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1. INTRODUCTION

Standard French (henceforth SF) enjoys several forms of interrogative sentence – clitic subject inversion (1), complex inversion (2a.), “stylistic” inversion (2b.). The est-ce que strategy (2c.) and the in situ option (2d.) belong to a rather informal subvariety of SF.

(1) A qui téléphone-t-elle?
To whom telephones she
‘Who does she phone?’

(2) a. A qui ton amie téléphone-t-elle?
To whom your friend phones she
b. A qui téléphone ton amie?
To whom phones your friend
c. A qui est-ce que ton amie téléphone?
To whom is it that your friend phones
d. Ton amie téléphone à qui?
Your friend phones to whom
‘Who does your friend phone?’

This paper examines an alternative form of interrogative sentence, which is characteristic of Québec French and other varieties of non-standard French (among others, the patois of Paris and Normandy1), and of Franco-provençal (see par. 3.4). It consists of an invariable interrogative marker ti or tu which cliticises on the tensed verb. In France the only attested form (in my knowledge) is ti, whereas Québec French (henceforth QF) prefers tu. The form ti, when accepted, is felt as more “popular”.

(3) A qui elle téléphone-tu/ti?

* This article has benefitted considerably from the comments and suggestions of Maria Teresa Biason, Anna Cardinaletti, Guglielmo Cinque, Nicola Munaro, Cecilia Poletto, Jean-Yves Pollock, Anne Rochette and Ur Shlonsky. It was presented in preliminary version as a paper for the Corso di Perfezionamento in Linguistica e Filosofia del Linguaggio (1998-99) at the Ca’ Foscari University of Venice. I wish to thank the professors and students who took part to the course. As to the judgements, I am grateful to Roger Boucher, Marie-Josée Hamel, Philippe Le May-Boucher and Anne Rochette for Québec French, and to Marie-Christine Jamet and Michal Starke for Standard French. Needless to say, I am entirely responsible for any mistakes.

1 Cf. Foulet (1921) for the patois of Paris. He also cites M. Joret (Romania 6, 1878), as the first to signal the ti morpheme in Normandy. Guy de Maupassant’s novels and short stories also offer several examples of it.

(i.) T’avais-ti perdu le sens? (Guy de Maupassant, Boule de suif, 1880)
you had-lost the sense
‘Had you lost your wits?’
To whom she phones—INTERR.
‘Who does she phone?’

The data presented here (par. 2) are partial counter-examples to usual claims in literature upon this subject. In order to explain the behaviour of the \textit{ti/tu} morpheme, I will examine (par. 3) different theoretical models of interrogative sentence—namely, the \textit{Wh}-Criterion of \textit{Rizzi} (1992), the theory of double [\textit{Spec, CP}] of \textit{Rizzi & Roberts} (1992) and the distinction between [\textit{Q}] and [\textit{op}] features of \textit{Friedemann} (1997). Other proposals linked to particular linguistic varieties will also be considered—that is, \textit{Poletto} (1993), \textit{Roberts} (1993) and \textit{Munaro} (1995). Then (par. 4), I will present an alternative proposal, which starts from \textit{Cardinaletti’s} (1997) Split-AGRP hypothesis. Finally (par.5), I will mention some opaque points in the analysis. The theoretical framework is \textit{Kayne} (1994).

2. \textsc{The Data}

\textit{Noonan} (1992), and \textit{Vinet} (2000)—among others—state that \textit{ti/tu} in QF is restricted to yes/no questions. In this paper, however, I report data which seem to squib a relatively homogeneous variety of QF spoken in a geographical area between Montréal and Québec City. In this variety, the interrogative marker is used indeed in \textit{yes/no} questions (4a), but also in \textit{wh-}questions (4b.), whereas it cannot be used in indirect interrogative sentences (i.e. subordinate clauses, see (4c.))\textsuperscript{2}.

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. \textit{Je suis-\textit{tu}} obligé de manger ma soupe? \textsuperscript{3}
\hline
\textit{I am-INTERR} obliged to eat my soup
\‘Am I obliged to eat my soup?’
\item b. \textit{A qui elle téléphone-\textit{tu}?}
\hline
\textit{To whom she phones—INTERR.}
‘Who does she phone?’
\item c. \textit{*Marie ne savait pas qui elle avait-\textit{tu} vu.}
\hline
\textit{Marie not cl knew not who she had—INTERR seen}
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{2} More precisely, this variety refers to Montréal Nord (M.-J. Hamel) and Nicolet (R. Boucher and P. Le May-Boucher). Instead, the zone of Montréal (A. Rochette) respects the pattern drawn by Noonan (1992) and \textit{Vinet} (2000).

It is perhaps useful to recall that the data I am treating here are not the only examples of a -\textit{ti} marker used with \textit{wh}-questions. \textit{Foulet} (1921, p. 280) reports (ii) as a sentence currently used in the \textit{patois} of Paris in the ‘20s. He also gives (iii) and (iv), although he judges them as \textit{gauches et contournées} ‘awkward and twisted’ sentences.

\begin{enumerate}
\item (ii.) \textit{Où j’ai \textit{ti} vu ce nom-là?}
\hline
\textit{Where I have INTERR seen that name-there}
‘Where did I see that name?’
\item (iii.) \textit{Comment tu as \textit{ti} fait?}
\hline
\textit{How you have INTERR done}
‘How did you do it?’
\item (iv.) \textit{Pourquoi elle y va \textit{ti}?}
\hline
\textit{Why she there goes INTERR}
‘Why does she go there?’
\end{enumerate}

Further on (idem, p. 332), he reports the form (v), attested in the \textit{Atlas linguistique de la France} by \textit{J. Gilliéron} & E. \textit{Edmont} (1902) for the Franco-provençal of Savoy.

\begin{enumerate}
\item (v) \textit{Comment il crie-\textit{ti}?}
\hline
\textit{How he shouts-INTERR}
‘How does he shout?’
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{3} The pronunciation of QF presents some peculiarities, which have not been reported because they would have probably made the picture blurry. For example, \textit{je suis} ‘I am’ assimilates in [\textit{Syi}]; the pronouns \textit{il} ‘he’ and \textit{elle} ‘she’ become [\textit{i}] and [\textit{a}] respectively. –\textit{Tu} is pronounced [\textit{tsy}].
The interrogative marker cliticises on the tensed verb, whatever its person and number is. However, since the marker is almost always used in informal contexts and in these contexts the impersonal pronoun on ‘one’ is preferred to the 1st p.pl. pronoun nous ‘we’, nous is slightly marginal with ti/tu (5c.). Ti/tu is also possible with ‘full’ NPs (5d.).

(5) a. T’es-tu en forme?
You are-INTERR. in form
‘Are you fit?’
b. On est-tu chanceux?
One is-INTERR. lucky
‘Are we lucky?’
c. ? Nous sommes-tu en guerre?
We are-INTERR in war
‘Are we at war?’
d. Rose a-tu grossi?
Rose has-INTERR fattened
‘Has Rose fattened?’

It is impossible to use ti/tu together with subject-clitic inversion (6a.)⁴, while judgements disagree about the est-ce que strategy (6b)⁵. The wh-operator must move to [Spec, CP] (6c.) – the in situ option is unavailable.

(6) a. *Vois-tu-tu des solutions?
See-you-INTERR some solutions
b. * /ok Est-ce qu’on va-tu au cinéma?
Is it that one goes-INTERR to the cinema
c. *Elle rencontre-tu qui?
She meets-INTERR who

As to wh-phrases, the interrogative marker is incompatible with a subject wh-operator, whatever its form is: interrogative pronoun (7a.), interrogative adjective modifying a NP (7b.), quantifier (7c.).

(7) a. *Qui a-tu tapé à la porte?
Who has-INTERR knocked at the door
b. *Quelle fille joue-tu?
What girl plays-INTERR
c. *Combien d’enfants mangent-tu?
How many of children eat-INTERR

On the contrary, the wh-operator can be an object NP (8a. - c.), or a PP (8d. - e.).

(8) a. Qui elle rencontre-tu tous les matins?

⁴ The speakers show doubts about (vi), probably because it tends to be a ‘fixed’ expression, and is difficult to be analysed in terms of subject-clitic inversion.

(vi.) Parlez-vous-tu anglais?
Speak-you pl-INTERR English
‘Do you speak English?’

⁵ M.-J. Hamel admits (6b.), whereas the other speakers do not.
Who she meets-INTERR all the mornings
‘Who does she meet every morning?’
b. Quelle remarque il a-tu fait?
What remark he has-INTERR made
‘What remark did he make?’
c. Combien de livres elle a-tu lus?
How many of books she has-inter read
‘How many books did she read?’
d. Avec qui elle veut-tu parler?
With whom she wants-INTERR to speak
‘Who does she want to speak to?’
e. Avec quel garçon il a-tu parlé?
With what boy he has-INTERR spoken
‘What boy did he speak to?’

No speakers admit quoi and que ‘what’ in [Spec, CP] together with ti/tu (9a., b.). Instead, the structures quoi c’est que (9c.) and qu’est-ce que (9d.) are always accepted, in contrast with the simple est-ce que structure (6b). The in situ strategy is impossible (9e.).

(9) a. *Quoi t’as-tu mangé?
What you have-INTERR eaten
b. *Que t’as-tu mangé?
What you have-INTERR eaten
c. Quoi c’est que t’as-tu mangé?
What it is that you have-INTERR eaten
‘What’s what you ate?’
d. Qu’est-ce que t’as-tu mangé?
What is it that you have-INTERR eaten
‘what’s what you ate?’
e. *T’as-tu mangé quoi?
You have-INTERR eaten what

Some wh-operators derived from adjuncts are also possible. Judgements disagree on pourquoi ‘why’, où ‘where’ and comment ‘how’ (10a.-c.). Most interestingly, the speakers seem to accept either all or none of them⁶. Combien ‘how much’ (10d.) is (marginally) accepted, while quand ‘when’ is not (10e.).

(10) a. */ok Pourquoi on existe-tu?
Why one exists-INTERR
‘Why do we exist?’
b. */ok Où il va-tu?
Where he goes-INTERR
‘Where is he going?’
c. */ok Comment il est-tu?
How he is-INTERR
‘How is he?’
d. ? Combien ça coûte-tu?

⁶ P.Le May-Boucher and R.Boucher accept all, whereas M.-J. Hamel accepts none.
How much this costs-interr
‘How much is it?’
e. *Quand elle aura-tu fini?
When she will-have-interr finished

All the accepted combinations are also possible if the complementiser que ‘that’
occupies C°, even when the wh-operator is the subject of the verb (11a. 7). Moreover, the
insertion of que ‘that’ rescues the sentences judged impossible – namely, sentences having
quoi ‘what’ (but not que ‘what’) and adjuncts in [Spec, CP] can be possible:

(11) a. Qui qu’a tapé à la porte? 8
b. Qui qu’elle rencontre-tu tous les matins?
c. Quelle remarque qu’il a-tu fait?
d. Avec qui qu’elle veut-tu parler?
e. Avec quel garçon qu’il a-tu parlé?
f. Quoi que t’as-tu mangé? 9
g. *Que que t’as-tu mangé?
h. Pourquoi qu’on existe-tu?
i. Où qu’il va-tu?
j. Comment qu’il est-tu?
k. Combien que ça coûte-tu?
l. *oku Quand qu’elle aura-tu fini?

3. THE ANALYSIS

3.1 Rizzi’s (1992) hypothesis: the Wh-Criterion

Rizzi (1992) establishes the general principle ruling interrogative sentences:

(12) The Wh-Criterion:
A. A wh-operator must be in a Spec-head configuration with X° [+wh];
B. An X° [+wh] must be in a Spec-head configuration with a wh-operator.

This principle describes the configuration universally needed for an interrogative
sentence to be accepted: since the [+wh] feature on a clausal head (typically C°) designates
that its CP is a question, at the appropriate level of representation interrogative operators
must be in the Specs of CPs interpreted as questions and, reciprocally, CPs interpreted as questions
must have interrogative operators as specifiers. This condition must be satisfied at LF in any
case. If the interrogative CP is embedded, the [+wh] feature of C° is selected by the verb of
the main clause:

(13) I wonder [ CP who, C° [+wh] [Mary has seen t]]

7 Obviously, (11a.) is impossible if the marker ti/tu is added (cf. 7a.):
(vii.) *Qui qu’a-tu tapé à la porte?
8 Anne Rochette (p.c.) informs me that in her dialect the current form of (11a.) is Qui qui a tapé à la porte?
[kakjatapealapRT].
(viii.) Quoi que tu as fait?
‘What have you done’
On the contrary, if the CP is a direct question, the starting point for the chain of licensing is the inflection head INFL, which also contains the tense specifications of the whole sentence. This postulate allows us to explain subject-auxiliary inversion: I°→C° movement moves the [+wh] feature in the right position to satisfy the Wh-Criterion.

(14) a. [C [Mary has [+wh] seen who]]
   b. [Who has [+wh] [Mary t seen t]]

When the wh-operator is the subject of the sentence, a chain of co-indexed positions is formed, which blocks the I°-to-C° movement. In fact, in English, I° and the inflection containing [+wh], lowered to V°, are co-indexed; the subject moved to [Spec, CP] triggers agreement in C°; the trace of the subject in [Spec, IP] is co-indexed with I°; hence, by transitivity, C° is co-indexed with I°. C° forms a chain with I° and with the lower inflection containing [+wh]. Then, the Wh-Criterion is met in syntax.

(15) [Who I° C° i t I° i love-s [+wh] Mary]]

Rizzi (1992) mentions the interrogative marker ti as the morphological realisation of [+wh] on I°. Noonan (1992) and Friedemann (1997) agree with him on this point, while Roberts (1993) and Poletto (1993) claim that [+wh] can also be base-generated in C° (cf. section 3.3). In order to explain how French can leave a wh-operator in situ (16a.) and/or avoid I-to-C movement, (16b.), Rizzi exploits a partially functional definition of wh-operator (17):

(16) a. Elle a rencontré qui?
   She has met whom
   b. Qui elle a rencontré?
   Whom she has met
   ‘Who did she meet?’

(17) A. wh-operator = a wh-phrase in a scope position
    B. scope position = a left-peripheral A-bar position

When an interrogative sentence has a wh-operator in situ, this wh-phrase does not qualifies as an operator; hence it needs not to be in a Spec-head relation with a X° [+wh]. In order to meet the Wh-Criterion, French exploits an option called dynamic agreement: in (16a.), the wh-phrase must move in a scope position at LF, and it endows C° of the [+wh] feature under dynamic agreement. This phenomenon takes place in syntax in the case of (16b.). However, the fact that this option is peculiar to French makes it look like an ad hoc solution.

(18) wh-op X° ⇒ wh-op X° [+wh]
3.2 Rizzi & Roberts (1992): double [Spec, CP]

Alternatively, Rizzi & Roberts (1992) suggest that I° can move to C° and check [+wh] at the appropriate level of representation, but, as C° can be occupied by COMP, I° adjoins to C°. The typically French asymmetry between NP and clitic subject (20a. -b.) is explained by the postulate that, after I-to-C movement, the clitic subject incorporates in C°. Its incorporation is required because of the visibility condition of NPs in syntax. As in French a NP is endowed with Nominative Case only by Spec-head agreement, I-to-C movement destroys the configuration needed for Case-marking. On the contrary, a clitic subject can be ‘saved’ by incorporation.

(19) a. Is John in Paris?
    b. Is he in Paris?

(20) a. *Est Jean a Paris?
     Is Jean in Paris
     *Est-il à Paris?
     ‘Is he in Paris?’

(21) a. *Quand est Jean venu?
     When is Jean come
     b. Quand est-il venu?
     When is he come
     ‘When did he come?’

Since adjunction of I° to C° needs not only two heads, but also two specifiers, French complex inversion can be explained:

(22) Quand Jean est-il venu?
    When Jean is-he come
    ‘When did Jean come?’

In (22), quand ‘when’ is in the higher SPEC, which is an A-bar position, whereas Jean is in the lower SPEC, an A position. The two specifiers are hierarchically ordered because the subject must be adjacent to the head that endows it with Nominative Case, namely I°:

(23) [CP Quand [CP Jean, [C [est-il]k [t_i t_k venu]]]]

Rizzi & Roberts claim that the two subjects are base-generated in the sentence; the full NP is generated in [Spec, VP], while [Spec, IP] is occupied by an expletive item. When the CP level is activated, I° moves to C° and the expletive incorporates.

This hypothesis has been contested for various reasons. Among others, it is doubtful that the clitic pronoun is an expletive, since it agrees with the subject NP in gender and number; it is not clear why I-to-C movement should destroy the context of Case-marking; inversion in normal declarative sentences has not been excluded.

---


Poletto (1993) states that clitic subjects in north-eastern Italian dialects are not NP subjects, but heads adjoined to Agr° which bear \( \varphi \)-features. Spec-head agreement with [Spec, AgrP] licenses a pro; in fact, these varieties are null subject languages (NSLs).

A piece of evidence for this conclusion is the fact that the series of preverbal clitic subjects (SCL1) are different from those of postverbal clitic subjects (SCL2) used in interrogative sentences, both in their morphological form and quantity – the series of SCL1s is incomplete. The examples are in Padouan dialect.

(24) a. Go da fare na roba.
   pro have to do something
   ‘I have to do something.’
   b. Cossa goi da fare?
      What have-I\(_d\) to do
      ‘What do I have to do?’

(25) a. Te ghè da fare na roba
      ‘You have to do something’
   b. Cossa ghèto da fare?
      What have-you\(_d\) to do
      ‘What do you have to do?’

(26) a. 1 2 3 4 5 6
      -  te el/la - - i/le
   b. 1 2 3 4 5 6
      i  to lo/la i o li/le

However, SCL1s are in complementary distribution with phonetically realised subject NPs: they cannot co-occur with another thematic subject in an argumental position, nor can they occur if a \( \theta \)-role has not been assigned to the subject, as with weather verbs. Hence, they must absorb a \( \theta \)-role:

(27) a. Nisun (*el) vien
      Nobody he\(_d\) comes
   b. Personne (*il) n’a rien dit
      Nobody he\(_d\) not\(_d\) has nothing said
      ‘Nobody said anything’

(28) a. *El pare che…
      He\(_d\) seems that…
   b. Il semble que…
      It\(_d\) seems that…
      ‘It seems that…’

Poletto (1993) shares Rizzi & Roberts’ (1992) hypothesis that I-to-C movement destroys the context of Case-marking. In Padouan, like in French, an NP subject cannot remain in [Spec, AgrP] with I-to-C movement (29), while a clitic subject can (30). Contrary to French, though, \( wh \)-questions do not allow clitic subject to follow the subject NP (31).
(29) a. *Quand est Jean venu?
   When is Jean come
b. *Quando ze Nane vegnúo?
   When is Nane come

(30) a. Quand est-il venu?
   When is-he come
b. Quando ze llo vegnuo?
   Quand Nane comes-he
‘When did he come?’

(31) a. Quand Jean vient-il?
   When Jean comes-he
‘When did Jean come?’

b. *Quando Nane vien llo?
   Quando Nane comes he
‘When did Jean come?’

Hence, Poletto suggests that in north-eastern Italian dialects SCL2s are true NPs, which can occupy [Spec, AgrP]. They have a complete morphological series, differently from SCL1s, because they have to licence pro after I-to-C movement.

Roberts (1993) adopts a parallel analysis for Valdôtain, as he distinguishes SCL1s – agreement markers – from SCL2s – real subject pronouns. He also sketches the diachronic origin of the ti/teu interrogative marker in Valdôtain. The ti form derives from t-il ‘(does) he’, while teu corresponds to ‘you’ 2nd p.s. pronoun; both of them were used in subject clitic inversion. The structural ambiguity of the interrogative form SCL-V-SCL allowed the evolution of SCL2 from a clitic subject agreeing in gender and number into an invariable interrogative marker. Speakers just re-analyse and simplify the structure.

The examples are drawn from Châtillon (32a.), where the ti marker has already settled, and Ayas (32b.), while the re-analysis is still going on. The structure in (33a) is the starting point: I°, with the preverbal clitic subject, has moved to C°. The postverbal clitic subject occupies [Spec, AgrP]. (33b) is the re-analysed structure: I° does not move, and the postverbal clitic is invariable.

(32) a. Me minjo ty ina poma?
   pro Icl eat-INTERR an apple
   ‘Will I eat an apple?’

b. L’a teu mindja?
   pro hecl has-PRON eaten
   ‘Did he eat?’

(33) a. [CP cl + auxk # tiI [IP tI [I’ t2k VP]]]

b. [IP pro [I’ cl + aux # ti VP]]

11 Cf. Vinet (2000), speaking about QF: “[…] The phonological representation of -tu can sometimes be blurred in the mind of speakers who will misinterpret the form as a 2ps enclitic. […] Journalists who sometimes write the colloquial form often mistakenly use a second-person verb form as in: Ça se peux-tu (‘Can you believe it?’ or more literally ‘Is it possible?’) instead of Ça se peut-tu, using the wrong inflectional form on the verb which rather reflects the agreement pattern with a 2ps of the Clitic Inversion structure from SF: Peux-tu? (Can you?). The same type of mispelling is observed in […] Y as-tu queu’un qui t’suit? (‘Is there anyone following you?’).”
As to the general theory about interrogatives, Poletto (1993) suggests that Rizzi’s (1992) Wh- Criterion presents a parameter about the choice of the head bearing the \([\text{wh}]\) feature.

(34) A. INFL is marked \([+\text{wh}]\)
    B. COMP is marked \([+\text{wh}]\)

While English, French and Padouan are examples of languages choosing I° as the head bearing the \([+\text{wh}]\) feature, Venetian has both opportunities open.

If INFL is marked \([+\text{wh}]\), the inflected verb has to move to C°, and a cleft structure is obligatorily realised, in which the verb moving to C° is the copula. According to Poletto (1993), this is due to the Venetian tendency not to use SCL2s and to the fact that I-to-C movement destroys the context of Nominative case assignement. Hence, the only element that can occupy [Spec, AgrP] is an expletive null subject.

(35) Cossa ze che la magna?     \((\text{Venetian})\)
    What is that she eats
    ‘What does she eat?’

(36) \([\text{CP} \text{Cossa} [\text{C}° \text{ze} [\text{AGRP} \text{pro} \text{t}]} [\text{VP} [\text{CP} \text{t}° [\text{AGRP} \text{la magna} \text{t}]}]]]])]

    Instead, if C° is marked \([+\text{wh}]\), a complementiser occupies C° and the resulting structure is a sentence like (37).

(37) Cossa che la magna?
    What that she eats
    ‘What does she eat?’

A third possibility is that of a language which chooses only the B option of (34). Triestino seems to be such a language.

In Triestino the inflected verb never moves to C°, because it is not \([+\text{wh}]\) marked; hence it has no feature to check through head movement. The Wh- Criterion is satisfied only by the movement of the wh- operator to [Spec, CP], because the Spec-head relation is established with the head C°, and not with the inflected verb.

(38) Cossa la dise?     \((\text{Triestino})\)
    What she says
    ‘What does she say?’
3.4 Friedemann (1997): distinction between \([Q]\) and \([op]\) features

Friedemann (1997) suggests that I-to-C movement is covert in French, and that postverbal clitics are not pronominal subjects, but mode and tense markers, which also bear \(\phi\)-features. This characteristic allows them to identify a null subject in clitic subject and complex inversion.

\[(39)\] 
\[\text{[Où [Jacques/pro a-t-il mangé]]}  
\text{Where Jacques/pro has-INTERR 3\textsuperscript{rd} p.s.m. eaten}  
\text{‘Where did Jacques/he eat?’}  
\]

This analysis permits fruitful parallelisms with English and north-eastern Italian dialects. In fact, in the contexts where French (40a.-b.) presents an interrogative marker, English uses the auxiliary \(\textit{do}\) (41a.-b.).

\[(40)\]  
a. \textit{Qui aime Marie?} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Qui: subject}  
\text{Who loves Marie}  
\text{‘Who loves Marie?’}  
b. \textit{Qui (Marie) aime-t-elle?} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Qui: object}  
\text{Who Marie loves-INTERR 3\textsuperscript{rd} p.s.f.}  
\text{‘Who does Marie love?’}  

\[(41)\]  
a. \textit{Who loves Fiona?} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Who: subject}  
b. \textit{Who does Fiona love?} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Who: object}  

Hence, \(\textit{do}\) is a free flexional morpheme, which differs from French interrogative markers in the fact that it is not an affix. It moves to \(C^0\) in syntax because it does not have any relevant semantic content, then it is invisible to LF processes.

Consequently, Rizzi’s (1992) Wh-Criterion is re-interpreted – instead of one \([\textit{wh}]\) feature, two distinct features are to be checked, namely \([Q]\), generated in \(I^0\), and \([op]\), generated in \([\text{Spec, CP}]\). If these features are strong, they require overt movement. \(I^0\) must raise to \(C^0\), while an interrogative operator must move to \([\text{Spec, CP}]\). Then, the Spec-head configuration required by Rizzi’s Wh-Criterion is preserved. If the features are weak, they delay movement to LF.

The crucial point is that these two features are independent. For example, interrogative sentences in Bellunese dialect (Munaro 1995) present overt I-to-C movement, but \(\textit{wh}\)-phrases \textit{in situ}. Hence, Bellunese has a strong \([Q]\) feature and a weak \([op]\) feature.

\[(42)\]  
\textit{A-tu fat che?} \hspace{1cm} (Munaro 1995)  
\textit{Have you done what}  
\text{‘What have you done?’}  

Manifestly, in French \([Q]\) is weak and \([op]\) is strong, except in the varieties which exploit the \textit{in situ} option, where \([Q]\) and \([op]\) are weak.

According to Friedemann, when the question bears on the subject, the \([Q]\) features have to be checked in an A position – namely, \([\text{Spec, IP}]\) – through spec-head relation with \(I^0\) (43a.-c.). When the question does not bear on the subject, the \([Q]\) features have to be checked in an A-bar position – namely, \([\text{Spec, CP}]\) – through I-to-C movement (44a.-c.). The interrogative marker in French and \(\textit{do}\) in English correspond to \([Q]\) to be checked in \([\text{Spec, CP}]\). I-to-C movement is covert in French.
(43) a. *Qui aime-t-il Claire?
   Who loves-INTERR 3rd p.s.m. Claire
b. *Who does love Claire?

(44) a. Qui Claire a-t-elle vu?
   Who Claire has-INTERR 3rd p.s.f. seen
  ‘Who did Claire see?’
b. Who did Claire see?

The grammaticality of (45) shows that in colloquial French the interrogative marker is not morphologically realised.

(45) Qui tu as\[wh\] vu?
   Who you have seen
   ‘Who did you see?’

Thus, Friedemann eliminates Rizzi’s (1992) partially functional definition of operator and the option of dynamic agreement, and Rizzi & Roberts’ (1992) adjunction of I$^\circ$ to C$^\circ$.

However, Friedemann’s (1997) theory presents opaque points as well. First, I would express some doubts about the possibility for a language to be pro-drop only in interrogative sentences. Second, Friedemann (1997) does not account for the main piece of evidence of I-to-C movement in French – that is, the fact that it is complementary to COMP. In fact, Rizzi & Roberts (1992) offer examples of QF (46a-c), where inversion is impossible if C$^\circ$ is taken by que ‘that’; SF (47a-c), where adverbs requiring subject-auxiliary inversion can, as an alternative, insert the complementiser; and informal SF (48a-c), where the if-clause of a conditional sentence can be expressed either by the complementiser si ‘if’ in C$^\circ$, or by subject-auxiliary inversion, with the verb in the conditional mode.

(46) a. Qui as-tu vu?
   Who have you seen?
b. Qui que tu as vu?
   Who that you have seen
c. *Qui qu’as-tu vu?
   Who that have you seen
   ‘Who did you see?’

(47) a. Peut-être a-t-il fait...
   Perhaps has he done
b. Peut-être qu’il a fait...
   Perhaps that he has done
c. *Peut-être qu’a-t-il fait...
   Perhaps that has he done
   ‘Perhaps he did…’

(48) a. Si tu étais parti, je t’aurais accompagné.
   If you had left, I you would-have accompanied
b. Serais-tu parti, je t’aurais accompagné.
   Had-you left, I you would-have accompanied
c. *Si serais-tu parti, je t’aurais accompagné.
   If had you left, I you would-have accompanied
‘If you had left, I would have accompanied you’

Third, Friedemann claims that, when the question bears on the subject, the [Q] feature is to be verified in [Spec, IP] through Spec-head relation with F°. However, in QF the complementiser can follow the wh-operator even when it is the subject. Hence, qui ‘who’ must have moved to [Spec, CP].

(49) Qui qu’a tapé à la porte? (=10a.)
Who that has knocked at the door
‘Who knocked at the door?’

Finally, the interrogative pronoun que ‘what’ is problematic. There are two hypothesis concerning it; the first one12 is that que is the phonetic realisation of COMP, and that [Spec, CP] is occupied by an abstract wh-operator; the second one (Friedemann 1990) is that que is the weak form of quoi, just like the personal pronoun me is the atonic equivalent of the tonic pronoun moi ‘me’. Que would be a ‘full’ pronoun which cliticises on C”, where the verb has moved.

(50) a. Que cherchez-vous?
‘What are you looking for?’

(51) a. Que cherche Rose?
‘What is Rose looking for?’

Since Friedemann (1997) excludes overt inversion in French, he is obliged to postulate that an adjacency relation is required between que and INFL at PF, although he admits that this is an ad hoc solution.

4. THE SPLIT-AGRP HYPOTHESIS

Picoche & Marchello-Nizia (1991) explain that the *ti* morpheme originates from –*t-il*, which is the verbal interrogative form of the third person singular (52). In “popular” French, since the end of the 18th century, –*ti* becomes an interrogative suffix for all persons, either preserving the SVO order (53a.), or cliticising on the inverted structure (53b.)

(52) L’aime-t-il?
    Her loves he
    ‘Does he love her?’

(53) a. Je l’aime-*ti*?
    I her love-INTERR
    Do I love her?

b. Veux-tu-*ti*?
    Want-you-INTERR
    ‘Do you want (it)?’

Friedemann’s (1997) approach would lead us to claim that in (53b.) an invariable interrogative marker (*ti*) is added to the interrogative marker agreeing with *pro* (*tu*).

I would like to suggest an alternative model, starting from Cardinaletti’s (1997) split-AgrP hypothesis. This theory states that, in a sentence, a higher AgrSP position – let us call it *SubjP* – is reserved to ‘full’ NPs and strong pronouns, while a lower position – **AgrSP** – is reserved to weak pronouns. In *SubjP* the “Subject-of-Predication” property of (strong) subjects is checked, and in *AgrSP* nominative case and *ϕ*-features are checked.

In fact, it is commonly accepted that in syntax the subject of a sentence occupies [Spec, AgrP] and that the tensed verb takes Agr°. However, ‘full’ NPs and strong pronouns (French *lui*, English *he*, German *er* [+human]) admit the insertion of a parenthetical, while weak pronouns (French *il*, English *it*, German *er* [-human]) do not.

---

13 Foulet (1921) also reports (ix) from E. Rolland (1878), Romania 7, p. 599; (x-xi) from G. Paris (1906), Mélanges linguistiques publiés par M. Roques, p. 280, (xii-xiii) from Nyrop (1903), Grammaire historique de la langue française, t. II, p. 168.

(ix.) Voulez-vous-*t’y*?
    Want you pl INTERR
    ‘Do you want (it) ?’

(x.) As-tu-*ti* bu?
    Have you INTERR drunk
    ‘Did you drink?’

(xi.) Viendrez-vous-*ti* me voir?
    Will-come you INTERR me see
    ‘Will you come and see me?’

(xii.) Suis-*je-*ti* ?
    Am I INTERR
    ‘Am I ?’

(xiii.) Sommes-nous-*ti*?
    Are we INTERR
    ‘Are we?’

14 This dichotomy is taken from Cardinaletti (1999). In Cardinaletti (1997) SubjP and AgrP were called Agr1P and Agr2p respectively.

15 Italian presents a peculiar situation, since *egli* ‘he’ admits the insertion of a parenthetical, although it belongs to the same pronominal class as *il/it/es*, whereas *pro* and *tu* ‘you’ are weak pronouns:

(xiv.) [Subj Gianni/Lui/Egli Subj° [FP [AgrSP pro/ tu Vfin [... ]]]]
a. Jean/Lui, je crois, aime beaucoup la musique.
   ‘Jean/He, I think, loves music a lot.’

b. *Il, je crois, aime beaucoup la musique.
   He weak, I think, loves a-lot the music

a. John/He, as you know, is a nice guy.

b. *It, as you know, rained the whole day.

a. Er, soweit ich weiss, spricht nur Englisch.
   ‘He, as far as I know, speaks only English’

b. *Er/Es, soweit ich weiss, kostet zuviel.
   It, as far as I know, costs too much

As in Kayne’s (1994) theoretical framework adjunction to X-bar is impossible, full NPs and strong pronouns must occupy a higher projection than the one taken by weak pronouns and the tensed verb. The higher projection, however, is not left dislocated. Parenthetical sentences take a functional projection in the middle.

a. [SubjP Jean/lui Subj° [FP je crois [AgrSP SPEC aime [XP beaucoup la musique]]]]

b. [SubjP John/he Subj° [FP as you know [AgrSP SPEC is [XP a nice guy]]]]

c. [SubjP Er Subj° [FP soweit ich weiss [AgrSP SPEC spricht [XP nur Englisch]]]]

This model can also account for complex inversion in SF. In a way, it restates Rizzi & Roberts’ (1992) idea, but the double [Spec, CP] hypothesis is eliminated, thus making analysis more straightforward. In SF, contrary to English, subject-auxiliary inversion is impossible with a ‘full’ NP subject. It seems that C° cannot be used.
(59)  
  a. Is John in Paris?  
  b. Is he in Paris?  

(60)  
  a. *Est Jean à Paris?  
  b. Est-il à Paris?  
    ‘Is he in Paris?’  

(61)  
  a. *Combien de livres a Jean lus?  
  b. Combien de livres Jean a-t-il lus?  
    ‘How many books did Jean read?’  

Complex inversion simply calls the two AgrSP layers into play. (62) is an indicative representation of (61b):  

(62) \[
[\text{CP} \text{[Combien de livres]} \text{X C° [SubjP Jean [a-t-ill] [AgrSP t j lus t s]]}]?
\]

My hypothesis holds Friedemann’s (1997) distinction between \([Q]\) and \([op]\) features to be valid, and takes the ti/tu marker as the overt realisation of \([Q]\). Contra Friedemann, however, I would claim that postverbal clitic subjects are not realisations of \([Q]\) and that whenever they appear, I-to-C movement has taken place.  

In (63a-b) the interrogative feature is abstract, contrasting with (63c-d).  

(63)  
  a. Tu veux de l’eau?  
    You want of the water  
  b. Veux-tu de l’eau?  
    Want-you of the water  
  c. Tu veux-ti de l’eau?  
    You want-INTERR of the water  
  d. Veux-tu-ti de l’eau?  
    Want-you-INTERR of the water  
    ‘Do you want any water?’

Since Kayne (1994, p. 20) refuses multiple head adjunctions, cyclic adjunction is necessary. The sentences in (63) should be represented as in (64):  

(64)  
  a. [CP C° [SubjP Subj° [AgrSP tu veux [TP de l’eau]]]]  
  b. [CP [veux-tu] [SubjP t [AgrSP t t [TP de l’eau]]]]  
  c. [CP C° [SubjP Subj° [AgrSP tu veux-ti [TP t de l’eau]]]]  
  d. [CP [[veux-tu-ti] [SubjP t [AgrSP t t [TP de l’eau]]]]]

In (64a.) AgrS° is \([Q]\)-marked, although the interrogative feature is not phonetically realised. I-to-C movement takes place at LF, because \([Q]\) is weak.  

In (64b.) the pronoun tu ‘you’ adjoins to a functional head on its left, let us say Subj°. The tensed verb, in its turn, cliticises on this complex head. Despite it is not phonetically realised, the \([Q]\) feature is strong and must be checked on C° in syntax. Hence, the complex head /veux-tu/ moves to C°.
(64c.) is structurally parallel to (64a.) with a difference: the weak \([Q]\) feature is phonetically realised. Then, the verb adjoins to \(\text{AgrS}^o\) where \(ti\) has been either generated, or moved.

(64d.) is parallel to (64b.), but it has an overtly realised \([Q]\) feature. The \(ti/tu\) marker is generated (or moved) in a functional head, let us say \(\text{Subj}^o\), and the pronoun \(tu\) ‘you’ leaves \([\text{Spec, AgrSP}]\) to adjoins to it. Then, the tensed verb would cliticise on the complex \([-tu-ti]\) yielding \([\text{veux-tu-ti}]\), which would move to \(\text{C}^o\) in order to check the \([Q]\) feature. Another possibility is that \(ti/tu\) is directly generated on \(\text{C}^o\) as the overt realisation of the strong \([Q]\). In this case, the pronoun \(tu\) would cliticise on \(\text{Subj}^o\), then the verb would cliticise on \(tu\), and finally the complex \([\text{veux-tu}]\) head would rise to cliticise on \(\text{C}^o\), where \(ti\) is found.

(65a) is the representation of (64a., c.), whereas (65b.) represents (64b., d.).

\[
(65) \quad \text{a.} \quad \text{CP} \rightarrow \text{Spec} \rightarrow \text{C}^o \rightarrow \text{SubjP} \rightarrow \text{Spec} \rightarrow \text{Subj}^o \rightarrow \text{AgrSP} \rightarrow \text{Spec} \rightarrow \text{Agr}^2o \rightarrow \text{TP} \rightarrow \text{veux} (\text{-ti})
\]

\[
(65) \quad \text{b.} \quad \text{CP} \rightarrow \text{Spec} \rightarrow \text{C}^o \rightarrow \text{SubjP} \rightarrow \text{[Veux}-\text{tu}_{\text{k}}\text{]}^o \rightarrow \text{-ti} \rightarrow \text{Spec} \rightarrow \text{Subj}^o \rightarrow \text{[Subj}^o\text{]}_j \rightarrow \text{AgrSP} \rightarrow \text{Spec} \rightarrow \text{Subj}^o \rightarrow \text{Subj}^o \rightarrow \text{Spec} \rightarrow \text{Agr}^2o \rightarrow \text{TP} \rightarrow \text{veux} (\text{-ti})
\]

The contrast in (54) is found also in QF – in declarative sentences with a ‘full’ NP subject, the tensed verb remains in \(\text{AgrS}^o\).

(66) \quad \text{a.} \quad \text{Jean, je crois, aime beaucoup la musique.}
\quad \text{b.} \quad \text{*Il, je crois, aime beaucoup la musique.}
Moreover (and most interestingly), the asymmetry in (67) shows that the same structure is respected also in interrogative sentences. Hence, it can be said that in the examined variety of QF ti/tu is always in Agr°.

(67) a. Pierre, selon toi, parle-tu anglais?
   Pierre, according-to you, speaks-INTERR English
   ‘Does Pierre speak English, according to you?’

   b. *Il, selon toi, parle-tu anglais?
   He, according-to you speaks-INTERR English

The structure of (67) is given in (68).

(68) a. \[CP C° [SubP Pierre Subj° [XP [AgrSP parle-tu anglais]]]]

   b. \[CP C° [SubP Subj° [XP [AgrSP parle-tu anglais]]]]

   In the case of null subject languages using the ti/tu morpheme, the relevant configuration should be (69), supposing that pro occupies [Spec, AgrSP]\(^{19}\). Here is the structure of (32a.), the Châtillon example:

(69) \[CP C° [SubP Subj° [AgrSP pro me minjo-ty [TP ina poma]]]]? (= 32a.)

   The asymmetry between subject and non-subject wh-operator as to the distribution of ti/tu proves that the interrogative marker coincides with the [Q] feature on verbal flexion.

(70) a. *Qui a-tu tapé à la porte? (= 7a.)

   b. Qui elle rencontre-tu tous les matins? (= 8a.)

   In fact, Rizzi’s (1992) Wh-Criterion states that a subject wh-operator triggers a chain of co-indexations by transitivity. I° and the inflection containing [+wh] are co-indexed; the subject moved to [Spec, CP] agrees with C°; the trace of the subject in [Spec, IP] is co-indexed with I°; hence, by transitivity, C° is co-indexed with I°. C° forms a chain with I° and with the lower inflection containing [+wh]. Then, the Wh-Criterion already is met in syntax.

(71) [Who\(_j\) C°\(_j\) [t\(_j\) I°\(_j\) love-s[+wh] Mary]] (= 15)

   This makes I-to-C inversion unavailable, since it would mark C° for the feature [+wh] twice. If we take Friedemann’s distinction between [op] and [Q] features as valid, we can simply state that the ti/tu morpheme is the overt realisation of the [Q] feature which needs to be checked by movement to C°, either in syntax (if [Q] is strong) or at LF (if [Q] is weak). Then, the presence of ti/tu rules out a sentence in which I° is already marked for the feature [Q] through a chain of co-indexations.

   In the variety of QF examined here, the [op] features in [Spec, CP] are strong. In fact, we noticed that the in situ option is unavailable.

(72) *Elle rencontre-tu qui? (= 6c.)

   She meets-INTERR who

\(^{19}\) Cf. ftn. 13.
Contrary to Friedemann’s (1997) claim that a subject wh-operator remains in [Spec, IP], the presence of the complementiser que ‘that’ in questions bearing on the subject proves that qui ‘who’ moves to [Spec, CP].

(73) Qui qu’a tapé à la porte?
    Who that has knocked at the door
    ‘Who knocked at the door?’

_A priori_, however, nothing keeps the variety of French exploiting the _in situ_ option from leaving the subject wh-operator in [Spec, IP], since its [op] feature is weak. In any case, the presence of que ‘that’ in C⁰ should never block the checking of [Q] and [op] features, because at LF elements without semantic content – like que - must disappear.

We observed in section 2 that sentences focussing on a direct object pronoun are possible only in cleft structures.

(74) a. Quoi c’est que t’as-tu mangé?
    What that is that you have-INTERR eaten

    b. Qu’est-ce que t’as-tu mangé?
    What is that that you have-INTERR eaten
    ‘What did you eat?’

Obenauer (1981) states that, in comparison with “simple” interrogative sentences (75), cleft interrogatives focus on the wh-operator of the question, and have two variables at LF level (76a.), whereas simple interrogatives have one (76b.)

(75) Qu’as-tu mangé?
    What have you eaten
    ‘Who would she like to meet again?’

(76) a. WH y it is y the x such as you have eaten x.

    b. WH x you have eaten x.

The derivation of cleft interrogatives should be the following. (77a) is the starting structure, where the wh-operator has not moved yet. (77b) is produced through wh-movement; however, without further modification, the sentence is ruled out. The only possible way for it to be accepted is that the wh-operator is “stressed” (i.e. clefted).

---

20 Actually, Obenauer’s (1981) also makes the distinction between complex (xvii.a) from cleft interrogative sentences (xvii.b). Both have the _est-ce que_ form, but only cleft interrogatives focus on the wh-operator and have two variables at LF level (xviii.b), while complex interrogatives have one, just like simple interrogatives (xviii.a). Cleft interrogatives also have a different phonological interpretation.

(xvii.) a. Qui est-ce que tu voudrais revoir?

    b. Qui EST-CE que tu voudrais revoir?

(xviii.) a. WH x you would like to meet x again.

    b. WH y it is y the x such as you would like to meet x again.

Obenauer (1981) suggests that complex interrogatives are produced through an option of cancelling the variable of the focussed interrogative operator (y), thus cancelling focus itself. Then the _est-ce que_ structure becomes an (inanalysable) unity. I would dare say that, if correct, the dichotomy between cleft and complex interrogatives could have something to say about the asymmetry of judgements on the _est-ce que_ strategy. I leave the question open.

(xix.) *f* Est-ce qu’on va-tu au cinéma?

    Is that that one goes-INTERR to the cinema
(77c) is a cleft in the assertive form, while (77d) has undergone wh-movement. Clitic subject inversion is only possible if que ‘what’ is the wh-operator (77c).

(77) a. T’as-tu mangé quoi?
    - You have-eaten what
b. (*)Quoi t’as-tu mangé?
    - What you have-eaten
c. C’est quoi que t’as-tu mangé?
    - It is what that you have-eaten
d. Quoi c’est que t’as-tu mangé?
    - What it is that you have-eaten
e. *Quoi est-ce que t’as-tu mangé?
    - What is it that you have-eaten
   ‘What have you eaten?’

On the contrary, que seems to admit an uninverted form of clefting. Noonan (1992) reports (78a.) – which she assumes to be the phonetic form of (78b.)

(78) a. Qu’seck c’est ça?
   - What it is that it is this
b. Que c’est que c’est ça?
   - What it is that it is this
   ‘What’s that there?’

(79) offers an indicative representation of cleft interrogatives, following Obenauer’s (1981) approach. The FocP node is occupied by the “stressed” wh-operator.

(79) a. [IP c’est [FocP quoi [CP t’x que t’as–tu mangé t]]]
b. [CP quoi/que [FocP t’x c’est que [CP t’x t’as–tu mangé t]]]
c. [CP qu’x est-ce [FocP t’x que [CP t’x t’as–tu mangé t]]]

Noonan (1992) considers the structures realising que ‘that’ in COMP as “hidden clefts”, meaning that the copula is missing. This claim implies that que-insertion should rescue sentences focussing on a direct object pronoun, and this is actually the case for quoi ‘what’, although not for que ‘what’. The speakers also generally find a sensible improvement if que ‘that’ is added to questions bearing on adjuncts.

(80) a. * Quoi t’as-tu mangé?
    - (=10)
b. */ok Pourquoi on existe-tu?
c. */ok Où il va-tu?
d. */ok Comment il est-tu?
e. ? Combien ça coût te-tu?
f. */ok Quand elle aura-tu fini?

(81) a. Quoi que t’as-tu mangé?
    - (=11)
b. Pourquoi qu’on existe-tu?
c. Où qu’il va-tu?
d. Comment qu’il est-tu?
e. Combien que ça coûte te-tu?
f. */ok Quand qu’elle aura-tu fini?
However, this leaves the question open of the unacceptability of a *que que* ‘what that’ structure.

(82) *Que que t’as-tu mangé?
What that you have-

The attested form (83a.) instead of (83b.) also goes in this direction. (83a.) would presuppose a starting structure like (83c.).

(83) a. Qui qui a tapé à la porte?
Who who has knocked at the door
b. Qui qu’a tapé à la porte?
Who that has knocked at the door
c. Qui est-ce qui a tapé à la porte?
‘Who knocked at the door?’

(84b.) offers the structure of a hidden cleft, starting from a cleft interrogative ((79c.), repeated as (84a.)).

(84) a. [CP qui, est-ce [FOCP t’x que [CP t, a tapé à la porte ]]]
b. [CP qui, [FOCP t’x, que [CP t, a tapé à la porte ]]]

5. Conclusion

This piece of research upon the *ti/tu* interrogative marker in QF offered some counter-examples to current claims in the literature. In a geographical area between Montréal and Québec City, the *ti/tu* morpheme is compatible with *wh*-questions, except if the *wh*-operator is the subject. *Quoi* and *que* ‘what’ are accepted only in cleft structures. Adjuncts have different behaviours; *combien* ‘how much’ is accepted, while *quand* ‘when’ is not. *Pourquoi* ‘why’, *ou* ‘where’ and *comment* ‘how’ are either accepted or not, depending on the speakers. However, the insertion of *que* ‘that’ in C° rescues sentences having *quoi* ‘what’ and adjuncts in [Spec, CP]. The in situ strategy, which is typical of colloquial SF, is not compatible with the *ti/tu* marker. Instead, the *est-ce que* ‘is it that’ structure is either accepted or refused.

Five theories on interrogative sentences were examined: Rizzi (1992); Rizzi & Roberts (1992); Poletto (1993) and Roberts (1993); Friedemann (1997). Then I suggested an alternative proposal, starting from Cardinaletti’s (1997) *split*-AgrP hypothesis.

Cardinaletti (1997) shows that full NPs and strong pronouns occupy the specifier of SubjP, where the properties of subject are checked, while weak pronouns take [Spec, AgrSP], the projection where NOM Case and *ϕ*-features are checked. Since the insertion of a parenthetical sentence between a subject and its verb is possible with strong subjects but not with weak subjects, it can be stated that the verb remains in AgrS° in French. Two AgrP layers – SubjP and AgrSP – can account straightforwardly for complex inversion. In fact, if the full subject occupies [Spec, SubjP] while the agreeing clitic subject takes [Spec, AgrSP], complex inversion is simply generated by AgrS°-to-Subj° movement of the inflected verb.

The different combinations of subject-auxiliary inversion and the presence of *ti/tu* are also explained more easily, since a further functional projection is available. When the interrogative morpheme preserves the SVO order, the structure of the sentence is that of a declarative; *ti/tu* occupies Agr°, where the inflected verb adjoins. If *ti/tu* cliticises on the
inverted structure, on the contrary, it is generated on another functional head – probably C° – and the complex verb-clitic subject adjoins on it. Since Kayne (1994) rejects multiple head adjunction, cyclic adjunction is required.

The examined variety of QF respects Cardinaletti’s (1997) asymmetry between strong and weak subjects, not only in declarative sentences, but also in interrogative sentences. Then, I would claim that the ti/tu interrogative morpheme always occupies AgrS°.

I keep Friedemann’s (1997) distinction between [Q] and [op] features as valid. I propose that the ti/tu marker is the overt realisation of [Q], whereas postverbal clitic subjects are not. However, the overt realisation of [Q] does not depend on its strength. C° and [Spec, CP] are the relevant positions for feature checking, which takes place in syntax if the interrogative features are strong, and is delayed to LF if the features are weak.

For some reason, questions bearing on object pronouns – quoi and que ‘what’ - are possible only if the pronoun is clefted. This asymmetry is mirrored in que-insertion, which is most likely a “hidden cleft” (Noonan 1992). In fact, the realisation of que ‘that’ in COMP rescues otherwise unaccepted sentences bearing on quoi ‘what’ and adjuncts.
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