

平成 29 年度 学術振興基金助成による成果報告書

平成 30 年 1 月 9 日

学 長 殿

所属部局・職名 経済経営学類・教授

申 請 者 名 福 富 靖 之

助成事業の区分 (該当するものに印)	研究協力に関する事業 (学術出版・叢書・学会等運営 <u>学会参加</u>) 学術振興に関する事業 (学生・事務職員・その他の特別事業)
事業名	The 19th Seoul International Conference on Generative Grammar (第 19 回ソウル国際生成文法会議)
事業実施期間	平成 29 年 8 月 9 日 ~ 平成 29 年 8 月 12 日
成果の概要	<p>The 19th Seoul International Conference on Generative Grammar (第 19 回ソウル国際生成文法学会)において、論文“Notes on Integrated Parenthetical Constructions”(統合挿入構文についての覚書)をポスター発表した。</p> <p>本発表では、生成文法に基づく従来の日本語研究において、WH作用域標示構文と分析されてきた構文を、ドイツ語とロシア語で観察される対応する構文との類似性から、「統合挿入構文(Integrated Parenthetical Constructions)」として分析すべきであることを示した。</p> <p>発表の要旨は以下の通りである。</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Notes on Integrated Parenthetical Constructions</p> <p>The present paper investigates a less-studied interrogative sentence in Russian, German and Japanese: Integrated Parenthetical Constructions (IPCs). Gelderen (2001) analyzes the example in (1) as a kind of IPCs:</p> <p>(1) Kak ty думаеш kogo ja videla? (Russian) how you think who I see-PAST 'Who do you think I saw'</p> <p>This construction shows three different properties from the real instance of Partial <i>Wh</i>-movement: a) IPCs do not allow the presence of an overt complementizer (2), b) IPCs allow a preposing of the 'apparently embedded' interrogative clause (3), and c) IPCs do not allow for more than two clauses (4).</p> <p>(2) Kak ty думаеш (*что) kogo ja videla? (R) how you think (that) who I see-PAST</p> <p>(3) a. [Kogo ja videla], [kak ty думаеш]? (R) who I see-PAST how you think b. Wird er morgen kommen, was glaubst du? (German) will he tomorrow come what believe you 'Will he come tomorrow, do you think?'</p> <p>(4) a. *Kak ty думаеш [(kak) Ivan skazal [kogo ja videla]]? how you think how Ivan said who I see-PAST 'Who do you think Ivan said I saw?' (R) b. Was (*glaubst sie er meint) eird er morgen tun? what believes she he thinks will he tomorrow do</p>

'What does she believe he thinks he will do tomorrow?' (G)
 Although Gelderen's analysis is based on the similarities to the German counterpart of IPCs, why IPCs have these three properties still requires an explanation. In this paper we will propose that these properties are derived from two assumptions concerning the nature and internal structure of *wh*-phrases in Russian, German and Japanese. Specifically, assuming that *wh*-phrases in these languages are morphological triggers to create a set of alternatives and also that associated interrogative clauses function as a restrictor, we will argue that *wh*-phrases have a layered internal structure, as in (5), each element of which is taken to correspond to a particular object in semantic representation.

(5) [DP [Restrictor ...] [OpP Operator [*wh*-stem]]]

Assuming that the operator and the restrictor are configurated like (5), the property (a) can be considered to be one of the concord phenomena; that is, several *wh*-elements contribute to one question. A *wh*-stem merged firstly with a question operator is realized as *kak* 'how,' which triggers a creation of alternative set. Then the associated interrogative clause restricts the domain of alternatives. The presence of an overt complementizer is semantically incompatible with the notion of alternatives. The property (b) can now be reanalyzed as an instance of a large-scale pied-piping; *kogo ja videla kak* moves to the sentence initial position as one *wh*-phrase with a rich internal structure. Lastly, the property (c) can be directly accounted for by the proposed internal structure; a *wh*-stem with an operator affixed is not locally merged with the associated interrogative clause.

The present analysis gains additional support from cross-linguistic evidence. Japanese also has an Integrated Parenthetical Construction (6a) as well as a long-distance *wh*-question (6b):

- (6) a. Anata-wa [John-ga dare-o aisiteiru ka] doo
 you-TOP John-NOM who-ACC loves Q how
 omotteiru no? (Japanese)
 think Q
 'Who do you think that John loves?'
 b. Anata-wa [John-ga dare-o aisiteiru to] omotteiru
 you-TOP John-NOM who-ACC love COMP think
 no? (J)
 Q

Like Russian and German, IPCs in Japanese do not allow the presence of the overt complementizer, as illustrated in (7):

- (7) a. *Anata-wa [John-ga dare-o aisiteiru to] doo
 you-TOP John-NOM who-ACC love COMP how
 omotteiru no? (J)
 think Q
 b. *Anata-wa [John-ga dare-o aisiteiru ka to] doo
 you-TOP John-NOM who-ACC love Q COMP how
 omotteiru no? (J)
 think Q

As for the property (b), Japanese, a strict SOV language, exhibits a mirror image effect to Russian and German. While the associated interrogative clause in IPCs can be post-posed (8a), the embedded clause in long-distance *wh*-questions cannot (8b):

- (8) a. Anata-wa doo omotteiru no, [John-ga dare-o
 you-TOP how think Q John-NOM who-ACC
 aisiteiru ka] (J)
 love Q
 b. *Anata-wa omotteiru no, [John-ga dare-o
 you-TOP think Q John-NOM who-ACC
 aisiteiru to] (J)
 love COMP

The example in (9) exemplifies the impossibility of multiple embedding in Japanese IPCs.

- (9) *Anata-wa [[John-ga dare-o aisiteiru ka] Mary-ga

you-TOP John-NOM who-ACC loves Q Mary-NOM
 doo itta ka]doo omotteiru no? (J)
 how said Q how think Q

'Who do you think Mary said John loves?'

Although Japanese permits almost unlimited freedom of word order, IPCs display a peculiar word order restriction. If the scope-marker *doo* is reordered to the left of its associate clause, the sentence is degraded, as indicated in (10). This word order restriction is also derived from the proposed structure of *wh*-phrases: the part of *wh*-phrases, i.e., the OpP in (5), is claimed not to undergo syntactic movement.

(10) *anata-wa doo [John-ga dare-o aisiteiru ka]
 you-TOP how John-NOM who-ACC love Q
 omotteiru no? (J)
 think Q

'Who do you think that John loves?'

In summary, assuming that *wh*-phrases have a rich internal structure, we can offer a unified account for IPCs in Russian, German and Japanese. The difference between Russian and German, on the one hand, and Japanese, on the other, does not reflect the availability of *wh*-movement operation but it is the result of differing instantiations of a parameter that specifies the possible size of checking phrases; both a *wh*-stem and a large-scale *wh*-phrase in Russian and German, while only a large-scale pied-piping of a *wh*-phrase containing a *wh*-stem and its associated interrogative clause in the case of Japanese. The present analysis could also open the way for a possible typological correlation: only the language that uses the same *wh*-stem to build questions and existential/universal quantifiers has the Integrated Parenthetical Constructions.