

Scope Marking, p. 1

Sample sentence

(Hungarian, from Louise Mycock (2006) *A Typology of Constituent Questions: A Lexical-Functional Grammar Analysis of 'Wh'-Questions*. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Manchester)

István mi- t gondol, hogy János ki- nek mutat- t- a be Mari- t?
 István what- ACC think.PRES.3SG that János who- DAT show- PST- 3SG in Mary- ACC
 'Who does István think János introduced Mary to?'

Possible analyses

(based on Mycock 2004; 2006)

In all of the following:

$f = [\text{"who"}]$

Direct Dependency analysis

This is the most obvious analysis. From a movement perspective, the *wh* element does not move all the way to the matrix clause, but stops on the way. In languages like Hungarian which have an element in the main clause (where the *wh* should have moved to), it is taken to be an overt marker of the scope of the *wh*.

SUBJ	[“István”]										
FOCUS	f										
PRED	‘think $\langle (\uparrow \text{SUBJ})(\uparrow \text{COMP}) \rangle$ ’										
TENSE	PRES										
COMP	<table> <tr> <td>SUBJ</td><td>[“János”]</td></tr> <tr> <td>PRED</td><td>‘introduce $\langle (\uparrow \text{SUBJ})(\uparrow \text{OBJ})(\uparrow \text{OBJ}_{\text{Dative}}) \rangle$’</td></tr> <tr> <td>TENSE</td><td>PAST</td></tr> <tr> <td>OBJ</td><td>[“Mari”]</td></tr> <tr> <td>OBJ_{Dative}</td><td>f</td></tr> </table>	SUBJ	[“János”]	PRED	‘introduce $\langle (\uparrow \text{SUBJ})(\uparrow \text{OBJ})(\uparrow \text{OBJ}_{\text{Dative}}) \rangle$ ’	TENSE	PAST	OBJ	[“Mari”]	OBJ _{Dative}	f
SUBJ	[“János”]										
PRED	‘introduce $\langle (\uparrow \text{SUBJ})(\uparrow \text{OBJ})(\uparrow \text{OBJ}_{\text{Dative}}) \rangle$ ’										
TENSE	PAST										
OBJ	[“Mari”]										
OBJ _{Dative}	f										

But the *wh* in the main clause does not have the right Case: it is accusative instead of dative. This suggests an indirect relation between the two *wh*'s, not one in which they represent the same structural entity.

Indirect Dependency analysis

In the indirect dependency analysis, the *wh* in the matrix clause is the actual argument of the verb; the sentence has a structure something like ‘What does István think: who did János introduce to Mari?’ The Case on the matrix *wh* is consistent with such an analysis. There are further examples in the Mycock paper.

Scope Marking, p. 2

If the indirect dependency analysis is correct, “partial movement” is not a very good name for the construction, since the *wh* lands right where it belongs.

SUBJ	[“István”]												
FOCUS	<i>g</i>												
PRED	‘think $\langle (\uparrow \text{SUBJ})(\uparrow \text{OBJ}) \rangle$ ’												
TENSE	PRES												
OBJ	<i>g</i>												
ADJ ?	<table> <tr> <td>SUBJ</td><td>[“János”]</td></tr> <tr> <td>FOCUS</td><td><i>f</i></td></tr> <tr> <td>PRED</td><td>‘introduce $\langle (\uparrow \text{SUBJ})(\uparrow \text{OBJ})(\uparrow \text{OBJ}_{\text{Dative}}) \rangle$’</td></tr> <tr> <td>TENSE</td><td>PAST</td></tr> <tr> <td>OBJ</td><td>[“Mari”]</td></tr> <tr> <td>OBJ_{Dative}</td><td><i>f</i></td></tr> </table>	SUBJ	[“János”]	FOCUS	<i>f</i>	PRED	‘introduce $\langle (\uparrow \text{SUBJ})(\uparrow \text{OBJ})(\uparrow \text{OBJ}_{\text{Dative}}) \rangle$ ’	TENSE	PAST	OBJ	[“Mari”]	OBJ _{Dative}	<i>f</i>
SUBJ	[“János”]												
FOCUS	<i>f</i>												
PRED	‘introduce $\langle (\uparrow \text{SUBJ})(\uparrow \text{OBJ})(\uparrow \text{OBJ}_{\text{Dative}}) \rangle$ ’												
TENSE	PAST												
OBJ	[“Mari”]												
OBJ _{Dative}	<i>f</i>												

$g = [\text{“what”}]$

The weakness of this analysis is that it claims that the *wh* in the matrix clause is a meaningful element, but it actually appears to be an expletive. Among the dummy-like properties are the fact that it cannot be stressed (or at least not stressed independently of the “real” *wh* element), cannot be passivized, and looks like the *wh* version of the expletive *it*.

Mixed Dependency approach

SUBJ	[“István”]
FOCUS	<i>h</i>
PRED	‘think $\langle (\uparrow \text{SUBJ})(\uparrow \text{COMP}) \rangle$ ’
TENSE	PRES
COMP	<i>h</i>

$h =$	<table> <tr> <td>SUBJ</td><td>[“János”]</td></tr> <tr> <td>FOCUS</td><td><i>f</i></td></tr> <tr> <td>PRED</td><td>‘introduce $\langle (\uparrow \text{SUBJ})(\uparrow \text{OBJ})(\uparrow \text{OBJ}_{\text{Dative}}) \rangle$’</td></tr> <tr> <td>TENSE</td><td>PAST</td></tr> <tr> <td>OBJ</td><td>[“Mari”]</td></tr> <tr> <td>OBJ_{Dative}</td><td><i>f</i></td></tr> </table>	SUBJ	[“János”]	FOCUS	<i>f</i>	PRED	‘introduce $\langle (\uparrow \text{SUBJ})(\uparrow \text{OBJ})(\uparrow \text{OBJ}_{\text{Dative}}) \rangle$ ’	TENSE	PAST	OBJ	[“Mari”]	OBJ _{Dative}	<i>f</i>
SUBJ	[“János”]												
FOCUS	<i>f</i>												
PRED	‘introduce $\langle (\uparrow \text{SUBJ})(\uparrow \text{OBJ})(\uparrow \text{OBJ}_{\text{Dative}}) \rangle$ ’												
TENSE	PAST												
OBJ	[“Mari”]												
OBJ _{Dative}	<i>f</i>												

Here the subordinate clause is itself the *wh* element; since a clause cannot be a *wh* the expletive *mi* ‘what’ is used, as in the extraposition structure with *it* in English and *az* ‘it, that’ in Hungarian. The expletive occupies the normal position for FOCUS in the language (in Hungarian, this is the pre-verb position)