

We propose that movement of the *für*-phrase is scrambling. In this proposal, the optionality of *was für*-split is reducible to that of scrambling. We can now rephrase (3) as (7). This can be accounted for by economy considerations. Scrambling is an optional operation and its word order changing effect must be represented in the PF representation (see Fox 2000). However, if a scrambled phrase lies within an ellipsis site, this requirement cannot be met, and scrambling is thus disallowed. Since scrambling of the *für*-phrase, a prerequisite step for *was für*-split, is not possible in sluicing, (2b) is unacceptable.

(7) A scrambled phrase (i.e., the *für*-phrase) must not be included in an ellipsis site.

4. Additional evidence: In order to offer further support, we capitalize on Müller's (1998) generalization in (8) (see also Takano 1994). While the entire *wh*-phrase can be scrambled in (9a), *was* cannot undergo scrambling alone in (9b) (cf., Blümel 2012). The unacceptability of (9b) shows that the *für*-phrase moves out of the *wh*-phrase via scrambling in (5) and hence, the remnant, which comprises *was* and the trace, cannot undergo scrambling.

(8) Remnant-inducing movement and remnant movement cannot be of the same type.

- (9) a. *Wer hat [was für ein Bier]₁ gern t₁ getrunken?*
 who has what for a beer gladly drunk
 b. **Wer hat was gern für ein Bier getrunken?*
 who has what gladly for a beer drunk
 'Who liked to drink what kind of beer?'

5. Parasitism: Before concluding, we address one puzzle raised by the remnant movement analysis: scrambling of the *für*-phrase is parasitic on *wh*-movement, and the derivation does not converge if it is terminated at the stage in (6b). Put simply, the *für*-phrase cannot precede *was*, as in (10) (see, e.g., den Besten and Webelhuth 1990; Brümel 2012). First, we adopt Leu's (2008b) internal syntax of *was für* (11), according to which *für* takes a silent nominal SORT and *was* as its complement and specifier, respectively, and F^0 combines with an NP complement and the *für*-phrase in its specifier. *Was* moves to the specifier of *whP*. In addition, we propose that FP is a phase and following Fox and Pesetsky (2005), the entire phase is Spelled-Out, which determines the relative linear order between the items within the phase. The relative order once determined must be preserved throughout the derivation. If *für* and *Bücher* could move to the edge of FP before Spell-Out, they would be able to precede *was*. However, as they do not form a constituent, they cannot. Movement of the NP *Bücher* alone to the edge of FP is not possible either, because it violates Abels' (2003) Comp-to-Spec anti-locality constraint. This explains the deviance of (12), where the NP precedes *was* and *für*. This predicts that a complement of the NP can precede the *wh*-phrase because its movement to the edge of FP does not violate the anti-locality constraint. The prediction is borne out in (13).

- (10) **Wer hat für Bücher was gelesen?*
 who has for books what read
 'Who read what kind of books?'

(11) [_{whP} ___ wh⁰ [_{FP} [_{fürP} was₁ für t₁ SORT] F⁰ [_{NP} Bücher]]] (irrelevant details omitted)

(12) **Bücher₁ frag ich mich, was₂ er [t₂ für t₁] gelesen hat.*
 books ask I REFL what he for read has

(13) [*Über Medizin*]₁ *frag ich mich, was₂ er [t₂ für Bücher t₁] gelesen hat.*
 about medicine ask I REFL what he for books read has
 'I wonder what kind of books he has read about medicine.'

6. Conclusion: If our analysis of the facts above is successful, it lends additional support to the independently motivated proposals: among others, Fox's economy-style view of optional operations, Müller's generalization, Fox and Pesetsky's cyclic linearization, and Abels' anti-

locality constraint.

References:

- Abels, Klaus. 2003. Successive cyclicity, anti-locality, and adposition stranding. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Abels, Klaus. 2012. *Phases: An essay on cyclicity in syntax*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- den Besten, Hans, and Gerth Webelhuth. 1990. Stranding. In *Scrambling and barriers*, ed. by Günter Grewendorf and Wolfgang Sternefeld, 77-92. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Blümel, Andreas. 2012. Towards a novel analysis of *was-für-split*. In *Proceedings of ConSOLE XIX*, ed. by Enrico Boone, Kathrin Linke, and Maartje Schulpen, 105-123. Leiden University.
- Fox, Danny. 2000. *Economy and semantic interpretation*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Fox, Danny, and David Pesetsky. 2005. Cyclic linearization of syntactic structure. *Theoretical Linguistics* 31:1-45.
- Leu, Thomas. 2008a. A note on *what for split*. In *NYU working papers in linguistics 1*, ed. by Lisa Levinson and Oana Savescu-Ciucivara. Department of Linguistics, New York University.
- Leu, Thomas. 2008b. *What for internally*. *Syntax* 11:1-25.
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Müller, Gereon. 1998. *Incomplete category fronting: A derivational approach to remnant movement in German*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Pafel, Jürgen. 1996. Kinds of extraction from noun phrases. In *On extraction and extraposition in German*, ed. by Uli Lutz and Jürgen Pafel, 145-177. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rooth, Mats. 1992. Ellipsis redundancy and reduction redundancy. In *Proceedings of the Stuttgart Ellipsis Workshop, Report Series, Sprachtheoretische Grundlagen für die Computerlinguistik, no 29, SFB 340*, ed. by Steve Berman and Arild Hestvik, 1- 26. IBM Heidelberg.
- Takano, Yuji. 1994. Unbound traces and indeterminacy of derivation. In *Current topics in English and Japanese*, ed. by Masaru Nakamura, 229-253. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.