

The V2-*wh*-copy construction in German

Background: As observed in Höhle (1989) (also Bayer 1996, Höhle 2000, Fanselow and Mahajan 2000, Pankau 2013), long *wh*-movement out of verb-final clauses in German may leave a copy: the *wh*-copy construction (1-a). Reis (2000, 395, footnote 33) notes that there is a variant of (1-a) that instantiates CP₁ as a V2-clause (1-b). I call this the V2-*wh*-copy construction.

- (1) a. [CP₂ Wen glaubst du [CP₁ wen sie heiraten wird]]?
who think you who she marry will
“Who do you think that she will marry?”
b. [CP₂ Wen glaubst du [CP₁ wen wird sie heiraten]]?
who think you who she will marry

Empirical study: I present a study that suggests that the V2-*wh*-copy construction is grammatical for a subgroup of speakers of German. It reveals the following properties of the construction. First, the number of copies is constrained to exactly two:

- (2) *[CP₃ Wen sagt sie [CP₂ wen glaubst du [CP₁ wen wird sie heiraten]]]?
who says she who think you who will she marry
“Who does she say that you think that she will marry?”

Second, the V2-*wh*-copy construction is subject to what Reis (1995, 50) calls the “V2 route restriction” (V2-RR), which states that putative extraction from a V2-clause may only target SpecC of another V2-clause, but not SpecC of a verb final clause:

- (3) a. *Es ist egal, [CP₂ wen₂ du glaubst [CP₁ wen₂ hat sie t₂ eingeladen]].
it is no.matter who you think who₂ has she invited
‘It doesn’t matter who you think that she invited.’
b. *Wo₂ meint er, [CP₂ t’₂ dass Peter geglaubt hat [CP₁ wo₂ wohnt sie t₂]]?
where thinks he that Peter thought has where lives she
‘Where does he think that Peter believed that she lives?’

Theoretical discussion: The second property suggests an analysis of the V2-*wh*-copy construction in terms of parenthesis (cf. Reis 2000, 395, footnote 33). The reason is that, as shown in Reis (1995), a parenthetical re-analysis of cases of putative extraction from V2-clauses without *wh*-copying (the EV2 construction in terms of Reis 1995) automatically derives the V2-RR.

It turns out that a parenthetical analysis of the V2-*wh*-copy construction (as opposed to the EV2 construction) is not straightforward. An extension of Murphy (2014) (a parenthetical analysis of the verb-final *wh*-copy construction) to the V2-*wh*-copy construction achieves this and has the additional merit of accounting for the restriction exemplified by (2). However, I illustrate that it also encounters various problems.

An alternative analysis in terms of extraction is presented that avoids these problems and also accounts for the restriction in (2). The rough idea is as follows. There is a constraint that bans movement of a category α across its own copy. Extraposition can apply before or after spell-out (Sauerland and Elbourne 2002). If it applies before spell-out, the *wh*-copy in the intermediate SpecC of the extraposed clause escapes deletion (there is no copy c-commanding the copy in the extraposed CP): *wh*-copying. If it applies after spell-out, the lower copy is deleted: no *wh*-copying. In derivations where three copies are generated, criterial movement (step h. in (4)) violates the constraint against crossing. No problem arises with verb-final copy-constructions because intermediate copies can incorporate into C (Nunes 1995).

(4) *Derivation of (2):*

- a. [TP sie wen heiraten wird] → cyclic movement
- b. [CP₁ wen wird [TP ... wen ...]] → (spell-out TP, copy is ⟨PF-deleted⟩)
- c. [CP₁ wen wird [TP ... ⟨wen⟩ ...]] → ...
- d. [TP du [CP₁ wen ... ⟨wen⟩ ...] glaubst] → cyclic movement
- e. [CP₂ wen glaubst du [CP₁ wen ... ⟨wen⟩ ...]] → extraposition CP₁
- f. [CP₂ [CP₂ wen glaubst du] [CP₁ wen ... ⟨wen⟩ ...]] → spell-out CP₁
- g. [CP₂ [CP₂ wen glaubst du] [CP₁ wen ... ⟨wen⟩ ...]] → ...
- h. [TP sie [CP₂ [CP₂ wen ...] [CP₁ wen ... ⟨wen⟩ ...]] sagt] → *criterial movement
- i. [CP₃ wen sagt sie [CP₂ [CP₂ wen ...] [CP₁ wen ... ⟨wen⟩ ...]]] → extraposition
- j. [CP₃ [CP₃ wen ...] [CP₂ [CP₂ wen ...] [CP₁ wen... ⟨wen⟩ ...]]] → spell-out CP₂

Whatever accounts for the V2-RR in a movement based approach to EV2-construction (e.g., Sternefeld 1989, Staudacher 1990, Haider 1993, Müller and Sternefeld 1993, Müller 2010) should carry over to the V2-*wh*-copy construction.

Selected references: •Bayer, Josef (1996): *Directionality and Logical Form: On the Scope of Focusing Particles and Wh-in-Situ*. Kluwer, Dordrecht. •Haider, Hubert (1993): 'ECP-Etüden: Anmerkungen zur Extraktion aus eingebetteten V/2-Sätzen', *Linguistische Berichte* 145, 185-203. •Höhle, Tilman (1989): *Die w-w-Konstruktion im Deutschen*. Ms., Universität Tübingen. •Müller, Gereon and Wolfgang Sternefeld (1993): 'Improper Movement and Unambiguous Binding', *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 461-507. •Murphy, Andrew (2014): 'Breaking chains: A parenthetical analysis of the German w...w-copy construction', *Wiener Linguistische Gazette* 78A, 198-217. •Pankau, Andreas (2013): *Wh-copying in German as replacement*. PhD thesis, Universiteit Utrecht. •Reis, Marga (1995): *Extractions from Verb-Second Clauses in German?*. In: U. Lutz and J. Pafel, eds, *On Extraction and Extraposition in German*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 45-88. •Reis, Marga (2000): *On the Parenthetical Features of German was...w-Constructions and How to Account for Them*. In: U. Lutz, G. Müller and A. von Stechow, eds, *Wh-Scope Marking*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 357-407.