

## **-TU IN QUEBEC FRENCH AS A (SUPER)POSITIVE MARKER\***

MARIE-THÉRÈSE VINET  
*Université de Sherbrooke*

### 1. *Introduction*

This paper proposes a unified analysis for the invariable item *-tu* in the grammar of Quebec French (henceforth QF), an enclitic which appears in root finite clauses with a variety of discursive or expressive effects. In these contexts, *-tu* is a bound morpheme which has a limited distribution in the sense that it is confined to finite verbs with overt subjects and it is precluded in non expressive root clauses. Moreover, when *-tu* cooccurs with the negative marker *pas*, it always deprives *pas* of its negative force. Traditionnally and even in recent theoretical studies, *-tu* in QF has been identified almost uniquely as an interrogative marker (cf. Noonan 1989 and many others cited in Vinet 1999: 383, footnote 2) but it is not the only role it plays. The main questions to be addressed are therefore the following:

- A) What is the function of *-tu* in this grammar?
- B) Why does *-tu* appear only in these identified environments and not in others?
- C) How can we license in a unified way all these expressions with *-tu* in QF?

---

\* I would like to thank the organizers of the Going Romance Conference for their warm welcome as well as the audience at the colloquium and at the Conference presented at Institut Charles V in Paris (*Conférences du lundi*, December 2<sup>nd</sup> 2002) for their comments and their interest. I would also like to thank Anne Zribi-Hertz, Nomi Erteschik-Shir and François Poiré for discussions and comments on a previous version of this article. This research was partly supported by SSHRC grant #410-2001-0119 (Martineau-Vinet) and #410-2000-0954 (Tellier-Vinet).

In order to account for these expressions I will use certain elements from two different theoretical approaches. Similar structures, mostly interrogative forms in French and in Romance, have recently been studied through a Remnant IP approach in a layered CP, as in Kayne & Pollock (2001) and Poletto & Pollock (2000), a framework which accounts for V related and phrasal movements merged to the left, including Subject Clitic Inversion (SCII) and Complex Inversion (CI). From this point of view, *-tu* structures, just like *ti*, can be considered as a variety of CI structures. However, *-tu* structures in QF do not only involve yes/no question forms as in (1d) below. *-Tu* can also appear in evaluative-exclamative structures (1a) as well as change of state expressive constructions (1b) and alleviated forms of command structure using a modal verb (1c). In order to illustrate how the function of *-tu* is to signal an affirmative or a (super)positive context, since *-tu* always appears in positively polarized contexts, I will use certain aspects of an f-structure model, as developed by Erteschik-Shir (1997). The four identified contexts in which *-tu* can appear are exemplified in (1):

- (1) a. *Ça se peut-tu!*  
 that REFL-CL can- TU  
 "Can it be possible!"
- b. *D'un coup, elle part-tu pas à crier*  
 suddenly, she starts-TU Neg yelling  
 "Suddenly, she starts yelling."
- c. *Tu veux-tu me laisser tranquille!*  
 you want-TU me leave peaceful  
 "Why don't you leave me alone!"
- d. *Elles sont-tu responsables?*  
 3FPL are-TU responsible  
 "Are they responsible?"

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section, I begin by summarizing previous results on the study of *tu* and *ti* as well as related forms of *-tu* in time and space. I then turn to the syntactic and semantic properties of this invariable enclitic and show that *-tu* must be merged to the left of IP, as an affirmative operator. Section 3 discusses the *-tu pas* eventive expressive structures in QF. In section 4, I present certain problems for the analysis of *-tu* within the framework proposed for *ti* by Poletto & Pollock (2000). Section 5 then explores the phonological aspect of Focus for *-tu* expressions in QF within the analysis of Erteschik-Shir (1997). The last section concludes briefly.

## 2. *Previous studies and related forms in time and space*

Previous studies on *-tu* (cf. references cited in Vinet 2000 and more particularly Noonan 1989) have analysed or identified this enclitic in QF as a yes/no interrogative marker only. The fact that it can also be an operator with a variety of expressive interpretations, as illustrated in (1), has usually been left aside, apart from my own work on the subject, namely Vinet (2000, 2001).

*-Tu* has often been studied, as in Pollock (2000), in a parallel fashion with the invariable *ti* form from a moribund dialect spoken in France or in Europe. Poletto & Pollock (2000) have identified the *-t* in *ti* as a “[question] morpheme” which is attracted in the derivation to delete an “uninterpretable [+interrogative] feature”. However, contrary to the *ti* forms, the *-tu* constructions in QF are very productive in a variety of contexts.

Moreover, I want to demonstrate that all these interpretations in (1) have in common an emphatic affirmative feature which is incompatible with a negative force reading, a situation which illustrates clearly that the function of *-tu* in this grammar is to signal a positively polarized context.

The empirical object of this study, QF *-tu*, is a quite recent grammatical phenomenon in Quebec. It developed in urban areas by the end of the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (cf. Morin 1985, Picard 1992). Before that period, dictionaries, popular novels and plays which reported on the vernacular only mentioned the *ti* forms (Clapin 1894, Dionne 1909, Glossaire du Parler français au Canada 1930, Dunn 1880). However, it is rarely mentioned that the presence of such an enclitic form has also been noticed in certain French “patois” in France (Creuse, Nièvre, Puy de Dôme) (cf. Foulet 1921:341, cited in Vinet 2001: 42), as in (2a) and also (2b) from the non corrected text of the 17<sup>th</sup> century *Agréables conférences*, reported in Deloffre (1999). A first person enclitic form *jou* has also been used in yes/no questions (cf. 2c) in a moribund Picard dialect from the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the Picard dialect of Demuin (see Hrkal 1910: 262, cited in Vinet 2001:32). Such invariable pronominal markers can also be found in Valdôtain (cf. Roberts 1993, Pollock 2000):

- (2) a. *Tu kreye tu? /Tu kre tu?* (Foulet 1921 :341)  
 you believe TU/ you believe TU  
 “Do you believe?”
- b. *Hé, d’ où je venas-tu, de Nanterre?* (AC, III, note 30)  
 (from Louis Richer, 17<sup>th</sup> c., cited in Deloffre 1999)  
 hey, from where I came-TU, from Nanterre  
 “Hey, where did I come from, from Nanterre?”

- c. *Ils y sont-jou?* (Hrkal 1910 :262, cited in Vinet 2001)  
 they there-CL are- JE  
 “Are they there?”

This use of nominative subject pronouns of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person as invariable enclitics in a variety of dialects, as illustrated in (2), must be clearly distinguished from 3<sup>rd</sup> person enclitics which agree in gender and number with the lexical subject in Complex Inversion structures from Standard French. However, Complex Inversion (CI) and Subject Clitic Inversion (SCII) do share with *-tu* structures a common restriction to root contexts.

#### 2.1 *Syntactic and semantic properties of an invariable -tu*

The following characteristics identify its properties:

- a) *-tu* is an enclitic limited to root clauses;
- b) It is also confined to finite verbs with a lexical subject;
- c) It cannot be used with non expressive statements or ‘residual V2’ sentences;
- d) It is precluded with negative sentences.

a) *-tu* is an enclitic form on a finite V and it is a Force operator limited to root clauses. It can indeed be used with root yes/no informative questions, as in (1d). It can also be used in other root sentences with several other interpretations where it reinforces a (super)positive reading connected to an expressive meaning, as in (1a-c).

Sentence (1a) is an evaluative sentence and *-tu* is translated as an intensifier. In (1b), *-tu* combined with *pas* serves to identify a segment of discourse which conveys new information and expresses unexpectedness and bewilderment. This last structure is always introduced by an aspectual change of state adverb, such as *suddenly*. It is observed that *-tu* and *pas* combine obligatorily in this structure as in the *vlà-tu pas/vlà ti pas* “here is” expressive aspectual structure introducing an event in discourse (cf. Morin 1985, Vinet 2000).

Example (1c) is a root clause imperative form which is composed of a subject, the addressee, with a modal verb (*aller* “go” or *vouloir* “want”) followed by a dynamic verb. I refer to such imperative clauses as ‘alleviated’ command structures because the command is perceived as less forceful than the injunctive form without an overt subject.

b) *-tu* is confined to finite verbs with a lexical subject. It is therefore ruled out with infinitives and past participles. This also explains why *-tu* is rejected with real imperatives as in (3c) since they do not present an overt subject. *-Tu* only identifies a root Finite T which has a lexical subject.

- (3) a. \**Ah! partir-tu en vacances!*  
 ah ! (to) Leave-TU on holidays  
 "If I could leave on holiday!"  
 b. \**Elle a mangé-tu?*  
 she has eaten-TU  
 c. \**Tais-toi-tu!*  
 keep quiet-TU

c) *-tu* cannot be used with non expressive statements (4a). It is also unacceptable in 'residual V2' sentences with adverbs in initial position, as illustrated in (4b, c) or in hypothetical structures (4d). The well-formed QF sentences in (4) must therefore be used without *-tu*.

- (4) a. \**Elle est-tu arrivée en effet.* (statement)  
 she has-TU arrived, indeed  
 "She has arrived indeed."  
 b. \**Sans doute elle est-tu malade.*  
 no doubt she is-TU ill  
 c. \**Peut-être il va-tu revenir bientôt.*  
 maybe he go-TU come-back soon  
 "Perhaps he will come back soon."  
 d. \**Elle serait-tu arrivée de bonne heure que je l' aurais*  
 she would-TU arrive early that I 3FS-CL would  
*jamais laissé rentrer.*  
 never let come in  
 "Even if she had arrived early, I would never had let her in."

d) *-tu* is precluded with negative sentences. In (5b), *-tu* deprives *pas* of its negative Force. This is illustrated by the fact that a negative polarity item like *qui que ce soit* "anyone" cannot be licensed when *-tu* is present. Without the negative polarity item, as in (5c), the sentence bears an acceptable expressive meaning in discourse:

- (5) a. *Elle a pas renvoyé qui que ce soit.*  
 “She didn’t fire anyone.”
- b. \**Fak là, elle a-tu pas renvoyé qui que ce soit.*  
 all of a sudden, she did-TU not fire anyone  
 “All of a sudden, she sent back anyone.”
- c. *Fak là, elle l’ a-tu pas renvoyé.*  
 all of a sudden, she 3MS-CL has-TU not sent back  
 “Suddenly, she sent him back.”

Considering the above characteristics and to answer our first question concerning *-tu*, I therefore propose the following descriptive generalization for *-tu* in QF:

- (6) Descriptive generalization for *-tu*  
*-Tu* in QF is an affirmative marker closely connected to a root Finite T with a lexical subject. Its function is to signal the existence of affirmative or super positively polarized contexts.

The affirmative reading associated with *-tu* therefore explains why it is always ruled out with a negative Force marker in informative yes/no questions as in (7) which can only be interpreted as gibberish in QF:

- (7) \**Ta mère est-tu pas là ?*  
 your mother is-TU Neg there ?  
 “Is your mother not there?”

## 2.2 *-tu* as an operator

Let us recall that Noonan (1989) has proposed that *-tu* in QF is an operator. Within her framework, it was presented as an in situ operator on I. In this section, I present two other arguments for the operator status of *-tu*. An argument which illustrates clearly that *-tu* must be treated as an operator in QF is the following. Sportiche (1995) 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” in (8c):

- (8) a. \**Il a vu qui que ce soit.* (statement)  
 he has seen 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 yes/no questions, 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:

- (9) 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 their left, then the derivation in (8c) crashes because the negative polarity item is not c-commanded by any operator. Otherwise, in (9a), the operator *-tu*, identified as a Question operator, is merged to the left of IP and correctly c-commands the polarity item in object position. In other words, *-tu* in (9a) seems to have the same effect the inverted subject clitic operation has on the licensing of the sentence in (8b). This effect is clearly absent in (8c). The [+Q] operator in both (8b) and (9a) therefore ‘neutralizes’ the polarity of the sentence and the indefinite *qui que ce soit* in these sentences is therefore interpreted in both cases as the positive form *quelqu’un*. Let us recall that 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, as illustrated in (10):

- (10) a. [*Q*] [<sub>IP</sub> *Il a-tu vu qui que ce soit?*]  
           <sup>^-----^</sup>  
 b. [*Q*] [<sub>IP</sub> *A-t-il vu qui que ce soit?*]

Another argument, based on evaluative structures with *-tu* as opposed to *donc*, runs as follows. In QF evaluative structures, *-tu* can be replaced by *donc*, an independent and stressed morpheme also translated by the degree word *so* in English. *Donc* always appears on the right of the inflected verb as in (11a). However, both forms cannot cooccur in the same clause with the same strong intonation (represented in capital letters) on TU and DONC, as the unacceptable example in (11b) illustrates:

- (11) a. *C'est donc choquant!*  
 "It is so shocking!"  
 b. \**C'est-TU DONC choquant!*  
 it is-TU so shocking

The clash between *-tu* and *donc* in (11b) indicates that they play the same role in terms of focal stress. However, only *-tu* is an operator. In (12), only the sentence with the operator *-tu* is interpreted positively, the same sentence with *donc* is not. Since *donc* is not an operator which has scope from a left peripheral position, it is possible for the negation marker to bear a Negative Force reading and to negate the adjectival constituent in (12b). *Donc* is therefore not identified as an affirmative operator like *-tu*.

- (12) a. *C'est-tu pas gentil!*  
 it is-TU neg nice  
 "How nice!"  
 b. *C'est donc pas gentil!*  
 it is DONC Neg nice  
 "How unpleasant!"

### 2.3 *-tu* as an affirmative operator

The operator *-tu* always combines with positively or superpositively polarized clauses. This explains why *-tu* in QF always appears as a positive reinforcer. Furthermore, when the negation marker *pas* combines with it, it always lacks negative Force. This situation is indeed observed in evaluatives (13a), it is also possible in alleviated command structures (13b) but, contrary to these last two structures, *pas* is always obligatory in aspectual expressive structures exemplified in (13c, d):

- (13) a. *C'est-tu pas choquant!*  
 it is- TU neg shocking  
 "It is so shocking!"  
 b. *Tu vas-tu pas sortir de d' là!*  
 you go-tu Neg get out of there  
 "Are you going to get out of there!"  
 c. *Fak là, il part-tu \*(pas) à crier.*  
 this has as a result that there, he starts-TU (Neg) to yell  
 "Suddenly, he starts yelling."



- d. *Vlà-tu \*(pas) Jean qui arrive.*  
 here-is-TU (Neg) Jean who arrives  
 “Here is Jean arriving.”

It is well known that evaluative-exclamatives are superpositive clauses which can never be negated. Command structures, and sudden change of state expressions also, can never be negated. If *-tu* is an affirmative operator, the lack of negative Force in these structures is therefore expected.

*-Tu* in Question forms presents a slightly different situation. In order to illustrate my point I will use Erteschik-Shir’s (1997) f-structure approach. The focus-structure theoretical model “assumes a theory of discourse which defines the state of the common ground both before and after the utterance of a sentence” (Erteschik-Shir 1997: 3). Yes/no questions can have many different f-structures. For instance, in sentences like the ones in (14), stressed low pitched tones L\* in American English are associated with a request to choose between two entries:

- (14) a. *Did he<sub>TOP</sub> [see Susan]<sub>FOC</sub>* (Erteschik-Shir 1997)  
           L\*   L\*  
       b. *Did he<sub>TOP</sub> laugh<sub>FOC</sub>*  
           L\*

In answers to yes/no informative interrogative *-tu* clauses, it is the affirmative option that is stressed, as in (15), where the focal stress is on *TU* along with the predicate with which it forms a prosodic unit:

- (15) *Tu<sub>TOP</sub> [viens-TU]<sub>FOC</sub> ?*  
       you   come-tu  
       “Are you coming?”

The question in (15) sets up a contrastive set consisting of the affirmed predicate and the negated predicate. The answer selects freely one of these two. It can then be claimed that the context with *TU* in (15) includes such a contrastive set and chooses the affirmative option of the question. As mentioned by Nomi Erteschik-Shir (p.c.), the function of *-tu* would be twofold: 1) to signal the existence of such a context and 2) to choose the affirmative option. Note that the affirmative option selected by the question form does not entail that the answer to the question will necessarily be positive. The intonation pattern of the question rather serves to indicate that one expects a

positive answer to the question. A reading which is not found within a verb-subject inverted yes-no question like *Vient-il?* "Is he coming?".

Moreover, in a disjunctive question with *-tu* in (16), it can be noted that the second clause can only appear with a negation marker *pas*, illustrating once again that *-tu* corresponds to the affirmative counterpart. Structures like (16a) in QF could perhaps be interpreted in a parallel fashion to disjunctive questions such as *Tu viens ou quoi?* "Are you coming or what?" found in a familiar European French (Anne Zribi-Hertz p.c.).

- (16) a. *Tu viens-tu ou tu viens pas?*  
 you come-TU or you come Neg?  
 "Are you coming or not?"
- b. *?\*Tu viens-tu ou tu viens-tu pas?*  
 you come-TU or you come-TU Neg  
 (acceptable for some QF speakers)
- c. *Elle va-tu toujours à Montréal ou elle y va pas?*  
 she goes-TU always to Montreal or she there-cl goes no more  
 "Is she still going to Montreal or is she not going any more?"
- d. *\*Elle va-tu toujours à Montréal ou elle y va-tu pas?*  
 she goes-TU always to Montreal or she there goes-TU no more

Recall that the presence of the negation marker is completely ruled out in yes/no informative questions with *-tu*. The sentence in (17a) is interpreted as gibberish in QF, unless a conditional or an Irrealis tense on V turns it into a question with a different reading (17b) where *pas* rather lacks Negative Force. These results are expected within our analysis of *-tu* as an affirmative or superpositive marker.

- (17) a. *\*Ta mère est-tu pas là?*  
 your mother is-TU Neg there  
 "Is your mother not there?"
- b. *Ta mère serait-tu pas là, par hasard?*  
 your mother would-be-TU Neg in, by chance  
 "Would your mother be in, by any chance?"

### 3. *-Tu pas in Eventive expressive structures and stage topic adverbs*

Let us discuss in more detail the semantic type involved in eventive expressive structures with this emphatic affirmative operator which conveys new information in discourse. The following structures correspond to the more

familiar *vla ti pas* “here is” constructions of regional French which also obligatorily appear with a marker *pas* that lacks Negative Force. Note that in these last sentences the sudden change of state situation is made explicit through the defective perception verb *voilà*.

Aspectual structures with *-tu* must correspond to an eventive reading. By definition, an event refers to a change of state, and in this case, more precisely, such structures refer to a sudden transition of one state into another in discourse. They do not possess a negation as a contrary. In other words, if a yell is an event, there is no non-yell:

- (18) a. *D'un coup, il part-tu pas à crier.*  
 “Suddenly, he starts yelling.”  
 b. *\*D'un coup, il part pas à crier.*  
 “Suddenly, he does not start to yell.”

Events take place and they are located in time. The temporal location is expressed by tense and frame adverbials. Events which are felicitous with *-tu pas* must be measured out. They can be measured out or delimited by aspectual prefixes (19b) or by arguments in the verbal projection which refer to the property of an event bearing an inherent endpoint (Tenny 1987) (cf. 20b):

- (19) a. *\*Tout d'un coup, elle dort-tu pas.*  
 suddenly, she sleeps-TU neg  
 b. *Tout d'un coup, elle s'endort-tu pas.*  
 suddenly, she falls-asleep-TU Neg  
 “Suddenly, she falls asleep.”  
 (20) a. *\*Fak là, il court-tu pas.*  
 it so happens (that) there, he runs-TU Neg  
 b. *Fak là, il court-tu pas au bout de la rue.*  
 it so happens (that) there, he runs-TU Neg to the end of the street

The adverbs which can introduce such change of state expressions are adverbs which would be identified by Cinque (1998) as higher sentence adverbs. Note that such change of state adverbs can also appear without *-tu* in Quebec French. In this case, however, the predicate requires more of a contrastive context, as illustrated in (21):

- (21) *Tout d'un coup, elle PART à crier.*  
 “Suddenly, she starts yelling.”

Adverbs which are not change of setting adverbs, such as *generally* (22a), evaluative adverbs (22b), modal adverbs (22c) or edging expressions like *mais* in (22d) are not felicitous with *-tu*:

- (22) a. \**Généralement, elle part-tu pas à crier.*  
           generally, she starts-TU Neg yelling  
       b. \**Malheureusement, elle part-tu pas à crier.*  
           unfortunately, she starts-TU Neg yelling  
       c. \**Probablement, elle part-tu pas à crier.*  
           probably, she starts-TU Neg yelling  
       d. \**Mais tu l'as-tu pas ton passeport!*  
           (cf. *Mais tu l'as ton passeport!*)  
           but you it have-TU Neg your passport

If *-tu pas* expressions are only licensed with preposed stage topic aspectual adverbs or equivalent forms, this explains why structures in (22) as well as structures in (4) above are all ill-formed. As discussed in Vinet (1999, 2000), static state verbs or predicates are always ruled out with *-tu pas*. Because *tu pas* is always related to a dynamic situation where change is involved, it is naturally compatible with verbs of achievements (*discover*), verbs expressing an inchoation of activity (*begin to sing*) or an inchoation of accomplishment (*begin to build a house*). These expressions all translate the ‘here-and-now’ of the discourse situation.

#### 4. *TI/TU and the Remnant movement approach*

Poletto & Pollock (2000) and Pollock (2002) argue that *ti* is subdivided into two distinct morphemes. They identify *-t* as an  $H^0$  morpheme of main clause interrogatives or a finite tense morpheme merged in  $H^0$  which bears an uninterpretable [+interrogative] feature and attracts to its specifier a constituent marked in the same way. This is a first flaw in their analysis since they do not take into account the other discourse functions of *ti* which can also appear in exclamative-evaluative structures (*C'est-ti bête!* ‘How silly’) or in change of state contexts such as (*Les vla ti pas ...* ‘Here they are...’). In their framework, the input structure is then as in (23b) for an interrogative sentence like (23a):

- (23) a. *Elle viendra-ti?* (Poletto & Pollock :2000)  
           she will+come-TI  
           “Will she come?”  
       b. [ HP [H<sup>0</sup> -t [FP<sub>1</sub> i [FP<sub>2</sub> elle [FP<sub>3</sub>

Space limitation prevents us from discussing in detail their analysis which poses certain problems for the analysis of *tu* (cf. Poletto & Pollock 2000, Pollock 2002). Following their analysis, a form like *Elle va-tu lui prêter son char?* “Is she going to lend him her car?” in QF would need an input like the following :

(24) [*tu* [*elle* [*va* [*lui prêter son char*]]]]

The problem is that this type of ordering with *-tu* in (24), based on data from Northern Italian dialects discussed in Poletto (2000), is counter-intuitive in French since the input presented in (24) never corresponds to a well-formed sentence in French, contrary to what is observed in the relevant Italian dialects.

Another main question concerning the *-tu* structures is the type of feature motivating movement since *-tu* bears several discourse functions. Following the remnant movement approach, *-tu* would need to be derived in a lower CP projection and would then need to combine with another projection in order to obtain the right interpretation as an evaluative-exclamative, an alleviated command structure or a sudden change of state situation in discourse.

This type of solution for *-tu (pas)* structures is therefore not obvious. Moreover, it does not capture the basic intuition that *-tu* corresponds to a single phenomenon when it is identified as an affirmative marker. I also refer the reader to a discussion by Newmeyer (2002), who has identified theoretical problems posed by a split CP approach. He then refers to Erteschik-Shir (1997) and more recent work by this author who proposes an alternative solution based on a system which derives intonation from focus structure rather than projecting focus structure from intonation.<sup>1</sup>

##### 5. *Intonational properties of -tu (pas) expressions and f-structure*

In this last section, I would like to explore the phonological aspect of Focus in connection with the intonational properties of *-tu* expressions of QF, an aspect which has been very poorly studied in the literature. It is interesting to observe that all structures with *-tu* present a similar f-structure in the sense of Erteschik-Shir (1997) where *-tu* or the predicate identifies the Focus and the subject is taken as the topic. The topic is what the statement is about and stress is assigned to the focus constituents. As discussed earlier, *-tu pas* structures are

<sup>1</sup> For a different perspective, see also Costa (2002), who discusses problems posed by a remnant movement analysis for VOS sentences with flat intonation in Portuguese.

different in that they must obligatorily present stage topics. It is also claimed that a sentence in discourse has only one main focus which is assigned to a syntactic constituent and this constituent can be an NP, a VP and sometimes the whole S.

Furthermore, it can be observed that all of the equivalent sentences without *-tu* in (1) require more of a contrastive context than the ones with *-tu*:

- (25) a. *Qu' elle est BELLe!*  
 that she is beautiful  
 "She is so beautiful!"
- b. *Tu VEUX me laisser tranquille!*  
 you want me leave quiet  
 "Why don't you leave me alone!"
- b. *D'un coup, il PART à crier.*  
 of a sudden, he starts to yell  
 "Suddenly, he starts yelling."
- d. *Tu VIENS?*  
 you are coming  
 "Are you coming?"

The stress within the *-tu* sentences can be identified as follows in the following sentences:<sup>2</sup>

- (26) a. *Elle est-TU intelligente!*  
 "She is so intelligent!"
- b. *Tu veux-TU me laisser tranquille!*  
 "Why don't you leave me alone!"
- c. *D'un coup, il part-tu PAS à crier.*  
 "Suddenly, he starts yelling."
- d. *Tu viens-TU ?*  
 "Are you coming?"

---

<sup>2</sup> Thanks to François Poiré for helpful discussions on the intonational patterns in these QF examples.

Another interesting aspect is raised by the f-model. In a model of f-structure, Topic and Focus are annotated on the relevant syntactic constituents. The constituents are rearranged to meet the assignment of the focus and topic structures. It can therefore be observed that in a sudden change of state structure, as in (26c), the stress is on PAS, contrary to the other structures. As illustrated in (27), the prosodic unit therefore becomes [V+ tu + pas]. It would be tempting to connect this unexpected prosodic unit here to the fact that *pas* is obligatory with *-tu* in this context, a situation which is not explained in a syntactic derivation. In other words, this prosodic constituent does not have a corresponding constituent in syntactic structure: f [*part-tu*] in (27) can be identified as a syntactic V constituent, [*part-tu pas*] cannot:

(27) Il [*part-tu PAS*] à crier.  
 he starts-TU Neg to yell

In the f-model, this is accounted by Prosodic Incorporation or PI, a P-syntactic correlate of cliticization. PI is a phonological process. It is said to apply to unstressed constituents which then form a constituent with a preceding adjacent host.

To conclude this section, it must be pointed out that this research is part of ongoing research. More information is needed on word ordering in the f-structure model as well as a more precise study of the intonation pattern in QF.

## 6. Conclusion

In this research, I have identified *-tu* in QF as an affirmative operator merged to the left of IP, contrary to a previous claim by Poletto & Pollock (2000) who have proposed an analysis of *ti* and *tu* in a more or less parallel fashion, as interrogative markers only. It was rather claimed that the various contexts in which *-tu* appears all have either a superpositive polarity reading or identify with a question oriented towards an affirmation in the mind of the speaker, in the case of yes/no questions. Based on work by Erteschik-Shir (1997), it was here proposed that the function of *-tu* is therefore to signal such a context of affirmation. The *-tu pas* structures where *pas* is obligatorily present on surface also present a similar function and signal superpositively polarized contexts. These last structures only differ in that a) in order to be correctly licensed, they must rely on an overt stage topic, namely a preposed aspectual change of setting adverb and b) they present a different prosodic intonation.

**References**

- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1998. *Adverbs and Functional Heads*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clapin, Sylva. 1894. *Dictionnaire canadien-français ou lexique-glossaire des mots, expressions et locutions ne se trouvant pas dans les dictionnaires courants et dont l'usage appartient surtout aux Canadiens-français*. Montréal: Beauchemin.
- Costa, João. 2002. "VOS in Portuguese : Arguments against an Analysis in terms of Remnant Movement". mimeo. Universidade Nova de Lisboa.
- Deloffre, Frederick. 1999. "Agréables conférences de deux paysans de Saint-Ouen et de Montmorency sur les affaires du temps". Text written by Louis Richer (1649-1651). Critical Edition. Genève: Slatkine Reprints.
- Dionne, Narcisse-Eutrope. 1909. *Le parler populaire des Canadiens-français*. Québec.
- Dunn, Oscar 1880. *Glossaire franco-canadien et vocabulaire de locutions vicieuses usitées au Canada*. Québec: A. Côté.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi 1997. *The dynamics of Focus Structure*. New York & Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foulet, Lucien. 1921. "Comment ont évolué les formes de l'interrogation?". *Romania* XLVII .243-358.
- Glossaire du parler français au Canada*. 1930. Québec: Action sociale.
- Hrkal, Émile. 1910. "Grammaire historique du patois picard de Démuin". *Revue de philologie française et de littérature* 24.118-119, 175-204, 241-277.
- Kayne, Richard & Jean-Yves Pollock. 2001. "New Thoughts on Stylistic Inversion". *Subject Inversion and the Theory of Universal Grammar*, ed. By Aafke Hulk & Jean-Yves Pollock, 107-162. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Morin, Yves-Charles 1985. "On the two French Subjectless Verbs *voici* and *voilà*". *Language* 61.777-820.
- Newmeyer, Frederick. 2002. "'Interpretable' Features, Feature-driven A-bar Movement and the Syntax-Discourse Interface". Glow Newsletter abstract, Tilburg University.
- Noonan, Máire B. 1989. "Operator Licensing and the Case of French Interrogatives". *Proceedings of WCCFL* 8.315-330. Stanford: Stanford Linguistics Association.
- Picard, Marc. 1992. "Aspects synchroniques et diachroniques du *tu* interrogatif en québécois". *Revue québécoise de linguistique* 21:2.65-75.
- Poletto, Cecilia. 2000. *The Higher Functional Field, Evidence from the Northern Italian Dialects*. New York: Oxford University Press.



- Poletto, Cecilia & Jean-Yves Pollock. 2000. "On the Left Periphery of some Romance Wh-Questions". mimeo. University of Padua & Université de Picardie à Amiens.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves. 2000. "Subject Clitics, Subject Clitic Inversion and Complex Inversion: Generalizing Remnant Movement to the Comp Area". mimeo. Université de Picardie à Amiens.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves. 2002. "Three Arguments for Remnant IP in Romance". unpublished manuscript. Université de Picardie à Amiens.
- Roberts, Ian. 1993. "The Nature of Subject Clitics in Franco-Provençal Valdôtain". *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italian*, ed. by Adriana Belletti, 319-353. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier .
- Sportiche, Dominique. 1995. "Sketch of a Reductionist Approach to Syntactic Variation and Dependencies". *Evolution and Revolution in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Carlos Otero*, ed. by Hector Campos and Paula Kempchinsky, 356-398. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press..
- Tenny, Carol. 1987. *Grammaticalizing Aspect and Affectedness*. Dissertation. MIT.
- Vinet, Marie-Thérèse. 1999. "-Tu pas : Aspect et Temps". *Langues et grammaire 3: Syntaxe* (Communications présentées au *Colloque Langues et Grammaire III, Paris 1997*, réunies par P. Sauzet). Université de Paris 8. 181-195.
- Vinet, Marie-Thérèse. 2000. "Feature Representation and -tu (pas) in Quebec French". *Studia Linguistica* 54.3:381-411.
- Vinet, Marie-Thérèse. 2001. *D'un français à l'autre : la syntaxe de la microvariation*. Montréal: Fides.