

ALLOSEMIES OF THE ANATOLIAN CONJUNCTION PARTICLE

BACKGROUND Hittite, along with other Anatolian languages, possessed a conjunctive marker $-(y)a$ (μ) that expressed not only conjunction but also universal quantification, free-choice inferences, and focal additivity.

PARTICLE $-(Y)A$ We provide empirical evidence for the the particle $-(y)a$ in Hittite as featuring the range of conjunction-related meanings mentioned above. Assuming the analysis of this allosemantic range as given in Mitrović (2014), we focus on two empirical issues that have not yet been explained.

- i. What is the morpho-syntactic/semantic relation between a free-choice item (FCI) and a universal quantifier (\forall)? Unlike in all other languages that have conjunctive μ superparticles (either in IE or other families), the phonological form (PF) of a \forall and FCI is identical, unlike in Hittite.
- ii. What is the morpho-syntactic/semantic relation between a plain ('and') and an adversative ('but') conjunction marker? While cross-linguistically, the two tend not to share PFs, in Hittite they do.

Both questions require an account of alternation of both the semantic (LF) and the PFs. We thus adopt the idea of contextual allosemy of Marantz (2011). We now briefly take each of the two questions in turn.

FROM \forall TO FCI In Hittite, the FCI 'whoever' type expressions are analogous but not identical to \forall *kuišša* (𐎧𐎢𐎠𐎫). As Hoffner and Melchert (2008: 150) show, while universal distributive *kuišša* (<*ku-iš-ša*) 'each, every(one)' shows geminate $-šš-$, the free-choice *kuiša* (<*ku-i-ša*) 'whoever' features the non-geminating conjunction $-a$ (𐎧) / $-ma$ (𐎧𐎠). The parallel between Hittite 'kuišš-a' and Latin 'quis-**que**' has also been established early on by Hahn (1933).

We analyse the non/geminating-coda alternation *kuišša_∃ ~ kuiša_{FCI}* using the tools from Distributed Morphology (DM). The idea we develop is that the phonological shape of the pair of particles is isomorphic to the semantic content of the pair. We appeal to a post-syntactic mechanism of Vocabulary Insertion (VI) in order to explain the relation between the LF and PF of $-(y)a$ featuring in \forall and FCI. The VI rules we propose are sensitive to the presence of a modal element that licenses universal FC inferences (Chierchia, 2013). This will also motivate a reconsideration of the allosemy of FCI and \forall in English given that the PF of \forall is **ever-y**' and the PF of is FCI '**-ever**'

FROM CONJUNCTION TO ADVERSATIVITY The conjunction particle $-(y)a$ shares both the LF and the PF with the adversative conjunction $-(m)a$ for which we also give a DM-based account. The core empirical observation is the double similarity between the particles' semantic and phonological shapes which we derive synchronically.

Since adversative conjunctions are contrastively enriched conjunctions, by definition, the semantic relation between an adversative and a non-adversative conjunction should be one of one-directional entailment. Just as a simple datum in (1) makes this inference natural, so does Toosarvandani's (2014) lexical entry for 'but' in English in (2), which we assume applies cross-linguistically (hence, also to Hittite).

- (1) $a \rightsquigarrow b$
- a. $\llbracket \text{John likes Mary but Mary likes Bill.} \rrbracket$
 - b. $\llbracket \text{John likes Mary and Mary likes Bill.} \rrbracket$
- (2) $\llbracket \phi \text{ but } \psi \rrbracket =$
- i. At issue (assertion): $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket \wedge \llbracket \psi \rrbracket$
 - ii. Presupposition:
 $\exists p : p \in \text{QUD}(\llbracket \phi \rrbracket \rightarrow p) \wedge \exists p : p \in \text{QUD}(\llbracket \psi \rrbracket \rightarrow \neg p)$

We take the presuppositional content to arise under a particular morphosyntactic feature specification – we identify this feature simply as [CONTR]. When this feature is present in the conjunction structure, adversative structure obtains and with it the associated meaning in (2). In absence of [CONTR], no Q(uestion) U(nder) D(iscussion) contrast is encoded as a plain-vanilla conjunction structure results. Also note that the second conjunct of the adversative expression that $-(m)a$ marks as contrastive, i.e., the negation of a QUD proposition p in (2).

Independent evidence for this — we think rather natural — treatment of the relation between contrastive (adversative) and non-contrastive conjunction lies in the phonological properties. While, in English, there is no clear historical or synchronic affinity between ‘and’ and ‘but’, such morphological identity exists Hittite.

We follow Bobaljik (2012) is assuming that Vocabulary Insertion (VI) is constrained by, or sensitive to, the maximality of projections (cf. Embick 2010), where the relevant such projection for us is μP . We take the default rule in (3) to associate with the phonemic content of /a/ alone, not /ja/ ($-(y)a$) since we view /j/ as a diaeresis-avoiding glide-insertion strategy that Hittite operated. Under this approach, the allophony of $-(m)a$ and $-(y)a$ is also the allophony of \pm contrastive conjunction.

- (3) Contextual allophony and allophony of the conjunctive μ particle:

	LF	NS	PF
$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{assertional content: } \lambda\phi\lambda\psi[\llbracket \phi \rrbracket \wedge \llbracket \psi \rrbracket] \\ \text{presuppositional content: } \emptyset \end{array} \right\}$	$\Leftrightarrow \mu \Leftrightarrow$		/a/
$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{assertional content: } \lambda\phi\lambda\psi[\llbracket \phi \rrbracket \wedge \llbracket \psi \rrbracket] \\ \text{presuppositional content: } \exists p \in \text{QUD} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \llbracket \phi \rrbracket \rightarrow p \\ \llbracket \psi \rrbracket \rightarrow \neg p \end{array} \right\} \end{array} \right\}$	$\Leftrightarrow \mu \Leftrightarrow$		/(m)a/ / [CONTR]

The presuppositional content of $-(m)a$ is syntactically triggered and encoded with \bar{A} -movement to the $-(m)a$ field. We will also bring in empirical evidence from other Anatolian languages.

SELECTED REFERENCES

- Bobaljik, J. D. (2012). *Universals in Comparative Morphology: Suppletion, superlatives, and the structure of Words*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chierchia, G. (2013). *Logic in Grammar: Polarity, Free Choice and Intervention*. Oxford studies in semantics and pragmatics 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Embick, D. (2010). *Localism versus Globalism in Morphology and Phonology*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hahn, E. A. (1933). Light from Hittite on Latin indefinites. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 63:28–40.
- Hoffner, H. A. and Melchert, H. C. (2008). *A Grammar of the Hittite Language. Part 1: Reference Grammar*. Languages of the Ancient Near East. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Marantz, A. (2011). Locality domains for contextual allophony. Paper presented at the Columbia Linguistic Society.
- Mitrović, M. (2014). *Morphosyntactic atoms of propositional logic: a philological programme*. PhD thesis, University of Cambridge.
- Toosarvandani, M. (2014). Contrast and the structure of discourse. *Semantics & Pragmatics*, 7(4):1–57.