

Old commitments and repeated speech acts: interpreting Hungarian *tényleg*

Beáta Gyuris

HUN-REN Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics, Budapest

ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest

The talk discusses the interpretation of the particle *tényleg* 'really'/'indeed' in Hungarian, which only contributes to the use conditions (Gutzmann 2015), analogously to *csakugyan* and *valóban* (cf. Egedi 2009), except for minor differences (cf. Kiefer 1988). *Tényleg* can appear syntactically and prosodically integrated or non-integrated in the sentence. Integrated *tényleg* appears in declaratives responding to assertions or to polar questions and in (responding) polar interrogatives; non-integrated *tényleg* appears in declaratives, in polar and *wh*-interrogatives.

The paper will show that integrated/non-integrated occurrences of *tényleg* are felicitous in the contexts characterized in Table 1, some of which are exemplified in (1)-(4) below:

<i>Config.</i>	<i>Context</i>	<i>Integrated</i>	<i>Felicity</i>	<i>Ex.</i>
C1	New assertion	✓	✗	
C2	Repeated assertion w/o current evidence	✓	✗	(1A-B)
C2A	Rep. assertion w/o current evid., Addr. is a child	✓	✓	(1A-B)
C3	Repeated assertion with current evidence	✓/✗	✓	(1A-B')
C4	Repeated assertion, predicate of personal taste	✓	✓	
C5	Repeated assertion, predicate of personal taste	✗	✗	
C6	Repeated assertion, stronger commitment	✓	✓	(2)
C7	Repeated assertion, stronger commitment	✗	✗	
C8	Contradicting a previous assertion	✓/✗	✗	(3)
C9	Answering an (indirect) question	✓/✗	✗	(4)
C10	Reasserting a statement rejected by interlocutor	✓	✓	
C11	Reasserting a statement rejected by interlocutor	✗	✗	
C12	Confirming a previous assertion	✓	✓	
C13	Confirming a previous assertion	✗	✗	
C14	Asking a new question	✓/✗	✗	
C15	Asking a repeated question	✗	✓	

Table 1. Felicity of (non-)integrated *tényleg* in different contexts.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(1) A: Esett éjjel az eső.
fell at.night the rain
'It rained last night.'</p> <p>B: (B heard the sound of rain last night.)
#Tényleg esett.
TÉNYLEG fell
'It rained indeed.' (OK if A is a child!)</p> <p>B': (B did not hear anything, but looks
out and sees that the ground is wet.)
Tényleg(, esett).
'It rained indeed.'</p> | <p>(2) A: Pali lehet, hogy külföldre ment.
Pali maybe that abroad went
'Maybe Pali went abroad.'</p> <p>B: Tényleg külföldre ment.
'He went abroad indeed.'</p> <p>(3) A: Pali nem ment külföldre.
Pali not went abroad
'Pali didn't go abroad.'</p> <p>B: (#Tényleg) külföldre ment.</p> <p>(4) A: Pali külföldre ment?
'Did Pali go abroad?'</p> <p>B: (#Tényleg) külföldre ment.</p> |
|--|---|

Analogous behaviour in configurations C2A and C6 support extending Northrup's (2014) analysis of Japanese *yo*, a "relative authority marker" to *tényleg*, felicity mismatches in C1, C8, C9, C12 and C15 contradict it. Adopting Yuan & Hara's (2019) account of Mandarin *dique*, which marks the prejacent issue as old (and believed to be old by all participants) would explain the (in)felicity of *tényleg* in C1, C2A, C3, C6, C8, C9, C15. This approach, however, would predict *tényleg* to be felicitous in C2, and *dique* in C10 and C12, contrary to fact. Yuan & Hara (2019) propose that Mandarin *zhende* marks the prejacent issue to be old, which some participant y has failed to resolve. Adopting the latter account for *tényleg* would explain its behaviour in C1, C2, C3, C10, C15, as well as in C12, where, apparently, *zhende* is not felicitous, but would not explain the felicity of *tényleg* in C3 and C6.

The talk proposes that integrated *tényleg* in declaratives marks that a commitment has been made previously to prejacent *p*, and in polar interrogatives that a commitment has been made to *p*, the "highlighted alternative" (Roelofsen & Farkas 2015). The fact that it is only compatible with particular declaratives (C3, C4, C6, C10) has to do with general principles of conversation (i.e., prohibitions against reasserting propositions without reason). The data will be captured with the help of a minimal modification of Yuan & Hara's (2019) analysis of *dique*, in Farkas & Bruce's (2010) framework. Non-integrated *tényleg* is proposed to be felicitous in interrogatives (C14, C15) when a question act realizing the same form type has been made in the discourse. The formal account minimally modifies Yuan & Hara's (2019) analysis of *dique*. Infelicity of non-integrated *tényleg* in C5, C7, and C11 is due to blocking by integrated *tényleg*.

References. Egedi, B. 2009. Adverbial (dis)ambiguities. In K. É. Kiss (ed.) *Adverbs and...* de Gruyter. • Farkas, D., & Bruce, K. 2010. On reacting to ... *JSem.* 27 • Gutzmann, D. 2015.

Use-conditional meaning. OUP. • Kiefer, F. 1988. Modal particles ... *ALH* 38 • Northrup, O. B. (2014) *Grounds for commitment*. Diss., UCSC • Roelofsen, F., & Farkas, D. 2015. Polarity particle ... *Lang.* 91 • Yuan, M. & Hara, Y. 2019. Guiding assertions and questions... *NLLT* 37.