Izabela Jordanoska, Anna Kocher* and Raúl Bendezú-Araujo

Introduction special issue: marking the truth: a cross-linguistic approach to verum

Abstract: This special issue focuses on the theoretical and empirical underpinnings of truth-marking. The names that have been used to refer to this phenomenon include, among others, *counter-assertive focus*, *polar(ity) focus*, *verum focus*, *emphatic polarity* or simply *verum*. This terminological variety is suggestive of the wide range of ideas and conceptions that characterizes this research field. This collection aims to get closer to the core of what truly constitutes verum. We want to expand the empirical base and determine the common and diverging properties of truth-marking in the languages of the world. The objective is to set a theoretical and empirical baseline for future research on verum and related phenomena.

Keywords: verum; cross-linguistic variation; polarity; semantics; typology

1 Defining verum

The topic of this special issue is truth-marking. There are various terms that have been employed to describe phenomena associated with this, among others, *counter-assertive focus* (Watters 1979), *polar(ity) focus* (Dik 1981), *verum focus* (Höhle 1992), *emphatic polarity* (Villa-García and González Rodríguez 2021) or simply *verum* (Gutzmann and Castroviejo Miró 2011). We use *verum* throughout this introduction for ease of reference. This special issue collects articles describing how verum is expressed in different languages. In many cases, the articles present the first description of verum in the specific language or the first description of the specific verum-strategy they focus on. The special issue also contributes theoretical novelties and shows how the new empirical findings refine our theoretical conception of verum. Our aim is twofold: (a) to get closer to the core of the nature of verum, and (b) to expand the empirical base for the cross-linguistic identification of its diverging

*Corresponding author: Anna Kocher**, Romanistik, Katholische Universität Eichstätt-Ingolstadt, Universitätsallee 1, 85072, Eichstätt, Germany, E-mail: anna.kocher@ku.de

Izabela Jordanoska, Linguistik, Max Planck Institut for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen, The Netherlands, E-mail: Izabela.Jordanoska@mpi.nl

Raúl Bendezú-Araujo, Linguistik, Universität Potsdam, Potsdam, Germany

properties. Our starting point is Höhle's (1992) definition of verum, who describes it as an emphasis on the expression of the truth of a proposition. In German, this is achieved by prosodical means, as shown in (1).

(1)   A: 'I asked Hanna what Karl was doing at the moment and she made the ridiculous claim that he was writing a screenplay.'

      B: (*das stimmt*)   *Karl*   SCHREIBT   *ein*   *Drehbuch.*
          (that's right)   Karl   writes   a   screenplay
          '(that's right) Karl IS writing a screenplay'

<div align="right">(German, Höhle 1992: 112)</div>

In B's reply in (1), the stress on the verb *schreibt* serves to reinforce the claim that Karl is writing a book in a context where the previous utterance indicates that the interlocutor believes this is not the case. Although the correction of previous utterances, as in this case, might be the most prototypical context for eliciting verum, it can actually be found in a much broader set of contexts. Expanding on the set of diagnostics employed by Zimmermann and Hole (2008), Matthewson and Glougie (2018: 165) present a list of environments where verum emphasis is either felicitous or infelicitous in German and English. These contexts are shown in (2).

(2)   **Properties of verum emphasis in English and German**
      Contexts where verum emphasis is allowed:
      i.   Correcting a previous utterance
      ii.   Corrections of negative expectations
      iii.   Emphatic agreement
      iv.   Confirmation of expected path of events
      v.   Answers to questions (with emphatic effect)
      vi.   Answers to indirect questions
      vii.   In the antecedent of conditionals ('stressing the conditionality')
      viii.   Inside yes-no questions (with an 'Is it really?' effect)

      Contexts where verum emphasis is disallowed:
      ix.   Discourse-initially
      x.   Neutral answers to questions

Matthewson and Glougie (2018) propose to use these contexts as a baseline for the cross-linguistic analysis of verum (or verum-related) strategies. Furthermore, the distribution of the felicity and infelicity of verum in these two sets of contexts reinforces the intuition that its use is deeply connected to pragmatics.

     The contexts summarized in (2) are illustrated by different languages in (3)–(10) with examples drawn from the literature. Verum is typically employed to correct a previous utterance as in (3) or to correct a negative expectation as in (4). In

these contexts, it overlaps with polarity focus because the corrected utterance is often of the opposite polarity to the verum-utterance.

(3)   **Correcting a previous utterance (context i. in [2])**
    A: 'Tan didn't help Mai.'
    B: Không. Tân **có**   giúp Mai.
        not   Tân   VERUM help Mai
        'No. Tan DID help Mai.'

                          (Vietnamese, Thuan 2016: 57)

(4)   **Correction of negative expectations (context ii. in [2])**
    A: 'I don't know whether John is coming to the party or not.'
    B: ***Sí***   (*que*) *viene*
        VERUM QUE   comes
        'He IS coming.'

                          (Spanish, Kocher 2023: 2)

Verum is also used to express an emphatic agreement with a previous utterance as in (5) or to confirm an expected path of events as in (6).

(5)   **Emphatic agreement (context iii. in [2])**
    A: 'Today Fatou looks good.'
    B: (*Waaw*) *rafet*   *na*   **kay/** **gaa!**
        yes.REV be.pretty 3SG.CL.FOC KAY   GAA
        '(Yes), she DOES look good!'

                          (Wolof, Jordanoska 2020: 102)

(6)   **Confirmation of expected path of events (context iv. in [2])**
    A: '(So) the midwife has to bury (it) herself?'
    B: *Apa-chi-j=llara*   *pamba-na=**rá***/ *#pamba-na*/ *#pamba-na=mi*
        bring-CAUS-AG=ID.REF bury-INF=VERUM bury-INF   bury-INF=MI
        'Yes, the midwife DOES have to bury (it) herself.'

                      (Upper Napo Kichwa, Grzech 2020: 91)

When used in an answer to a question, as in (7) and (8), the answer receives an emphatic reading.

(7)   **Answers to questions (with emphatic effect) (context v. in [2])**
    A: 'Is Paul tall at all?'
    B: ***Sí***   *ho*   *és!*
        VERUM CL.NEUT is
        'He is!'

                          (Catalan, Kocher 2022: 188)

(8)   **Answers to indirect questions (context vi. in [2])**
       A: 'I don't know if Henry is coming today.'
       B: **K'ap**   dim   'witxw=is.
            VERUM   PROSP   arrive=QUDD
            'He IS coming.'

                                         (Gitksan, Matthewson 2021:76)

Verum has also been observed in sentence types other than main declaratives. When appearing in the antecedent of conditionals, as in (9), verum stresses the conditionality of the statement.

(9)   **In the antecedent of conditionals (stressing the conditionality) (context vii. in [2])**
       Context: You think Aidan probably won't come.
       Ji   *daa*   ***ap***   *'witxw=s*   *Aidan,*
       irr   spt   VERUM   arrive=PN   Aidan
       dim   *ii*   *ha'w-'y,*   *ii*   ***ap***
       PROSP   CL.CNJ   go.home-1SG.II   CL.CNJ   VERUM
       nee=dii   *ha'niigood-'y*   *dim*   *'witxw-t.*
       NEG=FOC   think-1SG.II   PROSP   arrive-3.II
       'IF Aidan comes, I will leave (but I don't think he will come).'

                               (Gitksan, Matthewson and Glougie 2018: 171,
                                   adapted from Zimmermann and Hole 2008)

When verum appears in yes-no questions, as in (10), it receives an 'is it really?' reading, which is closely linked to the expression of doubt, surprise, or speaker bias.

(10)   **Inside yes-no questions (with an 'is it really?' effect) (context viii. in [2])**
       Ga   ***ku***   *masta*   *shinkafa*   *ni*   *ya?*
       2SG   VERUM   buy   rice   DEF   Q
       'DID you (really) buy the rice?'

                                   (Bura, Gutzmann et al. 2020: 21)

Verum-marking is infelicitous in discourse-initial contexts as in (11), and in neutral answers to questions, as in (12).

(11)   **Discourse-initially (context ix. in [2])**
       Context: We are sitting working and Michael is also in the room.
       Michael suddenly says out of the blue:
       (#**K'ap**)   ban=hl   t'imges-'y
       VERUM   hurt   head-1SG.LL
       'I #HAVE/have a headache.'

                                   (Gitksan, Matthewson and Glougie 2018: 172)

(12)   **Neutral answers to questions (context x. in [2])**
        Katie wonders what kind of animal Fluffy is, so she asks Michael what
        Fluffy is. Michael replies:
        (#***K'ap***)   *lelt/lalt=t*   *Fluffy*(*=ist*).
        VERUM   snake=DM   Fluffy(=QUDD)
        'Fluffy #IS/is a snake.'

<div align="right">(Gitksan, Matthewson and Glougie 2018: 172)</div>

One of our aims is to test how universally these contexts apply and what conclusions we can draw for our understanding of verum and its theoretical modeling. The results of the special issue, which contains data from Bantu, Quechuan, Romance and Germanic, showed that some strategies behave like verum, in being felicitous in the contexts given in (3)–(10) and infelicitous in the contexts in (11) and (12). Other strategies, however, show a different felicity behavior and are felicitous only in a subset of the contexts.

Standardly, verum is identified by using qualitative function-to-form methods such as context-based elicitation and picture-based elicitation, which we also find in this volume (Bloom Ström and Zeller, Kerr and Van der Wal). When authors are native speakers, we often find a combination of introspection and context-based felicity judgments from other speakers (Amido and Buchczyk, Müller, Muñoz Pérez and Verdecchia). Quantitative or mixed quantitative and qualitative approaches, however, are also possible. In this volume, Bendezú-Araujo uses a form-to-function corpus-based approach.

Having illustrated the current methods on identifying verum, in the next section, we will turn to theoretical approaches to analyzing the phenomenon.

2 Analyzing verum

There is a vast amount of theoretical work on verum, most of which has been strongly informed by Germanic data. As shown by example (1) in the previous section, in this language family, verum is expressed predominantly through stress on a finite verb. This empirical fact has been used to suggest a link between sentence mood and verum (cf. for instance Höhle 1992; Lohnstein 2016). Kocher (2023) showed that some Romance varieties, even though they use a particle strategy to express verum, can also be analyzed in much the same way as Lohnstein (2016) proposes for German.

Besides this *sentence mood theory of verum*, there are two main trends in theoretical approaches to the phenomenon. Gutzmann (2012) systematized

existing approaches by distinguishing Lexical Operator Theses (LOTs) from Focal Accent Theses (FATs).[1] FATs (such as Büring 2006; Höhle 1992) posit that every sentence has a verum operator that is subject to the focal marking rules of the language in question. In a verum context the verum operator is focused. A more recent approach to the FAT, that does not rely on a verum operator, can be found in Goodhue (2018, 2022), who posits that the verum interpretation is a pragmatic effect of focus. Since a focus always signals contrast between itself and its false alternative, focus marking can always be used as a strategy for emphasis. In the case of verum it is polarity focus, which signals contrast with the opposite polarity.

LOTs, such as Romero and Han (2004) and Gutzmann et al. (2020), on the other hand, posit that verum is a lexical operator independent of focus and is only present in a sentence when it is overtly realized. According to Romero and Han's (2004) LOT approach, verum in English can be realized by *do*-insertion, outer negation questions and the adverb *really*, although it has later been disputed whether the latter two are really instances of verum (see for example Goodhue 2018 and references therein). Gutzmann et al. (2020), studying a sample of African and indigenous American languages that use morphological verummarking, found that there is no systematic overlap between the strategies employed for the marking of focus and the marking of verum in these languages. Furthermore, they showed that even in languages in which double focus constructions are ungrammatical, focus and verum marking can co-occur provided that the context is right. They take this as evidence for the LOT, and against the FAT. However, it does not have to be the case that the FAT and the LOT form a dichotomy. Goodhue (2018, 2022) states that while his own FAT approach captures the English data, it is possible that different languages use different strategies. This means that both the FAT and the LOT can be found cross-linguistically and that they are not mutually exclusive.

One goal for this special issue was to get closer to the core of the nature of verum and contribute to the theoretical understanding of the phenomenon. The authors of this volume provide important arguments to the discussion on how to theoretically account for verum. In the articles, we come across versions of both LOTs and FATs, and a novel thesis: the Backgrounding and Underspecification Thesis (BUT, coined by Kerr and Van der Wal, this volume).

Lexical operators are employed in this volume by Bendezú-Araujo and by Amido and Buchczyk. Bendezú-Araujo accounts for the polyfunctionality of the clitic =*mi* in Conchucos Quechua, which can be found in a wide array of contexts, including

---

1 While the FAT in the narrow sense decomposes verum into focus and a verum operator, the sentence mood theory of verum can also be considered a FAT in the broad sense since it posits a relation between focus and verum, albeit not focus on a verum operator, but on sentence mood.

verum contexts, by analyzing the clitic as an assertion operator used when the speaker wants to ensure that a proposition will be a added to the common ground. Amido and Buchczyk analyze verum as an operator that can be coordinated with an exclamative operator to render the *assertion + exclamative* constructions that can be found in European Portuguese and Standard German. The authors also add ingredients from the FAT in identifying which moves can precede a verum-marked sentence.

Müller (this volume) argues for the FAT by providing novel data from German. He shows that overt truth-related adverbs, such as *wirklich* 'really', have different usage conditions when they do not carry the focal accent. It is only when they are accented that their distribution matches verb-verum. Thus, he concludes, the adverbs do not contribute verum on their own (contra LOT) and their behavior of these adverbs shows that verum can be decomposed into focus and a lexical anchor for said focus. However, like Amido and Buchczyk, Müller also does not consider the FAT and the LOT to be mutually exclusive: the author analyzes the specific discourse conditions of the particle *wohl* as a lexicalization of what in adverb- and verb-verum constructions is derived compositionally.

Bloom Ström and Zeller (this volume) show that the FAT can be interpreted more broadly and can also account for data in a language that does not mark focus prosodically. In the Nguni languages Zulu and Xhosa, verum is marked in the same way as predicate focus. These facts can be captured by a thesis that treats verum as a subtype of focus, regardless of how focus is marked in a given language. The FAT is also employed by Muñoz Pérez and Verdecchia (this volume), who analyze the clause doubling constructions in Spanish as bearing polarity focus.

Finally, Kerr and Van der Wal (this volume) argue for a novel thesis based on Bantu data: the BUT. In most of the languages in their sample, verum is marked only indirectly, by backgrounding other elements in the clause. Thus, the authors argue that, while verum is not directly marked as a focus in most of these languages (an argument in favor of the LOT), there is a conceptual link between verum and information structure (an argument in favor of the FAT). They therefore add the BUT to the typology of verum theses that can account for cross-linguistic data. As we will see in the next section, these data can be quite diverse.

3 Typologizing verum

In Section 2, we mentioned that most studies on verum are based on Germanic languages. Non-European languages for which the expression of verum has been described, in greater or lesser detail, include Vietnamese (Austroasiatic; Thuan 2016), Aghem (Niger-Congo; Watters 1979), Gur languages (Niger-Congo; Schwarz 2010),

Bambara (Niger-Congo; Prokhorov 2014), Kakabe (Niger-Congo; Vydrina 2020), Wolof (Niger-Congo; Jordanoska 2020), Bura (Afro-Asiatic; Gutzmann et al. 2020), Upper Napo Kichwa (Quechuan; Grzech 2020), Gitksan (Tsimshianic; Matthewson 2021) and Kwak'wala (Wakashan; Littell 2016). These languages employ a variety of different strategies. Moreover, even within one language, there does not always seem to be a single linguistic element dedicated to verum marking. In Wolof, for instance, there are four different particles that can occur in verum contexts: *de*, *kat*, *kay* and *gaa*. Their distribution is based on the polarity of the antecedent and all are restricted to declarative clauses. Jordanoska (2020) shows that Wolof does not have a single lexical exponent of the verum operator, she analyzes the particles as hybrids between verum and response particles.

　　In (13)–(20) we illustrate the different linguistic strategies that are used to express verum, all of them stem from this special issue. For ease of exposure, the strategies are presented in the three most typical contexts that license verum taken from the list in (2), namely correcting a previous utterance (context i.), correcting a previous negative expectation (context ii.) and emphatic agreement (context iii.). Conchucos Quechua and the Bantu language Cinyungwe use a particle. In Conchucos Quechua, the enclitic =*mi*, otherwise a more general assertional operator, is used to correct a previous utterance.

(13)　　**Particle** (context i. in [2])
　　　　Context: Two friends go into a small store to get beers. As they only see
　　　　bottles of the brand *Cristal*, one of them says to the store keeper "Too bad
　　　　there are no *Pilsen* left". However, she does have this beer brand at the store
　　　　and replies:
　　　　*Aw=mi, ka-n=**mi**　Pilsen=qa*
　　　　yes=mi cop-3=**mi**　Pilsen=ᴛᴏᴘ
　　　　'Yes, there IS Pilsen!'
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Conchucos Quechua, Bendezú-Araujo, this volume)

In the short dialog in (14) Cinyungwe's dedicated verum particle =*di* is used twice, in B's answer it corrects a previous negative expectation and in A's reaction it marks an emphatic agreement.

(14)　　**Particle** (context ii. and iii. in [2])
　　　　A:　*Ti-m-fik-a　　　　　lini?*
　　　　　　1ᴘʟ. sᴍ.ᴘʀs-arrive-ꜰᴠ　when
　　　　　　'When will we arrive?' (Are we there yet?)
　　　　B:　*Ku-fika,　　　　　t-a-fik-a(=**di**).*
　　　　　　15-arrive　　　　　1ᴘʟ.sᴍ-ᴘsᴛ-arrive-ꜰᴠ=ᴠᴇʀᴜᴍ
　　　　　　'We HAVE (indeed) arrived.' (lit. 'To arrive we arrived.')

A: *Aah,   t-a-fik-a=**di**.*
yes   1PL.SM-PST-arrive-FV=VERUM
'(I see) we HAVE indeed arrived.'

                 (Cinyungwe, Kerr and van der Wal, this volume)

Some Bantu languages use a strategy that in other contexts is employed to express predicate focus. This is illustrated in (15) for Zulu, which uses *-ile* here to correct a previous utterance.

(15)   **Predicate focus (suffix, part of disjoined morphological form)**
        (context i. in (2))
        Context: someone tells you that you did or did not do a certain thing, but it's not true. Speaker: You did not come to my party. – You: Contradict the person.
        *ngi-z-**ile**   ephathini   ya-kho*
        SM1SG-go-REC.DJ   LOC.9.party   POSS9-2SG
        'I DID come to your party!'
                   (Zulu, Bloom Ström and Zeller, this volume)

Another strategy found in Bantu languages is dislocation of background terms. In other contexts this strategy serves to topicalize the background term. In (16) from Kîîtharaka, the dislocation of the background term *ka-anǎ* 'the child' is used to either correct a previous utterance or a previous negative expectation.

(16)   **Dislocation (backgrounded terms)** (context i. or ii. in [2])
        Context: You're accused of not bathing the child, which was one of your tasks.
        ***Ka-anǎ,**   i   tû-ka-thaamb-iir-i-e.*
        12-child   FOC   1PL.SM-12OM-wash-PFV-IC-FV
        'The child, we DID bathe him/her.'
                 (Kîîtharaka, Kerr and van der Wal, this volume)

Other Bantu languages leave verum unmarked. In (17), illustrated by an example from Makhuwa, the correction of a negative expectation does not receive any particular marking.

(17)   **Unmarked** (context ii. in [2])
        A: 'Why don't you eat dark shima (made from cassava)?'
        B: *Mí   ki-ńní-c'   eshímá   y-oóríppa*
             1SG.PRO   1SG.SM-HAB-eat   9.shima   9-dark
             (tántú   eshímá   y-oóttéela).
             as   9.shima   9-light

'Me, I DO eat dark shima (just as light shima).'

(Makhuwa, Kerr and van der Wal, this volume)

In Portuguese and German, a special type of exclamative containing the languages' equivalent of *whether*, can be used to express verum. In (18) this is illustrated for both languages in a context of correcting a negative expectation.

(18)   **Exclamatives** (context ii. in [2])
    A: 'Don't you like him?'
    B: ***SE***   *gosto!*
        whether   like-1P.SG
    B: *Und* ***OB***!
        and   whether
        '(Yes, and) how much I do!'

(Portuguese and German, Amido and Buchczyk, this volume)

German also employs a number of truth-related adverbs to express verum. In (19) these are illustrated in a context where a previous utterance is corrected.

(19)   **Adverbs** (context i. in [2])
    S1: *Betül*   *kommt*   *nicht.*
         Betül   comes   not
         'Betül is not coming.'
    S2: *Doch,*   *sie*   *kommt* ***tatsächlich/*** ***wirklich/*** ***echt.***
         yes.CONTR she comes fact-ly   really   genuine
         'Yes, she IS coming.'

(German, Müller, this volume)

Finally, a strategy found in Spanish to express verum is clausal doubling. (20) shows an example where this strategy is used to correct a previous utterance.

(20)   **Clausal doubling** (context i. in [2])
    A: 'María did not buy wine.'
    B: *Que* *compró* *vino,* ***COMPRÓ*** *vino.*
        that   bought   wine   bought   wine
        'As for buying wine, she DID buy wine.'

(Spanish, Muñoz Pérez and Verdecchia, this volume)

What this overview shows is that there is substantial variation cross-linguistically in how verum is marked and which contexts fall under this marking and how to account for them in a theoretical model. One goal for this special issue was to broaden the empirical base and thereby document the variety in the linguistic expression of verum. This has been achieved and will certainly form an important reference for future research on the topic. For most of the Bantu languages and

Conchucos Quechua, the present special issue contains the first description of how verum is realized in them. For other languages, like German, Spanish and Portuguese, the strategies described in the volume have not yet been discussed in relation to verum.

4 This special issue

This special issue opens with *Indirect truth marking via backgrounding: Evidence from Bantu*, in which **Kerr and Van der Wal** argue that neither the FAT nor the LOT can fully account for their data and propose a third thesis: the Backgrounding and Underspecification Thesis (BUT). Taking a function-to-form approach, the authors survey the expression of truth in eleven Bantu languages and observe that there is no one-to-one relation between them, but rather that different grammatical strategies are employed across languages. Only one language in their sample, Cinyungwe, uses a dedicated verum particle. Most languages use information-structural means in which verum is marked indirectly through backgrounding what is not in focus; such strategies include predicate doubling or topic dislocation. This leads the authors to conclude that, while there is a conceptual link between verum and information structure (contra LOT), verum is not marked directly as a type of focus (contra FAT), and thus a third thesis is called for: the BUT.

Two additional Bantu languages are represented in **Bloom Ström and Zeller**'s *Verum in Xhosa and Zulu (Nguni),* in which the authors argue in favor of a version of the FAT in which verum focus is taken to be the same as polarity focus, which in turn is a predicate-centered focus. Similar to Kerr and Van der Wal, Bloom Ström and Zeller observe that verum in Xhosa and Zulu is marked by maximally backgrounding everything else. The authors additionally present findings that there is no prosodic reflex of verum in Xhosa and Zulu. They conclude that, while verum is not marked by the prosody in the same way as in the Germanic languages for which the FAT was conceptualized, the findings can still be captured by the FAT, since the way in which verum is marked is exactly the same as how predicate focus is marked in these languages.

Turning to Romance languages, **Muñoz Pérez and Verdecchia**'s *Clausal doubling and verum marking in Spanish* analyzes the previously undescribed phenomenon of clausal doubling in Spanish as a verum strategy, adding to the number of verum strategies in the language. The construction is formed with a fronted embedded finite clause that repeats the finite matrix clause, e.g., *Que compró vino, COMPRÓ vino.* 'As for buying wine, she DID buy it'. The authors analyze the

dislocated clause as a contrastive topic that evokes a set of polar questions about other propositions. The second clause in this construction then corresponds to the answer, which contains a polarity focus, giving rise to the verum interpretation.

In *Whether-exclamatives: a verum strategy,* **Amido and Buchczyk** investigate a subtype of exclamatives in Portuguese and German containing a stressed equivalent of *whether* (pt. *SE é!,* ger. *und OB!*). They argue that *whether*-exclamatives have properties that qualify their treatment as a verum strategy since they emphasize the truth of the proposition and are allowed in most of the typical verum contexts and disallowed out of the blue. Amido and Buchczyk also show how *whether*-exclamatives differ from plain assertions and *wh*-exclamatives. *Wh*-exclamatives are restricted to a high degree reading, while *whether*-exclamatives admit both a high degree and a verum reading. This makes the former infelicitous as a reaction to an utterance containing a non-gradable predicate: *Is 43 a prime number?* ger. #*Und wie!* (*wh*-exclamative)/ger. *Und OB!* (*whether*-exclamative). The authors develop an analysis that treats *whether*-exclamatives as hybrid speech acts consisting of a coordination of an assertion and an exclamative.

In *Getting the facts right: Focus on adverbial verum marking in German*, **Müller** develops an analysis of the truth-related adverbs *tatsächlich* 'in fact', *echt* 'genuinely' and *wirklich* 'really', and of the particle *wohl*. The author shows that these adverbs, when stressed, have effects that are analogous to those of German verb-verum. He argues in favor of a FAT analysis for these adverbs. In the case of *wohl*, however, he argues for a LOT analysis, since the particle is only licensed under very specific discourse conditions, namely the correction of previous utterances in which an explicit negation is given. The author complements these analyses with a discussion of the nature of verum, arguing that the relevant notion is one of factuality.

In the final article, *Verum, focus and evidentiality in Conchucos Quechua,* **Bendezú-Araujo** analyzes the enclitic =*mi*. For other varieties of Quechua, =*mi* has been described as a marker of contrastive focus or direct evidentiality. Based on a rich source of data Bendezú-Araujo shows that the enclitic functions differently in Conchucos Quechua than in the previously studied varieties. It does not qualify as an evidential marker and, while =*mi* can mark contrastive focus in Conchucos Quechua, the relation between focus and the enclitic is not categorical. Instead he characterizes =*mi* as an assertional operator that functions to bring closure to an explicit or implicit question under discussion. The author relates this function to verum. Having established that =*mi* is independent from focus (and evidential marking), the author takes a LOT approach and proposes that =*mi* forces an update of the common ground which explains the verum effect.

References

Büring, Daniel. 2006. Intonation und Informationsstruktur: Grammatik und darüber hinaus. In Hardarik Blühdorn, Eva Breindl & Ulrich Hermann Waßner (eds.), *Text – Verstehen*, 144–163. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Dik, Simon. 1981. On the typology of focus phenomena. In Teun Hoekstra, Harry van der Hulst & Michael Moortgat (eds.), *Perspectives on Functional Grammar 81*, 41–75. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter.

Goodhue, Daniel. 2018. *On asking and answering biased polar questions*. Montreal: McGill University dissertation.

Goodhue, Daniel. 2022. All focus is contrastive: On polarity (verum) focus, answer focus, contrastive focus and givenness. *Journal of Semantics* 39(1). 117–158.

Grzech, Karolina. 2020. Managing common ground with epistemic marking: 'Evidential' markers in Upper Napo Kichwa and their functions in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 168. 81–97.

Gutzmann, Daniel. 2012. Verum–Fokus–Verum-Fokus? Fokus-basierte und lexikalische Ansätze. In Hadarik Blühdorn & Horst Lohnstein (eds.), *Wahrheit – Fokus – Negation*, 67–103. Hamburg: Buske.

Gutzmann, Daniel & Elena Castroviejo Miró. 2011. The dimensions of verum. *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics* 8. 143–165.

Gutzmann, Daniel, Katharina Hartmann & Lisa Matthewson. 2020. Verum focus is verum, not focus: Cross-linguistic evidence. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 5(1). 51.

Höhle, Tilman. 1992. Über Verum-Fokus im Deutschen. In Joachim Jacobs (ed.), *Informationsstruktur und Grammatik*, 112–141. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Jordanoska, Izabela. 2020. *The pragmatics of second position and sentence final particles in Wolof*. Vienna: University of Vienna dissertation.

Kocher, Anna. 2022. *Complementizers on edge: On the boundaries between syntax and pragmatics in Ibero-Romance*, 1–47. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Kocher, Anna. 2023. A sentence mood account for Spanish verum. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 8(1). https://doi.org/10.16995/glossa.8784.

Littell, Patrick William. 2016. *Focus, predication, and polarity in Kwak'wala*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia dissertation.

Lohnstein, Horst. 2016. Verum focus. In Caroline Féry & Shinishiro Ishihara (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of information structure*, 290–313. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Matthewson, Lisa. 2021. Verum in Gitksan. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics/Revue Canadienne De Linguistique* 66(1). 60–90.

Matthewson, Lisa & Jennifer Glougie. 2018. Justification and truth: Evidence from languages of the word. In Masaharu Mizumoto, Stephen Stitch & Eric McCready (eds.), *Epistemology for the rest of the world*, 149–186. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Prokhorov, Kirill. 2014. Focalization particles in Bambara. *Mandenkan. Bulletin semestriel d'études linguistiques mandé* 52. 60–72.

Romero, Maribel & Chung-Hye Han. 2004. On negative yes/no questions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27(5). 609–658.

Schwarz, Anne. 2010. Verb-and-predication focus markers in Gur. In Ines Fiedler & Anne Schwarz (eds.), *The expression of information structure: A documentation of its diversity across Africa*, 287–314. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Thuan, Tran. 2016. Lone contrastive topic constructions: A puzzle from Vietnamese. In Mira Gubric & Anne Mucha (eds.), *Proceedings of the Semantics of African, Asian and Austronesian Languages 2*, 52–64. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag Potsdam.

Villa-García, Júlio & Raquel González Rodríguez. 2020. Dialectal variation in the expression of *que* in *sí-que* 'yes that' contexts across Spanish: The case of some Latin American Spanish varieties. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 5(1). 99.

Vydrina, Alexandra. 2020. Operator focus in discourse and grammar: The two perfectives in Kakabe. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 41(1). 99–145.

Watters, John. 1979. *Focus in Aghem: A study of its formal correlates and typology*. Los Angeles: University Los Angeles dissertation.

Zimmermann, Malte & Daniel Hole. 2008. Predicate focus, verum focus, verb focus: Similarities and differences. Paper presented at the Workshop on Predicate Focus, Potsdam University & SFB 632, 14-15 Nov 2008.