

Questions are Immediate Issues

Yurie Hara

Japan Society for Promotion of Science
Kyoto University

June 18th-19th, Logic and Engineering of Natural Language
Semantics 2007

Relevance Conditional Questions

- Operations over question acts seem to be more restricted than operations over assertions.
 - It is also possible to have a similar conditional with a question as its consequence (2-a).
 - However, it cannot be modified by *whenever*.
- (2) a. If I have your attention now, what do you want for dinner?
b. ??Whenever I have your attention, what do you want for dinner?

Relevance Conditionals

- The antecedent of a so-called *relevance conditional* (also known as *biscuit conditionals*) like (1-a) seems to express the condition on the assertion speech act.
 - This condition can be modified by the free-relative construction with *whenever* as in (1-b).
- (1) a. If you're hungry, there's pizza in the fridge.
b. Whenever you get hungry, there's pizza in the fridge.
[Siegel, 2006]

Japanese Wide-scope Exhaustification

- The Japanese *dake-wa* construction seems to express the exhaustification over the assertion acts as in (3),
 - This construction is not licit with a question as in (4).
- (3) JOHN-dake-wa kita.
John-only-Top came.
'At least John came.' (I don't make assertions about other individuals; only>assertion)
- (4) ??JOHN-dake-wa nani-o kai-mashi-ta-ka?
John-only-Top what-Acc buy-Hon-Past-Q
'What did at least John buy?'

Goal

Generalization

Operations over question acts are more restricted than operations over assertions.

- I take these data to show that questions (issues) are more context-dependent than assertion acts.

Siegel (2006)

- It has been suggested by various literature that relevance conditionals restrict the speech act performed by the main clause.

- (5) If you're hungry, there's pizza in the fridge.
- (6) If you're hungry, ASSERT (There's pizza in the fridge).

'whenever'

- (6) If you're hungry, ASSERT (There's pizza in the fridge).

- According to Siegel, however, this analysis leads us to an incorrect paraphrase for an example like (7).

- (7) Whenever you get hungry, there's pizza in the fridge. [Siegel, 2006]
- (8) Prediction: at any time t at which you get hungry (PERFORMED ASSERTION) there's pizza in the fridge

Potential Literal Acts

Siegel 2006

Relevance conditionals (Biscuit conditionals) involve existential quantification over *potential literal acts*.

potential literal acts

- lack the contextual specifics (speaker, addressee, appropriate context),
- are not necessarily the actual performed acts.
- are introduced by a context-sensitive meaning-shift rule in order to accommodate the cases where interpretation does not converge.

\exists -closure over potential literal acts

- After the meaning-shift rule, existential closure applies to the variables introduced by the meaning-shift.
- (9) If you're hungry, **there is a (relevant) assertion that** there's pizza in the fridge.
- As for a 'whenever'-conditional, it merely expresses that there is an abstract potential literal act at each time when the addressee gets hungry.
- (10) a. Whenever you get hungry, there's pizza in the fridge.
b. At any time t at which you get hungry, there is/will be a (relevant) assertion that there's pizza in the fridge.

Extending Siegel: exhaustification over speech acts

- Second, it can account for a seeming exhaustification over assertion acts in Japanese.
 - The contrastive topic marker *wa* forces the exhaustive particle *dake* 'only' to take scope higher than the assertion act,
 - yielding the negation of alternative assertion acts ('I do not make any other assertions.').
- (13) a. JOHN-dake-**ga** kita.
John-only-Nom came.
'Only John came.' (Others didn't come; assertion>only)
b. JOHN-dake-**wa** kita.
John-only-Top came.
'At least John came.' (I don't make assertions about other individuals; only>assertion)

Extending Siegel: 'whenever'-relevance cond

- Siegel's proposal is appealing in many respects.
 - First, as Siegel notes, it provides intuitively plausible paraphrases for similar conditional constructions with other "speech acts" such as questions and commands.
- (11) a. If I have your attention now, (there's a relevant question:) what do you want for dinner?
b. If you have the time, (there's a relevant question:) why is Johnson going to quit the firm?
- (12) a. Before you go, (there's a relevant command:) remember to call when you get there.
b. If you have the time, (there's a relevant command:) come over and help us.

On Quantification over Speech Acts

- (3) JOHN-dake-**wa** kita.
John-only-Top came.
'At least John came.' (I don't make assertions about other individuals; only>assertion)
- This is puzzling in view of Krifka's principle of the computation of speech acts

Krifka [2001]

Conjunction is the only operation in the computation of speech acts.

- In particular, negation, which is involved in the exhaustive particle, should not be a valid operation;
- hence (3) is predicted to be unacceptable.

On Quantification over Potential Literal Acts

- With Siegel's notion of **potential literal acts**, we can derive the desired interpretation as an instance of exhaustification of potential literal acts **without violating Krifka's principle**.
- (14)
- John-**dake-wa** came.
 - The speaker asserts that John came.
 - There is no assertion about individuals other than John with respect to the question 'who came?'.
- This is possible because potential literal acts are not actually performed acts but abstract semantic objects without the contextual specifics.
 - Siegel's analysis allows us to have plausible paraphrases for English relevance conditionals and Japanese wide-scope exhaustification.

On Quantification over Question Acts

- a careful look at question acts reveals that abstraction over question acts is dubious.
 - First, a relevance conditional with a command can include universal force,
 - while the parallel construction with a question cannot.
- (15)
- Whenever you leave, remember to call me.
 - Whenever you have the time, come over and help us.
- (16)
- ??Whenever I have your attention, what do you want for dinner?
 - ??Whenever you have the time, why is Johnson going to quit the firm?

Exhaustification over Commands and Questions

- Similarly, Japanese *dake-wa* construction with a command is possible (17-b) and yield the interpretation of wide-scope for exhaustification,
- (17)
- EIGO-dake-**o** benkyo-siro!
English-only-Acc study-do.Imp
'Study only English!' (Don't study other subjects; command>only)
 - EIGO-dake-**wa** benkyo-siro!
English-only-Con study-do.Imp
'Study at least English!' (I don't make orders about other subjects; only>command)

Exhaustification over Commands and Questions

- while the construction with a question is not possible (18-b).
- (18)
- JOHN-dake-**ga** nani-o kai-mashi-ta-ka?
John-only-Nom what-Acc buy-Hon-Past-Q
'What did only John buy?' (what is the thing x such that John bought x and others didn't buy x?)
 - ??JOHN-dake-**wa** nani-o kai-mashi-ta-ka?
John-only-Top what-Acc buy-Hon-Past-Q

Interim Summary

Generalization

Operations over question acts are more restricted than operations over assertion acts and command acts.

- Siegel's analysis does not easily extend to question acts.

What's Next?

- Siegel's paraphrase, 'If I have your attention now, there is a relevant question: what do you want for dinner?', sounds a little too weak.
- The speaker is waiting for the addressee's answer rather than merely presenting a relevant possible act.
- I offer an alternative explanation of the puzzle above following Isaacs and Rawlins's analysis of Conditional Questions.

Conditional Questions

- Isaacs and Rawlins [2006] analyze conditional sentences with interrogative consequents (conditional questions) using

- 1 dynamic semantics of conditionals and
- 2 partition semantics of questions.

(19) If Alfonso comes to the party, will Joanna leave?
[Isaacs and Rawlins, 2006]

Partition Semantics for Questions

- context as an equivalence relation on worlds.
- context set as a set of pairs of worlds
- assertive update amounts to **deleting** all pairs a member of which makes the assertional content false.
- w_1, w_2 : it is raining
- w_3, w_4 : it is not raining

(20) It's raining.

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{cccc} \langle w_1, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_1 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_2 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_3 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_4 \rangle \end{array} \right\}$$

Partition Semantics for Questions

- questions do not remove worlds but **disconnects** parts of the context.
- I.e., partitions the context set.
- w_1, w_2 : it is raining
- w_3, w_4 : it is not raining

(21) Is it raining?

$\left\{ \begin{array}{ c c } \hline \langle w_1, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_1 \rangle \\ \hline \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_2 \rangle \\ \hline \end{array} \right\}$		
	$\left\{ \begin{array}{ c c } \hline \langle w_3, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_3 \rangle \\ \hline \langle w_3, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_4 \rangle \\ \hline \end{array} \right\}$	← Inquisitive context

Stack-based Model

In implementing these steps, Isaacs and Rawlins employ Kaufmann's [2000] model of temporary contexts.

(22) If Alfonso comes to the party, will Joanna leave? [Isaacs and Rawlins, 2006]

Two steps for Conditionals

Given the dynamic view of assertive and inquisitive updates, conditionals are characterized as a two-step update procedure [Stalnaker, 1968, Karttunen, 1974, Heim, 1982]:

- 1 A derived context is created by updating the speech context with the antecedent of the conditional.
- 2 The derived context is updated with the consequent.

Illustration: Initial input macro-context

(22) If Alfonso comes to the party, will Joanna leave?

(23) $s =$

$s_0:$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{ c c c c } \hline \langle w_1, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_1 \rangle \\ \hline \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_2 \rangle \\ \hline \langle w_1, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_3 \rangle \\ \hline \langle w_1, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_4 \rangle \\ \hline \end{array} \right\}$			

- Alfonso comes to the party in w_1, w_2
- Alfonso does not come to the party in w_3, w_4
- Joanna leaves in w_1, w_3
- Joanna doesn't leave in w_2, w_4

Illustration: a temporary context

First, in interpreting the antecedent of the conditional, a temporary context is created by making a copy of the main context s .

s_0 :	$\left\{ \begin{array}{llll} \langle w_1, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_1 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_2 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_3 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_4 \rangle \end{array} \right\}$
s_1 :	$\left\{ \begin{array}{llll} \langle w_1, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_1 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_2 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_3 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_4 \rangle \end{array} \right\}$

Illustration: question in the consequence

- Second, in interpreting the question in the consequence, the derived context is partitioned into two blocks.
- Since w_1 and w_2 resolves the question in different ways, the two worlds are disconnected.
- In other words, the pairs that connect two worlds are removed.

(25) $s'' = s' + [\text{Will Joanna leave?}] =$

s''_0 :	$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \boxed{\langle w_1, w_1 \rangle} & \\ & \boxed{\langle w_2, w_2 \rangle} \end{array} \right\}$
s''_1	c

- Joanna leaves in w_1, w_3
- Joanna doesn't leave in w_2, w_4

Illustration: assertive update of the temporary context

- Then, the temporary context is assertive-updated.
- Hence, all the pairs which involves a member that makes the assertion false, i.e., w_3 and w_4 , are removed.

(24) $s' = s + [\text{If [Alfonso comes to the party]}] =$

s''_0 :	$\left\{ \begin{array}{llll} \langle w_1, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_1 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_2 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_3 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_4 \rangle \end{array} \right\}$
s''_1	c

- Alfonso comes to the party in w_1, w_2
- Alfonso does not come to the party in w_3, w_4

Illustration: yes-answer

A yes-answer removes all the pairs that makes the assertion (answer) false in the temporary context.

(26)

s''_0 :	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \langle w_1, w_1 \rangle \\ \langle w_2, w_2 \rangle \end{array} \right\}$
s''_1	c

- Joanna leaves in w_1, w_3
- Joanna doesn't leave in w_2, w_4

Illustration: Percolation of Information

- This assertive update by the answer affects not only the temporary context but other members in the stack.
- the update removes the worlds where the antecedent is true and the consequent is false
(w_2 : Alfonso comes to the party and Joanna does not leave the party).

$$(27) \quad s''' = s'' + \text{yes} =$$

s_0'' :	$\{ \langle w_1, w_1 \rangle, \langle w_2, w_2 \rangle \}$
s_1''' :	$\left\{ \begin{array}{cccc} \langle w_1, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_1 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_2 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_3 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_4 \rangle \end{array} \right\}$

Information and Issues

- Derived contexts are discarded after the interpretation of **declarative** conditionals.
- The subsequent utterances do not refer back to the temporary contexts.
- In contrast, Isaacs and Rawlins propose that derived contexts are not discarded after the interpretation of **interrogative** conditionals,
- since the derived contexts are still inquisitive.

Isaacs and Rawlins

Information brought by assertions percolates down the stack but **issues** raised by questions do **not**.

Illustration: temporary context removed

- After the question is resolved, and hence the temporary context is no longer inquisitive, the temporary context can be popped off the stack.

$$(28) \quad s'''' = \text{pop}(s''') =$$

s_0'''' :	$\left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} \langle w_1, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_1 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_3 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_4 \rangle \end{array} \right\}$
-------------	--

Why do issues not percolate?

Why do issues not percolate? In other words, why do questions not affect the other members of the stack?

Isaacs and Rawlins

Percolating issues would result either in **abandoning mutual exclusivity** or in **abandoning exhaustivity**.

What to do with extra worlds?

- Issues are partitions of the context.
- A derived context created by a conditional is a context where some of the worlds in the initial context are removed.
- if issues percolated, we would have to do something extra to the worlds which were not included in the derived context (i.e., w_3 and w_4).

S_0'' :	$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \langle w_1, w_1 \rangle \\ \langle w_2, w_2 \rangle \end{array} \right\}$
S_1''' :	$\left\{ \begin{array}{cccc} \langle w_1, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_1 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_2 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_3 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_4 \rangle \end{array} \right\}$

abandoning mutual exclusivity

If we put those extra worlds in each block as in (29), the partition is abandoning mutual exclusivity.

S_0 :	$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \langle w_1, w_1 \rangle \\ \langle w_2, w_2 \rangle \end{array} \right\}$
(29) S_1 :	$\left\{ \begin{array}{cccc} \langle w_1, w_1 \rangle & & \langle w_3, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_1 \rangle \\ & & \langle w_3, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_2 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_3 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_4 \rangle \\ & & \langle w_3, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_1 \rangle \\ & & \langle w_3, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_2 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_3 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_4 \rangle \end{array} \right\}$

abandoning exhaustivity

On the other hand, if we put those worlds in no block as in (30), we end up abandoning exhaustivity.

S_0 :	$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \langle w_1, w_1 \rangle \\ \langle w_2, w_2 \rangle \end{array} \right\}$
(30) S_1 :	$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \langle w_1, w_1 \rangle \\ \langle w_2, w_2 \rangle \\ \langle w_3, w_1 \rangle \quad \langle w_4, w_1 \rangle \\ \langle w_3, w_2 \rangle \quad \langle w_4, w_2 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_3 \rangle \quad \langle w_2, w_3 \rangle \quad \langle w_3, w_3 \rangle \quad \langle w_4, w_3 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_4 \rangle \quad \langle w_2, w_4 \rangle \quad \langle w_3, w_4 \rangle \quad \langle w_4, w_4 \rangle \end{array} \right\}$

Issues should not percolate

- Since we need mutual exclusivity and mutual exhaustivity independently as a general constraint, issues should not percolate.
- Questions can only partition the top-most context.
- Furthermore, assuming that percolation precedes the pop operation, an inquisitive (partitioned) context can never be popped without being resolved.

Interim Summary

- Only the topmost context in the stack can be partitioned, and
- The issue raised by the question has to be resolved before the context is popped.

Relevance Conditionals and Free relatives

- I assume that the 'whenever'-clause creates multiple temporary contexts.
- The speech act operates over those multiple contexts.

(31) Whenever you get hungry, there's pizza in the fridge. [Siegel, 2006]

Illustration: free relative

- The *whenever*-clause creates multiple temporary contexts
 - ▶ one where the addressee gets hungry and she is listening to music, s'_0 ,
 - ▶ and the other where the addressee gets hungry and she is not listening to music, s'_1 .

(32) $s' = s + [\text{Whenever [you get hungry]}] =$

s'_0 :	$\left\{ \begin{array}{cc} \langle w_1, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_1 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_2 \rangle \end{array} \right\}$
s'_1 :	$\left\{ \begin{array}{cc} \langle w_3, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_3 \rangle \\ \langle w_3, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_4 \rangle \end{array} \right\}$
s'_2 :	C

Illustration: Multiple Assertive Updates

- The consequence removes ('there's no pizza in the fridge') from each temporary context.
- This information can percolate down to the original member of the stack.
- After the percolation, the temporary contexts are popped.

(33) $s'' = s' + [\text{there's pizza in the fridge}] =$

s'_0 :	$\left\{ \begin{array}{cc} \langle w_1, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_1 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_2 \rangle \end{array} \right\}$
s'_1 :	$\left\{ \begin{array}{cc} \langle w_3, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_3 \rangle \\ \langle w_3, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_4 \rangle \end{array} \right\}$
s''_2 :	$\left\{ \begin{array}{cccc} \langle w_1, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_1 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_1 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_2 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_2 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_3 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_3 \rangle \\ \langle w_1, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_2, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_3, w_4 \rangle & \langle w_4, w_4 \rangle \end{array} \right\}$

Illustration: Multiple Inquisitive Updates

(34) ??Whenever I have your attention, what do you want for dinner?

The *whenever*-clause creates multiple temporary contexts in the same fashion as the declarative case.

- The question act of the consequent then attempts to operate over those contexts.
- However, this operation ends up partitioning the non-top contexts.
- This is an illegal operation, hence the sentence is ruled out.

wa as a restriction for speech act

- The Japanese translations of (35) are not ambiguous.
- In (36-a), the assertion is about a large general situation in the airport,
- while the phrase *inu-wa* in (36-b) restricts the context of the assertion to cases where there is a dog.

- (36) a. *inu-o kakaе nakerebanarani.*
dog-Acc carry must
'You have to carry a dog.' (unambiguous)
- b. *inu-wa kakaе nakerebanaranai.*
dog-Top carry must
'If there is a dog, you have to carry it.' (unambiguous)

wa as a restriction for speech act

- I assume that the Japanese topic-marker *wa* marks Austinian topics [Austin, 1950].
- The topic-marked element denotes what utterances are about.
- Hence, just like the *if*-clauses, the *wa*-phrase restricts the context for the speech act of the utterance.

- (35) Dogs must be carried. (ambiguous)
- a. Only people carrying dogs are allowed in that location.
- b. Dogs are forbidden there except when they are carried.
[Wasow et al., 2005]

Wide-Scope Exhaustification with *Dake-wa*

- Due to the *wa*-marking on the subject, *dake* takes scope over the restriction of the assertion.
 - *dake* generates alternative temporary contexts, 'if we are speaking of John', 'if we are speaking of Mary', etc.,
 - The exhaustive component of *dake* conveys that the speaker is restricting her assertion 'John came' to the context where the speaker and the addressee are talking about John.
- (3) JOHN-dake-wa kita.
John-only-Top came.
'At least John came.' (I don't make assertions about other individuals; only>assertion)

Wide-Scope Exhaustification over Questions

- *dake* creates multiple alternative temporary contexts that provide the restrictions for the performed speech act.
- In the current case, however, the act is a question (i.e., an inquisitive update),
- hence it attempts to partition those contexts.
- This operation is prohibited since it involves partitioning non-top contexts.

(4) ??JOHN-dake-**wa** nani-o kai-mashi-ta-ka?
John-only-Top what-Acc buy-Hon-Past-Q

Future topic: commands

- The treatment of command acts is one of the important future research questions pertaining to this approach.
- A command can co-occur with a free-relative and the *dake-wa* construction.

(37) Whenever you leave, remember to call me.

(17-b) EIGO-dake-**wa** benkyo-siro!
English-only-Con study-do.Imp
'Study at least English!' (I don't make orders about other subjects; only>command)

Summary

- Operations over questions are more restricted than operations over assertions.
- I take this data to provide some evidence in favor of Isaacs and Rawlins's principle of questions:
- issues raised by questions cannot percolate, while information brought by assertions can.
- Therefore, a question can only partition the topmost context, and the issue has to be resolved before the temporary context is popped off.

Future topic: requests

- If the question is not an information-seeking one like a request, it is possible to have a relevance conditional with a universal force and a question with wide-scope exhaustification.

(38) Whenever you leave, can I ask you to turn off the lights?

(39) denki-dake-wa keshi teoite-kure-masu-ka?
light-only-Con off leave-Ben-Hon-Q
'Could you make sure that at least lights are off?'
(I don't make other requests; only>request)

- This data suggests that commands and requests should be treated analogously to assertions.
- Future research on this topic will shed new light on the taxonomy of speech acts.

J. L. Austin. Truth. *Aristotelian Society Supp.*, 24:111–129., 1950.

Irene Heim. *The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases*. PhD thesis, University of Massachussets, Amherst, 1982. [Distributed by GLSA].

James Isaacs and Kyle Rawlins. Conditional questions. ms., University of California, Santa Cruz, 2006.

Lauri Karttunen. Presupposition and linguistic context. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 1(1/2):182–194, 1974.

Stefan Kaufmann. Dynamic context management. In S. Kaufmann M. Faller and M. Pauly, editors, *Formalizing the Dynamics of Information*. CSLI, Stanford, CA, 2000.

Muffy Siegel. Biscuit conditionals: Quantification over potential literal acts. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 29(2):167 – 203, 2006.

Robert Stalnaker. A theory of conditionals. In N. Resher, editor, *Studies in Logical Theory*. Blackwell, Oxford, 1968.

Thomas Wasow, Amy Perfors, and David Beaver. The puzzle of ambiguity. In O. Orgun and P. Sells, editors, *Morphology and The Web of Grammar: Essays in Memory of Steven G. Lapointe*. CSLI Publications, 2005.