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1. Introduction

As far as we know, the do support strategy, i.e., the insertion of a pro-verb to play the role of a main verb in positions to which the V itself cannot move, has been reported and analysed only for Modern English. Chomsky (1957) already treats the phenomenon as the insertion of a dummy in order to support inflectional features when the main verb cannot do it. Lightfoot (1979) linked the diachronic development of do support to the appearance of a special class of modal verbs, and to the loss of a rich verbal inflection; these historical facts converged in rendering V movement to I no longer necessary, which means, in an economy perspective, no longer possible: at this point the support do, which was a free substitute of the verb in I, became the only available support of morphology when a verb was necessary in a projection higher than V° (negative and interrogative sentences). The most comprehensive analysis of the phenomenon is given in Pollock (1989), who on the contrary proposes an explanation of the impossibility for main verbs to move to I in English directly depending on morphological poverty, which renders a moved verb opaque with respect to the th-roles it assigns; in this theory too a free availability of do is assumed, which at this point becomes the only possible support of inflection when needed.¹

¹ As for the syntax of interrogative sentences, we will adopt the theoretical framework outlined in Rizzi (1991). We are framing our discussion in terms of Rizzi’s and Pollock’s theories, not considering Chomsky’s (1995) reformulation, which attributes the syntactic details of the construction to properties of the PF component.
Both theories give then crucial relevance to poor morphology and free availability of *do* for the rising of the modern *do support* phenomenon.

In this paper we document the existence of a *do support* analogue in some Lombard dialects in Northern Italy, analysing in particular the data collected in the village of Monno. We think that this dialect offers an interesting way to check (some of) the predictions made by the aforementioned theories, and gather a more complete picture of movement phenomena in interrogative sentences. Both in Lightfoot's and in Pollock's analysis, the *do support* strategy is connected to certain peculiar features of English syntax; some of these features are apparently absent from the dialect we present, and nevertheless *do support* shows characteristics very close to the English construction, as the English word for word translation of the following Monnese examples shows:

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \quad a \quad \text{fa-l maja?} \\
& \quad \text{does-he eat?} \\
& \quad b \quad \text{ke fa-l maja?} \\
& \quad \text{what does-he eat?} \\
& \quad c \quad *\text{ke maia-l? / maja-l?} \\
& \quad \text{what eats-he? / eats he?} \\
& \quad d \quad \text{a-l maja?} \\
& \quad \text{has-he eaten?} \\
& \quad e \quad \text{ke a-l maja?} \\
& \quad \text{what has-he eaten?} \\
& \quad f \quad \text{fa-l plöer?} \\
& \quad \text{does-it rain?} \\
& \quad g \quad \text{a-l plöt?} \\
& \quad \text{has-it rained?} \\
& \quad h \quad *\text{plöe-l?} \\
& \quad \text{rains it?}
\end{align*}
\]

In this dialect, the support only appears in main questions, where it is - as in English - obligatory. It is not inserted in negative sentences, nor in emphatic contexts. It is then more restricted than the English parallel: we are going to show in what follows, however, that this narrowing is an independent consequence of other characteristics of the dialect, while the phenomenon *per se* is exactly the same as in English.
The examples in (1) show that the Monnese *fa*, the equivalent of English *do*, occurs immediately after the *wh*-element (or in first position in yes/no questions) and is followed by an infinitival form of the main verb. ²

2. An outline of Monnese

The general features of Monnese are common to the great majority of Northern Italian Dialects (NIDs); some more restricted phenomena (in particular *wh- in situ*) are shared by other Lombard and Northern Venetan varieties (see Benincà’ 1997). As already mentioned in the introduction, English *do support* is viewed both by Lightfoot (1979) and Pollock (1989) as a consequence of the loss of verbal morphology which has in turn triggered the loss of syntactic V to I movement. Thus, let us concentrate our attention first on these morphological and syntactic characteristics to test if in Monnese they can also be thought to be responsible for the occurrence of the *do support* strategy.

² The characteristics of verbal morphology, verb movement and *wh- movement of this dialect are shared by (many or most) Northern Italian Dialects (NID), while the *do support* strategy is only attested in this area in Northern Italy: Monno, the Lombard village whose dialect we are dealing with, is located off (but not far from) an ancient route connecting Brescia with Romansch Switzerland. Until 1963 the village was reachable only by a foot path: contacts with people speaking other varieties were rare, and this can perhaps explain why this very peculiar mode of question formation was preserved here. Possibly the phenomenon exists in other villages near Monno; we have recorded it recently in Malonno: we are not aware of other cases. The phenomenon is attested in German dialects and regional varieties. On the basis of the description given in ..., the fundamental difference between English and Monnese on the one hand and German varieties on the other is that in the latter the phenomenon is optional both in interrogative and assertive contexts and it shows no difference between main and embedded clauses.
2.1. Verb morphology and syntactic V to I movement

Verbal morphology of Monnese is as in any other NID. A sample of the present indicative forms is given below:

(2) Present indicative

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kumprè</td>
<td>èsse</td>
<td>vè</td>
<td>fà</td>
<td>ndà</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to buy'</td>
<td>'to be'</td>
<td>'to have'</td>
<td>'to do'</td>
<td>'to go'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

kumprjo  so  jò  fò  ndò
     te kumpret  te sé  te è  te fè  te ndè
l/la kumpra  l/la è  l/la dz-a  l/la fa  l/la va
m kumpra  m è  m a  m fa  m va
kumprè  sé  è  fè  ndè
i/le kumpra  i/le è  i/le a  l/le fa  i/le va

1st and 2nd sg. of a lexical verb show the agglutination of a subj. pronoun jo 'I' and t 'thou', while the auxiliaries and fa do not have this kind of morphology; the verb nda is the only lexical verb that partly behaves as auxiliaries and has a parallel type of inflection. It is not possible to state a simple correlation between the type of inflection and movement to C: auxiliaries have subject pronoun agglutination in tenses different from the present indicative and move to C all the same, while lexical verbs don't have agglutination in tenses different from present indicative and they cannot move to C in interrogatives.

(3)  

a  faja  (I) did  
b  te faet  you did  
c  jea  (I) had  
d  te jeet  you had
2nd sg., 1st pl., 3rd sg. and pl. have an obligatory subject clitic pronoun; 1st pl. is represented (as in French, other Lombard dialects, etc.) by a 3rd sg. verb form with an impersonal subj. pronoun *m* 'man' (etymologically derived from lat. *homo* 'man': cf. French *on*, and the semantically parallel German *Man*). Proclitic subjects become enclitic in main interrogatives (see (3)).

More importantly, Monnese inflected verbs show the type of phenomena which are considered typical of a 'rich' inflection. In the following examples we will observe (a) pro drop, (b) lexical DP subject postposing, (c) surface order of the verb with respect to adverbs:

(a) pro drop: the complex subject clitic+Verb gives a pro-drop inflected form for second singular, first plural, third singular and plural; some forms (1st sg. and 2nd pl.) do not have a subject clitic.

\[(4)\]

\[a\] livrjo
\n'I finish'

\[b\] te livrret

'you finish'

(b) subject postposing: a postverbal lexical subject is fully grammatical with any type of verb:

\[(5)\]

\[a\] livrjo mé

'I finish'

\[b\] te livrret té

'you finish'

\[c\] l e mort le cavre

'it is dead (unmarked masc.) the goats (pl.f.)'

"the goats died"

\[d\] l rya l pustl

it arrives the postman
These cases are not right dislocation structures, as (5h) shows. Moreover, notice that in (5c,d,e) there is no agreement between the verb and the posposed subject; a right dislocated subject would always require a completely agreeing subject clitic. For a more detailed description of this phenomenon see Benincà (1997).

(c) verb movement

A. the inflected lexical verb (or the inflected auxiliary) appears obligatorily to the left of those adverbs that distinguish the position of French and Italian inflected verbs from that of English: the inflected verb in Monnese has the same distribution as that of Italian and the NIDs (see Belletti 1990, 1994, Cinque 1997):

(6) a 1 tfakola semper
'he speaks always'

b 1 a semper tfakolà

c 1 njarèl 1 parla za
'the baby speaks already'

d 1 a za majà
'he has already eaten'

e 1 va maj
'he goes never'

B. Any inflected verb is higher than the postverbal negation mia, lexically the same as Italian mica, (originally a negative polarity item designating a 'minimal quantity', a 'crumb') and syntactically parallel to French postverbal negation pas. Assuming Pollock's idea that this type of postverbal negation is a specifier, we see here that the inflected verb moves to AgrS bypassing the position of the negative adverb. As in many NIDs, there is no preverbal negative morpheme:
(7) 1 tjakola mia
'he speaks not'
"he does not speak"

The fact that verbal morphology is as rich as it is in most NIDs, that this is a pro drop language, that adverbs must occur to the right of the inflected verb, show that V-to-I movement has in Monnese the same characteristics as in Italian and Northern Italian Dialects. In a language of this type we have English type do support, something unexpected within current analyses.

Let us now examine the position of the infinitive, as this is the form which occurs after the do- support. The infinitive (and the past participle) occurs to the left of adverbs like plö 'anymore' and anmò 'again', hence it moves higher than these lower adverbs:

(8)  a  el a di da tjakolà plö
  'he said (not) to talk anymore'
  b  l l a fat anmò
  'he has done it once again'

(9)  a  el a dit de fal anmò
  he has said to do it again
  b  l l a fat plö
  he it has done anymore

The infinitive of the auxiliaries optionally precedes the postverbal negative adverb:

(10)  a  par éi mia yly
       for to-have not wanted

---

3 See also Zanuttini (1995) for parallel cases of postverbal negations in NIDs, which she locates in the Spec of a NegP located lower than TP.
b  par mia éi yly
   'for not to-have wanted'
   "having not wanted"

Lexical infinitives must occur after postverbal negation. Infinitival main verbs never cross over the position of the negation mia, which structurally corresponds to French pas.

(11) a  par mia majal
       for not eat it

b  *par majal mia
   for eat it not

Note that object clitics are obligatorily enclitics on infinitival verbs, even though the infinitival occurs in a position lower than the negative adverb located lower than TP. This suggests that enclisis does not necessarily occur in a high position as AgrS or C, as proposed in Kayne (1991), (1994). We will not pursue this any further here.

On the basis of what we have seen, regarding the morphological and syntactic characteristics of the verb as the pro drop property, free inversion and the distribution of the inflected verb with respect to adverbs, we conclude that verb movement to the IP functional projections in Monnese is, for the relevant respects, parallel to Italian. In particular, any inflected verb moves to the head of a functional projection as high as AgrS.

2.2. Question formation

In this section we will illustrate some characteristics of Monnese questions, the context where do support applies. The differences with respect to English syntax will be shown to be a feature common to other varieties, and, as such, they have to be factored out from the analysis of do support itself and do not interfere with our comparison between English and Monnese.

We hypothesise that in Monnese C has to be filled by an inflected verbal form in main questions. We will first consider examples with compound tenses, which do
not show the do support strategy. In this case movement to C affects auxiliaries and the do support strategy is ungrammatical.

The main evidence for V to C movement is subject clitic inversion (SCI), which has been interpreted as indicating V to C in French (see Kayne 1984, ch. 10, Rizzi and Roberts (1989)), as it is a root phenomenon both in French and in the NIDs. Friedemann (1995) interprets SCI as a case of "interrogative inflection". He supposes that the verb moves to C only at the LF level but not in the Syntax. In section 4.3 we will see that Monnese do support provides evidence that SCI is indeed V to C. For the moment, let's simply state that this is a quite common phenomenon in NIDs, and, as such, it is not directly connected to the do support phenomenon we are studying.\(^4\)

In a main question, both a yes/no and a wh-interrogative, when it is not the subject to be interrogated, a 3rd sg. and pl., 1st and 2nd pl. inflected verb postposes the subject clitic; 1st sg. does not change, 2nd sg. only loses its proclitic subject. This phenomenology is analogous to other NIDs.

A less common feature of Monnese is the wh-in situ strategy: wh- elements and phrases can either appear in front of the sentence or immediately after the lexical verb. Some wh- elements have a different form depending on the position in which they occur: a wh- of this class is slightly different when moved or left in situ (see examples (12c,g); Munaro (1995,1997); Benincà (1997)). This strategy is not widespread in Northern Italy. It is found though in other dialects of Lombardy and Southern Switzerland and in Northern Veneto (it is also attested in spoken French, with some relevant differences)\(^5\). In Monnese, SCI is obligatory, independently from

\(^{4}\) In several NIDs other types of structures trigger SCI. They can all be analyzed as movement to a C\(^{\circ}\) position. Monnese shows inversion with lexical verbs in disjunctive and exhortative structures:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \begin{tabular}{l}
    (i) plöe-i o plöe-i mia,...
  \end{tabular} \\
    'rain it or rain it not "whether it rains or not,..."'
  \item \begin{tabular}{l}
    (ii) telefon-om-i subit
  \end{tabular} \\
    phone-we-her immediately/’let’s phone her immediately’
\end{itemize}

These data will be analyzed in section 4.4. They show that it is not the interrogative morphology that is missing in this dialect.

the fronting of the wh- element (the same is true in Bellunese, for example, but not in Mendrisiotto nor in French).

(12) a k e-t fat?
    what have-you done?

b e-t tjerkà fora kwal? /kwal è-t tjerkà fora ?
    have-you looked out which? / which have you looked out?
    'which one have you chosen?'

c ngo l e-t majada? / l è-t majada ngont ?
    where obj.clit.-have-you eaten? / obj.clit.-have-you eaten
    where?
    'where have you eaten it?'

d a ki i l’e-t dat? / i l’e-t dat a ki?
    'to whom dat.cl.-obj.clit.-have-you given? /dat.cl.-obj.clit.-
    have-you given to
    whom? “whom have you given it to?”

e a-l vist ki?
    'has-he seen who?'

f a-i vist ki?
    'have-they seen who?'

g ke ef kunta zo? / ef kunta zo kuë ?
    'what have-you (pl.) told down?' / ‘have-you told down
    what?'
    ‘what have you told?’

h kwat e-f spetà? / ef spetà kwat?
    ‘how-much have-you waited?’ / ‘have-you waited how-
    much?’

wh-elements that cannot be left in situ are identified by Munaro on the basis of a difference in the
text structure of the wh- itself and on the feature that it instantiates. What concerns us here is that
this possibility exists independently from do support. In the Lombard dialect of Mendrisio
(Switzerland: see Lurà (1987)) inversion applies only if the wh- moves to SpecCP, while Belluno
dialect is like Monnese, and shows SCI even when the wh-element has remained in situ (see below
fn. 9). Hence, the wh- in situ phenomenon is independent of verb movement to C, in principle, and
consequently of do support per se.
In our view, this means that movement of the verb to the C° position occurs even though the wh- element has remained in situ. Here we will assume that the SpecC position is occupied by an abstract wh-operator when the wh- element has not moved, and that it is the abstract operator which triggers verb movement to C°, as discussed in Poletto (1995) and Munaro (1996).

In all main questions, it is impossible for a lexical subject to appear immediately after the moved verb. This is a feature that Monnese has again in common with most other Romance varieties, as no subject DP is permitted in SpecAgr position in French, Italian, Spanish, NIDs (except for V2 varieties).

\[
\begin{align*}
(13) & \quad \text{a} \quad * \text{ke a-(l) Mario maja?} \\
& \quad \text{what has Mario eaten} \\
& \quad \text{b} \quad *\text{ngo e-(l) Mario ndà?} \\
& \quad \text{where is-he Mario gone?}
\end{align*}
\]

In all embedded interrogatives SCI is impossible (cf. (14 d), to compare with (12h)). We argue, following Rizzi and Roberts (1989) that the verb does not move to a C° position. In general, wh-elements require a following complementiser ke (cf. (14a) (14b)); an exception is ngo ‘where’ (see (14c)). Yes/no questions are introduced by the complementiser se ‘if, whether’. Again, a lexical subject is not easily allowed in Spec Agr position, as shown in (14a):

\[
\begin{align*}
(14) & \quad \text{a} \quad i \text{ ho domandà kol ke(??Mario) l’ha fat} \\
& \quad \text{‘to-him have asked what that (Mario) he has done’} \\
& \quad \text{b} \quad l \text{ so mia a ky ke i l’arò dat} \\
& \quad \text{‘it I-know not to whom that I it-will-have given’} \\
& \quad \quad \text{" I don’t know whom I could have given it to"} \\
& \quad \text{c} \quad l \text{ so miga ngo la mader l a cumprà i fiur} \\
& \quad \text{‘it-I-know not where the mother she-has bought the flowers’} \\
& \quad \text{d} \quad *l \text{ so miaquat ef spetà} \\
& \quad \text{‘it-I-know not how-much have-you waited’}
\end{align*}
\]

Hence, both features found in Monnese, (SCI and the wh- in situ strategy) are not a peculiarity of Monnese syntax, but are found in other varieties as well, all of which do not show do support. Therefore, we conclude that both SCI and the wh- in situ
strategy are not directly connected to the *do support* phenomenon, and must be factored out from our analysis.

2.2.1. Questioning the subject

When the *wh*- is a subject, there is no evidence of verb movement to C°, and there are two ways of realising the sentence:

1. the *wh*- subject is fronted and a complementiser is obligatorily inserted in C°. Main and embedded interrogatives show then a parallel structure:

   (15)  
   a  ki *(ke) a maja?  
       'who that has eaten?'
   b  el so mia ki *(ke) a maja
       'it-I-know not who that has eaten'
       " I don't know who has eaten"

2. another possibility is clefting, where the *wh*- is inserted in the focus position of the cleft structure:

   (16)  
   a  e-l ki ke telefona stasera?  
       is-it who that phones tonight?
   b  e-l ki ke maja / a maja?
       'is-it who eats / has eaten?'
   c  e-l ki ke è vyfy l altra sera?  
       'is-he who that is come yesterday night?'

While clefting is used in many NIDs as an unmarked question formation structure, in Monnese it conveys a pragmatic meaning, as it does in standard Italian: with this type of interrogative, it is underlined that the *wh*- is part of a 'given set', mentioned in the context.

A third possibility is only open to unaccusative verbs: the *wh*- subject appears in postverbal position as an object, and the auxiliary inverts with an expletive subject clitic:
(17) a  e-(l) vyñý ki l’altra sera?
        is-it come who last night?
b  * a-(l) majà ki ?
        has-it eaten who?
c  * a-(l) telefonà ki
        has-it telephoned who?
d  *e(l) ki vyñý?
        is-it who come?

We will discuss this in a more detailed fashion in the theoretical section. For the
moment we simply state that:
- the complementiser appears only when the wh-element has moved to SpecC.
- the SpecAgr position is not available for wh- in situ subjects.
- the in-situ strategy is possible only with unaccusatives.

Note that these data show that the extraction site of unergative subjects is
different from the extraction site of inaccusatives. Only unaccusative subjects have
the option of staying in situ, which is typical of objects.

3. 'Do support' in Monnese

Let's now turn our attention to the do support phenomenon itself. As we will see,
it has striking similarities with its English counterpart. We will try to show that the
phenomenon is indeed the same in the two languages first examining the common
characteristics and then trying (in the next section) to derive the differences from
independent syntactic factors that distinguish Romance from English.

Main interrogative sentences with a simple verb have the following form:

(18) a  fa-l ma'ja?
        does-he eat?
b  kome fa-l compor'ta-s?
        how does-he behave-himself?
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\begin{align*}
\text{c} & \quad \text{kwata fa-l ma'ja-n?} \\
& \quad \text{how much does-he eat-of it?}
\end{align*}

In all cases, it is impossible to have a DP subject immediately after the verb \textit{fa} in interrogatives:

\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
(19) & \quad \ast \text{Ngo fa (l) Mario majà?} \\
& \quad \text{'Where does Mario eat?}
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}

This is an instance of the general constraint we illustrated above commenting the examples in (13).

The translations of the examples are also glosses word by word: it appears then that this Romance dialect employs a \textit{do support} strategy exactly parallel to English. Following Rizzi (1991), (see discussion in section 2.2) we will assume that the verb \textit{fa} ('to do') is located in C° - as SCI suggests. The main verb takes the infinitival form and, if it is the case, it has enclitic object clitics (cf. \textit{b, c}) as all infinitival forms in this dialect\(^6\).

As SCI applies whether the \textit{wh}-element moves to Spec CP or is left \textit{in situ}, \textit{do support} occurs independently from the movement of the overt \textit{wh}-element (recall that we hypothesised the presence of a null operator when the \textit{wh}-element is left \textit{in situ}, as discussed in section 2.2).

\footnote{As a number of NID, this variety has no Clitic Climbing (see Rizzi (1982), Kayne (1989b)). Verbs such as \textit{rya'-f} 'to arrive at', i.e. 'can', \textit{ole} 'want', \textit{ve da} 'have to, must', which in other Italian varieties can or must host the clitics of the complement clause, in this dialect cannot. Notice that \textit{fa}, when a support, behaves as the other modals, refusing complement clitics, but when it is the causative auxiliary, it obligatorily hosts the complement clitics of its dependent clause (as it is the general case in Romance):

\begin{enumerate}
\item \quad I m l fa vede \\
\text{he to-me it makes see 'he makes me see it'}
\end{enumerate}}
(20)  a  'kome fa-l kompor'ta-s?
       how does-he behave-himself?
b  fa-l kompor'ta-s ku'me?
       does-he behave-himself how?
c  kwata fe-t ma'ja-n?
       how much do-you eat-of it?
d  fe-t ma'ja-n kwata?
       do-you eat-of it how much?

Let us now consider in detail the aspects in which do support in this dialect is parallel to English.

3.1. A comparison with English do support: the similarities

As in English, do support in Monnese has the following characteristics:
(a) it occurs both in wh- and in yes/no questions:

(21)  a  fe-t majà?
       - do-you eat?
b  ke fe-t majà
       what do-you eat?
c  fa-l plöer?
       does it rain?

(b) it does not occur in embedded interrogative contexts:

(22)a  (i domandjo) col che l maja
       'I ask (to) what that he eats'
b  i t domandjo s-el plöf
       'I ask you if it rains'7

7 If a fa 'do' is inserted in an embedded interrogative, it is inescapably interpreted as a causative form:

(i)  i t domandio ki ke fa majà    'I you ask who that makes (someone) eat'
(c) it cannot apply to 'have' and 'be', even when they are used as main verbs\(^8\):

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(23)] a \quad \text{kwal e-t tįerkà fo?}
  \quad \text{which have-you looked out?}
  \quad \\
  \quad \quad \text{'which did you choose'}\text{"}
  \item b \quad \text{*kwal fe-t ej tįerkà?}
  \quad \text{which do-you have chosen?}
  \item c \quad \text{ngo e-l na?}
  \quad \text{where is-he gone?}
  \item d \quad \text{* ngo fa-l ese na?}
  \quad \text{where does-he be gone?}
  \item e \quad \text{*kwal fe-t ej?}
  \quad \text{which one do-you have?}
  \item f \quad \text{*ngo fa-l ese?}
  \quad \text{where does-he be?}
\end{itemize}

(d) it can occur with the verb \(fa\) 'do, make'\(^9\)

---

\(^8\) In fact the similarity between English and Monnese is total with the verb \(be\) / \(esse\), while it is only partial with \(have\) / \(ej\). Lexical \(have\) cannot move to C in American English, while it can in some varieties of British English: in this varieties lexical and auxiliary \(have\) are not distinct in this respect.

\(^9\) This is also the case when \(fa\) is the causative auxiliary:

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(i)] fa-l fa-t na?
  \quad \text{does-he make-you leave?}
  \item[(ii)] fe-t fa-l coser com stasera?
  \quad \text{'do-you do-obj.clit. cook how tonight?'}
  \quad \text{"how do you cook it tonight?'"}
\end{itemize}
(24) a  fe-fà-l?
    ‘do-you (pl) do-it?’

b  ke fa-l fà?
    ‘what does he do?’

(e) it cannot occur if the wh- is a subject. In this case a complementiser is inserted
(see section 2.2.1), giving rise to a structure which is in fact parallel to embedded
questions (see case (d) above):

(25) a  ki ke maja / a ma'ja?
    who that eats / has eaten?

b  e-l ki ke maja / a ma'ja?
    is it who that eats / has eaten?

c  *ki fa(-l) ma'ja?

d  *(e-l) ki ke fa ma'ja?

It appears that fa support is triggered by the necessity to fulfil the requirement of
occupying a head higher than AgrS (presumably, C°); in the cases where further
verb movement is expected, and the verb is not the type of verb to perform it, the
support is inserted.

As will be pointed out in what follows, the impossibility to move the verb with an
interrogative on the subject is strikingly parallel to English; in Monnese, though, the
wh- subject evidently moves to SpecCP, and a complementiser has to be inserted in
C°. This structure can be viewed as identical to English, with the only difference that
in English the complementiser has no phonological content, as in other cases.

We will reconsider the strategy adopted with unaccusative subjects in section
3.3.: if they stay in situ, the verb must move to C° (see above the case of the
auxiliary be); in the case of a lexical verb, fa support is inserted.

3.2. The differences

The contexts of do support in Monnese are more restricted than in English, for
reasons due to independent differences between the two languages, the most relevant
being the fact that the lexical verb in Monnese moves far more than the English one
in the IP field. For principled reasons, then, Monnese *do support* is limited to interrogative contexts i.e. to movement in CP, and does not appear to substitute verb movement in IP (see section 4). Inside the interrogative domain, there are no syntactic contexts where *do support* applies in Monnese and not in English, but lexical differences in the members of the class allowing or prohibiting it.

The contexts where English has obligatorily *do support* and Monnese does not are cases where the English verb cannot reach a position that the Monnese verb can occupy.

The differences are the following:

3.2.1. Monnese does not show 'do support' with negation:

\[(26)\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{1 so mia} \\
& \quad \text{'(I) it know not'} \\
& \quad \text{"I do not know it"} \\
\text{b} & \quad * \text{fo mia savé-1} \\
& \quad (I) \text{do not know it}
\end{align*}
\]

A sentence like (26a) is similar to its positive counterpart with respect to verb syntax. The only difference is due to the presence of the sentential negative marker *mia* which we showed above is in any case lower than any inflected verb (and optionally bypassed even by an infinitive if it is an auxiliary: but the syntax of infinitives is - as far as we know - irrelevant for the *do support* phenomenon itself: see section 4????). The Monnese postverbal negative marker is therefore to be analysed as a specifier, as it does not block head-movement of the inflected verb higher than the negative projection (see Zanuttini (1997))

3.2.2. Monnese does not show emphatic 'do':

\[(27)\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{*ma tì te FET kantà be!} \\
& \quad \text{‘but you DO sing well!}
\end{align*}
\]

This difference between English and Monnese will also be treated as due to an independent factor concerning verb movement. The emphatic reading is supposed to
result from movement to a functional head that the English verb cannot reach. These differences are then to be considered as a consequence of the fact that the Monnese inflected lexical verb moves in the IP field bypassing NegP (or a PolarityP where both negation and emphasis are realized) and reaching a position where it can receive emphatic interpretation.

3.2.3. Monnese does not have VP-ellipsis

(c) As apparently all Romance varieties, Monnese does not permit VP Ellipsis with pro-sentence do:

(28) a  *I butigher i ha alsà i presi ma i cinema i a mia
shopkeepers have raised the prices but cinemas have not
b  *la turta l è suspendyda sö bè ma l pa l è mia
the cake has risen well but the bread has not
c  *ancö l Mario l maja a l’osteria e a l Carlo l fa
today Mario eats at the restaurant and also Carlo does

This is also true for other types of VP-ellipsis with auxiliaries, as in Romance in general.

3.2.4. Lexical differences

Some differences are finally found in the class of verbs that must or can have do support in main interrogatives. We have seen that 'have' and 'be', both as auxiliaries and main verbs, cannot have do-support. As is well known, do support does not apply in English when the verb is a modal, while it is obligatory with all main verbs and with lexical do. The situation in Monnese is more complex: olé (want, wish) does not admit do support.
(29)  a  k ṣél kwal?
     ke wants he which? 'which does he want?'
   b  ṣél kwal?
     wants he which?
   c  kwal ṣél?
     which wants he
   d  *fa-ł olé qual?
     does he want which?
   e  *qual fa-ł olé?
     which does he want?

The deontic modal 'must' is expressed by the phrase vej da 'have to' and, as such, it does not show do support, as the auxiliary 'have'. The verb podé ('can, may') necessarily has do support in main interrogatives. It has to be noticed that this verb is probably a borrowing from other varieties, a very frequent alternative with the same meaning being the form ryà-j 'to arrive+loc.clit'. This form too, being a lexical verb, cannot be moved to Co and requires do support.

Two other verbs, namely fa and nda can be optionally construed with do support, but can also be moved to Co, as the following examples illustrate:

(30)  a  ngo fe-t ndà?
     'where do-you go?'
   b  ngo vet?
     'where go-you'
   c  ke fa-ł fà
     'what does he do?'
   d  ke fa-ł?
     'what does-he?'

Speakers do not perceive any significant difference between the two variants. Other semi-auxiliary verbs meaning 'finish', 'begin', 'succeed', 'stop', etc., i.e. those restructuring verbs which have in many Romance varieties quasi-modal properties, behave as lexical verbs and always need do support in interrogative sentences.

The differences between the two languages can be summed up as follows: Monnese inflected verbs raise to AgrS while English inflected verbs do not. Moreover, in English an ambiguous verb such as do moves or not depending on its
semantic value: when it is used as an auxiliary it moves, when it is used as a main verb it does not.

The situation in Monnese is more complex: auxiliaries 'have' and 'be' and the sole true modal, olé 'want' always move to C° in interrogatives and never take do support.

Fa 'do' and nda 'go' optionally move to C°, again independently from their being used as auxiliaries or main verbs\(^\text{10}\). This partially resembles the situation of the

\(^{10}\) A peculiar behaviour of auxiliaries and modals is observed with wh- in situ, as shown in the following paradigm:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{(i) a} & \text{ngo ve-t?} \\
& \text{where go-you?}' \\
\text{b} & \text{ngo fe-t nda?} \\
& \text{where do you go?}' \\
\text{c} & \text{fe-t nda ngont?} \\
& \text{do you go where?}' \\
\text{d} & \ast \text{ve-t ngont} \\
& \text{go-you where?}' \\
\text{E} & \text{NGO VE-T NGONT}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{(ii) a} & \text{k je-t} \\
& \text{what have-you?} \\
\text{b} & \ast \text{k fe-t ej} \\
& \text{what do you have?}' \\
\text{c} & \ast \text{je-t ki} \\
& \text{have-you what?}' \\
\text{d} & \text{k je-t ki} \\
& \text{what have-you what?}
\end{array}
\]

What we see here is presumably an effect - more limited than in French or in Mendrisio dialect - of the weakness of a wh- in situ with respect to its capacity to induce verb movement. This weakness appears now more obscure than it used to be, the wh- criterion being not sufficient to account for it. Notice that this supposed weakness of a wh-in situ does not appear with real auxiliaries and fa 'do', which have SCI independently from overt wh-movement to SpecC, as assumed above.
British varieties mentioned above (fn.8), where the verb have optionally moves to C° even though it is used as a possessive and not as an auxiliary. This will be discussed in section 4.

3.3. Factoring out the differences

The differences found between Monnese and English do support can be seen as differences regarding the syntactic context in which the phenomenon appears or differences regarding the behaviour of single verbs depending on whether they belong or not to the class of verbs "moving to C° in-interrogatives" (this will be discussed in section 4.4.).

In Monnese only interrogative contexts both admit and require do support: no do support is found in negative, emphatic or VP-ellipsis contexts. As has been shown in section 2., Monnese, on a par with other Romance varieties, has obligatory V to I movement (or better to AgrS in Belletti’s (1990) framework) which crosses the position where the negative marker mia (and probably the positive emphatic too) is realised. This is true for apparently all modern Romance varieties, even if the Verb reaches different positions in the IP fields, as appears from a detailed comparison of Italian and Spanish, for example: see %%%%

As every main verb raises in the syntax to a position located higher than the negative/emphatic position, it seems obvious why do support is not possible in these contexts. As this is a last resort strategy (as already in Chomsky (1955)), it is not possible when it is not necessary, as is the case in Monnese.

Monnese shows that do support is not a unitary phenomenon in English, but the different types of do support must be distinguished on the basis of the functional projection that needs the verbal dummy element in order to be rendered visible (or to check its features).

The analysis generally assumed for English treats do support as a consequence of the impossibility of the verb to move to functional projections. Monnese data suggest that do support in the IP domain and do support in interrogative structures are only indirectly related: it is in both cases a matter of a movement which is not open to a main verb. The Monnese can go past the negation/emphatic projection, English verb cannot. The reason why the verb has to go past negation is another matter, and Monnese has little to say about it. In particular it gives us no hints
concerning competing hypotheses (1) either not is a head blocking the relation of the inflected verb and the subject, (2) or the verb has to move to 'too far' a functional projection in order to appear in a proper configuration with the negation. In any case Monnese negation is not a blocking head but a specifier and the inflected verb moving to an Agr projection bypasses it (cf. Pollock (1989) for French).

We will therefore conclude that Monnese and English *do support* in interrogative structures are instances of one and the same phenomenon, namely the lack of movement to C° of a main verb. In the next section we will see how the analysis of Monnese *do support* has both empirical and theoretical relevance for English and Romance syntax and for a general theory on the connection between auxiliaries and verb movement.

4. Reconsidering *do support*

Once we have factored out the differences noted in section 3.2., we are left with a Romance variety that has *do support* following structural conditions that are a proper subset of the English ones. This has consequences both for English and Romance syntax. Let's first examine the reflexes that it has on the analysis of English *do support*.

4.1. Consequences on English

4.1.1. The analysis of subject interrogatives

We have seen in 2.2.1 and 3.1 the two strategies for questioning the subject. We noted that Monnese does not show *do support* when the wh- element corresponds to the subject; in this case, the C° position is occupied by a complementiser and the wh- subject is located in SpecC.
A Case of do support in Romance

(31) a  ki ke a maja?
'who that has eaten?'

b  el so mia ki ke a majà
'it-know not who that has eaten'
" I don't know who has eaten"

This structure shows that the CP level is activated even when no verb moves to the C₀ position. Hence, in Monnese all interrogative clauses are CPs, even those on the subject. This can be considered an independent piece of evidence favoring an analysis of English interrogatives on the subject as Cps also. If we keep in mind that in no case does English show a complementizer following a wh- while in Monnese a complementizer is obligatory in embedded interrogatives, (cf. (31b)) the two languages can be reasonably analysed as having the same structure in subject interrogatives, the only difference being a different constraint regarding the realization of the complementizer.

Thus, the analysis of Monnese syntax seems to favour Rizzi (1991)’s analysis of English subject interrogative clauses over Grimshaw (1995)’s. Verb movement is possible (in fact obligatory) only with the wh-subjects of unaccusative verbs, and in compound tenses we have the auxiliary be (the auxiliary of unaccusative verbs) with expletive SCI. In simple tenses a lexical unaccusative verb shows do support with expletive SCI. In the latter case the wh- subject presumably behaves as an object - in the terms of Burzio (1986) and Belletti (1988) - and is left in situ:

(32) fa-l 'nda a ka ki?
'does-he go home who?'
"who does go home?"

Monnese and English are similar in that they do not admit do support with the subject of a transitive or intransitive verb. Only Monnese unaccusative subjects permit do support and they are normally left in situ.¹¹ Do support inverts with the

¹¹ In Monnese as in other varieties, moreover, the unaccusative subject is not forced to reach the AgrS projection, where an expletive subject clitic satisfies the Extended Projection Principle; the inflected verb agrees with the expletive (as we can infer from the unmarked masculine form of the past participle, the 3rd sg. inflection being identical with 3rd plural):
expletive subject clitic and the thematic subject is left *in situ*, and forms an A-CHAIN with the expletive. Unaccusative subjects thus permit *do support* because of an independent feature of the syntax,\(^\text{12}\) namely the existence of a class of unaccusative verbs whose subject behaves like an object.\(^\text{13}\)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(i) a} & \quad \text{l e ryà ina letra} \\
& \quad \text{'it is arrived (m.sg.) a letter (f.)}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b} & \quad \text{l è vyny la maestra} \\
& \quad \text{it has come (m.sg.) the teacher (f.)}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{c} & \quad \text{la letra l è rivada} \\
& \quad \text{the letter (f.) is arrived (f.)}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{d} & \quad \text{la maestra l e vynyda} \\
& \quad \text{the teacher (f.) is come (f.)}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{12} & \quad \text{Note that the same strategies used to question a subjects in Monnese are found in Bellunese:}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(i) a} & \quad \text{e-lo ki ke mafia kwa?} \\
& \quad \text{is-it who that eats here? 'who does eat here?'}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b} & \quad \text{rive-lo ki?} \\
& \quad \text{arrives-it who? 'who does arrive?'}
\end{align*}\]

The subject appears in the focus position of a cleft structure or can be left *in situ* only if it is an unaccusative subject. Differences between unaccusative subjects and other subjects are also found in the whole of northern Italy, as in many varieties that do not show *wh- in situ*, the subject of a transitive or unergative verb must be questioned through a cleft sentence (as in (1b)), while a direct question is possible with unaccusative *wh- subjects.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(i) a} & \quad \text{ki vjen stasera?} \quad \text{*Padovano} \\
& \quad \text{who comes tonight?}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b} & \quad \text{*ki mafia kwa?} \\
& \quad \text{who eats here?}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{13} & \quad \text{English seems to posses a limited set of unaccusative verbs whose subject is inserted in the object position (see Tortora (1997)). However, as it does not have a *wh- in situ* strategy for non d-linked *wh-words, the reflexes of this phenomenon cannot be observed in interrogative sentences.}
\end{align*}\]
4.1.2. The diachronic development of English

As already mentioned in the introduction, Lightfoot (1979) and (1991), Roberts (1985) and Pollock (1989) connect the development of the do support strategy in English to the disappearance of inflectional morphology, which has triggered in turn the loss of syntactic V to I movement. As Monnese has never lost obligatory V to I movement and nevertheless shows do support, we are forced to state that the lack of V to I movement cannot be a necessary condition to produce the do support strategy. At this point we can imagine two possible lines of reasoning to explain the diachronic discrepancy between English and Monnese.

a) It might be the case that the same strategy has evolved in the way in which the authors mentioned above hypothesise in English and in a different way in Monnese. The same phenomenon would thus be the result of two distinct evolutionary processes, as the loss of V to I in English and a still unknown factor in Monnese. This hypothesis is not very attractive at first sight, as it seems to redundantly postulate two mechanisms to obtain the same grammar (see the discussion in section 4.).

b) One could try to unify the two grammars postulating a more abstract mechanism which is responsible for the birth of the do support strategy. It could be the case that do support is not necessarily connected to any loss of morphology but develops when the syntactic movement of a main verb to a given functional head becomes impossible (for some independent reason) in a given language (but see section 4. for an apparent counterexample). English has lost syntactic movement of the verb to the I⁰ position (and this is the factor which is in turn connected to the morphological impoverishment and not do support itself) and therefore has developed do support which is inserted when the I⁰ position must be supported by a verbal element.¹⁴

Monnese could have lost I to C⁰ movement substituting it with a do support strategy. We have to assume that Monnese was most probably a fully V2 language in the Middle Ages, even though we do not have access to the diachronic development of this variety. This is the case for all Romance varieties including the

---

¹⁴ Independent evidence that a theory like this is needed comes from the comparison between the lack of I to C in English and mainland Scandinavian languages, which have maintained V to C movement but show a very poor morphology and no evidence of V to I movement.
NIDs for which we have older texts preserved. These languages were V2 varieties in the medieval period and lost this property at the beginning of the Renaissance period (cf. Benincà (1986) (1995)). As Monnese has simply lost V to C° and not V to I°, the context of application of the do support strategy is limited to the C° projection (but see section 4.4... for more discussion).

However, all NIDs have lost V2 and only in a small area do we find the do support strategy: if do support were the automatic development when a functional head becomes inaccessible to main verbs, we should find do support everywhere in Northern Italy. As we will see in section 4.2 movement to the C° position is being lost in most NIDs in all the residual V2 contexts. Some NIDs have substituted the SCI strategy with a (null or morphologically realised) complementiser, others have generalised the cleft structure to all wh- questions. Note that it cannot simply be postulated that in the northern Italian domain it is movement to C° that is being lost altogether, as both clefts and do support reveal that C° is still accessible, even though only to a particular class of verbs as auxiliaries. We have to assume that the C° position is losing some property to be defined, but it still retains some visibility. As we will see in section 4.4.2, it is difficult to relate this property to opacity vs. transparency of a given Functional head (as in Pollock (1989)). Our analysis suggests that it has most probably to do with the type of structure that a verb selects in the VP.

4.2. Consequences on Romance: V to C movement confirmed

The fact that do support exists also in Romance shows that the verb moves in interrogative structures higher than in normal declarative clauses also in Romance. Furthermore, it casts some doubts on recent analyses of Romance interrogatives as I to C only at LF but not in the syntax. Monnese data show that the verb moves in the syntax to the CP layer.

We can see do support as a strategy to compensate I movement to C°, thus fulfilling the requirements of (some version of) the wh-Criterion (cf. Rizzi (1991)).

The generality of Romance varieties with subject clitic inversion in main interrogatives develop some strategy to do without it; many of them optionally, at
least in some structures (see Poletto (1993) for a detailed description of the possible structures found in the northern Italian domain).

All these varieties (except for Triestino, whose story is more complex and scarcely documented) used to have subject clitic inversion until 30, 50, or 100 years ago; many of them exploit more than one strategy and still preserve traces of the obsolete subject clitic inversion, which can be optionally used at least in some syntactic contexts. The insertion of fa support can be seen as one of the possible ways (certainly the least used in Romance) to do the task of an inflected verb moving to C°. The existence of the do support strategy in the Romance domain is thus potentially very interesting as it confirms Rizzi (1991)'s intuition that the verb moves to the C° position in main interrogatives in Romance too as it does in the Germanic languages.

4.3. **General theoretical consequences**

4.3.1. **Pollock's theory**

Let's first briefly summarise the basic points of Pollock (1989)'s analysis:

a. in Modern English the lexical verb cannot move to Tense (the highest Infl projection in P.'s theory\(^{15}\)) as a consequence of the poverty of its agreement morphology, which renders it opaque to theta-role assignment;

a.1. English has a substitute do as an alternative to 0 in T. Only when necessary, on the basis of economy considerations, the option to insert do instead of 0 is chosen;

a.2. Aux - NP inversion is the result of movement of the highest Infl projection (Tense, in Pollock's terms) to C°;

a.3. TP is an inherent Barrier, and a 0 element in C° cannot L-mark it, producing an ECP violation.

\(^{15}\) Differently from Pollock (1989) we assume (following the reformulation of Belletti 1990) the higher projection of Infl to be AgrP and the lower to be TP.
b. In Modern English, auxiliaries, modals and the substitute *do* move to the highest Infl projection (T°);

b.1. these verbal elements are transparent to theta role assignment, due to their lack of theta roles endowment.

b.2. they can move to T° permitting theta role transmission, due to their transparency

b.3. they can also move to C° in questions, for the same reasons.\(^\text{16}\).

"The ECP, quantification theory, and Theta theory, which are not open to parametric variation, would seem to require a language with [the idiosyncratic properties of English], to develop a verb like English *do* with all its specific characteristics." This statement (Pollock 1989, 366) requires some amendment if confronted with the data of Monnese, a dialect that does not share the idiosyncratic properties of English, and nevertheless has developed *do support*.

### 4.3.2. The role of morphology

As we have seen, Monnese verbal inflection is strong as it usually is in pro drop languages with obligatory V to I and nevertheless Monnese has developed the *do support* strategy for I to C.

In section 4.1.2 we pointed out that it is possible to maintain the hypothesis that *do support* originates when the movement of the verb to a given F° is lost: the dummy verb substitutes for the main verb in the F° which has turned into an inaccessible position (opaque in Pollock's terms) for main verbs. Do-support can in

---

\(^{16}\) As for the historical development of the construction, Pollock sums it up as follows:

1. in Middle English an indiscriminate usage of *do* as a Verb substitute is observed in non-emphatic contexts.

2. in Middle English agreement was almost completely lost: there was enough left to render Agr (in P.'s theory, a projection lower than TP) a barrier, but it was scarce enough to render it opaque to theta role assignment: this means that in simple sentences *do* insertion was chosen for the same reasons of ECP violation.
principle occur in any of the functional heads in the sentence structure which becomes opaque.

Monnese has lost I to C⁰ movement and has substituted a dummy verb in the C⁰ position. English has lost V to I⁰ and has substituted a dummy verb in the I⁰ and C⁰ positions. However, what seems to be weakened by the observation of Monnese syntax is the role of overt morphology. As NIDs do not show morphological differences when they pass from a V2 to a non V2 status, we can only hypothesise that the strong feature that triggers I to C movement and is being lost is an abstract one. If we now consider English syntax, it is reasonable to think that the loss of V to I movement is the trigger for the do support strategy. The relation between the loss of syntactic movement to the I⁰ position and the loss of overt morphology is much less clear, as the lack of overt morphology does not imply the lack of syntactic movement, (as we can see for example in V2 languages, where the feature that attracts the verb to C⁰ is not necessarily an overt morpheme). The trigger for do support depends rather on a syntactic feature, namely the loss of verb movement to a given Functional head F⁰. This, in turn, presumably depends on the loss of a given abstract feature of the F⁰ itself which has to be matched by the verb. Hence, the relation between presence/absence of overt morphology and do support is only an indirect one.

4.3.3. Where the verbal support arises

Another problem partially related to the previous ones is the following: if Monnese syntax is substantially similar to the English one, do support is inserted to realise the features of an opaque position which cannot be reached by a main verb. We would expect that the Monnese do support originates in the C⁰ position, as the lower position AgrS is transparent and constitutes a landing site for verb movement (as we have shown in section 2.2.). We should therefore expect cases like the following to be grammatical in Monnese, if we take the form fa as a phonologically unmarked verbal root:

(33) * Fa-l màja?
    Do he eats?
In (33) the auxiliary originates in C⁰ (or a position located between C⁰ and AgrS) and the main verb reaches the AgrS position below. However, this structure is ungrammatical in Monnese (as in English) and do support is very similar to the English case, as the auxiliary is followed by an infinitival form, which remains most probably lower than AgrS (and T⁰), as shown in section 2.2.

Why is this? If the AgrS position is a transparent position, there is nothing to prevent the verb from moving as high as it usually does in declarative contexts. As this is not the case, we have to find a reason that prevents the auxiliary from being inserted directly under the C⁰ position and forces it to be generated lower down in the structure (probably at the T⁰ level, where the English do is also inserted). If the auxiliary is generated under T⁰, it cannot be compatible with an inflected main verb that has to raise to T⁰ and AgrS⁰ to check its features.

Note that a similar problem arises for English too, as we could in principle expect to find an inflected lexical verb and an uninflected ‘do’ in interrogative sentences; that is, ‘do’ would appear in C⁰ and would be followed by a declarative sentence structure, where the main verb takes the inflectional morpheme without raising to T⁰ and subsequently to AgrS⁰. If we assume Kayne (1989)’s hypothesis that the inflectional morpheme of third person singular s is the morphological counterpart of a Number projection located lower than AgrS in the structure, the problem remains, as it should always be possible to use the structure of a declarative sentence with the main verb raising to the projection where it usually raises in declarative sentences and insert do where it is needed, namely in C⁰.

We see two possible ways to solve the problem and exclude the occurrence of cases like (33): 1) if we assume Rizzi (1991)'s idea that T⁰ contains the [+wh-] feature that must be moved to the head of the CP in order to enter the Spec-head relation with the wh- operator, the auxiliary must be generated in T⁰ and not in C⁰, because it has to carry the wh-feature from I⁰ to C⁰. Note that this implies a particular view of do support as realising a lower feature which has to be moved onto another higher head, and not as the simple realisation of a strong feature on a given F⁰ which otherwise would remain unspelled. This could be correct for both V to I and I to C do support, if a split IP hypothesis is adopted.

2) The fact that a dummy auxiliary as do/inf can not be generated directly under the C projection could be a more general fact, that does not depend on the particular requirements of interrogative structures (as movement of the [+wh-] feature from T⁰ to C⁰). We could assume that every verbal element has to originate in a lexical or functional position of 'verbal nature'. The functional positions inside the IP field are
verbal in their nature, while the CP is not, as it constitutes the interface between IP and the outside of the clause (cf. Rizzi (1995) and Grimshaw (1995) for similar observations on the nature of the two functional fields, IP and CP). Hence, a verbal element as 'do' is, could only be generated inside the IP/VP domain. Therefore, Monnese do support uses a structure which is substantially very similar to the English one and not a structure like (33), even though the latter is a plausible candidate, being AgrS transparent (in Pollock's terms) in this language.

Thus, the examination of Monnese do support gives us a hint on the general constraints that are active when a support strategy is instantiated.

4.3.4. The opacity of C°

Pollock's theory could be restated in more general terms assuming that a given projection (I° or C°) is opaque when it blocks the transmission of thematic roles of the verb. Main verbs cannot raise to a theta-opaque position, auxiliaries and modal (which do not have a theta grid) can.
A possible problem for this formulation is represented by the following alternations of Monnese:

(34)  
a  plöe-l o plöe-l mia,...  
'rain (pres.it or rain it not) "whether it rains or not,..."

b  ke l ploés o ke l ploés mia  
that it rained or that it rained not "whether it rained or not"

The examples of disjunctive sentences above show Subject Clitic Inversion with a lexical verb, a pattern that produces ungrammaticality in main questions. In disjunctive sentences, SCI, both of lexical and auxiliary verbs, is obligatory if the complementiser is not inserted, and impossible if the complementiser is realised. we conclude then that SCI is produced by the upward movement of the verb to C in these structure as well. This calls for an explanation: if I to C movement for a lexical verb is admitted in disjunctive sentences, why is it impossible in interrogatives? This asymmetry between interrogatives and disjunctives cannot be immediately accounted for within Pollock's theory, as C° cannot be considered a totally opaque position by itself, as movement is indeed possible in some contexts but not in all.
If we adopt a split CP analysis, it is reasonable to assume that interrogatives and disjunctive sentences involve two different functional projections in CP. The problem we are discussing forces us to admit that the lower one is the CP where SCI is triggered and where the verb stops in disjunctive clauses, and the higher one is the CP that must be filled in interrogative contexts. The higher $C^0$ position is opaque in Pollock's terms and therefore no lexical verb can reach it (with consequent 'do' insertion) while the lower position is transparent to movement and can be reached by lexical verbs triggering no do support. The structure of the clause would be the following:

(35) interrogative CP

\[ WH- \rightarrow SPEC \rightarrow C' \]

\[ \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \right}
disjunctive strong features. Again, it is not clear why the lexical verbs should have lost only the interrogative strong feature and retained the disjunctive feature.

4.3.5. Lexical verbs and theta theory

In this section we will consider the second type of differences found in Monnese do support with respect to its English counterpart, namely those found inside the domain of modals and auxiliaries moving to C° (cf. section 3.2, 3.3).

We have seen that in Monnese the only modal which always moves to C° is olè 'want/wish' while other modals cannot be taken into account as they are borrowings or are a compound formed by 'have' and a preposition.

Two other semi-auxiliary verbs, fa 'do' and nda 'go', optionally move to C° or take do support. The problem that arises with Monnese data is that none of these verbs - olè, fa and nda - shows any difference in their use as main verbs or as auxiliaries. Olè always raises to C°, even in those contexts in which it is a main verb which takes a direct object, while fa and nda optionally use the do support strategy if they are used as main verbs which take respectively a direct and a locative object or when they are used as auxiliaries. This constitutes a potential problem for Pollock's theory.

Monnese, as we have seen to be the case for many others Italian dialects, has rich verbal morphology, and movement of the inflected verb to AgrS. The last step of interrogative movement, however, has to be performed by fa: clearly it is inserted when the verb has to go further than AgrS, to a position presumably corresponding to C°. In this respect, Monnese confirms Pollock's intuition. What is, in our view, weakened, is point 3. of Pollock's theory, namely the relation of the restriction with Theta transparency - that Pollock suggests discriminates between verbs that can reach higher positions and verbs which cannot. Here both the differences and the similarities between Monnese and English show that the assignment of a verb to the class of items that can reach C° is partially idiosyncratic. Auxiliaries necessarily belong to this class, modals can switch from one class to another in different languages. A real difference between English and Monnese appears to be the fact that in English a verb (as for ex. will) moves or does not move to higher projections (and consequently has or does not have do support) depending on its meaning: if it is a modal auxiliary it moves, if it is not (with the meaning of 'to want' or 'to make a
will') it cannot. But this difference becomes less obvious if we consider those often cited varieties of British English where 'have' - both the auxiliary and the lexical verb - can (or used to be able to) invert with the subject and avoid \textit{do support} independently of its value. These variety of English are in fact problematic for Pollock's analysis, if lexical \textit{have} is assumed to assign a theta role and can still move to C°.

The same difficulty is in more evident in Monnese. We have seen that in Monnese an ambiguous verb has apparently the option to move or not, regardless of its meaning. Hence, the \textit{do support} theory proposed by Pollock seems to be confirmed by Monnese data except for one point: Pollock attributes the impossibility for main verbs to raise to opaque positions to theta theory. Monnese shows that this cannot be entirely true, as some verbs move to C° (or use \textit{do support}) independently of their use as auxiliaries or as main verbs, which means independently from the supposed opacity that would affect their capacity to assign theta roles.

Pollock's hypothesis can be maintained if, adopting Kayne's (1994) proposal on auxiliaries, we argue that modals as well have the same structure, regardless of whether they are used with an infinitive or whether they are used with a DP. Hence, verbs like \textit{olè 'want'}, in Monnese would always have the same structure, the structure of an auxiliary capable of raising to opaque positions as it does not assign thematic roles.

Verbs like \textit{nda 'go} and \textit{fa 'do}, which optionally move to C°, would have the possibility of switching between the structure of a main verb and the structure of an auxiliary; the switch would be independent from their use as main verbs or as auxiliaries. It remains to be investigated what the conditions ruling this syntactic switch could be.

Whether this hypothesis proves teneble or not will depend on the feasibility of extending Kayne's proposal (originally made only for \textit{have} and \textit{be}) to other verbs, such as those we have seen in Monnese if this hypothesis proves teneble or not.

5. Conclusion

\textit{Do support} in the Romance variety we have analysed here shows striking similarities with the English phenomenon. It is triggered by the same factor: the impossibility of the verb raising to a given functional projection, and therefore it is
subject to the same restrictions (it only occurs in the context in which it is needed). Romance *do support* confirms the intuition that the phenomenon is a "last resort" strategy, but also shed some light on the general theory of auxiliary insertion as well as on English *do support*.

In general, there seems to be a requirement that forces auxiliaries to be inserted inside the IP domain (which is verb-related, while the C domain is not: cf. Rizzi (1995) and Grimshaw (1995)). *Do support* cannot arise in C°, it must originate inside a lower FP in the IP field. Moreover, it seems that the class of verbs that do not need *do support* contains some modals used as main verbs with a theta grid.

The examination of *do support* also has consequences for our analysis of Romance in general, as it confirms that in main interrogatives the inflected verb moves to C° (as proposed by Rizzi (1991)) in these languages too, while it does not in embedded clauses.

The Monnese facts suggest that the analysis of English *do support* needs to be revised: 1) in Romance *do support* shows that subject interrogatives are CPs and not IPs. This conclusion could be extended to English as well, supporting Rizzi's (1991) analysis; 2) English *do support* is not a unitary phenomenon, as it replaces the verb both in I° and in C°; 3) the role of morphology in the development of English *do support* must also be revised. Monnese shows that the *do support* is a purely syntactic phenomenon and can develop even though no morphological change occurs. The occurrence of a dummy verb in a functional head position is triggered by the fact that main verbs cannot raise to the F° in question. The reason for this prohibition still remains mysterious.
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