

Some Notes on the Behavior of *Ittai* WH-Phrases

OGURO, Takeshi

Oguro (2004) examines the behavior of WH-*the hell* phrases, which cannot escape WH-islands according to Lasnik and Saito (1992), and argues that their failure to escape such islands comes from their being focused in nature. The present paper deals with the behavior of *ittai* WH-phrases, which are the Japanese counterparts of the English WH-*the hell* phrases. We see that *ittai* WH-phrases, whose distribution is remarkably similar to that of WH-*the hell* phrases, behave differently in a certain respect, which, to the best of my knowledge, has so far not been observed in the literature. *Ittai* WH-phrases cannot take matrix scope when they are inside WH-island, which patterns with WH-*the hell* phrases, but they can readily take matrix scope when they are overtly moved to the matrix clause by way of scrambling. In this paper, I would like to account for the difference.

This paper is organized as follows: Section 1 briefly reviews the behavior of WH-*the hell* phrases, which cannot escape WH-islands, and the account for it provided in Oguro (2004). In section 2 we see that *ittai* WH-phrases behave exactly like WH-*the hell* phrases. Section 3 shows that *ittai* WH-phrases, unlike WH-*the hell* phrases, can be extracted out of WH-islands. Section 4 offers an account for the unexpected behavior of *ittai* WH-phrases under the assumption that scrambling can take place regardless of morphological requirement. Section 5 concludes the paper.

1. WH-*the Hell* Phrases

1.1 *The Behavior of WH-the Hell Phrases*

WH-*the hell* phrases are known to behave rather differently from other regular phrases. Let us see some of their oft-mentioned properties.

One of the aspects that separate WH-*the hell* phrases from other WH-phrases concerns the possibility of remaining in-situ. Observe the following contrast:

- (1) a. Who read which book?
- b. * Who read what the hell?

As this contrast shows, *which*-phrases can remain in-situ, but WH-*the hell* phrases cannot. Similarly, WH-*the hell* phrases are distinguished from other WH-phrases by whether they can undergo pied piping or not:

- (2) a. [Pictures of whom] cost the most at the sale?
 - b. * [Pictures of who the hell] cost the most at the sale?
- (Pesetsky (1987: 115))

A usual WH-phrase can find itself in sentence initial position, being contained by a larger noun phrase, but this is not an option for WH-*the hell* phrases. Another characteristic of these phrases is their island sensitivity:

- (3) a. ?? What do you wonder [_{CP} who wrote *t*]?
 - b. * What the hell do you wonder [_{CP} who wrote *t*]?
- (Lasnik and Saito (1992: 174))

- (4) a. ?? What do you wonder [_{CP} how to fix *t*]?
 b. * What the hell do you wonder [_{CP} how to repair *t*]?
 (Manzini (1992: 19-22))

As shown in the contrasts above, while extraction of regular WH-phrases results in marginality, WH-*the hell* phrases cannot be extracted.

1.2 WH-the Hell Phrases as Focused Phrases

In Oguro (2004) I suggested, following Lasnik and Saito (1992), that the source of the severe deviance that is detected in extraction of WH-*the hell* phrases out of WH-island comes from their being focused in nature. The cross linguistic investigation of WH-phrases shows that the impossibility of remaining in-situ and the failure to undergo pied piping is the sign that WH-*the hell* phrases are focused. Adapting the proposal by Den Dikken and Giannakidou (2002), I suggested that a question such as *What the hell did John buy?* has the following structure:

- (5) [_{CP} What the hell₁ [_{FP} *t*'₁ did you buy *t*₁]]?

Thus, a case with the WH-island effect is assumed to have the following structure:

- (6) * [_{CP} What the hell₁ do you wonder [_{CP} who₂ [_{FP} *t*'₁ [_{IP} *t*₂ John bought *t*₁]]]]?

In this structure, WH-movement of *what the hell* takes place from [Spec, FP], an A'-position inside the island. Thus, the example is excluded on a par with cases involving extraction of an adjunct from WH-island such as the following:

- (7) * [_{CP} Why₁ do you wonder [_{CP} who₂ *t*₂ was fired *t*₁]]

One important assumption which makes this story work is that WH-*the hell* phrases must move to the focus related position as soon as possible, which forces them to move to [Spec, FP] inside the island. Otherwise they could marginally escape the island.

2. Ittai WH-Phrases

In this section we briefly see that *ittai* WH-phrases are focused, just like WH-*the hell* phrases. One strong characteristic of focused WH-phrases is their refusal to remain in-situ. This is the case in Japanese, too, where WH-phrases generally remain in-situ. Observe the following paradigm which is adapted from Yanagida (1996):

- (8) a. Taroo-wa [_{VP} hayaku nani-o yonda]-no?
 Taroo-Top fast what-Acc read-Q
 ‘What did Taroo read fast?’
- b. Taroo-wa nani-o_i [_{VP} hayaku t₁ yonda]-no?
 Taroo-Top what-Acc fast read-Q
 ‘What did Taroo read fast?’
- (9) a. ?* Taroo-wa [_{VP} hayaku ittai nani-o yonda]-no?
 Taroo-Top fast the-hell what-Acc read-Q
 ‘What the hell did Taroo read fast?’
- b. Taroo-wa ittai nani-o_i [_{VP} hayaku t₁ yonda]-no?
 Taroo-Top the-hell fast what-Acc read-Q
 ‘What the hell did Taroo read fast?’

Yanagida assumes that VP-adverbs like *hayaku* ‘fast’ indicate the left edge position of VP. The examples in (8) show that regular WH-phrases like *nani* can either stay in-situ or move out of VP. The ones in (9) indicate that *ittai*

WH-phrases cannot stay inside VP but they necessarily have to move out of VP. Given this consideration, we may state that *ittai* WH-phrases, on a par with WH-*the hell* phrases, cannot remain in-situ.

Another motivation for regarding *ittai* WH-phrases as being focused has to do with the possibility of pied-piping. Consider the following contrast:

- (10) a. Mary-wa [_{DP}[_{IP} John-ni nani-o ageta] hito-ni] atta-no?
 Mary-Top John-Dat what-Acc gave person-Dat met-Q
 ‘Mary met [the person [who gave what to John]]?’
 (Lasnik and Saito (1992: 173))
- b. * Mary-wa [_{DP}[_{IP} John-ni ittai nani-o ageta] hito-ni]
 Mary-Top John-Dat the-hell what-Acc gave person-Dat
 atta-no?
 met-Q
 ‘Mary met [the person [who gave what the hell to John]]?’
 (Pesetsky (1987: 112))

In the fine (a) example, the WH-phrase *nani* is contained in a larger noun phrase. On the other hand, in the (b) example, which is degraded, *ittai* is attached to *nani*, which in turn is contained in the larger noun phrase.

Considering these two sets of facts, which show that the behavior of *ittai* WH-phrases patterns with that of WH-*the hell* phrases, it is fair to conclude that *ittai* WH-phrases are focused.

We then expect them to behave like their English counterparts in another aspect as well, that is to say, the strong WH-island effects. Let us begin with the following examples:

- (11) a. John-wa [_{CP} Mary-ga nani-o tabeta ka]
 John-Top Mary-Nom what-Acc ate Q

shiritagatteiru no?

want-to-know Q

‘lit. Q John wants to know Q Mary ate what’

‘Does John want to know what Mary ate?’

‘What does John want to know whether Mary ate?’

(Takahashi (1993: 657))

b. Kimi-wa [_{CP} [_{IP} dono hon-o_i [_{IP} dare-ga]]]

you-Top which book-Acc who-Nom

toshokan-kara *t*₁ karidashita]] ka] shiritai no?

library-from checked-out Q want-to-know Q

‘lit. Q you want to know [Q [which book_i, who checked out *t*₁ from the library]]’

‘Do you want to know who checked out which book from the library?’

‘Which book do you want to know who checked out from the library?’

(Saito (1994: 198))

In the (a) example, the WH-phrase *nani* ‘what’ can either take matrix or embedded scope, as shown by the translations, though the embedded scope is preferred. The same thing can be said about *dono hon* ‘which book’. (The other WH-phrase *dare* ‘who’ seems to be able to take only embedded scope for reasons which do not concern us here.) The less preferred status of matrix scope interpretation can be regarded as the examples displaying the WH-island effect, if we assume that WH-phrases in Japanese move in covert syntax and the constraint on movement regulates covert movement as well.

Nishigauchi (1990) observes that the addition of *ittai* makes the wide scope interpretation of the WH-phrase within a WH-island still more difficult to obtain:

(12) John-wa [ittai dono sensei-ga dono computer-o]

John-TOP the hell which professor which computer-ACC
 o-mochi-ka] oboeteimasu-ka?
 have-Q remember-is-Q
 ‘Does John remember which the hell professor has which computer?’
 (Nishigauchi (1990: 38))

As in the translation, this question has only the interpretation as a Yes/No question. The absence of matrix scope interpretation for the *ittai* WH-phrase is well expected in our analysis. The *ittai* WH-phrase, though it stays in the embedded clause, is not in its original position, but has moved to [Spec, FP]. Its covert movement to the matrix clause takes place from this non-argument position, crossing the WH-island, which results in strong deviance. Thus the wide scope interpretation is disallowed.

3. Where *Ittai* WH-Phrases Differ from WH-*the Hell* Phrases

What we have seen in the previous section suggests that *ittai* WH-phrases are parallel to WH-*the hell* phrases in their behavior. In this section I present a case where they differ.

It is well known that though WH-phrases in Japanese are not required to move to sentence initial position, they can do so by way of scrambling:

- (13) ? Dare-o₁ [John-ga [CP [IP Hanako-ga t₁
 who-Acc John-Nom Hanako-Nom
 aishiteiru] kadooka] sihritagatteiru] no?
 love whether want-to-know Q
 ‘[Q [Who₁, John wants to know [whether [Hanako loves t₁]]]]’

In this example the WH-phrase is scrambled out of the WH-island to the

matrix sentence initial position. Since the movement crosses the WH-island, marginality results.

Let us see what happens if the extracted element is accompanied by *ittai*:

- (14) ? Ittai dare-o_i [John-ga [CP [IP Hanako-ga t_i
the-hell who-Acc John-Nom Hanako-Nom
aishiteiru] kadooka] sihritagatteiru] no?
love whether want-to-know Q
‘[Q [Who the hell₁, John wants to know [whether [Hanako loves t_i]]]]’

This example is no worse than the one above without *ittai*. The strong deviance which is detected in the corresponding English examples is absent here, which calls for explanation.

4. An Account

What we have seen in the previous section poses two questions: One is what mechanism makes it possible for *ittai* WH-phrases to take matrix scope only when they are scrambled to the matrix, and the other is why the same mechanism is unavailable to WH-*the hell* phrases.

Recall the behavior of *ittai* WH-phrases. Their failure to remain in-situ shows that *ittai* phrases must move to [Spec, FP] as soon as possible, on a par with WH-*the hell* phrases. The less severely degraded status in the case of overt extraction shows that under our analysis the *ittai* phrase moves to the focus related position in the matrix clause which is mediated by long distance scrambling. The question therefore is how it is possible that *ittai* phrases do not have to stop at [Spec, FP] in the embedded clause only when they are scrambled to the matrix.

I would like to suggest that the WH-phrase under consideration acquires the

status of a focused phrase only after crossing the WH-island. Let us assume, as seems reasonable, that *ittai* is the source of the focus related properties of *ittai* WH-phrases. With this assumption I would like to claim that the WH-phrase has *ittai* attached to it after it has scrambled to [Spec, FP] in the matrix, crossing the island. In this course of derivation the *ittai* WH-phrase can find itself in [Spec, FP] soon enough.

A natural question here is whether the same story applies to WH-*the hell* phrases or not, that is to say, whether it is possible that a WH-phrase moves across a WH-island to [Spec, FP] in the matrix, where it has *the hell* attached to itself. Since WH-*the hell* phrases cannot escape WH-islands, as we have seen, this story should not apply to them.

I would like to show that way out does not work. Note that Japanese allows scrambling, which is assumed to be costless (See Saito (1989, 1992, 1994) for instance) and not to require any sort of morphological motivation, while English does not have scrambling as an option. Thus the movement of a WH-phrase to [Spec, FP] in Japanese can be costless if it is scrambled. In other words, it does not have to involve any checking whatsoever. The adjoining of *ittai* to the WH-phrase which has scrambled to [Spec, FP] is possible.

Let us turn to the English case. The story would be that a WH-phrase moves across a WH-island to [Spec, FP] in the matrix, where it has *the hell* attached to it. It would be reasonable to assume that the focal properties of WH-*the hell* phrases lie in the *the hell* part. In order for the story to go through, the WH-phrase moves to [Spec, FP] without checking the focus feature, which *the hell* is responsible for. This means that the movement of the WH-phrase involves no feature checking. This sort of movement is not allowed in English. Thus the story available to *ittai* WH-phrases is not available to WH-*the hell* phrases.

5. Concluding Remarks

In this paper, I dealt with *ittai* WH-phrases, which, unlike WH-*the hell* phrases, can be extracted out of WH-islands. I argued that this is because the movement involves the costless operation of scrambling, which moves the WH-phrases to [Spec, FP] in the matrix with no checking involved, which is followed by the attachment of *ittai*.

* I am grateful to Warren Elliott for carefully reading an earlier version of the present paper. Needless to say, any remaining responsibilities are solely mine.

REFERENCES

- Dikken, Marcel den and Anastasia Giannakidou (2002) "From *Hell* to Polarity: "Aggressively Non-D-Linked" WH-Phrases as Polarity Items," *Linguistic Inquiry* 33, 31-61.
- Lasnik, Howard and Mamoru Saito (1992) *Move α : Conditions on Its Application*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Manzini, Maria Rita (1992) *Locality*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Nishigauchi, Taisuke (1990) *Quantification in the Theory of Grammar*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- Oguro, Takeshi (2004) "*The Hell*, Emphatic Questions and Focus: with Special Reference to Extraction from WH-Islands," *The Journal of Chiba University of Commerce* 42, 3, 93-125.
- Pesetsky, David. (1987) "WH-in-situ: Movement and Unselective Binding," *The Representation of (In)definites*, ed. by Eric Reuland and Alice ter Meulen, 98-129, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Saito, Mamoru (1989) "Scrambling as Semantically Vacuous A'-Movement," *Alternative Conception of Phrase Structure*, ed. by Mark Baltin and Anthony Kroch, 182-200, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Saito, Mamoru (1992) "Long Distance Scrambling in Japanese," *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 1, 6-118.

- Saito, Mamoru (1994) "Additional WH-Effects and the Adjunction Site Theory," *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 3, 195-240.
- Takahashi, Daiko (1993) "Movement of WH-Phrases in Japanese," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11, 655-678.
- Yanagida, Yuko (1996) "Deriving Surface Word Order in Discourse Configurational Languages," *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 29, 283-302.