

Deontic *ghe vol* with past participle in some varieties of eastern Veneto

Mariachiara Berizzi – Silvia Rossi

(Università di Padova)

1. Introduction¹

Modality is an area of grammar that the languages of the world very often express by means of periphrastic constructions. Indeed, it is often the case that the same modal value, for instance, epistemic or deontic, is conveyed in the same language (or in a group of closely related languages) by a number of strategies sometimes only minimally different. A good example of this is the use of the functional verb *want* followed by a past participle to express deontic necessity, a phenomenon well attested in many Italo-Romance varieties (cf. Rohlf's 1969; Ledgeway 2000).²

In this contribution we focus on some varieties of eastern Veneto that show deontic *vo(l)er* (“want”) plus past participle. In these varieties, however, *vo(l)er* is obligatorily accompanied by the oblique clitic *ghe*, as exemplified in (1):

- (1) Sta roba a *(ghe) vol fata
this thing Cl.sbj.3.f.sg Cl wants done.f.sg
“This thing needs/ has to be done”

Henceforth, we will refer to this construction as *ghe vol* + p.p.

¹ We would like to thank our informants (Girolamo Antonini, Giorgia Buoso, Federico Mazzonetto, Elvi Pizzinato, Mauro Zanchetta, Elena Zanella) and Paola Benincà, Davide Bertocci and Guglielmo Cinque for their suggestions. Many thanks also to Luca Melchior for helping us with the Friulian data. Parts of this contribution have been presented at the XVI Giornata di Dialettologia, Padua 18 June 2010, at CIDSM 5, Berlin 2-3 July 2010 and at the X Incontro di Dialettologia Italiana, Bristol, 22-24 September 2010. We thank the audiences of these conferences for their helpful comments. Even though this contribution is the result of the constant collaboration of the two authors, Mariachiara Berizzi is responsible for sections 2, 3 and 5 and Silvia Rossi for sections 1 and 4.

² The phenomenon is not only restricted to Italo-Romance varieties but is present, for instance, in Scottish English and Midlands American English, see Remberger (2006: 254 and sources quoted therein):

(i) The car wants washed “The car needs washing”

The phenomenon has been investigated in two varieties in the administrative area of Venice, namely Fossalta di Piave and La Salute di Livenza (S. Stino di Livenza) and two varieties in the province of Treviso, Soffratta (Mareno di Piave) and Bocca di Strada (Mareno di Piave). The data have been collected by interviewing informants on the basis of a questionnaire with two tasks: in the first part they were asked to give grammaticality judgments on the acceptability of a set of dialectal sentences, in the second, they were asked to translate a number of Italian sentences into their own varieties.³

From the observation of the data, however, it emerged quite clearly that in the variety of Fossalta di Piave (henceforth Fossaltino) the phenomenon shows an interesting degree of morpho-syntactic variation. We will therefore concentrate on this variety, while the micro-variation across the abovementioned dialects will be adduced as evidence of the peculiar behaviour of deontic *ghe vol* in Fossaltino.

As we will show in detail, Fossaltino displays different types of constructions that can follow deontic *ghe vol*. These syntactic possibilities are not found in the neighbouring varieties but are attested with deontic *want* in Friulian. A closer comparison with the Friulian equivalent constructions turns out to be very insightful since it shows that we are dealing with basically two different types of deontic *ghe vol*, each to be distinguished by a number of morpho-syntactic factors such as the nature of the subject, the presence or absence of past participial agreement and the distributional properties of the clitic *ghe*. The aim of the present paper is to provide the analysis of the syntax of these constructions.

The paper is organized as follows: in the next section we give a brief overview of the extant literature on the phenomenon through the description of the most important analyses put forward in the past twenty years. In Section 3 we describe the different constructions involving deontic *ghe vol* in Fossaltino, hinting, when possible and/or useful, at the microvariation within the group of dialects we have sampled. In this section we also show that the different behaviour that Fossaltino displays with respect to the neighbouring varieties is actually paralleled by Friulian. On the basis of this comparison, we propose a unitary syntactic analysis of these constructions in Section 4. In this section we also consider the distribution of the clitic *ghe* in the *ghe vol* + p.p. of Fossaltino, in the attempt of understanding

³ It should be noted that *ghe vol* + p.p. is an optional phenomenon since the informants always have alternative constructions to express deontic necessity:

- (i) - *bisogna* + infinitive / *that*-clause, “it is necessary to, that”
- *aver da* + infinitive “to have to”
- the modal *dovere*
- *ndar* “go” + past participle, “something has to be done”

whether it should be considered a locative subject along the lines of Tortora (1997). Section 5 presents some conclusions.

2. Deontic *Want* with past participle in Italo-Romance

As already mentioned in the previous sections, deontic constructions with *want* and the past participle of a lexical verb are attested throughout the Italo-Romane area:

- (2) a. *Basso Polesano, PD* (Benincà & Poletto 1997: 102)
El vole magnà
Cl.sbj.3.m.sg wants eaten
“This thing has to be eaten”
- b. *Friulian* (Salvioni 1912, in Ledgeway 2000: 244)
La çhosse la ul fate
The thing Cl.sbj.3.f.sg wants done.f.sg
“This thing has to be done/it is necessary to do this thing”
- c. *Sardinian* (Remberger 2006: 250)
Deu bollu agiudau po fai is iscalas
I want.1.sg helped.m.sg to do the stairs
“I need to be helped up the stairs”
- d. *Salentino, Maglie, LE* (Salvioni 1912, in Ledgeway 2000: 244)
Lu pisce ulia mangiatu stammane
The fish wanted eaten.m.sg this-morning
“The fish had to be eaten this morning”

Rohlf's (1969: §738) reports some other cases of this from a number of Southern dialects.

In the linguistic literature, the phenomenon has received a fair amount of consideration and several analyses have been proposed. In what follows, we briefly present the most important of them as they turn out to be important for our analysis of deontic *ghe vol* in Fossaltino.

2.1 Benincà & Poletto (1994, 1997) on deontic want plus p.p. in Basso Polesano

In their studies on the deontic verbs of necessity in Italian and in some dialectal varieties of Veneto, Benincà & Poletto (1994, 1997) take into consideration the deontic use of *want* with a past participle in Basso Polesano, a variety of southern Venetan spoken in Polesine. In this variety the phenomenon is subject to the following morpho-syntactic restrictions:

(i) It is possible only with simple tenses, cf. (3a) vs. (3b)

- (3) a. El vole/voeva/ voria/ vorà magnà
Cl.sbj.3.m.sg wants/want.impf/want.pres.cond/want-fut eaten
“It has/had/would have/will have to be eaten”
b. *El ga volesto magnà
Cl.sbj.3.m.sg has wanted eaten

(ii) It is not possible with non-finite tenses, cf. (4):

- (4) *El podaria voler magnà/ *Volendo magnà, ...
Cl.sbj.3.m.sg could want eaten/ Wanting eaten

(iii) It appears generally only at 3rd persons, cf. (5):

- (5) *Mi voio petenà/ *Ti te voi petenà /*A volemo petenà /*A volì petenà
I want combed/you Cl.sbj.2.sg want combed/Cl.sgg.1/2.pl want combed

Moreover, they show that, in Italian and in the Venetan dialects, there are at least two types of verbs to express deontic necessity:

- Verbs like It. *bisogna* “to be necessary” and Ven. *toca* “touch” that do not have a subject (neither clitic nor DP) and are followed by an infinitive or by a *that*-clause;
- Verbs like It. *andare* “go” and Ven *vo(l)er* “want” that admit only a third person subject and are both followed by a past participle.

The authors propose that both these types of deontic verbs are functional verbs base generated in the head of a projection dedicated to the deontic modality of necessity in the functional area of the clause (IP). The difference between the two types of verbs relies in the fact that the first

group of verbs has an inert VP, i.e., no thematic grid, while the second group comprises verbs that are “parasitic” of the VP of the past participle that follows them.

2.2 *Ledgeway (2000) on the want-passives of the Southern varieties*

In the Southern Italian dialects Ledgeway (2000) identifies a number of different meanings for *want* plus a past participle form which he defines *WANT-passives*. More specifically, he observes that *want* shows up in the following three structures, here exemplified with data from Cosentino (Ledgeway 2000: 236-37):

I. ECM, in which *volere* assigns accusative case to the object of the lexical verb:

- (6) Mariu vo mannata chira littera
Mario wants sent.f.sg that letter.f.s
“Mario wants that letter (to be) sent!”

II. OC, subject control in which the subject of *volere* is originally an argument of the lexical verb:

- (7) Mario vo mannatu chira littera
Mario wants sent.m.sg that letter.f.sg
“Mario wants to be sent that letter!”

III. SR, subject raising in which the object of the lexical verb is promoted to subject position:

- (8) Vo mannata chira littera
Wants sent.f.sg that letter.f.sg
“That letter must be sent/needs sending”

Ledgeway (2000) also observes that in the ECM (6) and OC (7) examples, *volere* expresses volitional modality and as such it imposes thematic restrictions on the subject which must be [+animated]. On the other hand, in the SR example in (8), *volere* expresses deontic modality and thus it does not assign any thematic roles, while its subject is the object of the participle.

As for the ECM all the dialects considered show the same pattern. On the other hand, OC and SR show up differently in the Southern varieties and, on the basis of their distributional properties, Ledgeway distinguishes two groups of Southern varieties. The first group is that of Northern Calabria and Salento in which the passive auxiliary *essere* “to be” is never present and the agreement on the past participle is controlled by the argument that is raised to subject position, cf. (7) and (8). The second group is that of the other Southern dialects in which the passive auxiliary *essere* is always present and the agreement on the participle either appears at the default masculine singular form or is controlled by its object, cf. examples in (9) and (10) from Neapolitan (Ledgeway 2000: 236) that correspond respectively to (7) and (8):

(9) Mario vò esse mannata chella lettera
Mario wants to be sent.f.sg. that letter.f.sg.
“Mario wants to be sent that letter”

(10) Vò esse mannata chella lettera
wants to be sent.f.sg. that letter.f.sg.
“That letter must be sent/needs sending”

2.3 Remberger (2006) on want as a deontic passive auxiliary

Basing upon the observations and the classification made in Ledgeway (2000), Remberger (2006) restricts the term *WANT-passives* to those constructions that are characterised by: (a) the promotion of the internal argument to subject position and the agreement of *want* with it; (b) the absence of an overt passive auxiliary; (c) the deontic, and not volitional, value of *want*. Moreover, another crucial characteristic of *WANT-passives* is the absence of an explicit external argument with the possibility to reactivate it through a PP, as can be seen in the following example:

(11) *Sardinian* (Jones 1993, in Remberger 2006:259)
Sa makkina keret accontzada dae unu meccánicu
“The car has to be fixed by a mechanic”

Remberger (2006) analyses *want* as a true passive auxiliary with a deontic feature base generated in the head of the projection for tense. In other words, the author considers true *WANT-passives* only the SR examples of Ledgeway (2000), cf. (8).

3. Deontic *ghe vol* in Fossaltino

As shown in the previous section, the construction involving *volere* and a past participle is attested in many different varieties of Italy, all displaying a cluster of common properties. However, it also shows a fair degree of morpho-syntactic variation. In this section we will present the most relevant characteristics of *ghe vol* + p.p. in Fossaltino, keeping in mind all the criteria applied by the different analyses presented in section 2. In this description we will also point out the main differences of Fossaltino *ghe vol* w.r.t. the characteristics displayed by the same phenomenon in the other varieties investigated. As we have already seen, a crucial feature here is the obligatoriness of the oblique clitic *ghe*, cf. (1). The subject is expressed by a clitic subject and, when present, the DP subject co-indexed with the clitic is obligatorily left or right dislocated, as exemplified in (12):

- (12) (Sto bicer,) el ghe vol lavà (, sto bicer)
(this glass,) Cl.sbj.3.m.sg Cl wants washed, (this glass)
“This glass needs washing”

The agreement on the participle is controlled by the clitic subject while the external argument can be reactivated through a PP, as can be observed in (13):

- (13) Sta camisa a ghe vol lavada da to mare
This shirt Cl.sbj.3.sg Cl wants washed.f.sg by your mother
“This shirt has to be washed by your mother”

The characteristics we have outlined so far for the *ghe vol* + p.p. are evidence for a process of passivisation (cf. Remberger 2006). This is further confirmed by the fact that the construction is grammatical only with transitive verbs, as can be seen by the ungrammaticality of (14):

- (14) a. *Mario el ghe vol dormio / teefonà
M. Cl.sbj.3.m.sg Cl wants slept.m.sg / telephoned
b. *Mario el ghe vol partio / ndat
M. Cl.sbj.3.m.sg Cl wants left.m.sg / gone

However, Fossaltino presents another interesting distributional property: *ghe vol* + p.p. can also appear with no referential subject at all (neither clitics nor DPs). In this case, the construction is grammatical not only with transitives (15), but also with unaccusatives (16) and unergatives (17), (cf. the ungrammaticality of (14)):

- (15) Ghe vol netà (la toea) in cucina
Cl wants cleaned (the table) in kitchen
“It is necessary to clean (the table) in the kitchen”
- (16) Ghe vol ndat de persona
Cl wants gone by person
“It is necessary to go (there) in person”
- (17) Ghe vol dormio almanco do ore prima de partir
Cl wants slept at least two hours before of-leave
“It is necessary to sleep at least two hours before leaving”

According to our informants’ judgments, the examples in (16) and (17) express a deontic necessity of a more impersonal nature. This particular interpretation will be dealt in more details in the following section, in which we will try to account for it in syntactic terms.

As for the morpho-syntactic characteristics observed by Benincà & Poletto (1994, 1997) for Basso Polesano, *ghe vol* + p.p. in Fossaltino is not subject to the same restrictions. In particular, it is possible both in the compound (18) and non-finite tenses (19) and it is marginally possible at the first and second persons plural (20):

- (18) Sta roba a g-a voest fata⁴
This thing Cl.sbj.3.f.sg Cl-has wanted done.f.sg

⁴ Fossaltino *ga* is the combination of the auxiliary *a* “has” and the dative clitic *ghe*.

“It has been necessary to do this thing”

- (19) a. Voendoghe firmada sta carta, ...
Wanting-Cl signed this document, ...
“Being necessary to sign this document, ...”
- b. Sta carta qua, a podaria voerghe firmada come no
this document here, Cl.sbj.3.f.sg could want-Cl signed.f.sg as no
“It could be necessary to sign this document or not”
- (20) ?Noaltri / voaltri ghe voen / voè petenai
we / you Cl want.1.pl / want.2.pl combed.m.pl
“We/you need to be combed”

The examples in (18) - (20) show that Fossaltino, when compared to the other varieties here considered, displays a certain degree of variation since the latter are subject to the same restrictions observed by Benincà & Poletto (1994, 1997) for Basso Polesano. Moreover, in these same varieties, the construction is grammatical only with transitive verbs and with the overt expression of the clitic subject, as can be seen in (21):

- (21) *Ghe vol magnà / partio / teefonà
Cl wants eaten / left / phoned

Again, the comparison with the other varieties shows that Fossaltino presents not only less morpho-syntactic restrictions but also a syntactic possibility unknown to the neighbouring dialects, as illustrated by the contrast between (17) - (19) on one hand and (23) on the other.

However, Fossaltino shows some interesting similarities with Friulian. Friulian, like all the other varieties here investigated, exhibits a deontic construction with *want* and a past participle. Similarly to the Southern dialects a dative clitic is never present, cf. (3b) e (22):

- (22) I fruts a vuelin tignûts pe man (Nazzi 2003; s. v. *volè*)
The kids Cl.sbj.3.m.pl want.3.pl taken-m.pl by hand
“Children have to be held by hand”

Moreover, Friulian admits the construction with all types of verbs, cf. (23) in which there is no referential subject clitic but an expletive:

- (23) a. Al vûl mangiât
 Cl.sbj.3.m.sg / Cl.expl wants eaten
 “It is necessary to eat / It has to be eaten”
- b. Al vûl tornât
 Cl.expl wants returned
 “It is necessary to go back”
- c. Al vûl durmît
 Cl.expl wants slept
 “It is necessary to sleep”

The close similarity between the data in (18) - (20) of Fossaltino and the Friulian examples in (23) suggests that Friulian and Fossaltino have two different types of *ghe vol + p.p.*:⁵

- i. Deontic *ghe vol* followed by a passive construction, cf. (1) and (9). This type of construction is grammatical only with transitive verbs and the past participle agrees with the clitic subject. As to the DP subject, if it is expressed, it is always right or left dislocated.
- ii. Deontic *ghe vol* followed by a participial complement, cf. (12) - (14). In this case the construction is grammatical with all types of verbs and the past participle appears in the default masculine singular form. The subject is never expressed by a

⁵ D. Bertocci (p.c.) points out to us that the deontic periphrastic passive construction of Latin has distributional properties that closely resemble those of Fossaltino and Friulian *want + p.p.* In particular, (examples from A. Ernout & F. Thomas, 1954, *Syntaxe latine*, Paris, Klincksieck):

- with transitive verbs the object is inflected for nominative and the gerund agrees with it while the external argument can appear in dative:
 - (i) mihi colenda est virtus
 me.dat practicing.f.sg.nom is virtue.f.sg.nom (“I need to practice virtue”)
- If no subject is expressed the gerund appears in the default neuter singular form and the construction is possible with all types of verbs (and, most importantly, even if rarely, an object can appear in the accusative):
 - (ii) nunc est bibendum
 Now is drinking.neut.sg.nom (“Now it is time to drink”)
 - (iii) veniendum est
 coming-neut.sg.nom is (“It is necessary to go”)
 - (iv) viam quam nobis quoque ingrediendum sit
 way.f.sg.acc which.f.sg.acc us.dat also enter.neut.sg.nom be (“the road we also need to enter”)

referential clitic subject but either it is expressed by an expletive (Friulian) or it is absent (Fossaltino).

The following examples from Fossaltino further illustrate this distinction:

(24) deontic *ghe vol* + passivisation

(Sta torta,) a ghe vol magnada (, sta torta)

This cake-fem Cl.sbj.3.f.sg Cl wants eaten.f.sg (this cake)

“This cake has to be eaten”

(25) deontic *ghe vol* + participial complement

a. Ghe vol magnà sta torta

Cl wants eaten this cake

“It is necessary to eat this cake”

b. *A ghe vol magnà sta torta⁶

Cl.sbj.3.f.sg Cl wants eaten this cake

c. STA TORTA ghe vol magnà

this cake CL wants eaten

“It is this cake that we have to eat”

The absence of the agreement on the participial in (25a) indicates that *sta torta* is the direct object of the lexical verb, while in (24) the same DP originates as the internal argument of the lexical verb but is promoted to subject position by a process of passivisation, of which the participial agreement is a manifestation. The example in (25b) shows that when a referential subject clitic is present the *ghe vol* + participial complement construction is not possible. (25c) shows moreover that, in this context, the DP *sta torta* can be moved to sentence initial position but it is only interpretable as a contrastive Focus,

⁶ The fact that the sentence in (i) is marginally acceptable does not necessarily follow from the ungrammaticality of (25b):

(i) Ghe vol magnada sta torta
Cl wants eaten3.f.sg this cake

More precisely, (25b) shows that if the referential subject clitic is present, there should also be participial agreement, while the opposite is not necessarily true, i.e., the presence of the subject clitic depends on the more or less obligatory realisation of a subject clitic in that variety.

Finally, Fossaltino deontic *ghe vol* can be followed by a *that*-clause, a characteristic that this variety shares not only with some of the other varieties here investigated⁷ but also with Friulian, cf. (27):

- (26) G-a voest che te ciamesse zinke volte parchè te te giresse
 Cl-has wanted that Cl.obj.2.sg call-1sg.pst five times because you yourself turn
 “It has been necessary that I called you five times before you turned round”
- (27) Se il Friûl, (...), nol vûl diventâ un impuartadôr di sanc, (...), al vûl che
 if the F. not-Cl.sbj.3.m.sg wants to-become an importer of blood, Cl.expl wants that
 ogni donatôr al fâsi al mancûl dôs donazions ad an.
 each donor Cl.sbj.3.m.sg make at least two donations per-year
 “If the Friuli region (...) does not want to become an importer of blood, it is necessary
 that each donator should give blood at least twice a year”
http://www.friul.net/archivi_gnovis.php?r_mese=04&r_anno=2010&i=2

4. For an analysis of deontic *ghe vol* constructions in Fossaltino

As we have seen in the previous section, Fossaltino displays a wide range of syntactic possibilities for deontic *ghe vol*, i.e., it can be followed by (i) a passive construction, (ii) a participial complement, and (iii) a *that*-clause. In what follows, we will provide a syntactic analysis that aims to account for such a distribution in a unitary way.

Following the proposal of Cinque (1999), the different modal values (evidential, epistemic etc.) are encoded in distinct functional projections ordered in a universal hierarchy, here reported in a simplified way for what concerns modality:

- (28) [*allegedly* Mod_{Evidential} [*probably* Mod_{Epistemic} [*once* T(past) [*then* T(future)
 [*perhaps* Mood_{Irrrealis} [***necessarily*** Mod_{Necessity} [*possibly* Mod_{Possibility}
 [*intentionally* Mod_{Volitional} [Mod_{Obligation} [Mod_{Ability/Permission} ...

⁷ This possibility is attested also in the Trevisan varieties investigated, while it is absent in the eastmost variety, S. Stino di Livenza (VE).

Moreover, Patruno (2005) has claimed that the different modal values attested for *want* in the Italo-Romance varieties depend on the functional nature of *want*, i.e., it is always base generated in one of the modal projections of (28). The semantic and morpho-syntactic differences depend on which projection *want* has been base-generated in.

In the constructions we have examined so far, *ghe vol* always expresses deontic modality and thus it is to be analysed as a functional verb base generated in $\text{Mod}_{\text{Necessity}}$. However, if *want* is always base generated in the same projection, it is still to be explained how the different syntactic possibilities are to be accounted for.

It is worth noticing that the various constructions attested with deontic *ghe vol* can be grouped on the basis of the nature of their grammatical subject: deontic *ghe vol* + passive construction (i) admits only referential (3rd person) subjects, while deontic *ghe vol* + participial complement (ii) and deontic *ghe vol* + *that*-clause (iii) do not have referential subjects at all (no subject in Fossaltino and an expletive in Friulian). Moreover, the same distinction emerges also when testing the different distributional properties of the clitic *ghe* in each construction.

Benincà & Tortora (2009) discuss the properties of the clitic *ghe* of the Venetan *vo(l)erghe* “want-*ghe*” “it is necessary”. They show that this verb is ambiguous between two readings: the first is purely deontic (“it is necessary”), while the second is deontic and benefactive, i.e., it means “to be necessary for someone”, as can be seen in the two English translations given for (29), respectively (29a) and (29b):

(29) *Ghe vole do euro*

Cl wants two euros/to-him want two euros

a. “Two euros are necessary”

b. “Two euros are necessary for him/her/them = s/he/they need(s) two euros”

The benefactive reading becomes more evident when we try to introduce a first person benefactive clitic *me*. In this case, *ghe* cannot co-occur with the benefactive clitic, as (30) shows:

(30) *Me (*ghe) vole do euro*

“I need two euros”

Thus, they claim that *ghe* in *vo(l)erghe* can be either a deontic clitic, *ghe_{deon}*, or a dative (benefactive) clitic, *ghe_{dat}*, both having the capability of licensing the head of the projection for deontic modality (Mod_{Necessity} in Cinque's 1999 terms), occupied by *vole* "wants".

We can try and see now whether *ghe* in all the constructions we have described so far is either a *ghe_{deon}* or a *ghe_{dat}* by observing what happens when we introduce a first person dative (benefactive) clitic *me*. First, in all the three deontic *ghe vol* constructions the benefactive *me* and the clitic *ghe* cannot co-occur, as Benincà & Tortora (2009) has shown for *vo(l)erghe*:

- (31) a. *ghe vol* + passive construction
 *A me ghe vol lavada drioman, sta camisa
 Cl.sbj.3.f.sg Cl.dat.1.sg Cl wants washed.f.sg immediately this shirt
- b. *ghe vol* + participial complement
 *Me ghe vol telefonà al dottor
 Cl.dat.1.sg Cl wants phoned to-the doctor
- c. *ghe vol* + *that*-clause
 *Me ghe vol che vae casa drioman
 Cl.,dat.1.sg Cl wants that go.1.sg home immediately

However, there is an interesting asymmetry: while in the case of *ghe vol* + passive construction, (i), the clitic *ghe* is in complementary distribution with the benefactive *me*, cf. (32), in the case of both *ghe vol* + participial complement (ii) and *ghe vol* + *that*-clause (iii), the only admitted clitic is *ghe*, cf. (33):

- (32) A me vol lavada drioman, sta camisa qua
 Cl.sbj.3.f.sg Cl.dat.1.sg wants washed-f-sg immediately, this shirt here
 "I need this shirt washed immediately"
- (33) a. *Me vol partio / dormio / ndat
 Cl.dat.1.sg wants left / slept / gone
- b. *Me vol che vae casa drioman
 Cl.dat.1.sg wants that go.1sg home immediately

The contrast between (32) and (33) tells us that only in the case of *ghe vol* + passive construction can *ghe* have a benefactive reading (it can be both *ghe_{dat}* and *ghe_{deon}*) while with *ghe vol* + participial clause/*that*-clause *ghe* is only *ghe_{deon}* in Benincà & Tortora's (2009) terms, i.e., a clitic that licenses the head of Mod_{Necessity}. However, the exact nature of *ghe_{deon}* in all the deontic *ghe vol* constructions is still to be syntactically identified.

Following very recent work by Parry (2010), *ghe* could signal the presence of a non canonical subject, more specifically, of a null locative subject, LOC or *pro-loc* (cf. Anderson 1980; Freeze 1992; Tortora 1997). Yet, Fossaltino (34) does not show a clitic *ghe* in the contexts that Tortora (1997) individuated for Borgomanerese *ngh*, i.e., existentials and unaccusative *GOAL-entailing* verbs, (35), in which *ngh* is analysed as a locative subject:⁸

- (34) a. E dei bocie in mezo a strada (Fossaltino)
Is/are of-children in middle the road
“There are some kids on the road”
b. E rivà dei bocia/putei
is/are arrived some children
“Some children have arrived”
- (35) a. Ngh è-gghi tre mataj int la stônza (Borgomanerese)
Cl.loc.sbj is-Cl.loc three boy in the room
“There are three boys in the room”
b. Ngh è rivà - gghi na fjola
Cl.loc.sbj is arrived-Cl.loc a girl
“A girl has arrived”

(34) shows us that Fossaltino does not have a locative subject *ghe* in the most prototypical presentational contexts, thus we suggest that *ghe* in deontic *ghe vol* should be given a different account.

A further comparison with Friulian turns out to be very insightful. As we have seen in the previous section, Friulian presents a deontic *want* + past participle construction with all types of verbs when the subject clitic is the expletive *al* (recall 23a-c, here repeated in 36).

⁸ For a typological perspective see Freeze (1992).

- (36) a. Al vûl mangiât
Cl.sbj.3.m.sg / Cl.expl wants eaten
“It is necessary to eat / It has to be eaten”
- b. Al vûl tornât
Cl.expl wants returned
“It is necessary to go back”
- c. Al vûl durmît
Cl.expl wants slept
“It is necessary to sleep”

The corresponding Fossaltino examples with deontic *ghe vol* have no subject at all, cf. (18)-(20), here repeated in (37):

- (37) a. Ghe vol netà (la toea) in cusina
Cl wants cleaned (the table) in kitchen
“It is necessary to clean (the table) in the kitchen”
- b. Ghe vol ndat de persona
Cl wants gone by person
“It is necessary to go (there) in person”
- c. Ghe vol dormio almanco do ore prima de partir
Cl wants slept at least two hours before of-leave
“It is necessary to sleep at least two hours before leaving”

Notice furthermore that Fossaltino does not have an overt subject in other contexts where Friulian presents the expletive *al*, like weather verbs, raising verbs, unaccusatives and existentials cf. (38) with (39):

- (38) a. Al plòuf (Cordenons, PN; ASIIt 2.1)
Cl.expl rains (“It rains”)
- b. Al somea c' al aipi sigat qualchidun (Cordenons, PN; ASIIt 3.19)
Cl.expl seems that Cl.espl has cried someone (“It seems that somebody cried”)
- c. Al riva un fivuòl (Cordenons, PN; ASIIt 2.18)
Cl.espl arrives a boy (“A boy is approaching”)
- d. Al è un fivuòl (Cordenons, PN; ASIIt 2.23)

Cl.espl is a boy (“There’s a boy”)

- (39) a. Piove (Fossaltino)
Rains.
b. Par che Piero rive doman
seems that P. arrives tomorrow
c. Riva un bocia
arrives a boy
d. É un bocia
is a boy (“C’è un bambino”)

This similarity leads us to suggest that in the case of deontic *ghe vol* + participial complement, Fossaltino displays a null expletive so that the examples in (39) can be analysed as (40):

- (40) a. EXP *ghe vol* netà (a toea) in cusina
b. EXP *ghe vol* ndat
c. EXP *ghe vol* dormio

This analysis can be further extended to the cases of deontic *ghe vol* + *that*-clause given the similarity between (26) and (27) above, so that (26) can be analysed as (41):⁹

- (41) EXP *ghe vol* che vae casa drioman

We further suggest that it is the presence of this null expletive that gives to the two constructions the impersonal reading, while in the case of deontic *ghe vol* + passive construction the subject position is filled by a referential clitic in both Fossaltino and Friulian.

⁹ In these cases *ghe vol* is like It. *bisogna* with which some Italian dialects show an expletive clitic:

- (i) U bzogna poorti (Altare, Savona; ASIt 2.3)
(ii) Al gh’è de partir (Semogo, Valdidentro, Sondrio; ASIt 2.3)
“It is necessary to leave”

Both these varieties have the expletives *u* and *al* for weather verbs, raising predicates, unaccusative verbs and existentials. For other cases of the deontic verb *toccare* meaning *bisogna* with an expletive subject see Berizzi (2011).

As for the nature of the clitic *ghe* we are still in no position to give a precise definition of it, yet we tend to consider it a deictic/locative clitic. We leave this most interesting topic for future research.

Let us now turn to the three types of constructions that follow deontic *ghe vol*.

In the case of *ghe vol* + passive construction, Fossaltino — as the Group 1 dialects of Ledgeway (2000) — does not show the auxiliary passive *essere*, cf. (42).

(42) Sto bicer, el ghe vol (*essar) lavà

Nonetheless, we assume that it is still present in a silent form given the comparison with the facts of Group 2 (cf. Ledgeway 2000), cf. (43):

(43) Sto bicer el ghe vol ESSAR lavà

Contra Remberger (2006), we assume here that *want* is not a passive auxiliary with a deontic feature: we propose that *want* is simply a deontic modal verb while the passive meaning is maintained by a passive auxiliary, even if not overtly lexicalized.

In the case of *ghe vol* + participial complement we suggest that there should always be a silent auxiliary but not a passive one: we claim that it is the auxiliary selected by the lexical verb and its combination with the past participle conveys rather an aspectual value:

- (46) a. EXP ghe vol AVER netà (la toea) in cucina
b. EXP ghe vol ESSAR ndat de persona
c. EXP ghe vol AVER dormio almanco ...

In other words, we suggest that the construction with the silent auxiliary and the past participle in (46) conveys the meaning that it is necessary that the event expressed by the lexical verb (plus its arguments) has to be completed independently from whom actually carries out the event (cf. the arbitrary interpretation given to the subjects of the lexical verbs).

Finally, in the case of *ghe vol* + *that*-clause we follow Cinque (2004)'s and Patruno (2005)'s proposal for volitional *want* and we propose that also in this case *ghe vol* remains a

functional verb and it is then followed by a silent verb that takes a whole CP as its complement:¹⁰

(47) EXP *ghe vol* NULL VERB *che ...*

As a final note we briefly consider the Friulian cases deontic *want* plus past participle. We have argued for a null expletive subject in Fossaltino *ghe vol* + participial complement and *ghe vol* + *that*-clause on the basis of the equivalent Friulian examples presenting the lexicalized expletive *al*. This proposal has been further supported by the fact that Fossaltino systematically presents no subject in the other contexts in which Friulian presents the expletive *al* (existentials, raising verbs, presentational structures with unaccusatives and also weather verbs).

If we consider the clitic *ghe*, we have seen that Fossaltino does not present *ghe* in existentials. This clitic, however, is not completely absent in the clitic system of Fossaltino: it is present in the constructions we have examined and as referential locative clitic as in (47):

(47) *Ghe vae mi, in posta*
Cl.loc go.1.sg. me in post office
“I’ll go to the post office”

In most Friulian varieties, the clitic *ghe* is absent even in these contexts:

(48) *Tu devis vignì angia tu* Moimacco, UD; ASIt 1.17
you must come also you
“You have to come too”

We propose that the Friulian examples in (2b) and (36c) here repeated in (49a) and (50a) should be analysed as in (49b) and (50b), following a suggestion by P. Benincà (p.c.):

(49) a. *Al vûl durmî*

¹⁰ Cruschina (2010) analyses some modal adverbs of Sicilian that derive from a process of fusion and grammaticalisation of a verb and the complementiser *ca* (*dicica* lit. “say-that”, “presumably”, *parica* lit. “seems-that”, “allegedly”, *penzica* lit. “thinks-that”, “probably”). *Ghe vol che ...* cannot be analysed as a modal adverb since the verb *want* can be inflected and can be separated from the complementiser by low adverbs, differently from what happens with the modal adverbs of Sicilian.

- b. Al GHE vûl durmît
- (50) a. La çhosse la ul fate
b. La çhosse la GHE ul fate

5. Conclusions

In this article we have considered the different syntactic possibilities exhibited by deontic *want* in the eastern Venetan variety of Fossalta di Piave. Some of these syntactic properties are not attested in the neighbouring varieties but they have an interesting counterpart in the syntactic behavior of deontic *want* in Friulian. From a closer comparison between Fossaltino and Friulian it emerged that the deontic construction with the modal *want* and a past participle is of two types: in one case, a passivisation process is involved, in the other, the past participle conveys an aspectual value.

The two construction can be distinguished by the following: (i) the type of subject (ii) the past participial agreement, (iii) the type of lexical verb admitted and (iv) the distributional properties of the clitic *ghe*. More precisely, the passive construction exhibits a referential clitic subject (also a DP subject can be present) and past participial agreement. In this case, the construction is admitted only with transitive verbs and the clitic *ghe* may also have a benefactive reading, as the complementary distribution with other benefactive clitic shows.

In the participial complement construction we have argued for the presence of a null expletive subject (a lexicalized expletive is present in Friulian) and there is no participial agreement. This construction is possible with all types of verbs and the clitic *ghe* has no benefactive reading. Furthermore, Fossaltino deontic *want* can be followed by a *that*-clause. We have proposed that also in this case a null expletive clitic is present. We tentatively suggest that the presence of a null expletive could be responsible for the more impersonal reading native speakers attribute to *ghe vol* plus participial complement.

References

- Anderson, John M. (1980). 'Anti-Unaccusative, or: Relational Grammar in Case Grammar'
Revue Roumaine de Linguistique 25/3: 193-225.

ASIt = Atlante Sintattico d'Italia, <http://www.asis-cnr.unipd.it/>

- Benincà, Paola & Cecilia Poletto (1994). 'Bisogna and its Companions' in G. Cinque et al., *Paths Towards Universal Grammar. Studies in Honor of Richard S. Kayne*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, pp. 35-57.
- Benincà, Paola & Cecilia Poletto (1997). 'The diachronic development of a modal verb of necessity' in A. van Kemenade & N. Vincent, *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 94-118.
- Benincà, Paola & Christina Tortora (2009). 'Towards a Finer-Grained Theory of Italian Participial Clausal Architecture' *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium, 15/1*: 17-26; <http://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl>
- Berizzi, M. (2011). "Usi deontici di *toccare* nelle varietà italiane: considerazioni storiche", handout presented at CIDS6, University of Cambridge, 16-17 June 2011.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1999). *Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (2004). 'Restructuring' and Functional Structure' in A. Belletti, *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, vol. 3*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 132-191.
- Cruschina, Silvio (2010). 'Aspetti morfologici e sintattici degli avverbi in siciliano' in J. Garzonio, *Quaderni di Lavoro ASI, 11. Studi sui dialetti della Sicilia*. Padova: Unipress, pp. 21-42.
- Freeze, Ray (1992). 'Existentials and Other Locatives' *Language* 68/3: 553-595.
- Kayne, Richard (2007). 'Expletives, Datives, and the Tension between Morphology and Syntax', MS, New York University; <http://linguistics.as.nyu.edu/object/RichardSKayne.html>.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2000). *A Comparative Syntax of the Dialects of Southern Italy: A Minimalist Approach*. Oxford-Boston: Blackwell.
- Nazzi, Gianni (2003). *Vocabolario Italiano-Friulano, Friulano-Italiano*. Udine: Clape Culturâl Acuilee.
- Parry, Mair (2010). "Non-canonical subjects in the early Italian vernaculars", MS, University of Bristol.
- Patruno, Barbara (2005). *Il verbo volere nelle varietà italo-romanze. Tra sintassi e semantica*. PhD Thesis. Università di Padova.

- Remberger, Eva-Maria (2006). 'Syntax and Semantics of the deontic WANT-passive in Italo-Romance' in B. Lyngfelt & T. Solstad, *Demoting the Agent. Passive, middle and other voice phenomena*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 249-274.
- Rohlf, Gerhard (1969). *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. Sintassi e formazione delle parole*. vol. 3. Torino: Einaudi.
- Tortora, Christina (1997). *The Syntax and Semantics of the Weak Locative*, PhD thesis, University of Delaware.