

## DOUBLING AS A “SPARE-MOVEMENT” STRATEGY

### CECILIA POLETTO

The problem I intend to tackle in this talk is why doubling is such an extremely pervasive phenomenon, when dialects are taken into account. If we consider doubling as: two elements sharing a single syntactic function (and often also their morphological form or syntactic category) in the same clause, a number of heterogeneous constructions and phenomena meet this definition. Among all the doubling structures found in Italian dialects, of which I will briefly present an overview, I will select three, namely DP doubling (for subjects, direct objects and indirect objects), interrogative wh-doubling and negation doubling, illustrated in (1) to (5)

- |     |                       |                    |
|-----|-----------------------|--------------------|
| (1) | El Nane el vien       | Loreo (Veneto)     |
| (2) | A ghe lo go da a Nane | “ “                |
| (3) | Lo vedo a Vincenzo    | Catania (Sicilian) |
| (4) | Ngo el ndat ngont?    | Monno (Lombard)    |
| (5) | A ne lo voio mina     | Loreo (Veneto)     |

The reason for this choice is that they form a unitary phenomenon, as they share the following features:

- one of the two elements forming the doublet is a head, the other is an XP
- the head targets a functional checking position which in other languages that do not display doubling is occupied by the doubled XP itself
- doubling is sensitive to hierarchies, as not all XPs with the same function are doubled in all dialects, but the progressive enlargement of doubling across dialects can be expressed by implicational scales
- doubling is often a diachronically “transitional” stage towards a grammar without doubling and without movement of the doubled XP

The aim of the talk is to show and to explain why these features come about. Following Benincà and Poletto (2005), I will propose that the doubling strategy, which appears at first sight to be a redundancy of language, indeed obeys general principles of economy, instantiating a sort of “feature movement” without pied piping of the whole XP in overt syntax. In other words, the strategy of doubling allows a whole XP to stay in situ and nevertheless to check a strong feature higher up in the syntactic tree by means of a clitic particle. I will follow Uriagereka (1991)’s assumption that doubling structures start out as a single complex syntactic object with the form  $[X^\circ \text{XP}]$  and that the  $X^\circ$  element is raised to a feature checking position either leaving the XP in situ or moving it to a different checking position in a sort of job sharing between the two components of the complex which check each a distinct feature, thus yielding a one to one relation between the feature checked and the  $X^\circ/\text{XP}$  instead of a complex movement path of one single element. This explains why one of the two elements is a head, and why it diachronically a passage towards lack of movement, instantiated in other languages.

This still does not explain the implicational scale(s) found within the three phenomena, which partly follow from the syntactic makeup of sentence structure and from the nature of the XP itself. For instance, I will consider DP doubling, which is sensitive to the type of DP, as doubling of quantifiers implies doubling of DPs, which in turn implies doubling of tonic pronouns (the implication has to be read as: all dialects that have QP-doubling also have DP doubling and pronoun doubling as well, and all dialects that have DP doubling also have pronoun doubling as well). I claim that this depends on the number of features expressed by the type of DP itself, as pronouns (which not by chance maintain case distinctions) have in their syntactic makeup more projections (and consequently features to check) activated than DP, which in turn, being referential have more features than QPs. Hence the split in terms of features. The implications found with wh items and negation (which will be examined in the talk) also depend on the internal structure of the doubled element. This lends support to Uriagereka’s original intuition that doubling starts out in the internal

structure of the doubled element and to the formulation made here that doubling is a feature checking economy strategy.