Zo Toft 109299@soas.ac.uk

SOAS, Thornhaugh St.,

Russell Sq., London WC1H 0XG

Is there ever multiple wh-movement?
Evidence from Superiority effects and Focus in Hungarian

In trying to answer the questions ÔWhat moves where when in which languages and why?Õmany linguists have been kept busy over the years. With the growth of generative linguistics and an increasing amount of research into languages other than English, these answers have started to provide very interesting evidence for the debates concerning Universal Grammar and language typology: to what extent is there cross-linguistic patterning in the formation of wh-questions? Can the same formal mechanisms account for the variation that does exist? In this paper I contribute to the debate with an analysis of wh-movement in Hungarian which makes particular reference to recent proposals by Boskovic (1999) concerning the diagnosis of wh-movement and language typology. I show that while there are no Superiority effects in Hungarian, wh-movement does occur. However, not all fronting of wh-phrases is the result of wh-movement: by looking at cases where wh-phrases remain in situ I argue the secondary movement is motivated by reasons of focus, rather than wh-checking requirements.

Some languages (e.g. Chinese and Malay) appear not to move wh-elements at S-Structure whilst others (e.g. English) normally move one and only one wh-element before Spell Out. A third set of languages may exhibit optional wh-movement (e.g. French) whilst in a forth set, movement of *all* wh-elements at S-Structure is obligatory. Hungarian, as well as all Slavic languages, belongs to this set of multiple wh-fronting (henceforth MWF) languages. For example ÔWho said what when?Õ

Hungarian	Georgian	Russian
Ki mit mikor mondott?	**vin ra rodis tkva?**	**Kto _to kogda skazal?**
who what when said?	who what when said?	Who what when said?

Despite some surface similarities, the behaviour of MWF languages is not at all uniform. Rudin (1988) has argued that MWF languages fall into two distinct categories, based on the landing sites of the moved wh-elements; MWF languages either front all their wh-elements to (adjoined) SpecCP at S-structure (e.g. Bulgarian and Romanian), or they move only one wh-phrase to Spec CP with the remaining wh-phrases adjoining to IP (e.g. Polish, Czech and Serbo-Croatian). Boskovic (1999), in contrast, proposes that MWF languages pattern in three different ways, based on differences in the contexts where Superiority effects are exhibited. He argues that this three-way distinction in MWF languages corresponds to the three-way distinction in non-MWF languages and, on these grounds, makes the radical proposal that MWF languages (where movement is motivated by checking the strong +wh-feature of C) should actually be eliminated from the cross linguistic typology concerning the behaviour of wh-phrases with respect to wh-movement in multiple questions.

Research into MWF languages has thus far tended to focus on Slavic languages. However, in this paper I widen the discussion to include data from Hungarian (Uralic), thus testing the proposals made by Rudin and Boskovic and extending our understanding of wh-movement. I show that there are no restrictions on the ordering of wh-phrases and thus there are no Superiority effects, in either short or long distance wh-fronting in Hungarian:

Who did I introduce to whom? What works with what? When does she travel where?
Kit kinek muttatam be? **Mi mivel m k dik?** **Mikor hova utazik?**
Who-Acc who-Dat introduced-I Co-verb what what-with works When to-where travels
Kinek kit muttatam be? **Mivel mi m k dik?** **Hova mikor utazik?**

Who do you want to beat whom?
Kit$_i$ akarsz, hogy kit$_k$ verjen meg t$_i$ t$_k$? Movement of subject into higher clause
Who-Acc want-you that who-Acc beat-Subj. Co-verb

Who do they say M ria deceived?
Kit$_i$ mondanak, hogy becaspott M ria t$_i$? Movement of object into higher clause
Who-Acc say-they that Co-verb-deceived Maria

When does J nos want us to leave?
J nos mikor $_i$ akarja, hogy induljunk t$_i$? Movement of adverbial into higher clause
J nos when want that leave-we-Subj

While it is clear that Hungarian is a multiple wh-fronting language, there are certain, restricted circumstances under which it is possible to leave one or more wh-phrases in situ i.e. in a post verbal position:

Who is going out with who? Who fought with whom?
Ki j r kivel? **Ki verekedett kivel?**
who goes who-with who fought who-with
Kivel j r ki? **Kivel verekedett ki?**

This is only possible if (1) at least one wh-phrase *is* found raised, in a pre-verbal position and (2) if the domain of reference of the wh-phrases is somehow limited e.g. to the actuants in the discourse, events or characters in a novel. If the domain of reference is somehow limited, D-linked phenomena are called to mind: the range of reference for D-linked wh-phrases is limited to a set of objects assumed to be familiar to both speaker and hearer. As such, they are not inherently focused for we already know something about them. That D-linked wh-phrases remain in situ could be elegantly explained if we adopt a focus driven analysis of wh-fronting: in MWF languages (at least some) wh-fronting is actually driven by the need to check focus features (rather than wh-features), and thus when a wh-phrase is not inherently focused (e.g. because it is D-linked) it does not need to move. Boskovic provides evidence for this from Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian and Russian and I now contribute interesting supporting evidence from Hungarian.

This paper provides a wealth of data and convincing arguments for a reanalysis of language typology with respect to the formation of multiple wh-questions: an analysis of multiple wh-movement as a unitary phenomenon and language type is shown to be untenable. Intriguing questions are also raised concerning the interplay between animacy and focus, proper government of adverbial wh-traces and the possibility of a flat VP in Hungarian.

References
Boskovic, Z (1999) *What is special about multiple wh-fronting?* Ms. University of Connecticut.
Kenesei, I., R. Vago & A. Fenyvesi (1998) *Hungarian* Routledge, London and New York.
Kiss, K. (1987) *Configurationality in Hungarian* D. Reidel Publishing Co. Dordecht.
Kiss, K., F. Kiefer & P. S pt r (1998) *magyar nyelvtan* (*A new Hungarian grammar*) Osiris Kiad , Budapest.
de Mey, S. & L. Mar cz (1986) On questions sentences in Hungarian in W. Abraham & S. de Mey (Eds.) (1986) *Topic, Focus and Configurationality* Jonh Benjamins Publishing Co. Amsterdam and Philadelphia.
Rudin, C. (1988) On multiple questions and multiple wh-fronting *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6:455-501 non-existent