

Focus as a Case Position in Hungarian*

Elizabeth Coppock

1 Introduction

Through a series of articles including Molnár 1998, Molnár & Järventausta 2003 and Molnár 2006, and perhaps most explicitly in Molnár & Winkler 2009, Valéria Molnár has defended the importance of information structural notions such as contrast in grammar. In this paper I would like to point out that Hungarian provides a striking piece of evidence for the position that grammar and information structure are closely intertwined. In Hungarian, accusative case can be assigned by a verb to a noun phrase, triggering definiteness agreement, purely in virtue of the fact that the noun phrase serves as the focus in the same clause as the verb. As I will argue, these accusative case-marked nominals are not objects of the verb – not thematic objects or even athematic objects – so their only link to the verb that assigns case to them is via information structure.

The noun phrases to which I refer are ones that have undergone *focus raising* (cf. Zolnay 1926; Máraczi 1989; É. Kiss 1987, 1990; Kenesei 1994; Horvath 1998; Lipták 2001; Gervain 2007; *inter alia*) from an embedded clause into a matrix clause. Focus-raising is illustrated in (1); it is an island-sensitive, long-distance movement of a non-*wh* item that can cross so-called “bridge verbs” such as *mond* ‘say’ to the focus position of the matrix clause (immediately to the left of the matrix

*This is a streamlined and polished version of my first qualifying paper at Stanford University, *Object Agreement in Hungarian*, which benefitted greatly from discussions with Joan Bresnan, Beth Levin, Peter Sells, David Beaver, and Paul Kiparsky. I would also like to thank Katalin É. Kiss, Amy Dahlstrom and Stephen Wechsler for discussion of these issues, and Agnes Mihalik for extensive native speaker judgments. This paper is, of course, dedicated to Valéria Molnár, whose warmth, kindness and encouragement towards me during my far-too-brief stay at Lund University has meant the world to me and inspired me to become a better person. Happy birthday Valéria!

verb). In these respects it is similar to *wh* movement, illustrated in (2).

- (1) Holnap mond-ott, hogy jön.
tomorrow say-PST.3SG.IN COMP come.3SG.IN
'He said that he would come *tomorrow*.'
- (2) Mikor mond-ott, hogy jön?
when say-PST.3SG.IN COMP come.3SG.IN
'When did he say he would come?'

Usually, the fronted element bears the morphological case that it would bear if it were expressed in the lower clause. However, there is one class of exceptions to this general pattern, both in focus-raising and in question formation. When the subject of the embedded clause raises to the matrix focus position, the fronted phrase may bear accusative case:

- (3) Péter-t mond-t-a, hogy jön.
Péter-ACC say-PST-3SG.DEF COMP come.3SG.IN
'It is Peter who he/she said is coming.'

Péter would of course get nominative, not accusative, downstairs:

- (4) János mond-t-a, hogy Péter jön.
John.NOM say-PST-3SG.DEF COMP Peter.NOM come.3SG.IN
'John said that Peter is coming.'

Clearly, the accusative case on the focus-raised subject is coming from the matrix verb. In §2, I argue that focus-raised subjects are not objects of the matrix verb in any sense, so the only link between the matrix verb and the focus-raised subject is information structural.

In §3 I will make a brief detour to establish the following generalization:

(5) **Case-Agreement Generalization**

A verb agrees in definiteness with a noun phrase in Hungarian if and only if it assigns accusative case to it.

The focus-raising data shows that a verb sometimes agrees with an accusative-case marked noun phrase that is not its object. But simply bearing accusative case and being in the same clause is not enough; verbs only agree with nominals to which they *assign* accusative case.

In §4 I will return to focus-raising with this generalization in hand and argue that object focus-raising also exemplifies case-assignment to a non-argument. The evidence for this is that focus-raised objects optionally agree in definiteness with the matrix verb, so, given the Case-Agreement Generalization, there is case-assignment from the matrix verb to the focus-raised object in these cases. This means that both subject and object focus raising exemplify case-assignment to a noun phrase whose sole link to the case-assigning verb is through information structure.¹ And this means that information structure is everywhere; not even the theory of case-assignment can escape it.

2 Subject focus-raising

If accusative focus-raised subjects were objects of the matrix clause, then the subtype of focus-raising illustrated in (3) would be a kind of control, or A-movement. This control relation would either be *equi*, where the matrix verb assigns a θ -role to the accusative, or *raising* to a non-thematic position. The normal *say*, of course, has only two arguments, as roughly schematized in (6):²

- (6) *say* < agent, proposition >

I assume that focus-raising normally involves a verb with this argument structure, and targets an A' position. If focus-raised accusative subjects are *thematic* objects of the verb, then the matrix verb assigns a θ -role to them and the control relation is *equi*, and the verb has the argument structure schematized in (7).

- (7) *say* < agent, theme, proposition > [Equi hypothesis]

The raising option, according to which they are *athematic* objects of the verb, is given in (8), where the placement of 'Ø' outside the angle brackets indicates that

¹There is a great controversy over how elements in the 'focus' position are interpreted. The traditional notion that it signals focus interpretation, as the name suggests, has been challenged and it has been proposed instead that the position is for exhaustive identification (Horvath 2005; É Kiss 2007 *i.a.*). The notion that elements in this position are interpreted exhaustively has also been challenged, however; see Onea (2009) and references cited therein. I take it as uncontroversial that there is *some* information-structural notion similar to focus that the preverbal position is associated with, and the point I aim to make here is independent of what that turns out to be.

²I do not mean to imply that there is a fixed inventory of thematic roles; I use these labels only for convenience.

the argument is subcategorized syntactically but not assigned a thematic role, in pseudo-LFG-style (Bresnan 2001):

- (8) *say* < agent, proposition > ∅ [Raising hypothesis]

Another way of describing the raising hypothesis schematized in (8) is that the matrix verb subcategorizes an object position (distinct from the position occupied by the complement clause) without assigning a thematic role to it (cf. the discussion of object expletives in Postal & Pullum 1988; Runner 2000; Roberge 2002), and the focus-raised subject moves into this position prior to moving into the focus position. In §2.1, I will argue against the equi option; in §2.2, I will argue that the raising option cannot be right either (contra Coppock 2003).

2.1 Against equi: Incorporation

If accusative focus-raised subjects were assigned a θ -role by the matrix verb, then we would expect them to be able to incorporate, in the sense in which bare (determinerless, non-plural, but potentially case-marked) nominals are incorporated. Although they are not incorporated in the prototypical way (e.g. as in Navajo), Farkas and de Swart 2003 argue that bare nominals such as *beteget* in (9) participate in Type I Incorporation ('incorporation as juxtaposition'), according to the typology of incorporation given by Mithun 1984.

- (9) *Az orvos beteg-et vizsgál-t.*
the doctor patient-ACC examine-PST.3SG.IN
'The doctor patient-examined.'

Evidence for this comes from the fact that they have the same distribution as verbal prefixes (called "preverbs"), and from their semantics: incorporated nominals do not contribute a discourse referent, but rather further specify the kind of event denoted by the verb.

This type of incorporation is not possible for focus-raised subjects:

- (10) **Nem szabad nő-t mond-ani, hogy csunya.*
not allowed woman-ACC say-*INFIN* COMP ugly
'It is forbidden to say that women are ugly.'

The ungrammaticality of (10) cannot be attributed to the presence of a complement clause, as we can see using the verb (*meg*)*kér*, which takes an animate accusative object in addition to a subjunctive complement clause.

- (11) *A tolmács-ot kér-t-em, [hogy lefordít-s-a a cikk-et].*
the translator-ACC ask-PST-1SG.DEF COMP translate-SBJ-3SG.DEF the article
'I asked the translator to translate the article.'

The animate accusative is a thematic object of that verb, and thus can be incorporated:

- (12) *Nem szabad tolmács-ot kér-ni, hogy lefordítsa.*
not allowed translator-ACC request-*INFIN* COMP translate.SBJ
'It is forbidden to ask a translator to translate.'

Example (12) involves incorporation according to the semantic diagnostic; no translator is implied to exist. It displays the syntactic properties of incorporation as well. So incorporation is compatible with the presence of a selected complement clause.

Note also that incorporation in Hungarian is quite free, semantically. According to Farkas and de Swart (2003: 96), "in Hungarian the incorporation construction is freely available, and is not restricted to a set of lexical verbs ('incorporating verbs,' like in West Greenlandic for instance)". Thus, example (10) is not due to a semantic restriction on incorporation.

What (10) shows, then, is that accusative focus-raised subjects do not incorporate, and are in this respect unlike regular objects. This makes sense if accusative focus-raised subjects are not arguments of the verb; only arguments of the verb are expected to incorporate.

2.2 Against control in general

Given only what we have seen so far, it is still possible to maintain that focus-raised accusative subjects are matrix objects; the construction could be analyzed as raising, and the accusatives, therefore, as athematic objects of the matrix verb. In this section I will present three arguments against this view.

2.2.1 Argument 1: Focus-raising is long-distance

The long-distance nature of (subject) focus-raising as shown in (13) speaks against the notion that the focus-raised subject undergoes a type of A-movement; A-movement is typically clause-bounded.

- (13) János-t mond-t-am, [hogy hall-ott-am, [hogy jön]].
 John-ACC say-PST-1SG COMP hear-PST-1SG COMP come.3SG.IN
 'It was John that I said that I heard was coming.'

2.2.2 Argument 2: Binding

Another argument for the non-object status of accusative focus-raised subjects is that they can be non-reflexively bound by the matrix subject. This is shown in (14), where the non-reflexive pronoun-plus-emphatic *Ő magát* 'him, himself' is bound by the matrix subject.

- (14) Ő_i magá-t mondta Péter_i hogy szeret-i
 He himself-ACC say-PST-3SG.DEF Peter.NOM COMP love-3SG.DEF
 Mari-t.
 Mary-ACC
 'It is him_i, himself_i, that Peter_i said loves Mary.'

The non-reflexive anaphor in (14) is preferable to the reflexive anaphor in (15).

- (15) Önmagá-t_i mondta Péter_i hogy szeret-i Mari-t.
 himself-ACC say-PST-3SG.DEF Peter.NOM COMP love-3SG.DEF Mary-ACC
 'It is himself_i that Peter_i said loves Mary.'

This is parallel to the English situation illustrated in (16) and (17) (thanks to Joan Bresnan, p.c.).

- (16) It was himself_i that he_i said likes Mary.
 (17) It was him_i, himself_i, that he_i said likes Mary.

I find (17) slightly preferable to (16), but I find both grammatical. In (16) and (17), there is no reason to believe that the anaphors are objects of *say*, but the clefting indicates that they function as the focus of *say*. Thus focussed reflexive anaphors can in general be bound by subjects of the same clause, even though they are not objects. The fact that accusative focus-raised subjects may be reflexively bound by the matrix subject is therefore *not* evidence for the idea that they are matrix objects.

The binding configuration in (14) is not possible for regular objects; this is evidence *against* the objecthood of that anaphor. A non-reflexive pronoun functioning as an object cannot be bound by a subject in the same clause; this would be a Condition B-type violation. This is illustrated in (19).

- (18) Péter_i önmagá-t_i utálja.
 Peter.NOM himself-ACC hate-3SG.DEF
 Peter hates himself.
 (19) *Péter_i [ő magá-t_i] utálja.
 Peter.NOM him himself-ACC hate-3SG.DEF
 'Peter hates himself.'

To summarize, a focussed pronoun need not be reflexive when bound by the subject of the same clause, contrary to what we would expect if it were an object. Objects must be reflexive if bound by the subject in the same clause. Accusative focus-raised subjects are therefore not objects.

2.2.3 Argument 3: Depictives

Another piece of evidence against the treatment of accusative-marked focus-raised subjects as objects comes from depictive secondary predication. As in English, depictives can modify either the subject or the object in a simple transitive sentence, as in (20).

- (20) János-t_j lát-t-am_i részeg-en_{i/j}.
 John-ACC see-PST-1SG drunk-ly
 'I saw John drunk.'

Here, either John or the speaker may be construed as having been drunk. The same adverb, in the same position, cannot modify an accusative focus-raised subject, as shown in (21).

- (21) János-t_j lát-t-am_i részeg-en_{i/j}; hogy beszél-get-ett Mari-val.
 John-ACC see-PST-1SG drunk-ly COMP speak-FREQ-PST Mary-with
 'John, I saw drunk that he was chatting with Mary.'

In (21), *részegen* may only modify the speaker, not John.

In English, depictives are known to be capable of modifying only a subject or an object; they cannot modify, for example, an indirect object.

- (22) a. John_i fried the potatoes naked_i. (Rapoport 1999: 653)
 b. John fried the potatoes_i raw_i.
 (23) *John fried Mary_i the potatoes hungry_i.

Not all verbs allow their objects to be modified by a depictive, and the generalization governing the distribution of depictives has been a subject of debate. Williams (1980) and McNulty (1988) characterize the set of English noun phrases that can be modified by a resultative in terms of thematic role; Rapoport (1999) argues that this is inadequate, and proposes an aspectually-based account. It has also been assumed throughout the literature that the domain of depictive secondary predicates is based on the presence or absence of a c-command relationship between the depictive and the NP to be depicted. Regardless of whether the relevant criteria should be stated in terms of thematic role, aspect, c-command, or some combination thereof, the contrast between (20) and (21) shows that focus-raised subjects are not objects of the matrix verb. As shown in (20), *lát* 'see' is the kind of verb that enables its object to be modified by a depictive, and the aspectual properties of (20) and (21) do not differ (both describe punctual events). Hence focus-raised subjects should be modifiable by depictives in (21) if they are objects; since they cannot be modified by depictives, they must not be objects.

The reader may still consider the comparison between (20) and (21) slightly unfair. While the depictive in (21) is set off on the right by a complement clause, nothing occurs to the right of the depictive in (20), so the two depictives may not be in the same place. But a depictive set off by a complement clause on the right may still modify a true matrix clause object, as the following example shows:

- (24) János-t_j kér-t-em_j meg részeg-en_{i/j}, hogy jöjjön
 John-ACC ask-PST-1SG.DEF PERF drunk-ly COMP come.3SG.SBJ
 'I asked John drunk to come' ...
 (és az-ért nem emlékez-ett).
 and COMP-because not remember-3SG.IN.PST
 ... (and so he didn't remember).

The modifiability of the focussed accusative in (24) is crucially *not* due to surface structure c-command. Even if the complement clause in (21) prevents the depictive from c-commanding the focus-raised accusative at surface structure, it should still be possible for the depictive to modify the accusative noun phrase if it is an underlying object, but this is not possible.

To summarize §2, we have seen a number of arguments against treating accusative case-marked focus-raised subjects as objects of the matrix verb. In §2.1 I argued based on incorporation that they cannot be thematic objects, ruling out

the 'equi' analysis sketched in (7). In §2.2 I argued for the stronger claim that they are not objects at all, not even athematic objects as under the 'raising' analysis sketched in (8). Evidence for this came from the fact that focus-raising is long-distance movement, the possibility of non-reflexive binding by the matrix subject, and the non-modifiability of focus-raised objects by matrix-clause depictives. This implies that accusative case-marked focus-raised subjects are assigned accusative case just because they are foci in the matrix clause.

3 Case assignment

In §4, I will argue that object focus-raising provides examples of purely focus-mediated case-assignment as well, but in order to make that argument, I must first establish a generalization regarding definiteness agreement. Although there is speaker variation as to whether the accusative case marker in (3) is obligatory, it holds universally among Hungarian speakers that when the focus-raised subject receives accusative case, the matrix verb agrees in definiteness with the focus-raised subject (Gervain 2007). When a definite nominal such as the proper name *Péter* (accusative *Péter-t*) focus-raises and receives accusative case, the matrix verb appears in the definite conjugation (*mond-t-a* 'say-PST-3SG.DEF'), as in (3). In this case it is opaque whether the matrix verb agrees with the focus-raised phrase or with the clause, because bridge verbs show definite agreement with their clausal complements. However, noun phrases with plural numeric determiners such as *két fiú-t* in (25) and question words such as *ki-t* in (26) are indefinite, and the matrix verb goes in the indefinite conjugation (*mond-ott* 'say-3SG.PST.IN') when these are focus-raised.

- (25) Két fiú-t mond-ott hogy jön.
 two boy-ACC say-3SG.IN.PST COMP come.3SG.IN
 'It was two boys that he/she said were coming.'
- (26) Ki-t mond-ott, hogy jön?
 who-ACC say-3SG.IN.PST COMP come.3SG.IN
 'Who did he/she say is coming?'

This suggests that verbs simply agree in definiteness with whatever accusative-case marked nominal they see lying around in their clause. But as this section will

demonstrate, being an accusative in the same clause with some verb is not an entirely sufficient condition for triggering definiteness agreement with that verb.

3.1 Indefinite accusatives, definite verbs

In 27, an indefinite accusative noun phrase co-occurs in the same clause with a definite verb form.

- (27) Két órát tanul-t-a a lecké-t.
two hour-ACC study-PST-3SG.DEF the lesson-ACC
'I studied the lesson (for) two hours.'

The real object *a leckét* 'the lesson' is definite; the temporal phrase is just an adverbial, and it is the real object that determines the conjugation of the verb. This example suggests that there is more than one kind of accusative case: accusative case that is assigned by the verb, and accusative case that is licensed independently. In (27), the verb assigns accusative case to its object, and the indefinite temporal adverbial has independently licensed accusative case. So object agreement is not governed by the simple rule, "Verbs agree in definiteness with anything that is accusative-marked in the same clause."

It must be noted, however, that there does seem to be some kind of surface constraint relating accusative case and definiteness agreement. Consider the following example:

- (28) Két órát tanul-t.
two hour-ACC study-PST-3SG.IN
'He/she studied (for) two hours.'

The temporal expression *két órát* 'two hours' in (28) cannot be replaced by a definite accusative, as in (29).

- (29) *Az egész nap-ot tanul-t.
the whole day-ACC study-PST.3SG.IN
Intended: 'He/she studied all day.'

Assuming that accusative temporal adverbials have independently licensed accusative case, there should be no problem making the accusative definite, but (29) shows that this is not the case. This suggests that there may be an additional surface constraint regulating the distribution of accusative definite nominals.

3.2 Definite accusatives, indefinite verbs

We have seen already that the surface constraint on definite verb forms is insufficient to account for cases in which an indefinite accusative co-occurs with a definite noun phrase. There are also counterexamples involving definite accusatives. Consider again the verb *megkér* 'request', which takes an animate accusative requestee argument and a finite clause. It agrees with the animate accusative argument in definiteness, normally:

- (30) a. Meg-kér-t-e (őt), hogy hoz-z-a el a
PERF-ask-PST-3SG.DEF him/her COMP bring-SBJ-3SG.DEF away the
könyv-et.
book-ACC
'He asked him/her to bring the book.'
- b. Meg-kér-t (engem), hogy hoz-z-am el a
PERF-ask-PST-3SG.IN me COMP bring-SBJ-1SG.DEF away the
könyv-et.
book-ACC
'He asked me to bring the book.'

The finite clause argument of *megkér* 'request' is oblique, as evidenced by the fact that it can be associated with a sublativ (*-ra/-re* 'lit. onto') case-marked pronoun:

- (31) Ar-ra kér-t-e meg (őt), [hogy hoz-z-a
that-SUBL ask-PST-3SG.DEF PERF him/her COMP bring-SBJ-3SG.DEF
el a könyv-et].
away the book-ACC
'He asked him/her to bring the book.'

Despite the fact that the clause is oblique, it is marginally possible to focus-raise the object of the embedded clause in, for example, (30), and then the verb may agree either with it or with the implied accusative requestee, according to Számosi 1976.

- (32) a. A könyv-et kér-t meg, [hogy hoz-z-am el].
the book-ACC ask-PST.3SG.IN PERF COMP bring-SBJ-1SG.DEF away
'It was the book that he asked me to bring.'
- b. A könyv-et kér-te meg, [hogy hoz-z-am el].
the book-ACC ask-PST.3SG.DEF PERF COMP bring-SBJ-1SG.DEF away
'It was the book that he asked me to bring.'

In (32a), the indefinite verb form co-occurs with a definite accusative in the same clause, but this is alright because the accusative does not come from the verb.

Another example in which a definite accusative can co-occur with an indefinite verb in the same clause involves the verb *jön*. This verb does not agree in definiteness with the object of an embedded infinitive clause, and yet the object of the embedded infinitive may be expressed in the matrix clause, headed by *jön* (web attested example):

- (33) A legtöbb ember ő-t jött hallgat-ni.
 the most people him-ACC come.PST.3SG.IN hear-*INFIN*
 ‘The most people came and heard *him*.’

Here again we have a definite accusative in the same clause as an indefinite verb which does not assign accusative case to it.

To summarize §3, we have shown that the relationship between accusative case and definiteness agreement is not entirely direct. A verb does not agree in definiteness with any old accusative. Rather, the correct generalization is as follows:

(34) **Case-Agreement Generalization**

A verb agrees in definiteness with a noun phrase in Hungarian if and only if it assigns accusative case to it.

(This generalization falls out naturally from analyses such as that of den Dikken (1999), on which there is an AgrO projection that is the locus of accusative case assignment and checking of the definiteness feature. Under analyses such as that of Bartos (1999) on which there are distinct functional heads for accusative case checking and definiteness agreement, this generalization requires additional explanation.)

3.3 Infinitive-selecting verbs

Before returning to the main point, I would like to address a potential difficulty for the Case-Agreement Generalization that comes from infinitive-selecting verbs that agree in definiteness with the object of their complements. This is exemplified in (35), É. Kiss (2002: 203).

- (35) a. Meg-próbál-ok ritk-ább-an veszíteni el dolg-ok-at.
 PERF-try-1SG.IN rare-more-ly lose-*INFIN* away thing-PL-ACC
 ‘I’m trying to lose things more rarely.’

- b. Meg-próbál-om ritk-ább-an veszíteni el az esernyő-m-et.
 PERF-try-1SG.DEF rare-more-ly lose-*INFIN* away the umbrella-ACC
 ‘I’m trying to lose my umbrella more rarely.’

In (35a), the embedded verb’s infinitive object, *dolgokat* ‘things’ is indefinite, so the indefinite conjugation on the matrix verb is required. In (35b), the embedded object *az esernyőmet* ‘my umbrella’ is definite, so the definite conjugation on the matrix verb is required.

Facts related to preverb climbing indicate that the auxiliary-like verb *próbál* does not participate in “clause union” with the embedded verb. The future auxiliary verb *fog* behaves similarly to *próbál* ‘try’ in that they agree with the object of their complement, but it shows an additional clause-union property not witnessed with less auxiliary-like verbs like *próbál*. This is illustrated in (36).

- (36) Fel_i fog-ok t_i olvas-ni valami-t.
 up will-1SG.IN read-*INFIN* something-ACC
 ‘I will read something out.’

The “preverb-climbing” in (36) is not possible with more semantically contentful infinitive-selecting verbs like *próbál* ‘try’ (den Dikken 1999). This difference indicates that the verbs that allow it are more closely intertwined with their infinitival complements than the verbs that do not allow it. If preverb-climbing is the mark of clause-union, and lack of preverb-climbing indicates lack of clause-union, then the definiteness agreement phenomenon that we observe with verbs that do not allow preverb-climbing takes place in the absence of clause-union.³ This in turn suggests that the accusative with which the main verb agrees is not its object, nor even clausemate with the verb.

Furthermore, it is quite reasonable to assume that the object of the infinitive clause receives case from the infinitive verb; indeed, there are other infinitive constructions in which the matrix verb remains in the indefinite conjugation, regardless of the definiteness property of the embedded clause object (den Dikken 1999):

³Preverb-climbing can cross *hogy*-clause boundaries, though: *Fel akarom, hogy t_i olvasd a levelet* ‘I want you to read out the letter’. So we probably cannot assume that preverb-climbing implies clause-union. It still may be the case that lack of preverb-climbing implies non-clause-union, though.

- (37) Jött-él meg-látogat-ni valaki-t / Péter-t.
 came-2SG.IN PERF-visit-*INFIN* someone-ACC Peter-ACC
 ‘You came and visited someone.’
- (38) Igyeksz-ünk meglátogat-ni néhány kollégá-t / Péter-t.
 strive-1PL.IN visit-*INFIN* few colleague-ACC Peter-ACC
 ‘We make efforts to visit some colleagues.’

According to Bartos (1999) and É. Kiss (2002), the matrix verbs in these examples are intransitive, and therefore have no definiteness feature to check. This analysis is supported by the observation that the infinitive phrase that co-occurs with *jön* ‘come’ in (37) has a purpose interpretation, typical of adjuncts. Likewise, the complement of *igyekszik* ‘strive’ in (38) has an oblique function, and is therefore not a direct complement. Hence, the accusative case-marked object in these examples must receive case from the infinitive verb rather than the matrix verb.

This implies that in (35), the accusative case on the embedded object comes from the infinitive verb, rather than the matrix verb, with which it agrees in definiteness. A possible explanation for this apparent counterexample is that the matrix verb is actually agreeing with and assigning case to the infinitive phrase, which inherits definiteness from its complement; this is indeed what I assume in order to maintain the Case-Agreement Generalization.

4 Object focus raising

Now let us return to focus-raising. (The victory we achieve in this section may be seen to be Pyrrhic, but as Valéria said to me recently, it’s the journey, not the destination.) When objects of the embedded clause focus-raise, they agree in definiteness with the matrix verb as accusative focus-raised subjects do, although this agreement is optional (É. Kiss 1987):

- (39) Két lány-t mond-t-ál/-ad hogy Zoli fel-hív-ott.
 two girl-ACC say-PST-2SG.IN/DEF COMP Zoli.NOM up-call-PST.3SG.IN
 ‘You said that Zoli invited *two girls*.’

Given the generalization defended in the previous section, in the agreeing (indefinite) variant of (39), accusative case is assigned by the matrix verb to the focus-raised object. The focus-raised object is obviously not an argument of the matrix verb. Hence, this is another example of case-assignment mediated purely by focus.

Furthermore, in contrast to temporal adverbials, accusative focus-raised objects cannot co-occur with real direct objects that are also accusative-marked. The verb *megkér* ‘request’ assigns accusative case to an animate requestee argument in addition to taking a complement clause. With *megkér*, it is marginally possible to focus-raise the (accusative) object of the complement clause, but in the focus-raising situation the animate requestee cannot be overtly expressed:

- (40) Egy könyv-et kér-t meg (*engem), hogy hoz-z-ak
 the book-ACC ask-PST-3SG.DEF PERF me COMP bring-SBJ-1SG.IN
 el.
 away
 ‘It was a book that he/she asked me to bring.’

The fact that focus-raised accusatives may not co-occur with nominals to which the matrix verb would otherwise assign accusative case can be explained under the assumption that focus-raised elements receive accusative case from the matrix verb (unlike temporal adverbials, which have case independently).

Another case of optionality in focus-raising involves split bare NPs, as discussed recently by Jánosi (2011):

- (41) Autó-t mond-ott/-ta hogy új-at vett.
 car-ACC say-PST.3SG.IN/DEF that new-ACC bought
 ‘(S)he said that (s)he had bought a new *car*.’

Jánosi attributes the variation in object agreement to a difference in whether accusative case is assigned to the higher bare noun (*autót*) by the matrix verb; this is quite in line with what I have suggested for plain object focus-raising.

5 Conclusion

I have argued that in Hungarian, accusative case can be assigned by a verb to a noun phrase, triggering definiteness agreement, purely in virtue of the fact that the noun phrase serves as the focus in the same clause as the verb. As shown by data from incorporation, long-distance constructions, binding, and depictives, accusative case-marked focus-raised subjects are not objects of the verb – not thematic objects or even athematic objects – so their only link to the verb that assigns case to them is via information structure.

Based on the Case-Assignment Generalization—*A verb agrees in definiteness with a noun phrase in Hungarian if and only if it assigns accusative case to it*—I have argued that the same holds for accusative case-marked focus-raised objects that agree in definiteness with their are also examples where accusative case is assigned to a nominal purely in virtue of its information-structural status. Thus, both subject and object focus raising exemplify case-assignment to a noun phrase whose sole link to the case-assigning verb is through information structure. This means that the focus position in Hungarian is one to which accusative case can be assigned, and more broadly that information structure and grammar are closely intertwined.

References

- Bartos, Huba. 1999. Morfoszintaxis és interpretáció: a magyar inflexiók jeleségei szintaktikai háttere [Morphosyntax and interpretation: The syntactic background to inflectional phenomena in Hungarian]. PhD thesis, ELTE, Budapest.
- Bresnan, Joan. 2001. *Lexical-Functional Syntax*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Coppock, Elizabeth. 2003. Sometimes it's hard to be Coherent. In *Proceedings of LFG03 Conference*, ed. by Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King, 126–143. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- den Dikken, Marcel. 1999. Agreement and clause union. Ms., CUNY graduate center.
- É Kiss, Katalin. 1987. *Configurationality in Hungarian*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- É Kiss, Katalin. 1990. Why noun-complement clauses are barriers. In *Grammar in Progress*, ed. by J. Mascaró and M. Nespó, 265–277. Dordrecht: Foris.
- É Kiss, Katalin. 2002. *The Syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- É Kiss, Katalin. 2007. Topic and focus: Two structural positions associated with logical functions in the left periphery of the Hungarian sentence. In *The Notions of Information Structure*, ed. by Caroline Féry, Gisbert Fanselow & Manfred Krifka, 69–81. Berlin: University of Potsdam.
- Farkas, Donka. and de Swart, H. 2003. *The Semantics of Incorporation*. CSLI Publications.
- Gervain, Judit. 2007. Resumption in focus(-raising). *Lingua* 119(4): 687–707.
- Horvath, Julia. 1998. Multiple wh-phrases and the wh-scope-marker strategy in Hungarian interrogatives. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 45: 31–60.
- Horvath, Julia. 2005. Is 'focus movement' driven by stress? In *Approaches to Hungarian*, ed. by C. Piñón and P. Siptár, 131–158. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Jánosi, Adrienn. 2011. Long-distance split focalization in Hungarian: movement or base-generation? Talk presented at the 10th International Conference on the Structure of Hungarian.
- Kenesei, István. 1994. Subordinate clauses. In *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian*, ed. by Ferenc Kiefer and Katalin É Kiss, 275–354. New York: Academic Press.
- Lipták, Anikó. 2001. On the Syntax of *Wh*-Items in Hungarian. PhD thesis, Leiden University.
- Marácz, László. 1989. Asymmetries in Hungarian. PhD thesis, University of Groningen.
- McNulty, Edward. M. 1988. The Syntax of Adjunct Predicates. PhD thesis, University of Connecticut.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1984. The evolution of noun incorporation. *Language*, 60: 847–93.
- Molnár, Valéria. 1998. Topic in focus: On the syntax, phonology, semantics and pragmatics of the so-called "contrastive topic" in Hungarian and German. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 45: 89–166.
- Molnár, Valéria. 2006. On different kinds of contrast. In *Architecture of Focus*, ed. by Valéria Molnár & Susanne Winkler, 197–233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Molnár, Valéria and Järventausta, Maria. 2003. Discourse configurationality in Finnish and Hungarian. In *Structures of Focus and Grammatical Relations*, ed. by Jorunn Hetland, & Valéria Molnár, 111–148. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Molnár, Valéria and Winkler, Susanna. 2009. Edges and gaps: Contrast at the interfaces. *Lingua* 120(6): 1392–1415.
- Onea, Edgar. 2009. Exhaustiveness of Hungarian focus: Experimental evidence from Hungarian and German. In *Focus at the Syntax-Semantics Interface*, ed. by Arndt Rieger and Edgar Onea, 53–68. Stuttgart: Online Publikationsverbund der Universität Stuttgart.
- Postal, Paul M. and Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1988. Expletive noun phrases in subcategorized positions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19(4): 635–670.
- Rapoport, Tova R. 1999. Structure, aspect, and the predicate. *Language* 75(4): 653–677.
- Roberge, Yves. 2002. Transitivity requirement effects and the EPP. Paper presented at Western Conference on Linguistics (WECOL) 2002.
- Runner, Jeffrey T. 2000. The external object hypothesis and the case of object expletives. In *University of Rochester Working Papers in the Language Sciences* 1(2), ed. by Kathrine M. Crosswhite and James S. Magnuson, 257–269. Rochester: University of Rochester.
- Szamosi, Michael. 1976. On a surface structure constraint in Hungarian. In *Syntax and Semantics*, volume 7, ed. by Jim McCawley, 409–426. San Diego etc.: Academic Press.

Williams, Edwin. 1980. Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11: 203–238.

Zolnay, Gyula. 1926. Mondatátszövődés [Sentence-intertwining]. *Értekezések a Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Nyelv- és Széptudományi Osztálya Köréből* 23: 8–60.

Elizabeth Coppock, Heinrich Heine University, elizabeth.coppock@phil-fak.hhu.de

Enough!

A comparative study of clausal adverbials in English and Swedish*

Lars-Olof Delsing, Verner Egerland & Dianne Jonas

1 Introduction

English *enough* and its Swedish equivalent *nog* are commonly used to indicate quantity or degree, for instance as quantifiers of nouns (1a)–(1b) or modifiers of adjectives (2a)–(2b) and manner adverbs (3a)–(3b). Here and below, we do not include a gloss when the Swedish example is the equivalent of the given English example.

- (1) a. We have money enough to buy the house.
b. Vi har pengar nog för att köpa huset.
- (2) a. They were tired enough to go to bed.
b. De var trötta nog för att gå och lägga sig.
- (3) a. They answered intelligently enough to pass the exam.
b. De svarade intelligent nog för att klara tentan.

In (1a)–(3b), which we take to be examples of the basic meaning of these terms, *enough/nog* are paraphrasable by *sufficiently*. In a more functional use, *enough* and *nog* appear in adverbial phrases as in (4a)–(4b).

*Many thanks to Gunlög Josefsson and Ulf Teleman for discussing the data with us and to Valéria who has been an outstanding colleague and inspiring friend throughout the years.

Discourse and Grammar
A Festschrift in Honor of Valéria Molnár

Editors

Johan Brandtler, David Håkansson, Stefan Huber & Eva Klingvall



LUND UNIVERSITY

Dedication

On March 27, 2012, Valéria Molnár, Professor of German at Lund University, will celebrate her 60th birthday. For her birthday, we are most happy to be able to present Valéria with this Festschrift as an appreciation for her work in the field of linguistics. It was a pleasant surprise for the editors to learn how many friends wanted to pay their tribute to Valéria on this special occasion.

Valéria began her academic career at ELTE in Budapest. In 1991, she earned a Ph.D. in German linguistics at Lund University, successfully defending her thesis *Das TOPIK im Deutschen und im Ungarischen* ‘The TOPIC in German and Hungarian’. In 1999 she became a full professor for German linguistics at Lund University. An active instructor, Valéria is much appreciated by undergraduate and graduate students alike. She is also committed to numerous administrative assignments within the university and other scientific associations.

Valéria’s research primarily addresses the structuring of linguistic information, which she has investigated from a theoretical, contrastive, and typological perspective. However, her research interest reaches much further and, in a broad sense, is concerned with the interaction of linguistic form and function. Her many interests are mirrored in the 31 articles of this volume, including contributions from the field of German and Scandinavian studies as well as (theoretical) linguistics. Amongst the contributors are both colleagues and former students of Valéria’s.

The editors would like to thank all those who were instrumental in shaping the form and content of this Festschrift. A special thank you goes to *Vetenskapsso-cieteten i Lund* (‘Lund’s Scientific Society’), who made the printing of the book possible with a generous grant.

Happy birthday, Valéria!

March, 2012

Johan Brandtler, David Håkansson, Stefan Huber & Eva Klingvall

©2012 The Authors

Cover: Christian Berntsson

Photo: Lund University

ISBN: 978-91-637-0411-6

Set in Adobe Garamond Pro with L^AT_EX

Printed by Media-tryck, Lund University

Centre for Languages and Literature, Lund University 2012