The relation between MCP, epistemic modality and illocutionary force
Vesselina Laskova
University of Venice

1. Introduction

- ❖ This work presents the distribution of the Bulgarian conjunctions in adverbial clauses; a syntactic analysis of the left periphery is proposed.
- ❖ A co-relation is drawn between the presence of the so called perfective non-past verbal form (PNP) and the absence of epistemic modality.
- ❖ The premise interpretation of conjunctions is reanalyzed and is associated with a particular place of the conjunction inside the left periphery.
- ❖ The premise interpretation is contrasted to the "reversative" interpretation. These two are associated with two different positions.
- ❖ I suggest that the "reversative" clauses are those that permit MCP and epistemic modality.

2. The distribution of the conjunctions *kato*/"after", "since", *štom*/"as soon as", "since" and *ako*/"if" and the structure of the left periphery in Bulgarian.

Bulgarian is a language in which Topicalization and focalization could hardly be qualified as MCP. Examples (1) and (2) show that both focus and CLLD can appear in the complement of a factive predicate.

(1) Sažaljavam, če   TETRADKATA si e zarbavila. (ne tolkova za uchebnika) Focus
     (I) regret   that   NOTEBOOK-the (she) forgot (not so much for the textbook)
     "I'm sorry that she forgot her notebook." (Not so much that she forgot her textbook)

(2) Sazaljavam, če   tetradkata   si   ja   e zabravila.   **CLLD**
     (I) regret   that   notebook-the Refl   it   AUX(she) forgot
     "I'm sorry that she forgot her notebook."

Foc is also allowed in central adverbial clauses, as shown in (3). Sentence (4) shows that this holds true also for the CLLD.

(3) TETRADKATA   štom   vzeme trjabva da vlezeš. (a ne knigata)   **Focus**
     NOTEBOOK-the   as soon as   (she) takes you must enter (and not the book)
     "You must enter when she takes the notebook." (not the book)

(4) Tetradkata   štom   ja   vzeme   ti trjabva da izlezeš.   **CLLD**
     Notebook   as soon as   it   (she) takes,   you must leave
     "You must leave as soon as she takes the notebook."

As it is shown in (5), in event or central adverbial clauses, the conjunction can precede a CLLD element,.
(5) Štom   vratata   ja   otvoriha,   decata huknaha da izlizat.   **CLLD**
     As soon as   door-the   it   (they)opened, children-the rushed out
     "As soon as they opened the door the children rushed out."

Sentence (6), shows that the CLLD-ed element can equally well precede the conjunction, in the same type of clauses.

(6) Vratata   štom   ja   otvoriha, decata   huknaha da izlizat.
     door-the as soon as   it (they)   opened, children-the rushed out
     "As soon as they opened the door the children rushed out."

In examples (7) and (8), we see that Focus can either precede or follow the connective in a central adverbial clause.

(7) Štom   PLIKA   vzeme trjabva   da reagiraš.   **Focus**
     As soon as   ENVELOPE-the   (she)   takes   (you) must   DA react
     "You must react as soon as she takes the envelope." (not the notebook)

(8) PLIKA   štom   vzeme trjabva da reagiraš. (a ne tetradkata)   **Focus**
     ENVELOPE-the   as soon as   (she) takes (you) must react
     "You must react as soon as she takes the envelope." (not the notebook)

Apart form their temporal meaning, the conjunctions *štom* and *kato* have also a premise meaning. *Ako* does not really express a premise meaning. Speakers prefer to use *štom*. As shown in (9) and (10), *štom* and *kato* in their premise meaning, exhibit the same syntax, i.e. Focus can either precede or follow them.

(9) Štom PISMOTO   e   pročela znači znae za nas. (ne ot belezkata)   **Focus**
     Since LETTER-the AUX   (she) read means (she) knows about us (not from the note)
     "She knows about us because she read the letter." (and not from the note)

(10) PISMOTO   kato   e   pročela znači znae za nas. (ne ot belezkata) **Focus**
     LETTER-the   since AUX   (she) read means (she) knows about us
     "She knows about us because she read the letter." (and not from the note)

The same holds true for the CLLD. We can see this in examples (11) and (12).

(11) Štom   pismoto   go   e   pročela znači znae za nas.   **CLLD**
     Since   letter-the   it   AUX   (she) read means (she) knows about us
     "She knows about us because she read the letter."

(12) Pismoto   kato   go   e   pročela   znači znae za nas.   **CLLD**
     letter-the   since it   AUX   (she) read   means (she) knows about us
     "She knows about us because she read the letter."

It is not very easy to account for this distribution of the connectives by accepting the standard structure of the left periphery offered by Rizzy (1997). I would suggest, instead, that Roussou's (2000) three C position model could better accommodate Bulgarian data. It is represented in (13).

(13) $C_{(sub)}\cdots\cdots\cdots C_{(clause\ typing)}\cdots\cdots\cdots C_{(modal)}$
           štom

As to *kato*, two different positions can be associated to the two readings it may have. In its temporal reading, Bulgarian *kato* seems to occupy a position inside the IP. As we can see in (14) and (15), *kato* can never precede but can only follow the subject.

(14) Ivan **kato** zvănna,   Maria otvori vratata.
     Ivan kato rang   Maria opened the door
     "As Ivan rang the bell,   Maria opened the door."

(15) ***   Kato Ivan   zvănna,   Maria zatvori vratata.
         kato Ivan   rang   Maria opened the door

Alternatively, the subject can appear in the position after the verb, as shown in (16).

(16) **Kato**   zvănna   Ivan,   Maria otvori   vratata.
     kato   rang   Ivan   Maria opened   the door
     "As Ivan rang the bell, Maria opened the door."

Kato can be preceded by adverbs like *accidentally* and can be followed only by clitics and very low adverbs like adverbs of manner, as indicated in (17), (cf Cinque 1999)

(17) adverbs like *accidentally* > **kato** > very low adverbs like *carefully, fast*> Cl Aux > ClDat > ClAcc > **verb**

In its premise meaning, however, this element appears inside the left periphery. It can freely precede the subject, as shown in (18) and none of the above restrictions holds.

(18) Kato   ti   si   mu   go   obeštal,   ti   šte   mu go dadeš.
     Since   you   AUX   him   it   promised   you   AUX.FUT   him it give
     "If you promised it to him, you must give it to him."

3. The perfective non-past (PNP) verbal form.

In main clauses, this form occurs accompanied by the future particle *šte*, as shown in (19).

(19) Ivan šte   dojde   utre.
     Ivan will   PNP-come   tomorrow
     "Ivan will come tomorrow."

In ACs, two possibilities exist. In premise clauses, this form can only appear if accompanied by the future particle, otherwise, the sentence is ungrammatical. This is shown in (20).

(20) Šte   trăgnem   rano, štom Ivan   * (šte)   dojde napravo tam.
     (We) will leave   early if   Ivan   * (will)   PNP-come directly there
     "We will leave early if he will join us there."

In central adverbial clauses, i.e. in adverbial clauses with temporal reading, the non-past perfective form can no longer be accompanied by the future particle as shown in (21).

(21) Šte   trăgnem   štom   Ivan   (* šte)   pristigne.
     (We) will leave   as soon as Ivan (* will)   arrive
     "We will leave as soon as Ivan arrives."

Notice that some kind of semantic impoverishment is also present and it can be observed in examples like (22).

(22) Ako Ivan   dojde   navreme,   šte   izlezem   zaedno.
     If Ivan   PNP-comes   on time,   (we) will go out   together
     "If Ivan comes on time, we will go out together."

The semantic impoverishment of the perfective non-past form consists in the fact that when used in future oriented event conditionals, this form *cannot* express *any* kind of intention, higher probability or doubt concerning the realization of the event expressed in the conditional clause. In other words, by using the perfective non-past verb form, the speaker cannot express *any* kind of attitude towards the event, or else, uttering (22), the speaker does not know whether Ivan will arrive or not.

The present tense form of English future oriented conditionals is ambiguous in a very significant way. Consider (23).

(23) If she brings me her notebook tomorrow, I will not need to look for another one.

Depending on the context, the present tense can express either the above described meaning of the non-past perfective form, whereby the speaker does not know whether she will have the notebook tomorrow, or, alternatively, it expresses the *knowledge* of the speaker that the event *is going* to happen. I will show that these two readings are expressed in Bulgarian with two different conjunctions.

The contexts in which the perfective non-past form is used without the future article, do not allow speaker oriented adverbs. This is shown in (24).

(24) *   Kato   verojatno   dojde   Ivan, šte   izlezem zaedno.
         kato   probably   PNP-comes   Ivan, (we)   will go out together

It has been noticed in the literature by Deklerck and Reed (2001) and other authors, and it has also been reported in Haegeman's works that event or central adverbial clauses do not permit speaker oriented modality. Thus, example (24) presents additional support to the claim that contexts in which the perfective non present form is used without the future particle correspond to central adverbial clauses.

Giannakidou (2007) offers an analysis which tries to account for the peculiar status of the dependent perfective non-past verbal form, suggesting that this form actually cannot express a relation with the speech time. (The latter is expressed by the future particle.) This proposal seems quite compatible with the fact that the contexts containing the dependent form do not allow for speaker oriented adverbs. The proposal sounds also quite intuitive since the complete lack of *knowledge* about the future event, which I mentioned above, is actually the absence of the speaker.

4. The peripheral status of the conjunction *štom*/"since".

A syntactic test showing that premise clauses are peripheral adverbial clauses.

(25) Ivan niama da   zamine za   Milano,   štom tja   šte pristiga.
     Ivan NEG   da   leave for   Milan   if   she   will arrive.
     "Since she arrives, Ivan will not leave for Milan."

(26) Mašinata   njama da trăgne   štom ja   razklatiš,   a štom natisneš kopčeto.
     Machine-the   NEG   da start   if   it   (you) shake   but if (you) press bottom-the
     "The machine will start working not if you shake it but if you press the bottom."

(27) *   Ivan **niama** da zamine za Milano   štom Maria šte pristiga, a   štom Ivan go izvika.
          Ivan **NEG** da leave for Milan   since Maria will arrive but since Ivan him called
Intended reading: Ivan will not leave for Milan because Maria arrives but because Ivan called him.

In (27) we see that, if the adverbial clause is a premise clause introduced by *štom*, the possibility to put the *štom* clause under the scope of the matrix negation no longer exists. Therefore, we can conclude that premise clauses belong to the peripheral type of clauses, which are not as embedded as the temporal/conditional ones.

5. Types of peripheral adverbial clauses.

As we would expect, in *štom* clauses epistemic modality *is* possible. This is shown in sentence (28).

(28) Štom tja <u>verojatno</u>   šte   idva s   nas, šte   vzemem hrana za poveče hora.
     since she probably   will   come with us   (we) will take food for more people
     "If/since she will probably come with us, we will take food for more people."

Epistemic modality might be a criterion on the basis of which we can isolate at least two subtypes of peripheral adverbial clauses – adverbial clauses which allow fronting in English and tag questions in Bulgarian and adverbial clauses which are not that felicitous with either of these two MCP. In Bulgarian, the distinction between these two different types of adverbial clauses is expressed by the different position of the conjunction.
    In Haegeman (2002, 2006), the author suggests that those adverbial clauses that allow epistemic or speech act adverbials are not the ones that modify the event of the main clause but those that structure the discourse, i.e. the peripheral adverbial clauses.

(29) If we are so short of teachers, why don't we send our children to Germany to be educated?
                                                                                    (Haegeman 2002)

(30) If [as you say] it is going to rain this afternoon, why don't we just stay at home and watch a video?
                                                                                    (Haegeman 2002)

Notice that, similarly to the *štom* clauses, the adverbial *if-* clauses express the *knowledge* of the speaker that the event is realized or is going to be realized.
    Lyons (1977) points out, there exist two different types of epistemic modality – subjective and objective (an issue is analysed also in Papafragou, 2006). The epistemic modal in (31) may be interpreted in two ways, either as reflecting the speaker's own opinion/uncertainty, or as reporting what a meteorologist, i.e. and authorized group of people said.

(31) It may rain tomorrow.   (Papafragou 2006)

The same ambiguity is illustrated once again in sentence (32) this time by an epistemic adverb.

(32) It will probably rain tomorrow.

Bulgarian offers an unambiguous context, in which the modal adverb can only be interpreted as an objective epistemic modal. This is shown in (33)

(33) Utre   verojatno   štjalo   da   vali, ama   az   ne vjarvam.
     Tomorrow probably   will-Evid. da   rain   but   I   NEG believe
     "They say, it will probably rain tomorrow but I don't believe it."

    Since the *if-* clauses of the central adverbial clause type cannot host any type of epistemic modality, an *if-* clause with an epistemic modal can only be interpreted as belonging to the *štom* type. This is clearly seen in the example (34), which is taken from Papafragou (2006).

(34) If it may rain tomorrow, people should take their umbrellas.   (Papafragou 2006)

Out of all classes of verbs considered in Hooper and Thompson, only factive predicates resist subjective epistemic modality. There are examples of complements of factive predicates which allow for epistemic adverbs. The following examples are taken from (Basse 2008).

(35) John knows that Mary *probably/unfortunately* can't come to the party.
(36) John hates that Mary *obviously* doesn't like him.

Here is an example from Italian.

(37) Mi dispiace che   domani   probabilmente pioverà.
     (I) regret   that   tomorrow   probably   rain-FUT
     "I'm sorry that it will probably rain tomorrow."

In (38) we see its Bulgarian correspondent, which is also fine.

(38) Săžaljavam, če   utre   verojatno   šte   vali.
     (I) regret   that tomorrow   probably   will   rain
     "I'm sorry that it will probably rain tomorrow."

At this point it would not sound strange if we assume that what follows the conjunction in a *štom* clause is presupposed and not asserted. This amounts to saying that in premise clauses the speaker is present through her *knowledge* about the event which is actually her presupposition. This accounts for the echoic character of premise *if-* clauses.
    In Haegeman (2006), the author provides examples in support of her claim that peripheral adverbial clauses allow for MCP. These are sentences (39) - (41).

(39) If *these problems* we cannot solve, there are many others that we can tackle immediately.
(40) If *aphids* we did not worry about, snails we did.
(41) If *anemonies* you don't like, why not plant roses instead?

I would like to argue that, though very similar to the *štom* constructions, these sentences exhibit different properties. The aim will be to show that *if-* clauses of this type are not premise clauses but reversative clauses.
    If we cancel the connective "if", in one of the conditional clauses in examples (39)-(41), the meaning of the clause will not change dramatically. This does not hold true, however, for the premise sentence in (42).

(42) If it may rain tomorrow, people should take their umbrellas.   Papafragou (2006)

Unlike the premise clauses, these *if-* clauses allow for subjective epistemic modality. I provide examples from Italian:

(43) Se   questi problemi   <u>probabilmente</u> non risolverò,
     if   these problems   probably   NEG resolve-FUT

     ce ne sono **invece** tanti altri che   posso affrontare subito.
     there are   instead many others that   (I) can face right now.
     "If these problems I probably cannot resolve there are so many others that I could do right now."

(44) (looking at the sky) Se,   come è   <u>probabile,</u> tra poco   pioverà,
                          If   as   is   probable,   in a while   rains

ieri **invece** a quest'ora splendeva il sole.
yesterday instead this time the sun was shining
"If it starts raining in a while, as it is very probable, yesterday this time the sun was shining."

Notice also that, while the premise clauses are most naturally expressed with *štom* in Bulgarian, to form an adversative clause, one uses again the connective *if*. In the Italian sentences, the adversative meaning was additionally emphasized by the adverb *invece*/ "instead". To this end, Bulgarian uses the construction "*ako….to*", as shown in (45).

(45) <u>Ako</u> teksta niakak si **verojatno** shte uspeja da go preveda,
if text-the somehow **probably** (I) will manage to it translate

<u>to</u> sas zadačite njama da moga da se spravja.
TO with problems-the NEG da be able to manage
"If I will probably manage somehow to translate the text, the problems I will not be able solve."

Notice that fronting does not seem to be so acceptable in premise sentences. This is shown in (46), (47) and (48).

(46) * If this exam you passed, why don't you take a rest now?
(47) * If this problem you can't solve, why don't you try the next one?
(48) * If your paper Mr. Smith hasn't read yet, why don't you find another teacher to read it?

These examples confirm the different status of premise clauses. Therefore, the conclusion we reached above, that what follows the premise conjunction is not asserted, would not be incoherent.

The following examples show that the conjunctions introducing reversative clauses cannot be preceded by a CLLD element.

(49) Ako reklamata ja haresah, to samijat film napravo me razočarova.
if trailer-the it (I) liked TO itself film-the really me disappointed
"If I liked the trailed, the film itself really disappointed me."

(50) * Reklamata ako ja haresah, to samijat film napravo me razočarova.
trailer-the if it (I) liked TO itself film-the really me disappointed

The same contrast can be observed in Italian as well. With premise *if*- clauses, the unmarked word order is the one we observe in (51). Substandard Italian, however, permits also the word order in (52), in which the CLLD element precedes the conjunction.

(51) Se non prendiamo il libro, non ha senso che andiamo in biblioteca.
if NEG (we) take the book there is no sense that we go to library
"If we don't take the book, there is no sense that we go to the library."

(52) Il libro se non lo prendiamo non ha senso che andiamo in biblioteca. (subst.) **CLLD**
the book if NEG it (we) take there is no sense athat we go to library
"If we don't take the book, there is no sense that we go to the library."

Now notice the sharp contrast between (53) and (54). It is impossible to place the CLLD-ed element in front of the adversative conjunction.

(53) Se non prendiamo questo libro, gli altri invece dobbiamo leggerli. **CLLD**
if NEG (we) take this book the others (we) must read them
"If we do not take this book, the others we must read."

(54) * Questo libro se non lo leggiamo, gli altri invece dobbiamo leggerli. **CLLD**
this book if NEG it (we) read the others instead we must read

The impossibility to place a topic in a position higher than the position of the connectives, in adversative clauses, suggests that this connective occupies a higher/the highest position in the CP. Following Roussou (2000) and Haegeman (2002 and subsequent work), I would place the conjunction in the Sub position.

6. The conjunctions *kogato*/"when" and *dokato*/"while"

The behaviour of the adversative conjunction *ako* is similar to that of the conjunctions *kogato*/"when" and *dokato*/"while".

Apart form their temporal meaning, these two conjunctions have another meaning, which can be qualified as adversative meaning as well, rather than as premise meaning. It is illustrated in examples (55) and (56).

(55) Ne moga da se saglasja s teb, kogato dannite ot eksperimenta
NEG can da Refl agree with you when results-the from experiment-the

pokazvat nešto savsem drugo.
show something quite different
"I can't agree with you when the results from the experiment are so different."

(56) Ivan raboti varhu teorjata, dokato Maria podgotvia dannite.
Ivan works on theory-the while Mary prepares data-the
"Ivan works on the theory while Mary prepares the data."

Examples (57) and (58) show that a topic can be placed immediately after the conjunction.

(57) Ne moga da se saglasja s teb, kogato <u>nešto savsem drugo</u>
NEG can da Refl agree with you when <u>something quite different</u>

pokazvat dannite ot exsperimenta.
show results-the from experiment-the
"I can't agree with you when the results from the experiment are so different. "

(58) Ivan raboti varhu teorijata, dokato <u>dannite</u> gi podgotvja Maria.
Ivan works on theory-the while data-the them prepares Mary
"Ivan works on the theory while Mary prepares the data."

(59) and (60) show that the topic can *never* precede the conjunction.

(59) * Ne moga da se saglasja s teb, <u>dannite ot eksperimenta</u>
NEG can da Refl agree with you <u>results-the from experiment-the</u>

kogato pokazvat nešto savsem drugo.
when show something quite different

(60) * Ivan   raboti varhu teorjata,   <u>dannite</u>   dokato Maria gi podgotvia.
        Ivan   works on theory-the   <u>data-the</u>   while   Mary them prepares

Bulgarian adversative clauses are compatible with tag questions, while premise clauses are not. Consider examples (61)-(64).

(61) Ne moga da se saglasja s teb,   <u>kogato</u> dannite   pokazvat nešto savsem drugo, **nali**?
     NEG can da Refl agree with you   <u>when</u> results-the   show something quite different, **don't they**
     "I can't agree with you when the data show something very different, **don't they**."

(62) ??? Ne moga da se saglasja s teb,   <u>štom</u> dannite pokazvat nešto savsem drugo, **nali**?
         NEG can da Refl agree with you <u>since</u> results-the show something quite different, **don't they**
         "I can't agree with you when the data show something very different, don't they."

(63) Ivan raboti varhu teorijata, <u>dokato</u> Maria podgotvja dannite,   **nali**?
     Ivan works on theory-the   <u>while</u> Mary prepares data-the,   **doesn't she**
     "Ivan works on the theory while Mary prepares the data, doesn't she?"

(64) * Ivan šte podgotvi teorijata,   <u>štom</u> Maria ne ja razbira,   **nali**?
        Ivan will prepare theory-the <u>since</u> Maria NEG it understand, **doesn't she**?

In (61) and (63), the particle "nali", which serves to form a tag question, can refer to the adverbial clause. In (62) and (64), on the other hand, it is not possible to form a tag question referring to the adverbial clause. These data show again that premise clauses, though being peripheral adverbial clauses in some sense, do not seem to allow for MCP so easily. Adversative clauses, on the other hand do allow MCP both in English and in Bulgarian.

7. Conclusions

To sum up, what I tried to show is that even data from Bulgarian, a language whose syntax of the left periphery seems different from the suggested one for English and Romance, we can find confirmation for the existence of a co-relation between the types of embedded contexts and the presence versus absence of speaker oriented modality on the one hand and between the types of embedded contexts and the presence vs. absence of MCP.

I suggested also that peripheral adverbial clauses are not a homogenous group but can be divided in at least two subgroups – premise clauses and adversative clauses, which are introduced by conjunctions occupying different positions inside the CP. These two types of clauses behave differently with respect to epistemic modality and MCP as well.

References:

Basse G. (2008) "Factive complements as defective phases" *Proceedings of the 27ᵗʰ West Coast Conference of Formal Linguistics*, in Abner, N. and J. Bishop (eds), pp 54-62. Somerville, MA Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Cinque, G (1999) *Adverbs and functional heads*. Oxford university Press.

Declerck, R and S. Reed (2001) Conditionals: a comprehensive empirical analysis. Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.

Giannakidou (2007) "A termporal semantics for the subjunctive." ms.University of Chicago.

Haegeman (2002) "Anchoring to the speaker, adverbial clauses and the structure of CP", *Georgetown University Working Papers in Linguistics*, 2, pp. 117-180.

Haegeman (2006) "Conditionals, factives and the left periphery."*Lingua*, 116, pp. 1651-1659

Hooper J. and S. Thompson (1973) "On the applicability of root transformations." Linguistic Inquiry, 4, pp. 465-497

Lyons, J. (1977) *Semantics*, 2 vols. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Papafragou, A. (2006) "Epistemic modality and truth conditions", *Lingua*, 116, pp. 1688-1702

Rizzi, L. (1997) "The fine structure of the left periphery" in Haegeman, L (ed.) *Elements of Grammar*. Kluwer

Roussou, A. (2000) "On the left periphery: modal particles and complementizers." *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 1, pp. 65-94

Tsimpli, L.M., D. Papadopoulou, A. Mylonaki (2010) "Temporal modifications in Greek adverbial clauses: The role of aspect and negation." *Lingua, 120,* pp. 649-672.