Coordinated on the context: the many uses of Marathi =ʦ

ASHWINI DEO, *The University of Texas, Austin*

ABSTRACT

Several Indo-Aryan languages, including Bangla, Gujarati, Hindi, and Marathi contain a discourse clitic whose uses overlap with those of English particles like exclusives *only/just*, anaphoric *indeed/that very*, intensifiers *really/totally*, precisifiers *right/exactly/absolutely*, and scalar additive *even* without corresponding perfectly to any of them. This paper focuses on the Marathi variant *=ʦ* and offers a detailed empirical picture of a subset of its uses – uses involving discourse salience and noteworthiness or unexpectedness. I put forward the hypothesis that *=ʦ* conventionally signals that interlocutors are in mutual agreement that the proposition denoted by the prejacent is uniquely salient among alternatives in the current question. That is, *=ʦ* conveys that the proposition expressed by the prejacent offers a **schelling point** (or focal point) for the interlocutors to coordinate on.

1 Introduction

Marathi contains a chameleon-like enclitic discourse particle *=ʦ* (with an allomorph *=əʦ* in post-consonantal contexts). Depending on contextual conditions, the presence of *=ʦ* in declarative clauses may give rise to a range of inferences that include those associated with exclusives (1a, 1b), precisifiers, (1c), intensifiers (1d), mirativity marking (1e), clefts, expectation confirmation (1f) and scalar additives (1g).

(1) a. CONTEXT: Last week, 20 girls attended the meeting Sp had organized but yesterday...
dəha=ʦ mulī mīʈiŋg=la a-lyat
ten=*c* girl.F.PL.NOM meeting=DAT/ACC come-PERF.3.F.PL
Yesterday, *only/just* ten girls came to the meeting.
⇝ *No more than ten girls came to the meeting.*

b. CONTEXT: Sp told Anu to visit the cities of both Pune and Mumbai. But...
Anu **puɳya=la=ʦ** ge-lī
Anu.F.SG.NOM Pune.OBL=DAT/ACC=*c* go-PERF.F.SG
She went *only/just* to Pune.
⇝ *Anu went nowhere other than Pune.*

c. CONTEXT: Sp tells Ad about the power situation after an earthquake.
səgɭya=ʦ bʰag-at-lī vīʤ ge-lī
every.OBL=*c* area-LOC-F.SG power.F.SG.NOM go-PERF.F.SG
They lost power in *absolutely* every neighborhood.
⇝ *The claim does not exclude any neighborhood in the context.*

d. CONTEXT: Sp tells Ad about a new restaurant.
   tit^{h}lə ʤevəɳ **p^{h}ar=əts** tsəvdar ah-e
   there.from food.N.SG.NOM very=*c* tasty be-PRES.3.SG
   The food there is *really* very tasty.
   ⇝ *The standard for tastiness is boosted at the context.*

e. CONTEXT: Sp tells Ad about how angry their friend got about a sexist remark from a colleague.
   ti=ne tya=la **t^{h}əppəɖ=əts** mar-lī
   she=ERG he.OBL=DAT/ACC slap.F.SG.NOM=*c* strike-PERF.F.SG
   She *just* gave him a slap.
   ⇝ *The slapping deviated sharply from what was contextually expected.*

f. CONTEXT: Ad wants to know if Sp has made dinner; they had discussed making pasta beforehand.
   hoy, mi aʤ **pasʈa=ts** bənəv-la ah-e
   Yes I.NOM today pasta.M.SG.NOM=*c* make-PERF.M.SG be-PRES.3.SG
   Yes, I have made pasta *indeed*.
   ⇝ *The pasta making perfectly matches what was contextually expected.*

g. CONTEXT: Sp tells Ad that Bilal did not invite his colleagues to his wedding, not even his assistant, Nita.
   Bilal=ne **Nīta=la=ts** bolav-lə nahī, bakī
   Bilal=ERG Nita=DAT/ACC=*c* invite-PERF.N.SG NEG other
   lokan=tsə soɖ
   people.OBL.PL=N.SG.GEN leave.IMP
   Bilal didn't invite *even* Nītā, let alone other people.
   ⇝ *Nita was most expected to be a wedding invitee in the context.*

To the best of my knowledge, the clustering of effects of the sort associated with =*ts* has not been identified and investigated in unified fashion for any known discourse marker in Germanic, Romance, or any other language. Moreover, genetically related modern languages like Bangla, Gujarati, Hindi, and Punjabi contain functional counterparts which almost perfectly parallel the distribution and interpretation of Marathi =*ts*.[1] The presence of functional cognates across Indo-Aryan points to the possibility that the particular clustering of discourse effects in Marathi =*ts*'s profile is part of an inherited grammatical core from an older proto-system. This stability in the clustering of uses across related languages (and potentially across time) makes it even more likely that it arises from a single core of conventionalized pragmatic meaning in interaction with specific contextual conditions. In this paper, I take a first stab towards analyzing some uses of =*ts*, explicating the interaction between conventional and contextual meaning.

[1]Of these, only the facts of Hindi =*hi* have been described in some detail (Bhatt, 1994; Varma, 2006; Bajaj, 2016) and will be discussed comparatively as appropriate.

I will claim here that the discourse function of Marathi =*ts* in declarative clauses is to indicate that the speaker takes the prejacent's interpretation to correspond to the unique mutually salient propositional alternative in the current question (CQ_c). The mutually perceived salience of the proposition denoted by the prejacent may be rooted in the localized beliefs and expectations of particular interlocutors at a given utterance context, as in (1f). Alternately, it may emerge from some intrinsic property that lends mutually recognizable prominence to the prejacent proposition (for instance, its unexpectedness or noteworthiness), as in (1e) and (1g).[2] In both cases, I suggest that =*ts* signals that interlocutors are in mutual agreement that the proposition denoted by the prejacent is uniquely salient – it stands out among alternative answers. This amounts to a signal that the interlocutors are coordinated with each other with respect to crucial aspects of the structure and content of the current question. For instance, they might be expected to be coordinated on what the addressee "really" wants to know in asking the question (e.g. 1f) or what the scalar structure of the question is (e.g. 1e). From this perspective, =*ts* conveys that the proposition expressed by the prejacent offers a **schelling point** (or focal point) among alternative answers for the interlocutors to coordinate on. As Schelling (1960) notes, the prominence of such a point in any domain is not necessarily a definite solution; it is heavily context-dependent, varying by time, place and the people involved.

> People can often concert their intentions or expectations with others if each knows that the other is trying to do the same. Most situations – perhaps every situation for people who are practiced at this kind of game – provide some clue for coordinating behavior, some focal point for each person's expectation of what the other expects him to expect to be expected to do. Finding the key, or rather finding a key – any key that is mutually recognized as the key becomes the key – may depend on imagination more than on logic; it may depend on analogy, precedent, accidental arrangement, symmetry, aesthetic or geometric configuration, casuistic reasoning, and who the parties are and what they know about each other. (Schelling, 1960, 57)

This type of flexibility means that although Marathi =*ts* (and Hindi =*hi*) presuppose coordination on the salience of a particular propositional alternative in the current question, the "how" and the "why" of its salience is a contextually varying matter. I will focus here on two kinds of salience: (a) salience that arises on the basis of shared interlocutor beliefs, expectations, and preferences; and (b) salience that arises because of the prejacent's position at the end of a scale of relevant alternatives.

In §2, I organize the core set of facts for the discourse salience and noteworthiness-based uses of =*ts*. In §4, I present the analysis together with descriptions of how it accounts

[2] I leave aside for this presentation the third class of uses of =*ts*. In these uses, what is to be resolved is the intended interpretation of the prejacent. This interpretation is under-determined at a given context, requiring interlocutors to coordinate on a shared interpretation. The role of =*ts* is to facilitate such coordination by presupposing a unique mutually salient interpretation. The examples in (1a, 1b, 1c, 1d) are subsumable under this category. However, articulating the full details of how these cases work is beyond the scope of this more concise presentation.

for described uses. §2. In §5, I briefly document further uses and contrasts that are covered by the analysis and conclude.

2 Some empirical facts about =ts

All judgements reported are the author's native judgements corroborated with two other native speakers. In order to ensure that intuitions about the subtle contrasts that I report here are maximally confirmable, I also provide corresponding translations in Hindi (without glosses) so that Hindi speakers can determine for themselves whether they agree with my judgements regarding the (in)felicity of the Hindi clitic *=hi* in those very contexts.

2.1 Mutual salience based on prior knowledge and expectations

In this section I do two things: First, I rule out the possibility that *=ts* is a "focus" marker simpliciter, in other words, a signal that marks the presence of alternatives relevant to the interpretation of linguistic content (Rooth, 1992; Krifka, 2008; Zimmermann & Onea, 2011). Second, I show that *=ts* can cliticize to a focused constituent felicitously only when the alternative offered as the answer is assumed to be already salient to both interlocutors.

Alternatives made available through focus may be employed in different ways, depending on the goals of discourse participants and surrounding discourse context. Following Zimmermann & Onea (2011) (who in turn build on the functional-typological literature), we can observe the pragmatic use of focus alternatives at least in contexts where *new information* is expected (in answers to questions), *correction* is provided, one among a salient previously introduced set of alternatives is *selected*, and when elements of the alternative set are *contrasted* with each other. We examine the felicity of *=ts* in each of these contexts in succession.

2.1.1 New information focus

=ts is infelicitous in an answer to a wh-question unless the answer is mutually recognized as being salient in the context. *=ts* thus does not correspond to new-information focus simpliciter but may be cliticized to the constituent that provides new information in certain circumstances. Consider the contrast between the two contexts in (2), with the relevant Marathi sentence in (2c). *=ts* is perfectly felicitous (though optional) in Context-1, where there is a salient alternative based on commonly shared experience and this alternative is expressed by Bilal's response. *=ts* is infelicitous in Bilal's response given Context-2, where there is no commonly assumed expectation that the prejacent be true. The Hindi counterpart, which has the same felicity profile, is in (2d).

(2) a. $\surd$ CONTEXT-1: Bilal was at work late last night and Anu wants to know how he got back home. It is commonly known that Niśa usually drops Bilal off when they have to stay late at the office.

A: Who drove you home last night?

b. × CONTEXT-2: Bilal was at work late last night and Anu wants to know how he got back home.
A: Who drove you home last night?

c. B: **Niśa=ne=ts** mə=la soɖ-lə
Niśa=ERG=*c* I.OBL=DAT/ACC leave-PERF.N.SG
Niśa dropped me off.

d. Hindi: **Niśa=ne=hi** muʤʰe ʧʰoɖa

2.1.2 Corrective focus

=*ts* is also infelicitous in corrections unless the answer corresponding to the prejacent is mutually recognized as being salient in the context. (3) shows that =*ts* does not correspond to corrective focus but it may be cliticized to the constituent that provides the correction to a previously offered alternative under certain circumstances. In Context-1, given Niśa's status as the default cook, Bilal's correction in (3c) offers an alternative that is already contextually salient – the use of =*ts* is felicitous. In Context-2, Bilal's correction of Anu's claim does not offer an already salient answer, given that there is no common expectation that Niśa be tonight's cook. (3c) is infelicitous in this context.

(3) a. √ CONTEXT-1: Niśa usually cooks for everyone and it is commonly known that she is the default cook. Bilal had told Anu that he would cook dinner tonight. But he got too busy and Niśa ended up cooking as usual. Anu does not know this and tells her friend:
A: You know, Bilal cooked this delicious meal.

b. × CONTEXT-2: Bilal usually cooks for everyone and it is commonly known that he is the default cook. But it was Niśa who cooked tonight. Anu is unaware of this change, assumes that Bilal cooked as usual, and tells her friend:
A: Bilal cooked this delicious meal.

c. B: nahi-nahi, **Niśa=ne=ts** ʤevəɳ bənəv-lə
No-no Niśa=ERG=*c* meal.N.SG.NOM make-PERF.N.SG
No-no, Niśa made the meal.

d. Hindi: **Niśa=ne=hi** kʰana bənaya

2.1.3 Selective focus

=ts is also infelicitous in contexts where the answer constituent is selected from a restricted set of previously mentioned alternatives, unless the answer is mutually recognized as being independently salient in the context. At Context-1, given the discussion between Anu and Bilal, Anu's answer can be understood as offering a priorly salient alternative – (4c) is felicitous at this context. At Context-2, Anu's answer is expected to be either Nagpur or Mumbai but there is no commonly known preference for either answer – (4c) is infelicitous here.

(4) a. $\surd$ CONTEXT-1: Anu had told Bilal that she offered to pay for a trip for Anu's daughter to any city in Maharashtra. Her daughter was debating between Nagpur and Mumbai. Anu and Bilal have had a prior discussion about why Nagpur would be more interesting for her given its location.
B: So which of the two did she finally decide on?

b. $\times$ CONTEXT-2: Anu had told Bilal that she offered to pay for a trip for Anu's daughter to any city in the state of Maharashtra. Her daughter had been debating between Nagpur and Mumbai.
B: So which of the two did she finally decide on?

c. A: ti=ne **nagpur=la=ts** ʤa-ytsə ʈʰərəv-lə
She.ERG Nagpur.OBL=DAT/ACC=*c* go-INF.N.SG decide-PERF.N.SG
She decided to go to Nagpur.

d. Hindi: us=ne **nagpur=hi** ʧuna

2.1.4 Contrastive focus

=ts is also infelicitous in contrastive statements unless the alternative offered by the prejacent is recognized as independently being mutually salient in the context. Relative to Context-1, given common knowledge about Deepa's schedule, Bilal's use of *=ts* in (5c) indicates that the true answer to part of Anu's question is the commonly expected answer. At Context-2, Bilal contrasts the location of Niśa and Deepa, but there is no shared knowledge about the location of either, making (5c) infelicitous.

(5) a. $\surd$ CONTEXT-1: Anu and Bilal are visiting Niśa's house but Anu cannot see either Niśa or her cousin Deepa. They both know that Deepa is supposed to be teaching at school around this time but Anu is uncertain.
A: Where are Niśa and Deepa?
B: Niśa is out shopping, and...

b. $\times$ CONTEXT-2: Anu and Bilal are visiting Niśa's house but Anu cannot see either Niśa or her cousin Deepa and has no idea where they are.

A: Where are Niśa and Deepa?
B: Niśa is out shopping, and...

c. Deepa **ʃaḷet=ətsˑ** ah-e
Deepa school.LOC=*c* be-PRES.3.SG
Deepa is at the school.

d. Hindi: Deepa **skul=mẽ=hi** hɛ

2.2 Mutual salience by explicit coordination

In this section, I describe a class of slightly different uses from those in §2.1, in which the speaker draws the addressee's attention to an entity before offering the prejacent with *=tsˑ* as the answer. *=tsˑ* cliticizes to individual-denoting demonstratives in pronominal or complex determiner phrases, and the effect is similar to that associated with *that very NP* or clefts in English. In Context-1, given a shared perceptually accessible context, Anu wants to know which individual satisfies the description *Bilal's sister*. Bilal draws her attention to a specific individual in their shared perceptual field and then asserts that that (now salient) individual is his sister. The sentence with *=tsˑ* in (6c) is felicitous at this context. In Context-2, Anu has exactly the same question but structures her inquiry differently; she asks whether a specific individual wearing the green sari satisfies the description *Bilal's sister*. Bilal corrects her, draws her attention to a different individual who is actually his sister and offers the prejacent as the answer in (6c). Crucially, *=tsˑ* is infelicitous at this context. The difference between (6a) and (6b) is that there is no other salient alternative at the context in (6a), while there is a clear competing alternative answer at the context in (6b), introduced by the polar question asked by Anu.

(6) a. √ CONTEXT-1: Anu has never met Bilal's sister and wants to be introduced to her at a party.
A: Bilal, where/which woman is your sister?
B: Do you see that tall woman in the sky-blue dress?

b. × CONTEXT-2: Anu has never met Bilal's sister and wants to be introduced to her at a party.
A: Bilal, is your sister the one wearing the green sari?
B: [Looks at where she is pointing] No, do you see that tall woman in the sky-blue dress?

c. **tī=tsˑ** maʤʰī bəhīɳ ah-e
She=*c* my.F.SG.NOM sister.F.SG.NOM be-PRES.3.SG
It is that woman that is my sister.

d. Hindi: **və=hi** meri bɛhɛn hɛ

(7) offers similar minimally differing contexts where the referent (Deepa's mother's wedding sari) is in the shared knowledge of the interlocutors but not within their shared perceptual field at the time of utterance. *=ts* is felicitous when there is no competing alternative answer introduced through a prior discourse move (Context-1 in 7a), but infelicitous when a different answer has been highlighted by a polar question (Context-2 in 7b).

(7) a. √ CONTEXT-1: Anu wants to know Deepa's attire at a party the night before and asks her friend Niśa.
A: What was Deepa wearing at the party last night?
N: You have seen her mother's wedding sari, right?

b. × CONTEXT-2: Anu wants to know Deepa's attire at a party the night before and asks her friend Niśa.
A: Did Deepa wear the green sari her sister gave her to the party?
N: No. You have seen her mother's wedding sari, right?

c. ti=ne **ti=ts** saḍi g^{h}at-li hot-i
she=ERG that=*c* sari.F.SG.NOM wear-PERF.F.SG PST-F.SG
She was wearing *that very* sari.

d. Hindi: us=ne **və=hi** sari pɛhɛni t^{h}i

The (in)felicity judgements associated with the context-sentence pairings in (6) and (7) reveal that the felicitous use of *=ts* depends on whether the prejacent can be taken to be the unique mutually salient alternative in the current question. Even if the speaker draws attention to a discourse referent and thereby makes the alternative offered by the prejacent salient, if the preceding discourse contains a competing false alternative, this competitor prevents the prejacent from being construed as uniquely mutually salient.

2.3 Summary

To summarize the data so far, the felicity of *=ts* depends on whether the alternative corresponding to the prejacent is understood to be mutually salient for both interlocutors at the utterance context. The effect of *=ts* is to convey that the answerer is providing that privileged answer that the questioner has reason to expect the answerer to provide. In only the CONTEXT-1 descriptions above, the prejacent is salient because of priorly known shared information about patterns of behavior (2a, 3a, 5a) or priorly known shared interlocutor preferences (4a). This makes the use of *=ts* felicitous, regardless of the pragmatic function of focus at that context. Moreover, in cases where the alternative offered by the speaker is rendered salient by pointing or otherwise drawing attention, the presence of a competing false alternative prevents the prejacent from being construed as uniquely mutually salient.

3 Salience based on noteworthiness or unexpectedness

I focus on two uses of *=ʦ* here: its mirative use and its behavior like a scalar additive in some (not all) negated contexts.

3.1 Mirative uses of =ʦ

In its mirative uses, *=ʦ* is used to convey that the proposition denoted by its prejacent is surprising and deviates sharply from contextual expectations. This is similar to some uses of *just* as can be seen in (8). In (8a), Anu conveys that her daughter inviting the whole class exceeded what she had expected. In (8a), Anu conveys that the colleague's response to problematic behavior exceeded what Anu had expected.[3]

(8) a. CONTEXT: Anu had given her daughter permission to invite a few friends for her birthday party.
B: So how many friends did she invite?
A: It was crazy...
ti=ne akk^{h}ya **vərga=la=ʦ** bolav-lə
she=ERG entire class.N.SG.OBL-DAT=*c* invite-PERF.N.SG
She *just* invited the whole class! (H: *us=ne pure klas=ko=hi bulaya!*)
⇝ *The number of invitees was much higher than contextually expected.*

b. CONTEXT: Anu tells Bilal about how angry their friend got about a sexist remark from a colleague.
A: She was so mad...
ti=ne tya=la **tʰəppəɖ=əʦ** mar-lī
she=ERG he.OBL=DAT/ACC slap.F.SG.NOM=*c* strike-PERF.F.SG
She *just* gave him a slap. (H: *us-ne us=ko ʧãʈa=hi ləgaya!*)
⇝ *The slapping was a more extreme response than contextually expected.*

There are two things that characterize what I am descriptively labeling as mirative uses with *=ʦ*. First, these uses involve deviation from expectations in the upward direction, i.e. the prejacent is understood to describe a state of affairs that is *beyond* what was expected, not *less than* what was expected. Mirativity that involves a "lower-than-expected" inference does also obtain with *=ʦ*, when it gives rise to the exclusive effect as in (1a) and (1b) but I do not discuss it in detail here.
Second, in questions that involve answers that make reference to numerical/quantity scales, *=ʦ* can be used to convey that a number or quantity is surprisingly high *only* when the lexical expression used is independently interpretable as a salient quantity on the relevant scale of values. So with respect to (8a), suppose Anu's daughter's classroom has 50 children.

[3] Although I do not provide the relevant contextual modulations in detail here, it is easily possible to construct contexts where the Marathi sentences in (8a) and (8b) can convey that the prejacent is something that both interlocutors take to be mutually salient on the basis of shared beliefs and expectations/preferences.

Then, at the utterance context, saying that her daughter invited the whole class is equivalent to saying that she invited her 50 classmates. But, crucially, Anu cannot answer Bilal's question saying *"She invited her **50**=**ts** classmates!"* instead of (8a).[4] To the extent that I can see, this has nothing to do with the interpretation of round vs. non-round numerals – round numerals are not seen as more salient locations on the scale of numerical values as the example shows. What is required is a way to construe the prejacent as a natural endpoint on a scale of values. The minimally different formulation in (9a) illustrates this. If the prejacent explicitly conveys that the answer corresponds to a natural scalar endpoint (the maximum number of potential invitees in the context have been actually invited), the use of *=ts* is felicitous. (9b) provides another example to illustrate this empirical pattern. In (9b-i), the reference is to a whole crate and Anu's answer is felicitous with *=ts*. In (9b-ii), the prejacent explicitly uses the expression *sixty mangoes* and *=ts* fails to be felicitous.

(9) a. CONTEXT: Anu had given her daughter permission to invite a few friends for her birthday party.
B: So how many friends did she invite?
A: It was crazy. There are fifty kids in her class.
ti=ne pənnas-ʧya-pənnas **mulan=na=ts** bolav-lə
she=ERG fifty-of-fifty child.N.PL.OBL/DAT=*c* invite-PERF.N.SG
She *just* invited all fifty! (H: *us-ne pəʧas-ke-pəʧas bəʧʧõ=ko=hi bulaya*)

b. CONTEXT: Anu had asked a mango seller to send her 2 dozen mangoes when they came in season. It is commonly known that one crate of mangoes contains sixty mangoes.
B: So has he sent you the mangoes?
A: Oh yes! But I am surprised...

i. tya=ne akk^{h}i **peʈi=ts** paʈ^{h}əv-li
he=ERG whole crate.F.SG.NOM=*c* send-PERF.F.SG
He *just* sent a whole crate! (H: *us-ne puri peʈi=hi b^{h}eʤi*)

ii. #tya=ne **saʈ^{h}=əts** paʈ^{h}əv-let
he=ERG sixty.M.PL.NOM=*c* send-PERF.M.PL
He *just* sent sixty! (H: *#us-ne saʈ^{h}=hi b^{h}eʤe*)

3.2 Scalar additive-like uses of =ts

Bhatt (1994) observes that Hindi *=hi* often has an *only*-like reading in non-negated clauses. However, in negative declaratives, an additional *even*-like reading emerges. This reading is also available with Marathi *=ts*, as illustrated with the examples in (10a) and (10b). In

[4]Such a response would typically lead to the complement exclusion reading (*only 50 classmates*) or be felicitous if Anu and Bilal had discussed their expectations beforehand and it was mutually salient between them based on this discussion that the daughter would end up inviting 50 classmates.

(10a), the proposition that Bilal did not invite Nita is understood to be least likely at the context. In (10b), the proposition that Deepa does not know Hindi at utterance time is understood to be least likely at the context.[5]

(10) a. CONTEXT: Deepa wants to know more about Bilal's recent wedding. It is commonly known that Nita is Bilal's best friend at the office.
D: So did he invite his entire office?
A: No...
Bilal=ne **Nita=la=ʦ** bolav-lə nahi, baki
Bilal=ERG Nita=DAT/ACC=*c* invite-PERF.N.SG NEG other
lokan=ʦə soɖ
people.OBL.PL=N.SG.GEN leave.IMP
Bilal didn't invite *even* Nita, (H: *Bilal=ne Nita=ko=hi nəhi bulaya!*)
let alone other people.
⇝ *Nita was least expected among Bilal's colleagues to not be invited.*

b. CONTEXT: Anu and Bilal are discussing Deepa's plan to do linguistic fieldwork in a remote area where the contact language is Bhojpuri and the target language is Sadari.
A: Does Deepa have the linguistic expertise to do this fieldwork?
B: Not at all...
ti=la əʤun **Hindi=ʦ** ye-t nahī
she.OBL=DAT/ACC yet Hindi=*c* come-IMPF NEG
She doesn't know *even* Hindi yet. (H: *us=ko Hindi=hi nəhi ati!*)
⇝*Not knowing Hindi is less likely than not knowing any of the other languages.*

Two things are to be noted regarding this scalar additive-like effect associated with Marathi =*ʦ*. These also extend to the observations made for Hindi in Bhatt (1994) and Bajaj (2016). First, appropriate context modulation can easily wipe out the *even*-like effect and convey only that the prejacent proposition is something that both interlocutors take to be mutually salient on the basis of shared beliefs and expectations/preferences. In such cases, the felicity of =*ʦ* arises from discourse-based mutual salience constraint given in and not because the answer is particularly noteworthy or unexpected. To make this clear, the relevant minimally different contexts are given in (11).

(11) a. CONTEXT: Deepa wants to know more about Bilal's wedding. She knows that he deliberately didn't invite one of his colleagues but doesn't know which one. Anu and Deepa know that Bilal really does not like Nita.

[5]This is expected if one takes =*ʦ* to make its conventional contribution outside the scope of negation as Karttunen & Peters (1979) suggest for the reverse implication associated with English *even* in negative clauses. Bhatt (1994) suggests that the even-like reading comes about when Hindi =*hi* is in the scope of negation but it is unclear to me that this is the right scopal relation. Intuitively, what Hindi =*hi* and Marathi =*ʦ* seem to comment on is the unexpectedness or unlikelihood of proposition denoted by the negative declarative.

D: So which colleague did he not invite? Nita, I am guessing.
A: Yes, you are right...

Bilal=ne **Nita=la=ts** bolav-lə nahi
Bilal=ERG Nita=DAT/ACC=*c* invite-PERF.N.SG NEG
It was Nita that Bilal didn't invite. (H: *Bilal=ne Nita=ko=hi nəhi bulaya*).
↛ Nita was least expected among Bilal's colleagues to not be invited.

b. CONTEXT: Anu and Bilal are discussing Deepa's plan to do comparative ethnographic research in India, Bangladesh, and Nepal. Deepa needs to be fluent in Hindi, Bangla, and Nepali. Anu knows that Deepa has been learning two of the three needed languages.
A: So which language does she not know well yet? It is Hindi, right?
B: Yes, you are correct...

ti=la **Hindi=ts** ye-t nahī
she.OBL=DAT/ACC Hindi=*c* come-IMPF NEG
It is Hindi that she does not know. (H: *us=ko Hindi=hi nəhi ati*)
↛Not knowing Hindi is less likely than not knowing any of the other languages.

Second, it is impossible to get the scalar additive-like effect if the alternative propositions are also ordered by entailment. For brevity, I provide only the relevant English context-sentence pairings and the unglossed Hindi translations. In (12a) the alternatives {...Deepa didn't read one paper, Deepa didn't read two papers, Deepa didn't read three papers} are ordered by entailment but neither Marathi *=ts* nor Hindi *=hi* can be used felicitously to convey that the prejacent is less likely than most alternatives. In (12b), the alternatives would be {...The doorway is not 6 feet tall, The doorway is not 7 feet tall, The doorway is not 8 feet tall} and similarly ordered by entailment. English *even* is of course felicitous in both contexts.[6]

(12) a. CONTEXT: Deepa was supposed to read three papers for a class discussion.
A: So how many were you able to read?
D: You know, I was so busy...
I didn't read *even* one. (H: *#mɛ̃=ne ek=hi pepər nəhi pəʈʰa*)

b. CONTEXT: Deepa and Anu are discussing a door-opening for which they need to buy a curtain.
A: So do we need an 8 foot long curtain?
D: That's too long!
The opening isn't *even* six feet. (H: *#dərvaʤa ʧʰe-fuʈ=hi ləmba nəhi hɛ*)

The unavailability of the scalar additive-like effect when entailment-based scales are involved is connected to the constraint on numerical/quantity scales discussed in §3.1. There

[6]In both cases, the dedicated additive clitics (Marathi *=pəɳ* and Hindi *bʰi*) would be needed express the *even*-like meaning.

we saw that in answers that make reference to numerical/quantity scales, =*ts* can be used to convey that a number or quantity is surprisingly high only when the lexical expression used is independently interpretable as a salient quantity on the relevant scale of values. Here we see that numerical/quantity expressions, even when used to construct less and more likely alternatives, do not by themselves provide the sort of salience that =*ts* is sensitive to. More generally, =*ts* does not seem to involve a notion of comparative salience. For =*ts* to be felicitous, it is not sufficient that the prejacent is more unlikely/surprising/noteworthy than some of its alternatives. It appears that =*ts*'s felicity depends on whether the proposition its prejacent is taken to denote is construable as *absolutely uniquely salient* on some scale of values.

4 Analysis

Assume that each context c is associated with a body of information INFO_c characterizing the joint, mutually agreed upon public commitments of all interlocutors at c. INFO_c can be construed as a set of propositions or the set of worlds yielded by their intersection (the context set). Each context c also provides a question CQ_c (i.e. a set of answers) and a contextually determined ranking over the alternative answers $\leq_c$. We assume a set of worlds W, a set of propositions $Prop \subseteq \wp(W)$, and a set of questions $Ques \subseteq \wp(Prop)$, such that the conditions in (13) hold.

(13) a. $\forall \text{Q} \in Ques : \forall p, p' \in \text{Q} : p \subseteq p' \vee p \nsubseteq p'$
The alternatives in any question may be overlapping, disjoint, or one proposition may be contained in another.[7]

b. $\forall \text{Q} \in Ques : \cup\{p \mid p \in \text{Q}\} = \cap \text{INFO}_c$
The alternatives in any question form a cover over the common ground INFO_c at a context c (defined in 14) .

(14) A context is a tuple $\langle \text{INFO}_c, \text{CQ}_c, \leq_c \rangle$, such that

a. $\text{INFO}_c \subseteq W$

b. $\text{CQ}_c \in Ques$

c. $\leq_c$ is a contextually determined ordering on CQ_c s.t.

i. $\forall p \in \text{CQ}_c : p \leq_c p$ (Reflexive)

ii. $\forall p, p', p'' \in \text{CQ}_c : [p \leq_c p' \wedge p' \leq_c p''] \rightarrow p \leq_c p''$ (Transitive)

iii. $\forall p, p' \in \text{CQ}_c : p <_c p' \leftrightarrow [p \leq_c p' \wedge p' \not\leq_c p]$ (Strict ordering)

[7] This is obviously a weak condition that corresponds to the way that alternatives are construed in Beaver & Clark (2008); Coppock & Beaver (2014). This construal of possible answers to a question contrasts with Groenendijk & Stokhof (1984), where a question is formally modeled as a partition that divides a set of worlds into some number of mutually exclusive alternatives. It also contrasts with the view in Inquisitive Semantics (e.g. Ciardelli et al. (2019)), which allows alternatives in an issue to be overlapping or disjoint (sets of information states) but does not allow one alternative to be contained in another.

According to (14c), the alternatives in the CQ_c are ordered from weak to strong by a contextually given ordering. This is taken to be a preorder i.e. a reflexive (14c-i) and transitive (14c-ii) binary relation on the CQ_c.
In work on discourse particles and discourse marking strategies more generally, the "stronger than" ordering $\leq_c$ is often entailment/informativity based where $p \leq_c p'$ indicates that p entails or is informationally stronger than p'. Pragmatically determined orderings corresponding to rank-order, likelihood, or newsworthiness are also invoked in analyses involving exclusive *just* and scalar additive *even*. *=ts* seems to be sensitive to both entailment-based and pragmatically determined orderings. But from the class of cases from §2.1, we see that it may also be licensed by mutual salience based on interlocutor knowledge and expectations/preferences. Therefore, the analysis proposed here takes *mutual salience* (or equivalently Schelling point status) to be the unifying feature of *=ts*'s conventional contribution, deriving inferences about informative strength and high newsworthiness or unlikelihood from it.

4.1 The lexical entry for =ts

=ts makes no at-issue contribution but simply imposes a felicity condition on the contexts in which it occurs. The lexical entry given in (15) specifies that *=ts* is felicitous at a context c iff the contextual interpretation of its prejacent $[\![S]\!]^c$ is a SCHelling point among the alternatives in the CQ_c.

(15) $[\![\text{=ts}(S)]\!]^c$ is defined iff
$\exists! p : p = [\![S]\!]^c \wedge \text{SCH}(p, \text{CQ}_c, \leq_c)$
If defined,
$[\![\text{=ts}(S)]\!]^c = p$

A *=ts*-using speaker presupposes that the alternative p they convey by uttering the prejacent S at c is uniquely mutually salient among the ordered alternatives in the CQ_c. Such a speaker must be confident in the addressee's ability at the context to uniquely recover p given S, using pragmatic reasoning. In utterances where the discourse context does not already provide a mutually salient proposition, the speaker must presuppose that the interlocutors are coordinated on the structure of the ordered CQ_c and specifically the position of p relative to the contextually given ordering $\leq_c$.

In (16) I propose three classes of contextual conditions in which interlocutor coordination on a unique alternative might be expected to obtain: p is construable as a minimal element of the ordered CQ_c; p is construable as a maximal element of the ordered CQ_c; the common ground entails that the speaker and the addressee of c are uniquely attending to p as an answer to CQ_c.[8]

[8] I do not further define the relation ATT here; it is intended to capture the fact that propositional discourse referents may often be the object of joint interlocutor attention. The point here is that being the object of joint interlocutor attention is only one of the ways in which a proposition may emerge as a schelling point. In other cases, the determination of the schelling point alternative requires additional pragmatic reasoning on part of the addressee.

(16) $\text{SCH}(p, \text{CQ}_c, \leq_c) \leftrightarrow$

a. $p \in \textbf{Minimal}(\text{CQ}_c, \leq_c) \wedge \exists p' \in \text{CQ}_c : p' <_c p$ OR
No alternative in the CQ_c is strictly weaker than p on the contextually given ordering $\leq_c$ and CQ_c contains strictly stronger alternatives.

b. $p \in \textbf{Maximal}(\text{CQ}_c, \leq_c) \wedge \exists p' \in \text{CQ}_c : p <_c p'$ OR
No alternative in the CQ_c is strictly stronger than p on the contextually given ordering $\leq_c$ and CQ_c contains strictly weaker alternatives.

c. $\text{INFO}_c \subseteq \lambda w.\text{ATT}(Sp_c, Ad_c, p, \text{CQ}_c)(w)$
INFO_c entails the proposition that the Speaker and the Addressee are jointly attending uniquely to p as an answer to CQ_c.

The conditions in (16) offer salient points of reference in the ordered CQ_c that enable interlocutors to coordinate on the intended interpretation of the prejacent S at c. In other words, if c does not already provide a salient alternative that interlocutors are attending to given their shared expectations/beliefs, (i.e. if (16c) does not hold), the speaker's use of =*ts* guides the addressee towards an interpretation of the prejacent that occupies the lowest or highest position in the ordered question.[9] The idea is that scalar endpoints are salient at any context and can always be recruited in determining the interpretation of an under-specified prejacent. In such cases, the =*ts*-using speaker must also presuppose that the interlocutors are fully coordinated on $\langle \text{CQ}_c, \leq_c \rangle$. It is only against this presupposition that a proposition can be salient by virtue of corresponding to a scalar endpoint of the ordered CQ_c.

4.2 Accounting for =ts's uses

4.2.1 Accounting for discourse-sensitive mutual salience uses

In §2.1 and §2.2 we saw that =*ts* can be used in contexts where the salience of an alternative answer is rooted in the interlocutors' beliefs about each other's beliefs. There were also examples in which the speaker draws on information that is accessible (perceptually or otherwise) to their addressee in order to make their answer mutually salient as long as there is no other contextually salient competing alternative.

The lexical entry proposed in (15), together with the construal of salience as in (16c), straightforwardly accounts for this set of uses. =*ts* is infelicitous if there is no unique alternative in the CQ_c that the interlocutors are jointly attending to in the discourse context. But =*ts* is felicitous whenever there is such a mutually salient alternative – as seen in the contrasting examples in (2), (3), (4) and (5). =*ts* is also infelicitous when the context provides multiple alternatives that compete for salience, as seen in the contrasting felicity of the =*ts* marked answer in response to contrasting contexts in (6) and (7).

[9] Given the space constraints here, I do not discuss cases where () is the condition responsible for achieving mutual salience.

4.2.2 Accounting for mirative uses

In §3.1, we saw that =*ts* can be used to convey that the proposition denoted by its prejacent is surprising and deviates sharply from contextual expectations. Specifically, the prejacent is understood to describe a state of affairs that exceeds (rather than falls short of) contextual expectations. A second observation was that if the set of alternative answers is ordered along a numerical or quantity scale, =*ts* can be used to convey that the quantity referenced in the prejacent exceeds expectations *only if* the quantity expression is independently interpretable as a scalar endpoint (the contrasts in (8) and (9)).

Note that the prejacents in these uses denote context-invariant propositions – there are no variable values to be fixed contextually. =*ts* signals that the speaker takes the prejacent to be uniquely mutually salient for the interlocutors. At such a context, the addressee faces uncertainty with respect to determining why the prejacent proposition is taken to be a schelling point by the speaker. The addressee reasons that the speaker must assume a particular ordering on the CQ_c such that the prejacent stands out among alternatives relative to this contextually given ordering. In other words, =*ts* gives the signal that the interlocutors are coordinated on the structure of the ordered CQ_c, triggering pragmatic reasoning regarding this structure. So, in mirative uses, =*ts* guides the addressee towards construing the prejacent as a maximal element in the CQ_c where the contextually given ordering $\leq_c$ corresponds to noteworthiness or unexpectedness.

If this is on the right track, then we can also make sense of why =*ts* is infelicitous with noteworthiness/unexpectedness orderings that rely on numerical or quantity based scales. =*ts*'s felicity condition requires the contextually relevant scale of values to be closed – otherwise it makes no sense to constrain reference to a salient scalar endpoint. The addressee reasons that the prejacent proposition corresponds to a maximal element on such a closed scale of values. Numerical/quantity scales are open and invoke quantity-based lexical alternatives that do not naturally lend themselves to an ordering with maximal elements. Simply put, it is unclear why *fifty kids* or *sixty mangoes* should be the precise quantities corresponding to maximally noteworthy/unexpected propositions in contrast to higher quantities such as *sixty kids* or *seventy mangoes*. Quantity expressions such as *the whole class* or *a whole crate* on the other hand are more naturally construable on a closed scale with relevant alternative quantities like *half the class* or *a quarter of a crate* being clearly ordered below the maximum.[10]

To summarize, the mirative effect of =*ts* can only arise in contexts where the addressee can effectively reason about the speaker's construal of the CQ_c, such that the prejacent is construed as a schelling point by virtue of being a maximal element of the CQ_c on the contextually given noteworthiness/unexpectedness based ordering $\leq_c$.

[10] In fact, the use of the expression *whole* in the prejacents in (8a) and (9b-i) makes these lower ordered alternatives salient.

4.2.3 Accounting for scalar-additive uses

The scalar additive-like effect of =*ts*, described in §3.2, obtains when =*ts* contains negation in its scope (i.e. when the prejacent is a negative declarative).[11] This is also one of main effects described for Hindi =*hi* by Bhatt (1994) and Bajaj (2016). Remember also from the examples in (12) that it is impossible to get this effect if the alternative propositions are ordered by entailment, a restriction not present with *even*.

We can straightforwardly make sense of the distribution in (10b), for instance, if we take the CQ_c to correspond to the interrogative *Which languages does Deepa not know?* The use of =*ts* triggers reasoning about the ordered CQ_c and guides the addressee towards construing the prejacent as a maximal element where the contextually given ordering $\leq_c$ corresponds to unlikelihood. The addressee reasons that if the speaker has signaled the prejacent to be a schelling point among the alternatives, then they must likely take alternatives in the assumed CQ_c to be ordered by unlikelihood. On this ordering, the proposition that Deepa does not know Hindi is construable as a maximal element, given that it is the least likely proposition among alternatives.

This also allows us to make sense of why =*ts* is infelicitous if some of the alternative propositions are ordered by entailment as in (12). =*ts*'s felicity condition requires that the prejacent be a schelling point among alternatives, which in many cases turns out to be a maximal or minimal element of the ordered CQ_c. In a context like (12a), the prejacent *Deepa did not read one paper* corresponds to neither the minimal nor the maximal element among the alternatives.[12] Similarly, in a context like (12b), it is unclear how the prejacent might be construed as a maximal or minimal element on a likelihood scale – the doorway not being six feet does not uniquely stand out in comparison to, say, the doorway not being five feet or seven feet. More generally, a likelihood-based ordering which is derived from lexical alternatives to numerical/quantity expressions in the prejacent does not lend itself to providing salient scalar endpoints that the speaker and the addressee can easily coordinate on at a context. The infelicity of =*ts* with such uses follows.

5 Extensions and conclusion

The previous section offered an analysis of =*ts* that takes it to signal that its prejacent is a schelling point among the alternatives in the CQ_c. When a propositional alternative is already the object of joint interlocutor attention at the context, =*ts* is felicitous. When a specific alternative is not already mutually salient, the felicity of =*ts* depends on the addressee's ability to reason about the source of the mutual salience of the prejacent proposition. I showed how this reasoning works in service of determining the structure of the

[11] To be clear, there are affirmative clauses in Marathi/Hindi that contain =*ts/hi* which are most naturally translated using *even*. But these are subsumable under the mirative uses accounted for in §4.2.2 and so I do not discuss them separately here.

[12] The maximal (least likely) element would be *Deepa did not read zero papers* and the minimal (most likely) element would be *Deepa did not read three papers*.

ordered CQ_C, recovering the contextually given ordering assumed by the speaker. Mirativity and scalar additivity effects of =*ʦ* arise from this sort of pragmatic reasoning. A range of further empirical facts about the (in)felicity of =*ʦ* can be made sense of once we assume that it uniformly signals that its prejacent denotation is a schelling point among alternatives in the CQ_C. I discuss some of these facts in the domain of declarative clauses here.

5.1 The utterance context can always be coordinated on

There is a strong asymmetry between the acceptability of =*ʦ* in prejacents containing elements that signal proximity/coincidence with the utterance context and those that signal distance. Consider the contrast between (17b) and (17c) uttered at a context where there is no priorly salient expectation about Niśa's location. In (17b), we see that the proximal spatial demonstrative, an indexical that resolves to the utterance location, and other similar expressions are perfectly felicitous without discourse support. In contrast, (17c) shows that the distal demonstrative and expressions conveying distance from the utterance location are infelicitous without discourse support. (17d) and (17e) illustrate the contrast for Hindi.

(17) a. CONTEXT: Anu has no idea where Niśa is and asks Bilal about her.
A: Where is Niśa?

b. B: Niśa **it^{h}e=ʦ / ʤəvəɭ=əʦ/ aspas=əʦ** ah-e
Niśa.NOM here=*c* / nearby=*c* / around.here=*c* be-PRES.3.SG
Niśa is *right* here / *just* close by / *just* around here.

c. #B: Niśa **tit^{h}e=ʦ / dur=əʦ** ah-e
Niśa.NOM there=*c* / far.away=*c* be-PRES.3.SG
Niśa is *right* there / *just* far away.

d. Hindi: Niśa **yəhĩ / nəʤdik=hi / aspas=hi** hɛ

e. Hindi: #Niśa **vəhĩ / dur=hi** hɛ

In (18), the same pattern is found in the temporal domain. =*ʦ* is felicitous with *atta* 'now' without discourse support as in (18b) but infelicitous with *tev^{h}ã* 'then' (18c) without an antecedent. The Hindi counterparts are in (18d) and (18e).

(18) a. CONTEXT: Anu has no idea when Niśa left the house and asks Bilal.
A: When did Niśa leave?

b. B: Niśa **atta=ʦ** ge-li
Niśa.NOM now=*c* go-PERF.F.SG
Niśa left *right* now.

c. #B: Niśa **tev^{h}ã=ts** ge-li
Niśa.NOM then=*c* go-PERF.F.SG
Niśa went *right* then.

d. Hindi: Niśa **əb=hi** gəyi

e. Hindi: #Niśa **təb=hi** gəyi

This distribution falls out naturally from the assumption that =*ts* signals the mutual salience of the alternative denoted by the prejacent. If the value of indexical elements in the answer constituent resolves to entities that are by definition salient to interlocutors – e.g. utterance place and time – the prejacent is rendered mutually salient. But when the resolution of an indexical depends on more specific contextual information, the use of =*ts* is infelicitous in the absence of discourse support.

5.2 =ts in contexts with imperfectly aligned interests

An expression that signals that interlocutors are coordinated with respect to the salience of the prejacent in the CQ$_c$ is well-suited for use in aligned contexts – when cooperative interlocutors have similar interests regarding how the CQ$_c$ is resolved. It is interesting then that =*ts* can be used to "inflict" the mutual salience of the prejacent on a resisting interlocutor. Consider the context in (19a) where Deepa and Anu cannot possibly come to a shared perspective on how the CQ$_c$ *Who started the fight?* is to be resolved. Anu's response to Deepa in (19b) signals that the prejacent *Deepa started the fight* is an answer that *both* interlocutors can coordinate on by virtue of its mutual salience – it is obvious in the discourse context!

(19) a. CONTEXT: Deepa and Anu have gotten into a heated argument and cannot agree on whose fault it is.
D: Anu, you started the fight.
A: Deepa, now don't twist facts...

b. **tu=ts** b^{h}aɳɖəɳ suru ke-lə-s
You.ERG=*c* fight.NOM.N.SG start do-PERF.N.SG-2.SG
It was YOU who started the fight!

c. Hindi: **tum=hi=ne** ləɽai ʃuru ki

The effect of =*ts* in unaligned contexts in general is that the speaker appears to be forcing consensus on the interlocutors in their bid to admit the proposition they convey to the common ground. Working out the precise dynamics of such interactions in context must be left for future research.

5.3 Concluding remarks

I have tried to demonstrate that Marathi *=ts* squarely addresses the issue of interlocutor coordination in discourse. It is a dedicated device to signal coordination with respect to crucial components of the context – the shared common ground, the nature and structure of the question that is taken up at the relevant stage of discourse, and/or the resolution of contextual variables. *=ts* conveys the existence of a schelling point that is available for coordination in the resolution of the salient question.

Acknowledgements

I thank the organizers of FASAL 12 for inviting me to present this project and the audience there for stimulating feedback. I am also grateful to participants in the UT SynSem research group, UMich colloquium, and the Stanford Construction of Meaning workshop for stimulating comments on this project.

References

Bajaj, Vandana. 2016. Scaling up exclusive-hii: Rutgers University PhD dissertation.

Beaver, David I. & Brady Z. Clark. 2008. Sense and sensitivity: How focus determines meaning. Oxford: Blackwell Publications.

Bhatt, Rajesh. 1994. The semantics of hi. Unpublished ms. University of Pennsylvania.

Ciardelli, Ivano, Jeroen Groenendijk & Floris Roelofsen. 2019. Inquisitive semantics. Oxford University Press.

Coppock, Elizabeth & David Beaver. 2014. Principles of the exclusive muddle. Journal of Semantics 31.3. 371–432.

Groenendijk, Jeroen & Martin Stokhof. 1984. Studies on the semantics of questions and the pragmatics of answers: University of Amsterdam PhD dissertation.

Karttunen, Lauri & Stanley Peters. 1979. Conventional lmplicature. In C. Oh & D. Dinneen (eds.), Syntax and semantics 11: Presupposition, 1–56. New York: Academic Press.

Krifka, Manfred. 2008. Basic notions of information structure. Acta Linguistica Hungarica 55(3–4). 243–276. doi:10.1556/ALing.55.2008.3-4.2.

Rooth, Mats. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. Natural Language Semantics 1(1). 75–116.

Schelling, Thomas C. 1960. The strategy of conflict. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Varma, Terry. 2006. Some aspects of the meaning of the Hindi particle hii. In Rajendra Singh (ed.), The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics, 87–122. Mouton de Gruyter.

Zimmermann, Malte & Edgar Onea. 2011. Focus marking and focus interpretation. Lingua 121(11). 1651–1670.