

## When Hungarians Agree (to Disagree) — The Fine Art of ‘Phi’ & ‘Art’

7<sup>th</sup> International Conference on the Structure of Hungarian (ICSH7) • Veszprém, Hungary • 29–31 May 2005  
Marcel den Dikken — Linguistics Program — CUNY Graduate Center — MDen-Dikken@gc.cuny.edu

---

The aim of this paper is (i) to review the realm of agreement phenomena in Hungarian, and (ii) to present a maximally integrated account of them from the point of view of the minimalist theories of Agree and locality. Hungarian agreement phenomena are conveniently classifiable as ‘phi-based’ or ‘article-based’ — where by ‘phi-based’ we mean that reference is made to the phi-features of the agreeing elements, and by ‘article-based’ we refer to agreement between the finite verb and the (possibly phonologically null) definite article (D–head; cf. Bartos 1997) of an accusative-marked noun phrase in its complement. Assuming this dichotomy, the Hungarian agreement phenomena that this paper will concern itself with can be summarised as follows:

### ‘Phi’:

- agreement and anti-agreement in possessed noun phrases
- agreement, anti-agreement and lack of agreement in adpositional phrases
- agreement, anti-agreement and lack of agreement on causativised infinitives
- apparent person agreement on finite verbs (2<sup>nd</sup> person *-lak/lek*)

### ‘Art’:

- ‘objective’ agreement as definite article (‘Art’) agreement
- ‘objective’ agreement and the behaviour of pronominal objects
- ‘objective’ agreement and restructuring/clause-union constructions
- ‘objective’ agreement (and Case switch) in ‘raising-to-object’ contexts

For ‘phi-based’ agreement and anti-agreement in possessed noun phrases, Den Dikken (1999a) presents an analysis assimilating it to agreement and anti-agreement in Celtic (Welsh, in particular). That analysis, while empirically largely adequate, is in need of revision in view of its reliance on Spec–Head agreement, a structural relation that is unformulable in current minimalism. The analysis of agreement phenomena in Hungarian possessed noun phrases will be rethought from an Agree-based perspective, taking our cue from Rezac & Joutiteau’s (to appear) insightful account of Breton. This account will be extended to agreement in adpositional phrases (Marác 1989, É. Kiss 2002:Ch. 8), which, apart from full and anti-agreement also exhibit lack of agreement (unlike possessed nominals), and thus introduce one additional variable. The same three-way agreement split manifests itself in the domain of inflected infinitives (Tóth 2000), whose analysis is the most elusive of the three prominent phi-agreement domains. New empirical material will be presented to carefully gauge the factors governing the distribution of agreement, anti-agreement and lack of agreement in infinitives.

‘Phi-based’ agreement in Hungarian, outside the domain of subject agreement, is by and large a matter of number; but the special *-lak/lek* form of finite verbs seems to instantiate person agreement with the object. Den Dikken (1999b/2004) analyses it in terms of object cliticisation, breaking *-lak/lek* up into an object clitic *-l* and a subject-agreement marker *-k* — the subject-agreement marker from the ‘subjective/indefinite’ agreement paradigm. Second person objects thus behave on a par with first person objects, which likewise trigger ‘subjective/indefinite’ agreement. The paper will revisit the account of these facts presented in Den Dikken (1999b/2004), simplifying it and bringing it in line with the Agree-based approach, capitalising on ‘objective’ (or ‘definite’) agreement being ‘art-based’. A major ingredient of the discussion of ‘art-based’ agreement in Hungarian in the paper will be an analysis of ‘long-distance’ agreement — both in restructuring or clause-union contexts and in cases of *wh*/focus-movement out of an embedded finite clause. The latter’s account will be modelled closely on the analysis of ‘raising-to-object’ phenomena found in Algonquian (Bruening 2001, Branigan/MacKenzie 2002), Tsez (Polinsky/Potsdam 2001) and Itelmen (Bobaljik/Wurmbrand, to appear).

## References

- Bartos, Huba. 1997. On ‘subjective’ and ‘objective’ agreement in Hungarian. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 44. 363–84.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan & Susi Wurmbrand. to appear. The domain of agreement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.
- Branigan, Phil & Marguerite MacKenzie. 2002. Altruism, A’-movement, and object agreement in Innu-aimûn. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33. 385–407.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2001. *Syntax at the edge: Cross-clausal phenomena and the syntax of Passamaquoddy*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Dikken, Marcel den. 1999a. 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. 1999b/2004. Agreement and ‘clause union’. In Katalin 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]
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2002. *The syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Marác, László. 1989. *Asymmetries in Hungarian*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Groningen.
- Polinsky, Maria & Eric Potsdam. 2001. Long-distance agreement and topic in Tsez. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19. 583–646.
- Rezac, Milan & Mélanie Joutiteau. to appear. Deriving the complementarity effect: Relativized Minimality in Breton agreement. *Lingua*.
- Tóth, Ildikó. 2000. *Inflected infinitives in Hungarian*. Ph.D. dissertation, Tilburg University.