

## Why Integrated?

Yasuyuki Fukutomi  
e107@ipc.fukushima-u.ac.jp  
Fukushima University

Gelderen (2001) analyzes the example in (1) as a kind of Integrated Parenthetical Constructions (IPCs). This construction shows three different properties from what she calls Construction B, the real instance of Partial *Wh*-movement: a) IPCs do not allow the presence of an overt complementizer (2), b) IPCs allow a preposing of the ‘apparently embedded’ interrogative clause (3), and c) IPCs do not allow for more than two clauses (4). Although her analysis is based on the similarities to the German counterpart of IPCs, why IPCs have these three properties still requires an explanation. In this paper we will propose that these properties are derived from two assumptions concerning the nature and internal structure of *wh*-phrases in Russian and German. Specifically, assuming that *wh*-phrases in these languages are morphological triggers to create a set of alternatives and also that associated interrogative clauses function as a restrictor, we will argue that *wh*-phrases have a layered internal structure, as in (5), each element of which is taken to correspond to a particular object in semantic representation proposed by Hamblin (1973).

Assuming that the operator and the restrictor are configured like (5), the property (a) can be considered to be one of the concord phenomena; that is, several *wh*-elements contribute to one question. A *wh*-stem merged firstly with a question operator is realized as *kak* ‘how,’ which triggers a creation of alternative set. Then the associated interrogative clause restricts the domain of alternatives. The presence of an overt complementizer is semantically incompatible with the notion of alternatives. The property (b) can now be reanalyzed as an instance of a large-scale pied-piping; *kogo ja videla kak* moves to the sentence initial position as one *wh*-phrase with a rich internal structure. Lastly, the property (c) can be directly accounted for by the proposed internal structure; a *wh*-stem with an operator affixed is not locally merged with the associated interrogative clause.

The present analysis gains additional support from cross-linguistic evidence. Japanese also has a *wh*-scope marking construction (6a) as well as a long-distance *wh*-question (6b). Like Russian and German, *wh*-scope marking constructions in Japanese do not allow the presence of the overt complementizer, as illustrated in (7). As for the property (b), Japanese, a strict SOV language, exhibits a mirror image effect to Russian and German. While the associated interrogative clause in *wh*-scope marking constructions can be post-posed (8a), the embedded clause in long-distance *wh*-questions cannot (8b). The example in (9) exemplifies the impossibility of multiple embedding in *wh*-scope marking constructions. Although Japanese permits almost unlimited freedom of word order, *wh*-scope marking constructions display a peculiar word order restriction. If the scope-marker *doo* is reordered to the left of its associate clause, the sentence is degraded, as indicated in (10). This word order restriction is also derived from the proposed structure of *wh*-phrases.

In summary, assuming that *wh*-phrases have a rich internal structure, we can offer a unified account for IPCs in Russian, German and Japanese. The difference between Russian and German, on the one hand, and Japanese, on the other, does not reflect the availability of *wh*-movement operation but it is the result of differing instantiations of a parameter that specifies the possible size of checking phrases; both a *wh*-stem and a large-scale *wh*-phrase in Russian and German, while only a large-scale pied-piping of a *wh*-phrase containing a *wh*-stem and its associated interrogative clause in the case of Japanese. The present analysis also suggests a possible typological correlation: only the language that uses the same *wh*-stem to build questions and existential/universal quantifiers has the Integrated Parenthetical Constructions.

## Data

- (1) Kak ty думаеш kogo ja videla? (Russian)  
 how you think who I see-PAST  
 ‘Who do you think I saw?’
- (2) Kak ty думаеш (\*что) kogo ja videla? (R)  
 how you think (that) who I see-PAST
- (3) a. [Kogo ja videla], [kak ty думаеш]? (R)  
 who I see-PAST how you think  
 b. Wird er morgen kommen, was glaubst du? (German)  
 will he tomorrow come what believe you  
 ‘Will he come tomorrow, do you think?’
- (4) a. \*Kak ty думаеш [(kak) Ivan skazal [kogo ja videla]]? (R)  
 how you think how Ivan said who I see-PAST  
 ‘Who do you think Ivan said I saw?’  
 b. Was (\*glaubst sie er meint) eird er morgen tun? (G)  
 what believes she he thinks will he tomorrow do  
 ‘What does she believe he thinks he will do tomorrow?’
- (5) [DP [Restrictor ...] [OpP Operator [*wh*-stem] ]]
- (6) a. Anata-wa [John-ga dare-o aisiteiru ka] doo omotteiru no? (Japanese)  
 you-TOP John-NOM who-ACC loves Q how think Q  
 ‘Who do you think that John loves?’  
 b. Anata-wa [John-ga dare-o aisiteiru to] omotteiru no? (J)  
 you-TOP John-NOM who-ACC love COMP think Q
- (7) a. \*Anata-wa [John-ga dare-o aisiteiru to] doo omotteiru no? (J)  
 you-TOP John-NOM who-ACC love COMP how think Q  
 b. \*Anata-wa [John-ga dare-o aisiteiru ka to] doo omotteiru no? (J)  
 you-TOP John-NOM who-ACC love Q COMP how think Q
- (8) a. Anata-wa doo omotteiru no, [John-ga dare-o aisiteiru ka] (J)  
 you-TOP how think Q John-NOM who-ACC love Q  
 b. \*Anata-wa omotteiru no, [John-ga dare-o aisiteiru to] (J)  
 you-TOP think Q John-NOM who-ACC love COMP
- (9) \*Anata-wa [[John-ga dare-o aisiteiru ka] Mary-ga doo itta ka]doo omotteiru no? (J)  
 you-TOP John-NOM who-ACC loves Q Mary-NOM how said Q how think Q  
 ‘Who do you think Mary said John loves?’
- (10) \*anata-wa doo [John-ga dare-o aisiteiru ka] omotteiru no? (J)  
 you-TOP how John-NOM who-ACC love Q think Q  
 ‘Who do you think that John loves?’

## References

- Gelderen, Véronique van. 2001. “Partial Wh-movement in Russian,” *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 2001, 89-100.
- Hamblin, C.L. 1973. “Questions in Montague English,” *Foundations of Language* 10, 41-55.
- Reis, Marga. 2000. “On the Parenthetical Features of German Was ... W-Constructions and How to Account for Them,” In U. Lutz, G. Müller and A. von Stechow, eds., *Wh-Scope Marking*, Benjamins, Amsterdam, 359-407.