

WAYS OF CLAUSAL TYPING

Nicola MUNARO & Cecilia POLETTO

1. Introduction

In this work we intend to describe and analyse both the syntactic and the semantic behaviour of a number of sentential particles (henceforth *SPs*), which can appear in some Veneto dialects in main non declarative clauses.¹

The presence of these particles induces interesting interpretive effects; an investigation of their properties is relevant for the analysis of the left periphery of the clause in general; moreover, a detailed study of these particles turns out to have theoretical relevance for a crosslinguistic 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 contribute to highlight the way sentence type is encoded in the syntactic structure.²

While the particles can appear in main interrogatives, exclamatives or 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

¹ This work has been presented at the *XXIX IGG* meeting in Urbino (13th-15th February 2003); we thank that audience as well as Paola Benincà, Guglielmo Cinque, Alessandra Giorgi, Hans Obenauer, Paul Portner and Raffaella Zanuttini for helpful comments and suggestions; needless to say, the responsibility for any mistakes rests entirely on us. Although the article is the product of a constant collaboration of 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. This paper develops and elaborates some aspects of Munaro & Poletto (2002), a more descriptive article we wrote on the same topic.

² We will systematically analyze data from two varieties, a Northern Veneto variety (Pagotto) and an Eastern Veneto variety (Venetian), glossed as *Pg* and *Ve* respectively. However, the particles described here occur, with a partially different distribution, in several other dialects of the North-Eastern Italian area.

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 witnessed by the following contrasts:

- (5) a Parècia sta minestra, mo ! Pg
 b *Mo parècia sta minestra !
 [Mo] prepare this soup [mo]
- (6) a Vien qua, mo ! Ve
 b *Mo, vien qua !
 [Mo] come here [mo]
- (7) a Ali magnà, mo ? Pg
 b *Mo, ali magnà ?
 [Mo] have-they eaten [mo]
- (8) a Quando rivelo, mo ? Pg
 b *Mo, quando rivelo ?
 [Mo] when arrives-he [mo]

Also the particles *po* and *lu*, appearing in interrogative and exclamative contexts respectively, appear generally sentence final:

- (9) a Quando eli rivadi, po ? Pg
 When have-they arrived po
 b Eli partidi, po ?
 Have-they left po
- (10) a Dove zeì ndai po ? Ve
 Where have-they gone po
 b Zeì ndai via, po ?
 Have-they gone away po
- (11) a L' à piovest, lu ! Pg
 b (*Lu) l' à (*lu) piovest !
 [Lu] it has [lu] rained [lu]

The second property concerns the fact that, among those *SPs* that occur in *wh*-contexts, some can also occur immediately after the *wh*-item and with a *wh*-item in

isolation; this is the case of the particles *mo* and *po* in Pagotto, as exemplified in (13)/(14) and (15)/(16), but not of *ti*, for example:³

- | | | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|---|-------------|----|
| (12) a | *Dove, ti, zelo ndà ? | | Ve | |
| b | *Dove ti | | | |
| | Where [ti] has-he gone | | | |
| (13) a | Quando rivaràli, mo ? | | Pg | |
| b | Quando, mo, rivaràli ? | | | |
| | When [mo] arrive-fut-they [mo] | | | |
| (14) a | Che mo ? | b | Andé mo ? | Pg |
| | What mo | | Where mo | |
| (15) a | Quando eli rivadi, po ? | | Pg | |
| b | Quando, po, eli rivadi ? | | | |
| | When [po] have-they arrived [po] | | | |
| (16) a | Andé po ? | b | Quando po ? | Pg |
| | Where po | | When po | |

The third property concerns sensitivity to clause type: the examples reported above show that *SPs* always occur in interrogative, exclamative or imperative

³ 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 one:

- (i) a Parché po éli 'ndadi via ?
 b ?Parché éli 'ndadi via, po ?
 c ?Po, parché eli 'ndadi via ?
 [Po] why [po] have-they gone away [po]

Notice that, as witnessed 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. 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 a relevant way with the presence of the particle.

In Venetian *parché* is the only *wh*-item that can appear in that position, as shown by the contrast between (ii) and (iia):

- (ii) *Dove, po, zeì ndai ?
 Where po have-they gone
- (iii) a Parché, po, i ze/zeli ndai via ?
 b Parché po ?
 Why [po] (they-have/have-they gone away)

clauses and are never found in declarative clauses; in addition, they always convey a presuppositional entailment which we try to depict in greater detail in section 5.

Finally, the occurrence of *SPs* is restricted to main contexts; as shown by the following data, particles are banned from embedded contexts:

- | | | |
|--------|--|----|
| (17) a | El me ga domandà dove (*ti) che i ze ndai (*ti) ?
He-me-has asked where [ti] that they-have gone [ti] | Ve |
| b | No so dirte quando(*ti) che i é partidi (*ti)
I can't tell you when [ti] that they-have left [ti] | Pg |
| (18) a | I me a domandà cossa (*mo) che avon fat (*mo)
They-have asked me what [mo] that we have done [mo] | Pg |
| b | No so andé (*mo) che i é ndadi (*mo)
I don'y know where [mo] that they-have gone [mo] | Pg |
| (19) a | I me à domandà parché (*po) che l' à parlà (*po)
They-me-have asked why [po] that he-has spoken [po] | Pg |
| b | No so dove (*po) che el ze ndà (*po)
I don't know where [po] that he-has gone [po] | Ve |
| (20) a | L' à dit (*lu) che l' à piovest (*lu), ieri sera (*lu) ⁴
He-has said [lu] that it-has rained [lu] yesterday evening [lu] | Pg |

The distributional restriction to main clauses suggests that in the presence of the particle the CP-layer, where the main *vs* embedded distinction is encoded, is activated; we discuss this issue more thoroughly in the next section.⁵

⁴ A subject clause can either precede or follow the particle *lu*, which invariably refers to the main clause:

- | | |
|--------|---|
| (i) a | L' é meio, lu, che te vegne ale nove |
| b | L' é meio che te vegne ale nove, lu
It is better [lu] that you-come at nine [lu] |
| (ii) a | L' é bel, lu, sveiarse tardi ala matina |
| b | L' é bel sveiarse tardi ala matina, lu
It is nice [lu] to wake up late in the morning [lu] |

⁵ A further common distributional feature concerns the fact 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):

- | | |
|--------|--|
| | *No sta farlo, mo
Don't do it, mo |
| (ii) a | *Andé no i é/éli ndadi, ti ?
Where not they-have/have-they gone, ti |
| b | *No i a/ali fat che, mo ? |

3. Sentential particles as C° heads

As anticipated in the introduction, we propose to analyze the *SPs* considered here as heads which can host their CP complement in their specifier.

The head status of the *SPs* is suggested by the fact that they cannot be modified or focalized:

- (21) a *Cossa ali fat, proprio ti ?! Pg
What have-they done, just ti
b *Quando riveli, proprio mo ?!
When arrive-they, just mo
c *Eli partidi, proprio po ?
Have-they left, just po
d *L'è fret incoi, proprio lu !
It-is cold today, just lu
- (22) a *Cossa ali fat, TI ?! Pg
Why have-they done TI
b *Quando riveli, MO ?!
When arrive-they MO
c *Eli partidi, PO ?
Have-they left PO
d *L'è fret incoi, LU !
It-is cold today LU

-
- Not they-have/have-they done what, mo
(iii) a *No l'è piovest, lu
Not it-has rained, lu
b *No l'è rivà (lu) nisuni, (lu)
Not it-has arrived (lu) anybody (lu)

The Pagotto examples in (iv) might suggest that the particle *mo* is indeed compatible with negation in *yes/no* questions; however, as discussed by several authors, the negative marker in *yes/no* questions has a presuppositional value, and does not function as real negation:

- (iv) a No i gnen, mo ?
Not they-come, mo
b No te dis gnet, mo ?
Not you-say anything, mo

Therefore, the observation that all the *SPs* we considered are incompatible with real sentential negation holds; for the time being, we do not have an explanation for this fact and leave a deeper investigation of this issue for future research.

(27) [FP CPi [F° particle][CP ti]]

The idea that SPs are located very high in the structure and that the CP must move to their left might seem at first sight a rather ad hoc solution. We therefore compare this analysis with the null hypothesis, namely with the view that SPs are located in the low position inside the IP field, showing that the null hypothesis encounters a number of problems; in addition, there are empirical arguments suggesting that these particles belong to the CP-layer.

Firstly, we have to exclude that SPs are merged inside the VP, as they have no argumental status. The assumption that SPs are located very low in the IP field would force us to the problematic conclusion that, given their sentence final positioning, all arguments must have vacated the VP; if this analysis might in principle be conceivable for object DPs (which move out of the VP in order to get case in some SpecAgrO position), it looks much less plausible for PPs, which, not being in need of structural case, have no trigger for scrambling out of the VP.⁹

Secondly, given that low functional projections have in general aspectual value, we would expect that these particles also do. As we will see below, this is not the case; on the contrary, the interpretation triggered by the presence of SPs concerns semantic and pragmatic aspects such as presupposition, point of view, and presentation of the event, which are usually encoded in the left periphery of the clause.

Thirdly, the very syntactic behaviour of SPs shows that they belong to the highest functional domain: as shown above, they are not found in embedded contexts: this asymmetry is a typical property of phenomena involving the CP field (like for example V2, do-support, subject clitic inversion, etc.); to the best of our knowledge, no elements of the low IP area are sensitive to the main versus embedded status of the clause in which they occur.

4. The analysis: clause preposing to [Spec,Prt]

Given our claim that SPs are located in a head position of the CP layer and that their sentence final occurrence is derived via remnant movement of their clausal complement, the whole CP, to their specifier, we intend to show now that the relation between SPs and the preceding CP does indeed display the properties of the structural spec-head relation.

As is well known, parentheticals cannot intervene between a head and its specifier, while they can intervene between two maximal projections. Therefore, we

⁹ Moreover, the position of the particle would have to be the lowest specifier above VP: it cannot be head because it would block verb movement and it must be the lowest functional specifier because otherwise we would expect it to be followed by low adverbs.

can use parentheticals as a diagnostic test for spec-head relations; the following examples show that it is not possible to insert a parenthetical expression between the CP and any SP:

- (28) a *L'à piovest, son sicur, lu, ieri sera Pg
 It-has rained, I'm sure, lu, last night
 b *Cossa falo, diseme, ti ? Ve
 What does-he, tell me, ti
 c *Vien, sa, mo ! Ve
 Come, you know, mo

If our analysis is on the right track, the natural question arises as to whether all the particles we consider are located in the same head or whether each particle occupies a different C° position. As we will discuss in the next section, there are reasons to believe that each particle marks a different semantic value. There is, however, a more straightforward syntactic argument for the hypothesis that *SPs* occupy different head positions inside the CP layer. Interestingly, the particles *ti* and *po* can cooccur, in a rigid order in which *po* precedes *ti*:

- (29) Quando eli rivadi, po, ti? Pg

If the two particles cooccur, 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 (29), which can be derived either as in (30) or in (31):

- (30) a [[ti] [po] [_{CP} quando eli rivadi]]
 b [[ti] [[_{CP} quando eli rivadi]_x [po]] t_x]
 c [[[[_{CP} quando eli rivadi]_x [po]] t_x]_y [ti]] t_y]
 (31) a [[po] [ti] [_{CP} quando eli rivadi]]
 b [[po] [[_{CP} quando eli rivadi]_x [ti]] t_x]
 c [[[_{CP} quando eli rivadi]_x [po]] [t_x [ti]] t_x]

As illustrated, we can hypothesize two different initial sequences, depending on the relative linear order of the two particles. If *ti* is higher than *po*, like in (30a), we have movement of the interrogative clause into the specifier of *po*, like in (30b), and the final word order in (30c) is obtained by raising the whole constituent formed by the CP and the particle *po* into the specifier of *ti*. In the second derivation, with *po* higher than *ti*, like in (31a), the interrogative CP raises, through the specifier of *ti*, up to the specifier of *po*. Beside 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.¹⁰

¹⁰ Notice that under either analysis it is possible to account for the ungrammaticality of the following sequences:

We have seen that some *SPs* can either be preceded by the whole interrogative clause, like in (32), or intervene between the sentence initial *wh*-item and the rest of the clause, like in (33):

- (32) a Parché gnenlo, mo ? Pg
 Why comes-he, mo
 b Quando eli rivadi, po ?
 When have-they arrived, po
- (33) a Parché, mo, gnenlo ? Pg
 Why, mo, comes-he
 b Quando, po, eli rivadi ?
 When, po, have-they arrived

The examples in (32) show that the particle can be located in the left periphery, as it precedes the inflected verb which has undergone subject clitic inversion¹¹; if we took (32) as the basic sequence, in view of (33) we would have to posit that the particle can either be merged in two different positions, belonging to very different sentence domains, or be merged very low in the structure and then moved to the CP area for some mysterious reason. In our account the position of the particle remains the same, the difference between (32) and (33) depending on whether the particle attracts to its specifier the whole clause or only the *wh*-item, stranding the clause; hence, cases like (33) are expected if we assume the analysis in (27) and have a structure like the following, where the element checking the strong feature in the specifier of the *SP* is not the entire CP but the *wh*-item:

-
- (i) a *Quando eli rivadi, ti, po?
 b ?? Po, quando eli rivadi, ti ?
 c ?? Quando po éli rivadi ti ?
 [Po] when [po] have-they arrived [po/ti] [ti/po]

Under the first analysis the ungrammaticality of (ia) may be traced back to the fact that *ti* requires its specifier position to be filled by the whole complement (including the particle *po*); on the other 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 which is 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.

¹¹ We take subject clitic inversion to witness that (some type of) verb movement to the CP layer has applied.

- (37) a Quando sarali rivadi, ti ? Pg
 b Sarali rivadi quando, ti ?
 [When] be-fut-they arrived [when], ti
- (38) a *Saràli rivadi, ti ? Pg
 Be-fut-they arrived, ti
 b *I ze partii, ti ? Ve
 They-have left, ti

Ti questions can have two interpretations. The first interpretation can be identified with the one defined as “can’t find the value” (henceforth *cfv*) by Obenauer (1994); under this reading the speaker has already unsuccessfully tried to identify a value for the variable; moreover, this type of questions can only be self-addressed questions.¹³ The second interpretation is a surprise/reproach (henceforth *sr*) interpretation (see Poletto (2000:67 ff.), Munaro & Obenauer (2002)); in this case the speaker already knows the value of the variable, so his question does not really bear on the value of the variable bound by the *wh*-operator but rather expresses a feeling ranging from mild surprise up to reproach towards the event referred to.

The choice between the two interpretations seems to be connected to the verbal features: present and past trigger the *sr* interpretation more easily, while future favours the *cfv* one:¹⁴

- (39) a Dove le gavarò messe, ti ? Ve
 Where cl have-fut-I put, ti
 b Cossa avarali magnà, ti ? Pg
 What have-fut-they eaten, ti

¹³ Interestingly in Venetian epistemic questions, which are marked by a subjunctive mood preceded by a complementizer, are incompatible with *ti*:

- (i) a Cossa che el gabia fato?
 b ??Cossa che el gabia fato, ti ?
 What that he-have-subj done (ti)

Questions of the type exemplified in (i) are also self-addressed questions, which might be taken to show that self-addressing in questions cuts across questions types.

¹⁴ Notice that *cfv* questions with *ti* are incompatible with second person subjects, most likely because the speaker excludes every possibility of getting an answer from the addressee:

- (i) a *Andé sareo ndadi, t i?
 b *Dove sarì ndai, ti ?
 Where be-fut-you gone, ti

- (40) a Andé eli ndadi, ti ? Pg
 Where have-they gone, ti
 b Cossa sî drio magnar, ti ? Ve
 What are-you eating, ti

Let us see what semantic property these two interpretations share: in the *cfv* interpretation all the possible values of the variable 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 (cf. Obenauer (1994)). Hence, what the two interpretations have in common is the fact that the answer drawn from the set specified by the *wh*-item is not sufficient and/or relevant; we propose that this is precisely the feature marked by *ti*.

The choice between the two interpretations is performed via different mood marking: both in the case of *cfv* questions and in the case of *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 (cf. Munaro & Obenauer (2002) for a specific proposal on the second type of questions).

The fact that modality is relevant to the interpretation of the question could provide us with the explanation for why *ti*, unlike other particles, always requires the whole CP, and not simply the *wh*-item, in its specifier. Suppose that the modal feature has to be in a local structural relation with the particle; there are a priori two possible 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 CP up to the specifier of the particle.¹⁵

5.2. The particle *mo*

As illustrated in section 2, the particle *mo* has a different distribution in Venetian and Pagotto, as only in the latter dialect it can occur both in interrogatives as well as in imperatives.

We propose that *mo* can have the following values in the structures examined: it introduces a *presupposition* and/or it expresses what has been defined in the literature as a *point of view*. From these two properties we derive its interpretive import in the two dialects under investigation; in Pagotto *mo* introduces “point of view”, because it expresses a reference to the person to whose benefit the action has to be performed (either the speaker or the hearer): imperatives with *mo* are uttered to

¹⁵ As for the fact that *ti* occurs only in *wh*-interrogatives and not in *yes/no* questions, this may depend on 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.

the benefit of a class of persons which includes the hearer (a similar information is conveyed by the particles *mo/ma* in the Raethoromance variety of Badiotto, as discussed by Poletto & Zanuttini (2003)):

- (41) a Magna, mo (che te diventa grant) ! Pg
 Eat, mo, (so that you grow up)
 b Ledelo, mo (che te capisarà tut) !
 Read it, mo, (so that you'll understand everything)
- (42) a Nèteme le scarpe, mo (che sion in ritardo) ! Pg
 Clean my shoes, mo, (that we are late)
 b Parèceme da magnar, mo (che dopo avon da 'ndar via) !
 Cook for me, mo, (that later we have to go)

Sentences like the ones illustrated in (41) are clearly uttered to the advantage of the hearer, while those in (42) are felicituos only if they are uttered in a context in which both the speaker and the hearer will benefit from the action performed.¹⁶

As for the role of *mo* in imperatives in Venetian, it 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 tense:

- (43) a Ciamime (*tra un'ora), mo ! Ve
 Call me (in an hour), mo
 b Lezilo (*doman), mo !
 Read it (tomorrow), mo

Mo in Venetian imperatives seems to be sensitive to the tense of the utterance, as it signals that the utterance time and the performance time must coincide. In addition to this, *mo* signals the presence of a presupposition: in all these examples the speaker already knows that the hearer does not intend to obey the order. The combination of these two components, that is, the coincidence between utterance and performance time and presupposition, yields a semantic effect that Venetian informants translate as “reinforcement of the order”.

Thus, *mo* expresses two distinct values in imperative clauses in Venetian and Pagotto. However, in Pagotto interrogatives *mo* seems to convey a reading partially similar to its Venetian counterpart in imperatives because it introduces a

¹⁶ The distinction concerning point of view found in Pagotto is not relevant in Venetian:

- (i) a Vien mo, che te iuto!
 Come mo, that I help you
 b Vien mo, che ti me porti casa !
 Come mo, that you take me home

presupposition concerning the addressee's intentions;¹⁷ we surmise that in *mo* interrogatives both a presupposition and a point of view are involved, the interpretation depending on the position of the *SP*:

- (44) a Quando rivaràli, mo ? Pg
b Quando, mo, rivaràli ?
When [mo] arrive-fut-they [mo]

If the whole clause raises, like in (44a), the speaker expresses the fact that the present situation does not conform to his expectations, a fact which, due to the presence of the point of view, might have negative consequences; if *Point of view* is encoded by a modal projection in IP (cf. Poletto & Zanuttini (2003)), then IP raising is necessary for the interpretation to obtain, similarly to what happens in the case of *ti*. When the particle occurs immediately after the *wh*-item, like in (45b) (or with the *wh*-item used in isolation) *mo* introduces the speaker's opinion that the addressee does not intend to answer, so that he is forced to repeat his question again, with insistence. Hence, what is expressed in this case is not a point of view, but just a presupposition; given the absence of point of view, the clause need not raise as a whole and the *wh*-item can, and must, raise alone.

We can conclude that both in Venetian imperatives and in Pagotto interrogatives with the particle following the *wh*-item the effect of reinforcement perceived by the informants is due to some presupposition concerning the addressee's attitude.

5.3. The particle *po*

Also in the case of *po* the interpretation of the sentence depends on the position of the particle, which, as anticipated above, can appear either sentence final or immediately after the *wh*-item:

- (45) a Quando eli rivadi, po ? Pg
b Quando, po, eli rivadi ?
When [po] have-they arrived [po]

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

When *po* immediately follows the *wh*-item, like in (45b), the speaker knows that the event was to take place and asks for a confirmation;¹⁸ this position triggers an

¹⁷ Recall that in Venetian *mo* does not appear in interrogatives.

interpretation in which the possible values for the variable have been ordered with the exclusion of the most probable ones.

With sentence final *po*, in (45a), in addition to the ordering of the possible values and the exclusion of the most probable ones, the speaker refers back to a communicative situation that has been left suspended and is taken up again at the time of the question; we suggest that the speaker's reference to a previous situation might be connected to the activation of the *Tense* projection, which, being relevant for this interpretation, must move to the specifier of the particle pied piping the whole clause (as in the cases of *ti* and *mo*).¹⁹

5.4. The particle *lu*

The occurrence of the particle *lu* is limited to non-constituent exclamatives focussing on the whole propositional content; it is not compatible with constituent exclamatives in which a *wh*-phrase is fronted to the sentence initial position, as shown by the following examples:

- (46) a L'è frèt, lu Pg
 It-is cold [lu]
 b L'è rivà al to amigo, lu Pg
 It-has arrived your friend, lu
- (47) a Che fret (*lu) che l'è incoi (*lu) Pg
 How cold [lu] that it-is today [lu]
 b Quant (*lu) che à piovest ieri sera (*lu)
 How much [lu] that it has rained last night [lu]

We suggest that *lu* introduces a presupposition; in this case the event described by the clause corresponds to either of the two possible truth values (the positive and the negative one); the content expressed is contrary to the speaker's expectations, so

¹⁸ As discussed above for *mo*, this interpretation seems to convey a presupposition concerning the whole event; as a consequence, the question does not really bear on the *wh*-item itself.

¹⁹ Indeed, in Venetian this additional interpretation is excluded with future tense:

(i) % Quando sarali rivai, po
 When be-fut-they arrived, po

As mentioned in footnote 3, in Pagotto *po* is also attested in sentence initial position, in which case it expresses the speaker's surprise about the fact that the event has taken place; hence the event is presented as unexpected given the context, and the value of the variable is not relevant.

the function of *lu* may simply be that of choosing the contextually less probable value between the two a priori conceivable ones.²⁰

6. Conclusion

In this article we have taken into account the syntactic and semantic behaviour of some sentential particles in two Veneto dialects. All particles share interesting syntactic and semantic properties: they are all sensitive to clause type and can only appear in matrix clauses, they can all occur in sentence final position and have the typical properties of X⁰-elements. We claim that the correct syntactic analysis is the one exploiting movement of the *wh*-item or of the whole clausal complement to the specifier of the CP projection whose head is occupied by the particle.

The possibility of combining two particles suggests that each particle occupies a different head position in the CP layer; however, it remains to be seen what their precise ordering is and exactly which projection they mark.

The interpretation changes depending on whether the constituent which raises to the specifier of the *SP* is the *wh*-item or the whole clause. We have proposed that raising of the whole CP-complement is induced by the necessity for some IP projections (either Tense or Mood) to enter a local relation with the particle.

When this obtains Tense or Mood also contribute to the interpretation of the clause, which becomes a function of the meaning of the particle combined with the feature added by Tense/Mood. Each particle is sensitive to tense and modality in a different way, a subject which still remains to be explored.

References

- Benincà, P. (1996) 'La struttura della frase esclamativa alla luce del dialetto padovano', in: P. Benincà et alii (eds.) *Italiano e dialetti nel tempo. Saggi di grammatica per Giulio C. Lepschy*, Bulzoni – Roma: 23-43.
- Cinque, G. (1976) 'Mica', in: *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Padova*, vol.1: 101-112.
- Kayne, R. (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, LI Monographs, MIT Press.
- Munaro, N. (1997) *Proprietà strutturali e distribuzionali dei sintagmi interrogativi in alcuni dialetti italiani settentrionali*, PhD thesis, Universities of Padua/Venice.
- Munaro, N. & H.-G. Obenauer (2002) 'On the semantic widening of underspecified *wh*-elements', in: M. Leonetti, O. Fernández Soriano & V. Escandell Vidal (eds.) *Current Issues in Generative Grammar*, Universidad de Alcalá - Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia - Universidad Autónoma de Madrid: 165-194.

²⁰ In this respect the interpretive contribution of *lu* in reversing the presupposition resembles the one of *mica* in standard Italian (cf. Cinque (1976)).

- Munaro, N. & C. Poletto (2002) 'Distribuzione ed uso delle particelle frasali in alcune varietà venete', to appear in *Quaderni Patavini di Linguistica* 18, Unipress – Padua.
- 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.
- Pellegrini, G. (1972) *Saggi sul ladino dolomitico e sul friulano*, Adriatica Editrice – Bari.
- Poletto, C. (2000) *The Higher Functional Field*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Poletto, C. & R. Zanuttini (2003) 'Making Imperatives', in: C. Tortora (ed.) *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*, Oxford University Press - Oxford/New York: 175-206.
- Portner, P. & R. Zanuttini (1998) 'The Force of Negation in *Wh*-Interrogatives and Exclamatives', in: P. Benincà & C. Poletto (eds.) *Quaderni di Lavoro dell'ASIS* 2, CNR – Padova: 13-37.
- Rohlf, G. (1969) *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*, vol.3, Einaudi – Torino.