

# The syntacticization of discourse<sup>1</sup>

Liliane Haegeman	Virginia Hill
Ghent University	University of New Brunswick-SJ

Second draft: 30.12.2010 vh-lh

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Aim and scope of the paper

The goal of this paper is to explore the viability of a syntactic analysis of a range of empirical data that have so far received scarce attention in the syntactic literature, namely pragmatic markers which appear either on the left or the right edge of the utterance, as those illustrated in (1), from Romanian (R) and West Flemish (WF), and whose distribution will also be shown to interact with that of vocatives:

- (1) a Hai/uite, plecăm. R  
*hai uite* leave-1PL  
'We are leaving (injunction)'/ 'There, we are leaving now.'
- b K'en kennen da nie wè. WF  
I *en* know-1SG that not *wè*  
'I don't know that, you know.'

Discourse particles have received a lot of attention in the context of discourse studies but, with some notable exceptions (Munaro & Poletto 2004, del Gobbo & Poletto 2008), have so far usually been left aside by syntacticians. In this paper, we want to examine to what extent a syntactic analysis is possible and what it would look like.

Our proposal builds on our own earlier work in this area. We refer in particular to Haegeman 1984, 1993 for early discussion of the syntax and interpretation of some WF discourse particles and Hill 2007a, b and 2008 for the discussion of syntax and interpretation of Romanian particles. Inspired by Speas & Tenny (2003), we will elaborate an account that postulates a speech act layer that dominates the standardly assumed left periphery (LP) of clauses, and which hosts the relevant pragmatic markers and Vocative phrases in West Flemish (WF) and Romanian (R). Differently from Speas & Tenny, though, we will conclude that the layers we identify are directly related to the speech event as such, that is, the establishment of a rapport between speaker and hearer in terms of either 'attention seeking' or of 'bonding'.

Because this is pioneering work, we will confine our analysis to a restricted set of data, namely verb-based particles that "profile the speaker-hearer relationship" (Kirsner & van Heuven 1996), and which are used as pragmatic markers, as in (1). We will show that two investigations along these lines, which had initially been undertaken independently of each other, for R and WF, respectively, turned out to concur in the syntactic analysis that was elaborated, which seems to us a promising direction<sup>2</sup>.

## 1.2. The empirical data

Both R and WF display a wide range of particles that contribute conversational pragmatic information to the compositional reading of sentences, as discussed in Hill (2007a,b, 2008) and Haegeman (to appear). Among these particles, we focus on those (i) that are verb-based, in the sense that they etymologically derive from verbs, and (ii) which convey the speaker's relation to the speech event and to the interlocutor. The etymology and the conversational import of each particle are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: List of verb based particles with pragmatic role

Lg	Particle	Etymology	Conversational use	Approx. gloss
R	<i>Hai</i>	Turk. <i>hajde</i> (=Fr. <i>allez</i> )	injunction; evaluative	'c'mon', 'ok' etc
	<i>Lasă</i>	<i>lăsa</i> 'allow/let'	injunction	'it's ok'
	<i>Uite</i>	<i>se uita</i> 'look'	ostensive; surprise	'look here'
WF	<i>Allé</i>	Fr. <i>aller</i> 'go'	injunction	'c'mon'
	<i>Gow</i>	<i>Gaan</i> 'go'+ <i>weg</i> 'away'	injunction	'c'mon'
	<i>nè(m)</i>	<i>nemen</i> 'take'	ostensivity; surprise	'so there'; 'take that'
	<i>Wè</i>	<i>weet je</i> 'know you' <i>wil je</i> 'want/will you'	the authority of the experience	'you know'
	<i>Zulle</i>	<i>zul je</i> 'shall you'	same as <i>wè</i>	same as <i>wè</i>
	<i>Zé</i> <i>Zè</i>	<i>zien</i> 'see'	attention drawer; evidentiality	'look here'

For WF we will concentrate on *nè(m)*, *wè*, *zé/zè*, leaving *alle* (Kloots 2007) and *gow* for future study.

Verb-based particles are, of course, not the prerogative of R and WF. The following are just some examples of such particles in other languages: French has *tiens*, the imperative of *tenir* ('hold'), and *dis* (*donc*) the imperative of *dire* ('say') followed by the adverb *donc* ('then'). Spanish has *mira*, the 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular (informal) imperative of *mirar* ('look'); *oye*, the 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular imperative of *oir* ('hear'); *vamos*, the 1<sup>st</sup> person plural present indicative of *ir* ('go'), etc. (Tanghe 2010). Catalan has the imperatives *escolti* ('listen') and *miri* ('look') (Sanne Tanghe pc). Italian has *guarda*, the imperative of *guardare* ('look'), *sa(i)*, *sapete* (initial only) the second person (singular and plural) of *sapere* ('know'), and so on.

In both WF and R, some particles appear to have two distinct conversational uses that correlate with their distribution in the clause and/or with the intonation. For example, R *hai* has an injunction reading when followed by a subjunctive clause (2a) introduced by *să*, the subjunctive marker, but it has an evaluative reading when followed by the conjunction *că* 'that' with an indicative clause (2b).

- (2) a. Hai *să* citim.  
*hai* SUBJ read-1PL  
 'C'mon, let's read.'
- b. Hai *că* este nemaipomenit.  
*hai* that is unbelievable  
 'It is unbelievable, really.'

WF *zè*, with falling intonation, occurs in final position and can be followed only by de-stressed material. It has an evidential reading. On the other hand, *zé*, with rising intonation, has an attention-drawing function in the speech event. *Zé* can appear clause initially, or clause finally. The two particles may also co-occur, with specific distributions, summarized in (3).

- (3) a        *Zé*, Valère is doa!  
               *Zé*, Valère is there!  
               ‘Look, Valère is there!’  
       b        Valère is doa *zè*.  
               Valère is there *zè*  
               ‘Valère is there, as you see’  
       b’        \**Zè*, Valère is doa.  
       c        *Zé*, Valère is doa *zè*.  
       d        Valère is doa *zè*, *zé*.  
       e        \*Valère is doa *zé*, *zè*.

We interpret the various constraints on the form of the particles, their distribution and their interpretation to indicate that the insertion of these particles in the clause is not free but structure dependent; hence, the necessity to formalize the behaviour of these particles in the syntax.

### 1.3. Organisation of the paper

Our paper is organised as follows: Section 2 provides a survey of the general syntactic properties of the discourse markers under investigation. Section 3 sets out the research background of our analysis. Section 4 sketches what we think could be a semantic account of the discourse markers. Section 5 examines in detail the syntax of the Romanian particle *hai(de)*, which leads us to our first formal proposal for the syntax of discourse particles. Section 6 provides an analysis of the distribution and interpretation of West Flemish particles, and, on this basis, we further develop the formal proposal introduced in Section 5. The conclusions follow in Section 7.

## 2. The syntactic properties of the particles

The question may be asked whether it is at all legitimate to try to provide a syntactic analysis for the particles we are examining here. Our answer to this is twofold, aiming at adequacy in the empirical coverage and in the theoretical plausibility. Hence, we believe that the justification for a syntactic analysis partly depends on how successful it is (or is not) in handling the data: if an insightful syntactic analysis can be provided that captures the distribution and interpretation of such particles, we consider that this in itself would offer some support for such an enterprise.

In this sense, there are empirical grounds for attempting such an analysis. The distribution of the verb-based particles in R and in WF is constrained by factors that also constrain the merging of elements specific to narrow syntax, as follows:

(i) Some of these particles display sensitivity to clause typing: e.g., R *uite*; WF *wè* are incompatible with interrogatives:

- (4) a. \*Uite cine vine?  
*uite* who comes  
 b. \*Ee’j gedoan wè?  
 have you finished *wè*

(ii) R particles show selectional properties; e.g., they select a CP introduced by *că* (‘that’), where *că* is a Force head.

- (5) Hai *că* vine.  
*hai* that comes  
 ‘Ok, s/he’s coming.’

(iii) Unlike R adverb-based particles, R verb-based particles show inflectional properties that correlate with their distribution. For instance the particles *hai* and *lasă* show up in a number of different forms, shown in Table 2:

Table 2: inflectional properties

	<i>hai</i>	<i>lasă</i>
2SG	<i>hai/haide</i>	<i>las’/lasă</i>
1PL	<i>haidem</i>	
2PL	<i>hai/ haideți</i>	<i>lăsați</i>

Inflection on these particles is also systematically constrained under co-occurrence. That is, the two particles may co-occur as in (6a), but that constrains the inflectional morphology, which is then allowed only on the second particle (6c), but not on both (6b). The word order is also fixed to *hai*>*lasă*; the order *lasă* > *hai* is possible, but with significant intonation breaks between the two particles, which we interpret to mean that they belong to different utterances instead of being part of one utterance.

- (6) a. Hai-lasă nu te enerva.  
*hai lasa* not REFL upset  
 ‘C’mon, don’t upset yourself.’  
 b. \*Haideți-lăsați nu vă enervați.  
*hai-2PL-lasa-2PL* not REFL upset-2PL  
 c. Hai-lăsați nu vă enervați.  
*hai lasa-2PL* not REFL upset-2PL  
 ‘C’mon, don’t upset yourselves.’

Similar restrictions on the appearance of inflectional morphology have been observed for

verb-based particles in other languages. For instance, the Italian verb-based particle *sa/sai* ('know') must be inflected when it is clause-initial, but remains non-inflected when clause-final. We refer to Banzanella (2001) for more discussion and examples.<sup>3</sup>

- (7) (Sapete / \*sai), non vi siete mica comportati bene/ (sa/sai/\*sapete)!  
*sapete*-2PL / *sai* not REFL are not behaved well *sa/sai/sapete* -2PL  
 'You know, you haven't behaved yourself at all.'

(iv) The R clitic particle *ia* marks illocutionary force and can be prefixed only to verb-based particles and to full-fledged imperative verbs; it forces an injunctive (e.g, versus information) reading (8a vs. 8b), in the same way proclitic mood markers force the use of the verb as subjunctive (i.e., *să*) or infinitival (i.e., *a*) in root and main clauses (8c).

- (8) a. *Ia* hai că vine<sup>4</sup>. (injunctive)  
*ia* hai that comes  
 'Let's move, s/he's coming.'  
 b. Hai că vine. (injunctive OR informational)  
*hai* that comes  
 'Let's move because s/he's coming.'// 'Ok, s/he's coming.'  
 c. *Să* vină! A nu deranja!  
 SUBJ come-3SG; INF not come  
 'S/he better come!'; 'Do not disturb!'

(v) The particles display rigid ordering restrictions. Some particles are initial, others are final, others may be initial and final, but with constraints. We have already mentioned the fixed word order of R *hai*>*lasă* above. In WF, for instance, *zé/zè* 'see' can be both initial and final, with different intonation patterns and interpretation, whereas *wè* is always final. *Wè* can be followed by *zé* with rising intonation, but not by *zè*, with falling intonation. Neither *zè* nor *zé* can precede *wè*.

- (9) a. K'een gedoan wè zé.  
 I have finished wè zé  
 b. \*K'een gedoan wè zè.  
 c. \*K'een gedoan zè/zé wè .  
 I have finished zè/zé wè

(vi) As shown in Hill (2007b) and Haegeman (to appear), the verb-based particles interact with the syntax of vocatives in terms of their distribution and (for R) their inflection. In both languages examined, the vocative displays locality constraints in relation to the particle (10), whether in initial or final position. R displays person and number agreement between the vocative and the verb-based particle (10d,e). This agreement relation looks similar to subject/object-verb agreements in narrow syntax, in general. That is, it is indicative of a local Spec-head relation between the noun and the verb/particle.

- (10) a. K'een gedoan wè Valère.

- I- have finished *wè* Valère  
 b \*K'een gedoan Valère *wè*.  
 c Zé Valère k'een gedoan.  
*zé* Valère I-have finished.  
 d \*Valère zé k'een gedoan.  
 e Lăsați fetelor că plecăm.  
*lasă* -2PL girls-the-VOC that go-1PL  
 'There-there, girls, we'll be leaving.'  
 f \*Lasă fetelor, că plecăm.  
*lasă* -2SG girls-the- VOC that go-1PL

(vii) On a more speculative note: in the diachronic literature it is generally assumed that a Gothic verb-based particle *sai* related to the verb 'see' is at the basis of the sibilant in the Germanic proximal demonstratives such as English *this* and German *dieser*. Here is what the OED presents as an etymology of *this*:

A Norse and W.Ger. formation, produced by adding *se, si* (prob. =Got. *Sai* 'see, behold') to the simple demonstrative represented by *the* and *that* as shown by the early ON. Runic foms *sá-si, sú-si, þat-si*, acc.sing *þan-si, þàn-si*, dat *þaim-si*, pl-neut *þau-si*. Later the compound was felt as a single word and inflected at the end. [...] (*The compact edition of the Oxford English Dictionary*, OUP, 1971, P-Z, 322)

In contemporary WF the same kind of process of grammaticalisation seems to be on its way for the particle *zè*, which can be associated with fronted deictic constituents:

- (11) a Dienen boek *zè* moe- j lezen.  
 this book *zè* must you read

Though the exact syntax of this type of use of *zè* is unclear (Haegeman to appear), the fact remains that for a discourse particle to have become part and parcel of a demonstrative pronoun, as has arguably happened with Gothic *sai* ('see'), there must have been a "point of entry" through the syntax. If the particle were completely outside the clausal syntax, then such a development would be unexpected. Assuming that the discourse particle does have a syntactic anchor to the clause would allow us to speculate on a type of development as that in (11b), where FP is a projection headed by a particle, the nature of which we return to below.

- (11) b [FP2 CP [F2 *zè* [CP...  
 c [FP2 XP [F2 *zè* [CP... ~~XP-zè~~  
 d ⇒ [FP2 XP-*zè* [F2 Ø [CP ~~XP~~...

The properties in (i)-(vi), as well as the known development of the proximal demonstrative by the incorporation of a particle, have led us to the hypothesis that the verb-based R and WF particles are part of narrow syntax, and that the particles are subject to the same syntactic computation as the other elements of narrow syntax, where the derivation is constrained by clause type, selection properties of heads, Spec-head

agreement reflected through morphology, differences in interpretation according to the location of the element on the configurational map.

(vii) Further support for a syntactic treatment of discourse particles is discussed in Miyagawa (2010), who examines the distribution of allocutive inflection of direct address in Souletin, a Basque dialect, also presented in Oyharçabal (1993). Miyagawa shows that this dialect has four ways to say ‘Peter worked’, depending on the gender/number of the addressee(s) and the inter-personal relation between the speaker and the addressee. The relevant patterns are given in (12), from Miyagawa (2010).

- (12) a. *To a male friend*  
 Pettek lan egin dik.  
 Peter-ERG work-ABS do-PRF AUX-3.S.ABS-2.S.C.MSC.ALLOC-3.S.ERG
- b. *To a female friend*  
 Pettek lan egin din.  
 Peter-ERG work-ABS do-PRF AUX-3.S.ABS-2.S.C.FM.ALLOC-3.S.ERG
- c. *To someone higher in status (formal)*  
 Pettek lan egin dizü.  
 Peter-ERG work-ABS do-PRF AUX-3.S.ABS-2.S.F.ALLOC-3.S.ERG
- d. *Plural addressee*  
 Pettek lan egin du.  
 Peter-ERG work-ABS do-PRF AUX-3.S.ABS-3.S.ERG

Based on (Oyharçabal 1993) Miyagawa shows convincingly that allocutive agreement is authentic agreement; it competes with the regular 2<sup>nd</sup> person agreement morpheme. If the sentence contains a 2<sup>nd</sup> person subject, object, etc, allocutive agreement does not arise:

- (12) e. (Nik hi) ikusi haut.  
 (1SG.ERG **2SG.C.ABS**) see.PRF AUX-**2.S.C.ABS**-1SG.ERG  
 ‘I saw you.’
- f. (**Zuek** ni) ikusi naizue.  
 (**2PL.ERG** 1SG.ABS) see.PRF AUX-1SG.ABS-**2PL.ERG**  
 ‘You saw me.’

If we agreement is considered to be the spell-out of uninterpretable features which have to be valued by a goal with the corresponding interpretable features, then the goal itself must also be available for probing in the syntax. This sort of data thus offers support for encoding speaker and interlocutor roles in the syntax.

Based on the considerations presented in Section 2, we attempt, in the remainder of this paper, to elaborate a proposal for the syntactic analysis of the verb-based particles, aiming to identify the type of computation at work in these particular constructions.

### 3. Research context and framework

While there is an abundant literature on discourse particles in those sub-disciplines of linguistics that focus on discourse or on pragmatics, less attention has been paid to such particles in formal syntax. The reason is probably that these particles are optional, that they are seen as having a purely or mainly pragmatic function, and that they generally are located outside the CP, which is taken to delimit the edge of the narrow syntax. For instance, as shown in the examples above, WF *z'è* precedes what is taken to be a full-fledged V2 structure. Furthermore, no direct relation between the particle on the clausal edge and the verb argument structure of the clause can be established.

Recently, however, among syntacticians, attention has been paid increasingly to the syntax of particles. Quite a lot of interest has been paid to the modal particles, which are *prima facie* located TP internally, such as German *ja, doch, schon* (Coniglio 2007, 2009, Cardinaletti 2010). There has also been some interest for clause typing particles that are found on the periphery of the clausal domain in Italian (Munaro & Poletto 2004, del Gobbo & Poletto 2008). Most of the particles studied so far are either grammaticalised from adverbs (cf. Cardinaletti 2010 for discussion) or from pronouns (cf. Munaro & Poletto 2004). With some exceptions, notably Hill (2007b, 2008), Penello & Chinellato (2008a,b), del Gobbo & Poletto (2008), Haegeman (to appear), verb-based particles have received rather less attention. Yet, this specific group is relevant for our understanding of the interface between syntax and conversational pragmatics. In independent work on particles from a variety of languages, Speas & Tenny (2003) have proposed that the interfacing between syntax and conversational pragmatics is established through a functional predicative structure which is projected through the syntacticization of speech act features, in the same way that the argument structure of a lexical verb is projected. Due to their categorial feature [V], the verb-based particles can be seen to provide empirical support for such hypotheses.

Our analysis adopts a cartographic approach to the LP, following the kind of approach that has led to proposing a fine-grained hierarchy of the CP field in Rizzi (1997, 2004) and many others working in this approach. As the guidelines to our research we reproduce the following quotation from Cinque & Rizzi (2010):

The cartographic studies can be seen as an attempt to “syntacticize” as much as possible the interpretive domains, tracing back interpretive algorithms for such properties as argument structure (Hale and Keyser 1993 and much related work), scope, and informational structure (the “criterial” approach defended in Rizzi 1997 and much related work) to the familiar ingredients uncovered and refined in half a century of formal syntax. To the extent to which these efforts are empirically supported, they may shed light not only on syntax proper, but also on the structure and functioning of the cognitive systems at the interface with the syntactic module. (Cinque & Rizzi 2010: 63)

Of particular interest to us for this paper is the identification in the cartographic approach of Force as a head with clause typing features, which is also seen as the edge of the narrow syntax configuration (equating the *phase* head C in Chomsky 2001). Since both verb-based particles and vocatives (Moro 2003) appear above the ForceP level, the location of elements that merge in this head (e.g., subordinating conjunction) can serve as reference points for determining the position of the particles in relation to the



(articulated) CP layer. For our analysis we adopt the antisymmetry hypothesis (Kayne 1994) as well as specific insights from other studies on particles with speech act properties (e.g., Munaro & Polletto 2009, Speas 2004).

In the remainder of this paper we will show how an analysis of the verb-based particles that uses these principles leads to remarkably converging results for the analysis of the R and the WF data. Before launching into the syntactic analysis we will briefly sketch the interpretative properties of discourse particles and we will sketch the type of analysis we think would be a fruitful one to explore.

#### 4. The interpretation of discourse particles

In this section we briefly outline the interpretive properties shared by the speech act particles under discussion (section 4.1.) and we outline one way of going about analysing them (section 4.2.).

##### 4.1. Interpretive properties of the verb-based particles analysed here

Consider the examples in (13a, b): The utterances expressing the propositional content ‘we already have a medal’ is accompanied by a discourse particle.

- |      |    |  |                                    |
|------|----|--|------------------------------------|
| (13) | a. | M’een al een medalie wè / zè <sub>2</sub> / zé <sub>1</sub> /né. | WF                                 |
|      |    | we have already a medal wè /zè / zé/ né                          |                                    |
|      |    | ‘We already have a medal.’                                       |                                    |
|      | b. | Hai că deja avem o medalie.                                      | R                                  |
|      |    | <i>hai</i> that already have-1pl a medal                         |                                    |
|      |    | ‘We already have a medal.’                                       | (evaluation; relief; satisfaction) |

Characterizing the interpretive value of discourse particles is not an easy task. Clearly they are not truth conditional: Questioning the truth-value of the sentences in (13) (‘Is that true?’) cannot challenge the particle as such; in (13) we can only question whether we indeed have a medal. Likewise, the particles in (13) are inaccessible to dissent or to consent, outside the scope of negation and tense.

Though there undeniably exist clause-typing particles (Munaro & Poletto **xxx**, Poletto & Zanuttini 2009), the discourse particles above are not clause-typers: the clauses are typed independently and the particles are never required to type the clause. Some particles may select certain clause types, but they do not provide the typing itself.

The particles are ‘expressive’ (Kratzer 1999), and have an ‘illocutionary’ or ‘interpersonal’ value: they signal the speaker’s attitude or his/her commitment towards the content of the utterance and/or of his relation towards the interlocutor. They can be said to be ‘conversational’, they presuppose direct speaker-interlocutor contact and would, for instance, be inappropriate in broadcasts, except for the discourse situations of interviews, or panel discussions; being conversational, they are also used in blogs.

Being related to speaker and/or to hearer and directly anchored in the speech event, the particles can be said to be ‘deictic’. The particles examined here are not discourse bound: they do not need to be used in a response to a preceding utterance.

Each of the particles has many slightly different overtones/values, depending on the context. For instance, the particle *wè* can be used in WF to accompany a statement, in which case the speaker will use it to strongly endorse the content of his utterance by somehow appealing to his/her experience, and (thus) to reassure the interlocutor, or even to threaten him. In such a use it is near-equivalent to English ‘you see’, or ‘you know’ (14a). However, the same particle may also be used with an imperative (14b, c), in which case it somehow implies that the speaker has the authority to utter the imperative. In such a context it corresponds more to the emphatic use of *do*.

- (14) a. Dat is nie gemakkelijk wè. WF  
 that is not easy wè  
 ‘It’s not easy, you know.’
- b. Zet je mo wè.  
 sit you PRT wè  
 ‘Do sit down.’
- c. Komt doa nie an wè.  
 come there not on we  
 ‘Don’t you dare touch that.’

#### 4.2. Conceptual meaning vs procedural meaning

This section is entirely based on Wilson (2010a). Following the Relevance Theoretic approach to interpretation, we distinguish between conceptual meaning and procedural meaning (cf. Blakemore 1987, 2002). Lexical items that encode concepts are constituents of the conceptual representations and are truth conditional. Procedural meaning is non-truth conditional meaning. Expressions with procedural meaning serve to guide the inferential comprehensive process by imposing constraints on the construction of the context for utterances and, hence, guide their cognitive effects. The following extracts are from Wilson (2010a) and summarize the major properties of procedural expressions:

- (15) a. Elaboration  
 Procedural expressions may be seen as activating, or triggering, cognitive procedures already available to the organism. These procedures may be of any type at all, so that what all procedural items have in common is not their cognitive function but only their triggering role. So we may expect to find procedural expressions with many disparate cognitive functions.
- b. Consequences  
 (a) Procedural items (e.g. pronouns, particles, interjections) should activate procedures formulated in a sub-personal ‘machine language’ rather than full-fledged concepts which are constituents of a ‘language of thought’ and thus available for general inference (cf. pronouns).

- (b) The meanings of procedural items may be hard to pin down in conceptual terms.
- (c) Thoughts (unlike ‘silent speech’) should not contain procedural elements (*although, alas*)

Given that discourse particles we are interested in here do not convey truth conditional meaning, it seems plausible that they be conceived of as procedural expressions. For instance, the WF particle *wè*, illustrated in (9) and (14), could be said to guide the hearer into accepting the utterance which it accompanies, either to seek for its cognitive effects or to act accordingly.

### 4.3. Procedural meaning and epistemic vigilance

This section is based on Wilson (2010b), focusing on Japanese discourse connectives. Wilson (2010b) sees the role of these connectives as relating to epistemic vigilance, rather than to the inferential process of comprehension itself. She describes the concept of epistemic vigilance as in (16).

- (16) Epistemic vigilance  
The hearer assesses the information re: its content and source.  
This forces the speaker to present the information by relating it to the hearer’s background assumptions (e.g., his argument must show that the proposition in question follows logically from, or is strongly supported by the hearer’s background beliefs/assumptions); hence, the use of discourse connectives to create the logical/evidential relations. (Wilson 2010: handout)

Wilson (2010b) characterises the use of a number of particles in Japanese as follows:

Returning now to linguistic indicators of epistemic modality and evidentiality such as the particles *yo*, *kana* and *tte* in Japanese, ... these may also be linked to epistemic vigilance mechanisms, this time geared to assessing the reliability, honesty and trustworthiness of the source of information rather than the consistency or coherence of its content. ... Suppose, now, that the speaker wants the hearer to believe some proposition, but is not sure it will get past the hearer’s source monitoring mechanisms in the absence of information about the type of evidence she has available, or how reliable she is on that particular topic. An obvious way to solve this problem would be to display openly the type of evidence she has, or her degree of confidence about the truth of her assertion, by using linguistic indicators of epistemic modality or evidentiality. On this account, the role of evidentials and epistemic modals is not to guide the comprehension process in one direction or another (the proposition expressed by the utterance would have been understood just as well without them), but to display the communicator’s competence, benevolence and trustworthiness to the hearer. (Wilson 2010b: 16-18)

The particles we are investigating here have similar functions: with reference to WF *wè*, for instance, used to accompany statements, this clearly serves to display the communicator's competence and trustworthiness; with imperatives, it may display either benevolence or authority, depending on the content of the imperative.

Along the lines of Wilson's (2010) analysis, we formulate the hypothesis that the discourse particles we are interested in here are geared to influencing the interlocutor's epistemic vigilance. Obviously further research into the discourse particles we study here and those that we leave out of the discussion must reveal whether our hypothesis is tenable.

## 5. The syntax of the Romanian speech act particle *hai*

This section proposes a formal approach to the syntacticization of verb-based particles. The supporting data come mainly from the use of the particle *hai(de)* by itself and in conjunction to other particles and to vocatives.

### 5.1. General properties

Etymologically *hai/haide/haideti* is analysed as a verb-based particle, which is said to be derived from the frozen imperative form of Turkish (*h*)*ajde* ('go!'; let's go!) (Tschizmarova 2005).<sup>5</sup> The particle *hajde* has been adopted in the entire Balkan area as an invariable pragmatic marker, but in R it got enriched with person and number agreement inflection.

Hill (2007b) argues that a verb-based particle such as *hai/haide* has lost all the lexical properties of a verb. As a consequence it fails to project a vP or a TP structure, as shown in (17) and (18).

It is clear that *hai* is not associated with thematic roles (Croitor-Balaciu 2006); for example, it cannot take a subject in any environment (e.g., \*nobody *hai*-injunction; \*nobody *hai*+ *că* 'that'). As an injunctive marker, *hai* is parasitic on imperative verbs without adding anything to their semantics (e.g., unlike invariable modals or causatives): *hai* only intensifies or attenuates the strength of command and qualifies the relation between speaker and hearer (e.g., in terms of familiarity, endearment, etc.). However, *hai* has a second use in which it takes a clause introduced by *că* 'that' as its complement. For this particular pattern, one may think that *hai* has become re-analyzed (through some form of lexicalization) as a non-thematic/non-raising verb, such as (*se*) *părea* ('seem'). The question thus arises whether in this use the particle *hai* selects the *că* 'that'-indicative clause as its sentential complement in a bi-clausal derivations, or whether some other merging operation is involved. The diagnostics in (17) are revealing in this respect. Unlike non-thematic *părea* 'seem', *hai* cannot be regularly embedded (17a, b). Furthermore, *hai* may occur as an imperative, a pattern that is not available to non-thematic verbs (17c,d). Hence, the relation between *hai* and the clausal *că* 'that' complement does not have exactly the same properties as what we find in regular sentential complementation in which a verb (or a predicate) embeds a clause. Put differently, *hai* does not have an embedding relation with the clause that it precedes.

- (17) a. Maria insistă că se pare că Ion nu mai vine.  
 Maria insists that ARB-*se* seems that Ion not more comes  
 ‘Maria insists that it seems that Ion is not coming any more.’  
 b. \*Maria insistă că hai că Ion nu mai vine.  
 Maria says that *hai* that Ion not more comes  
 c. \*Păreți!  
 Seem-2PL.IMP  
 d. Haideți!  
*hai*-2PL.IMP

Alternatively, then, one might propose that *haideți* may have retained an external thematic role as a frozen imperative form of a thematic verb (e.g., of the type ‘go’). In that case, though, we would expect it to enter coordinating constructions with other such imperative forms, contrary to fact, as shown by the contrast between (17e-f) and (17g-h).

- (17) e. Mergeți și cântați!  
 go-2PL.IMP and sing-2PL.IMP  
 ‘Go and sing!’  
 f. Plecați și nu vă mai întoarceți!  
 go-2PL.IMP and not REFL more return-2PL.IMP  
 ‘Go and don’t come back again.’  
 g. \*Haideți și cântați!  
*hai*-2PL.IMP and sing-2PL.IMP  
 h. \*Haideți și nu vă mai întoarceți!  
*hai*-2PL.IMP and not REFL more return-2PL.IMP

Furthermore, imperative verbs project a functional TP field, allowing for the insertion of the marker of sentential negation *nu* ‘not’ (18a,c) and clitic adverbs such as *mai* ‘more’ (18b). This is not available with *hai* (18b,c). This incompatibility with markers belonging to the functional TP field also suggests that *hai* cannot be seen as an auxiliary or a modal, such elements being part of the TP (i.e., compatible with sentential negation and clitics) in Romanian. Thus, although it retains a categorial [V] feature, which allows it to carry the morphology for phi-features, *hai/haide* does not qualify as a verb, insofar as it cannot project a vP shell or and/or a TP field.

- (18) a. Nu adu.  
 not bring  
 b. Mai adu.  
 more bring  
 c. \*Nu haide(m/ți).  
 not *hai*  
 d. \*Mai haide(m/ți).  
 more *hai*

Based on the data discussed above we conclude that *hai* is neither an instantiation of the vP/VP thematic layer or of the functional TP layer. Though it seems to select a clausal

complement introduced by a complementizer, there is no evidence that *hai* projects its own clausal functional structure. However, *hai* and the utterance following it are not syntactically independent of each other. One piece of evidence for the dependency of *hai* and the CP to its right is distributional in that the position of *hai* determines the shape of the clause it associates with. *Hai* may be sentence initial or sentence final. However, the lexicalization of Force as *că* ('that') in the complement CP associated with *hai* depends on the clause initial position of *hai* (19); with *hai* in clause final position, *că* ('that') is cannot be realized. Note, however, that this selectional property is not unique to initial *hai*, but it is shared by other pragmatic markers, verb-based or not (19c).

- (19) a Hai *că* nu te cred.  
*hai* that not you believe-1SG  
 b (\**Că*) nu te cred, hai.  
 that not you believe-1SG *hai*  
 'C'mon, I don't believe you.'  
 c. Sigur/ zău/ fără îndoială *că* nu te cred.  
 Surely/by.God/without doubt that not you believe-1SG  
 '(By God) I definitely/without doubt do not believe you.'

In conclusion, the general properties of *hai*, such as indicated through its distribution, inflection and the word order restrictions, indicate that this item is a particle (vs some sort of functional or lexical verb). Despite its 'particle' status, *hai* is visible to the syntactic computation of the clause, and it is part of the clause – that is, it belongs to a mono-clausal structure, despite its position above the complementizer 'that'.

## 5.2. Matching position and interpretation

An important observation is that *hai* is underspecified in the lexicon. Its interpretation depends on the type of complements it displays and on its position in relation to the utterance. It has been mentioned above that *hai* may function as an enhancer for illocutionary force or as an assessing tool. The examples are repeated for convenience:

- (2) a. Hai să citim.  
*hai* SUBJ read-1PL  
 'C'mon, let's read.'  
 b. Hai *că* este nemaipomenit.  
*hai* that is unbelievable  
 'It is unbelievable, really.'

Although *hai* may the two mentioned readings, they are not interchangeable: the illocutionary reading depends on the presence of an imperative verb (2a), whereas the evaluative reading depends on the presence of a CP-'that'. These examples clearly show that the value of *hai* is read off the syntactic configuration.

Furthermore, *hai* varies its interpretation according to its position in relation to the utterance. In (2), *hai* is clause initial. It may also appear clause final, as in (2'), on the

condition that the intonation is modified. In particular, a break is needed between the utterance and *hai*.

- (2') a. Să citim, hai.  
 SUBJ read-1PL *hai*  
 'Let's read, please.'
- b. #Este nemaipomenit, hai.  
 is unbelievable *hai*  
 'It is unbelievable, really.'

The change in position affects the interpretation of the inter-personal relation: in (2a) the speaker feels entitled to give a command, whereas in (2'a) the speaker negotiates the event with the addressee, mitigating the tone. In (2b) the speaker expresses a personal assessment; in (2'b) the use of *hai* sounds inappropriate, the hearer expecting a different particle in this context, with a more intrinsic evaluative or evidential content (e.g., *zău* 'cross my heart'). The inappropriateness of *hai* may be derived from its position: the hearer cannot reconstruct the CP-'that' configuration since the language does not allow for 'that' initial main clauses.

In conclusion, the interpretation of *hai* is so varied (e.g., Tschizmarova 2005 lists meanings in the order of hundreds in the use of *hai* in the Balkans) because it is not fixed by the semantics but rather, by its location and complementation in the syntactic mapping. While the distribution of *hai* in this mapping is limited, the combination between its location, complementation and the predication it belongs to allows for high proliferations in the compositional meanings.

### 5.3. Co-occurring elements and ordering restrictions

In order to sort out the mapping of *hai* in the clause architecture, we must define its position in relation to other elements that occur in speech acts; notably, the presence of vocatives and of particles expressing the speaker's point of view.

In (15), we show the co-occurrence of *hai* with the particle *vai* ('ah'), which is a 'lamenting' marker expressing the speaker's feelings. This particle may also be considered "verby", insofar as it served for the derivation of a verb: *a (se) văita* ('lament (oneself)'). There are ordering restrictions on the sequencing of *vai* and *hai*: (i) *vai* may only precede *hai* (20a /20b); (ii) The vocative phrase is always adjacent to *hai*, either preceding it (20a) or following it (20c). (iii) A vocative may also precede *vai*, as in (20d), but in this case, the intonation pattern is markedly different, with a prosodic break between the vocative and *vai*, from which we conclude that we are dealing with two utterances.

- (20) a. Vai Dane hai că nu te cred.  
*vai* Dan- VOC *hai* that not you believe-1SG  
 'Ah, Dan, c'mon, I don't believe you.'
- b. \*Dane, vai hai că nu te cred  
 Dan- VOC *vai hai* that not you believe-1SG
- c. Vai, hai Dane că nu te cred.

- vai hai* Dan-VOC that not you believe-1SG  
 ‘Ah, c’mon, Dan, I don’t believe you.’
- d. Dane #. *Vai*, nu te cred.  
 Dan-VOC, *vai* not you believe-1SG  
 ‘Dan, ah, I don’t believe you.’

Although they can both be seen as [V] type elements, there are two differences between the morpho-syntax of *vai* and that of *hai*: (i) Only *hai* may display person/number agreement with the vocative (20e), and (ii) only *hai* can license a *că* (‘that’) indicative clause (20a, c versus 20f). We take the observed distribution of the vocative in (20a-d) as well as the observed restrictions on agreement between the vocative and the particles to indicate that: (i) the vocative is in a local relation with *hai*, not with *vai*; and (ii) the *că* ‘that’ CP is in a sisterhood relation with *hai*, but not with *vai*.

- (20) e. *Vai*(\*ți) fetelor haideți că nu e bine.  
*vai* (ți) girls *haideți* that not is good  
 ‘Ah-ah, girls, this is not good, really.’
- f. *Vai* (\*că) nu te cred, Dane, hai.  
*vai* that not you believe Dan- VOC *hai*  
 ‘Ah, c’mon Dan, I don’t believe you.’

In conclusion, the distribution of these two particles indicates differences in their syntactic position, so that only one is in a local relation with the vocative.

#### 5.4. The cartography of particles

On the basis of data and tests similar to those in Section 5, Hill (2007b) argues that the particles must be in a hierarchical relationship with each other, and proposes that *vai* and *hai* occupy different functional heads; the vocative is licensed in a Spec-head relation with *hai*, as is shown in (21). Her analysis is in line with and indebted to the proposal in Speas & Tenny (2003) to the effect that the speech act layer is mapped as a predicative structure encoding the conversational set-up (who is the speaker, who is the addressee and what is the power relation in the conversation), which is conveyed compositionally in the interpretation of the utterance. In terms of their analysis, the speech act is computed in the same way as the functional ‘little v’.

Based on their proposal,<sup>6</sup> we assume that ForceP is selected by an articulated Speech Act projection headed by the Speech Act (SA) head, with a layered articulation, much as is the case with transitive verbs which project VP and vP. This SA projection is articulated around two shells: the ‘hearer’ shell (SA), analogous with VP, and the ‘speaker’ shell (*sa*), analogous with vP. We tentatively assume, with Hill (2007b) that the particle *hai* is inserted in the lower SA head, which is directly associated with the ‘hearer’. SA takes two arguments: its ‘direct object’, the ForceP complement (which may be introduced by *că* ‘that’), and its ‘indirect object’, the vocative phrase, which is the specifier of SA. This structural articulation captures the privileged relation between



vocatives and injunctive particles, which has been noticed in the descriptive grammars of languages from various genetic groups (e.g., Schadeberg 1990 for Umbundu).

(21) [<sub>saP</sub> [<sub>sa</sub>] [<sub>SAP</sub> VOCATIVE [<sub>SA</sub> *hai*] [<sub>FORCEP</sub> Utterance/ *cǎ* ...]]]

The default order is that in which the vocative precedes *hai*, with *hai* in SA. When the vocative is preceded by *hai* we assume that this is due to *hai* moving up to the higher head *sa*, much in the way that V moves to v. Sentence-final *hai* is derived by the movement of the complement ForceP to the specifier of *sa*, in which case the configuration is ‘passive like’ in lacking the external (speaker) argument.

When *vai* co-occurs with *hai* the order is that in (20a) in which *vai* appears to the left of *hai*. One might propose that *vai* be inserted in the higher speech act head *sa*, resulting in the order in which the vocative is sandwiched between the two particles (20a) but under that analysis, the order in (20c) is problematic because both *hai* and *vai* appear to the left of the vocative. Data such as these either suggest that particles may cluster in one head, in the same way that in many languages clitics can be seen to cluster; or, alternatively, that more than one particle layer may be available. The latter option is exactly the conclusion that is reached by Haegeman (to appear) for WF and which we discuss in the next section.

## 6. Elaborating the speech act layer: The syntax of West Flemish particles

### 6.1. General properties

Haegeman (to appear) shows that the WF verb-based particles are either clause initial or clause final, and cannot appear in the middle field of the clause. This is shown for *né* in (22).

(22) Né, doet (\*né) da (\*né) mo mee!  
*né* do *né* that *né* PRT with  
 ‘Here you are, you can have this!’

WF clauses may display up to two verb-based particles at a time, with either a combination of an initial particle and one final one, or with a combination of two final particles, with specific ordering constraints. (23) illustrates some of the possible and impossible combinations.

(23) a. Né, men artikel is gedoan wè (\*zé).  
*né*, Men artikel is gedoan *zé* (\*wè)  
 b. \*Men artikel is gedoan wè (\*zè) (*né*).

The availability of the particles is partly dependent on clause typing. For instance the particle *wè* is incompatible with questions or sentences with question intonation. This suggests that *wè* has selectional properties w.r.t. its complement.

(24) a. Een z’al een medalie, wè?  
 Have they already a medal, *wè*?

- b Ze zoun al een medalie een wè?

Furthermore, the WF particles qualify as main clause phenomena: for example, initial *né* cannot occur at the LP of the complement clause (25a) and final *né* in (25b) is computed as a main clause particle related to the speaker rather than as an embedded particle related to the ‘embedded speaker’:

- (25) a. \*Je zei [né dat da roare was.]  
           he said *né* that that strange was  
       b. Je zei [dat da roare was] né.

As mentioned above, when initial, the particles precede the first constituent of a V2 clause suggesting that they are ‘outside’ the regular CP/ForceP layer, which accounts for their restricted distribution.

- (25) c. Né, dienen medalie een me a.  
           *né* that medal have we already  
           ‘There we are, the medal is ours.’

Therefore, WF offers additional support for the hypothesis elaborated in Section 5 that the particle heads a layer of structure above CP, and selects CP. The relevant layer encodes properties of the speech act. We have labelled the relevant heads of the speech act layer *sa* and *SA*.

Based on restrictions on the number of co-occurring verb-based particles, as in (23), and, in particular, on the observation that an initial particle (*né*) may co-occur with a final one (*wè*, *zè*), we are led to the conclusion that co-occurring particles do not (necessarily) cluster under one functional head. To accommodate co-occurring particles in WF, and, in particular, the co-occurring initial and final particles, we conclude that two speech act layers must be available. In addition, given the restriction on the number of particles in WF, we provisionally postulate two articulated speech act projections. The observed distributional restrictions on the WF particles provide clues on the internal organization of the functional domain that encodes speech event properties.

## 6.2. Matching position and interpretation

Clause initially, both initial *zé* (with rising intonation) and initial *né* draw attention to the content of the utterance. Clause final *zè*, with falling intonation, has an evidential shade of meaning, qualifying the speaker’s source of evidence for his utterance; hence, it signals his authority with respect to the content of the utterance and with respect to the addressee, thus inspiring more confidence in his interlocutor with respect to the utterance, and making him more likely to pay attention to it and (where relevant) to act upon it. *Wè* is only clause final and also signals the speaker’s position of authority w.r.t. the contents of the utterance and the addressee. Final *wè* cannot co occur with final *zè*:

- (26) a. Zé men artikel is gedoan, zè.  
           *Zé* my article is finished *zè*

- ‘Look, my article is finished, there you are.’
- b. (\*Wè) men artikel is gedoan wè.  
(\*wè) my article is finished wè  
‘My paper is finished, you know.’
- d. Men artikel is gedoan wè (\*zè)/( \* zè) wè.  
my article is finished wè (\*zè)/( \*zè) wè

Attention seeking *né* has the same distribution as initial *zé*, and the two cannot co-occur:

- (27) *Né* (\*zè) men artikel is gedoan.

### 6.3. Co-occurrence in final position and ordering restrictions

The particles *né* and *zé* with rising intonation may be found in initial position, but they may also be found in final position, where they can co occur with just one particle of the ‘final’ type. When particles co-occur in final position, the particle with falling intonation precedes that with rising intonation, and there may only be one particle of each type.

- (28) a. Men artikel is gedoan wè zé/\*zé wè.  
b. Men artikel is gedoan wè né/( \*né wè)  
c. Men artikel is gedoan zè zé/\*zé zè.  
d. Men artikel is gedoan zè né/( \*né zè)

### 6.4. The cartography of the WF particles

#### 6.4.1. Two SAP

Pursuing our hypothesis that the particles under examination here head functional projections, the distribution and the ordering restrictions on the WF particle can be derived on the basis of a structure such as that in (29), in which there are two projections for particles, provisionally labeled SAP1 and SAP2. The linearly final position of the particles in SAP1 follows from movement of CPs to the Specifier position within the particle phrase. (29) offers a first schematic account, to be refined presently. The final position of *wè* in (29b) is derived by movement of the complement CP to its specifier position; the final position of *né* in (29c) is derived by moving the projection headed by (final) *wè* to the specifier of *né*.

- (29) a. [SAP1 *né* [SAP2 *wè* [CP ...]]]  
b. [SAP1 *né* [SAP2 [CP ...] *wè* [CP ...]]]  
c. [SAP1 [SAP2 [CP ...] *wè* [CP ...]] *né* [SAP2 [CP ...] *wè* [CP ...]]]

#### 6.4.2. Vocatives and SAP

A further complication needs to be introduced here. As was the case in R, WF particles interact with vocative phrases, suggesting that here too, the two SA projections must be

further articulated in a structure with two shells, *sa* and *SA*. In WF, vocatives always follow the particle, whether this be initial (30a) or final (30b).

- (30) a. Né Valère, men artikel is gereed (wè).  
 b. \*Valère né, men article is gereed (wè).  
 c. (Né) Men artikel is gereed wè Valère.  
 d. \*(Né) Men artikel is gereed Valère wè.

The different positions of the vocative – initial or final - coincide with a difference in interpretation: the initial vocative has an “appeal” or attention seeking function, aiming at establishing a discourse relation; the final vocative consolidates the already established relation of the speaker with an “addressee” (see also Schegloff 1968 ao).

In line with Hill (2007b), Haegeman (to appear) proposes that, in order to accommodate the vocatives, each of the two SA projections be further articulated, in the same way that we proposed to decompose the speech act projection for R in section 5: the speech act projection is a shell structure, modelled on the structure of vP/VP, where, analogously to a ditransitive V, the SA head selects a complement (ForceP) and has an indirect object (the vocative phrase) as its Specifier. The resulting SA is dominated by a higher layer ‘saP’ (analogous to vP), with the particle moving from *SA* to *sa*, the higher head. Thus the structure in (21) is updated to include a representation of the vocative syntax and the sequence *né* –vocative – CP is schematically represented as follows:

- (31) a [saP [sa né [SAP VOCATIVE [SA ~~né~~ ...[ForceP...

Furthermore, given that two particles can co-occur, Haegeman (to appear) proposes that there are two speech act projections, each articulated in the double shell structure, and each with a specialized discourse function, where *sa1P* dominates *sa2P*. (31b) schematically summarizes our conception of the fully articulated speech event layer: it includes an attention seeking layer (*sa1/SA1P*) and a consolidating/bonding layer (*sa2/SA2P*):

- (31) b [sa1P [sa1 ~~né~~] [SA1P VOC [SA1 ~~né~~]  
 [sa2P [sa2 wè] [SA2P VOC [SA2 ~~wè~~] [ForceP]]]]]]]]

Thus, (32a) with initial *né* and final *wè* is derived as in (32b-c). In (32b) *wè* is merged as SA2, it selects ForceP as its complement and the vocative *Valère* as its Specifier SA2P. *sa1* merges with SA2P: in the same way that V moves to v, the particle *wè* moves to *sa2* and attracts ForceP to its specifier, leading to the linear sequence in which the clause precedes the particle which in turns precedes the vocative. As shown in (32c), the particle *né* is then merged as SA1, the head of a higher speech act projection, which selects saP2 as its complement. Again, *né* moves from SA1 to *sa1*.

- (32) a. Né, k’een a gedoan wè Valère.  
 b. [saP2 ForceP [sa2 wè] [SAP2 Valère [SA2 ~~wè~~] [ForceP]]  
 c. [saP1 [sa1 ~~né~~] [SAP1 [SA1 ~~né~~]

[<sub>saP2</sub> ForceP [<sub>sa2</sub> wè] [<sub>SAP2</sub> Valère [<sub>SA2</sub> wè] [~~ForceP~~]]]]

The final position of *né* in (33a) is derived on the basis of (32c) above, by further moving saP2 in (32c) to the Specifier of sa1, headed by *né*, as shown in (33b):

- (33) a K'een a gedoan wè Valère né.  
 b [<sub>saP1</sub> [<sub>saP2</sub> ForceP [<sub>sa2</sub> wè] [<sub>SAP2</sub> Valère [<sub>SA2</sub> wè] [~~ForceP~~]]]  
 [<sub>sa1</sub> né] [<sub>SAP1</sub> [<sub>SA1</sub> né] [<sub>saP2</sub>]]]

## 7. Conclusions

In this paper we have examined to what extent the distribution and interpretation of so called discourse particles can be captured in terms of a syntactic model along the lines of the cartographic approach (Cinque & Rizzi 2010).

Data from two unrelated languages support the view that discourse markers are computed syntactically at the edge of clauses, more precisely, outside what is usually referred to as the CP domain. Evidence for the syntactic proposal comes from various restrictions on the particles, which are determined by clause type, morpho-syntactic manipulations for agreement and mood marking, and from their distribution in relation to their complement CPs.

Following pioneering work by Speas & Tenny (2003) we have elaborated a structure according to which the syntactic configuration for the mapping of the speech act layer has a layered shell structure, similar to that elaborated for vP/VP. This approach is also justified by the intrinsic [V] property of the particles examined and their licensing function in relation to vocative phrases. In this respect, the analyses proposed for R and WF coincide in their general outline.

At a finer-grained level, Haegeman's (to appear) analysis of WF suggests that the predicative shell for the speech act particles is two-tiered (vs. the one-tiered proposal in Hill 2007b). This two-tiered structure is better able to represent the relevant distribution of particles, vocatives and the complement clause. Thus, inclusion of the WF data in the analysis has led to a refinement to Hill's original proposal: while in the latter two different groups of particles were merged as a cluster in one predicative shell, the WF data indicate that co-occurring particles project separately, resulting in a tighter matching of semantics and syntax: the higher SA projection encodes the setting up of the discourse layer ('attention seeking'), while the lower layer encodes the consolidation of the discourse relation ('bonding'). This refinement is in line with the cartographic line of enquiry as in Cinque & Rizzi (2010), which advocates the syntactization of the interpretive domains and extending it to the speech act layer of the clause, in line with a tradition first set out in Ross (1970).

## References

- BAZZANELLA, C. 2001. I segnali discorsivi. In L. Renzi, G. Salvi & A. Cardinaletti (eds.), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, Vol. III, 225-257. Bologna: il

- Mulino.
- BLAKEMORE, D. 1987. *Semantic Constraints on Relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- BLAKEMORE, D. 2002. *Relevance and linguistic meaning: The Semantics and pragmatics of discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CARDINALETTI, A. 2010. On the syntactic status of (German and Italian) modal particles.
- CHOMSKY, N. 2001. Derivation by Phase. In M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. 1-52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- CINQUE, G. & L. RIZZI (eds). 2010. *Mapping Spatial PPs. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures 6*. NY: Oxford University Press. 51-65.
- CONIGLIO, M. 2007. German modal particles in root and embedded clauses. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 32, 13-37.
- CONIGLIO, M. 2009. Italian modal particles as a root phenomenon. ZAS conference on Root phenomena 2-4 September 2009.
- CROITOR-BALACIU, B. 2006. Interjecția. In: Institutul de Cercetări Lingvistice (eds.), *Gramatica Limbii Române*. Editura Academiei, Bucharest.
- GOBBO, del F. & POLETTI, C. 2008. A typology of sentential particles. *Giornata di Dialettologia*, Università di Padua, 20th June 2008. Handout.
- HAEGEMAN, L. 1984. Interjections and phrase structure. *Linguistics* 22, 41-49.
- HAEGEMAN, L. 1993. The interpretation of the particle *da* in West Flemish. *Relevance theory* (2). eds. D. Wilson and N. Smith. *Lingua* 90, 111-128.
- HAEGEMAN, L. (to appear). The cartography of discourse markers in West Flemish. *Cambridge Occasional Papers in Linguistics*.
- HALE, K. & J. KEYSER. 1993. On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations. In *The View from Building 20: Essays in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, ed. K. Hale & S. J. Keyser, 53-109. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- HILL, V. 2007a. Romanian adverbs and the pragmatic field. *The Linguistic Review* 24, 61-86.
- HILL, V. 2007b. Vocatives and the pragmatics-syntax interface. *Lingua* 117, 2077-2105.
- HILL, V. 2008. Pragmatics markers as syntactic heads: a case study from Romanian. In Grohmann, K. & P. Panagiotidis (eds.), *Syntaxfest Cyprus Conference*. 237-265. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge University Scholars Press.
- KAYNE, R. S. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- KIRSNER, R. & V. van HEUVEN. 1996. Boundary tones and the semantics of the Dutch particles *hè*, *hoor*, *zeg* and *joh*. *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1996*, eds. C. Cremers & M. den Dikken, 133-146. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 133-146.
- KLOOTS, H. 2007. "Allee, wat was het weer?" Het tussenwerpsel *allee* in spontaan gesproken Standaardnederlands. *Over Taal* 46, 1: 17-19.
- KRATZER, A. 1999. Beyond 'Oops' and 'Ouch'. How descriptive and expressive meaning interact. Paper presented at the Cornell Conference on Theories of Context Dependency, 26 March 1999.
- MIYAGAWA, S. 2010. Agreements that occur mainly in the main clause. Paper presented at the Main Clause Phenomena workshop. Ghent University/GISt: September 2010.
- MORO, A. 2003. Notes on Vocative Case: a case study in clause structure. *Romance Languages and Linguistic theory*. eds. J. Quer et al, 247-261. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- MUNARO, N. & POLETTI, C. 2004. Ways of clause typing. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 27, 87-105.
- MUNARO, N. & POLETTI, C. 2009. Sentential particles and clausal typing in Venetan dialects. *Dislocated elements in discourse*. eds. B. Shaer, P. Cook, W. Frey & C. Maienborn, 173-199. New York & London: Routledge.
- OYHARÇABAL, B. 1993. Verb agreement with non arguments: On Allocutive Agreement. In: José Ignacio Hualde and Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), *Generative Studies in Basque Linguistics*, 89-114. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- PENELLO, N. & CHINELLATO, P. 2008a. Le dinamiche della distribuzione di *ciò* in Veneto. Breve saggio di microvariazione. *L'Italia dei dialetti*, Proceedings of the Dialectology Meeting of Sappada/Plodn – (2007). ed. G. Marcato, 111-118. Padova: Unipress.
- PENELLO, N. & CHINELLATO, P. 2008b. On the distribution of the particle *ciò* in Veneto dialects. Talk presented at the Workshop “*Looking for Particles*” (Venice, 4 February 2008).
- POLETTI, C. & R. ZANUTTINI (2009) Sentential Particles and Remnant Movement. To appear in P. Benincà and N. Munaro (eds.) *Mapping the Left Periphery*. Oxford University Press.
- RIZZI, L. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In: Haegeman, L. (ed.), *Elements of Grammar: Handbook of Generative Syntax*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp. 281–339.
- RIZZI, L. 2004. Locality and left periphery. In: Belletti, A. (ed.), *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures* 3. 223-251. NY: OUP.
- ROSS, J. R. 1970. On Declarative Sentences. *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, ed. R. A. Jacobs and Peter S. Rosenbaum. Waltham, Mass.: Ginn.
- SCHADEBERG, T. 1990. A Sketch of Umbundu. Ruediger Koeppe Verlag, Koeln.
- SCHEGLOFF, E. A. 1968. Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist* 70, 1075-1095.
- SPEAS, M. 2004. Evidentiality, logophoricity and the syntactic representation of pragmatic features. *Lingua* 114, 255-277.
- SPEAS, M. & TENNY, C. 2003. Configurational properties of point of view roles. *Asymmetry in grammar*. ed. A.-M. Di Sciullo, 315-344. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- TANGHE, S. 2010. Pues *oye*, ¡*Vaya* cajón de sastre! Spanish deverbial interjections revisited. Lingforum presentation, Ghent University
- TSCHIZMAROVA, I., 2005. The analysis of the Bulgarian discourse marker *hajde*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37, 1143–1163.
- WILSON, D. 2010A. Word meaning, concepts and procedures. Conference on Word meaning. University of Oslo, 2-3.9.2010
- WILSON, D. 2010B. Modality and the Conceptual-Procedural Distinction. Manuscript UCL/ CSMN, University of Oslo

---

<sup>1</sup> Liliane Haegeman’s research is funded by the FWO 2009-Odysseus-Haegeman-G091409. We thank the audience of ONLI for their comments. Thanks to Raffaella Folli for help with the Italian data and to Sanne Tanghe for help with the Romance data. Needless to say, none of them can be held responsible for the way we have used their input.

---

2        Though we concentrate on verb-based particles, we assume that discourse particles which have a similar distribution to those discussed here will be amenable to a similar analysis. For instance, the WF particle *da* discussed in Haegeman (1993) is probably not verb based, but it patterns with the sentence final particle *wè* discussed here.

3        The judgements vary across speakers. For instance, Raffaella Folli (p.c.) does accept *sapete* both in initial and in final position; the same speaker does not have *sa* at all. She also points out that there is an agreement condition on the ‘particle’ and the subject of the clause in that with a singular subject *sapete* would be ungrammatical:

- (i)        Sai, non ti sei comportato bene (sai/\*sapete).  
            *sai non* you be-2sg behave-part well (*sai*)

The variation observed here should be subject to future research.

4        Note that *cã* ‘that’ may be either an embedded clause or an adjunct (causal) clause.

5        Observe that in this respect it is strikingly similar to Flemish *alle*, which derives from French *allez*, the imperative of *aller*, ‘go’.

6        While Speas and Tenny equate the SA layer with the high modals in Cinque’s (1999) proposal, we remain non-committal concerning this particular aspect of the analysis.