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WEST FLEMISH VERB-BASED DISCOURSE MARKERS
AND THE ARTICULATION OF THE SPEECH ACT LAYER*

Liliane Haegeman, Ghent University

Abstract. This paper focuses on the West Flemish discourse markers located at the edge of the clause. After a brief survey of the distribution of discourse markers in WF, the paper proposes a syntactic analysis of the discourse markers né and wè. Based on the distribution of these discourse markers, of vocatives and of dislocated DPs, an articulated speech act layer is elaborated which corroborates the proposals in Hill (2007b). It is postulated that there is a syntactic relation between particles used as discourse markers and vocatives. The paper offers further support for the grammaticalization of pragmatic features at the interface between syntax and discourse and for the hypothesis that the relevant computation at the interface is of the same nature as that in Narrow Syntax.

1. Introduction

The empirical focus of this paper is a set of particles that appear on the clausal edge and that are used as discourse markers (DM) (cf. Fischer 2006) in West Flemish (WF), a dialect of Dutch, and also in the Flemish tussentaal (“between-language”). Apart from Haegeman (1984, 1993), which discusses the DM da, the empirical data presented here have, to the best of my knowledge, not been discussed systematically in the generative
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literature. The goal of this paper is twofold. The first part presents a brief overview of the distribution of WF sentence-initial and sentence-final DMs. The second part of the paper analyzes the distribution of two specific DMs: nè(m) (‘so there’, ‘take that’) and wè (‘you know’), and their relation to vocatives. On the basis of the distribution of these two particles a hypothesis is elaborated concerning the syntactic representation of speech acts. The conclusions reached in the current paper are very much in line with work by Hill (2007b).

The paper is organised as follows: Section 2 offers a survey of a number of DMs surfacing at the right or left edge of the WF utterance. I discuss their etymology, interpretation and distribution relative to the utterance and relative to each other. In section 3, I outline the core data. Section 4 provides a first analysis based on proposals in the literature. Section 5 relates the proposed analysis to work by Hill (2007b). Section 6 summarises the paper and discusses issues for future research.

2. West Flemish particles: a survey

2.1. Position

Like Dutch particles (van der Wouden 2002, 2009, Schelfhout, Coppen, Oostdijk & van der Silk 2005), WF particles are mainly found in two areas of the clause: (i) in the middle field, i.e. IP-externally, and (ii) on the edge of the clause, either preceding the clause or following it, i.e. the DMs. I do not discuss WF middle field particles here: they seem at first sight to have the same syntactic and semantic properties as the better studied Dutch and German modal particles (cf. Schelfhout et al 2005, Coniglio 2007, del Gobbo & Poletto 2008, etc.). I focus exclusively on the WF DMs at the clausal edge, which typically encode the speaker’s attitude with respect to the (contents of) the speech act and/or with respect to the addressee. As will be shown in section 2, most of these DMs derive from verbs (see Cardinaletti 2011 for a brief discussion of verb-based particles in Italian). All the DMs discussed are ‘optional’ in that an utterance remains grammatical if a DM is removed, but deletion of the DM results in a change in interpretation. As the final DM forms an intonational unit with the preceding clause (see Deroey. Needless to say, all aberrations are my own. The work presented here is part of the FWO project
van Kirsner & van Heuven 1996 for intonation patterns), removing the DM requires adjusting the intonational contour of the clause.

(1) offers some examples. Because it is difficult to translate DMs, I retain the original form of the DM in the glosses. The idiomatic translation tries to convey the discourse effect achieved by the DM. DMs may be initial or final (see also Table 1). Exclusively initial DMs are *mo(r), allè, gow, soei* (1a,b); exclusively final DMs are *da* (see Haegeman 1984, 1993), while *wè/wei, zulle* (1c,d); ¹ *zè* and *né* may precede or follow the clause.

(1) a. **Mo/Allè/gow** m’ een toch al een medalie.  

    **Mo/Allè/gow** we have PART already a medal  

    ‘Come one, we already have a medal.’

d. **Zè/né, m’ een al een medalie.**  

    **zè/né, we have already a medal**  

    ‘Look, we already have a medal.’

e. **M’ een al een medalie zè/né.**  

    **we have already a medal zè/nè**  

    ‘We already have a medal, look.’
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¹ WF also has a set of final particles derived from adverbs: *zeker* (‘certainly’), *misschien* (‘perhaps’), *trouwens* (‘actually’) etc. Their interpretation and distribution is probably like that in Standard Dutch. For discussion of the standard Dutch equivalents see van der Wouden (2009). I hope to look at these in later work.
f. Een-ze al een medalie da?

have they already a medal *da

‘Do they already have a medal?’

2.2. Clause type

DMs are not clause typers; they co-occur with clauses that are independently typed. Table 1 summarizes the compatibility of DMs with clause types and also the possibility of using them in isolation. Some DMs (mo, allore, gow) are insensitive to clause type; other DMs are sensitive to clause type. Ze (and its variant ghè) belongs to the latter group: it co-occurs mainly with declaratives, and with some imperatives. As for interrogatives: only rhetorical questions seem possible with zè/ghè (hence my !(✓)). Wè and zulle typically co-occur with declaratives and imperatives and are incompatible with interrogatives. *Da essentially occurs with interrogatives (Haegeman 1984, 1993, but see Cappelle 2003 and (6a) below)).

Table 1: Distribution of particles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Clause type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soei</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mo</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allè, gow</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>né</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wè/zulle</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zè/ ghè</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A descriptive generalisation that emerges from the WF data and which has not previously been noticed is that only a DM that can be initial (mo, allore, gow, soei, zè, ghè, né) can also constitute an utterance by itself. Final DMs da, we, zulle cannot appear in isolation – i.e. as ‘interjections’. The generalisation extends to Dutch and to the Italian dialects analysed by Penello & Chinellato (2008a,b). Anticipating the discussion, the outcome of my analysis is that only DMs that are merged in the higher Speech Act Projection (cf. section 5) can be used as interjections. I hope to return to this point in future work.
(2)–(5) complement (1), illustrating additional clause types for the DMs. (2) shows the initial DMs *mo, gow, allè* with an interrogative and with an imperative. (3) illustrates *né* with an interrogative and with an imperative. (4) shows that *wè* and *zulle* are compatible with imperatives, but not with interrogatives. (5) shows *zè* with imperatives and with interrogatives.

(2) a. Mo/gow/allè, peinz-je gie da?

mo/gow/allè  think-you you that

‘Come on, do you really think that?’

b. Mo/alle/gow, geeft dat ier!

mo/alle/gow,  give that here

‘Come on, give me that!’

(3) a. Né, is-ze nie thus?

né  is-she not home

‘Isn’t she in?’

b. Is ze nie thus, né?

is she not home  né

‘Isn’t she in?’

c. Doe ’t mee, né.

do it with,  né

‘Just take it with you, don’t worry!’

(4) a. Houkt ze mo, wè/zulle.

Keep them PART wè/zulle

‘Don’t worry, you can keep them.’

b. * Een-me al een medalie wè/zulle?

have we already a medal  wè/zulle
(5) a. Kyk/lustert (een kee) zè!
    Look/listen (PART) zè
    ‘Just look/listen.’

    b. Zie-j t neu zè?!
    know you it now zè
    ‘Do you understand/see now ?!’

The DM *da* is typically used with interrogatives (Haegeman 1984, 1993), but it can also be used with declaratives (Cappelle 2003). This is shown in (6a). Such declaratives have the rising intonation associated with questions, and (6a) as a whole is a request for confirmation and clarification of the content of the clause that precedes *da*. *Da* is incompatible with imperatives (6b).

(6) a. Ze zou al een medailie een da?
    she will-PAST-3SG already a medal have *da*
    ‘I hear she already have a medal.’

    b. * Geeft da mo da!
    give that PART *da*

2.3. Interpretation

2.3.1. *DM express speaker’s attitude*

Though the precise interpretive properties of the DMs are hard to pin down, they all share the following properties:

(a) DMs are not truth-functional. For instance, all of (1a), (1c), (1d), and (1e) above share the propositional content ‘we already have a medal’. Questioning cannot focus on a DM, DMs are inaccessible to dissent or to consent, they are outside the scope of negation and tense.
(b) DMs are ‘conversational’ or ‘interactional’ and imply “the obligatory (and largely implicit) presence of the entities involved in the specific communicative situation (speaker and, especially, hearer)” (Munaro 2006:7, 2010). The interactional role of the DM is very clear with né. In initial position, when associated with declaratives, this DM initiates the exchange, it draws the hearer’s attention to the utterance; in final position, it can be used to conclude an exchange, as it were ‘transferring’ the content of the utterance to the addressee, in which case the presence of né, in concluding the exchange, may imply defiance (‘Take that!’) or helplessness (‘That’s how it is!’).

(c) DMs are ‘expressive’ (Kratzer 1999), or ‘illocutionary’/‘interpersonal’. The DM may express “the mental state of the speaker, which can be surprise, curiosity, desire, disappointment, anger and so on” (Munaro 2006:7, 2010). Several DMs qualify the already established relation between speaker and hearer: for instance, wè and zulle are used to ‘profile the speaker-hearer relationship’ (Kirsner & van Heuven 1996 and references cited): they convey that the speaker is in a relation of authority with respect to the hearer and to the content of his utterance. The speaker uses these DMs to underline and reinforce the propositional content of his utterance, suggesting his endorsement is based on his own experience, and (thus), depending on the content of the associated proposition, reassure his addressee or threaten him (cf. (8)).

(d) DMs are deictic. They are directly correlated with the speech act: they may express a response to a linguistic event or to a non-linguistic event which is manifest in the speech situation. The DMs examined in this paper are not discourse-bound in a narrow sense in that they do not need to be used in a response to a preceding utterance.

2.3.2. Etymology and interpretation: verb-based DMs

According to the descriptive literature, many of the WF DMs in initial or final position are verb-based. I briefly summarize their etymology as discussed in the literature here.

---

3 With Hill (2007b:2009) I assume that the concept ‘utterance’ corresponds to ForceP.
4 At first sight, (West) Flemish wè and zulle correspond to Dutch hoor (Kirsner & van Heuven 1996).
5 WF also uses kom (‘come’), kyk (‘look’), and zeg (‘say’), with bleached semantics. These particles, which are also either initial or final, can also be used in isolation and are set off intonationally from the sentence with which they combine. Possibly they (always?) constitute separate utterances. Thanks to Ton
According to De Bo (1892:639), the WF DM nè is derived from the imperative neem (‘take’) of nemen (‘take’). To present-day dialect speakers, the etymological connection between nè and the verb nemen, is not synchronically apparent, because, though nemen exists in the standard language, in the dialect the verb used to express the relevant sense is not nemen but pakken (‘take’). That De Bo’s analysis of nè is on the right track is suggested by the fact that in some other dialects the form né alternates with ném.

Flemish né(m) is analogous to French tiens (‘take’), which may also convey surprise, to Veneto ciapa from V ciapar (‘take from me’), which is also used sometimes as a particle expressing defiance (Penello p.c.) and to Italian toh (‘take’). WF also uses tiens (or tiens tiens), borrowed from French, as a DM to express surprise:

(7) a. Tiens, m’ een al een medalie.
   tiens we have already a medal
   ‘We already have a medal.’

b. M’ een al een medalie, tiens.
   we have already a medal tiens
   ‘We already have a medal.’

According to Ryckeboer (1986), we7 has developed either from weet je (lit. ‘know you’),8 or from wil je (lit. ‘want you’/ ‘will you’). The attested examples in (8a) and (8b), one dialectal and one from the tussentaal, illustrate wè used to underline that the speaker has personal experience of the content of the proposition conveyed in a statement and hence expects the addressee to accept what she/he is saying. This wè has falling intonation. In (8a), the speaker was discussing travel experience abroad. (8a) was followed by an illustration by the same speaker of similar problems experienced in

---

van der Wouden for discussion. Verb-based DMs are also found in French (tiens, dis (donc), and in standard Dutch (hoor, zeg, kijk). For Italian see Penello & Chinellato (2008a,b), Poggi (1995) and also Cardinaletti (2011). See also Hill (2007b:2091-2) on the spread of Turkish hai in Slavic and Balkan languages.

6 Standard Dutch verbs derived from nemen are also replaced by those derived from pakken: opnemen (‘record’) for instance, is oppakken, and innemen (‘take in’) is inpakken.

7 Flemish wè and zulle correspond to Dutch hoor (‘hear’). See Kirsner & van Heuven (1996) for the latter.
Belgium. In (8b), the speaker is explaining problems for academics in publishing, and in particular for those who, like herself, work on French linguistics. By using wè the speaker implies that she ‘knows what she is talking about’ and hence reinforces the reliability of the content of the utterance which it follows. With imperatives (8c), wè conveys that the speaker has the authority to perform the relevant speech act (order, advice) with respect to the addressee (and expects the addressee to respond appropriately).

(8) a. Je keut dat ier ook tegenkomen wè, zukken dingen.
    you can that here also meet-with wè such things
    ‘These things happen here too.’ (WF speaker, 13.10.08, overheard on the train)

b. Voor mensen die met Frans bezig zijn is dat anders
    for people who with French busy are is that different
    wè.
    wè
    ‘For people working on French, things are different, you know.’
    (Tussentaal, KL, WF speaker, 21.10.08, 18.30 telephone conversation)

c. Zet je mo wè.
    sit you PRT wè
    ‘Do sit down.’

Zulle is reported to be derived from the combination of modal zul and the second person pronoun (zul je ‘shall you’) and has a similar interpretation to wè. Zulle is widely used in the tussentaal.

According to De Brabandere (1999:528), zè is derived from the imperative of zien (‘see’). Anecdotal evidence shows that speakers still associate zè with zien. In subtitles on Flemish TV-channels, dialectal zè is rendered as zie (‘see’). French voice (lit. ‘look here’) decomposes into voi- (‘see’) and ci (‘here’). The (archaic) Dutch analogue of voici is zie hier (lit: ‘see here’). Ziehier in turn corresponds to hierzie in the

---

8 The DM witte (‘you know’) in the Antwerp dialect does not have exactly the same distribution as WF
tussentaal, and to WF hierzè, which consists of hier (‘here’) and zè. The tussentaal analogue of zè is zie (9).

(9) Ik ga nu weer gaan verbeteren zie.
    ‘I am off to do some more corrections.’ (MvH, female speaker 05.02.2009, 13.30)

Initial zè, with rising intonation, is used to draw the addressee’s attention. Final zè has two uses. With rising intonation it is used to draw the addressee’s attention. With falling intonation, the function of zè resembles that of wè: it has an evidential function and signals that the discourse context provides direct or indirect evidence for the content of the utterance. Like with wè, this use of zè is implicated in bonding between speaker and hearer: by its implication that there is independent evidence, zè reinforces the reliability of the content of the associated utterance. Though I will not develop the syntax of zè here, it is relevant to point out that two occurrences of final zè may co-occur as illustrated in (10). In (10a), initial zè with a rising intonation is attention-seeking and final zè with a falling intonation is ‘evidential’ in the sense described above. In (10b) the first leftmost occurrence of zè has falling intonation and is evidential, and the second occurrence (with rising intonation) is attention-seeking.

(10) a. Zè, k’een gedoan zè.
    ‘I have finished, see.’

    b. K’een gedoan zè, zè.

Injunctive gow (‘come on’) is reported to derive from the verb gaan (‘go’) + weg (‘away’) (De Bo 1892:300; Desnerk 1972:52). Thus gow would be parallel to the DM allé, which derives from the imperative of the French verb aller (‘go’). Gow and allé are
used as injunctives and are widespread in the Flemish dialects and in the *tussentaal* (Kloots 2007).\(^9\)

2.4. *The distribution of the Discourse Markers*

The DMs we are concerned with in this paper are restricted to root clauses and are excluded from the left periphery of embedded clauses (11). Final DMs always scope over the root clause. For instance, *da* cannot be associated with an embedded domain (12).

\[(11)* \text{Je zei né dat da roare was.} \quad \text{He say-PAST-3SG né that that strange be-PAST-3SG}\]

\[(12)* \text{Je vroeg wanneer/ of dan ’k gingen veruzen} \quad \text{he ask-PAST-3SG when/ whether that-1SG I go-PAST-1SG move-house da.}\]

Initial DMs precede declarative subject-initial (13a) or non-subject-initial root V2 clauses (13b). The DM cannot occur in a medial position. The DM also precedes a root question, whether it be a *wh*-question (14a) or a *yes no* question (14b), and it precedes imperatives. Final *wè* precedes, and final *né* follows, a dislocated DP (15a)-(15b); final *zè* can either precede or follow such material (15c). I will return to this point in section 4, where I will argue that there are two positions for final DMs, one to the left of a dislocated DP and one to the right.

\[(13)a. \text{Né, m’ een (*né) al een medalie.} \quad \text{né we have né already a medal}\]

\[\text{‘I say, we have a medal!’}\]

---

\(^9\) *Gow* and *allé* are similar to Turkish *hai*, which has spread to Balkan and Slavic languages (cf. Hill
b. Né, dienen medalie (*né) een me (*né) a.
   né that medal né have we né already
   ‘There we are, that medal is ours.’

(14) a. Né, wat (*né) ee- j (*né) gie (*né) doa?
   né what né have-you né you né there
   ‘What is that you’ve got there?’

b. Né, is (*né) da (*né) van jun?
   né is né that né of you
   ‘Is that yours?’

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

(15)a. ’t Is gereed wè, men artikel.
   it is ready wè my paper
   ‘My paper is ready, you know.’

b. ’t Is gereed men artikel, né

c. T’is gereed (zè), men artikel (zè).

3. A pilot study: WF né and wè

3.1. The central data
In the remainder of this paper, I set out a framework for the syntactic analysis of the WF DMs, né and wè, illustrated in (16) and (17). Future work will examine to what extent the analysis can be extended to the other DMs in WF and cross-linguistically.

Né can be either initial (16a) or final (16b), and it has rising intonation. In (16a), né initiates the utterance and focuses the addressee’s attention to the content of the utterance. In (16b), né winds up the utterance and ‘transfers’ it to the addressee. The DM wè, with falling intonation, is necessarily final (17); wè qualifies the speaker-hearer relation, establishing that the speaker has the authority (with respect to the hearer as well as with respect to the content of the utterance) to make the utterance.

(16)

a. Né, men artikel is gedoan.
   né  my paper is done
   ‘There we go: my paper is finished.’

b. Men artikel is gedoan, né.

(17)

a. *Wè, men artikel is gedoan.
   wè  my paper is done

b. Men artikel is gedoan wè.

When né and wè co-occur, their distribution is as shown in (18). (18a) illustrates the split pattern: né precedes the clause and wè follows it. The opposite split order is ungrammatical (18b). When both DMs follow the clause, né must be to the right of wè (18c,d). Since wè must follow the clause, any alternatives with wè in initial position are excluded (18e).

(18)

a. Né, men artikel is gedoan wè.

b. *Wè, men artikel is gedoan né.

c. Men artikel is gedoan wè né.
d. *Men artikel is gedoan né wè.

e. *Né wè/#Wè né men artikel is gedoan.

It is important to also briefly turn to the interaction with other DMs because this reveals that, when final, the DMs né and wè pattern differently. Both final né and final wè can co-occur with final zè: however, né follows zè (19a,b), while wè precedes zè (19c,d).

The function of zè differs in the two cases. In (19a) zè, with falling intonation, has its ‘evidential’ function, corresponding to the leftmost instantiation of zè in (10b) and in (15c). In (19c), with rising intonation, zè has the attention-focusing use, corresponding to the rightmost instantiation of zè in (10b) and in (15c). So final né is in complementary distribution with final attention-drawing zè, and final wè is in complementary distribution with final ‘evidential’ zè.

(19)a. Men artikel is gedoan zè né.

b. *Men artikel is gedoan né zè.

c. Men artikel is gedoan wè zè

d. *Men artikel is gedoan zè wè.

3.2. Only two positions for DMs

Though final né can co-occur with final zè (19a) and with final wè (18c), and though final wè can also co-occur with final zè (19c), the three DMs cannot co-occur, regardless of the orders (20). (20b) and (20d) are acceptable with né clearly set off from the following segment and I would analyze these as involving an isolated interjection. (20) suggests that in the unmarked case there are just two slots for final DMs. I will leave the full analysis of zè for future work.
(20)a. *Men artikel is gedoan wè zè né.

b. Men artikel is gedoan wè zè. Né!

c. ??* Né, men artikel is gedoan wè zè.

d. Né! Men artikel is gedoan wè zè.

3.3. The syntax of discourse markers

My analysis of the WF DMs né and wè is inspired by seminal work on particles by Munaro & Poletto (2003) and will prove striking confirmation for the hypothesis of Hill (2007a,b) on the syntactic representation of the speech act. Munaro & Poletto (2003, 2009) were the first to propose that particles head functional projections and may attract the clause they select to their specifier. They propose that particles head functional projections in the CP layer and that, when final, they attract their clausal complement to their specifier. Observe that the derivation in (21) violates the anti-locality condition on movement in that a complement is moved to the specifier of the head that selects it (cf. Abels 2003, Grohmann 2003, Aboh 2004). I return to this point in section 4.2 below.

(21) [FP Int-ForcePᵢ, [F⁺ particle][Int-ForcePᵣ]] (Munaro & Poletto 2009:286)

As already noted, WF initial DMs precede the initial constituent of a V2 root clause and they cannot be embedded. If we assume, in terms of Rizzi’s split CP, that the initial constituent in a V2 clause occupies SpecFocP or SpecTopP for non-subject-initial V2 and SpecFinP for subject-initial V2 (see Haegeman 1996, van Craenenbroeck & Haegeman 2007), we might propose that the Flemish DM is merged in ForceP, the topmost projection of the left periphery. However, at least two problems arise for this proposal. First, WF DMs are not clause typers: they do not determine the illocutionary force of the clause they associate with; some DMs select for a clause which has a

---

10 See Munaro (2006:9-10, (43)) for an update of the analysis.
particular Force. Secondly, it is usually assumed that there is one projection ForceP, which types the clause, while in WF two DMs can co-occur, suggesting that two projections are involved. Differently from what is proposed for the clause-typing particles discussed for Northern Italian dialects (Munaro & Poletto 2003, 2009, Munaro 2006), let us assume that the lower WF DM selects ForceP (see also Hill 2007a:80 (22), 2007b for similar proposals based on Romanian), and that the higher DM selects the projection of the lower DM. I will revise this initial hypothesis on the basis of additional data. I label the projections headed by DMs ‘PartP’, but this does not imply that I take a stance on the validity of postulating a category ‘particle’.

There have been a number of proposals in the literature that postulate a functional domain above ForceP as the interface between the clause and the discourse and that “sorts out the discourse setting for the utterance” (Hill 2007a:78). The labels for such projections come in two ‘flavours’. Some of these labels bring to the fore the performative aspect of speech acts and the anchoring of the utterance in the discourse. For instance, Benincà (2001) labels this domain DiscourseP (cf. also Garzonio 2004), Hill (2006:180) uses the label PragP, Hill (2007a,b) proposes an articulated Speech Act Projection (‘SAP’), a point to which I return in section 5. Other labels reflect the speaker’s relation to the utterance. For instance, Speas & Tenny (2003), Speas (2004) and Tenny (2006) associate the high projection with modal values (see also Hill 2007a); based on Chinese data Paul (this volume) proposes the label Attitude. That two types of labelling are proposed may not be accidental. As already suggested above, WF offers evidence for postulating two projections on the interface between clause and discourse, which will be discussed in more detail in section 5.

4. Speech act syntax

4.1. Sentence-final DMs: a spec-head relation?

Starting from Munaro & Poletto’s work, let us assume that DMs select a clausal complement (here labelled CP), and that final DMs attract the clause to their specifier.
With *né*, attraction is optional (22a,b). With *wè*, it is mandatory (22c). Since two DMs can co-occur either in a split configuration, with *né* initial and *wè* final, or, in a configuration with both DMs final, with *wè* preceding *né*, we conclude that two projections must be available, where *né* preceding the projection headed by *wè* (23a), deriving the split order. When *né* attracts its complement to its specifier, the two DMs will be final, with *wè* preceding *né*.

(22)

- (22a) \[ [FP \left[ F° \; \text{né} \right] \left[ CP \; CP \right] ] \]
- (22b) \[ [FP \; CP \left[ F° \; \text{né} \right] \left[ CP \; CP \right] ] \]
- (22c) \[ [FP \; CP \left[ F° \; \text{wè} \right] \left[ CP \; CP \right] ] \]

(23)

- (23a) \[ [FP_1 \; \left[ F_1° \; \text{né} \right] \left[ FP_2 \; CP_1 \left[ F_2° \; \text{wè} \right] \left[ CP \; CP \right] \right] ] \]
- (23b) \[ [FP_1 \; \left[ FP_2 \; CP_1 \left[ F_2° \; \text{wè} \right] \left[ CP \; CP \right] \right] \left[ F_1° \; \text{né} \right] \left[ CP \; CP \right] ] \]

4.2. DMs and vocatives

As it stands, (23) leads to the prediction that (i) initial *né* will be adjacent to the clause it is associated with, (ii) final *wè* and *né* will be adjacent to the fronted CP, and (iii) final *wè* and *né* will be adjacent. A problem for the analysis is that, like (21), (22c) and (23b) violate anti-locality conditions on movement.

When we examine the distribution of vocatives in relation to DMs, the adjacency prediction is confirmed for the relation between *wè* and the fronted clausal constituent, as shown in (24a) and (24b): sentence-final *wè* cannot be separated from the clause it modifies by a vocative, which has to follow *wè*:

(24)

- *Men artikel is gereed Valère wè.*
- *My paper is ready Valère wè*

---

11 In section 5, I will propose an analysis according to which the optionality is be apparent.
b. Men artikel is gereed wè, Valère.

The adjacency prediction is, however, not confirmed for né, neither in initial nor in final position. With initial né, the order in (23a) is hard to reconcile with the head-complement relation between né and the clause postulated in (22a). Final wè is right-adjacent to the clause to its left and immediately precedes the vocative. We have already seen that final né patterns differently from final wè in relation to the DM zè, suggesting they occupy a different position (19). This is confirmed by the distribution of the final DMs in relation to vocatives: while wè precedes a final vocative, né may either precede or follow a final vocative. In (25b), the particle is a separate prosodic unit, and the vocative is prosodically associated with the preceding clause, while in (25c), the vocative forms a prosodic unit with the DM. According to (23b), final né and final wè should be adjacent. This prediction is not confirmed: a vocative will preferably be found between the two particles (25d).

(25)a. Né Valère, men artikel is gereed.

né Valère, my paper is ready

b. Men artikel is gereed, Valère, né.

c. Men artikel is gereed, né Valère.

d. Men artikel is gereed wè Valère né.

For completeness’ sake, note that in the split pattern with initial né, the vocative follows either né (26a) or wè (26b) and that the vocative can also precede the clause with final wè (26c).

(26)a. Né Valère, men artikel is gereed wè.

b. Né men artikel is gereed wè Valère
c. Valère, men artikel is gereed wè.

(27) schematically summarizes the distribution of the DMs in relation to the vocative:

(27) a. \( \text{né} \) (voc) CP

b. CP (voc) \( \text{né} \) (voc)

c. (voc) CP (*voc) wè (voc)

d. CP (*voc) wè (voc) \( \text{né} \) (voc)

I take the fact that a vocative can separate initial \( \text{né} \) from the clause to its right to mean that sentence-initial \( \text{né} \) does not directly select a clausal complement. As a first approximation, the structure hosting \( \text{né} \) could be represented as in (28), where \( \text{né} \) heads a projection, here labeled \textit{PartP}, and selects FP, which hosts the vocative in its specifier and which has as its complement a clausal projection, here labeled \textit{CP} (for a discussion of vocatives in terms of the split CP, see Moro 2003). In (28a), the clause selected by \( \text{né} \) remains in its merge position; in (28b), it moves to the specifier of \( \text{né} \). I return to these two variants in section 5. The same representation can be proposed for the projection headed by \( \text{wè} \). Differently from \( \text{né} \), however, \( \text{wè} \) forces the movement of ForceP from the complement position of F to its specifier. Note that the leftward movement of CP in (28b) and (28c) no longer violates anti-locality:

(28) a. \( [\text{PartP} \ [\text{Part} \ \text{né}] \ [\text{FP} \ \text{voc} \ [F] \ [\text{ForceP} \ \text{CP}]]] \)

b. \( [\text{PartP} \ \text{CP} \ [\text{Part} \ \text{né}] \ [\text{FP} \ \text{voc} \ [F] \ [\text{ForceP} \ \text{CP}]]] \)

c. \( [\text{PartP} \ \text{CP} \ [\text{Part} \ \text{wè}] \ [\text{FP} \ \text{voc} \ [F] \ [\text{ForceP} \ \text{CP}]]] \)
I will assume that, in the absence of an overt vocative FP, the projection that hosts it, is still available, with the specifier either not realized or with a null specifier that gets a default reading. I return to this point below, where I identify the nature of FP.

(29)

a. \[[\text{PartP} \ [\text{Part nè}]] \ [\text{FP} \ [\text{F} \ [\text{ForceP CP}]]]\]

b. \[[\text{PartP} \ [\text{CP} \ [\text{Part nè}]] \ [\text{FP} \ [\text{F} \ [\text{ForceP CP}]]]\]

c. \[[\text{PartP} \ [\text{CP} \ [\text{Part wè}]] \ [\text{FP} \ [\text{F} \ [\text{ForceP CP}]]]\]

Let us assume that the PartP headed by nè dominates the PartP headed by wè and that these PartPs each select a specialized position for the vocative in SpecFP (as in (29)). To differentiate the projections, I have identified them as PartP1 and PartP2, where PartP1 dominates PartP2, and I have also numbered the FP hosting vocatives accordingly. (30a) represents the split pattern with initial nè and final wè; (30b) derives the combination of final wè and final nè: PartP2, headed by wè, moves to the specifier of nè.

(30)

a. \[[\text{PartP1} \ [\text{Part1 nè}]] \ [\text{FP1 \ Voc \ [F1]} \ [\text{PartP2} \ [\text{CP} \ [\text{Part wè}]] \ [\text{FP2 \ Voc \ [F2]} \ [\text{ForceP CP}]]]]]\]

b. \[[\text{PartP1} \ [\text{Part2 wè}] \ [\text{FP2 \ Voc \ [F2]} \ [\text{ForceP CP}]] \ [\text{Part1 nè}] \ [\text{FP1 \ Voc \ [F1]} \ [\text{PartP2} \ [\text{PartP2}]]]]\]

Following Hill (2007b), I will assume that PartP1 and PartP2, and the associated FP1 and FP2, constitute the speech act layer, i.e. a syntactically encoded interface between the utterance and the discourse. The structure postulated here contains two positions for vocatives. I return to both these points in section 5. I will assume that the speech act layer is projected even in the absence of an overt DM.

---

12 Hill’s proposals are of course reminiscent of earlier approaches such as Ross (1970) and Banfield (1982).

13 Perhaps in non-interactional speech or writing the projections might be truncated along the lines of Haegeman (2007).
With initial *né*, the vocative either precedes or follows the clause (26a,b), depending on whether it occupies SpecFP1 or SpecFP2 respectively (31a). With final *né*, the vocative is either right adjacent to *né* (25c) or right adjacent to the clause (25b).

(31b) derives the two positions of the vocative with final *né*: the rightmost position corresponds to SpecFP1 and the leftmost position corresponds to SpecFP2. With only *wè* instantiated, the vocative in SpecFP1 will be initial (26c), and that in SpecFP2 will follow *wè* (24b). These positions are derived as in (31c):

(31) a. \[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[PartP1 [Part1 } n\acute{e} ] [FP1 Voc [F1] [PartP2 [CP [Part2] [FP2 Voc [F2] [ForceP CP]]]]]}
\end{array}
\]

b. \[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[PartP1 [PartP2 [CP [Part2] [FP1 Voc [F1] [PartP2 [Part1 } n\acute{e} ] [FP2 Voc [F2] [ForceP CP]]]]]}
\end{array}
\]

c. \[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[PartP1 [Part1 Voc [F1] [PartP2 [CP [Part2 w\acute{e} ] [FP2 Voc [F2] [ForceP CP]]]]]}
\end{array}
\]

Since Part2 is associated with ‘final’ DMs, I assume that Part2 always attracts the clausal constituent (abbreviated as CP in the representations). Thus, as shown in (32b) and (32c), in the absence of any overt DMs, a clause can be preceded (SpecFP1) or followed (SpecFP2) by a vocative.

(32) a. \[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[PartP1 [Part1 Voc1 [F1] [PartP2 [CP [Part2 [FP2 Voc2 [F2] [ForceP CP]]]]]}
\end{array}
\]

b. Valèrè, k’een gedoan.
Valèrè I have done
‘Valèrè, I have finished.’

c. K’een gedoan, Valèrè.

4.3. DMs and dislocated material
Haegeman (1984, 1993) shows that dislocated material appears to the right of the final particle *da* in WF. For reasons of space, I only look at dislocated DPs here. Dislocated DPs follow final *wè* (33), precede final *né* (34) and separate final *wè* and *né* (35). Note incidentally that once again final *wè* and *né* are not adjacent.

(33)a. ’t Is gereed *wè*, men artikel.
   it is ready *wè* my paper

   b. *’t Is gereed, men artikel, wè.

(34)a. ’t Is a gedoan men artikel, né.
   it is already done my paper *né*

   b. *’t Is a gedoan né, men artikel.

(35)a. ’t Is a gedoan *wè* men artikel, né.
   it is already done *wè* my paper *né*

   b. *’t Is a gedoan men artikel *wè*, né.

   c. *’t Is a gedoan we né men artikel.

It would go far beyond the scope of the current paper to provide a full discussion of the syntax of WF dislocated DPs. I will provisionally assume that a right-dislocated DP is merged in a projection dominating ForceP (here provisionally labeled *DislP*)\(^\text{14}\) and that it is stranded by leftward movement of ForceP. In sentences with split DMs containing a dislocated DP, the representation will be as in (36a), with *wè* to the left of the stranded DP. With final *né*, movement of PartP2 into the spec of *né* piedpipes the dislocated DP, which ends up to the left of *né*, but remains to the right of *wè*, as in (36b). Since stranding of the dislocated DP to the right of *né* is ungrammatical (35c) we must

\(^\text{14}\) Cf. the clause external topic in Hill (2006:164).
conclude that CP movement from SpecPartP2 to SpecPartP1 is prohibited. This must be either because Part1 attracts PartP2, or else that the CP in SpecPartP2 piedpipes PartP2.

(36)a. \([\text{PartP1} [\text{Part1 } n\acute{e}] [\text{FP1} [F1] [\text{PartP2} [\text{CP} [\text{Part2 } w\acute{e}] [\text{FP2} [F2] [\text{DislP} [\text{DP} [\text{ForceP} \text{CP}]]]])]])\\

b. \([\text{PartP1} [\text{PartP2} [\text{CP} [\text{Part2}] [\text{FP2} [F2] [\text{DislP} [\text{DP} [\text{ForceP} \text{CP}]]]]][\text{Part1 } n\acute{e}] [\text{FP1} [F1] [\text{PartP2} \text{PartP}]]])\\

4.4. DMs, vocatives and dislocated material

(37) contains \(w\acute{e}\), a dislocated DP and a vocative. The vocative is either initial (37a), or it follows \(w\acute{e}\) and precedes the dislocated DP (37b). (37c) with the vocative after the dislocated material is quite marginal. These patterns are derived by the structures elaborated here. In (37a), the vocative is in SpecFP1 and in (37b), it is in SpecFP2. (37c) would be a case in which the vocative is in SpecFP1 and the null Part1 attracts PartP2. I provisionally assume that the null Part1 is not an attractor, but this hypothesis remains to be looked at more carefully, because I assume that Part2 is always an attractor, even when there is no overt filler, as for instance in (32).

(37)a. Valère, ’t is gereed \(w\acute{e}\), men artikel.

b. ’t Is gereed \(w\acute{e}\), Valère, men artikel.

\(\text{it is ready } w\acute{e}\) Valère my paper

c.?? ’t Is gereed, \(w\acute{e}\), men artikel, Valère.

d. \([\text{PartP1} [\text{Part1} [\text{FP1} \text{voc} [F1] [\text{PartP2} [\text{CP} [\text{Part2 } w\acute{e}] [\text{FP2} \text{voc} [F2] [\text{DislP} [\text{DP} [\text{ForceP} \text{CP}]]]]]])])\\

With only sentence-initial \(n\acute{e}\) and a dislocated DP, the vocative either immediately follows \(n\acute{e}\), with the dislocated DP final, or the vocative immediately precedes the
dislocated DP. According to (38c), the vocative in (38a) is in SpecFP1, while that in (38b) is in SpecFP2.

(38)a. Né, Valère, ’t is gedoan, men artikel.

b. ?? Né, ’t is gedoan Valère, men artikel.

c. \[\left[\text{PartP1} \left[\text{Part1 } né\right] \left[\text{FP1 voc} [\text{F1}] \left[\text{PartP2} \left[\text{CP} [\text{Part2}] \text{[FP2 voc} [\text{F2}] \left[\text{DisIP DP} [\text{ForceP CP}]]\right]]\right]\right]\right]\]

With split DMs, the vocative either immediately follows *né*, or, more marginally, it follows *wè* and immediately precedes the dislocated DP. (39c) represents (39a), (39d) represents (39b).

(39)a. Né Valère, ’t is gedoan wè, men artikel.

b. ??Né, ’t is gedoan wè, Valère, men artikel.

c. \[\left[\text{PartP1} \left[\text{Part1 } né\right] \left[\text{FP1 voc} [\text{F1}] \left[\text{PartP2} \left[\text{CP} [\text{Part2 wè}] \left[\text{FP2 F2} \left[\text{DisIP DP} [\text{ForceP CP}]]\right]\right]\right]\right]\right]\]

d. \[\left[\text{PartP1} \left[\text{Part1 } né\right] \left[\text{FP1} [\text{F1}] \left[\text{PartP2} \left[\text{CP} [\text{Part2 wè}] \text{[FP2 Valère [F2] \left[\text{DisIP DP} [\text{ForceP CP}]]\right]]}\right]\right]\right]\]

With only final *né* and a dislocated DP, the vocative either follows *né*, see (40a), or it precedes *né* and the dislocated DP, see (40b), the latter order more marginal. (40c) with the vocative to the left of *né* and to the right of *men artikel* (‘my paper’) is out. The orders are derived by the structures proposed, see (41): for (40a), the vocative is in SpecFP1 (41a); for (40b), the vocative is in SpecFP2 (41b). (40c) cannot be derived, if the dislocated DP does not move.

(40)a. ?? ’t Is a gedoan, men artikel, né Valère.
it is already finished my paper né Valère

b. ?? ’t Is a gedoan, Valère, men artikel, né

c. * ’t Is a gedoan men artikel, Valère, né.

(41)a. [PartP1[PartP2[CP][Part2][FP2[F2][DislDP[ForceP CP]]]][Part1 né][FP1 voc[F1][PartP2 PartP2]]]

b. [PartP1[PartP2[CP][Part2][FP2 voc[F2][DislDP[ForceP CP]]]][Part1 né][FP1[F1][PartP2 PartP2]]]

When both DMs are final, the preferred orders are as in (42): the vocative is either to the immediate right of wè (see (42a)) or to the immediate right of nè (see (42b)), the latter more marginal. These orders are derived as in (42c) and (42d): the vocative to the immediate right of wè is that associated with FP2; that to the right of nè is that in FP1.

(42)a. ? ’t Is a gedoan wè Valère, (**wè) men artikel (**wè), né
it is already done wè Valère wè my paper wè nè

b. ?? ’t Is a gedoan, wè men artikel, (**wè) né Valère.

c. [PartP1[PartP2[CP][Part2 wè][FP2 voc[F2][DislDP[ForceP CP]]]][Part1 nè][FP1[F1][PartP2 PartP2]]]

d. [PartP1[PartP2[CP][Part2 wè][FP2[F2][DislDP[ForceP CP]]]][Part1 nè][FP1 voc[F1][PartP2 PartP2]]]

The speech act layer elaborated above consist of two functional projections (‘PartP’), whose heads host DMs, and two projections (labeled ‘FP’) whose specifiers host vocatives. In the next section, I re-examine and reinterpret the nature of these functional projections.
5. Particle projections and vocatives

Based on the distribution of DMs, vocatives and dislocated DPs in WF, I have elaborated the articulated structure in (43a), with CP here an abbreviation for ForceP and projections containing dislocated material.

Each DM comes with a vocative DP and a CP. The representation above does not capture the relation between these three components, however. To encode the relation between the projection of the DM (‘PartP’), and that of the vocative (‘FP’), I propose to replace (43a) by the layered functional structure in (43b), with two PartP shells: Part projects a lower shell (corresponding to FP) and a higher shell (corresponding to PartP). The DM is merged in the lower Part head and moves to the higher head (in the same way that a lexical verb is merged in V and moves to v).
(43b) was postulated entirely on the basis of WF data and standard assumptions about phrase structure representations. Interestingly, though, in terms of the architecture of the projections, (43b) is strikingly similar to (43c), the ‘Speech act shell’ proposed by Hill (2007b:2009) on the basis of the distribution of the verb-based particle *hai* (‘come’) and vocatives in Romanian. In (43c), Hill’s RolePhearer hosts the vocative. Hill explicitly says that “Speech Act heads have [V]-features” (2007b: 2078). This is very much in line with the fact that the WF DMs studied here are all verb-based. This suggests indeed that the DMs, if anything, are of the category V, with a bleached semantics compared to lexical verbs. For Hill, the speech act layer corresponds to a projection with V-features with 3 arguments: speaker, hearer and utterance. Put differently, (43c) is like the projection of a transitive verb. Hill (2007a,b) does not consider the possibility of there being unaccusative variants of (43c), but we will see presently that WF may provide evidence for that.

(43c).

My analysis departs from Hill’s (2007a,b, 2009) in a number of respects, of which I discuss two here.

---

15 But see note 16.
(i) Hill (2007a,b, 2009) postulates just one SAP. Based on the distribution of WF DMs, I adopt the hypothesis that there are two speech layer projections. The interpretative properties of the two speech act projections are distinct. I will sketch the core differences as I identify them at this stage and return to this point in future work. The higher speech act projection can host the DM né. Initial né initiates and establishes the discourse relation between speaker and hearer, catching the addressee’s attention, and directing his focus to the content of the utterance. The vocative associated with né has the function of a ‘call’ vocative (Schegloff 1968, Zwicky 1974, Portner 2004a,b, Schaden 2010, Shiina 2005): it serves to identify one (or more) individual(s) (among a set) as the addressee(s) to whom the utterance is directed. Final né closes off the utterance and transmits its content to an addressee. The vocative to the right of né is like Portner’s ‘tag’ vocative (2004b:7) in that it re-establishes the addressee. Based on the functions of né, I tentatively characterize the higher SAP as ‘dynamic’ and ‘directional’: it relates the utterance to an addressee as the one for whom the utterance is intended.

The lower speech act shell is headed by wè. (Final) wè is used to consolidate and possibly qualify the already established speaker-addressee relationship in relation to the content of the utterance: wè signals that the speaker has the authority to make the statement or give the order. The vocative associated with wè does not serve to identify the addressee within the set of potential addressees; rather the vocative is an ‘address vocative’ in the sense of Schegloff (1968): it is “designed to maintain or emphasize the contact between speaker and addressee” (Schaden 2010:3-4). This vocative has a ‘bonding’ function: the speaker qualifies or reaffirms the already established relationship with his hearer. By his lexical choice of the term of address, the speaker (‘Valère’, ‘my friend’, ‘you idiot’, ‘sweetie’, etc.) will also qualify his relation with the hearer. Tentatively we can say that the lower SAP/PartP is ‘stative’, it is more ‘attitudinal’ (cf. Paul, this volume).

Recall that I pointed out in section 3.3. that the terminology used to identify and label the relevant syntactic domain in the literature on the representation of speech acts was ambivalent, referring, on the one hand, to the speech act as a performative (see especially Hill 2007b) and, on the other hand, referring to speaker attitude (Paul, this volume), and also to modal (especially evaluative) values (Speas & Tenny 2003, Speas 2004, Tenny 2006). This observed divergence in the labeling no longer seems accidental
if, as I argue, two speech act projections are present: the higher projection is more directly related to the performative aspect of the speech act, initiating the hearer-speaker relation. The lower projection modulates the (already established) relation between speaker and hearer, and thus corresponds to the Attitude projection identified by Paul (this volume) for Chinese.

I have shown that the DM ｚè has a double function, and that it may even appear twice in one utterance, either in the split pattern (10a) or with two instances in final position (10b). We can relate these two occurrences to the two projections postulated here. The question arises, then, if we need to postulate two items ｚè, one inserted in Part1 and the other in Part2, or whether ｚè is underspecified and can thus be inserted in either projection.

(ii) Hill (2007a,b) represents the Speaker role in the specifier of the topmost SAP (43c).¹⁶ Since I assume that CP moves into the specifier of the lower PartP2 (which would correspond to a lower SAP), and that PartP2 itself may move to SpecPart1, I cannot completely adopt this proposal. Recall that SAP has [V]-features, echoing the verb-based nature of Hill’s hai (2007b) and of the WF DMs. A line that I will pursue in future work is to take the verb properties of the higher speech act layer seriously and to propose that the relevant verb heads come in a transitive and an unaccusative variety. With initial DMs, Part1 is like a transitive ‘v’ and assigns the speaker role to its specifier. When PartP2 moves to SpecPartP1, Part1 is unaccusative, and does not theta-mark an external argument. Observe that this proposal also eliminates the optionality in PartP2 movement. Part2, which always triggers movement, must also be unaccusative.

6. Conclusion and questions for future research

The paper sets out a framework for the analysis of DMs in WF. Based on the relative positions of the DMs ｎé and ｗé, vocatives and dislocated DPs, and on standard assumptions about clause structure, a structure has been elaborated which matches

¹⁶ Hill (2009) allows for CP movement to the specifier of her SAP in order to account for the final position of the vocative in (i):
(i) I can’t do this, John.
She assumes one unique vocative position, with the different interpretations of initial and final vocatives being pragmatically determined.
independent work by Hill (2007a,b). The WF data thus provide clear independent support for her proposals.

The analysis proposed here is based on two DMs. With respect to the WF data, many questions, however, still remain to be addressed. For instance, the analysis does not yet cover all the nuances of meaning that the two DMs convey. Further research is also needed to establish to what extent other WF DMs can be analyzed along the lines outlined here and how to characterize the shades of interpretation associated with them (see Cappelle 2003). With respect to DMs such as ‘zè, briefly discussed above, which head either the lower or the higher projection, with appropriate differences in interpretation, the question arises if this is a case of an underspecified DM or of two different DMs ‘zè.

The projections identified here are headed by verb-based particles. Hill (2007b) illustrates a similar phenomenon in Romanian. It would be important to examine to what extent the analysis developed here can account for the distribution of verb-based DMs in other languages.

Hill (2007a) proposes that Romanian adverbs such as ‘sigur (‘surely’) and ‘fireste (‘naturally’) may head SAP. In WF, the same adverbs can also appear at the fringe of the clause (45) and it is important to determine their distribution in relation to the DMs described here and in relation to the speech act layer.

(45)a. Natuurlijk, zen artikel is niet gereed.
   naturally, his article is not ready
   ‘Of course, his paper isn’t ready.’

b. Zen artikel is niet gereed, zeker?
   his paper is not ready, certainly
   ‘I suppose his paper isn’t ready?’

I hope to return to these (and other) issues in future work.
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