What in the world are aggressively non-D-linked questions?
Behaviors of things like what in the world…? and ittai nani o…? and kak zhe…?

Pesetsky (1987) suggested that there are two kinds of wh-words—D-linked and non-D-linked—and D-linked wh-words don’t need to move. He writes:

Phrases like what the hell are good candidates for “aggressively non-D-linked” wh-phrases. Roughly speaking, the whole point of uttering a question like What the hell did you read that in? is to express surprise in the answer. The appropriate answer is presumed not to figure in previous discourse.

[fn.15] Roger Higgins (personal communication) brings up the question of the exclamative use of the hell. If John starts to leave the room and I say Where the hell do you think you’re going!, I may know perfectly well that John is heading home. Nonetheless, we might still want to say that where the hell is non-D-linked, since home is in fact not a destination under previous discussion and there is no “accommodation” here…

…Japanese ittai seems to have the same function as English the hell.

[fn.16] Speakers of Korean differ on whether Korean todeche, used much like ittai, acts like ittai with respect to the facts in question.

Not surprisingly in a head-final language, ittai precedes the wh-phrase with which it is interpreted.

[fn.17] As Junko Itô (personal communication) points out, it is vital to distinguish this use of ittai from its use as a sentence adverb, meaning roughly ‘in general’. The speakers with whom I worked had little difficulty in disambiguating the uses, which is essential if the effects discussed in the text are to be observed.

What’s the difference between (1a) and (1b)?

(1) a. Who left the door open?
   b. Who the hell left the door open?
   b’. Who in the world left the door open?

Ladusaw (1979): NPIS are licensed in the scope of a downward-entailing operator.

Ladusaw (1979): NPIS are licensed in the scope of a downward-entailing operator.
(3) I swim $\rightarrow$ I move
(4) I don’t move $\rightarrow$ I don’t swim

(5) O is DE when A $\rightarrow$ B implies O(B) $\rightarrow$ O(A)

But there’s a question about FC any—is it the same thing or not?

(6) Any owl hunts mice.

(7) Q. Do you have dry socks?
A. I don’t have ANY socks.

(8) WIDENING
  In an NP of the form any CN, any widens the interpretation of the common noun phrase (CN) along a contextual dimension.

(9) a. An owl hunts mice.
   b. Any owl hunts mice.

(10) a. A sick owl doesn’t hunt mice.
   b. Right, of course. Still, it’s true that an owl hunts mice.
   b’. Wrong. ANY owl hunts mice. Sick ones are just less successful.

(11) STRENGTHENING
    Any is licensed only if the widening that it induces creates a stronger statement.

(12) a. I didn’t buy a book.
   b. I didn’t buy any books (of any kind). (entails a)

---


The particle ņe in Russian can be used in several different contexts, among them:

- Ona zhe uzhe ubita. ‘It ņe is already killed.’
- Èto zhe ne slomalos’? ‘This ņe isn’t really broken, is it?’
- Kak zhe ne slomalos’? ‘How in the world ņe isn’t it broken?’

**Idea:** ņe $p$ means $p$ is true, but also presupposes that $p$ is obvious, yet you seem to be erroneously concluding that $\neg p$. 

---
That’s the first case. How about \textit{wh}-questions?

(13) U kogo \textsc{že} mne togda sprosit’?
    at who\textsc{(gen)} \textsc{že} me\textsc{(dat)} then ask\textsc{(infin)}
    ‘Who (the hell) should I ask then?’

Why this meaning?

(14) Who should I ask? \{I should ask mother, I should ask father\}

Apply \textsc{že} to each, presuppositions become:

You seem to be erroneously concluding that I should not ask mother.
You seem to be erroneously concluding that I should not ask father.

What does one do with a question? Well, you’re supposed to pick the true one, but it seems like we’re presupposing already that you don’t believe any of them is true.

That’s not a cooperative question to ask.

\begin{quote}
Huang, C.-T. James, and Masao Ochi (200x). Syntax of the hell: Two types of dependencies. \textit{NELS}.
\end{quote}

\textit{Wh-the-hell} cannot remain in situ, it has to move to SpecCP:

(15) \begin{itemize}
    \item a.  Who the hell saw what?
    \item b.  *Who saw what the hell?
\end{itemize}

(16) \begin{itemize}
    \item a.  Tell me why he bought what.
    \item b.  *Tell me what he bought why.
\end{itemize}

(17) \begin{itemize}
    \item a.  *What did he buy the hell?
    \item b.  What did he buy of yours?
\end{itemize}

(18) *They left for home the hell.
Chinese *daodi*:

(19) a. *ta daodi mai-le shenme?*

he daodi bought what

‘What the hell did he buy?’

b. *shei daodi xiang yao zhe-fu hua?*

who daodi think want this-cl picture

Claim is: *Daodi* needs to be in the scope of Q, c-commanding a *wh*-word.

*Wh*-words can be in islands, but *daodi* cannot.

The attitude phrase

(20) ![Diagram]

Japanese *ittai*: Much like *daodi*.

- Must c-command *wh*-phrase.
- Bad if in islands.
- Must be outside the VP (must precede *yoku* ‘often’)

There seem to be two relations (A and B):

(21) ![Diagram]

In Chinese: ① cannot be an island, but ② can. Both A and B are covert.
In English: Both A and B are overt.
In Japanese: A and B can be either overt or covert.

Is there really a dependency B? (Most accounts do without it…)

- Why does *daodi* have to c-command the *wh*-word?
- Why does *daodi* need a *wh*-word but not vice versa?
Interesting intervention effect facts:

(22) a. *Taroo-sika nani-o tyuumon-shi-na-katta no?  
Taro-only what-acc order-do-neg-past Q  
(‘What is the thing x such that only Taro ordered x?’)

b. nani-o Taro-sika tyuumon-shi-na-katta no?

(23) a. kimii-wa pizza-sika naze tyuumon-shi-na-katta no?  
you-top pizza-sika order-do-neg-past Q  
‘Why did you order only pizza?’

b. pizza-sika kimii-wa naze tyuumon-shi-na-katta no?  
you-top pizza-sika order-do-neg-past Q  
‘Why did you order only pizza?’

There seems to be an intervention effect between naze and ittai.

(24) a. kimii-wa pizza-sika ittai naze tyuumon-shi-na-katta no?  
you-top pizza-sika ittai order-do-neg-past Q  
‘Why the hell did you order only pizza?’

b. *kimii-wa ittai pizza-sika naze tyuumon-shi-na-katta no?  
you-top ittai pizza-sika order-do-neg-past Q  
‘Why the hell did you order only pizza?’

Differences between ittai, daodi, and wh-the-hell

(25) a. *Which the hell book does he want to read?

b. ta daodi yao kan na yi ben shu?  
he daodi want see which one cl book  
‘Which the hell book does he want to read?’

c. kimii-wa ittai dono hon-o yomi-tai no?  
you-top ittai which book-acc read-want Q  
‘Which the hell book do you want to read?’

All indicate an attitude, all exhibit island effects (well, maybe English). But only English forces non-D-linking. Idea: these things force movement through the attitude phrase, which is an adjunct.

(26) Who the hell bought that book?

This is a genuine information question, but also licenses a negative inference: *Nobody was supposed to buy that book.*

(27) Who the hell would buy that book?

Only a rhetorical question (negative answer), not an information question

Like minimizers:

(28) Who could sleep a wink with that racket?

(29) Which student read any of the papers?
(30) Which student would read any of the papers?

Veridical predicates:

(31) I know who would buy that book.
(32) *I know who the hell would buy that book.

(33) I don’t know who would buy that book.
(34) I don’t know who the hell would buy that book.

(35) He confirmed who had spread those horrible rumors.
(36) *He confirmed who the hell had spread those horrible rumors.

(37) He didn’t realize who had spread those horrible rumors.
(38) He didn’t realize who the hell had spread those horrible rumors.

(39) *He realized that John bought any books.
(40) He didn’t realize that John bought any books.

(41) a. I am wondering who the hell bought that book.
    b. I am wondering if anyone bought that book.
(42)  a. John refused to tell me who the hell bought that book.
    b. John refused to tell me if anyone had bought that book.

(43)  a. Only John knows who the hell wrote this secret report.
    b. Only John knows if anyone is aware of this secret report.

(44)  a. Nobody knows who the hell wrote this secret report.
    b. Nobody knows if anyone is aware of this secret report.

(45)  a. If John knows who the hell wrote this, he should tell us now.
    b. If you see anybody, let me know.

Pair-list readings disappear

(46)  Who is love with who?
(47)  Who the hell is in love with who?

(48)  What did everyone buy for Max?
(49)  What the hell did everyone buy for Max?

Polarity items: Giannakidou
  • Distributionally sensitive to one of the following semantic properties:
    —veridicality, non-veridicality, antiveridicality, modality, …

Veridical: $Op\ p$ entails $p$.

He confirmed that John left $\rightarrow$ John left. confirm: veridical
He doubted that John left $\rightarrow$ ?Did John leave? doubt: nonveridical
It’s not the case that John left $\rightarrow$ John didn’t leave negation: antiveridical

Indefinites as variables:

(50)  John bought a book

Heim (1982): a book is something like “$x$ being a book”. Unlike every book, which is something like “for all $x$, $x$ being a book”. Since a book lacks anything that assigns reference to $x$ (unlike every book, where for all $x$ assigns reference to $x$), there is a last-resort “default” rule that adds a “for some $x$” at the top. Default existential closure.

Any book is like a book except that it can’t undergo default existential closure, so it needs to be bound by something else. That is, it can’t assert existence.
dD&G suggests that’s all there is to it—that *wh-the-hell* is similarly “defective.” Though it seems to me that it really needs to be more globally a constraint against asserting existence, because if we fill in a non-default operator, it still doesn’t help.

(51) John usually buys a book.
(52) *John usually buys any book.

Proposal: The contribution of *the hell* is **domain extension**.

And a presupposition that none of the answers *should* be true. That is, if there is an true answer, it shouldn’t have been true.

(53) Who the hell would buy that book?

For all possible worlds, if *x buys that book, x shouldn’t have bought that book*.

What licenses *wh-the-hell*?

(54) Who the hell bought that book?
(55) *I know who the hell bought that book.

This is kind of a problem, there seems to be no licensor in the first one, and it’s fatal for the second one, right?

Consider topics:

(56) ?A book like this, why should I buy?
(57) ?Bill doesn’t know why a book like this, he should buy.

Look where the wh-word is with respect to the topic. Embedded wh-phrases move higher.

Ah-ha. So, the structure of the explanation is clear: There’s something in the CP area that can license *wh-the-hell* by c-commanding it, except that in embedded clauses *wh-the-hell* moves too far.

There is a lower projection for *wh*-phrases, FocP. Main clauses, *wh*-phrases just go there. Embedded clauses, *wh*-phrases go all the way to SpecCP.

What’s in C? Well, Q. You know, *ka*.
It licenses NPIs...

(58) Does anybody here speak Kurdish?  
(59) Who has given anything to Bill?

What’s the difference between main clauses and embedded clauses? Idea: C has a strong wh-feature, but a technicality of how strong features are checked keeps the wh-phrase from having to move to SpecCP in main clauses:

A strong feature requires that the derivation *not continue* without it being checked.

In embedded clauses, does the wh-phrase stop in SpecFocP?

(60) Under no circumstances would he do that.  
(61) John said that under no circumstances would he do that.

(62) What would he do?  
(63) I wonder what he would do.

If movement to SpecFocP entails inversion, then there’s no movement to SpecFocP for wh-phrases in embedded wh-questions.

Multiple wh-fronting in Hungarian—one to Foc, the rest to Tops.

(64) a. (Kiváncsi vagyok hogy) ki mit vett.  
   curious I-am that who what-acc bought  
   b. (Kiváncsi vagyok hogy) mit ki vett.  
   curious I-am that what-acc who bought  
   ‘(I wonder) who bought what.’

(65) a. Ki mi a fenét vett?  
   who what the hell-acc bought  
   b. *Ki a fene mit vett?  
   who the hell what-acc bought  
   c. Mit ki a fene vett?  
   what-acc who the hell bought  
   d. *Mi a fenét ki vett?  
   what the hell-acc who bought