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Introduction

- Sentential conjunctions can obtain conditional readings:
  Conditional conjunctions, CCs

  (1) Mary sings another song and John leaves the bar.
  \[\approx\] If Mary singes another song, John leaves the bar.

- Asserting a CC does not commit the speaker to the first conjunct and commits them to the second only conditionally on the first (\(\approx\) hypothetical conditional):

  (2) ‘C1 and C2’ \(\approx\) ‘If C1, then C2.’

- Challenge: derive conditional readings for sentential conjunctions that look like their Boolean counterparts.

- CCs exist across many typologically unrelated languages.
• Starr (2018), Kaufmann (2018a): the first conjunct of a CC introduces a hypothetical state of affairs as the topic, relative to which the second conjunct is evaluated.

With construction specific assumptions; Starr: lexical, Kaufmann: prosodic cues.
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- Starr (2018), Kaufmann (2018a): the first conjunct of a CC introduces a hypothetical state of affairs as the topic, relative to which the second conjunct is evaluated.
  With construction specific assumptions; Starr: lexical, Kaufmann: prosodic cues.
- Here: topicalization is directly responsible (building on crosslinguistic data from Kaufmann and Whitman Ms.)
- Develop a dynamic account with propositional discourse referents
- Challenges
  - CCs and semantic types of indicative conditionals
  - Choice of material topicalized
  - What sort of topicalization?
Conjunctions and hypothetical conditionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( \phi \land \psi )</th>
<th>( \phi \Rightarrow \psi )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entailments</strong></td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \phi )</td>
<td>entailed</td>
<td>not entailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \psi )</td>
<td>entailed</td>
<td>( \phi ) entails ( \psi )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dynamics**

\[
C + \_\_ = ? \quad (C + \phi) + \psi \quad (C + \phi) + \psi \cup (C + \neg \phi)
\]
### Conjunctions and hypothetical conditionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\phi \land \psi$</th>
<th>$\phi \Rightarrow \psi$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entailments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi$</td>
<td>entailed</td>
<td>not entailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\psi$</td>
<td>entailed</td>
<td>$\phi$ entails $\psi$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dynamics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C + __ = ?$</td>
<td>$(C + \phi) + \psi$</td>
<td>$(C + \phi) + \psi \cup (C + \neg \phi)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Weakened dynamic conjunctions without commitment to $\phi$?
  
  $((C + \phi) + \psi) \cup (C + \neg \phi)$

  $\Rightarrow$ Account-type 1...
Account-type 1: Left-subordinating *and*  


CCs are ordinary hypothetical conditionals derived from a special (Starr: left-topicalizing) variant of *and*:

\[(3) \quad \left[ C_1 \, \textit{and}_{LS} \, C_2 \right] \]

♥ Draws on dynamic similarity
Account-type 1: Left-subordinating *and*


CCs are ordinary hypothetical conditionals derived from a special (Starr: left-topicalizing) variant of *and*:

(3) \[ C_1 \text{ and}_{LS} C_2 \]

- Draws on dynamic similarity
- Requires polysemous lexical marker *and*
- Requires ‘conjoinable’ φ and ψ (–alternative forms of C1?)
- Predicts regular epistemic conditionals
- Connection with information structure
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Account-type 2: Restricting quantificational operator

(Keshet, 2013; Keshet and Medeiros, 2019)

CCs are ordinary conjunctions in the scope of a quantificational operator (conjuncts aren’t entailed):

(4)  \text{OPERATOR} [C1] [ C1 and C2 ]

Asymmetry from information structure: backgrounded C1 comes to restrict \text{OPERATOR} (restrictor: focus semantic alternatives)

♥ Ordinary conjunctions
♥ Inherently information structure sensitive
CCs are ordinary conjunctions in the scope of a quantificational operator (conjuncts aren’t entailed):

\[(4) \quad \text{OPERATOR } [C1] \ [ C1 \ and \ C2 ]\]

Asymmetry from information structure: backgrounded $C1$ comes to restrict $\text{OPERATOR}$ (restrictor: focus semantic alternatives)

❤ Ordinary conjunctions
❤ Inherently information structure sensitive
⚠️ But...
Issues for restricting quantificational operator

- **Q-adverbs** need to be extracted from C2 (regular conjunctions: only from C1; Keshet 2013:225):

  (5)  
  a. *You come on time and you usually get a seat.*  
      ≈ *Usually, you come on time, and you get a seat.*  
  b. *She probably left and you just didn’t notice.*  

Even when embedded:

(6)  
*You come on time and you can be sure that you’ll always get a seat.*
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  (5)  
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Issues for restricting quantificational operator

• Q-adverbs need to be extracted from C2 (regular conjunctions: only from C1; Keshet 2013:225):

(5) a. You come on time and you usually get a seat. 
≈ Usually, you come on time, and you get a seat.
   b. She probably left and you just didn’t notice. (his ii-a)

Even when embedded:

(6) You come on time and you can be sure that you’ll always get a seat.

• Dealing with alternative forms of C1

(7) a. You only have to come on time and you will get a seat.
   b. Come on time and you’ll usually get a seat.

⇒ more to come
Outline

Introducing conditional conjunctions

**Topicalization out of regular conjunction**
- Against lexical polysemy of *and*
- Stable impact of topicalization
- Mismatches between C1 and target antecedent
- Restrictions on felicitous CCs

Towards an implementation

Topic content across form-types
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It’s not all about *and*

- Conditional effects for juxtapositions

(8)  
   a. *You call the cops, I break her legs.*  
      
      
(9)  
   *These warm summer days ain’t gonna last forever, Thorn. You don’t hurry up, we gonna be hidin’ from the rat creatures in a snowbank!*  
      
      Jeff Smith, *Bone 6*; p. 50
It’s not all about and

• Conditional effects for juxtapositions

  (8) a. You call the cops, I break her legs.  
      Klinedinst and Rothschild 2015
      US Dept. of Transportation

(9) These warm summer days ain’t gonna last forever, Thorn. You don’t hurry up, we gonna be hidin’ from the rat creatures in a snowbank!
      Jeff Smith, Bone 6; p. 50

• Conjunctive adverbial modifiers become conditional antecedents when topicalized

  Rosina (2019)

(10) [Bei schönem Wetter]_{CT} [grillen wir im Garten].
       with nice weather barbeque we in.the garden
   ‘In case the weather is nice, we’ll have a barbeque in the garden.’
   ‘In nice weather, we’ll have a barbeque in the garden.’
Japanese, Korean: it’s about topicalization

- Rich inventory of conditional markers
  (e.g. Japanese -reba, -tara, =to, -te mo,-te=wa,nara, Takubo 2020)
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Japanese, Korean: it’s about topicalization

- Rich inventory of conditional markers  
  (e.g. Japanese -reba, -tara, =to, -te mo,-te=wa,nara, Takubo 2020)
- Standard view: ‘no CCs’
- Kaufmann and Whitman (Ms.): JK transparently derive CCs
  - Japanese -te=wa and Korean -ko=nun conditionals instantiate  
    ‘[p-TOPIC] and q’
  - Japanese -to involves syntactic topicalization (Hasegawa, 2017)
  - Diachronically, possibly all Japanese and Korean conditional markers  
    are derived this way (e.g. Japanese -reba, Hara 2020; Korean myen),  
    but others don’t show CC-characteristic interpretations (anymore).
CCs from conjunction plus topic marker: Japanese

(11)  Mary=ga *uta=o* utat-te John=ga dete iku.
   Mary=Nom song=Acc sing-Ger John=Nom leave go-NPast
   ✓‘Mary sings a song and John leaves.’ (Boolean)
   ✗‘If Mary sings a song, John leaves’ (conditional)
CCs from conjunction plus topic marker: Japanese

(11)  Mary=ga uta=o utat-te John=ga dete iku.
Mary=NOM song=Acc sing-Ger John=NOM leave go-NPast
✓‘Mary sings a song and John leaves.’  (Boolean)
✗‘If Mary sings a song, John leaves’  (conditional)

(12)  Mary=ga uta=o utat-te=wa John=ga dete iku.
Mary=NOM song=Acc sing-Ger=Top John=NOM leave go-NPast
✗‘Mary sings a song and John leaves.’  (Boolean)
✓‘If Mary sings a song, John leaves’  (conditional)
CCs from conjunction plus topic marker: Korean

(13) \[ \text{Mary} = \text{ka} \quad \text{nolay} = \text{lul} \quad \text{pulu-kö} \quad \text{John} = \text{i} \quad \text{ttena} \quad \text{ka-n-ta}. \]

Mary = Nom  song = Acc  sing - Ger  John = Nom  leave  go - Prs-Dec

✓ ‘Mary sings a song and John leaves.’ (Boolean)

✗ ‘If Mary sings a song, John leaves’ (conditional)
CCs from conjunction plus topic marker: Korean

(13)  \(\text{Mary} = \text{ka} \ \text{nolay} = \text{lul \ pulu-ko} \ \text{John} = \text{i} \ \text{ttena ka-n-ta.}\)
Mary=Nom song=Acc sing-GER John=Nom leave go-Prs-Dec
✓‘Mary sings a song and John leaves.’
✗‘If Mary sings a song, John leaves’
(Boolean)                                           (conditional)

(14)  \(\text{Mary} = \text{ka} \ \text{nolay} = \text{lul \ pulu-ko} = \text{nun} \ \text{John} = \text{i} \ \text{ttena ka-n-ta.}\)
Mary=Nom song=Acc sing-GER=Top John=Nom leave go-Prs-Dec
✗‘Mary sings a song and John leaves.’
✓‘If Mary sings a song, John leaves’
(Boolean)                                           (conditional)
Foreground/background split in English and German

- CCs receive a special intonation: first conjunct ends in fall-rise (Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg, 1990)
- CCs cannot express uncertainty about which conditional holds: not all focus

(15) (Context 1: There seems to be a particular connection between one of the keys and what your character does, but I haven’t fully figured this out, I have to keep watching some more.)

a. ✓Either your character jumps if you press the space bar, or it disappears if you press the ALT key.

b. ✗Either you press the space bar and your character jumps, or you press the ALT key and it disappears.
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- CCs cannot express uncertainty about which conditional holds: not all focus

(Context 1: There seems to be a particular connection between one of the keys and what your character does, but I havent fully figured this out, I have to keep watching some more.)

(15)

a. ✔ Either your character jumps if you press the space bar, or it disappears if you press the ALT key.

b. ✗ Either you press the space bar and your character jumps, or you press the ALT key and it disappears.
• CCs receive a special intonation: first conjunct ends in fall-rise (Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg, 1990)
• CCs cannot express uncertainty about which conditional holds: not all focus

(15) (Context 1: There seems to be a particular connection between one of the keys and what your character does, but I haven't fully figured this out, I have to keep watching some more.)
   a. ✓Either your character jumps if you press the space bar, or it disappears if you press the ALT key.
   b. ✗Either you press the space bar and your character jumps, or you press the ALT key and it disappears.

After ‘In the next round you have two options’: (15b) is felicitous and preferred, but can be construed as regular conjunctions
Desiderata

- CCs derive from topicalization of the initial sentence(s) in conjunctions or juxtapositions
  - ...
  - ...
  - ...
  - ...
Alternative form types of CCs

• Declarative and Declarative (DaD) (16)
  Mary starts singing and John leaves the bar.
  ≈ 'If Mary starts singing, John leaves the bar.'

• Imperative and Declarative (IaD) (17)
  Sing another song and John will leave the bar.

• Sufficiency Modal and Declarative (SMaD) (18)
  Mary only has to sing another song John will leave the bar.

• (Minimal) Noun Phrase and Declarative (NPaD) (19)
  One more song and John leaves the bar.

C1 contains 'unfit' material in IaDs, additional material in SMaDs, and misses material in NPaD.
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Alternative form types of CCs

• **Declarative and Declarative (DaD)**

(16) *Mary starts singing and John leaves the bar.*  
≈ ‘If Mary starts singing, John leaves the bar.’

• **Imperative and Declarative (IaD)**

(17) *Sing another song and John will leave the bar.*

• **Sufficiency Modal and Declarative (SMaD)**

(18) *Mary only has to sing another song John will leave the bar.*

• **(Minimal) Noun Phrase and Declarative (NPaD)**

(19) *One more song and John leaves the bar.*

🚨 C1 contains ‘unfit’ material in IaDs, additional material in SMaDs, and misses material in NPaD.
Desiderata

- CCs derive from topicalization of the initial sentence(s) in conjunctions or juxtapositions
- Form of topicalized material conspires with discourse settings to determine what the second conjunct is relativized to
- ...
- ...
A ban on epistemic CCs?

CCs are generally taken to not express epistemic conditionals

exs from Bolinger 1967 and Keshet 2013

(20)  
  a. *If you have the other half of the locket you are my half-sister.*
  b. #*You have the other half of the locket and you are my half-sister.*

(21)  
  a. (#)*John left work at 6 and he’s probably home by now.*    no CC
  b. *Probably, John left work at 6 and he’s home by now.*    no CC
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A ban on epistemic CCs?

CCs are generally taken to not express epistemic conditionals
exs from Bolinger 1967 and Keshet 2013

(20)  a. If you have the other half of the locket you are my half-sister.
     b. #You have the other half of the locket and you are my half-sister.

(21)  a. (#)John left work at 6 and he’s probably home by now. no CC
     b. Probably, John left work at 6 and he’s home by now. no CC

• Unexpected with hypothetical updates of the contextually given belief state (as assumed by Klinedinst and Rothschild 2015; Starr 2018)

• Ideas:
  – Syntactically smaller conjuncts corresponding to ontological distinction (situations vs. worlds) Bjorkman 2010; Kaufmann and Whitman Ms.
  – Lack in focus sensitivity for epistemic modals and averbials Keshet 2013

• Next: two types of exceptions to the ban on epistemic CCs
Epistemic CCs 1: Predictive

probably-CCs after all from Kaufmann and Whitman Ms.

(22)  
   a. Mary tosses that coin, and it probably comes up heads. 
   b. Probably Mary tosses that coin and it comes up heads.

(23) Mary sings one more song and John probably has a headache for 5 weeks.
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(22)  a. Mary tosses that coin, and it probably comes up heads.
    b. Probably Mary tosses that coin and it comes up heads.

(23) Mary sings one more song and John probably has a headache for 5 weeks.

• Have readings other than ‘probably > (regular) CC’:
  ✓ ‘I know that Mary always cheats a bit and manages to often make fair coins come up heads, but I exclude that she can guarantee it’
Epistemic CCs 1: Predictive

*probably*-CCs after all from Kaufmann and Whitman Ms.

\[(22)\]

a. Mary tosses that coin, and it probably comes up heads.
b. Probably Mary tosses that coin and it comes up heads.

\[(23)\] Mary sings one more song and John probably has a headache for 5 weeks.

- Have readings other than ‘*probably* > (regular) CC’:
  ✓‘I know that Mary always cheats a bit and manages to often make fair coins come up heads, but I exclude that she can guarantee it’

- Crucially: predictive conditionals (Kaufmann 2005; antecedent refers to state of affairs not yet manifest or verifiable at speech time)
Settled antecedents with unsettled consequents:

(24) (context: I’m about to open the door to find out whether or not you’ve broken anything.)
%You’ve broken another vase and I’m leaving.

ex from Culicover and Jackendoff 1997; Weisser 2015
Epistemic CCs 1: Epistemic predictive (continued)

Settled antecedents with unsettled consequents:

(24) (context: I’m about to open the door to find out whether or not you’ve broken anything.)
%You’ve broken another vase and I’m leaving.

⇒ CCs can be epistemic (without much contextual support) when at least one of C1 and C2 describes a future contingency

ex from Culicover and Jackendoff 1997; Weisser 2015
• Confirm: epistemic CCs without predictivity are awkward out of the blue

(25)  *He left around 5 and he is home by now.*  

standalone: no CC
Epistemic CCs 2: Inference tickets (Ryle 1949)

- Confirm: epistemic CCs without predictivity are awkward out of the blue

\[(25) \quad \text{He left around 5 and he is home by now.} \quad \text{standalone: no CC} \]

but improve \{ significantly/\% fully \} in ‘what shows what?’-reasoning: ?

surveyed informally for English, German, Japanese to

\[(26) \quad \text{A: Oh no, look, John forgot his phone. We can probably find out when he left the office, but I have no clue where he is now. - Do you think we can reach him somehow?} \]

\[\text{B: Come on, it's not that hard, you know him!... He left around 5 and he's / he must be home by now; he left around 6 and he still will be / must still be exercising at the gym.} \]

\[(27) \quad \text{Conversation in the department kitchen:} \]

\[\text{A: Have you seen Jon? I'm not sure if he's at the department today...} \]

\[\text{B (pointing to a tea pot sitting on the kitchen counter without being able to see if it's empty): Well, there's no more tea in that pot and he's around / he was here this morning}. \]
Predictivity and inference tickets

- Finding: CCs are sensitive to discourse structure
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- Tentatively:
  - CCs presuppose ‘What correlates with what?’ questions and presupposes alternatives to both conjuncts
  - Topicalization in CCs is contrastive
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Predictivity and inference tickets

- Finding: CCs are sensitive to discourse structure
- Tentatively:
  - CCs presuppose ‘What correlates with what?’ questions and presupposes alternatives to both conjuncts
  - Topicalization in CCs is contrastive
  - Inference tickets and predictivity indicate the required discourse structure or facilitate its accommodation:
    Causal networks promise to offer the required alternatives
- Possible unification: (set aside for the moment)
  It’s only about predictivity, inference ticket contexts involve coercion ‘\(\phi\) and \(\psi\)’ \(\Rightarrow\) ‘\(\phi\) and \{ we know that \} \(\psi\)’
- Could there be aboutness topicalization from conjunctions?
  (– if not, related to known syntactic symmetry constraints, Mayr and Schmitt 2017)
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(28) A: Under what conditions will you buy this house?
B: I will buy this house if you give me the money.
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  (28) A: Under what conditions will you buy this house?
  B: I will buy this house if you give me the money.
  (von Fintel 1994: 81, his (6)), also Iatridou 2013 for Turkish

- Topic marked conditional antecedent can constitute answer as contrastive topic:

  (29) If you give me the money, then I will give you the house.

- Focus marking on first conjunct yields corrections of regular CCs, not ‘Inverse CCs’:

  (30) [You press the SPACE button]_{F} and your character jumps.
  a. ⇋ All (typical) cases in which you do something relevant and your character jumps are cases in which you press the space bar and your character jumps.
  b. ≈ Pressing the space button is the action such that, if you do it, your character jumps
Topics of questionable topicality -?

- following Kaufmann and Whitman Ms.

(28) A: Under what conditions will you buy this house?
B: I will buy this house if you give me the money.
(von Fintel 1994: 81, his (6)), also Iatridou 2013 for Turkish

- Topic marked conditional antecedent can constitute answer as contrastive topic:

(29) If you give me the money, then I will give you the house.

- Focus marking on first conjunct yields corrections of regular CCs, not ‘Inverse CCs’:

(30) [You press the SPACE button] \_F and your character jumps.

a. \:\not \exists All (typical) cases in which you do something relevant and your character jumps are cases in which you press the space bar and your character jumps.

b. \: \approx Pressing the space button is the action such that, if you do it, your character jumps

- Maintain: C1s in CCs are topical.
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Desiderata

- CCs derive from topicalization of the initial sentence(s) in conjunctions or juxtapositions
- Form of topicalized material conspires with discourse settings to determine what the second conjunct is relativized to
- The readings of CCs are constrained by discourse structure
  - Predictive epistemic conditionals are ok (generic or single-case)
  - Non-predictive epistemic conditionals work as ‘inference tickets’
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Referential *if*-clauses

- Conditional antecedents are definite descriptions referring to worlds or propositions
  
  Schein 2003; Schlenker 2004; Bhatt and Pancheva 2006, Kaufmann 2018b; Williamson 2019; Yang t.a.

- *if*-antecedents introduce discourse referents for worlds (store propositions)
  
  Stone 1999; Brasoveanu 2006, 2010; Ebert et al. 2014

- Topicalized C1 should behave like *if*-antecedent
  
  To keep in mind: C1 content can differ from target antecedent (IaD, SMaD, NPaD)
DPL with propositional referents

AnderBois, Brasovenau, Henderson 2015 (ABH15)

- Formulas denote binary relations between variable assignments
- Variables for individuals $x, y, \ldots$ and propositions (sets of possible worlds) $p, q, \ldots$
- Translation indexes with designated referent $p$ that stores a (possibly improper) subset of the current context set and can be bound by intensional operators

Simplified from ABH15

- Add: $dref$ for topical proposition $p^{top}$

- Relevant atomic formulas:

  $$\text{(31)} \quad \begin{array}{ll}
  \text{a. } & [p = p']^{g,h} = 1 \text{ iff } g = h \text{ and } h(p) = h(p') \\
  \text{b. } & [p \subseteq p']^{g,h} = 1 \text{ iff } g = h \text{ and } h(p) \subseteq h(p') \\
  \text{c. } & [R_p(x_1, \ldots, x_n)]^{M,g,h} = 1 \text{ iff } g = h \text{ and for all } w \in h(p): \\
  & < h(x_1), \ldots h(x_n) > \in l_w(<R>) \\
  \text{d. } & [[p]]^{g,h} = 1 \text{ iff for any variable } v \text{ s.t. } v \neq p: g(v) = h(v)
  \end{array}$$

Dynamic conjunction:

$$\text{(32)} \quad [\phi \land \psi]^{g,h} = 1 \text{ iff there exists } k \text{ s.t. } [\phi]^{g,k} = [\psi]^{k,h} = 1.$$
Translating CCs

(33)

\[ S \xrightarrow{\phi-\text{TOP}} \] and \[ S \xrightarrow{\psi} \]

- \( \phi\text{-TOP} \xrightarrow{\[p^{\text{top}}\] \land \max_{p}^{p^{\text{top}}} (\phi')} \)
- \( \max_{p}^{p^{\text{top}}} (\phi') \mid g, h = 1 \) iff \( \max_{p}^{p^{\text{top}}} (\phi'[p/p^{\text{top}}]) \mid g, h = 1 \) and there is no \( h' \) s.t. \( \max_{p}^{p^{\text{top}}} (\phi'[p/p^{\text{top}}]) \mid g, h' = 1 \) and \( h(p^{\text{top}}) \subset h'(p^{\text{top}}) \)
- \( \text{and } \psi \xrightarrow{\psi'[p/p^{\text{top}}]} \)

and triggers evaluation on \( p^{\text{top}} \) (default: \( p^{\text{top}} = p \))

SDRT: coordinating relation with joint topic

Txurruka 2003; Asher and Lascarides 2003

- \( (33) \xrightarrow{\[p^{\text{top}}\] \land \max_{p}^{p^{\text{top}}} (\phi') \land \psi'[p/p^{\text{top}}]} \)
You sing another song and I’m out of here.

- Boolean and CC:

  (34) a. you sing another song $\leadsto \text{SONG}_p$
  b. I’m out of here $\leadsto \text{OUT}_p$
  c. and I’m out of here $\leadsto \text{OUT}_{p_{top}}$
You sing another song and I’m out of here.

• Boolean and CC:

(34) a. \( you \ sing \ another \ song \ \leadsto SONG_p \)
b. \( I'm \ out \ of \ here \ \leadsto OUT_p \)
c. \( and \ I'm \ out \ of \ here \ \leadsto OUT_{p^{top}} \)

• Boolean:

(35) a. \( [ \ You \ sing \ another \ song [ \ and \ I'm \ out \ of \ here ] ] \)
b. \( SONG_p \land OUT_{p^{top}} \)
c. By default, \( p^{top} = p \)
You sing another song and I’m out of here.

• Boolean and CC:

(34)  a. you sing another song ⇝ SONG_p
    b. I’m out of here ⇝ OUT_p
    c. and I’m out of here ⇝ OUT_{p^{top}}

• Boolean:

(35)  a. [ You sing another song [ and I’m out of here ] ]
    b. SONG_p ∧ OUT_{p^{top}}
    c. By default, p^{top} = p

• CC:

(36)  a. [ You sing another song-TOP [ and I’m out of here ] ]
    b. [p^{top}] ∧ \max_p^{p^{top}} (SONG_p) ∧ OUT_{p^{top}}
    c. p^{top} set to SONG-subset of p

⇒ an assignment g that stores SONG-worlds in p that are not in OUT has no successor (\approx\ hypothetical conditional)
You sing a song and I’m usually out of here.

- Desideratum: *usually* in situ

But what about wide-scope *usually*?

Usually, you sing a song and I’m out of here. But today I have ear plugs :)!
You sing a song and I’m usually out of here.

- Desideratum: *usually* in situ
- With *usually* as ‘most’

(37)  

a. *usually* $\psi \rightsquigarrow \text{GEN}_p(p^{top})(\psi')$

b. $\llbracket \text{GEN}_p(p^{top})(\psi') \rrbracket^{g,h} = 1$ iff $\llbracket [p'] \land \max_{p^{top}}^{p'}(\psi') \rrbracket^{g,h} = 1$

$\text{MOST}(p^{top})(p')^{g,h} = 1$

c. $\llbracket \text{MOST}(p^{top})(p') \rrbracket^{g,h} = 1$ iff for most $w \in h(p^{top}) : w \in h(p')$
You sing a song and I’m usually out of here.

- Desideratum: *usually* in situ
- With *usually* as ‘most’

\[(37)\]

\[\text{a. } \text{usually } \psi \rightsquigarrow \text{GEN}_p(p^{\text{top}})(\psi') \]

\[\text{b. } \llbracket \text{GEN}_p(p^{\text{top}})(\psi') \rrbracket^{g,h} = 1 \text{ iff } \llbracket [p'] \land \text{max}_{p^{\text{top}}}^{p'}(\psi') \rrbracket^{g,h} = 1 \text{ iff } \llbracket \text{MOST}(p^{\text{top}})(p') \rrbracket^{g,h} = 1 \]

\[\text{c. } \llbracket \text{MOST}(p^{\text{top}})(p') \rrbracket^{g,h} = 1 \text{ iff for most } w \in h(p^{\text{top}}) : w \in h(p') \]

- But what about wide-scope *usually* -?

\[(38)\] 

*Usually, you sing a song and I'm out of here. But today I have ear plugs :)!*

CC can scope under *usually*: replace \text{MOST} with normalcy w.r.t. \(p \Rightarrow More work!\)
Good news for one-place anaphoric *and*

• \( \text{and } \psi \rightsquigarrow \psi'[p/p^{top}] \)
Good news for one-place anaphoric \textit{and}

- \textit{and} $\psi \rightsquigarrow \psi'[p/p^{top}]$
- \textit{and} can be discourse-anaphoric, both Boolean and CC reading

(39) A: We can send Sue an email.
    B: Right! And we can send John a text message.

(40) A: We can send Sue an email.
    B: Yes. And she’ll never talk to us again.
    $\approx$ ‘If we do that, she’ll never talk to us again.’
All about *and* after all?

- *and* signals evaluation w.r.t. local propositional topic
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- Japanese and Korean CCs (conjunction marker in first conjunct) -?
  
  (Teruyuki Mizuno, p.c.)
All about *and* after all?

- *and* signals evaluation w.r.t. local propositional topic
- Juxtapositions?
- Japanese and Korean CCs (conjunction marker in first conjunct) -?
  
  (Teruyuki Mizuno, p.c.)

- **Minimally**: Avoid vacuous topicalization
All about *and* after all?

- *and* signals evaluation w.r.t. local propositional topic
- Juxtapositions?
- Japanese and Korean CCs (conjunction marker in first conjunct) -?
  
  (Teruyuki Mizuno, p.c.)

- **Minimally**: Avoid vacuous topicalization
- Suggests: Propositional dref in C1 resolved according to pragmatic considerations, effect of *and* is more indirect (Asher and Lascarides 2003 (SDRT) Maximize Discourse Coherence; Stonjnić 2016)
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The missing modal puzzle (Kaufmann 2018)

- Imperative and SM modality in C1 \(\rightsquigarrow\) modal-free antecedent

\[(41)\]

a. *Sing one more song and I'm out of here.*  
   LaD

b. *You only have to sing one more song and I'm out of here.*  
   SMaD

\(\approx\) ‘If you sing one more song,…’
The missing modal puzzle (Kaufmann 2018)

- Imperative and SM modality in C1 $\leadsto$ modal-free antecedent

  (41)  
  a. *Sing one more song and I’m out of here.* IaD
  b. *You only have to sing one more song and I’m out of here.* SMaD

  $\approx$ ‘If you sing one more song,…’

- Regular modals in C1 $\leadsto$ modal antecedent:

  (42)  
  a. *You { have to / should / must } sing one more song and I’m out of here.*
  $\approx$ ‘If you have to/should/must sing one more song, …’
Conclusions from missing modality -?

**Claim:** Evidence for the non-modal nature of imperatives (von Fintel and Iatridou, 2017; Starr, 2018)

- SMaDs leave out overt modal, even though modal proposition is available for pick-up elsewhere (pace Starr 2018)

(43) a. You only have to sing another song and I'm out of here.

b. You only have to go to the North End. You know that, right?

- Imperative proposition is available for pick-up elsewhere (pace Snider 2017, his (44a): confound from stress, John Whitman, p.c.)

(44) a. Shut the door! Nancy (already) told you that.

b. Shut the door! Hasn't Nancy told you that already?

- Sometimes even regular modals disappear from the antecedent . . .
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Claim: Evidence for the non-modal nature of imperatives (von Fintel and Iatridou, 2017; Starr, 2018)

• SMaDs leave out overt modal, even though modal proposition is available for pick-up elsewhere  
  pace Starr 2018

(43) a. You only have to sing another song and I’m out of here.
    b. You only have to go to the North End. You know that, right?

• Imperative proposition is available for pick-up elsewhere  
  pace Snider 2017, his (44a): confound from stress, John Whitman, p.c.

(44) a. Shut the door! Nancy (already) told you that.
    #that: Addressee should shut the door.
    b. Shut the door! Hasn’t Nancy told you that already?

• Sometimes even regular modals disappear from the antecedent . . .
Case 1: Possibility modals staying out

- Possibility modals with even if-effect: ex from Schwager 2006

(45) You can call him at MIDnight and he won’t be angry.
   a. ≈ Even if you call him at midnight he won’t be angry.
   b. ?? ≈ ◊ CallAtMn ∧ ¬ Angry
   c. ∄ ◊(Call-At-Mn ∧ ¬ Angry)
Case 1: Possibility modals staying out

- Possibility modals with even if-effect: ex from Schwager 2006

  (45)  You can call him at MIDnight and he won’t be angry.
  a.  ≈ Even if you call him at midnight he won’t be angry.
  b.  ?? ≈ ♦ CallAtMn ∧ ¬ Angry
  c.  ≱ ♦(Call-At-Mn ∧ ¬ Angry)

- Possibility modal with minimizing effect
  Culicover and Jackendoff 1997, base case for extraction contrast; don’t comment on interpretation

  (46)  You can just wave your hands like this and we arrest the whole gang.
        ≈ You can just wave your hands like this [to get our attention/to make us arrest the whole gang] and if [you wave your hands like this] we arrest the whole gang.
Case 2: Even necessity modals can stay out after all

• Contrastive focus can make modal vanish from antecedent:

(47) You { have to / must / need to } sing [ one more SONG] and I’ll leave.
≈ ‘It’s if you sing one more song that I’ll leave.’
≈ ‘If you want me to leave you have to sing one more song.’
But they’re all not entirely gone. . .

- even-effect:

  (48) a. (#)You can call him at midnight and you’re friends with his boss.
  b. You can [call him at MIDnight] and he won’t be angry.

- SMs: sensitive to a scale of alternatives to their prejacent von Fintel and Iatridou 2007

  (49) You only have to sing one more song and I leave.
  ⇒
  < you sing one more song, . . . , you hit me >

- Imperatives impose constraints on contexts of felicitous use by a.o. constraining QUD to decision problem with alternatives to the prejacent (Kaufmann and Kaufmann t.a.), not questions about suitable goals

  (50) If you want to host the department party, buy a bigger dining table.
But they’re all not entirely gone…

- **even-effect:**

  (48) a. (♯)You can call him at midnight and you’re friends with his boss.

  b. You can [call him at MIDnight] and he won’t be angry.

- **SMs:** sensitive to a scale of alternatives to their prejacent

  von Fintel and Iatridou 2007

  (49) You only have to sing one more song and I leave.

  ⇒ < you sing one more song, . . . , you hit me >
But they’re all not entirely gone. . .

- **even-effect:**

  \[(48)\]
  a. (♯)You can call him at midnight and you’re friends with his boss.
  b. You can [call him at MIDnight] and he won’t be angry.

- **SMs: sensitive to a scale of alternatives to their prejacent**

  [von Fintel and Iatridou 2007]

  \[(49)\]
  You only have to sing one more song and I leave.
  \[⇒ < you sing one more song, . . . , you hit me >\]

- **Imperatives impose constraints on contexts of felicitous use by a.o. constraining QUD to decision problem with alternatives to the prejacent (Kaufmann and Kaufmann t.a.), not questions about suitable goals**

  \[(50)\]
  If you want to host the department party, buy a bigger dining table.
Tracking imperative meaning in IaDs

Keshet and Medeiros (2019): experimental evidence that DaDs are preferred over IaDs if CCs don’t contribute to choice of action:

(51) Present Context: An exasperated parent is searching the cluttered attic for a mischievous child and shouts:

a. You’re hiding from me again and you’re in big trouble.

b. Be hiding from me again and you’re in big trouble.

(52) Future Context: An exasperated parent wants a mischievous child to stop hiding before some visitors arrive. She exclaims:

a. You’re hiding from me when grandma arrives and you’ll be in big trouble.

b. Be hiding from me when grandma arrives and you’ll be in big trouble.
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(51)  **Present Context:** An exasperated parent is searching the cluttered attic for a mischievous child and shouts:

a. *You’re hiding from me again and you’re in big trouble.*

b. *Be hiding from me again and you’re in big trouble.*

(52)  **Future Context:** An exasperated parent wants a mischievous child to stop hiding before some visitors arrive. She exclaims:
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So what’s missing -?

- Modal meaning is missing from antecedent of the conditional that is conveyed (‘not part of $p^{top}$’)
So what’s missing -?

- Modal meaning is missing from antecedent of the conditional that is conveyed (‘not part of $p^{top}$’)
- Commitment to full first conjunct is hard to distinguish from ‘missingness’ in a context that presupposes ‘what does Agent have to do to reach goal G’

(53) A: How do I get to Harlem?
    B: You have to take the A-train.

(54) You have to sing one more SONG.
So what’s missing -?

- Modal meaning is missing from antecedent of the conditional that is conveyed (‘not part of $p_{\text{top}}$’)
- Commitment to full first conjunct is hard to distinguish from ‘missingness’ in a context that presupposes ‘what does Agent have to do to reach goal $G$’

(53) A: How do I get to Harlem?
    B: You have to take the A-train.

(54) You have to sing one more SONG.

- To try: composition of material with underspecified logical forms, discourse relations and focus contours as presuppositions (Schlöder and Lascarides 2020, SDRT)
- DaDs, NPaDs: no corresponding commitment to C1
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And so far...

- First stab at formalizing a unified account of different CC-types
- Drawing on a dynamic framework with referents for propositions
- Allows to derive CCs from topicalization only, no need for lexical(ly polysemous) conjunctions
- More work needed to determine what becomes the propositional topic $p^{top}$ and how it relates to overall discourse structure (QUD or discourse relations; presumed causal networks, . . . ).

Many thanks!!! – to you here and many others in preparation. . .
And so far...

- First stab at formalizing a unified account of different CC-types
- Drawing on a dynamic framework with referents for propositions
- Allows to derive CCs from topicalization only, no need for lexical(ly polysemous) conjunctions
- More work needed to determine what becomes the propositional topic $p^{\text{top}}$ and how it relates to overall discourse structure (QUD or discourse relations; presumed causal networks,...).

- Many thanks!!! – to you here and many others in preparation...
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