On the Echoic Licensing of Propositional Negation in Hungarian Polar *e*-Interrogatives

Hungarian (polar) *e*-interrogatives (H*e*Is) have been shown to disallow what following Ladd (1981) has been called "inside," i.e., propositional, negation (IN). As one of the standard tests via polarity-sensitive items in (1) shows, H*e*Is appear to only be compatible with "outside," arguably "speech act"(-related), negation (ON) (Gyuris 2017:16f.).

(1) a. **Nem esik-e az eső sem?*
not fall-Q the rain either
"Doesn't it rain either?"

b. *Nem esik-e az eső is?*
not fall-Q the rain too
"Doesn't it rain too?"

Interestingly, a corpus search has yielded examples that seem to contradict these observations. However, such examples contain echoic instances of IN, due to a negative declarative of an interlocutor being echoed within a polar interrogative.

This talk sketches the formal core of a treatment that derives the contrast in (1) as a minimality effect such that negation prevents clausal typing to take place between "low" *-e* and the left-peripheral TypeP. Echoic language will be argued to render parts of derivations "inert," in our case suspending intervention.

For several reasons it makes sense to assimilate H*e*Is to (the positive A-part of) Chinese A-not-A interrogatives (ANAIs) (Hagstrom 2006). ANAIs share the ban on negation in (1a) (Hagstrom 2006:198f.) and both H*e*Is and ANAIs show pragmatic "anti-bias"/"neutrality" (Gyuris 2017:50; Hagstrom 2006:188). Also, the Hungarian particle *-e* can been argued to derive historically from a negated copula translatable as "(or) not is/does" (Gyuris 2017:49). We assume that contemporary *-e*, while preserving a purely formal (uninterpretable) negative feature ⟨*u*POL:–⟩, has semantically "bleached" to an ordinary question operator (⟨*i*TYPE:?⟩). The fact that H*e*Is can combine with *vagy nem* ("or not") belongs to the arguments in favor of this:

(2) *Esik-e az eső, vagy nem?* ("Does it rain, or not?")

(3)/(4) shows the core hierarchy of projections and essential featural specifications we rely on:

(3) ... ⟩⟩ ForceP ⟩⟩ ... ⟩⟩ TypeP ⟩⟩ ... ⟩⟩ PolP ⟩⟩ IP ⟩⟩ VP

(4) a. *-e*: ⟨*i*TYPE:?⟩, ⟨*u*POL:–⟩$^{\varphi}$ b. Pol°: ⟨*u*POL:_⟩ c. *nem*$_1$:⟨*i*NEG:¬⟩
d. *nem*$_2$:⟨*i*NEG:~⟩, ⟨*i*FORCE$_{\mu}$:~⟩ e. Type°: ⟨*u*TYPE:_⟩ f. Force°: ⟨*u*FORCE$_{\mu}$:_⟩$^{(EPP)}$

To derive (1a), we adapt the proposal by Huang (1991) for ANAIs and take *-e* to be base-generated in I°. From there it must (covertly) move to the peripheral TypeP for clausal typing (valuing ⟨*u*TYPE:_⟩ on Type°). Following É. Kiss (2008), we assume IP(/TP) in Hungarian to immediately dominate VP, serving as target for overt (EPP-driven) movements (V°-to-I°, V(erbal)M(odifier)-to-Spec,IP). This guarantees that *-e* ends up as a suffix on the finite verb at Spell-Out. The negative marker *nem* ("not") occupies Spec,PolP. Standard propositional negation, *nem*$_1$, induces valuation ⟨*u*POL:–⟩ on Pol°. This prevents clausal typing between Type° and *-e* by intervention, due to matching ⟨*u*POL:–⟩$^{\varphi}$ on the latter. With ⟨*u*TYPE:_⟩ unchecked (or ⟨*i*TYPE:?⟩ mismatching a default declarative specification ⟨*u*TYPE:⊦⟩), ill-formedness results: *(1a)!

By contrast, (1b) is the result of "speech act" negation, *nem*$_2$, in Spec,PolP leading to ⟨*u*POL:+⟩ on Pol°. Without featural intervener between Type° and *-e*, clausal typing between ⟨*u*TYPE:_⟩ and ⟨*i*TYPE:?⟩ can take place: ✓(1b)!

In apparent contradiction to the facts in (1), (5) illustrates an H*e*I with IN.

(5) *A lakók valóban nem kapnak-e megfelelő étkeztetést?*
the inhabitants really not receive-Q adequate food
"Do the inhabitants really not receive adequate food?"

However, (5) occurs in a context where an "accusation" that "the inhabitants do not receive adequate food" has been made. This claim is echoed in the scope of *-e* in (5). We assume that echoic language "re-uses" parts of the derivation (e.g., movements and valuations) of the source utterance, but renders them "inert" wrt. non-echoic parts. Thus, crucially, *qua* "echoicity" of nem_1, Pol° bears inert $^{\varepsilon}\langle u\text{POL}{:}{-}\rangle$, which does not interfere with clausal typing between the non-echoic *-e* ($\langle i\text{TYPE}{:}?\rangle$, $\langle u\text{POL}{:}{-}\rangle^{\varphi}$) and non-echoic Type°: ($\langle u\text{TYPE}{:}\_\rangle$).

Further evidence for the IN/ON-divide comes from the fact that nem_2 can optionally move to Spec,ForceP (somewhere in the "topic field"). This is triggered by the optional EPP feature accompanying $\langle u\text{FORCE}_{\mu}{:}\_\rangle$ on Force°. On the surface, instances of such "high" ON can be detected by failure of V_{fin}/VM-inversion ($nem_{1/2}$ *utazik el* "not travels away" vs. $nem_{*1/2}$ *elutazik* "not away-travels"), i.e., the failure of I°-to-Pol° to take place. In addition to spelling out the underlying approach to head movement, the remainder of our presentation will primarily focus on

(A) motivating "phantom" features – (temporary) survivors of language change – like $\langle u\text{POL}{:}{-}\rangle^{\varphi}$ (diacritic "φ") on *-e*, which participate in some syntactic processes, such as the computation of minimality, but have no interface impact otherwise (e.g., unmatched $\langle u\text{POL}{:}{-}\rangle^{\varphi}$ can be deleted);

(B) assessing the compatibility of treating ON as a hard-wired speech act modifier $\langle i\text{FORCE}_{\mu}{:}{\sim}\rangle$ (diacritic "μ") with more or less purely scopal approaches (Krifka 2017; Romero and Han 2004); and

(C) distinguishing echoic negations in our sense, like $^{\varepsilon}nem$ (diacritic "ε") from the "metalinguistic" ones discussed by Cormack and Smith (2002) that scope over echoic content.

References:

Cormack, Annabel, and Neil Smith. 2002. "Modals and Negation in English." Pp. 133-63 in *Modality and its Interaction with the Verbal System*, edited by Sjef Barbiers, Frits Beukema, and Wim van der Wurff. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

É. Kiss, Katalin. 2008. "Free Word Order, (Non)configurationality, and Phases." *Linguistic Inquiry* 39:441-75.

Gyuris, Beáta. 2017. "New Perspectives on Bias in Polar Questions: A Study of Hungarian *-e*." *International Review of Pragmatics* 9:1-50.

Hagstrom, Paul. 2006. "A-not-A Questions." Pp. 173-213 in *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax, I*, edited by Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk. Oxford: Blackwell.

Huang, C.-T. James. 1991. "Modularity and Chinese A-not-A Questions." Pp. 305-32 in *Interdisciplinary Approaches to Language*, edited by Carol Georgopoulos and Roberta Ishihara. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Krifka, Manfred. 2017. "Negated Polarity Questions as Denegations of Assertions." Pp. 359-98 in *Contrastiveness in Information Structure, Alternatives and Scalar Implicatures*, edited by Chungmin Lee, Ferenc Kiefer, and Manfred Krifka. Heidelberg: Springer.

Ladd, D. Robert. 1981. "A First Look at the Semantics and Pragmatics of Negative Questions and Tag Questions." *CLS* 17:164-71.

Romero, Maribel, and Chung-hye Han. 2004. "On Negative *Yes/No* Questions." *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27:609-58.