

Truncated or not, these are alternative concessive conditionals
Josep Quer & Marika Lekakou

The literature on concessive conditionals, or unconditionals, has identified three distinct subtypes, on the basis of form and meaning (König 1986; 1988, Zaefferer 1991): universal, scalar/polar and alternative. The three kinds are illustrated in (1)-(3) from English.

- (1) However much/whatever advice you give him, he will do what he wants.
 (2) Even if you drink only a little, you will get fired.
 (3) Whether he is right or not, we must support him.

In this talk we focus on alternative unconditionals in Greek, and in particular on two related ways of expressing this type of concessive semantics, provided in (4) and (5) (see Holton et al. 1997 for a more comprehensive overview of concessive constructions). In (4) the affirmative and the negative counterpart of the same clause are co-ordinated, introduced in each case by the disjunctive conjunction *ite* ('either'). The (seemingly) reduced version in (5) involves, again, co-ordination of the affirmative and the negative clause, however in this case no overt disjunction is realized; rather it seems that the verb alone (or the clitic-verb complex, if there is a clitic) is duplicated in a paratactic combination.

- (4) Ite to thelis ite den to thelis, tha erthis stin ekdromi.
 DISJ it.ACC want-2SG DISJ NEG it.ACC want-2SG FUT come-3SG to.the-ACC excursion-ACC
 'Whether you like it or not, you are coming [with] to the excursion.'
 (5) To thelis den to thelis, tha erthis stin ekdromi.
 it.ACC want-2SG NEG it.ACC want-2SG FUT come-3SG to.the-ACC excursion-ACC
 'Like it or not, you are coming [with] to the excursion.'

We dub (5) the V-doubling construction, a purely descriptive label since, arguably, the parataxis comprises clausal components. We explore the relation between V-doubling and the disjunctive conjunction construction in (4). The interpretation of both constructions is roughly as follows: "irrespective of p or not-p holding, q holds" (where q corresponds to the matrix clause). Following Rawlins (2008, 2013), we take it that unconditionals have the external syntax and semantics of conditional adjuncts, and the internal syntax and semantics of questions: they denote sets of alternatives. Note that the disjunction *ite* originates from the Ancient Greek complementizer *eĩ*, which introduced conditional protases and indirect questions, plus the coordinative conjunction $\tau\epsilon$. In both (4) and (5) we are dealing with clausal constituents: *ite* is, therefore, in (4) a C-head. We argue that (5) features a covert form of the double disjunction *ite...ite*, with an underlying structure à la (4). Despite the potential appeal of an analysis in terms of V-to-C movement attested in conditional protases (Iatridou & Embick 1994), we discard it because unlike V-to-C derivations (e.g. imperatives), bare unconditionals robustly display proclisis and not enclisis. However, the dependent CPs exhibit some degree of truncation of peripheral positions, as they do not allow for focused constituents, as illustrated in (6).

- (6) *TO VIVLIO, diavasis den diavasis, tha perasis stis eksetasis.
 the book.ACC read-PNP.2SG NEG read-PNP.2SG FUT pass-PNP.2SG in.the-ACC exams-ACC

The evidence that unconditionals are externally conditional clauses comes from the fact that the matrix clause cannot contain an episodic tense, as shown in (7). In other words, the presence of a modal operator is a crucial ingredient of the structure. This is easily understood if, as per Rawlins (op. cit.), unconditionals are conditional clauses: they serve to restrict the domain of the sentential operator.

- (7) a. *(Ite) ta dosi (ite) den ta dosi ta xrimata piso,
 DISJ them.ACC give-PNP.3SG DISJ NEG them.ACC give-PNP.3SG the money back
 ton apelian xtes/ ton apoliun afti ti stigma.
 him.ACC fire-PST.3PL yesterday/him.ACC fire-PRS.3PL this the moment
 b. (ite) ta dosi (ite) den ta dosi ta xrimata piso,
 DISJ them.ACC give-PNP.3SG DISJ NEG them.ACC give-PNP.3SG the money back
 tha ton apolisun.
 FUT him.ACC fire-PNP.3PL
 'Whether he gives the money back or not, they will fire him.'

In addition, unconditionals display the full paradigm of conditional clauses. (4)-(5) and (7b) correspond to a factual (future oriented) conditional; (8a) and (8b) to a present counterfactual and to a past counterfactual, respectively:

- (8) a. Erxosoun den erxosun, tha pijename
 come-IMPF.2SG NEG come-IMPF.2SG FUT go-IMPF.1PL
 ‘Whether you came or not, we would go.’
 b. Ixes den ixes erthi, tha ixame pai.
 have-IMPF.2SG NEG have-IMPF.2SG come-NONFIN FUT have-IMPF.1PL go-NONFIN
 ‘We would have gone regardless of you coming or not.’

In contrast to the restriction in (7) on the matrix clause, the unconditional clause itself may feature any tense form. In (4) and (5) we see the imperfective non-past, but the perfective non-past is equally possible (7b), as are past tense forms in (9) (past imperfective, past habitual reading), (10) (past perfective, epistemic reading) and (11) (perfect).

- (9) Erxotan den erxotan, emis tu ixame to krevati stromeno.
 come-IMPF.3SG NEG come-IMPF.3SG we him-GEN had.1PL the bed made.up
 ‘Whether he came or not, we had his bed ready.’
 (10) Irthe den irthe o ximonas, emis tha kripsume
 come-PST.3SG NEG come-PST.3SG the.NOM winter we.NOM FUT store.PNP.1PL
 ta kalokerina.
 the summer.clothes
 ‘Whether the winter has arrived or not, we’ll store the summer clothes.’
 (11) Exis den exis fai ja vradi, tin pita tis jajas
 have-PRS.2SG NEG have-PRS.2SG eat-NONFIN for night the.ACC pie the-GEN granny
 prepi na tin dokimasis.
 must SUBJ it-ACC try-PNP-2SG
 ‘Whether you have had dinner or not, you must try granny’s pie.’

Of particular interest is the grammaticality of the perfective non-past (or PNP for short) in the unconditional protases. This is a form whose occurrence is restricted – whence the characterization ‘dependent’ in many descriptive works; see Roussou (2000) and references therein. The PNP is only allowed in contexts which involve some sort of modal particle or C-element; it is licensed in the presence of future/modal *tha*, optative *as* and subjunctive *na*, prohibitive *min*, in temporal clauses with *prin*, in free relatives, and crucially in conditional protases (see Giannakidou 2009). Note, for example, that when *ite* is purely disjunctive, outside unconditionals, it fails to license the PNP; in (11), it is modal/future *tha* which renders the PNP licit. The same is attested in correlation with the doubled default disjunction in (12).

- (11) Dio pragmata borun na simvun: ite *(tha) vrexsi ite den *(tha) vrexsi.
 two things can-PRS.3PL SUBJ happen-PNP.3PL DISJ FUT rain-PNP.3SG NEG FUT rain-PNP.3SG
 ‘Two things may happen: either it will rain or it will not rain.’
 (12) I *(tha) mu to pis i *(tha) figo.
 DISJ FUT me-GEN it.ACC tell-PNP.2SG DISJ FUT leave-PNP-1SG
 ‘Either you tell me or I’ll leave.’

We take the licitness of the PNP in unconditionals in conjunction with the facts in (11)-(12) to show that unconditionals are necessarily clausal – i.e. larger than simply *vP* or *TP* constituents – which restrict the modal operator present in the matrix clause. Indirectly, therefore, we provide evidence for covert *C* heads even in the seemingly “bare” V-doubling constructions as in (5). In the talk we will provide an explicit analysis of the syntactic relation (a) between the two paratactically or conjunctively conjoined clauses, as we well as (b) their relation to the matrix clause.

Selected References

- Giannakidou, A. 2009. The dependency of the subjunctive revisited: temporal semantics and polarity. *Lingua* 120: 1883-1908. Iatridou, S. & D. Embick 1994. Conditional inversion. In *Proceedings of NELS 24*. Amherst, MA: GLSA. König, E. 1986. Conditionals, concessive conditionals and concessives: Areas of contrast, overlap and neutralization. In E. Traugott, A.G.B. ter Meulen, J. Reilly, & C. Ferguson (eds.), *On Conditionals*. 229–246. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Quer, J. 1998. *Mood at the interface*. PhD Dissertation, University of Utrecht. Rawlins, K. 2008. Unifying *if*-conditionals and unconditionals. In *Proceedings of SALT 18*. Ithaca, NY. CLC Publications. Rawlins, K. 2013. (Un)conditionals. *Natural Language Semantics* 40:111-178. Roussou, A. 2000. On the left periphery: modal particles and complementizers. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 1: 63–93. Zaefferer, D. 1991. Conditionals and unconditionals: Cross-linguistic and logical aspects. In D. Zaefferer (ed.), *Semantic universals and universal semantics*, 210–236. Dordrecht: Foris.