Ne, discourse particle in Tłı̨chǫ: Speaker commitments, common ground, and calls on the addressee

Leslie Saxon, University of Victoria

Beyssade and Marandin (2006) present a nuanced view of conversational moves in dialogue, arguing that speakers' commitments are expressed grammatically by means of clause type, while other aspects of an utterance yield speakers' calls on addressees. Thoma's (2016) analyzes the pragmatic contributions of Miesbach Bavarian (MB) discourse particles in these terms, arguing in particular that the MB particles *doch* and *fei* are used felicitously in contexts where a proposition *p* is or is not understood by the speaker to be part of the common ground (CG) shared by speaker and addressee. This paper, a textual study of Tłı̨chǫ [ISO dgr], examines prior and following contexts to tease out the particular function of *ne*, called a 'confirmational' in other work (Saxon 2014). (See also Welch 2016 on the left periphery in this language.) Extended context shows that use of *ne* depends on a speaker's commitment that *p* is part of CG, and calls on the addressee to acknowledge that *p* is in CG.

The text is an authoritative Tłı̨chǫ translation of the New Testament plus Genesis. It is well suited to pragmatic analysis because the contexts of events in it are thoroughly understood. (Space in this abstract precluded full glossing; two representative examples are discussed below as illustrations.)

[29]Eyı tł'axǫǫ̀ Jacob dıı hagòhdı: "Hòt'a ełaehwhı ha sehò̧hwho, <u>secho gıts'ǫ̀ ahde ha</u> <u>**ne**</u>. Het got'į̀ Efron wedèè k'e secho gıxè sekw'ǫǫ̀ whetǫ aahłe. …"
Genesis 49:29

[29]Then he charged them, saying to them, "[Already the process by which I will die has begun.] <u>I am about to be gathered to my people.</u> Bury me with my ancestors—in the cave in the field of Ephron the Hittite, …"   *[NRSV]*

The underlined clause in Tłı̨chǫ translates literally as 'I will go to my ancestors ***ne***'. The preceding sentence is not present in the NRSV translation of Genesis; I have provided a free translation in square brackets. In this example, the speaker knows that he is about to die, and he knows that *p* is in CG, having just said it. In asking them to bury him with his ancestors, he is calling upon them to acknowledge *p* as being in CG, as motivation for fulfilling his request.

[9]Į̀łàà, to Paul wenazhıı xègoèht'į̀ t'à gots'ǫ K'àowo yets'ǫ̀ gode, hayèhdı, "Nı̧ı̧jı̧-le, į̧łaà dǫ gıts'ǫ̀ goı̧de ghǫ naą̨t'e-le. [10]<u>Nexè aht'ı̧</u> **ne.** […]" yèhdı.   *Acts 18:9-10*

[9]One night the Lord said to Paul in a vision, "Do not be afraid, but speak and do not be silent; [10]<u>for</u> <u>I am with you</u> […]"   *[NRSV]*

This example is similar in that the Lord, speaking to Jesus' disciple Paul, with ***ne*** draws attention to the underlined clause as being in CG, and calls on Paul to acknowledge this shared understanding. As in the first example, the call on the addressee is made evident in context: Paul is to use this understanding as motivation to heed the Lord's words. Many examples in the corpus have this character: *p* expresses information that might inform a course of action. Its relevance to the course of action is brought to the addressee's attention by ***ne***: the call to acknowledge *p* as CG.

Descriptions of ***ne*** as a confirmational is not at odds with the approach here, as an addressee's acknowledgement of *p* in CG entails a confirmation of *p*. This study, like those of Heim et al 2016, Lam 2014, Thoma 2016, Wiltschko and Heim 2016, and Yang and Wiltschko 2016, show that, crosslinguistically, speakers' commitments, CG, and calls on addressees contribute to the felicity conditions for "confirmationals" and other categories of discourse particles.

References

Beyssade, Claire, and Jean-Marie Marandin. 2006. The speech act assignment problem revisited: Disentangling speaker's commitment from speaker's call on addressee. In Olivier Bonami and Patricia Cabredo Hofherr (eds.) *Empirical issues in syntax and semantics*, 6:37-68.

Heim, Johannes, Hermann Keupdjio, Zoe Wai-Man Lam, Adriana Osa-Gómez, Sonja Thoma, and Martina Wiltschko. 2016. Intonation and Particles as Speech Act Modifiers: A Syntactic Analysis. *Studies in Chinese Linguistics* 37(2): 35-55.

Lam, ZoeWai-Man. 2014. A complex ForceP for speaker-and addressee-oriented discourse particles in Cantonese. *Studies in Chinese Linguistics*, 35(2):61-80.

Saxon, Leslie. 2014. "Discourse particles" and selection by higher predicates. Workshop on Structure and Constituency in the Languages of the Americas, St John's, Newfoundland, 25-27 April 2014.

Thoma, Sonja Christine. 2016. *Discourse particles and the syntax of discourse--Evidence from Miesbach Bavarian.* Electronic Theses and Dissertations (ETDs) 2008+. Department of Linguistics, University of British Columbia. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.14288/1.0340686.

Welch, Nicholas. 2016. Deducing clause structure from the right periphery in Tłı̨chǫ Yatı̀ *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 81(2):261-291

Wiltschko, Martina. 2014. *The universal structure of categories: Towards a formal typology.* Cambridge University Press.

Wiltschko Martina and Johannes Heim. 2016. The syntax of confirmationals. A neoperformative analysis. In: Gunther Kaltenböck, Evelien Keizer and Arne Lohmann (eds.) *Outside the Clause. Form and function of extra-clausal constituents*, 303-340. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Yang, Xiaodong and Martina Wiltschko, 2016. The confirmational marker *ha* in Northern Mandarin. *Journal of Pragmatics* 104: 67-82.