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1. Introduction to *fa* ‘do’-support in Camuno
Camuno dialect of Val Camonica
Syntax of *fa* ‘do’-support (FS)

**Synthetic tense - Present**

**Declarative: SCL-Vlex**

1. Maria la *màngia* ‘l peh da hena. (Bresciano, e.g. Esine)
   - Maria SCL.3f eat.3 the fish for supper.
   - “Maria is eating / (usually) eats fish for supper.”

**Interrogative: Vlex-SCL**

2. *Màngie*-la ‘l peh da hena, Maria?
   - “Is Maria eating / Does Maria (usually) eat fish for supper?”

**Subject-clitic, finite-verb inversion (SCI)** is the normal way to make an interrogative in the Northern Italian dialects. Here with lexical verb.
Syntax of *fa* ‘do’-support (FS)

Analytic tense – *passato prossimo*

Declarative: SCL-Aux
1. Maria l-a mangiàt ‘l peh da hena. (Bresciano-Esine)
   Maria SCL.3f has eat.3 PP the fish for supper.
   “Maria has eaten (the) fish for supper.”

Interrogative: Aux-SCL
2. A-la mangiàt ‘l peh da hena, Maria?
   “Has Maria eaten (the) fish for supper?”

**Subject-clitic, finite-verb inversion (SCI)** is the normal way to make an interrogative in the Northern Italian dialects. Here with auxiliary verb.
Syntax of *fa* ‘do’-support (FS)

(Normally) synthetic tense – Present

Declarative: SCL-Vlex

3. Maria la *màngia* ‘l peh da hena.
   “Maria is eating/Maria (usually) eats fish for supper.”

Interrogative: **Aux**-SCL – *fa* ‘do’-support (FS)

4. **Fa**-la mangià ‘l peh da hena, Maria? (Val Camonica – Esine)
   Does.3-SCL.3f eat.infin the fish for supper, Maria?
   “Is Maria eating/Does Maria (usually) eat fish for supper?”

*fa* ‘do’-support (FS) is unique to Val Camonica. It uses an additional ‘do’ auxiliary not present in corresponding declarative of synthetic tenses (present, imperfect, future, conditional tenses).
Syntax of *fa* ‘do’-support (FS)

Embedded question: No FS

5. Go domandat chol che la màngia da sena, Maria. (Monno)
   have.1sg asked.PP what that SCL.3f eat.3 for dinner Maria
   “I asked what Maria is eating/ (usually) eats for dinner.”

Negative is adverbial: No FS

   Maria SCL.3f eat.infin not the fish.
   “Maria is not eating (the) fish. / Maria does not (usually) eat fish.”

Declarative *fa* is recognized as causative

7. Maria la fa mangià ‘l pes ai gnarei. (Monno)
   Maria SCL.3 make.3 eat.infin the fish to-the children.
   Maria fa mangiare il pesce ai bambini (Italian)
   “Maria is making /(usually) makes the children eat (the) fish.”

Characteristics as demonstrated by Benincà & Poletto (2004) for Monno. (Examples from this study)
Syntax of *fa ‘do’*-support (FS)

Upper Val Camonica (Monno): FS is the ONLY interrogative form

8. *Màngia*-la ‘l pes per sena, Maria  
   eats.3-SCL.3f  the fish for supper, Maria?  
9. Fa-la  mangià ‘l pes per sena, Maria?  
   does.3-SCL.3f  eat.infin  the fish for supper, Maria?  
   “Is Maria eating/Does Maria (usually) eat fish for supper?”

Middle Val Camonica (Esine, Bienno): FS and SCI co-exist

10. Màngia-la ‘l peh per hena, Maria?  
11a. Fa-la mangià ‘l peh per hena, Maria?  
    b. Ha-la mangià ‘l peh per hena, Maria?  
12. La Màngia ‘l peh per hena, Maria?  

In Monno FS is obligatory for almost all verbs except ‘be’ ‘have’ (lex & aux), ‘want’ and ‘know’; but in Esine/Bienno, FS is entirely optional and co-exists with SCI (and QDec).
Semantics of *fa* ‘do’-support (FS)

In Esine FS is grammatical to varying degrees with different lexical verbs.

✓ Fé-t mangià-la la carne?
   “Do you eat meat?”

? Fé-t troà le ciaf hemper an tàhca?
   “Do you always find your keys in your pocket?”

* Fé-t penhà che ’l hàeh anna bùna idéa o no?
   “Do you think that it’s a good idea, or not?”

➢ *fa* semantically selects its VP complement.
Semantics of *fa* ‘do’-support (FS)

In Esine FS is grammatical to varying degrees with different (semi-) auxiliary verbs.

✓ Fé-t nà dehpeh a curì la matina preht?
   “Do you often go running in the early morning?”

? Fé-t finì a tô-ho i cachi prima che ‘l rüa la nef?
   “Do you finish gathering the persimmons before the snow comes?”

* Fé-t podé mangià-la la carne graha?
   “Can you eat fatty meat?”

➢ *fa* semantically selects its VP complement
The hypothesis to be developed here:

- *fa* ‘do’ and the *fa*-support construction is in the earliest stages of grammaticalization in Esine.
- The semantic component of the auxiliary results in restrictions on complement type.
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2. Pragmatic meaning of FS
Pragmatics of *fa* ‘do’-support (FS)

FS question has additional meaning

“Does my coat smell of smoke?”

1. **Hpühe-l** de fūm al mé paltò? (Esine)
2. **Fa-l** hpūhà de fūm al mé paltò?

1. **SCI** Direct question, almost sounds anxious.
2. **FS** It’s quite possible the coat does NOT smell, perhaps because it’s been left on the balcony to air.

> FS is expressing a presupposition (in this case, that the answer to the question is ‘no’).
Pragmatics of *fa* ‘do’-support (FS)

FS question has additional meaning

“Does this beautiful lake freeze in winter?”

1. Chèhto bel laghèt zèle-İ ann inverno? (Esine)
2. Fa-I zelà chèhto laghèt ann inverno?

1. **SCI** Neutral question, driven by curiosity.
2. **FS** The person asking the question is expressing a) the hope it will freeze so they can skate on it or b) the fear that it will freeze (because the ducks can’t swim in it or because they can’t fish in it).

➤ FS is expressing emotional involvement of the questionner.
Pragmatics of *fa ‘do’*-support (FS)

*fa*-DS question has additional meaning

The girl is reading Manzoni's masterpiece. You ask her: "Are you (really) reading "I Promessi Sposi"!?

**Fe-t lidì "I Promessi Sposi"!?** (Esine)

- FS can be used to express surprise (which is also presupposition of the opposite)
Pragmatics of *fa* ‘do’-support (FS)

FS question has additional meaning

The letter has not arrived.
"Can it have gone missing?"

1. **Pödela** eser nàda persa? (Malonno – U. Valley)
2. **Fala** podé eser nàda persa?

1. **SCI** Neutral question.
2. **FS** Expressing doubt. (Interpretation: You think someone might have stolen it or that it was never sent.)

- The pragmatics of FS remain even when the construction is highly grammaticalized and when there are very few verbs that use SCI.
Jäger (2006) in his cross-linguistic study of a ‘do’ auxiliary notes that where a synthetic and analytic ’do’-support form co-exist there usually isn’t true optionality.

Chambers & Trudgill (1988) go further to suggest that two apparently identical forms can ONLY continue to co-exist in a language if they serve different functions.

Kroch (1994) suggests that to prevent overlap, one form moves to assume a different meaning. However, as the same pragmatic meanings of presupposition and emotional involvement occur with ‘do’-support cross-linguistically, the additional meaning seems inherent to ‘do’.

Bybee et al. (1994) points to an agent-oriented root-modality evolving to an epistemic modality.

FS includes ‘do’ (agent assertion) > ‘do’ (proposition assertion)
Pragmatics of *fa* ‘do’-support (FS)

Assertion is still part of the meaning of the highly grammaticalized English auxiliary ‘do’

1. Epistemological: asserting the truth of the proposition (‘do’ not always stressed)

   (I think you think I don’t really want to come.)

   1a. I do want to join you but I'm not free at 5 pm.
   1b. No, honestly, I DO want to join you.

2. Emphasis

   2. I DO like that hat. “I really like that hat.”

   ➢ The fact that in English an auxiliary verb can take stress – which accounts for some of this effect – masks the underlying remnant “assertiveness” semantics in *do*.
Pragmatics of *fa* ‘do’-support (FS)

1. **Fa-l** hpühà de füm al mé paltò?
   ‘Does my coat **really** smell of smoke?’ (It shouldn’t. I just left it to air on the balcony.)

2. **Fa-l** zelà chèhto laghèt ann inverno?
   ‘Does this **really** lake freeze in winter?’ (It would be great if we could skate on it! OR Poor ducks!)

- Camuno support verb *fa* (which cannot take stress) has must have a remnant “assertiveness” semantics to account for same effect.
3. Semantic meaning of FS
Semantics of $fa$ ‘do’-support (FS)

$fa$ ‘do’ selects according to complement verb aspectual class (here shown with full, lexical verbs). But it’s not a case of yes/no grammaticality.

✓ Fé-t mangià-la la carne?
   “Do you eat meat?”

? Fé-t troà le ciaf hemper an tahca?
   “Do you always find your keys in your pocket?”

?? Fé-t penhà che ’l hàeh anna bùna idéa, o no?
   “Do you think that it’s a good idea, or not?”
Semantics of *fa ‘do’*-support (FS)

*fa ‘do’* selects according to complement verb aspectual class (here with (semi-)auxiliary verbs). It can almost reach the level of yes/no grammaticality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Fé-t nà dehpeh a curì la matina preht?</th>
<th>“Do you often go running in the early morning?”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Fé-t finì a tö-ho i cachi prima che ‘l rüa la nef?</td>
<td>“Do you finish gathering the persimmons before the snow comes?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Fé-t podé mangià-la la carne graha?</td>
<td>“Can you eat fatty meat?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![ ✓ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>manner-act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>result (act, achv, acmp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>stative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Measuring FS use by verb aspectual class
Elicitation experiments

Phase 4: 2584 tokens
- 17 lexical verbs
- 11 auxiliary verbs
- 4 questions per verb
- 16 Middle Valley informants

Phase 3: 2935 tokens
- 18-25 lexical verbs
- 4-10 auxiliary verbs
- 3 (or 1/2) questions per verb
- 14 Middle Valley, 7 Upper Valley informants

Phases 1-4: 12538 tokens
- Total interrogative tokens: 9429
- Total tokens: 12538

You need a lot of tokens to attempt statistically valid generalizations that are not based on yes/no grammaticality!
P3/P4 measurement by verb: all yes/no Qs in the Present-habitual
Elicitation experiments: Phase 4

Lexical verbs (Camuno cognates)

**Manner (activity) verbs**
lavorare 'work', mangiare 'eat', lavare 'wash',
leggere 'read', girare 'turn, spin' *rompere ‘break’
( causative)

**Result (achievement/accomplishment) verbs**
rompersi 'break (itself)', maturare 'ripen', cadere
'fall', trovare 'find' + dare ‘give’ (causative) *pesare
'weigh' (static used eventively)

**Stative verbs**
sapere 'know'; pensare 'think'; piacere 'like, please',
credere in 'believe in', fidarsi 'trust'

* Indicates the category with which they patterned: it was
not predicted in advance.
Elicitation experiments: Phase 4

(Semi-)auxiliary verbs (Camuno cognates)

**Manner (activity) verbs**
andare 'go'

**Result (achievement/accomplishment) verbs**
finire (nat) 'finish', cominciare (nat) 'begin', smettere 'stop', riuscire 'succeed', *provare 'try'
fare (caus)-anim ‘make, let', fare (caus)-inanim 'cause, make',

**Stative verbs**
volere 'want', potere (req) 'could', potere (pos) 'could/might', potere (abil) 'can'

* Indicates the category with which they patterned: it was not predicted in advance.
Elicitation experiments: Phase 4

Divisions of non-stative verbs

**Activity verbs lexicalizing manner**
Use of a manner adverb is possible
Typically pass tests for agentivity (subject-orientated adverbs, embedding in FI causative, imperative), but may not in all uses.
Unergative, or transitive. If transitive, object is usually deletable.
Typical: *mangiare* ‘eat’; Atypical: *girare* ‘turn/spin’ (machine subj)

**Eventives lexicalizing result - achv./acmpl. verbs**
Use of a manner adverb is NOT possible
Includes (non-stative) unaccusatives and causative counterparts. If transitive, object is not deletable.
Heterogeneous group: *rompersi* ‘break (itself)’, *maturare* ‘ripen’,
*cadere* ‘fall’, *trovare* ‘find’, *dare* ‘give’
Enrica ti ha detto che non voleva più lavorare il sabato. Ma adesso è sabato la vedi in azienda davanti alla machinetta del caffè. Chiedi ad Enrica se lavora il sabato.

Sentence requested

Lavori il sabato?

Laùret 'l sabet?

Fet laurà 'l sabet?

Fet laurà 'l habet?
5. Defining $fa$ used in early stages of FS construction
## Initial use of FS

### Average results for one Esine speaker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>ac-m/st</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lexical only</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stative</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>result</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auxiliary only</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stative</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>result</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 ∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All verbs: lex &amp; aux</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stative</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>result</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19 3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FS: activity > stative (and stronger effect with auxiliaries)**
Initial FS use

Results for four Esine speakers by verb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 1: Esine (4 ins)</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Tok</th>
<th>FS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sapere</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rompersi</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piacere</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pensare</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dare</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fare (caus)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maturare</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>credere in</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pesare</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fidarsi</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadere</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trovare</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>girare</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mangiare</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lavorare</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rompere</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lavare</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leggere</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FS: manner-activity (red) > result (blue) & stative (green)
 Semantic content of support verb *fa* ‘do’

*fa* in Esine preferentially selects for manner-activity complement verbs, thus *fa* ‘do’ (Esine) also has the semantic content of a manner-activity verb.

Using lexical decomposition system of Rappaport Hovav & Levin, 1998, 2015:

\[ fa \text{ (support-verb) ‘do’} = [ x \text{ ACT } <\text{MANNER=DO}> ] \]
Semantic content of support verb *fa* ‘do’

\[ fa \text{ (support) ‘do’ } = [ x \text{ ACT } <\text{MANNER}=\text{DO} > ] \]

\[ fa \text{ (pro-verb) ‘do’ } = [ x \text{ ACT } <\text{MANNER}=\text{DO} > y ] \]

\[ fa \text{ (caus and acmpl.) ‘make, let, cause’ } = [ x \text{ ACT } ] \text{ CAUSE } [ \text{ BECOME } [ y <\text{RES-STATE}=\text{caused}> ] ] \]

The support verb *fa* is aspectually similar to the pro-verb, not the causative verb (or the accomplishment verb).

- The Camuno support verb *fa* is probably derived from the pro-verb, not the causative verb. (But we have no direct evidence for these initial stages.)
6. FS grammaticalization pathway
Grammaticalization of *fa* ‘do’-support (FS)

**Lexical verbs: manner > result > state**  
animate > inanimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 1: Esine (4 infs)</th>
<th>Zone 2: Mal-Civ-Mez-BnA (4)</th>
<th>Zone 3: Bienno-C (3 infs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verb</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tok</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sapere</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rompersi</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piacere</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pensare</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dare</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fare (caus)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maturare</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>credere in</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pesare</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fidarsi</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadere</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trovare</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>girare</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mangiare</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lavorare</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rompere</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lavare</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leggere</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

White (total/almost total use) and grey (no/almost no use) lettering indicates relative order of verbs is not discernable.
Grammaticalization of *fa* ‘do’-support (FS)

**Auxiliary verbs:**
- manner > result > state
- aspectuals/causative > *riuscire/provare*
- *potere* (ability, permission & possibility) > *volere*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>FS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>volere</em></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>potere</em> (pos)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>potere</em> (req)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>potere</em> (abil)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>riuscire</em></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fare</em> (caus)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>provare</em></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cominciare</em></td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>finire</em></td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>smettere</em></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>andare</em></td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>volere</em></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>potere</em> (req)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>potere</em> (abil)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>riuscire</em></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>provare</em></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>finire</em></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>andare</em></td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fare</em> (caus)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fare</em> (caus)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>smettere</em></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>smettere</em></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>andare</em></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>andare</em></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>volere</em></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>potere</em> (pos)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>potere</em> (req)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>potere</em> (abil)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>riuscire</em></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>provare</em></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cominciare</em></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>finire</em></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>andare</em></td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fare</em> (caus)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>smettere</em></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>smettere</em></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>andare</em></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>andare</em></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>volere</em></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>potere</em> (pos)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>potere</em> (req)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>potere</em> (abil)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>riuscire</em></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>provare</em></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cominciare</em></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>finire</em></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>andare</em></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- FS is incompatible with ‘uncertainty’ (also suggested by tense contrasts)
- *potere* has several overlapping senses but is still one verb

White (total/almost total use) and grey (no/almost no use) lettering indicates relative verb order is not discernable.
Grammaticalization of *fa* ‘do’-support (FS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS hierarchy</th>
<th>Cinque 1999, 2006b, 2006c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>volere</td>
<td>potere-pos 'could, might'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potere (pos/req)</td>
<td>volere 'want' / volentieri 'willingly'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potere (abil)</td>
<td>potere-abil 'can'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riuscire</td>
<td>riuscire 'succeed'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provare</td>
<td>provare 'try'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cominciare (nat)</td>
<td>(smettere 'stop')* / (non) piu' 'no longer'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finire</td>
<td>finire 'finish' / del tutto 'completely'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smettere</td>
<td>Ø / bene 'well'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fare (caus)</td>
<td>fare-caus 'cause, make, let'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>andare</td>
<td>cominciare-nat 'begin (natural start)'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Asp: Aspirational
- Mod: Modal
- Causative
- Inceptive
- Inceptive-II
- Andative
- Andative-II
- Completative
- Completative-I
- Completable
- Voice

There is some similarity to cartographic hierarchy

*Taking position of *più* rather than *smettere*
Grammaticalization of *fa* ‘do’-support (FS)

Explaining the manner > result > state sequence

Stage 1:  
[ x ACT <MANNER > (y) ]

Stage 2:  
[ x ACT ] CAUSE [ BECOME [ y <RES-STATE > ]] OR
[ BECOME [ y <RES-STATE > ]] OR
Interval use of statives

Stage 3:  
[ x <STATE > (y) ]

- Presence of activity in the semantics of a result verb does not influence pattern of grammaticalization. Associations or implications of the verb are more important.
Grammaticalization of *fa* ‘do’-support (FS)

Factors other than aspect: grammaticalization of the final states (P3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 1: MV</th>
<th>Zone 2: MV (&amp;UV)</th>
<th>Zone 3: UV</th>
<th>Zone 4: UV Monno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verb</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Verb</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volere DP/AdjP</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>volere DP/AdjP</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sembrare</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>sembrare</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sapere DP</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>potere (abil)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piacere</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>piacere</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pensare</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>pensare</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mancare</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>mancare</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potere (abil)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>potere (abil)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>credere in</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>credere in</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sequence deduced from P3 and P4

*fidarsi* 'trust' > *credere in* 'believe' > *mancare* 'miss' >

*pensare* 'think' / *piacere* 'please' >

*potere* (ability) 'can' > *potere* (permission) ‘can/could’ / *potere* (possibility) 'can’ >

*sembrare* 'seem' > *volere* 'want' / *sapere* 'know'
Grammaticalization up the valley
Communication within the valley

Grammaticalization chains
1. S > N up Oglio
2. W > E up Grigna
3. E > W down Ogliolo
4. E > W down Val di Scalve
In contact zones where FS-dialects interact with SCI-only dialects (south and west), FS is optional, pragmatically controlled fails to generalize semantically across verbal classes.

- The functional/pragmatic contrast FS-SCI prevents extension of the activity meaning of *fa* and grammaticalization of the construction.

The sequence of generalization of *fa* to verbs of different aspectual classes is similar in three different valleys.

- The grammaticalization sequence is largely predetermined.

An alternative hypothesis? Could there have been full grammaticalization then recent re-introduction of SCI and de-grammaticalization?

- There would be no reason for the pragmatically-neutral SCI to target stative verbs.
7. Cross-linguistic generalizations about ‘do’-support
Camuno manner ‘do’ (in 'do’-support) belongs to a group that is cross-linguistically common.

Survey of 200 languages from all major language groups

Type 2 (most common):
“If a language has a rigid or dominant word order, periphrasis is used to mark clause types that display a deviant or irregular word order or to maintain a close approximation of the regular word order in these, i.e. to keep the relative order of verb and object unchanged. Focalization, topicalization and interrogativity are the most common functions that can be associated with the periphrasis in this context.”
Cross-linguistic ‘do’-support

Maintenance of VO confers no apparent advantage in Romance

Forget the verb-raising motivation advanced for English ‘do’-support! The lexical verb raises out of the VP even in the declarative.

1. Te Mangiet hemper ann insalata a mehdé.? QDec  
   \[V \quad \text{Adv} \quad \text{O}\]
2. Màngie-t hemper ann insalata a mehdé? SCI  
   \[V \quad \text{Adv} \quad \text{O}\]
3. Fé-t hemper mangià ann insalata a mehdé? FS  
   \[\text{Aux} \quad \text{Adv} \quad V \quad \text{O}\]
   “Do you always eat a salad for lunch?”

➢ Does fa simply perform a highlighting function? (Just add fa to QDec and change the stress?)
Jäger (2006) obligatory versus optional periphrasis

“While one and the same grammatical function can often be formulated for obligatory periphrasis in one language (LgA) and optional periphrasis in another (LgB), the crucial difference is that in LgA it is this function itself that necessitates periphrastic expression [grammatical use], whereas in LgB the salience of the function first has to be evaluated by a speaker in a given context [pragmatic use] before it is expressed periphrastically.”

With optional periphrasis, or ‘do’-support, the speaker is evaluating whether the proposition requires highlighting.
Cross-linguistic ‘do’-support

**Type 2** accounts for 38 of 200 languages studied, including:

**Germanic:** English (obligatory); German (av/hl), Dutch, (av), Swedish

**Celtic:** Welsh (av/hl), Cornish (hl), Breton

Let’s add:

**Romance:** BUT ONLY Camuno (av/hl); (Medieval French: VP ellipsis)

And members of these families:

Niger-Congo, Barbacoan, Penutian, Tacanan, Tucanoan, Chadic, Salishan, Uto-Aztecan, Malayo-Polynesian, Hokan, Wakashan, Chibchan-Paezan, Arauan, Formosan, Sko-Vanimo, Berber, TNG/MAR, Sepik-Ramu

additional pragmatic functions: av = avoidance of lexical verb inflexions, hl – highlighting

- Camuno is Type 2. Interrogativity (relatively rare) is part of more common set of uses related to information structure or ‘highlighting’.
Cross-linguistic ‘do’-support

Highlighting is the main function of *do*.

1. Despite my opinion of him, I do **hope he wins**.
2. Not often do **you find such a good batsman**.*
3. Quite incorrectly did **he assume that Mars is not flat**.
4. Does **that beer taste good**! **
5. I do **WANT to be there**, I’m just not free at 5.
6. I **DO like that hat**!
7. You don’t want me to buy it, do **you [want me to buy it]**?
8. I said I would clean the bathroom and **clean the bathroom**, I did <clean the bathroom>.

* From Jäger (2006)

➤ Is there other evidence for a highlighting function for *fa ‘do’* in Camuno besides interrogative use?
Cross-linguistic ‘do’-support

Highlighting the VP with fa ‘do’ in an emphatic causative (declarative or interrogative)

(Emanuela makes mistakes when she is tired or distracted. Today:)
1. Ol vi ol ghe farà fà amò hbaìà i cùncc. (Bienno)
   Il vino le farà (*far) ancora sbagliare i conti. (Italian)
   ‘The wine will make her get the accounts wrong again.’

(Simone doesn’t have the strength he once did.)
2. Ghe fa-la piü fà hegà-fo l'erba (la ho fonna)? (Berzo)
   dat.3 caus.3-SCL.3f no-more do.infin cut.infin-down the grass (his wife)
   (Non) gli fa più (*far) tagliare l'erba, la moglie? (Italian)
   ‘Does his wife no longer make him cut the grass?’

(If Tonino is on a diet...)
3. Fosa la mama he-la fà-ga fà mangià la nutella? (Bienno)
   Why his mother does-SCL.3f let.infin-dat.3 do.infin eat.infin the nutella
   Perché la mamma gli fa (*far) mangiare la nutella? (Italian)
   'If Tonino is on a diet, why (on earth) does his mother let him eat nutella?'
Cross-linguistic ‘do’-support

Grammaticalization of English ‘do’: stative verbs lagged behind

Figure 4.5: The behavior of know-class verbs compared to others in Ellegård’s corpus.

Redrawn by Ecay, 2016
8. (Peaceful?) co-existence of *fa* ‘do’ and *fa* ‘cause’?
Distinguishing ‘do’ and ‘cause’

Manner verb

fa (support) ‘do’ = [ x ACT <manner=do > ]

Result verb

fa (caus) ‘make, let, cause’ =

[ x ACT ] CAUSE [BECOME [ y <RES STATE=caused> ]]

Many languages lexicalize ‘do’ (raising verb: no additional argument) and ‘cause’ (introduces an argument) with same word (e.g. eastern dialect of Middle English, Dutch) so having both is not impossible.

FACERE derivatives meaning ‘cause’ are common in Romance but:

Why is the manner ‘do’ sense so rare in Romance as an auxiliary verb? Is it due to possible confusion with the causative verb?

*eg. ‘clean’ and ‘climb’ (Rappaport Hovav & Levin, 2010)
Distinguishing ‘do’ and ‘cause’

No confusion possible: presence of non-subject clitics

Interrogative (non-causative)
1. Fa-la hemper mangià-la (‘l peh per hena)?
   Do.3-SCL.3F always eat.infin-ACC.3f (the fish for supper) ?
   “Is she eating/Does she (usually) eat it (fish for supper)?”

Causative (and interrogative)
2a. Ghe la fa-la hemper mangià (la mama)?
   3.DAT 3F.ACC make.3-SCL.3F always eat.INFIN (their mother)
   “Does she (their mother) always make them eat it?”

2b. Fa-la semper fa-ghe-l mangià, (la mare)?
   Does-SCL.3F always make.3-3.DAT 3F.ACC eat.infin (their mother)
   “Does she (their mother) always make them eat it?”

**fa (caus):** Object/causee clitics climb to the causative verb

**fa (do):** Object clitics are on the (first) infinitival verb
Distinguishing ‘do’ and ‘cause’

Potential confusion in Esine (1): Unnamed causee (faire-par) and no other non-subject clitics

**Fa-l giühtà la machina, Davide?**

Interrogative (non-causative)

1. **Fa-l giühtà la machina, Davide?**
   
   SCL.m.sg / Davide = subject
   «Is he repairing the car?»

Causative (and interrogative)

2. **Fa-l giühtà la machina, Davide?**
   
   SCL.m.sg / Davide = causee, faire-par
   = Fa aggiustare la machina, Davide? (Italian)
   «Is he getting the car repaired?»

- But... *faire-par* structure is relatively rare

This ambiguity (i.e. lack of named causee) was suggested by Ellegård (1953) as the source of *do*-support in Early Modern English.
Distinguishing ‘do’ and ‘cause’

1. **Fa-la hpetà, Angela?**
   = Aspetta Angela? (Ital.); Angela=subject “Is Angela waiting?”

2. **Fa-la hpetà Angela (e.g. Maria)?**
   = ? Aspetta Angela,, (Maria)? (Ital.). Angela=object
   “Is she (Maria) waiting for Angela?”

Causative (and interrogative)

3. **Fa-la hpetà Angela (e.g. Maria)?**
   Angela = “causee” (subj. of lexical verb)
   = Fa aspettare Angela (Maria)? (Ital.) *(faire-infinitif)*
   “Is she (Maria) making Angela wait?”

But... intonation helps discriminate.
Distinguishing ‘do’ and ‘cause’

Fa-l mangià ‘l ca? (Camuno, Esine)

The three solutions to not ‘eating the dog’:
• add a clitic object/causee
• support the causative verb
• change one of the verbs*

Is he feeding the dog?

i fa-l mangìà, ‘l ca?** (Esine)
Fa-l fà mangià ‘l ca? (Astrio di Breno)
Ha-l fà mangià ‘l ca? (Bienno)

Is the dog eating?

Hà-l mangià, ‘l ca? (Bienno)

*In the same way make was borrowed from another dialect in Early Modern English so ‘do’ and ‘cause’ were no longer both lexicalized by do (Ellegård, 1953).

**default clitic as m.sg already used.
Distinguishing ‘do’ and ‘cause’

Conclusion

fa ‘do’ and fa-support exists in Camuno but with limitations due to potential confusion with fa ‘cause’ and the causative structure.

- Hence fa ‘do’ exists in the interrogative but not declarative (B&P, 2004). The one exception is when fa ‘do’ is embedded under fa ‘cause’ inside a causative (this work).

- In the early stages of grammaticalization there can be potential confusion. One solution is to use a different word for the newer, non-causative use. If the construction generalizes so that it is then also applied to the causative verb, the problem goes away.
9. Origin of the Camuno support verb *fa* ‘do’
Origin of support verb *fa ‘do’* in Camuno?

Possible reasons why ‘do’-support exists in Camuno

- ‘Do’-support is a contact effect/calque from Germanic dialects? (No. Effectively no direct contact between peoples.)
- The expression is a *Sprachbund* effect from Germanic? (Maybe)
- The ‘idea’ comes from a Celtic substratum? (Maybe)

Does there have to be a reason?

- A ‘do’ auxiliary is (almost) a cross-linguistic universal.
- Camuno capitalizes on an auxiliary verb that was invented for pragmatic reasons.
10. Summary and conclusions
The lingering pragmatic meaning of ‘do’

- The different pragmatic use is the reason why two interrogative forms, SCI and FS continue to co-exist in certain dialects.
- The pragmatics of *fa* ‘do’ and the FS construction is a consequence of the natural extension of the ‘do’ semantics to include “assertiveness”.
- The “assertiveness” pragmatics (therefore semantics) never quite goes away while there is another form for contrast.

- Semantic ‘extension’ seems a more appropriate term than semantic ‘bleaching’.
Summary and Conclusions

The lingering semantic meaning of ‘do’

- Initial use of fa ‘do’ is with verbs of similar aspect, i.e. activity verbs with lexicalized manner.
- Use of fa ‘do’ and FS generalizes to result verbs but this is via implication of activity in the situation not necessarily by its inclusion in the verb semantics.
- Generalization to stative verbs could be through an interpretation of the result state of an activity or by complete loss of the ‘activity’ connection.

❖ Pragmatics drives grammaticalization.


https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199544325.001.0001
The grammaticalization of ‘do’-support in the northern Italian Camuno dialect

Nicola Swinburne
Oxford University

With grateful thanks to Sandra Paoli, University of Oxford
Vittorio Volpe, Esine; and all the informants of Val Camonica
Grammaticalization of *fa* ‘do’-support (FS)

Tense variation: Future (perfective) > Present-Habitual (imperfective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fut/PresHab</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th></th>
<th>PresHab</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>Toks</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Tot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity - atelic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cantare</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parlare</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>andare* - aux</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity - telic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lavare + DP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mangiare + DP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>andare + loc*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achievement (telic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finire di (nat)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riuscire a</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

➢ This is not due to telicity. More likely is an “uncertainty” connection.