

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

## Mapping additivity through translation: From French aussi to Italian anche and back in the Europarl-direct corpus

### This is the author's manuscript

*Original Citation:*

*Availability:*

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1644271> since 2018-02-16T19:04:17Z

*Publisher:*

Benjamins

*Published version:*

DOI:10.1075/pbns.278.06and

*Terms of use:*

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)



# UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

*This is an author version of the contribution published on:*

*Questa è la versione dell'autore dell'opera pubblicata su:*

*Focus on Additivity.*

*Adverbial modifiers in Romance, Germanic and Slavic languages*

*edited by Anna-Maria De Cesare & Cecilia Andorno*

*2017, Amsterdam, Benjamins, pp. 157-200*

*The final version is available at:*

*La versione definitiva è disponibile alla URL:*

*<https://benjamins.com/#catalog/books/pbns.278/main>*

**Mapping additivity through translation.**  
**From French *aussi* to Italian *anche* and back**  
**in the Europarl-direct corpus<sup>1\*</sup>**

Cecilia Andorno (Università di Torino)  
 and Anna-Maria De Cesare (Universität Basel)

**Abstract**

Many languages have an overabundant set of additive focus particles, whose differences are mostly investigated in semantic (e.g. scalarity) or syntactic (scope phenomena and restrictions for specific domains of application) terms. The present study adopts a discourse perspective on the issue, comparing two cross-linguistic, near-equivalent AFAs (Italian *anche* and French *aussi*) in original texts and their translations in the Europarl corpus. Specifically, this study describes the relation established between the constituent in the scope of the AFAs and its alternatives, which can be either co-textually available or contextually inferable. Comparing the frequencies of *anche* and *aussi* in original texts and taking into account their translation equivalents confirms important differences between these adverbs. While *aussi* is more restricted to the syntagmatic function of linking co-textually available alternatives in

---

\* The content of this paper has been discussed, written, and revised by both authors (with the exception of §§ 1-2, written by AMDC). AMDC wishes to thank the Swiss National Science Foundation for its financial support in the project *Italian Sentence Adverbs in a Contrastive Perspective* (ISAaC, <http://p3.snf.ch/Project-159273>).

adjacent sentences, *anche* appears in a wider array of uses, including cases in which the identification of alternatives requires more complex inferential steps, as they are distant or even implicit to the domain of application.

**Key words:** French, Italian, additive focus adverbs, alternatives, paradigmatic relations, syntagmatic relations, translation equivalent, Europarl corpus

## 1. Introduction

The goal of this paper is to pin down the similarities and differences between the two cross-linguistic near-equivalents *aussi* and *anche* when functioning as additive focus adverbs in Italian and French. In contrast with previous work, which focuses mainly on the semantic and syntactic properties of these forms, our analysis strongly relies on the context in which they occur, in particular regarding the presence/absence of alternatives or sets of alternatives to the so-called *domain of application* of the adverb and the ways these alternatives are identified, when present, or reconstructed, when absent, by the hearer/reader. Taking a closer look at the alternatives to the domain of application of the adverb and at the set of alternatives allows us to (i) identify another relevant parameter explaining the differences in use of close cross-linguistic synonyms (such as Fr. *aussi* and It. *anche*); (ii) achieve a better understanding of what

“additive” really means (there are different ways in which the alternatives to an adverb’s domain of application can be identified in the text and reconstructed on the basis of both textual and contextual cues); (iii) grasp more precisely the discourse functions played by these adverbs, by distinguishing two main forms of addition: paradigmatic and syntagmatic. In order to highlight the uses of *aussi/anche* in context and the role played by the alternatives to their domain of association, our study has a strong empirical basis; the uses of *aussi* and *anche* are described through a corpus of original texts and their translations. In addition to considering real occurrences of these adverbs, we take into account a wide context in which they are used.

Our paper is organized as follows: in § 2, we describe the main semantic, syntactic and discourse properties of additive focus adverbs, in particular by showing what role the alternatives to the domain of application of the adverb has been playing so far in the literature in explaining their use; in § 3, we provide the relevant information on the empirical basis used in this study, namely the Europarl-direct corpus; § 4 presents the main results of our study, first by outlining the parameters we chose to analyze, second by providing both the relevant quantitative and qualitative findings of our corpus analysis and third, on the basis of the descriptive parameters chosen in the study, by tracing the discourse functions associated to *aussi* and *anche* in the text type analyzed. Our results, presented in § 5, show that an analysis that takes into account the alternatives to the domain of association of the adverb is relevant from both a descriptive and theoretical point of view. It allows us to highlight major

differences in the ways *aussi* and *anche* interact with their context, and shows that adverbs with the same basic semantic meaning component of ‘addition’ place different conditions on their context of occurrence.

## 2. Additive focus adverbs: semantic, syntactic and discourse properties

Fr. *aussi* and It. *anche* are Focus Adverbs (FAs)<sup>2</sup> belonging to the subgroup of additive focus adverbs (henceforth AFAs). AFAs form a relatively closed set of expressions sharing a group of central semantic and syntactic properties (cf. König 1991, 1993; Ricca 1999; Andorno 1999, 2000; De Cesare 2015b). In Table 1 we provide a list of French and Italian AFAs based on the main reference works on FAs:

<b>French</b> (Nølke 1983; Molinier and Lévrier 2000)	<i>également, même, surtout, notamment, par exemple, particulièrement, en particulier, principalement, spécialement, essentiellement, voire, non plus, même pas</i>
<b>Italian</b> (Ricca 1999; Andorno 1999, 2000)	<i>anche, pure, altresì, parimenti, addirittura, perf/sino, soprattutto particolarmente, in particolare, principalmente, specialmente, essenzialmente, neanche, nemmeno, neppure</i>

Table 1. Sets of AFAs in French and Italian

---

<sup>2</sup> The term *Focus* in the label *Focus Adverbs* refers to the fact that the items belonging to this class are typically used to highlight a piece of information in the sentence in which they occur (cf. Taglicht 1984 as well as Quirk et al. 1985). This aspect is controversial, though, as some scholars prefer to claim that FAs limit themselves to interaction with the focused part of the sentence (cf. König 1991; De Cesare 2010) and claim that these forms are sensitive to the presence of a focus that is determined by other linguistic means (in particular, in oral communication, by prosody).

In this section of the paper, we will briefly describe the basic parameters defining AFAs (§ 2.1.), identify the two main semantic criteria involved in a finer classification of AFAs in French and Italian (§ 2.2.) and describe the role played by the context, in particular the alternatives to the element upon which an AFA operates, in explaining the use of AFAs in discourse (§ 2.3.).

### 2.1. *Setting defining parameters in the description of AFAs: domain of association, scope and alternatives*

From a semantic point of view, AFAs behave like quantifiers (Longobardi 1988). They presuppose that at least one element other than the element with which they are associated is valid, i.e. yield to a true proposition (cf. Andorno 2000:67 on It. *anche*; Amsili and Winterstein 2012 on Fr. *aussi*). For instance, in the examples given in (1) and (2), Fr. *aussi* and It. *anche* presuppose that, besides Shakespeare, Stella read at least one more author (or book).<sup>3</sup>

(1) Stella a **aussi** lu *Shakespeare*.

(2) Stella ha **anche** letto *Shakespeare*.

‘Stella **also** read *Shakespeare*.’

---

<sup>3</sup> In the examples given in this paper, the AFA is highlighted in bold, the element on which it operates is presented in italics and the alternative to the element on which it operates is underlined. The set to which both the DA and its alternatives belong is identified with small capital letters. In some examples, the background part of the proposition hosting the DA and/or its alternatives will be underlined with a thick line.

In this paper, we call the element with which AFAs are associated, and which is to be interpreted as added to a previous piece of information, its *domain of association* (henceforth DA; on this concept, cf. Dimroth and Klein 1996, Ricca 1999, Andorno 2005: 406).<sup>4</sup> The rest of the sentence, less the AFA, will be called its *scope* (it is the part of the proposition that functions as the background and which contains an open variable; cf. König 1991:30). In examples (1) and (2), we interpret the AFA's default DA as being the noun phrase *Shakespeare* and their scope as being *Stella a lu/ha letto* 'Stella read'. Another important parameter in the description of AFAs is the *alternative(s) to the AFA's DA* (or simply *alternative*; cf. Rooth 1992:76), i.e. the element(s) to which the DA is added (in (1) the other author(s) read by Stella). The alternative(s) to the AFA's DA can be explicit or can be left implicit in the discourse and/or discourse context. In (1) and (2), for instance, an alternative to the DA of *aussi/anche*, namely *Shakespeare*, is not present in the utterance containing the AFA. By contrast, in (3), we find an alternative to that of *anche* in the same utterance as *anche* and its DA:

(3) Stella ha letto Kant e **anche** *Shakespeare*.

'Stella read Kant and also Shakespeare.'

---

<sup>4</sup> In the literature, different terms are used for this concept: E. *focus* (in König 1991:18), E. *added constituent* (in Gast 1996); Fr. *noyau* 'nucleus' (in Nølke 1983); It. *portata* 'scope' (Andorno 2008).



The *paradigm of alternatives* to an AFA's DA coincides with all the possible alternative values of the DA in a given context (Ricca 1999:146).<sup>5</sup> For instance, in (1) and (2), the paradigm of alternatives to the DA of *aussi/anche*, *Shakespeare*, is the sum of the authors that Stella read. The extension of the paradigm can be determined linguistically, in particular by a hypernym identifying the *set* (or class) to which both the AFA's DA and its alternative belong. Consider (4) and (5), in which the universal quantifier *tutti* + SN define a different (larger and smaller, respectively) paradigm of alternatives to the DA of *anche* (*Shakespeare*). In (4) and (5), the NP *tutti i classici della letteratura (inglese)* "all the classics of (English) literature" refers to the class of items including the AFA's DA (*Shakespeare*) and the DA's alternative values (*Dante*, *Cervantes* etc. in the first case; *Brontë*, *Orwell* etc. in the second case).

- (4) Stella ha letto TUTTI I CLASSICI DELLA LETTERATURA, **anche**  
*Shakespeare*. {Dante, Cervantes...}

'Stella read all the classics of literature, also/including *Shakespeare*.

---

<sup>5</sup> Following Nølke 1983, according to Perrin-Naffakh (1996:139), *aussi* presupposes a paradigm (realized or virtual) of elements that correspond both structurally and conceptually to what she calls the nucleus of the adverb (and that we call DA of *aussi*). Specifically, in her view, the alternatives to the AFA's DA must be congruent syntactically with the DA (i.e., have the same syntactic form and function, e.g. coincide with a subject NP or an object NP), while the scope of the propositions hosting both the AFA's DA and its alternatives must be semantically compatible. As we will see in this study, this view holds for the most prototypical uses of *aussi* (and *anche*).

- (5) Stella ha letto TUTTI I CLASSICI DELLA LETTERATURA INGLESE, **anche** *Shakespeare*. {Brontë, Orwell...}

‘Stella read all the classics of English literature, also/including Shakespeare.

The set containing both the AFA’s DA and the paradigm of alternatives can be closed/finite (as in *Stella also saw him on Monday*) or open/non-finite (as in *Stella would also like to learn Sardinian*). Moreover, a set can include just two elements, forming a binary set, or be composed of more than two elements, and form a multiple set (on the relevance of this parameter in explaining the German equivalents to E. *even*, see Gast in this volume).

## 2.2. Semantic classification of AFAs in French and Italian

### 2.2.1. Polarity and scalarity

French and Italian AFAs are generally classified on the basis of two semantic criteria. The first criterion is polarity. According to their occurrence in a positive or negative clause, we can distinguish between positive (Fr. *aussi*, It. *anche*) and negative (Fr. *non plus*, *même pas*, It. *nemmeno*, *neppure*, *neanche*) AFAs. As shown in (6) and (7), negative contexts call for negative AFAs. These examples also show that, while French does not have a lexicalized form of negative AFA in its repertoire, Italian has three similar items, which vary in

their degree of formality and geographic distribution (on the differences between *nemmeno*, *neppure*, *neanche*, see De Cesare in press).

- (6) Giovanni non ha mangiato la verdura e **neppure** *la frutta*. (ex. from Mari and Tovenà 2006: 187)

- (7) Jean n'a pas mangé les légumes et *les fruits* **non plus**.

'John did not eat the vegetables and **neither** did he eat the fruit.'

A second crucial semantic criterion to subdivide the class of AFAs is scalarity. This semantic feature can have three different realizations (a positive, a negative and a neutral one:  $+/-/\pm$ ): an AFA can be inherently scalar (as Fr. *même* and It. *perfino*; on these forms, see Atayan in this volume), inherently non-scalar (It. *altresì*) or compatible with a scalar reading (Fr. *aussi*, It. *anche*). In examples (8) and (9), *même* and *perfino* convey the idea that giants are the last group of individuals we would think about when referring to someone who once was small.

- (8) **Même** *les géants* ont été petits. (ex. adapted from Lauwers 2003)

- (9) **Perfino** *i giganti* sono stati piccoli.

'**Even** giants have been small.'

On the basis of the two central semantic criteria described above (polarity and scalarity), we can propose a finer classification of some of the AFAs included

in Table 1. As shown in Table 2, this classification includes a total of eight semantic subclasses (note that we do not distinguish here between inherently scalar and compatible with a scalar reading).

	<b>Positive AFAs</b>		<b>Negative AFAs</b>	
	[+scalar]/[± scalar]	[- scalar]	[+scalar]/[± scalar]	[- scalar]
<b>French</b>	<i>aussi, également, même</i>		<i>même pas</i>	<i>non plus</i>
<b>Italian</b>	<i>anche, pure, addirittura, perf/sino</i>	<i>altresì, parimenti</i>	<i>neanche, nemmeno, neppure</i>	

Table 2. Semantic classification of AFAs in French and Italian

### 2.2.2. Semantic properties of Fr. *aussi* and It. *anche*

As can be seen in Table 2, Fr. *aussi* and It. *anche* are both positive AFAs. This means that they are used when a piece of positive information is introduced into the discourse. When a piece of negative information is introduced into a discourse, other AFAs are used instead (see *non plus* and *neppure* in (6) and (7)).<sup>6</sup> In addition to being positive AFAs, *aussi* and *anche* are both compatible with a scalar reading. In (10) and (11), the fact that the last element (i.e. *her canary*) is the most unexpected companion one would bring at a party is not due to the presence of *aussi/anche*, since it is already available in an utterance without the AFA (*To our party, Mary will bring her children, her cat and her canary*). The scalar reading of the list is enforced by our general and culturally-

---

<sup>6</sup> It should be observed that the use of *aussi* in a negative context (i.e. with the presence of a negation) is not excluded, but is less standard (*Je ne vous cache pas aussi* [instead of *non plus*] *que je cherchais peut-être des idées* ‘I don’t hide either that I was perhaps looking for ideas’).

related knowledge of the world. Examples (12) and (13) show, on the other hand, that *aussi* is more restricted than *anche* in occurring in scalar contexts, as it cannot signal that an element taken from a set is to be interpreted as the most relevant in the paradigm of alternatives. From these brief observations, it thus seems that *aussi* can be associated with a scalar reading only when the alternatives to its DA are present in the co-text as well.

(10) A notre fête, Marie amènera ses enfants, son chat, et **aussi** *son canari*.

(11) Alla festa Maria porterà i suoi bambini, il suo gatto, e **anche** *il suo canarino*.

‘To our party, Mary will bring her children, her cat, and **also** *her canary*.’

(12) \*A notre fête, Marie amènera TOUS SES AMIS, **aussi** *son canari*.

(13) Alla festa Maria porterà TUTTI I SUOI AMICI, **anche** *suo canarino*.

‘To our party, Mary will bring ALL OF HER FRIENDS, **including** *her canary*.’

### 2.3. *The role of alternatives in the use of AFAs*

Despite relying on a fine-grained classification of AFAs based on two semantic criteria, i.e. on polarity and scalarity (cf. Table 2), it is not easy to pin down

both intra- and cross-linguistic differences in the repertoire of French and Italian AFAs. Fr. *aussi* and *également* as well as It. *anche* and *pure* are pairs of positive AFAs, compatible with a scalar reading; the same holds true, cross-linguistically, for *aussi* and *anche*. The four AFAs *aussi*, *également*, *anche*, *pure* are thus to be considered as synonymous, as they are associated to the same meaning components ([+ addition] and [ $\pm$  scalar]).

In order to identify what distinguishes the set of scalar-compatible positive AFAs, other parameters have to be considered as well. A first additional parameter that is often taken into account in the literature is syntax, in particular the position these AFAs occupy in relation to their DA.<sup>7</sup> Due to their different morphological make-up (only *également* is derived using the adverbial suffix *-ment*), it seems for instance plausible to assume that *aussi* is less constrained than *également*, which tends to occur with predicate-like DAs (verb phrases or parts of them). Another parameter that is relevant to take into account in explaining the differences between semantically equivalent AFAs is register variation. In line with the claims made by Hummel 2013 on *-ment(e)* derived adverbs in the Romance languages, which are considered to be typical of standard and formal texts, *également* could turn out to be a more formal variant than *aussi* within the synonymic pair *aussi/également*.

In this paper, we would like to pursue another route to pin down the differences between the two cross-linguistic equivalents *aussi* and *anche*. The

---

<sup>7</sup> See Gast in this volume; interestingly, Gast shows that syntax does not play a decisive role in explaining the German translation equivalents of E. *even*.

parameter at which we would like to look more closely is the role played by the alternatives of the DA of these AFAs (on this issue, see Schwenter 2001 for a distinction of Spanish *hasta*, *incluso* and *además*; also see Gast in this volume for a distinction of the closely related German FAs *sogar*, *selbst* and *auch*). In the literature, the properties of the alternatives to the AFA's DA are often neglected in explaining the use of an AFA and/or its differences from other AFAs, although the context in which the clause containing an AFA occurs is often considered to be relevant in describing the use of these forms. It is in fact customary to claim that the DA of an AFA (and, more generally, of an FA) cannot be determined accurately without taking into account a broader context (this is especially true for written texts; on this issue, see Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 80). This claim can be illustrated on the basis of sentence (2), repeated in (14), and the examples given in (15) to (17):

(14) Stella ha **anche** letto Shakespeare.

‘Stella also read Shakespeare.’

(15) Stella ha letto TUTTI I CLASSICI: ha **anche** letto *Shakespeare*.

‘Stella read all the classics: she also read *Shakespeare*.’

(16) Stella s’impegna molto: ha **anche** letto *Shakespeare*.

‘Stella is very engaged: she also *read Shakespeare*.’

(17) Stella non ha solo sentito parlare di Shakespeare: ha **anche** *letto* Shakespeare.

‘Stella did not only hear about Shakespeare: she also *read* Shakespeare.

As far as positive AFAs are concerned, Blumenthal 1985 argues that there is an important cross-linguistic difference between Fr. *aussi* and G. *auch*:

in general French requires that the terms linked by a relationship of equivalence be present in the text, while German allows more easily for their implicit mention; thus, in the following example from a newspaper headline “**Auch** Europäer in den Händen der Rebellen” [Europeans, too, in the hand of the rebels] would be difficult to translate into French.

(Blumenthal 1985: 150; boldface and translation are ours)

If these claims were true, in particular the fact that Fr. *aussi* generally requires the presence of alternatives to its DA to be used felicitously, we would expect to be able to verify it empirically, as it would restrict the occurrences of *aussi* to discourses in which at least one alternative to its DA is present.

### 3. Comparing AFAs in discourse



### 3.1. *Mapping AFAs discourse functions through translation equivalents*

In order to achieve a better understanding of intralinguistic and interlinguistic differences in discourse among semantically similar AFAs, multilingual corpora are needed to compare actual tendencies in speaker preferences in use.

A multilingual corpus can be built from different sources:

- comparable texts, consisting of “similar”, namely functionally equivalent texts produced independently from each other in different languages (EAGLES 1996). Comparability is assured by the similarity of texts “in terms of genre, content, form, date of appearance, etc.” (Laviosa 2002);
- parallel (Baker 1995) or translation (Johansson 2007) texts, including sets of "original" and translated texts, with original texts in one language working as the direct source for translated texts in another language.

Both comparable and parallel corpora have advantages and disadvantages when used in comparative analysis (see De Cesare et al. 2016, Part I, § 2.2 for a detailed discussion). Comparable texts have been used in comparing the use of AFAs in De Cesare (2015a) and Dimroth et al. (2010), with a form-to-function and a function-to-form approach respectively. De Cesare (2015a) analyses a multilingual (Italian, French and English) corpus of online news (ICOCP, De Cesare et al. 2014). Results show, among others, that *anche* is three times more frequent than *aussi*. The difference has been partly explained with the availability of alternative AFAs in French, such as *également*, and *même*, carrying a scalar value possible for *anche* but not for

*aussi* (as seen in § 2.2.2.). However, a strict check of speakers' choices among the possible alternatives is not possible unless very similar micro-contexts are observed. In Dimroth et al. (2010), the same non-linguistic stimulus (*The finite story*) has been used to elicit comparable narrative texts of native speakers of four different languages (French, Italian, German and Dutch). The stimulus provided narrative sequences highly favorable to the use of AFA's, as shown by the following example:

sequence 1: In his apartment, Mr. Blue is going to sleep

sequence 2: In his apartment, Mr. Green is going to sleep

Results show that both French and Italian speakers make use of different cohesive devices to express sequence 2, mostly AFAs (Fr: *M. Vert se couche aussi*; It: *Anche il signor Verdi va a dormire*) and anaphoric predicates (Fr: *M. Vert fait de même*; It: *Il signor Verdi fa la stessa cosa*). In addition, once again, Italian speakers use AFAs more frequently than French speakers. Differences in the frequency of use of AFAs between Italian and French speakers can easily be observed thanks to the high comparability of the narrative contexts. However, a claim concerning a "functional equivalence" between AFAs and anaphoric predicates is allowed by as well as limited to such a specific context-type.

In order to combine fine-grained analysis of highly comparable contexts in a wide number of occurrences and contexts-types, parallel corpora can be used, as already stated by De Cesare (2015a): "it is clear that our explanation

ought to be based on a fine-grained qualitative analysis of all the forms that could potentially be used. Clearly, more research ought to be done on this point in the future, in particular by relying on a parallel (i.e. translation) corpus of written texts". Parallel corpora assure a strong semantic equivalence among source and translated texts ("translation counterparts" or "translation equivalents", cf. Johansson 2007 and Brianti 2014). On the other hand, they can suffer problems deriving from the interdependence between the source and the translated text, causing a possible "interference" effect. In translated texts, interference can be given at a local level, as the translator can be induced to choose the construction most similar to the one provided by the source text.<sup>8</sup> It should be noted, as pointed out to us by Vahram Atayan (p.c.), that the translators of the European Union use a software program that provides them with translation suggestions. This kind of help could increase the interference effect, as it is very likely that one of the most frequent translation suggestions of Fr. *aussi* is It. *anche* and vice versa. However, our results show that translators resort to a wide range of other possible translation equivalences in translations in both directions (cf. results given in § 4.2.), suggesting that the local effect of the proposed translations is not overspread. Interference can also

---

<sup>8</sup> This is particularly true when optional constructions are considered. While the choice between, say, definite or indefinite articles is linked to stricter rules in different languages, and translational interference possibly leading to unacceptable constructions is therefore blocked by the translator competence, optional structures are possibly more sensitive to cross-linguistic influence. This effect is well known in the literature concerning learner varieties (Jarvis and Pavlenko 2008) and has been found for AFA constructions in intermediate and advanced L2 learners (cf. Benazzo and Andorno 2010; Andorno and Turco 2015).

act at a global level, as the translator, being a fluent bilingual speaker, can use his own languages differently from mostly monolingual speakers of the same languages, as is well known from literature on bilinguals (Grosjean 1989, Jarvis and Pavlenko 2008).

A different type of problem in using parallel corpora are “translation divergences”, that is cases in which a functional match between the original and the translated text is missing. Using parallel corpora thus requires some caution. In § 3.2., our use of the parallel corpus Europarl will be illustrated, while the specific problem of translation divergences in our data is dealt with in § 3.3.2.

### *3.2. Europarl as a parallel corpus*

We used the Europarl parallel corpus (Koehn 2005), the well-known multilingual corpus containing documents issued by the European Parliament in the last 15 years. Europarl contains the speeches of the Members of the European Parliament (MEPs). MEPs usually give their talk in their own native language; the talks are then transcribed and edited by professional translators before their translation (Cartoni et al. 2013:26). Texts in the Europarl corpus are therefore professional transcriptions of a peculiar type of ‘spoken language’: monological, planned in advance, and possibly written to be read. The texts are mostly argumentative, but they can include short narrative, descriptive and expository parts. Given the official occasion of the speech, the text register is

usually very formal and texts are carefully elaborated on a rhetorical level; however, instances of informal and spoken language are also available.<sup>9</sup>

For all these reasons, Europarl cannot be considered to be a representative corpus – in Biber (1994)' terms, a statistical sample of the whole variety of textual uses – for the languages included in the corpus. Despite the highly specific text type it provides, Europarl has been recently widely used in research interested in discourse structures in comparative cross-linguistic perspectives (see De Cesare et al. 2016 for a review), because it provides a large sample of authentic texts, often of considerable length and with a high degree of complexity, together with their translations in many different languages. Moreover, given that we are dealing with monologic, public speeches, the relevant contextual information needed to understand the text is in most cases recoverable. This turned out to be a crucial feature that allowed us to reconstruct with a certain degree of plausibility the alternatives to the AFA's DAs, which is the aim of the current study. It has to be pointed out, however, that speakers often make reference to previous talks given by themselves or by other MEPs, or to previous situations only known by the specific audience of MEPs. Therefore, despite their monologic nature, these texts sometimes include anaphoric and deictic references that are not easily identifiable.

The last release of Europarl, that is Europarl7, includes texts ranging from 1996 to 2011. In the corpus, texts originally produced by MEPs in their

---

<sup>9</sup> As an example, see the use of the colloquial expression *piangersi addosso*, 'to cry on each other's shoulders'.

native language (one of the official languages of the European Parliament) are paired with their translations into all other official languages of the EU, offering an almost unique opportunity to compare texts in a wide variety of languages. Europarl7 is currently available in a number of web resources, as *Sketch Engine* (<https://the.sketchengine.co.uk>) and *Opus* (<http://opus.lingfil.uu.se>). For this study, however, we decided to recur to a different release of the corpus, namely the Europarl-direct compiled by Cartoni et al. (2013), as we wanted to disentangle source and translated texts, in order to minimize problems due to interference phenomena. As already observed by Olohan (2004: 25), such a result is not easy to obtain in the Europarl7 because of the way the corpus is compiled. In order to identify the source text, each text-file should contain metadata concerning, among others, the original language in which the talk was given. According to Cartoni et al. (2013:28), however, 37% of texts do not contain information on the original language or may even provide contradictory information about it. Cartoni et al. (2013)'s work aimed at improving such results: they retrieved metadata concerning the source language whenever available, spread it throughout the paired texts and finally produced the Europarl-direct corpus, a collection of "directional corpora", subsets of the Europarl corpus, which match source and translated texts in specific language pairs. For the current research we used French > Italian and Italian > French directional corpora (available at <https://www.idiap.ch/dataset/europarl-direct>). A major problem of such a procedure is that source and translated texts are not

aligned and we needed to proceed to manually align our source texts and translated examples.

A different problem comes from the peculiar working method of translators in the European Parliament, specifically from the use of so-called pivot languages in translations. As stated on the European Parliament website,<sup>10</sup> translators of the European Parliament sometimes work via a pivot language: the original text is translated into a "pivot" language and the pivot translation is subsequently used as a basis for translation in the other languages. In such cases, the text in the pivot language, rather than the original text, is the actual source of the final translated text. Information concerning the use of pivot translations in the single files is not available in the Europarl corpus, and is therefore not recoverable in Cartoni's directional corpora either. A check in the congruence of results of the two directional corpora will be useful in order to partly control for the possible effect of the use of a pivot translation. We assume that, if cross-linguistic differences observed between French and Italian source texts are mirrored in differences observed between source and translated texts in both directions (French > Italian and Italian > French), we can disregard the effect of possible pivot translations.

### 3.3. *The selected directional corpora: French aussi > Italian and Italian anche > French*

---

<sup>10</sup> cf. <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/aboutparliament/en/007e69770f/Multilingualism.html>.

As shown in § 2., both French and Italian repertoires of AFAs include one adverb that can be considered as prototypical for the class: Fr. *aussi* and It. *anche* are both additive and compatible with a scalar meaning, occur in different syntactic contexts and are unmarked in register; not surprisingly, in corpus studies they result as the most frequent AFAs in the respective repertoire.

Therefore, in the current study we focused our analysis on *aussi* and *anche* in the Europarl-direct French > Italian and Italian > French and on their translation in Italian and French respectively.

Table 3 gives the overall frequency of *aussi* and *anche* in the source and in the translated texts:

		<b>AF*</b>	<b>RF</b>
original texts	<i>aussi</i>	11597	1978.83 x million
	<i>anche</i>	12235	5366.95 x million
translated texts	<i>aussi</i>	5328	2118,75 x million
	<i>anche</i>	13920	2764,16 x million

\*AF = absolute frequency; RF = relative frequency (mostly expressed as a percentage). In other tables, we will use the abbreviation TP to refer to the *translation paradigm* of *aussi/anche*.

Table 3. Frequency of *aussi/anche* in source and translated texts<sup>11</sup>

As already observed in previous studies, *anche* is much more frequent in Italian than *aussi* in French. As we saw, the difference has been explained with the

---

<sup>11</sup> The count is based on the raw occurrences of *aussi* and *anche* in the corpus. Therefore, it includes non-AFA uses of these forms, such as comparative *aussi* (*il est aussi grand que toi* ‘he’s as tall as you are’) or concessive *anche se* (*anche se è costoso, lo compro* ‘even if it’s expensive, I’ll buy it’) that we later excluded from the analysis of translation equivalents.



availability of a roughly equivalent AFA in French (*également*) but not in Italian, with the minor acceptability of *aussi* in scalar contexts (cf. § 2), and the preference of French speakers for functionally equivalent constructions (such as anaphoric predicates). An analysis of the translational equivalents will give further insights on this issue.

Interestingly, Table 3 shows that the frequency of *aussi* in French translations increases slightly with respect to texts originally in French, while the frequency of *anche* in Italian translations decreases significantly with respect to texts originally in Italian. The difference in frequency between original texts and translations in the same language can be interpreted as the effect of interference: the use of AFAs in translations tends to converge towards the use in the source texts from which translations originate, therefore differing from their use in original texts. This result suggests the need for the disentangling of original and translated texts in parallel corpora, as suggested in § 3.2.1.<sup>12</sup>

In order to analyze choices and the frequencies of translation equivalents, we randomly selected 250 occurrences of *aussi* in the original texts of the French > Italian corpus and 250 occurrences of *anche* in the original texts

---

<sup>12</sup> As a matter of comparison, let's observe that in Europarl7 the frequency of It. *anche* is 3095.07 per million, which is significantly below the frequency we observed in source texts in the Europarl-direct Italian > French. We think that this may be due to the fact that Italian source texts (where the frequency is higher) and Italian translated texts (where the frequency is lower, as shown in our corpus of translation from French) are considered as a whole.

of the Italian > French corpus.<sup>13</sup> As source and translated texts are not aligned in the Europarl-direct sub corpora, we then manually searched and aligned the corresponding segments of translated texts (in both corpora). The 250 + 250 aligned matches of source and translated texts in French > Italian and in Italian > French form the basis of our subsequent analysis.

Before providing the detailed comparative analysis of *aussi* and *anche* in source texts and their translation, we offer some quantitative results following the methodology proposed for multilingual corpora by Johansson (2007). In § 3.3.1., we offer the translation paradigms for *aussi* and *anche* in Italian and French translations respectively; in § 3.3.2., we comment on some cases of translation errors and problems arising from interference phenomena.

### 3.3.1. Tables of translation paradigms

In the tables given below, we only include the translation paradigms to *aussi* and *anche* occurring at least five times in the Europarl-direct corpus. Other translations, occurring in less than five cases, are given in a footnote.

In Table 4, we give the translation paradigm (TP) of *aussi*:

TP	AF	RF
<i>anche</i>	155	62%
Ø	44	18%
<i>inoltre</i>	15	6%

---

<sup>13</sup> In each sample, we only included uses of *aussi* and *anche* as AFA, thus excluding comparative uses of Fr. *aussi* or the concessive construction It. *anche se*. We also excluded negative sentences.

<i>nonché</i>	8	3%
<i>altresì</i>	6	2%
other cases**	22	9%
Total	250	100%

\*\*The other translations (22 occ. total) include *come pure* (2), *a sua/loro volta* (2), *altro/i* (2), *così...come* (2), *altrettanto* (2), *ancora, pure; bensì, infine, ma persino, poi; non... neanche, sia...sia* (1 time each), the adjectives *altre ancora, stessa* (1 time each) and the verbs *fare lo stesso, aggiungere* (1 time each).

Table 4. Translation paradigm of *aussi* in Italian

The results given in Table 4 show that the great majority of equivalences are overt congruent correspondences, i.e. forms belonging to the same grammatical category (adverbs) in the source and target language (for a definition, see Johansson 2007:23). There only are a few divergent correspondences of *aussi* in Italian, and these correspondences occur in a fairly restricted number of cases (see, e.g., the verb *aggiungere* and the noun phrase *la stessa*, both occurring once in the data, which lexicalize the additive meaning and identity relation conveyed by *aussi*, respectively). In fact, the closest equivalent to *aussi* is *anche*, which occurs 62% of the cases as its translation. The second most common way of translating *aussi*, which occurs far less often, is by omission (18%, cf. the results for Ø in the table), which means that in the Italian target text there is no equivalent lexical and/or syntactic form corresponding to *aussi* (examples illustrating this case in Italian translation are given in § 3.3.2.). The wide range of possibilities found in the Italian corpus to translate *aussi* suggests of course that no one-to-one correspondence between *aussi* and *anche* exists. It should also be observed that there are very few instances in which *aussi* is translated with a scalar expression (one of these translations is *ma perfino*,

occurring only once in our entire dataset). This thus confirms the idea that *aussi* is not inherently scalar and that it is not easily compatible with a scalar reading (on this issue, cf. § 2.2.2.).

In Table 5 we give the translation paradigm of *anche*.

TP	AF	RF
<i>aussi</i>	85	34%
<i>également</i>	76	30%
Ø	59	24%
<i>même</i>	16	7%
other <sup>***</sup>	14	5%
Total	250	100%

\*\*\*The other translations include *encore* (3 occ.), *non plus* (2), *ainsi que*, *notamment*, *parfois*, *pas plus*, *toutefois*, *toute aussi*, *tout en*, *voire*, and the verb *ajouter* (1 time each).

Table 5. Translation paradigm of *anche* in French

As a whole, the translation equivalents of *anche* in French are mostly adverbs belonging to the class of AFAs. Thus, overall, despite a certain degree of variation in both directions, French and Italian share a small set of roughly equivalent AFAs. Two adverbs are mainly used in the French translation of *anche* (each occurring in one third of the translation equivalents of *anche*): *aussi* and *également*, with *aussi* slightly prevailing over *également* (34% vs. 30%). This result confirms the hypothesis proposed in De Cesare 2015a on the competing role of *également* within the semantic space of *aussi*. Interestingly, our data also show that the third most frequent solution in translating *anche* is by omission, i.e. by omitting to provide a lexical or syntactic expression carrying additive value (24%). This is almost the same result already observed

for the translation of *aussi*. Translations by omission will therefore deserve special attention in our analysis.

The percentage of *anche* translated with *même* shows cases in which the possible scalar value of *anche* has been made explicit in the translation (cf. § 3.3.2).

### 3.3.2. Translation divergences

In the translated texts analyzed, we found divergent translations of two semantic types: translation with a lexeme or structure forcing a different semantic interpretation from the one provided in the source text, and a loss in the translation of part of the semantic implications provided by the source text. These cases, exemplified in what follows on the basis of the Italian > French corpus, occur in both corpora.

Divergences arise in the selection of the scope or the DA of the AFA. In ex. (18), *questo provvedimento* ‘resolution’ is the DA of *anche* in the Italian source text; but *moi* ‘me’ is selected as the DA of *aussi* in the French translation:<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> The Italian and French translations obviously come from Europarl-direct. In turn, the English translations of our French and Italian examples come from Europarl, except in a few cases in which the English text was not close enough to the source text to make the reader aware of the source text constructions. In these cases, we provided our own English translation (see ex. 18 and 42). In case the translated text omitted the AFA, we added the symbol ‘Ø’ near the corresponding AFA’s DA in the target text.

- (18) Signor Presidente, **anche** su *questo provvedimento* [...] ho espresso il mio parere favorevole.

*Fr. transl.* Monsieur le Président, j'ai exprimé *moi aussi* un avis favorable sur cette disposition.

*Eng. transl.* Mr. President, I gave a favorable opinion about this provision **too**.

Further divergences occur as a consequence of the choice of the translator. In (19), the use of Fr. *encore* as a translation equivalent for *anche* forces a different selection of the DA and a different implication for the alternative. In the Italian source text, *anche* selects the predicate *abbiamo qualche perplessità* (meaning as a whole “we also have some doubts”) as its DA, thus suggesting that the previous predicate *esprimiamo un giudizio positivo* (“we give a favorable judgement”) is the alternative candidate to its DA. Instead, Fr. *encore* (“still”) in the translation functions as a phasal adverb and selects the current time span as its DA and previous time spans as its alternatives, thus forcing a temporal-phasal interpretation of the predicate (“we still have some doubts”) that is absent in the source text.

- (19) Noi esprimiamo un giudizio sostanzialmente positivo sul Libro bianco della Commissione sulla concorrenza, [...], ma *abbiamo anche qualche perplessità*.

*Fr. transl.* Nous exprimons un jugement globalement positif sur le Livre blanc de la Commission sur la concurrence, [...], mais nous avons **encore** quelques doutes.

*Eng. transl.* We have a basically positive view of the Commission's White Paper on competition [...], but we are **also** puzzled by several things.

In (20), *anche* in the source text admits, but does not require, a scalar interpretation, which is instead forced by the use of inherently scalar *même* in the French translation:

- (20) Nella contraddittorietà delle versioni fornite c'è stato **anche** il tentativo di rassicurare l'opinione pubblica internazionale sulla sorte di Babitsky.

*Fr. transl.* Les versions fournies sont très contradictoires et il en est **même** une qui tente de rassurer l'opinion publique internationale sur le sort de Babitsky.

*Eng. transl.* Among the contradictions in the accounts that have been given, there has **also** been an attempt to reassure international public opinion over Mr Babitsky's fate.

Omission of the AFA in the translation occurs rather frequently, as we have seen. The omission can change the meaning of the translation, as in ex. (21): in

the Italian source text, *anche* selects *ieri* (“yesterday”) as its DA, and implies that in addition to yesterday “the feeling of jeopardizing the project of an European political union” was perceived in other occasions. Because no corresponding AFA is present in the translation, such an implication is lost in the French translation (in the target text, the risk was perceived yesterday (*hier*) possibly for the first time).

- (21) Da sottolineare tuttavia è la presenza, **anche** *ieri*, nella consapevolezza di molti, del rischio che con l'ampliamento il disegno originario di costruzione di un'Europa politica possa essere messo in questione.

*Fr. transl.* Il faut cependant souligner qu' Ø hier, nombre d'entre nous étaient conscients du risque qu'avec l'élargissement, le projet originel de construction d'une Europe politique puisse être remis en question.

*Eng. transl.* Nevertheless, we must stress that many people are aware, as they were yesterday **too**, of the risk that enlargement could compromise the original plan for the construction of a political Europe.

Note, conversely, that the absence of a translation equivalent to *aussi/anche* does not necessarily lead to a translation diverging in meaning. The meaning of the source text is kept in the target text for instance when the additive value



conveyed by the AFA is redundant as there are other lexemes or structures conveying it as well (cf. the copulative conjunction It. *e*, Fr. *et*, "and"); in this case, since the AFA is redundant, its omission in the translation does not cause a loss of the additive value:

- (22) Credo ci debbano aiutare gli scritti di von Eieck e sicuramente **anche** quelli di un grande liberale italiano come Bruno Leoni.

*Fr. transl.* Je crois que nous devons nous inspirer des écrits de von Eieck et certainement  $\emptyset$  de ceux du grand libéral italien qu'était Bruno Leoni.

*Eng. transl.* In this respect, we should heed the words of von Eieck, and doubtless **also** those of the great Italian liberal Bruno Leoni.

#### 4. Mapping additivity of *aussi* and *anche* in the Europarl-direct corpus

In this paper we would like to pin down the differences between the use of the two cross-linguistic equivalents *aussi* and *anche* and understand if these differences can be explained on the basis of the availability and identifiability/recoverability of the alternatives to the DA of these AFAs as well as of the set of alternatives. In § 4.1., we trace the parameters on which we focus our analysis and give examples either in French or Italian. In § 4.2., we

offer quantitative and qualitative results for both the French > Italian and the Italian > French datasets.

#### *4.1. Parameters for the analysis: availability of alternatives and set of alternatives*

As a first step in the analysis, we distinguish two possible case scenarios:

1. the alternatives to be added to the AFA's DA are present in the co-text
2. the alternatives to be added to the AFA's DA are not present in the co-text

We will further refine our categorization of cases 1 and 2 in §§ 4.1.1. and 4.1.2, respectively.

##### *4.1.1. Co-textually available alternatives*

The cases in which overt alternatives are explicitly mentioned in the co-text can be further differentiated on the basis of how the text eases the identification of the alternatives to the AFA's DA. We will show that the hearer/reader can resort to syntactic, semantic and/or lexical cues found in the text and identify five subtypes of contexts, ranging from instances in which the alternatives to the AFA's DA are clearly identifiable to cases in which the alternatives are present in the text, but are not easily identifiable; in a sixth subtype, the AFA's DA has no real alternative in the text and has to be interpreted as having a continuative value, rather than an additive one.

At the top of the scale of recoverable alternatives are two subcases in which the link between the AFAs' DA and its alternatives are clearly signaled by syntactic structures: the DA and its alternatives can both be part of the same coordinated construction (subtype 1A; cf. Fr. *mais aussi, et aussi*; It. *ma anche, e anche*),<sup>15</sup> as in the French ex. (23), or they can occur in two separate propositions involving a strong syntactic and/or lexical parallelism (subtype 1B), as in the Italian ex. (24).

- (23) Comme vous le savez, il y a des problèmes qui concernent notre Parlement, certes, mais **aussi** *des fonctionnaires européens*, lesquels sont, eux aussi, des citoyens européens.

*Eng. transl.* As you know, there are problems which not only concern this House but also the European officials who are **also** European citizens.

- (24) Rappresentanti sindacali fanno anche parte, incomprensibilmente, delle commissioni di concorso, e non mi meraviglierei se membri del sindacato facessero già parte **anche** *dell'OLAF*.

---

<sup>15</sup> In some studies, it is claimed that *anche/aussi* following a conjunction (*ma/mais* 'but', *e/et* 'and') are not used as FAs, but are part of a complex conjunction (cf. Borreguero Zuloaga 2011; also see Taglicht 1984: 184 on E. *and also, but also*). In this paper, we consider the cases in which *anche/aussi* are preceded by a conjunction as special instances of the use of *anche/aussi* as AFAs.

*Eng. transl.* Incomprehensibly, trade union representatives are also members of committees on competition, and I would not be surprised if union members were already members of *OLAF* Ø.

In the two cases mentioned above, the presence of a structural parallelism between the proposition hosting the DA and the proposition in which the alternatives occur helps the reader/hearer to identify the intended alternative. In these cases, the alternatives are identified *a posteriori* at the onset of the AFA. There are cases, however, in which the paradigm can even be constructed at the onset of the first alternative, i.e. before the AFA and its DA actually occur in the text.<sup>16</sup> This happens when the text contains a lexical mark that signals to the reader that what immediately follows (Fr. most frequently *non/pas seulement/pas simplement* x, but also *d'une part, à la fois*; It. *non solo/soltanto/solamente* or *oltre che, insieme a*) or precedes (Fr. x *d'un côté*; x *certes/bien sûr*; It. x *sì*)<sup>17</sup> is to be interpreted as the first member of a set of alternatives. An example from French is given in (25). The alternatives can also appear in the form of a list containing one or more members. In cases such as (26), the onset of the list itself is a signal that a set of alternatives is to be constructed before the AFA actually appears in the subsequent text. Moreover, the AFA typically functions as a signal towards the closure of the list. Another

---

<sup>16</sup> This claim is of course true unless the alternative to the AFA's DA is given after the AFA and its DA (a case that is rather infrequent in our data).

<sup>17</sup> In all these cases, we have discourse markers with a segmentation function.

example of explicit parallel structure clearly identifying the alternative and its proposition is when both the proposition including the DA and the one with the alternative are linked in a concessive relation through concessive conjunctions such as It. *malgrado* or *se*, as illustrated in (27).

- (25) Cela touche **non seulement** la Roumanie, mais **aussi** *la Yougoslavie*, cela touche en fait tout le bassin du Danube.

*Eng. transl.* It affects **not only** Romania, but **also** Yugoslavia and, in fact, the entire Danube basin.

- (26) Credo che siamo di fronte a una tragedia umana, pensando ai familiari e agli amici; a una tragedia politica, pensando alla famiglia politica di appartenenza, ma **anche** *a una tragedia culturale*.

*Eng. transl.* For the friends and relatives of the victims this is a human tragedy and for their political families it is a political tragedy, but I feel that we are **also** witnessing a cultural tragedy.

- (27) **Se** quindi il termine "manifesto" può essere negativo, *ha* **però anche** *una sua grande validità, un forte contenuto politico*.

*Eng. transl.* So **while** the term "manifesto" might sound negative, it does, **nevertheless**, have an important value of its own and a sound political content.

In addition to the two subcases outlined above, the identification of the alternatives to the AFA's DA can be eased by partial semantic and/or lexical parallelism occurring either in the two propositions – possibly distant from each other – hosting the DA and its alternative (subtype 1C), as in *grande unità... non c'è stata una voce discordante... un accordo* in ex. (28), or only in the DA and its alternative (subtype 1D), such as *una risposta... una risposta...* in ex. (29):

- (28) Apprezzo questa grande unità sull'ampliamento. Non c'è stata pressoché una voce discordante nel dibattito di stamattina, e lo apprezzo, perché l'ampliamento sarà per noi una decisione che comporta sacrificio, che comporta grandi cambiamenti in noi stessi [...] **Anche** *sull'Africa* credo che sia importante che troviamo un accordo.

*Eng. transl.* I welcome this broad unity over enlargement. There has hardly been any difference of opinion during this morning's debate, and I welcome that because enlargement is a decision that is going to entail sacrifice for us and great changes within ourselves.[...] It is **also** important to reach an agreement over Africa.

- (29) E' ancora poco per avere un controllo della globalizzazione, o perlomeno per capire le conseguenze della globalizzazione, ma è una risposta forte, ed è una risposta che dobbiamo dare. [...] C'è

**anche** *una risposta a livello mondiale* che la Commissione ha fortemente proposto tramite il Commissario Lamy, in queste ultime settimane.

*Eng. transl.* This still does not go far enough towards controlling globalisation, or at least understanding the consequences of globalisation, but it is a substantial and necessary response. [...] In recent weeks, Commissioner Lamy **also** vigorously proposed a response at global level on behalf of the Commission.

At the bottom of the scale of recoverable alternatives, we identify a case in which no syntactic, lexical or overt semantic parallelism can be drawn between the proposition hosting the DA and previous propositions present in the text (subtype 1E). The hearer/reader therefore lacks any explicit linguistic hints to identify the alternative to the AFA's DA, which is present in the text. An example in point is offered in (30). For this example, we suggest that the alternative to the DA of the AFA, namely *loro* ("the Communist countries returning to Communism"), is Austria, i.e. a country that has in the past been threatened by some MPEs with being thrown out of the European Union because of the growth in political popularity of Haider's neo-Nazi movement.

- (30) Siamo stupefatti di fronte all'insipienza politica di chi, con parole imprudenti, ha rafforzato Haider in Austria e ridicolizzato l'Unione, calpestando l'articolo 7 del Trattato annunciando provvedimenti

anticostituzionali [...]. Altrimenti, come la metteremo con i paesi comunisti, che si riaffermano comunisti: butteremo fuori **anche loro** dall'Unione se andranno al governo, oppure per i nipoti di Stalin tutto sarà assolto?

*Eng. transl.* We are astonished by the political naivety of people who, with thoughtless words, have bolstered Mr Haider's position in Austria and made the Union look ridiculous, riding roughshod over Article 7 of the Treaty by announcing unconstitutional measures. Otherwise, how will we deal with Communist countries which return to Communism: will we throw them out of the Union **too** if Communists enter into government, or will Stalin's grandchildren be forgiven for everything?

To what we said so far about the alternatives to the DA of the AFA, we should add that the text can also explicitly mention the set to which the DA and its alternatives belong. The set is easy to identify in particular when it is mentioned with a hypernym evoking the paradigm of alternatives (cf. *certaines groupes sociaux* in ex. 31) or with a plural or collective noun (as *un nombre significatif d'instruments législatifs* in ex. 32). Additional examples and comments concerning the presence of a set are offered in § 4.1.2.

- (31) Troisième point : des actions spécifiques en faveur de CERTAINS GROUPES SOCIAUX - plusieurs intervenants parmi vous les ont



rappelés - les femmes, mais **aussi** *les immigrants, les réfugiés*, qui devraient être prévues.

*Eng. transl.* Third point: specific measures in favour of some social groups - some speakers mentioned them - women, but **also** immigrants and refugees, must be envisaged.

- (32) Je tiens à souligner que la Commission a déjà déposé, depuis Tampere, UN NOMBRE SIGNIFICATIF D'INSTRUMENTS LEGISLATIFS, pour qu'ils puissent être débattus par le Conseil et adoptés dans les délais prévus par le scoreboard. Il s'agit non seulement de l'instrument du règlement Eurodac, mais **aussi** de la proposition de décision sur le Fonds européen pour les réfugiés, de la directive sur la protection temporaire, de la révision de la Convention de Dublin.
- Eng. transl.* I must emphasise the fact that, since Tampere, the Commission has already proposed a number of legislative instruments, so that they can be discussed by the Council and adopted within the deadlines that have been established by the scoreboard. I am not only talking about the instrument for the regulation of Eurodac. I am **also** talking about the proposal for a decision on the European Refugee Fund, the directive on temporary protection, the revision of the Dublin Convention.

In our corpus we also identified a last case (subtype 1F, which only occurs with *aussi*), in which neither the set nor real alternatives can be reconstructed, as in ex. (33).

- (33) Dès lors, les fraudes à la TVA communautaire et les distorsions dans le calcul du PIB, base imposable de la quatrième ressource, affectent, dans des proportions sensibles, les rendements et la justice des ressources communautaires. *Dès lors* **aussi**, l'Europe à prétention fédérale se finance plus que jamais comme la banale organisation intergouvernementale qu'elle est, mais qu'elle refuse d'être.

*Eng. transl.* Since then, Community VAT fraud and distortions in the calculation of GDP, the taxable basis for the fourth resource, have had a perceptible effect on the yield and justice of Community resources. Since then, **of course**, this Europe with pretensions to federalism is now more than ever financed like the commonplace intergovernmental organisation it actually is, but which it refuses to see itself as.

In (33), the AFA does not evoke a real set of alternatives to the element associated with *aussi*, as the alternative to be found in the text is identical to the AFA's DA (*dès lors* < *dès lors aussi*). In this specific use, thus, *aussi* cannot be considered to be additive: not only is its DA not added to an alternative that

differs from the DA, but the AFA's DA is informationally given rather than new in the text. In this use, *aussi* operates on information that functions as background (or frame) in the utterance in which it occurs. Thus, *aussi* has what has been called a continuative value (cf. Andorno 2000:237).

#### 4.1.2. *Co-textually non-available alternatives*

In the cases in which alternatives to the AFA's DA are not explicitly mentioned in the text, but are recoverable in the communicative situation, they can be reconstructed both via textual and contextual cues. As we will see further below, this is also true for the set to which both the DA of the AFA and its alternatives belong. Since both the alternatives and the set can be specified to different degrees, here, too, we identify five subtypes according to the degree of precision with which the alternatives to the AFA's DA and the set of alternatives can be identified. These subtypes range from a maximum to a minimum of precision in identifying the alternatives to the AFA's DA.

At the top of the scale, in terms of precision in recovering alternatives to the AFA's DA, is the case in which these alternatives have a deictic reference in some contextual elements (subtype 2A), e.g. the speaker (ex. 34) and/or the audience (ex. 35) or the current situation (ex. 21):

- (34) Come ha ricordato **anche** *il Presidente Prodi* nell'esporre gli obiettivi strategici 2000 - 2005, il rilancio del processo di Barcellona rappresenta una priorità per l'Unione.

*Eng. transl.* As President Prodi **too** mentioned when outlining the strategic objectives for the period 2000-2005, boosting the Barcelona process is a priority for the Union.

- (35) E' possibile continuare a lasciare i Balcani fuori dall'ampliamento, senza pensare che Croazia, Macedonia e altri paesi hanno diritto **anche loro** a stare in questa Casa comune?

*Eng. transl.* Can we really continue to leave the Balkans out of the enlargement process, disregarding the fact that Croatia, Macedonia and other countries **also** have the right to a place in this House that is open to all?

Further on the scale we identify the cases in which the alternatives are recovered through reference to a common ground (subtype 2B). In ex. (36), for instance, a possible alternative proposition to the proposition including the DA of *anche* (*cerchiamo di chiudere il deficit di avvenire* “let’s try to control the deficit of the future”) can be reconstructed on the basis of the listener’s common knowledge concerning financial deficit, and its need to be controlled, which is likely a frequent theme in discussion of the European agenda.

- (36) Ci siamo piantati addosso tanto tempo, mentre maturavano invece i semi di quello che avevamo messo con tanto sacrificio alle radici

dell'Europa. [...] Adesso, per favore, cerchiamo di chiudere **anche** *il deficit di avvenire* e dare un senso alle nuove generazioni.

*Eng transl.* We cried on each other's shoulders for such a long time, but during this time the seeds of what we had sown with such sacrifice in the early days of Europe were preparing to bear fruit.

[...] Now, let us please endeavour to make good  $\emptyset$  *the deficit of the future* and give the coming generations a sense of direction.

The third case is when the identification of the alternatives to the AFA's DA is eased through the formulation of the DA itself (subtype 2C). It should be noted that this identification can be more or less precise depending on the expression of the DA. In ex. (37) the DA *queste nuove risorse* "these new resources" clearly identifies the alternative *vecchie risorse* "old resources". By contrast, in ex. (38) the alternatives to the AFA's DA, *sul piano giurisdizionale* "on the level of jurisdiction", are rather undefined, as they simply point to "other levels" on which it is possible to reinforce the protection of the rights mentioned by the speaker.

- (37) Libereremo dunque nuove risorse, ma verrà anche il momento [...] nel quale **anche** *queste nuove risorse* che noi stiamo già liberando non saranno sufficienti.

*Eng. transl.* So we shall be freeing up new resources, but [...] the time will come when *these new resources* that we are already freeing up will, **in turn**, be insufficient.

- (38) Il Parlamento europeo si è pronunciato nettamente perché ci sia questa integrazione, nella convinzione che questa sia la via per garantire il valore giuridico della Carta e per rafforzare la protezione dei diritti **anche** *sul piano giurisdizionale*.

*Eng. transl.* The European Parliament declared itself fully in favour of this move, convinced that this is the way to guarantee the legal status of the Charter and to consolidate the protection of rights at a legal level **as well**.

In all the three cases mentioned so far (subtypes 2A-C), contextual and co-textual cues help to directly identify one or more possible alternatives to which the AFA's DA points. As we have seen on the basis of the examples provided above, these alternatives can be more or less defined. In other cases, by contrast, the alternatives to the AFA's DA are identified only through the preliminary identification of the paradigmatic set they belong to. The result is that the alternatives are much vaguer than in the cases seen so far. We distinguish two cases of this later type: the set is explicitly mentioned in the co-text (subtype 2D), as in ex. (39), and the set is to be reconstructed itself

(subtype 2E), as in ex. (40), where neither the set nor real alternatives can be reconstructed.

- (39) In tal senso, l'Europa nel suo complesso, e ciascuno Stato membro in particolare, dovrà utilizzare al meglio TUTTE LE SUE RISORSE E LE SUE POTENZIALITÀ, quindi **anche** *i Fondi strutturali disponibili*.  
*Eng. transl.* To this end, Europe as a whole, and each Member State individually, will have to make optimum use of all available resources and capacities, **including** *the Structural Funds*.

- (40) Signor Commissario, so benissimo quali siano i vincoli dei Trattati ma credo che anche in questa occasione sia importante ribadire che l'economia europea soffre nella competizione con quella americana, **anche** e soprattutto *per mancanza di aperture e di concorrenza*.  
*Eng. transl.* Commissioner, I am quite familiar with the constraints imposed by the Treaties, but I believe that, it must be emphasised once again that the European economy is finding it hard to compete with the American economy, **especially** *because of insufficiently open markets and a lack of genuine competition*.

In both the cases illustrated in (39) and (40), the role of the AFA is to specify the most relevant member of the set according to the speaker. The difference between (39) and (40) concerns the nature of the set. Because it is clearly

stated, this set is of course more precise in the first, than in the second case. In ex. (40), by contrast, the set is only identified as “all possible reasons for which the European economy can suffer when compared with the US economy”; no precise alternative to be added to the AFA’s DA can thus be identified here.

#### 4.2. Results of the analysis: *aussi* and *anche* in source texts and translations

##### 4.2.1. *Aussi* and *anche* in source texts: general picture

In Table 6, we report the outcome of our corpus analysis related to the distribution of *aussi* and *anche* in the two case scenarios outlined in § 4.1., i.e. according to their use with the presence / absence of alternatives to their DA in the co-text.

	<i>aussi</i>		<i>anche</i>	
	AF	RF	AF	RF
1. Alternatives available in the co-text	205	82%	161	64%
2. Alternatives not available in the co-text	45	18%	89	36%
Total	250	100%	250	100%

Table 6. Frequency of *aussi/anche*  
according to the presence/absence of alternatives to be added in the co-text

Our results show that the use of *aussi* is strongly favored in texts in which one or more alternatives to its DA are present in the co-text (82%). However, there is still approximately a fifth of the instances of *aussi* (18%) in which no alternative to the DA of *aussi* is present in the same text. From this finding, we can draw our first interesting conclusion: *aussi* is used four times more often



with than without an alternative to its DA in the same text. This finding allows us to partially confirm, at least as far as the text type we are analyzing is concerned, Blumenthal's claim about the use of *aussi* (cf. § 2.3.).

Turning to It. *anche*, we see that it occurs in most of the cases (two thirds) in the presence of alternatives to its DA. However, in a fair amount of instances (the other third), *anche* is used in contexts in which, although reconstruction is possible, no explicit alternative to its DA can be found in the text.

Our results also show that, while being fairly close on the semantic level, there are some differences between the discourse use of *aussi* and *anche*. The former occurs more often than the latter with an explicit alternative to its DA (81% vs 64%), while the latter is used two times more frequently than the former in contexts in which no alternative is mentioned (18% vs 36%). These differences, as we will see in the next paragraphs devoted to the two case scenarios separately, can also be observed in the translation choices for *aussi* and *anche*.

#### 4.2.2. *Cross-linguistic differences in source texts and translation paradigms of aussi/anche with co-textually available alternatives*

4.2.2.1. *Source texts.* A more precise picture of the cross-linguistic differences between the meaning and uses of *aussi* and *anche* can be obtained by looking at the distribution of both AFAs according to the subtypes 1A-E described in §

4.1. on the basis of a scale of alternatives that are more or less clearly identifiable in the text. The quantitative data provided in Table 7 shows that in the cases in which the alternatives to *aussi* and *anche* are present in the text, they are often marked by a strong parallelism: subtypes 1A-B occur 143 times with *aussi* (69% of the 205 occurrences) and 104 times with *anche* (64% of 161 occurrences); the alternatives to the AFA's DA are therefore usually easily identifiable in the text and close to both the AFA and its DA.

Contexts	<i>aussi</i>		<i>anche</i>	
	AF	RF	AF	RF
1A. Strong syntactic parallelism: the alternative and the DA are part of a coordinated construction	81	39%	71	44%
1B. Syntactic and/or lexical parallelism in the proposition in which DA and its alternative occur	62	30%	33	20%
1C. Semantic and lexical parallelism in the scope of the proposition in which the DA and its alternative occur	16	8%	23	14%
1D. No syntactic-semantic parallelism, but alternative easy to identify in the co-text; lexical congruence between the DA and its alternative	22	11%	28	17%
1E. No syntactic-semantic parallelism and the alternative difficult to identify in the co-text	21	10%	6	4%
1F. No set nor real alternatives can be identified in the text	3	1%	0	-
Total	205	100%	161	100%

Table 7. Contexts in which alternatives to AFA's DA are present in the co-text

Another difference in the discourse context of the two AFAs can be found when we consider whether the set is mentioned in addition to the alternatives. In the case of *aussi*, the set is generally mentioned alongside at least one explicit alternative to the AFA's DA, while it happens in only four cases with *anche*. As

we will see in the next paragraph, mention of the set is much more frequent in the cases in which *anche* occurs with co-textually non-available alternatives.

4.2.2.2. *Translation paradigms.* In Table 8 we give the translation paradigms for *aussi* and *anche* and the frequency of each translation option (occurring more than five times in the dataset) when the alternatives to their DA are available in the co-text.

<i>aussi</i>			<i>anche</i>		
TP	AF	RF	TP	AF	RF
<i>anche</i>	122	59%	<i>aussi</i>	68	42%
Ø	34	17%	<i>également</i>	48	30%
<i>inoltre</i>	15	7%	Ø	32	20%
<i>nonché</i>	8	4%	<i>même</i>	4	2%
<i>altresì</i>	6	3%			
other	20	10%	other	9	7%
Total	205	100%	Total	161	100%

Table 8. Translation paradigms of *aussi/anche* with co-textually available alternatives

In the case in which *aussi/anche*'s DA occur with an explicit alternative in the co-text, we find that *aussi* is translated more often with *anche* (59%), than *anche* with *aussi* (42%). This result leads to the conclusion that *anche* is a closer translation equivalent to *aussi* than *aussi* to *anche*. However, as we know, French *aussi* has an important competitor, *également*, which is used as a translation to *anche* in an important part of the data (30%). Interestingly, with respect to the translations found in the whole dataset (cf. Table 5), in the cases in which an explicit alternative to its DA appears in the text, *aussi* is chosen more frequently as a translation to *anche* (its frequency jumps from 34% in

Table 5 to 42% in Table 8). For *aussi* translated with *anche*, by contrast, there is no difference in this respect (as shown in Tables 4 and 8, respectively, this translation occurs in 62% of the whole dataset and 59% of the cases in which at least one alternative to the AFA's DA is mentioned explicitly in the co-text).

Our data also show that the translation paradigm is wider for *aussi* than for *anche*. Besides *anche*, we find that *aussi* is translated with a certain frequency by *inoltre*, *nonché* and *altresì* (14% taken together) and that there is quite a wide palette of translations occurring less than five times in the corpus. In turn, besides *aussi* and *égalelement*, *anche* is translated in a small number of cases by *même* (2%). Finally, fairly often both AFAs are not even translated at all (16% and 20%, respectively). These results suggest that *anche* is much less specialized, both semantically and functionally, than *aussi*.

Moving beyond the general data provided in Table 8, we can pin down the differences between *aussi* and *anche* even more precisely by taking a closer look at their translation paradigms in the five specific subtypes identified (Table 9).

Contexts	<i>aussi</i>		<i>anche</i>	
	TP	Total	TP	Total
1A.	<i>anche</i> : 62; Ø: 8; <i>nonché</i> : 7; <i>other</i> : 4	81	<i>aussi</i> : 39; <i>égalelement</i> : 14; Ø: 13; <i>même</i> : 3; <i>other</i> : 2	71
1B.	<i>anche</i> : 24; Ø: 13; <i>inoltre</i> : 9; <i>altresì</i> : 5; <i>other</i> : 11	62	<i>aussi</i> : 15; <i>égalelement</i> : 10; Ø: 5; <i>other</i> : 3	33
1C.	<i>anche</i> : 8; Ø: 4; <i>inoltre</i> : 4	16	<i>égalelement</i> : 12; <i>aussi</i> : 6; Ø: 3; <i>other</i> : 2	23
1D.	<i>anche</i> : 14; Ø: 3; <i>nonché</i> : 1; <i>altresì</i> : 1; <i>other</i> : 3	22	Ø: 9; <i>égalelement</i> : 9; <i>aussi</i> : 7; <i>other</i> : 3	28
1E.	<i>anche</i> : 13; Ø: 4; <i>inoltre</i> : 2; <i>other</i> : 2	21	<i>égalelement</i> : 3; Ø: 2; <i>aussi</i> : 1	6

1F.	<i>anche</i> : 1; Ø: 2	3	-	0
-----	------------------------	---	---	---

Table 9. Translation paradigms for *aussi/anche* in different contexts  
(alternatives to AFA's DA present in the co-text).

In all the five subtypes identified, *anche* is chosen fairly often as a translation to *aussi*. The data also shows that in each context *anche* is clearly the preferred translation option over the other translation possibilities. However, if we compare the percentage of the different translation options for each context, we find that there are contexts in which *anche* is a preferred or unpreferred translation option. This AFA is a clear preferred option (62/81: 77%) in cases in which the French source text contains a strong syntactic parallelism (subtype 1A, in particular the sequence *mais aussi*), as in ex. (41). Note that with respect to the other four contexts identified, It. *nonché* is also favored in subtype 1A, in particular in the cases in which the French source text contains the adversative sequence *mais aussi* (6/8 occ). Often, in these cases, the element linked to *aussi* ranks higher (less often lower) on a scale of importance, thematic relevance, expectations, argumentative force etc. Often, too, there is a discourse marker to convey this meaning component; in ex. (42), we find *bien sûr* 'of course', translated in Italian by *beninteso*. In light of these observations, the use of *nonché* as a translation of *aussi* seems less appropriate than *anche*, as *nonché* marks a strict parallelism between the elements involved in the text.

- (41) Comme vous le savez, il y a des problèmes qui concernent notre  
Parlement, certes, mais **aussi** *des fonctionnaires européens*, lesquels  
sont, eux aussi, des citoyens européens.

*It. transl.* Come è noto, vi sono problemi che riguardano il nostro Parlamento, è vero, **ma anche** *alcuni funzionari europei*, i quali sono anch'essi cittadini europei.

*Eng. transl.* As you know, there are problems which not only concern this House but **also** the European officials who are also European citizens.

- (42) Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, permettez-moi d'ajouter ma voix à celle de nos collègues qui ont déjà pris la parole dans ce débat pour souligner combien ce problème de l'incertitude dans laquelle sont laissées les familles sur le sort de ces 605 prisonniers et disparus est insupportable, au regard des droits de l'homme bien sûr, mais **aussi** *du droit à la dignité de la personne humaine*.

*It. transl.* Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, consentitemi di aggiungere la mia voce a quella di coloro che hanno già preso la parola nel dibattito per sottolineare quanto sia insostenibile l'incertezza nella quale vivono le famiglie in merito alla sorte dei 605 prigionieri scomparsi, un problema inerente, beninteso, ai diritti dell'uomo **nonché** *al diritto alla dignità della persona umana*.

*Eng. transl.* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, allow me to add my voice to those who have already spoken in the debate to underline how unsustainable the uncertainty is in which the families of the 605 missing prisoners are living, a problem which is of

course inherently related to human rights **as well as** the right which human beings have to dignity.

By contrast, *anche* is somewhat less preferred in the cases in which there is a syntactic and/or lexical parallelism in the scope of the proposition in which both the DA and the alternative occur (subtype 1B). The most frequent translation competitor of *anche* in this case is *inoltre* (there is also *altresi*, but it does not occur very often). The example provided in (43) shows that *inoltre* is selected over *anche* because *aussi*'s DA coincides with a clause.

- (43) En effet, alors que trois récoltes annuelles des travailleurs marocains et africains font vivre cent mille personnes, alors qu'ils réussissent à ramener un chiffre d'affaires annuel de près de deux millions d'euros, 60 % de la plupart d'entre eux n'ont pas l'eau courante dans une région où on sait pourtant que, par moment, il fait 40 degrés l'été. On sait aussi que beaucoup d'entre eux ne perçoivent que 30 euros par mois là où nos concitoyens européens peuvent percevoir le triple.

*It. transl.* Sappiamo inoltre che molti di essi ricevono solo 30 euro al mese, laddove i cittadini europei possono percepire il triplo.

*Eng. transl.* Three annual crops of Moroccan and African workers support 100 000 people and manage to bring in an annual turnover of nearly EUR 2 million; and yet 60 % of them have no running

water in a region where, as we know, the temperature may reach 40 degrees in summer. We **also** know that many of them only earn EUR 30 a month, while their fellow European citizens can earn three times that.

Turning to the translations of *anche* in French, we find that there is an evident correlation between the five subtypes identified and their translation with *aussi* and *également*. When the alternatives are embedded in clear syntactic structures and are located at a short distance from the AFA's DA (subtypes 1A-B), *aussi* is favored over *également* to translate *anche*. Vice versa, when the syntactic parallelism is less explicit (subtypes 1C-E), translations with *également* prevail over those containing *aussi*. Another interesting finding is that, among the recurrent syntactic structures at the foundation of subtypes 1A-B, *aussi* is the preferred translation with lists of alternatives (17 occ. *aussi* out of 26 cases, cf. ex. 44) and adversative/concessive structures ((*non solo/soltanto/unicamente...*) *ma/però/tuttavia anche*; *malgrado/se X, però anche Y*: 48 occ. *aussi* and 14 occ. *également* in a total of 70 cases), while omission is clearly preferred in copulative structures (*oltre che/insieme a X anche Y*; *X e/o anche Y*), 11 occ. out of a total of 24). In this case, exemplified in (22), the translation by omission seems to be related to the intention to eliminate the redundancies found in the original text.



- (44) Ci sarà amicizia, serenità, apertura, ma ci sarà anche *severità*  
nell'ampliamento.

*Fr. transl.* L'élargissement sera empreint d'amitié, de sérénité,  
d'ouverture, **mais aussi** de sévérité.

*Eng. transl.* There will be friendship, calm, openness but **also** a  
certain strictness in the enlargement process.

#### 4.2.3. Cross-linguistic differences in source texts and translation paradigms of *aussi/anche with co-textually non-available alternatives*

4.2.3.1. *Source texts.* A more accurate picture of the cross-linguistic differences between the meaning and uses of *aussi* and *anche* can again be obtained by looking at the distribution of both AFAs according to the subtypes 2A-E described in § 4.1., i.e. on the basis of a scale of alternatives that absent in the text but more or less precise to reconstruct via textual and contextual cues. These results are given in Table 10.

Contexts	<i>aussi</i>		<i>anche</i>	
	AF	RF	AF	RF
2A. Alternatives with deictic reference to contextual element	19	42%	18	20%
2B. Alternatives identified through common ground	3	7%	5	6%
2C. Alternatives developed out of the formulation of the DA	3	7%	18	20%
2D. Set mentioned; alternatives generic	2	4%	21	24%
2E. Set not mentioned; alternatives vague	18	40%	27	30%
Total	45	100%	89	100%

Table 10. Contexts in which alternatives to be added to the DA of AFA  
are not present in the co-text

The data provided in Table 10 shows that, while *anche* is distributed fairly evenly in four of the five subtypes identified, *aussi* tends to occur in the first and in the last category. At the same time, *aussi* and *anche* have a fairly similar frequency with respect to the last subtype identified. As we saw in § 4.1.3., they differ, however, on the basis of the structures that are used most frequently in both languages to reconstruct the alternatives to the AFA's DA. In French, the alternative to the DA of *aussi* is often reconstructed on the basis of a demonstrative pronoun preceding a noun that coincides with the set, as shown in (45).

- (45) Au demeurant, j'approuve le dégroupage, mais il faut, *dans ce domaine* **aussi**, élaborer très vite des règles simples, claires et contraignantes pour définir l'étendue, accompagner l'évolution et préciser le financement du service universel.

*Eng. transl.* Nevertheless, I approve of unbundling, but simple, clear constraints need to be worked out in this area **as well** in order to define the limits, follow progress and lay down terms for the financing of the universal service.

In Italian, by contrast, a range of structures exists in which the AFA occurs without a clear alternative. One frequent case involves the structure *anche*

*per/anche perché* ‘also for/also because’, which introduces a motive to what has been stated in the previous text (see ex. 46):

- (46) Signor Presidente, interverrò su INTERREG limitandomi ad alcuni aspetti critici, **anche** *per rispettare ovviamente i limiti di tempo del mio intervento*.

*Eng. transl.* Mr President, I am taking the floor to speak about INTERREG, but I shall confine myself to a few criticisms, which will clearly **also** enable me to keep to my speaking time.

Other uses of *aussi* and *anche* can be traced in two other recurrent contexts, both on the verge of conventionalization. In a first context (cf. ex. (47) and (48)), *aussi* and *anche* are found in a syntactic construction in which the predicate involves a modal verb with the semantic value of possibility. In (48), for instance, the speaker conveys the idea that his group can either vote or not vote for the advice mentioned in the text; clearly, these two options cannot be added to one another, in the sense that they logically cannot both be verified. These possibilities only form a set of alternatives to be added to each other when one takes into account the different possible worlds evoked by the modal verb; in the real world, only one alternative will be verified.

- (47) Je pense qu'il faudrait un jour parler en profondeur de ce que cet avantage peut **aussi** *contenir*.

*Eng. transl.* I think that one day we will have to discuss in depth what this advantage may **also** imply.

- (48) Io credo inoltre che, essendo questo parere abbastanza rilevante, lo possiamo **anche** *votare*, e, infatti, la maggioranza del nostro gruppo lo voterà.

*Eng. transl.* Moreover, given that this opinion is quite important, we can **still** vote for it, and indeed, the majority of our group will be voting for it.

In a second context, *anche* modifies an adjective (typically evaluative); the resultant adjectival phrase is in turn used to modify a noun phrase. The case in point provided in (49) shows that, in this construction, *anche* is not used to add the property expressed by its DA (“difficult”) to alternative properties which can be ascribed to the referent in the scope (“the mediation process”), but rather to introduce a further circumstance (the mediation process having been difficult) that has to be taken into account in order to evaluate the main claim, namely how commendable the work done by the culture commission is. As was the case in the previous example, the additive value of *anche* does not apply at the level of properties or facts in the world. Rather, it applies at the level of propositions that function as arguments in an argumentation (“in addition to other arguments, it should be considered that...”).

(49) Signora Presidente, condivido pienamente le valutazioni che sono state fatte dal relatore e ringrazio anche il presidente della commissione per la cultura, onorevole Gargani, per l'opera pregevole svolta in un processo di mediazione **anche** *sostanzialmente difficile*.

*Eng. transl.* Madam President, I absolutely agree with the rapporteur's analysis and I would also like to thank the chairman of the Committee on Culture, Mr Gargani, for his praiseworthy work in a mediation process that was **also**, considerably difficult.

4.2.3.2. *Translation paradigms.* Table 11 gives the translation paradigms for *aussi* and *anche* and the frequency of each translation option in the cases in which the alternatives to their DA are not available in the co-text. The translation data reported in this table show that this case scenario is clearly different from the one in which at least one alternative to the AFA's DA is indeed present in the text, a fact that confirms the relevance of taking into account the presence/absence of alternatives to the AFA's DA in the text when explaining the discourse use of *aussi/anche*.

<i>aussi</i>			<i>anche</i>		
TP	AF	RF	TP	AF	RF
<i>anche</i>	33	73%	<i>également</i>	28	31%
Ø	10	22%	Ø	27	30%
			<i>aussi</i>	17	19%
			<i>même</i>	12	13%
other	2	5%	other	5	6%
Total	45	100%	Total	89	100%

Table 11. Translation paradigms of *aussi/anche*  
with co-textually non-available alternatives

As far as the translation of *aussi* is concerned, we find that *anche* is again its preferred translation option (73% of the cases); one example is provided in (50). In fact, when compared to the translation options observed for the first case scenario, in this case *anche* is to be understood as an even closer equivalent to *aussi*.

- (50) Or, cela ne va pas de soi, car cette nouvelle croissance est très inégalitaire et peut s'accompagner, comme nous l'avons vu aux États-Unis depuis une dizaine d'années, de phénomènes persistants de précarité, d'exclusion, de pauvreté, de ghettoïsation urbaine. Il s'agit d'une croissance dans les conditions héritées de la crise : de nombreux emplois sont créés mais il n'y a jamais eu autant d'emplois précaires, d'interims, de temps partiels imposés. Je crois que nous devons faire en sorte que ne se généralise pas *chez nous* **aussi** le phénomène des working poors.

*It. transl.* Credo che dobbiamo fare in modo che non si generalizzi **anche** *da noi* il fenomeno dei working poor.

*Eng. transl.* This is not self-evident as this new growth is very unfair and, as we have seen in the United States for some ten years now, may be accompanied by persistent insecure employment, exclusion, poverty and urban ghettoisation. Growth will take place

under conditions inherited from the crisis: a lot of jobs are being created, but there have never been so many insecure jobs, temporary jobs and imposed part-time work. I believe that we must ensure that the phenomenon of the working poor does not become widespread over here **as well**.

We can observe a different paradigm of translations for *anche* as well. With respect to the instances in which *anche* occurs with explicit alternatives in the co-text, in the case in which the alternatives are not present, but ought to be reconstructed by the hearer/reader, we find that the preferred translation option is *également* (roughly a third of the cases), followed by its translation by omission (roughly a fourth). In contrast, *aussi* is used as a translation for *anche* in less than a fourth of the cases, while there are a fair number of occurrences in which *anche* is translated with *même* (this translation occurs much more often than in the subtypes 1A-E).

As shown by the results in Table 12, data from translation permits us to confirm/allows for the confirmation of the different uses and semantic values associated with *aussi* and *anche*. Moreover it further validates the five subtypes identified.

Contexts	<i>aussi</i>		<i>anche</i>	
	TP	TOT	TP	TOT
2A.	<i>anche</i> : 16; Ø: 3	19	<i>également</i> : 7; <i>aussi</i> : 5; Ø: 4; <i>même</i> : 2	18
2B.	<i>anche</i> : 2; Ø: 1	3	Ø: 5	5
2C.	<i>anche</i> : 3	3	<i>également</i> : 6; <i>même</i> : 5; <i>aussi</i> : 4; Ø: 2; <i>encore</i> : 1	18

2D.	<i>anche</i> : 2	2	<i>également</i> : 9; Ø: 5; <i>même</i> : 4; <i>aussi</i> : 2; <i>ainsi que</i> : 1	21
2E.	<i>anche</i> : 10; Ø: 6; <i>pure</i> : 1, <i>altro</i> : 1	18	Ø: 11; <i>également</i> : 6; <i>aussi</i> : 6; <i>même</i> , <i>parfois</i> , <i>tout en</i> , <i>notamment</i> : 1	27

Table 12. Translation paradigms for *aussi/anche* in different contexts  
(alternatives to be added to AFA's DA not present in the co-text)

Table 12 shows that *aussi* is practically always translated with *anche*, except in the subtype 2E, where translation by omission is also quite frequent. For Italian, too, the translation of *anche* does not vary significantly across the five subtypes identified, all preferring *également* over *aussi*, with the most notable exception of the last case (type 2E), in which zero translation is the most frequent choice. Worth noticing, moreover, is the fact that *même* is mainly used to translate the uses of *anche* belonging to subtypes 2C and 2D (9 occ., ex. 51), specifically the cases in which the DA is presented in the text as an extreme case in point. In these cases, *anche* has a clear scalar value, which is only traceable in *aussi* when the AFA is part of a list, i.e. when the alternatives to *aussi*'s DA are explicitly mentioned in the text (on this issue, cf. § 2.2.2. and 4.2.2.).

- (51) E' chiaro che la globalizzazione sta divaricando la nostra società,  
aumentando le nostre povertà, aumentando molte rabbie,  
provocando delle divisioni e delle spartizioni nei livelli salariali,  
***anche*** di categorie che sembravano omogenee

*Fr. transl.* Il est évident que la mondialisation crée un fossé au sein  
de notre société en aggravant la pauvreté, en exaltant de



nombreuses colères, en provoquant des divisions et des différences salariales, **même** dans les catégories qui semblaient homogènes.

*Eng. transl.* It is clear that globalisation is causing our society to diverge, increasing poverty, giving more grounds for anger, causing wide differences in salaries, **even** in sectors which seem similar, and we need to focus our attention on this.

#### 4.3. Mapping the discourse functions of *aussi/anche* in the *Europarl-direct corpus*

The analysis of the uses of *aussi/anche* in the *Europarl-direct corpus* leads us to identify different macrofunctions linked to the presence/absence of alternatives to the AFA's DA in the co-text. We will describe them on the basis of the distinction between syntagmatic and paradigmatic addition (on this proposal, see Gast in this volume). Specifically, we will show that AFAs can be involved in the construction of a list involving a climax or in a textual movement in which there are contrasting alternative values; an AFA can also be used to weaken the force of a speech act or, conversely, to strengthen the argumentative force of a piece of information or of an entire speech act.

##### 4.3.1. *Aussi/Anche as syntagmatic AFAs*

When there are alternatives to their DA in the same text, *aussi/anche* function as syntagmatic AFAs. Specifically, the element associated with the AFA is

explicitly linked to one or more alternatives given in the preceding or (rarely) subsequent part of the text. In this case, the general function of these AFA can be claimed to be discourse-cohesive. The cohesive function of *aussi/anche* is very clear in particular when their DA is linked to alternatives that are distant in the text and/or when the relation between the AFA of the DA and its alternatives is instantiated by the AFA itself, and does not clearly arise on the basis of other linguistic cues (i.e. on syntactic and lexical cues, such as in ex. 28, 29 and particularly 30).

In addition to linking different portions of a text, the AFA can induce a reinterpretation of the text by instructing the reader/hearer to interpret in a new way a piece of information already integrated in the common ground. Specifically, by virtue of its component providing an additive meaning, the AFA instructs the reader to assign to the alternatives the same property as the one asserted for the AFA's DA. This function arises when the alternatives to the AFA's DA occur in a proposition that differs both structurally and semantically from the one involving the DA. In ex. (30), for instance, the proposition "some country – possibly Austria – was about to be thrown out of the Union" is neither expressed nor inferable in the preceding text, and only arises as a result of the presence of the AFA. In implicating that the property of the DA of the AFA also holds for at least one alternative element, once this element has been identified in the previous text, the AFA gives rise to new inferences between previous parts of the text and the one involving the AFA, thereby enriching textual coherence.

While the general function of *aussi/anche* can be claimed to be cohesive, we can identify other, more specific discourse functions when the alternatives to the AFA's DA immediately precede the proposition including the AFA (note that these specific functions can occur simultaneously and therefore need not be interpreted as being mutually exclusive), in particular when the AFA occurs in a clear parallel syntactic structure and/or with a coordinating conjunction (either with a copulative, i.e. *et aussi/e anche*, or adversative, *mais aussi/ma anche*, conjunction). In these cases, the AFA does not function as the primary copulative element, as it's not the AFA itself that gives the instruction to link together the propositions hosting the AFA's DA and its alternatives. The AFA's instruction is somewhat redundant with respect to the instructions given by the syntactic structures involved in the text; as a result it is reinterpreted pragmatically (cf. also Perrin-Naffakh 1996:152). Specifically, the AFA's role is metatextual (Bazzanella 1995, 2006), as it assigns different roles to the AFA's DA and its alternatives, in particular in terms of their textual weight either in the rhetorical structure or the thematic structure of the text (cf. Ferrari et al. 2008). Two types of textual movements are frequently promoted by this use of the AFA:

- (i) a climactic textual movement, proceeding from more expected propositions – i.e. the ones involving the alternatives to the AFA's DA – to a less expected (and possibly also more controversial) proposition including the AFA, which is also the most relevant proposition with respect to the argumentation developed

by the speaker. The scalar effect associated with *aussi/anche* is particularly clear when the DA is part of a list of alternatives given in the text. In (52), for example, the alternative propositions *ci sono processi lenti*, [*ci sono*] *processi ingiusti* are quite embraceable claims used by the speaker to prepare the audience for the main argument he wants to convey: the existence of a *giustizia politicizzata* ‘a politicized justice’, which becomes the topic of the subsequent discourse.

- (52) La politica della giustizia in Europa è una politica di grande rilievo. Ci sono processi lenti, processi ingiusti [...] **e anche**, in molti paesi d’Europa, *una giustizia politicizzata*, con alcuni magistrati che usano il loro potere non per svolgere un’azione di giustizia ma per svolgere un’azione politica, e, spesso, per colpire anche l’opposizione e le minoranze.

*Eng. transl.* Justice Policies in Europe are very relevant. There are slow trials, unfair trials [...] and **also**, in many European countries, *a politicized justice*, with some magistrates using their power to play politics and often to damage political opposition and the minorities, rather than to enforce justice.

In the textual movements involving a climax, the climactic effect can be anticipated by the presence of negated restrictive adverbs occurring before the alternative (*pas seulement..., mais aussi...; non solo..., ma anche...*).

(ii) a contrastive textual movement between the proposition hosting the AFA and the propositions containing its alternatives. In this function, the AFA typically occurs with an adversative conjunction (*mais aussi/ma anche*) and the set of alternatives is often conceived as binary, including opposed (groups of) alternatives. Also note that in this function, the AFA's DA typically ranks higher (less often lower) on a scale of relevant arguments. A discourse marker accompanying the alternative, such as Fr. *certes* and *bien sûr* (cf. ex. 41 and 42) or It. *sì* (cf. ex. 53), can make explicit the meaning component of contrast and relative ranking.

- (53) Se l'Unione europea vuole ampliarsi e divenire un compatto sistema di riferimento della comunità internazionale, è necessaria, **sì**, una reazione forte e coerente da parte delle Istituzioni europee, **ma** è **anche** necessario che ognuno di noi vada al di là del suo interesse politico nazionale e guardi al bene dell'Unione attraverso un voto politicamente e soprattutto umanamente responsabile su questi temi.
- Fr. transl.* Si l'Union européenne veut s'élargir et devenir une référence pour la communauté internationale, il faut une réaction forte et cohérente de la part des institutions européennes, **mais** il faut **aussi** que chacun d'entre nous aille au-delà de son intérêt politique national et cherche le bien de l'Union à travers un vote politiquement et surtout humainement responsable sur ces sujets.

*Eng. transl.* If the European Union wants to enlarge and become an authoritative reference system for the international community, we do **indeed** need a strong, coherent reaction from the European institutions, **but** there is **also** the need for each of us to transcend his own national political interests and focus on the good of the Union as a whole by voting responsibly, in both political and, more importantly, humane terms on these issues.

The contrastive textual movement can also involve a concessive relation. In this case, the speaker first expresses his agreement on possible counterarguments of the audience by mentioning alternative propositions to the one s/he has in mind; subsequently, through the proposition including the AFA, s/he expresses the relevant argument for his/her conclusion. Example (54) shows how the contrastive textual movement (involving both a positive and a negative judgement about the books and the communications mentioned by the speaker) is anticipated by the concessive conjunction *malgrado*.

- (54) **Malgrado** abbiano il grande merito di approfondire il dibattito, libri verdi, libri bianchi e comunicazioni hanno **anche** *un effetto collaterale complesso e difficile*, perché dilazionano l'intervento legislativo.

*Eng. transl.* **Despite** the fact that they do, on the whole, make for a more in-depth debate, green papers, white papers and statements

**also** have complex, problematic side-effects, as, more often than not, they prolong legislative action.

#### 4.3.2. Aussi/Anche as *paradigmatic AFAs*

When no alternatives to their DA can be found in the text, *aussi/anche* function as paradigmatic AFAs. In this case, two main functions – a discourse-cohesive one and a modulating one – can be identified depending on how precisely the alternatives can be reconstructed outside the text (see subtypes 2A and 2E):

(i) when the alternatives are available in the discourse situation (either because they are contextually accessible to the audience, as in ex. 33 and 34, or shared in the common ground, as in ex. 35, or identifiable thanks to the formulation of the DA, as in ex. 36), the function of the AFA is to allow the speaker to evoke the intended alternatives without mentioning them explicitly. In this function, the AFA cooperates in strengthening the links between the text and the context shared by the speaker and his/her audience.

(ii) a second main function of *aussi/anche* arises when only the set to which the alternatives belong can be identified, while the alternatives themselves remain unexpressed and vague. In this case, the function of the AFA is not to point at or to evoke specific alternatives to its DA, but rather to project the AFA's DA against a – more or less defined – set of alternatives. In this function, the AFA merely implies that its DA is not the only possible element fulfilling the current

proposition. Moreover, together with instructions given in this specific context of occurrence (presence of the set, but no clear alternatives to be identified), the AFA conveys the idea that its DA is the most or the only relevant member of the set that needs to be identified in order to understand the speaker's message, in particular (discourse locally) the conclusion s/he wants to reach. Clearly, in contrast with the function described in (i), no cohesive function can be associated to the AFA in this case, as it does not serve to link different stretches of texts to the discourse context. Instead, in this use, the AFA's effect can be captured in terms of modulation (Caffi 1999, Sbisà 2001) of the argumentative force associated to the speech act (generally an assertion) performed by the proposition in which both the AFA and its DA occur. This effect can coincide either with a reinforcement or a mitigation of the speech act.

In many cases, evoking a set of alternatives without mentioning any of them explicitly suggests that other arguments could be given to reinforce the speaker's claim. This is a textual movement that can be considered to be specular to the *praeteritio*, as the evocation rather than the actual mention of possible further arguments aims at reinforcing the speaker's position. This rhetorical strategy is particularly clear when the AFA is involved in an argumentative textual movement, in particular when it introduces a causal or final subordinate clause mentioning possible reasons or goals to sustain the main claim(s) the speaker wants the audience to accept as true or valid (see ex. 40, 46).



In a similar context, the opposite modulation effect is also possible. In ex. (48), for instance, *anche* projects the possibility expressed by its DA on the background of other possibilities, with a resulting mitigation of its force: the speaker and his/her colleagues will vote, but this decision comes at the end of an evaluation process involving other possible alternative decisions. In ex. (49), in turn, *anche* introduces a second argument supporting the main claim. Here, the additive value of the AFA implies that this additional information – together with others – should be considered in order to evaluate the proper relevance of the assertion. In both cases, the information (i.e. the AFA's DA) to which the additive value applies is not to be found at the level of alternative properties and predicates, but at the level of alternative propositions. Such a change in the nature of the information associated to the AFAs *aussi/anche* (DA and alternatives), which are no longer linked to the semantic but rather to the pragmatic meaning of the utterance, is commonly observed in the development of pragmatic markers (Mosegaard Hansen and Rossari 2005). In the texts analyzed, the omission of a translation equivalent to the AFAs *aussi/anche* does not change the semantic value of the proposition, but changes the strength associated to the speech act performed by the utterance hosting the AFA and its DA. These uses of *anche* (which are marginal for *aussi*: see also Lauwers 2006) pave the way to its function as a pragmatic marker (It. *segnale discorsivo*, G. *Abtönungspartikel*).

## 5. Final remarks and conclusion

Based on a corpus analysis of Fr. *aussi* and It. *anche* occurring in original and translated texts from the European Union, this study has shown the relevance of taking into account the discourse context in which these AFAs occur in order to explain their distribution. Specifically, after having distinguished two main uses of *aussi/anche* (with and without overt alternatives in the text) and several subtypes of these uses according to the linguistic cues given to the reader to identify (in case alternatives are present) or reconstruct (in case alternatives are not present) the alternatives to the AFA's DA, we showed that *anche* puts less restrictions on its context of use than *aussi*. This claim is primarily based on the finding that *anche* is more frequent than *aussi* in contexts in which no explicit alternatives to its DA are present in the co-text (*anche* occurs without alternatives twice as often as *aussi*). By contrast, the use of *aussi* is strongly favored in contexts in which at least one alternative is present in the co-text, a fact that confirms an important claim made in Blumenthal 1985 (cf. § 2.3.).

The greater discourse flexibility of *anche* with respect to *aussi* is also supported by the different subtypes of cases in which the alternatives to the AFA's DA are identified in the text or reconstructed outside of it. In the cases in which an alternative to the AFA's DA is present in the context, *aussi* tends to occur in clear parallel syntactic structures, while *anche* more readily occurs in texts in which the alternatives are not easy to identify and in which the process leading to the identification of the alternatives to the AFA's DA is more

complex, as it involves different inferential steps. This is the case when the alternatives to *anche*'s DA occur at a distance in the text and/or in a proposition that differs from the one hosting both the AFA and its DA (subtype 1D-E). A further interesting confirmation of the differences between *aussi* and *anche* comes from translations: *anche* is translated more often by *également* than by *aussi* when the alternatives to its DA are absent in the co-text or are present but difficult to identify. The reverse is true when the alternatives to the AFA's DA are present in the text, in particular when they are close to both the AFA and its DA. These results could be interpreted in terms of the information status of the alternative proposition to the one hosting the AFA and its DA. From our findings it seems that, differently from *anche*, *aussi* favors contexts in which the alternatives belong to easily accessible propositions.

A cross-linguistic analysis of the two near-synonyms *aussi* and *anche* in both original and translated texts highlights, on the basis of different empirical data, the specific and divergent restrictions these two AFAs put on their discourse context, i.e. their different discourse values. This finding is significant, as it shows that the procedural meaning associated with forms such as *aussi/anche* cannot be captured merely on the basis of a shared meaning component, i.e. the additive meaning, but that it ought to be extended to instructions involving their use in discourse. This finding thus confirms a fact that has already been observed in the literature, namely that certain lexical items also encode features related to the ways the discourses and texts in which

they occur ought to be constructed (on this issue, see, e.g., Schwenter on Spanish FAs and Ferrari (ed.) 2004 for a broader view).

The different discourse procedural meaning associated to *aussi* and *anche*, in turn, ought to be explained by taking into account the existence of other near-synonyms, such as Fr. *également*. In French, *aussi* and *également* tend to occur in different types of discourse, the former preferring contexts in which the alternatives to its DA are explicitly given, the latter in which they are not explicitly mentioned. In contrast, as shown by the translation data French > Italian, *anche* does not have a major competitor in Italian,<sup>18</sup> a fact that could explain why we find it in context in which alternatives to its DA are present or absent. As a result, *anche* it is the least specialized item of the set of AFAs *anche/aussi/également*. This claim is also based on the fact that *anche* is more readily compatible than *aussi* in contexts in which it takes up a scalar reading. In French, the scalar AFA *même* plays a more important role than It. *perfino/persino* and *addirittura* (on which, see Atayan in this volume). The higher discourse flexibility of *anche* is ultimately also what explains its higher frequency in the texts analyzed (cf. §§ 3.1. and 3.3.).

## References

---

<sup>18</sup> In our texts, contrary to what is often claimed in the literature, we cannot identify *pure* as a major competitor of *anche* (for a synchronic and diachronic description of *pure*, see Ricca in this volume).

- Amsili, Pascal, and Grégoire Winterstein. 2012. “Les déclencheurs de présupposition additifs”. *Langages* 186/2: 85–100.
- Andorno, Cecilia. 1999. “Avverbi focalizzanti in italiano. Parametri per un’analisi”. *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata* 28/1: 43–83.
- Andorno, Cecilia. 2000. *Focalizzatori fra connessione e messa a fuoco. Il punto di vista delle varietà di apprendimento*. Milano: Angeli.
- Andorno, Cecilia. 2005. “Additive and restrictive particles in Italian as a second language. Embedding in the verbal utterance structure”. In *The Structure of Learner Varieties*, ed. by Henriëtte Hendriks, 405–444. Berlin-New York: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Andorno, Cecilia. 2008. “Ancora su *anche*, anche su *ancora*. Per uno studio comparativo dell’apprendimento e della gestione di strategie coesive in IL”. In *Diachronica et Synchronica. Studi in onore di Anna Giacalone Ramat*, ed. by Romano Lazzeroni, Emanuele Banfi, Giuliano Bernini, Marina Chini, and Giovanna Marotta, 29–52. Pisa: Edizioni ETS.
- Andorno, Cecilia, and Giuseppina Turco. 2015. “Embedding additive particles in the sentence information structure: How L2 learners find their way through positional and prosodic patterns”. In *Focus Particles in the Romance and Germanic Languages. Corpus-based and Experimental Approaches*, ed. by Anna-Maria De Cesare, and Cecilia Andorno, 57–79 [*Linguistik Online* 71/2].
- Baker, Mona. 1995. “Corpora in Translation Studies. An overview and some suggestions for future research”. *Target* 7/2: 233–243.

- Bazzanella, Carla. 1995. "I segnali discorsivi". In *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, ed. by Lorenzo Renzi, Giampaolo Salvi, and Anna Cardinaletti, vol. 3, 225–257. Bologna: il Mulino.
- Bazzanella, Carla. 2006. "Discourse Markers in Italian: Towards a 'compositional' meaning". In *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, ed. by Kerstin Fischer, 449–464. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Benazzo, Sandra, and Cecilia Andorno. 2010. "Discourse cohesion and Topic discontinuity in native and learner production: Changing topic entities on maintained predicates". In *EUROSLA Yearbook 10/1*, ed. by Leah Roberts, Martin Howard, Muiris Ó Laoire, and David Singleton, 92–118. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Biber, Douglas. 1994. "Representativeness in corpus design". In *Current Issues in Computational Linguistics: in Honour of Don Walker*, ed. by Antonio Zampolli, Nicoletta Calzolari, and Martha Palmer, 377–407. Pisa: Giardini.
- Blumenthal, Peter. 1985. "Aussi et auch: deux faux amis?" *Französisch Heute* 2: 144–150.
- Borreguero Zuloaga, Margarita. 2011. "Focalizzatori a confronto: *anche* vs *también*". *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata* XL/3: 441–468.
- Brianti, Giovanna. 2014. "Cleft sentences. A translation perspective on Italian and French". In *Frequency, Forms and Functions of Cleft Constructions in Romance and Germanic. Contrastive, Corpus-based Studies*, ed. by Anna-Maria De Cesare, 277–321. Berlin-New York: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Caffi, Claudia. 1999. "On mitigation". *Journal of Pragmatics* 31: 881–909.

- Cartoni, Bruno, Sandrine Zufferey, and Thomas Meyer. 2013. "Using the Europarl corpus for cross-linguistic research". *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 27: 23–42.
- De Cesare, Anna-Maria. 2010. "On the focusing function of focusing adverbs. A discussion based on Italian data". In *40 Jahre Partikelforschung/40 Years Particle Research*, ed. by Elke Hentschel, 99–116 [*Linguistik Online* 44/4].
- De Cesare, Anna-Maria. 2015a. "Additive particles in canonical word orders: A cross-linguistic, corpus-based study on Italian *anche*, French *aussi* and English *also*". In *Focus Particles in the Romance and Germanic Languages. Corpus-based and Experimental Approaches*, ed. by Anna-Maria De Cesare, and Cecilia Andorno, 31–56. [*Linguistik online* 71/2].
- De Cesare, Anna-Maria. 2015b. "Defining Focusing Modifiers in a cross-linguistic perspective. A discussion based on English, German, French and Italian". In *Adverbs – Functional and Diachronic Aspects*, ed. by Karin Pittner, Daniela Elsner, and Fabian Barteld, 47–81. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: Benjamins [Studies in Language Companion Series]. [doi 10.1075/slcs.170.03ces].
- De Cesare, Anna-Maria. In press. Per un altro tassello dell'italiano come lingua (debolmente) pluricentrica: l'uso di *pure* e *neppure* nell'italiano giornalistico d'Italia e della Svizzera italiana. In *Linguisti in contatto. Ricerche di linguistica italiana in Svizzera. Atti del convegno dell'Osservatorio linguistico della Svizzera italiana* (Bellinzona, 16-17 novembre 2007), ed. by Bruno Moretti, Elena M. Pandolfi, and Matteo

- Casoni, 146–159. Bellinzona: Osservatorio linguistico della Svizzera italiana.
- De Cesare, Anna-Maria, and Margarita Borreguero Zuloaga. 2014. “The contribution of the Basel Model to the description of polyfunctional discourse markers. The case of It. *anche*, Fr. *aussi* and Sp. *también*”. In *Discourse Segmentation in Romance Languages*, ed. by Salvador Pons Bordería, 55–94. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: Benjamins [*Pragmatics and Beyond New Series*, vol 250]. [DOI: 10.1075/pbns.250.03ces]
- De Cesare, Anna-Maria, and Davide Garassino, Rocío Agar Marco, Laura Baranzini. 2014. “Form and frequency of Italian cleft constructions in a corpus of electronic news. A comparative perspective with French, Spanish, German and English”. In *Frequency, Forms and Functions of Cleft Constructions in Romance and Germanic. Contrastive, Corpus-based Studies*, ed. by Anna-Maria De Cesare, 49–99. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton [*Trends in Linguistics* 281].
- De Cesare, Anna-Maria, and Davide Garassino, Rocío Agar Marco, Ana Albom, Doriana Cimmino. 2016. *Sintassi marcata dell’italiano dell’uso medio in prospettiva contrastiva con il francese, lo spagnolo, il tedesco e l’inglese. Uno studio basato sulla scrittura dei quotidiani online*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
- Dimroth, Christine, and Wolfgang Klein. 1996. “Fokuspartikeln in Lernervarietäten. Ein Analyserahmen und einige Beispiele”. *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 104: 73–114.



- Dimroth, Christine, Cecilia Andorno, Sandra Benazzo, and Josie Verhagen. 2010. "Given claims about new topics. How Romance and Germanic speakers link changed and maintained information in narrative discourse". *Journal of Pragmatics* 42/12: 3328–3344.
- EAGLES. 1996. Preliminary recommendations on Corpus Typology. <http://www.ilc.cnr.it/EAGLES/corpus typ/corpus typ.html> (accessed in May 2016).
- Ferrari, Angela, Luca Cignetti, Anna-Maria De Cesare, Letizia Lala, Magda Mandelli, Claudia Ricci, and Carlo Enrico Roggia. 2008. *L'interfaccia lingua-testo. Natura e funzioni dell'articolazione informativa dell'enunciato*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Ferrari, Angela (ed.). 2004. *La lingua nel testo, il testo nella lingua*. Torino: Istituto dell'atlante linguistico italiano.
- Fjelkestam-Nilsson, Brita. 1983. 'Also' and 'too'. *A Corpus-based Study on their Frequency and Use in Modern English*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Gast, Volker. 2006. "The distribution of *also* and *too* – a preliminary corpus study". *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 54/2: 163–176.
- Grosjean, François. 1989. "Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person". *Brain Language* 36/1: 3–15.
- Hummel, Martin. 2013. "Attribution in Romance: Reconstructing the oral and written tradition". *Folia Linguistica Historica* 34: 1–42.

- Jarvis, Scott, and Aneta Pavlenko. 2008. *Cross-linguistic Influence in Language and Cognition*. London: Routledge.
- Johansson, Stig. 2007. *Seeing through Multilingual Corpora. On the Use of Corpora in Contrastive Studies*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Koehn, Philipp. 2005. "Europarl: A parallel corpus for statistical machine translation". Phuket. MT Summit X.
- König, Ekkehard. 1991. *The Meaning of Focus Particles: A Comparative Perspective*. London-New York: Routledge.
- Lauwers, Peter. 2003. "Aussi vs ook. Une étude contrastive de deux 'faux-amis'". Preprint 201, KULeuven: Dept. Linguistiek.
- Lauwers, Peter. 2006. "Aussi vs ook. Une analyse contrastive de deux adverbes polyfonctionnels". In *Studies in Contrastive Linguistics. Proceedings of the 4th International Contrastive Linguistics Conference* (Santiago de Compostela, September 2005), ed. by Cristina Mourón Figueroa, and Teresa Iciar Moralejo Gárate, 479–491. Santiago de Compostela, Universidade: Servizo de Publicacións e Intercambio Científico.
- Laviosa, Sara. 2002. *Corpus-based Translation Studies. Theory, Findings, Applications*. Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1988. "I quantificatori". In *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, ed. by Lorenzo Renzi, vol. 1, 645–698. Bologna: il Mulino.
- Mari, Alda, and Lucia Tovená. 2006. "A unified account for the additive and the scalar uses of Italian *neppure*". In *New Perspectives on Romance*

- Linguistics: Vol. I: Morphology, Syntax, Semantics, and Pragmatic*, ed. by Nishida Chiyo, and Jean-Pierre Y. Montreuil, 187–200. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Molinier, Christian, and Françoise Lévrier. 2000. *Grammaire des adverbes. Description des formes en -ment*. Genève-Paris: Droz.
- Mosegaard Hansen, Maj-Britt, and Corinne Rossari. 2005. “The evolution of pragmatic markers: Introduction”. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 6/2: 177–187.
- Nølke, Henning. 1983. *Les adverbes paradigmatiques: Fonction et analyse*. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.
- Olohan, Maeve. 2004. *Introducing Corpora in Translation Studies*. London-New York: Routledge.
- Perrin-Naffakh, Anne-Marie. 1996. “Aussi adjonctif: de la syntaxe à la sémantique”. *Le Français Moderne* 64/2: 136–154.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Ricca, Davide. 1999. “Osservazioni preliminari sui focalizzatori in italiano”. In *Grammatica e discorso. Studi sull’acquisizione dell’italiano e del tedesco*, ed. by Norbert Dittmar, and Anna Giacalone Ramat, 146–164. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Rooth, Mats. 1985. *Association with Focus*. Ph.D Thesis. Amherst (MA): University of Massachusetts.

- Rooth, Mats. 1992. "A theory of focus interpretation". *Natural Language Semantics* 1: 75–116.
- Sbisà, Marina. 2001. "Illocutionary force and degrees of strength in language use". *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 1791–1814.
- Schwenter, Scott. 2001. "Additive particles and the construction of context". In *La pragmática de los conectores y las partículas modales*, ed. by Hang Ferrer, and Salvador Pons Bordería, 245–262. Valencia: Universidad de Valencia [*Quaderns de Filología. Estudis Linguistics* VI].
- Taglicht, Josef. 1984. *Message and Emphasis. On Focus and Scope in English*. London: Longman.