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‘Are you reading *I Promessi Sposi*?!’
The northern Italian Camuno dialect
Obligatory *fa* ‘do’ support – Monno

**Declarative**

1a. Maria la **màngia** ‘l pes per sena.
   Maria SCL.3F.SG eats the fish for supper?
   ‘Maria [is eating] / [(usually) eats] fish for supper.’

**Interrogatives**

2a. *Màngia*=la ‘l pes per sena, Maria? (*I SCI)
   eats= SCL.3F.SG the fish for supper, Maria?

2b. **Fa**= la mangià ‘l pes per sena, Maria? (FS)
   does=SCL.3F.SG eat.INFIN the fish for supper, Maria?
   ‘[Is Maria eating] / [Does Maria (usually) eat] fish for supper?’
Object clitics

3. \textbf{Fa}="la mangià -l per sena, Maria? (FS)
does=SCL.3F.SG eat.INFIN-\textbf{3M.ACC} for supper, Maria?
(Re: the fish) ‘[Is Maria eating] / [Does Maria (usually) eat] it for supper?’

• Object clitics are encliticized to the infinitival verb
Obligatory *fa ‘do’* support – Monno

**Monno ‘do’-support appears very similar to English:**

- Obligatory with all verbs except (main and auxiliary) ‘be’ and ‘have’ with which it is agrammatical. (Although, note that English usually supports main verb ‘have’).
- Used in all synthetic tenses (Camuno: present, future, conditional, imperfect).

**Monno ‘do’-support differs from English:**

- Can be used with modals (contrary to Benincà & Poletto, 2004).
- It is usually not used with ‘know’.
- Does not exist in the declarative. Declarative *fa* is causative.
Declarative auxiliary *fa* is causative

- **Usually includes reference to a causee**
  4a. Maria la i fa mangià 'l pes. (Monno)
      Maria SCL.3F.SG 3.DAT makes eat.INFIN the fish.
  4b. Maria gli fa mangiare il pesce. (Italian)
      ‘Maria [is making] / [(usually) makes] them eat (the) fish.’

- **All non-subject clitics procliticized to finite verb, *fa* ‘make, let, cause’**
  5a. 'I pes, Maria la 'l fa mangià ai gnarei. (Monno)
      The fish Maria SCL.3F.SG 3.ACC makes eat.INFIN to-the children.
  5b. Il pesce, Maria lo fa mangiare ai ragazzi.
      ‘Regarding the fish, Maria [is making] / [(usually) makes] the children eat it.’

*With causative *fa*, (non-subject) clitics climb.*
Interrogative support verb *fa* is non-causative

(Repeated from above)

**Interrogative *fa***

3. $Fa=la$ mangià -l per sena, Maria? (FS)
   does=SCL.3F.SG eat.INFIN-*3M.SG.ACC* for supper, Maria?
   (Re: the fish) ‘[Is Maria eating] / [Does Maria (usually) eat] it for supper?’

- Non-subject clitics are encliticized to the infinitival verb.
  
  With interrogative *fa*, (non-subject) clitics do NOT climb.
  This is suggestive, but not definitive, of a non-causative origin.
Obligatory *fa ‘do’ support – Monno

(Repeated from above)

Interrogatives

2a. *Màngia=la ‘l pes per sena, Maria? (SCI)
eats=SCL.3.F.SG the fish for supper, Maria?

2b. ✓Fa= la mangià ‘l pes per sena, Maria? (FS)
does=SCL.3.F.SG eat.INFIN the fish for supper, Maria?
‘[Is Maria eating] / [Does Maria (usually) eat] fish for supper?’
Optional *fa* ‘do’ support – Esine

**Interrogatives**

6a. ✓ **Màngia**=la ‘l peh da hena, Maria?  
   eats=SCL.3F.SG the fish for supper, Maria?  
   (√ SCI)

6b. ✓ **Fa**=la mangià ‘l peh da hena, Maria?  
   does=SCL.3F.SG eat.INFIN the fish for supper, Maria?  
   ‘[Is Maria eating] / [Does Maria (usually) eat] fish for supper?’  
   (√ FS)
Optional *fa* ‘do’ support

1. The probability that a question is made with FS depends on **semantics of supported verb**
   - non-stative > stative
   - manner > result

2. The FS question has a **special meaning**
   - pragmatically, it is like an indirect question
   - syntactically, it is interpreted as an embedded question
Supported verb semantics: grammaticality judgements

7a. FS    Fé-t mangià-la, la carne?  
7b. SCI    La mange-t, la carne?  
     ‘Do you eat meat?’
     (De hòlit, per nedàl)

8a. FS     ?Fé-t dà-ga an regàl a la zìa?  
8b. SCI    Ghe dé-t an regàl a la zìa?  
     ‘Usually, for Christmas, do you give your aunt a present?’

9a. FS     ??#Fé-t pen hà che ’l hàeh anna bûna idéa (o no)?  
9b. SCI    Penhe-t che ’l hàeh anna bûna idéa (o no)?  
     ‘Do you think it would be a good idea, or not?’
Defining a verb by manner/result

1. **Manner verb ‘eat’**
   - Direct object may be optional (not definitive).
   - Use with a manner adverb is possible. (This qualifies how the activity proceeds rather than how a result is achieved)
   - Verb describes complex change measurable along multiple axes.

2. **Result verb ‘give’**
   - As the direct object represents the result, the verb cannot be used intransitively.
   - Verb describes simple change measurable along one axis. At its simplest the change is binary from \(-\) (quality X) to \(+\) (quality X).

   [Paraphrased from Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998]
Classifying non-stative verbs by manner/result

1. **Manner verbs**
   - lavorare/laurà 'work', leggere/lidì (intrans) 'read', mangiare/mangià 'eat', lavare/laà-do 'wash',
   - aggiustare/giühtà 'fix, repair' (used generically), nuotare/nudà 'swim', girare/girà 'turn, spin'

2. **Result verbs**
   - **Main verbs**
     - dare/dà 'give', rompere/rumpì 'break' (trans), trovare/troà 'find', maturare/marudà 'ripen',
     - andare a/nà a ‘go’, cadere/gni-do/nà-do/crödà ‘fall’, rompersi/rumpih 'break (intrans.)'

   - **Auxiliaries**
     - finire di/finì de ‘finish’; cominciare a/cumincià a ‘begin’, smettere di/dehmitì de ‘stop’; provare a/proà a ‘try’;
     - riuscire a/rüaga a ‘succeed’, fare/fà (animate/inanimate subj.) ‘make, let, cause’

   - **Verbs of measure**
     - pesare/pedà 'weigh' (P4), costare/cohtà 'cost', durare/dürà 'last'

[Verbs taking ESSE ‘be’ auxiliary in brown. Verbs in Italian/Camuno-Esine]
3. **Stative verb**

- Verb cannot be used with adverbs of manner, time, or place (except when these are framesetters or degree modifiers).
- Verb cannot be the complement to a verb of perception (as it not located in time or place, so cannot be perceived).
- Unlike non-stative verbs, a stative verb is used the simple present tense with non-habitual meaning. It is not usually used in a continuous tense.
- The sentence containing the verb in the present tense would be an inappropriate response to the question ‘what’s happening?’.

[Generally following Rothmayr, 2009]
Classifying stative verbs

3. **Stative verbs**
   
   **CP (propositional) complement**
   *sapere/hai* 'know', *pensare/penhà* 'think'
   
   **DP complement**
   *volere/(v)ulì (+DP) 'want X'*
   
   **PP complement**
   *credere in/cridìga 'n 'believe in’*
   
   **dative experiencer**
   *piacere/piadì 'like, please’, mancare/mancà 'miss, lack’, sembrare/hembrà ‘seem’, volere bene/(v)ulì bé 'love’*
   
   **pronominal**
   *fidarsi/fidàh 'trust’*
   
   **vP complement (auxiliaries)**
   *volere/(v)ulì 'want', potere/pudì (1. ability; 2. request; 3. possibility) 'can, could’*
Elicitation experiment

Recording in some local dialect:

*Maria has told you that she didn’t want to work on Saturday anymore, but today is Saturday and you see her in the office in front of the coffee machine. Ask Maria if she works on a Saturday.*

Informant replies in their dialect:

‘(Maria), do you work on Saturday?’

- SCI: Laùret 'l sabet?
- FS: Fet laurà 'l sabet?

Each verb is represented by several contexts & Q requests. All y/n-Qs Results are obtained from several informants for whom FS use is optional.
Results by verb semantics (main and auxiliary)

3rd experimental phase

Probability of use of FS:
- **stative** <
- **result** <
- **manner**

Dataset P3, 8 MV Infs, 2-5 Qs/verb
Geographic pattern of grammaticalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 1 (MV): Esine (3 infs)</th>
<th>Zone 2 (MV): Civ/Mal/Mez/Sell (6)</th>
<th>Zone 5 (UV): Monno/Vezza (2 infs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>FS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pensare</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piacere</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sapere</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sembrare</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fare (caus)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potere (abil)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>durare</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dare</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leggere</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>costare</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mangiare</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nuotare</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laverare</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggregiare</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lavorare</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grammaticalization of FS: **manner > result > stative**
Optional *fa* ‘do’ support

1. The probability that a question is made with FS depends on **semantics of supported verb**
   - non-stative > stative
   - manner > result

2. The FS question has a **special meaning**
   - pragmatically it is like an ‘indirect question’
   - syntactically it is interpreted as an ‘embedded question’
Presupposition

(To the shopkeeper)

Do you sell artichokes?

10a. ‘Indì-f i articiòc? (Inf. 36. Esine)

**SCI:** Open question.

10b. Fì-f vindì i articiòc?

**FS:** Presupposes that there aren't any artichokes for sale [because there are none visible].
Presupposition/confirmation-seeking

Does Elisabetta still smoke?

11a. Fûme-la amò Elisabeta? (Inf. 70. Cividate)
SCI: I’m not investigating her! There were no preconceived ideas. It’s an open question.

11b. Ha-la fûmà amò Elisabeta?
FS: Presupposes that there is already an understanding that she still smokes.

[Note: In Cividate fa is aspirated as ha.]
(The arm is very swollen.)

Could it be broken?

12a. **Pöde-I eser ròt? ?**  
**SCI:** Normal question. [Anyone could be asked this.]

12b. **Fal podé eser ròt?**
**FS:** Said to the doctor [because you want an authoritative answer of whether or not it could be true that it’s broken.]  
[“Is it true (what I’ve heard/suspect): that it could be broken?”]
Old information

(You hear a noise and wonder: Has there been a goal?)

What's happening?

13a. Che hücédel?

SCI: You are frightened [by the ongoing noise]. [You don’t know if it was a goal or something else. You want to know what is happening.]

13b. Che fal hücedé? / Fal hücedé che?

FS: This presupposes you have already heard the noise. [You have interpreted the noise. You know that something has happened.]

[Note: This dialect has wh”in-situ”]
Wh-specificity

(They tell me that you've got a lovely collection of ties.)
Which one are you wearing to the wedding?

14a. Mètet chela a hpude? (Inf. 33. Berzo Inf.)

SCI: You’re asking which one.

14b. Het meté chela (a hpude)?

FS: It’s already decided. [Are you wearing the one we talked about?]

[Note: Berzo inf. also aspirates fa]
Properties of embedded questions

• **Specificity**
  Taking the definition that a pronoun is specific if it refers to an entity that already exists in the mind of the speaker, it can be argued that:
  • An interrogative pronoun with argumental position in a matrix clause can be/?must be non-specific, but
  • A relative pronoun or interrogative pronoun with argumental position in an embedded clause must have specific reference.

• **Old information/opinion seeking/presupposition**
  The embedded clause is all old information, about which the speaker has a preconceived notion. They are requesting an opinion about this embedded proposition from the addressee (“Is it true that X?”).
  [Specificity is essentially as per Karttunen, 1977]
Optional *fa* ‘do’ support

- The lexical verb *fa* embeds a CP and the structure of optional FS is **biclausal**. Manner verb, *fa*, has an adjunct relationship its lexical verb modifier.

\[ [\text{CP } \text{fa}(\text{lex})-\text{SCL} [\text{CP } [\text{IP Vlex (DP) }]] ] \]

- Presumably the structure of obligatory FS is **monoclausal**.

\[ [\text{CP } \text{fa}(\text{func})-\text{SCL} [\text{IP Vlex (DP) }]] \]

- Grammaticalization that results in **semantic bleaching** of *fa* ‘do’ also simplifies the structure.
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Results by verb semantics (main and auxiliary)

4th experimental phase

Probability of use of FS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>Tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>potere (req) 'could'</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volere 'want'</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sapere 'know'</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potere (pos) 'could'</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potere (abil) 'can'</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pensare 'think'</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piacere a 'please, like'</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riuscire a 'succeed'</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rompersi (intr) 'break'</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fare - inan 'make, cause'</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provare a 'try'</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pesare 'weigh'</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dare 'give'</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>credere in 'believe in'</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadere 'fall'</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>girare 'turn, spin'</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maturare 'ripen'</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trovare 'find'</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finire di 'finish'</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fare - anim 'make, let'</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fidarsi 'trust'</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cominciare a 'begin'</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lavorare 'work'</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mangiare 'eat'</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smettere di 'stop'</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rompere (trans) 'break'</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lavare 'wash'</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leggere 'read'</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>andare a 'go'</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dataset P4, 8 MV Infs, 4 Qs/verb (girare 2 Qs)
Results by subject type

More extensive results from 4\textsuperscript{th} experiment phase suggest FS is preferred according to subject type:

- effector (manner) > effector (result) (except where manner strongly indicated pragmatically)
- effector (human) > effector (non-human)
- effector > theme
- effector (incl. causer-effector) > causer and non-effector
- effector/theme/causer > experiencer

If $fa$ is a lexical verb in optional FS and $fa$ = ‘do’ (not ‘cause’), this is unsurprising, as the subject of lexical ‘do’ (the ‘do-er’) is prototypically the instigator of an activity.