
Wh-in-Situ in Mandarin Chinese

Author(s): Hooi Ling Soh

Source: *Linguistic Inquiry*, Vol. 36, No. 1 (Winter, 2005), pp. 143-155

Published by: The MIT Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4179313>

Accessed: 30-01-2020 08:22 UTC

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.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

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

- ity alternation in Japanese and English), ed. by Tadao Maruta and Kazuyoshi Suga, 145–165. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.
- Nishiyama, Kunio. To appear. Verbs, adjectives, and Pred: Review of Mark C. Baker, *Lexical categories. English Linguistics* 22.1.
- Parsons, Terence. 1990. *Events in the semantics of English*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Radford, Andrew. 1988. *Transformational grammar: A first course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sells, Peter. 1995. Korean and Japanese morphology from a lexical perspective. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26:277–325.
- Spencer, Andrew. 1991. *Morphological theory*. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Uehara, Satoshi. 1998. *Syntactic categories in Japanese: A cognitive and typological introduction*. Tokyo: Kuroshio.
- Urushibara, Saeko. 1993. Syntactic categories and extended projections in Japanese. Doctoral dissertation, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.
- Urushibara, Saeko. 2000. A lexical-syntactic approach to Japanese psychological predicates: A preliminary analysis. Paper presented at the 6th Morphology and Lexicon Forum, University of Tokyo.
- Yamakido, Hiroko. 2000. Japanese attributive adjectives are not (all) relative clauses. In *WCCFL 19*, ed. by Roger Billerey and Brook Danielle Lillehaugen, 588–602. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadia Press.

WH-IN-SITU IN MANDARIN
CHINESE

Hooi Ling Soh

University of Minnesota, Twin
Cities

It is controversial whether an in-situ *wh*-phrase in Mandarin Chinese (MC) undergoes covert (LF) movement to its scope position (Huang 1982, Xu 1990, Lin 1992, Aoun and Li 1993, Tsai 1994a, 1999, Cole and Hermon 1998). Recent studies (e.g., Tsai 1994a, 1999, Cole and Hermon 1998) have argued that *wh*-phrases fall into two groups, *nominal and adverbial*, and that only adverbial *wh*-phrases (e.g., *weishenme* ‘reason-why’) raise to their scope position at LF, while nominal *wh*-phrases (e.g., *shenme* ‘what’, *shei* ‘who’, *na Numeral-Classifer N* ‘which N’, *nali* ‘where’, and *wei-le shenme* ‘purpose-why’) do not. The claim is based on the fact that unlike a nominal *wh*-phrase, an

I would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for *Linguistic Inquiry* for very helpful comments. I am grateful to Noam Chomsky, Michel DeGraff, Valerie Guerin, Jeanette Gundel, Heejeong Ko, Ljiljana Progovac, Alec Marantz, Shigeru Miyagawa, David Pesetsky, and Hidekazu Tanaka for discussions at various stages of this squib. The research for this squib is partially supported by an ILES Faculty Summer Research Award, a Faculty Summer Research Fellowship for the Arts and Humanities, and a McKnight Summer Fellowship for the Arts and Humanities (all from the University of Minnesota). All errors are mine.

adverbial *wh*-phrase may not take scope across an island (Huang 1982, Xu 1990, Lin 1992, Tsai 1994a,b, 1999).¹ In this squib, I argue that both adverbial and nominal *wh*-phrases undergo covert raising (Huang 1982). I show that an adverbial *wh*-phrase in MC undergoes covert feature movement, while a nominal *wh*-phrase undergoes covert phrasal movement.

Beck (1996a,b) argues that in German, LF *wh*-movement may not cross a quantifier, with negation and ‘only’ included as quantifiers. The constraint, given in (1), is argued to be responsible for the contrast in (2) involving multiple question constructions.

- (1) *[... X_i ... [Q ... [... t_i^{LF} ...]]]
- (2) a. Wen hat Luise wo gesehen?
whom has Luise where seen
‘Where did Luise see whom?’
b. *Wen hat niemand wo gesehen?
whom has nobody where seen
‘Where did nobody see whom?’

A multiple question in German has a *wh*-phrase in the scope position and one or more *wh*-phrases in situ. It is argued that for semantic reasons, the in-situ element has to move at LF to a position reserved for *wh*-phrases. This movement is blocked if there exists a quantifier (e.g., *niemand* ‘nobody’) along the movement path as shown in (2b) (Beck 1996a:3–4). (2b) is said to exhibit the intervention effect (Hagstrom 1998, 2000, Pesetsky 2000). Note that overt *wh*-movement does not produce the intervention effect (Beck 1996a:5).

- (3) Wo hat niemand Karl gesehen?
where has nobody Karl seen
‘Where did nobody see Karl?’

Beck (1996b) notes that (1) may not be a universal constraint, as English LF *wh*-movement does not appear to obey it. Pesetsky (2000) argues that the intervention effect is universally observed when (1) is considered a constraint on *wh*-feature and not *wh*-phrasal movement. The universal characterization of the intervention effect is given in (4).

- (4) A semantic restriction on a quantifier (including *wh*) may not be separated from that quantifier by a scope-bearing element. (Pesetsky 2000:67)

The intervention effect detects *wh*-feature and not *wh*-phrasal movement because *wh*-feature movement leaves the restriction on *wh*-quantification inside the clause, while *wh*-phrasal movement pied-pipes the restriction with the *wh*-phrase.

¹ There are some disagreements about whether *zenmeyang* ‘how’ observes island effects (Xu 1990, Lin 1992, Tsai 1994b, Shi 1994).

Assuming following Pesetsky (2000) that the intervention effect detects covert feature movement, there is evidence that a *wh*-adverb in MC undergoes covert feature movement, while a *wh*-nominal does not. I show below that *zhi* ‘only’, *bu* ‘not’, *meiyouren* ‘nobody’, *hen-shao N* ‘few N’, *zuiduo Numeral-Classifier N* ‘at most numeral-classifier N’, *chang* ‘often’, and *ye* ‘also’ are interveners in MC, and they block LF movement of a *wh*-adverb, but not that of a *wh*-nominal.²

The examples in (5) show that *zhi* ‘only’ and *bu* ‘not’ are interveners and they prevent *weishenme* ‘reason-why’ from taking scope.

- (5) a. Ni renwei Lisi weishenme {*zhi/bu*} kan
 you think Lisi why only/not read
 zhentan-xiaoshuo?
 detective-novel
 ‘What is the reason *x* such that you think Lisi {only/does not} read(s) detective novels for *x*?’
 b. *Ni {*zhi/bu*} renwei Lisi weishenme kan
 you only/not think Lisi why read
 zhentan-xiaoshuo?
 detective-novel
 ‘What is the reason *x* such that you {only/don’t think} Lisi reads detective novels for *x*?’

Assuming that an A-not-A (yes-no) question in MC involves the movement of a Q-operator from I to its scope position in C (Huang 1982), there is evidence that this movement is blocked by *zhi* ‘only’ and *bu* ‘not’.³ An A-not-A question is marked by an A-not-A verb or modal. As (6) shows, *zhi* ‘only’ and *bu* ‘not’ may precede or follow the modal *neng* ‘can’.

- (6) a. Ta {*zhi/bu*} neng qu Meiguo.
 he only/not can go U.S.
 ‘He can {only/not} go to the U.S.’
 b. Ta neng {*zhi/bu*} qu Meiguo.
 he can only/not go U.S.
 ‘He can {only/not} go to the U.S.’

However, when the modal appears in its A-not-A form, *zhi* ‘only’ and *bu* ‘not’ can only follow it, as shown in (7). The contrast suggests that the movement of the Q-operator is blocked when *zhi* ‘only’ and *bu* ‘not’ are along its movement path.

² The counterparts of these elements in German have been shown to be interveners (Beck 1996a,b). However, unlike the universal quantifier in German, *meigere* ‘everyone’ in MC is not an intervener. The problem with this crosslinguistic variation has been noted (Beck 1996a,b, Beck and Kim 1997). See Hagstrom 1998:58 and Kim 2002 for attempts to address this problem.

³ I treat the Q-operator in an A-not-A question as an adverbial *wh* as it patterns like *weishenme* ‘reason-why’ in its inability to escape an island (Huang 1982).

- (7) a. Ta neng-bu-neng {*zhi/bu*} qu Meiguo?
 he can-not-can only/not go U.S.
 'Can he {only/not} go to the U.S.?'
 b. *Ta {*zhi/bu*} neng-bu-neng qu Meiguo?
 he only/not can-not-can go U.S.
 'Can he {only/not} go to the U.S.?'

In addition to *zhi* 'only' and *bu* 'not', *meiyouren* 'nobody', *henshao ren* 'few people', and *zuiduo liang-ge ren* 'at most two people' are also interveners as they block *weishenme* 'reason-why' and the Q-operator in an A-not-A question from taking scope.⁴

- (8) a. Ni weishenme shuo {meiyouren/henshao ren/
 you why say nobody/few person/
 zuiduo liang-ge ren cizhi}?
 at most two-CL person resign
 'What is the reason *x* such that for *x* you said {nobody/
 few people/at most two people} resigned?'
 b. *{Meiyouren/Henshao ren/Zuiduo liang-ge ren}
 nobody/few person/at most two-CL person
 weishenme shuo ni cizhi?
 why say you resign
 'What is the reason *x* such that for *x* {nobody/few
 people/at most two people} said you resigned?'
 (9) a. Ta shi-bu-shi xiwang {meiyouren/henshao ren/
 he be-not-be hope nobody/few person/
 zuiduo liang-ge ren} lai?
 at most two-CL person come
 'Does he hope that {nobody/few people/at most two
 people} come(s)?'
 b. *{Meiyouren/Henshao ren/Zuiduo liang-ge ren}
 nobody/few person/at most two-CL person
 shi-bu-shi xiwang ta lai?
 be-not-be hope he come
 'Do(es) {nobody/few people/at most two people} hope
 that he comes?'

(10) and (11) show that *chang* 'often' and *ye* 'also' are also interveners.

- (10) a. Ta weishenme {chang/ye} ma ta?
 he why often/also scold he
 'What is the reason *x* such that he {often/also} scolds/
 scolded him for *x*?'
 b. *Ta {chang/ye} weishenme ma ta?
 he often/also why scold he
 'What is the reason *x* such that he {often/also} scolds/
 scolded him for *x*?'
 (11) a. Ta weishenme {chang/ye} ma ta?
 he why often/also scold he
 'What is the reason *x* such that he {often/also} scolds/
 scolded him for *x*?'
 b. *Ta {chang/ye} weishenme ma ta?
 he often/also why scold he
 'What is the reason *x* such that he {often/also} scolds/
 scolded him for *x*?'

⁴ The following abbreviations will be used: CL = classifier, MM = modification marker, NUM = numeral.

- (11) a. Ta hui-bu-hui {chang/ye} qu?
 he will-not-will often/also go
 ‘Will he {often/also} go?’
 b. *Ta {chang/ye} qu-bu-qu?
 he often/also go-not-go
 ‘Does he often go?/Is he also going?’

Unlike the adverbial *wh*-phrases, nominal *wh*-phrases do not exhibit the intervention effect. Examples with *shenme* ‘what’ are given in (12)–(14) (but see Kim 2002).⁵

- (12) Ta {zhi/bu} mai shenme?
 he only/not sell what
 ‘What is the thing *x* such that he {only sells/does not sell} *x*?’
 (13) Ta {chang/ye} mai shenme?
 he often/also sell what
 ‘What is the thing *x* such that he {often/also} sells *x*?’
 (14) {Meiyouren/Henshao ren/Zuiduo liang-ge ren}
 nobody/few person/at most two-CL person
 gan gen shei dajia?
 dare with who fight
 ‘Who is the person *x* such that {nobody/few people/at most two people} dare(s) to fight with *x*?’

The presence of the intervention effect with a *wh*-adverb, but not with a *wh*-nominal, suggests that the former undergoes covert feature movement, and the latter does not.

A reviewer wonders if the intervention effect found with LF movement of an adverbial *wh*-phrase could be considered the weak (negative) island effect, which is found with movement of ‘nonreferential’ *wh*-phrases like *why*, but not ‘referential’ *wh*-phrases like *what* (Rizzi 1990, 2001; see also Zhang 1997:145–149). The intervention effect differs from the weak (negative) island effect in that it detects covert (feature) movement, but not overt movement (Beck 1996a,b, Pesetsky 2000, Beck and Kim 1997; but see Tanaka 1997, 2003). In what follows, I show that overt movement of an adverbial *wh*-phrase does not exhibit the intervention effect.

Weishenme ‘why’ and the A-not-A form of the auxiliary *shi* ‘be’ may precede or follow the subject, as shown in (15) and (16). However,

⁵ Kim (2002) argues that the intervention effect is found with nominal *wh*-phrases in MC, when the source of the effect is taken to be focus phrases (e.g., *lian-NP* ‘... ye ‘even-NP ... also’, *zhiyou-NP* ‘only-NP’, *shei* ‘... ye ‘who ... also’) rather than negation or quantifiers. The data raise questions about whether MC may exhibit both the intervention and the focus effect, with the focus effect insensitive to the nominal/adverbial distinction. However, if MC *wh*-in-situ exhibits the focus effect, it is unclear why focused elements like *zhi* ‘only’ (as well as *ye* ‘also’) do not produce this effect.

when the subject is an intervener, the *wh*-adverb can only precede the subject. This is shown in (17) and (18).

- (15) a. Ta weishenme mei lai?
 he why not come
 ‘Why did he not come?’
 b. Weishenme ta mei lai?
 why he not come
 ‘Why did he not come?’
- (16) a. Ta shi-bu-shi xiang qu?
 he be-not-be want go
 ‘Is it the case that he wants to go?’
 b. Shi-bu-shi ta xiang qu?
 be-not-be he want go
 ‘Is it the case that he wants to go?’
- (17) a. *{Meiyouren/Henshao ren/Zuiduo liang-ge ren}
 nobody/few person/at most two-CL person
 weishenme cizhi?
 why resign
 ‘Why did {nobody/few people/at most two people} re-
 sign?’
 b. Weishenme {meiyouren/henshao ren/
 why nobody/few person/
 zuiduo liang-ge ren} cizhi?
 at most two-CL person resign
 ‘Why did {nobody/few people/at most two people} re-
 sign?’
- (18) a. *{Meiyouren/Henshao ren/Zuiduo liang-ge ren}
 nobody/few person/at most two-CL person
 shi-bu-shi xiang qu?
 be-not-be want go
 ‘Is it the case that {nobody/few people/at most two peo-
 ple} want(s) to go?’
 b. Shi-bu-shi {meiyouren/henshao ren/
 be-not-be nobody/few person/
 zuiduo liang-ge ren} xiang qu?
 at most two-CL person want go
 ‘Is it the case that {nobody/few people/at most two peo-
 ple} want(s) to go?’

There are several possible analyses for the different orderings between *weishenme* and *shi-bu-shi* and the subject in (15) and (16). One is to posit no movement relation between the different orders. *Weishenme* may be base-merged in an IP-internal position or in Spec,CP, while *shi-bu-shi* may be base-merged in I or in C. However, this analysis has trouble explaining the contrast in (17) and (18). A second analysis is to posit subject topicalization. *Weishenme* and *shi-bu-shi* are base-merged in Spec,CP and C, respectively, and the subject may be topicalized (Lin 1992, Ko 2003). This analysis may explain the contrast

in (17) and (18) in terms of the inability of a quantifier to topicalize (Ko 2003). However, it has trouble explaining the distribution of the A-not-A form of *hui* 'will'. Unlike *shi-bu-shi*, *hui-bu-hui* 'will-not-will' can only appear after the subject, when the subject is not an intervener.

- (19) a. Ta hui-bu-hui qu?
he will-not-will go
'Will he go?'
b. *Hui-bu-hui ta qu?
will-not-will he go
'Will he go?'

When the subject is an intervener, *hui-bu-hui* can only precede the subject.

- (20) a. *{Meiyouren/Henshao ren/Zuiduo liang-ge ren}
nobody/few person/at most two-CL person
hui-bu-hui qu?
will-not-will go
'Will {nobody/few people/at most two people} go?'
b. Hui-bu-hui {meiyouren/henshao ren/
will-not-will nobody/few person/
zuiduo liang-ge ren} qu?
at most two-CL person go
'Will {nobody/few people/at most two people} go?'

The subject topicalization analysis may explain the ungrammaticality of (20a) in terms of the inability of a quantifier to topicalize. Given this analysis, it is unclear why topicalization must occur in (19a) when the subject is a pronoun and the A-not-A auxiliary is *hui* 'will'. In addition, assuming that the auxiliary occupies the same position as its A-not-A form, the analysis predicts that (21) should be as unacceptable as (20a), contrary to fact.⁶

- (21) {Meiyouren/Henshao ren/Zuiduo liang-ge ren} hui qu.
nobody/few person/at most two-CL person will go
'{Nobody/Few people/At most two people} will go.'

A third analysis is to posit movement of *weishenme* and *shi-bu-shi*. *Weishenme* is base-merged in an IP-internal position and may move overtly to Spec,CP, while *shi-bu-shi* is base-merged in I and may move overtly to C. This analysis provides a straightforward account for the contrast in (17) and (18). The overt movement of a *wh*-adverb does not exhibit the intervention effect, while the covert movement of a *wh*-adverb does. The contrast indicates that (17a) and (18a) display the intervention effect, rather than the weak island effect. The distribution of *hui-bu-hui* 'will-not-will' in (19) and (20) can be explained in

⁶ Huang's (1988a:50) subject-raising analysis of constructions with *shi* and *hui* faces the same problem as the subject topicalization analysis.

terms of its special property: while both covert and overt movement are possible, overt movement is only allowed when covert movement leads to ungrammaticality.

The absence of the intervention effect with a nominal *wh*-phrase in MC is consistent with its undergoing covert phrasal movement (Huang 1982, Pesetsky 2000:119) or no movement at all (Tsai 1994a, 1999, Cole and Hermon 1998). Antecedent-contained deletion (ACD) constructions provide a way to determine whether covert phrasal movement is involved (Pesetsky 2000:3–4). In an ACD construction, the antecedent VP appears to contain the elided VP. An example of an ACD construction with its corresponding interpretation is given in (22).

- (22) a. Mary [_{VP} invited [_{DP} everyone that I did [_{VP} Δ]]].
 b. Mary [_{VP} invited [_{DP} everyone that I [_{VP} *invited t*]]].

The ACD construction has been used to argue for the existence of covert phrasal movement of the argument containing the ellipsis (May 1985, Larson and May 1990, Fiengo and May 1994, Hornstein 1994, 1995, Lasnik 1999).⁷ This is because without such a movement, there is no VP antecedent of the form [*invited t*] to serve as the antecedent of the elided VP. The covert phrasal movement creates an appropriate VP antecedent for the elided VP.

- (23) [_{DP} everyone that I [_{VP} *invited t*]] [_{Mary} [_{VP} invited *t*]]

Pesetsky (2000:6) shows that *wh*-in-situ in a multiple *wh*-question in English may contain an instance of ACD.

- (24) Which girl invited [which student that John did [_{VP} Δ]]?

⁷ A reviewer wonders whether ACD (despite its widespread use) can be used as an argument for covert phrasal movement, more specifically quantifier raising (QR), given that appositives with proper names may sometimes contain ACDs even though they do not undergo QR (under May's (1985) assumption).

- (i) a. *Mary kissed John, who Jane did.
 b. Mary kissed John, who Jane did not/did, too.

While this fact raises questions about May's explanation, it does not necessarily pose a problem for a covert phrasal movement analysis of ACD, or specifically a QR-type analysis. The problem may or may not arise depending on whether appositives and restrictive relatives (RR) are given a uniform analysis. If they are (e.g., Hornstein 1995), then (ib) poses a problem for the QR approach to ACD resolution. However, an approach that assigns a uniform structure to appositives and RRs needs to explain why appositives require focus/contrast, while RRs do not, when they contain an ACD. If, on the other hand, appositives and RRs do not involve the same analysis (see Lasnik 1999), then the acceptability of (ib) does not pose a problem for the QR approach. Hornstein (1995) considers an analysis where appositives are interpreted as simple conjuncts with the relative pronoun coreferential with the head. This analysis allows the ungrammaticality of (ia) to be given the same treatment as *John left and Bill did* *(*toolas well*) (see also Lasnik 1999).

This fact is used to argue that in-situ *wh*-phrases may undergo covert phrasal movement.

It is not immediately obvious whether ACD involving a relative clause is available in MC. While (25) seems to be such a construction, one cannot readily accept it as such because of several puzzling restrictions that it exhibits.⁸

- (25) (?)Ta {neng/gan} zuo (mei-jian) wo bu {neng/gan} de
 he can/dare do every-CL I not can/dare MM
 shi.⁹
 thing
 'He {can/dares to} do everything I {can't/don't dare to}.'

First, the acceptability of a construction like (25) depends on the choice of verb. While verb phrases headed by verbs with the meaning 'do' can be elided, those headed by other verbs cannot. Compare (25) with (26).

- (26) a. *Ta {neng/gan} chi (mei-dao) wo bu {neng/gan} de
 he can/dare eat every-CL I not can/dare MM
 cai.
 dish
 'He {can/dares to} eat every dish I {can't/don't dare to}.'

⁸ A reviewer questions whether (25) is a genuine case of ACD and suggests that it may be an object relativization construction, and not ACD. The reviewer notes that auxiliaries such as *gan* 'dare' and *neng* 'can' seem to be able to take DP objects, when the objects are topicalized (but not when they are not).

- (i) a. Zhe-jian shi, wo gan, ta bu gan.
 this-CL matter I dare he not dare
 'This matter, I dare to (do), he does not dare to (do).'
 b. *Wo bu gan zhe-jian shi.
 I not dare this-CL matter
 'I don't dare to do this matter.'

The reviewer wonders whether the same phenomenon is found in (25). It seems to me that (i) involves VP-ellipsis. A VP-ellipsis analysis would explain why the verb cannot be missing when there is no object topicalization. In addition, like VP-ellipsis and unlike ACD (see Soh 2003), object topicalization does not seem restricted with regard to the type of verb that can be missing. For example, (ii) can be an answer to the question *Ni gan-bu-gan kan zhe-xie dianying?* 'Do you dare to watch these movies?'

- (ii) Zhe-bu dianying wo gan. Na bu dianying, wo bu gan.
 this-CL movie I dare that-CL movie I not dare
 'This movie, I dare to. That movie, I don't.'

Also, as in VP-ellipsis and unlike in ACD, the missing verb phrase does not need to be introduced by negation. Because of these differences, I do not think that (25) should be given the same analysis as (ia).

⁹ Among the 11 MC speakers consulted, 6 find the sentence acceptable with either *gan* 'dare' or *neng* 'can', and 5 find it slightly awkward with *neng* 'can', while accepting it with *gan* 'can'.

- b. *Ta {neng/gan} qu (mei-ge) wo bu {neng/gan} de
 he can/dare go every-CL I not can/dare MM
 difang.
 place
 'He {can/dares to} go to every place I {can't/don't dare to}.'

Second, ACD cannot be licensed by an auxiliary alone and must involve negation in the ellipsis site, as shown in (27a).¹⁰ The contrast between (25) and (27b) shows that negation must occur within the same clause as the ellipsis site.

- (27) a. *Ta {neng/gan} zuo (mei-jian) wo (ye) {neng/gan} de
 he can/dare do every-CL I also can/dare MM
 shi.
 thing
 'He {can/dares to} do everything I (also) {can/dare to}.'
 b. *Ta bu {neng/gan} zuo (mei-jian) wo {neng/gan} de
 he not can/dare do every-CL I can/dare MM
 shi.
 thing
 'He {can't/doesn't dare to} do everything I {can/dare to}.'

Finally, while the auxiliary *shi* 'be', which is like *do*-support in English (Huang 1988b), may license VP-ellipsis, it may not license ACD.

- (28) a. Ta xihuan Zhangsan. Wo ye shi.
 he like Zhangsan I also be
 'He likes Zhangsan. I do too.'
 b. *Ta xihuan mei-ge wo {ye/bu} shi de ren.
 he like every-CL I also/not be MM person
 'He likes everyone I {do/don't}.'

In Soh 2003, I argue that (25) is a genuine case of ACD and that the restrictions can be explained by a mismatch between the ellipsis site and the reconstruction site. In particular, assuming that a VP has the structure [_{VP}[VP]] (Hale and Keyser 1993, Chomsky 1995:315), I argue that MC ACD involves the ellipsis of a vP, but the reconstruction of only a VP. I suggest that when such a mismatch occurs, a null v DO is inserted directly into v to check the strong features in v. The v DO must be semantically identical with the antecedent verb in v. This explains why only VPs headed by verbs with the meaning 'do' can contain ACD. I propose that it is the reconstructed VP, and not the elided VP, that must be licensed by a morphologically realized head (see Bresnan 1976, Lobeck 1995, Potsdam 1997). Given that a VP is reconstructed in ACD, an auxiliary, which may only license the

¹⁰ Of the 11 speakers I consulted, 2 do not require negation in an ACD. The same 2 speakers also do not show a contrast between verb phrases headed by *zuo* 'do' and those headed by other verbs in ACD constructions.

reconstruction of a vP, cannot license the reconstruction in an ACD construction. Negation is needed to license the VP reconstruction across the null v DO. The reason why *shi* 'be' cannot introduce an ACD construction is that such constructions require negation. Independent of ACD, *shi* cannot license ellipsis with negation present.

- (29) *Ta xihuan Zhangsan. Wo bu shi.
 he like Zhangsan I not be
 'He likes Zhangsan. I don't.'

Assuming that (25) is a genuine case of ACD and that, as in English, covert phrasal movement is involved in resolving ACD, we can use a construction like (25) to determine whether a nominal *wh*-phrase undergoes phrasal movement in MC. The following ACD construction illustrates that a nominal *wh*-phrase, *na-Numeral-Classifier* N 'which N', like a universal quantifier, can license ACD in MC:

- (30) Ta {neng/gan} zuo na-yi-jian wo bu {neng/gan} de
 he can/dare do which-NUM-CL I not can/dare MM
 shi.
 thing
 'Which is the thing *x* such that he {can/dares to} do *x* and
 I {can't/don't dare to} do *x*?'

The fact that a nominal *wh*-phrase in situ can license ACD suggests that a nominal *wh*-phrase undergoes covert phrasal movement in MC (Huang 1982, Pesetsky 2000:119).

I have shown here that an adverbial *wh*-phrase undergoes covert feature movement in MC, while a nominal *wh*-phrase undergoes covert phrasal movement. Given that a nominal *wh*-phrase does not exhibit island effects, while an adverbial *wh*-phrase does, the analysis presented here implies that island effects detect *wh*-feature and not *wh*-phrasal movement in MC. This is unlike what we find in English, where island effects detect *wh*-phrasal and not *wh*-feature movement (Pesetsky 2000:58).¹¹ Thus, there seems to be parametric variation in whether island effects detect phrasal or feature movement in a particular language.

References

- Aoun, Joseph, and Yen-hui Audrey Li. 1993. *Wh*-elements in situ: Syntax or LF? *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:199–238.
 Beck, Sigrid. 1996a. Quantified structures as barriers for LF movement. *Natural Language Semantics* 4:1–56.
 Beck, Sigrid. 1996b. *Wh*-constructions and transparent Logical Form. Doctoral dissertation, Universität Tübingen.
 Beck, Sigrid, and Shin-Sook Kim. 1997. On *wh*- and operator scope in Korean. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6:339–384.

¹¹ Whether feature movement has a looser locality constraint than phrasal movement is debated (Cheng 1997, Ochi 1998).

- Bresnan, Joan. 1976. On the form and functioning of transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7:3–40.
- Cheng, Lisa Lai-Shen. 1997. ‘Partial’ *wh*-movement. In *UCI working papers in linguistics* 3, ed. by Luther Chen-Sheng Liu and Kazue Takeda, 27–50. Irvine: University of California, Department of Linguistics.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Cole, Peter, and Gabriella Hermon. 1998. The typology of *wh*-movement: *Wh* questions in Malay. *Syntax* 1:221–258.
- Fiengo, Robert, and Robert May. 1994. *Indices and identity*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Hagstrom, Paul. 1998. Decomposing questions. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Hagstrom, Paul. 2000. The movement of question particles. In *NELS 30*, ed. by Masako Hirotani, Andries Coetzee, Nancy Hall, and Ji-yung Kim, 275–286. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, GLSA.
- Hale, Kenneth, and Samuel Jay Keyser. 1993. On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations. In *The view from Building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, ed. by Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, 53–109. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1994. An argument for minimalism: The case of antecedent-contained deletion. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25:455–480.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1995. *Logical Form: From GB to minimalism*. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Huang, C.-T. James. 1982. Logical relations in Chinese and the theory of grammar. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Huang, C.-T. James. 1988a. Shuo ‘shi’ he ‘you’ (On ‘be’ and ‘have’ in Chinese). *The Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 59:43–64. Taipei: Academia Sinica.
- Huang, C.-T. James. 1988b. *Wo pao de kuai* and Chinese phrase structure. *Language* 64:274–311.
- Kim, Shin-Sook. 2002. Intervention effects are focus effects. In *Japanese/Korean linguistics 10*, ed. by Noriko Akatsuka and Susan Strauss, 615–628. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.
- Ko, Heejeong. 2003. External-Merge of *why*-in-situ. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Atlanta, Ga., January 2003.
- Larson, Richard, and Robert May. 1990. Antecedent containment or vacuous movement: Reply to Baltin. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21: 103–122.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1999. *Minimalist analysis*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Lin, Jo Wang. 1992. The syntax of *zenmeyang* ‘how’ and *weishenme* ‘why’ in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 1:293–331.

- Lobeck, Anne C. 1995. *Ellipsis: Functional heads, licensing, and identification*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- May, Robert. 1985. *Logical Form*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Ochi, Masao. 1998. Move or Attract? In *Proceedings of the 16th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. by Emily Curtis, James Lyle, and Gabriel Webster, 319–333. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.
- Pesetsky, David. 2000. *Phrasal movement and its kin*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Potsdam, Eric. 1997. NegP and subjunctive complements in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28:533–540.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2001. Relativized minimality effects. In *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*, ed. by Mark Baltin and Chris Collins, 89–110. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Shi, Dingxu. 1994. The nature of Chinese *wh*-questions. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 12:301–333.
- Soh, Hooi Ling. 2003. Antecedent-contained deletion constructions in Mandarin Chinese. In *NELS 33*, ed. by Makoto Kadowaki and Shigeto Kawahara, 367–370. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, GLSA.
- Tanaka, Hidekazu. 1997. Invisible movement in *sika-nai* and the Linear Crossing Constraint. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6: 143–188.
- Tanaka, Hidekazu. 2003. Remarks on Beck's effects: Linearity in syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34:314–323.
- Tsai, Wei-tien Dylan. 1994a. On economizing the theory of A-bar dependencies. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Tsai, Wei-tien Dylan. 1994b. On nominal islands and LF extraction in Chinese. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 12:121–175.
- Tsai, Wei-tien Dylan. 1999. On lexical courtesy. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 8:39–73.
- Xu, Liejiong. 1990. Remarks on LF movement in Chinese questions. *Linguistics* 28:355–382.
- Zhang, Ning. 1997. Syntactic dependencies in Mandarin Chinese. Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont.

A NOTE ON THE STRUCTURE OF
 PREDICATE PHRASE + *BE* +
THAT-CP
 Yoshio Ueno
 Waseda University

1 Kuno's (1973) Observation

Kuno (1973) observes that the English construction in (1), in which a preposed predicate phrase (PredP) is followed by a form of *be* and a non-*wh* CP such as *that*-CP, is ungrammatical.

I would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their comments. I am deeply grateful to one of the reviewers, in particular, for detailed comments on and convincing counterarguments to my original draft, in which I had erroneously claimed that the construction in question is a kind of pseudocleft with PRO instead of *what*. All remaining errors are of course my own.