This programmatic talk lays out the empirical, theoretical and methodological objectives of a newly funded research project on exhaustivity of embedded questions (co-PI: Edgar Onéa, Göttingen). Empirically, I will focus on the interpretation of relative concealed questions, as in (1), which are the preferred if not only way of expressing embedded questions in Hausa (Chadic) and Akan (Kwa):

(1) Musa ya \( \text{san} \) [ \text{wa-n-dà} \ ya \text{tāfī Kano} ]
Musa 3sg.m.pfv know one.sg-def.m-REL 3sg.m.pfv go Kano
‘Musa knows who went to Kano.’ (lit. ‘Musa knows the person who went to Kano’)

In its theoretical part, the talk establishes a link between the long-standing debate of exhaustiveness effects in embedded questions (from Groenendijk & Stokhof 1982 to Cremers & Chemla 2016), on the one hand, and the interpretation of so-called Concealed Questions (DPs with question interpretation, cf. 2), on the other.

(2) John knows the price. \( \Rightarrow \) John knows what the price is / which price it is.

In particular, we will investigate what predictions recent formal analyses of concealed questions (Nathan 2006, Romero 2007, Aloni & Roelofs 2011) make regarding exhaustivity. In a final step, I illustrate the methodological tools designed for measuring exhaustiveness in embedded questions, and apply these to Concealed Questions in English.