The Distribution of Wh-word in Single Wh-Questions in Persian

Ahmadreza Sharifipur Shirazi[1]
Jala Rahimian[2]

Received: 12/07/2017
Accepted: 12/12/2017

Abstract
By investigating the distribution of wh-word in single Wh-questions in Persian through a qualitative method in terms of the theory of Derivational Approach (Epstein et al., 1998) and Feature-Free Syntax (Boeckx, 2015) we intend to explain why wh-word is necessarily in situ. in some sentences and why its movement is optional in others. In this study, based on the distribution of wh-words, we put languages into two different categories: fixed wh-word and non-fixed wh-word. Languages like English and Japanese in which wh-word appears in just one place (either in situ. or non-in situ.) are put in the first category, and languages like Persian in which wh-word appears in a variety of positions are put in the second category. By combining this classification with Scope-Marking (Pesetsky, 1987) (in which it is believed that each quantifier (such as wh-word) must have a scope) and Remerge (Zhang, 2004) (in which it is believed that the movement of α is not the process of "copy+ merge+ delete", but a simple remerge of α), we suggest that converting a statement into a wh-question is related to conceptual-intentional systems and we can achieve it by resorting to merge, remerge and the related interpretation in conceptual-intentional systems without resorting to morphological features. Besides, we show that forming a wh-question is not the matter of being a wh-in situ. language or a non-wh-in situ. language, but is the matter of scope marking. By accepting the compulsory merger of wh-word in two positions in Persian, we naturally admit that the movement of wh-word is compulsory as well. Since if no remerge process happens, wh-word cannot extend its scope over the whole sentence, and as a result, no wh-question will be formed. Accordingly, we show that merger of wh-word in two positions is compulsory, just one of which must be pronounced, however: A. an in situ. position and B. the position in which the wh-word can scope mark the whole sentence.

We, also discuss the factors which determine the pronunciation of one of those merged wh-words. By taking a look at Persian related data, we understand that each

[1] Ph.D. in General Linguistics, Shiraz University, Iran (corresponding author); s.sharifipur@rose.shirazu.ac.ir
[2] Full Professor in General Linguistics, Shiraz University, Iran - jrahimian@rose.shirazu.ac.ir

merged wh-word enjoys the same chance of being pronounced and if we just resort to articulatory-perceptual systems, then, we must make some arguments in favor of those wh-words which can be pronounced in both in-situ. and non-in-situ. positions. Meanwhile, if we put all these issues into discourse, the problem we face is those wh-words which are only pronounced in the in-situ. position. Accordingly, we resort to a mixed solution in which both articulator-perceptual systems and discourse related issues are observed. As a result, by reinterpreting the focus fronting as a triggering factor for pronunciation of the higher merged wh-word, we hold that, according to discourse, if an element which is not the already established "matter of current concern", becomes "the matter of current concern" or becomes more relevant to the already established "matter of current concern"; then, the interpretation systems detect wh-word as a structure which is susceptible to focus fronting. This detection and interpretation sends instructions to externalization systems, and they accordingly, pronounce the highest remerged wh-word. As a result, we cannot take focus fronting as a triggering factor for remerge (or movement). This shows that the pronunciation of the highest merged wh-word is the result of the interaction between interpretation systems and externalization systems. Accordingly, we formalize "the principle of pronouncing the highest wh-word" as follows:

The principle of pronouncing the highest wh-word:

In a language the Externalization Systems pronounce the highest wh-word, if;

A) The language is a non-fixed wh-word,

B) The interpretation systems detect the wh-word as a structure which is susceptible to focus fronting.

** In case B does not happen, wh-in situ. will be pronounced

We also investigate into the structures with copulas in which a wh-word is adjacent to a copula and indicates that presence or absence of the copula with a wh-word can be a significant factor in pronouncing the highest merged wh-word. Accordingly, we formalize "the revised principle of pronouncing the highest wh-word" as follows:

The principle of pronouncing the highest wh-word alone:

In a language the Externalization Systems pronounce the highest wh-word alone, if;

A) The language is a non-fixed wh-word,

B) The interpretation systems detect the wh-word as a structure which is susceptible to focus fronting,

C) Wh-word is not the sister of copula.

** In case B or C does not happen, wh-in situ. will be pronounced.

By resorting to the above-mentioned approach that is, by utilizing merge, remerge, the interpretation of the conceptual-intentional systems and the interaction between these systems and the externalization systems (articulatory-perceptual system), and without referring to morphological features, we can analyze the movement of wh-word as both optional and obligatory in a unified manner.

Keywords: Wh-word distribution, Remerge, Scope-marking, Focus fronting, Copula, Interpretation systems, Externalization systems