Toward a typology for additive markers

Diana Forker [*]

University of Bamberg, General Linguistics, Obere Karolinenstr. 8, 96049 Bamberg, Germany

Abstract

This study represents a typological investigation of additive markers that correspond to English *too*, *also*, and *as well*. It is cross-linguistically common for additives to fulfill a wide range of functions including, among others, scalar additivity, the marking of concessive clauses, indefinite pronouns, association with contrastive topics, and constituent coordination. Based on data from 42 languages from all over the world this paper proposes a list of functions that are commonly expressed by additives and provides explanations for how and why these functions relate to each other. The distribution of these functions and their connections are then interpreted by means of categorical and distance-based semantic maps.
© 2016 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Additive; Scalarity; Contrast; Semantic maps; Typology

1. Introduction

With the term ADDITIVE I refer to linguistic items that are commonly referred to as focus-sensitive operators indicating existential quantification over alternatives with respect to the material contained in the scope and the inclusion of some alternatives as possible values for the open proposition in their scope (see e.g. König, 1991:33). Well-known English additives are *too*, *also*, and *as well*. In addition, in many languages additives serve also a broad range of other functions. The following examples from Abui, a Papuan language spoken on Alor Island in eastern Indonesia, are illustrative. The additive *bai* is translated with 'as well' in (1a), with 'even' in (1b); in combination with the negative marker *naha* it is responsible for the negative indefinite in (1c), and for the free-choice indefinite in (1d).

(1)   a.   Abui

       a   tanga   nu,   oro nu   **bai**   da-moi-d-a

       2SG speak.CNT SPEC DST SPEC ADD[1] 3.PAT-sound-hold-DUR

       'When you speak, let it be heard (lit. 'sound') over there as well.' ([Kratochvíl, 2007](#):269)

    b.   ni   nu-naha-d-i-a   **bai** ba,   ri   ko

       1PL.EXCL 1PL.EXCL.RECIP-be.not-hold-PFV-DUR ADD say 2PL soon

       ri-i   we   ri-i   me

       2PL.LOC-put leave 2PL.LOC-put come

       'Even when we are no longer, you will have to visit.' ([Kratochvíl, 2007](#):317)

    c.   ama   nuku **bai** siei   naha

       person one   ADD come.down.ICP NEG

       'Nobody (lit. not one man) came down.' ([Kratochvíl, 2007](#):269)

    d.   Dori kang   **bai**=se   anu=ng   yaa

       Dori be.good ADD=ICP.INCH market=see go

       'Whenever Dori can, she goes to the market.' ([Kratochvíl, 2007](#):282)

In the linguistic literature, additives, which are frequently called *focus particles* or *focus-sensitive particles*, have been widely discussed for English and some other European languages, and occasionally for non-European languages. However, all the studies up to now have either been conducted within a formal framework, overlooking the multifunctionality while focusing only on some aspects of the meaning and explaining those with the mechanisms of formal semantics, or the investigations are rather descriptive in nature, mentioning the various functions without providing a convincing explanation for why those functions should be covered by the same lexical item.

This study represents a cross-linguistic investigation of additives based on data from 42 languages of 17 languages families and two isolates from all over the world. On the basis of descriptions, grammars and text collections of these languages, I propose a list of functions that are commonly expressed by additives. While exploring the range of these functions, I also provide explanations for how and why these functions relate to each other. I then come up with semantic maps for the functions that show which of them are frequently covered by additives and can thus be said to belong to the semantic core of these particles and which are rather marginal.

The structure of the paper is as follows: section 2 provides an overview of the literature and outlines the cross-linguistic core functions of additives as well as their most important morphosyntactic properties. Section 3 describes each function in detail, illustrating it with examples and analyzing its semantic similarities with the other core functions. In some languages additional functions are attested that will be briefly touched upon at the end of this section. In section 4 I present and discuss two distinct types of semantic maps for additives, a categorical map with lines connecting the functions and a distance-based map integrating frequency. Section 5 contains the conclusion. Appendix includes a list of the languages and a table with the data and the references that have been used for this paper.

2. Additives

Additives in European languages have been a rather popular topic of investigation in semantics, pragmatics, philosophy, and related disciplines. A vast amount of literature centers on English *too* (e.g. [Kaplan, 1984; van der Sandt and Geurts, 2001; Rullmann, 2003; Winterstein and Zeevat, 2012](#)) and the scalar additive *even* (e.g. [Kay, 1990; Franscescotti, 1995; Kalerikos, 1995; Wilkinson, 1996; Giannakidou, 2007](#)). A considerable number of studies have been published that analyze additives in other European languages such as German (e.g. [Reis and Rosengren, 1997; Krifka, 1999; Dimroth, 2002; Sudhoff, 2010; Umbach, 2012](#)), Dutch ([Hoeksema, 2002](#)), Greek ([Giannakidou, 2007](#)), Finnish ([Karttunen, 1975](#), [Karttunen and Karttunen, 1976](#)), or French ([Winterstein, 2010](#)). Furthermore, there are also some investigations of (scalar) additives in individual non-European languages, such as Amharic ([Demeke and Meyer, 2008](#)), Malay ([Goddard, 2001](#)), Karbi ([Konnerth, 2012](#)), Avatime ([van Putten, 2013](#)), Ishkashimi ([Karvovskaya, 2013](#)), Turkish ([Kerslake, 1996; Göksel and Özsoy, 2003](#)), Persian ([Stilo, 2004](#)), Central Kurdish ([Öpengin, 2013](#)), Tamil ([Arunachalam and Sundaresan, 2004](#)) and other Dravidian languages ([Emeneau, 1980](#)), Nakh-Daghestanian languages ([van den Berg, 2004; Nichols and Peterson, 2010; Daniel, 2013](#)), Mandarin Chinese ([Huijuan, 2009; Hole, 2004](#)), Japanese ([Shudo, 2002; Matsuoka et al., 2006; Nakanishi, 2006; Kobuchi-Philip, 2009](#)), Vietnamese ([Hole, 2013](#)), and Hindi ([Dayal, 1995; Lahiri, 1998; Schwenter and Vasishth, 2000](#)).

---

[1] Despite their diverse functions, I will use the glossing ADD throughout the paper in order to facilitate the identification of the additives.