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1. Introduction

German Modal Particles (henceforth, MPs) constitute a small class of words (e.g. ja, doch, eben, schon, wohl etc.), very similar to adverbs, which generally “[...] express the speaker’s mental attitude toward or belief about what he or she is saying, i.e. they usually add the speaker’s subjective point of view to the basic meaning conveyed by the utterance” (Coniglio 2006:57).

They are a thorny problem in many respects, mainly as regards their meaning and the pragmatical contexts in which they are used. In recent studies (see Abraham 1995, Ormeliust-Sandblom 1997a,b, Thurmail 1989, etc.), their syntactical behaviour has gained an increasing interest as well.

Given their abstract meaning, they are often difficult to translate. Consequently, since I cannot always give the exact English equivalent of the MPs used in the paper, I will provide the translations of their semantic features as indicated by Thurmail (1989:200) (stressed particles are indicated in capital letters):

bloß (<REINFORCEMENT>), denn (<CONNECTION>, (<UNEXPECTED>_S)), doch (<KNOWN>_H, <CORRECTION>), eben (<EVIDENT>_H, <CONNECTION>), halt (<PLAUSIBLE>_H, <CONNECTION>), ja (<KNOWN>_H), JA (<REINFORCEMENT>), nur (<REINFORCEMENT>, <ENCOURAGEMENT>), schon (<VALIDITY RESTRICTION>), wohl/WOHL (<RESTRICTION>).
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A noteworthy aspect is their distribution both in root clauses, which have been rather well investigated, and in embedded ones, a point that has not been fully looked into yet. Even though we do observe some restrictions in the use of single particles in certain types of clauses (for example, denn can only appear in interrogative clauses), they are – as a class – generally admitted in all types of root contexts. In contrast, their syntactical behaviour in terms of their distribution in embedded clauses is rather puzzling. On the whole, MPs are compatible with most types of subordinate clauses. However, there are a few exceptions and restrictions worth noting, which enable us to draw some important conclusions about their syntactical behaviour in general. Thurmail (1989:73) observes:

Da Modalpartikeln die Illokution eines Satzes verstärken oder modifizieren können, müßte ihr Auftreten in Nebensätzen beschränkt sein.²

It has been argued that since MPs display their effects on the illocutionary field³, they can only appear in embedded clauses endowed with independent illocutionary force. In what follows, I will endorse this hypothesis by taking into account Haegeman’s (2002, 2004, 2006) recent theories about the structure of the left periphery of the clause. She (2002:159) claims that illocutionary force must be ‘anchored’ to a speaker (or a potential speaker) and would be encoded in a functional projection, namely Rizzi’s (1997) ForceP, which contains information about the type of clause (interrogative, declarative, etc.) and also about its illocutionary force. This projection would be present in root clauses as well as in embedded clauses with root properties (complements of non-factive predicates and ‘peripheral’ adverbials), given that they have an illocutionary force of their own, but not in complements of factive predicates and in what she calls ‘central’ adverbials, where Force is instead ‘unanchored’.⁴

². ‘Since MPs can strengthen or modify the illocution of a clause, their occurrence in embedded clauses should be restricted’.

³. See Thurmail (1989:2), who claims that each MP modifies illocutionary types in a specific way.

⁴. In this case, it is the ‘associated’ root clause that would be anchored to the speaker. It is worth pointing out that Haegeman (2002:118) prefers to use the term ‘associated clauses’ because ‘matrix clauses’ would be inappropriate in the case of ‘premise-conditionals’ (see next section) and peripheral adverbials in general, since they constitute propositions on their own and do not depend syntactically on the matrix sentence.
I will then provide some evidence for a link between the presence of MPs and that of Force in subordinate clauses with root properties. I will claim that embedded clauses lacking ForceP (complements of factive verbs, central adverbials and restrictive relative clauses) cannot license MPs. In the fourth section, I will analyse the data by postulating a covert movement of MPs to ForceP.

2. Force affecting the internal and external syntax of the clause

Haegeman (2002, 2004, 2006) starts her analysis by claiming that there are two kinds of conditionals. Let us consider the following sentences, taken from Haegeman (2002:117):

(1)  

   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?

The proposition in (1a) contains a sequential relation between the event expressed in the embedded conditional clause and the consequence in the main clause. In this case, we speak of ‘event-conditionals’. On the other hand, the conditional in (1b) is discourse-related, a ‘premise-conditional’, because it expresses a premise that leads to a question in the ‘associated clause’.  

On the basis of several syntactic and semantic properties, firstly she proposes that the two types of clause present a different structure with regard to their external syntax. In particular, they would differ in their relation to the ‘associated clause’, i.e. event-conditionals would be more embedded than premise-conditionals. The first would belong to the class of central adverbials, thus being merged in the IP of the matrix clause (probably adjoined to vP or to an AspP, see Haegemann 2000:131), while the latter would be adjoined to the CP of the associated clause and they are, therefore, peripheral adverbials. Cf. Haegeman (2002:132):

   In derivational terms, the conditional clauses differ in the timing of the merger with the associated clause. Central adverbial clauses such as event-conditionals are inserted in (or merged with) the associated clause early on

---

5. See fn. 4 for the use of the expression ‘associated clause’.
in the derivation of the sentence. Specifically, they are merged before IP is completed. Peripheral adverbial clauses such as premise-conditionals are merged after the associated CP has been projected.

The different timing of the merger would correlate with many semantic, pragmatic and syntactic properties. Principally, event-conditionals are part of the speech act of the matrix clause, while premise-conditionals have their own illocutionary force. That is, in the latter case we have two different speech acts.

Haegeman then extends her hypothesis of a differentiated external syntax of conditionals to all adverbial clauses, by providing some tests (mainly of syntactical nature), which permit to distinguish between central and peripheral adverbials.

At a second stage, she suggests that the internal syntax of the CP-domain of the two types of clauses is different as well, which is of greater interest to our discussion. In particular, her assumptions are based on the theories by Rizzi (1997, 2001, 2004), who proposed the following structure of the left periphery of the clause:

\[(2) \text{ Force Top}^* \text{ Focus Mod}^* \text{ Fin}^6\]

Starting with the observation of the behaviour of fronted arguments and adjuncts in English and other languages, she takes on and develops the structure proposed by Rizzi (1997, 2001) by arguing that the CP-domain is extended more in peripheral adverbials (and root clauses) than in central adverbials. The latter would contain less functional structure, being truncated above ModP, as illustrated here:

\[(3) \begin{array}{l}
\text{a. Central adverbials:} \quad \text{Sub} \quad \text{Mod} \quad \text{Fin} \\
\text{b. Peripheral adverbials:} \quad \text{Sub} \quad \text{Force} \quad \text{Top}^* \quad \text{Focus} \quad \text{Mod}^* \quad \text{Fin} \\
\text{c. Root clauses:} \quad \text{Force} \quad \text{Top}^* \quad \text{Focus} \quad \text{Mod}^* \quad \text{Fin} \\
\end{array}\]

Haegeman (2002:159)\(^7\)

---

\(^6\) Here, I leave aside the lower TopP postulated by Rizzi (1997) for Italian.

\(^7\) In the current paper, I will not address the issue of the correct position of the projection Force or, as Haegeman (2006:1662f) calls it in later works, SD (‘speaker deixis’), which is not entirely agreed upon in the literature, as evident by the difference between examples (3) and (4). See Haegeman (2002:162f) for alternative analyses. Notice further that she postulates the existence of two very high projections, namely
The fact that complement clauses can involve more or less functional structure, too, was already known. Thus, following Haegeman (2004, 2006), factive complements would have an impoverished structure with respect to non-factive complements:  

(4) a. Non-factive complements: \( \text{that} \) (Top)(Focus) Force Mod* Fin  
b. Factive complements: \( \text{that} \) Mod* Fin

Haegeman (2004:171)

According to Haegeman, the left periphery of central adverbials (and of other reduced embedded structures, such as factive complements) is truncated because no Force projection is present in these contexts. It would therefore lack the speaker-related projections. There would be neither FocusP nor TopP available, whose presence would directly depend on the activation of ForceP (Haegeman 2002:160ff).

In contrast to these reduced structures, full embedded clauses and root contexts have a projection ForceP, which encodes their illocutionary force and clause type. This means that not only root contexts but also full embedded clauses constitute independent illocutionary speech acts.

More precisely, the presence of ForceP correlates with the possibility of anchoring Force to the speaker. See Haegeman (2002:159):

I propose that the presence of the functional head Force […] directly correlates with what is referred to as ‘illocutionary force’, the fact that the speaker takes on the proposition as part of a speech act (assertion, prediction, question, etc).

Therefore, not all clause types permit the anchoring of Force to the speaker. The author continues:

---


---

8. A similar proposal could also be put forward for relative clauses, since restrictive contexts seem to involve less structure than non-restrictive clauses (Haegeman 2002:166).
To be licensed, Force, being about speaker commitment, must be anchored to a speaker or a potential speaker. This means that clauses with Force are unembedded (i.e. they don’t merge with a head) or they merge with a verb which can encode a speaker, i.e. a source of Force. Root clauses are anchored to the speaker by default. Complement clauses of verbs of speech are also anchored to a speaker, the subject of the selecting verb, and by extension clauses under other bridge verbs where the subject of the selecting verb is a ‘potential speaker’. Central adverbials, which are not selected by the relevant predicate, do not provide a link between Force and a speaker. I assume that in such adverbial clauses, the abstract head Force is not licensed because there is no connecting path to a speaker, and Force is unanchored.

Haegeman (2002:159f)

According to Haegeman, root clauses and certain types of embedded clauses, namely those displaying root properties, have independent illocutionary force, which must be anchored to a speaker. In the next section, I will provide some evidence that MPs can only occur in these contexts, since not only do they have connections to the illocutionary force of the clause, but they also require its anchoring to the speaker.

3. Modal particles in embedded clauses

In the following, I will survey some occurrences of MPs in the main types of embedded clauses (complements, adverbials and relative clauses) with no claim to exhaustiveness. Needless to say, a more refined classification of embedded clauses would be necessary in some cases.

Notice that, although MPs in root contexts are included in the final analysis of the data, I will not take them directly into consideration in what follows, since they are well attested in all illocutionary types (declaratives, interrogatives, imperatives, etc.).

Before starting my analysis, I would like to draw attention to the fact that in the following examples (mainly taken from the literature on the topic), I will not systematically investigate the occurrences of each MP in every clause type. The issue I want to address here is the compatibility restrictions of MPs as a class. For example, I will argue that MPs can occur in indirect questions, since this is true, say, for the
particle *denn*, although this is not the case for *ja*, which is only compatible with assertive illocutionary force.

### 3.1. Complement clauses

Thurmair (1989:74ff) makes a distinction between complement clauses depending on *verba dicendi* and the other types of complement clauses. She suggests that MPs can only occur in the first group. The fact that all particles are admitted in reported (indirect) speech can be easily proved. However, one should probably draw finer distinctions within the residual class, because MPs are not only attested in complement clauses selected by *verba dicendi*, but also in clauses embedded by verbs of a different type, as evidenced by the following examples:

(5) Mir fällt gerade ein, daß Hans *ja* längst hier sein müßte. (Borst 1985:105)
   ‘I just remembered that Hans should actually have been here a while ago.’

(6) Er glaubte, daß sie es *schon* schaffen würde. (Ormélius-Sandblom 1997a:82)
   ‘He thought that she would certainly make it.’

(7) Und das bedeutet, daß sie dir *wohl* kaum nach Rom folgen wird […]
    (Métrich et al. 2002:345)
   ‘And that means that she will hardly follow you to Rome.’

Rather, as we will see, MPs seem to be banned from the class of complements of factive predicates. Since these clauses contain a fact, whose truth is presupposed, there is no place for the expression of the speaker’s point of view. Therefore, they clearly do not display an illocutionary force of their own⁹, in contrast to non-factive complements and indirect questions, which generally admit the presence of MPs. Parenthetically, it is worth noting what Haegeman (2002:159f) points out in this respect:

Complement clauses of verbs of speech are […] anchored to a speaker, the subject of the selecting verb, and by extension clauses under other bridge verbs where the subject of the selecting verb is a ‘potential speaker’.

---

This means that, these clause types are not necessarily anchored to the speaker of the (whole) sentence, but may also be anchored to a ‘potential speaker’ (the speaker in the imagined or reported context), that is to the subject of the selecting verb in the matrix clause (for example, er ‘he’ in (6)).

In the following sections, I will distinguish factive and non-factive clauses and indirect questions. I will demonstrate that MPs can occur in all types of complement clauses except for factive ones, since they lack Force.

3.1.1. Non-factive complement clauses

Complements of non-factive predicates have illocutionary force and represent a speech act on their own (Haegeman 2004:170f). Thus, they admit the presence of MPs, as illustrated by the following examples:

(8)  Mir ist eingefallen, daß Natassja ja verheiratet ist.  (Meibauer 1994:135)
    ‘I remembered that Natassja is actually married.’

(9)  Ich denke, daß wir das Problem schon lösen werden.  (Borst 1985:114)
    ‘I think that we will somehow solve the problem.’

(10) Schröder hat gesagt, dass die SPD wohl Unterstützung verdient.  (Zimmermann 2004a:13)
    ‘Schröder said that the SPD actually deserves support.’

3.1.2. Factive complement clauses

Factive complements depend on a predicate that presupposes the truth of their propositional contents. Since they consist of undisputable facts, they cannot have independent illocutionary force. Adopting a syntactical analysis à la Haegeman (2002, 2004, 2006), we could argue that they lack the projection ForceP. Therefore, we would expect MPs to be banned from this type of clauses. This prediction is borne out, as illustrated by the following examples:
(11) Es stimmt, daß Udo (*ja) verheiratet ist. (Jacobs 1986:156)
‘It is true that Udo is actually married.’

(12) * Er leugnete, daß er die Zeugin ja unter Druck gesetzt habe.
(Thurmair 1989:109)
‘He denied having exerted pressure on the witness.’

Nevertheless, we find problematic cases, which only apparently contradict the hypothesis. For example, let us consider the following sentence:

(13) Es ist bedauerlich, daß die Situation an den Hochschulen sich wohl weiter verschärfen wird. (Asbach-Schnitker 1977:47)
‘It is regrettable that the situation at universities will most likely get even worse.’

Actually, the presence of the MP\textsuperscript{10} is due to the fact that the embedded clause is probably not a real factive clause, contrary to some assumptions in the literature. The embedded clause contains a questionable fact, i.e. it is impossible to determine its truth at the time when the sentence is uttered, since it refers to a still uncertain future event.\textsuperscript{11} Furthermore, the subordinate clause conveys a new piece of information, which is by no means presupposed, as is generally the case in factive clauses. The matrix clause es ist bedauerlich (‘it is regrettable’) is almost a synonym for leider (‘unfortunately’), which does not entail that the fact is in any way presupposed, but simply expresses the speaker’s attitude toward what he or she is saying. Therefore, we can claim that the sentence constitutes no counterexample at all. I would then suggest that, despite some problematic cases, MPs are in general excluded from complements of factive verbs, since the latter lack independent illocutionary force.

---

\textsuperscript{10} That is, if we are dealing with a MP at all. Notice that wohl in the example is similar to an epistemic adverb, such as vermutlich ‘probably’. See the discussion in 3.3.1.

\textsuperscript{11} Cf. Asbach-Schnitker (1977:47).
3.1.3. Indirect questions

Since indirect questions are reported questions, they clearly display root properties. In fact, they admit the presence of MPs that are compatible with interrogative illocutionary force, such as denn, wohl, etc. See the following examples:

(14) Ob er wohl noch kommen würde, war ihre letzte Frage.
    ‘If he would probably still come was her last question.’

(15) Er fragte sich, ob er wohl die Prüfung bestehe.
    ‘He asked himself whether he had a chance to pass the exam.’

3.2. Adverbial clauses

In the following sections, I will consider the main types of adverbial clauses. MPs are well attested in most but not all of them, namely they are present in peripheral adverbials, which have the type of illocutionary force typical of root clauses. I will suggest that since locative, temporal and a subset of conditional clauses generally admit no MPs, they probably belong to the class of central adverbials, their Force being ‘unanchored’. However, despite being introduced by the same subordinating conjunctions, since many adverbial clauses sometimes display root phenomena, sometimes do not, it would be necessary to draw a more fine-grained classification of each class of adverbial clauses.

3.2.1. Adversative clauses

Adversative (or ‘contrastive’) clauses admit the presence of MPs, thus displaying root properties. They are often introduced by the grammaticalized subordinating conjunction während (‘while’), which still preserves its original temporal meaning in many cases. Notice that in its temporal reading it structures the event, while in its adversative use it structures the discourse, as illustrated in the following examples:12

(16) (Man nahm immer Holzkeulen), während die Boulette ja [...] wirklich selbst als Sportgerät [...] verwendet worden ist. (Ormélius-Sandblom 1997b:27) ‘(They always used wooden clubs), while the “Boulette” itself was actually used as sports equipment.’

(17) Gestern ist sie den ganzen Tag zu Hause geblieben, während sie doch sonst bei schönem Wetter meistens einen Ausflug macht. (Thurmail 1989:78) ‘She stayed at home all day yesterday, while she usually makes excursions when the weather is fine.’

3.2.2. Causal clauses

MPs can often occur in embedded clauses expressing a causal relation. As pointed out by Thurmail (1989:77f), this indicates that causal clauses possess independent illocutionary force13. See the following examples:

(18) Da ihr ja von diesem Schuljahr an zwei Fremdsprachen hat, könnt ihr diese Sprachen auch miteinander vergleichen. (Weinrich 1993:844) ‘As you will in fact learn two foreign languages this school year, you will also be able to compare those languages with each other.’

(19) Er hat ein schlechtes Gewissen, weil er wohl gelogen hat. (Asbach-Schnitker 1977:48) ‘He has a guilty conscience because he probably lied.’

Interestingly, Asbach-Schnitker (1977:48) observes that, besides typical causal subordinating conjunctions, such as weil, da and so on, we find the same subordinators as in temporal clauses. This would be the result of a grammaticalization process from a

13. This is also proved by the fact the subordinator weil (‘because’) is often used as a coordinating conjunction in the spoken language (Thurmail 1989:78). However, one should probably draw finer distinctions also within this class. See Haegeman (2002:143f), who distinguishes two readings of English because.
temporal to a causal meaning, which affects many temporal subordinators, such as *nachdem* (‘after’), *als* (‘when’) and so on:¹⁴

(20) Nachdem er *ja* immer gesagt hatte, ich könne ihn jederzeit anrufen, habe ich das gestern auch gemacht. (Hentschel 1986:203)
   ‘As he had repeatedly said that I could call him anytime, I did so yesterday.’

### 3.2.3. Concessive clauses

Concessive clauses seem to possess an illocutionary force of their own and admit MPs without particular restrictions. See the following examples:¹⁵

(21) Obwohl es *doch* regnete, packte er alles für das Picknick zusammen. (Hentschel 1986:202)
   ‘Even though it was raining, he still got everything ready for the picnic.’

(22) Er hat die Prüfung nicht bestanden, trotzdem er *ja* recht intelligent ist. (Thurmair 1989:78)
   ‘He did not pass the exam, even though he is actually quite clever.’

(23) Hans hat sich mit Depressionen in seinem Zimmer eingeschlossen, obgleich er das Examen *schon* bestehen wird. (Borst 1985:120)
   ‘Hans locked himself up in his room feeling depressed, even though he will certainly pass the exam.’

---

¹⁴. Cf. also the discussion in 3.2.9. about temporal clauses and Haegeman (2002:142ff) about other ambiguous subordinators.

¹⁵. However, we should maybe distinguish between central and peripheral concessive clauses. Cf. Haegeman (2002:144f) about the different distribution of the English subordinators *though* and *although*: the first is limited to central adverbials, the latter to peripheral ones.
3.2.4. Conditional clauses

Conditional clauses raise some problems. By the observation of the following simple examples, we could claim that MPs cannot occur in this type of subordinate clauses:

(24) *Wenn der Angeklagte wohl der Täter ist, wird er inhaftiert.  
     (Molnár 2002:69)  
     ‘If the accused is the perpetrator, he will be taken into custody.’

(25) ?*Wenn der Smutje wohl betrunken ist, gibt es heute keinen Labskaus.  
     (Zimmermann 2004a:13)  
     ‘If the ship’s cook is drunk, there will be no Labskaus today.’

(26) Wenn es (*schon) regnet, wird die Wäsche wieder naß.  
     (Braüße 1994:112)  
     ‘If it rains, the laundry will get wet again.’

However, as suggested by Haegeman (2002, 2004, 2006), we should distinguish two types of conditional clauses, namely ‘event-conditionals’ (see examples (24)-(26)) and ‘premise-conditionals’. As expected, premise-conditionals and other peripheral conditional clauses display independent illocutionary force, in contrast to event-conditionals, where Force would be ‘unanchored’. Consider the following contrast:

(27) Wenn es (*schon) Frost gibt, erfrieren die Rosen.  
     (Braüße 1994:112)  
     ‘If it freezes, the roses will be killed by frost.’

(28) Wenn es schon Frost gibt, könnte es wenigstens auch schneien.  
     (Braüße 1994:112)  
     ‘If it really has to freeze, it should at least snow as well.’

---

16. See the discussion in section 2.

17. Here, I will speak more generally of peripheral conditionals because, as hinted by Haegeman (2002:120 fn. 4), there seems to be other types of peripheral conditionals beside premise-conditionals. See the examples below.
The event-conditional exemplified in (27) admits no MPs, which are on the other hand possible in peripheral conditionals, such as (28). The particle schon is well attested in this second pattern. Brauße (1994:112) argues that, in these contexts, the MP entails that the fact expressed in the conditional clause is rather unexpected and, in most cases, unwanted. Thus, the meaning of such propositions would be roughly the following:

(29) If \( p \) comes true, which is very unlikely, then \( q \) should come true as well.

This stereotypical form of embedded clause usually correlates with other particles or adverbs in the associated clause, such as dann... wenigstens (‘then… at least’), dann... auch (‘then… as well’) and so on. See also the following examples:

(30) Wenn ihr schon nicht länger bleiben könnt, dann kommt wenigstens mal kurz vorbei.  
(Brauße 1994:116) 
‘If you really cannot stay for long, then at least come over for a little bit.’

(31) Wenn ich schon hinfahre, dann mußt du wenigstens die Fahrkarten besorgen.  
(Ormelius-Sandblom 1997a:76) 
‘If I do go there, then you’ll at least have to buy the tickets.’

(32) Wenn wir schon ein Haus kaufen […], dann soll es mit Garten sein.  
(Métrich et al. 2002:74) 
‘If we really must buy a house, then it should at least have a garden.’

In these cases too, we are not dealing with conditionals of the central type, but rather with peripheral adverbials. On a closer inspection, we could even question whether they express a condition at all. Here, the relation between condition and main sentence is, so to say, inverted (Roland Hinterhölzl, p.c.), since the condition is expressed by the associated clause. Thus, we could paraphrase the whole proposition as follows:

(33) It is a fact that \( p \), but this only holds on condition that \( q \).

Hence, conditionals with schon express a fact leading to the utterance in the main clause. They are sometimes similar to causal clauses, as becomes clear if we replace the conditional subordinator wenn (‘if’) in the examples with a causal one, such as da (‘since’, ‘because’).
Denn too can occur in certain conditional contexts of peripheral kind\textsuperscript{18}. Let us consider the following examples:

(34) An der Peripherie der Großstädte sind Ladengeschäfte um ein vielfaches billiger zu bekommen, wenn sie denn zu bekommen sind. (Métrich et al. 1995:77)
‘In the outskirts of the big cities, business premises are available for a much lower price, if they are at all available’.

(35) Das Universum käme auch ohne uns zurecht, und es wird eines Tages mit Gewißheit ohne uns auskommen müssen, ohne daß seine Geschichte deshalb ihren Sinn verlöre, wenn sie denn einen hat. (Métrich et al. 1995:78)
‘The universe could do without us, and one day it will certainly have to do without us, without its history losing its sense, if there is such a thing as a sense to it.’

In these cases, denn is nearly a synonym for überhaupt (‘at all’). Actually, as in the preceding case, the condition is no real one, since the speaker considers it to be very difficult to meet.

What matters here is the fact that MPs also bear out Haegeman’s (2002, 2004, 2006) hypothesis that there are at least two types of conditional clauses, namely central and peripheral ones. This is a basic hypothesis, which she then extends to all adverbial clauses, thus arguing for the existence of central and peripheral adverbials in general.

\subsection*{3.2.5. Consecutive clauses}

This type of clause tolerates the presence of MPs rather freely, thus displaying root properties:

(36) Er hat sich bei diesem Tanzwettbewerb so verausgabt, dass er dann ja auch drei Tage nicht zur Arbeit gehen konnte. (Thurmair 1989:79)
‘He overtaxed himself at the dance competition, so that, consequently, he could not go to work for three days.’

\textsuperscript{18} Cf. also Brauße (1994:162ff).
(37) [...] Die Opposition kann in dieser Frage mit Stimmen von den Regierungsparteien rechnen, so daß sie die betreffenden Gesetzesvorlagen schon zu Fall bringen wird. (Borst 1985:171) ‘The opposition can rely on the government's support on this matter, so that they will most likely make sure that the bills in question will not become law.’

(38) Inzwischen war es so stockfinster geworden, daß uns halt nichts anderes übrigblieb, als die Suche aufzuziehen. (Hentschel 1986:203) ‘In the meantime it had become pitch-black, so that in the end we had no choice but to give up the search.’

3.2.6. Final clauses

Although they are not completely banned from these contexts, we can hardly ever find MPs in final clauses. Only particles that are typical for imperatives can occur here, namely nur, JA and bloß. As observed by Thurmair (1989:79), this correlation should be explored more deeply. Nevertheless, precisely this fact could be regarded as further evidence that we are dealing with propositions endowed with independent illocutionary force.

(39) Ich muß also meinen Vorrat verstecken, damit ihn JA keiner sieht. (Thurmair 1989:79) ‘I therefore need to hide my stocks to make sure nobody sees them.’

(40) Er versteckte ihre Briefe, damit JA keiner sie finden sollte. (Hentschel 1986:203) ‘He hid her letters, to make sure nobody would find them.’

(41) Fritz zog einen Schlips an, um nur JA nicht aufzufallen. (Meibauer 1994:134) ‘Fritz put on a tie to make sure he would go unnoticed.’

3.2.7. Locative clauses

This type of embedded clauses generally admits no MPs, probably because they belong to the class of central adverbials:
‘Where I grew up, we have an interesting tradition: the “Kirtarennenn”.’

However, there are potential counterexamples, such as the following:

(43) Wir fahren dahin, wo **wohl** die Sonne scheint.  
‘We will go where the sun will most likely shine.’

Apparently, MPs are not completely banned from these contexts. However, we should observe that locative clauses are at the boundary with relative clauses and are often indistinguishable from them. Relative clauses, at least in non-restrictive contexts, admit the presence of MPs, as we will see below. To this point, Thurmair (1989:77) observes:

\[\text{Die lokalen Adverbialsätze stehen [...] oft an der Grenze zu den lokalen Relativsätzen; in letzteren sind Modalpartikeln nun wieder möglich.}^{19}\]

Therefore, as in the case of relative clauses, we must probably distinguish between restrictive and non-restrictive locative clauses. We expect to find MPs only in non-restrictive contexts. The example above is no genuine restrictive relative clause, but rather a ‘type-restrictive’ one, since it leaves its reference open, thus operating no real restriction. In this regard, we could maybe speak of ‘appositive’ locative clauses. But I do not want to pursue this point any further and would claim that, in general, MPs are not admitted in (restrictive) locative clauses.

---

19. ‘Locative adverbials are [...] often at the boundary with locative relative clauses; in the latter, MPs are again possible.’

20. See also 3.2.9., where I assume the existence of ‘appositive’ temporal clauses as well. Maybe it would be necessary to distinguish central and peripheral adverbials in both classes of temporal and locative clauses. Notice, however, that the particle used in the examples given for the temporal and locative clauses is **wohl**, which, in assertive clauses, is probably not an MP, but rather has an adverbial function. See the discussion in 3.3.1.
3.2.8. Modal clauses

Modal clauses form a very rich and heterogeneous group of embedded sentences. This is the reason why we do not find unambiguous distinctions within this class in the literature. Some authors separate instrumentals, comparatives, and so on (cf. for example Thurmail 1989:77). Here, I will consider all types as a unique class, although finer distinctions are probably needed.

In general, MPs occur rather freely in this group of clauses as well:

(44) […] Die Zigarette schmeckte ihm nicht. Wie einem zum Tode Verurteilten wohl
die letzte Zigarette nicht schmeckte; […] (Métrich et al. 2002:346)
‘[…] He did not like the cigarette. Just as a condemned man most likely does not
enjoy his last cigarette; […]’

(45) Schließlich befreite sie sich von seiner Tyrannei, indem sie ihn eben vergiftete.
(Hentschel 1986:203)
‘She finally freed herself from his tyranny by just poisoning him.’

However, Thurmail (1989:77) claims that MPs do not occur in all the types of modal clauses she lists. In particular, they would be marginally possible in instrumental clauses (see example (45)) and possible in comparatives, since the latter are very similar to relative clauses of the weiterführend-type (see example (44)). Concerning comparative correlatives, Thurmail claims that MPs would be completely excluded from these contexts. Unfortunately, she gives only the following example:

(46) Je mehr ich (*ja/*doch/*eben/*wohl) darüber nachdenke, desto mehr beunruhigt
mich die ganze Sache. (Thurmail 1989:77)
‘The more I think about it, the more I am upset by whole situation.’

Although we probably have to classify some types of modal clauses as central adverbials, I claim that they generally possess independent illocutionary force, thus admitting the presence of MPs.
3.2.9. Temporal clauses

It has been observed that no MPs are admitted in this clause type:21

‘When I lived in Syracuse, I often went to Ithaca.’

(48) * Während er wohl den Brief schrieb, ist er gestört worden. (Asbach-Schnitker 1977:47)
‘While he was writing the letter, he was disturbed.’

We sometimes find apparent counterexamples, which needs an explanation. First of all, we can find MPs in sentences introduced by (originally) temporal subordinators, which, having undergone a grammaticalization process, can be found in other clause types as well (cf. Haegeman 2002:137 ff., 142ff). Während, for example, primarily expresses a temporal relation, but can also introduce adversative clauses, which belong to the class of peripheral adverbials. Thus, the presence of MPs in these contexts is not surprising (see 3.2.1.).

Consider further the case of nachdem (‘after’), which, despite its originally temporal meaning, can often introduce a causal proposition, as exemplified by the following examples taken from Hentschel (1986:203):

(49) Nachdem ich doch alles schon dreimal erklärt hatte, wurde es mir zu dumm.
‘As I had already explained everything three times, I was fed up.’

(50) Nachdem er ja immer gesagt hatte, ich könne ihn jederzeit anrufen, habe ich das gestern auch gemacht.
‘As he had actually repeatedly said that I could call him anytime, I did so yesterday.’

Here, nachdem could be replaced by the causal subordinator da (‘since’). Therefore, I classify both sentences as causal clauses and not as temporal ones as suggested by the author. This would explain the presence of MPs, which cannot otherwise appear in temporal clauses.

---

21. See also Thurmair (1989:76).
Leaving aside the problem of the grammaticalization of some subordinators, other cases occur, which are more problematic. Let us consider the following sentence:

(51) Sie sprengten die Brücke, während der Feind wohl näher rückte.  
    (Asbach-Schnitker 1977:48)  
    ‘They blew up the bridge while the enemy was probably coming closer.’

The presence of the MP\textsuperscript{22} is quite surprising, given that the embedded clause is a temporal one, thus probably a central adverbial. However, notice that although the embedded sentence has a clear temporal meaning, it seems to form a predication of its own (Manfred Krifka, p.c.), “juxtaposed” to the proposition in the associated clause. Observe that the example becomes ungrammatical if the temporal adverbial precedes the main proposition:

(52) *Während der Feind wohl näher rückte, sprengten sie die Brücke.  
    ‘While the enemy was probably coming closer, they blew up the bridge.’

We could claim that the structure in (51) is not ‘embedded’ in the proper meaning of the word. It would rather be a kind of ‘weakly embedded’ structure, which we can rewrite as follows, by splitting up the whole proposition into two parts:

(53) Sie sprengten die Brücke. Währenddessen rückte der Feind wohl näher.  
    ‘They blew up the bridge. In the meantime, the enemy was probably coming closer.’

Further, I wish to draw attention to another important fact. Haegeman (2002:139) provides a useful test to distinguish cases where the subordinator während ‘while’ has a temporal meaning, thus introducing a central adverbial, from other cases where, on the contrary, it has to be interpreted as adversative, as in peripheral sentences. In contrast to an analogous adversative clause, a temporal clause introduced by während can be “the focus of a question operator in the associated clause”. Let us consider the following example:

\footnote{\textsuperscript{22} If we are dealing with a MP at all. Many authors suggest it is actually an adverb, meaning ‘probably’. See 3.3.1.}
(54) a. Wann sprengten sie die Brücke?
   ‘When did they blow up the bridge?’
   b. Während der Feind (*wohl) näher rückte.
   ‘While the enemy was probably coming closer.’

In this case, während can only have a temporal meaning. But here, in contrast to example (51), the insertion of the particle wohl leads to ungrammaticality, as expected, since temporal clauses should probably be classified as central clauses. Therefore, sentence (51) is not an ordinary temporal clause. Interestingly, the behaviour of the embedded sentence in this case is analogous to that of an adversative clause (or, more generally, of a peripheral adverbal), since it admits the presence of the particle.

In this case, we are probably dealing with an ‘appositive’ temporal clause (Roland Hinterhölzl, p.c.), as further demonstrated by the fact that, here, the temporal relation is weak, only conjectured and not established with certainty. But I do not want to further pursue this point and will claim that since temporal clauses generally have a reduced structure, they do not admit the presence of MPs.

3.3. Relative clauses

In the following sections, I will consider restrictive, non-restrictive, headless relative clauses and those of the weiterführend-type. Although they generally depend on a nominal head, thus being different in nature, I will take them into account together with other embedded clauses, since they present strong analogies. In particular, I will argue that only restrictive relative clauses do not admit MPs, thus suggesting that, in contrast to the other types, they exhibit no independent illocutionary force.

---


24. Cf. Haegeman (2002:166), claiming that “[…] the syntactic distinctions introduced for adverbial clauses can be extended to relative clauses.”
3.3.1. **Restrictive relative clauses**

Restrictive relative clauses seem to exclude MPs, as already observed by many authors (see, for example, Thurmair 1989:79f). Therefore, we could consider them as propositions lacking illocutionary force of their own, as illustrated by the following examples:

(55) Eine Kollegin, die (*ja) in Syracuse wohnt, wird kommen.  \(\text{(Kratzer 1999:5)}\)
    ‘A colleague who lives in Syracuse will come.’

(56) * Die Firma sucht einen Angestellten, der ja immer pünktlich ist.  \(\text{(Zimmermann 2004a:32)}\)
    ‘The company is looking for an employee who will always be on time.’

(57) * Diejenigen Tauben, die wohls weiblich sind, sollen vergiftet werden.  \(\text{(Asbach-Schnitker 1977:46)}\)
    ‘Those pigeons who are probably female shall be poisoned.’

The MPs *ja* and *wohl* are banned from the preceding examples because, in contrast to non-restrictive relative clauses, this type does not admit the expression of the speaker’s attitude to the proposition.

Nonetheless, in several cases, some particles are attested in this clause type too. Let us consider the following example containing the stressed particle *JA*:

(58) Die Kinder, die *JA* nichts verpassen wollten, grinsten durchs Schlüsselloch.  \(\text{(Meibauer 1994:134)}\)
    ‘The kids(, who wanted to make sure they wouldn’t miss a thing(,) peeked grinningly through the keyhole.’

Here, a non-restrictive reading of the relative clause is permitted, although the restrictive interpretation is also possible. On the contrary, if we consider an analogous relative clause with the unstressed MP *ja*, only the restrictive reading is available:
(59) Die Kinder, die ja nichts verpassen wollten, grinsten durchs Schlüsselloch.

(59) The kids who wanted to make sure they wouldn't miss a thing peeked grinningly through the keyhole.'

We could explain this remarkable contrast by saying that JA in (58) is no genuine MP, since it does not express the speaker’s attitude to the proposition, but rather the children’s one. The MP JA, in connection with nichts (‘nothing’), is only a synonym for auf keinen Fall (‘by no means’).

A second apparent counterexample concerns the particle wohl. The stressed variant WOHL$^{25}$ poses no particular problem, because it cannot occur in restrictive relative clauses, as observed by Asbach-Schnitker (1977:58), who gives the following example:

(60) *Der Mann, der WOHL bei dem Unfall verletzt wurde, wurde in die Klinik eingeliefert.

(60) ‘The man who got injured in the accident was taken to the hospital.’

On the other hand, the unstressed variant is rather problematic, since it occurs in restrictive relative clauses:

(61) Der Schlüssel, den du dort wohl finden wirst, wird dir Einlaß gewähren.

(61) ‘You will get in with the key that you will most likely find there.’

In this case, we can paraphrase the relative clause with derjenige Schlüssel, den... (‘that key that…’). The paraphrasability of a clause by means of such expressions usually constitutes a useful test to detect a restrictive relative clause. However, the presence of the particle wohl would not be accounted for. I suggest two possible explanations for this apparent counterexample.

First of all, we could argue that we are not dealing with a genuine restrictive relative clause. As a matter of fact, some of my informants consider the sentence as non-restrictive, since the relative clause in the preceding example does not single out a key,

---

$^{25}$ The status of the stressed variant WOHL as a MP is controversial. However, I do not want to pursue this problem in the present paper.
it rather restricts the set of the possible keys.\textsuperscript{26} Roland Hinterhölzl (p.c.) pointed out to me that it is impossible to answer a question like (62a) with (62b):

\begin{enumerate}
  \item Welchen Schlüssel soll ich nehmen?
    \begin{quote}
      ‘Which key shall I take?’
      \end{quote}
  \item Nimm den Schlüssel, der \textit{wohl} auf dem Tisch liegt.
    \begin{quote}
      ‘Take the key that is probably on the table.’
      \end{quote}
\end{enumerate}

Furthermore, the relative clause can even refer to a type, instead of restricting the set of possible objects, as we can see from the following example (Manfred Krifka, p.c.):

\begin{enumerate}
  \item Sie sucht jenen Mann, den es \textit{wohl} gar nicht gibt.
    \begin{quote}
      ‘She is looking for the man that probably doesn't even exist.’
      \end{quote}
\end{enumerate}

Thus, we could speak of a ‘type-restrictive’ relative clause.

Secondly, we could explain the presence of \textit{wohl} in such sentences by arguing that we are dealing with an adverbal variant of the particle. I would like to argue that there are two variants, namely an epistemic and a real modal one. The epistemic variant can be found in assertive clauses and is probably an adverb, since it can be paraphrased with \textit{vermutlich} (‘probably’). It generally does not express the speaker’s personal attitude to the proposition, but rather his or her evaluation of its truth-value on the basis of a personal assumption. In this case, the meaning of the particle lies on the propositional level (Thurmair 1989:139). Regarding its modal variant, it cannot be paraphrased by \textit{vermutlich} (‘probably’) any longer. It operates on the illocutionary level or sometimes has a function similar to that of a sentence adverb (Thurmair 1989:140).\textsuperscript{27}

As already anticipated, from a syntactic perspective, we can assume that at LF MPs are licensed in a functional projection encoding information about clausal type and illocution, namely Rizzi’s (1997) ForceP or a similar projection. No such projection would be available in central adverbials, i.e. in embedded clauses that do not allow for the encoding of illocutionary force. Thus, they cannot license MPs. On the contrary,

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{26} Cf. Asbach-Schnitker (1977:46).

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{27} See the discussion about the use of the adverbal variant of \textit{wohl} in 3.2.7. and 3.2.9.
adverbs are admitted in central adverbials more freely than MPs. If we find occurrences of particles in these contexts, we can suspect that they are actually adverbial variants. These would be licensed in the IP, not in the CP-domain. Therefore, we can assume that MPs are generally excluded from restrictive relatives, since this type of clause has no independent illocutionary force and consequently no Force projection where MPs can be licensed.

3.3.2. Non-restrictive (or ‘appositive’) relative clauses

Non-restrictive relatives do not pose any particular problem for my analysis. They are propositions endowed with their own illocutionary force and, consequently, they can host MPs, as demonstrated by the following examples:

(64) In meiner Kinderzeit, deren Beginn sich ja während des Ersten Weltkriegs abspielte, kamen nicht viele Gäste nach Friedrichstein […].

(Métrich et al. 1998:130)

‘In my childhood, which did, as you know, take place during World War I, not many guests came to Friedrichstein.’

(65) Es war nichts zu entdecken außer einem Lager aus Heu, auf dem wohl ein Jäger geschlafen hatte.

(Métrich et al. 2002:346)

‘There was nothing there to see except for a bed made of hay, which a hunter had probably slept on.’

Thurmair (1989:80) correctly predicts that the insertion of a MP generally turns a relative clause that is ambiguous between a restrictive and a non-restrictive reading into a non-restrictive clause. See her example (slightly modified):

\[\text{28. However, there are many restrictions as to the use of expressions of epistemic modality and speech act in reduced embedded clauses (Haegeman 2002:126, 2004:163f, 166, 2006:1652f, 1655, 1664). Therefore, wohl, in its adverbial use, meaning vermutlich (‘probably’), should not be licensed either. Unfortunately, I have no explanation for this.}\]
(66) Autos, die (ja) laut sind, sollten mit einer geschlossenen Motorkapsel versehen werden.
   ‘Cars(,) which(, as you know,) make a lot of noise(,) should have an engine encloser.’

In the absence of the MP, the sentence is ambiguous between a restrictive \textit{(only the cars that are loud...)} and a non-restrictive reading \textit{(all cars, which by the way are loud...)}.
Interestingly, by inserting the particle \textit{ja}, the sentence receives only a non-restrictive reading.

3.3.3. Other relative clauses

Headless relative clauses and relative clauses of the \textit{weiterführend}-type admit the presence of MPs since they are illocutionarily independent. See the following examples:

(67) Was \textit{ja} so erstaunlich ist, ist die Schönheit seiner Gedichte.
   ‘What is amazing is the beauty of his poems.’

(68) Er wollte unbedingt diesen Keks haben, was dann \textit{ja auch} letztendlich zum zweiten Weltkrieg geführt hat. \hfill (Thurmail 1989:81)
   ‘He absolutely wanted to have that cookie, which did in the end cause WWI.’

4. Observations on the syntactic dependency between MPs and ForceP

MPs are attested in all of the types of embedded clauses considered here, with the important exceptions of factive complements, restrictive relatives, peripheral conditionals, locative and temporal clauses, as illustrated by the following table:
(69) **MPs in embedded clauses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement clauses</th>
<th>non-factive complement clauses</th>
<th>+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>factive complement clauses</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indirect questions</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbial clauses</td>
<td>adversative clauses</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>causal clauses</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>concessive clauses</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conditional clauses</td>
<td>central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>peripheral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consecutive clauses</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>final clauses</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>locative clauses</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>modal clauses</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>temporal clauses</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative clauses</td>
<td>restrictive relative clauses</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-restrictive relative clauses</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other relative clauses</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this point, we could ask ourselves which property the embedded clauses admitting MPs have in common. As already pointed out, we could claim that MPs can only occur in embedded clauses with root properties, which are ‘independent’ from their associated clause.\(^{30}\)

Therefore, we should distinguish between root and root-like embedded clauses on one side, which display their own illocutionary force, and the remaining embedded clauses (factive complements, central adverbials and restrictive relative clauses) on the other, which depend on the root clause as far as the anchoring of Force is concerned. Interestingly, MPs can only occur in the first group, but not in the second one. With regard to this aspect, see Thurmair (1989:82):

---


\(^{30}\) See fn. 4 about the use of the expression ‘associated clause’. 
In bestimmten Nebensätzen [können] durchaus Modalpartikeln auftreten […], was wiederum Erkenntnisse über die Nebensätze liefert: Es handelt sich dann um illokutiv eigenständige Nebensätze.\(^{31}\)

Thus, from the discussion above, we can draw an interesting parallelism between Haegeman’s proposals and the results of the investigation into the presence of MPs in root and embedded clauses.

\((70)\) Distribution of MPs in root and embedded clauses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause types</th>
<th>MPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced embedded clauses</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full embedded clauses</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root clauses</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obviously, root contexts admit the presence of MPs, as shown by the wide literature on this topic (see, for example, the fundamental work by Thurair 1989). On the other hand, regarding embedded contexts, it seems that MPs can only occur in clauses displaying root properties, while they are banned from reduced ones, which lack the functional projection ForceP and, hence, the possibility of anchoring Force to the speaker.

Consider \((71)\), resuming Haegeman’s (2002, 2004, 2006) proposals on the left clausal periphery:\(^{32}\)

\((71)\) a. Reduced embedded clauses: Sub Mod Fin  
               b. Full embedded clauses: Sub Force Mod* Fin  
               c. Root clauses: Force Mod* Fin

The only\(^{33}\) difference in the syntax of root and full embedded clauses, on one side, and reduced embedded clauses, on the other side, consists in the presence vs. absence of

\(^{31}\) ‘[…] in certain embedded clauses, MPs can definitely occur, which in turn provides insights about the embedded clauses, i.e. that we are dealing with illocutionarily independent embedded clauses’.

\(^{32}\) Here, I omit Top and Focus projections, which are ancillary to the presence ForceP.

\(^{33}\) Abstracting from the problem posed by the Sub projection.
Force. Notice that this difference exclusively affects the left periphery of the clause. We could then try to explain the correlation between clause type and presence of MPs by assuming that MPs have to move to the CP-domain at LF, specifically to SpecForceP. If this projection is not present, no MPs can be licensed. This would explain their absence in reduced embedded clauses.

As I suggested in previous works (Coniglio 2005, 2006, 2007), MPs superficially occupy a high position within the IP-domain, namely a variable position among the higher functional clausal projections detected by Cinque (1999). More precisely, the lowest position MPs can occupy is the one between habitual and higher repetitive adverbs. However, on the basis of several independent reasons, we must postulate a movement of the MPs to an even higher position at LF. The natural candidate as landing site for this covert operation is the specifier of ForceP (see (72))\(^{34}\), the projection in the CP-domain that encodes information about clausal type (interrogative, declarative and so on) and the illocutionary force of the proposition and permits to anchor Force to the speaker. As we know, MPs must have access to this information.

\[
(72) \quad \text{Covert movement of MPs:}^{35} \\
\quad \quad [\text{ForceP} \text{MP} [\text{Force}^0 [\ldots [\text{IP} \ldots \text{MP} \ldots ] \ldots ]]]
\]

Hence, although superficially they occupy an IP-internal position, I claim that they have to move to this higher projection\(^{36}\). Abraham (1995) and Zimmermann (2004a,b) have

---

\(^{34}\) Notice that Zimmermann (2004a,b) claims that SpecForceP is the landing site of \textit{wohl}. According to him, \textit{ja} and \textit{denn} would probably occupy a still higher position. Here, I assume that ForceP is the landing position of all MPs and that the lexeme \textit{wohl} is licensed in a lower position, maybe an IP-internal one (Cinque’s (1999) Mod\textsubscript{epistemic}), only when used as an adverb. See 3.3.1.

\(^{35}\) Here, I will not consider MPs as heads, but as maximal projections (in a specifier position). More precisely, I proposed (Coniglio 2005:107ff, 2006:83ff) that they are deficient non-branching structures, but nonetheless maximal projections. See also Cardinaletti (2007).

\(^{36}\) Particles used in their adverbial function probably need not move to this position, since they would be licensed in an IP-internal projection (see the case of adverbial \textit{wohl} in assertive clauses in 3.3.1. and in fn. 34). This would explain their presence in reduced embedded clauses as well, where no ForceP is available.
already proposed this covert movement\textsuperscript{37} and the data presented here provides further evidence in favour of this hypothesis. Strong arguments lead us to assume an LF-movement to the CP-domain. We saw that they are sensitive to the opposition root vs. embedded clauses. As pointed out, MPs can occur in all types of root clauses, but only in certain types of embedded clauses, namely those with root properties. Such information about the presence of independent illocutionary force is clearly encoded in the left periphery of the clause. Consider further that when occurring in root clauses, MPs are sensitive to Force (declarative, interrogative, imperative, etc.), i.e. not all MPs can occur in all illocutionary types (see Thurmair 1989:49). Thus, for example, denn is only possible in interrogatives, while ja can only occur in declaratives. Furthermore, in embedded contexts, not all MPs are compatible with all types of adverbial and relative clauses\textsuperscript{38}. Only particles typical for declarative and imperative clauses are attested in these contexts (see Thurmair 1989:81). Since, according to Rizzi (1997), ForceP encodes information about the type of illocutionary act, its specifier seems to be the natural landing site of the covert movement of MPs. The compatibility between the semantic features of a specific particle and the illocutionary force of the (root or embedded) clause it occurs in would then be checked in this projection. Other evidence for necessarily postulating this covert movement is the fact that MPs clearly do not belong to the proposition, but have a wider scope. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that, in order to be licensed, they have to move to a higher position, from where they can modify illocutionary type and speech act operators.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I demonstrated the close relation existing between the presence of MPs in a clause and its illocutionary force. I based my analysis on Haegeman’s (2002, 2004, 2006) seminal work on the different structure of root and embedded clauses. One important difference regards their internal syntactical structure, namely the presence vs. absence of a Force projection, which encodes information about the illocutionary force of the clause. When this projection is present, the clause displays root properties. I

\textsuperscript{37} See also Coniglio (2005:141, 2007:110).

\textsuperscript{38} Complement clauses generally admit all MPs. Cf. Thurmair (1989:81).
suggested that the presence of MPs directly correlates with the presence of independent illocutionary force and, thus, of ForceP. That is, MPs are admitted in a specific context, provided that the clause in which they occur is endowed with Force, as we see from the analysis of the occurrences of MPs both in root and, most notably, in embedded clauses. Further, I argued that there are semantic and syntactic reasons which enable us to postulate a covert movement of the particles to a higher CP-internal projection, probably SpecForceP. This idea would predict that MPs are banned form the types of clauses that lack this position and are thus devoid of independent illocutionary force.
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