**Adrienn Jánosi (CRISSP/HUB): Long-distance split focalization in Hungarian: movement or base-generation?**

*Introduction and main claim:*
Although long focus movement has received continuous attention in the Hungarian generative literature over the past decades (É.Kiss 1987, Puskás 2000, Lipták 1997), it has recently become a highly debated issue. Based on new data, Gervain (2007) and Den Dikken (2010) show that in addition to the movement derivation of long focus constructions, a group of speakers derives such structures by base-generating the focused DP in the matrix clause. This paper takes yet another set of data, namely long focus constructions involving split bare NPs (henceforth LDSF, see (1)), and argues that these structures are also derivable in two ways, i.e. movement and base-generation.

    (1) **AUTÓT**Foc mondott/mondta    hogy    **ÚJAT**Foc   vett.
        Car.ACC    said.3Sg.Indef./Def.   that    new.ACC    bought.3Sg.Indef
        *'(S)he said that(s)he had bought a new CAR.'*

*The data:*
In this talk I argue that Hungarian has four different subtypes of LDSF. This classification is based on the following three factors:

*1. The case of the higher DP*
There are two options for case-marking the higher DP (i.e. *AUTÓT* in (1)): case is either assigned by the matrix verb (3) or by the embedded verb (4). Note that *hall* 'hear' takes an accusative complement and *örül* 'be pleased' a dative one.

    (3) **AUTÓT**Foc    hallott         hogy    **ÚJNAK**Foc    örülnének.
        Car.ACC        heard.3Sg.**Indef.**   that    new.DAT     be.pleased.Cond.3Pl.
        *'(S)he heard that they would be pleased with a new car.'*
    (4) **AUTÓNAK**Foc    hallotta       hogy    **ÚJNAK**Foc     örülnének.
        Car.DAT        heard.3Sg.**Def.**    that    new.DAT      be.pleased.Cond.3Pl.
        *'(S)he heard that they would be pleased with a new car.'*

*2. Object definiteness agreement in the matrix clause*
A transitive matrix verb can either agree in definiteness (i.e. 'indefinite agreement' (6)) or not agree (i.e. 'definite agreement' (7)) with the higher DP in LDSF.

    (5) **AUTÓT**Foc     mondott       hogy    **ÚJAT** Foc   vett.
        Car.ACC        said.3Sg.**Indef.**   that    new.ACC    bought.3Sg.Indef
        *'(S)he said that (s)he had bought a new CAR.'*
    (6) **AUTÓT**Foc     mondta       hogy    **ÚJAT** Foc   vett.
        Car.ACC        said.3Sg.**Def.**   that    new.ACC    bought.3Sg.Indef
        *'(S)he said that (s)he had bought a new CAR.'*

*Correlation between factor 1 and factor 2:*
Indefinite agreement correlates with a case ending on the higher DP that is assigned by the matrix verb (see (3) and (5)) while definite agreement correlates with a case ending that is determined by the embedded verb (see (4) and (6)).

*3. The case of the lower DP*
The case of the lower DP is always determined by the embedded verb (i.e. ACC in (5)/(6) and DAT in (3)/(4)).

*The 4 patterns of LDSF with a transitive matrix verb*
The above facts yield a fourfold classification of LDSF structures with a transitive matrix verb. The four patterns are summarized in *table 1*.

| | **Case of the higher DP** | **Obj.agr on the matrix V** | **Case of the lower DP** |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Transitive embedded verb** | ACC | definite | ACC |
| | ACC | indefinite | ACC |
| **Intransitive embedded verb** | ACC | indefinite | OBL |
| | OBL | definite | OBL |

*Table 1. The 4 patterns of LDSF with a transitive matrix verb*

*Analysis:*

I argue that

1. LDSF constructions in which the higher DP does not agree with the matrix verb (i. e. line 1 and line 4 in *table 1*) are derived by successive cyclic A'-movement.

2. LDSF constructions in which the higher DP agrees with the the matrix verb (line 2 and line 3 in *table 1*) involve two DPs base-generated in their own clause along the lines of the 'concordial scope marking dependency' introduced in Den Dikken (2010).

Main arguments:

**a. Case mismatches:** It is clear from *table 1* that case mismatches between the higher and the lower DP are only allowed in cases where the higher DP agrees in (in)definiteness with the matrix verb. I rely on Merchant's (2004) generalization based on 16 languages that A'-binding dependencies are restricted by case, that is, A'-chains can only have one case. It follows from this that in contexts where case mismatches are allowed a movement analysis is excluded.

**b. Reconstruction effects:** As expected, reconstruction succeeds in the types of LDSF represented in line 1 and line 4 (*table 1*):

(7) **KÉPET  egymásról** Foc  mondta       hogy a     lányok **ÚJAT** Foc  csináltak.
     Photo.ACC each.other.ABOUT said.3Sg.**Def.** that the   girls   new.ACC  made.3Pl.Indef.
     *'(S)he said that the girls took new pictures of each other.'*

(8) **KÉPNEK  egymásról** Foc       mondta      hogy a      lányok **ÚJNAK** Foc   örülnének.
     Photo.DAT each.other.ABOUT   said.3Sg.**Def.** that  the    girls   new.DAT      would.be.happy.3Pl.Indef.
     *'(S)he said that the girls would be happy with a/some new picture(s) of each other.'*

It is not possible in the LDSF constructions illustrated in lines 2 and 3:

(9) *****KÉPET      egymásról** Foc       mondott      hogy a     lányok   **ÚJAT** Foc     csináltak.
     Photo.ACC     each.other.ABOUT   said.3Sg.**Indef.** that  the   girls     new.ACC     made.3Pl.Indef.
     *'(S)he said that the girls took new pictures of each other.*

(10)*****KÉPET      egymásról** Foc       mondott      hogy a     lányok   **ÚJNAK** Foc    örülnének.
     Photo.ACC     each.other.ABOUT   said.3Sg.**Indef.** that  the   girls     new.DAT     would.be.happy.3Pl.Indef.
     *'(S)he said that the girls would be happy with a/some new picture(s) of each other.'*

Main steps of the movement derivaton:

The full DP *új autó* 'new car' is base-generated in the embedded clause and is case-marked by the embedded verb. I assume that the DP is an elliptical appositive construction (i.e. [DP autót [DP új ~~autót~~]] ) ,which can explain the case marking on the stranded adjective. The full DP moves to Spec,FocP of the embedded clause, the site where the adjective remains stranded. The noun moves further up to the Spec,FocP of the matrix clause (i.e. subphrasal extraction of the core noun).

Main steps of the base-generation derivation:

The lower DP *új autó* 'new car' is base-generated in the embedded clause with the adjective in prenominal position. This DP is casemarked by the embedded verb. The higher DP *autó* 'car' is base-generated in the matrix clause and is case-marked by the matrix verb. Both DPs A'-move to the Spec,FocP of their respective clause. The noun in the lower DP (regarded as the 'donor' to the higher DP, cf. Den Dikken (2010)) is, apart from case, featurally identical to the noun in the higher DP (regarded as a scope marker, cf. Den Dikken (2010)). Concord established under closest c-command gives the scope marker all the features of the 'donor' (i.e. the lower DP) except for the ones that have already been checked in the embedded clause, i.e. case. Featural identity forces the 'donor' (lower DP) to delete while the scope marker (higher DP), having a case feature of its own, must be spelled out bearing its own case (Den Dikken 2010).

**References: Den Dikken, Marcel** 2010. On the strategies for forming long A'-dependencies: Evidence from Hungarian. **É. Kiss, Katalin** 1987. Configurationality in Hungarian. Dordrecht: Reidel. **Gervain, Judit** 2007. 'Resumption in focus(-raising)', in Lingua 119: 4. **Lipták, Anikó**. 1998. A magyar fókuszemelések egy minimalista elemzése.. In: Büky, L., Maleczki, M. (Eds.). Proceedings of A mai magyar nyelv leírásának újabb módszerei III. JATE Press, Szeged, pp. 93-115. **Merchant, Jason** 2004. Resumptivity and Non-Movement. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 24, 471‒481. **Puskás, Genovéva** 2000. *Word Order in Hungarian: The Syntax of A'-positions*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.