CLLDed and Ordinary Wh-Questions in Macedonian

The paper argues for the existence of two types of wh-questions in Macedonian, Clitic Left Dislocated and ordinary ones, with the former being base-generated and the latter derived by movement. Evidence for the derivational differences comes from WCO and island effects.

The existence of the two types of questions crucially builds on the characterization of the wh-phrases in Macedonian w.r.t. their patterning with clitics. Consider the data in (1)-(3). The data shows that *koj N* 'which N' phrases obligatorily co-occur with a clitic pronoun (1), while *kakov N* 'what N' phrases, can never co-occur with a clitic (2). Mono-morphemic phrases *koj/što* 'who/what' present a mixed case. *Koj* 'who' is optionally possible with a clitic (3a); *što* 'what' is not (3b).

To explain the paradigm in (1)-(3), I propose that Macedonian distinguishes between three types of wh-phrases based on their inherent D-Linked (DL) properties [5]. On the view that the specification of these properties is tied to partitivity [3] and the assumption that these semantic properties give the wh-phrases their feature specification for strength (in the sense of [1]), I argue that *which N*s are marked as [+strong$_{WH}$], *what* and *what N* are marked as [-strong$_{WH}$] and *who* is unspecified for strength. The distribution of the clitics with the wh-phrases in (1)-(3) is then explained in terms of the Clitic Criterion (following [6]): only [+strong$_{WH}$] in Macedonian license the presence of the clitic.

Given the three-way characterization of the wh-phrases, the different types of wh-expressions are shown to give rise to two types of wh-questions, which I claim are derivationally distinct. Evidence for their different derivation comes from their behavior w.r.t. WCO and syntactic islands.

WCO: Wh-phrases in Macedonian differ w.r.t. WCO. Inherently DL wh-phrases, like *koj N* 'which N' in (4a), do not give rise to WCO effects, but NDL wh-phrases, like *kakov N* 'what N' in (5a), do. The lack of WCO effects in (4a-b) can be attributed to the fact that the wh does not bind a trace inside IP. The ungrammaticality of (5a-b) is due to the fact that the variable bound by the wh is coindexed with a pronoun to its left. WCO effects also arise in questions with *što* 'what', as evident in the ungrammaticality of (6), again due to the coindexation of the variable with the pronoun. *Koj* 'who', when not clitic-doubled as in (7), follows the same pattern as that of *što* 'what': the example shows that coindexation between the fronted wh and the pronoun leads to a WCO violation. As is expected, WCO violations become significantly weaker when *koj* 'who' co-occurs with a clitic as in (8).

Taking the lack/presence of WCO effects in wh-questions to be indicative of base-generation and movement, respectively, we can conclude that wh-phrases coindexed with a clitic ((4) and (8)) in Macedonian are base-generated in their surface position. The presence of the clitic in both cases would be due to strong *pro* in object position (following [2], [1], etc.). Wh-phrases not coindexed with a clitic ((5), (6) and (7)), on the other hand, move to their clause-initial position. In such cases, the clitic is not licensed because the wh-phrases in question are [-strong$_{WH}$] or unspecified.

Islands: The proposed analysis distinguishes between wh-phrases that enter into a binding relation with their clitics and *pro* in the argument position and w-phrases that enter into a government chain with the traces they leave after movement. Given this, it's expected for questions with CLLDed wh-phrases to be able to violate weak islands, but those that move to be sensitive to weak islands. These predictions are borne out, as shown in (9a-c). From this we can conclude that the two types of wh-phrases enter in different types of chain relations: a CLLDed wh forms a binding chain with *pro* in object position, while a moved wh and its trace are part of a government chain.

Given that binding chains, as well as those formed by movement, are constrained by strong islands [2], it's expected that both types of wh-phrases will obey these. Again, the predictions are borne out, as evident from (10a-c). The sensitivity to strong islands also confirms that the relation between the wh and *pro* in argument position is that of a chain to begin with.

The paper explores the option that the behavior of *što/koj* 'what/who' w.r.t. clitics is a reflex of deeper semantic differences between the two elements (e.g. their level of individuation; see [4]).

(1) **Koja kniga** *(**ja**) kupi Ana? (2) **Kakva kniga** (***ja**) pročita Ana?
which book it(f.sg.)bought Ana   what book it(f.sg.)read Ana
'Which book did Ana buy?'   'What book did Ana read?'

(3) a. **Kogo** (**go**) vide?   b. **Što** (***go**) kupi Ana?
   whom him saw   what it(m/n.sg.) bought Ana
   'Who did you see?'   'What did Ana buy?'

(4) a. [**Koe momče**]$_i$ [brat mu$_i$] **go**$_i$ poseti?
   which boy brother his him visit
   'Which boy did his brother visit?'
   b. [koe momče]$_i$ [[brat mu$_i$] *pro*$_i$ go$_i$ poseti t$_i$]

(5) a. *[**Kakvo momče**]$_i$ [brat mu$_i$] poseti?
   what boy brother his visit
   'What boy did his brother visit?'
   b. [kakvo momče]$_i$ [[brat mu$_i$] poseti t$_i$]

(6) **Što**$_i$ [negoviot$_i$ sopstvenik] prodade?
   what his owner sell
   'What did its owner sell?'

(7) **Kogo**$_{j/*i}$ [brat mu$_i$] poseti? (8) ?**Kogo**$_{i/j}$ [brat mu$_i$] **go**$_i$ poseti?
   whom brother his visit   whom brother his him visit
   'Whom did his brother visit?'   'Whom will his brother visit?'

(9) a. **Koi studenti** / **kogo** se misliš dali da **gi/go** isprašaš?
   which students / who refl think whether to them/him examine
   'Which students/Who are you wondering whether to examine them/him?'
   b. ***Kakvi studenti** / **kogo** se misliš dali da isprašaš?
   what students / who refl think whether to examine
   'What students/Who are you wondering whether to examine?'
   c. ***Što** te prašaa dali pročita?
   what you asked whether read
   'What did they ask you whether you read?'

(10) a. ***Koja prijatelka** / **kogo** go ispi kafeto pred da **ja/go** vikneš?
   which friend / who it drank coffee-the before to her/him call
   'Which friend/Who did you drink the coffee before you called her/him?'
   b. ***Kakva prijatelka** / **kogo** go ispi kafeto pred da vikneš?
   what friend / who it drank coffee-the before to call
   'What friend/Who did you drink the coffee before you called?'
   c. ***Što** plačeše zatoa što Petar istepa?
   what cried because that Petar beat
   'What did you cry because Petar beat?'

References: [1] Barwise, J. & R. Cooper. 1981. Generalized Quantifiers in Natural Languages. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4: 159-219. **[2]** Cinque, G. 1990. *Types of Ā-Dependencies*. Cambridge: MIT Press. **[3]** Comorovski, I. 1996. *Interrogative Phrases and the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. **[4]** Dayal, V. & R. Schwarzschild. (2010). Definite Inner Antecedents and Wh-Correlates in Sluices. Rutgers University, ms.. **[5]** Pesetsky, D. 1987. Wh-in-Situ: Movement and Unselective Binding. In *The Representation of (In)definiteness*, E. Reuland and A. ter Meulen (eds.), 98-129. Cambridge: MIT Press. **[6]** Sportiche, D. 1998. *Partitions and Atoms of Clause Structure: Subjects, Agreement, Case and Clitics*. London/New York: Routledge.