

## DOUBLING BY CLITICS AND DOUBLING OF CLITICS

M. RITA MANZINI

1 In this paper I shall try to argue against a number of hypotheses put forward in the conference call, to wit that ‘doubling constructions contain elements that make no semantic contribution’, that doubling ‘involves the spell-out of intermediate copies of a movement chain’, that it ‘reveals the existence of generalized spec-head configurations’, that it is ‘basically a phonological procedure’. The biolinguistic perspective (Chomsky 2005) also casts doubts on the idea that doubling may be ‘a ... tool .. to facilitate communication’; more likely there are internal reasons favoring its emergence, independently of its adaptive value.

As for the question why ‘doubling phenomena ... occur far more pervasively in the.. dialects than in the standard variet[es]’, I take it that the spread of phenomena found in dialects is what we expect within the biolinguistic perspective (Manzini and Savoia 2005, forthcoming). Purely accidental factors come into play in standardization -- such as the fact that Italian represents a standardization of Central varieties, with some morphosyntactic properties and not others; the fact that the language of culture in Western Europe before the standardization of vernaculars, namely Latin, provided a template of sorts for them etc. Non purely accidental factors will involve in any event the status of written communication etc.

2 Since the beginning of the Principles and Parameters framework (and before, of the interest in variation within the generative framework) attention was paid to the phenomenon of doubling of a lexical NP by a clitic, specifically in Romance languages like Spanish. Northern Italian dialects made an early appearance in the field with the observation that lexical subjects were systematically doubled by subject clitics (Brandi and Cordin 1981). At the same time an equally pervasive phenomenon, namely the appearance of multiple copies of clitics passed unobserved; Poletto (1993, 2000) studies in detail the doubling of subject clitics, again in Northern Italian dialects but limits herself to the case where the doubling involves a higher expletive-like element. In what follows we shall list a few cases where Manzini and Savoia (2005, forthcoming) find *bona fide* copies of pronominal clitics (other instances of doubling occur with negation, clitic negation, agreement of the verb, middle-reflexive morphology in Albanian dialects, etc.)

(1) subject clitics in questions

et	'derm	-is	-tö	<i>S.Bartolomeo Pesio</i> (Piedmont)
you	sleep	-2sg	-you	
	‘Do you sleep?’			

(2) object clitics in imperatives

a.	ra	-mi	-te	-me	kwiste	<i>Senise</i> (Lucania)
	give-me	-2pl	-me	this		
	‘Give me this.’					

b.	da	-mma	-∇m	-ille	<i>S.Severo</i> (Apulia)	
	give	-me		-me	-it	
	‘Give it to me’					

(3) object clitics in auxiliary – perfect participle constructions

a.	a	r	ö	ciamö	-ra	<i>Degeo</i> (Liguria)
	I	her	havecalled	-her		
	‘I have called her’					

b.	u	s	e	lavo	-se	
	he	self	is	washed	-self	
	‘He has washed himself’					

The basic view that I shall try to argue against is that there are elements in morphosyntax that ‘make no semantic contribution’, whose formalization is provided by uninterpretable features in the system of Chomsky (1995ff.). To begin with it is easy to show that the existence of uninterpretable

features, or uninterpretable morphological elements spelling out such features, is just a theory not a fact. Thus take subject-verb agreement, as exemplified by agreement of *et* and *-is* in (1). There is a perfectly possible construal of it in which the verb inflection is interpretable. That is if instead of pretending that the inflection contributes properties to the event denoted by the verb, we assume that the inflection plays the same role within the verb structure as the subject clitic within the sentence. In other words, the so-called agreement inflection is a subject clitic internal to the morphological structure of the verb. As such, it contributes to the interpretation of the verb and of the sentence, providing in particular the only lexicalization of the referential properties of the subject in null subject sentences.

I shall argue that this move not only does not complicate the relationship between syntax and morphology but actually simplifies it. In fact, one of the basic advantages of the solution that I put forward (and hence one of the basic arguments in its favour) is that it makes the syntax and the morphology effectively identical, allowing for an unification of the two (not just a redundancy between them as in the Distributed Morphology framework). The reason to resist this solution at the syntactic level would be that it makes it impossible to entertain the idea that uninterpretability, and hence feature checking, is the motor of derivations in the computational component. Indeed if both *et* and *-is* in (1) are interpretable, feature checking cannot insure their agreement. The present move towards what we may call full interpretability therefore goes hand in hand with a different conception of agreement.

Now, in the domain of anaphora, agreement is not viewed as triggered by a computational rule. Rather the fact that two or more lexical items agree, simply forms the basis for their ability to be construed as having a single referent. The same model can obviously be extended to all other cases of agreement. Thus in (1) the agreement of *et* and *-is*, i.e. their sharing of referential features (hearer in this case), forms the basis for their sharing of the same slot in the argumental structure of the verb (the one argument slot in this case). Should agreement not take place, the argument calculus would fail. Now, sharing of the same argument slot is formalized in generative grammar as chain formation. Hence the chain formation relation is imputed to a syntactic and a morphological object; but more important than that, chain is treated as precisely a relation between two independently lexicalized objects, and not as itself the product of a derivational process. In other words, we are squarely within a 'representational' framework (Brody 1997 ff.).

3 In this framework, the instances of doubling in (1)-(3) are straightforwardly formalized as independent lexicalizations of the two clitics and of chain formation (a relational primitive) between them – allowing the predicate - argument calculus to converge. It will not have escaped the reader that the contexts in which doubling is found belong to two main types. Either the verb moves (or to be more precise, is spelled-out) in the C field, as in the interrogative in (1) and in the imperative in (2), or a two verbs, hence bisentential (Kayne 1993), structure is involved, as in (3). In this second case some restructuring (incorporation etc.) process must take place in order for the monoclausal interpretation typical of present perfects to arise; thus one clitic appears in the clitic climbing position while the other appears on the verb that it is an argument of. For this case, it is reasonable to assume that the two copies of the clitic are inserted in two independently available clitic domains, i.e. the clitic domain of the embedded participle (inserted in a high C field position within its own sentence) and the clitic domain of the matrix auxiliary.

We simply extend this treatment to (1)-(2), assuming that the appearance of more than one copy of a clitic depends on the existence of clitic domains to host them. We in fact propose more generally that every possible position of the verb (roughly V, I, C) supports a full set of argumental projections; full lexical arguments typically appear in the low (V) domain while clitics typically lexicalize higher (I and C) domains. The reason doubling appears (in simple sentences) only when the verb is in C (or higher) can then be construed as a consequence of the fact that the higher C field for the lexicalization of the clitic is available only if the verb in C activates it. Thus in (1) the

proclitic and the enclitic will lexicalize the same position of the clitic string, the proclitic in the C domain and the enclitic in the I domain. Something similar will hold in (2a) assuming that the imperative is so high in the C field as to leave to its right both the C set of clitic projections (corresponding to the first copy) and the I set. The same explanation can also be extended to (2b).

As time allows, I shall try to shoot down conceivable alternatives to this account, in terms of phonological processes, (partial) copies under movement and/or generalized head-Spec.