Chen-An Chang

"Taiwanese *Daodi*-Questions in Despair: Empirical Studies of Triggering Emotive Agreements"

Studies have investigated Taiwanese discourse particle *daodi* and compared *daodi* to English *the-hell* (Huang & Ochi 2004, Chou 2012) in *extreme ignorance questions* (EIQ, e.g. *Where the hell is my key?*). *Daodi,* marking a question as 'non-canonical', can also be used in *cornering questions* (CorQ), see (1), and be used in *unanswerable questions* (UnansQ), see (2).

(1) CorQ Dialogue
Your sister: Ni   yao-bu-yao   he   kafe? (= *plain information-seeking question* (ISQ))
                      you want-not-want drink coffee
                      'Do you want to drink coffee?'
Since you keep not answering, your sister becomes impatient and utters.
Your sister: Ni   daodi yao-bu-yao   he   kafe? (=CorQ)
                       you daodi want-not-want drink coffee
                      'Do you want to drink coffee or not?'

(2) UnansQ Context (Emo) John and you are working in IT department of a company. Both of you are IT nerds who completely have no idea about other colleagues' leave or stay. But you both hate your colleague Anna, who always ruins the project. This time, she unsurprisingly ruins the project again. John utters to you.
John: Daodi ta   shenmeshihuo hui   lizhi?
          daodi she when   will   quit
          'When the hell will she quit?'

As current accounts only studied *daodi* in syntactic points of view, this talk I will present how I analyze *daodi* in semantics and pragmatics to cover all uses of *daodi* (EIQs, CorQs, and UnansQs). Two empirical studies were conducted. EXP1 examines if there is a pragmatic correlation between the use of *daodi* and contexts, and EXP2 investigates the reaction to UnansQ, as there is no way to solve the question. Note that the purpose of asking a question is about solving its issue, see Searle (1969) and Farkas (2022). The results of the studies will be presented in the talk. Based on the results of the studies, I develop an account, which consists of two ingredients. Ingredient (i) from EXP1: I argue that *daodi* conveys a CI content: *"Speaker is emotionally affected by the current situation.",* and Ingredient (ii): based on Farkas & Bruce (2010) and Farkas (2022), I propose that only $\{DC_{ad} \cup \{info(I)\}\}$ is in the *projected set* of the scoreboard for UnansQs. That is, *Addressee* is expected not to resolve the question and the question can be removed from the Table although it remains unresolved. Moreover, with ingredients (i) and (ii), *Speaker* does not expect *Addressee* to answer *daodi*-UnansQ, and *Addressee*, via pragmatic reasoning, offers the emotive agreement to UnansQs. This emotive agreement triggered by the context, which is emotion-loaded, or by the CI content of *daodi*, supported by the results of EXP2. In conclusion, I discuss how pragmatic contexts and linguistic cues (e.g. *daodi*) play the role in triggering felicitous reactions of discourse interlocutors.