The syntax of discourse: what an Anishinaabemowin oral text teaches us

Sonja Frazier, Monique Dufresne
Queen's University
Rose-Marie Déchaine
UBC

1. Research question: what is the syntax of discourse? The investigation of clausal syntax has matured to the point that we now have a more granular understanding of the range of cross-linguistic variation attested in the CP domain (Rizzi 1997; 2004; 2013). However, less well understood, and also less well investigated, is the question of how clausal syntax is integrated into larger discourse spans, with many analyses arguing for an enriched set of syntactic labels outside of the CP-domains (Speas&Tenny 2003; Wiltschko&Heim 2016; Wiltschko 2018). In this context, we exam the syntactic patterning of an Anishinaabemowin oral text (Nancy Jones' *Gakina Dibaajimowin Gwayakwaawan* 'All Teachings are Correct' published in 2013), with the goal of testing current hypotheses about the syntax of discourse, focusing on the syntax of discourse markers (DMs), which are prolific in Anishinaabemowin (a central Algonquian language that spans Manitoba to Québec in Canada, and Michigan to Wisconsin in the USA).

2. Research context and proposal. Two streams of research have focused on this question: on the one hand, the integration of syntax and prosody has been investigated relative to information structure (Büring 2013); on the other hand, the integration of syntax and pragmatics has been examined relative to discourse markers (Bayer & Struckmeier 2016). Information structure analyses have focused on a relatively narrow sample of language families, with Indo-European and Bantu being the most well-studied, along with a few studies on Sinitic and Altaic languages. Remarkably, according to Büring's 2013 survey, for the languages of the Americas, only one case study of syntax-prosody integration has been conducted (on the Uto-Aztecan language O'odham). Relative to the syntax of discourse markers (DM), there are several recent competing proposals. We specifically consider the divergent claims that are made concerning the interaction of SPEAKER-oriented versus HEARER-oriented features: while Speas & Tenny (2003) position SPEAKER higher than HEARER (1), in a series of papers published by Heim&al., the opposite ordering is proposed (2). The Anishinaabemowin data bears on these proposals in two different ways. First, *contra* both Speas & Tenny (2003) and Wiltschko (2018) there is no dedicated structural relation between SPEAKER and HEARER: in speaker-oriented ("*ego-phoric*") utterances SPEAKER>HEARER; in hearer-oriented (which we call "*audi-phoric*") utterances HEARER>SPEAKER. Second, again *contra* both Speas & Tenny (2003) and Wiltschko (2018), DMs have the syntax of adverbial restrictors, as in (3); rather than introduced layers of dedicated functional categories, DMs function as semantic restrictors that (predictably) narrow the context-of-use of the proposition they attach to.

(1) $[_{sa}\text{P:SPEAKER} \dots$ $[_{sa*P}\text{:HEARER} \dots]$ $[_{CP} \dots [_{TP} \dots]]]]$
(Speas & Tenny 2003)

(2) $[_{\text{RESPONSEP}} \dots$ $[_{\text{GROUNDP:ADRESSEE}} \dots$ $[_{\text{GROUNDP:SPEAKER}}$ $[_{CP} \dots [_{TP} \dots]]]]]]$
(Heim et al. 2014, 2016; Wiltschko 2018)

(3) $[_{CP} \text{DM*}$ $[_{CP} \dots [_{TP} \dots]]]$

3. Consequences of the proposal. For Anishinaabemowin, our analysis captures the following: (i) the perspective-dependence (*ego-phoric* versus *audi-phoric*) of clause-typing; (ii) relative to prosody-syntax mapping, DMs are always associated with a pitch prominence, consistent with their status as left-edge anchors of CP; (iii) DM stacking, rather than being conditioned by semantics features, is conditioned by prosody (this last finding converges with Fairbanks 2016);

(iv) DMs, though prolific, are never obligatory. More broadly, if this approach generalizes, this suggests that CP-external syntax reduces to adjunction to CP.

References

Bayer, L & V. Struckmeier 2016. *Discourse Particles. Formal Approaches to their Syntax and Semantics*. Berlin: de Gryuter, 334.

Büring, D. 2013. Syntax, Information Structure and Prosody. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Generative Syntax*; M. den Drikken (ed), Cambridge University Press.

Fairbanks, B. 2016. *Ojibwe Discourse Markers*. University of Nebraska Press.

Heim, J., Keupdjio, H., Wai-Man Lam, Z., Osa- Gómez, A., Thoma, S., Wiltschko, M. 2016. Intonation and Particles as Speech Act Modifiers: A Syntactic Analysis. *Studies in Chinese Linguistics*, Vol. 37(2); DOI: 10.1515/scl-2016-0005 by T.T. Ng Chinese Language Research Centre, Institute of Chinese Studies, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 109-129.

Heim, J., Keupdjio, H., Wai-Man Lam, Z., Osa- Gómez, A., Wiltschko, M. 2014. How to do things with particles. *Actes du congrès annuel de l'Association canadienne de linguistique/ Proceedings of the 2014 annual conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association*.

Ogimaawigwaebiik [Nancy Jones] 2013. Gakina Dibaajimowin Gwayakwaawan. In *Dibaajimowinaan; Anishinaabe Stories of Culture and respect*; Nigaanigiizhig [Jim Saint-Arnold] (ed.), Great Lakes Indian Fish & Wildlife Commission, 9-10.

Rizzi 2013. *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Berlin: de Gryuter.

Rizzi, L. 2004. *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*. Vol 2. Oxford; Oxford: OUP, 366p.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. *Elements of Grammar*, L. Haegeman (ed.), Amsterdam: Kluwer, 281-337.

Speas, P. and C. Tenny. 2003. Configurational Properties of Point of View Role. In *Asymmetry in Grammar,* A-M. DiSciullo, (ed.) Amsterdam: John Bejamins, 315-343.

Wiltschko, M. 2018. Response particles beyond answering. In *Order and Structure in Syntax 1 : Word order and syntactic structure*. L. Bailey & M. Sheenan (eds); Berlin: Language Science Press, 241-281.

Wiltschko, M. & J. Heim. 2016. The syntax of confirmationals: a neo-performative analysis. *Outside the Clause: Form and function of extra-clausal constituents*; G. Kaltenböck, E. Keizer & A. Lohmann (eds.), Amsterdam: Benjamins, 305-340.