

BOOK REVIEWS

Eugen Helinski – Anna Wildmer (eds): Wüša wüša – Sei gegrüßt! Beiträge zur Finnougristik zu Ehren von Gert Sauer dargebracht zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag. Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica. Band 57. Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, 2002, 385 pp.

The latest issue of the long-established journal pays tribute to Dr. Gert Sauer. The front page is illustrated with a portrait of the scholar celebrating his jubilee. He wears the usual friendly smile that he gives all of his colleagues and friends whether they contributed to this book or not. The scholar of Finno-Ugristics graduated at Humboldt University and has become an internationally recognized researcher of Ob-Ugric languages in the research workshop of Wolfgang Steinitz. He completed his doctoral thesis on nominal suffixes in Eastern Ostyak and took part in compiling Steinitz's Ostyak Dialectal and Etymological Dictionary. After the death of the editor-in-chief he took the leading role in the work and gained imperishable credits to have this great undertaking published in 15 booklets (Lieferungen) including a word index in 1993. Gert Sauer also engaged in the publication of Steinitz's works on Ostyakology. While his own studies mostly cover this area of research, he also carried out thorough investigations concerning the contacts of Finno-Ugric languages with one another and with Russian (see a list of his publications on pages XVII–XXII). Our colleague is a determined researcher who works with clocklike regularity and whose writings have become essential handbooks in everyday use in Finno-Ugric research.

Colleagues and friends published 23 studies in honour of Gert Sauer. Although the articles cover several areas of complex Finno-Ugristics, here I mainly review and comment on papers on linguistic issues. I only indicate the language of the article if it is other than German. Articles are thematically organised here under four headings.

1. Ob-Ugric languages

Márta Csepregi contributes to the book with two new Agan Ostyak texts (pp. 85–93) about the Ostyak house and on the custom of breadbaking. The author briefly touches on some characteristic features of the dialect as well as on its place among other Ostyak dialects. Vuokko Eiras considers the meaning formulations of word entries in the dictionaries of Ob-Ugric languages (pp. 95–102). He discusses an actual example of the fact that some of the difficulties result from cultural differences between the learned collector and the native informant. István Futaky explores the etymologies of Russian mythological terms (pp. 103–10). He highlights the origins of the following two Ob-Ugric words and the way they rooted in Ostyak: (1) 'Erscheinung, Ungeheuer; phenomenon, ghost' (2) 'Botschafter Gottes; Ambassador of God'. Eugen Helinski studies Ostyak phonotactics (pp. 111–16) when he surveys the combinations of word-initial and word-medial dental consonants (plosive/affricate and nasal). He shows that the four consonants constitute two groups that are unable to combine with each other. This regularity provides an explanation for the lack of other combinations as well. Paula Jääsalmi-Krüger analyses volitive sentences in standard Ostyak (pp. 155–85). She examines expressions of volition and intention in a current linguistic context and she describes pragmatic tools and the use

of ten verbs of volition. Ariadna I. Kuznecova considers word formation in Eastern Ostyak, an area also covered by Sauer (pp. 209–28 in Russian) and she also examines affixes from a semantic point of view. She studies names of plants, animals and body parts occurring in Mogutaev's Khanti–Rusian dictionary according to their affix structure and meaning and also pays attention to compound words. Irina Nikolaeva considers the possessive constructions of Uralic languages (pp. 239–250 in English). She starts with Ob-Ugric structures and draws up conclusions regarding Proto-Uralic. The author doubts the existence of a marked and an unmarked possessive construction in Proto-Uralic as “the two constructions are clearly distinct in function and structure”. Rosemarie Radomski, Steinitz's former colleague examines Ostyak ghost names (pp. 252–70) that belong to the category of personal names. She divides these two-constituent constructions into a primary word (Grundwort) and a determining word (Bestimmungswort) and sets up a typology according to their meaning. Károly Rédei examines the development of definite (transitive) conjugation in Ostyak (pp. 271–78). Stress (stressed thematic vowels in 1st and 2nd person singular), and the 3sg personal pronoun **se*, as well as the demonstrative pronouns **tä*, **ta*, all contributed to the extension of the Ostyak definite paradigm. Timothy Riese considers consonant–consonant combinations in Northern Vogul (pp. 279–86). He only examines thematic combinations in the lexicon and fails to pay attention to polymorphemic combinations. Eszter Ruttkay-Miklián reveals the ethnographic background of Steinitz's Sinja texts (pp. 287–314). As the study is abundant in names, it is a useful source for those interested in onomastic research. Elena Skribnik surveys participial constructions of reason and purpose in Northern Vogul where postpositions are used to express adverbial relations of reason and purpose (pp. 323–39). Regarding the use of personal possessive endings these structures resemble shortened sentences in Finnish but postpositions are used instead of case endings to express adverbial relations. Anna Widmer discusses the meaning of a seemingly meaningless and fully opaque compound while exploring the mythological background of the word (pp. 369–78).

2. Other Uralic languages

Gerson Klumpp carries out an etymological analysis on Kamas Samoyed month names and concludes that they are all internal creations except for one of Turkish origin. The names are related to the so-called lunisolar year of 13 months. Peter Sherwood studies the suffixability of Hungarian ethnonyms (pp. 315–22). Examining the use of the suffix *-ság/-ség* he shows that *magyar* ‘Hungarian’ has a special status in this respect. Haik Wenzel contributes a contrastive study of aspectuality and actionality in Hungarian and Finnish (pp. 351–67). Although both languages have several mechanisms of aspectuality and actionality, their rate of grammaticalisation is higher in Hungarian than in Finnish. Both languages use analytic and syntetic tools. Eberhard Winkler considers the Russian loan words of the Livonian lexicon (pp. 379–85). Layers are specified bearing the background of Latvian loans in mind.

3. Finno-Ugric/Uralic history of science

Raija Bartens gives a detailed portrait of H. C. v.d. Gabelenz (1807–1874) (pp. 65–84). Besides studying law and economy, the German v.d. Gabelenz was a self-educated linguist who was extremely interested in languages. His unparalleled achievement was his study (1861) on passive constructions, examining 208 (!) languages. He was one of the first scholars to give a detailed description of the grammatical phenomena of several Uralic languages. It is amazing how thorough a survey he offered on Erzya Mordvin on the basis of gospel translations without any preliminary studies and background knowledge about Finno-Ugristics. Later he compiled the grammar summaries of Zyrian, Cheremis, Votyak and Samoyed. His work secures his name

in Finno-Ugristics even within a distance of 150 years as he displayed a taste for combining comparative and synchronic methods. László Honti (pp. 117–53) brings recent “revolutionary” ideas in Uralistics under critical examination. He highlights the historical roots of the “new” hypotheses and outlines his views on Proto-Uralic, the family tree and on the theories of the ancient homeland of the Finno-Ugric peoples. One by one he proves how insupportable the “revolutionist’s” ideas are. He also emphasises the pitfalls of human genetics. As a conclusion of his polemical study supported by rich logical arguments he claims (for the first time in the German literature) that the “revolutionist’s” hypotheses take readers and believers to the world of science fiction. Lars-Gunnar Larsson describes the work of Fredrik Martin, a young ethnographer, who visited the Surgut Ostyak in 1891. Although his accounts of his journeys were published in the following years, summaries on the history of science have failed so far to report on his activities.

4. *Other*

Apart from linguistic issues the book touches on folklore and ethnography. It includes an article on the Sami joika (Hans-Hermann Bartens pp. 1–63), on the shaman rituals of the Surgut Ostyak (Ágnes Kerezi pp. 187–99 in Russian) and on the folkloristic aspects of idiom research (Ujváry Zoltán pp. 341–49). To sum up, we can claim that Dr. Gert Sauer was presented with a rich and colourful professional gift by his friends on his 70th birthday. Having been a linguist of Ob-Ugric languages in times past let me follow the Ostyak greeting in the title of the book and wish Dr. Gert Sauer good health, i.e., sound hands and feet in Vogul: *pus kāt, pus lāyē!*

László Keresztes

Uli Lutz – Gereon Müller – Arnim von Stechow (eds): Wh-Scope Marking. (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, vol. 37). John Benjamins, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, 2000, vi + 483 pp.

The book contains the harvest of a few years’ work of the authors, initiated by a workshop on the same topic, held at the University of Tübingen, Germany, in 1995. Its predecessor is the volume of proceedings of that workshop (Lutz–Müller 1996), but most of the papers have since been revised or rewritten, with an eye, in many cases, on the others’ contributions so that some sense of overall coherence has developed, and the authors have mostly (though obviously not always) paid attention to possible support or objection to their proposals coming from the research carried out by the other contributors. But the papers are perfectly self-contained and independent of each other, reflecting the often incompatible views of the different authors.

Introduction

The introductory chapter, written by the editors, sets up the scene for the discussion by sketching the context within which the individual papers explore the subject in the focus of this volume: the multiclausal wh-scope marking constructions. The general background includes the parametric variability of wh-movement across languages (in situ, single movement, multiple movement), and its widespread accounts within the principles and parameters tradition of syntactic theory, e.g., the wh-criterion, or minimalist feature-based analyses. Then an illustrative sample of wh-scope marking is presented, from various languages, such as German (1a), Hindi (1b), or Hungarian (1c), with a brief history of relevant research carried out in the past, and its major findings.

Acta Linguistica Hungarica 50, 2003

- (1) (a) [_{CP1} Was denkt sie [_{CP2} wen_x Fritz t_x eingeladen hat]]?
 what thinks she who_{acc} F. invited has
 ‘Whom does she think Fritz invited?’
 (b) [_{CP1} Siitaa-ne kyaa socaa [_{CP2} ki Ravii-ne kis-ko dekhaa]]?
 S._{erg} what thought that R._{erg} who saw
 ‘Who did Sita think that Ravi saw?’
 (c) [_{CP1} Mit gondolsz [_{CP2} hogy ki látta Marit]]?
 what_{acc} think-2sg that who_{nom} saw-3sg Mary_{acc}
 ‘Who do you think saw Mary?’

Finally, the three main types of analysis proposed so far are surveyed: (i) the **direct dependency** approach, establishing both a syntactic and a semantic link between the scope marking element (SM), and some contentful wh-phrase in an embedded domain; (ii) the **indirect dependency** approach, which associates the SM, semantically as well as syntactically, with a whole embedded clause (CP₂) containing at least one contentful wh-phrase, assuming SM to be a genuine wh-phrase, quantifying over propositions, with CP₂ spelling out the restriction of the quantification; (iii) **mixed** approaches, which link up SM and CP₂ in syntax, but postulate a semantic relationship between SM and the contentful wh-phrase in CP₂. (2) provides a schematic representation of the construction:

- (2) [_{CP1} SM ... V ... [_{CP2} ... XP_{wh} ...]]

The conclusion given by the editors is that no unified approach seems to be feasible and adequate for the full spectrum of wh-scope marking languages—which turns out to be the majority view among the contributors, too.

Sigrid Beck – Stephen Berman: Wh-Scope Marking: Direct vs. Indirect Dependency

Although this paper has been assigned the first slot (right after the editors’ introduction) in the volume simply because its first author’s name begins with a letter very early in the alphabet, it happens to be a rather fortunate and appropriate choice for this place, as it makes an exposition of the two major competing approaches to the wh-scope marking construction: the so-called **direct** and **indirect dependency** accounts. Direct dependency analyses share the property that they consider the construction a variant of (or at least related to) the long-distance wh-dependencies, and the scope-marking item an expletive, chain-/movement-linked to some contentful wh-item in some embedded clause (call it CP₂), whose scope is indicated by the position of the scope-marker (SM). On the other hand, proponents of the indirect dependency analyses focus on the differences between the scope-marking and the long-distance movement constructions, and assume a link between SM and the whole CP₂, in such a way that the matrix clause constitutes a full-fledged question on its own, with the SM interpreted as a wh-quantifier over propositions, restricted by the content of CP₂, and the scope of the wh-items inside CP₂ is established only indirectly, in the semantic representation. Beck – Berman compare these two approaches with respect to both empirical and theoretical adequacy, to conclude that German and Hindi instantiate two different strategies of scope-marking, with coincidental interpretive functions, and while Hindi displays a clear case of indirect dependency, German data are only compatible with a direct dependency account, i.e., it is meaningless to seek a unified account for the two types.

In the course of developing a proper direct dependency account in terms of LF-movement of an embedded wh-item to the position of the SM, the authors also present, evaluate, and

augment McDaniel's (1989) original account implemented as a chain-relation between the SM and a locally moved wh-item in CP₂. They then incorporate certain insights of this analysis into their own version.

The presentation is exceptionally well-articulated and clear, introducing the arguments in a neat stepwise fashion, covering both the syntactic and the semantic aspects, with special attention paid to explicitness in the latter domain.

Ellen Brandner: Scope Marking and Clausal Typing

Brandner sets up an analysis of the 'partial movement' construction in terms of clausal typing (following Cheng's (1991) hypothesis): in her view the insertion of expletive wh-items in German and Hindi serves precisely this end—to type the matrix clause as interrogative. In other languages, as well as in certain other constructions in scope-marking languages, this is done, by overt movement of a wh-item to the appropriate C-domain. Furthermore, another relation termed 'interrogative concord' is evoked to account for the potential of the typing relation to arch over several intermediate clauses, between the root clause, and the one containing a genuine wh-phrase. Concord ensures the identical typing of the intermediate clauses, and establishes an interpretive link (much like a chain) between the matrix typer expletive and the embedded contentful wh-item. German displays direct dependency in this respect, while in Hindi the link is between an argumental wh-phrase, and a CP associated with it, in accordance with the *in situ* nature of wh-phrases in this language, i.e., that they do not move to A'-positions at all. This difference between German and Hindi is further attributed to the different make-up of wh-items: in German they are composed of a wh- and an indefinite constituent (cf. Cheng's paper, introduced below), of which the typing item *was* is just the wh-part. In Hindi, on the other hand, the wh-pronouns are inherently [+wh], which enables them to type the clause directly from an A-position.

Brandner's paper also contains an interesting discussion of the distinction between typing a clause as interrogative, and interpreting it as a question, and the claim that contentful wh-phrases (whether via pure typers, like *was*, or by undergoing syntactic movement) can be interpreted (i.e., take scope) from their base positions, and their 'displacement' relations merely serve syntactic purposes.

Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng: Moving Just the Feature

Cheng's contribution is one of the clearest cases of the direct dependency approach—but applicable only to the German type of wh-scope marking, and not, e.g., the Hindi type. Concomitantly, she rejects the view (advocated by Dayal) that wh-scope marking is a uniform phenomenon across languages, in need of a common explanation.

The core assumption in her analysis is that the scope-marking *was* spells out a set of formal features moved independently of the rest of their category, i.e., that this is an instance of pure feature movement in Chomsky's (1995) sense. Wh-movement in general consists of two steps: movement of the [+wh] feature to an appropriate C⁰, followed by movement of the full category to the corresponding spec,CP, where a "repair strategy" unites the two independently moving parts again, to avoid scattered features. Languages like German appear to allow the repair strategy to be postponed until several clausal layers are built upon one another, so the [+wh] feature can move (in overt syntax) on its own to C⁰ of a higher clause than where its category remnant occurs. This yields partial movement structures, which may bridge several serially embedded clause domains, with the full category still in the lowest spec,CP, or, optionally, in the specifier of any of the higher CPs having been visited by the loose feature. In sum: partial movement is an option just in case the given language parametrically tolerates

scattered features at spell-out. Full category movement is obligatory in the clause of the tail of the wh-chain to ensure that the repair may take place in a spec-head ('checking') configuration. The question arises, though (and is left unanswered by the paper), why the repair configuration must emerge at all if the language allows scattered features anyway.

The possibility of splitting the [wh] feature from the full category at spell-out is argued by Cheng to be contingent on the availability of an appropriate vocabulary item (*was* in German), which, in turn, is related to the composition of pronouns. In German, like in Japanese, wh-words have an indefinite usage, indicative of the complex nature of these pronouns: they are composed of a "core", and a specifying affix, such as a wh-affix—a null-prefix in the particular case of German. It is this dissociable wh-affix that embodies the wh-feature moving independently and gets spelled out as *was*.

Hindi (and also Hungarian), Cheng claims, constitutes a different case: in such languages there is an **expletive** + **CP-associate** structure, rather than partial movement. In fact, there is no overt movement to any spec,CP at all, and the scope-marking expletive is in an object position, too, though its wh-feature covertly moves to the matrix C^0 . Hence there is no direct dependency between the expletive (or the [wh]-feature of the matrix C^0) and the wh-item in the embedded domain. Therefore, as expected, and as opposed to German, the embedded clause can be a yes/no question, too, provided the expletive itself has a more general [+Q] feature, rather than a specific [+wh] one. The different patterns of wh-scope marking in the German-type and the Hindi-type languages are supposed to follow from the different nature of the dependency in question.

Peter Cole – Gabriella Hermon: Partial Wh-Movement: Evidence from Malay

Cole and Hermon investigate partial wh-movement in Malay, a language whose data have largely been ignored by linguists working on the wh-scope marking phenomena. This, in itself, lends importance to the paper. On the other hand, they say very little about other languages, whereby their contribution to the project behind the volume is rather hard to evaluate or locate in the full context. They couch their analysis in the direct dependency approach, without discussing its superiority or inferiority to the indirect dependency hypothesis.

The most obvious specialty of the Malay partial movement construction is that it has no overt scope marker in the matrix clause:

- (3) Kamu fikir [ke mana (yang) Mary pergi]?
 you think to where that M. go
 'Where do you think that Mary went?'

However, if one compares this with full wh-movement and wh-in-situ constructions of Malay, it turns out that partial wh-movement induces the same kind of island effects, both below and above the partially moved wh-phrase, that characterizes full wh-movement, while at the same time morphological indications of overt movement are only perceived in the domain below it. This strongly suggests that there is covert movement from the intermediate spec,CP to the scopal spec,CP. The authors find arguments for this derivation, as opposed to another theoretical possibility: overt wh-movement all the way up, followed by the phonological spell-out of the intermediate position, rather than the topmost, scopal one. Likewise, they argue that Hungarian, with an overt scope marker in the matrix domain, constitutes a case against the latter analysis, since in this language the SM must be attracted by a strong feature, which is incompatible with spelling out an intermediate chain link.

Finally, the paper points out a typological distinction of what drives partial wh-movement. In languages like Hungarian, and even in certain cases in Malay, it is an instance of focus movement, triggered by a strong focus feature, while in other cases (Malay adjuncts, possibly also German) it is the greed of the wh-item that drives it to some spec,CP. Other languages, like English, lack partial movement altogether because they have no wh-expletive lexical items, either overt, as in German or Hungarian, or pro, as in Malay.

Franz Josef d'Avis: On the Wh-Expletive Was in German

D'Avis' paper addresses a side issue of the book's main theme: it looks at three constructions in German which make use of *was* as a wh-expletive. Besides the "classic" partial movement construction, there is one type in which *was* questions the reason of an event (4a), and another one where it functions as a degree-marking exclamative (4b):

- (4) (a) Was schlägst du schon wieder den Hund?
 what beat you prt again the dog
 'Why are you beating the dog again?'
 (b) Was (der) Otto seine Frau liebt!
 what (the) O. his wife loves
 'How Otto loves his wife!'

These uses of *was* are compared to its use as a proper wh-pronoun, to find that these three uses behave rather differently from contentful wh-pronouns. The common properties are attributed to the expletive, semantically contentless nature of this type of *was*. The expletive *was* is assumed to be base generated in spec,CP. The further divide between the partial movement structure on the one hand, and the reason-questioning and exclamative use of *was* on the other, is due to their different syntactic and LF relations: while the partial-wh *was* is in a chain with a contentful wh-phrase, and for interpretive reasons must be replaced by it in the LF-representation, the other two types of *was* are not chain-linked to any other item (hence their total inability to license any wh-in-situ), and as expletives, they must be eliminated at LF, after licensing a [+wh] feature on C⁰. This yields an interrogative sentence without any element in spec,CP, an "empty" interrogative, or proto-question, which acquires its specific meanings (causal question or exclamation) via pragmatic factors, and intonation is used to distinguish the two subcases.

The paper investigates interesting data, but offers no novel analysis for the constructions which the whole book focuses on, and leaves it for the reader to work out the pragmatic solution called for in interpreting the empty questions.

Veneeta Dayal: Scope Marking: Cross-Linguistic Variation in Indirect Dependency

Dayal's paper is probably the pivotal piece in the volume, aiming to show that the direct and indirect dependency approaches must be distinguished in semantic terms, rather than syntactic ones, and once so done, it becomes clear that all the major variants of the wh-scope marking constructions found in such diverse languages as German, Hindi, Iraqi Arabic, etc. (with the possible exception of Hungarian), uniformly fall into the indirect dependency type, and the cross-linguistic diversity displayed by these languages appears just at the level of syntax, representable by various grades of the embedding of the non-question clause containing the lexical wh-phrases. Besides refuting the validity of the (semantic) direct dependency approach, she also shows that accounts that might at first sight appear as exponents of a third kind

of approach (such as in Mahajan's, Fanselow – Mahajan's, and Horvath's contributions in the volume) are in fact reducible to either the indirect or the direct dependency approach, i.e., at the level of semantics there is no third way.

In presenting her analysis, Dayal first reiterates the essential ingredients of her earlier, indirect dependency, accounts (1994, 1996), originally developed for the Hindi wh-scope marking construction: the scope marking wh-phrase (SM) is a genuine wh-quantifier, not a semantically void expletive, questioning about propositions, the range of which is restricted by the embedded clause (CP₂), while syntactically there is a chain-like relation (coindexation) between SM and CP₂. Wh-phrases in CP₂ are thus never directly related to the matrix spec,CP. She then shows that the direct dependency approach cannot properly account for the Hindi facts (esp. that the SM is not an expletive, as it is generated in an argument position, and gets interpreted semantically; and that CP₂ can be a yes/no question, whose operator cannot be directly linked to the matrix wh-operator). Next she presents apparent evidence against the applicability of the indirect dependency approach to German, arguments that have been mustered against her earlier analyses (e.g., the availability of yes/no-questions in CP₂; superiority effects between the SM and other wh-phrases in the matrix clause). In order to nevertheless reconcile these facts with the indirect dependency approach, Dayal sets up a typological paradigm of syntactic configurations for wh-scope marking, with a conjectured diachronic grounding: degrees of grammaticalization. Supporting evidence is sought from languages not classified as wh-scope marking languages (e.g., English), which still possess a peculiar construction used for the same purpose: sequential questions, as in (5a).

- (5) (a) What did Tom say? Who will Mary see?
 (b) He said Mary will see Joe.
 (c) #He said he's fine. She will see Joe.

(5b) is a possible answer to such a sequence, while (5c) is not, so the two sentences must be interpreted together, as a single question. This suprasentential construction shares many properties of the "standard" wh-scope marking construction: it can span over several clauses (6a), it accepts yes/no-questions in CP₂ (6b), the V of the first sentence must not be of the type that strictly selects [+wh] complements (6c), the first sentence cannot be negated (6d), and CP₂ can be a multiple question (6e):

- (6) (a) What do you think? What will he say? Who should go?
 (b) What did she say? Will Tom come?
 (c) What did she ask? Who is coming?
 (d) *What don't you think? Who is coming?
 (e) *What did she say? Who will go where?

Now, this construction is only amenable to an indirect dependency account, since no direct dependency can be established cross-sententially. It constitutes one edge of the spectrum of wh-scope marking constructions, on the verge of not being subject to syntactic analysis at all, as a non-subordinating conjunction of the two sentences. A second grade of embedding is exemplified by Hindi: in that type, CP₂ is adjoined to the matrix IP or VP, coindexed by an empty element in the restrictor part of the wh-XP in the matrix clause, to whose position CP₂ may move at LF. This is already a case of syntactic subordination. The third, and strongest, subordinative structure, on the other hand, places CP₂ in the complement position of the

matrix V, while the SM is still in the same relationship with CP₂ as in the intermediate type. German may then instantiate either the intermediate or the strong subordinative type, while semantically it shares with Hindi the indirect dependency. That is, all cross-linguistic variation falls within the scope of syntax, while there is significant uniformity in the way of semantically interpreting the wh-scope marking constructions.

Eventually, to lend impetus to this new conception, Dayal presents evidence against the correctness of direct dependency analyses for German, both theoretical (the problem of SM linked with two coordinated CP₂'s; the stipulative explanation of "anti-locality", i.e., the fact that SMs cannot be paired with clausemate wh-phrases), and empirical (from the interrelation between wh-phrases and parasitic gaps). She also points out that intervention effects are neatly captured by her analysis, while the fact that the ban on negation in the first clause is observed in sequential questions, as well, undermines the credibility of accounting for such intervention effects relying on alleged ⟨SM, wh-XP⟩ chains—the key device of direct dependency.

In a final section Dayal speculates that if Horvath's data from Hungarian are valid, then this language has proceeded farthest on the scale of grammaticalization, towards turning into a direct-dependency language, but here further study is necessary to settle the issue.

Gisbert Fanselow – Anoop Mahajan: Towards a Minimalist Theory of Wh-Expletives, Wh-Copying, and Successive Cyclicity

Fanselow and Mahajan's contribution is a theoretically oriented one, whose main goal is to reconcile the basics of their earlier analysis with the spirit of the latest minimalist developments, and by doing so, also to shed light on the problem of expletives occurring in spec,CPs as fits Chomsky's 2000 model, since in that system expletives cannot be legitimately inserted directly into such positions. The authors' approach to the relation between SM and CP₂ is essentially of the indirect dependency type (as pointed out by Dayal), though they are explicit in distancing themselves from Dayal's analysis. And they also share the insight with Dayal that the wh-scope marking constructions of German and Hindi are essentially similar, surface variance being derivable from fundamental differences between the two languages, such as overt wh-movement in German, vs. wh-in-situ in Hindi. Apart from these two languages, they occasionally remark on Latin and Hungarian, which seem to them to behave genuinely differently in some respects, but they do not offer comprehensive accounts for them.

They treat SMs (German *was*, Hindi *kya*) as sentential wh-object expletives, in complementary distribution with other, non-wh, sentential expletives (German *es*, Hindi *yah*). The sentential nature of SMs is evidenced by their resistance to Case-marking, and the so-called pseudoparasitic gap construction, which is analysed here as a German-specific type of conjunction reduction. SMs are regarded as semantically void, which helps explain why raising them to Comp is cheaper, hence preferred, over raising contentful wh-XPs.

The paper makes a point of treating in detail an alternative construction of German, called the "copy construction", in which the phonological like of the contentful wh-word appears in the superordinate spec,CPs, where otherwise the SM would occur:

- (7) **Wen** denkst Du, **wen** sie meint, **wen** Harald liebt?
 who think you who she believes who H. loves
 'Who do you think that she believes that Harald loves?'

As regards its syntactic behavior, this construction patterns with the scope marking construction, rather than with the long wh-movement one, with the peculiarity that only monomorphemic wh-phrases are allowed. Nevertheless, the authors propose to treat the copy construc-

tion as a variant of long wh-movement *à la* copy-and-deletion, where monomorphemic items in spec,CPs may cliticize on C^0 , and thus survive the deletion of all of the lower copies. The similar behavior of the scope marking and the copy constructions, as opposed to long wh-movement, is a result of their empty intermediate C^0 s, contrasted with the obligatorily filled $[-wh]$ C^0 (*daß*) of the long wh-movement structures.

As to the question of how the wh-phrase(s) in CP_2 assume matrix scope, the analysis assumes that CP_2 is covertly pied-piped to the matrix spec,CP (this is comparable to overt CP pied-piping in Basque, and in the case of infinitival clauses in German), where the wh-XP is entitled to take matrix scope as “specifier of a specifier”:

- (8) $[_{CP_1} [_{CP_2} wh- C_2 \dots] C_1 \dots$

The covert movement of CP_2 is a case of expletive replacement obeying the principle of Full Interpretation in government-binding terms, or analysed as pied-piping on attraction of the contentful wh-XP in spec, CP_2 in classic minimalism (Chomsky 1995), but in terms of later minimalism (Chomsky 2000), matrix C^0 directly agrees with the wh-XP inside CP_2 , and since CP_2 cannot cross the vP phase boundary of the matrix clause, the SM *was/kyaa* is inserted as an object expletive to serve as a mediator between matrix C^0 and CP_2 .

Finally, the authors address the question why wh-phrases move to $[-wh]$ spec,CPs at all, in an attraction-based system. They propose that wh-movement is driven by categorial feature attraction (in particular, D- or P-feature), while $[+wh]$ is just a possible subfeature of the attractor, C^0 . This way, they conflate wh-movement with all other cases of movement to (matrix) spec,CP in German, and accommodate partial and cyclic (wh-)movement. This, they claim, also paves the way for an account of certain cases of CP-islandhood.

The paper, on the whole, is highly technical in nature, abounding in detailed engineering work deriving the structures involved. On the other hand, however, the authors often sketch different alternative solutions to problems, without conclusively deciding on any one of them.

Hubert Haider: Towards a Superior Account of Superiority

Haider investigates the parametric differences in wh-superiority effects between German and English, with a glimpse on Dutch, as well. This bears only tangentially on the main issues of the book, but provides the discussion of the wh-scope marking constructions with a background on wh-interaction, and wh-in-situ licensing.

After reviewing the basic patterns of interaction between moved and in situ wh-items in English and German, Haider concludes that no single condition on superiority can be capable of accounting for the variation, all the more so since it does not involve only cross-linguistic variation, but also language-internal, cross-constructional variation, of extreme complexity. Therefore he begins working out his own multifactorial analysis by establishing four fundamental generalizations about wh-interaction, which serve as a basis for finding the correct replacement of mono-causal explanations of superiority. Two of these split apart individual-denoting and higher-order adverbials, claiming that the latter must c-command the event-denoting projection, i.e., the VP, and cannot license each other's staying in situ. A third generalization proscribes in situ wh-subjects when some other wh-phrase has crossed over them, while the fourth one applies to interactions between complement wh-phrases, prohibiting configurations where a wh-in-situ c-commands a wh-trace with non-distinct categorial and case features.

Haider shows that the standard accounts (the superiority condition, economy considerations preferring shorter and covert movement, as well as the reduction of superiority to weak crossover) all fail empirically, and proposes that the grammaticality status of the relevant con-

figurations results from the interplay of principles underlying the above generalizations and other, independent parameters (like the well-known OV/VO parameter, or the existence vs. lack of a designated VP-external subject position in Dutch vs. German). What remains to be done is to sharpen the explanations for the proposed generalizations, and to examine how they fare in other languages.

Tilman N. Höhle: The W- ... W- Construction: Appositive or Scope Indicating?

Höhle's paper allows a glimpse into the origins of discussion concerning the German *was ... w-* construction, and sets out to assess two 'classic' accounts for it in the face of a wide array of data from various related constructions. The two accounts are: the scope marking/direct dependency account, and the apposition account, which holds that the two clauses of the *was ... w-* construction are syntactically independent of each other, being in an apposition relationship—this view obviously relates the construction to the case of sequential questions, discussed in detail by Dayal.

As a first step, he draws some key generalizations from the relevant data (such as: the matrix clause is a self-contained sentential wh-question, the embedded one is just like an ordinary wh-question, but the matrix predicate must be able to select a [-wh] complement), then examines how the two accounts under scrutiny can handle them, noting that the scope marking account, albeit more suitable to cover the basic data empirically, carries a number of inherent theoretical difficulties. (In this section, there is a notable remark made in passing, condemning the "abuse of coindexation", i.e., the unconstrained use of what used to be indices of **reference** in a narrow sense, ubiquitous in current theorizing.)

The next part of the paper is devoted to comparing the *was ... w-* construction with the copy construction, to help decide between the alternative analyses. Höhle concludes that the two constructions are essentially similar, hence must be subject to closely related analyses (a view that Fanselow – Mahajan explicitly reject), which is possible only in the scope marking account. Further evidence in favor of this account is adduced by wh-in-situ phenomena, and properties of the LF-raising of the embedded-clause wh-phrase necessarily assumed by the scope-marking hypothesis. On the other hand, the author suggests that proper analyses of the exclamative use of wh-phrases, as well as the behavior of the wh-XPs inside the embedded [+wh] clauses support the apposition account.

The paper provides interesting observations, and presents data from Frisian, Romani, and even Afrikaans, apart from German, but ends in a rather abrupt way, without any final conclusion regarding the comparison of the two accounts—Höhle seems to be content with simply enumerating potential advantages and drawbacks of both. As regards the examples, it is somewhat impolite to readers unfamiliar with the languages examined to just give glosses, but not translations, for the examples. Also, the author appears to be rather unaware of the contents of certain other papers in the volume, and keeps referring to much earlier versions of those analyses.

*Julia Horvath: On the Syntax of "Wh-Scope Marker" Constructions:
Some Comparative Evidence*

Horvath's discussion of wh-scope marking is based primarily on Hungarian data (which assigns to it a special place in the present review), following the lead of her earlier papers on the subject, defending a 'mixed' analysis, built on indirect syntactic dependency, but rejecting the adequacy of a Dayal-style indirect **semantic** dependency for the relevant Hungarian construction. Horvath also rejects Dayal's theoretical preference for a unified account to cover cross-linguistic variation in wh-scope marking, on empirical grounds: she shows that this vari-

ation is such that none of the major existing analyses can cater for all known options: there exist clear cases of direct syntactic dependency (e.g., Malay), as well as of indirect semantic dependency (e.g., the sequential question construction, which necessitates a suprasentential approach), therefore different accounts are needed anyway.

In her discussion, Horvath introduces a tripartite system of approaches: beside Dayal's indirect semantic dependency approach, and the classic syntactic direct dependency approach, she recognizes a third option—indirect syntactic dependency, combined with direct semantic linking of the scope marking item with some embedded *wh*-phrase. Hungarian instantiates this last option, but German and Hindi are not subject to a similar, mixed analysis, she claims, contra Fanselow – Mahajan's view.

Horvath then goes on to reiterate the basic points of her analysis put forth earlier: *mit* 'what' is an expletive scope marker in Hungarian, associated with CP₂, which is in a complement position, and is related to another clausal expletive, *az* 'it', which links up with non-interrogative clauses. CP₂ is assumed to undergo covert movement to adjoin to the expletive (driven by the principle of full interpretation), leaving behind a full copy, part of which must be reconstructed there, including the trace of the contentful *wh*-phrase inside CP₂. This *wh*-phrase, in some C-space specifier of CP₂, must furthermore transmit its [wh]-feature to CP₂—the situation thus parallels the overt raising of CP₂ to scope position in Basque.

The next section examines how Dayal's account and its predictions fare with Hungarian facts. Three predictions are tested: (i) that all kinds of interrogative clauses can function as CP₂, (ii) that no otherwise ill-formed interrogative can occur as CP₂, and (iii) in a CP₂ with multiple *wh*-items all *wh*'s must be uniform with respect to scope. These all fail in the face of Hungarian data: (i) simple yes/no-questions cannot serve as CP₂; (ii) yes/no-questions combined with *wh*-items are ill-formed outside the context of the *wh*-scope marking construction, but are good as CP₂; (iii) multiple *wh*-items in CP₂ can (in fact, must) have split scope, with one of them taking scope in the matrix, and another one within the embedded clause. The latter two cases also falsify the widely-held generalization that only those matrix predicates can participate in the scope-marking construction which may select [–wh] complements (cf. Höhle), since in these cases CP₂ is obviously typed as a question, and must thus be compatible even with predicates exclusively selecting for [+wh]. This is the most powerful part of the argumentation.

As a next step, Horvath examines the scope-marking element itself, and presents evidence for its status as an expletive originating in a non-theta A-position. She purports to use the alleged lack of an appropriate counterpart for it in answers to such questions, and its inability to license parasitic gaps, as arguments against analysing it as a genuine *wh*-quantifier à la Dayal. However, the judgments she assigns to the data are, in my opinion, questionable, or even invalid.

Finally, Horvath discusses the cross-linguistic applicability of Dayal's uniform indirect semantic dependency account, and the indirect syntactic dependency account. While the former is untenable for both German and Hungarian (for partly different reasons), and suffers from theoretical problems from a minimalist syntactic perspective, the latter seems inappropriate for Hindi, for which Dayal's analysis appears to be well-grounded, and its extension is problematic for German (contra Fanselow – Mahajan), especially in respect of the variable behavior of matrix predicate classes. So facts point in the direction of the semantic and syntactic non-uniformity of *wh*-scope marking in various languages, although they might have common diachronic roots, in sequential questions. But Dayal's attempt to perceive the variation as grades of diachronic grammaticalization is on the wrong track.

Horvath's paper is tightly argued, maybe the best-written one in the volume, with careful, detailed analyses of the facts, frequently presenting and evaluating alternatives—its main problem being the questionability of some data.

Anoop Mahajan: Towards a Unified Treatment of Wh-Expletives in Hindi and German

Mahajan's paper can be conceived as a "support article" to Fanselow–Mahajan's joint work (or vice versa). Its objective is to show how a unified analysis can be developed for the German and Hindi scope-marking construction. A crucial hypothesis underlying the proposal, though not discussed in detail, is that this construction is coexistent with a long movement construction in both languages (long wh-movement in German, long-distance scrambling in Hindi), but is derived from a distinct underlying structure, so the question of economy-based preference for one or the other does not emerge.

The paper is neatly organized: first it enumerates the most important properties of the Hindi scope-marking construction (noting, in particular, the clitic nature of *kyaa* whereby it is always adjacent to the verb, unlike its use as a contentful wh-phrase, and its complementary distribution with the non-interrogative clausal expletive *yah*). Then the major differences between Hindi *kyaa* and German *was* are presented (the in situ nature of both *kyaa* and the contentful wh-XP within CP₂ in Hindi, vs. the local movement of both *was* and the full wh-XP in German; the presence/absence of scope markers in intermediate clauses, and the possibility of the copy construction in German).

An analysis is proposed, first for Hindi, in terms of covert clausal pied-piping. In this indirect dependency account, closely related to that of Fanselow–Mahajan, there is LF-movement of both the scope-marking clausal expletive *kyaa*, and the contentful wh-phrase inside CP₂, to the local spec,CP, followed by the covert raising of CP₂ to the expletive (presumably a copy-operation), triggered by feature-matching between the expletive and CP₂, from whose spec the full wh-item can take scope. Intermediate clauses involve sequential cyclic application of this, and in the emerging configuration, scope-taking must be possible from the "spec of a spec of ... of a spec" (which, by the way, is in compliance with Kayne's (1994) conception of c-command, and his analysis of bound pronominals—not noted by any of the authors assuming this way of scope-taking).

Mahajan then goes on to derive from his proposal all the major properties presented in the first part, as well as the systematicity of differences between Hindi and German, and certain other assumptions (some widely recognized, others obviously only alleged) about the parametric variance between the two languages. Mahajan notes in passing that the issues of yes/no questions in CP₂, and of the factivity of the selecting predicates are left unexplained here. In the final section, readers find some (not very convincing) arguments for regarding *was* as an object expletive on a par with *kyaa*, and a minor argument against the direct dependency approach.

Jürgen Pafel: Absolute and Relative. On Scope in German Wh-Sentences, W- ... W-Constructions Included

The main concern of Pafel's semantically oriented paper is the determination of absolute and relative scope, primarily between a wh-item and a (universal/distributive) quantifier, but also between non-wh quantifiers, and between multiple wh-items, and with an eye on the wh-scope marking construction. Relative scope is assumed to rely on three factors: c-command, subjecthood, and inherent distributivity, in such a way that the weight of c-command equals the combined weight of the other two.

Pafel investigates the interaction of universal quantifiers (UQ) and wh-items in four constructions: partial movement (*was ... w*), long wh-movement, the copy construction, and wh-imperatives, such as (9a), which is interpreted as (9b), i.e., the wh-phrase behaves as if it was “reconstructed” into the embedded clause:

- (9) (a) Wo schätz mal, daß die besten Weine wachsen!
 where guess one-time that the best wines grow
 ‘Guess where the best wines grow.’
 (b) Schätz mal, wo die besten Weine wachsen!

When there is an additional UQ in the embedded clause of these constructions, the sentences are ambiguous in each case. However, if the UQ is in the matrix, only the long wh-movement and the copy constructions display ambiguity, while the *was ... w* construction, and the wh-imperatives do not: they only have the UQ > wh scope reading. This is taken as evidence that the *(was, wh)* chain cannot take scope in the position of its head, so *was* is not a scope-marker in the strict sense, contrary to common belief, therefore positing LF-movement of either the contentful wh-phrase or the whole of CP₂ to its position leads to incorrect predictions. The scope-computing algorithm proposed by Pafel (the essential idea of which is that absolute scope may be dependent on relative scope, and only overt chain-links are involved) “sees” the higher chain link, but it cannot outscope the matrix subject UQ, by virtue of the latter being an inherently distributive subject, c-commanding the relevant lower link of the wh-chain. Long wh-movement, on the other hand, results in a configuration where the only overt link of the wh-chain is in the matrix domain, c-commanding the UQ, whereby their scopal weight is equal, yielding ambiguity. Facts about the copy construction show the same effect, although the question of the precise way of computing it is left open, while in the case of wh-imperatives, taking the matrix-clause position of the wh-phrase into account leads to a semantically invalid wh > IMP scope-order, so repair is forced, in the form of quantifier-lowering.

Pafel’s paper places the central issue of the volume in a different perspective, arguing against the scope-marking nature of the German wh-expletive from a semantic point of view. On the other hand, it only offers some speculations as to the proper analysis of Hindi *kyaa*, and related items in other languages.

Marga Reis: On the Parenthetical Features of German Was ... W-Constructions and How to Account for Them

Reis’ contribution, although dealing exclusively with German, adds new dimensions to the topic, both datawise, and analytically. First, she introduces a subtype of parenthetical constructions (*was*-parentheticals, (10b)) whose surface form resembles, in many ways, the scope-marking *was ... w* construction (10a), then she attempts to build an account covering both, in terms of diachronic change, which she hopes can be ‘translated’ into a synchronic analysis.

- (10) (a) Was glaubst du, wo er jetzt wohnt? *was ... w*
 what believe you where he now lives
 ‘Where do you believe he now lives?’
 (b) Was glaubst du, wo wohnt er jetzt? / *was*-parenthetical
 Wo wohnt er jetzt, was glaubst du?
 ‘Where do you think he lives now?’

Acta Linguistica Hungarica 50, 2003

After distinguishing between unintegrated *was*-parentheticals, which are appositive in nature, akin to sequential questions, and integrated ones (as in (10b)), in which the two clauses are not separated either prosodically, or in focus/background articulation, Reis establishes that only the latter are really relevant to the discussion of *was ... w* sentences. In these integrated *was*-parentheticals (*was*-IP), only the clause corresponding to CP₂ of the scope-marking construction counts as a question pragmatically, and unlike in *was ... w* sentences, this is the dominant clause of the two. *Was*-IPs share all the important properties with integrated parentheticals in general.

Reis then compares the *was ... w* construction to *was*-IPs, and the *wh*-extraction construction, in turn, showing that it resembles both to a significant extent. What she finds most remarkable is the overlap between *was ... w* and *was*-IPs in the predicates they admit in the *was*-clause. Moreover, as regards their interpretation, though these three constructions are quite similar, there is a closer match between *was ... w* and *was*-IPs. Thus the parallelism between them cannot be accidental.

Reis explores a number of possible diachronic processes for developing the *was ... w* construction from *was*-IPs, which all share the basic insight that the former arose “cross-bred” by the interference between the latter and the *wh*-extraction construction. However, the recorded historical data available is insufficient for evaluating the proposals, and the diachronic explanation is dispreferred on general theoretical grounds *vis à vis* a proper synchronic account. Therefore the author sets out to transfer the achievements of her diachronic account (besides the obvious derivation of the wholesale similarity between *was ... w* sentences and *was*-IPs, the absence of yes/no questions from the *was ... w* construction, the anti-locality effect, and the partial *wh*-movement in the [–*wh*] CP₂ all gain a natural explanation) into a synchronic analysis. Here the discussion centers around the predicate classes that may or may not occur in the *was*-clause in the different constructions examined. After assessing and rejecting two proposals set in “orthodox” theoretical contexts, she outlines a viable account, the leading idea of which is that the *was ... w* construction is assimilated to the parentheticals, and analysed in such terms—the ‘scope-marking’ construction is regarded as sufficiently “paratactic” for such an account to go through. Analogy and constructional factors play an important role in her proposal, but she argues in favor of such “unorthodox” devices showing that more standard generative theories are simply incapable of providing a unifying account for the dual parallelism of the *was ... w* construction with parentheticals on one side, and *wh*-extraction, on the other. Many details of the precise analysis remain to be worked out, though.

Joachim Sabel: Partial Wh-Movement and the Typology of Wh-Questions

Sabel presents a minimalist, feature-based analysis of partial *wh*-movement in the context of a general typology of *wh*-movement—the divergence of the *wh*-in-situ and *wh*-ex-situ strategies, in particular. Besides well-known languages like English or German, he also investigates the *wh*-constructions of much less known languages, like Kikuyu and Duala, to set up a typology covering all possible options. He assumes that the *wh*-scope marking construction is similar in crucial respects to *wh*-extraction, thus a direct dependency approach is taken, but on the basis of overt chain formation, rather than LF-movement, as suggested by most other contributors—these assumptions are furnished with evidence from German data displaying “anti-crossover” effects, and CP-fronting inside CP₂. Moreover, he claims that the multiclausal *was ... was ... w* construction is a variant of the copy-construction, itself a spell-out variant of long *wh*-dependency chains.

The medial part of the paper is devoted to the comparison of *wh*-question forming in two African languages: Kikuyu and Duala. Both are optional *wh*-in-situ languages, but while

Kikuyu has partial wh-movement, with a phonologically null SM, whose chain relation to the embedded question is indicated by accompanying interpretive and prosodic features characteristic of wh-extraction, Duala lacks any such construction. The comparison of such languages with the likes of English and German suggests that the availability of partial wh-movement is independent of the wh-in-situ vs. wh-ex-situ distinction.

The third part is devoted to the proposed account, the key insight of which is that wh-movement is closely related to focus-movement. This is based on previous semantic analyses treating wh-questions as a subcase of focus, and on observations such as the complementary distribution between wh-question and focus in a single clause, attested in several languages, and the occurrence of focus features in intermediate clauses of long wh-movement in Kikuyu and Bahasa Indonesia/Malaysia. Attributing the surfacing of wh-chain links in these domains to focus effects solves the long-standing problem of why/how [+wh] items mark the left-periphery of semantically [–wh] domains. On the standard minimalist assumption that strong features trigger overt movement, while weak interpretable features trigger no movement at all, the segments of the typological spectrum can be analysed as follows: scope-bound strong [+wh] features induce (potentially long) wh-movement, while strong [+focus] features induce local movement. Moreover, [+focus] always accompanies [+wh], but the former, unlike the latter, trickles down to embedded clause-domains, too. The partial wh-construction emerges when [+focus] is strong, and [+wh] is weak (as in German or Hungarian). Numerations containing a pure SM (*was/mi*) yield the scope-marking construction, otherwise long wh-movement occurs, so economy does not apply to the two alternatives. In languages like English, strength values are just the opposite, giving rise to long wh-movement, but no overt focus-movement ever. In Kikuyu, [+focus] is optionally strong, while [+wh] is weak, so wh-in-situ and wh-movement coexist, and partial wh-movement is found, albeit with a null SM. In Duala, the strength properties are again the opposite, leading to optional wh-in-situ, but no partial movement.

The analysis is well-engineered, and the Kikuyu/Duala data are very relevant—with further data from multiple- and partial-wh-moving languages treated in numerous footnotes. The main objection that can be made concerns the general problem of minimalist theory applying feature-strength. It is non-explanatory, just another descriptive technique to capture certain generalizations, refreshingly different though these may be from those arrived at by other descriptive devices.

Arnim von Stechow: Partial Wh-Movement, Scope Marking, and Transparent Logical Form

Stechow reiterates Stechow–Sternefeld’s (1988) analysis of partial wh-movement, fleshed out with a semantics of questions in the mood of Hamblin (1973) and Karttunen (1977), to argue for the appropriacy of the direct dependency approach. The syntactic representation, Transparent Logical Form (TLF), which unambiguously determines semantic interpretation, plays a crucial role in the analysis, which is built on the insight that the wh-scope marking construction is similar, in essential respects, to full wh-extraction. Detailed, compositional semantic translations are provided throughout the paper, even for those competing accounts (refuted here) whose authors have not worked these out at all, in order to reveal their inadequacies. Covert movement of a contentful wh-phrase to the locus of SM is assumed, so that it can c-command, at TLF, the interrogativizer located in C⁰. The reason why yes/no questions never occur as CP₂ in German scope-marking constructions is that their wh-operator, *ob* ‘whether’, is not an existential quantifier, thus it cannot combine with the SM-construction to yield a coherent interpretation.

The analysis, imported from Stechow–Sternefeld (1988), is admittedly non-explanatory, but is obviously capable of covering the wide range of relevant German data, relying on its

classification of wh-elements, and (partly language-specific) scope binding principles. The obligatory wh-movement inside CP₂, for instance, is forced by the requirement that some wh-element, other than SM, scope-bind every wh-in-situ, plus the lexical property of German that it lacks an empty wh-COMP, comparable to those in, e.g., Japanese or Korean.

With respect to the applicability of the indirect dependency approach to Hindi, Stechow observes that it seems correct, but also that it assigns basically the same semantics to the corresponding sentences as the proposed direct dependency analysis in German, provided everything is correctly computed. He then points out that the Hindi SM *kyaa* is not an expletive in the technical sense, but a wh-determiner, and is thus not a scope-marker *per se*.

The paper considers, but rejects, the indirect dependency analysis for German, primarily because it cannot rule out (unless stipulatively) the absence of yes/no-type CP₂. Further, less powerful counterevidence is provided from the negative- and factive-island data, the copy construction, and wh-UQ scope interaction. In defense of the direct dependency approach, Stechow refutes the validity of certain data cited by Dayal and Fanselow – Mahajan as problematic for this approach. Finally, he addresses some issues raised by Horvath's paper, and its Hungarian data, but his dismissal of Horvath's analysis rests on the empirical misjudgment of the well-formedness of a certain Hungarian sentence-type.

In sum: this paper presents a very well worked-out analysis for German, but as Stechow himself notes, it is a descriptively adequate account, in need of principled explanations. As was the case with some of the previous contributions, the translations of the German examples are often missing, to the readers' annoyance.

Conclusion

The majority of the papers argue for either (i) the primacy of the direct dependency approach, or (ii) the futility of seeking a unified solution, because different languages necessitate radically different accounts—but then this overall picture might be due to the fact that most of the contributors are German. Moreover, a remark is in order here about a recent article by Utpal Lahiri (2002) on the topic: this paper argues rather convincingly for the accuracy of the indirect dependency analysis for Hindi, as well as the inadequacy of the direct dependency approach for German and Hungarian, on the basis of cross-linguistically uniform data displaying “scope-freezing” effects, involving cases related to the split-scope phenomenon treated by Horvath. So the issue is far from being settled.

As a general assessment of this book, I wish to point out that the order of the articles might have been better arranged, had it been done by some thematic consideration. (As it stands, they appear in alphabetical order, arranged by the (first) authors' last names—obviously a neutral solution from the editors.) For example, Stechow's and Höhle's papers could serve their purposes better somewhere at the beginning, and so could Dayal's, I believe, being the “keynote address”, so far as theoretical issues are concerned. Also, the papers by Mahajan and Fanselow – Mahajan are so closely linked that they should have been placed next to each other. As for the contents, readers may find occasional “blindness” to problematic and counterevidential data, as well as to clear theoretical objections, in some of the papers. Nevertheless, this volume is a ‘must read’ for anyone interested in aspects of the wh-scope marking phenomenon, giving a multi-dimensional, cross-linguistic perspective on the topic.

Huba Bartos

References

- Cheng, Lisa Lai-Shen 1991. On the typology of wh-questions. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Chomsky, Noam 1995. The Minimalist Program. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.
- Chomsky, Noam 2000. Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In: Roger Martin–David Michaels–Juan Uriagereka (eds) *Step by step: essays in honor of Howard Lasnik*, 89–155. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.
- Dayal, Veneeta 1994. Scope marking as indirect wh-dependency. In: *Natural Language Semantics* 2: 137–70.
- Dayal, Veneeta 1996. Locality in wh quantification: questions and relative clauses in Hindi. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Hamblin, C.L. 1973. Questions in Montague English. In: *Foundations of Language* 10: 41–53.
- Karttunen, Lauri 1977. Syntax and semantics of questions. In: *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1: 3–44.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1994. The antisymmetry of syntax. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.
- Lahiri, Utpal 2002. On the proper treatment of ‘expletive wh’ in Hindi. In: *Lingua* 112: 501–40.
- Lutz, Uli–Gereon Müller (eds) 1996. Papers on wh-scope marking. *Arbeitspapiere des Sonderforschungsbereichs* 340, Nr. 76. Stuttgart & Tübingen.
- McDaniel, Dana 1989. Partial and multiple wh-movement. In: *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 7: 565–604.
- Stechow, Arnim von – Wolfgang Sternefeld 1988. *Bausteine syntaktischen Wissens*. West-deutscher Verlag, Opladen.