What's at stake in scope-marking?

Veneeta Dayal
Rutgers University

In this talk I assume the indirect dependency approach to scope-marking constructions and explore some theoretical implications of this choice:

1a. What do you think? Where should we go?
 b. I think we should go home.

2. [$_{CP}$ [$_{CP}$ what$_i$ do you think t$_i$] [$_{CPi}$ where$_j$ should we go t$_j$]]

The direct dependency account of scope-marking treats *what* in the first question as a pleonastic element, an option that seems to be based on dubious theoretical considerations. The indirect dependency account, on the other hand, treats the matrix *wh*-expression as contentful and avoids the need for appealing to pleonastic operators. We also discuss, in this connection, the possibility of natural language having null operators for marking *wh*-scope across clause boundaries.
Another interesting aspect of scope-marking, one that has not been satisfactorily accounted for in the literature on the topic, is the fact that the matrix clause cannot be negated. It shares this property with *wh*-slifting:

3a. *What don't you think? Where should we go?
 b. Where should we go, do/*don't you think?

I suggest a pragmatic explanation for the ungrammaticality of negation in these constructions. If we take the discourse active part in scope-marking and *wh*-slifting to be *where should we go*, the positive version of *(what) do you think* can help settle the question while the negative version cannot. Classifying them under the rubric of root phenomena has consequences for a theory of complementation, given that there are languages in which the second question in scope marking structures can be syntactically subordinated.
Finally, we look at some of the acquisition literature on this topic to see how the indirect vs. direct dependency debate plays out in that domain.