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1 Seven strategies to ask a polar question in Medumba

Medumba…
… is a Grassfields’ Bantu Bamileke language
… is spoken in the Western region of Cameroon.
… its basic sentence structure is SVO

(1) [Númí yuú ¹mbh₃u]ₜₜ
 Numi have dog
“Numi has a dog.”

To ask a polar question in Medumba, one can use either of the strategies in (2-8):

(2) ú yuú ¹mbh₃u kí
 2SG have dog Prt
“Do you have a dog?”

(3) ú yuú ¹mbh₃u áá
 2SG have dog Prt
“Do you have a dog?”

(4) kù ú yuú ¹mbh₃u á
    kù [...]ₜₜ -á
Prt 2SG have dog Prt
“Do you have a dog?”

(5) ú yuú ¹mbh₃u á
    [...]ₜₜ -á
 2SG have dog Prt
“Do you have a dog?”

(6) kùlá ú yuú ¹mbh₃u á
    kùlá [...]ₜₜ -á
Prt 2SG have dog Prt
“Do you have a dog?”

(7) kùlá ú yuú ¹mbh₃u
    kùlá [...]ₜₜ
Prt 2SG have dog
“Do you have a dog?”

(8) ú yuú ¹mbh₃u k₃
    [...]ₜₜ -k₃
 2SG have dog Prt
“Do you have a dog?”

The challenge:
To account for the distribution and interpretation of sentence-peripheral particles in Medumba
2 Proposal I: Interpretation and Distribution

2.1 Interpretation

The sentence peripheral particles found in (biased) polar questions establish a relation between the propositional content and the speaker’s attitude

- They establish whether \( p \) is in the speaker’s set of beliefs (\( \text{Bel}_S \))
- Once established this relation can be modified:
  - Source: How did \( p \) get into \( \text{Bel}_S \)?
    - i) mention by Adr(essee)
    - ii) situation
  - Time: When did it get into \( \text{Bel}_S \)?
    - i) present
    - ii) past
  - Strength: How strong is evidence for \( p \) in \( \text{Bel}_S \)?
    - i) weak
    - ii) strong

(9) The Logic of polar questions in Bamileke Medumba

(Keupdjio & Wiltschko 2016)
2.2 Distribution

The sentence peripheral particles associate with the **speech-act structure**.

(10) The syntax of polar questions in Bamileke Medumba

![Diagram of SA-structure]

3 Background: The structure of speech acts

3.1 The performative hypothesis

(11) Performative hypothesis (Ross 1970)

![Diagram of SA-structure]

3.2 An updated version of Speech-act structure

Ross’ (1970) performative hypothesis reflects traditional assumptions about discourse conditions for assertions:

(12) Discourse conditions for assertions

i) Spkr believes p

ii) Spkr wants Adr to believe p

(13) Context: Mary just got a new dog. None of her friends know about this yet. On the first walk with her new dog, she runs into John and tells him:

Mary: I got a new dog.

John: a. #no response
     b. nods his head
     c. {uh-huh/Oh, really?/I see/That’s nice/…}
(14) Ingredients of an Assertion
a. a proposition
b. Spkr’s propositional attitude (e.g., belief)
c. Spkr’s request for Adr to adopt the same propositional attitude towards p

(15) Ingredients of a Polar question
a. a (set of) propositions (+p, -p)
b. Spkr’s propositional attitude towards p (the bias)
c. Spkr’s request for Adr to respond

(16) RespP

GroundP

\[ \text{Resp}(pa(A,p)) \]

\[ pa(S,p) \]

\[ S \]

\[ p \]

- GroundP encodes propositional attitude of Spkr towards p
- Resp(onse)P encodes what Spkr wants Adr to do with p


4 Proposal II: Linearization

- There is layer in the clausal spine which serves to mark the relation between CG_S and p.
- This layer is above [...]_{Root-S}
- Different particles associate with different layers, as heads or as modifiers

(17) a. Neutral question

b. Biased question

Linearization: movement of the p-structure to the left edge
4.1 Language internal evidence for movement:

Downstep on structurally final High tone (H) items

\[(18)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. Merge order} & \quad \text{b. Derived order} \\
\text{RespP} & \quad \text{RespP} \\
\text{Resp} & \quad \text{Resp} \\
\text{ki} & \quad \text{ki} \\
\text{TP} & \quad \text{TP} \\
\text{ū} & \quad \text{ū} \\
\text{TP} & \quad \text{TP} \\
\text{T} & \quad \text{T} \\
\text{VP} & \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{V} & \quad \text{V} \\
\text{< yuu>} & \quad \text{< yuu>} \\
\text{\_\_\_mb\_u} & \quad \text{\_\_\_mb\_u} \\
\end{align*}
\]

4.2 Prediction: a root phenomenon

S-peripheral particles are restricted to root clauses

- The layers above S is restricted to root clauses.
- Hence material that associates with these layers are restricted to root contexts

The verb ‘ask’ can select two distinct complementizer \textit{mbù} (COMP1) and \textit{mbùù} (COMP2).

- COMP1 is used for direct quotations
- In this context, S-peripheral particles are possible

\[(19)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} \quad \text{Mú bëttó mbù ü yùù \_mb\_ù \_kì} \\
\text{1SG ask COMP1 2SG have dog Prt} \\
\text{I ask: “Do you have a dog”} \\
\text{b.} \quad \text{Mú bëttó mbù ü yùù \_mb\_ù \_áá} \\
\text{1SG ask COMP1 2SG have dog Prt} \\
\text{I ask: “Do you have a dog”} \\
\text{c.} \quad \text{Mú bëttó mbù kù ü yùù \_mb\_ù \_á} \\
\end{align*}
\]
COMP2 works only if the particles are not embedded:

- COMP2 is used for embedding questions:
- In this context S-peripheral particles are ungrammatical if embedded:

\[(20)\]

a. *Mú bëttô mbû ú yûú \[^{mb\,û} \ás\]*
1SG ask COMP2 2SG have dog Prt
Lit: I ask whether do you have a dog

b. *Mú bëttô mbû ú yûú \[^{mb\,û} \ás\]*
1SG ask COMP2 2SG have dog Prt
Lit: I ask whether do you have a dog

c. *Mú bëttô mbû [kû ú yûú \[^{mb\,û} \ás\]*
1SG ask COMP2 Prt 2SG.S have dog Prt
Lit: I ask whether do you have a dog

d. *Mú bëttô mbû ú yûú \[^{mb\,û} \ás\]*
1SG ask COMP2 2SG have dog Prt
Lit: I ask whether do you have a dog

e. *Mú bëttô mbû [kûlá ú yûú \[^{mb\,û} \ás\]*
1SG ask COMP2 Prt 2SG.S have dog Prt
Lit: I ask whether do you have a dog

f. *Mú bëttô mbû [kûlá ú yûú \[^{mb\,û} \ás\]*
1SG ask COMP2 Prt 2SG.S have dog Prt
Lit: I ask whether do you have a dog

g. *Mú bëttô mbû ú yûú \[^{mb\,û} \ás\]*
1SG ask COMP2 Prt 2SG.S have dog Prt
Lit: I ask whether do you have a dog

- COMP2 works only if the particles are not embedded:

\[(21)\]

a. *Mú bëttô mbû ú yûú \[^{mb\,û} \ás\]* ki
1SG ask COMP2 2SG have dog Prt
“Did I ask whether you have a dog”

b. *Mú bëttô mbû ú yûú \[^{mb\,û} \ás\]* áá
1SG ask COMP2 2SG have dog Prt
“Did I ask whether you have a dog”

c. \( \text{kú mú bëttō mbúū ú ūuū } \text{mb}^bū \text{á} \)
Prt 1SG ask COMP2 2SG.S have dog Prt
“Did I ask whether you have a dog”

d. \( [\text{Mú bëttō mbúū ú ūuū } \text{mb}^bū] \text{á} \)
1SG ask COMP2 2SG have dog Prt
“Did I ask whether you have a dog”

e. \( \text{kūlā mú bëttō mbúū ú ūuū } \text{mb}^bū \text{á} \)
Prt 1SG ask COMP2 2SG.S have dog Prt
“Did I ask whether you have a dog”

f. \( \text{kūlā mú bëttō mbúū ú ūuū } \text{mb}^bū \)
Prt 1SG ask COMP2 2SG.S have dog
“Did I ask whether you have a dog”

g. \( [\text{Mú bëttō mbúū ú ūuū } \text{mb}^bū] \text{á} \)
1SG ask COMP2 2SG.S have dog Prt
“Did I ask whether you have a dog”

5 Analysing the seven strategies of polar questions

• Sentence-peripheral particles in Medumba associate with RespP or GroundP respectively
• They function either as heads, or as modifiers of these functional categories

5.1 Neutral questions: no Spkr-attitude towards \( p \)

The “ki-strategy” is used for neutral polar questions in Medumba. In this context, the speaker does not display bias towards Bel (\( p \)) or Bel (\( \neg p \)) as shown in the context below:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{S-attitude} & \\
\text{Bel (p)} & \bullet \quad \text{Bel } \neg \text{p}
\end{align*}
\]

(22) Context: Mary doesn't know whether John has a dog. One day she runs into him and asks him:

\[
\text{ú ūuū } \text{mb}^bū \text{á} \text{ki}
\]
2SG have dog Prt
“Do you have a dog?”

**Analysis of […]S-ki**

• ki associates with RespP and selects for [p-structure]S rather than GroundP
• in the absence of GroundP, Spkr-attitude cannot be encoded
• ki requires Adr to respond (= Call on Addressee) hence results in question interpretation
• linearization is derived via S to Spec-RespP movement
Prediction:  
- since *ki* selects for *S*, none of the GroundP particles can co-occur with it

\[ \text{(24)} \]

*ki* cannot co-occur with *S*-initial particles

\[ \begin{align*}
  \text{a. } & *kùlù \ u \ yùù \ mbù \ u \ kì \\
  & \text{Prt} \ 2\text{SG.S} \  \text{have} \ \text{dog} \ \text{Prt} \\
  \text{b. } & *kì \ u \ yùù \ mbù \ u \ kì \\
  & \text{Prt} \ 2\text{SG.S} \  \text{have} \ \text{dog} \ \text{Prt}
\end{align*} \]

5.2 **Negative bias: p ∉ CG\textsubscript{S}**

Negatively biased polar questions are expressed using the “aa-strategy” in Medumba. Here, the speaker displays bias towards negative belief, Bel (¬p) as illustrated in the following context:

\[ \text{(25)} \]

**Context:** John is not a ‘dog person’ and has always claimed that he will never get a dog. One day, he changed his mind and decided to buy a dog. Then he has to inform his friend Mary. He runs into her and tells her that he has a new dog. Mary responds:

\[ \begin{align*}
  \text{ú} \ yùù \ mbhù \ áå & \\
  \text{2SG} \  \text{have} \ \text{dog} \ \text{Prt} & \\
  \text{“You you have a dog?”}
\end{align*} \]

**Analysis of [...]\textsubscript{S-áå}**

- Negative bias is indirectly encoded as a result of a focus-strategy: by focusing \( p \), \( \neg p \) is activated as the set of alternatives (cf. Rooth 1985)
- \( \text{áå} \) = complex:
  i) \( \neg\text{á} \) = Resp (encoding CoA)
  ii) \( \neg\text{á} \) = Focus marker
- both are independently attested
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Syntax of biased questions

(26) á Nùgà bèèn m-fà bò Nùmí á?
FOC Nuga AUX N-give bag Numi Q
Did Nuga_{Foc} give the bag to Numi?

Keupdjio (2015)

- linear order is derived by moving S[p-structure] to Spec-RespP (via Spec-FocP)
- as a result, Adr is asked to respond to S[p-structure]

(27)

(28) a. Merge order

(29) -áá cannot co-occur with S-initial particles

Prediction:
- in the absence of ground, Spkr-commitment cannot be modified (otherwise unclear why source, timing, and strength of bias cannot be specified)
5.3 Positive bias: p ∈ CG

Positive bias is encoded in GroundP (where Spkr commitment towards proposition is encoded)

- The source of the speaker bias is either a previous conversation with Addressee or some situation
- The Strength is either weak or strong

5.3.1 Positive bias based on a previous conversation

5.3.1.1 Weak positive bias: kù [...]₅-á

The “kù [...]₅-á” strategy is used to express weak positive bias based on a previous conversation in Medumba. Its context of use is illustrated as follows:

Source: previous conversation
Strength: weak

Bel (p)  Bel ¬p

(30) Context: John tells his friend Mary that his is going to buy a dog. Mary congratulates him. A few days later, Mary runs into John on the street. Mary isn’t sure whether John bought the dog they talked about in a previous conversation. Now just wants to check whether John bought the dog or not. Mary asks:

```
kù  ú  ʒīn  'mb₇ú  áá
Prt  2SG  buy  dog  Prt
```

“Did you buy the dog?”

Analysis of kù [...]₅-á

- á associates with Resp, and encodes CoA
- zero marker (-0) associates with Ground (marks p-structure as being part of Spkr’s ground)
- kù modifies GroundP, weakening the commitment
- linearization derived via movement of GroundP to RespP (hence Adr is asked to respond to Spkr’s attitude towards p)
5.3.1.2 Strong positive bias: [...]_{s-\hat{a}}

The “\(\hat{a}\)-strategy” is used to express strong positive bias based on a previous conversation in Medumba. Its context of use is illustrated below:

Source: previous conversation

Strength: strong

S-attitude
(33) **Context:** John tells his friend Mary that his is going to buy a dog. Mary congratulates him. A few days later, Mary runs into John on the street. She has a strong feeling that John bought the dog they talked about in a previous conversation and is very excited to hear about it. So she asks:

```
ũ 3yṅ ¹mbʰ ū  á
2SG buy dog Prt
“Did you buy the dog?”
```

**Analysis of [...]-á**

- á associates with Resp, and encodes CoA
- zero marker (-0) associates with Ground (marks p-structure as being part of Spkr’s ground)
- unlike in the ku […]-á strategy, the bias is not weakened by a Ground modifier
- linearization derived via movement of GroundP to RespP (hence Adr is asked to respond to Spkr’s attitude towards p)

(34)

(35)  

a. Merge order  

b. Derived order
5.3.2 Positive bias based on situation

5.3.2.1 Positive bias based on past situation: kùlá [...] á

The “kùlá ... á strategy” is used to express a positive bias based on a past situation in Medumba. In this context, only two conditions are in play namely the source for the bias and the timing as shown in the context below:

Source: situation

Timing: past

S-attitude

Bel (p)    Bel ¬p

(36) Context: John tells Mary that their common friend Greg has a new dog. Mary is really happy for Greg. The next day Mary runs into Greg on the street (the dog is not there). So Mary asks:

\[ kùlá \; ü \; ụü \; ū \; mbù \; á \]

Prt  2SG  have  dog  Q

“Do you have a dog?”

☞ Analysis of kùlá [...] á

• á associates with Resp, and encodes CoA
• zero marker (-0) associates with Ground (marks p-structure as being part of Spkr’s ground)
• kùlá specifies that the bias is based on a situation (We hypothesize that pastness is not directly encoded, it follows from saying that p is in Spkr’s ground).
• linearization derived via movement of GroundP to RespP (hence Adr is asked to respond to Spkr’s attitude towards p)
5.3.2.2 Strong positive bias based on present situation: kùlù […]s

The “kùlù-strategy” is used to express a strong positive bias based on a present situation in Medumba. In this context, the evidence for the speaker’s bias must be present as shown in the context below:

(39) **Context:** John asks Mary whether their common friend Greg has a dog. Mary says she has no idea. The next day Mary runs into Greg on the street. **Greg is with a dog.** So Mary asks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f.</th>
<th>kùlù</th>
<th>ū</th>
<th>ūuú</th>
<th>mbₙʰū</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prt 2SG have dog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Do you have a dog?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☞ **Analysis of kùlù […]s**

- no direct encoding of Response
- we hypothesize that in the presence of strong evidence this is not necessary
- zero marker (-0) associates with Ground (marks p-structure as being part of Spkr’s ground)
- kùlù specifies that the bias is based on a situation (We hypothesize that present is not directly encoded, it follows from saying that p is in Spkr’s ground).
- linearization derived via movement of GroundP to RespP (hence Adr is asked to respond to Spkr’s attitude towards p)
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(40) 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{RespP} \\
\text{GroundP} \\
\text{[...]} \\
\text{Resp} \\
\text{GroundP} \\
\text{\textit{kulà-}} \\
\text{GroundP} \\
\text{S} \\
\text{p-structure}
\end{array}
\]

(41) 

a. Merge order

b. Derived order
5.3.2.3 *Weak evidence based on present situation: […]_{kɔ̄}*

The “*kɔ̄*-strategy” is used to express a weak positive bias based on a present situation in Medumba. In this context, the speaker’s bias is based on indirect evidence as shown in the context below:

Context: John asks Mary whether their common friend Greg has a dog. Mary says she has no idea. The next day Mary runs into Greg on the street (*Greg is carrying a leash*). So Mary asks:

```
2SG have dog Prt
“Do you have a dog?”
```

**Analysis of […]_{kɔ̄}**

- no direct encoding of Response
- we hypothesize that in the presence of evidence this is not necessary
- *kɔ̄* modifies GroundP by weakening the evidence
- absence of origo-shift follows from the fact that Ground is always Speaker’s ground
- linearization derived via movement of p-structure to Spec, RespP (hence Adr is asked to respond to Spkr’s attitude towards p)
6 Conclusion

- There are 7 strategies to ask a polar question in Medumba
- They differ in form (different particles) and function (different context of use)

(45) The logic of polar questions in Medumba:

Polar questions

neutral 
kí

biased

negative 
áá

positive

previous conversation

weak 
kú+ á

strong 
á

situation

past 
kúlá + á

present 
weak 
k5

strong 
kúlá

- The variables that distinguish the 7 strategies for polar questions in Medumba
In Medumba, a tone language, much of the work associated with intonation in English is carried by sentence-peripheral particles (cf. Wakefield 2012 for evidence based on Cantonese, another language with a vast range of sentence-peripheral particles; see Asher & Reese 2007 for the role of intonation in biased questions).

Syntactically,

- There is layer in the clausal spine which serves to mark the relation between CGS and p.
- This layer is above [\ldots]_{\text{Root-S}}
- Different particles associate with different layers, as heads or as modifiers

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(46)} & & \\
& \text{a. Neutral question} & & \text{b. Biased question} & \\
\end{align*}\]
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Appendix

7.1 The relation between p and CG is marked in similar ways as the relation between discourse referents and CG

Common ground (CG)
… information shared among interlocutors
… contains (at least)
   i) discourse referents (DR)
   ii) propositions (p)

Heim 1982, Roberts 1996, Erteshik-Shir 1997 (a.o.)

(47) The contents of CG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Ground</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>propositions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{p, q, r}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discourse referents:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{i, j, k…}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both propositions and discourse referents can be marked based on when they are introduced into CG (at the time of utterance (new: r, k) vs. prior to time of utterance (old: p, q; i, j)

(48) Old vs. new information
• Just as discourse referents can be marked as old and new so can propositions
• Just as discourse referents can be marked as being introduced based on conversation or based on situation so can propositions

(49) The marking of discourse referents and propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Proposion</th>
<th>Discourse Referent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old</td>
<td>külā [...]s-á</td>
<td>Engl. the [...]NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Med. [...]NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>külā [...]</td>
<td>Engl. a [...]NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[...s-k3]</td>
<td>Med. tā[/] [...]NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>situation</td>
<td>külā [...]s-á</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>külā [...]</td>
<td>Ger dea[...]NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[...s-k3]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>conversation</td>
<td>(kü) [...]s-á</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ger da[...]NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[...s-á]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strength of evidence

| Strong       | külā [...]s  | n/a (??)         |
| Weak         | [...s-k3]    |                   |

7.2 Evidence for speech act structure

(50) Performative hypothesis (Ross 1970)

\[
S \xrightarrow{SA\text{-structure}} I tell you that \xrightarrow{P\text{-structure}} I have a dog
\]

(51) Neo-performative hypothesis (Speas & Tenny 2003)
Evidence for SA-structure

- Speaker-agreement
  (52) a. \textit{Khaw maa khráp.} Thai
     he come \textbf{spkr=male}
     ‘He is coming.’
  b. \textit{Khaw maa kā.} he come \textbf{spkr=female}
     ‘He is coming.’

- Adr-agreement
  (53) a. \textit{Pettek lan egin dik} Basque
     Peter.erg work.abs do.prf aux-\textbf{2masc}
     ‘Peter worked.’
  b. \textit{Pettek lan egin din}
     Peter.erg work.abs do.prf aux-\textbf{2fem}
     ‘Peter worked.’
  c. \textit{Pettek lan egin dizü}
     Peter.erg work.abs do.prf aux-\textbf{2formal}
     ‘Peter worked.’
  d. \textit{Pettek lan egin du}
     Peter.erg work.abs do.prf aux-\textbf{2pl}
     ‘Peter worked.’

Miyagawa 2012: (8) cited from Oyharçabal 1993

(54) SA-structure modification

a. \textit{Yoshi is not here [because I don’t see him].}

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}[level distance=1.5cm,
  level 1/.style={sibling distance=3.5cm}]
  \node (S) {S}
    child {node (S) {S}}
    child {node (SA-structure) {I tell you that}}
    child {node (S) {S}}
    child {node (p-structure) {because I don’t see him}}
    child {node (S) {because I don’t see him}}
    child {node (S) {Yoshi isn’t here}}
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

b. ≠ i) the reason for Yoshi’s not being here is that I don’t see him.
   = ii) the reason for my telling you that Yoshi is not here is that I don’t see him

7.3 Problems with the (neo-)performative hypothesis:

7.3.1 Ordering of Spkr and Adr

Cantonese has Speaker- and Addressee- oriented sentence final particles:
(55) a. zi3ming4 jau5 fu6ceot1 gwo3 si4gaan3
   Jimmy have devote Asp time
   ‘Jimmy has spent time (on the project).’

b. zi3ming4 jau5 fu6ceot1 gwo3 si4gaan3 me1?
   Jimmy have devote Asp time prt
   ‘Jimmy has spent time (on the project), has he?’

c. zi3ming4 jau5 fu6ceot1 gwo3 si4gaan3 gaa3 ho2?
   Jimmy have devote Asp time prt prt
   ‘Jimmy has spent time (on the project), right?’

Adr-oriented ho2 has to follow Spkr-oriented me1:
(56) a. daai6 seng1 zau6 dak1 gaa3 laa3 me1 ho2
    loud voice then okay prt prt prt
    ‘What can one get by just by being loud? I assume you’d agree it’s a valid
    question, right?’

b. *daai6 seng1 zau6 dak1 gaa3 laa3 ho2 me1
    loud voice then okay prt prtprt

Lam 2014: 64 (6)

This suggests that Adr-oriented projection is generated higher than Spkr-oriented projection (contrary

7.3.2 Discourse conditions for assertions are more complex

Ross (1970) performative hypothesis reflects traditional assumptions about discourse conditions for
assertions:
(57) Discourse conditions for assertions
   i) Spkr believes p
   ii) Spkr wants Adr to believe p

   (adapted from Bach & Harnish, 1979)

But discourse conditions for assertions are more complex:
   … Spkr wanting Adr to believe p is not sufficient for a felicitous speech act
   … Adr needs to confirm that they indeed adopts p into her common ground (CGAdr)

(58) Context: Mary just got a new dog. None of her friends know about this yet. On the first
    walk with her new dog, she runs into John and tells him:
    Mary: I got a new dog.
    John: a. #no response
         b. nods his head
         c. {uh-huh/Oh, really/?I see/That’s nice/…}

(59) Ingredients of an Assertion
   a. a proposition: p
   b. Spkr’s propositional attitude (pa (Spkr, p)) = Spkr-oriented
   c. Spkr’s request for Adr to adopt pa Req (pa (Adr, p)) = Adr-oriented

Wiltschko & Heim 2015
7.3.3 **An updated version of SA-structure: GroundP + RespP**

(60)

```
    RespP
     /\  \\
    Req (pa (A,p))

    GroundP
    /\ \\
    pa (S,p)

    S
    /\ \\
    p
```

- GroundP \(\rightarrow\) encodes propositional attitude of Spkr towards p
- Resp(onse)P \(\rightarrow\) encodes what Spkr wants Adr to do with p

For further evidence and discussion, see Wiltschko 2015, Heim & Wiltschko 2015, Lam et al. 2015, Thoma in prep.