

# Focus on Additivity

Adverbial modifiers  
in Romance, Germanic  
and Slavic languages

EDITED BY

Anna-Maria De Cesare  
Cecilia Andorno



*John Benjamins Publishing Company*



The present volume is centered on the notional domain of *additivity*. Many linguistic phenomena are based on additivity (i.e. are incremental) and additive relations are a mechanism that underlies a wide array of text types. Specifically, the present volume is centered on the class of function words which have been labeled, among many others, *Additive Focusing Modifiers* (AFMs). The chapters gathered in this volume deal with the syntactic, prosodic and pragmatic properties of AFMs and new lines of research on these items are pursued, including (i) the historical development of AFMs and the use of these forms in older stages of the European languages; (ii) the pragmatic and sociolinguistic properties of AFMs, in particular of the functions they play in discourse and their distribution in different language varieties; (iii) the processing of AFMs by adults, in particular by relying on reading experiments involving eye tracking and self-paced reading; (iv) the use of AFMs in language contact situations and (v) the acquisition of AFMs by different learner groups.

ISBN 978 90 272 5683 6



**John Benjamins Publishing Company**

P&b

ns

278

# DE CESARE & ANDORNO Focus on Additivity

db

# Focus on Additivity

Adverbial modifiers in Romance, Germanic  
and Slavic languages

*Edited by*

Anna-Maria De Cesare

University of Basel

Cecilia Andorno

University of Torino

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam / Philadelphia





The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences – Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

DOI 10.1075/pbns.278

Cataloging-in-Publication Data available from Library of Congress.

ISBN 978 90 272 5683 6 (HB)

ISBN 978 90 272 6525 8 (E-BOOK)

© 2017 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Company · <https://benjamins.com>

## Focus on Additivity

# *Pragmatics & Beyond New Series (P&BNS)*

ISSN 0922-842X

*Pragmatics & Beyond New Series* is a continuation of *Pragmatics & Beyond* and its Companion Series. The New Series offers a selection of high quality work covering the full richness of Pragmatics as an interdisciplinary field, within language sciences.

For an overview of all books published in this series, please see  
<http://benjamins.com/catalog/pbns>

## **Editor**

Anita Fetzer  
University of Augsburg

## **Associate Editor**

Andreas H. Jucker  
University of Zurich

## **Founding Editors**

Jacob L. Mey  
University of Southern  
Denmark

Herman Parret  
Belgian National Science  
Foundation, Universities of  
Louvain and Antwerp

Jef Verschueren  
Belgian National Science  
Foundation,  
University of Antwerp

## **Editorial Board**

Robyn Carston  
University College London

Thorstein Fretheim  
University of Trondheim

John C. Heritage  
University of California at Los  
Angeles

Susan C. Herring  
Indiana University

Masako K. Hiraga  
St. Paul's (Rikkyo) University

Sachiko Ide  
Japan Women's University

Kuniyoshi Kataoka  
Aichi University

Miriam A. Locher  
Universität Basel

Sophia S.A. Marmaridou  
University of Athens

Srikant Sarangi  
Aalborg University

Marina Sbisà  
University of Trieste

Deborah Schiffrin  
Georgetown University

Paul Osamu Takahara  
Kobe City University of  
Foreign Studies

Sandra A. Thompson  
University of California at  
Santa Barbara

Teun A. van Dijk  
Universitat Pompeu Fabra,  
Barcelona

Chaoqun Xie  
Fujian Normal University

Yunxia Zhu  
The University of Queensland

## **Volume 278**

Focus on Additivity

Adverbial modifiers in Romance, Germanic and Slavic languages

Edited by Anna-Maria De Cesare and Cecilia Andorno

# Table of contents

Introduction: On ‘additivity’ as a multidisciplinary research field	1
<i>Anna-Maria De Cesare</i>	

## Part I. Additive Focusing Modifiers from a typological and historical perspective

### CHAPTER 1

Syntax and semantics of additive focus markers from a cross-linguistic perspective: A tentative assessment of the state of the art	23
<i>Ekkehard König</i>	

### CHAPTER 2

Meaning both ‘also’ and ‘only’? The intriguing polysemy of Old Italian <i>pur(e)</i>	45
<i>Davide Ricca</i>	

## Part II. Additive Focusing Modifiers from a semantic, prosodic and pragmatic perspective

### CHAPTER 3

On the distribution of additive focus particles <i>addirittura</i> and <i>perfino/persino</i> in Italian	79
<i>Vahram Atayan</i>	

### CHAPTER 4

French additive particle <i>aussi</i> : Does prosody matter?	107
<i>Sandra Benazzo and Cédric Patin</i>	

### CHAPTER 5

Processing additivity in Spanish: <i>incluso</i> vs. <i>además</i>	137
<i>Laura Nadal, Inés Recio Fernández, Martha Rudka and Óscar Loureda</i>	



**Part III. Additive Focusing Modifiers from a discourse-oriented perspective**

CHAPTER 6

Mapping additivity through translation: From French <i>aussi</i> to Italian <i>anche</i> and back in the Europarl-direct corpus	157
<i>Cecilia Andorno and Anna-Maria De Cesare</i>	

CHAPTER 7

The scalar operator <i>even</i> and its German equivalents: Pragmatic and syntactic factors determining the use of <i>auch</i> , <i>selbst</i> and <i>sogar</i> in the Europarl corpus	201
<i>Volker Gast</i>	

**Part IV. Additive Focusing Modifiers from a language contact perspective**

CHAPTER 8

Additive focus particles in German-speaking learners of Italian as L2	237
<i>Irene Caloi</i>	

CHAPTER 9

Additive relations in L2 French: Contrasting acquisitional trends of Italian and Russian learners	265
<i>Sandra Benazzo and Katia Paykin</i>	

CHAPTER 10

Ënghe, ence and also <i>anche</i> : Ladin and Italian additive particles in language contact situation	311
<i>Ilaria Fiorentini</i>	

Focusing modifiers index	331
--------------------------	-----

General index	333
---------------	-----

# Introduction

## On ‘additivity’ as a multidisciplinary research field

Anna-Maria De Cesare

Universität Basel

### 1. Focus on additivity

#### 1.1 Defining the domain of ‘additivity’ and its expression through additive markers

The present volume, entitled *Focus on Additivity. Adverbial Modifiers in Romance, Germanic and Slavic languages*, is centered on the notional domain of *additivity* (or *addition*). Additivity is part of a group of four logical operations: (1) additivity (or addition), (2) repetition, (3) subtraction, and (4) disjunction (see Nøjgaard 1992/1, §79, p. 150). We are thus dealing with a very broad and basic notional domain, which can certainly be considered to be a universal cognitive category. Many linguistic phenomena are based on addition (i.e. are incremental) and the very acts of speaking and writing can be captured in linear terms, as operations minimally based on adding chunks of information to what has been previously said and/or written. Additive relations are a mechanism that underlies a wide array of text types (argumentative, narrative, descriptive etc.) and is central to the discourse of both adults and children (suffice it to consider the use of *puis* in informal spoken French as well as of the French and Italian expressions *(et) après* and *(e) poi* ‘(and) then’ even by L2 learners; on *puis* as an additive marker derived from a temporal expression, cf. Mosegaard Hansen 1994).

From a discourse point of view, the additive operation can be considered to be more basic than all the other logical or rhetorical relations (contrast, condition, concession etc.): it doesn’t need to be linguistically explicit, i.e. expressed through the use of an additive marker, and the default interpretation of two or more adjacent linguistic segments (<a + b + n>) is often that of addition. Moreover, additive relations are used frequently in any text type; see Example (1) for an illustration of additive relations occurring in journalistic prose, specifically in an online article published by the nytimes.com. In this article, there are numerous additive relations,

taking place both within the same utterance (as in the first text block and the last block after the colon), between utterances and even between text blocks (see the relation holding between the third text block and fourth one, beginning with the conjunction *And*).

- (1) AVENTURA, Fla. – Freshly energized protesters are taking to the streets, members of Congress are being confronted in their districts by constituents angry over health care, and wealthy donors are turning fear into action.

Eight years after Republicans united after a stinging electoral defeat to oppose President Barack Obama, Democrats are channeling an even deeper anxiety over President Trump – and a far shallower defeat – into a newfound burst of organizing.

Party leaders, eyeing the huge protests last weekend and growing worries over the promised repeal of the Affordable Care Act, are hoping to recreate the mass movement that sprang up in 2009 and swept Republicans to power in the House and in governor’s races across the country – a Tea Party equivalent from the left.

And they are turning to the same playbook that guided their conservative counterparts in the aftermath of Mr. Obama’s election: creating or expanding a number of groups outside the formal architecture of the party, focusing on often-overlooked state legislative and redistricting campaigns, and bringing together frightened fund-raisers to underwrite it all. (nytimes.com, 23.1.2017)

From a linguistic point of view, while additive discourse relations can remain unexpressed, as shown in the French and English invented examples given in (2), in which the second proposition (*q*; *Elle a froid* / *She is cold*) is added to the first one (*p*: *Eva est fatiguée* / *Eva is tired*), they can be made explicit through a variety of function words (or discourse markers), realized as coordinating conjunctions, such as *et* / *and* in (3), prepositional phrases and clauses functioning as discourse connectives, such as *en plus* / *in addition*, and *qui plus est* / *what is more*, respectively in (4), and adverbs, such as *également*, *aussi* and *also* in (5). In contrast to the implicit additive operation occurring in (2), the choice of using an additive marker to explicitly signal the presence of an additive relation often also involves conveying an idea of reinforcement of what has been said in the previous discourse (see Greenbaum 1969: 35).

- (2) a. Eva est fatiguée. Elle a froid.  
b. Eva is tired. She is cold.
- (3) a. Eva est fatiguée. *Et* elle a froid.  
b. Eva is tired. *And* she is cold.



- (4) a. Eva est fatiguée. *En plus* / *Qui plus est*, elle a froid.  
 b. Eva is tired. *In addition* / *What is more*, she is cold.
- (5) a. Eva est fatiguée. Elle a *également* / *aussi* froid.  
 b. Eva is tired. She is *also* cold.

Addition generally requires that the elements involved present some degree of similarity. In text linguistics, an additive discourse relation holds when at least two propositions (belonging to the same or to different utterances) cooperate to express the same logical relation in respect to a third proposition (Ferrari et al. 2008: 125). Typically, as shown in (6), the propositions involved in an additive relation point to the same conclusion (*r*: *Elle ne continuera pas à skier* / *She will not continue skiing*). In other words, these propositions are co-oriented towards a conclusion that can be explicit, as in (6), or left implicit, as in (3) to (5). In light of these considerations, it turns out that at the discourse level an additive relation involves at least three linguistic segments. This relation can be schematized as in (7), on the basis of Ricci's (2007: 61) analysis of Fr. *en plus* 'in addition' and Boursier et al.'s 1980 study on Fr. *d'ailleurs*, roughly corresponding to 'also', 'moreover':

- (6) a. Eva est fatiguée. *En plus*, elle a froid. Elle ne continuera pas à skier.  
 b. Eva is tired. *In addition*, she is cold. She will not continue skiing.
- (7)  $r: p - \text{addition} - q$

There is another important general distinction to be made in the set of additive markers available in the European languages. This distinction concerns the type of additive relation in which they are involved. While coordinating conjunctions are involved in *syntagmatic addition* (even when the conjunction is used at the beginning of a new sentence, as in Example 3), additive adverbs such as French *également*, *aussi* and English *also* (Example 5) are primarily involved in *paradigmatic addition*. Roughly speaking, the main difference between syntagmatic and paradigmatic addition is that only the former requires all the elements (i.e. the elements that are added and the elements to which one or more elements are being added) to be expressed in the context; syntagmatic addition also typically requires the elements involved in the additive operation to be adjacent. Referring again to Example (3), it would be odd (but of course not impossible) to limit oneself to express the proposition starting with the conjunction (*Et elle a froid.* / *And she is cold*). By contrast, additive adverbs, such as *également*, *aussi* and their equivalents in other languages, are perfectly natural in contexts in which there is no explicit mention of the elements to which the part affected by these adverbs (i.e. their domain of application) is added. In other words, in the case of additive adverbs, only the added element ought to be made explicit. Moreover, when these elements are



explicit, there is no need for them to be adjacent, even to the domain of application of the additive marker. Note that, when the other members involved in the additive operation are expressed in the previous context, and are adjacent to the domain of application of the additive marker, as is the case in Example (5), we can consider that a form of syntagmatic addition is present as well (on these issues, see Nøjgaard 1992: 150–158).

Finally, mention should be made of an important semantic difference within the set of additive markers, which has to do with the extension of their scope. The scope of additive markers coincide with an entire clause or, more precisely, proposition (involving a Subject and a Predicate). Consequently, in cases such as (8), in which *also* associates with an entire proposition (*any woman could become a diviner*), the additive adverbial marker functions as a discourse connective. Specifically, in this example, *also* adds a proposition (i.e. the one following the adverbial) to a previous one (expressed in the second utterance of the text: *they [the women] were allowed to dress as men, tend the cattle, drink beer in a masculine fashion*) and both propositions specify the content of the claim made in the first utterance of the paragraph (*women could only ever assert power in any public fashion in two ways*). Thus, a crucial distinction holds between the categories of *additive connectives* and *additive adverbs* functioning as *focusing modifiers* (as will be seen in more details in §1.2): the latter require the backdrop of secondary information, i.e. a background, and consequently, by definition, involve a segment that is smaller than a proposition (on this issue, see König in this volume).

- (8) In only two ways could women ever assert power in any public fashion. On one day in the year they were allowed to dress as men, tend the cattle, drink beer in a masculine fashion [...]. *Also* any woman, if possessed by the spirits of the dead ancestors, could become a diviner – usually called in lay description ‘a witch-doctor’.  
(example from Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 29)

## 1.2 Additive focusing modifiers as a research object: Looking back and moving forward

The present volume is centered on the class of function words corresponding to the items highlighted in italics in Example (5), which have been labeled, among many others, *additive focus particles* in the English literature (König 1991), *Gradpartikeln* ‘degree particle’ in the German literature (Altmann 1976, 2009), *adverbiaux paradigmatizants* ‘paradigmatizing adverbials’ in the French literature (Nölke 1983) and *avverbi focalizzanti additivi* ‘additive focusing adverbs’ in the Italian one (Ricca 1999; Andorno 1999, 2000). In this introduction and in several chapters of the volume (see the chaps. by König as well as Ricca), the terms *additive focusing modifiers*

(also found, e.g., in Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 592) and *additive focus markers* are used instead.<sup>1</sup> The main advantage of employing these labels in cross-linguistic studies devoted to several language groups (such as the Romance, Germanic and Slavic ones) is that they do not refer to a specific linguistic superordinate class, i.e. they do not indicate if these forms belong to the macro-category of ‘Adverbs’, ‘Adverbials’ or ‘Particles’. Thus, these labels are welcome when one has to refer to items such as English *also* (to which we can add *too, as well, even, so much as*), German *auch*, Italian *anche*, French *aussi* and *également*, Spanish *también*, Ladin *ënghe/ence*, Rumantsch Grischun *er(a)*, Russian *tože/takže* etc., which belong to different parts of speech, depending on the grammatical traditions of each of these languages. It is well known, for instance, that in the German grammatical tradition, additive focusing modifiers belong to the class of *Partikeln* ‘particles’ (see Altmann 2009 for an overview of the main literature), a class that does not have the same extension and intension in the Romance languages (for a discussion on this issue related to the Italian language, cf. De Cesare 2000).

Over roughly the last forty years, as members of the class of focusing modifiers (henceforth FMs), comprising other important and in part semantically related subclasses (see Table 2 below), additive FMs have been defined as an autonomous category (cf. De Cesare 2015a). While most of the studies on (additive) FMs describe these forms in a single language (cf. Altmann 1976, 1978; Jacobs 1983, Dimroth 2004, Sudhoff 2010 and Poźlewicz 2011 on German; Nølke 1983 on French; Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983, Moser 1992, Gast 2006 on English; Ricca 1999, Andorno 2000, De Cesare 2002 and La Forgia 2006 on Italian; Schwenter 2001, Cuartero Sánchez 2002, and Portolés 2007 on Spanish), many recent relevant works take into account more than one language. The first important study to describe FMs from a comparative perspective is König 1991.

The main contribution of the first relevant studies on FMs (namely Altmann 1976, 1978; Jacobs 1983; König 1991, 1993; Nølke 1983; Ricca 1999; Andorno 1999, 2000) is to have set the defining semantic and syntactic core properties of this class (a class considered by König 1991 to have “some proto-typical members, which have a great deal in common and some marginal ones, which also share properties with other classes or subclasses of lexical items”, p. 15), showing how these forms differ from other adverbs or particles subclasses, and to have provided an open list

---

1. In the chapters of this volume, these forms are also labeled differently: *additive (focus) particles* (Atayan; Benazzo and Patin; Nadal et al.; Benazzo and Paykin; Caloi; Fiorentini), *additive focus adverbs* (Andorno and De Cesare), *additive focalizers* (Caloi) and *additive operators* (Gast). While some of these labels refer to a specific word class (particles, adverbs), the terms *operators* and *focalizers* directly relate to the semantic properties of these items. For an overview of the labels used in the literature, see De Cesare 2015a.



of the forms included in the class. The central semantic operation performed by FMs consists in quantifying over the set of alternative values to the element in focus, i.e. domain of application of the FM (cf. König 1991: 33; Ricca 1999: 146; Andorno 2000: 49–50). Based on the relevant literature, the following tentative inventories of FMs in English, German, French and Italian can be proposed:

**Table 1.** English, German, French and Italian FMs (from De Cesare 2015a: 56–57)

English	again, alone, also, as well, at least, chiefly, either, equally, especially, even, exactly, exclusively, further, in addition, in particular, just, largely, let alone, likewise, mainly, merely, mostly, neither, nor, notably, only, particularly, precisely, primarily, principally, purely, similarly, simply, solely, so much as, specifically, still/much less, too
German	allein, allenfalls, allerdings, auch, auch nur, ausgerechnet, ausschließlich, bereits, besonders, bestenfalls, bloß, eben, ebenfalls, ebenso, ebensowenig, einzig, einzig und allein, erst, ferner, freilich, genau, genauso wenig, gerade, geradezu, gleich, gleichfalls, höchstens, insbesondere, in Sonderheit, jedenfalls, lediglich, mindestens, nachgerade, nicht, nicht einmal (nicht mal), nicht zuletzt, noch, nur, schon, selbst, sogar, sonderlich, vollends, vor allem, wenigstens, wieder(um), zumal, zumindest
French	à peine, approximativement, au moins, au plus, aussi, d'ailleurs, de plus, déjà, également, encore, environ, essentiellement, exactement, exclusivement [as antonym to <i>inclusivement</i> ], exclusivement [as synonym of <i>seulement</i> ], inclusivement, justement, largement, même, ne...que..., non plus, notamment, par exemple, particulièrement, personnellement, pour ainsi dire, pour le moins, pratiquement, précisément, presque, principalement, prioritairement, purement, quelque, respectivement, seulement, si j'ose dire, similairement, simplement, spécialement, spécifiquement, surtout, uniquement, voire
Italian	addirittura, affatto, al massimo, al più, almeno, altresì, anche, ancora, appena, appunto, ben, esattamente, esclusivamente, già, in particolare, in persona, mai, meramente, mica, neanche, nemmeno, neppure, parimenti, particolarmente, perfino, persino, personalmente, più, precisamente, principalmente, proprio, pur, puramente, pure, semplicemente, sempre, sì, solamente, solo, soltanto, soprattutto, specialmente, tuttalpiù, unicamente

Several semantic and formal sets are clearly identifiable from Table 1. In Table 2 we identify five subgroups of FMs primarily on the basis of their meaning. This volume is centered on the *also*-group and the *even*-group.<sup>2</sup> These two groups of

2. The *neither*-group, by contrast, is only sporadically taken into consideration, but it certainly deserves more attention in future research (on these forms, see De Cesare 2017 and Franco et al. 2016 for both a synchronic and diachronic perspective on Italian *neanche*, *neppure* and *nemmeno*, all of which can be roughly translated as ‘(n)either’, ‘not either’, ‘nor’, ‘not even’).

FMs differ in their semantic features. The first set, which includes E. *also*, G. *auch*, Fr. *aussi* and It. *anche*, conveys the idea that at least one relevant alternative value to the one in focus is valid, i.e. yield to a true proposition (*Eva also speaks French* = *Eva speaks French besides speaking other languages*). Their main semantic feature is [+ additive]. The second set, which includes the *scalar/grading* FMs, i.e. E. *even*, G. *sogar*, Fr. *même*, It. *perfino* (or *persino*) and *addirittura*, instructs to order the alternative values to the one in the domain of application of the FM on a scale (of likelihood, but not only) and in assigning the added value a high or low position on the scale (cf. Jacobs 1983, König 1991, Andorno 2000; on scalar operators in the languages of Europe, cf. Gast and van der Auwera 2011). The FMs included in the second set are thus associated to two semantic features (*Eva even speaks Chinese* = *Besides speaking other languages, Eva speaks Chinese and this language is rated as low on the likelihood scale of idioms one is capable of speaking*): [+ additive] and [+ scalar].

**Table 2.** Semantic groups of English, German, French and Italian FMs (from De Cesare 2015a: 58)

	<i>also-group</i>	<i>even-group</i>	<i>neither-group</i>	<i>only-group</i>	<i>just-group</i>
English	also too	even so much as	neither either, nor	only solely alone	just
German	auch	sogar	auch nicht nicht einmal	nur, allein einzig erst	ausgerechnet gerade
French	aussi également	même voire	non plus même pas	seulement	justement
Italian	anche altresi pure	perfino persino addirittura	neanche nemmeno neppure	solo solamente soltanto	proprio

Following the seminal works on FMs mentioned earlier, a large body of studies has refined the semantic and syntactic properties of one or more prototypical members of the class of additive FMs (cf., to name but a few, Sabatier 1979; Kay 1990; Perrin-Naffakh 1996; Suomela-Härmä 1998; Krifka 1998; De Cesare 2004a). Moreover, other properties of these forms have been under close scrutiny. In the last two decades, the prosodic and pragmatic properties of additive FMs have been taken into consideration as well, and new lines of research on these forms have emerged (on this issue, also see the overview provided in De Cesare and Andorno 2015). These lines of research include, among others, the following four (note that the references given in parentheses are by no means exhaustive):



- i. the **historical development of FMs and the use of these forms in older stages of the European languages** (see Prévost 1999; Dardano 2002; Visconti 2005; Traugott 2006; García Pérez 2011, 2013; Herrero Ruiz De Loizaga 2014; Franco et al. 2016);
- ii. the **pragmatic and sociolinguistic properties of FMs**, in particular the functions they play in discourse and their distribution in different language varieties (Schwenter 2001; De Cesare 2004b; La Forgia 2006; Portolés 2009; Schiemann 2009; De Cesare 2017; De Cesare under review);
- iii. the **processing of FMs by adults**, specifically by relying on reading experiments involving eye tracking and self-paced reading (Loureda and Nadal 2011; Loureda et al. 2015);
- iv. the **acquisition of FMs** by different learner groups and, more generally, their **use in language contact situations** (Dimroth and Klein 1996; Nederstigt 2003; Gayraud 2004; Benazzo et al. 2004; Andorno 2005, 2008; Watorek and Dimroth 2005; Benazzo 2005; Bohnacker and Rosén 2008; Höhle et al. 2009; Leray 2009; Müller et al. 2009; Benazzo and Andorno 2010; Berger and Höhle 2012; Borreguero Zuloaga 2012; Benazzo and Dimroth 2015; Andorno and Turco 2015).

A wide array of the studies devoted to additive FMs take a comparative-contrastive approach, offering a description based on data from more than one language (see also König 1982; Blumenthal 1985; Lauwers 2006; Sainz 2006; Gast and van der Auwera 2011; Borreguero Zuloaga 2011, 2015; De Cesare and Borreguero Zuloaga 2014; the sets of languages taken into account in these studies can be retrieved from the titles given in the reference section). These fine-grained micro-typological studies show that FMs vary significantly from a semantic, syntactic and pragmatic point of view not only across language groups (cf. Dimroth et al. 2010 and Benazzo and Dimroth 2015 on Romance and Germanic), which is somewhat expected, but also within one and the same language group (see Sudhoff 2012 on Germanic). Conversely, other studies show that there also are significant similarities between FMs belonging to different language groups (see for instance Ramat and Ricca 1994 on English, French, Italian and Spanish; Ureña Gómez-Moreno 2009 on English and Spanish, as well as De Cesare 2015a on English, German, French and Italian and De Cesare 2015b on Italian, French and English).

Despite a growing interest in the lines of research mentioned above, a number of important issues on additive FMs in the European languages (in particular on their prototypical members: E. *also*, G. *auch*, It. *anche*, Fr. *aussi* etc.) are still open to discussion. Moreover, new questions have emerged and the perspectives one can adopt to investigate additive FMs as well as the languages to study further enriched. The most pressing general questions to address in relation to these forms concern