Roussou, Anna

Expanding of the left

Linguistica Brunensia. 2017, vol. 65, iss. 2, pp. 7-20

ISSN 1803-7410 (print); ISSN 2336-4440 (online)

Stable URL (handle): https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/137678
Access Date: 17. 02. 2024
Version: 20220831

Anna Roussou

EXPANDING ON THE LEFT

Abstract

In this paper I discuss the particle ande in Greek as a discourse element that expresses the speaker's attitude towards the utterance, building on work on its Romanian counterpart hai/haide. *The background assumption is that ande anchors the utterance to the speech event. It is shown that it can modify an imperative, a subjunctive, a pu-clause, or an adverbial/PP expression. Assuming that there is a Speech Act layer in the uppermost part of the left periphery, it is shown that ande realizes a predicative position in that layer. The different readings it gives rise to are derived on the basis of the utterance it embeds. Since there is no event structure in that layer, the elements that realize the Speech Act position are 'defective' in both inflectional and thematic terms.*

Keywords

left periphery; speech acts; discourse; particles; predicative

1. Introduction

Unclassified elements, often characterized as 'particles' or 'discourse-markers', raise at least two questions: the first one concerns their feature content, call it their 'micro-structure'; the second one concerns their position in the clause structure. The answer to both questions has implications for the way we view the syntax-lexicon, on the one hand, and the syntax-discourse interface, on the other hand. The micro-structure of these 'particles' can be viewed in terms of their morphological make-up, while their syntactic position has been treated in the context of cartographic approaches. With respect to the latter, Haegeman – Hill (2013) argue that elements of this sort manifest the "syntacticization of discourse", and assume that there is a Speech Act layer on the very top of the left periphery. The Speech Act shell was introduced by Speas – Tenny (2003) and has been adapted in various recent approaches (see for example Miyagawa 2010, Heim et al. 2016).[1] This shell

1 See also Giorgi (2010) and Coniglio – Zegrean (2012) for splitting up Force to accommodate the speaker and the hearer features.

introduces the discourse participants (e.g., speaker, hearer), in a way similar to the vP-shell which introduces the event participants (theta-roles).

Discourse particles may originate from all sorts of different syntactic categories. Some of them derive from verbs. For example, Cardinalletti (2015, 73) discusses the discourse markers *guarda* (> *guardare* 'to look'), *senti* (> *sentire* 'to listen'), *sai* (> *sapere* 'to know') in Italian, as in the following examples:

(1) a. *No, te lo meriti,* guarda.
'You deserve it, look. (I'm convinced.)'
b. *Non hai mica ragione,* sai.
'You are not right, you know.'
c. *Fa quello che ti dico,* senti.
'Do what I tell you, listen.'

These forms show 2nd person singular or plural agreement, as is the case with imperatives; they may also exhibit 3rd person singular, which is the honorific form in Italian.

Another case of V-based particles is discussed by Haegeman – Hill (2013) who analyze the West Flemish (WF) elements *nè(m)* (> *nemen* 'take'), *wè* (> *weet je/wil je* 'know you/will you'), *zé/zè* (> *zien* 'see'), and Romanian *hai* (> Turkish *hajde* 'come/go') and *lasă* (> *lăsa* 'allow/let'). They assume that these elements are 'expressive' (after Kratzer 1999), 'conversational', and 'deictic' (i.e., anchored to the speech event), and argue that they realize a Speech Act position, above ForceP (the highest C head). Both approaches argue for a syntactic analysis of V-based particles, on the grounds that they may show inflection, selectional requirements, and sensitivity to clause-typing.

The goal of the present paper is to offer further empirical support to the syntactic analysis of (V-based) discourse particles, by focusing on the properties of Greek *ande*, as in (2), which happens to have a distribution similar to its Romanian cognate *hai*. A detailed presentation of *hai* (and its variant *haide*) is given in Hill (2008, 2014). The two main readings of *hai* are 'injunctive' and 'expressive' (E-). As an injunctive, *hai* enhances the imperative, while in its E-reading it can be evaluative, epistemic, or evidential. The following examples show similar readings for the Greek *ande* (or *ainde*). Throughout the paper, I will gloss *ande* as such, following in this respect the glossing practice of Haegeman – Hill (2013):

(2) a. *Ande fije*!
ande leave.IMP.2SG
'C'mon leave!'
b. Ande na fijis!
ande SUBJ leave.IMP.2SG
'C'mon leave!'

c. *Ande, efije.*
ande left.3SG
'OK, he's gone!'

In (2a) and (2b) *ande* is injunctive, roughly translating as 'c'mon', while in (2c) it is expressive. In (2a) the main verb is in the imperative mood, while in (2b) it is introduced by the 'subjunctive' particle *na*. Both Romanian *hai/haide* and Greek *ande* have a core meaning 'go/come' and are (possibly) etymologically related to the Turkish *hajde* (see also Bulgarian *hadje/adje*; Tchizmarova 2005).

In what follows, I will present the Greek data, in comparison to the Romanian ones in section 2, and then offer an approach that takes into consideration the predicative property of *ande* in section 3; finally, section 4 will conclude the discussion.

2. The particle *ande*: distribution

Before we introduce the relevant empirical data with *ande*, some background assumptions need to be spelled out. First, I take 'particle' to be a cover term for a range of elements that ultimately reduce to well-known syntactic categories (Zwicky 1985). Second, I assume that discourse particles "are used in order to organize the discourse by expressing the speaker's epistemic attitude towards the propositional content of an utterance, or to express a speaker's assumptions about the epistemic states of his or her interlocutors concerning a particular proposition." (Zimmermann 2011, 2022). Under this definition, discourse particles relate a situation to the discourse participants (e.g., speaker, hearer/addressee).

Let us start our discussion with a brief presentation of Romanian *hai* (Hill 2008, 2014). In terms of form, *hai* has a variant *haide*, and two inflected forms, *haide-ţi* (2nd plural) and *haide-m* (1st plural). In terms of syntax, it selects an imperative verb, a subjunctive (a *să*-clause), a complement *că*-(that)clause, or an adverb/PP. Finally, in terms of meaning it can be injunctive (see (3a)) or expressive (see (3b)), as mentioned above.

(3) a. *Hai să citim.*
hai SUBJ read.1PL
'C'mon, let's read.'
b. *Hai că este nemaipomenit.*
hai that is unbelievable
'It is unbelievable, really.'

Haegeman – Hill (2013), adopting and adapting Speas – Tenny (2003), provide the structure in (4), where the lower SA (Speech Act) head involves the hearer/addressee, and the higher one (*sa*) involves the speaker of the utterance:

(4) $[_{saP}$ [*sa*] $[_{SAP}$ VOCATIVE $[_{SA}$ *hai*] $[_{FORCEP}$ Utterance/ *că* ...]]]

The two main readings that *hai* receives depend not only on its structural position but also on the type of complement it selects; more precisely, whether it embeds an imperative/*să*-verb or a *că*-clause.

Bearing the above in mind, let us now consider Greek *ande*. The following examples show its inflectional options:

(5) *ande* + imperative V:

a.	*Ande*	*klise*	*tin porta*.
	ande	close.IMP.2SG	the door
b.	*Ande*	*kliste*	*tin porta*.
	ande	close.IMP.2PL	the door
c.	*Ande(s)te*	*kliste/*klise*	*tin porta*.
	ande.2PL	close.IMP.2PL/IMP.2SG	the door
	'Go close the door/C'mon, close		the door!'

(6) *ande* + *na*-(subjunctive)-V

a.	*Ande na*	*klisis/klisete*	*tin porta*.
	ande SUBJ	close.2SG/2PL	the door
b.	*Andeste na*	*klisete/*klisis*	*tin porta*.
	ande.2PL SUBJ	close.2PL/2SG	the door
	'Go close the door/C'mon close the door!'		

As shown above, *ande* has an inflected form *ande(s)te*, which exhibits the *-te* ending (or *-ste* in some variants) of 2nd person plural of imperatives, as in *klisete/kliste* 'you(plural) close'. The form *ande* seems to bear the *-e* ending of the 2nd person singular of imperatives, as in *klis-e* 'you(sing) close'. What we observe is that the *andeste* form is possible only when the imperative verb or the surrogate imperative (*na*+indicative) also inflects for number. If the main verb is in the singular form, *ande* is the only option. The pattern we get is *ande*–$V_{SG/PL}$, *andeste*–V_{PL}, **andeste*–V_{SG}. If *ande* itself is treated as an imperative form, then the examples in (5) show what looks like a sequence of two imperatives.

It is interesting to note that this pattern is found with other discourse markers, such as the verb *ela* 'come':

(7) a.

Ela	*pes*	*mu*.
come.IMP.2SG	tell.IMP.2SG	me
'C'mon, tell me.'		

b. *Elate* *pite* *mu*.
come.IMP.2PL tell.IMP.2PL me
'C'mon, tell (plural) me.'
c. **Elate pes mu*. (*plural – singular)

Joseph (1990) points out that the sequence of verbs in (7) looks like a serial verb construction. However, it has a restricted distribution, since the first verb can only be in the imperative and the second one either in the imperative or in the *na*-form. He then argues against a serial-verb construction, also on the basis of (8) where instead of an imperative verb we find the preposition *ja*:

(8) a. *Ja* *pes* *mu*.
for tell.IMP.2SG me
'So, tell me.'
b. *Ja* *na* *mu* *pis*.
for SUBJ me tell.2SG
'So, tell me.'

Ela in (7) is the imperative of the verb *erxome* 'come'. Note that the verb *erxome* has a complete inflectional paradigm, unlike *ande*. *Ja* in (8) is a preposition, and interestingly it can also enhance an imperative/subjunctive.[2]

The next pattern has *ande* with an indicative form in a declarative or an interrogative clause, or a clause introduced by the complementizer *pu*:

(9) a. *Ande, efije* *epitelus!*
ande left.3SG finally
'OK, he finally left!'
b. *Ande, ti* *kanis?/* *jati* *arjis?/* *pote* *tha* *fijis?*
ande, what do.2SG/ why be.late.2SG/ when FUT leave.2SG
'C'mon, what are you doing?/Why are you late/When are you leaving?'
c. *Ande, fevghume*?
ande, leave.1PL
'C'mon, are we leaving?'
d. *Ande pu* *ine* *eksipnos!*
ande that is smart
'C'mon, that he's smart!' (negative implicature: of course he's not)

In the above examples, *ande* expresses the speaker's attitude towards the utterance it embeds: relief (9a), impatience (9b-c), or an evaluation (9d). All these readings

2 We also find *ja* with an NP complement, as *ja ena lepto* 'wait a second!'. For a discussion of its Romanian equivalent *ia*, see Hill (2014, Ch. 5).

fall under the E-reading that Hill (2008, 2014) also provides for Romanian *hai*. We should note two things about (9d): first, there is no pause between *ande* and the rest of the clause, and second, the *ande pu* construction triggers a negative implicature. If negation were present, as in *Ande pu dhen ine eksipons!*, there would be a positive implicature. *Ande* in this context expresses the speaker's certainty about the content of the proposition, to such an evaluative extent, that it triggers the reverse implicature. Finally, this pattern is only possible with the complementizer *pu*, and not with *oti* (which is also a declarative complementizer). At this point, it suffices to say that *pu* introduces relatives and factive complements (of emotive predicates in particular).

The particle *ande* may also occur with adverbs or PPs (in particular directional), as in (10), or in isolation, as in (11):

(10) a. *Ande pali.*
ande again
'Go again' or 'There we go again (i.e. not again)!'

b. *Ande sti dhoulia su.*
ande to-the work yours
'C'mon, go to your work!'

(11) a. *Ande!*
'Go!'/'Really?'

b. A: *O Kostas kerdhise to laxio.*
the Costas won.3SG the lotto
'Costas won the lotto.'
B: *Ande!*
'Really?!'

The example in (10) can have an injunctive reading, or an E-reading (evaluative); the two readings have different prosodies. The injunctive reading has the prosodic pattern of an imperative, while this not the case with the E-reading. An injunctive reading is also found in (10b). These uses are only available with directional PPs, or adverbials/PPs that express repetition (as in (10a)). In (11), *ande* stands for an utterance and here as well it may have an injunctive ('go') or an E-reading of surprise, disbelief, etc., as in (11b).

There is a final context where *ande* is found, which is quite different from what we have seen so far. More precisely, *ande* may co-ordinate two measure phrases, as in (12):

(12) a. *Tha ine 30 ande 35 xronon.*
FUT is 30 *ande* 35 years.GEN
'She must be 30, at most 35, years old.'

b. *To psari afto itan 5 ande 7 kila.*
the fish this was 5 *ande* 7 kilos
'This fish was 5, at most 7, kilos.'

Ande in these examples introduces the upper limit of a quantity. Although *ande* does not modify the utterance, it still implies an evaluative reading. So according to the speaker's view the person described in (12a) must have been at most 35 years old, and similarly, the fish described in (12b) must have weighed 7 kilos at most.

To summarize the discussion so far: the particle *ande* shows an inflected form which matches the imperative plural (2nd person); the plural form must agree with a plural verb. Romanian *hai/haide* has an inflected form for 2nd person plural (*haideți*) and 1st person plural (*haidem*). The readings of *ande* also seem to match those of Romanian *hai*. In the injunctive reading, it enhances the imperative or the *na*-clause (request, command, etc.). In the E-reading it evaluates the utterance, expressing the speaker's certainty, surprise, disbelief, or it evaluates the quantity of a degree phrase (denoting the uppermost point). In the following section, I will consider the syntactic positioning of *ande* in relation to the other particles that occur in the left periphery.

3. The syntactic properties of *ande*

3.1 The position of ande

Let us start with the position of *ande* in the clause structure. As the examples below show, *ande* is (predominantly) clause-initial:[3]

(13) a. *Ande klise (*ande) tin porta (*ande).*
ande close.IMP.2SG *ande* the door *ande*
b. *Ande na klisis tin porta (*ande).*
ande SUBJ close.2SG the door *ande*
'Go/C'mon close the door!'

3 Cases where *ande* seems to occur in clause-final position are (possibly) construed as two separate utterances:

(i) a. *Klise tin porta! Ande!*
b. *Na klisis tin porta! Ande!*

In any case, only the E-reading is available in (i). Note that when a *pu*-clause is selected, despite the E-reading, *ande* must precede. See also HILL (2014, Ch. 5) on Romanian *hai*.

c. *Ande pu ine eksipnos* (**ande*).
ande that is smart ande
'C'mon that he is smart!'

d. *Ande pali* (**ande*).
ande again *ande*
'Go again!' or 'There we go again (i.e. not again)!"

e. *Ande sti dhulia su* (**ande*).
ande to-the work yours *ande*
'C'mon, go to your work!'

Related to its clause-initial position is the fact that it precedes the (so-called) modal particles. For example, in (13b) it precedes the 'subjunctive' particle na. It also precedes the 'future' marker tha and the 'hortative'/'optative' as (glossed as such), as in (14):

(14) a. *Ande tha fighume.*
ande, FUT leave.1PL
'C'mon, we will leave.'

b. *Ande as fighume.*
ande, AS leave.1PL
'C'mon, let's leave.'

Note that in combination with tha, ande can only give rise to an E-reading, while with as, the reading is necessarily injunctive.

At this point it is useful to provide a brief discussion of the position these modal particles occupy. I will assume that they occur in the left periphery (Roussou 2000, 2015). These three elements (*as, na, tha*) share a number of properties, namely, they form a cluster with the verb, they precede clitics (PRT+Cl-V), and take fully inflected verbal forms, excluding the imperative. At the same time, they differ. In particular, as and na take negator min (as/na min-V), while tha is negated by dhen (*dhen tha*-V) – the non-modalized negator. Furthermore, as, like the imperative form of the verb cannot be embedded, while na can itself introduce an embedded clause; finally, tha can only occur in an embedded context provided a complementizer (declarative or interrogative) is present. On these grounds, the argument is that tha is in the lower C responsible for mood/modality (cf. Fin), while as, but also na, occupies a higher C, responsible for the intensionality of the clause (cf. Force); this high C is also targeted by the imperative verb.

Despite the fact that tha and as occupy different positions in the left periphery, they share a further property, that of having a verbal base. More precisely, tha is a reduced form of the verb *thelo* 'want', while as is also a reduced imperative form (*ase* > *as*) of the causative verb afino 'let' or 'leave', as shown below:

(15) a. *As ton dhis.* [Particle]
HORT him see.2SG
'You may see him.'
b. *As ton! / Ase me!* [Imperative]
'Leave him!' / 'Leave me!'
c. *As ton na fiji.* [Causative construction]
let him SUBJ leave.3SG
'Let him leave!'

The above examples show that as shows a distribution as a particle taking a finite verbal form as its complement (excluding the imperative), as in (15a), but may also occur as an imperative main verb, as in (15b-c).

In short, the particles as and tha are argued to occupy distinct positions in the left periphery, as in (16):

(16) a. [C_I *as*/V-imperative [C_M [I ...]]]
b. [C_I [C_M *tha* [I ...]]]

The higher position, realized by as, is also the one targeted by V-movement in imperatives (see also the enclisis pattern in (15b)).[4] The position of na is a bit more debatable, as it is not only a modal particle in matrix clauses, but also introduces complement clauses, in the contexts where we find the infinitive in Romance and Germanic. For present purposes it suffices to say that it is situated in a high position in the left periphery. Unlike as, tha occurs in embedded contexts, provided there is a complementizer present. Since these elements modify properties associated with the verbal predicate, the idea is that they form part of the V-chain. In other words, they form part of the extended chain of the verb, since they realize grammatical properties associated with the verb (Roussou 2015). Therefore the V-chain in this case has two positions spelled-out: the higher one with the modal particle, and a lower one in I/T with the verb. Being part of the V-chain, these particles share the argument structure of the verb and have a grammatical (auxiliary-like) status.[5]

Let us now see whether the similarities of ande with as would support the former's analysis along similar lines. More precisely, the question is whether ande also realizes grammatical properties associated with the main verb, in a way similar to as for example. The answer seems to be negative. This is so for a couple of reasons. First, as we have already seen, ande may co-occur with as (cf. (14b)). This favours the analysis of ande as an element in an even higher position. Second, ande may

4 Greek *as* has a different distribution from its Romanian counterpart (*las)*, which behaves more like *haide* (see Hill (2014, Ch. 5) for a discussion.

5 *Na* is situated in the left periphery but is not part of the V-chain; it interacts with the arguments of the verb, as in control contexts.

also embed a clause introduced by the complementizer pu (cf. (9d)). Finally, ande may embed imperatives but also other types of complements, such as PPs or adverbs. Assuming that the latter may define an utterance, they support the view that ande modifies an utterance and is situated in a high position, above the 'typical' left periphery of the clause.

Bearing the above observations in mind, we are in a position to consider the properties of ande as an element that realizes the Speech Act head, as also argued for Romanian hai by Hill (2008, 2014).[6] The suggested structure is then the following:

(17) $[_{SA}$ *ande* $[C_I$ *as*/V-imperative $[C_M$ *tha* [I ...]]]]

The question that arises is what exactly the properties of this Speech Act head are. Speas – Tenny (2003) argue that the Speech Act head is a predicate. Similarly, Hill (2008) argues that it is defined as [+V, -N]. For present purposes, it suffices to assume that SA is a predicative head; further categorial specification may not be relevant or easily defined. To be more precise, ande could be arguably considered as a verbal element, on the basis that it may inflect as verbs do in the plural imperative. Going back to the structure in (17), it is worth mentioning that ande cannot be negated, thus supporting the view that it is situated very high in the clause structure, outside the projections associated with the proposition.

On the other hand, a verbal property cannot be assigned to other elements that behave like ande. Recall the case of the preposition ja in Greek, which may also introduce an imperative form, as in (8). To this we can add more examples, as the ones in (18a), which alternate with other imperatives as in (18b):

(18) a. *Krima/kala* [*pu* *dhen* *efijes*].
shame/good that not left.2SG
'Shame/Good (that) you did not leave.'

b. *Ela/* *sopa* [*pu* *dhen* *to* *prolaves*].
come.2SG/ be.quiet.2SG that not it catch.2SG
'C'mon that you did npt catch it!' (Positive implicature: of course you did!)

To the extent that imperative forms like *ela/sopa* in (18b), but also (speaker-oriented) adverbs in (18a), can assume a Speech Act function, the conclusion seems to be

6 In fact Hill (2014) assumes a Speech Act shell, where the lower SA head is associated with the Hearer (SAH) and the higher one with the Speaker (SAS). In this configuration, the hearer is the indirect argument in Spec, SAHP, while the utterance it embeds is the direct argument in the complement position of SAH head. For present purposes, I adopt a simpler structure, without subscribing to a full cartographic approach, on the assumption that the different readings of *ande* are not independent of the complement it takes.

that in principle any category that qualifies as a predicate (verbal, nominal, prepositional) can realize the Speech Act head, that in turn embeds an utterance.

Two questions arise at this point. The first concerns the status of ande and the like as predicates, in comparison to the predicates that form part of the proposition. The second concerns the presence of inflection, typically for imperative, on these verbal elements. Let us start with the first question. Being identified as Speech Act elements, they basically lack argument structure in the typical sense. More precisely, the only argument structure they bear relates to the discourse participants (pragmatic-roles) and the utterance and not to the event participants (theta-roles). This also explains why they are associated with the speaker and the hearer, excluding third person participants. This property assigns them a rather 'defective' status in terms of argument structure, as they can only assigning pragmatic roles, as opposed to theta roles.

The second question concerns the inflection they may show. With respect to ande and the other verbal forms that we have seen so far (also for Romanian hai) inflection is restricted to the imperative affix associated with 2nd person (singular/plural) (or possibly allocutive agreement). Does this suffice as evidence that there is an I position above the SA head? Postulating an I position would turn the relevant predicate into a propositional one, assuming that I is the position where the EPP is also satisfied. Would that be an option? If the answer is positive, then we would have to account for the limited inflectional properties these elements carry. If the answer is negative, we still need to account of its presence (and the potential agreement with the main predicate). Note that inflection shows up word-internally, as below:

(19) $[_{SA}$ *ande* – I]

To the extent that the morphological structure is visible to syntax, the phi-features that inflection carries are read off and are allowed to agree where relevant (recall the plural-plural pattern with andeste-V sequences). There is an alternative view regarding the 'apparent' inflection (suggested to me by an anonymous reviewer), namely that this is an instance of allocutive agreement of the kind discussed by Miyagawa (2012). This is indeed a viable option that should be further explored in future work. In any case, lack of any projections associated with the temporal reference of the SA predicate accounts for the lack of eventive and propositional properties.

Related to the above is another question: why is it usually the imperative forms of verbs that seem to be more amenable to qualifying as SA heads? Note that, as shown by Fagard (2010) on Romance, this pattern is independently attested. In order to answer this question we need to consider the positioning of imperatives in the clause structure. At least in Greek (and Romance) they occupy a position high

in the C domain (C_I). So the verb in this form raises beyond its canonical position in I; this is supported by the enclitic pattern in imperatives vs. the proclitic pattern in indicatives, among other things. Being in the uppermost periphery of the clause, imperatives can further 'move' outside the clause, into what we have assumed to be the SA head. This kind of movement is consistent with the path of 'grammaticalization' in the sense of Roberts – Roussou (2003), with implications for the syntactic status of the elements involved. Specifically, as long as they are in the left periphery, they remain part of the extended V-chain. If they embed the utterance that contains the proposition, then they acquire a discourse-oriented status. This allows us to view the following three steps:

(20) a. A lexical verb: an imperative.
b. A functional verb: part of the V-chain (two verbs essentially, as with as).
c. A V-based discourse element.

In the final case, verbs may retain the imperative morphology or simply reduce to a verbal stem, further depending on the morphological restrictions of the language in question (i.e. whether it allows for free stems or not).

Having discussed the syntactic status of ande, extending it to other elements that behave alike, let us briefly consider the readings it gives rise to. Whether the reading is injunctive or expressive depends on the form of the utterance (e.g., imperative vs. *pu*), the intonation (prosody) and the context (see also Haegeman – Hill 2013). In this respect, the various readings are not as such intrinsic to *ande*. This allows us to maintain a 'lighter' cartographic approach, namely one that does not syntactically represent each different reading. The element *ande* seems to retain a core 'come/go' meaning, but its syntactic structure and more precisely, the types of complements it takes determine its discourse properties and the range of readings. Since the two basic readings (injunctive vs. E-reading) are also prosodically marked, future research should take this property into consideration as well.[7] At a very first approximation, we can note that the injunctive reading patterns with imperatives in terms of prosody. To this, we should add the role of ande in co-ordinating measure phrases. Once we treat ande as a predicate, we can outline an account of this use as well. In particular, as a predicate it takes the two measure phrases as its arguments. Its evaluative reading defines the first one as the low point of the scale and the second one as the highest point of the scale. Arguably in this kind of construction it does not realize the Speech Act head, but still retains a predicative use with an evaluative reading relating to the speaker.

7 On the relation between discourse particles and intonation, see Heim et al. (2016).

4. Concluding remarks

In this paper, I have considered the discourse particle *ande* in Greek, drawing on the analysis of its Romanian counterpart *hai*. The particle in question takes a range of complements, most typically imperatives/subjunctives (*na-clauses*), but also a pu-clause, adverbials, PPs, as well as NPs (measure phrases). The two basic readings are the injunctive (mainly with the imperatives and subjunctives) and the expressive/evaluative. On the basis of its distribution, *ande* realizes a Speech Act head, that is, a predicative head which takes the utterance and the two discourse participants as its arguments. Its defectiveness in terms of inflectional properties and argument structure follows from this property. It was further pointed out that this analysis may extend to other imperative forms of verbs, as well as to the preposition *ja* and some speaker-oriented adverbs, thus offering a wider coverage of empirical data.

REFERENCES

Cardinaletti, Anna. 2015. Italian Verb-based Discourse Particles in a Comparative Perspective. In: Bayer, Joseph et al., eds. *Discourse-Oriented Syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 71–91.

Coniglio, Marco – Zegrean, Iulia. 2012. Splitting Up Force. Evidence from Discourse Particles. In: Lobke, Aelbrecht et al., eds. *Main Clause Phenomena: New Horizons*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 229–256.

Fagard, Benjamin. 2010. É vidha, ola...: Imperatives as Discourse Markers and Grammaticalization Paths in Romance. A Diachronic Corpus Study. *Languages in Contrast* 10(2), pp. 245–267.

Haegeman, Liliane – Hill, Virginia. 2013. The Syntacticization of Discourse. In: Folli, Rafaella et al., eds. *Syntax and Its Limits*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, pp. 370–390.

Heim, Johannes et al. 2016. Intonation and Particles as Speech Act Modifiers: A Syntactic Analysis. *Studies in Chinese Linguistics* 37(2), pp. 109–129.

Hill, Virginia. 2008. Pragmatic Markers as Syntactic Heads: A Case Study from Romanian. In: Grohmann, Kleanthes – Panagiotidis, Phoevos, eds. *Selected Papers form the 2006 Cyprus Syntasfest*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 237–265.

Hill, Virginia. 2014. *Vocatives. How Syntax Meets Pragmatics*. [With the contribution of Melita Stavrou]. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Joseph, Brian D. 1990. On Arguing for Serial Verbs (with Special Reference to Modern Greek). In: Joseph, Brian D. – Zwicky, Arnold, eds. *When Verbs Collide: Papers from the Ohio State Mini-Conference on Serial Verbs. OSU Working Papers in Linguistics* 39, pp. 77–90.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1999. *Beyond 'ouch' and 'oops': How Descriptive and Expressive Meaning Interact*. Paper presented at the Cornell Conference on Theories of Context Dependency.

Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2010. *Agreements That Occur Mainly in the Main Clause*. Paper presented at the Main Clause Phenomena workshop. Ghent University/GISt, September 2010.

Nicholas, Nick. 2010. A Turkish Etymology for Both α and σιχτίρ; Blog: *Hellenisteukontos*. http://hellenisteukontos.blogspot.gr/2010/06/turkish-etymology-for-both-and.html

Roberts, Ian – Roussou, Anna. 2003. *Syntactic Change. A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roussou, Anna. 2000. On the Left Periphery: Modal Particles and Complementizers. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 1, pp. 65–94.

Roussou, Anna. 2015. Is Particle a (Unified) Category? In: Bayer, Joseph et al., eds. *Discourse-Oriented Syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 121–158.

Speas, Peggy – Tenny, Carol. 2003. Configurational Properties of Point of View Roles. In: di Sciullo, Anna Maria, ed. *Asymmetry in Grammar: Vol. I Syntax and Semantics*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam, pp. 315–344.

Tschizmarova, Ivelina. 2005. Hedging Functions of the Bulgarian Discourse Marker *xajde*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37(8), pp. 1143–1163.

Zimmermann, Malte. 2011. Discourse Particles. In Maienborn, C. et al., eds. *Semantics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 2011–2038.

Zwicky, Arnold, M. 1985. Clitics and Particles. *Language* 61(2), pp. 283–305.

Anna Roussou
University of Patras
Department of Philology
26504 Rion, Greece
aroussou@upatras.gr