

# Reduplication as a Strategy for *-ever* Free Relatives: Semantic and Syntactic Observations\*

*Giuseppina Silvestri*

University of Cambridge (<[gs486@cam.ac.uk](mailto:gs486@cam.ac.uk)>)

*Abstract:*

Italo-Romance varieties display a typologically rare strategy to realize the unconditional (or free-choice) free relative clauses, i.e. the reduplication of the verb complex. The semantic entailment of unconditionality is not conveyed through the lexicalization of a morpheme corresponding to *-ever*. Also, the modal force of the semantic operator does not match the selection of the subjunctive morphology, which is not available in most Italian dialects. The ItaloRomance varieties of our sample resort to structural reduplication as the only strategy to express the unconditionality requirement of this type of free relative clauses. In this contribution, I compare unconditionals across Italian dialects and other Romance varieties on the basis of their morphosyntactic properties. In the analysis of the reduplication structure I link the derivation of unconditional free relatives with the semantic and syntactic aspects of free-choice indefinite pronouns. I finally propose a unifying formal account of two types of reduplication configurations, both corresponding to unconditional free relatives, both available across Italo-Romance.

*Keywords: Italian Dialects, Free-choice Pronouns, Syntactic Reduplication, Unconditional Relative Clauses*

## *1. Introduction*

Among free relative clauses (FRs, henceforth), i.e. headless (Caponigro and Pearl 2008; Caponigro and Fălăuș 2017) or light-headed (Citko 2004)

\* The first observations stemming from this piece of research were presented in November 2015 at the ‘Bucharest Romance Syntactic Workshop’: I am grateful to the scholars in the audience who then made insightful remarks. This version of the paper has benefitted from the comments and suggestions of two anonymous reviewers thanks to which a previous version has surely improved. Needless to say, all mistakes and oversights the reader is going to find are my only responsibility.

embedded non-interrogative *wh*-clauses, *wh-ever* FRs are distinguished on the basis of their quantificational force. Much debate has been carried on about the semantic entailments of the morpheme *-ever* and the definiteness of the *wh-ever* clause (Bresnan and Grimshaw 1978; Dayal 1997; Grosu and Landman 1998; Tredinnick 2005). On the one hand, *-ever* appears to be similar to universally quantified expressions when referring to a plurality of individuals. Syntactic tests prove that it behaves like universals (Larson 1987). In particular, *-ever* licenses NPIs (1 a,b) and can be modified by *almost*-like modifiers (*almost, just, about, practically*; 1c).

- (1) a. There's a lot of garlic in whatever Arlo has ever cooked.  
 b. Bill grabbed whatever object was anywhere near him.  
 c. Bill grabbed practically whatever was on the desk. (Tredinnick 2005: 34)

On the other hand, the universal quantificational force is distinct from the definite reading attributed to *-ever* FRs under some specific analyses (Larson 1987; Jacobson 1995; Dayal 1995, 1997; Iatridou and Valrokosta 1998; Giannakidou and Cheng 2006, a.o.). More specifically, FRs have been analyzed as either universal (2a-b) or definite (2c-d), whereby the difference in the interpretation is typically triggered by singular vs non-singular entity of a given domain and correlates with the presence or absence of *-ever* (Jacobson 1995; van Riemsdijk 2000, 2005: 358-359):

- (2) a. I will eat whatever the waiter will put on my plate (+universal)  
 b. I will eat everything that the waiter will put on my plate  
 c. I ate what the waiter put on my plate (+definite, ± universal)  
 d. I ate the thing that the waiter put on my plate

The contrast between (2a) and (2c) is the key of the opposition between plain FRs and *-ever* FRs: in (2c) the set of maximal entities denoting what the waiter puts on the speaker's plate may be limited to a single entity, whereas in (2a) *-ever* forces to interpret this set as composed by all entities that the waiter puts on the plate. The result is that (2c) is equivalent to a definite and (2a) to a universal interpretation.

Another interpretation is proposed by Quer and Vicente (2009), whereby the operator *ever* within FRs does not act as ordinary universal, as it contains a variable over worlds on top of the usual variable over individuals. In this view, *-ever* FRs acquire an indefinite interpretation, therefore adopting the quantificational force of the operator that binds their variables and allowing a free-choice reading. In this sense, *-ever* FRs match a quasi-universal reading which arises when a universal modal operator binds the world variable (Quer 1999; Giannakidou 2001; Giannakidou and Quer 2013). The specific modality of *-ever* FRs makes them unconditional clausal modification struc-

tures (see also Kratzer 1986; Rawlins 2008), whereby unconditionality corresponds to structures in which the proposition expressed by the consequence (or apodosis; ‘Maria will be happy’ in (3)) is true in every possible world:<sup>1</sup>

- (3) a. *Quienquiera* que venga a Bucarest, Maria estará contenta  
 whoever that comes.SBJ to Bucharest Maria be.FUT.3SG happy  
 ‘Whoever comes to Bucharest, Maria will be happy’ (Castilian Spanish)
- b. *Chiunque* venga a Bucarest, Maria sarà contenta  
 whoever comes.SBJ to Bucharest Maria be.FUT.3SG happy  
 ‘Whoever comes to Bucharest, Maria will be happy’ (standard Italian)

This paper is centered on the structural correlates of *-ever* FRs of the unconditional types (hereafter, unconditionals). I assume that the operator *ever* expresses a type of modality which enforces universal quantification over epistemic alternatives to the evaluation of worlds. Following Quer and Vicente’s (2009) account, I argue that *ever* endows FRs with properties typically associated with universal quantifiers. However, the resulting structure delivers a quasi-universal interpretation (Giannakidou 2001: 707) in which the universal modal operator binds the world variable. More specifically, the operator *ever* exhausts the values that can be assigned to its variable within a single world. In *-ever* FRs a value is checked in each alternative (i.e. the context domain introduced by ‘or’ in (4)), whereas considering all values in a single alternative is not possible. In particular, given that antecedents (or protases) of unconditionals denote sets of disjoint alternatives with a {world, individual} variable pair (Rawlins 2008, 2013), variables receive a different value in each alternative (4). Therefore, *ever* defines a maximal set of mutually exclusive alternatives that are also undifferentiated, hence triggering the free choice among them (Farkas 2013: 221; Caponigro and Fălăuș 2017: 26):

(4)

$$\llbracket \textit{whoever comes to Bucharest} \rrbracket = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_1 \textit{ comes to Bucharest in } w_1 \\ \textit{or } x_2 \textit{ comes to Bucharest in } w_2 \\ \textit{or } x_3 \textit{ comes to Bucharest in } w_3 \\ \textit{or } \dots \\ \textit{or } x_n \textit{ comes to Bucharest in } w_n \end{array} \right\}$$

<sup>1</sup> Conversely, the conditional clausal modification corresponds to a structure in which the proposition expressed by the consequence (or apodosis) is true only in those worlds defined by the antecedent (or protasis). Thus, the antecedent functions as a domain restrictor operating on the modal base of the consequence.

Arguably, the quantificational structure is headed by a silent conditional operator (COND). Given a protasis, that acts as a restrictor, and a consequent (or apodosis) which is the nucleus, COND operator composes protasis and apodosis, creating a set of disjoint conditional statements (see Haspelmath and König 1998:565 for a different formulation):

(5)

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{[[[COND antecedent] consequent]]} \\ & = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_1 \text{ comes to Bucharest in } w_1 \rightarrow M. \text{ will be happy in } w_1 \\ \text{or } x_2 \text{ comes to Bucharest in } w_2 \rightarrow M. \text{ will be happy in } w_2 \\ \text{or } x_3 \text{ comes to Bucharest in } w_3 \rightarrow M. \text{ will be happy in } w_3 \\ \text{or ...} \\ \text{or } x_n \text{ comes to Bucharest in } w_n \rightarrow M. \text{ will be happy in } w_n \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Licit unconditional antecedents correspond to FRs with free-choice interpretation expressed by *ever*. Thus, it matches the semantic equivalent of (5). Illicit unconditional antecedents, i.e. FRs displaying no *ever* morpheme, would deliver different semantic entailments.

Based on syntactic properties, FRs are pluricategorical constructions.<sup>2</sup> Namely, the relative operator (or the whole FR, according to Bresnan and Grimshaw (1978)) can correspond to a determiner phrase (6 a,b), an adverb phrase (6c), a prepositional phrase (6d) or an adjectival phrase (6e):

- (6) a. Please, return whatever you have taken from the office.  
 b. I'll sing whichever songs you want.  
 c. I'll write however carefully you want me to write.  
 d. They're about to arrive in whatever village they'd mentioned.  
 e. However high that wall is, she's going to climb it.

As for the distribution, multiple *wh-ever*-clauses can occur (van Riemsdijk 2006):

- (7) You always criticize whatever book of whichever author I buy.

In Romance languages unconditional FRs (8a, 9a) may show an identical syntactic distribution as plain FRs, i.e. verb argument (8b, 9b) or adverb:

<sup>2</sup> For some languages it has been observed the requirement whereby the *wh* pronouns fulfill the case requirement of both the matrix and the relative clauses ('Matching Effect' of FRs; Grosu 1994; van Riemsdijk 2005: 346-356). According to Grosu's (1994) typological distinction, at least three classes of languages arise: (i) fully matching languages (e.g. English, French, Hebrew, Russian, Italian); (ii) non-matching languages (e.g. Latin, earlier stages of the Romance, Old and Middle high German and possibly Gothic); (iii) partially matching languages, i.e. languages that allow non-matching only under restricted circumstances (e.g. Finnish, Spanish, Catalan, Romanian).

- (8) a. El detective interrogará a quienquiera que esté presente  
 the detective interrogate.FUT.3SG to whomever that be.PRT.3SG present  
 b. El detective interrogará a quien que esté presente  
 the detective interrogate.FUT.3SG to whom that be.PRT.3SG present  
 ‘The detective will interrogate whomever was present’ (Castilian Spanish)
- (9) a. Detectivul va audia pe oricine a fost prezent.  
 detective.DEF AUX examine.INF to whomever has been present  
 b. Detectivul va audia pe cine a fost prezent.  
 detective.DEF AUX examine.INF to whom has been present  
 ‘The detective will interrogate whomever was present’ (Romanian)

The same distributional parallel is not found in central and southern Italian dialects, where the two types of FRs exhibit a different syntactic distribution (10) and are realized through different strategies. The unconditional FRs are left-dislocated and optionally linked to the main clause through a binding pronoun. Also, crucially, the only possible structural realization of unconditionals is through the reduplication of the verb complex (10c):<sup>3</sup>

- (10) a. U privətə vo parlà cu ccu ha cantatə alla missa  
 the priest wants talk.INF with who has sung to.the mass  
 ‘The priest wants to talk to whom has sung at the mass’  
 b. \*U privətə vo parlà cu ccu ha cantatə cantatə alla missa  
 the priest wants talk.INF with who has sung sung to.the mass  
 c. Cu ha cantatə cantatə alla missa, u privətə ci vo parlà  
 who has sung sung to.the mass the priest to.them=wants talk.INF  
 ‘Whoever has sung at the mass, the priest wants to talk to them’  
 (S. Maria del Cedro, Cosenza)

<sup>3</sup> One of the reviewers asks whether this pattern of V reduplication also conveys a specific aspectual value, i.e. iterative and/or habitual, given that cross-linguistically V reduplication is linked to the imperfective aspect. S/He also wonders if the reduplication structure, as the one in (10c), could also be linked to expressiveness. Based on the evidence discussed in this contribution, the reduplication structure represented in (20a,b) and assessed throughout the paper only corresponds to *-ever* RFs. Yet, some of the Italo-Romance varieties considered here exhibit other reduplication patterns (Silvestri in prep.) that clearly correlate either with an expressive stance or an imperfective aspectual value, e.g.:

- i. Marija parla pparla (expressive value: the speaker thinks that Maria talks too much)  
 Maria talks talks  
 ‘Maria talks a lot/too much’  
 ii. Marija parlədə e pparlədə (aspectual value: Maria talks continuously)  
 Maria talks and talks  
 ‘Maria repeatedly talks / What usually Maria does is talking’ (S. Maria del Cedro, Cosenza; Silvestri in prep.)

Yet, neither (i) nor (ii) convey an unconditional reading or display a *wh* element to introduce the clause. Therefore, there are distinct V reduplication patterns across ItaloRomance which correspond to as many aspects of the grammar.

In what follows I am going to take into consideration the morphosyntactic properties of the unconditional FRs occurring in the left-dislocated position (10c), i.e. preceding the matrix clause. After a brief descriptive account of this type of unconditionals across Romance (§2), I shall focus more closely on the empirical evidence from Italo-Romance (§3) on which I build a semantically motivated structural analysis (§4).

## 2. Unconditional free relatives in Romance

Romance languages avail themselves of several different strategies to structurally convey the unconditional FRs (Haspelmath and König 1998: 604-619). Other than the lexicalization of a morpheme corresponding to *ever* (§2.1), following (Latin, Spanish, Portuguese, French, standard Italian) or preceding (Romanian) the *wh* pronoun, Romance unconditionals can be marked by reduplication of the *wh* pronoun (Latin), or not marked with a *wh*-based morphology (French).

In this section, I will describe the semantic and structural properties of unconditionals in Italo-Romance varieties as opposed to the rest of Romance.

### 2.1 The morphosyntax unconditional relative clauses with the morpheme *ever*

In standard Romance varieties, when lexicalised, the *ever* operator is realized either as a grammaticalized morpheme ultimately deriving from Latin present or subjunctive forms of the verbs *VELLE* / *QUAERERE* / *ESSE* (11) or through the diachronic outcome of the Latin pronoun formations involving *CUNQUĒ* (< *UMQUAM* 'ever') (12).<sup>4,5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> The *ever* morpheme in of Latin, i.e. *CUNQUĒ*, shows an additive particle (i.e. *QUĒ*; Haspelmath and König 1998:609). This finds a comparative match in the formations of indefiniteness markers in other Indo-European languages, such as Serbo-Croatian, Hittite, Kannada (Haspelmath 1997: 1578), where an additive particle (*and, also*) attaches to a *wh* element.

<sup>5</sup> The Romance series of *wh-ever* pronouns is a new formation, as Latin displayed other two free-choice series of pronouns, both formed with a verb-derived morpheme, i.e. the series formed with *vis* and the series formed with *libet*. Crucially, Latin also exhibited reduplicated pronouns (e.g. *quisquis* 'whoever', *quidquid* 'whatever, whichever'; Haspelmath 1997:179-182; Haspelmath and König 1998:605, 615). In this contribution I limit myself to provide only a few relatively straightforward etymological notes on Romance *wh-ever* elements. Their diachronic development from Latin to modern Romance would be definitely instrumental for shading lights on the factors that trigger the large amount of variation concerning their morpho-syntactic and semantic-pragmatic properties. Yet, a proper diachronic investigation of this series of pronouns based on their semantic-pragmatic entailments, some of them being now lost, is far beyond the focus of this paper.

- (11) a. Quem quer que o disse é un caluniador.  
 who ever that it= said.3SG is a slanderer  
 ‘Whoever said it, is a slanderer’ (European Portuguese; Dunn 1930: 322)
- b. Quienquiera que hubiese gritado, ...<sup>6</sup>  
 whoever that have.3SG.IMP.SUBJ scream.PST.PRT  
 ‘Whoever had screamed, ...’
- c. Había decidido seguirla adondequiera que fuese  
 had.1SG decided follow=her wherever that go.3SG.PST.SUBJ  
 ‘I had decided to follow her wherever she went’ (Castilian Spanish)
- d. Anirà a cercarlo onsevulla que s’ hagi amagat  
 go.3PL.FUT to look.for=him wherever that self=has hidden  
 ‘They will look for him wherever he’s hidden’  
 (Catalan; Fabra 1969 *apud* Hirschbuhler and Rivero 1981: 608)
- e. Spună el orice, nu-l ascult  
 say.SUBJ he anything not=CL.ACC.3SG listen.IND.PRES.1SG  
 ‘Whatever he may say, I won’t listen to him’ (Romanian; Dindelegan 2013: 31)
- f. Qualsiasi cosa tu decida di fare,  
 whichever thing you decide.1SG.SUBJ.PRS to do.INF  
 tua madre deve essere informata.  
 your mother has. to be.INF informed  
 ‘Whatever you will decide to do, your mother has to be notified’  
 (standard Italian)
- (12) a. Quiconque n’a pas de tempérament personnel n’a pas de talent.  
 whoever not has NEG some temperament personal not has NEG some talent  
 ‘Whoever does not have personal temperament, does not have any talent’  
 (French)
- b. Qualunque film io proponga, Paolo non è mai soddisfatto.  
 whichever film suggest.1SG.SUBJ.PRS Paolo not is never content  
 ‘Whichever film I suggest, you are never happy’ (standard Italian)

Each series of *whenever* pronouns in Romance varieties may not employ the same morphological strategy (Table 1). Also, both historical sources of the morpheme corresponding to *ever* may be available in the same language, as in Italian ‘*qualsiasi*’ (11f) and ‘*qualunque*’ (12c).<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> In some examples, I omit the matrix clause for the sake of simplification, and I put a comma and three dots at the end of the FR clause.

<sup>7</sup> Romance languages also employ non-grammaticalized expression involving a generic noun (Haspelmath 1997: 6970, 25365). These expressions are put in brackets in Table 1.

	standard Italian	Castilian Spanish <sup>8,9</sup>	Catalan	European Portuguese	French	Romanian
who-ever	chiunque	quienquiera / quienesquiera	quisvulla / quisvulga (que)	quem quer	quiconque [+subj] / (qui que [+obj])	oricine, orişicine
what-ever	qualunque /qualsiasi cosa		qualsevol (que)	qualquer (coisa)	(quoi qui [+subj] / quoi que [+obj])	orice, orişice
when-ever	(in qualsiasi momento)	cuandoquiera				oricând, orişicând
wher-ever	(d)ovunque	dondequiera/ (a)doquiera/	onsevulla (que)			oriunde, orişiuunde
which-ever	qualunque	cualquiera/ cualesquiera	qualsevol (que)	qualquer que (seja)		orice, orişice
how-ever	((in) qualunque/ qualsiasi modo)	comoquiera (cuantoquiera)				oricum, orişicum

Table 1. *wh-ever* pronouns in Romance free relatives

The empirical evidence also suggests that if *ever* is overtly realized though a morpheme on the *wh* pronoun, the subjunctive is selected either obligatorily (Castilian Spanish, Catalan, standard Italian; see also Haspelmath and König 1998: 609) or optionally along with the indicative (European Portuguese, French, Romanian) (see (13) and Table 2):

<sup>8</sup> As also pointed out by one of the anonymous reviewers, the use of the FRs headed by *wh-ever* elements in Castilian Spanish, with the exception of *cualquier(a)* 'whoever' (NGLE §20.4, §22.12), is more frequent in a formal register (NGLE §44.1z). In Castilian Spanish the most common option of expressing FRs is the employment of plain FRs introduced by *wh* pronouns with the selection of the subjunctive (over the indicative), therefore conveying the indefinite and unconditional reading:

- i. Quien te            haya        dicho        eso        mente  
     who you=OBJ has.SUBJ.3SG        said.PPT this        lies  
 'Whoever has told you this is lying'        (Castilian Spanish, NGLE §15.9j)

<sup>9</sup> In Spanish the same morphological formation of the other *wh-ever* elements can be observed for *siquiera* 'at least, not even' which, however, is not an element heading FRs and functions as a negative adverb (NGLE §40.8f) or a conjunction in *if*-clauses, also in insubordinate *if*-clauses (NGLE 47.3ñ), and in concessive subordinates (NGLE §47.16j).

- (13) a. Qualquer coisa que te irrita, não te preocupes.  
 whichever thing that you.OBJ bother.3SG.IND not you.OBJ=worry.2SG.SUBJ.PRS  
 ‘Whatever bothers you, do not worry’ (European Portuguese)
- b. Quiconque parlait de clemence, était un révolutionnaire  
 whoever speak.3SG.IND.IMPV of mercy was.IMPV a rebel  
 ‘Whoever used to speak of mercy was a rebel’ (French)
- c. (Îi) răspunde oricărui coleg îl întreabă  
 to.him answers whomever.DAT.MSG colleague to.him asks  
 ‘He answers any colleague who asks him’ (Romanian; Dindelegan 2013: 156)

	nonreduplication unconditional FRs	
	morpheme <i>ever</i>	subjunctive
E. Portuguese	+	+/-
Castilian Spanish	+	+
Catalan	+	+
French	+	+/-
st. Italian	+	+
Romanian	+	-

Table 2. Unconditional free relatives and selection of subjunctive

## 2.2 Reduplication structures as an alternative

Some standard Romance varieties display reduplication structures alternatively to FRs introduced by *wh-ever* pronouns, whilst conveying identical semantic entailments. In such structures the operator *ever* does not correspond to a morpheme. The unconditional (or free-choice) reading is conveyed through a peculiar construction formed by two adjacent phrasal elements,<sup>10</sup> generally involving two identical verb forms (cf. Brazilian Portuguese, where the two verbs can morphologically differ only for tense (14a), but not for person and mood). One of the two clauses is headed by the *wh* pronoun and can either precede or follow the other clause. Reduplication structures in standard Romance varieties are not fully productive. If a variety shows both the reduplication strategy as well as the morphological pronoun formation to realize unconditionals, the former is perceived as less formal, or even colloquial, as in (15a) and (16b) versus (15b). Additionally, they are often pragmatically marked and restricted to a formulaic context (16):

<sup>10</sup> Nonspecific free relative clause in Haspelmath and König (1998: 616).

- (14) a. Venha quem vier, eu vou embora  
 come.3SG.SUBJ.PRS who come.3SG.SUBJ.FUT I go away  
 ‘Whoever comes, I’m still leaving’  
 b. Seja quem for, eu vou embora  
 be.SUBJ.PRES who be.SUBJ.FUT I go away  
 ‘Whoever it is, I’m still leaving’ (Brazilian Portuguese; Quer and Vicente 2009: 12)
- (15) a. Se ponga la ropa que se ponga, siempre está elegante.  
 self= put.3SG.SUBJ the cloth that self=put always is elegant  
 b. Cualquiera que sea la ropa que se ponga, ...  
 whichever that be.3SG.SUBJ the cloth that self= put.3SG.SUBJ  
 ‘Whichever clothes/s/he wears, s/he is always elegant’ (Castilian Spanish; NGLÉ:\$47.16c)
- (16) a. Costi quel che costi,  
 cost.3SG.SBJ.PRS that.DEM that cost.3SG.SBJ.PRS  
 Paolo riuscirà nel suo intento.  
 Paolo succeed.3SG.IND.FUT in.the his intention  
 ‘However the price, Paolo will succeed in his plan’ (standard Italian)  
 b. Come la giri giri, la frittata è sempre la stessa.  
 how her=turn.2SG.IND.PRS turn.2SG.IND.PRS the frittata is always the same  
 ‘However you put it, it’s not going to change’ (standard Italian)

When realized through reduplication structures, the unconditional FRs in standard Romance varieties generally involve a third person subject. They also show a strict adjacency of the two verb complexes, not allowing the intervention of subject or object full DPs or adverbs in between them.<sup>11</sup> Crucially, the mood is set on subjunctive which contributes to express the specific modality of this type of FRs, which other than indifference or ignorance, i.e. two general entailments of unconditionals, also convey a concessive stance.

### 3. Reduplication as the only strategy in Italian dialects

Central and southern Italian dialects as well as Sardinian witness an idiosyncrasy between form and meaning concerning unconditionals: namely, FRs license the unconditional entailment and yet a specific form, such as the *wh-ever* pronouns in Table 1, is largely or totally unavailable. In order to express the unconditionals, these varieties avail themselves with the on-

<sup>11</sup> In other Italo-Romance varieties, e.g. among Apulian dialects, a conjunction appears between the two Vs (D’Onghia 2019).

ly structural strategy of reduplication to realize *ever* FRs (Haspelmath and Köning 1998: 615; Gulli 2009; D'Onghia 2019), being the morphological pronominal formation (almost) completely absent in their grammar (17).<sup>12,13</sup>

- (17) a. Lua en en i fregghi, en contenti d'esse giti.  
 where are.3PL are.3PL the kids are.3PL happy of be.INF gone.MPL  
 'Wherever the kids go, they're always happy to be there' (Sant'Egidio, Perugia)
- b. Quiddà k- ha dittà ha dittà, non mē nē 'ncaracè chjù.  
 what that has said has said, not me of.it care more  
 'Whatever s/he said, I don't care anymore' (S. Maria del Cedro, Cosenza)
- c. Ca quannu arrivi arrivi, mi truovi pronto.  
 CA when arrive.2SG arrive.2SG me=find.2SG ready  
 'No matter when you arrive, I'll be ready' (Ragusa)
- d. Anca andada andada Vito,  
 wherever goes goes Vito  
 cumbinada sempre guaiusu cun is atrus pipiusu  
 makes always troubles with the other.PL kids  
 'Wherever Vito goes, he gets into troubles with the other kids'  
 (Campidanese; Sinnai, Cagliari)

In some of the varieties where the reduplication is the largely preferred option, *ever* FRs may also be realized with *wh* pronouns with *ever* morpheme, i.e. freechoice indefinite pronouns (18), as an alternative to the reduplication structure. The use of these pronouns in such varieties does not rule out the reduplication of the verb complex (19):

<sup>12</sup> The data collected refer to the central, upper southern and extreme southern Italian dialects spoken in the following localities, from north to south: Sant'Egidio (Perugia), Neapolitan, Buonvicino (Cosenza), Orsomarso (Cosenza), Verbicaro (Cosenza), S(anta) Maria del Cedro (Cosenza), Altomonte (Cosenza), Lecce, Carpignano S(alentino) (Lecce), Squinzano (Lecce), Villa San Giovanni (Reggio Calabria), Ragusa. Further relevant data were collected from the Sardinian Campidanese variety of Sinnai (Cagliari). All data have been elicited through interviews to native speakers, unless otherwise stated.

<sup>13</sup> To my knowledge at the date, the reduplication *ever* FRs are attested across Italo-Romance with a patchy geolinguistic distribution. For example, among the Salentino dialects of the area immediately surrounding Lecce some varieties only build the *ever* FR through reduplication structures (e.g. Carpignano S.), whereas some other do exhibit a formulaic usage of them only, as in the dialect of Squinzano (as well as the variety of Lecce itself), where the reduplication structure only co-occurs with the *whenever* pronoun (*addunca* 'wherever'; i) or has a formulaic state (ii):

- i. Addunca vae vae lu Vito, cumbina sempre wai.  
 wherever goes goes the.MSG Vito makes always troubles  
 'Wherever Vito goes, he always gets in trouble'
- ii. Sia komu sia, su contenta ca osce su binuta.  
 be.3SG.SUBJ how be.3SG.SUBJ be.1SG.IND happy:FSG that today be.1SG.IND come.PPT.FSG  
 'No matter how it goes, I am happy that I came today' (Squinzano, Lecce)

- (18) a. Adunca va Marija, pur Rita c' ha dda ji.  
 wherever goes Maria, also Rita there has to go  
 'Wherever Maria goes, Rita has to go too' (S. Maria del Cedro, Cosenza)
- b. Cunca parlava, u prívità durmiva.  
 whoever speak.3SG.IMPF the priest sleep.3SG.IMPF  
 'No matter who was speaking, the priest kept sleeping' (Buonvicino, Cosenza)
- (19) a. Lu Petru, addhunca vae vae, litica cu l'addhi piccinni.  
 the.MSG Pietro wherever goes goes argues with the other kids  
 'Wherever Pietro goes, he always argues with the other kids' (Carpignano S., Lecce)
- b. Cunca vidəsə vidəsə, no dicennə nentə.  
 whomever see.2SG.IND see.2SG.IND NEG say.GER nothing  
 'Whomever you see, do not say anything' (Verbicaro, Cosenza)

In the relevant varieties, the reduplication structure corresponding to unconditional FRs displays two strictly adjacent verb complexes (i.e. VP1 and VP2). The linear order is fixed in that the *wh* element always precedes the first VP.<sup>14</sup> The rest of the elements of the clause, such as verb arguments and modifiers (i.e. modal, temporal and spatial adverbs), follow the entire reduplication structure (21). The unmarked linear order is provided in (20a) and the specifics of the reduplication structure in (20b):

- (20) a. [<sub>FR</sub> [<sub>Reduplication</sub>] (DObj) (IObj) (Subj) (Adv\*) [<sub>matrix clause</sub> ... ]]
- b. Reduplication = [ *wh*-pronoun VP1 (and) VP2 ]
- (21) a. Chéllə ca rićə rićə Marì rumanə  
 what that says says Maria.SUBJ tomorrow  
 a Luca nun ćə nə mbortə  
 to Luca not to.him of.it interests  
 'Whatever Maria says tomorrow, Luca is no longer interested in it' (Neapolitan)
- b. Quannə da da i libbrə allə quatrarə Maria, rəcimillə  
 when give.2SG give.2SG the books to.the kids Maria tell=to.me=it  
 'Whenever Maria gives the books to the kids, let me know' (Orsomarso, Cosenza)

If the subject is topicalized or focalized, it can be left-dislocated and preceding the whole FR clause:

- (22) Lu Mariu, cu cue parla parla, no sape ce dice.  
 the.MSG Mario with whom speaks speaks not knows what says  
 'With whomever Mario speaks, he never really knows what he's saying'  
 (Carpignano S., Lecce)

<sup>14</sup> This is not the only possible word order for FRs in Romance languages. Another type of FRs formed through reduplication that exhibits a distinct word order as well as different modal properties is discussed in §5.

The functional elements of the VP, i.e. the clitics and the auxiliary of compound verb forms, can be silent in VP2. Therefore, only the lexical component of VP2 must be spelled out. More specifically, if either the DO or the IO or both are doubled through a clitic pronoun, the resulting structure can be reduplicated entirely into VP2, i.e. inclusive of the clitics, or only the lexical verb can:

(23) [ [<sub>FR</sub> wh [IOcl DOcl V]<sub>VP1</sub> [(IOcl) (DO cl) V]<sub>VP2</sub> (DO) (IO) (Subj)] ] ...

(24) a. Quannə n'ù daj (n'ù) daj u libbr a nuj ...  
 when to.us=it=give.2SG.IND.PRS to.us=it=give.2SG.IND.PRS the.MSG book to us ...  
 'Whenever you give us the book, ...'

b. Cu n'haa datə (dd'haa) datə u rəgalə a Frankə, ...  
 who to.him=it=has given to.him=it=has given the present to Franco ...  
 'Whoever gave Franco the present, ...' (Orsomarso, Cosenza)

As the morphology of (present) subjunctive is mostly unavailable in central and southern Italian dialects, not surprisingly the two VPs of the unconditionals exhibit indicative mood.

### 3.1 Restructuring verbs

Complex clauses such as those with restructuring verbs represent no exception to the strategy of reduplication. In southern and central Italian dialects a restructuring verb might take an infinitival or a finite complement (Ledgeway 1998), depending on the internal syntactic variation of each variety. FRs with matrix verbs that take a canonical infinitival complement show consistent patterns of reduplication across Italian dialects in that the functional component of VP1 can be left unpronounced in VP2:

(25) a. A cu vo parlà (vo) parlà, a nua non nə 'nteressa.  
 to whom want.2SG talk.INF want.2SG talk.INF to us not us=interests  
 'Whoever you want to talk to, we don't care'

b. Quantə ddə vilitə da' (ddə vilitə) da', ppə mija va buəə  
 how much to.him want.2PL give.INF to.him give.INF for me goes well  
 'However much you want to give him, it will be fine with me'  
 (S. Maria del Cedro, Cosenza)

As for those dialects in which the restructuring verbs take MODO-clauses, we can observe a similar reduplication structure:

(26) a. Chidhru chi voi u mangiu voi u mangiu, mangiatillu  
 that which want to eat want to eat eat=you=it  
 'Whatever you want to eat, eat it' (southern Calabrese; Gulli 2009: 7)

- b. Ci vole cu legga                      vole cu legga                      la lettera...  
 who wants CU read.3SG.SUBJ.PRS wants CU read.3SG.SUBJ.PRS the letter...  
 ‘Whoever wants to read the letter, ...’                      (Carpignano S., Lecce)

This evidence proves further the phrasal nature of the reduplication structure.

### 3.2 Reduplications structures across Romance for unconditional FRs

In Romance the unconditional FRs are conveyed either through the lexicalization of the corresponding *-ever* morpheme, embedded in the *wh* element, or through the reduplication of the VP. The same variety may display both strategies which equally represent an unconditional FR. The systems that avail themselves of subjunctive morphology employ it jointly with the *wh-ever* pronoun. The concurrent selection of the subjunctive mood contributes to turn plain FRs (27a) into unconditionals (27b):

- (27) a. Giudicherà      questo      esposto      chi conosce      quella legge.  
 judge.3SG.FUT this.MSG petition who knows                      that.FSG law  
 ‘Who knows that law will judge this petition’
- b. Giudicherà      questo      esposto      chiunque conosca      quella legge.  
 judge.3SG.FUT this.MSG petition whoever know.3SG.SUBJ that.FSG law  
 ‘Whoever knows that law will judge this petition’                      (standard Italian)

	nonreduplication unconditional FRs		reduplication unconditional FRs		
	lexicalised <i>ever</i>	SUBJ	{VP <sub>1</sub> - Wh - VP <sub>2</sub> }	{Wh - VP <sub>1</sub> - VP <sub>2</sub> }	SUBJ
E. Portuguese	+	+/-	?	-	?
Castilian Spanish	+	+	+	-	+
Catalan	+	+	+	-	+
French	+	+/-	+	-	+/-
st. Italian	+	+	+	-	+
Romanian	+	+	-	-	0
Italian dialects Type 1	-	0	-	+	-
Italian dialects Type 2	-	0	+	+	+
Sardinian (Campidanese)	-	0	-	+	-

Table 3. Forms of unconditional FRs series across Romance

It emerges that across Romance the reduplication structure whereby the *wh* element precedes both VP1 and VP2 is exclusively attested in Ital-

ian dialects (Type 1 in Table 3) and in Sardinian. Crucially, the availability of Type 1 correlates with the lack of both morphological formation for the *ever* operator and the impossibility of the consequent selection of subjunctive morphology. Italo-Romance also displays the structure in which the *wh* element precedes the VP2 (Type 2 in Table 3):

- (28) a. Pensino            quel    che pensino,            per me Paolo è innocente.  
           think.3PL.SUBJ what    that think.3PL.SUBJ for me Paolo is innocent  
           ‘No matter what they think, Paolo is innocent for me’ (standard Italian)
- b. Rəcissə            chéllə ca rəcissə,            non ɛə    sta chjù tiəmbə pə cagnà  
           say.3SG.SUBJ what that say.3SG.SUBJ not there=stay more time    forchange.INF  
           ‘No matter what s/he says, there is no more time to change’ (Neapolitan)
- c. Vinissa            quannə vinissa,            nua simə qua.  
           come.PRS.SUBJ.3SG when    come.PRS.SUBJ.3SG we be.1PL here  
           ‘No matter when s/he arrives, we’ll be here’ (S. Maria del Cedro, Cosenza)

In Type 2 reduplicated unconditionals the subjunctive must be selected. More specifically, standard Italian employs present subjunctive (28a), whereas Italian dialects use the imperfective subjunctive morphology that is often the only relic form of subjunctive attested in those systems (28b,c).

Given this structure, we can conclude that the lack of the lexicalization of the *ever* morpheme does not necessarily correlate with the absence of subjunctive. Crucially, it does correlate with a reduplication structure. In other words, if in Romance *ever* is not lexicalized, the unconditional semantic entailment of FRs has to be obtained through a reduplication strategy, that can give rise to two distinct structures: (a) Type 1, i.e. the one in which the *wh* element precedes both VP1 and VP2 and the indicative is selected (29a) and (b) Type 2, i.e. the one in which the *wh* element precedes VP2 and the subjunctive is selected for both VP1 and VP2 (29b).

- (29) a. Type 1 = [<sub>FR</sub> wh VP1<sub>indic</sub> VP2<sub>indic</sub> ]
- b. Type 2 = [<sub>FR</sub> VP1<sub>subjv</sub> wh VP2<sub>subjv</sub> ]

Both structures may be found in the same Italo-Romance variety (30 a-d), whereas all other Romance varieties of our sample only allow Type 2 (30 e,f):

- (30) a. Chéllə            ca            rícə            rícə, ...  
           that.DEM    that.REL    says            says  
           (Type 1, Neapolitan)
- b. Rəcissə            chéllə            ca            rəcissə, ...  
           say.3SG.SUBJ    that.DEM    that.REL    say.3SG.SUBJ  
           ‘No matter what s/he says, ...’  
           (Type 2, Neapolitan)
- c. Quannə            vena            vena, ...  
           when            comes            comes            (Type 1, S. Maria del Cedro)



- b. Por favor, consulte cualquier libro sobre Picasso.  
 for favor consult.2SG.IMP any book on Picasso  
 ‘Please, consult any book about Picasso’
- c. Cualquiera puede jugar acá.  
 anybody can.3SG.IND play.INF here  
 ‘Anybody can play here’ (Castilian Spanish)
- d. Ovunque tu stia pensando di andare, fermati!  
 wherever you stay.2SG.SUBJ think.GER of go.INF stop.IMP=you  
 ‘Wherever you’re thinking of going, stop here!’
- e. Questa voce si spargerà ovunque.  
 this.FSG voice self=spread.INF anywhere  
 ‘This rumor will spread anywhere’ (standard Italian)

Not surprisingly, most central and southern Italian dialects lack the morphological formation of *ever* morpheme in the *wh-ever* pronominal and adverbial items as well. These varieties resort to a reduplication strategy involving the verb ‘to be’ (33), as in the examples in (34):

(33) [<sub>DP</sub> wh V<sub>be</sub> V<sub>be</sub> ...]

- (34) a. Pò pigghjà qualə lwibrə jè jè.  
 can.2SG take.INF which book is is  
 ‘You can choose any book’ (Orsomarso, Cosenza)
- b. A Marija da-ddə qualə libbrə su su.  
 to Maria give.IMP=to.her which book are.3PL a re.3PL  
 ‘Give Maria whichever books’ (S. Maria del Cedro, Cosenza)
- c. Spanna i scirpə adduvə jè jè.  
 spread the clothes where is is  
 ‘Hang the clothes anywhere (you want)’ (Verbicaro, Cosenza)

A semantic observation of this type of construction suggests that the verb ‘to be’ is used to process a predication over the existence of an individual. In (34a) the XP *qualə lwibrə jè jè* ‘any book’ is arguably the result of an unconditional predication on the identity<sup>15</sup> of the exiting individual ( $X=book$ ) that the subject can freely choose (35a). The book that the subject can choose is any book that exists (35 b,c):

- (35) a. (*You can take*) which X is(=identity) *any/ever* X that is(=existence)  
 b. operator = *Q-ever*(y)

<sup>15</sup> This pre-theoretical account of the predication on the identity clearly correlates with the property of (non)identifiability of discourse referents that characterizes some other pronouns that fall into the category of indefinites. With free-choice pronouns what is relevant is exactly the nonidentifiability of the referent as the individual’s identity can be left freely interpretable (see Gianollo 2018:135 for an overview).

Given the unconditionality of the identification of the individual X over all individuals that exist, the specific identification does not matter. This leads to the unconditionality of the relative (or free-choice meaning). Arguably, the structure in (35a) can be analysed on the basis of the semantic entailments of unconditional relative clause. More specifically, the first part of the structure, i.e. [which X is(=identity)], functions as a protasis that denotes sets of disjoint alternatives with a variable pair of {world,individual}. In other words, the very identity of the individual X, i.e. the variable, receives a different value in each context domain. The second part of the structure, i.e. [X that is(=existence)], works as an apodosis which predicates over the very existence of the individuals. This semantic assessment confirms the unconditionality entailment of *wh-ever* pronouns: the value of the identity is assigned to its variable within a single world and checked in each disjoint alternatives that represent the given context domain. Based on these observations, we can assume that the structural origin of free-choice indefinite pronouns<sup>16</sup> is a (bi)clause-like structure involving a copula (36) and a verb of existence, respectively:

(36) [ X is [ X(that) exists ] ]

We can assume a structure where the specifier is the referential argument and the complement the predicative argument. The copula can be merged in a VP above PredP ((37a). See Mikkelsen 2005:167). Compare (36) with (37):

(37) a.  $[_{\text{PredP}} \text{XP}_{\text{REF}} (\text{COPULA}) [_{\text{Pred}} \text{Pred XP}_{\text{PRED}} ]$   
 b.  $[_{\text{DP}} \text{wh} (\text{Q-ever}) [_{\text{NP}} \text{N} [_{\text{PredP}} \text{COPULA} [_{\text{Pred}} (\text{Qever})\text{N} (\text{that}) \text{exists} ]$

In the relevant Italian dialects of our sample, the structure in (37b) is now fully grammaticalized into a pronoun. As a result of the desemantization process, the semantic entailments are not transparent. Also, the pronouns do not allow verb agreement with other persons, tenses or moods:

(38) a. \*Jamə                      cu                      simə                      simə  
           goes                      who                      are.1PL are.1PL

      b. Va                      cu                      jè                      jè                      (i    nua)  
           goes                      who                      is                      is                      of    us  
           'Anybody of us is going'                      (S. Maria del Cedro, Cosenza)

<sup>16</sup> I henceforth use '(free-choice) pronouns' as a comprehensive term for grammatical/functional element that therefore also includes '(free-choice) determiners.'

To summarize, central and southern Italian dialects resort to a reduplication strategy to realize free-choice indefinite pronouns. The resulting structure involves the reduplication of the verb ‘to be’, which is semantically motivated by the predication on the existence of an individual whose identification is not relevant as she/he/it is equal to any existing individual in all possible worlds. This interpretation matches the semantic nature of the *Q-ever(y)* operator as it endows the free-choice pronouns with properties typically associated with (quasi)-universal quantifiers.

Syntactically, the reduplication configuration (35a) is built on a clause-type structure (36, 37) in which the first XP is a copular structure that establishes the equivalence of the entity X with the individual predicated in the second XP (and whose identity is not to be determined).

In the following session, I will show that the structural properties of the free-choice indefinite pronouns in the Italian dialects of our sample provide the template for the *wh-ever* pronouns and the whole reduplicated configuration of the FRs to be built.

#### 4.2 *The structure of reduplicated unconditional FRs*

In analyzing the structure of the unconditional FRs of the type discussed in §3 and §3.1 (and exemplified here in (39)), some specific syntactic properties have to be considered. One of these is the position of the subject, which linearly occurs clause-finally (the object is always postverbal, following namely both verbs of the reduplication structure):<sup>17</sup>

- (39) Qualə libbrə ha pigghiatə ha pigghiatə Marija, ...  
 which book has taken has taken Maria  
 ‘Whichever book Maria has taken, ...’ (Buonvicino, Cosenza)

- (40) [<sub>CP</sub> wh [<sub>VP1</sub> V] [<sub>VP2</sub> V] DO Subj ]

The resulting unmarked word order is VOS, a linear positioning that reveals the placement of the reduplicated VP in the structure.<sup>18</sup> I assume that, before the VP undergoes reduplication, the subject moves to the lower left periphery, i.e. to [Spec,TopP] (41a). This operation is motivated by the semantic

<sup>17</sup> Subject, as well as the object, if focalized or topicalized, can be also further extraposed to a higher position in the left periphery (see example (22)).

<sup>18</sup> Several ways of analyzing the derivation of VOS order in Romance have been proposed which can be reconducted to two main views: one in which the subject stays in its base-position (Gallego 2013) whereas the object shifts to the higher specified of *vP* (Ordóñez 2000); another whereby the resulting structure is given by a VP-fronting (Cecchetto 1999; Belletti 2001, 2004). In my analysis, I adopt a version of the VP-fronting analysis.

of the discourse structure. The subject of the clause as well as the clause itself convey some old/given/known information by the discourse participants: (39) is the comment or the response of the speaker to a possible known situation in which Maria has taken some book. The VP is fronted to the same lower portion of the left periphery and raised to a higher-up topic position (41b). Finally, the structure of the specific FR in (39) is given by the *wh* extraction of the object and its placement in the outer specifier of TopP (41c).

- (41) a. [CP [TopP subject [Top' Top [VP subject verb object] ] ] ]  
 b. [CP [TopP [VP verb object] [Top' Top [TopP subject [Top' Top [VP ] ] ] ] ]  
 c. [CP [TopP object [Top' verb object [TopP subject [Top' Top [VP ] ] ] ] ]

Still, the resulting CP in (41c) does not yet reflect the structure of the unconditional FRs. Namely, it corresponds to a plain FR, i.e. an embedded non-interrogative *wh*-clause, of the type in (42):

- (42) U pruvæssurə vo [u libbrə/quiddə ca ha pigghiatə Marija]<sub>FR</sub>  
 the professor wants the book what that has taken Maria  
 'The professor what the book that/what Maria has taken' (Buonvicino, Cosenza)

What is missing in (41c) is the *Q-ever(y)* operator (or COND in (5)) that modifies completely the semantic stance of the sentence. I assume that in an unconditional FR like (39), the operator has scope on the object before it is extracted and moved to the left periphery of the clause (43a). The operator lends unconditionality to the direct object DP. In the Italo-Romance varieties of our sample, this results in a free-choice indefinite pronoun (§4.1) that is ultimately analysed as the grammaticalization of a biclausal-type structure (36)-(37), which is to be assumed to have modified the object DP (43b) of the unconditional clause before the grammaticalization process is completed. As there is no evidence that the PredP (43a) exhibits a complex structure in correspondence of the object DP, I assume that PredP only hosts an empty XP. In extracting the object and fronting it to the left periphery of the clause, the PredP is moved along the DP as *Q-ever(y)* must be structurally realized, given the fact that it never lexicalizes into a morpheme (43c).<sup>19</sup> The structural

<sup>19</sup> My analysis does not hinge upon adopting one of the two competing views regarding the position of the *wh*-phrase: one view, i.e. the Comp Account (Groos and van Riemsdijk 1981; Grosu 1996, a.o.) assumes that the *wh*-phrase is in [Spec, CP] and the head is occupied by an empty pronominal element, whereas the other view, i.e. the Head Account (Bresnan and Grimshaw 1978; Larson 1987; Iatridou *et al.* 2001, a.o.) the *wh*-phrase is in the head position and the [Spec, CP] is either non-projected or empty.

realization of the *Q-ever(y)* operator occurs through filling up the empty XP position that the fronted DP brings along.

- (43) a.  $[_{CP} [_{TopP} \text{subject} [_{Top} \text{Top} [_{VP} \text{subject verb (Q-ever)} N_{obj} ] ] ] ]$   
 b.  $[_{CP} [_{TopP} \text{subject} [_{Top} \text{Top} [_{VP} \text{subject verb } N_{obj} [_{PredP} \text{XP} [_{Pred'} (\text{Q-ever}) N (\text{that}) \text{-exists} ] ] ] ] ] ] ]$   
 c.  $[_{CP} [_{TopP} [_{VP} \text{verb} [_{DPobj} N [_{PredP} \text{Q-everXP} ] ] ] ] ] [_{TopP} \text{subject} [_{Top} \text{Top} [_{VP} ] ] ]$

Arguably, the structural realization of the *Qever(y)* operator occurs through filling up the empty XP position that the fronted DP brings along. The VP is then moved to that position. The copy left lower is not erased or erased partially (44a), i.e. its functional elements may be left unuttered (44b).<sup>20, 21</sup>

- (44) a.  $[_{CP} [_{TopP} \text{whN} [_{PredP} \text{verb} ] ] ] [_{TopP'} \text{verb} ] [_{DPobj} N ] [_{PredP} \text{-Q-ever} ] [_{TopP} \text{subject} \dots] \dots$   
 b. Qualə libbrə ha pigghiatə (ha) pigghiatə Marija, i' non singə cuntentə.  
 which book has taken has taken Maria I not am happy  
 'Whichever book Maria takes, I am not happy' (Buonvicino, Cosenza)

This structural account of the reduplication builds on the assumption that the movement of an item leaves a copy behind, to be eventually deleted (Chomsky 1995). In the case of the unconditional FRs, the copy left behind is identical to the original element and cannot be deleted as a whole, as the *Q-ever(y)* operator has to be structurally yielded in order for the relative clause to be interpreted as an unconditional. The two reduplicated verb complexes stand in specific relationship (both semantically and syntactically), determined by the very connective element that relates them, i.e. the semantic operator *Q-ever(y)* at work.<sup>22</sup>

It is crucial to point out that the resulting structure is reminiscent of the (bi)clausal structure assumed for the free-choice indefinite pronouns. In

<sup>20</sup> For a different hypothesis of the structural reduplication derivation see Gulli (2009: 36).

<sup>21</sup> In the spirit of the Distributed Morphology framework (Halle and Marantz 1993), one can say that in Italo-Romance varieties the Quasi-Universal feature of *Q-ever(y)* has a precise positive instruction to PF, i.e. to pronounce what would normally remain silent. Deletion (or failure of (late) lexical insertion) is cheaper than non-deletion. Yet, nondeletion overrides deletion just in case a feature has special instruction. In Italian dialects this special instruction is obligatory for the derivation not to crash and, rather, results in unconditional FRs.

<sup>22</sup> Following Koopman (1984, 2000), one can argue that, of the two VPs, just one is selected from the numeration and it is reduplicated derivationally, via syntactic movement (*contra* Nunes 1995 according to whom cases of reduplication require selecting the same term twice from the lexicon in order for the two terms to form a chain).

some varieties, the reduplicated verbs are joint by a connector (mostly ‘and’; D’Onghia 2019), a clue into an ongoing grammaticalization process.

### 5. *The role of mood in the reduplication structure*

The type of unconditional FR analyzed in §4.2 is the most widespread among central and southern Italian dialects (Type 1; 45a). The lack of the morphological formation for the morpheme *ever* correlates with the lack of present subjunctive morphology. Yet, another type is given (Type 2; 45b), where the *wh*element precedes the VP2. See examples of Type 2 in (46).

- (45) a. Type 1 = [ wh- VP1<sub>indic</sub> VP2<sub>indic</sub> ]  
 b. Type 2 = [ VP1<sub>subjv</sub> wh VP2<sub>subjv</sub> ]
- (46) a. Ræcissə chéllə ca ræcissə un è verə.  
 say.3SG.SUBJ.IMPF that.DEM that.REL say.3SG.SUBJ.IMPF not is true  
 ‘No matter what s/he says, it is not true’ (Neapolitan)  
 b. Vinissa quannə vinissa, nua simə qua.  
 come.3SG.SUBJ.IMPF when come.3SG.SUBJ.IMPF we are here  
 ‘No matter when s/he arrives, we’ll be here’ (S. Maria del Cedro)

Italian dialects display the only subjunctive morphology available, i.e. imperfective subjunctive. The derivation of Type 2 unconditional FRs (46) differs from the derivation of Type 1 unconditionals as the verb moves to an IP field (47b) where can get subjunctive morphology that corresponds to the concessive stance expressed by Type 2 unconditionals:<sup>23</sup>

- (47) a. [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>TopP</sub> subject [<sub>Top</sub> Top [<sub>VP</sub> subject verb N<sub>obj</sub> [<sub>PredP</sub> XP [<sub>Pred</sub> XP ]]]]]  
 b. [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>TopP</sub> subject [<sub>Top</sub> Top [<sub>FinP</sub> (ca<sub>-realis</sub>) [<sub>IP</sub> verb<sub>[+subj/-realis]</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> subject verb N<sub>obj</sub> [<sub>PredP</sub> XP]...]]]]

Once the verb expresses overtly the *irrealis* feature of the concessive modality, it moves further upwards to a higher-up Topic position (48a). At this point the derivation of Type 2 unconditionals overlaps with the derivation of Type 1, in that the object becomes the *wh* element and occupies a Topic position. It carries the PredP=XP requested by the *Qever(y)* which

<sup>23</sup> In these varieties, plain concessive clauses may be introduced by a matrix complementizer (usually CA; see Colasanti and Silvestri 2019 on other types of matrix complementizers in Italo-Romance):

- i. (Ca) si mintiassə quala cravatta vo  
 CA self=put.3SG.SUBJ.PST which.F.SG tie wants  
 ‘S/He may wear whichever tie s/he wants’ (Verbicaro, Cosenza).

is filled up by the verb when it is copied there and its copy left behind is not erased (48b).

- (48) a.  $[_{CP} [_{TopP} [_{VP} \text{verb}_{\{+subj/-realis\}}] [_{DPobj} N [_{PredP} Q\text{-}everXP] [_{TopP'} \text{subject} [_{Top}, \text{Top} [_{VP} ]$   
 b.  $[_{CP} [_{TopP} \text{wh-N}_{obj} [_{PredP} \text{verb}_{\{+subj/-realis\}}] ] [_{TopP'} \text{verb}_{\{+subj/-realis\}}] \bar{f}_{DPobj} \bar{N} \bar{f}_{PredP} Q\text{-}ever]$   
 $[_{TopP} \text{subject} \dots] \dots$

Still, the concessive stance is not yet integrated in the structure of the unconditional FR. In order to obtain the concessive pragmaticsemantic entailment, the verb moves further upwards into the Force layer, i.e. the head of the CP that expresses illocutionary force (Rizzi 1997):

- (49)  $[_{CP} [_{ForceP} \text{verb}_{\{+subj/-realis\}}] [_{TopP} \text{wh-N}_{obj} \bar{f}_{PredP} \text{verb}_{\{+subj/-realis\}}] \bar{f} [_{TopP'} \text{verb}_{\{+subj/-realis\}}] \bar{f}_{DPobj} \bar{N} \bar{f}_{PredP} Q\text{-}ever]$   
 $[_{TopP} \text{subject} \dots] \dots$

At the end of this operation the closer copy of the verb can be erased as the structural realization of *Q-ever(y)* was successful.

To sum up, the lack of lexicalization, i.e. the ultimate utterance act or spellout, of *Q-ever(y)* operator, i.e. an element which is extremely relevant semantically, is the counterpart of the peculiar syntactic structure assessed here.<sup>24</sup> The reduplication is a very rudimentary way to realize semantically relevant elements at the phonetic level (see also Silvestri in prep.).

## 6. Conclusions

The evidence analyzed in this paper proves that unconditional free relatives across central and southern Italian dialects are built through a reduplication configuration. This strategy, which is the only structural option for the Italian dialects discussed here to express unconditionals, is characterized by the lack of the lexicalization of the *ever* morpheme. I proposed a semantically motivated structural account, whereby the reduplication structure of unconditional free relatives takes on the reduplication structure at the origin of the free-choice pronouns. The latter offers a template to the system, on which the unconditional relative clauses are ultimately built. Also, unconditionals do not exhibit subjunctive mood in the most common reduplication structure available.

Yet, Romance varieties, including some Italian dialects, may also display a different reduplication strategy that does involve subjunctive mood.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. the 'Principle of Semantic Relevance' by Ross (1972: 106): "Where syntactic evidence supports the postulation of elements in underlying structure which are not phonetically manifested, such elements tend to be relevant semantically."

Building on the interpretation of different roles of subjunctive, I proposed a unifying account for these two types of reduplication structures. More specifically, I argue that the subjunctive mood is selected in unconditionals to express the modality value over the quantificational force of the Quasi-Universal feature of *Q-ever(y)* operator. This mood selection is not available in most Italo-Romance varieties which resort to a structural reduplication of the VP to convey the same semantic entailment, i.e. unconditionality (or free-choice). Still, subjunctive mood occurs in the less frequent reduplication structure attested in Italo-Romance where conveys a different stance, i.e. the concessive force.

From a typological point of view, I showed that the reduplication strategy is not that rare for unconditional free relatives (cf. Citko 2004: 119; Kandybowicz 2008), given the number of ItaloRomance varieties showing it (*pace* Haspelmath and König 1998: 615).

Finally, I envisage that the analysis I put forward here can serve as a solid starting point for the assessment of another type of syntactic reduplication, i.e. the nominal reduplication within DPs, largely attested in Italo-Romance (Silvestri in prep.) and beyond, and triggered by similar semantic entailments to the ones holding for unconditional free relatives.

#### *References*

- NGLE = AAVV. 2009. *Nueva gramática de la lengua española. Morfología-Sintaxis I, Sintaxis II*. Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española. Real Academia Española. Barcelona Foinsa-Edifilm.
- Belletti, Adriana. 2001. "Inversion as Focalization." In *Subject Inversion in Romance and the Theory of Universal Grammar*, ed. by Aafje Hulk, and Yves D'Hulst, 60-90. Oxford, MS: Oxford UP.
- Belletti, Adriana. 2004. "Aspects of the Low IP Area." In *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, ed. by Luigi Rizzi, 16-51. Oxford, MS: Oxford UP.
- Bresnan, Joan, and Jane Grimshaw. 1978. "The Syntax of Free Relatives in English." *Linguistic Inquiry* 9: 331-391.
- Caponigro, Ivano. 2002. "Free Relatives as DPs with a Silent D and a CP Complement." In *Proceedings of WECOL 2000*, ed. by Vida Samiian, 140-150. Fresno: California State University.
- Caponigro, Ivano, and Lisa Pearl. 2008. "Silent Preposition: Evidence from Free Relatives." In *The Syntax and Semantics of Spatial P*, ed. by Anna Asbury, Jakub Dotlaèil, Berit Gehrke, and Rick Nouwen, 365-85. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Caponigro, Ivano, and Anamaria Fălăuş. 2017. "Free Choice free Relative Clauses in Italian and Romanian." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 36 (2): 323-363.
- Cecchetto, Carlo. 1999. "A Comparative Analysis of Left and Right Dislocation in Romance." *Studia Linguistica* 53 (1): 40-67.
- Citko, Barbara. 2004. "On Headed, Headless, and Light-headed Relatives." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22: 95-126.

- Colasanti, Valentina, and Giuseppina Silvestri. 2019. "Matrix Complementizers in Italo-Romance." In *Italian Dialectology at the Interfaces*, ed. by Silvio Cruschina, Adam Ledgeway, and EvaMaria Remberger, 155-184. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 1995. "Quantification in Correlatives." In *Quantification in Natural Language*, ed. by Emmon Bach, Eloise Jelinek, Angelika Kratzer, and Barbara Partee, 179-205. Kluwer Academic Press: Dordrecht.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 1997. "Free Relatives and 'Ever': Identity and Free Choice Readings." In *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT 7)*, ed. by Aaron Lawson, 99-116. Ithaca, New York: CLC Publications, Cornell University.
- Dindelegan, Gabriela Pana (ed.). 2013. *The Grammar of Romanian*. Oxford, MS: Oxford UP.
- D'Onghia, M. Vittoria. 2019. "Addò va e vva. Analisi sintattica della reduplicazione verbale con valore indefinito nei dialetti apulo-baresi." *Talk given at the VI International Conference of Dialectology* (Potenza, April 2019).
- Dunn, Joseph. 1930. *A Grammar of the Portuguese Language*. Washington: National Capital Press.
- Farkas, Donka. 2013. The Semantics of Determiners. In *A Reference Grammar of Romanian*, ed. by Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin, and Ion Giurgea, 175-230. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Gallego, Ángel. 2013. "Object Shift in Romance." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 31 (2): 409-451.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2001. "The Meaning of Free Choice." *Linguistics & Philosophy* 24: 659-735.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia, and Lisa Cheng. 2006. "(In)Definiteness, Polarity, and the Role of Wh-morphology in Free Choice." *Journal of Semantics* 23 (2): 135-183.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia, and Josep Quer. 2013. "Exhaustive and Non-exhaustive Variation with Free Choice and Referential Vagueness: Evidence from Greek, Catalan, and Spanish." *Lingua* 126: 120-149.
- Gianollo, Chiara. 2018. *Indefinites Between Latin and Romance*. Oxford, MS: Oxford UP.
- Groos, Anneke, and Henk van Riemsdijk. 1981. "Matching Effects in Free Relatives: A Parameter of Core Grammar." In *Theory of Markedness in Generative Grammar: Proceedings of the 1979 GLOW Conference*, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, ed. by Adriana Belletti, Luciana Brandi, and Luigi Rizzi: 171-216. Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore.
- Grosu, Alexander. 1994. *Three Studies in Locality and Case*. London: Routledge.
- Grosu, Alexander. 1996. "The Proper Analysis of Missing-P Free Relative Constructions." *Linguistic Inquiry* 27: 257-293.
- Grosu, Alexander, and Fred Landman. 1998. "Strange Relatives of the Third Kind." *Natural Language Semantics* 6: 125-170.
- Gulli, Antonino. *Phrasal Reduplication in Syntax*. Leipzig: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.
- Halle, Morris, and Alec Marantz. 1993. "Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflection." In *The View From Building 20*, ed. by in Kenneth Hale, and Jay Keyser, 111-17. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite Pronouns*. Oxford, MS: Oxford UP.
- Haspelmath, Martin, and Ekkehard König. 1998. "Concessive Conditionals in the Languages of Europe." In *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe*, ed. by Johan van der Auwera, 563-640. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Iatridou, Sabine, and Spyridola Varlokosta. 1998. "Pseudoclefts Crosslinguistically." *Natural Language Semantics* 6: 3-28.
- Iatridou, Sabine, Anagnostopoulou Elena, and Roumyana Izvorski. 2001. "Observations About the Form and Meaning of the Perfect." In *Ken Hale: a Life in Language*, ed. by Micheal J. Kenstowicz, 189-238. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jacobson, Pauline. 1995. "On the Quantificational Force of English Free Relatives." In *Quantification in Natural Languages*, ed. by Emmon Bach, Eloise Jelinek, Angelika Kratzer, and Barbara Partee, 451-486. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Kandybowicz, Jason. 2008. *The Grammar of Repetition. Nupe Grammar at the Syntax Phonology Interface*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Koopman, Hilda. 1984. *The Syntax of Verbs: from Verb Movement Rules in the Kru languages to Universal Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Koopman, Hilda. 2000. "Unifying Predicate Cleft Constructions." *The Syntax of Specifiers and Heads. Collected Essays of Hilda J. Koopman*, 357-374. London-New York: Routledge.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1986. Conditionals. *Chicago Linguistics Society* 22 (2): 1-15.
- Larson, Richard. 1987. "Missing Prepositions and the Analysis of English Free Relative Clauses." *Linguistic Inquiry* 19: 239-266.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 1998. "Variation in the Romance Infinitive: The Case of the Southern Calabrian Inflected Infinitive." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 96: 1-61.
- Mikkelsen, Line. 2005. *Copular Clauses: Specification, Predication and Equation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nunes, Jairo. 1995. *The Copy Theory of Movement and Linearization of Chains in the Minimalist Program*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Ordóñez, Francisco. 2000. "Post-verbal Asymmetries." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16 (2): 313-345.
- Quer, Josep. 1999. *The Quantificational Force of Free Choice Items*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
- Quer, Josep. 2001. "Interpreting Mood." *Probus* 13: 81-111.
- Quer, Josep, and Luis Vicente. 2009. *Semantically Triggered Verb Doubling in Spanish Unconditionals. Paper Presented at CGG 19*. Vitoria-Gasteiz.
- van Riemsdijk, Henk. 2000. "Free Relatives Inside Out: Transparent Free Relative as Grafts." In *PASE Papers in Language Studies: Proceedings of the 1999 PASE Conference*, ed. by Bożena Rozwadowska. Wrocław: University of Wrocław.
- van Riemsdijk, Henk. 2006. "Free Relatives." In *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, vol. II., ed. by Martin Everaert, and Henk van Riemsdijk, 338-382. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Rawlins, Kyle. 2008. *(Un)conditionals: An Investigation in the Syntax and Semantics of Conditional Structures*. Doctoral dissertation: UC Santa Cruz.
- Rawlins, Kyle. 2013. "(Un)conditionals." *Natural Language Semantics* 21 (2): 111-178.
- Ross, John. 1972. "Act." In *Semantics of Natural Language*, ed. by Donald Devinson, and Gilbert Harmon, 701-26. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Silvestri, Giuseppina. In preparation. *Patterns of Reduplication in Romance: Pragmatic Interpretations, Semantic Implications, and Syntactic Structures*. Manuscript: University of Cambridge.
- Tredinnick, Victoria. 2005. *On the Semantics of Free Relatives with ever*. Doctoral dissertation: University of Pennsylvania.