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1 Introduction

CONCESSIVE CONNECTIVES IN MATRIX SENTENCES
— truth conditionally equivalent to conjunction
— convey “contrast” between the conjuncts

(1) $p$ although $q$
   a. Asserts: $p \land q$
   b. For some $r$, implies: $p \rightarrow \neg r, q \sim r$ (in Rimon and Winter’s formulation)

(2) The police opened fire although the protest was peaceful.
   a. Asserts the police opened fire and the protest was peaceful
   b. Implies: the police opened fire $\sim \neg$the protest was peaceful

THIS TALK: a puzzling quotative concessive adverbial found in East Circassian (or Kabardian, Northwest Caucasian), which differs from familiar concessives in intriguing ways.

(3) [dekw wadewpše] z’ә-p-ʔ-wә]
    good 2SG.ABS.climb.DYN PREV-2SG.ERG-say-ADV tree.OBL 2SG.ABS-LOC-NEG-climb
    ‘Although you may climb well, don’t climb the tree’ (Kuban)

The quotative concessive cannot be analyzed like although.

— [3] does not assert the matrix, which is not declarative.
— [3] does not assert the prejacent (speaker not commited to you climb well)
— The adverbial is restricted in ways that although and its equivalents are not.

MAIN GOALS:
• Describe the distribution and interpretational effects of the quotative concessive
• Propose a preliminary analysis

---

1This paper is based on data from two dialects of East Circassian: Kuban, spoken in the village Khodz, and Besleney, spoken in the village Ulyap, in the Republic of Adygea, Russia. The construction under discussion has the same distribution in the two dialects, so examples from the two are used intermittently, with the corresponding dialect marked in parentheses after the translation. The data was collected by the first author during two trips to the region in the summers of 2015 and 2016, in collaboration with researchers from HSE and RSUH in Moscow. The authors are grateful to the speakers of East Circassian for sharing their knowledge of the language. Additional thanks go out to Yury Lander and Anastasia Giannakidou.
2 The details

A The quotative concessive adverbial is restricted both in what it can take as prejacent, and in what it can modify.

- Unlike the lexical verb ǯo?e ‘say’, the quotative concessive is incompatible with factive-marked prejacent.

(4) aslan ǯo?ja [nwebe zero ma-kw-e-ne-r]
Aslan 1SG.IO+3SG.ERG.say.PST today FCT-NEG-go-FUT-ABS
‘Aslan told me that he won’t come today.’ (Besleney; Ershova 2013:79)

(5) [wa-zero-xwesaqar] ǯap?wa ś’er jämäkʷat
2SG.ABS-FCT-beware-ABS 2SG.ERG.say.ADV milk.ABS NEG.spill
‘Don’t spill the milk while saying that you’re being careful.’
‘*Even though you’re careful, don’t spill the milk.’ (Besleney)

- The quotative concessive can only modify matrix clauses in a directive mood, and is incompatible with roughly equivalent modal statements:

(6) a. Context: Zara wants to eat a piece of spicy sausage, says: “This isn’t spicy, I can eat this.” Marina thinks that Zara is wrong. She says.

b. [ar ǯap?wa] ar wa-ma-šx
that.ABS 2SG.ERG.say.ADV that.ABS 2SG.ABS-NEG-eat(IMP)
‘That said, don’t eat that.’ (Besleney)

c. (*[ar ǯap?wa]) ar pšxω χʷane-qqam
that.ABS 2SG.ERG.say.ADV that.ABS 2SG.ERG.eat can-NEG
‘(*That said,) you can’t eat that.’ (*modal)

d. (*[ar ǯap?wa]) ar pšxωω
that.ABS 2SG.ERG.say.ADV that.ABS 2SG.ERG.eat.MOD.ADV
_transaksi_2SG.IO-BEN-1SG.ERG-allow-NEG
‘(*That said,) I forbid you to eat that.’ (*indicative)

- Even with directive matrix clauses, it is restricted to negative ones, unlike the concessive connective šhač’e ‘although’

(7) a. [iaxer qwēge] ǯap?wa wa-ma-kw
that.PL.ABS 2SG.IO.call 2SG.ERG.say.ADV 2SG.ABS-NEG-go
‘Don’t go thinking that they’re calling for you.’
b. # [[axer qweqeqam] z’arpwa] kw e
   that.pl.abs 2sg.io.call.neg 2sg.erg.say.adv go
   Intended: ‘Go, even though they’re not calling for you.’

c. [[axer qweqeqam] shaq’e] kw e
   that.pl.abs 2sg.io.call.neg although go
   ‘Go, even though they’re not calling for you.’ (Kuban)

In some cases, the matrix can be a positive imperative with a negative adverbial modifier:

(8) a. Daughter: “I’ll stop by the store and by the school, maybe chat with some people.”
   Mother responds:
   b. [ar z’arpwa] z-we-ma-plah-wa kw e
      that.abs 2sg.erg.say.adv refl.abs-2sg.erg-look-adv go
      ‘That said, go without getting distracted (lit. while not looking around)’ (Besleney)

Except for imperatives, other directive moods are also possible, such as the prohibitive -qwer

(9) [ar z’arpwa] zaqwerem wafe-qwen
    that.abs 2sg.erg.say.adv something.obl 2sg.abs-hurt-proh
    ‘That said, don’t hurt anyone.’ (Besleney)

(10) a. Context: One woman says to another: “I bought my children a bicycle, now they
   can play with it.” The other responds:
   b. [ar za’apwa] wjasabjoxem sjanebegwa
      that.abs 3pl.erg.say.adv 2sg.poss.child.pl.obl 1sg.poss.cucumber
      jare-ma-wate (< a-jere-ma-wate)
      3pl.erg+jus-neg-trample
      ‘That said, your children shall not trample my cucumbers.’ (Besleney)

(11) [ar za’apwa] d-a-d-we-ma-ke-zej
    that.abs 2sg.erg.say.adv 1pl.abs-3pl.io-com-2sg.erg-neg-caus-play
    ‘That said, let’s not play with them (lit. don’t make us play with them)’ (Besleney)

B The quotative concessive is a root phenomenon: it may not modify embedded propositions, even
if they are imperatives framed as indirect speech [12].

(12) wonem sojwamk war sabjoxem [(ar za’apwa)]
    house.obl 1sg.abs.neg.leave.cnv child.pl.obl that.abs 3pl.erg.say.adv
    jalaqwe jamawoqa naz’anwa ja’jesa
    3pl.poss.foot 3pl.erg.neg.get.wet.mod.adv 3pl.io+1sg.erg.say.pst
    ‘Before leaving the house I told the children not to get their feet wet.’
3 The analysis

Descriptively, two components are involved in the interpretation of sentences with the quotative concessive:

- Attributed belief
- Consequential eventuality

\[(13) \quad \text{[} \text{pš'edje } \tilde{z} '\text{ow wəqetəzəneqəm]} \quad \tilde{z} '\text{əpʔwə} \quad \text{kwedre} \quad \text{tomorrow early 2SG.ABS.get.up.FUT.NEG} \quad \text{2SG.ERG.say.ADV much} \quad \text{wə-s'ə-mə-s} \quad \text{2SG.ABS-LOC-NEG-sit} \]

‘Even though you won’t be getting up early tomorrow, don’t stay up too long.’ (Besleney)

Attributed belief: Addressee does not need to get up early.

Consequent eventuality: Addressee stays up late.

An utterance of (13) gives rise to three inferences:

(a) ATTEMPTED CONCESSION: The speaker entertains, but does not commit to, the attributed belief.

(b) DISPREFERENCE: The speaker dispreferes the consequent eventuality.

(c) PRETEXT DENIAL: The speaker rejects the attributed belief as motivation for the consequent eventuality.

How is the adverbial interpreted and how do these inferences arise?

(14) PROPOSAL: The quotative concessive adverbial involves a presupposition and a selectional restriction (or felicity condition):

Presupposition: the (individual denoted by) the quotative subject believes the prejacent \( p \)

Selectional restriction: there is a contextually familiar \( q \) such that, in the context:

(i) the issue ‘whether \( q \)’ is unsettled and

(ii) the quoted belief \( p \) leads to a ranking (metaphysical or epistemic) of \( q \) over \( \neg q \)

(iii) the matrix modifiand matrix \( S \) asserts speaker preference for \( \neg q \)

THE PRESUPPOSITION

— The inference that the quoted subject is epistemically committed to the prejacent cannot be cancelled:

\[(15) \quad \text{[} \text{wered deəw } \tilde{qəzəbəwəʔə]} \quad \tilde{z} '\text{əpʔwə} \quad \text{prazdnikam vəstupat’} \quad \text{song good 2SG.ERG.DYN.say 2SG.ERG.say.ADV celebration.OBL perform} \quad \text{š-ew-mə-s} \quad \text{*[} \text{wered deəw } \tilde{qəzəbəpʔwə} \quad \text{we wjəfeš} \quad \text{LOC-2SG.ERG-NEG-do} \quad \text{song good 2SG.ERG.say.ADV you 2SG.POSS.certainty} \quad \text{χəzəqəm]} \quad \text{become.NEG} \]

‘Don’t perform at the celebration even though (you think) that you sing well. *(You yourself don’t think you sing well.)’ (Kuban)

4
The speaker need not commit to the prejacent:

- In [10], the matrix presupposes speaker commitment to falsity of the prejacent (speaker thinks dress is NOT ready)

  \[
  (16) \quad [\text{\textipa{zaner \ qebw\xaw}} \quad \text{\textipa{\dh \ap\w \w}}] \quad \text{\textipa{\dh\-we-m\-tae}}
  \]
  \[
  \begin{array}{l}
  \text{dress.ABS 2SG.ERG.finish.PST.ADV 2SG.ERG.say.ADV LOC-2SG.ERG-NEG-put.on} \\
  \text{jo\c\'e \ \textipa{\dh\,\textipa{edz\,\textipa{\w\j}}} \ \text{\textipa{x\w\j}}} \\
  \text{POSS.edge sew.MOD must}
  \end{array}
  \]
  \'
  Don’t put the dress on thinking that it is finished, the hem still needs trimming.’
  \quad \text{(Besleney)}

- Incompatibility with factive marker

THE SELECTIONAL RESTRICTION

- For regular directives, such as imperatives, things are fairly clear, since such sentences conventionally commit the speaker to a preference regarding an action under the addressee’s control.

  - Following Condoravdi & Lauer (2012), imperatives utterances commit speakers publicly to a preference about the addressee’s actions.

    \[
    (17) \quad \text{\textipa{\dh\textipa{\w\j}}} = \lambda w[\text{\textipa{PEP\,\w\j}(Sp,p)\,}] \quad \text{(Condoravdi and Lauer’s (2012) ex. (34))}
    \]
    \[
    \quad \text{where PEP\,\w\j}(Sp,p) \quad \text{is true in } w \quad \text{iff the speaker is publicly committed to acting as if they prefer } p \text{ to } \neg p.
    \]

- Since the modified matrix must express speaker dis-preference for some \textit{q} that is implied (in the context) by the attributed belief, only negative directives are possible.

- If \textit{q} is itself negative, two negations surface.

  \[
  (18) \quad \text{a.} \quad [\text{\textipa{ar \ \dh\ap\w \w}}] \quad \text{\textipa{m\j \zaw\w\w\w\w\w\w \w\-q\-m\-te\w\w\w \w}} \\
  \quad \text{that.ABS 2SG.ERG.say.ADV this.time.OBL 2SG.ABS-DIR-NEG-stand.up-ADV} \\
  \quad \text{p-\textipa{\dh\,\textipa{\w\j}}} \quad \text{\textipa{\dh\,\textipa{\w\j}}} \\
  \quad \text{2SG.ERG-do-PROH} \\
  \quad \text{‘That said, this time make sure to stand up (lit. don’t not stand up).’}
  \]

  \[
  \text{b.} \quad (*[\text{\textipa{ar \ \dh\ap\w \w}}]) \quad \text{\textipa{m\j \zaw\w\w\w\w\w\w \w\q\w\w\w \w}} \\
  \quad \text{that.ABS 2SG.ERG.say.ADV this.time.OBL stand.up} \\
  \quad \text{Expected: ‘That said, this time make sure to stand up.’ (Besleney)}
  \]

How the inferences arise:

a. ATTENUATED CONCESSION: This is the presupposition of the adverbial.

b. DISPREFERENCE: This is the force of the matrix clause

c. PRETEXT DENIAL: This is a contextual entailment when the consequential eventuality \textit{q} is an action causally linked to the quoted belief \textit{p}:

  - Speaker entertains the quoted belief \textit{p}
  - The belief that \textit{p} leads quoted subject to prefer consequential action \textit{q}
  - Speaker prefers (or presumes to prefer) that quoted subject NOT prefer \textit{q}
  \quad \text{\rightarrow} \quad \text{Speaker believes that } \textit{p} \text{ does not motivate } \textit{q}.
4 Some consequences

The analysis anticipates cases in which the relation between attributed belief and consequential eventuality is not causal.

(19) a. Context: Thinking to oneself: “Everyone around me is sick, I’m the only one who isn’t.”
    Suddenly realizing, that the likelihood of getting sick is very high:

b. [ar z’æs’wa] soqe-ma-somega-tere
    That said, if only I wouldn’t get sick! / I wish I wouldn’t get sick!’ (Besleney)
    • Here, the consequential eventuality is not under the quoted subject’s (= speaker’s) control.
    • The relation between the belief and the eventuality is epistemic, not causal.

The analysis also anticipates that the adverb can modify matrix sentences that are not negative directives but nevertheless conventionally commit the speaker to a dispreference. We conjecture, but don’t yet know, that the following are such cases:

• Sentences where the matrix S contains a (presumably peformative) negated deontic modal.

(20) [[qazdek’e z’aʔe] z’ær?wa] zewe aje
    1SG.IO.marry 3PL.ERG.say 2SG.ERG.say.ADV immediately yes
    ‘If you are being asked to marry (lit. if they say “marry me”), you don’t have to immediately say yes.’ (Kuban)

• Sentences in which the matrix clause contains an inferential existential copula

(21) [[zəw’ereč’ e qazeleʔw’axe] z’ær?wa woʔ’u ar
    something.INS 1SG.IO.ask.PL.ABS 2SG.ERG.say.ADV 2sgabs.run.ADV that.ABS
    pšem-ra-ʔəm
    2SG.ERG.do.MOD.ADV-EMPH-NEG
    ‘Just because you were asked (to do) something, it’s not that you should rush to do it (lit. do it, running).’ (Kuban)

• Sentences in which the matrix clause contains a rhetorical question

(22) [[sobje] z’ær?wa] adrjexem jag’w xebes x’w’one
    1SG.ABS.rich 2SG.ERG.say.ADV other.PL.OBL 3PL.POSS.heart 2SG.ERG.hurt may
    ‘(You think) you can hurt other people because you’re rich?’ (Kuban)

• Sentences in which the matrix clause contains a negated attitude predicate

(23) se sog’w’aqe-ʔəm abə wəq’ep’enwə [[japeč’ e
    1SG.ABS.think-NEG that.OBL 2SG.ABS.jump.MOD.ADV before
    wəq’ep’efwa šta] z’ær?wa]
    2SG.ABS.jump.POT.ADV can.PST 2SG.ERG.say.ADV
    ‘I don’t think that you can jump from there, even though you’ve jumped from there before.’ (Kuban)
Finally, the analysis has something to say about cases where negation is in a clause embedded by the matrix clause.

— Negative adverbials inside directives

(24) a. Context: A guest says that they will not start eating without the rest of the guests. The host answers:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ar} & \quad \text{ž′op′wə} \\
\text{axem} & \quad \text{w-ja-₇-mə-ž-wə} \\
\text{that.ABS} & \quad \text{2SG.ERG.say.ADV} \\
\text{that.PL.OBL} & \quad \text{2SG.ABS-3PL.IO+DAT-NEG-wait.ADV} \\
\text{šxe} & \quad \text{eat.IMP} \\
\text{‘That said, don’t wait for them, eat something. (Literally: Not waiting for them, eat something.)’ (Besleney)}
\end{align*}
\]

- eat without waiting has a negative directive force: don’t wait before eating.
  Or: eat! don’t wait!

— Directives to give negative directives

(25) a. Context: Aslan tells his mother that his friends are calling for him to play with them; he still has homework to do, but speculates about going after finishing the homework or at some other time. His mother replies:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ar} & \quad \text{ž′ap′wə} \\
\text{jaž’jeəe} & \quad \text{₇-mə-₇-ʒeg₇-wə-ne-r} \\
\text{that.ABS} & \quad \text{2SG.ERG.say.ADV} \\
\text{3PL.IO.say} & \quad \text{2SG.ABS-FCT-NEG-play-FUT-ABS} \\
\text{‘That said, tell them you won’t be playing.’ (Besleney)}
\end{align*}
\]

- Here, the consequential action is telling the friends that he will play later, and hence also playing later.
- A negative directive don’t tell them you’ll be playing would be too weak, expressing dispreference for the speech act, but not dispreference for playing.
- The positive directive in 25b conveys dispreference for both.

5 Conclusion and questions

- The Circassian quotative is different from familiar contrastive connectives like although
  - presupposes an attributed belief – due to its quotative origin.
  - presupposes that the attributed belief implies a certain resolution of a contextually familiar unsettled issue – also due to quotative origin.
  - requires the matrix modifiand to commit the speaker to a dispreference to that resolution
- Inferences of negated causality (König 1991) arise as contextual entailments in some contexts

Looking forward:

- More field work to determine the status of the cases where the matrix is not a negative directive.
- Better understanding of the relation between this adverbial and related connectives in other languages:
  - Japanese quotative concessive restricted to negative contexts (Suzuki 2008)
  - English just because construction (Bender & Kathol 2001)
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