

Monoclausal Question Word Coordinations Across Languages

Andreas Haida & Sophie Repp (Humboldt University Berlin)

It has been claimed (e.g. [v]) that in questions with conjoined question words, or **Q**(uestion) **W**(ord) **C**(oordination)s, only multiple *wh*-fronting (MF) languages allow the coordination of argument phrases, see (1a vs. b). In this paper we explain this correlation and propose (a) that the structure of multiple *wh*-questions in MF languages is a necessary derivational stage in the derivation of monoclausal QWCs, (b) that this stage involves movement of the *wh*-phrases into multiple specifiers of FocP.

We follow [xii] in the assumption that QWCs are derived by sideward movement ([viii]): the *wh*-phrases are copied and remerged in an unconnected syntactic object (here &P) that is assembled in parallel with the ‘source’ object, and then remerged with it, see (2). Vitally, we assume that the sideward movement to &P is restricted to *wh*-phrases that reside in (multiple) specifiers of FocP. This is motivated in (A)-(C) below. We further assume that the lower copies in (2) are chain-reduced at PF, where the necessary c-command relation arises from the percolation of the indices of the *wh*-conjuncts to the &P, which is conditioned by the LF requirement to derive a binary function from the complement of the conjoined *wh*-phrases.

(A) Phrases in Spec,FocP receive a focal interpretation, and the conjunction of unlikes, which is usually excluded, has been observed to be possible for foci, e.g. the focus associates of *only* in (3) ([vi]), also see the clefted conjoined phrases in (4). (B) If it were a lower position that serves as the source for the sideward movement, incompatible uninterpretable features would be copied into the &P, making the derivation crash. (C) Our proposal explains (C1) differences between MF- and non-MF languages, (C2) differences within the class of MF-languages, (C3) differences between QWCs and non-conjoined multiple questions. Re (C1), in Russian-type MF-languages, there is multiple focus movement of *wh*-items, see (2a) ([xi]). Such movement does not occur overtly in non-MF languages. Hence, there is no structure like (2a) that can feed a derivation resulting in (2c). For Romanian-type MF-languages we assume that they also involve multiple focus movement but – re (C2) – in these languages, the *wh*-items move further into Spec,CP. Thus, the derivation given in (2) also is available, with the addition that &P moves onwards to Spec,CP, see (5). This difference is crucial for explaining why the coordination of non-clause-mate *wh*-phrases is possible in Russian, see (6) ([vii]) but impossible in Romanian, see (7a) ([ii]): In Romanian-type languages, long-distance and clause-internal *wh*-movement differ wrt. the prefinal movement step. In a single clause, this is movement to Spec,FocP driven by the F-feature of the *wh*-phrase – followed by movement to Spec,CP, driven by an attract-all-*wh* feature of interrogative C (see [ix]). In the long-distance case, the prefinal step is successive cyclic movement to the left edge of vP: the F-feature of a *wh*-item is checked as early possible, i.e. in the embedded clause. The latter is evidenced by languages in which interrogative C does not overtly attract *wh*-phrases: focus movement applies in the declarative embedded clause (see (8)). Hence, in Romanian, non-clause-mate *wh*-phrases do not occur in the Spec of the same Foc head, which would be required for sideward movement (Phase Impenetrability Condition). In Russian-type languages, long and short distance *wh*-movement do not differ wrt. the movement to Spec,FocP: all *wh*-phrases (by bearing an F-feature) check this feature in the FocP of the clause in which they take interrogative scope because – we assume – interrogative C checks its featural requirements in conjunction with the head it selects (cf. [i] for a similar interplay of C and T). Importantly – re (C3) – in Romanian, non-conjoined multiple *wh*-fronting of non-clause-mate *wh*-phrases, which proceeds without sideward movement, is possible, see (7b) ([ii]).

Greek, which is not usually considered a MF-language (cf. (10a)) behaves like one when it comes to QWCs, see (9). This suggests that Greek might be MF after all, which is supported by data like (10b vs. c), cf. [x]: given that Greek is canonically S>O (10c) should be grammatical but it is not: the *wh*-object has to move to the left of the subject, see (10b). [x] argues that it moves at least to the edge of vP. The QWC data suggest that it moves even further, to FocP. Our analysis also predicts that movement of *wh*-phrases to the left in languages like German, which do not have QWCs with conjoined arguments, is not focus movement.

QWCs in non-MF-languages we consider to be underlyingly biclausal, cf. (11) for an English example (also cf. [iv]; Chinese, discussed in [xii] needs more research). We remain agnostic here wrt. the particular ellipsis type involved but argue that biclausal structures must be available both in MF- and in Non-MF-languages. This is motivated inter alia by the fact that QWCs with *if&wh* (investigated by [iii], see (12)), as well as QWCs with the conjunctions *or* or *let alone* (see (13)) for semantic reasons require a biclausal analysis.

- (1) a. *Who and whom saw? (English, Non-MF)
 b. Kto i kogo videl? (Russian, MF)
 who and whom saw
 ‘Who saw somebody and who was it?’
- (2) a. syntactic object 1: [_{FocP} kto [_{FocP} kogo Foc [_{TP} kto videl kogo]]
 b. syntactic object 2: [_{&P} kto [_{&P} i kogo]]
 c. remerge: [_{FocP} [_{&P} kto [_{&P} i kogo]] [_{FocP} kto [_{FocP} kogo Foc [_{TP} kto videl kogo]]]
 SIDeward MOVEMENT
- (3) John eats only pork and only at home.
- (4) It was in a drunken stupor and on a Wednesday that John met the woman he would marry.
- (5) [_{CP} [_{&P} cine [_{&P} ši ce]] C [_{FocP} [_{&P} cine [_{&P} ši ce]] [_{FocP} cine [_{FocP} ce Foc [_{TP} cine ți-a spus ce]]]]]
 who and what to.you-has told
 ‘Who told you something and what was it?’ (Romanian)
- (6) Kto i čto xočet, čtoby ja delal? (Russian)
 who and what wants that I did
 ‘Who wants that I do what?’
- (7) a. ??Cine ši ce ~~eine~~ își închipuie că ai descoperit ee? (Romanian)
 who and what who imagines that you.have discovered what
 b. Cine ce ~~eine~~ își închipuie că ai descoperit ee?
 ‘Who imagines you discovered what?’
- (8) fu tiense ani ta adongo zaa nye (Gurune, Niger-Congo)
 you think who FOC Adongo yesterday saw
 ‘Who do you think Adongo saw yesterday?’
- (9) kséro pjos ce ti píre. (Greek)
 I.know who and what took
 ‘I know who took something and what he took.’
- (10) a. Pjos agorase ti? b. Pote agorase ti o Petros? c. *Pote agorase o Petros ti?
 who bought what when bought what_{ACC} the Peter_{NOM}
 ‘Who bought what?’ ‘When did Peter buy what?’ (b) intended (Greek)
- (11) Where does Peter spend his Sundays and with whom does Peter spend his Sundays.
- (12) The doctor wants to know if and when patient Miller ate his lunch.
- (13) Ne znaju kak ne govorja uže o tom za čem ja dolžen eto sdelat
 not I.know how not speak already about that for what I must that do
 ‘I don’t know how let alone why I should do that.’ (Russian)

References: [i] Chomsky, N. (2007). On phases. In H.-M. Gärtner & U. Sauerland (eds) *Interfaces + Recursion = Language?* Berlin: de Gruyter. [ii] Comorovski, I. (1996) *Interrogative phrases and the syntax-semantics interface*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. [iii] Giannakidou, A. & Merchant, J. (1998) Reverse sluicing in English and Greek. *The Linguistic Review* 15: 233–256. [iv] Gračanin-Yuksek, M. (2007) *About sharing*. PhD thesis. MIT. [v] Gribanova, V. (to appear) Structural adjacency and the typology of interrogative interpretations. *Linguistic Inquiry*. [vi] Grosu, A. (1985). Subcategorization and parallelism. *Theoretical Linguistics* 12, 231-240. [vii] Kazenin, K. (2002) On coordination of *wh*-phrases in Russian. Ms., Tübingen University & Moscow State University. [viii] Nunes, J. (2004) *Linearization of chains and sideward movement*. Cambridge: MIT Press. [ix] Pesetsky, D. (2000) *Phrasal movement and its kin*. Cambridge: MIT Press. [x] Sinopoulou, O. (2007). Multiple questions and apparent *wh*-in situ: Evidence from Greek. Paper presented at Console XV. Brussels. [xi] Stepanov, A. (1998) Interpretive aspects of *wh*-fronting in Russian. *Proceedings of NELS* 28, 453-467. GLSA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. [xii] Zhang, N.N. (2007) The syntactic derivations of two paired dependency constructions. *Lingua* 117, 2134–2158.