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This paper’s main goal is to shed light on the doubling wh-structures that many North Eastern Italian dialects exhibit, on the one hand, and on the ‘hidden’ doubling at work in French que-questions, on the other. Both constructions we claim should be analysed as the A-bar counterparts of pronominal clitic doubling. The execution of these ideas rests on a highly split left periphery and Remnant movement to the different layers of the CP domain.
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1. Introduction

The syntax of *wh*-questions in North Eastern Italian dialects exhibits unusual properties\(^2\). Some dialects have *wh*-doubling configurations like (1)\(^3\):

(1) a. S’ a-lo fato che? Illasi (Verona)
   what has-he done what
   ‘What has he done?’

   b. Ndo e-lo ndat endoe?
   where is-he gone where
   ‘Where has he gone?’

just as Monnese\(^4\) has, as shown in (2a, b), and also permit non doubling configurations in which either the leftmost or the rightmost *wh*-word may surface, as in (2c, …, f):

(2) a. Ch’ et fat què? Monno (Brescia)
   what have-you done what
   ‘What have you done?’

   b. N go fet majà ngont?
   where do-you eat where
   ‘Where do you eat?’

   c. Ch’ et fat?
   what have-you done

   d. Fet fà què?
   do-you do what
   ‘What are you doing?’

   e. Ngo fet majà?
   where do-you eat

   f. Fet majà ngont?
   do-you eat where

Doubling is only licit with a subset of *wh*-words. Complex *wh*-phrases or *parché* ‘why’ exclude it:

(3) a. *Parché e-lo partio parché? Illasi
   why is-he left why

   b. *E-lo partio parché?
   is-he left why

   c. *S’ a-lo magnà che torta?
   what has-he eaten what cake

   d. Parché e-lo partio?
   why is-he left

   e. Che torta a-lo magnà?
   what cake has-he eaten
The doubling configurations in Illasi and Monno ban inversion of the two wh-forms, as (4) shows,

(4) a. *Che a-lo fato sa? Illasi
    what has-he done what
b. *Ngont fet andà ngo? Monno
    where do-you go where

and when only one form is lexically realised it must be in the same position as in the doubling structures:

(5) a. *Che a-lo fato? Illasi
    what has-he done
b. S’ a-lo fato?
    what has-he done
   
c. *Ngont fet andà?
    where do-you go

   
d. Ngo fet andà?
    where do-you go

In other respects the syntax of wh-questions in these dialects follows patterns typical of other North Eastern dialects; in particular both the doubling configurations and the nondoubling ones require subject clitic inversion:

(6) a. *Sa l’ a fato? Illasi
    what he has done

   
b. *Ngo tu andà? Monno
    where you go

A, B and C below provide what we take to be a perspicuous way of summarising these intriguing data:

A. Wh-doubling cases like (1) and ‘wh-in-situ’ cases like (2d, f) are restricted to the set of wh-items that can have a ‘short’ – phonologically reduced – counterpart and the short and ‘long’ – phonologically more contentful – wh-words have the same distribution in the doubling and non doubling contexts.

B. Wh-in-situ and wh-doubling obligatorily show subject clitic inversion.

C. In all doubling cases the ‘short’ form must be adjacent to the verbal complex while its ‘long’ counterpart occurs at the right edge of the sequence.

In this work we shall attempt to derive A, B and C from principled properties of wh-configurations and computations in North Eastern Romance on the one hand and the concept of wh-clitic on the other. Section 2 introduces the notion of wh-clitics, section 3 tackles wh-doubling, section 4 deals with the obligatory nature of subject clitic inversion – henceforth SCLI – when a
wh-clitics is involved, both in Illasi, Monno and other NIDs and in yet another – better known – Romance language, French; section 5 deals with embedded questions, section 6 identifies the various layers of the left periphery our analysis requires, section 7 reconsiders the computations at work in SCLI and section 8 concludes the article.

2. On wh-clitics

The claim that there are such things as wh-clitics, although it may sound odd from a discourse perspective – wh-words are evidently not topics, nor do they refer back to already mentioned elements in discourse as pronominal clitics typically do5 –, has some prima facie support in the fact that some wh-words exhibit all the restrictions that define pronominal clitics. That is why French que ‘what’ was claimed to be a clitic in Obenauer (1976), Bouchard and Hirschbühler (1986): like pronominal clitics it cannot be separated from its verb ‘host’, used in isolation, be the object of a preposition, be co-ordinated or modified:

\[(7)\]
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
a. & *_{Que, d’après toi, a vu Jean?} \quad \text{French} \\
   & ‘What, according to you, has Jean seen?’ \\
b. & Qui, d’après toi, a vu Jean? \\
   & ‘Who, according to you, has John seen?’ \\
c. & Qui ? Quoi ? *_{Que}? \\
   & ‘Who? What? What?’ \\
d. & À {qui, quoi,*que} elle pense? \\
   & to whom what what she thinks \\
e. & *_{Que et qui a-t-elle vu}? \\
   & what and who has she seen \\
f. & À quoi et à qui a-t-elle pensé? \\
   & to what and to whom has she thought \\
\end{array}
\]

Que thus shares most6 of its distributional properties with its pronominal counterparts le or me, a fact that evidently calls for a common account; the idea that it too is a clitic provides a natural one. In much the same vein, Poletto (2000, section 3.3.5) shows independently that the very same properties hold true of do ‘where’ in Friulian and likewise concludes that do is a (wh-)clitic:

\[(8)\]
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
a. & *_{Do, seconde tu, van-u?} \quad \text{San Michele (Friulian, Venice)} \\
   & where according-to you go-they \\
b. & Dulà, seconde tu, van-u? \\
   & where according-to you go-they \\
c. & *_{Do ? Dula}? \\
   & ‘Where? Where?’
\end{array}
\]
d. *Do e quant van-u? 
   where and when go-they

e. *Do e quant van-u?
   where and when go-they

We too believe that the properties that pronominal clitics and *wh-
words like *que and *do share must be captured; we conclude that some
languages do have clitic *wh-words and that UG must consequently allow for
such entities.

Saying that French *que and Friulian *do are clitics does not necessarily
imply that *wh-clitics and pronominal clitics share all their distributional
properties. In fact they clearly do not; (9) shows, for example, that *que can
move very far – in fact infinitely far – from its input position:

(9) Qu’as-tu dit que [... ] Marie pensait que Jacques dirait que Paul avait fait ?
   ‘What have you said that [...] Marie thought that Jacques would say that Paul
   had done?’

Pronominal clitics can also move relatively long distance in clitic
climbing contexts like (10a) in Italian:

(10) a. L’avrei potuto dover fare 
    (I) it could have had to do
b. Avrei potuto dover farlo 
    (I) could have had to do it

Structures like (9) are very different from (10), however, in not being
restricted to infinitival verbs embedded under modal auxiliaries. One must
thus say why *que and *l’/lo differ in this respect if both are clitics. The answer
to this question is trivial: the difference follows from the fact that *que, in
addition to being a clitic, is also a *wh-word, targeting an A-bar position in the
left periphery of the clauses embedded under the declarative verbs *dit, *pensait
and *dirait; put another way, (9) simply exemplifies the well-known
successive cyclic movement of *wh-elements sketched in (11):

(11) [Qu’as-tu dit [t₁ que Marie pensait [t₁ que Jacques dirait [t₁ que Paul avait fait 
t₁]]]]?

Granted the derivation in (11), it is only in the topmost clause, after it
has moved up successive cyclically to the root sentence, that *que must do
what all clitics do, viz. find a cliticisation site. Evidently the same thing holds
for Friulian *do but not for pronominal clitics like *l’/lo which have no landing
site in the left periphery. In short, clitic forms move as phrases on the first leg
of their movement – as claimed for pronominal clitics by Sportiche (1996)
and Taraldsen (2001) – targeting A-bar slots in the various CP domains and only become clitics upon reaching the root sentence.

Concerning the cliticisation site of *wh*-clitics, what we take to be the null hypothesis is that together with a hierarchically ordered set of pronominal and negative clitic positions in the IP field – Sportiche’s (1996) ‘clitic voices’ – there exists one specific clitic slot for *wh*-clitics. Put another way, since there definitely is a clitic field in the higher layers of IP it is natural to assume that it hosts *wh*-clitics in addition to pronominal and negative clitics; after all *que* is traditionally described as both a pronoun and an operator – that is what the traditional notion ‘interrogative pronoun’ means –, so we should also expect to find *wh*-clitics targeting the IP (pronominal) clitic field; we claim that the (only)\(^8\) target for *wh*-words qua clitics is the topmost layer in the IP clitic field, immediately below the subject position; this is sketched in (12):

\[
\text{(12) } \text{[IP Subject [\text{Wh-clitic position que} [\text{neg. clitic position ne} [... [VP]]]]]}^{9}
\]

3. On clitic *wh*-words and *wh*-doubling

With this much background in mind we now go back to the NIDs and to the *wh*-doubling of (1). We again make the null hypothesis that this type of doubling should be looked at in the same light as the better known pronominal doubling phenomena of Spanish and other Romance languages exemplified in (13):

(13)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Lo via Juan him I saw to Juan</td>
<td>Il me parle à moi he to me speaks to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standard analysis of such cases has been provided by Kayne (1991) and Uriagereka (1996); it posits that the clitic and its associate phrase are merged as a complex ‘clitic phrase’ – CIP – headed by the clitic in whose specifier the ‘doubled’ DP stands:

(14) \[\text{[CIP DP cl]}\]

We extend this analysis to *wh*-doubling cases and claim that the two *wh*-forms are also merged as a complex entity whose head is the *wh*-clitic and the ‘long’ forms the clitic’s specifier:

(15) \[\text{[CIP WhP wh-cl]}\]

 Granted this, the doubling cases in (16), from (1) and (2) above,

(16)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Illasi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>S’a-lo fato che? what has-he done what</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Ndo e-lo ndat endoe?
   where is-he gone where

c. Ngo fet majà ngont?
   where do-you eat where

Given the phonologically ‘weak’ nature of s’, ndo and ngo this seems like a natural move. In some dialects – e.g. in Val Camonica – there is a north vs south dimension to the doubling phenomenon: speakers in the north have doubling, speakers in the south don’t and the speakers in the areas in between accept and use both doubling and non doubling questions 10. On this basis only and because of the position in which the ‘weak’ and ‘strong’ forms must be realised in non doubling contexts – see (5) above – it is reasonable to assume that sentences like (18b) and (18c) only differ from (18a) in having a NULL ‘strong form’ or a NULL wh-clitic respectively.

(18) a. Ch’et fat quê?
    what have-you done what

b. Ch’et fat?
   what have-you done

c. Fet fà quê?
   do-you do what

If that is so, the CIP of (18a), for instance, [què ch’], can also be realized as (19a) or (19b) 11.

(19) a. [ClP què Ø]

b. [ClP Ø ch’]

This approach, then, deals with wh-doubling and wh-stranding – i.e. the structure that results from merging (19) as a unit in the derivation – in those dialects as one and the same phenomenon and provides an explanation for the first descriptive generalisation in (6): if wh-in-situ is a case of ‘invisible’ wh-doubling one should expect the two phenomena to have the same distribution and share the same lexical restrictions; in particular they should both only surface with those wh-elements that can be merged in clitic phrases. By hypothesis perché cannot be, whence the facts in (3) 12.
4. On obligatory subject clitic inversion

The descriptive statement in B, repeated below,

B. Wh-in-situ and wh-doubling obligatorily show SCLI.

can now be tackled; French provides a clue here; as is well-known French speakers typically fail to invert subject clitics in normal speech:

(20) a. Qui il a vu?
   who he has seen
b. Où tu vas?
   where you go
c. Quand on part?
   when we go

The one conspicuous exception to this is que,

(21) a. *Que tu as dit?
    what you have said
b. Qu’as-tu dit?
    what have-you said

which requires subject clitic inversion\(^{13}\). We will tie the clitic nature of que to this property. The analysis in (12) suggests a natural way of doing so; suppose que, like other clitics, can only move short distance as a head once it has reached its cliticisation site in IP, as originally claimed in Sportiche (1996) for pronominal clitics. If so once que has reached its cliticisation site in the IP field it ceases to be able to move to the left periphery since it would have to cross over a number of intervening\(^{14}\) head positions to do so. For example, in the sharply ungrammatical (21a), clitic que crosses over the head position in the specifier of which the tu subject is standing. Moreover it would also cross over a number of heads in the (highly articulated) CP field\(^{15}\). This does no harm where non clitic wh-words like qui or où are concerned, whence (20), but will exclude cases like (21a), as desired.

What we now want to claim is that SCLI provides a way of reconciling the need for clitic wh-words to reach their target in the left periphery and their clitic nature which in and of itself would make that impossible, for the reasons just stated.

It is well-known that SCLI ‘drags along’ pronominal clitics both in French and in the NIDs:

(22) a. Où le lui as-tu dit? French
    where it to-him have-you said
b. À qui ne l’a-t-il pas dit?
   to whom not it has-he not said
c. Ndove ghe lo ga-to dito? Loreo (Rovigo)
   where to-him it have-you said
It is therefore natural to suggest that SCLI can also carry *wh*-clitics as ‘excess baggage’. The standard view of SCLI is that the inflected verb and the non subject clitics move to some slot in the CP field; on the assumption that that slot is adjacent to the target position of *que* and other *wh*-clitics, SCLI gives French *que* – and Friulian *do* – a ‘leg-up’, which allows them to check their operator feature in the proper left periphery position without violating the Head to Head constraint – or some minimalist version thereof.

This line of thought carries over naturally to the Illasi and Monno data repeated in (23) below:

\[(23)\]

a. S’a-lo fato (che)?
   what has-he done (what)
   Illasi

b. Ndo e-lo ndat (endoe)?
   where is-he gone (where)
   Monno

c. Ngo fet majà (ngont)?
   where do-you eat (where)

Adopting our claim in section 2 that *wh*-doubling is an instance of clitic doubling and the view that *s*, *ndo* and *ngo* are clitic forms, we now account for the obligatoriness of SCLI in those dialects as well (see (6) above); in addition to this desirable result the analysis also makes sense of one further property of French *que*, its inability to move from subject position:

\[(24)\]

a. *Qu’est tombé ?
   ‘What fell?’

b. *Que t’a surpris ?
   ‘What surprised you?’

The account goes as follows: Make the standard assumption that subjects are merged in the vP field, either as the ‘object’ of unaccusatives or as the vP Specifier of unergatives. If so *que* must move up from one of these positions to its cliticisation site in the IP field and from there to the subject position, maybe adjoining to the head of AGRs to check its (nominative) case. From this position it must also move to its checking position in the left periphery. On the assumption that this checking position is not structurally adjacent to AGRs the previous analysis will ban (24) on principled grounds.

5. On the left periphery of *wh*-questions

To explain why subject *que*’s target position is not structurally adjacent to AGRs and to account for the third generalisation, repeated in (25) below,

\[(25)\]

C. In all doubling cases the ‘short’ form must be adjacent to the verbal complex while its ‘long’ – *i.e.* phonologically more contentful – counterpart occurs at the right edge of the sequence.
we now need to be more explicit about the number and nature of functional
projections in the left periphery of questions. Consider the Illasi cases in (23)
again; there are good reasons to believe that the strong *wh*-form at the right
edge of the sentence is NOT standing in an in situ position within IP. Ambar
(2001), Munaro (1999), Munaro, Poletto & Pollock (2001), Etxepare &
Uribe-Etxebarria (2000) have shown for example that the *wh*-forms in this
position are subject to all the island constraints that characterise movement,
are intonationally different form ordinary in-situ objects, are not in their
argument position but must be sentence final etc.

If so, an Illasi sentence like *S’a-lo fato (che)*? (what has-he done
(what)) has its optional *che* in (a low layer of) the CP field, despite
appearances. This in turns means that the whole IP has also moved to the left
periphery. On the natural assumption that clitic *s’* has also moved to a specific
operator position, the left periphery of SCLI sentences must contain at least
three different structural layers, each of which headed by a specific bundle of
formal features:

\[
[W_1 WH\ F_1 W_2 [WH_2 F_2 [IP \ldots]]]
\]

Going back to (24), we can make use of these independently needed
heads to block movement of *que*, as we must. This will be enough to explain
(24) if no SCLI is possible in subject extraction cases. This is a well-known
fact about French, less well-known in the case of Bellunese, but equally
true:

\[
\begin{align*}
a. \text{ *Qui a-t-il téléphoné?} & \quad \text{(qui and il subjects)} \\
& \text{who has-he phoned} \\
b. \text{ *Che te disturbe-lo?} & \quad \text{Bellunese (Northern Veneto)} \\
& \text{what you disturbs-it} \\
& \text{‘What disturbs you?’} \\
c. \text{ *Chi laore-lo de pi?} & \\
& \text{who works-he more} \\
d. \text{ *Chi à-lo magnà la torta?} & \\
& \text{who has-he eaten the pie}
\end{align*}
\]

Since no SCLI is possible in (24), *que* is left to its own devices to reach
its left periphery target. It will fail to do so because of the intervening heads
just mentioned.

Our analysis does, then, account for (24), as it must. It also explains
another property of *que*, its unique inability to occur in so-called in situ *wh-
questions, which, as is well-known, are very common in French:

\[
\begin{align*}
a. \text{ *Il a vu que?} & \\
& \text{he has seen what} \\
b. \text{ Il a vu qui?} & \\
& \text{he has seen who}
\end{align*}
\]
c. Il est parti quand?
  he has left when

If *que* in (28a) is really in its object position, as on some influential analyses\(^\text{20}\), then it fails to have cliticised, hence is excluded for the same reason (29) is:

(29) *Il a vu le.
  ‘He saw it’

If, as we have claimed elsewhere\(^\text{21}\), sentences like (28b) may (also) be derived as sketched in (30),

\[(30)\text{ Input: } [\text{IP } \text{Il a vu qui}]
  (a) Move the *wh*-word to the left periphery \(\Rightarrow [\text{qui} \text{IP } \text{Il a vu ti}]\)
  (b) Remnant move IP to the left periphery \(\Rightarrow [\text{IP } \text{Il a vu ti} \text{IP } \text{qui ti}]\)
\]

*que* in (27a) might have moved to some relevant operator position in the left periphery as a phrase but can’t have cliticised. As for (31),

(31) *Il que a vu ?
  he what has seen

it is banned on the ‘real’ *in situ* analysis because *que* has failed to move to its target position in the CP field and, on the remnant IP movement account, because movement of *que* into IP from the *wh*-position in which *qui* is standing in (30b) – required for *que* to reach its cliticisation site in IP – would be movement to a non c-commanding position.

Going back to descriptive statement C, it follows straightforwardly from what we have just suggested: if the ‘weak’ forms are clitics they are incapable of reaching their target unless SCLI, which targets ForceP a relatively ‘high’ layer of the CP domain, gives them a leg-up. As for the strong forms, they target the lowest slot in the left periphery; in short our account of (25) rests on a structural claim concerning the structure of the CP domain, sketched in (26), and on the clitic nature of the relevant *wh* forms.

### 6. Doubling in embedded questions

A general fact about (genuine)\(^\text{22}\) embedded questions in many Germanic and Romance languages is that they do not allow for SCLI. Given the analysis above this predicts that embedded *que* in French and embedded clitic forms in Illasi and Monno should be banned.

The prediction is straightforwardly born out by *que*: all embedded questions of the type in (32) are sharply ungrammatical in Modern\(^\text{23}\) French, regardless of the selecting verb in the root sentence:
The NIDs are more complex; there are *wh*-doubling questions in embedded clauses if – possibly only if – 24 their complementiser is null:

(33) a. *So mia ‘ngo (*che) l’ é ndà (ngont). Monno
   I-know not where (*that) he is gone where
b. Dime ci (*che) l’a tolto (ci), el quadro. Illasi
   tell-me who that he has taken (who), the picture

There are several ways of trying to reconcile such sentences with our previous analysis. The first that comes to mind would attempt to tie (33) and (embedded) ‘Stylistic Inversion’ – henceforth SI – in French:

(34) Je ne sais pas quand a téléphoné Marie.
   ‘I know not when has telephoned Marie’

The idea would be that the overt complementiser in (33) would block the (Remnant 25) movement at work here, now taken to characterise both (33) and (34). In addition, the doubling in (33) would be made licit by SI just as *que* is in (35):

(35) Qu’a fait Jean?
   ‘What has done Jean?’

However this line of thought fails to say why SI does not make *que* licit in embedded clauses as (32c) and (36) show,

(36) *Dismoi qu’a fait Jean.
   tell-me what has done Jean

and glosses over the fact that the doubling configuration in (33) is (crucially) different from that analysed so far. This is shown in (37):

(37) a. So mia col che l’a fat (què). Monno
   I-know not that demonstrative that he has done what
b. Je ne sais pas ce qu’il a fait. French
   I-know not that demonstrative that he has done

and
In (37a, c, d) the topmost wh-like element is different from the clitic forms studied so far; compare (37a) and (38):

(38) a. Ch’al fat què?
what has-he done what
Monno
b. *Col ch’al fat què?
what has-he done what
Illasi
c. N do el nà (ndoe)?
where is he gone where
d. *Ando el nà ndoe?
where is he gone where

Plainly ndo vs ando, ch vs col (che), que vs ce (que), etc. are different forms. On the basis of morphology alone it would thus appear that the ‘doubling’ at work in (37) has nothing to do with the clitic phrases and clitic heads which are found in main clauses. Whatever the correct analysis of (37) and the like turns out to be it seems clear therefore that it will have no direct bearing on the wh-doubling that results from clitic phrases.

7. More on SCLI

The standard analysis of SCLI tacitly adopted above relies on head movement of I° to C°, relabeled above as Force°. This analysis has a number of problems discussed at some length in Pollock (2000) and (2002). To mention just a couple here, note that for the ‘standard’ head movement analysis to go through it has to be the case that non subject clitics are all adjoined to the I° head. However Kayne (1991), (1994) and Sportiche (1996) have shown convincingly that non nominative clitics head a number of different functional projections distinct from the verb’s; therefore SCLI questions like e.g. te l’a-t-il donné? (‘to you it has he given?’ = ‘Has he given it to you?’), cannot be a case of head movement; this carries over to the corresponding clitic-verb sequences in the NIDs. Kayne (1991), Poletto & Pollock (2000), Pollock (2002) further argue that the view that non nominative clitics are not adjoined to V is almost certainly required by examples like (39) in literary and classical French and (40) in Modern Triestino and Calabrian; in all of these the clitics are separated from the verb by various (maximal) adverbal phrases:

(39) a. Il a dû en fort bien parler
he must have of it very well spoken
‘He must have spoken of it very well.’

b. […] ils ont été affligés de ne vous point voir
[…] they have been sorry to neg you not see
‘They were sorry not to see you.’
If one takes Kayne’s and Sportiche’s idea of independent clitic functional layers, SCLI as a movement operation can only be phrasal movement; since the nominative clitic itself ends up to the right of the moved phrase it too must have been extracted to the left periphery at a previous stage in the derivation; consequently SCLI must be Remnant IP movement to the Force layer.

Granted these conclusions our account in the first five sections of this article rests on (Wh) Clitic Phrases, on the one hand, and derivations like (41), on the other:

\[(41) \text{Input: } [\text{IP }\text{tu }\text{as }\text{dit }[\text{CIP }\emptyset, \text{que}]]\]

(a) Clitic que to interrogative Clitic Phrase within IP ⇒
[IP tu [CIP quei [as ] dit [CIP \emptyset, ti]]]

(b) Merge Wh² and IP and attract ‘\emptyset’ to spec Wh2P ⇒
[Wh² IP j Wh² [IP tu quei as dit [CIP t j t i]]]

(c) Merge Top and Wh2P and attract Participle Phrase to Spec TopP ⇒
[TopP [dit [CIP t j t i]]k Top²[Wh² IP j Wh² [IP tu quei as ti]]]

(d) Merge G (round) and attract tu to Spec GP ⇒
[GP tu G [TopP [dit [CIP t j t i]]l Top²[Wh² IP j Wh² [IP tu quei as t i]]]

(e) Merge Force and GP and attract Remnant IP to Spec Force ⇒
[ForceP [IP t j quei as ti]m Force² [GP tu G [TopP [dit [CIP t j t i]]l Top²[Wh² IP j Wh² [IP tu quei as ti]]]

(f) Merge Wh¹ and ForceP and attract que to Wh¹ ⇒
[Wh¹ IP quei + Wh¹ ForceP [IP t j [CIP t [as ] t j]]m Force² [GP tu G [TopP [dit [CIP t j t i]l Top²[Wh² IP j Wh² [IP tu quei as t i]]]]]

Some comments on (41) are in order.
First, although the whole participle phrase and the whole IP move at stages (c) and (e), they overtly carry along only the verb and the clitics (when any): this is because of previous extractions from the relevant phrases at stages (a), (b) and (d): these are instances of Remnant Movement.

Second, the input structure of (41) shows that we have extended to que the doubling analysis suggested for the overt and covert doubling cases of the NIDs; if we are right que always enters the derivation as the clitic phrase in (42a),

\[(42) \text{a. } [\text{CIP }\emptyset \text{que}]\]
\[(42) \text{b. } [\text{CIP }\emptyset \text{s’}]\]
which is identical in all due respects to the Illasi case (42b) at work in fine
questions like S’a-lo fato ‘What has he done?’. This is a natural move in the
micro comparative perspective which we have adopted; our claim, then, is
that all clitic wh-words come with a covert or overt phrasal associate; we are
thus extending to wh-clitics the standard view of pronominal clitics which are
commonly held always to licence a (null) phrasal specifier. Naturally, since
wh-clitics are A-bar operators the phrases they are paired with are operators
and as such they have an operator feature to check in the left periphery,
whence stage (b) in the derivation; we have relied on the overt manifestation
of these phrasal elements in the NIDs to locate that checking position in the
lowest layer of the left periphery in French (see discussion of (1) above).

Third, in accord with our conclusions concerning the phrasal nature of
SCLI, step (41d) moves the subject clitics to a further slot – called GroundP,
as in Poletto & Pollock (in press) –, and the past participle phrase itself moves
to a Topic position at step (41c), again as in Poletto & Pollock (in press).
Although these are important ingredients of the analyses in Poletto & Pollock
(in press) and Munaro & Pollock (in press), it may be noted in passing that
they are dispensable for our present purposes. Our chief goal in this article has
been to shed light on the syntax of wh-doubling and wh-clitics and the only
thing we crucially require to do so is the idea that SCLI is overt movement of
the verb and the various pronominal and non pronominal clitics to a position
immediately adjacent to the ultimate target of the wh-clitics, our Wh1P.

8. Concluding remarks

This paper has attempted to show that the syntax of wh-elements in
some Romance dialects and languages shares important properties with the
syntax of clitic pronouns; if we are right UG should allow for entities
surfacing in the CP field that are typically assumed to exist only in the IP
domain, viz. clitics; pronominal clitics give rise to doubling configurations
and so do wh-clitics. In addition, just as pronominal clitics are always paired
with a null or overt phrasal associate so are wh-clitics, even in languages like
French in which, contrary to the NID, no overt wh-doubling is ever found.
Given our doubling structures, one further expects there to exist cases in
which the null member is the clitic and the overt one the phrasal wh-word. We
have argued that this prediction is indeed correct and that the (apparent) wh-
in-situ constructions found in Monno and other such dialects correspond
exactly to this configuration.

 Granted the highly ‘split’ left periphery adopted here and in much
other recent work, we have argued that the only way a wh-clitic can satisfy its
antagonistic requirements as a clitic and as a wh-operator is by ‘piggy-
backing’ on verb-related movement to the CP domain and have shown that
SCLI should be seen in that light.
NOTES

1. Many thanks to Roberta Maschi for her help with the Illasi data and to Luigi Ferrari for the Monnese data. Preliminary versions of this paper were presented at the 2002 GLOW conference in Amsterdam and at the CP workshop (Program 4 «Architecture de la phrase», Fédération «Typologie et universaux linguistiques» of the CNRS) organised by Hans Obenauer in Paris in December 2002. Many thanks to the organisers and audiences of these events for their comments. We participate both in the bilateral cooperation CNRS-CNR «Dialectology and formal syntax». Each of us has contributed to each and every part of this article but for administrative reasons in Italy Cecilia Poletto takes responsibility for sections 1, 3, 5, 7 and Jean-Yves Pollock for sections 2, 4, 6, 8.

2. Such unusual properties surface in different guise in many language families, including Germanic. Taraldsen (1996), for instance, analyses short wh forms not triggering V2 in some Norwegian dialects as wh-clitics. For an account of these facts adopting a more micro comparative approach see also Westergaard & Vangsnes (forthcoming). Ideally an account of the Romance data covered in this paper should at least be compatible with a proper analysis of those Norwegian facts. We have not attempted to reach this desirable goal here.

3. Although we illustrate the doubling phenomenon with Illasi and Monno data for reasons of consistency it is found in many other North eastern dialects.

4. Irrelevantly, though importantly, Monnese has (the fare counterpart of) do-support, as shown in (2b, d, e, f). On this see Benincà & Poletto (in press-a).

5. The literature has suggested that many different parts of speech can be or become clitics regardless of these discourse properties; for example some adverbial forms in Greek are clitics, as argued convincingly in Rivero (1992) and Alexiadou (1995); negation in French and Italian and auxiliaries in the Slavic languages are clitics too and so is French bien on some analyses (cf. Cardinaletti & Starke (1999)). The anaphoric property of pronominal clitics is a property of pronouns, not of clitics per se, and should thus not be seen as an inherent feature of that category.

6. Obenauer (1976) analysed que as a complementiser with clitic properties. Bouchard and Hirschbühler (1986) claimed that que is a pronominal clitic and has a strong form counterpart quoi, alternating with que in the way moi alternates with me. However that claim is weakened by the existence of a third form ce que as in (i)

(i) J’ai oublié ce qu’il m’a dit
    I have forgotten ‘ce’ what he told me

and by the fact that quoi and que do not always alternate since in infinitival questions like (ii) both show up in what appears to be the same syntactic environment:

(ii) Je ne sais pas {quoi, que} faire

On the (subtle) semantic differences regulating the choice of quoi or que in (ii) see Obenauer (1994).

7. We are thus led to question the analysis of que questions in French offered by Hans Obenauer in much work in the seventies. It must be noted however that our own analysis will end up incorporating one essential feature of his work, namely the idea that que is paired with a null (phrasal) wh-operator.
8. It is crucial for the analysis developed below that there should be no other – in particular higher – cliticisation site for *wh*-clitics.

9. Each embedded clause has one such potential cliticisation site in sentences like (9)-(11). If a ‘low’ one is chosen, there will be no way for the resulting *wh*-clitic to check its operator feature in the topmost CP field, and the derivation will crash at LF – see Chomsky (1995) and subsequent work; for why this is so, see section 3 below.

10. In Illasi too there is variation among speakers concerning the *wh*-elements that permit doubling. Among older speakers only the [che, s’] CIP is found, while younger speakers have generalised it to *ndo* (where) and *ci* (who). For the older speakers, the [che, s’] doubling structure only has a ‘marked’ interpretation – rhetorical or ‘surprise’ question; although possible, that marked interpretation is never obligatory for younger speakers. Unlike what holds true for Monnese, Illasi does not allow for the in situ strategy; in our terms this means that the weak *wh*-word in the (wh) clitic phrase cannot be null in that dialect, while it can or even must be – as in Bellunese – in others.

11. Bellunese also has structures of the (19a) type.

12. One may wonder why *perché* and (wh) phrases in general cannot be merged in the complex structure in (15). Note first that there are (ill-understood) restrictions on pronominal doubling too: French allows the clitic form to double only pronouns, not DPs, while Spanish allows for PPs as well. It would appear that only morphologically non complex forms can be so merged in *wh*-clitic phrases, which makes them similar to pronominal doubling in French. Whatever the ultimate reason for this restriction it explains why *perché* cannot be doubled since it is at least bimorphemic in the Romance languages. In addition *wh*-clitics seem to fit in an implicational scale that also holds of pronominal clitics: if a language has only one clitic form then it is the direct object; if it has two they are the accusative and dative forms; if it has three the third can either be a partitive or a locative; *perché* or its non interrogative counterpart therefore never show up as clitics. Illasi also has a non clitic form *cossa* ‘what’ which always surfaces at the left edge of the sentence:

(i) Cossa a-lo fato?
    ‘What has he done?’

and which cannot be doubled:

(ii) a. *Cossa a-lo fato ché?
    ‘What has-he done what?’

   b. *S’a-lo fato cossa?
    ‘What has-he done what?’

*Cossa* is not a clitic form, clearly, so it cannot be the head of the CIP. Why couldn’t it be the specifier of s’ as in (iib)? It would be tempting to say that it lacks the ‘ch’ – i.e. /k-s/ – morphology that would make that possible, even though it does have a [+wh] formal feature. Perhaps the ‘a’ of *cossa* – an agreement morpheme typical of DPs, not of QPs –, makes it impossible to (re)analyse the initial /k/ of *cossa* as the lexicalisation of the ‘ch’/k/ morphology. On doubling pronominal structures see Kayne (2002); on the implicational scale for clitics see Benincà & Polletto (in press-b).

13. Or stylistic inversion or the ‘est-ce que’ strategy of (i)

(i) a. Qu’a dit Jean?
    ‘What has said Jean?’

   b. Qu’est-ce que tu as dit?
    ‘What is it that you have said?’
On these see Kayne & Pollock (2001) and Munaro & Pollock (in press). In both constructions the clitic wh word can also get a ‘leg-up’ to its left periphery target.

14. i.e positions to which *que* cannot adjoin.


17. An alternative would be for *que* first to check its wh feature in the left periphery and then move back to the clitic position in IP; that derivation would also crash since it would involve illicit countercyclic movement to a non c-commanding position.

18. Of course there is SCLI in those cases where the subject wh is extracted from the complement position of unaccusative verbs, as in (i)

   (i) a. Qu’arrive-t-il ?
       ‘What happens it?’
   b. Vien-lo chi ?
       ‘Comes-lo who?’

19. In Friulian dialects cases like (27a) are not only grammatical but obligatory. The reason for this difference lies, we believe, in the respective status of subjects or subject clitics in the two types of languages. In Friulian it is tempting to say that nominative clitics are merged directly in the left periphery while French nominative clitics move as phrases from the Spec AGR position to the CP field; note that no *wh- clitic phrase of the form [Qui, il] is possible in French, for two reasons: *il* is a phrase not a head, and a pronominal clitic, not a wh-clitic.


22. This qualification is meant to exclude pseudo embeddings like (i):

   (i) Il m’a demandé quand pars-tu ?
   he asked me when do you leave

   which are quotes of root questions.

23. As noted in Munaro, Poletto & Pollock (2002) embedded *que* questions, though ungrammatical in Modern French are attested sporadically up until late 19th century, as witnessed by the two lines from Verlaine’s poem ‘O triste était mon âme’ in (i), which would have to surface as (ii) in present day French:

   (i) Mon âme dit à mon coeur: sais-je
   my soul says to my heart know-I
   Moi-même que nous veut ce piège
   myself what of us wants this trap

   (ii) Mon âme dit à mon coeur: sais-je
   my soul says to my heart: know-I
   Moi-même *ce* que nous veut ce piège
   myself *that* which of us wants this trap

*Que* in Old and Middle French was *not* a clitic, whence facts like these.

24. Munaro (2003) in fact offered a descriptive generalisation stating that this is true of all the dialects in Northern Italy. Depending on how ‘col che’ is analysed in (37) below this generalisation may or may not hold.

26. It seems very likely that *che and *que in *chol *che and *ce *que sequences are complementisers.

27. In some of these cases the terminology ‘doubling’ is probably misleading, as in the Monno *col *che…. *que configurations.


29. We also claim that the low phrasal (bare) *wh-words that stand in the low operator position in the CP field are always doubled by an overt or covert clitic *wh-word. See Poletto & Pollock (in press). Observe that the fact that in Illasi the *cossa form only occurs on the left hand side and cannot be doubled,

   (i)  
       a. *Cossa a-lo fato?
           what has-he done
       b. *A-lo fato *cossa?
           has-he done what
       c. *S’a-lo fato *cossa?
           what has-he done what

   would seem to indicate that the *wh-phrases that always occur on the left side of the CP field in Illasi and Bellunese are standing in yet another (probably higher) *wh-position, as was already claimed in Poletto (2000) and Munaro, Poletto & Pollock (2001).


31. It must be emphasised that this analysis jives very well with the spirit of Kayne (2003), which deals with various (micro) parameters hinging on the null vs non null dimension.
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Résumé

L’objectif principal de cet article est de contribuer à la compréhension des questions à redoublement des mots-wh communes dans de nombreux dialectes de l’Italie du Nord, d’une part, et, d’autre part, de la syntaxe des questions en *que* du français que nous analysons comme un cas de redoublement caché. Notre thèse est que les deux types de construction mettent en jeu dans le domaine des déplacements A-barre la contrepartie du redoublement des clitiques pronominaux. La mise en œuvre de ces idées repose sur une périphérie gauche hautement ‘éclatée’ et sur le déplacement résiduel de IP dans les différentes projections du domaine CP.
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