PA9.2 – Intersentential clausal exceptive constructions

Student: Sumedha Gupta   Supervisors: Clemens Steiner-Mayr, Thomas Weskott

Ext./Th.Com.: Rajesh Bhatt (UMass)

I.   The form-meaning mismatch

- Exceptive constructions both exhibit a 1:many and 0:1 (presupposition projection) form-meaning mismatch, depending on quantifier type, pragmatic factors and other contextual elements [1][2][3][4].
- In Bangla, the exceptive forms 'tʃʰara' (free, clausal) and 'baɖe' (connected, phrasal) shows similar form-meaning mismatches. The form supports multiple readings (confirmed from parallelism test that there is actual ambiguity, not just mere under specification).

(1)) rik   bʰebetʃʰilo ,   nil tʃʰara/baɖe   kitʃʰu tʃʰatro   eʃetʃʰilo,   ar abir o ʈai bʰebetʃʰilo
    Rik   think.PRV.PST.3, Neel CHARA/BADE   some student.M come.PRV.PST.3,   and Abir too that think.PRV.PST.3

a. Rik thought some students besides Neel came, and Abir thought that (some students besides Neel came).
b. Rik thought some students excluding Neel came, and Abir thought that (some students excluding Neel came).

> • Research questions:
> - How can the ambiguity issue be accounted for the interaction with existential quantifiers (and if found elsewhere)?
> - What are the intrasentential semantic building blocks of the constructions? Further exploring an account for the intersentential restrictions the constructions seem to have.

II.   Methodology and hypotheses

Method:
- Experimentally, the research plans to design and conduct acceptability judgment tasks.
- Theoretically, uncovering how pragmatic inference and other factors interact in exceptive constructions.

Preliminary hypotheses:
- Containment inferences are a precondition for additive interpretations and play a crucial role in maintaining the acceptability of exceptive constructions with universal quantifiers.
- Existential quantifiers are more flexible but still require containment for the availability of multiple readings.

III.   Expected results and discussion

- Preliminary observations from a quasi-experimental setup suggest results - favorable to the hypothesis, though the additive particle 'o' may introduce a blocking effect that merits further investigation.
- (2) nil   tʃʰara/bade rik ar rina pianoʈa   tuletʃʰilo
    Neel CHARA/BADE rik and rina piano.CLF lift.PRV.PST.3
 'Rik and Rina excluding Neel had lifted the piano.'
 'Rik and Rina including Neel had lifted the piano.'
○ Unexpected result: Leastness Condition Violation.
○ This unexpected pattern calls for a deeper exploration particularly in relation to the presuppositions of membership and exhaustivity.
- The distributional constraints in clausal constructions also need in-depth investigation as the exception clause need to precede the quantification clause (unlike English).
(3) Rik aʃeni   ʈatʃʰara   ʃob tʃʰelera eʃeʃʰe
    Rik come.3.NEG CHARA.CLAUS every boy.P   come.PRF.PRS.3
 'Every student came but Neel didn't come.'
(4) # ʃob tʃʰelera eʃeʃʰe   ʈatʃʰara   Rik aʃeni
    every boy.PL come.PRF.PRS.3 CHARA.CLAUS Rik come.3.NEG
 'Every student came but Neel didn't come.'

IV.   Consequences and follow-up questions

- PA9.3 will build on PA9.1 by investigating presupposition projection and PA9.2 by taking linear order effects among others into account:
  - Q1: Do presuppositions embedded under operators project in the form of conditionals, or not?
  - Q2: Does linear order have an effect on this, or not?
- Conditional projection has been proposed to account for the filtering of presuppositions (Heim 1983, Schlenker 2009 a.m.o.) as in Either Ann never smoked, or she stopped, which overall presupposes nothing, i.e., if ``Ann not never smoked, she smoked.''
- At the same time, conditional projection has been criticized (e.g. Geurts 1996), as Either Ann can't run a marathon, or she stopped smoking, intuitively, gives rise to an unconditional inference.
- PA9.3 tests this with sentences where one presupposition trigger is embedded under another one (e.g. John met the woman who can't run a marathon or stopped smoking).
- If the presupposition of stopped projects conditionally, it becomes part of the presupposition of the in this form.
- If projection depends on a linear algorithm (e.g. Schlenker 2009), reversing the order should change the results.

References
[1] von Fintel, Kai. 1993. Exceptive constructions. *Natural Language Semantics* (1): 123–148. [2] Moltmann, Friederike.1995.Exception sentences and polyadic quantification. Linguistics and Philosophy 18 (3): 223–280.[3] Vostrikova, Ekaterina. 2019. Phrasal and clausal exceptive-additive constructions crosslinguistically. PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.[4] Vostrikova, Ekaterina. 2021. Conditional analysis of clausal exceptives. Natural Language Semantics https://doi.org/10.1007/s11050-021-09177-z.