



Whether-Deletion

Author(s): John Robert Ross

Source: *Linguistic Inquiry*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Jan., 1970), p. 146

Published by: [The MIT Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4177547>

Accessed: 24/04/2013 23:28

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The MIT Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Linguistic Inquiry*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

(3b) is impossible (without contrastive stress on *tomorrow*), though (3c), which parallels (1b), is grammatical.

- (3) a. I expected him to [be there tomorrow].
- b. *Tomorrow I expected him to be there.
- c. Tomorrow I expect him to be there.

What explains this difference in preposability?

Whether-DELETION

John Robert Ross,
Massachusetts Institute of
Technology

A fact supporting deriving yes-no questions from embedded *whether*-questions is the following: while embedded questions can in general contain more than one *wh*-word (cf. (1)), they cannot contain any if the embedded question is headed by *whether* (cf. *(2b)) (unless the *wh*-word bears emphatic stress).

- (1) I wonder who sent what (to whom) (on what occasions), etc.
- (2) a. I wonder whether Bill left.
- b. *I wonder whether who left.

These facts are exactly mirrored in independent questions:

- (3) Who sent what (to whom) (on what occasions), etc.?
- (4) a. Did Bill leave?
- b. *Did who leave?

While I have no explanation for the contrast in (2), this contrast can be used to argue that (4) is derived from an embedded *whether*-clause.