

Agreement with possessed direct objects in Hungarian

An experimental approach

^aAndrás Bárány, ^bÁdám Szalontai

^aReCoS/DTAL, University of Cambridge,

^bResearch Institute for Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences

SinFonIJA 8, Ljubljana, 25 September 2015



European Research Council

Established by the European Commission

Overview

Intro: Object agreement and possessed NPs

The data

Surveys

Results

Intro: Object agreement and possessed NPs

Object agreement in Hungarian

- (1) a. *Mari lát egy kutyá-t.*
M. see.3SG a dog-ACC
'Mari sees a dog.'

Object agreement in Hungarian

(1) a. *Mari lát egy kutyá-t.*

M. see.3SG a dog-ACC

‘Mari sees a dog.’

b. *Mari lát-ja a kutyá-t.*

M. see-3SG.OBJ the dog-ACC

‘Mari sees the dog.’

- ▶ Roughly sensitive to definiteness of the DO
- ▶ Possessed direct objects are an exception
- ▶ They can be indefinite yet require agreement
- ▶ Standard Hungarian: all possessed DOs agree
- ▶ But: dialectal variation?

This presentation

Questions

- ▶ What kind of variation do we find?
- ▶ What kinds of factors determine variation?
- ▶ What determines object agreement?

Methods and results

- ▶ Series of online surveys
- ▶ Acceptability judgments with and without contexts
- ▶ Forced choice tests with and without contexts
- ▶ Speakers treat all possessed DOs alike: syntactic trigger?
- ▶ ???

The data

Object agreement

- ▶ Definiteness often a good predictor; not with possessed DOs
- ▶ Indefinite possessed DOs require agreement

Object agreement

- ▶ Definiteness often a good predictor; not with possessed DOs
- ▶ Indefinite possessed DOs require agreement

Object agreement

- ▶ Definiteness often a good predictor; not with possessed DOs
- ▶ Indefinite possessed DOs require agreement

(2) a. *Mari lát/ *lát-ja egy kutyá-t.*

M. see.3SG see-3SG.OBJ a dog-ACC

‘Mari sees a dog.’

b. *Mari lát-ja/ %lát egy kutyá-m-at.*

M. see-3SG.OBJ see.3SG the dog-1SG.POSS-ACC

‘Mari sees a dog of mine.’

Types of possessed NPs

- (3) a. *Mari* (*a) / *egy kutyá-ja* Nominative possessor
Mari.NOM (the) a dog-3SG.POSS
‘Mari’s dog’, ‘Mari’s one dog’

Types of possessed NPs

- (3) a. *Mari* (*a) / *egy kutyá-ja* Nominative possessor
 Mari.NOM (the) a dog-3SG.POSS
 ‘Mari’s dog’, ‘Mari’s one dog’
- b. *Mari-nak a / egy kutyá-ja* Dative possessor
 Mari-DAT the a dog-3SG.POSS
 ‘Mari’s dog’, ‘a dog of Mari’s’

Types of possessed NPs


- (3) a. *Mari* (*a) / *egy kutyá-ja* Nominative possessor
 Mari.NOM (the) a dog-3SG.POSS
 ‘Mari’s dog’, ‘Mari’s one dog’
- b. *Mari-nak a / egy kutyá-ja* Dative possessor
 Mari-DAT the a dog-3SG.POSS
 ‘Mari’s dog’, ‘a dog of Mari’s’
- c. *az ő* *kutyá-ja* Pronominal possessor
 the s/he.NOM dog-3SG.POSS
 ‘her/his dog’

Types of possessed NPs

- (3) a. *Mari* (*a) / *egy kutyá-ja* Nominative possessor
 Mari.NOM (the) a dog-3SG.POSS
 ‘Mari’s dog’, ‘Mari’s one dog’
- b. *Mari-nak a / egy kutyá-ja* Dative possessor
 Mari-DAT the a dog-3SG.POSS
 ‘Mari’s dog’, ‘a dog of Mari’s’
- c. *az ő kutyá-ja* Pronominal possessor
 the s/he.NOM dog-3SG.POSS
 ‘her/his dog’
- Distribution suggests different heights in the NP (Bartos 1999; den Dikken 1999; Dékány 2015)


Structures: NOM possessor

(4)

Mari kutyája 'Mari's dog'


Structures: NOM possessor

(4)

Mari kutyája 'Mari's dog'


Structures: DAT possessor

(5)

Marinak a kutyája 'Mari's dog'


Structures: DAT possessor

(5)

Marinak a kutyája 'Mari's dog'


Structures: pronominal possessor

(6)

az ő kutyája 'her/his dog'

Structures: pronominal possessor

(6)

az ő kutyája 'her/his dog'

Syntactic and semantic properties

Extraction

- ▶ Dative possessors can be extracted (Szabolcsi 1994)
- ▶ Only extracted possessors in definiteness effect-contexts (7a)
- ▶ Non-specific reading in (7a)

Syntactic and semantic properties

Extraction

- ▶ Dative possessors can be extracted (Szabolcsi 1994)
- ▶ Only extracted possessors in definiteness effect-contexts (7a)
- ▶ Non-specific reading in (7a)

(7) a. *Mari-nak van kutyá-ja.*
Mari-DAT is dog-3SG.POSS
'Mari has a dog/dogs.'

b. **Mari van kutyá-ja.*
Mari.NOM is dog-3SG.POSS

Variation

- ▶ Szabolcsi (1994): DOs with extracted possessors show variation
- ▶ Semantic agreement? only specific DOs agree

Variation

- ▶ Szabolcsi (1994): DOs with extracted possessors show variation
- ▶ **Semantic agreement?** only specific DOs agree

- (8) a. %*Chomsky-nak nem olvas-t-ál vers-é-t.*
 Chomsky-DAT NEG read-PST-2SG poem-3SG.POSS-ACC
 ‘You haven’t read a poem of Chomsky’s.’
- b. *Chomsky-nak nem olvas-t-ad vers-é-t.*
 Chomsky-DAT NEG read-PST-2SG.OBJ poem-3SG.POSS-ACC
 ‘You haven’t read a poem of Chomsky’s / Chomsky’s poem.’

What triggers object agreement?

- ▶ Syntax? DP structure (Bartos 1999)
- ▶ Semantics? [DEF] introduces presupposition (Coppock 2013)

Goals of the surveys

- ▶ Mapping the variation
- ▶ Finding out which factors determine variation ...
- ▶ ... and agreement

Surveys

Methodology

- ▶ Online surveys hosted on <http://spellout.net/ibexfarm/>
- ▶ April, May, September 2015: xxx participants
- ▶ Acceptability judgments (7 point scale):
 - ▶ Subject vs. object agreement
 - ▶ Nominative vs. dative possessors
 - ▶ Positive vs. negative polarity (semantic effect?)
 - ▶ Word order (no effect?)
 - ▶ Contexts: definite (unique) vs. indefinite (non-unique) reading of the DO
- ▶ Forced choice:
 - ▶ Nominative vs. dative possessors
 - ▶ Presence vs. absence of determiner
 - ▶ Contexts: definite (unique) vs. indefinite (non-unique) reading of the DO

Data: Acceptability judgments

(9) In literature class, the children were reading Petőfi and Arany.

a. *Mari olvas-ott Petőfi vers-ét.*

Mari read-3SG.PAST Petőfi.NOM poem-3SG.POSS

b. *Mari olvas-t-a Petőfi vers-ét.*

Mari read-PAST-3SG.OBJ Petőfi.NOM poem-3SG.POSS

c. *Mari olvas-ott Petőfi-nek vers-ét.*

Mari read-3SG.PAST Petőfi-DAT poem-3SG.POSS

d. *Mari olvas-t-a Petőfi-nek vers-ét.*

Mari read-PAST-3SG.OBJ Petőfi-DAT poem-3SG.POSS

intended: 'Mari read Petőfi's poem / a poem by Petőfi.'

Data: Forced choice I, no context

Ismerte a szomszéd nővérét.

Ismerte a szomszéd nővérét.

Ismerte a szomszéd nővérét.

Ismerte a szomszéd nővérét.

Ismerte a szomszéd **egy** nővérét.

⋮

Ismerte a szomszéd**nak** nővérét.

Ismerte a szomszéd**nak a** nővérét.

Ismerte a szomszéd**nak egy** nővérét.

Ismerte a szomszéd **egy** nővérét.

Ismerte a szomszéd**nak** nővérét.

⋮

- *S/he knew the neighbour's daughter / **the** daughter **of the** neighbour / **a** daughter **of the** neighbour ...*

Data: Forced choice II, def. context

- ... *is a famous writer, but she also painted a landscape.*

Péter látta a költő **egy** tájképét.

Péter látta a költő tájképét.

Péter látta a költő **egy** tájképét.

Péter látta a költő**nek** tájképét.

Péter látta a költő **egy** tájképét.

Péter látta a költő**nek egy** tájképét.

Péter látta a költő **egy** tájképét.

Péter látta a költő**nek a** tájképét.

Péter látta a költő tájképét.

Péter látta a költő**nek** tájképét.

⋮

⋮

- Péter saw the painter **one** landscape / the painter's landscape /
the landscape **of the** painter ...

Data: Forced choice III, indef. context

- ... *is a famous writer, but she also painted several landscapes.*

Péter látta a költő egy tájképét.

Péter látta a költő tájképét.

Péter látta a költő egy tájképét.

Péter látta a költőnek tájképét.

Péter látta a költő egy tájképét.

Péter látta a költőnek egy tájképét.

Péter látta a költő egy tájképét.

Péter látta a költőnek a tájképét.

Péter látta a költő tájképét.

Péter látta a költőnek tájképét.

⋮

⋮

- Péter saw the painter one landscape / the painter's landscape /
the landscape of the painter ...

Results

Results

Subject agreement with possessed DOs

- ▶ Object agreement is always better than subject agreement
- ▶ Subject agreement has medians of 1
- ▶ blokk1&2nomdat.png (exp 2), blokk1.png (exp 3)
- ▶ → We do not find judgments reported in the literature

What triggers agreement?

- ▶ Cannot be (in)definiteness: possessed DOs can be indefinite, yet trigger agreement
- ▶ Cannot be the possessive suffix: independent of interpretation
- ▶ But:

Results II

- ▶ → We do find significant effects between items with and without determiners
- ▶ Null possessors with and without determiners: *néhány* ‘some’, *minden* ‘every’ do not trigger agreement on their own
- ▶ B1/B2 (röviden)
- ▶ Dative possessors with and without determiners: *egy* ‘a, one’, *a(z)* ‘the’
- ▶ DEF/IND/NIL, kontextus nélkül és kétféle kontextussal

Acknowledgements

Thank you!

The first author's research is supported by ERC Grant No. 269752 "Rethinking Comparative Syntax". Thanks to: Theresa Biberauer, Anders Holmberg, Georg Höhn, Ian Roberts, Michelle Sheehan, and Jenneke van der Wal.

References I

- Bartos, Huba (1999). “Morfoszintaxis és interpretáció: A magyar inflexió jelenségek szintaktikai háttere [Morphosyntax and interpretation: the syntactic background of Hungarian inflection]”. PhD thesis. Budapest.
- Coppock, Elizabeth (2013). “A semantic solution to the problem of Hungarian object agreement”. *Natural Language Semantics* 21, 345–371.
- Dékány, Éva (2015). “The syntax of anaphoric possessives in hungarian”. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*. DOI: 10.1007/s11049-014-9278-0.
- den Dikken, Marcel (1999). “On the structural representation of possession and agreement”. In: *Crossing Boundaries: Advances in the Theory of Central and Eastern European Languages*. Ed. by István Kenesei. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 137–178.
- Szabolcsi, Anna (1994). “The noun phrase”. In: *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian*. Ed. by Ferenc Kiefer and Katalin É. Kiss. Vol. 27. Syntax and Semantics. New York: Academic Press, 179–274.