

Focus-partitioning in Hindi-Urdu

The view from a low adverb

Jyoti Iyer

University of Massachusetts Amherst

TripleA-8, 23 June 2021

Today's talk

- Hindi-Urdu
 - ▶ Indo-European > Indo-Iranian > *Indo-Aryan*
 - ▶ South Asia (SA) as a linguistic area
 - ▶ SOV
 - ▶ Positional Focus
- Preverbal Focus position across many languages in SA
 - ▶ Hindi/Urdu: Butt & King (1996), Kidwai (1999)
 - ▶ Malayalam (*Dravidian*): Jayaseelan (2001)
 - ▶ Kutchi Gujarati (*Indo-Aryan*): Patel-Grosz & Beck (2014, 2019)
- Standard analysis of Focus in SA languages: There's a Focus projection FocP above VP; its single Spec,FocP is where the focused constituent in the sentence surfaces
- I'll look closely at Hindi-Urdu and show you that this analysis undergenerates the actual attested possibilities for positional Focus

Today's talk

- In order to see the undergeneration, you need:

Today's talk

- In order to see the undergeneration, you need:
 - ▶ More constituents that can be focused

Today's talk

- In order to see the undergeneration, you need:
 - ▶ More constituents that can be focused
 - ▶ Something focus-sensitive that can reveal effects of Focus in different places

Today's talk

- In order to see the undergeneration, you need:
 - ▶ More constituents that can be focused
 - ▶ Something focus-sensitive that can reveal effects of Focus in different places
 - ▶ Bhatt & Dayal (2020) use adverbial phrases and polar question particle *kyaa*

Today's talk

- In order to see the undergeneration, you need:
 - ▶ More constituents that can be focused
 - ▶ Something focus-sensitive that can reveal effects of Focus in different places
 - ▶ Bhatt & Dayal (2020) use adverbial phrases and polar question particle *kyaa*
 - ▶ My tools: Ditransitives and a focus-sensitive adverb meaning BACK

Today's talk: Claims

- Empirical claims:

Today's talk: Claims

- Empirical claims:
 - ▶ The position of *vaapas* 'back' determines the content of its presupposition

Today's talk: Claims

- Empirical claims:
 - ▶ The position of *vaapas* 'back' determines the content of its presupposition
 - ▶ *Focus non-neutral orders* have been thought of as restricted to cases where arguments appear in 'non-canonical' order...

Today's talk: Claims

- Empirical claims:

- ▶ The position of *vaapas* 'back' determines the content of its presupposition
- ▶ *Focus non-neutral orders* have been thought of as restricted to cases where arguments appear in 'non-canonical' order...
- ▶ ...I show that *focus non-neutral orders* can also arise when arguments appear in 'canonical' order, by varying the position of the adverb instead

Today's talk: Claims

- Analytical claims:

Today's talk: Claims

- Analytical claims:
 - ▶ Core property of different senses of BACK, stable across studied languages is that it operates on *paths of scalar change*
 - ★ Dutch: Zwarts (2019)
 - ★ Kutchi Gujarati: Patel-Grosz & Beck (2014, 2019)

Today's talk: Claims

- Analytical claims:
 - ▶ Core property of different senses of BACK, stable across studied languages is that it operates on *paths of scalar change*
 - ★ Dutch: Zwarts (2019)
 - ★ Kutchi Gujarati: Patel-Grosz & Beck (2014, 2019)
 - ▶ BACK is a focus-sensitive presupposition trigger

Today's talk: Claims

- Analytical claims:
 - ▶ Core property of different senses of BACK, stable across studied languages is that it operates on *paths of scalar change*
 - ★ Dutch: Zwarts (2019)
 - ★ Kutchi Gujarati: Patel-Grosz & Beck (2014, 2019)
 - ▶ BACK is a focus-sensitive presupposition trigger defined iff “there is a prior event with a path reverse to the asserted event”

Today's talk: Claims

- Analytical claims:
 - ▶ Core property of different senses of BACK, stable across studied languages is that it operates on *paths of scalar change*
 - ★ Dutch: Zwarts (2019)
 - ★ Kutchi Gujarati: Patel-Grosz & Beck (2014, 2019)
 - ▶ BACK is a focus-sensitive presupposition trigger defined iff “there is a prior event with a path reverse to the asserted event”
 - ▶ The precise event properties of the presupposed event can be very very different from the asserted event

Today's talk: Claims

- Analytical claims:
 - ▶ Core property of different senses of BACK, stable across studied languages is that it operates on *paths of scalar change*
 - ★ Dutch: Zwarts (2019)
 - ★ Kutchi Gujarati: Patel-Grosz & Beck (2014, 2019)
 - ▶ BACK is a focus-sensitive presupposition trigger defined iff “there is a prior event with a path reverse to the asserted event”
 - ▶ The precise event properties of the presupposed event can be very very different from the asserted event
 - ▶ The Hindi-Urdu facts about how the presupposition of *vaapas* ‘back’ varies with its position are explained by Focus-alternatives

Today's talk: Claims

- Analytical claims:
 - ▶ Core property of different senses of BACK, stable across studied languages is that it operates on *paths of scalar change*
 - ★ Dutch: Zwarts (2019)
 - ★ Kutchi Gujarati: Patel-Grosz & Beck (2014, 2019)
 - ▶ BACK is a focus-sensitive presupposition trigger defined iff “there is a prior event with a path reverse to the asserted event”
 - ▶ The precise event properties of the presupposed event can be very very different from the asserted event
 - ▶ The Hindi-Urdu facts about how the presupposition of *vaapas* ‘back’ varies with its position are explained by Focus-alternatives
 - ▶ The adverb *vaapas* partitions sentences such that a focused constituent must occur in the post-adverb “Focus zone”

Today's talk: Claims

- Analytical claims:
 - ▶ Core property of different senses of BACK, stable across studied languages is that it operates on *paths of scalar change*
 - ★ Dutch: Zwarts (2019)
 - ★ Kutchi Gujarati: Patel-Grosz & Beck (2014, 2019)
 - ▶ BACK is a focus-sensitive presupposition trigger defined iff “there is a prior event with a path reverse to the asserted event”
 - ▶ The precise event properties of the presupposed event can be very very different from the asserted event
 - ▶ The Hindi-Urdu facts about how the presupposition of *vaapas* ‘back’ varies with its position are explained by Focus-alternatives
 - ▶ The adverb *vaapas* partitions sentences such that a focused constituent must occur in the post-adverb “Focus zone”
- Open syntactic questions for further work

Setting a baseline: Neutral focus

- I'll use the term 'focus-neutral' as a catch-all for all sentences that *don't* have any instance of narrow Focus
- I deliberately avoid 'canonical word order' because it conventionally refers only to order of arguments
- Sentences that are focus-neutral
 - ▶ Can be uttered 'out of the blue'
 - ▶ Answer maximally broad questions like *What happened?*
 - ▶ In Hindi-Urdu have the arguments in 'canonical' order *SOV* (ditransitives *S IO DO V* which I'll abbrev. as *SIOV*)
- I'll often refer to 'focus-neutral order' to describe the word order of sentences that are focus-neutral by virtue of having the above properties

Focus- $\{\text{neutral}/\text{non-neutral}\}$ orders

- *Focus-neutral* orders can answer the question below; good out of the blue
- *Focus non-neutral* orders *can't* answer the question below; infelicitous out of the blue

(1) kya huaa?

what happen.PFV

‘What happened?’

maximally broad question

Focus- $\{\text{neutral}/\text{non-neutral}\}$ orders

- *Focus-neutral* orders can answer the question below; good out of the blue
- *Focus non-neutral* orders *can't* answer the question below; infelicitous out of the blue

(1) kya huaa? *maximally broad question*
what happen.PFV
'What happened?'

- *Transitive*

(2) raam kitaab laayaa hai *f-neutral, SOV*
Ram book bring.PFV be.PRES
'Ram has brought a/the book.'

Focus- $\{\text{neutral}/\text{non-neutral}\}$ orders

- *Focus-neutral* orders can answer the question below; good out of the blue
- *Focus non-neutral* orders *can't* answer the question below; infelicitous out of the blue

(1) kya huaa? *maximally broad question*
what happen.PFV
'What happened?'

- *Transitive*

(2) raam kitaab laayaa hai *f-neutral, SOV*
Ram book bring.PFV be.PRES
'Ram has brought a/the book.'

(3) #kitaab raam laayaa hai *f-non-neutral, OSV*
book Ram bring.PFV be.PRES
'It is Ram who has brought the book.'

Focus- $\{\text{neutral}/\text{non-neutral}\}$ orders

- *Focus-neutral* orders can answer the question below; good out of the blue
- *Focus non-neutral* orders *can't* answer the question below; infelicitous out of the blue

(1) kya huaa?

what happen.PFV

‘What happened?’

maximally broad question

Focus- $\{\text{neutral}/\text{non-neutral}\}$ orders

- *Focus-neutral* orders can answer the question below; good out of the blue
- *Focus non-neutral* orders *can't* answer the question below; infelicitous out of the blue

(1) kya huaa? *maximally broad question*
what happen.PFV
'What happened?'

- *Ditransitive*

(4) uma-ne ali-ko kitaab dii *f-neutral, SIOV*
Uma-ERG Ali-DAT book give.PFV
'Uma gave a/the book to Ali.'

Focus- $\{\text{neutral}/\text{non-neutral}\}$ orders

- *Focus-neutral* orders can answer the question below; good out of the blue
- *Focus non-neutral* orders *can't* answer the question below; infelicitous out of the blue

(1) kya huaa? *maximally broad question*
what happen.PFV
'What happened?'

- *Ditransitive*

(4) uma-ne ali-ko kitaab dii *f-neutral, SIOV*
Uma-ERG Ali-DAT book give.PFV
'Uma gave a/the book to Ali.'

(5) #uma-ne kitaab ali-ko dii *f-non-neutral, SIOV*
Uma-ERG book Ali-DAT give.PFV
'It is Ali that Uma gave the book to.'

Focus-non-neutral order \Rightarrow Argument scrambling

- I'll show you the old observation that *f-non-neutral* order correlates with the presence of narrow Focus on a constituent:

Focus-non-neutral order \Rightarrow Argument scrambling

- I'll show you the old observation that *f-non-neutral* order correlates with the presence of narrow Focus on a constituent:
- something is focused \iff word order fails focus-neutral test

Focus-non-neutral order \Rightarrow Argument scrambling

- I'll show you the old observation that *f-non-neutral* order correlates with the presence of narrow Focus on a constituent:
- something is focused \iff word order fails focus-neutral test
- The primary pragmatic function of any marked word order is the introduction of material that is not already GIVEN in the sense of Schwarzschild (1999)

Focus-non-neutral order \Rightarrow Argument scrambling

- I'll show you the old observation that *f-non-neutral* order correlates with the presence of narrow Focus on a constituent:
- something is focused \iff word order fails focus-neutral test
- The primary pragmatic function of any marked word order is the introduction of material that is not already GIVEN in the sense of Schwarzschild (1999)
- Non-GIVEN material doesn't have to be discourse-new, it can be stuff from the common ground used contrastively

Focus-non-neutral order \Rightarrow Argument scrambling

- I'll show you the old observation that *f-non-neutral* order correlates with the presence of narrow Focus on a constituent:
- something is focused \iff word order fails focus-neutral test
- The primary pragmatic function of any marked word order is the introduction of material that is not already GIVEN in the sense of Schwarzschild (1999)
- Non-GIVEN material doesn't have to be discourse-new, it can be stuff from the common ground used contrastively
- Previous scholarship has generally treated *f-non-neutral* orders as *synonymous* with argument scrambling (Kidwai 1999), but I will show you that there are other ways to have *f-non-neutral* orders

Focus-non-neutral order \Rightarrow Argument scrambling

- I'll show you the old observation that *f-non-neutral* order correlates with the presence of narrow Focus on a constituent:
- something is focused \iff word order fails focus-neutral test
- The primary pragmatic function of any marked word order is the introduction of material that is not already GIVEN in the sense of Schwarzschild (1999)
- Non-GIVEN material doesn't have to be discourse-new, it can be stuff from the common ground used contrastively
- Previous scholarship has generally treated *f-non-neutral* orders as *synonymous* with argument scrambling (Kidwai 1999), but I will show you that there are other ways to have *f-non-neutral* orders
- For now let's look at the *known* facts: *when there is argument scrambling, the constituent that appears in the immediately preverbal position gets a Focus-interpretation*

Focus non-neutral order and preverbal Focus position

- This sentence with *f-non-neutral* order has Focus-marking as below

Focus non-neutral order and preverbal Focus position

- This sentence with *f-non-neutral* order has Focus-marking as below

(6) kitaab raam laayaa thaa *non-neutral*
book Ram bring-PFV be.PST
'It is Ram who brought the book.'

Focus non-neutral order and preverbal Focus position

- This sentence with *f-non-neutral* order has Focus-marking as below

(6) kitaab raam laayaa thaa *non-neutral*
book Ram bring-PFV be.PST
'It is Ram who brought the book.'

(7) kitaab [RAAM]_F laayaa thaa *preverbal Focus*
book Ram bring-PFV be.PST
'It is Ram who brought the book.'
→ {¬ *Shyam brought the book*, ¬ *Sita brought the book*,...}

Focus non-neutral order and preverbal Focus position

- This sentence with *f-non-neutral* order has Focus-marking as below

(6) kitaab raam laayaa thaa *non-neutral*
book Ram bring-PFV be.PST
'It is Ram who brought the book.'

(7) kitaab [RAAM]_F laayaa thaa *preverbal Focus*
book Ram bring-PFV be.PST
'It is Ram who brought the book.'
→ {¬ *Shyam brought the book*, ¬ *Sita brought the book*,...}

- How can we tell?
 - ▶ No other constituent can be targeted by a question

Focus non-neutral order and preverbal Focus position

- Only preverbal constituent can be targeted by a question

Focus non-neutral order and preverbal Focus position

- Only preverbal constituent can be targeted by a question

(7) kitaab [RAAM]_F laayaa thaa *preverbal Focus*
book Ram bring-PFV be.PST
'It is Ram who brought the book.'
→ {¬ *Shyam brought the book*, ¬ *Sita brought the book*,...}

Focus non-neutral order and preverbal Focus position

- Only preverbal constituent can be targeted by a question

(9) (kaun) kitaab (kaun) laayaa thaa?
(who) book (who) bring-PFV be.PST
'Who brought the book?'

= {*Shyam brought the book, Sita brought the book,...*}

(7) kitaab [RAAM]_F laayaa thaa *preverbal Focus*
book Ram bring-PFV be.PST
'It is Ram who brought the book.'

→ { \neg *Shyam brought the book, \neg Sita brought the book,...*}

Focus non-neutral order and preverbal Focus position

- Only preverbal constituent can be targeted by a question

(8) raam **kyaa** laayaa thaa? Q about DO
Ram what bring-PFV be.PST
'What did Ram bring?'
= {*Ram brought food, Ram brought flowers,...*}

(7) #kitaab [**RAAM**]_F laayaa thaa preverbal Focus
book Ram bring-PFV be.PST
'It is Ram who brought the book.'
→ {*¬ Shyam brought the book, ¬ Sita brought the book,...*}

Focus non-neutral order and preverbal Focus position

- Same with ditransitives: only preverbal constituent can be questioned

Focus non-neutral order and preverbal Focus position

- Same with ditransitives: only preverbal constituent can be questioned

(12) uma-ne kitaab [ALI-KO]_F dii *preverbal Focus*
Uma-ERG book Ali-DAT give.PFV
'It is Ali that Uma gave the book to.'
→ {¬ Uma gave book to U, ¬ Uma gave book to V,...}

Focus non-neutral order and preverbal Focus position

- Same with ditransitives: only preverbal constituent can be questioned

(11) uma-ne (kis-ko) kitaab (kis-ko) dii?
Uma-ERG (who-DAT) book (who-DAT) give.PFV
'Who did Uma give the book to?'
= {*Uma gave book to S, Uma gave book to T,...*}

(12) uma-ne kitaab [ALI-KO]_F dii *preverbal Focus*
Uma-ERG book Ali-DAT give.PFV
'It is Ali that Uma gave the book to.'
→ { \neg *Uma gave book to U, \neg Uma gave book to V,...*}

Focus non-neutral order and preverbal Focus position

- Same with ditransitives: only preverbal constituent can be questioned

(10) uma-ne ali-ko **kyaa** diyaa?

Uma-ERG Ali-DAT what give.PFV

‘What did Uma give Ali?’

= {*Uma gave Ali food, Uma gave Ali flowers,...*}

(12) #uma-ne kitaab [**ALI-KO**]_F dii

preverbal Focus

Uma-ERG book Ali-DAT give.PFV

‘It is Ali that Uma gave the book to.’

→ { \neg *Uma gave book to U, \neg Uma gave book to V,...*}

Summary so far

- When there is *focus non-neutral* order, it is obligatory for the sentence to contain a constituent that is focused

Summary so far

- When there is *focus non-neutral* order, it is obligatory for the sentence to contain a constituent that is focused
- You can't utter sentences with *f-non-neutral* order in 'out of the blue' contexts because of this Focus they obligatorily contain: it would be hard to figure out what specific proposition to accommodate such that the Focus is felicitous

Summary so far

- What is already known about Hindi-Urdu:

Summary so far

- What is already known about Hindi-Urdu:
 - ▶ *Argument scrambling has been taken to be the only way to get f-non-neutral order*

Summary so far

- What is already known about Hindi-Urdu:
 - ▶ *Argument scrambling has been taken to be the only way to get f-non-neutral order*
 - ▶ *When there is argument scrambling, the constituent that appears in the immediately preverbal position gets a Focus-interpretation*

Summary so far

- What is already known about Hindi-Urdu:
 - ▶ *Argument scrambling has been taken to be the only way to get f-non-neutral order*
 - ▶ *When there is argument scrambling, the constituent that appears in the immediately preverbal position gets a Focus-interpretation*
- New facts that I will show you:

Summary so far

- What is already known about Hindi-Urdu:
 - ▶ *Argument scrambling has been taken to be the only way to get f-non-neutral order*
 - ▶ *When there is argument scrambling, the constituent that appears in the immediately preverbal position gets a Focus-interpretation*
- New facts that I will show you:
 - ▶ *F-non-neutral word orders are possible even when all the arguments seem to be in their canonical positions...*

Summary so far

- What is already known about Hindi-Urdu:
 - ▶ *Argument scrambling has been taken to be the only way to get f-non-neutral order*
 - ▶ *When there is argument scrambling, the constituent that appears in the immediately preverbal position gets a Focus-interpretation*
- New facts that I will show you:
 - ▶ *F-non-neutral word orders are possible even when all the arguments seem to be in their canonical positions...*
 - ▶ *...by varying the position of a focus-sensitive element like an adverb*

Summary so far

- What is already known about Hindi-Urdu:
 - ▶ *Argument scrambling has been taken to be the only way to get f-non-neutral order*
 - ▶ *When there is argument scrambling, the constituent that appears in the immediately preverbal position gets a Focus-interpretation*
- New facts that I will show you:
 - ▶ *F-non-neutral word orders are possible even when all the arguments seem to be in their canonical positions...*
 - ▶ *...by varying the position of a focus-sensitive element like an adverb*
 - ▶ *When the position of the focus-sensitive element leads to a f-non-neutral order, **any** constituent **following** the adverb can get a Focus-interpretation...*

Summary so far

- What is already known about Hindi-Urdu:
 - ▶ *Argument scrambling has been taken to be the only way to get f-non-neutral order*
 - ▶ *When there is argument scrambling, the constituent that appears in the immediately preverbal position gets a Focus-interpretation*
- New facts that I will show you:
 - ▶ *F-non-neutral word orders are possible even when all the arguments seem to be in their canonical positions...*
 - ▶ *...by varying the position of a focus-sensitive element like an adverb*
 - ▶ *When the position of the focus-sensitive element leads to a f-non-neutral order, **any** constituent **following** the adverb can get a Focus-interpretation...*
 - ▶ *...and **no** constituent **preceding** the adverb can*

Summary so far

- What is already known about Hindi-Urdu:
 - ▶ *Argument scrambling has been taken to be the only way to get f-non-neutral order*
 - ▶ *When there is argument scrambling, the constituent that appears in the immediately preverbal position gets a Focus-interpretation*
- New facts that I will show you:
 - ▶ *F-non-neutral word orders are possible even when all the arguments seem to be in their canonical positions...*
 - ▶ *...by varying the position of a focus-sensitive element like an adverb*
 - ▶ *When the position of the focus-sensitive element leads to a f-non-neutral order, **any** constituent **following** the adverb can get a Focus-interpretation...*
 - ▶ *...and **no** constituent **preceding** the adverb can*

Summary so far

- FocP analysis:
 - ▶ Is that the linearly preverbal position reflects the structural Specifier of FocP above VP

Summary so far

- FocP analysis:
 - ▶ Is that the linearly preverbal position reflects the structural Specifier of FocP above VP
 - ▶ I'll show you that the preverbal position is only *one* of *many* places that can a focused constituent can be

Summary so far

- FocP analysis:
 - ▶ Is that the linearly preverbal position reflects the structural Specifier of FocP above VP
 - ▶ I'll show you that the preverbal position is only *one* of *many* places that can a focused constituent can be
 - ▶ The FocP analysis cannot account for the range of orders possible with the adverb

Summary so far

- FocP analysis:
 - ▶ Is that the linearly preverbal position reflects the structural Specifier of FocP above VP
 - ▶ I'll show you that the preverbal position is only *one* of *many* places that a focused constituent can be
 - ▶ The FocP analysis cannot account for the range of orders possible with the adverb
- The adverb I use in these examples is *vaapas* 'back', let's dive in

BACK: basics

BACK: basics

- (13) biinaa **vaapas** chalii gayii
Bina back walk.PFV go.PFV
'Bina went **back**.'

BACK: basics

- (13) biinaa **vaapas** chalii gayii
Bina back walk.PFV go.PFV
'Bina went **back**.'
- (14) biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
'Bina gave Ali the key **back**.'

BACK: basics

- (13) biinaa **vaapas** chalii gayii
Bina back walk.PFV go.PFV
'Bina went **back**.'
- (14) biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
'Bina gave Ali the key **back**.'
- (15) TukRaa **vaapas** alag ho rahaa hai
piece back separate be stay.PFV be.PRES
'The piece is coming **back** apart.'

BACK: basics

- (13) biinaa **vaapas** chalii gayii SPATIAL PATH
Bina back walk.PFV go.PFV
'Bina went **back**.'
- (14) biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
'Bina gave Ali the key **back**.'
- (15) TukRaa **vaapas** alag ho rahaa hai
piece back separate be stay.PFV be.PRES
'The piece is coming **back** apart.'

BACK: basics

- (13) biinaa **vaapas** chalii gayii SPATIAL PATH
Bina back walk.PFV go.PFV
'Bina went **back**.'
- (14) biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii ACTION PATH
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
'Bina gave Ali the key **back**.'
- (15) TukRaa **vaapas** alag ho rahaa hai
piece back separate be stay.PFV be.PRES
'The piece is coming **back** apart.'

BACK: basics

- (13) biinaa **vaapas** chalii gayii SPATIAL PATH
Bina back walk.PFV go.PFV
'Bina went **back**.'
- (14) biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii ACTION PATH
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
'Bina gave Ali the key **back**.'
- (15) TukRaa **vaapas** alag ho rahaa hai SCALAR PATH
piece back separate be stay.PFV be.PRES
'The piece is coming **back** apart.'

BACK: basics

- (13) biinaa **vaapas** chalii gayii
Bina back walk.PFV go.PFV
'Bina went **back**.'
= Bina moved away from some place x
- (14) biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
'Bina gave Ali the key **back**.'
- (15) TukRaa **vaapas** alag ho rahaa hai
piece back separate be stay.PFV be.PRES
'The piece is coming **back** apart.'

BACK: basics

- (13) biinaa **vaapas** chalii gayii
Bina back walk.PFV go.PFV
'Bina went **back**.'
= Bina moved away from some place x (and she had gone to x earlier)
- (14) biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
'Bina gave Ali the key **back**.'
- (15) TukRaa **vaapas** alag ho rahaa hai
piece back separate be stay.PFV be.PRES
'The piece is coming **back** apart.'

BACK: basics

- (13) biinaa **vaapas** chalii gayii
Bina back walk.PFV go.PFV
'Bina went **back**.'
= Bina moved away from some place x (and she had gone to x earlier)
- (14) biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
'Bina gave Ali the key **back**.'
= Bina gave Ali the key
- (15) TukRaa **vaapas** alag ho rahaa hai
piece back separate be stay.PFV be.PRES
'The piece is coming **back** apart.'

BACK: basics

- (13) biinaa **vaapas** chalii gayii
Bina back walk.PFV go.PFV
'Bina went **back**.'
= Bina moved away from some place x (and she had gone to x earlier)
- (14) biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
'Bina gave Ali the key **back**.'
= Bina gave Ali the key (and Ali had given Bina the key earlier)
- (15) TukRaa **vaapas** alag ho rahaa hai
piece back separate be stay.PFV be.PRES
'The piece is coming **back** apart.'

BACK: basics

- (13) biinaa **vaapas** chalii gayii
Bina back walk.PFV go.PFV
'Bina went **back**.'
= Bina moved away from some place x (and she had gone to x earlier)
- (14) biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
'Bina gave Ali the key **back**.'
= Bina gave Ali the key (and Ali had given Bina the key earlier)
- (15) TukRaa **vaapas** alag ho rahaa hai
piece back separate be stay.PFV be.PRES
'The piece is coming **back** apart.'
= The piece is moving away from being attached

BACK: basics

- (13) biinaa **vaapas** chalii gayii
Bina back walk.PFV go.PFV
'Bina went **back**.'
= Bina moved away from some place x (and she had gone to x earlier)
- (14) biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
'Bina gave Ali the key **back**.'
= Bina gave Ali the key (and Ali had given Bina the key earlier)
- (15) TukRaa **vaapas** alag ho rahaa hai
piece back separate be stay.PFV be.PRES
'The piece is coming **back** apart.'
= The piece is moving away from being attached (and it had gone from separate to attached earlier)

BACK: How does it ‘find’ the correct presupposition?

- BACK (examples modelled on Zwarts 2019 for Dutch)

BACK: How does it ‘find’ the correct presupposition?

- BACK (examples modelled on Zwarts 2019 for Dutch)

(16) Ada cycled to school. She walked back.

BACK: How does it ‘find’ the correct presupposition?

- BACK (examples modelled on Zwarts 2019 for Dutch)

(16) Ada cycled to school. She walked back.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—

BACK: How does it ‘find’ the correct presupposition?

- BACK (examples modelled on Zwarts 2019 for Dutch)

(16) Ada cycled to school. She walked back.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected)

BACK: How does it ‘find’ the correct presupposition?

- BACK (examples modelled on Zwarts 2019 for Dutch)

(16) Ada cycled to school. She walked back.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:

BACK: How does it ‘find’ the correct presupposition?

- BACK (examples modelled on Zwarts 2019 for Dutch)
 - (16) Ada cycled to school. She walked back.
⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:how the path is being traversed.
 - (17) Bob emigrated in the fifties. His family came back to Holland recently.

BACK: How does it ‘find’ the correct presupposition?

- BACK (examples modelled on Zwarts 2019 for Dutch)

(16) Ada cycled to school. She walked back.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:how the path is being traversed.

(17) Bob emigrated in the fifties. His family came back to Holland recently.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—

BACK: How does it ‘find’ the correct presupposition?

- BACK (examples modelled on Zwarts 2019 for Dutch)

(16) Ada cycled to school. She walked back.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:how the path is being traversed.

(17) Bob emigrated in the fifties. His family came back to Holland recently.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected)

BACK: How does it ‘find’ the correct presupposition?

- BACK (examples modelled on Zwarts 2019 for Dutch)

(16) Ada cycled to school. She walked back.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:how the path is being traversed.

(17) Bob emigrated in the fifties. His family came back to Holland recently.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:

BACK: How does it ‘find’ the correct presupposition?

- BACK (examples modelled on Zwarts 2019 for Dutch)
 - (16) Ada cycled to school. She walked back.
⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:how the path is being traversed.
 - (17) Bob emigrated in the fifties. His family came back to Holland recently.
⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:who is traversing that path.
 - (18) I gave the cashier a twenty and he handed me back some change.

BACK: How does it ‘find’ the correct presupposition?

- BACK (examples modelled on Zwarts 2019 for Dutch)

(16) Ada cycled to school. She walked back.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:how the path is being traversed.

(17) Bob emigrated in the fifties. His family came back to Holland recently.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:who is traversing that path.

(18) I gave the cashier a twenty and he handed me back some change.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse action path—

BACK: How does it ‘find’ the correct presupposition?

- BACK (examples modelled on Zwarts 2019 for Dutch)

- (16) Ada cycled to school. She walked back.
⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:how the path is being traversed.
- (17) Bob emigrated in the fifties. His family came back to Holland recently.
⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:who is traversing that path.
- (18) I gave the cashier a twenty and he handed me back some change.
⇒ The earlier event has the reverse action path—(expected)

BACK: How does it ‘find’ the correct presupposition?

- BACK (examples modelled on Zwarts 2019 for Dutch)

(16) Ada cycled to school. She walked back.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:how the path is being traversed.

(17) Bob emigrated in the fifties. His family came back to Holland recently.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:who is traversing that path.

(18) I gave the cashier a twenty and he handed me back some change.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse action path—(expected), but also an additional difference:

BACK: How does it ‘find’ the correct presupposition?

- BACK (examples modelled on Zwarts 2019 for Dutch)

- (16) Ada cycled to school. She walked back.
⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:how the path is being traversed.
- (17) Bob emigrated in the fifties. His family came back to Holland recently.
⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:who is traversing that path.
- (18) I gave the cashier a twenty and he handed me back some change.
⇒ The earlier event has the reverse action path—(expected), but also an additional difference:what is the ‘content’ of that action path in terms of an object traversing it.

BACK: How does it ‘find’ the correct presupposition?

- BACK (examples modelled on Zwarts 2019 for Dutch)

(16) Ada cycled to school. She walked back.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:how the path is being traversed.

(17) Bob emigrated in the fifties. His family came back to Holland recently.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:who is traversing that path.

(18) I gave the cashier a twenty and he handed me back some change.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse action path—(expected), but also an additional difference:what is the ‘content’ of that action path in terms of an object traversing it.

- AGAIN

BACK: How does it ‘find’ the correct presupposition?

- BACK (examples modelled on Zwarts 2019 for Dutch)

(16) Ada cycled to school. She walked back.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:how the path is being traversed.

(17) Bob emigrated in the fifties. His family came back to Holland recently.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:who is traversing that path.

(18) I gave the cashier a twenty and he handed me back some change.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse action path—(expected), but also an additional difference:what is the ‘content’ of that action path in terms of an object traversing it.

- AGAIN

(19) Ada went to school yesterday.

BACK: How does it ‘find’ the correct presupposition?

- BACK (examples modelled on Zwarts 2019 for Dutch)

(16) Ada cycled to school. She walked back.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:how the path is being traversed.

(17) Bob emigrated in the fifties. His family came back to Holland recently.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:who is traversing that path.

(18) I gave the cashier a twenty and he handed me back some change.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse action path—(expected), but also an additional difference:what is the ‘content’ of that action path in terms of an object traversing it.

- AGAIN

(19) Ada went to school yesterday.#She went to the park again today.

BACK: How does it ‘find’ the correct presupposition?

- BACK (examples modelled on Zwarts 2019 for Dutch)

(16) Ada cycled to school. She walked back.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:how the path is being traversed.

(17) Bob emigrated in the fifties. His family came back to Holland recently.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:who is traversing that path.

(18) I gave the cashier a twenty and he handed me back some change.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse action path—(expected), but also an additional difference:what is the ‘content’ of that action path in terms of an object traversing it.

- AGAIN

(19) Ada went to school yesterday.#She went to the park again today.

⇒ The earlier event is identical to the asserted event (expected due to the semantics), and no additional difference is tolerated.

BACK: How does it ‘find’ the correct presupposition?

- BACK (examples modelled on Zwarts 2019 for Dutch)

(16) Ada cycled to school. She walked back.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:how the path is being traversed.

(17) Bob emigrated in the fifties. His family came back to Holland recently.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:who is traversing that path.

(18) I gave the cashier a twenty and he handed me back some change.

⇒ The earlier event has the reverse action path—(expected), but also an additional difference:what is the ‘content’ of that action path in terms of an object traversing it.

- AGAIN

(19) Ada went to school yesterday.#She went to the park again today.

⇒ The earlier event is identical to the asserted event (expected due to the semantics), and no additional difference is tolerated.

(20) Ada went to school yesterday.

BACK: How does it ‘find’ the correct presupposition?

- BACK (examples modelled on Zwarts 2019 for Dutch)

- (16) Ada cycled to school. She walked back.
⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:how the path is being traversed.
- (17) Bob emigrated in the fifties. His family came back to Holland recently.
⇒ The earlier event has the reverse spatial path—(expected), but also an additional difference:who is traversing that path.
- (18) I gave the cashier a twenty and he handed me back some change.
⇒ The earlier event has the reverse action path—(expected), but also an additional difference:what is the ‘content’ of that action path in terms of an object traversing it.

- AGAIN

- (19) Ada went to school yesterday.#She went to the park again today.
⇒ The earlier event is identical to the asserted event (expected due to the semantics), and no additional difference is tolerated.
- (20) Ada went to school yesterday.#She went to [THE PARK]_F again today.

A rich example found in the wild

An amazing story is going around Instagram involving a Ukrainian wood pipe carver by the name of Max Bogdan and his admiration for Arnold Schwarzenegger and the *Terminator* movie franchise. The talented woodcarver set out to craft a briar pipe of the damage time-traveling cyborg assassin (in great detail) along with a liquid metal T-1000 pipe tamper.

After finishing his masterpiece, Bogdan posted the finished pipe to Reddit to celebrate the Governator's 73rd birthday. Well, the long shot paid off as Arnie himself chimed in on the post asking to purchase the pipe from the artist. After learning that it was actually a gift for him all along, *Schwarzenegger returned the gesture of kindness by agreeing to send back a signed photo of himself smoking from the hand-carved pipe.* And now, that day has come. Taking to Instagram, Bogdan has just shown off, as promised, a signed photo of Arnold Schwarzenegger smoking from his Terminator pipe.

<https://hypebeast.com/2020/9/>

[arnold-schwarzenegger-terminator-2-t-1000-briar-pipe-news](https://hypebeast.com/2020/9/arnold-schwarzenegger-terminator-2-t-1000-briar-pipe-news)

Why is *vaapas* interesting?

- *vaapas* ‘back’ is interesting because it can occur in a number of orders in a sentence...

Why is *vaapas* interesting?

- *vaapas* ‘back’ is interesting because it can occur in a number of orders in a sentence...
- ...each of which corresponds to different presupposition(s)

Why is *vaapas* interesting?

- *vaapas* ‘back’ is interesting because it can occur in a number of orders in a sentence...
- ...each of which corresponds to different presupposition(s)
- Here’s the ditransitive (ACTION PATH) case to illustrate; first without *vaapas*

Why is *vaapas* interesting?

- *vaapas* ‘back’ is interesting because it can occur in a number of orders in a sentence...
- ...each of which corresponds to different presupposition(s)
- Here’s the ditransitive (ACTION PATH) case to illustrate; first without *vaapas*

(21) biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii de dii
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key give give.PFV
‘Bina gave Ali the key.’

Why is *vaapas* interesting?

- *vaapas* ‘back’ is interesting because it can occur in a number of orders in a sentence...
- ...each of which corresponds to different presupposition(s)
- Here’s the ditransitive (ACTION PATH) case to illustrate; first without *vaapas*

(21) biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii de dii
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key give give.PFV
‘Bina gave Ali the key.’

(22) **vaapas** biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii de dii
back Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key give give.PFV
≈ ‘Bina gave Ali key **back**.’

Why is *vaapas* interesting?

- *vaapas* ‘back’ is interesting because it can occur in a number of orders in a sentence...
- ...each of which corresponds to different presupposition(s)
- Here’s the ditransitive (ACTION PATH) case to illustrate; first without *vaapas*

(21) biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii de dii
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key give give.PFV
‘Bina gave Ali the key.’

(22) biinaa-ne **vaapas** ali-ko caabii de dii
Bina-ERG back Ali-DAT key give give.PFV
≈ ‘Bina gave Ali key **back**.’

Why is *vaapas* interesting?

- *vaapas* ‘back’ is interesting because it can occur in a number of orders in a sentence...
- ...each of which corresponds to different presupposition(s)
- Here’s the ditransitive (ACTION PATH) case to illustrate; first without *vaapas*

(21) biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii de dii
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key give give.PFV
‘Bina gave Ali the key.’

(22) biinaa-ne ali-ko **vaapas** caabii de dii
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT back key give give.PFV
≈ ‘Bina gave Ali key **back**.’

Why is *vaapas* interesting?

- *vaapas* ‘back’ is interesting because it can occur in a number of orders in a sentence...
- ...each of which corresponds to different presupposition(s)
- Here’s the ditransitive (ACTION PATH) case to illustrate; first without *vaapas*

(21) biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii de dii
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key give give.PFV
‘Bina gave Ali the key.’

(22) biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
≈ ‘Bina gave Ali key **back**.’

Why is *vaapas* interesting?

- *vaapas* ‘back’ is interesting because it can occur in a number of orders in a sentence...
- ...each of which corresponds to different presupposition(s)
- Here’s the ditransitive (ACTION PATH) case to illustrate; first without *vaapas*

(21) biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii de dii
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key give give.PFV
‘Bina gave Ali the key.’

(22) biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
≈ ‘Bina gave Ali key **back**.’

- Only this order is focus-neutral; in all other orders of *vaapas* an instance of Focus is obligatory

Focus- $\{\text{neutral}/\text{non-neutral}\}$ orders with *vaapas*

- (23) kyaa huaa?
what happen.PFV
'What happened?'

all responses are canonical SIOV

Focus- $\{\text{neutral}/\text{non-neutral}\}$ orders with *vaapas*

(23) kyaa huaa?

what happen.PFV

‘What happened?’

all responses are canonical SIOV

- a. biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
‘Bina gave Ali the key back.’

f-neutral

Focus- $\{\text{neutral}/\text{non-neutral}\}$ orders with *vaapas*

(23) kyaa huaa? *all responses are canonical SIOV*

what happen.PFV

‘What happened?’

a. biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii *f-neutral*

Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV

‘Bina gave Ali the key back.’

b. #biinaa-ne ali-ko **vaapas** caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*

Bina-ERG Ali-DAT back key give give.PFV

Focus- $\{\text{neutral}/\text{non-neutral}\}$ orders with *vaapas*

(23) kyaa huaa?

all responses are canonical SIOV

what happen.PFV

‘What happened?’

- a. biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii *f-neutral*
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
‘Bina gave Ali the key back.’
- b.#biinaa-ne ali-ko **vaapas** caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT back key give give.PFV
- c.#biinaa-ne **vaapas** ali-ko caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*
Bina-ERG back Ali-DAT key give give.PFV

Focus- $\{\text{neutral}/\text{non-neutral}\}$ orders with *vaapas*

(23) kyaa huaa?

all responses are canonical SIOV

what happen.PFV

‘What happened?’

- a. biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii *f-neutral*
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
‘Bina gave Ali the key back.’
- b. #biinaa-ne ali-ko **vaapas** caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT back key give give.PFV
- c. #biinaa-ne **vaapas** ali-ko caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*
Bina-ERG back Ali-DAT key give give.PFV
- d. #**vaapas** biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*
back Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key give give.PFV

Focus- $\{\text{neutral}/\text{non-neutral}\}$ orders with *vaapas*

(23) kyaa huaa? *all responses are canonical SIOV*
what happen.PFV
'What happened?'

a. biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii *f-neutral*
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
'Bina gave Ali the key back.'

b. #biinaa-ne ali-ko **vaapas** caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT back key give give.PFV

c. #biinaa-ne **vaapas** ali-ko caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*
Bina-ERG back Ali-DAT key give give.PFV

d. #**vaapas** biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*
back Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key give give.PFV

- *vaapas* yields focus-neutral sentences only when it's in preverbal position

Focus- $\{\text{neutral}/\text{non-neutral}\}$ orders with *vaapas*

(23) kyaa huaa? *all responses are canonical SIOV*

what happen.PFV

‘What happened?’

a. biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii *f-neutral*

Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV

‘Bina gave Ali the key back.’

b.#biinaa-ne ali-ko **vaapas** caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*

Bina-ERG Ali-DAT back key give give.PFV

c.#biinaa-ne **vaapas** ali-ko caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*

Bina-ERG back Ali-DAT key give give.PFV

d.#**vaapas** biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*

back Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key give give.PFV

- *vaapas* yields focus-neutral sentences only ~~when it's in preverbal position~~ if there's nothing to F-mark after it

Focus- $\{\text{neutral}/\text{non-neutral}\}$ orders with *vaapas*

(23) kyaa huaa? *all responses are canonical SIOV*

what happen.PFV

‘What happened?’

a. biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii *f-neutral*

Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV

‘Bina gave Ali the key back.’

b.#biinaa-ne ali-ko **vaapas** caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*

Bina-ERG Ali-DAT back key give give.PFV

c.#biinaa-ne **vaapas** ali-ko caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*

Bina-ERG back Ali-DAT key give give.PFV

d.#**vaapas** biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*

back Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key give give.PFV

- *vaapas* yields focus-neutral sentences only ~~when it's in preverbal position~~ if there's nothing to F-mark after it
- Let's zoom in on just one of the *f-non-neutral* cases

Focus & *vaapas*: Where is difference allowed?

- b. benu-ne **vaapas** anu-ko caabii dii
Benu-ERG back Anu-DAT key give.PFV
'...Benu gave Anu a key back.'

Focus & *vaapas*: Where is difference allowed?

- (24) a. ek din anu-ne benu-ko taalaa diyaa. (baad meN...)
one day Anu-ERG Benu-DAT lock give.PFV later in
'One day Anu gave Benu a lock. (Later...)'
- b. benu-ne **vaapas** anu-ko caabii dii *post-vaapas*
Benu-ERG back Anu-DAT key give.PFV
'...Benu gave Anu a key back.'

Focus & *vaapas*: Where is difference allowed?

- (24) a. ek din anu-ne benu-ko taalaa diyaa. (baad meN...)
one day Anu-ERG Benu-DAT lock give.PFV later in
'One day Anu gave Benu a lock. (Later...)'
- b. benu-ne **vaapas** anu-ko caabii dii *post-vaapas*
Benu-ERG back Anu-DAT key give.PFV
'...Benu gave Anu a key back.'
- c. benu-ne **vaapas** alisha-ko taalaa diyaa *post-vaapas*
Benu-ERG back Alisha-DAT lock give.PFV
'...Benu gave Alisha a lock back.'

Focus & *vaapas*: Where is difference allowed?

- (24) a. ek din anu-ne benu-ko taalaa diyaa. (baad meN...)
one day Anu-ERG Benu-DAT lock give.PFV later in
'One day Anu gave Benu a lock. (Later...)'
- b. benu-ne **vaapas** anu-ko caabii dii *post-vaapas*
Benu-ERG back Anu-DAT key give.PFV
'...Benu gave Anu a key back.'
- c. benu-ne **vaapas** alisha-ko taalaa diyaa *post-vaapas*
Benu-ERG back Alisha-DAT lock give.PFV
'...Benu gave Alisha a lock back.'
- d. # riju-ne **vaapas** alisha-ko taalaa diyaa *#pre-vaapas*
Riju-ERG back Alisha-DAT lock give.PFV
'...Riju gave Alisha a lock back.'

Focus & *vaapas*: Where is difference allowed?

- (24) a. ek din anu-ne benu-ko taalaa diyaa. (baad meN...)
one day Anu-ERG Benu-DAT lock give.PFV later in
'One day Anu gave Benu a lock. (Later...)'
- b. benu-ne **vaapas** anu-ko caabii dii *post-vaapas*
Benu-ERG back Anu-DAT key give.PFV
'...Benu gave Anu a key back.'
- c. benu-ne **vaapas** alisha-ko taalaa diyaa *post-vaapas*
Benu-ERG back Alisha-DAT lock give.PFV
'...Benu gave Alisha a lock back.'
- d.# riju-ne **vaapas** alisha-ko taalaa diyaa *#pre-vaapas*
Riju-ERG back Alisha-DAT lock give.PFV
'...Riju gave Alisha a lock back.'
- e.# benu-ne **vaapas** anu-ko taalaa diyaa
Benu-ERG Anu-DAT back lock give.PFV
Identity is *prohibited* due to the *f-non-neutral* order that require something to be non-GIVEN

Other tests for post-*vaapas* zone

- Following Bhatt & Dayal (2020) if a constituent is “open to challenge” (i.e. can create F-alternatives), it is focused

Other tests for post-*vaapas* zone

- Following Bhatt & Dayal (2020) if a constituent is “open to challenge” (i.e. can create F-alternatives), it is focused
- Same result: The focused constituent can be anywhere after *vaapas*—not before

Other tests for post-*vaapas* zone

- Following Bhatt & Dayal (2020) if a constituent is “open to challenge” (i.e. can create F-alternatives), it is focused
- Same result: The focused constituent can be anywhere after *vaapas*—not before

(25) biinaa-ne **vaapas** ali-ko taalaa diyaa↑
Bina-ERG back Ali-DAT lock give.PFV
‘Did Bina give Ali a lock back...’

Other tests for post-*vaapas* zone

- Following Bhatt & Dayal (2020) if a constituent is “open to challenge” (i.e. can create F-alternatives), it is focused
- Same result: The focused constituent can be anywhere after *vaapas*—not before

(25) biinaa-ne **vaapas** ali-ko **taalaa** diyaa_↑
Bina-ERG back Ali-DAT lock give.PFV
‘Did Bina give Ali a lock back...?’

- a. ya **lifaafaa**?
or envelope
‘or an envelope?’

Other tests for post-*vaapas* zone

- Following Bhatt & Dayal (2020) if a constituent is “open to challenge” (i.e. can create F-alternatives), it is focused
- Same result: The focused constituent can be anywhere after *vaapas*—not before

(25) biinaa-ne **vaapas** ali-ko taalaa diyaa_↑
Bina-ERG back Ali-DAT lock give.PFV
‘Did Bina give Ali a lock back...?’

- a. ya lifaafaa?
or envelope
‘or an envelope?’
- b. ya arjun-ko?
or Arjun-DAT
‘or to Arjun?’

Other tests for post-*vaapas* zone

- Following Bhatt & Dayal (2020) if a constituent is “open to challenge” (i.e. can create F-alternatives), it is focused
- Same result: The focused constituent can be anywhere after *vaapas*—not before

(25) **biinaa-ne vaapas** ali-ko taalaa diyaa_↑
Bina-ERG back Ali-DAT lock give.PFV
‘Did Bina give Ali a lock back...?’

a. ya lifaafaa?
or envelope
‘or an envelope?’

b. ya arjun-ko?
or Arjun-DAT
‘or to Arjun?’

c. #ya **bipaasha-ne**?
or Bipasha-ERG
‘or did Bipasha?’

Other tests for post-*vaapas* zone

- Following Bhatt & Dayal (2020) if a constituent is “open to challenge” (i.e. can create F-alternatives), it is focused
- Same result: The focused constituent can be anywhere after *vaapas*—not before

(25) biinaa-ne **vaapas** ali-ko taalaa diyaa_↑
Bina-ERG back Ali-DAT lock give.PFV
‘Did Bina give Ali a lock back...?’

a. ya lifaafaa?
or envelope
‘or an envelope?’

b. ya arjun-ko?
or Arjun-DAT
‘or to Arjun?’

c. #ya bipaasha-ne?
or Bipasha-ERG
‘or did Bipasha?’

d. *ya BIPAASHA-ne?
or Bipasha-ERG

Explaining f- $\{\text{neutral/non-neutral}\}$ order w/ *vaapas*

(26) kyaa huaa?

all responses are canonical SIOV

what happen.PFV

‘What happened?’

- a. biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii *f-neutral*
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
‘Bina gave Ali the key back.’
- b. #biinaa-ne ali-ko **vaapas** caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT back key give give.PFV
- c. #biinaa-ne **vaapas** ali-ko caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*
Bina-ERG back Ali-DAT key give give.PFV
- d. #**vaapas** biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*
back Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key give give.PFV

Explaining f- $\{$ neutral/non-neutral $\}$ order w/ *vaapas*

(26) kyaa huaa?

all responses are canonical SIOV

what happen.PFV

‘What happened?’

a. biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii *f-neutral*
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
‘Bina gave Ali the key back.’

b.#biinaa-ne ali-ko **vaapas** caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT back key give give.PFV

c.#biinaa-ne **vaapas** ali-ko caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*
Bina-ERG back Ali-DAT key give give.PFV

d.#**vaapas** biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*
back Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key give give.PFV

- *vaapas* yields focus-neutral sentences only when it’s in preverbal position

Explaining f- $\{$ neutral/non-neutral $\}$ order w/ *vaapas*

(26) kyaa huaa?

all responses are canonical SIOV

what happen.PFV

‘What happened?’

a. biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii *f-neutral*
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
‘Bina gave Ali the key back.’

b.#biinaa-ne ali-ko **vaapas** caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT back key give give.PFV

c.#biinaa-ne **vaapas** ali-ko caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*
Bina-ERG back Ali-DAT key give give.PFV

d.#**vaapas** biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii de dii *f-non-neutral*
back Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key give give.PFV

- *vaapas* yields focus-neutral sentences only when it’s in preverbal position
- That’s the only order where there’s no obligatory Focus

Explaining f-{neutral/non-neutral} order w/ *vaapas*

(26) *kyaa huaa?*

all responses are canonical SIOV

what happen.PFV

‘What happened?’

a. *biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii vaapas de dii* *f-neutral*
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
‘Bina gave Ali the key back.’

b. *#biinaa-ne ali-ko vaapas caabii de dii* *f-non-neutral*
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT back key give give.PFV

c. *#biinaa-ne vaapas ali-ko caabii de dii* *f-non-neutral*
Bina-ERG back Ali-DAT key give give.PFV

d. *#vaapas biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii de dii* *f-non-neutral*
back Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key give give.PFV

- *vaapas* yields focus-neutral sentences only when it’s in preverbal position
- That’s the only order where there’s no obligatory Focus
- This has a huge impact on how many presuppositions are evoked by a single sentence

Presupposition accommodation

(27) Option 1:

biinaa-ne **vaapas** ali-ko [CAABII]_F de dii
Bina-ERG back Ali-DAT key give give.PFV
'What Bina gave back to Ali was a key.'

(28) *Presuppositions consistent with target sentence:*

{~~Ali had given Bina a key earlier,~~
Ali had given Bina a lock earlier,
Ali had given Bina a letter earlier,
Ali had given Bina a password earlier,...}

(29) $\exists Z$ such that Ali had given Bina Z earlier

Presupposition accommodation

(27) Option 2:

biinaa-ne **vaapas** [ALI-KO]_F caabii de dii
Bina-ERG back Ali-DAT key give give.PFV
'Who Bina gave the key back to was Ali.'

(28) *Presuppositions consistent with target sentence:*

{~~Ali had given Bina a key earlier,~~
Ali had given Riju a key earlier,
Ali had given Piya a key earlier,
Ali had given Rafi a key earlier,...}

(29) $\exists Y$ such that Ali had given Y a key earlier

Presupposition accommodation

- We have seen that *vaapas* is presuppositional
- But it does work in one position in ‘out of the blue’ contexts
- This suggests that its presupposition (once computed) is easy to accommodate out of the blue
- In that one case, there is no place to put Focus, so the presupposition is simple to compute: just a vanilla reverse of the asserted event
- In all other cases there is a proliferation of F-alternatives, so the presupposition much harder to arrive at
- Hence the impossibility of accommodation in all other cases

Presupposition accommodation

- Takeaway 1:
 - ▶ Most positions of *vaapas* are bad in ‘out of the blue’ contexts, but it’s not simply because *vaapas* is presuppositional
 - ▶ The bad cases are bad because they have presuppositions that are too hard to accommodate
- Takeaway 2:
 - ▶ Varying the position of *vaapas* yields several *focus non-neutral* orders, which by definition are those orders where some constituent is obligatorily focused
 - ▶ The cases where the presupposed event and the asserted event can differ from each other are exactly the cases where there is Focus somewhere in the sentence
 - ▶ Any part of the sentence that precedes *vaapas* (and is \therefore independently banned from being focused) must be the same across asserted and presupposed meaning.
- Looking ahead: How to capture these factors in the semantics?

BACK: Semantics

- Let's return to the basic meaning of *vaapas* 'back'

BACK: Semantics

- Let's return to the basic meaning of *vaapas* 'back'

- (30) biinaa-ne ali-ko caabii **vaapas** de dii ACTION PATH
Bina-ERG Ali-DAT key back give give.PFV
'Bina gave Ali the key **back**.'
= Bina gave Ali the key (and Ali had given Bina the key earlier)
- (31) biinaa **vaapas** chalii gayii SPATIAL PATH
Bina back walk.PFV go.PFV
'Bina went **back**.'
*= Bina moved away from some place *x* (and she had gone to *x* earlier)*
- (32) TukRaa **vaapas** alag ho rahaa hai SCALAR PATH
piece back separate be stay.PFV be.PRES
'The piece is coming **back** apart.'
= The piece is moving away from being attached (and it had gone from separate to attached earlier)

BACK: Semantics

- *vaapas* is **presuppositional**
- *vaapas* operates on **paths of scalar change**, as does *terug* in Dutch (Zwarts 2019)
- the presupposition of *vaapas* is “there exists a prior event with a path **reverse** to the asserted event”
- The parts of BACK’s meaning that we have to capture are
 - ▶ there are two events involved (e, e')
 - ▶ the two events are in a strict temporal ordering ($e' \prec e$)
 - ▶ there is a path involved in each event (p, p')
 - ▶ a notion of path-reversal is needed (I adopt Zwarts 2019)
- Here I adopt a semantics where the prior event is referential, not existential (I adopt Beck & Gergel 2015)

Defining BACK (à la Beck & Gergel 2015)

(33) $\llbracket \text{BACK} \rrbracket$ function of type $v, \langle \langle l, \langle v, t \rangle \rangle, \langle l, \langle v, t \rangle \rangle \rangle =$
 $\lambda e'. \lambda R_{\langle l, vt \rangle}. \lambda p. \lambda e : \exists p' \exists P [e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)]. R(e)(p)$

- BACK is a 4-argument function which takes
 - ▶ a first event $e'_{\langle v \rangle}$,
 - ▶ a predicate of ‘pathed’-events $R_{\langle l, vt \rangle}$,
 - ▶ a path $p_{\langle l \rangle}$,
 - ▶ a second event e
 - ▶ the following types are basic: v for events, l for paths
- is defined if and only if
 - ▶ the (presupposed) event e' temporally precedes (asserted) event e
 - ▶ there exist a path p' and a predicate of pathed-events P , such that:
 - ▶ $P(e')(p')$ holds, and
 - ▶ path p' is the reverse of path p
- and if defined, returns the assertion as it is: $R(e)(p)$

Defining BACK (à la Beck & Gergel 2015)

- Main features to note:
 - ▶ Prior event is not introduced existentially, it is anaphoric (just like with other presupposition triggers e.g. *too*, *also*)
 - ▶ If there's no path specification of any kind in the event, the sentence will be undefined and crash (that's what we want)
 - ▶ Treating path as an independent property of events enables us to “extract” it from a macro-property of events like $R(e)$
 - ▶ Looking ahead: This separation is good, because the meaning contribution of BACK kept constant is “presuppose an event with reversed path”, but the *other* parts of that presupposed event (can) vary from the asserted event based on what's focused

Towards a derivation

- Let's look at a basic SPATIAL PATH case

- ▶ *Ada walked back*

- Here's what we want to capture:

(34) $\lambda p.\lambda e$: the relevant event preceding e had path reverse to p .
she walked along p in e

(35) LF: $[[\lambda p\lambda e [_{VP} \text{Ada walk } p \text{ in } e]] \text{ back } e']$

- Event descriptions take an additional path argument
- BACK first 'eats' the (presupposed) event argument, then the meaning of the VP

Derivation of a SPATIAL PATH use

- (36) *Eat first argument, event*
[[BACK]]

Derivation of a SPATIAL PATH use

(36) *Eat first argument, event*
[[BACK]](*e'*)

Derivation of a SPATIAL PATH use

(36) *Eat first argument, event*

$\llbracket \text{BACK} \rrbracket (e')$

$= [\lambda e'. \lambda R_{\langle l, vt \rangle}. \lambda p. \lambda e :$

$\exists p' \exists P [e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)]. R(e)(p)]$

Derivation of a SPATIAL PATH use

(36) *Eat first argument, event*

$\llbracket \text{BACK} \rrbracket (e')$

$= [\lambda e'. \lambda R_{\langle l, vt \rangle}. \lambda p. \lambda e :$

$\exists p' \exists P [e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)]. R(e)(p)](e')$

Derivation of a SPATIAL PATH use

(36) *Eat first argument, event*

$\llbracket \text{BACK} \rrbracket (e')$

$= [\lambda e'. \lambda R_{\langle l, vt \rangle}. \lambda p. \lambda e :$

$\exists p' \exists P [e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)]. R(e)(p)] (e')$

$= \lambda R. \lambda p. \lambda e : \exists p' \exists P [e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REV}(p')(p)]. R(e)(p)$

Derivation of a SPATIAL PATH use

(36) *Eat first argument, event*

$\llbracket \text{BACK} \rrbracket(e')$

$= [\lambda e'. \lambda R_{\langle l, vt \rangle}. \lambda p. \lambda e :$

$\exists p' \exists P[e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)]. R(e)(p)](e')$

$= \lambda R. \lambda p. \lambda e : \exists p' \exists P[e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REV}(p')(p)]. R(e)(p)$

(37) *Eat next argument, pred of pathed-events:*

$\lambda R. \lambda p. \lambda e : \exists p' \exists P[e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)]. R(e)(p)$

Derivation of a SPATIAL PATH use

(36) *Eat first argument, event*

$\llbracket \text{BACK} \rrbracket(e')$

$= [\lambda e'. \lambda R_{\langle l, vt \rangle}. \lambda p. \lambda e :$

$\exists p' \exists P[e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)]. R(e)(p)](e')$

$= \lambda R. \lambda p. \lambda e : \exists p' \exists P[e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REV}(p')(p)]. R(e)(p)$

(37) *Eat next argument, pred of pathed-events:*

$\lambda R. \lambda p. \lambda e : \exists p' \exists P[e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)]. R(e)(p)$

$(\lambda p \lambda e \text{ Ada walk } p \text{ in } e) =$

Derivation of a SPATIAL PATH use

(36) *Eat first argument, event*

$\llbracket \text{BACK} \rrbracket(e')$

$= [\lambda e'. \lambda R_{\langle l, vt \rangle}. \lambda p. \lambda e :$

$\exists p' \exists P[e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)]. R(e)(p)](e')$

$= \lambda R. \lambda p. \lambda e : \exists p' \exists P[e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REV}(p')(p)]. R(e)(p)$

(37) *Eat next argument, pred of pathed-events:*

$\lambda R. \lambda p. \lambda e : \exists p' \exists P[e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)]. R(e)(p)$

$(\lambda p \lambda e \text{ Ada walk } p \text{ in } e) =$

(38) $\lambda p. \lambda e : \exists p' \exists P[e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)].$

Ada walk p in e

- The actual assertoric meaning that is output here can be manipulated by Focus
- Alternatives to *Ada walk* are: *Ada run*, *Ada cycle*,... (if the predicate is focused) OR
- *Benny walked*, *Jenny walk*,... if the subject is focused

Derivation of an ACTION PATH use

- Let's look at an ACTION PATH case
 - ▶ *Bina gave the key back to Ali*

Derivation of an ACTION PATH use

- Let's look at an ACTION PATH case
 - ▶ *Bina gave the key back to Ali*
- Path p is now defined as starting at *Bina*, ending at *Ali*

Derivation of an ACTION PATH use

- Let's look at an ACTION PATH case
 - ▶ *Bina gave the key back to Ali*
- Path p is now defined as starting at *Bina*, ending at *Ali*
- $p = \textit{Bina-to-Ali}$

Derivation of an ACTION PATH use

- Let's look at an ACTION PATH case
 - ▶ *Bina gave the key back to Ali*
 - Path p is now defined as starting at *Bina*, ending at *Ali*
 - $p = \textit{Bina-to-Ali}$
- (39) $\lambda p.\lambda e$: the relevant event preceding e had path reverse to p .
give key p in e
- (40) LF: $[[\lambda p\lambda e$ [$_{VP}$ give key along path p in e]] back e']

Derivation of an ACTION PATH use

- Let's look at an ACTION PATH case
 - ▶ *Bina gave the key back to Ali*
- Path p is now defined as starting at *Bina*, ending at *Ali*
- $p = \textit{Bina-to-Ali}$
- Going through the computation would yield this:

(39) $\lambda p.\lambda e : \exists p'\exists P[e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)]$.
give key along path p in e

Derivation of an ACTION PATH use

- Let's look at an ACTION PATH case
 - ▶ *Bina gave the key back to Ali*
- Path p is now defined as starting at *Bina*, ending at *Ali*
- $p = \textit{Bina-to-Ali}$
- Going through the computation would yield this:

$$(39) \quad \lambda p. \lambda e : \exists p' \exists P [e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)].$$

give key along path p in e

- Which can then be fed path $p = \textit{Bina-to-Ali}$

Derivation of an ACTION PATH use

- Let's look at an ACTION PATH case
 - ▶ *Bina gave the key back to Ali*
- Path p is now defined as starting at *Bina*, ending at *Ali*
- $p = \textit{Bina-to-Ali}$
- Going through the computation would yield this:

$$(39) \quad \lambda p.\lambda e : \exists p' \exists P[e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)].$$

give key along path p in e

- Which can then be fed path $p = \textit{Bina-to-Ali}$

$$(40) \quad \lambda p.\lambda e : \exists p' \exists P[e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)].$$

give key along path p in e

Derivation of an ACTION PATH use

- Let's look at an ACTION PATH case
 - ▶ *Bina gave the key back to Ali*
- Path p is now defined as starting at *Bina*, ending at *Ali*
- $p = \textit{Bina-to-Ali}$
- Going through the computation would yield this:

$$(39) \quad \lambda p.\lambda e : \exists p' \exists P[e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)].$$

give key along path p in e

- Which can then be fed path $p = \textit{Bina-to-Ali}$

$$(40) \quad \lambda p.\lambda e : \exists p' \exists P[e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)].$$

give key along path p in e (*Bina-to-Ali*)

Derivation of an ACTION PATH use

- Let's look at an ACTION PATH case
 - ▶ *Bina gave the key back to Ali*
- Path p is now defined as starting at *Bina*, ending at *Ali*
- $p = \textit{Bina-to-Ali}$
- Going through the computation would yield this:

$$(39) \quad \lambda p.\lambda e : \exists p' \exists P[e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)].$$

give key along path p in e

- Which can then be fed path $p = \textit{Bina-to-Ali}$

$$(40) \quad \lambda p.\lambda e : \exists p' \exists P[e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)].$$

give key along path p in e (*Bina-to-Ali*)

$$(41) \quad \lambda e : \exists p' \exists P[e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ p' = \textit{Ali-to-Bina}].$$

give key *Bina-to-Ali* in e

Derivation of an ACTION PATH use

- Let's look at an ACTION PATH case
 - ▶ *Bina gave the key back to Ali*
- Path p is now defined as starting at *Bina*, ending at *Ali*
- $p = \textit{Bina-to-Ali}$
- Going through the computation would yield this:

$$(39) \quad \lambda p.\lambda e : \exists p' \exists P [e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)].$$

give key along path p in e

- Which can then be fed path $p = \textit{Bina-to-Ali}$

$$(40) \quad \lambda p.\lambda e : \exists p' \exists P [e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)].$$

give key along path p in e (*Bina-to-Ali*)

$$(41) \quad \lambda e : \exists p' \exists P [e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ p' = \textit{Ali-to-Bina}].$$

give key *Bina-to-Ali* in e

- There are some open questions here, primarily: How does the grammar get from arguments to path-points in this way? What is, e.g. and event of giving a key, above, without the syntactic arguments?

How does this relate to Focus?

- I want to draw your attention to the event description P which holds of the prior event e'
- $\lambda p. \lambda e : \exists p' \exists P [e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ \text{REVERSE}(p')(p)]$.
Ada walk p in e
- $\lambda e : \exists p' \exists P [e' \prec e \ \& \ P(e')(p') \ \& \ p' = \textit{Ali-to-Bina}]$.
give key *Bina-to-Ali* in e
- I'm interested in how the grammar determines the content of P by looking at R in the actual utterance
- What relationship does it have to R (property of asserted event)?

How does this relate to Focus?

- I'm interested in how the grammar determines the content of P by looking at R in the actual utterance
- What relationship does it have to R (property of asserted event)?
 - ▶ $P \approx R$ is possible: The presupposed and asserted events have reverse paths and different time *but are identical in every other way*;
e.g. *The boxer punched the opponent and he punched him back.*
 - ▶ $P \not\approx R$ is also possible: The presupposed and asserted events have reverse paths and different time *and also vary in some other way*;
e.g. *I gave him [a twenty] and he gave me back [some change].*
- In Hindi-Urdu, the parts of the event permitted to vary are only those which can bear Focus

Putting the pieces together

- The semantics has a way for some part(s) of the presupposed event's event-property to be different from the event-property in the asserted (uttered) sentence.
- A reasonable way to think about parts of a set varying is through Focus-alternatives
- The syntax of Hindi-Urdu shows that the constituents that can be focused are exactly the ones which can vary in this way, which supports the use of Focus-alternatives

Putting the pieces together

- In Hindi-Urdu

- ▶ Syntax determines which (non-path, non-time) parts of of the presupposed event can be different from the asserted event
- ▶ Any part of the event description (argument/predicate/adjunct) can vary, but only if it is otherwise permitted to be focused (i.e. is in the post-*vaapas* zone)

(42) biinaa-ne **vaapas** [ALI-KO]_F caabii de dii
Bina-ERG back Ali-DAT key give give.PFV
'Who Bina gave the key back to was Ali.'

(43) *Presuppositions consistent with target sentence:*
{Ali had given Bina a key earlier,
Ali had given Riju a key earlier,
Ali had given Piya a key earlier,
Ali had given Rafi a key earlier,...}

(44) $\exists X$ such that Ali had given X a key earlier

Wrapping up

- Today using new tools I have uncovered new data and given a fresh perspective on Focus in Hindi-Urdu
- In doing so, I have developed a semantics for BACK with a view to explain the data by means of the semantics of BACK in combination with general principles of Focus
- A crucial part of this analysis is the separation of path from the event such that it can be its own argument and not one of many events properties within a macro-property like $P(e')$ or $R(e)$
- This separation, combined with the anaphoricity of the event argument should allow the two events to be sufficiently different (on path and time) while being sufficiently similar (on other properties)
- There is more formal formalizing to do, which I assign to ongoing and future work

The syntactic problem

- The FocP analysis as it's usually understood makes predictions that aren't borne out

The syntactic problem

- The FocP analysis as it's usually understood makes predictions that aren't borne out
- If the focused constituent always has to move to Spec,FocP it will *always* predict adjacency between focused constituent and *vaapas*

The syntactic problem

- The FocP analysis as it's usually understood makes predictions that aren't borne out
- If the focused constituent always has to move to Spec,FocP it will *always* predict adjacency between focused constituent and *vaapas*
- Here's some options:

The syntactic problem

- The FocP analysis as it's usually understood makes predictions that aren't borne out
- If the focused constituent always has to move to Spec,FocP it will *always* predict adjacency between focused constituent and *vaapas*
- Here's some options:

(45) *vaapas in VP*
[_{FocP} [_{VP} **vaapas** [_{VP} B-ne A-ko DO V]] Foc]

- Erroneously predicts focused constituent to always be l-adjacent to *vaapas*

(46) \Rightarrow [_{FocP} F-slot [_{VP} **vaapas** [_{VP} B-ne A-ko DO V]] Foc]

The syntactic problem

- The FocP analysis as it's usually understood makes predictions that aren't borne out
- If the focused constituent always has to move to Spec,FocP it will *always* predict adjacency between focused constituent and *vaapas*
- Here's some options:

(45) *vaapas in FocP* (Patel-Grosz & Beck 2014, 2019)
[_{FocP} **vaapas** [_{VP} B-ne A-ko DO V] Foc]

- Erroneously predicts focused constituent to always be r-adjacent to *vaapas*

(46) \Rightarrow [_{FocP} **vaapas** [_{FocP} **F-slot** [_{VP} B-ne A-ko DO V] Foc]]

The syntactic problem

- The FocP analysis as it's usually understood makes predictions that aren't borne out
- If the focused constituent always has to move to Spec,FocP it will *always* predict adjacency between focused constituent and *vaapas*
- Here's some options:

(45) *vaapas in FocP* (variant)
[_{FocP} **vaapas** [_{VP} B-ne A-ko DO V] Foc]

- Erroneously predicts focused constituent to always be l-adjacent to *vaapas*

(46) \Rightarrow [_{FocP} F-slot [_{FocP} **vaapas** [_{VP} B-ne A-ko DO V] Foc]]

Side note: Prosodic Focus?

- General note: declaratives have falling intonation whether neutral or non-neutral; prosody is not a relevant factor in this presentation

Side note: Prosodic Focus?

- General note: declaratives have falling intonation whether neutral or non-neutral; prosody is not a relevant factor in this presentation
- Does Hindi-Urdu ever mark Focus with just prosody?

Side note: Prosodic Focus?

- General note: declaratives have falling intonation whether neutral or non-neutral; prosody is not a relevant factor in this presentation
- Does Hindi-Urdu ever mark Focus with just prosody?
 - ▶ In a corrective or contrastive context, yes.

Side note: Prosodic Focus?

- General note: declaratives have falling intonation whether neutral or non-neutral; prosody is not a relevant factor in this presentation
- Does Hindi-Urdu ever mark Focus with just prosody?
 - ▶ In a corrective or contrastive context, yes.
 - ▶ Kidwai (1999): Hindi-Urdu permits the use of word-stress for *contrastive* focus (there is no Nuclear Stress Rule, HU is a syllable-timed language)

Side note: Prosodic Focus?

- General note: declaratives have falling intonation whether neutral or non-neutral; prosody is not a relevant factor in this presentation
- Does Hindi-Urdu ever mark Focus with just prosody?
 - ▶ In a corrective or contrastive context, yes.
 - ▶ Kidwai (1999): Hindi-Urdu permits the use of word-stress for *contrastive* focus (there is no Nuclear Stress Rule, HU is a syllable-timed language)
 - ▶ We have seen evidence for order being ‘ranked’ higher than prosodic prominence; where word order makes positional Focus on some constituent infelicitous, prosodic prominence cannot save it; we have also seen cases where prosodic Focus is ungrammatical.

Side note: Prosodic Focus?

- General note: declaratives have falling intonation whether neutral or non-neutral; prosody is not a relevant factor in this presentation
- Does Hindi-Urdu ever mark Focus with just prosody?
 - ▶ In a corrective or contrastive context, yes.
 - ▶ Kidwai (1999): Hindi-Urdu permits the use of word-stress for *contrastive* focus (there is no Nuclear Stress Rule, HU is a syllable-timed language)
 - ▶ We have seen evidence for order being ‘ranked’ higher than prosodic prominence; where word order makes positional Focus on some constituent infelicitous, prosodic prominence cannot save it; we have also seen cases where prosodic Focus is ungrammatical.
- See Biezma, Butt & Jabeen (2017, 2018) for an apparent counterexample, and Bhatt & Dayal (2020) for discussion.
- See Patel et al. (2008), Féry et al. (2016) for experiments on prosody, Focus, and givenness: The normal pattern of HU prosody is a series of downsteps. Focus does not change that, but it does introduce post-focal compression.