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1. **Settledness and two types of 'open' conditionals:**
The recent works on conditionals claim that 'open' conditionals are not of the same category:
(1) I will be happy if we find a solution.
(2) [I hope Liverpool won their home match yesterday.] If they did, they still have a chance of winning the championship.

(1) and (2) are distinguished in **uncertainty** of the protasis. (Funk 1985, Kaufmann 2001)
In (1), whether 'we find a solution' in the future or not is uncertain for everyone at the time of speaking, whereas in (2), whether 'Liverpool won their home match yesterday' or not has established at the time of speaking, although the speaker does not have enough information to affirm or deny it.

To deal with the difference of uncertainty between them, we assume two types of proposition: one is that its truth value has already been **determined** (Fauconnier 1994) at the time of speaking, another is that its truth value cannot be determined at that time. We call the former 'settled propositions' and the latter 'unsettled propositions'. Now we can classify the 'open' conditionals into two groups: settled protasis as in (2) and unsettled protasis as in (1).

2. **Settledness and tensedness in Japanese conditionals:**
The settledness of protasis is reflected in selecting a conditional form in Japanese. Japanese has at least four basic conditional forms:

a) verb stem + (r)eba
b) verb stem + tara
c) verb stem + {non-past tense morpheme ((r)u) / past tense morpheme (ta)}+nara
d) verb stem + {non-past tense morpheme ((r)u) / past tense morpheme (ta)} +no nara

-Eba and -tara are **inflectional endings** of predicates, whereas nara and nonara are **connectives** for tensed clause just as 'if' in English.

In Japanese unsettled protasis selects -eba, -tara and nara(non-tensed') as in (3) but cannot nonara as in (4).

(3) *Moshi kaiketsusaku-ga* {mitsukar-eba/mitsukat-tara/mitsukat-ta-nara/} 
If a solution-NOM be found-COND 
mitsukar-u-nara}, ureshii-desu.

---

*1 Both non-past morpheme -u and past morpheme -ta can appear in the nara-clause of bservable. This indicates that these morphemes are not used temporally in the case.
happy be

'If we find a solution, I will be happy.'


'If we find a solution, I will be happy.'

On the contrary, 'settled protasis' can be selected by nonara and nara(tensed) as in

(5). -Eba and tara can appear in settled protasis only if in the circumstance where they are followed by 'perfective' teir as in (6).

(5) [I hope Liverpool won their home match yesterday.]

Moshi kat-ta {nara/nonara} championship-ni katsu chance-ga aru.

If win-PAST-COND -DAT win -NOM be

'If they did, they have a chance of winning the championship.'

(6) [I hope Liverpool won their home match yesterday.]

Moshi {*kat-eba/*kat-tara/kat-teir-eba/kat-tei-tara} championship-ni katsu chance-ga aru.

'If they did, they have a chance of winning the championship.'

Therefore, tense and perfective aspect are closely related to settledness in Japanese.

3. Counterfactuality and nonara as conditional form of noda

Our system predicts that protasis of counterfactual conditionals should be settled; counterfactual statement presupposes settledness. Only tensed nara-clauses or tei-r-eba/tei-tara clauses can be counterfactual conditionals:

(7) [Unfortunately, Liverpool lost their home match yesterday.]

Moshi {??kat-eba/??kat-tara/kat-teir-eba/kat-tei-tara/kat-ta-nara/kat-tei-ta-nara},

If had won-COND

championship-ni katsu chance-ga at-ta-daroo-ni.

-DAT win -NOM be MOD

'If they had won, they would have had a chance of winning the championship.'

However nonara cannot be counterfactual clauses as in (8).

(8) [Unfortunately, Liverpool lost their home match yesterday.]


'If they had won, they would have had a chance of winning the championship.'

Why can't nonara express counterfactual protasis, while nara can? It is natural to ascribe the difference to the form no(da), for nara is treated as conditional form of copula da, and nonara as conditional form of noda.

---

*1 Oghara 1998 proposes that 'te' of 'teir' is classified into two types: perfective and imperfective.
No-da functions as a sort of connector combining two situations. Typically, it relates one situation to another as in (9), and sometimes it bears change of speaker's belief as in (10), and also that of speaker's knowledge as in (11). In other words, noda highlights transition from one situation to another.

(9) *Dooro-ga nure-teir-u. Ame-ga fut-ta-noda.*
The road is wet. It is because it rained.

(10) *Sooka. Aitsu-ga koroshi-ta-n(o)da.*
Now I got it. The man killed her.

(11) *Nanda! Minna koko-ni ita-n(o)-da!*
I didn't know, but all you have been here!

Nonara as a conditional form of noda never presupposes the falsity of the protasis because noda just marks settledness of the proposition, and the truth value of the protasis is still open to the speaker at the time of speaking.
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