

ROADMAP				
► Russian has a construction consisting of two clauses: <i>kak</i> -clause with the fronted <i>wh</i> -adverbial <i>kak</i> ‘how’ and <i>wh</i> -clause with a fronted <i>wh</i> -phrase				
(1)	<i>kak</i>	<i>vi</i>	<i>ʃʹita</i> – <i>itʹi</i> ,	<i>paʃʹimu</i> <i>ʲudʲ</i> – <i>i</i> <i>edʲ</i> – <i>at</i> <i>mʹas</i> – <i>a</i> ?
	how	you(pl).NOM	consider–2SG.PRES	why people–PL.NOM eat–3PL.PRES meat–SG.ACC
	lit.	How	you	consider why people eat meat?; ‘Why do you think people eat meat?’
● seems to be an equivalent of long extraction (NB: <i>wh</i> -fronting in Russian is obligatory)				
(2)	<i>paʃʹimu</i>	<i>vi</i>	<i>ʃʹita</i> – <i>itʹi</i>	<i>ʲudʲ</i> – <i>i</i> <i>edʲ</i> – <i>at</i> <i>mʹas</i> – <i>a</i> ?
	why	you(pl).NOM	consider–2SG.PRES	people–PL.NOM eat–3PL.PRES meat–SG.ACC
	‘Why	do	you	think people eat meat?’
● was analyzed as Partial Wh–Movement by Stepanov (2000), Fanselow (2006)				
My Proposal				
► Russian has no partial movement.				
● Russian does not fit well into the typology of Partial Movement and shows unexpected restrictions such as lexical idiosyncrasies, lack of fixed linear order and non-embeddability				
► the construction in question is a full-fledged parenthetical				
● its properties such as absence of fixed linear order, non-embeddability and comma intonation follow naturally from this assumption				
● syntactically, this parenthetical is adjoined at the root level				
● semantically, it is a conventional implicature (à la Potts 2002, 2005)				
PARTIAL MOVEMENTS				
PARTIAL MOVEMENT: cover term for a range of superficially and arguably structurally similar phenomena in Bahasa Indonesian, Hindi, Hugarian, German, Malay, Romani inter alia (Lutz et al 2000)				
DIRECT DEPENDENCY (McDaniel (1989) and others for German): PM and long movement are structural variants, <i>wh</i> -phrase stopped on its way in the specifier of its own clause, scope in the higher clause marked by a <i>wh</i> -expletive, semantically empty <i>wh</i> -phrase				
INDIRECT DEPENDENCY (Dayal (1994) for Hindi): PM and long movement are not structural variants, both clauses are regular questions, <i>wh</i> -expletive is associated with the embedded CP via coindexation and functions as a quantifier over propositions with interpretation restricted by the <i>wh</i> -clause				
A BRIEF TAXONOMY OF PM CONSTRUCTIONS ACROSS LANGUAGES				
	Hindi	Hungarian	German	Russian
any wh-phrase	✓	✓	✓	✓
locality	✓	✓	✓	✓
ungrammaticality across negation	✓	✓	✓	✓
scope marking over yes/no-questions	✓	no	no	✓
binding relations between clauses	✓	✓	✓	NO
island effects different from long mvmt	✓	✓	✓	NO
further embedding	✓	✓	✓	NO
any clause–embedding predicate	✓	✓	✓	NO
(that does not require wh-complement)				
WHERE RUSSIAN IS SIMILAR				
● has no restrictions w.r.t. the choice of a <i>wh</i> -phrase				
● obeys locality and maintains adjacency of the scope marker and <i>wh</i> -phrase in structures with three clauses				
● does not allow for scope marking across negation				
● allows for scope marking across yes/no-questions (like Hindi):				
(3)	<i>ʋertʹitsa</i>	<i>ʲi</i> <i>zʹimʲ</i> – <i>a</i> ?	// <i>zʹimʲ</i> – <i>a</i>	<i>ʋertʹitsa</i> ?
	turn–3SG.PRES	Q earth–NOM.SG	// earth–NOM.SG	turn–3SG.PRES
	‘Is	the	Earth	turning?’
(4)	<i>kak</i>	<i>tʹibʹe</i>	<i>kazitsa</i> ,	<i>ʋertʹitsa</i>
	how	you.DAT	seem.3SG.PRES	turn–3SG.PRES
	Q	earth–NOM.SG	// earth–NOM.SG	turn–3SG.PRES
	‘What	does	it	seem to you, is the Earth turning?’

WHERE RUSSIAN IS DIFFERENT				
PM languages are not uniform and one-theory-fits-all approach often fails (Beck & Berman 2000). Is it so surprising then that Russian does not always display many commonalities with them?				
● no binding relations between the two clauses				
● no further embedding, though embeddability is a core property of PM:				
(5)	<i>mam</i> – <i>a</i>	<i>spraʃʹiva</i> – <i>it</i> ,	<i>kak</i> <i>vam</i>	<i>kazitsa</i> ,
	mom–NOM.SG	ask–3SG.PRES	how	you(pl).DAT
	seem.3SG.PRES	who.ACC	hire–3PL.FUT	
	Intended:	‘Mom	is	asking who it seems to you will be hired.’; OK as a quotative only
● any linear position with respect to the <i>wh</i> -clause:				
(6)	<i>kak</i>	<i>ti</i>	<i>ʃʹita</i> – <i>ij</i> ,	<i>kavo</i>
	how	you.NOM	consider–2SG.PRES	who.ACC
	she–NOM	love–3SG.PRES	‘Whom	do you think that she loves?’
(7)	<i>kavo</i> ,	<i>kak</i> <i>ti</i>	<i>ʃʹitaiʃ</i> ,	<i>ana</i> <i>ʲubʲ</i> – <i>it</i> ?
(8)	<i>kavo</i>	<i>ana</i> ,	<i>kak</i> <i>ti</i>	<i>ʃʹitaiʃ</i> ,
(9)	<i>kavo</i>	<i>ana</i> <i>ʲubʲ</i> – <i>it</i> ,	<i>kak</i> <i>ti</i>	<i>ʃʹitaiʃ</i> ?
● highly restricted in terms of predicates and is possible with four predicates <i>kazatsa</i> ‘seem’, <i>dumaʃʹ</i> ‘think’, <i>palagaʃʹ</i> ‘assume’, <i>ʃʹitaʃʹ</i> ‘consider’ (a very small subset of bridge verbs);				
(10)	<i>kto</i>	<i>ti</i>	<i>ʋerʲ</i> – <i>ij</i>	<i>paʲitʹe</i> – <i>L</i>
	who.NOM	you.NOM	believe–2SG.PRES	fly–M.SG.PST
	to	Mars–ACC	‘Who	do you believe flew to Mars?’
(11)	* <i>kak</i> <i>ti</i>	<i>ʋerʲ</i> – <i>ij</i> ,	<i>kto</i>	<i>paʲitʹe</i> – <i>L</i>
	how	you.NOM	believe–2SG.PRES	who.NOM
	fly–M.SG.PST	to	Mars–ACC	
● strong preference towards present tense in <i>kak</i> -clause				
● ban on first person subjects, lesser frequency of third person subjects in the <i>kak</i> -clause-clause and even lesser preference towards quantified phrases as subjects				
● tendency to have nothing besides <i>kak</i> , subject and predicate in the <i>kak</i> -clause; restriction sensitive to phonology with short adverbials allowed				
INTEGRATED PARENTHETICALS				
► Reis (2000): German, besides genuine PM, has an Integrated Parenthetical characterized by:				
● subordinate status of the clause with the hypothetical <i>wh</i> -expletive				
● this clause occupies any linear position w.r.t. the <i>wh</i> -clause				
● the <i>wh</i> -clause may contain no <i>wh</i> -phrase being a yes/no-question				
● possible iteration				
● ban on main clause material such as modal particles				
● lack of prosodic autonomy				
► Russian shares the linear order property and scope marking over a yes/no-question				
► van Gelderen (2001): Russian construction is an IP				
► actually, the construction differs from German in several crucial points:				
● no iteration allowed				
(12)	* <i>kak</i>	<i>tʹibʹe</i>	<i>kazitsa</i> ,	<i>kak</i> <i>ti</i>
	how	you.DAT	seem.3SG.PRES	how
	you.NOM	think–2SG.PRES	earth–NOM.SG	Q
	turn–3SG.PRES	Lit.	What	do you think, what does it seem to you, is the Earth turning?
● main clause material allowed, such as short modal particles (similar to German <i>ja</i> and <i>doch</i>)				
(13)	<i>tak</i>	<i>kak</i> <i>ʒe</i>	<i>vi</i>	<i>palagai</i> – <i>tʹe</i> ,
	PTCL	how	PTCL	you(pl).NOM
	assume–2PL.PRES	who.NOM	I.NOM	such.M.NOM.SG
	fool.NOM.SG	or	<i>nʹigodʹaj</i> ?	
	villain.NOM.SG	‘So	finally	who do you assume I am, a fool or a villain?’
● prosodic autonomy: a clear-cut comma intonation and surrounded by commas when written				
► PM landscape of Russian is different from that of German and demands a new analysis.				

PROPOSAL				
► I propose to treat PM-like thing in Russian as a full-fledged parenthetical to be analyzed as a conventional implicature in the spirit of (Potts 2002, 2005).				
● this parenthetical is a supplement that requires multi-dimensional semantics				
● meaning inside the parenthetical clause is interpreted via standard rules				
● and then shifted to the CI dimension by COMMA operator that takes an argument of at-issue type and returns a CI type				
● semantics of questions with a <i>kak</i> -parenthetical consists of an at-issue question and of a conventional implicature ‘The speaker wants to know hearer’s opinion about that question’				
► APPARENT PM PROPERTIES SOLVED				
● badness with negation is not intrinsic to PM: parentheticals also avoid it				
● Locality is among crucial empirical predictions made by any PM approach. There are two options to maintain adjacency of the <i>wh</i> -phrase and the scope marker in structures with three clauses: repeat the scope marker in the intermediate clause or move the <i>wh</i> -phrase further. Russian seems to obey locality ruling out non-adjacency and choosing to move the <i>wh</i> -phrase to the second clause:				
(14)	*[<i>kak</i>	<i>tʹibʹe</i>	<i>kazitsa</i> ,	[<i>Petʹa</i>
	how	you.DAT	seem.3SG.PRES	Peter.NOM
	think–3SG.PRES	what.ACC	I.NOM	buy.1SG.FUT
	lit.	‘[How	it seems to you	[Peter thinks [what I will buy]]?’
(15)	[<i>kak</i>	<i>tʹibʹe</i>	<i>kazitsa</i> ,	[<i>ʃto</i>
	lit.	‘[How	it seems to you	[what Peter thinks [I will buy]]?’
	Intended	in both cases:	‘What	does it seem to you that Peter thinks I will buy?’
Parenthetical approach does not exclude this configuration and predicts that a <i>kak</i> -clause attaches to the sentence with long movement yielding the meaning: ‘What, according to your opinion, Peter thinks that I will buy?’ This is why, unlike other languages, island effects are exactly the same for long movement and ‘partial’ movement.				
► TROUBLESOME PROPERTIES SOLVED				
● more likely to have lexical idiosyncrasies with parentheticals rather than with productive PM				
● “relaxed” linear order w.r.t. the host clause is typical for parentheticals				
● CIs are scopeless and belong to root phenomena hence are non-embeddable				
● impossibility of binding relations, typical for CIs, shows general non-integrated-ness				
● comma intonation is the most reliable way to identify parentheticals (plus other CIs such as appositives and expressives). English CI and non-CI As-parentheticals are distinguished on the base of intonation and it is the comma operator that turns the clause into a CI				
► EXTRA EMPIRICAL SUPPORT				
● ‘how’ is a non-standard wh-expletive as most languages use ‘what’				
● in Russian, <i>kak</i> is the most common way to introduce parentheticals (similar to English <i>as</i>):				
(16)	<i>puʃʹkʲin</i> ,	<i>kak</i> <i>izʋesn</i> – <i>a</i> ,	<i>rost</i> – <i>am</i>	<i>biʲl</i>
	Pushkin.NOM	how	known–NOM.SG	height–INS
	be.3SG.PST	small.M.SG	‘Pushkin,	as it is known, was of small height.’ (Daniil Kharms)
● normally possible with 2nd person subjects (<i>you</i> , <i>fool</i>), apositives are not allowed in the <i>kak</i> -clause, which follows naturally from the fact that CIs are not stacked on top of each other				
PUZZLE				
Outside of interrogatives <i>kak</i> -parentheticals are not limited with respect to particular predicates, subject, tense, or length. It seems that in questions CI-content should be “bleached”, adding little to the very semantics of question so that the two dimensions, at-issue and CI, remain coherent and parallel.				
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS				
Many thanks to Daniel Büring, Lyn Frazier, Vania Kapitonov, Hilda Koopman, Anoop Mahajan, Anna Szabolcsi and Igor Yanovich for various discussions and encouragement.				
REFERENCES				
Beck, S. and S. Berman. 2000. Wh-Scope marking: Direct vs. indirect deoendency. In Lutz et al. Dayal, V. 1994. Scope marking as indirect wh-dependency. <i>NLS</i> 2. Fanselow, G. 2006. Partial wh-movement. In M.Everaert, H.Riemsdijk (eds.), <i>The Blackwell Companion to Syntax</i> . van Gelderen, V. 2001. Partial wh-movement in Russian. In <i>Linguistics in the Netherlands</i> . Lutz, U., G. Müller and A. von Stechow. (Eds). 2000. <i>Wh-Scope Marking</i> . John Benjamins. McDaniel, D. 1989. Partial and multiple wh-movement. <i>NLLT</i> 7. Potts, C. 2002. The syntax and semantics of As-parentheticals. <i>NLLT</i> 20. Potts, C. 2005. <i>The Logic of Conventional Implicatures</i> . OUP. Reis, M. 2000. On the parenthetical features of German Was.W-constructions and how to account for them. In Lutz et al. Stepanov, A. 2000. Wh-scope marking in Slavic. <i>Studia Linguistica</i> 54.				