

**Focus, Exhaustivity, and the Syntax of Wh-interrogatives**  
**Julia Horvath**  
**Tel-Aviv University**

Pre-theoretically, wh-interrogatives are commonly assumed to divide languages into three basic types: (i) wh-movement (of the English-type), (ii) wh-in-situ, and (iii) multiple wh-fronting languages. Although the proposed accounts vary, advancing different hypotheses regarding the structure of wh-phrases, the formal features and interpretive mechanisms that trigger the relevant movements and provide the appropriate interpretations, yet they share the assumption that if an interrogative wh-construction requires movement of a wh-interrogative element, this movement targets the edge of CP (Spec, CP position) (see in particular Cheng's (1991) clause-typing hypothesis, and subsequent work such as Tsai (1994), Watanabe (1992), Richards (1997), Hagstrom (1998), Cable (2010)). As is also widely-known, though Hungarian wh-interrogatives require overt movement of a wh-phrase, the landing site of these wh-phrases is clearly not the Spec, CP position. The prevailing view has been that interrogative wh-phrases in Hungarian land in the position that is known as the designated structural Focus position, namely a position left-adjacent to V in Hungarian clause structure (hierarchically clearly lower than material occurring to its left, namely C and a variety of topic and quantifier positions). Based on this observation it is commonly concluded that what looks like wh-movement in fact is an instance of "Focus-movement"; accordingly, the wh-interrogatives (at least one, if there are multiple) are claimed to bear a [Focus] feature, the same feature that was assumed to drive the movement of non-wh phrases to the designated Focus position in the language (Brody 1990, Horvath 1981, 1986, Lipták 2001). Moreover, this is far from being an isolated property of Hungarian. As is well-known, a wide range of languages exhibit syntactic and/or morphological parallelism between their wh-interrogative and (non-wh) Focus constructions. An early proposal to formally capture this cross-linguistic observation Horvath's (1986, sect. 2.3), hypothesis according to which the interpretation of a wh-operator can be a non-echo interrogative only if it comes to bear the syntactic feature [Focus].

In more recent work (Horvath 2000, 2007), I argued that the widely-assumed "Focus movement" to a designated structural position in Hungarian is in fact not movement of Focus at all, and subsequently advanced the proposal (Horvath 2010) that contrary to common assumptions, no formal feature [Focus], or any other non-truth conditional, "discourse", feature, is encoded and active in the computational system. The Hungarian "Focus-movement" construction was instead argued to involve (overt) syntactic movement driven by a quantificational feature. The proposal postulated a (phonologically null) Exhaustive Identification (EI) operator, performing "exclusion by identification" (in the sense of Kenesei 1986) on a set of pragmatically given alternatives for which the predicate can potentially hold. Specifically I claimed that the EI-operator gets merged as Spec of DP, drawing a parallel with the case of the Q-operator of Japanese interrogative wh-phrases (under Tsai's (1994) analysis). The EI-operator was assumed to associate with Focus – a constituent bearing main stress within its c-command domain – on a par with other focus-sensitive operators (such as ONLY or EVEN). A corresponding functional head EI<sup>0</sup> in the clausal projection served as probe for the EI operator feature, establishing an Agree relation with the EI-operator phrase, and triggering overt phrasal movement to Spec, EIP.

Taking the above results as a point of departure, the present paper will examine and reevaluate the status, driving mechanism and landing site(s) of interrogative wh-movements, with the aim to (a) further test and elaborate the EI-operator movement proposal in relation to this challenging new domain, and (b) assess potential implications with respect to the minimalist framework's rationale for and alternative implementations of syntactic displacements. Specifically, parallelisms and discrepancies in distribution and interpretation displayed by interrogative wh and (non-wh) EI-operator movements will be examined within Hungarian and cross-linguistically, with regard to the position of focus (pitch-accent-bearing constituent) and wh-elements within their respective phrases ("pied-piping" options), with regard to the range and limitations of multiple and "mixed" occurrences of interrogative-wh and Focus phrases in a clause, as well as manifestations of locality, "scope-marking", and the potential role of PF constraints.