

### 3.

#### Lawrence Y.-L. Cheung – *University of California, Los Angeles* *On certain (non-)violations of coordinate structure constraints*

yllc@ucla.edu

---

The Coordinate Structure Constraint (Ross 1967) prohibits the extraction of a conjunct from a coordinate structure, except in Across-the-Board extraction.

- (1) \*What did John buy [a book and \_\_\_ ]? (English)

However, *wh*-phrases in a coordinate structure (henceforth, WhCS) are well attested in *wh*-in-situ languages like Chinese, Japanese and Korean, e.g. (2a)-(2b).

- (2) a. Ta mai-le shu he shenme (ne)? (Mandarin Chinese)  
he buy-ASP book and what Q  
'What is the thing x such that he bought some books and x?'  
b. Taro wa niku to nani-o kattano? (Japanese)  
Taro-TOP meat and what-ACC buy  
'What is the thing x such that Taro bought some meat and x?'

It has often been argued that in-situ *wh*-phrases do not undergo *wh*-movement. They are licensed by the checking of the Q-feature in C0 by either a *wh*-particle (e.g. Chinese) or a moved *wh*-phrase (e.g. multiple *wh*-questions in English) (Cheng 1991, Tsai 1994 and Cheng and Rooryck 2000). As a result, in-situ *wh*-phrases can occur in syntactic islands, as in (2) and (3).

- (3) a. Who likes the book that who wrote? (English)  
b. Nei yi ge xuesheng hui xuan nei yi wei jiaoshou jiao  
which one CL student will choose which one CL professor teach  
de ke (ne)? (Chinese)  
DE class Q  
'Which student will choose the class that which professor will teach?'

Nevertheless, the literature seems to have overlooked the importance of island type. Surprisingly, WhCS is unacceptable on the pair-list reading of multiple *wh*-questions in both *wh*-movement (English, German, Spanish) and *wh*-in-situ languages (Chinese, Japanese, Korean). The mechanism that licenses the WhCS's in (2) and (3) becomes unavailable in (4) and (5) respectively. (It should be noted that Reinhart (1997: 339) reports a different judgment for a sentence similar to (4a). My consultants found it rather bad, however.)

- (4) a. \*Which detective saw [John and which student]? (English)
-

- b. \*Cuál detective (de los detectives) vio [al profesor Ito y a cual estudiante]? (Spanish)  
 ‘\*Which detective saw [Prof. Ito and which student]?’
- (5) a. \*Nei ge zhentan kanjian [Zhangsan he nei ge xuesheng]? (Chinese)  
 which CL detective saw Zhangsan and which CL student  
 ‘\*Which detective saw [Zhangsan and which student]?’
- b. \*Dono keiji-ga [Ito kyoju to dono gakusei-o mimasita-ka] (Japanese)  
 which det.-NOM Ito prof. and which student-ACC saw-Q  
 ‘\*Which detective saw [Prof. Ito and which student]?’

The non-violability of CSC in (5) is particularly puzzling because the WhCS construction and multiple *wh*-questions are allowed independently in these *wh*-in-situ languages.

The results presented in the table below suggest that the well-formedness of the in-situ *wh*-phrase is dependent on the interaction of (i) the *wh*-question type (i.e. single vs multiple) and (ii) the type of island. D-linking (Pesetsky 1987) seems irrelevant here: the use of non-D-linked *wh*-phrases does not affect the judgment. It is also worth noting that the same pattern does not hold for weak quantified DPs (e.g. indefinites), which behave rather similarly to in-situ *wh*-phrases concerning the ability to take wide scope. Although the configuration QP ... [VP [ ...QP ... ] and [ ... DP... ] ] is generally fine when QP is a weak DP (Ruys 1992), it is impossible when QP is a *wh*-phrase.

	<i>Wh-movement languages</i>	<i>Wh-in-situ languages</i>
Single Wh-Question involving WhCS	* (1)	<b>OK</b> (2)
Multiple Wh-Question involving WhCS	* (4a, b)	* (5a, b)
Multiple Wh-Question with a <i>wh</i> in a CNP island	<i>OK</i> (3a)	<i>OK</i> (3b)

### References

- Cheng, Lisa. (1991) *On the typology of wh-questions*. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Cheng, Lisa and Johan Rooryck. (2000) “Licensing *wh*-in-situ.” *Syntax* 3.1: 1-19.
- Pesetsky, David. (1987) “*Wh*-in-situ: movement and unselective binding.” In *The representation of (in)definiteness*, ed. E. J. Reuland and A. G. B. ter Meulen. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 98-129.
- Reinhart, Tanya. (1997) “Quantifier scope: How labor is divided between QR and choice functions”. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20: 335-397.
- Reinhart, Tanya. (1998) “*Wh*-in-situ in the framework of the minimalist program”. *Natural Language Semantics* 6: 29-56.

- Ross, John. (1967) *Constraints on variables in syntax*. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Ruys, Eddy (1992) *The scope of indefinites*. Ph.D. dissertation, Utrecht University.
- Tsai, W.-T. Dylan. (1994) *On economizing the theory of A-Bar dependencies*. PhD dissertation, MIT.