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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):

\[ [CP \ C^o [IP \ I^o [VP \ V^o ]]] \]

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):

\[ [ForceP \ Force^o [TopP \ Top^* [IntP \ Int^o [TopP \ Top^* [FocP \ Foc^o [ModP \ Mod^* [TopP \ Top^* [FinP \ Fin^o [IP \ I^o ... ] ] ] ] ] ] ] ] ] ] ]
(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):

\[
(3) \quad [_{\text{ForceP}} \text{Force}^\circ [_{\text{TopP}} \text{Top}^* [_{\text{IntP}} \text{perché} \text{Int}^\circ [_{\text{TopP}} \text{Top}^* [_{\text{FocP}} \text{quando} \text{Foc}^\circ [_{\text{ModP}} \text{Mod}^* [_{\text{TopP}} \text{Top}^* [_{\text{FinP}} \text{Fin}^\circ [_{\text{IP}} \text{l}^\circ [_{\text{VP}} \text{quando} ] ] ] ] ] ] ] ] ] ] ]
\]
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'rika sa'ver se TO MARE a ze 'kaska: (no to pare) (TV)
  would.like₁₈₂ know se YOUR MON she is fell NEG your dad
  “I’d like to know whether YOUR MOM fell, not your dad.”

b. par'ke I POMI te ga fi'nio (no i 'peri)? (TV)
  parce 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.”
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 \underline{\text{why}} \text{ did you say } [CP_{emb} \text{ that } [IP_{emb} \text{ John left }]]] ]]]]]
   b.  \[ CP \underline{\text{why}} \text{ did you say } [CP_{emb} \underline{\text{why}}_{copy} \text{ that } [IP_{emb} \text{ John left }]]] ]]]]]
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. par'kɔsːa e-o ke te a be'vuo el 'me 'vin?  
parcossa is-it ke you have drunk the my wine  
“why did you drink my wine?”

b. *par'ke 'e-o ke te a be'vuo el 'me 'vin?  
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):
”Why” in Trevigiano

(9) a. par'kɔ:sə a ke te 'si pa'sa par kw'a?
parcossa ke you are passed in here
“why did you come here?”

b. ??par'ke ke te 'si pa'sa par kw'a?
parche ke you are passed in here

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

(10) a. ??'a-tu ma'ŋa par'ke i me 'pomi?
have-you eaten parché the my apples
“why did you eat my apples?”

b. 'a-tu ma'ŋa par'kɔ:sə a i me 'pomi?
have-you eaten parcossa the my apples
"Why" in Trevigiano

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?"
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. 'a-tu kan'ta 'kwando a 'nɔstra 'kanson
have-you sung when the our song
“when did you sing our song?”

b. *'a-tu kan'ta a 'nɔstra 'kanson 'kwando
have-you sung the our song when

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

(13) me do'mando SE a 'ga 'visto 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?
**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)  
\[ \text{a. } ?\text{par'ke TO MARE a ze 'nda: al mar'ka (e no 'ti)}? \]
\[ \text{parche YOUR MOM she is gone to.the market and NEG you} \]
\[ \text{“why did YOUR MOM go to the market, not you?”} \]

\[ \text{b. *TO MARE par'ke a ze 'nda: al mar'ka (e no 'ti)?} \]
\[ \text{YOUR MOM parche she is gone to.the market and NEG you} \]

(15)  
\[ \text{[’to ’nono], par'ke, [’dopo ’sena], no te o 'ga a'sa in 'paze?} \]
\[ \text{your grandpa parche after dinner NEG you him have left in peace} \]
\[ \text{“why, your grandpa, after dinner, you didn’t leave (him) alone?”} \]
"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 'nono, 'j3ri, '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 parché, to 'nono, 'dopo '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 ...]]]]]]]
“Why” in Trevigiano

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 do'mando AL CAN par'kɔss:a ke te ge ga 'dato da maɲar, no al 'gato
    myself ask₁PS 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 do'mando par'kɔss:a ke AL CAN te ge ga 'dato da maɲar, no al 'gato
    myself ask₁PS parcossa ke TO.THE DOG you DAT have given to eat, NEG to.the cat
"Why" in Trevigiano

(19) a. me do'mando, 'dopo 'sena, par'kɔs:a ke a ze vi'nua da 'mi myself ask₁PS, after dinner, parcossa ke she is come at me “I wonder she came to my place after dinner”

b. ??me do'mando par'kɔs:a ke, 'dopo 'sena, a ze vi'nua da 'mi myself ask₁PS 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 Top₀ [IntP Int₀ [FocP Foc₀ [TopP Top₀ [WhP parcossa Wh₀ [FinP Fin₀ [IP ... ]]]]]]]
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 ‘si-tu pa′sa par′kos:a da ‘mi? (“why did you come over?”) is difficult to account for (22):
Discussion

(22)  Input: $[CP \text{par'kɔsːa} \ [IP \text{te 'si pa'sa da 'mi}]]$

  a. Step 1: move the PP higher: $[CP \text{par'kɔsːa} \ [IP \ [PP \text{da 'mi}]_i \ [IP \text{te 'si pa'sa }t_i ]]$]

  b. Step 2: SC1-inversion: $[CP \text{si}_v\text{-tu par'kɔsːa} \ [IP \ [PP \text{da 'mi}]_i \ [IP \text{t}_v \text{pa'sa }t_i ]]$]

  c. Step 3: TP-movement: $[CP \text{si}_v\text{-tu } [IP \text{t}_v \text{pa'sa }t_i \ ] \text{par'kɔsːa} \ [IP \ [PP \text{da 'mi}]_i \ t_{TP}]$]

The meaningless “topicalization” of the PP (Step 1) is difficult to explain. Could the PastP be “dragged along” to the CP by SC1I (23)?

(23)  $[CP \ 'si_v\text{-tu pa'sa}_{pastP} \text{par'kɔsːa} \ [IP \text{t}_v \text{t}_{pastP} \text{ da 'mi}]]$
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):

\[
(24) \quad [\text{ForceP} \ [ \text{Force} \ [\text{TopP} \ [ \text{Top} \ [\text{IntP} \ \text{parché} \ [ \text{Int} \ [\text{TopP} \ [ \text{Top} \ [\text{FocP} \ \text{otherWh} \ [ \text{Foc} \ [\text{WhyP} \ \text{parcossa} \ [ \text{Why} \ [\text{FinP} \ [ \text{Fin} \ [\text{IP} \ [ \text{I} \ [\text{whP} \ \text{otherWh} \ \text{wh} \ [ \text{VP} \ \text{otherWh} \ ]]}]}]}]}]}]]}
\]

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.
THANK YOU!
References


