SYNTAX AND SEMANTICS OF SPLIT QUESTIONS[*]

KARLOS ARREGI
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

1. Introduction

Spanish 'split questions' are illustrated in the following examples:[1]

(1) a. *Qué libro leyó Juan, el Quijote?*
   what book read Juan the Quijote
   "What book did Juan read, Don Quijote?"
  b. *Quién leyó este libro, Juan?*
   who read this book Juan
   "Who read this book, Juan?"

Split questions have two parts, orthographically separated by a comma. The 'wh-part' is before the comma and looks like a wh-question. The 'tag' is after the comma, and is, in some sense, a correlate of the wh-phrase in the wh-part. The intuition behind this observation is that the tag provides a possible answer to the question expressed in the wh-part.

In this paper, I argue for a biclausal analysis of this construction. Specifically, most of its peculiar properties can be explained by adopting the following proposals. First, the wh-part is a wh-question. Second, the tag is the focused remnant of ellipsis in a non-wh-question. For instance, the split question in (1a) has the following structure under this analysis:

[1] In order to avoid confusion with markers for grammaticality judgments, I do not use the opening question mark '¿' in the Spanish examples. Other languages (e.g. English and Basque) seem to have the same construction. However, I have not tested all the claims made here in these languages. This paper concentrates only on Spanish.

(2)   *wh-part*   *tag*
          $[_{CP}$ [what book]$_i$ read Juan t_i]   , $[_{CP}$ ~~Juan read~~ [the Quijote]$_F$]

The wh-part and the tag form separate clauses. The wh-part is a wh-question,
and the tag is a non-wh-question with ellipsis (a yes/no question in this specific
case.) Furthermore, the only overt material in the tag is focused, which is why it
survives ellipsis.

I provide evidence from the phonology, syntax and semantics of split ques-
tions that this is the correct account. The main virtue of this analysis is that it re-
lies exclusively on independently motivated mechanisms, such as wh-movement
in the wh-part and ellipsis in the tag.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides evidence for the syn-
tax of split questions proposed above, and section 3 argues that this syntax can
explain the particular semantic properties of split questions. In section 4, I dis-
cuss further issues in the syntax of this construction and compare the biclausal
analysis defended here with Camacho's (2002) monoclausal analysis.[2] Section 5
concludes with some questions for future research.

2.   *Syntax of split questions*

In the present analysis, the split question in (1a) has the structure in (2). That
is, (1a) has the same syntax as the sequence of questions "What book did Juan
read? Did Juan/he read Don Quijote?" except for the fact that the former has
undergone ellipsis. Initial evidence for the analysis comes from prosody. Both
parts of the split question have the predicted intonation contour.[3] First, the wh-
part has the intonation contour of a wh-question, with a final fall. Second, the tag
has the intonation contour of a non-wh-question, as expected. If it is interpreted
as a yes/no question, there is a final rise.[4] Finally, the tag can also be interpreted
as an alternative question:

---

[2] Camacho 2002 is the only previous work on this particular construction that I have found in
the literature. Lorenzo (1994) and López-Cortina (2003) discuss a very similar construction in
Spanish that has some peculiar morphological and syntactic properties. In this paper, I do not
discuss this particular kind of split question.

[3] For relevant literature on Spanish intonation patterns, see Beckman et al. 2002 and references
cited there.

[4] In some dialects, yes/no questions do not have a final rise, and the main intonational correlate
of the question is upstep beginning on the word with nuclear or focal accent (see Beckman et al.
2002 for details.)

(3)   *Qué libro leyó Juan, el   Quijote o La Celestina?*
        what book read Juan the Quijote or La Celestina
        "What book did Juan read, Don Quijote or La Celestina?"

The non-elided source of this alternative split question is like (1a), except that the second question is the alternative question "Did Juan read Don Quijote or La Celestina?" As expected, the tag in this type of split question shows the characteristic intonation contour of an alternative question, with a final fall.

In the following subsections, I provide further details of the syntax of split questions, and present further arguments for the analysis. Subsection 2.1 discusses the process of ellipsis in the tag, and subsection 2.2 deals with the syntax of wh-movement in the wh-part.

2.1 The tag is a non-wh-question with ellipsis

In the present analysis, the tag is the result of ellipsis in a non-wh-question, as in (1a, 2). Recall that another important ingredient in the analysis is that the tag survives ellipsis because it is interpreted as focused. Furthermore, ellipsis in the tag is licensed because the wh-part provides a suitable antecedent.

This is, essentially, the same analysis as has been proposed for other well-known ellipsis phenomena, such as fragment answers (see among others Morgan 1973, Merchant 2004):

(4)   a.   *Qué libro leyó Juan?*
             what book read Juan
             "What book did Juan read?"
        b.   *(Juan leyó) el   Quijote.*
             (Juan read) the Quijote

As shown in (4b), the question in (4a) can be answered with a full sentence or with a fragment. The latter is the same as the full answer, except that everything but the focus (*El Quijote*) undergoes ellipsis. Ellipsis of everything but the focus in the answer is licensed because the wh-question provides a suitable antecedent.

In the analysis defended here, the tag in split questions is the result of the same type of ellipsis. Ellipsis is licensed by the wh-part, and the tag survives ellipsis because it is focused. Thus, the syntax proposed for the tag is justified by the fact that it uses mechanisms that are independently needed in other ellipsis constructions.[5]

---

[5] Presumably, the focus in the tag in split questions undergoes movement to the left periphery, so that the material undergoing ellipsis is a constituent. See Merchant 2004, and references cited

2.2 The wh-part is a wh-question

In this subsection, I argue that the wh-part involves wh-movement, thereby showing that it has the same syntax as a wh-question. The first argument, from Camacho 2002, comes from sensitivity to islands. As expected, a split question is grammatical if the wh-part involves extraction from a clause that is the complement of a bridge verb (5), but it is not when the wh-phrase is extracted from an adjunct island (6) (see Camacho 2002 for other islands.)

(5)   [*Qué libro*] *crees*   [*que compró Juan t*] , *el   Quijote*
         [what book] you.think [that bought Juan *t*]   the Quijote
         "What book do you think Juan bought, Don Quijote?"

(6)   *[*Qué libro*] *te   alegrarás*   [*si publican   t*] , *el   Quijote*
         [what book] REFL you.will.be.happy [if they.publish *t*]   the Quijote
         "What book will you be happy if they publish, Don Quijote?"

A further argument for wh-movement comes from crossover effects. The following examples show that both weak (7a) and strong (7b) crossover configurations lead to ungrammaticality:

(7)   a.   *[*A quién*]$_i$ *cree*   [*su$_i$ madre*] *que quieres   t$_i$, a Juan?*
              [to who   ]$_i$ thinks [his$_i$ mother] that you.love *t$_i$* to Juan
              "Who$_i$ does his$_i$ mother think you love, Juan?"
         b.   *[*A quién*]$_i$ *cree*   { pro$_i$ / *él$_i$* } *que quieres   t$_i$, a Juan?*
              [to who   ]$_i$ thinks { *pro$_i$* / he$_i$ } that you.love *t$_i$* to Juan
              "Who$_i$ does he$_i$ think you love, Juan?"

To conclude this section, the present analysis makes the correct predictions for both the tag and the wh-part. The former is the focused remnant of ellipsis in a non-wh-question, and the latter is a question that involves wh-movement.

3. Semantics of split questions

In this section, I show how the analysis proposed here explains the peculiar semantic properties of split questions. The analysis is largely based on Roberts' (1998) framework for questions and focus, which is summarized in subsection 3.1. Based on this framework, and on the syntax for split questions proposed above, subsections 3.2 and 3.3 discuss the role of the tag and the wh-part in the semantics of split questions, respectively.

there, that this is the case at least for fragment answers. Whether this is actually the case for split questions is a matter in need of further research.

3.1 The semantics of focus and questions

Roberts 1998 defines the denotation of a question in terms of a set of 'Q-alternatives' (see among others Hamblin 1973, Rooth 1985.)

(8)   *The Q-alternatives corresponding to utterance of a clause α*:
        Q-alt$(\alpha) = \{p : u^{i-1}, \ldots, u^{i-n} \in D[p = [\![\beta]\!](u^{i-1}) \ldots (u^{i-n})]\}$, where α has
        the logical form $\text{wh}_{i-1}, \ldots, \text{wh}_{i-n}(\beta)$, with $\{\text{wh}_{i-1}, \ldots, \text{wh}_{i-n}\}$ the (possibly empty) set of wh-elements in α, and D is the domain of the model
        for the language, suitably sortally restricted.

The denotation of a question is its Q-alt. Furthermore, a partial answer to a question is a proposition which contextually entails the evaluation—either true or false—of at least one element of its denotation. A *complete answer* is a proposition which contextually entails an evaluation for each element of the denotation of the question..

According to these definitions, the denotation of the question "What did Mary read?" is $\{p : u \in D[p = [\lambda x.\text{Mary read } x](u)]\}$ (with D restricted to inanimates), i.e. the set of propositions of the form "Mary read u" where u is inanimate. If D is restricted to Great Expectations, Ulysses and The Great Gatsby, then "Mary read Great Expectations" is a partial answer to the question, and "Mary read Great Expectations and she did not read Ulysses or The Great Gatsby" is a complete answer.

On the other hand, a yes/no question like "Did Mary read Great Expectations?" denotes the set containing only the proposition that Mary read Great Expectations. The positive answer to this question denotes the proposition that Mary read Great Expectations, and the negative answer denotes the proposition that Mary did not read Great Expectations. Both are complete answers to the question, since both entail the evaluation of the single proposition in the set denoted by the question.

As expected, focus is also a crucial part of Roberts' semantics for questions and answers.[6]

(9)   *Focus alternative sets*
        The focus alternative set corresponding to a constituent β, $\|\beta\|$, is the
        set of all interpretations obtained by replacing all the focused and wh-constituents in β with variables, and then interpreting the result relative

---

[6] In (11), $*\beta$ is an utterance of β with mood variable * ranging over the set {? (interrogative), . (assertion) }. I have made small changes in Roberts' definitions that are not important for our purposes.

to each member of the set of all assignment functions which vary at most in the values they assign to those variables.

(10) β is *congruent* to a question $?\alpha$ iff its focal alternatives $\|\beta\|$ are the Q-alternatives determined by $?\alpha$, i.e. iff $\|\beta\|$ = Q-alt(α).

(11)   *Presupposition of focus in an utterance *β*
        β is congruent to the question under discussion.

For our purposes, the question under discussion (QUD) for some sentence is simply a question that has been uttered prior to the sentence.

Given these definitions, the answer to a wh-question must have focus on the correlate of the wh-phrase in the question. For instance, consider the sentence *A* "Mary read Great EXPECTATIONS," with focus on "Great Expectations". If D is restricted as above, the focus alternative set of this sentence is the set containing the propositions that Mary read Great Expectations, that Mary read Ulysses and that Mary read The Great Gatsby. This is precisely the denotation of the question *Q* "What did Mary read?" (see above). If *Q* is the QUD for *A*, then *A* satisfies the presupposition of focus.

On the other hand, the sentence "MARY read Great Expectations," with focus on "Mary", does not satisfy the presupposition of focus if *Q* is the QUD, since its focus alternative set is the set of propositions of the form "*u* read Great Expectations", where *u* is human.

For our purposes, it is important to also discuss the role of focus in yes/no questions such as "Did Mary read Great EXPECTATIONS?" Just like declaratives, questions must also be congruent to the QUD, which in this case must be "What did Mary read?" The focus alternative set of the yes/no question is the set of propositions of the form "Mary read *u*", where *u* is inanimate. This is also the Q-alternative set of the QUD. Thus, the yes/no question satisfies the presupposition of focus.

Note that these definitions establish a hierarchy of questions in a discourse. In particular, a complete answer to the yes/no question above can be "Mary read Great Expectations" or "Mary did not read Great Expectations," and both are partial answers to the QUD, since they both evaluate at least one member of its denotation (namely, the proposition that Mary read Great Expectations.) In general, a yes/no question containing a focused constituent has a wh-question as its QUD, and a complete answer to the former is a partial answer to the latter. We can thus understand the yes/no question as a 'subquestion' of the wh-question.

Focus in a yes/no question also determines possible continuations in the discourse. For instance, "Did Mary read Great EXPECTATIONS?" can be given the reply "No. (She read) ULYSSES." The first part of the reply is a complete

(negative) answer to the yes/no question. However, the second part is not, since it does not evaluate the proposition that Mary read Great Expectations. It is licensed because it is congruent to the QUD "What did Mary read?" since its focus alternative set is the set of propositions of the form "Mary read u", which is the denotation of the QUD. That is, it is licensed because it provides a partial answer to the QUD.

On the other hand, "No. JOHN (read Great Expectations)" is not felicitous as a reply to "Did Mary read Great EXPECTATIONS?". This is because the focus alternative set of the second part is the set of propositions of the form "u read Great Expectations" which is not congruent to the QUD. As we will see, these restrictions on the possible continuations to negative answers are a useful tool in detecting focus in questions (including split questions.)

3.2 The role of the tag

It is fairly straightforward to show that the form of the tag determines the semantics of split questions. Specifically, if the source of the tag is a yes/no-question, the split question must be interpreted as a yes/no-question, i.e. the answer must be *yes* or *no*:

(12)   *Qué libro leyó Juan, el   Quijote?*
        what book read Juan the Quijote
        "What book did Juan read, Don Quijote?"
(13)   *Sí   / No / %El   Quijote / %La Celestina.*
        Yes / no /   the Quijote /   La Celestina.

On the other hand, if source of tag is an alternative question, the split question is interpreted as an alternative question, and the answer must be one of the alternatives given in the tag:

(14)   *Qué libro leyó Juan, el   Quijote o La Celestina?*
        what book read Juan the Quijote or La Celestina
        "What book did Juan read, Don Quijote or La Celestina?"
(15)   *El   Quijote / La Celestina / %Sí   / %No*
        the Quijote / La Celestina /   yes /   no

Another crucial part of the analysis is that the tag is the focused remnant of ellipsis in a non-wh-question. As shown in the previous subsection, in the case of yes/no questions, we can determine the role of focus by looking at possible continuations to a negative answer. In a yes/no split question, the focus in the

correction following a negative answer must have focus on the correlate of the tag:

(16)   *A quién le   regaló Juan el coche, a María?*
        to who   CL.DAT gave   Juan the car   to María
        "Who did Juan give the car to, María?"

(17)   a. *No. (Se   lo   regaló) a SUSANA.*
            no   (CL.DAT CL.ACC he.gave) to SUSANA
            "No. (He gave it to) SUSANA."

        b. *%No. (Le   regaló) la MOTO.*
            no   (CL.DAT he.gave) the BIKE
            "No. (He gave her) the BIKE."

In this case, the tag is the indirect object. Accordingly, (17a), with focus on the indirect object is a possible reply, but (17b), with focus on the direct object, is not. This is just as expected if the tag is the focused remnant of a yes/no question. Its focus alternative set is the set of propositions of the form "Juan gave the car to u", where u is animate. Thus, it must be congruent to the QUD "Who did Juan give the car to?"[7] The continuation in (17a), with focus on the indirect object, is also congruent to this QUD, since its focus alternative set is the set denoted by the QUD. On the other hand, (17b), with focus on the direct object, is not congruent to the QUD, since its focus alternative set is the set of propositions of the form "Juan gave u to María".

To summarize so far, the possible replies to split questions argue for two aspects of the analysis proposed here. First, the tag is the remnant of ellipsis in a non-wh-question (which can be a yes/no or an alternative question), and second, the tag is interpreted as focused within the non-wh-question.

From these conclusions, it would seem that the wh-part has no role in the semantics of a split question, apart from providing an antecedent for ellipsis in the tag. The remainder of this section argues that this is not the case.

3.3 The role of the wh-part

The role of the wh-part in a split question can be defined as follows:

(18)   In a split question, the wh-part is the QUD for the tag.

This entails that, in order to satisfy the presupposition of focus, the tag must be congruent to the wh-part. The tag is a subquestion of the wh-part, and a complete

---

[7] Note that this QUD is in fact provided by the wh-part. This is discussed in subsection 3.3.

answer to the former is a partial answer to the latter. In the present analysis, this follows from the simple fact that the tag is a question that is preceded by the question in the wh-part.

This can be illustrated with our original example, repeated here:

(19)   *Qué libro leyó Juan, el Quijote?*
         what book read Juan the Quijote
         "What book did Juan read, Don Quijote?"

Recall that the tag has the same denotation as the question "Did Juan read Don QUIJOTE", with focus on "Don Quijote". Its focus alternative set is the set of propositions of the form "Juan read u". Furthermore, the wh-part denotes the same set of propositions. This means that the tag is congruent to the wh-part, which is the QUD of the former.

This explains why the tag must be a correlate of the wh-phrase in the wh-part. For instance, the tag in (19–20) must be understood as the object, and the one in (21) below must be understood as the subject.

(20)   **Qué libro leyó Juan, Pedro?*
         what book read Juan Pedro
         "What book did Juan read, Pedro?"

(21)   a.   *Quién leyó el Quijote, Juan?*
              who   read the Quijote Juan
              "Who read Don Quijote, Juan?"
         b.   **Quién leyó el Quijote, La Celestina?*
              who   read the Quijote La Celestina
              "Who read Don Quijote, La Celestina?"

However, an additional requirement must be met in split questions: the answer to a split question must be a complete answer to the wh-part. This can be shown by using a plural wh-phrase in the wh-part. The tag must also be plural:

(22)   *¿Qué libros leyó Juan, { *el Quijote / estos }?*
         what books read Juan   { the Quijote / these }
         "What books did Juan read, { Don Quijote / these }?"

The plural wh-phrase introduces the presupposition that Juan read more than one book. This means that the object in a complete answer to the wh-part must denote a group of individuals. If the wh-part where used as a simple wh-question,

"Juan read Don Quijote" would not provide a complete answer (although it would provide a partial answer.) Thus, given (22) with the singular tag is ungrammatical because the answer to the tag does not provide a complete answer to the wh-part. On the other hand, the plural tag makes (22) grammatical.

To conclude this section, the analysis proposed here explains most of the relevant semantic properties of split questions. However, it is important to note that the complete answer requirement discussed above is specific to split questions and does not seem to follow from the underlying structure proposed here. In non-elliptical pieces of discourse, a complete answer to a yes/no question with a focused constituent does not have to be a complete answer to its QUD. A partial answer is sufficient. For instance, "What books did Juan read?" can be followed by "Did he read El QUIJOTE?", even though a complete answer to the latter is only a partial answer to the former. This is a matter in need of further research.

4. *Further issues in the syntax of split questions*

In this section, I discuss further properties of split questions in the light of certain predictions made by Camacho's (2002) monoclausal analysis of this construction. According to him, the tag and the wh-phase form a constituent prior to wh-movement:

(23)   a.   *Leyó Juan* [$_{DP}$ [*qué   libro*] [*el   Quijote*]]
              read Juan [$_{DP}$ [what book] [the Quijote]]
        b.   [what book]$_i$ read Juan [$_{DP}$ t_i [the Quijote]]

Camacho also proposes that the wh-phrase is not a true [+wh]-operator.[8] He offers evidence that split questions cannot be embedded as an argument for this proposal:

(24)   *Juan no sabe   qué compraste, { un libro? / si   un libro }*
        Juan not knows what bought   { a book / whether a book }
        "Juan doesn't know what you bought, a book? / whether a book."

According to him, the embedding verb requires a [+wh] complement, but, by hypothesis, the wh-phrase cannot provide this feature. In the present proposal, the unembeddability of split questions can be simply attributed to the fact that they are formed by concatenating two sentences in discourse. This is something that can be done only at the matrix sentence level. Concatenating two embedded

---

[8] Although this is not stated explicitly in Camacho 2002, this might explain why split questions are interpreted as non-wh-questions.

sentences would require a grammatical device such as coordination. Thus, there is no need to stipulate that the wh-phrase is not marked as [+wh]. Furthermore, it was argued in section 3 that the interpretation of the wh-phrase is crucial in accounting for the semantic properties of split questions. If [+wh] is in any way crucial in the interpretation of wh-phrases, it is clear that they must me marked as such in split questions.

Nevertheless, there are apparent counterexamples to Camacho's generalization. Something parallel to (24) is possible if the tag is an alternative question:

(25)   *Juan no sabe   qué compraste, si   un libro o una revista.*
        Juan not knows what bought   whether a   book or a   magazine
        "Juan doesn't know what you bought, whether a book or a magazine."

Under the present analysis, (25) must involve concatenation of two matrix sentences, with ellipsis of both matrix and embedded material in the second sentence (*J̶u̶a̶n̶ ̶d̶o̶e̶s̶n̶'̶t̶ ̶k̶n̶o̶w̶* whether *y̶o̶u̶ ̶b̶o̶u̶g̶h̶t̶* a book or a magazine.) However, it is not clear why the same analysis is not available for the yes/no-question in (24). This is a question in need of further research.

Camacho's monoclausal analysis makes the clear prediction that the tag need not be final in a split question. This is because in his analysis, the tag forms a constituent with the trace of the wh-phrase, which need not be final in the sentence. On the other hand, the wh-part and the tag form separate matrix clauses in the present analysis, which entails that the tag must be final in a split question, that is, it must follow all elements in the wh-part. These differing predictions can be tested with split questions with multiple wh-phrases. As in multiple questions, only one wh-phrase can undergo overt movement in Spanish split questions:

(26)   *Quién criticó   a quién, Juan a Pedro?*
        who   criticized to who   Juan to Pedro
        "Who criticized who, Juan Pedro?"

Under Camacho's analysis, the multiple split question in (26) must have a structure where each part of the tag forms a constituent with the corresponding wh-phrase in the wh-part. Since only one wh-phase undergoes movement, the predicted structure after overt wh-movement is the following:

(27)   who$_i$ [$_{TP}$ [t_i Juan] criticized [to who   to Pedro]]

However, this does not result in the desired word order. Essentially, the analysis predicts that the correlate of the wh-phrase can be embedded inside the wh-part, since the constituent it forms with the wh-phrase need not be final in the sentence. (26) shows that this is not the case: the correlate of "who", i.e. "Juan" must be part of the tag, not the wh-part. No such prediction is made in the analysis defended here. The correlates of both wh-phrases are the focused remnants of ellipsis in a non-wh-question that necessarily follows the wh-part.

This prediction should also be testable in split questions with a single wh-phrase. As in multiple questions, the correlate of the wh-phrase must be in the tag, which means that it must be final in the split question. This prediction is borne out:

(28)   a.   *Quién habló con María, Juan?*
              who   talked with María   Juan
              "Who talked to María, Juan?"
         b.   **Quién habló Juan, con María?*
               who   talked Juan with María

However, there is a complication in the data. With the right intonation, the following is grammatical:

(29)   *Quién habló, Juan con María?*
         who   talked Juan with María

In this split question, the correlate of the wh-phrase in the tag is the subject *Juan*. However, this is followed by the object *con María* "with María", which is not a correlate of any wh-phrase in the wh-part. In all grammatical examples of split questions we have seen so far, the tag only contains the correlate(s) of the wh-phrase(s) in the wh-part. Thus, it would seem that this example contains a tag, *Juan*, that is not final in the split question, since it is followed by material that appears to belong in the wh-part (*con María*).

In the biclausal analysis defended here, the intonation break present in (29), represented by a comma in the orthography, indicates that, in fact, the tag is *Juan con María*, not simply *Juan*. That is, we are forced to the conclusion that the tag contains material other than the correlate of the wh-phrase. This entails that both the tag and the wh-part involve ellipsis in this type of example:

(30)   [who talked ~~with María~~] [Juan ~~talked~~ with María]

As in previous examples, ellipsis in the tag is licensed by material in the wh-part (i.e. by "talked"). What is new about this example is that it also involves ellipsis in the wh-part, which is licensed by material in the tag (i.e. by "with María"). That is, examples of this type involve 'backward ellipsis': lack of pronunciation of material licensed by overt material that follows it. As is well-known, backward ellipsis, and backward anaphora in general, is possible, and is attested in constructions such as right node raising (see, among others, Wilder 1997, Hartmann 2000.)

This analysis of (29) makes a clear prediction with respect to prosody. Since the correlate of the wh-phrase in the tag is the subject *Juan*, it must be focused. On the other hand, *con María* is not a correlate of a wh-phrase, so it is not focused. Since the tag is a yes/no question, the prediction is that it has the same intonation contour as a yes/no question with a non-final focus:

(31)   *Habló JUAN con María?*
        talked JUAN with María
        "Did JUAN talk to María?"

(31), a yes/no question with focus on the subject *Juan*, must be pronounced with upstep beginning on the focus (see Beckman et al. 2002 and references cited there.) As predicted by the analysis, the tag in the split question in (29) has exactly this intonation contour, with upstep beginning with *Juan*.

To conclude this section, the fact that the tag must be final in a split question provides strong evidence for the biclausal analysis over Camacho's monoclausal analysis. The apparent problematic example in (29), turns out to provide further evidence for the analysis proposed here. Finally, note that examples similar to (29) cannot be constructed using multiple questions, which is why multiple split questions provide the clearest evidence that the tag must be final. For instance, if we pronounce (27) so that the tag starts with *Juan* (the correlate of the overtly moved wh-phrase), the result is still ungrammatical, since the tag would in this case contain the wh-phrase *con quién* "with who". In the present analysis, this is not possible, since the tag must be a non-wh-question. This split question cannot be generated even if we used backward ellipsis.

5. *Conclusion*

In this paper, I have argued for a biclausal analysis of split questions. This account explains why the wh-part has the syntax and semantics of a wh-question, and why the tag is interpreted as a non-wh-question with a focused constituent. Furthermore, the analysis relies on independently motivated mechanisms, such

as wh-movement and ellipsis. Evidence for the analysis has been drawn from the phonology, syntax, and semantics of this construction, and it has been shown to be superior to the previous monoclausal analysis proposed in Camacho 2002.

References

Beckman, Mary E., Manuel Díaz-Campos, Julia Tevis McGory & Terrell A. Morgan. 2002. "Intonation across Spanish, in the Tones and Break Indices Framework". *Probus* 14:1.9–36.

Camacho, José. 2002. "Wh-doubling: Implications for the Syntax of Wh-movement". *Linguistic Inquiry* 33:1.157–164.

Hamblin, Charles L. 1973. "Questions in Montague English". *Foundations of Language* 10:1.41–53.

Hartmann, Katharina. 2000. *Right Node Raising and Gapping: Interface Conditions on Deletion.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

López-Cortina, Jorge. 2003. "The Structure of Split Interrogatives". *Theory, Practice, and Acquisition: Papers from the 6th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium and the 5th Conference on the Acquisition of Spanish and Portuguese (Iowa City, 18–20 October 2002)* ed. by Paula Kempchinsky & Carlos-Eduardo Piñeros, 140–155. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadilla.

Lorenzo, Guillermo. 1994. "Qué Expletivo en Preguntas Dislocadas". *Archivum* 44:1.423–446.

Merchant, Jason. 2004. "Fragments and Ellipsis". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27:6.661–738.

Morgan, Jerry. 1973. "Sentence Fragments and the Notion "sentence"". *Issues in Linguistics* ed. by Braj Kachru, Robert Lees, Yakov Malkiel, Angelina Pietrangeli & Sol Saporta, 719–751. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press.

Roberts, Craige. 1998. "Information Structure in Discourse: Towards an Integrated Formal Theory of Pragmatics". Ms., The Ohio State University.

Rooth, Mats. 1985. "Association with Focus". Ph.D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Wilder, Chris. 1997. "Some Properties of Ellipsis in Coordination". *Studies on Universal Grammar and Typological Variation* (= *Linguistik Aktuell,* 13) ed. by Artemis Alexiadiou & T. Alan Hall, 59–107. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.