This paper is a study of sentences like (1) and (2), discussed parenthetically in recent literature (Horváth 1998, 2007, Cable 2008). In this paper we develop and modify a suggestion by Kayne (2000: 277, n.107) that such examples are akin to partial \textit{wh}-movement constructions in Hindi and German. We show that this view is superior to one which takes these cases to be simply a case of large scale pied piping, though we will use the term clausal pied piping descriptively. We first show that such sentences are indeed \textit{bona fide} cases of clausal movement, i.e. the bracketed material raises to its surface position in the left periphery of the matrix clause from a first-merged position below the matrix V. We offer four different empirical arguments to support this view. First, these structures give rise to island effects; specifically, (3) and (4) show sensitivity to \textit{wh}-islands and complex DP-islands respectively. Second, backwards binding is available, as in (5) and (6), which we take as evidence of reconstruction of the lower clause to its initial position low in the matrix clause. Third, crossover effects are observed in these structures. In examples (7) and (8), the inability of \textit{who} to bind \textit{he}, indicates weak and strong crossover violations, respectively. Fourth, there is a selectional relation between the higher verb and the moved clause. In particular, scope marking constructions are known to be lexically restricted in a way similar to long distance \textit{wh}-movement: speakers seem to find these best with bridge verbs such as \textit{think, say, and believe} as the matrix V. At the same time, verbs of \textit{manner of speaking} like \textit{shout} and \textit{whisper}, which are poor in long distance \textit{wh}-movement, are similarly poor in the cases of clausal movement at hand. Having established that movement is involved in these constructions, we then compare two potential analyses of the phenomenon. The first is in terms of \textit{clausal pied piping} (CPP) following Arregi’s (2003) analysis of similar facts in Basque (cf. 9). Arregi’s analysis suggests that CPP cases are derived from the same underlying structures that feed long \textit{wh}-movement. Nevertheless, as we show, three facts suggest that in English, CPP and long \textit{wh}-movement have distinct underlying structures. First, unlike CPP, long \textit{wh}-movement and embedded questions do not trigger SAI in the lower clause (9,10). Second, while long \textit{wh}-movement is possible across negation, CPP is not (11,12). Third, CPP and long distance \textit{wh}-movement differ in the way \textit{how many} phrases take scope. While a \textit{many > think} reading is marginally available in (13), it is not in (14); a \textit{think > many} reading is preferred in both cases. In view of these facts, we propose that long \textit{wh}-movement and CPP in English are derived from different underlying structures. In particular, we assume the standard treatment of long distance \textit{wh}-movement with the lower CP merged as the sister of the matrix verb. We propose, however, that these CPs are merged as root clauses adjoining to an empty complement of the verb, as illustrated in (15).The empty element to which the clause adjoins is an operator-like element. We propose, following Kayne, that the operator part of the constituent [[Op] [CP]] raises first to the matrix [Spec CP] and then the CP raises further pat the operator. The operator functions here as a scope marker for the whole CP. This account is reminiscent of the standard analysis of floating quantifiers which, as is well known also serve to mark the scope of the associated NP. On this account the unavailability of (12) is explained as a violation of the inner island condition (Ross 1984), which blocks movement of adjuncts out of the scope of negation. This adjunction analysis of pied-piped clauses enables us to account for the scopal behaviour of \textit{how many} phrases too. The fact that \textit{think} can scope over \textit{many} in (14) suggests that the pied-piped material reconstructs (cf. (5) and (6)). The inability of \textit{how many} to scope over \textit{think} in (14) is therefore plausibly attributed to the adjunct-hood of the moved clause: because the moved clause is an adjunct, it is opaque to extraction of \textit{how many} to the matrix CP at LF. Crucially, evidence from crossover effects suggests that the category that raises to the matrix spec, CP is not the pied-piped CP, but rather is headed by the \textit{wh}-operator. Example (16) shows that CPP is sensitive to WCO: \textit{who} cannot bind \textit{his}. On standard assumptions, for WCO to arise i.e. for \textit{who} to bind both \textit{his} and the empty category the empty category must be a trace of \textit{who} and not the pied-piped CP. We propose, then, that the moved CP is an adjunct attaching to the \textit{wh}-phrase as in (17). This paper, then, provides an account of sentences such as (1) and (2) and shows that English has an overarching scope marking strategy which consists in stranding an operator/Determiner at the scope position of the contentful scope bearing element. The CP in our case the NP associate of a floating quantifier in the case of floating quantifiers. The analysis provided also shows that the partial \textit{wh}-movement/scope marking strategies found in languages such as Romani, German, Hindi etc... are much more widespread than initially thought.
(1) [How old is she] do you think?
(2) [What is your name] did you say?
(3) Wh-island effects:
   a. [How old is she] do you think he said <how old is she>?
   b. *[How old is she] do you wonder whether he said <how old is she>?
(4) Complex DP island effects:
   a. ?[How old is she] did John claim she said <how old is she>?
   b. *[How old is she] did John report the claim that she said <how old is she>?
(5) [ Which picture of himself ] was downloaded ] did John, say?
(6) [ What, did each other's brothers buy t ] do they, believe?
(7) *[Who is Mary dating <who> ] does his, mother think < Who is Mary dating <who>>?
(8) *[Who is Mary dating <who> ] did he, say <who is Mary dating <who>>?
(9) [ How old is she ] did you [*whisper/*shout/say]?
(10) How old did you [ *whisper/*shout/say ] she is?
(11) [Se idatzi rabela Jonek ] pentzate su?
    What do you think Jon wrote?  
    (Basque clausal Pied-piping Arregi 2003)
(12) Se pentzate su [ t idatzi rabela Jonek ]?
    what you-think [ t written has Jon.E ]
    What do you think Jon wrote?  
    (Basque long wh-movement: Arregi 2003)
(13) *[How old] do you think is she <how old>?
(14) *I know how old is she.
(15) Who dont you think [<who will come]?
(16) *[Who will come] dont you think?
(17) [How many books] do you think Al read?
(18) [How many books did Al read] do you think?
(19) [V [DP [CP ]
(20) ??Who is Mary dating does his, mother think e_i?
(21) [Who [ who is Mary dating t_i ] ] do you think e_i?