Partial movement in full light: new arguments for Dayal's approach

1. The phenomenon Partial movement constructions are questions involving a sequence of two clauses, each of which contains minimally one *wh*-expression (schematically $[_{CP1}$ ...wh_1...$][_{CP2}$ ...wh_2 ...]), exemplified from Hungarian in (1a). The answer to these questions fills in the variable for the embedded *wh*-item (1b).

Recent discussions of this relatively widespread phenomenon compared the properties of these sentences in German, Hindi, Hungarian, Romani, to find out how their meaning is construed, i.e. how the matrix scope of the embedded *wh*-item arises. Two fundamentally different approaches were born in this respect. One is the *direct* linking approach (van Riemsdijk 1983, McDaniel 1989), which connects the two *wh*-items directly via an expletive-replacement mechanism. The other is the *indirect* linking approach, which argues for linking the matrix *wh*-item to the *whole* embedded clause, either in the *syntax* via expletive-replacement (Mahajan 1992, Horvath 1997, 2000) or in the *semantics* via a quantifier-restriction relationship (Dayal 1994, 2000). As Lutz, Müller & von Stechow (2000) show, the debate about the proper analysis is still not settled.

2. The new data The aim of this talk is to set the debate one step further by providing and analyzing new empirical evidence from Hungarian for the Dayal-type semantic indirect dependency approach and its particular claims. The new data concern examples of partial movement where we find noun-complement clauses (2a,b) or restrictive relative clauses (3a,b) in the position of CP_2 in $[_{CP1}$ ...wh_1...$][_{CP2}$ ...wh_2...]. These constructions qualify as partial movement constructions, as they pattern with standard examples of the latter in their properties: (**i**) they are bi-clausal, (**ii**) they get answered in terms of the embedded *wh*-variable (2b,3b), (**iii**) they can contain any type of embedded *wh*-item; (**iv**) they are unbounded (4,5), (**v**) they cannot contain a selected +*wh*-clause (6), (**vi**) they cannot contain a yes/no question in the embedded clause (7,8). The availability of these constructions leads us to the generalization that Hungarian partial movement is uniformly available *in every construction in which an embedded clause is associated with a (pro)nominal element* (a sentential pronominal or a full NP, embedding argument or adjunct clauses).

3. The analysis and the theoretical relevance It is clear that a uniform analysis of the patterns in (1)-(3) cannot refer to any type of *expletive*-replacement, for the simple reason that noun-embedded and relative clauses do not combine with expletives. Rather, they combine with full-blown arguments. The only analysis that can accommodate these data is the semantic indirect dependency approach by Dayal (1994, 2000), which is based on the fundamental assumption that the matrix *wh*-element in scope marking constructions like (1a) is a propositional *argument* of the matrix predicate. The restriction to this propositional quantifier is provided by the embedded clause. As can also be seen from the logical paraphrase of (1a), this explains why answers to partial movement constructions need to specify the question in the embedded clause. Dayal's analysis suits the Hungarian facts in (2)-(3) like a glove: in these constructions it is beyond doubt that the embedded clause functions as a restriction on the denotation of the matrix *wh*-item (standard assumption for restrictive relatives; for claims to this effect for noun-complement clauses see Stowell 1981, Kenesei 1994). The underlying semantics therefore has to be the one proposed by Dayal for partial movement of the type in (1). Apart from confirming the validity of Dayal's approach, and refuting earlier approaches by Horvath to the Hungarian data in (1), the new facts also further our understanding of the structure of noun-complement and standard embedded clauses: these are to be analyzed as *adjunct* clauses that modify the meaning of argumental elements (nouns and sentential pronouns) (in line with Moro 1997 among others).

Examples

(1) a. **Mit•l** félsz, hogy *ki* lesz az igazgató?
what-FROM fear-2SG that who be-FUT.3SG the director
'What do you fear? Who will be the director?'
b. Attól, hogy Péter.
that-FROM that Péter.
'(I fear) Péter.'

(2) a. **Minek** a belátása hosszadalmas, hogy *ki* tévedett?
what-DAT the realization-NOM long that who erred
'The realization of what is long? That who erred?'
b. Annak a belátása, hogy az igazgató.
that-DAT the realization-NOM that the director
'The realization that the director (erred).'

(3) a. **Melyik diák** megy át a vizsgán, aki *hány pontot* ér el?
which student goes PV the exam *a*-who 20 point-ACC score PV
'The student who scores 20 points passes the exam.'
b. Aki 20 pontot ér el.
a-who 20 point-ACC score-3SG PV
'Who scores 20.'

(4) **Minek** a belátása hosszadalmas [hogy ***minek*** a bizonyítása
what-DAT the realization-NOM long that what-DAT the proving
képtelenség [hogy *ki* tévedett]]?
impossible that who erred
'The realization of what is long? Proving what is impossible? Who erred?'

(5) **Ki** megy át a vizsgán, aki ***milyen könyvb•l*** tanul,
who go-3SG PV the exam-ON *a*-who what book-FROM study-3SG
amit *hol* nyomtattak?
a-what-ACC where printed-3PL
'Who passes the exam? The person who studies from what kind of book, which was printed where?'

(6) ***Minek** a megvitatása hosszadalmas, hogy *ki* tévedett?
what-DAT the discussion-NOM long that who erred
'The discussion of what is long? That who erred?'

(7) ***Minek** a belátása hosszadalmas, hogy tévedett-e az igazgató?
what-DAT the realization-NOM long that erred-Q the director
'The realization of what is wrong? Whether the director erred?'

(8) ***Ki** megy át a vizsgán, aki szépen öltözik-e?
who goes through the exam *a*-who nicely dresses-Q
'Who passes the exam? The person who dresses up nicely?'

(9) for which proposition *p* in the denotation of 'who will be the director?' does it hold that you fear *p*

References

McDaniel 1989 Partial and multiple *Wh*-Movement.*NLLT* 7; **Dayal** 1994 Scope Marking as Indirect Wh Dependency. *NLS* 2; 2000 Scope Marking: Cross Linguistic Variation in Indirect Dependency. In Lutz, Müller, & v. Stechow (eds); **Horvath** 1997 The status of '*wh*-expletives' and the partial movement construction in Hungarian. *NLLT* 15; 2000 On the Syntax of "*Wh*-Scope Marker" Constructions: Some Comparative Evidence. In Lutz, Müller & v. Stechow (eds); **Kenesei** 1994 Subordination. *Syntax and Semantics* 28. **Lutz**, **Müller**, **v. Stechow** (eds) 2000 *Wh-Scope Marking*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins; **Mahajan** 1990 The A/A-bar Distinction and Movement Theory. Diss. MIT; **Moro** 1997 The raising of predicates. CUP. **van Riemsdijk** 1983 Correspondence Effects and the Empty Category Principle. Studies in Generative Grammar and Language Acquisition, edited by Y. Otsu et al. (1983), Tokio: ICU. Rosenbaum, P. **Stowell** 1981 Origins of phrase structure. Diss, MIT.