Sample sentence

István mi-t gondol, hogy János ki-nek mutat-t-a be Mari-t?
István what-ACC think.PRES.3SG that János who-DAT show-PST-3SG in Mary-ACC
‘Who does István think János introduced Mary to?’

Possible analyses
(based on Mycock 2004; 2006)

In all of the following:
\[ f = \text{[“who”]} \]

Direct Dependency analysis
This is the most obvious analysis. From a movement perspective, the *wh* element does not move all the way to the matrix clause, but stops on the way. In languages like Hungarian which have an element in the main clause (where the *wh* should have moved to), it is taken to be an overt marker of the scope of the *wh*.

Indirect Dependency analysis
In the indirect dependency analysis, the *wh* in the matrix clause is the actual argument of the verb; the sentence has a structure something like ‘What does István think: who did János introduce to Mari?’ The Case on the matrix *wh* is consistent with such an analysis. There are further examples in the Mycock paper.
If the indirect dependency analysis is correct, “partial movement” is not a very good name for the construction, since the \( wh \) lands right where it belongs.

The weakness of this analysis is that it claims that the \( wh \) in the matrix clause is a meaningful element, but it actually appears to be an expletive. Among the dummy-like properties are the fact that it cannot be stressed (or at least not stressed independently of the “real” \( wh \) element), cannot be passivized, and looks like the \( wh \) version of the expletive \( it \).

**Mixed Dependency approach**

Here the subordinate clause is itself the \( wh \) element; since a clause cannot be a \( wh \) the expletive \( mi \) ‘what’ is used, as in the extraposition structure with \( it \) in English and \( az \) ‘it, that’ in Hungarian. The expletive occupies the normal position for \( FOCUS \) in the language (in Hungarian, this is the pre-verb position)