A CROSS LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE SEMANTIC FEATURES OF ITALIAN *POI;* CAMUNO *PO;* AND GERMAN *DOCH*

Matteo Fiorini

(Department of Linguistics, University of Utah)

68StuTS in Berlin. November 21, 2020

THE TOPIC

- No consensus on grammatical properties or categorial status (Bayer&Struckmeier, 2016 for an overview);

- Discourse particle = Modal particle?

- Abraham (2016): *"Sp(eaker) puts the utterance of p up for negotiation"* → *no* modal particles in Romance Languages

- **poi *(Italian) and po (Camuno) are modal particles.***

PLAN

- German *doch* as **prototypical example of MP**;
- Italian *poi* as a discourse particle;
- New analysis of **temporal** *poi* and its **scalar values in exclamatives**;
- A **MP in Camuno:** *po*;
- Summary;
- Additional properties and syntactic distribution;
- Conclusions.

GERMAN *DOCH*

- It requires a *propositional discourse referent* (Krifka, 2013);
- the proposition is not under discussion at the utterance time (Lindner, 1991);
- It **re-activates a common ground**;
- Presupposes the incompatibility of two propositions part of the CG.

1.   a.   A: Malte ist nicht nach Utrecht gefahren
            'Malte didn't go to Utrecht.'
            B: Malte ist **doch** nach Utrecht gefahren
            'He DID go to Utrecht.'   [Egg/Zimmerman, 2012 [4], 226]
      b.   Ich habe morgen **doch** Zeit.
            'I do have time tomorrow (I thought I wouldn't)

ITALIAN *POI*

Italian temporal adverb *poi* 'afterward' as a discourse particle:

(i)   neither the speaker nor the hearer can find an answer (Coniglio, 2008);

(ii)   used in hypothetical and optative contexts (Cardinaletti and Starke, 1999; Cardinaletti, 2011);

(iii)   signals that the speaker is expecting the addressee to know the answer):

2.   l'ha/avrà comprata poi?

'Did he buy it? (I'm wondering)/(who knows)'   [Cardinaletti (2015), adapted]

ITALIAN *POI*

Not felicitous out of the blue: it presupposes *p* to be potential and salient ($\lozenge\!\!\!\!/\,p$).
Speaker's assumptions: (i) an event *e* either occurred or not; (ii) the addressee knows if *e* occurred (3b) or does not (3c).

No epistemic evaluation nor negotiation of truth values is active.

3. a. [Mario was deciding where to eat: he would have been working on a construction site with no restaurant (where he usually eat) around.]

b. Mario dove ha mangiato poi?
'where did Mario **end up** eating?'

c. (poi) Mario si è portato il pranzo da casa.
'He **ended up** bringing lunch from home.'

ITALIAN *POI*

Scalar and epistemic reading in exclamative structures;

Given the appropriate syntactic and prosodic properties, the temporal reading is ruled out.

4.   Si sarà poi portato il pranzo da casa!
      'He must have brought lunch from home, obviously!"

Given the background ➔ if $\lozenge\!\!\!/\, p$ ➔ $\square p = p$ is the only possible event

-- ranking of the possible states of affair based on likelihood

CAMUNO *PO*

The speaker evaluates a proposition p on a scale based on likelihood against the common ground (1a);
The presupposition is either □p (declaratives) or □¬p (interrogatives).

5. Mario a   majat   ndoe po?
   'Where did Mario eat? (surely not at a restaurant)'

(5) is a genuine wh-structure biased in its set of alternatives = all the focus alternatives, excluding the least likely for the speaker to happen, i.e., the most likely in unmarked contexts.

CAMUNO *PO*

In (6) and (7) *po* only selects the maximally likely to be true for the speaker, and the selected alternative is marked as 'obvious' or 'equally accessible' to the addressee:

6. A portat al disna de kà po.
   'He brought lunch from home (what did you expect?)'

7. al orà portat al disna de kà *po*!
   'He must have brought lunch from home, obviously!"

SUMMARY

		Shared Background	Scalarity	Modal particle
Declaratives	*Poi*	✓		✗
	Po	✓	✓	✓
Yes/no question	*Poi*	✓		✗
	Po	✓	✓	✓
Wh questions	*Poi*	✓		✗
	Po	✓	✓	✓
Exclamatives	*Poi*	✓	✓	✓
	Po	✓	✓	✓

SUMMARY

- Epistemic evaluation ╞ (entails) point of view ╞ a proposed further negotiation of truth values (*Foreign Consciousness Alignment thesis* (Abraham, 2012)).

- Italian *poi* (exclamatives) and Camuno *po* qualify for a characterisation as a modal particle, in Abraham's (2016) definition.

- Modal particles are part of the inventory of grammatical items in (at least) two Romance languages.

FURTHER STUDIES

Properties of modal particles (Gutzmann (2016)):

- MPs (i) cannot receive main sentence stress; (ii) are optional; (iii) cannot be negated; (iv) have sentential scope; (v) cannot be questioned; (vi) do not affect truth conditions; (vii) are speaker oriented.

- MPs can only occur in the middle-field

   → some restriction can be observed:

FURTHER STUDIES

8.   (*po) Mario (*po) **a** (?? po) majat (?? po) ndoe   po?
       'Where did Mario eat? (surely not at a restaurant)'

9.   (*po) **a** (?? po) portat (?? po) al   disna de kà po.
       'He brought lunch from home (what did you expect?)'

10.   (*po) al **arà** (po) portat (po) al disna de kà *po*!
       'He must have brought lunch from home, obviously!"

11.   (# poi) Si **sarà** poi portato (poi) il pranzo da casa (poi)!
       'He must have brought lunch from home, obviously!"

CONCLUSIONS

- More data are needed (Further pragmatic values; Different types of sentences).
- *Doch* is explicitly contrastive and implicitly scalar vs explicitly scalar and implicitly contrastive.
  - Prediction: **MP need to be scalar**
- Two main conclusions:

  (i) **modal particles are present in Romance languages;**

  (ii) **both Italian and Camuno possess a low periphery that hosts discourse-related, and arguably speaker-oriented, items** (Belletti, 2004; Giorgi, 2016; Poletto, 2000 i.a.).

THANKS!

matteo.fiorini@utah.edu

PARTIAL REFERENCES

Abraham, W. (2016). Discourse marker = discourse particle = thetical = modal particle? A futile comparison. In Bayer, J., & Struckmeier, V. (Eds.). *Discourse particles: Formal approaches to their syntax and semantics*.

Bayer, J. and Struckmeier, V. (Ed.s) (2016). *Discourse Particles: Formal Approaches to Their Syntax and Semantics*, De Gruyter, Inc., 2016.

Cardinaletti, A. (2015). *Italian verb-based discourse particles in a comparative perspective*, Discourse-oriented Syntax, Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 71-91.

Cardinaletti, A. (2011). German and Italian modal particles and clause structure. Linguistic Review 28(4). 493– 531.

Egg, M. and Zimmermann, M. (2012). Stressed Out! Accented Discourse Particles: the case of doch. *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 16: Volume 1.* Ana Aguilar Guevara, Anna Chernilovskaya, and Rick Nouwen (eds.).

Grosz, P. (2010). Germandoch: An element that triggers a contrast presupposition.CLS 46.

Gutzmann, D. (2016). Modal particles ≠ modal particles (= modal particles). In Bayer, J., & Struckmeier, V. (Eds.). *Discourse particles: Formal approaches to their syntax and semantics*.

Krifka, M. (2013). Response particles as propositional anaphors. *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 23:1-18.

Zimmermann, M. (2011). Discourse particles. In Semantics: an international handbook of natural language meaning, ed. Claudia Maienborn, Klaus von Heusinger, and Paul Portner,2011–2038. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.