Wh-in situ & *wh*-doubling in Northern Italian Varieties: Against Remnant Movement

M. Rita Manzini & Leonardo M. Savoia
University of Florence

0. Abstract

In this article we address the remnant movement analysis of *wh-* in situ in Northern Italian varieties (Pollock, Munaro and Poletto 1999, 2001, Poletto and Pollock 2004a, 2004b, 2009), beginning with a review of the empirical evidence that it has been taken to account for. Based on data from Lombard varieties, we argue that *wh*-in situ is not necessarily restricted to root contexts (section 2.1) and it does not necessarily display sensitivity to islands (section 2.2). When it comes to *wh*-doubling (section 2.3), while *wh*-clitics are restricted to the left periphery, non-clitic *wh*-phrases equally distribute at the left periphery and in situ. We conclude that remnant movement is (at best) unnecessary to account for such evidence. Therefore we propose that the parameter between *wh*-in situ and *wh*-movement in Northern Italian varieties is the classical one between overt scope (i.e., *wh*-movement) and scope construal (i.e., *wh*-in situ). As for *wh*-doubling we conclude that it is restricted to pairs of bare *wh*-elements, of which the lower bears Focus properties, while the higher one is the scope marker. No role, even a descriptive one, is played by the notion of "weak" *wh*-pronouns.

1. Introduction

The classical analysis of the *wh*-in situ phenomenon in generative grammar goes back to Huang's (1982) work on Chinese. According to it, both *wh*-movement languages like English and *wh*-in situ languages like Chinese do in fact have *wh*-movement. However this movement is overt, or syntactic, in English, while it is covert in Chinese, since it happens at LF, after the syntax has already been sent over to PF for spell-out.

Within the Minimalist framework, Chomsky (2000) posits an uninterpretable Q feature associated with C which acts as a probe for interpretable Q features; the latter are supplied by *wh-* phrases, which enter into an Agree relation with C. In languages like Chinese, which present *wh-*in situ, this Agree mechanism is sufficient to assign scope to *wh-* phrases. On the other hand in a language like English, *wh-*movement applies as a consequence of the EPP features associated with C as a phase. Chomsky (2000:109) suggests that this feature, or to be more precise the phasehood of C, is language specific, whence the parameterization observed.

Since Huang (1982), the discussion of *wh-*in situ has been connected with that of island phenomena. According to Huang (1982) *wh-*in situ in Chinese does not show sensitivity to (so called strong) islands. Therefore he concludes that locality conditions, in the form of the CED (Condition on Extraction Domains), apply to overt, but not to covert movement.[1] Under Chomsky's theory (2000) there is no need to stipulate an asymmetry between overt and covert movement, since there is in fact no covert movement but only at-distance licensing through Agree. In this respect, Minimalist theory incorporates proposals advanced by previous literature, to the effect that the covert *wh-*movement of Huang should really be construed as quantificational binding at the LF interface (Nishigauchi 1990).

Another major proposal regarding *wh-*in situ was influenced by a research program formulated by Kayne (1998:175) in the following terms:

> In a number of cases … where covert (LF) phrasal movement has been postulated, it is possible and advantageous to dispense with covert movement (including feature raising) and replace it with a combination of overt movements of phonetically realized phrases. The strongest interpretation of this conclusion is that … UG leaves no choice: Scope must be expressed hierarchically, there are no covert LF phrasal movements permitted by UG, and neither can the effect of covert phrasal movement be achieved by feature raising. Scope reflects the interaction of merger and overt movement.

[1] To be more precise, Huang (1982) notices that while *wh-*elements like "what" can have scope over other *wh-*elements, "why" or "how" cannot. This could be described as a sensitivity of adjuncts to *wh-*islands, i.e., to so called weak islands. Huang proposes that a different principle is responsible for the behaviour of adjuncts, namely the ECP (Empty Category Principle), which applies to the traces of abstract movement no less than to those of overt movement.

"Feature movement" refers to Chomsky's (1995) construal of covert movement—which one might think of as the antecedent of Agree. The kind of "combination of overt movements" that Kayne had in mind is in fact well illustrated by work on *wh*-in situ in Romance, and specifically in Northern Italian dialects, by Pollock, Munaro and Poletto (1999, 2001), Poletto and Pollock (2004a,b, 2009). This analysis is based on overt *wh*-movement and on remnant movement of the sentence vacated by the *wh*- phrase around the *wh*-phrase itself.

In this article we address the remnant movement analysis of *wh*-in situ in Northern Italian dialects beginning with the empirical evidence that it has been taken to account for (section 2). We argue that remnant movement is (at best) unnecessary to account for such evidence. Therefore we conclude in favour of a non-movement analysis, by interpretive construal (section 3). In the process we also consider *wh*-in situ with doubling by a moved *wh*-phrase. We cannot exclude that other evidence offered in favour of remnant movement is more robust. However if no such evidence is found, then the most parsimonious option would seem to be to let Chomsky's (1995) Economy filter out remnant movement, also implying the abandonment of Kayne's (1998) program.

1.1. The remnant movement analysis of *wh*-in situ in Northern Italian dialects

The existence of *wh*-in situ in Northern Italian varieties is documented by various authors in recent literature. For instance Benincà and Vanelli (1982: 33) note it for the Feltre (Belluno, Veneto) area, Lurà (1987: 148-149) for Mendrisio (Canton Ticino), Poletto and Vanelli (1995: 156) for Tignes d'Alpago (Belluno, Veneto), Benincà (1997) for Monno (Lombardy)—followed by a more systematic investigation by Munaro (1997, 1999) in particular of Bellunese. Pollock, Munaro and Poletto (1999, 2001) take up Bellunese data of the type in (1) and provide a remnant movement analysis for them.

(1) a. à- lo magnà che?   (Bellunese)
         has-he eaten   what
         'What did he eat?'

     b. se- tu   ndat andé
         are-you gone where
         'Where have you gone?'

According to Pollock et al. (2001), in a sentence like (1a) the *wh*-phrase moves to the left periphery, as in (2a), to a N(ew)I(nformation) position, while the remnant of the sentence, vacated by the *wh*-phrase, moves to a Ground position to the left of the *wh*-phrase itself, as in (2b)—yielding the appearance of *wh-* in situ in (1a). Structure (2c) corresponds to the insertion of the "non-assertive" (subject) clitic which according to the authors characterizes Bellunese (cf. the discussion in section 3 below). This non-assertive clitic in turn requires verb movement, as in step (2d).[2]

(2) a.   [$_{NIP}$che [$_{IP}$ à magnà ~~che~~]
     b.   [$_{GroundP}$ [$_{IP}$ à magnà ~~che~~] [$_{NIP}$che t$_{IP}$ ~~à magnà che~~]
     c. [$_{ForceP}$lo   [$_{GroundP}$ [$_{IP}$ à magnà ~~che~~] [$_{NIP}$ che
     d. [$_{ForceP}$ à+lo [$_{GroundP}$ [$_{IP}$ ~~à~~ magnà ~~che~~] [$_{NIP}$ che

Poletto and Pollock (2004a, 2004b) widen the empirical basis of the theory by considering the doubling of a *wh*-element (in sentence initial position and in situ) in Veneto and Lombardy dialects. This leads them to modify the analysis of examples like (1), which they assume to instantiate *wh*-doubling with a silent *wh*-clitic (notated by them "Rest," here Ø). The derivation in (2) is substantially maintained, except that in the final step of the derivation the *wh*-clitic moves to an even higher position, as in (3e). The other most relevant changes are that in step (3c), remnant movement to the left periphery of the *wh*-phrase involves only the participial phrase and not the whole sentence; and that in step (3d), subject clitic inversion is itself conceived in terms of remnant movement. It is evident that if in (3) the clitic *wh*-head was lexical, *wh*-doubling would be obtained.

(3) a.   [[$_{OpP}$ andé Ø] [tu se [ndat ~~andé Ø~~]
     b.   [$_{TopP}$[ndat ~~andé Ø~~] [[$_{OpP}$ andé Ø] [tu se ~~ndat andé Ø~~]
     c. [$_{GP}$tu [$_{TopP}$[ndat ~~andé Ø~~] [[$_{OpP}$ andé Ø] [~~tu~~ se ~~ndat andé Ø~~]
     d. [$_{FP}$ [~~tu~~ se ~~ndat andé Ø~~] [$_{GP}$ tu   [$_{TopP}$[ndat ~~andé Ø~~] [[$_{OpP}$ andé Ø]
        ~~[tu se ndat andé Ø]~~
     e. [$_{OpP}$ Ø   [$_{FP}$ [~~tu~~ se ~~ndat andé Ø~~] [$_{GP}$ tu [$_{TopP}$ [ndat ~~andé Ø~~]
        [[$_{OpP}$ andé Ø]

---

[2] Pollock et al. (2001) assume that the "non-assertive" clitic is inserted in a lower position and then moved to Force together with the verb, which is irrelevant for the present purposes.

Poletto and Pollock (2009) turn to the variety of Mendrisio, display-ing a "tripartite distinction among *wh-* items: not only does it have clitic and strong ('tonic') *wh*-items … but also weak *wh*-words."[3] They reproduce essentially the derivation in (3) for sentences where the *wh*-in situ is doubled by a *wh*-clitic. For sentences where the *wh*-in situ is doubled by a "weak" *wh*-element they propose a parallel derivation, based on the idea that "*wh*-pairs … are merged as a unit in argument position," i.e., on the assumption "that each element in such pairs instantiates a (set of) feature(s) in the complex functional structure of *wh*-items."

The actual labels adopted by Poletto and Pollock (2004a) whose derivation we reproduce in (3) are partially different from those of Pollock et al. (2001) reproduced in (2) (Poletto and Pollock (2009) are again slightly at variance with both). What remains constant is that the labels hint at interpretive properties, implying interpretive reasons for the various movements postulated. In spite of this, it seems to us that the analyses in (2)-(3) face the restrictiveness problem generally imputed to Kaynian movement, namely that Chomsky's (1995) Economy principle (to the effect that movement is possible only if necessary) does not hold. It seems to us that the labels are reconstructed backwards from the required movements, rather than motivated by genuinely independent needs. Still, despite this lack of restrictiveness, one may have to bear with the analysis for empirical reasons, in other words because empirical evidence necessitates it. This is the issue we turn to in the next section, arguing that available evidence at best is neutral with respect to remnant movement.

2. Empirical Evidence[4]

2. 1. Root and embedded *wh*-in situ

According to Pollock et al. (2001) a crucial difference between the *wh*-in situ of East Asian languages and that of Bellunese in (1), is

---

[3] According to Poletto and Pollock (2009) this tripartite distinction was "hitherto undocumented"; in reality Manzini and Savoia (2005), on whose data and analyses the present article is based, already discuss paradigms of the relevant type as prob-lems for Poletto and Pollock's previous work (cf. here the discussion surrounding (17)-(21)).

[4] Our data concern different varieties with respect to those considered by Munaro, Poletto and Pollock. Thus we we do not seek to disconfirm the data that these au-thors present. Rather the aim of our empirical discussion is to check to what extent

that in Bellunese *wh*-in situ is a root phenomenon. On the evidence of the data we collected, this is anything but a general fact about *wh*-in situ in Romance. In particular we find embedded *wh*-in situ in Lombard varieties like (4)-(5). One may wonder whether these examples do not in fact represent the quotation of a direct question, rather than a genuine embedding. There are facts that tend to discount this possibility. Thus in (4), subject clitic inversion is apparently impossible, while in the same language main questions do at least admit of it (cf. (28) below).

(4)   *Cologno al Serio*   (Lombardy)

     a. domande-ga   l   a   fa:tʃ   ko'hɛ
        ask-him   he has   done   what
        'Ask him what he has done'

     b. ma ha   mera'viʎe   g   ɛ   eɲit   ki
        myself I.wonder   there is   come   who
        'I wonder who came'

     c. øre   ha'i   l   e   nda:tʃ   indo'ɛ
        I.would.like   to.know   he   is   gone   where
        'I would like to know where he has gone'

More straightforwardly, (5) cannot represent the embedding of a quotation, given the control reading that characterizes the subject of the embedded question.

(5)   a. *La Strozza Valle Imagna*   (Lombardy)
         so   mia dyr'mi   ndo'ɛ/   por'ta   t   ko'zɛ/fa l ko'mɛ
         I.know not   to.sleep   where/   to.bring   you   what/   do it how
         'I don't know   where to sleep/what to bring you/how to do it'

---

their generalizations hold for languages which have strictly comparable grammars. Where the data disagree we are ready to entertain the idea that this represents a true instance of variation.

    Here we present selected data from *Grumello del Monte, Cologno al Serio, La Strozza Valle Imagna, Adrara San Rocco, Borgo di Terzo* (Bergamo), *Passirano* (Brescia), *Civate, Olgiate Molgora* (Lecco). More comprehensive data are found in Manzini and Savoia (2005), including a few other varieties, namely *S. Fedele Intelvi* (Como) and *Zoldo Alto, Corte* (Belluno).

b. *Grumello del Monte*   (Lombardy)
al ho   mia durmi ndoᵢɛ/ pityra l komɛ
it I.know not to.sleep where/to.paint it how
'I don't know where to sleep/ how to paint it'

In turn *wh-* doubling is so frequently encountered in embedded contexts that even Poletto and Pollock (2004b) notice it for the languages they consider—except that they conclude that this doubling has nothing to do with that found in main sentences "on the basis of morphology alone," i.e., of the morphological differences between the *wh-*elements appearing in matrix and embedded contexts. Perhaps the clearest asymmetry noted by Poletto and Pollock (2004b: 265) between matrix and embedded *wh-* morphology is between *ch* 'what' in matrix *wh-*sentences and *col che* 'that which' in embedded ones in Monno. A similar asymmetry is found in standard Italian where *quel che* 'that which' can introduce an embedded question as in (6b), but not a matrix question, as in (6a).

(6)   a. Che/ che cosa/ cosa/   *quel che   farà?
         what   /that which he.will.do
         'What will he do?'

      b. Mi   chiedo   che/ che cosa/ cosa /quel che   farà
         myself I.ask   what   /that which he.will do
         'I wonder what he will do'

Yet it is just a language-particular fact about Monno, or standard Italian, that the type 'that which' is restricted to embedded questions. In other languages, for instance Provençal varieties of Piedmont such as *Cantoira* in (7), *sən k̇* 'that which' introduces not only embedded questions, both finite and infinitival, as in (7a-b), but also main questions as in (7c). In other words, the form of interrogative introducers does not correlate in any necessary way with the matrix or the embedded context of occurrence, or *a fortiori* with different underlying structures to be imputed to such contexts.

(7)   *Cantoira* (Piedmont)
      a. sɛ   ɲiŋ lu: aŋkwe sən k   u   fənt
         I.know not they today that which they do
         'I don't know what they do today'

b. se   ɲiŋ   səŋ   k   fa
    I.know not   that   which to.do
    'I don't know what to do'

c. səŋ   k   u   fə̃nt e
    that which   they do they
    'What do they do?'

What is more, there are *wh-* doubling varieties, such as (8) and (9), where the *wh*-elements involved are perfectly identical in embedded questions, exemplified in (a)-(c), and in matrix questions (a')-(c'). In other words, in (8)-(9), the symmetry between matrix and embedded sentences could not be imputed to two different structures "on the basis of morphology alone." At the very least, more motivation would have to be provided as to why what appears to be entirely identical morphosyntaxes are in fact instantiations of different derivations.

(8)   *La Strozza*
    a. so   mia ndo   dyr'mi   ndo'ɛ
      I. know not   where   you.sleep   where
      'I don't know where you sleep'

    a'. ndo   l   pur'ti: f   indo'ɛ
      where   it bring   you   where
      'Where are you bringing it?'

    b. so   mia koza   maɲ'dʒa   ko'zɛ
      I.know not   what   to.eat   what
      'I don't know what to eat'

    b'. koza fet   ko'zɛ
      what you.do   what
      'What are you doing?'

    c. so   mia kome   i   fa   ko'mɛ
      I. know not   how   they do   how
      'I don't know how they manage'

    c'. kome fi: f   ko'mɛ
      how do   you how
      'How are you managing?'

(9)   *Civate*   (Lombardy)
    a. di   m   m   i   dur'mi ku'mɛ
       tell   me   how you.have slept   how
       'Tell me   how you have slept'

    a'. m   i   dur'mi   ku'mɛ?
       how you.have slept   how
       'How did you sleep?'

    b. di   m   se   te   fet   ku'zɛ
       tell   me   what you do   what
       'Tell me what you do'

    b'. se   fet   ku'zɛ
       what you.do what
       'What do you do?'

    c. al so   mia in'de l dɔrma indu'ɛ/ in'de dur'me indu'ɛ
       it I.know not where he sleeps where/ where to.sleep where
       'I don't know where he sleeps/ where to sleep'

    c'. in'de   l dɔrma ndu'ɛ
       where he sleeps where
       'Where does he sleep?'

In short, according to Pollock et al. (2001) Northern Italian dialects allow for *wh*-in situ/*wh*-doubling in matrix but not in embedded questions. On the basis of actual evidence, however, this conclusion does not hold for Lombard varieties like *Cologno* in (4), *La Strozza* in (5) and (8) and *Civate* in (9). Thus there is no major typological distinction between, say, Chinese and Romance in this respect, but at best a parameter that discriminates between closely connected varieties.

Let us then consider how Pollock et al. (2001) derive the generalization that *wh*-in situ in (some) Northern Italian dialects is a root phenomenon. As it turns out, there is no direct connection between remnant movement and its eventual restriction to root contexts. If there is a rule that can move the remnant of a sentence, vacated from a *wh*-phrase, to a left peripheral position (around that *wh*-phrase), that rule is in principle applicable to embedded contexts as well. In

fact, the logic of Kayne's research program (1998) as outlined in
section 1, requires that in languages like Chinese, the scope-taking
of *wh*-phrases be a result of overt (hence remnant) movement.

   Recall now that in step (a) of the derivation in (2) the *wh*-phrase
moves relatively low in NI and the Force position is ultimately
checked by the "non-assertive" subject clitic that attracts the verb.
For Pollock et al. (2001), since subject clitic inversion "is restricted to
root contexts cross-linguistically," the *wh*-phrase itself moves higher
than NI in embedded interrogatives. Therefore the proposed contrast
is between movement of the *wh*-phrase to NI in matrix questions,
and to Force in embedded questions, due to the independent non-ap-
plication of subject clitic inversion. Crucially, as far as we can see,
the remnant movement analysis of *wh*-in situ plays no necessary role
in this analysis. Suppose that *wh*-in situ was derived through Agree/
quantificational binding in matrix clauses. Then the explanation by
Pollock et al. as to why the *wh*-phrase moves (to Force) in embedded
question could still apply—namely because of the unavailability of
subject clitic inversion (in Force itself).

   In short, even if (in some varieties) *wh*-in situ is restricted to
root contexts, this provides no evidence for the remnant movement
analysis, making the issue irrelevant. We will come back to this in
section 3, after discussing subject clitic inversion.

2.2. Sensitivity to islands

   In the introductory section we briefly summarized Huang's (1982)
conclusion that (so-called strong) islands do not hold of *wh*-situ in
Chinese. However, Munaro (1999) argues that Bellunese *wh*-in situ
obeys islands, providing Pollock et al. (2001) with an argument in
favour of remnant movement. In this case, the logic of the argument
is much more transparent—and yet it is anything but cogent. It is
certainly true that in standard generative practice, sensitivity to islands
is imputed to movement; however, it has been observed more than
once that there are phenomena ostensibly not involving movement,
but rather construal with, say, a resumptive pronoun, that are also
sensitive to islands. It is on this basis that Cinque (1991) concludes
that islands apply to a wider set of theoretical constructs than just
movement chains. This line of argument can be circumvented in turn,
by assuming, for instance, that resumption depends on movement
from a "big DP" of which the resumptive pronoun is the head and

the overtly moved phrase the Spec—precisely as in the analysis of *wh-* doubling in (3). What is relevant for us here is that, given movement and given islands, the correlation of islands with movement is not a fact, but a theorem, based on a certain number of accessory assumptions. In other words, if *wh-* in situ in Northern Italian varieties is sensitive to islands the conclusion that *wh-* movement takes place is anything but inescapable.

On the other hand, suppose we adopt the strongest conclusion about a one-to-one correlation between islands and movement. Even accepting Munaro's (1999) intuitions about the sensitivity of Bellunese *wh-*in situ to islands, we note that examples of island violations are well formed in the Lombard varieties with *wh-*in situ that we studied. Note that extractions from subjects are hard to test, since postverbal subjects are generally available in the relevant varieties and they tend to behave as non-islands, not only with *wh-*in situ but also with *wh-*fronting, as shown in particular by the comparison between (12a) and (12a'). Similarly, comparison between (13c) and (13c') shows that adjunct island effects can be circumvented by *wh-*fronting no less than by *wh-*in situ or *wh-*doubling. Incidentally, we have comparable intuitions about standard Italian—which raises potential questions about the theoretical status of islands in general. In the (b) examples we display embeddings under relatives and infinitival relatives/pseudorelatives. Interestingly the absence of island effects holds in our examples even in this latter case not only for *wh-*in situ but also for *wh-*doubling, as can be seen for instance in (10b-b').

(10) *Grumello*
    a. dig ei ke g   ɛ   eˈɲit i aˈmis de ki
       say they that there are come the friends of whom
       '*Who do they say that friends of have come?'

    b. (koha) kompr ei i   leber ke i   parla de koˈhɛ
       what buy   they the books that they speak of what
       '*What do they buy the books that speak of?'

    b'. (koha) a   i   veht kel ɔm a maˈja koˈhɛ
       (what) have they seen that man to eat   what
       '*What have they seen that man eating?'

    c. ɛ l in'datʃ iˈvja hɛnha halyˈda ki
      is he gone   away without greet who
      '*Who has he left without greeting?'

(11) *Passirano* (Lombardy)
    a. pɛnset ke l ɛ bela   la spuzɔ de ki
      you.think that she is good.looking the wife   of whom
      '*Of whom do you think that the wife is good looking?'

    b. g   a   i   vest i ɔm ke   majɔ ki
      there have they seen the men that eat   what
      '*What have they seen the men that eat?'

    c. ɛ l nat via hɛnsɔ halyˈda ki
      is he gone away without greet who
      '*Who has he left without greeting?'

(12) *Borgo di Terzo* (Lombardy)
    a. dig ei ke l ɛ bela   la fomla de ki
      say they that she is good.looking the wife of whom
      '*Of whom do they say that the wife is good looking?'

    a'. de ki   dig ei ke l ɛ bela   la fomla
      of whom say they that she is good.looking the wife
      '*Of whom do you think that the wife is good looking?'

    b. a   i   komprat i leber ke i   parla de kohɛ
      have they bought the books that they speak of what
      '*What did they buy the books that speak of?'

    c. ɛ i   ndatʃ hɛnsa halyˈda ki
      are they gone without greet who
      '*Who have they left without greeting?'

(13) *La Strozza*
    a. dig ei ke ʎ   ɛ eɲitʃ i amis de ki
      say they that there are come the friends of whom
      '*Who do they say that friends of have come?'

b. konoset   ol ɔm ke l lɛs koˈsɛ
  you.know the man that he reads what
  '*What do you know the man who reads?'

b'. (koˈzɛ) ed ei ki   omeɲ   a manˈdʒa koˈzɛ
  what   see they those men   to eat   what
  '*What do they see those men eating?'

c. e la ndatʃa viˈa sɛnsa   tø   koˈsɛ
  is she gone   away without take what
  '*What has she leftß without taking?'

c'. kosɛ e la   ndatʃa viˈa   sɛnsa   tø (koˈsɛ)
  what is she gone   away without take what
  '*What has she left without taking?'

The fact that in (10)-(13) *wh*-in situ does not display island be-
haviours does not imply that Munaro (1999) is wrong in imputing
such sensitivity to Bellunese. Yet, it does imply that there is a pa-
rameter which does not correlate with any major typological divide,
but which arises in a context of microvariation. We will come back
to a possible formulation of this parameter in section 3. The same
parameter will in principle apply to the Lombard vs. Bellunese split
and to the Chinese vs. Bellunese one.

The literature also raises the question of whether weak island
effects hold for *wh*-in situ, including the Northern Italian varieties.
This question revolves around data reported for Bellunese by Pollock
et al. (2001), according to whom *wh*-in situ is impossible in negative
sentences, as in (14). They argue that ungrammaticality arises in step
(2d) of the derivation in (2), when the inflected verb should adjoin to
the enclitic; the intervening negative head blocks that movement. If
this is so, then the issue is irrelevant for the present purposes — since
we are not questioning head movement (on which see Manzini and
Roussou 2011), but only the movement analysis of *wh*-in situ.

(14) *A-tu   no parecia che?   (Bellunese)
    have-you not prepared what?

However Mathieu (1999) argues that in French *wh*-in situ is sensi-
tive not only to negation but also to *wh*-islands and that both should

be treated as weak island effects. Shlonsky (to appear) concludes that, if this is the case, Pollock et al. have a problem, since the derivations in (2)-(3) involve argumental *wh*-movement—which should not be sensitive to weak islands at all. Our evidence shows that this line of argument is irrelevant for the Lombard varieties that we are studying, since they consistently allow for *wh*-in situ taking scope across the negation, as in (15)-(16).[5]

(15) *Borgo di Terzo*
    a. vøl   el mia koˡhɛ
       wants he not what
       'What doesn't he want?'

    b. a   i   mia tølt sø   koˡhɛ
       have they not   taken up what
       'What haven't they taken?'

    c. (koha) pɛnset   k   el vøli mia koˡhɛ
       what you.think that he wants not what
       'What do you think that he doesn't want?'

(16) *La Strozza*
    (kosa) a   l   mia majat   koˡsɛ
    what   has he not eaten   what
    'What hasn't he eaten?'

Data such as (15)-(16) are in turn irrelevant to the argument of Pollock et al. (2001), since there is an early consensus in the literature (Zanuttini 1997) that varieties with adverbial negation like those in (15)-(16) do not show negation effects on verb movement.[6]

---

[5] In order to keep the discussion manageable we must limit it to Northern Italian varieties (thus we cannot extend it to wh-in situ in French and in Romance in general) and to the approaches that have been proposed for these varieties i.e., the remnant movement approach of Munaro, Poletto and Pollock—to which we oppose a purely interpretive account. The potential relevance of Mathieu (1999) and Shlonsky (to appear) was pointed out to us by our anonymous reviewer.

[6] In Manzini and Savoia (2005) we argue that there is no negation effect on verb movement even in varieties like Bellunese where there is only a negation clitic. Thus our data for *Corte* (Belluno) include well-formed negative question with subject clitic inversion, including both yes-no contexts, like (ia) and wh-contexts like (ib-c).
    (i) *Corte*   (Veneto)

2.3. The distribution of *wh*-elements in left peripheral and in situ positions

The analysis of *wh*-in situ in Northern Italian dialects in Poletto and Pollock (2004a, b), as schematized in (3), relies not only on remnant movement but also on a particular analysis of clitic doubling, of which they consider *wh*-doubling (including covert *wh*-doubling, i.e., *wh*-in situ) to be an instance. As already mentioned, this analysis assumes that a clitic and the phrase it doubles are base generated as part of the same "'big DP"; specifically, the clitic represents its head and the phrase it doubles represents its Spec. Thus there is no interpretive process construing the clitic and the phrase it doubles as a chain, but the chain is produced by movement. Elsewhere we have expressed doubts about this theory of clitic doubling (e.g., Manzini 2008). Yet what we are immediately interested in here is the claim that *wh*-doubling is an instance of clitic doubling, as well as the claim that in turn *wh*-in situ is an abstract version of *wh*-doubling.

Let us begin with the latter. There are several varieties where the same *wh*-element that appears in situ also appears in the left periphery of the sentence. This is exemplified in (17)-(18) with *ku'zɛ, kɔ'hɛ* 'what' appearing in the left periphery in (b) and in situ in (a).

(17) *Olgiate Molgora*   (Lombardy)
     a. se   fa   la   ku'zɛ
        what does she what
        *'What doe she do?'

---

a. no   l   as   to   kla'me
   not   him   have   you   called
   'Haven't you called him?'

b. tʃi'e   no   pɔ   lo   maɲ'dʒe
   who   not   can   he   eat
   'What can't he eat?'

c. ula   no   dɔrm   elo
   where   not   sleep   he
   'Where doesn't he sleep?'

We note that the well-formed word-order in (i) (and similar examples in Manzini and Savoia (2005)) has the negation clitic (which behaves like an object clitic) preceding the verb and then the subject clitic. Pollock et al. (2001) do not exemplify this order at all. However, for all we know the order in (14) could be independently excluded (for instance because the so-called negation clitic is in reality an object clitic of sorts, cf. Manzini and Savoia 2002, 2011b).

b. ku'zɛ   fa   la
   what   does she
'What does she do?'

b'. so   miŋga ku'zɛ   maɲ'dʒɔ
   I.know not   whatto. eat
'I don't know what to eat'

(18) *Grumello*

a. al fe:t   koŋ   ko'hɛ
   it you.do with   what
'What do you do it with?'

b. ho   mia ko'hɛ   fa
   I.know not whatto. do
'I don't know what to do'

Evidently if the *wh*-element in situ in (17a)-(18a) depends on doubling by a silent *wh*-clitic, in the left periphery we expect to always find a *wh*-clitic, and not the very same element, as in (17b)-(18b). In fact the lack of morphological distinction between in situ and left peripheral *wh*-items can be seen with *ki* 'who' in practically all varieties considered, leading also to the doubling of two identical elements, as in (19).

(19) *La Strozza*

a. ki   tʃamet
   who you.call
'Who are you calling?'

b. tʃamet   ki
   you.call who
'Who are you calling?'

c. ki   tʃamet   ki
   who you.call who
'Who are you calling?'

There is also evidence against the conclusion that *wh*-doubling is clitic doubling. Thus consider *Olgiate*. Overt doubling is possible

not only when the left peripheral *wh*-element is the clitic *se* 'what', as in (17a), but also when it is non clitic, namely *kuza* 'what', as in (20). Similar data are found in *La Strozza* in (21). Incidentally this possibility is explicitly excluded for *wh*-doubling languages by Poletto and Pollock (2004b: 252) based on data from Illasi (Veneto).

(20) *Olgiate*
    kuza / se fa   la   ku'zɛ
    what   does she what
    'What doe she do?'

(21) *La Strozza*
    a. so   mia koza /se por'ta   t   ko'zɛ
       I.know not what   to.bring you what
       'I do not know what to bring you'

    b. so   mia koza/ se maɲ'dʒa ko'zɛ
       I.know not what   to.eat   what
       'I do not know what to eat'

More recently,[7] Poletto and Pollock (2009) describe distributions of the type in (17)-(21) for Mendrisio. They draw two conclusions: One is that, as already mentioned in section 1, forms such as *kuza, koza* in (20)-(21) are "weak" in the sense of Cardinaletti and Starke (1999). We have reasons to doubt the structuring of pronouns that underlies this tripartion in "clitic," "weak" and "strong" forms (Manzini and Savoia 2005) and hence the validity of the corresponding descriptive categories. Yet let us limit ourselves to the empirical predictions of Poletto and Pollock (2009) namely that "weak" *wh*-phrases cannot occur "sentence internally," that they must be "adjacent to (the pronominal clitics adjacent to) a finite verb" and that "they cannot bear focus."

Now, in *Grumello* and *Civate* in (22)-(23) the elements *koha/ kuzɛ* 'what', clearly non clitic and equally distinct from the in situ elements *ko'hɛ/ ku'zɛ*, can be embedded in a prepositional phrase. We take it that this position of the *wh*- phrase is "sentence internal," given that it is embedded under a preposition; for the same reason, though linearly adjacent to the verb, the *wh*-phrase is not "structur-ally" adjacent to it in the sense presumably meant by Poletto and Pollock (2009).

   [7] Cf. fn. 3.

(22) *Grumello*
    koŋ koha al fe:t
    with what it you.do
    'What do you do it with?'

(23) *Civate*
    kuŋ kuzɛ te   l et   fa :
    with what you it have done
    'With what have you done it?'

Even more clearly, in *Grumello* in (24) the supposedly strong and weak forms *indo'ɛ* and *indoe* alternate in sentence final position, linearly non-adjacent to the verb (i.e., not left adjacent) and focal. Similarly, consider *wh*-doubling in *Adrara* in (25). (25a) has *indo* 'where' in the left peripheral position and "strong" *indo'ɛ* in situ. In (25b) *ndo* takes the left peripheral position; yet crucially the in situ position is taken by *indoe*, whose stress pattern clearly makes it a variant of *in'do*.

(24) *Grumello*
    alla port   el indoe/ indo'ɛ
    he.it brings he where
    'Where does he bring it?'

(25) *Adrara San Rocco* (Lombardy)
    a. in'do   et   indo'ɛ
       where you.go where
       'Where are you going?'

    b. ho   mia ndo   nda n doe
       I.know not where to.go where
       'I don't know where to go'

A second conclusion drawn by Poletto and Pollock (2009) about examples like (17)-(18) is that "while the weak *cusa, cuma* always require a double—i.e., are always merged as one of the two elements of a complex *wh*-phrase, just like clitics *sa, se* and *me*—strong forms like *cusè* do not." Because of this, the apparently symmetrical distribution in (17)-(18) would result from a deeper asymmetry. In particular, the in situ examples in (a) would involve the base-generation of the *wh-*

element as part of a "big" *wh*-phrase, while the leftward movement examples in (b) would involve the base generation of the *wh*-element "as a single *wh*-word." However, in the absence of any independent evidence, a theory which treats these examples as containing the same *wh*-phrases wins on the grounds of simplicity.

Incidentally, in our data the lack of asymmetry between *wh*-elements found in situ and found in the left periphery also extends to *wh*-phrases endowed with a restrictor. This runs counter to the conclusion reached by Munaro (1999) for Bellunese, namely that only simple *wh*-words can remain in situ while *wh*-phrases with a complex internal structure must move to the left-peripheral position. For Pollock et al. (2001) full *wh*-phrases, because of the presence of a restrictor will not move to NIP in the schema in (2) but to a higher position, such as Ground, which in turn is not a possible position for *wh*-phrases; this means that they will ultimately move all the way up to Force. In our data however complex *wh*-phrases are attested in situ, as well as in the left peripheral position, as in (26)-(27).

(26) *Grumello*
   a. iŋ kɛ   pɔht l e:t   kom'pra:t
      in what place it you.have bought
      'Where did you buy it?'

   a'. l e:t   kom'pra:t iŋ kɛ   pɔht?
       it you.have bought   in what place
       'Where did you buy it?'

   b. kɛ   liber e:t   le'zit
      which book you.have read
      'Which book did you read?'

   b'. e:t   le'zit kɛ   liber?
       You.have read   which book
       'Which book did you read?'

(27) *La Strozza*
   a. ke   leber et   le'zit
      which book you.have read
      'Which book did you read?'

a'. et   le'zit ke leber
 you.have read which book
 'Which book did you read?'

b. iŋ ke pɔst set in'da:tʃ
 in what place you.are gone
 'Where did you go?'

b'. set   in'da:tʃ iŋ ke pɔst
 you.are gone in what place
 'Where did you go?'

 Summarizing so far, there is a clear distributional constraint on *wh*-clitics, which only appear in the left periphery of the sentence, either alone or doubling *wh*-phrases in situ. On the other hand, non-clitic *wh*-phrases, including those that Poletto and Pollock (2009) would classify as "weak," those that they would classify as "strong" and *wh*-phrases inclusive of a restrictor equally distribute at the left periphery and in situ. This is not to deny that the varieties considered here have not one but two series of full *wh*-phrases, including a distinctive series with final stressed -'ε. We will return to this property and to its (true) distributional consequences in dealing with *wh*-doubling in section 3.1.

3. Analysis: *wh*- in situ

 The present discussion of Pollock et al. (1999, 2001), Poletto and Pollock (2004a, b, 2009) shows that the remnant movement analysis is at best possible and that *wh*-in situ in Northern Italian dialects remains open to an Agree/quantificational binding analysis. In other words, the *wh*-element is simply lexicalized in its argument position, where it is construed with an (abstract) question operator, by an Agree operation or by a purely interpretive process. If we adopt such an analysis, then of course we must account for facts that appeared problematic to supporters of remnant movement, such as sensitivity to islands or the absence of embedded *wh*-in situ in at least some varieties. We return to *wh*-doubling in section 3.1.

 First, we need to clear from the field yet another piece of evidence—concerning subject clitic inversion. An important strand of

theorizing in generative grammar seeks to establish a close connection between verb movement and *wh*-movement in interrogatives. In particular, according to the *Wh*-Criterion of Rizzi (1996), a *wh*-phrase must be in the Spec of a *wh*-head, and vice versa, a *wh*-head must have a *wh*-phrase in its Spec—implying that *wh*-movement to [Spec, C] and verb movement to C must cooccur. If this approach is correct, then the cooccurrence of *wh*-in situ with subject clitic inversion (i.e., I-to-C movement) in Northern Italian dialects is potentially problematic under the view that we propose here. For, if no movement of the *wh*-phrase occurs, then the verb in C, presumably a *wh*-head, finds itself without a *wh*-Spec.

Note however that the independence of *wh*-movement and verb movement has been built into the theory by Chomsky (1995) himself. In his terms, *wh*-movement and verb movement are two alternative ways of checking the Q feature associated with the C head. In fact, checking of this feature by the sole movement of the verb is what can be seen in matrix yes-no questions; under Rizzi's (1996) theory these must be handled by the postulation of a zero operator in [Spec, C]. The strategy with sole *wh*-movement can be overtly seen in embedded *wh*-questions, without subject inversion. Under the *Wh*-Criterion these require a zero C head with the relevant properties. On the other hand Chomsky (1995) must explain why in matrix *wh*-questions, raising of either the verb or the *wh*-phrase is not sufficient. He argues that leaving the *wh*-phrase in situ is impossible not for syntactic reasons, but for interpretability reasons; in other words, the English-Chinese parameter concerns the interpretability of the *wh*-phrase in situ, i.e., presumably its ability to be assigned a scope in the absence of movement. As for the impossibility of moving a *wh*-phrase without moving the verb in turn, he invokes PF interface reasons.

The choice between models revolves around the extra assumptions that each of them must make. The zero categories necessitated by the *Wh*-Criterion represent of course a potentially unrestricted device. In the shape of "silent" categories, they have recently been proposed as the major (perhaps sole) factor in language variation by Kayne (2006, 2008). However in Manzini and Savoia (2008, 2011a, 2010), Savoia and Manzini (2010) we argue that they are at best able to describe variation, without really explaining it. For these reasons we avoid recourse to them, and correspondingly reject the *Wh*-Criterion approach.[8]

---

[8] Cf. also section 3.1 on the idea that *wh*-in situ involves *wh*-doubling and a silent *wh*-clitic, as in (3).

In Chomsky's theory (1995) it remains unclear what PF conditions may impel verb movement in questions (or elsewhere). However what we are interested in here is that *wh*-movement and verb movement are independent of each other. It seems to us that this conclusion is equally compatible with the idea that they both respond to interpretive needs—though different ones. In particular we assume, as is classically done, that *wh*-movement corresponds to a form of scope taking by the *wh*-phrase. For us, verb movement to C (yielding subject clitic inversion) in turn responds to what we conceptualize as "interrogative modality" properties.

This frees us to assume that Northern Italian dialects display genuine *wh*-in situ and at the same time require I-to-C movement. From a purely empirical point of view, if *wh*-movement and verb movement are independent of one another, we may expect to find their presence or absence to combine fairly freely. As it turns out, in a language like *Cologno*, *wh*-in situ can cooccur with the ordinary position of the verb in I (no inversion) as in (28b) no less than with subject clitic inversion as in (28a). The same possibilities are attested with overt *wh*-movement as in (28a'-b'). Incidentally the same indifference as to the position of the verb can be observed in *wh*-doubling varieties. Thus *La Strozza* combines *wh*-doubling with subject clitic inversion, as in (8a'), (8c'), while *Civate* in (9a'), (9c') is a language with *wh*-doubling and no inversion.[9]

(28) *Cologno*

    a. fa   l   ko'hɛ
       does he what
       'What does he do?'

    a'. kɔha fa   l
       what does he
       'What does he do?'

    b. l a   fatʃ ko'hɛ
       he has done what
       'What has he done?'

[9] Our anonymous reviewer points out the potential relevance of Cardinaletti's (2007) conclusion that the verb does not move to C in Romance *wh*-interrogatives. Indeed for Cardinaletti (2007) the verb remains in I (T) in pro drop languages like Italian—which is exactly what we conclude in Manzini and Savoia (2005, pf. 3.5.4). On other points we do not necessarily agree with Cardinaletti.

    b'. kɔha l a fatʃ
      what he has done
      'What has he done?'

In short, *wh*-in situ is just lack of displacement for the *wh*-phrase and scope assignment at LF—and at the same time subject clitic inversion is a fully independent process of verb movement to C. In this perspective the structure of a sentence like (28a) is simply as in (29a).[10] In its counterpart without inversion (28b), everything is in situ, as in (29b).

(29) *Cologno*
    a. $[_C$ fa $[_D$ l $[_I$ $[_V$ ko'hɛ
    b. $[_D$ l $[_I$ a $[_V$ fatʃ   ko'hɛ

As an appendix to the present discussion, let us note that Pollock et al. (2001) further insist on the existence of a correlation between *wh*-in situ and "non-assertive" subject clitics triggering inversion. According to them, Bellunese varieties with *wh*-in situ differentiate the paradigm of preverbal (declarative) subject clitics from that of inverted (interrogative) subject clitics and the latter, i.e., "non-assertive," clitics include lexicalizations for all persons as well as for expletive contexts.

The first question then is whether the presence of a subject clitic series with these properties is a sufficient condition for *wh*-in situ. As Pollock et al. (2001) note, in Friulan varieties many enclitic forms are different from their proclitic counterparts and all subject enclitics are lexicalized, including expletives. Another defining property of

---

[10] In adopting the classical account of subject clitic inversion in terms of verb movement we are disregarding the case made by Poletto and Pollock (2004a, b) in favour of a remnant movement account of this phenomenon. They observe that in subject clitic inversion object clitics maintain their proclitic position. They argue that this cannot be accounted for by assuming that they are adjoined to the left of the verb before the inversion operation, if one assumes (Sportiche 1996, Manzini and Savoia 2005, 2007) that each clitic has its own dedicated position. In Manzini and Savoia (2005, 2007, 2008) we devote considerable attention to this difficulty. One of the keys to our solution is the observation that in many cases the inverted subject clitic has a higher correlate or (partial) copy; we take it that there is a higher domain for clitic insertion than I, say C, and that object clitics systematically target this domain in questions. Object clitics in turn can be seen to double for instance on either side of a negation (Manzini 2008) or on either side of a declarative auxiliary in Albanian (Manzini and Savoia 2007). Therefore they also have two domains of insertion at their disposal (I and C) and questions simply instantiate the C ("modal") domain.

"non-assertive" clitics which is satisfied is that changes in the verb inflection are observed in connection with the enclitics. Yet despite all of this, Friulan varieties are ordinary *wh*-fronting languages. Therefore Pollock et al. (2001) introduce a further criterion, namely that "proclitics should be sensitive to the type of subject," i.e., argumental, expletive, etc, "while enclitics should not be," thereby making the two systems "asymmetric."

What precedes seems to us more like a post-hoc reconstruction of a set of properties that may provide the required distinction than a genuinely predictive, i.e., independently motivated cluster. However, we will come directly to what is a stronger point, namely that in the *wh*-in situ varieties that we are studying here, the existence of a "non-assertive" clitic paradigm with the properties individuated by Pollock et al. (2001) is not a necessary condition for *wh*-in situ. From this perspective, consider the variety of *Passirano* in (30) (cf. (34) below). The inverted subject clitic paradigm is far from complete, reducing in essence to the 3rd person in (30b) and to the 1st person singular in (30b'). But what is particularly striking is that the enclitic is not instantiated for persons that have an available proclitic. Thus the 2nd person singular in the declarative has a subject clitic *ta* which is lacking in the interrogative. In the 1st person plural, the *-'om* morphology that appears after the verb base in the interrogative is the ordinary verb inflection for this person, whereas the declarative form is created by the ε*n* "impersonal" clitic and the 3rd person singular inflection (Manzini and Savoia 2005 and references quoted there).

(30) *Passirano* (Lombardy)

	a.		b.		
		dorme			
	ta	dormɛt		dormɛt	
	ɛl/la	dormɒ		dorm	el/elɔ
	En	dormɒ		dur'mom	
		dur'mi:f		dur'mi:f	
	i/le	dormɒ		dorm	ei/ele
	ClS	sleep		sleep	ClS
		'I sleep etc.'		'Are you sleeping? etc.'	

b'. ke   fo i
   what do I
   'What shall I do?'

In short, though Pollock et al. (2001) argue in some detail for the connection of *wh*-in situ in Northern Italian varieties with "non-assertive" clitic paradigms, and hence with subject clitic inversion, this double connection appears not to be tenable on empirical grounds. Poletto and Pollock (2009) finally acknowledge the possibility of *wh*-in situ without subject clitic inversion for Mendrisio. They propose that "the subject clitic does not move to GroundP," cancelling step (c) in the derivation in (3) "prior to Remnant IP movement to Force," i.e., step (3d). In other words, they simply accede to the position expressed here and in Manzini and Savoia (2005) that subject clitic inversion is independent of *wh*-movement/ *wh*-in situ.

It is now time to reconsider some of the empirical points reviewed in section 2 as potentially problematic for the analysis of *wh*-in situ without movement in (29). In discussing whether *wh*-in situ is admissible in embedded questions, in Northern Italian varieties in section 2.1, we noted that *wh*-in situ does emerge in embedded contexts. Yet the problem remains that we have no reason to doubt Munaro's (1999) intuitions about the impossibility of embedding *wh*-in situ in his variety. While data such as (4)-(5) show that there are grammars which allow for *wh-* in situ in embedded questions, it is possible that in other grammars some reason impels *wh-* movement in embedded sentences.

Recall that in Pollock's et al. (2001) analysis of Bellunese, this reason is the lack of subject clitic inversion, i.e., technically of verb movement to Force, in embedded contexts; because of this *wh*-phrases are themselves required to move to ForceP, showing up in the left periphery, rather than in situ. However in our data, *La Strozza* systematically moves the verb (inverting it with the subject clitic) in matrix questions (cf. (8a', c')) but allows *wh*-in situ in embedded contexts, as in (5). Therefore there is no necessary correlation between the unavailability of subject clitic inversion and the application of *wh*-movement.

We suggest that in languages where *wh*-movement is obligatory in embedded sentences, though *wh*-in situ is possible in matrix sentences, what matters is the fact that the interrogative properties of embedded sentences are selected by a higher verb. Thus we suggest that, for the relevant varieties/speakers, interrogative properties must be overtly lexicalized in C just in case they are selected for. This means that either an interrogative complementizer or a *wh*-phrase must occupy the left periphery of the sentence. This proposal appears especially

natural if we think of the realization of overt *wh*-material in scope position in terms of clause typing (Cheng 1991). Roughly speaking *wh*-typing is obligatory when *wh*-properties are selected for — though it is not in non selected (i.e., matrix) contexts.[11]

It remains for us to consider islands. To the extent that *wh*-in situ in (10) does not display any sensitivity to islands, our idea that it corresponds to an interpretive construal of *wh*-scope at the LF interface is confirmed. But as before, we cannot disregard evidence like that provided by Munaro (1999) to the effect that *wh*-in situ is sensitive to islands. Our take on this is exactly what we suggested in section 2.2 in reviewing the data, namely that islands, or the principle(s) explaining them, may not to be conditions on the movement operation but rather conditions on LF interpretive construal. The latter will include chains, hence subsume movement, but for some varieties/ speakers they may also include *wh*-scope construal, thus including *wh*-in situ without any need for the latter to involve movement.

Saying that locality conditions apply on chains and chain-like constructs strongly suggests a representational model of grammar (in the sense of Brody 2003). We have repeatedly argued in favour of such a model (Manzini and Savoia 2005, 2007, 2008) — so that we do not consider this to be a problem. The current state of the art concerning islands in generative theory is characterized by the absence of a standardized proposal comparable to Subjacency (Chomsky 1973), the CED (Huang 1982) or barriers (Chomsky 1986).[12] For what it is worth, however, all of these principles, though derivationally stated, had a representational equivalent.

In short, we conclude that the parameter between *wh*-in situ and *wh*-movement in Northern Italian dialects is the classical one between scope construal (i.e., *wh*-in situ) and overt scope (i.e., *wh*-movement). In the next section, we consider *wh*-doubling.

---

[11] As pointed out by our anonymous reviewer, Shlonsky (to appear) also takes the natural step of connecting the matrix vs. embedded asymmetry to the fact that embedded contexts are selected. In his account, however, the exclusion of wh-in situ in embedded contexts is due to the fact that the probe feature activated on the C head by the matrix verb makes the complement of C impenetrable under the PIC (Phase Impenetrability Condition). Overt movement is possible because the relevant probe feature is a different one.

[12] Phases are not (primarily) a theory of islands.

3.1. *Wh-* doubling

Before we proceed to our analysis of *wh*-doubling, let us point out that any asymmetry existing between the *wh*-element in situ and the leftward moved *wh*-element tends to discount an analysis of this phenomenon in terms of movement and multiple spell-out of copies. Doubling data show that strict copies are mostly not involved in doubling; in other words, the *wh*-element appearing in situ typically has different morphology from the one appearing in the left periphery. Nor can the reduced forms be predicted from the full forms (or vice versa) on the basis of general Spell-Out (i.e., PF) properties of the language. This of course represents an argument in favour of the conclusion that they are independently lexicalized—as is the case both for Poletto and Pollock (2004b, 2009) and for the theory to be proposed here.

In fact Poletto and Pollock (2004b) are correct in stating that in *wh*-doubling a "'short' form must stand to the left of the verbal complex, while its 'long' counterpart occurs at the right edge of the sequence." For instance, a *wh*-phrase in situ embedded under a preposition is doubled by a simple *wh*-element in left peripheral position, as in (31)-(32). Since we know that pied piping is possible in simple leftward movement, under multiple spell-out we would expect a counterpart of (31)-(32) to be possible with a pied-piped *wh*-copy in the left periphery—which is not the case.

(31) *Grumello*
      koha l fe:t   koŋ ko'hɛ
      what it you.do with what
      'What do you do it with?'

(32) *Olgiate*
      se   l fet   kuŋ ku'zɛ
      what it you.do with what
      'What do you do it with?'

In present terms, *wh*-in situ, as in (29), is exactly what it appears to be—i.e., the positioning of a *wh*-phrase in argumental position, rather than in scope position. In a representational grammar of the type entertained here, the simplest way to construe *wh*-doubling is as a chain relation between the *wh*-element in argumental position and a

wh-element inserted in scope position, e.g., in (33). The fact that the two *wh*-elements share the same argument slot (which is the core of the notion of "chain") implies that they have compatible referential properties—i.e., in more traditional terms they agree.

(33) *Olgiate*
   [kuza/ se   [$_C$ fa [$_D$ la [ku'zɛ

Recall that the alternation in many varieties of *wh*-in situ and *wh*-doubling is taken into account by Poletto and Pollock (2004b) by assuming that *wh*-in situ is a variant of *wh*-doubling with a silent clitic in the left peripheral position. We object to this approach on grounds of restrictiveness;[13] until it is proven that the grammar can suitably constrain the elements that are allowed to be null, the mechanism is simply too unrestricted. In this sense the unification is notational rather than substantial.

As a point of fact, furthermore, the overt alternation between *wh*-in situ and *wh*-doubling is restricted to some varieties (here *Grumello, La Strozza, Adrara, Passirano*). Judging from our data, *Civate* and *Olgiate* have *wh*-doubling but not *wh*-in situ, while *Cologno* has *wh*-in situ but not *wh*-doubling (as does Bellunese). Given this picture, under zero lexicalization models one must state which varieties can or must have zero lexicalizations for the left periphery member of the *wh*-doubling pair. As far as we can see, an equivalent result can be achieved without recourse to zero lexicalizations. In terms of the present study, *wh*-in situ corresponds to grammars that allow for a purely interpretive construal of *wh*-scope, and *wh*-movement corresponds to grammars that require overt scope marking. *Wh*-doubling grammars then require an overt lexicalization both of the scope marker and of its variable (on whose nature, see the discussion surrounding (36)). We saw in section 2.1 that embedding of *wh*-doubling is systematically attested—which is not necessarily the case for *wh*-in situ. This is consistent with the proposal that varieties/speakers that do not allow for embedded *wh*-in situ require overt clause typing under selection by a higher verb; the latter is of course provided in *wh*-doubling.

---

[13] Its generalization to a full fledged program of research on parameterization can be found in the work of Kayne (2006, 2008). We have explicitly addressed this in Manzini and Savoia (2008, 2010, 2011a), Savoia and Manzini (2010).

There are also distributional reasons that militate against *wh*-in situ as a zero lexicalization variant of *wh*-doubling. According to the conclusions of section 3, in *wh*-in situ any non-clitic *wh*-phrase can appear in the situ position, making the latter entirely parallel (up to cliticization) to the left peripheral position in *wh*-movement. This contrasts with the asymmetries between the left peripheral and in situ *wh*-elements in *wh*-doubling. Some of these asymmetries can be made to follow from the properties of the chain in (33). Thus, by hypothesis the left peripheral *wh*-element is inserted to mark the scope of the *wh*-chain. If so, we may surmise that it takes a bare form, without any pied-piped material, as in (31)-(32). In other words only *wh*-material can be inserted in the scope position.

Concerning this latter point it is worth introducing a further set of data, concerning *Passirano* in (34), which is a possible *wh*-in situ language, as shown in (34a'-b'). The examples relevant here are (34a-c), where an invariable *ke* element appears in the left peripheral position doubled by different *wh*-phrases in situ. The *ke* element does not coincide with 'what', which is lexicalized by *ki* (as in (34c-c')), however it coincides with 'which', as in (34c''). Furthermore, it co-incides with the 'that' finite complementizer, though this is not its construal here, given that it also introduces infinitival questions, as in (34c'). The distribution of *Passirano* is reminiscent of so-called partial *wh*-movement in German (McDaniel 1989) and other languages, which involves invariable *wh*-elements in scope position (*was* 'what' in German) doubled by full *wh*-phrases lower down.

(34) *Passirano*
    a. ke   ni:f   ɛndoɛ oter
       what come.you where   you
       'Where are you coming?'

    a'. dur'mi: f   ɛndoɛ
       sleep.you   where
       'Where do you sleep'

    b. ke   fi:f   komɛ oter
       what do.you   how   you
       'How do you manage?'

b'. g   et   dur'mit   komɛ
    there you. have slept how
    'How did you sleep there?'

c. ke   hy'tʃet ki   a'dɛs
    what happens what now
    'What happens now?'

c'. ho   mia ke   di   t   ki
    I.know not what to.tell you what
    'I don't know what to tell you'

c''. ke   leber g   et   tøt
    which book to.him you.have taken
    'Which book did you bring him?'

The relevant structure for *Passirano* is entirely parallel to that in (33) except that the scope position is taken by the invariable *ke* scope marker, as in (35). The *wh*-operator status that we assign to *ke* is of course compatible with its role as a *wh*-quantifier in "which" interrogative phrases—and with its complementizer status, at least if Manzini and Savoia (2003, 2005, 2008, 2011b) are correct in concluding that ordinary complementation by *k-* elements in Romance involves *wh*-quantification over situations, i.e., propositional contents.

(35) *Passirano*
    [*ke* [$_C$ *fa* [$_D$ *l* [*ki*

Let us then consider the right end side copy of *wh*-doubling pairs. The data in section 2.3 show that there is no necessary morphological distinction between in situ and left peripheral *wh*-items, leading to the doubling of two identical elements, as can be seen in particular with *ki* 'who' in (19). Commenting on an analogous example, Poletto and Pollock (2009) state that "the clitic and the full form are homophonous"; similarly, for Sportiche (2008) French *qui* (animate) is both a strong pronoun and a weak/ clitic pronoun. In both cases, the distribution is taken to be paramount, and abstract properties will be associated with lexical items so that they fit the distribution. It seems to us that an analysis along these lines at best doesn't add anything to the observed data, which it simply restates. In the absence of any

genuine explanation, we will therefore assume that there is a single lexical item *ki* which can appear both right and left peripherally (cf. also *indoe* 'where' of *Adrara* in (25)).

One constraint concerning the right peripheral position in *wh*-doubling that emerges from the data is that -$'\varepsilon$ forms are required to appear in that position, i.e., in situ, and cannot appear in the left periphery. Conversely, as we have just seen, the in situ position cannot be restricted to the -$'\varepsilon$ morphological series, given the fact that elements such as *ki* can felicitously occupy it. Furthermore it is only in doubling that -$'\varepsilon$ forms are constrained to appear in situ, since they can appear in the left periphery in ordinary *wh*-movement sentences.

We begin by considering the internal structure of -$'\varepsilon$ forms. At least etymologically, ε coincides with the 3rd person singular of *be*. In other words *ku'z-ε* is literally 'what-is' and so on. Now the copula has a focussing role in cleft constructions—and more to the point here, it is grammaticalized as a specialized focus particle for instance in Somali (Lamberti 1983, Frascarelli and Puglielli 2005). This makes it fairly natural to conclude that the -$'\varepsilon$ morphology lexicalizes focus properties. In other words a *wh*-root like *Olgiate*'s *kuz-* in (36), rather than presenting a conventional inflection, is closed by a Focus particle. In the structure in (36) we suggest that -$'\varepsilon$ plays its focussing role by virtue of the same C properties that are associated with sentential Focus (and for that matter *wh*-movement).[14]

(36) *Olgiate*
      [$_V$ *kuz*   [$_C$ ε]]

Let us then return to the fact that in the *wh*-doubling configuration a *wh*-element of the type in (36) can be found only in situ. While *wh*-morphology can be lexicalized more than once (yielding a descriptive *wh*-doubling), it is evident that there is a single position in which the *wh*-operator is interpreted that coincides with its scope (left peripheral) position. The fact that the -$'\varepsilon$ morphology cannot be doubled means that Focus properties are not only interpreted once,

---

[14] Note that the C (Modality/ Focus) position hosting $'\varepsilon$ is in conventional terms a morphological-level position internal to the *wh*-word. In turn, the position that *ku'zε* occupies in (33) is taken to be the ordinary internal argument/ accusative position. In other words, despite the impression of our anonymous reviewer, the present account is entirely independent of the predicative-level Focus position proposed by Belletti (2009).

but also lexicalized once, and furthermore that they are apportioned to the argumental, non-scopal position. Recall that according to Poletto and Pollock (2009) left peripheral element must be "clitic" or "weak" *wh*-elements. In fact, as we saw in some detail in section 2.3 the category of "weak" elements is empirically inadequate. The only possible characterization for left periphery *wh*-elements is therefore that they are non-focal—equivalent to the conclusions just reached here.

Another generalization emerging from our data is that *wh*-doubling is only possible with bare *wh*-phrases, i.e., *wh*-phrases without a lexical restriction, both in left peripheral position and in situ. Recall that in discussing examples like (31)-(32) we suggested that the left peripheral *wh*- phrase in *wh*-doubling must be a pure operator and cannot therefore pied-pipe a preposition. We can extend the same explanation to the fact that it lacks a lexical restriction. On the other hand, it also seems to be the case that the argumental position cannot contain a lexical restriction.

In the larger variation picture concerning so-called partial *wh*-movement, there is no general constraint against complex *wh*-phrases in situ in the presence of higher *wh*-operators, routinely found in German (McDaniel 1989) and in other languages. But precisely the comparison with partial *wh*-movement reveals an important difference between the left peripheral scope markers of, say, German and those of Northern Italian dialects. For, the normal state of affairs in Northern Italian dialects is that elements in scope position, though bare, incorporate restrictions to "thing," "human," "locative," and "other." It is possible that this incorporated restriction does not allow for any doubling except by an element endowed with the very same restriction—excluding any full *wh*-phrase.

Summing this section up, we have provided structures for *wh*-doubling and we have explored the restrictions placed on both the *wh*-element in scope position and the *wh*-element in situ. If our data are correct, these restrictions are less stringent than envisaged by Pollock et al. (1999, 2001), Poletto and Pollock (2004 a, b, 2009). Roughly, *wh*-doubling is restricted to couples of bare *wh*-elements, of which the lower bears Focus properties, while the higher is the scope marker. No role, even a descriptive one, is played by the category of "weak" pronouns.

Works Cited

1. Belletti, A. 2009. *Structures and Strategies*. London/New York: Routledge.

2. Benincà P., L. Vanelli. 1982. Appunti di sintassi veneta. In *Guida ai dialetti veneti* vol. IV: 7-38.

3. —. 1997. Gli elementi interrogativi nel dialetto di Monno. *Quaderni di lavoro dell'ASIS*, 1: 13-29.

4. Brody M. 2003. *Towards an Elegant Syntax*. London/New York: Routledge.

5. Cardinaletti, A. 2007. Subjects and *wh*-questions. Some new generalizations. In J. Camacho et al. (eds.), *Romance Linguistics 2006*, 57-78. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

6. Cardinaletti A., M. Starke. 1999. The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of three classes of pronouns. In H. van Riemsdijk (ed.), *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, 145-233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

7. Cheng, L. 1991. *On the Typology of Wh-questions*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

8. Chomsky N. 1973. Conditions on Transformations. In S. Anderson, P. Kiparsky (eds.) *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

9. —.1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press

10. —. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*, Cambridge Mass: The MIT Press.

11. —. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In R. Martin, D. Michaels, J. Uriagereka (eds.) *Step by Step*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.

12. Cinque G. 1990. *Types of A'-Dependencies*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press

13. Frascarelli M., A. Puglielli. 2005. The Focus system in Cushitic languages. A comparative-typological analysis. In P. Fronzaroli, P. Marrassini (eds.), *Proceedings of 10th Metting of Hamito-Semitic Linguistics*, *Quaderni di Semitistica* 25, Dipartimento di Linguistica, Università di Firenze.

14. Huang J. 1982. *Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

15. Kayne, R. 1998. Overt vs. covert movement. *Syntax* 1:128-191.

16. —. 2006. On the parameters and on principles of pronunciation. In H. Broekhuis, N. Corver, R. Huybregts, U. Kleinhenz & J. Koster (eds.) *Organizing Grammar. Linguistic Studies in Honor of Henk van Riemsdijk*, 289-299. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

17. —. 2008. Expletives, datives and the tension between morphology and syntax. In Biberauer, M.T. (ed.) *The Limits of Syntactic Variation*, 175-217. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

18. Lamberti M. 1983. The origin of the focus particles in Somali. In V. von Rainer, U. Claudi (eds.) *Sprache, Geschichte und Kultur in Afrika*, 59-112. Amburgo: Helmut Buske.

19. Lurà F. 1987. *Il Dialetto del Mendrisiotto*. Edizioni Unione di Banche Svizzere, Mendrisio-Chiasso.

20. McDaniel D. 1989. Partial and multiple *wh*-movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 7:565-604

21. Manzini M. R. 2008. Doubling by clitics and doubling of clitics. In S. Barbiers, *Syntactic Doubling in European Dialects* (*Syntax and Semantics*), Amsterdam: Emerald.

22. Manzini, M.R, A. Roussou. 2011. "'Movement': A View from the left." Paper presented at *Parallel Domains*, USC, Los Angeles, May 5-7.

23. Manzini M. R, L.M. Savoia. 2002. Negative Adverbs are neither Adv nor Neg. In *Proceedings of North East Linguistic Society* 32, Masako Hirotani (ed.), GLSA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 327-346.

24. —. 2003. The nature of complementizers. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa*, 28: 87-110.

25. —. 2005 *I Dialetti Italiani e Romanci. Morfosintassi Generativa*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 3 vols.

26. —. 2007. *A Unification of Morphology and Syntax. Studies in Romance and Albanian Dialects*. London/New York: Routledge.

27. —. 2008. *Work Notes on Romance Morphosyntax*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

28. —. 2010. Syncretism and suppletivism in clitic systems: Underspecification, silent clitics or neither? In R. D'Alessandro, A. Ledgeway, I. Roberts (eds.) *Syntactic Variation: The Dialects of Italy*, 86-101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

29. —. 2011a. Mesoclisis in the imperative: Morphology, Phonology or Syntax? *Lingua* 121: 1101-1120.

30. —. 2011b. *Grammatical Categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

31. Mathieu, E. 1999. WH in situ and the intervention effect. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 11:441472. [Available as: http://www.phon.ucl.ac.uk/home/PUB/WPL/99papers/mathieu.pdf].

32. Munaro, N. 1997. Proprietà distribuzionali dei sintagmi interrogativi in alcuni dialetti veneti settentrionali. *Quaderni di Lavoro dell'ASIS* 1: 63-74.

33. —. 1999. *Sintagmi Interrogativi nei Dialetti Italiani Settentrio-*

nali. Padova: Unipress.

34. Nishigauchi T. 1990. *Quantification in the Theory of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

35. Poletto C., J.-Y. Pollock. 2004a. On the left periphery of some Romance wh-Questions. In L. Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP*, 251-296. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

36. —. 2004b. On wh-clitics, wh-doubling and apparent wh in situ in French and some North Eastern Italian Dialects. *Probus 16: 241-273*.

37. —. 2009. Another look at wh-questions in Romance: A look at Mendrisiotto. In D. Torck, L. Wetzels (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 200?*, 199-258. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

38. Poletto C., L. Vanelli. 1995. Gli introduttori delle frasi interrogative nei dialetti italiani settentrionali. In E. Banfi, G. Bonfadini, P. Cordin, M. Iliescu (eds.) *Italia Settentrionale: Crocevia di Idiomi Romanzi*, 145-158. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

39. Pollock J.-Y., N. Munaro, C. Poletto. 1999. Eppure si muove! On comparing French, Portuguese and Bellunese *wh*-movement. *Celebration: An Electronic Festschrift for Noam Chomsky*.

40. —. 2001. *Eppur si muove!* On Comparing French and Bellunese *Wh*-Movement. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook 1*, 147-180. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

41. Rizzi L. 1996. Residual verb second and the *Wh*-Criterion. In A. Belletti, L. Rizzi (eds.), *Parameters and Functional Heads*, 63-90. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

42. Savoia L.M., M.R. Manzini. 2010. Lexicalization of 3rd person object clitics: clitic enclisis and clitic drop. In R. D'Alessandro, A. Ledgeway, I. Roberts (eds.) *Syntactic Variation: The Dialects of Italy*, 102-118. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

43. Shlonsky, U. to appear. Notes on *wh*-in situ in French. In L. Brugè et al. (eds.), *A Festschrift for Guglielmo Cinque*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

44. Sportiche D. 1996. Clitic constructions. In J. Rooryck, L. Zaring (eds.), *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, 213-276. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

45. —. 2008. Inward Bound: Splitting the *wh*-paradigm and French Relative *qui*. Ms., on line.

46. Zanuttini, R. 1997. *Negation and Clausal Structure*. New York: Oxford University Press.