particles

(13) **Spanish *aunque sea* in a conditional (Lahiri 2010):**

Si lees   **aunque sea** UN/*CINCO libro, vas a aprobar.

if you read AUNQUE SEA one/*five   book, you'll pass

≈ 'If you read **even just** one book, you'll pass.'

Concessive scalar particles…

- Alonso-Ovalle (2016: 185): "trigger a characteristic interpretation: they convey a strengthening effect in downward entailing environments, a 'settle for less' interpretation in modal contexts…" and
- Crnič (2011: 5): "The associate [of a concessive scalar particle] is the lowest element on the pragmatic scale."

(14) **X *yin.n'ang* licensed by a conditional:**
དེབ་གཅིག་**ཡིན་ནའང་**ཀློག་ན་ཡིག་ཚད་མཐར་འཁྱོལ་གི་རེད། =(2)
[Dep [gcig]$_F$ **yin.n'ang** klog-na] yig.tshad mthar.'khyol-gi-red.
 book one YIN.N'ANG read-COND exam succeed-IMPF-AUX
≈ '[If [you] read **even just** one book], [you] will pass the exam.'

X *yin.n'ang* in a conditional

(14) **X *yin.n'ang* licensed by a conditional:**

#དེབ་གསུམ་<u>**ཡིན་ནའང་**</u>ཀློག་ན་ཡིག་ཚད་མཐར་འཁྱོལ་གི་རེད། =(2)

[Dep [gsum]$_F$ **yin.n'ang** klog-na]   yig.tshad mthar.'khyol-gi-red.
book three   YIN.N'ANG read-COND exam   succeed-IMPF-AUX

≈ '[If [you] read **even just** three…], [you] will pass the exam.'

X *yin.n'ang* under negation

(15) **X *yin.n'ang* licensed by negation:**

བཀྲ་ཤིས་ཨང་ <u>གསུམ་</u>པ་**ཡིན་ན་འི་**ལེན་**མི་**འདུག

bKra.shis ang	[gsum]_F-pa	**yin.n'i**	len-**mi**-'dug.

bKra.shis ang   [gsum]$_F$-pa **yin.n'i**   len-**mi**-'dug.

Tashi   number three-ORD YIN.N'ANG receive-NEG-AUX

'He didn't **even** get [third]$_F$ place.'

X *yin.n'ang* under negation

(15) **X *yin.n'ang* licensed by negation:**

*བཀྲ་ཤིས་ཨང་གསུམ་པ་**ཡིན་ནའི་**ལེན་འདུག

bKra.shis ang   [gsum]$_F$-pa **yin.n' i**   len-'dug.

Tashi   number three-ORD YIN.N'ANG receive-AUX

'He **even** got [third]$_F$ place.'

(16) **X *yin.n'ang* licensed in an imperative:**
ཁ་ལག་ཏྲེས་ <u>**ཡིན་ནའི་**</u> ཟ་དང་།
Kha.lag [<u>tis</u>]_F **yin.n'i** za-(dang)!
food   a little YIN.N'ANG eat-IMP
≈ 'Eat **at least** a little food!'

(17) **Licensing in a conditional (14):**

a. <u>LF:</u> EVEN $[_\alpha$ if it$_i$'s [one/three]$_F$ book,

[if you read it$_i$, you will pass the exam]]

b. $[\![\alpha]\!]^{alt} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} {}^\wedge\text{if it}_i\text{'s } n \text{ books, [if you read them}_i, \\ \text{you will pass the exam]} \end{array} : n \geq 1 \right\}$

c. <u>With a weak element, 'one':</u>

$[\![\alpha]\!]^o = {}^\wedge$if it$_i$'s <u>one</u> book, [if you read it$_i$, you will pass...]

The prejacent $[\![\alpha]\!]^o$ is the least likely within $[\![\alpha]\!]^{alt}$, satisfying EVEN.

21

(17) **Licensing in a conditional (14):**

a. <u>LF:</u> EVEN $[_{\alpha}$ if it$_i$'s [one/three]$_F$ book,

[if you read it$_i$, you will pass the exam]]

b. $[\![\alpha]\!]^{\text{alt}} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} {}^{\wedge}\text{if it}_i\text{'s } n \text{ books, [if you read them}_i, \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad \text{you will pass the exam]} \end{array} : n \geq 1 \right\}$

c. <u>With a weak element, 'one':</u>

$[\![\alpha]\!]^{\text{o}} = {}^{\wedge}\text{if it}_i\text{'s } \underline{\text{one}} \text{ book, [if you read it}_i, \text{ you will pass...]}$

The prejacent $[\![\alpha]\!]^{\text{o}}$ is the least likely within $[\![\alpha]\!]^{\text{alt}}$, satisfying EVEN.

21

Analysis, in the spirit of Lahiri 2010

(17) **Licensing in a conditional (14):**

a. <u>LF:</u> EVEN $[_\alpha$ if it$_i$'s [one/three]$_F$ book,

$\qquad\qquad\qquad$ [if you read it$_i$, you will pass the exam]]

b. $[\![\alpha]\!]^{alt} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} {}^\wedge\text{if it}_i\text{'s } n \text{ books, [if you read them}_i, \\ \qquad\qquad \text{you will pass the exam]} \end{array} : n \geq 1 \right\}$

c. <u>With a weak element, 'one':</u>

$[\![\alpha]\!]^{o} = {}^\wedge$if it$_i$'s <u>one</u> book, [if you read it$_i$, you will pass...]

The prejacent $[\![\alpha]\!]^{o}$ is the least likely within $[\![\alpha]\!]^{alt}$, satisfying EVEN.

(17) **Licensing in a conditional (14):**

    a.   <u>LF:</u> EVEN $[_{\alpha}$ if it$_i$'s [one/three]$_F$ book,

                                 [if you read it$_i$, you will pass the exam]]

    b. $[\![\alpha]\!]^{\text{alt}} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} {}^{\wedge}\text{if it}_i\text{'s } n \text{ books, [if you read them}_i, \\ \qquad\qquad\quad \text{you will pass the exam]} \end{array} : n \geq 1 \right\}$

    c.   <u>With a weak element, 'one':</u>

         $[\![\alpha]\!]^{\text{o}} = {}^{\wedge}$if it$_i$'s <u>one</u> book, [if you read it$_i$, you will pass...]

         The prejacent $[\![\alpha]\!]^{\text{o}}$ is the least likely within $[\![\alpha]\!]^{\text{alt}}$, satisfying EVEN.

(17) **Licensing in a conditional (14):**

    a. <u>LF:</u> EVEN [$_\alpha$ if it$_i$'s [one/three]$_F$ book,

                             [if you read it$_i$, you will pass the exam]]

    b. $[\![\alpha]\!]^{alt} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} {}^\wedge \text{if it}_i\text{'s } n \text{ books, [if you read them}_i, \\ \text{you will pass the exam]} \end{array} : n \geq 1 \right\}$

    d. <u>With a stronger element, 'three':</u>

        $[\![\alpha]\!]^o = {}^\wedge$if it$_i$'s <u>three</u> books, [if you read it$_i$, you will pass…]

        $[\![\alpha]\!]^o$ is *not* the least likely alternative and so EVEN is infelicitous.

(18) **Licensing by negation with 'even' reading (15):**

    a. <u>LF:</u> EVEN $[_\alpha$ if it$_i$'s [third]$_F$ place, Tashi didn't get it$_i$]

    b. $[\![\alpha]\!]^o$ = $^\wedge$if it$_i$'s third place, Tashi didn't get it$_i$

$$[\![\alpha]\!]^{alt} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} ^\wedge\text{if it}_i\text{'s } n\text{-th place,} \\ \text{Tashi didn't get}_i \end{array} : n \in \{1,2,3\} \right\}$$

       Assuming getting first place is less likely — or more
       noteworthy (Herburger 2000) — than second, etc., *not*
       getting third place will be the least likely, satisfying EVEN.

This follows the logic of Lahiri 1998.

Analysis, in the spirit of Lahiri 2010

(18) **Licensing by negation with 'even' reading (15):**

    a. <u>LF:</u> EVEN $[_\alpha$ if it$_i$'s [third]$_F$ place, Tashi didn't get it$_i$]

    b. $[\![\alpha]\!]^o = {}^\wedge$if it$_i$'s third place, Tashi didn't get it$_i$

$$[\![\alpha]\!]^{alt} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} {}^\wedge\text{if it}_i\text{'s } n\text{-th place,} \\ \text{Tashi didn't get}_i \end{array} : n \in \{1, 2, 3\} \right\}$$

    Assuming getting first place is less likely — or more
    noteworthy (Herburger 2000) — than second, etc., *not*
    getting third place will be the least likely, satisfying EVEN.

This follows the logic of Lahiri 1998.

§5 *Wh* universal free choice item

Universal free choice items ($\forall$-FCIs) are licensed in a range of modal/conditional and non-episodic (non-veridical; Giannakidou 2001) environments and lead to *universal free choice inferences*:

(20) $f(\text{FCI}_x) \Rightarrow$ for any choice of x, $f(x)$ is true

(See e.g. Giannakidou 2001, Kratzer and Shimoyama 2002)

(21) **Computing the *wh* ∀-FCI in (10):**

    a. <u>Literal (10):</u> She talks to [even if it's *who*] ⟹

    b. <u>LF:</u> EVEN [$_\alpha$ if it$_7$'s *who*, she talks to *them*$_7$]

I follow the approach to non-interrogative *wh* interpretation that I
develop in my ongoing work (Erlewine 2019)...

(21) **Computing the *wh* ∀-FCI in (10):**

    a. <u>Literal (10):</u> She talks to [even if it's *who*] $\Rightarrow$

    b. <u>LF:</u> EVEN [$_\alpha$ if it$_7$'s *who*, she talks to *them$_7$*]

I follow the approach to non-interrogative *wh* interpretation that I develop in my ongoing work (Erlewine 2019)…

(21) **Computing the *wh* ∀-FCI in (10):**

g. $\llbracket\alpha\rrbracket^0$ = $^\wedge$if it$_7$'s *someone*, she talks(HABITUAL) to them$_7$

$\llbracket\alpha\rrbracket^{alt}$ = {$^\wedge$if it$_7$'s *x*, she talks(HABITUAL) to them$_7$: *x* human}

h. The conditional restricts the domain of a modal/temporal quantifier (Lewis 1975, Kratzer 1979, 1986, von Fintel 1994):

∀ appropriate situations/times *s* she talks to *g*(7) in *s*

(21) **Computing the *wh* ∀-FCI in (10):**

g. $\llbracket\alpha\rrbracket^{o}$ = $^{\wedge}$if it$_7$'s *someone*, she talks(HABITUAL) to them$_7$

$\llbracket\alpha\rrbracket^{alt}$ = {$^{\wedge}$if it$_7$'s *x*, she talks(HABITUAL) to them$_7$: *x* human}

h. The conditional restricts the domain of a modal/temporal quantifier (Lewis 1975, Kratzer 1979, 1986, von Fintel 1994):

∀ appropriate situations/times *s* she talks to *g*(7) in *s*

(21) **Computing the *wh* ∀-FCI in (10):**

g. $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{o}$ = $^{\wedge}$if it$_7$'s *someone*, she talks(HABITUAL) to them$_7$

$\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{alt}$ = {$^{\wedge}$if it$_7$'s *x*, she talks(HABITUAL) to them$_7$: *x* human}

h. The conditional restricts the domain of a modal/temporal quantifier (Lewis 1975, Kratzer 1979, 1986, von Fintel 1994):

∀ appropriate situations/times *s* she talks to *g*(7) in *s*

(21) **Computing the *wh* ∀-FCI in (10):**

g. $[\![\alpha]\!]^o$ = $^\wedge$if it$_7$'s *someone*, she talks(HABITUAL) to them$_7$

$[\![\alpha]\!]^{alt}$ = {$^\wedge$if it$_7$'s *x*, she talks(HABITUAL) to them$_7$: *x* human}

h. The conditional restricts the domain of a modal/temporal quantifier (Lewis 1975, Kratzer 1979, 1986, von Fintel 1994):

∀ appropriate situations/times *s* and assignments *g*, <u>where *g*(7) exists and is human in *s*</u>, she talks to *g*(7) in *s*

Analysis

(21) **Computing the *wh* ∀-FCI in (10):**

i. $[\![\alpha]\!]^o = {}^\wedge \forall s, g[g(7) \text{ defined, human in } s \rightarrow$
$$\text{she talks to } g(7) \text{ in } s]$$

$$[\![\alpha]\!]^{\text{alt}} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} {}^\wedge \forall s, g[g(7) = x \rightarrow \\ \text{she talks to } g(7) \text{ in } s] \end{array} : x \text{ human} \right\}$$

$[\![\alpha]\!]^o$ asymmetrically entails every alternative in $[\![\alpha]\!]^{\text{alt}}$.

The presupposition of EVEN is thus satisfied: the prejacent is the least likely alternative.

Analysis

► **The universal force of ∀-FCIs comes from the universal modal/temporal quantification** — here, habitual — **which is restricted by the conditional!**

(22) But what if the conditional restricts a possibility modal?

    a. $[_\alpha$ POSSIBLE [she talks to $g(7)$]]
       ∃ accessible w she talks to $g(7)$ in w

Analysis

▶ **The universal force of ∀-FCIs comes from the universal modal/temporal quantification** — here, habitual — **which is restricted by the conditional!**

(22) **But what if the conditional restricts a possibility modal?**

    a. [$_\alpha$ POSSIBLE [she talks to $g(7)$]]
       ∃ accessible w she talks to $g(7)$ in w

Analysis

- ► **The universal force of ∀-FCIs comes from the universal modal/temporal quantification** — here, habitual — **which is restricted by the conditional!**

(22) **But what if the conditional restricts a possibility modal?**

    a.   [$_\alpha$ if it$_7$'s someone, POSSIBLE [she talks to $g(7)$]]
        ∃ accessible w and assignment g,
        <u>where $g(7)$ exists and is human in w</u>, she talks to $g(7)$ in w

Analysis

► **The universal force of ∀-FCIs comes from the universal modal/temporal quantification** — here, habitual — **which is restricted by the conditional!**

(22) **But what if the conditional restricts a possibility modal?**

b. $[\![\alpha]\!]^{\mathrm{o}} = {}^{\wedge}\exists w, g[g(7)$ defined, human in $w \to$
$$\text{she talks to } g(7) \text{ in } w]$$

$$[\![\alpha]\!]^{\mathrm{alt}} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} {}^{\wedge}\exists w, g[g(7) = x \to \\ \text{she talks to } g(7) \text{ in } w] \end{array} : x \text{ human} \right\}$$

But here, the prejacent $[\![\alpha]\!]^{\mathrm{o}}$ is *weaker* than each of the alternatives in $[\![\alpha]\!]^{\mathrm{alt}}$. The prejacent cannot be less likely than its alternatives, so EVEN is infelicitous!

Analysis

- ► **The universal force of ∀-FCIs comes from the universal modal/temporal quantification** — here, habitual — **which is restricted by the conditional!**

(22) **But what if the conditional restricts a possibility modal?**

    b. $[\![\alpha]\!]^o = {}^{\wedge}\exists w, g[g(7)$ defined, human in $w \rightarrow$

$$\text{she talks to } g(7) \text{ in } w]$$

$$[\![\alpha]\!]^{alt} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} {}^{\wedge}\exists w, g[g(7) = x \rightarrow \\ \qquad\qquad \text{she talks to } g(7) \text{ in } w] \end{array} : x \text{ human} \right\}$$

But here, the prejacent $[\![\alpha]\!]^o$ is *weaker* than each of the alternatives in $[\![\alpha]\!]^{alt}$. The prejacent cannot be less likely than its alternatives, so EVEN is infelicitous!

Analysis

▶ The semantics of EVEN ensures that *wh=yin.n'ang* (≈ *even if it's someone*) conditionals can only restrict universal modal/temporal operators!

(23) ∀-FCI with possibility modal in (3):

    a. Literal (3): He can eat [even if the food is what]

    b. If the food$_i$ exists, he CAN eat it$_i$ × EVEN

    c. If the food$_i$ exists, MUST [he CAN eat it$_i$]   ◯ EVEN

       ⟹ ∀-FC > CAN

▶ The semantics of EVEN ensures that *wh=yin.n'ang* (≈ *even if it's someone*) conditionals can only restrict universal modal/temporal operators!

(23) **∀-FCI with possibility modal in (3):**

   a. <u>Literal (3):</u> He can eat [even if the food is what]

   b. If the food$_i$ exists, he <u>CAN</u> eat it$_i$ ✕ EVEN

   c. If the food$_i$ exists, <u>MUST</u> [he CAN eat it$_i$]   ◯ EVEN

      ⟹ ∀-FC > CAN

Analysis

► The semantics of EVEN ensures that *wh=yin.n'ang* (≈ *even if it's someone*) conditionals can only restrict universal modal/temporal operators!

(23) **∀-FCI with possibility modal in (3):**

   a. <u>Literal (3):</u> He can eat [even if the food is what]

   b. If the food$_i$ exists, he <u>CAN</u> eat it$_i$ × EVEN

   c. If the food$_i$ exists, <u>MUST</u> [he CAN eat it$_i$]   ○ EVEN

      ⟹ ∀-FC > CAN

Analysis

- ► The semantics of EVEN ensures that *wh=yin.n'ang* (≈ *even if it's someone*) conditionals can only restrict universal modal/temporal operators!

(23) **∀-FCI with possibility modal in (3):**

    a. <u>Literal (3):</u> He can eat [even if the food is what]

    b. If the food$_i$ exists, he <u>CAN</u> eat it$_i$ × EVEN

    c. If the food$_i$ exists, <u>MUST</u> [he CAN eat it$_i$]   ○ EVEN

        ⟹ ∀-FC > CAN

Analysis

▶ The semantics of EVEN ensures that *wh=yin.n'ang* (≈ *even if it's someone*) conditionals can only restrict universal modal/temporal operators!

(23) **∀-FCI with possibility modal in (3):**

    a. <u>Literal (3):</u> He can eat [even if the food is what]

    b. If the food$_i$ exists, he <u>CAN</u> eat it$_i$ × EVEN

    c. If the food$_i$ exists, <u>MUST</u> [he CAN eat it$_i$]   ◯ EVEN

         ⟹ ∀-FC > CAN

Analysis

► The semantics of EVEN ensures that *wh=yin.n'ang* (≈ *even if it's someone*) conditionals can only restrict universal modal/temporal operators!

(23) **∀-FCI with possibility modal in (3):**

    a. <u>Literal (3):</u> He can eat [even if the food is what]

    b. If the food$_i$ exists, he <u>CAN</u> eat it$_i$ ✕ EVEN

    c. If the food$_i$ exists, <u>MUST</u> [he CAN eat it$_i$]   ◯ EVEN

        ⇒ ∀-FC > CAN

§6 Conclusion

Summary

Tibetan *yin.n'ang* has three functions:

1. *Yin.n'ang*   counterexpectational discourse particle
2. X *yin.n'ang*   concessive scalar focus particle
3. *wh yin.n'ang*   universal free choice item

▶ All three uses can be derived compositionally from (4):

(4)   ཡིན་   ན་   ཡང་
     yin   + na   + yang
     COPULA   CONDITIONAL   EVEN

Summary

Tibetan *yin.n'ang* has three functions:

1. *Yin.n'ang*   counterexpectational discourse particle
2. X *yin.n'ang*   concessive scalar focus particle
3. *wh yin.n'ang* universal free choice item

► **All three uses can be derived compositionally from (4):**

(4) ཡིན་   ན་   ཡང་
    yin   + na   + yang
    COPULA CONDITIONAL EVEN

▶ **A new approach to universal free choice**, parasitic on an existing universal/necessity operator via the conditional, enforced by the logical properties of EVEN… motivated by its overt morphology (4).

► **A new approach to universal free choice**, parasitic on an existing universal/necessity operator via the conditional, enforced by the logical properties of EVEN, motivated by its overt morphology (4).

Extensions

► If this is really derived from the independent conventional semantics for the copula, conditional, and *even*, we might expect similar expressions in other languages.

Rahul Balusu has recently shown (2019b, 2019a) this to be true in a range of Dravidian languages!

Extensions

▶ If this is really derived from the independent conventional semantics for the copula, conditional, and *even*, we might expect similar expressions in other languages.

Rahul Balusu has recently shown (2019b, 2019a) this to be true in <u>a range of Dravidian languages</u>!

Extensions: Telugu

For example, Telugu *ai-naa* = COP-EVEN.IF has three functions:

1. *Ai-naa*   counterexpectational discourse particle
2. X *ai-naa*   concessive scalar focus particle
3. *wh ai-naa*   universal free choice item

! But there are subtle differences! For example, Telugu *wh ai-naa* also allows ∃-FCI ('somebody or other') readings. See Balusu 2019a,b.

For example, Telugu *ai-naa* = COP-EVEN.IF has three functions:

1. *Ai-naa*   counterexpectational discourse particle
2. X *ai-naa*   concessive scalar focus particle
3. *wh ai-naa*   universal free choice item

! But there are subtle differences! For example, Telugu *wh ai-naa* also allows ∃-FCI ('somebody or other') readings. See Balusu 2019a,b.

For example, Telugu *ai-naa* = COP-EVEN.IF has three functions:

1. *Ai-naa*   counterexpectational discourse particle
2. X *ai-naa*   concessive scalar focus particle
3. *wh ai-naa*   universal/<u>existential</u> free choice item

! But there are subtle differences! For example, Telugu *wh ai-naa* also allows ∃-FCI ('somebody or other') readings. See Balusu 2019a,b.

Japanese *demo* has three functions:

1. *Demo*   counterexpectational discourse particle
2. X *demo*   concessive scalar focus particle
3. *wh demo*   universal free choice item

See the Appendix for some data and one particularly striking parallel between Tibetan *yin.n'ang* and Japanese *demo*.

> ! But there is a subtle difference! *Demo* has a 'for example' use (Watanabe 2013). See Appendix.

Extensions: Japanese

Japanese *demo* has three functions:

1. *Demo*   counterexpectational discourse particle
2. X *demo*   concessive scalar focus particle / ‘for example’
3. *wh demo*   universal free choice item

See the Appendix for some data and one particularly striking parallel between Tibetan *yin.n'ang* and Japanese *demo*.

! But there is a subtle difference! *Demo* has a ‘for example’ use (Watanabe 2013). See Appendix.

ཐུགས་རྗེ་ཆེ།

Alonso-Ovalle, Luis. 2016. Are all concessive scalar particles the same? probing into Spanish *siquiera*. In *Proceedings of SALT 26*, 185–204.

Balusu, Rahul. 2019a. The anatomy of the Dravidian unconditional. Presented at GLOW in Asia XII.

Balusu, Rahul. 2019b. Unifying NPIs, FCIs, and unconditionals in Dravidian. Presented at NELS 50.

Crnič, Luka. 2011. On the meaning and distribution of concessive scalar particles. In *Proceedings of NELS 41*, ed. Nicholas LaCara, Lena Fainlib, and Yangsook Park, 1–14.

Erlewine, Michael Yoshitaka. 2019. *Wh*-quantification in Alternative Semantics. Presented at GLOW in Asia XII, Dongguk University, Seoul.

von Fintel, Kai. 1994. Restrictions on quantifier domains. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts.

References II

Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2001. The meaning of free choice. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 24:659–735.

Herburger, Elena. 2000. *What counts: focus and quantification*. Number 36 in Linguistic Inquiry Monographs. MIT Press.

Kluck, Marlies. 2011. Sentence amalgamation. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Groningen.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1979. Conditional necessity and possibility. In *Semantics from different points of view*.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1986. Conditionals. In *Papers from the Parasession on Pragmatics and Grammatical Theory*, 115–135. Chicago Linguistic Society.

Kratzer, Angelika, and Junko Shimoyama. 2002. Indeterminate pronouns: the view from Japanese. In *The Proceedings of the Third Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics (TCP 2002)*, ed. Yuko Otsuka, 1–25. Tokyo: Hitsuji Syobo.

Lahiri, Utpal. 1998. Focus and negative polarity in Hindi. *Natural Language Semantics* 6:57–123.

Lahiri, Utpal. 2010. Some *even*'s are *even (if) … only*: The concessive "even" in Spanish. Manuscript.

Lakoff, George. 1974. Syntactic amalgams. In *Proceedings of CLS 10*, 321–344.

Lewis, David. 1975. Adverbs of quantification. In *Formal semantics of natural language*, ed. Edward L. Keenan, 3–15. Cambridge University Press.

Shimoyama, Junko. 1999. Internally headed relative clauses in Japanese and E-type anaphora. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 8:147–182.

Watanabe, Akira. 2013. Ingredients of polarity sensitivity: Bipolar items in Japanese. In *Strategies of quantification*, ed. Kook-Hee Gil, Stephen Harlow, and George Tsoulas, 189–213. Oxford University Press.

https://mitcho.com/
research/talk-lsa2020.html