

Remnant Movement, Smuggling and Pied Piping in some Romance Interrogative Clauses¹

Cecilia Poletto, Goethe Universität Frankfurt & University of Padua
Jean-Yves Pollock, Université Paris Est.

1. Setting the scene: on so-called ‘wh-in-situ’.

Let us start with a non-controversial point: if, as almost universally accepted, displacement – ‘internal merge’ in minimalist terms– affects (only) constituents, displacement of constituents which sub-constituents have vacated at previous stages in the derivation cannot be avoided. That a great variety of constructions in many languages do make use of that possibility has been repeatedly claimed in the generative literature for at least forty years. To our knowledge the first instance of (VP²) remnant movement is to be found in Thiersch (1985) and den Besten & Webelhuth (1987) and was offered as an account of the VP fronting to the initial position of finite clauses in German, illustrated in (1):

- (1) Gelesen hat das Buch keiner
(Read has the book no one)
No one has read the book

Here, only a derivation where the direct object *das Buch* has first vacated the VP before it is fronted, i.e. a remnant VP movement derivation, can yield the sequence in (1) because head movement to the first position of a V2 language like German is not an option. Since then, remnant movement derivations have been argued for in many other languages, including Romance³. Evidently the strings that derivations displacing ‘remnant’ constituents yield are sometimes identical to sequences obtained by external merge only. Consider (2) in French:

- (2) a. Il a embrassé Marie
(He has kissed Marie)
b. Il a embrassé qui?
(He has kissed whom?)
c. Qui il a embrassé?
(Whom he has kissed?)
d. *Marie il a embrassé
(Marie he has kissed)

Few linguists would question the traditional assumption that the sub-constituent ‘*embrassé Marie*’ in (2a) is obtained by external merge of ‘*embrassé*’ and ‘*Marie*’. If so, it is *prima facie* tempting to analyze (2b), in its “real” question interpretation,⁴ in exactly the same terms, i.e. as being a case of genuine “wh-in situ”, claimed to characterize the interrogative syntax of many languages of the world, e.g. Chinese. Quite a few linguists have taken that tack, in one guise or another, among others Kato (2013) for Brazilian Portuguese and Cheng and Rooryck (2001) for French.

¹ This article has greatly benefited from Richie Kayne’s comments and suggestions though he shouldn’t be considered to agree with all our claims here nor, of course, be held responsible for our mistakes. Many thanks to Adèle, Marcello, Luciano and Louisa who provided all the input on what we call ‘playground French’ in the appendix to the paper.

² A case of Remnant NP movement was (implicitly) suggested by Ruwet in the late 60’s in his analysis of the ‘en-avant’ syntax in French. See Poletto & Pollock (2015, 136).

³ See Poletto & Pollock (2015) and their references.

⁴ As opposed to its “echo” interpretation, typically requiring heavy stress on *qui* as in *Il a embrassé QUI?*

Of course (2c) –which contrasts sharply with the unacceptable (2d) – shows that interrogative syntax in French may also rely on internal merger of *qui* and the left periphery of the clause (the so called ‘wh-movement’ of much government and binding work). Should data like these be taken to indicate, then, that there are two radically different ways of deriving questions in the internal language of French speakers, i.e. that French speakers have two very different interrogative grammars, one of the Chinese type, the other of the more run-of-the-mill Romance and Germanic type?

At first blush, it seems that such a move wouldn’t be optimal because of the unacceptability of both (3a) and (3b):

- (3) a. *Il a fait que?
(He has done what?)
b. *Qu’il a fait?
(What he has done?)

Que (what) is the only interrogative word in (Modern) French banning both post-verbal *and* sentence initial position.⁵ Assume now that (2b) involves more computations than meets the eye, in particular that at some previous stage it involved “wh-movement” yielding the string that overtly surfaces in (2c), followed by (remnant) movement of the whole IP to a slot further up in the left periphery. Now, if for reasons to be described, ‘*que*’, unlike *qui*, *où*, *comment* etc. cannot move to the left periphery in this fashion, as shown by (3b), the subsequent remnant movement of the clause won’t yield (3a) either. On the other hand, positing two radically different interrogative grammars in the internal language of French speakers would, everything else being equal, have to rely on two different explanations for (3a) and (3b), a rather inelegant result.⁶

Despite this indirect argument and the more direct ones developed in work of ours over the last twenty years or so (see Munaro, Poletto and Pollock 2001, Poletto and Pollock 2004a, b, Poletto and Pollock 2015) several authors have argued against our remnant IP movement derivations of ‘wh-in-situ’ configurations also adopted in our work on Bellunese and Mendrisiotto. The Bellunese data in (3) illustrate the relevant data:

- (4) a. Ha-tu magnà che?
(Have you eaten what?)
What did you eat?
b. *Che ha-tu magnà?
(What have you eaten?)
c. Se-tu 'ndat andé?
(Are you gone where?)
Where did you go?
d. *Andé se-tu 'ndat?
(Where are you gone?)

(4a, c) differ from (2b) and French questions like *Il part où?* (He leaves for where?), *Elle va comment?* (She goes how? = How is she?) *Pierre parle à qui?* (Pierre speaks to whom?) in exhibiting (obligatory) ‘Subject Clitic Inversion’—henceforth SCLI—, crucially banned in such ‘in situ’ questions in French, as shown by the hopelessly bad **Part-il où?*, (Goes he where?) **Va-t-elle comment?* (Goes she

⁵ On *Qu’a-t-il fait ?* (What has he done?) see Poletto & Pollock (2004a, b), (2015) and section 11 below.

⁶ As we shall see in section 9 below this argument is not as cogent as we once thought it was. See (text to) footnote 34.

how ?), **Pierre parle-t-il à qui?* (Pierre speaks he to whom ?). Despite this major difference, which we come back to at length in sections 15 and 16 below, our past work did analyze (4) and the like as also involving (a series of) remnant XP movements to the (highly articulated) left periphery of the clause, the so-called ‘CP’ layer.

In sharp opposition to our remnant IP movement approach, a line of research originating in Belletti (2005)⁷ and later developed in Manzini and Savoia (2011), Bonan (2017) and Donzelli (2018) argues that (4) and the like in Bellunese are rather to be interpreted as a lower type of displacement moving the wh-item to a Focus position in the vP left periphery. The (remnant) vP is then claimed to move to a higher Topic-like position in the vP periphery crossing over the Focus position, resulting in a string in which wh-item seems to be standing at the right edge of the sentence.

In this work, we shall argue that both types of remnant movement coexist in French and many other Romance languages. We shall do so by first concentrating on the ill-understood syntax of *quoi*, *que* (what) and *pourquoi* (why) (sections 2 to 11). Our investigation will lead us to suggest that the syntax of French interrogatives must crucially take into account the fact that most QU- pronouns –“Qu-” is the French counterpart of “Wh-” in English– are both interrogative and relative elements, this dual nature having quite concrete consequences in their syntax. Our results in this area we take to be the main result of the present research. If correct they lend additional credibility to Kayne’s (2011), (2015) remark that notions like ‘relative constructions’ or ‘interrogative constructions’ should not be considered primitives of the language faculty. As we go along, more particularly in section 11, we shall also take up the question of ‘smuggling’ inherent in remnant movement derivations and go back to (some) *est-ce* questions in French in sections 12 to 14. In sections 15 and 16 we shall tackle the interrogative syntax of some Northern Italian Dialects in the light of the various findings of the first 14 sections.

As we proceed, the facts, tests and arguments we shall provide should help determine whether the interrogative syntax of other Romance languages and dialects make use of remnant movement to the high or low left peripheries of IP or vP, or indeed both. This would be a welcome result since the recent claim that all phases are parallel⁸ and include Topic and Focus layers, if true, will clearly allow for those equally possible, though potentially competing, analyses, quite a puzzle for the language learner. It is thus crucial to find evidence for teasing apart the syntax of the vP and CP left peripheries, as Belletti (2004) did in another context. This, in addition to more factual claims, is what we hope to do in this work. It would thus seem to jibe well with Bonan’s (2017), which puts forwards a first typology of wh-in-situ. However that work does not tackle the deeper question of why some languages take one or the other option, or indeed both, like French, if we are right. Ideally the morphological properties of the various wh-words and the surface form of the sentences involved should be all that the language learner requires.

2. On French *quoi*.

French *quoi* (what) has a rather enigmatic distribution in tensed clauses, illustrated in (5):

- (5) a. Il fait quoi?
(He does what?)
What does he do?
b. *Quoi il fait?
(What he does?)
c. *Quoi fait-il?

⁷ See section 4 of Belletti (2005).

⁸ See Poletto (2006) for the idea that DPs too have a left periphery of that type.

- (What does he?)
 d. *Dis-moi quoi il fait
 (Tell me what he does)

Quoi can only surface at the right edge of the clause,⁹ and is banned in the left periphery of all finite interrogatives in root questions with or without SCLI and in the initial position of embedded questions like (5d).¹⁰ Clearly, the sketch in the preceding section concerning real questions like (5a) and *Il a embrassé qui?* (He's kissed whom?) *Il est parti où?* (He's gone where?) etc. does not carry over to (5b) and would only be consistent with it if we could explain why remnant IP movement to the CP layer is obligatory with *quoi*. We are not aware of any such explanation, which in any case would fail to account for (5c) and (5d) although they and (5b) cry out for a unified analysis.

As a first comparative step to try to make sense of those data, let us go back to Italian and endorse Belletti's (2004) seminal idea that its clause structure in finite sentences may contain two left peripheries, a low one –henceforth 'LLP'– (also argued for in Poletto (2006) for Old Italian), standing to the left of the vP layer, and the longer-studied one higher up in the left periphery of IP, the CP layer of much government and binding work –henceforth 'HLP'– containing a variety of positions, including both a focus position and a topic/ground position.¹¹ Since Belletti has shown that the LLP also contains a topic position, it is not unnatural to conjecture that QU- pronouns and phrases, (typically) focussed elements *par excellence*, can be sub-categorized for one or both of these focus positions.

Let us now explicitly import Belletti's analysis into French and say that *quoi* is unique in French in that its interrogative feature may only be checked by adjoining to the Focus position of the LLP. We now have an account of the data in (5): (5a) is fine because *quoi* has moved to the low focus position, where it has checked the appropriate feature. Further remnant movement of vP to the Topic/ground layer yields the

⁹ We're putting aside de-accented NPs like *Jean* in (i),

- (i) Il a donné un livre à Marie, mais il a donné quoi à Jean ?
 (He gave a book to Marie, but he gave what to Jean?)

and right-dislocated elements like *à Paul* in (ii):

- (ii) Il va faire quoi, à Paul ?
 (He is going to do what, to Paul?)

¹⁰ As R. Kayne reminds us (p.c.) some speakers find (5a, b, c, d) somewhat improved if phrases like *d'autre* or *d'intéressant*, are added to the right of *quoi*, as in ???*Quoi d'autre il fait?* (what else he does) ??? *Quoi d'autre fait-il?* (What else does he) ???*Il ne sait pas quoi d'autre il fera* (He doesn't know what else he'll do). Other speakers, including Jean-Yves, find the improvement at best minimal, hence the '???'. The *raison d'être* of that improvement, for those speakers who do find it significant, remains to be understood. In this work we shall also put aside *quoi+que* in (i), the French counterparts to Wh-ever constructions in English:

- (i) Quoi qu'il fasse, les gens pensent qu'il a tort.
 (What that he do (subjunctive), people think he is wrong)
 Whatever he does, people think he is wrong

In such constructions *quoi* often does not have its (indefinite, inanimate) direct object meaning, as shown in (ii):

- (ii) Quoi qu'il en soit, nous ne tiendrons pas compte de cela
 (What that it of it be (= However that maybe), we shan't take that into account)

quoi+que has developed yet another meaning in (contemporary) French, close to {*encore, bien*} *que* (= although) in sentences like (iii):

- (iii) Pierre pense que Marie est amoureuse de lui, quoi qu'on puisse en douter!
 Pierre thinks that Marie is in love with him, although one may have one's doubts

(ii) and (iii) are enough to justify putting *quoi+que* aside, we believe, even though it obviously deserves much further study.

¹¹ See Rizzi (1997) and all the work accumulated in his and Cinque's 'cartographic' project. See for example the various articles in Rizzi (2004).

correct word order. (5b) could only be derived if *quoi* could bear a feature to be checked in the HLP, which, by hypothesis, isn't the case. The same holds of (5d), evidently. It will also of (5c) if in such SCLI contexts the QU-determiner also has to check some feature in the HLP, which seems reasonable.¹²

It is also easy to see that (2c) and all fine questions like *Où il est parti?* (Where he has gone?), *A qui il a parlé?* (To whom he has spoken?), *Quel livre il a lu?* (Which book he has read) etc. can only be derived if *qui*, *où*, *à qui*, *quel NP* etc., contrary to *quoi*, can bear a feature to be checked in the HLP, yielding the attested word order. Continuing to claim that French allows remnant IP movement to the HLP, as in our past work, we also derive *Il est parti où? Il a lu quel livre, Il a parlé comment* etc. Let us now make one further claim. It says that like *quoi*, all other French interrogative QU- pronouns and phrases bear a feature to be checked in the LLP but may also bear one to be checked in the HLP, when there is one.¹³ If so, a sentence like *Il aime qui?* (he loves whom?) is ambiguous since it can be derived either as in (6) –just as *Il fait quoi?* would have to be– or as in (7):¹⁴

(6) [IP il [VP aime qui]]

Merge low focus and vP and Move *qui* to FocP:

⇒ [IP il [FocP qui Foc [VP aime ~~qui~~]]]

Merge Top and FocP and Remnant move vP to TopP:

⇒ [IP **il** [TopP [VP **aime qui**] Top [FocP **qui** Foc] [VP ~~il [aime qui]]]]~~

(7) [IP il [VP aime qui]]

Merge HLP and IP and Move *qui* :

⇒ [HLP qui [IP il aime ~~qui~~]]

Merge Top in HLP and Remnant move IP to TopP:

⇒ [HLP [TopP [IP **il aime qui**] ~~Top-qui~~] [IP ~~il [aime qui]]]]~~

So questions in which *qui*, *où*, *lequel*, *quel(le)(s)+NP* etc. sit at the *right* edge of the sentence may, though need not, have activated the HLP. The same strings featuring *quoi* only activated the LLP. It could be that the choice between (6) and (7) is variable among speakers. This might lead to contrasting acceptability judgements. We shall briefly come back to this in section 4.

3. More on French *quoi*.

¹² On *Qu'a-t-il dit?* and such like see section 11.

¹³ The features to be checked in the LLP and HLP will be properly characterized in section 7. *Qui* in a sentence like (i) is sitting in the HLP:

(i) Qui il a embrassé?
(Who he has kissed?)
Who did he kiss?

It must therefore have moved there to check some feature. If, like *quoi*, it also has some feature to be checked in the low focus of the LLP, it must have moved on to the HLP, in a successive cyclic fashion. See section 7. Successive cyclic derivations of this sort have been claimed to be required by Phase theory and the PIC: at the point when the HLP is merged, VP has already been sent to spell-out. On *Pourquoi* see sections 4 and 6, on *que* sections 9 to 11. For the sake of readability the pronounced items appear in bold type in the final lines of the derivations, which don't show the further displacement of the finite verb(P) to TP.

¹⁴ In these derivations the question of where the subject clitic *il* is first merged is glossed over and so is the ultimate movement of the verb to TP, not represented here. In (7) we have not included the movement of *qui* to the focus position of the LLP.

To make its properties even more enigmatic one must add that in infinitival questions, *quoi* must sit at the *left* edge of the infinitive in Standard French –but see appendix on “Children’s playground French” –, as shown in (8):

- (8) a. Je ne sais pas quoi dire
 (I ne know not what (to) say)
 I don’t know what to say
 b. *Je ne sais pas dire quoi
 (I ne know not (to) say what)
 c. A-t-il dit quoi apporter?
 (Has-t-he said what (to) bring?)
 Did he say what we were to bring?
 d. *A-t-il dit apporter quoi?
 (Has-t-he said (to) bring what?)

Taking our analysis in 2 seriously, (8b, c) and the like would make sense if in such structures the infinitive *quoi dire*, *quoi apporter* etc. was a variant of Belletti’s vP –call it interrogative infinitival vP. On the widely accepted view that subjects are first merged in the specifier position of VP, vP is clause-like from a thematic point of view, so nothing precludes analysing infinitives as vPs, their null PRO subject standing ‘low’ in the structure. Accepting this much, we do derive (8a) and (8c) by moving *quoi* to the Focus position of what is in fact a LLP.

Two questions immediately arise:

- A.** Why couldn’t the verb –or some part of the remnant vP– move up to the infinitival IP dominating it, crossing over the focussed QU-determiner, yielding the ungrammatical (8b, d)?
B. Why couldn’t there be remnant vP movement to Top/GroupP past the QU- pronouns, thus again yielding the ungrammatical (8b) and (8d),

Let us tackle question A first. Although it has seldom, if ever, been entertained before,¹⁵ a simple-minded answer would state that in such structures there’s no IP at all, hence no possible (remnant) v(P) movement to infinitival IP either. In this perspective, the fact that *quoi* in (7a) surfaces to the left of the verb should be seen in the same light as the fact that *rien* (nothing), *tout* (everything), *beaucoup* (much, many, (a) lot) also precede the infinitival verb in sentences like (9):

- (9) a. Ne rien comprendre à la linguistique, ce n’est pas un crime
 (Ne nothing (to) understand to the linguistics, that is not a crime)
 To know nothing about linguistics is not a crime
 b. Tout comprendre, c’est tout pardonner
 (Everything (to) understand, it is everything to forgive)
 To understand everything is to forgive everything
 c. Beaucoup manger de fruits, c’est bon pour la santé
 (Many (to) eat of fruits, it’s good for the health)
 To eat lots of fruit is good for one’s health

¹⁵ At least in print, probably because it goes against the tacit assumption that the spine of all sentence types is invariant, differing only in its feature composition, finite sentences being [+ finite] and infinitives [-finite], as Pollock (1989, 2.1) explicitly stated, incorrectly if the facts in (8) above are correctly analyzed here. What we are saying instead is that infinitives entirely lack the defining element of finite sentences, i.e. tense, which, much as in Pollock (1989), we take to be the head of IP, to be more perspicuously called ‘TP’ below, again as in Pollock 1989.

The fact that they can't in finite sentences like (10),

- (10) a. Il ne (*rien) comprend rien à la linguistique
(He ne (*nothing) understands nothing to the linguistics)
He doesn't understand linguistics at all
b. Il (*tout) comprend tout et pardonne tout
(He (*everything) understands everything and forgives everything)
c. Il (*beaucoup) mange beaucoup de fruits
(He (*many) eats many of fruits)
He eats lots of fruit

being due to the obligatory displacement of the verb to tense, as in Pollock (1989),¹⁶ or, more likely,¹⁷ to (some variety of) remnant movement of vP to tense. Assuming this analysis of the paradigm in (8) to be correct, the fine sentences in (11) to (14) do show that, as claimed above, *qui*, *où*, *comment*, *quel NP* etc. can check their relevant feature in the 'low' focus position of (infinitival) vP questions:

- (11) Il ne sait pas qui voir
(He ne knows not who (to) see)
He doesn't know who to see
(12) Pierre ne sait pas comment faire
(Pierre (ne) knows not how to do)
(13) Marie ne sait pas où aller
(Marie (ne) knows not where to go)
(14) Elle ne sait pas quel livre consulter
(She ne knows not what book to consult)

Accepting this analysis now, the following examples require further comments:

- (15) Pierre ne sait pas quoi lui envoyer
(Pierre ne knows not what to him (to) send)
Pierre doesn't know what to send to him
(16) Marie ne sait pas à qui en parler
(Marie ne knows not to whom of it (to) talk)
Marie doesn't know to whom to talk about it
(17) Marie ne sait pas quand y retourner
(Marie ne knows not when there (to) go back)
Marie doesn't know when to go back there
(18) Pierre ne sait pas où la rencontrer
(Pierre ne knows not where her to meet)

¹⁶ On this and much else see Pollock (1989). The idea that in (8a) or (11) the QU- pronouns surface to the left of the infinitive for the same reason adverbs, *tout* or *beaucoup* do in (9) does not commit us to saying that they stand in the same position: only QU- pronouns move to the LLP, which is higher up in the vP than adverbs, or even negation, as in examples like (i), suggested to us by Richie Kayne (p.c.):

- (i) J'ai fini par savoir à qui ne rien dire
(I finally ended up knowing to whom not nothing (to) say)
I finally ended up knowing to whom not to say anything

¹⁷ The question of how best to capture in (remnant) vP movement terms the distinction between Pollock's (1989) "short verb movement" and "long verb movement" is beyond the scope of the present paper. So is the sensitivity of 'long' verb movement to the 'richness' of the agreement morphology, which seems to be at work in the diachronic evolution of the syntax of (Adv)verb movement in English.

Pierre doesn't know where to meet her

They show that infinitival vP questions are a possible site for cliticization. This conclusion is evidently forced on us by our claim that such infinitives have no IP field at all, hence only a LLP, a conclusion which is itself forced on us by the distribution of *quoi*.

That, in addition to the TP field of finite sentences, other (unexpected) constituents can host clitics is shown by the Piedmontese examples in (19):

- (19) a. J'ò vustala jera
I have seen-her yesterday (Borgomanero, Novara)
b. ho vistara jer
I have seen-her yesterday (Trecate, Novara)
c. L'hai vist-lo jer
Him have seen-him yesterday (Moncalieri, Turin)
d. I l'hai vødula ier
I him have seen-her yesterday (Turin, city)

In (19a) and (19b) the clitic appears to the right of the participle and in (19c) and (19d) the low clitic is 'doubled' in the finite clause. Obviously here the past participial clause hosts clitics that would obligatorily surface higher up in other Romance languages like French, as in (20):

- (20) Je l'ai (*le) vu (*le) hier
I him have (him) seen (him) yesterday

Because of these Piedmontese examples, one should probably consider (20) as a case of obligatory Clitic Climbing. In any case, the participial clauses of Piedmontese are evidently not tensed TPs, which is no obstacle to their hosting clitics. Saying that in (15) to (17) the clitics surface in the infinitival vP should therefore not be a surprise.

Let us now tackle question B above. In order to do that we need to go back to Belletti's analysis of (the Italian counterpart of) (5a) *–Il a fait quoi?*– As we saw, it relies on Qu-movement to the Focus position in LLP, followed by remnant vP movement to a higher Topic/ground position in the same LLP, 'back-grounding' the content of the clause (see (6) above). Why isn't the same remnant vP movement to Top/ground allowed in embedded contexts? We believe that the ungrammaticality of (21b)-(22b) and the like –but see appendix for more on this– should be seen in the same light as that of (23b):

- (21) a. Il a dit quoi ?
(He has said what ?)
b. *Je ne sais pas il a dit quoi
(I ne know not he has said what)
(22) a. Il voit qui?
(He sees whom ?)
b. *Dis-moi il voit qui
(Tell me he sees whom)
(23) a. Qui voit-il ?
(who sees he ?)
b. *Dis-moi qui voit-il ?
(Tell me who sees he?)

We would like to claim that (Qu-) movement to Foc + remnant vP movement to TOP/Ground are the functional counterparts in the LLP of SCLI in the HLP: both sets of computations yield root questions and are excluded for the same reason in embedded contexts. Going partly away from the usual approach to the ban on SCLI and, more generally, subject verb inversion in embedded clauses, we hold that the selecting verb must assign its complement a question feature and that that assignment is incompatible with a constituent that is already typed as a question. The computations at work in the embedded clause in (23c), *and* (22b)-(23b) do produce (root) questions, whence the *. In short the LLP of infinitival ‘questions’ is truncated –i.e. missing its Topic/Ground layer– for the same reason the targets of the various computations yielding SCLI sentences are missing (or unreachable) in embedded contexts.¹⁸ Consequently verbs selecting for an infinitival vP can only select a FocusP, and *quoi* must surface on the left side of the vP. We shall say further that the resulting question interpretation of the (QU- pronoun, ghost) pairs is provided by the matrix verb tying its complement as a question.

4. On *pourquoi*.

The preceding analysis of (French) infinitival questions sheds light on one additional odd fact in their syntax. As a first step, let us go back to Qu-in situ questions in French and consider the pair (24) vs. (25):

- (24) Pourquoi il fait ça, ce type?
 (Why he does that, that bloke?)
 Why does that bloke do that?
- (25) ?(?) Il fait ça pourquoi, ce type ?
 (He does that why, that bloke?)
 Why does that bloke do that?

All French native speakers we’ve questioned find (25) worse than the perfect (24), even speakers like Jean-Yves, who seems to be particularly non-restrictive in his use of (apparent) Qu-in situ. Some reject (25) entirely. The pair (26) vs. (27) shows no such contrast in acceptability:

- (26) Dans quel but il fait ça, ce type?
 (In what goal he does that, that bloke?)

¹⁸ One might want to see the preceding along the lines of the feature inheritance mechanism proposed in Ouali (2008). Basing himself on Chomsky’s (2004, 13) idea that T inherits its features from C and that “...T enters into feature-checking only in the C-T configuration...” Ouali proposes that agreement relations can be seen as resting on three different computations “keep”, “share” and “donate”. He argues that features can remain in C (C “keeping” its feature), be “shared” by C and T (C “sharing” its feature with T) or occur only on T (C “donating” its feature to T). Suppose that the same keep/share/donate options obtain in all agreement processes. They should then also hold for the relation between a verb and its (clausal) complement. This would mean that a verb selecting for an interrogative complement can either “keep”, “share” or “donate” its [+wh] feature. On the first option a language in which both (21b) and (22b) are possible should surface. It is tempting to view the facts in the appendix below in those terms. If a language selects “share” sentences like (21b) and (22b) will be blocked since the complement already bearing a [+wh] feature no agreement will be possible. This is why SCLI and remnant vP movement to Top/Ground are blocked in embedded clauses in Standard French and English. On the other hand on the “donate” option, languages displaying SCLI or T to C in embedded questions will be generated. As is well-known, there are indeed English dialects where subject verb inversion is possible in embedded questions. (i), from Berizzi’s (2008), is a relevant example of Hiberno-English and (ii) of Belfast English (cf. Henry (XXX):

- (i) Judge Mangan asked did the accused intend to stay in Ireland and was told that he has lived here for the past two years and planned to stay here.
- (ii) I wondered where were they going

Similar examples are reported in the English spoken by English native speakers born in India.

- What does that bloke do that for?
 (27) Il fait ça dans quel but, ce type ?
 (He does that in what goal, that bloke?)
 What does that bloke do that for?

We know that *pourquoi* and its counterparts in many languages have unique ‘climbing’ properties distinguishing them from other wh-determiners and phrases. So, for example, Poletto & Pollock (2015, section 5) show that only Paduan *parcossa* can cross over topics in the left periphery, giving rise to fine examples like (28), the counterparts of which with other wh-words being excluded, as shown in (29) to (34):

- (28) Parcossa Mario zelo scampà via cussí?
 Why Mario is-he run away so?
 ‘Why has Mario run away like this?’
 (29) *Cossa Mario galo dito?
 What Mario has-he said?
 ‘What has Mario said?’
 (30) *Dove Mario zelo nda?
 Where Mario is-he gone?
 ‘Where has Mario gone?’
 (31) *Chi Mario galo visto?
 Who Mario has-he seen?
 ‘Who has Mario seen?’
 (32) *Come Mario lo galo cusinà?
 How Mario it-has-he cooked?
 ‘How did Mario cook it?’
 (33) *Quanto Mario galo pagà?
 How much Mario has-he paid?
 ‘How much has Mario paid?’
 (34) *Quando Mario zelo partío?
 When Mario.is-he gone?
 ‘When did Mario leave?’

Examples like (28) should thus be viewed as instances of Clitic left dislocation constructions. Only *parcossa* can cross over topics of this sort. This property of Paduan *parcossa* is argued by Rizzi (2001) to be shared by *perché* in modern Italian, which he shows is the only wh-item that can reach his Interrogative Phrase in the HLP, standing higher up than either Topics or Foci.

Let us try to tie (24) vs. (25) and (28) vs. (29) to (34). We can do so if we assume that *pourquoi*, *parcossa*, *perché*, etc. can only move to a very high slot of the HLP. If so, (25) can only be derived via Remnant IP movement crossing over that very high portion of the HLP, which only “lax” speakers like Jean-Yves can do as a matter of course. Granted this, we can now shed light on the fairly robust contrast between (35) and (36):

- (35) *Pierre ne sait pas pourquoi écrire à Marie
 (Pierre ne knows not why (to) write to Marie)
 Pierre doesn’t know why to write to Marie
 (36) Pierre ne sait pas dans quel but écrire à Marie
 (Pierre ne knows not in what goal (to) write to Marie)
 Pierre doesn’t know what to write to Marie for

It follows simply from the fact that *pourquoi*, unlike *dans quel but*, cannot check its question feature in the focus position of LLP of vP.¹⁹

5. On Infinitival vP Interrogatives.

The distribution of the low focus position of vP interrogatives like (8a, c) or (15) to (18) has so far been limited to interrogative contexts. It could not be merged in the left periphery of the infinitival vP embedded under a verb like *vouloir* and declarative verbs in general: such verbs do not select for interrogative subordinate clauses. When one tries to force them to do so, hopeless sentences like (37a, b) are produced:

- (37) a. *Il veut qui tu verras?
 (He wants who you will see?)
 b. *Il veut {quoi, à qui, où} {dire, parler, aller}}?
 He wants {what, to whom, where} (to) {say, speak, go}}?

On the other hand, in such sentences the vP headed by (ultimately tensed) *veut* or declarative verbs like *croire* (believe) and *décider* (decide) can host Belletti's LLP Focus. They must if an interrogative QU-pronoun is first merged in the infinitival vP. Such a configuration will yield perfectly fine questions like (38), (39) and (40).

- (38) Il veut dire quoi?
 (He wants (to) say what?)
 What does he want to say?
 (39) Il croit parler à qui?
 (He thinks (to) talk to whom?)
 Who does he think he is talking to?
 (40) Il a décidé d'aller où ?
 (He has decided to go where?)
 Where has he decided to go?

The considerably simplified derivation of (38) is sketched in (41):

- (41) [TP II [_{vP1} vouloir [_{vP2} PRO [_{vP3} dire [_{+Foc2} quoi]]]]]
 ⇒ Merge Foc and vP₁ Move *quoi* to FocP:
 (a) [TP II [_{FocP} quoi Foc [_{vP1} vouloir [_{vP2} PRO [_{vP3} dire ~~quoi~~]]]]]

¹⁹ The (35) vs. (36) minimal pair is duplicated in their English translation, which would follow from the text analysis if in English as well infinitival questions like (i) and (ii),

- (i) I don't know *how to contact him*
 (ii) She doesn't know *who to see*

were mere 'bare' vPs. The acceptability of (iii) and (iv),

- (iii) Pourquoi partir maintenant?
 (iv) Why leave now?

must mean that all such deontic infinitives are reduced variants of the finite interrogatives in (v) and (vi):

- (v) Pourquoi (devrait-on) partir maintenant?
 (vi) Why (should we) leave now?

Concerning sentences like *Now he knows why to resign!* and *Well, John has no idea why to resign* which Richie Kayne finds fairly acceptable (p.c.) the sequence *why to resign* should we believe be seen as the non-lexical variant of ...*why HE IS REQUIRED/EXPECTED to resign*. On *is to* see Kayne Kayne (2012, section 6). Of course it will be ultimately necessary to derive our stipulation that *pourquoi* can only surface in the HLP from its semantics and/or specific syntax. See section 6 for an attempt.

- ⇒ Merge Top and FocP and Remnant move vP₂ to TopP
- (b) [TP **Il** [ToP [vP₂ PRO [vP₃ ~~dire quoi~~] Top ~~veut~~ [FocP **quoi** Foc [vP₁ vouloir [vP₂ PRO [vP₃ ~~dire quoi~~]]]]]]
- (c) Move *vouloir* (preferably move remnant vP₁) to TP :
- ⇒ [TP **Il veut** [ToP [vP₂ PRO [vP₃ ~~dire quoi~~] Top [FocP **quoi** Foc [vP₁ ~~vouloir~~ [vP₂ PRO [vP₃ ~~dire quoi~~]]]]]]

Note that *quoi* at stage (a) in (41) has ‘vouloir PRO dire’ in its scope, just like *what* in better-behaved languages like English in sentences like *what does he want to say?* Assuming as above that *à qui, où* etc., unlike *quoi*, can also check their relevant feature in the HLP, the alternative derivation in (42) would yield parallel strings, under a different parse:

- (42) [TP **Il a** [Participial Phrase [décidé [_{?P} de [PRO aller [_[+foc1] où]]]]]]
- ⇒ Merge HLP and IP and Move *où*:
- [HLP où [TP **Il a** [Participiale Phrase [décidé [_{?P} de [vP PRO aller ~~où~~]]]]]]
- ⇒ Merge Top and Remnant move IP to TopP:
- ⇒ [TopP [TP **Il a** [Participial Phrase [décidé [_{?P} de [vP PRO aller ~~où~~]]]]] Top [HLP **où** [~~IP Il a~~ [Participial Phrase [~~décidé [_{?P} de [vP PRO aller [_[+foc1] où]]]]]]]]~~
- ⇒ Il a décidé d’aller où ?²⁰

The derivation in (43) is also available when *où*, like *quoi*, checks its interrogative feature in the Focus position of the LLP:

- (43) [vP décidé [_{?P} de [PRO aller [où]]]]
- ⇒ Merge Foc and participial phrase and Move *où* to FocP:
- (a) [FocP où Foc [vP décidé [_{?P} de [PRO aller ~~où~~]]]]
- ⇒ Merge Top and FocP and Remnant move ?P to TopP:
- (b) [TopP [Participial Phrase [_{?P} **de** [PRO aller ~~où~~]]] Top [FocP **où** [vP décidé [~~_{?P} de [PRO aller [_[+foc2] où]]]]]]]]~~
- ⇒ Merge auxiliary and participial phrase and Move *décidé* to participial phrase
- (c) [TopP [Participial Phrase **décidé** [_{?P} **de** [PRO aller ~~où~~]]] Top [FocP **où** [vP ~~décidé~~ [~~_{?P} de [PRO aller [_[+foc2] où]]]]]]]]~~
- ⇒ Merge Tense and move/merge *avoir* and subject to TP
- (d) [TP **il a** [Participial Phrase **décidé** [_{?P} **de** [PRO aller ~~où~~]]] Top [FocP **où** [vP ~~décidé~~ [~~_{?P} de [PRO aller [_[+foc2] où]]]]]]]]~~

6. *Pourquoi* again.

Consider the following dialogues:

- (44) Speaker:
Pierre a pris l’avion
(Pierre has taken a plane)
A. Pour aller où?
(To go where?)
B. Pour surprendre qui?

²⁰ Here again we have not shown the first movement of *où* to the focus position in the LLP. In such examples we consider ‘de’ as a case-marking preposition, not as a ‘complementizer’. On this see Garzoni & Rosso (2013). In these derivations we gloss over the exact nature of the displacement of verbs to TP or the participle phrase

(To surprise whom?)

- (45) Speaker :
Pierre a fait un beau discours
(Pierre has made a nice speech)
A. Pour prouver quoi ?
(To prove what ?)
B. Pour impressionner qui ?
(To impress whom ?)

The four answers in such dialogues should be analysed as in (46):

- (46) Input: [_{VP} PRO [_{VP}V [quoi, qui, où]]]
(a) Merge Foc and vP and attract QU-determiner to Spec Foc:
[_{FocP} {quoi, qui, où} Foc [_{VP} PRO [_{VP}V {~~quoi, qui, où~~}]]
(b) Merge Top and FocP and remnant move vP to TopP:
[_{TopP} [_{VP} PRO [_{VP}V {~~quoi, qui, où~~}] Top [_{FocP} [quoi, qui, où] [_{VP} PRO [_{VP}V {~~quoi, qui, où~~}]]
(c) Merge *pour* and TopP:
Pour {prouver quoi, impressionner qui, aller où}

Such derivations differ from those sketched above in section 3 in that they allow for, indeed require, remnant vP movement to TopP. In section 3 we stated that infinitival questions selected by verbs are truncated: they cannot have a TopicP/GroundP layer because the selecting verb needs to assign its complement a question feature, which is incompatible with the complement already being typed as a question by remnant vP movement to Top/Ground. But prepositions like *pour* do **not** select for an interrogative complement hence **cannot** assign its complement any question feature. Consequently if that complement is to be interpreted as a question the Top/GroundP layer of the LLP must be merged and the relevant remnant vP to Top/Ground must take place. Granted this, consider the perfectly fine dialogue in (47):

- (47) A. Pierre est parti à Paris
(Pierre is gone to Paris)
Pierre has gone to Paris
B. Pour quoi faire ?
(For what (to) do?)
Why (did he)?

The unexpected string *pour+quoi* in B's answer evidently recalls '*Pourquoi*' (why) and so does its interpretation. In our perspective it is the output of *quoi*'s moving to the low left periphery of our interrogative infinitival vP. It could surface as such if no remnant vP movement to Top/Ground was necessary, or indeed possible. Bearing this in mind, consider the following:

- (48) A. Pierre est parti à Paris
(Pierre is gone to Paris)
B. Pour faire quoi?
(For (to) do what?)
What (did he do that) for?
C. *Pour quoi y faire?
(For what (to) there do?)

- D. Pour y faire quoi?
 (For there (to) do what?)
 What will he do there?
- (49) A. Marie a trainé Pierre dans la chambre
 Marie has dragged Pierre into the room
 B. *Pour quoi lui faire ?
 (For what to him (to) do?)
 C. Pour lui faire quoi?
 (For to him (to) do what?)
 What (did she plan) to do to him?

Such minimal pairs show, it seems to us, that there are two verbs ‘*faire*’ in French. *Faire* can be a ‘real’ action verb denoting a process. When this is the case it may have a goal (as in (48B)), unfold in a specific place (as in (48D)) and affect an object (as in (49C)). When the infinitival question concerns such a process remnant vP movement to TopP is necessary, just as it is in (44) and (45) with verbs like *aller*, *prouver*, *dire* and *impressionner*: in all these sentences movement to Top/Ground has the effect of ‘back-grounding’ the process involved, which, in conjunction with Qu-movement to Focus, types the resulting constituent as a (partial) question. So syntax reflects the semantics of questions not only in the sense that Qu- words need to bind a variable –which gives rise to wh-movement–, but also in the sense that partial questions must “background” the rest of the clause.

French has another homophonous verb, however, which is a variant of the copula, illustrated in (50):

- (50) a. Pierre fait l’idiot
 (Pierre does the idiot)
 Pierre is being a fool
 b. Il fait mauvais aujourd’hui
 (it does bad today)
 The weather is bad today
 c. Quel idiot tu fais!
 (What idiot you do!)
 What an idiot you are!

We would like to claim that *faire* in (47B) is that copula-like verb, and that (51) holds:

- (51) The denotation of copula-like *faire* cannot be back-grounded.

This (unfortunately only descriptive) constraint will block remnant vP movement to Top in (47B), as desired. Because of the meaning of (47B) –which contrasts minimally with that of (48b) (on the ambiguity of *pourquoi* see also Shlonsky & Soares (2011)) – it is evidently tempting, perhaps mandatory, to analyse *Pourquoi* in French, *Parcosa* in Paduan, *Perché* in Italian and their counterparts in many Romance languages and dialects as having their (diachronic) source in sentences analogous to (47B). It would be tempting in particular to suggest that in a sentence like *Pourquoi Pierre a embrassé Marie?* (Why Pierre kissed Marie), and even in *Pourquoi Pierre a-t-il embrassé Marie?* (Why did Pierre kiss Marie?) there is a hidden copula-like FAIRE taking the whole HLP as its complement, thus accounting for the very high position of *pourquoi* in the HLP. If this was correct it would be wrong to say that *pourquoi* has unique

‘climbing’ capacities: it just is merged on top of the world, so to speak. It remains to be seen whether a similar approach is possible for *parcossa*, *perché* and their counterparts in other Romance languages.²¹

7. On *quoi* yet again, and some unsuspected structural consequences of its proper analysis.

We have so far just stipulated that *quoi* bears a feature to be checked only in the Focus position of the LLP, thus offering a description of the reason why (52) are fine and (53) unacceptable.

- (52) a. Tu fais quoi aujourd’hui?
(You do what today?)
What do you do today?
b. Sais-tu quoi raconter au colloque?
(Know you what (to) recount at the conference?)
Do you know what to talk about at the conference?
- (53) a. *Quoi tu fais aujourd’hui ?
b. *Quoi fais-tu aujourd’hui ?
(What do you today?)
What do you do today?

Let us now raise the deeper question of why that should be so. We wish to claim that the ungrammaticality of (53) should be seen in the same light as that of (54):

- (54) *C’est une chose quoi tu devrais faire
(It’s something what you should do)
It is something that you should do

(54) is easily described by stating that *quoi* cannot be a relative pronoun. The minimally different *à quoi*, on the other hand, can be, as shown in (55), a fine relative, and it can also sit at the left edge of questions with or without SCLI, as in (56):

- (55) C’est une chose à quoi tu devrais faire attention
(That is something to what you should pay attention)
That is something that you should pay attention to
- (56) a. A quoi tu penses?
(To what you think?)
What are you thinking of?
b. A quoi penses-tu?
(To what think you?)
What are you thinking of?
c. Dis-moi à quoi tu penses

²¹ As pointed out in Kayne & Pollock (1978), (2001, 132), *pourquoi*, unlike other Qu- elements does not ‘trigger’ stylistic inversion, a property that ought to follow from the text analysis, which should generalize to *en quel sens* (in what sense). Saying that *pourquoi* and its counterparts in other Romance languages is merged ‘high’ does not mean that it cannot move (successive cyclically) from the position where it is first merged to a higher HLP, as it does in (i), where it may be interpreted as having scope on the embedded clause:

(i) Pourquoi crois-tu que Paul est parti?
(Why believe you that Paul is gone?)
Why do you believe that Paul has gone?

(Tell me to what you think)
Tell me what you're thinking of

That correlation, taken seriously, amounts to saying that the position in the HLP to which interrogative QU- pronouns move is restricted to those that are also relative pronouns. To go beyond that stipulation we now claim that *à quoi* in (56a, c) should be seen in the same light as *à quoi* in (57):

(57) Je pense à quoi tu penses
(I think of what you think)
I think about what you think about

In this perspective, the impossibility of (53) should be correlated to that of (58), which shows that *quoi* cannot be the head of a free relative:

(58) *Je vois quoi tu vois
(I see what you see)

If this conjecture is correct it should be the case that all the QU- pronouns that can occur in the HLP in sentences like (59) should have a well-formed free relative counterpart. This appears to be true, as shown by (60):²²

(59) a. Où tu iras?
(Where you will go?)
Where will you go?
b. Quand tu partiras?
(When you will go?)
When will you go?
c. Qui tu embrasseras?
(Who you will kiss?)
Who will you kiss?
d. Combien ça coutera?
(How much it will cost?)
How much will it cost?
e. Combien t'en mangeras?
(How many you of them will eat?)
How many of them will you eat?
f. A qui tu penses?
(To whom you think ?)
Who are you thinking of?
g. Comment tu vas?
(How you go?)

²² With one notable exception, *pourquoi*, as shown by (i):

- (i) a. Pourquoi tu pars?
(Why you leave?)
Why are you leaving?
b. *Je partirai pourquoi tu pars
(I will leave why you leave)

This should be tied to the properties of *pourquoi* described in sections 4 and 6 above: *pourquoi* occurs sentence initially in (ia) because it is merged there, in a position higher up than the position to which other QU- pronouns and phrases move in (59), cf. section 6. On *lequel, lesquels* (which one(s)) etc. see next section.

How are you?

- (60) a. J'irai où tu iras
I will go where you will go
b. Je partirai quand tu partiras
I will leave when you leave
c. J'embrasserai qui tu embrasseras²³
I'll kiss who you will kiss
d. Ça coutera combien ça coutera²⁴
(It will cost how much it will cost)
e. J'en mangerai combien tu en mangeras
(I of them will eat how many you of them will eat)
f. Je pense à qui tu penses
(I think of whom you think)
I am thinking of whom you're thinking
g. Je ferai comment tu fais²⁵

²³ It must be stressed, as Richie Kayne reminds us (p.c.), that while *qui* can head a free relative, it can't occur in headed relative clauses, as shown by (i) vs. (ii). On the other hand *que* stands perfectly comfortably in headed relatives like (iii) and (iv) but cannot be the head of a free relative, as shown by (v) (= (61b) below):

- (i) *La personne qui je vois
The person who I am seeing
(ii) *Il cherche quelqu'un qui tu pourrais inviter
He is looking for someone who you could invite
(iii) La personne que je vois
The person that I am seeing
(iv) Il cherche quelqu'un que tu pourrais inviter
He is looking for someone that you could invite
(v) *Je ferai que tu fais
(I'll do what you do)

The correlation this section argues for only concerns interrogative and *free* relative QU- pronouns.

²⁴ An alternative, favored over (60d) by many, would be (i):

- (i) Ça coutera ce que ça coutera
(It will cost ce that it will cost)
It'll cost what it'll cost

Similarly an alternative to (60e) would be:

- (ii) J'en mangerai ce que tu en mangeras
(I of it will eat ce that you of it will eat)
I'll eat the same quantity of it as you will eat

We shall come back to (i) and (60d) in section 14 below.

²⁵ An alternative would be (i):

- (i) Je ferai comme tu fais
I'll do like you do

Comme, unlike *comment*, is not traditionally analyzed as a relative pronoun, any more than *like* would be in English, for good reasons:

- (ii) *Comme elle va?
(Like she goes?)
(iii) Comment elle va?
(How she goes?)
How is she?

Still *comme* has exclamative functions that English *like* doesn't have, illustrated in (iv), which it shares with *comment*:

- (iv) Comme(nt) il s'est moqué de nous !
How he made fun of us!

(I'll do how you do)

In the best of possible worlds it should also be true that, in addition to *quoi*, other QU- pronouns that cannot occur in (59) will also fail to occur in free relatives like (60). There's only one such QU-determiner, *Que*, and it fulfils that prediction:

- (61) a. **Que tu fais?*
(What you do?)
b. **Je ferai que tu fais*
(I will do what you do)

In view of these striking correlations we shall indeed conclude that in questions like (59) as well as those featuring SCLI, the sentence-initial QU- pronouns are really behaving like free relative pronouns,²⁶ and so are attracted to the HLP to check a relative feature. This raises one obvious problem: why aren't (59) and all the fine root questions without SCLI in French perceived as ungrammatical free relatives, since such structures must elsewhere be either the object or the subject of a predicate? Another, more comparative way of raising the same problem, would be to ask why English bans all interrogatives like *What you do?* *Who you saw?* etc. In order to answer that question we shall examine the behaviour of *dont* (of it) which traditional grammar classifies as a relative pronoun, plausibly so, because of sentences like (62):

- (62) a. *La question dont tu as parlé est intéressante*
The question of which you spoke is interesting
b. *Ce dont tu as parlé était intéressant*
That of which you have talked was interesting
What you talked about was interesting

Neither *dont*, nor *Ce+dont* can give rise to well-formed root questions, with or without SCLI:

- (63) a. **Ce dont tu parles?*

Interestingly, (iv) has a *ce+que* variant:

- (v) *Ce qu'il s'est moqué de nous!*

We come back to *comment* in section 14.

²⁶ To Jean-Yves's ear, *lequel*, *laquelle*, *lesquels* etc. which are traditionally analysed as relative pronouns, sit rather uncomfortably in free relative contexts like (60), as shown by the far from perfect examples in (i), (ii) and (iii):

- (i) ?**Je lirai lequel tu lis.*
(ii) ?**J'embrasserai lesquels tu embrasseras*
(iii) ?**Je pense à laquelle tu penses*

It is tempting to analyse these as *wh-phrases* with a null NP, analogous to *lequel* (*journaliste*) in appositive relatives like (iv) :

- (iv) *J'ai rencontré un journaliste l'autre jour, lequel (journaliste) m'a dit que ...*
I met a journalist the other day, which (journalist) told me that ...

If so, *lequel*, *laquelle* etc. are *Qu-phrases* in questions like (v), (vi) and (vii):

- (v) *Lequel a-t-il vu ?*
Which one did he see?
(vi) *Pour les quelles va-t-il voter ?*
(For which ones goes-t-he to vote?)
Which ones is he going to vote for?
(vii) *Pour laquelle il a perdu la tête ?*
(For what/which one he has lost his mind?)
Which one did he lose his mind over?

On the proper analysis of *Qu-phrases* in such questions, see next section.

- (That of which you talk?)
 b. *Ce dont parles-tu?
 (That of which talk you?)
 c. *Dont tu parles?
 (Of what/which you talk?)
 d. *Dont parles-tu?
 (Of what/which talk you?)

Why should that be so? As a relative pronoun, *dont* is the odd-man out: it is clearly not a ‘QU-’ entity morphologically. It is tempting to suggest this is why it can’t surface as the subject of infinitival questions like (64), unlike other genuine QU- pronouns like *quoi, qui, à quoi* etc:²⁷

- (64) a. Je ne sais pas {quoi, qui, à quoi, où...} {lire, voir, penser, aller...}
 (I ne know not {what, who, to what, which...} (to) {read, see, think, go...}
 I don’t know {what to read, who to see, what to think of, where to go}
 b. *Je ne sais pas dont parler
 (I ne know not of which/what (to) talk)
 c. *Je ne sais pas ce dont parler
 (I ne know not that of which/what (to) talk)

Let us then assume, fairly reasonably, that *dont*, unlike *quoi* and other QU- pronouns, *never* is an interrogative operator. Let us further claim that ‘strong’²⁸ interrogative words in French *must* check their interrogative feature in the LLP by adjoining to (our interpretation of) Belletti’s ‘low’ focus. *Dont* cannot therefore move through that position since it has no interrogative feature to check.²⁹ It must thus go in one swoop from its argument position in the VP to its position as relative operator in the HLP. We can now say that (62) and the like are excluded because the relative (*ce*) *dont* cannot bind an interrogative variable, as it should if the sentence was to be interpreted as a question.

We therefore conclude that all questions like (59) in French are fine because their QU- pronouns have checked their interrogative feature in the Focus position of LLP and because remnant vP movement to Top/ground has applied before the QU- pronouns moved to the HLP to check their relative feature. Putting aside infinitival questions, it now seems plausible to suggest that the ungrammaticality of **What you do? *Who you saw?* is due to the fact that Belletti’s LLP is not available in English in such cases. We know this independently of the syntax of finite Qu-questions: while Italian and French can reverse the order of dative and accusative complements in focus contexts fairly freely, English does not.

Granted all this, why is the complement of *sais-tu* in (65a) a fine embedded question? ³⁰

- (65) a. Sais-tu ce dont il parlera ?

²⁷ Où (where), despite its spelling, should be seen as a true QU- pronoun, because of sentences like *Pour aller où* (to go where), *Où tu vas?* (Where you go?) and *Je ne sais pas où aller* (I don’t know where to go).

²⁸ This qualification is meant to exclude *que* which is demonstrably a clitic. See sections 10 and 11.

²⁹ Correspondingly no Focus position could be generated in the LLP in such cases.

³⁰ As opposed to (i),

- (i) *Sais-tu dont il parlera?
 (Know you of it he will talk?)

whose ungrammaticality, as in the text, is to be seen as parallel to that of (ii):

- (ii) *Je parlerai dont tu parleras
 I’ll talk of it you’ll talk

‘bare’ *dont* cannot head a free relative, unlike *ce+dont*. We come back to *ce dont* and *ce que* below in section 12.

- (Know you that of it he will talk?)
 Do you know what he will talk about?
 b. Sais-tu l'heure (qu'il est)?
 (Know you the time (that it is)?
 Do you know the time (it is)?

Like many linguists before us,³¹ we shall say that the free relative *ce dont il parlera* is interpreted as a question for the same reason the noun phrase *l'heure* or the relative *l'heure qu'il est* are so interpreted in (65b).

Let us summarize the main result of this section. French, like many languages of the world, does not morphologically distinguish most relative and interrogative pronouns.³² What we have suggested here is that in questions like (56) and (59) the sentence initial QU- pronoun is *both* and interrogative *and* a (free) relative operator: as an interrogative operator it must check an interrogative feature in the focus position of the LLP and from that (low) position it binds an interrogative variable after remnant vP movement to Top/Ground has applied. As a free relative operator it is attracted to the HLP –when there is one– where other relative operators stand. In French and no doubt many other Romance languages and dialects, QU- pronouns are Janus-like, except for *quoi*, a ‘pure’ interrogative QU- pronoun, and *dont*, a pure relative pronoun. The question of the possible range of strategies some Romance languages adopt to deal with this fundamental ambiguity we shall come back to in section 15 and 16, though it will mainly remain open for future research. From this comparative perspective it is of some interest to note, for example, that Monnese treats some of its interrogative/relative pronouns much as French does. So its ‘Ch’-words meaning ‘what’ and ‘who’ pattern like their French counterparts: they are identical in embedded interrogatives and relatives but different in root questions, as illustrated in (66):

- (66) a. E me, ch'oi da maja?
 And I, what do I have to eat?
 b. 'L so mia col che 'l fa 'l Zuan
 It knows not that (= ce) that he does, the Z.
 Z does not know what he is doing
 b. Fa col che te o
 (Do that (= ce) that you want)
 Do what you want
 c. Chi che maja le patate? / Ch'el chi che...
 (Who that eats the potatoes?)
 Who's eating the potatoes?
 d. 'L so miga cu che laverà-zo i piacc
 (It know not who that will wash the dishes)

³¹ See among many others Munaro (1999) in the Romance domain.

³² This fact has of course not gone unnoticed in the generative literature. As Kayne (2015, section 2) notes, quoting early work by Postma, it is significant that “The *which* of English (headed) relatives is identical to the *which* of English interrogatives, the *where* of English relatives is identical to the *where* of English interrogatives, (as well as to the *where* of indefinites *somewhere, nowhere, anywhere, everywhere, elsewhere*) and similarly for other wh-words in whatever language”. He also observes that the sets of wh-words occurring in relatives and interrogatives and indefinites do not match perfectly, English *where* occurring in all three but *who* occurring only in relatives and interrogatives. Similarly, Italian *quale* (‘which’) occurs in both relatives and interrogatives, but *cui* (‘who/what’) occurs only in relatives and *chi* (‘who’) occurs only in interrogatives and free relatives. What we have attempted to show in this section is that the fact that *quoi* is only an interrogative pronoun and *dont* only a relative pronoun, contrary to the dual nature of *qui, où, quand* etc. has major syntactic consequences in the interrogative syntax of French.

- e. Cu ch' ha dit quest, l'è segn che 'l conosea miga la situasiu
(Who that has said this, it is sign that he knew not the situation)

8. On Qu-phrases.

The analysis in the preceding section is not meant to cover questions like (67) in which Qu-*phrases* have moved to the HLP,

- (67) a. Quels étudiants as-tu collés
(Which students have you failed?)
b. Pour quelle fille a-t-il perdu la tête ?
(For what girl has he lost the head?)
(What girl has he lost his mind over?)
c. Quels étudiants t'as collés
(Which students you have you failed?)
d. Pour quelle fille il a perdu la tête ?
(For what girl he has lost the head?)

nor to carry over to *lequel, laquelle, les quels, les quelles, auxquels, auxquelles* etc. in questions like (68):

- (68) a. Lequel as-tu choisi?
Which have you chosen?
b. Lesquels tu veux?
(Which ones you want?)
Which ones do you want?
c. A laquelle tu penses?
(To which one you think?)
Which one (feminine) are you thinking of?

Concerning such examples we shall simply continue to hold that Rizzi's (1991) analysis is correct: The Qu-phrases move (higher up than bare QU- pronouns) to a slot very much like his Interrogative ForceP. We also know that the same Qu-phrases can check their interrogative feature in the LLP because of infinitives like, say, *Je ne sais pas combien d'étudiants coller* (I don't know how many students to fail), *Tu vas à Paris pour rencontrer quel collègue?* (You're going to Paris to meet what colleague) etc. If so in sentences like (67) and (68) the Focus position in the vP's LLP and Rizzi's interrogative ForceP are likely to have both been activated and checked by successive cyclic Qu-movement. This presupposes that whatever interrogative feature is born by Qu-phrases it is not deleted on reaching the Focus layer of the LLP, which seems like an extremely reasonable hypothesis: question phrases and words do not cease being question phrases and words because they're focussed. If so French Qu-phrases, like French QU- pronouns also move through Adriana Belletti's LLP.

9. On interrogative *Que* and its many puzzles.

The distribution of interrogative *que* is at least as puzzling as that of *quoi* as illustrated in (3), repeated and expanded in (69):

- (69) a. *Il fait que?
(He does what?)

- b. *Qu'il fait?
(What he does?)
- c. *Sais-tu qu'il fait?
(Do you know what he does)
- d. Que fait-il?
(What does he?)
What does he do?
- e. Sais-tu ce qu'il fait?
(Do you know 'ce' {t, w}hat he does)
Do you know ce that he has done?
- f. Sais-tu que faire?
(Do you know what (to) do?)
- g. *Sais-tu ce que faire ?
(Do you know ce that (to) do?)

Que can neither surface in sentence final position as shown in (69a), unlike *quoi*, nor, like *quoi*, in the initial position of root or embedded questions like (69b, c). But, unlike *quoi*, it is fine in the initial position of root questions when and only when SCLI has taken place, as in (69d). In embedded finite questions, (69e) is grammatical unlike its *ce*-less counterpart in (69c). However in embedded infinitival questions *que* can surface at the left edge of the sentence, much like *quoi* does (see e.g. (8a, c) above),³³ but cannot be preceded by *ce*. No previous study has, to the best of our knowledge, ever accounted for all these properties, including our own work (Poletto & Pollock (2004 a, b), (2015) which left out (69e, f and g).

10. *Que* and other interrogative clitics.

Let us start with (69a, b, c). We believe that these follow fairly straightforwardly from the fact that interrogative *que* is a clitic, as claimed in Bouchard & Hirschbühler (1986), Poletto & Pollock (2004a, b), (2015), on a par with such clitic wh-words as *s'* and *ndo* in Illasi, or *ch'* and *ngo* in Monnese, exemplified in (70) and (71):

- (70) a. s'a-lo fat che? Illasi (Verrona)
(What has-he done what?)
What has he done?
- b. Ndo e-lo ndat endoe?
(Where is he gone where?)
Where has he gone?

- (71) 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?)

Like these clitic wh-words and pronominal clitics, interrogative *que* in French cannot be used in isolation, be the object of a preposition, be coordinated or modified and, like all clitics, it cannot be focussed:

- (72) a. *C'est que, ça?
(It is what, that?)

³³ Such sentences are invariably described as stylistically more literary than their *quoi* counterparts.

- What is that?
 b. C'est quoi, ça?
 (It is what, that?)
 What is that?
 c. *C'est le, là-bas?
 (It is him, there?)
 Is that him, over there?
 d. C'est lui, là-bas?
 (It is him, there?)
 Is that him, over there?

Let us take Belletti's characterisation of the LLP seriously, in particular her claim that those interrogative pronouns that adjoin to it are focussed elements. Since interrogative *que* is a clitic, it will of necessity fail to be attracted to that position.

This is enough to give us an account of (69a, b and c): since *que* cannot check its interrogative feature in the LLP, (69a) –**Il fait que?*– will never be generated via movement to the focus layer of LLP, followed by subsequent Remnant VP movement to Top,³⁴ unlike its *quoi* counterpart in, e.g. *Il fait quoi?* As for (69b) –**Que tu fais?*– and (69c) –**Sais-tu qu'il fait?*– they will both be excluded since interrogative *que* is standing in a non clitic position (cf. *Il le voit* vs. **Le il voit*). But what if *que* in (69b) is a relative pronoun, as in e.g. *Le temps qu'il fait* (The weather it makes = The weather that there is)? Whatever relative *que*'s morphological properties are, (69b) will be excluded: as a relative pronoun it cannot check any interrogative feature so (69b) won't be interpretable as a question though, of course, the same string is a perfectly fine relative clause elsewhere.

11. On *Que*, clitics and Smuggling.

The preceding section probably struck the reader as puzzling because of the fine examples in (69c and d) repeated below in (73):

- (73) a. Que lui dit-il?
 (What to him says he?)
 What is he saying to him?
 b. Je ne sais que lui dire
 (I ne know what to him (to) say)
 I don't know what to say to him

Let us start with (73b). It is evidently tempting to see it as parallel to (74):

- (74) Je ne sais pas quoi lui dire
 (I ne know not what to him (to) say)
 I don't know what to say to him

That would be a mistake: while *quoi* is a full form which can be focussed, *que* cannot be, as shown by (72a) vs. (72b): *que*'s preverbal position in (73b) cannot be due to movement to (the focus layer of) the

³⁴ Even under a Chinese-like analysis of French Qu-in situ questions like Cheng and Rooryck's (2000), *que* couldn't surface in that post-verbal position since it would have failed to move to the clitic field, incorrectly: **Je vois le* vs. *Je le vois*. The argument in favor of remnant IP movement based on (3a, b) (= (69a, b)) is thus weakened when *que* is analyzed as a clitic.

LLP. But interrogative *que* is a clitic and must therefore move to the clitic field, just as other clitics like *lui* and *en* do in such examples as (75):

- (75) a. Pierre ne sait pas quoi lui envoyer
 (Pierre ne knows not what to him (to) send)
 Pierre doesn't know what to send to him
 b. Marie ne sait pas à qui en parler
 (Marie ne knows not to whom of it (to) talk)
 Marie doesn't know to whom to talk about it

In (73b) *que* must therefore be standing in the clitic field, preceding the infinitive. But interrogative *Que* is both a clitic and an interrogative operator.³⁵ As such it should bind an appropriate variable. Its 'trace' (i.e. its 'ghost') in post-verbal position *is* that interrogative variable since the predicate in the root clause types the subordinate as a question. It is important to observe that when the latter condition is not met, as in infinitival questions embedded under a preposition (see section 6 above), the counterpart to (73b) is ill-formed, as shown in (76B):

- (76) A. Pierre a pris rendez-vous avec Anne
 Pierre has an appointment with Anne
 B. *Pour que lui dire ?³⁶
 (To what to her say)
 What does he want to discuss with her?

Similarly all other non clitic QU- pronouns sitting at the left edge of such infinitival subordinate sentences are equally ill-formed, as illustrated with *qui* in (77B), which contrasts minimally with (78B).

- (77) A. Pierre a pris rendez-vous avec Anne
 Pierre has an appointment with Anne
 B. *Pour qui lui présenter ?

³⁵ Although clitics are typically considered to sit in A positions, we know that operators like negation can be clitics, which means that there is no contradiction between the fact that *que* is a clitic *and* binds a variable in argument position.

³⁶ This implies that well-formed questions like (i) and (ii),

- (i) Que faire?
 (What to do?)
 (ii) Qui voir?
 (Who to see?)
 (iii) Quoi faire
 (What to do ?)

be analysed as JE ME DEMANDE/DIS-MOI {que faire, qui voir, quoi faire}. It may be worth pointing out that other root infinitival questions should be seen as being the complement of a null *pour*, as in (iv):

- (iv) A. Pierre est parti à Paris
 (Pierre's gone to Paris)
 B. POUR {faire quoi, voir qui ?}
 (FOR {to do what, to see whom?})

Non lexical POUR is only recoverable if the preceding sentence contains a displacement verb like *partir* which may be construed as having an implicit goal. A predicate like *faire un discours* (make a speech) doesn't, hence (v):

- (v) A. Pierre a fait un beau discours
 (Pierre made a nice speech)
 B. *(Pour) impressionner qui?
 *(For) to impress whom?

- (To whom to her introduce)
Who does he want to introduce her to?
- (78) A. Pierre a pris rendez-vous avec Anne
B. Pour lui présenter qui ?
C. *Pour lui dire que ?
(To tell her what ?)

This is because in (78B) remnant vP movement to Top/GroundP has typed the sentence as a question, thus allowing for the pair (*qui*, (ghost of) ~~*qui*~~) to be interpreted as an (interrogative operator, variable) pair. As for (78C), we know it is ungrammatical because clitic *que* cannot move to the LLP focus position.

Let us briefly go back to (71b) and raise the further question of whether *que* in such structures also moved to the “relative field”, where relative pronouns move in relative constructions and where other QU-pronouns move in SCLI sentences? In view of the severe ungrammaticality of (79),

- (79) *Le livre que lire
(The book which/that to read)

this seems extremely unlikely, just as the ungrammaticality of (64b, c) – **Je ne sais pas (ce) dont parler* – already suggested. We conclude that in such (embedded) infinitival questions, all the QU-words, including *que* despite its being a clitic, are ‘pure’ interrogative operators, as we conjectured above in section 2, because no HLP is activated in such sentences. This will also account for the ungrammaticality of (69g) if, as we claim below, *ce+que* is always a free relative pronoun.

We can now move on to (73a), a clear case of SCLI. The analysis of that process –and of the closely related ‘Complex Inversion’ of French– we suggested in Poletto & Pollock (2004a, b), Pollock (2006), Poletto & Pollock (2015) will remain essentially unchanged. We showed in these works that SCLI involves potentially many instances of remnant IP movement to the HLP –see for instance the derivations sketched in example (56) of Poletto & Pollock (2015) –. In these sentences interrogative *que* qua clitic obligatorily moves to the clitic field along with whatever pronominal clitics may be present, past the finite verb, just as it does in infinitives. Like all the other clitics, it is ‘stuck’ there. The (remnant) vP, including the whole clitic field,³⁷ then moves to the HLP crossing over the previously extracted subject clitic. Simplifying drastically, the derivation of (73a) can thus be represented as in (80):

- (80) Input : [_{vP} il dit que lui]
(a) cliticisation:
[_{vP} Il que lui dit ~~que lui~~]
(b) Subject extraction to TP:
[_{TP} il [_{vP} ~~il~~ que lui dit ~~que lui~~]]
(c) Remnant vP movement to HLP:

³⁷ As well as the subject in French ‘Complex Inversion’ –‘CI’– cases like *Pierre partira-t-il?* (Pierre will-go he) = Will Pierre go? – On the reason why CI does not exist in the NIDs see Poletto & Pollock (2015), section 5. The reader is referred back to work by Kayne and to our own past work for arguments that clitics in general and *que* in particular are not prefixes on the verb, which implies that what moves in SCLI is a phrase, either the remnant IP or the remnant vP. We choose the latter option somewhat arbitrarily for the sake of simplicity in the derivations below. On the syntactic role of the so-called ‘epenthetic’ ‘-t-’ of examples like (i)

- (i) Pierre va-t-il partir
(Pierre goes-t- he to go?)
Will Pierre go?

See Kayne & Pollock (2013, 2014) and note 39 below.

[HLP [_{VP} ~~il que lui dit que~~] [_{TP} ~~il~~ [_{VP} ~~il que fait que lui~~]]]

This, then, derives the **string** *Que lui dit-il?* Should this be the final step of the derivation? If it were *que* in such finite questions would be a ‘pure’ interrogative pronoun, just as we argued it is in infinitives like (73b). We don’t believe so, if only because a parallel derivation in embedded question –where no SCLI can take place– would derive the gibberish in (81):

- (81) *Je ne sais il que lui dire
(I ne knows he what to him say)

What we want to argue instead, as in our past work, is that because of the leg-up *que* gets in (80b) by being ‘dragged along’ to the HLP, it can now escape from the clitic field in which it is trapped by ‘hopping’ from its position in (80c) to the adjacent position to which other non clitic interrogative QU-pronouns like those in (82) move:

- (82) a. A qui a-t-il parlé?
(To whom has he spoken?)
b. Qui Pierre a-t-il vu ?
(Whom Pierre has he seen?)
Who did John see?
c. Où Jean et Marie passent-ils leur vacances?
(Where Jean and Marie spend they their holiday?)
Where do Jean and Marie spend their holiday?

On the analysis suggested above –though not in our previous work– that position is that of relative pronouns. That *que* is a relative pronouns in (81),

- (83) L’homme que j’ai vu
The man that I have seen

is almost beyond doubt.³⁸ If we are correct *que* in (80), like the non clitic QU- pronouns in (82), binds a low interrogative feature in the VP **and** checks a relative feature in the HLP. But it can only do so because it is ‘smuggled’ to the force layer of the HLP and thus comes to occupy a position adjacent to its ultimate target in the relative field above. The complete, though simplified, derivation of such examples should thus be as in (84).³⁹

- (84) Input : [_{VP} il dit que lui]

³⁸ Though Obenauer (1976) claimed that it was a mere complementiser. The distinction between relative pronouns and complementisers vanishes if, as Kayne (2014) argues forcefully ‘complementisers’ like French *que* and English *that* **are** relative pronouns.

³⁹ The very same derivation will yield well-formed questions like (i),

- (i) Que lui dit Jean?
(What to him says John?)
What is John telling him?

if the nominative clitic *il* is replaced by *Jean*. Such sentences as (i) are normally described as cases of “stylistic inversion”. If we are right in this footnote, standard stylistic inversion sentences like (ii), as analyzed in Kayne & Pollock (2001), should be rethought, at least in part, and should also take into account complex inversion (arising when the subject NP is not displaced), and real SCLI, requiring subject displacement and Case licensing –via ‘-t-’– in a way that non pronominal subjects ban. See footnote 42.

- (ii) La femme à qui a parlé Jean
(The woman to whom has spoken Jean)
The woman John spoke to

- (a) cliticisation:
[_{VP} Il que lui dit ~~que lui~~]
- (b) Subject extraction to TP:
[_{TP} Il [_{VP} ~~il~~ que lui dit ~~que lui~~]]
- (c) Remnant vP movement to the force layer of the HLP:
[_{HLP} [_{VP} ~~il~~ que lui dit ~~que lui~~] [_{TP} il [_{VP} ~~il~~ ~~que lui~~ ~~dit~~ ~~que lui~~]]]
- (d) ‘Hop’ clitic *que* to relative field in HLP
[_{HLP} [_{RelIP} **que** Rel [_{VP} ~~il~~ **que** **lui** **dit** ~~que~~] [_{TP} **il** [_{VP} ~~il~~ ~~que~~ ~~lui~~ ~~fait~~ ~~que~~ ~~lui~~]]]]]

This analysis thus says that *que* questions will be excluded in all the structures in which *que* cannot be ‘smuggled’ to the HLP, i.e., whenever the computations yielding SCLI inversion cannot apply. In addition to (69a, b, c) this accounts for the minimal pair in (85): While non clitic *qui* can move to the relative field in the HLP on its own steam,⁴⁰ clitic *que* cannot and (85a) is therefore excluded because SCLI is unavailable in cases of subject extraction.⁴¹

- (85) a. *Que t’a surpris?
(What you has surprised?)
What surprised you?
- b. Qui t’a surpris?
(Who you has surprised?)
Who surprised you?

As in our previous work –see Poletto & Pollock (2004a), (2015)– we claim that the intervening subject NP, also dragged along by remnant vP movement in “Complex Inversion” (CI) examples like (82b, c)⁴², ‘blocks’ the movement of clitic *que* to the relative field in the HLP, whence the degraded status of (86), to be compared with the perfect (82b, c):

- (86) a. ?*Que Pierre a-t-il vu?
(What Pierre has he seen?)
What has Peter seen?
- b. *Que Pierre et Marie mangent-ils?
(What Pierre and Marie eat they?)
What are Pierre and Marie eating?

As noted, though not explained, in Poletto & Pollock (2004a, 261) CI of that type becomes fairly acceptable in aggressively non D-linked questions like (87), first suggested to us by R. Kayne (p.c.):

- (87) (?) Que diable Pierre allait-il donc faire dans cette galère ?!
(What the hell Pierre was he thus doing on that galley?)

⁴⁰ From the focus position in the LLP, a position that clitic *que* cannot move to, for the reasons stated above.

⁴¹ We come back to *est-ce que* questions like (i) in sections 13 and 14.

- (i) Qu’est-ce qui t’as surpris?
(What is it that surprised you?)

⁴² Under the analysis adopted here this would result from subject NPs other than subject clitics in French not having to move to IP in derivations similar to (84), which might be linked to different case requirements on subject pronouns and subject NPs. This should in turn be tied with minimal pairs like (i) vs. (ii), which show that so-called epenthetic “-t-” is required with the former and excluded with the latter:

- (i) A qui parlera*(-t-) il?
- (ii) A qui parlera (*-t-) Yves

See Kayne & Pollock’s (2013) analysis of “-t-” as a case assigner. See also footnote 56 below.

What the hell was Pierre up to in that mess?

We are now tempted to believe that the improvement is due to the fact that *que* is here partially (re)interpreted as the “exclamative” *que* of sentences like (88) and (89):

- (88) Que Pierre est-il donc bête !
(That Pierre is he thus stupid!)
How stupid can Pierre be!
- (89) Que vous êtes joli, que vous me semblez beau!⁴³
(That you are pretty, that you to me seem beautiful!)
How pretty you are, how beautiful you appear to me!

As observed earlier, sentences of this sort can also take the following shape:

- (90) Ce que Pierre est bête!
(Ce what Pierre is a fool!)
How foolish Pierre is!
- (91) {Comme, combien} Pierre est bête !
How Pierre is foolish!
How foolish Pierre is!

Let us take our clue from (90), the initial sequence of which is otherwise that of free relatives, despite its exclamative, evaluative interpretation. On that basis it is plausible to argue that *que* in exclamative-evaluative (88)-(89) must be relative *que* too. Since the aggressively non D-linked question in (87) also has an exclamative component, it seems plausible to view *que* in such sentences as playing both its ‘ordinary’ interrogative-relative role **and** its exclamative one. In the latter function it is insensitive to the presence of intervening subject NPs in the HLP, as shown by (88), (89) and (90), whence the improved acceptability of (87) and the like.

12. On *Ce que* and *Ce dont*.

The reader has no doubt wondered how French can express the perfectly ordinary English question *What surprised you?* Example (92) is the answer:

- (92) Qu’est-ce qui t’a surpris?
(What is it that has you surprised?)
What is it that surprised you?

This section aims at providing the elementary ground-work for the proper characterisation of such questions in French,⁴⁴ in an effort to relate it to other constructions displaying the same ubiquitous *ce+que* sequences.

Let us return to the question of free relatives in French and take another look at minimal pairs like the following:

- (93) Je lirai le livre que tu as acheté
(I’ll read the book which you bought)

⁴³ This is a line from La Fontaine’s “Le corbeau et le renard”, a ‘fable’ all French children learn in primary school. Because of that, the fact that (89) could also surface as in (i) would probably fail to come to the mind of many Francophones.

(i) Ce que vous êtes joli, ce que vous me semblez beau!

⁴⁴ First tackled in a comparative perspective in Munaro & Pollock (2006).

- (94) *Je lirai que tu as acheté
(I'll read which you bought)
- (95) Je lirai ce que tu as acheté
(I'll read that which you bought)
- (96) J'ai trouvé intéressante l'histoire dont tu parlais
(I enjoyed the story of which you talked)
- (97) *J'ai trouvé intéressant dont tu parlais
(I enjoyed of which you talked)
- (98) J'ai trouvé intéressant ce dont tu parlais
(I enjoyed that of which you talked)

Let us adopt Vergnaud's (1974) raising analysis of relatives.⁴⁵ We can now say that (94) and (97) are excluded because these relatives have no antecedent and because neither *dont* nor *que*, unlike *qui*, *où*, *combien* etc. can in and of themselves be the heads of free relatives (cf. (60) above). If so 'ce' in (95) and (98) plays the part of *le livre* in (93)-(96). Simplifying considerably⁴⁶ this amounts to treating *ce+que* and *ce+dont* as complex relative determiners, as Kayne (2011) did, excluding (other) (lexical) antecedents (whence e.g. **Je lirai le livre ce que tu as acheté*, **J'apprécie l'histoire ce dont tu parles*).

13. On *Qu'est-ce que/qui* questions.

Although the preceding is considerably simplified,⁴⁷ it will be enough to provide an account of questions like (92), (99) and (100):

- (99) Qu'est-ce que tu fais?
What is it that you're doing?
- (100) Qu'est-ce qui te surprend ?
What is it that surprised you?

If we are right, one should disregard the spelling in such questions that misleadingly treats *ce* as analogous to clitic subjects like *il* and *tu* in (101):

- (101) a. Viens-tu ?

⁴⁵ See also Vergnaud (1985), Kayne (1994, chap. 9), Bianchi (1999) and Kato and Nunes (2009).

⁴⁶ On demonstrative *ce*, which should clearly be viewed in the same light as *ce* in *ce+que* and *ce+dont*, see Kayne (2014, section 7).

⁴⁷ Because a proper analysis should also cover the 'ce' of (i) to (v), and also probably that of (vi), on which see Pollock (1973) and Kayne & Pollock (2009):

- (i) Je veux que tu partes
(I want that you go) = I want you to go
- (ii) *Je tiens à que tu partes
(I insist on that you go)
- (iii) Je tiens à ce que tu partes
(I insist on ce that you go) = I insist on your going
- (iv) Je vois à quoi tu fais allusion
(I see to what you allude)
- (v) Je vois ce à quoi tu fais allusion
(I see that to which you allude) = I see what you're alluding to
- (vi) Pierre, c'est un idiot
(Pierre, that is a fool) = Pierre, he is a fool

Such a task far exceeds what could be accomplished here. On all this see Kayne & Pollock (2009) and especially Kayne (2011).

- (Come you?)
 Are you coming?
 b. Parle-t-il ?
 (Speaks (-t-) il?)
 Is he speaking?

What we maintain instead is that *ce* is syntactically tied to *que/qui*, in other words that *ce qui te surprend* and *ce que tu fais* are free relatives in (99)-(100) and that the sentence initial sequence ‘*Que+est*’ is a question about the identity of the entity denoted by the free relative. Before proceeding let us first comment on *qui* following *ce* in (100), which might be something of a puzzle for non-Francophones. Consider the following pairs:

- (102) a. Qui tombe sans arrêt finira par se casser le cou
 He who constantly falls will end up breaking his neck
 b. *Qui tombe sans arrêt finira par se briser
 He who constantly falls will eventually shatter
 (103) a. *Ce qui tombe sans arrêt finira par se casser le cou
 That which constantly falls will end up breaking his neck
 b. Ce qui tombe sans arrêt finira par se briser
 That which constantly falls will eventually shatter

“*Se casser le cou*” (break one’s neck) can only be predicated of a human being, while “*se briser*” (shatter) selects an inanimate (breakable) subject. The free relative subject in (102a) headed by *qui* does denote a human being and can therefore be the subject of “*se casser le cou*”. For the same reason it cannot be the subject of “*se briser*” in (102b). The free relative “*ce qui tombe sans arrêt*” in (103), on the contrary, denotes an inanimate entity, whence the unacceptability of (103a) and the acceptability of (103b). In short, the *qui* of *ce+qui* in (100) is really *que*, as in (95) –*Je lirai ce que tu as acheté*. It is thus tempting, perhaps mandatory, to see it in the same light as the *qui* appearing in subordinate clauses in subject extraction cases like (104):

- (104) a. L’homme que je crois qui (*que) viendra
 The man who I think who (*that) will come
 b. Que crois-tu qui (*que) se passera?
 What do you think who (*that) will come?

Among the many past analyses of that phenomenon we are not aware of any that explicitly carries over to *ce+que* vs. *ce+qui*. We shall assume, however, that a proper generalisation can be found⁴⁸ and now proceed to analyse (99) and (100), repeated below:

- (105) Qu’est-ce que tu fais?
 What is it that you’re doing?
 (106) Qu’est-ce qui te surprend ?
 What is it that surprised you?

We believe that their (considerably simplified) input structures at the relevant point are (107) and (108):

- (107) [TP [VP [HLP ce que [IP tu fais ~~ce que~~] [VP est que]]]
 (108) [TP [VP [HLP ce qui [IP ~~ce qui~~ te surprend]] [VP est que]]]

⁴⁸ See Kayne (2011).

The rest of their derivation proceeds exactly as in example (84), namely:⁴⁹

- (109) Cliticisation of interrogative *que*:
- (a) [TP [vP [HLP *ce que*_i [IP *tu fais t*_i]] [vP *que*_j *est t*_j]]
 Subject extraction to TP:
 (b) [TP [HLP *ce que*_i [IP *tu fais t*_i]]_k [vP *t*_k [vP *que est t*_j]]
 Remnant vP movement to the force layer of the HLP:
 (c) [HLP [vP *t*_k [vP *que est t*_j]]_i [TP [HLP *ce que*_i [IP *tu fais t*_i]]_k *t*_i]
 ‘Hop’ relative-interrogative *que* to relative field in HLP:
 (d) [HLP [RelP **que**_m [HLP [vP *t*_k [vP *t*_m **est t**_j]]_i *t*_i [TP [HLP **ce que**_i [IP **tu fais t**_i]]_k *t*_i]]
- (110) Cliticisation of interrogative *que*:
- (a) [TP [vP [HLP *ce qui*_i [IP *t*_i *te surprend*]]] [vP *que*_j *est t*_j]]
 Subject extraction to TP:
 (b) [TP [HLP *ce qui*_i [IP *t*_i *te surprend*]]_k [vP *t*_k [vP *que est t*_j]]
 Remnant vP movement to the force layer of the HLP:
 (c) [HLP [vP *t*_k [vP *que est t*_j]]_i [TP [HLP *ce qui*_i [IP *t*_i *te surprend*]]_k *t*_i]
 ‘Hop’ relative-interrogative *que* to relative field in HLP:
 (d) [HLP [RelP **que**_m [HLP [vP *t*_k [vP *t*_m **est t**_j]]_i *t*_i [TP [HLP **ce qui**_i [IP *t*_i **te surprend**]]_k *t*_i]]

As pointed out above in these structures the sequence that comes out as *est-ce* in spelling is misleading: it is not a consequence of the activation of the force layer of the HLP, contrary to *est-il* in, say, (*Pierre*) *parle-t-il?* Here *ce* is part of the free relative subjects *ce+que tu fais* and *ce+qui te surprend*. The sharp contrast in acceptability of pairs like (111) vs. (112),

- (111) a. Je ne sais pas qu’est-ce qui te surprend là-dedans
 (I don’t know what is it that surprises you therein)
 I don’t know what surprises you about that
 b. Tu ne sais pas qu’est-ce qu’il veut ?
 (You don’t know what is it that he wants)
 Don’t you know what he wants?
 c. J’ignore qu’est-ce qui peut se passer
 (I am not aware of what is it that could happen)
 I am not aware of what could happen
- (112) a. *Je ne sais pas à quoi a-t-il fait allusion?
 (I don’t know to what has he alluded?)
 b. *Tu ne sais pas qui épousera-t-il ?
 (You don’t know who will he marry?)
 c. *On ignore pour qui votera-t-il ?
 (One isn’t aware of who will he vote for)

supports that analysis: ‘real’ subject verb inversion like those in (112) are sharply rejected because embedded questions ban it. (111), on the other hand, are only deemed less ‘elegant’, more ‘colloquial’ than (113), in which the embedded questions are in fact free relatives:

⁴⁹ The input structures already include the movement of *ce que* and *ce qui* in the relative clauses in subject position. For the sake of readability we return to indexed ‘traces’ to represent the ‘ghosts’ of the moved constituents.

- (113) a. Je ne sais pas ce qui te surprend là-dedans
 (I don't know what surprises you there)
 b. Je ne sais pas ce qu'il veut
 (I don't know what he wants)
 c. J'ignore ce qui peut se passer
 (I am not aware of what could happen)

14. More on *Qu'est-ce que* questions.

The analysis developed in the previous section cannot, as it stands, account for the full range of *Est-ce que* questions in French. This is easy to see: there is no way one could derive (114), for example,

- (114) A qui est-ce que tu as parlé?
 (To whom is it that you have spoken?)
 Who did you speak to?

from a question like “A qui est” and a free relative “ce que tu as parlé”, which is not even well-formed. So although the preceding section sheds revealing light on questions like *Qu'est-ce que tu fais? Qu'est qui te surprend?* it will have to be supplemented by further analysis, perhaps along the lines of Munaro and Pollock (2005). This is far beyond the scope of the present article. Keeping to the confines of the previous section, let us try to see whether it can extend to some other *Est-ce que* questions. Let us go back to examples (60d, g) above, and consider examples (115a, b and c). The derivation of (115a) is uneventful and entirely parallel to those discussed in the previous section, as shown in 116):

- (115) a. Qu'est-ce que ça coute ?
 (What is it that it costs?)
 How much does it cost?
 b. Combien est-ce que ça coute?
 (How much is it that it costs?)
 How much does it cost?
 c. Comment est-ce que tu as fait?
 (How is it that you have done?)
 How did you do it?

- (116) Input : [TP [vP [HLP ce que_i [IP ça coute t_i]] [vP est que_j]]
 Cliticisation of interrogative *que*:
 (a) [TP [vP [HLP ce que_i [IP ça coute t_i]] [vP que_j est t_j]]
 Subject extraction to TP:
 (b) [TP [HLP ce que_i [IP ça coute t_i]]_k [vP t_k [vP que est t_j]]]
 Remnant move vP to HLP:
 (c) [HLP [vP t_k [vP que est t_j]]_l [TP [HLP ce que_i [IP ça coute t_i]]_k t_l]
 ‘Hop’ relative-interrogative *que* to relative field in HLP:
 (d) [HLP [R_{elIP} **que**_m [HLP [vP t_k [vP t_m **est** t_j]]_l t_l [TP [HLP **ce que**_i [IP **ça coute** t_i]]_k t_l]]

A parallel derivation for (115b) and (115c) would substitute *combien* and *comment* to *que* in the input, but, if what we said above is correct, this would lead to an impossible structure since at no stage in the derivation would *combien* and *comment* check a question feature in the focus position of the LLP, which, not being a clitic, they have to move through. As a consequence *Combien est-ce que ça coute* and *comment est-ce que tu as fait* under a derivation like (116b) should be free relatives, which they clearly are

not. The only viable derivations for (115b, c) would start off with a small clause like (117a, b), the vP-like entity ‘selected’ by the copula at a later stage

- (117) a. Input : [_{VP} [_{HLP} ce que_i [_{IP} ça coute t_i]] combien]
 b. Input : [_{VP} [_{HLP} ce que_i [_{IP} tu as fait t_i]] comment]

Granted this, the two derivations would then proceed as follows:

- (118) Merge Focus and vP and move *combien* to Spec Foc:
 (a) [_{LLP} combien_j Foc [_{VP} [_{HLP} ce que_i [_{TP} ça coute t_i]] t_j]
 Merge Top and vP and move remnant vP to Spec Top:
 (b) [_{LLP} [_{VP} [_{HLP} ce que_i [_{IP} ça coute t_i]] t_j]_k Top [_{LLP} combien_i Foc] t_k]
 Merge est and vP and move *combien* to the relative layer of the HLP:
 (c) [_{HLP} [_{RelIP} **combien**_j Rel [_{LLP} [_{TP} **est** [_{VP} [_{LLP} [_{HLP} **ce que**_i [_{IP} **ça coute** t_i]] t_j]_k Top [_{LLP} t_j Foc [_{VP} t_k t_i]]]]]]]

Merge Focus and vP and move *comment* to Spec Foc:

- (d) [_{LLP} comment_j Foc [_{VP} [_{HLP} ce que_i [_{TP} tu as fait t_i]] t_j]
 Merge Top and vP and move remnant vP to Spec Top:
 (e) [_{LLP} [_{VP} [_{HLP} ce que_i [_{TP} tu as fait t_i]] t_j]_k Top [_{LLP} comment_i Foc] t_k]
 Merge est and vP and move *comment* to the relative layer of the HLP:
 (f) [_{HLP} [_{RelIP} **comment**_j Rel [_{LLP} [_{TP} **est** [_{VP} [_{LLP} [_{HLP} **ce que**_i [_{TP} **tu as fait** t_i]] t_j]_k Top [_{LLP} t_j Foc [_{VP} t_k t_i]]]]]]]

As in the simpler *Qu'est-ce qui te surprend? Qu'est-ce que t'as fait? Qu'est-ce que ça coute?* the *est+ce* string in the last lines of (118 a, b) is **not** produced by the computations yielding, say, *Où va-t-il?* (Where goes he?). The acceptability of the colloquial *Je ne sais pas combien est-ce que ça coute, je ne sais pas comment est-ce que tu as fait* confirms this.

Let us finally compare the following embedded questions.

- (119) a. Je ne sais pas ce que c'est
 (I ne know not ce that it is)
 I don't know what it is
 b. Je ne sais pas qu'est-ce que c'est?
 (I ne know not what is ce that it is)
 I don't know what it is
 c. Je ne sais pas comment il fait
 (I ne know not how he does)
 I don't know how he does it
 d. J'sais pas c'est quoi
 (I know not it is what)
 I don't know what it is
 e. J'sais pas i'fait comment⁵⁰

⁵⁰ Jean-Yves's younger grand-son spontaneously produced that sentence in his presence when he was 6. Jean-Yves hasn't heard *J'sais pas ça coute combien*, so we haven't included the sentence in (119), although we suspect it is probably produced constantly on primary school playgrounds, for the same reason (119d, e) are. His slightly older grand-daughter did recently say *Je sais pas encore j'aurai combien* (I don't know yet I will get how much = I don't know yet what grade I'll get). For more on this see the appendix.

(I know not he does how)
I don't know how he does it

We have already discussed (119a, b, c). (119a) is a free relative, where *ce que* is only a relative pronoun. In the colloquial (119b) clitic *que* is an interrogative clitic *and* a relative, having been given a leg-up to the relative field of the HLP at the final step of the derivation just as in *Qu'est-ce que c'est?* (What is it that it is?). *Comment* in (119c) is both an interrogative pronoun and a (free) relative pronoun: it has moved to the LLP to check its interrogative feature and to the relative layer of the HLP.

What about (119d, e)? Such sentences, which we come back to more fully in the appendix, are more frequent than the standard (119a, b, c) in the spontaneous speech of children of primary school age in France. For speakers of Jean-Yves's generation they sound horrendously bad. Yet from the view point of this study such constructions essentially extend to finite embedded interrogatives the syntactic pattern at work in infinitival questions studied in sections 3 and 5: in these structures the HLP is *not* activated, the QU- pronouns need only be analysed as interrogative determiners. It is easy to see how (119d, e) are derived: they do involve movement to the LLP, *Quoi* and *comment* to the Focus position *and* remnant vP movement to Top, which is banned in standard French in such cases, though required in infinitival questions selected by prepositions. For these (young) speakers the matrix verb does *not* select the HLP and its relative layer (see appendix). One might conjecture that speakers making use of these structures are trying to get rid of the HLP that requires French QU- pronouns to be Janus-like, entities that are both interrogative and relative pronouns.⁵¹

15. High vs. Low left peripheries and the Northern Italian dialects.

Granted what we say of French Qu-questions in what precedes, the problem arises whether our past analysis of Northern Italian dialects like Bellunese, Illasi and Monese might not be profitably modified by taking into account the existence of the LLP unquestionably at work in both French and Italian.

Let us first repeat the basic facts showing that none of these dialects should be seen in the light of Chinese-like interrogative syntax, choosing Bellunese as representative of all of them. Its 'Ch'-words sitting at the right edge of the sentence do not occur in their argument position but sentence finally and the arguments found to their right must be right dislocated, contrary to what obtains in affirmative sentences:

- (120) a. Al ghe ha dat al libro a so fradel
(He to him has given the book to his brother)
He gave the book to his brother
b. *Ghe halo dat che a so fradel?
(To him has he given what to his brother)
What did he give to his brother?
c. Ghe halo dat che, a so fradel?

⁵¹ What we are saying here amounts to claiming that although all QU- pronouns except *quoi* are lexically marked as both [+interrogative] and [+relative], the latter feature remains 'dormant' unless the relative layer of the HLP is activated. It is therefore 'dormant' in substandard questions like (119, d, e) and also in the perfectly ordinary vP infinitival questions described above in sections 3, 5 and 6. Conversely, the interrogative feature of QU- pronouns remains 'dormant' in ordinary relative clauses and free relatives because the LLP is not activated in such structures. We must leave open for future research the question of whether there could be 'real' (headed) relative clauses in which the question feature of the relative QU- pronouns is activated and whether there are contexts in which both features remain 'dormant', so-called "echo" questions being plausible candidates.

to him has he given what, to this brother

Munaro (1999) argued further that those Ch-words in sentence final position obey strong and weak island restrictions, a cogent argument for movement, as illustrated in (121) and (122),:

- (121) a. *Te ha-li dit che i clienti de chi no i-ha pagà?
(To you have they told that the customers of whom not they have paid?)
Who have they told you the customers of haven't paid?
b. *Ho-e da telefonarte prima de 'ndar andé?
(Have I to phone you before of going where)
Where have I to phone you before going?
- (122) ??Te despiàse-lo de aver desmentegà ché?
(To you displeases-it to have forgotten what?)
What are you sorry you have forgotten?

That such constructions do involve some movement is thus beyond reasonable doubt, but they do not tell us whether the Ch-words move to the LLP or to the HLP. In root questions SCLI in Romance has always been taken to signal activation of the HLP. As already pointed out in section 1 (cf. (2a) vs. (4)), Bellunese SCLI is obligatory even though the Ch-words do show up at the right edge of the sentence, in sharp contrast with French:

- (123) a. Tu vas où? (French)
You go where?
'Where are you going?'
b. *Vas-tu où?
Go you where?
- (124) a. *Te se ndat andé? (Bellunese)
You are gone where?
b. sé-tu 'ndat andé?
Are you gone where?
'Where have you gone?'

In neither language do embedded interrogatives allow for (apparent) Qu/Ch-in situ.⁵² The following Lombard dialects make the same point: in root questions the Iseo dialect does not display verb+pronoun inversion while Malonno and Monno do (Monno in addition shows Ch-doubling):

- (125) Go desmentegat chi? (Iseo)
((I) have forgotten who?)
'Who have I forgotten?'
- (126) Hoi dimenticà chi? (Malonno)
(Have.I forgotten who?)
'Who have I forgotten?'
- (127) Ch'oi desmentegà chi? (Monno)
Who have.I forgotten who
'Who have I forgotten?'

⁵² But see discussion of *On sait pas c'est quoi* in children's French in section 14 above and in the appendix below.

But whether they allow ‘subject verb inversion’ in root questions of this type or not, none of them allows Ch-in-situ in embedded interrogatives:

- (128) a. El so mia chi che laerà i piac
 (I it know not who that will wash the dishes)
 I don’t know who will wash the dishes
- b. So mia chi che'l laerà do i piac
 Know not who that he will-wash down the dishes
 I don’t know who will wash the dishes
- c. 'L so miga cu che laverà-zo i piacc
 it know not who that will wash down the dishes
 “I do not know who will wash the dishes”

The same is true of Bellunese embedded questions:

- (129) a. No so *che* che l'à comprà
 (neg I-know what that he has bought)
- b. *No so halo comprà che
 (neg I-know has he bought what)
- c. *No so che alo comprà
 (neg I-know what has he bought)

In standard generative terms, as well as in Rizzi’s cartographic approach, the root vs. embedded distinction is phrased in terms of ‘selection’: embedded interrogatives are selected by the matrix verb, which assigns a feature (say [+question]) to a slot in the HLP of the embedded clause. As a consequence the Wh-Qu-Ch-words and phrases have to adjoin to that slot for checking purposes, whether they have moved to the LLP or not.

Our analysis of French embedded infinitives in sections 2 to 7, if correct, forces us to express things differently since these embedded questions would seem only to have a LLP. In addition we have tried to show that in French, both in finite root and embedded questions, it is the (free) ‘relative side’ of QU-pronouns that needs to be checked rather than some question feature. Still, we can agree with Rizzi that ‘selection’ by a matrix predicate makes the slot in the HLP targeted by the computation(s) resulting in SCLI unavailable,⁵³ and opens up a domain in the HLP that is absent in the LLP, the ‘relative layer’, if we are right. French and Bellunese behave uniformly in finite embedded questions because that extra slot is activated and requires both QU- pronouns and Ch-words to adjoin to it, whether that extra slot be characterized in Bellunese and French in exactly the same terms or not.⁵⁴ Summing up, SCLI is a clear

⁵³ On the acceptability of *Je ne sais pas qu'est-ce que tu as fait* vs. **Je ne sais pas qu'a-t-il mangé ?* see section 14 above. See also see Loporcaro for an analysis of SCLI as a modality marker in Emilian dialects, a phenomenon we shall not deal with here.

⁵⁴ It may not be totally implausible to say that in (i) –same as (129a)–

(i) No so *che* che l'à comprà
 (neg I-know what that he has bought)

the first ‘che’ is akin to French *ce* in questions like (ii)

(ii) Je ne sais pas *ce* qu'il a acheté
 (I ne know not *ce* that he has bought) = I don’t know what he bought

indication that the HLP is active, but, as we have repeatedly stressed above, a sentence in which the QU-pronouns show up at the left edge of the sentence may well have involved only the LLP –embedded infinitival questions in French– or only the HLP –*pourquoi*– or indeed both, like root questions with or without SCLI in French. As for embedded questions like (113) or (130), as we have seen, they are free relatives syntactically, despite their interpretation.

- (130) a. Sais-tu ce dont il parlera ?
 (Know you that of it he will talk?)
 Do you know what he will talk about?
 b. Je ne sais pas ce qui se passe
 (I know not ce that is happening)
 I don't know what is happening

Clearly when a language has sentences in which the HLP is demonstrably active because they show 'real' SCLI and also displays sentence-final Ch-words, such a language may reasonably be conjectured to use both, the HLP being responsible for 'subject verb inversion' and the LLP for the sentence final position of the Ch-word. Bellunese appears to be such a language. But is this really true? Given our description of the **apparent** SCLI of *Qu'est-ce que tu fais?* in French it is natural to raise the question. In our past work we took it for granted that the answer was positive and consequently relied on the HLP⁵⁵ only and the computations its various layers require, in particular SCLI, taken to move some remnant constituent including the verb to the Force layer. (131) shows the simplified derivation of a sentence like *A lo magna che?* (Has he eaten what?) in that framework and the highly split HLP it took for granted:⁵⁶

- (131) Input: [TP a [vP lo [vP magnà che]]]
 a. Merge Foc and TP and attract che to Spec Foc:
 [HLP che_i FOC [TP a [vP lo [vP magnà t_i]]]
 b. Merge Top and FocP and attract remnant VP to Spec TopP
 [HLP [vP magnà t_i]_j Top [HLP che_i FOC [TP a [vP lo t_j]]]
 c. Merge Interrogative Force and attract remnant IP to Spec Force:
 [HLP [TP a [vP lo t_j]]_k Force [HLP [magnà t_i]_j Top [HLP che_i FOC t_k]]]

An alternative derivation only involving the LLP would go as follows:

- (132) Input: [vP lo [vP magnà che]]
 a. Merge Foc and vP and attract che to Spec FocP:
 [LLP che_i FOC [vP lo [vP magnà t_i]]]
 b. Merge TopP and FocP and attract vP to SpecTop:
 [LLP [vP [lo [vP magnà t_i]]_j Top [LLP che_i FOC t_j]]]
 c. Merge TP and the auxiliary:
 [TP a [LLP [vP lo [vP magnà t_i]]_j Top [LLP che_i FOC t_j]]]

In both languages embedded interrogatives are free relatives, as they are, more obviously so, in the dialects exemplified in (66) at the end of section 7.

⁵⁵ The question of the LLP didn't even arise when we wrote our early work with N. Munaro in the late 90's because whatever work A. Belletti had done on it then was unknown to us.

⁵⁶ As above we use 't' to denote the ghosts of the moved constituents. The labels are those adopted in our past work. The lower layers of our HLP duplicated those A. Belletti later showed were at work in the LLP.

(132) should be compared to the derivations at work in the comparable French sentence *Il a mangé quoi*. We believe that (133) would obtain:

- (133) Input : [_{VP} PRO [mangé quoi]]
- a. Merge low focus and vP and Move *quoi* to FocP:
 [_{LLP} [_{FocP} *quoi*_i Foc [_{VP} PRO mangé *t*_i]]]
 - b. Merge Top and FocP and Remnant move vP to TopP:
 [_{LLP} [_{TopP} [_{VP} PRO mangé *t*_i]_k Top [_{LLP} [_{FocP} *quoi*_i Foc *t*_k]]]]]
 - c. Merge TP and the auxiliary and merge *Il* in SpecTP:
 [_{TP} *Il* a [_{LLP} [_{TopP} [_{VP} PRO mangé *t*_i]_k Top [_{LLP} [_{FocP} *quoi*_i Foc] *t*_k]]]]]

In this perspective, the difference in word order the two languages display (i.e. *a+lo* vs. *il+a*) in such sentences would not result from Bellunese activating the Force layer of the HLP resulting in ‘SCLI’ but rather from the respective properties of the nominative clitics in the two languages. This, in turn, might be linked to the fact that only Bellunese has specific interrogative declension (i.e. postverbal subject clitics only appearing in questions), as indeed Munaro, Poletto & Pollock (2001) stressed nearly twenty years ago.

So let us suppose that questions like *alo magna che* are to be analyzed as in (132) and therefore do not activate the HLP. All sorts of elements could then occur in between the auxiliary and *lo*. But it is well-known that nothing can intrude between them, an incorrect prediction. An easy rebuttal would point out that the interrogative clitics of Bellunese are *nominative* clitics, whose case must be licensed. The case licenser is (the finite tense of) the auxiliary. On the view that the licensing in question is strictly local, any intruding element will prevent it, which accounts for the facts. It can be observed in passing that the same strict locality between *est* and *ce* in *est-ce que* questions in French is observed, as the following minimal pair shows:

- (134) a. Combien diable est-ce que ça coute?
 (How much the devil is ce that it costs?)
 How the hell much does it cost?
- b. ***Combien est diable ce que ça coute?
 (How much is the hell ce that it costs?)

If *ce* is a nominative pronoun in (134) and all the *est-ce que* questions we’ve dealt with earlier, its case must be licensed. If (the tense incorporated in) *est* only licenses/assigns *ce* its nominative case under strict adjacency, (134) vs. (134b) again follows.⁵⁷

⁵⁷The same strict adjacency holds between the misleadingly called “epenthetic” ‘-t-’ and the following pronoun it licenses in French SCLI questions like *Pierre viendra-t-il*. As R. Kayne observes (p.c), this requirement is probably to be seen as (one of) the reason(s) why the participial phrase *téléphoné* in (i):

- (i) Pierre a-t-il téléphoné?
 (Pierre has-t-he telephoned?)
 Has Pierre called?

must have (remnant) moved, contrary its counterpart in stylistic inversion sentences like (ii) –compare (iii) and (iv):

- (ii) Quand a téléphoné Pierre?
 (When has telephoned Pierre?)
 When did Pierre call?
- (iii) *Quand a-t- téléphoné il?
 (When has-t- telephoned he?)
- (iv) *Quand a téléphoné-t-il?
 (When has phoned -t- he?)

Those arguments, though valid, are not enough to show that Bellunese questions like *Alo magna che?* (has he eaten what) do not activate the HLP. For one thing, if they didn't, it is not clear what would stop them showing up in embedded clauses, which they never do, as stressed earlier (cf. (128)-(129)). Concerning embedded questions in French we have pointed out they are free relatives and seen that this is also clearly true of dialects in the Lombard area like Monno and Malonno, in which both object and subject Ch-words have the same form in embedded interrogatives and relative clauses:

- (135) a. 'L so miga cu che laverà-zo i piacc
It know not who that will-wash down the dishes
b. 'L so mia col che 'l fa 'l Zuan
It know not that.dem that he does the Z.
c. Cu ch'ha dit quest, l'è segn che 'l conosea miga la situasiu
Who that has said this, it is sign that he knew not the situation
d. Fa col che te o
Do that.dem that you want

Even more strikingly for the question at hand, there are dialects in the Piedmontese area (see Munaro (2000)), whose Ch-words in root questions take the shape of the demonstrative pronoun that introduces free relatives:

- (136) E mi lo che mang?
And I that.dem that eat?
'What should I eat?'

If so, at least in this dialect, the morphology of the Ch-words, coupled with what we know of the relative layer of HLP directly shows that the HLP *must* have been activated in (136). In addition it can be added that other cases of subject verb inversion in the dialects are typically related to constructions traditionally seen as crucially involving the HLP, like exclamatives and disjunction contexts (see Munaro 2010):

- (137) No à- lo magnà tut!
(Not has-he eaten all!)
He ate all sorts of things!

- (138) Magne- lo o no màgne- lo , mi parècie instéss.
(Eats.he or not eats.he, I prepare anyway)
Whether he eats or not, I will set the table

In view of such facts, we shall now try to develop an account of the syntax of questions in those NID's we've studied that maximizes their similarity with French, continuing to make crucial use of the force layer of the HLP to account for subject verb inversion and of the LLP to explain the location of the Ch-words. In doing so we can simplify the structure of the HLP drastically, a clear step forward.

In the framework developed here it is tempting to say that the participial phrases in (i) has moved to the Topic position of the LLP, rather than to some slot in the HLP. If *ce* is nominative in *est-ce que/qui* questions it must be accusative in, say, *Je ne sais pas ce que tu veux*, with its accusative case checked by matrix *savoir*. In *ce que tu fais est très mal* (what you do is very naughty), *ce* must have had its nominative checked/assigned by (the tense in) *est*. By the same token, *ce* must be oblique in *Il va voter contre ce que tu proposeras* (he'll vote against ce that you'll suggest = He'll vote against what you suggest).

16. Bellunese, Illasi, Monese vs. French.

Let us begin with compound tenses and our favorite question in Bellunese *ghe al dat che?* (To him has he given what? = What did he give to him?). Cutting quite a few irrelevant corners,⁵⁸ we claim it could be derived as follows:

- (139) Input: [_{VP} I [ghe dat che]]
- a. Merge LLP Foc and move che to Spec, Foc:
[_{LLP} che_i Foc [_{VP} I [ghe dat t_i]]]
 - b. merge TopP and move the remnant vP to Spec,Top:
[_{LLP} [_{VP} I [ghe dat t_i]]_j Top [_{LLP} che_i Foc t_j]]
 - c. merge Tense and insert the auxiliary in TP:
[_{TP} a Tense [_{LLP} [_{VP} I [ghe dat t_i]]_j Top [_{LLP} che_i Foc t_j]]]
 - d. Clitic climbing to TP:
[_{TP} ghe_k a tense [_{LLP} [_{VP} I [t_k dat t_i]]_j Top [_{LLP} che_i Foc t_j]]]
 - e. Attract subject to Spec T (dragging along the whole structure dominated by TopP):
[_{TP} [_{VP} I [t_k dat t_i]]_j Top [_{LLP} che_i Foc t_j]]_i Tense [_{TP} ghe_k a t_i] t_i]
 - f. Adjoin⁵⁹ interrogative nominative clitic to TP:
[_{TP} I_m [_{TP} [_{VP} t_m [t_k dat t_i]]_j Top [_{LLP} che_i Foc t_j]]_i Tense [_{TP} ghe_k a t_i] t_i]
 - g. Merge Force in HLP and attract remnant TP to Spec Force:
[_{HLP} [_{TP} ghe_k a t_i]_n Force [_{TP} I_m [_{TP} [_{VP} t_m [_{TP} [t_k dat t_i]]_j Top [_{LLP} che_i Foc t_j]]_i Tense t_n t_i]]]

As for root questions with simple tenses like *ghe dal che?* (to him gives he what? = what does he give to him?), the first two steps of its derivation would obviously be identical and the last steps minimally distinct:

- (140) Input: [_{VP} I [_{VP} ghe da che]]
- a. Merge LLP Foc and move che to Spec, Foc:
[_{LLP} che_i Foc [_{VP} I [_{VP} ghe da t_i]]]
 - b. merge TopP and move remnant vP to Spec,Top:
[_{LLP} [_{VP} I [_{VP} ghe da t_i]]_j Top [_{LLP} che_i Foc t_j]]]
 - c. Merge T and move remnant vP from TopP to SpecT:
[_{TP} [_{VP} I [_{VP} ghe da t_i]]_j Tense [_{LLP} t_j Top [_{LLP} che_i Foc t_j]]]
 - d. Adjoin I to TP:
[_{TP} I_k[_{TP} [_{VP} t_k [_{VP} ghe da t_i]]_j Tense [_{LLP} t_j Top [_{LLP} che_i Foc t_j]]]
 - e. Merge Force in HLP and attract remnant vP to spec Force:
[_{HLP} [_{VP} t_k ghe da t_i]_i Force [_{TP} I_k [_{TP} t_i Tense [_{LLP} t_j Top [_{LLP} che_i Foc t_j]]]

If this goes in the right direction, at step (c) in (140) what is attracted to spec T is the remnant vP containing the inflected verb. At step (d) *l*, Bellunese interrogative third person nominative clitic, adjoins to TP, as it must for case-checking purposes. If we are right, no similar computation can take place at step (d) in (139), which instead involves pied-piping of the whole structure containing *l*. Why should that be so? We believe that this may be seen in the same light as the obligatory pied-piping of clitic *que* in French

⁵⁸ Especially concerning the exact form of clitic climbing.

⁵⁹ We might have supposed that *l* moves to a SubjPhrase instead of adjoining to TP. Nothing would change in the reasoning. Having adjunction just saves labels.

SCLI: As stressed in section 11 *que* is too ‘weak’ to cross over intervening material to reach its target in the relative layer of the HLP. Similarly, we shall say that nominative interrogative *l* is so weak that unless it is immediately (string) adjacent to TP’s left bracket it cannot adjoin to it. At step (d) it therefore can’t.⁶⁰ However when the whole phrase dominating it is pied-piped to spec TP, *l* is ‘smuggled up’ to a position adjacent to TP –step (e) of (139) –, thereby permitting at step (f) the adjunction required by (nominative) case licensing/assignment.

An obvious comparative question now arises: why can’t fine French questions like (141),

- (141) a. Il va épouser qui?
 (He’s going to marry whom?)
 Who is he going to marry?
 b. Il vote contre qui ?
 (He votes against whom?)
 Who does he vote against?

also surface as (142)?

- (142) a. **Va-t-il épouser qui?
 (Going-he to marry whom?)
 b. **Vote-t-il contre qui ?
 (Votes-he against whom?)

In short, why can’t the HLP be ‘activated’ in such ‘in situ’ questions in French, contrary to Bellunese? We believe that a clue to an adequate answer is provided by other Northern dialects like Illasi: Those dialects, in addition to the Ch-word at the right edge of their root questions, also display clitic S/ndo/Ci-words at the left edge of the sentence, as shown in (143) (= (70) above):

- (143) 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?’

As already stressed above in (143) the left-most S/Nd/C-words have all the properties of clitics: they cannot be modified, coordinated, used in isolation etc. (see Poletto & Pollock (2004a) and (2015)), while the rightmost one is a tonic interrogative pronoun. Let us then say that when the Force layer of the HLP is activated in these dialects –resulting in SCLI– its relative layer also is. In this perspective, in such root sentences Illasi *s*, *ndo* and *ci* are (weak) relative pronouns sitting in that relative layer, and the tonic forms are standing in the Focus position of the LLP, just as Bellunese *che* is in (139)-(140).

⁶⁰ Note that this would still be true if no dative clitic was present.

Put in another way sentences like (143) in Illasi and other doubling dialects wear on their sleeves the complex relative/interrogative structure we have been describing in this work. In such root questions Illasi differs from non-doubling languages like French and (modern) Bellunese in merging in argument position complex entities like [*sa, che*],⁶¹ the two sides of which have different targets, the low interrogative focus position of the LLP for *che*, the relative layer in the HLP for *sa*.

French has to make do with single lexical QU- pronouns, whose task is therefore twofold when the HLP is activated, for example in (142): in such structures *qui* and *contre qui* have indeed checked their question feature in the LLP, as they must, but they have failed to check their relative feature in the HLP, whence the sharp ungrammaticality. Of course if they move on, as they must, the perfectly well-formed (144) will be derived:

- (144) a. Qui va-t-il épouser?
 (Whom Going-he to marry?)
 Who is he going to marry?
 b. Contre qui vote-t-il?
 (Against whom votes-he?)
 Who does he vote against?

In this perspective, Bellunese *ghe al dat che?* or *ghe dal che?* are the surface instantiations of the last but one step in the derivation of sentences like (144) in French. The question is now to understand why the relative layer in Bellunese appears not to have been activated in (139)-(140). There are three possible types of answer to that question.

One might contend that *ghe al dat che?* or *ghe dal che?* are not real cases of SCLI, contrary to what we have been arguing in this section. On that option the derivation of such sentences –cf. (132) above– does not activate the force layer of the HLP. Therefore there is no relative layer to be checked in such sentences any more than there is in *Il lui a donné quoi* – cf. (133) – and *che* can stay put in the LLP, exactly like *quoi* does. The second type of answer would continue to view the subject verb inversion of such questions as genuinely reflecting the activation of the HLP but would look at them in the light of the interrogative grammar of very young speakers of French discussed above in relation to (119d, e) –see appendix for more on this–, repeated below in (145):

- (145) a. J’sais pas c’est quoi
 (I know not it is what)
 I don’t know what it is
 b. J’sais pas i’fait comment
 (I know not he does how)
 I don’t know how he manages

We suggested that the speakers who produce such embedded questions have the option of ignoring the relative layer which more mature speakers obligatorily activate in ‘standard’ examples like (146):

- (146) a. Je ne sais pas ce que c’est
 (I know not ce that it is)
 I don’t know what it is
 b. Je ne sais pas comment il fait

⁶¹ For more on this see Poletto & Pollock (2004a).

(I don't know how he does)
I don't know how he manages

If this is the correct way of looking at (145), it is at least conceivable that Bellunese speakers avail themselves of the same option in (139) and (140). The third type of answer would say that the full HLP is activated in such sentences, including the relative layer, and claim that Bellunese is despite appearances a dialect of the Illasi variety. It would say in effect, as we indeed did in our past work, that in (139)-(140) there *is* a relative pronoun in the HLP, though null. This is all the more plausible as N. Munaro has shown that such a null element did have lexical counterparts at earlier stages of the language (cf. Munaro (1999))

It could in fact be argued that those three answers are not as incompatible as it might seem. One might claim that, everything else being equal, they correspond to three stages in the history of the language. The third option might describe the internal grammar of speakers still aware of the lexical relative pronouns showing up in the speech of older generations. The second might be adopted by a generation of speakers entirely lacking that sort of input. As for the first solution it might be seen as describing the internal grammar of speakers resulting from a drastic restructuring, radically simplifying the analysis of the primary linguistic data they are confronted with.

Whatever the correct answer to the problem raised by Bellunese 'in situ' questions turns out to be, one thing is clear: Illasi questions like (143), as well as the Monese ones in (71) do require the activation of both the Low and the high Left Periphery, as (standard) French, Italian and many other NIDs do. Before we conclude one last remark concerning Illasi is in order. If, as we have claimed, the weak forms *sa*, *ndo* and *ci* in (143) and the like are relative pronouns, why don't they show up in embedded questions, which we have claimed are free relatives? The answer is simple: like *que* in French they are too 'weak' to head free relatives, and *che*, otherwise an interrogative pronoun in (143), is then analyzed as *ce (que)* in French. As we have seen, the same is true of *che* in Bellunese and other NIDs. We repeat some relevant data in (147):

- (147) a. El so mia chi che laerà i piác
(I it know not who that will wash the dishes)
I don't know who will wash the dishes
- b. So mia chi che'l laerà do i piác
(Know not who that he will-wash down the dishes)
I don't know who will wash the dishes
- c. 'L so miga cu che laverà-zo i piacc
(it know not who that will wash down the dishes)
I do not know who will wash the dishes
- d. No so *che* che l'à comprà
(Not know what that he has bought)

One might of course raise the deeper question of why that particular form is chosen, rather than some arbitrary ad-hoc entity. It is very likely, it seems to us, that the fact that *che* is also the so-called 'complementiser' in so many Romance languages and dialects plays a fundamental role in that choice. This becomes more immediately understandable if, as Kayne (2014) has shown, 'complementisers' in Germanic

and Romance in general and *che* in particular are *relatives* whose (covert) antecedent ‘fact’ is predicated of the subordinate clause.⁶²

17. Concluding remarks

We started this work by pointing out that if languages make use of the HLP and Belletti’s LLP it becomes necessary to raise the question of why some languages make use of one or the other, or indeed both. We pointed out that in the best of possible worlds for language learners, the morphological properties of the various Wh-words and the surface forms of the sentences should be all that is required. We believe that the present work suggests that this ideal might not be as distant as one might have feared, an agreeable situation for both the linguist and the language learner.

Appendix: On “Children’s playground French”

We wish here to do (slightly more) justice to the (internal) interrogative grammar of the young people we already mentioned above in relation to embedded questions like (119), repeated in (148):

- (148) a. J’sais pas c’est quoi
(I know not it is what)
I don’t know what it is
b. J’sais pas i’fait comment
(I know not he does how)
I don’t know how he manages
c. J’sais pas encore j’aurai combien
(I know not yet I’ll have how much)
(I don’t know yet what grade I’ll get)

Such questions have, we believe, almost entirely replaced standard embedded questions like (149) –on which see sections 7 and passim–, in the spontaneous speech of children of primary school age in (working class districts in) France.⁶³

- (149) a. Je ne sais pas ce que c’est

⁶² If so, one might raise a further question, to which we have no answer: why do languages like French and Monese use *que/che* as an interrogative pronoun? Although this paper has succeeded, we hope, in shedding some light on the syntax of *quoi*, *pourquoi* and *que* and their counterparts in some NIDs it leaves us without an answer to another deeper question: what is it that prevents French children from moving *quoi* to preverbal positions given the much wider distribution of all other French QU- pronouns in the speech of adults around them? Our analysis ties the unacceptability of *quoi* as a preverbal interrogative to it not being a free relative pronoun. But children don’t have access to negative evidence of this sort and our analysis doesn’t say why *quoi* fails to be a relative pronoun. Perhaps the facts mentioned in examples (i), (ii) and (iii) in footnote 10 play a part, but that remains to be worked out. From this point of view, the morphology of *dont* –evidently not a QU- entity– and the clitic nature of *que* are more promising.

⁶³ Jean-Yves’s three oldest grand children went to primary school in Saint Denis, a working class city adjacent to north east part of Paris, in the ‘Seine Saint Denis’ district. The interrogative grammar described in this appendix rests primarily on their input. We have no first-hand knowledge of whether it is shared by children going to school in more bourgeois environments. We suspect it is, if only because similar data have been sporadically reported in other areas, among them in places as distant as Quebec, and because Jean-Yves’s youngest grand-daughter, age 6, brought up in the slightly wealthier city of Meaux, sixty kilometres to the north east of Paris, also spontaneously produces questions of the relevant type. We call these children’s internal interrogative grammar “Playground French” because it is what they use spontaneously when they play together, away from adults and teachers who might want to correct their syntax. The four children that served as informants for this appendix are bilingual: they also use ‘standard’ interrogative syntax when they are with adults –except for occasional slips of the tongue– but, as far as some spying on them seems to indicate, revert to playground French when alone together.

- (I (ne) know not what it is)
- b. Je ne sais pas comment il fait
(I (ne) know not how he does (it))
- c. Je ne sais pas encore combien j'aurai
(I (ne) know not yet how much I'll get)
I don't know yet what grade I'll get

(148) and the like are severely banned both in primary schools and lycées, sternly sanctioned in written prose and deemed extremely vulgar when adults occasionally produce them. For speakers of Jean-Yves's generation they are inconceivable: when he first heard such sentences he could hardly process them.

Let us start with pointing out the main difference between standard French and Playground French. In section 3 we observed that infinitival questions like (150a, c) couldn't surface as (150b, d) in (Standard) French and that such strings would be incorrectly derived if Qu-movement to the Focus position in the LLP was followed by remnant vP movement to Belletti's LLP Topic/Ground position.

- (150) a. Je ne sais pas quoi dire
(I ne know not what (to) say)
I don't know what to say
- b. *Je ne sais pas dire quoi
(I ne know not (to) say what)
- c. A-t-il dit quoi apporter?
(Has-t-he said what (to) bring?)
Did he say what we were to bring?
- d. *A-t-il dit apporter quoi?
(Has-t-he said (to) bring what?)

We claimed that expanding that Topic slot was excluded in such cases because these infinitival questions are selected by the matrix predicates which, unlike prepositions like *pour* (see section 4), only select for a truncated LLP. Clearly (148) in Playground French *are* embedded questions and would follow from the preceding analysis if in playground French the LLP had a Topic slot in *all* embedded interrogative contexts. That does seem to be the case: to our amazement the examples in (151) are all fine embedded *infinitival* questions for our informants:

- (151) a. J'sais pas dire quoi
(I know not (to) say what)
I don't know what to say
- b. Elle sait pas embrasser qui
(She knows not (to) kiss whom)
She does not know who to kiss
- c. Dis-moi parler de quoi
(Tell me to speak of what)
Tell me what to speak of
- d. Dis-moi aller où
(Tell me (to) go where)
Tell me where to go
- e. Dis-moi en acheter combien
(Tell me of it/them (to) buy how many/much)
Tell me how many/much I should buy

QU-phrases sitting at right edge of embedded finite and infinitival questions are also accepted:

- (152) a. On ne sait pas il partira quel jour
 (We ne know not he will go what day)
 We don't know what day he'll leave
 b. Je voudrais savoir il voit quelle fille
 (I would-like (to) know he sees what girl)
 I'd like to know what girl he sees
 c. Il t'a dit il voit quelle fille
 (He you has told he sees what girl)
 Has he told you what girl he sees
 d. Il sait pas appeler quelle fille
 (He know not (to) call which girl)
 He doesn't know which girl to call
 e. Il t'a dit appeler quelle fille
 (He you has told (to) call what girl)
 Has he told you what girl to call

The only QU-phrase they absolutely refuse is *pourquoi*:

- (153) a. *Dis-moi je devrais partir pourquoi
 (Tell me I should go why)
 Tell me why I should go
 b. *Sais-tu on part pourquoi
 (Tell me we are going why)
 Tell me why we're going

In terms of our analyses in the first 9 sections of this paper, such facts are expected once it is recognised that Playground French differs from Standard French in generalising to all embedded contexts the interrogative syntax of examples like (154a, b, c),

- (154) Pierre a dit cela
 a. Pour prouver quoi?
 (To prove what?)
 b. Pour impressionner qui?
 (To impress whom?)
 c. Pour aller où
 (To go where?)

which we analysed as in (155):

- (155) Input: [_{VP} PRO [_{VP} V [quoi, qui, où]]]
 Merge Foc and vP and attract QU-determiner to Spec Foc:
 (a) [_{FocP} {quoi, qui, où} Foc [_{VP} PRO [_{VP} V {~~quoi, qui, où~~}]]
 Merge Top and FocP and remnant move vP to TopP:
 (b) [_{TopP} [_{VP} PRO [_{VP} V {~~quoi, qui, où~~}]] Top [_{FocP} [quoi, qui, où] [_{VP} PRO [_{VP} V {~~quoi, qui, où~~}]]]
 (c) Merge *pour* and TopP:
 Pour {prouver quoi, impressionner qui, aller où}

Why should that be so? Our claim above was that (Qu-) movement to Foc + remnant vP movement to TOP/Ground is the functional counterparts in the LLP of SCLI in the HLP: both sets of computations yield root questions and are excluded for the same reason in embedded contexts. We asserted that this was a consequence of the fact that selecting predicates like *ne pas savoir*, *dis-moi* etc. assign their complement a question feature incompatible with a constituent already typed as a question. Granted this, it is reasonable, we believe, to say that in playground French such selecting predicates need only *check* that their complements are questions.

In addition to *pourquoi*, the only other QU-determiner they dislike in embedded infinitival questions is *quand* (when). They find (154a) marginal⁶⁴ though they accept (154b) and (154c):

- (154) a. ??Dis-moi partir quand
 (Tell me (to) go where)
 Tell me where to go
 b. Dis-moi tu pars quand
 (Tell me you're going when)
 Tell me when you're going
 c. Dis-moi je dois partir quand
 (Tell me I must go when)
 Tell me when I must go

It is tempting to suggest that the marginality of (154a) is due to the fact that it requires a null deontic *devoir*, overtly present in (154c), adding some unwanted weight to the derivation of (154a).

References

- Belletti, Adriana (2004). 'Aspects of the low IP area', in Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *The structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 2, 16-51. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Belletti, Adriana (2005). 'Answering with a cleft: the role of the null subject parameter and the VP periphery', in Laura Brugè, Giuliana Giusti, Nicola Munaro, Walter Schweikert and Giuseppina Turano (eds), *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*, 63-82. Venezia: Cafoscarina.
- Bianchi, Valentina (1999). *Consequences of Antisymmetry: Headed Relative Clauses*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bonan, Caterina (2018). 'On Insituness and very (low) Wh-positions. The case of Trevigiano', in Giuseppe Samo, Karen Martini and Giuliano Bocci (eds.), *Proceedings of the 1st SynCart Meeting. Generative Grammar in Geneva (GG@G)*.
- Bouchard, Denis and Paul Hirschbühler (1986). 'French *Quoi* and its clitic allomorph *QUE*', in Carol Neidle and Rafael A. Nuñez Cedenao (eds.), *Studies in Romance Languages*, 39-60. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Cheng, Lisa Laih-Shen and Johan Rooryck (2000). 'Licensing Wh-in-Situ', *Syntax* 3(1). 1-19.

⁶⁴ « On n'aime pas trop » they said.

- den Besten, Hans and Gert Webelhuth (1987), 'Adjunction and remnant topicalization in the Germanic SOV-languages', paper presented at the Generative Linguists of the Old World conference, Venice, March 30–April 2.
- Donzelli, Giulia (2018). 'Two Types of Wh- in situ in Lombard Dialects', paper presented at GenWH 2018 – The Geneva Wh-orkshop on Optional Insituness. Université de Genève.
- Garzoni & Rossi (2013).
- Kato, Mary Aizawa (2013). 'Deriving 'wh-in-situ' through movement in Brazilian Portuguese', in Maria Victoria Camacho-Taboada, Angel L. Jiménez Fernández, Javier Martín-González and Mariano Reyes Tejedor (eds.), *Information Structure and Agreement*, 178-192. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kato, Mary Aizawa and Jairo Nunes (2009). 'A uniform raising analysis for standard and non-standard relative clauses in Brazilian Portuguese', in Jairo Nunes (ed), *Minimalist Essays on Brazilian Portuguese Syntax*, 93-120. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kayne, Richard S. (1994). *The Anti-symmetry of Syntax* (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 25). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kayne, Richard S. (2011), "More on Relative Pronouns", hand-out to a conference given in Leiden
- Kayne, Richard S. (2012), 'Comparative Syntax', NYU manuscript.
- Kayne, Richard S. (2014). 'Why Isn't *This* a Complementizer', in Peter Svenonius (ed), *Functional Structure from Top to Toe: A Festschrift for Tarald Taraldsen* (The Cartography of Syntactic Structures 9), 188-231. Oxford u.a.: Oxford University Press.
- Kayne, Richard S. (2015). 'A Note on Some Even More Unusual Relative Clauses', in Laura R. Bailey and Michelle Sheehan (eds.), *Order and structure in syntax I: Word order and syntactic structure*, vol. 1, 363-372. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Kayne, Richard S. and Jean-Yves Pollock (1978). 'Stylistic inversion, Successive Cyclicity and Move NP in French', *Linguistic Inquiry* 9, 595-621.
- Kayne, Richard S. and Jean-Yves Pollock (2001). 'New thoughts on Stylistic Inversion', in Aafke Hulk and Jean-Yves Pollock (eds.), *Subject Inversion in Romance and the Theory of Universal Grammar*, 107-162. New York & Oxford: OUP.
- Kayne, Richard S. and Jean-Yves Pollock (2009), "Notes on French and English Demonstratives", manuscript NYU.
- Kayne, Richard S. and Jean-Yves Pollock (2012). 'Toward an Analysis of French Hyper-Complex Inversion', in Laura Brugé, Anna Cardinaletti, Giuliana Giusti, Nicolas Munaro and Cecilia Poletto (eds.), *Functional heads* (The Cartography of Syntactic Structures 7), 150-167. Oxford u.a.: Oxford University Press.
- Kayne, Richard S. and Jean-Yves Pollock (2014). 'Locality and Agreement in French Hyper-Complex Inversion', in Enoch Oladé Aboh, Maria Teresa Guasti and Ian Roberts (eds.), *Locality* (Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax), 32-57, Oxford University Press.

- Kiparsky, Paul and Carol Kiparsky (1970). 'Fact', in Manfred Bierwisch and Karl Erich Heidolph (eds.) *Progress in Linguistics*, The Hague, Mouton.
- Manzini, Maria Rita and Leonardo M. Savoia (2011). 'Wh- in situ and wh- doubling in Northern Italian varieties: against remnant movement', *Linguistic Analysis* 37. 79-113.
- Munaro, Nicola (1999). *Sintagmi interrogativi nei dialetti italiani settentrionali*. Padova: Unipress.
- Munaro, Nicola (2000). 'Free relative clauses as defective wh-elements: Evidence from the North-Western Italian dialects', *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 10(1). 89-120.
- Munaro, Nicola (2010). 'Towards a hierarchy of clause types' in Paola Benincà and Nicola Munaro (eds.), *Mapping the Left Periphery* (The Cartography of Syntactic Structures 5), 125–162. 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 Johan Roorick and Pierre Pica (eds.), *Linguistic Variation Yearbook*, vol. 1, 147-180. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Munaro, Nicola and Jean-Yves Pollock (2005). 'Quest-ce que (*qu*)-est-ce que? A Case Study in Comparative Romance Interrogative Syntax', in Guglielmo Cinque and Richard Kayne (eds.), *Handbook of Comparative Syntax*, 542-606. New York & Oxford: OUP.
- Obenauer, Hans-Georg (1976). *Etudes de syntaxe interrogative du français* (Linguistische Arbeiten 34). Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Poletto, Cecilia (2006b). 'Parallel phases: a study on the high and low left periphery of Old Italian', in Mara Frascarelli (ed), *Phases of Interpretation*, 261-294. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Poletto, Cecilia and Jean-Yves Pollock (2004a). 'On Wh-Clitics, Wh-Doubling in French and Some North Eastern Italian Dialects', *Probus* 16 (2). 241–272.
- Poletto, Cecilia and Jean-Yves Pollock (2004b). 'On the Left Periphery of Some Romance Wh- Questions', in Luigi Rizzi (ed), *The Structure of CP and IP* (The Cartography of Syntactic Structures 2), 251–296. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Poletto, Cecilia and Jean-Yves Pollock (2015). 'Arguing for Remnant Movement in Romance', in Günther Grewendorf (ed), *Remnant Movement*, 135-178. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Poletto, Cecilia and Jean-Yves Pollock (2017). 'Subject clitics, Subject Clitic Inversion and Complex Inversion: Generalizing Remnant Movement to the Comp Area', in Henc C. van Riemsdijk (ed), *Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, 4191-4249. Oxford & Boston: Blackwell.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves (1983). 'Sur quelques propriétés des phrases copulatives en français', in Hans-Georg Obenauer and Jean-Yves Pollock (eds.), *Français et grammaire universelle*, 89-125. Paris: Larousse.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves (1989). 'Verb Movement, Universal Grammar and the Structure of IP', *Linguistic Inquiry* 20(3). 365-425.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves (2006). 'Subject clitics, Subject Clitic Inversion and Complex Inversion', in Martin Everaert and Henc C. van Riemsjik (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, vol. IV, 601- 659. Malden, Mass u.a.: Blackwell.

- Rizzi, Luigi (1991). 'Residual Verb Second and the Wh-Criterion', *Geneva Generative Papers 2*. Reprinted in *Parameters and Functional Heads*, (2006). 63-90, Belletti, Adriana and Luigi Rizzi (eds.) Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1997). 'The fine structure of the left periphery', in: Liliana Haegeman (ed), *Elements of Grammar. A Handbook of generative syntax*, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rizzi, Luigi (2004). 'Locality and Left Periphery', in Adriana Belletti (ed), *Structures and Beyond (The Cartography of syntactic structures 3)*, 223-251. Oxford u.a.: Oxford University Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi (ed) (2004). *The Structure of CP and IP*. Oxford u.a.: Oxford University Press.
- Rosenbaum, Peter S. (1967). *The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- Shlonsky, U. Soares G. "Where's 'why'?" , *Linguistic Inquiry* (2011, 42-4), 651-669.
- Thiersch, Craig. (1985). *VP and Scrambling in the German Mittelfeld*. Ms., University of Tilburg.
- Vergnaud, Jean Roger (1974). *French Relative Clauses*, Doctoral dissertation. Cambridge, Mass: M.I.T.