

Case alternations in long-distance split focalization in Hungarian

Adrienn Jánosi, Hogeschool-Universiteit Brussel (HUB), janosiad@yahoo.com

Outline of the talk

1. Introduction

1.1. Some terminology and directions of previous research

1.2. The problem of case

1.3. Description of data

1.4. Properties of long-distance split focalization (SF)

2. A base-generation approach to split focalization

2.1. Syntactic characteristics of SF in the light of A-bar movement constructions

2.2. Arguments for a base-generated REM

2.3. Arguments for a base-generated CORE

2.4. Arguments against CORE and REM being one constituent

3. Conclusion

4. Further directions of research

1. Introduction

1.1. Some terminology and directions of previous research

Split topicalization (ST) is generally assumed to be a subtype of topicalization(cf. (1) and (2)).

(1) Topicalization:

[Szép gyűrű]_i kapott [e]_i Péter.

Beautiful ring.ACC got Peter

'Peter got a beautiful ring.'

(2) Split topicalization (ST):

[CORE Gyűrű]_i kapott [REM szépet t]_i Péter.

Ring.ACC got.3.Sg. beautiful.ACC Peter

'Peter got a beautiful ring.'

CORE: higher NP/preposed core of the constituent

REM: lower NP/stranded non-core of the constituent

Previous analyses (Van Hoof 2005, see Appendix 1)

1. Subphrasal extraction analyses (Van Riemsdijk, Haegeman, Giusti)
2. Verbal complex extraction (Fanselow)
3. Phrasal extraction analyses (Fanselow, Fanselow and Cavar, Van Hoof, Van Riemsdijk)

1.2. The problem of case

1.2.1. Necessary condition of the occurrence of case mismatches

A case mismatch is a mismatch of case endings between CORE and REM.

However, it only occurs when CORE is focalized but never when CORE is topicalized.

(3) [(A) GYŰRŰT]_{FP} mondta Péter hogy szépnek örülne.
The ring.ACC said Peter that beautiful.DAT would.be.pleased.he
'Peter said that he would be pleased with a beautiful ring.'

(4) *[(A) Gyűrűt]_{TopP} mondta Péter hogy szépnek örülne.
The ring.ACC said Peter that beautiful.DAT would.be.pleased.he
'Peter said that he would be pleased with a beautiful ring.'

1.2.2 Preliminary remark: Split topicalization and split focalization are different phenomena

The standard literature on split topicalization does not make this differentiation.

Standard assumption based on German data (without differentiating between short- and long-distance topicalization):

CORE: topic or secondary focus

REM: focus

Assumption based on Hungarian data (after differentiating between short- and long-distance topicalization):

Long-distance SPLIT TOPICALIZATION and long-distance SPLIT FOCALIZATION are different syntactic phenomena.

In Hungarian, split topicalization with a focused CORE shows different syntactic properties from split topicalization with a topicalized CORE.

1.3. Description of data

Observation 1: the adjective is not inflected in prenominal position

(5) Azt mondta Péter, hogy szép[*et] gyűrűt kapott.
That.ACC said Peter that beautiful[*ACC] ring.ACC bought.he
'Peter said that he'd got a beautiful ring.'

(6) Azt mondta Péter, hogy szép[*nek] gyűrűnek örülne.
That.ACC said Peter that beautiful[*DAT] ring.DAT would.be.pleased.he
'Peter said that he would be pleased with a beautiful ring.'

Observation 2: the embedded verb assigns case to the NP

(7) Azt mondta Péter, hogy szép gyűrű[*t]/nek örülne.
That.ACC said Peter that beautiful ring.[*ACC]/DAT would.be.pleased.he

Note: 'mond' (say) takes an accusative-marked complement clause. The expletive bears the case of the sentential argument.

Observation 4: in split focalization the adjectival REM takes the Case assigned by the embedded verb

(8) (A) gyűrűt mondta Péter hogy szépet kapott.
The ring.ACC said Peter that beautiful.ACC got.he
'Peter said that he'd got a beautiful ring.'

(9) (A) Gyűrűt mondta Péter hogy szépnek örülne.
The ring.ACC said Peter that beautiful.DAT would.be.pleased.he
'Peter said that he would be pleased with a beautiful ring.'

Observation 4: The preposed NP CORE takes the case ending corresponding to the theta grid of the matrix verb.

Observation 5: CORE can take an optional definite article. (preferred)

Q: Why does case ending occur on REM and why can it be a case different from that of CORE in split focalization?

1.4. Properties of long-distance split focalization (SF)

1. Case mismatch between CORE and REM is possible (cf. observation 4 in section 1.3.)

2. No expletive may co-occur with CORE:

(10) *Azt GYŰRŰT mondta Péter hogy szépet kapott.
That.ACC ring.ACC said Peter that beautiful.ACC got.he

(11) *GYŰRŰT azt mondta Péter hogy szépet kapott.
Ring.ACC that.ACC said Peter that beautiful.ACC got.he

2. A base-generation approach to split focalization

2.1. Syntactic characteristics of split focalization (SF)

1. Adjunct island: Indef. CORE - yes / def. CORE and embedded island - no

(12) *Bücher ist sie schon nach Hause gegangen [bevor sie [welche t_j] gelesen hat].
(Ott)
Books is she already to home go.Past.Part before she some read.Past.Part has
INTENDED: 'She often went home before reading some books.'

(13) *GYŰRŰT indultunk el mikor szépet láttam.
Ring.ACC left.we VM when beautiful.ACC saw.I
INTENDED: 'We were leaving when I saw a beautiful ring.'

(14) A gyűrűt mondtad hogy már elindultunk mikor szépet láttal.
The ring.ACC said.you that already left.we when beautiful.ACC saw.you

'You said that we had already left when you saw a beautiful ring.'

2. Complex NP constraint: Indef. CORE - yes / def. CORE and embedded island - no

(15) *[Augen] kenne ich [[NP keine Frau, [CP die schönere __i] hat [als ich]_j]]. (Van Hoof)
Eyes know I no woman who more.beautiful has than I
'As for eyes, I know no woman who has more beautiful ones than I have.'

(16) *Gyűrűt láttam olyan nőt aki szépet kapott.
Ring.ACC saw.I such woman.ACC who beautiful.ACC got
'I saw a woman who got a beautiful ring.'

(17) A gyűrűt mondtad hogy hallottad a hírt hogy szépet kaptam.
The ring.ACC said.you that heard.you the news.ACC that beautiful.ACC got.I
'You said that you had heard the news that I got a beautiful one.'

3. Mismatching adjectival inflections: yes

(18) [Polnische Gänse] hat sie [keine_] gekauft. (Van Hoof)
Polish geese has she none buy.Past.Part.
'As for Polish geese, she has bought none.'
Note: *[keine Polnische Gänse]

(19) Gyűrűt Péter szépet kapott.
Ring.ACC Peter beautiful.ACC got.Indef.obj
'Peter got a beautiful ring.' Note: (*[szépet gyűrűt])

4. Number disagreement: yes

(20) [Autos] hat er nur [eins_]. (Van Hoof)
Cars has he only one
'He's got only one car.'

- (21) **Biciklit** mondta Peter hogy a **nagyokat** vette.
 Bicycle.Sing.ACC said Peter that the big.Pl.ACC bought.he
'Of bicycles he bought the big ones.'

5. Determiner overlap: no

- (22) [CP [Eine Lösung] [C' hat er [NP eine bessere_] als ich]]. (Van Hoof)
 A solution has he a better than I
'As for solutions, he has a better one than I have.'

- (23) (A) gyűrűt mondta Péter hogy szépnek örülne.
 (the) ring.ACC said Peter that beautiful.ACC would.be.pleased.he
'Peter said he would be pleased with a beautiful ring.'

6. Non-source REMs: no

- (24) [Pflanzen hatte sie immer [welche_] im Angebot. (Van Hoof)
 Plants had she always some in.DAT offer
'As for plants, she always had some to offer.'
 *[NP welche Pflanzen]

Hungarian: -

7. Full-NP remnants: no

- (25) [Raubvögel] glaube ich kennt Gereon nur [Bussarde]. (Van Hoof)
 Birds.of.prey think I knows Gereon only buzzards
'As for birds of prey, Gereon knows only buzzards.'

Hungarian: -

2.2. Argument for a base-generated REM

2.2.1. Argument: The distribution of predicative and attributive adjectives

Following Lobeck (2005), it can be stated that the empty category in REM is licensed by the overt nominal features preceding and c-commanding it. This requirement can be satisfied by case morphology on the preceding adjective. The same conditions apply to NP ellipsis.

Adjectives/numerals which can only be used attributively (but not predicatively) can not occur in REM and can not undergo NP ellipsis:

'Kis' and 'kicsi' ('small')

Note: 'kis' (small) can only be used attributively. 'Kicsi' (small) can be used both attributively and predicatively.

Attributive use of the adjective:

- (26) **Kis** könyvet vettem, nem nagyot.
 Small book.ACC bought.I not big.ACC
'I bought a small book and not a big one.'

- (27) **Kicsi** könyvet vettem, nem nagyot.
 Small book.ACC bought.I not big.ACC
'I bought a small book and not a big one.'

Predicative use of the adjective:

- (28) *A könyv **kis**.
 The book small

- (29) A könyv **kicsi**.
 The book small
'The book is small.'

Adjective used as REM in split focalization:

(30) *Könyvet mondta Péter hogy **kist** vett.
Book.ACC said Peter that small.ACC bought.he

(31) Könyvet mondta Péter hogy **kicsit** vett.
Book.ACC said Peter that small.ACC bought.he
'Peter said that he bought a small book.'

Adjective used in elliptical NPs:

(32) A: Milyen könyvet vettél?
What book.ACC bought.you
'What book did you buy?'

B1: ***Kist**.
Small.ACC

B2: **Kicsit**.
Small.ACC
'A small one.'

(Note: The pattern is the same in the nominative, with no case ending on the adjective.)

'két' and 'kettő' ('two')

Note: The numeral 'két' can only be used attributively. The numeral 'kettő' can be used both attributively and predicatively.

Attributive use of the numeral:

(33) **Két** könyvet vettem, nem hármat.
Two book.ACC bought.I not three.ACC
'I bought two books and not three.'

(34) **Kettő** könyvet vettem, nem hármat.
Two book.ACC bought.I not three.ACC
'I bought two books and not three.'

Predicative use of the numeral:

(35) *Fogainak száma **két**.
Teeth.3Poss.PL.DAT number.Poss.3Sg two
INTENDED: 'The number of his teeth is two.'/'He's got two teeth.'

(36) Fogainak száma **kettő**.
Teeth.3Poss.PL.DAT number.Poss.3Sg two
'The number of his teeth is two.'/'He's got two teeth.'

Numeral used as REM in split focalization:

(37) *Könyvet mondta Péter hogy **kétet** vett.
Book.ACC said Peter that two.ACC bought.he
INTENDED: 'Peter said he had bought two books.'

(38) Könyvet mondta Péter hogy **kettőt** vett.
Book.ACC said Peter that two.ACC bought.he
'Peter said he had bought two books.'

Numeral used in elliptical NPs:

(39) A: Hány könyvet vettél?
How.many book.ACC bought.you
'How many books did you buy?'

B1: *Kétet.

Two.ACC

B2: Kettőt.

Two.ACC

(Note: The same pattern is used in the nominative, with no case ending on the numeral.)

2.2.2. Conclusion

Turning back to the original question, repeated here,

Why does case ending occur on REM and why can it be a case different from that of CORE in split focalization?

a possible answer to the first part of the question is:

Case morphology appears on the adjective used in REM as a result of NP ellipsis.

The answer immediately raises a new question, though:

Why is NP ellipsis obligatory in REM? (cf. Full NP remnants do not occur in Hungarian, as shown in section 2.1.)

This question is subject to further research.

2.3. Arguments for a base-generated CORE

Argument 1: Other left-peripheral, base-generated, case-bearing elements

It is not uncommon in Hungarian to have a left-peripheral, base-generated element in a clause which is case-marked without being theta-marked by the matrix verb. These elements are either expletives (40) or some other semantically empty constituents (41).

(40) [FP *Azt* *if* hallottam [IP *t* [CPj hogy [FP *Ildikót* veszi [IP *t* feleségül]]]]

That.ACC heard.I that **Ildikó.ACC** take.3Sg wife.as

'I heard that he would marry Ildikó.' (Puskas 2000 137)

(41) **Mit** mondott Péter hogy **minek** örülne, ami szép?

What.ACC said3Sg Peter that what.DAT please.Cond.3Sg which beautiful

'What did Peter say he would be pleased with which is beautiful?' (Horvath 1995)

Compare the example of partial wh-movement (41) to the example of split focalization (42).

Note that there is a correlation between the case mismatch patterns of the higher NP and the lower NP in the two sentences.

(42) A **gyűrűt** mondta Péter hogy **szépnek** örülne.

The ring.ACC said3Sg Peter that beautiful.DAT please.Cond.3Sg

'Peter said he would be pleased with a beautiful ring.'

Besides, the higher NP occupies the preverbal focus position in split focalization (note the verbal modifier-verb inversion showing that the focus position is filled in (43)), just like the scope-marking wh-element in partial wh-movement (41) and also like the expletive in the focused expletive-focused contentive construction (40)

(43) Gyűrűt felejtette el Péter hogy **szépet** vett.

Ring.ACC forgot VM Peter that beautiful.ACC bought.he

'Peter forgot that he'd bought a beautiful ring.'

Although CORE is a contentive element in the split focalization examples, there is reason to assume that it is base-generated in the same position as the expletive, as CORE is in complementary distribution with the expletive pronoun and it bears the case that the corresponding expletive would bear.

(44) Gyűrűt mondott Péter hogy **szépnek** örülne.

Ring.ACC said Peter that beautiful.DAT would.be.pleased.

'Peter said that he would be pleased with a beautiful ring.'

(45) **Azt* gyűrűt mondta Péter hogy **szépnek** örülne.

That.ACC ring.ACC said Peter that beautiful.DAT would.be.pleased

Argument 2: Case-mismatches do not occur in short-distance split focalization (cf. (48)).

(46) **Gyűrűt** kapott Peter **szépet**.

Ring.ACC got Peter beautiful.ACC

'Peter got a beautiful ring.'

(47) Gyűrűnek örülne Péter szépnek.
 Ring.DAT would.be.pleased.3Sg Peter beautiful.DAT
 'Peter would be pleased with a beautiful ring.'

(48) *Gyűrűt örülne Péter szépnek.
 Ring.ACC would.be.pleased.3Sg Peter beautiful.DAT
 INTENDED: 'Peter would be pleased with a beautiful ring.'

Argument 3: Optional definite object-verb agreement

(eg. (49)), which becomes obligatory when an optional (spurious) definite article precedes CORE (51):

(49) GYŰRŰT mondta Péter hogy szépét kapott.
 Ring.ACC said.Def.obj Peter that beautiful.ACC got.he
 'Peter said that he'd got a beautiful ring.'

(50) GYŰRŰT mondott Péter hogy szépét kapott.
 Ring.ACC said.Indef.obj Peter that beautiful.ACC got.he
 'Peter said that he'd got a beautiful ring.'

(51) A GYŰRŰT mondta Péter hogy szépét kapott.
 The Ring.ACC said.Def.obj Peter that beautiful.ACC got.he
 'Peter said that he'd got a beautiful ring.'

(52)*A GYŰRŰT mondott Péter hogy szépét kapott.
 The Ring.ACC said.Indef.obj Peter that beautiful.ACC got.he
 INTENDED: 'Peter said that he'd got a beautiful ring.'

Note: In the expletive-associate constructions the matrix verb is used with a def. obj. conjugation

2.4. Arguments against CORE and REM being one constituent

Argument 1: No case marking on REM as a premodifier

REM never bears a case suffix when CORE and REM occur as one constituent eg. in long focus movement:

(53) Szép[*et] gyűrűt mondta Péter hogy kapott.
 Beautiful[*ACC] ring.ACC said Peter that got.he
 'Peter said that he'd got a beautiful ring.'

Argument 2: Stress on both CORE and REM

When CORE and REM are merged to form a grammatical constituent, they can not both be stressed. However, they are both stressed in split focalization, no matter the position of REM.

(54) *['Szép 'gyűrűt] mondta Péter hogy kapott.
 Beautiful ring said Peter that got.he

(55) 'Gyűrűt mondta Péter hogy 'szépét kapott.
 Ring.ACC said.Def.obj Peter that beautiful.ACC got.he
 'Peter said that he'd got a beautiful ring.'

Based on the above arguments, a hypothetical answer can be given to the second half of the original question, repeated here:

Why does case ending occur on REM and why can it be a case different from that of CORE in split focalization?

Answer: CORE and REM can occur with mismatching case endings because they are both base-generated in their own clause.

REM is assigned case by the embedded verb, while CORE is base-generated in the position of the expletive (Spec, AgrOP of the matrix clause, cf. Gervain 2007)

3. Conclusions

1. Several independent structures are treated under the label 'split topicalization' and some of them seem to involve base-generation. Split focalization must be distinguished from split topicalization, just as long-distance cases must be distinguished from short-distance cases.

2. Factors influencing the island sensitivity of SF and similar structures are not clarified. Two crucial factors seem to be:

1. Definiteness of the noun phrase
2. Island embedding

4. Further directions of research

- To provide a detailed account of which type of SF (cf. with def./indef. CORE) show which type of island sensitivity to which types of islands (embedded or unembedded)
- To find where CORE and REM are base-generated
- To account for the obligatory ellipsis in REM
- To identify the link between CORE and REM

Appendix

Outline of previous analyses of split topicalization (based on Van Hoof 2005)

1. Subphrasal extraction analyses:

Van Riemsdijk (1989)

Movement and regeneration

(1) a. [CP [N' Definitiver Beweis]_i [C' ist bis jetzt [NP keiner *t*] gefunden worden]].

b. Regeneration: [CP [NP [N' Definitiver Beweis]_i] [C' ...

c. Relexicalization: [CP [NP Ein [N' definitiver Beweis]_i] [C' ...

Haegeman (1995)

Subphrasal movement without regeneration and relexicalization

(2) a. [QP keinen [DP einen Wagen]]

b. [DP Einen Wagen]_i hat er sich noch [QP *t* keinen *t*] leisten können.

'As for cars, he has not been able to afford one yet.'

Giusti (1993)

Subphrasal movement combined with a base-generated TOP

In this analysis TOP is base-generated in left-dislocated position and is co-indexed with a moved empty operator in Spec, C that binds an empty category in REM:

(3) [CP [F [NP] _i] [CP *O_{pi}* ... [VP ... [QP Q *t*] ...]]]

2. Extraction of a verbal complex from VP

Fanselow (1987)

Reanalysis and movement (R&M)

(4) a. D-str1: [VP [NP viele Mädchen] [V verführt]]

b. D-str 2 after reanalysis: [VP [NP viele *t*] [VC Mädchen_i verführt]]

SNPT (split noun phrase topicalization) and MST (mixed split topicalization) are derived by A'-movement of the verbal complex (VC) to Spec, C:

(5) a. [VC Mädchen]_i hat er schon [viele t_i] verführt.

'As for girls, he has seduced many.'

b. [VC Mädchen verführt]_i hat er schon [viele t_i].

'As for having seduced girls, he has already seduced many.'

Fanselow (1993)

Base-generated VP plus chain:

A base-generated VP is co-indexed through a binding chain with an empty category in the middle field.

TOP-NP and REM-NP are base-generated as two independent NPs in the sentence.

(6) a. MST (mixed split topicalization)

[CP [VP1 TOP-NP V1]_i [C' ... [VP2... REM-NP ... [VP1 e]_j V2]]].

b. SNPT (split noun phrase topicalization)

[CP [VP1 TOP-NP [V1 e]_i] [C' ... [VP2 ... REM-NP ... [VP1 [NP e] V1]_j V2]]].

3. Phrasal extraction analyses

Fanselow (1988)

The two NPs are base-generated in the middle-field and one of them is topicalized. In the base-generated structure REM is in a VP-internal A-position and TOP, an indefinite property-denoting NP, is adjoined to V.

(7) a. Sie hat [VP [NP keine *pro*] [V [NP polnischen Gänse] [V gekauft]]].

'She didn't buy any Polish geese.'

b. [CP [NP Polnische Gänse]_i [C' hat sie [VP [NP keine *pro*] [V t_i [V gekauft]]]]].

'As for Polish geese, she bought none.'

Fanselow and Cavar (2002)

Copy and distributed deletion analysis (C&DD)

SNPT is assumed to be information-structure driven. The information-structural requirements of TOP and REM (i. e. REM has to be focused and TOP has to be a topic or secondary focus) are assumed to be encoded as strong semantico-pragmatic operator features that have to be checked by two different functional heads: a focus head F1 and a topic (or secondary focus) head F2.

The explanatory force of this analysis stems from the different possible rankings of principles.

Hanneke van Hoof (1997), Van Riemsdijk (1998)

Apposition Analysis (Restrictive Elliptic Appositive = REA)

It base-generates split NPs as members of a paratactic NP.

(8) [[Unterhosen] [dreckige]] solltest du waschen.

'You should wash dirty underpants.'

References

Den Dikken, Marcel 2006, 'When Hungarians Agree (to Disagree): The Fine Art of 'Phi' and 'Art' ' (ms.)

É. Kiss, Katalin 2002, *The Syntax of Hungarian*, CUP

Fanselow, Gisbert and Damir, Cavar (2002), 'Distributed Deletion', in: *Theoretical Approaches to Universals*. Artemis Alexiadou (ed.), Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 65-109

Gervain, Judit 2007, 'Resumption in focus(-raising)', in *Lingua* 2007.11.008, Elsevier B.V.

Lobeck, Anne 2005, 'Ellipsis in DP', in Everaert, Martin and van Riemsdijk, Henk (eds.) 2005, *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, Blackwell Publishing, Malden MA.

Lipták, Aniko 1998, 'Focus and ECM' Approaches to Hungarian long focus movements.

Ott, Dennis 2009, 'Multiple NP split. A Distributed Deletion analysis', in: *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik* 48, pp. 65-80.

Puskás, Genovéva 2000, *Word Order in Hungarian: The Syntax of A'-positions*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Van Hoof, Hanneke 2005, 'Split topicalization', in Everaert, Martin and van Riemsdijk, Henk (eds.) 2005, *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, Blackwell Publishing, Malden MA.

Van Riemsdijk, Henk 1989, 'Movement and Regeneration', in: *Dialect Variation and the Theory of Grammar*, Paola Beninca (ed.), Dordrecht: Foris, pp. 105-136