Fanselow, and Ralf Vogel, 289–325. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Postal, Paul. 1974. *On raising: One rule of English grammar and its theoretical implications*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Richards, Marc. 2004. Object shift and scrambling in North and West Germanic: A case study in symmetrical syntax. Doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge.

Richards, Marc. 2006. On phases, phase heads, and functional categories. Ms., University of Cambridge.

Richards, Norvin. 1999. Featural cyclicity and the ordering of multiple specifiers. In *Working minimalism*, ed. by Samuel David Epstein and Norbert Hornstein, 127–158. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of grammar*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Svenonius, Peter. 2001. Impersonal passives: A phase-based analysis. In *Proceedings of the 18th Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*, ed. by Arthur Holmer, Jan Olof Svantesson, and Åke Viberg, 109–125. Travaux de l'Institut de Linguistique de Lund 39.2. Lund: Lund University.

Svenonius, Peter. 2004. On the edge. In *Peripheries*, ed. by David Adger, Cécile de Cat, and George Tsoulas, 259–287. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

RHETORICAL QUESTIONS AND
 WH-MOVEMENT
Jon Sprouse
 University of Maryland

1 Observations

Rhetorical questions (RQs) have the syntactic form of a question but the semantic value of a declarative (Sadock 1971, Han 2002). In general, the meaning of RQs can be obtained by replacing the *wh*-word[1] with the appropriate negative quantifier (1a) or, in the case of polar questions, by adding negation (1b).

(1) a. After all, what does John know?
      ''John knows nothing.''
   b. After all, does John ever help?
      ''John doesn't ever help.''

Despite the semantic difference, RQs appear to be identical to interrogative questions (IQs) with respect to syntactic behavior (at least

[1] Here and throughout, for ease of exposition, I use the term *wh-word* to refer to both single *wh*-words such as *what* and *wh*-phrases such as *which book*.

in English): the *wh*-word moves to sentence-initial position, induces subject-auxiliary inversion, and displays island effects.

(2) a. After all, what did he t$_{did}$ buy t$_{what}$?
    b. *After all, what did he t$_{did}$ meet [$_{RC}$ the man who bought t$_{what}$]?

This squib addresses three additional syntactic observations about RQs across several languages, and their consequences for theories of *wh*-movement.

Observation 1
Some languages allow multiple *wh*-words in a single rhetorical question, while others only allow a single *wh*-word.

Much as with multiple *wh*-words in IQs, only certain languages allow multiple *wh*-words in RQs (illustrated here with the contrast between Chinese, Japanese, and Russian, on the one hand, and English, on the other).

(3) a. *Chinese*
       Shei hui dai   shenme lai bisai   ne?
       who will bring what   to competition Q
       'Who will bring what to the competition?'
       ''Nobody would bring anything to the competition.''
    b. *Japanese*
       Dare-ga   nani-o   paatii-ni mottekita-to iu-no?
       who-NOM what-ACC party-to bring-COMP saying-Q
       'After all, who will bring what to the party?'
       ''Nobody will bring anything to the party.''
    c. *Russian*
       V principe, kto   prineset   čto   na tvoju večerinku?
       after all   who will.bring what to your party
       'After all, who will bring what to your party?'
       ''Nobody will bring anything to your party.''
    d. *English*
       *After all, who would bring what to the party?

To date, I have observed RQs with multiple *wh*-words (MRQs) in Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, Russian, and to some extent Bulgarian. MRQs are not possible in Egyptian Arabic, English, French, Hebrew, Italian, Portuguese, and Spanish, although Egyptian Arabic and Italian also disallow multiple IQs.

Crucially, there is no obvious correlation between multiple *wh*-words in IQs and multiple *wh*-words in RQs, although it does seem that the existence of multiple *wh*-words in IQs in a language is necessary, but not sufficient, for the existence of multiple *wh*-words in RQs (i.e., Egyptian Arabic and Italian lack both multiple IQs and MRQs). Furthermore, there doesn't seem to be any correlation between types of *wh*-movement and the possibility of MRQs: Chinese and Japanese are in-situ languages, Russian is a multiple *wh*-fronting lan-

guage, and Hindi has a mixed system with both overt *wh*-movement
and *wh*-in-situ.

Observation 2
Wh-arguments in languages without overt *wh*-movement show
island effects in rhetorical questions.

Huang (1982) and others have demonstrated that languages with-
out overt *wh*-movement do indeed display island effects, although
these effects occur only with *wh*-adjuncts, not with *wh*-arguments. In
RQs in these languages, all *wh*-words show island effects, regardless
of whether they are arguments or adjuncts (illustrated here with Japa-
nese; (4a) shows an island violation with an argument, (4b) shows an
island violation with an adjunct, and (4c) demonstrates that the effects
in (4a) and (4b) are not simply long-distance effects).

(4) a. *[$_{IP}$ John-wa [$_{Adj}$ kare-no okusan-ga nani-o   katta
            John-TOP   he-GEN wife-NOM what-ACC bought
        kara]   okoru-to   iu-no]?
        because get.angry-COMP saying-Q
        'What would John get angry because his wife bought?'
        ''There is nothing such that John would get angry be-
        cause his wife bought that thing.''
   b. *[$_{IP}$ John-wa [$_{Adj}$ kare-no okusan-ga naze atarasii
            John-TOP   he-GEN wife-NOM why new
        doresu-o katta   kara]   okoru-to   iu-no]?
        dress-ACC bought because get.angry-COMP saying-Q
        'Why would John get angry because his wife bought a
        new dress?'
        ''There is no reason such that John would get angry
        because his wife bought a new dress for that reason.''
   c. [$_{IP}$ John-wa [$_{CP}$ ano Hanako-ga   anna misede
            John-TOP   that Hanako-NOM that store
        nani-o   katta-to]   iu-no]?
        what-ACC bought-COMP saying-Q
        'What does John say that a person like Hanako bought
        at that kind of store?'
        ''There is no thing such that John says that a person like
        Hanako would have bought that thing at that kind of
        store.''

Observation 3
Island violations with arguments in rhetorical questions in
languages without overt *wh*-movement show Principle of Mini-
mal Compliance effects.

Richards (1998) observes that under specific circumstances,
island violations are judged better when a second *wh*-word is added
to the construction. For example, following Richards's assumption
that Subjacency holds of both overt and covert movement, the contrast
between (5a) and (5b) seems to indicate that adding a *wh*-word outside

the island rectifies the island violation incurred by the in-situ (and covertly moved) *wh*-word.

(5) a. *What do you wonder whether John bought?
    b. Who wonders whether John bought what?

For Richards, this is a specific instance of a more general principle called the Principle of Minimal Compliance (PMC), in which constraint violations lose their effect if the very same constraint is respected elsewhere in the sentence. Of interest here is that island violations in MRQs demonstrate PMC effects in languages that allow MRQs, such as Japanese.[2]

(6) a. *[John-wa [$_{Adj}$ kare-no okusan-ga nani-o   katta
       John-TOP   he-GEN wife-NOM what-ACC bought
       kara]   okoru-to   iu-no]?
       because get.angry-COMP saying-Q
       'What would John get angry because his wife bought?'
       ''There is nothing such that John would get angry be-
       cause his wife bought it.''
    b. ?[Dare-ga [$_{Adj}$ John-no okusan-ga nani-o   katta
       who-NOM   John-GEN wife-NOM what-ACC bought
       kara]   okoru-to   iu-no]?
       because get.angry-COMP saying-Q
       'Who would get angry because John's wife bought what?'
       ''There is no person and no thing such that that person would get angry because John's wife bought that thing.''

2 The Typology of *Wh*-Movement

The three observations in section 1 can be restated as three properties of *wh*-words:

---

[2] There are undoubtedly several dialects of Japanese, and two bear special mention. First, as Masaya Yoshida (pers. comm.) points out, for some speakers of Japanese the PMC effect in (6b) may be disguised by a scope ambiguity in adjunct islands that decreases acceptability. For these speakers, the effect may be resurrected by scrambling the entire adjunct island to the left periphery.

(i) ?[$_{Adj}$ John-no okusan-ga nani-o   katta kara]   [dare-ga t$_{Adj}$
     John-GEN wife-NOM what-ACC bought because   who-NOM
    okoru-to   iu-no]?
    get.angry-COMP saying-Q
    'Because John's wife bought what, who would get angry?'
    ''Because John's wife bought nothing, no one would get angry.''

In the second dialect of interest, adjunct islands may be so weak as to cancel the island effect in (6a). For these dialects, the same paradigm may be created using a stronger relative clause island. The choice of adjunct islands throughout this squib is purely expository, as the syntactic structure of adjunct islands in Japanese is often easier to visualize for English speakers than the structure of relative clause islands.

Table 1
The three possible clusters of *wh*-properties in interrogative questions

	Covertly moved arguments	Overtly moved arguments	Adjuncts
Island effects	−	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
PMC effects	NA	$\checkmark$	−
Cooccurrence effects	−	−	$\checkmark$

- whether they display island effects (ISLANDS)
- whether they display PMC effects (PMC)
- whether they cooccur with elements of the same type (COOCCUR)[3]

The core of the theory of *wh*-movement is the fact that these three properties cluster in only three permutations. It has been standardly assumed that these three clusters are the result of the combination of two very robust distinctions, as shown in table 1: the argument/adjunct distinction among *wh*-words and the overt/covert movement distinction across languages (see especially Huang 1982, Lasnik and Saito 1984, Chomsky 1986, Richards 1998).

Most major theories of *wh*-movement have been built around these distinctions in one way or another. In the *Barriers* system (Chomsky 1986), the effect of the Empty Category Principle (ECP) is to constrain adjuncts but not arguments, and Subjacency constrains overt movement but not covert movement. In Nishigauchi's (1990) pied-piping account, only covert movement of arguments can induce massive pied-piping, while overt movement of arguments and all movement of adjuncts cannot. And in the unselective binding account proposed by Tsai (1994), or the choice function approach proposed by Reinhart (1997), arguments can be unselectively bound/interpreted via choice function, but adjuncts cannot.

Under the quite plausible assumption that RQs involve *wh*-movement, these theories would predict the same interaction between the argument/adjunct distinction and the overt/covert movement distinction, yielding the same distribution of the three classes. However, the observations laid out in section 1 are inconsistent with this prediction. Observation 1 indicates that the argument/adjunct distinction does not predict the correct clusters in English, as arguments in

---

[3] *Type* here provisionally refers to the argument/adjunct distinction. So the question is whether *wh*-arguments may cooccur with other *wh*-arguments, or whether *wh*-adjuncts may cooccur with other *wh*-adjuncts. Later in this squib, when the argument/adjunct distinction is proven inadequate, *type* will refer to the three types delineated in table 3.

Table 2
The three possible clusters of *wh*-properties in rhetorical questions

	Unobserved	Covertly moved arguments	Overtly moved arguments, all adjuncts
Island effects	–	√	√
PMC effects	NA	√	–
Cooccurrence effects	–	–	√

RQs display the ''adjunct'' property of not cooccurring with other arguments. Observation 2 indicates that the overt/covert distinction does not predict the correct class distinction in languages such as Japanese, as the in-situ argument *nani-o* 'what' in (4) induces an island violation typical of ''overtly moved arguments'' and ''adjuncts.'' Taken together with observation 3, that there is a PMC effect in example (6), this seems to suggest that arguments in languages such as Japanese are ''overtly moved,'' despite the lack of overt movement. Given these observations, the labels in table 1 must be changed as in table 2 to account for the properties of RQs.

In sum, under standard theories of locality, we would be forced to the following conclusions: (a) arguments in English RQs are syntactic adjuncts, despite being semantic arguments; and (b) arguments in Japanese RQs are overtly moved *wh*-words, despite appearing in situ. These conclusions suggest a rethinking of the properties underlying the three clusters in table 1, crucially away from the dimensions of argument/adjunct and overt/covert, and for expository purposes, toward a more generic labeling of these clusters as in table 3.[4]

[4] Soh (2005), following Pesetsky (2000), offers a novel two-way distinction in Chinese: *wh*-words that resolve antecedent-contained deletion (ACD) also do not show island effects, and *wh*-words that show intervention effects also show island effects. In effect, this reduces to the argument/adjunct distinction, but it provides a new way of viewing islands: in Chinese, islands exist for feature movement, but not for phrasal movement; in English, islands exist for phrasal movement, and possibly not for feature movement. While this observation falls outside the scope of this squib, it should be noted that RQs raise problems for this view as well: in Chinese, the very same constructions that Soh claims are instances of ACD can be interpreted as rhetorical (thus, ACD movement shows island effects), and rhetorical arguments show intervention effects, just like interrogative adjuncts.

(i) Meiyouren gan gen shei dajia?
   nobody   dare with who fight
   IQ: 'Who would nobody dare fight with?'
   RQ: '*There is nobody that nobody would dare fight with.'

These facts seem to be at direct odds with Soh's distinction, and they lead one to question Pesetsky's use of ACD as a test for phrasal movement.

Table 3
The three possible clusters of *wh*-properties with generic labels

	Type I *wh*-words	Type II *wh*-words	Type III *wh*-words
Island effects	−	√	√
PMC effects	NA	√	−
Cooccurrence effects	−	−	√

3 Move First

As noted by an anonymous *LI* reviewer, tables 1 and 2 seem to indicate that *wh*-movement in RQs is more restricted than *wh*-movement in IQs. The properties of *wh*-movement in RQs, however, are not monolithic: for example, *wh*-arguments in Japanese are type I in IQs and type II in RQs, but *wh*-arguments in English are type II in IQs and type III in RQs. So while rhetorical *wh*-movement is more restricted than interrogative *wh*-movement, rhetorical *wh*-arguments are still of two types (II and III), much like interrogative *wh*-arguments (I and II). This suggests that a comprehensive analysis of *wh*-movement that accounts for both IQs and RQs must consist of more than the addition of a single ''rhetorical'' feature.

While this squib is not the place for a full analysis of the *wh*-movement properties in question, this section suggests what one might look like. First, the analysis must capture the [±islands] distinction between types I and II (as accomplished by the analyses of Huang, Nishigauchi, Reinhart, and others) and the [±cooccur] distinction between types II and III, without invoking an absolute overt/covert or argument/adjunct distinction. Second, the analysis must capture the covariation between [±PMC] and [±cooccur]. While there are undoubtedly a number of possible analyses, I would like to briefly suggest one that resurrects an idea from the early days of Government-Binding (GB) Theory.

Under the classic GB approach to *wh*-movement, [−cooccur] was the result of an ECP violation (see Lasnik and Saito 1984 for details). More importantly, the ECP violation occurred when the adjunct was not the *first wh*-word to move to the specifier of CP. This *move first* analysis predicted that adjuncts could not be in situ in English (7a) because another *wh*-word had moved first to CP, that adjuncts could be in situ in Chinese (7b) because there is a derivation in which the adjunct could move first, and that adjuncts in Chinese could not cooccur with other adjuncts (7c) because both could not move first.

(7) a. *What did John buy why?
    b. Zhangsan weishenme maile   shenme?
       Zhangsan why   bought what
       'Why did Zhangsan buy what?'

    c. *Zhangsan ruhe weishenme maile   yibu chichi?
       Zhangsan how why   bought CL car
       'How did Zhangsan buy a car why?'

Tying [±cooccur] to the ECP also captured the correlation between [±cooccur] and [±PMC], because as Richards (1998) argues, the PMC does not apply to licensing constraints such as the ECP (see Richards 1998 for details).

    Despite the loss of the ECP to minimalism, and the loss of the argument/adjunct distinction to the RQ observations in section 1, Lasnik and Saito's (1984) *move first* intuition still predicts a correlation between [±cooccur] and [±PMC]: if a *wh*-word must move first, then there is no way it can cooccur with another element that must move first; if a *wh*-word must move first, then there is also no way for the movement of another element to satisfy its requirements via the PMC. Furthermore, if a *wh*-word must move first, then it must move; therefore, it is plausible to expect it to induce island effects. In this way, Lasnik and Saito's intuition can be applied directly to type III: type III items *must move first*. Logically, then, type II items *must move* (whence island effects and the possibility of cooccurrence and PMC amelioration), and type I items either do not move (perhaps with choice function application or unselective binding) or move with some extra mechanism such as LF pied-piping.

    While *move first* is by no means the only way to capture the observations in section 1, and even though many questions remain unanswered (such as the ultimate source of the *move first* requirement), the description of *wh*-movement based on the *move first* intuition has some points in its favor: it captures the bifurcated nature of RQs (types II and III) in a way that resurrects an idea from the early days of GB while still fitting nicely with modern approaches to *wh*-movement.

References

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Han, Chung-hye. 2002. Interpreting interrogatives as rhetorical questions. *Lingua* 112:201–229.

Huang, C.-T. James. 1982. Move *wh* in a language without *wh*-movement. *The Linguistic Review* 1:369–416.

Lasnik, Howard, and Mamoru Saito. 1984. On the nature of proper government. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15:235–289.

Nishigauchi, Taisuke. 1990. *Quantification in the theory of grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Pesetsky, David. 2000. *Phrasal movement and its kin*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Reinhart, Tanya. 1997. Quantifier scope: How labor is divided between QR and choice functions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20: 335–397.

Richards, Norvin. 1998. The Principle of Minimal Compliance. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29:599–629.

Sadock, Jerrold. 1971. Queclaratives. In *Papers from the Seventh*

Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, ed. by D. Adams, M. A. Campbell, V. Cohen, J. Lovins, E. Maxwell, C. Nygren, and J. Reighard, 223–232. Chicago: University of Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society.

Soh, Hooi Ling. 2005. *Wh*-in-situ in Mandarin Chinese. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36:143–155.

Tsai, W.-T. Dylan. 1994. On nominal islands and LF extraction in Chinese. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12:121–175.

WHETHER WE TENSE-AGREE
    OVERTLY OR NOT
Rint Sybesma
    Universiteit Leiden

1 A Tense Node for Chinese

It is often claimed that Sinitic languages have no syntactic Tense node (T). The two most frequent arguments for this claim are, first, that these languages have no morphological/semilexical or grammatical(ized) means of marking events as past events,[1] and, second, that locating events in time in these languages is done by means of temporal adverbs or is determined by the context.[2] Sentences like the following

[1] I use a simple and informal definition of *past*: an event is past if it is placed before the utterance time.

[2] Here are some quotations (a small selection): ''. . . there is no inflectional morphology to express tense . . .'' (Klein, Li, and Hendriks 2000:723); ''Mandarin has no markers for tense'' (Li and Thompson 1981:13); ''The temporal status of an event in Chinese is mainly indicated by time words or expressions'' (Tiee 1986:90); ''Tense is not a feature of Chinese grammar. An act or event is located in time by time words or context, not by the form of the verb'' (Ramsey 1989:76); ''The position of TT [topic time] on the time line . . . must be marked by adverbials or left to the context'' (Klein, Li, and Hendriks 2000:753); ''[Mandarin] Chinese has no grammaticalized means to restrict TT [topic time] to some particular time span in relation to TU [time of utterance]'' (Klein 1994:124); Chinese belongs to the type of languages that show ''no formal distinction of the tenses in their verbs'' (Mei 2002:46); ''Chinese is a nontensed language'' for several reasons, one being that ''the verbal system of Chinese [has] no obligatory morphological marking of a past/non-past distinction'' (Hu, Pan, and Xu 2001:1120); ''Modern Chinese . . . does not have the grammatical category of tense'' (Gōng 1991:252); ''Chinese . . . is an aspect and not a tense language. . . . The plotting of action along some sort of time axis . . . is not a feature of Chinese'' (Norman 1988:163); ''[Chinese] utilizes various factors such as the information provided by default aspect, the tense-aspect particles, and pragmatic reasoning to determine the temporal interpretation of sentences'' (Lin, to appear).