The Meaning of the Avatime Additive Particle *tsyɛ**[*]**

Saskia van Putten

Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen

Avatime, a Kwa language of Ghana, has an additive particle *tsyɛ* that at first sight looks similar to additive particles such as *too* and *also* in English. However, on closer inspection, the Avatime particle behaves differently. Contrary to what is usually claimed about additive particles, *tsyɛ* does not only associate with focused elements. Moreover, unlike its English equivalents, *tsyɛ* does not come with a requirement of identity between the expressed proposition and an alternative. Instead, it indicates that the proposition it occurs in is similar to or compatible with a presupposed alternative proposition.

Keywords: additive particle, focus particle, contrast, Kwa languages

1 Introduction

Additive particles have traditionally been analyzed as focus particles (König, 1991). They associate with the focused constituent in the clause and presuppose an alternative proposition that differs from the expressed one only in the element in focus.

In Avatime, a Kwa language spoken in Ghana, the additive particle *tsyɛ* 'also, too' cannot be analyzed in this way. This particle frequently associates with elements that are not in focus. Moreover, unlike English and German additive particles, *tsyɛ* does not require identity between the expressed proposition (minus the particle and the element it modifies) and its presupposed alternative.

In this paper I explore how to best define the semantics of the particle and I point out differences to additive particles as described in the literature. I show that the Avatime particle *tsyɛ* needs its own, language-specific, definition.

I will proceed as follows. In Section 2, I discuss the information-structural notions that will be relevant for this paper. I then briefly introduce the language in Section 3 and describe my research methods in Section 4. In Section 5 I discuss the meaning and use of the Avatime particle *tsyɛ* and Section 6 is for conclusion and discussion.

2 Theoretical Background

2.1 Topic and focus

The notions of topic and focus have been defined in various ways in the literature. In this section, I will describe how I use these notions in this paper.

I define focus as the part of the sentence by which the speaker intends to augment the common ground between herself and the interlocutor. The focused element can be seen as the answer to the implicit question under discussion (Roberts, 1996), or as the asserted part of the proposition (Lambrecht, 1994). Focus is not necessarily always marked in all languages. Whereas some languages obligatorily distinguish between focused and non-focused elements, others may only mark a certain subtype of focus.

I will use Gundel's (1988, 210) definition of topic: *"An entity, E, is the topic of a sentence, S, iff in using S the speaker intends to increase the addressee's knowledge about, request information about, or otherwise get the addressee to act with respect to E."* This captures the idea that the topic is 'what the sentence is about' (Reinhart, 1981). The part of the sentence that is assessed relative to the topic is the comment. The comment

contains the focused part of the sentence. There are no good tests to determine the topic of a sentence, but there are some properties that topics frequently have crosslinguistically. Topics tend to be sentence-initial, the subject tends to be the topic in unmarked sentences, left-dislocated elements often function as topics and topics usually contain 'old' information.

2.2 Additive particles

König (1991) describes additive particles as presupposing *"that at least one of the alternative values under consideration in a context satisfies the complex predicate represented by the λ-expression"*, where the λ-expression corresponds to the meaning of the sentence minus the element modified by the additive particle. This means that the additive particle presupposes an alternative proposition in which the additive particle and the constituent it modifies are replaced by a contextually relevant alternative to this constituent. For the purpose of this paper, I will subdivide this definition into three parts, which can be seen in (1). Note that (1c) is an implicit assumption in the original definition, but it will play a crucial role in my discussion of the Avatime additive particle.

(1) Definition of additive particles (of the English/German type).

    a. the additive particle associates with an element of the proposition (the added constituent)

    b. it presupposes a contextually relevant alternative proposition

    c. the alternative proposition is identical to the expressed one, except that the additive particle and added constituent are replaced by a contextually relevant alternative to the added constituent

Additive particles have traditionally been described as focus particles (König, 1991), based on the observation that they associate with the accented and thus focused element in the clause. An example can be seen in (2), where the particle *also* associates with *book* in (2a) but with *Mark* in (2b) (focus accents are indicated by capitalization). Example (2a) evokes the presupposition that I gave Mark something other than a book, whereas (2b) evokes the presupposition that I gave a book to a person other than Mark.

(2)   a.   *I also gave Mark a BOOK.*

      b.   *I also gave MARK a book.*

Several authors have noticed, however, that English and German additive particles can also associate with contrastive topics (Krifka, 1999; Dimroth, 2002). In this case, the particle occurs towards the end of the sentence and is marked with a pitch accent. An example can be seen in (3) where *Peter* is the added constituent but is also topical, as the preceding sentence is a question about him. *Peter* is marked as a contrastive topic by a rising pitch accent, while the falling focus accent is realized on the additive particle.

(3)   [I know that Pia visited the exhibition. But what did Peter do?]

      Péter hat die Ausstellung àuch besucht
      Peter has the exhibition   also   visited

      'Péter visited the exhibition, tòo.' (Krifka, 1999, 113)

It thus seems that at least some additive particles can associate with both foci and contrastive topics. In Kwa languages (related to Avatime), additive particles have also been discussed in connection with contrastive topics (Ameka, 2010; Fiedler, 2009). But how can contrast be defined, and how does it relate to additivity? These questions will be discussed in the next section.

2.3 Contrast

Contrast can be defined in a broad and a narrow sense. According to the broad definition, contrast means indicating the presence of contextually relevant alternatives to the contrasted element (e.g. Krifka, 2007; Vallduví and Vilkuna, 1998; Büring, 2003; Chafe, 1976).

Broadly defined contrast thus includes additivity, as additive particles indicate alternatives. Note that focus is often also defined as indicating alternatives (Rooth, 1992) and thus is not different from contrast. On this view, additive particles do not evoke alternatives themselves, but operate on the alternatives evoked by the focus. Such an analysis does not work for a language like Avatime in which focus is not obligatorily marked and the additive particle can associate with elements that are not focused (see Section 5.1).

The narrow definition of contrast is proposed by Prince (1998). She claims that *"contrast is not a primitive notion but rather arises when alternate members of some salient set are evoked and, most importantly, when there is felt to be a salient opposition in what is predicated of them"* (290–291). This definition does not include additives and captures the observation that marking a topic as contrastive in English usually implies that what is predicated of it does not hold for an alternative[1]. For instance, if Peter and Pia are a salient set and example (4) is uttered (with a contrastive topic accent on *Peter* and a focus accent on *exhibition*), the listener can infer that Pia did not go to the exhibition.

(4) *Péter visited the exhibìtion.*

Repp (2010) also defines contrast in a more restricted way, noting that contrasted elements are somehow different or opposite. This narrow definition of contrast has in common with additives that next to

---

[1] This is also noted by Büring (2003) who treats it as a conversational implicature rather than part of the meaning of contrast.

indicating the presence of alternatives, there is a relation between what is predicated of these alternatives. In the case of additives, this relation is identity (see (1c)) and in the case of narrow contrast it is opposition.

3   Avatime

Avatime is a Kwa (Niger-Congo) language, belonging to the group of Ghana-Togo-Mountain languages. It is spoken by about 10,000 speakers in the South-East (Volta Region) of Ghana.

Like other Kwa languages, Avatime is a tone language. It has three level tones and one contour tone: low (marked `` ` ``), high (unmarked), extra-high (marked ´) and rising (marked ˇ).

Avatime is a noun-class language. It has seven genders, six of which consist of singular-plural pairings.[2] Noun-class/number is marked by a prefix on the noun.

Subject agreement prefixes on the verb are obligatory. In the absence of a lexical subject, they have a pronominal function. There is no object marking on the verb. Zero objects are possible but they seem to be mainly restricted to certain types of serial verb constructions.

Constituent order in Avatime is rigidly SVO. The only way to deviate from this order is by focus marking or left-dislocation. To mark an element for focus, it is placed in the focus position immediately preceding the subject and marked with an extra high tone on the final syllable (5). Focus marking is optional and seems to indicate contrastive focus. Left-dislocated elements precede focused ones and are repeated by a resumptive element (usually a pronoun) in the main clause (6). Left-dislocation is used to introduce referents into the discourse and may also indicate

---

[2] The noun classes are numbered 1–7, which means that each gender has its own number. This is different from the Bantu tradition, where noun classes can usually not be grouped into fixed singular-plural pairs and each different agreement pattern gets its own number.

topicality. However, most of the time topics do not receive any special marking in Avatime.

(5) *kị̀-bɔ̀ɛ́*   *bɛ-tá-kpɛ*   *kị́* *yɛ*
C_4S-money:FOC C_1P-INT-put.in give him
'They put [money]$_{FOC}$ in for him.' (conv-street_100720_1) [3]

(6) *lị̀-fịflị̀-nɛ*   *ɛ́ɛ́-sɔlì*   *lɛ*
C_3S-porridge-DEF C_1S.PROG-catch C_3S
'The porridge, he was catching it.' (kadzidzia_110406_QM)

4 Methods

This paper is based on data recorded in the village of Vane in the Avatime area. Over the course of several fieldtrips, I have collected a corpus of recordings of different genres of speech. For an initial investigation of the properties of the particle *tsyɛ*, a diversified corpus was used, consisting of 22 elicited and non-elicited narratives, interviews, procedural texts, official meetings and casual conversations. The overall annotated length of this corpus is 2 hours and 44 minutes. In this corpus, I found 195 instances of the particle *tsyɛ*.

For the analysis of the semantics of *tsyɛ*, I used a smaller corpus of narratives only. I made this choice because the use of the particle depends a lot on the common ground shared between interlocutors, and in narratives, this common ground is relatively well controlled: we can assume it consists only of what has been mentioned before in the narrative. The corpus of narratives consists of 13 recordings, with a total length of

---

[3] Each Avatime example in this paper is followed by a reference to the filename of the recording it appears in. These filenames start with a keyword describing their content and/or the genre, followed by the recording date in a yymmdd format, which may in turn be followed by the initials of the speakers who are recorded. All recordings can be found in the language archive at the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics.

one hour. The narratives are either folk tales or stories elicited by using pictures or video material. In all cases, a native listener was present. A total of 79 instances of the particle *tsyɛ* was found in this corpus.

5   The Particle *Tsyɛ*

In this section, I will discuss the distribution and semantics of the Ava-time additive particle *tsyɛ*, based on a corpus study. In Section 5.1, I describe the distribution of *tsyɛ*, based on my wide corpus of 195 instances. In Section 5.2, I present a preliminary analysis of the semantics of *tsyɛ*, based on my narrow corpus of 79 instances found in narratives. Finally, in Section 5.3 I discuss whether *tsyɛ* can be analyzed as an additive or contrastive particle, using the definitions given in Section 2.

5.1   Distribution

The particle *tsyɛ* always directly follows the added constituent. This can be seen in (7), where it associates with *banùvɔ̀wa* 'the children'.

(7)   *ɛ̀ɛ́-trɛ*   *rrr lɛ̆*   *ba-nùvɔ̀-wa*   ***tsyɛ*** *bɛ-sɛ̀*   *bɛ̀ɛ́-trɛ*
       C_1S.PROG-go ID   then C_1P-child-DEF ADD C_1P-leave C_1P.PROG-go
       'He was going and the children, too, left and were going.'
       (pear_100719_PhA-DQ)

The added constituent is usually a noun phrase, as in (7), but it may also be a predicate. Out of 195 instances of *tsyɛ*, 11 associate with a predicate. An example can be seen in (8), where the particle *tsyɛ* associates with the entire predicate *do gbe da ní ba litukpo* 'pray for them'.

(8)   *lɛ lósò kíà-zo-dí*   *ba kù-do*   *nu*
       so   1P.POT-REC-look C_1P C_5S-road opening
       'So we'll be looking forward to their coming.'

> *kíà-zo-do_gbè_da   ní   ba   li-tukpo   **tsyɛ***
> 1P.POT-REC-pray   LOC C_1P C_3S-head ADD
> 'We'll also be praying for them.' (avopa_100512_1-1)

When the added constituent is a noun phrase, it is usually a subject, as in (7). Out of 180 NPs marked by *tsyɛ*, 129 (72%) are subjects.

When the added constituent is not a subject, it is frequently left-dislocated (24 out of 51 non-subject NPs). An example can be seen in (9), where 'him', the object of the verb 'catch' is left-dislocated.

(9) [Two people have jumped down from a burning house and have been caught by firemen. The third person is initially afraid and refuses to jump. After a while the firemen come back to him.]

> *àblɔ́ɔ gì   kị̀-fụ̀-yɛ̀   ki-na   yɛ pɔ́=ɛ   a-bá-dị̀mɛ*
> now   REL C_4S-fire-DEF C_4S-reach C_1S finish=CM C_1S-VEN-agree
> 'Now that the fire had reached him, he agreed.'

> *a-yɔ...   yɛ   **tsyɛ,** bɛ́-sɔ́li   yɛ*
> C_1S-jump C_1S ADD C_1P-catch C_1S
> 'He jumped... Him too, they caught him.' (FinSto_100524_SO)

Non-subjects in canonical position only form 9% of the total number of NPs marked by *tsyɛ* (17 cases). An example can be seen in (10).

(10) *a-mɔ̀   li-we-lè*
    C_1S-see C_3S-sun-DEF
    'He saw the sun.'
    *a-mɔ̀   ɔ-dzị̀dzị̀-ɛ   **tsyɛ***
    C_1S-see C_1S-moon-DEF ADD
    'He saw the moon, too.' (famprob_110401_MeD-BeK_story)

These distributional facts indicate a problem with the analysis of *tsyɛ* as a focus particle. As I mentioned in Section 2.1, subjects and left-dislocated elements tend to be topics, whereas objects are typically in

focus. If *tsyɛ* only associated with focused constituents, we would not expect the observed bias for subjects and we would expect more examples like (10). The particle *tsyɛ* thus seems to have a preference for associating with topics, but may also associate with focused constituents. Note that the 'focused constituents' I am referring to are all unmarked cases of focus as in (10). There are no instances in my corpus of *tsyɛ* associating with an element overtly marked for focus.

5.2   Semantics

In the examples we have seen so far, it looks like *tsyɛ* conforms to the definition of additivity as given in (1). *Tsyɛ* associates with an element in the proposition (1a) and presupposes an alternative proposition (1b). So far, *tsyɛ* also seems to conform to (1c), as the alternative proposition has so far been identical to the expressed one, except for the added constituent. This last part of the definition will be called the 'identity requirement' in the remainder of this paper. In this section, I will show that this requirement does not hold for Avatime. In the corpus of narratives, there are 19 cases out of 79 in which there is no identity requirement.

We can thus not simply equate *tsyɛ* to German/English additive particles. How can it be defined, then? Do we simply remove the identity requirement from the definition, or can we change it to fit the Avatime data? My initial investigation suggests the latter option: *tsyɛ* does require a relation between the asserted proposition and its alternative, but rather than a relation of identity, this is one of similarity or compatibility.

Consider the third sentence in example (11). The added constituent is *Taga Kofi*, but there is no presupposition that a person other than Taga Kofi will go to the second house downtown. There is thus no identity requirement. There is a clear similarity between the two sentences though, as in both someone is going to a house to see what is being cooked there.

(11) *ńtekuma trɛ ní ke-pé kɛ́-ya mɛ ka-lị̌ kalaɛ*
ntekuma go LOC C$_6$S-house C$_6$S-PROX inside C$_6$S-be.at top
'Ntekuma, go to that house at the top.'

zɛ-di sị̀ egé bɛ-tá-tɔ́ na
IT-look COMP what C$_1$P-INT-cook Q
'Go and look what they are going to cook there.'

*wɔ taga kofí wɔ **tsyɛ** trɛ ní ke-pe bla mɛ ní*
2S taga kofi 2S ADD go LOC C$_6$S-house second inside LOC
kaba
down
'You, Taga Kofi, you in turn go to the second house downtown.'

di sị̀ kɔ egé bɛ-tá-tɔ́ na
look COMP then what C$_1$P-INT-cook Q
'Look what they are going to cook there.' (kadzidzia_110409_AB1)

Another example of similarity can be seen in (12). Here the particle *tsyɛ* indicates that something similar to 'standing beside the boy' holds for another topic. This is the case, even though it is not said overtly: it follows that if the dog is standing beside the boy, the boy must be standing beside the dog. The boy is thus the alternative topic and 'standing beside the dog' is sufficiently similar to 'standing beside the boy' to use the particle *tsyɛ*.

(12) *ɔ-nùvɔ-ɛ ɛ́ɛ́-kpɛ è-wù-la*
C$_1$S-child-DEF C$_1$S.PROG-put C$_3$P-clothes-DEF
'The child was putting on his clothes.'

ma-mɔ̀ sị̀ ɛ-lɛ-pɛ àkpɔ̀kplɔ-ɛ
1S-see COMP C$_1$S-IT-look.for frog-DEF
'I think he is going to look for the frog.'

*ka-drụ̀i-a **tsyɛ** ka-lɛ ní yɛ kapà*
C$_6$S-dog-DEF ADD C$_6$S-be LOC C$_1$S side
'The dog is standing beside him.' (frog_100719_DQ-PhA)

There are also cases where what is predicated about the two topics is not similar, but can be said to be compatible. In these examples, what is predicated of the two topics conforms to what is expected of them in a common type of situation. This can be seen in (13), where proposing and accepting form compatible parts of a common type of situation, in which each participant plays an expected role.

(13) *lĕ ó-nyime sì o e-ti   a-pɔnì   yɛ sì̀*
      and C₁S-man say o C₁S-follow C₁S-move.closer C₁S COMP
      yáà-gbanì   yɛ
      LOG.POT-marry C₁S
      'And the man said 'o'; he got close to her and said he would marry her.'

      ɔ́-dzɛ   tsyɛ ó-gbe   kóŋ lĕ a-dị̀mɛ   sì
      C₁S-woman ADD C₁S.NEG-refuse at.all and C₁S-agree COMP
      áà-ze nì   yɛ
      C₁S.POT-marry C₁S
      'The woman, in turn, did not refuse at all and she agreed to marry him.' (kadzidzia_110406_AuA)

In example (14), the 'common situation' is that of a struggle, in which one participant is trying to escape the other.

(14) [In the forest, Atrodze and Lulu want to eat leftover porridge at the location of a mysterious party. They are hungry, but Lulu wants to wait until the people have gone before going to take the porridge. Atrodze does not agree.]

      àtrodze e-tsyidzyì   sì   yí-ze-halì   lị̀-fịflị̀-nɛ
      Atrodze C₁S-impatient COMP LOG.SBJV-IT-collect C₃S-porridge-DEF
      'Atrodze was impatient to go and collect the porridge.'

      lulu tsyɛ e-vu   yɛ sì̀   ɔ-kí-trɛ
      Lulu ADD C₁S-hold C₁S COMP C₁S-PROH-go
      'Lulu was holding him so he would not go.' (kadzidzia_110406_QM)

Example (15) is perhaps a less obvious example of this use of *tsyɛ*. Here, the scenario is one of being away from home for a long time, in which it could be expected that your wife would forgive you and your children would grow up.

(15)   [After being in prison for a long time, a man returns home.]

    ye-dze   *á-kɔ*   *tsya*   *yɛ* *kɪ̣́lɛ* *gì* *a-bɪ̀tɛ* *petee*
    C_1S.POS-wife C_1S-take forgive C_1S how REL C_1S-do all
    'His wife forgave him everything he has done.'

    lóso ye-bie   **tsyɛ** *a-é-tsì*   *e-dzi*   *ɔ-yásɔwi*
    so C_1S.POS-child ADD C_1S-VEN-grow C_1S-become C_1S-young.man
    'His child, on his part, has grown up to become a young man.'
    (famprob_110401_MeD-BeK_story)

Out of the 19 cases of *tsyɛ* in which there is no identity requirement, five do not seem to be analyzable in terms of similarity or compatibility. In these cases, *tsyɛ* seems to be used as a mere topic-switch device (16).

(16)   *bɛ̀ɛ́-ŋà* *e-séwi-là*   *xé* *bɛ̀ɛ́-za*
    C_1P-eat C_3S-fruit-DEF and C_1P-pass
    'They (the children) were eating the fruit and were passing.'

    kɔ *ó-vì*   *wa* *liboeboe* *tsyɛ* *e-dì*   *wa* *dũũ*
    then C_1S.NEG-ask C_1P anything ADD[5] C_1S-look C_1P ID
    'And he did not even ask them anything, he just stared at them.'

    lɛ̆   *ba-nùvɔ̀-wa*   **tsyɛ** *bɛ́-sɛ́*   *lɛ̆*   *yɛ* **tsyɛ** *a-kɔ̀*
    then C_1P-child-DEF ADD C_1P-leave then C_1S ADD C_1S-take
    dɔ̀mɛ *kpɛ* *ní*   *kà-sɔ-ya*   *mɛ̀*
    thing put LOC C_6S-basket-DEF inside
    'And the children left and then he put the things into the basket.'
    (pear_100719_PhA-DQ)

---

[5] The additive particle can also have a scalar meaning, as in this example.

Interestingly, all these five cases were produced in the same text, by the same speaker. Perhaps for this speaker, the semantics of *tsyɛ* has bleached, losing the similarity / compatibility requirement and keeping only the aspect of indicating an alternative topic.

All in all, in this section we have seen that in 25% of its occurrences, *tsyɛ* does not come with an identity requirement. In most of these cases, *tsyɛ* seems to come with a more general requirement of similarity or compatibility between the expressed proposition and its alternative.

This is of course only a first approximation of the possible semantics of *tsyɛ*. A corpus study clearly has its limits for this kind of research, as it shows only where *tsyɛ* is found and not where it cannot be used. A more controlled study of the use of *tsyɛ* in different kinds of contexts, including information on when it cannot be used, would be necessary to draw firmer conclusions. Nevertheless, the data above does show a pattern in the use of *tsyɛ* and it clearly shows that the identity requirement used to describe English/German additive particles is insufficient to account for the use of the Avatime additive particle.

5.3   Additive or contrastive?

In this section I discuss whether the semantics of the particle *tsyɛ* can be captured using the notions of additivity and contrast as described in Section 2. In the previous section, I already mentioned that the usual notion of additivity, including an identity requirement, does not adequately capture the meaning of *tsyɛ*. However, there is one way in which the identity requirement could possibly be upheld, which is to assume that *tsyɛ* may associate with the entire sentence. If the entire sentence is the added constituent, it does not have to be identical to anything in the presupposition. This can account for English cases like (17). The particle *also* associates with the entire last sentence and connects it to the previ-

ous sentence. On a higher level, there is some kind of identity between the two sentences, as both refer to consequences of what is described in the first sentence: the bad state of the economy.

(17)   *The economy in the USA is going through rough times these days. Banks are struggling and the value of homes is rising. **Also**, many employees are being laid off.* (example found on an internet forum: http://forum.wordreference.com/showthread.php?t=1337878)

However, I would like to argue that the Avatime examples in the previous section do not involve the association of *tsyɛ* with the entire sentence. Firstly, unlike English additive particles, *tsyɛ* has a fixed position with respect to the added constituent: it directly follows it. If we want to analyze examples (11–16) as involving the entire sentence as the added constituent, we would have to stipulate an additional rule that *tsyɛ* may associate with the entire sentence, perhaps whenever it follows a sentence-initial element. This is not very elegant, because *tsyɛ* normally associates with preceding rather than following material (unlike English *also*). In fact, as I showed in Section 5.1, there are cases in which *tsyɛ* associates with the entire predicate (8). In these cases, *tsyɛ* occurs sentence-finally. We might thus expect that *tsyɛ* would also occur sentence-finally if it associated with the entire sentence. Secondly, proposing association with the entire sentence fails to explain the relation of similarity or compatibility between the part of the sentence not marked by *tsyɛ* and its alternative. Instead, we would expect identity on a 'higher level' as in (17), which we do not find. The particle *tsyɛ* is thus better analyzed as always associating with the immediately preceding constituent.

As *tsyɛ* cannot be defined as additive, can it perhaps be analyzed as contrastive? If contrast is defined in the narrow sense, as explained in Section 2.3, the answer is no. The Avatime particle *tsyɛ* does not indicate

an opposition between the element it associates with and an alternative. There are in fact other Avatime particles which have exactly this function, the most frequent of which is *kɔ*. An example can be seen in (18), where what is predicated about *Atrodze* is opposite to what is predicated about its alternative, the old man.

(18)   *o kílɛ gì agì ɔ-kàtsie   xunyɔ e-tsée xé ɔ̀-fɔɛfɔɛ-nɔ̀*
       oh how REL ? C_1S-old.man CTR2 C_1S-die and C_2S-spirit-DEF
       e-dó   yɛ mɛ̀
       C_2S-move.out:LOC C_1S inside
       'Oh, how the old man died and his spirit left him.'

       *kɔ àtrodze **kɔ**   ɔ-í-tse*
       so atrodze CTR1 C_1S-NEG-die
       'As for Atrodze, he didn't die.' (kadzidzia_110406_QM)

The particle *tsyɛ* does express contrast in the broad sense, as it indicates the presence of alternatives. However, the broad notion of contrast is not specific enough to define the semantics of *tsyɛ*. Firstly, it also includes narrowly contrastive particles such as *kɔ* and secondly, it does not capture the relation of similarity/compatibility between propositions that *tsyɛ* also expresses. The particle *tsyɛ* thus needs its own definition. Its meaning is in some sense in between additivity in the traditional sense and narrow contrast. As I mentioned in Section 2.3, both the notions of additivity and contrast in the narrow sense presuppose an alternative proposition and specify a relation between the expressed and presupposed propositions. In the case of additive particles of the English/German type, this relation is one of identity and in the case of narrow contrast, this relation is one of opposition. The Avatime additive particle adds another possibility to these relations in requiring the alternative propositions to be similar or compatible.

6   Conclusion and Discussion

In this paper I have investigated the semantics and use of the Avatime additive particle *tsyɛ*. The two most important findings are (i) that *tsyɛ* is not a focus particle, but can associate with either topical or focused elements and (ii) that *tsyɛ* does not necessarily indicate that the presupposed proposition is identical to the expressed one (without the added constituent). Instead of this 'identity requirement', there seems to be a more general constraint requiring the presupposed proposition to be similar to or compatible with the expressed one.

There are of course limitations to the corpus studies presented in this paper and these yield questions for further research. The main unclarity is the exact nature of the relation between the expressed proposition containing *tsyɛ* and the alternative proposition. 'Similarity or compatibility' is not a very satisfying definition and preferably one concept that encompasses both would be found. It is also not clear where the boundaries on the use of *tsyɛ* are. In which contexts is it infelicitous to use *tsyɛ*? This question can only be answered using elicitation methods and so must remain the topic of a future study.

Nevertheless, the findings presented here are important, as they show that even particles that seem to have rather straightforward functions can differ widely crosslinguistically. There is no concept, proposed in theoretical or typological work, that exactly maps onto the Avatime particle *tsyɛ*. The notions of additivity and contrast are relevant in describing the semantics of *tsyɛ*, but a more detailed, language-specific definition is needed to adequately define it.

Abbreviations

1	first person	NEG	negative
2	second person	P	plural
ADD	additive	POS	possessive
C_{number}	noun class	POT	potential
CM	clause marker	PROG	progressive
COMP	complementizer	PROH	prohibitive
CTR	contrastive	PROX	proximal demonstrative
DEF	definite	Q	question particle
FOC	focus	REC	recurrent
ID	ideophone	REL	relative
INT	intentive	S	singular
IT	itive	SBJV	subjunctive
LOC	locative	VEN	ventive
LOG	logophoric		

References

Ameka, Felix K. 2010. Information packaging constructions in Kwa: Micro-variation and typology. *Topics in Kwa syntax*, volume 78 of *Studies in natural language and linguistic theory*, ed. by Aboh, Enoch O. and James Essegbey, 141–176, Dordrecht: Springer.

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

Chafe, Wallace L. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. *Subject and topic,* ed. by Li, Charles N., 27–55, New York: Academic Press.

Dimroth, Christine. 2002. Topics, assertions, and additive words: how L2 learners get from information structure to target-language syntax. *Linguistics* 40(4): 891–923.

Fiedler, Ines. 2009. Contrastive topic marking in Gbe. *Current issues in unity and diversity of languages. Collection of papers selected from the CIL 18, held at Korea University in Seoul, on July 21-28, 2008*, 295–308, Seoul: The Linguistic Society of Korea.

Gundel, Jeanette K. 1988. Universals of topic-comment structure. *Studies in syntactic typology*, ed. by Hammond, Michael; Edith Moravcsik and Jessica Wirth, 209–239, Amsterdam: Benjamins.

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

Krifka, Manfred. 1999. Additive particles under stress. *Proceedings of SALT 8*, ed. by Strolovitch, Devon and Aaron Lawson, 111–128, Cornell: CLC Publications.

Krifka, Manfred. 2007. Basic notions of information structure. *Interdisciplinary studies on information structure* 6: 13–55.

Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form: topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents.*, volume 71 of *Cambridge Studies in Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Prince, Ellen F. 1998. On the limits of syntax, with reference to left-dislocation and topicalization. *The Limits of Syntax*, volume 29 of *Syntax and Semantics*, ed. by Culicover, Peter and Louise McNally, 281–302, San Diego, Cal.: Academic Press.

Reinhart, Tanya. 1981. Pragmatics and linguistics: an analysis of sentence topics. *Philosophica* 27: 53–94.

Repp, Sophie. 2010. Defining 'contrast' as an information-structural notion in grammar. *Lingua* 120: 1333–1345.

Roberts, Craige. 1996. Information structure: Towards an integrated formal theory of pragmatics. *Papers in Semantics*, volume 49 of *OSU Working Papers in Linguistics*, ed. by Yoon, Yae Hak and Andreas Kathol, 91–136, Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Department of Linguistics.

Rooth, Mats. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1: 75–116.

Vallduví, Enric and Maria Vilkuna. 1998. On rheme and kontrast. *The limits of syntax*, volume 29 of *Syntax and semantics*, ed. by Culicover, Peter and Louise McNally, 79–108, San Diego, Cal.: Academic Press.

Saskia van Putten
Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics
Wundtlaan 1
6525 XD Nijmegen
The Netherlands
saskia.vanputten@mpi.nl