

Wh-Scope Marking in Japanese: Evidence for the Indirect Dependency Approach

Yoshiki Fujiwara, University of Connecticut

1. Introduction

The goal of this squib is to tease apart two approaches to *wh*-scope marking by introducing Japanese *wh*-scope marking. German and Hindi are well-investigated languages in the literature on *wh*-scope marking. (1) and (2) illustrate the basic examples for German and Hindi *wh*-scope marking, respectively.

(1) Ger: Was glaubst du [**wo** Maria getanzt hatte]?

what think you where Maria danced had

‘Where do you think Maria danced?’ (Dayal 2000:166)

(2) Hin: siitaa-ne kyaa socaa [ki ravii-ne **kis-ko** dekhaa]?

Sita-ERG what thought that Ravi-ERG who saw

‘Who did Sita think that Ravi saw?’ (Mahajan 2000:317)

(1) and (2) have two *wh*-phrases, one in the matrix and one in the embedded clause. In German, the *wh*-phrase occupies SpecCP, whereas it stays in-situ in Hindi. It is the lower *wh*-phrase that provides the relevant semantic content, as the translations show. Thus, the questions in (1) and (2) are answered by giving values for the embedded *wh*-phrases. The function of the matrix *wh*-item appears to be merely to extend the scope of the lower *wh*-item to the matrix. In fact, the embedded *wh*-phrase cannot take matrix scope when the matrix *wh*-phrase is dropped (Mahajan 2000).

(3) Ger: a. *Du glaubst [**wo** Maria getanzt hatte]?

you think where Maria danced had

intended: ‘Where do you think Maria danced?’

Hin: b. *siitaa-ne socaa [ki ravii-ne **kis-ko** dekhaa]?

Sita-ERG thought that Ravi-ERG who saw

intended: ‘Who did Sita think that Ravi saw?’ (Mahajan 2000:319)

In this sense, the matrix *wh*-phrase is called scope marker.

Wh-scope-marking constructions are attested in a wide variety of languages, for examples, Bengali (Bayer 1990), Frisian (Hiemstra 1986), Hungarian (Horvath 1997), Iraqi Arabic (Wahba 1991), Kashmiri (Manetta 2010), Polish (Stepanov 2001), Romani (McDaniel 1989), Russian (Stepanov 2001), and Warlpiri (Legate 2011). Several analyses have been proposed for this kind of scope-marking questions. They are roughly divided into two types (see Dayal 1994): the direct dependency approach (Cheng 2000; Hiemstra 1986; Manetta 2010; McDaniel 1989; Sabel 2000, a.o) and the indirect dependency approach (Dayal 1994, 2000; Fanselow & Mahajan 2000; Legate 2011; Mahajan 2000; Stepanov 2001, a.o). The direct dependency approach attempts to capture *wh*-scope marking constructions in a structurally similar way to long-distance *wh*-movement constructions. This appears to be reasonable since the two allow the same kinds of answers. A feature movement analysis of this approach is given in (4) (Cheng 2000; Hiemstra 1986; Sabel 2000).

(4) [CP₁ [WH] ... V [CP₂ *wh* ... t_{*wh*}...]]

Under their approach, the scope marker is regarded as the *wh*-feature of the embedded *wh*-phrase. Thus, in (4), the *wh*-phrase first moves to the embedded SpecCP and then, its *wh*-feature is extracted out of the *wh*-word to the matrix SpecCP, where the *wh*-feature is spelled out as a default or unmarked *wh*-word ‘what.’ The difference from long-distance *wh*-movement concerns the item moved from the embedded SpecCP: in long *wh*-movement, the whole *wh*-phrase moves, whereas only partial features of the

wh-phrase move in *wh*-scope marking. Manetta (2010) proposes another version of the direct dependency approach, where the embedded *wh*-word enters an Agree relation with the matrix C to form a long-distance *wh*-dependency assuming that the scope marker is a *wh*-expletive.¹ The scope marker is also regarded as a *wh*-expletive in another type of the direct dependency approach, where it is linked with the embedded *wh*-word by coindexation or LF expletive replacement (Horvath 1997; McDaniel 1989, a.o).

On the other hand, the indirect dependency approach attempts to relate the scope marker with the *whole* embedded interrogative clause, not with the embedded *wh*-phrase itself. In this sense, the embedded *wh*-word has an indirect association with the scope marker. Dayal's (1994, 1996) version of this approach is given below:

(5) [CP₁ [CP₁ *wh*_i ... t_{*wh*} ... V] [CP₂ ***wh*** ... t_{*wh*}...]i]

According to Dayal, each clause in *wh*-scope marking forms a separate question and the scope marker is not an expletive but a true *wh*-phrase that questions propositions (see also Legate 2011; Stepanov 2001). Dayal also suggests that the embedded question functions as a restriction on the matrix question. Thus, (1) asks the question of what you think, whose answers are limited to the set of answers to the question of where Maria danced. Hence, the rough translation of (1) is something like ‘What do you think? Where did Maria dance?’ In another type of the indirect dependency approach, proposed by Fanselow & Mahajan (2000) and Mahajan (2000), the scope marker is treated as a *wh*-expletive, which undergoes expletive-replacement with the whole embedded question at LF. What these approaches have in common is that they relate the scope marker with the *whole* embedded question, not just the embedded *wh*-word.

Crucially, the two different approaches make different predictions regarding the clause type of the embedded clause in *wh*-scope marking. Under the direct dependency approach, *wh*-scope marking is analyzed as involving a long-distance *wh*-question. Thus, this approach assumes that the embedded clause is declarative, so that the embedded *wh*-phrase takes matrix scope. In contrast, under the indirect dependency approach, the embedded clause is regarded as an interrogative clause, which relates to the scope marker.

In the literature, we have not so far seen a language that provides clear morphological evidence regarding whether the embedded clause is declarative or interrogative. For example, the Hindi complementizer *ki* optionally appears irrespective of the type of the embedded clause, as shown in (6).

- (6) a. raam jaantaa hai (ki) ramaa ravi-se baat karegii. [embedded declarative]
 Ram know-PR that Ramaa Ravi-INS talk-do-FUTURE
 ‘Ram knows that Ramaa will talk to Ravi.’
- b. raam jaantaa hai (ki) ramaa kis-se baat karegii. [embedded interrogative]
 Ram know-PR that Ramaa who-INS talk-do-FUTURE
 ‘Ram knows who Ramaa will talk to.’
- c. raam kyaa jaantaa hai (ki) ramaa **kis-se** baat karegii? [*wh*-scope marking]
 Ram what know-PR that Ramaa who-INS talk-do-FUTURE
 ‘Who does Ram know that Ramaa will talk to?’
- d. raam kis-se jaantaa hai (ki) ramaa t baat karegii? [*wh*-extraction]
 Ram who-INS know-PR that Ramaa talk-do-FUTURE
 ‘Who does Ram know that Ramaa will talk to?’ (Veneeta Dayal, p.c.)

This suggests that the Hindi complementizer *ki*, whether it is overt or covert, does not contribute to clause typing. Also, the complementizer in German does not relate to clause typing. Although German complementizer *dass* ‘that’ is absent in the embedded clause of *wh*-scope marking like (1), its absence relates to overt movement of *wh*-words, not to the interrogativity of the embedded clause.² For example, *wh*-movement is involved in free relatives in German, which are not questions, but they disallow the overt complementizer, as in (7).³

(7) Ich werde [_{FR} was_i (*dass) ich t_i gefunden habe] niemandem zeigen.

I will what that I found have nobody show

‘I won’t show to anybody what I found.’ (Ott 2011:184, slightly modified)

In other words, we are dealing here with the traditional doubly-filled COMP effect. At any rate, German cannot tell us whether the embedded clause in *wh*-scope marking is declarative or interrogative.

This paper introduces *wh*-scope marking in Japanese, where morphology quite clearly shows whether an embedded clause is declarative or interrogative.

2. Claim

Japanese morphologically differentiates clause types of embedded clauses. Embedded clauses ending with *to* must be interpreted as declarative, while the ones with *ka* must be interpreted as interrogative, as shown in (8).

(8) a. John-wa [Mary-ga ki-ta to] hanasi-ta.

John-TOP Mary-NOM come-PAST C tell-PAST

‘John told us that Mary came.’/ *‘John told us whether Mary came.’

b. John-wa [Mary-ga ki-ta ka] hanasi-ta.

John-TOP Mary-NOM come-PAST Q tell-PAST

‘John told us whether Mary came.’/ *‘John told us that Mary came.’

These morphological items also determine the scope of *wh*-phrases in embedded clauses. *Wh*-phrases embedded under a *to*-clause take matrix scope and establish a long-distance dependency, whereas *wh*-elements embedded under a *ka*-clause cannot take matrix scope, as illustrated in (9) (see e.g. Nishigauchi 1990).

(9) a. John-wa [dare-ga ki-ta to] ii-masi-ta ka?

John-TOP who-NOM come-PAST C say-POLITE-PAST Q

‘Who did John say came?’/ *‘Did John say who came?’

b. John-wa [dare-ga ki-ta ka] ii-masi-ta ka?

John-TOP who-NOM come-PAST Q say-POLITE-PAST Q

‘Did John say who came?’/ *‘Who did John say came?’

Keeping this in mind, consider the Japanese examples in (10). There are two *wh*-phrases, one in the matrix and one in the embedded clause, and it is the embedded *wh*-phrase that provides the “real” question content, just as in German and Hindi *wh*-scope marking.⁴ I argue that (10) is an instance of *wh*-scope marking.

(10) a. Ano-hito-wa [**dare-ga** senkyo-ni tousensi-soo ka] nante⁵ itte-ta kke?

that-person-TOP who-NOM election-to win-EVID Q what_{prop} say-PAST Q

‘What did that person say: who would win the election?’

b. [John-ga **nani-o** site tukama-tta no ka] doo omow-are-mas-u ka?

John-NOM what-ACC do be.arrested-PAST C Q how think-HON-POL-PRES Q

‘What do you think: what did John get arrested for?’

In fact, the *wh*-phrase in the embedded clause cannot take matrix scope without the matrix *wh*-phrase, just as in German and Hindi *wh*-scope marking in (3) (see Section 3 for more diagnostic tests).

(11)a. Ano-hito-wa [**dare-ga** senkyo-ni tousensi-soo ka] itte-ta kke?

that-person-TOP who-NOM election-to win-EVID Q say-PAST Q

‘Did he say who would win the election?’

*‘Who did he say would win the election?’

b. *[John-ga **nani-o** site tukama-tta no ka] omow-are-mas-u ka?

John-NOM what-ACC do be.arrested-PAST C Q think-HON-POL-PRES Q

lit. ‘Do you think what John got arrested for?’

What is especially interesting here is that Japanese *wh*-scope marking requires the embedded clause to be interrogative (i.e. it requires it to be marked with *ka*). (12) shows that it cannot be marked with *to*.

(12) a. *Ano-hito-wa [**dare-ga** senkyo-ni tousensi-soo *to*] nante itte-ta kke?

that-person-TOP who-NOM election-to win-EVID C what_{prop} say-PAST Q

‘What did that person say: who would win the election?’

b. *[John-ga **nani-o** site tukama-tta *to*] doo omow-are-mas-u ka?

John-NOM what-ACC do be.arrested-PAST C how think-HON-POL-PRES Q

‘What do you think: what did John get arrested for?’

This provides evidence for the indirect dependency approach. Recall that the indirect dependency approach analyzes the embedded clause as interrogative, which relates to the scope marker. Thus, it is predicted under this approach that the embedded clause is interrogative. On the other hand, the direct dependency approach to *wh*-scope marking assumes that the embedded clause is declarative since *wh*-scope marking is an instance of long-distance *wh*-questions under this approach. The interrogativity of the embedded clause in Japanese *wh*-scope marking is unexpected under the direct dependency approach since long-distance *wh*-questions in Japanese require the embedded clause to

be declarative, not interrogative, as we have seen in (9). Therefore, Japanese provides morphological evidence for the indirect dependency approach.

3. *Wh*-Scope Marking in Japanese

In this section, I discuss additional properties of Japanese constructions in question, which also confirm that we are indeed dealing here with *wh*-scope marking.

First of all, Japanese *wh*-scope marking allows two *wh*-phrases as the scope marker, in contrast to other languages, which have only one item for the scope marker. The scope marker in Japanese can be either the propositional *wh*-phrase *nante* ‘what’ as in German and Hindi or *doo* ‘how’ as in Polish (Stepanov 2001) and Warlpiri (Dayal 1994; Legate 2011).

(13) Mary-wa [John-ga **dare-ni** hanasikake-ru ka] nante / doo omo-tta no?

Mary-TOP John-NOM who-DAT talk-PRES Q what_{prop}/how think-PAST Q

‘What did Mary think: who would John talk to?’

According to Dayal’s (1994) version of the indirect dependency approach, the scope marker is a regular propositional *wh*-phrase (see also Legate 2011; Stepanov 2001), while it is regarded as a *wh*-expletive or a default *wh*-phrase under other approaches. What is relevant here is that *nante* ‘what’ and *doo* ‘how’ are in fact propositional *wh*-phrases in Japanese, as seen in (14).

(14) Nante / doo omo-tta no?

what_{prop}/how think-PAST

‘What did you think?’

Dayal’s indirect dependency approach seems to provide a better (i.e. more natural) explanation for the correspondence between the scope marker and the propositional *wh*-phrases, although this does not conclusively show that other approaches are incorrect.

Japanese *wh*-scope marking is unique in the sense that the scope marker has two variants, but it also exhibits general properties of *wh*-scope marking attested in other languages. The points A-G below illustrate them. The relevant points are first illustrated with German and Hindi, and then with Japanese.

A. Any *wh*-phrase can be associated with the scope marker:

(15) Ger: a. Was glaubst du [**wo/wann/warum/wie** Maria getanzt hatte]?

what think you where/when/why/how Maria danced had

‘What do you think: where/when/why/how did Maria dance?’

(Beck & Berman 2000:19)

Hin: b. jaun kyaa soctaa hai [meri **kahaaN** jaayegii]?

John what think-PRES Mary where will-go

‘What does John think: where will Mary go?’ (Dayal 1994:140)

c. tum kyaa socte ho [ki **kyaa** vo aayegaa]?⁶

you what think be that whether he come-FUTURE

‘What do you think: will he come?’ (Fanselow & Mahajan 2000:214)

(16)a. John-wa [Mary-ga **doko-ni** ik-u ka] nante yosoosite-ta kke?

John-TOP Mary-NOM where-DAT go-PRES Q what_{prop} predict-PAST Q

‘What did John predict: where would Mary go?’

b. Ano-hito-wa [**itu** amerika-no daitooryoo-ga rainiti sur-u

that-person-TOP when America-GEN president-NOM coming.Japan do-PAST

ka] nante itte-ta kke?

Q what_{prop} say-PAST Q

‘What did he say: when would the president of US come to Japan?’

c. Soonansya-wa [yukiyama-kara **doo** yatte seikan si-ta ka]

victim-TOP snow.mountain-from how do coming.back do-PAST Q

nante kotaete-masi-ta ka?

what_{prop} answer-POL-PAST Q

‘What did the victim answer: how did he return from a snow mountain?’

d. Anata-wa [kono-seitoo-ga **naze** ooku-no-kata-kara

you-TOP this-political.party-NOM why many-GEN-person-from

sizi-o atumete-i-ru no ka] do omow-are-masu ka?

support-ACC collect-be-PRES C Q how think-HON-POL Q

‘What do you think: why does this party gain support from many people?’

e. Kimi-wa [Sintakkusutuu-o tor-u-beki **kadooka**] do omo-u?

you-TOP syntax.2-ACC take-PRES-should whether how think-PRES

‘What do you think: should we take Syntax 2?’

B. More than one *wh*-phrase can be associated with the scope marker:

(17) Ger: a. Was glaubst du [**wann** Hans an **welcher** Universität studiert hat]?

what think you when Hans at which University studied has

‘What do you think: when did Hans study at which university?’

(Dayal 1994:140)

Hin: b. raam-ne kyaa kahaa thaa [ki mohan-ne **kab** **kis-ko** **kEse** maaraaa]?

Ram-ERG what said that Mohan-ERG when whom how hit

‘What did Ram say: how did Mohan hit whom when?’

(Mahajan 1990:170)

(18) Jap: Anata-wa [John-ga ima **doko-de nani-o** site-ru no ka] do omou?

you-TOP John-NOM now where-in what-ACC do-PRES C Q how think

‘What do you think: what is John doing now where?’

C. An embedded *wh*-phrase can take matrix scope across multiple clauses if each intermediate clause also has a *wh*-scope marker:

(19)Ger: a. Was meinst du [was/[%]dass sie glaubt [wen Fritz liebt]]?

what think you what/that she believes who Fritz loves

‘What do you think: what does she believe: who does Fritz love?’

Hin: b. tum kyaa socte ho [ki us-ne *(kyaa) kaha [ki **kɔOn** aayegaa]]?

you what think be that he-ERG what said that who come-FUT

‘What do you think: who did he say: who would come?’

(Fanselow & Mahajan 2000:212)

(20)Jap: [[*pro* Sintakkusutuu-o tor-u-beki **kadooka**]

we Syntax.2-ACC take-PAST-should whether

sensei-ga *(doo) omotteta ka] kimi-wa nante itta n da kke?

teacher-NOM how thought C] you-TOP what_{prop} said C COP Q

‘What did you say: what did the teacher think: should we take Syntax2?’

D. The *wh*-scope marker cannot be associated with an embedded declarative:

(21)Ger: a. *Was glaubst du [dass Maria mit Hans gesprochen hat]?

what think you that Maria with Hans spoken has

Hin: b. *jaun kyaa jaantaa hai [meri ravi-se baat karegii]?

John what know-PRES Mary Ravi-with will-talk (Dayal 1994:141)

(22)Jap: *Kimi-wa [John-ga Mary-ni hanasikake-ta to] doo omow-u?

you-TOP John-NOM Mary-DAT speak-PAST C how think-PRES

As Dayal (1994) notes, German and Hindi have declarative counterparts of *wh*-scope marking, where the scope marker is an optional pronoun/demonstrative associated with an embedded declarative. Japanese also has a declarative version of *wh*-scope marking.

(23) Ger: a. Ich habe (es) bedauert [dass Hans Maria eingeladen hat].
 I have it regretted that Hans Mary invited has
 ‘I regretted that Hans invited Mary.’ (Fanselow 2017:slightly modified)

Hin: b. siitaa (yeh) jaantii hai [ki ravi-ne anu-ko dekhaa].
 Sita this knows that Ravi-ERG Anu-ACC saw
 ‘Sita knows that Ravi saw Anu.’ (Dayal 2017:160)

(24) Jap: Boku-wa [John-ga Mary-ni hanasikake-ta to] (koo) omot-ta.
 I-TOP John-NOM Mary-DAT talk-PAST C this.way think-PAST
 ‘I thought that John talked to Mary.’

E. The predicate of the clause containing the *wh*-scope marker must be able to take a [-Q] clausal complement:⁷

(25) Ger: a. *Was fragst du [mit wem Maria gesprochen hat]?
 what ask you with whom Maria spoken has
 Hin: b. *jaun kyaa puuchhtaa hai [meri **kis-se** baat karegii]?
 John what ask-PRES Mary who-with will-talk (Dayal 1994:141)

(26) Jap: *Kimi-wa [John-ga **dare-ni** hanasikake-ta ka] nante tazune-ta?
 you-TOP John-NOM who-DAT speak-PAST Q what_{prop} ask-PAST

F. The *wh*-scope marker cannot be associated with a clause-mate *wh*-phrase:

(27) Ger: a. *Was ist sie **warum** gekommen?
 what is she why come (Müller 1997:255)

Hin: b. *meri kyaa **kyuuN** aayegii?
 Mary what why will.come

(28) Jap: *John-wa **naze** doo/nante ki-ta no?
 John-TOP why how/what_{prop} come-PAST C

G. *Wh*-scope marking across sentential negation is ungrammatical:

(29) Ger: a. *Was glaubst du *nicht* [**mit wem** Maria gepochen hat]?

what think you not with whom Maria talked has

‘Who don’t you think Maria has spoken to?’ (Dayal 1994:145)

Hin: b. *jaun kyaa nahiiN soctaa hai [meri **kis-se** baat karegii]?

John what not think-PRES Mary who-with will-talk

‘Who doesn’t John think Mary will talk to?’ (Dayal 1996:57)

(30) Jap: *Kimi-wa [John-ga **dare-ni** hanasikake-ru ka] do omow-*anak*-atta?

you-TOP John-NOM who-DAT talk-PRES Q how think-NEG-PAST

‘Who didn’t you think that John will talk to?’

The above data confirm that Japanese has *wh*-scope marking.⁸

4. Conclusion

This squib has shown that Japanese has *wh*-scope marking, just like German and Hindi, and that Japanese scope marking constructions can help us tease apart two competing approaches to *wh*-scope marking, the direct dependency approach and the indirect dependency approach. Crucially, the two approaches make different predictions regarding the clause type of the embedded clause in *wh*-scope marking. The embedded clause is regarded as declarative under the direct dependency approach but as interrogative under the indirect dependency approach. What is particularly interesting in this respect is that the embedded clause in Japanese *wh*-scope marking is marked by the interrogative complementizer *ka*. Japanese *wh*-scope marking thus provides clear morphological evidence for the indirect dependency approach.

References

- Beck, Sigrid, and Stephen Berman. 2000. Wh-Scope Marking: Direct vs. Indirect Dependency. In *Wh-Scope Marking*, edited by Uli Lutz, Gereon Muller, and Arnim Von Stechow, 17–44. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Cheng, Lisa Lai-Shen. 2000. Moving Just the Feature. In *Wh-Scope Marking*, edited by Uli Lutz, Gereon Muller, and Arnim Von Stechow, 79–99. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 1994. Scope Marking as Indirect Wh-Dependency. *Natural Language Semantics* 2 (2): 137–70.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 2000. Scope Marking: Cross-Linguistic Variation in Indirect Dependency. In *Wh-Scope Marking*, edited by Uli Lutz, Gereon Muller, and Arnim Von Stechow, 157–93. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 2017. Does Hindi-Urdu Have Feature-Driven Wh-Movement to Spec,VP? *Linguistic Inquiry* 48 (1): 159–72.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 2017. Partial Wh-Movement. In *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Syntax, Second Edition*, edited by Martin Everaert and Henk C. van Riemsdijk, 2885–2941. Somerset, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- Fanselow, Gisbert, and Anoop Mahajan. 2000. Towards a Minimalist Theory of Wh-Expletives, Wh-Copying, and Successive Cyclicity. In *Wh-Scope Marking*, edited by Uli Lutz, Gereon Muller, and Arnim Von Stechow, 195–230. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Hiemstra, Inge. 1986. Some Aspects of Wh-Questions in Frisian. *NOWELE: North Western European Language Evolution* 8: 97–110.

- Horvath, Julia. 1997. The Status of ‘Wh-Expletives’ and the Partial Wh-Movement Construction of Hungarian. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 15 (3): 509–72.
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2011. Warlpiri Wh-Scope Marking. *Syntax* 14 (2): 97–121.
- Mahajan, Anoop. 1990. The A/A-Bar Distinction and Movement Theory. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- Mahajan, Anoop. 2000. Towards a Unified Treatment of Wh-Expletives in Hindi and German. In *Wh-Scope Marking*, edited by Uli Lutz, Gereon Muller, and Arnim Von Stechow, 317–32. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Manetta, Emily. 2010. Wh -Expletives in Hindi-Urdu: The vP Phase. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41 (1): 1–34.
- McDaniel, Dana. 1989. Partial and Multiple Wh-Movement. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 7 (4): 565–604.
- Müller, Gereon. 1997. Partial Wh-Movement and Optimality Theory. *The Linguistic Review* 14 (3): 249–306.
- Nishigauchi, Taisuke. 1990. *Quantification in the Theory of Grammar*. Vol. 37. Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.
- Ott, Dennis. 2011. A Note on Free Relative Clauses in the Theory of Phases. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42 (1): 183–92.
- Sabel, Joachim. 2000. Partial Wh-Movement and the Typology of Wh-Questions. In *Wh-Scope Marking*, edited by Uli Lutz, Gereon Muller, and Arnim Von Stechow, 409–46. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Stepanov, Arthur. 2001. Cyclic Domains in Syntactic Theory. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut.

¹See Dayal 2017 for arguments against Manetta’s (2010) approach, including data from Japanese.

²It should be noted that there are varieties of German where *dass* is quite generally tolerated in embedded questions.

³According to Ott (2011), a true embedded question appearing in the middle field of the sentence, like (7), degrades the grammaticality of the sentence as shown in (i).

(i) ??Mir hat sie [Q wer es gesagt hat] ja nicht gesagt.

me has she who it said has PRT not said

‘She didn’t tell me who said it.’

The asymmetry between (7) and (i) indicates that the clause labeled as FR in (7) should not be analyzed as an embedded question.

⁴As shown in Section 3, languages differ regarding whether they use ‘what’ or ‘how’ as the scope marker in *wh*-scope marking questions.

⁵*Nante* ‘what_{prop}’ originally consists of *nani* ‘what’ and *-te* complementizer, and it behaves only as a propositional *wh*-phrase. Thus, *nante* ‘what_{prop}’ has a different distribution from *nani* ‘what’, which can be an individual *wh*-phrase like German *was* and Hindi *kyaa*.

⁶Hindi and German differ with respect to the possibility of yes-no questions occurring with *wh*-scope marking, German (i) being unacceptable.

(i) *Was glaubst du [ob sie kommt] ?

what think you whether she comes

‘What do you think: will she come?’ (Fanselow & Mahajan 2000:215)

⁷There is some cross-linguistic variation regarding what kind of verbs can cooccur with the scope marker. In Japanese and in German, factive verbs cannot be the predicate of the clause containing the scope marker as in (i), which is possible in Hindi (Dayal 1994).

- (i) *Anata-wa [John-ga **dare-ni** hanasikake-ru ka] nante siri-masi-ta ka?
 you-TOP John-NOM who-DAT talk-PRES Q what_{prop} know-POL-PAST Q

⁸A reviewer brings up the construction in (ia), where the embedded clause is followed by a postposition *nituite* ‘about’.

- (i) a. [John-ga nani-o site tukamatta no ka]-nituite doo omowaremasu ka?
 John-NOM what-ACC do was.arrested C Q-about how think Q
 ‘Regarding what John got arrested for, what do you think?’ [‘about’-construction]
- b. [John-ga nani-o site tukamatta no ka] doo omowaremasu ka? (= 10b)
 John-NOM what-ACC do was.arrested C Q how think Q
 ‘What do you think: what John got arrested for?’ [*wh*-scope marking]

Notice first that the *wh*-scope marking construction in (ib) cannot be analyzed as being derived from (ia) by dropping the postposition *nituite* ‘about’ since postpositions in Japanese cannot be dropped as shown by (ii). This suggests that *wh*-scope marking constructions are not derived by dropping the postposition *nituite* ‘about.’

- (ii) Mary*(-nituite) osiete.
 Mary-about tell
 ‘Tell me about Mary.’

In fact, (ia) differs from *wh*-scope marking constructions. Thus, as illustrated in (iii), the matrix *wh*-phrase in the *nituite* ‘about’-construction can be substituted by a whole declarative clause, but the one in *wh*-scope marking cannot be.

(iii) a. [John-ga nani-o site tukamatta no ka]-nituite boku-wa
 John-NOM what-ACC do was.arrested C Q-about I-TOP
 [_{CP} manbiki-o site tukamatta no da to] omotta.
 shoplifting-ACC do was.arrested C COP C thought
 ‘Regarding what John got arrested for, I thought [that he got arrested for shoplifting].’

b. *[John-ga nani-o site tukamatta no ka] boku-wa
 John-NOM what-ACC do was.arrested C Q I-TOP
 [_{CP} manbiki-o site tukamatta no da to] omotta.
 shoplifting-ACC do was.arrested C COP C thought

This indicates that it is the scope marker that “allows” the embedded question in *wh*-scope marking, whereas the existence of the embedded question in the ‘about’-constructions is not connected to the matrix *wh*-item.

Furthermore, the embedded question in the ‘about’-construction does not restrict the answer to the matrix *wh*-item, unlike *wh*-scope marking. In other words, ‘about’-constructions ask for a general opinion regarding the embedded question, whereas *wh*-scope marking asks for an answer which satisfies the value of the embedded question. For example, the embedded clause in (iva/b) is itself a polar question, but (ivc), which does not answer it, can be used as a satisfactory answer to the ‘about’-construction in

(iva). This is because (ivc) can be a general opinion regarding the question of whether we should take syntax 2. On the other hand, (ivc) cannot be a satisfactory answer to the *wh*-scope marking in (ivb) since it does not answer the embedded question.

(iv) a. Kimi-wa [Sintakkusutuu-o toru-beki kadooka]-nituite doo omou?
you-TOP syntax.2-ACC take-should whether-about how think
‘Regarding whether we should take Syntax 2 or not, what do you think?’
[‘about’-construction]

b. Kimi-wa [Sintakkusutuu-o toru-beki kadooka] doo omou? (= 16e)
you-TOP syntax.2-ACC take-should whether how think
‘What do you think: should we take Syntax 2?’ [*wh*-scope marking]

c. [Mada kangae-nakute ii to] omou. (to iva/#to ivb)
yet think-NEG good C think
‘We do not have to think about it now.’

This indicates that the relation between the embedded question and the matrix *wh*-phrase in ‘about’-constructions is different from the one in *wh*-scope marking constructions.