

### COMPLEMENTIZER DOUBLING IN BELLINZONESE CLEFT *WH*-QUESTIONS

Complementizer doubling in cleft *wh*-questions (1) is very productive in Bellinzonese (NID). Along the lines of Poletto (2000), but against Munaro (1997) and Meinunger (1998), I argue that this construction has a bi-clausal structure and that it is related to an existential presupposition of the type range (*à la* Starke 2001). Although the two languages realize different components, standard Italian will be said to have the same cleft construction as Bellinzonese.

I argue that (1) has two variants: (2) an apparent doubly filled phrase construction, and (3) where no doubling of the complementizer occurs. (1)-(3) are interchangeable and are truth conditionally equivalent, they all have a range presupposition; the speaker uses these forms when he already has a cohort of possible identities in mind. (1) and (3) have a particular emphasis on the interrogative word due to the presence of the copula. Given the semantic similarity between (1), (2), and (3), I claim that (1) is the full-fledged version of the cleft *wh*-question, while (2) and (3) are reduced versions of (1), resulting from different syntactic configurations. I show that depending on the position occupied by the *wh*-word, different cleft configurations arise. (2) is not an example of DFP but an instance of a reduced cleft question: only the higher  $C^\circ$  is expressed, while the rest of the cleft construction remains unpronounced. In (3), only the lower portion of the cleft construction is realized, the higher complementizer is not activated until LF. Consistent with Munaro (1997), Meinunger (1998), I consider *che* ‘that’ a full complementiser and not a relative pronoun. This is confirmed by Italian which has the same focal construction (see (12a)). Italian has in fact two different forms expressing the relative pronoun: *che* ‘that’ and *il quale* ‘which’. If it were the case that in (3) the complementizer is a relative pronoun, (3b) and (3c) should be equally good. They are not. Also, contrary to Munaro (1997), I do not consider the complementiser as having an interrogative feature. Now, if *che* ‘that’ can appear without the copula (2), the copula cannot appear without *che* ‘that’ (4a). I claim that the lower *che* is related to the presence of the copula: it is selected by the copula, hence the ungrammaticality of (4b). I conclude that in (2) the complementizer which is realized is the higher one that appears in doubling configurations, whereas the lower part of the cleft construction is not expressed. In (3), the higher complementizer is not projected until LF. Like Poletto (2000) but contra Munaro (1997), and Meinunger (1998), I claim that cleft *wh*-questions are not derived from a simple structure (5), but are rather bi-clausal. This is suggested by the presence of two complementizers within the same structure, but also by the configuration in (6). The optional invariable SCI *a* (Poletto 2000) incorporates into *che* (Munaro 1997, Poletto 2000), hence *ca* ‘that+SCI’. If Poletto (2000) is right in assuming that *a* is located in the left periphery, then in the case of complementizer doubling (1) we have two left peripheries: the main IP and the copula phrase. For (2) and (3) I maintain a bi-clausal analysis. I adopt Munaro&Pollock’s (2000) perspective according to which “bare *qu*-words are to be analysed as existential quantifiers in the scope of a disjunction operator” (the disjunction operator being the interrogative word itself (7)) and their representation. I thus distinguish between Op1 for the quantifier and Op2 for the restrictor (8). I make no commitment to their Remnant Movement analysis. I argue that in non-presuppositional non-cleft *wh*-questions (9), the interrogative word first raises to Op1 and finally checks its restrictor feature in Op2, which—contrary to Munaro & Pollock (2000)—I assume to be lower than ForceP (10). In the case of cleft *wh*-questions like (1), I argue that a copula clause is present with its own left periphery. The presence of the [+range] *wh*-word in Op2 forces the merging of the copula phrase and consequently the realization of the lower complementizer. As said above the copula is related to emphasis and thus raises to  $Foc^\circ$ . The *wh*-word raises to [spec, Foc] and further to [spec, Force] where it forces the insertion of the higher complementizer and then ends up in RangeP where it checks its feature. (2) is derived like (1) but the *wh* does not raise to [spec, Foc] which prevents the realization of the copula and its complement. Only the higher complementizer is phonologically realized. The *wh*-word can also remain in [spec, Foc] and raise towards [spec, RangeP] at LF and (3) obtains. It will raise to [spec, Force] at LF. Also, the distribution of the cleft construction suggests that *wh*-words have different distributions (11): *perchè* ‘why’ cannot be [+range] and *cus* ‘what’ cannot raise to the spec of the copular Force. The same *wh*-cleft construction is found in Italian (12). In Italian, however, only the lowest  $C^\circ$  is available (12b). I argue that the in Italian the highest  $C^\circ$  cannot be realized in the syntax proper because of a parametrical reason.

- (1) Chi che l è che rivò?  
who that scl<sub>IIIsg</sub> is that arrived  
'Who is it that arrived?'
- (2) Chi che rivò?  
who that arrived
- (3) a. Chi l è che rivò? (Bellinzonese)  
who scl<sub>IIIsg</sub> is that arrived  
b. Chi è che è arrivato? (Italian)  
who is that is come  
c. \* Chi è il quale è arrivato? (Italian)  
who is which is arrived
- (4) a. \* Chi l è rivò?  
who scl<sub>III</sub> is arrived  
b. \* Chi che che rivò?  
who that that arrived
- (5) a. [ it is a book<sub>i</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> RelOp<sub>i</sub> C<sup>0</sup> that [he bought t<sub>i</sub>]]]  
b. [<sub>CP</sub> What<sub>i</sub> C<sup>0</sup> is<sub>j</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> it t<sub>j</sub> t<sub>i</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> RelOp<sub>i</sub> C<sup>0</sup> that [he bought t<sub>i</sub>]]]
- (6) a. Chi che l è ch' a töö al pan?  
who that scl<sub>III</sub> is that scl<sub>Inv</sub> buy the\_masc.sg bread  
b. Chi ch' a l è ch' a töö al pan?  
who that scl<sub>Inv</sub> scl<sub>III</sub> is that scl<sub>Inv</sub> buy the\_masc.sg bread
- (7) [wh- [∃ ]]
- (8) [<sub>OP2P</sub> rest<sub>m</sub> [<sub>FORCEP</sub> F<sup>0</sup> [<sub>GP</sub> G<sup>0</sup> [<sub>TOPp</sub> TOP<sup>0</sup> [<sub>OP1P</sub> OP1<sup>0</sup> t<sub>1</sub> [<sub>AgRP</sub> ...]]]]]]]
- (9) Chi rivò?  
who arrived
- (10) [<sub>RangeP</sub> wh<sub>i</sub> [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>Force</sub><sup>o</sup> che<sub>j</sub> [<sub>Top</sub> [<sub>Foc</sub> t<sub>j</sub> Foc<sup>o</sup> [<sub>CopP</sub> l è]<sub>i</sub> [<sub>AGRP</sub> pro AGR<sup>0</sup> t<sub>i</sub> [<sub>CopP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> [<sub>ForceP</sub> Force<sup>0</sup>  
che [<sub>Op2P</sub> t<sub>j</sub> [<sub>GP</sub> [pro] [<sub>TopP</sub>] TOP<sup>0</sup> [<sub>Foc</sub> [<sub>Op1P</sub> [<sub>AgRP</sub> ...][<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>j</sub>]]]]]]]]]]]]]
- (11) a. Cusa \*(l è) che t he töi/töcc?  
a'. Cusa che \*(l è che) t he töi/töcc?  
who that scl<sub>III</sub> is that scl<sub>II</sub> have bought  
b. Quant/In dua (che l è) che l va?  
when where che scl<sub>III</sub> is that scl<sub>III</sub> goes  
c. Perchè \*(che l è che) l s è indurmentò?  
why that scl<sub>III</sub> is that scl<sub>III</sub> pron<sub>refl</sub> is fallen asleep
- (12) a. Chi è che Maria ha ucciso?  
who is that Mary has killed  
b. \*Chi che è che Maria ha ucciso?  
who that is that Mary has killed

#### References

- Meinunger, A. 1998. "A monoclausal structure for (pseudo-) cleft sentences". In NELS 28
- Munaro, N. 1997. "Proprietà strutturali e distribuzionali dei sintagmi interrogativi in alcuni dialetti italiani settentrionali". Doctoral thesis, Padova/Venezia.
- Munaro, N. & Pollock, J-Y. 2000. "Qu'est-ce (qu)-est-ce que? A Case Study in Comparative Romance Interrogative Syntax" (to be published)
- Poletto, C. 2000. *The Higher Functional Field. Evidence from Northern Italian Dialects*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Starke, M. 2001. *Move Dissolves into Merge: a Theory of Locality*. PhD dissertation, University of Geneva.