

***Chyba* as a discourse particle and its licensing conditions in Polish adverbial clauses**

Łukasz Jędrzejowski (University of Cologne, Germany)
l.jedrzejowski@uni-koeln.de

Introduction In this talk, I will examine the Polish discourse particle (= DiscPart) *chyba* (≈ 'presumably') at the syntax-semantics interface and its licensing conditions, mainly in different types of adverbial clauses. The main focus of this talk is threefold. First, I provide evidence that *chyba* as a DiscPart is restricted to assertive speech acts and account for where this restriction comes from. Second, I illustrate to what extent *chyba* can be licensed in embedded environments and argue that the (im-)possibility of licensing *chyba* in selected embedded clauses follows from their internal syntax (cf. Haegeman 2006, 2012). Third, based on two selected types of adverbial clauses (purpose clauses vs. mirative-prospective clauses), I offer a novel analysis of *chyba*, claiming that the incompatibility of *chyba* with mirative-prospective clauses follows from the compositionality of both *chyba* and of the adverbial clause type.

Phenomenon I Consider the example in [1], illustrating the use of *chyba* in a declarative clause:

- [1] *Chyba wymyśliłeś tę regułę na własny użytek.*
chyba conceive.I-PTCP this rule.ACC on own purpose
'You conceived this rule for your own purpose, I think.' (FP, p. 243)

Using *chyba*, the speaker establishes a particular common ground relationship among discourse interlocutors. Concretely, the speaker indicates that her/his commitment is speculative. Accordingly, I analyze *chyba* as a modifier of assertive speech acts, contributing to a weaker commitment of the speaker to the proposition (cf. Zimmermann 2004):

- [2] Meaning of *chyba*(p):
[[*chyba* p]] = $\overset{f^v}{\text{assume}}(x,p)$, whereby x = speaker

It is ruled out in information-seeking questions as well as in imperatives:

- [3] *Wymyśliłeś *chyba tę regułę na własny użytek?*
[4] *Wymyśl *chyba tę regułę na własny użytek!*

As neither questions nor imperatives involve any speculative attitude towards what is embedded, *chyba* is excluded in [3] and [4]. [3] is well-formed as soon as it is analyzed as a rhetorical question. Though, this exception does not weaken the claim that *chyba* cannot occur in questions in general, as rhetorical questions have the structure of a question but the illocutionary force of an assertion (cf. Stalnaker 1978, Krifka 1995).

Phenomenon II Compare the sentences given in [2] and [3]:

- [5] *A tu ktoś wybił dziurę w ścianie,*
and here someone stave.in.I-PTCP.3SG.M hole.ACC in wall.LOC
żeby chyba mieć podgląd co my tu mamy.
COMP chyba have.INF preview.ACC what we here have.1PL

'And here someone made a hole in the wall, presumably to be able to see what we have here.' (NKJP, *Dziennik Polski*, 26/11/1999)

- [6] *Kupiłem parasol, żeby i tak go *chyba nie użyć.*
buy.I-PTCP.1SG.M umbrella.ACC COMP and so him.ACC chyba NEG use.INF
'I bought an umbrella *presumably only not to use it anyway.'

In both cases, the dependent clause is headed by the complementizer *żeby* ('that' + conditional clitic) containing a bare infinitive, *mieć* 'have' in [5] and *użyć* 'use' in [6]. Both clauses differ in meaning though. While in [5] the embedded clause is analyzed as a purpose clause (= PC) (cf. Schmidtke-Bode 2009), its counterpart in [6] has been referred to in the literature as a prospective clause. According to Leys (1988), the relationship between the main and subordinate clause in [6] is not a purposive one; instead it is deemed to be a chronological one (= prospective). Additionally, based on DeLancey (1997), I also adopt a second term with regard to the embedded clause in [6], viz. *mirative* marking information which is surprising/unexpected to the speaker. In what follows, I dub such examples mirative-prospective clauses (= MPC).

Analysis The received wisdom has it that adverbial clauses can be divided into three main groups: (i) central adverbial clauses (= CACs), (ii) peripheral adverbial clauses (= PACs), and non-integrated adverbial clauses (= NACs) (cf. Haegeman 2006, 2010 for English and Frey 2011, 2012 for German). Whereas CACs are taken to be merged with the IP- (English) or VP-domain (German) of the associated matrix clause and thus depend on its illocutionary force, PACs are claimed to possess their own illocutionary potential and be merged with the associated matrix CP. NACs, in turn, are deemed to be independent speech acts connected with the matrix clause in a pragmatic way. Keeping this division in mind, PCs have been analyzed as CACs, while MPCs, according to Pauly (2013, 2014), have a NAC status. I disagree with both views and provide empirical evidence showing that whereas PCs should be analyzed as PACs, MPCs are CACs. First, I show that PCs exhibit no restrictions with respect to any movement to the left periphery of the matrix clause, while MPCs are restricted to their base position, i.e. to the VP-domain of the host clause. Contrary to Pauly (2013, 2014), I assume MPCs to be dependent on the matrix clause to such an extent that any kind of movement to a higher position from information-structural reasons (e.g. via topicalization) is prohibited. Second, contrary to Frey (2012) and Jacobs (2018), I argue that while PCs can host DiscParts, e.g. *chyba* (cf. [5]), their occurrence in MPCs is disallowed, cf. [6]. This straightforwardly follows from the analysis proposed here: If MPCs are CACs and thus exhibit a strong dependency relationship with their matrix clause depending on their illocutionary force, there is no possibility to license speaker-oriented DiscParts, e.g. *chyba*. Diachronically, MPCs developed out of PCs. In order to reanalyze the development of MPCs, distinct features in the clause that contribute to evoking a mirative-prospective interpretation are needed. Correspondingly, I postulate: a) intentionality, b) target-directedness, and c) hypothetical result state. As for PCs, the matrix verbal situation is performed with the intention of bringing about another situation, that of the purpose. No such intentionality can be observed with regard to MPCs. They rather express a sequence of two events, whereby the following event appears to be surprising/unexpected. PCs are always target-oriented. MPCs, in turn, lack this property altogether. In addition, as for PCs there is no necessity for the desired result to come about, as not every intention is successfully realized by action. MPCs, on the other hand, presuppose the veridicality of the embedded proposition by action. This accounts for why *chyba* is illicit in [6]: The derivation crashes because the contribution of *chyba* (= speaker's uncertainty) and the truth value of MPCs (= 1) conflict with each other. PCs, in turn, do not presuppose any truth value of the embedded clause (= hypothetical result state). Hence, no mismatch arises. I assume the loss of intentionality to have paved the way for the possibility of embedding surprising/unexpected situations. This change entailed a syntactic recategorization, turning PACs into CACs and, simultaneously, leading to a change of the merge height of attached clauses themselves.

Selected references S. DeLancey (1997): Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information, in: *Linguistic Typology* 1(1): 33-52. L. Haegeman (2010): The internal syntax of adverbial clauses, in: *Lingua* 120(3): 628-648. K. Schmidtke-Bode (2009): *A Typology of Purpose Clauses*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.