

**French embedded cleft questions**  
Magda Oiry  
University of Massachusetts, Amherst<sup>1</sup>

**1 The facts**

Speakers of Non-Standard Colloquial French in Francophone countries (France, Québec, Switzerland, Belgium) allow *wh*-clefts under non-interrogative selecting verbs. They have the interpretation of a long distance question.

Context : you're talking with friends about Marie seeing people the day before / Marie buying a dress/ Paul placing a bet, etc.

1. Tu penses que c'est qui qu'elle a vu hier, Marie?  
you think that it-is of who that-she has seen  
'Who do you think Marie has seen yesterday?'
2. T'as l'impression que c'est pour qui qu'elle a acheté cette robe ?  
you have the-impression that it-is for who that-she bought this dress
3. Paul a parié que c'est qui qui a gagné ?  
P. has bet-past that it-is who that has win-past
4. Tu crois que c'est dans quelle voiture que Jean est parti ?  
you believe that it-is in which car that J. is leave-PAST
5. Louis, il a découvert que c'est qui que Marie aime?  
L., he has discover that it-is who that M. loves

We are talking about a grammar that allows *wh*-in situ in subordinate clauses, non-standard colloquial French (NSC from now on, from Baunaz 2008).

6. Paul croit que Marie a vendu quoi? NSC French  
P. believe that M. has sell-PAST what  
What does Paul think Marie sold?

(6) is non-echoic and grammatical in NSC, differently from standard colloquial French (SC from now on) where *wh*-in situ is a root phenomena (see Mathieu 1999, Bošković 00, Cheng & Rooryck 2000, Boeckx 06, 09). NSC is more permissive by allowing *wh*-in situ in embedded context as described by Adli, Baunaz<sup>2</sup>, Oiry, Shlonsky, Starke a.o.

---

<sup>1</sup> Thank you to Aria Adli, Lena Baunaz, Lisa Cheng, Olivier Crouzet, Hamida Demirdache, Anamaria Falas, Nicolas Guilliot, Fatima Hamlaoui, Roger Higgins, Sophie Moracchini at MIT, Gereon Müller, Orin Percus, Eric Potsdam, Raphael Sighet-Bizun, all the tested French subjects, UMass colleagues: Seth Cable, Brian Dillon, Kyle Johnson, Rajesh Bhatt, Ellen Woolford.

<sup>2</sup> Baunaz (2008) gives a set of examples regarding *wh*-in situ that are grammatical in NSC but that SC do not allow: availability in embedded contexts, ability to escape Neg-island, its interaction with quantifiers, the not-so presuppositional properties associated with it.

The constructions (1) to (5) and (6) are co-occurring in the grammar with long-distance questions in NSC:

7. Qui est-ce que tu penses que j'ai vu ?  
what ESK you think that it-is  
'Who do you think I saw?'

The differences in interpretation between the three are still unclear. It is harder to accommodate the presupposition of seeing someone out-of-the-blue when it hasn't been asserted or isn't familiar in context, in (1) to (5) vs. (7) – Percus, p.c.

## 2 Availability of the embedded cleft : verb selection, tense and mood

The matrix verb is clearly not a parenthetical – the embedded cleft can be selected by numerous predicates, including bridge verbs, emotive factives, cognitive predicates and others: *croire, penser, parier, regretter, désirer, avoir envie, souhaiter, apprécier, déplorer, être triste, être content, découvrir, apprendre, avoir l'impression, admettre, comprendre, dire, être sûr/certain, réaliser, espérer, douter, rêver, imaginer, impliquer, vouloir, ordonner, suggérer, faire savoir, préférer, craindre...*

Second or third person subjects (Full DPs, clitics or hanging topic) are found.

DP, PP can be clefted<sup>3</sup>; arguments and adjuncts too (see Clech-Darbon & al 09, Rialland & al 2002, a.o.).

8. Tu penses que c'est de qui qu'elle est la fille ?  
you think that it-is of who that-she is the daughter  
'Who do you think she is the daughter of?'
9. Michel, il a l'impression que c'est pour qui qu'elle a acheté cette robe ?<sup>4</sup>  
M., he has the-impression that it-is for who that-she bought this dress
10. T'as rêvé que c'est qui qui gagnait ?  
you-have dreamt that it-is who that won
11. Albert croit que c'est dans quelle voiture que Jean est parti ?  
A. believe-3d.p. that it-is in which car that J. is leave-PAST
12. T'as découvert que c'est quoi que Marie a perdu?  
you-have discover that it-is what that M. has lost

---

<sup>3</sup> Pied-piping is obligatory when movement occurs in (8-9). See Guillot & Oiry (in prep.) for a full review of the phenomenon: *real* relatives in *dont* (c'est qui dont tu parles ?) behave differently from the one in *que* (this paper) or from redundant relatives (*C'est avec quel couteau avec lequel t'as coupé le gâteau ?*).

Changing the tense (present to past) or the mood (indicative to conditional) of the matrix predicate, extends the list to *saying* verbs like *dire* that can select a *wh*-cleft or an in situ:

13. Tu dirais que c'est quoi que Marie va acheter? Embedded cleft  
you say-COND that it-is what that Marie will buy
14. T'as dit que Marie va acheter quoi? Wh-in situ  
you have say-past that Marie will buy what

Compare with the indicative present tense, which only gets an echo reading:

15. # Tu dis que c'est quoi que Marie va acheter?  
you say-IND-pst that it-is what that Marie will buy
16. # Tu dis que Marie va acheter quoi?  
you say-IND-pst that Marie will buy what

Presumably, verbs that can take *wh*-in situ are more common than those that can take a cleft, but the verbal mode and tense is definitely playing a role: the subjunctive mode especially (thanks to Lena Baunaz for her input, see Homer 2007, for corroborative facts). When the indicative mode is used with verbs that obligatorily take the subjunctive, it results in ungrammaticality.

17. ✓ T'as envie que qui vienne ce soir? Wh-in situ  
you-have desire that who come-SUBJ  
'Who do you want to come tonight?'
18. \* T'as envie que c'est qui qui vienne ce soir? Embedded cleft  
you-have desire that it-be-IND who come-SUBJ tonight  
'Who do you want to come tonight?'

Subjunctive 'spreading' into the copula (term from Baunaz p.c.) renders the embedded cleft examples available to NSC speakers:

19. a. T'as envie que ce soit qui qui vienne ce soir?  
you-have desire that it-be-SUBJ who come-SUBJ tonight  
'Who do you want to come tonight?'
- b. Tu suggères que ce soit qui qu'on fasse partir?  
you suggest that it be-SUBJ who that make-SUBJ leave
- c. Tu désires/souhaites/veux que ce soit qui qui vienne ce soir?  
you desire/wish/want that it be-SUBJ who that come-SUBJ tonight
- d. T(u) regrettes/es content/es triste que ce soit qui qui vienne ce soir?  
you regret/is happy/is sad that it be-SUBJ who that come-SUBJ tonight

This is one of the strongest arguments showing that the construction is not a parenthetical, as the matrix verb triggering a change in mood requires c-command. (20) (compared to 19d) is ungrammatical as the subordinate depends on the matrix, and is not adjoined to it<sup>5</sup>.

20. \* (Que) ce soit qui qui soit venu, t'es triste?  
C° this be-SUBJ who that be-SUBJ came, you-are sad  
'You're sad because who came?'

The facts above strongly suggest that there is an agreement necessary between the copula and the predicate in the following CP, which raises the question of their relation.

The subjunctive-spreading phenomenon appears only under a predicate and not in isolation, as the subjunctive is triggered by the matrix verb<sup>6</sup>.

21. \* Ce soit quoi que Marie a vu? vs.  
that be-SUBJ be what that M. saw
22. √ C'est quoi que Marie a vu?  
it-is what that M. saw
23. √ Ce serait quoi que Marie aurait vu?  
it would be what that M. saw

Some verbs leave open the possibility of using the subjunctive mode<sup>7</sup> - see Baunaz (2014):

24. Marc espère que c'est qui qui va lui répondre ? (= *count on*)  
M. hopes that it-be-IND who that will write-back
25. Marc espère que ce soit qui qui lui réponde ? (= *wish*)  
M. hopes that it-be-SUBJ who that write-back-SUBJ
26. Ça implique que c'est qui qui va sortir ?  
That implies that it-is who that will go-out
27. Ça implique que ce soit qui qui sorte ?  
That implies that it-be-SUBJ who that go-out-SUBJ

---

<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, it is of course fine with bridge verbs : C'est qui qui vient ce soir, tu crois?

<sup>6</sup> Sentences such as 'Qu'elle fasse n'importe quoi, je m'en fiche' (whatever she does, I don't care), would suggest that the subjunctive might be inherited by the complementizer *que* himself as in exclamatives 'Qu'il vienne!' (may he come)

<sup>7</sup> Less conservative speakers accept this sentence, as well as:

- i. Tu veux que c'est qui qui revienne ?  
ii. T'as envie que c'est qui qui revienne ?

See Amsili, for a thorough review of the subjunctive use

[http://www.linguist.jussieu.fr/~amsili/talks/slides\\_Subj\\_USP2014.pdf](http://www.linguist.jussieu.fr/~amsili/talks/slides_Subj_USP2014.pdf)

The copula can also be changed to a past or a modal:

28. Tu pensais que c'était qui qu'avait donné la meilleure présentation?

you think-past that it-be-past who that gave the best talk  
'Who do you think gave the best talk?'

29. T'as l'impression que ça devrait/peut/doit être qui que Marie épouse?

you-have the-impression that it could/can/ should be who that Mary marry-SUBJ  
'Who could/can/should it be that Mary marry, do you think?'

## 2 Partial movement

### 2.1 Syntax

Fanselow describes (30) to (32) as involving Partial movement<sup>8</sup> without a lexical scope marker present in Spec, CP, i.e. *Simple partial movement*. The focus marker co-occurring with the *wh*-word is obligatory but its placement seems to vary across languages: possibly above C in (32), under C in (31), in CP in (30).

30. Bahasa Indonesia (Saddy 1991)

*Bill tahu siapa yang Tom cintai?*

Bill knows who Foc Tom loves

'Who does Bill know that Tom loves?'

31. Kitharaka (Muriungi 2004)

*U-ri-thugania ati n-uu John a- ring- ir- e- t ?*

2ndSG-Tense-think that Foc-who J. Simple-past-beat-Tense-FV

'Who do you think that John beat?'

32. Kikuyu (Sabel 2000)

*Ó- gw-eciiri-á Ngoye a-úy-íre nóo ate o-on-íre Kaanake?*

you-think N. said FP-who that saw Kanake

'Who do you think Ngoye said that Kaanake saw?'

The French embedded cleft is parallel to the Kitharaka data:

33. Paul croit que c'est quoi que Marie a acheté ?

P. believes that it-is what that Marie has bought

'What does Paul believe Marie bought?'

---

<sup>8</sup> Partial movement in German is not called simple, because a lexical scope marker has to appear in the matrix CP, see (i) below:

i. [<sub>CP1</sub> Was meinst du [<sub>CP2</sub> wen<sub>i</sub> Maria t<sub>i</sub> liebt]]?

SM/what think you who<sub>acc</sub> M. loves  
'Who do you think Maria loves?'

*Quoi* is below *que / that* and follows the cleft particle *c'est*. So, the *wh*-word is outside of the CP domain, raising the question as to how it could be derived by movement.

If we do follow the movement theory, we could argue that the embedded cleft is an example of a split-CP case, *Quoi* moved from its object position of *acheté* to a focus position in the left periphery of the embedded easily enough in terms of features<sup>9</sup>.

34. Paul croit que c'est <sub>[FocP]</sub> *quoi*<sub>i</sub> que Marie a acheté *t*<sub>i</sub>?  
P.believes that it-is what that Marie has bought  
'What does Paul believe Marie bought?'

If *quoi* moves to an A'-position in FocP to check its strong features, we can't justify how it is able to move further (due to criteria freezing, Rizzi 2006) as below in (35) - a completely grammatical construction:

35. *Qu*<sub>i</sub>'est-ce que Paul croit que c'est ~~*quoi*~~<sub>i</sub> que Marie a acheté?  
what ESK P. believes that it-is ~~what~~ that Marie has bought  
'What is that that Paul believes Marie bought?'

I will then assume that the *wh*-word is in situ in the embedded cleft and is able to move as in (36). *Quoi* has kept his in situ form (not *que*). I will present in part 3 what potentially differentiates the embedded cleft from the plain in situ.

The embedded cleft would have the following syntax:

36. [<sub>CP</sub><sub>[+wh]</sub> Q<sub>i</sub> [tu penses [<sub>CP</sub><sub>2</sub> [<sub>C</sub><sup>o</sup> que] [<sub>TP</sub> c'est [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> *quoi*<sub>i</sub>] [<sub>CP</sub> Op<sub>j</sub> que Marie a acheté *t*<sub>j</sub>]]]]]]]]

*Quoi* doesn't move but is base-generated and an operator in the CP [Op<sub>i</sub> que Marie a acheté *t*<sub>i</sub>] moves (à la Clech-Darbon & al 1999).

A morpheme Q is merged in Spec, CP of the matrix to check the [+wh] features *a la Cheng* (1991).

## 2.2 Presuppositional properties

Partial movement in German and Hindi are associated strongly with presuppositionality.

Herburger (1994) notes an important difference between long-distance *wh*-movement and scope marking in German. The following examples (cf. example (15) in Lahiri 2002) illustrate this difference with Hindi scope marking and English long-distance *wh*-movement (Arregi 2003):

---

<sup>9</sup> We could postulate that along Sabel (2004), a [+strong] focus feature is generated in CP1 and CP2, and has to be checked: this would trigger the movement of *quoi* into FocP under/in CP2. An empty or non-lexical Q feature would enter the syntax as well and move all the way up to CP1 and check its [+strong] focus feature satisfying Cheng's clausal typing hypothesis.

37. a. Scope marking

raam kyaa soctaa hai [CP ki ramaa-ne kisko dekha].

Raam what thinks [CP that Ramaa-E who saw ]

‘Who does Raam think that Ramaa saw?’

b. Long-distance movement

Who does Raam think that Ramaa saw?

In the long-distance movement structure in (37b), the speaker does not necessarily presuppose that Ramaa saw someone; rather, the speaker presupposes that Raam thinks that Ramaa saw someone. However, in the scope marking structure in (37a), the speaker does presuppose that Ramaa saw someone. Under the assumption that a question like *Who did Ramaa see?* presupposes that Ramaa saw someone, this difference between scope marking and long-distance wh-movement means the following: in the former, the matrix sentence inherits the presupposition; in the latter, it does not.

Notice now that LD *wh*-in-situ in French patterns with long movement (Oiry 2011). Thus, (38b), with the appropriate intonation and stress on *qui/who*, is felicitous in the context provided in (38a) which makes it clear that the existential presupposition behind CP2 (that someone will help us clean up) cannot be satisfied (see Demirdache & Oiry 2007).

38. LD *wh*-in situ in French (Example adapted from Dayal 2000, 180)

a. Toi et moi, on sait qu’il n’y a personne pour nous aider à nettoyer, mais Marie apparemment ne le sait pas.

‘Both you and I know that there is no one to help us clean up, but Mary apparently doesn’t.’

b. Et alors, Marie, elle pense que qui va nous aider à nettoyer?

‘And so, Mary, she thinks that who will help us clean up?’

2.3 Study

What about the French embedded cleft?

38c. Et alors, Marie, elle pense que c’est qui qui va nous aider à nettoyer?’

‘And so, Mary, she thinks that it’s who that will help us clean up?’

Using IBEX farm online experiment platform (<http://spellout.net/ibexfarm/>), 26 native speakers read random stories where the presupposition is asserted or denied, then had to pick between the LD *wh*-in situ, the embedded cleft or chose both.

Il croit que tu as choisi quoi ?

Il croit que c’est quoi que tu as choisi ?’

*ou* Les deux.

Here is in (39) an example of a presuppositional story:

39. #1 presuppositional

Adèle dit à Guillaume: ‘aujourd’hui, pendant que tu vas courir, je vais aller acheter une bande dessinée. Je ne sais pas encore ce que je vais choisir, ça dépend complètement de ce qu’ils ont en magasin. Ça va être sympa, on pourra lire ça ensemble ce soir.’

Adèle va au magasin de bandes dessinées, se balade dans les rayons et tombe sur les bandes dessinées de Jessica Blandy, qu’elle et Guillaume aiment beaucoup, et décide d’en acheter une.

En rentrant chez elle, Adèle tombe sur la voisine à qui elle raconte la surprise qu’elle fait à Guillaume. La voisine est curieuse et dit ‘comme Guillaume ne sait pas ce que tu as acheté,

39’

- i. Il croit que tu as choisi quoi ?
- ii. Il croit que c’est quoi que tu as choisi ?
- iii. Les deux.

*Adele says to Guillaume: while you’re going running, I am going to go to the bookstore to buy a comic. I don’t know what I will get, it depends on what they have. We will get a chance to read it tonight in any case.*

*Once at the bookstore, Adele strolls into the store, finds the Jessica Blandy series and decides to pick one up because they both like her a lot. Coming home, Adele runs into the neighbor to whom she tells the surprise she’s planning for Guillaume.*

*The neighbor says: Guillaume doesn’t know what you are choosing, so:*

*Guillaume believes that it’s what that you are choosing?*

*Guillaume believes that you are choosing what?’*

*or both.*

And its non-presuppositional counterpart:

40. #1 nonpresup

Adèle dit à Guillaume: ‘aujourd’hui, pendant que tu vas courir, je vais aller acheter une bande dessinée. Je ne sais pas encore ce que je vais choisir, ça dépend complètement de ce qu’ils ont en magasin. Ça va être sympa, on pourra lire ça ensemble ce soir.’

Adèle va au magasin de bandes dessinées, ère dans les rayons et tombe sur les bandes dessinées de Jessica Blandy, qu’elle et Guillaume aiment beaucoup, et décide d’en acheter une.

La vendeuse lui dit malheureusement qu’ils ne leur restent qu’un seul exemplaire en magasin, et elle ne peut pas le lui vendre. Adèle était fixée sur son idée et elle décide de ne pas en acheter une autre.

En rentrant chez elle, Adèle croise la voisine à qui elle raconte la surprise qu’elle aurait voulu faire à Guillaume. La voisine est curieuse: ‘toi et moi on sait que t’as pas acheté de BD mais Guillaume ne le sait évidemment pas alors,

40’.

- i. Guillaume croit que tu as choisi quoi ?
- ii. Guillaume croit que c’est quoi que tu as choisi ?
- iii. Les deux.



*Adele says to Guillaume: while you're going running, I am going to go to the bookstore to buy a comic. I don't know what I will get, it depends on what they have. We will get a chance to read it tonight in any case.*

*Once at the bookstore, Adele strolls into the store, finds the Jessica Blandy series and decides to pick one up because they both like her a lot. The seller says that unfortunately it is the last copy of the series in the store and she can't sell it to her. Adele is disappointed and decides not to buy any other comic.*

*Coming home, Adele ran into the neighbor to whom she tells the surprise she was planning for Guillaume.*

*The neighbor says: Guillaume doesn't know what happened and that you didn't buy any, so:*

*Guillaume believes that it's what that you are choosing?*

*Guillaume believes that you are choosing what?'*

*or both.*

The 26 participants each saw one version of the story, as well as of 11 others, with a total of 6 presuppositional (P) and 6 non-presuppositional (NP), plus 12 fillers.

Table 1: Results of the forced preference task

| Contexts | P    | NP   |
|----------|------|------|
| Both     | 19.8 | 21   |
| Clefts   | 6.8  | 4.9  |
| In situ  | 73.4 | 74.1 |

Contrary to what would happen if this was parallel to Hindi or German Partial Movement, the embedded cleft is not rejected in a non-presuppositional context<sup>10</sup>.

There is strictly no difference between the two contexts: the embedded cleft is the least favorite of the two constructions (chosen around 25% in each context), but is also equivocally chosen 1/4 of the time regardless of the context (P/NP). 16 out 26 speakers chose the cleft or both at least once.

### 3 A bit more on clefts

#### 3.1 Exhaustivity

To test whether embedded clefts have the same properties as matrix clefts, let's look at the properties of exhaustivity requirements known for matrix clefts.

The context in (41) below doesn't allow an exhaustive answer as you can't name all the things kids like to eat at parties without appalling to a property (kids like any fried

<sup>10</sup> Arregi (2003, fn 16 p.125) notes that German PM in (i) would not felicitous in a context in which both the speaker and hearer know that Rosa did not kiss anyone, but that Georg does think so.

i. Was glaubt der Georg, [CP wen die Rosa geküsst hat]?  
what believes the Georg [CP who the Rosa kissed has]  
'Who does Georg believe Rosa kissed?'

food) or a definition, and the *wh*-cleft is excluded from such a context, whereas the long distance and LD *wh*-in situ are felicitous:

41. Context (adapted from Cable 2012):

You are trying to design a menu for a child's party. You have no idea what food children these days like, and would like to get some suggestions from a friend.

- a. # Tu crois que c'est quoi que les enfants aiment manger?  
you believe that it-is what that the children like eat
- b. ✓ Qu'est-ce que tu crois que (c'est) \_\_\_\_ (que) les enfants aiment manger?  
what-ESK you believe that (it-is) (that) the children like eat
- c. ✓ Tu crois que les enfants aiment manger quoi?  
you believe that the children like eat what  
'What do you think children like to eat?'

Note that matrix clefts will neither be felicitous in the same context<sup>11</sup>:

- d. # C'est quoi que les enfants aiment manger ?  
it-is what that the children like eat  
'What is that that children like to eat ?'

Furthermore, adding elements contradicting the exhaustivity of the focus should result in ungrammaticality with clefts if they really denote that property. Speakers reject the sentences below, exhibiting the exhaustivity requirement characteristic of a cleft. Embedded *wh*- don't pattern well with adverbs such as *seulement*, *aussi*, *même* (from Percus 1997) - they are incompatible or redundant.

42. \* Tu crois que c'est quoi aussi que Pierre a acheté?  
you think that it-is also what that P. bought
43. \* Tu crois que c'est même quoi que Pierre a acheté?  
you think that it-is even what that P. bought
44. \* Tu crois que c'est seulement quoi que Pierre a acheté?  
you think that it-is only what that P. bought

---

<sup>11</sup> It is true for any situation in which you cannot provide an exhaustive answer, that the cleft is excluded:

i. # C'est quel nombre qui est primaire?  
it-is which number that is primary

### 3.2 Intervention effects

Matrix negation blocks the licensing of the clefted *wh*-word in (45)<sup>12</sup>, and less so LD *wh*-in situ in (46):

45. \* Tu crois pas que c'est quoi que Marie a acheté ?  
you believe not that it-is what that M. has bought  
46. ??/\* Pierre croit pas que Marie a acheté quoi ?  
P. ne believe not that M. has bought what  
'What don't you believe that Marie bought ?'

With LD *wh*-in situ, subjunctive renders it acceptable under negation for every speaker:

47. √ Pierre, il croit pas que Marie ait acheté quoi ?  
P. he believe not that M. have-SUBJ bought what

But not for the embedded cleft :

48. \* Tu crois pas que ce soit quoi que Marie ait acheté ?  
you believe not that it-be-SUBJ what that M. have-SUBJ bought

There is an intervention effect between the focus marker+*wh* and the negation. This is not due to the intervention effect between the *wh*- itself and the negation because (47) is fine.

When the negation is on the embedded verb, the pattern is very different :

49. Et Paul, il pense que t'as pas vu qui ?  
And P., he thinks that you-have NOT seen who  
'He thinks you haven't seen who ?'

*Qui* obviously in interpreted as having large scope: *x*, the person such as he thinks you didn't see (specific : among a group of people, there is one person such that you didn't get to see).

The same happens with clefts but *qui* is never under the scope of negation at any point of the derivation:

50. Et Paul, il pense que c'est qui que t'as pas vu ?<sup>13</sup>  
And P., he thinks that it-is who that you-have NOT seen

In (50) and (51), both the *wh*- cleft and LD *wh*-in situ are interpreted in the main CP but through a different process.

---

<sup>12</sup> Note that partial movement constructions do not appear under negation either.

<sup>13</sup> Shlonsky (200) notes that the data below in (i) suggests that the strong intervention effect that the position occupied by the cleft *wh*- is not its final landing site, and that '*wh* clefting is akin to partial *wh*-movement'

i. \* C'est pas qui que t'as vu? (it-is not who that you have seen)

Two approaches have been put forward (see Kotek & Hackl 2013 and references therein):

- the covert movement approach: no *wh*- phrase stays in situ at LF, all the *wh*-phrases must be next to C in order to be interpreted. (Karttunen, 1977; Huang, 1982; Lasnik and Saito, 1992; Hornstein, 1995; Pesetsky, 2000; Richards, 2001; Cable, 2007, a.o.)

- the in situ approach: *Wh*-phrases in a question can be interpreted in situ and do not require any movement. (Hamblin, 1973; Kiss, 1986; Cheng, 1991; Chomsky, 1995; Reinhart, 1998; Kratzer and Shimoyama, 2002, a.o.).

The facts described above about the embedded cleft *wh*- lead us to think that the intervention effect between the focus marker+*wh* and the negation is decisive in order to understand what is going on here, possibly *partial movement*. (cf. Kotek & Hackl 2013).

#### 4 Conclusion

The embedded cleft appears in a grammar where LD *wh*-in situ is comfortably established. Whereas embedded *wh*-in situ can lack exhaustiveness and uniqueness, the embedded cleft fulfills those criterions and satisfy speakers who have a tendency to avoid movement at all costs.

What could explain the fact that those three strategies coexist in the grammar? Long movement in (51) is still used (see Oiry 2011) esp. in standard colloquial French but the emergence of constructions with no apparent movement still has to be explained.

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| 51. <b>Qu'est-ce que</b> t'imagines que Marie a vendu?<br>What ESK you imagine that M has sell-PAST   | Long movement  |
| 52. T'imagines que Marie a vendu <b>quoi</b> ?<br>you imagine that M has sell-PAST what   | In situ        |
| 53. T'imagines que <b>c'est quoi que</b> Marie a vendu?<br>you-imagine that it-is what that Marie has sold<br>'What do you think Marie sold?' | Embedded Cleft |

LF movement is characterized as less costly and could justify the existence of the last two strategies in a grammar in which speakers have to keep a large range of strategies to interact at different levels of language (more or less formal). Arguably, we are not in a position of diglossia in French (see *French Language Studies* 23, 2013). We can also follow Lambrecht in saying that the lack of word order flexibility to put focus on constituents is explaining the emergence of embedded clefts in coordination with the tendency to avoid long distance extraction.

Selected references (more at <http://blogs.umass.edu/moiry/2014/10/06/references/>)

Arregi, K. (2003) "Clausal Pied-Piping." *Natural Language Semantics* 11.2:115-143.

- Baunaz, L., & Puskás, G. (2008). Feature stripping and wh-movement in French and Hungarian. *Selected Proceedings of the 34 th Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*. Paola Benincà, Federico Damonte and Nicoletta Penello (eds.). Padova: Unipress Special Issue of the Rivista di Grammatica Generativa, 33, 43-60.
- Baunaz, L. (2005). The syntax and semantics of wh in-situ and existentials: The case of French. *Leiden Papers in Linguistics*, 2, 1-27.
- Baunaz, L. (2011). *The grammar of French quantification* (Vol. 83). Springer.
- Boeckx, C. (1999). Decomposing French questions. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, 6(1), 6.
- Bošković, Ž. (2000) 'Sometimes in SpecCP, sometimes in-situ', in R. Martin, D. Michaels, and Step by step: Essays on minimalism in honor of Howard Lasnik ed. by Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 53–87. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Bhatt, R. (2002). The raising analysis of relative clauses: Evidence from adjectival modification. *Natural language semantics*, 10(1), 43-90.
- Chang, L. (1997). *Wh-in-situ phenomena in French* (Doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia).
- Cheng, L. L. S. (1997). *On the typology of wh-questions*. Taylor & Francis.
- Cheng, L.L.S., & Rooryck, J. (2000). Licensing Wh-in-situ. *Syntax*, 3(1), 1-19.
- Clech-Darbon, A., G. Rebuschi, and A. Rialland. (1999). Are there cleft sentences in French? In Rebuschi and Tuller (1999), pages 83 - 118.
- Cable, S. (2012). The optionality of movement and EPP in Dholuo. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 30(3), 651-697.
- Dayal, V. (2000). Scope marking: Cross-linguistic variation in indirect dependency. *Wh-scope marking*, 37, 157-193.
- Dagnac, A. (2013). La variation des interrogatives en français.
- Demirdache and Oiry 2007. On the Felicity Conditions for Long-Distance Questions in L1 Acquisition. Proceedings of BUCLD 31. Edited by Heather Caunt-Nulton, Samantha Kulatilake and I-Hao Woo. Cascadilla Press: 184-195. 2007.
- Déprez, V., Syrett, K., & Kawahara, S. (2013). The interaction of syntax, prosody, and discourse in licensing French *wh-in-situ* questions. *Lingua*, 124, 4-19.
- Fanselow, G. (2006). Partial Wh-Movement. *The Blackwell companion to syntax*, 437-492.
- Guilliot, N., & Oiry, M. Some Questions (and Answers) about Cleft Sentences. Ms.
- Gotowski, M. & Baker M. An Information Structural Account of Children's Wh-In Situ Questions in French. Galana paper. To appear.
- Herburger, E. (1994). A semantic difference between full and partial wh-movement in German. In *LSA Annual Meeting, Boston*.
- Kayne, R. S. (1994). *The antisymmetry of syntax* (No. 25). MIT Press.
- Lahiri, U. (2002). On the proper treatment of "expletive *wh*" in Hindi. *Lingua*, 112(7), 501-540.
- Lambrecht, K. (1988). Presentational cleft constructions in spoken French. *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*, 135-179.
- Hamlaoui, F. (2009). *La focalisation à l'interface de la syntaxe et de la phonologie: le cas du français dans une perspective typologique* (Doctoral dissertation, Paris 3).
- Hamlaoui, F., & Mathieu, E. An interface approach to French *wh*-questions.
- Homer, V. (2007). Intervention Effects: The Case of Presuppositions
- Kotek, Hadas and Hackl, M. (2013). An experimental investigation of interrogative syntax/semantics. *Proceedings of the 2013 Amsterdam Colloquium*, eds. Maria Aloni, Michael Franke and Floris Roelofsen.
- Krein, K. Prosodic Licensing of French WH-in-situ: An Agree-base Approach.
- Mathieu, E. (1999). Wh in-situ and the intervention effect. *UCL working papers in linguistics*, 11, 441-472.
- Mathieu, E. (2004). The mapping of form and interpretation: the case of optional WH-movement in French. *Lingua*, 114(9), 1090-1132.
- Mathieu, E. (2009). Les questions en français: Micro et macro-variation. *Le Français d'Ici: Études Linguistiques et Sociolinguistiques de la Variation*, 37-66.
- Mathieu, É. The wh parameter and radical externalization.
- Munaro, N., Poletto, C., & Pollock, J. Y. (2001). Eppure si muove!: On comparing French and Bellunese. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook*, 1(1), 147-180.

- Myers, L. L., & Pellet, S. (2014). Pourquoi in spoken French. *Perspectives on Linguistic Structure and Context: Studies in honor of Knud Lambrecht*, 244, 157.
- Oiry, M. (2011). A Case of True Optionality: Wh- in situ Patterns like Long Movement in French1. *Linguistic Analysis*, 37, 1a2.
- Poletto, C., & Pollock, J. Y. (2004). On the left periphery of some Romance wh-questions. *The structure of CP and IP. The cartography of syntactic structures*, 2, 251-296.
- Prince, E. F. (1976). The syntax and semantics of neg-raising, with evidence from French. *Language*, 404-426.
- Rialland, A., Doetjes, J., & Rebuschi, G. (2002). What is Focused in C'est XP qui/que Cleft Sentences in French?. In *Speech Prosody 2002, International Conference*.
- Rizzi, L. (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of grammar* (pp. 281-337). Springer Netherlands.
- Rizzi, L., & Shlonsky, U. (2007). Strategies of subject extraction. *Interfaces+ recursion= language*, 115-160.
- Sabel, J. (2000). Partial wh-movement and the typology of wh-questions. *Wh-scope marking*, 37, 409.
- Shlonsky, U. (2013). Notes on wh in situ in French. *Geneva: University of Geneva, MS*.
- Sportiche, D. (2011). French relative qui. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 42(1), 83-124.
- Sportiche, D. (to appear) The que/qui Alternation: New Analytical Directions (with Hilda Koopman). to appear in P. Svenonius (ed.) *Functional Structure from Top to Toe*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Et tu penses que c'est quoi ? que le bébé appuie sur la vessie ou que les intestins n'on plus trop de place ??

<http://www.mamanandco.fr/forum/topic21550-1320.html>

tu penses que c'est quoi que j'ai fait mal ?

[http://forums.cnetfrance.fr/topic/177357-comment-mettre-un-virus-en-quarantaine/page\\_st\\_20](http://forums.cnetfrance.fr/topic/177357-comment-mettre-un-virus-en-quarantaine/page_st_20)

et tu penses que c est quoi que j ai ?

[http://forum.doctissimo.fr/psychologie/schizophrenie/delires-persecution-sujet\\_148838\\_1.htm](http://forum.doctissimo.fr/psychologie/schizophrenie/delires-persecution-sujet_148838_1.htm)

Si j'ai dis "2L, 60 ch", tu crois que c'est quoi que j'ai ?



<http://www.forum-auto.com/automobile-pratique/discussions-libres/sujet177557.htm>

guillou, tu penses que c'est qui que la femme et son fils cachent dans la cave? c'est le père nan?

<http://generation-football.forumactif.com/t1161p735-le-topic-des-series-tv>