DP-INTERNAL MODAL PARTICLES: A CASE STUDY OF GERMAN *JA**

Andreas Trotzke

Abstract. In this paper, I investigate the DP-internal occurrence of the German modal particle *ja*. I first demonstrate what kind of attributive configurations seem to prefer the presence of the particle *ja* inside the DP domain. In this context, I focus on the occurrence of particles within simple-adjective configurations and examine the roles of restrictive and so-called extreme content. I demonstrate that the DP-internal occurrence of modal particles cannot be analyzed analogous to the occurrence of modal particles in other attributive constructions such as certain types of relative clauses. Given this demonstration, I sketch a fine-grained syntactic representation of DP-internal particles, and I point out parallels to the functional makeup of CPs.

1. Introduction

Modal particles are richly attested in Germanic, Slavic, and South East Asian languages (Bayer & Obenauer 2011; Biberauer, Haegeman & van Kemenade 2014). It is controversial whether modal particles are functionally and/or lexically articulated in Romance (Bayer, Hinterhölzl & Trotzke 2015). At the level of pragmatics, modal particles organize the discourse by conveying the epistemic states of both the speaker and the hearer (Zimmermann 2011). Given that in the prominent framework of cartographic syntax the organization of the discourse is encoded in the CP domain of the clause (Rizzi 2014), it is an interesting observation that certain German modal particles, e.g., *wohl* (lit. 'well') or *ja* (lit. 'yes'), can occur within complex DPs, as shown in (1).[1]

(Thurmair 1989:27)

(1) a. dieser ja leider   viel   zu   früh   verstorbene
      this   JA unfortunately much too soon departed
      Komponist
      composer

---

[1] It is unclear whether this is an idiosyncratic property of German. Other languages that have a rich inventory of modal particles, for instance Bangla, do not license DP-internal modal particles (Josef Bayer, Rajat Ghosh p.c.). However, Coniglio (2011: 82) gives examples from Italian.

(Zimmermann 2008:224)

 b. das wohl beste Restaurant von Berlin
  the WOHL best restaurant of Berlin

Examples such as in (1) are mentioned only casually in the literature. However, if the phenomenon is mentioned, the examples almost always contain adverbial modifications such as *leider viel zu früh* (1a) or superlatives such as *beste* (1b).[2] As already said, there are only very few studies that cite DP-internal examples, and the differences in acceptability in the cited cases are notoriously subtle. The only more recent study I am aware of that tries to approach this topic empirically is Viesel (2015). Viesel (2015) provides corpus evidence from the DWDS corpus ('Digital Dictionary of the German Language') suggesting that adverbial modification in general improves the acceptability of DP-internal particles; that is, APs containing particles are mostly structurally complex in her corpus. Interestingly, Viesel (2015:425) states that co-occurrence of modal particles with simple adjectives is fine if the adjectives receive a narrow focus interpretation in the discourse situations she found in her corpus.

 Given this general data situation and given additional complications due to the heterogeneity of the class of modal particles, (i) I adopt the common strategy to single out an individual particle (here: *ja*) as a case study, and (ii) I illustrate core properties for this case only in contexts where the particle occurs with a simple adjective as in (1b). As for the more complex cases, I concur with Viesel (2015:425) who speculates that "the reasons [for the frequency of co-occurrence of particles with more complex APs] are unclear and could be of structural or pragmatic nature, e.g., to prevent a simple attributive reading by enforcing a clausal/predicational structure or to maximize activation."

 The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, I examine what kind of attributive structures modal particles seem to prefer within the DP. In particular, in Section 2.1, I investigate the role of so-called extreme content in this context. In Section 2.2, I discuss whether the DP-internal occurrence of modal particles can be characterized analogous to the occurrence of modal particles in other attributive constructions such as certain types of relative clauses. In Section 3, I turn to the issue of what modal particles reveal about the internal fine-grained structure of DPs and APs, respectively, and about parallels to the functional makeup of CPs. Section 4 summarizes and concludes the paper.

---

[2] Zimmermann (2004:29) hypothesizes that these are the preferred contexts for DP-internal modal particles.

2. DP-internal modal particles and attributive constructions

When we start to investigate modal particles inside the DP domain, we first observe that only DPs containing an adjectival modifier license the presence of modal particles, as demonstrated in (2).

(2) a. *Sie trägt [ihre ja Schuhe].
     she wears her JA shoes
     'She is wearing her shoes.'
   b. Sie trägt [ihre ja umwerfenden Schuhe].
     she wears her JA gorgeous   shoes
     'She is wearing her gorgeous shoes.'

We can thus see that modal particles cannot directly modify an NP. Accordingly, claims that relate the phenomenon of DP-internal particles to the issue of whether DPs are phases in the sense of Chomsky (2008) are misguided (see Zimmermann 2004 for such a claim). If at all relevant for the issue at hand, one would have to discuss the phasehood of APs.

   The second observation is that modal particles can only occur in DPs where the adjective, according to many approaches (e.g., Kayne 1994: ch. 8), originates in a reduced relative clause which is itself a complement of D^0 (3). In other words, modal particles are not licensed in constructions containing non-intersective adjectives ((4); direct modification adjectives according to Cinque 2010, 2014).

(3) a. [$_{DP}$ ihre [$_{CP}$ [$_{AP}$ umwerfenden]$_i$ C^0 [$_{IP}$ [$_{DP}$ Schuhe] ... t$_i$]]]
       her   gorgeous   shoes
   b. Ihre Schuhe, die   umwerfend sind, [...]
     her shoes   which gorgeous   are

(4) a. *[$_{DP}$ ihre ja ehemaligen Schuhe]
         her JA former   shoes
   b. *Ihre Schuhe, die   ehemalig sind [...]
     her shoes   which former   are

In Section 2.2, I will discuss the parallels between DP-internal modal particles and the occurrence of particles in relative clauses. But before turning to this issue, we should first focus in more detail on the type of adjectives that are preferably used in simple-adjective configurations containing modal particles.

2.1. DP-internal particles and extreme content

When we turn to the connection between attributive elements and the presence of e.g. *ja* in adnominal modification in more detail, we already mentioned in Section 1 that DP-internal modal particles are preferred in

examples containing degree expressions such as superlatives. This tendency is also reflected in (5).

(5) a. ??Sie trägt [ihre ja schwarzen Schuhe].
      she wears her JA black   shoes
      'She is wearing her black shoes.'
    b. ?Sie trägt [ihre ja schönen Schuhe]
      she wears her JA pretty   shoes
      'She is wearing her pretty shoes.'
    c. Sie trägt [ihre ja umwerfenden Schuhe].
      she wears her JA gorgeous   shoes
      'She is wearing her gorgeous shoes.'

Let us look at (5c) in more detail and turn to diagnostics from adjectival semantics. As for adjectives such as *umwerfend*, it has been argued that certain degree modifiers do only occur with adjectives that can be analyzed as conveying so-called 'extreme' content. This is shown by the contrast given in (6).

(Morzycki 2012:568)

(6) a. Your shoes are {downright, positively} {gigantic, gorgeous}
    b. ??Your shoes are {downright, positively} {big, pretty}

We see that an adjective like *gorgeous* is lexically extreme and thus can combine with, e.g., *downright* very naturally. Crucially, these adjectives resist an additional modification by *sehr* ('very'), cf. *very gorgeous or, in German, *sehr umwerfend. Often, this class of adjectives is characterized as 'implicit superlatives' (Cruse 1986). Given what we discussed above in the context of DP-internal modal particles, this characterization dovetails nicely with the observation in the literature (see Zimmermann 2004, 2008) that DP-internal modal particles sound very natural with superlatives (cf. example (1b) above). I will come back to the semantics of these extreme expressions below, but for now it suffices to point out that their denotation involves a highest value on a given scale and that this specific degree component makes them particularly suitable for co-occurring with the particle *ja* in one of its particular readings.

Specifically, the use of *ja* in cases such as *umwerfend* seems to be related to a subtype of the particle *ja* that has been called "emphatische[s] *ja* der Steigerung" ('emphatic *ja* of intensification'; Burkhardt 1982:357). This type often occurs in combination with *gar/sogar* ('even'), cf. corpus examples from Kwon (2005:31–32):

(7) Die Organisation rechnet auch mit dem Eintritt der
    the organization reckons also with the entry   of.the
       Schweizer, Holländer, Briten, Belgier, Franzosen, ja gar
       Swiss   Dutch   British Belgians French   JA even

    der   Kanadier.
    the   Canadians
'The organization also reckons that the Swiss, the Dutch, the
British, the Belgians, the French, even the Canadians will join.'
(TAZ, 09/19/1995, 19)

If occurring with adjectival attributes, however, the semantics of the
particle clearly involves the 'as you know' component that is distinctive
of the German modal particle *ja* (e.g., Kratzer 1999), cf. the following
corpus example from Kwon (2005:32):

(8) Ihre praktische Politik hat keine Achse, sie ist widersprüchlich,
    their practical   policy has no   axis,   it is contradictory
     ja hoffnungslos.
     JA hopeless
    'Their practical policy has no orientation; it is contradictory,
    hopeless.'
    (TAZ, 10/17/1995, 4)

In (8), the particle *ja* expresses that the denoted property 'hopeless' is
undoubtedly true with respect to its validity. As Burkhardt (1982:357) puts
it, 'the intensifying *ja* reasserts the things already said in order to further
reaffirm them by adding what follows. The intensifying *ja* affirms, it
confirms both the preceding and the following material in an enumeration;
it is thus a speech act particle performing an illocutionary act.'[3]

    In the following section, I will show that this subtype of *ja* can not only
be used in contexts featuring superlatives or 'implicit' superlatives (i.e.,
extreme expressions). Rather, it can also be used with various kinds of
simple adjectives as long as the adjectives receive a clearly restrictive
interpretation.

2.2. *DP-internal particles and restrictiveness*

Given the observations above, one could argue that structures containing
modal particles at the level of DP should be analyzed analogous to
relative clauses at the level of CP.

    It is generally claimed that modal particles can occur in certain types of
relative clauses (Coniglio 2011; Potts 2005), namely in appositive, i.e.
non-restrictive, relative clauses, but not in restrictive ones (see Heringa
2012 for an overview of the syntactic representation of appositions in
general). To see this, let us look at the following examples.

---

[3] Translated; original German text: "Das steigernde *ja* hält gewissermaßen das schon
Gesagte bestätigend fest, um es schließlich durch das noch Folgende bekräftigen zu können.
Das steigernde *ja* bejaht, ja es bekräftigt sowohl den vor ihm als auch den nach ihm
stehenden Teil einer Aufzählung und ist so eine ‚illokutionsvollziehende Sprechhand-
lungspartikel'."

(9) Was für eine Kollegin wird kommen?
'What kind of colleague will come?'
Eine Kollegin, die (*ja) in Syracuse wohnt, wird kommen.
a colleague who JA in Syracuse lives will come
'A colleague who lives in Syracuse will come.'

(10) *Die Firma sucht einen Angestellten, der ja immer
the company looks.for an employee who JA always
pünktlich ist.
punctual is
'The company is looking for an employee who is always punctual.'

In this respect, modal particles pattern with discourse- or speaker-oriented adverbs such as *frankly* (11), suggesting that these elements rely on the same illocutionary independence of appositive relative clauses (see Ernst 2009 for an account of adverbial modification at the level of utterance meaning).

(11) a. *The boys [that have frankly lost their case] should give up.
    b. The boys, [who have frankly lost their case], should give up.

We see that, in some cases, the occurrence of modal particles in relative clauses even forces an appositive interpretation. Compare (12a) to its unambiguous counterpart in (12b):

(12) a. Autos, die laut sind, sollten mit einer geschlossenen
    cars which loud are should with a closed
    Motorkapsel versehen werden.
    motor.capsule equipped become
    'Cars(,) which are loud(,) should be equipped with a closed motor capsule.'
    b. Autos, die ja laut sind, sollten [. . .]
    'Cars, which are loud, should [. . .]' (= All cars are generally loud.)

However, some qualification is in order.[4] First, although modal particles may be more frequent in appositive relative clauses, there is evidence suggesting that other factors play a role, such as the semantic content of *ja*, which serves to reactivate common ground information and is therefore inappropriate in its environment in (9). Consider (13), where

---

[4] In addition to what follows, I should also point out that there is no real consensus in the syntactic literature concerning valid criteria to distinguish between restrictive and appositive relative clauses (Holler 2013). Likewise, we find diverging approaches in pragmatics. Potts (2005) claims that the contribution of appositive relative clauses can be analyzed in terms of conventional implicatures. Chierchia & McConnell-Ginet (1991) and Holler (2005), on the other hand, characterize appositive clauses as background assertions.

the modal particle *wohl* simply expresses some uncertainty on the part of the speaker:

(13) Was für eine Kollegin wird kommen?
  'What kind of colleague will come?'
  Eine Kollegin, die wohl   in Syracuse wohnt, wird kommen.
  a   colleague who WOHL in Syracuse lives   will   come
  'A colleague who lives in Syracuse will come.'

We thus see that different particles behave differently regarding their occurrence in relative clauses. Let us now turn to DP-internal contexts again.

   Consider first nominal phrases that do not license non-restrictive APs. Here, we observe that restrictive relative clauses pattern with restrictive prenominal attributes in not allowing the presence of the modal particle *ja*:

(Jacobs 1991:156)

(14) a. ??Vorwürfe, die ja schon oft   erhoben worden sind,
       reproaches that JA already often made   been   are
         hat she repeated
         has sie wiederholt.
      'She repeated reproaches that have often been made.'
   b. ??[Ja schon oft   erhobene Vorwürfe] hat sie wiederholt.
       JA already often made   reproaches has she repeated

Regardless of cases like (14b), where the prenominal attribute is clearly restrictive, Fabricius-Hansen (2009) has shown convincingly that (extended) prenominal attributes are almost always non-restrictive (or at least not clearly restrictive as (14b)). Note that, in contrast to appositive relative clauses, non-restrictive prenominal attributes are usually not formally distinguished from restrictive ones by displaying, for instance, special prosody ('parenthesis prosody'). In most cases, it is thus hard to distinguish between restrictive and non-restrictive readings on purely formal grounds and without referring to the global textual/discourse context.

   As for the meaning side, it has been argued that non-restrictive supplements such as appositive relative clauses are special at the level of semantics/pragmatics and are represented in a separate semantic, 'not-at-issue' dimension – see Potts 2005 and his analysis in terms of conventional implicatures (CIs). Specifically, it has been shown that a certain semantic-pragmatic independence of non-restrictive relative clauses allows the presence of modal particles. In what follows, I will point out differences between appositive relative clauses and non-restrictive prenominal attributes, and I will thus demonstrate that the parallels between these two attributive configurations are not so clear-cut as minimal pairs like (14) above suggest.

One important feature that distinguishes non-restrictive prenominal attributes from other kinds of appositive structures is the anti-backgrounding requirement. According to Potts (2007a: 485), CIs are distinguished from presuppositions in obeying "an anti-backgrounding requirement: in cases where the content of a supplement is part of the initial context, the result is infelicity due to redundancy." This can be illustrated by the following example. While the redundancy expressed by (15b) causes no problem, a CI, here expressed by a nominal appositive or an appositive relative clause (15a), results in infelicity. Note, however, that a prenominal attribute is felicitous in this context (15c):

(15) Lance Armstrong survived cancer.
    a. #When reporters interview Lance, (who is) a cancer survivor, he often talks about the disease.
    b. And most riders know that Lance Armstrong is a cancer survivor.
    c. When reporters interview the cancer-surviving Lance, he often talks about the disease.

On the other hand, assuming that appositives as in (15a), like other 'supplements', are represented in a separate semantic dimension as CIs, we see that the modal particle *ja* cannot occur with a simple adjective such as *bescheuert* ('stupid') that clearly operates at this separate CI-level:

(16) a. Ich kriege die bescheuerte Tür nicht auf.
       I get the stupid door not open
       'I cannot open this stupid door.'
    b. ??Ich kriege [die ja bescheuerte Tür] nicht auf.

Taken together, this short discussion questions the parallels between relative clauses and prenominal attributes suggested by cases such as (14) above. What is more, in some contexts the modal particle *ja* preferably occurs with simple adjectives that do not express a non-restrictive, but rather a restrictive property, as the following data show.

Consider cases where the non-restrictive adjective denotes some evident feature of the NP referent (in a prototype-theoretic sense):

(17) a. ??der ja schwarze Rabe
          the JA black raven
    b. der ja pechschwarze Rabe
        the JA pitch-black raven

In (17a), the denotation of the NP is not restricted by the modification, irrespective of the context (in formal terms: ADJ∩NOM = NOM). On the other hand, modification can restrict the NP denotation as in *pechschwarz* in (17b) because ravens are not pitch-black per se (i.e., ADJ∩NOM ⊆ NOM); that is, ravens can feature shades of gray.

Interestingly, the fact that modal particles are also possible in restrictive APs becomes even clearer when restrictiveness is signaled by narrow focus. Note that the only means to force a clearly restrictive interpretation of prenominal attributes is narrow focus on the adjunct and deaccentuation of the NP head. Narrow focus is thus a sufficient (but not necessary) condition for restrictiveness, given the general approach that restrictiveness is correlated with narrow focus (Baumann & Riester 2013).

To illustrate this very clearly, let us add a focus or grading particle inside the AP (see Sudhoff 2010 for such constructions). In (18), I introduced the DP-level alternatives {P(shoes) | P ∈ color of shoes} by adding a focus particle inside the AP (18a)/(18a).

(18) a.　ihre nur　SCHWARzen Schuhe
　　　　 her　only　black　　　 shoes
　　 b.　ihre ja nur SCHWARzen Schuhe
　　 c.　??ihre ja schwarzen Schuhe

We see that in these cases, the presence of *ja* becomes acceptable even with adjectives like *schwarz* ('black'), which inherently lack the extreme/ superlative degree dimension that I discussed in Section 2.1 and that is also lexically entailed in cases such as *pechschwarz* in (17). The attribute is interpreted restrictively as soon as the adjectival attribute is contrasted and thus narrowly focused as in (18a) and (18b). In such contexts, the co-occurrence of the particle *ja* with simple adjectives becomes felicitous.

This licensing of modal particles in atypical contexts by adding focus structure is corroborated by evidence given in Hinterhölzl & Krifka (2013:11) who show that modal particles are licensed in so-called central adverbial clauses (here: an event conditional) as soon as a focus particle is added (19b).

(19) a.　??Wenn ja　der Peter kommt, dann wird　　es langweilig.
　　　　　 if　　JA　the Peter　comes　 then　becomes it　boring
　　 b.　 Wenn ja nur der PEter kommt, dann wird es langweilig.

Usually, central adverbial clauses cannot contain modal particles because they lack their own illocutionary force (Haegeman 2002).

Hinterhölzl & Krifka (2013) provide further evidence for the claim that modal particles are licensed (or even preferred) in restrictive contexts. In particular, they show that indefinite DPs, when containing a modal particle, can only be interpreted as referring to a unique or generic entity. In the following example (Hinterhölzl & Krifka 2013:9), we see that modal particles are excluded from the *de dicto* reading given in (20c).[5]

[5] Hinterhölzl & Krifka (2013) use the particle *wohl* (lit. 'well') to illustrate this property. This suggests that the observed pattern holds for different particles and is thus not due to lexical idiosyncrasies of modal particles.

(20) a. Hans sucht   eine ja erst 30-jährige Frau.
        Hans looks.for a   JA only 30-year-old woman
    b. Speaker asserts [ja]: There is a 30 years old woman.
      Speaker asserts: Hans is looking for this woman.
    c. Speaker asserts: Hans wants it to be the case that there is a
      30 years old woman.
      Speaker asserts: Hans is looking for this woman.

An indefinite DP like *eine Frau* is not intrinsically unique (Heim 2011). Still, in (20b) Hans is looking for a unique individual (*de re* reading), whereas in (20c) Hans is looking for any woman that fulfills the criterion to be of a specific age. That is, in potentially intensional contexts as in (20a), only the *de re* reading of the DP is available. Accordingly, the particle forces a specific interpretation of the indefinite DP, and thus the AP should receive a restrictive rather than an appositive interpretation, in line with what I said up to this point.

Let us take stock. The data above show that contrasting the adjective by phonetic, information structure-driven means improves the acceptability of modal particles within DPs. Coming back to the 'extreme' cases discussed in Section 2.1, we can now see that in these cases the simple adjective also involves a contrast, namely a contrast across degrees. Note that cases such as *umwerfend* or *pechschwarz* lexically entail that their denotation exceeds a contextually provided set of salient degrees. In formal terms, given a salient range of degrees (= C), the denotation of adjectives such as *umwerfend*, in contrast to *schön*, exceeds the greatest degree in C (= max(C)), see Portner & Rubinstein (in press) for a simplified formalism:

(21) a. $[\![schön_C]\!] = \lambda x \, \lambda d \, . \, d \in C \wedge x$ is d-schön
    b. $[\![umwerfend_C]\!] = \lambda x \, \lambda d \, . \, d \geq max(C) \wedge x$ is d-schön

As we saw above, adjectives that do not entail any salient set of degrees (e.g., *schwarz*) are worst with modal particles as long as they are not contrasted by means of restrictive narrow focus. In other words, extreme degree expressions do not need extra heavy stress expressing narrow focus because they lexically entail a salient contrast across degrees and are thus, if one may say so, 'noteworthy' enough to co-occur with the 'emphatic *ja* of intensification' discussed in Section 2.1.

In sum, given the syntactic and pragmatic features of simple-adjective constructions containing DP-internal particles, I conclude that the DP-internal occurrence of the modal particle *ja* displays some characteristics that cannot be explained by referring to the prima facie quite similar domain of relative clauses. After having demonstrated these differences between the levels of DP and CP, I now turn to aspects that display parallels between these two syntactic domains.

3. DP-internal modal particles and Force

3.1. *Modal particles and Force*

Modal particles at the level of CP are geared to certain clause types (declarative, polar interrogative, *wh*-interrogative, exclamative, imperative, etc.) and arise mainly in root clauses, where they are invariably stuck in a pre-VP/*v*P position.

(22) $[_{\text{ForceP/FinP}} \text{Force}^0/\text{Fin}^0 \ [_{(\text{TopP})} \ldots [\text{Prt}^0 \ [_{(\text{AdvP*})} \ [_{\text{VP}/v\text{P}} \ldots]]]]]$

Although modal particles make a semantic contribution by co-determining the illocutionary force of an utterance and are thus sensitive to sentence types and utterance contexts, they can appear at an arbitrary distance from Force^0. In contrast to approaches assuming LF-movement of the particle (or feature movement), Bayer & Obenauer (2011) demonstrate how modal particles obtain access to the force system of the clause by virtue of probe-goal agreement. In the recent literature, many approaches assume that the Force projection hosts at least two kinds of information: (i) the clause type (e.g., declarative vs. interrogative) and (ii) an epistemic reference point (see Abraham 2015 for an even more elaborated representation). In the following, I will point out that DP-internal particles must connect to a speaker-related dimension (the epistemic 'judge') that is independent of the illocutionary force of the clause. Accordingly, Split-Force approaches could prove useful when one wants to account for the DP-internal cases.

3.2. *Modal particles and DP-internal Force*

We observe that DP-internal *ja* can also be used even if the DP is part of an interrogative (23a), although it is a well-known observation that *ja*, as a particle scoping over VP/*v*P, cannot occur in interrogative clauses (23b).

(23) a. Warum trägt sie [DP diese ja umwerfenden Schuhe]?
        why   wears she   this JA gorgeous   shoes
        'Why does she wear these gorgeous shoes?'
    b. *Warum trägt sie diese Schuhe ja auf der Arbeit?
        why   wears she these shoes   JA at   the work
        'Why does she wear these shoes at work?'

In (23a), the particle *ja* does not take scope over the VP/*v*P of the clause. Rather, the particle only scopes over a propositional part expressed within the DP (see also Jacobs 1986:108). That is, by adding *ja* to the utterance, the speaker indicates that he thinks that at the time of utterance it is an uncontroversial/self-evident fact that the shoes are gorgeous (the propositional content *p* expressed within the DP).

Crucially, the speaker does not indicate that he thinks that it is uncontroversial that the referent of *she* is wearing these shoes. Note that the DP-internal occurrence provides evidence against LF-movement of the particle (see Section 3.1 above), since the particle takes scope where we see it and, given the Complex NP Constraint, should not be able to move out of the DP constituent anyway.

The fact that the particle scopes over the propositional part expressed within the DP distinguishes these cases from predicative constructions with a truncated functional structure like small clauses (SCs).

(24) Hans findet [$_{SC}$ die Schuhe ja   nicht schön].
     Hans finds   the shoes   JA   not   pretty
     'Hans does not consider the shoes pretty.'

In (24), the particle *ja* does not take scope over a propositional part expressed within the SC. That is, by adding *ja* to the utterance, the speaker indicates that he thinks that at the time of utterance it is an uncontroversial/self-evident fact that Hans thinks that the shoes are not pretty (the propositional content *p* expressed by the whole CP). Crucially, the speaker does not indicate that he thinks that it is uncontroversial that the shoes are not pretty.

Given these observations, I hypothesize that the predicational structure expressed within the DP should be situated in a non-truncated, rich functional structure comparable to the one required by modal particles at the level of CP. Specifically, I claim that APs have an ASSERT operator, cf. Jacobs (1991:156) for such an approach in terms of illocutionary operators:

(25) [$_{AP}$ ASSERT [$_{AP}$ ja umwerfenden]

There is some evidence supporting this claim. First, particles that cannot appear in assertions such as the question particle *denn* (lit. 'then') are not licensed in DPs, as shown in (26b):

(26) a. Hat sie denn   [diese umwerfenden Schuhe] schon
        has she DENN these gorgeous   shoes   already
          weggeschmissen?
          thrown.away
        'Has she already trashed these gorgeous shoes (I'm
        wondering)?'
    b. *Hat sie [diese denn umwerfenden Schuhe] schon
        weggeschmissen?

Second, evidence from the interplay between modal particles and other scope-bearing elements supports such an approach. Consider (27a), where the negation *nicht* cannot scope over the modal particle:

(27) a. *Karl ist nicht ja zu Hause.
         Karl is not JA at home
         'Karl is not at home.'
     b. Karl ist ja nicht zu Hause.

Given facts like (27), Jacobs (1991) has argued that modal particles have the same scope as illocutionary operators because all expressions that are within the scope of illocutionary operators are also within the scope of modal particles. Observe now DP-internal cases like the following, cf. Geilfuss-Wolfgang (2011) for such data:

(28) a. *Ich muss   auf [diese selten ja lieben Kinder] aufpassen.
         I   have.to up these rarely JA lovely children watch
         'I have to watch these children, which are most of the time not lovely.'
     b. Ich muss auf [diese ja selten lieben Kinder] aufpassen.
     c. Ich muss   selten auf [diese ja lieben Kinder] aufpassen.
         I   have.to rarely up these JA lovely children watch
         'I rarely have to watch these lovely children.'

We see that within the DP, a scope-bearing element such as *selten* ('rarely') cannot precede the modal particle (28a). However, at the level of CP, which expresses a separate assertion according to our approach, we observe no such conflict (28c).

   Given that the modal particle *ja* is thus licensed by an illocutionary operator ASSERT within the DP/AP, the question now arises: How come the epistemic stance expressed by the DP-internal modal particle is nevertheless ascribed to the speaker who performs the speech act reflected in the choice of syntactic structure at the level of CP? My claim is that DP-internal modal particles are evaluated according to the DP-external speaker due to non-compositional and, accordingly, non-syntactic operations that have been observed in the context of perspective-shifting phenomena. For instance, Kratzer (1999:6) has argued that in (29) the usually speaker-oriented expressive *that bastard* expresses an emotion of the speaker's father and is thus not ascribed to the speaker of the utterance:

(29) My father screamed that he would never allow me to marry that bastard Webster.

Concerning this particular case, Potts (2007b: 175) hypothesizes that "*my father* picks out an agent that is so salient and so powerful in the context of the sentence that he becomes not only the attitudinal and deontic judge but also the contextual one." In subsequent work, Potts has revised his claim that speaker-orientation in general can be explained in terms of semantic, i.e. compositional mechanisms. Specifically, Potts and colleagues have developed a series of experiments that manipulate discourses to yield different interpretations of expressives in the context of such shifting

phenomena (e.g., Harris & Potts 2009). Given that the epistemic 'judge' (the entity according to which expressions such as modal particles or expressives are evaluated) can thus be determined by non-compositional factors, we do not need syntactic communication into DP/AP in the cases of DP-internal particles and can thus maintain the generally accepted claim that DP is an island and (possibly) a cyclic node. In other words, the DP-internal particle is accessed from outside via a non-syntactic process.

After clarifying (in accordance with Split-Force approaches) that we must distinguish between the particle's dependence on illocution and on epistemic reference points, let us now push the analogy between DP and CP by assuming that the DP-internal particle is invariably stuck in a particle-specific position. Notice that material can intervene between D and Prt, as shown in (30a).

(30) a. ihre in der letzten Saison ja umwerfenden Schuhe
       her in the last   season JA gorgeous   shoes
    b. ihre ja in der letzten Saison umwerfenden Schuhe
       her JA in the last   season gorgeous   shoes

There is an information-structural difference between (30a) and (30b), cf. their usage in the context given in (31).

(31) Was ist eigentlich mit ihren Schuhen aus der letzten Saison passiert?
     'What happened to her shoes from the last season?'
    a. Ihre in der letzten Saison ja umwerfenden Schuhe hat
        her in the last   season JA gorgeous   shoes   has
         sie leider   verloren.
         she unfortunately lost
    b. ??Ihre ja in der letzten Saison umwerfenden Schuhe hat
        her JA in the last   season gorgeous   shoes   has
         sie leider   verloren.
         she unfortunately lost
        'Unfortunately, she lost her gorgeous shoes from the last season.'

Accordingly, I refer to the intervening landing site as TopP, and I claim that the particle is located within AP between this information-structural layer and a TP domain. Although DP-internal TP does not encode Tense in a strict sense, I follow Struckmeier (2010) in postulating a TP-like category at the level of AP. This is motivated by the overt expression of Aspect in participle constructions where present or past participle suffixes fill a T-like head.

Given the above, the derivation of the AP runs as follows:

(32) a. [$_A$ umwerf]
       => Merge PP
    b. [$_{lexical\ layer}$ in der letzten Saison [$_A$ umwerf]]
       => Merge T (overt as participle suffix)

c. [$_{TP}$ [$_{lexical\ layer}$ in der letzten Saison [$_A$ umwerf]] [-end]]
   =>   Merge Prt

d. [$_{PrtP}$ ja ... [$_{TP}$ [$_{lexical\ layer}$ in der letzten Saison [$_A$ umwerf]]
   [-end]]]
   => Merge Top

e. [$_{TopP}$ Top^0 [$_{PrtP}$ ja ... [$_{TP}$ [$_{lexical\ layer}$ in der letzten Saison
   [$_A$ umwerf]] [-end]]]]
   =>   Move PP

f. [$_{TopP}$ in der letzten Saison$_i$ [$_{PrtP}$ ja ... [$_{TP}$ [$_{lexical\ layer}$ t$_i$
   [$_A$ umwerf]] [-end]]]]

g. (...)

In addition to the derivation in (32), we observe a positional variation of higher adverbs such as *leider* ('unfortunately') inside the AP. Given reasonable assumptions, *leider* should neither be analyzed as some kind of topic nor as a frame setter.

(33) a. ihre ja   leider   gräßlichen Schuhe
       her JA unfortunately disgusting shoes
    b. ihre leider   ja gräßlichen Schuhe
       her unfortunately JA disgusting shoes

A reasonable approach would be to analyze both *ja* and *leider* as belonging to the same category (essentially an evidential-evaluativeP) and thus as being base-generated in both positional variants without changing their information-structural status.

At the level of CP, the traditional view is that modal particles precede sentence adverbials (see, e.g., Meibauer 1994:99). However, as has recently been pointed out by Grosz (2015), the judgments are anything but clear. Accordingly, Grosz (2015:10) concludes that "the assumption of a rigid order of modal particles and sentence adverbials must be rejected." Our DP-internal data support this conclusion and show that we cannot syntactically distinguish between the two categories within the domain of DP. At the level of CP, however, many properties show that we must nevertheless distinguish between sentence adverbials and modal particles for syntactic reasons. For instance, German modal particles like *ja* are, unlike adverbs, stuck in the middle field of the clause, as already mentioned above. To see this, consider a minimal pair involving the adverb/particle *vielleicht* (lit. 'perhaps'), cf. Bayer & Trotzke (2015:14):

(34) a. Der   ist vielleicht SÜSS.
       this.MASC is perhaps   sweet
       'This one (e.g., coffee) is perhaps sweet.'
    b. Vielleicht ist der SÜSS.
       'Perhaps, this one is sweet.'

(35) a. DER   ist vielleicht   süß!
        this.one (e.g., a cute little dog) is   VIELLEICHT sweet
        'My god, how sweet it is!'
    b. *Vielleicht ist DER süß!
        (intended: same as 35a)

In its function as an adverb, *vielleicht* may be fronted as in (34b); in its function as a modal particle, however, this is impossible as seen in (35b). An extensive list of other syntactic differences can be found in Thurmair (2013). Note again, however, that these syntactic differences do not show up at the level of DP where higher adverbs and modal particles thus cannot be syntactically distinguished.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, I investigated the DP-internal occurrence of the German modal particle *ja*. I demonstrated that simple-adjective configurations containing extreme or clearly restrictive content license the presence of modal particles inside the DP domain (Sections 2.1 and 2.2). Given this demonstration, I argued against an analysis that accounts for the occurrence of modal particles in the DP by referring to appositive relative clauses containing modal particles. After having sketched the connection of particles to illocutionary force at the level of CP (Section 3.1), I demonstrated parallels between the functional makeup of the syntactic representations involving modal particles at the level of CP and DP by showing (i) that the DP contains its own illocutionary operator and (ii) that DP-internal *ja* also fulfills the information-structural role of acting as a 'watershed' element within APs.

References

ABRAHAM, W. (2015). Strong modality and truth disposability in syntactic subordination: What is the locus of the phase edge validating modal adverbials? *Studia Linguistica*, 69:119–159.

BAUMANN, S. & RIESTER, A. (2013). Coreference, lexical givenness and prosody in German. *Lingua*, 136:16–37.

BAYER, J., HINTERHÖLZL, R. & TROTZKE, A. (eds.). (2015). *Discourse-oriented Syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

BAYER, J. & OBENAUER, H.-G. (2011). Discourse particles, clause structure, and question types. *The Linguistic Review*, 28: 449–491.

BAYER, J. & TROTZKE, A. (2015). The derivation and interpretation of left peripheral discourse particles. *Discourse-oriented Syntax*, eds. J. Bayer, R. Hinterhölzl & A. Trotzke, 13–40. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

BIBERAUER, T., HAEGEMAN, L. & VAN KEMENADE, A. (2014). Putting our heads together: Towards a syntax of particles. *Studia Linguistica*, 68:1–15.

BURKHARDT, A. (1982). Die kommunikativen Funktionen von *ja* und ihre lexikographische Beschreibung in Wörterbüchern. *Muttersprache*, 92:337–361.

338

CHIERCHIA, G. & MCCONNELL-GINET, S. (1991). *Meaning and Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

CHOMSKY, N. (2008). On phases. *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory*. eds. R. Freidin, C. P. Otero & M. L. Zubizarreta, 133–166. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

CINQUE, G. (2010). *The Syntax of Adjectives*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

CINQUE, G. (2014). The semantic classification of adjectives: A view from syntax. *Studies in Chinese Linguistics*, 35:1–30.

CONIGLIO, M. (2011). *Die Syntax der deutschen Modalpartikeln: Ihre Distribution und Lizensierung in Haupt- und Nebensätzen*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

CRUSE, D. A. (1986). *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

EMONDS, J. (1979). Appositive relatives have no properties. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 10:211–243.

ERNST, T. (2009). Speaker-oriented adverbs. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 27:497–544.

FABRICIUS-HANSEN, C. (2009). Überlegungen zur pränominalen Nicht-Restriktivität. *Linguistische Berichte, Sonderheft* 16:89–112.

GEILFUSS-WOLFGANG, J. (2011). Modalpartikeln in der NP. *Talk at SPSW 2011* [Handout].

GROSZ, P. G. (2015). Information structure and discourse particles. *The Oxford Handbook of Information Structure*. eds. C. Féry & S. Ishihara. Online version: DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199642670.013.36.

HAEGEMAN, L. (2002). Anchoring to speaker, adverbial clauses, and the structure of CP. *Georgetown University Working Papers in Linguistics*, 17:109–141.

HARRIS, J. A. & POTTS, C. (2009). Perspective-shifting with appositives and expressives. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 32:523–552.

HEIM, I. (2011). Definiteness and indefiniteness. *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning*. eds. P. Portner, C. Maienborn & K. von Heusinger, 996–1025. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

HERINGA, H. (2012). *Appositional constructions*. Dissertation, University of Groningen.

HINTERHÖLZL, R. & KRIFKA, M. (2013). *Modal particles in adverbial and adnominal clauses*. Ms., Ca'Foscari University of Venice & Humboldt University of Berlin.

HOLLER, A. (2005). *Weiterführende Relativsätze: Empirische und theoretische Aspekte*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

HOLLER, A. (2013). d- und w-Relativsätze. *Satztypen des Deutschen*. eds. J. Meibauer, M. Steinbach & H. Altmann, 266–300. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

JACOBS, J. (1986). Abtönungsmittel als Illokutionstypmodifikatoren. *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik*, 27:100–111.

JACOBS, J. (1991). On the semantics of modal particles. *Discourse Particles*. ed. Werner Abraham, 141–161. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

KAYNE, R. (1994). *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

KRATZER, A. (1999). Beyond "ouch" and "oops:" How descriptive and expressive meaning interact. *Cornell Conference on Theories of Context Dependency, Cornell University*.

KWON, M.-J. (2005). *Modalpartikeln und Satzmodus: Untersuchungen zur Syntax, Semantik und Pragmatik der deutschen Modalpartikeln*. Dissertation, LMU Munich.

MEIBAUER, J. (1994). Modaler Kontrast und konzeptuelle Verschiebung. *Studien zur Syntax und Semantik deutscher Modalpartikeln*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

MORZYCKI, M. (2012). Adjectival extremeness: Degree modification and contextually restricted scales. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 30:567–609.

PORTNER, P. & RUBINSTEIN, A. (in press). Extreme and non-extreme deontic modals. *Deontic Modality*. eds. N. Charlow & M. Chrisman. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

POTTS, C. (2005). *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

POTTS, C. (2007a). Conventional implicatures: A distinguished class of meanings. *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Interfaces*. eds. G. Ramchand & C. Reiss, 475–501. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

POTTS, C. (2007b). The expressive dimension. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 33:165–198.

RIZZI, L. (2014). Syntactic cartography and the syntacticisation of scope-discourse semantics. *Mind, Values, and Metaphysics*. ed. A. Reboul, 517–533. Dordrecht: Springer.

STRUCKMEIER, V. (2010). Attributive constructions, scrambling in the AP, and referential types. *Lingua*, 120:673–692.

SUDHOFF, S. (2010). Fokuspartikeln innerhalb von DPn im Deutschen. *40 Jahre Partikelforschung*. eds. T. Harden & E. Hentschel. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

THURMAIR, M. (1989). *Modalpartikeln und ihre Kombinationen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

THURMAIR, M. (2013). Satztyp und Modalpatikeln. *Satztypen des Deutschen*. eds. J. Meibauer, M. Steinbach & H. Altmann, 627–651. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

VIESEL, Y. (2015). Discourse structure and syntactic embedding: The German discourse particle *ja*. *Proceedings of the 20th Amsterdam Colloquium*, 418–427.

ZIMMERMANN, M. (2004). Zum *wohl*: Diskurspartikeln als Satztypmodifikatoren. *Linguistische Berichte*, 199:253–286.

ZIMMERMANN, M. (2008). Discourse particles in the left periphery. *Dislocated Elements in Discourse: Syntactic, Semantic, and Pragmatic Perspectives*. eds. B. Shaer et al., 200–231. New York & London: Routledge.

ZIMMERMANN, M. (2011). Discourse particles. *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning*. eds. P. Portner, C. Maienborn & K. von Heusinger, 2011–2038. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Andreas Trotzke
Stanford University
Center for the Study of Language and Information
210 Panama Street
Stanford, CA 94305
USA
trotzke@stanford.edu