

IN-SITU HUNGARIAN WH-HELL: EVIDENCE AGAINST AN INTERVENTION ACCOUNT

Mai Ha Vu (maiha@udel.edu) and Karoliina Lohiniva (karoliina.lohiniva@unige.ch)

University of Delaware and Université de Genève

INTRODUCTION

The central puzzle:

- (1) **English** [WH-hell: ex-situ, *in-situ]
a. **Who the hell** loves who?
b. *Who loves **who the hell**?

- (2) **Hungarian** [WH-hell: ex-situ, in-situ]
a. **Ki a fene** szerelmes kibe?
who the hell in.love who.ILL
'Who the hell is in love with who?'
b. Ki szerelmes **ki a fenébe**?
who in.love who the hell.ILL
'Who is in love with who the hell?'

- ▶ Previous proposal for English by den Dikken and Giannakidou (2002):
 - ▶ WH-hell phrases are NPIs licensed by Q (in CP)
 - ▶ in (1b), fronted 'who' intervenes between Q and WH-hell
- ▶ Our proposal:
 - ▶ The distribution of Hungarian WH-hell is regulated by non-D-linkedness only
 - ▶ If Hungarian WH-hell is an NPI licensed by Q, the relevant licensing relation is not sensitive to intervention by another WH
- ▶ In this paper, we
 - ▶ Present novel data in Hungarian that supports our proposal
 - ▶ Give a detailed syntactic-semantic account of Hungarian questions based on Kotek's (2014) theory of questions

ENGLISH DATA

den Dikken and Giannakidou (2002): Q and anti-veridical verbs license WH-hell; WH-phrases target different positions in matrix vs. embedded clauses

- (3) a. **Who the hell** loves who? [SP-echo, *SP, *PL]
b. *Who loves **who the hell**?
- (4) I wonder **who the hell** loves who [SP, PL]

HUNGARIAN DATA

Multiple-fronting WH-questions:

- (5) Ki **mi a fenét** vett? [*SP, PL]
who what the hell bought
'Who bought what the hell?'
- (6) ***Ki a fene** mit vett?
who the hell what bought
'Who the hell bought what?'

Partially-fronting WH-questions:

- (7) **Ki a fene** nézett rá kire? [SP, *PL]
who the hell looked on who
'Who the hell looked at who?'
- (8) Ki nézett rá **ki a fenére**? [SP, PL]
who looked on who the hell
'Who looked at who the hell?'

WH-HELL AS AN NPI

Evidence from licensing environment:

- (9) English
a. *John knows **who the hell** is coming with us.
b. John doesn't know who the hell is coming with us.
- (10) Hungarian
a. *János tudja, hogy **ki a fene** jön velünk.
János knows that who the hell come 3PL.COM
'John knows who that hell is coming with us.'
b. János nem tudja, hogy **ki a fene** jön velünk.
János NEG knows that who the hell come 3PL.COM
'John doesn't know who that hell is coming with us.'

den Dikken and Giannakidou (2002): fronted WH intervenes between Q and in situ WH-hell

Counterarguments to intervention account:

- ▶ Not cross-linguistically accurate (this poster)
- ▶ Not true for other NPIs in English:
(11) Who has seen anything?

A Q-PARTICLE THEORY OF QUESTIONS

Based on Kotek (2014); Cable (2010)

Syntax:

- ▶ Q merges with WH-DP and *may* project a QP
- ▶ Q agrees with left-peripheral head H°, moves to Spec,HP
 - ▶ *With* WH-DP (if projection) or *alone* (if no projection)

Semantics:

- ▶ WH-DP has an undefined ordinary semantic value; its f(ocus) sem. value is a set $\langle \langle e, t \rangle \rangle$
- ▶ Q is responsible for the defined ordinary semantic value of the question
 - ▶ (i) $\llbracket Q(\alpha) \rrbracket^o = \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^f$; (ii) $\llbracket Q(\alpha) \rrbracket^f = \{ \llbracket Q(\alpha) \rrbracket^o \}$
- ▶ The o-value of a single-WH question is a set of propositions $\langle \langle st, t \rangle \rangle$
- ▶ The o-value of a two-WH question is a set of propositions $\langle \langle st, t \rangle \Rightarrow \text{SP} \rangle$ or a family of questions $\langle \langle \langle st, t \rangle t \rangle \Rightarrow \text{SP or PL} \rangle$ depending on number of Qs and their order wrt. WHs

HUNGARIAN QUESTIONS

- ▶ Foc° carries [uF(ocus)] and/or [uQ] (cf. Surányi, 2002; Surányi, 2006)
- ▶ Single-*wh* questions:
(12) $[QP_{[iF]} Q_{[iQ]} [DP_{[iF]} wh_{[iF]}]]_i \dots \text{Foc}^\circ_{[uF]} \dots t_i$
- ▶ Multiple-fronting wh-questions: pair-list (PL) reading only (Surányi, 2002)
(13) $[QP Q_{[iQ]} [DP wh]]_j [QP_{[iF]} Q_{[iQ]} [DP_{[iF]} wh_{[iF]}]]_i \dots \text{Foc}^\circ_{[uF, uQ]} \dots t_i \dots t_j$ [PL]
- ▶ Partially-fronting wh-questions: pair-list (PL) or single-pair (SP) reading
(14) a. $[QP_{[iF]} Q_{[iQ]} [DP_{[iF]} wh_{[iF]}]]_i \dots \text{Foc}^\circ_{[uF]} \dots Q_{[iQ]j} \dots t_i \dots [DP t_j wh]$ [PL]
b. $[(Q_{[iQ]j}) [QP_{[iF]} Q_{[iQ]} [DP_{[iF]} wh_{[iF]}]]]_i \dots \text{Foc}^\circ_{[uF, uQ]} \dots t_i \dots [DP (t_j) wh]$ [SP]

INTERPRETING HUNGARIAN WH-HELL

Predictions of the Q-particle theory for multiple-WH questions:

- ▶ With PL reading, the highest WH is the 'sorting key' (D-linked, topical)
 - ▶ Aggressively non-D-linked WH-hell *cannot* be the highest WH
- ▶ With SP reading, neither WH is the 'sorting key'
 - ▶ Aggressively non-D-linked WH-hell *can* be the highest WH

Confirmation of predictions:

- ▶ Multiple-fronting WH-questions:
(15) Q ... WH ... Q ... WH-hell [(5): *SP, PL]
(16) *Q ... WH-hell ... Q ... WH [* (6)]
- ▶ Partially-fronting WH-questions:
(17) (Q) Q ... WH-hell ... WH [(7): SP, *PL]
(18) a. (Q) Q ... WH ... WH-hell [(8): SP]
b. Q ... WH ... Q ... WH-hell [(8): PL]

The analysis of den Dikken and Giannakidou (2002) wrongly predicts *(18a)

CONCLUSIONS

- ▶ Although WH-hell is an NPI in Hungarian, the intervention account of den Dikken and Giannakidou (2002) does not capture its distribution
- ▶ The behavior of Hungarian WH-hell follows from the assumption that aggressively non-D-linked WH-hell phrases cannot be the sorting key of multiple-WH questions with a PL reading
- ▶ The English ban on WH-hell in-situ is unexpected – descriptively, aggressive non-d-linkedness drives overt movement in English
- ▶ The data presented here adds to previous research on the cross-linguistic variation of WH-hell (Huang and Ochi, 2004; Polinsky et al., 2007)
- ▶ Future research: licensing of Hungarian WH-hell, obligatory movement of English WH-hell, matrix vs. embedded WH-hell questions in English

REFERENCES

- Cable, S. (2010). *The grammar of Q*. Oxford University Press.
- den Dikken, M. and A. Giannakidou (2002). From hell to polarity: "Aggressively non-d-linked" wh-phrases as polarity items. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33(1), 31–61.
- Huang, C. T. J. and M. Ochi (2004). Syntax of the Hell: Two Types of Dependencies. *Proceedings of NELS 34* (Huang 1982).
- Kotek, H. (2014). *Composing Questions*. Ph. D. thesis.
- Polinsky, M., N. Hedberg, and R. Zacharski (2007). What on earth: Non-referential interrogatives. *The Grammar-Pragmatics Interface*.
- Surányi, B. (2002). *Multiple Operator Movements in Hungarian*. Ph. D. thesis, Utrecht University.
- Surányi, B. (2006). Mechanisms of wh-saturation and interpretation in multiple wh-movement. In *WH-Movement: Moving On*, Volume 42 of *Current Studies in Linguistics*, pp. 289–318. MIT PRESS.