When Hungarians Agree (to Disagree) — The Fine Art of 'Phi' and 'Art'

Marcel den Dikken — Linguistics Program — CUNY Graduate Center — MDen-Dikken@gc.cuny.edu

0 Introduction

In this paper, I will review and analyse a number of interrelated batches of data that all come under the general rubric of 'agreement phenomena' in the morphosyntax of Hungarian finite clauses and possessed noun phrases.[1] Most of these data are well known and are part and parcel of the 'hard core' of Hungarian morphosyntax; but it is fair to say that many of them have so far remained poorly understood from an analytical point of view. My objective in this paper is to present a maximally integrated analysis of Hungarian agreement phenomena in finite clauses and possessed nominal phrases, incorporating, revising, and extending earlier research (including my own), and introducing new empirical and theoretical perspectives. The overall background for the formulation of the analysis of the morphosyntax of Hungarian agreement in this paper will be the minimalist approach to agreement, couched in the operation Agree.

The paper is organised as follows. In section 1, I will provide the necessary background on Hungarian agreement, laying out the main empirical issues that need to be taken into account. In section 2, I turn to an analysis of possessive agreement, basing myself on my earlier account of these facts (presented in Den Dikken 1999) and updating it from the perspective of the Agree-based theory of agreement relationships. The Agree-based update will allow us to bring a number of agreement related questions (including ones concerning the syntax of person and the EPP) more sharply into focus — questions whose answers will continue to play a role in the discussion later in the paper as well. Section 3 subsequently addresses definiteness agreement: the well-known fact that Hungarian finite transitive verbs have two different subject-agreement paradigms depending, roughly, on whether their object is definite or indefinite (or absent). The main claim of this section is that so-called 'definiteness agreement' is in fact the interaction between garden-variety subject-agreement and a third-person object clitic. In section 4, I then show — following up on Den Dikken (2004[1999]) — that object clitics for first and second person also exist in Hungarian, and that these help us understand the otherwise quite enigmatic fact that Hungarian verbs inflect for *in*definite agreement when they take a first or second person object pronoun as their complement, and also provide an immediate perspective on the morphosyntax of the special *-lak/-lek* agreement form employed when the subject is first person singular and the object is second person. The *-lak/-lek* form will be shown to be a composite consisting of the first person singular subject-agreement morpheme *-k*, an epenthetic vowel, and a second person object clitic *-l*. In addition, section 4 — again, largely following in the footsteps of Den Dikken (2004[1999]) but updating this analysis in non-trivial ways — unfolds a perspective on the internal structure of the first and second person object pronouns of Hungarian, which are formally possessed noun phrases. The question of what is the head (the 'possessum') of these possessed noun phrases will be taken up, and a syntactic structure for these forms will be unveiled. Section 5 then switches over to the domain of long-distance agreement phenomena. In particular, it addresses the question of how foci that extract from embedded clauses come to establish an agreement and Case-checking relationship with the finite verb of the clause into which they move. The discussion in this section puts the Hungarian facts in a cross-linguistic perspective by considering them against the background of similar phenomena from Passamaquoddy, Tagalog, and Tsez, carefully considers the various theoretical options that are at our disposal when it comes to the analysis of the Hungarian facts, and finally proposes detailed analyses for the two ways in which long-distance focus fronting may proceed in the language. Section 6 closes by reviewing the main conclusions of the paper.

1 Unfortunately, I will not be in a position here to address agreement in inflected infinitives (cf. Tóth 2000 and references cited there) and adpositional phrases (cf. esp. Marácz 1989 and É. Kiss 2002:Chapter 8). The facts in these domains (which will briefly be illustrated in (6) and (7), below) are to a significant degree similar to the agreement facts found in possessed noun phrases; but there are intriguing differences that seem to stand in the way of a direct and complete assimilation of the former to the latter.

Hungarian agreement has traditionally been viewed as a mixture of agreement based on phi-features (person and number, to be specific) and definiteness. That phi-feature-based agreement exists in the language is beyond dispute, and will be amply demonstrated in what follows. With respect to the definiteness agreement, Bartos (1997) has argued most forcefully that it should be thought of as being article- or determiner-based. Putting Bartos' perspective on definiteness agreement together with the phi-based agreement phenomena elsewhere in Hungarian morphosyntax, one thus is led to the conclusion, to which this paper owes the pun in its title, that Hungarian agreement is the fine art of 'phi' and 'art' (where 'art' is short for 'article'). If the proposal in this paper with regard to 'definiteness agreement' hold water, however, at the end of the day, Hungarian agreement is really only about phi-features, instantiated either in the form of agreement suffixes or in the form of clitics, the latter either overt or null.

1 Hungarian agreement: The main empirical issues

Let me start by giving a quick bird's eye view of the facts of Hungarian agreement. Perhaps the best-known property of the Hungarian verbal inflectional system is its distinction between a 'definite' and an 'indefinite' conjugation. The traditional terms for these two inflectional paradigms in Hungarian descriptive grammar are *tárgyas ragozás* 'objective conjugation' and *alanyi ragozás* 'subjective conjugation', respectively.[2] This terminology signals that when the former is used, a property of the object is reflected in the finite verb's inflection: the fact that *(a)* there is an (accusative-marked) object, and *(b)* it is of a particular morphosyntactic type (it is definite[3]). (1) illustrates the difference in form and distribution of the two finite verb conjugations.

(1)	a.	(én)	szeret-ek	{∅ /	valaki-t	/ egy	görög	nő-t}		
		I	love-1SG.INDEF		someone-ACC	a	Greek	woman-ACC		
	b.	(én)	szeret-em	{az-t /	ő-t	/ azt a	görög	nő-t	/	Mari-t}
		I	love-1SG.DEF	that-ACC	(s)he-ACC	that	Greek	woman-ACC		Mari-ACC

An interesting quirk in this otherwise quite transparent inflectional pattern manifests itself when we consider sentences with a first or second person object pronoun. Whereas third person object pronouns trigger definite agreement on the finite verb (cf. (1b) with *őt* 'him/her'), first and second person object pronouns do not: thus, in (2b) and (3a,b), we see the verb appear in its indefinite conjugation form. An additional puzzle in this domain is posed by finite clauses whose subject is first person singular and whose object is second person. Such sentences pick a form of the finite verb not featured anywhere else in the grammar of the language: the special *-lak/-lek* form illustrated in (2a).

2 This terminology may suggest a treatment of Hungarian (finite) clause syntax as belonging to the *ergative* type (cf. e.g. Lindhout-Lengyel 1993). The fact, however, that the marking of the subject is the same regardless of whether there is an object and, if so, whether it is definite or indefinite suggests that the ergative hypothesis is unlikely to be sustained. I will not pursue it further.

3 Or, more precisely (cf. Bartos 1997, 2001 for a particularly clear demonstration), its projection is a DP. Thus, note the difference between (ia) and (ib). In (ia), the object is a full-fledged DP — visibly so: the definite article *a* introduces the object — and definite agreement on the verb is obligatory. In (ib), on the other hand, we are dealing with an object that is smaller than DP, and concomitantly, we find indefinite agreement on the finite verb. Note that (non-)specificity does not seem to make the desired cut here: *minden* is specific in both examples. The key here and elsewhere seems to be that definite agreement results whenever the accusative-marked noun phrase in the verb's complement is a DP. An apparent problem for this approach is the fact that (ia) is also grammatical with *a te* dropped and even then will still demand definite agreement. I cannot address this issue here.

(i)	a.	ismer-jük/*ismer-ünk	a	te	minden	titk-od-at	
		know-1PL.DEF/1PL.INDEF	the	you_{SG}	every	secret-2SG.POSS-ACC	
		'we know your every secret'					
	b.	ismer-ünk/*ismer-jük	minden	titk-ot			
		know-1PL.INDEF/1PL.DEF	every	secret-ACC			
		'we know every secret'					

(2)	a.	(én)	szeret-lek	{téged /	titek-et	/ bennetek-et}	**szeretem, *szeretek*
		I	love-LAK/LEK	you$_{SG}$	you$_{PL}$-ACC	you$_{PL}$-ACC	
	b.	(ő)	szeret	{téged /	titek-et	/ bennetek-et}	**szereti* (3SG.DEF)
		(s)he	love-3SG.INDEF	you$_{SG}$	you$_{PL}$-ACC	you$_{PL}$-ACC	
(3)	a.	(te)	szeret-sz	{engem /	mink-et	/ bennünk-et}	**szereted*
		you$_{SG}$	love-2SG.INDEF	me	us-ACC	us-ACC	
	b.	(ő)	szeret	{engem /	mink-et	/ bennünk-et}	**szereti* (3SG.DEF)
		(s)he	love-3SG.INDEF	me	us-ACC	us-ACC	

The generalisations we can distill from the facts just surveyed can be summarised as follows:

- definite/DP objects trigger DEF–inflection on the finite verb, *except that...*
- first/second person objects trigger INDEF–inflection on the finite verb, *except that...*
- second person objects trigger the special *-lak/-lek* form if the subject is first person singular

This set of generalisations has eternally preoccupied linguists studying the Hungarian inflectional system. In this paper, I will set out to provide an integrated account of them, one of my major objectives being precisely the construction of an analysis that will explain the form and distribution of the various finite inflectional forms.

Once we have gained an understanding of the basic facts in (1)–(3), we may proceed to tackle the behaviour of long-distance focus movement in the context of agreement. Here, we find that, while a finite verb would normally show definite agreement when its complement is a finite clause (cf. (4a)), it may switch to indefinite inflection when an indefinite noun phrase that originates in the lower clause fronts into the matrix clause and is focused there; when doing so, it will obligatorily check accusative Case against the matrix verb, which results in a 'case-switch' if the focused constituent serves as the subject of the embedded finite clause (cf. (4b,b′) and (4c,c′)).[4] Note that when a second person pronoun undergoes long-distance focus fronting and ends up in a matrix clause whose subject is first person singular, we once again see the special *-lak/-lek* form of the verb showing up in the matrix clause as a result of upstairs agreement. This is illustrated in (4d).

(4)	a.	(azt)	akar-om,	hogy	EGY NŐ	legyen	elnök
		it/that-ACC	want-1SG.DEF	that	a woman	be-SUBJ-3SG	president
	b.	%EGY NŐ	akar-om,	hogy	*ec*	elnök	legyen
		a woman(NOM)	want-1SG.DEF	that		president	be-SUBJ-3SG
	b′.	EGY NŐ-T	akar-ok,	hogy	*ec*	elnök	legyen
		a woman-ACC	want-1SG.INDEF	that		president	be-SUBJ-3SG
	c.	%KI	akar-od,	hogy	*ec*	elnök	legyen
		who-NOM	want-2SG.DEF	that		president	be-SUBJ-3SG
	c′.	KI-T	akar-sz,	hogy	*ec*	elnök	legyen
		who-ACC	want-2SG.INDEF	that		president	be-SUBJ-3SG
	d.	TÉGED	akar-lak,	hogy	*ec*	elnök	legyél
		you-OBJ	want-LAK/LEK	that		president	be-SUBJ-2SG

The behaviour of long-distance focus fronting in the domain of agreement will be the subject of section 5 of this paper.

4 The '%' sign in front of (4b) and (4c) indicates that not all speakers readily accept these sentences. Gervain (2003, 2005) presents a detailed study of speaker variation in this area. Notice that all speakers accept, and in fact prefer, the primed examples: 'case-switch' and 'upstairs' agreement are the norm, not the exception.

Before turning to the definite/indefinite agreement facts, however, I will first address agreement and 'anti-agreement' in the Hungarian possessed noun phrase. As is well known, the Hungarian possessed noun (or 'possessum', as I will call it hereinafter) bears inflectional morphology that cross-references, in the general case, the person and number of its possessor — thus, *a könyv-e-i-m* 'the book-POSS-PL.POSS'UM-1SG.POSS'OR' means 'my books' (with *-m* being the marker of first person singular possessive morphology, cross-referencing the person and number features of the pro-dropped possessor) and *a könyv-e-i-nk* 'the book-POSS-PL.POSS'UM-1PL.POSS'OR' means 'our books' (*-nk* realising first person plural possessive marking); the *-i* occurring in between the head noun *könyv* 'book' and the possessive agreement markers is the sign of plurality of the possessum, NOT a sign of plurality of the possessor: it shows up in *könyv-e-i-m* 'my books' as well, and conversely, it does not show up in *könyv-ünk* 'our book', where the possessor is plural whereas the possessum is morphologically singular.

Interestingly, however, there are two contexts in which something seems to be going 'awry' in the domain of possessive agreement in Hungarian possessed noun phrases with a nominative (or non-case-inflected) possessor:

(i) the plural inflectional marker, *-k*,[5] fails to show up on the possessum when the nominative possessor is 3PL and *non*-pronominal (5b);[6] as a result, the form of the possessed noun is the same in (5a) and (5b), the two being distinguished only in terms of the number marking on the possessor

(ii) the plural inflectional marker, *-k*, must show up on the possessum and does NOT surface on the possessor when the nominative possessor is a 3PL *pronoun* (5d); as a result, the form of the pronominal possessor is the same in (5c) and (5d), the two being distinguished only in terms of the number marking in the possessive morphology on the possessed noun

(5)	a.	a	nő	könyv-e-i-∅	'the woman's books'
		the	woman	book-POSS-PL.POSS'UM-3SG.POSS'OR	
	b.	a	nő-k	könyv-e-i-∅	'the women's books'
		the	woman-PL	book-POSS-PL.POSS'UM-3SG.POSS'OR	
	b′.	*a	nő-k	könyv-e-i-k	
		the	woman-PL	book-POSS-PL.POSS'UM-3PL.POSS'OR	
	c.	az	ő	könyv-e-i-∅	'her books'
		the	(s)he	book-POSS-PL.POSS'UM-3SG.POSS'OR	
	d.	az	ő	könyv-e-i-k	'their books'
		the	(s)he	book-POSS-PL.POSS'UM-3PL.POSS'OR	
	d′.	*az	ő-k	könyv-e-i-k	
	d′′.	*az	ő-k	könyv-e-i-∅	

The kind of (anti-)agreement illustrated in (5a) is not found in adpositional phrases with full-nominal complements. Adpositions do not show any morphology whatsoever when their complement is a full noun phrase, as shown in (6a): the possessive morpheme *-e*, which is present throughout the possessed DP examples given above, is absent from (6a,b). But they do bear *-e* when their complement is a third person singular pronoun (cf. (6c)), and when that pronoun is plural, we see the same kind of 'migration' of the plural marker *-k* that we also found in (5d): in (6d), *-k* shows up on the inflected adposition, not on the third person pronoun, which is realised as *ő* rather than *ők*.

5 The most common PL–marker of Uralic is **-t*. In addition, one finds **-n* and **-j* (the latter surfacing as *-i* in Hungarian possessed plurals). Hungarian *-k* is also found in Mordvinian, Baltic Finnish and Ostyak (cf. Livonian *me-k* 'we'); Hajdú (1972:41).

6 Though see Károly (1972:88) on (5b′) in 'Old Hungarian' (cf. his *a tanuló-k könyv-ük* 'the student-PL book-3PL'; he does not specify a date for this kind of example).

(6)	a.	a	nő	mellett(*-e)	‘near/next to the woman’
		the	woman	near-POSS	
	b.	a	nő-k	mellett(*-e)	‘near/next to the women’
		the	woman-PL	near-POSS	
	b′.	*a	nő-k	mellett-ük	
		the	woman-PL	near-3PL	
	c.		ő	mellett*(-e)	‘near/next to her’
			(s)he	near-POSS	
	d.		ő	mellett-ük[7]	‘near/next to them’
			(s)he	near-3PL	
	d′.	*	ő-k	mellett-ük	
	d′′.	*	ő-k	mellett-e	

On the surface, therefore, it seems that there is a *partial* parallel in the domain of agreement between adpositional phrases and possessed noun phrases with a nominative (or non-case-marked) possessor. Bartos (1999:sect. 2.1.3) argues in detail, however, that the inflectional behaviour of adpositional phrases *can* in fact be fully assimilated to that of possessed noun phrases. This is a desirable result, but I will refrain from reproducing it in this paper, whose focus lies elsewhere.

Possessed noun phrases with a *dative*-marked possessor differ in yet another way from the patterns we observed in (5) and (6): here, though the ‘anti-agreement’ found in (5b) is indeed available, it is only optional in dative-possessor constructions (cf. (7a,b); see Den Dikken 1999 for detailed discussion of speaker variation on this point, briefly summarised in the right-hand margin, and to be revisited in section 5, below), whereas in (5b) it is obligatory (i.e., (5b′) is ungrammatical in present-day Hungarian; recall fn. 6 on ‘Old Hungarian’). Anti-agreement seems to be found with inflected infinitives as well (Tóth 2000, É. Kiss 2002; the latter characterises anti-agreement in (7c) as ‘slightly substandard’ and gives it a ‘?’, reproduced here), but this is a somewhat contentious issue (cf. Rákosi & Laczkó 2005).

(7)	a.	csak	[János-ék-nak	a	terv-ük/-e]	sikerül-t		dialect A: *-e/*-ük*
		only	János-PL-DAT	the	plan-3PL/3SG	be.successful-PST		dialect B: *-e/*-ük*
		‘only János *et al.*’s plan was successful’						dialect C: *-e/-ük*
	b.	János-ék-nak	sikerül-t		a	terv-ük/-e		dialect A: *-e/-ük*
		János-PL-DAT	be.successful-PST		the	plan-3PL/3SG		dialect B: *-e/-ük*
		‘János *et al.*’s plan was successful’						dialect C: *-e/-ük*
	c.	János-ék-nak	sikerül-t		tervez-ni-ük/ʔ-e			
		János-PL-DAT	be.successful-PST		plan-INF-3PL/3SG			
		‘János *et al*. were successful at planning’						

The facts in (1)–(7) provide a quick, rough-and-ready overview of the agreement facts of Hungarian. Lack of space and insight prevents me from covering the entire spectrum of data. I will have nothing further to say about agreement in adpositional phrases (6) and inflected infinitives (7c) in what follows, basically because I do not fully understand the behaviour of these constructions in the domain of agreement at this time. For the agreement properties of possessed noun phrases with dative-marked possessors (7a,b), I refer the reader to Den Dikken (1999), whose account of the patterns is unaffected by what will be argued below. In section 5, I will have occasion to recapitulate the analysis of (7a,b) in connection with Gervain’s (2003, 2005) account of agreement in long focus fronting constructions, which is directly based on Den Dikken (1999).

7 The ‘disappearance’ of the possessive marker *-e* in (6d) is not a quirk of adpositional inflection — we see it in singular *az ő könyv-ük* ‘the (s)he book, i.e., their book’ as well (contrast this with plural (5d), where *-e* is preserved). This is the result of a phonological rule (deleting *-e* if immediately followed by *ü*, the vowel that lexically belongs to the third person plural possessive suffix). I will not go into the phonological specifics here. See esp. Rebrus’s work (e.g. 2000a,b, 2005) for detailed discussion.

My focus in this paper will be on possessive agreement in noun phrases with nominative (or non-case-inflected) possessors, and finite verb agreement and the form and distribution of the definite and indefinite agreement paradigms, the behaviour of first and second person object pronouns, and the special *-lak/-lek* form. I will open the discussion by looking at possessive agreement, updating the analysis thereof presented in Den Dikken (1999).

2 Possessed noun phrases: Agreement, anti-agreement, and plural ‘migration’

In Den Dikken (1999), I argue in detail for a parallel between the Hungarian facts in (5b,d), repeated below in a condensed form as (8), and Welsh (anti-)agreement in VSO sentences, illustrated in (9) (from Rouveret 1991).

(8)	a.	a	nő-k	könyv-e-i-∅/*-k	(cf. (5))
		the	woman-PL	book-POSS-PL.POSS’UM-3SG/*3PL.POSS’OR	
	b.	a(z	ő)	könyv-e-i-k/*-∅	
		the	(s)he	book-POSS-PL.POSS’UM-3PL/*3SG.POSS’OR	

(9)	a.	darllen-odd/*-asant	y	plant	y	llyfr		(Welsh)
		read-PST-3SG/*3PL	the	children	the	book		
	b.	darllen-asant/-*odd	{*pro* /	hwy}	y	llyfr		
		read-PST-3PL/*3SG		they	the	book		

The account presented in Den Dikken (1999) follows directly in the footsteps of Rouveret’s (1991) insightful analysis of (anti-)agreement in Welsh, which is summarised by the structures in (10).

(10) *Rouveret’s (1991) analysis of Welsh (anti-)agreement*

a. $[_{\text{AgrSP}}\ [_{\text{AgrS}'}\ \text{AgrS}\ [_{\text{TP}}\ [_{\text{DP}}\ y\ [_{\text{NumP}}\ \text{Num=PL}\ [_{\text{NP}}\ \textit{plant}]]]]\ [_{\text{T}''}\ \text{T}\ \ldots]]]]$ → anti-agreement

b. $[_{\text{AgrSP}}\ [_{\text{AgrS}'}\ \text{AgrS}\ [_{\text{TP}}\ \ldots\ [_{\text{NumP}}\ \text{Num=PL}\ [_{\text{NP}}\ \textit{pro/hwy}]]\ [_{\text{T}''}\ \text{T}\ \ldots]]]]$ → agreement

In (10a), no subject–finite verb agreement results because *(a)* no Spec–Head relationship between AgrS and the subject–DP is established,[8] and *(b)* the Num–head of the subject, fully encapsulated within DP, cannot raise up to AgrS and adjoin to it. As a result, no checking configuration between AgrS and the number feature of the subject is establishable, and the derivation crashes if AgrS contains a bundle of uninterpretable subject-agreement features. In (10b), on the other hand, Num can raise to AgrS (in fact, it *has to*, to ensure that it is licensed: it does not have a local D–head to depend on, hence it must raise to AgrS to be licensed under what Baker 1988 calls ‘morphological licensing’), and by so raising, it establishes a checking relationship with AgrS, reflected morphologically in the obligatory occurrence of subject-agreement inflection on the finite verb.

Rouveret’s (1991) analysis of the Welsh (anti-)agreement facts can be carried over straightforwardly to the Hungarian possessed noun phrase, as schematised in (11).

8 Rouveret’s (1991) analysis is couched in an early version of the minimalist outlook on clause structure and feature checking, the former involving a post-Pollockian ‘inflated’ inflectional structure with AgrS and T, and the latter being assumed to proceed only in particular structural configurations — specifically, in configurations in which the goal is in the ‘checking domain’ of the probe, with only the specifier position(s) of and positions adjoined to the probe being included in the ‘checking domain’ of the probe.

(11) *Rouveret's (1991) analysis carried over to Hungarian (anti-)agreement and migration*

a. $[_{AgrP}\ [_{Agr'}\ Agr\quad [_{FP}\ [_{DP}\ a\ [_{NumP}\ Num{=}\textit{-k}\ [_{NP}\ \textit{nő}]]]\quad [_{F'}\ F\ ...]]]]$ → anti-agreement

b. $[_{AgrP}\ [_{Agr'}\ Agr\quad [_{FP}\quad [_{NumP}\ Num{=}\textit{-k}\ [_{NP}\ \textit{pro/ő}]]\quad [_{F'}\ F\ ...]]]]$ → agreement

The attractiveness of carrying the Rouveret (1991) analysis over to Hungarian possessed noun phrases, in light of the agglutinative nature of Hungarian, is that Num can actually be *seen* to move — raising Num to Agr results in physical displacement of an overt morpheme, *-k*: it 'migrates' from the possessive pronoun to the Agr–head of the possessed noun phrase (ultimately being spelled out on the possessum, via 'Affix Hopping' or its equivalent in Distributed Morphology, 'Merger'[9]).

Den Dikken (1999) ascribed the difference between Hungarian clauses and possessed noun phrases in the domain of (anti-)agreement to the EPP. The 'subject' of a Hungarian possessed noun phrase (i.e., the possessor) is not attracted to SpecAgrP because the EPP is not in effect for Hungarian DP–internal Agr. But the subject of a Hungarian finite clause is obligatorily attracted to SpecAgrSP: the EPP *is* in effect for Hungarian AgrS (unlike in Welsh). As a result, Hungarian (unlike Welsh) does not show anti-agreement in the clause.

While empirically quite successful in accounting for the facts of Hungarian and the partial parallel with Welsh, the analysis of (anti-)agreement and '*-k* migration' in Hungarian possessed noun phrases defended in Den Dikken (1999) raises a number of non-trivial questions (see esp. Bartos 1999 for a good critique). Some of these questions apply equally to Rouveret's (1991) parent analysis, others are Hungarian-specific. In the ensuing paragraphs, I will address five questions that I believe deserve careful scrutiny.

Q1 What is the status of 'AgrS' and 'Agr' in an Agr-less theory? How to reconceptualise these nodes?

For 'AgrS' the obvious relabelling is 'T', with the functional projection immediately below AgrSP in Rouveret's structures in (10) then being relabelled '*v*P' or, if (as the empirical evidence suggests; cf. McCloskey 2005 and references cited there) the subject is not *in situ* in Celtic VSO clauses , some functional projection between TP and *v*P.[10] For 'Agr' in the structure of possessed noun phrases in (11), I propose 'Person' as the new label (for reasons that will become more transparent below). As a cover label for 'T' and 'Person' (which I prefer to think of as features of functional heads rather than as functional heads themselves), I propose 'Deixis' (to be abbreviated as 'Dx'). The Dx–head may possess either [TENSE] or [PERSON] as its primary feature specification — so we get two differently flavoured Dx–heads, $Dx^{[TENSE]}$ and $Dx^{[PERSON]}$, respectively. Leaving the label of the functional projection immediately below DxP open for now, what we thus arrive at is the structure in (12a) for Celtic clauses, and (12b) for Hungarian possessed DPs.

(12) a. $[_{DxP}\ [_{Dx'}\ Dx^{[TENSE]}\quad [_{FP}\ [_{DP}\ \textit{y}\quad [_{NumP}\ Num{=}PL\ [_{NP}\ \textit{plant}]]]\quad [_{F'}\ F\ ...]]]]$

b. $[_{DxP}\ [_{Dx'}\ Dx^{[PERSON]}\quad [_{FP}\ [_{DP}\ \textit{a}\quad [_{NumP}\ Num{=}\textit{-k}\ [_{NP}\ \textit{nő}]]]\quad [_{F'}\ F\ ...]]]]$

9 The details concerning the way in which the possessive agreement morphology in Agr ultimately gets spelled out on the possessum will be immaterial in the discussion to follow. It is plain that this is *not* the result of raising of the possessed head-noun to Agr: unlike in Welsh, where V does indeed raise up to AgrS and comes to precede the subject in SpecTP, in Hungarian the surface word order of possessed noun phrases is POSSESSOR – POSSESSUM.

10 This could perhaps be AspP, though it is not straightforward to have the *subject* raise to SpecAspP (esp. if 'Asp' here is *Aktionsart*, which is sensitive to properties of the *object*, not the subject). McCloskey (2005) takes SpecTP to be the locus of the subject in Irish, erecting an 'FP' (tentatively identified as Laka's 1990 'ΣP' or, alternatively, as Rizzi's 1997 'FinP'). Since my concerns in this paper are with Hungarian rather than Celtic, I will leave open the exact details of the relabelling of the structures in (10); this is immaterial for our purposes here though not ultimately trivial.

Q2 How to preserve the analysis in an Agree-based theory (Chomsky 2000, 2001)?

Since in the Agree-based theory it is no longer necessary to manoeuvre the probe's goal into the 'checking domain' of the probe in order for agreement to be able to take effect (cf. fn. 8, above), Dx should be able to establish an Agree relationship with the constituent in SpecFP without the head of that constituent undergoing movement. So a different way of asking the above question is to ask why movement of the head of NumP up to Dx is nonetheless obligatory when the constituent in SpecFP is a 'bare' NumP. The requirement that Num raise to Dx cannot be imposed by Dx itself. It must instead be thought of as a licensing requirement on a Num–head not included in a larger DP–structure (cf. also Rouveret 1991, and the discussion below (10)): Num needs a licenser; D can license it within DP whenever present, but with D absent, Num needs to raise to Dx to get licensed.[11]

This point can be strengthened if Dx is not itself directly specifiable for number (the feature that Dx establishes an Agree-relationship with the subject/possessor for), and cannot have this feature bear an 'EPP–property'. I propose that [NUMBER] is either a value of the feature of a Num–head in the extended projection of a noun, or (in contexts where there is no Num–head present in the structure) [NUMBER] is a feature of a Dx–head. In the latter case, it is dependent on [PERSON] or [TENSE] — that is to say, [NUMBER] on Dx is a *sub*feature of either [PERSON] or [TENSE]. If this is right, and if we assume further that no EPP–property can be attributed to a head by a *sub*feature of one of that head's features (put differently, *only* a feature for which a head is *directly* specified for can be 'EPP–marked'), then it follows that [NUMBER] on Dx cannot contribute an EPP–property, hence can never drive overt movement to SpecDxP or Dx^0 — only [PERSON] or [TENSE] can. Movement of the Num–head to Dx in Welsh (12a) or Hungarian (12b) cannot therefore be triggered by Dx's [NUMBER] property; it must instead be driven 'from within', by a licensing requirement imposed on the Num–head. This derives the essence of Rouveret's (1991) account of Num–raising.

Note that the idea that [NUMBER] is a *sub*feature of Dx also predicts that the number morpheme cannot be spelled out *independently* on Dx as *-k* in Hungarian (12b). $Dx^{[PERSON]}$ is not specifiable for number at all in third-person contexts: third person is 'non-person' (Benveniste 1966), hence either Dx lacks [PERSON] altogether (as seems reasonable), or its [PERSON] feature is ∅ and incapable of having [NUMBER] as a dependent.[12] Either way, the Dx–head in (12b), unspecified for [NUMBER], is predicted to be unable to host PL *-k* by itself. This is an important result. Without it, an Agree-based account would still fail to predict the absence of *-k* in Dx in the structure in (12b) (after all, if we did allow [NUMBER] features to be present under third-person Dx in (12b), those features should be able to establish an Agree relationship with the matching features of the *-k* of the possessor in SpecFP, and would be spelled out as a *-k* realised on the possessum), and it would hence fail to derive the obligatory anti-agreement effect seen in (5a)/(8a).[13]

11 Recall Baker's (1988) 'morphological licensing', referred to below (10). One could perhaps think of Num as clitic-like, imposing licensing restrictions of its own.

12 I will not tarry on the choice between these two 'translations' of the 'third person = non-person' adage. See Nevins (2005) for recent discussion of the status of third person in morphology and syntax.

13 For Welsh (12a), it is not immediately plain why $Dx^{[TENSE]}$ should be unspecifiable for [NUMBER]. Hence the account of anti-agreement in Welsh may not run along exactly the same lines — which may be a good result if Rezac & Jouitteau (to appear) are right that apparent 'anti-agreement' in Celtic is in fact genuine agreement with a (singular) nominal *v*P; see their paper for careful argumentation. Note that, whatever the fate of the Rezac & Jouitteau approach to apparent 'anti-agreement' in Celtic (which I will provisionally adopt here), their account stands little chance of carrying over to the Hungarian facts: the nominal constituent in the complement of $Dx^{[PERSON]}$ in (12b) is the possessum, which is specified for number features of its own; it will *never*, however, control the selection of a number marker in Dx — i.e., a plural possessum will *never* trigger a *-k* under Dx (cf. **a nő cipő-i-k* 'the woman shoe-PL.POSS'UM-PL').

Q3 How to codify the difference between possessed noun phrases and clauses with respect to movement to SpecDxP?

This is now straightforwardly recast in terms of the EPP as a property of the active head of DxP — [TENSE] and [PERSON], for clauses and possessed noun phrases, respectively. In possessed noun phrases with a third person ('non-person') possessor,[14] Dx is either not specified for [PERSON] at all or has a ∅ [PERSON] feature (unvaluable because the possessor, being 'non-person', lacks a specification for [PERSON]). Either way, Dx cannot bear the EPP–property, which, in possessed noun phrases, is a property of (valued) [PERSON]. In tensed clauses, by contrast, the valued [TENSE] feature of Dx *can* be equipped with the EPP–property. In languages (such as Hungarian) in which the EPP is in effect on Tense (= $Dx^{[TENSE]}$), this will drive the subject up to SpecTP (= Spec$Dx^{[TENSE]}$P).[15]

Q4 How does a third person (singular) pronoun manage to satisfy the EPP–property of $Dx^{[TENSE]}$?

Let me make it explicit right at the outset that I assume the EPP–property of $Dx^{[TENSE]}$ to be checked by the uninterpretable [TENSE] feature of the subject ('*u*T' in Pesetsky & Torrego's 2001 notation, equivalent to nominative Case). For third-person subjects, this uninterpretable [TENSE] feature is specifiable only on the D–head if third person is 'non-person' (which, if [PERSON] is privative, translates as absence of [PERSON]), and if singular is 'non-plural' (which likewise may translate as absence of [NUMBER]). If indeed possession of *u*T presupposes the possession of a D–head,[16] then this means that third person pronouns must project a full-fledged DP in contexts in which they have to check the EPP–property of $Dx^{[TENSE]}$. Assuming economy of projection (cf. Speas 1993, 1995), pronouns are mere NumPs *unless* the syntax demands that they be larger — and satisfaction of the EPP constitutes one such syntactic demand.

This line of thought leads to the desirable conclusion that claiming that third person pronouns are smaller than DP in the context of possessed noun phrases is not tantamount to claiming that third person pronouns are *systematically* smaller than DP — they most certainly CAN be as large as DP, if circumstances so dictate. This conclusion undercuts one of Bartos' (1999) major points of criticism of Den Dikken's (1999) analysis of agreement in the Hungarian possessed noun phrase. Bartos points out correctly that the fact that third person object pronouns obligatorily trigger definite agreement on the finite verb would not follow if they were systematically smaller than DP (on the assumption that it is D that DEF agrees with, which is what Bartos 1997, 2001 argues; see section 3, below, for a reinterpretation preserving the basic insight). But on the assumption that pronouns (or syntactic constructs in general) only *prefer* to be as small as possible but are allowed to be larger when forced, there is no conflict between Den Dikken's (1999) analysis of the possessive agreement facts and Bartos' (1997, 2001) account of distribution of definite agreement, provided that we can come up with a syntactic condition that forces object pronouns to be full-blown DPs. I will present such a syntactic condition in my account of definiteness agreement in section 3. Before turning to that account, however, there remains one further question to be discussed concerning agreement in possessed noun phrases.

14 I will talk briefly about possessed noun phrases with a first or second person possessor at the end of this section (see Q5 and the discussion below it).

15 Of course, languages may differ with respect to whether they assign $Dx^{[TENSE]}$ the EPP–property: if I am right to suggest that (12a) is the structure of Welsh finite clauses, then its $Dx^{[TENSE]}$ lacks an EPP specification. See McCloskey (2005) for an alternative analysis (alluded to already in fn. 10), keyed specifically to Irish, which maintains that the EPP *is* actually in effect in Celtic VSO languages. In his analysis, T is not the highest head in the 'IP domain'; he has the TP and FP of (12a) switched, with TP being the lower of the two projections, and thereby the host of the subject.

16 This is arguably supported by restrictions on 'bare NPs' as subjects in SpecTP: Dutch **dat kinderen op straat aan het spelen zijn* 'that children are playing in the street', contrasting with grammatical *dat er kinderen op straat aan het spelen zijn*, where the expletive *er* 'there' checks $Dx^{[TENSE]}$'s EPP–property and the 'bare NP' subject stays low.

Q5 What to do with first and second person subjects and possessors?[17]

In third person contexts, the Dx–head is not independently specifiable for [NUMBER], which, when not projecting, is a dependent of the [PERSON] or [TENSE] feature of Dx. In possessed noun phrases with first or second person possessors, by contrast, $Dx^{[PERSON]}$ is specified for [PERSON] and hence *(a)* must Agree with matching [PERSON] features of the possessor, and *(b)* will be specifiable, by itself, for [NUMBER].[18] This directly takes care of the fact that in first and second person possessor cases, one does not find 'anti-agreement' — agreement is forced, in fact (cf. (13)).

(13) a. a mi cipő-i-n-k / *cipő-i-m
the we shoe-PL.POSS'UM-1-PL shoe-PL.POSS'UM-1SG
'our shoes'

b. a ti cipő-i-te-k / *cipő-i-d
the you_{PL} shoe-PL.POSS'UM-2-PL shoe-PL.POSS'UM-2SG
'$your_{PL}$ shoes'

First and second person pronouns must have a functional head in their structure that can host [PERSON] (either a dedicated 'Person'–head or D; I will leave the choice between the two open for lack of insight). This will also allow first and second person pronouns to satisfy the EPP–property of $Dx^{[PERSON]}$ if it has one. That is, the EPP may actually hold in the Hungarian possessed noun phrase (*contra* Den Dikken 1999, where it was claimed that the EPP is not in effect here), but its effect should be noticeable only with first and second person possessors. I will come back to the question of whether the EPP is operative in Hungarian possessed noun phrases with first or second person possessors in section 4, where I will provide an affirmative answer.

3 Definiteness agreement: The fine art of 'Art'

First, though, let me return to the basic contrast in (1), repeated here, between indefinite and definite agreement in finite clauses.

(1) a. (én) szeret-ek {∅ / valaki-t / egy görög nő-t}
I love-1SG.INDEF someone-ACC a Greek woman-ACC

b. (én) szeret-em {az-t / ő-t / azt a görög nő-t / Mari-t}
I love-1SG.DEF that-ACC (s)he-ACC that Greek woman-ACC Mari-ACC

What we see here (as stressed already in section 1) is the co-existence of two different *subject*-agreement forms, their distribution depending on the properties of the *object*. A close comparison of the paradigms for the indefinite and definite conjugations (presented in table form on the next page) indicates that the INDEF and DEF forms do not stand in a systematic agglutinative relation to one another — one cannot 'get' from the INDEF forms to the DEF forms by adding the same, discrete morpheme to the former throughout (cf. in particular 1SG *-k* ~ *-m*, 2SG *-l*/*-sz* ~ *-d*, 1PL *-n* ~ ∅). Yet, the relationship between the two paradigms does not seem to be random: there are some important regularities to be captured. The numbered ellipses in the tables in (14) and (15) try to highlight these regularities.

17 This question was not addressed in Den Dikken (1999), which concentrated on the behaviour of third-person possessors.

18 The fact that $Dx^{[PERSON]}$ in the structure of possessed noun phrases with first or second person possessors is specified for person and number features matching those of the possessor does not entail that possessed noun phrases with first or second person possessors should behave outwardly (i.e., in their external syntax) like first or second person pronouns: the person and number features of $Dx^{[PERSON]}$ are uninterpretable, hence marked for deletion upon checking against the possessor's matching features, and erased upon the completion of DP. The outward plurality of (13a,b) is contributed by the number feature of the possessum's head.

(14)

INDEFINITE – PRESENT TENSE INDICATIVE				INDEFINITE – PAST TENSE INDICATIVE				
V	PERSON	V	NUMBER	TENSE	V	PERSON	V	NUMBER
o/e/ö	*k*			*t*	*a/e*	*m*		
o/e/ö	*l* ❶			*t*	*á/é*	*l*		
(a/e)	*sz*							
	∅			*t~o/e/ött*		∅		
u/ü	*n* ❷		*k*	*t* ❸	*u/ü*	*n* ❷		*k*
(o/e/ö)	*t*	*o/e/ö*	*k*	*t*	*a/e*	*t*	*o/e*	*k*
(a/e)	*n*	*a/e*	*k*	*t*	*a/e*	∅		*k*

(15)

DEFINITE – PRESENT TENSE INDICATIVE				DEFINITE – PAST TENSE INDICATIVE				
V	PERSON	V	NUMBER	TENSE	V	PERSON	V	NUMBER
o/e/ö	*m* ❶			*t*	*a/e*	*m*		
o/e/ö	*d*			*t*	*a/e*	*d*		
ja/i	∅			*t*	*a/e*	∅		
ju/jü ❸	❷		*k*	*t* ❸	*u/ü*	❷		*k*
já/i	*t*	*o/e*	*k*	*t*	*á/é*	*t*	*o/e*	*k*
já/i	∅		*k*	*t*	*á/é*	∅		*k*

The ellipses labelled ❶ bring out the fact that the subject agreement markers for first and second person singular are radically different in the DEF and INDEF conjugations.[19] By contrast, the person markers for 3SG and all plurals are essentially identical in the two paradigms,[20] as the ellipses labelled ❷ show. And with the person markers for 3SG and all plurals being identical in the two paradigms, and with number being marked the same way throughout the system, the DEF forms for 3SG and all plurals (identified by the solid ellipses labelled ❸) distinguish themselves from their INDEF counterparts in the presence of additional vocalic material: in the present-tense DEF paradigm, the 3SG and all plural forms are characterised by the presence of a high front unrounded vowel/glide *-j/i*, which seems to be the 'DEF–marker' there; in the past-tense paradigms, we see that the DEF form for 3SG have a vowel *a/e* where its INDEF counterpart does not, and the 2PL, 3PL forms have a long vowel *á/é* where the INDEF forms have a short vowel.

So while there is no *single* way in which the DEF and INDEF forms can be systematically distinguished from one another, two rough generalisations can be distilled from the data (abstracting away from the problem posed by the absence of *-n* in the 1PL DEF, which I take to be accidental, not profound; recall fn. 20):

19 Notice, however, the absence of the *-k* of 1SG PRES INDEF from the past-tense paradigm, where the *-m* of 1SG PRES DEF shows up instead. One suspects that the use of *-m* in lieu of *-k* in the 1SG cell of the past-tense indefinite agreement paradigm is 'motivated' by a desire to avoid homophony with the 3PL form of this paradigm: *lát-t-ak* 'see-PST-3PL' would otherwise be indistinguishable from the first person form. Though Hungarian inflection certainly is not devoid of syncretism, it seems that conflation of *person* distinctions is avoided; there being no sign for third person, the only way to avoid syncretism of 1SG and 3PL in the past-tense indefinite agreement paradigm is to select an otherwise unexpected form for the former marker, *-m* instead of *-k*. I have not so far been able to translate this functional perspective on the distribution of 1SG *-k* and *-m* in the indefinite agreement paradigm into a structural analysis.

20 The mysterious absence of *-n* from the DEF paradigm for 1PL spoils the otherwise highly regular picture to some extent. Based on the historical roots of the 1PL agreement marker, one clearly expects there to be a nasal in this form throughout: the form derives from the concatenation of the 1SG marker *-m* and the plural marker *-k*. The nasal is indeed systematically present in the INDEF conjugation, as well as in 1PL possessive agreement; its absence from 1PL DEF is an outlier, both historically and synchronically.

(i) the DEF and INDEF forms either involve different PERSON markers (1SG, 2SG), or
(ii) the DEF and INDEF forms are distinguished in the vocalic melody preceding PERSON

Two historical facts directly relate to these observations:

(iii) the Uralic [PERSON] suffixes go back to 'agglutinated forms of personal pronouns (much the same as the possessive suffixes)' (Hajdú 1972:43)
(iv) 'the verb had two forms of Sg3 as early as the proto-Uralic period' — a 'bare' form for 'indefinite' agreement, a suffixed form for 'definite' agreement (Hajdú 1972:44)

The reconstructed paradigms of the verbal inflectional suffixes and personal pronouns of Proto-Uralic (the common ancestor of all Finno-Ugric languages, including Hungarian) in (16) illustrate this.

(16) *Proto-Uralic verbal inflectional suffixes*

1	**-m*	cf. pronouns	**me*
2	**-t*		**te*
3INDF	**∅*		
3DEF	**-se*		**se*

Hajdú (1972:44) points out (without giving concrete evidence, however) that '[t]he pronoun of the 3rd person [giving rise to **-se*] ... was originally a pronoun with the value of the Accusative'. I interpret this as saying that the immediate ancestor of the 3DEF marker **-se* was an *object clitic*. This object clitic freely combined with the ∅ suffix of the third person (cf. the reconstructed 3INDEF form, **∅*) to deliver 'definite agreement'. But apparently, the object clitic **-se* did not combine with the first and second person subject agreement markers — there are no forms **-m-se*, **-t-se* attested in the historical records.

(17) the third person OCL cannot co-occur with a first or second person subject agreement marker

This becomes immediately reminiscent of other 1/2 + 3 co-occurrence restrictions (cf. Bonet's 1991 Person Case Constraint or **me lui* Constraint) if the original first and second person subject agreement markers are analysed as clitics themselves (cf. their transparent relationship with first and second person singular pronouns):

(18) Proto-Uralic first person **-m* and second person **-t* are subject CLITICS

We may then recast the fact that the object clitic **-se* did not combine with the first and second person markers **-m* and **-t* as the Clitic Co-Occurrence Restriction in (19).

(19) *Clitic Co-Occurrence Restriction* (Proto-Uralic)
a third person OCL cannot co-occur with a first or second person SCL

In present-day Hungarian, *-m* and *-d* (the successor of PU and early Hungarian **-t*) are precisely the subject markers that are employed when the object is definite. They are also precisely the subject markers that do not co-occur with the special vocalic melody that we have found to otherwise distinguish the DEF paradigm from the INDEF paradigm. To make sense of this, I will make the following assumptions:

(a) synchronically as well as historically, *-m* and *-d* are SUBJECT CLITICS
(b) the special vocalic melody distinguishing the DEF paradigm from the INDEF paradigm is the synchronic descendant of **-se*, i.e., an OBJECT CLITIC

The fact that present-day Hungarian *-m* (1SG.DEF) and *-d* (2SG.DEF) do not combine with *-j/i* or other synchronic surface reflexes of **-se* then follows from the Clitic Co-Occurrence Restriction in (19), carried over to Hungarian.

The idea that the syntactic distribution of the DEF conjugation is characterised by the presence of an object clitic which may *double* an accusative-marked object noun phrase derives the generalisation underlying the difference between (1a) and (1b) distilled by Bartos (1997, 2001), that the DEF conjugation is used in the presence of an accusative-marked *DP* in the complement of the verb (with the INDEF conjugation being the default case). The link between DEF agreement (on present assumptions, the use of a third person object clitic) and the definiteness or DP–hood of the object (here, the noun phrase that clitic doubles) ties in with the fact that object clitic doubling is generally known to impose definiteness or 'DP–hood' restrictions.[21]

In the next section, I will argue that there is further evidence to support the claim in *(a)*, above, that *-m* and *-d* are subject clitics. There, I will also make a case (originally due to Den Dikken 2004[1999]) for the idea that Hungarian has object clitics for first and second person as well — that is, the present-day successors to **-se* (the special vocalic effects of DEF) are not the only object clitics of Hungarian. The argument is based on the peculiar fact that Hungarian first and second person objects go together with INDEF agreement on the finite verb (recall (2b) and (3a,b)),[22] and also on the internal composition and external syntactic distribution of the special *-lak/-lek* form found in (2a).

4 'Person' agreement: The fine art of 'Phi'

I pointed out in section 1 that Hungarian first and second person pronominal objects (overt or null) behave like indefinite objects with respect to the determination of verb agreement (cf. (2b), (3a,b), repeated below). I also noted there that second person pronominal objects trigger a special agreement form (*-lak/lek*) when the subject is first person singular (cf. (2a)). In this section, I set out to analyse these facts in such a way that they will fall into place with minimal effort on the basis of the hypotheses already put in place.

(2)	a.	(én)	szeret-lek	{téged /	titek-et	/ bennetek-et}	**szeretem, *szeretek*
		I	love-LAK/LEK	you$_{SG}$	you$_{PL}$-ACC	you$_{PL}$-ACC	
	b.	(ő)	szeret	{téged /	titek-et	/ bennetek-et}	**szereti* (3SG.DEF)
		(s)he	love-3SG.INDEF	you$_{SG}$	you$_{PL}$-ACC	you$_{PL}$-ACC	

21 These restrictions manifest themselves, for instance, in the realm of clitic doubling in Romance and the languages of the Balkans. The empirical picture is appreciably subtler than suggested in the main text. First, the generalisation concerning definiteness should be understood to be confined in its scope to *accusative* object clitic doubling. (The fact that dative or other oblique-marked objects do not have to be definite when clitic-doubled is evident from Albanian and Greek, for instance; but this is obviously immaterial for Hungarian DEF–marking, which is tied to accusative objects exclusively.) Secondly, there are clitic-doubling languages for which even accusative object clitic doubling does not impose a definiteness requirement: thus, though Greek has been claimed to restrict accusative object clitic doubling to definites (Anagnostopoulou 1994), there are apparent counterexamples to this restriction (acknowledged by Anagnostopoulou herself). See Kallulli (2000) for careful discussion of these facts and for discussion of Albanian object clitic doubling as well. For Hungarian DEF–marking, too, the generalisation that only (morphological) definites trigger it is a simplification of the empirical facts (see Bartos 1997, 2001). Kallulli (2000) argues that clitic doubling is an anti-focusing device similar to scrambling (which likewise shows a strong tendency to affect definites rather than indefinites, though, as is well known, indefinites are allowed to undergo it, in which case they obtain a so-called *strong* reading). Such a characterisation definitely will not carry over to the distribution of DEF–marking in Hungarian, however: objects triggering DEF–marking can readily be focused.

22 As it stands, this statement is apparently not fully accurate. As Den Dikken, Lipták & Zvolenszky (2001) point out, there are — for a subset of speakers — cases of definite agreement triggered by first or second person object pronouns: cases in which the referent of the subject is included in the referent of the object ('inclusive reference anaphora'; cf. English *I saw us on TV last night*, Hungarian %*én minket valasztom meg* 'I elect us'). Den Dikken, Lipták & Zvolenszky (2001) analyse these cases in such a way that they do not actually challenge the text generalisation: the first/second person object pronoun is not in fact itself the direct object here.

(3)	a.	(te)	szeret-sz	{engem /	mink-et	/ bennünk-et}	**szereted*
		you$_{SG}$	love-2SG.INDEF	me	us-ACC	us-ACC	
	b.	(ő)	szeret	{engem /	mink-et	/ bennünk-et}	**szereti* (3SG.DEF)
		(s)he	love-3SG.INDEF	me	us-ACC	us-ACC	

Two key points will be crucial in the analysis of the facts in (2) and (3):

(i) the *-lak/lek* form is arguably a composite:

-l	+	V	+	*-k*	
2		(epenthetic)		1SG.INDEF	

(ii) 1/2 person object pronouns are composite:

én	+ *g* +	*-em*	(+	*-et*)	*engem(et)*
I	?	1SG		ACC	
te	+ *g* +	*-ed*	(+	*-et*)	*téged(et)*
you$_{SG}$	?	2SG		ACC	
mi	+	*-nk*	+	*-et*	*minket*
we		1PL		ACC	
ti	+	*-tek*	+	*-et*	*titeket*
you$_{PL}$		2PL		ACC	

POSSESSIVE MORPHOLOGY

The possessive morphology on the pronominal stem, highlighted by the ellipse above, has the same person and number features as the pronoun itself. This led Simonyi (1907) to conclude that *engem* is really 'mein ich' (i.e., 'my I/me'). I followed this line in Den Dikken (2004[1999]).[23] But it makes little intuitive sense to literally analyse *engem* as 'my me'. Moreover, a binding or coreference relationship between a possessor and its possessum is generally impossible (cf. **John$_i$ is* [*his$_i$ cook*]$_i$ — a familiar case of the '*i*-within-*i* filter'). In what follows, I will seek to preserve the possessiveness of 1/2 object pronouns while avoiding this problem.

The alternative account that I would like to pursue capitalises on the presence of an additional piece of morphology in two of the four forms illustrated under *(ii)* — the mysterious *g* of *engem* and *téged*. I suggest (though I do not have any historical evidence to shore up this claim[24]) that this *g* is the left-over of the possessum. With this suggestion in place, we then obtain the preliminary result in (20).[25]

23 If indeed Hungarian first and second person object pronouns are possessed noun phrases, as their possessive morphology suggests, then a more microscopic analysis of plural *minket* and *titeket* becomes available that sheds light on the occurrence of the *-i* morpheme that is otherwise characteristic of plural possessums (cf. *a könyv-e-i-nk(-et)* 'our books(-ACC)', *a könyv-e-i-tek(-et)* 'your$_{PL}$ books(-ACC)'): this *-i* can be looked upon as marking the plurality of the (null) possessum in the structure of *minket* and *titeket* proposed below. The fact that the nominative forms of the first and second person plural pronouns (*mi* and *ti*) have this *-i* as well (rather than the regular plural marker *-k*; cf. Livonian *me-k* 'we' — Hajdú 1972:41) may then be looked upon as a case of analogy.

24 Historical grammars seem at a loss finding an ancestor and function for this *g* (cf. Benkő 1991: *-g* may go back to a reconstructed **-ng* whose nature/function remains unclear). One possible avenue to explore (though I will not be able to explore it here for lack of data) is that this *g* is all that is left of *mag* 'core, kernel' — the same noun that Hungarian builds its *reflexives* on by adding possessive agreement morphology to it that reflects the person of the reflexive (cf. (i)). I have no insights to offer regarding the question of why *-g* is not overtly present in the first/second person *plural* object pronouns (**migünket, *tigeteket*).

(i) *Hungarian reflexives*

1SG	(én) mag-a-m	→ cf. *en-g-e-m*	1PL	(mi) mag-unk	
2SG	(te) mag-a-d	→ cf. *té-g-e-d*	2PL	(ti) mag-a-tok	
3SG	(ő) mag-a-∅		3PL	(ő) mag-uk	

25 (20) assumes that first and second person pronouns (*én, te, mi, ti*) themselves project a full DP (in line with the discussion above), but nothing crucial hinges on this. The exact locus of the possessum, *-g*, is also immaterial (cf. Den Dikken 1999 for detailed discussion, irrelevant here).

(20) $[_{DP}\ D\ [_{DxP}\ [_{Dx'}\ Dx^{[PERSON]}$=*-em/-ed* $[_{FP}\ [_{DP}\ D\ [_{NumP}\ Num\ [_{NP}\ en/te]]]]\ [_{F'}\ F\ ...\ [_{NP}\ -g]\ ...]]]]]$

The Agree relationship between $Dx^{[PERSON]}$ and the possessor in SpecFP delivers possessive agreement. And the phonological realisation of possessive agreement will be hosted by *-g*, the possessum, as usual (recall the text below (11), and fn. 9). Since *-g* is itself lexically specified as being a suffix, the same will hold for the combinations of *-g* and the first/second person possessive agreement morphology, *-gem* and *-ged*. The phonological hosts for these complex suffixes are the possessor pronouns occupying SpecFP, *én* and *te*, resp.[26]

The structure in (20) will be seen to be parallel, in all relevant morphosyntactic respects, to the structure of possessive pronouns. Like the first and second person object pronouns just discussed, Hungarian possessive pronouns (whose paradigm is given in (21)) feature *(a)* a personal pronoun (sometimes phonologically modified[27]) in initial position, *(b)* a possessive agreement suffix at the end that matches the person and number features of the personal pronoun, and *(c)* a little something in between these two, which in the case of the possessive pronouns is a vowel, *e/é*.[28] If, as is plausible, we take this vowel *e/é* to be the overt surface realisation of the possessum (in other words, the same kind of creature that the *-g* in (20) also instantiates), then the structure of the possessive pronouns in (21) that we arrive at is the one in (22) — which is entirely analogous to that in (20).

(21) *Hungarian possessive pronouns*

1SG	eny-é-m	‘mine’	1PL	mi-e/é-nk	‘ours’
2SG	ti-e/é-d	‘$yours_{SG}$’	2PL	ti-e/é-tek	‘$yours_{PL}$’
3SG	öv-é-∅	‘his/hers’	3PL	ő-é-k	‘theirs’

(22) $[_{DP}\ D\ [_{DxP}\ [_{Dx'}\ Dx^{[PERSON]}$=*-em/-ed* $[_{FP}\ [_{DP}\ D\ [_{NumP}\ Num\ [_{NP}\ en^{y}/ti]]]\ [_{F'}\ F\ ...\ [_{NP}\ -e/é]\ ...]]]]]$

There remains an important difference between object pronouns and possessive pronouns, however: possessive pronouns, when used as accusative objects, invariably trigger DEF agreement on the verb (cf. (23)), and we do not get the special *-lak/-lek* form when the subject is 1SG and the object is a second person possessive pronoun (cf. (24)). So a further piece to the puzzle needs to be put in place.

(23)	a.	Mari	kap-ja/*kap	az	eny-é-m-et
		Mari	get-DEF.3SG/*INDEF.3SG	the	I-‘ONE’-1SG-ACC
	b.	Mari	kap-ja/*kap	a	ti-e/é-d-et
	c.	Mari	kap-ja/*kap	az	öv-é-∅-t
	d.	Mari	kap-ja/*kap	a	mi-e/é-nk-et
	e.	Mari	kap-ja/*kap	a	ti-e/é-tek-et
	f.	Mari	kap-ja/*kap	az	ő-é-k-et
(24)	a.	(én)	kap-om/*kap-lak	a	ti-e/é-d-et
		I	get-DEF.1SG/*LAK/LEK	the	you-‘ONE’-2SG-ACC
	b.	(én)	kap-om/*kap-lak	a	ti-e/é-tek-et

26 I have nothing insightful to say about the shortening of the vowel of *én* to *en*; vowel lengthening in *te>té* is probably automatic if the underlying representation of *-g* is actually -V*g*, with ‘V’ an abstract vowel (note that *te* will not lengthen in front of an *overt*, homorganic vowel: hiatus results instead; cf. *a te egered* ‘your mouse’, not **a tégered*). I leave the phonological details aside since they are ultimately inconsequential for the morphosyntactic analysis that I am pursuing here.

27 Recall fn. 26 on *én>en* and *te>té*. The change from *ő* ‘(s)he’ to *öv-* seen in the 3SG/3PL forms in (21) is not specific to the third person pronoun: it is found in lexical nouns ending in *-ő* as well (cf. *kő* ‘stone, rock’ ~ *kövek* ‘–PL’, *követ* ‘–ACC’).

28 Only in the third person possessed pronouns, *övé* and *övék*, is the vowel obligatorily long; in the other pronouns, the long and short vowels seem to alternate freely, subject to dialectal/idiolectal variation. As before, the phonological details are probably immaterial; I will not address the question of whether the distribution of *e* and *é* is predictable.

The missing piece is the *-l* of the *-lak/-lek* form — an element that I argued in Den Dikken (2004[1999]) to be an object clitic. More specifically, following the proposal in Den Dikken (2004[1999]), which in turn was prompted by Schmitt’s (1998) discussion of accusative clitic doubling, I take *-l* to be an *expletive* clitic, sitting in $SpecDx^{[PERSON]}P$ and satisfying the EPP–property of the $Dx^{[PERSON]}$ head, and ‘doubled’ by its ‘associate’, the second person pronoun in SpecFP. The structures in (25a,b) illustrate this for the two personal pronouns featuring *-l*, 2SG *téged* and 2PL *titeket*.[29]

(25) a. $[_{DP}\ D\ [_{DxP}\ [_{EXPL}\ -l]\ [_{Dx'}\ Dx^{[PERSON]}$=*-ed* $[_{FP}\ [_{DP}\ D\ [_{NumP}\ Num\ [_{NP}\ te\ ]]]\ [_{F'}\ F\ ...\ [_{NP}\ -g\ ]\ ...]]]]]$

b. $[_{DP}\ D\ [_{DxP}\ [_{EXPL}\ -l]\ [_{Dx'}\ Dx^{[PERSON]}$=*-etek* $[_{FP}\ [_{DP}\ D\ [_{NumP}\ Num\ [_{NP}\ ti\ ]]]\ [_{F'}\ F\ ...\ [_{NP}\ \varnothing\ ]\ ...]]]]]$

The representations in (25) are directly parallel to the one familiar from *there*-expletive constructions, with *there* sitting in SpecTP (= $SpecDx^{[TENSE]}P$), ‘doubled’ by its ‘associate’, the noun phrase in SpecFP.[30]

(26) $[_{CP}\ C\ [_{DxP}\ [_{EXPL}\ there]\ [_{Dx'}\ Dx^{[TENSE]}\ [_{FP}\ [_{DP}$ ‘ASSOCIATE’$]\ [_{F'}\ F\ ...\ ]]]]]$

The structure of possessive pronouns in (22) does not feature this clitic — nor can it: the sentences in (24) are ungrammatical with the *-lak/-lek* form. This seems to be directly correlated with the fact that possessive pronouns are, and personal pronouns are not, introduced by a definite article:

(27)	a.	(én)	szeret-lek	(*a)	téged/titeket
		I	love-LAK/LEK	the	you_{SG}/you_{PL}
	b.	(én)	szeret-em	*(a)	tiedet/tieteket
		I	love-1SG.DEF	the	$yours_{SG}$/$yours_{PL}$

The distribution of the definite article is arguably correlated with the presence/absence of a clitic in SpecDxP because the clitic needs to escape from DP in order to get to its cliticisation site ($Dx^{[TENSE]}$/T). I assume here that, on its way out of DP, the clitic transits through D (a case of successive-cyclic head movement).[31] The

29 If the *-g* of *engem* and *téged* goes back to *mag* ‘core, kernel’ (as suggested in fn. 24), then, in light of the discussion here, the only difference between first/second person singular reflexives and first/second person singular pronouns (both based on *mag*) is the absence in the former and the presence in the latter of a clitic in SpecDxP (cf. (25a) for second person singular object pronoun).

30 The parallel is particularly direct for so-called ‘transitive expletive constructions’, where the ‘associate’ is in the SpecFP (≈ Spec*v*P) position. Note that in (25) the expletive person-agrees with its ‘associate’; this is arguably the case in *there*-expletive constructions as well, except in those that do not obey the definiteness restriction: *there will never be *(another) you* has third person *another you* (cf. *another you is/*are going to emerge from the operation*); in ‘mention-an-example’ cases, which disobey the definiteness restriction (*well, there’s John, for instance*), we do find ‘plain’ *you* (*well, there’s you, for instance*), but this is a different *there*.

31 This deviates from one of the key assumptions in Den Dikken (2004[1999]), *viz.* the idea that the clitic undergoes phrasal movement prior to its final, strictly local head-movement step to T. The rationale for the two-step clitic-movement analysis lay in the blocking effect exerted on clitic movement in *hagy*-permissives: (ia) is ungrammatical with *Jánosnak* included. This effect will follow straightforwardly from minimality if the first step that the clitic undergoes is phrasal A–movement, blocked by the intervening dative (which demonstrably occupies an A–position; see the above-mentioned paper for evidence from binding). The minimality-based analysis is compromised, however, by the fact that there are speakers for whom (ib) is grammatical, with inflection on the infinitive: arguably, the inflection on the infinitive is the reflex of an agreement relation between the inflectional head of the infinitival clause and a null argument (probably *pro*; see Tóth 2000 for detailed discussion) in an A–specifier position — and that null argument should block A–movement across it just like the dative does. The argument based on (ib) is weakened by the fact that not all speakers accept (ib). But all speakers seem to accept (ic), with an embedded negation, without difficulty — and it, too, makes the point that the proper account of (ia) probably is not going to be one couched in terms of minimality: on the assumption that the presence of sentential negation implies the presence of Tense (Zanuttini 1996), and that Tense needs a subject (the EPP, which is plainly operative in Hungarian clauses; see above), there will be an A–position (occupied by PRO) crossed by movement of the clitic in (ic). The root of the problem with clitic movement in (ia) will be left open here.

(*examples overleaf...*)

presence of the clitic thus forces D to be empty: transiting through a filled 'escape hatch' is impossible. As a result, the definite article *a* is obligatorily absent in (27a).

With this in place, let me go back to the key question: why does (25) give rise to INDEF agreement on the verb? — or, put differently, why do we get *-l* to combine with the *-k* of 1SG.INDEF agreement (forming *-lak/-lek*) rather than with the *-m* of 1SG.DEF agreement (forming the non-existent **-lam/-lem* of (28))?[32]

(28) *én szeret-l-e-m téged/titeket
I love-2.O-1SG.S you_{SG}/you_{PL}

The grammatical *-lak/-lek* form is straightforwardly derived if *-l* left-adjoins to T/Dx[TENSE] and *-k* is a lexicalisation of a subfeature of T/Dx[TENSE]. By contrast, (28), an attempt at combining *-l* with the *-m* of 1SG.DEF agreement, presents us with a problem: *-l* and *-m* are both clitics. Recall from section 3 that *-m* (and 2SG *-d*) is historically a subject clitic — and I claim that it is still a subject clitic today. Moreover, for the *-l* of *-lak/-lek*, I had already argued in Den Dikken (2004[1999]) that it is an object clitic. Putting the two together then yields, for (28), a clitic cluster *-l+-m*. From the history of Finno-Ugric, we deduced in section 3 that the language family experienced difficulty, from the earliest times, with clitic clusters. I have derived the fact that the reconstructed object clitic **-se* did not combine with the first and second person subject agreement markers **-m*, **-t* from the Clitic Co-Occurrence Restriction in (19), repeated here.

(19) *Clitic Co-Occurrence Restriction* (Proto-Uralic)
a third person OCL cannot co-occur with a first or second person SCL

I now hypothesise (somewhat speculatively) that Hungarian has generalised the Clitic Co-Occurrence Constraint in (19) to a general ban on the formation of clitic clusters, formulated in (29).

(29) *Clitic Co-Occurrence Restriction* (Hungarian)
an OCL cannot co-occur with another CL

Assuming, as before, that what characterises the first and second person DEF forms is precisely the fact that the subject is cross-referenced on the verb with the aid of a subject clitic, we then derive the ban on 1/2SG DEF–marking (i.e., *-m/-d*) in the presence of an object clitic. While *-m* and *-d* are (and have always been) subject clitics, and are hence incompatible with object clitics (as per (29)), the *-k* and *-sz* of 1SG and 2SG subject agreement in the INDEF paradigm are pure inflectional morphemes, not clitics.[33] Being inflectional morphemes rather than clitics, *-k* and *-sz* are perfectly compatible with object clitics.

(i) a. hagylak (*János-nak) meg-látogat-ni
let-LAK/LEK János-DAT PV-visit-INF
'I let {*János/[unspecified causee]} visit you'
b. %hagylak *pro* meg-látogat-ni-a
let-LAK/LEK PV-visit-INF-3SG
'I let him/her visit you'
c. hagylak PRO nem meglátogatni
let-LAK/LEK not PV-visit-INF
'I let you not be visited'

32 István Kenesei (p.c.) points out that even with the so-called *ikes igék* '*-ik*-verbs' (verbs whose PRES.3SG.INDEF ends in *-ik*), which do not normally accept 1SG.INDEF *-k* and take *-m* instead (cf. *megesz-em/*-ek egy almát* 'I'm eating an apple'), we find *-lak/-lek*, not **-lam/-lem*: *megesz-lek téged* 'I eat you up'. This supports the account of the ban on **-lam/-lem* to be presented below.

33 A tricky question is raised by the fact that *-l* (which I have identified as an object clitic in the account of the *-lak/-lek* form) figures in the INDEF agreement paradigm as a 2SG *subject* marker as well — only after sibilant-final stems in the present tense, but systematically in the past tense. While the surface identity of the *-l* of the *-lak/-lek* form gave me my rationale for treating this *-l* as a marker of second person, I am now being led to set up two lexical entries for *-l*: one as a second person object clitic (unspecified for number), and one as a second person singular subject agreement marker. This is obviously a rather unpleasant result.

To make the account carry over to all cases in which the object is first or second person, not just the ones featuring the overt object clitic *-l*, we are led to assume (as in Den Dikken 2004[1999]) that the first person object pronouns, *engem* and *minket*, feature a *null* object clitic in their SpecDx[PERSON]P in the structure in (25). The *-l* of the second person object pronouns in (25) itself also has a null allomorph, which 'surfaces' whenever the subject of the finite verb is not first person singular — thus, there is no **szeret-l-ünk* or **szeret-el*; instead, to express 'we love you' or '(s)he loves you', Hungarian must use 'plain' indefinite *szeret-ünk* and *szeret*.[34] So all Hungarian non-third person object pronouns involve clitic doubling constructions; but the clitic in SpecDxP in the structure in (25) is very often inaudible (i.e., present-day Hungarian has a very limited repertoire of *overt* object clitics). The conclusion that all Hungarian non-third person object pronouns involve clitic doubling ties in with the conclusion that ensued from the account of DEF–marking offered in section 3, according to which all Hungarian third person DP–objects are typically associated with an object clitic as well, hence these, too, are clitic doubling constructions.[35]

To ensure that DEF–marking in the presence of a first or second person object pronoun is also impossible when the subject is not first or second person singular (i.e., when DEF–marking takes the form of an object clitic going back historically to **-se* in (16)), all we need to say is that one cannot have *two* object clitics present at the same time. Having a third person object clitic (i.e., DEF–marking in contexts other than 1/2SG) prevents the presence of a first or second person object clitic (at minimum via (29), but probably for other reasons as well).

One point emerging from this analysis of INDEF agreement with first and second person object pronouns is worth highlighting in closing. Note that this analysis does not force us to make any special assumptions regarding the top node of these pronouns. In particular, the analysis is entirely compatible with first and second pronouns projecting all the way to DP (unlike Bartos' 1997, 2001 analysis, which ties definite agreement directly to DP–syntax, and is hence led to conclude that first and second person object pronouns are smaller than DP). This is desirable in light of the referential properties of first and second person object pronouns: first and second person pronouns are semantically as definite as can be, always picking out a specific referent in the extra-linguistic discourse.[36]

5 Long-distance agreement: The finest art of (dis)agreement

Having dealt with the distribution of the indefinite and definite conjugations and the special *-lak/-lek* form in simple finite clauses, I now move on to an investigation of long-distance agreement and 'case switch' phenomena arising in long focus fronting constructions in Hungarian, illustrated in (4b–f), repeated below.[37]

34 É. Kiss's (2005) recent proposal regarding the use of indefinite agreement with first/second person object pronouns and the special *-lak/-lek* form has the advantage of not having to set up null object clitics in many contexts, which my account is led to. On the other hand, its major disadvantage is its reliance on a combined PERSON/NUMBER hierarchy (1SG>1PL/2>3), which, while descriptively adequate, has no obvious status in minimalist syntax. Such a hierarchy may perhaps be encoded in a Distributed Morphology framework, but exactly how to do this remains to be investigated.

35 Though not when the subject is first or second person singular, whose *-m* and *-d* are incompatible with the third person object clitic, as per (29). Why Hungarian does not 'solve' the incompatibility of *-m* and *-d* with the third person object clitic by letting the object clitic prevail and using *-k* and *-sz* as subject agreement markers instead of the subject clitics *-m* and *-d* is a question whose answer may lie in some kind of PERSON hierarchy: expression of a first or second person clitic takes precedence over expression of a third person (i.e., 'non-person') clitic. See also fn. 34.

36 Note, in particular, that Larson & Segal (1995) and Lyons (1999) treat person features (first/second) as special *definiteness* features.

37 On speaker variation with respect to 'case switch' and 'upstairs agreement' under long-distance focus fronting (whence the '%' in the examples in (4b) and (4c)), see Gervain (2003, 2005); I will come back to this below.

(4) a.	(azt)	akar-om,	hogy	EGY NŐ	legyen	elnök
	it/that-ACC	want-1SG.DEF	that	a woman	be-SUBJ-3SG	president
b.	%EGY NŐ	akar-om,	hogy	*ec*	elnök	legyen
	a woman(NOM)	want-1SG.DEF	that		president	be-SUBJ-3SG
b′.	EGY NŐ-T	akar-ok,	hogy	*ec*	elnök	legyen
	a woman-ACC	want-1SG.INDEF	that		president	be-SUBJ-3SG
c.	%KI	akar-od,	hogy	*ec*	elnök	legyen?
	who-NOM	want-2SG.DEF	that		president	be-SUBJ-3SG
c′.	KI-T	akar-sz,	hogy	*ec*	elnök	legyen?
	who-ACC	want-2SG.INDEF	that		president	be-SUBJ-3SG
d.	TÉGED	akar-lak,	hogy	*ec*	elnök	legyél
	you-OBJ	want-LAK/LEK	that		president	be-SUBJ-2SG

Before addressing these long focus fronting cases, let me first briefly discuss the example in (4a), which unlike the examples in (4b–d) features no extraction out of the embedded clause: *EGY NŐ* 'a woman' here is the focus of the embedded finite clause, and it stays inside its boundaries. Hungarian finite complement clauses normally go together with DEF agreement on the upstairs verb. Kenesei (1994) has argued that this agreement is mediated by the (optionally overt) pronoun *azt* seen in (4a) — a definite DP, triggering definite agreement as expected.[38]

A question that now comes up in connection with the examples in (4b–c) is whether the INDEF agreement seen here could be thought of as a case of agreement with the embedded CP itself (rather than with a mediating pronoun), with CP then triggering the indefinite conjugation (by default). Such an approach to upstairs agreement in (4b–c) would make Hungarian similar to Tagalog, on Rackowski & Richards' (2005) analysis of the latter. I will explore the merits of an analysis of the Hungarian facts along these lines in section 5.1, ultimately concluding that it cannot account for the entire spectrum of the Hungarian facts. In section 5.2, I then proceed to presenting my own account of the upstairs agreement and 'case switch' facts. Section 5.3 addresses the upstairs *-lak/-lek* effect in (4d), and the question of whether the term 'case switch' should be taken literally.

5.1 Hungarian is not Tagalog

5.1.1 Long-distance extraction in Tagalog

Rackowski & Richards (2005) argue that in Tagalog long-distance extraction constructions, illustrated in (30), the upstairs verb obligatorily case-agrees with the embedded clause — which has different cases (italicised in the examples) depending on the idiosyncratic case-assignment properties of the matrix verb.

(30) a.	kailan	sasabih-*in*	ng	sundalo	[na	uuwi	ang	Pangulo	*t*]?
	when	will.say-ACC	ANG	soldier	that	NOM-will-go-home	ANG	president	
a′.	*kailan	*m*agsasabi	ang	sundalo	[na	uuwi	ang	Pangulo	*t*]?
	when	NOM-will.say	ANG	soldier	that	NOM-will-go-home	ANG	president	
b.	kailan	*i*-pinangako	ng	sundalo	[na	uuwi	ang	Pangulo	*t*]?
	when	OBL-promised	ANG	soldier	that	NOM-will-go-home	ANG	president	
b′.	*kailan	*n*angako	ang	sundalo	[na	uuwi	ang	Pangulo	*t*]?
	when	NOM-promised	ANG	soldier	that	NOM-will-go-home	ANG	president	

38 I will return to the way DEF agreement is licensed in constructions involving finite CP complementation; Kenesei's (1994) analysis serves expository purposes here.

(30) c.	kailan	pinaniwala-*an*	ng	sundalo	[na	uuwi	ang	Pangulo	*t*]?
	when	believed-DAT	ANG	soldier	that	NOM-will-go-home	ANG	president	
c′.	*kailan	*n*aniwala	ang	sundalo	[na	uuwi	ang	Pangulo	*t*]?

Rackowski & Richards show that the upstairs verb must agree with the complement–CP and cannot agree with the extractee — they present examples of the type in (31), where the extractee is dative but the case-agreement marker on the verb varies depending on the case assigned to the clause (even though the verbs in question *do* independently accept dative case-agreement elsewhere).

(31)	ang	kalabaw ...								
	ANG	water.buffalo								
a.	[na	sinabi-∅	ng	guro	[na	bibigy-an	ng	lalaki	ng	bulaklak *t*]]
	that	said-ACC	ANG	teacher	that	would.give-DAT	ANG	man	ANG	flower
b.	[na	*i*-pinangako	ng	guro	[na	bibigy-an	ng	lalaki	ng	bulaklak *t*]]
	that	OBL-promised	ANG	teacher	that	would.give-DAT	ANG	man	ANG	flower
c.	[na	pinaniwala-*an*	ng	guro	[na	bibigy-an	ng	lalaki	ng	bulaklak *t*]]
	that	believed-ACC	ANG	teacher	that	would.give-DAT	ANG	man	ANG	flower

'the water buffalo that the teacher {said/promised/believed} that the man would give a flower to'

For Rackowski & Richards, the reason why the upstairs *v* must agree with the lower CP is to make extraction out of the latter legitimate. The argument runs as follows.[39]

In line with the locality restrictions on Agree, *v* qua probe must Agree with the closest available goal, which in the cases at hand is the complement–CP.[40] Once *v* has established an Agree relationship with the complement–CP (which is a phase), it may henceforth ignore the complement–CP for the computation of the locality of other Agree relations that *v* might engage in (cf. Richards' 1998 Principle of Minimal Compliance). In other words, once *v* has established an Agree relationship with CP, CP becomes transparent, and *v* can attract the *wh*-phrase up to its specifier position — directly, without a stopover in SpecCP being necessary (or even legitimate, by economy standards). The matrix C will finally establish a local Agree relationship with the *wh*-phrase in the outer Spec*v*P in the matrix clause, and will successfully attract the *wh*-phrase up to SpecCP. If *v* had not established an Agree relationship with the complement–CP, the *wh*-phrase would not have been extractable out of CP — on the assumption (which Rackowski & Richards argue for at length) that the *wh*-phrase in Tagalog does not raise to the embedded SpecCP prior to leaving the clause (i.e., it is attracted to the matrix Spec*v*P straight from the embedded *v*P's edge).

At this point, it will be good to note that there is evidence (in particular from Q–Float in Irish English; cf. McCloskey 2000 — see (32c) for illustration) that *wh*-extraction does sometimes proceed through SpecCP, at least in some languages.[41]

(32) a.	what *all* did he say (that) he wanted *t*?	(Irish English)
b.	what did he say (that) he wanted *t all*?	
c.	what did he say *all* (that) he wanted *t*?	

39 I refer to Rackowski & Richards' (2005) paper for fuller discussion. What follows is an outline of their account cued specifically to a comparison between Tagalog and Hungarian.

40 If nothing raises to SpecCP; see below for discussion of why, in Rackowski & Richards' analysis, movement to the embedded SpecCP does not take place in cases of long-distance extraction in Tagalog.

41 Rackowski & Richards correctly note that other familiar evidence for successive cyclicity, having to do with Comp–agreement, can be taken care of without movement through SpecCP on an Agree-based approach. But the Q–Float facts are less easy to take care of without a stopover in SpecCP.

It is conceivable that there is variation, cross-linguistically or cross-constructionally or both, with respect to whether the upstairs *v* morphologically agrees with the embedded CP from which extraction takes place. Whenever *v* morphologically agrees with the embedded CP there will be no touchdown in SpecCP, whereas in contexts in which *v* does not morphologically agree with the embedded CP a touchdown in SpecCP must be made. Once the extractee makes a touchdown in the embedded SpecCP, it and its container (CP) become equally close to *v*. A stopover in SpecCP should hence enable the extractee to establish an Agree relationship with *v* from the embedded SpecCP.

Assuming this much, we are now led to ask whether/when Hungarian *v* morphologically agrees with the complement–CP. For cases of long-distance extraction with upstairs agreement and 'case switch', the key datum that the analysis should explain is that the surface realisation of the Agree relationship that the upstairs *v* is engaged in is directly sensitive to the definiteness and person features of the *extractee*: cf. (33a) *vs* (33b) and the distribution of (IN)DEF, and also (4d) (the upstairs *-lak/-lek* case), repeated here as (33c).

(33) a. EGY NŐ-T akar-ok, hogy *ec* elnök legyen (= (4b′))
a woman-ACC want-1SG.INDEF that president be-SUBJ-3SG
b. AZT A NŐ-T akar-om, hogy *ec* elnök legyen
that woman-ACC want-1SG.DEF that president be-SUBJ-3SG
c. TÉGED akar-lak, hogy *ec* elnök legyél (= (4d))
you-OBJ want-LAK/LEK that president be-SUBJ-2SG

A possible response to these facts would be to say that some or even all of these examples involve a derivation that does not employ long-distance extraction — the focus originates in the matrix clause instead. This, in fact, is Richards' (2005) response (drawing on Bruening 2001) to a similar problem they face for Passamaquoddy long-distance agreement. Consider (34).

(34) a. n-wewitaham-a-k [mate nomiyawik mawsuwinuwok Kehlisk]
1-remember-DIR-3PL not I-saw-them people Calais-LOC
'I remember that I didn't see people in Calais' (Passamaquoddy)
b. k-piluwitaham-ul [Mihku ketimacehat ['sami sakhiphuk-ihin]]
2-suspect-1/2 Mihku would-leave because drive.up-2
'I suspected (about you) that Mihku would leave when you drove up'

(34a) is a genuine case of long-distance agreement (which in Passamaquoddy can reach the topic of an embedded clause; see also the discussion of Tsez below); (34b), on the other hand, involves base-generation of the second person 'agree-ee' in the highest clause, as is apparent from the fact that 'long-distance agreement' for first and second person is insensitive to the adjunct island in (34b).

I have no facts to report on long-distance agreement across islands in Hungarian, an avenue that remains to be explored. But I can report other evidence from Hungarian to show that while there is merit in the idea of upstairs base-generation, Hungarian long-distance focus fronting can certainly involve successive-cyclic movement through SpecCP as well. Hungarian is not (just) Tagalog, therefore.

5.1.2 Long focus fronting and downstairs agreement: Extraction versus resumption

Gervain (2003, 2005) makes an important novel empirical contribution to the literature on Hungarian long focus fronting. She points out that this operation may result in 'notional agreement' (Gervain calls it 'anti-agreement', but this is confusing in light of section 2) with the downstairs verb. To set this up, note first that Hungarian quantified noun phrases are formally singular, even though they may have plural reference. Thus, in (35), *két fiú* 'two boy' is a singular noun phrase; insertion of the plural marker *-k* on *fiú* would be ungrammatical, and equally ungrammatical would be the selection of the plural agreement form of the finite verb. (On the different behaviour of Hungarian as spoken in the United States in these respects, see Fenyvesi 1995.)

(35) két fiú(*-k) jön(*-nek)
two boy-*PL(NOM) come-3SG/*3PL
'two boys are coming'

Now consider (36) and (37).[42] These are cases of long focus fronting with upstairs agreement and 'case switch' (as witness the accusative form of the focus, which corresponds to the subject of the embedded finite clause, and upstairs INDEF agreement in (36)). And interestingly, though selection of the plural form *jön-nek* was entirely impossible in (35), in these long focus fronting cases, downstairs *jön-nek* is not categorically rejected — though there turns out to be a dialect split on this point: Gervain finds that speakers differ in their appreciation of downstairs 'notional plural' inflection, some finding it perfect (and in fact preferring it to singular inflection; Group I), and some finding it very marginal (and worse than singular inflection; Group II).

(36) a. ?KÉT FIÚ-T mond-t-ál, hogy jön Group I: ?
two boy-ACC say-PST-2SG.INDEF that come-3SG Group II: ?
b. %KÉT FIÚ-T mond-t-ál, hogy jön-nek Group I: ✓
two boy-ACC say-PST-2SG.INDEF that come-3PL Group II: ??(?)
'you said that TWO BOYS are coming'

(37) a. ?AZ ÖSSZES LÁNY-T mond-t-ad, hogy jön Group I: ?
the all girl-ACC say-PST-2SG.DEF that come-3SG Group II: ?
b. %AZ ÖSSZES LÁNY-T mond-t-ad, hogy jön-nek Group I: ✓
the all girl-ACC say-PST-2SG.DEF that come-3PL Group II: ??(?)
'you said that ALL THE GIRLS were coming'

Gervain argues, plausibly, that anti-agreement results from a *resumption* strategy (preferred by Group I): the focus is base-generated upstairs and binds a resumptive *pro* in the embedded subject position.[43] In Gervain's analysis of the resumption strategy, the base-generation site for the focus upstairs is the same position that the sentential expletive, *azt*, originates in, in sentences such as (38).

(38) azt mondtad hogy *pro* jön
it-ACC say-PST-2SG.DEF that come-3SG
'you said that (s)he is coming'

For concreteness, I assume a VP–internal base-generation site for the sentential expletive *azt*, as in (39a), glossing over details that will not be relevant for the discussion to follow. Gervain's hypothesis that the base-generation site of foci that originate in the matrix clause and bind a resumptive *pro* in the embedded clause is identical with that of *azt* in (39a) then leads to (39b) as the analysis of 'anti-agreement' cases such as (36b) and (37b).

(39) a. ... [$_{vP}$ *v* [$_{VP}$ V [EXPL=*azt*]$_k$ [$_{CP/k}$ [$_{C'}$ C [$_{TP}$ SU [$_{T'}$ T ...]]]]]]
b. [$_{FocP}$ ACC-FOCUS$_i$ [$_{F'}$ Foc ... [$_{vP}$ t_i′ [$_{vP}$ *v* [$_{VP}$ V t_j [$_{CP}$ [$_{C'}$ C [$_{TP}$ *pro*$_i$ [$_{T'}$ T ...]]]]]]]]]

42 Gervain (2003, 2005) also discusses the counterparts of the examples in (36) and (37) featuring a NOM focus and upstairs DEF agreement. These cases (which are irrelevant for the discussion at hand) will be briefly addressed in fn. 54, below.

43 Den Dikken (1999:166) already points out that there are speakers for whom an *overt* resumptive pronoun is in fact grammatical in long-distance focus fronting cases. Gervain (2003) also included examples of this type in her questionnaire.

(i) %PÉTER-T hiszem, hogy *ő* jött
Péter-ACC believe-1SG.DEF that he came
'it is Péter that I believe came'

Gervain's analysis takes its inspiration from Den Dikken's (1999) analysis of speaker variation in the domain of possessive number agreement in DP when the possessor has 'run away from home' (Szabolcsi 1983). Consider the examples in (40) (of which (40a,a′) repeat (8a,b)).

(40) a. a nő-k könyv-e-i(*-k)
the woman-PL book-POSS-PL.POSS'UM-PL.POSS'OR
'the women's hats'

a′. az ő/*pro* könyv-e-i-*(-k)
the (s)he book-POSS-PL.POSS'UM-PL.POSS'OR
'their books'

b. [a nő-k-nek a könyv-e-i-(%-k)]
the woman-PL-DAT the book-POSS-PL.POSS'UM-PL.POSS'OR
'the women's books'

c. a nő-k-nek, csak a KÖNYV-e-i-%(-k) veszett el
the woman-PL-DAT only the book-POSS-PL.POSS'UM-PL.POSS'OR got lost
'only the women's BOOKS got lost'

d. csak a NŐ-K-nek veszett el a könyv-e-i-%(-k)
only the woman-PL-DAT got lost the book-POSS-PL.POSS'UM-PL.POSS'OR
'only the WOMEN's books got lost'

There is no speaker variation on (40a,a′), where the possessor is *nominative* and 'at home', occupying an A–position position within the DP. These facts were discussed in section 2 already, and will not be revisited here. For our purposes in the present section, what is interesting is that in (40b–d), where the possessor is *dative*, speakers vary when it comes to possessive agreement — with speaker variation being sensitive in addition to the question of whether the dative possessor is 'at home', inside the possessed noun phrase, or instead is 'away from home'. In (40b), the dative possessor is still within the DP, occupying SpecDP (an A′–position). For this example, most speakers reject plural agreement on the possessum, though there are some who accept plural agreement here. By contrast, in (15c,d), where the dative possessor is physically outside the DP, most speakers prefer plural agreement on the possessum.

Den Dikken (1999) reduces the speaker variation in (40b–d) to the distribution of *resumption*. Plural possessive agreement is the reflex of a resumption strategy: the dative possessor binds a null resumptive pronoun occupying the nominative possessor position in (40a,a′).[44] In the majority dialect, the resumption strategy is subject to an anti-locality condition (similar to that found in Semitic or Celtic): it is applicable whenever the dative possessor is wholly outside the possessed noun phrase (as in (40c,d)), but not when the dative possessor is in SpecDP (as in (40b)). But dialects differ when it comes to the distribution of null resumption, some speakers allowing it even in local contexts — these are the speakers who accept (40b) with plural agreement.

44 As with long focus fronting (recall fn. 43), overt resumptive pronouns are allowed by some speakers in these possessed noun phrases (Den Dikken 1999:165). Whenever the overt resumptive pronoun shows up, plural possessive agreement is obligatory, as expected (cf. (i)). Testing Gervain-type 'anti-agreement' with runaway possessors is still to be done on a systematic basis. So far, what I have found is that there are indeed speakers for whom (36) and (ii) behave the same way: two 'Group I' speakers accept PL agreement in both contexts; one 'Group II' speaker rejects PL in both. But there appears to be speaker variation on (ii) that does not quite run parallel to that on (36): one speaker accepts both SG and PL in (36) but rejects PL in (ii); two speakers (from Transylvania) accept both SG and PL in (36) but reject SG in (i) (i.e., they allow *only* 'anti-agreement' in (ii)). So more must be going on in the possessed noun phrase cases (recall also the existence of *three* speaker groups for (40b–d), as opposed to just two for (36)–(37)).

(i) %a nők-nek az ő könyv-e-i-*(-k)
the women-DAT the she book-POSS-PL.POSS'UM-PL.POSS'OR

(ii) KÉT FIÚ-NAK mondtad hogy eltűnt a könyv{-e/-ük}
two boy-DAT say-PST-2SG.DEF that disappeared the book-POSS.3SG/3PL
'it is TWO BOYS' books that you said disappeared' [judgements on agreement not marked]

In Den Dikken's (1999) analysis of the facts in (40), resumption correlates one-to-one with plural possessive agreement — in other words, the resumptive, in contexts such as (40b–d), MUST be plural (see also fn. 44 on overt resumption). In concert with this, Gervain (2005:12) notes that the overt pronoun in (41) MUST be plural as well (cf. also Farkas 2006). If we assume (as is arguably the null hypothesis) that what holds of overt pronouns holds of null pronouns as well,[45] the null resumption strategy employed by Group I speakers will yield *only* anti-agreement (i.e., (36b), (37b)). But note that no speaker categorically rejects downstairs agreement under 'case switch' and upstairs agreement — (36a) and (37a) are '?' for both groups. This indicates that there must exist an additional long focus fronting strategy alongside null resumption that can then be exploited to obtain (singular) agreement in the downstairs clause. This additional strategy should arguably involve actual extraction from the embedded clause.

(41) két fiú jött be a szobába; leültettem őket /*őt
two boy came PV the room-into seated-1SG.DEF them him
'two boys entered the room; I offered them a seat'

Now note that agreement between the upstairs ACC–marked focus and the downstairs verb is possible regardless of whether the focus is definite or indefinite — recall (35a) and (36a), which differ from one another precisely in that the former involves an indefinite focus whereas the latter involves a definite one, introduced by the definite article *az*. So the extraction strategy must be available for both DEF and INDEF ACC–marked foci. This, coupled with the fact that DEF and INDEF ACC–marked foci give rise to different agreement forms of the upstairs verb, now means that it cannot be the case that *v* systematically Agrees with CP in cases long focus fronting with 'case switch' in Hungarian. This shows that the analysis of Hungarian upstairs agreement and 'case switch' cannot be fully assimilated to Rackowski & Richards' (2005) account of the Tagalog facts in (30), which has the matrix *v* Agreeing with the complement–CP.

5.2 Hungarian is sometimes more like Tsez

If *v* does not Agree with the embedded CP, a touchdown in SpecCP on the way is inescapable for physical extraction from CP (see (42)). Once in the embedded SpecCP, the extractee can serve as a goal for *v* qua probe. I will return to this in more detail below.[46] At this point, it is worth highlighting that Hungarian here behaves similarly to Tsez (Polinsky & Potsdam 2001), Innu-aimûn (Branigan & MacKenzie 2002), Passamaquoddy (Bruening 2001) and Itelmen (Bobaljik & Wurmbrand, to appear).[47] An apparently non-local Agree relationship is established between *v* and a constituent of the embedded clause; but in actual fact, this Agree relationship is strictly local: there is no phase boundary between because the goal is on the edge of the lower clause.

(42) $[_{\text{FocP}}\ \text{FOCUS}_i\ [_{\text{F}'}\ \text{Foc} \ldots [_{v\text{P}}\ t_i'' [_{v\text{P}}\ v\ [_{\text{VP}}\ \text{V}\ [_{\text{CP}}\ t_i'\ [_{\text{C}'}\ \text{C}\ [_{\text{TP}}\ (\ldots)\ t_i\ \ldots]]]]]]]]$

45 Note, though, that in (i) (also from Gervain 2005), there apparently is optional plural agreement for all speakers. 'Anti-agreement' in focus fronting constructions does not behave like (i), where *hat meghívott* originates in a translative PP inside the matrix clause. The reason why (i) differs from the accusative cases discussed in the main text is not entirely unclear to me at this time. One factor that is likely to affect the distribution of morphological and notional/semantic agreement between *pro* and its morphologically singular but semantically plural associate is *distance*: with a CP–boundary between them, notional agreement is the rule.

(i) hat meghívott-ról tudom, hogy *pro* {jön/jönnek}
six invitee-about I-know that come-3SG/3PL
'about/for six invitees, I know that they are coming'

46 In its present form, (42) deliberately abstracts away from the position that the extracted focus is launched from. This is a question that will be addressed in the discussion in section 5.3, below.

47 See also É. Kiss (2005) on a possible Uralic–Siberian 'Sprachbund' for finite verb agreement.

In Tsez (and the other languages just mentioned), Agree between *v* and the embedded clause as a whole (shown in (43a)[48]) alternates with Agree between *v* and a constituent (more specifically, the *topic*) of the embedded clause, as in (43b). A long-distance Agree relationship of the latter kind is possible even if *v*'s goal stays wholly within the embedded clause throughout (as in (43b)), as long as there is no complementiser present in the embedded clause. The minimal contrast between (43b) and (43c), the latter containing a downstairs complementiser, illustrates this interdependence between long-distance agreement and the absence of a lower complementiser.

(43) a. eni-r [už-ā magalu b-āc'-ru-łi] r-iyxo (Tsez)
mother-DAT boy-ERG bread.III.ABS III-eat-PTC-NOMINAL.IV IV-knows
'the mother knows that they boy ate the bread'
b. eni-r [už-ā magalu b-āc'-ru-łi] b-iyxo
mother-DAT boy-ERG bread.III.ABS III-eat-PTC-NOMINAL III-knows
c. *eni-r [už-ā magalu b-āc'-si-ƛin] b-iyxo
mother-DAT boy-ERG bread.III.ABS III-eat-PST.EVID-COMP III-knows

Polinsky & Potsdam (2001) argue that long-distance agreement in Tsez involves an embedded topic raised (overtly or, as in the case of (43b), covertly) to SpecTopP. With TopP serving as the complement of the matrix V, the matrix *v* can Agree with the topic, as in (43b). This is schematised in (44a). But with a CP phase separating *v* from the embedded topic, as in (43c) (structurally represented in (44b)), *v* can only morphologically agree with CP; no agreement relation with the topic can be morphologically expressed, whence (43c).

(44) a. $[_{vP}\ v\ [_{VP}\ V\ [_{TopP}\ \text{TOPIC}\ [_{Top'}\ \text{Top ... } t \text{ ...}]]]]$[49]

b. $[_{vP}\ v\ [_{VP}\ V\ [_{CP}\ C\ [_{TopP}\ \text{TOPIC}\ [_{Top'}\ \text{Top ... } t \text{ ...}]]]]]$ ✖

Note that *v* in (44a) has a *choice* when it comes to what to establish an Agree relationship with — TopP and SpecTopP are equally close to *v*, by the definition of *Closest* in (45), hence *v* can in principle establish an Agree relationship with either.

(45) *Closest* (Rackowski & Richards 2005:579)
a goal α is the closest one to a given probe if there is no distinct goal β such that for some X (X a head or maximal projection), X c-commands α but does not c-command β

Van Koppen (2005) argues that, in configurations in which a probe can in principle Agree with two goals, it in fact Agrees simultaneously with *both*, the morphological component determining which of the two Agree relationships is spelled out on the surface, in keeping with the 'Subset Principle' of Distributed Morphology: 'the relation between the Probe and the Goal that results in the more specific agreement morphology will be spelled out' (Van Koppen 2005:22). So let us ask for the particular case of (44a) which of the two Agree relationships 'wins' (i.e., gets a surface phonological realisation). Agree between *v* and TopP results in 'IV' agreement (43a), whereas Agree between *v* and SpecTopP results in 'III' agreement (43b). On the assumption (plainly necessary for the case of Tsez) that 'III' and 'IV' agreement are equally specific, we have a genuine choice here in Tsez, which comports well with the facts.

48 In all the Tsez examples, underlining signals the Agree relationship between the matrix verb (in final position) and its goal.

49 It is actually fairly dubious that TopP could serve as the complement of V — cf. the fact that embedded topicalisation in languages such as English forces the presence of a complementiser (cf. e.g. *I believe *(that) Bush, I could never take seriously*). Note also that the clause in (43a,b) is a *nominalised* clause, which may be an additional motive for revising (44) slightly.

In Hungarian cases of long focus fronting of the subject of an embedded finite clause, the situation will certainly be more complex, given that two features are involved: DEF and ACC. Agree between *v* and CP results in DEF agreement (assuming that CP is eligible to be the associate/double of the DEF object clitic originating on *v*; recall section 4), but no overt realisation of ACC Case emerges: CP cannot morphophonologically spell out an ACC Case-feature in Hungarian.[50] Agree between *v* and the fronted focus, on the other hand, results in definiteness and Case-feature agreement with the focus — which for the focus will yield an overt accusative case-morpheme *-t*, and for the matrix verb will deliver a specific form (the DEF form) if the focus is definite (as in (37a)). If we assume, with Van Koppen (2005), that the two Agree relationships are in effect simultaneously and that the surface spell-out of Agree relationships is determined in the morphological component on the basis of DM's 'Subset Principle' (i.e., basically in terms of Paninian specificity), we now face the question of how (46b) will translate into a surface representation.[51]

(46) a. $[_{vP}\ v\ [_{VP}\ V\ [_{CP}\ [_{C'}\ \text{... FOCUS ... }]]]]$

b. $[_{vP}\ v\ [_{VP}\ V\ [_{CP}\ \text{FOCUS}\ [_{C'}\ C \text{ ... } t \text{ ...}]]]]$

For a DEF focus, spell-out of the Agree relationship between *v* and the focus in SpecCP in (46b) is more specific than spell-out of the Agree relationship between *v* and CP (cf. the first and third lines of the table in (47), below: the third line 'gives you more' in the way of specific morphology than does the first, so the Agree relationship between *v* and the focus wins out).[52] For an INDEF focus, by contrast, spell-out of the Agree relationship between *v* and the focus is equally good as spell-out of Agree between *v* and CP: as a comparison of the first and second lines of the table in (47) shows, either option results in one specific form (ACC on the focus *vs* DEF on the verb).

(47)

SPELL-OUT	DEFINITENESS	CASE
Agree between *v* and CP	*specific*	(default)
Agree between *v* and $\text{Focus}_{\text{INDEF}}$	(default)	*specific*
Agree between *v* and $\text{Focus}_{\text{DEF}}$	*specific*	*specific*

50 From the perspective of the approach to DEF agreement presented in section 3, this likely means that it is the DEF clitic that checks the upstairs *v*'s ACC feature when the verb takes a CP complement. Note that I am not assuming Kenesei's (1994) *azt*-mediated analysis of apparently simple cases of CP–complementation (invoked at the outset of section 5) here. The clitic-based analysis of DEF agreement outlined in section 3 makes this analysis unnecessary (though it does not in and of itself argue against it: that is, Kenesei's analysis could in principle be maintained on the assumptions of section 3, but it is not necessary to adopt it here, so I will not, in the interest of simplicity).

51 This structure also yields a perspective on Case checking in *wager*-class ECM constructions featuring *wh*-extraction (Postal 1974, Kayne 1984, Bošković 1997, *i.a.*): assuming that the verb's complement in these constructions is an infinitival *CP*, the subject of the infinitival clause is prevented from checking Case against the matrix *v* unless it exits the clause by transiting through SpecCP, at which point (46) arises and a checking relationship between *v* and the subject of the infinitive is establishable. This allows us to understand the difference in grammaticality between (ia) and (ib), basically along the lines of Kayne's (1984) original account (involving Case-assignment in SpecCP, to the intermediate trace of the *wh*-chain). Of course the empirical picture is more complex than this: *wager*-class ECM constructions are also salvageable in other ways (via passivisation and *there*-insertion). I have nothing to say about these options at this time; see Bošković (1997) for particularly detailed discussion.

(i) a. *I wager $[_{CP}\ C\ [_{TP}$ John to be crazy]]
b. who$_i$ do you wager $[_{CP}\ t_i\ C\ [_{TP}\ t_i$ to be crazy]]?

52 I am assuming here, as is entirely plausible, that DEF is the specific form, INDEF being the default. This is evident from the fact that the INDEF conjugation is used not only when there is an indefinite object in V's complement, but also when there is *no* object.

So whenever an *indefinite* focus is extracted from the subject position of a lower clause, we might expect the upstairs verb to have a choice when it comes to agreement:[53] INDEF agreement with the ACC–marked focus (i.e., 'case switch' and upstairs agreement), or DEF agreement with CP, with the lower-subject focus coming out as NOM. This would capture the alternation between (4b) and (4b′) (and that between (4c) and (4c′) as well). The relevant examples are repeated here in (48).[54]

(48)	a.	%EGY NŐ	akar-om,	hogy	*ec*	elnök	legyen	(= (4b))
		a woman(NOM)	want-1SG.DEF	that		president	be-SUBJ-3SG	
	a.	EGY NŐ-T	akar-ok,	hogy	*ec*	elnök	legyen	(= (4b′))
		a woman-ACC	want-1SG.INDEF	that		president	be-SUBJ-3SG	
(49)	a.	%AZT A NŐ	akar-om,	hogy	*ec*	elnök	legyen	
		that woman(NOM)	want-1SG.DEF	that		president	be-SUBJ-3SG	
	a.	AZT A NŐ-T	akar-om,	hogy	*ec*	elnök	legyen	(= (33b))
		that woman-ACC	want-1SG.DEF	that		president	be-SUBJ-3SG	

But for *definite* lower-subject foci, by contrast, (46b) cannot deliver (49a): if the focus is DEF and *v* morphologically agrees with its intermediate copy in SpecCP, that delivers morphological spell-out of both ACC and DEF (as in (49b)); this is a more specific result than the spell-out of an Agree relationship between *v* and CP, which will yield only DEF (nominative Case on the focus is not morphophonologically realised). So for (49a) to come out (for speakers accepting it), we need (46a), a Rackowski & Richards-style derivation.

5.3 The strategies for long focus fronting: Overview and discussion

At this point, it will be helpful to stop for a moment and consider the various strategies uncovered in the preceding discussion regarding the derivation of long focus movement constructions — constructions, that is, in which a focused constituent in the matrix clause is interpreted as a constituent belonging to the embedded clause. The various strategies for deriving such constructions we encountered are summarised in (50).

(50) a. $[_{\text{FocP}}\ \text{FOCUS}_i\ [_{\text{F}'}\ \text{Foc} \ldots [_{v\text{P}}\ t_i'\ [_{v\text{P}}\ v\ [_{\text{VP}}\ \text{V}\ t_i\ [_{\text{CP}}$ C $[_{\text{TP}}\ pro_i\ [_{\text{T}'}\ \text{T} \ldots]]]]]]]]$ (cf. (39b))
<ACC>

b. $[_{\text{FocP}}\ \text{FOCUS}_i\ [_{\text{F}'}\ \text{Foc} \ldots [_{v\text{P}}\ t_i''\ [_{v\text{P}}\ v\ [_{\text{VP}}\ \text{V}\ [_{\text{CP}}\ t_i'\ [_{\text{C}'}$ C $[_{\text{TP}}\ \ldots\ [_{\text{T}'}\ \text{T} \ldots\ t_i \ldots]]]]]]]]]$ (cf. (46b))
<ACC>

c. $*[_{\text{FocP}}\ \text{FOCUS}_i\ [_{\text{F}'}\ \text{Foc} \ldots [_{v\text{P}}\ t_i''\ [_{v\text{P}}\ v\ [_{\text{VP}}\ \text{V}\ [_{\text{CP}}\ t_i'\ [_{\text{C}'}$ C $[_{\text{TP}}\ t_i\ [_{\text{T}'}\ \text{T} \ldots]]]]]]]]]$ (cf. (46b))
<NOM>

d. $[_{\text{FocP}}\ \text{FOCUS}_i\ [_{\text{F}'}\ \text{Foc} \ldots [_{v\text{P}}\ t_i''\ [_{v\text{P}}\ v\ [_{\text{VP}}\ \text{V}\ [_{\text{CP}}$ C $[_{\text{TP}}\ t_i\ [_{\text{T}'}\ \text{T} \ldots]]]]]]]]$ (cf. (46a))
<NOM>

53 Note that if (46b) were the *only* grammatical derivation for long focus extraction, we would expect that a DEF subject undergoes long focus fronting should always undergo 'case switch'. This is not true, which indicates that there must be a derivation, alongside (46b), that lower-subject foci can participate in such that they can 'retain' their nominative case. That derivation is (46a), a fell-swoop movement analysis of the Rackowski & Richards (2005) type. The discussion in section 5.3 will address this in more detail.

54 Gervain (2003, 2005) shows that NOM (as in the a-examples in (48)–(49)) is generally dispreferred, by all speakers, to ACC (as in the a-examples). To the extent that a NOM focus is accepted, it *must* trigger agreement on the lower verb — so NOM foci can only be *extracted* from the embedded clause; they cannot be base-generated upstairs and linked to a null resumptive in downstairs.

(i)	a.	%KÉT	FIÚ	mond-t-ad,	hogy	jön	I: ???
		two	boy(NOM)	say-PST-2SG.DEF	that	come-3SG	II: ??
	a′.	*KÉT	FIÚ	mond-t-ad,	hogy	jön-nek	I: *
		two	boy(NOM)	say-PST-2SG.DEF	that	come-3PL	II: *

Of these three strategies, the one in (50a) strictly speaking does not involve long focus movement at all: the focus is base-generated in the matrix clause, and binds a resumptive pronoun in the downstairs clause. This is the derivation which, in Hungarian sentences in which the upstairs focus is a morphological singular but a notional plural, deliver plural agreement on the downstairs verb, as discussed in section 5.1.2. The focus in (50a) is accusative-marked, inescapably so: it originates in a position (left somewhat underspecified in (50a)) in which it is the closest available goal for the ACC–checking *v* in the matrix clause.

The successive-cyclic movement strategy in (50b) also yields an accusative-marked focus: *v* here engages in a morphologically realised Agree relationship with the focus's copy in SpecCP, and will hence check accusative Case against the focus, with the latter conditioning the definiteness agreement form of the matrix verb: (50b) delivers upstairs DEF–agreement whenever the focus is definite, and INDEF–agreement whenever it is indefinite.

In both (50c) and (50d), *v* morphologically Agrees with the matrix verb's CP complement, but the two derivations differ with respect to whether the extracted focus makes a stopover in the embedded SpecCP position: it does in (50c), but it does not in (50d). The outputs of the two derivations in (50c,d) are precisely the same when the lower-subject focus is *indefinite*: upstairs DEF (as a reflex of the Agree relationship between *v* and CP), and nominative Case for the focus. But when the extracted lower-subject focus is *definite*, (50c) has no output because its spell-out is less specific than that of (50b) in this context: if the focus is DEF and *v* morphologically agrees with its intermediate copy in SpecCP, as in (50b), that delivers both ACC and DEF; if, by contrast, *v* morphologically agrees with CP, as in (50c), this will yield only DEF (nominative Case on the focus is not morphophonologically realised), which involves fewer specific forms than does DEF+ACC. For *indefinite* foci, (50c) would deliver an output that is equally good as (50b): each leads to one specific form, (50b) giving ACC on the focus but no upstairs DEF, and (50c) giving upstairs DEF but a morphophonologically unmarked NOM focus (the same result as (50d)). But for *definite* foci, (50c) is defeated by the fact that (50b) (which, like (50c), involves simultanous Agree relationships between *v* and CP as well as the intermediate trace in SpecCP) yields a more specific output. So on balance, (50c) is not very useful: for definite foci, it does not deliver; and for indefinite foci, it has the same output as (50d). This makes one suspicious that (50c) might not be a converging derivation.

This suspicion is confirmed from the perspective of Rackowski & Richards' (2005) theory of long movement out of embedded clauses. For them, whenever upstairs *v* morphologically agrees with CP, this makes CP transparent, allowing *v* to 'look into' the CP phase and establish an additional Agree relationship with something that is not separated from *v* by a lower phase boundary. In other words, once upstairs *v* engages in a morphological agreement relationship with CP, there is *no motivation* for escape-hatching movement to SpecCP: *v* can EPP–attract a focus from CP under these circumstances without the focus stopping over in SpecCP. Since escape-hatching movement through SpecCP is thus redundant when upstairs *v* morphologically agrees with CP, we expect such movement to be illicit in this context, by economy.

It is ultimately an empirical question whether there is any evidence for an intermediate trace in SpecCP in sentences of the type in (48a) — and if so, whether that evidence differentiates between (48a), involving long focus fronting of an *indefinite* nominative focus (which could potentially proceed via (50c)), and (48b), featuring long focus fronting of a *definite* nominative focus (for which (50c) is not available; only (50d), lacking an intermediate trace in SpecCP, is). I have no empirical evidence at my disposal at this time that will allow me to draw a firm conclusion on whether (50c) should or should not be kept. But even in the absence of clear empirical pointers, we can certainly allow the theory to lead the way here: with (50c) and (50d) in direct competition, economy considerations reject (50c) in favour of the simpler derivation in (50d).

5.4 Upstairs -lak/-lek *and the true nature of 'case switch'*

A question that the account presented so far has remained neutral on is whether a long-moved focus, in 'case switch' and upstairs agreement examples, checks case both in the embedded clause and in the matrix clause. Put differently, are we dealing with literal 'case switch', or does the focus have an ACC Case feature only?

For cases such as (33a,b), repeated below, there is no obvious way to tell — nominative case in Hungarian is morphologically unmarked, and accusative case systematically involves the affixation of a *-t* to the host noun, agglutinatively. The facts in (33a,b) are hence compatible in principle with an analysis that takes a morphologically unmarked nominative and 'converts' it into a morphologically marked accusative in the course of successive-cyclic focus fronting.

(33)	a.	EGY NŐ-T	akar-ok,	hogy	*t*	elnök	legyen	(= (4b′))
		a woman-ACC	want-1SG.INDEF	that		president	be-SUBJ-3SG	
	b.	AZT A NŐ-T	akar-om,	hogy	*t*	elnök	legyen	
		that woman-ACC	want-1SG.DEF	that		president	be-SUBJ-3SG	
	c.	TÉGED	akar-lak,	hogy	*t*	elnök	legyél	(= (4d))
		you-OBJ	want-LAK/LEK	that		president	be-SUBJ-2SG	

But for cases such as (33c), I argued in Den Dikken (2004[1999]) that a literal 'case switch' account cannot be maintained. The accusative form of the pronoun *te* is not derivable through literal 'case switch': *te* + ACC *-t* should yield **té-t*, which, however, is not found; instead, what we find is *téged*, which section 4 argued has a complex internal structure that is not itself adorned with the ACC–marker.[55]

So what I have referred to throughout as 'case switch' (crucially, in inverted commas) is not literally a switch from nominative to accusative (or, equivalently, the possession of multiple structural Case features, as, for instance, in Bejar & Massam 1999) — at least, not in Hungarian (and I suspect that this conclusion should extend more generally as well). In the Hungarian example in (33c), the focused pronoun starts out as an accusative, raising from its base position in T's complement to the embedded SpecCP and from there on further up. The embedded $Dx^{[TENSE]}$ head establishes an Agree relationship with *téged* in its base position, which results in ϕ-feature agreement between $Dx^{[TENSE]}$ and the extracted pronoun; but since this pronoun has an accusative Case feature, not a nominative one, and since it does not raise through SpecTP on its way out, the EPP–property and the nominative Case feature of embedded $Dx^{[TENSE]}$ are checked by a null expletive *pro* in SpecTP — much like the way Italian (Rizzi 1982) and several northern-Italian dialects (Brandi & Cordin 1989) handle subject extraction out of finite clauses and circumvent the '*that-t* filter'. Finally, the object clitic *-l* (an integral part of the *-lak/-lek* form attached to the matrix verb in (33c)) is launched into the matrix clause when the focused pronoun is in SpecCP.

Extrapolating from the conclusion reached for (33c) to all cases of long focus fronting with 'case switch', we are thus led to assume that in (50b), above, the focus cannot be launched from SpecTP — instead, it starts out from a lower position inside the VP, raising straight into SpecCP and on into the matrix clause:

(50b′) $[_{\text{FocP}}\ \text{FOCUS}_i\ [_{\text{F}'}\ \text{Foc} \ldots [_{v\text{P}}\ t_i''\ [_{v\text{P}}\ v\ [_{\text{VP}}\ \text{V}\quad [_{\text{CP}}\ t_i'\ [_{\text{C}'}\ \text{C}\ [_{\text{TP}}\ pro_{\text{EXPL}}\ [_{\text{T}'}\ \text{T} \ldots\ t_i \ldots]]]]]]]]]$

The derivations in (50b′) and (50a) thus come to resemble one another in one important respect: the SpecTP position of the embedded clause is filled by a null pronoun in both cases. There is a key difference between the two derivations, however: whereas *pro* in (50a) is bound by its antecedent, allowing for a certain amount of 'leeway' when it comes to number, in (50b′) *pro* is an expletive, with its associate obligatorily controlling morphological agreement with the embedded finite verb as a reflex of the Agree relation between it and T. Thus, (50b′) can only produce (36/7a); (50a), by contrast, delivers the 'notional agreement' cases in (36/7b).

55 Though it may optionally be so adorned (cf. *tégedet*). The form *téged* does not actually occur as a nominative subject at all — probably due to the fact that the *-l* that forms an integral part of its structure (cf. (25a)) is an OBJECT clitic. What remains an open question, however, is why *-l* (which, after all, is an expletive on my assumptions) must apparently necessarily be a part of the internal structure of the form *téged*. I suspect that this is because *(a)* $Dx^{[PERSON]}$ is endowed with the EPP–property whenever [PERSON] is specified, and *(b) te*, the possessor, cannot itself raise to SpecDxP (something which may fit in with the fact that Hungarian never A–moves a possessor to SpecTP (= $SpecDx^{[TENSE]}P$) either: Hungarian has no 'have'-sentences of the English type, the equivalent of *John has a book* being expressed in Hungarian as a 'be'-sentence with a dative-marked possessor; cf. Szabolcsi 1983).

(36)	a.	?KÉT	FIÚ-T	mond-t-ál,	hogy	jön	Group I:	?
		two	boy-ACC	say-PST-2SG.INDEF	that	come-3SG	Group II:	?
	b.	%KÉT	FIÚ-T	mond-t-ál,	hogy	jön-nek	Group I:	✓
		two	boy-ACC	say-PST-2SG.INDEF	that	come-3PL	Group II:	??(?)
		'you said that TWO BOYS are coming'						
(37)	a.	?AZ ÖSSZES	LÁNY-T	mond-t-ad,	hogy	jön	Group I:	?
		the all	girl-ACC	say-PST-2SG.DEF	that	come-3SG	Group II:	?
	b.	%AZ ÖSSZES	LÁNY-T	mond-t-ad,	hogy	jön-nek	Group I:	✓
		the all	girl-ACC	say-PST-2SG.DEF	that	come-3PL	Group II:	??(?)
		'you said that ALL THE GIRLS were coming'						

Generalising over the a– and b–examples in (36) and (37), therefore, the accusative-marked lower-subject focus is *never* itself physically in the canonical structural subject position of the downstairs finite clause: it either starts out in the matrix clause and binds a resumptive pronoun in the embedded clause (as depicted in (50a); in this case 'notional' plural agreement ensues in cases of the type in (36) and (37)), or it starts out inside the VP of the lower clause, where it enters into a morphological Agree relationship with the downstairs T, and then raises past SpecTP (occupied by a null expletive) into SpecCP.

5.5 Possible support: Subject-licensed parasitic gaps

Let us return once again to the set of derivations in (50a–d), repeated below for convenience.

(50) a. $[_{\text{FocP}}\ \text{FOCUS}_i\ [_{\text{F}'}\ \text{Foc} \ldots [_{v\text{P}}\ t_i'\ \underset{\text{<ACC>}}{[_{v\text{P}}\ v\ [_{\text{VP}}\ \text{V}\ t_i\ [_{\text{CP}}}\quad \text{C}\ [_{\text{TP}}\ pro_i\ [_{\text{T}'}\ \text{T} \ldots]]]]]]]]$ (cf. (39b))

b. $[_{\text{FocP}}\ \text{FOCUS}_i\ [_{\text{F}'}\ \text{Foc} \ldots [_{v\text{P}}\ t_i''\ \underset{\text{<ACC>}}{[_{v\text{P}}\ v\ [_{\text{VP}}\ \text{V}\quad [_{\text{CP}}\ t_i'\ [_{\text{C}'}}\ \text{C}\ [_{\text{TP}}\ \ldots\ [_{\text{T}'}\ \text{T} \ldots\ t_i \ldots]]]]]]]]]$ (cf. (46b))

c. $*[_{\text{FocP}}\ \text{FOCUS}_i\ [_{\text{F}'}\ \text{Foc} \ldots [_{v\text{P}}\ t_i''\ \underset{\text{<NOM>}}{[_{v\text{P}}\ v\ [_{\text{VP}}\ \text{V}\quad [_{\text{CP}}\ t_i'\ [_{\text{C}'}}\ \text{C}\ [_{\text{TP}}\ t_i\ [_{\text{T}'}\ \text{T} \ldots]]]]]]]]]$ (cf. (46b))

d. $[_{\text{FocP}}\ \text{FOCUS}_i\ [_{\text{F}'}\ \text{Foc} \ldots [_{v\text{P}}\ t_i''\ \underset{\text{<NOM>}}{[_{v\text{P}}\ v\ [_{\text{VP}}\ \text{V}\quad [_{\text{CP}}}\quad \text{C}\ [_{\text{TP}}\ t_i\ [_{\text{T}'}\ \text{T} \ldots]]]]]]]]$ (cf. (46a))

Of these various structures, only one has the extraction site of the lower-subject focus in a position below T: (50b). In all the other structures, the launching site for A′–movement of the lower-subject focus is one that c-commands everything inside the embedded TP. This makes an interesting prediction in the domain of parasitic gap constructions, on the assumption (which, admittedly, is somewhat controversial; cf. e.g. Chomsky 1986) that parasitic gaps must not be c-commanded by the head of the A–chain of their licensers (the so-called anti-c-command condition on parasitic gap constructions). In particular, we predict that the lower-subject focus should be able to license a parasitic gap inside the embedded clause *only* if the derivation in (50b) ensues; in all other derivations, the head of the A–chain of the lower-subject focus will inescapably c-command the parasitic gap.

Interestingly, this prediction is verifiable, and seems to be verified (though the contrast is perhaps somewhat weaker than desired). The thing to note first is that while in English it is impossible to have parasitic gaps in right-peripheral adjunct clauses licensed by extraction of the subject of a finite clause (cf. (51)), Horvath (1992) points out that Hungarian does allow such constructions — provided that the lower subject is raised into the matrix clause and undergoes 'case switch' there: see (52), from Horvath's paper.[56]

56 Thanks to Kelly Nedwick and Ronit Shaham for drawing my attention to Horvath's paper. I am reproducing (52) in its original form, adding that some of my Hungarian informants find it awkward with present-tense *megbüntet*. Hungarian native-speaker readers of this paper should feel free to replace it with past-tense *megbüntetett* if that facilitates their evaluation of these sentences.

(51) *who do you think *t* would never complain when the teacher punishes *pg*?

(52) a. (?)?kiket mondtál hogy sosem panaszkodnak azután hogy a tanító megbüntet?
who-PL-ACC you-said that never complain-3PL after that the teacher punishes
'whom did you say never complain after the teacher punishes?'

b. *kik mondtad hogy sosem panaszkodnak azután hogy a tanító megbüntet?
who-PL(NOM) you-said that never complain-3PL after that the teacher punishes

I should point out that, though Horvath presents (52a) without any markings suggesting that it might be somewhat degraded, all of my Hungarian informants have indicated to me that, while passable, (52a) is certainly not perfect. I have therefore decided to adorn (52a) with some question marks, acknowledging its marked status. But what is clear is that (52a) is decidedly better than the entirely ungrammatical example in (52b), which can only be derived via ((50c) or) (50d), delivering a violation of the anti-c-command condition.[57] Its case-switch counterpart in (52a), by contrast, can be derived via (50b), which allows us to circumvent an anti-c-command violation.

For (52a), it is impossible to test independently of theoretical constraints on parasitic gaps whether (50a) or (50b) is employed in its derivation: *kiket* is accusative, which means that (50c,d) are inapplicable. But theory-internal considerations aside, a choice between (50a) and (50b) can be based only on the agreement triggered by the lower-subject focus on the finite verb — (50a) yields 'notional' agreement, whereas (50b) delivers morphological agreement. For *kiket*, which is both morphologically and semantically plural, there is no difference between (50a) and (50b): there will be downstairs plural agreement in both derivations. So the thing to look at is cases similar to (52a) in which the focus is a morphological singular denoting a plurality of individuals — in other words, examples of the type in (53)–(55).[58]

(53) a. (?)?KÉT FIÚT mondtál hogy sosem panaszkodik azután hogy a tanító megbüntet
two boy-ACC you-said that never complain-3SG after that the teacher punishes

b. *KÉT FIÚT mondtál hogy sosem panaszkodnak azután hogy a tanító megbüntet
two boy-ACC you-said that never complain-3PL after that the teacher punishes

(54) a. (?)?KÉT FIÚT mondtál hogy jön a buliba anélkül hogy meghívtál volna
two boy-ACC you-said that come-3SG the party-to without that PV-invited-2SG would

b. *KÉT FIÚT mondtál hogy jönnek a buliba anélkül hogy meghívtál volna
two boy-ACC you-said that come-3PL the party-to without that PV-invited-2SG would

(55) a. (?)?KÉT FIÚT szeretnék hogy eljönne anélkül hogy meghívok
two boy-ACC would.like-1SG that would.come-3SG without that PV-invite-1SG

b. *KÉT FIÚT szeretnék hogy eljönnének anélkül hogy meghívok
two boy-ACC would.like-1SG that would.come-3PL without that PV-invite-1SG

The general pattern here seems to be the one indicated — the a–examples, while marginal (like (52a)), are better than the b–sentences, which are unacceptable. This is an interesting result, for it confirms that there is a *structural* difference between the morphological and 'notional' agreement cases; and more specifically, it confirms my conclusion, based in section 5.4 on the facts in (33) (esp. (33d)), that in examples involving long focus fronting of a lower subject with 'case switch' upstairs and morphological agreement downstairs (i.e., in the a–examples), the lower-subject focus is launched from a position relatively low inside the embedded finite clause, *not* from SpecTP (cf. (50b)). (I hasten to add, however, that the facts discussed in this section are not overwhelmingly robust. There seems to be a contrast of the type indicated, but even the passable examples are not particularly good.)

57 I am assuming, as is entirely reasonable, that the *azután*-clause is adjoined in a position lower in the tree than SpecTP; it will not be necessary to take a stand here on precisely where it is adjoined, so long as it is lower than the highest A–position occupied by the lower-subject focus.

58 Many thanks to Katalin É. Kiss and Judit Gervain for constructing the examples in (54) and (55), and providing judgements.

5.6 Long focus fronting of non-argument nominatives: No case switch

The Rackowski & Richards-type 'fell-swoop movement' derivation in (50d), whereby the focus raises into the matrix clause without a stopover in SpecCP, never yields upstairs INDEF–agreement and 'case switch'. These effects can only result from derivations of the type in (50a) and (50b). And because (50a) involves a binding relationship between the focus (base-generated upstairs) and a resumptive pronoun in the embedded clause, we expect this derivation to be available only when the focus is a potential binder of a resumptive — that is, (50a) will likely impose a referentiality requirement upon the focus in the matrix clause. For (50b), no such requirement is expected to be in effect: the focus should in principle be allowed to be non-referential. It turns out, however, that long focus fronting with case switch is categorically impossible for foci that cannot possibly be construed as referential expressions: the b–examples in (56)–(58) are ungrammatical.[59]

(56) a. HÁNY KILÓ-T gondol-od, hogy nyom ez a malac?
how.many kilo-ACC think-2SG.DEF that weighs this the pig
'how many kilos do you think this pig weighs?'

b. *HÁNY KILÓ-T gondol-sz, hogy nyom ez a malac?
how.many kilo-ACC think-2SG.INDEF that weighs this the pig

(57) a. MILYEN EMBER szeretné-d hogy legyen Béla?
what.kind.of man(NOM) would.like-2SG.DEF that be(come).SUBJUNC-3SG Béla
'what kind of man would you like Béla to be(come)?'

b. *MILYEN EMBER-T szeretné-l hogy legyen Béla?
what.kind.of man-ACC would.like-2SG.INDEF that be(come).SUBJUNC-3SG Béla

(58) a. MI szeretné-d hogy legyen Bélá-ból?
what(NOM) would.like-2SG.DEF that be(come).SUBJUNC-3SG Béla-out.of
'what would you like to become of Béla?'

b. *MI-T szeretné-l hogy legyen Bélá-ból?
what-ACC would.like-2SG.INDEF that be(come).SUBJUNC-3SG Béla-out.of

This means, viewed from the point of view of the analysis of upstairs agreement and case switch under long focus fronting presented in this paper, that non-argument DPs cannot stop over in SpecCP on their way out of CP — *v* cannot m-agree with the extractee in such cases, only with CP; both (50a) and (50b) are unavailable whenever the focus is non-referential. I do not have an explanation at this time for *why* non-argument DPs cannot stop over in SpecCP; but given that the Hungarian agreement and case facts in (56)–(58) reliably indicate that such a stopover indeed cannot be made, we can exploit this empirical fact to help derive a quintessential ingredient of the ECP — the argument/non-argument distinction (at least for DPs).

Consider, in particular, *wh*-island configurations of the type in (59). Rackowski & Richards (2005: 594) argue that in the configuration in (59a), *v* Agrees with the complement–CP and with the *wh*-phrase in SpecCP, the latter Agree relationship making it impossible for *v* to Agree with the lower *wh*, adjoined to *v*P. This derives the *wh*-island effect.[60] But nothing in principle prevents C from attracting *what* up to its specifier, creating (59b), which should allow upstairs *v* to Agree with and attract *what*.

59 Thanks to Anikó Lipták for constructing and judging these sentences. The judgements here are robust, and have been confirmed with other native speakers.

60 Note that this derives too strong a *wh*-island effect: *all* extraction from *all wh*-constructions should be ungrammatical, even regardless of whether the subject-*wh* in highest-subject *wh*-constructions raises to SpecCP or stays in SpecTP: it will always be higher than the *v*P–adjoined *wh*. See Den Dikken (2006) for discussion of successful extraction from highest-subject *wh*-constructions.

(59) a. *v* ... [$_{CP}$ *why* [$_{C'}$ C ... [$_{vP}$ *what* [$_{vP}$ ... ~~*what*~~]]]]
b. *v* ... [$_{CP}$ *what* [$_{CP/C'}$ *why* [$_{C'}$ C ... [$_{vP}$ ~~*what*~~ [$_{vP}$ ... ~~*what*~~]]]]]

The availability of (59b) as an intermediate derivational stage is probably parametrically determined — languages allowing multiple *wh*-fronting (to the C–domain, more specifically) may allow this (and concomitantly allow 'violations' of the *wh*-island constraint) whereas languages such as English do not;[61] other factors (such as the finite/non-finite distinction) may be involved as well, in ways that merit further study. But in any case, a configuration of the type in (59b) should never be derivable for *non-argument* DPs — recall that the b–examples in (56)–(58) tell us that *v* cannot morphologically agree with a non-argument DP in a configuration of this type. So assuming that the Hungarian agreement facts are an indication that there is something wrong with a morphological agreement relationship between upstairs *v* and a non-argument *wh*–DP in (50b) and (59b) *universally*,[62] we predict that non-argument DPs should never be extractable from *wh*-islands in any language. I do not currently possess evidence that could (dis)confirm the cross-linguistic prediction; but certainly for English, it is true that non-argument DPs are robustly unextractable even from weak *wh*-islands: whereas *argument*–DP extraction from non-finite *wh*-questions is near-perfect (cf. (63)), *non-argument*–DP extraction from *wh*-questions is always impossible.

(60) a. how many pounds do you think that you should weigh?
b. *how many pounds do you wonder whether you should weigh?
c. *how many pounds do you wonder whether to weigh?

(61) a. what kind of (a) person do you think that you want to become?
b. *what kind of (a) person do you wonder whether you want to become?
c. *what kind of (a) person do you wonder whether to become?

(62) a. how many times do you think that you should do this?
b. *how many times do you wonder whether you should do this?
c. *how many times do you wonder whether to do this?

(63) $^{(?)}$which problem don't you know how to solve?

The systematic ungrammaticality of non-argument–DP extraction from all *wh*-islands follows from the unavailability of (50b)/(59b) for non-argument DPs, as indicated by the Hungarian agreement facts in (56)–(58).

6 Conclusion

In this paper, I have endeavoured to present an integrated analysis of agreement phenomena in Hungarian finite clauses and possessed noun phrases. The analysis of (anti-)agreement and *-k* 'migration' in possessed noun phrases presented in section 2 is essentially a theoretically updated and empirically extended version of the original account in Den Dikken (1999), the theoretical updates ensuing primarily from the adoption of the Agree–*cum*–EPP perspective. Important ingredients of the analysis of agreement in possessed noun phrases are *(i)* the claim that the Dx$^{[\text{PERSON}]}$ in the extended projection of a possessed noun, which is the head

61 There does indeed seem to be a correlation between multiple *wh*-fronting to the C–domain and allowability of *wh*-island 'violations' (cf. Rudin 1988: Bulgarian, Romanian multiple *wh*-fronting targets the C–domain, hence no *wh*-island effects; Serbo-Croatian multiple *wh*-fronting targets the C–domain for the highest *wh* but a lower projection (IP for Rudin) for other *wh*'s, hence *wh*-island effects are in evidence here; cf. also Richards 1997). I will not discuss this any further here.

62 It is difficult to see how this could be learnt: negative evidence would seem to be required to acquire it.

Agreeing with the possessor, cannot Agree in number with a *third* person possessor (third person being 'non-person', and [NUMBER] on Dx$^{[\text{PERSON}]}$ being a subfeature of [PERSON]), but must Agree with *first* and *second* person possessors, and *(ii)* the argument to the effect that the Num–head of a third person pronominal possessor raises to Dx$^{[\text{PERSON}]}$ so as to be licensed. The analysis of possessed noun phrases and agreement formed a natural segue to the discussion of first and second person object pronouns, which I showed have a complex internal structure paralleling that of possessed noun phrases, including an object clitic (spelled out as *-l* in second person cases in the context of a first person singular subject) that raises to T. Object clitics cannot co-occur with other clitics in present-day Hungarian — something that I blamed on (29), a Clitic Co-Occurrence Restriction. This constraint rules out the co-occurrence of the object clitic *-l* with the *-m* of 1SG.DEF (which I argued is a subject clitic), thereby blocking **-lam/-lem*, and also the co-occurrence of the (null) first person object clitic with the *-d* of 2SG.DEF (itself, like 1SG.DEF *-m*, a subject clitic). The constraint in (29) also rules out the co-occurrence of first/second person object clitics with the definite conjugation forms for 3SG and all plurals, for which I argued that they involve an object clitic, the ancestor of reconstructed Prot-Uralic **-se*, which — judging from Hajdú (1972:44) — was an overt object clitic. Sections 3 and 4 may thus be read as an extended plea for the existence of both subject clitics and object clitics in the morphosyntax of present-day Hungarian.

Section 5 of the paper, which is relatively independent of the preceding sections, concerned itself with the analysis of 'long-distance' agreement with focus fronting. It argued that such agreement can be obtained via two independently available scenarios: *(i)* base-generation of the focus in the upstairs clause (which results in 'notional' agreement in the downstairs clause), and *(ii)* successive-cyclic extraction through SpecCP (which yields morphological agreement downstairs). I argued that 'case switch' is actually an illusion — the case form of the focus never actually switches from nominative to accusative. Finally, the discussion in section 5 firmly supports the conclusion that *v* in cases of extraction from clausal complements can morphologically agree either with CP or with the extractee raising through SpecCP. Whenever *v* morphologically agrees with the entire CP, no stopover is made in SpecCP, and extraction proceeds without escape-hatching through SpecCP; but the Rackowski & Richards (2005) derivation is not the only one available for long-distance extraction from an embedded finite clause: the Hungarian case-switch and upstairs definiteness agreement data show that a 'classic' derivation involving escape-hatching movement through SpecCP is available alongside the fell-swoop scenario, and has a different surface output.

Acknowledgements

This origins of this paper lie in earlier work I have done on the morphosyntax of Hungarian agreement (cf. esp. Den Dikken 1999, 2004[1999]), and, more directly, in the ideas I presented in the keynote addresses I delivered at the 7th International Conference of the Structure of Hungarian, in Veszprém, Hungary, 30 May 2005 (concentrating on sections 2–4), the 5th Budapesti Uráli Műhely at the Magyar Tudományos Akadémia (MTA), 11–13 January 2006 (sections 3 and 4), and at 'The Hungarian Language: Past and Present', a conference organised at UCLA on 5–6 May 2006 (focused on section 5). Several sections of this paper were also discussed in the 'szuperkurzus' I gave at the Nyelvtudományi Intézet of the MTA in Jaunary 2006. I thank the organisers of all these events for inviting me to present there; and I thank the participants for their copious feedback. István Kenesei sent me very helpful written comments on an earlier version of this paper. Judit Gervain helped me tremendously by sending me her papers, and by providing much-needed help with many of the facts discussed in the paper. Finally, but by no means as an afterthought, I would like to very gratefully acknowledge the judgements I have received from many Hungarian native-speaker linguists on the data discussed in the paper — in particular, Huba Bartos, Judit Gervain, Katalin É. Kiss, István Kenesei, Ferenc Kiefer, and Anikó Lipták. I thank and absolve all.

References

Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 1994. On the representation of clitic doubling in Modern Greek. *EUROTYP Working Papers*, Theme Group 8, Vol. 5. 1–66.

Baker, Mark. 1988. *Incorporation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bartos, Huba. 1997. On 'subjective' and 'objective' agreement in Hungarian. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 44. 363–84.

Bartos, Huba. 1999. *Morfoszintaxis és interpretáció: A magyar inflexiós jelenségek szintaktikai háttere*. Ph.D. dissertation, ELTE Budapest.

Bartos, Huba. 2001. Object agreement in Hungarian — A case for minimalism. In G. Alexandrova & O. Arnaudova (eds), *The minimalist parameter*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bejar, Susana & Diane Massam. 1999. Multiple Case checking. *Syntax* 2. 65–79.

Benkő, Loránd & Samu Imre. 1972. *The Hungarian language*. The Hague: Mouton.

Benkő, Loránd. 1991. *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana* [Historical grammar of Hungarian]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Benveniste, Émile. 1966. *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Paris: Gallimard.

Bobaljik, Jonathan & Susi Wurmbrand. to appear. The domain of agreement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.

Bonet, Eulália. 1991. *Morphology after syntax: Pronominal clitics in Romance*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

Bošković, Željko. 1997. *The syntax of nonfinite complementation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Brandi, Luciana & Patrizia Cordin. 1989. Two Italian dialects and the null subject parameter. In Osvaldo Jaeggli & Ken Safir (eds), *The null subject parameter*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 111–42.

Branigan, Phil & Marguerite MacKenzie. 2002. Altruism, A′–movement, and object agreement in Innuaimûn. *LI* 33. 385–407.

Bruening, Benjamin. 2001. *Syntax at the edge: Cross-clausal phenomena and the syntax of Passamaquoddy*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

Bruening, Benjamin. 2004. Two types of *wh*-scope marking in Passamaquoddy. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22. 229–305.

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In Roger Martin, David Michaels & Juan Uriagereka (eds), *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 89–155.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A life in language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 1–52.

Dikken, Marcel den. 1999. On the structural representation of possession and agreement. The case of (anti-) agreement in Hungarian possessed nominal phrases. In István Kenesei (ed.), *Crossing boundaries: Theoretical advances in Central and Eastern European languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 137–78.

Dikken, Marcel den. 2004[1999]. Agreement and 'clause union'. In Kalalin É. Kiss & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds), *Verb clusters: A study of Hungarian, German and Dutch*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 445–98 [written in 1999; published in its original form in 2004].

Dikken, Marcel den. 2006. Vacuous movement in focus — On the syntax of highest-subject *wh*-questions and relative clauses. Paper presented at the 29th GLOW Colloquium, Barcelona; ms., CUNY Graduate Center.

Dikken, Marcel den, Anikó Lipták & Zsófia Zvolenszky. 2001. On inclusive reference anaphora: New perspectives from Hungarian. In K. Megerdoomian & L.A. Bar-El (eds), *WCCFL 20 Proceedings*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press. 137–49.

É. Kiss, Katalin. 1987. *Configurationality in Hungarian*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

É. Kiss, Katalin. 1993. Wh-movement and specificity. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11. 85–120.

É. Kiss, Katalin. 2002. *The syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge: CUP.

É. Kiss, Katalin. 2005. The inverse agreement constraint in Hungarian: A relic of a Uralic–Siberian Sprachbund? In Hans Broekhuis, Norbert Corver, Riny Huybregts, Ursula Kleinhenz & Jan Koster (eds), *Organizing grammar: Linguistic studies in honor of Henk van Riemsdijk*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 108–15.

Farkas, Donka. 2006. Number in Hungarian and beyond. Paper presented at 'The Hungarian Language: Past and Present', UCLA, 5 May 2006.

Fenyvesi, Anna. 1995. Language contact and language death in an immigrant language: The case of Hungarian. *University of Pittsburgh Working Papers in Linguistics* 3. 1–117.

Gervain, Judit. 2003. Syntactic microvariation and methodology: Problems and perspectives. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 50. 405–34.

Gervain, Judit. 2005. Two strategies of focus-raising: Movement and resumption. In Christopher Piñón & Péter Siptár (eds), *Approaches to Hungarian* 9. *Papers from the Düsseldorf conference*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Hajdú, Péter. 1972. The origins of Hungarian. In Benkő & Imre (eds). 15–48.

Horvath, Julia. 1992. The anti-c-command and case-compatibility in the licensing of parasitic chains. *The Linguistic Review* 9. 183–218.

Horvath, Julia. 1997. The status of 'Wh-expletives' and the partial Wh-movement construction in Hungarian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15. 509–72.

Kallulli, Dalina. 2000. Direct object clitic doubling in Albanian and Greek. In Frits Beukema & Marcel den Dikken (eds), *Clitic phenomena in European languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 209–48.

Károly, Sándor. 1972. The grammatical system of Hungarian. In Benkő & Imre (eds). 85–170.

Kayne, Richard. 1984. *Connectedness and binary branching*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kenesei, István. 1984. Word order in Hungarian complex sentences. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15. 328–42.

Kenesei, István. 1994. Subordinate clauses. In Ferenc Kiefer & Katalin É. Kiss (eds), *The syntactic structure of Hungarian. Syntax and Semantics* 27. New York: Academic Press. 275–354.

Koppen, Marjo van. 2005. *One probe – two goals. Aspects of agreement in Dutch dialects*. Ph.D. dissertation, ULeiden/ULCL.

Laka, Itziar. 1990. *Negation in syntax: On the nature of functional categories and projections*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

Larson, Richard & Gabriel Segal. 1995. *Knowledge of meaning: An introduction to semantic theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lindhout-Lengyel, Klára. 1993. Agreement in Hungarian nominal and verbal projections. Paper presented at the Workshop on V–initial Languages, University of Leiden, June 1993.

Lipták, Anikó. 2001. *On the syntax of* wh*-items in Hungarian*. Ph.D. dissertation, ULeiden/ULCL.

Lyons, Christopher. 1999. *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marácz, László. 1989. *Asymmetries in Hungarian*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Groningen.

McCloskey, James. 2000. Quantifier Float and *wh*-movement in an Irish English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31. 57–84.

McCloskey, James. 2005. Irish and the requirement of subjecthood. Ms., University of California, Santa Cruz.

Nevins, Andrew. 2005. The representation of third person: **me lui* meets **le lo*. Ms., Harvard University.

Pesetsky, David & Esther Torrego. 2001. T–to–C movement: Causes and consequences. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A life in language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 355–426.

Polinsky, Maria & Eric Potsdam. 2001. Long-distance agreement and topic in Tsez. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19. 583–646.

Postal, Paul. 1974. *On raising*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rackowski, Andrea & Norvin Richards. 2005. Phase edge and extraction: a Tagalog case study. *Linguistic Inquiry*.
Rákosi, György & Tibor Laczkó. 2005. The categorial status of agreement-marked infinitives in Hungarian. Paper presented at the 7th International Conference on the Structure of Hungarian, Veszprém, Hungary, 30 May 2005.
Rezac, Milan & Mélanie Jouitteau. to appear. Deriving the complementarity effect: Relativized Minimality in Breton agreement. *Lingua*.
Richards, Norvin. 1997. *What moves where when in which language?* Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
Richards, Norvin. 1998. The Principle of Minimal Compliance. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29. 599–629.
Richards, Norvin. 2005. The agreement sequence for successive-cyclic movement in Tagalog and English. Paper presented at Maryland Mayfest on *wh*-constructions.
Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. *Issues in Italian syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar. Handbook in generative syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 281–337.
Rouveret, Alain. 1991. Functional categories and agreement. *The Linguistic Review* 8. 353–87.
Rudin, Catherine. 1988. On multiple questions and multiple *wh*-fronting. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6. 445–501.
Schmitt, Cristina. 1998. Lack of iteration: Accusative clitic doubling, participial absolutes and *have*+agreeing participles. *Probus* 10. 243–300.
Simonyi, Zs. 1907. *Die ungarische Sprache. Geschichte und Charakteristik.* Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.
Speas, Margaret. 1993. Null arguments in a theory of economy of projection. *UMOP*. University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
Speas, Margaret. 1995. Economy, agreement and the representation of null arguments. Ms., University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
Szabolcsi, Anna. 1983. The possessor that ran away from home. *The Linguistic Review* 3. 89–102.
Tóth, Ildikó. 2000. *Inflected infinitives in Hungarian*. Ph.D. dissertation, Tilburg University.
Zanuttini, Raffaella. 1996. On the relevance of tense for sentential negation. In Adriana Belletti & Luigi Rizzi (eds), *Parameters and functional heads. Essays in comparative syntax*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press. 181–207.

fourth, fully revised version • 15 May 2006

Linguistics Program
CUNY Graduate Center
365 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10016–4309
MDen-Dikken@gc.cuny.edu
http://web.gc.cuny.edu/dept/lingu/dendikken/index.html