

FEATURE REPRESENTATION AND –*tu(pas)* IN QUEBEC FRENCH*

Marie-Thérèse Vinet

Abstract. This paper offers an analysis of –*tu(pas)* in Quebec French in terms of feature composition. It is proposed that the features of –*tu* are checked both at PF and LF. It is argued that –*tu* represents a PF reflex of an emphatic stress on the last syllable of the prosodic unit $V_{\text{finite}}+tu$ and it is a LF reflex of a reinforcer in the internal domain of TP for certain types of mood-force expressions. However, it is not an inherent illocutionary Force marker. It is illustrated how –*tu pas* creates an aspectual effect in discourse and is connected to predicates with a built-in terminal point. Even though –*tu pas* must sometimes appear obligatorily together in the proposition, the two forms bring a different contribution to the meaning of the sentence. It is argued that –*tu* is a Force operator identified in the CP domain at LF and *pas* is a negative marker which is interpreted with a reverse positive polarity when it scopes over –*tu*.

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to examine the use of the so-called “question particle” –*tu* in Quebec French (henceforth QF)¹ and to argue for a different and more comprehensive identification of this lexical item. The proposed analysis is based on theoretical considerations within the minimalist framework as well as the examination of a larger set of data in this grammar.

The enclitic form –*tu* can be used with root yes-no questions:

- (1) a. Ta mère est-tu là?
Your mother is-TU there?
(Is your mother in?)

* This research was partly supported by SSHRC grant 410-97-0055 to the author. Portions of this material were presented at the Conference on *Negation: Syntax, semantics and pragmatics* at the University of Salford, November 1998 and at the CLA meeting in Sherbrooke, June 1999. I would like to thank the audience at both these meetings for their comments and support. In the development of this work I have benefitted from helpful discussions with Liliane Haegeman. Thanks also to Maire Noonan for valuable suggestions on a previous draft of this paper and to two anonymous reviewers. None of these people are responsible for errors or shortcomings.

¹ I am aware that some of the data discussed in this paper can be used by speakers outside of the targeted geographical area, in other provinces of Canada and in some varieties of French spoken in the United States on the East coast. However, because part of the data is not always accepted by all, the term QF will be used throughout this paper to identify the dialect under study. For instance, even if –*tu* is present in the grammar, –*tu pas* does not seem to be used in the variety of French spoken in New-Brunswick (Louise Péronnet, p.c.). Contrary to –*ti* in another colloquial variety of French, all these structures with –*tu(pas)* are very robust in QF and show no signs of disappearing from the language. Since these expressions are unrendered in English, we use upper-case letters to indicate TU and PAS in the example translations.

- b. I(ls) dorment-tu?
They sleep-TU?
(Are they sleeping?)

It can also be used in other root sentences with several other interpretations where it reinforces a certain reading, such as the following:

- (2) a. C'est-tu choquant!
It is-TU shocking!
(It is so shocking!)
b. Tu vas-tu sortir!
You go-TU go out
(Are you going to get out!)
c. Fak là, il part-tu pas à crier
This has as a result that there, he starts-TU PAS to yell
(Suddenly, he starts yelling)

The interpretations in (2) are all linked to Mood or illocutionary force, in the sense that they mark expressive meaning. Sentence (2a) is an evaluative sentence and *-tu* is translated as an intensifier, (2b) is a command type of clause and in (2c) *-tu*, combined with a negation marker *pas* identifies a segment of discourse which expresses unexpectedness and bewilderment. This particle cannot be used with declarative sentences (3a). It is precluded with negative sentences which lack negative force, as illustrated in (3b) where the presence of *pas* in connection with *-tu* cannot license a negative polarity item such as *qui que ce soit* (anyone). It also cannot co-occur with wh-question forms (3c):

- (3) a. *Elle est-tu arrivée hier (statement)
She has-TU arrived yesterday
b. *Fak là, elle a-tu pas renvoyé qui que ce soit
This has as a result that there, she did-TU not send back anyone
(Suddenly, she sent back anyone)
c. *Qui elle aime-tu?
Who she likes-TU?
(Who does she like?)

It cannot be used within embedded clauses: (4a) is an ungrammatical embedded yes/no question and (4b) is an ungrammatical embedded evaluative form:

- (4) a. *Je me demande si elle m'aime-tu encore?
I wonder if she loves-TU me still?
(I wonder if she still loves me?)
b. *C'est fou ce qu'elle est-tu belle!
It is crazy dem-cl that she is-TU pretty
(It is amazing how pretty she is!)

Many studies have proposed a descriptive analysis for what has traditionally been called “the question particle *-tu*” in this grammar.² Noonan (1989, 1992) has offered an insightful analysis of *-tu* in the grammar of QF. In a study where she tries to bring out the differences and similarities between English Auxiliary Inversion, Standard French (SF) inversions and the absence of inversion in the grammar of QF, this author identifies *-tu* as a wh-feature generated *in situ* in Infl, more precisely under a projection which she calls Interrogative Phrase. Her analysis is couched in terms of a feature chain between I and C, and a filter is proposed to prohibit an interrogative operator in Spec, CP from receiving more than one iota (I) feature. Roberts (1993: 237, fn. 43) offers a similar analysis for the interrogative *-ti* form in colloquial French. Rizzi & Roberts (1989) have also provided an interesting analysis within the government and binding framework to account for the problematic landing site of the DP subject and the status of the enclitic within the Complex French Inversion constructions. In their proposal, the subject is adjoined to C and the enclitic is given an expletive status.³

With a larger set of data now available for the use of *-tu* (cf. Vinet 1997, 1998a, 1999a, 1999b, 1999c), we would like to propose a somewhat different analysis. While maintaining the core of Noonan’s proposal for *-tu*, we want to argue that the different interpretations observed with *-tu* in (1)–(2) and the various restrictions on its distribution (3)–(4) all serve to identify a set of specified feature values for the general representation of *tu* in the lexicon. In other words, *-tu* corresponds to one single lexical element and one lexical entry in the generative lexicon, just like *rire* (laugh), for instance, is defined as a structurally ambiguous lexical entry in the lexicon since it can be a noun or a verb and therefore relate to a *v* or not. Specifically, it is claimed here that *-tu* is the morphophonological realization of stress insistence in this grammar, a sort of focus *in situ* in the T domain and its semantic features refer to features of illocutionary force. It is closely connected to a finite Tense and, as is well known, Tense is encoded in the CP domain where the propositional force of the sentence can be checked (cf. Rizzi 1997, Chomsky 1995).

The overall outline of the paper is as follows. Section 2 describes the different uses of *-tu* in QF and discusses the features of this lexical item within the minimalist program. Section 3 describes the particular meaning of *-tu pas* in this grammar and illustrates how it fits with the proposed hypothesis. From a theoretical point of view, the analysis of these expressions in the grammar of QF concerns studies on the left edge of the inflectional complex.

² Cf. Kayne (1975), Morin (1979, 1985), Léard (1996), Picard (1992, 1991), Sportiche (1992), Hirschbühler & Labelle (1992), Noonan (1989, 1992), among others.

³ For reasons of space, these papers will not be discussed in this study as well as a new analysis of French stylistic inversion without covert movement, recently proposed by Kayne & Pollock (1999).

2. The features of *-tu* in a minimalist approach

Within the minimalist program, the generative procedure, the I(nternal/n)tensional-language, has two components, a computational system and a lexicon. The lexicon is usually understood as a repository of idiosyncracies, it is a list of all the words in a language and their idiosyncratic linguistic properties. This does not mean, however, that regularities do not exist within that list. The representation of these specifications is a highly organized structure and recent studies on pronominal forms point in this direction. There is an increasingly large body of work which attempts to demonstrate how a structured lexicon can constrain the syntactic and phonological representations of pronominal forms in Universal Grammar (cf. Bonet (1995), Harley & Ritter (1997), Kayne (1998), Roberge & Bibis (1999), Heap (1999), among others).

Within this program of research, it is generally assumed that variation from one grammar to another is minimal. It is limited to properties of morphophonological heads such as C, T, D, etc. and to certain aspects of the lexicon (Chomsky 1995). Universal properties of language in UG relate to primitive features, the combinatory operations of Merge and Move as well as the interfaces with the linguistic systems. These last systems are considered invariant among languages and individuals.

This study is part of a larger research concerned with the study of variation mechanisms between grammars which are minimally distinct, a line of research which has been previously explored in Kayne (1996), Rizzi (1982), Zanuttini (1997) and Roberge & Vinet (1989).

Summarizing and simplifying somewhat, we could say that the use of *-tu(pas)* in the grammar of QF is limited to learning the specified feature values corresponding to this lexical item which can be specified in the numeration (or the lexicon). In a nutshell, *-tu* in (1) and (2) is a PF reflex of an emphatic stress on the last syllable of the prosodic unit $V_{\text{finite}}+tu$ and it is a LF reflex of a reinforcer in the internal domain of TP for certain types of mood-force expressions. It is said to be a reinforcer because the equivalent sentences without *-tu* in (1)-(2) above are also acceptable in QF but with a different intonation pattern. *-Tu* is therefore closely related to finiteness and the features of the verbal complex are checked in C at LF, as postulated by Rizzi (1997:284).

2.1. *The features of -tu*

Even though on the surface *-tu* appears to be the equivalent of the second person singular pronominal nominative clitic form *tu*, this affixal *-tu* in (1)-(2) above cannot be interpreted as such since it bears no referential D feature and no phi-features. Following Chomsky (1995), who has proposed that the features of a lexical item (LI) consist of a set of distinct phonological, formal and semantic features, the set of features for *tu* in

the grammar of French in general has been roughly identified as follows by Bibis & Roberge (1999):

Features of French *tu*: (Bibis & Roberge 1999)

- | | | |
|------------|------|-------|
| (5) D | /ty/ | TU ? |
| 2p | | (θ ?) |
| singular | | |
| nominative | | |

Bibis & Roberge (1999) have proposed a paradigm for the representation of clitic pronouns as well as marginal or idiomatic clitics found in various grammars, namely sub-standard varieties of Greek, French and also in Niuan. They have demonstrated that there exist asymmetries in the representation of features of a single lexical item. More specifically, they illustrate how a lexical item can retain its phonological form but lose its usual formal and *phi* features (D, person, gender, number, Case) and compensate by developing semantic features of some sort.

In the case of Quebec French *-tu*, and based on Vinet (1999c), Roberge & Bibis (1999) argue that the enclitic form has lost the formal features of the clitic *tu* and has gained new semantic features, as illustrated in the following representation:

- | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| (6) clitic: <i>-tu</i> | (Roberge & Bibis 1999) |
| / \ | |
| ⊘ illocutionary | |
| pers force | |
| number | |
| gender | |
| ⊘ Case | |

We find this hypothesis very illuminating for the study of *-tu*, pronounced /tsy/ in QF. It clearly shows how a form can deviate from its original referential meaning to develop a different interpretation with various possible extensions in a sub-variety of French while still retaining certain properties of the original form. For instance, as illustrated above in (4), there are striking similarities between the distribution of the enclitic D form in the Complex Inversion structure of SF and the distribution of this affixal *-tu* in QF (cf. also Morin 1979). *-Tu* is historically derived from *-t-il* by developing into *-ti* through *l* deletion in Colloquial French, and then to *-tu*, the 2ps pronominal form, in QF only.⁴ Both lexical items are limited to root sentences:

⁴ For descriptive facts on the use of *-ti*, cf. Foulet 1921, Bauche 1951, Gadet 1994, Morin 1979, 1985, Kayne 1975, among others and for a brief comparison between the use of *-ti* and *-tu*, cf. Morin 1979, Hirschbühler & Labelle (1992: chap.14), Vinet 1999c.

- (7) *Je me demande si Paul sort-il / *Je me demande si Paul sort-tu
 I wonder whether Paul is going out-3msg / I wonder whether Paul is
 going-TU out

In minimalist terms, a root structure is a syntactic object that is not a term of any syntactic object other than itself. Therefore, *-tu* as well as *-t-il*, form part of a building block which cannot be selected. *-Tu* behaves morphologically as an affix: it is necessarily attached to a lexical V head and, as a deficient form, it can never occur in isolation. The behavior of *-tu* in (7) clearly illustrates that it has retained some of the fundamental features of the referential D head *-t-il*. Both sentences in (7) are ill-formed because of an identical feature shared by *-t-il* and *-tu*.

Moreover, the phonological representation of *-tu* can sometimes be blurred in the mind of speakers who will misinterpret the form as a 2ps enclitic. Evidence for this can be found in Picard (1991:182) who notes that journalists who sometimes write the colloquial form often mistakenly use a second-person verb form as in: *Ca se peux-tu* ("Can you believe it?" or more literally "Is it possible?") instead of *Ca se peut-tu*, using the wrong inflectional form on the verb which rather reflects the agreement pattern with a 2ps of the Clitic Inversion structure from SF: *Peux-tu?* (Can you?). The same type of misspelling is observed in Grevisse & Goosse (1993:599) *Y as-tu quequ'un qui t'suit?* (Is there anyone following you?).⁵

If, as argued by Roberge & Bibis (1999), the lack of formal D features on *-tu* partly explains its role as an illocutionary force marker, what exactly are these semantic features of illocutionary force that *-tu* expresses? Why does *-tu* select this particular semantic interpretation? We now turn to the discussion of such forms.

2.2. Stress and illocutionary forms

The presence of *-tu* in the sentence is always associated with a certain stress pattern on the verbal complex. As is well known, focused structures always relate to a given phonetic representation, and because *-tu* reinforces the stress pattern of the sentence, it can be identified as a stress marker. Let us refer to this stress feature as [emphasis] on the V complex. *-Tu* is a word-level element which is syntactically dependent because it cannot appear in isolation. It cannot be coordinated (**tu viens-tu et -ti ?* (Are you coming-TU and TI)) and it is phonologically dependent on another element since it forms a prosodic unit with the verb. This can be exemplified with the following contrast described in (8) below. In current spoken French a question form can appear without a change in word order between the clitic and the verb. However, one always finds a rising intonation on the verb when the verb appears in the sentence final position in (8a) (↑ represents a rising intonation). The same

⁵ From Marie Laberge's novel, *C'était avant la guerre à l'Anse à Gilles*.

intonation pattern appears on *-tu* when it surfaces in a yes-no question (8b) where the word order is the same as in statements:

- (8) a. Tu viens ↑ ? (current spoken French)
 you come
 (Are you coming?)
 b. Tu viens-tu ↑ ? (QF)
 (Are you coming?)
 c. *Tu viens ↑ -tu ↑ ? (QF)

As can be observed in (8c), the ungrammaticality here follows from considerations of economy, the expression is ruled out because the emphasis is redundant within this expression. Let us therefore assume that *-tu* realizes a stress feature [emphasis] and this stress is also associated with a finite Tense. In QF, stress is indeed spelled out as *-tu* on a verbal tensed form only.⁶ Consequently, an illocutionary form with an infinitival verb cannot co-occur with *-tu* and, as expected, this is exactly what is observed in the following infinitival exclamative structure which expresses surprise:

- (9) a. Lui lire un livre! Ce serait vraiment étonnant.
 Him read a book! That would really be astonishing.
 b. *Lui lire-tu un livre! Ce serait vraiment étonnant
 Him read-TU a book ! That would really be astonishing.
 (Him read a book! That would really be astonishing)

In other words, *-tu* is not an inherent illocutionary force marker, it selects certain types of illocutionary forms which correspond to its feature values, features which are closely connected to the enclitic form *-t-il* in the Complex Inversion structure of SF. For instance, *-tu* can appear with certain command or directive expressions but not with all of them. French imperative or command clauses can be used with a limited variety of tense forms which express an irrealis tense, an eventuality, namely present, subjunctive, future and infinitival forms (cf. Nyrop 1930, Dominik 1999). However, *-tu* cannot co-occur with a command construction which lacks an overt subject, since it has to be connected to a lexically filled subject position. Such command or directive structures are possible with *-tu*

⁶ In Vinet (1997), it was also indicated, for the same reasons, that *-tu* can never be affixed on a past participle or a gerundive *-ant* form:

- (i) a. *Elle a vu-tu Jean?
 She has seen-TU Jean?
 (Has she seen Jean?)
 b. *En criant-tu à son frère de partir, elle est tombée.
 While yelling-TU to her brother to leave, she fell

Note that French gerundive forms, as in (ib) are also ruled out in root sentences anyway. They always appear in an embedded or adjoined position where *-tu* is rejected for independent reasons.

(10a); they express an attenuated form of the imperative and they represent a subclass of this clause type. Both forms of commands are exemplified in (10):

- (10) a. Tu vas-tu/veux-tu sortir de là!
 You are going-TU/wanting-TU get out of there!
 (Will you get out of there!)
 b. *S'il-te-plaît, sors-tu de là!
 Please, get-TU out of there!

In (10a), the command is given through a word ordering which is reminiscent of an *in situ* interrogative expression but the intonation clearly does not correspond to the intonation of a question form. Furthermore, such command structures are only possible with a limited number of auxiliary type of verbs such as *aller* (go) or *vouloir* (want) whose meaning is to urge someone to do something. This explains the ungrammaticality of such command forms with other verbs, namely **?Tu sors-tu de là!* (You leave-TU from there) which would be otherwise acceptable with an interrogative reading.

In (10b), *-tu* is clearly ruled out with the more usual subjectless imperative form and it could be suggested that this situation is related to the lack of an independent tense projection with this imperative form. The fact that (some) imperatives lack T has already been proposed by many authors for several languages, namely Grohmann (1999), Platzack & Rosengren (1998), Pirvulescu & Roberge (1999), among others. As already mentioned, imperatives rather instantiate an irrealis tense. If a verb is inflected for Mood, Tense and phi features, it could then be proposed that imperatives as in (10b) lack T. The main difference indeed between the two structures in (10) is connected to the presence vs. absence of an overt subject and, as is well known, only a finite T has nominative Case-assigning features.⁷

Interestingly, in command structures such as (10a) the *-il* form is not rejected. The addressee of the command structure is a 3p instead of a 2p. It implies that the exhortation is heard by others if not by the addressee himself.⁸ Note that the same interpretation with a 3p is available with *-tu*:

⁷ If *-tu* can occur with a subjectless verb like *voilà*, as in *Vlà-tu pas Jacques qui arrive*, this is because it is a finite subjectless verb, as argued by Morin (1985).

⁸ Let us assume that the aim for the use of the imperative is to associate the addressee in some manner to the change of state that one wants to create or see happening. A command with a 3p is also used with the subjunctive form in French, as in (ia) in QF. We note that the presence of *-tu* is ruled out in this case (ib) because subjunctives and infinitives form part of a building block (in the derivation) which must be selected, contrary to *-tu*:

- (i) a. Qu'il s'en alle! (QF)
 That he leave-Subj
 (He will have to leave!)
 b. *Qu'il s'en alle-tu!
 That he leave-Subj-TU!

Jean va-tu sortir de là! (Is Jean going-TU to get out of there!). As expected, *-t-il* is also rejected from the subjectless command structure in (11b):

- (11) a. *Jean va-t-il sortir de là!*
 Jean is going-3ps to get out of there!
 (Is Jean ever going to get out of there!)
 b. **S'il-vous-plaît, sors-t-il de là!*
 Please, get-3ps of there!

The example in (11a) serves to illustrate that *-t-il* and its variants in gender and number can also be used in certain cases to reinforce a mood form. As discussed for *-tu* above, *-t-il* and its variants cannot co-occur with a verbal form connected to a selected tense such as a subjunctive **Que Jean sorte-t-il de là!* (That Jean come-Subj-t-IL out of there), an infinitive (cf. (9b) above) or a gerundive form **Jean sortant-t-il de là!* (Jean coming-t-IL out of there!) (cf. fn. 6).

-T-il and its variants can also be used to reinforce an evaluative form, as in the following literary form in (12a), from Milner (1978), where an I to C movement has occurred. The equivalent expression with a Complex inversion structure (12b) is possible as well:

- (12) a. *Est-elle serviable!* (Milner 1978)
 Is she helpful!
 b. *Jeanne est-elle serviable!* (SF)
 Jeanne is-3ps helpful

Since there is no inversion in the grammar of QF, (12a) is rather translated as *A est-tu serviable!* (She is-TU helpful) with the typical lengthening of the vowel in the subject pronominal form in the grammar of QF.

To sum up this section, it was proposed that *-tu* bears a feature F that has a particular PF reflex in the sense that it translates a feature [emphasis] and it also has a LF reflex since it licenses certain types of illocutionary force structures with a finite T. It was also observed that some of the features of *-tu* as a reinforcer of a mood force indicator can also be found with the *-t-il* form and its variants in the grammar of SF. More importantly, it was observed that they share similar features in the sense that the tensed V must be unselected. If, in French, the choice between proclitics and enclitics is determined by the Mood and Tense on the verb, then it follows that *-tu*, *-t-il* and its variants as enclitic forms should share the same phi features on V. This similarity serves to strengthen the proposed hypothesis concerning certain shared features between *-tu* in QF and *-t-il* in SF.

2.3. *The feature representation of –tu*

It was mentioned above that *–tu* is not an inherent mood indicator. If it identifies certain forms of illocutionary mood, then how is the connection established between *–tu* as an *in situ* mood indicator in (2) and *–tu* as an *in situ* yes/no question indicator in (1)? We have already indicated that in both cases *–tu* is a morphophonological spell-out of stress which is closely connected to a finite verbal form.

The particular feature representation of the affixal *–tu* under study in QF could thus be drawn as follows in (13) where P, F and S stand for phonological, formal and semantic features. Phonologically, *–tu* is an enclitic on V which expresses an emphatic stress only when it forms a prosodic unit with a finite V. This situation is also observed with enclitics in imperatives which can also be stressed: *Donne-LE!* (Give it). Since *–tu* forms part of a term which is always unselected, it follows that the Tense and Mood on V must be unselected as well. This last property automatically excludes past participle and gerundive forms, as well as subjunctives and infinitives. Let us posit the following schematic representation for *–tu* in QF, where it appears as a functional head which identifies a finite verbal form in an unselected C at LF. This last property coincides with a subset of illocutionary forms and yes/no questions.

- (13)
- | | |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| P | |
| /tsy/ | |
| [emphasis] | |
| / \ | |
| F S | |
| functional head | wh Force operator |
| features | |
| of V _{finite} | |

What then clearly emerges from the comparison between the feature representation of a D head *tu* in (5) and a functional head *–tu* in (13) is that the former has nominal properties while the latter rather identifies with verbal properties. Therefore, the operations that interpret sentences with *–tu* in QF will read it as a [+V] feature since *–tu* checks features related to V, namely the phi features [person, number], as well as Tense and Mood.

2.4. *–tu as an affixal form derived from t-il and –ti*

Previous analysis of *–tu* all agree that it is derived from *–t-il* and *–ti* (cf. Foulet 1921, Roberts 1993, Morin 1979, 1985, Noonan 1992, Picard 1992, 1991, among others). Roberts (1993) claimed that *–ti* developed from Complex Inversion structures in the late 16th century. The form –

ti has been observed in a more or less moribund dialect of French in Europe (Morin 1985, Gadet 1994) as well as in the variety of French spoken in Canada before the introduction of *-tu*, which probably dates back to the middle or the end of the first part of this century (cf. Picard 1992, Morin 1985:811). All three forms are limited to root sentences and *-ti* as well as *-tu* must appear in a surrounding with a filled subject pronoun. They differ in phi features since only *t-il*, a specific and a doubled pronominal form, can vary in gender and number. The actual correct output for *t-il* can either be *-t-ils*, *-t-elle*, *-t-elles* depending on the choice of gender and number. This form copies the features of a lexically filled DP subject only (14a), not a pronominal form (14b):

- (14) a. Marie viendra-t-elle? / Les enfants viendront-ils?
 Mary will come-3ps-cl / The children come-fut-
 (Will Mary come over? / Will the children come over?)
 b. *Il sortira-t-il? / *Elles accepteront-elles?
 He will go out-3ps.masc.cl / They will accept-3pp fem.cl
 (Will he go out?) / (Will they accept?)

Kayne (1984:216–217) explains this last difference with a restriction on a Case chain, where Case can be morphologically realized only on one element of the chain. The well-formed sentences with *-ti* then follow from the lack of morphological Case on *-ti*.

As already mentioned, when *-tu* surfaces the subject position must be lexically projected as D or a full DP, but it does not matter if it has semantic content or not. A weather *il* is acceptable with *-tu* (15a) as well as an expletive *il* (15b):

- (15) a. Il pleut-tu ? (QF)
 It rains-TU?
 (Is it raining?)
 b. Y'est-tu probable qu'il vienne pus jamais? (QF)
 It is-TU possible that he never comes back?
 (Is it possible that he may never come back?)

2.5. *Wh* forms and *-tu*

Noonan (1992:41) has proposed that in Standard French “a clitic on I is strictly limited to Is that have received the feature [+WH]” and in QF, she has analysed the enclitic form *-tu* as an *in situ* wh feature on I which does not form a wh chain between C and I. Following this line of reasoning, we can thus safely assume that *-tu* will always be connected to a type of clause where a wh operator must somehow be checked in the CP domain, at LF. However, there seems to be a contradiction at first sight in the fact that, as mentioned above, wh-forms in general are ruled out in the

presence of *-tu*.⁹ Recall that Rizzi (1990) has developed an analysis where a *wh* interrogative marker in SpecCP can be licensed by a +Q head, V+Infl moved into C. His analysis does not take into account the case of an *in situ* +Q like *-tu*. More examples of unacceptable forms with *-tu* and *wh* constituents are given in (16) below:

- (16) a. *Qui elle aime-tu?
Who she like-TU?
(Who does she like?)
b. *Comment elle s'habille-tu habituellement?
How she dresses-TU usually?
(How does she usually dress?)
c. *A qui elle a-tu parlé dernièrement?
To whom she has-TU spoken?
(To whom has she spoken?)

Following Larson (1985) and Sportiche (1995), yes/no questions involve the movement of a yes/no *wh*-operator to [Spec, CP]. A yes/no operator¹⁰ and a *wh*-phrase cannot both overtly or covertly move to this position. A *wh* feature, as an interpretable feature (following Chomsky 1995) can only be checked once. If it is checked by the *wh* form, as in (16) then the *wh* features in C cannot also be satisfied by the hostal verbal complex [V_{finite} + *-tu*]. These different types of *wh* features are therefore incompatible and this explains the ungrammaticality in (16).¹¹ The same situation is found with exclamative/evaluative sentences in this grammar:

⁹ Morin (1979) accepts the following examples with *-ti*:

- (i) a. Et quand il viendra-ti?
And when he will come-TI?
b. Et comment je pouvais-ti savoir ça?
And how I could-TI know this?

Interestingly, Morin (1979:60, fn.15) notes: "In my sample of spontaneous speech both in Quebec and in Paris, I have not recorded instances of *-ti* (or *-tu*) with *wh* questions. . . . My intuitions as a speaker of that variety of colloquial French is that the marker *-ti* is possible in independent *wh*-questions when the interrogative pronoun is stressed, thus the use of *et* (and) before these pronouns (in (i) above)." Such examples with a stressed *wh* form are still unavailable with *-tu* in QF. On *-ti* and *wh* questions, see also Roberts (1993:237, fn.43).

¹⁰ An operator is an element such as Tense, Negation, Quantifier, etc. which takes scope over a certain domain. A yes/no question has scope over the CP domain and a *wh* question also. For a similar proposal concerning the redundancy of *ti* and *wh* movement, cf. Roberts (1993:237, fn. 43). Both this last analysis and ours would be incompatible with a model of grammar where *wh* covert movement is not found, as in Kayne (1998).

¹¹ However, in yes/no questions with *-tu* in QF where no word order change is observed, a *wh in situ* can be described as either unfelicitous or completely ungrammatical depending on various factors such as the type of *wh* word or the intonation pattern. In (ia), for instance, the sentence would be more acceptable in a context where it is an echo question to a previous question with a *-tu* marker as in *Elle aime-tu JEAN?*, with a heavy stress (indicated by capital letters) on the noun *Jean* in the latter sentence or the equivalent *wh* form:

- (i) a. ? Elle aime-tu QUI? (QF) (cf. Elle aime qui?)
She likes-TU who?

- (17) a. *Comme elle est-tu belle! (QF)
 How she is-TU pretty!
 (How pretty she is!)
 b. [_{CP} Comme [_C Ø] [_{TP} elle est-tu belle]]

In (17), *comme* is a wh operator in [Spec,CP] and *-tu* is an *in situ* wh operator and both operators are incompatible because they are checked in the same position in the derivation, before or after Spell-Out. If one can find the following acceptable sequence in (18), this is because *Que* is not a wh operator and it therefore does not interfere with the *in situ* operator *-tu* which identifies its operator features at LF. *Que* is generated in the CP domain in (18b) but contrary to *comme* in (17b), it is assumed not to have any wh operator feature:

- (18) a. Qu'elle est-tu fine! (QF)
 That she is-TU nice
 How nice she is!
 b. [_{CP} Op [Que] [_{TP} elle est-tu fine]]

An alternative approach would be to take into consideration the stress pattern discussed above in these questions, since wh items always trigger a stress. One could then argue, following economy considerations, that there is a redundancy in stress patterns in (16) and (17). This explanation could also account for another type of stress redundancy where two lexical forms semantically interpreted as degree markers or intensifiers are considered morphophonological realizations of a stress in an evaluative structure as in (19b) below (here again capital letters indicate heavy stress):

- (19) a. C'est DONC choquant! (QF)
 It is so shocking
 (It is so shocking!)
 b. *C'est-TU DONC choquant (QF)
 It is-TU so shocking!

Whether the explanation is accounted for in terms of operator incompatibility and/or stress redundancy, it is clear that *-tu* is both a lexical wh *in situ* operator in the T domain¹² and a morphophonological spell-out of stress.

-
- b. ??Elle a-tu parlé à QUI dernièrement? (cf. Elle a parlé à qui dernièrement?)
 She has-TU spoken to who?
 c. *Elle s'habille-tu COMMENT habituellement? (cf. Elle s'habille comment habituellement?)
 She dresses-TU how usually?

For reasons of space, we will not discuss these examples any further in this paper. They will be analyzed in future research.

¹² The exact position of *-tu* in the derivation raises questions. Following Chomsky (1995), all elements enter the derivation fully inflected, *-tu* is then an affix on the verb which

In (16a) repeated below, it could therefore be argued that the derivation crashes because the features on Q have been checked twice, as roughly sketched in (20):

- (20) CP[Q] elle aime-tu qui → checking wh Features on Q
 CP[Qui] elle aime-tu → checking features of *-tu* on Q
 (after spell-out) = crash
 *Qui elle aime-tu?

If *qui* is checked in the derivation in the CP domain then the features of the *in situ* operator *-tu* cannot be checked since the features on Q have already been identified.

2.6. The operator status of *-tu*

The following argument can also serve to illustrate further how *-tu* can correctly be analyzed as an operator. Sportiche (1995, 1998) has shown that questions without a change in word order in French but with a rising intonation cannot license a negative polarity item such as *qui que ce soit* (anybody). His examples are given in (21) below:

- (21) a. *Il a vu qui que ce soit (statement)
 He saw anybody
 b. A-t-il vu qui que ce soit?/Il n'a pas vu qui que ce soit
 Has he seen anybody /He has not seen anybody
 c. *Il a vu qui que ce soit? (question)
 He has seen anybody

However, when *-tu* is present in QF, both the negative polarity item *qui que ce soit* (anybody) or the positive polarity item *quelqu'un* (somebody) can be licensed. This situation follows from the well known fact that the polarity of Yes/No questions can be either positive or negative:

- (22) a. Elle a-tu vu qui que ce soit? (QF)
 She has-TU seen anybody
 b. Elle a-tu vu quelqu'un? (QF)
 She has-TU seen somebody

If, as generally assumed, negative polarity items must be c-commanded by an operator [+ Neg] or [+Q] on its left, then the derivation in (21c) crashes because the negative polarity item is not c-commanded by any operator. Otherwise, in (22a), the operator *-tu* in the domain of T correctly c-commands the polarity item in object position.

motivates checking through T. The question is then to determine what type of affix *-tu* is, since it is not Agr. It is clearly outside VP and close to T in the structure, as also argued for *-ti* by Roberts (1993:221). If *-tu* is an *in situ* mood operator on a finite T then it should somehow be identified as a functional head (close to T) which needs the support of a finite verbal form to be fully interpreted.

Examples (21c) and (22a) can be represented as follows in (23a) and (23b) respectively. In standard logic representation, an operator must have scope from a left peripheral position and the domain of this operator is always to its right:

- (23) a. Il a vu qui que ce soit? [Q]
 b. [Q] Il a-tu vu qui que ce soit?
- 

But how are all these different kinds of *-tu* checked in the derivation? If we adopt the Split CP hypothesis, as developed by Rizzi (1997) and adopted by many others, the feature-checking of *-tu*, as will be demonstrated below, is greatly facilitated.

2.7. The Split CP domain

It is proposed that *-tu* is an operator licensed through feature checking in a higher functional head at LF. In minimalist terms, movement is triggered by a feature F of a functional category (for instance a Q feature in CP) which needs checking and therefore attracts F' to the checking domain of F. Whether the movement is overt or covert depends on whether the phonological features are among the features which are moved or not. In any case, the target position must be lexically empty. Let us therefore hypothesize that the higher functional head is either C for yes/no questions or Focus/Evaluative (following Rizzi 1997, Ambar 1997, Bosque 1994, Uriagereka 1992) for the other interpretations of *-tu*. More specifically, we adopt some recent proposals concerning a split CP domain. Rizzi (1997) postulates different positions for topicalizations and focus within CP in Italian and in other languages. Clauses can choose among the various features available (Top, Focus, etc.) to define their own clause-type.¹³ Since complementizers specify to a certain extent the type of clause, namely interrogative, declarative, relative, evaluative, etc., this domain is thus said to specify the Force of the proposition (Rizzi 1997, Chomsky 1995). Clause types are therefore unique and they

¹³ More specifically, Rizzi (1997) has proposed the following positions for the split CP domain, where certain projections are absent in some clause types (* indicates recursivity):

- (i) ForceP TopP* FocP TopP* FiniteP (Rizzi 1997)

However, some illocutionary force constructions present an impoverished structure, namely imperatives and infinitival exclamatives which lack some of these projections (cf. Platzack & Rosengren 1998, Grohmann 1999). Finite phrase is usually absent in command clauses which are unmarked for tense even if command clauses are inherently marked for a future reference. Of course, evaluative structures do not all pattern in the same fashion and non-infinitival exclamatives do not lack a TP projection:

- (i) Comme elle était verte ma vallée!
 How she was green my valley
 (How green was my valley!)

are incompatible. A proposition, for instance, cannot bear the features for both an interrogative clause, an exclamative and a declarative clause. If the word order is the same in some cases, as in (12) above *Est-elle serviable! / Est-elle serviable?* (Is she (ever) helpful! /Is she helpful?), the sentences can be differentiated on prosodic grounds. The various clause types with *-tu* must therefore be checked in CP with the corresponding force expressing head and this operator position cannot be lexically filled. The arguments for such a proposal are based on the incompatibility of *-tu* with the equivalent *wh* operator in the CP domain, as discussed in section 2.5 above. Furthermore, these force positions cannot be selected since embedded clauses lack independent force. This explains why *-tu* cannot appear within an embedded CP clause, as illustrated in (4) above. In the spirit of Rizzi (1997), Grohmann (1999), and leaving certain details aside, we here follow the specific implementation of checking various *wh* operators in a split CP domain. *-Tu*, along with V, moves to C at LF and checks off the corresponding force head where Q stands for yes/no questions, E for evaluative and M* for the particular type of command clause under discussion in this study where the construction must have an overt subject, contrary to subjectless imperative clauses.¹⁴

- (24) a. CP[V_{finite}-tu_i C[Q] TP[Su_j t_v t_i . . .] FP[. . .] VP[t_j . . . t_v]]
 b. CP[V_{finite}-tu_i C[E] TP[Su_j t_v t_i . . .] FP[. . .] VP[t_j . . . t_v]]
 c. CP[V_{finite}-tu_i C[M*] TP[Su_j t_v t_i . . .] FP[. . .] VP[t_j . . . t_v]]

Since the V adjoined to *-tu* must have a lexical subject, then it follows that the verb must be inflected, as discussed above.

2.8. The incompatibility of *-tu* with other operators

We have just seen that *-tu* is incompatible not only with *wh* question forms but also with other types of *wh* operators such as *wh* evaluative operators. We would now like to consider its incompatibility with the negative operator, as illustrated in (25), from Vinet (1999b):

- (25) *Ta mère est-tu pas à maison? (QF)
 Your mother is-TU not home?
 (Is your mother not home?)

The presence of the negative marker *pas* in (25) is interpreted as gibberish in this variety of French (see also Picard 1991:185). This sentence cannot be interpreted as an “oratory question” (interrogation oratoire), a classification offered by traditional grammars (Grevisse & Goosse 1993) to describe a situation where one must accept the non-negative counterpart

¹⁴ We leave aside in this paper the discussion concerning the precise identification of the projections within such command structures.

of what is said in the negated interrogative clause as in *Ne vous avais-je pas averti?* = *Je vous avais averti* (Didn't I warn you? = I have warned you). How can this be explained?¹⁵

Work on negation has clearly demonstrated that the scope of a negative operator is the domain of TP, see Zanuttini (1997). However, as indicated in a previous section *-tu* is incompatible with overt operators which scope over the CP domain, namely *wh* operators in questions (16) and *wh* operators in evaluatives (17). Note incidentally that negation is always incompatible with evaluative structures which are always super-positively polarized (cf. McCawley 1988 for examples in English):

- (26) a. *Comme elle est pas grande!
 How she is not tall
 *C'est fou ce qu'elle a pas l'air jeune!
 (It's amazing how she doesn't look young!)

It is here assumed that *-tu* is a lexical *wh* operator generated *in situ* in the internal TP domain. As a spell-out of stress, it identifies the type of clause or illocutionary force and the locus of clause typing is the CP domain. This lexical operator therefore takes scope over the CP domain as well as the domain of TP since it is closely connected to inflection on V. However, NegP is rather the locus of clausal polarity features (Pollock 1989, Haegeman 1995, Rowlett 1998) and when a negation operator appears in the scope of an operator in the CP domain such as the operator Q of yes/no questions or the operator of an evaluative expression, the clause is then interpreted with a reverse polarity, it is polarized positively and a different interpretation arises:

- (27) N'est-elle pas à la maison?
 Isn't she at home?

Note the distinction in acceptability between (25) in QF and (27) in SF. This situation raises further questions. What is the explanation behind this difference considering that *-tu* shares many of the features of *-t-il* and its variants, as observed above? Is this difference directly linked to *-tu*, to *pas* or to some other property? Moreover, if a negation reading is ungrammatical with an emphatic *-tu* marker in (25), why can the negative marker be present in some cases (cf. (2c) above)? In order to answer these questions we now turn to the discussion of the interpretation of *-tu pas* in the grammar of QF.

¹⁵ An example with *-ti pas* from Foulet (1921) is presented in Roberts (1993:221): *Ca marche ti pas?* (Doesn't it work?). This example instantiates a dubious question where the speaker is not sure of the answer but is assuming the non-negative counterpart of what is said. This interpretation is not acceptable with *-tu* in QF and the difference in behavior between *-ti* and *-tu* will be explained in section 3 below.

3. The interpretation of *-tu pas* in Quebec French

This section raises the question of the interpretation and the analysis of *-tu pas* in the grammar of QF, two distinct morphemes which combine to form a connective marker in a narration or conversation where the speaker reports on an unexpected event.¹⁶ In other words, these elements serve to focus, in the Universe of Discourse, a dynamic event which always expresses surprise and bewilderment, as illustrated in (28) below:

- (28) a. Fak là, j'entends-tu pas une bardasse terrible (Michel Tremblay, *La grosse femme* . . . 289)
 It so happens that there, I hear-TU PAS a terrible noise
 (And then, I (suddenly) hear a terrible noise)
- b. D'un coup, il se met-tu pas à chanter, toi là
 Of a blow, he refl-cl put-TU PAS to sing, you there
 (And suddenly, he starts singing)
- c. Le voilà-tu pas qui arrive
 3ps-cl here-TU PAS who arrives
 (Well, here he is just coming)

It is argued that these are two distinct morphemes, namely *-tu*, an enclitic and a mood-force indicator in the T domain, as analysed in section 2 above, and *pas*, a negative marker which is here polarized positively. Note that the positive reading of this *pas* is not to be interpreted in the same way as the one which can appear with N-words in QF without inducing a double negation effect, as in *Tu iras pas nulle part* (You won't go (nowhere)/anywhere).¹⁷ The semantic property of the *pas* under discussion is often found in root question forms naturally used to express doubt (29a) or for seeking confirmation that the proposition is really true (rhetorical questions) (29b) or purely informative yes/no questions (29c), as illustrated in (29) in SF:

¹⁶ This marker has received very little attention in the linguistic literature, cf. Vinet (1997, 1999a, 1999b) for previous analysis of *-tu* and *pas*. These expressions belong to a colloquial variety of Quebec French and they have been rarely used by novelists or others who report, in a written form, QF colloquial speech. Moreover, this connective marker in narrative discourse is not found in the same terms in other varieties of French or in other Romance languages in general, but as will be illustrated below, there exist other lexical means to account for the same aspectual contexts or bounded situations, namely a built-in terminal point and the presence of a change of setting adverb. It was reported, for instance, that such expressions can sometimes be found through *-ti pas* with the defective verb *voilà* as in: *Vlà-ti pas* . . . (Here is . . .) (cf. Vinet 1999a). This last form is generally used nowadays to recall the way of talking of the elderly. In other words, such forms with *-ti pas* are more or less considered obsolete in France (cf. Gadet 1994). Other studies have also dealt with an aspectual effect in discourse. Recent work by Reed (1997) and Authier (1997), for example, have focused on a pronominalized form with aspectual effects, namely the French demonstrative pronoun *ce* which is used to encode the aspectual notions of perfectivity, unboundedness and non-habituality.

¹⁷ For a detailed study of these facts in QF, which we assume are not completely unrelated to the ones discussed here, see Vinet (1998b) and Muller (1991:262–263).

- (29) a. Ne serait-elle pas malade, par hasard?
 Neg would be-3psf ill, by chance
 (She wouldn't be ill, by any chance?)
 b. N'est-ce pas la santé qui est le plus grand des trésors?
 Neg is-neuter.dem not the health which is the biggest of treasures
 (Isn't health the most precious of treasures?)
 c. Ne dort-elle pas?
 Neg sleep-3pfs not
 (Isn't she sleeping?)

The non negative interpretation of *pas* in (28) can be confirmed by the fact that positive polarity items like *plutôt* (rather) can easily combine with –tu *pas* (cf. 30c) while negative polarity items such as *remuer le petit doigt pour aider* (lift a finger to help) are always ruled out (cf. 31c):

- (30) a. Elle se met plutôt à crier
 (She rather starts yelling)
 b. *Elle se met pas plutôt à crier
 (She rather doesn't start yelling)
 c. Fak là, elle se met-tu pas plutôt à crier
 (She rather starts-TU PAS yelling)
- (31) a. Elle a pas remué le petit doigt pour vous aider
 (She didn't lift a finger to help you)
 b. *Elle a remué le petit doigt pour vous aider
 c. *Elle a-tu pas remué le petit doigt pour vous aider
 (She lifted(-TU PAS) a finger to help you)

Interestingly, it can also be observed that the equivalent QF structures with –tu *pas* in the grammar of SF can be paralleled by sentences where one finds either a lexically filled CP (with a Q operator (32a) or an E(valuative) operator (32b,c)) cooccurring with a negative marker *pas* whose semantic property is not to negate the proposition:

- (32) a. Tout à coup, **est-ce que** je n'entends **pas** un bruit terrible venant de la salle de bain.
 (SF) (example due to Y-C. Morin)
 All of a sudden, do I not hear a terrible noise coming from the bathroom..
 (Suddenly, I hear a terrible noise arising from the bathroom)
 b. Mais **quelle** ne fut **pas** sa stupeur quand . . . (Togebly 1982:224)
 But what was not his astonishment when . . .
 (But you can imagine his astonishment when . . .)
 c. **Qu'est-ce qu'il** (ne) faut **pas** entendre!
 (The things that one must hear!)
 d. Elle arrive à l'aéroport, et là, **qui** ne voit-elle **pas**!
 (She gets to the airport and then, who does she see (PAS)?)

In (32a), the typical instantaneous change of state reading is observed, introduced by a change of setting adverbial, in (32b,c,d) we find an exclamative/evaluative reading with a scalar implicature.¹⁸ An equivalent wh-exclamative structure with a scalar implicature reading is also found with *-tu pas* in QF, as in the following:

- (33) a. Fak là, qui je vois-tu pas! (QF)
 This has as a result that there, who I see-TU Neg!
 (And then, who do I see-TU PAS?).
 b. Qu'est-ce qu'i(l) faut-tu pas entendre! (QF)
 What is-dem-neuter that it must-TU Neg hear
 (The things that one must hear!)

It should be noted that this interpretation of negation has been too often neglected by linguists in general. As a consequence, linguists lack a precise term to describe this particular reading of *pas* in this context.¹⁹ Based on work by Cinque (1976, 1998) and Zanuttini (1997), let us therefore assume that this reading of *pas* is some sort of a presuppositional *pas* since the role of this negation marker is also “to induce a positive interpretation in the mind of the hearer” (cf. Zanuttini 1997).²⁰ This presuppositional *pas* in some of these forms introduced by a Q or E operator such as *est-ce que*, *quelle* in (32a,b) seems to play a grammatical role in the interpretation of sentence-types since its presence is mandatory, as can be observed in (34) below:

¹⁸ Following Portner & Zanuttini (1996), “(a) scalar negation implicates that – out of a set of different alternative possibilities – certain of them, including the true one, were unexpected in the conversation up until that point”.

¹⁹ Grevisse & Goosse (1993:1460) use the term *interrogations oratoires*. Muller (1991) refers to rhetorical questions to refer to questions where no answer is to be expected as in *Qui n'a jamais causé un accident?* (Who has never caused an accident?). Espinal (1997) refers to *Expletive negation* in her discussion of negation in wh-exclamatives in Catalan and Spanish. The study proposes that this expletive negation is licensed in the scope of a higher functional projection called *Intensifier projection*. Cormack and Smith (1999) use the term *Echoic negation* for certain contexts where “the Modal₁ *should* may be interpreted as within the scope of negation as in *Shouldn't Suzy be at school?*”. They argue for a higher ‘polarity’ position Echo[Neg] assumed to be on the left periphery of C.

²⁰ These presuppositional negative markers in Italian and various dialects of Italian have a distinct lexical form. Zanuttini (1997:61) notes, following Cinque (1976), that *mica* in (i) is one such marker:

- (i) Gianni non ha mica la macchina (Italian)
 Gianni neg has neg the car
 (@ Gianni hasn't got a car)

She then explains that the diacritic @ is used to express that *mica* is limited to certain pragmatic contexts where it is understood that the non-negative counterpart of the proposition is assumed in the discourse. Therefore, the sentence in (i) must entail that Gianni has a car, otherwise, it must appear without *mica*. In French, as will be illustrated, this presuppositional reading is obtained with a single lexical item, namely *pas*, but only when it is in the scope of a certain type of illocutionary force marker.

- (34) a. *Tout à coup, **est-ce que** j'entends un bruit terrible venant de la salle de bain.
 All of a sudden, do I hear a terrible noise coming from the bathroom.
- b. *Mais **quelle** fut sa stupeur quand . . .
 But what was his astonishment when . . .

In these last examples, the negation form serves to establish the distinction between an interrogative and an evaluative interpretation (cf. also Nøjgaard 1967). Similarly in QF, *-tu pas* appears as a combination of two distinct morphemes but they must obligatorily surface together. Otherwise, the result is uninterpretable since the temporal adverb at the beginning of the proposition (*fak là*) introduces a change of state event and this adverb must be reinforced by both *-tu* and *pas* in the clause:

- (35) a. *Fak là, j'entends-tu une bardasse terrible
 b. *Fak là, j'entends pas une bardasse terrible
 (And then, I hear a terrible noise)

However, the two lexical items are always adjacent: *Fak là, j'entends-tu (*dèjà/*vraiment) pas une bardasse terrible* (And then, I hear-TU already/ really not a terrible noise).

Considering that *pas* contributes to the meaning of the sentence and considering that negation is undetermined for a positive or a negative reading (cf. Laka 1994), we here assume that the features of *pas* should be checked at LF in a projection which takes into account the polarity of the proposition, Neg/Pos, as will be proposed below.

What then is the exact meaning of *-tu pas* and what is its role in the sentence? It can be observed from the examples in (29) and (32) that a presuppositional reading for *pas* in French is limited to certain semantic contexts, namely sentences which introduce an illocutionary force marker of some type and *-tu* has been identified as an *in situ* illocutionary force marker. In the examples (28), it expresses surprise and both morphemes serve to identify the unexpected culminating point of the story. They are closely connected: the presuppositional reading of *pas* is linked to *-tu* and both elements convey a particular meaning to the sentence in the sense that the representation of *-tu pas* is correlated with the interpretation of Tense and Aspect in grammar, namely an instantaneous change of state with a built-in terminal point. In other words, *-tu* and *pas* bear a close connection to T and Aspect.

3.1. *Measured out Events*

Events which are used felicitously with *-tu pas* must be temporally measured out. Events denoted by a verb can be temporally measured

out and delimited through affixes, aspectual prefixes, more precisely, as demonstrated in Di Sciullo & Klipple (1994) and by arguments in the verbal projection, DP or PP which refer to the property of an event bearing an inherent endpoint (Tenny 1987). An affix or a (directional) object can be considered a delimiter, using the terms of Tenny (1994) and Borer (1994). This is illustrated in (36) where we find a clear contrast between acceptable and unacceptable predicates occurring with *-tu pas*:

- (36) a. Tout d'un coup, *elle dort-tu pas / elle s'endort-tu pas
(Suddenly, she sleeps /falls asleep)
 b. Fak là, *il court-tu pas / il court-tu pas directement au bout de la rue
(Suddenly, he runs / he runs directly to the end of the street)
 c. D'un coup, *il se met-tu pas / il se met-tu pas à crier
(Suddenly, he starts / he starts yelling)

In (36), we find different elements which all serve to create the same aspectual effects. The prefix *en-* in (36a) defines a terminal endpoint for the verb *sleep*, the underlined PPs in (36b–c) convey the same effect. A non event or a stative interpretation, such as the introduction of a narrative in (37), is completely ruled out with *-tu pas* in QF (37a) as well as the mere presence of a change of state adverb introducing the proposition in the grammar of SF (37b). In both sentences, there is no change in the Reference time and, as mentioned by Kamp & Reyle (1993), events always follow their Reference point while states include them:

- (37) a. *Il était-tu pas une fois un roi qui vivait dans un château . . . (QF)
(Once upon a time there was-TU PAS a king living in a castle . . .)
 b. *Tout d'un coup, il était une fois un roi qui vivait dans un château . . . (SF)
(Suddenly, once upon a time there was a king living in a castle . . .)

The examples in (37) clearly indicate that *-tu pas* as well as the change of setting adverbs both reinforce the aspectual reading of the whole proposition. For instance, and as expected, *-tu pas* always modifies a single event reading and never a proposition with a generic or habitual interpretation without an endpoint. This explains why adverbs of frequency are ruled out with the following expressions:

- (38) a. *Depuis deux mois, je vois-tu pas Jean qui sort toujours du cinéma à midi (QF)
(For two months, I see-TU PAS Jean always coming out of the cinema at noon)
 b. *On pendait-tu pas souvent les prisonniers dans c'temps-là (generic interpretation) (QF)
(They used to often hang prisoners in those days)

3.2 *The relation to Realis tense*

-Tu pas cannot combine with just any tense, it must be a realis tense. Comrie (1985) has observed that realis is a mood involving situations that “are ongoing or were observed in the past”, and Cowper (1996) also mentions that the realis/irrealis distinction is closely connected to what part of the temporal domain an event/state is linked to. The examples in (39) below all indicate unfelicitous tense or irrealis forms combined with *-tu pas*. Infinitives or past participles (39a,b) are ruled out as well as conditionals (39c) which convey an irrealis interpretation:

- (39) a. *Fak là, elle se met à crier-tu pas
(Suddenly, she starts to yell-TU PAS)
 b. *Tout d’un coup, je l’ai vu-tu pas sortir
(Suddenly, I have seen-TU PAS her going out)
 c. *Tout d’un coup, elle pourrait-tu pas venir dehors (irrealis Tense)
(All of a sudden, she would be-TU PAS able to come outside)

As previously mentioned, the representation of these morphemes correlates with the interpretation of Tense and Aspect in grammar, namely grammatical aspect (punctual as opposed to progressive) and the distinction between eventive and stative predicates. Following Partee (1973, 1984), Tense is viewed as a referential expression. This intuition is linked to the general observation that a certain tense can refer to particular locations in time even when it is not introduced by previous linguistic context. In (28a) above, for instance, the present tense can refer to an interval of time during which someone heard a terrible noise and this interval of time is understood to be prior to the utterance time. The tense on the verb which combines with *-tu pas* is therefore always past, in its many varieties, in the sense that the time of the event is always prior to the time of utterance.

Interestingly, the future tense can be used with *-tu pas* but the interpretation is then of a special type, it refers to a particular imagined situation, namely a movie director talking about a previously written scenario:

- (40) Pis là, Belmondo sortira-tu pas du restaurant en se jetant par terre
(And then, Belmondo will-TU PAS go out of the restaurant throwing himself on the ground)

The time of utterance seems to precede the event-time in (40), but it is a mere illusion. In this type of sentence in the grammar of QF, the event is already planned at the time of utterance. There is therefore no other possible interpretation than the “scenario” point of view when the future tense is used. In other words, *-tu pas* always serves to identify a past narrative.

3.3. *The non-negative reading of pas and the operator –tu*

We have mentioned in section 2.7 above that *pas* cannot negate the proposition in yes/no questions when *–tu* is present. This result stands in opposition to what is observed in SF with yes/no question. The examples previously given in (25) and (27), are repeated below for ease of exposition:

(25) **Ta mère est-tu pas à maison?* (QF)

Your mother is-TU not home?

(Is your mother not home?)

(27) *N'est-elle pas à la maison?* (SF)

(Isn't she at home?)

A plausible explanation, at first sight, for this mysterious distinction would be to tentatively hypothesize that an overt V-to-C movement could be responsible for this difference because there is no such inversion in QF. But this proposal immediately raises further questions. How could such an explanation be generalized to other facts in this grammar? Note that (25) is acceptable if the verb is inflected with a conditional tense form. The example in (41) illustrates clearly that this expression in QF is sensitive to modality:²¹

(41) *Ta mère serait-tu pas à maison?* (QF)

Your mother wouldn't be at home

(Wouldn't your mother be at home?)

This interesting piece of information reminds us that only sentential types of negation (Echo or Σ , in the C domain and Pol in the T domain, following Cormack and Smith 1999) are sensitive to negation or to a negative interpretation. If an affirmative reading of *pas* is somehow connected to Tense, then it could be suggested that the rejected reading in (25) would be ruled out as an adverbial negation reading which lies outside the domain of Tense. However, it is not clear why a constituent negation would be a difficult reading as well, in (25) above.

More interestingly, one notes that other types of Yes/No questions are also unacceptable with *–tu pas*, namely rhetoric questions and pure informative questions previously presented in (29). Out of the three types of yes/no question forms only dubious questions are acceptable

²¹ In a certain way, this situation recalls Negative particle negation in the grammars of several dialects of Chinese. Cheng, Huang & Tang (1996) have argued for a Neg⁰-to-C⁰ movement in yes/no questions called Negative Particle questions where the question is marked by a negation marker at the end of the sentence. In these varieties of Chinese grammars, we find more than one negation marker and there is agreement between the negation marker and the aspect/verb form. In a somewhat similar fashion in (41) above, we could posit that there exists a dependency between the interpretation of negation and the mood/verb form.

with *-tu pas* and the question is explicitly dubious with the presence of the conditional tense form, as in (41). The following unacceptable sentences are all in the present tense.²²

- (42) a. *?La santé est-tu pas le plus grand des trésors?
 Health is-TU PAS the biggest of treasures
 b. *Elle dort-tu pas?
 She sleeps-TU PAS

When the modal is introduced, it can be proposed that the *in situ* operator *-tu* checked in the CP domain at LF can scope over *pas* in the T domain and reverse its polarity only if the mood on V is restricted to the conditional form. It suggests that the whole complex [T+V+tu] must be checked in C-Q at LF and not only [V+tu]. Therefore, *-tu pas* in root question forms (41) is limited to utterances which express doubt explicitly through a conditional tense form in QF. They are non-neutral questions. As in tag questions in English, they express a certain commitment towards the truth value of the proposition (cf. Lyons 1995:255) and the expected answer is the positive reading of the sentence. However, this constraint on Mood is only linked to *-tu*, not to *-t-il* and its variants. When V+T is checked overtly in a higher position, as in (27), a present tense can also trigger a dubious question interpretation. The representation of the derivation at LF for both (27) in SF and (41) in QF, where *pas* is interpreted positively are as follows:

- (43) C Pol/Echo [pas] V_{Tense}-tu/-t-il C[Q] . . . TP PolP[] . . .

The reversal in polarity with *pas* when it scopes over a Q operator, namely *-tu*, is not unique in grammar. It is reminiscent of an often observed phenomenon, namely in the case of the reversal in polarity of a negative polarity item like *qui que ce soit* when it appears in combination with a Q operator either in a root clause (44b) or an embedded clause (44c):

- (44) a. *Jean aime qui que ce soit
 Jean loves anybody
 b. Aime-t-il qui que ce soit?
 Does he love anybody?
 c. Je me demande si Jean aime qui que ce soit?
 I wonder whether Jean loves anybody

Note that this reversal in polarity is not licensed by a wh operator or a wh E(xclamative) operator, illustrating that it is limited to certain types of operators:

²² The link between the presence of *-tu pas* and the type of yes/no questions is based on the classification proposed by Brown (1999) for Russian yes/no questions that allow the interrogative marker *li* and an expletive negation. As observed with *-tu pas* in QF, not all types of negated yes/no questions in Russian can cooccur with *li*, (see also Vinet 1999d).

- (45) a. *Qui a rencontré qui que ce soit hier?
Who met anybody yesterday?
b. *Qu'est-ce que qui que ce soit était beau hier soir!
How anybody was beautiful last night!

Following our general hypothesis for the representation of *-tu* as an *in situ* wh Force operator identified in the CP domain, as in (24) above, we could therefore extend our representation of *-tu* in these structures as in (46), for yes/no non-neutral question forms, and as in (47) for the focalized and aspectually constrained fragment of discourse in the narration. We leave aside in (46)–(47) the representation of *pas* (see below):

- (46) a. $_{CP}[T+V-tu_i C[Q] \text{ Mood}[Su_j t_v t_i \dots] \text{ Neg}[pas] \text{ FP}[\dots] \text{ VP}[t_j \dots t_v]]$
b. Ta mère serait-tu pas à maison?
(Wouldn't your mother be at home?)
- (47) a. $_{CP}[T+V-tu_i C[\text{Focus}] \text{ TP}[Su_j t_v t_i \dots] \text{ Neg}[pas] \text{ FP}[\dots] \text{ VP}[t_j \dots t_v]]$
b. Fak là, j'entends-tu pas une bardasse terrible
(And then, I (suddenly) hear a terrible noise)

In (46), Mood is limited to a conditional tense form since such questions are unacceptable with the future tense **Il viendra-tu pas?! *Il va-tu pas venir?* (Will he not come-TU), as also noted by Picard (1991), or the infinitive which is ruled out anyhow as a selected T. Finally, it is important to add that, as expected from our hypothesis, utterances with *-tu pas* are also limited to root phenomena (48a) and to finiteness (48b):

- (48) a. *Je suis sûr que, fak là, ça commence-tu pas à trembler (FQ)
I am sure that, suddenly, it starts-TU PAS to shake
b. *Lui lire-tu pas un livre! Ce serait vraiment étonnant (FQ)
Him read-TU PAS a book! That would be really astonishing.
(Him read a book! That would really be astonishing)

In other words, the presuppositional or positive reading of *pas* in *-tu pas* is here dependent on the presence at LF of a higher Q operator in the non selected CP domain. Otherwise, *pas* is interpreted as being negatively polarized and the proposition is uninterpretable. The intuition that I would like to capture here is that a positive reading for *pas* is always triggered by another element, namely another operator in the same domain. The following principle is proposed:

Principle of interpretation for a positive [POS] reading of French *pas* in connection with a wh operator in C:

- (49) The negative marker *pas* can be interpreted [POS] when it is checked in a higher PolP position in the C domain of a root clause and when it scopes over a wh Force operator which is

connected to an inflected V form (Mood, Tense and phi features).

It can therefore be proposed that *pas*, being underspecified for the feature [neg], is checked in a higher PolarityP projection, as argued by Cormack & Smith (1999), a position they labelled Echo or Σ , as in Laka (1994). It can be roughly exemplified as follows for the two structures identified in (46)–(47) above:

- (50) a. C [Echo/ Σ [Pos]] pas C[Q] [T+V-tu_i]
 $_{\text{TMood}}[\text{Su}_j \text{t}_v \text{t}_i \dots] \text{Neg}[\] \text{FP}[\dots] \text{VP}[\text{t}_j \dots \text{t}_v]$
 b. Ta mère serait-tu pas à maison?
- (51) a. C [Echo/ Σ [Pos]] pas C[Focus] [T+V-tu_i]
 $_{\text{TP}}[\text{Su}_j \text{t}_v \text{t}_i \dots] \text{Neg}[\] \text{FP}[\dots] \text{VP}[\text{t}_j \dots \text{t}_v]$
 b. Fak là, j'entends-tu pas une bardasse terrible

At PF, the complex [V+tu+pas] forms a prosodic unit and the stress of insistence falls on *pas*, the last syllable of the complex form in examples such as (49b). This explains the obligatory adjacency between *-tu* and *pas*.

To summarize briefly section 3, it was proposed that *-tu pas* creates an aspectual effect in discourse. It was also shown that the use of this aspectual marker is closely connected to properties of predicates, namely predicates with a built-in terminal point. Moreover, it was argued that *-tu pas* must be analyzed as two different morphemes, where *-tu* is a Force operator identified in the CP domain at LF and *pas* is a negative marker which is interpreted with a reverse positive polarity when it scopes over a Force operator, such as *-tu*. The interpretable features of *pas* are therefore checked at LF in Echo, following Cormack & Smith (1999) or Σ following Laka (1994), and *pas* gets its interpretation only if it is checked in a higher position over a Focus *-tu* operator in C. Otherwise, the sentence is interpreted as gibberish and the derivation crashes. Each morpheme thus makes a different contribution to the meaning of the utterance.

When *-tu* is a Q operator in yes/no questions, the reversal in polarity is further constrained by the surfacing of a particular Mood affix on the V connected to *-tu*. This mood affix (conditional tense form) explicitly identifies dubious questions in QF.

4. Conclusion

This paper has offered a descriptive study of *-tu* in Quebec French and has proposed an analysis in terms of formal, semantic and phonological features for this lexical item within a minimalist approach. It was concluded that *-tu* represents a morphophonological spell-out of stress at PF and it is identified as an *in situ* wh Force operator checked at LF in

an unselected C. If the 2p pronoun *tu* is connected to *-tu*, as proposed by Roberge & Bibis (1999), then the most important distinction which emerges from a feature representation of both forms is that the former has nominal features while the latter rather identifies with verbal properties. As a verbal element, it follows the derivational path concerned by the checking of the finite verb. Even though many questions remain, we believe to have offered a plausible explanation for the distribution of this enclitic morpheme in QF. It was illustrated that *-tu* is not an inherent interrogative marker nor an inherent illocutionary force marker. It rather selects a subset of these structures according to its feature values. We have also shown how the expressions with *-tu pas* in this variety of French can be interpreted as a natural extension of the other structures with which *-tu* combines.

More importantly, we have suggested that the representation of *-tu* in terms of feature composition should not establish an irreversible distinction in the lexicon between a functional head *-tu* and the D head *-t-il* from which it is derived. The referential D head *tu* represents one meaning of the form in the lexicon and its morphologically equivalent functional head *-tu* is historically derived from the D head *-t-il*. In other words, if *-tu* as a Force operator has lost the formal features of the equivalent nominal D head *tu* in French, we have argued that *-t-il*, the D head with nominal phi features and *-tu* the functional head which identifies verbal phi features nonetheless behave alike in some syntactic and semantic respects.

References

- AMBAR, M. 1997. Aspects of the syntax of focus in Portuguese. The grammar of focus. ed. G. Rebuschi & L. Tuller, 23–53. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- AUTHIER, J.-M. 1997. When Syntax Overrides Semantics. *Proceedings of Nels 28*. U. Mass. Amherst.
- BAUCHE, H. 1951. *Le langage populaire*. Paris: Payot.
- BIBIS, N. & ROBERGE, Y. 1999. A popos de clíques à comportement marginal. Ms. U. of Toronto.
- BONET, E. 1995. Feature structure of Romance clitics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13.4, 607–647.
- BORER, H. 1994. The projection of arguments. *Functional Projections*. ed. E. Benedicto & J. Runner. *U. of Massachusetts Occasional Papers* 17, 19–47.
- BOSQUE, I. 1994. Degree quantification and modal operators in Spanish. Ms. Universidad Complutense, Madrid.
- BROWN, S. 1999. *The Syntax of Negation in Russian. A Minimalist Approach*. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information. CSLI Publications.
- CHENG, L., HUANG, J. & TANG, J. 1996. Negative particle questions: a dialectal comparison. *Microparametric Syntax and Dialect Variation*, eds. J. Black & V. Motapanyane, 41–78. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- CHOMSKY, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

- CINQUE, G. 1976. Mica. *Annali della Facolta di Lettere e Filosofia*. U. Padova.
- CINQUE, G. 1998. *Adverbs and Functional Heads*. London: Oxford U. Press.
- CORMIE, B. 1985. *Tense*. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press.
- CORMACK, A. & SMITH, N. 1999. Head movement and Negation in English. Ms. U. College London.
- COWPER, E. 1996. The features of Tense in English. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 14, 19–40.
- DI SCIULLO, A-M. & KLIPPLE, E. 1994. Modifying affixes. *Proceedings of WECOL XXIII*. Seattle: U. of Washington.
- DOMINIK, A. 1999. Les structures impératives et la variation: un traitement minimaliste. Ms. U. Sherbrooke.
- DOWTY, D. 1986. The effects of aspectual class on the temporal structure of discourse: semantics or pragmatics? *Linguistics and Philosophy* 9, 37–61.
- ESPINAL, M-T. 1997. Non-Negative Negation and wh-exclamatives. *Negation and Polarity*. eds. D. Forget et al. 75–93. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- FOULET, L. 1921. Comment ont évolué les formes de l'interrogation? *Romania XLVII*: 243–358.
- GADET, F. 1994. *Le français populaire*. Paris: PUF.
- GREVISSE, M. & GOOSSE, A. 1993. *Le bon usage*. 13th ed. Louvain-la-Neuve: Duculot.
- GROHMANN, K. 1999. Infinitival Exclamatives. *U. of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics* 8, 213–238.
- HAEGEMAN, L. 1995. *The Syntax of Negation*. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press.
- HARLEY, H. & RITTER, E. 1998. Meaning in Morphology: motivating a feature-geometric analysis of person and number. Ms. U. of Philadelphia & U. of Calgary.
- HEAP, D. 1999. Split subject pronoun paradigms: a feature geometry. Ms. U. of Western Ontario.
- HIRSCHBÜHLER, P. & LABELLE, M. 1992. *Syntaxe du français: l'universel et le particulier dans la langue*. Ms. U. du Québec à Montréal.
- KAMP, H. & REYLE, U. 1993. *From Discourse to Logic*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- KAYNE, R. 1975. *French Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- KAYNE, R. 1984. *Connectedness and Binary Branching*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- KAYNE, R. 1996. Microparametric syntax: some introductory remarks. *Micro-parametric Syntax and Dialect variation*. eds. J. Black & V. Motapanyane ix-xviii. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- KAYNE, R. 1998. Person morphemes and reflexives. Ms. New York U.
- KAYNE, R. & POLLOCK, J.-Y. 1999. New Thoughts on Stylistic Inversion. Ms. New York U. and UPR 9075 CNRS Lyon.
- LARSON, R. 1985. On the syntax of disjunctive scope. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3, 217–264.
- LAKA, I. 1994. *On the Syntax of Negation*. New York: Garland.
- LEARD, J.-M. 1996. Ti-tu, est-ce que, qu'est-ce que, ce que, hé que, don: des particules de modélisation en français? *Revue québécoise de linguistique* 24:2, 105–124.
- LYONS, J. 1995. *Linguistic Semantics: An introduction*. New York: Cambridge U. Press.
- MCCAWLEY, J. 1988. *The Syntactic Phenomena of English*. Chicago and London: The U. of Chicago Press.

- MILNER, J.-C. 1978. *De la syntaxe à l'interprétation. Quantités, insultes, exclamations*. Paris: Le Seuil.
- MORIN, Y.-C. 1979. There is no inversion of subject clitics in Modern French. Ms. U. de Montréal.
- MORIN, Y.-C. 1985. On the two French subjectless verbs *voici* and *voilà*. *Language* 61, 777–820.
- MULLER, C. 1991. *La négation en français*. Geneva: Droz.
- NØJGAARD, M. 1967. Le rôle de la négation dans les exclamations introduites. Actes du quatrième Congrès des romanistes scandinaves. *Revue Romane*, numéro spécial 1. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.
- NOONAN, M. 1989. Operator Licensing and the Case of French interrogatives. *Proceedings of the Eight West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 315–330. Stanford, California.
- NOONAN, M. 1992. *Case and Syntactic Geometry*. PhD. diss., McGill U.
- NYROP, K. 1930. *Grammaire historique de la langue française*. Vol VI. Paris: Picard.
- PARSONS, T. 1990. *Events in the Semantics of English: A Study in Subatomic Semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- PARTEE, B. 1973. Some structural analogies between tenses and pronouns. *The Journal of Philosophy* 70, 601–09.
- PARTEE, B. 1984. Nominal and temporal anaphora. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 7, 243–86.
- PICARD, M. 1991. Clitics, affixes, and the evolution of the question marker *tu* in Canadian French. *French language studies* 1, 179–187.
- PICARD, M. 1992. Aspects synchroniques et diachroniques du *tu* interrogatif en québécois. *Revue québécoise de linguistique* 21:2, 65–75.
- PIRVULESCU, M. & ROBERGE, Y. 1999. Objects and the structure of imperatives. *Formal Perspectives on Romance Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- PLATZACK, C. & ROSENGREN, I. 1998. On the subject of imperatives: a minimalist account of the imperative clause. *Journal of Comparative Linguistics* 1, 177–224.
- POLLOCK, J.-Y. 1989. Verb movement, UG and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20, 365–424.
- PORTNER, P. & ZANUTTINI, R. 1996. The syntax and semantics of scalar negation: Evidence from Paduan. *Proceedings of NELS* 26, 257–71. Amherst.
- REED, L. 1997. Pronominalized aspect. *Studia Linguistica* 51:2, 121–53.
- RIZZI, L. 1982. *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- RIZZI, L. 1990. Speculations on verb second. *Grammar in Progress. GLOW Essays for Henk van Riemsdijk*. eds. M. Nespø & J. Mascarò, 375–386. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- RIZZI, L. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. *Elements of Grammar*, ed. L. Haegeman, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- RIZZI, L. & ROBERTS, I. 1989. Complex Inversion in French. *Probus* 1, 1–30.
- ROBERGE, Y. & BIBIS, N. 1999. Items lexicaux, asymétries F-S et clitiques pronominaux. Ms. U. of Toronto.
- ROBERGE, Y. & VINET, M.-T. 1989. *La variation dialectale en grammaire universelle*. Montréal: Montréal U. Press.
- ROBERTS, I. 1993. *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- ROWLETT, P. 1998. *Sentential Negation in French*. New York: Oxford U. Press.
- SPORTICHE, D. 1992. Clitic constructions. Ms. UCLA.
- SPORTICHE, D. 1995. Sketch of a reductionist approach to syntactic variation ad

- dependencies. *Evolution and Revolution in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Carlos Otero*. ed. H. Campos & P. Kempchinsky.
- SPORTICHE, D. 1998. *Partitions and Atoms of Clause Structure. Subjects, agreement, case and clitics*. New York: Routledge.
- TENNY, C. 1987. *Grammaticalizing Aspect and Affectedness*. Ph. D. Diss. MIT.
- TENNY, C. 1994. *Aspectual Roles and the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- TOGEBY, K. 1982. *Grammaire française*. Vol. I-IV. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.
- VINET, M.-T. 1997. *Tu pas* en français québécois: identification grammaticale. *Mélanges de linguistique offerts à Rotislav Kocourek*. ed. H. Runte, L. Lapiere & I. Oore, 351–56. Halifax: Dalhousie U. Press.
- VINET, M.-T. 1998a. *Tu-pas* as a modifier of event relations in a narrative discourse. *Studies on the Syntax of Central Romance Languages*. eds. O. Fullana & F. Roca, 243–255, Girona U. Press.
- VINET, M.-T. 1998b. Contrastive Focus, French N-words and variation. *The Canadian Journal of Linguistics*. 43:1, 121–141.
- VINET, M.-T. 1999a. *-Tu pas: Aspect et Temps*. *Langues et grammaire 3: syntaxe*. Département SDL Université de Paris 8, 181–195.
- VINET, M.-T. 1999b. Negation with [-Neg] features. Paper presented at *Negation: syntax, semantics and pragmatics conference*. Salford.
- VINET, M.-T. 1999c. *-Tu* en français québécois et les traits dans le domaine de C. Paper presented at the Colloquium of the *Canadian Linguistic Association*. Sherbrooke.
- VINET, M.-T. 1999d. La position Pos/Neg, *-tu (pas)* et les questions oui/non. Ms. Sherbrooke.
- URIAGAREKA, J. 1992. Focus in Iberian languages. Paper presented at the Glow Colloquium, Lisbon.
- ZANUTTINI, R. 1997. *Negation and Clausal structure. A comparative study of Romance languages*. Oxford U. Press.

Received August 17, 1998

Accepted January 1, 2000

Marie-Thérèse Vinet
Faculté des Lettres et sciences humaines
Université de Sherbrooke
Sherbrooke (Québec)
Canada, J1K 2R1
email: mtvinet@courrier.usherb.ca