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1. Premise:
- Particle -to

2. Data:
(i) Distributional range
adjective(to) does(to) larnhe=(to) larka=(to)
today=(to) two=(to) tall=(to) boys=(to)
pērva=(to) nīra=(to) kḷaṁva=(to) pën=(to)
trees=(GEN) under=(TO) stand=(PFV.MPL) I be.PST.3PL
'Today two tall boys stood under the tree.'

(ii) Declarative Clause (with falling intonation)
rahu=(to) gana ga-ja
Rahul sang the song.' (without -to)
'About/As for Rahul, he sang the song.' (with -to)

(iii) Interrogative Clause (with rising intonation)
rahu=(to) gana=(to)
Rahul sang the song, right!? (available)
'Did Rahul sing the song?' (unavailable)

(iv) Imperative Clause
ek gīla pani=(to) pjo
eat a glass of water.' (without -to)
'Drink a glass of water.' (with -to)

3. Research Questions:
- What is the meaning of particle –to?
- What is the syntax of particle –to?

4. Meaning of –to:
- Particle –to: No truth conditional meaning contribution
  \( \text{In (2.ii)} \) \[ [\text{Ram}-(to) sang a song}] = [\text{Ram sang a song}]
- Use Conditional Items convey meaning that don't contribute to truth conditions but affect conditions in which sentence can be felicitously uttered (Gutzmann 2013, 2015).

- Hybrid Semantics: for any expression A having a Truth conditional Content (TC) and a Use conditional Content (UC), interpretation fn on A yields:
  \[ | A | = < T (A), U(C) > \]
- Particle –to is a UCI and “... x-to ...” is felicitously used iff the speaker imposes salience on a hearer-known x. Speaker salience signals an entity being important for the upcoming discourse from speaker’s perspective (Falk 2014). For a context c, speaker c\(_S\), hearer c\(_H\) and world c\(_W\),
  \[ \text{Premise:} \]
  \[ x\text{-to} \text{I} = (c_cH \text{ imposes salience on a c_H-known } x \text{ in c_W}) \]

Checking Felicitous & Infelicitous Contexts for (2.ii):

- Speaker A: Tell me about Rahul.
  \( \text{Context 1: Rahul was already salient prior to marking (i.e. a continued topic)} \)
  Speaker B: rahol pari mē gaja tā. os-ne-(#) gana gaja
  'Rahul went to the party. He sang a song.'

- Speaker C: rahol-ne-to gana gaja. vo pari ki dyan bon gaja
  'Rahul sang a song. He became the soul of the party.' (topic-chaining)
  Speaker D: rahol-ne-to gana gaja. bakįj kī pata nā
  'Rahul sang a song. I don’t know about others.' (contrast established)

5. Syntactic Derivation:
- Interactional Spine Hypothesis Framework (Witschko 2021)
- L-structure: GroundP and Resp(onse)P layers (linked to felicity conditions) above p-structure; Discourse particle marks deviation from regular felicity conditions associated with speech acts
- Ingredients of proposal: [UC\(_\text{spkr}\)-sal] semantic feature for particle –to; (Abstract) Agree values [ucoin] coincidence of GroundSpkr head
- For a proposition p containing x-to,
  **Addition to GroundSpkr:** speaker ‘believes’ or ‘desires’ that p, specifically relative to salient marked x