

SCOPE MARKING: CROSS-LINGUISTIC VARIATION IN INDIRECT  
DEPENDENCY in U. Lutz and G. Mueller (eds.) *Studies on Wh-Scope Marking*, John  
Benjamins 2000 (pp. 157-93).

Veneeta Dayal  
Rutgers University  
dayal@rci.rutgers.edu

*Overview* A scope marking structure is characterized by the fact that it has two clauses, each of which contains wh expressions [CP-1...wh1...][CP-2...wh2(...whn)...]. While wh-1 is a fixed lexical item, wh-2...wh-n are not. A possible answer to the question seems to specify values not for wh1 but for wh2...whn. In recent years such structures have come under a lot of scrutiny and various analyses have been proposed to account for their properties. In spite of differences in detail, these analyses can be classified into two groups on the basis of the status they accord to the wh expressions. The direct dependency approach treats wh-1 as semantically inert and assigns matrix scope to wh-2...wh-n. The indirect dependency approach, on the other hand, takes wh-1 to play a crucial role in determining what the question quantifies over. Wh-2...wh-n do not have matrix scope but play an indirect role in matrix quantification because CP-2 forms the restriction of wh-1. Seen in this light, the direct and indirect dependency approaches are not tied to particular syntactic claims about the relation between CP-1 and CP-2. Whether a particular analysis can be characterized as direct or indirect depends solely on the status of the wh expressions at transparent LF, von Stechow's term for the level of syntactic representation that feeds into the interpretive module.

This paper is primarily concerned with cross-linguistic variation in scope marking structures. In particular, it investigates whether languages differ in instantiating a direct or an indirect dependency. It argues that different syntactic options exist in natural language for scope marking structures but the semantic relation remains constant. Wh-1 always fixes what the question quantifies over while the restriction on the quantification depends on wh-2...wh-n. That is to say, scope marking structures always involve indirect dependencies. In the interest of keeping the discussion focused, the paper deals with three languages, German, Hindi and English. These languages span a wide enough spectrum that conclusions based on them may be expected to provide a valid basis for further cross-linguistic work.

The first section of this paper briefly summarizes the core properties of the direct and indirect dependency approaches. It also considers a proposal that appears to be a third alternative and shows that, in fact, once this proposal is fleshed out it reduces to either the direct or the indirect dependency approach. The second section of the paper focuses on similarities and differences in scope marking structures across languages. Integrating a recent proposal relating scope marking structures to paratactic constructions, three different syntactic realisations for scope marking are shown to be logically possible in natural language. Evidence is presented to establish that this is the locus of cross-linguistic variation in German, Hindi and English. As far as the semantics is concerned, scope marking in all these languages instantiates an indirect dependency. The third section addresses what may be considered open questions in the literature and

discusses their status in the new conception of indirect dependency proposed in section 2. The paper ends by drawing out the implications of this proposal for future research on the topic.