

Integrated Parenthetical Constructions and Long *Wh*-Movement

In practically all Germanic languages we find long *wh*-movement constructions (WMCs) from complement clauses as well as integrated parenthetical constructions (IPCs); cf. the examples from English in (1)-(2):

- (1) a. WMC (-*wh*): [This book_i I think [(that) you should read t_i]]
b. WMC (+*wh*): [What_i do you think [(that) he should read t_i]]
(2) a. IPC (-*wh*): [This book_i you should read t_i , [I think]]
[This book_i [I think] you should read t_i]
b. IPC (+*wh*): [What_i should he read t_i , [do you think]]
[What_i [do you think] should he read t_i]

Their standard analyses are roughly exemplified in (1)-(2): While WMCs come about by *extraction* of a $\pm wh$ phrase into the matrix clause, IPCs are parenthetical *insertion* constructions of a special sort: (i) the proposition of the host clause always satisfies the object requirement of the parenthetical verb which must not be satisfied in the parenthetical clause itself; (ii) the parenthetical clause plus its host clause form one prosodic domain (i.e. no comma intonation, just one focus-background structure, the main accent being located in the host clause), i.o.w. inserted parenthetical and host clause are interpretively as well as prosodically *integrated*. This property distinguishes IPCs from parenthetical constructions like *Peter - this much is CLEAR - will come, TOO*, etc., and gives rise as we shall see to special interpretive effects.

Obviously, $\pm wh$ -WMCs and $\pm wh$ IPCs have near identical use value, (1a)-(2a) assert and (1b)-(2b) question practically the same thing from the same person's perspective. This parallelism is clearly mediated by WMCs and IPCs using overlapping grammatical means (in particular, the same predicates figuring in integrated parentheticals (IPs) may also figure as bridge predicates in corresponding WMCs, though not vice versa). Note also that prefinite IPCs and WMCs are frequently identical in surface structure (cf. for example 1a,2a). Still, it has always been tacitly taken for granted that IPCs and WMCs are structurally worlds apart, for which good reasons can be cited: First, the range of WMCs and IPCs extends beyond the clear points of contact illustrated in (1)-(2) in diverging ways (*wh*-movement also applies in relative clause formation, comparative constructions etc., is not confined to extractions from complement clauses; IP insertion also applies to *yes-no* questions). Second, *wh*-movement may apply recursively, also building up embedded structures, and clearly belongs to sentence grammar, whereas parenthetical insertion is (pragmatically) main clause bound and may have to be relegated to discourse grammar. If so, the undeniable closeness between IPCs (especially prefinite ones) and a certain subtype of WMCs seems to be a purely *semantopragmatic* fact, without any syntactic significance. It is in keeping with this impression that IPCs – in contrast to WMCs, which play a central role for generative theorizing and are also a well-studied area in the Germanic languages – have hardly been mentioned let alone integrated into the analysis of complex *wh*-constructions at all, no matter which complex *wh*-construction in which Germanic language we look at.

What I would like to show in my talk is, expectably, that this neglect of IPCs is harmful, *even if you are only interested in the syntax of wh-movement constructions*. To this end I will report on work I have done in the last few years on two German *wh*-constructions in which according to standard wisdom long *wh*-movement is crucially involved, (i) so-called extractions from V2-clauses like (3), (ii) so-called partial movement constructions (= '*was...w*-constructions') like (4):

- (3) a. Dieses Buch glaube ich solltest du lesen
‘This book I think you should read’
- b. Was glaubst du soll er lesen?
‘What do you think he should read?’
- (4) Was glaubst du, welches Buch ich lesen sollte?
‘Which book do you think I should read?’

Concerning (i) I will argue based on a close comparison with bona fide IPCs like (5) and bona fide extraction structures like (6) that cases like (3) are in reality prefinite IPCs; the evidence will be come from structural, interpretive and comparative considerations.

- (5) Dieses Buch solltest du (glaube ich) lesen (glaube ich).
Was sollte er (glaubst du) lesen (glaubst du)?
- (6) Dieses Buch glaube ich dass du lesen solltest.
Was glaubst du, dass er lesen sollte?

Turning then to (ii), I will first show that there are parenthetical *was*-constructions in German like (7) which share the ‘integrated’ properties of IPCs,

- (7) Was glaubst du, welches Buch soll er lesen?
Welches Buch soll er lesen, was glaubst du?

and then show that there are salient, hitherto unnoticed parallels between the entire range of IPCs and the *was...w*-constructions like (4), which given the syntactic distance normally assumed between IPCs and WMCs seem hard to reconcile with the way complex *wh*-constructions have so far been handled in generative theory.

The main thrust of my talk, then, will be descriptive and Germanocentric at that. However, if my results concerning (i) and (ii) are convincing, they will have interesting theoretical and comparative implications, to at least some of which I will try to do justice as we go along and in my concluding remarks.