Bare quantifiers and the like: analyzing the internal structure of functional words

Jacopo Garzonio (University of Venice) & Cecilia Poletto (University of Frankfurt)
garzonio@unive.it   poletto@em.uni-frankfurt.de

1. *Wh*-items are known to have a different distribution according to whether they are bare or they contain a lexical restrictor. To mention only some cases, Pesetsky (1987) already noted that complex *wh*-phrases *in situ* receive scope without LF movement. Ambar (1988) for Portuguese, Munaro (1999) for Northern Italian dialects show that also within the Romance domain there is a clear split between *wh*-phrases and bare *wh*-words in terms of position. More recently Rizzi (2004) on standard Italian and Grewendorf (2012) on Bavarian have proposed that this distinction is a function of the internal structure of the *wh*-item: complex *wh*-phrases are topic-like as they contain a lexical restrictor, while bare *wh*-words are "pure operators". In this work, observing mainly the variation in the Italo-Romance domain, we intend to show that the same split is also found when bare quantifiers and complex quantified expressions are taken into account and that the split is also a function of an internal layering of projections, not of the morphosyntactic "weakness" of bare quantifiers. Furthermore, on the basis of crosslinguistic morphological evidence, we will argue that bare quantifiers and *wh*-words have part of the internal structure in common.

2. It is well known that languages like French allow for a pre-participial position of bare quantifiers like *rien* 'nothing', *tout* 'everything', etc., while this is not possible with complex quantified expression. The same split is found in a VO German dialect, Cimbrian (spoken in the province of Trento, among Italian dialects), where only bare Qs can occur in OV order before the past participle, while complex QPs are located in the same position as DPs, i.e. after the past participle:

(1) a. I hon niamat gesek.
         I have noone seen
     b. *I hon kummane sbemm   gesek.
         I have no   mushrooms seen
     c. I hon gesek kummane sbemm.
         I have seen   no   mushrooms

Old Italian also provides the same dichotomy, as bare Qs like *tutto* 'everything', *tutti* 'everybody', *molto* 'much', *molti* 'many', etc., are always located in preparticipial position, while complex QPs have the same distribution of DPs (i.e. either pre- or postparticipial depending on information structural conditions). The *OVI* corpus does not contain any occurrence of bare *tutto* after the past participles:

(2) a. Ànne   tutto   paghato. (B. Bencivenni, 1296)
         (they) have everything paid
     b. da che   ebbe tutto Egitto vinto. (B. Giamboni, before 1292)
         since (he) had all   Egypt conquered
     c. questi m'ànno venduto tutto i loro podere (Anonym., circa 1290)
         these to.me have sold   all   the their farm

Old Italian clearly shows that this split cannot be due to a supposed weakness (in the terms of Cardinaletti and Starke (1999)) of the bare Q, as it could be the case for French or Cimbrian, as bare Qs are always preparticipial also when they are paired with a preposition:

(3)   s'i' mi fosse al tutto   a tte   gradato (Dante, *Fiore*)
           if I me were to everything to you adapted
           'If I adapted to you in everything'

We argue that the reason of this split is indeed a different internal structure of the Q, which does not contain a lexical restrictor, but a [+/-human] classifier-like functional item, which

can be null, or lexically realized, as in English *every-thing*, *every-body*. Southern Italian dialects provide a clear case of this as they have two variants: Sicilian displays for instance both *tuttu* and *tutticuosi*. The bare form can be used as a floating Q, the complex one cannot, and *tutti* and *cuosi* cannot be separated.

(4) a. n'a sta casa è tuttu   prontu.
          in this home is everything ready
     b. n'a sta casa su (*tutticuosi) pronti tutticuosi.
          in this home are all-things   ready all-things
     c. *n'a sta casa su tutti pronti cuosi.

Similar facts are found in Old Italian, where the two forms *niente* and *neuna cosa*, both meaning 'nothing', alternate in a way which is very similar to the one described by Rizzi (2004) for bare and complex *wh*-items.

3. The internal structure of a bare Q is thus not identical to the one of a Q which is paired to an entire DP, or found in adjectival position inside the DP itself, (see Giusti-Leko (2005) on a dicussion about the two types of Qs), because it contains a classifier-like element as illustrated in (5):

(5) a. [Q [Class]]
     b. [Q [DP]

To explain why the classifier is sometimes lexically present and sometimes not, we propose an analysis of the alternation illustrated in (5) in a Kaynian framework that allows for Ns to be null if they are located at the edge of a phase, while they have to be spelled out if they are not on a phase edge. Hence, preparticipial bare Qs do not contain an overt classifier because this is licensed by the fact that the element reaches the edge of the *v*P phase, while this is not the case when the bare Q is found in postparticipial position, or in subject position (for the case of *neuna cosa*). In the talk we will discuss further cases in which an alternation between a null and a lexical classifier depends on the position of the bare Q and why systems like standard Italian display *qualchecosa* for 'something' but not *tutte cose* for 'everything'.

On this basis we interpret cases where the same lexical item is used to express the *wh*-item and the corresponding bare Q like German *was, wer, wo*, which mean respectively both 'what/something' 'who/someone' and 'where/somewhere' or ambiguities like Italian *cosa*, meaning 'thing' or 'what' as something more than a morphological accident. The deeper reason behind these homophonies is the parallel between the internal structure of bare *wh*-items and bare Qs. Bare *wh*-items/Qs have a different internal structure which is not simply a reduced (or complete but lexically empty) version of a nominal expression with a Q/*wh* on top. Their internal articulation contains something more, namely a classifier-like element which can be lexically realized or null depending on the position of the Q/*wh* itself. In the talk, we will try to derive well known distributional distinctions between *wh*-words and *wh*-phrases on the one hand and bare Qs and quantified expression in languages like Italian on the basis of their different internal structure.

References
Ambar, M. (1988) *Para uma Sintaxe da Inversão Sujeito-Verbo em Português*. Lisboa, Colibri ♦ **Cardinaletti, A. & M. Starke** (1999) "The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of the three classes of pronouns". In H. van Riemsdijk (ed.) *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, 145-233 ♦ **Giusti, G. & n. Leko** (2005) "The categorial status of quantity expressions". In N. Leko (ed.) *Linguisticki vidici*, Sarajevo, Forum Bosniae, 121-184 ♦ **Grewendorf, G.** (2012) "The internal structure of *wh*-elements and the diversity of *wh*-movement", ms. Univ. of Frankfurt ♦ **Kayne, R.** (2006) "On Parameters and on Principles of Pronunciation". In H. Broekhuis *et al.* (eds.) *Organizing Grammar. Linguistic Studies in Honor of Henk van Riemsdijk*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, 289-299 ♦ **Munaro, N.** (1999) *Sintagmi interrogativi nei dialetti italiani settentrionali*, Padova, Unipress ♦ **_OVI_** database of the *Opera del Vocabolario Italiano* (http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/efts/ARTFL/projects/OVI/) ♦ **Pesetsky, D.** (1987) "*Wh*-in-situ: Movement and unselective binding". In *The Representation of (In)definiteness*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass. ♦ **Rizzi, L.** (2004) "Locality and Left Periphery". In A.Belletti (ed.) *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, vol.3*, New York: Oxford University Press.