

How Do You Think? On the Apparent *Wh*-Scope Marking in Russian

natasha korotkova

University of California, Los Angeles

“Parenthesis and Ellipsis: Cross-Linguistic and Theoretical Perspectives”
during 35. Jahrestagung der DGfS, Potsdam, Germany

March 13, 2013

The *kak*-construction

- a *kak*-clause with the fronted *wh*-adverbial *kak* ‘how’
- a *wh*-clause with a fronted *wh*-phrase

(1) *kak* ty *dumaesh*, *skol'ko* *chelovek*
how you.(SG)NOM think.2SG.PRES *how.many.NOM* people.GEN.PL
bylo *arestovano* *v* *stalinskie* *vremena?*
be.N.SG.PST arrest.PRT.N.SG in Stalin.PL.ACC time.PL.ACC
‘What do you think? How many people were arrested during the
Stalin time?’ (Russian National Corpus, henceforth RNC)

APPARENT EQUIVALENCE TO LONG EXTRACTION:

‘How many people do you think were arrested during the Stalin
time?’

wh-scope marking (Stepanov 2000; Fanselow 2006)

- the *wh*-clause is subordinate
- *kak* in the higher clause indicates matrix scope of the embedded *wh*-phrase

... or what?

- does not pattern with canonical scope marking in other languages
- exhibits puzzling properties
- some are explained by virtue of the *kak*-clause being an *As*-parenthetical (Korotkova 2012)
- but not all
- e.g. what do *As*-parentheticals mean in questions?
- proposal: parallel with perspective shift of evidential markers (Speas and Tenny 2003)

The phenomenon

- a minimally bi-clausal structure
- the *wh*-phrase in the lower clause determines what the entire question is about
- the upper clause predicate does not select for questions
- the upper clause may or may not contain a “meaningless” *wh*-phrase, labelled the scope marker / *wh*-expletive
- attested in Romani (McDaniel 1989), child English (Thornton 1990), Bahasa Indonesian, Hindi, Hungarian, German, Kikuyu, Malay (Lutz et al. 2000), Warlpiri (Legate 2002), Passamaquoddy (Bruening 2004), child French (Oiry and Demirdache 2006)

The phenomenon II

CHILD ENGLISH (Thornton 1990, 246)

(2) **What** do you think **which animal** says “woof woof”?

HUNGARIAN (Horvath 1997, 510)

(3) **Mit** gondolsz, hogy **kit** látott János?
what.ACC think.2SG that **who.ACC** saw.3SG John-NOM
 literally: What do you think, who John saw?
 ‘Who do you think that John saw?’

- **DIRECT DEPENDENCY** (van Riemsdijk 1982; McDaniel 1989): *wh*-expletive is replaced by the meaningful *wh*-phrase at LF; same LF as long extraction
- **INDIRECT DEPENDENCY** (Dayal 1994, 1996, 2000): the scope marker is co-indexed with the embedded clause and existentially quantifies over propositions, its interpretation being restricted by the *wh*-clause
- uniform account possible (Dayal 2000; Mahajan 2000) or not (Beck and Berman 2000)

Core Properties (Beck and Berman 2000)

	HUNGARIAN	GERMAN	HINDI	RUSSIAN
A. any <i>wh</i> -phrase	✓	✓	✓	✓
B. any amount of <i>wh</i> -phrases	✓	✓	✓	✓
C. locality	✓	✓	✓	✓
D. antilocality	✓	✓	✓	✓
E. ungrammaticality across negation	✓	✓	✓	✓
F. binding relations between clauses	✓	✓	✓	★
G. further embedding	✓	✓	✓	★
H. any [- <i>wh</i>]complement-taking predicate	✓	✓	✓	★
I. scope marking over polar questions	no	no	✓	✓

⇒ Russian is different from other languages (Korotkova (2012) for detail)

⇒ can the analysis still be along the same lines?

⇒ no evidence for movement with the *kak*-construction

⇒ Indirect Dependency? (Stepanov 2000)

(Dayal 2000, 190)

“The locus of variation in scope marking is the syntax not the semantics”.
NB: English sequential scope marking included

Stepanov (2000)'s claims

- restrictions on the *kak*-construction are syntactic
- predicates form a natural syntactic class: non-case marking with CP complements
- *kak* ‘how’ quantifies over propositions

Lines of defence I: predicates

Predicates in the *kak*-clause: a small subset of bridge verbs

(1) *kazatsia* 'seem', (2) *dumat* 'think', (3) *polagat* 'assume',
(4) *predpolagat* 'suppose', (5) *schitat* 'consider' (see Lahiri 2002 on
restrictions in Hindi)

(4) a. **kto** ty verish poletel na
who.NOM you.NOM be.confident.2SG.PRES fly.M.SG.PST to
mars?

Mars.ACC

'Who are you confident flew to Mars?'

b. ***kak** ty verish, **kto** poletel na
how you.NOM believe.2SG.PRES **who.NOM** fly.M.SG.PST to
mars?

Mars.ACC

Intended: 'What are you confident in? Who flew to Mars?'

Lines of defence I: predicates

- predicates in the *kak*-clause do not form a natural syntactic class:
 - *mereshit'sia* 'appear' and *chudit'sia* 'fancy' pattern with *kazatsia* 'seem'
 - but both are out in the *kak*-construction whereas *kazatsia* 'seem' is ok:

(5) **kak** tebe kazhetsia / *mereshitsia /
how you.DAT seem.3SG.PRES / appear.3SG.PRES /
*chuditsia, **kto** stuch-it v dver'?
fancy.3SG.PRES **who.NOM** knock-3SG.PRES in door.ACC
'What does it seem to you? Who is knocking at the door?'

⇒ the locus of variation drifts into semantics

Lines of defence II: ‘how’ vs. ‘what’

- Dayal (2000): if a language distinguishes between quantifiers over individuals vs. propositions, the latter is used a scope marker
 - most languages use ‘what’ for both
 - ‘what’ is the most common scope marker
 - Warlpiri (Legate 2002, 229–268): ‘what’ for individuals, ‘how’ for propositions and scope marking
- (6) a. What / *how did you eat?
b. How / *what did you say?
c. How / *what did you ask?
- (7) As a reply to something incomprehensible:
How / *what?

- Russian patterns with English, not with Warlpiri

- (8) a. Chto / *kak ty sjel?
what.ACC / how you(sg).NOM eat.M.SG.PST
'What did you eat?'
- b. Chto / *kak ty skazal?
what.ACC / how you(sg).NOM say.M.SG.PST
'What did you say?'
- c. Chto / *kak ty sprosil?
what.ACC / how you(sg).NOM ask.M.SG.PST
'What did you ask?'

⇒ *kak* 'how' does not quantify over propositions

The *kak*-construction is not an instance of *wh*-scope marking.

Relaxed linear order

- (9) *kak ty schita-esh, kogo ona liub-it?*
 how you.NOM consider-2SG.PRES who.ACC she-NOM love-3SG.PRES
 ‘What do you think? Whom does she love?’
- (10) *kogo, kak ty schita-esh, ona liub-it?*
- (11) *kogo ona, kak ty schita-esh, liub-it?*
- (12) *kogo ona liub-it, kak ty schita-esh?*

⇒ Such behaviour is a hallmark of parentheticals

How vs. as

Kak is the default way to introduce parentheticals (frequent merge of 'how' and 'as' (Haspelmath and Bucholz 1998, 287–288)):

- (13) *ej* *nuzhna* *postojannaja* “Bozhja”, ***kak***
 she.DAT necessary.F.SG constant.F.NOM.SG God's.F.NOM.SG as
ona ***dumaet***, *pomosch*, *chtoby* *zhit'*.
 she.NOM think.3SG.PRES help.NOM.SG to live.INF
 'She needs constant God's, as she thinks, help to live.' (RNC)

The *kak*-construction is a parenthetical.

Typical features I

The nature of parentheticals (Dehé and Kavalova 2007; Brinton 2008):
Quintessential lack of integration into the host clause

- prosody of parentheticals
 - surrounded by breaks and pauses
 - create separate intonational domains
 - change the pitch of the host
 - but cf. integrated parentheticals with no phonological effects (Reis 2000, 2002; Lubanska 2005; Peters 2006; Buffington 2013)
- the *kak*-construction
 - pauses (and commas/colons when written)
 - question intonation in the *kak*-clause (van Gelderen (2001) dismisses these prosodic characteristics and mistakenly treats the *kak*-construction as an integrated parenthetical à la Reis (2000))

Typical features II

- syntax of parentheticals
 - orphan constituents (Haegeman 1988)
 - adjuncts of some sort, from Ross (1973) to McCawley (1982) to Potts (2002)
 - ⇒ lack of syntactic interaction with the host clause; root clause status
- the *kak*-construction
 - relaxed linear order
 - lack of binding
 - non-embeddability

Some approaches to semantics

- extra-truth conditional (Ifantidou-Trouki 1993)
 - backgrounded and akin to presuppositions (Asher 2000)
 - not-at-issue meaning that is not part of the main assertion; trigger conventional implicatures (Potts 2002, 2005), also (Tonhauser et al. 2013)
- ⇒ lack of semantic interaction with propositional operators and with the host clause (AnderBois et al. (2010) for counterexamples)

Pottsian *As*-parentheticals (Potts 2002)

(14) As we all know, getting older isn't hard to do. (Google)

- English *As*-parentheticals trigger conventional implicatures
- lack of interaction (no binding, no negation) is due to multidimensionality (Schlenker (2013) for a unidimensional account)
 - syntactically: the widest scope via adjunction to the root
 - semantically: shift to the Conventional Dimension
 - Potts (2005, 2007): the shift is performed by the Comma operator (Potts (2002) has a different story)

Identifying not-at-issue content (Simons et al. 2010; Beaver 2012; Tonhauser et al. 2013)

- **PROJECTION**: survival under various propositional operators

(15) James was certain ten years ago that, as Wiles proved the other day, Fermat's Last Theorem is correct. (Potts 2002, 662)
- **BACKGROUNDEDNESS**: irrelevance for the main point of the utterance and inability to be challenged, or (dis)agreed with, in the subsequent discourse

(16) A. Who proved that Fermat's last theorem is correct?
B. # Fermat's Last Theorem, as Wiles proved, is correct.

(17) A. Fermat's Last Theorem, as Wiles proved, is correct.
B. #That's not true, Wiles did not prove it!

Buts

- all of the above applies only to declaratives
- examples of interrogative parentheticals: Reis (2000); Buffington (2013), *kak*-construction
- what do interrogative (*As*-)parentheticals do?
- what does it mean for a question to be not-at-issue?
- none of the tests above would work

Present tense

Future and past are not good:

- (18) kak ty schita-esh / #schita-la /
how you.NOM consider-2SG.PRES / consider-2SG.F.PST /
*bud-esh schita-t', kto pobedi-t?
be-2SG.FUT consider-INF who.NOM win-3SG.FUT
'What do you think / did you think / will you think? Who will win?'

Second person

- degraded third person subjects:

(19) ?*kak* *duma-et* *denis,* *kto* *stan-et*
how think-3SG.PRES Denis.NOM who.NOM become-3SG.FUT
prezident-om?
prezident-INS.SG
Intended: 'What does Denis think? Who will become the president?'

- banned first person subjects:

(20) **kak* *my* *duma-em,* *gde* *on-a?*
how we.NOM think-1PL.PRES where she-NOM
Intended: 'What do we think? Where is she?'

Length

- a tendency to have only *kak*, pronominal subject and the predicate in the *kak*-clause
- might be due to phonology, short adverbials like *sejchas* 'now' allowed

- these restrictions are not explained by Potts's theory
- Russian declarative *As*-parentheticals not restricted wrt to predicate, tense, person, or length

(21) ...kak vsem bylo izvestno iz ego stixov,
 as all.PL.DAT be.N.SG.PST known.N.SG from his poem.GEN.PL
 v Sibiri, v tajge rodilsia.
 in Siberia.NOM.LOC in taiga.NOM.LOC be.born.M.SG.PST
 'As everyone knew from his poems, he was born in Siberia, in
 taiga'. (RNC)

The *kak*-construction is a parenthetical but this is insufficient to explain all of its properties.

Similar, yet not equivalent, restrictions in slifting constructions (e.g. Lau and Rooryck (2012) for English):

- (22) Sneg rastajal, mne kazhetsia / ja
snow.NOM melt.M.SG.PST I.DAT seem₃SG.PRES / I.NOM
nadejus' / ja schitaju / *ty
hope₁SG.PRES / I.NOM suppose₁SG.PRES / you.NOM
schitaesch / *moja mama schitaet.
suppose.2SG.PRES / my.F.SG.NOM mom.SG.NOM suppose.3SG.PRES
'The snow has melted, it seems to me / I hope / I suppose / *you
suppose / *my mom supposes.'

Wh-slifting

Russian does not have *wh*-slifting per se:

(23) When will the snow melt do you think?

(24) *Kogda rastajet sneg, ty schitaesh /
when melt.M.SG.FUT snow.NOM you.NOM think.2SG.PRES /
ty dumaesh?
you.NOM suppose.2SG.PRES
Intended: 'When will the snow melt, do you think?'

⇒ *kak*-construction occupies this niche and instantiates some sort of *wh*-slifting

- syntax different from English wh-slifting (Haddican et al. 2011) (e.g. no evidence for movement)
- *kak*-construction grammaticises the implication carried by most questions: 'What do you (addressee) think on X?'; therefore:
 - the set of predicates is limited to the very general, bleached verbs of thinking
 - present tense
 - second person

Evidential markers

- grammatical encoding of the information source (Willet 1988; Aikhenvald 2004)
- not-at-issue: presuppositions (Izvorski 1997; Matthewson et al. 2008) or secondary assertions (Murray 2010; Koev 2011)
- prone to perspective shift when embedded under attitude reports (e.g. Tibetan, (Garrett 2001)) or when used in questions

Interrogative flip (Speas and Tenny 2003):

Evidence holder in interrogative context shifts from the speaker to the addressee

KOREAN (Lim 2011, 419-420)

- (25) a. John-i na-lul po-te-la.
John-NOM I-ACC see-te-DECL
'John saw me.'

Implication: The speaker has direct evidence that John saw the speaker himself/herself

- b. John-i na-lul po-te-nya?
John-NOM I-ACC see-te-Q
'Did John see me?'

Implication: The addressee is expected to answer based on his/her direct evidence relative to whether John saw the speaker or not

- parenthetical and similar constructions exhibit interrogative flip
- ENGLISH (*wh*-)SLIFTING

- (26) a. Spring has come, I think / #you think.
b. Has spring come, do you think / #do I think?

- the Russian *kak*-construction is an evidential of some sort (cf. Lau and Rooryck (2012) on English evidential parentheticals in slifting)

- syntax of the *kak*-construction is more complex
- semantics is the same
- non-presupposed content becomes presupposed in questions
- **second person**: orientation towards addressee
- **present tense**: orientation towards now of the addressee
- information source?
- Matthewson et al. (2008): modals/evidentials lexically encode
 - information source: direct, reported, inferred, etc.
 - quantificational force: existential vs. universal, e.g. may vs. must
- **choice of predicates**: 'think' in the *kak*-construction and denote a certain degree of confidence, i.e. quantification force and not information source
- another parallel: evidentials often resist embedding

- interrogative flip: Cheyenne (Murray 2010), Korean (Lim 2010, 2011), Cuzco Quechua (Faller 2002), Tibetan (Garrett 2001) a.o.
- if available shift is not always obligatory

CHEYENNE (Murray 2010, 42)

- (27) Tóne'se é-ho'eohtse-**sestse**
when 3-arrive-**RPT.3SG**
i. 'Given what you heard, when did he arrive?'
ii. 'He arrived sometime, I wonder when.'

Analysing interrogative flip

- Lim (2010, 2011); Murray (2012): parallels between evidentials and indexicals
- shifting profile of indexicals is different
- Murray (2010): update with centering analysis of optional shift
- Lim (2010, 2011): Kaplan's semantics for indexicals and Hamblin semantics for questions for the obligatory shift
- the *kak*-construction: obligatory shift

- the *kak*-construction is not *wh*-scope marking: plausible neither empirically nor theoretically
- the *kak*-construction is a parenthetical restricted to general verbs of thinking, second person and present tense
- traditional analysis of parentheticals does not explain these restrictions
- parallel with evidentials does

Slavic perspective

- some other Slavic languages use ‘how’ in a similar function: Bulgarian (Snezhina Dimitrova, p.c.), Polish (Lubanska 2005)
- some other use ‘what’: Chezh, Horvat (Philip Minlos, p.c.)
- how much do all of these constructions have in common?
- how does it correlate with the *wh*-profile of a language?

Thank you!

Many thanks also go to Anoop Mahajan, Daniel Buring, Vania Kapitonov, Hilda Koopman, Keir Moulton, Yael Sharvit, Tim Stowell, Anna Szabolcsi, Igor Yanovich, and audience of the UCLA SynSem seminar.

Glosses

1,2,3 person, ACC accusative case, DAT dative case, DEF definite determiner, F feminine, FUT future tense, GEN genitive case, INF infinitive, INS instrumental case, M masculine, N neuter, NOM nominative case, PL plural, PREP prepositional case, PRES present tense, PST past tense, Q question, SG singular

References I

- Aikhenvald, A. (2004). *Evidentiality*. Oxford: OUP.
- AnderBois, S., A. Brasoveanu, and R. Henderson (2010). Crossing the appositive/at-issue meaning boundary. In *Proceedings of SALT XX*.
- Asher, N. (2000). Truth conditional discourse semantics for parentheticals. *Journal of Semantics* 17(1), 31–50.
- Beaver, D. (2012). Anti-matters. At 'Questions in Discourse' during DGfS Jahrestagung, 7-9 March 2012, Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main.
- Beck, S. and S. Berman (2000). Wh-scope marking: Direct vs. indirect dependency. In U. Lutz, G. Müller, and A. von Stechow (Eds.), *Wh-Scope Marking*, pp. 17–44. John Benjamins.
- Brinton, L. J. (2008). *The Comment Clause in English: Syntactic Origins and Pragmatic Development (Studies in English Language)*. CUP.
- Bruening, B. (2004). Two types of wh-scope marking in Passamaquoddy. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22(2), 229–305.
- Buffington, J. (2013). What do you think's happening in English is surprising? (integrated parentheticals). Manuscript, UCLA.

References II

- Dayal, V. (1996). Scope marking: In defence of indirect dependency. In U. Lutz and G. Müller (Eds.), *Papers on Wh-Scope Marking*, Volume 340 of *Arbeitspapiere des Sonderforschungsbereichs*, pp. 107–130.
- Dayal, V. (2000). Scope marking: Cross-linguistics variation in indirect dependency. In U. Lutz, G. Müller, and A. von Stechow (Eds.), *Wh-Scope Marking*, pp. 157–194. John Benjamins.
- Dayal, V. S. (1994). Scope marking as indirect wh-dependency. *Natural Language Semantics* 2, 137–170.
- Dehé, N. and Y. Kavalova (Eds.) (2007). *Parentheticals*. John Benjamins.
- Faller, M. (2002). *Semantics and Pragmatics of evidentials in Cuzco Quechua*. Ph. D. thesis, Stanford.
- Fanselow, G. (2006). Partial wh-movement. In M. Everaert and H. Riemsdijk (Eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, pp. 437–492. Blackwell.
- Garrett, E. J. (2001). *Evidentiality and Assertion in Tibetan*. Ph. D. thesis, UCLA.
- Haddican, B., A. Holmberg, H. Tanaka, and G. Tsoulas (2011). English wh-slifing as an embedded root phenomenon. Submitted. research.ncl.ac.uk/yesandno/Wh-slifing%20submitted.pdf.

References III

- Haegeman, L. (1988). Parenthetical adverbials: the radical orphanage approach. In *Aspects of modern linguistics: Papeps presented to Masamoto Ukaji on his 60th birthday*, pp. 232–254.
- Haspelmath, M. and O. Bucholz (1998). Equative and similative constructions in the languages of Europe. In J. van der Auwera (Ed.), *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*, pp. 277–334. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Horvath, J. (1997). The status of ‘wh-expletives’ and the partial wh-movement construction of Hungarian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15(3), 509–572.
- Ifantidou-Trouki, E. (1993). Sentential adverbs and relevance. *Lingua* 90(1/2), 69–90.
- Izvorski, R. (1997). The present perfect as an epistemic modal. In *Proceedings of SALT XII*, pp. 222–239.
- Koev, T. (2011). Evidentiality and temporal distance learning. In *Proceedings of SALT XXI*, pp. 115–134.
- Korotkova, N. (2012). On alleged wh-scope marking in Russian. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 30*, pp. 205–215.
- Lahiri, U. (2002). On the proper treatment of “expletive wh” in Hindi. *Lingua* 112, 501–540.

References IV

- Lau, M. and J. Rooryck (2012). The syntax of SV \emptyset parentheticals. At “The Nature of Evidentiality”, 14–16 June 2012, Leiden University, <http://media.leidenuniv.nl/legacy/1au-rooryck.pdf>.
- Legate, J. A. (2002). *Warlpiri: Theoretical Implications*. Ph. D. thesis, MIT.
- Lim, D. (2011). Evidentials in interrogatives: A case study of Korean. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 15*, pp. 419–433.
- Lim, D. S. (2010). *Evidentials and interrogatives: a case study from Korean*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Southern California.
- Lubanska, M. (2005). *Focus on Wh-Questions*, Volume 278 of *Europäische Hochschulschriften*. Peter Lang.
- Lutz, U., G. Müller, and A. von Stechow (Eds.) (2000). *Wh-Scope Marking*. John Benjamins.
- Mahajan, A. (2000). Towards a unified treatment of wh-expletives in Hindi and German. In U. Lutz, G. Müller, and A. von Stechow (Eds.), *Wh-Scope Marking*, pp. 317–332. John Benjamins.
- Matthewson, L., H. Davis, and H. Rullman (2008). Evidentials as epistemic modals: Evidence from st’át’imcets. In J. van Craenenbroeck (Ed.), *Linguistic Variation Yearbook*, Volume 7. John Benjamins.

References V

- McCawley, J. (1982). Parentheticals and discontinuous constituent structure. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13(1), 91–106.
- McDaniel, D. (1989). Partial and multiple wh-movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 7, 565–604.
- Murray, S. (2010). *Evidentiality and the Structure of Speech Acts*. Ph. D. thesis, Rutgers.
- Murray, S. (2012). The indexical component of evidentiality. At a workshop "Meaning as Use: Indexality and Expressives" during NASSLLI 2012 in Austin, <http://conf.ling.cornell.edu/sem/NASSLLI.pdf>.
- Oiry, M. and H. Demirdache (2006). Evidence from L1 acquisition for the syntax of wh-scope marking in French. In V. Torrens and L. Escobar (Eds.), *The Acquisition of Syntax in Romance languages*, Volume 41 of *Language Acquisition and Language Disorders*, pp. 289–318. John Benjamins.
- Peters, J. (2006). Syntactic and prosodic parenthesis. In *Proceedings of the international conference on speech prosody*.
- Potts, C. (2002). The syntax and semantics of *As*-parentheticals. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20(3), 623–689.
- Potts, C. (2005). *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*. Oxford: OUP.

References VI

- Potts, C. (2007). Conventional implicatures, a distinguished class of meanings. In G. Ramchand and C. Reiss (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Interfaces*, pp. 475–501. OUP.
- Reis, M. (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*, pp. 359–408. John Benjamins.
- Reis, M. (2002). Wh-movement and integrated parenthetical constructions. In J.-W. Zwart and Werner Abraham (Eds.), *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax*. John Benjamins.
- Ross, J. R. (1973). Slifting. In *The Formal Analysis of Natural Language*, pp. 133–169. Mouton.
- Schlenker, P. (2013). Supplements without bidimensionality. Ms. Institut Jean-Nicod, CNRS; New York University.
- Simons, M., J. Tonhauser, D. Beaver, and C. Roberts (2010). What projects and why. *Proceedings of SALT 20*, 309–327.
- Speas, M. and C. Tenny (2003). Configurational properties of point of view roles. In A. M. DiSciullo (Ed.), *Asymmetry in Grammar*, pp. 315–343. John Benjamins.
- Stepanov, A. (2000). Wh-scope marking in Slavic. *Studia Linguistica* 54, 1–40.

References VII

- Thornton, R. (1990). *Adventures in Long-Distance Moving: The Acquisition of Complex Wh-Questions*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Connecticut.
- Tonhauser, J., D. Beaver, C. Roberts, and M. Simons (2013). Towards a taxonomy of projective content. *Language*, to appear.
- van Gelderen, V. (2001). Partial wh-movement in Russian. *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, 89–100.
- van Riemsdijk, H. (1982). Correspondence effects and the Empty Category Principle. *Tilburg papers in Language and Literature* 12.
- Willet, T. (1988). A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12, 51–97.