

The paper presents an analysis of two strategies for long *wh*-scope marking in Polish. The *jak w* construction (1) is treated in the recent literature (Stepanov 2001, Lubanska 2004) in line with the Indirect Dependency Approach (Dayal 2000). A competing construction (2) is, to the best of my knowledge, absent from the literature. Because of the numerous restriction of *jak w* (to be discussed) as opposed to the classical Hindi IDA examples (Dayal 2000), I argue that at the syntactic level this construction is best analysed as a paratactic sequence of two independent questions, and that, since semantically it doesn't let itself to lambda conversion analysis of Dayal (2000: 163), as *jak* in Polish is not an argument but an adjunct, equivalent to viewpoint markers as in (3) (cf. Willim 1989:113), it does not fit in the IDA long *wh*-scope marking.

(1) Jak myślisz, kogo Janek przyprowadzi?

How think<sub>2sing pres</sub> who<sub>acc</sub> Janek bring<sub>3singfut</sub> (Who do you think J. will bring along?)

(2) Co myślisz, że kogo Janek przyprowadzi?

what think<sub>2sing pres</sub> that who<sub>acc</sub> Janek bring<sub>3singfut</sub> (Who do you think J. will bring along?)

(3) Twoim zdaniem, kogo Janek przyprowadzi?

Your<sub>instr</sub> opinion<sub>instr</sub> who<sub>acc</sub> Janek bring<sub>3singfut</sub> (Who will J. bring along in your opinion?)

The *co, ze wh* construction (2), on the other hand, takes an argument *wh* in the matrix clause (case marking of *what* depends on the verb, see (4) below). An indirect semantic dependency between *co* and the embedded *wh* can, thus, be postulated.

(4) a. Co/\*Jak o tym myślisz?

What/How about it think<sub>2sing pres</sub> (What do you think about it?)

b. Czego się dowiedziałeś, (że kogo Janek przyprowadzi)?

What<sub>gen</sub> refl. find out<sub>2sing past</sub> that who<sub>acc</sub> Janek bring<sub>3singfut</sub>

Who did you find out J. will bring along?

Under the analysis pursued here, syntactically, *co* originates as an object of the matrix clause with an appositive propositional modification of the second clause, and is then moved to the clause initial position. *Co* is, thus, treated as a classical quantifier over propositions and parallels the Hindi IDA constructions discussed by Dayal (2000:160-164)

**The two main proposals of the paper are, thus, that:**

1. *jak w* involves a paratactic sequence of a viewpoint adjunct and a genuine question rather than either the direct or the indirect semantic dependency between *jak* and the *wh*-expression,
2. *co, ze wh* construction allows for an IDA analysis and not for one set in the Direct Dependency Approach (van Riemsdijk 1982, McDaniel (1989).

These are posed on the basis of qualities of the two constructions of which some are summarised in the table below.

<i>jak w</i>	<i>co, ze w</i>
<b>tense in <i>jak</i> clause:</b> present only	<b>tense in <i>co</i> clause:</b> present, future, past
<b>verb forms in <i>jak</i> clause:</b> 2 <sup>nd</sup> person singular and plural, 3 <sup>rd</sup> person singular honorific (addressee of the whole sentence necessarily equal to the subject of the <i>jak</i> clause)	<b>verb forms in <i>co</i> clause:</b> 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 3 <sup>rd</sup> sing. and pl. (all possible addressees)
verbs: <i>myśleć</i> , <i>sądzić</i> , <i>uważać</i> (verbs of thinking), <i>wydawać się</i> (seem), <i>mówić</i> (say) (only these 5 verbs possible)	verbs: <i>myśleć</i> , <i>sądzić</i> , <i>uważać</i> , <i>mówić</i> , <i>twierdzić</i> (claim), <i>utrzymywać</i> (maintain), <i>dowiedzieć się czego<sub>gen</sub></i> (find out what), <i>odkryć</i> (discover) etc., (all bridge verbs (i.e. non-factive verbs taking <i>that</i> -clause complementation in declarative sentences))

<p>direct yes-no questions in the second clause possible</p> <p><i>Jak myślisz, (czy) ja jestem naiwny?</i> how think<sub>2sing pres</sub>, <i>whether I am naive</i> (<i>Do you think I am naive?</i>)</p> <p>complementation with <i>that</i>-clause impossible</p> <p>*<i>Jak myślisz, że kto przyjdzie?</i> how think<sub>2sing pres</sub> that who come<sub>3sing fut</sub></p>	<p>direct yes-no questions in the second clause not likely unless paratactic.</p> <p>*<i>Co myślisz, (czy) ja jestem naiwny?</i> <i>what you think, whether I am naive?</i></p> <p>complementation with <i>that</i>-clause obligatory</p> <p><i>Co myślisz, że kto przyjdzie?</i> <i>what<sub>acc</sub> think<sub>2sing pres</sub> that who come<sub>3sing fut</sub></i></p>
<p>multiple embedding impossible as no 3rd person is allowed</p> <p>*<i>Jak myślisz, jak on sądzi, jak ona uważa...</i></p>	<p>multiple embedding possible</p> <p><i>Co myślisz, że co on uważa, że kogo powinniśmy zapytać?</i> what think<sub>2sing pre</sub> that what<sub>acc</sub> he thinks that who<sub>acc</sub> should<sub>1pl</sub> ask. Who do you think he thinks we should ask?</p>
<p>order of clauses reversible</p> <p><i>Kogo Janek przyprowadzi, jak myślisz?</i></p>	<p>order of clauses irreversible</p> <p>*<i>Że kogo Janek przyprowadzi, co myślisz?</i></p>

### **The survey.**

What are believed to be the most conspicuous differences between the two constructions (boldfaced in Table 1) were posited following a pilot survey on 20 native speakers of Polish. (60 more to be assessed). A sample of 6 questions (appendix below) were fed through Ivona text-to-speech software and played to the participants.

### **Some conclusions are presented below:**

A. Considerable bias (82% of 120 tokens) towards analyzing the subjects of the *jak* and *co* clauses as the addressees can be observed. B. Past tense excluded from *jak w* on the basis of 100% violation of the above rule in the case of (5) and by 100% rating of this sentence as unacceptable.

(5) *Jak babcia uważała, kto zobaczył Marysię?*

How grandma thought, who saw Mary

Grandma, who did you think saw Mary? or Who did grandma think saw Mary?

(5) was treated as a question to Szymon, as opposed to its present tense equivalent (4 in the appendix). C. *Co, ze wh* frequently allowed an embedded clause or contextual addressee but only in the written version (70% out of 120 tokens), as opposed to *jak w*.

### **Appendix**

1. *Jak sądzisz, co Marysia zjadła?* (how think<sub>2sing pres</sub>, what M. ate) 2. *Co Szymon sądzi, że kogo babcia lubi?* (what S.thinks, that whom granda likes) 3. *Co Marysia powiedziała, że kogo Szymon lubi?* (What M. said that whom S likes) 4. *Jak babcia sądzi, co Szymon zjadł?*(how grandma thinks what S ate) 5. *Jak babcia uważała, kto zobaczył Marysię?* 6. *Co Marysia myśli, że komu Szymon się podoba?* (what M.thinks, that whom S. refl. is attractive)

### **References**

Dayal, Veneeta, 2000. "Scope Marking: Cross-linguistic Variation in Indirect Dependency", in U. Lutz, G. Mueller and A. von Stechow (eds.) *Wh-Scope Marking*, John Benjamins. 157-194

Lubanska, Maja, 2004. "Wh-scope marking in Polish", in *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 39, 73-88.

McDaniel, Dana, 1989. 'Partial and Multiple Wh-Movement', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 7, 565-604.

Riemsdijk 1982,

Stepanov, Arthur, 2001. *Cyclic domains in syntactic theory*. MITWPiL

Willim, Ewa, 1989. *On word order: A Government-Binding Study of English and Polish*. Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Językoznawcze 100, Krakow.