

SPECIAL INTERROGATIVES - LEFT PERIPHERY, *WH*-DOUBLING, AND (APPARENTLY) OPTIONAL ELEMENTS

HANS-GEORG OBENAUER
CNRS, UMR 7023

1. Introduction

Wh-interrogatives, as is well known, are not exclusively interpreted as ‘requests for information’, that is, as requests to specify the value(s) of the variable bound by the *wh*-quantifier. It is generally acknowledged that besides their interpretation as ‘standard’ (or ‘information’) questions, they can convey other meanings, although it remains largely unclear what ‘special’ question interpretations there are and where they have their sources. I argue that the syntactic structure, in particular the left sentence periphery, plays a crucial part.¹

Such an approach contrasts with largely shared views concerning interrogatives; thus, a common view is expressed by Siemund (2001) who sees rhetorical questions (like *Who cares?*) as (true) “interrogatives uttered in a context in which the answer to them is given”, a “non-canonical use”. I want to demonstrate that there are cases - including rhetorical questions - where particular structural properties can be shown to be correlated with particular meaning types. Such cases might be analyzable as *bona fide* pairings of grammatical form and functional meaning - i.e., sentence types, as (traditionally understood and) defined by Sadock and Zwicky (1985), among others.

Contrary to many well-studied languages, the Northeastern Italian dialect (NEID) Bellunese overtly distinguishes standard questions (with bare *wh*-phrases in noninitial position) and special questions (SpQs) (with bare *wh*-phrases in initial position). Obenauer (2004) (also see Munaro and Obenauer 2002) argued that there exist (at least) three types of special questions and that they activate higher layers of the left periphery: surprise-disapproval questions, rhetorical questions and Can’t-find-the-value-of-x questions.

Adopting this general context, I want to refine on my 2004 analysis and tackle the particular case of surprise-disapproval questions (SDQs). Two main reasons suggest this choice: first, the existence of the SDQ type is not yet generally acknowledged;

¹ Earlier versions of this article were presented at the Groupe CP, CNRS, Paris, and at the Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft (ZAS), Berlin; I wish to thank these audiences as well as that of Going Romance 2004. I am grateful to Nicola Munaro for generous help as informant over several years and invaluable discussion. Special thanks also go to Josef Bayer, Paola Benincà, Ellen Brandner, Cassian Braconnier, Richard Kayne, Manfred Krifka, Cecilia Poletto and two anonymous reviewers for important comments and discussion.

This research was carried out as part of the Conjoined research project No. 16279 CNRS-CNR “Dialectology and formal syntax - the microvariation of sentence types” and partially supported by the Fédération Typologie et Universaux Linguistiques (CNRS).

second, certain properties of SpQs and the theoretical issues they shed light on can be demonstrated particularly clearly in SDQs.

Sections 2 and 3 give a short overview of the properties of standard questions and special questions, respectively. Section 4 introduces the general analytical framework developed for standard questions in the NEIDs on which this article builds for its analysis of special questions in Bellunese. Sections 5 and 6 analyze in detail the derivation and structure of SDQs. Section 7 summarizes the analysis and discusses some of its consequences.

2. *Standard wh-questions in Bellunese/Pagotto*

In the Northern Veneto dialects known as Bellunese, the *wh*-phrases of standard interrogatives² do not show a uniform behavior. Nonbare *wh*-phrases appear in sentence initial position (cf. (1)):

- (1) a. *Che libro à-tu ledest? Quanti libri à-tu ledest?*
 “What book / how many books have you read?”
 b. **À-tu ledest che libro / quanti libri?*

Bare *wh*-phrases, on the contrary, appear sentence internally (cf. (2), (3)). The judgments are given for standard question (StQ) interpretation.

- (2) a. *À-tu incontrà chi?*
 have-you met who
 “Who did you meet?”
 b. **Chi à-tu incontrà?*
- (3) a. *Sié-o stadi andé?*
 are-you been where
 “Where have you been?”
 b. **Andé sié-o stadi?*

This paradigm includes *che* ‘what’:

- (4) a. *À-lo magnà che?*
 has-he eaten what
 “What did he eat?”
 b. **Che à-lo magnà?*

² Following common practice, I use the terms ‘interrogatives’ and ‘questions’ interchangeably, despite their not being synonymous. In Obenauer (2004), I used the term ‘nonstandard’ questions for the question types called ‘special’ here. I choose the latter term because it avoids possible misinterpretations in terms of stylistic / register considerations.

The *wh*-phrase *cossa* ‘what’ alternates freely, in Bellunese, with *che*, but behaves as a nonbare element.³

- (5) a. *Cossa à-lo magnà?* (* qua StQ in Pagotto)
 what has-he eaten
 b. **À-lo magnà cossa?*

Pagotto, a dialect belonging to Bellunese, contrasts with the rest of Bellunese in not allowing *cossa* to introduce StQs (though it does have *cossa* in SpQs).

Abstracting away from some slightly more complex cases which I leave aside (see Munaro 1999, section 1.3), bare and nonbare *wh*-phrases thus have an inverse distribution; in particular, bare *wh*-elements occupy an apparent *in-situ* position. Their analysis by Poletto & Pollock (2002; 2005) will be seen below; for the time being it suffices to say that according to these authors, they are moved to a low left peripheral position and their overt final appearance results from later movements raising the rest of the sentence to their left.⁴

3. *Special wh-questions in Bellunese/Pagotto*

Obenauer (2004) argues in detail that Bellunese provides reasons to distinguish three types of SpQs. As announced in the introduction, above, I will concentrate here on one of them, surprise-disapproval questions.

3.1. *Surprise-disapproval questions (SDQs)*

This question type can be characterized intuitively as (obligatorily) expressing an attitude of the speaker towards the propositional content, an attitude of surprise with a negative orientation, i.e., combined with disapproval. Thus, (6) expresses the speaker’s surprise and disapproval concerning what is being eaten (the punctuation “?!” signals intended SDQ interpretation):

- (6) *Cossa sé -tu drìo magnar?!*
 what are-you behind eat
 “‘What (on earth) are you eating?!”
 (cf. (8) of Munaro and Obenauer (1999), henceforth M&O)

In Pagotto, (6) can only be a SpQ (the StQ counterpart being *Sé-tu drìo magnar che?*); recall that in the rest of Bellunese, *cossa* can also introduce a StQ. Alongside the argumental usage of *cossa* as in (6), there is also a nonargumental one, as in (7):

³ A property explainable on diachronic grounds; see Munaro 1999:25ff.

⁴ This general approach is already present in Munaro, Poletto & Pollock (2001). Poletto & Pollock (2002, 2005) develop the approach further.

- (7) *Cossa zighe-lo?! (cf. M&O's (13a))*
 what shouts-he
 “Why on earth is he shouting?!”

The adjunct use of *cossa* seen in (7) is not easy to render in English, which has no analogous use of *what*. It is important to notice that the interpretation, close to ‘why’, obligatorily combines this meaning with the expression of surprise and disapproval, not very clearly rendered by *on earth*, which can also express other values.⁵ (7) contrasts with (8), where *cossa* is replaced by *parché* ‘why’ which, in its normal (i.e., StQ) usage (indicated by the punctuation ‘?’) has the neutral interpretation corresponding to normal usage of *why* in English.

- (8) *Parché zighe-lo?*
 why shout-cl
 “Why is he shouting?”

Let us return to argumental *cossa* which, as shown above, ‘replaces’ *che* in SDQs for reasons which will be examined later. Since *cossa* is always sentence initial, its position in the SDQ (6) does not seem, at first sight, to be specifically related to the SD-interpretation. M&O (p. 217) suggest, however, that in view of much recent work on functional sentence structure, it is reasonable to assume that the position of *cossa* is not the same here as in StQs. This hypothesis is strongly supported by the following data, which show that the *wh*-words which can (and must) appear ‘*in situ*’ in StQs must raise to the left edge of the sentence in SDQs:⁶

- (9) a. *Chi à-tu invidà?! “Who(m) did you invite?!”*
 b. *??À-tu invidà chi?! (OK qua StQ)*
- (10) a. *Andé sié-o ‘ndadi?! “Where have-you gone?!”*
 b. *??Sié-o ‘ndadi andé?! (OK qua StQ)*

As noted by Munaro (2003), these examples must be distinguished from their exclamative counterparts, in which the complementizer *che* is obligatory; at the same

⁵ There are, however, exact counterparts of ‘why’-like *cossa* in many different languages, which use their *wh*-phrase equivalent to ‘what’ in this way, among them Italian (*cosa*), German (*was*), Icelandic (*hvað*), Hungarian (*mit*), Japanese (*nani*).

English *what ... for* can come close in meaning, but contrary to *cossa* and its counterparts, it is not obligatorily associated with the SD meaning.

⁶ Such sentences were considered as a particular type of exclamatives in Munaro (2003). I follow Obenauer’s (2004) argumentation to the effect that they form a syntactically and interpretively coherent paradigm with sentences like (6) and (7), namely, that of SDQs.

time, the subject is no longer inverted and appears in its ‘non-interrogative’ form, as shown in (11)-(13).⁷

- (11) *Chi che te à invidà!*
 who that you have invited
- (12) *Andé che sié ‘ndadi!*
 where that you-are gone
- (13) *Cossa che te sé drìo magnar!*
 what that cl are behind eat
 “What you are eating!”

Such sentences - including (13) containing *cozza* - are interpretively ‘neutral’, in Munaro’s terms; in particular, the attitude of the speaker can be anything in a spectrum reaching from strong appreciation to outright blame. SDQs and exclamatives, thus, differ both formally and interpretively from each other.

Since *wh*-phrases must raise to initial position in SDQs, let us ask if interrogative *che* also appears there. The answer is negative; only *cozza* is possible ((14)-(15a)). This gap in the paradigm will be examined in detail in section 6, as well as the fact that *cozza* can be ‘doubled’, in SDQs (but not in StQs), by ‘in situ’ *che*, as seen in the synonymous (15b):

- (14) **Che avé-o magnà?!*
- (15) a. *Cossa avé-o magnà?!*
 b. *Cossa avé-o magnà che?!*
 “What have you eaten?!”

To summarize this section, SDQs

- have a specific semantic value which in fact weakens their status as requests for information;
- are clearly distinguished syntactically from standard interrogatives;
- are also formally and interpretively distinguished from exclamatives.

3.2. *Other special questions: rhetorical questions, Can’t-find-the-value-of-x questions*

Besides SDQs, Bellunese leads one to distinguish, for similar reasons, two other types of special questions (Obenauer 2004).⁸ Reasons of space exclude adequate discussion, but a short presentation is required in view of the analysis to be developed below for SDQs, which is in a number of respects representative of that of SpQs more generally.

⁷ See Munaro (1999) on subject clitics in Bellunese.

⁸ The existence of particular syntactic properties of rhetorical and Can’t-find-the-value-of-x questions (‘‘*diable*’ questions’) in French and other languages was demonstrated and analyzed in detail, in the Principles-and-parameters framework, in Obenauer (1994).

The term ‘rhetorical question’ (RQ) is understood here as referring to those questions whose interpretation is taken to convey, rather than a request for the value(s) of a variable, the assertion that no corresponding value exists (more precisely, an assertion of opposite polarity; cf., for example, Quirk et al. 1985). Bellunese RQs display a behavior that is strikingly similar to that of SDQs, and at the same time, in one respect, significantly different.

The parallelisms with SDQs concern the fact that in RQs again, bare *wh*-elements must raise to initial position (cf. (16)), *che* is excluded in this position and *cosa* appears instead (17), again optionally ‘doubled’ by *che*:

- (16) a. *Chi à-lo iutà in tuti sti ani?*
 “Who(m) has he helped in all these years?”
 b. **À-lo iutà chi in tuti sti ani?* [qua RQ]
- (17) a. **Che à-lo fat par ti?*
 b. *Cossa à-lo fat par ti?*
 “What has he done for you?”

On the other hand, RQs allow a left-peripheral DP subject to appear to the right of their *wh*-phrase, a possibility⁹ excluded in StQs as well as in SDQs:

- (18) a. ??*CHI Mario à-lo iutà in tuti sti ani?*
 b. ?*CHI MAI Mario à-lo iutà in tuti sti ani?*
 “Who(m) (ever) has Mario helped in all these years?”
 c. *QUANDO Mario à-lo magnà patate?*
 “When has Mario eaten potatoes?”

These facts, which Bellunese shares with Italian, strongly suggest that in RQs the *wh*-phrase raises higher than in StQs (and SDQs), an analysis developed for Italian by Obenauer & Poletto (to appear).

‘Can’t-find-the-value-of-x questions’ (CfvQs), finally, is the term used in Obenauer (2004:367) for a type of question by which the speaker expresses that, though he has tried to do so, he is not able to find the value(s) of the variable bound by the *wh*-operator. Again, bare *wh*-elements must raise to initial position (cf. (19)), *che* is excluded in this position and *cosa* appears instead, again optionally ‘doubled’ by *che*:

- (19) a. *Andé l’à-tu catà?* CfvQ
 where it-have-you found
 “Where (the hell) did you find it?”
 b. *L’ à-tu catà andé?* StQ

⁹ Which requires a particular stress in this case. While the nature of this requirement remains to be understood, analogous stress does not help in SDQs (nor in CfvQs; see below). Instead of the DP subject, a (CLLD-) topic is also possible.

The reader is referred to Obenauer (2004) for detailed discussion. An example involving *cossa* (... *che*) will appear in section 6, below.

To summarize, Bellunese, through the basic contrast between sentence final and initial position of its bare *wh*-elements, isolates question types which are not as obviously distinguished in other languages. The three types of SpQs differ together from StQs by the obligatory raising of their bare *wh*-phrases to initial position; at the same time, there is evidence strongly suggesting that they are also distinguished structurally from each other. With this background, let us now turn to the analysis of SpQs.

4. *Standard questions in the NEIDs - the general framework of analysis*

A central part of the analysis to be developed below is the hypothesis that surprise-disapproval questions (as well as the other SpQs) activate functional structure ‘above’ the structure derived in StQs. I will therefore briefly characterize the general background of assumptions that I adopt concerning the structure of StQs in the NEIDs.¹⁰

Benincà & Poletto (2005) have brought to light the essential role that *wh*-clitics play in the syntax of interrogatives in these dialects. The authors stress the crucial connection between *wh*-clitics and two other phenomena, *wh-in-situ* with Subject-Clitic Inversion (cf. (20d), (20f) below) and *wh*-doubling with Subject-Clitic Inversion (cf. (20a), (20b) below) and conclude that any adequate analysis of the *wh*-syntax of these dialects must be able to relate the three phenomena to each other.

Poletto & Pollock (2002; 2005) give these relations a formal expression via the hypothesis of *wh*-CliticPhrases (CIPs) - analogous to pronominal CIPs (Kayne 1991, Uriagereka 1995) - of the form [_{CIP} nonclitic form [_{Cl} clitic]]. The *wh*-clitic must leave the CIP to cliticize inside a clitic projection high in IP. From this position to its final landing site (in a *wh*-related projection in CP), its movement is subject to the usual locality constraints (‘head movement’ or what subsumes it). The nonclitic *wh* moves on its own to the left periphery. The two constituents of the CIP are each associated with a binary parameter [+/-phonetically realized]. Using this parameterization, the *wh*-CIP hypothesis is able to account in a unified way for ‘lonely’ *wh*-clitics ((20c), (20e)), *wh-in-situ* ((20d), (20f)), and *wh*-doubling ((20a), (20b)), all seen as involving (overt or covert) doubling:¹¹

- (20) a. *Ch’ e-t fat què?* Monno (Brescia)
 what have-you done what
 “What have you done?”

¹⁰ Space limitations prevent me from doing full justice to these works; I refer the reader to the detailed analyses they develop.

¹¹ (20b, d, e, f), irrelevantly in this context, are cases of *fa*-support, comparable to *do*-support in English. On *fa*-support see Benincà & Poletto 2004.

- b. *Ngo fe-t majà ngont?*
 where do-you eat where
 “Where do you eat?”
- c. *Ch’ e-t fat?*
 what have-you done
 “What have you done?”
- d. *Fe-t fà què?*
 do-you do what
 “What are you doing?”
- e. *Ngo fe-t majà?*
 “Where do you eat?”
- f. *Fet majà ngont?*
 do-you eat where
 “Where do you eat?”

The CIP of (20a) has the form [_{CIP} *què* [_{Cl} *ch’*]], the CIP of (20c) is [_{CIP} \emptyset [_{Cl} *ch’*]], the CIP of (20d) is [_{CIP} *què* [_{Cl} \emptyset]], and so forth.

Poletto & Pollock further assume for interrogatives with Subject-Clitic Inversion the following structure of the left periphery:¹²

- (21) [_{Wh1P} Wh1° [_{ForceP} F° [_{G(roun)P} G° [_{TopP} Top° [_{Wh2P} Wh2° [_{IP} ...]]]]]

5. *Surprise-disapproval questions as an exemplary case of special questions: I-bare wh with a positive restriction*

As shown before, in Bellunese standard questions (StQs) a bare *wh* appears in final position, as in (22). In the spirit of Poletto & Pollock (2002; 2005), *chi* is introduced in the numeration as [_{CIP} *chi* [_{Cl} \emptyset]]. The structure of (22), reduced to its essentials, is (23), where Remnant IP-movement to the Spec of ForceP has led to the sentence final appearance of *chi*:

- (22) *À-lo invidà chi?*

“Who(m) has he invited?”

- (23) [_{Wh1P} [_{Cl} \emptyset]_j + Wh1° [_{ForceP} [_{IP} ... t_j à ...]_m Force° [_{GP} lo G° [_{TopP} [_{in-}
vidà [_{CIP} t_i t_j]]] Top° [_{Wh2P} chi_i Wh2° [_{IP} t_m]]]]]]]]

In special questions (SpQs), the visible operator raises to initial position, in order to check the feature of a higher functional head:

- (24) *Chi à-lo invidà?!*

¹² The authors note that the two Wh-projections correspond to the two analogous projections assumed in Kayne & Pollock (2001).

Under the null hypothesis, *chi* in (24) is again part of the CIP [*chi* [Ø]] and checks the feature of Wh2 before raising to the Spec of the high head. Where precisely is this functional projection located? Consider (25), which is further simplified from (23), as a schematical surface order of the StQ (22):

(25) [_{cl} Ø] à lo invidà chi

From a linear point of view, *chi* could, after its raising from position t_i in Wh2P, be in either of the following two configurations:

(26) a. [_{cl} Ø] chi_i à lo invidà t_i
 b. chi_i [_{cl} Ø] à lo invidà t_i

Let us call the high projection hosting *chi* SDP (Surprise-DisapprovalP), for purely mnemonic reasons. According to (26a), SDP would be below Wh1P, a configuration which would require the clitic to move beyond an activated projection; the only possible option therefore is (26b). In other words, given the CIP-hypothesis, SDP must dominate Wh1P. Such a relation between the two projections seems natural if Wh1P and Wh2P together determine a domain of StQs in the tree structure and if SDQs include additional (peripheral) elements which are external to this domain.

Notice that a priori there is another candidate for raising to initial position, the empty clitic, which is also the more ‘local’ candidate (it *c*-commands *chi*). In (27), nothing should block raising of [_{cl} Ø] to the head of SDP:

(27) SDP [_{cl} Ø] à lo invidà chi_i

Visibly, the Ø-clitic cannot bear the relevant feature, a weakness - compared to *chi*'s raising - presumably related to its phonetically non-realized status.

The other bare *wh*-elements except *che* behave like *chi*.

6. *Surprise-disapproval questions II - the bare wh with a default restriction: che*

6.1. *The two a priori options*

As shown above, the paradigm of bare *wh*-elements in initial position of SpQs exhibits an asymmetry in the case of *che* (cf. (29) vs. (28)); *che* cannot raise to initial position, an incapacity presumably related to its deficient status (see Munaro and Obenauer 1999): bearing only a default restriction (perhaps [-animate]) *che* is the least specified *wh*-element. While not a clitic, it thus shares the handicap of Ø-clitics seen in the preceding section; neither of the two elements of the *che*-CIP [*che* [Ø]], then, can raise to the Spec of SDP, and *cossa* is used, as in (30) and (31). How are *cossa* and *che* to be analyzed here?

(28) *À-lo fat che?* StQ
 “What has he done?”

- (29) **Che à-lo fat?! SDQ*
- (30) *Cossa à-lo fat?! SDQ*
- (31) *Cossa à-lo fat che?! SDQ*
 “What (the hell) has he done?!”

At first sight, two intuitions seem plausible:

- a morphologically stronger form *cozza* might ‘replace’ *che*;
- *cozza* might be ‘added’ to StQ *che*.

The first possibility is suggested by ‘lonely’ *cozza* in (30); the *cozza ... che* configuration in (31) could then result from *che* optionally doubling the ‘strong form’. The second possibility, motivated by (31), sees *cozza* as a sort of ‘helper’ added to the deficient *che*. In the worst case, both solutions might be required to account for the difference between (30) and (31), and thus coexist.

Let us try to be more precise. Two options can be distinguished according to the relation assumed between *cozza* and *che*. Consider first (31), with the supposed structure (32):

- (32) [_{SDP} *cozza* [_{Wh1P} [_{cl} Ø] *à-lo fat* [_{Wh2P} *che ...*

I will call Option 1 the hypothesis that Bellunese has, besides the *che*-CIP, an element *cozza* which is syntactically independent from *che* and can be used to check SDP (i.e., SD°’s feature). If so, Wh2P, Wh1P and SDP are each checked by a different element. There is no derivational relation between *cozza*, on the one hand, and *che* and the Ø-clitic on the other, nor is there a relation between *cozza* and the thematic object position.

Alternatively, let Option 2 express a direct relation between *cozza* and *che* via the hypothesis that they form one phrase at the outset; in parallelism with the StQ CIP, which has the Ø-clitic as its head, the *cozzaP*(hrase) in (33) has the nonclitic *cozza* as its head and leads to structure (34), with a derivational relation between *cozza* and the A-position in which it is first merged:¹³

- (33) [*che* [_{N°} *cozza*]]
- (34) [_{SDP} *cozza*_i [_{Wh1P} *t*_i *à-lo fat* [_{Wh2P} *che ...*

As for (30), the case without *che*, either a QP *cozza* (whose relation with Options 1 and 2 is yet unclear) might check the three positions:

- (35) [_{SDP} *cozza*_i [_{Wh1P} *t*_i *à-lo fat* [_{Wh2P} *t*_i ...

¹³ (33) has a look reminiscent of Italian *che cosa* ‘what’, which, however, has very different properties. On the one hand, contrary to *cozza*, *cosa* has kept the meaning ‘thing’ and can function as a common noun; on the other hand, the two components of *che cosa* cannot move separately from each other. Moreover, *cozza ... che* is excluded in StQs.

or (36), a counterpart of Option 2's [_{COSSAP} *che* [_{N°} *cozza*]] with silent *che*, could lead to structure (37):

(36) [_{Ø_{che}} [_{N°} *cozza*]]

(37) [_{SDP COSSA_i} [_{Wh1P t_i} *à-lo fat* [_{Wh2P Ø_{che}} ...

(33) and (36) together would express the idea that both in the *che*-CIP and the *cozza*P the Spec *che* may remain non-pronounced.

6.2. *StQ* *cozza* and its relation with *SpQ* *cozza* - if any

Given the initial options introduced in the preceding section, it is useful, in view of a first clarification of the relation between 'lonely' *cozza* and 'doubled' *cozza*, to return to the *cozza* of StQs. We saw earlier that in Bellunese (with the exception of Pagotto) StQs, *cozza* alternates with *che* in its argumental function; Pagotto has only *che*:

(38) *À-lo fat che?* StQ (Bellun., Pagotto included)

(39) *Cossa à-lo fat?* StQ (Bellunese except Pagotto)

There is one case in Pagotto where *cozza* is possible in direct StQs: in the particular function of quasi-argument (measure/amount phrase) selected by predicates like *costar* 'cost', *pezar* 'weigh', etc., where it again alternates with *che* (cf. (40), (41)); this 'extended' use as element selected by a predicate is not possible with *ciamarse* 'be called', which only selects *che* in StQs:¹⁴

(40) *Coste-lo che?* StQ (Bellun., Pag. incl.)

Pèze-lo che?

(41) *Cossa coste-lo?* StQ (Bellun., Pag. incl.)

Cossa pèze-lo?

"What/how much does it cost/weigh?"

(42) *Se ciàme-lo che?* StQ (Bellun., Pag. incl.)

(43) **Cossa se ciàme-lo?* StQ (Bellun., Pag. incl.)

what REFL calls-he

"What's his name?"

(44) summarizes the data concerning StQ *cozza* in the two dialects:¹⁵

¹⁴ In this function, *che* alternates with *comé* 'how'. Irrelevantly at this point, (43) is acceptable as cfvQ, meaning 'What the hell is his name?'; see below.

¹⁵ Embedded questions impose less restrictions in Pagotto; here argumental *cozza* is possible (*che* in (iib) is the complementizer, obligatory in tensed subordinate clauses):

(44) functional distribution of StQ *cozza*

	them. argum.	sel. by <i>costar</i>	sel. by <i>ciamarse</i>
Pagotto	–	+	–
Bell. except Pag.	+	+	–

StQ *cozza* thus has - particularly in Pagotto, to a lesser extent in Bellunese except Pagotto - an incomplete distribution, in comparison with that of *che*. Turning to the comparison of StQ *cozza* with the *cozza* of SpQs, we note two important differences. First, the incomplete distribution of StQ *cozza* shows up again, here in contrast with that of SpQ *cozza*. Recall that argumental *cozza* is OK in SpQs in Pagotto (sections 3.1-3.3); anticipating slightly, we note that (41) and (43) *qua* SpQs are well-formed too, including in Pagotto (see section 6.3, below). Second, StQ *cozza* is incompatible with ‘doubling’ *che*: *che* cannot be added in the StQs (39), (41), ; i.e. ‘doubling’ *che* is limited to SpQs.

As a preliminary result, the double contrast between the *cozza* of StQs and that of SpQs makes it highly unlikely that SpQ *cozza* might be identified with StQ *cozza* - rather, their striking difference will have to be expressed. I will take up this topic later, and turn directly to the question: how is SpQ *cozza* to be analyzed, and what relation is there between its ‘lonely’ and its ‘doubled’ instantiation?

6.3. *The case for (a version of) Option 1 - first part*

Let us begin with the ‘doubling’ case. Section 6.1 noted that the combined presence of *cozza* and *che* in a SDQ like (45) may suggest a view according to which *cozza* is ‘added’ in this case to the *che* of StQs; the section then introduced the two initial options which suggest themselves in view of a formal expression of this idea:

(45) *Cossa à-lo fat che?!*

“What on earth has he done?!”

According to Option 1, *cozza* and *che* are not derivationally related; *che* is in fact the CIP [*che* [_{Cl} Ø]], one of the elements composing the set of the bare *wh* like *chi*, *comé*, According to Option 2, *cozza* originates as a co-constituent, along with *che*, of a *cozza*P(hrase) of the form [*cozza*P *che* [*cozza*]]; *che* and *cozza* then move separately to their respective surface positions.

Under Option 1, in a SDQ like (45), *cozza* has the specific function of checking the feature of the highest head, SD^o (which, as noted, *che* is unable to do); on the other hand, *che* checks Wh2^o and the Ø-clitic checks Wh1^o, just as in StQs with *che*. It is

-
- (i) a. *No so cozza far.*
 ‘I don’t know what to do.’
 b. *No so cozza che l’abbia magnà.*
 ‘I don’t know what he has eaten.’

precisely this parallel appearance of the *che*-CIP in SpQs and StQs that derives two important generalizations, (46) and (47):

- (46) *Generalization 1*
cozza ‘doubled’ by *che* in SpQs appears in Bellunese/Pagotto with the variety of functions found in StQs with *che*.
- (47) *Generalization 2*
cozza ‘doubled’ by *che* in SpQs does not suffer from the distributional restrictions affecting the *cozza* of StQs.

Indeed, under Option 1, the argumental element bearing the theta-role is the CIP [*che* [_{CI} Ø]], not *cozza*; under the null hypothesis this CIP has the same properties in SpQs as in StQs. In other words, Option 1 *explains* why the SDQ (45) and the CfvQ (48):

- (48) *Cossa se ciàme-lo che?*
 COSSA REFL calls-he what
 “What (the hell) is his name?”

are as acceptable as the RQ (49):

- (49) *Cossa ghe coste-lo che iutàrli?*
 COSSA to-him costs-it what to-help-them
 “What does it cost him to help them?” (“Nothing”)

These three sentences have indeed StQ counterparts with *che*:

- (50) *À-lo fat che?*
 (51) *Se ciàme-lo che?*
 (52) *Ghe coste-lo che?*
 “What does it cost him?”

but only (49) has a standard interrogative counterpart with *cozza* (and without *che*, of course) in Pagotto. This limitation is absent from the *cozza ... che* paradigm (cf. Generalization. 2) instantiated by (45), (48), (49), which parallels (50), (51), (52). The contrast can be highlighted by opposing the functional distribution of StQ *cozza* given under (44) and repeated here, and that of *cozza ... che* - identical to that of StQ *che* -, shown in (53).

- (44) functional distribution of StQ *cozza*

	them. argum.	sel. by <i>costar</i>	sel. by <i>ciamarse</i>
Pagotto	–	+	–
Bell. except Pag.	+	+	–

(53) functional distribution of SpQ *cozza* ... *che*

	them. argum.	sel. by <i>costar</i>	sel. by <i>ciamarse</i>
Pagotto	+	+	+
Bell. except Pag.	+	+	+

Note that in the perspective of Option 1, *cozza* is not really doubled by *che*; rather, *che* (more precisely, the CIP) is the *wh*-phrase and *cozza* lexicalizes the higher projection of each type of SpQ, normally checked by the ‘true’ *wh*-word (*chi*, etc.) raised to the specifier of that projection (SDP, RP or CfvP). Strictly speaking, *cozza* is introduced in the numeration as an auxiliary high checker which makes up for *che*’s inability to perform the checking itself. This clarification being made, I will continue to use occasionally the term ‘‘doubled’ *cozza*’ as a handy short term for ‘combined presence of *cozza* and *che*’.

Option 1 thus derives Generalizations 1 and 2 by reducing the distribution of *cozza* cooccurring with *che* to the distribution of StQ *che*. How can Option 2 deal with the distributional facts? In other words, how can Option 2 explain that the hypothetical *cozza*P [*che* [*cozza*]] has the distribution of the StQ CIP [*che* [_{Cl} \emptyset]], and not of StQ *cozza*? I see no way of achieving this goal except by stipulating the desired parallelism. The *cozza*P, then, is the SpQ version of the *che*-CIP, which Option 2 declares limited to StQs (contrary to Option 1). Option 2 shares with Option 1 the assumption that StQ *cozza* and SpQ *cozza* are quite different elements; Option 2, however, is incapable of explaining the functional distribution of ‘doubled’ *cozza*. This weakness of Option 2, in comparison with Option 1, will turn out not to be the only one; another is related to the fact that under Option 2, *cozza* originates in argument position within the phrase [_{cozza}P *che* [*cozza*]]: it thus must check Wh1° and the highest head, that is, it must *move* (stepwise) to the initial position, a requirement which will prove crucial for the choice between the two options.

Let us return now to *cozza* not accompanied by *che*, as in (54).

(54) *Cossa à-lo fat?! (= (30))*

At first sight, Option 1, seeing *cozza* as an element independent of *che*, must interpret ‘lonely’ SpQ *cozza* as an argumental *wh*-phrase checking Wh2°, Wh1° and the high sentence initial head; ‘lonely’ *cozza* would thus differ sharply from ‘doubled’ *cozza*, under Option 1. It would also differ crucially from StQ *cozza* since, as anticipated at the end of section 6.2, their respective functional distributions are not the same.

As a result, considering ‘lonely’ SpQ *cozza* as an argumental element forces one to consider it as a third type of *cozza* in addition to StQ *cozza* and *cozza* ‘doubled’ by *che*. This dubious status¹⁶ is aggravated by the fact that the functional distribution of

¹⁶ An additional problem for this assumption is the following: assuming this ‘third type’ *cozza*, which is argumental and can check the three heads indicated, why should Bellunese/Pagotto have in addition - to assume the same functions - *che*, in need of resorting to ‘checker’ *cozza*?

'lonely' SpQ *cozza*, for the range of data examined so far, is exactly the same as that of its 'doubled' counterpart.

We arrive, indeed, at Generalization 3, illustrated by (54), (56) and (57):

(55) *Generalization 3*

In SpQs, *cozza* 'non doubled' by *che* appears with the same syntactic functions as *cozza* 'doubled' by *che*.

(The formulation will be qualified below, in ways which do not affect its validity; see (58a).)

(56) *Cossa se ciàme-lo?* (like (48))

(57) *Cossa ghe coste-lo iutàrli?* (like (49))

(54), (56) and (57) are again the SpQ counterparts - here without *che* - of the StQs (50), (51), (52).

I take this identical distribution as a central fact opposing (the two instantiations of) SpQ *cozza* to StQ *cozza*, and which calls for a common analysis of the former. Recall that Option 1 reduces the distribution of *cozza* ... *che* to that of StQ *che*, via the hypothesis that *cozza* is simply the checker of the sentence initial F^o's feature, *che* being the *wh*-phrase (CIP) also occurring in StQs. Since the functional distribution of 'lonely' *cozza* is the same, it too, then, should be reduced to the distribution of *che*.

An apparent obstacle on this way is the very fact that 'lonely' *cozza* is *not* accompanied by *che*, which seems to make reference to this element impossible. A more articulate approach, however, consists in assuming that *che*'s absence is only superficial; in other words, *che* - i.e. the *che*-CIP - is (again) structurally present, but in the case of 'lonely' *cozza*, its *two* components - *che* as well as the clitic head - are phonetically nonrealized, 'silent'. Consequently, *cozza*'s distribution is derived as in the case of *cozza* ... *che*, as it should be; as for checking, Wh2^o is checked by silent *che*, Wh1^o by the silent clitic, and F^o by *cozza*, in total parallelism with the case of 'doubled' *cozza*.

Alternatively, under Option 2, the *cozza*P might in analogous (but still quite different ways) be assumed to have a phonetically nonrealized *che* in its Spec, with a functioning analogous to that assumed for 'doubled' *cozza*, and the same absence of an explanation of the distributional facts.

Two observations are in order at this point. First, contrary to the initial impression that 'lonely' and 'doubled' *cozza* might necessitate different solutions ('replacement' of vs. 'adding' to *che*), Option 1 turns out to provide a uniform, simple, and explanatory analysis for both elements, provided we accept the structural presence of silent *che* in the case of 'lonely' *cozza*. This silent status of *che* is in fact strongly motivated by the need for a parallel explanation of the distributional facts.

We want of course to prevent proliferation of different instances of seemingly identical elements. I come back later to the question why two 'different' instances of *cozza* are acceptable.

The second observation supports this conclusion by noticing that the idea of a silent *che* is nothing surprising. Recall that the Northern Italian dialects show clearly that - even non realized phonetically - either of the components of the CIP can bear the feature corresponding to Wh2° and Wh1°, respectively (cf. (20c-f)). The hypothesis of the silent CIP, then, is very natural in the general context of the use of *wh*-CIPs (I will come back below to the question of the silent status of both components at the same time).

Examining the distributional facts has left us with a strongly preferred analysis - the one in terms of (the ‘articulate’ version of) Option 1, assuming the combined presence of StQ *che*, phonetically realized or not within its CIP, and the ‘high’ checker *cozza* - and a less satisfying alternative analysis, in terms of Option 2. Leaving the distributional aspect, I now turn to independent evidence which will lead to a clear choice between the two options, in favor of the first, the ‘omnipresence hypothesis’ of *che*.

6.4. *The case for Option 1 - second part: independent evidence*

The comparison of StQ *cozza* and SpQ *cozza* has shown the following surface properties for the latter:

- SpQ *cozza* is associated with a regular (nonrestricted) paradigm;¹⁷
- SpQ *cozza* is associated with an ‘optional’ *che*.

Option 1, the favorite at this point, explains the former property by the hypothesis that the (argumental¹⁸) CIP [*che* [C_I Ø]] is present alongside *cozza*, and the latter by the hypothesis that *che* can be overtly realized in the CIP or not.

Since this ‘articulate’ version of Option 1 assumes the presence of the CIP, it has as corollaries two other claims concerning properties of *cozza*:

- SpQ *cozza* does not move; it is merged directly in the highest projection;
- SpQ *cozza* is nonargumental, since even silent, the CIP is the argument.

(Notice that these two properties again oppose SpQ *cozza* and StQ *cozza*.)

Showing that these claims about properties of *cozza* are correct would constitute independent evidence in favor of Option 1. I will give two decisive arguments to this effect in what follows.

6.4.1. *The long-movement argument*

The first relevant case is *wh*-movement from a subordinate, as in (58).

- (58) a. ??Cossa pensi-tu de aver fat Ø ?!
 b. Cossa pensi-tu de aver fat che ?!
 COSSA think-you C° have done (what)
 “(But) what do you think you have done?!”

¹⁷ Aside from the exception concerning ‘lonely’ *cozza* announced in (55).

¹⁸ Except for ‘why-like’ *cozza* (cf. (7), above).

In its acceptable version, (58) expresses the speaker's disapproval with respect to what his interlocutor thinks he has done.

In this case of an embedded *wh*-object the parallelism between *cozza* ... *che* and 'lonely' *cozza* is broken; the sentence requires the overt presence of *che*.¹⁹ What does this contrast show concerning Options 1 and 2? If *cozza* were merged qua DP/QP in (58a) as object of *fat*, it should raise to the matrix sentence, check Wh2°, Wh1° and SD° and allow the intended interpretation, unless structural reasons block this raising. The perfect acceptability of the parallel structure (58b) shows that there are no such reasons (as expected with a bridge verb like *pensar*), since *che* raises to [Spec, Wh2] of the matrix sentence and the Ø-clitic adjoins to matrix Wh1°, ²⁰ *cozza* being merged as last step. Nothing, then, can prevent a hypothetical object *cozza* in (58a) to raise analogously, and the unacceptability of (58a) forces the conclusion that SpQ *cozza* cannot function as an argument and does not move.

As an immediate consequence, the briefly considered hypothesis of an argumental DP/QP *cozza* in SDQs (the 'third type' of *cozza*) is definitely refuted. More importantly, Option 2 is also shown untenable since the unmovability of SDQ *cozza* is incompatible with the movement requirement that is part of the option. At the same time, obviously, Option 1 in its articulate version gets strong independent support.

According to this option, which from now on I adopt as the definitive analysis, (58b) *Cossa pensi-tu de aver fat che?!* is derived as in (59); only the elements necessary for understanding the steps are given.

- (59) derivation of the SDQ (58b) *Cossa pensi-tu de aver fat che?!*
(traces represented as *t* for better readability)
- a. subordinate CP
[_{CP} de [_{IP} PRO aver fat [_{CIP} che [_{cl} Ø]]]]
 - b. *wh*-movement of the CIP in the subordinate clause
[_{CP} [_{CIP} che [_{cl} Ø]] de aver fat _t_{CIP}]
 - c. merge of matrix V and v, raising of the CIP to [Spec,v]
[_{vP} [_{CIP} che [_{cl} Ø]] v [_{vP} pensi [_{CP} _t_{CIP} de aver fat _t_{CIP}]]]

¹⁹ The same contrast as in (58a, b) appears with a tensed sentential complement:

- (i) a. ??*Cossa pensi-tu che i sia drìo far?!*
b. *Cossa pensi-tu che i sia drìo far che?!*
 'What (the hell) do you think they are doing?!'

Given the perfectly acceptable status of analogous nonembedded cases - cf. *Cossa à-lo fat?!*, *Cossa sé-tu drìo magnar?!* (= (6)) - I treat the very marginal (58a) and (ia) as though they were excluded. Why they are not entirely unacceptable is not clear to me at present.

²⁰ Just as in the parallel StQ *Pensi-tu de aver fat che?* 'What do you think you have done?'

- d. raising of matrix V to I, raising of the \emptyset -cl to its cliticization position, merge of subject *tu*
 $[_{IP} \text{ tu } [_{cl} \emptyset] \text{ pensi } [_{AspP} [_{vP} [_{CIP} \text{ che } t_{cl}]] t_{pensi} [_{CP} t_{CIP} \text{ de aver fat } t_{CIP}]]]]$
- e. merge Wh2 and IP, attract *che* to [Spec,Wh2]
 $[_{Wh2P} \text{ che Wh2}^\circ [_{IP} \text{ tu } [_{cl} \emptyset] \text{ pensi } [_{AspP} [_{vP} [_{CIP} t_{che} t_{cl}]] t_{pensi} [_{CP} t_{CIP} \text{ de aver fat } t_{CIP}]]]]]]$
- f. merge Top and Wh2P, attract the complement of V_{fin} , AspP (containing the subordinate clause) to [Spec,Top]
 $[_{TopP} [_{AspP} [_{vP} [_{CIP} t_{che} t_{cl}]] t_{pensi} [_{CP} t_{CIP} \text{ de aver fat } t_{CIP}]]] \text{ Top}^\circ [_{Wh2P} \text{ che Wh2}^\circ [_{IP} \text{ tu } [_{cl} \emptyset] \text{ pensi } t_{AspP}]]]]$
- g. merge G and TopP, attract *tu* to [Spec,G]
 $[_{GP} \text{ tu G}^\circ [_{TopP} [_{AspP} [_{vP} [_{CIP} t_{che} t_{cl}]] t_{pensi} [_{CP} t_{CIP} \text{ de aver fat } t_{CIP}]]]] \text{ Top}^\circ [_{Wh2P} \text{ che Wh2}^\circ [_{IP} t_{tu} [_{cl} \emptyset] \text{ pensi } t_{AspP}]]]]$
- h. merge Force and GP, attract the remnant IP to [Spec,Force]
 $[_{ForceP} [_{IP} t_{tu} [_{cl} \emptyset] \text{ pensi } t_{AspP}] \text{ Force}^\circ [_{GP} \text{ tu G}^\circ [_{TopP} [_{AspP} [_{vP} [_{CIP} t_{che} t_{cl}]] t_{pensi} [_{CP} t_{CIP} \text{ de aver fat } t_{CIP}]]]] \text{ Top}^\circ [_{Wh2P} \text{ che Wh2}^\circ t_{IP}]]]]]]$
- i. merge Wh1 and ForceP, attract the \emptyset -clitic to Wh1
 $[_{Wh1P} [_{cl} \emptyset] + \text{Wh1}^\circ [_{ForceP} [_{IP} t_{tu} t_{cl} \text{ pensi } t_{AspP}] \text{ Force}^\circ [_{GP} \text{ tu G}^\circ [_{TopP} [_{AspP} [_{vP} [_{CIP} t_{che} t_{cl}]] t_{pensi} [_{CP} t_{CIP} \text{ de aver fat } t_{CIP}]]]] \text{ Top}^\circ [_{Wh2P} \text{ che Wh2}^\circ t_{IP}]]]]]]]]$
- j. merge SD and Wh1P, merge *cozza* in [Spec,SD]
 $[_{SDP} \text{ cozza SD}^\circ [_{Wh1P} [_{cl} \emptyset] + \text{Wh1}^\circ [_{ForceP} [_{IP} t_{tu} t_{cl} \text{ pensi } t_{AspP}] \text{ Force}^\circ [_{GP} \text{ tu G}^\circ [_{TopP} [_{AspP} [_{vP} [_{CIP} t_{che} t_{cl}]] t_{pensi} [_{CP} t_{CIP} \text{ de aver fat } t_{CIP}]]]] \text{ Top}^\circ [_{Wh2P} \text{ che Wh2}^\circ t_{IP}]]]]]]]]$

The following comments are in order. Only step j. pertains to the specific syntax of SDQs. Steps a.-d. assemble the initial IP; the derivation of the matrix periphery is shown in steps e.-j.

The *wh*-CIP raises successive-cyclically *via* the embedded *vP* (step not shown here) to the subordinate left periphery (b.) and to the matrix *vP* (c.); see Chomsky (2001) for *vP* as edge position imposed for general reasons,²¹ and Poletto & Pollock (2005) for the derivation of the clitic head of the CIP, which is independently in need of an ‘escape hatch’ within IP.

²¹ Chomsky (2001) considers two definitions of ‘phase’, which differ with respect to the possibility of putting in relation or not the internal domain of a phase with an element belonging to the (strong) higher phase. In the clause where it originates, the more ‘permissive’ definition a priori allows the *wh*-clitic to raise directly to its position high in IP without ‘stopping’ in [Spec,*vP*]; depending on certain assumptions *che* too could skip that position on pure locality grounds on its way to the left periphery. Nonetheless, the CIP needs to get Case, which prevents its constituents from raising directly.

From this position, the (silent) clitic and *che* move separately; *che* raises to [Spec,Wh2], its final position (e.), while the clitic moves to its cliticisation position in between the subject and the verb (d.), before being displaced within the remnant IP to [Spec,Force] (h.), from where it adjoins to Wh1° (i.).

6.4.2. *The argument from simple SDQs*

The long movement paradigm confirmed that SDQ *cosa* is nonargumental and directly merged with SD°.22 Prepositional arguments lead to the same conclusion even in simple sentences.

Thus, the SDQ (61) contrasts with (60) and even more strikingly with its StQ counterparts, unembedded and embedded, (62), (63).

(60) *Cossa à-lo fat?! (= (54))*

(61) *??De cosa parle-li?!
of what talk-they (= they should not be talking of that)*

(62) *De cosa parle-li? StQ (Bellunese except Pagotto)
“What are they talking about?”*

(63) *Me domande de cosa che i à parlà. StQ (Bellun. including Pagotto)
“I wonder what they have been talking about.”*

(Recall the obligatory presence of the complementizer in tensed subordinates.) The very marginal status of (61) is not due to a general prohibition against prepositions in SDQs, as shown by the full acceptability of (64):

(64) *Con chi à-li parlà?!
“Who (the hell) did they talk with?!”*

The contrast between (62) and (63), on the one hand, and the SDQ (61), on the other, is precisely of the type expected between an argumental element merged as such (in its theta-position) and a nonargumental element merged directly in the left periphery. (61) is excluded if SDQ *cosa* can never appear in a theta-position, as claimed by Option 1.²³

²² The relevance of the long movement paradigm was pointed out in Munaro & Obenauer (1999), who also noted the case of prepositional objects examined below. In a different analytical framework, the article drew the same conclusion concerning *cosa* accompanied by *che* while considering ‘lonely’ *cosa* as an argumental element.

²³ Kayne (2000; 2001) argues against the traditional idea that arguments of the verb can be PPs in VP; according to him, the argument is merged with its predicate without the preposition, which is introduced outside of VP and associated with the argument without creating at any point a constituent of the form [P NP].

The acceptable counterpart of (61), (i), which uses the preposition *de* and the CIP [*che* [Ø]], raises questions concerning the movement of the clitic and the way *che* combines with the preposition which I will not treat here; Kayne’s (2000; 2001) propositions could be relevant.

Summarizing, both the long-movement case (58a) ??*Cossa pensi-tu de aver fat?!* and (61) are now reduced to SpQ *cozza*'s particular status. SpQ *cozza* contrasts in regular ways with the *cozza* of StQs: it is a 'simple' checker of the initial head's feature. Correlatively, the presence of the CIP in the structure has been independently confirmed.

6.5. On licensing the silent CIP

With the checker status of SpQ *cozza* definitely established, let us come back to the relation between *cozza* and the silent *che*-CIP. It remains to account for the contrast between the long movement case (58a) ??*Cossa pensi-tu de aver fat?!* and its simple-CP counterpart (65). In both cases, the CIP [_{che} Ø [_{cl} Ø]] is the argumental *wh*-phrase, and *cozza* checks SD°.

(65) *Cossa à-lo fat?! (= (60))*

Assuming, alongside *cozza*, the presence of a silent CIP in (58a) as well as in (65), Option 1, so far, has nothing to say about the contrast; it would seem that both sentences should be acceptable, as are their counterparts with a pronounced *che* (45) *Cossa à-lo fat che?!* and (58b) *Cossa pensi-tu de aver fat che?!*

I have already noted that the silent-CIP hypothesis is entirely in line with the principles governing bare *wh*-elements in the NEIDs, in realizing one of the possible combinations of the parameter choices argued for by Poletto & Pollock (2005). Recall that according to the authors, the two components of a CIP are each associated with a binary parameter [\pm pronounced]. Thus, the four a priori possible combinations of parameter choices are those shown in (66).

(66)	nonclitic in [Spec,CIP]	clitic head of CIP
a.	+	+
b.	+	–
c.	–	+
d.	–	–

« + » = phonetically realized, « – » = silent

(i) *Cossa parle-li de che ?!*
COSSA speak-they of what

Example (i) compares with its StQ counterpart (ii):

(ii) *Parle-li de che?*
speak-they of what

The fact that (ii) has a SpQ counterpart introduced by *cozza* supports Generalization (1) (= (46)) and is explained if, like (ii), (i) brings into play a CIP, as claimed by Option 1, *cozza* being the checker of the highest head's feature.

The NEIDs always realize phonetically one of the two components of the CIP (sometimes both - *à la* (66a) -, case of the Monno dialect). The parameter choice for the Bellunese/Pagotto bare *wh - chi, andé*, etc. - corresponds to case (66b).²⁴ As I have shown in detail, there exists one case in which the CIP can be entirely silent - *à la* (66d) -, namely, the case of *che*. Crucially, this ‘exception’ can be found only in SpQs, when they contain *cozza*; in other words, it is *conditioned* by the presence of *cozza*. The silent CIP is illegitimate in (67), the StQ counterpart of (65):

(67) **À-lo fat* [_{che} \emptyset [_{cl} \emptyset]] ?

Thus, non-pronunciation of *che*, while possible depending on parameter choice, does not come for free, but requires licensing,²⁵ a fact reminiscent of certain phenomena discussed in Kayne (2005). It follows that SpQ *cozza* is more than a mere checker of SD^o: it is also a licenser for the silent *che*-CIP.

This licensing is expected to be a local process involving a notion of distance governed by general constraints. I will assume that the contrast between the successful licensing of (65) *Cossa à-lo fat?!* and the impossible licensing of (58a) *??Cossa pensitu de aver fat?!* is due to the fact that in the long-movement case, the locality requirement is not respected.

The licensing process itself - though it raises intriguing questions²⁶ - is not the subject of this article. It brings into play a range of additional phenomena which are also relevant for the notion of distance at stake with *che*, and which are outside the scope of this article and cannot be dealt with here. I limit myself to the preceding considerations concerning the general nature of the contrast between the legitimate cases of silent *che* and those which are not.

7. *Summary and consequences of the analysis of SDQs*

Building on the analytical framework developed for StQs by Benincà, Poletto & Pollock, I have shown that Bellunese SpQs - in particular, SDQs - have a syntax of their own and argued that it derives from the fact that they use functional structure ‘on top of’ the structure activated in StQs. The typical sentence initial appearance of bare *wh*-elements (sentence final in StQs) results from the activation of a dedicated projection, SDP,²⁷ a projection belonging to the ‘split CP’ in Rizzi’s (1997) sense.

²⁴ Case (66c) was illustrated in (20c, e), above.

²⁵ Even if *che*, as assumed here, bears only a default restriction. Thanks to an anonymous reviewer for help in sharpening this aspect.

²⁶ Under the analysis developed above, in both (65) and (58a) - as shown for *che* by the parallel sentences with overt *che* - the silent clitic and the silent *che* end up in the same positions (i.e., in the root sentence, adjoined to Wh1^o and in Spec,Wh2, respectively). Therefore, the fact that (65) and (58a) contrast as they do shows that *cozza* cannot license the silent *che* in its peripheral position, nor can this be done ‘via’ the silent clitic adjacent to *cozza*. Consequently, the licensing must involve lower instances of (the) *che*-(CIP). I leave this and other questions to work in progress.

²⁷ Recall that the label SDP is a purely mnemonic one.

While the behavior of *wh*-elements with a positive restriction is quite straightforward, the syntax associated with the *che*-CIP turned out to be more complex. I have argued that two hypotheses - the ‘omnipresence hypothesis’ for the *che*-CIP and the ‘high checker hypothesis’ for SpQ *cozza* - provide a revealing analysis of these facts. Modulo these hypotheses, the pattern of distinctive properties of SpQs/SDQs - besides initial *wh*-elements the absence of initial *che*, the appearance of *cozza*, ‘doubled’ or not by sentence final *che* - has been reduced to the need for checking of SD° . In this, the analysis is maximally simple, since it resorts to a single hypothesis belonging to the construction, the existence of this head (and its projection).

Let us turn to some consequences of this analysis. First, the presence of *cozza* is the particular case allowing the silent parametric options for both constituents of the CIP at the same time, a possibility predicted in principle by the Benincà/Poletto/Pollock framework, but realized only in SpQs, since it depends for its realization on a licenser of the silent elements.

A second consequence concerns the respective properties of the two *cozza* isolated by the analysis. The StQ *cozza* has an incomplete paradigm, is never accompanied by *che*, is argumental and moves; the SDQ *cozza* is in all these points the exact opposite. (68) and (69) visualize the contrast.

(68) StQ *cozza*

- incomplete paradigm
- never ‘doubled’ by *che*
- argumental
- raises from its A-position, i.e., *moves*

(69) SDQ *cozza*

- regular paradigm (in fact, that of *che*)
- always ‘doubled’ by *che* (silent or not)
- nonargumental
- first merged with SD° , i.e., *does not move*

The two *cozza* are maximally different from each other; there is no ‘intermediate’ instance of *cozza* (like the ‘third type’ of (the discarded) Option 2). This result is reminiscent of the well-known crosslinguistic opposition between argumental and ‘expletive’ *what*, and may thus express another very general - rather than idiosyncratic - property of *cozza*.

Third, the alternation between the surface forms *cozza* ... and *cozza* ... *che* is not a case of optional presence of an element in the numeration/computation; it is a simple fact of PF. The phenomenon, thus, does not support the idea of optionality in narrow syntax.

Fourth and finally, the analysis of SDQs in Bellunese suggests that, at least in closely related languages and dialects, SpQs are structurally parallel to their Bellunese counterparts. In other words, where the initial position of *wh*-elements is obligatory in StQs, it ‘masks’ positional differences in the left periphery (recall that even StQs resort

to different positions, depending on the type of initial *wh*-phrase; cf. Kayne and Pollock 2001, Rizzi 2001, Poletto 2000).

REFERENCES

- Benincà, Paola. 2001. "The Position of Topic and Focus in the Left Periphery". *Current Issues in Italian Syntax - Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, ed. by Guglielmo Cinque & Giampaolo Salvi, 39-64. The Hague: Elsevier.
- Benincà, Paola & Cecilia Poletto. 2004. "A Case of *Do*-Support in Romance". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22-1. 51-94.
- Benincà, Paola & Cecilia Poletto. 2005. "On Some Descriptive Generalizations in Romance". *Handbook of Comparative Syntax*, ed. by Guglielmo Cinque & Richard S. Kayne. 221-258. Oxford, New York : Oxford University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. "Derivation by Phase". *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 1-52. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1991. "Romance clitics, verb movement, and PRO". *Linguistic Inquiry* 22. 647-686.
- Kayne, Richard S. 2000. "A Note on Prepositions, Complementizers, and Word Order Universals". *Parameters and Universals*, ed. by Richard S. Kayne, 314-326. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kayne, Richard S. 2001. "Prepositions as Probes", ms., New York University.
- Kayne, Richard S. 2005. "Some Notes on Comparative Syntax, with Special Reference to English and French". *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax*, ed. by Guglielmo Cinque & Richard S. Kayne, 3-69. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kayne, Richard S.; Pollock, Jean-Yves. 2001. "New Thoughts on Stylistic Inversion". *Subject Inversion in Romance and the Theory of Universal Grammar*, ed. by Aafke Hulk & Jean-Yves Pollock, 107-163. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Munaro, Nicola. 1999. *Sintagmi interrogativi nei dialetti italiani settentrionali*, Rivista di Grammatica Generativa Monograph, Unipress, Padova.
- Munaro, Nicola. 2003. "On some differences between interrogative and exclamative *wh*-phrases in Bellunese: further evidence for a split-CP hypothesis". *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*, ed. by Christina Tortora, 137-151. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Munaro, Nicola & Hans-Georg Obenauer. 1999. "On underspecified *wh*-elements in pseudo-interrogatives", *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 9, no. 1-2. 181-253.
- Munaro, Nicola & Hans-Georg Obenauer. 2002. "On the semantic widening of underspecified *wh*-elements". *Current Issues in Generative Grammar*, ed. by Manuel Leonetti, Olga Fernández Soriano & Victoria Escandell Vidal, 165-194. Madrid: Universidad Alcalá de Henares.
- Munaro, Nicola, Cecilia Poletto & Jean-Yves Pollock. 2001. "Eppur si muove: On comparing French and Bellunese *Wh*-movement". *Linguistic Variation Yearbook*, ed. by Pierre Pica & Johan Rooryck, vol. 1. 147-180. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Obenauer, Hans-Georg. 1994. *Aspects de la syntaxe A-barre - Effets d'intervention et mouvements des quantifieurs*. Thèse d'Etat, Université de Paris VIII.
- Obenauer, Hans-Georg. 2004. "Nonstandard *wh*-questions and alternative checkers in Pagotto". *Syntax and Semantics of the Left Periphery, Interface Explorations 9*, ed. by Horst Lohnstein & Susanne Trissler, 343-384. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Obenauer, Hans-Georg & Cecilia Poletto. To appear. "'Rhetorical' *Wh*-Phrases in the Left Periphery of the Sentence", *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa*.
- Poletto, Cecilia. 2000. *The Higher Functional Field - Evidence from Northern Italian Dialects*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Poletto, Cecilia & Jean-Yves Pollock. 2002. "On the left periphery of Romance interrogatives", abstract of GLOW talk, GLOW Newsletter n° 48.
- Poletto, Cecilia & Jean-Yves Pollock. 2005 "On *Wh*-Clitics, *Wh*-doubling and Apparent *Wh-in-situ* in French and some North Eastern Italian Dialects". *Recherches Linguistiques de Vincennes* 33. 135-156.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leach, & Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London, New York: Longman.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. 'The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery'. *Elements of Grammar: Handbook of Generative Syntax*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2001. "On the Position 'Int(errogative)' in the Left Periphery of the Clause". *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, ed. by Guglielmo Cinque & Giampaolo Salvi. 287-296. The Hague: Elsevier.
- Sadock, Jerrold M. & Arnold M. Zwicky. 1985. "Speech act distinctions in syntax". *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Vol. I: Clause Structure*, ed. by Timothy Shopen, 155-196. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Siemund, Peter. 2001. "Interrogative constructions". *Language Typology and Language Universals*, ed. by Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher, Wolfgang Raible, Vol. 2, 1010-1028. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Uriagereka, Juan. 1995. "Aspects of the Syntax of Clitic Placement in Western Romance". *Linguistic Inquiry* 26, 79-123.