

***Wh*-Scope Marking and Argument/Predicate Distinction**

It is well known that both German and Hungarian have a *Wh*-Scope Marking (WSM) construction, as illustrated in (1) and (2):

- (1) Was glaubt Hans mit wem Jakob jetzt spricht?
 what believes Hans with whom Jakob now is talking
 With whom does Hans think that Jakob is now talking?
- (2) Mit gondolsz, hogy kit látott János?
 what-ACC think-2sg that who-ACC saw-3sg John-NOM
 Who do you think that John saw?

In spite of striking similarities, they exhibit a different behavior with respect to certain locality effects: while WSM constructions in Hungarian do not show the effects of the CED, German counterparts are sensitive to both the Subject Condition and the Adjunct Condition:

- (3) a. Mi zavarta Marit, hogy kinek telefonáltál?
 what-NOM disturbed Mary-ACC that who-DAT phoned-2sg
 Lit. What disturbed Mary, to whom you phoned?
- b. Miért vagy dühös mert kivel találkoztál?
 why are-2sg angry because who-with met-2sg
 Lit. Why are you angry, because who you had met?
- (4) a. *was ist mit wem Hans gesprochen hat schade
 what is with whom Hans spoken has a-pity
 With whom is that Hans talked a pity?
- b. *was hat Hans das Auto gesehen bevor er glaubte mit wem Peter sprach
 what has Hans the car seen before he believed with whom Peter spoke
 With whom did Hans see the car before he believed that Peter talked?

The contrast between the two languages is even broader. The same contrast is found in the sensitivity to the factive island and the negative island:

- (5) a. Mit sajnálsz hogy hogy viselkedtek a gyerekek?
 what-ACC regret-2sg-indef.DO that how behaved-3pl the kids-NOM
 Lit. What do you regret how the kids had behaved?
- b. ??was hast du bedauert mit wem du gesprochen hast
 what have you regretted with whom you spoken have
 With whom did you regret that you talked?
- (6) a. Mit nem ismert be János hogy hányszor
 What-ACC not admitted-3sg-indef.DO John-NOM that how-many-times
 hamisította az aláírásodat?
 Forged-3sg.def.DO the signature-2sgposs-ACC
 Lit. What didn't John admit how many times he had forged your signature?
- b. *Was glaubst du nicht, mit wem Maria gesprochen hat?
 what think you not with whom Maria spoken has
 Who don't you think Maria has spoken to?

If WSM constructions in German and Hungarian receive the same analysis, why do such differences exist?

In this paper I will derive this locality difference from the argument/predicate distinction of the *wh*-scope marker. Specifically I will propose that although the scope-maker in Hungarian, which is a real *wh*-expletive in the sense that its associate is a full CP, is built into a structure as an argument of the matrix verb (cf. Horvath (1997)), the scope marker *was* in German is merged as a predicate of the embedded small clause, as illustrated in (7):

(7) [_{VP} matrix verb [FOCUS [_{SC} [_{SUBJ} embedded question] [_{PRED} was]]]]

The proposal is based on the fact pointed out by Müller (1995) that the WSM construction shares its sensitivity to locality with verb-second clause in German, and that WSM and verb-second cannot occur in the same clause in German, as demonstrated in (8) and (9):

- (8) a. Ich glaube den Fritz mag jeder (bridge verb)
 I believe ART Fritz_{ACC} likes everyone
 b. *Ich bedaure den Fritz mag jeder (factive verb)
 I regret ART Fritz_{ACC} likes everyone
 c. *Mich hat überrascht den Fritz mag jeder (sentential subject)
 me_{ACC} has surprised ART Fritz_{ACC} likes everyone
 d. *obwohl den Fritz mag jeder (adjunct)
 although ART Fritz_{ACC} likes everyone

- (9) *Was glaubte sie wann geht er ins Wirtshaus?
 what believed she when goes he into-the pub
 When did she believe that he goes into the pub?

The above-mentioned set of data can be explained straightforwardly if the *wh*-scope marker and the verb compete at the same functional head. I will assume here that the relevant head is the embedded FOCUS position and thus the scope marker in German is subject to severe restrictions on further movement to the spec of the matrix CP.

The present analysis is corroborated by the same kind of differences observed in *wh*-in-situ languages such as Hindi and Japanese. While WSM constructions in Hindi do not show the factive island effect, Japanese counterparts are subject to the relevant island condition. Moreover, Japanese uses the *wh*-phrase *doo* ‘how’, not *nani* ‘what’, as a scope marker, which is also used as a predicate in the small clause, as shown in (10):

- (10) a. Mary-wa [[John-ga nani-o yonda ka] doo] omotteiru no?
 Mary-TOP John-NOM what-ACC read Q how think Q
 ‘What does Mary think that John read?’
 b. Mary-wa [_{SC} John-o doo] omotteiru no?
 Mary-TOP John-ACC how think Q
 ‘What does Mary think John (to be)?’

Interestingly, in both constructions the *wh*-phrase *doo* cannot be preposed to the left of the subject of the small clause, as indicated in (11):

- (11) a. *Mary-wa doo_i [[John-ga nani-o yonda ka] t_i] omotteiru no?
 Mary-TOP how John-NOM what-ACC read Q think Q
 ‘What does Mary think that John read?’
 b. *Mary-wa doo_i [_{SC} John-o t_i] omotteiru no?
 Mary-TOP how John-ACC think Q
 ‘What does Mary think John (to be)?’

This also indicates that the scope marker is introduced into the structure as a predicate of the embedded small clause in Japanese.

Summarizing, differences with respect to the sensitivity to locality observed in WSM constructions are derived from the argument/predicate distinction of the *wh*-scope marker. In this respect, the analysis gives an additional support to the Minimalist thesis that parametric variations should be reduced to the lexicon.

References

- Horvath, Julia. 1997. “The Status of ‘*Wh*-Expletives’ and the Partial *Wh*-Movement Construction of Hungarian,” *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15: pp.509-572.
 Müller, Gereon. 1995. *A-bar syntax: a study in movement types*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.