

Long-Distance Wh-Movement in Chamorro

Some of the most striking evidence for successive-cyclic wh-movement comes from the morphology of Chamorro (Chung 1994, 1998). In the default pattern, each A-bar-bound trace triggers Wh-Agreement, in the form of an infix or nominalization, on the immediately higher verb. In (1) and (2), *Hafa* moves from the lower clause to the matrix CP, passing through the specifier of the lower CP. Both clauses show agreement morphology (underlined). The trace in *hafa*'s A-position triggers agreement in the lower clause, and the intermediate trace triggers agreement in the matrix clause. Were movement not successive-cyclic, agreement would appear only in the lower clause because the intermediate trace would be absent.

In an alternative pattern, Wh-Agreement appears in the lowest clause, but it is absent from all higher clauses (3). Chung (1994) suggests that long movement (Cinque 1990) occurs in these constructions. The specifier position of the intermediate CP is bypassed, and Wh-Agreement appears only in the lowest clause.

Chung's long-movement analysis is incompatible with Minimalist assumptions (Chomsky 1999). According to the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC), a probe cannot locate a goal embedded multiple clauses below the probe's phase. The matrix C in (3) cannot target the wh-DP in the lower clause, yet the agreement pattern suggests that this is what happens.

This paper presents an analysis of the long-movement agreement pattern that reconciles the data with the PIC. Normal successive-cyclic movement generates the default pattern in (1) and (2), and a second strategy produces the long-movement pattern. The wh-DP is base-generated in the matrix CP's specifier position, checking the features on C that would normally be checked by wh-movement.

Agreement appears in the lowest clause because of a short movement in that clause. A null resumptive pronoun with a [*i*WH] feature (like that found on wh-phrases) is merged into this clause, acquiring the θ -role that the wh-DP appears to fill. Null pronouns are well attested in Chamorro (Chung 1998). Just as wh-phrases move from CP to CP checking each C's [*u*WH] feature, the resumptive pronoun moves to the lowest C's specifier position via the usual successive-cyclic mechanisms. It leaves an agreement-triggering trace behind and checks C's [*u*WH] feature. Since the wh-DP checks the highest C's [*u*WH] feature, no further movement is necessary. Wh-Agreement appears in the lowest clause because of the resumptive pronoun's movement. No agreement appears in any other clause because no other A-bar-bound trace exists. Finally, the wh-DP in the matrix clause binds the resumptive pronoun, thus acquiring the pronoun's θ -role.

This strategy is only available to Cinque's (1990) referential DPs. Nonreferential DPs are insufficiently salient to bind the resumptive pronoun, so they cause ungrammaticality in the long-movement scenario. Compare (2) and (3) with (4).

The conflict between the PIC and the morphology is resolved: Only one short movement occurs, so just one instance of Wh-Agreement appears. The lack of additional movement explains the absence of agreement in the higher clauses. There are two ways to form wh-constructions in Chamorro: successive-cyclic movement (1), and merger of a wh-DP that binds a resumptive pronoun (3). Exceptions to successive-cyclic movement are unnecessary.

- (1) Hafa malago'-ña si Magdalena [t pära ta-chuilil' t]?
 what? WH[obl].want-agr Magdalena Fut WH[obj].agr-bring
 “What does Magdalena want us to bring?” (Chung 1998:249)
- (2) Hafa malago'-mu [t u-mafa'maolik t]?
 what? WH[obl].want.agr WH[nom].agr-be.fixed
 “What do you want to be fixed?” (Chung 1994:17)
- (3) Hafa na patti gi atumobit malägu' hao [u-ma-fa'maolik t]?
 what? L part Loc car agr.want you WH[nom].agr-Pass-fix
 “Which part of the car do you want to be fixed?” (Chung 1998:248)
- (4) *Hafa malägu' hao [u-mafa'maolik t]?
 what? agr.want you WH[nom].agr-be.fixed
 (“What do you want to be fixed?”) (Chung 1994:17)

References

- Chomsky, Noam (1999). “Derivation by Phase.” In *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics*, no. 18. Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, Department of Linguistic and Philosophy.
- Chung, Sandra (1994). “Wh-Agreement and “Referentiality” in Chamorro.” *Linguistic Inquiry* 25(1):1–44.
- Chung, Sandra (1998). *The Design of Agreement: Evidence from Chamorro*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1990). *Types of \bar{A} -Dependencies*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.