Non-deterministic QUD downdating: evidence from Tagalog naman

Scott AnderBois (Brown)

InqBnB2 – Amsterdam

December 18-19, 2017
Introduction: QUDs

Questions Under Discussion

- One of the most important developments in pragmatics in recent decades: QUDs

  QUDs: is a partially structured set of (possibly implicit) questions which discourse participants are mutually committed to resolving at a given point in discourse.

- Applied to a diverse range of pragmatic phenomena:
  - Rigorous way to determine relevance in implicatures
  - Capture illocutionary force of questions in discourse
  - At-issueness (addressing/not address the QUD) sheds light on typology of entailed contents
Formalizing QUDs

3 aspects of formalizing QUD structures

- QUD structures often conceived of (and sometimes defined) as tree structures:

  Who ate what?
  Who ate tacos? ... burritos? ...

  Did Bill? Did Maribel? ...

  No Yes

- To define a QUD structure, then, is to define 3 different components

  1. Question semantics to characterize individual elements in the QUD (i.e. nodes in tree)
  2. Constraints on the relationship between questions (i.e. edges in the tree)
  3. Dynamics of discourse (i.e. rules of traversal through tree)
Roberts (1996)’ formulation

Edges: the sub/superquestion relation

- Roberts (1996) defines QUD structures as follows:

\[ \text{InfoStr}_D = \langle M, Q, A, <, \text{Acc}, CG, QUD \rangle \]

QUD is a function from \( M \) to ordered subsets of \( Q \cap \text{Acc} \) such that for all \( m \in M \):

a. For all \( q \in Q \cap \text{Acc}, q \in QUD(m) \) iff

1. \( q < m \) (i.e. neither \( m \) nor any subsequent questions are included), and
2. \( CG(m) \) fails to entail an answer to \( q \) and \( q \) has not been determined to be practically unanswerable.

b. \( QUD(m) \) is (totally) ordered by \(<\).

c. For all \( q, q' \in QUD(m) \), if \( q < q' \), then the complete answer to \( q' \) contextually entails a partial answer to \( q \).
Roberts (1996)’ formulation (cont’d)

Dynamics

- Roberts (1996) informally defines the following dynamics for Q and A moves respectively:

  (2) **QUD updating:** If a question is accepted by the interlocutors in a discourse, then it is added to the set of questions under discussion.

  (3) **QUD downdating:** A member of the set of questions under discussion in a discourse $\mathcal{D}$ is removed from that set iff it is either (completely) answered or determined to be unanswerable.
Roberts first gives an intuitive argument based on the (highly idealized) discourse in (4):

(4) Who ate what?
   a. What did Hilary eat?
      i. Did Hilary eat bagels?  
         Ans_{a.i} Yes.
      ii. Did Hilary eat tofu?  
         Ans_{a.ii} Yes.
   b. What did Robin eat?
      i. Did Hilary eat bagels?  
         Ans_{b.i} Yes.
      ii. Did Hilary eat tofu?  
         Ans_{b.ii} Yes.
Empirical argument from focus

Roberts (1996): Focus presupposes current QUD

Empirical argument from English intonational focus, as in (5):

(5) Mary invited John\textsubscript{F} to the party.

Roughly speaking, focus determines alternatives, and these alternatives must ‘match’ those of the QUD.

Presupposition of prosodic focus in an assertion \( \beta \):

\( \beta \) is a congruent answer to the QUD at the time of its utterance.

a. **Congruence** Move \( \beta \) is congruent to a question \(?(\alpha)\) iff its focal alternatives, \(\llbracket \beta \rrbracket^f\) are the q-alternatives determined by \(?(\alpha)\), i.e. iff \(\llbracket \beta \rrbracket^f = \text{q-alt}(\alpha)\)
Contrastive topic and discourse particles

- Focus gives evidence the natural language makes reference to the immediate QUD.
- More recent works have provided arguments for the larger QUD structure:
  - Büring (2003) argues that English contrastive topic conventionally encodes a shift to a sister QUD of the prior QUD.
  - Rojas-Esponda (2014a) argues that the German discourse particle *überhaupt* encodes the resolution of the superquestion of the current QUD.
Argue for non-deterministic QUD downdating

- For Roberts (1996), QUD downdating occurs automatically when an assertion is accepted resolving a given QUD (or when that QUD is mutually determined to be unanswerable).
- Today: argue for a QUD theory in which QUD downdating is non-deterministic, governed by pragmatic reasoning.
- QUDs *may* be downdated when a complete answer is given, but may also remain on the stack, allowing for new subquestions to be addressed.
- Two arguments parallel to Roberts (1996)’s:
  1. Intuitive/theoretical argument from ‘follow-up’ questions in English dialogues
  2. Empirical argument from Tagalog particle **NAMAN**, which makes reference to the prior immediate QUD both in situations where it remains on the stack and those in which it does not.
§2 presents a more theoretical argument from follow-up questions in English dialogues.

§3 introduces Tagalog NAMAN with a focus on contrastive uses.

§4 turns to non-contrastive uses, showing how they receive a unified account with non-deterministic QUD downndating.

§5 extends the account to imperative uses of NAMAN which Schachter & Otanes (1972) describe as conveying “politeness together with mild reproach”

§6 concludes.
Non-deterministic QUD dynamics

‘Follow-up’ questions

Consider the following English dialogues:

(7) A1 What did Alejandro bake?
    B1 Alejandro baked a cake.
    A2 What kind of cake was it?
    B2 Alejandro baked black forest cake.
    A3 Did the cake have cherries inside?
    B3 Yes, the cake had cherries inside.

(8) C1 Who brought a date to the party?
    D1 (Only) Marcus brought a date to the party.
    C2 Who did Marcus bring to the party?
    D2 Marcus brought Yesenia to the party.

A2, A3, and C2 each intuitively serve as follow-ups to the preceding answers, yet in most theories B1, B2, and D1 each obligatorily return the QUD stack to its initial state.
Taking up subquestions

Follow-up questions in tree form

- Follow-up questions ask for greater detail about the original topic, (8).
- Despite following A moves, they do not open a new topic of conversation, but rather ‘drill down’ on the same topic.
- Moreover, there is no predetermined set of such issues (cf. sluicing)

```
Who brought a date?
  - Did M?
    - M brought a date
      - Who did M bring?
        - Did M bring Y?
          - M brought Y
  - Did N?
    - ...
```
Analyzing these dialogues

Roberts (1996)

There are three ways to tackle such dialogues in the framework of Roberts (1996):

1. Treat the latter QUD as an unrelated topic of conversation (i.e. pop the original question, add a new unrelated question)
2. Assume multiple wh- QUD was salient implicitly from the start (e.g. Who brought who to the party?)
3. Non-monotonic revision of the QUD to accommodate the new question

While these options may each cover some cases, they aren’t intuitive for the above dialogues.

- e.g. who Marcus brought as a date is related to the preceding QUD, was not previously salient, and there doesn’t seem to anything exceptional warranting revision
A conservative response

Non-deterministic QUD downdating

- Informally, the idea we pursue here is to treat QUD downdating as essentially optional, governed by pragmatic coordination between interlocutors

- A QUD which has been resolved, then, will typically lead to one of two responses:
  1. Downdating the QUD stack by removing the just resolved question
  2. Updating the QUD stack with a new subquestion of the just resolved question

- Making a move that does neither of these will not typically be pragmatically viable, but may be in special cases such as disagreements (cf. Gutzmann & Castroviejo Miró (2011) on verum focus)
Revising the formalism

A conservative tweak to Roberts (1996)

While this may seem like a major shift, accommodating such cases in fact requires only minor tweaks to Roberts (1996)’s formalism:

(1’) **QUDs (revised):** QUD is a function from $M$ to ordered subsets of $M \cap \text{Acc}$ such that for all $m \in M$:

a. For all $m' \in M \cap \text{Acc}$, $m' \in \text{QUD}(m)$ iff
   1. $m' < m$ (i.e. neither $m$ nor any subsequent questions are included), and
   2. $\text{CG}(m)$ fails to entail an answer to $m'$ and $m'$ has not been determined to be practically unanswerable.

b. $\text{QUD}(m)$ is (totally) ordered by $<$.

c. For all $m', m'' \in \text{QUD}(m)$, if $m' < m''$, then the complete answer to $m''$ contextually entails a partial answer to $m$. 
Revising the formalism

A conservative tweak to Roberts (1996)

- While this may seem like a major shift, accommodating such cases in fact requires only minor tweaks to Roberts (1996)'s formalism:

(3') **QUD downdating (revised):** A member of the set of questions under discussion in a discourse $D$ is **may be** removed from that set *iff* it is either (completely) answered or determined to be unanswerable.
Revising the formalism

A conservative tweak to Roberts (1996)

- While this may seem like a major shift, accommodating such cases in fact requires only minor tweaks to Roberts (1996)'s formalism:

- Two other notational tweaks:
  1. Add $\text{Exp}$ the set of explicit moves to the model.
  2. Formally define the ancillary notion of $\text{IMM-QUD}(m)$

\[(9) \quad \text{IMM-QUD}(m) = \text{the unique question } q \text{ such that for all } q' \in \text{QUD}(m) \text{ where } q \neq q', q' < q\]
Analyzing a sample English dialogue

Follow-up questions

(8)  C1 Who brought a date to the party?  
     D1 (Only) Marcus brought a date to the party.  
     C2 Who did Marcus bring to the party?  
     D2 Marcus brought Yesenia to the party.

(10) QUD(C1) ∅  
     QUD(D1) ⟨C1⟩  
     QUD(C2) ⟨C1, ?D1⟩  
     QUD(D2) ⟨C1, ?D1, C2⟩

► For our sample dialogue, this allows us the QUD in (10)
► For Roberts (1996), QUD(C2) would be empty since D1 gives a complete answer to C1.
► With flexible downdating, however, whether this happens is determined pragmatically
Analyzing a sample English dialogue

Follow-up questions

(8) C1 Who brought a date to the party?
D1 (Only) Marcus brought a date to the party.
C2 Who did Marcus bring to the party?
D2 Marcus brought Yesenia to the party.

(10) QUD(C1)  ∅
QUD(D1) ⟨C1⟩
QUD(C2) ⟨C1, ?D1⟩
QUD(D2) ⟨C1, ?D1, C2⟩

Interim conclusion: dialogues with follow-up questions motivate non-deterministic QUD downdating.

For our sample dialogue, this allows us the QUD in (10).
For Roberts (1996), QUD(C2) would be empty since D1 gives a complete answer to C1.
With flexible downdating, however, whether this happens is determined pragmatically.
Discourse particles in Tagalog

- Tagalog has a rich inventory of 2nd position clitics conveying modal, evidential, and discourse-related meanings.
- One of the most puzzling of these is the particle **NAMAN**.
- **NAMAN** is often described as a marker of ‘contrast’ and given glosses like ‘on the other hand’, ‘but’, and ‘also’:

(11) Nagaaral si Linda. Naglalaro **NAMAN** si Carmen. learn.AV.IMPF DIR Linda play.AV.IMP naman DIR Carmen
‘Linda is studying. Carmen, **on the other hand**, is playing.’ Schachter & Otanes (1972)
Problem: **NAMAN** is not always contrastive

- While **NAMAN** often conveys contrast, many examples don’t involve contrast:

  (12) **Context:** A asks B “Will you marry me?”. B replies:
      Oo **NAMAN**.
      yes naman
      ‘Yes, **of course**.’

  (13) **Context:** The speaker is asked what the speaker and hearer should do today.
      Ma-rami **NAMANG** restaurant sa mall.
      ADJ-quantity naman.LNK restaurant OBL mall
      ‘**Well**, there are many restaurants at the mall.’
A QUD-account of naman

**NAMAN** as marker of a closed QUD

- Analyze **NAMAN** as marking that the immediate QUD of the prior utterance is (or at least should be) resolved.
- Contrastive uses like (11) arise when the prior immediate QUD is marked resolved, and . . .
  - . . . the utterance containing **NAMAN** happens to address a sister QUD (which may or may not be indicated by other elements such as topic and focus).
- Non-contrastive uses arise when the prior immediate QUD is marked resolved, and . . .
  - . . . the utterance containing **NAMAN** happens to address the same QUD, conveying obviousness as in (12), or
  - . . . the utterance containing **NAMAN** happens to address a follow-up question, as in (13).
A side problem

Side problem: **NAMAN** across sentence types

- Schachter & Otanes (1972) give very different characterizations of **NAMAN** across sentence types:

(14) **Imperative** – “politeness together with mild reproach”

Tulung-an mo **NAMAN** ako.  
help.IMP-PV 2SG.INDIR naman 1SG.DIR  
‘Please help me. *(Don’t just sit there.)*’ Schachter & Otanes (1972)

(15) **Predicative adjective** – “critical or negative attitude”

Ma-rumi **NAMAN** ito  
ADJ-dirt naman this  
‘This is dirty *(and I’m displeased).*’ Schachter & Otanes (1972)

- We return to these uses later time permitting.
Contrastive uses of naman

Semantic opposition uses of NAMAN

- Schachter & Otanes (1972), p. 425 distinguish 2 uses of NAMAN with all declaratives.
  - “to express dissimilarity between two situations”:

(16) a. Nagaaral si Linda. Naglalaro NAMAN si Carmen. learn.AV.IMPF DIR Linda play.AV.IMPF naman DIR Carmen ‘Linda is studying. Carmen, on the other hand, is playing.’ Schachter & Otanes (1972)

b. Bumili ako ng karne kahapon. Ngayon, isda buy.AF.PERC 1SG.DIR INDIR meat yesterday today fish NAMAN.
naman ‘I bought meat yesterday. Today, (it will be) fish (instead).’ (Schachter & Otanes, 1972)
Correction/counterexpectation not due to NAMAN

- *naman* in these uses is comparable to ‘semantic opposition’ uses of English *but* (see, e.g. Toosarvandani (2014)):

  (17) a. The player is tall, but agile. [Counterexpectational]
     b. Liz doesn’t dance, but sing. [Corrective]
     c. John is tall, but Bill is short. [Semantic Opposition]

- NAMAN is possible with counterexpectation, but it is *pero* or *ngunit* convey these inferences:

  (18) May umuugoy talaga-ng duyan ng bata, pero wala exist rock.AV.IMPF really-LNK cradle INDIR child but not.exist NAMAN tao.

  naman person
  ‘Something is really rocking the child’s cradle, but no one is there.’ Martin (2004)
Shift of viewpoint uses of naman

Questioner-responder shifts

▶ Schachter & Otanes (1972)’s second use they describe is “to express a shift of viewpoint”:

(19) **Context:** *Kumusta ka?* ‘How are you?’
Mabuti. Ikaw **NAMAN**?
fine 2sg.Dir naman
‘Fine. **And [what about] you?**’ (Alt. ‘Your turn.’) Schachter &
Otanes (1972)

(20) Juan **ang pangalan ko.** At ang iyo **NAMAN**?
Juan Dir name 1sg.INDIR and Dir 2sg.INDIR naman
‘My name is Juan. And yours?’ Schachter & Otanes (1972)
Contrast beyond declaratives

Contrasting uses in imperatives and interrogatives

- We also find similarly contrastive examples with imperative and interrogative sentences:

(21) **Context:** A child, B, talking to their mother about what food they bought yesterday and will buy later today.
Kahapon bumili ka ng manok. Ngayon NAMAN yesterday buy.AV.PFV DIR.2sg INDIR chicken today naman bumili ka (na) ng isda. buy.AV.IMPER DIR.2sg now INDIR fish
‘Yesterday, you bought chicken. Today, on the other hand, buy fish!’

(22) **Context:** Two siblings, A and B, discussing what food their mother bought yesterday and will buy later today.
Bumili si nanay ng manok kahapon (pero) ano buy.AV.PFV DIR mother INDIR chicken yesterday but what NAMAN ang bibilhin niya ngayon? naman DIR buy.PV.FUT INDIR.3sg today
‘Mom bought chicken yesterday, but what will she buy today?’
Contrastive topic in QUD theories

Büring (2003) analyzes Contrastive Topic (CT) intonation in English as indicating a QUD strategy:

Who ate what?

- Fred\(CT\) ate the beans\(_F\)
- Mary\(CT\) ate the eggplant\(_F\)

An alternative: decompose CT into two components (cf. Constant (2014))

- Indicating a shift between sister QUDs
- Constrains which QUDs these are together with focus
Contrastive naman signals a shift between sister QUDs

- In the uses of Naman we have seen, there is similarly closure of the prior immediate QUD and the opening of a sister QUD:

learn.AV.IMPF DIR Linda play.AV.IMPF naman DIR Carmen

‘Linda is studying. Carmen, on the other hand, is playing.’

What is everyone doing?

What is Linda doing?  What is Carmen doing?

Linda is studying  Carmen Naman is playing

- Pragmatic topic and focus may constrain the possible QUDs, but need not. (e.g. Kroeger (1993), Kaufman (2005))
Cross-linguistic comparisons

CT across languages

- Contrastive **NAMAN** is like contrast markers cross-linguistically: (Tonhauser (2012) for Guaraní, Constant (2014) in Chinese, Mikkelsen (2016) in Karuk)

- These elements all differ from English CT in two key ways:
  1. English CT is ‘forward-looking’, whereas **NAMAN** is ‘backward-looking’.
  2. English CT picks out specific sister QUDs
     - Since English CT incorporates intonational focus (setting aside boundary tones, F= H*, CT = L+H*), it constrains the QUD in particular ways
     - Given the pragmatics of deaccenting in English (unlike Tagalog), this means that CT is obligatory in English when possible (Büring (2003), Constant (2014))
Naman is not always contrastive

- The examples we have seen thus far all intuitively involve contrast of some kind.
  - **However,** NAMAN is also frequently used in declaratives where there is no contrast.

- Descriptively, there are two uses of this sort:
  1. to convey the obviousness of the previous immediate QUD.
  2. to signal a move to a sub-question/sub-issue of the previous immediate QUD.

- (cf. Bloomfield (1917): NAMAN “expresses transition to another subject, hence often also mild contrast”)

§4: Beyond contrast
Obviousness uses of **NAMAN**

- **NAMAN** often is used to signal that the resolution of the prior immediate QUD is (or should be) obvious:

(24) **Context:** A asks B “Will you marry me?”. B replies: Oo **NAMAN**. yes naman ‘Yes, **of course**.’

(25) **Context:** A Facebook discussion about whether a recipe which calls for steaming a chocolate cake counts as ‘no-bake’. “Of course po. Steaming is definitely not baking. Steamed ang siopao. Hindi **NAMAN** yun baked. Lol!”

(26) **Context:** Responding to the question ‘Who likes chocolate?’ Lahat **NAMAN** ay mahilig sa tsokolate all naman **TOP fond** OBL chocolate ‘Everyone likes chocolate (**duh**)’
Obviousness used concessively

Concessions as a particular case of obviousness

One particular use of this sort is in concessives:

(27) a. Alam ko **NAMANG** sadya-ng magkalayo ang know 1SG.INDIR naman.LNK purpose-LNK be.far.apart ANG ating mundo. 1PL.INDIR.LNK world.

‘I know, **of course**, there’s a reason our worlds are far apart.’

b. Pero aking ma-ima-pangako-ng:

‘but I will promise you (this):’

(28) Kahit alam **NAMANG** walang pag-asa, ang puso although know naman.LNK not.exist.LNK NMLZ-hope DIR heart ko-ng ito-’y ’di pamimigay 1SG.INDIR-LNK this-TOP NEG be.free

‘Even if I know there’s no hope, my heart won’t be free (i.e. available to anyone else)’
Move to subquestion uses

Raising sub-issues

- The second non-contrastive use is to shift the immediate QUD to a sub-question/sub-issue:

(29) **Context:** Spkr is asked what the speaker and hearer should do today.
Ma-rami NAMANG restaurant sa mall.
Adj-quantity naman restaurant OBL mall
‘Well, there are many restaurants at the mall.’

(30) **Context:** Addr states that Juan is going to the concert. Spkr replies:
Hindi siya pupunta, nagcancel NAMAN siya.
NEG 3SG.DIR go cancel naman 3SG.DIR
‘He’s not going, he cancelled.’
The effect of naman

**NAMAN** as a marker of QUD-closure

- Using **NAMAN** in a discourse move $m$ signals the following:

  (31) $naman(m)$ indicates that $\text{Imm-QUD}(m-1)$ is (or should be) entailed by $\text{CG}(m)$

- Note that **NAMAN** does not directly indicate anything about the current QUD-structure (e.g. $\text{Imm-QUD}(m)$).

- Nor does it indicate any sort of non-monotonic revision to the overall QUD structure.

- **NAMAN** merely marks $\text{Imm-QUD}(m-1)$ as resolved, leaving other aspects of QUD coordination to pragmatic reasoning and other linguistic means (e.g. focus, *pero* ‘but’, *ngunit* ‘but’).
Three kinds of QUDs

- The three subcases we have seen, then, represent the different kinds of \( \text{Imm-QUD}(m) \) possible under non-deterministic QUD downdating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrastive</th>
<th>Obviousness</th>
<th>Move to subquestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( m \rightarrow m-1 \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow m )</td>
<td>( m \rightarrow m-1 \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow m )</td>
<td>( m \rightarrow m-1 \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow m )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sisterhood)</td>
<td>(Identity)</td>
<td>(Subquestion)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Returning to the data

Analysis of contrastive **NAMAN**

learn.AV.IMPF DIR Linda  play.AV.IMP naman DIR Carmen 
‘Linda is studying. Carmen, on the other hand, is playing.’

- **ImM-QUD**(m − 1): ‘What is Linda doing?’
- **ImM-QUD**(m): ‘What is Carmen doing?’
  - Therefore, **NAMAN** in the second clause, move m, indicates that **ImM-QUD**(m − 1) is settled by **CG**(m)
  - Since m is construed as addressing a sister QUD, **NAMAN** has the effect of signalling this shift
Obviousness use revisited

Analysis of obviousness **NAMAN**

- **Imm-QUD**($m - 1$): ‘Who likes chocolate?’
- **Imm-QUD**($m$): ‘Who likes chocolate?’

  > Therefore, **NAMAN** in the second clause, move $m$, indicates that **Imm-QUD**($m - 1$) is settled by **CG**($m$)
  > Since $m$ is construed as addressing an identical QUD, **NAMAN** has the effect of signalling that the speaker regards this question as already settled.

(33) **Context:** Responding to the question ‘Who likes chocolate?’

Lahat **NAMAN** ay mahilig sa tsokolate
all naman TOP fond OBL chocolate
‘Everyone likes chocolate (**duh**)’
Subquestion use revisited

Analysis of subquestion NAMAN

- \textbf{Imm-QUD}(m - 1): ‘What should we do?’
- \textbf{Imm-QUD}(m): ‘Where should we eat lunch (the thing we should do)?’

- Therefore, \textbf{NAMAN} in the second clause, move \textit{m}, indicates that \textbf{Imm-QUD}(m - 1) is settled by CG(m)
- Since \textit{m} is construed as addressing a subquestion, \textbf{NAMAN} has the effect of signalling this.
- N.B. this sort of use is potentially risky since it relies on the addressee inferring the intended resolution of \textbf{Imm-QUD}(m - 1)

(34) **Context:** Spkr is asked what the speaker and hearer should do today.
Ma-rami \textbf{NAMANG} restaurant sa mall.
Adj-quantity naman restaurant OBL mall
\textit{‘Well, there are many restaurants at the mall.’}
Cases that disallow naman

(35) **#Correction with same QUD:**

a. Si John ba ang kumain ng tinola?  
   Dir John Q Dir eat.Pfv.AV Indir soup  
   ‘Was John the one who ate the soup?’

b. Hindi, si Bill (#NAMAN) yung kumain ng tinola.  
   No Dir Bill naman that.Lnk eat.Pfv.AV Indir soup  
   ‘No, it was Bill who ate the soup.’

(36) **#Move to superquestion:**

a. Kailan mo pinatay si Fred?  
   when 2sg.Indir kill.Pfv.Pv Dir Fred  
   ‘When did you kill Fred?’

b. Hindi ko (#?NAMAN) siya pinatay  
   Neg 1sg.Indir naman 3sg.Dir kill.Pfv.Pv  
   Intended: ‘I didn’t kill him at all.’

Finally, **NAMAN** is infelicitous with non-sequiturs and other attempts to change the QUD altogether.
**Summary**

**NAMAN in declaratives**

- To summarize, we have presented an analysis of contrastive and non-contrastive uses of Tagalog **NAMAN** in declaratives.
- **NAMAN** is uniformly analyzed as signalling that the prior immediate QUD is (or at least should be) already resolved.
- Despite this, the current **IMMQUD** can remain the same or else be a sub-question as the prior one, supporting the claim that QUD downdating is non-deterministic.
- Whereas changing topics entirely with **NAMAN** is infelicitous, the range of felicitous **NAMAN** matches what we expect given our revised QUD theory.
Contrastive and non-contrastive cases

- Contrastive instances of NAMAN in imperatives are straightforward, (37).

(37) **Context:** A child, B, talking to their mother about what food they bought yesterday and will buy later today.

Kahapon bumili ka ng manok. Ngayon NAMAN yesterday buy.AV.PFV DIR.2sg INDIR chicken today naman bumili ka (na) ng isda.

buy.AV.IMPER DIR.2SG now INDIR fish

‘Yesterday, you bought chicken. Today, on the other hand, buy fish!’
Contrastive and non-contrastive cases

- Contrastive instances of NAMAN in imperatives are straightforward, (37).

- However, there are also non-contrastive imperatives that Schachter & Otanes (1972) describe as expressing ‘politeness together with mild reproach’:

(38) Huwag NAMAN kayo-ng maingay
    Neg.IMP naman Dir.2PL-LNK noisy
    ‘Please don’t be noisy.’

Schachter & Otanes (1972, p. 425)
More on imperatives

Further empirical observations

- However, this use only arises when the addressee’s choice of action should already be apparent.
- Consider, for example the context sensitivity of their (39): 

(39) Tulung-an mo NAMAN ako.
help.IMP-PV 2SG.INDIR naman 1SG.DIR
‘Please help me. (Don’t just sit there.)’

a. ✓ Context: You can see that my foot is stuck and that I am in pain.

b. ✗ Context: Unbeknownst to you, my foot is stuck under a table.

- Just as obviousness uses of NAMAN in declaratives may mark the prior IMMQUD resolved, NAMAN in imperatives may signal that the prior choice is (or should be) resolved.
Assumptions about imperatives

Imperative express preferences

- Setting aside many substantial differences between accounts, the bulk of recent work on imperatives takes imperatives to express preferences of a certain kind (e.g. Portner (2004), Kaufmann (2012), Condoravdi & Lauer (2012))

- Drawing on parallels with assertion and CG, several recent works argue that imperatives encode proposals to update mutual preferences (e.g. von Fintel & Iatridou (2017), AnderBois (t.a.), Portner (t.a.))

- Just as proposals to update CG (≈ assertions) address a QUD, proposals to update mutual preferences/todolist address a decision problem/QUD
Imperatives w/ naman

Insistence

- **NAMAN** conveys that this prior QUD/decision problem is (or should be) resolved already, despite the fact that imperative in this case still addresses it.
  - Insistence is due to the speaker uttering the imperative while acknowledging that the addressee’s decision problem is or should be resolved already
  - **Note** Schachter & Otanes (1972) claim that such uses receive a ‘emphatic statement’ intonation rather than that found in commands or requests.

Politeness

- Resolving a QUD is a shared endeavor, so the use of **NAMAN** conveys that the speaker does not aim to change the preferences the addressee will act upon.
We have informally proposed that the proposed account can also be applied also to imperatives, capturing both contrastive and non-contrastive uses.

Contrastive uses are very similar across different sentence types.

Non-contrastive uses superficially – NAMAN ‘strengthens’ declaratives, while it ‘softens’ imperatives.

Similar asymmetries found in many other cases: e.g. Kaufmann & Kaufmann (2012) for German doch, Schachter & Otanes (1972) for Tagalog nga, Davis (2009) for Japanese yo, Lee (2015) for Colloquial Singapore English lah
In this talk, I have given two arguments for flexible QUD downdating: 1) intuitions about dialogues with ‘follow-up’ questions, 2) data from the Tagalog discourse particle NAMAN.

While NAMAN is often described as ‘contrastive’, it in fact has a range of uses across sentence types.

Claim: these uses arise from a single meaning where NAMAN marks the prior immediate QUD as resolved.

Different current immediate QUDs produce different relationships with the resolved QUD, leading to different perceived effects.

Crucially, these relations include not just sisterhood, but identity and subquestionhood.

Finally, I have argued that the account captures seemingly different uses with imperatives (predicate adjectives and interrogatives with NAMAN present yet further cases).
Further implications

Typology of contrastive elements

The account also expands the cross-linguistic typology of contrast-like elements:

1. Indicates resolution of prior IMMQUD
2. Signals a shift to a new QUD sister to the prior one
3. Constrains the new sister QUD to a particular question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrast type</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>English CT intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Guaraní =katu, YM kux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Tagalog naman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>German doch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rojas-Esponda (2014b) analyzes German doch as the opposite of Type 2, explicitly limiting it to identical QUDs.
Possible QUDs?

- Ginzburg (1996) has the same essential issue, though the more flexible notion of what it means to resolve a question in Ginzburg (1995) helps in certain cases.
- Rojas-Esponda (2014a)’s formalism allows presuppositions for questions and therefore could be naturally extended to cover such cases, but explicitly does not.
- Onea (2015) develops a notion of possible QUD which is at once more restrictive (it requires some syntactic/compositional connection with prior material) and less restrictive (it permits side issues with no relation to the prior QUD).
  - Recall that NAMAN doesn’t work with non-sequiturs/true tangents.
Maraming salamat po! Thank you!

Thanks to anonymous AFLA 23 reviewers and audiences at AFLA 23 and Georgetown University. Thanks also Michael Yoshitaka Erlewine, Vera Hohaus, Henrison Hsieh, Paul Portner, Norvin Richards, Jenny Tan, and especially to Amber Teng for her hard work and patience as a language consultant.
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Predicate adjectives

S&O: NAMAN with adjectives across various constructions: “critical or negative attitude”

(41) Mahal NAMAN ito.
    expensive naman this
    ‘This is expensive (and I am displeased).’
Predicate adjectives

- S&O: NAMAN with adjectives across various constructions: “critical or negative attitude”

(41) Mahal NAMAN ito.
    expensive naman this
    ‘This is expensive (and I am displeased).’

- However, their examples have naturally negative adjectives – positive antonyms yield the opposite:

(42) Mura NAMAN ito.
    affordable naman this
    ‘This is so affordable (I can buy it).’
**Predicate adjectives**

- **S&O:** NAMAN with adjectives across various constructions: “critical or negative attitude”

  (41) Mahal NAMAN ito.  
  expensive naman this  
  ‘This is expensive (and I am displeased).’

- However, their examples have naturally negative adjectives – positive antonyms yield the opposite:

  (42) Mura NAMAN ito.  
  affordable naman this  
  ‘This is so affordable (I can buy it).’

**Possibility 1** NAMAN signals a move to a sub-question about the *degree* to which the predicate holds.

**Possibility 2** NAMAN signals that a prior QUD (here, ‘Can I buy it?’) is resolved.

- **Suspicion:** 1 is true of exclamatives and other ‘high degree’ constructions, 2 holds of ordinary declaratives.
Interrogatives with naman

As we have seen, interrogatives with NAMAN may have contrastive uses:

(43) **Context:** Two siblings, A and B, discussing what food their mother bought yesterday and will buy later today.

Bumili si nanay ng manok kahapon (pero) ano buy.AV.Pfv DIR mother INDIR chicken yesterday but what NAMAN ang bibilhin niya ngayon?
naman DIR buy.PV.FUT INDIR.3sg today

‘Mom bought chicken yesterday, but what will she buy today?’
Interrogatives with naman

Interrogatives with NAMAN

- As we have seen, interrogatives with NAMAN may have contrastive uses:

- However, they also have rhetorical question-like uses in identity cases:

(44) **Context:** The singer finds their lover has done them wrong and moved on.

Diyos ko, ano ba naman ito?
god my what Q naman this
‘My God, what the hell is this?’
Ensuring semantic opposition

Ruling out parallelism cases

- One potential worry: the account seems to predict that **NAMAN** can be used in cases of parallelism.

(45) #Nagaaral si Linda. Nagaaral **NAMAN** si Carmen.
learn.AV.IMPF Dir Linda play.AV.IMP naman Dir Carmen
‘Linda is studying. Carmen is studying.’

- Suppose $\text{IMM-QUD}(m_1) = \text{‘Is Linda studying?’}$ and $\text{IMM-QUD}(m_2) = \text{‘Is Carmen studying?’}$.

**Response 1:** QUD structures don’t include individual polar questions (i.e. (45) is bad because $\text{IMM-QUD}$ is ‘Who is studying?’ in both clauses).

**Response 2:** Parallelism must be expressed overtly with *rin*. When expressed, this forces the higher-level $\text{IMM-QUD}$ (see Krifka (1999) on *too*)