Department of Linguistics | University of British Columbia

A wh discourse particle: Dutch Hoezo

Hotze Rullmann & Sander Nederveen

Introducing hoezo

- = **hoe + zo** (lit. 'how so')
- Usually translated as 'why'
- Has a pragmatic meaning
- Often paraphrased as 'What do you mean?' •
- Contrasts with *waarom* (regular 'why') ullet

Main claims

• *Hoezo* is both a *wh*-word and a discourse particle, hence a *wh* discourse particle

Pragmatics

- *Hoezo* expresses the **speaker's atttitude** towards the discourse state
- It signals resistance to updating the CG (or other discourse component such as the QUD or To-Do List)
- It asks the interlocutor to **provide a reason** ulletfor their preceding discourse move

Semantics

• Hoezo is not a variable-binding operator (unlike *waarom/why*)

Syntax

• Hoezo is base-generated in Spec-CP (no whmovement)

Types of *hoezo* utterances

- (1) Speaker A: Ons plan is totaal mislukt. our plan is totally failed 'Our plan totally failed.'
- Speaker B can respond with:
- a. *Hoezo?* 'What do you mean?'

isolated *hoezo*

- b. Hoezo, (totaal) mislukt?' hoezo + X 'What do you mean, (totally) failed?'
- c. Hoezo is ons plan mislukt? V2 hoezo HOEZO is our plan failed 'What do you mean, our plan failed?'

Hoezo in action

Prototypical use: response to an assertion of a propo

Challenging a presupposition or conversational implicature:

(2)	A:	Bob Dylan is geen go Bob Dylan is no go 'Bob Dylan is not a go	od sing	er a		
	B:	Hoezo geen goede za HOEZO no good si What do you mean, no	nger ang	ymor		
(3)	A:	Het water is warm. 'The water is warm.'	B:	Hc 'W		
 In response to other speech acts such as questions of 						
(4)	A:	Ben je ziek? 'Are you sick?'	B:	Hc 'W		
(5)	A:	Doe je jas aan!	B:	Hc		

Syntactic consequences: hoezo vs. waarom

'Put on your coat!'

No long-distance construal

(6) Waarom/Hoezo zei de politie dat de verdachte gearresteerd is? 'Why did the police say the suspect was arrested?' (waarom: ambiguous; hoezo: not ambiguous)

Can't introduce an embedded clause

(7) Ik vraag me af **waarom/*hoezo** het regent.

Can't appear in multiple-*wh* or echo questions

(8) Wie is waarom/*hoezo afgetreden?



Local interpretation \bullet

Hoezo as a discourse particle

osition	p,	as	in	(1)
---------	----	----	----	-----

meer. anymore iymore.'

(Ik heb hem altijd vreselijk gevonden!) have him always terrible found nger anymore? (He's always been terrible!)'

loezo warm? (Het is gloedheet!) Vhat do you mean, warm? (It's scalding!)

or **commands**:

oezo? Nhy?'; 'Why do you ask?' loezo? (Ben jij de baas soms?) 'Why? (Are you my boss?)'

'I wonder why it's raining.'

'Who resigned why?'

Similarities

Non-wh discourse particle	Hoezo
Not truth-conditional contribution	\checkmark
Not at issue	\checkmark
Situates p in the Common Ground	\checkmark
Manages CG-content dispute	\checkmark
Marks p as controversial	\checkmark
Does not bind a variable	\checkmark

Differences

- Dis
- Ca
- Def
- Ca
- Car

Conclusion

- Our analysis extends the **typology of** *wh*questions
- Our analysis extends the **typology of discourse** particles
- We introduce a new category of *wh* discourse particles
- Other potential *wh* discourse particles: Wat dan nog? `what then still', So what?, What of it?

Selected references

Cox. 2021. How *why*-interrogatives work. Farkas & Bruce. 2010. On reacting to assertions and polar questions. Grosz. 2021. Discourse particles. Krifka. 2008. Basic notions of information structure. **Portner**. 2004. The semantics of imperatives within a theory of clause types. **Roberts**. 2012. Information structure in discourse. Schwarz & Simonenko. 2018. On the logical make-up of how- and why-questions. Zwicky & Zwicky. 1973. How come and what for

Acknowledgments

Thanks to the *Questions about Questions Lab* at UBC. This project is funded by the SSHRC Insight Grant #435-2021-0900 (PI: Lisa Matthewson)



scourse particle	Hoezo
nnot be independent	X
ficient adverb (cf. Grosz 2021)	X
nnot introduce a question	X
nnot directly challenge p	X

