Partial Wh-movement in Russian

Véronique van Gelderen
University of Leiden/UCLC-HIL

1. Introduction

The phenomenon known as Partial Wh-movement has been observed in various languages, including German (McDaniel 1989), Hungarian (Horvath 1997) and Hindi (Dayal 1994) among others. The example in (1) is from German and exemplifies the main properties of the phenomenon in question.

(1) Was glaubst du, wo er jetzt wohnt?
     what believe you where he now lives
     'Where do you believe he lives now?'
     (Reis 2000)

The chief characteristic of Partial Wh-movement consists in the fact that a Wh-phrase, originating within the subordinate clause, is raised to a subordinate scope position, such as the SpecCP of the lower clause, and yet acquires a matrix scope interpretation. In (1), the Wh-phrase *wo* is interpreted as having matrix scope, even though it has only been raised within the subordinate clause.

   A secondary characteristic of this phenomenon is that the matrix scope position, where the Wh-phrase is interpreted is occupied in some languages by a second Wh-element, usually the most neutral Wh-phrase in that language, which seems to have no function other than to indicate the scope position of the real Wh-phrase. This element has been referred to in the literature as the Wh-scope marker. In some languages, there is no visible Scope Marker (Malay, Bahasa Indonesian, Slave, a/o.). The example in (2) is taken from Bahasa Indonesian (Saddy 1991). Just as in (1), the Wh-phrase *siapa* has matrix scope even though it does not occupy a matrix scope position.

(2)   Bill tahu siapa yang Tom cintai
      Bill knows who FOC Tom loves
      'Who does Bill know that Tom loves?'
      (Saddy 1991)

Considering the case of Russian, it might seem, at first sight, as if both subtypes of Partial Wh-movement are represented in this language. (3) is an example of what will henceforth be referred to as Construction A and it resembles strongly the example from German.

Construction A:

(3)   Kak ty   dumaesh kogo ja videla?
      how you think   who I see-PAST
      'Who do you think I saw?'

Construction B, on the other hand, as illustrated in (4), seems to be of the Bahasa Indonesian type.

Construction B:

(4)   Ty dumaesh kogo ja videla?
      you think   who I see-PAST
      'Who do you think I saw?'

Construction A has been argued by Stepanov (2000) to be a case of Partial Wh-Movement, whereas Construction B has not, to my knowledge, been discussed yet.

In this paper, I show, contra Stepanov (2000), that Construction A is not, in fact, a valid candidate for the Partial Wh-movement strategy, whereas Construction B does display most of the characteristics of the phenomenon. Moreover, I suggest a possible alternative analysis of Construction A, as well as formulate a theoretical approach for Construction B. The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is a summary of the major differences between Construction A and Construction B, showing that the two could not possibly be one and the same phenomenon. It is suggested that Construction A displays matrix properties and a link is made to the German construction known as Integrated Parentheticals. Section 3 deals with the status of Construction B. Evidence is provided for it being a case of Partial Wh-movement, and a comparison is made with other languages that display this phenomenon, as well as with other types of Wh-strategy in Russian. On basis of this discussion, I suggest that a Direct Dependency Approach (McDaniel 1989 a/o) is best suited to account for the Russian data. Moreover, the properties of Construction B in Russian provide empirical evidence for the debate within Minimalism concerning the status of feature movement.

2.   Differences between Construction A and Construction B

2.1   Construction A as juxtaposition of matrix clauses

Three main properties differentiate between Construction A and Construction B. Firstly, Construction A does not allow the presence of an overt complementizer (5a), whereas Construction B does (5b).

(5)   a.   Kak ty   dumaesh (*chto) kogo ja videla?
            how you think   (that) who I see-PAST
       b.   Ty dumaesh (chto) kogo ja videla?
            you think   (that) who I see-PAST
            'Who do you think I saw?'

Secondly, Construction A allows a re-ordering of the clauses, with Clause 2 appearing before Clause 1 (6a), whereas Construction B only allows the canonical order of Clause 1 followed by Clause 2 (6b).

(6)   a.   [Kogo ja videla]$_{Cl2}$, [kak ty   dumaesh]$_{Cl1}$?
             who I see-PAST   how you think
       b.   [*Chto kogo ja videla]$_{Cl2}$, [ty   dumaesh]$_{Cl1}$?
             that who I see-PAST   you think
            'Who do you think I saw?'

Finally, Construction A does not allow for more than two clauses, whereas Construction B can, in principle, be infinitely embedded under similar types of clauses. This is shown in (7a) for Construction A and in (7b) for Construction B.

(7)   a.   *Kak ty   dumaesh [(kak) Ivan skazal [kogo ja videla]]?
            how you think   how Ivan said   who I see-PAST
            'Who do you think Ivan said I saw?'
       b.   [Ty dumaesh [Ivan skazal [chto kogo ja videla]]]?
             you think   Ivan said   that who I see-PAST
            'Who do you think Ivan said I saw?'

In order to understand the nature of the underlying difference between the two constructions, a comparison is necessary with the properties of normal subordinate clauses in Russian. Firstly, in Russian finite subordinate clauses, the complementizer is always optional in indicative clauses (with a subjunctive matrix verb, the complementizer has a different form, and it is compulsory). However, it is never the case that the presence of the complementizer leads to ungrammaticality.

(8) Ja dumaju (chto) on zavtra   pridet.
     I think   (that) he tomorrow come-FUT
     'I think he will come tomorrow.'

This gives a first indication that Construction A might perhaps not be a bona fide case of matrix and subordinate clause. This is further confirmed by the other properties of subordinate clauses. CP fronting of finite subordinate clauses, for topicalization or focalization purposes, is not possible in Russian, as shown in (9). This again makes Construction A suspiciously different from subordinate clauses.

(9) ^{??}[(Chto) on zavtra   pridet]   ja dumajut.
      (that) he tomorrow come-FUT I think
      'I think he will come tomorrow.'

Finally, as expected, it is entirely possible to have more than two clauses embedded under one another in Russian.

(10) [Ja dumaju [(chto) Ivan skazal [(chto) on zavtra   pridet]]].
       I think   (that) Ivan said   (that) he tomorrow come-FUT
       'I think Ivan said that he will come tomorrow.'

All of these properties seem to indicate that whereas Construction B indeed consists of a matrix clause followed by a subordinate clause, Construction A, on the other hand, displays matrix properties. This leads me to suggest that Construction A is a juxtaposition of two matrix clauses, and therefore does not qualify as an instance of Partial Wh-movement. This leaves Construction B as the only candidate, but before proceeding to the status of Construction B, it is interesting to ask the question of what Construction A is, if not Partial Wh-movement.

2.2 What is Construction A?

Reis (2000) makes an extensive overview of the types of Wh-constructions in German. She argues that, besides Partial Wh-Movement and Long Extraction, there is a third construction in German, which she refers to as the Integrated Parenthetical. This construction, exemplified in (11c) looks on the surface very much like Partial Wh-movement (11b), but it shares only part of its properties with this phenomenon. The other properties of Integrated Parentheticals are reminiscent of the normal Parenthetical construction in German (11a).

(11) a. Was glaubst du: Wo   wohnt er jetzt?
          what believe you where lives   he now
      b. Was glaubst du, wo   er jetzt wohnt?
          what believe you where he now lives

   c. Was glaubst du, wo   wohnt er jetzt?
       what believe you where lives   he now
       'Where do you believe that he lives now?'

What this essentially means is that Integrated Parentheticals have matrix clause properties, even though they look like Partial Wh-movement constructions on the surface. Moreover, precisely those properties that differentiate Construction A from Construction B in Russian, also differentiate Integrated Parentheticals from Partial Wh-movement constructions in German. Integrated Parentheticals allow a re-ordering of the clauses (12a), whereas Partial Wh-movement constructions do not (12b).

(12) a. Wird er morgen   kommen, was glaubst du?
          will   he tomorrow come   what believe you
          'Will he come tomorrow, do you think?'
      b. *Wo   er jetzt wohnt, was glaubst du?
          where he now lives,   what believe you
          'Where do you believe that he lives now?'

Moreover, Integrated Parentheticals allow only two clauses (13a), whereas Partial Wh-movement allows further embedding (13b).

(13) a. Was (*glaubst sie er meint) eird er morgen   tun?
          what   believes she he thinks will he tomorrow do
          'What does she believe he thinks he will do tomorrow?'
      b. Was glaubst du, was sie sagt, was … denkt, wieviel   das kostet?
          what believe you what she says what … thinks how.much this costs
          'How much do you believe that she says that … thinks that this costs?'

Since Construction A in Russian behaves in the same way as the Integrated Parenthetical construction in German, I suggest that the two constructions are one and the same phenomenon, and should therefore be analysed in a similar way. Having shown, contra Stepanov (2000), that Construction A is not a case of Partial Wh-movement, I proceed in the next section to the analysis of Construction B.

3.   Construction B as Partial Wh-movement

3.1   Properties of Construction B

As previously shown, Construction B in Russian shares at least some of the properties of Partial Wh-movement in other languages, more specifically German. The properties discussed in Section 2 are of the most basic type, differentiating between Partial Wh-movement and Parenthetical constructions. However, there is an

important difference between Partial Wh-movement in German and Construction B in Russian, the presence of a Wh-scope marker. Whereas German Partial Wh-movement makes use of the Wh-scope marker *was*, Construction B in Russian has no such scope marker (14).

(14)   Ty dumaesh kogo ja videla?
       you think   who I see-PAST
       'Who do you think I saw?'

As mentioned in the introduction, there are other languages that display a similar pattern. The question with regard to these constructions is whether they contain a covert Wh-scope marker, or whether one should assume that since no scope marker is visible, there is no scope marker. The difference between the two approaches lies in the predictions they make concerning similarity of behavior between Partial Wh-movement constructions with scope markers and those without. If (14) contains the covert equivalent of a scope-marker, its properties should largely correspond to those of Partial Wh-movement in German and other languages with overt scope markers. In order to test this claim, Table 1 offers an overview of the main properties of Partial Wh-movement constructions in German (McDaniel 1989), Hungarian (Horvath 1997) and Hindi (Dayal 1994), all of which have an overt Wh-scope marker. These properties are compared to those of Construction B in Russian.

Table 1.

Properties	German	Hungarian	Hindi	Russian
Wh-phrases allowed	All	All	All	All
Multiple embedding of PM	OK	OK	OK	OK
Embedded Y/N with matrix scope	*	*	OK	OK
PM out of Indicative CP	OK	OK	OK	OK
PM out of tense-dependent CP	*	*	*	**OK**
Bound variable in PM	OK	OK	OK	OK
PM out CNP	*	*	*	*
PM out Subject Island	*	OK	*	OK
PM out Adjunct Island	*	OK	*	OK
PM out Factive Island	*	OK	OK	OK
PM out Negation Island	*	**OK/***	*	**OK**
PM out of Quantifier Island	*	OK	*	OK

As can be seen from the table, Russian Construction B shares most of its properties with at least a subset of the other languages. This leads me to conclude that Russian Construction B is indeed a case of Partial Wh-movement, with the covert equivalent of a Wh-scope marker.

Despite the large degree of similarity between Russian Partial Wh-movement, and the Partial Wh-movement constructions of the other languages in Table 1, there are two properties that Russian does not share with any of the other languages. Firstly, whereas all the other languages in the table strictly disallow Partial Wh-movement if the subordinate clause is tense-dependent on the matrix verb (i.e. with infinitival or subjunctive subordinate clauses), Russian allows it. This contrast is illustrated for German versus Russian in (15a) and (15b).

(15) a. *Was versucht Hans wen   zu bestechen?
          what tries   Hans whom to bribe
          'Whom is Hans trying to bribe?'
      b. Ty   xochesh kuda idti?
          You want   where go-INF
          'Where do you want to go?'

The second property which Russian does not share with any of the other Partial Wh-movement languages has to do with the presence of negation in the matrix clause. Whereas negation in the matrix predicate leads to ungrammaticality in German (16a), it has no effect on the grammaticality of the Russian cases (16b).

(16) a. *Was glaubst du nicht, mit wem Hans sich   dort treffen wird?
          what believe you not   with whom Hans himself there meet   will
          'Who don't you think that Hans will meet there?'
      b. ?Ty ne dumaesh, chto kuda Ivan poshel?
          You NEG think   that where Ivan go
          'Where don't you think that Ivan went?'

These two properties are particular to the Russian construction, and must therefore find an explanation within the general pattern of Russian Wh-constructions. The next sub-section deals with the various analyses that have been proposed in the literature to account for Partial Wh-movement, and how these different approaches fare with respect to the Russian data.

3.2 Analysis of Construction B

There have been two types of approaches to Partial Wh-Movement in the literature: the Direct Dependency Approach (McDaniel 1989 a/o) and the Indirect Dependency Approach (Dayal 1994 a/o). The two approaches are substantially different, and make very different predictions concerning the similarity between Partial Wh-movement and long-distance extraction of Wh-phrases. The Direct Dependency approach presupposes a direct relation between the Wh-scope marker and the Wh-phrase. Under this approach, the two elements form one chain (A-bar chain). At

some level of representation, the Wh-phrase is assumed to move into the position occupied on the surface by the scope marker. This approach can be instantiated in various ways, which vary as to the point in the derivation at which this movement takes place (Overt versus Covert) and the identity of the moved object (the whole Wh-phrase or only a certain set of features). However, all these approaches have in common that at some level of representation, (some part of) the Wh-phrase occupies the matrix scope position. Therefore, at this level of representation, there is no distinction to be made between a Partial Wh-movement construction and a long-distance extraction of a Wh-phrase. In both cases, a Wh-phrase, originating in a subordinate clause ends up in the scope position of the matrix clause. This kind of approach will therefore predict a great similarity between long-distance extraction of Wh-phrases and Partial Wh-movement.

The Indirect Dependency Approach has been designed to account for languages such as Hindi. In these languages, the differences between long-distance extraction of Wh-phrases and Partial Wh-movement are too substantial to be reduced to a distinction between covert and overt movement. This kind of approach assumes that the Wh-scope marker is in fact a sentential expletive, the Wh-equivalent of English *it*. This Wh-expletive has the entire lower CP as its associate. Under this approach, the entire CP will eventually raise (or not, depending on the details of the analysis) to the position occupied by the Wh-expletive. In any case, no direct relation is pre-supposed between the Wh-expletive and the Wh-phrase, and therefore no particular predictions are made concerning the similarity of Partial Wh-movement to long-distance extraction of Wh-phrases.

In order to test the validity of either of these approaches for Russian, a comparison with long-distance extraction of Wh-phrases in this language seems essential. Table 2 compares the two constructions on some salient properties.

Table 2

Properties	Long Distance Extraction	PM
Out of CNP	*	*
Out of Subject Island	OK	OK
Out of Factive Island	OK	OK
Out of Negation Island	OK	OK
Out of Quantifier Island	OK	OK
Out of Modal Island	OK	OK

As is apparent from Table 2, long-distance extraction and Partial Wh-movement in Russian resemble each other in all the properties examined. Therefore, it would seem that a Direct Dependency Approach is most desirable to account for

the data.

The question that remains to be answered concerns the specific version of the Direct Dependency Approach that should be used in accounting for the Russian data. As mentioned above, two factors interact in choosing the best analysis. On the one hand, there is the issue of the level of representation at which the further movement takes place: is it in the syntax proper or at LF? On the other hand, there is the question of the moved element: does the entire Wh-phrase move, or only a set of its features? These two factors interact to form four logical possibilities, summarized in (17).

(17)   Direct Dependency Approach: Four logical options.
    a.   Overt phrasal movement
    b.   Covert phrasal movement
    c.   Overt feature movement
    d.   Covert feature movement

Since in Russian, the scope marker is not visible, it is not possible to really make a difference empirically between overt and covert feature movement. This is different from the situation in a language where the scope marker is overt, since there it can be argued that the scope marker is in fact the overt realization of the Wh-feature that has moved (see Cheng 2000). For the purposes of Russian, however, options (17c) and (17d) are deemed equivalent. Therefore, a choice must somehow be made between the following three options: overt phrasal movement, covert phrasal movement and feature movement.

Russian provides empirical evidence to reject option (17a). It has often been mentioned in the literature (Stepanov 2000 a/o.) that extraction of Wh-phrases out of finite indicative clauses in Russian is degraded (18).

(18)   (??)Kogo ty   skazala ty   vchera   videla?
         who you said   you yesterday saw
     'Who did you say you saw yesterday?'

My own interviews with various Russian speakers have led me to believe that the degradation in (18) is largely a question of speaker preference. For some speakers, such sentences are indeed slightly degraded, and become increasingly so if a subject is extracted rather than an object, or the overt complementizer *chto* is inserted. For other speakers, none of these sentences are degraded. Interestingly, for those speakers who allow long-distance extraction out of indicative subordinate clauses, long-distance extraction is the standard default strategy for asking a matrix scope question. On the other hand, those speakers who find (18) degraded tend to make use of the Partial Wh-movement strategy in these cases. This fact seems to indicate that for this group of speakers, there is a substantial difference between long-

distance extraction of Wh-phrases and Partial Wh-movement. This difference lies in the possibility of the phenomenon occurring accross an indicative subordinate clause. This provides evidence against (17a). If the movement of the Wh-phrase in Partial Wh-movement constructions is a case of overt phrasal movement, nothing differentiates it from long-distance extraction of Wh-phrases, and the relevant speakers should make no difference between the two strategies.

This leaves two logical options: covert phrasal movement and feature movement. In the literature, a debate has arisen of late, dealing specifically with the existence of a distinction between the two. Chomsky (1995) claims that there is no distinction at LF between phrasal movement and feature movement. He argues that only feature movement takes place at LF, since the 'generalized pied-piping' strategy that results in phrasal movement is uneconomical and only necessary in overt syntax (and even then, not always). Pesetsky (2000), on the other hand, argues that feature movement is more than a reformulation of covert phrasal movement. He argues that the two co-exist, and that empirical tests can be provided to distinguish between the two. For instance, the possibility of licensing Antecedent-Contained Deletion (ACD) is restricted to phrasal movement. In the case of Russian, this claim cannot be tested, because ACD is never possible in Russian to start with (19).

(19) *Masha priglosila vsez ljudej kotoryx ja tozhe budu.
       Masha invited   all   people whom I too   will
       'Masha invited everyone that I will too.'

Further tests are also suggested in Pesetsky (2000) (see also Cheng and Rooryck 2000 for a similar argument with Wh-in-situ in French). He argues that the presence of intervention effects, first discussed by Beck (1996), can differentiate between feature movement and covert phrasal movement. Whereas feature movement is sensitive to the intervention of negation, modals and quantifiers, covert phrasal movement is not. This seems to be a valid test for the present case. As can be seen from (20a–d), none of the relevant intervention effects lead to ungrammaticality in Russian.

(20) a. ?Ty   ne   dumaesh, chto kuda Ivan poshel?
          You NEG think   that where Ivan go
          'Where don't you think that Ivan went?'

      b. Vse studenty dumali chto kogo oni videli?
          All students think   that who they see
          'Who did all the students think they saw?'

      c. Ty   mozhesh skazat' chto kogo ona ljubit?
          You can   say   that who she loves
          'Who can you say that she loves?'

    d.   Ty   vsegda dumal chto kogo ja prigloshu?
              You always think that who I invite
              'Who did you always think that I would invite?'

These data seem to clearly indicate that the movement of the Wh-phrase to scope position in Russian Partial Wh-movement is a case of covert phrasal movement, rather than feature movement. This in turn shifts the balance of the debate towards Pesetsky's (2000) side, by showing that there is a type of phrasal movement, empirically distinct from feature movement, which takes place at LF.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, evidence is presented to show that the construction usually considered in the literature to be a case of Partial Wh-movement in Russian (Construction A) is actually a juxtaposition of two matrix clauses, which shares properties of the Integrated Parenthetical construction known from German. Moreover, it is argued that a different construction, hitherto not discussed, is a much better candidate for the Partial Wh-movement analysis. I have shown that this construction (Construction B) shares most of the properties of Partial Wh-movement in those languages that display the phenomenon, but that it also has properties of its own. It is argued that the best way to analyze the Russian type of Partial Wh-movement is by means of a Direct Dependency Approach, which accounts both for its similarities with and differences from long-distance extraction of Wh-phrases in Russian. The specific type of analysis best-suited to the Russian data is an analysis whereby the Wh-phrase moves in its entirety to the scope position and this movement takes place at LF (covert phrasal movement). This in turn provides evidence for the existence of phrasal movement after Spell-Out, which is empirically distinct from feature movement.

References

Beck, S. (1996) 'Quantified structures as barriers for LF-movement'. *Natural Language Semantics* 4, 1–56.

Cheng, L. (2000) 'Moving just the feature'. In U. Lutz, G. Mueller and A. von Stechow, eds., *Wh-scope marking*, Benjamins, Amsterdam, 77–99.

Cheng, L. and J. Rooryck (2000) 'Licensing wh-in situ'. *Syntax* 3, 1–19.

Dayal, V. (1994) 'Scope marking as indirect wh-dependency'. *Natural Language Semantics* 2, 137–170.

Horvath, J. (1997) 'The status of "Wh-expletives" and the partial Wh-movement construction of Hungarian'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15, 509–572.

Lutz, U., G. Mueller & A. von Stechow (2000). *Wh-scope marking*. Benjamins, Amsterdam.

McDaniel, D. (1989) 'Partial and multiple wh-movement'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 7, 565–604.

Pesetsky, D. (2000) *Phrasal movement and its kin*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Reis, M. (2000) 'On the parenthetical features of German was…w-constructions and how to account for them'. In U. Lutz, G. Mueller and A. von Stechow, eds., *Wh-scope marking*, Benjamins, Amsterdam, 359–407.

Saddy, D. (1991) 'Wh-scope mechanisms in Bahasa Indonesian'. *MIT Working Papers* 15, 182–218.

Stepanov, A. (2000) 'Wh-scope marking in Slavic'. *Studia Linguistica* 54, 1–40.