

### Stylistic postposing or something else?

The paper takes a new look at a well-known phenomenon in Hungarian, first discussed in Hunyadi (1981a, 1981b), Szabolcsi (1983), and É. Kiss (1984). As the data in (1) show, postverbal stressed universal quantifiers can take wide scope over the preverbal operators, and, therefore, constitute an exception to the generalization according to which the scope principle of generative grammar (operators precede and c-command their scope), is already satisfied in S-structure in Hungarian (boldface indicates stress, and '\ falling intonation).

- (1) [FP \bKét filmet nézett meg \bmindenki.]  
two movie-acc watched PV everybody  
'Everybody watched two movies.' (everybody > two movies)

É. Kiss (1984, and subsequent work) accounts for the above phenomenon by saying that it involves stylistic postposing of the universal quantifier from a preverbal position, which, however, has no consequence on its scope.

This paper proposes a compositional method to derive the meaning of the declarative sentences illustrated above, as well as those of constituent questions containing a postverbal stressed universal quantifier. It does not rely on LF movements, but assumes that the semantic interpretation of such sentences can be calculated on the basis of surface structure, provided that the prosodic pattern of the constituents makes an independently characterizable contribution to the interpretation (the way proposed in Steedman 2000).

The approach relies furthermore on the information structural properties of the relevant sentences, which depend crucially on the structure of discourses where they can appear (cf. Roberts 1996, Büring 2003). The theory accounts for the following empirical observations.

The interrogative and declarative sentences under consideration do not support Szabolcsi's 1983 generalization on the relation between the scope of *wh*-expressions and the scope of quantifiers in the focus position of their answers:

- (2) The quantifier in F '*inherits*' its scope properties from *wh* words, namely, the quantifier in F has wider scope than a scope-bearing element in its sentence if and only if (other things being equal) that element may also occur in the same position of the corresponding interrogative. (Szabolcsi 1983:128)

The claim is illustrated by investigating the relation between constituent questions with stressed postverbal quantifiers as well as declaratives of the same prosodic structure which should comply to the generalization in (2). (3) and (4) are constituent questions discussed in É. Kiss (1993), repeated in an unchanged form, boldface indicates stress:

- (3) \bKit javasolt mindenki?<sup>1</sup>  
(Who is the person such that he was the only person recommended, and he was recommended by everybody?)

---

<sup>1</sup> Although É. Kiss 1993 claims that this interrogative is pronounced with a falling intonation, I believe that the required interpretation only arises if the stressed postverbal quantifier is pronounced with a fall-rise.

- (4) Kit javasolt **mindenki**?  
Who did **everybody** recommend? (*mindenki* has narrow scope with respect to *kit*, but it is contrasted with the existential quantifier)

(5) and (6) are declaratives with a parallel structure and intonation:

- (5) **Ke1t** dia1kot javasolt **mindenki**.  
two student-acc recommended everybody  
Everybody recommended two students.

- (6) \*Ke1t dia1kot javasolt **mindenki**.

(3)-(5) and (4)-(6) do not constitute well-formed question-answer pairs. (3) and can only be interpreted as an echo-question, and (5) as a correction of a previous declarative. (4) is a well-formed question, although the postverbal stressed quantifier does not take wide scope over the interrogative expression, as it would have been expected. Its declarative pair in (6), however, is unacceptable with the stress pattern indicated. (7) is a well-formed declarative with falling accent on both the preverbal and the postverbal quantifier, although it cannot answer any of the questions above (nor any intonational variant of these), rather, a multiple constituent question of the type in (8):

- (7) \bKe1t dia1kot javasolt \bmindenki.

- (8) Ki kit javasolt?  
who who-acc recommended  
'Who recommended whom?'

The question in (4), however, is to be answered by a declarative in which the universal quantifier is pronounced sentence-initially with the contrastive topic intonation or an unstressed universal quantifier occupies postverbal position:

- (9) /**Mindenki** \két diákot javasolt.

- (10) Két diákot javasolt mindenki.

The paper argues that a compositional interpretation procedure based on the above empirical observations can moreover make the explicit reference to the specificity filter proposed in É. Kiss 1993 superfluous.

## References

- Büring, Daniel. 2003. On D-Trees, Beans, and B-Accents. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26: 511-545.
- É. Kiss, Katalin 1984. *Chapters of a Hungarian Generative Syntax*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- É. Kiss, Katalin 1993. *Wh-Movement and Specificity*. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11: 85-120.
- Hunyadi, László 1981a. *A nyelvi polaritás kifejezése a magyarban*. PhD diss., Debrecen.
- Hunyadi, László 1981b. Remarks on the syntax and semantics of topic and focus in Hungarian. *Acta Linguistica* 31: 107-136.
- Roberts, Craig 1996. Information Structure in Discourse: Towards an Integrated Formal Theory of Pragmatics. In J. H. Yoon and Andreas Kathol (eds.) *OSU Working Papers in Linguistics 49: Papers in Semantics*, pp 91-136.
- Steedman, Mark. 2000. *The Syntactic Process*. MIT Press: London, Cambridge, MA.
- Szabolcsi, Anna 1983. Focussing properties, or the trap of first order. *Theoretical Linguistics* 10: 125-145.