

# 6 Sentential Particles and Clausal Typing in Venetan Dialects<sup>1</sup>

*Nicola Munaro and Cecilia Poletto*

University of Venice

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this work we describe both the syntactic and the semantic properties of a number of sentential particles (henceforth SPs), which can appear in some Venetan dialects<sup>2</sup> in main non-declarative clauses, as exemplified in (1):

- (1) Cossa falo, *ti*?!  
what does-he *ti*  
'What is he doing [ti]?'

The presence of these particles induces interesting interpretive effects, and an investigation of their properties is relevant for the analysis of the left periphery of the clause; a detailed study of these particles turns out to have theoretical relevance for a cross-linguistic theory of clausal typing on the one hand and for a deeper understanding of the syntax–semantics interface on the other. The distribution of SPs also involves a number of interpretive and pragmatic distinctions that highlight the way sentence type is encoded in the syntactic structure and provide some insights into finer grained distinctions internal to each sentence type.<sup>3</sup>

We will systematically analyse data from two varieties: Pagotto, a Northern Veneto variety, and Venetian, an Eastern Veneto variety (indicated as 'Pg' and 'Ve,' respectively, in the examples). However, the particles described here occur, with a partially different distribution, in several other dialects of the Northeastern Italian area, which we will occasionally refer to as well.

While SPs can appear in main interrogatives, exclamatives, and imperatives, none of them can occur in declarative clauses or in embedded contexts; furthermore, they always occur in 'special' contexts, in the sense that they induce a presupposition in the clause determined either by the linguistic context or by the universe of discourse.

The particles we consider also share the following distributional property: They can occur in sentence-final position, a fact that—we claim—can be derived by movement of the whole clause to the specifier position of the head occupied by the particle. We take this head to be a high functional head

in the split CP layer, which can attract to its specifier either a *wh*-item or its whole complement. This explains why some particles can also occur either immediately after the *wh*-element or with a *wh*-item in isolation.

This study is organized as follows: In Section 2 we provide a description of the syntactic properties shared by all SPs; in Section 3 we examine more closely the interpretive properties and attempt a description of the semantic contribution of each particle; in Section 4 we address the issue of the categorial status of the particles, providing some arguments in favour of the hypothesis that SPs are heads; in Section 5 we analyse in detail the syntactic derivation, exploiting clause preposing; and in Section 6 we offer a summary.

## 2. COMMON SYNTACTIC PROPERTIES OF SENTENCE PARTICLES

As mentioned above, the SPs attested in the two dialects examined here share the following distributional properties:

- (2) a. SPs usually occur in sentence-final position;
- b. those SPs which can occur immediately after the *wh*-element can also co-occur with the *wh*-item in isolation;
- c. SPs are sensitive to clause type: they cannot occur in declarative clauses;
- d. SPs never occur in embedded contexts;
- e. SPs can/must be followed by right emarginated constituents.

With respect to the first property, the sentence-final position is always available for the particle, independently of the clause type it is associated with. As shown by the following examples, the particle *ti* occurs exclusively in main *wh*-questions, and the only possible position is the sentence-final one:<sup>4</sup>

- (3) a. Dove valo, ti? [Ve]  
      where goes-he ti
- b. \*Ti, dove valo?  
      ti where goes-he  
      ‘Where is he going [ti]?’
- (4) a. Dove zelo ndà, ti? [Ve]  
      where is-he gone ti
- b. \*Dove zelo, ti, ndà?  
      where is-he ti gone  
      ‘Where has he gone [ti]?’

The particle *mo*, which can appear both in imperative and in interrogative clauses, can always appear in sentence-final position but never in sentence-initial position, as shown by the following contrasts:

- (5) a. Parècia sta minestra, mo! [Pg]  
 prepare this soup mo  
 b. \* Mo parècia sta minestra!  
 mo prepare this soup  
 'Prepare this soup [mo]!'

 (6) a. Vien qua, mo! [Ve]  
 come here mo  
 b. \* Mo, vien qua!  
 mo come here  
 'Come here [mo]!'

 (7) a. Ali magnà, mo? [Pg]  
 have-they eaten mo  
 b. \* Mo, ali magnà?  
 mo have-they eaten  
 'Have they eaten [mo]?'

 (8) a. Quando rivelo, mo? [Pg]  
 when arrives-he mo  
 b. \* Mo, quando rivelo?  
 mo when arrives-he  
 'When is he going to arrive [mo]?'

Sentence-final occurrence is also attested for the particles *po* and *lu*, which appear in interrogative and exclamative contexts, respectively:

- (9) a. Quando eli rivadi, po? [Pg]  
 when have-they arrived po  
 'When have they arrived [po]?'  
 b. Eli partidi, po? [Pg]  
 are-they left po  
 'Have they left [po]?'

 (10) a. Dove zeì ndai, po? [Ve]  
 where are-they gone po  
 'Where have they gone [po]?'  
 b. Zeì ndai via, po? [Ve]  
 are-they gone away po  
 'Have they left [po]?'

- (11) a. L'à piovest, lu! [Pg]  
 it-has rained lu  
 b. (\*Lu) l'à (\*lu) piovest!  
 (lu) it-has (lu) rained  
 'It has rained [lu]!'

The second property involves those SPs that occur in *wh*-contexts. Of the SPs in question, some can also occur immediately after the *wh*-item and with a *wh*-item in isolation. This is the case for the particles *mo* and *po* in Pagotto, as shown in (12)–(15), but not for *ti*, for example, as shown in (16):<sup>5</sup>

- (12) a. Quando rivaràli, mo? [Pg]  
 when arrive-FUT-they mo  
 b. Quando, mo, rivaràli?  
 when mo arrive-FUT-they  
 'When [mo] will they arrive [mo]?'  
 (13) a. Che mo? b. Andé mo? [Pg]  
 'What [mo]?' 'Where [mo]?'  
 (14) a. Quando eli rivadi, po? [Pg]  
 when are-they arrived po  
 b. Quando, po, eli rivadi?  
 when po are-they arrived  
 'When [po] have they arrived [po]?'  
 (15) a. Andé po? b. Quando po? [Pg]  
 'Where [po]?' 'When [po]?'  
 (16) a. \*Dove, ti, zelo ndà? [Ve]  
 where ti is-he gone  
 'Where [ti] has he gone?'  
 b. \*Dove ti?  
 'Where [ti]?'

A third property of SPs, common to all of them, is that they are sensitive to clause type: the examples reported above show that SPs always occur in interrogative, exclamative, or imperative clauses and are never found in declarative clauses. In addition, they always convey a presupposition which we try to describe in greater detail below.

A final property of SPs is that they occur only in main contexts. As shown by the following data, particles are banned from embedded clauses, independently of the clause type they are associated with:

- (17) a. El me ga domandà dove (\*ti) che i ze ndai (\*ti). [Ve]  
 he-me-has asked where (ti) that they-are gone (ti)  
 ‘He asked me where [ti] they went [ti].’  
 b. No so dirte quando (\*ti) che i é partidi (\*ti). [Pg]  
 not know tell-you when (ti) that they-are left (ti)  
 ‘I can’t tell you when [ti] they left [ti].’
- (18) a. I me à domandà cossa (\*mo) che avon [Pg]  
 they-me-have asked what (mo) that have-1PL  
 fat (\*mo).  
 done (mo)  
 ‘They asked me what [mo] we have done [mo].’  
 b. No so andé (\*mo) che i è ndadi (\*mo). [Pg]  
 not know where (mo) that they-are gone (mo)  
 ‘I don’t know where [mo] they have gone [mo].’
- (19) a. I me à domandà parché (\*po) che l’ à [Pg]  
 they-me-have asked why (po) that he-has  
 parlà (\*po).  
 spoken (po)  
 ‘They asked me why [po] he spoke [po].’  
 b. No so dove (\*po) che el ze ndà (\*po). [Ve]  
 not know where (po) that he-is gone (po)  
 ‘I don’t know where [po] he went [po].’
- (20) L’ à dit (\*lu) che l’ à piovest (\*lu), ieri [Pg]  
 he-has said (lu) that it-has rained (lu) yesterday  
 sera (\*lu).<sup>6</sup>  
 evening (lu)  
 ‘He said [lu] that it rained [lu] last night [lu].’

This restriction of SPs to main clauses suggests that the presence of the particle entails the activation of (some portion of) the CP layer, where the main versus embedded clause distinction is encoded.<sup>7</sup>

Notice in addition that arguments are generally emarginated to the right (as indicated by the presence of resumptive clitics) in interrogative clauses containing a particle:

- (21) a. Dove le gavarò messe, ti, le chiave?! [Ve]  
 where them-have-FUT-I put ti the keys  
 ‘Where could I have put [ti] the keys?’  
 b. Quando lo àla magnà, mo, al polastro?! [Pg]  
 when it-has-she eaten mo the chicken  
 ‘When did she [mo] eat chicken?!’

However, this effect is not due to the presence of the particle, but is a general property of main *wh*-questions (see Antinucci and Cinque 1977 and Munaro, Poletto, and Pollock 2001 for further discussion of this issue).

This effect is, in fact, not attested in imperative clauses, where an object DP or an embedded clause can either occur in its canonical position or be right-emarginated after the particle:

- (22) a. Magna sta minestra, mo! [Ve/Pg]  
eat this soup mo  
b. Magna, mo, sta minestra! [Ve]  
eat mo this soup  
c. Magnela, mo, sta minestra! [Pg]  
eat-it, mo, this soup  
'Eat [mo] this soup [mo]!'
- (23) a. Gnen qua che finison sto laoro, mo! [Pg]  
come here that finish-1PL this work, mo  
b. Gnen qua, mo, che finison sto laoro!  
come here mo that finish-1PL this work  
'Come here [mo] so we can finish this work [mo]!'
- (24) a. Vien che fazemo sta roba, mo! [Ve]  
come that do-1PL this thing mo  
b. Vien mo, che fazemo sta roba!  
come mo that do-1PL this thing  
'Come [mo] so that we can do this [mo]!'

In the case of the particle *lu*, which occurs in yes/no exclamatives, adverbials are also preferably right-emarginated:

- (25) a. L'à piovest, lu, ieri sera! [Pg]  
it-has rained lu yesterday evening  
b. ??L'à piovest ieri sera, lu!  
it-has rained yesterday evening lu  
'It rained [lu] last night [lu]!'
- (26) a. L'é fret, lu, qua dentro! [Pg]  
it-is cold lu here inside  
b. ?L'é fret, qua dentro, lu!  
it-is cold here inside lu  
'It is cold [lu] inside here [lu]!'

Finally, it should be pointed out that the SPs considered here behave differently from other particles attested in the Venetan dialects as well as in other Northern Italian dialects. The latter particles are characterized by two

properties not shared by the particles we have examined: they occur in initial position and they have no presuppositional import. This is the case for the particle *e* in the Southern Venetan dialect of Taglio di Po, which indicates that the utterance in which it occurs is an exclamative. As shown by (27) and (28), in this variety an exclamative clause is fully grammatical only if the particle *e* appears in sentence-initial position:

- (27) a. *E c bel libro c l'à scritto!* [Taglio di Po]  
           *e what nice book that he-has written*  
       b. \**C(he) bel libro c l'à scritto e!*  
           *what nice book that he-has written e*  
           ‘[E] what a nice book he wrote [e]!’
- (28) a. \**Che bel libro c l'à scritto!* [Taglio di Po]  
           *what nice book that he-has written*  
           ‘What a nice book he wrote!’  
       b. \**Co beo!*<sup>8</sup>  
           ‘How nice!’

We suggest that particles like *e* have a purely typing function and consequently are obligatory in the clause type they mark. This is not the case for our SPs, which at first sight seem optional, although, as we claim, they help to convey a special meaning.

In the following sections we will analyse all the syntactic properties listed here, trying to provide a plausible unified account for them.

### 3. ON THE INTERPRETIVE CONTRIBUTION OF THE PARTICLES

In this section we attempt a more thorough description of the contexts in which SPs are attested, which involves sketching an account of the semantic contribution of each particle to the interpretation of the clause.

#### 3.1. *Ti*

As already mentioned, *ti* appears only in *wh*-questions and is not compatible with yes/no questions:<sup>9</sup>

- (29) a. *Quando sarali rivadi, ti?* [Pg]  
           *when be-FUT-they arrived ti*  
       b. *Sarali rivadi quando, ti?*  
           *be-FUT-they arrived when ti*  
           ‘When might they have arrived [ti]?’

- (30) a. \*Saràli rivadi, ti? [Pg]  
           be-FUT-they arrived ti  
       b. \*I ze partii, ti? [Ve]  
           they-are left ti  
           ‘Might they have arrived?’

*Ti* questions can have two different interpretive shades, which both correspond to non-canonical interpretations of the question. On the first interpretation, which can be identified with Obenauer’s (1994) ‘can’t find the value’ (henceforth CFV) reading, the speaker has already unsuccessfully tried to find an answer to the *wh*-question.<sup>10</sup> The second interpretation is a ‘surprise/reproach’ (henceforth SR) interpretation; in this case the speaker already knows the answer, so that the question conveys a sense of surprise and reproach.<sup>11</sup> We propose that the function of *ti* in both cases is to signal that the value of the variable is outside the set of expected values.<sup>12</sup> Suppose that what a speaker typically does in asking a question is to present a class of possible answers and to invite the addressee to select one. Then *ti* signals a non-canonical interpretation of the question: that is, the fact that the addressee is not allowed to choose a value for the variable from inside the set. So, the feature shared by both the interpretations associated with the presence of *ti* is that the answer drawn from the set specified by the *wh*-item is not sufficient and/or relevant.

Let us now determine in more detail what semantic property these two interpretations share. In the CFV interpretation, all of the likely answers to the *wh*-question have already been tried and excluded by the speaker, while in the SR interpretation the value of the variable is already identified but it is outside the set of plausible values defined by the context (see Obenauer 2004). Interestingly, the choice between the two interpretations seems to be connected to verbal features, as present and past trigger the SR interpretation more easily, while future favours the CFV interpretation:<sup>13</sup>

- (31) a. Dove le gavarò messe, ti? [Ve]  
           where them-have-FUT-1SG put ti  
           ‘Where can I have put them [ti]?’  
       b. Cossa avaràli magnà, ti? [Pg]  
           what have-FUT-they eaten ti  
           ‘What could they have eaten [ti]?’
- (32) a. Andé eli ndadi, ti? [Pg]  
           where are-they gone ti  
           ‘Where did they go [ti]?’  
       b. Cossa sù drio magnar, ti? [Ve]  
           what are-2PL behind eat ti  
           ‘What are you eating [ti]?’



The choice between these two interpretations appears to be related to different mood marking: in both CFV and SR questions the activation of a modal feature may be involved, most likely an epistemic modality in the former case and an evaluative modality in the latter (see Munaro and Obenauer 2002 for a discussion of the second type of question).<sup>14</sup>

The relevance of modality to the interpretation of the question might explain why *ti*, unlike other particles, always requires the whole clause, and not simply the *wh*-item, in its specifier. If the modal feature must be in a local structural relation with the particle, there are in principle two ways to satisfy this requirement: Since *ti* has no affixal properties, left-adjunction of the finite verb to the particle via head movement is excluded, so we are left with the option of pied-piping the whole clause up to the specifier of the particle.<sup>15</sup>

In the SR interpretation not only does the speaker know that the value of the variable is outside the set; the set is defined either on the basis of acceptable values (producing the reproach reading) or on the basis of expected values (producing the surprise interpretation). The two basic meanings of the SR question type are thus derived from the typing of the set of possible values, which can be either expected or acceptable.

### 3.2. *Mo*

As mentioned above, the particle *mo* has a different distribution in Venetian and Pagotto, as only in the latter dialect can it occur both in interrogatives and in imperatives. We propose that *mo* can have the following values in the structures examined: It introduces a *presupposition* or it expresses what has been defined in the literature as a *point of view*, or both. From these two properties we derive its interpretive import in the two dialects under investigation. In Pagotto *mo* encodes ‘point of view’ inasmuch as it expresses a reference to the person for whose benefit the action is performed (either the speaker or the hearer): Imperatives with *mo* are uttered to the benefit of a class of persons that includes the hearer (similar information is conveyed by the particles *mo/ma* in the Raethoromance variety of Badiotto, as discussed by Poletto and Zanuttini 2003):

- (33) a. Magna, mo (che te deventa grant)! [Pg]  
 eat mo that you become big  
 ‘Eat [mo] (so that you grow up)!’
- b. Ledelo, mo (che te capisarà tut)! [Pg]  
 read-it mo that you understand-FUT all  
 ‘Read it [mo] (so that you’ll understand everything)!’
- (34) a. Nèteme le scarpe, mo (che sion in ritardo)! [Pg]  
 clean-me the shoes mo that are-1PL in late  
 ‘Clean my shoes [mo] (because we are late)!’

- b. Parèceme da magnar, mo (che dopo avon da [Pg]  
 prepare-me to eat mo that after have-1PL to  
 'ndar via)!  
 go away  
 'Cook something for me [mo] (because later we have to go)!'

Sentences like the ones illustrated in (34a) are clearly uttered to the advantage of the hearer, whereas those in (34b) are felicitous only if they are uttered in a context in which both the speaker and the hearer benefit from the action performed.<sup>16</sup>

As for the role of *mo* in imperatives in Venetian, this can be informally characterized as expressing the confirmation of an order already given, requiring that the action be performed immediately; as such it is not compatible with adverbs expressing future time:

- (35) a. Ciamime (\*tra un'ora), mo! [Ve]  
 call-me between an hour mo  
 'Call me (in an hour) [mo]!'   
 b. Lezilo (\*doman), mo!  
 read-it tomorrow mo  
 'Read it (tomorrow) [mo]!'

In Venetian imperatives *mo* is sensitive to the time of the utterance, as it signals that the utterance time and the event time must coincide.<sup>17</sup> In addition, the use of *mo* presupposes that the hearer does not intend to obey the speaker's order. The combination of these two factors—that is, the presupposition and the coincidence between utterance and performance time—yields a semantic effect characterized by Venetian informants as 'reinforcement of the order.'

In imperatives *mo* expresses two distinct values in the two dialects under investigation, but the reading conveyed by *mo* in Pagotto interrogatives is partially similar to the one expressed in Venetian imperatives in that *mo* clearly carries a presupposition about the addressee's intentions in both cases (as noted above, *mo* does not appear in Venetian interrogatives). We conjecture that in *mo* interrogatives both a presupposition and a point of view are involved, with the interpretation depending on the position of the SP:

- (36) a. Quando rivaràli, mo? [Pg]  
 when arrive-FUT-they mo  
 b. Quando, mo, rivaràli?  
 when mo arrive-FUT-they  
 'When [mo] will they arrive [mo]?'

When *mo* is sentence-final, as in (36a), the speaker indicates that the present situation does not conform to his or her expectations—a fact that, due to

the presence of point of view, might have negative consequences: in (36a) the presence of *mo* suggests that the speaker fears that the delay may be due to some unfortunate event that has involved the subject of the clause. If point of view is encoded by a modal projection in the higher portion of IP (see Poletto and Zanuttini 2003), then IP-raising is necessary for the intended interpretation to obtain, as is the case with *ti* (as represented in structure (47) below). When the particle occurs immediately after the *wh*-item, as in (36b) (and in structure (54) below), *mo* introduces the speaker's opinion that the addressee does not intend to answer, so that he is forced to repeat his question. Hence, what is expressed in this case is not the speaker's fear that something dangerous might have happened, but just the speaker's impatience; given the absence of point of view, the clause need not raise as a whole and the *wh*-item can, and must, raise alone.<sup>18</sup>

We can conclude that in both Venetian imperatives and Pagotto interrogatives (with the particle following the *wh*-item), the effect of reinforcement perceived by our informants results from the presupposition carried by *mo*.

### 3.3. *Po*

In the case of *po* too the interpretation of the sentence depends on the position of the particle, which, as mentioned above, can appear either sentence-finally or immediately after the *wh*-item:

- (37) a. Quando eli rivadi, po? [Pg]  
           when are-they arrived po  
       b. Quando, po, eli rivadi?  
           when po are-they arrived  
           ‘When [po] did they arrive [po]?’

We claim that the contribution of *po* to the interpretation of the clause consists of two components: the ordering of the set of answers specified by the *wh*-item along a probability scale (along the lines of Portner and Zanuttini's 1998 analysis of exclamative clauses); and the presupposition that the most probable values have already been tried and excluded.

When *po* immediately follows the *wh*-item, as in (37b), the speaker knows that the event is supposed to have taken place and is asking for confirmation. This position for *po* triggers an interpretation in which the possible values of the variable questioned by the *wh*-item have been ordered along a probability scale derived from context, and the most probable values have been excluded.

Sentence-final *po*, as in (37a), also requires, in addition to an ordering of possible values and the exclusion of the most probable ones, that the speaker's reference to a previous communicative situation, which has been suspended, is taken up again at the time of speech. We conjecture that the speaker's reference to a previous situation might be connected to the

activation of the Tense projection, which, being relevant to this interpretation, must move to the specifier of the particle, pied-piping the whole clause (as with *ti* and *mo*).<sup>19,20</sup>

### 3.4. *Lu*

The occurrence of the particle *lu* is limited to non-constituent exclamatives that present the whole propositional content as unexpected:

- (38) a. L'é frét, lu! [Pg]  
 It-is cold lu  
 'It is cold [lu]!'  
 b. L'é rivà al to amigo, lu! [Pg]  
 it-is arrived the your friend lu  
 'Your friend (has) arrived [lu]!'

So, in the two examples in (38), the speaker becomes aware of unexpected facts: in (38a) he realizes that the temperature is lower than he expected, and in (38b) he is surprised that the addressee's friend has arrived. What is presupposed in the two cases in (38) is that it is warm and that the friend is not coming.

*Lu* is not compatible with constituent exclamatives in which a *wh*-phrase has been fronted to sentence-initial position, as shown by the following examples:

- (39) Che fret (\*lu) che l'é incoi (\*lu)! [Pg]  
 how cold lu that it-is today lu  
 'How cold [lu] it is today [lu]!'  
 (40) Quant (\*lu) che l'à piovest ieri sera (\*lu)!  
 how lu that it-has rained yesterday evening lu  
 'How much [lu] it rained last night [lu]!'

We suggest that the semantic function of *lu* consists in introducing a presupposition. In this case, the proposition described by the clause corresponds to one of two possible truth values; *lu* indicates that the situation described by the sentence is contrary to the speaker's expectations, so the interpretive feature associated with *lu* may be reduced to the choice of the contextually less probable value (given a choice between the two values that are in principle available).

In this respect the interpretive contribution of *lu* in signalling that the situation holds contrary to expectations resembles the semantic function performed by *mica* in standard Italian. Accordingly, *lu* might be viewed as the positive counterpart of *mica*.<sup>21</sup>

#### 4. SENTENTIAL PARTICLES AS X° CATEGORIES

In principle, SPs can be analysed as either heads or specifiers. In this section we will provide empirical evidence that SPs are heads, which obey the same restrictions holding for object clitics in Romance, as originally noted by Kayne (1975). The head status of SPs is suggested by the fact that they cannot be modified or focalized on a par with object clitics:

- (41) a. \*Cossa gali fato, proprio ti? [Ve]  
 what have-they done just ti  
 ‘What did they do [just ti]?’  
 b. \*Zeli partii, proprio po? [Ve]  
 are-they left just po  
 ‘Did they leave [just po]?’  
 c. \*Quando riveli, proprio mo? [Pg]  
 when arrive-they just mo  
 ‘When are they going to arrive [just mo]?’  
 d. \*L’è fret incoi, proprio lu! [Pg]  
 it-is cold today just lu  
 ‘It is cold today [just lu]!’
- (42) a. \*Cossa gali fato, TI? [Ve]  
 what have-they done TI  
 ‘What did they do [TI]?’  
 b. \*Quando riveli, MO? [Pg]  
 when arrive-they MO  
 ‘When are they going to arrive [MO]?’  
 c. \*Eli partidi, PO? [Pg]  
 are-they left PO  
 ‘Did they leave [PO]?’  
 d. \*L’è fret incoi, LU! [Pg]  
 it-is cold today, LU  
 ‘It is cold today [LU]!’

The ungrammaticality of (41) and (42) and the fact that SPs cannot be used in isolation would be completely unexpected if SPs were located in some specifier position.<sup>22</sup>

Evidence for the head status of SPs is also provided by their diachronic evolution: two of these particles, namely, *ti* and *lu*, were originally tonic pronouns, the second singular and third singular masculine forms, respectively. However, they have a different distribution with respect to subject pronouns. The particle *ti* is compatible with third person subjects and can co-occur with the homophonous tonic pronominal subject *ti*:

- (43) a. Dove zelo ndà, ti? [Ve]  
 where is-he gone ti  
 'Where did he go [ti]?'  
 b. Ti, dove ti ze 'ndà, ti? [Ve]  
 you where you-are gone ti  
 'You, where did you go [ti]?'

The particle *lu* is compatible with a singular or plural third person subject (though not with first or second person subjects):<sup>23</sup>

- (44) a. L'é rivà al to amigo lu! [Pg]  
 it-is arrived the your friend lu  
 'Your friend arrived [lu]!'  
 b. L'é riva i to amighi lu! [Pg]  
 it-is arrived the your friends lu  
 'Your friends arrived [lu]!'  
 (45) a. \*Son vegnest anca mi, lu! [Pg]  
 am come also I lu  
 'I came as well [lu]!'  
 b. \*Te sé rivà anca ti, lu! [Pg]  
 you-are arrived also you lu  
 'You arrived as well [lu]!'  
 c. \*Sion partidi anca noi, lu! [Pg]  
 are left also we lu  
 'We left as well [lu]!'

In addition, while the particle *lu* is restricted to third person subject clauses in Pagotto, this restriction does not hold in Paduan, where, as discussed in Benincà (1996), *lu* may appear in exclamatives and is compatible with first, second, and third person subjects:<sup>24</sup>

- (46) a. A ghe go ditto tuto a me sorèla, mi, lu! [Paduan]  
 a him-have-1SG told all to my sister I lu  
 'I told everything to my sister [lu]!'  
 b. A te ghe fato ben, ti, lu!  
 a you-have done well you lu  
 'You did the right thing [lu]!'  
 c. A le gera vignù trovarte, le toze lu!  
 a they-were come find-you the girls lu  
 'The girls had come to see you [lu]!'

Given these data, *ti* and *lu* cannot be analysed as personal pronouns, although a diachronic connection to such pronouns is clearly indicated by the fact that the particles are homophonous with them. As for the other two

particles, *mo* and *po*, they were most probably temporal adverbs in origin, with *po* being connected to Latin *post* ‘afterwards’ (see Pellegrini 1972) and *mo* to Latin *modo* ‘now’ (see among others Rohlfs 1969; *mo* in fact still retains this original temporal meaning in the Central and Southern Italian dialects).<sup>25</sup>

Based on this evidence, we propose that SPs are the result of a grammaticalization process which includes phonological as well as semantic impoverishment along with the development of special syntactic properties. Such a process is generally attested for elements that are the overt realization of (marked values of) functional heads, and not for specifiers.<sup>26</sup> Hence, we take the SPs considered here to fill functional heads located in a layered CP field (see Rizzi 1997).

## 5. CLAUSE FRONTING OF PARTICLES

We propose to account for the observation that all SPs can occur in sentence-final position in terms of the assumption that SPs are located in a head position in the CP layer, with their sentence-final position derived via movement of their clausal complement to their specifier. More precisely, we take the clausal complement to coincide with the structural portion of the sentence dominated by a functional projection labelled ‘Interrogative Force’ in Munaro, Poletto, and Pollock (2001) and containing the *wh*-item—when present—in its specifier, as illustrated in (47):

$$(47) \text{ } [_{FP} \text{ Int-ForceP}_i \text{ } [_{F^o} \text{ particle}] [_{\text{Int-ForceP}} \text{ t}_i]]$$

The hypothesis that SPs are located very high in the structure and that the whole clause must raise across them might seem at first sight a rather ad hoc proposal. We will therefore compare this analysis with the null hypothesis—namely, that SPs are located in the low position inside the IP field—and show that the null hypothesis encounters a number of problems. In addition, we will offer empirical arguments for taking these particles to belong to the CP layer.<sup>27</sup>

First, we can exclude the possibility that SPs are generated inside the VP, since they do not have argument status. We can also exclude the possibility that SPs are located very low in the IP field, since this would force us to the problematic conclusion that, given their sentence-final positioning, all arguments must have vacated the VP. Although this analysis might be conceivable for object DPs (which move out of the VP in order to receive case in some agreement projection), it looks much less plausible for PPs, which, not requiring structural case, have no trigger for scrambling out of the VP.<sup>28</sup>

Second, since low functional projections generally encode aspectual notions (such as habituality, perfectivity and durativity), as shown by Cinque (1999: 105), we would also expect these particles to do the same. However,

as we will see below, this is not the case; on the contrary, SPs are associated with semantic and pragmatic notions such as presupposition, point of view, and presentation of the event, which are usually encoded in the left periphery of the clause.

Third, the syntactic behaviour of SPs suggests that they belong to the highest functional domain. As shown above, they are not found in embedded contexts, and thus display the kind of asymmetry typical of phenomena involving the CP field (such as V2, *do*-support, and subject clitic inversion). To the best of our knowledge, no elements in the low inflectional field are likewise sensitive to the main versus embedded status of the clause in which they occur.

Having claimed that SPs are located in a head position of the CP layer and that their sentence-final occurrence is derived via movement of their clausal complement, the Int-ForceP, to their specifier, we will now show that the relation between SPs and the preceding clause does indeed display the properties of the structural specifier-head relation.

We can use parentheticals as a diagnostic for the existence of a specifier-head relation, as parentheticals cannot intervene between a head and its specifier, while they can intervene between two maximal projections.<sup>29</sup> The following examples show that it is not possible to insert a parenthetical expression between a clause and any SP:

- (48) a. \*L'à piovest, son sicur, lu, ieri sera! [Pg]  
 it-has rained am sure lu yesterday evening  
 'It rained, I'm sure [lu] last night!'
- b. \*Cossa falo, diseme, ti? [Ve]  
 what does-he tell-me ti  
 'What is he doing, tell me [ti]?'
- c. \*Vien, sa, mo! [Ve]  
 come know mo  
 'Make sure you come [mo]!'

Given the analysis being proposed here, a natural question that arises is whether all of the particles are located in the same head or whether each particle occupies a different head position within the split CP range. As we will discuss in the next section, there are reasons to believe that each particle marks a different semantic value.<sup>30</sup> There is, however, a more straightforward syntactic argument for the claim that each SP occupies a different head position inside the CP layer. This is that the particles *ti* and *po* can co-occur in a rigid order in which *po* precedes *ti*:

- (49) Quando eli rivadi, po, ti? [Pg]  
 when are-they arrived po ti  
 'When did they arrive [po ti]?'



If the two particles co-occur, it is obvious that they cannot be located in the same head. According to our account there are two possible analyses of the sequence in (49), which can be derived either as in (50) or as in (51):

- (50) a. [ [ti] [po] [<sub>Int-ForceP</sub> quando eli rivadi]]  
 b. [ [ti] [[<sub>Int-ForceP</sub> quando eli rivadi]<sub>x</sub> [po]] t<sub>x</sub>]  
 c. [ [ [[<sub>Int-ForceP</sub> quando eli rivadi]<sub>x</sub> [po]] t<sub>x</sub>]<sub>y</sub> [ti]] t<sub>y</sub>]
- (51) a. [ [po] [ti] [<sub>Int-ForceP</sub> quando eli rivadi]]  
 b. [ [po] [[<sub>Int-ForceP</sub> quando eli rivadi]<sub>x</sub> [ti]] t<sub>x</sub>]  
 c. [ [[<sub>Int-ForceP</sub> quando eli rivadi]<sub>x</sub> [po]] [t<sub>x</sub> [ti]] t<sub>x</sub>]

As shown in these examples, we can hypothesize two different initial sequences, depending on the relative linear order of the two particles. If *ti* is higher than *po*, as in (50a), we have movement of the interrogative clause into the specifier of *po*, as in (50b), with the final word order shown in (50c) being obtained by the raising of the whole constituent formed by the clause and the particle *po* into the specifier of *ti*. In the second derivation, with *po* higher than *ti*, as in (51a), the Int-ForceP raises through the specifier of *ti* and up to the specifier of *po*. Besides the different initial order, the difference between the two alternatives lies in the second step of the derivation: Only in the former case does the moved constituent include the lower particle.<sup>31</sup>

We have seen that some SPs can either be preceded by the whole interrogative clause, as in (52), or intervene between the sentence-initial *wh*-item and the rest of the clause, as in (53):

- (52) a. Parché gnenlo, mo? [Pg]  
 why comes-he mo  
 ‘Why is he coming [mo]?’  
 b. Quando eli rivadi, po? [Pg]  
 when are-they arrived po  
 ‘When did they arrive [po]?’
- (53) a. Parché, mo, gnenlo? [Pg]  
 why mo comes-he  
 ‘Why [mo] is he coming?’  
 b. Quando, po, eli rivadi? [Pg]  
 when po are-they arrived  
 ‘When [po] did they arrive?’

The examples in (53) show that the particle can be located in the left periphery, as it precedes the inflected verb, which has undergone subject clitic inversion (we take subject clitic inversion to indicate that (some type of) verb movement to the CP layer has applied).<sup>32</sup>

On our account the particle occupies one and the same position, with the difference between (52) and (53) depending on whether it attracts to its specifier the whole clause or only the *wh*-item, stranding the clause. Hence, cases like (53) are expected if we assume the analysis in (47) and have a structure like the following one, where the element checking the strong feature in the specifier of the SP is not the entire clause but the *wh*-item:

$$(54) \text{ [}_{\text{FP}} \text{ wh}_i \text{ [}_{\text{F}^0} \text{ particle}] \text{ [}_{\text{Int-ForceP}} \text{ t}_i \text{ [}_{\text{IP}} \dots \text{t}_i \dots \text{]}} \text{]}}$$

We propose that the difference between particles that allow for this possibility and the ones that do not should be linked to the semantic feature that the particle marks, as discussed in Section 3.<sup>33</sup>

As for the obligatoriness of right emargination in interrogative clauses, we assume that these cases should be treated along the lines of Kayne and Pollock (2001) and Munaro, Poletto, and Pollock (2001), where these cases are analysed as left dislocation of the prosodically emarginated constituent to the specifier of a Topic projection, followed by remnant movement of the whole clause. According to our analysis, the constituents occurring after the particle are, despite appearances, actually left-dislocated to a specifier position lower than the one occupied by the particle itself.

There is an empirical argument in favour of the idea that in the cases under examination what looks like emargination to the right is in fact left dislocation followed by clausal movement. As noted by Benincà (1988), a right-dislocated constituent can be preceded by a focalized XP, which is prosodically tied to the verbal complex; this does not hold for the kind of constructions we are examining here, as shown by the contrasts in (55) and (56):

- (55) a. \*Vèrzila mo SUBITO,            sta finestra!                           [Ve]  
           open-it mo IMMEDIATELY this window  
       b. Vèrzila mo, subito,            sta finestra!  
           open-it mo immediately this window  
           ‘Open [mo] this window right now!’
- (56) a. \*L’àtu            vist mo IERI,            to papà?                           [Pg]  
           him-have-you seen mo YESTERDAY your father?  
       b. L’àtu            vist mo, ieri,            to papà?  
           him-have-you seen mo yesterday your father?  
           ‘Did you see [mo] your father, yesterday?’

Interestingly, in (55b) and (56b) the adverb cannot be focalized, which shows that the object must have undergone left dislocation at some stage in the derivation.

## 6. SUMMARY

In this chapter, we have analysed the syntactic and semantic behaviour of certain sentential particles attested in the Venetan dialects.

The particles that we have considered share some interesting properties: They are associated with specific clause types; they can appear only in matrix clauses; they can all occur in sentence-final position and display the typical properties of  $X^{\circ}$ -elements. Our hypothesis that each particle occupies a different head position within the CP layer is crucially supported by the possibility of combining two particles; however, their precise ordering and a detailed characterization of the single projections they mark remains to be determined.

We have proposed a syntactic analysis exploiting movement either of the *wh*-item or of the whole clausal complement to the specifier of the functional head occupied by the particle. The interpretation triggered by the presence of the particle changes depending on whether the constituent which targets the specifier of the SP is the *wh*-item or the whole clause. We have suggested that the raising of the whole clausal complement is induced by the necessity for some projection of the inflectional field (typically tense or mood) to enter a local structural relation with the particle. When this obtains, tense or mood also contributes to the interpretation of the clause, which becomes a function of the semantic import of the particle combined with the interpretive contribution of the relevant projection. Each particle is sensitive to tense and modality features in a different way, an issue that deserves further investigation.

## NOTES

1. The content of this study has been presented at the *XXIX IGG* meeting in Urbino (13–15 February 2003), at the *Dislocated Elements Workshop* in Berlin (28–30 November 2003) and at the *GURT* conference in Georgetown (26–29 March 2004). We thank those audiences as well as Paola Benincà, Guglielmo Cinque, Alessandra Giorgi, and Hans Obenauer for helpful comments and suggestions; special thanks go to Paul Portner and Raffaella Zanuttini for patiently discussing some of the semantic aspects of the issue addressed in Section 3. Needless to say, the responsibility for any mistakes rests entirely on us.

This study is part of work made possible by the joint project CNRS-CNR number 16279, ‘Dialectology and Formal Syntax: the Microvariation of Clause Types’, and develops and elaborates some aspects of Munaro and Poletto (2002), (2005). Although the research reported here is the product of constant collaboration between the two authors, for the concerns of the Italian academy Nicola Munaro takes responsibility for Sections 1–3 and Cecilia Poletto for Sections 4–6.

2. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* defines Venetan as a ‘group of dialects of Italian spoken in northeastern Italy. It includes the dialects spoken in Venice (Venetian), Verona (Veronese), Treviso (Trevisan), and Padua (Paduan).’

3. We will not attempt here to provide a very detailed analysis of the semantic-pragmatic notions encoded by the various sentence particles examined; we will limit ourselves to observing that their interpretive import is related—albeit in different ways—to the speaker’s attitude (along the lines suggested by Sigurdsson 2004) and that the values expressed by *SPs* can also be found in other languages (see, among others, Pak, forthcoming, and Pak, Portner, and Zanuttini, in preparation, on the function of Korean particles in jussive clauses).
4. In this chapter we will not be providing translations of the particles, whose semantic import cannot be easily rendered in English. In addition, the presence of a comma setting off the particle should be intended as expressing not an intonational break isolating the particle from the rest of the clause, but rather a change in the intonational contour of the clause, not necessarily inducing a par-enthetical interpretation. Another possibility would be to treat these particles as extrasentential elements—‘orphans’ in the terminology of Haegeman (1991, reprinted in this volume). Although the discussion of such a possibility is beyond the scope of the present study, see Haegeman’s study and Shaer (this volume) for some suggestions about how such a possibility could be cashed out.
5. As discussed in Munaro (1997), Pagotto belongs to the group of Northern Italian dialects in which some classes of *wh*-items can appear either sentence-initially or sentence-internally in main *wh*-questions; however, the position of the *wh*-item does not seem to interact in any relevant way with the presence of the particle.

With respect to the particle *po*, the *wh*-element *parché* displays a special behaviour, as in Pagotto the position after the *wh*-item is preferred to the sentence-final position:

- (i) a. *Parché po éli* ‘ndadi via?  
why po have-they gone away
- b. ?*Parché éli* ‘ndadi via, po?  
why have-they gone away po
- c. ?*Po, parché eli* ‘ndadi via?  
po why have-they gone away  
‘[Po] why [po] did they leave [po]?’

As shown by (ic), the sentence-initial position of *po* is not excluded in Pagotto; we leave a more detailed investigation of this fact for future research.

In Venetian *parché* is the only *wh*-item that can be immediately followed by *po* and used alone with the particle, as shown by the data in (ii):

- (ii) a. \**Dove, po, ze* ndai?  
where po are-they gone  
‘Where [po] did they go?’
- b. *Parché, po, i ze /ze/* ndai via?  
why po they-are /are-they gone away  
‘Why [po] did they go away?’
- c. *Parché po?*  
‘Why [po]?’

6. Notice that *lu* is compatible with a subjective clause, which can be either preceded or followed by the particle:

- (i) a. *L’é meio, lu, che te vegne ale nove!*  
it-is better lu that you-come at-the nine
- b. *L’é meio che te vegne ale nove, lu!*  
it-is better that you-come at-the nine lu  
‘You’d better [lu] come at nine [lu]!’

- (ii) a. L'é bel, lu, sveiarse tardi ala matina!  
 it-is nice lu to wake up late at-the morning  
 b. L'é bel sveiarse tardi ala matina, lu!  
 it-is nice to wake up late at-the morning lu  
 'It's nice [lu] to wake up late in the morning [lu]'

Incidentally, these data provide evidence that *lu* is not a tonic pronoun in these contexts.

7. See, e.g., Rizzi (1997) on this issue, which we address more thoroughly in the following sections. A further common distributional feature is that all SPs are incompatible with sentential negation, as shown by the Venetian imperative in (i) and the Pagotto interrogatives and exclamatives in (ii) and (iii):

- (i) \*No sta farlo, mo!  
 not stay do-it mo  
 'Don't do it [mo]'
- (ii) a. \*Andé no i é /éli ndadi, ti?  
 where not they-are /are-they gone ti  
 'Where couldn't they have gone [ti]?'  
 b. \*No i a /ali fat che, mo?  
 not they-have /have-they done what mo  
 'What couldn't they have done [mo]?'  
 (iii) a. \*No l'à piovest, lu!  
 not it-has rained lu  
 'It did not rain [lu]!'  
 b. \*No l'é rivà (lu) nisuni, (lu)!  
 not it-is arrived (lu) nobody (lu)  
 'There did not arrive [lu] anybody [lu]'

The Pagotto examples in (iv) might suggest that the particle *mo* is indeed compatible with negation in yes/no questions:

- (iv) a. No i gnen, mo?  
 not they-come mo  
 'Aren't they coming [mo]?'  
 b. No te dis gnent, mo?  
 not you-say nothing mo  
 'Don't you say anything [mo]?'  
 However, as discussed by several authors (see, e.g., Portner and Zanuttini 1998), negation in yes/no questions is an instance of so-called *expletive negation*, which has only a presuppositional value, and does not perform the function of a real negative marker. Accordingly, the generalization that all of the SPs we consider are incompatible with real sentential negation holds. At present, we do not have an explanation for this fact and leave a deeper investigation of this issue for future research.

8. The element *co* is used only in exclamative clauses and modifies adjectives exclusively.
9. We are aware that there is a vast literature on the semantics of questions; however, we will not be undertaking any discussion of this literature here, which is outside the scope of our preliminary and informal treatment of questions. See, e.g., Higginbotham (1996) for discussion of this topic.
10. Note that this type of question can be used only when the speaker addresses him- or herself. Interestingly, both in Venetian and in Pagotto (as exemplified

in (ia) and (ib)), *ti* cannot appear in questions which display an overtly realized complementizer *che* and subjunctive mood:

- (i) a. Cossa che el gabia fato, (??ti)?  
 what that he-have-subj done (ti)  
 ‘What may he have done [ti]?’  
 b. Che’l sia ‘ndat andé, (??ti)?  
 that he-be-SUBJ gone where (ti)  
 ‘Where may he have gone [ti]?’

Questions of the type exemplified in (i) are also ones in which the speaker addresses him- or herself, which might be taken to show that ‘self-addressing’ in questions cuts across questions types.

11. For a more detailed analysis of questions with this particular type of pragmatic salience, see Poletto (2000: 67–71) and Munaro and Obenauer (2002).  
 12. See Obenauer (1994, 2004) for a more detailed analysis of non-standard questions; Obenauer (1994) provides the following definition for non-standard questions:

Dans le domaine  $\Delta$  défini par les traits restrictifs de l’opérateur et parcouru par la variable («domaine de variation»), il n’existe aucun élément qui constitue une valeur appropriée de la variable . . .

(‘Within the domain  $\Delta$  defined by the restrictive features of the operator that the variable ranges over (“domain of variation”), there exists no element constituting an appropriate value for the variable . . .’) (Obenauer 1994: III.1 (47))

13. Notice that CFV questions with *ti* are incompatible with second person subjects, which is probably because the speaker excludes the possibility of receiving an answer from the addressee:

- (i) a. \*Andé saréo ndadi, ti?  
 where be-FUT-you gone ti  
 b. \*Dove sarì ndai, ti?  
 where be-FUT-2PL gone ti  
 ‘Where will you have gone [ti]?’

14. In these dialects, future rarely has a temporal value, but has modal properties instead, as shown by examples like the following one:

- (i) I ze drio battar ala porta. Sarà Gianni.  
 they-are behind knock at-the door will-be John  
 ‘Somebody is knocking at the door. It’s probably John.’

As illustrated by the English translation, the use of the future triggers an epistemic interpretation, i.e., the speaker wonders who might be knocking at the door. We assume here Cinque’s (1999) hierarchy of modal projections, which we claim are syntactically activated by verb raising; for further details we refer the reader to Cinque (1999: ch. 4).

15. As for the occurrence of *ti* only in *wh*- and not yes/no questions, this may be related to the fact that in the latter the variable can have either a positive or a negative value; since these two values exhaust the set, there is no third value to be placed outside the set.  
 16. The distinction concerning *point of view* attested in Pagotto is not relevant in Venetian, as *mo* can appear in the following imperative clauses expressing an order whose performance is exclusively to the advantage of either the hearer or the speaker:

- (i) a. Vien mo, che te iuto!  
 come mo that you-help-1SG  
 'Come here [mo] so that I can help you!'  
 b. Vien mo, che ti me porti casa!  
 come mo that you-me-take home  
 'Come here [mo] so that you take me home!'
17. In these dialects *mo* is used only as a particle. In Central and Southern Italian dialects it has retained its original meaning, 'now.'
18. A similar distinction between two different dialects is found in the Rhaeto Romance varieties spoken in the Badia valley; in the dialect spoken in S. Leonardo *mo* exclusively expresses the speaker's point of view:
- (i) a. Arzignem mo le bagn!  
 prepare-me mo the bath  
 'Prepare me [mo] a bath!'  
 b. \*Tòt mo n'de d vacanza!  
 take mo one day of holiday  
 'Take [mo] one day off!'

The ungrammaticality of (ib), which is uttered to the benefit of the addressee, shows that in this dialect the particle *mo* expresses an order to be performed to the benefit of the speaker. In the minimally different dialect of S. Vigilio di Marebbe, *mo* encodes an order to be performed immediately and as such is incompatible with adverbials of duration or with those referring to a point in the future:

- (ii) a. Dayrela mo (\*te siis mensc)!  
 open-it mo (\*in six months)  
 'Open it [mo] in six months!'  
 b. Comportete mo (\*entrees) bun!  
 behave-REFL mo (\*always) well  
 'Behave [mo] always well!'
19. This additional interpretation is excluded in Venetian with a future tense:
- (i) %Quando sarali rivai, po?  
 when be-FUT-they arrived po  
 'When may they have arrived [po]?'  
 As mentioned above, in Pagotto *po* is also attested in sentence-initial position, both in yes/no and in *wh*-questions:

- (ii) a. Po, éli rivadi?  
 po are-they arrived  
 '[Po] did they arrive?'  
 b. Po, quando éli rivadi?  
 po when are-they arrived  
 '[Po] when did they arrive?'

In both cases the presence of *po* conveys the speaker's mild surprise that the event has taken place, rather than focussing the question on whether or not they have arrived or on what time they have actually arrived; hence the event is presented as unexpected given the context, and the value of the variable does not seem to be relevant.

20. How exactly the speaker's reference to a previous situation is related to the activation of the Tense projection is a topic that we leave for future research.

21. According to Cinque (1976), the presence of *mica* widens the presuppositions already present with negative polarity; by using *mica* the speaker intends to negate an expectation rather than an assertion:

- (i) a. Non è freddo oggi.  
not is cold today  
b. Non è *mica* freddo oggi.  
not is mica cold today  
'It is not [mica] cold today.'

Thus, although in (ia) the speaker neutrally states that it is not cold, in (ib) the speaker wants to emphatically deny the common expectation that it is cold.

22. As shown by the following examples from standard Italian, object clitics cannot be modified, contrastively focalized, or used in isolation:

- (i) a. \*Proprio *lo* ho incontrato.  
just him have met  
'I met just him.'  
b. \*LO ho incontrato, non lei.  
HIM have met not her  
'I met HIM, not her.'  
c. Chi hai visto? \*Lo.  
whom have seen him  
'Whom did you see? Him.'

The striking interpretive similarity between our particles and those in ancient Indo-European languages suggests that particles could be analysed as clitic-second elements, which occurred after the first constituent of the clause in ancient Indo-European languages (see Vai 2005 and Luraghi 1995); in our case the constituent preceding the particle is either the clause or the *wh*-item.

23. Notice, however, that a preverbal subject is compatible with *lu* only if it is third person singular:

- (i) a. Al to amigo l'è rivà, lu!  
the your friend he-is arrived lu  
'Your friend arrived [lu]!'  
b. I to amighi i é rivadi, lori/ \*lu!  
the your friends they-are arrived they lu  
'Your friends arrived [they/lu]'

Furthermore, *lu* is generally compatible with postverbal subjects and induces a contrastive focalization of the subject with any verb class:

- (ii) a. L'à magnà tut al tozatel, lu!  
he-has eaten all the child lu  
'The child ate everything [lu]!'  
b. L'à laorà to fradel, lu, incoi!  
he-has worked your brother lu today  
'Your brother worked [lu] today!'  
(iii) L'é rivà anca/ proprio to fradel, lu!  
he-is arrived also/ just your brother lu  
'Also/just your brother arrived [lu]!'

The non-contrastive interpretation is possible only if the subject follows the particle:



- (iv) L'é rivà, lu, to fradel (atu vist)?  
 he-is arrived, lu, your brother (have-you seen)?  
 'There arrived [lu] your brother (have you seen)?'
24. Moreover, *lu* is compatible with adjectival predicates with feminine endings:
- (i) L'é vera, (lu), che i é tornadi, (lu)!  
 it-is true (lu) that they-are returned (lu)  
 'It is true [lu] that they have come back [lu]!'
25. To the best of our knowledge, no serious investigation (apart from traditional etymological work) has yet been undertaken on this subject, so our remarks are of necessity highly speculative. It should also be pointed out that we have confined our investigation of sentential particles to spoken discourse not only because they are rare in written texts, but also because the exact shade of meaning that they are intended to express in such cases would be extremely difficult to determine. Our claim that *ti* and *lu* were originally tonic pronouns is based on the standard etymological assumption that two formally identical elements have developed from the same lexical source.
26. For a detailed discussion and for specific empirical substantiation of this claim the reader is referred to Roberts and Roussou (1999).
27. As we have shown in Munaro and Poletto (2005), these particles, which were originally either adverbs or pronouns, have undergone a grammaticalization process which has caused them to lose their original lexical meaning and to develop functional properties. If they were analysed as lexical elements, as suggested to us by an anonymous reviewer, they would have to be adverbial elements located, according to Cinque's (1999: 106) hierarchy, in functional specifiers in the *Mittelfeld*; however, this cannot be the case, as argued in the main text. On the idea that sentential particles such as German *wohl* can move covertly to a left-peripheral specifier, see Zimmermann (this volume).
28. Moreover, the structural position of the particle should in that case be the lowest specifier position above the VP projection: if it were a head, it would block verb movement and if it were not the lowest functional specifier, we would expect it to be followed by low adverbs.
29. The general constraint blocking the insertion of parenthetical elements, and of lexical material in general, between a head and its specifier, follows straightforwardly from the antisymmetric approach of Kayne (1994), which excludes multiple specifiers, which, non-asymmetrically c-commanding each other, cannot be linearized. In apparent counterexamples like (i) the specifier position occupied by the *wh*-item may not correspond to the specifier of the projection headed by the inflected verb:
- (i) What, do you think, was the Prime Minister saying?
30. Adopting Cinque's (1999: 20) view that each functional projection can encode only one semantic feature, we are led to the conclusion that each particle must occupy a different head position.
31. On either analysis it is possible to account for the ungrammaticality of the following sequences:
- (i) a. \*Quando eli rivadi, ti, po?  
       when are-they arrived ti po  
       b. ??Po, quando eli rivadi, ti?  
           po when are-they arrived ti  
       c. ??Quando po éli rivadi ti?  
           when po are-they arrived ti  
           '[Po] when [po] did they arrive [ti] [po]?'

On the first analysis, the ungrammaticality of (ia) may be traced to the fact that *ti* requires its specifier position to be filled by the whole complement (including the particle *po*). On the one hand, the deviance of (ib,c) suggests that the raising of the whole clause to the specifier of *ti* requires previous movement of the clause (and not only of the *wh*-item) to the specifier of *po*, a condition virtually identical to the well-known general restriction on successive cyclic movement, according to which intermediate positions of the same type cannot be crossed over. On the other hand, the second analysis correctly predicts the ungrammaticality of (ia), where the particles are in the reverse order, as well as the deviance of (ib), where the specifier of *po* remains empty, and of (ic), where the *wh*-item has been extracted from a left branch. We will leave open here the question of which factors trigger the raising of the clause.

32. If we took (52) to be the basic sequence, in view of (53) we would have to posit that the particle can either be generated in two different positions, belonging to very different sentence domains, or be generated very low in the structure and subsequently moved to the CP area for some reason to be determined. This hypothesis is not plausible, given that SPs do not encode any aspectual features.
33. A further argument in favour of our analysis is provided by the empirical generalization formulated above: those particles that can intervene between the *wh*-item and the rest of the clause may also occur with the *wh*-item in isolation. This fact follows straightforwardly from the analysis proposed here, while it would remain unaccounted for if we took SPs to be located in the low IP area. We assume that a requirement for the filling of the specifier of the head occupied by the particle follows from some feature-checking requirement, which makes these particles very similar to the functional prepositions discussed in Kayne (2002).

## REFERENCES

- Antinucci, F., and Cinque, G. (1977) 'Sull'ordine delle parole in italiano: l'emarginazione,' in *Studi di grammatica Italiana*, vol. VI: 121–146.
- Benincà, P. (1988) 'L'ordine degli elementi della frase e le costruzioni marcate' in L. Renzi, G. Salvi, and A. Cardinaletti (eds.) *Grande Grammatica Italiana di Consultazione*, vol. 1, 129–208, Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Benincà, P. (1996) 'La struttura della frase esclamativa alla luce del dialetto padovano' in P. Benincà, G. Cinque, T. De Mauro, and N. Vincent (eds.) *Italiano e dialetti nel tempo. Saggi di grammatica per Giulio C. Lepschy*, 23–43, Roma: Bulzoni.
- Cinque, G. (1976) 'Mica,' in *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Padova*, vol. 1, 101–112.
- Cinque, G. (1999) *Adverbs and Functional Heads*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Haegeman, L. (1991) 'Parenthetical adverbials: The radical orphanage approach,' in S. Chiba, A. Ogawa, Y. Fuiwara, N. Yamada, O. Koma, and T. Yagi (eds.) *Aspects of Modern English Linguistics*, 232–254, Tokyo: Kaitakusha; reprinted in this volume.
- Higginbotham, J. (1996) 'The semantics of questions,' in S. Lappin (ed.) *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*, Malden, MA: Blackwell, 361–383.
- Kayne, R. (1975) *French Syntax*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kayne, R. (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kayne, R. (2000) 'Prepositional complementizers as attractors,' in *Parameters and Universals*, 282–323, New York: Oxford University Press.

- Kayne, R., and Pollock, J.-Y. (2001) 'New thoughts on stylistic inversion' in A. Hulk and J. Y. Pollock (eds.) *Subject Inversion and the Theory of Universal Grammar*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Luraghi, S. (1995) 'Verb initial sentences in some ancient Indo-European languages,' in P. Downing and M. Noonan (eds.) *Word Order in Discourse*, 355–386, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Munaro, N. (1997) 'Proprietà strutturali e distribuzionali dei sintagmi interrogativi in alcuni dialetti italiani settentrionali,' doctoral thesis, Universities of Padua, Venice.
- Munaro, N., and Obenauer, H.-G. (2002) 'On the semantic widening of under-specified *wh*-elements,' in M. Leonetti, O. Fernández Soriano, and V. Escandell Vidal (eds.) *Current Issues in Generative Grammar*, 165–194, Universidad de Alcalá, Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- Munaro, N., and Poletto, C. (2002) 'Ways of clausal typing,' *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa*, 27: 87–105.
- Munaro, N., and Poletto, C. (2005) 'On the diachronic origin of sentential particles in North-Eastern Italian dialects,' *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*, 28: 247–267.
- Munaro, N., Poletto, C., and Pollock, J.-Y. (2001) 'Eppur si muove! On comparing French and Bellunese *wh*-movement,' in P. Pica and J. Rooryck (eds.) *Linguistic Variation Yearbook 1*, 147–180, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Obenauer, H.-G. (1994) *Aspects de la syntaxe A-barre. Effets d'intervention et mouvements des quantifieurs*, Thèse de doctorat d'état, Université de Paris VIII.
- Obenauer, H.-G. (2004) 'Nonstandard *wh*-questions and alternative checkers in Pagotto,' in H. Lohnstein and S. Trissler (eds.) *The Syntax and Semantics of the Left Periphery—Interface Explorations 9*, 343–383, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Pak, M. (forthcoming) 'Jussive clauses and agreement of sentence final particles in Korean,' in *Proceedings of the Japanese/Korean Conference*, 14.
- Pak, M., Portner, P., and Zanuttini, R. (in preparation) 'Sentence final particles and jussive clauses in Korean.' Ms., Georgetown University.
- Pellegrini, G. (1972) *Saggi sul ladino dolomitico e sul friulano*, Bari: Adriatica Editrice.
- Poletto, C. (2000) *The Higher Functional Field*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Poletto, C., and Zanuttini, R. (2003) 'Making imperatives,' in C. Tortora (ed.) *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*, 175–206, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Portner, P., and Zanuttini, R. (1998) 'The force of negation in *Wh*-interrogatives and exclamatives,' in P. Benincà and C. Poletto (eds.) *Quaderni di Lavoro dell'ASIS 2*, CNR–Padova, 13–37.
- Rizzi, L. (1997) 'The fine structure of the left periphery,' in L. Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of Grammar*, 281–337, Kluwer: Dordrecht.
- Roberts, I., and Roussou, A. (1999) 'A formal approach to grammaticalization,' *Linguistics*, 37: 1111–1141.
- Rohlf, G. (1969) *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*, vol. 3, Torino: Einaudi.
- Sigurdsson, H. (2004) 'The syntax of Person, Tense, and speech features,' *Journal of Italian Linguistics*, 16: 219–251.
- Vai, M. (2005) 'Wackernagel's Law among Greek, Latin and other Indo-European Languages,' Ms., University of Milan.