

Force and German solitaires

Kerstin Schwabe, ZAS Berlin

The talk discusses German independently used subordinated declarative and interrogative-clauses (*solitaires*) which can function either as *exclamative* ((1a') and (2b')), *directive* (1b'), or *interrogative* (2a') speech acts. Taking Pott's (2003) and Portner's (2006) expressing meaning theory as a starting point, which regards the sentence meaning as a pair consisting of its ordinary and expressive meaning, the talk shows that a solitaire and its corresponding root clause have the same ordinary meaning, but differ with respect to the expression of illocutionary meaning. The central claim of the talk is that declarative and interrogative root clauses express illocutionary force syntactically whereas solitaires do not. Their force can be inferred pragmatically if they are related to a situation which is given by the situational context. The inference can be supported by particular prosodic and lexical devices – cf. the particles *bloß* and *wohl*.

- (1) a. *Die U-Bahn fährt ja doch noch!*
the tube runs PART PART still
'The tube runs, indeed!'
- a'. *Dass die U-Bahn ja doch noch fährt!*
that the tube PART PART still runs
'Well I never, the tube is still running!'
- i. $\exists M. M(\lambda s \text{ (is.running (s), (tube))})$
- ii. $\exists s \exists s' \text{ (IS.SURPRISED } (\alpha), (s), (s')) \wedge \text{ (is.running (tube), (s))}$
- b. *Fahr bloß jetzt an die Ostsee!*
drive.IMP.SG PART now to the Baltic
'You drive to the Baltic now.'
- b'. *Dass du bloß jetzt an die Ostsee fährst!*
that you PART now to the Baltic drive
'So drive to the Baltic now!'
- i. $\exists M. M(\lambda s \text{ (Baltic.drive } (\beta), (s)))$
- ii. $\exists s \exists s' \text{ ((WANT } (\alpha), (s), (s')) \wedge \text{ ((Baltic.drive } (\beta), (s))))$
- (2) a. *Wer kommt wohl?*
who is coming PART
- a'. *Wer wohl kommt?*
who PART is coming
'I wonder who is coming.'
- i. $M(\lambda x \in \text{PERSON } \lambda s \text{ (come (s), (x))))$
- ii. $\forall a \exists s' \exists s \text{ ((WANT } (\alpha), (s')) \wedge \text{ ((KNOW } (\alpha), (\langle s, \langle a, (\lambda x \in \text{PERSON } \lambda s \text{ (come (s), (x)))) \rangle \rangle \langle s' \rangle \rangle \wedge \text{ ((KNOW } (\alpha), (\neg \langle s, \langle a, (\lambda x \in \text{PERSON } \lambda s \text{ (come (x), (s)))) \rangle \rangle \langle s' \rangle \rangle))))$
- b. *Wer kommt denn dort!*
who is coming PART there
- b'. *Wer dort kommt!*
who there comes
'Who on earth is coming there!'
- i. $\exists M. M(\lambda x \in \text{PERSON } \lambda s \text{ (come (x), (s))))$
- ii. $\forall a \exists s' \exists s \text{ ((IS.SURPRISED } (\alpha), (s), (s')) \wedge \text{ ((\langle s, \langle a, \lambda x \in \text{PERSON } \lambda s \text{ (come (x), (s)))) \rangle \rangle \langle s' \rangle \rangle))$

German declarative root and dependent clauses share the sentence type (CP-type) *declarative* and thus the ordinary meaning *proposition*. Interrogative root and dependent clauses share the sentence type *interrogative* and the ordinary meaning *question*. Root clauses ((1a, b) and (2a, b)), however, indicate syntactically expressive illocutionary meaning by verb-second which indicates independency on a grammatical context, but dependency on an illocutionary context. The independency feature together with the sentence type feature is semantically represented by an expressive, illocutionary operator

(ASSERT or QUEST) which maps the ordinary meaning onto a particular complex of speech act conditions. A German dependent clause, which exhibits verb-final and a complementizer, indicates dependency on a grammatical context, on a matrix predicate. The dependency is represented as a predicate variable which is specified by a predicate which either characterises the illocutionary force of the subordinated clause (*ask, claim, ...*) or enables the derivation of its illocutionary force (*be surprised, know, want, ...*). The predicate can be given either linguistically, as it is the case with respect to canonically used dependent clauses, or be 'silent', as it is the case with respect to solitaires. Since the matrix predicate variable of solitaires is not specified linguistically, their semantic structure is undetermined (cf. (i) in (1) and (2)). The specification of the variable is given by the non-linguistic, situational context. The agent and the addressee instantiate the predicate variable pragmatically by an illocutionary predicate which maps the ordinary meaning of the declarative or interrogative solitaire onto a particular complex of conditions determining either an exclamative, a directive or a question act.

It will be shown that the pragmatic specification of the predicate variable of solitaires is restricted to SURPRISE and VOLITIONAL predicates. If one distinguishes between predicates that relate the ordinary sentence meaning, a proposition, to the subject (e.g. *wissen 'know', glauben 'believe', behaupten 'claim', ...*) and predicates that relate situations, which exemplify the ordinary meaning, to the subject (e.g. *überrascht sein 'be surprised, wollen 'want', ...*), only those predicates can specify the predicate variable of solitaires which relate a situation to the subject. The reason for this is that only situations, situations which are given by the utterance context in fact, are accessible for the addressee. A SURPRISE-predicate, for instance, takes the ordinary meaning of a declarative or interrogative and relates it to a situation the agent is surprised at ((1a'ii), (2b'ii)). In order to relate the ordinary meaning of the interrogative to the situation the agent is surprised at, the question, which is regarded as an interrogative function (cf. Krifka 2001), and its term answer *a* must form a question answer pair – cf. $\langle a, q \rangle$ in (2b'ii). A WANT-predicate also takes the ordinary meaning of a declarative or interrogative and relates it to a situation the attitudinal subject wants to be realized ((1b'ii) (2a'ii)). If a declarative solitaire is related to a contextually given deontic situation, the declarative solitaire functions as a directive (1b'ii). If an interrogative is related to deontic epistemic situations – the (wanted) epistemic situations that for all answers *a*, α knows *a* is coming or α knows *a* is not coming –, it is a directive epistemic speech act, a question speech act (2a'ii).

It will be demonstrated how the pragmatic inference of the expressive, exclamative and volitional meaning is supported by particles and/or intonation which also indicate a certain kind of expressive meaning.

References

- Krifka, Manfred 2001. For a structured meaning account of questions and answers (revised version). In *Audiatur Vox Sapientia. A Festschrift for Arnim von Stechow* [Studia Grammatica 52], Caroline Féry, and Wolfgang Sternefeld (eds.), 287-319. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Portner, Paul: t.a. Instructions for Interpretation as Separate Performatives. In Schwabe, Kerstin & Winkler, Susanne (eds.) *On Information Structure, Meaning and Form. Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today*. (Series Editor: Werner Abraham). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Potts, Christopher 2003 The performative nature of expressive content. Talk delivered at the University of Connecticut and the University of Rochester.