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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 nominal phrases. 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 enlightening fact that Hungarian verbs inflect for indefinite 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 ‘possessor’) 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 flexi 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 considering 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 fronting may proceed in the language. Section 6 closes by reviewing the main conclusions of the paper.

---

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 történeti ragozás ‘objective conjugation’ and alanyi ragozás ‘subjective conjugation’ respectively. 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). (1) illustrates the difference in form and distribution of the two finite verb conjugations.

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

---

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. e.g. Marcács 1989 and E. 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.

2 This terminology may suggest a treatment of Hungarian (finite) clause syntax as belonging to the subject-verb-object type. 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 negative 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 (ii-a) and (ii-b). In (ii-a), the object is a full-fledged DP — visibly so: the definite article introduces the object — and definite agreement on the verb is obligatory. In (ii-b), 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 applies when the verb’s complement is a DP. An apparent problem for this approach is the fact that (ii-a) is also grammatical with a te dropped and even then will still demand definite agreement. I cannot address this issue here.

---
The behaviour of long-distance focus in the domain of possessive 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.

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

6 Though see Károly (1972:88) on (5b) 'in Old Hungarian' (cf. his tamuló-è könyv-ok 'the student's books' -3PL.POSS); he does not specify a date for this kind of example.)
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).

The ‘disappearance’ of the possessive marker -e in (6d) is not a quirk of adpositional inflection — we see it in singular az dölésú-ék ‘the (s) book, i.e., their book’ as well (contrast this with plural azok, where -e is preserved). This is the result of a phonological rule deleting -e if immediately followed by it, the vowel that lexically belongs to the third person plural possessive suffix. I will not go into the phonological specifics here. See esp. Rebus’s work (e.g. 2006a,b, 2005) for detailed discussion.

7 The ‘disappearance’ of the possessive marker -e in (6d) is not a quirk of adpositional inflection — we see it in singular az dölésú-ék ‘the (s) book, i.e., their book’ as well (contrast this with plural azok, where -e is preserved). This is the result of a phonological rule deleting -e if immediately followed by it, the vowel that lexically belongs to the third person plural possessive suffix. I will not go into the phonological specifics here. See esp. Rebus’s work (e.g. 2006a,b, 2005) for detailed discussion.

My focus in this paper will be on possessive agreement in noun phrases with nominative (or non-case-marked) possessor. Bartos’s (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, E. 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 & Lackó 2005).
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').

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 AgrSP: 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 ‘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 P. 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 [PERSON] or [NUMBER] as its primary feature specification — so we get two differently flavoured Dx-heads, DxMorph and DxMorphless, 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 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 Dxnonspec is 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 vP, 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 Dxnonspec (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 ad-=gubh a the woman who’s-Clothe possesum of the woman’).
q3 How does the third person (singular) pronoun manage to satisfy the EPP–property of $Dx^{\text{TENSE}}$?

Let me make it explicit right at the outset that I assume the EPP–property of $Dx^{\text{TENSE}}$ to be checked by the uninterpretable [$\text{TENSE}$] feature of the subject (at T in Pesetsky & Torrego’s 2001 notation, equivalent to nominative Case). For third-person subjects, this uninterpretable [$\text{TENSE}$] 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 $\text{T}$ presupposes the possession of a D-head, 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 $Dx^{\text{TENSE}}$. 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 the simplest 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 are syntactic constructs in general (I 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.

q4 How does the dyadic subject pair ‘bare NPs—possessor’ versus ‘bare NPs—subject’ work?

In third person contexts, the D–head is not independently specifiable for [NUMBER], which, when not projecting, is a dependent of the [PERSON] or [$\text{TENSE}$] feature of $Dx$. In possessed noun phrases with first or second person possessors, by contrast, $Dx^{\text{TENSE}}$ 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].

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 $Dx^{\text{TENSE}}$ 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.

(a) a. (én) szeret-ek {i-n} / egy görög nő-t
    I love-1SG.POSS someone-ACC a Greek woman-ACC

b. a. mi cipő-i-m / *cipő-i-t
   the we shoe-PL.POSS-1SG shoe-PL.POSS-1PL
   'our shoes'

[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 $Dx^{\text{TENSE}}$ the EPP–property. If I am right to suggest that (1a) is the structure of Welsh finite clauses, then its $Dx^{\text{TENSE}}$ lacks an EPP specification. See McCloskey (2005) for an alternative analysis (alluded to already in fn. 10), keyed specifically to Welsh, 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 da- Kinderen op straat aan het spelen zijn, where the existive or ‘there’ checks $Dx^{\text{POSS}}$’s EPP–property and the ‘bare NP’ subject stays low.

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

[18] The fact that $Dx^{\text{TENSE}}$ is 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 $Dx^{\text{POSS}}$ 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 possessor’s head.
conjugation, as well as in 1PL possessive agreement; its absence from 1PL DEF is an outlier, both historically and synchronically.

Based on the historical roots of the 1PL agreement marker, one clearly expects there to be a nasal in this form throughout: the form -m shows up instead. One suspects that the use of -m was an innovation 'motivated' by a desire to avoid homophony with the 3PL form of this paradigm: *-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 e suffix of the third person (cf. the reconstructed 3NDEF form, *-e) 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.

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 *-d *te
3NDEF *-e
3DEF *-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 e suffix of the third person (cf. the reconstructed 3NDEF form, *-e) 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.

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 subject agreement marker

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 (3SG.DEF) and -d (2SG.DEF) do not combine with 3g or other syn-
crone-surface reflexes of *-se then follows from the Ctic 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 indefinite 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 (2a), 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 vocative 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 indefinite
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 ‘Ph’

I pointed out in section 1 that Hungarian first and second person pronouns (overt or null) behave like
indefinite objects with respect to the determination of verb agreement (cf. (2b), (3a,b), repeated below). I also
d rew that there second person pronoun 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.

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 shallower 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 immu-
nent 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 Kalluli (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). Kalluli (2000) argues that clitic doubling is an anti-focused 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). A characterisation definiteness 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, Lüpik & Zöllecsényi (2001) point out, there are
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 on miel (vallatam meg. I effect us’). Den Dikken, Lüpik & Zöllecsényi (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.

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 titk was becomes available that sheds light on the occurrence of
the -morpheme that is otherwise characteristic of plural possessums (cf. a könyv(–i)–h–el–et) (‘our book(s)-ACC’ or a könyv–s–t–alk–et)
(your, book–ACC). This -is can be looked upon as marking the plurality of the (null) possessum in the structure of minket and titk
proposed below. The fact that the nominative forms of the first and second person plural pronouns (mi and di) have this -is as well
(though it is obvious that the morpheme is not a plural marker; cf. Livonian mink ‘we’ — Hajiž 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. Benko 1991:59) may go back to a
reconstructed *-g 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 possessums (*minket,/ *titk).
The missing piece is 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 /-lak/ to be an expletive clitic, sitting in SpecDx\(\{\)Pers\(\}\) and satisfying the EPP–property of the Dx\(\{\)Pers\(\}\) 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 /-lak/-lek and /-tied/ietiek.

There is a further piece to the puzzle that needs to be put in place.

In (20), if that is the only difference between first/second person singular reflexives and first/second person singular pronouns (both based on \(\text{mag}\)) is the absence in the former and the presence in the latter of a clitic in SpecTP (= SpecDx\(\{\)Tense\(\}\)) (cf. (25a) for second person singular object pronoun).

The representations in (25) are directly parallel to the one familiar from there-expletive constructions, with there sitting in SpecFP (= SpecDx\(\{\)Pers\(\}\)\)}, ‘doubled’ by its ‘associate’, the noun phrase in SpecFP.

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:

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 clitisation site (Dx\(\{\)Pers\(\}\)/\(\text{mag}\)). I assume here that, on its way out of DP, the clitic transits through D (a case of successive-cyclic head movement).
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presence of the clitic thus forces D to be empty; transiting through a filled ‘escape hatch’ is impossible. As a result, the definite article e 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 -t 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

The grammatical -lak/-lek form is straightforwardly derived if -l- left-adjoints to T/Dx[TENSE] and -k is a lexicalisation of a subfeature of T/Dx[PRES]. By contrast, (28), an attempt at combining -t with the -m of 1SG.DEF agreement, presents us with an oblem: -t 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 object clitic cannot co-occur with a first or second person clitic.

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 OCL.

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 -se 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 -se are perfectly compatible with object clitics.

(1) a. hagyjak *(jáno-s-nak)
   let-unl.AUX-3SG-INF
   meg-lágoált-ni
   meg-lágoált-
   ni
   (I let [János] [unspecified cause] you go)
   b. *hagyjak
   pro
   meg-lágoált-ni-a
   PV-VIS-INF
   (I let you go)
   c. hagyjak
   PRO
   nem
   meg-lágoált-a
   not
   PV-VIS-INF
   (I do not let you go)

32 István Knessy (p.c.) points out that even with the so-called ők (the “-k” verbs) whose PRES.3SG.INDEF ends in -k), which do not normally accept 1SG.INDEF and take -m instead (cf. megnősí-n*ojkó oreg "I am eating an apple"), we find -lak/-lek, not *-lam/-lem: megnősí-lak tíged I cut 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 -t (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 -t: 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 subject 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[PRES] 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 *zsekit-l-at-look or *zseketli-look, instead, to express ‘we love you’ or *(s)he loves you’, Hungarian must use ‘plain’ indefinite object clitic -lek and zseket.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.

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 definite can be, always picking out a specific referent in the extra-linguistic discourse.35

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.36

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 -se as subject agreement markers instead of the subject clitics -m and -d is a question whose answer may lie in some kind of PERSON-NUMBER 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.

On speaker variation with respect to ‘case switch’ and ‘upstairs agreement’ under long-distance focus fronting (whence the ‘*-t’ in the examples in (4b) and (4c)), see Gervain (2003, 2005); I will come back to this below.
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 NÖ ‘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. Kenesi (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.39

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 (italicized in the examples) depending on the idiosyncratic case-assignment properties of the matrix verb.

```
(30) a. kailan pinaniwala-an ng sundalo [na uuwi ang Pangulo]?  
    when believed-DAT ANG soldier that NOM-will-go-home ANG president  
    [at that-ACC]  
    when will-say-ACC ANG soldier that NOM-will-go-home ANG president  
    when NOM-will-say ANG soldier that NOM-will-go-home ANG president  
    when OBL-promised ANG soldier that NOM-will-go-home ANG president  

    c'. *kailan naniwala ang sundalo [na uuwi ang Pangulo]?  

Rackowski & Richards show that the upstairs verb must agree with the complement–CP and cannot agree with the extractor — they present examples of the type in (31), where the extractor 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 ...

```
a. [na sinabi- ng guro [na bibigay-an ng lalaki ng bulaklak ]]
    [at said-ACC ANG teacher that would.give-DAT ANG man ANG flower ]
    when believed-DAT ANGsoldier thatNOM-will-go-home ANG president
    when will.say-ACC ANG soldier that NOM-will-go-home ANG president
    when NOM-will-say ANG soldier that NOM-will-go-home ANG president
    when OBL-promised ANG soldier that NOM-will-go-home ANG president

b. [na p-pinangako ng guro [na bibigay-an ng lalaki ng bulaklak ]]
    [that said-ACC ANG teacher that would.give-DAT ANG man ANG flower ]
    when believed-DAT ANGsoldier thatNOM-will-go-home ANG president
    when will.say-ACC ANG soldier that NOM-will-go-home ANG president
    when NOM-will-say ANG soldier that NOM-will-go-home ANG president
    when OBL-promised ANG soldier that NOM-will-go-home ANG president

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.40

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.41 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 Complement). In other words, once v has established an Agree relationship with CP, CP becomes transparent, and v can attract the wh-phase 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-phase in the outer SpecP in the matrix clause, and will successfully attract the wh-phase up to SpecCP. If v had not established an Agree relationship with the complement–CP, the wh-phase would not have been extractable out of CP — on the assumption (which Rackowski & Richards argue for at length) that the wh-phase in Tagalog does not rise to the embedded SpecCP prior to leaving the clause (i.e., it is attracted to the matrix SpecP straight from the embedded v’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.42

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

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 SpecP, 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 too easy to take care of without a stopover in SpecCP.

```

I will return to the wayINF agreement is licensed in constructions involving finite CP complementation; Kenesi’s (1994) analysis serves expository purposes here.

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/hen 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 NÓT a woman-ACC akar-ok* hogy ec elnök legyen (= (4b‘))
    b. AZT A NÓT that woman-ACC akar-am* hogy ec elnök legyen be-SUBJ-3SG
    c. TÉGED you-OBJ akar-lak* hogy ec elnök legyél (= (4d))

A possible response to these facts would be to say that some or even all of these examples involve a derivational process 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 that face they face for Passamaquoddy long-distance agreement. Consider (34).

(34) a. n-wewitaham-a-k [mate nomiyawik sawsawunyovok Kehlík]
    i-remember-DIR-3PL not i-saw-them people Calais-LOC
    ‘I remember that I didn’t see people in Calais’ (Passamaquoddy)
    b. k-giluwitaham-ul [Míihku kemtumacebat ‘sami sahphpihk-chimí]
       2-suspect-1/2 Míihku would-leave because drive.up-2
    ‘I suspected (about you) that Míihku 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 ‘agreee’ 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 ‘nominalization’ (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 boys’ 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 Fenyvesy 1995.)
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, 46 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 downwards agreement under ‘case switch’ and upwards 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.

46 At this point, it is worth highlighting that Hungarian here behaves similarly to Tsez (Polinsky & Potsdam 2001), Inn-aaimin (Branigan & MacKenzie 2002), Passamiquoddy (Bruening 2001) and Itelmen (Bobaljik & Wurmbrand, to appear).
In Tsez (and the other languages just mentioned), Agree between v and the embedded clause as a whole (shown in (43a)) 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 (43a) and (43c), the latter containing a downstairs complementiser, illustrates this interdependence between long-distance agreement and the absence of a lower complementiser.

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).

In Hungarian cases of long focus fronting of the subject of an embedded finite clause, the situation will 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.25 Agree between v and the focused fronted, 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 simultaneous and that the surface spell-out of Acc-Case is determined in the morpho-phonological 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

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).

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 appropriates v’s ACC feature when the verb takes a CP complement. Note that I am not assuming Kenesei’s (1994) act-mediated analysis of apparently simple cases of CP—complementation (invoked at the outset of section 4) 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 nonglass-class ECM constructions featuring sub-ch-assignment (Pastoral 1974, Kayne 1984, Bošković 1997, i.e.) 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 established. This allows us to understand the difference in grammaticality between (i) and (ii), basically along the lines of Kayne’s (1983) original account (involving Case-assignment in SpecCP, to the intermediate trace of the sub-chain). Of course the empirical picture is more complex than this: nonglass-class ECM constructions are also salvageable in other ways (via passivisation and thw-insertion). I have nothing to say about these options at this time; see Bošković (1997) for particularly detailed discussion.

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 not only used 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: indefinite 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).53

(48) a. *KÉT FIÚ akar-om, hogy ec elnők legyen (= (4b))
   a woman(NOM) want-1SG.DEF that president be-SUBJ-3SG
   a woman-ACC akar-ok, hogy ec elnők legyen (= (4b′))
   a woman-ACC want-1SG.INDER that president be-SUBJ-3SG

b. *KÉT FIÚ az akar-om, hogy ec elnők legyen
   a woman-ACC akar-ok, hogy ec elnők legyen (= (33b))
   a 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 Agreement 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. [\_Foc \[.Voc \[ ... \]]\] /CP C [\_p, \_t \[T \[ ... \]]\] (cf. (39b))
   a. long-focus, [\_Foc \[.Voc \[ ... \]]\] /CP C [\_p, \_t \[T \[ ... \]]\] (cf. (39b))
   a. long-focus, [\_Foc \[.Voc \[ ... \]]\] /CP C [\_p, \_t \[T \[ ... \]]\] (cf. (39b))
   a. long-focus, [\_Foc \[.Voc \[ ... \]]\] /CP C [\_p, \_t \[T \[ ... \]]\] (cf. (39b))

53 Note that if (48b) 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 (48b), that lower-subject foci can participate in such that they can ‘retain’ their nominative case. That derivation is (46a), a full-sweep 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.

A question that the account presented so far has remained neutral on is whether a long-moving 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? 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, inexpressibly so: it originates in a position (left somewhat under-specified in (50a)) in which it is the closest 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 Agreement 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 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 Agreement relationship between v and CP), and nominative Case for the focus. But when the extracted lower-subject focus is definite, (50b) has no output because its spell-out is less specific than that of (50c) in this context: if the focus is DEF and v morphologically agrees with its intermediate copy in SpecCP, as in (50c), 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 simultaneous Agreement 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 Agreement 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 (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 us to the way here: with (50c) and (50d) in direct competition, economy considerations reject (50c) in favour of the simpler derivation in (50d).
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, aglutinatively. 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.

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,t ACC should yield *te-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 (and I suspect that this conclusion might be pushed even more drastically 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 DIACC head establishes an Agree relationship with téged in its base position, which results in a φ-feature agreement between DIACC and the extracted pronoun; but since this pronoun has an accusative Case feature, not a nominative one, and since it does not raise through nominative Spec, on its way out, the EPP–property and the nominative Case feature of embedded DIACC are checked by a null expletive pro in SpecTP — much like the way Italian (Rizzi 1982) and several northern-Italian dialects (Brandi & Cordon 1988) handle subject extraction out of finite clauses and circumvent the ‘that–t filter’. Finally, the object clitic -t (an integral part of the t-ak-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’)
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(51) *who do you think r would never complain when the teacher punishes pg?

(52) a. *ki a mondtad hogy sosem panaszodnak azután hogy a tanító megkibent a who-PL-ACC you-said that never complain-3PL after that the teacher punishes
b. *ki mondatt hogy sosem panaszodnak azután hogy a tanító megkibent 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 (55c) or (55d), delivering a violation of the anti-c-command condition. 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: kiker 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 kiker, 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 (53a)–(55a).

(53) a. *kiker mondtal hogy two boy-ACC you-said that
   b. *kiker mondtal hogy two boy-ACC you-said that

(54) a. *kiker mondtal hogy two boy-ACC you-said that
   b. *kiker mondtal hogy two boy-ACC you-said that

(55) a. *kiker szeretnek two boy-ACC you-wish that
   b. *kiker szeretnek two boy-ACC you-wish that

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) and (34), 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 SpecCP (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 azur–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 E. Kiss and Judit Gervain for constructing the examples in (54) and (55), and providing judgements.

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 higher-subject wh-constructions raises to SpecCP or stays in SpecCP; it will always be higher than the wh–adjunction itself. See Den Dikken (2006) for discussion of successful extraction from highest-subject wh-constructions.
It is difficult to see how this could be learnt: negative evidence would seem to be required to acquire it. Categorial island effects are in evidence here; cf. also Richards 1997. I will not discuss this any further here.

Croatian multiple-wh ‘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 Radul in) for other wh’s, hence wh-island effects are in evidence here; cf. also Richards 1997). I will not discuss this any further here.

There does indeed seem to be a correlation between multiple-wh-fronting to the C-domain and allowability of wh-island ‘violations’ (cf. Radul 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 Radul in) for other wh’s, hence wh-island effects are in evidence here; cf. also Richards 1997). I will not discuss this any further here.

61 There does indeed seem to be a correlation between multiple-wh-fronting to the C-domain and allowability of wh-island ‘violations’ (cf. Radul 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 Radul in) for other wh’s, hence wh-island effects are in evidence here; cf. also Richards 1997). I will not discuss this any further here.
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