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Introduction

0. 1 Aims of the present work

The purpose of the present work is to account for the syntactic behaviour of four invariable clausal particles which are found in the Sienese dialect, an Italian variety spoken in the Tuscan town of Siena. These particles are che, e, ε and o; while che and o are only found in questions, as shown in 1(a, b) and 2(a, b), e occurs either in questions or declarative clauses, as shown in 2(a, b):

(1) a. Che vanno, al mare?
   che go-3.Pl to-the-Mas.Sg sea
   Are they going to the sea?

   b. O dove vai?
   o where go-2.Sg
   Where are you going?

(2) a. E si sente male.
   e Refl.Cl feels-3.Sg bad
   (S)he feels bad.

   b. E si sente male.
   e Refl.Cl feels-3.Sg bad
   Does (s)he feel bad?

Instead, ε is incompatible with questions of any kind; as illustrated in 3(a, b), it can only appear in declarative clauses.
a. ε, ha comprato il pane.
   ε has-3.Sg bought-Past.Part the-Mas.Sg bread
   (S)he has bought bread.

b. *ε, ha comprato il pane?
   ε has-3.Sg bought-Past.Part the-Mas.Sg bread
   Has (s)he bought bread?

Moreover, che and e only appear in yes/no questions, while o is only allowed in wh-questions or in those yes/no questions, where che occurs. Let us consider the following examples:

(4) a. *Che quando parti?
   che when leave-2.Sg
   When are you leaving?

b. *ε, quando parti?
   ε when leave-2.Sg
   When are you leaving?

(5) a. O come stai?
   o how are-2.Sg
   How are you?

b. O che vai, a casa?
   o che go-2.Sg to home
   Are you going home?

c. *O vai a casa?
   o go-2.Sg to home
   Are you going home?

I will limit my description of the aforementioned clausal particles to a syntactic point of view. One
of the major aims of this work is to establish their position in the structure of the clause, and to
determine how they interact with other constituents, such as Topic and Focus.
Their use and functions display many interesting differences and similarities with cognate elements
in better-studied Northern and Southern Italian varieties (Cruschina, 2004).
It is worth mentioning that Sienese is one of the generally neglected Central varieties; although
some literature exists on other Tuscan varieties (for instance, Garzonio (2004), Chinellato and
Garzonio (2003)), no specific work has ever addressed the study of Sienese syntax. The present
thesis intends to start filling this descriptive and theoretical gap and to raise some interesting related
questions, which can represents a fertile field for future research in Italian dialectology.

0.2 Current theory and its implications

To begin with, let us recall one of the main theoretical achievement in recent syntactic theory,
namely the Split-CP Hypothesis (Rizzi, 1997), which will have a bearing on the proposals and
framework of the present thesis.
The Split-CP Hypothesis will be of crucial importance throughout the chapters. Since che, e, ε and
o are clearly inserted in some position at the left periphery of the clause, namely inside the Split-CP.
It is necessary to provide a brief introduction of the Split-CP Hypothesis, as proposed by Rizzi
(1997), and as adopted by many other researchers after him.

0.2.1 The Split-CP Hypothesis

Rizzi (1997) proposed that the left periphery of the clause is to be subdivided in four projections
namely ForceP, TopicP, FocusP and FinitenessP, with TopicP being allowed to recur on either side
of FocusP.
A schematic representation is given below in (6):
According to Rizzi (1997), the Complementizer system typically contains two types of information: the specification of Force and the specification of Finiteness. Let us consider the following examples:

(2)  
   a. They said that John is nice.
   b. They asked if John is nice.

In 2(a), the complementizer that introduces a declarative subordinate clause, and therefore it expresses declarative Force. Instead, the complementizer if in 2(b) introduces an indirect question, and therefore it conveys an interrogative Force.

Force is the head which determines the interpretation of a sentence as an interrogative, a declarative, an exclamative or imperative clause, for instance. Therefore, Rizzi (1997) assumes that Force must be the highest head of the CP-system.

Finiteness is instead the selector of a given type of Inflection and it is the lowest head in the Split-CP. Let us take a look at the following examples:

(3)  
   a. That Mary went there is not true.
   b. For Mary to go there would be difficult.
(4)   a. *For Mary went there is not true.
  b. *That Mary to go there would be difficult.

As shown by the contrast between 3(a) and 3(b), the complementizers *for* and *that* introduce two different kinds of subordinate clause, as far as Finiteness is concerned. While *that* in 3(a) selects a subordinate finite clause, *for* signals that the verb of the subordinate is non-finite. It would be impossible for *that* to introduce a non-finite subordinate, as it would be impossible for *for* to introduce a finite subordinate, as shown by the ungrammaticality of 4(a, b).

As far as the optional heads Topic and Focus are concerned, Rizzi (1997) argues that they are sandwiched between Force and Finiteness. As already shown in (1), TopP is higher than FocP; let us consider the following examples:

(5)   a. This book, to MARY I gave.
  b. *THIS BOOK to Mary, I gave.

As shown by the contrast between 5(a) and 5(b), topicalized constituents must occur before focused constituents. The reverse order would lead to ungrammaticality, as shown in 5(b). This observation provides evidence for the assumption that TopP is higher than FocP.

0.3 Outline of the chapters

The present work is organized in four chapters; each chapter is dedicated to the description and the analysis of one functional particle.

In the first chapter I will entertain the analysis of *che*, which is often found in *yes/no* questions, but which crucially does not appear in *wh*-questions. I will try to provide an adequate descriptive and theoretical account for the syntactic behaviour of this invariable item, which seems to be consistent with similar particles in many other Central and Southern Italian dialects. I will argue that *che* is an operator, which can bind a phrase or a clause inside its scope and marks it as new information.

The second chapter deals with the categorial status of *e*, which is in complementary distribution with *che* in *yes/no* questions. Furthermore, *e* occurs in declarative clauses, as opposed to *che*. This will ultimately lead to the proposal that *e* is not an interrogative particle but rather a marker of an English-style topicalization.
The third chapter is dedicated to the analysis of $\varepsilon$, which is only allowed in declarative clauses. I will also take into consideration another similar vocalic morpheme, namely $\sigma$, which seems to be in complementary distribution with $\varepsilon$. I will argue that $\varepsilon$ and $\sigma$ are two evidential particles, which are related to positive and negative evidence, respectively.

The last chapter is dedicated to $o$, which occurs in $wh$-questions and in those $yes/no$ questions, which are introduced by $che$. I will assume that $o$ is a speaker-oriented particle, which conveys a non-canonical interpretation. I find it relevant to mention that this is the only topic in the present work, on which there is some relevant literature already (Poletto (2000), Chinellato and Garzonio (2003) and Garzonio (2004)), although it does not specifically concern the Sienese dialect.
Chapter 1

The occurrence of che in yes/no questions

1.0 Introduction

Yes/no questions are frequently preceded by the word *che* in Sienese. The aim of the present chapter is to develop a coherent analysis of the syntactic behaviour of *che*, that could possibly account for its distribution and interpretation in a wide range of contexts.

First of all, it is important to describe the kind of sentences, in which *che* regularly occurs. As already mentioned, *che* appears in yes/no questions 1(a, c), while its insertion in wh-questions, such as in 1(b, d), leads to ungrammaticality:

(1)  

a. *Che* hai visto, Gianni?  
   *che* have-2.Sg seen-Past.Part John  
   Did you see John?

b. *Che* che hai visto?  
   *che* what-Obj have-2.Sg seen-Past.Part  
   What did you see?

c. *Che* ti senti, male?  
   *che* Refl-2.Sg feel-2.Sg bad  
   Do you feel bad?

d. *Che* come ti senti?  
   *che* how Refl-2.Sg feel-2.Sg  
   How do you feel?
As a preliminary remark, I find it necessary to point out that the meaning of *che*-questions is in no way different from standard Italian *yes/no* questions; this topic will be discussed in 1.1. Section 1.2 deals with the investigation of the syntactic position of *che*, with respect to topicalized and focused constituents, while 1.3 is dedicated to the analysis of some crucial prosodic effects, which characterize *che*-questions. In section 1.4, I entertain an analysis of the syntactic behaviour of *fare*, a supportive verb which is often found in *che*-questions. Finally, 1.5 collects some concluding remarks, whose aim is to summarize the major points made in the present chapter.

### 1.1 *Che*-questions as standard *yes/no* questions

As a matter of fact, standard *yes/no* questions are always introduced by *che* in Sienese; therefore, I assume that *che* is nothing but a *yes/no* question marker.

I use the term *standard* to indicate that *yes/no* questions introduced by *che* are actually asked to obtain pure new information, as opposed to what has been claimed for other particles in other dialects (Obenauer 2004, Garzonio 2004). There is no difference in meaning between standard Italian *yes/no* questions and their Sienese counterparts, which are marked by *che*.

Let us consider the following examples of *che*-questions:

(2)  

a. *Che* hai visto, Gianni?

*che* have-2.Sg seen-Past.Part John

Did you see John?

b. *Che* hanno parlato, con Gianni?

*che* have-3.Pl talked-Past.part with John

Did they talk with John?

c. *Che* è andata, al mare?

*che* is-3.Sg gone-Fem.Sg-Past.Part to-the.Mas.Sg sea

Did she go to the sea?
d. *Che* lo hai dato, a tua madre?

*che* it-Obj have-2.Sg given-Mas.Sg-Past.Part to your-Fem.Sg mother

Did you give it to your mother?

As shown in 2(a-d), *che* appears as the leftmost element in the clause, immediately preceding the auxiliary verb. It is relevant to point out that *che*-questions also have a special prosody; the commas in 2(a-d) signal indeed the presence of an intonational break, which seems to separate some constituent in the right part of the clause. I regard the constituents, which occur at the right of the intonational break, as the *Questioned Phrase*. As a matter of fact, the Questioned Phrase is focused and it represents what the question is about.

### 1.1.1 A cross-linguistic perspective

As already claimed, the meaning of the 2(a-d) is actually the same as their standard Italian counterparts without initial *che*. This phenomenon seems to be quite consistent with similar phenomena in other Central and Southern Italian varieties. As claimed by Cruschina (2006), many Central and Southern Italian dialects have a special particle for marking standard *yes/no* questions, as opposed to northern Italian dialects, which often recur to verb-subject inversion (Benincà, 1997). This particle is *che* in Roman (Cruschina, 2006) as well, *chi* in Sicilian (Cruschina, 2006), *ce/cə* in Salentino (Cruschina, 2006), *ma* in Calabrian (Rohlfs 1969) and *a* in Sardinian (Jones 1993). Let us compare the Sienese data with Cruschina's data for Sicilian:

1. *Chi* a puzzu addumari a luci?

   *chi* it-Fem.Sg-Obj.Cl can-1.Sg switch-on-Inf the-Fem.Sg light-Fem.Sg

   Can I switch the light on?

2. *Che* la posso, spengere, la luce?

   *che* it-Fem.Sg-Obj.Cl can-1.Sg switch-on-Inf the-Fem.Sg light-Fem.Sg

   Can I switch the light on?

As shown in 4(a), *chi* is used for marking canonical *yes/no* questions in Sicilian and it seems to
behave like Sienese che, as shown in 4(b). However, there are some important syntactic differences between Sienese che-questions and Sicilian chi-questions, which should be taken into consideration in order to analyze the two varieties from a comparative point of view. According to Cruschina (2006), chi can be preceded by Topics; this is possible for Sienese che too, as shown in 5(a, b):

(5)  a.  A Maria chi a salutasti?
        to Mary chi her-Fem.Sg-Obj.Cl greet-2.Sg-Past
    Did you greet Mary?

    b.  Maria che l'hai, salutata?
        Mary che her-Fem.Sg-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg greeted-Fem.Sg-Past.Part
    Did you greet Mary?

Moreover, Cruschina (2006) argues that chi can preceed a fronted informational focus, as opposed to Sienese che:

(6)  a.  Chi a Maria salutasti?
        chi to Mary greeted-2.Sg-Past
    Did you greet Mary?

    b.  *Che Maria hai salutato?
        che Mary have-2.Sg greeted-Past.Part
    Did you greet Mary?

As shown by the ungrammaticality of 6(b), no focused constituent is allowed to follow che in Sienese. However, this asymmetry between Sicilian and Sienese is not directly related to the issue of chi- and che-questions. As pointed out by Cruschina (2006), Sicilian informational Focus is always realized in a pre-verbal position, and therefore it is not surprising that it can occur after chi in a sentence, such as 6(a). Instead, Sienese is no different from standard Italian, in that it does not allow any informational Focus to occur before the verb. Consequently, I assume that the asymmetry between 6(a) and 6(b) does not follow from a specific restriction involving the syntax of che-questions versus chi-questions.
1.2 The position of *che*

In order to shed some light on the grammatical function of *che*, it is necessary to establish its position in the structural representation of the clause. Therefore, it is important to check its behaviour with respect to different kinds of preverbal constituents, in order to understand whether it can be preceded by topicalized or focused constituents.

Let us begin with subjects, and see whether an overtly realized preverbal subject can be followed by *che*. In fact, all the examples provided so far lack an overt subject; the subject position is filled up by a null pronoun, which is licensed by the activation of the Null Subject Parameter in Italian, as well as in the Sienese variety. Let us take a look at the following examples, where the subject is overtly realized in a preverbal position:

(7) a. Maria *che* è andata, al mare?

   Mary *che* is-3.Sg gone-Fem.Sg-Past.Part to-the-Mas.Sg sea

   Did Mary go to the sea?

b. *Che* Maria è andata al mare?

   *che* Mary is-3.Sg gone-Fem.Sg-Past.Part to-the-Mas.Sg sea

   Did Mary go to the sea?

As shown in 7(a), *che* follows the preverbal subject, if present; the reversed order would lead to ungrammaticality, as shown in 7(b). As a matter of fact, the same pattern is followed by left-dislocated objects. Let us consider the following *che*-questions:

(8) a. Il pane *che* l'hai comprato, ieri?

   the-Mas.Sg bread *che* it-Mas.Sg-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg bought-Mas.Sg-Past. Part

   Part yesterday

   Did you buy bread yesterday?

b. *Che* il pane l'hai comprato ieri?

   *che* the-Mas.Sg bread it-Mas.Sg-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg bought-Mas.Sg-Past. Part

   yesterday

   Did you buy bread yesterday?
If the direct object is left-dislocated, then it must necessarily precede *che*, as shown in 8(b); just as with preverbal subjects, *che* is never allowed to occur before left-dislocated objects.

The same seems to be true for left-dislocated constituents of any kind; let us consider the following example of PP left-dislocation:

(9)  

a. A Gianni *che* gli hai scritto, una lettera?  
to John *che* to-him-Cl have-2.Sg written-Past.Part a-Fem.Sg letter  
Did you write a letter to John?

b. *Che* a Gianni gli hai scritto una lettera?  
*che* to John to-him-Cl have-2.Sg written-Past.Part a-Fem.Sg letter  
Did you write a letter to John?

As expected, the left-dislocated PP occurs before *che*; as shown by the ungrammaticality of 9(b), *che* is not allowed to precede a left-dislocated PP.

Let us now take a look at what happens, when more than one element is left-dislocated:

(10)  

a. Maria, la lettera, a Gianni *che* gliel'ha scritta, ieri?  
Mary the-Fem.Sg letter to John *che* to-him-Cl has-3.Sg written-Fem.Sg-Past.Part yesterday  
Did Mary write the letter to John yesterday?

b. *Maria *che* la lettera a Gianni gliel'ha scritta ieri?  
Mary *che* the-Fem.Sg letter to John to-him-Cl has-3.Sg written-Fem.Sg-Past.Part yesterday  
Did Mary write the letter to John yesterday?

c. *Maria, la lettera, *che* a Gianni gliel'ha scritta ieri?  
Mary the-Fem.Sg letter *che* to John to-him-Cl has-3.Sg written-Fem.Sg-Past.Part yesterday  
Did Mary write the letter to John yesterday?
Che must follow all the preverbal constituents, that occur in the clause. As shown in 10(a), che occurs after a preverbal subject, a left-dislocated object and a left-dislocated PP. As a matter of fact, this is the only position available for che. Otherwise, the sentence would turn ungrammatical, as in 10(b), where che is inserted between the subject and the object, and 10(c), where che is inserted between the object and the PP.

All in all, the syntactic behaviour of che seems to be rather regular; it occurs as the leftmost element in the clause, but it must be preceded by preverbal subjects and left-dislocated elements of any type, if present. Furthermore, che is not allowed to occur between two left-dislocated elements, but must necessarily follow them.

However, there is another significant restriction which should be taken into consideration, in order to account for the distribution of che in yes/no questions. As a matter of fact, it is relevant to highlight that che is incompatible with any kind of preverbal focus. Any left-dislocated element occurring before che is to be interpreted as a Topic, meaning as known information. As shown in the following examples, it is impossible to focus a preverbal constituent in che-questions:

(11) a. *A MARIA che gli hai dato, le chiavi?

    to Mary che to-her-Cl have-2.Sg given-Past.Part the-Fem.Pl keys-Fem.Pl

    Did you give the keys TO MARY?

    b. *GIANNI che è arrivato, ieri?

    John che is-3.Sg arrived-Mas.Sg-Past.Part yesterday

    Did JOHN arrive yesterday?

(12) a. A Maria che gli hai dato, le chiavi?

    to mary che to-her-Cl have-2.Sg given, the-Fem.Pl keys

    Did you give the keys to Mary?

    b. Gianni che è arrivato, ieri?

    John che is-3.Sg arrived-Mas.Sg-Past.Part yesterday

    Did John arrive yesterday?
Sentences such as 9(a, b) are ungrammatical because it is not allowed to focus the left-dislocated PP and the preverbal subject, respectively. Instead, it is possible to isolate a postverbal constituent in the Questioned Phrase and focus it, as shown in 12(a, b). However, this is not a contrastive focus, as opposed to 11(a, b).

According to the data provided so far, it seems that the only Topics are allowed to occur before che, while focused constituents must necessarily follow the VP, because they have to stay inside the Questioned Phrase.

1.2.1 Che and the sentential negation

A different and unexpected restriction involving the occurrence of che in yes/no questions is related to the sentential negation. Let us consider the following examples:

(13) a. Che hai visto, Maria?
    
    che have-2.Sg seen-Past.Part Mary
    Did you see Mary?

    b. *Che un hai visto, Maria?
    
    che not have-2.Sg seen-Past.Part Mary
    Didn't you see Mary?

(14) Un l'hai vista Maria?
    
    not have-2.Sg seen-Fem.Sg-Past.Part Mary
    Didn't you see Mary?

As shown by the contrast between 13(a) and 13(b), it is impossible to insert a sentential negation in che-questions. Surprisingly enough, negative yes/no questions do not allow the presence of che, as shown by the ungrammaticality of 13(b).

Furthermore, negative yes/no questions do not require any intonational break to occur, as opposed to che-questions.
1.3 Prosodic effects

As already introduced, *che*-questions are always characterized by the insertion of a long intonational pause, which in fact seems to isolate some constituents in the right edge of the clause. This pause is obligatory and its omission makes *che*-questions totally unacceptable.

At first sight, one may think of a marginalization effect (Cardinaletti, 2001); however, this is not the case because the separated elements are focused and therefore they are to be interpreted as new information. Instead, marginalized constituents always act as Topics, meaning they are marked as known information. Moreover, marginalized constituents are not characterized by the same peculiar prosody; this also depends on the fact that they are not focused, as opposed to what happens to the Questioned Phrase in Sienese *yes/no* questions.

1.3.1 The Questioned Phrase

In order to describe the functioning of this prosodic phenomenon, it is necessary to look at different verb-types, according to two main criteria: the availability of lexical material and the thematic structure of the verb.

Let us compare the following examples:

(15) a. *Che* sei arrivato, alle cinque?

*che* are-2.Sg arrived-Mas.Sg-Past.Part at-the-Fem.Pl five
Did you arrive at five?

b. *Che* hai dormito, a casa?

*che* have-2.Sg slept-Past.Part at home
Did you sleep at home?

c. *Che* hai mangiato, la torta?

*che* have-2.Sg eaten-Past.Part the-Fem.Sg cake
Did you eat the cake?

As shown in 15(a, b, c), there is no restriction on pause-insertion as far as the argument structure of
the main verb is concerned. The verb *arrivare* (=arrive) in 15(a) is in fact unaccusative, while *dormire* (=sleep) in 15(b) is unergative and *mangiare* (=eat) in 15(c) is transitive.

Moreover, pause insertion does not seem to interact with the choice of the auxiliary, as illustrated in 15(a), whose auxiliary is *essere* (=be), and 15(b, c), whose auxiliary is *avere* (=have).

What these examples have in common is their syntactic structure; they are characterized by the same sequence of constituents, as shown in (16):

(16) \[ [CP \text{ che} ] [IP \text{ Auxiliary Verb} ] [VP \text{ Lexical Verb} [NP/PP \text{ Complement/Adjunct} ] ] ]

As already introduced, it is also necessary to consider the availability of lexical material, in order to account for the function of pause-insertion. In this case, it is possible to focus the rightmost constituent, meaning an adjunct (as in 15(a, b)) or a complement (as in 15(c)). Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that the aforementioned intonational pause separates lexical verbs from their complements or adjuncts.

However, there are good reasons to believe that this is not the whole story. If we assumed that the function of the intonational pause is to focus complements/adjuncts, then it would be impossible to account for sentences, such as those in illustrated in 15(a, b, c). As a matter of fact, another position is available for pause-insertion in the same contexts:

(17) a. *Che sei, arrivato alle cinque?*
   
   *che* are-2.Sg arrived-Mas.Sg-Past.Part at-the-Fem.Pl five
   
   Did you arrive at five?

b. *Che hai, dormito a casa?*
   
   *che* have-2.Sg slept-Past.Part at home
   
   Did you sleep at home?

c. *Che hai, mangiato la torta?*
   
   *che* have-2.Sg eaten-Past.Part the-Fem.Sg cake
   
   Did you eat the cake?

As shown in 17(a, b, c), the pause can be inserted between the auxiliary and the lexical verb as well.
In this case, the intonational break separates the lexical verb together with the complements/adjuncts. Again, no restriction regarding the thematic structure of the lexical verb and the nature of the auxiliary seems to affect the systematic process of pause-insertion.

1.3.2 *Che* as a scope-marker

All in all, it seems that two positions are available as hosting sites for the pause in the same contexts; I assume that two different underlying structures are associated with 15(a, b, c) and 17(a, b, c), respectively. The choice of one structure over another is determined by the meaning, that the speaker wants to convey. As a matter of fact, the meanings of 15(a, b, c) and 17(a, b, c) are quite different.

I assume that *che* is an operator (OP), which binds one or more constituent; these elements are what the whole question is about. In other words, I claim that *che* takes scope over the constituents which occur after the intonational break, marking them as new information. Therefore, the meaning of *yes/no* questions crucially depends on where the pause is inserted, and therefore on the lexical material which is bound in the Questioned Phrase.

In a sentence, such as 15(a), it clearly emerges the speaker already knows that the interlocutor has arrived, but (s)he wants to underline that (s)he is unsure about the arrival time. I assume that *che* only has scope over the marginalized time adjunct, and not over the lexical verb. In other words, the time adjunct is focused, as opposed to the lexical verb.

Instead, the scope of *che* is represented by the lexical verb together with the time adjunct in a sentence such as 17(a). Consequently, it seems reasonable to argue that *che* takes scope over the whole sentence, marking all the lexical elements as new information.

Thus, I assume that those *yes/no* questions, where the pause is inserted between the auxiliary and the lexical verb, are asked to obtain pure new information. The whole sentence\(^1\) is focused, as opposed to 15(a). The same analysis can be extended to 15(b, c) versus 17(b, c). A schematic representation of the relation between *che* and the constituents, over which it takes scope, is given below in 18(a, b):

\[^1\text{Altough the auxiliary verb is not included in the scope of *che*, I assume that the whole sentence is focused because the lexical elements are all inside the Questioned Phrase.}\]
As already suggested, it is necessary to look at the availability of lexical material over which *che* can take scope, in order to account for the syntactic behaviour of *che* with respect to the observed prosodic effects.

As a matter of fact, if more lexical material is available, it is necessary to have two intonational breaks, which indicate the boundaries of the Questioned Phrase; let us compare the following examples:

(19) a. *Che* hai dormito, *a casa*, ieri?

     OP               SCOPE

     a casa

b. *Che* hai, dormito *a casa*, ieri?

     OP               SCOPE

If the lexical verb is followed by two constituents, the scope of *che* has to be delimited by two pauses, as shown in 19(a, b). The Questioned Phrase is represented by the DP *a casa* in 19(a); therefore, only the DP is marked as new information.

Instead, *che* binds both the lexical verb and the DP inside its scope in 19(b). I find it relevant to point out that the omission of the second pause leads to ungrammaticality, as shown in 20(a, b):

(20) a. *Che* hai dormito, a casa ieri?

     che have-2.Sg slept-Past.Part at home yesterday

Did you sleep at home yesterday?
b. *Che hai, dormito a casa ieri?
che have-2.Sg slept-Past.Part at home yesterday?
Did you sleep at home yesterday?

The same analysis can be extended to those yes/no questions, where a resumptive pronoun occurs before the finite verb. Let us consider the following examples:

(21) a. Che l' hai, *mangiata, la torta?
che it-Fem.Sg-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg eaten-Fem.Sg-Past.Part the-Fem-Sg cake
Did you eat the cake?

b. Che l' hanno, comprata, la casa?
che it-Fem.Sg-Obj.Cl have-3.Pl bought-Fem.Sg-Past.Part the-Fem.Sg house
Did they buy the house?

Again, it is necessary to have two intonational breaks in order for the sentence to be grammatical. As expected, only the lexical verb is allowed to appear inside the scope of che and be marked as new information. This is not surprising because the complement of the verb is anticipated by a resumptive pronoun, which marks it as old information. Instead, as already claimed, the Questioned Phrase is marked as new information and it represents what the question is about.

So far, only examples where the verb is followed by a complement or an adjunct were taken into consideration. Let us see whether the analysis elaborated so far can also account for the occurrence of prosodic effects in sentences, where no complement or adjunct is found after the lexical verb:

(22) a. Che sei, arrivato?
che are-2.Sg arrived-Mas.Sg-Past.Part
Did you arrive?

b. *Che, sei arrivato?
che are-2.Sg arrived-Mas.Sg-Past.Part
Did you arrive?
(23)  a.  *Che hai, dormito?

\[ che \ \text{have-2.Sg slept-Past.Part} \]

Did you sleep?

b.  *Che, hai dormito?

\[ che \ \text{have-2.Sg slept-Past.Part} \]

Did you sleep?

(24)  a.  Che hai, mangiato?

\[ che \ \text{have-2.Sg eaten-Past.Part} \]

Did you eat?

b.  *Che, hai mangiato?

\[ che \ \text{have-2.Sg eaten-Past.Part} \]

Did you eat?

As shown in 22(a), 23(a) and 24(a), the pause is inserted between the auxiliary and the lexical verb in sentences, whose structure is:

\[ \text{[CP} \ che \ \text{[IP} \ \text{Auxiliary [VP} \ \text{Lexical Verb} \text{]} \text{]} \]\n
On the one hand, it seems natural to focus the rightmost element, i.e. the lexical verb. On the other hand, we may wonder whether any other position is possibly available for the intonational break in structures of this kind. For instance, we may expect the pause to be inserted between \textit{che} and the auxiliary verb. However, as shown by the ungrammaticality of 22(b), 23(b) and 24(b), the pause can never separate \textit{che} from the auxiliary and the lexical verb. The prosodic break is only allowed to appear after a finite verb, which can be either lexical, as in 15(a, b, c), or auxiliary, as in 22(a), 23(a), 24(a) and 17(a, b, c). However, it is never allowed to appear right after \textit{che}, separating it from the auxiliary and the lexical verb. For some reasons, it seems that \textit{che} loses its ability to take scope over the lexical material which appears after the prosodic break, if the auxiliary is included in the scope of \textit{che}. In other words, \textit{che}-questions always require the pause to be inserted after a finite
verb, which is preceeded by *che*.

So far, I only described prosodic effects in sentences, which have both a finite auxiliary and a non-finite lexical verb; therefore, no problem arises with the assumption that the intonational break is inserted after the finite verb. There is indeed enough lexical material to meet the aforementioned requirements, meaning that the pause can be inserted after the auxiliary verb, so that *che* can take scope over the lexical verb and/or the complements/adjuncts.

However, it is necessary to look at sentences, where the lexical verb appears as a main verb, in order to see whether this generalization can be maintained. As expected, no problem arises as long as the finite, lexical verb is followed by a complement or an adjunct:

(26)  a. *Che* arrivasti, alle cinque?
       *che* arrived-2.Sg-Past at-the-Fem.Pl five
       Did you arrive at five?

       b. *Che*, arrivasti alle cinque?
       *che* arrived-2.Sg-Past at-the-Fem.Pl five
       Did you arrive at five?

(27)  a. *Che* dormisti, a casa?
       *che* slept-2.Sg-Past at home
       Did you sleep at home?

       b. *Che*, dormisti a casa?
       *che* slept-2.Sg-Past at home
       Did you sleep at home?

(28)  a. *Che* mangiasti, la torta?
       *che* ate-2.Sg the-Fem.Sg cake
       Did you eat the cake?
b. *Che, mangiasti la torta?
   che ate-2.Sg the-Fem.Sg cake
   Did you eat the cake?

As expected, the pause can be inserted between the lexical verb and the complements/adjuncts in sentences, which have the following structure:

\[(29) \quad [CP \ che [IP \ Lexical \ Verb [VP \ Lexical \ Verb [NP/PP \ complement/adjunct ] ] ]] \]

As shown in 26(a), 27(a) and 28(a), the complements/adjuncts are bound in the Questioned Phrase by the operator che and therefore they are marked as new information. However, it is not allowed for che to bind both the lexical verb and the complements/adjuncts; as a matter of fact, the pause can never occur right after che, separating it from its marginalized scope. This is exactly the same pattern that arises in 22(b), 23(b) and 24(b), which show that the pause is not even allowed to immediately follow che in sentences, where both an auxiliary and a lexical verb occur. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that no intonational break can ever separate che alone from the rest of the sentence; the only available position is after a finite verb.

Nevertheless, it is now necessary to make a further step in order to check whether this generalization can be possibly extended to those che-questions, where the finite lexical verb does not have any complement/adjunct. This topic will be discussed in the following section, because it requires amore complex analysis.

1.3.2 Fare-insertion

According to the observations made so far, it is predictable that the pause will not be inserted between che and the lexical verb, altough this seems to be the only place available. Let us take a look at the following examples:

(30) a. *Che, arrivi?
   che arrive-2.Sg
   Are you arriving?
b. *Che, dormi?
   che sleep-2.Sg
   Are you sleeping?

c. *Che, mangi?
   che eat-2.Sg
   Are you eating?

As a matter of fact, che always needs to bind some constituents. In sentences where no lexical material is available, the insertion of a dummy verb is required in order to focus the lexical verb and include it in the scope of che. The verb in question is fare, meaning do; its number, person and tense features must match those of the lexical verb. Sentences, such as 30(a, b, c), are ruled out because they lack supportive fare; let us see how their grammatical counterparts are built:

(31)   a. Che fai, arrivi?
       che do-2.Sg arrive-2.Sg
       Are you arriving?

       b. Che fa, dorme?
          che do-3.Sg sleep-3.Sg
          Is (s)he sleeping?

       c. Che facevano, mangiavano?
          che did-3.Pl ate-3.Pl
          Were they eating?

As shown in 31(a, b, c), it is obligatory to introduce fare between che and the lexical verb, so that the lexical verb can be included in the scope of che and focused. I regard the clause which appears after the intonational break as a Juxtaposed Clause. As previously claimed for the Questioned Phrase, I assume that the Juxtaposed Clause is focused, and that it represents what the whole question is about.
However, it should be noticed that *fare* is also allowed to occur in questions, where an auxiliary verb is already present; let us consider the following examples:

(32)  

a. *Che* ha fatto, è arrivato (alle cinque)?

   *che* has-3.Sg done-Past.Part is-3.Sg arrived-Mas.Sg-Past.Part

   Did he he arrive (at five)?

b. *Che* hanno fatto, hanno dormito (a casa)?

   *che* have-3.Pl done-Past.Part have-3.Pl slept-Past.Part

   Did they sleep (at home)?

c. *Che* avete fatto, avete mangiato (la torta)?

   *che* have-2.Pl done-Past.Part have-2.Pl eaten-Past.Part

   Did you eat (the cake)?

As shown in 32(a, b, c), *fare* can occur in sentences where there is already enough lexical material to be bound inside the scope of *che*. In this case, the whole yes/no question is in the scope of *che*; there is no reason to exclude the auxiliary, because the intonational break can be inserted after the finite supportive verb, i.e. *fare*. Actually, it is not only possible but also obligatory; the pause can only be inserted after finite *fare*, so that the following constituents can be focused and interpreted as new information.

There is no difference in meaning between 32(a, b, c) and 17(a, b, c), which lack supportive *fare*. *Fare*-insertion seems to be optional in this context; however, I assume that there is no real optionality but rather a simplification of the underlying structure, due to a principle of economy. It is indeed rather costly to display the whole structure with supportive *fare*, when one or more auxiliary verbs are already present. Nevertheless, it is relevant to underline that *fare*-insertion never leads to ungrammaticality.

According to *prima facie* evidence, fare seems to be a pretty functional verb, devoided of its lexical meaning; in other words, it seems to be a copy of the tense, person and number features of the main verb. Further evidence for the functional nature of *fare* can be inferred from its behaviour with respect to verbs, which do not assign an agentive role to the subject. Were *fare* interpreted as a lexical verb, its co-occurrence with those verbs should not be expected because *fare* assigns its
subject the role of agent. However, questions such as 33(a, b) are perfectly well-formed:

(33)  

a.  

*Che ha fatto, è morto?  

che has-3.Sg done-Past.Part is-3.Sg dead-Mas.Sg-Past.Part  

Did he die?

b.  

*Che fa, soffre?  

che does-3.Sg suffers-3.Sg  

Is (s)he suffering?

They would not be acceptable if fare were interpreted as a lexical verb, because there would be a contrast between the agentive role assigned by fare and the non-agentive one assigned by the main verb. However, if fare is conceived of as a pretty functional element, then no interpretive conflict arises.

Nevertheless, its person, number and tense features must match those of fare. Were this not the case, then the resulting clause would end up being ungrammatical:

(34)  

a.  

*Che fa, piangi?  

che does-3.Sg cry-2.Sg  

Are you crying?

b.  

*Che hanno fatto, soffrono?  

che have-3.Pl done-Past.Part suffer-3.Pl  

Did they suffer?

The example in 34(a) is ungrammatical because there is no person agreement between the two verbs; fare is third person singular while piangere (i.e. to cry) is second person singular. However, the verbs share the same tense for they are both simple present.

Instead, 34(b) is characterized by a lack of tense agreement; fare is past, while soffrire (i.e. to suffer) is simple present. This mismatch actually makes the sentence unacceptable, because fare and the lexical verb must share their person, number and tense features.

Now that all the basic facts about Sienese yes/no questions have been introduced, it is possible to
discuss a working hypothesis, that may shed some light on the nature of *che*. Given that its morphological form resembles that of a complementizer, it may be the case that *che* actually is a complementizer, and that Sienese yes/no questions are a sort of reversed clefts or pseudo-clefts. Let us observe the following examples:

(35)  a. Che parli, con Gianni?
    Che talk-2.Sg with John
    Are you talking with John?

    b. È con Gianni, che parli?
        is-3.Sg with John that talk-2.Sg
        Is it John that you are talking with?

It could be possible to hypothesize that *che*, which occurs in 35(a), is the same *che*, which occurs in 35(b). However, if we try to insert *fare*, it becomes clear that there is no relationship between the complementizer *che*, and the yes/no questions scope marker *che*. Let us take into consideration the following examples:

(36)  a. *Che fai, parli con Gianni?*
    Che do-2.Sg talk-2.Sg with John
    Are you talking with John?

    b. *È parli con Gianni quello che fai?* (Pseudo-cleft)
        is talk-2.Sg with John what that do-2.Sg

    c. *Quello che fai è parli con Gianni?* (Pseudo-cleft)
        what that do-2.Sg is-3.Sg with John

    d. *È parlare con Gianni che fai?* (Cleft)
        is talk-Inf with John that do-2.Sg

As shown by the ungrammaticality of 36(b-d), *che* is clearly not derived from an underlying cleft or
pseudo-cleft structure, and therefore, the (pseudo-)cleft hypothesis must be abandoned here. I will try to provide a more successful account of the role played by *che* in the following section.

### 1.4 The syntactic behaviour of *fare*

According to the data discussed so far, it seems that *fare* behaves as a dummy verb, which has a pure functional meaning but no lexical meaning. However, I will show in this section that *fare* is not just a supportive verb; evidence for this claim is provided by the fact that it is allowed to co-occur not only with auxiliaries, but also with various functional verbs, such as restructuring verbs.

#### 1.4.1 Fare and restructuring verbs

There are some interesting asymmetries in the co-occurrence of *fare* and different restructuring verbs, such as modal, causative, perception, aspectual and control verbs. I will provide a detailed description of the occurrence of restructuring verbs outside and inside the Juxtaposed Clause, in order to account for the syntactic behaviour of *fare* and its relation with *che*. Against prima-facie evidence, I will also argue that *che* is not a moved constituent which refers to some DP, but rather a base-generated operator which marks the scope of the yes/no question.

As expected, no difference emerges with respect to non-restructuring verbs as long as the the restructuring verb itself is not included in the questioned phrase; let us consider the following examples:

(37) a. *Che* devi/voi parti, domani?
    *che* must/want-2.Sg leave-Inf tomorrow
    Do you have/want to leave tomorrow?

    b. *Che* devi/voi, parti'domani?
    *che* must/want-2.Sg leave-Inf tomorrow
    Do you have/want to leave tomorrow?
(38) a. *Che vai a comprà, il pane?*
   *che go-2.Sg to buy-Inf the-Mas.Sg bread*
   Are you going to buy bread?

   b. *Che vai, a comprà il pane?*
   *che go-2.Sg to buy-Inf the-Mas.Sg bread*
   Are you going to buy bread?

(39) a. *Che ti fa lavà, i piatti?*
   *che to-you.Cl makes-3.Sg wash-Inf the-Mas.Pl dishes*
   Does (s)he make you wash the dishes?

   b. *Che ti fa, lavà i piatti?*
   *che to-you.Cl makes-3.Sg wash-Inf the-Mas.Pl dishes*
   Does (s)he make you wash the dishes?

(40) a. *Che m'hai sentito, arrivà?*
   *che me-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg heard-Past.Part arrive-Inf*
   Did you hear me arrive?

   b. *Che m'hai, sentito arrivà?*
   *che me-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg heard-Past.Part arrive-Inf*
   Did you hear me arrive?

(41) a. *Che hanno cominciato, a fumà?*
   *che have-3.Pl started-Past.Part to smoke-Inf*
   Did they start smoking?

   b. *Che hanno, cominciato a fumà?*
   *che have-3.Pl started-Past.Part to smoke-Inf*
   Did they start smoking?
(42) a. *Che pensi d'andà, al mare?*

*che* think-2.Sg to go-Inf to-the-Mas.Sg sea

Are you thinking of going to the sea?

b. *Che pensi d'andà, al mare?*

*che* think-2.Sg to go-Inf to-the-Mas.Sg sea

Are you thinking of going to the sea?

As expected, the intonational break can be possibly realized in two positions: after the non-finite lexical verb, or after the finite restructuring verb. This is not surprising, for the same pattern was already observed with non-restructuring verbs, in sentences such as 15(a,b,c) and 17(a,b,c).

If the pause is found after the lexical verb, as in 37(a), 38(a), 39(a), 40(a), 41(a) and 42(a), the complements/adjuncts are bound inside the Questioned Phrase and focused. Instead, both the lexical verb and the complements/adjuncts are focused if the pause occurs after the finite auxiliary or restructuring verb, as in 37(b), 38(b), 39(b), 40(b), 41(b) and 42(b).

However, the picture gets more complicated if we try to insert supportive *fare*; as previously claimed, *fare*-insertion never leads to ungrammaticality. However, it is necessary to consider the different positions, where *fare* can possibly be inserted, both inside and outside the Juxtaposed Clause. I will try to shed some light on the relation between *fare* and *che*, and on the way they affect the structure of Sienese yes/no questions.

Let us now consider the three potential combinations of *fare* with modal verbs:

(43) a. *Che devi/voi fa, devi/voi partì?*

*che* must/want-2.Sg do-Inf must/want-2.Sg leave-Inf

Do you have/want to leave?

b. *Che fai, devi/voi parti?*

*che* do-2.Sg must/want-2.Sg leave-Inf

Do you have/want to leave?
c. *Che devi/voi fa, partì?
   
   \[ \text{che} \text{ must/want-2.Sg do-Inf leave-Inf} \]
   
   Do you have/want to leave?

The modal verb occurs inside and outside the Juxtaposed Clause in 43(a), which is perfectly well-formed. The example in 43(b) also shows a well-formed yes/no question, where the modal verb only occurs inside the Juxtaposed Clause. Instead, as shown by the ungrammaticality of 43(c), it is not allowed for the modal verb only to occur outside the Juxtaposed Clause.

The same analysis can be extended to andative verbs. Let us compare 43(a,b,c) and 44(a,b,c):

(44)  
   a. *Che vai a fa, vai a comprà il pane?
      
      \[ \text{che} \text{ go-2.Sg to do-Inf go-2.Sg to buy-Inf the-Mas.Sg bread} \]
      
      Are you going to buy bread?

   b. Che fai, vai a comprà il pane?
      
      \[ \text{che} \text{ do-2.Sg go-2.Sg to buy-Inf the-Mas.Sg bread} \]
      
      Are you going to buy bread?

   c. *Che vai a fa, comprà il pane?
      
      \[ \text{che} \text{ go-2.Sg to do-Inf buy-Inf the-Mas.Sg bread} \]
      
      Are you going to buy bread?

Again, we see in 44(c) that it is not allowed for andative verbs to occur outside the juxtaposed clause, if they do not occur inside the juxtaposed clause as well. The only possible combinations are shown in 44(a), where the andative verb occurs inside and outside the Juxtaposed Clause, and 44(b), where it only occurs inside the Juxtaposed Clause.

There is another subclass of restructuring verbs, where fare-insertion seems to be subject to the same constraints. As shown in 45(a,b,c), causative verbs behave just like modal verbs and andative verbs:
(45)  a.  *Che vi fa fà, vi fa lavà i piatti?
   che to-you-Cl makes-3.Sg do-Inf to-you-Cl makes-3.Sg wash-Inf the-Mas.Pl dishes
   Does (s)he make you wash the dishes?

   b.  Che fa, vi fa lavà i piatti?
   che does-3.Sg to-you-Cl makes-3.Sg wash-Inf the-Mas.Pl dishes
   Does (s)he make you wash the dishes?

   c.  *Che vi fa fà, lavà i piatti?
   che to-you-Cl makes-3.Sg do-Inf wash-Inf the-Mas.Pl dishes
   Does (s)he make you wash the dishes?

According to the data discussed so far, it seems that all restructuring verbs follow the same pattern with respect to fare-insertion. Nevertheless, many interesting differences arise when we consider other subclasses of restructuring verbs, such as perception and aspectual verbs. Let us discuss the following instances of yes/no questions with perception verbs:

(46)  a.  *Che m' hai visto/sentito fà, m' hai visto/sentito arrivà?
   che me-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg seen/heard-Past.Part do-Inf me-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg seen/heard-Past.Part arrive-Inf
   Did you see/hear me arrive?

   b.  Che hai fatto, m' hai visto/sentito arrivà?
   che have-2.Sg done-Past.Part me-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg seen/heard-Past.Part arrive-Inf
   Did you see/hear me arrive?

   c.  *Che m' hai visto/sentito fà, arrivà?
   che me-Obj.l have-2.Sg seen/heard-Past.Part do-Inf arrive-Inf
   Did you see/hear me arrive?
As shown by the ungrammaticality of 46(a,c), perception verbs are never allowed to occur outside the Juxtaposed Clause; it makes no difference whether they also occur inside the Juxtaposed Clause, as in 46(a), or whether they only occur outside, as in 46(c). As opposed to the other subclasses of restructuring verbs described so far, it seems that perception verbs are only allowed to appear inside the Juxtaposed Clause.

This characteristics is shared by aspectual verbs; let us compare 46(a,b,c) with 47(a,b,c):

(47)  a. *Che hai cominciato a/smesso di fà, hai cominciato a/smesso di fumà?
      che have-2.Sg started/stopped to do-Inf have-2.Sg started/stopped to
      smoke-Inf
      Did you start/stop smoking?

      b. Che hai fatto, hai cominciato a/smesso di fumà?
      che have-2.Sg done-past.Part have-2.Sg started/stopped to smoke-Inf
      Did you start/stop smoking?

      c. *Che hai cominciato a/smesso di fà, a/di fumà?
      che have-2.Sg started/stopped to do-Inf to smoke-Inf
      Did you start/stop smoking?

Like perception verbs, aspectual verbs are never allowed to occur outside the Juxtaposed Clause; they can only appear inside the Juxtaposed Clause.

However, this is not the whole story about restructuring verbs; as a matter of fact, there is a subclass of restructuring verbs, namely control verbs, which seems to display a different pattern when it comes to fare-insertion.

Let us discuss the position of control verbs with respect to fare and to the lexical verb:

(48)  a. *Che hai deciso/promesso di fà, hai deciso/promesso d'andà al mare?
      che have-2.Sg thought/promised to do-Inf have-2.Sg decided/promised to
      go-Inf to-the-Mas.Sg sea?
      Did you decide/promise to go to the sea?
b. *Che hai fatto, hai deciso/promesso d'andà al mare?*

*che* have-2.Sg done-Past.Part *have-2.Sg* decided/promised to go-Inf  
to-the-Mas.Sg sea  
Did you decide/promise to go to the sea?

c. *Che hai deciso/promesso di fà, d'andà al mare?*

*che* have-2.Sg decided/promised to go-Inf to-the-Mas.Sg sea  
Did you decide/promise to go to the sea?

As opposed to the other subclasses of restructuring verbs examined so far, control verbs are not allowed to occur inside and outside the Juxtaposed Clause at the same time, as shown in 48(a). They can only occur either inside or outside the Juxtaposed Clause, but they are not allowed to occur twice in the same *yes/no* question.

### 1.4.2 A possible interpretation

The different occurrences of restructuring verbs with respect to *fare* and to the lexical verb are summarized in the following table:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Inside and outside the Juxtaposed Clause at the same time</th>
<th>Inside the Juxtaposed Clause only</th>
<th>Outside the Juxtaposed Clause only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modal verbs</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andative verbs</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative verbs</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception verbs</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspectual verbs</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control verbs</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All in all, one significant conclusion can be drawn from the data analyzed in the present section. I assume that the extended functional projection of the juxtaposed clause must be equal to the extended functional projection of *fare*, or even bigger. However, it is not allowed to be smaller than the extended functional projection of fare. This generalization is able to account for all the classes of restructuring verbs presented here, except for control verbs.

As shown in the table above, the extended functional projection of modal, andative and causative verbs can be either equal to that of *fare*, or bigger. Perception and aspectual verbs only allow their extended functional projection to be bigger than that of *fare*, but they crucially never allow it to be smaller.

Instead, control verbs seem to not to follow the same pattern; their extended functional projection can be either bigger or smaller than that of *fare*. However, it can never be equal to the extended functional projection of fare.
Nevertheless, this does not come as a surprise because control verbs are after all the less functional of all reconstructing verbs. While all the other subclasses of reconstructing verbs examined so far are similar to functional verbs, control verbs are more similar to lexical verbs. As a matter of fact, they can take a subordinate sentence as their complement, unlike modal, andative, perception, causative and aspectual verbs. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that fare only refers to the subordinate sentence, whose functional extended projection stops at the subordinating preposition *di* in a sentence such as 48(c).

Moreover, the data discussed in the present section provide evidence for the claim that *fare* is not so dummy, as opposed to what one may think at first sight. *Fare* is indeed allowed to co-occur with restructuring verbs, which are in fact functional verbs and which already support a lexical verb. Furthermore, *fare* does not support tense and this strongly suggests that it cannot be regarded as a mere supportive verb. As a matter of fact, *fare* itself needs to be supported by an auxiliary in order to express tense, as shown by the contrast between 49(a) and 49(b):

(49) a.  *Che* fai, dormi?
    *che* do-2.Sg sleep-2.Sg
    Are you sleeping?

    b.  *Che hai fatto, hai dormito?*
    *che* have-2.Sg done-Past.Part have-2.Sg slept-Past.Part
    Did you sleep?

*Fare* alone is not able to support the tense of the lexical verb; as shown in (49)b, it is necessary to introduce an auxiliary verb, namely *avere* (=have). Further evidence for the claim that fare is not a dummy verb is provided by the fact that the auxiliary verb of the juxtaposed clause may be different from that found before *fare*. Let us consider the following example:

(50) a.  *Che* hai fatto, sei andato al mare?
    *che* have-2.Sg done-Past.Part *are* -2.Sg gone-Mas.Sg-Past.Part to-the-Mas.Sg
    sea
    Did you go to the sea?
As shown by the contrast between 50(a) and 50(b), the auxiliary verb of *fare* and that of the lexical verb in the juxtaposed clause have to be different, if the lexical verb requires another auxiliary. This shows that the juxtaposed clause is a different, independent clause, which needs to maintain its own auxiliary. Therefore, it is not possible to assume that *fare* is a pro-TP. However, *fare* alone can always stand for the whole extended projection of functional verbs, as shown in (51):

(51) Che *hai fatto, hai arrivato tardi?*

*che* have-2.Sg done-Past.Part have-2.Sg arrived-Mas.Sg-Past.Part late

Did you arrive late?

Instead, as far as the function and the meaning of *che* are concerned, I claim that *che* is not moved from an argument position to the SpecCP; as opposed to *wh*-elements proper, *che* is a base-generated element and it does not refer to any DP. As a matter of fact, it is not possible to interpret *che* as a complement of *fare*. Let us consider the following examples:

(52) a. *Che hai fatto, hai visto Gianni?*

*che* have-2.Sg done-Past.Part have-2.Sg seen-Past.Part *John*

Have you seen John?

b. *Che (gli) hai fatto a Gianni, l'hai visto?*

*che* (to-him-Cl) have-2.Sg done-Past.Part to *John him-Obj.Cl* have-2.Sg seen-Past.Part

Have you seen John?

(44) a. *Che fai, parli con Gianni?*

*che* do-2.Sg talk-2.Sg with *John*

Are you talking with John?
b. *Che (ci) fai con Gianni, ci parli?
   che (with-him-Cl) do-2.Sg with John with-him-Cl talk-2.Sg
   Are you talking with John?

(45) a. Che fece, arrivò a casa?
   che did-3.Sg arrived-3.Sg to home
   Did he arrive home?

b. *Che fece a casa, arrivò?
   che did-3.Sg at home arrived-3.Sg
   Did he arrive home?

As shown by the ungrammaticality of 52(b), 53(b) and 54(b), the complement of the lexical verb is not allowed to occur as the complement of fare. Were fare a mere copy of the lexical verb, we may expect it to be able to take its complements as well, but this is clearly not the case. In fact, if the complement of the lexical verb is found after fare, then the sentence becomes ungrammatical. This is due to the fact that fare is interpreted as a lexical verb, if followed by a complement. This interpretation cannot be licensed because of the different thematic structures of fare and the lexical verb. The lexical verb may not assign an agentive role to its subject and a patient role to its object, unlike fare; therefore, if fare takes the complements of the lexical verb and assign them a patient role, an interpretative conflict arises with the roles assigned by the focused lexical verb. These observations provide further evidence for the assumption that fare is not as dummy as previously claimed, and that it takes the whole juxtaposed yes/no question as its complement, namely the auxiliary/restructuring verb or the lexical verb, together with its complements/adjuncts. Consequently, che must be a base-generated operator which binds the focused yes/no question inside its scope and marks it as new information. However, it does not move from an argument position, as opposed to wh-elements; its function is to mark the scope of yes/no questions. Nevertheless, it is not crystal-clear whether che functions as a Head or as a Specifier of some functional projection inside the CP; I leave this question for future research.
1.5 Concluding remarks

- Sienese yes/no questions are always introduced by the word *che*. I assume that *che* is a yes/no question marker, which does not add any non-standard meaning to the canonical interpretation of yes/no questions. A first piece of evidence for this claim is provided by the fact that *che* is never allowed to occur in wh-questions. As a matter of fact, many other Central and Southern Italian dialects show a similar pattern, as opposed to Northern Italian Dialects.

- *Che*-questions are always characterized by a special prosody; it is necessary to have an intonational break, which separates the *Questioned Phrase* from the rest of the clause. The Questioned Phrase is focused, and it represents what the question is all about. I assume that *che* is an operator, which binds the Questioned Phrase inside its scope; the Questioned Phrase can include complements/adjuncts and lexical verbs, according to the availability of lexical material to be bound inside the scope of *che*. Crucially, the Questioned Phrase cannot include the inflected auxiliary.

- The systematic mechanism of pause-insertion in *che*-questions is not related to the thematic structure of the verbs involved; moreover, it does not interact with the choice of auxiliaries. The only crucial factor, which affects the structure of the Questioned Phrase, is the availability of lexical material to be focused. It is indeed necessary to have two intonational breaks, if the Questioned Phrase does not include all the constituents found after the inflected auxiliary. This happens when just one out of two complements/adjuncts is focused, as well as when resumptive pronouns occur. As expected, resumptive pronouns mark the postverbal constituents as known information, and therefore prevent them from entering the Questioned Phrase.

- Topicalized subjects and left-dislocated constituents are allowed to occur before *che*; however, they cannot appear right after *che*. The only other available position is after the lexical verb. Instead, no focused constituent is ever allowed to occur before *che*. This provides further evidence for the assumption that focused constituents must be included in
the Questioned Phrase.

- When there is no enough lexical material for che to bound the Questioned Phrase inside its scope, it is necessary to introduce a supportive verb. This happens when the yes/no question is only composed by an inflected lexical verb, which has no complements/adjuncts. The intonational break is inserted after the supportive verb fare, which shares the same person, number and tense features of the lexical verb. In this case, I assume that what is found after the intonational break is to be regarded as a Juxtaposed Clause, which is focused and represent what the whole question is about.

- Fare can also be inserted in those che-questions, where there is enough lexical material to be focused and bound inside the Questioned Phrase. This may be rather surprising, but it clearly shows that fare-insertion never leads to ungrammaticality. However, I assume that the whole complex structure with fare and the Juxtaposed clause is systematically reduced, whenever it is not strictly required in order for the clause to be grammatical.

- Fare is not as dummy as it may appear at first sight; it clearly has no lexical meaning, but it does not function as a full functional verb, because it co-occurs with auxiliaries and restructuring verbs. From the analysis of the occurrence of restructuring verbs inside and outside the Juxtaposed Clause, it is possible to infer that the extended functional projection of the lexical verb is always equal to the extended functional projection of fare, or larger.

- It is not possible to regard fare as a mere copy of the lexical verb; further evidence for this claim is provided by the fact that the complements of the lexical verb cannot be interpreted as being the complements of fare. Moreover, fare is clearly not a canonical supportive verb because it cannot express tense; as a matter of fact, it is necessary to introduce an auxiliary verb to support fare itself. Further evidence for the claim that the non-Juxtaposed clause and the Juxtaposed clause are two different clauses, each with its complete TP, is provided by the fact that the auxiliaries of fare and of the lexical verb in the Juxtaposed clause may be different.
Chapter 2

The occurrence of e in declarative clauses and interrogative clauses

2.0 Introduction

In the present chapter I entertain the analysis of an invariable vocalic morpheme, namely e, which frequently occurs in Sienese declarative clauses and in yes/no questions. Section 2.1 describes the occurrence of e in main declarative clauses, while section 2.2 is concerned with the restrictions which affect the distribution of e. In section 2.3, I describe the occurrence of e in subordinate declarative clauses, which presents some interesting differences and similarities with its occurrence in main declarative clauses. Section 2.4 presents a possible interpretation of the syntactic behaviour and the function of e, which is motivated by the observation of some further special restrictions on the occurrence of e in subordinate clauses. Section 2.5 is dedicated to the description of the role played by e in yes/no questions, while section 2.6 describes the differences between che-questions and e-questions. Finally, section 2.7 collects some concluding remarks.

2.1 The occurrence of e in main declarative clauses

The invariable vocalic morpheme e occurs in declarative main clauses; however, I find it relevant to point out that e is not obligatory. I will try to establish its function in the following sections.

2.1.1 Different person specification of the subject

No restriction concerning person features affects the distribution of e, which can occur with any person specification of the subject:
As shown in 1(a-f), which illustrate the whole paradigm, e is allowed to occur with any person. There is no asymmetry between different person specification of the subject.

### 2.1.2 Different verb-classes and interpretations

It is possible for e to occur with any type of verb, disregarding the thematic structure; let us compare the following examples:
(2)  a.  

\[ E \text{ sei venuto alle cinque.} \]

\[ e \text{ are-2.Sg come-Mas.Sg-Past.Part at-the-Fem.Pl five} \]

You came at five.

b.  *\[ E \text{ sei venuto alle cinque.} \]

\[ e \text{ are-2.Sg e come-Mas.Sg-Past.Part at-the-Fem.Pl five} \]

You came at five.

c.  *\[ E \text{ venuto e alle cinque.} \]

\[ e \text{ are-2.Sg come-Mas.Sg-Past.Part e at-the-Fem.Pl five} \]

You came at five.

(3)  a.  

\[ E \text{ correvi sempre.} \]

\[ e \text{ run-2.Sg-Past always} \]

You were always running.

b.  *\[ E \text{ correvi e sempre.} \]

\[ e \text{ run-2.Sg e always} \]

You were always running.

(4)  a.  

\[ E \text{ mangia la torta.} \]

\[ e \text{ eats-3.Sg the-Fem.Sg} \]

(S)he eats the cake.

b.  *\[ E \text{ mangia la torta.} \]

\[ e \text{ eats-3.Sg e the-Fem.Sg} \]

(S)he eats the cake.

The verb of the sentences in 2(a, b, c) is unaccusative, while the verb in 2(a, b) is unergative and that in 2(a, b) is transitive. The invariable vocalic morpheme \( e \) is not incompatible with any of these verb classes, and therefore it is not incompatible with an argumental interpretation.
However, it is relevant to notice that the only available position for $e$ in main declarative clauses is before the inflected verb, which can be either an auxiliary, as in 2(a), or a lexical verb, as in 4(a) and 5(a).

Nevertheless, $e$ is never allowed to occur after the inflected verb; as shown by the ungrammaticality of 2(b, c), where $e$ occurs respectively between the finite auxiliary and the non-finite lexical verb, and of 3(b) and 4(b), where $e$ occurs after the inflected lexical verb.

Let us now check whether $e$ is allowed to occur in sentences, where the interpretation is quasi-argumental. The following examples illustrate some examples of verbs, which do not convey an argumental interpretation, such as metheorologic verbs:

(3) a. $E$ piove.
   \[ e \text{ rains-3.Sg} \]
   It is raining.

b. $E$ tona.
   \[ e \text{ -3.Sg thunders-3.Sg} \]
   It is thundering.

c. $E$ fa freddo.
   \[ e \text{ does-3.Sg cold} \]
   It is cold.

As shown in 3(a-c), $e$ is also compatible with quasi-argumental interpretations; moreover, I find it relevant to underline that no asymmetry arises with respect to different kinds of quasi-argumental verbs. As argued by Manente (2006), there are some syntactic differences between those metheorologic verbs, which imply a motion, and those that do not imply a motion. For instance, piove’ (=rain) implies a motion, while tona’ (=thunder) and fa’ freddo (=be cold) do not. However, as shown in 3(a-c), $e$ seems not to be sensitive to this differences. It appears indeed with any kind of quasi-argumental verb, disregarding their argument structure.
2.1.3 The position of e

Let us now consider whether any restriction affects the occurrence of \( e \) with respect to pre-verbal, post-verbal and null-subject.

No problem arises when the subject is not overtly realized, meaning it is a null pronoun. As already shown in 1(a-f), \( e \) is indeed perfectly compatible with null subjects.

Let us now turn our attention to preverbal subjects, in order to see whether \( e \) can co-occur with a preverbal subject in the same clause:

(4) a. Maria \( e \) va a casa.
    Mary \( e \) goes-3.Sg to home
    Mary is going home.

    b. *E Maria va a casa.
       e Mary goes-3.Sg to home
       Mary is going home.

(5) a. La su' nonna \( e \) camina male.
    the-Fem.Sg his/her-Fem.Sg e walks-3.Sg badly
    His/her grandmother walks badly.

    b. *E la su nonna camina male.
       e the-Fem.Sg his/her-Fem.Sg walks-3.Sg badly
       His/her grandmother walks badly.

(6) a. Il su' babbo \( e \) beve il vino.
    the-Mas.Sg his/her-Mas.Sg dad e drinks-3.Sg the-Mas.Sg wine
    His/Her father drinks wine.

    b. *E il su' babbo beve il vino.
       the-Mas.Sg his/her-Mas.Sg dad e drinks-3.Sg the-Mas.Sg wine
       His/Her father drinks wine.
When a declarative main clause has an overtly realized preverbal subject, then *e* must necessarily follow it, as shown in 4(a), 5(a), and 6(a). It is never allowed to put *e* after the subject, as shown by the ungrammaticality of 4(b), 5(b) and 6(b). The same pattern arises with left-dislocated objects, PPs and adjuncts; let us consider the following examples, where a direct object is left-dislocated:

(7)  
   a. Il pane *e* l'ho comprato.  
       the-Mas.Sg bread *e* it-Mas.Sg-Obj.Cl have-1.Sg bought-as.Sg-Past.Part  
       I bought bread.  
   
   b. *E* il pane *e* l'ho comprato.  
       the-Mas.Sg bread *e* it-Mas.Sg-Obj.Cl have-1.Sg bought-as.Sg-Past.Part  
       I bought bread.  

(8)  
   a. La su' figliola *e* l'hanno vista.  
       the-Fem.Sg his/her-Fem.Sg daughter *e* her-Fem.Sg-Obj.Cl have-3.Pl  
       seen-Fem.Sg-Past.Part  
       They saw his/her daughter.  
   
   b. *E* la su'figliola l'hanno vista.  
       the-Fem.Sg his/her-Fem.Sg daughter *e* her-Fem.Sg-Obj.Cl have-3.Pl  
       seen-Fem.Sg-Past.Part  
       They saw his/her daughter.  

(9)  
   a. La finestra *e* l'hai chiusa.  
       the-Fem.Sg window *e* it-Fem.Sg have-2.Sg closed-Fem.Sg-Past.Part  
       You closed the window.  
   
   b. *E* la finestra l'hai chiusa.  
       the-Fem.Sg window *e* it-Fem.Sg have-2.Sg closed-Fem.Sg-Past.Part  
       You closed the window.  

As shown in 7(a), 8(a) and 9(a), *e* is preceded by left-dislocated objects; the reverse would lead to
ungrammaticality, as shown in 7(b), 8(b) and 9(b). As a matter of fact, \( e \) seems to behave the same way with pre-verbal subjects and left-dislocated objects; it must necessarily follow them in order for the sentence to be grammatical. As already suggested, the same is true for left-dislocated PPs; let us take a look at the following examples:

(10) a. Per Gianni \( e \) preparo un'altra cosa.
    for John \( e \) prepare-1.Sg a-Fem.Sg other-Fem.Sg thing
    I am going to prepare something else for John.

    b. *\( E \) per Gianni preparo un'altra cosa.
        \( e \) for John prepare-1.Sg a-Fem.Sg other-Fem.Sg thing
        I am going to prepare something else for John.

(11) a. Alla su' mamma \( e \) gli ha dato un regalo.
    to-the-Fem.Sg his/her-Fem.Sg mother \( e \) to-her-Fem.Sg have-3.Sg given-Past.Part
    (S)he gave a present to her mother.

    b. *\( E \) alla su' mamma gli ho dato un regalo.
        \( e \) To-the-Fem.Sg his/her-Fem.Sg mother to-her-Fem.Sg have-3.Sg given-Past.Part
        (S)he gave a present to her mother.

(12) a. Con Maria \( e \) ci andavo a scuola insieme.
    with Mary \( e \) with-her-Cl went-1.Sg to school together
    I was at school with Mary.

    b. *\( E \) con Maria ci andavo a scuola insieme.
        \( e \) with Mary with-her-Cl went-1.Sg to school together
        I was at school with Mary.

As shown by the contrast between 10(a), 11(a), 12(a) and 10(b), 11(b), 12(b), \( e \) can only occur after
any left-dislocated PP. Otherwise, the sentence would turn ungrammatical.

Let us now consider another case, where $e$ seems to be subject to the same constraints:

(13)  
   **a.** Ieri $e$ so' andata al mare.
   
yesterday $e$ am-1.Sg gone-Fem.Sg to-the-Mas.Sg sea
   I went to the sea yesterday.

   **b.** *$E$ ieri so' andata al mare.*
   
yesterday $e$ am-1.Sg gone-Fem.Sg to-the-Mas.Sg sea
   I went to the sea yesterday.

(14)  
   **a.** Forse $e$ compro un cane.
   
maybe $e$ buy-1.Sg a-Mas.Sg dog
   Maybe I will buy a dog.

   **b.** *$E$ forse compro un cane.*
   
$e$ maybe buy-1.Sg a-Mas.Sg dog
   Maybe I will buy a dog.

(15)  
   **a.** Domani $e$ chiamo la su' mamma.
   
tomorrow $e$ call-1.Sg the-Fem.Sg his/her mother
   I will call her mother tomorrow.

   **b.** *$E$ domani chiamo la su' mamma.*
   
tomorrow $e$ call-1.Sg the-Fem.Sg his/her mother
   I will call her mother tomorrow.

As shown in 13(a), 14(a) and 15(a), $e$ must necessarily precede any adjuncts, which occur in a preverbal position. It is not possible for $e$ to follow a preverbal adjunct.

As a matter of fact, the behaviour of $e$ seems to be rather coherent, in that it cannot precede any constituent, which is found before the inflected verb. We saw that this generalization is able to account for the co-occurrence of $e$ with pre-verbal subjects, left-dislocated objects and PPs, and pre-
verbal adjuncts. Let us now see what happens, when more than one constituent is found in a preverbal position:

(16) a. Ieri il regalo al tu' fratello la tu' mamma e gliel'ha comprato.
yesterday the-Mas.Sg present to-the-Mas.Sg your-Mas.Sg brother the-Fem.Sg your-Fem.Sg mother e to-him-it-Cl has-3.Sg bought
Your mother bought the present for your brother yesterday.

b. Ieri il regalo la tu mamma al tu' fratello e gliel'ha comprato.
yesterday the-Mas.Sg present the-Fem.Sg your-Fem.Sg mother to-the-Mas.Sg your-Mas.Sg brother e to-him-it-Cl has-3.Sg bought
Your mother bought the present for your brother yesterday.

c. Ieri la tu' mamma al tu' fratello il regalo e gliel'ha comprato.
yesterday the-Fem.Sg your-Fem.Sg mother to-the-Mas.Sg your-Mas.Sg brother the-Mas.Sg present e to-him-it-Cl has-3.Sg bought
Your mother bought the present for your brother yesterday.

d. La tu' mamma al tu' fratello il regalo ieri e gliel'ha comprato.
the-Fem.Sg your-Fem.Sg mother to-the-Mas.Sg your-Mas.Sg brother the-Mas.Sg present yesterday e to-him-it-Cl has-3.Sg bought
Your mother bought the present for your brother yesterday.

As shown in 16(a-d), e must follow the last preverbal constituent in the clause. It makes no difference whether the last preverbal constituent is a subject, as in 16(a), an indirect object, as in 16(b), a direct object, as in 16(c), or an adjunct, as in 16(d).

It is instead impossible to insert e after each constituents, as shown by the ungrammaticality of 17(a). Furthermore, e is not allowed to appear in between two pre-verbal constituents. As shown in 17(b), e cannot occur between the first and the second preverbal constituent, just like it cannot occur between the second and the third, as in 17(c), or between the third and the fourth, as in 17(d).
(17) a. *Ieri e il regalo e al tu' fratello e la tu' mamma e glie l'ha comprato.
   yesterday e the-Mas.Sg present e to-the-Cl your-Mas.Sg brother e the
   your-Fem.Sg mother e to-him-it-Cl has-3.Sg bought.
   Your mother bought the present for your brother yesterday.

b. *Ieri e il regalo al tu' fratello la tu' mamma gliel'ha comprato.
   yesterday e the-Mas.Sg present to-the-Cl your-Mas.Sg brother the
   your-Fem.Sg mother to-him-it-Cl has-3.Sg bought.
   Your mother bought the present for your brother yesterday.

c. *Ieri il regalo e al tu' fratello la tu' mamma gliel'ha comprato.
   yesterday the-Mas.Sg present e to-the-Cl your-Mas.Sg brother the
   your-Fem.Sg mother to-him-it-Cl has-3.Sg bought.
   Your mother bought the present for your brother yesterday.

d. *Ieri il regalo al tu' fratello e la tu' mamma gliel' ha comprato.
   Yesterday the-Mas.Sg present to-the-Cl your-Mas.Sg brother e the
   your-Fem.Sg mother to-him-it-Cl has-3.Sg bought.
   Your mother bought the present for your brother yesterday.

2.1.4 Post-verbal subjects

So far, only examples where the subject is realized in a pre-verbal position were taken into
consideration. Let us now check whether e is compatible with post-verbal subjects:

(18) a. E viene la tu' mamma.
   e comes-3.Sg the-Fem.Sg your-Fem.Sg mother
   Your mother is coming.

b. E corre anche la lupa.
   e runs-3.Sg too the-Fem.Sg lupa-Fem.Sg
   The wolf is running too.
c.  *E mangiano troppo i mi' figlioli.*

*e eat-3.Pl too much the-Mas.Pl my-Mas.Pl children*

My children eat too much.

As shown in 18(a, b, c), *e* is perfectly compatible with post-verbal subjects; therefore, I assume that there is no direct relationship between *e* and the subject, which can occur either to the right or to the left of *e*, without however affecting its syntactic behaviour. According to the data described so far, the following conclusions can be drawn about the occurrence of *e* in main declarative clauses:

- It can only occur once in the same clause;
- It can only appear before the inflected verb;
- It must follow any kind of preverbal constituent;
- If more than one preverbal constituent is present, then the only available position for *e* is after the last preverbal constituent;
- It is compatible with either pre-verbal or post-verbal subjects.

### 2.2 Restrictions on the occurrence of *e* in main declarative clauses

There are some restrictions on the occurrence of *e* in main declarative clauses, which need to be taken into consideration in order to shed some light on the syntax of *e*. The following subsections are dedicated to the description of the syntactic behaviour of *e* with pre-verbal and post-verbal focused constituents, and with some functional verbs.

#### 2.2.1 Focused pre-verbal constituents

First of all, I find it relevant to point out that *e* seems to be incompatible with any kind of pre-verbal contrastive focus; let us take into consideration the following examples:
(19)  a.  *MARIO e m'ha visto (no Gianni).
    Mary e me-Obj.Cl has-3.Sg seen-Past.Part (not John)
    MARY saw me (not John).

    b.  MARIO m'ha visto (no Gianni).
    Mary me-Obj.Cl has-3.Sg seen-Past.Part (not John)
    MARY saw me (not John).

(20)  a.  *GIANNI e ho chiamato (no Maria).
    John e have-1.Sg called-Past.Part (not Mary)
    I have called JOHN (not Mary).

    b.  GIANNI ho chiamato (no Maria).
    John have-1.Sg called-Past.Part (not Mary)
    I have called JOHN (not Mary).

(21)  a.  *A MARIO e l'ho detto (no a Gianni).
    to Mary e it-Mas.Sg-Obj.Cl have-1.Sg told-Past.Part (not to John)
    I told it TO MARY (not to John).

    b.  A MARIO l'ho detto (no a Gianni).
    to Mary it-Mas.Sg-Obj.Cl have-1.Sg told-Past.Part (not to John)
    I told it TO MARY (not to John).

(22)  a.  *IERI e ci so' stata (no oggi).
    yesterday e there-Cl am-1.Sg been-Fem.Sg-Past.Part (not today)
    I went there yesterday (not today).

    b.  IERI ci so' stata (no ierillaltro).
    yesterday there-Cl am-1.Sg been-Fem.Sg-Past.Part (not today)
    I went there yesterday (not today).
As shown by the ungrammaticality of 19(a), 20(a), 21(a) and 22(a), e is not allowed to co-occur with a preverbal focus. It makes no difference whether the preverbal focused constituent is a subject, as in 19(a), an object, as in 20(a), a PP, as in 21(a), or an adjunct, as in 22(a). It seems that the only available interpretation for any kind of pre-verbal constituent followed by e in a main declarative clause is that of a topic, as we already saw in the previous section.

Nevertheless, I find it necessary to mention that it is actually possible to have a preverbal focus in Sienese main declarative clauses. However, in order for the preverbal constituents to be focused, it is necessary to eliminate e. As shown in 19(b), 20(b), 21(b) and 22(b), preverbal focused constituents are allowed in main declarative clauses if and only if e is not present.

2.2.2 Focused post-verbal constituents

All in all, it could be possible to hypothesize that e is incompatible with any kind of focused constituent, but this is clearly not the whole story. Let us consider the following examples, where e co-occurs with a post-verbal focused constituent:

(23) a.  E m'ha visto Maria.
     e me-Obj.Cl has-3.Sg seen-Past.Part Mary
     Mary saw me.

    b.  E ho chiamato Gianni.
     e have-1.Sg called-Past.Part John
     I have called John.

    c.  E l'ho detto a Maria.
     e it-Mas.Sg have-1.Sg told-Past.Part to Mary
     I told it to Mary.
As shown in 23(a-d), it is possible for \textit{e} to co-occur with a focused\textsuperscript{2} postverbal constituent, as opposed to what was observed with respect to pre-verbal constituents. Therefore, it is not possible to assume that \textit{e} is incompatible with any kind of focus, although it is clear that there must be some constraints, which prevents it from following a focused constituent.

\subsection*{2.2.3 Functional verbs}

Another restriction on the occurrence of \textit{e} in main declarative clauses can be observed when \textit{e} co-occurs with some functional verbs. Let us consider the syntactic behaviour of \textit{e} with respect to different classes of functional verbs, such as modal verbs and control verbs:

\begin{enumerate}
\item (24)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item *Gianni pole/vole \textit{e} venì.
\begin{description}
\item[John] can-3.Sg/wants-3.Sg to \textit{e} come.
\item[John] can/wants to come.
\end{description}
\item Gianni \textit{e} pole/vole venì.
\begin{description}
\item[John] \textit{e} can-3.Sg/wants-3.Sg to come.
\item[John] can/wants to come.
\end{description}
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

As shown by the ungrammaticality of 24(a), \textit{e} is not allowed to occur between the modal verb and the infinite verb. In order for the clause to be grammatical, \textit{e} must necessarily occur before the modal verb, as shown in 22(b). However, this should not come as a surprise because after all modal verbs do not project a double CP structure, meaning they do not take a subordinate as their complement. Therefore, it is not strange that \textit{e} has to come before the inflected modal verb.

Nevertheless, I find it relevant to point out that the same pattern arises with control verbs, which instead take a subordinate as their complement and therefore require two CPs to be realized in the

\footnote{I did not use capital letters for the focused constituents because they are not necessarily contrastive, as opposed to the pre-verbal focused constituents in 18(a, b), 19(a, b), 20(a, b) and 21(a, b).}
same clause.

Let us take a look at the following examples:

(25)  

a.  *Maria e ha promesso/pensato e d'andà al mare.  
Mary e has-3.Sg promised-Past.Part/thought-Past.Part e to go-Inf  
to-the-Mas.Sg sea  
Mary promised/thought to go the sea.

b.  *Maria ha promesso/pensato e d'andà al mare.  
Mary has-3.Sg promised-Past.Part/thought-Past.Part e to go-Inf to-the-Mas.Sg  
sea  
Mary promised/thought to go the sea.

c.  Maria e ha promesso/pensato d'andà al mare.  
Mary e has-3.Sg promised-Past.Part/thought-Past.Part e to go-Inf  
to-the-Mas.Sg sea  
Mary promised/thought to go the sea.

As shown by the ungrammaticality of 25(a), it is impossible to insert one *e before the finite control verb, and one *e between the two CPs, meaning between the finite control verb and the non-finite verb, which functions as its complement. This should not come a surprise either, for we already saw that *e can never occur more than once in the same clause.

As a matter of fact, it is also ungrammatical only to put *e between the control verb and its sentencial complement, as shown in 25(b). The only possibility is illustrated in 25(c), where *e is only inserted before the control verb.

2.3 The occurrence of *e in subordinate declarative clauses

The invariable vocalic morpheme *e can also occur in subordinate declarative clauses, although it is subject to a different restriction. The aim of the following subsections is to describe the occurrence of *e in subordinate declarative clauses and provide a possible interpretation of its syntactic behaviour.
2.3.1 The position of *e*

As a matter of fact, it seems that no subordinate clause is allowed to have *e* in the first syntactic position. Let us consider the following examples:

(26)  a. *Mi hanno detto che *e* corre la lupa.
     to-me-CL have-3.Pl told-Past.Part that *e* runs-3.Sg the-Fem.Sg wolf-Fem.Sg
     They told me that the wolf is going to run.

     b.  *E* corre la lupa.
         *e* runs-3.Sg the-Fem.Sg wolf-Fem.Sg
         The wolf is going to run.

(27)  a. *So' convinta che *e* mangi troppo.
     am-1.Sg convinced-Fem.Sg-Past.Part that *e* eat-2.Sg too much
     I am convinced that you eat too much.

     b.  *E* mangi troppo.
         *e* eat-2.Sg too much
         You eat too much.

(28)  a. *So che *e* viene anche la su' figliola.
     know-1.Sg that *e* comes-3.Sg too the-Fem.Sg his/her-Fem.Sg daughter
     I know that his/her daughter is coming too.

     b.  *E* viene anche la su' figliola.
         *e* comes-3.Sg too the-Fem.Sg his/her-Fem.Sg daughter
         His/her daughter is coming too.

As shown by the ungrammaticality of 26(a), 27(a) and 28(a), it is impossible for *e* to occupy the first syntactic position in a subordinate declarative clause. This is something we would not expect,
according to what was observed with respect to the occurrence of \( e \) in main declarative clauses. As shown in 26(b), 27(b) and 28(b), it is indeed possible for a main declarative clause to have \( e \) as the leftmost element.

Instead, in order for subordinate \( e \)-clauses to be grammatical, it is necessary to put a constituent before \( e \). Let us now consider the following examples, which illustrate how the ungrammatical sentences in 26(a), 27(a) and 28(a) may turn grammatical, thanks to the insertion of a constituent between the complementizer and \( e \):

(29)  a.  Mi hanno detto che \( a \) luglio \( e \) corre la lupa.
    to-me-CL have-3.Pl told-Past.Part that in July \( e \) runs-3.Sg the-Fem.Sg
    wolf-Fem.Sg
    They told me that the wolf is going to run in July.

    b.  So' convinta che \( a \) cena \( e \) mangi troppo.
        am-1.Sg convinced-Fem.Sg-Past.Part that at dinner \( e \) eat-2.Sg too much
        I am convinced that you eat too much at dinner.

    c.  So che \( domani \) \( e \) viene anche la su' figliola.
        know-1.Sg that tomorrow comes-3.Sg too the-Fem.Sg his/her-Fem.Sg daughter
        I know that tomorrow his/her daughter is coming too.

As shown in 29(a, b, c), it is necessary for \( e \) to be preceded by some constituent in order for the subordinate \( e \)-clause to be grammatical. However, it is relevant to point out that it makes no difference whether the constituent, which precedes \( e \) in the subordinate clause, is a subject, an object, a PP or an adjunct. Let us take into consideration the following examples, which show that \( e \) can follow different kinds of constituent in a subordinate declarative clause:

(30)  a.  Penso che \( la \) su' figliola \( e \) si chiami Maria.
        think-1.Sg that the-Fem.Sg his/her-Fem.Sg daughter \( e \) her-Refl.Cl calls Mary
        I think his/her daughters's name is Maria.
b. La su' figliola e si chiama Maria.
the-Fem.Sg his/her-Fem.Sg daughter e her-Refl.Cl calls Mary
His/her daughter's name is Maria.

(31) a. Credo che il pane e l' abbia comprato Gianni.
believe-1.Sg that the-Mas.Sg bread e it-Obj.Cl has-3.Sg-Subj bought-Past.Part
John
I think that John bought bread.

b. Il pane e l'ha comprato Gianni.
the-Mas.Sg bread e it-Obj.Cl has-3.Sg bought-Past.Part John
John bought bread.

(32) a. M' hanno detto che alla tu' mamma e gli hai comprato un regalo.
to-me-Cl have-3.Pl told-Past.Part that to-the-Fem.Sg your-Fem.Sg mother e
to-her-Fem.Sg have-2.Sg bought-Past.Part a-Mas.Sg present
They told me that you have bought a present for your mother.

b. Alla tu' mamma e gli hai comprato un regalo.
to-the-Fem.Sg your-Fem.Sg mother e to-her-Fem.Sg have-2.Sg bought-Past.Part a-Mas.Sg present
You have bought a present for your mother.

(33) a. Hanno saputo che domani e si parte.
Have-3.Pl known-Past.Part that tomorrow e leave.1.Pl
They have known that we are leaving tomorrow.

b. Domani e si parte.
tomorrow e leave.1.Pl
We are leaving tomorrow.

The invariable vocalic morpheme e can be preceded by a subject, as in 30(a), by an object, as in
31(a), by a PP, as in 32(a), or by an adjunct, as in 33(a). It seems that no specific restriction prevents any of these constituents to preceed e in subordinate declarative clauses.

As already discussed, this pattern also characterizes main declarative clauses, which allow any type of constituent to preceed e. In fact, if we compare the subordinates e-clauses in 30(a), 31(a), 32(a) and 33(a), with the corresponding main e-clauses in 30(a), 31(a), 32(a) and 33(a), we can see that the order of the constituents is just the same.

Furthermore, another analogy can be detected between main and subordinate e-clauses; when more than one constituent is found before e, subordinate declarative clauses only allow e to appear once, just like main declarative clauses. Let us take a look at the following examples:

(34)  

a. Gianni mi ha detto che ieri Maria al su' figliolo il regalo e un gliel'ha comprato.
   John to-me-Cl has-3.Sg told-Past.Part that yesterday Mary to-the-Mas.Sg her-Mas.Sg son the-Mas.Sg present e not to-him-it-Cl has-3.Sg bought-
   Mas.Sg-Past.Part  
   John told me that Mary did not buy the present to her son yesterday.

b. *Gianni mi ha detto che ieri e Maria al su' figliolo il regalo un gliel'ha comprato.
   John to-me-Cl has-3.Sg told-Past.Part that yesterday e Mary to-the-Mas.Sg her-Mas.Sg son the-Mas.Sg present not to-him-it-Cl has-3.Sg bought-
   Mas.Sg-Past.Part  
   John told me that Mary did not buy the present to her son yesterday.

c. *Gianni mi ha detto che ieri Maria e al su' figliolo il regalo un gliel'ha comprato.
   John to-me-Cl has-3.Sg told-Past.Part that yesterday Mary e to-the-Mas.Sg her-Mas.Sg son the-Mas.Sg present not to-him-it-Cl has-3.Sg bought-
   Mas.Sg-Past.Part  
   John told me that Mary did not buy the present to her son yesterday.
d. *Gianni mi ha detto che ieri Maria al su' figliolo e il regalo e gliel'ha comprato.
   John to-me-Cl has-3.Sg told-Past.Part that yesterday Mary to-the-Mas.Sg her-Mas.Sg son e the-Mas.Sg present not to-him-it-Cl has-3.Sg bought-Mas.Sg-Past.Part
   John told me that Mary did not buy the present to her son yesterday.

e. *Gianni mi ha detto che ieri e Maria e al su' figliolo e il regalo e un gliel'ha comprato.
   John to-me-Cl has-3.Sg told-Past.Part that yesterday e Mary e to-the-Mas.Sg her-Mas.Sg son e the-Mas.Sg present e not to-him-it-Cl has-3.Sg bought-Mas.Sg-Past.Part
   John told me that Mary did not buy the present to her son yesterday.

As shown by the contrast between 34(a) and 34(b, c, d, e), e is only allowed to appear after the rightmost constituent which appears before the verb. It is ungrammatical to put e after any other constituent, as shown in 34(b, c, d), and it is ungrammatical to put one e after each preverbal constituent as well. Again, it clearly emerges that no more than one e is allowed to appear in the same clause; however, it is possible that two e co-occur in the same sentence, if the sentence is made up by a main clause and a subordinate clause. Let us take a look at the following example:

(35) a. Maria e m'ha detto che domani e viene Gianni.
   Mary e to-me has-3.Sg told-Past.Part that tomorrow e comes-3.Sg John
   Mary told me that John is coming tomorrow.

As far as the person features of the subject are concerned, subordinate e-clauses behave just like main e-clauses, in that they are not restricted to some specific person. Moreover, there is no restriction regarding the verb which occurs in the e-clause; as already pointed out for main e-clauses, all verb-types are compatible with subordinate e-clauses.
2.3.2 Pre-verbal focused constituents

Another characteristics shared by main and subordinate *e*-clauses is their incompatibility with pre-verbal focused constituents; let us consider the following examples:

(34)  
   a. *Mi hanno detto che MARIA *e va a scuola.
       to-me-Cl have-3.Pl told-Past.Part that Mary *e goes-3.Sg to school
       They told me that Mary goes to school.

   b. Mi hanno detto che MARIA va a scuola.
       to-me-Cl have-3.Pl told-Past.Part that Mary goes-3.Sg to school
       They told me that Mary goes to school.

(35)  
   a. *Gianni dice che IL PANE *e ha comprato ieri.
       John  says-3.Sg that the-Mas.Sg bread *e has-3.Sg bought-Past.Part yesterday
       John says that he bought bread yesterday.

   b. Gianni dice che IL PANE ha comprato ieri.
       John  says-3.Sg that the-Mas.Sg bread has-3.Sg bought-Past.Part yesterday
       John says that he bought bread yesterday.

(36)  
   a. *Maria pensa che A GIANNI  *e gli garbi il vino.
       Mary thinks-3.Sg that to John *e to-him pleases the-Mas.Sg wine
       Mary thinks that John likes wine.

   b. Maria pensa che A GIANNI gli garbi il vino.
       Mary thinks-3.Sg that to John to-him pleases the-Mas.Sg wine
       Mary thinks that John likes wine.

(37)  
   a. *Credo che IERI *e sia arrivata la lettera.
       Think-1.Sg that yesterday *e is-3.Sg arrived-Fem.Sg-Past.Part the-Fem.Sg letter
       I think that the letter arrived yesterday.
b. Credo che IERI sia arrivata la lettera.
Think-1.Sg that yesterday is-3.Sg arrived-Fem.Sg-Past.Part the-Fem.Sg letter
I think that the letter arrived yesterday.

As shown by the ungrammaticality of 34(a), 35(a), 36(a) and 37(a), it is not possible to focus the constituent which immediately precedes e in a subordinate declarative clause. This observation suggests that the constituents which appear before e in subordinate clauses may be interpreted as topics, for they are incompatible with a focus interpretation. However, it is worth noticing that Sienese allows preverbal constituents to be focused, both in main and subordinate declarative clauses. However, it is necessary to eliminate e in order for declarative clauses with a preverbal focused constituent to be grammatical, as shown in 34(b), 35(b), 36(b) and 37(b).

2.3.3 Post-verbal subjects

Another analogy between main and subordinate declarative clauses is provided by the compatibility of e with post-verbal subjects. Let us observe the following sentences:

(38) a. Penso che oggi e venga la su' sorella.
think-1.Sg that today e comes-3.Sg the-Fem.Sg her-Fem.Sg sister
I think that her sister is coming today.

b. *Penso che e venga la su' sorella.
think-1.Sg that e comes-3.Sg the-Fem.Sg her-Fem.Sg sister
I think that her sister is coming.

(39) a. Dicono che la casa e gliel'abbia comprata il su' babbo.
say-3.Pl that the-Fem.Sg house e to-him/her-CI has-3.Sg bought the-Mas.Sg his/her father
They say that his/her father bought him/her the house.
b. *Dicono che e gliel'abbia comprata il su' babbo.

say-3.Pl that e to-him/her-Cl has-3.Sg bought the-Mas.Sg his/her father
They say that his/her father bought it to him/her.

(40) a. Credo che a Maria e gliel' abbia detto Gianni.

think-1.Sg that to her e to-her-it-Cl has-3.Sg said-Past.Part John
I think that John said it to Mary.

b. *Credo che e gliel' abbia detto Gianni

think-1.Sg that e to-her-it-Cl has-3.Sg said-Past.Part John
I think that John said it.

As shown in 38(a), 39(a) and 40(a), it is possible to have a post-verbal subject in subordinate e-clauses, as long as there is another constituent which precedes e. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that the ungrammaticality of 38(b), 39(b), 40(b) and 41(b) does not depend on the position of the subject, which is post-verbal, but rather on the fact that no constituent is found before e.

As already discussed, it is strictly necessary for subordinate e-clauses to have some constituent before e, no matter whether this constituent is the subject, the direct object, an indirect object or an adjunct.

2.4 A topic marker of an English-style topicalization?

As a matter of fact, there are some other contexts, in which the occurrence of e is not allowed. I decided to put them together in the present section because they may indicate a path that could possibly be taken in order to account for the function and the syntactic behaviour of e in main and subordinate declarative clauses.

Let us consider the following examples:

(41) a. *Quando la tu' mamma e parla, un capisco niente.

when the-Fem.Sg your-Fem.Sg mother e talks-3.Sg not understand-1.Sg
nothing
When your mother talks, I understand nothing.
b. Quando la tu' mamma parla, e un capisce niente.
   when the-Fem.Sg your-Fem.Sg mother talks-3.Sg  not understand-1.Sg nothing
   When your mother talks, I understand nothing.

(42)  a. *Se questi esami e un li passi, un la prendi la laurea.
   if these-Mas.Pl exams e not them-Obj.Cl pass-2.Sg not it-Fem.Sg-Obj.Cl
take-2.Sg  the-Fem.Sg degree
   If you do not pass these exams, you willl not get a degree.

   b. Se un passi questi esami, un la prendi la laurea.
   if not pass-2.Sg these-Mas.Pl exams not it-Fem.Sg-Obj.Cl take-2.Sg
   the-Fem.Sg degree
   If you do not pass these exams, you willl not get a degree.

(43)  a. *A Gianni gli garberebbe e comprà questo libro.
   to John to-him-Cl would-please-3.Sg e buy-Inf this-Mas.Sg book
   John would like to buy this book.

   b. A Gianni gli garberrebbe comprà questo libro.
   to John to-him-Cl would-please-3.Sg  buy-Inf this-Mas.Sg book
   John would like to buy this book.

(44)  a. *Che la su' mamma e verrà, è chiaro a tutti.
   that the-Fem.Sg her-Fem.Sg mother e will-come-3.Sg is-3.Sg clear to
everybody
   It is clear to everybody that her mother is going to come.
b. Che la su' mamma verrà, è chiaro a tutti.
that the-Fem.Sg her-Fem.Sg mother will-come-3.Sg is-3.Sg clear to
everybody
It is clear to everybody that her mother is going to come.

(45) a. *Mi dispiace che domani e piova.
            to-me-Cl displeases that tomorrow e rains-3.Sg
I am sorry that tomorrow it is going to rain.

b. Mi dispiace che domani piova.
            to-me-Cl displeases that tomorrow rains-3.Sg
I am sorry that tomorrow it is going to rain.

(46) a. Penso che domani e piova.
            think-1.Sg that tomorrow e rains-3.Sg
I think that tomorrow it is going to rain.

b. Penso che domani piova.
            think-1.Sg that tomorrow rains-3.Sg
I think that tomorrow it is going to rain.

As shown in 41(a), 42(a), 43(a), 44(a) and 45(a), it is impossible to insert e in some special
subordinate-types, where in fact we should expect it to be possible. Instead, they require e not to be
present in order to be grammatical.

According to what has been discussed so far, e is compatible with subordinate clauses as long as it
is preceeded by another constituent, which can be either a subject, a direct object, an indirect object,
a PP or an adjunct. However, this generalization seems not to include Headless Relatives (as 41(a)),
Conditional Clauses (as in 42(a)), Infinitive Clauses (as in 43(a)), Sentential Complements (as in
44(a)) and subordinates which are found after Factive Verbs (as in 45(a)).

According to Haegeman (2006), it is impossible to have a topic in English in the same contexts.
Moreover, she reports an asymmetry between Factive and non-Factive verbs; while it is impossible
to have a topic in the subordinate of a Factive verb, non-Factive verbs are not subject to such a restriction.

The generalizations arrived at in Haegeman (2006) seem to be able to account for the Sienese data presented in 41(a, b)-46(a, b); the parallelism between the English and the Sienese data is striking. Let us consider the following examples:

(47)   a. *When your mother talks, nothing I understand.

   b. *If these exams you do not pass, you will not get the degree.

   c. *John wants this book to buy.

   d. *That this book Mary read thoroughly, is true.

   e. *John regrets that this book Mary read.

   f. I believe that this book you should read.

As a matter of fact, the contexts presented in 47(a-f) are exactly the same that are illustrated in 41(a, b)-46(a, b); they show that it is impossible in English to have a topic in Headless Relatives (as 47(a)), Conditional Clauses (as in 47(b)), Infinitive Clauses (as in 47(c)), Sentential Complements (as in 47(d)) and in subordinates which act as the complement of Factive Verbs (as in 47(e)). However, as shown in 47(f), it is possible to have a topic in subordinates which act as the complement of non-Factive Verbs.

Haegeman (2006) argues that those subordinate clauses which do not allow the presence of a topic are characterized by a reduced left periphery, where the higher topic projection is not preserved. I find it significant to point out that Haegeman does not mention a further type of subordinate clauses, where English clearly does not allow the presence of a Topic. This context is represented by Headless Subject Relatives, as illustrated below:

---

3 This example, together with 47(d), is taken from Haegeman (2006) and Cardinaletti (2007).
4 This example is taken from Chomsky (1977).
(48)  a.  *Who has a chance, that often wastes.

   b.  *Chi ha la possibilità, spesso e la spreca.

   who has-3.Sg the-Fem.Sg possibility often e it-Fem.Sg-Obj.Cl wastes-3.Sg

   Who has a chance, often wastes it.

As shown by the ungrammaticality of 48(a), Headless Subject Relatives too are incompatible with a Topic. As expected, Sienese do not allow the presence of e in the same context, as illustrated in 48(b).

Following Haegeman (2006)'s generalization, I assume that e cannot appear in the same contexts, where no topic can occur in English, because e is a topic marker of an English-style topicalization. English Topicalization resembles Italian Resumptive Preposing (RP, Cinque, 1983) because the left dislocated element lacks a resumptive pronoun:

(48)  a.  La stessa proposta fece poi il partito di maggioranza.  

   the-Fem.Sg same-Fem.Sg proposal made-3.Sg then the-Mas.Sg party of majority

   The majority party made then the same proposal.

   b.  John, his mother really likes.

However, Italian Resumptive Preposing (48(a)) is to be distinguished from English Topicalization (48(b)) because the subject must be pre-verbal in the latter, while Resumptive Preposing requires the subject to be post-verbal. Moreover, Resumptive preposing belongs to a higher linguistic register, despite its similarities with English topicalization from a syntactic point of view.

As far as the register is concerned, English Topicalization is to be compared with Italian Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD, Cinque, 1983):

(49)  a.  These books, you should read.

   b.  Questi libri tu li dovresti leggere.

   these-Mas.Pl books you them-Obj.Cl should-2.Sg read-Inf

5 This example is taken from Benincà (2001).
Sentences 12(a) and 12(b) are content equivalent, as far as their meanings and their registers are concerned. Their difference is due to syntactic reasons, for CLLD needs a resumptive clitic to be realized between the left dislocated, or topicalized element, and the inflected verb, while English Topicalization does not require the presence of any resumptive pronoun in that position. The assumption that Sienese *e* may share many structural and informational properties with English topicalized elements seems to be able to account for the parallel distribution of our hang-up vocalic morpheme and the distribution of English Topics.

According to Haegeman (2002), English topicalized constituents depend on the presence of Force and therefore they occupy the higher Topic position, which is indeed licensed by Force. According to Cardinaletti (2007), Haegeman (2002)'s analysis can be extended to Resumptive Preposing, thus assuming that RP constituents are found in the higher Topic position. Instead, CLLD constituents occupy the lower Topic position, as illustrated in the schematic representation below:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ForceP} \\
\text{[TopicP] [FocusP [ModifierP [TopicP [FinitenessP ...]]]]]}
\end{array}
\]

As pointed out by Cardinaletti (2007), Haegeman (2002)'s analysis is in line with the proposal made by Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007), who assume that different Topic-types occupy distinct syntactic position in the structure of the clause. They propose a distinction between *Aboutness-shift Topics*, which newly introduce or reintroduce a Topic in the discourse, and *Familiar Topics*, which refer to given information in the discourse. They claim that Aboutness-shift Topics occupy the higher Topic position, which is licensed by Force, while Familiar Topics are found in the lower Topic position, immediately above the Finiteness Phrase.

Within this framework, I assume that Sienese *e* marks a similar structure to English Topicalization and Italian Resumptive Preposing. Thus, I assume that the constituent followed by *e* is forced into the higher Topic position, meaning the Aboutness-shift Topic Phrase. However, this configuration cannot take place when the left periphery of the subordinate clause is reduced, as in the contexts discussed by Haegeman (2006). Therefore, *e* is not allowed to occur in these contexts and the
topicalized constituent must occupy the lower Topic position, just like CLLD constituents.

2.5 The occurrence of *e in interrogative clauses

The invariable vocalic morpheme *e does not only occur in main and subordinate declarative clauses; as a matter of fact, it can occur in interrogative clauses as well. The aim of the present section is to describe the kind of interrogative clauses, which allow *e to be realized.

2.5.1 *Wh*-questions

(50) a. *Quando *e ci parli?
   when *e with-him/her-Cl talk-2.Sg
   When are you talking with him/her?

   b. *Che *e mangi?
      what *e eat-2.Sg
      What are you eating?

   c. *Dove *e vai?
      where *e go-2.Sg
      Where are you going?

   d. *Come *e ti senti?
      how *e you-Refl.Cl feel-2.Sg
      How are you?

(51) a. *E quando ci parli?
   *e when with-him/her-Cl talk-2.Sg
   When are you talking with him/her?
As shown in 50(a-d) and 51(a-d), *e is not allowed to occur in *wh*-questions; it makes no difference whether *it* appears to the right or to the left of the *wh*-element. It seems that *e* is incompatible with any kind of *wh*-elements.

**2.5.2 Che-questions**

Similarly, it is impossible for *e* to appear in *che*-questions; let us consider the following examples:

(52)  

a. *Che *e* vieni, alle cinque?  
*che e* come-2.Sg at-the-Fem.Pl five  
Are you coming at five?

b. *Che *e* mangi, la pasta?  
*che e* eat-2.Sg the-Fem.Sg pasta  
Are you eating pasta?

c. *Che *e* hai, corso?  
*che e* have-2.Sg run-Past.Part  
Did you run?
(53)  a. *E che vieni, alle cinque?
    e che come-2.Sg at-the-Fem.Pl five
    Are you coming at five?

    b. *E che mangi, la pasta?
    e che eat-2.Sg the-Fem.Sg pasta
    Are you eating pasta?

    c. *E che hai, corso?
    e che have-2.Sg run-Past.Part
    Did you run?

As shown by the ungrammaticality of 52(a-c) and 53(a-c), e seems to be incompatible with che too. Again, it makes no difference whether e is put before or after che; che-questions never allow the presence of e.

2.5.2 Yes/no questions (without che)

Instead, it is possible to insert e in those yes/no questions, which are not introduced by che. Let us take into the consideration the following grammatical examples of e-questions:

(54)  a.  E vengano?
    e come-3.Pl
    Are they coming?

    b.  E mangia?
    e eats-3.Sg
    Is (s)he eating?
c.  

\[ E \text{ dormi?} \]

\[ e \text{ sleep-2.Sg} \]

Are you sleeping?

As illustrated in 54(a-c), \( e \) is compatible with either unergative, transitive or unaccusative verbs, which yield an argumental interpretation. Furthermore, \( e \) is also allowed to occur with those verb, which yield a quasi-argumental interpretation, such as metheorologic verbs:

\[(55) \]

a.  

\[ E \text{ piove?} \]

\[ e \text{ rains-3.Sg} \]

Is it raining?

b.  

\[ E \text{ tona?} \]

\[ e \text{ thunders-3.Sg} \]

Is it thundering?

As shown in 55(a) and 55(b), \( e \) seems not to be sensitive to the underlying differences between different classes of metheorologic verbs (Manente, 2006). This is exactly the same pattern that was observed with respect to the occurrence of \( e \) in declarative clauses.

2.5.3 Restrictions on the occurrence of \( e \) in yes/no questions

However, there is one significant restriction which affects the distribution of \( e \) in yes/no question, which needs to be discussed in order to account for the syntax of \( e \)-questions.

As shown in 56(a, b), 57(a,b) and 58(a,b), \( e \)-questions always require the presence of a resumptive pronoun if the verb has a complement:

\[(56) \]

a.  

\[ E \text{ ci sei andato al mare?} \]

\[ e \text{ there-Cl are-2.Sg gone-Mas.Sg-Past.Part to-the-Mas.Sg sea} \]

Did you go to the sea?
b. *E sei andato al mare?
   e are-2.Sg gone-Mas.Sg-Past.Part to-the-Mas.Sg sea
   Did you go to the sea?

(57)  a. E ci hai dormito a casa?
   e there-Cl have-2.Sg slept-Past.Part at home
   Did you sleep at home?

b. *E hai dormito a casa?
   e have-2.Sg slept-Past.Part at home
   Did you sleep at home?

(58)  a. E l'hai visto Gianni?
   e him-Mas.Sg-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg seen-Mas.Sg-Past.Part John
   Did you see John?

b. *E hai visto Gianni?
   e have-2.Sg seen-Mas.Sg-Past.Part John
   Did you see John?

As shown by the ungrammaticality of 56(b), 57(b) and 58(b), it is necessary for the complement of
*e* to be anticipated by a resumptive pronoun in order for *e*-questions to be well-formed.

### 2.5.4 The position of *e*

Let us now turn our attention to the investigation of the syntactic behaviour of *e*, in order to
establish its position in the syntactic structure of the clause. Let us consider the following examples:

(59)  a. Maria e c'è andata al cinema?
       Mary e there-Cl is-3.Sg gone-Fem.Sg-Past.Part to-the-Mas.Sg cinema
       Did Mary go to the cinema?
b.  *E Maria c'è andata al cinema?
   e Mary there-Cl is-3.Sg gone-Fem.Sg-Past.Part to-the-Mas.Sg cinema
   Did Mary go to the cinema?

c.  E c'è andata al cinema Maria ?
   e there-Cl is-3.Sg gone-Fem.Sg-Past.Part to-the-Mas.Sg cinema Mary
   Did Mary go to the cinema?

As shown by the contrast between 59(a) and 59(b), if the subject is overtly realized in a pre-verbal position, e must necessarily follow it. The reversed order would lead to ungrammaticality, as in 59(b). It is relevant to notice that e can also co-occur with a post-verbal subject, as shown in 59(c). So far, it seems that interrogative e behaves just like declarative e with respect to left-dislocated constituents; let us investigate and see whether this generalization can apply to left-dislocated object, PPs and adjuncts:

(60)  a.  Il biglietto e l'hai comprato?
       the-Mas.Sg ticket e it-Mas.Sg-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg bought-Mas.Sg-Past.Part
       Did you buy the ticket?

       b.  *E il biglietto l'hai comprato?
           e the-Mas.Sg ticket it-Mas.Sg-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg bought-Mas.Sg-Past.Part
           Did you buy the ticket?

As illustrated in 60(a, b), left-dislocated objects behave just like pre-verbal subjects in that they must preceed e. The same pattern is followed by left-dislocated PPs, as shown in 61(a, b), and adjuncts, as shown in 62(a, b):

(61)  a.  A Gianni e gliel'hanno date le chiavi?
       to John e to-him-them-Cl have-3.Pl given-Fem.Pl-Past.Part the-Fem.Pl keys
       Did they give the keys to John?
By and large, it seems that there is no substantial difference between the syntactic behaviour of *e* in declarative and interrogative clauses respectively. Therefore, it is predictable that most generalizations arrived at for declarative clauses will hold for interrogative clauses as well, as far as the occurrence of *e* is concerned.

Following these considerations, we expect *e* to occur after the last pre-verbal constituent, when more than one constituent is found before the verb, as it does in declarative clauses:

\[(63) \quad \text{Ieri il regalo al tu' fratello la tu' mamma e gliel'ha comprato?} \]

Yesterday the-Mas.Sg present to-the-Mas.Sg your-Mas.Sg brother the-Fem.Sg your-Fem.Sg mother *e* to-him-it-Cl has-3.Sg bought

Did your mother buy the present for your brother yesterday?

As shown in 63(a), *e* must follow the last constituent which occurs before the verb. It makes no difference whether the last constituent is a subject, an object, a PP or and adjunct. Furthermore, *e* is not allowed to occur more than once in the same *yes/no* question.

All in all, it seems that there is no syntactic difference between the *e* that occur in declarative clauses, and the *e* that occur in *yes/no* questions. Therefore, I conclude that they are the same syntactic item.
2.6 *Che*-questions and *e*-questions

In order to provide an exhaustive description of the occurrence and the function of *e* in *yes/no* questions, it is necessary to compare *e*-questions with *che*-questions. As a matter of fact, they are two different kinds of *yes/no* questions, which are not realized in standard Italian.

First of all, it is significant to point out that there is an important prosodic difference between *che*-questions, which always require one (or more) intonational break to isolate some constituents, and *e*-questions, which do not:

(64) a. *Che* ti senti, male?
    *che* you-Refl.Cl feel-2.Sg bad
    Do you feel bad?

        b. *E* ti senti male?
            *e* you-Refl.Cl feel-2.Sg bad
            Do you feel bad?

As shown by the contrast between 64(a) and 64(b), no intonational break occurs in *e*-questions, as opposed to *che*-questions.

Furthermore, there are two significant syntactic differences which need to be discussed in order to get a clearer picture of the relationship between *che*-questions and *e*-questions.

First of all, it is interesting to notice that no additional supportive verb, namely *fare*, has to be introduced in *e*-questions, as opposed to *che*-question. As discussed in the first chapter, it is necessary to introduce the supportive verb in *che*-questions, when the verb has neither a complement, nor an adjunct nor an overtly realized subject. Instead, *e*-questions are not subject to the same constraint, as shown in 65(a, b):

(65) a. *Che* fa, piove?
    *che* does-3.Sg rains-3.Sg
    Is it raining?
b. *E piove?  
    *e rains-3.Sg  
    Is it raining?

Secondly, *che*-questions and *e*-questions behave differently with respect to resumptive pronouns. As a matter of fact, *e*-questions require the insertion of a resumptive pronoun whenever the verb has a complement; in other words, resumptive pronouns are obligatory if the verb has a complement. Instead, they are never obligatory in *che*-questions; they are optionally inserted, according to the meaning that the speaker wants to convey. Let us compare the following examples:

(66)    a. *Che l'hai, visto, Gianni?  
        *che him-Obj.Cl have -2.Sg seen-Mas.Sg-Past.Part John  
        Did you see John?  

    b. *Che hai, visto Gianni?  
        *che have -2.Sg seen-Mas.Sg-Past.Part John  
        Did you see John?

(67)    a. *E l'hai visto Gianni?  
        *e him-Obj.Cl have -2.Sg seen-Mas.Sg-Past.Part John  
        Did you see John?  

    b. *E hai visto Gianni?  
        *e have -2.Sg seen-Mas.Sg-Past.Part John  
        Did you see John?

As shown in 66(a, b), *che*-questions do not obligatorily require a resumptive pronoun; there is a prosodic and syntactic difference between those *che*-questions which have a resumptive pronoun, and those which do not. However, both types of *che*-questions are grammatical. Instead, *e*-questions always require their complement to be anticipated by a resumptive pronoun in order to be grammatical, as shown by the contrast between 67(a) and 67(b).

Altough the many differences between *che*-questions and *e*-questions, it is necessary to underline
that they also have much in common. In fact, both *che* and *e* can be preceeded by subjects, objects, PPs and adjuncts. Let us compare the following pairs of sentences:

(68)  
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{ Maria } e \text{ ci va al mare?} \\
& \text{Mary } e \text{ there-Cl goes-3.Sg to-the-Mas.Sg sea} \\
& \text{Does Mary go to the sea?}
\end{align*}\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{ Maria che va, al mare?} \\
& \text{Mary che goes-3.Sg to-the-Mas.Sg sea} \\
& \text{Does Mary go to the sea?}
\end{align*}\]

(69)  
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{ Il pane } e \text{ l'hai comprato?} \\
& \text{the-Mas.Sg bread } e \text{ it-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg bought} \\
& \text{Did you buy bread?}
\end{align*}\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{ Il pane che l'hai, comprato?} \\
& \text{the-Mas.Sg bread che it-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg bought} \\
& \text{Did you buy bread?}
\end{align*}\]

(70)  
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{ A gianni } e \text{ gliel'hai dato il biglietto?} \\
& \text{to John } e \text{ to-him-it-Cl have-2.Sg given-Mas.Sg Past.Part} \\
& \text{Did you give the ticket to John?}
\end{align*}\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{ A Gianni che gli hai, dato il biglietto?} \\
& \text{to John che to-him-Cl have-2.Sg given-Past.Part the-Mas.Sg ticket} \\
& \text{Did you give the ticket to John?}
\end{align*}\]

(71)  
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{ Ieri } e \text{ ci sei stato al mare?} \\
& \text{yesterday } e \text{ there-Cl are-2.Sg been-Mas.Sg Past.Part to-the-mas.Sg sea} \\
& \text{Did you go to the sea yesterday?}
\end{align*}\]
b. *Ieri che sei, stato al mare?*

Did you go to the sea yesterday?

As shown in 68(a, b)-71(a, b), preverbal subjects, left-dislocated object, PPs and adjuncts must be followed by *che* in *che*-questions and by *e* in *e*-questions. The reversed order would lead to ungrammaticality in both *che*-questions and *e*-questions, as already shown in the present chapter and in the first chapter.

### 2.7 Concluding remarks

- The invariable vocalic morpheme *e* occurs in main declarative clauses, although it is not obligatory. It is compatible with any person specification of the subject and it can occur with either unergative, unaccusative and transitive verbs. Furthermore, it is compatible with either argumental or quasi-argumental interpretation; it is not sensitive to the underlying differences between different classes of verbs, which yield a quasi-argumental interpretation.

- *E* is always found before the inflected verb in main declarative clauses, which can be either an auxiliary or a lexical verb. However, it must follow any constituent, which occurs before the verb, such as subjects, left-dislocated objects, PPs and adjuncts. If more than one constituent is found before the verb, then *e* must follow the last constituent in the string; it is not allowed to appear between two pre-verbal constituents and it is not allowed to occur more than once in the same clause. Furthermore, *e* is incompatible with any kind of pre-verbal (contrastive) Focus, while it can co-occur with a post-verbal (non-contrastive) Focus. Instead, it is not incompatible with post-verbal subjects.

- The invariable vocalic morpheme *e* can also occur in subordinate declarative clauses, but it must necessarily be preceded by some constituent. It makes no difference whether this constituent is a subject, a left-dislocated object, a PP or an adjunct. If more than one constituent is found before the verb, then *e* must follow the last constituent in the string, just like in main declarative clauses. However, no more than one *e* is allowed to occur in the same clause, meaning under the same CP. Similarly to what happen in main declarative
clauses, no focused constituent can ever preceed e in a subordinate declarative clause. Furthermore, no restriction prevents e from co-occurring with post-verbal subjects.

- According to Haegeman (2006), some subordinate-types are characterized by a reduced left periphery and therefore they do not allow a Topic to be realized. Given that Sienese e cannot be inserted in the same contexts, where it is impossible to have a Topic in English, I assume that e marks an English-style Topicalization. English topicalization is realized in the higher Topic projection, like Italian Resumptive Preposing (Cinque, 1983) and unlike Italian Clitic Left Dislocation (Cinque, 1983).

- The invariable vocalic morpheme e can also occur in interrogative clauses; it is incompatible with wh-questions and che-questions, but it can occur in those yes/no questions which are not introduced by che. However, the complement of the verb, if present, must be anticipated by a resumptive pronoun in order for the e-question to be grammatical. E-questions are compatible with any person specification of the subject and with any verb-type, including those verb which yield a quasi-argumental interpretation.

- Che-questions and e-questions are two distinct kinds of yes/no questions. There is a prosodic difference between them, for che-questions always need an intonational break to isolate some constituent(s) in the Questioned Phrase or in the Juxtaposed Clause, while e-questions do not require any intonational break. Moreover, there are two significant syntactic difference between them; firstly, e-questions do not need to introduce a supportive verb when the verb has neither a complement, nor an adjuncts, nor an overtly realized subject, as opposed to che-questions. Secondly, e-questions always require a resumptive pronoun to anticipate their complement. Instead, resumptive pronouns are never obligatory in che-questions. However, che and e share some basic syntactic properties for they must both follow any pre-verbal constituent, such as subjects, left-dislocated objects, PPs and adjuncts.
Chapter 3

Evidential particles

3.0 Introduction

The present section deals with another invariable vocalic morpheme which appears in some declarative clauses in Sienese. I decided to indicate this morpheme with its corresponding phonetic symbol in the IPA, namely \( \varepsilon \), in order to avoid any possible confusion with \( e \).

The aim of this section is to account for the syntactic behaviour of \( \varepsilon \) in its contexts of occurrence and to establish its function in the structural representation and in the interpretation of a clause.

In section 3.1, I discuss the position of \( \varepsilon \) in declarative clauses with respect to preverbal subjects and left-dislocated elements of different kinds.

Some restrictions on the occurrence of \( \varepsilon \) in declarative clauses are presented in 3.2, while section 3.3 deals with the occurrence of \( \varepsilon \) in interrogative clauses. I propose a possible interpretation of \( \varepsilon \) in section 3.4, where I also introduce another vocalic morpheme which displays many interesting analogies with \( \varepsilon \). Again, I decided to indicate it with its corresponding IPA symbol, namely \( \varnothing \), in order to clearly distinguish it from \( o \), which is instead the topic of chapter 4. Finally, section 3.5 collects some concluding remarks, which summarize the major point of the present chapter.

3.1 The occurrence of \( \varepsilon \) in declarative clauses

\( \varepsilon \) occurs in main declarative clauses, as shown in 1(a-c):

(1) a. \( \varepsilon \), ha parlato con Gianni la su' sorella.
    \( \varepsilon \) has-3.Sg talked-Past.Part with John the-Fem.Sg his/her-Fem.Sg sister
    His/her sister has talked with John.
b. ε, mi sento male.
   ε me-Refl.Cl feel-1.Sg bad
   I feel bad.

c. ε, so' andata a casa.
   ε am-1.Sg gone-Fem.Sg-Past.Part to home
   I went home.

ε appears as the leftmost element in the clause, immediately followed by the verb. As far as 1(a-c) are concerned, it seems that ε is inserted in the same position of e. Therefore, it may well be the case that they are in complementary distribution in the same head. From a structural point of view, 1(a-c) would be perfectly grammatical if we replaced ε with e, as shown in 2(a-c):

(2) a. E ha parlato con Gianni la su' sorella.
   e has-3.Sg talked-Past.Part with John the-Fem.Sg his/her-Fem.Sg sister
   His/her sister has talked with John.

b. E mi sento male.
   e me-Refl.Cl feel-1.Sg bad
   I feel bad.

c. E so' andata a casa.
   e am-1.Sg gone-Fem.Sg-Past.Part to home
   I went home.

3.1.1 The position of ε

It is possible to show that the parallelism between the syntactic behaviour of ε and e is only apparent. In fact, if the subject is realized overtly and is preverbal, then it becomes clear that ε and e just occupy different surface positions:
(3)  a.  ε, Maria sta in campagna.
    ε Mary lives-3.Sg in country
    Mary lives in the country.

b.  ε, Gianni fa l'attore.
    ε John does-3.Sg the-Mas.Sg actor
    John is an actor.

c.  *Maria ε, sta in campagna.
    Mary ε lives-3.Sg in country
    Mary lives in the country.

d.  *Gianni ε, fa l'attore.
    ε John does-3.Sg the-Mas.Sg actor
    John is an actor.

(4) a.  *E Maria sta in campagna.
    e Mary lives-3.Sg in country
    Mary lives in the country.

b.  *E Gianni fa l'attore.
    John does-3.Sg the-Mas.Sg actor
    John is an actor.

c.  Maria e sta in campagna.
    Mary e lives-3.Sg in country
    Mary lives in the country.

d.  Gianni e fa l'attore.
    John e does-3.Sg the-Mas.Sg actor
    John is an actor.
As illustrated in 3(a-b), $\varepsilon$ must precede the preverbal subject; if this constraint is not respected, then the resulting sentences are ungrammatical, as shown in 3(c-d).

The behaviour of $e$ with respect to preverbal subjects just follows the opposite pattern; $e$ is not allowed to precede preverbal subjects, as pointed out in the ungrammatical sentences in 4(a-b). If a preverbal subject is overtly realized, then it must be followed by $e$.

### 3.1.2 Prosodic effects

Another difference between $e$- and $\varepsilon$-clauses is of prosodic nature. Differently from $e$-clauses, $\varepsilon$-clauses require quite a long intonational pause to separate $\varepsilon$ itself from the rest of the sentence. It seems that $\varepsilon$ always form a cluster with this intonational pause; without it, the sentence would be ungrammatical, as shown in 5(a):

\[(5) \quad * \varepsilon \text{ Maria sta in campagna.} \]

\[
\varepsilon \text{ Mary lives-3.Sg in country} \\
\text{Mary lives in the country.}
\]

Despite the obvious differences, the close relation between $\varepsilon$ and this pause reminds us of the similar behaviour of $che$, which always requires the introduction of an intonational pause for the sentence to be grammatical.

### 3.1.3 $\varepsilon$ and pre-verbal topicalized constituents

Going back to the position of $\varepsilon$ in declarative clauses, it seems that no preverbal material is ever allowed to precede it. Further evidence for supporting this claim comes from the observation of its behaviour with left-dislocated elements. Let us take a look at the following examples of Topicalization (CLLD$^6$) :

\(^6\) (Clitic Left Dislocation, Cinque 1983, 1990)
(6)  a. *Il libro ε, l'ho comprato ieri.
the-Mas.Sg book ε it-Obj.Cl have-1.Sg bought-Mas.Sg-Past.Part yesterday
I bought the book yesterday.

b. *La pasta ε la mangio.
the-Fem.Sg pasta ε it-Fem.Sg-Obj.Cl eat-1.Sg
I eat pasta.

c. ε, Il libro l'ho comprato ieri.
ε the-Mas.Sg book it-Obj.Cl have-1.Sg bought-Mas.Sg-Past.Part yesterday
ε, I bought the book yesterday.

d. ε, la pasta la mangio.
ε the-Fem.Sg pasta ε it-Fem.Sg-Obj.Cl eat-1.Sg ε
ε, I eat pasta.

No topicalized element can occur before ε, as shown by the ungrammaticality of 6(a, b); ε must always precede the left-dislocated element, in order for the sentence to be grammatical (6c, d). As a matter of fact, no PP or adjunct of any kind is ever allowed to precede ε:

(7)  a. *Con Gianni ε, c'ho parlato.
with John ε with-him.Cl have-1.Sg talked-Past.Part
I have talked with John.

b. *In vacanza ε, ci so' stata.
on holiday ε there-Cl am-1.Sg been-Fem.Sg-Past.Part
I have been on holiday.

c. *Ieri ε, ho comprato il vino.
yesterday ε have-1.Sg bought-Past.Part the-Mas.Sg wine
I bought wine yesterday.
d.  *A scuola ε, ho visto un film.
    at school ε have-1.Sg watched-Past.Part a-Mas.Sg movie
    I watched a movie at school.

Instead, ε would be perfectly suitable for the contexts examined in 6(a, b) and 7(a-d); it seems that ε and ε are in complementary distribution in the same position in these cases.
All in all, ε always appears to occur as the leftmost element in the clause; so far, it seems that ε can never be preceeded by another element, no matter whether this element is the subject (3(a-d)) or a left-dislocated element (6(a-b), 7(a-d)).

### 3.1.4 ε and pre-verbal focused constituents

Let us now consider whether ε is allowed to co-occur with a focused constituent:

(8)  a.  ε, MARIA ho visto.
    ε Mary have-1.Sg seen-Past.Part
    I have seen Mary.

    b.  ε, GIANNI ha vinto.
    ε John has-3.Sg won
    John has won.

    c.  ε, A MARIA l'ho dato.
    ε to Mary it-Obj.Cl have-1.Sg given-Mas.Sg-Past.Part
    I give it to Mary.

As shown in 8(a-c), there is no restriction which prevents ε from co-occurring with a focused constituent, as long as ε appears as the leftmost element in the clause. As shown by the ungrammaticality of 9(a-c), it is indeed impossible for a focused constituent to preceed ε:
(9)  a.  * MARIA ε, ho visto.
    ε Mary have-1.Sg seen-Past.Part
    I have seen Mary.

    b.  *GIANNI ε, ha vinto.
    ε John has-3.Sg won
    John has won.

    c.  * A MARIA ε, l'ho dato.
    ε to Mary it-Obj.Cl have-1.Sg given-Mas.Sg-Past.Part
    I gave it to Mary.

All in all, it is possible to conclude that ε cannot be preceded by any kind of constituent, no matter whether it is topicalized or focused. It must necessarily appear as the leftmost element in the clause.

3.1.5 The co-occurrence of ε and e

As a matter of fact, ε is allowed to co-occur with e in main declarative clauses, as shown in the following examples:

(10)  a.  ε, la su' mamma e lavora in comune.
    ε the-Fem.Sg his/her mother e works-3.Sg in town hall
    His/her mother works at the Town Hall.

    b.  ε, il pane e l'avevo comprato.
    ε the-Mas.Sg bread e it-Mas.Sg-Obj.Cl had-1.Sg bought-Mas.Sg-Past.Part
    I had bought bread

    c.  ε, a Gianni e gliel'avevo detto.
    ε to John e to-him-Cl had-1.Sg said
    I told it to John.
As shown in 10(a-d), it is possible for ε and e to co-occur in the same declarative clause; however, it is necessary to have an intervening topicalized constituent between them. It makes no difference whether the topicalized constituent is a subject, as in 10(a), an object, as in 10(b), a PP, as in 10(c), or an adjunct as in 10(d).

Instead, if no topicalized constituent occurs between ε and e, the clause is no longer grammatical, as shown in 11(a-d):

(11)   a. *ε, e lavora in comune la su' mamma.
      ε e works-3.Sg in town hall the-Fem.Sg his/her mother
      His/her mother works at the Town Hall.

   b. *ε, e l'avevo comprato il pane.
      ε e it-Mas.Sg-Obj.Cl had-1.Sg bought-Mas.Sg-Past.Part the-Mas.Sg bread
      I had bought bread

   c. *ε, e gliel'avevo detto a Gianni.
      ε e to-him-Cl had-1.Sg said to John
      I told it to John.

   d. *ε, e si viene anche noi domani.
      ε e come-1.Pl too we tomorrow
      Tomorrow we are coming too.

3.2 Restrictions on the occurrence of ε in declarative clauses

The occurrence of ε in declarative clauses is however subject to some syntactic restrictions; for instance, it is not possible to insert it in subordinate declarative clauses, as shown in 12 (a-b):
   (S)he has told me that (s)he wants to go on holiday.

   b. *Penso che ε piove.
      I think that it is raining.

(13)  a. *M' ha detto che ε Maria vole andà in vacanza.
      (S)he has told me that Mary wants to go on holiday.

      I think that tomorrow it is going to rain.

(14) a. M'ha detto che Maria e vole andà in vacanza.
      (S)he has told me that Mary e wants to go on holiday.

   b. Penso che domani e piove.
      I think that tomorrow e it is going to rain.

As discussed in the second chapter, the same constraint applies to ε-insertion in subordinate clauses. However, we saw that in fact it is possible to insert ε in a subordinate clause, but it must be preceded either by an argument of the verb, or by an adjunct. Instead, ε-insertion does not depend on the structural characteristics of the subordinate clause. As illustrated in 13(a, b), the presence of some preverbal material does not make subordinate ε-clauses grammatical.

As suggested by the examples above, it is possible to claim that ε and e are in complementary distribution in the same context, namely in subordinate declaratives. Nevertheless, they are not in
complementary distribution in the same head, for they are clearly inserted in different surface positions.

A case of analogy between \( e \) and \( \varepsilon \) is instead represented by their parallel behaviour with resumptive pronouns. Despite their different surface positions, \( e \) and \( \varepsilon \) are both allowed to co-occur with resumptive pronouns in main declarative clauses. Let us take a look at the following examples, where different surface constituent orders are illustrated:

(15)  

a. \( \varepsilon \), Maria c'ha parlato.
   \( \varepsilon \) Mary with him/her/them has-3.Sg talked-Past.Part
   Mary has talked with him/her/them.

b. *\( \varepsilon \) Maria c'ha parlato.
   \( e \) Mary with him/her/them has-3.Sg talked-Past.Part
   Mary has talked with him/her/them.

(16)  

a. \( \varepsilon \), c'ha parlato Maria.
   \( \varepsilon \) with him/her/them has-3.Sg talked-Past.Part Mary
   Mary has talked with him/her/them.

b. \( \varepsilon \) c'ha parlato Maria.
   \( e \) with him/her/them has-3.Sg talked-Past.Part Mary
   Mary has talked with him/her/them.

(17)  

a. *Maria \( \varepsilon \) c'ha parlato
   Mary \( \varepsilon \) with him/her/them has-3.Sg talked-Past.Part
   Mary has talked with him/her/them.

b. Maria \( e \) c'ha parlato.
   Mary \( e \) with him/her/them has-3.Sg talked-Past.Part
   Mary has talked with him/her/them.

The ungrammaticality of 15(b) and 17(a) is not due to some restriction on the co-occurrence of \( e \)
and ė with respect to resumptive pronouns, but rather to the constraint that requires e to follow
preverbal subjects or left-dislocated elements, and ė to preceed them.

An analogy between the syntactic behaviour of these two invariable vocalic morphemes arises with
respect to negation. As a matter of fact, both ė and e are allowed to co-occur with the sentential
negation, as shown in 18(a, b):

(18) a. ė, un lo sapevo.
    ė not it-Mas.Sg-Obj.Cl knew-1.Sg
    I didn't know that.

    b. ė, un c'è andata Maria in vacanza.
    ė not there-Cl is-3.Sg gone-Fem.Sg-Past.Part in holiday
    Mary didn't go on holiday.

(19) a. E un lo sapevo.
    e not it-Mas.Sg-Obj.Cl knew-1.Sg
    I didn't know that.

    b. E un c'è andata Maria in vacanza.
    e not there-Cl is-3.Sg gone-Fem.Sg-Past.Part in holiday
    Mary didn't go on holiday.

As expected, ė must be the leftmost element in the clause and it must be separated from the rest of
the sentence by a long intonational pause. The negation cannot preceed ė but it can be freely
inserted in the sentence; it seems that the order and the nature of the constituents never affects the
grammaticality of ė-clauses.

The negation can co-occur with e as well, as shown in 19(a, b); the only syntactic difference
between 18(a, b) and 19(a, b) is represented by the different positions occupied respectively by ė
and e. However, this difference is not visible unless some preverbal subject, topic or left-dislocated
element occurs.
3.3 The occurrence of $\varepsilon$ in interrogative clauses

So far, only the occurrence of $\varepsilon$ in declarative clauses was discussed; let us now take into consideration the distribution of $\varepsilon$ with respect to different types of interrogative clauses:

(20)  
   a.  *$\varepsilon$, quando sei arrivata?
       $\varepsilon$ when are-2.Sg arrived-Fem.Sg-Past.Part
       When did you arrive?
   
   b.  *$\varepsilon$, come stai?
       $\varepsilon$ how are-2.Sg
       How are you?

As far as $wh$-questions are concerned, $\varepsilon$-insertion leads to ungrammaticality; as shown in 20(a, b), $\varepsilon$ seems to be incompatible with $wh$-elements.

Let us now take a look at what happens when $\varepsilon$ is inserted in $e$-questions:

(21)  
   a.  *$\varepsilon$, e l'hai trovate le chiavi?
       $\varepsilon$ e them-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg found-Fem.Pl-Past.Part the-Fem.Pl keys
       Did you find the keys?
   
   b.  *$\varepsilon$, e l'hanno arrestato il ladro?
       $\varepsilon$ e him-Obj.Cl have-3.Pl arrested-Mas.Sg-Past.Part the-Mas.Sg robber
       Did they arrest the robber?

As shown by the ungrammaticality of 21(a, b), it is impossible to insert $\varepsilon$ in $e$-questions. Let us now consider the behaviour of $\varepsilon$ in $che$-questions:

(22)  
   a.  *$\varepsilon$, che vanno al mare?
       $\varepsilon$ che go-3.Pl to-the-Mas.Sg sea?
       Are they going to the sea?
As shown in 22(a, b), ε is not compatible with e-questions either. One may wonder whether ε is allowed to follow che; as illustrated in 23(a, b), ε cannot be inserted neither before nor after che:

(23)  a. *Che ε, vanno al mare?
      che ε are they going to the sea?
      Are they going to the sea?

b. *Che ε, dormi?
      che ε sleep-2.Sg
      Are you sleeping?

The situation described throughout examples (20)-(23) seems to strongly support the claim that ε is never allowed in any kind of interrogative clause.

This assumption may sound rather bizzarre and quite unexpected. In fact, no similar constraint applies to e, which is instead allowed to occur in yes/no questions.

Given that many parallelisms can be drawn between these two preverbal invariable vocalic morphemes, one may expect them to follow a similar pattern, at least when it comes to some macro-distinctions.

However, the data presented so far leave no room for doubts; ε can never occur in an interrogative clause, disregarding of whether it is a wh-question or a yes/no question. The distinction between e- and che-questions does not seem to play any role in this case.

3.4 ε (and o) as evidential particles

As just introduced, ε is not allowed to appear in questions of any kind. Given this restriction, it is now necessary to specify which clause types allow ε to be realized; the aim of this section is to shed some light on the function and meaning of ε.

Starting from the consideration that ε is incompatible with any kinds of question, I assume that it is
an evidential particle which marks sentences as being supported by positive evidence, according to the speaker. Therefore, I claim that $\varepsilon$ is speaker-oriented, because it expresses a judgement of the speaker, which may not be shared with the interlocutors.

I claim that $\varepsilon$ is incompatible with questions, because in fact it expresses a truth value which is considered to be evident for the speaker. Instead, questions ask for a truth value and consequently they do not admit the presence of an evidential particle.

Moreover, it is worth pointing out that $\varepsilon$ also has a negative counterpart, namely $\sigma$, which signals instead negative evidence. $\sigma$ occurs in declarative clauses whenever the speaker wants to express negative evidence with respect to the content of a sentence.

As a matter of fact, there is no difference between the syntactic behaviour of $\sigma$ and that of $\varepsilon$; they cannot be preceeded neither by topicalized nor by focused constituents, and they cannot occur in questions of any kind.

3.4.1 $\varepsilon$ and $\sigma$ in answers to yes/no questions

The occurrence of $\varepsilon$ in answers to yes/no questions does not seem to depend on the distinction between che- and e-questions. As shown in the following examples, either 24(a) or 24(b) can be answered with 25(a) or 25(b):

(24) a.  *Che* hanno parlato, con Gianni?
    *che* have-3.Sg talked-Past.Part with John
    Did they talk with John?

    b.  *E* c'hanno parlato (con Gianni)?
    *e* with-him.Cl have-3.Pl with John
    Did they talk with John?

(25) a.  $\varepsilon$, c'hanno parlato (con Gianni).
    $\varepsilon$ with-him.Cl have-1.Sg with John
    I talked with John.
b. ᵃ, un lo so.
    ᵃ not it-Obj.Cl
    I don't know.

As shown in 24(a, b), both ᵇ and ᵃ can occur in declarative clauses, which are the answers either of che-questions or e-questions. The function of ᵇ in 25(a) is to express that the content of the clause is considered to be evident by the speaker. Similarly, ᵃ in 25(b) signals that the speaker considers the negative meaning of the clause too be evident.

The presence of resumptive pronouns does not interact with the occurrence of e and ᵇ; in fact, the same analysis applies to those che-questions, which do not have an overtly realized argument:

(26) a. Che fa, dorme?
    che does-3.Sg sleeps-3.Sg
    Is (s)he sleeping?

    b. E dorme?
    e sleeps-3.Sg
    (S)he e is sleeping.

(27) a. ᵇ, dorme.
    ᵇ sleeps-3.Sg
    (S)he is sleeping.

    b. ᵃ, un si capisce.
    ᵃ not understand-3.Sg-Impersonal
    One cannot tell.

As a matter of fact, both ᵇ and ᵃ can occur in the answer to che-questions and e-questions. Again, ᵇ signals that the affirmative content of the clause is taken for evident by the speaker in 27(a), while ᵃ marks the negative content of the clause as evident to the speaker.
3.4.2 Yes and no

Given that ε and σ can occur as the answer to yes/no questions, it is necessary check their behaviour with respect to the affirmative and the negative particles yes and no. Let us consider the following examples:

(28)  
   a. ε, si/no.
       ε yes/no
       Yes/no.
   b. *Si/no ε.
       yes/no ε
       Yes/no.

(29)  
   a. *σ, si/no.
       σ yes/no
       Yes/no.
   b. *Si/no σ.
       yes/no σ
       Yes/no.

As shown in 28(a), ε is allowed to co-occur with both yes and no. However, as shown by the ungrammaticality of 28(b), ε must necessarily precede them. Instead, σ cannot co-occur neither with yes nor with no. It makes no difference whether yes or no are put before or after σ; the result is always ungrammatical, as shown in 29(a, b).

3.4.3 ε and σ in answers to wh-questions

Now that the function of ε and σ in the answers to yes/no question has been cleared, let us consider the role that they play when the declarative clause, in which they appear, is the answer to a wh-question:
(30) a. Che hai fatto ieri?
    what have-2.Sg done-Past.Part yesterday
    What did you do yesterday?

b. ε, so' andata al mare.
    ε am-1.Sg gone-Fem.Sg-Past.Part to-the-Mas.Sg sea
    I went to the sea.

c. ο, un me lo ricordo.
    ο not me-Refl rememeber-1.Sg
    I can't remember.

Again, we see that no restriction prevents ε or ο from occurring in the answer to a wh-question, each with its positive or negative evidential implication.

3.5 Concluding remarks

- ε in inserted in main declarative clauses in Sienese and it appears to occur in the leftmost position available. No preverbal subject, topic or left-dislocated element of any kind is ever allowed to precede ε. As opposed to ε, e must follow these constituents when it is inserted in declarative main clauses. These observations lead me to assume that ε must be necessarily generated in a higher syntactic position than e, for the different constituent orders clearly show that they are not in complementary distribution in the same head.

- Unlike e, ε can never occur in subordinate declaratives. Instead, it is allowed to co-occur with resumptive pronouns and with the sentencial negation; the same pattern is followed by e. Like e, ε is not allowed to be inserted in wh-questions. As a matter of fact, ε is not even allowed to occur in yes/no questions of any kind. It seems that ε is incompatible with any type of interrogative Force.

- ε is an evidential particle, which signal that the speaker considers the content of a sentence
to be true and evident; therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that it is speaker-oriented, because it expresses a judgement of the speaker. $\varepsilon$ has a negative counterpart too, namely $\sigma$, which instead marks negative evidence. Both $\varepsilon$ and $\sigma$ are not allowed to occur in questions because they express a truth value, while questions ask for a truth value.
Chapter 4

The occurrence of \textit{o} in interrogative clauses

4.0 Introduction

This section deals with the syntactic and semantic analysis of another invariable vowel, which again seems to involve the left periphery of the clause in Sienese.

This vowel is \textit{o} and its occurrence in other Tuscan varieties has already been discussed by scholars such as Poletto (2000), who calls it \textit{o}-morpheme, Chinellato and Garzonio (2003) and Garzonio (2004).

As pointed out by Chinellato and Garzonio (2003), the distribution and the interpretation of \textit{o} are subject to slight variations in different varieties. Nevertheless, no specific research has ever been addressed to the study of \textit{o} in Sienese; the aim of the present section is to fill up this descriptive and theoretical gap.

I will first present a semantic analysis of \textit{o}, following Garzonio (2004)'s categorization of \textit{o}-clauses, with a special stress on the analogies and differences between the interpretation of \textit{o} in the Sienese and in the Florentine dialect.

Then, I will discuss the occurrence of \textit{o} in Sienese from a syntactic point of view, according to its distribution in different interrogative clause types.

As expected, the position of \textit{o} in interrogative clauses will be described with respect to preverbal subjects and different kind of left-dislocated elements, in order to establish the position of \textit{che} in the Split-CP. I will finally propose a possible interpretation of the syntactic behaviour of \textit{o}, which should be able to account for its occurrence in both the Sienese and the Florentine dialect.

4.1 Interpretation of \textit{o}-questions

According to Garzonio (2004), the occurrence of \textit{o} in interrogative clauses marks them as non-canonical; he claims that \textit{o}-questions are not standard questions, meaning they are not asked to
obtain a piece of information.

The function of $o$ is to change the sentential force of a clause, meaning the conventional pragmatic force associated with it (Chierchia and Mc Connel-Ginet, 1990)\(^7\). In other words, he assumes that $o$ encodes some semantic property which is overtly represented at the syntactic level. This property modifies the interrogative force, so that the clause acquires a different interpretation. Garzonio distinguishes between five types of sentential forces, which are conveyed by $o$ in Florentine interrogative clauses:

- *Surprise force*
- *Can't find the value force*
- *Rethorical force*
- *Exclamative force*
- *Imperative force*

In the next five subsections, I will compare the Florentine data with the Sienese one, in order to understand whether Garzonio (2004)'s generalizations can apply to Sienese as well. Nevertheless, I find it necessary to point out that there is no clear-cut difference between these contexts, which are all characterized by a speaker-oriented interpretation.

### 4.1.1 *Surprise force*

The so-called *surprise or disapproval* questions\(^8\) are those interrogative clauses, that are uttered for expressing astonishment and often disappointment too. Their function not that of asking, but rather that of expressing an attitude of the speaker toward certain events or ideas.

With respect to this clause-type, Sienese behaves just like Florentine:

(1) a. $o$ che fai?

\[ o \text{ what do-2.Sg} \]

What are you doing?

---

\(^7\) See the discussion in section 1.1.

\(^8\) For further discussions about *surprise/disapproval* interrogative clauses in NIDs see Munaro and Obenauer (1999) and Obenauer (2003).
b.  *o che* hai comprato, la macchina nova?

    *o che* have-2.Sg bought-Past.Part the-Fem.Sg car new-Fem.Sg

Have you bought a new car?

In 1(a) the value of the *wh*-element is known, meaning the speaker who utters the *wh*-question already knows the answer and considers it non-plausible or non-decent (Garzonio, 2004). The aim of this sentence is to show surprise or disappointment with respect to the behaviour of the speaker, to whom the question is addressed. The example shown in 1(b) is instead a *yes/no* question and the speaker who utters it knows whether the propositional content is true or false. Again, the function of such a *yes/no* question is that of reflecting astonishment, often from a negative perspective.

I find it relevant to underline that *o* can convey a surprise interpretation both in *wh*- and *yes/no* questions.

### 4.1.2 Can't find the value force

The second kind of force conveyed by *o* in Florentine interrogative clauses is the so-called *Can't find the value* force, according to Garzonio (2004)'s distinction.

Garzonio recurs to Obenauer (1994)'s terminology, who first introduced the notion of *Can't find the value* force in the analysis of French *diable* questions. According to Obenauer, *Can't find the value* interrogatives express that the speaker who utters the question is unable to find a possible answer, despite his/her efforts.

This category of non-standard interrogatives seems to be marked by *o* in Sienese too, as shown in 2(a, b):

(2)  a.  *o* quando arriva il treno?

    *o* when arrives-3.Sg the-Mas.Sg train

When does the train arrive?

b.  *o* perché se ne so' andati?

    *o* why them-Refli.Cl from-there.Cl are-3.Pl gone-Mas.Pl-Past.Part

Why did they leave?
The function of $o$ in sentences 2(a, b) is to communicate that the speaker does not have any guess on the possible answer. For instance, 1(a) could be suitable for a situation where the speaker is waiting for a delayed train and does not know how consistent this delay will become. However, the speaker does not expect someone to know the answer; as a matter of fact, 1(a) cannot be considered a canonical question, for it is not addressed to someone in particular and it does not necessarily requires an answer.

Unlike the so-called *Surprise* interpretation discussed in 4.2.1, the *Can’t find the value* force cannot be conveyed by $o$ in all clause-types indistinctly. As shown by the contrast between 2(a, b) and 3(a, b), this interpretation is not available for *yes/no* questions:

(3)  
   a. *$o$ arriva il treno?*
       
       $o$ arrives-3.Sg the-Mas.Sg train
       
       Does the train arrive?

   b. *$o$ se ne so' andati?*
       
       $o$ them-Refl.Cl from-there.Cl are-3.Pl gone-Mas.Pl-Past.Part
       
       Did they leave?

### 4.1.3 Rethorical force

Another case of interrogative clause, where $o$ is inserted both in Sienese and in Florentine, is provided by *rhetorical* questions.

As pointed out by Garzonio (2004), this kind of clause implies that the speaker considers the answer to be evident to all the speakers involved. There may be a flavour of disapproval, but they are different from real disapproval questions because their propositional content is not regarded as non-plausible or not decent, but rather as obvious.

Let us take a look at the following Sienese examples:

(4)  
   a. *$o$ un t’aveva promesso di venì?*
       
       $o$ not to-you-Cl had-3.Sg promised-Past.Part to come-Inf
       
       Didn’t (s)he promise you to come?
b.  *o perché gliel'hai chiesto?*

   *o why to-Him/her it-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg asked-Past.Part*

   Why did you ask it to him/her?

In uttering a sentence such as 4(a), the speaker expresses his/her disappointment, or irony with respect to a person who promised the interlocutor to come, but who in fact did not. Its propositional content is assumed to be obvious, meaning both the speaker and the interlocutor know that someone promised to come. Therefore, the function of this sentence is not that of asking but rather that of stressing that the promise made to the interlocutor was broken, either from a negative or from an ironic perspective.

Similarly, the value of the *wh*-element in 4(b) is assumed to be obvious; it is clear that both the speaker and the interlocutor know the answer; again, the stress is on the negative or ironic interpretation, that the sentence may convey.

As shown respectively by 4(a) and 4(b), the so-called rhetorical force is available for both *yes/no* questions and *wh*-questions; no significant difference arises between Florentine and Sienese, as far as rhetorical *o*-questions are concerned.

### 4.1.4 Exclamative force

Garzonio (2004) points out another category of non-standard interrogative clauses introduced by *o* in Florentine, namely *exclamative* interrogatives, which are also found in Sienese.

As a matter of fact, they are very similar to surprise and rhetorical questions; however, they do not admit any answer, even if the answer is obvious to all the speakers involved. Instead, *surprise* and *rhetorical* questions can be answered, although it is not required.

Let us take a look at the following sentences⁹, which are typical both for Sienese and Florentine:

(5) a.  *o che vestito ti sei comprato?*

   *o which garment to-you-Cl are-2.Sg bougth-Mas.Sg-Past.Part*

   What a garment you bought!

---

⁹ Examples 5(a, b) are taken from Garzonio (2004).
b.  *o quanto piove?
   *o how much rains-3.Sg
   What a rain!

According to Garzonio, the function of exclamative interrogatives is just to point out that something is worth underlying and therefore they are more similar to exclamative clauses than to interrogative clauses.
Nevertheless, it is significant to underline that the so-called exclamative interpretation is only available for *wh*-questions. As shown in 6(a, b), it is impossible to insert *o* in a *yes/no* question, in order to give it an exclamative meaning:

(6)    a.  *o ti sei comprato un vestito?
   *o to-you.Cl are-2.Sg bought-Mas.Sg-Past.Part a-Mas.Sg garment
   *o What a garment you bought!

b.  *o piove tanto?
   *o rains-3.Sg much
   *o What a rain!

As shown by the ungrammaticality of these examples, *o* is not allowed to occur in *yes/no* questions as far as the so-called exclamative meaning is concerned.

4.1.5 *Imperative force*

*Imperative* interrogatives are the last type of non-standard interrogative clauses introduced by *o*, that Garzonio (2004) takes into consideration.
He argues that imperative interrogatives are in fact imperative clauses; this is confirmed by the fact that they do not allow any answer, just like exclamative questions.
Let us consider the following Florentine examples\(^\text{10}\):

---

\(^{10}\) The examples in 7(a, b) are taken from Garzonio (2004).
As shown in 7(a) and 7(b) are characterized by an imperative force; they cannot be considered as standard questions because their function is not that of asking, but rather that of expressing an order. As a matter of fact, they should be translated into English as imperative clauses. Nevertheless, a significant difference between Florentine and Sienese arises with respect to Garzonio (2004)'s categorization of imperative interrogatives. Unlike Florentine, Sienese does not allow the realization of this clause-type by means of *o-insertion in yes/no questions; in fact, 7(a, b) would be ungrammatical in Sienese. However, the strategy displayed by Sienese in order to mark the same kind of force is to insert *o in real imperative clauses. The complements of the verb, if present, must be realized as clitics on the verb itself; no different surface constituent order is allowed, as shown by the contrast between 8(a, b) and 9(a, b):

(8) a.   *o smettila!
   o stop-it-Fem.Sg-Obj.Cl
Stop it!

b.   *o vattene!
   o go-2.Sg-you-Cl-from-here-Cl
Go away!

(9) a.   *o la smetti!
   o it-Fem.Sg-Obj.Cl stop-2.Sg
Stop it!
b.  *o te ne vai!
    o you-Cl from-here-Cl go-2.Sg
    Go away!

The correspondence between Florentine imperative interrogative o-clauses and Sienese imperative o-clauses is striking: it provides further evidence for Garzonio (2004)'s claim that o can realize a [+imperative] feature.

I assume that Florentine does not require this feature to be realized on the verb, which in fact has to be an indicative rather than an imperative. Instead, Sienese needs to mark the [+imperative] feature on the verb as well, which therefore has to be an imperative.

4.2 The distribution of o in Sienese interrogative clauses

The analysis proposed so far, which is based on Garzonio (2004) is mainly concerned with the function of o in interrogative clauses from an interpretive point of view, meaning a special stress is put on the semantic contribution made by o to the meaning of the clause.

Let us now try to approach the issue from a more syntactic point of view; the following two subsections, 4.2.1 and 4.2.2, describe the occurrence of o in different types of interrogative clauses, which are categorized according to their syntactic structure. The occurrence of o in wh-questions is described in 4.2.1, while 4.2.2 deals with its behaviour with respect to yes/no questions.

4.2.1 o in wh-questions

O is allowed to occur in wh-questions; it is compatible with any kind of wh-element. Let us take a look at its position in the syntactic structure of the clause:

(10)  a.  o quando viene?
    o when comes-3.Sg
    When is (s)he coming?
b.  *o* la su' sorella quando viene?
   *o* his-her sister when comes-3.Sg
   When is his/her sister coming?

As shown in 10(a, b), *o* appears as the leftmost element of the clause; it precedes the preverbal subject, if present. However, it is possible to find *wh*-questions introduced by *o* where the subject is followed by *o*.

As a matter of fact, *o* can possibly be realized in two position, if the subject is preverbal; as shown in (11), *o* can be inserted before the subject and before the *wh*-element:

(11)    *(o)* la su' sorella *(o)* quando viene?
   *(o)* the-Fem.Sg His/her-Fem.Sg sister, *(o)* when comes-3.Sg
   When is his/her sister coming?

*o*-insertion always seems to be optional; one may realize the higher, but not the lower *o* and viceversa. One may also insert *o* in both positions at the same time. The interpretation of Sienese *wh*-questions does not depend on whether *o* is pronounced once or twice, or is inserted in the first or second position available. It only depends on whether *o* is present or not; when *o* is realized, it provides the sentence with some additional meanings, such as those discussed at the beginning of the present chapter.

*o*-reduplication is also allowed when the object is left-dislocated and therefore appears in a preverbal position; as shown in 12(a, b), *o* may be either inserted before the left-dislocated object or before the *wh*-element:

(12) a.  *(o)* il pane *(o)* perché l'hai comprato?
   *(o)* the-Mas.Sg bread *(o)* why it-Mas.Sg-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg bought-Mas.Sg-
   Past.Part
   Why did you buy bread?

b.  *(o)* Maria *(o)* dove l'hai vista?
   *(o)* Mary *(o)* where her-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg seen-Fem.Sg-Past.Part
   Where did you see Mary?
The same pattern arises with respect of other kinds of left-dislocated elements, such as PPs and Hanging Topics:

(13)  

(a) \((o)\) a Maria \((o)\) quando glielo dici?  

\((o)\) to Mary \((o)\) when to-her-it.Mas.Sg-Cl. Say-2.Sg

When are you telling Mary?

(b) \((o)\) su Gianni \((o)\) quante n'hanno dette?  

\((o)\) about John \((o)\) how many of-them-Cl have-3.Pl told-Fem.Pl-Past.Part

How many stories did they tell about John?

As expected, \(o\) can be inserted in two different positions, immediately before the left-dislocated PP and before the \textit{wh}-element, as shown in 13(a, b). The same structure is displayed with Hanging Topics:

(14)  

(a) \((o)\) Maria, \((o)\) quando c'hanno parlato?  

\((o)\) Maria \((o)\) when with-her-Cl have-3.Pl talked-Past.Part

When did they talk with Mary?

(b) \((o)\) Gianni, \((o)\) perché gliel'hai dato?  

\((o)\) John \((o)\) why to-him-it.Mas.Sg-Cl have-2.Sg given-Mas.Sg-Past.Part

Why did you give it to John?

As shown throughout examples (12)-(14), \(o\)-reduplication always appears in sentences, where a resumptive pronoun is inserted. However, the co-occurrence of \(o\)-reduplication and resumptive pronouns falls from independent factors.

As discussed in 2.2.1, left-dislocated elements must be co-referential with resumptive pronouns in standard Italian (CLLD\textsuperscript{11}); therefore, it is not resumptive pronouns that co-occur with \(o\)-reduplication, but rather the other way around.

The only possible strategy to dislocate an element to the left without using resumptive pronouns is

\textsuperscript{11} Cinque (1983).
Resumptive Preposing (RP\textsuperscript{12}); as expected, RP is not found in Sienese for it belongs to a highly formal linguistic register, which is not usually typical of local, non-standard varieties.

Within this framework, I do not assume that there is a direct relationship between \( o \)-reduplication and resumptive pronouns. In fact, resumptive pronouns must be inserted in order for the sentence to be grammatical, while \( o \)-insertion is never obligatory.

So far, I only took into consideration sentences with one left-dislocated element; let us now consider the distribution of \( o \) in \textit{wh}-questions, where more than one element is dislocated. Examples 15(a, b) show a case, where the direct object and a PP are dislocated to the left of the \textit{wh}-phrase:

\begin{enumerate}[leftmargin=\parindent]
\item[(15)]
\begin{enumerate}[leftmargin=\parindent]
\item[(a)] \( (o) \) il libro, a Gianni, \( (o) \) quando glielo ridai?
\begin{itemize}[leftmargin=\parindent]
\item \( (o) \) the-Mas.Sg book to John \( (o) \) when to-him-it-Mas.Sg-Cl give-2.Sg back
\end{itemize}
When will you give John the book back?
\item[(b)] \( (o) \) a Gianni, il libro, \( (o) \) quando glielo ridai?
\begin{itemize}[leftmargin=\parindent]
\item \( (o) \) to John the-Mas.Sg book \( (o) \) when to-him-it-Mas.Sg-Cl give-2.Sg back
\end{itemize}
When will you give John the book back?
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

As shown in 15(a, b), \( o \) can occur either before the object or before the PP, and before the \textit{wh}-element. However, no more than two \( o \) are allowed to occur at the same time; in other words, only one dislocated element can be modified by \( o \) in a single sentence. Let us take a look at the following ill-formed \textit{wh}-questions:

\begin{enumerate}[leftmargin=\parindent]
\item[(16)]
\begin{enumerate}[leftmargin=\parindent]
\item[(a)] \*\( (o) \) il libro, \( (o) \) a Gianni, \( (o) \) quando glielo ridai?
\begin{itemize}[leftmargin=\parindent]
\item \( (o) \) the-Mas.Sg book \( (o) \) to John \( (o) \) when to-him-it-Mas.Sg-Cl give-2.Sg back
\end{itemize}
When will you give John the book back?
\item[(b)] \*\( (o) \) a Gianni, \( (o) \) il libro, \( (o) \) quando glielo ridai?
\begin{itemize}[leftmargin=\parindent]
\item \( (o) \) to John the-Mas.Sg book \( (o) \) when to-him-it-Mas.Sg-Cl give-2.Sg back
\end{itemize}
When will you give John the book back?
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

As shown by the ungrammaticality of 16(a, b), it is impossible to insert \( o \) before both the dislocated object and the PP at the same time. It is only the leftmost dislocated element, the highest in the

\textsuperscript{12} Cinque (1983).
hierarchy, which can be modified by o together with the wh-element. However, there is no restriction on the nature of the leftmost dislocated element, meaning it can be an object, as shown in 15(a), a subject, as shown in (17) and a PP, as shown in (18):

(17) (o) Maria, a Gianni, (o) perché gliel'ha detto?
(o) Mary to John (o) why to-him-it-Mas.Sg-Cl has-3.Sg told-Past.Part
(o) Mary, to Johnz, (o) why did she tell it to himz?

(18) (o) di Gianni, a Maria, (o) quando glin'hai parlato?
(o) about John to Mary (o) when to-him-it-Mas.Sg-Cl have-2.Sg told-Past.Part
(o) about John, to Maryz, (o) when did you tell herz about him?

As clearly suggested by the data, only two positions are available for o in wh-questions, no matter which and how many constituents are dislocated to the left of the wh-element.

4.2.2 o in yes/no questions

In order to tackle the distribution of o in yes/no questions from a syntactic point of view, it is necessary to recall the distinction between che- and e-questions. Crucially, the occurrence of o in yes/no questions seems to depend on this distinction.

4.2.2.1 o in che-questions

As just introduced, it is allowed to insert o in generic yes/no questions. As discussed in 1.2, generic yes/no questions are introduced by che. Che has been analyzed as a wh-element, which is interpreted as a pretty functional word.

Nevertheless, despite the different role it plays in the interpretation of the clause, it still retains the morphological form of a wh-element. Therefore, it should not come as a suprise that o is compatible with che, given that o is allowed to appear in wh-questions, as discussed in 4.3.1.

Let us take into consideration the following examples:
As shown in 19(a, b), o occurs as the leftmost element in the clause, immediately before che. However, it may be the case that o is preceded by something, like an overtly realized preverbal subject; this context is illustrated in 20(a-c):

(20)  
   a. (o) Maria (o) che stava, a Roma?  
       (o) Mary (o) che lived-3.Sg in Rome  
       Did Mary live in Rome?  
   
   b. (o) Maria, l'anno scorso, (o) che stava a Roma?  
       (o) Mary the-Mas.Sg year last-Mas.Sg (o) che lived-3.Sg in Rome  
       Did Mary live in Rome last year?  
   
   c. *(o) Maria, (o) l'anno scorso, (o) che stava a Roma?  
       (o) Mary (o) the-Mas.Sg year last-Mas.Sg (o) che lived-3.Sg in Rome  
       Did Mary live in Rome last year?  

In sentence 20(a), we can see that a preverbal subject occurs before o and che. However, it is significant to observe that in this case it is also possible to insert another o (or to reduplicate it) before the subject. More than one constituent may precede the lower o and che; in 20(b), it is the subject and a left-dislocated time adjunct that precede them. Nevertheless, it is not possible to realize o in more than two positions at the same time. The two positions available are respectively before che and before the leftmost element. If che is the leftmost element, then just one o needs to be realized. As shown in 20(c), it is ungrammatical to insert o before both the constituents which precede the
cluster formed by the lower o and che.

This restriction does not depend on categorial distinctions. It does not matter whether the first constituent is a subject or a different element. In fact, sentence (20)b would be perfectly well-formed even if the order subject/time-adjunct were reversed.

All the observations made so far should not come as a surprise, for the pattern followed by o in generic yes/no questions is pretty much the same, that it follows in wh-questions. While in wh-questions o can occur before the leftmost (dislocated) element and before the wh-element, in generic yes/no questions it can occur before the leftmost element and before che. Again, it is possible to see that a close relationship exists between che and wh-elements.

There is no special restriction about the nature of those elements, which can occupy the leftmost position and therefore be modified by o in the structures considered. Let us discuss the following examples:

(21)  a.  (o) il pane, (o) che l'hai comprato al supermercato?

(o) the-Mas.Sg bread (o) che it-Mas.Sg-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg bought-Mas.Sg-
Past.Part at-the-Mas.Sg supermarket
Did you buy bread at the supermarket yesterday?

b.  (o) il pane, ieri, (o) che l'hai comprato al supermercato?

(o) the-Mas.Sg bread (o) che it-Mas.Sg-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg bought-Mas.Sg-
Past.Part at-the-Mas.Sg supermarket
Did you buy bread at the supermarket yesterday?

c.  *(o) il pane, (o) ieri, (o) che l'hai comprato al supermercato?

(o) the-Mas.Sg bread (o) che it-Mas.Sg-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg bought-Mas.Sg-
Past.Part at-the-Mas.Sg supermarket
Did you buy bread at the supermarket yesterday?

(22)  a.  (o) a Gianni, (o) che gli hanno regalato un cane?

(o) to John (o) che to-him-Cl have-3.Pl given a-Mas.Sg dog
Did they give John a dog?
b. (o) a Gianni, pel su'compleanno, (o) che gli hanno regalato un cane?

(o) to John for-the-Mas.Sg his-Mas.Sg birthday (o) che to-him-Cl have-3.Pl given-Past.Part a-Mas-Sing dog

Did they give John a dog for his birthday?

c. *(o) a Gianni, (o) pel su'compleanno, (o) che gli hanno regalato un cane?

(o) to John for-the-Mas.Sg his-Mas.Sg birthday (o) che to-him-Cl have-3.Pl given-past a-Mas-Sing dog

Did they give John a dog for his birthday?

As shown in 21(a) and 21(b), the leftmost constituent can be a direct object or a PP; this is true for both generic yes/no questions and wh-questions.

As expected, o is allowed to occur twice, before the direct object or PP and before che; it cannot be inserted in any intermediate position between the highest and the lowest o.

Let us now consider the behaviour of o in che-questions, where no argument of the verb is overtly realized:

(23) a. *o che, dormi?

o che sleep-2.Sg

Are you sleeping?

b. *o che, piove?

o che rains-3.Sg

Is it raining?

As shown in 23(a, b), it is not possible to insert o before che, followed by a main verb. However, this does not depend on o-insertion, but rather on the constraint which prevents che to occur with a main verb, which does not have neither auxiliaries nor complements. In other words, there is no direct relationship between the occurrence of o in 23(a, b) and the ungrammaticality of 23(a, b).

As discussed in the first chapter, it is necessary to introduce a supportive verb, namely fare (=do), in order for che-questions with light VPs to be grammatical. Let us take into consideration 24(a, b):
As expected, *o* is inserted before *che* in *che*-questions with light VPs, where the *fare*-structure is displayed. As shown in 25(a, b), *o*-reduplication is possible in this context too.

4.2.2.2 *o* in *e*-questions

As already introduced, it is not possible to insert *o* in *e*-questions. Let us consider the following ungrammatical sentences:

(26) a. *o e l'hai vista Maria?*

*e* her-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg seen-Fem.Sg-Past.Part Mary

Have you seen Mary?

b. *E o Maria l'hai vista?*

*e* o Mary her-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg seen-Fem.Sg-Past.Part

Have you seen Mary?
As shown in 26(a, b), it is impossible to insert o, either before or after e. However, given that e must necessarily follow any left dislocated constituent, it is not surprising that 26(b) is ungrammatical. As a matter of fact, it would be ungrammatical without o as well.

Let us now try to hypothesize a more plausible context for o-insertion in e-questions, where some left-dislocated element occurs:

(27) *o Maria e l'hai vista?
    o Mary e her-Obj.Cl have-2.Sg seen-Fem.Sg-Past.Part
    Have you seen Mary?

In (27), the left-dislocated object is preceded by o and followed by e; in theory, this structure should be more correct than that in 26(b), for e is placed in the right position. Nevertheless, we can see that the order [o + left-dislocated element + e] is not grammatical as well.

4.3 o and the left periphery

As suggested throughout the whole present section, I assume that o realizes some kind of non-standard force, which modifies the force of interrogative clauses (Garzonio, 2004). Therefore, it seems natural to claim that o is inserted in some high projection inside the split CP (Rizzi, 1997). According to Garzonio (2004)'s analysis, o is a head and it is inserted between the Discourse phrase and the Topic phrase. In fact, he shows that o has to follow Hanging Topics, while it has to precede left-dislocated elements in Florentine. Therefore, he proposes the following structural representation:\(^\text{13}\):

(28) [DiscourseP [ForceP o [TopicP [FocusP [FinitenessP ] ] ] ]]
    HT left-dislocated elements

The structure proposed by Garzonio for Florentine can be maintained for Sienese as well. However, I assume that an an additional leftward projection is needed, in order to host the reduplicated o. Namely, I suggest that a Reduplicated-Force phrase immediately dominates the Discourse phrase.

\(^{13}\) The structure proposed by Garzonio is taken from Benincà (2001).
and that the reduplicated o is its head.

This projection is only activated if the Discourse phrase is activated. Instead, if the Topic phrase is activated, o is inserted in the head of the Force phrase. However, they can never be activated at the same time; o has to be inserted either in the head of the Reduced-Force phrase or in the head of the Force phrase, but not in both of them. In addition to one of these two positions, o can also be inserted in the projection, that immediately dominates che or the wh-element.

The structure that I propose is the following:

      HT                          left-dislocated
      elements

To sum up, o can be realized in three projections in Sienese, but no more than twice in a single clause. One of these two available positions is fixed and it is the head of the projection immediately dominating che or wh-elements.

Instead, the other position is only available when some left-dislocated element is present; o is inserted in the head of the Reduplicated Force phrase if there is an Hanging Topic, while it occurs in the head of the Force phrase if there is a left-dislocated element, such as a Topic.

As opposed to Sienese, the Reduplicated Force phrase is never activated in Florentine for no Hanging Topic can be preceeded by o; therefore I assume that only two positions available for o-insertion. o is only reduplicated if the Topic phrase is activated, and it is inserted in the head of the Force phrase; the non-reduplicated o occurs instead in the so-called fixed position, namely in the head of the projection immediately dominating che or wh-elements.

4.4 Concluding remarks

- o is an invariable vocalic fragment, which is found in some kinds of non-standard interrogative clauses in Sienese (and Florentine). Its function is to add some semantic property to the interpretation of the clause, which is encoded in syntax. Those questions, which are introduced by o, are to be considered as non-standard because their aim is not really that of asking, but rather that of pointing out a speaker-oriented perspective on the propositional content of the clause.
According to Garzonio, some of the non-standard questions that o can introduce are: *Surprise* interrogatives, *Can't find the value* interrogatives, *Rhetorical* interrogatives and *Exclamative* interrogatives. This distinctions hold for Florentine, as well as for Sienese. However, there is a fifth non-standard question-type, namely *Imperative* interrogatives, which is found in Florentine but not in Sienese.

In Sienese, o can introduce both *wh*-and *che*-questions, but it is not allowed to appear in *e*-questions. In *wh*-questions, o is inserted before the *wh*-element, which is usually the leftmost element in the clause. When the *wh*-element is not found in the leftmost position, then it is possible to reduplicate o; one o appears before the *wh*-element, while the other one appears before the leftmost element. There is no special restriction on the constituents, which are allowed to occur before the *wh*-element; they can be subjects, objects, PPs or adjuncts. However, it is impossible to realize o in more than two positions.

The same constraint observed for *wh*-questions holds for o-insertion in *che*-questions. o is allowed to occur before *che*, which is usually the leftmost element in the clause. If *che* is preceeded by some constituents, such as subjects, objects and other kinds of left-dislocated elements, then it is possible for o to appear in two positions at the same time. As expected, o appears before *che* and before the leftmost element; however, no more than two o can be inserted in the same question.

Following Garzonio (2004), I assume that o is a head, which is inserted in a very high projection inside the Complementation layer. However, in order to account for the observed o-reduplication phenomena, I propose that an additional leftward projection is added to the structure of the clause in Sienese, namely the Reduplicated Force Phrase. O can be inserted in the head of this projection only if the Discourse Phrase is activated, while it can be inserted in the head of the Force Phrase only if the Topic Phrase is activated. However, it is not possible for o to occur in the Reduplicated Force phrase and in the Force phrase at the same time.

Florentine never activates the Reduplicated Force projection because o cannot preceed
Hanging Topics. Therefore, the only position available for the reduplicated o is the head of the Force phrase, which is preceded by Hanging Topics and followed by Topics and left-dislocated elements.
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