Generalized C-doubling in an Oïl dialect, subjects and the nature of *que2*

This paper aims at broadening the empirical coverage of investigations on double-complementizer constructions (DCC), which dialect syntax has drawn recent attention to, in order to feed its theoretical analysis. It focuses on a novel case of DCC, found in a dialect of Picard, an Oïl endangered and under-described language spoken in Northern France and Hainaut. In a given area, which we will loosely call "Ternois", some speakers display (quasi-) systematic DCC when at least one XP is fronted in an embedded clause, yielding the pattern (1), for clauses that display (2) when no XP is fronted:

> (1) *que1* XP, (YP), (ZP) *que2* TP   (2) *que* TP

■ **Contexts.** Unlike other dialects, such as Irish English (McCloskey 2006) or Turinese and Ligurian (Paoli 2007), Ternois generalizes DCC to various embedded clauses, whatever their type, tense or mood: argument clauses (3), adjunct clauses (4), relative clauses (5), cleft structures (6), embedded interrogatives, complements of noun or adjectival predicates, etc.:

> (3) Rappell'-ti **qu'**(…)ch' l'éclusier, des carpe' et d's inguilles, plein t'n' épuigett' **qu'**i t'in mettra[1]
>   Remember *that* the lock keeper, carps and eels, your net full, *that* he to-you of-them will put

> (4) . Et si **qu'**edman **qu'** j'épreuv' seul'mint (…) l'sintimint…
>   And if *that* tomorrow *that* I have only   the feeling…

> (5) Sur chés rimparts, édù **que** ch'l'herp' **qu'**all' poussaut drue
>   On these ramparts, where *that* the grass *that* it grew thick

> (6) Ch'est toudis aveucque émotion **qu'**tes incienn's fortifications, **que** j'les ardrèch'…
>   It is always with emotion *that* your ancient ramparts *that* I them rebuild…

In this respect, it is reminiscent of medieval Romance (Wanner 1995) and, to some extent, European Portuguese (Mascarenhas 2007).

■ **Fronted XP.** Nevertheless, it seems to differ from the latter and other Iberic varieties at least in one respect. In (1), XP can take various forms: adverbials (*cf.* 4), (left-dislocated) internal arguments (*cf.* 6) and subject DPs (*cf.* 5), or a combination of them (*cf.* 3). But first, in the latter case, unlike what Mascarenhas shows for European Portuguese, only one *que2* shows up, at the end of the sequence. Triple Cs may only very marginally appear, and are never obligatory. Second, for Iberic varieties, Uriagereka (1995) and Mascarenhas (2007) argue that only Topics can be fronted in DCC and Foci are excluded. This leads the latter to conclude that *que2* is a Topic head. This does not seem to hold for Ternois, yet. First, in Ternois, foci, such as *plein t'n épuigett'* in (3) can be fronted. Second, subjects give rise to a specific problem.

■ **Subjects.** Ternois, indeed, as do most dialects of Picard, displays extensive doubling of DP subjects by a clitic (Auger 2003). It has been argued that such subject-doubling differs from Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) in that all quantified DPs, some of which are commonly held to be banned from Topic positions, can be doubled (cf. 7, from Auger 2003: 3):

> (7) Parsonne i n'   poroait mie vnir ll'értcheure
>   Nobody he neg could   neg come him get ('Nobody could come and get him')

Yet, in Ternois' DCC, bare quantifiers can stand in a left peripheral position, as in (8), where *tout'* is neither a focus nor a hanging topic – a situation reminiscent of Turinese and Ligurian (Paoli 2007), though with differences:

> (8) Et ch'est ainsi qu' tout' qu 'i s'évanuit, dins la vie
>   Ant it is thus that all that it vanishes, in our lives

I argue that quantified expressions *can* in fact be left-dislocated (Cinque 1990, Arregi 2003): their usual ban from these structures relies not on the syntax or semantics of the QP itself, but on the properties of the clitic: in Picard (*vs*, say, French), P3 subject clitic are not interpreted as individual variables. Doubled and undoubled DP subjects, on the other hand, stand in Subject position and are not involved in DCC.

---

[1] Unless otherwise mentionned, all cited occurrences are from Lemaire (1945, 1947).

■ **The nature and position of** *que*.

Previous analyses of DCC assume that *que2* is the head of a lower projection, either TopP or FinP. Yet, except for Paoli's (2007) analysis – that links it to the deficient subjunctive-marking on the verb in some Italian dialects and can't be extended as such to Ternois – the question of why *que2* is overtly present, and of what relationship it may bear with *que1* are not directly addressed.

For European Portuguese and Early Romance, given that only Topics, not Foci, can appear between *que1* and *que2*, Mascarenhas and Paoli respectively argue that *que2* is the realization of Top°. Even if it were the case for Ternois, this would not account for the presence of *que2*. A topicalized item *per se* does not, indeed, trigger the presence of an overt *que* in Ternois: unlike Portuguese, double Tops in DCC do not trigger double *que2*; besides, topicalized XPs are not followed by *que* in matrix clauses. Furthermore, *embedded* clauses that do not license a *que1* do not display a *que2*. *Que2*, then, seems actually 'parasitic' on the formally identical *que1*. Barbiers et al. (2008) argue that the lower occurrence of a doubled XP can be viewed as a pronounced copy of the higher one in a movement chain, dialects showing parametric variation as to which copy may be pronounced. We propose to extend this analysis to DCC, and to consider that *que1* and *que2* are the two ends of a chain created by head-movement, the lower position being Fin°. They would indeed qualify for a *Project Both* (Citko 2008) view of head-movement, since they are categorically non-distinct and *que* conflates two pieces of information *wrt* the CP-domain: the fact that the sentence is embedded and the fact that it is finite, the addition of which determining for instance that TP may be subject to Sequence-Of-Time. It is then first-merged in Fin° and rises to the higher C°. If this is correct, it would account for the fact that infinitive complementizer *de* is never doubled in Ternois, neither by a *que* or by a *de*: infinitives lack the higher C position; *de* is and stays in Fin°, whether preceded by a Topic or not.

References

Arregi, K. (2003). Clitic Left Dislocation is Contrastive Topicalization. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium, Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 9.1:31-44.

Auger, J. (2003). Le Redoublement des sujets en picard. *Journal of French Language Studies* 13/3: 381-404.

Barbiers, S., Koeneman, O. & M. Lekakou (2008). Syntactic Doubling and the Structure of Chains. In C. B. Chang and H. J. Haynie (eds). *Proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Somerville, MA, Cascadilla Proceedings Project: 78-86.

Cinque, G. (1990). *Types of A'-Dependancies.* Cambridge, MA, MIT Press

Citko, B. (2008). Missing labels: Head-Movement as Project Both. In C. B. Chang and H. J. Haynie (eds). *Proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Somerville, MA, Cascadilla Proceedings Project: 121-128

Demonte, V. & O. Fernandez Soriano. (2007). La periferia izquierda oracional y los complementantes del español. In J. Cuartero & M. Emsel (eds), *Vernetzungen: Kognition, Bedeutung, (kontrastive) Pragmatik*. Frankfurt, Peter Lang :133-147

Lemaire, Léon (1947). *Racontaches d'ein boïeu rouche: poésies et chansonnettes en patois d'Arras.* Imprimerie Centrale de l'Artois.

Lemaire, L. (1945). *Eclats d'...patois.* Base de Textes du LESCLAP, U. d'Amiens.

McCloskey, James (2006): Questions and questionning in a local English. In R. Zanuttini (ed): *Crosslinguistic research in syntax and semantics*, Vol. 2004. Georgetown University Press, 87-123.

Mascarenhas, S. (2007) Complementizer doubling in European Portuguese. Unpublished Ms. Amsterdam: ILLC. http://homepages.nyu.edu/~sdm330/

Paoli, Sandra (2007). The Fine structure of the left periphery: COMPs and subjects; evidence fromRomance. *Lingua*, 117:1057-1079.

Rizzi, Luigi (1997): The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (ed): *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht, Kluwers: 281-337.

Rizzi, L. & U. Shlonsky, (2007). Strategies of Subject Extraction. In H-M. Gärtner & U. Sauerland (éds.) *Interfaces + recursion = language? Chomsky's minimalism and the view from syntax-semantics.* Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter: 115-160.

Uriagereka, J. (1995). An F position in Western Romance. In K.E. Kiss(ed), *Discourse Configurational Languages*, Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax, chapter 6: 153-175.

Wanner D. (1995) Les subordonnées àdouble complementateur en roman medieval. In G. Ruffino (ed), *Atti del XXI Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica e Filologia Romanza*, sezione 1: 421-433.