“Why” in situ in Northern Italian dialects

Trevigiano, a Venetan dialect, has two forms for “why”: parché and parcossa. Crosslinguistically, “why” has been argued to be merged directly in the Left Periphery (Hornstein 1995, Ko 2005, Rizzi 1990, 2001, Stepanov and Tsai 2008, Thornton 2008, Shlonsky and Soare 2011), so one does not expect it to appear sentence-externally. We show that parché behaves as a well-behaved ‘why’ but parcossa is merged sentence-externally.

Aims of this paper:
- Introduce novel data on parché and parcossa in Trevigiano;
- Study the different distributional properties of parché and parcossa;
- Explain how “why” is licensed sentence-externally in Trevigiano.

1. Trevigiano

(1) a.  
Chi a-tu visto al marcà?
who have-youCL seen at.the market
“Who did you see at the market?”

b.  
A-tu visto chi al marcà?
have-youCL seen who at.the market

a’.  
Che profesor a-ea visto al marcà?
what professor has-sheCL seen at.the market
“Which professor did she see at the market?”

b’.  
A-ea visto che profesor al marcà?
has-sheCL seen what professor at.the market

(2) a.  
Chi pens-ea [ che te ga visto al marcà ]?
who thinks-sheCL that youCL have seen at.the market
“Who does she think you saw at the market?”

b.  
Pens-ea [ che te ga visto chi al marcà ]?
thinks-sheCL that youCL have seen who at.the market

a’.  
Che maestra pens-ea [ che te ga visto al marcà ]?
what teacher thinks-sheCL that youCL have seen at.the market
“Which teacher does she think you saw at the market?”

b’.  
Pens-ea [ che te ga visto che maestra al marcà ]?
thinks-sheCL that youCL have seen what teacher at.the market

French: D-linked and non-D-linked wh-phrases “in situ”; but “insituness” and SCII are NOT compatible (Mathieu 1999, Boskovic 2000, Cheng & Rooryck 2002) (3a-b). TV: “insituness” triggers obligatory Subject-Clitic Inversion (SCII):

(3) a. *As-tu mangé quand?
have-you eaten when
“When did you eat?”

b. T’as mangé quand?
you’have eaten when

North Italian dialects (Poletto 1993, Poletto & Vannelli 1993): Clefting is the most productive question formation strategy (4a-b):

(4) a. Chi ze-o che te a visto ieri?
who COP-expl that you.CL have seen yesterday
“Who is it that you saw yesterday”

b. Ze-o chi che te a visto ieri?
COP-expl who that you.CL have seen yesterday

1.1 Parcossa

Parcossa obligatorily triggers SCII (5a-b):

(5) a. Parcossa si-tu ndàa al marcà?
parcossa is-you.CL gone,F to.the market
“Why did you go to the market?”

b. *Parcossa te si ndàa al marcà?
parcossa you.CL is gone,F to.the market

Parcossa is perfectly fine “in situ” in the true (as opposed to echo) question reading (5c), and it can be licensed both in regular (6a) and in reverse clefts (6b):

(5) c. Si-tu ndàa parcossa al marcà?
is-you.CL gone,F parcossa to.the market

(6) a. Parcossa ze-o che te me ciami a ste ore?
parcossa COP-expl that you.CL call me at these hours
“Why are you calling me so late?”

b. Ze-o parcossa che te me ciami a ste ore?
COP-expl parcossa that you.CL call me at these hours

1.2 Parché

Parché CANNOT be combined with SCII (7a-b):

(7) a. *Parché si-tu ndàa al marcà?
parché is-you.CL gone,F to.the market
“Why did you go to the market?”

b. Parché te si ndàa al marcà?
parché you.CL is gone,F to.the market

Parché is very marginal “in situ” in the non-echo reading (7c):
(7) c. ??Te si ndàa parché al marcà?
youCL is goneF parché to.the market

Parché is ungrammatical in regular clefts (8a), and slightly degraded in reverse clefts (8b):

(8) a. *Parché ze-o che te me ciamì a ste ore?
parché COP-expl that youCL call me at these hours
   “Why are you calling me so late?”

b. ?Ze-o parché che te me ciamì a ste ore?
   COP-expl parché that youCL call me at these hours

Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parché</th>
<th>Parcossa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex situ + SCII</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex situ NO SCII</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In situ + SCII</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In situ NO SCII</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular cleft</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Reverse” cleft</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Distribution of parcossa and parché in TV

1.3 The position of lexical subjects in questions with parché and parcossa

(9) a. Parcossa cant-ea, to mama?
     parcossa sings-sheCL # your mother
     “You mother, why is she singing?”

b. *Parcossa to mama cant-ea?
    parcossa your mother sings-sheCL
    “Why is your mother singing?”

a’. Cuando cant-ea, to mama?
     when sings-sheCL # your mother
     “Your mother, when does she sing?”

b’. *Cuando to mama cant-ea?
     when your mother sings-sheCL
     “When does your mother sing?”

(10) a. Parché a canta, to mama?
     parché sheCL sings, your mother
     “Your mother, why is she singing?”

b. Parché to mama a canta?
   parché your mother sheCL sings
   “Why is your mother singing?”
Standard Italian (StandIT) (Rizzi 2001), perché (11a-b vs. 12a-b):

(11) a. **Perché ha parlato Gianni?**
perché has spoken Gianni
“Why did Gianni speak?”

b. **Perché Gianni ha parlato?**
perché Gianni has spoken

(12) a. **Quando ha parlato Gianni?**
when has spoken Gianni
“When did Gianni speak?”

b. *Quando Gianni ha parlato?
when Gianni has spoken

Conclusion:
➢ *Parché* can be analysed as externally-merged in the left periphery.
➢ The different behaviour of *parcossa* can be attributed to its being externally-merged TP-internally and then (optionally) moved to the left periphery.

2. The interaction of *parché* and *parcossa* with negation and focus

2.1 (In)compatibility with focus

(13) a. Why didn’t you fix the car?

b. *How didn’t you fix the car?

(14) a. **Parché no te si vignuo**
why NEG youCL are come
“When didn’t you come?”

b. *Parcossa no si-tu vignuo?
why NEG are-youCL come

In a bi-clausal sentence, both *parché* and *parcossa* can be construed either with the high or with low clause (15a-c):

(15) a. **Parcossa dizi-tu [ che a ze vignua ]?**
why say-youCL that sheCL is come
“Why are you saying that she came?”

b. **Parché te dizi [ che a ze vignua ]?**
why youCL say that sheCL is come
“Why are you saying that she came?”

c. **Parché dizi-tu [ che a ze vignua ]?**
why youCL say that sheCL is come
“Why are you saying that she came?”

With negation (16 vs. 17):

(16) a. *Parcossa no dizi-tu che a ze vignua?
parcossa NEG say-youCL that sheCL is come

b. **Parcossa dizi-tu che no a ze vignua?**
parcossa say-youCL that NEG sheCL is come

4
(17) a. \textit{Parché no te dizi che a ze vignua?} ✓ short construal, ✗ long construal
   parché NEG you say that she\texttt{CL} is come
b. \textit{Parché dizi-tu che no a ze vignua?} ✓ long construal
   parché NEG say-you\texttt{CL} that she\texttt{CL} is come
b’. \textit{Parché te dizi che no a ze vignua?} ✓ short construal
   parché you say that NEG she\texttt{CL} is come

2.2 (In)compatibility with focus

(18) a. ??\textit{Cuando a-tu dato I POMI a Gianni?}
   when have-you\texttt{CL} given THE APPLES to Gianni
b. ??\textit{Cuando a-tu dato i pomi A GIANNI?}
   when have-you\texttt{CL} given the apples TO GIANNI

(19) a. \textit{Parché te ghe dato I POMI aa Maria?}
   parché you DAT have given THE APPLES to.the Maria
b. \textit{Parché te ghe dato i pomi AA MARIA?}
   parché you DAT have given the apples TO.THE MARIA

(20) a. \textit{*Parcossa ghe ga-tu dato I POMI aa Maria?}
   why DAT have-you\texttt{CL} given THE APPLES to.the Maria
b. \textit{*Parcossa ghe ga-tu dato i pomi AA MARIA?}
   why DAT have-you\texttt{CL} given the apples TO.THE MARIA

(21) a. \textit{*Ghe ga-tu dato parcossa I POMI aa Maria?}
   DAT have-you\texttt{CL} given parcossa THE APPLES to.the Maria
b. \textit{*Ghe ga-tu dato parcossa i pomi AA MARIA?}
   DAT have-you\texttt{CL} given parcossa the apples TO.THE MARIA

2.3 Parcossa can have a ‘pure’ reason interpretation

(22) \textit{But-ei parcossa i persegheri, de sta stajon?}
   blossom-they parcossa the peach.trees, in this season
   “Why are the peach trees blossoming so early?”
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