On wh-clitics and wh-doubling in French and some North Eastern Italian dialects[1]

CECILIA POLETTO AND JEAN-YVES POLLOCK

Abstract

The main goal of this paper 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.*

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. Many thanks to Roberta Maschi for her help with the Illasi data, to Luigi Ferrari for his help with the Monnese data and to Nicola Munaro for once more sharing with us his intuitions on Bellunese. Various preliminary versions of this paper were presented at the 2002 GLOW conference in Amsterdam, at the Minimalist workshops organised by Hans Obenauer in Paris in December 2002 and 2003, at the LSRL in Salt Lake City and in NYU in March 2004. Many thanks to the organisers and audiences of these events for their comments. We are much indebted to Richard Kayne and three anonymous *Probus* reviewers for comments on previous versions. 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 (1986), 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 and 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

(1)   a.   S'*a-lo*   *fat*   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?'

        c.   *Ci*   *alo*   *visto*   *ci?*
             whom has-he seen   whom
             'Who has he seen?'

just as Monnese[4] has, as shown in (2a, b), and also permit non doubling con-
figurations 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.   Ngo   *fet*   *majà*   ngont*?*
             where do-you eat   where
             'Where do you eat?'

        c.   Ch'*et*   *fat?*
             what have-you   done
             'What have you done?'

        d.   *Fet*   *fà*   què?
             do-you do   what
             'What have you done?'

        e.   Ngo   *fet*   *majà?*
             where do-you eat
             'Where do you eat?'

        f.   *Fet*   *majà*   ngont*?*
             do-you eat   where
             'Where do you eat?'

   Doubling is only licit with a subset of wh-words; complex wh-phrases of the
che+NP type and *parché* 'why' exclude it:

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

---

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 and Poletto (2004).

b. **E-lo partio parché*
   is-he gone why
   'Why has he gone?'
c. **S' alo magnà che torta?*
   what has-he eaten what cake
   'What cake has he eaten?'
d. *Parché e-lo partio?*
   why is-he gone
   'Why has he gone?'
e. *Che torta alo magnà?*
   what cake has-he eaten
   '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
       'What has he done?'
     b. **Ngont fet andà ngo?*   Monno
       where do-you go where
       'Where do you go?'

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
       'What has he done?'
     b. *S' a-lo fato?*
       what has-he done
       'What has he done?'
     c. **Ngont fet andà?*   Monno
       where do-you go
       'Where do you go?'
     d. *Ngo fet andà?*
       where do-you go
       '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 non doubling ones require subject clitic inversion:

(6)   a. **Sa   l'à   fato?*   Illasi
              what   he-has done
              'What he has done?'

         b. **Ngo   tu   è nà?*   Monno
              where   you   go
              'Where do 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 SCLI.
C. In all doubling cases the 'short' form must stand to the left of the verbal complex while its 'long' counterpart occurs at the right edge of the sequence.

In this article 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-clitic 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

Our claim is that there are such things as wh-clitics; this might be considered somewhat odd from a discourse perspective as wh-words are evidently not topics; nor do they refer back to already mentioned elements in discourse as pronominal clitics typically do; However, the literature has shown conclusively 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 and Starke 1999). Therefore it is reasonable to assume that the anaphoric character 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, whence not an obstacle to the existence of wh clitics.

    That such entities could exist has some *prima facie* support in the fact that some wh-words exhibit all the restrictions that have standardly been taken to define pronominal clitics since Kayne (1974). That is why French interrogative *que* 'what' was claimed to be a clitic in Bouchard and Hirschbühler (1986) almost twenty years ago and in Friedemann (1990): 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:[5]

(7)   a.   *Que, d'après   toi, vu   Jean?*   French
              what according to you has seen Jean
              'What, according to you, has John seen?'

        b.   *Qui, d'après   toi, a   vu   Jean?*
              who according to you has seen Jean
              'Who, according to you, has John seen?'

        c.   *Que? Qui? Quoi?*
              'What? Who? What?'

        d.   *À {*que, qui,   quoi} elle pense?*
              to what   whom what she thinks
              'What, who is she thinking of?'

        e.   *Que   et   qui a-t-elle   vu?*
              What and who has-t-she seen
              'What and who has she seen?'

        f.   *À quoi et à qui   a-t-elle   pensé?*
              to what and to whom has-t-she thought?'
              'Of what and of whom has she thought?'

    Que thus shares most[6] of its distributional properties with its pronominal counterparts *le* or *me*, a fact that evidently calls for a common account; the

---

    5. The properties listed under (7) have been taken to define clitics since at least Kayne (1974). However, as Richard Kayne (p.c.) reminds us, much work over the last twenty years or so has shown that cliticness has little or nothing to do with being adjacent to V, as the facts in (42) and (43) below will show; similarly there are attested cases of coordination with some pronominal clitics, as in French sentences like (i):

    (i)   *Je le ou les   verrai   demain.*
           I   it or   them see+FUTURE tomorrow
           'I will see him or them tomorrow.'

    It should be clear therefore that we are only using paradigms like (7) and (8) as a clue to the need for a common analysis of wh- and pronominal clitics; (7) and (8) should ultimately follow from this analysis and from other (structural) properties concerning parentheticals, coordination etc. On the independence of V-adjacency and cliticness see also the discussion of (32) and (33) below.

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; So does *sa* in Illasi as the following shows:

(8)   a.   *Sa, secondo ti, falo?*   Illasi
            'What, according to you, does he?'
       b.   *Cossa, secondo ti, falo?*
            'What, according to you, does he?'
       c.   *Sa? Cossa?*
            'What? What?'
       d.   *A {*sa,   cossa} pensalo?*
            to   what, what   thinks-he
            'What is he thinking of?'
       e.   *Sa   o   chi   alo   visto?*
            what or who has-he seen
            'What or who has he seen?'
       f.   *Cossa o chi   alo   visto?*
            what   or who has-he seen
            'What or who has he seen?'

   Properties that pronominal clitics and wh-words like *que*, *sa* and *do* share must evidently be captured; if so some languages must have clitic wh-words and UG should allow for such entities.[7]

   Saying that French *que* and Illasi *sa* are clitics does not necessarily imply that wh-clitics and pronominal clitics share *all* their distributional properties.

---

6. Bouchard and Hirschbühler (1986) also claimed that *que* 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* that he to-me has told
          'I have forgotten what he's 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.*
          I   NEG know not   what, what to-do
          'I don't know what to do.'

   On the (subtle) stylistic 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 (cf. Obenauer 1976). 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.

In fact they clearly do *not*; (9) shows, for example, that *que*, just like (non clitic) *what* in English, can move very far – in fact arbitrarily far – from its input position:

(9)   a.   [Qu'as-tu dit [que … [que Marie pensait [que Jean dirait [que Paul avait fait t]]]]]
        b.   [What have you said [that … [that Marie thought [that Jean would say [that Paul had done t]]]]]

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 (9a) are very different from (10a), however, in not being restricted to infinitival verbs embedded under modal auxiliaries. One must therefore say why *que* and *l'/lo* differ in this respect if both are clitics. The answer to this 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*; in short (9a) simply exemplifies the well-known successive cyclic movement of wh-elements sketched in (11):

(11)   [Qu_i'as-tu dit [t_i que Marie pensait [t_i que Jean dirait [t_i que Paul avait fait t_i]]]]?

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.[8] Evidently the same holds for Illasi *sa* and Friulian *do* but not for pronominal clitics like *l'/lo* which have no landing site in the left periphery. In short, wh-clitics move as phrases on the first leg of

---

8. Similarly in 'simple' cases like (i)

(i)   a.   *Il   l'   a   fait*
              He   it   has   done
              'He has done it'
        b.   *Qu'   a-t-il   fait?*
              What   has-t-he   done
              'What has he done?'

pronominal clitic *le* and wh-clitic *que* move as phrases across the various participial heads on their way to their cliticisation site within the finite IP.

their displacement – as claimed for pronominal clitics by Sportiche (1996) and Taraldsen (2001) – targeting A-bar slots in the various CP domains and only (have to) become clitics upon reaching the root sentence.

Concerning the cliticisation site of clitics, what is standardly assumed for the Romance languages is that there is a hierarchically ordered set of pronominal and negative clitic positions in the IP field – see Kayne (1994) and Sportiche (1996). We shall make the natural hypothesis that in this clitic field there exists one specific slot for wh-clitics as well. Put another way, since there definitely *is* a clitic field in the higher layers of IP it is natural to assume that it may host 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 targets for wh-clitics in the IP (pronominal) clitic field;[9] Since (Modern) Romance languages, in contrast to Old Romance and some Modern Slavic languages, exhibit no Wackernagel effect or clitic second phenomena we conclude they have no cliticization site in the CP area. Therefore the *only* cliticisation site for wh-clitics in Romance, when such exist, is in the IP clitic field; more precisely we say that the wh-clitic position together with the pronominal, negative and adverbial clitic positions stands immediately below the subject in Modern Romance. Although we cannot do justice to the complexity of the pronominal clitic field in this work, the following sketch will derive all the facts concerning wh-clitics that we need to capture:

(12)   [$_{IP}$ Subjects [$_{Wh\text{-clitic position}}$ {que, sa} [$_{neg.clitic position}$ {ne, non} [. . . [VP]]]]][10]

---

9. Clitic negation in Romance and adverbial clitics in Romanian target precisely one of those IP internal clitic positions, showing that such positions are not only devoted to pronominal clitics. On this see among other work Belletti (1990), Sorin (1996).

10. Just as there are different slots for pronominal clitics it might be that there are different sites for different wh-clitics in this area of the clitic field; we have no evidence in favor of further 'splitting'. If this were required the spirit of the present analysis wouldn't be weakened, quite the contrary. Each embedded clause has one potential IP internal cliticisation site in sentences like (9)–(11); If a 'low' one were chosen, there would be no way for the resulting wh-clitic to check its operator feature in the topmost CP field without violating the head to head constraint – even if further Remnant IP movement brought the matrix clause and the subordinate IP to which *que* cliticized to the topmost CP field and the derivation would crash at LF – see Chomsky (1995) and subsequent work –; for why this is so, see Section 3 below. Movement of *que* to its IP internal clitic position from its left periphery position in successive cyclic movement cases like (11) is not a violation of the A-bar to A to A-bar ban (Emonds' 'structure preservation'). All IP internal clitic slots are clearly *not* A-like positions, as the clitic negation in French and Italian show: *que*'s cliticisation site in the IP˙field is an A-bar like position.

Of course since wh-clitics are also wh-operators, they in addition need to move to the immediately dominating CP field to check their operator feature. How they do that will be discussed at some length in Section 4.

3.   On clitic wh-words and wh-doubling

With this much background in mind let us now go back to the NIDs and to the wh-doubling of (1). We 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)   a.   *Lo   vi   a   Juan*   Spanish[11]
             him (I) saw   to   Juan
             'I saw John'

        b.   *Il   me   parle   à   moi*   French
             he   to-me speaks to   me
             'He speaks to me'

        c.   *L   am   vazut   pe   Ionut*   Romanian
             him have (I) seen   to   John
             'I saw John'

What we take to be the standard analysis of such cases has been provided by Kayne (1991) and Uriagereka (1996);[12] it posits that the clitic and its associate phrase are merged as a complex 'clitic phrase' – CLP – headed by the clitic in whose specifier the 'doubled' DP stands:

(14)   [$_{CIP}$ 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 'strong' forms the clitic's specifier:

(15)   [$_{CIP}$ WhP wh-cl]

Granted this, the doubling cases in (1), repeated in (16) below,

---

11. Or rather some varieties of Spanish.
12. Kayne (1991) and Uriagereka (1996) are not strictly identical in their respective execution of the Clitic Phrase idea; we gloss over these differences here, as they seem irrelevant for our present purposes. See Footnote 21 below however. Sportiche's original proposal has the clitics merged in the various clitic voices, whereas we hold that our wh-clitics move there; the idea that there are various clitic positions in the IP field is of course independent of the move vs. merge debate. See Kayne (1994).

(16)   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   g   one   where
              'Where has he gone?'

        c.   *Ci*   *alo*   *visto*   *ci?*
              whom   has-he   seen   whom
              'Who has he seen?'

        d.   Ngo   *fet*   *majà*   ngont*?*   Monno
              where do-you   eat   where
              'Where do you eat?'

enter the syntactic derivation as the clitic phrases in (17):

(17)   a.   [$_{CIP}$ Che s']
        b.   [$_{CIP}$ Endoe ndo]
        c.   [$_{CIP}$ ci ci]
        d.   [$_{CIP}$ Ngont ngo]

Given the phonologically 'weak' nature of *s', ndo, ci* and *ngo* this seems like
a natural move. On the other hand data like (16) would be hard to reconcile with
any approach analysing wh-doubling as an instance of multiple spell-out of a
single wh-word. In such a theory the fact that the various instances of a wh-
word come in different phonetic forms is unexpected. Similarly generalisation
C above could not be accounted for. In fact such a theory would lead one to
expect the higher instance of the wh-item to bear at least as many features as
its (lower) copy(s), possibly more.[13]

In some dialects – e.g., in Val Camonica – there is a north vs. south dimen-
sion to the doubling phenomenon: speakers in the north have doubling, speak-
ers in the south don't and the speakers in the areas in between accept and use
both doubling and non doubling questions.[14] On this basis only and because

---

13. See for instance partial wh-movement in German. The multiple spell-out of traces is so pow-
    erful a device that it leads one to expect facts that to the best of our knowledge are never
    found. If multiple spell-out can somehow yield cases like (16) why couldn't a pronominal
    clitic form occur in argument position, yielding (i):

    (i)   *Je* *l'* *ai*   *vu*   *le*
           I   it   have   seen   it
           'I have seen it'

    Similarly why doesn't one get *John seems to be John unhappy* and such like. Kayne's,
    Uriagereka's and our clitic phrase hypothesis can in fact be considered as an attempt to con-
    strain multiple spell-out, which in its bare format overgenerates wildly. On this see below and
    Footnote 14.

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*   què*?*
            what have-you done   what
            'What have you done?'
       b.   Ch'   *et*   *fat?*
            what have-you done
            'What have you done?
       c.   *Fet*   *fà*   què*?*
            do-you   do   what
            'What do you do?'

If that so, all of the forms of (18) are identical modulo the lexical vs. non lexical dimension and start out as (19a, b and c) respectively:[15]

(19)   a.   [$_{ClP}$ Qué, ch']
       b.   [$_{ClP}$ Què, ø]
       c.   [$_{ClP}$ Ø, ch']

This analysis, 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 (apparent) wh-in situ[16] 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).[17]

---

14. In Illasi, too, there is variation among speakers concerning the wh-elements that permit doubling. Among older speakers only the [che, s'] ClP is found, while younger speakers have generalised it to *ndo* (where) and *ci* (who). The [che, s'] doubling structure only has a 'marked' interpretation – rhetorical or 'surprise' question – for the older speakers; 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 head of the (wh) clitic phrase cannot be null in that dialect, while it can or even must be – as in Bellunese – in others.

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

16. Fort lack of a better term we shall continue describing such constructions as cases of '(apparent) wh-in situ' despite the fact that our analysis ultimately rests on the claim that all wh-items in the languages studied here move to the left periphery.

17. Contrasts like (3e) vs. (5a) vs. (5b), repeated in (i),

Why can't *perché* and *che+NP* phrases be merged in clitic phrases? There are restrictions on pronominal doubling too: French allows the clitic form to double only pronouns, not DPs, while Spanish and Romanian allow 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 is – one could for example conjecture that only 'weak' forms in the sense of Cardinaletti and Starke (1999) and clitic forms can make up a wh-clitic Phrase – it will explain why *perché* cannot be doubled since it is at least bimorphemic in the Romance languages. Alternatively, as suggested to us by Richard Kayne (p.c), it might be that *perche* is a PP, since 'real' PPs in the NIDs are never doubled by clitic wh-words.[18] 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 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 are therefore not expected to show up as clitics.

Illasi also has a non-clitic form *cossa* 'what' which always surfaces at the left edge of the sentence and cannot be doubled in true questions:

(20)   a.   *Cossa   alo   fato?*
            what   has-he   done
            'What has he done?'

       b.   **Cossa   alo   fato   ché?*
            what   has-he   done   what
            'What has he done?'

(i)   a.   *Che   torta   alo   magnà?*
            what   cake   has-he   eaten
            'What cake has he eaten?'

       b.   **Che   a-lo   fato?*   Illasi
            what   has-he   done
            'What has he done?'

       c.   *S'   a-lo   fato?*
            What   has-he   done
            'What has he done?'

which may have struck the reader as rather mysterious, follow from the text analysis on the view that Illasi *che* is always the specifier of a clitic phrase while *s'* is always a clitic form; as for the acceptability of (ia) it follows from (a) the fact that full wh-phrases like *che torta*, just like *perché*, cannot be merged in a clitic phrase; (b) the view that these full wh-phrases must move up to a (still) higher wh-phrase position in the CP field, as was already claimed in Poletto (2000) and Munaro, Poletto and Pollock (2001).

18. If *perche* is merged in a high layer of the left periphery, as in Rizzi (2002) the problem would not arise. This does not carry over to other non doubling wh-phrases however.

c. **S'   alo   fato   cossa?*
   what   has-he   done   what
   'What has he done?'

Cossa is not a clitic form, clearly, so it cannot be the head of the CLP. Why couldn't it be the specifier of s(a)' as in (20c)? Suppose, as suggested to us by Richard Kayne (p.c), that *cossa* is always *che cossa* underlyingly; if so it will fail to merge as the specifier of a clitic wh-word for the same reason as all other *che+NP* phrases.[19]

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 useful clue here; as is well-known French speakers typically fail to invert subject clitics in normal speech with one conspicuous exception viz. *que*:

(21)   a.   *Qui   il   a   vu?*
            who   he   has   seen
            'Who has he seen?'
       b.   *Où   tu   vas?*
            where   you   go
            'Where are you going?'
       c.   *Quand   on   part?*
            when   we   leave
            'When are we leaving?'
       d.   **Que   tu   as   dit?*
            what   you   have   said
            'What did you say?'
       e.   *Qu'   as-tu   dit?*
            what   have-you   said
            'What did you say?'

Que requires subject clitic inversion.[20] We will tie the clitic nature of *que* to this property. The analysis in (12) suggests a natural way of doing so; sup-

---

19. On doubling pronominal structures, see Kayne (2002); on the implicational scale for clitics, see Benincà and Poletto (in press).

20. Or stylistic inversion or the 'est-ce que' strategy of (i)

(i)   a.   *Qu'   a   dit   Jean?*
           what   has   said   Jean
           'What has John said?'

pose *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.[21] 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[22] head positions to do so. For example, in the sharply ungrammatical (21d), clitic *que* crosses over the head position in the specifier of which subject *tu* is standing. Moreover it would also cross over a number of heads in the (highly articulated) CP field.[23] This does no harm where non clitic wh-words like *qui* or *où* are concerned, whence (21a, b, c), but will exclude cases like (21d), 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.

---

b. *Qu' est- ce que tu as dit?*
    what is *ce* that you have said
    'What did you say?'

On these see Kayne and Pollock (2001) and Munaro and Pollock (in press). In both constructions the clitic wh-word can also get a 'leg-up' to its left periphery target.

21. The standard approach to Clitic Phrases adopted above, which views the clitic's associate to be its specifier, does not easily lend itself to a formal account of the 'dual' nature of (wh-) clitics with respect to movement. That *que* functions as a phrase on the first leg of its movement is surely required in cases like (i),

(i) *Qu'as-tu fait?*

where it crosses over a number of intervening heads in the vP field immediately dominating *fait* and in the participle phrase dominating vP. However *que* must crucially only move as a head once it has reached its IP internal cliticisation site, as argued below. But in clitic phrases like (ii),

(ii) [$_{ClP}$ WhP wh-cl]

the clitic is always a head, a non maximal projection, which should make the 'phrasal' half of *que*'s movement impossible. That problem would not arise if wh-clitic phrases were really the maximal projection of functional category – call it FP – as in (iii):

(iii) [$_{FP}$ WhP F° wh-clitic]

where the wh-clitic's 'phrasal' associate would be F°'s specifier and the 'clitic' wh-word its complement. In (iii) the wh-'clitic' is both a maximal and minimal projection, therefore can move as a phrase to its cliticisation site. FP could of course be analyzed as an AGRP if such entities were not banned by legibility requirements on the syntax/LF mapping. We will not develop this sketch any further as the formal problem noted here seems easy to factor out of the empirical discussion at the core of this article. See Poletto and Pollock (in prep.).

22. I.e., heads to which *que* cannot adjoin.

23. See Poletto and Pollock (in press), Rizzi (1997), Benincà (2001).

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
     'Where did you say it to him?'
  b. *À qui ne l'a-t-il pas dit?*
     to whom not it-has-he not said
     'To whom didn't you say it?'
  c. *Ndove ghe lo ga-to dito?* Loreo (Rovigo)
     where to-him it have-you said
     'Where did you say it to him?'

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 together to the CP field; on the assumption that relevant landing site is adjacent to the target position of *que* and other wh-clitics, SCLI gives French *que* – and Illasi *sa* – a 'leg-up', which at the next step in the derivation will allow them to check their operator feature in the proper left periphery position without violating the Head to Head constraint –or some minimalist version thereof (see Section 7 for a more detailed analysis of SCLI in terms of Remnant IP movement).

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

(23) a. S' *a-lo fato (*che*)?*   Illasi
     what has-he done (what)
     'What has he done?'
  b. Ndo *e-lo ndato (*endoe*)?*
     where is-he gone   where
     'Where has he gone?'
  c. Ngo *fet majà (*ngont*)?* Monno
     where do-you eat   (where)
     'Where do you eat?'

Adopting our conclusion 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 is   fallen
     'What fell?'

     b.   **Que   t'a   surpris?*
             what you-has surprised
             '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 AGR_s to check its nominative case.[24] From this position it must also move to its checking position in the left periphery. On the assumption that that position is not structurally adjacent to AGR_s the previous analysis will ban (24) on principled grounds.[25]

This analysis differs quite crucially from those – e.g., Bouchard and Hirsch-bülher's (op. cit.) – that stipulate that *que*, like the accusative pronominal *le* but unlike the nominative pronominal *ce*, is an accusative pronoun only. The latter proposal, unlike ours, fails to account for the fact that there are perfectly licit cases of *que* extractions from subject positions like (25):

(25)   a.   *Que crois-tu   qui   puisse encore étonner Jean?*
              what think-you that+i might still   surprise Jean
              'What do you think might still surprise Jean?'
    b.   *Que te   semble-t-il qui   puisse encore étonner*
              what to-you seems-t-it that+i might still   surprise
              Jean?
              Jean
              'What would you say might still surprise Jean?'

In such ('que to qui') contexts *que* has been extracted from the subject position of the embedded clause. It is difficult to see how such examples could be reconciled with the stipulation that *que* is always accusative.[26]

---

24. Alternatively whatever functional head checks nominative case.

25. 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.

26. The point made in (25) was already made in a different context in Obenauer (1976: 96). *Ce que* and *quoi* in (i),

    (i)   a.   *Je ne   sais   pas ce qu' il a   fait*
               I   NEG know not ce that he has done
               'I don't know what he has done'
       b.   *Je ne   sais   pas quoi faire*
               I   NEG know not what to-do
               'I don't know what to do'

are dealt with respectively as cases of hidden relative in Munaro, Poletto and Pollock (2001:

5. On the left periphery of wh-questions

To explain why subject *que*'s target position is not structurally adjacent to AGR$_s$ and to account for generalisation C, repeated below,

C. In all doubling cases the 'short' form must stand to the left of 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 and Monno 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 and Pollock (2001), Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebaria (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.[27]

Note 11) and hidden Aux to Comp in Poletto and Pollock (in press).

27. So for example, the *wh-* counterpart to a sentence final phrase like *in casa* in (ia) below cannot appear in sentence final position, as the deviance of (ib), the interrogative counterpart of (ia), shows; all such must surface to the left of the right-dislocated direct object, as in (ic), where the *wh*-item and the following constituent are separated by a clear intonational break:

(i)   a.   *El   g'   ha   da   el   libro   in   casa.*   Illasi
               he   to-him   has   given   the   book   in   the house
               'He gave him the book at home.'
      b.   **Ndo   g'   alo   da   el   libro   endoe?*
               where   to-him   has-he   given   the   book   where
               'Where has he given him the book?'
      c.   *Ndo   g'   alo   da   endoe,   el   libro?*
               where   to-him   has-he   given   where,   the   book
               'Where has he given him the book?'

If *endoe* in (ia) was in the ordinary sentence internal object position in which *el libro* in (ia) is standing, such facts would be difficult to understand; pairs like (ib) vs. (ic) thus give support to an *overt* movement analysis of all right edge wh words in those dialects. Furthermore these right edge wh-words also obey the negative island constraint, as (ii) shows:

(ii)   a.   **Ci   no   te   a   visto   ci?*
               who   not   you   have   seen   who
               'Who haven't you seen?'
      b.   **Sa   no   a   lo   visto   che?*
               what   not   has   he   seen   what
               'What hasn't he seen?'

Other weak and strong islands are also excluded in such doubling configurations but are not conclusive since they are independently excluded by the fact that subject clitic inversion is banned in embedded contexts.

If so, an Illasi sentence like *S*'a-lo fat (*che*)? ('What has-he done (what)?') has its optional *ché* 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 assumption that clitic *sa* has also moved to a specific operator position, check-ing the relevant feature by head-adjoining to its target,[28] 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 attracting various phrases to their specifiers (see Section 7 for more on this):

(26)   [$_{WhP1}$ Wh°1 [$_{ForceP}$ F° [$_{WhP2}$ Wh°2 [$_{IP}$ ...]]]]

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.[29] This is a well-known fact about French and English, less well-known in the case of Bellunese, but equally true:[30]

(27)   a.   *Qui   a-t-il   téléphoné?   French
              who   has-t-he   phoned?'
              'Who phoned?' (*qui* and *il* subjects)
        b.   *Who did (he) phone?*
              (*who* subject)
        c.   *Che   te   disturbe-lo?*   Bellunese (Northern Veneto)
              who   you   disturbs-he
              'Who disturbs you?'

---

28. An anonymous reviewer raises the question of wheter heads can check operator features, more generally whether neads can be operators. Italian *non* and French *ne* have been argued convincingly to be (clitic) heads – cf. Pollock (1989), Belletti (1990), Zanuttini (1997) – and are indubitably operators.

29. 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
                  'What's happening?'
           b.   *Vien-lo   chi?*
                  comes-lo   who
                  'Who's coming?'

30. 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; no wh-clitic phrase of the form [Qui, il] is possible in French, because *il* is only the head of a pronominal clitic phrase.

    d. **Chi   laore-lo   de pì?*
         who   works-he more
         'Who works more?'
    e. **Chi   alo   magnà la   torta?*
         who has-he eaten   the   pie
         'Who has eaten the pie?'

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:

(28)   a. **Il   a   vu   que?*
             he has seen what
             'What did he see?'
     b. *Il   a   vu   qui?*
             he has seen who
             'Who did he see?'
     c. *Il   est parti quand?*
             he is   left   when
             'When did he leave?'

If *que* in (28a) is really in its object position, as on some influential analyses,[31] 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,[32] sentences like (28b) may (also) be derived as sketched in (30),

(30)   Input: [$_{IP}$ Il a vu qui]
      a.   Move wh-word to the left periphery $\Rightarrow$
          [qui$_i$ [$_{IP}$ Il a vu t$_i$]]
      b.   Remnant move IP to the left periphery $\Rightarrow$
          [$_{IP}$ Il a vu t$_i$]$_j$ [qui$_i$ t$_j$]]

que in (28a) might have moved to some relevant operator position in the left periphery as a phrase but can't have cliticised. As for (31),

---

31. See Rizzi (1996), Cheng and Rooryck (2001), Mathieu (2002).
32. Glow talk, 2002.

(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.

Consider (32) in this general perspective:

(32)   a. **De que diable   voulait Jean parler?*
                of   what (the) devil wanted Jean to speak
                'What the hell did John want to talk about?'
        b. **Que diable   s'est passé?*
                what (the) devil has   happened
                'What the hell refl+is happened?'
        c. **Je sais   très bien que diable   tu   as   fait.*
                I   know very well what (the) devil you have done
                'I know very well what the hell you have done.'
        d. **Que diable   tu   as   fait?*
                what (the) devil you have done
                'What the hell have you done?'

Clearly such sentences should be excluded for the same reason as those in (33):

(33)   a. **De que   voulait Jean parler?*
                of   what   wanted Jean to speak
                'What did John want to talk about?'
        b. **Que s'est   passé?*
                what refl+is happened
                'What has happened?'
        c. **Je sais   très bien que tu   as   fait.*
                I   know very well what you have done
                'I know very well what you have done.'
        d. **Que tu   as   fait?*
                what you have done
                'What have you done?'

The analysis above will provide the desired account provided *que* in 'Que diable' questions is indeed a clitic. This in turns implies, as Richie Kayne observes (p.c), that *que+diable* does not enter the derivation as a constituent – if it did *que+diable* would presumably be an unexpected and unwanted case of modification of a clitic. If so 'diable' in well formed (aggressively non D-linked)[33] questions like (34),

(34)   a.   *Que (diable)   a-t-il   fait?*
                what (the) devil has-t-he done
                'What the hell has he done?'
        b.   *Que (diable)   Jean voulait-il   dire   par   là?*[34]
                what (the) devil Jean wanted-he to say by   that
                'What the hell did John mean by that?'

must be merged as an independent item in a separate 'high' left periphery position; we are thus reaching the conclusion that French 'que diable' constructions share significant properties with Chinese 'daodi' questions as analysed in Huang and Ochi (2004).[35] If *diable* is analysed as the head of that additional functional layer, it could be standing immediately above the WhP1 layer to which (the correctly licensed) *que* moves in (34) – see (26). From the latter

---

33. See Pesetsky (1987).

34. Sentences like (34b) without 'diable' are often felt to be worse than those with 'diable'; This is true by and large of Pollock's French; in other varieties of French – e.g., Geneva French – the contrast is very weak, if it exists at all. We have no explanation for theses variations.

35. In Chinese 'daodi' – lit. 'to the bottom' – plays the role of 'diable' or 'hell' in French and English; 'daodi' must be in the scope of an interrogative CP and must have a wh-phrase in its domain although it does not form a constituent with it, as (i) – Huang and Ochi's (9a) and (9d) – suffices to show:

(i)   a.   *Ta daodi mai-le shenme?*
             he *daodi* bought what
             'What the hell did he buy?'
     b.   *wo jiushi bu   xiaode daodi ta weishenme me lai*
             I   just   not know *daodi* he why   not come
             'I simply don't know why the hell he did not show up.'

Huang and Ochi (2004) suggest that 'daodi' is merged as the specifier of an 'Attitude phrase' whose head contains a logophoric feature of attitude. The additional layer we are suggesting for French seems very closely related to their Attitude Phrase, whose existence in English could be argued for on the basis of sentences like (ii):

(ii)   A: *Did John finally send you the book back?*
        B.   *The hell he did! I am still waiting for it!*

If so, contrary to the attitude phrase whose specifier is 'daodi' in Chinese, 'in the world' in English and 'diable' in French, the Attitude Phrase in (ii B) wouldn't need a [+wh] feature requiring (overt or covert) movement of a wh-word.

position *que* would then (left[36]-)adjoin to *diable*, yielding (34). Alternatively if *diable* is a specifier rather than a head, the relevant 'diable projection' – maybe Huang and Ochi's (2004) 'Attitude Phrase' – would be standing immediately below WhP1 and *que* would have to adjoin to the null head of that projection on its way to its final target, Wh1°. Be that as it may, (32) and (33) will be excluded in the same way since on the first leg of the derivations of these examples *que* would still have to cross over a variety of heads on its way to Wh1°, which the Head to Head constraint still suffices to exclude. In the derivation of (34), on the other hand, SCLI – or Complex Inversion see Pollock (2000, 2002) – gives *que* the leg-up it needs to a position adjacent to Wh1P from which it moves through or to the 'diable' projection. To use Chris Collins' (2004) terminology, we can say that SCLI 'smuggles' *que* to the left periphery, which it couldn't do if it was left to its own devices.

On this account there cannot be any V-adjacency requirement on *que* since *que* is *not* (string) adjacent to the finite verb in (34); in short, as Richie Kayne observes (p.c.), paradigms like (32) and (34) in French count against V-adjacency being intrinsically tied to cliticness.[37] Note finally that this analysis of *que diable* does show that *que* is moving out of its IP internal position in Force to a higher head in the left periphery, dubbed Wh1 in the structure in (26) above.[38]

6. Doubling in embedded questions

A general fact about (genuine)[39] 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.

---

36. See Kayne (1994)

37. (7a) and (8a) must therefore be excluded either because parentheticals cannot be merged in the position in which the 'diable projection' may be merged or because the head position into which such parentheticals would be merged cannot host *que* on its way to Wh1P, thereby causing a head to head violation.

38. If correct, this shows that there cannot be any general 'freezing' principle of the type argued for in Muller (1998). As noted by Collins (2004) in a very similar context, it is clear that in the antisymmetry framework any freezing effect will have to be rethought completely if, for example, scrambling from embedded clauses in Japanese takes place from an IP that has moved to Spec CP.

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

(i)   *Il   m'   a   demandé   quand   pars-tu?*
       he   me   has   asked   when   leave-you
       'He asked me when do you leave?'

which are quotes of root questions.

The prediction is straightforwardly born out by *que*: all embedded questions of the type in (35) are sharply ungrammatical in Modern[40] French, regardless of the selecting verb in the root sentence:

(35)   a. **Je me demande que/qu' il a fait.*
           I   wonder   what   he has done
           'I wonder what he's done.'
    b. **Dis moi que/qu' il a fait.*
           tell me what   he has done
           'Tell me what he's done.'
    c. **Dis moi qu'a fait Jean.*
           tell me what has done Jean
           'Tell me what John has done.'

The NIDs are more complex; there are wh-doubling questions in embedded clauses if – possibly only if –[41] their complementiser is null:

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

---

40. As noted in Munaro, Poletto and 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 // Moi-même que nous*
       my   soul says to my   heart: know-I   myself   what of us
       veut ce piège?
       wants this trap
       'My soul asks my heart: Do I really know what sort of trap this is?'

  (ii)   *Mon âme dit à mon coeur: sais-je // Moi-même* ce   *que*
       my   soul says to my   heart: know I   myself   *that* which of
       nous veut ce piège?
       us   wants this trap
       'My soul asks my heart: Do I really know what sort of trap this is?'

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

41. 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.

There are several ways of trying to reconcile such sentences with our previous analysis. The first that comes to mind would attempt to tie (36) and (embedded) 'Stylistic Inversion' – henceforth SI – in French:

(37)   *Je   ne   sais   pas   quand   a   téléphoné   Marie.*
        I   not   know   not   when   has   telephoned   Marie
        'I don't know when Mary has phoned.'

The idea would be that the overt complementiser in (36) would block the (Remnant Movement)[42] at work here, now taken to characterise both (36) and (37). In addition, the doubling in (36) would be made licit by SI just as *que* is in (38):

(38)   *Qu'   a   fait   Jean?*
        what   has   done   Jean
        'What has John done?'

However, this line of thought fails to explain why SI does not make *que* licit in embedded clauses,

(39)   **Dis   moi   qu'   a   fait   Jean.*
        tell   me   what   has   done   Jean
        'Tell me what John has done.'

and glosses over the fact that the doubling configuration in (36) is (crucially) different from that analysed so far. This is shown in (40):

(40)   a.   *So   mia   col   che   l'a   fat*   Monno
            (I)   know   not   that (demonstrative)   he has   done
            (que).
            (what)
            'I don't know what he has done.'
       b.   *Je   ne   sais   pas   ce   qu'*   French
            I   not   know   not   that (demonstrative)   that
            il   a   fait.
            he   has   done'
            'I don't know what he has done.'
       c.   *G'o   dumandat   cos   el   ga*   Rovato (Brescia)
            (I) to him   have   asked   what   he
            fat   (chi).
            has done   (what)
            'I asked him what he had done.'

---

42. See Kayne and Pollock (2001).

> d. *Dime   ando   l'e   nà   (ndoe).*   Illasi
>   tell me where he is gone (where)
>   'Tell me where he has gone.'

In (40a, c, d) the topmost wh-like element is different from the clitic forms studied above; compare (40a) and (41):

(41)   a. *Ch'   al   fat   que?*   Monno
         what has-he done what?
         'What has he done?'
       b. **Col   ch'   al   fat   que?*
          what has- he done   what?
          'What has he done?'
       c. *Ndo   el   nà   (ndoe)?*   Illasi
          where is-he gone (where)
          'Where has he gone?'
       d. **Ndo   el   nà   ndoe?*
          where is-he gone where
          'Where has he gone?'

Plainly *ndo* vs. *ando*, *ch* vs. *col (che), que* vs. *ce (que)* etc. are different forms.[43] On the basis of morphology alone it would thus appear that the 'doubling'[44] at work in (40) has nothing to do with the clitic phrases and clitic heads which are found in main clauses. Whatever the correct analysis of (40) turns out to be, it may therefore be assumed to have no direct bearing on the wh-doubling configurations studied above which results from the merging of (wh-)clitic phrases in the argument positions of questions.

7.   More on SCLI

The standard analysis of SCLI[45] 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 (Sportiches's 'clitic voices'); therefore SCLI

---

43. It seems very likely that *che* and *que* in *chol che* and *ce que* sequences are complementisers.
44. In some of these cases the terminology 'doubling' is probably misleading, as in the Monno *col che … que* configurations.
45. See Kayne (1984), Roberts & Rizzi (1989).

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 and 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 (42) in literary and classical French and (43) in Modern Triestino and Calabrian; in all of these the clitics are separated from the verb by various (maximal) adverbial phrases:

(42)   a.   *Il   a   du   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.'

(43)   a.   *El   me   sempre   disi*   Triestino
              he   to-me   always   says
              'He always tells me'

        b.   *Un   ti   manco   canusciu.*   Calabrian
              not   you   at all   know
              'I do not know you at all.'

If one adopts 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 (44), on the other:

(44)   Input: [$_{IP}$ tu as dit [$_{CIP}$ Ø, que]]

        a.   Clitic *que* to interrogative Clitic Phrase within IP $\Rightarrow$
              [$_{IP}$ tu [$_{CIP}$ que$_i$ [as] dit [$_{CIP}$ Ø, t$_i$]]

        b.   Merge Wh°2 and IP and attract 'Ø' to spec Wh2P $\Rightarrow$
              [$_{Wh2P}$ Ø $_j$ Wh°2 [$_{IP}$ tu que$_i$ as dit [$_{CIP}$ t$_j$ t$_i$]]]

        c.   Merge Top and Wh2P and attract Participle phrase to Spec TopP
              $\Rightarrow$ [$_{TopP}$ [dit [$_{CIP}$ t$_j$ t$_i$]$_k$ Top°[$_{Wh2P}$ Ø $_j$ Wh°2 [$_{IP}$ tu que$_i$ as t$_k$]]]]

        d.   Merge G and attract *tu* to Spec GP $\Rightarrow$
              [$_{GP}$ tu$_l$ G° [$_{TopP}$ [dit [$_{CIP}$ t$_j$ t$_i$]$_k$ Top°[$_{Wh2P}$ Ø$_j$ Wh°2 [$_{IP}$ t$_l$ que$_i$ as t$_k$]]]]]

e. Merge Force and GP and attract Remant IP to Spec Force $\Rightarrow$
[$_{ForceP}$ [$_{IP}$ t$_l$ [$_{CIP}$ que$_i$ [as] t$_j$]]$_m$ Force$^\circ$ [$_{GP}$ tu$_l$ G$^\circ$ [$_{TopP}$ [dit [$_{CIP}$ t$_j$ t$_i$]$_k$ Top$^\circ$[$_{Wh2P}$ Ø$_j$ Wh$^\circ$2 t$_m$]]]]]]

f. Merge Wh1° and ForceP and attract *que* to Wh1° $\Rightarrow$
[$_{Wh1P}$ que$_i$+Wh$^\circ$1 [$_{ForceP}$ [$_{IP}$ t$_l$ [$_{CIP}$ t$_i$ [as] t$_j$]]$_m$ Force$^\circ$ [$_{GP}$ tu$_l$ G$^\circ$ [[$_{TopP}$ [dit [$_{CIP}$ t$_j$ t$_i$]$_k$ Top$^\circ$[$_{Wh2P}$ Ø$_j$ Wh$^\circ$2 t$_m$]]]]]]]

Some comments on (44) 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. Step (e) makes it clear why the leg-up provided to *que* by SCLI circumvents the head movement constraint: *que* is moving as part of a phrase to ForceP, the position adjacent to its final target.

Second, the input structure of (44) 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 (45a),

(45)   a.   [$_{CIP}$ Ø que]
       b.   [$_{CIP}$ Ø s']
       c.   *S'   a-lo   fat?*
            what   has-he done
            'What has he done?'

which is identical in all due respects to the Illasi case (45b) at work in fine questions like (45c). 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;[46] we are thus extending to wh-clitics

---

46. Recall that we also claimed above 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 and Pollock (in press). The fact that in Illasi the *cossa* form only occurs on the left hand side and cannot be doubled,

(i)   a.   *Cossa halo fato?*
           'What has he done?'
      b.   **Alo fato cossa?*
           'Has he done what?'
      c.   **S'alo fato cossa?*
           'What has he done what?'

indicates that the wh-phrases that always occur on the left side of the CP field in Illasi and Bellunese stand in yet another (probably higher) wh-position. See Footnote 17 above.

the standard view of pronominal clitics which are commonly held always to licence a (null) phrasal specifier. Naturally, the A-bar operators which wh-clitics are merged with in wh-clitic phrases 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).[47]

Third, in accord with our conclusions concerning the phrasal nature of SCLI, step (44d) moves the subject clitics to a further slot – called GP,[48] and the past participle phrase itself moves to a Topic position at step (44c), as in Poletto and Pollock (in press). Although these are important ingredients of the analyses in Poletto and Pollock (in press) and Munaro and Pollock (in press), it may be noted in passing that they are dispensable for our present purposes. Our chief goal in this article is to shed light on the syntax of wh-doubling and wh-clitics and the one thing we crucially require to do so is the idea that SCLI is *overt*

---

47. The explanation offered in Kayne and Pollock (2001) for the sensitivity of SI sentences to the presence of displaced wh-words independently requires the low wh-position in question. See Kayne and Pollock (2001). In the framework developed here, the island constraints to which *que* questions obey, as shown in (i),

(i) a. **Que   ne   sais   tu   pas   si   elle   achètera?*
         what NEG know you not   if   she buy-will
         'What don't you know whether she will buy?'
     b. **Qu'   as-tu   fait   l'hypothèse   qu'il   achètera?*
         what have you made the hypothesis that he will buy
         'What have you made the hypothesis that he will buy?'
     c. **Qu'   a-t-il   emprunté   le   livre   sans   payer?*
         what has-he borrowed the book without paying
         'What did he borrow the book without paying?'

result from locality violations in the movement of the clitic phrase as a whole, as in (ia, b) or from the non local movement of *que*'s null phrasal associate from its specifier position in the clitic phrase merged in the object position of *payer*, as in (ic); in short, the matrix IP internal clitic position to which *que* must move before it gets 'smuggled' to the left periphery, plays no part in violations of locality such as these.
48. For our present purposes, the label 'GP' can be taken as purely mnemonic – as it was in Kayne and Pollock (2001), although we give it some intuitive semantic content in Poletto and Pollock (in press: Section 10). As for our Topic phrase it is argued for at length in Kayne and Pollock (2001), Sections 1 through 5.

(phrasal) movement of the verb and the various pronominal and non pronominal clitics to a position adjacent to the target of the wh-clitic, 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 NIDs, 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. Obviously this should *NOT* be taken to mean that *all* instances of repeated wh-items should be dealt with in this way. We only make that claim for structures in which one of the paired wh-words – the higher one – wears its clitic credentials on its sleeves as *que, sa, ngo* in French, Illasi and Monno most emphatically do.

Granted the highly 'split' left periphery of questions 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 'piggybacking' on verb-related (phrasal) movement to the CP domain and have argued that SCLI should be seen in that light.

As a final remark it should be emphasised that our analysis is very much in the spirit of Kayne (2003). In that work it is demonstrated that closely related languages exhibit spectacular surface differences because one lexicalises a head or a phrase which the others don't. The languages and dialects studied here differ in exactly that dimension and show equally spectacular surface differences that can be accommodated in this fashion; if we are right the wh-questions in (46),

(46) a. S   *'a-lo   fato   che?*   Illasi
          what   has-he   done   what
          'What has he done?'
      b. *Fet   fà   què?*   Monno
          do-you   do   what
          'What have you done?'

c.   Qu' *a-t-il   fait?*   French
      what   has-t-he   done
      'What has he done?'

for example, only differ in the (non) lexicalisation of one of the two members
of the wh-clitic phrase.

ISTC-CNR Padua
Université de Picardie à Amiens

References

Alexiadou, Artemis (1995). Issues in the syntax of adverbs. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Pots-
    dam University.
Ambar, Manuela (2002). Wh-questions and Wh-exclamatives – unifying mirror effects. In *Ro-
    mance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2000,* Clair Beyssade et al. (eds.), 15–40. Amster-
    dam: John Benjamins.
Benincà, Paola (2001). The position of topic and focus in the left periphery. In *Current Studies
    in Italian Syntax-Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, Guglielmo Cinque and G. Salvi (eds.),
    39–64. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
Benincà, Paola and Cecilia Poletto (in press). A case of *do*-support in Romance. *Natural Language
    and Linguistic Theory*.
—   (in press). On some descriptive generalizations in Romance. In *Handbook of Comparative
    Syntax.*
    Guglielmo Cinque and Richard Kayne (eds). New York: Oxford University Press.
Bouchard, Denis and Paul Hirschbühler (1986). French *Quoi* and its clitic allomorph *Que*. In *Stud-
    ies in Romance Languages*, Carol Neidle and Rafael Nuñez Cedeño (eds.), 39–60. Dordrecht:
    Foris Publications.
Cardinaletti, Anna and Michal Starke (1999). The typology of structural deficiency: On the three
    grammatical classes. In *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, vol. 8, *Empirical Approaches to
    Language Typology*, Henk van Riemsdijk (ed.), 145–233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Cheng, Lisa and Johan Rooryck (2001). Licensing wh-in-situ. *Syntax* 3 (1): 1–19.
Chomsky, Noam (1995). *The Minimalist Program.* Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
Collins, Chris (2004). A smuggling approach to raising in English. Unpublished ms., Cornell Uni-
    versity.
Etxepare, Ricardo and Miriam Uribe-Etxebaria (2000). On the properties of in situ wh-questions
    in Spanish. Talk delivered at the Minimal Elements of Linguistic Variation Workshop, Paris
    15–16 December 2000.
Friedemann, Marc-Ariel (1990). Le pronom interrogatif que et la montée du verbe en C°. *Rivista
    di Grammatica Generativa* 15: 123–139.
Huang, C.-T. James and Ochi Masao (2004). Syntax of the hell: Two types of dependencies. Un-
    published ms., Harvard and Osaka.
Kayne, Richard (1984). *Connectedness and Binary Branching.* Studies in Generative Grammar 16.
    Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
—   (1991). Romance clitics, verb movement, and PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 647–686.
—   (1994). *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
—   (2002). *Parameters and Universals.* New York: Oxford University Press.
—   (in press). Some notes on comparative syntax, with special reference to English and French.
    In *Handbook of Comparative Syntax,* Guglielmo Cinque and Richard Kayne (eds). New York:
    Oxford University Press.

Kayne, Richard and Jean-Yves Pollock (2001). New thoughts on stylistic inversion. In *Subject Inversion and the Theory of Universal Grammar*, Aafke Hulk and Jean-Yves Pollock (eds.), 1070-162. New York: Oxford University Press.

Müller, Gereon (1998). *Incomplete Category Fronting*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Munaro, Nicola (1999). *Sintagmi interrogativi nei dialetti italiani settentrionali*. Padova: Unipress.

— (2003). Interrogative strategies in the Northern Italian domain. Talk delivered at the EDF Exploratory workshop in European dialect syntax, Padua 11th–13th, September 2003.

Munaro, Nicola and Jean-Yves Pollock (in press). Qu'est-ce que *(qu)-est-ce que*? A case study in comparative Romance interrogative syntax. In *Handbook of Comparative Syntax.* Guglielmo Cinque and Richard Kayne (eds), New York: Oxford University Press.

Munaro, Nicola, Cecilia Poletto and Jean-Yves Pollock (2001). Eppur si Muove: On comparing French and Bellunese wh-Movement. In *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 1.1, 147–180. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Obenauer, Hans-Georg (1976). *Etudes de syntaxe interrogiative du français, quoi, combien et le complémenteur*. Linguistische Arbeiten 34, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

— (1994). Aspects de la syntaxe A-barre. Unpublished thèse de doctorat d'état, Paris 8.

Obenauer, Hans-Georg and Cecilia Poletto (in press). Rhetorical *wh*-phrases in the left periphery of the sentence. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa.*

Pesetsky, David (1987). Wh-in situ: Movement and unselective binding. In *The Representation of Indefinites*, Eric Reuland and Alice ter Meulen (eds.). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Poletto, Cecilia (2000). *The Higher Functional Field*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Poletto, Cecilia and Jean-Yves Pollock (in press). *On the Left Periphery of some Romance Wh-questions*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pollock, Jean-Yves (1989). Verb movement, universal grammar and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20 (3): 365–425.

— (2000). Subject clitics, subject clitic inversion and complex inversion: Generalizing remnant movement to the comp area. Internet publication, Syn.com. web-site.

Pollock, Jean-Yves (2002). Three arguments for remnant IP movement in Romance. In *Asymmetry in Grammar*, Volume 1, *Syntax and Semantics*, Anna-Maria di Sciullo (ed), 251–277. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Rivero, Maria-Luisa (1992). Adverb incorporation and the syntax of adverbs in Modern Greek. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 15: 289–331.

Roberts, Ian and Luigi Rizzi (1989). Complex inversion in French. *Probus* 1: 1–30. Reprinted in *Parameters and Functional Heads*, Adriana Belletti and Luigi Rizzi (eds.), 91–116. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rizzi, Luigi (1996). Residual verb second and the wh-criterion. *Geneva Generative Papers* 2. Also in *Parameters and Functional Heads,* Adriana Belletti and Rizzi Luigi (eds.), 63–90. New York: Oxford University Press.

— (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of Grammar*, Liliane Haegeman (ed.), 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

— (2002). Locality and left periphery. In Adriana Belletti (ed.) *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 3. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sportiche, Dominique (1996). Clitic constructions. In *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, Laurie Zaring and Johan Rooryck (eds.), 213–276. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Taraldsen, Knut Tarald (1986). On verb second and the functional content of syntactic categories. In *Verb Second phenomena in Germanic Languages*, Hubert Haider and Martin Prinzhorn (eds.), 7–25. Dordrecht: Foris

— (2001). Subject extraction, the distribution of expletives and stylistic inversion. In *Subject Positions in Romance and the Theory of Universal Grammar*, Aafke Hulk and Jean-Yves Pollock (eds.), 163–182. New York: Oxford University Press.

Uriagereka, Juan (1996). Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in Western Romance. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26: 79–123.

Westergaard, Marit and Øystein Alexander Vangsnes (forthcoming). Wh-questions, V2 and the left periphery of three Norwegian dialect types. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Syntax.*
Zanuttini, Raffaella (1997). *Negation and Clausal Structure.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.