The composite derivation of Shona partial wh-movement

Jason Zentz
Yale University
jason.zentz@yale.edu

1 Overview

Wh-question formation strategies can be categorized according to whether the wh-phrase is pronounced in its scopal position, its thematic position, or in between:

(1) a. Wh-in-situ: [cp Scopal … Thematic=Pronounced …]

b. Full wh-movement: [cp Pronounced=Scopal … Thematic …]

c. Partial wh-movement: [cp Scopal … [cp Pronounced … Thematic …]]

Roadmap:

§ 2: Previous approaches to (simple) partial wh-movement

§ 3: Island sensitivity of Shona partial wh-movement

§ 4: A composite derivation for Shona partial wh-movement

Today, I will demonstrate how this empirical generalization suggests that a composite derivation of partial wh-movement is indeed possible.
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1 Shona examples appear in the standard orthography, which does not mark tone. The graphemes that depart from IPA usage are given here with their IPA equivalents: <ch> [tʃ], <g> [ɡ], <j> [dʒ], <ng> [ŋɡ], <ny> [ɲ], <sh> [ʃ], <v> [ʋ], <y> [j].

2 For the sake of clarity and consistency, I have occasionally adjusted glosses and translations in examples cited from other sources, following the Leipzig Glossing Rules wherever possible. Abbreviations used include: 1pl = first person plural, 1sg = first person singular, 2sg = second person singular, appl = applicative, caus = causative, cop = copula, foc = focus, fv = final vowel, hab = habitual, nse = non-subject extraction, pfv = perfective, poss = possessive, prs = present, pst = past, sm = subject marker. Bare numerals (and also 1a and 2a) in glosses indicate noun class, encoding both number and gender features.
2 Previous approaches

2.1 Island sensitivity and partial wh-movement

2.1.1 Singaporean Malay

In Singaporean Malay, an island boundary may intervene between an in-situ wh-phrase and its scopal position (3a), but wh-ex-situ is sensitive to islands whether above or below the pronunciation site of the wh-phrase (3b–d).

(3) Island sensitivity in Singaporean Malay (Cole & Hermon 1998)

a. Wh-in-situ: \[
\left[\text{CP Scop} \ldots \left[\text{island} \ldots \left[\text{CP} \ldots \left[\text{Them} \equiv \text{Pron}\right]\right]\right]\right]
\]

b. Full wh-movement: \[
\text{*}\left[\text{CP Pron}=\text{Scop} \ldots \left[\text{island} \ldots \left[\text{CP} \ldots \left[\text{Them}\right]\right]\right]\right]\]

c. Partial wh-movement: \[
\text{*}\left[\text{CP Scop} \ldots \left[\text{CP Pron} \ldots \left[\text{island} \ldots \left[\text{Them}\right]\right]\right]\right]\]

d. Partial wh-movement: \[
\text{*}\left[\text{CP Scop} \ldots \left[\text{island} \ldots \left[\text{CP Pron} \ldots \left[\text{Them}\right]\right]\right]\right]\]

(4) Complex DP island (relative clause)

a. Wh-in-situ within a subject relative clause
Kamu sayang [island perempuan yang Ali fikir] [Singaporean Malay] you love [woman that Ali thinks]
[cp yang telah makan apa]? that already eat what
‘What do you love the woman who Ali thinks ate ___?’
(Cole & Hermon 1998: 235 (34b))

b. Full wh-movement out of a subject relative clause
* [cp Pron=Scop ... [cp ... [island ... [cp ... [Them]]]]]

2.1.2 Kîîtharaka

The same pattern is found in Kîîtharaka ([thk], Bantu E54, Kenya).

(5) Island sensitivity in Kîîtharaka (Abels 2012)

a. Wh-in-situ: \[
\left[\text{CP Scop} \ldots \left[\text{CP} \ldots \left[\text{island} \ldots \left[\text{CP} \ldots \left[\text{Them} \equiv \text{Pron}\right]\right]\right]\right]\right]
\]

b. Full wh-movement: \[
\text{*}\left[\text{CP Pron}=\text{Scop} \ldots \left[\text{island} \ldots \left[\text{CP} \ldots \left[\text{Them}\right]\right]\right]\right]\]

c. Partial wh-movement: \[
\text{*}\left[\text{CP Scop} \ldots \left[\text{CP Pron} \ldots \left[\text{island} \ldots \left[\text{Them}\right]\right]\right]\right]\]

d. Partial wh-movement: \[
\text{*}\left[\text{CP Scop} \ldots \left[\text{island} \ldots \left[\text{CP Pron} \ldots \left[\text{Them}\right]\right]\right]\right]\]

c. Partial wh-movement out of a subject relative clause
* Ali memberitahu kamu [cp apa yang Mari fikir] [Singaporean Malay] Ali told you what that Mari think
[cp dia suka [island perempuan yang beli ___]]? he likes woman that buy
‘What did Ali tell you that Mary thinks that he likes a woman who bought ___?’
(Cole & Hermon 1998: 235 (33))

d. Partial wh-movement within a subject relative clause
* Kamu sayang [island perempuan yang Ali fikir] [Singaporean Malay] you love [woman that Ali thinks]
[cp apa yang telah makan ___]? what that already eat
‘What do you love the woman who Ali thinks ate ___?’
(Cole & Hermon 1998: 235 (35b))

Cole & Hermon (1998) show further that the higher relation’s island sensitivity extends beyond relative islands to subject islands, adjunct islands, wh-islands, factive islands, and negative islands.
(6) Complex DP island (relative clause)
a. Wh-in-situ within a subject relative clause
   *U-ri-thûgan-i-a  
   2SG.SM-PRS-think-CAUS-FV  1SG.SM-hit-PPV-FV
   [island mw-ari û-ra  a-u-g-ir-e  [cp ati Peter
   1-girl 1-that 1.SM-say-PPV-FV that 1.Peter
   a-gur-ir-e  ûû]]?
   1.SM-marry-PPV-FV who
   ‘Who do you think I hit the girl who said that Peter will marry ___?’
   (Abels 2012: 71 (10a))

b. Full wh-movement out of a subject relative clause
   *N-ûû  ú-kû-thûgan-i-a  
   2SG.SM-PRS-think-CAUS-FV  FOC-1SG.SM-hit-PPV-FV
   [island mw-ari û-ra  n-a-u-g-ir-e  [cp ati Peter
   1-girl 1-that FOC-1.SM-say-PPV-FV that 1.Peter
   n-a-gur-ir-e  ____]]?
   FOC-1.SM-marry-PPV-FV
   ‘Who do you think I hit the girl who said that Peter will marry ___?’
   (Abels 2012: 71 (10e))

c. Partial wh-movement out of a subject relative clause
   *U-ri-thûgan-i-a  
   2SG.SM-PRS-think-CAUS-FV  FOC-who  1SG.SM-hit-PPV-FV
   [island mw-ari û-ra  n-a-u-g-ir-e  [cp ati Peter
   1-girl 1-that FOC-1.SM-say-PPV-FV that 1.Peter
   n-a-gur-ir-e  ____]]?
   FOC-1.SM-marry-PPV-FV
   ‘Who do you think I hit the girl who said that Peter will marry ___?’
   (Abels 2012: 71 (10d))

d. Partial wh-movement within a subject relative clause
   *U-ri-thûgan-i-a  
   2SG.SM-PRS-think-CAUS-FV  1SG.SM-hit-PPV-FV
   [island mw-ari û-ra  a-u-g-ir-e  [cp ati n-ûû Peter
   1-girl 1-that 1.SM-say-PPV-FV that FOC-who 1.Peter
   a-gur-ir-e  ____]]?
   1.SM-marry-PPV-FV
   ‘Who do you think I hit the girl who said that Peter will marry ___?’
   (Abels 2012: 71 (10b))

(7) Fanselow’s (2006) Generalization S4:
A wh-phrase that has undergone (partial) wh–movement must not be separated from its scope position by an island for movement.

2.2 Partial wh-movement is an independent construction

2.2.1 Covert (LF) movement

(Saddy 1991 for Indonesian, Cole & Hermon 1998 for Singaporean Malay)

- Lower relation: overt wh-movement (as in full wh-movement)
- Higher relation: covert (LF) wh-movement (unlike either wh-in-situ or full wh-movement)

(8) Cole & Hermon’s (1998) analysis of Singaporean Malay

a. Wh-in-situ:
   [cp Op ... [island ... [cp ... wh]]]
   unselective binding

b. Full wh-movement:
   *[cp wh ... [cp ... [island ... wh]]]
   overt wh-movement

c. Partial wh-movement:
   *[cp wh ... [cp wh ... [cp ... [island ... wh]]]]
   overt wh-movement

d. Partial wh-movement:
   *[cp wh ... [island ... [cp wh ... wh]]]
   covert wh-movement
2.2.2 Overt movement of a null operator

(Abels 2012 for Kîîtharaka)

- **Lower relation**: overt focus movement of a null focus operator, pied-piping the *wh*-phrase (as in full *wh*-movement)
- **Higher relation**: overt *wh*-movement of the null focus operator, stranding the *wh*-phrase (unlike either *wh*-in-situ or full *wh*-movement)

(9) *Abels’s (2012) analysis of Kîîtharaka*

a. *Wh*-in-situ: \[ \text{cp} \{uWh\} \ldots \text{island} \ldots \text{scop} \text{wh} \]  
   down¬ward agreement

b. Full *wh*-movement: \[ *\text{cp} \{Op-wh\} \ldots \text{island} \ldots \text{scop} \text{wh} \]  
   overt focus movement

c. Partial *wh*-movement: \[ *\text{cp} \{Op \ldots \text{island} \ldots \text{scop} \text{wh} \} \]  
   overt focus movement

d. Partial *wh*-movement: \[ *\text{cp} \{Op \ldots \text{island} \ldots \text{scop} \text{wh} \} \]  
   overt *wh*-movement

2.3 Partial *wh*-movement is not an independent construction

2.3.1 Partial *wh*-movement assimilated to full *wh*-movement

(Fanselow & Ćavar 2001 and Richards 2001 for Singaporean Malay and Indonesian)

Fanselow & Ćavar (2001) and Richards (2001: §3.2) assimilate partial *wh*-movement to full *wh*-movement. In both strategies, the *wh*-phrase moves overtly to the scopal position; what varies is which copy is pronounced.

2.3.2 Partial *wh*-movement is a hybrid of *wh*-in-situ and full *wh*-movement

This is the analysis presented by Sabel (2000: 441) for Kikuyu and Sabel & Zeller (2006: 280) for Zulu, but no island data are discussed there.

Abels (2012: 155–156) proposes this as the simplest way to model simple partial *wh*-movement within his theory, but then because of the impossibility of islands above the pronunciation site in Kîîtharaka and Singaporean Malay he introduces the null operator that moves from the pronunciation site to the scopal position.

**Prediction**: Partial *wh*-movement that is sensitive to islands below but not above the pronunciation site of the *wh*-phrase.

3 Shona island data

Just as in Singaporean Malay and Kîîtharaka, Shona partial *wh*-movement out of an island is impossible (10c), like full *wh*-movement (10b). In contrast to Singaporean Malay and Kîîtharaka, Shona allows partial *wh*-movement within an island (10d), like *wh*-in-situ (10a). According to Kandybowicz & Torrence (2014), Krachi (Kwa, Ghana) shows the same pattern.

(10) *Island sensitivity in Shona*

a. *Wh*-in-situ: \[ \text{cp} \{Scop \ldots \text{island} \ldots \text{scop} \text{Them} \ldots \text{Pron} \} \]  
   OK

b. Full *wh*-movement: \[ *\text{cp} \{Scop \ldots \text{island} \ldots \text{scop} \text{Them} \} \]  
   X

c. Partial *wh*-movement: \[ *\text{cp} \{Scop \ldots \text{island} \ldots \text{scop} \text{Them} \} \]  
   X

d. Partial *wh*-movement: \[ \text{cp} \{Scop \ldots \text{island} \ldots \text{scop} \text{Them} \} \]  
   OK

Below, I illustrate this pattern for adjunct islands, complement clause islands, and relative clause islands.
(11) **Adjunct island**

a. **Wh-in-situ within an adverbial clause**

\[
\text{W-ai-fung-a} \quad \text{nokuti} \quad v\text{-aka-ner-a} \quad \text{ma-purisa} \\
\text{2SG.SM-PST-HAB\-think-FV} \quad \text{that} \quad \text{2.SM-PST\-call-FV} \quad \text{6-police} \\
[\text{island} \text{nokuti} \quad v\text{-aka-on-a} \quad \text{Ø\-ani}]
\]

because \text{2.SM-PST\-see-FV} \text{1a\-who}

‘Who(m) did you think they called the police because they saw ___?’

(2014-09-27-01-TD)

b. **Full wh-movement out of an adverbial clause**

\*\text{Ndi-Ø-ani} \quad \text{wa-w-ai-fung-a} \quad [\text{cp} \text{kuti} \text{cop-1a-who} \text{1a.NSE-2SG.SM-PST-HAB\-think-FV} \text{that} \text{v\text{-aka-ner-a} \text{ma-purisa} [\text{island} \text{nokuti} \text{v\text{-aka-on-a} ___]}}]

\text{2.SM-PST\-call-FV} \text{6-police because 2.SM-PST\-see-FV}

‘Who(m) did you think they called the police because they saw ___?’

(2014-09-27-01-TD)

c. **Partial wh-movement out of an adverbial clause**

\*\text{W-ai-fung-a} \quad [\text{cp} \text{kuti} \text{ndi-Ø-ani} \text{wa-v-aka-ner-a} \text{ma-purisa} \text{[island} \text{nokuti} \text{v\text{-aka-on-a ___]]}})

\text{2.SM-PST\-call-FV} \text{6-police because 2.SM-PST\-see-FV}

‘Who(m) did you think they called the police because they saw ___?’

(2014-09-27-01-TD)

d. **Partial wh-movement within an adverbial clause**

\text{W-ai-fung-a} \quad [\text{cp} \text{kuti} \text{v\text{-aka-ner-a} \text{ma-purisa}} \text{2SG.SM-PST-HAB\-think-FV} \text{that 2.SM-PST\-call-FV} \text{6-police}]

[\text{island} \text{nokuti} \text{ndi-Ø-ani} \text{wa-v-aka-on-a ___]]}

because \text{cop-1a-who} \text{1a.NSE-2.SM-PST-see-FV}

‘Who(m) did you think they called the police because they saw ___?’

(2014-09-27-01-TD)

(12) **Complex DP island (complement clause)**

a. **Wh-in-situ within a DP’s clausal complement**

\text{W-aka-nzw-a} \quad [\text{cp} \text{kuti} \text{v\text{-aka-ramb-a} \text{ny-aya}} \text{2SG.SM-PST\-hear-FV} \text{that 2.SM-PST\-deny-FV 9-story}]

[\text{island ye-kuti} \text{y\text{-aka-ram} used} \text{pa-Ø-gumbo}]

9.of-that \text{9.SM-PST\-bite-FV 1a\-who} \text{16-5-leg}

‘Who(m) did you hear that they denied the story that it (their dog) bit ___ on the leg?’

(2014-09-27-01-TD)

b. **Full wh-movement out of a DP’s clausal complement**

\*\text{Ndi-Ø-ani} \quad \text{wa-w-aka-nzw-a} \quad [\text{cp} \text{kuti} \text{v\text{-aka-ramb-a} \text{cop-1a-who} \text{1a.NSE-2SG.SM-PST\-hear-FV} \text{that} \text{2.SM-PST\-deny-FV} \text{ny-aya} \text{[island ye-kuti} \text{y\text{-aka-ram-a} ___ pa-Ø-gumbo}]

9-story 9.of-that \text{9.SM-PST\-bite-FV} \text{16-5-leg}

‘Who(m) did you hear that they denied the story that it (their dog) bit ___ on the leg?’

(2014-09-27-01-TD)

c. **Partial wh-movement out of a DP’s clausal complement**

\*\text{W-aka-nzw-a} \quad [\text{cp} \text{kuti} \text{ndi-Ø-ani} \text{wa-v-aka-ramb-a} \text{cop-1a-who} \text{1a.NSE-2SG.SM-PST\-hear-FV} \text{that} \text{2.SM-PST\-deny-FV} \text{ny-aya} \text{[island ye-kuti} \text{y\text{-aka-ram-a} ___ pa-Ø-gumbo}]

9-story 9.of-that \text{9.SM-PST\-bite-FV} \text{16-5-leg}

‘Who(m) did you hear that they denied the story that it (their dog) bit ___ on the leg?’

(2014-09-27-01-TD)

d. **Partial wh-movement within a DP’s clausal complement**

\text{W-aka-nzw-a} \quad [\text{cp} \text{kuti} \text{v\text{-aka-ramb-a} \text{ny-aya}} \text{2SG.SM-PST\-hear-FV} \text{that} \text{cop-1a-who} \text{1a.NSE-2.SM-PST\-deny-FV} \text{ny-aya} \text{[island ye-kuti} \text{y\text{-aka-ram-a} ___ pa-Ø-gumbo}]

9-story 9.of-that \text{9.SM-PST\-bite-FV} \text{16-5-leg}

‘Who(m) did you hear that they denied the story that it (their dog) bit ___ on the leg?’

(2014-09-27-01-TD)
(13) Complex DP island (relative clause)
   a. Wh-in-situ within a subject relative clause
      U-no-fung-a \([_{cp} \text{kuti a-no-farir-a} [_{island} \text{chi-kwata} 2sGSM-PRS-think-FV that 1sSM-PRS-like-FV 7-team chi-no-bv-a ku-pi] 7SM-PRS-be.from-FV 17-which]
      ‘Where do you think s/he likes the team that is from ____?’
   b. Full wh-movement out of a subject relative clause
      *Nde-ku-pi kwa-a-no-farir-a [_{island} chi-kwata cop-17-which 17NSE-1SM-PRS-like-FV 7-team cha-u-no-fung-a [_{cp} kuti chi-no-bv-a ____] 7SM-PRS-be.from-FV]
      ‘Where does s/he like the team that you think is from ____?’
   c. Partial wh-movement out of a subject relative clause
      ?A-no-farir-a [_{island} chi-kwata cha-u-no-fung-a [_{cp} kuti 1sSM-PRS-like-FV 7-team 7NSE-2SgSM-PRS-think-FV that nde-ku-pi kwa-chi-no-bv-a ____] cop-17-which 17NSE-7SM-PRS-be.from-FV]
      ‘Where does s/he like the team that you think is from ____?’

(14) Complex DP island (relative clause)
   a. Wh-in-situ within a subject relative clause
      A-no-farir-a [_{island} chi-kwata cha-u-no-fung-a [_{cp} kuti 1sSM-PRS-like-FV 7-team 7NSE-2SgSM-PRS-think-FV that chi-no-bv-a ku-pi] 7SM-PRS-be.from-FV 17-which]
      ‘Where does s/he like the team that you think is from ____?’
   b. Full wh-movement out of a subject relative clause
      *Nde-ku-pi kwa-a-no-farir-a [_{island} chi-kwata cop-17-which 17NSE-1SM-PRS-like-FV 7-team cha-u-no-fung-a [_{cp} kuti chi-no-bv-a ____] 7SM-PRS-be.from-FV]
      ‘Where does s/he like the team that you think is from ____?’
   c. Partial wh-movement within a subject relative clause
      ?A-no-farir-a [_{island} chi-kwata cha-u-no-fung-a [_{cp} kuti 1sSM-PRS-like-FV 7-team 7NSE-2SgSM-PRS-think-FV that nde-ku-pi kwa-chi-no-bv-a ____] cop-17-which 17NSE-7SM-PRS-be.from-FV]
      ‘Where does s/he like the team that you think is from ____?’

4 Composite derivation of partial wh-movement

- Lower relation: overt focus movement (as in full wh-movement)
- Higher relation: unselective binding (Pesetsky 1987) (as in wh-in-situ)
  (Sabel 2000, Sabel & Zeller 2006)
4.1 Lower relation assimilated to full wh-movement

4.1.1 Island sensitivity

As we saw in §3, the lower relation in partial wh-movement is sensitive to islands in exactly the same way as the full wh-movement relation. This follows if both are instances of overt focus movement.

4.1.2 Cleft structure

Shona full wh-movement involves clefting, observable morphologically by the allomorph of the copula ndi- attached to the wh-phrase (16b). Partial wh-movement is similarly impossible without clefting (16c).

(16) Wh-phares marked with ndi-

a. Wh-in-situ cannot have ndi-

\[
\text{W-ai-fung-a} \quad \text{[cp kuti t-aka-teng-er-a]}
\]

\[
\text{2SG.SM-PST.HAB-think-FV} \quad \text{that 1PL.SM-PST-BUY-APPL-FV}
\]

\[\text{*(ndi)-O-ani} \quad \text{Ø-rokwe}\]?

\text{cop-1a-who} \quad 5\text{-dress}

‘Who(m) did you think we bought a dress (for)?’ (2014-07-30-01-TD)

b. Full wh-movement requires ndi-

\[\text{*(ndi)-O-ani} \quad \text{wa-w-ai-fung-a} \quad \text{[cp kuti}
\]

\[
\text{cop-1a-who} \quad 1a.NSE-2SG.SM-PST.HAB-think-FV \quad \text{that}
\]

\[
\text{t-aka-teng-er-a} \quad \text{Ø-rokwe}\]

\[
\text{1PL.SM-PST-BUY-APPL-FV} \quad 5\text{-dress}
\]

‘Who(m) did you think we bought a dress (for)?’ (2014-07-30-01-TD)

c. Partial wh-movement requires ndi-

\[\text{W-ai-fung-a} \quad \text{[cp kuti}
\]

\[
\text{*(ndi)-O-ani} \quad \text{wa-t-aka-teng-er-a} \quad \text{[cop-1a-who}
\]

\[
\text{2SG.SM-PST.HAB-think-FV} \quad \text{that}
\]

\[
\text{cop-1a-who} \quad 1a.NSE-1PL.SM-PST-BUY-APPL-FV \quad 5\text{-dress}
\]

‘Who(m) did you think we bought a dress (for)?’ (2014-07-30-01-TD)

4.1.3 Extraction marking

When a non-subject like the indirect object ani ‘who’ in (17a–b) is extracted for either full wh-movement or partial wh-movement, the verb in the clause in which the wh-phrase is pronounced must agree with it in ϕ-features (in addition to bearing ϕ-agreement with the subject).³

(17) Non-subject extraction marking

a. Full wh-movement requires extraction marking in the pronunciation clause

\[\text{Ndi-Ø-ani} \quad *(wa)-w-ai-fung-a \quad \text{[cp kuti}
\]

\[
\text{cop-1a-who} \quad 1a.NSE-2SG.SM-PST.HAB-think-FV \quad \text{that}
\]

\[
\text{t-aka-teng-er-a} \quad \text{Ø-rokwe}\]

\[
\text{1PL.SM-PST-BUY-APPL-FV} \quad 5\text{-dress}
\]

‘Who(m) did you think we bought a dress (for)?’ (2014-07-30-01-TD)

b. Partial wh-movement requires extraction marking in the pronunciation clause

\[\text{W-ai-fung-a} \quad \text{[cp kuti}
\]

\[
\text{ndi-Ø-ani} \quad \text{wa-w-ai-fung-a} \quad \text{[cop-1a-who}
\]

\[
\text{2SG.SM-PST.HAB-think-FV} \quad \text{that}
\]

\[
\text{cop-1a-who} \quad 1a.NSE-1PL.SM-PST-BUY-APPL-FV \quad 5\text{-dress}
\]

‘Who(m) did you think we bought a dress (for)?’ (2014-07-30-01-TD)

4.1.4 Reconstruction effects

Ex-situ wh-phrases reconstruct to their base position; this is true for both full wh-movement and partial wh-movement. This suggests that it is the movement of the wh-phrase itself rather than a null operator that is responsible for the island effects associated with clefting (Torrence 2013).

³The location of extraction marking is dependent on the location of the pronunciation site of the wh-phrase. Thus, the extraction marking appears in different clauses for full wh-movement versus partial wh-movement, but the generalization still holds that the pronunciation clause verb must agree with a clefted non-subject wh-phrase.
(18) Reconstruction of a pronoun bound by a subject quantifier

a. **Wh-in-situ**: Quantifier c-commands pronounced copy of pronoun

\[ \text{U-no-fung-a} \quad \text{[cp kuti \[dp mw-ana w-ese]\]} \]
\[2SG.SM-PRS-think-FV \quad \text{that 1-child 1-every} \]
\[a-no-kosh-es-a \quad \text{[dp ma-onero a-Ø-ani e-kuti]} \]
\[1.SM-PRS-be.valued-CAUS-FV \quad 6-view 6.of-1a-who 6.of-that \]
\[a_{1}\text{-ka-ngwar-a}]? \]
\[1.SM-PST-be.smart-FV \]

‘Whose opinion that s/he is smart do you think every child\text{’}s values?’ (2014-10-04-02-TD)

b. **Full wh-movement**: Quantifier does not c-command pronounced copy of pronoun

\[ \text{[dp Má-onero a-Ø-ani e-kuti a}_{1}\text{-ka-ngwar-a]} \]
\[\text{cop.6-view 6.of-1a-who 6.of-that 1.SM-PST-be.smart-FV} \]
\[a-u-no-fung-a \quad \text{[cp kuti \[dp mw-ana w-ese]\]} \]
\[6.NSE-2SG.SM-PRS-think-FV \quad \text{that 1-child 1-every} \]
\[a-no-kosh-es-a \quad \text{[} \]
\[6.NSE-1.SM-PRS-be.valued-CAUS-FV \]

‘Whose opinion that s/he is smart do you think every child\text{’}s values?’ (2014-10-04-02-TD)

c. **Partial wh-movement**: Quantifier does not c-command pronounced copy of pronoun

\[ \text{U-no-fung-a} \quad \text{[cp kuti \[dp má-onero a-Ø-ani e-kuti]} \]
\[2SG.SM-PRS-think-FV \quad \text{that cop.6-view 6.of-1a-who 6.of-that} \]
\[a_{1}\text{-ka-ngwar-a}] \quad \text{[dp mw-ana w-ese]} \]
\[1.SM-PST-be.smart-FV \quad 1-child 1-every \]
\[a-a-no-kosh-es-a \quad \text{[} \]
\[6.NSE-1.SM-PRS-be.valued-CAUS-FV \]

‘Whose opinion that s/he is smart do you think every child\text{’}s values?’ (2014-10-04-02-TD)

---

(19) Lack of binding when quantifier in subject does not c-command any copy of the pronoun

a. **Wh-in-situ**: Quantifier does not c-command any copy of pronoun

\[ \text{*U-no-fung-a} \quad \text{[cp kuti Ø-amai ve-[dp mw-ana w-ese]} \]
\[2SG.SM-PRS-think-FV \quad \text{that 2a-mother 2a.of-1-child 1-every} \]
\[va-no-kosh-es-a \quad \text{[dp ma-onero a-Ø-ani e-kuti]} \]
\[2a.SM-PRS-be.valued-CAUS-FV \quad 6-view 6.of-1a-who 6.of-that \]
\[a_{1}\text{-ka-ngwar-a}]? \]
\[1.SM-PST-be.smart-FV \]

‘Whose opinion that s/he is smart do you think every child\text{’}s mother values?’ (2014-10-04-02-TD)

b. **Full wh-movement**: Quantifier does not c-command any copy of pronoun

\[ \text{*[dp Má-onero a-Ø-ani e-kuti a}_{1}\text{-ka-ngwar-a]} \]
\[\text{cop.6-view 6.of-1a-who 6.of-that 1.SM-PST-be.smart-FV} \]
\[a-u-no-fung-a \quad \text{[cp kuti Ø-amai ve-[dp mw-ana]} \]
\[6.NSE-2SG.SM-PRS-think-FV \quad \text{that 2a-mother 2a.of-1-child} \]
\[w-ese]} \quad \text{va-no-kosh-es-a \quad [} \]
\[1.SM-PST-be.smart-FV \quad 1-every \quad 2a.SM-PRS-be.valued-CAUS-FV \]

‘Whose opinion that s/he is smart do you think every child\text{’}s mother values?’ (2014-10-04-02-TD)

c. **Partial wh-movement**: Quantifier does not c-command any copy of pronoun

\[ \text{*U-no-fung-a} \quad \text{[cp kuti \[dp má-onero a-Ø-ani e-kuti]} \]
\[2SG.SM-PRS-think-FV \quad \text{that cop.6-view 6.of-1a-who 6.of-that} \]
\[a_{1}\text{-ka-ngwar-a}] \quad \text{Ø-amai ve-[dp mw-ana w-ese]} \]
\[1.SM-PST-be.smart-FV \quad 2a-mother 2a.of-1-child 1-every \]
\[a-va-no-kosh-es-a \quad \text{[} \]
\[6.NSE-2a.SM-PRS-be.valued-CAUS-FV \]

‘Whose opinion that s/he is smart do you think every child\text{’}s mother values?’ (2014-10-04-02-TD)

---

*The allomorph of the copula for class 6 is a floating high tone prefix that attaches to the noun class prefix.*
4.2 Higher relation assimilated to wh-in-situ

4.2.1 Lack of island sensitivity

As we saw in §3, the higher relation in partial wh-movement is insensitive to islands in exactly the same way as the wh-in-situ relation. This follows if both are instances of unselective binding (Pesetsky 1987), as commonly assumed for Bantu wh-in-situ (Sabel 2000, Sabel & Zeller 2006, Schneider-Zioga 2007).

4.2.2 Lack of extraction marking

Extraction marking is impossible above the pronunciation site of a partially moved wh-phrase (20b), just as it is with wh-in-situ (20a).

(20) Non-subject extraction marking

a. Wh-in-situ cannot have extraction marking

(*Wa)-w-ai-fung-a [cp kuti 1a.NSE-2SG.SM-PST.HAB-think-FV that

(*wa)-t-aka-teng-er-a Ø-ani Ø-rokwe]

1a.NSE-1PL.SM-PST-buy-APPL-FV 1a-who 5-dress

‘Who(m) did you think we bought a dress (for)?’ (2014-07-30-01-TD)

b. Partial wh-movement cannot have extraction marking above the pronunciation site

(*Wa)-w-ai-fung-a [cp kuti ndi-Ø-ani 1a.NSE-2SG.SM-PST-HAB-think-FV that cop-1a-who

(*wa)-t-aka-teng-er-a Ø-rokwe]

1a.NSE-1PL.SM-PST-buy-APPL-FV 5-dress

‘Who(m) did you think we bought a dress (for)?’ (2014-07-30-01-TD)

5 Conclusion

- Shona allows partial wh-movement within islands, as predicted by several analyses.

- This provides support for a composite derivation of partial wh-movement, where the higher relation can be assimilated to wh-in-situ and the lower relation to full wh-movement.
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