Information-Structural Perspectives on Discourse Particles: Introduction to the volume

Pierre-Yves Modicom, Olivier Duplâtre

What can information-structural categories tell us about discourse particles?

Pierre-Yves Modicom
Olivier Duplâtre

1. Discourse particles and Information Structure: Preliminary definitions

This volume is concerned with the various interactions between Information Structure and the syntax, semantics and pragmatics of those particles that take scope over the whole utterance or even beyond, and mark phenomena such as stance, speech act specification, Common Ground Management or discourse structuration (Fernandez-Vest 1994). For clarity's stake, all these particles will be labelled 'discourse particles". Several subtypes ought to be distinguished depending on the scope or on the precise function of these particles. Especially, modal particles tend to emerge as a special subgroup within the set of discourse particles or even discourse markers (for discussion, see Waltereit & Detges 2007 and the studies collected in Degand et al. 2013 or Fedriani & Sansò 2017). As we shall see in the course of this volume, information-structural categories might actually be relevant tools to assess the relevance of such a distinction. But for now, we shall use 'discourse particles' as cover term for modal particles as they are known from Germanic, sentential particles like Japanese sentence-final particles, and other illocutionary particles that might interact with Information Structure.

Under 'Information Structure', we understand the packaging of information within and between utterances. Following Chafe (1976), Molnár (1998, 2002) and Krifka (2008), we acknowledge three main levels of information-packaging.

First, speakers can mark chunks of information as expressing what the utterance is about ("topic") or what it claims about the topic ("comment"). There are various types of topics: aboutness topics proper, but also frametting topics, which point at the set of circumstances about which the comment is asserted. There are also differences of scope, between sentence topics and discourse topics (for a language-specific assessment of both, see for instance Spevak 2010:65-66). Discourse topics are associated with general cohesion and coherence mechanisms at the transphrastic, textual and conversational levels.

(1) Central Pomo:

Mu:l	'=ma	t̪ı́ya:kʰe	ha	l'el
that	COP=FAC	3PL.POSS	language	the

'and their language,'

dú:	ló-w-ač'-in
other	talk.PL-PFV-IPFV.PL-SAME.SIM

'they talk different'

yáq'-č'i-č'		cʰów
know-SML-IPFV.PL		not-PFV

'and we don't understand them very well.' (Mithun 2018:128)

On the other hand, sentence topics, such as Japanese *wa*-topics are identified at the level of the sentence, or even of the clause:

(2) Japanese

John	wa	tikyuu	wa	marui	koto	o sitte-iru
John	TOP	Earth	TOP	round	that	know-be

'John knows that the Earth is round.' (cit. Kuroda 2005:19)

Further, information can be marked as discourse-old (or accessible) or discourse-new, a distinction that corresponds to the traditional opposition between "theme" and "rheme" as it is known from the Prague school, and to the opposition between "given" and "new" information in works following the categories established by Chafe (1976). Newer research has shown that we might have to distinguish between discourse- or speaker-new and hearer-new, discourse- or speaker-old and hearer-old, with Squartini (2017) arguing for a three-level distinction between discourse-, speaker- and hearer-new resp. -old in his study on the particle-like behaviour of non-canonical negations in Romance. The distinction between hearer-old and discourse-old goes back to Prince (1992), who states that the old/new opposition that is grammatically marked in English (by the use of the definite vs. indefinite article) is the distinction at the level of the hearer, not the discourse-level distinction. More generally, while the perspective of the Prague school was primarily centered on the level of sentences and on intersentential cohesion mechanisms, the old (or accessible) vs. new opposition can be extended at a wider level and to the managing of inferences and expectations from previous discourse.

Finally, the information-structural notion of contrast mostly corresponds to the repartition between focus and background; here, too, the management of expectations is a central parameter. Regarding the definition of focus, the notion of "newness" (as opposed to "givenness") has been defended in quite different frameworks, starting with Halliday's "information focus" (Halliday 1967:200). But according to Molnár (2002) and Krifka (2008), there are many cases in which a constituent that refers to something mentioned previously is still subject to focus / contrast. As a consequence of that, it seems more suitable to strictly restrict our notion of focus thanks to the concept of contrast and to define the corresponding information-structural layer independently of the opposition between "new" and "given".

All three layers can interact. Contrasted constituents often correspond to hearer-new information. Topics are usually accessible ("old"?). Yet, given (discourse-old) topics can be marked differently from new (=newly introduced) topics or resumed topics (i.e., topics that were first introduced, then left aside for a moment before being resumed in a third step). Contrastive topics are often realized by specific means (for a detailed discussion on contrastive topics as focalized topics, see Molnar 1998 and Büring 2003). Mithun (2018) has provided a detailed account of how all layers have to be taken into consideration for the analysis of information-structural strategies in a specific language (in that case, Central Pomo), including specialized particles and enclitics.

Discourse- or hearer-old vs. new; contrasted information vs. non-contrasted information; "what we are talking about" vs. "what we say about it": from these distinctions, there is but one step to the general realm of Common Ground Management as it is defended by researchers defennding a more pragmatic approach. Under Common Ground Management, we understand the management of "mutually ostensive knowledge" between speakers, and their opinions as to what information is "mutually ostensive" to them (for a discussion of Common Ground as "mutually ostensive information", see Wilson & Sperber 2012). From a linguistic point of view, Common Ground Management is (at least partly) realized by the means of Information Structure. Among the information-structural strategies pertaining at Common Ground Management, we identify: the syntactic and prosodic opposition between hearer-old and hearer-new information; the use of particles and discourse markers to formally mark knowledge gaps between the speaker and the hearer, as well as the management of hearer expectations by the speaker (see Blakemore 1987); morphological, syntactic and prosodic meta-instructions to the hearer regarding the discourse structure (e.g., topic shift).

The interaction between contrast and the syntax and semantics of particles has been extensively studied: many languages resort to special sets of contrast- or focus-sensitive operators to specify the relationships between the contrasted constituent and the set of alternatives to which it is contrasted – operators mostly known as "focus particles" (König 1991). In this volume, our attention is devoted to particles taking wide scope rather than with those particles that merge with a specific constituent. Thus, the studies in this volume are primarily concerned either with other particles than focus particles. When they take focus particles into consideration, they deal with their non-focussing (mostly discourse-structuring) uses.

2. Information-structural aspects of the syntax, semantics and pragmatics of discourse particles

To this date, two languages have played a central role in the scholarly reflexion on how discourse particles help shape Information Structure, or conversely, on how Information Structure determines the use-conditions of discourse particles: German and Japanese. In German, this question has been addressed from the perspective of modal particles. The corresponding research on Japanese has mainly focused sentence-final particles (Endo 2007, 2012), although this language is also notorious for its case particles (*wa/ga/0*) that mark givenness or topicality in the clause at a grammatical level.

2.1. Givenness and newness in the syntax and semantics of German discourse particles

If we first turn to German, we see that modal particles such as *ja*, *doch* or *schon* are used to indicate whether the content of the utterance is part of the conversational Common Ground and in what way the utterance matches intersubjective expectations (similar particles can be found in Dutch and in Scandinavian languages, but not in English).

(3) German:

Aber	Simone,	deine	Mutter	war	**doch**	verheiratet!
But	Simone,	your	mother	was	**PRT**	married!

'But Simone, your mother was married!' (implied: 'You should know that!')

It has been pointed out that the position of MPs in the clause is chiefly determined by the theme-rheme structure of the VP, modal particles being just before the rheme ('watershed function' in Grosz 2016, see also Krivonossov 1977, Hentschel 1986, Abraham 1991).

(4) Ich   möchte   Ihnen   **ja**   wirklich keine   Schwierigkeiten machen

    I   would.like   formal:DAT   PRT   really   NEG.ART   troubles   make

    'I really don't want to put you in trouble, you know' (quoted from Métrich et al. 2002: 126)

(5) weil   d-ie   Priester   **ja**   auch   Ärzte   war-en

    because   DEF-PL   priests   PRT   also   doctors   be:PAST-PL

    'Because the priests were also doctors [as you know].'

(6) Es   liegt   **ja**   kein   Ozean   zwischen   d-en   beid-en

    expletive   lie-3SG PRT   NEG.ART ocean   between   DEF-DAT.PL   both-DAT.PL

    Länder-n.

    countries-DAT.PL

    'There is no ocean between both countries [as you know].'

(7) Es   glaub-t   Ihnen   **ja**   **doch**   kein   Mensch.

    expletive   believe-3SG 2:FORMAL:DAT PRT   PRT   NEG.ART   human

    'Nobody believes you, anyway.' (quoted from Métrich et al. 2002:127)

Further, the very meaning of MPs seems to rely on semantic categories that are typical for Information Structure research, such as "notorious information", "already known", "contextually available", "part of the Common Ground"… For instance, Grosz (2016:337) describes the meaning of *ja* in the following terms:

"*ja(p)* triggers a presupposition that the contextually given speaker believes that the modified proposition *p* is true; it furthermore presupposes a belief concerning the contextually given addressee, namely that she either knows that *p* is true, or that the truth of *p* is evident in the utterance context."

2.2. Common Ground Management and speech act specification as loci for information-structural strategies

The collective volume edited by Abraham (1991) presents various models of description for

German MPs, but shared knowledge appeared to be the most central notion. This tradition has been pursued up to this day, and has led to proposals intertwining the conditions of MP usage and Information Structure or Common Ground Management. For instance, Gast (2006) named MP *doch* the marker of "contradictions in the Common Ground" and MPs in general instruments of "Common Ground updating". Gutzmann (2015) has modelled the use-conditional semantics of MPs with the help of the opposition between the Context Set and Common Ground (the Context set is the set of alternative propositions that are accessible at a given point in the flow of conversation). Repp (2013) also presents MPs as exponents of Common Ground Management, whereas Fischer (2007), in a completely different theoretical framework, insists upon MPs helping manage the "Argumentative Common Ground". Although Relevance Theory rather uses the concept of "mutually ostensive knowledge" than speak of "Common Ground", König's (1991 and 1997) relevance-theoretical account of MPs also insists upon particles managing inferences and anticipations by the hearer. By doing this, he draws on proposals by Blakemore (1987) on English discourse markers, thus suggesting that these operations might actually involve other kinds of particles and markers than only modal particles of the German type.

Another important strain of thought in MP research rather insists upon speech act specification, but here, too, information-structural notions are never far. In the aforementioned collective volume (Abraham 1991), Jacobs (1991) presents MP *ja* as a specifier of assertive specch acts, but this mostly imposing additional restrictions onto the accessible focus alternatives to *p*. Jacob's account, in turn, has led Egg & Mursell (2016) to claim that MPs interact with a focus constituent in their syntactic domain. Thus, speech act specification by MPs appears to be information-structural specification. More generally, the role of focus, especially Verum focus, has been highlighted by several newer articles on MPs, such as Repp (2013) or Abraham (2017). The latter paper also underlines theticity constraints: as it seems, thetic utterances, i.e. all-rheme utterances, cannot license MP use, due to what Abraham (2017 and this volume) calls the discourse-embedding function of MPs.

2.3. A cross-linguistic view: equivalence and interactions between particles and information-structural strategies

One important question at this stage is to determine whether these insights are language-specific, or restricted to a small subset of particles sharing the essential properties of German MPs. This is the main point of debate between two contributions of this volume, by Werner Abraham and Richard Waltereit. Waltereit (2006) has proposed a general theory of *Abtönung* (a term coined by Weydt 1969 for the analysis of German MPs), corresponding to the anticipation of hearer's reactions. He illustrates the functional equivalence between MP *ja* and specific information-structural strategies such as I-topicalisation in several languages, or right dislocation in Italian.

The comparison between Romance and Germanic has yielded new generalization attempts by Schoonjans (2013, 2014), and has also led to the re-examination of Romance markers using theoretical insights from MP research. For instance, Romance double negations are new often described as equivalents of MPs (see Coniglio 2008 for a discussion about Italian *mica* being a modal particle). Information-structural concepts appear to play a key role in the discussion, as exemplified by Squartini (2017), who examines the variations of use for non-canonical negation *mica* in terms of speaker-old vs speaker-new and hearer-old vs hearer-new information.

Other Indo-European languages also seem to exhibit discourse particles (in the sense given above) whose use conditions are intertwined with Information Structure. In Ancient Greek, several

discourse particles seem to have focus-sensitive usages as well: *δή* ('now, in truth, verily') can be used both as a sentential particle, for instance to mark an unexpected entailment, and in association with a constituent under contrast. *Μήν* ('verily, truly') can also be used at the sentence level and have a contrastive value (Thijs 2017). Similar phenomena can be observed in Slavic: Bonnot & Bottineau (2012) show that the Russian conditional / irrealis particle *by* is sensitive to the focus/background distinction. On the other hand, the Russian particle *to*, even though it seems to be specialized for the marking of topicality, also exhibits modal values (Bonnot 1990, 2015); the particle *že,* which arguably marks the uncontroversiality of a claim (Padučeva 1987), is frequently associated with the marking of sentence-initial thematic information (Bonnot 1986). This matter of fact actually casts doubt upon the distinction made above between contrast- or focus-sensitive and discourse particles, as it seems that at least in Ancient Greek or in Russian, the same items can actually occur in both categories. Thus, the question has to be raised whether Information Structure can play a role in the disambiguation of polyfunctional and polysemic particles.

When it comes to Japanese, a frequent assumption is that sentence-final particles play a role similar to the discourse particles already mentioned for Indo-European languages. Indeed, their use is strongly correlated to the management of presuppositions and expectations, as can be seen in examples (8) and (9), both quoted from Endo (2012:408).

(8) A: Zenzen   benkyoosite   -nainda

        not.at.all   studied   NEG

        'I have not studied at all.'

    B: Demo,   ukaru   **yo/ʔwa**

        nevertheless   pass   PRT/ʔPRT

        'But you will pass nevertheless'.

(9) A: John-wa   kyoo-no   party-ni   ki   masen.

        John-TOP   today-GEN   party-to   come   NEG

        'John will not come to today's party.'

    B: E,   kuru   **yo / ʔwa!**

        What   come   PRT/ʔPRT

        'What? He will definitely come!'

But given the fact that Information Structure is also marked by the alternation between *wa*, *ga* and a null case particle (see Endo, this volume), we can expect these two sorts of particles to interact. Are there significant restrictions to the combinations of *wa*/*ga*/0 with certain sentence-final particles?

2.4. Particle placement, polyfunctionality and the role of Information Structure in the emergence and specialization of discourse particles

Beyond these two extensively studied sets of particles, Japanese also exhibits sentence-internal, so-called "interjectional particles", some of them identical to sentence-final particles, albeit with arguable meaning differences. For instance, Onodera (2004:178) glosses the following sentence-internal use of *yo* (see ex. 8 and 9) as "emphatic":

(10) | noo | goranze | **yo** | kahodo | made. |
|------|---------|--------|--------|-------|
| see | look.at | EMP | like | this |

'See, look at it.'

Do these interjectional particles contribute to the information-structural characterization of the utterance? Or is it possible to resort to information-structural categories to help make a clear-cut semantic distinction between sentence-final and interjectional particles of the same source? As we shall see, Japanese is not the single language in which sentential particles appear to be polyfunctional or to have "sibling particles" whose functional status still has to be cleared, included with respect to Information Structure.

This raises the issue of how discourse particles emerge in language history. Leaving aside the question of whether discourse particles are best defined as cases of grammaticalization or pragmaticalization, we want to ask which role information-structural strategies can play in the specialization of discourse particles. Word order and the position of particles should come under special scrutiny in this respect. In many languages, particles occupy specific slots either on the margins of the VP, or in the "Wackernagel position" (after the first stressed constituent of the clause, whereby it should be noted that depending on languages, this can be either the first full phrase, or the first lexeme, see Anderson 1993). Haselow (2015) as well as Hancil et al. (2015) and Panov (2018) have underlined the fact that clause-final, predicate-final or utterance-final positions show a strong affinity with intersubjectivity, expectations and/or illocutionary marking.

Regarding the left and right peripheries, there has been a great amount on publications in the recent years about the role of peripheral positions in the rise and the semantic specialisation of discourse markers and particles (a milestone publication in this domain is probably the collection of papers by Beeching & Detges 2014). Given the frequent role of clause peripheries in the expression of Information Structure, it is all the more tempting to raise the hypothesis that information-structural factors can partly determine the specialization of particles.

Beeching & Detges (2014:1) write: "in dialogical conversation, the left margin of the most basic unit, the turn, is the place where the speaker takes the right to speak, whereas at the right margin the floor is handed over to the hearer." However, their understanding of Information Structure is restricted to speaker-oriented strategies. Thus, for them, the locus of information-structural specialization of particles and discourse markers is the left clause periphery. If markers appear on the right periphery, "they tend to have an interpersonal (i.e. intersubjective) function (cf. Traugott 2010), rather than an information-structuring one. They serve to confirm shared assumptions, check or express understanding, request confirmation, express deference or are used for face-saving." (Beeching & Detges 2014: 3-4). For us, the "confirmation of shared assumptions" belongs to interactional Common Ground Management strategies that might be expressed by Information Structure. Indeed, this implies different, more intersubjective semantic and pragmatic features than the "subjective" dimensions expressed on the left margin of the turn. Thus, we could expect that the shift from the left to the right might correspond to a rise in intersubjectivity, as proposed by Izutsu & Izutsu (2013) for Japanese, for example (see also Shinzato 2017 for a general discussion on the validity of Beeching & Detges' 2014 hypothesis for Japanese). Language-specific arguments for this claim are provided by the use-conditional restrictions on initial and medial position for the Hokkaido-Japanese marker *sosite* when it is use as an intersubjective modal particle (Izutsu & Izutsu 2013:226), as opposed to its core lexical use as an additive connective. In the following examples, *sosite* is a connective in (11a), and a particle in (11b).

(11a) Maido   simete. **(Sosite)** kore   **(sosite)** simatte   -kite   **(sosite).**

window   close   and   his   and   put.aside and.come   and

'Close the window. And go and put this aside.' (cit. Izutsu & Izutsu 2013:225)

(11b) (informed that a restaurant serves good sausage at reasonable prices:)

(*Sosite) zawaakurauto   -toka   **(ˀsosite)** tuitekuru -wake   **(sosite)**?

*DM   sauerkraut   etc.   ˀDM   come.with-FIN   DM

'And does it come with sauerkraut as well?' (cit. Izutsu & Izutsu 2013:226)

Another issue is the tendency of many of those particles to appear in second position. An extreme case is Latin *enim*, that has to appear after the first full word of the sentence:

(12) Adventus   **enim** L. Nasidi   summa   spe   et   voluntate

arrival:NOM   PRT   L Nasidus:GEN extreme:ABL   hope:ABL   and   goodwill:ABL

civitatem   compleverat.

city:ACC   fill:PLPFT

'For the arrival of L. Nasidus had filled the city with utmost hope and goodwill.' (Caesar, quoted from Spevak 2010:16; glossed by the editors)

The Wackernagel position needs not be associated with information-structural parameters, but in languages where the first position is often used as a slot for prosodically-marked constituents with a specific information-structural status, we can wonder if these features help give rise to discourse particles in the Wackernagel position, and if their conditions of use bear traces of this information-structural factors. Spevak (2010:72) has provided extensive evidence for the fact that the first position of the clause in Latin is determined by Information Structure (see esp. Spevak 2010:68-72). Adams (1994) has been so far as to reinterpret the Law of Wackernagel for Latin clitics as a tendency to associate with contrasted elements, in order to account with placement regularities outside of the second position. In Ancient Greek, Fraser (2001) has similarly interpreted the tendency of particles to occupy the second position of the clause as the result of semantic value of "emphasis", which is itself linked to the "informational prominence" of the first constituent.

(13) Πῶς   οὖν ;   τί   δράσω;

How   indeed   What   do:1SG:FUT

'How? What should I do?'

κάρτα   **γὰρ**   κἀγὼ   θέλω.

very.much PRT   also.me wish:1SG

'For I too very much wish that.' (Euripides, cit. from Fraser 2001:163; glossed by the editors)

3. "Epistemic authority", "engagement" and "enimitives": Information-structural approaches in the face of the newest typological research on particle semantics

It must be noted that interpretations of discourse particle semantics in terms of shared knowledge,

Common Ground and information-structural notions are not undisputed. Especially, the last few years have seen newer developments in typological research on issues pertaining to the semantics of discourse particles, yet Information Structure hardly seems to play a role in the theoretical backgrounding of these analyses. In this section, we want to address these new insights from typology and to show that the aforementioned concepts from information-structural research are actually quite complementary to them.

3.1. Engagement, epistemic authority, egophoricity

A first strain of research is associated with notions such as "engagement" and "epistemic authority". Works in this domain actually maintain references to the intersubjective management of knowledge repartition or to the hearer's expectations, and sometimes even explicitly mention Common Ground Management as a dimension of analysis. Yet, they come up essentially without any reference to the traditional dichotomies of Information Structure. Indeed, notions like "engagement" and the emerging field of research on "egophoricity" rather insist upon the notion of "epistemic authority" and especially on asymmetry between speech act participants regarding this epistemic authority.

The notion of epistemic authority has been proposed by Hargreaves (most recently Hargreaves 2018) to depict the "privileged access" to knowledge that the speaker is supposed to enjoy in first-person declaratives, whereas in second-person interrogatives, epistemic authority lays with the addressee (see also Schultze-Berndt 2017 and most of the studies in Floyd, Norcliffe & San Roque 2018). In other words, "epistemic authority" is very comparable to the kind of deictic, intersubjective epistemic modality that has been proposed to describe the semantics of modal particles in frameworks open to information-structural readings (e.g. Abraham & Leiss 2012, Leiss 2012, Abraham 2012). "Engagement", in the meantime, is defined as the "relative accessibility of an entity or state of affairs to the speaker and addressee" (Evans, Bergqvist & San Roque 2018b:141). In recent work, Bergqvist (2019) has showed that Swedish modal particles *ju* and *väl* behave like markers of epistemic authority, with *ju* being associated with uncontroversial speaker authority and *väl* with the speaker acknowledging the hearer's superior epistemic authority, hence a higher frequence of *ju* in utterrances with first-person subjects and of *väl* in utterances with second-person subjects (i.e. contexts in which the privileged access of the speaker resp. the hearer is hardly disputable).

As can be expected from the definition quoted above research on egophoricity and engagement are widely converging with many insights on the behaviour of discourse or modal particles. Most crucially, they meet analyses of properties that are essentially independent of Information Structure. For instance, in the case of German *wohl*, whose inferential-like semantics tend to lower the commitment of the speaker to the propositional content of assertions, it has often been observed that in questions, this effect actually concerns the hearer's prospective answer: the speaker anticipates that the addressee, envisaged as a future speaker, might give an answer to which she might not be capable of fully committing herself – hence the affinity of *wohl* with verb-final questions, which never demand a firm answer:

(14) Ob   wir   das   **wohl**   schaffen?

      If   1PL   this   PRT   get

'Will we be able to do that?' [~ 'hard to know!'] (cit. from Kwon 2005:207)

Exactly the same effects have been well noted cross-linguistically by scholars of egophoricity, who acknowledge the existence an "interrogative flip" of epistemic authority. Indeed, this is a clear case where the semantics and pragmatics of a particle exhibit a feature that is autonomous from any information-structural parameters and should rather be interpreted in terms of epistemic conversation roles (see Zimmermann 2008 for the notion of "epistemic reference point" and Modicom 2012 for a discussion including first insights from "engagement" theory). In this respect, joint work on particles with egophoricity and engagement scholars appears to be promising. In their 2018 paper on the grammar of engagement, Evans, Bergqvist & San Roque (2018:165) name German modal particles, Japanese sentence-final particles and Italian negative particles (*mica*) as examples of well-known items whose function should now be interpreted and analyzed in the light of recent typological research on the tightly grammaticalized marking of engagement. Conversely, in his monography on German particles and their functional equivalents, Waltereit (2006) names Goffman's views on conversational "footing" and the various levels of speaker and hearer alignment as a parameter that should be taken more seriously in particle research. He also calls for a more sustained dialogue between the analysis of conversational roles and the model-theoretic tradition of the multi-level, "polyphonic" analysis of commitment associated with the name of Ducrot. This proposed dialogue with Goffman and with "polyphonic" theories of commitment would probably lead to a more extensive recourse to the notion of asymetries in epistemic authority and knowledge authority.

The great merit of research on engagement and egophoricity is certainly to recall that "discourse particles" should not be separated from core grammatical categories and that the recourse to more or less vagues discourse functions ("reinforcement", "mitigation", "emphasis"…) are not sufficient to capture their basic linguistic function. On the other hand, "shared accessibility" and asymetries in accessibility are very akin to information structural features, and they are even more close to the notions at play in pragmatic accounts such as the theories of Common Ground Management, especially if the Common Ground is defined as "mutually ostensive knowlegde" and Common Ground Management as the negociation of updates to the Common Ground (see above). Our claim is that resorting to information-structural parameters can only be profitable to these analyses. For instance, both topicality and thematicity involve mutual accessibility to the speaker and hearer. Further, in her study of epistemic particles Quechuan, Grzech (2016a and b), who also works within the broad domain of egophoricity and engagement marking, signals that particles marking different epistemic stance, when they interact with focus, are associated with diverging focus effects, including Verum focus (see for instance Grzech 2016a:283 ff.). This usage of focus and Verum focus in the treatment of particles within the framework of "engagement" studies confirms that there is much room left for convergence between "engagement" and Information Structure.

Even independently of the language-specific issues that bring particles in connexion with Information Structure (e.g. positional problems), the newer developments in this field are actually a good opportunity to redefine the position of Information Structure within the study of language and explore its interactions with core grammatical notions such as modality and evidentiality, whose precise contours are equally likely to be affected by these new developments in typological theory. Information Structure is a complex realm of multiple language-specific strategies ordered along at least levels. Given the fact that knowledge gaps between speech act participants, the management of diverging opinions in interaction and the accessibility of information are already important issues in Information Structure research, it is not unlikely that at least some information-structural strategies

participate in the assessment of epistemic authority or in the management of accessibility hierarchies. Discourse particles, since they manifest strong links with Information Structure and are at the same time markers of "engagement", are a privileged field to show this complementarity between the two approaches.

3.2. "Enimitives"

A more radical critique of both Information Structure and knowledge-sharing as tools for the description of discourse particles has been proposed very recently by Panov (2019), who coined the term "enimitive" to cross-linguistically examine those markers that are used to flag an assertion as "uncontroversial". Panov's claim is that Germanic modal particles, or at least some of them (such as German *ja* and *doch*), the Russian discourse particle *že* (Padučeva 1987) and some Japanese sentence-final particles like *yo* do not mark "shared knowledge", but the uncontroversiality of a claim, as the particle *enim* did in Latin (see example 12 above), hence the name *enimitive*.

His proposed typology of enimitives in Eurasia involves markers in many languages, mostly from Central, Northern and Eastern Europe, with a core group in a broad Baltic area (extending to most of the Eastern and Western Slavic languages), where such items are also licit special *wh*-questions and in impatient commands and requests. Even though Panov intends to go beyond strictly knowledge-based accounts, his claims are actually not incompatible with epistemic or egophoric approaches. First, since all those items seem to be facultative, their use has to be triggered by contextual conditions. The speaker's claim of "uncontroversiality" has to be grounded in the conversational context, and it is well possible that these (pragmatic) felicity conditions finally boil down to a more semantic matter of unequal epistemic authority. In that case, "enimitives" would be a subset of markers for engagement and egophoricity.

If so, the claims made above about the relevance of information-structural research for the study engagement also hold for the enimitives. Especially, if we want to zoom in to the differences between several "enimitives" in one and the same language (e.g. between German *ja* and *doch* or Swedish *ju* and *väl*), or if we want to analyze non-enimitive items belonging to the same formal paradigm as enimitive particles (e.g. German *wohl*, arguably also Swedish *visst*), we will have to insert the "claim for uncontroversiality" inside of a broader set of conversational attitudes pertaining to commitment-in-interaction (be it egophoricity, engagement, or Common Ground). Enimitives are likely to finally re-join the general apparatus of linguistic tools used to manage expectations, speaker-hearer-gaps, and intersubjective ratification, which directly brings us back to the realm of Information Structure as linguistic marking of such interactional phenomena.

Panov claims that the uncontroversiality of an assertion within the interactional context is a notion that can be fully integrated into the grammatical apparatus of a language; this is actually very reminiscent of the "argumentative" approaches to particles (Ducrot, Fischer). According to these scholars, languages have at their disposal specialized items that prepare the ground for further developments in conversation; they also help position the speaker (or the epistemic instance) to face possible counterarguments. In many respects, "argumentative" theories of discourse markers are but a branch of Common Ground Management theories, so that the study of language-specific strategies pertaining at this domain would inevitably lead to the double question of particles and Information Structure. Marking the strength of the proposition content respectively to possible alternatives has already been proposed as the core semantic function of particles within the broader set of discourse markers (Paillard 2017).

The semantic map of "enimitives" proposed by Panov shows just that, since he distinguishes carefully between "simple" enimitives and "contrastive" enimitives, which maintain the claim for uncontroversiality against a contrary proposition. In our eyes, the notion of contrast and the acknowledgement of the relevance of alternative viewpoints are characteristic for information-structurally determined views of conversation. We can expect alternatives, focus and/or contrastivity to be important notions for the characterization of "enimitives" and their neighbours. Thus, it seems to us that analyses resorting to Information Structure would also be compatible with, or even profitable for, the "enimitive" approach of particles.

4. The contributions in this volume

The contributions collected in this volume aim at addressing these various interactions between discourse particles and Information Structure. They go back to a workshop on "Discourse Particles and Information Structure" held at the 51st meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea in Tallinn in September 2019. The papers are grouped into three parts.

The first part is devoted to studies on the contribution of information-structural strategies to the rise of discourse particles. In her paper "Discourse particle position and Information Structure", Marianne Mithun addresses this issue drawing on data from Mohawk. She argues that in many cases, the position of particles in Mohawk utterances, especially the second position, can be accounted for if we look at the source constructions of particles. She shows that particles emerged from a grammaticalization process involving marked information-structural constructions, such as topic shifts, antitopics or focus constructions. The following paper, "Information-structural properties of IS THAT clauses" by Eva-Maria Remberger, is devoted to the grammaticalization of *es que* ('is that') and *no es que* ('NEG is that') as inferential discourse markers in Spanish. Though *es que* should rather not be regarded as a particle in Spanish, the Sicilian equivalent to *no es que, neca*, has undergone further grammaticalization and is now a particle comparible to Italian *mica*. Thus, *(no) es que* represents an interesting example of intermediate development between a copula clause construction serving information-structural goals and a discourse particle. In her paper, the author examines several possible interpretations for the path that led from a copula clause construction to an inferential marker, and delivers a fine-grained discussion of how clefts and cleft-like constructions can specialize for epistemic meanings. The grammaticalization of a copula construction serving information-structural goals into a particle is also at the heart of Nadia Christopher's chapter on "Kazakh Particle *ğoj* as an Existential Operator". In Kazakh, *ğoj* is used to mark the assumption that (some of) the information provided in the utterance was already shared, or should be treated as such. The author shows that in post-predicative position, *ğoj* is always used with predicates that are either narrowly focused, or part of a focus phrase. Drawing on cross-linguistic comparison and etymology, she shows that *ğoj* should be treated as an existential operator marking the presence of *p* inside of the Common Ground, and that the particle *ğoj* has probably grammaticalized from an existantial copula in a special construction expressing Verum focus. The final paper in this section is by Marco Favaro and shows how an item that has already grammaticalized into an information-structural device can further evolve into an illocutionary modifier ("From focus marking to illocutionary modification: Functional developments of Italian *solo*"). *Solo* 'only' has evolved into a connective discourse marker, but also into a discourse particle in directional and assertive speech acts. Illocutionary *solo* contributes to the Common Ground Management: the utterance marked with *solo* "is projected against a proposition present in the Common Ground, contrasting (or correcting) it in an emphatic way". The study is based on

conversational data and shows that illocutionary *solo* has retained several of its quantificational and contrast-inducing features.

The second part is devoted to polysemic or heterosemic particles, for which *solo* is only one example. In their paper "Final or medial: morphosyntactic and functional divergences in discourse particles of the same historical sources", Mitsuko Narita Izutsu and Katsunobu Izutsu examine three Japanese particles (-*yo*, -*ne*, and -*sa*). These particles have two uses that are easily identified thanks to positional features: they can be used as sentence-final particles fulfilling a function of illocutionary modification, but they also appear sentence-internally, with a completely different interpretation as "interjectional particles" (see above). For instance, whereas sentence-final -*ne* marks that the content of the sentence is actually presupposed, medial -*ne* is used as a priming marker paving the way for new information. The authors shows that information-structure and addressee-directedness play a major role not only to distinguish between the two kinds of uses for these three particles, but also to account for their distribution and the restrictions on their mutual compatibility. The second paper of this section ("Types and functions of *Wa*-marked DPs and their structural distribution in a Japanese sentence" by Koichiro Nakamura) is also devoted to Japanese, but this time we turn to the ominous topic particle *wa*. The author is concerned with the semantic and distributional opposition between stressed and unstressed uses of the particle. He argues that the differences between both *wa*'s are due to the fact that stressed *WA* expresses both topic and focus. He examines the various kinds of foci at stake to deliver explanations on the different distributional properties of *wa* and *WA*. The final paper in this section is a discussion on French *quand même* by Richard Waltereit ("Is the information-structural contribution of modal particles in the syntax, in discourse structure, or in both?"). When they originally proposed to make a strict distinction between discourse particles and modal particles, Waltereit & Detges (2007) argued that modal particles operate at sentence level and can interact with Information Structure whereas discourse particles operate at discourse level. In his paper, Waltereit discusses the implication of Ozerov's (2005) work on Burmese, where it is suggested that core information-structural features usually analyzed at sentence level might actually have to be interpreted at discourse level. These findings invite to look for contexts where modal particles could operate at discourse level, thus challenging the original distinction proposed by Waltereit & Detges. The author argues that French modal particle *quand même* exhibits such usages at discourse level. Most crucially, he shows that there is a "backward-looking" use of *quand même* which is still close to the core lexical meaning of the source lexeme, and a "forward looking" use of *quand même* as a modal particle with strong information-structural properties both at sentence- and at discourse level.

The third and last part addresses discourse particles and especially modal particles for their contribution to the specification of illocutionary types. Here too, information-structural categories prove crucial for the description and analysis of the syntax and semantics of particles. In many cases, the illocutionary modification caused by particles appear to be an information-structural specification : particles give rise to a new, specific information-structural profile. The section is divided into two halves. In the first half, Werner Abraham and Yoshio Endo explain how the syntax of particles can be used as a key for the interpretation of information-structural and illocutionary features of the clause they modify. In the second half, Sergio Monforte as well as Balkiz Öztürk & Didar Akar examine the case of "special questions" and show how the use of particles leads to the information-structural specification of interrogative speech acts.

In his paper ("Discourse particles in thetic judgments, in dependent sentences, and in non-finite phrases"), Werner Abraham explores the information-structural and illocutionary constraints

weighing on the use of modal particles in German, with occasional cross-linguistic comparisons. The other aim of his paper is to look for syntactic generalizations that could answer the questions on the comparability of language-specific kinds of particles raised by Waltereit in his own paper. In the following chapter, "Information Structure, Null Case Particle and Sentence Final Discourse Particle", Yoshio Endo makes a comparable plea for a syntactic, grammar-inherent view on particles. The author starts with an analysis of Japanese sentence-final particles as grammatical markers of Theory of Mind and empathy. He then turns to the interaction between sentence-final particles and case and topic particles (*wa* / *ga* / 0) and argues that sentence-final particles trigger the deletion of the case particle *ga*.

The final two chapters are devoted to particles as information-structural specifiers of interrogative utterances. Drawing on work by Bayer & Obenauer (2011) on particles in German "special questions" and by Trotzke & Turco (2015) on "emphasis", Monforte's paper ("Modal particles in Basque: Two cases of interaction between *ote* and Information Structure") examines how modal particle *ote*, at least in some Eastern Basque dialects, interacts with the Information Structure of questions. Special attention is devoted to the combination between *ote* and *wh*-items, a syntactic pattern also observed in German and seemingly associated with emphasis. Finally, Öztürk & Akar draw our attention to "the discourse marker *hani* in Turkish", a Common Ground-managing particle which is mostly used in questions. They discuss its syntax, semantics and prosody. The Turkish data is interpreted in the light of previous research on interro-negative utterances and the difference between their "inner" and "outer" negation reading in English. The availability of evidence or counter-evidence for the expected answer appears to play a crucial role in the triggering of *hani*. The particle shapes specific, yet various information-structural and epistemic profiles in the questions that it modifies.

5. Conclusion

The articles collected in this volume show how the behavior and the interpretation of discourse particles are connected to categories such as 'old' / 'given' or 'new' (Abraham, Izutsu & Izutsu), to the management of presuppositions and expectations (Remberger, Waltereit, Endo, Öztürk & Akar), and to contrast, short: to how discourse particles constantly interact with information-structural parameters. Especially, contrast plays a major role in the description of the semantics of many items dealt with in this volume: Verum focus or contrast on the truth of the proposition plays a role in the licensing of particles not only in German (Abraham) but also in Kazakh with the particle *ğoj* (Christopher); contrastive topics lay the ground for the emergence of particles in Mohawk (Mithun), whereas in Japanese, the contrastivity of topics triggers different licensing conditions for *wa* and *WA* at the syntactic level (Nakamura); the two readings of the French particle *quand même* amount to two sorts of contrast (exhaustivity contrast and uncertainty contrast, Waltereit). Further, discourse particles seem to strongly interact with wh-items and questions in order to create "special questions" that rely on specific prerequisites concerning the set of alternatives present either in the Common Ground, or in the Context set (Endo, Monforte, Öztürk & Akar). Turning to the diachrony of markers, we also find strong hints at a link between particles and contrast. For instance, Italian *solo* is an instance of focus particle turning to a discourse particle (Favaro), whereas Spanish *(non) es que* is a case of a syntactic strategy for the expression of contrast that progressively grammaticalizes into a discourse marker and in some parallel cases (Sicilian) into a discourse particle (Remberger). Yet, other information-structural source constructions are possible. Especially, various kinds of topic marking stand at the origin of some Mohawk particles (Mithun),

whereas the Japanese sentence-final particle *wa* seems to originate from the topic-marking particle *wa* (Endo). Both contrast and topicality point at the general "discourse-embedding value" of particles underlined by Abraham in his contribution. The regrammaticalization of topic markers into particles further suggests that clause position and functional value are tightly linked, as manifested by the Japanese data examined by Izutsu & Izutsu as well as Endo, whereby the question of the interaction between particles in different syntactic positions is still open.

This leads us to the question of the relationship between Information Structure and Common Ground Management or, following Krifka (2008) the pair Common Ground Management vs Common Ground Content. Many studies in this volume assume a theoretical approach that is indebted to Common Ground research, a stance that is now quite common in particles research. In this introduction, we have assumed that Common Ground Management is a general pragmatic domain (the management of "mutually ostensive knowledge" as defined by Wilson & Sperber 2013) and that Information Structure designates a complex area of properly linguistic strategies involving three levels (given/old vs new, topic vs comment and contrast/focus). While Common Ground theories are manifestedly fruitful for strictly pragmatic or semantic research, especially from the formalist side, it seems to us that if the study of particles is to take their syntax into consideration, it has to rely on more fine-grained notions such as those made available by Information Structure research as a key domain of the syntax/semantics interface. In the light of the studies collected in this volume, this might be especially true of the various subtypes of foci and contrasts isolated in the literature, but the same might hold for topics, as well. But this is not "only" a question of favoring one domain of linguistic analysis to the other. Waltereit's paper on sentence-level vs discourse-level semantics for particles, and Abraham's discussion of Waltereit's categorial criteria, show that the articulation between Common Ground Management and Information Structure can have consequences for the very definition not only of Information Structure, but also of particles: if Common Ground Management and Common Ground Content are a set of communicative, pragmatic operations, they are defined at the level of discourse, and if a particle is understood as a Common Ground operator (see Gast 2006, to some extent also König 1997), it is rather susceptible of being what Waltereit & Detges (2007) call a "discourse particle". For them, "Modal particles" proper, on the other hand, operate at the sentence level, which is also the reason why they can easily interact with Information Structure, at least if the latter is defined as a set of equally semantic and morphosyntactic strategies embedding primarily discursive parameters at the level of the sentence or even of the clause. Waltereit's paper show that Information Structure, and thus modal particle, actually retain a higher discourse-level capacity than was thought before, thus opening modal particles to the kind of treatment he and Detges reserved for what they called "discourse particles". On the other hand, Abraham insists on particles being clause-level discourse-embedding markers. To a wide extent, Abraham's view can be compared to Endo's depiction of intersubjective modalities as properly grammatical, clause-internal parameters rather than a vague functional domain. All three authors fight with this complementarity between sentence-level and discourse-level operations. The study of particles needs further fine-grained research at the interface of sentence and discourse. In this respect, the capacity of Information Structure to address discourse-level matters from within the sentence level might prove more fruitful than the strong bias of Common Ground research for discourse-level semantics and pragmatics. From a methodological point of view, this double nature as sentence- *and* discourse-level operators might well be the most characteristic common feature of discourse / modal particles and Information Structure. They

operate at the same interface, involve the same notions and raise the same questions.

References

Abraham, Werner. 1991. The grammaticization of the German modal particles. In *Approaches to grammaticalization II: Types of grammatical markers,* Elisabeth C. Traugott & Bernd Heine (eds), 331-380. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Abraham, Werner. 2012. Illocutive force is speaker and information source concern. What type of syntax does the representation of speaker deixis require? In *Modality and Theory of Mind elements across languages*, Werner Abraham & Elisabeth Leiss (eds), 109-146. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Abraham, Werner. 2017. Modal particles and Verum focus: new corollaries. In *Pragmatic markers, discourse markers and modal particles*: *New perspectives,* Chiara Fedriani & Andrea Sansó (eds), 171-202. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 171-202.

Abraham, Werner & Leiss, Elisabeth. 2012. Introduction: Theory of Mind elements across languages. In *Modality and Theory of Mind elements across languages,* Werner Abraham & Elisabeth Leiss (eds), 1-36. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Adams, James Noel. 1994. Wackernagel's law and the position of unstressed personal pronouns in classical Latin. *Transactions of rhe Philological Society* 92.2: 103-178.

Anderson, Stephen R. 1993. Wackernagel's revenge: Clitics, morphology, and the syntax of second position. *Language* 69.1 : 68-98.

Bayer, Josef & Obenauer, Hans-Georg. 2011. Discourse particles, clause structure, and question types. *The Linguistic Review* 28: 449-491.

Beeching, Kate & Detges, Ulrich (eds). 2014. *Discourse functions at the left and right periphery : Crosslinguistic investigations of language use and language change.* Leiden : Brill.

Bergqvist, Henrik. 2019. The frequency and distribution of modal particles in spoken Swedish. Talk at the 52nd meeting of Societas Linguistica Europaea, Leipzig.

Blakemore, Diane. 1987. *Semantic constraints on relevance.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Bonnot, Christine. 1986. La particule že marqueur de thème. In *Les particules énonciatives en russe contemporain* 1, 125-151. Paris: Université Paris VII.

Bonnot, Christine. 1990. La particule to et la polémique cachée en russe moderne : à propos du statut énonciatif du thème. *Revue des études slaves* 62/1: 67-75.

Bonnot, Christine. 2015. Deixis, intersubjectivité et thématisation. La particule énonciative –to en russe contemporain. *Faits de Langues* 45. 11-34.

Bonnot, Christine & Bottineau, Tatiana. 2012. Lorsque la marque du conditionnel est une particule mobile : le cas du russe. *Faits de Langue* 40: 189-196.

Büring, Daniel. 2003. On D-trees, beans, and B-accent. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26: 511-545.

Chafe, Wallace. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In *Subject and topic*, Charles N. Li (ed.), 25-55. New York: Academic Press.

Coniglio, Marco. 2008. *Modal particles in Italian*. University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics 18.

Degand, Liesbeth, Bert Cornillie & Paola Pietrandrea (eds). 2013. *Discourse markers and modal particles: Categorization and description*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Diewald, Gabriele. 2013. Same same but different: modal particles, discourse markers and the art (and prupose) of categorization. In *Discourse markers and modal particles: Categorization and description,* Degand, Liesbeth, Bert Cornillie & Paola Pietrandrea (eds), 19-45. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Egg, Markus & Mursell, Johannes. 2016. The syntax and semantics of discourse particles. In *Discourse particles: Formal approaches to their syntax and semantic*s, Josef Bayer & Volker Struckmeier (eds), 15-48. Berlin: De Gruyter

Endo, Yoshio. 2007. *Locality and information structure. A cartographic approach to Japanese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Endo, Yoshio. 2012. Illocutionary force and modal particles in the syntax of Japanese. In *Modality and Theory of Mind elements across langages*, Werner Abraham & Elisabeth Leiss (eds), 405-424. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Evans, Nicholas, Bergqvist, Henrik & San Roque, Lila. 2018a. The grammar of engagement. *Language and Cognition* 10: 110-170.

Fernandez-Vest, Marie-Madeleine Jocelyne. 1994. *Les particules énonciatives dans la constructions du discours*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Fischer, Kerstin. 2007. Grounding and common ground: Modal particles and their translation equivalents. In *Lexical Markers of Common Grounds*, Anita Fetzer & Kerstin Fischer (eds), 47-66. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Floyd, Simeon, Norcliffe, Elisabeth & San Roque, Lila (eds). 2018. *Egophoricity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fraser, Bruce. 2001. The clause start in Ancient Greek: Focus and the second position. *Glotta* 77: 138-177.

Gast, Volker. 2006. Modal particles and context updating: The functions of German 'ja', 'doch', 'wohl' and 'etwa'. In *Modalverben und Grammatikalisierung,* Heinz Vater & Ole Letnes (eds), 153-177. Tier : Wissenschaftlicher Verlag.

Grosz, Patrick. 2016. Information Structure and Discourse Particles. In *The Oxford Handbook of Information structure,* Caroline Féry & Shinichiro Ishihara (eds), 336-358. Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Grzech, Karolina. 2016a. Discourse enclitics in Tena Kichwa: A corpus-based account of information structure and epistemic meaning. PhD thesis, SOAS, University of London.

Grzech, Karolina. 2016b. The non-evidential meaning of the Tena Kichwa 'direct evidential'. York Papers in Linguistics Special issue 3 : 73-94.

Gutzmann, Daniel. 2015. *Use-conditional meaning*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood. 1967. Notes in transitivity and theme in English, 2. *Journal of Linguistics* 3.2, 199-244.

Hancil, Sylvie, Haselow, Alexander & Post, Margje (eds). 2015. *Final particles.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Hargreaves, David. 2018. Am I blue? Privileged access constraints in Kathmandu Newar. In *Egophoricity*, Simeon Floyd, Elisabeth Norcliffe & Lila San Roque (eds), 79-107. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Haselow, Alexander. 2015. Left vs. right periphery in grammaticalization: The case of *anyway. In New directions in grammaticalization research,* Andrew D.M. Smith, Graeme Trousdale & Richard Waltereit (eds), 157-186. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hentschel, Elke. 1986. *Funktion und Geschichte deutscher Partikeln.* Ja*,* doch*,* halt *und* eben. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Izutsu, Katsunobu & Izutsu, Mitsuko Narita. 2013. From discourse markers to modal/final particles: What the position reveals about the continuum. In *Discourse markers and modal particles: Categorization and description*, Liesbeth Degand, Bett Cornillie & Paola Pietrandrea (eds), 217-235. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jacobs, Joachim. 1991. On the semantics of modal particles. In *Discourse Particles. Descriptive and theoretical investigations on the logical, syntactic and pragmatic properties of discourse particles in German,* Abraham, Werner (ed.), 141-162. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

König, Ekkehard. 1991. *The meaning of focus particles: a comparative perspective*. London: Routledge.

König, Ekkehard. 1997. Zur Bedeutung von Modalpartikeln im Deutschen: Ein Neuansatz im Rahmen der Relevanztheorie. *Germanistische Linguistik* 136 [Studien zu Deutsch als Fremdsprache III. Aspekte der Modalität im Deutschen – auch in kontrastiver Sicht, Friedhelm Debus & Oddleoif Leirbukt (eds)]: 57-75.

Krifka, Manfred. 2008. Basic notions of information structure. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 55, 243-276.

Krivonossov, Alexey. 1977. *Die modalen Partikeln in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache.* Göppingen: Kümmerle.

Kuroda, Sige-Yuki. 2005. Focusing on the matter of topic : a study of *wa* and *ga* in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 14. 1-58.

Kwon, Min-Jae. 2005. Modalpartikeln und Satzmodus Untersuchungen zur Syntax, Semantik und Pragmatik der deutschen Modalpartikeln. PhD thesis, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München.

Leiss, Elisabeth. 2012. Epistemicity, evidentiality and Theory of Mind. In *Modality and Theory of Mind elements across languages*, Werner Abraham & Elisabeth Leiss (eds), 109-146. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Métrich, René, Faucher, Eugène & Courdier, Gilbert. 1999. *Les invariables difficiles: Dictionnaire allemand-français des particules, connecteurs, interjections et autres mots de la communication*, vol. 2: bald-geradezu. Nancy: Nouveaux Cahiers d'Allemand.

Métrich, René, Faucher, Eugène & Courdier, Gilbert (eds). 2002. *Les invariables difficiles: Dictionnaire allemand-français des particules, connecteurs, interjections et autres mots de la communication*, vol. 3: gern-nur so. Nancy: Nouveaux Cahiers d'Allemand.

Mithun, Marianne. 2018. Factors behind variation in marking information structure: Contributions from Central Pomo. In *Information structure in lesser-described languages: Studies in prosody and syntax*, Evangelia Adamou, Katharina Haude & Marthine Vanhove (eds), 119-156. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Modicom, Pierre-Yves. 2012. The epistemological treatment of information and the interpersonal distribution of belief in language: German modal particles and the typological challenge. In

Modality and Theory of Mind elements across languages, Werner Abraham & Elisabeth Leiss (eds), 361-382. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Molnár, Valéria. 1998. On the Syntax, phonology, semantics and pragmatics of the so-called "contrastive topic" in Hungarian and German. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 45, 89-166.

Molnár, Valéria. 2002. Contrast – from a contrastive perspective. In *Information Structure in a Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Hilde Hasselgård, Stig Johansson, Bergljot Behrens & Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen (eds), 147-161.

Müller, Sonja. 2014. *Modalpartikeln*. Heidelberg : Winter Verlag.

Ozerov, Pavel. 2015. Information structure without topic and focus: Differential Object Marking in Burmese. *Studies in Language* 39(2): 386–423.

Paillard, Denis. 2017. Scène énonciative et types de marqueurs discursifs. *Langages* 207: 17-32.

Padučeva, Edita. 1987. La particule že: sémantique, syntaxe et prosodie. In *Les particules énonciatives en russe contemporain 3*, 1-44. Paris: Université Paris VII.

Panov, Vladimir. 2018. Defining the area of (sentence-)final particles in Asia. Talk at the 51st meeting of Societas Linguistica in Tallinn.

Panov, Vladimir. 2019. The markers of uncontroversial information in Europe. Talk at the 52nd meeting of Societas Linguistica in Leipzig.

Prince, Ellen. 2002. The ZPG letter: Subjects, definiteness and information-status. In *Discourse description: Diverse linguistic analyses of a fund-raising text*, William S. Mann & Sandra A. Thompson (eds), 293-325. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Repp, Sophie. 2013. Common ground management: Modal particles, illocutionary negation and verum. In *Beyond Expressives: Explorations in Use-Conditional Meaning,* Daniel Gutzmann & Hansmartin Gärtner (eds), 231-274. Leiden: Brill.

Schoonjans, Steven. 2013. Modal particles: Problems in defining a category. In *Discourse markers and modal particles: Categorization and description*, Liesbeth Degand, Bert Cornillie & Paola Pietrandrea, 133-161. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schoonjans, Steven. 2014. Oui, il y a des particules de démodulation en français. *Cognitextes* 11. Online: URL : http://journals.openedition.org/cognitextes/712.

Schultze-Berndt, Eva. 2017. Shared vs. Primary Epistemic Authority in Jaminjung/Ngaliwurru. *Open Linguistics* 3: 178-218.

Shinzato, Rumiko. 2017. Grammaticalization of pragmatic markers, discourse markers and modal markers in Japanese. In *Pragmatic markers, discourse markers and Modal particles: New perspectives*, Chiara Fedriani & Andrea Sansò (eds), 305-333. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Spevak, Olga. 2010. *Constituent order in classical Latin prose.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Squartini, Mario. 2017. Italian non-canonical negations as modal particles: Information state, polarity and mirativity. In *Pragmatic markers, discourse markers and Modal particles: New perspectives*, Chiara Fedriani & Andrea Sansò (eds), 203-228. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Thijs, Kees. 2017. The Attic particle μήν: Intersubjectivity, contrast and polysemy. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 17: 73-112.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2010. Revisiting subjectification and intersubjectification. In *Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization*, Kristin Davidse, Lieven Vandelanotte & Hubert Cuyckens (eds), 29-70. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Trotzke, Andreas & Turco, Giuseppina. 2015. The grammatical reflexes of emphasis: Evidence from german wh-questions. *Lingua* 168 : 37-56.

Waltereit, Richard. 2006. *Abtönung : Zur Pragmatik und historischen Semantik von Modalpartikeln und ihren funktionalen Äquivalenten in romanischen Sprachen.* Tübingen : Niemeyer.

Waltereit, Richard & Detges, Ulrich. 2007. Different functions, different histories. Modal particles and discourse markers from a diachronic point of view. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 6: 61-80.

Weydt, Harald. 1969. *Abtönungspartikel: die deutschen Modalwörter und ihre französischen Entsprechungen*. Bad Homburg: Gehlen.

Wilson, Deirdre & Sperber, Dan (eds). 2013. *Meaning and relevance*. Cambridge: Cambrige University Press.

Zimmermann, Malte. 2008. Discourse particles in the left periphery. In *Dislocated elements in discourse. Syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic perspectives*, Benjamin Shaer, Philippa Cook, Werner Frey & Claudia Maienborn (eds), 200-231. London: Routledge.