bambai

bam-
bai

bam-
bai
??

Context:
I've invited a friend around to join for dinner. They reply:
Subsequential reading of bambai
bam-bai

Apprehensional reading of
bambai
bam-bai

bam-
bai
??
??
bam-
bai

by-
and-
by

[1,2]

??

Context: bam-bai

bam-bai

bam-bai

bam-bai

?

ada
AP-
PRE-
HEN-
SIONAL
apprehensive-

$\neg r(w')^6$

[dif]

(d).[9]
In
all
cases,
the
pred-
i-
cate
over
which
-
yathi
scopes
is
modalised
and
ex-
presses
a
propo-
si-
tion
that
the
speaker
iden-
ti-
fies
as
'un-
pleas-
ant
or
harm-
ful'
[227]Austin2011.
Lit-
tle
work
has
been
un-
der-
taken
on
the
gram-
mat-
i-
cal-
i-
sa-
tion
oo=f
ap-
pre-
hen-
sion-
al-

ity.[10]

As we will see in the following sections, appreheNsional uses of preposed *bambai* in Kriol have a strikingly similar distribution and semantic import to the appreheNsional category described in the Australianist and other typo-

ropa.mang).[11] While detailed work on the expression of apprehensionality in these languages (including the syntactic status of apprehensional clauses) is not currently available,[12] a number of generalisations can be made on the basis of the data in (). In all cases, the apprehensional appears to modify

Compare these uses of Mangarrayi *baḷaḷaga~baḷaga* in (mang) to (ropa.mang) above. In (mang.a), [138]Merlan1989 notes that the temporal frame uses of *baḷaḷaga*—while often translated as 'today'—appears to correspond to 'right now' (she also notes that "Pidgin English informants use [...the reduplicated form] *today-today* to mean 'now' as well as 'today' in the English sense"). In all of

$t_2 \leftrightarrow t_1$ precedes t_2). A TFA like *today*, then, is a predicate of times: it picks out a temporal *frame* for the predicate — that is, all the points in time between the beginning and the end of the day of utterance. In the sentence *Mel ate today*, the TFA restricts the instantiation time of the eat-

tive. In each of the *by-and-by* clauses in (??), the speaker asserts that the event being modified is *subsequent* to a reference time set by the previous event description. In this respect, *by-and-by* imposes a temporal frame on the event description that it modifies.

As we have seen above (e.g. ssq0), the subseq-

the proposition' — and (a shade of) *volitive modality* — 'the fear that an undesirable state of affairs may obtain' [295-6]Lichtenberk1995. While we are not committed to Lichtenberk's metalinguistic labels a this stage (to be further investigated below), a modal meaning for Kriol *bambai* is shown below. We will see how

to have a similar function, although has no overt sentential antecedent.[14] **In this case, the Speaker is issuing a general warning/admonition about the children's behaviour at speech time. In uttering the** *bambai*$_1$ **clause, she asserts that, should they fail to heed this warning, an event of their breaking the car is a possible outcome. (appr1.chase) shows**

u-
a-
tion
world
$(w' \not\preceq$
$w*)^{15}$
—
namely
one
in
which
the
event
de-
scribed
in
the
an-
tecedent
failed
to
ob-
tain
—
there
is
a
(sig-
nif-
i-
cant)
pos-
si-
bil-
ity
that
he
would
have
slept
at
work.
Con-
se-
quently,
and
com-
pa-
ra-
bly
to
the
ex-
am-
ple
()
above,
bam-
bai
modalises
its
pre-
ja-
cent:
it
as-
serts
that
$\exists w'[w' \notin$
$\kappa \wedge$
$Isleepbyt^{+}inw']$.
sjvAaibin
dringgi
kofi
nair-
ram
bam-

sider first the elab- o- ra- tion of (app0rp) in (kofi2) be- low. Here there is no ex- plicit lin- guis- tic an- tecedent for *bam- bai*, whereas its pre- ja- cent en- codes an un- for- tu- nate fu- ture pos- si- bil- ity.

[labeltype=caps]Context: Grant's head- ing to bed. Josh of- fers him a cuppa.kofi2 yu wandi kofi muliri?// 2s want cof- fee kin- ship.term// 'Did you want a cof- fee, *muliri*?'//najing, im rait muliri!

the men might have slept with your wife. You could have caused many problems for us!'[KB Jen 26.10]//

***if*-Conditionals**

In contrast to the 'non-implicational' (*i.e.* precautioning/lest-type) readings presented immediately above, Kriol also forms conditional sentences using an English-like *if…(then)* construction. The two sentences in () give examples of an indicative and subjunc-

tion of *bam-bai*'s ex-pres-sive con-tent (sim-i-lar to 'sincerity'-or 'use-conditions' for a given lex-i-cal item.) The ex-tent of this pro-cess is fur-ther evinced in () be-low, where the se-lec-tion of *marri* in-stead of *bam-bai* gives rise to a con-ven-tional im-pli-ca-ture that the Speaker's ut-ter-ance of () ought not be in-ter-preted as

pol-
y-
semy
be-
tween
tem-
po-
ral
and
ap-
pre-
hen-
sional
uses)
has
been
ob-
served
by
a
hand-
ful
of
other
au-
thors
An-
gelo2016,Angelo2018,Boogaart2020
on
the
ba-
sis
of
data
in-
clud-
ing
Ger-
man
*nach-
her*
and
Dutch
straks
in
ad-
di-
tion
to
Kriol
*bam-
bai*
[see
also
][427-
8]Kuteva2019.
Par-
al-
lels
be-
tween
*bam-
bai*
and
straks,
for
ex-
am-
ple,
are
shown
in
the
con-
trast
be-
tween

post hoc ergo propter hoc), *bambai* can be understood to assert that there exists some type of logical (*e.g.* etiological) relation between the predicate contained in the first proposition and the eventuality described in *bambai*'s prejacent: the second clause. In (car), for example, the child's failure to

pre-
ja-
cent.

mains.)[21,22]

bai,[23] shown by its felicity in the discourse in (nachher) below, where, tracking ⟨*marri, bambai*⟩, *nachher* appears to have encroached into the semantic domain of *vielleicht* 'perhaps.' In these contexts, *nachher* asserts negative speaker attitude with respect to its prejacent in terms relative to neutral *vielleicht* (Hanna Weck-

a type of modality, where the quantificational domain of the modal is explictly restricted. This is achieved by intersecting a (contextually-retrieved) modal base with a proposition (*viz.* that proposition denoted by the conditional antecedent) (VonFintel1994,Kratzer2012).

The "precautioning" uses described here (*i.e.*, those of the form p *bambai* q are inter-

we assume a Kratzerian treatment of modal operators (Kratzer1977,Kratzer1981 *et seq.*)

Subsequentiality §??

showed how Kriol has retained the temporal frame uses of *bambai* derived from 'by-and-by.' For Dowty1979,Dowty1982, time adverbials are taken to denote sets of sets of temporal intervals. A frame adverbial[24] then, takes a predicate and says that its in-

of
set-
tled-
ness
was
in-
tro-
duced,
as
de-
ployed
by
Con-
do-
ravdi2002
and
oth-
er-
wise
well
es-
tab-
lished
in
the
lit-
er-
a-
ture.
Thoma-
son1984
traces
the
no-
tion
of
his-
tor-
i-
cal
ne-
ces-
sity
to
Aris-
to-
tle
and
Jonathan
Ed-
wards
[138]Thoma-
son1984
[see
also][]Kamp1979.
The
no-
tion
is
de-
ployed
to
sim-
i-
lar
ef-
fect
in
Gi-
an-
naki-
dou2018
in
their
modal
ac-
count

() **proposes a unified, modalised semantics for *bambai*.**

$[c]$***bambai*** $=$ $\lambda m \lambda o \lambda P . \exists w' \left[w' \in \textbf{best}_{o(w)}(m, t*, w*) \wedge subseq(P, t_r, w') \right]$

bambai **asserts that there exists some world** w' **in a set of worlds that are optimal with respect to a contextually-determined modal base** m **and ordering source** o **in the reference context** $c = \langle t*, t_r, w* \rangle$**. It additionally asserts that the subsequential instan-**

$\lambda m \lambda o$:
$t'' \prec$
$t\!*$
$.\exists w' \big[w' \in$
$\mathbf{best}_o(m, t_r, w*)$
$\wedge$
$\mathbf{subseqInst}\Big(\big(\mathbf{make.lunch}(t'')(w)\big), t_r, w\Big)\big]$
substitution of conversational backgrounds
m, o
[c]*bambai imin gugum dina*=:t"$\prec$
$t*$
$.\exists w' \big[w' \in$
$\mathbf{best}_{(}m_{meta}, t_r, w*)$
$\wedge$
$\mathbf{subseqInst}\Big(\big(\mathbf{make.lunch}(t'')(w)\big), t_r, w\Big)\big]$
Given that make.lunch is instantiated prior to speech time $t*$**, the modal component of *bambai* involves quantifying over a veridical conversational background, *sc.*** $\{w' \mid w' \simeq_{t*} w*\}$ **(*per* general pragmatic principles/assertoric norms, *e.g.*,**

Given a modal base m, ordering source o and an evaluation time & world $t*, w*$:

$$\textbf{\textit{garra}} = \lambda P \forall w' \big[w' \in \textbf{best}_o(m, w*, t*) \rightarrow \textbf{at}\big((t*, \infty], w', P\big)\big]$$

garra **takes a predicate P and says that P holds in the future of t of all best-according-to-*o*-worlds in the modal base.**

Meaning of the first clause

$$\textbf{\textit{airra dringgi kofi}} = \forall w' \big[w' \in \textbf{best}_o(m, w*, t*) \rightarrow \textbf{at}\big((t*, \infty], w', \textbf{drink.coffee}\big)\big]$$

uses.)[29]

This condition allows us to unify the modalised and non-modalised readings of *bambai*: iff utterance context satisfies the diversity condition, the modal reading "emerges."

Use conditions

In §??, we saw how (along with the illocutionary "downtowning" analysed immediately above), the expressive content of *bambai*