CP-internal Discourse Particles and the Split ForceP Hypothesis

1. Introduction
In the cartographic approach to the left periphery of the clause initiated by the seminal work of Rizzi (1997), the Force domain is considered to play a special role in CP structure. The peculiarity of this domain is suggested by the fact that ForceP is the projection where information about clausal type and illocutionary force is codified, and that it corresponds to the (unsplit) C of Chomsky (1995). In fact, Bayer et al. (2015) point out that despite the structural parallelisms between CP and other domains such as DP or VP, Force is unique to CP, that is, ForceP is the projection that distinguishes CP from all other domains.

While Rizzi’s (1997) proposal to split CP in articulated projections is widely accepted, its exact structure has been a subject of discussion. Although a number of works have proposed to further enrich the structure of CP (see, for instance, Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl’s (2007) study, for non-recursive TopicP as well as Cardinaletti’s (2016) counterargument, Haegeman’s (2002) study, and Alexiadou’s (1997) study, for SubP, which simply subordinates the clause), the necessity for such enrichment should be closely examined, as Occam’s razor suggests. This paper will investigate the proposal by Coniglio and Zegrean (2012) under which ForceP is claimed to need further articulation. The aim of the paper is to introduce further evidence in favor of that hypothesis, providing novel data from discourse particles that occur directly in the CP area. It will be shown that Italian sentence-initial (adverb-based) particles and Japanese sentence-final particles show striking similarities and yet differ in an interesting way with respect to their syntactic properties. How to capture this cross-linguistic variation by presupposing a split-ForceP will also be discussed.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, the hypothesis proposed by Coniglio and Zegrean (2012) is presented. In sections 3 and 4, the syntactic properties of CP-internal particles are described, and in section 5, a unified analysis for CP-internal particles is provided. Section 6 concludes the paper.

2. Coniglio and Zegrean’s (2012) split ForceP hypothesis
As indicated above, Coniglio and Zegrean (2012) and Coniglio’s subsequent work (2014) propose to split ForceP into two distinct projections, namely ILL (Illocutionary Force) and CT (Clause Type). In this section I will briefly outline this hypothesis. First, however, note that their argument is partly based on observations of discourse particles, which they define as “a particular group of (clause-integrated) discourse elements, with semantic and pragmatic properties similar to those of the class of German modal particles” (Coniglio and Zegrean, 2012:230, fn1). Discourse particles share discourse-related pragmatic functions, and may occupy various positions in the syntactic structure of the

---

¹ However, see Sobin (2004) for arguments against the split CP hypothesis.
Among these elements, a group which occur in the IP zone are often referred to as modal particles (henceforth MPs), especially in German literature, as indicated above. See the following sentence from Bazzanella (1995:226) for a typical example of an Italian MP:

(1) Non siamo poi così lontani dalla verità.

‘We are not that far from the truth, after all.’

Despite their superficial position in the IP layer, MPs have been claimed to have access to the CP zone (cf. Abraham, 1995). As Coniglio (2007) and his subsequent works point out, in the split-CP perspective the interaction of MPs and CP is considered to take place in ForceP, given that MPs interact with both illocutionary force and clause type. That is, on one hand, as originally claimed by Jacobs (1986, 1991), MPs modify illocutionary force—let us consider the following German sentences with various MPs from Coniglio and Zegrean (2012:233):

(2) Ruf die Polizei!
   Call the police
   ‘Call the police!’

   a. Ruf *halt* die Polizei!
   b. Ruf *mal* die Polizei!
   c. Ruf *doch* die Polizei!
   d. Ruf *JA* die Polizei!

   *bloss, nur, etc.*

In (2), while the clause type is imperative in all cases, sentences a-d are lined up in order of the pragmatic strength of the order; that is, the choice between MPs is linked to the nuancing of the phrase. In this way, MPs modify the illocutionary force of a sentence. In the case of (2), the original illocutionary force, which is modified in (2)a-d, is “directive” in Searle’s (1975) definition.

On the other hand, MPs interact with clause type, in that they are not compatible with all clause types (cf. Thurmair, 1987, a.o.). The Italian MP *poi* in (1) can also occur in both wh- and yes/no questions, but not in imperatives.

---

2 See Coniglio (2008) and Cardinaletti (2011) for Italian MPs serving as counterparts to German MPs.
(3) Chi avrà poi telefonato?
   who have.Fut Prt called
   ‘Who called after all?’ (Coniglio, 2008:112)

(4) Ha poi cantato alla festa?
   have Prt sung at.the party
   ‘Did she sing at the party after all?’ (Coniglio, 2008:112)

(5) *Telefonagli poi!
   call.him Prt

A further argument in favor of MPs' access to ForceP comes from their distribution in main and subordinate clauses. According to Haegeman’s (2002) proposal, there are two types of subordinate clause, namely, central adverbials like (6)a and peripheral adverbials like (6)b.

(6) a. If it rains we will all get terribly wet and miserable.
    b. If [as you say] it is going to rain this afternoon, why don't we just stay at home and watch a video? (Haegeman, 2002:117)

The difference between conditional clauses in (6)a-b consists in the way the subordinate clause interacts with the main clause. The subordinate clause in (6)a is a modifier of the event expressed by the main clause, in that it specifies the condition in which the event in the main clause is realized. The subordinate clause in (6)b, on the other hand, is not a condition, but a premise that leads to the question in the main clause. Thus, central adverbials like the one in (6)a are event related, whereas peripheral adverbials like the one in (6)b are discourse related.

Haegeman (2002) claims furthermore that (6)a and b differ with respect to CP structure, in that ForceP is present in the former but absent in the latter. Haegeman (2002:159) schematizes the structure of CP in two types of subordinate clauses and in main clauses as follows:

(7) Central adverbials: Sub Mod Fin
    Peripheral adverbials: Sub Force Top* Focus Mod* Fin
    Root clauses: Force Top* Focus Mod* Fin

Coniglio (2008) argues that MPs can only occur in clauses endowed with ForceP. In fact, beside main clauses, MPs can be employed in peripheral adverbials as in (8)b, but not in central adverbials as in (8)a.

---

3 See Haegeman (2002) and her subsequent works for the extension of this analysis to other types of subordinate clauses.
Therefore, ForceP is fundamental for licensing MPs, which “depend on the clause type for their syntactic licensing and on illocutionary force for their pragmatic and discourse functions” (Coniglio and Zegrean, 2012:237). The existence of two distinct projections in the Force domain is suggested by this twofold way MPs interact with illocutionary force and clause type, as illustrated in (9).4

(9) Twofold link of MPs to the left periphery:
   i. MPs must be compatible with the clause type of the utterance they occur in;
   ii. MPs modify the illocutionary force of the utterance. (Coniglio, 2014:113)

In the following sections, I will examine the interaction of CP-internal discourse particles with illocutionary force and clause type.

3. Sentence-initial particles in Italian
As already mentioned, the syntactic properties of discourse particles vary. In the literature, a variety of particles are claimed to occur in a higher domain than the IP zone (see Law, 2002, for Cantonese; Munaro and Poletto, 2002, for the Veneto dialects;5 see also Poletto, 2002, for MPs occurring in the CP zone in some dialects of Dolomitic Ladin). One class of these particles is verb-based sentence-initial particles in Italian like sai in (10).

(10) *Sai*, non hai mica ragione.
    Prt not you.have at.all reason
    ‘You know, you are not right at all.’ (Cardinaletti, 2015:77)

The particle precedes left-dislocated elements like *su questa questione* in (11), which occur in TopicP. The position of sai in the clause structure thus must be very high.

---
4 See Coniglio and Zegrean (2012) for ampler evidence in favor of the hypothesis.
5 See Cardinaletti (2011) for a counterargument.
The elements analyzed in this section are adverb-based discourse particles, that is, adverbs such as *tanto* in (12) that have a special interpretation when they occur in sentence-initial position. These elements are typically intonationally integrated in the sentence, whereas verb-based particles such as *sai* are not, as indicated by the commas in (10) and (11) (see section 3.2 for syntactic differences between adverb-based sentence-initial discourse particles and verb-based ones).

(12) *Tanto* non succederà mai.
       Prt not will.happen never
       ‘It will never happen in any case.’

The idea that some sentence-initial adverbs are discourse particles is already hinted at in the literature. Coniglio and Zegrean (2012) suggest that, with other potential candidates such as *almeno* ("at least"), *magari* (maybe) and *proprio* ("exactly"),

\textsuperscript{6} *tanto* may be taken as a discourse particle from a semantic/pragmatic point of view. However, as pointed out by Coniglio and Zegrean, no cartographic works specifically on these elements are available so far. In the following sections I will develop the analysis of Italian sentence-initial particles. The main focus of the study is on *tanto*, although potentially a similar analysis can be applied to other candidates.

### 3.1. Semantic properties of *tanto*

As claimed by Coniglio and Zegrean (2012), the status of *tanto* as a discourse particle in (12) is suggested by its speaker-oriented, pragmatic nature; the particle in fact functions at the utterance level rather than the propositional level, in that its existence does not affect the proposition—the part of the utterance that determines the truth value of the sentence (cf. Bußmann, 2002:542). The semantic contribution of *tanto* is rather a speaker-oriented one, that is, the speaker’s assessment of the proposition. \textsuperscript{7}

\textsuperscript{6} At least some of these particles have already been claimed to have similar pragmatic properties to MPs. See, for instance, Radtke (1985) for *magari* as an *Abtönungspartikel*.

\textsuperscript{7} Sentence-initial discourse particles differ from typical MPs with respect to the assessment of the addressee’s state of knowledge. As pointed out in the literature (cf. Abraham, 2009; Leiss, 2009; Coniglio, 2012, a.o.), MPs often provide information about the speaker’s estimate of the addressee’s assessment of the truth value of the proposition.

(i) a. Haider *soll* betrunken gewesen sein.
       Haider is.supposed.to drunk been be
       ‘Haider is supposed to have been drunk.’
Furthermore, at the grammaticality level, the particle is optional, like MPs (cf. Coniglio, 2008): the sentence in (12) but without *tanto* is perfectly well-formed, as in (13).

(13) *Non succederà mai.*  
    ‘It will never happen.’

Its MP-like function suggests that *tanto* also modifies the illocutionary force of the sentence. Let us consider the following examples:

(14) a. *Tanto cosa ci stai a fare qua?*  
    Prt what there you stay to do here  
    ‘What are you going to do here anyway? (You have nothing to do here.)’

b. *Cosa ci stai a fare qua?*  
    ‘What are you going to do here?’

(14)b can be read as an information-seeking question, although the same sentence may allow for other interpretations, such as the rhetorical one in (14)a. In contrast, (14)a cannot be interpreted as an information-seeking question; it is a rhetorical question, where the illocutionary force is modified by *tanto* and is similar to that in declaratives rather than interrogatives.8

3.2. Syntactic properties of *tanto*

Syntactically, sentence-initial adverb-based particles must be distinguished from verb-based ones such as *sai* in (10):

b. *Haider ist ja betrunken gewesen.*  
    Haider is Prt drunk been  
    ‘Haider IS supposed to have been drunk.’ (Abraham, 2012:91-2)

Epistemic modal verbs like *soll* in (ia) refer to speaker’s assessment of the proposition but not to the addressee’s, whereas MPs like *ja* in (ib) refer to both speaker’s and addressee’s assessment. Sentence-initial discourse particles like *tanto* seem similar to the former, given that they do not convey the speaker’s estimate about the addressee’s state of knowledge. Nevertheless, as discussed below, sentence-initial discourse particles show similar syntactic behavior to MPs. I will leave this issue for future studies.

8 Note that in (14) the clause type is interrogative in both sentences. The mismatch of clause type and illocutionary force is taken to be a piece of evidence for the split-Force analysis in Coniglio and Zegrean (2012).
Sai, guarda, dai, and senti are verb-based particles, derived respectively from the imperative forms of sapere ‘to know’, guardare ‘to look’, dare ‘to give’, and sentire ‘to hear’. As exemplified in (15), adverb-based particles freely co-occur with verb-based particles, keeping the order verb > adverb. In contrast, co-occurrence among the particles of the same type seem to be more limited.

The two types of particle also differ with respect to the relative order of vocatives. As Cardinaletti (2015) points out, verb-based particles obligatorily precede vocatives, unless the particle is separated by an intonational break and constitutes an independent speech act:\(^9\)

\[
\begin{align*}
(16) & \quad \text{a. } \text{Sai, Maria, la mia pazienza è finita.} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{Prt Maria-Voc the my patience is finished} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad ‘\text{You know, Maria, my patience is finished.’ (Cardinaletti, 2015:88)} \\
& \quad b. \quad *\text{Maria, sai, la mia pazienza è finita.}
\end{align*}
\]

Whereas adverb-based particles follow them.

\[
\begin{align*}
(17) & \quad \text{a. } \text{Maria, tanto la mia pazienza è finita.} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad ‘\text{Maria, my patience is finished in any case.’} \\
& \quad b. \quad *\text{Tanto, Maria, la mia pazienza è finita.}
\end{align*}
\]

Note that (17)b is grammatical with an intonational break separating Maria from the remainder. I assume that, as in cases like (16), the order tanto > vocative is possible only when vocatives constitute independent speech acts.

Tanto is a polyfunctional lexeme whose functions include indefinite pronoun and quantitative adjective or adverb functions. The concessive meaning in (12) is linked to its sentence-initial position, as suggested by the contrast in (18).

---

\(^9\) In at least some regional varieties of Italian, Maria can belong to the independent speech act realized by sai as opposed to the second part of the utterance, with an intonational break after it (see Penello and Chinellato, 2008, for a similar analysis of ciò ‘take’ in some dialects spoken in the Veneto region of North Italy). I would like to thank an anonymous reviewer for the observation.
a. Non è il caso di preoccuparsi tanto.
   Not is the case of worry.oneself much
   ‘There’s no need to worry so much.’ (De Mauro, 2000:2677)

b. Tanto non è il caso di preoccuparsi.
   ‘There’s no need to worry, in any case.’

Sentence-internal tanto in (18)a cannot bear a concessive interpretation without an intonational break that separates it and thus, with plain intonation, must be a quantitative adverb. In contrast, sentence-initial tanto in (18)b is a discourse particle. This sentence-initial discourse particle tanto must therefore be distinguished from tanto with other meanings, although they are almost certainly derived from the same lexeme through different grammaticalization processes (see also section 3.3). I take this fact to suggest that sentence-initial tanto does not move from other positions, but is base-generated directly in CP.

As discussed above, tanto modifies the illocutionary force, which is codified in ForceP. Therefore, I assume that the position where tanto occurs is in the Force domain. Some evidence seems to support this analysis. Consider the following sentences, adapted from Giorgi’s (2015:231) study on Left Dislocation (LD) and Hanging Topic (HT):

(19) Tanto a Gianni, Maria non gli ha dato un bellissimo regalo.
   Prt to Gianni Maria not to.him have given a beautiful present
   ‘To Gianni, Maria did not give a beautiful present after all.’
(20) *Tanto Gianni, Maria non gli ha dato un bellissimo regalo.

Above, a Gianni in (19) is an LD, while Gianni in (20) is an HT. LD and HT are the two major strategies to thematize phrases in Italian (see Cinque, 1977, 1990). As Cinque (1983) observes, HTs occur higher in the sentence structure than LDs; in fact, in (21), an HT Giorgio cannot follow an LD ai nostri amici.

(21) a. Giorgio, ai nostri amici, non parlo mai di lui.
    Giorgio to.the our friends not talk never of him
    ‘As for Giorgio, to our friends, I never talk about him.’
 b. *Ai nostri amici, Giorgio, non parlo mai di lui. (Benincà, 2006:57)

While LDs occupy the Topic position in the CP layer, HTs seem to occupy a higher position than Force. Consider the following sentence:
Sono certa, questo libro, [che non ne abbia mai parlato nessuno].

'I am sure that nobody has ever talked about this book.' (Benincà and Poletto, 2004:65)

In (22) an HT *questo libro* appears in the embedded clause introduced by the subordinator *che* and precedes it. Although for some speakers it is difficult to accept the sentence in (22), for those who do accept it, the order HT > *che* cannot be inverted.

Given that subordinators are considered to occupy the leftmost position in the CP structure of an embedded clause, as illustrated in (7), HTs indeed occur in a higher position than the CP layer (cf. also Poletto, 2002):

(24) HT > (Sub) > Force > LD

Thus, the fact that *tanto* can precede LD in (19) but not HT in (20) suggests that the position occupied by *tanto* is within ForceP.

Notice however that there exist cases in which *tanto* seems to appear in a lower domain of CP. See the following sentences where *tanto* follows an LD topic *il libro* (I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for the examples):

(25) a. (Credo che) *tanto* il libro non lo leggerai mai.

'I believe that you won’t read the book in any case.'

b. (Credo che) *il libro*, *tanto*, non lo leggerai mai.

However, in sentences like (25)b, *tanto* is obligatorily used parenthetically. I assume,

---

10 See Cinque (1977:410) regarding the claim that HTs cannot occur in embedded contexts.  
11 Nevertheless, *tanto* can also follow LDs like *a Gianni* in (19):

(i) A Gianni, *tanto* Maria non gli ha dato un bellissimo regalo.

A possible account for this fact is that in a case like (i) the topic *a Gianni* is in the scene-setting position described by Benincà and Poletto (2004), which occurs higher than the usual LDs.  
12 Notice that the examples are embedded to avoid the hanging topic reading.
thus, that these are cases in which *tanto* is not fully integrated (see also (17)b and (18)a).\(^{13}\)

An indirect piece of evidence for sentence-initial particles in ForceP comes from their close interaction with ForceP, as suggested by distributional properties. *Tanto* is sensitive to clause type, occurring only in declaratives as in (12) or in wh-interrogatives as in (14). It cannot occur in other clause types, such as imperatives.

\[
(26) \quad *\text{Tanto lascia lo sul tavolo.} \quad \text{Prt leave it on the table}
\]

Furthermore, *tanto* only occurs in embedded clauses endowed with ForceP.\(^{14}\) Consider

\[
(i) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. Ma, guarda, hai fatto cadere il vaso!} \\
& \text{But look you have done fall the vase}
\end{align*}
\]

'Hey, look, you dropped the vase!'

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. Tanto! (Non valeva molto.)} \\
& \text{Prt not was worth much}
\end{align*}
\]

'It's OK (it wasn't worth so much).'

The possibility of isolated use is shared by some Japanese final particles, such as *ne*. Note that *ne* in (ii) is read with falling intonation; with rising intonation, the sentence would be paraphrased as 'you know?'.

\[
(ii) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. Kyoo atu-sugi-nai?} \\
& \text{Today hot too not}
\end{align*}
\]

'It's too hot today, isn't it?'

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. Ne!} \\
& \text{Prt}
\end{align*}
\]

'I know!'

While the analysis in this paper is limited to cases in which the particles are syntactically and prosodically integrated, their use in isolation should be further investigated in future studies.

\(^{13}\) Yet another case in which *tanto* is not integrated in the sentence when used as a discourse particle is when it is used in isolation (thanks to an anonymous reviewer for the example).

\(^{14}\) This is another characteristic of *tanto* not shared by verb-based particles, which cannot occur in any embedded contexts.
the following contrast:

\[(27)\]

a. \[Se \ tanto \ non \ capisco \ quello \ che \ sto \ leggendo,] \[
\text{if Prt not I understand that that I stay reading why}\]
\[\text{studio I’ hangul?}\]
\[I study the hangul}\]
\[‘If I don’t understand what I’m reading, why I’m studying hangul?’\]

b. \[Se \ (*tanto) \ non \ so \ quello \ che \ sto \ leggendo,] \[
\text{if Prt not I know that that I stay reading you It}\]
\[\text{chiedo.}\]
\[I ask}\]
\[‘If I don’t understand what I’m reading, I will ask you.’\]

The embedded clause introduced by se ‘if’ in (27)b is event related and thus has a reduced CP, while the one in (27)a is discourse related and has a full-fledged CP. \textit{Tanto} can occur only in sentences like (27)a.

### 3.3. Licensing MPs and \textit{tanto}

Summing up the observations made in previous sections, Italian MPs and sentence-initial adverb-based discourse particles have quite similar properties:

- a) they both modify illocutionary force;
- b) they both are sensitive to clause type; and
- c) they both can occur only in sentences endowed with ForceP.

As discussed in section 1, these observations suggest that MPs have access to ForceP; I further assume that sentence-initial particles like \textit{tanto} have access to ForceP in the same way MPs do. In the literature, a covert movement at LF has often been presupposed to account for the link between MPs and ForceP (cf. Abraham, 1995; Coniglio, 2007).\textsuperscript{15} In the following, I will sketch very briefly Zimmermann’s (2004:560ff) covert movement analysis on German MP \textit{wohl}, a typical example of which is presented as (28).

\[(28)\]

\[\text{Das hat er wohl nicht gewollt.}\]
\[it have he Prt not wanted}\]
\[‘I guess that’s not what he wanted.’ (Weydt and Hentschel, 1989:3)\]

The semantic contribution of \textit{wohl} in declaratives is to express the uncertainty of the speaker with respect to the proposition (see Zimmermann, 2004, for a more detailed discussion of the MP status of \textit{wohl}). Therefore, in (28) \textit{wohl} modifies the illocutionary

\textsuperscript{15} See Bayer (2012) and Coniglio and Zegrean (2012) for a more detailed feature-based alternative account.
force of the sentence and, roughly, turns an assertive into an assumption.

The distribution of *wohl* is restricted to declaratives like (28) and interrogatives like (29); the particle is banned from other clause types, such as imperatives like (30).

(29) Hat Hania *wohl* auch ihre Chefin eingeladen?

has Hania Prt also her boss invited

‘What is your guess: Did she or didn’t she invite her boss?’

(30) *Sei *wohl* still!

be Prt quiet (Zimmermann, 2004:546)

Given these properties, Zimmermann assumes that *wohl* at LF moves to the specifier position of ForceP, whose head position is occupied by one of the privative features *decl* (declarative), *int* (interrogative), and so on. According to this analysis, *wohl*, which in overt syntax occurs in VP as in (31)a, moves covertly to SpecForceP and enters into a Spec-Head-agreement relationship with Force⁰ as in (31)b.

(31) a. \[\text{ForceP } \text{decl } \text{TopP } \text{Hein } [\text{FinP } \text{ist } [\text{VP } \text{wohl } [\text{VP } \text{auf See}]]]]\].

Hein is Prt at sea

‘Hein is presumably at sea.’

b. \[\text{ForceP } \text{wohl } \text{decl } \text{TopP } \text{Hein } [\text{FinP } \text{ist } [\text{VP } \text{t } [\text{VP } \text{auf See}]]]]\]

Note that (31) is simplified from Zimmermann’s (2004:562) original analysis. More specifically, in his proposal, privative features like *decl* determine the “epistemic reference point,” which is “that discourse participant (speaker, addressee, or both) whose epistemic state or knowledge is under discussion” (Zimmermann, 2004:546). The epistemic reference point of *wohl* (i.e., the one who assumes) is determined under agreement between the clause type and *wohl*—since declaratives have speakers as an epistemic reference point, in the case of (31) it is the speaker. Thus, the modification to the illocutionary act triggered by *wohl* is illustrated as ASSUMEspeaker. However, as Zimmermann (2004) himself points out, this analysis is not compatible with particles like *ja*, which take both speaker and addressee as epistemic reference points and indicate the speaker’s awareness of the addressee’s state of knowledge, while the shared properties of MPs discussed in section 2 strongly suggest that they should be analyzed in a unified fashion. Therefore, to extend the analysis on *wohl* to MPs in general, I adopt the ideas that i) MPs covertly move to SpecForceP and ii) MPs are licensed by the clause type features codified as privative operators by means of agreement (see Coniglio, 2007:137, for a similarly simplified analysis).

Once the modification of illocutionary force is identified by the covert movement, it is combined with illocutionary operators determined by clause type, such as ASSERT for assertions or *?* for questions. In (31), the illocutionary operator is ASSERT, since the
clause type is declarative. The modified interpretation of (31) is illustrated by Zimmermann (2004:562) as follows:16

(32)  ASSERT (ASSUME)

Note that (32) captures the fact that in (31) the otherwise assertive proposition (that Hein is at sea) is toned down by inserting *wohl*, which conveys that the proposition is an assumption made by the speaker. It is crucial for the present study that this interpretation is obtained in a two-step fashion, namely, covert movement to SpecForceP and then combination with the illocutionary operator.

As mentioned, I am assuming that licensing of *tanto* takes place in the same way as that of MPs. I therefore postulate that *tanto* is generated directly in the position to which MPs move, namely SpecForceP. Following the model proposed by Zimmermann, the structure of declaratives with *tanto* like (12) can then be illustrated as follows:

(33)  [ForceP Tanto decl [TP non succederà mai]].

In (33), *tanto* occurs in the specifier position of ForceP headed by a clause type operator *decl*. Now, if we tentatively describe the modification applied to the illocutionary force by *tanto* as CONCEDE, the modified interpretation of (12) would be as follows:

(34)  ASSERT (CONCEDE)

Similarly, in interrogatives like (14)a, *tanto* in ForceP agrees with *int*, and then modifies the illocutionary force, ?, giving rise to the rhetorical interpretation.

(35)  [ForceP Tanto int [FocP cosa [VP ci stai a fare qua]]]?  (36)  ? (CONCEDE)

If we analyze *tanto* and MPs in a unified way, a problem should arise: why can *tanto* occur directly in ForceP, while MPs cannot? Zimmermann (2004) claims that German MPs cannot move overtly in ForceP because of their residual adverbial property, due to which overt movement to ForceP would violate the V2 restriction. However, given that MPs also do not move overtly to ForceP in non-V2 languages like Italian (see the ungrammaticality of (37) with the same interpretation as (1)), this analysis should be revised.

(37)  *Poi non siamo così lontani dalla verità.

A possible account here is that *tanto* and MPs are given rise to by different processes.

16 (32) is simplified from its original version in Zimmermann (2004:562), as in the case of (31).
Evidence supporting this idea is that *tanto* and MPs also differ in distribution with respect to their adverbia
counters, in that the former can co-occur with its homophonic quantitative adverb, as in (38), whereas the
latter cannot, as in (39).

(38) *Tanto* non è il caso di preoccuparsi *tanto*.
Prt not is the case of worry.oneself much
‘There’s no need to worry so much, in any case.’

(39) ‘*Gianni, cos’ ha poi fatto poi?*
Gianni what he.has Prt done then
‘What did Gianni do later? (I am wondering)’ (Cardinaletti, 2011:506)

As Ormelius-Sandblom (1997) observes, this restriction on MPs is because speakers feel that MPs and
the corresponding adverbs are still related. If so, it is possible that speakers will not also feel that way
about *tanto*, because of the two different processes that derived the respective elements.

Furthermore, Cardinaletti (2011)\textsuperscript{17} claims that the way of grammaticalization traditionally
presupposed (such as the one in Abraham, 1991) is valid only for MPs without adverbial counterparts.
MPs with corresponding adverbs have undergone a synchronic process that derives a “deficient” adverb in
the sense of Cardinaletti and Starke (1999), that is, an MP, from a strong adverb. Crucially, Cardinaletti
(2011:510) claims that deficient elements move obligatorily from their first merge position.\textsuperscript{18} Hence,
if we assume that *tanto* is base-generated in SpecForceP position, it would not be a deficient adverb and
therefore would not arise from the same process as MPs do. No studies on the grammaticalization of
Italian sentence-initial particles are available so far, however.

To sum up, in this section I discussed pragmatic and syntactic properties of Italian sentence-initial
discourse particle *tanto*. It was shown that *tanto* and MPs have a number of similar characteristics,
from which we can hypothesize that *tanto* occurs in the specifier position of (unsplit) ForceP and
interacts with both clause type and illocutionary force. In section 5, I will refine the analysis in (35)-(36)
within a split-ForceP view integrating data from Japanese, which will be introduced in the next section.

4. Sentence-final particles in Japanese
The rich variety of Japanese sentence-final particles (henceforth FPs) has been studied predominantly in
terms of their pragmatic functions (see Cheng, 1987; Kinsui and Takubo, 1998; among many others),
while a series of works by Endo (2010, 2012, 2014) addresses them in the cartographic framework; in fact, the idea that
Japanese FPs can

\textsuperscript{17} See Grosz (2005) for ‘the same conclusion on the basis of syntactic and semantic
observations’ (Cardinaletti, 2011:494); see also Coniglio (2005).

\textsuperscript{18} See Cardinaletti and Starke (1999) for a detailed discussion on deficient elements.
be taken as a piece of evidence for split-ForceP is already found in Endo (2012). In the following sections I will develop Endo’s view and show that some Japanese FPs should be treated on a par with *tanto* and thus with MPs, while they also differ from each other in a minimal but interesting way. In the present study I will follow Endo (2010) and focus on three typical FPs, 19 namely *wa*, *yo*, and *ne*. I will also point out that typical FPs have heterogeneous properties from both semantic and syntactic points of view, and only *ne* and *yo* should be treated on a par with *tanto* and MPs.

4.1. Semantic properties of FPs

Coniglio and Zegrean (2012:241, fn14) consider that Japanese FPs “differ in their syntax, and perhaps also in their semantic/pragmatic functions, from the discourse particles we consider.” 20 However, while they do indeed differ in their syntactic properties (but not as much as one might imagine from surface syntax), at least some Japanese FPs do not differ in their semantic/pragmatic functions from German/Italian MPs. Consider the following imperative sentences:

(40)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Kaeri-nasai <em>na</em>.</td>
<td>'Go back home!'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Kaeri-nasai <em>ne</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Kaeri-nasai <em>yo</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Kaeri-nasai <em>ttara</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sentences in (40) are arranged in order by strength of command, as in (2). 21 As this reflects, Japanese FPs modify the illocutionary force, while they usually leave the clause type intact. Hence, I assume that some FPs interact with ForceP in the same fashion MPs do. In the following sections, I will describe the main semantic/pragmatic properties of Japanese FPs based on Endo (2010).

4.1.2. *Wa*

The particle *wa* is one of the ‘gender’ particles, 22 employed only by one sex (cf. Ide and

---

19 Endo analyzes also *sa*, which is presumed to occur in the same position as *wa*.
20 Coniglio and Zegrean (2012) here follow Nasu (2012). As will be discussed, the overall analysis in this study is compatible with Nasu’s observations.
21 As Coniglio and Zegrean (2012) admit for (2), this may be a simplification of empirical facts. Nevertheless, it is crucial here that both German (and Italian) MPs and Japanese FPs turn sentences with the same clause type into sentences with slightly different illocutionary force.
22 Note that *wa* has a homophonous dialectal particle in Kansai dialects, which is pronounced with falling intonation, while ‘gendered’ *wa* is pronounced with rising intonation. The use of the
Yoshida, 1999 and references cited there). *Wa* indicates that the speaker is a woman, or a man who pretends to be a woman, as opposed to masculine counterparts such as *zo*. See, for instance, the following sentences:

(41) Kore kara issyookenmei yaru *zo.*
    now from one’s best do Prt
    ‘I will do my best from now on. I strongly insist.’ (Ide and Yoshida, 1999:463)

(42) Kore kara issyookenmei yaru *wa.*
    ‘I will do my best from now on. I mildly insist.’

These particles fall into the Japanese word category called *yakuwarigo* ‘role language’—‘a set of spoken language features (such as vocabulary, grammar and phonetic characteristics) that can be psychologically associated with a particular character type. (Character's attributes include age, gender, occupation, social status, appearance and personality.)’ (Kinsui and Yamakido, 2015:30; cf. also Kinsui, 2007, 2011). I thus assume that the nuancing in (41) and (42) takes place because of the (stereo)typical image of a manly/girly character and that the pragmatic function of gender particles is essentially different from that of MPs or *tanto*. As shown in the following discussion, the syntactic behavior of the respective particle types seems to confirm this conclusion.

4.1.2. Yo

*Yo* is a polyfunctional element whose exact meaning is subject to wide discussion (cf. Matsuoka, 2003). While generalization of the functions of *yo* is beyond our scope here, it is relevant to the present study that *yo* is typically employed in contexts where the speaker believes that the state of her knowledge is better than the addressee’s (cf. Hayano, 2011). *Yo* is thus impossible in a context like that in (43).

(43) Genki-ga nai yooda (*yo’dwa*).
    spirit-Nom Neg look Prt
    ‘You do not look fine.’ (Endo, 2012:407)

The addressee’s condition of health is not, or hardly ever, information with which the speaker is more familiar than the addressee herself. *Yo*, being a ‘reportive-style’ particle
dialectal *wa* is also common among young speakers who are not native speakers of Kansai dialects, due to ‘dialect cosplay,’ that is, the phenomenon where speakers use (fake) dialects as a sort of word play (cf. Tanaka, 2011; Heinrich, 2018).

23 It is noteworthy that different elements of Japanese role language do not have homogeneous syntactic properties (see for instance Sadanobu, 2007, for *kyarajoshi* ‘character suffix’ and *kyaracopula* ‘character copula’). No specific study on these elements in the generative framework is available so far.
Unlike *wa*, *yo* is an ‘intersubjective’ particle (cf. Onodera, 2014; Shinzato, 2017), which needs a hearer to be utilized felicitously. In fact, *yo* is not possible in a monologue like (43), while a ‘speaker-oriented’ particle that does not need the presence of the addressee, such as *wa*, can occur.

(44)  (To herself)
   a. A, ame-ga futteiru *wa*.
      ah rain-Nom be.falling Prt
   b. “A, ame ga futteiru *yo*.
      ‘Ah, it’s raining.’ (Endo, 2010:90)

4.1.3. Ne
As noted by Endo (2010:80), the main function of *ne* is to allow the speaker to ask for confirmation of a proposition from the addressee: Onodera (2014:110) describes the use of *ne* in (45) as the *confirmation use*.

(45) Kayoobi, gakkoo iku *ne*.
      Tuesday school go Prt
      ‘I’ll go to school on Tuesday.’

*Ne*, like *yo* and unlike *wa*, has an intersubjective property: (45) is not felicitous in the context in which the speaker assumes that the addressee is aware that the speaker will go to school on Tuesday. Another use of *ne* has the same function as the one in (45), yet requires the assessment of the speaker to be that the addressee supposes the proposition to be true.

(46) Samui *ne*.
      cold Prt
      ‘It’s cold, isn’t it?’

---

24 Endo (2010, 2012) considers that the agrammaticality of (43) is because *yo* expresses the speaker’s evaluation of the proposition. However, the speaker’s assessment of the addressee’s state of knowledge plays a crucial role in licensing *yo*; in fact, (43) is significantly more acceptable with a third-person interpretation, probably because the condition of health of someone else can be information accessible only to the speaker:

(i) (Kare *wa*) genki-ga nai youda *yo*.
    he Top spirit-Nom Neg look Prt
    ‘He does not look fine, you know.’
In both cases, the speaker’s assessment of the addressee’s state of knowledge is an important factor for the use of *ne*.

### 4.2. Syntactic properties of FPs

In (40) it was shown that *ne* and *yo* modify the illocutionary force of a clause. Since this characteristic is shared by German/Italian MPs and by *tanto* but not by *wa*, it can be expected that *ne* and *yo* have similar syntactic properties as MPs while *wa* does not. In this section, I will examine the behavior of Japanese FPs from a syntactic point of view in order to test this prediction.

First of all, Endo (2010) observes the linear ordering of FPs: when more than one FP is used, they have to be in a specific order.

(47) a. Iku *wa yo ne.*
   go   Prt Prt Prt
   ‘You will go, right?’
   b. Iku *yo ne.*
   c. *Iku ne yo.*
   d. Iku *wa yo.*
   e. *Iku yo wa.*

Considering the fact that Japanese is a head-final language, Japanese FPs must have the following hierarchy:25

(48) \( Ne > yo > wa \)

In the previous sections we have already seen that the rightmost (thus highest) particles differ from gender particles in their pragmatic function, in that the former are intersubjective, like German MPs. *Ne* and *yo* also pattern with MPs and differ from *wa* in terms of their distribution in embedded contexts: they can only occur in peripheral adverbials. As Haegeman (2002) points out based on a personal communication from H. Maki, in Japanese there are two subordinators that correspond to English *while*: *aidani* introduces a central adverbial clause, whereas *ippoode* introduces a peripheral adverbial clause. *Ne* and *yo* can only occur in embedded clauses introduced by *ippoode* (examples adapted from Haegeman, 2002:169):

---

25 Endo also points out that this hierarchy coincides with Cinque’s (1999) universal hierarchy of clausal functional projections.
Note that some speakers may find (48)a with ne grammatical; for instance, it may sound like the utterance of a child. I assume this is due to the possibility that the particle is employed in its interjection use (cf. Masuoka and Takubo, 1992). In the following I do not consider this usage of ne and yo.

In contrast, the distribution of gender particles like wa is more restricted. The only embedded clauses that can host these particles are the ones introduced by Hooper and Thompson’s (1973:473-4) ‘class A’ verbs (say, report, etc.) with the subordinator to.

The relative order with complementizers supports the idea that the FPs’ locus is in the Force domain, like that of tanto too. Saito (2012:172) shows that three Japanese complementizers, to, ka, and no, head three different projections in CP, as illustrated in (51), where Report is the projection in which elements employed for ‘paraphrases of quotes’, such as que in Spanish (cf. also Plann, 1982), occur.

Ne and yo occur between ka and to, which can be taken as evidence that FPs are in

This distribution is similar to that of politeness markers such as -mas- (cf. Miyagawa, 2012). Nevertheless, gender particles cannot occur in a reason-clause introduced by kara ‘because’, which allows -mas-.

(i) a. Hanako-ga ki-mas-u kara, uti-ni ite-kudasai.
Hanako-NOM come-MAS-PRES because home-at be-please
‘Because Hanako will come, please be at home.’ (Miyagawa, 2012:99)
b. Hanako-ga kuru (*wa) kara, uti-ni ite-kudasai.
Hanako-NOM come PRT because home-at be-please
Gender particles like wa cannot co-occur with no or ka, while they have to precede to.

(i) Hanako-wa Taroo-wa kaetta (wa) to (*wa) itta.
ForceP.28

(52) Hanako-ga sonna tokoro-ni iku no ka ne to omou.
Hanako-Nom such place-to go Nom Q Prt that think
‘I wonder if Hanako would go to such a place.’

Nonetheless, ne and yo differ from MPs and tanto with respect to sensibility to the clause type: they freely co-occur with various clause type markers, as observed by Nasu (2012:203).

(53) a. Suguni ik-u ne.
soon go-Decl Prt
‘I’m going soon.’

b. Suguni iki-nasai ne.
soon go-Imp Prt
‘Go soon!’

c. Suguni ik-oo ne.
soon go-Exh Prt
‘Let’s go soon.’

d. Suguni iku-ka ne.
soon go-Q Prt
‘Are you going soon?’

This property of ne and yo again contrasts with wa, whose distribution is limited to declaratives.29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hanako-Top</th>
<th>Taroo-Top</th>
<th>went.home</th>
<th>Prt</th>
<th>that</th>
<th>said</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Hanako said that Taroo went home.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 Another possible analysis is that to, like Spanish que, is in Haegeman’s (2002) Sub(ordinator)P, which is higher than ForceP. It is crucial to this analysis that FPs never follow elements occurring above Force.

29 Each gender particle occurs in different clausal types. For instance, a male particle ze can also be used in exhortatives:

(i) Suguni ik-oo ze.
soon go-Exh Prt
‘Let’s go soon!’
(54) a. Suguni ik-u wa.
b. *Suguni iki-nasai wa.
c. *Suguni ik-oo wa.
d. *Suguni iku-ka wa.

Summing up, the Japanese FPs examined in this section can be divided into two groups, namely CP-internal discourse particles (*ne and *yo) and gender particles (wa, ze). Given that the former but not the latter largely share their properties with German MPs, in the following I will refer to *ne and *yo as FPs and focus on them. Nevertheless, wa’s sensitivity to clause type, shown in (54), should also be investigated and accounted for in future studies.

4.2.1. On sentence-initial *ne and *yo

*Ne and *yo can occur sentence-initially.

(55) Yo/*Ne, are-wa henda zo.
   Prt that-Top strange Prt
   ‘Hey, that’s strange.’ (Endo, 2014:13)

Endo (2014) suggests that this position is similar to that of German, Italian and Romanian CP particles. In fact, in (55) the particles precede the element with topic marker wa, which is considered to be in the CP domain. In this section, however, I will show that the sentence-initial particles occupy a distinct, higher position than FPs, and that therefore syntactically they do not represent one and the same element as FPs.

Cardinaletti (2011, 2015) analyzes Italian verb-based particles such as sai in (10), which can also occur in both sentence-initial and sentence-final positions, and argues that they are two different elements both from semantic and syntactic points of view. For instance, a discourse particle *guarda has two different meaning depending on its position: the main function of sentence-initial *guarda is to gain the attention of the addressee, whereas sentence-final *guarda reinforces the utterance 30 (cf. Bazzanella, 1995:230-31, Cardinaletti, 2015:78):

30 Notice that under certain circumstances the differences between sentence-initial particles and sentence-final ones can be very unclear. The possible conditions that play a role are prosody, regional variety, and the presence of elements such as other discourse particles, negation, etc. Nevertheless, I follow Cardinaletti’s (2015) claim that the two types of particles are semantically different, since, generally, sentence-initial *guarda tends to have the request for attention reading, whereas sentence-final *guarda tends to have the reinforcement of utterance reading.
(56) a. [Giving directions to a friend]
   Guarda, non puoi sbagliare.
   Prt not you.can make.a.mistake
   ‘Look, you can’t get wrong.’

   b. No, te lo meriti, guardat.
   No yourself it deserve Prt
   ‘No, you deserve it (I’m convinced).’

As a result, these usages have different distributions: sentence-initial guarda, but not the sentence-final one, can occur in all-new-information sentences.

(57) A: Cos’è successo?
   What-is happened
   ‘What’s happened?’

   B: a. Guarda, non ci crederai. Maria ha chiamato e ci ha
   Prt not it will.believe Maria have called and us have
   invitato al workshop.
   invited to.the workshop
   ‘Look, you won’t believe it. Maria called and invited us to the workshop.’

   b. *Non ci crederai, guardat. Maria ha chiamato e ci ha invitato al workshop.
   (Cardinaletti, 2015:78)

Distributional properties also suggest that the two guardas have a different status: sentence-initial guarda can occur in an interrogative sentence, while sentence-final guarda cannot.

(58) a. Guarda, sei pronto?
   Prt you.are ready
   ‘Look, are you ready?’ (Cardinaletti, 2015:79)

   b. *Sei pronto, guardat? (Cardinaletti, 2015:73)

Quite similar observations can be made about the Japanese particles. While sentence-final nel' yo like in the sentences in (53) reinforces the utterance, sentence-initial nel' yo in (59) solicits the attention of the addressee.

(59) [On assistant driver’s seat]
   Nel’ Yo, kono miti-de atturu no?
   Prt this way-with right Q
   ‘Hey, is this the right way?’

Ne, at least, has a similar distributional asymmetry to Italian verb-based particles: sentence-initial ne can occur in all-new contexts, whereas sentence-final ne cannot.
Sentence-final *yo* is compatible with all-new contexts, however, as in (60), probably because it is a reportive particle (cf. section 4.1.2).

(60) A. Nani-ga atta no?  
     what-Nom happened Q  
     ‘What happened?’

   B. a. Ne, sugoi yo. Taroo-ga hitori-de zenbu tabetyatta.  
        Prt extraordinary Prt Taroo-Nom by.oneself all ate  
        ‘Hey, it’s crazy. Taroo ate it all by himself!’

   b. *Sugoi yo ne. Taroo-ga hitori-de zenbu tabetyatta.

In some cases, sentence-initial *yo* is less acceptable without an FP (see *zo* in (55)), whereas sentence-final *yo* is completely acceptable.

(61) a. Are-wa henda yo.  
     ‘That’s strange, you know.’

   b. ?Yo, are-wa henda.

Finally, sentence-initial *ne* and *yo* cannot co-occur, suggesting that they occupy the same position.

(62) a. *Ne yo, are-wa henda zo.  

   b. *Yo ne, are-wa henda zo.

Notice that *ne* and *yo* can co-occur in sentence-final position, as in (47)b. Given these properties, I assume that sentence-initial particles are not the FPs moved from their original position.

Furthermore, sentence-initial particles occupy a higher position than FPs. Consider the following sentence adapted from Takita (2014:137):

(63) Taroo-ga katta *ne yo, ano hon-Ø.  
    Taroo-Nom bought Prt that book  
    ‘Taroo bought that book, you know.’

In (63) a right-dislocated object without case marker (pseudo-right dislocation in Takita’s term) follows the FP. As Takita (2014) discusses, following Taguchi (2009), this type of construction behaves in quite a similar way to bare topics, like the one in (64), which also follow sentence-initial particles.

(64) *Ne Yo, ano hon-Ø, Taroo ga katta zo.
One of the similarities between the two phenomena is that both pseudo-right dislocated elements and bare topics are restricted in the main clause. Consider the following sentences (examples adapted from Takita, 2014:139, 142; see his paper for discussions with wider evidence):

   Prt
   ‘Hanako thinks that Taroo bought, that book.’


Takita (2014) claims that the properties of pseudo-right dislocation and bare topicalization can be captured by presupposing that the former derives from the latter as a result of the fronting of a whole sentence that is in a lower position than the bare topic. This derivation is illustrated as (66), with the addition of ne and yo (cf. Takita, 2014:142).

(66) a. \[\alpha\text{bare-topic} [\beta \ldots \Delta_i \ldots V \ldots ne/yo]\]

   b. \[[\beta \ldots \Delta_i \ldots V \ldots ne/yo] [\alpha \text{bare-topic}] t_6\]

Since the pseudo-right dislocation follows sentence-final ne/yo, as in (66)b, its original position must be higher than theirs, as in (66)a. In contrast, since the bare topic follows sentence-initial ne/yo, as in (64), its original position must therefore be lower than theirs. Thus, if we follow Takita and assume that the bare topic and the pseudo-right dislocation occupy the same position, the hierarchy would be as follows:

(67) Sentence-initial ne/yo > bare topic/pseudo-right dislocation > sentence-final ne/yo

Since both FPs and tanto are considered to be in the Force domain (cf. sections 3.2 and 4.2), the position occupied by Japanese sentence-initial particles would then be higher than that of tanto.

In the following section I will concentrate on FPs; I will leave the further investigation of sentence-initial particles to future studies.

5. Licensing CP-internal particles
In this section I revisit the analysis in section 3.3 from the Split-ForceP perspective, which shows that it captures the cross-linguistic observations made in the present study.\(^{31}\) In

\(^{31}\) Note that the analysis in this section is not intended as an alternative to the feature-based one in Coniglio and Zegrean (2012) and does not exclude other accounts based on different theoretical assumptions.
the previous sections I examined properties of German and Italian MPs, Italian *tanto*, and Japanese FPs. See Table 1 for a summary of characteristics found with these particles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MPs</th>
<th><em>Tanto</em></th>
<th><em>Ne, yo</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base-generated in CP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modification of illocutionary Force</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restriction to main clause</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity to clause type</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Properties of Italian MPs, *tanto*, and Japanese FPs

In section 3.3, I adopted Zimmermann’s (2004) covert movement analysis of MPs and applied it to *tanto* as in (33) and (34), repeated below as (68) and (69).

(68) \([\text{ForceP} \ Tanto \ decl \ [TP \ non \ succederà \ mai]]\).

(69) \(\text{ASSERT (CONCEDE)}\)

Crucially, *tanto* is derived in two steps: it is base-generated in SpecForceP as in (68) and then semantically modifies the illocutionary operator as in (69). Its sensitivity to clause type is captured by postulating an agreement with a privative clause type operator.

In section 4 I claimed that Japanese FPs also occur in the Force domain, since they largely share properties with MPs and *tanto*. It is, however, impossible to analyze them with the model illustrated above, as they are not sensitive to clause type and thus agreement does not take place; the licensing of Japanese FPs and *tanto* must instead come about in two slightly different ways. As will be shown below, I adopt Coniglio and Zegrean’s (2012) split-ForceP model and assume that Japanese FPs occur in ILLP, while *tanto* in CTP.

Extending Zimmermann’s analysis within a Split-Force scenario, I assume the structure of a sentence with *nel* *yo* is as follows:

(70) \([\text{ILLP} \ [\text{CTP} \ [\text{VP} \ Suguni \ ik] \ -u] \ ne \ assert]\)

According to Endo (2014), CTP in Japanese is headed by inflectional markers like *-u* in (70) instead of privative elements like *decl* in (68). In (70) I tentatively postulate that illocutionary force is codified as a privative operator like *assert(ion)* for declaratives, which can be modified by FPs in the SpecILLP position.
Italian adverb-based sentence-initial particles such as *tanto* agree with the CT head, in a Spec-Head relationship, since they are sensitive to clause type. I therefore assume that *tanto* is base-generated in the specifier position of CTP as in (71)a. Since *tanto* has to modify the illocutionary force of the clause in the same way as *yo* and *ne*, it then moves to SpecILLP as in (71)b.

(71) a. [ILLP assert [CTP *Tanto* decl [TP non succederà mai]]].
    b. [ILLP *Tanto* assert [CTP t_i decl [TP non succederà mai]]].

6. Conclusions
In the present study I examined CP-internal discourse particles and their interaction with the Force domain, focusing on Italian and Japanese. After presenting Coniglio and Zegrean’s (2012) proposal to split up ForceP, I described the properties of an Italian particle *tanto* and showed that it shares a number of characteristics with MPs. Then, I observed that Japanese FPs also have quite similar properties, but some of them do not share the sensitivity to clause type. Finally, I proposed an account based on Zimmermann’s (2004) covert movement analysis of MPs and modified it within the split ForceP hypothesis, which captures the homogeneity and the differences among CP-internal discourse particles in Italian and Japanese.
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