Revisiting Conditional Typology for Bangla

There are three broad kinds of Conditionals: Hypothetical (Indicative and Subjunctive), Factual (or Premise) and Biscuit (or Relevance, Speech-Act) (Bhatt and Pancheva (2006), Haegeman (2019) a.o.). Eastern Indo-Aryan languages like Ashamiya, Bangla and Odia have a conditional participle –le exclusively used for forming conditional antecedents. We show that Bangla antecedents with –le can be used to form a Hypothetical conditional (HC)(3), Factual conditional(5) and a standard Biscuit conditional (BC) (7), but when –le antecedents are used to form BCs of the discourse structuring Speech-Act kind (9), they are not felicitous. Like the rest of the Indo-Aryan, Bangla uses correlative clauses to form conditional antecedents, too (1-4, 6, 8). The correlatives can be felicitously used to form all kinds of conditionals including the Speech-Act. Based on the limitation shown by –le, we propose to modify the typology of conditionals by introducing a clear sub-division among BCs. The two kinds of BC differ in terms of what predicates can embed their consequents. Additionally, we observe that the distribution of the then-word tahole in Bangla is exactly parallel to a –le antecedent (Table) and these two items are in complementary distribution(3). We propose that the empirical coverage of the participle –le provides evidence in favor of a unified semantic analysis of HC and BCs (Biesma and Goebel (to appear), Csipak (2016) a.o.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table:</th>
<th>Conditionals</th>
<th>Hypothetical</th>
<th>Factual</th>
<th>Relevance/Biscuit</th>
<th>Speech-Act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlative antecedent</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-le antecedent</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tahole ‘then’ in consequent</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data: For Indicative (1) and Subjunctive (2) conditionals, the verb of the correlative antecedent is necessarily in Habitual aspect of present or past tenses. The verb of –le antecedent (3), however, is marked only by –le and does not contain any other verbal morphology. The correlative antecedent contains the word jodi ‘if’, whereas the –le antecedent cannot contain jodi. The consequent with the correlative antecedent may contain the word for ‘then’, which varies between tahole, tbe, to etc. depending upon the type of the conditional. The consequent with –le antecedent cannot contain tahole (3).

(1) [jodi o pərəʃ[unokore] (tahole) o pəʃ korbe (Indicative)
   if she study do.Hab.Prs.3 then she pass do.Fut.3
   ‘If she studies, she will pass.’

(2) [jodi o pərəʃ[unokarto] (tahole) o pəʃ karto (Subjunctive)
   if she study do.Hab.Pst.3 then she pass do.Hab.Pst.3
   ‘If she studied, she would pass.’

(3) [pərəʃunokor-le] (*tahole) o pəʃ korbe/karto
   study do-LE then she pass do.Fut.3/do.Hab.Pst.3
   ‘If she studies she will pass./If she studied she would pass.’

A correlative antecedent for a Factual conditional (4) may contain non Habitual verb forms.

(4) [jodi o ætəi pərəʃ[unokoreche] tahole o fel koreche kæno ?
   If she so.much study do.Pfv.Prs.3 then she fail do.Pfv.Prs.3 why
   ‘If she has studied so much, then why has she failed?’

(5) [ætəi pərəʃ[unokore thak-le] (*tahole) o fel koreche kæno ?
   so.much study do.Pfv have-LE then she fail do.Pfv.Prs.3 why
   ‘If she has studied so much, then why has she failed?’

A standard Biscuit conditional (BC) can be formed using a –le antecedent (7):

(6) [jodi khide pae] (tahole), nice canteen ače
   if hunger get.Hab.Prs.3 then bottom.Loc canteen be.Prs.3
   ‘If you get hungry, there are canteens downstairs.’

(7) [khide pe-le], nice canteen ače
   hunger get-LE bottom.Loc canteen be.Prs.3
   ‘If you get hungry, there are canteens downstairs.’

However, the discourse structuring Biscuit conditionals are inelicitous with –le (9).

(8) [jodi tumi bhule gie thako] (#tahole), aj amar jonmodin
if you forget.Pfv go.Pfv have.Hab.Prs.3 then today my birthday
‘If you have forgotten, it is my birthday today.’
(9) [tumi bhule gie thak-le], aj amar janmodin
you forget.Pfv go.Pfv have-LE today my birthday
‘If you have forgotten, it is my birthday today.’

To elaborate on the difference between a BC and its discourse structuring variety, we note that a standard BC can be turned into a HC by embedding the consequent under a belief-type predicate like remember or a speech-act predicate like say etc. However, a discourse structuring BC or Speech-Act can be turned into a HC only by embedding the consequent under speech-act predicates like say, ask, inform etc. (note, (11) would be infelicitous with an –le antecedent, when the consequent is not embedded by say).

(10) [jodi khide pae] tahole mone rekho nice canteen ache
if hunger get.Hab.Prs.3 then mind keep.Subj.2 bottom.Loc canteen is
‘If you get hungry then remember there are canteens downstairs.’
(11) [jodi kichu mone na koro] tahole boli tomae khub klanto dækhaache
if anything mind neg do.Hab.Prs.2 then say.Subj.1 you.Dat very tired looking
‘If you don't mind, then let me tell you, you are looking very tired.’

**Analysis:** We propose to recognize the discourse structuring Biscuit conditionals as Speech-Act conditionals. To differentiate between the two kinds of BCSs, we take up the QUD based mapping of Biscuit conditionals to discourse structure proposed by Biesma and Goebel (to appear) (BG). In BG, the antecedent of a conditional is understood as identifying the QUD that the consequent answers. For a Hypothetical conditional like (12), the (enriched) QUD posed by the antecedent is *What do the selected worlds in which it rains look like in terms of how I protect myself from the weather?*, to which the consequent provides the congruent answer: *I wear my hat.*

(12) If it rains, I wear my hat. (13) If you are hungry, there are biscuits on the sideboard.

For a Biscuit conditional like (13), the consequent that *there are biscuits on the sideboard* provides the congruent answer to the QUD *What do the selected worlds in which you are hungry and wish to find food look like?* The answer is subsequently further enriched as a suggestion for the addressee to take the biscuits. We propose that Speech-Act conditionals like (9) or (11) are those where it is not possible to see the conditional as a complex question-answer move like (12) or (13).

[For (9): enriched QUD: *What do the selected worlds in which you have forgotten that it’s my birthday today look like?* Answer: *It is my birthday.*] Here the answer is already presupposed in the QUD posed by the antecedent and hence it should be unassertable. However, the answer would be felicitous if it could be enriched to *I tell/remind you that it is my birthday.*

[For (11): enriched QUD: *What do the selected worlds in which you don’t mind my (possibly impolite) discourse move look like?* Answer: *You are looking very tired.*] In (11) there is no intended correlation between my supposedly impolite discourse move and your looking very tired. The only way to make sense of (11) would be to enrich the answer to *I tell you that you are looking very tired.* The answer enriched thus would be congruent to the QUD posed by the antecedent.

We propose that such enrichment of answers with the insertion of speech-act predicates as required in cases like (9) or (11) is not possible for –le conditionals but it is possible for correlative conditionals. As a contrast notice that for BCss like (6/7, 10) the answer is already congruent and does not need enrichment by embedding. Furthermore, observing their similarity in distribution (and also because of the fact that they can be coordinated), we claim that a –le antecedent and the ‘then’ word tahole occupy the same syntactic position in the consequent (matrix) clause, and that tahole is actually a –le antecedent, as is evident from the morphology (-le). Moreover, we propose that tahole in the consequent is restricted like –le antecedents in terms of the enrichment of answers using speech-act predicates.