

Free Relatives and Correlatives in Wh-in-situ

Ömer Demirok, MIT

Problem. What Cecchetto and Donati (2015) call *the labeling ambiguity* - exemplified by the paradigm in (1) - is precluded in many *wh-in-situ* languages. To illustrate, the *wh*-structures that receive the indirect question interpretation in Turkish (2a) and in Laz (3a) fail to function as *wh*-FRs. Both languages employ a gap in the relativization site (2b) and (3b). Interestingly, however, they exhibit *wh*-correlatives as shown in (4). (See Iatridou (2013) for the discussion on *wh*-correlatives in Turkish.)

- (1) I know/ate [*what he cooked*]. (indirect question/free relative)
- (2) a. John [Mary-nin **ne** pişir-diğ-in-i] bil-iyor
 John Mary-GEN what cook-NOML-3.SG.POS-ACC know-IMPF
 “John knows what Mary cooked.”
- b. John [Mary-nin **(*ne)** pişir-diğ-in-i] ye-di
 John Mary-GEN what cook-NOML-3.SG.POS-ACC eat-PST
 “John ate what Mary cooked.” (Turkish)
- (3) a. [ham **mi-k** na jk’omu] mişk’un
 this who-ERG COMP ate I.know
 “I know who ate this.”
- b. [ham **(*mi-k)** na jk’omu]-s motzondu
 this who-ERG COMP ate -DAT liked
 “Who(ever) ate this liked it.” (Laz)
- (4) a. [Mary ***(ne)** pişir-se] John on-u yer
 Mary what cook-CORR John that-ACC will.eat
 “John will eat whatever Mary cooks.” (Turkish)
- b. [ham ***(mi-k)** na jk’omu] himu-s motzondu
 this who-ERG COMP ate that-DAT liked
 “Whoever ate this liked it.” (Laz)

How can we make sense of the distribution in (1)-(4)? C&D (2015) conjecture that the absence of *wh*-FRs in *wh-in-situ* is predicted under their proposal whereby FRs are derived within the “move & project” approach. However, Tsez, as a *wh-in-situ* language, exhibits argumental FRs (5) (Polinsky, 2015).

- (5) hül babi-y-ä febi zek’a-zor magalu tetl
 yesterday father-OS-ERG who.ABS hit-PST.WIT.INTER-ATTR.OBL-LAT bread.ABS give.IMPER
 “Give the bread to whoever Father beat yesterday!” (Polinsky, 2015, ex. 131 p. 291)

Furthermore, it is not immediately clear under C&D (2015) why *wh*-correlatives are available in Laz and Turkish while *wh*-FRs are not. This becomes a problem particularly under the well-acknowledged view that the correlative clause involves relativization and is an adjunct FR (Izvorski, 1996 a.o) that is followed by a demonstrative proform in an argument/case position. Hence, we need to answer these two questions:

- i. What is it that allows a *wh-in-situ* language to have *wh*-correlatives but not *wh*-FRs?
- ii. How can Tsez, as a *wh-in-situ* language, have argumental *wh*-FRs?

Proposal. There is a typological bifurcation in the *wh*-syntax of languages: Type-1: *wh*-words denote predicates (e.g. [[what]] = $[\lambda x. x \text{ is inanimate}]$). They move (possibly “covertly”) [resulting in predicate abstraction] and generate a predicate base. (e.g. [[what λ_1 John ate t_1]] = $[\lambda x. x \text{ is inanimate and John ate } x]$). This derived predicate can combine with a Question operator yielding an interrogative structure (i), combine with *iota* yielding a FR (a definite description) (ii) (Caponigro, 2003), or combine with both Q and ι yielding a question-like FR (i.e. *wh-ever* FRs) (Hirsch, 2015). **i.** $Q(\text{what } \lambda_1 \text{ John ate } t_1) = \{\lambda w. \text{ John ate pasta in } w, \lambda w. \text{ John ate pizza in } w, \dots\}$ **ii.** $\iota(\text{what } \lambda_1 \text{ John ate } t_1) = \iota x. \text{ John ate } x$

Type-2: *wh*-words denote alternatives (e.g. [[who]] = $\{x \mid x \text{ is human}\}$) and compose with the rest of the structure via Pointwise Functional Application (Hamblin 1973), i.e. with no resort to movement. (e.g. PFA([[who]] [[came]]) = $\{\lambda w. \text{ John came in } w, \text{ Susan came in } w, \dots\}$)

In the proposed typology, a Type-2 language will never have *wh*-FRs as its genuinely in-situ *wh*-syntax will never yield a predicate base that the FR can build on. A Type-1 language, however, can freely build *wh*-questions and *wh*-FRs within the same *wh*-syntax that relies on predicate abstraction.

