

-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. Traditionally 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 2nd 2002) for their comments and their interest. I would also like to thank Anne Zribi-Hertz, Nomi Erteschik-Shir and François Poité for discussions and comments on a previous version of this article. This research was partly supported by SSHRC grant #410-2001-0119 (Martinéau-Vinet) and #410-2000-0954 (Télie-Vinet).

"Faithfulness and Reduplicative
ry. University of Massachusetts
d. by Jill Beckman, Laura Walsh-
Amherst.
Catala. *Els Principis Generals i la*
i de Publicacions de la Universitat
oga Excessiva en Fonologia". *Els*
l'Abadia de Montserrat.
stitution Revisited". *Segmental*
Lombardi, 159-182. Cambridge &
ctives Consonantics en Balear.
n, Universitat de Barcelona.
t, *Processos Segmentals i Variació*
lmanistik 16. 55-76.
ents: a Cross-Dialectal Analysis".
nal Conference of Phonetics and
aining Overkill in Dissimilation".
ity.
or *Syllable Structure*. Berlin, New
Fonologia Catalana: Perspectives
extos de l'ALDC". *Interlingüística*
er Neutralisation and Targeted
Principle and Phonological Rules:
9. 65-100.

- 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 1st and 2nd person as invariable enclitics in a variety of dialects, as illustrated in (2), must be clearly distinguished from 3rd 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 *là-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 and is not used with infinitives and past participles, as in (3a), or with real imperatives as in (3c) since *-tu* only identifies a root Finite T which has no other T in the clause.

- (3) a. **Ah! partir-tu en vacances!*
ah ! (to) Leave-TU on holiday!
"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 declarative sentences, as in (4), which is unacceptable in 'residual V2' sentences, as illustrated in (4b, c) or in hypothetical sentences, as in (4d). Sentences in (4) must therefore be used without *-tu*.

- (4) a. **Elle est-tu arrivée en effet?*
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?*
maybe he go-TU come-back
"Perhaps he will come back."
- d. **Elle serait-tu arrivée de Paris si elle n'avait jamais laissé rentrer.*
she would-TU arrive early if she had never let come in
"Even if she had arrived early, she would not have let her come in."

d) *-tu* is precluded with negative sentences, as in (5), which is unacceptable with negative Force. This is illustrated by the sentence *qui que ce soit* "anyone" cannot be used with *-tu* as a negative polarity item, as in (5c), the meaning in discourse:

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! partit-tu en vacances!*
ah! (to) Leave-TU on holidays
- 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
- 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
- d. **Elle serait-tu arrivée de bonne heure que je t'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:

:262, cited in Vinet 2001)

of 1st and 2nd person as invariable
tated in (2), must be clearly
agree in gender and number with
structures from Standard French.
Clitic Inversion (SCII) do share
t contexts.
variable *-tu*
properties:

lexical subject;
ve statements or 'residual V2'

it is a Force operator limited to
es/no informative questions, as in
sentences with several other
positive reading connected to an

ce and *-tu* is translated as an
serves to identify a segment of
nd expresses unexpectedness and
roduced by an aspectual change
erved that *-tu* and *pas* combine
as/via *ti pas* "here is" expressive
discourse (cf. Morin 1985, Vinet

n which is composed of a subject,
or *vouloir* "want") followed by a
clauses as 'alleviated' command
ived as less forceful than the

- (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.*
 he has seen anybody

However, when *-tu* is present in the question, the negative polarity item *qui que ce soit* "anybody" can be licensed. This shows that the polarity of yes/no questions is not affected by *-tu*.

- (9) a. *Elle a-tu vu qui que ce soit?*
 she has-TU seen anybody
 b. *Elle a-tu vu quelqu'un?*
 she has-TU seen somebody

If, as generally assumed, negative polarity items are licensed by a negative operator [+Neg] or [+Q] on the left of IP, the negative polarity item in (9a) is licensed because the negative polarity operator is present on the left. Otherwise, in (9a), the operator *-tu* is present to the left of IP and correctly c-commands the negative polarity item. In other words, *-tu* in (9a) seems to be a negative operator. In clitic operation has on the licensing of negative polarity items is clearly absent in (8c). The [+Q] operator 'neutralizes' the polarity of the question. The polarity of these sentences is therefore interpreted as affirmative. *quelqu'un*. Let us recall that in (8c) the question has scope from a left peripheral position. The question is always to its right, as illustrated in (10):

- (10) a. $[Q] [IP \text{ Il } a\text{-}tu \text{ vu } qui \text{ que } ce \text{ soit}]$
 ^-----^
 b. $[Q] [IP \text{ A-t-il } vu \text{ qui } que \text{ ce soit}]$

Another argument, based on the licensing of *donc*, runs as follows. In QF evaluation, *donc* is an independent and stressed morpheme. In English, *Donc* always appears on a rising intonation. However, both forms cannot co-occur with a rising intonation (represented in capital letters). This is an unacceptable example in (11b) illustrated in (11):

- (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*
 here-is-TU (Neg) Jean who
 "Here is Jean arriving."

It is well known that evaluative-exclamatory structures can never be negated. Command structures and interrogative expressions also, can never be negated. The lack of negative Force in these structures is a consequence of the lack of negative Force in these structures.

-Tu in Question forms presents a specific intonation pattern. I will use Erteschik-Shir's focus-structure theoretical model "as a way to describe the state of the common ground between speaker and hearer in a sentence" (Erteschik-Shir 1997: 3). This model is based on f-structures. For instance, in sentences with a question intonation pattern pitched tones L* in American English. The intonation pattern between two entries:

- (14) a. *Did he_{TOP} [see Susan]_{FOC}?*
 L* L*
 b. *Did he_{TOP} laugh_{FOC}?*
 L*

In answers to yes/no informative interrogatives, the option that is stressed, as in (15), when the question is a predicate with which it forms a proposition.

- (15) *Tu_{TOP} [viens-TU]_{FOC}?*
 you come-tu
 "Are you coming?"

The question in (15) sets up a contrastive set between the affirmative predicate and the negated predicate. It can then be claimed that the question is a contrastive set and chooses the affirmative option mentioned by Nomi Erteschik-Shir (1997: 1) to signal the existence of such a contrastive set. Note that the affirmative option and the negated option entail that the answer to the question is a yes/no option. The intonation pattern of the question raises the pitch of the

d. *Vla-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 entities:

- (14) a. *Did he^{TOP} [see Susan]^{FOC}* (Erteschik-Shir 1997)
 L* L* L*
 b. *Did he^{TOP} laugh^{FOC}*
 L*

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

(15) *Tu^{TOP} [viens-TU]^{FOC} ?*
 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

with positively or superpositively in QF always appears as a positive option marker *pas* combines with it, it is indeed observed in evaluatives and structures (13b) but, contrary to obligatory in aspectual expressive

indicates that they play the same role *-tu* is an operator. In (12), only the operator which has scope from a left negation marker to bear a Negative focal constituent in (12b). *Donc* is operator like *-tu*.

*part-tu *(pas) à crier.*
 starts-TU (Neg) to yell

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 *voilà ti pas* "here is" constructions. These structures obligatorily appear with a marker *pas*. In these last sentences the sudden change of state is expressed through the defective perception verb *entendre*.

Aspectual structures with *-tu* must be defined in a precise definition, an event refers to a change of state. In such structures refer to a sudden change of state in discourse. They do not possess a negative force. 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 yelling."

Events take place and they are expressed by tense and frame adverbs. The duration of *pas* must be measured out. They can be measured out by prefixes (19b) or by arguments in the structure. The property of an event bearing an inherent duration is expressed by the prefix *d'un coup*.

- (19) a. **Tout d'un coup, elle dort-tu pas?*
 suddenly, she sleeps
- b. *Tout d'un coup, elle s'endort-tu pas?*
 suddenly, she falls-asleep
 "Suddenly, she falls asleep."
- (20) a. **Fak là, il part-tu pas?*
 it so happens (that) there, he starts
- b. *Fak là, il part pas?*
 it so happens (that) there, he starts

The adverbs which can introduce such structures are those which would be identified by Cinque (1987) as stage topic adverbs. In this case, however, the predicate is a verb. The structures illustrated in (21):

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

familiar *via 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. **Tou d'un coup, elle dort-tu pas.*
suddenly, she sleeps-TU neg
- b. *Tou d'un coup, elle s'endort-tu pas.*
suddenly, she falls-asleep-TU Neg
- (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) *Tou d'un coup, elle PART à crier.*
"Suddenly, she starts yelling."

g which is not found within a verb-

with *-tu* in (16), it can be noted that negation marker *pas*, illustrating once we counterpart. Structures like (16a) parallel fashion to disjunctive questions "ing or what?" found in a familiar

al on elle y va pas?
"or she there-cl goes no more
is she not going any more?"
al on elle y va-tu pas?
"or she there goes-TU no more

on marker is completely ruled out in the sentence in (17a) is interpreted as an Irrealis tense on V turns it into a *pas* rather lacks Negative Force. analysis of *-tu* as an affirmative or

par hasard?
"by chance
y chance?"

ures and stage topic adverbs
semantic type involved in eventive affirmative operator which conveys ng structures correspond to the more

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 H⁰ morpheme of main clause interrogatives or a finite tense morpheme merged in H⁰ 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 [H⁰ -t [FP1 *i* [FP2 *elle* [FP3

Space limitation prevents us from posing certain problems for the analysis (Pollock 2002). Following their analysis, is *char?* "Is she going to lend him her car?" following:

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

The problem is that this type of structure is not found in Northern Italian dialects discussed in Pollock (2002) and in French since the input presented in (24) is not a sentence in French, contrary to what is claimed.

Another main question concerning the analysis is the motivating movement since *-tu* is not a remnant movement approach, *-tu* is not a projection and would then need to be moved to obtain the right interpretation as a remnant command structure or a sudden change of state.

This type of solution for *-tu* is not satisfactory. Moreover, it does not capture the basic phenomenon when it is identified with *ti*. I refer the reader to a discussion by Newmeyer (1999) on the problems posed by a split CP approach. More recent work by this author (2002) is based on a system which derives *ti* by projecting focus structure from into the main clause.

5. *Intonational properties of -tu*

In this last section, I would like to discuss Focus in connection with the intonational aspect which has been very poorly analyzed. To observe that all structures with *-tu* are of Erteschik-Shir (1997) where *-tu* is the subject is taken as the topic. The intonational focus is assigned to the focus constituents.

¹ For a different perspective, see also Coste (2002) on remnant movement analysis for VOS sentences.

ing adverbs, such as *generally* (22a), (22c) or edging expressions like *mais*

s à crier.
g yelling

pas à crier.
g yelling

pas à crier.
g yelling

passport!

passport

with preposed stage topic aspectual s why structures in (22) as well as As discussed in Vinet (1999, 2000), dled out with *-tu pas*. Because *tu pas* n where change is involved, it is ements (*discover*), verbs expressing or an inchoation of accomplishment s all translate the 'here-and-now' of

approach

(2002) argue that *ti* is subdivided ty -t as an H° morpheme of main theme merged in H° which bears an attracts to its specifier a constituent w in their analysis since they do not ions of *ti* which can also appear in *bête!* "How silly!" or in change of re they are...". In their framework, interrogative sentence like (23a):

ook :2000)

¹ 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.

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.¹

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

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:²

- (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?"

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

Another interesting aspect is structure, Topic and Focus are announced. The constituents are rearranged to structures. It can therefore be observed structure, as in (26c), the stress is on *PAS* illustrated in (27), the prosodic unit can be tempting to connect this unexpected obligatory with *-tu* in this context syntactic derivation. In other words corresponding constituent in syntax identified as a syntactic V constituent

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

In the f-model, this is accounted for by the correlate of cliticization. PI is a phrase of unstressed constituents which then acts as a host.

To conclude this section, it must be noted that ongoing research. More information is needed on the structure model as well as a more precise

6. Conclusion

In this research, I have identified the *-tu* clitic merged to the left of IP, contrary to what has been proposed (2000) who have proposed an analysis in this fashion, as interrogative markers of questions in contexts in which *-tu* appears all have been identified with a question oriented structure. For the speaker, in the case of yes/no questions (1997), it was here proposed that the *-tu* clitic in the context of affirmation. The *-tu pas* clitic on surface also present a similar structure in negative contexts. These last structures only appear in specific licensed, they must rely on an overall context of setting adverb and b) the

sent stage topics. It is also claimed
 main focus which is assigned to a
 can be an NP, a VP and sometimes
 at all of the equivalent sentences
 ve context than the ones with *-tu*:

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 FAS, 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) // [part-tu FAS] à critér.
 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.

on the intonational patterns in these QF

identified as follows in the following

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. "Romance Wh-Questions". mimeo. Université de Picardie à Amiens.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves. 2000. "Subject Inversion: Generalization and Complex Inversion: Generalization". mimeo. Université de Picardie à Amiens.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves. 2002. "Three A-bar Structures". unpublished manuscript. Université de Picardie à Amiens.
- Roberts, Ian. 1993. "The Nature of Subject Inversion in Italian". *Syntactic Theory and its Applications*, ed. By Belletti, 319-353. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Sportiche, Dominique. 1995. "Sketch of a Theory of Subject Inversion: Variation and Dependencies". *Syntactic Theory: Essays in Honor of C. F. N. Martin*, ed. By Paula Kempchinsky, 356-398. Dordrecht: Kluwer Press.
- Tenny, Carol. 1987. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Vinet, Marie-Thérèse. 1999. "-Tu interrogatif en français: une étude de la grammaire 3: Syntaxe (Commu- et Grammaire III, Paris 1997, 8. 181-195.
- Vinet, Marie-Thérèse. 2000. "Feature Theory and the French Subjectless Verb". *Studia Linguistica* 54.3. 401-420.
- Vinet, Marie-Thérèse. 2001. *D'ur microvariation*. Montréal: Fides.

Functional Heads. Oxford: Oxford

en-français ou lexicque-glossaire des
trouvant pas dans les dictionnaires
surtout aux Canadiens-français.

Arguments against an Analysis in
. Universidade Nova de Lisboa.

différences de deux paysans de Saint-
res du temps". Text written by Louis

Genève: Slatkine Reprints.
populaire des Canadiens-français.

français et vocabulaire de locutions
A. Côte.

of Focus Structure. New York &
ss.

lue les formes de l'interrogation?"
930. Québec: Action sociale.

que du patois picard de Dénain";
érature 24.118-119, 175-204, 241-

2001. "New Thoughts on Stylistic
Theory of Universal Grammar, ed.

ock, 107-162. New York: Oxford
French Subjectless Verbs *voici* and

ible? Features, Feature-driven A-bar
use Interface?". *Glow Newsletter*

censing and the Case of French
CFL 8.315-330. Stanford: Stanford

es et diachroniques du *tu* interrogatif
nguistique 21:2.65-75.

ctional Field. Evidence from the
Oxford University Press.

Polotto, 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
Valdotain". *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.