BAVARIAN GERMAN DISCOURSE PARTICLES - NOT A NATURAL CLASS*

Sonja Thoma (thoma@interchange.ubc.ca)

1. INTRODUCTION

A large body of descriptive literature exists on German discourse particles (DPRT), (a.k.a. toning or modal particles, *German 'Abtönungs-/Modalpartikeln')*. However, DPRTs have been the subject of formal investigation only more recently. Most of these formal studies are limited to the closer investigation of the semantics of DPRT (e.g. Kratzer 1999, Grosz 2009, 2010, among others), leaving their syntax aside (with the exception of Coniglio 2009, Bayer & Obenauer 2010). This present study questions the general assumption that DPRT are a *natural class* and thus classifiable as a word class, concluding that this is not the case.

I specifically restrict the claims made in this paper to a specific German dialect, the middle Bavarian variant spoken in the Miesbach area south of Munich (MB). This approach allows for a homogenous data sample, restricting the variability of judgments. In light of a wide range of grammaticality judgments for the data available in the literature, the delimitation of a certain dialectal region seems particularly salient.

The claims about the 'unclassiness' of DPRT are only supported by data from MB in this paper, I do assume, however, that the results are transferable to other German dialects and standard high German (SHG), verification pending.

What are DPRTs then? A standard definition (1) gives a descriptive approximation towards the function of DPRTs in discourse.

(1) *'Discourse particles form a **closed class** of invariable natural language expressions. They help to organize a discourse by conveying information concerning the epistemic states of the speaker, or her interlocutors, or both, with respect to the descriptive content of an utterance.'* (Zimmermann, to appear)

Recent approaches to the syntax of German DPRTs (Coniglio 2009, Abraham 2010, 2011, cf. Bayer & Obenauer 2010) identify a functional projection in CP (ForceP/SpeakerDeixisP) as syntactic licensor for DPRTs. Any claim about, or search for, unified syntactic licensing conditions for DPRTs crucially rests on the assumption that these particles all behave as a group, i.e. that they are a *natural class*. Definitions such as (1), which identify DPRTs as a closed class, their classification as a separate word class in reference grammars (Duden 2005)

* This research was supported by a DAAD research scholarship awarded to the author and a SSHRC SRG grant awarded to Martina Wiltschko. Thanks to the audience at the Swiss Workshop in Generative Grammar 2011 in Geneva for questions and comments. Thanks as well as to an anonymous reviewer for helpful comments and references. All errors are of course my own.

as well as the explicit treatment of DPRTs as a category (e.g. Meibauer 1994, Coniglio 2009) further illustrate a general assumption about their 'classiness'.

In the following section I show that despite some common tendencies, MB DPRTs do *not* form a natural class (cf. Zimmermann 2004, Grosz 2010). This predicts that unified syntactic licensing conditions should not exist for them; in section 3. I show that this prediction is borne out empirically. Section 4 concludes, and gives a very brief outlook and suggestion for the analysis of DPRTs.

2. MB BAVARIAN DISCOURSE PARTICLES ARE NOT A NATURAL CLASS

SHG DPRT generally are classified based on a miscellaneous 'laundry' list of criteria (2). These criteria are often quoted (e.g. Thurmair (1989), Meibauer 1994, Grosz 2005, Coniglio 2009, Bayer & Obenauer 2010) and are supposed to capture the 'typical' or 'core' DPRTs such as *aber, ja, doch, halt, bloß, denn* (cf. Thurmair's 1989 *'classical 16'*).

(2) DPRT characteristics

- *not obligatory*
- *can be combined but not coordinated*
- *unstressed/ unstressable*
- *uninflected*
- *have sentence scope*
- *are expressions of speaker attitude*
- *modify illocutionary force*
- *depend on clause types*
- *occur only in the 'middle field' (between IP and V°)*
- *are polyfunctional*

These rather informal criteria overlap to some degree with formal fields traditionally used to establish natural class membership, namely phonology, syntax, and semantics (3).

(3) Phonology *(≈ stressability*)
Semantics
- Lexical semantics (≈ *polyfunctionality*)
- Expressive semantics (≈ *speaker attitude*)

Syntax
- Internal
  - Morphology (≈ *inflectability*)
- External
  - Sentence internal distribution (≈ *middle field restriction*)
  - Sentence "external" (≈ *clause-type restriction*)

Given the definition in (1) and the list in (2), a set of criteria exists that should allow us to define a closed class of DPRT. It should be a formality to list the DPRT of German, and show that they behave like a natural class with respect to phonology, semantics and/or syntax. This is not the case though; there is no consensus about the number of DPRT, and debate about

which items are and are not DPRT in a given context. Thurmair (1989) establishes a list of the so-called 'classical 16', but the number of items considered DPRT ranges up to 52 (Burkhardt 1994).

Given the unclear status of DPRT as a natural class, consider the following quote (emphasis mine):

> "*To achieve descriptive, observational and explanatory adequacy**, a linguistic theory must have definitions that provide clear criteria for class membership that do not depend on (implicit or explicit) pre-theoretical intuitions** *about the nature of categorical distinctions."* (Déchaine & Tremblay, in prep.)

In the following sections I will take the criteria in (3) as a starting point, and show that tested against them, some core MB DPRTs, corresponding to items identified as the SHG 'classical 16', Thurmair 1989) cannot be classified. That is, that they do not constitute a natural class.

2.1. Phonology

Starting with the phonological properties of DPRTs, variable stress patterns can be observed. Some MB DPRTs are stressable (4), some are obligatorily stressed (5), and some can never be stressed (6) (CAPS indicate stress, *italicized* parts in the gloss give an approximation of the DPRT contribution).

(4) a. Wos machst'*na* du?
What do *na* you?
'What are you doing (*then)?*

b. Wos, Du studierst nimmer? Wos machst *NA*?
what do.you *na*
'What, you are not studying anymore? What are you doing *THEN*?

(5) Geh *JA/* ja /BLOß/#bloß* ins Bett!
Go *ja* *bloß* into bed
'Go to bed' (*I mean it/whatever you do, do x)*

(6) Geh f*ei/*FEI* ins Bett!
Go *fei* into bed
'Go to bed' (*in case you weren't going to)*

The data in (4), (5) and (6) show that some 'core' cases of DPRTs such as *ja* and *bloß* vary in stressability, showing that stressability is neither a sufficient criterion to classify DPRTs, nor a necessary one[2].

[2] Stress on DPRTs is one of the most debated characteristics; e.g. Thurmair (1989), Meibauer (1994) claim that stress on a SHG DPRTs changes its categorical status to an adverb. A claim like that ignores the fact that no other category/word class distinction exists in German based on lexical stress (cf Féry 2010 to appear). Abraham (2000) and Gutzmann (2010) on the other hand consider stressed particle instances as DPRTs with added meaning (focus).

Criterion	sufficient for classification	necessary for classification
stressability	✘	✘

2.2. Semantics

Turning to the semantics, neither a particle's lexical semantics (≈ polyfunctionality), nor its expressive semantics (≈ speaker attitude) are sufficient for DPRT classification. Expressive semantics, besides not being sufficient, is also not a necessary criterion for all MB DPRTs.

2.2.1. Lexical semantics

A distinct property of nearly all DPRTs is their polyfunctionality. Most items used as DPRT also have uses in other contexts, either as adverbs, adjectives, exclusive or additive operators, etc. DPRTs are thought to have arisen out of their non-DPRT counterparts due to grammaticalization (Abraham 2000). The data in (7)-(10) show that DPRTs have no common underlying lexical or operator semantics in their other uses that could define them as a semantic class. Items also used as DPRTs range from operator/functor-like (7) to lexical (8), pronominal (9), or temporal (10), among others.

(7) exclusive: *bloß 'only'*

a. Da Elias hod *bloß* da LUZIA oans gem (DP focus) → focus adverb
DET E has only DET L one given
'Elias gave only Luzia one.

cf b. Sei BLOß brav! → DPRT
be bloß well. behaved
'(whatever you do) be good!

c. Wo ist bloß wieda da Andreas? → DPRT
where is bloß again DET Andreas
'Where *(the hell)* is Andreas again?'

(8) lexically contentful : *ruhig 'quiet'*

a. Sei ruhig! → adverb
Be quiet
'Be quiet !'

cf b. Ziag *ruhig* de Kinder wos warms oo → DPRT
dress ruhig DET children.dat WH.INDEF. warm on
'Dress the kids warm (*feel free to do so /I encourage you*)'

(9) Pronominal : *mir/ma 'me'(2nd person dative singular pronoun)*

a. Ziag ma wos warms oo → pronoun
dress me.DAT WH.INDEF. warm on
'Dress me warm'

cf b. Ziag *ma* de Kinder was warms oo → DPRT
dress me DET children.DAT WH.INDEF warm on
'Dress the kids warm (*do me the favor/I really care that you do*)'

(10) Temporal : *nachad 'after'*

a. Zerscht pack'ma zam, und *nachad* fahr' ma → temporal adverb
first pack.we togethter and after drive.we

'First we're packing, then we're off'

cf. b. Wo fahrt's *nachad* hi? → DPRT
Where drive.youPL nachad there
'Where are you going to (*then*)?'

DPRT polyfunctionality is, however, neither sufficient for classification, nor is it necessary; whereas the majority of MB DPRTs lead a 'double life', not all are *necessarily* polyfunctional. In (11a-b) I show particles that have no other use than DPRT use; the same is the case with 11c, although a similar form (*amoi* vs. *oamoi*) is used as a count adverbial (12b).

(11) a. *halt:* only DPRT use
b. *fei:* only DPRT use
c. *amoi:* only DPRT use

Comparing MB *amoi* (11c, 12b) to the equivalent SHG *einmal* (12a), it is evident that despite a similar form, no polyfunctionality between the SHG DPRT *einmal* and the count adverbial *einmal ('one-time, once')* exists*;* the internal stress pattern clearly distinguishes two separate lexical items[3]. For the corresponding MB DPRT *amoi*, the stress facts are parallel to SHG, in addition to a different phonological realization for the count adverbial (12b).

(12) a. SHG: *einmál* DPRT *éinmal* count adverbial
b. MB: *amói* DPRT *óamoi* count adverbial

This section showed that polyfunctionality is neither sufficient nor necessary to establish a natural class of DPRT.

Criterion	sufficient for classification	necessary for classification
polyfunctionality	✘	✘

2.2.2. *Expressive semantics*

DPRTs are considered 'expressions of speaker attitude" (Weydt 1978, Meibauer 1994), or part of the non-propositional (i.e. the expressive) level of the utterance (Kratzer 1999, Potts 2007, Zimmermann to appear). Whereas the use of DPRTs may convey some speaker attitude (or presupposition, as shown in (13)), expressiveness is not a sufficient criterion for the classification of MB DPRTs. Speaker attitude can map onto various categories, such as nouns, adverbs or adjectives.

(13) a. I hob *leider* koa Zeit → adverb
I have unfortunately no time

[3] Similar ambiguities in English are also disambiguated based on stress, clearly showing the different internal syntactic makeup of the structures.
(i) black bóard
(ii) bláckboard

'Unfortunately I don't have time.' *(speaker regrets)*

b. Da *Köter* vom Nachbarn → noun
DET dog.NEGATIVE of.DET neighbor
'The neighbor's dog.' *(speaker strongly dislikes dog)*

c. Des *g'schissne* Telefon is hi →adjective/past participle
DET shitty phone is broken
'The damn phone is broken' *(feels negatively about the phone)*

The next question is whether the speaker is obligatorily the anchor for the DPRT, i.e. whether speaker attitude is necessarily inherent to all DPRTs, or whether the (syntactic) context determines the anchor[4]. The data in (14-17) show that not all MB DPRTs anchor to the speaker (cf. Müller 2011), i.e. MB DPRT are not all inherently specified for carrying speaker attitude.

The particle *fei* carries a polarity presupposition about knowledge of the addressee, with the presupposition informally expressed as: *I think you believe that ¬p* (Thoma 2009).

(14) Linguisten san *fei* gscheid.
linguists are fei smart
'Linguists are smart' *(I think you believe that linguists are not smart)*

The presupposition still present and ascribed to the speaker when sentence is embedded (15).

(15) a. Da Andreas hod gsogt, dass Linguisten *fei* gscheid san
DET andreas has said that Linguists fei smart are
'Andreas said that Linguists are smart. (speaker (≠Andreas) thinks addressee believes the opposite)

b. I know that you know that Linguists are smart and I tell you:
Da Andreas hod gsogt, dass Linguisten *fei* gscheid san
'Andreas said that Linguists are smart. (speaker (≠Andreas) thinks addressee believes the opposite)

On the other hand, the particle *bloß,* often used in imperatives, adds 'emphasis'. As (16) shows, it doesn't carry a presupposition about the speaker (or hearer). When this particle is embedded, the emphasis associated with the use of *bloß* is not ascribed to the speaker anymore (as with *fei*), but anchors to the matrix subject (=Andreas) (17). The effect is similar to indirect speech.

(16) Sei *BLOß* brav! ! !
Be bloß well.behaved
'Be good! (*emphatic*/*whatever you do, be good*)

---

[4] What I rather informally label 'context' here, could be more formally considered the *context of speech C* (Schlenker 2004). Schlenker, following Banfield (1982) argues for a subdivision of *C* into a *context of utterance U* and a *context of thought θ*. The attitude holder (protagonist, narrator, etc.) can be different from the speaker of the sentence, with the former being represented by *θ,* and the latter by *U*. I think an analysis of the semantics of DPRTs with respect to *U* and *θ* would yield promising results, and I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer for pointing out these references. Unfortunately I currently cannot provide an analysis here for reasons of space.

(17) a. Da Andreas hod g'sogt dass'd *BLOß* brav sei soisst!
DET andreas has said that .you bloß well.behaved be shall
'Andreas said that you are (*really*) supposed to be good! (≈ indirect speech)

b. If it's for me, act as you want, but:
Da Andreas hod g'sogt dass'd *BLOß* brav sei soisst!
DET andreas has said that .you bloß well.behaved be shall
'Andreas said that you are (*really*) supposed to be good! (≈ indirect speech)

Zimmermann (2004) notes a similar difference with the SHG DPRTs *ja* and *wohl;* he analyzes the former as a speech act modifier with expressive meaning, the latter as a sentence type modifier without expressive meaning. Müller (2011) also argues in detail that SHG DPRTs such as *wohl, ja,* and *halt* do not uniformly anchor to either speaker or matrix subject.

I conclude from the evidence in this section, that expressive semantics, and more specifically speaker attitude, is neither a necessary nor a sufficient criterion to classify MB DPRTs[5].

Criterion	sufficient for classification	necessary for classification
expressiveness	✘	✘

2.3. Syntax

In the following, some syntactic criteria that have been used to classify DPRTs are investigated. I show that neither internal syntax distribution within a clause, nor clause type restrictions are sufficient criteria to identify MB DPRTs as a natural class.

2.3.1. *Internal Syntax (≈ inflectability)*

Any 'run-of-the-mill' particle definition (e.g. Duden 2005) identifies a particle as an uninflectable word in a language. Whereas descriptively uninflectability applies to MB DPRTs[6] (18), it does not suffice for a classification of DPRTs. Many sub-classes of particles exist, that can also not be inflected (adverbials, conjunctions, etc.), some of them being other uses of DPRTs (cf 7-10).

(18) a. Er is jetza ruhiger wia vorher.
He is now quiet.COMP than before.
'He's now quieter than before.'

b. Ziag *ruhig* /**ruhiger* de Kinder wos warms oo
dress ruhig DET children.dat WH.INDEF. warm on

[5] I have not investigated MB DPRTs in terms of their focus properties, but Grosz (2010) shows that SHG DPRTs can differ in their focus associaton properties. *ja* and *doch* are not uniform w.r.t. to focus: the former shows no association with focus, whereas the latter clearly has association with focus effects, according to Grosz.

[6] One exception may be the ethical dative (*datives ethicus*). It is a (theta-) free pronominal dative form, considered a DPRT by some, (e.g. Thurmair 1989, Wegener 1989, Jacobs 1991), but not by others (Meibauer 1994, Gutzmann 2007).

(i) Ziag *ma* de Kinder was warms oo
dress me.dat det children.dat wh.indef. warm on
"Dress the kids warm (do me the favor/I really care that you do)'

'Dress the kids warm (*feel free to do so /I encourage you*)'

Inflectability is thus a seemingly necessary criterion that applies to MB DPRTs, but it is not sufficient to distinguish DPRTs from other particles.

Criterion	sufficient for classification	necessary for classification
inflectability	✘	✔ (?cf *datives ethicus*)

2.3.2. *External syntax*

2.3.2.1. Sentence internal distribution (≈ middle field restriction)

The restriction to occur in the syntactic 'middle field' of a sentence, i.e. in the area between verb second (=Cº) and verb last (=Vº) is considered the most salient characteristic of DPRTs. Within that area corresponding to IP and VP, the exact position of DPRTs is unclear. Diesing (1992), assumes that DPRTs are adjoined to vP, where they function as indicators of the vP boundary, whereas Bayer & Obenauer (2010) suggest a functional projection above vP as their host. Grosz (2005), and Coniglio (2009) posit DPRTs in the specifiers of a cascade of functional projections in IP (cf. Cinque 1999). Haider (1993) assumes a separate functional projection (ParticleP) between CP and IP/VP as the host for DPRTs, and Meibauer (1994) analyzes them as adjuncts to IP. This debate about the position of DPRTs also shows the unclarity about their categorial status as either head or adjunct. Whereas I will currently not be able to contribute to this particular discussion for reasons of space, I want to show that middle field occurrence of MB DPRTs is not sufficient to establish a class.

One immediate question concerns the difficulty of establishing the exact DPRT position. The reason for this is scrambling, which is pervasive not only in SHG, but also in all dialects; (19) shows that on the surface, the particle can occur in various positions (< > indicates alternative positions). It is unclear though which material moves; arguments, the DPRT, or possibly both.

(19) <**halt*>Da Hans <**halt*>hat <*halt*>seim Buam <*halt*>de Million <*halt*>vererbt
<**halt*> DET hans has his boy DET million left
'(*It is a fact that*) Hans left his son the Million.'

Subsequently I show that MB DPRTs can occur outside of the IP/VP area. First, clitic DPRTs always attach to the verb in Cº (20), i.e. a DPRT reading can arise in Cº.

(20) a. Machst'*n* $_{IP}$[Du nix mehr heid]]? !
Make.(den)n you nothing more today?
'Aren't you *gonna* doing anything anymore today?' (*then*)
b. $_{CP}$[Du [$_{C}$ host'*a* $_{IP}$[aa scho 3 ghabt !
you have.(j)a also already 3 had
'Plus, You've already had 3' (*as we both know*)

Secondly, in combination with a stressed wh-word, DPRTs can occur in CP (21) (cf. Bayer 2008, Bayer & Obenauer 2010).

(21) $_{CP}$[WER *scho/bloß/aber* [$_{C}$ hod $_{IP}$[a Million auf'm Konto]]]?
who has DET million on.DET account
'Who (*rhetorical/the hell/however)* has a million on his account?'

Third, DPRTs can occur in complex DPs (22), which do not have an IP (middle field). Whereas this particular example was dispreferred by some MB Bavarian speakers, it was still accepted by all. Note that the equivalent construction in SHG (22b) is completely acceptable.

(22) a. De *fei* nimma ganz frischn Brezn do drim ...
DET fei not more very fresh pretzel there over
'the not so fresh pretzels (*you may think they're still fresh*) over there'...
b. der *wohl* attraktivste Matrose
DET wohl attractive-superl sailor
'the (*presumably)* most attractive sailor.' (Zimmermann 2004:2)

Fourth, DPRTs can occur in fragments. Even under an ellipsis account of fragments (Merchant 2005), the DPRTs would not be located in the area between IP and VP.

(23) Wer soll jetzt in des seichte Wasser nei ?
'who is supposed to go into the shallow water ?'
a. Na, de wo no ned schwimma kenna *halt*
'interj. pron.WH-INDEF still NEG swim can halt
'well, those who can't swim (*it is clear/isn't it clear*)
b. *Halt* de, de wo no ned schwimma kenna
halt DET, DET still NEG swim can
those who can't swim (*it is clear/isn't it clear*)
c. Du *halt*!
you halt
'You (*it is clear/isn't it clear*)'

This data establish that occurrence in a specific section of the clause, i.e. the topological middle field between IP and Vº is not necessary for all MB DPRTs.

(24) furthermore shows that occurrence in that topological field is also not sufficient to establish a DPRT class.

(24) a. Trink *BLOß* des Bia! (…sonst is da Hans, der wo's gebraut hat, beleidigt)
drink bloß DET beer (otherwise Hans, who brewed it, is offended)
'(*whatever you do*) drink that beer!
b. Trink *BLOß* des Bia! (…du sollst ned den Wein aa no dringa!)
drink bloß DET beer (… don't drink the wine as well!)
'Drink only the beer (*nothing else*)!

In string-identical position, *bloß* in (24a) has a DPRT interpretation, whereas in (24b) it has a focus particle interpretation. Thus the position does not map onto function in a 1:1 manner.

In sum, the clause internal distribution is neither sufficient, nor necessary to establish a natural class membership for MB DPRTs.

Criterion	sufficient for classification	necessary for classification
middle field restriction	✘	✘

2.3.2.2. Sentence 'external' distribution (≈*clause type restriction/modifiers of illocution force)*

Another widely noted criterion for DPRTs is their clause type restriction. Not every particle can occur in every clause. The reason for this is thought to be due to featural specification of each DPRT (e.g. Bayer & Obenauer 2010) for a given clause type. Others (e.g. Grosz 2009) assume a semantic compatibility of the DPRT and the sentential/modal force.

(25) shows the restriction, although for the purposes of this paper I stay agnostic about the reason; MB *nachad* is restricted to interrogatives (25a), *fei* to declaratives and imperatives (25b), i.e. each DPRT seems limited in its occurrence to a specific clause type.

(25) a. Versteht *nachad /*fei* a jeder wos i sog?
Understand DET everybody what I say
'Does everybody understand what I say?'

b. I verstehe **nachad/fei* genau wos Du sogst
I understand exactly what you say
'I understand exactly what you say'

(26-27) show that DPRT distribution and the (syntactic) form type of the sentence are co-dependent. DPRT choice does not depend on the illocutive force the speaker intends for the utterance (cf. Thurmair 1993).

(26) Bist du staad — Form⇒ interrogative
are you still
a. 'Are you quiet?' — Force⇒ question
b. 'Be quiet!' — Force ⇒ command

(27) establishes that the intent (i.e. illocution force) with which a sentence is uttered does not affect the choice of particle. (27a) is a canonical imperative, uttered as a command. Here only *fei* is acceptable. (27b) is a command uttered in the form of an interrogative. Here *nachad* is the grammatical option[7].

(27) a. Sei *fei/*nachad* staad!! — Form= imperative
be quiet!
'Be quiet!' — Force= command

[7] There is a question of whether the syntax constrains the choice of particle, or whether the DPRT determines the syntactic form as in typical procedural meaning. I am grateful to the reviewer for clarifying for me and questioning this non-trivial point. I belive that the latter applies, especially since I think that DPRT meanings of particles are *derived* (cf section 4). That is, DPRT are not all inherently lexically specified as such, but are meanings that arise from basic lexical items under certain syntactic conditions. E.g. the lexical item *bloß 'only'* can have DPRT, focus particle, adverbial or connective meaning, depending on the syntax.

b. Bist **fei/nachad* staad! Form= interrogative
are.you quiet
'Be quiet!' Force= command

This data show two things; first, MB DPRTs are not classifiable with regard to their clause type restriction. Second, clause type and illocution force need to be treated as separate concepts; DPRTs only interact with the former, not with the latter.

2.4. Not a natural class

Summarizing the findings of this section, I conclude that the criteria typically associated with the classification of DPRTs are neither sufficient nor necessary to classify MB DPRTs.

classification criteria	sufficient condition	necessary condition
Phonology *≈ stressability*	✘	✘
Semantics *≈ polyfunctionality* *≈ expressions of speaker attitude*	✘ ✘	✘ ✘
Syntax *≈ uninflected* *≈ middle field restriction* *≈ clause type restriction/modifiers of illocution force*	✘ ✘ ✘	✔? ✘ ✘

This finding predicts that by virtue of not forming a natural class, MB DPRTs are not behaving like a natural class in other respects than those shown above; this prediction is borne out, and discussed in more detail in the following section.

3. NO UNIFIED SYNTACTIC LICENSING FOR DPRT

Section 3 established that MB DPRTs do not constitute a natural class; this predicts that unified syntactic licensing conditions for all DPRTs should not exist, contrary to recent claims (Coniglio 2009, Abraham 2010, 2011). In the following, I show empirical evidence that this prediction is borne out. In the quest for finding syntactic licensing conditions for DPRTs, the cartographic approach (Rizzi 1999) has been particularly popular. Nevertheless, once more than one particle is considered in a given syntactic context, it becomes evident that holding a specific functional projection (e.g. ForceP), or a specific embedding context (e.g. under *verba dicendi*, Thurmair 1989) responsible for the licensing of *DPRT as a group*, i.e. generalizing over DPRT at large, is untenable.

3.1. DPRTs are embeddable

As mentioned previously, DPRTs are all thought to be inherently associated with speaker attitude and illocution force, and thus considered to be a root phenomenon (e.g. Thurmair 1989). Coniglio (2009) investigates the licensing conditions for SHG DPRTs in subordinate

clauses; he determines that DPRTs as a group are illocutionary modifiers, and as such require the presence of sentential force. In a cartographic approach, this translates into the presence of ForceP as licensor for all DPRTs (cf. also Abraham 2010, 2011, Bayer & Obenauer 2010). If ForceP is present in a subordinate, a DPRT is allowed, if ForceP is not present, a DPRT is disallowed. Such a claim crucially rests on the assumption that DPRTs all display the same behavior, i.e. that they are a *natural class*; ungrammaticality of one DPRT would imply the ungrammaticality of all.

Subsequently I show several environments identified as 'forceless' (i.e. without the projection ForceP). Considering a wider range of DPRTs in these environments, it can be shown that some DPRTs can indeed appear in sentences without ForceP. This is predicted by the finding that DPRTs do not constitute a class.

3.1.1. *DPRT occurrence does not depend on ForceP*

Some of the subordinate clauses that are said to ban DPRTs are the complements of factive verbs. Since factive verbs presuppose the truth of the embedded proposition, they contain a 'fact' that doesn't allow for speaker attitude (Thurmair 1989, Coniglio 2009). Accordingly complements of factive verbs lack ForceP, and supposedly ban DPRTs (28a). (28b) shows that the MB DPRTs *halt* and *fei* can be nevertheless embedded under a factive predicate.

(28) a. Es stimmt, daß Udo (**ja*) verheiratet ist.
it true.is that udo married is
'It is true that Udo is married.' (Jacobs 1986:156)

b. Es stimmt dass kloane Kinda *hoid/fei* vui Gmias essn soiddn
it true.is that little children halt/fei much vegetables eat should
'It's true that little kids are supposed to eat many vegetables.'

Another non-DPRT licensing environment under a 'licensed by ForceP' approach are proportional clauses (Coniglio 2009). Again, the MB *fei* can occur in this context (29).

(29) a. Je mehr ich (**ja*/**doch*/**eben*/**wohl*) darüber nachdenke, desto mehr
per more I there.over after.think the more
beunruhigt mich die ganze Sache.
disconcert me DET whole thing
'The more I think about it, the more disconcerting I find the whole thing.'
(Thurmair 1989:77)

b. Je mehr I *fei* drüber nachdenk, desto weniger g'foit ma des ganze
per more I fei there.over after.think the less like me DET whole
'The more I think about it, the less I like it.'

By virtue of being truncated (i.e. without ForceP), restrictive relative clauses (30a) also are supposed to ban DPRTs. Considering MB *halt* (30b) and *fei* (30c), it can be again shown that some DPRTs can occur in those contexts.

(30) a. Eine Kollegin, die (**ja*) in Syracuse wohnt, wird kommen.
DET colleague DET ja in syracuse lives will come.
'A colleague who lives in Syracuse is going to come.' (Kratzer 1999:5)

b. Dejenigen, de wo *hoid* ned verstengan wos I sog, miassn wartn bis'e's
DET.DEM DET WHERE halt NEG understand WHAT I say have.to wait until.I.it
bessa erklärn ko
better explain can
'Those who don't understand what I'm saying are going to have to wait until I can explain better'

c. Dejenigen, de wo *fei* no ned schwimma kenna miassn am Ufa bleim
DET.DEM DET WHERE fei still NEG swim can have.to at.DET shore stay
'Those who can't swim yet have to stay at the shore.'

Final clauses are another ForceP-less environment identified by Coniglio (2009), yet again allowing the MB DPRT *hoid* (31).

(31) Damit's *hoid* aa a bissal ausgeflippt aussschaut hod's jetzta rote Haar
so.that.she halt also DET bit flipped.out look.out has.she now red hair
'She's got red hair now, so she also can look a bit funky.'

3.2. DPRT in infinitives

Force specification is also difficult to argue for in infinitives. DPRTs such as *JA*, and *BLOß,* can nevertheless occur in MB infinitives (32).

(32) a. *JA* ned frech sein
ja NEG cheeky be
'Don't be cheeky.'

b. *BLOß* imma aufbassn
bloß always watch.up
'Always watch out !'

The translations indicate that the infinitives are used as imperatives. I already showed in 2.3.2.2. that the clause type is independent from the intent (illocution force) the sentence is used with. Although *JA* and *BLOß* are also typically used in (syntactic) imperatives (33a), not all DPRTs that occur in imperatives can be used in infinitives. (33) shows that *fei,* also widely used in formal imperatives, cannot be used in infinitives. This also shows that infinitives with DPRTs do not have an elided 'do' or 'you should' (33c), since such an assumption would make *fei* in infinitives acceptable, contrary to fact (33b).

(33) a. Bass *fei* (*BLOß*/*JA)* auf!
Watch fei/bloß/ja up
'Watch out !'

b. **fei* aufbassn
fei up.watch
'watch out !

c. dua/du soisst *fei* aufbassn !
do/ you should fei up.watch
'watch out/ you should watch out.'

3.3. DPRTs in fragments

I showed in (22) that MB DPRTs can occur in fragments. Fragments, independently of showing that DPRTs can occur outside of the syntactic middle field (space between IP and Vº), also cannot be reconstructed into a full CP. The data in (34 a-b) show that constituent deletion is not responsible (cf Merchant 2005). That is, if a verb (positioned in Cº in the examples below) and an IP are reconstructed, the examples are ungrammatical. Therefore, no ForceP is present. (22) is repeated below as (34).

(34) Wer soll jetzt in des seichte Wassa nei ?
'who is supposed to go into the shallow water ? '

a. Na, DP[de wo no ned VP[schwimma kenna]] *hoid (** ~~soin in des Wassa~~)
'well, DEM WH-INDEF still NEG swim can halt shall in DET water
'well, those who can't swim'

b. Du *hoid (**~~soist in des Wassa~~)!
you halt shall in DET water
'You'

3.4. DPRT in small clauses

A final environment that has no projection ForceP, yet allows MB DPRTs, are small clauses. (35) shows that *fei, ja ,*and *halt* all can occur within a small clause.

(35) I sig'n des Bier *fei/ja/ hoid* dringa
I see.him DET beer fei/ja/halt drink
'I see him drink the beer.'

This all over inhomogeneous behavior of MB DPRTs is fully expected in accordance with the finding of section 2. Since MB DPRTs are not a natural class, they do not behave as such. No unified behavior with respect to their syntax is thus predicted, and it was shown that ForceP is not a factor for licensing DPRTs.

4. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

The findings of this paper establish that MB DPRTs, as they are recognized now, do not constitute a natural class. Several alternatives to the current picture present themselves in light of this:

(i) <u>DPRTs as a class exist:</u>

DPRTs as they are identified today exist, and constitute a natural class. The correct criteria to establish that class haven't been identified yet, however.

(ii) <u>DPRTs as a class don't exist:</u>

DPRTs as they are identified today are only perceived as a class, by what could be

called'familiarity association' (cf. focus sensitivity, Beaver & Clark (2003)[8]. There are (two or several) formally identifiable subclasses, which just appear to be grouping together.

I would like to suggest that option (ii) is a fruitful way of looking at DPRTs. The larger, assorted DPRT group could be broken down into at least 2 subgroups. One way to approach a subdivision could be particle polyfunctionality: currently it is assumed that DPRTs are the result of a historical 'accident' of grammaticalization of a wide variety of lexical/functional items (while the original items continue with their original use). I suggest to take polyfunctionality of these items seriously as an actual diagnostic. The original meanings of the non-DPRT uses of the items in question are often transparent in the DPRT use. A good example is *bloß*. It has a variety of functions, such as focus particle, conjunctional adverb, or DPRT. Each function is traditionally labeled as a separate lexical item, i.e. there is an assumption about different lexical entries for each use (36).

(36) a. Context: I paid extra good attention that Luzia doesn't get gummybears...

Da Elias hod *bloß* da Luzia oans gem
DET Elias has bloß DET Luzia one given
'*It's just that* Elias gave one to Luzia.' → conjunctional adverb

b. Context: Did Elias give a gummybear to every child?

Da Elias hod *bloß* da Luzia oans gem
DET Elias has bloß DET Luzia one given
'Elias gave only L. one' → focus particle

c. Sei *BLOß* brav!
be bloß well.behaved
'(*whatever you do*) be good!' → DPRT (stressed)

d. Wo is *bloß* wieda da Andreas?
where is bloß again DET Andreas
'Where (t*he hell*) is Andreas again?' → DPRT (unstressed)

I suggest that all of these used are *derivable* from one underlying core item, which, depending on syntactic context, is interpreted with specified meanings as seen in (36 a-d). The core semantics, however, stays constant.

On the other side, monofunctionality is equally important: note that it is the monofunctional particles *halt* and *fei* which have a much more flexible distribution and a wider variety of syntactic contexts (as seen in section 3) than e.g. the polyfunctional particle *bloß*.

---

[8] Beaver & Clark (2003) show that focus particles do not all associate with focus the same way. Whereas e.g. *only* is lexically specified for focus association, *always* associates with focus via pragmatic mechanisms. A similar concept could apply to DPRTs: some are lexically specified as such, whereas some are derived.

The division of DPRTs then could be into *inherent DPRTs,* those items lexically specified as DPRT (as is assumed for the larger group currently); I suggest that these inherent DPRTs are a small group, however, corresponding to the monofunctional items. The second, larger group are *derived DPRTs*, and correspond to the polyfunctional items.

REFERENCES

Abraham, W. (2000) "Modal particles in German: word classification and legacy beyond grammaticalization". In: P. M. Vogel & B. Comrie (Hrsgg.), *Approaches to the typology of word classes*, Berlin etc., Mouton de Gruyter, 321-350.

Abraham, W. (2010) "Fremdbewusstseinsabgleich in Syntax und Semantik". Manuscript, München-Wien.

Abraham, W (2011) "Illocutive Force is Speaker and Information Source Concern. What Type of Syntax does the Representation of Speaker Deixis Require? Template vs. Derivational Structure?", in press: Abraham, A./E. Leiss (Hgg.), *Theory of Mind Elements in Sundry Languages*.

Bayer, J. & Obenauer H.-G. (2010) in press: "Discourse Particles, Clause Structure, and Question Types", *The Linguistic Review*.

Beaver, D & Clark B. (2003) "Always and Only: Why Not All Focus Sensitive Operators Are Alike", *Natural Language Semantics* 11/4, 323–362.

Burkhardt, A. (1994) "Abtönungspartikeln im Deutschen: Bedeutung und Genese." *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 22, Nr. 2. S. 129–151.

Cinque, G. (1999) "Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective", Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Coniglio M. (2009) "Die Syntax der deutschen Modalpartikeln: ihre Distribution und Lizenzierung in Haupt- und Nebensätzen", Ph.D. dissertation, Università Ca' Foscari Venezia / Humboldt-Universität Berlin.

Déchaine, R.-M. & M. Tremblay (In prep.) "Categories as syntactic objects". Ms., University of British Columbia & Queen's University.

Diesing, M. (1992) "Indefinites", MIT Press, Cambridge (Mass.).

Duden Volume 4 (2005), "Die Grammatik". Seventh edition. Edited by Dudenredaktion, Dudenverlag, Mannheim.

Féry, C. (to appear) "Prosody and information structure of the German particles *selbst, wieder* and *auch*" To appear in Borowsky, Toni, Shigeto Kawahara, Takahito Shinya & Mariko Sugahara (eds.) *Prosody Matters: Essays in Honor of Elisabeth O. Selkirk*, Equinox Press, London.

Gutzmann, D. (2010) "Betonte Modalpartikeln und Verumfokus", in Harden T. & Hentschel. E. (eds.) *40 Jahre Partikelforschung* 40, 119-138. Staufenburg, Tübingen.

Grosz, P. (2005) "Dn in Viennese German. The Syntax of a Clitic Version of the Discourse Particle denn". Diplomarbeit, Universität Wien.

Grosz, P. (2009). German Particles, Modality, and the Semantics of Imperatives. *Proceedings of NELS 39,* ed. S. Lima, K. Mullin and B. Smith. Amherst (MA).

Grosz, P. (2010). "German *doch*: An Element that Triggers a Contrast Presupposition.", *Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistic Society 46.* University of Chicago.

Haider, Hubert (1993)"Deutsche Syntax – generativ", Narr, Tübingen.

Jacobs, J. (1991), "On the semantics of modal particles", W. Abraham (eds.), *Discourse particles. Descriptive and theoretical investigations on the logical, syntactical, and pragmatic properties of discourse particles in German*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia, 141-162.

Kratzer, A. (1999) "Beyond Ouch and Oops. How descriptive and expressive meaning interact", Manuscript, handout for *Cornell Conference on Theories of Context Dependency*, Cornell University, March 26, 1999.

Meibauer, J. (1994) "Modaler Kontrast und konzeptuelle Verschiebung: Studien zur Syntax und Semantik deutscher Modalpartikeln" *Linguistische Arbeiten 314*, Max Niemeyer Verlag , Tübingen.

Merchant, J. (2005) "Fragments and Ellipsis" *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27, 661–738.

Müller, S. (2011) *(Un)informativität und Grammatik. Extraktion aus Nebensätzen im Deutschen*. Stauffenburg, Tübingen.

Thoma, S. (2009) "To p or to ¬p-The Bavarian Particle fei as Polarity Discourse Particle". *Sprache& Datenverarbeitung* 33, 139-152.

Thurmair, M. (1989) "Modalpartikeln und ihre Kombinationen" Linguistische Arbeiten 223, Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen.

Thurmair, M (1993): Äußerungsform oder Äußerungsfunktion? Zu den Bedingungen für das Auftreten von Modalpartikeln. *Deutsche Sprache* 21, 22–43.

Wegener, H. (2002), "The evolution of the German modal particle *denn*". In: I. Wischer & G. Diewald (Hrsgg.), *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*, [= Typological Studies in Language 79] Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 379-394.

Weydt, H. (1969) "Abtönungspartikeln. Die deutschen Modalwörter und ihre französischen Entsprechungen", Gehlen, Bad Homburg.

Zimmermann, M. (2004) "Discourse Particles in the Left Periphery". B. Shaer, W. Frey & C. Maienborn *ZAS Papers in Linguistics (ZASPiL)* 35, 543-566.

Zimmermann, M. (to appear) "Discourse Particles." To appear in P. Portner, C. Maienborn und K. von Heusinger (eds.), *Handbook of Semantics*. (= Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft), Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.