

BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

**46TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
*SOCIETAS LINGUISTICA EUROPAEA***

BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

University of Split
Croatia
18 – 21 September 2013

Part I

46TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
SOCIETAS LINGUISTICA EUROPAEA

Part I

SLE
Societas
Linguistica
Europaea





46th Annual Meeting of the *Societas Linguistica Europaea*

Book of Abstracts

University of Split,
Croatia

18 – 21 September 2013

Our analysis considers tense use in indirectly reported complements of *say* and *think*, and in factive complements of *regret* and *accept*. Random samples of 200 hits (compiled from *WordbanksOnline*) of these verbs in the preterit, including negatives and passives, allow us to test the Kiparskys' hypothesis about the relative proportions of absolute tense and sequence of tenses.

Second, on the basis of in-depth qualitative analysis of the data we propose refinements of both the factive presupposition and the different tense uses found in complement clauses.

Necessary refinements of the factive presupposition include the points that

(i) it is sometimes a reported, not the actual, speaker who presupposes the truth of the proposition (cf. Delacruz 1976), e.g.

(3) Someone, who did not accept the Medjugorgje phenomena were supernatural in origin,... (WB)

(ii) factive complements may involve presupposed commitment to a deontic, rather than truth-oriented, proposition (Halliday 1994), e.g.

(4) I did not accept that we should follow the Law's Commission's recommendation (WB)

Accordingly, we need to redefine both *what* is presupposed and the *nature* of the presupposition.

Our proposed refinements of tense use relate to the distinction between *absolute* tenses, which have the time of speaking - or temporal zero-point (t_0) (Lyons 1977) - as reference point, and *relative* tenses, whose reference point is another situation (Declerck 2006). We argue that absolute tenses have to be further divided into those that relate to the *actual* speaker's time of utterance, the real t_0 , and those that relate to the *represented* speaker's time of utterance, a t_0 derived from the represented speech situation (cf. Haberland 1986, *author₄*, *author_{3,4}*). As for the sequence of tenses, the 'backshifting' involved in it may be directly relative to a described situation, or it may be mediated by the second, derived, t_0 . In our view, tenses in reported speech/thought *inherently* involve the t_0 derived from the represented speech situation (*author_{3,4}*), while factive complements *typically* have 'real' absolute and relative tenses under the deictic control of the actual speaker. For the marked type of factive complement to which a represented, rather than the actual, speaker is committed, as in (3), we will have to develop a coherent tense analysis.

Collectively, the proposed quantitative and qualitative corpus studies afford a new global insight into tense in factive complements.

References

- Declerck, R. in collaboration with S. Reed and B. Cappelle. 2006. *The Grammar of the English Verb Phrase, vol. 1: The Grammar of the English Tense System: A Comprehensive Analysis*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Delacruz, E. 1976. Factives and proposition level constructions in Montague Grammar. B. Partee (ed.) *Montague Grammar*. New York: Academic Press. 177–199.
- Haberland, H. 1986. Reported speech in Danish. F. Coulmas (ed.) *Direct and Indirect Speech*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 219–253.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 2nd Edition. London: Arnold.
- Kiparsky, P. & C. Kiparsky. 1971. Fact. D. Steinberg & L. Jacobovits (eds) *Semantics: An Interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics, and Psychology*. Cambridge: CUP. 345–369.
- Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics*. Cambridge: CUP.

The Nuosu logophor.

Gerner, Matthias
(City University of Hong Kong)

The influence of SOURCE-logophors on reference possibilities of other anaphors and personal pronouns is poorly understood. The Nuosu language (Tibeto-Burman: China) exhibits an African-style logophor, a Chinese-style reflexive and a set of personal pronouns.

Syntactic function	Discourse role (Sells 1987: 457)	Nuosu Form
L_{Ophor} . $S_{\text{inGular/PLural}}$	SOURCE	i/op
$S_{\text{shortDistanceReflexive}}$ anaphor		zyt jie
$L_{\text{ongDistanceReflexive}}$	SELF/PIVOT	zyt jie

The Nuosu reflexive and logophor

In a paper submitted for publication, I revise Safir (2004a, 2004b)'s theory in a way that allows deriving complementary binding of the logophor and the reflexive in their domains. In this abstract, I only survey descriptive language features.

1. SDR excludes LG, LDR and pronouns

The logophor *i/op*, the long-distance reflexive *zyt jie* and the pronouns must be free in the co-argument domain in which the SDR *zyt jie* must mark dependency on an antecedent.

- (1) a. * mu ga₁ hxip go i₁ ix₊₁ hxie yy ddix.
 male name say SENT-TOP LOG-SG LOG-SG respect QUOT
 Embedded clause
 '*Muka₁ said that he₁ respects himself₊₁.'
- b. * mu ga₁ hxip go op₊₁₊₂ op₊₁₊₂ hxie yy ddix.
 male name say SENT-TOP LOG-PL LOG-PL respect QUOT
 Embedded clause
 '*Muka₁ said that they₁₊₂ respect themselves₊₁₊₂.'
- (2) mu ga₁ ngop go lat mop₂ zyt jie_{1/2} hxie yy tat xi.
 male name think SENT-TOP male name LDR/SDR respect should
 Embedded clause
 '*Muka₁ thought that Lamo₂ should respect himself_{1/2}.'
- (3) mu ga₁ ngop go lat mop₂ cyx_{1/+2} hxie yy tat xi.
 male name think SENT-TOP male name 3P SG respect should
 Embedded clause
 '*Muka₁ thought that he₁ should respect himself₁.'

2. LG excludes LDR and pronouns

The logophor *i/op* must covary with an internal SOURCE in the reported speech domain. The logophor can occur in any syntactic position (subject, direct object, adjunct).

- (4) mu ga₁ hxip go lat sse₂ ix₁ nzur jox jjip ox ddix.
 male name say SENT-TOP male name LOG-SG hate might DYP QUOT
 Embedded clause
 '*Muka₁ said that Laze₂ might hate him₁.'

The LDR and pronouns are illicit in reported speech constructions if they covary with the SOURCE.

- (5) * mu hlie₁ hxip go zyt jie_{+1/+2} dde jji ox ddix.
 male name say SENT-TOP LDR mature, grow up DYP QUOT
 '*Muhlie₁ said that he_{+1/+2} is mature now.'
- (6) mu jie₁ vut nyop₂ jox hxip go cy_{+1/2/3} ssox dde bbo tat xi ddix.
 male name female name to say SENT-TOP 3P SG school go should QUOT
 '*Mujie₁ told Vunyo₂ that she_{+1/2/3} should go to school.'

When two speech reports are embedded in each other with two SOURCES, then the logophor is bound in the minimal reported speech clause in which it is contained. Reference to the distant SOURCE can be made by means of the LDR or pronouns.

- (7) **mu ga₁** hxi_p ngop₂ ge go, **lat mop₃** hxi_p go
 male name say 1P PL tell SENT-TOP male name say SENT-TOP

i_{1/3}	/	zyt jie_{1/2/*3}
LOG-SG		LDR

 mup shy dex op rro la tat xi ddix.
 tomorrow Xichang come should QUOT
 'Muka₁ told us₂ that Lamo₃ said that **he_{1/3}** / **self_{1/2/*3}** should come to Xichang tomorrow.'

References

- Safir, K. (2004a). *The syntax of (in)dependence*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
 Safir, K. (2004b). *The syntax of anaphora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 Sells, P. (1987). Aspects of logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18, 445-479.

Grammaticalized exhaustivity in focus.

Gerőcs, Mátyás; Babarczy, Anna; Fekete, István and Surányi, Balázs
 (Hungarian Academy of Sciences)

The issue. Exhaustivity in the interpretation of focus has been commonly treated in terms of pragmatic implicatures in both (Neo-)Gricean and Relevance Theoretic accounts, while some recent treatments analyze the relevant exhaustivity effects as part of grammatically represented and compositionally interpreted exhaustivity operators (Chierchia 2004, Fox 2007, Sevi 2009). Exhaustivity due to pragmatic inferences is characteristic of purely prosodic focus of the English type, including syntactically unmarked focus (SUF) in Hungarian too. On the other hand, some syntactically marked foci in languages, among them immediately pre-verbal focus in Hungarian (PVF), have been described as exhibiting truth-conditional, semantic exhaustivity, arising in the same way as it does for the focus of clefts and specificational pseudoclefts (for PVF: Szabolcsi 1981, 1994, Kenesei 1986, 2006, É-Kiss 1998). Recently, this view of PVF has been both challenged (Wedgwood 2005, 2007, Onea 2007, 2008, Onea and Beaver 2009) and defended (É-Kiss 2010, Horvath 2005, 2007) in theoretical work.

The experiment. We address this debate by presenting novel results from a sentence-picture matching experiment, which involved a multiple choice task that allowed for multiple responses. Each test sentence, describing the culprit of a crime, contained one of four types of focus: PVF, SUF, (specificational) pseudocleft and cleft. Simultaneously, subjects were presented with a picture containing four human figures, the potential suspects: Suspect₁ corresponding to an exhaustive interpretation, Suspect₂ corresponding to an unambiguously non-exhaustive interpretation, and two distractors. Subjects had to choose which suspect or suspects may possibly be the actual offender. We measured the rate of exhaustive responses (=just Suspect₁) and non-exhaustive responses (=Suspect₁&Suspect₂). As an outstanding advantage, this task remains implicit, not involving a meta-judgment whether some sentence is 'true'/'false'.

Results and discussion. Focus type yielded a significant main effect (Friedman test: $\chi^2(n=31, df=3)=48.803$, $p<0.001$). Pairwise comparisons using Wilcoxon Matched Pairs tests revealed the following significant differences: SUF and PVF ($p<0.001$), SUF and cleft ($p<0.001$), PVF and cleft ($p<0.05$), SUF and pseudocleft ($p<0.001$). The rate of exhaustive responses in each focus type were: SUF:16%, PVF:51%, pseudoclefts:61%, clefts:64%.

The significant difference found between clefts and PVF argues against treating the exhaustivity of PVF as arising semantically in the same way as in clefts. We interpret this finding as supporting a pragmatic account of the exhaustivity of PVF. We propose, drawing on Onea (2007, 2008), that the word order associated with PVF sentences (as opposed to those containing SUF) are *grammaticalized* as a form expressing an answer to the Question Under Discussion (QUD, Roberts 1998; answers are, by default, pragmatically interpreted exhaustively, e.g., van Rooij and Schulz 2004). Given the availability of this grammaticalized form, SUF is *not* interpreted as an answer to the QUD proper, hence it is not exhaustive (Uegaki 2012).

Cross-linguistically, the account can be extended to any focus marked exclusively by word order and associated with relatively high levels of exhaustivity in languages where the 'focus word order' is the ordinary word order that is used in answers to *wh*-questions, signaling their status as an answer to the QUD.