On "why" in situ in Trevigiano

Distribution and syntax

Caterina Bonan
Université de Genève
19 May 2017

Table of contents

Introduction

The Cartography of syntactic Structures

This presentation is based on the assumption that there is distinction between functional and contentive categories in the lexicon, and that functional elements are syntactic heads.

Chomsky (1986) shows that functional elements give rise to X-bar projections, and argues that the clause structure is that in (1):

(1) $[_{CP}$ C° $[_{IP}$ I° $[_{VP}$ V°]]]

The **cartography of syntactic structures** took off from there. Pollock 1989 studies the morpho-syntactic properties of Vs, and shows that the IP is actually an IP-layer - a set of many inflectional XPs (Split-Infl hypothesis). Rizzi 1997 extends this observation to the CP, studying the distributional properties of left peripheral elements (topics, focus, Cs) (2):

(2) $[_{ForceP}$ Force° $[_{TopP}$ Top* $[_{IntP}$ Int° $[_{TopP}$ Top* $[_{FocP}$ Foc° $[_{ModP}$ Mod* $[_{TopP}$ Top* $[_{FinP}$ Fin° $[_{IP}$ I° ...]]]]]]]]]]
(Rizzi 2004)

The cartography of "why"

Why "why"? Cross-linguistically, "why" has been proved to occupy a different structural position than other wh-elements (moved from their base-position inside the VP to SpecFocP). Here I discuss Rizzi 2001 and one later development, Shlonsky and Soare 2011.

Rizzi 2001

In Italian, *perché* is base-generated in SpecIntP - it lays higher than other wh-elements, that are moved to SpecFocP (3):

(3) [$_{ForceP}$ Force° [$_{TopP}$ Top* [$_{IntP}$ **perché** Int° [$_{TopP}$ Top* [$_{FocP}$ **quando** Foc° [$_{ModP}$ Mod* [$_{TopP}$ Top* [$_{FinP}$ Fin° [$_{IP}$ I° [$_{VP}$ ~~quando~~]]]]]]]]]]]

The cartography of "why"

The interrogative C *se* ("if"), and the wh-phrases *perché* ("why") and *come mai* ("how come"), differently from the other wh-elements, may co-occur with foci and when they do, they precede them (4) (my examples, from Trevigiano):

(4)   a.   vo'rja sa'ver se TO MARE a ze 'kaska: (no to pare) (TV)
           would.like$_{1PS}$ know *se* YOUR MON she is fell NEG your dad
           "I'l like to know whether YOUR MOM fell, not your dad."

      b.   par'ke I POMI te ga fi'nio (no i 'peri)? (TV)
           parche THE APPLES you have finished NEG the pears
           "I'd like to know why you finished THE APPLES, not the pears."

      c.   'kome 'maj EL VIN te ga be'vuo (no 'lakwa)? (TV)
           come mai THE WINE you have drunk, NEG the.water
           "I'd like to know why you drunk THE WINE, not the water."

The cartography of "why"

Rizzi claims that *perché* and *come mai* are *merged directly in the LP of the clause that they have in their scope* → "why" does not bind any (syntactic) variable because it is not associated with a trace/copy. BUT it can move and be associated with a variable in long-distance questions (5):

(5) par'ke 'a-tu 'dito ke 'nane el ze par'tio? (TV)
    parche have-you said that John he is left
    "why did you say that John left?"

This question is ambiguous:

      (i) "why did you say so?": why is in the high LP (6a);

     (ii) "why did John leave?": why raises from the low SpecIntP to the high SpecFocP. Its copy determines its scope (6b).

(6) a. [$_{CP}$ **why** did you say [$_{CPemb}$ that [$_{IPemb}$ John left]]]]]

    b. [$_{CP}$ **why** did you say [$_{CPemb}$ **why**$_{copy}$ that [$_{IPemb}$ John left]]]]]

Shlonsky&Soare 2011

Criterial freezing: An element satisfying a criterion is frozen in place (Rizzi 2006, 2010)

The internal merge position of "why" is distinct from its *criterial position* (=where it is interpreted) - it forms a chain and leaves a trace. Take an embedded infinitival clause (truncated CP) (7):

(7) Why did you ask her to resign?
   a. "because I didn't want to just tell her" = short construal
   b. I asked her to resign for her health = long construal → why leaves a *t* in the infinitival CP, where it cannot stay because it cannot satisfy the criterial requirements of WhP. It moves to the matrix SpecIntP, which is "specialized to interact with it".

Differently, *how come* is generated directly in SpecIntP, a criterial position, hence it does not move.

"Why" in Trevigiano

"Why" in Trevigiano

Trevigiano (TV) is a Romance dialect spoken in the Venetan mainland. Its interrogative syntax lays somewhere in between French (Mathieu 1999, Cheng & Rooryk 2002) and Bellunese (Munaro 1995, Poletto & Pollock 2015 → this makes it worth studying. TV has an Italian-like LP, but it has two different "why": **parché** and **parcossa**. They are semantically identical, but have different distribution:

(i) *Parcossa* can appear in clefts, whereas *parché* is ruled out (8):

  (8)   a.   parˈkɔsːa **e-o ke** te a beˈvuo el ˈme ˈvin?
           parcossa is-it ke you have drunk the my wine
           "why did you drink my wine?"

     b.   *parˈke ˈe-o ke te a beˈvuo el ˈme ˈvin?
           parche is-it ke you have drunk the my wine

(ii) *Parcossa*, like *all* other wh-elements, is obligatorily followed by the complementizer *ke*, whereas *parché* is agrammatical if followed by it (9):

(9) a. parˈkɔsːa **ke** te ˈsi paˈsa par kwˈa?
   parcossa ke you are passed in here
   "why did you come here?"

b. ??parˈke ke te ˈsi paˈsa par kwˈa?
   parche ke you are passed in here

(iii) *Parché* is degraded in situ, whereas *parcossa* is perfect (10):

(10) a. ??ˈa-tu maˈɲa parˈke i me ˈpomi?
   have-you eaten *parché* the my apples
   "why did you eat my apples?"

b. ˈa-tu maˈɲa parˈkɔsːa i me ˈpomi?
   have-you eaten *parcossa* the my apples

Working questions

    (i) are *parché* and *parcossa* merged directly in the LP?

    (ii) are they moved like *parché* or do they stay in the position where they are merged, like *come mai* ("how come")?

    (iii) where are they merged?

Background info

TV has optional "insituness" (like FR) (11):

  (11)   a. {ki} 'a-tu 'visto {ki}
            who have-you see who "who did you see?"

          b. {'kwando} 'a-tu be'vuo {'kwando}
            when have-you drank when
            "when did you drink?"

"Why" in Trevigiano

Insituness in genuine questions in TV is actually *fake insituness* → the "in situ" wh-element moves to a whP position within the IP-layer (12):

(12) a. ˈa-tu kanˈta **ˈkwando** a ˈnɔstra ˈkanson
         have-you sung when the our song
         "when did you sing our song?"

     b. *ˈa-tu kanˈta a ˈnɔstra ˈkanson **ˈkwando**
         have-you sung the our song when

TV licenses "insituness" in embedded questions → using SE_{wh} (13):

(13) me doˈmando SE a ˈga ˈvisto **ki**
         myself ask$_{1PS}$ SE she has seen who
         "I wonder who she saw"

Observations (i):

a) parché cannot appear "in situ";

b) parcossa, that can appear "in situ" in matrix questions, cannot be licensed under SE_{wh} (differently from all other wh-elements).

→ they cannot be base-generated in the IP.

Observations (ii):

c) neither can introduce a relative clause;

d) they cannot be extracted from an embedded clause, be it infinitive of finite (they meet their criterion and are frozen in place)

→ they must behave like *how come*, not like *perché*.

Where in the LP are *parché* and *parcossa* internally merged?

"Why" in Trevigiano

Parché

Parché is marginally compatible with a focus in the order why-Foc (14), and can be preceded, followed or surrounded by topics (15):

(14)   a.   ?parˈke TO MARE a ze ˈndaː al marˈka (e no ˈti)?
             parche YOUR MOM she is gone to.the market and NEG you
             "why did YOUR MOM go to the market, not you?"

       b.   *TO MARE parˈke a ze ˈndaː al marˈka (e no ˈti)?
             YOUR MOM *parche* she is gone to.the market and NEG you

(15)   [ˈto ˈnɔno], parˈke, [ˈdɔpo ˈsena], no te o ˈga aˈsa in ˈpaze?
       your grandpa *parche* after dinner NEG you him have left in peace
       "why, your grandpa, after dinner, you didn't leave (him) alone?"

"Why" in Trevigiano

In indirect questions, wh-phrases land in a low wh-projection (WhP, in Rizzi 2004's terms) (16a); *parché* clearly sits higher than other - it can be followed by recursive topics (16b):

(16) a. me do'mando, to 'nɔno, 'jɜri, **'kwando** ke l ga pre'ga
          myself ask$_{1PS}$, your grandpa, yesterday, when that ke has prayed
          "I wonder when, your grandpa, yesterday, prayed"

      b. me do'mando **par'ke**, to 'nɔno, 'dɔpo 'sena, el 'ga pre'ga
          myself ask$_{1PS}$ *parché*, your grandpa, after dinner, he has prayed
          "I wonder why, your grandpa, after dinner, (he) prayed"

It must be merged high in the structure, plausibly in SpecIntP (17):

(17) ... [$_{TopP}$ Top^0 [$_{IntP}$ *parché* Int^0 [$_{FocP}$ Foc^0 [$_{TopP}$ Top^0 ... [$_{WhP}$ cuando Wh^0 ... [$_{IP}$ ~~cuando~~ ...]]]]]]

Parcossa

The distribution of *parcossa* shows that it does not occupy the same left peripheral position as *parché* - it can marginally co-occur with focus in the order Foc-why (18), and it can only be *preceded* by (recursive) topic(s) (19a and 19b):

(18)   a.   me doˈmando AL CAN parˈkɔːsːa ke te ǥe ga ˈdato da maˈɲar, no al ˈgato
myself ask$_{1PS}$ TO.THE DOG *parcossa ke* you DAT have given to eat, NEG to.the cat
"I wonder why you fed THE DOG, not the cat"

   b.   ??me doˈmando parˈkɔːsːa ke AL CAN te ǥe ga ˈdato da maˈɲar, no al ˈgato
myself ask$_{1PS}$ *parcossa ke* TO.THE DOG you DAT have given to eat, NEG to.the cat

(19) a. me do'mando, 'dɔpo 'sena, par'kɔsːa ke a ze vi'ɲua da 'mi
          myself ask$_{1PS}$, after dinner, *parcossa ke* she is come at me
          "I wonder she came to my place after dinner"

      b. ??me do'mando par'kɔsːa ke, 'dɔpo 'sena, a ze vi'ɲua da 'mi
          myself ask$_{1PS}$ *parcossa ke*, after dinner, she is come at me

Parcossa must be merged very low in the LP, lower than focus and lower than (all?) topics. Let us called this position WhP for now, how it was called in Rizzi 2004 (20):

(20) ... [$_{TopP}$ Top^0 [$_{IntP}$ Int^0 [$_{FocP}$ Foc^0 [$_{TopP}$ Top^0 [$_{WhP}$ *parcossa* Wh^0 [$_{FinP}$ Fin^0 [$_{IP}$ ...]]]]]]]

Discussion

Discussion

Poletto&Pollock 2015 propose that insituness in *North Italian dialects* (NIDs) is actually overt movement of the wh-element to a low WhP, followed by movement of the remnant-TP to an higher LP-position (21):

(21) Input: [$_{IP}$ tu ha magnà che] (Bellunese)
   a. Wh-movement: [$_{CP}$ che$_i$ X^0[$_{IP}$ tu ha magnà t$_i$]]
   b. Remnant IP movement and further displacement: [$_{CP}$ [$_{IP}$ ha-tu magnà t$_i$]$_j$ C [$_{CP}$ che$_i$ C^0 t$_j$]]]

The TV data are incompatible with a "Remnant-TP movement" analysis:

> (i) for P&P, embedded insituness is ruled out (the C blocks overt movement of the Rem-TP to ForceP);

> (ii) even if we find a way to apply the RemMov analysis to embedded clauses, the TP-movement analysis cannot account for the fact that SE$_{wh}$ appears to the left of the embedded clause;

> (iii) if there was RemMov in TV, we would expect the wh-element to occupy the rightmost position in the sentence (like in Spanish (Etxepare & Uribe-Etxebarria 2004, 2012));
>
> (iv) in P&P 2015, the movement of the remnant-TP targets a position right above bare wh-nominals - adverbials and complex wh-elements land higher and should never be clause-final. BUT in TV both complex wh-elements and *parcossa* can appear in situ.

→ I suggest there is no RemMov in TV.

Problem

The fact that *parcossa* appears to the right of the past participle in examples like ˈsi-tu paˈsa parˈkɔsːa da ˈmi? ("why did you come over?") is difficult to account for (22):

Discussion

(22) Input : [$_{CP}$ parˈkɔsːa [$_{IP}$ te ˈsi paˈsa da ˈmi]]

    a. Step 1: move the PP higher: [$_{CP}$ parˈkɔsːa [$_{IP}$ [$_{PP}$ da ˈmi]$_i$ [$_{IP}$ te ˈsi paˈsa t$_i$]]

    b. Step 2: SCl-inversion: [$_{CP}$ si$_v$-tu parˈkɔsːa [$_{IP}$ [$_{PP}$ da ˈmi]$_i$ [$_{IP}$ t$_v$ paˈsa t$_i$]]

    c. Step 3: TP-movement : [$_{CP}$ si$_v$-tu [$_{IP}$ t$_v$ paˈsa t$_i$] parˈkɔsːa [$_{IP}$ [$_{PP}$ da ˈmi]$_i$ t$_{TP}$]

The meaningless "topicalization" of the PP (Step 1) is be difficult to explain. Could the PastP be "dragged along" to the CP by SCII (23)?

(23) [$_{CP}$ ˈsi$_v$-tu paˈsa$_{pastP}$ parˈkɔsːa [$_{IP}$ t$_v$ t$_{pastP}$ da ˈmi]]

Conclusions

Conclusions

The data of TV that I discuss are clearly incompatible with a RemMov analysis (Poletto&Pollock 2015), but the presence "in situ" of the low left-peripheral *parcossa* is problematic: should we allow it to be the only case of RemMov in TV, should we find a way to extend the RemMov analysis to all wh-elements of TV, or maybe admit that TV is different from the other NIDs and calls for a different analysis?

The structure that I propose for the LP of TV is (24), where *parche* is merged directly in SpecIntP, whereas *parcossa* occupies the Spec of a lower functional projection (WhyP):

(24) $[_{ForceP}$ [Force^0 $[_{TopP}$ [Top^0 $[_{IntP}$ **parché** [Int^0] $[_{TopP}$ [Top^0 $[_{FocP}$ otherWh [Foc^0 ... $[_{WhyP}$ **parcossa** [Why$°$ ... $[_{FinP}$ [Fin^0 $[_{IP}$ [I^0 $[_{whP}$ otherWh wh^0 $[_{VP}$ ~~otherWh~~]]]]]]]]]]]]]

How *parcossa* ends up to the right of the past participle, and how wh-elements are licensed "in situ", in a non-criterial position, will be the subject of further work.

References

References

Belletti, A. (2004). Aspects of the low IP area. In Rizzi, L., editor, *The Structure of IP and CP. The Cartograph of Syntactic Structures*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Bošković, Ž. (2000). Sometimes in [Spec CP], Sometimes in-situ. In Martin, R., Michaels, D., and Uriagereka, J., editors, *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalism in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, pages 53–88, Cambridge, MA. MIT Press.

Cheng, L. L.-S. and Rooryck, J. (2002). *Types of Wh-in-situ*. Leiden University.

Etxepare, R. and Uribe-Etxebarria, M. (2004). In situ wh-phrases in Spanish: locality and quantification. *Recherches Linguistiques de Vincennes*, 33:9 – 34.

Etxepare, R. and Uribe-Etxebarria, M. (2012). Las preguntas de qu- in situ en español: un análisis derivacional. In Brucart, J. M. and Gallego, A. J., editors, *El movimiento de constituyentes*, page 251 – 271. Visor.

Kato, M. (2013). Deriving "wh-in-situ" through mouvement in Brazilian Portuguese. In Camacho Taboada, M. V., Jiménez-Fernández, , Martín-González, J., and Reyes-Tejedor, M., editors, *Information Structure and Agreement*, page 175 – 192. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Manzini, M. R. and Savoia, L. M. (2005). *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa.*, volume 1. Edizioni dell'Orso, Alessandria.

Mathieu, E. (1999). French wh in situ and the intervention effect. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics*, 11:441–472.

Miyagawa, S. (2001). The EPP, Scrambling, and wh-in-situ. In Kenstowicz, M., editor, *A Life in Language Ken Hale*, page 293 – 338. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Munaro, N. (1995). On nominal wh-phrases in some North-Eastern Italian dialects. *RGG. Rivista di Grammatica Generativa*, 20:69–110.

Munaro, N., Poletto, C., and Pollock, Y.-Y. (2001). Eppur si muove! On comparing French and Bellunese wh-movement. In Pica, P. and Roorick, J., editors, *Linguistic Variation Yearbook 1*, pages 147–180. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Poletto, C. (1993). *Subject Clitic-Verb Inversion in North Eastern Italian Dialects. Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy.* Rosemberg e Sellier, Torino.

Poletto, C. and Pollock, Y.-Y. (2015). Arguing for remnant movement in Romance. In Günter GREWENDORF (ed.). Remnant Movement. In Grewendorf, G., editor, *Studies in Generative Grammar*. Mouton De Gruyter.

Poletto, C. and Vanelli, L. (1993). Gli introduttori delle frasi interrogative nei dialetti italiani. In Banfi, E., Bonfadini, G., and Cordin, P., editors, *Atti del Convegno Italia Settentrionale: Crocevia di Idiomi Romanzi*, pages 145–158. Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen.

Rizzi, L. (1990). *Relativized Minimality*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Rizzi, L. (2001). On the Position Int(errogative) in the Left Periphery of the Clause. *Current Studies in Italian Syntax: Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, page 287–296.

Rizzi, L. (2004). On the Cartography of Syntactic Structures. In Rizzi, L., editor, *The Structure of CP and IP, The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume II*, page 223 – 251. Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax, Oxford University Press.

Rizzi, L. (2017). Che and weak islands. In *Linguistic variation: structure and interpretation. M. Rita Manzini: Festschrift for her 60th birthday*.

Rizzi, L. and Bocci, G. (2016). The Left Periphery of the Clause - Primarily illustrated for italian. In *Blackwell Companion to Syntax, II Edition*. Blackwell Publishers.

Shlonsky, U. and Soare, G. (2011). Where's why? *Linguistics Inquiry*, 42.4:651 – 669.

Stepanov, A. and Tsai, W.-T. D. (2008). Cartography and licensing of wh-adjuncts: A crosslinguistic perspective. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 26:589 – 628.