Monoclausal Question Word Coordinations Across Languages

It has been claimed (e.g. [v]) that in questions with conjoined question words, or Q(uestion) W(ord) C(o-ordination)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) ([xii]). 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) ([viii]) but impossible in Romanian, see (7a) ([iii]): 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) ([iii]).

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 canonicallly 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 the 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. [xiv]; 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 saw somebody and who was it?’ 

(2) a. syntactic object 1: \[ \text{[FocP} \text{kto} \text{[FocP} \text{kogo} \text{Foc} \text{TP} \text{kto videl kogo}]] \]  
   SIDeward MOVement  

b. syntactic object 2: \[ \text{[&P} \text{kto} \text{[&'i kogo]} \] \]  

c. remerge: \[ \text{[FocP} \text{kto} \text{[&P} \text{kto} \text{[&'i kogo]} \text{FocP} \text{kto} \text{FocP} \text{kogo} \text{Foc} \text{TP} \text{kto videl kogo}]] \]  

(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) \[ \text{[CP} \text{[&P} \text{cine} \text{[&'i ce]} \text{C} \text{[FocP} \text{cine} \text{[&'i ce]} \text{[FocP} \text{ce} \text{Foc} \text{TP} \text{cine ti-a spus ce]}]]] \]  
   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 wants that I did?’ 

(7) a. ??Cine și ce cine își închipuie că ai descoperit ce? (Romanian) 
   who and what that I have discovered what  
   ‘Who imagines you discovered what?’ 

b. Cine ce cine își închipuie că ai descoperit ce? 
   ‘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 pjós ce ti píre. (Greek) 
   I.know who and what took 
   ‘I know who took something and what he took.’ 

    ‘Who bought what? when bought what \text{ACC} the Peter \text{NOM} 
    ‘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) 