Agreement and 'Clause Union'

Marcel den Dikken — The Graduate Center of The City University of New York

---

1 The theoretical claims to be defended

This paper will defend the following general theoretical claims:

- *weak features* can be checked *only* within X^0; hence 'accidentally' checking weak features under overt-syntactic XP–movement is impossible, and overt-syntactic XP–movement beyond F of a category bearing a feature matching a weak feature of F will bleed the checking of F's weak feature
- *object agreement* and *accusative Case feature checking* are not tied to aspect, hence not checked in the domain of an aspectual head; both object agreement and accusative Case checking are tied to AgrO (Chomsky 1991, 1993) or *v* (Chomsky 1995:Chapter 4), the latter opening up a clearer perspective on the mechanics of *faire à* type causative constructions
- *'clause union'* is not a unitary phenomenon; 'clause union' effects are a function of the variable placement of *v*/AgrO and Asp projections and the presence/absence of an embedded IP on the movement path; several 'levels' of 'clause union' manifest themselves depending on whether both, one or neither of the set {*v*/AgrO, Asp} is generated upstairs in multi-verb constructions
- *clitic doubling* involves a possessive noun phrase configuration
- Bošković's (1997) *Inverse Case Filter* holds; DPs need Case features only if these allow for the (most economic) checking of the matching Case features of non-substantive heads

These claims will be defended with particular reference to a battery of agreement and 'clause union' phenomena in Hungarian, giving rise to a number of further claims specific to this language:

- Hungarian *definiteness agreement with objects* and *structural accusative Case-feature checking* involve *feature movement* at LF
- Hungarian *person agreement with objects* involves *clitic movement* in overt syntax
- Hungarian *object clitic movement* is a case of two-step movement: head-adjunction preceded by NP–movement, the latter blocked by intervening A–positions
- Hungarian has *object clitics* for first and second person, not for third person
- Hungarian first and second person object pronouns are *syntactically complex entities*, most having the structure of possessed nominal phrases with the clitic functioning as the possessor and the full pronoun as the possessum, and others featuring a locative/partitive PP and a null indefinite head
- Hungarian *Case and agreement 'switch'* phenomena under long A′–extraction are the reflex of the combination of a *that-t* avoidance strategy similar to the one employed by the Romance languages and the weakness of the D–features of *v*/AgrO

Before we can go take a look at the four sets of data which will form the backbone of this paper, we will first need to fill in the necessary background knowledge concerning the Hungarian agreement system. This will be the topic of the next section. Section 3 will subsequently present an overview of the facts to be discussed in the remainder of the paper, sections 4 and following developing their analysis, defending the claims listed in the above on the basis of the facts laid out in section 3.

2 Notes on Hungarian agreement

As in many other languages, Hungarian finite verbs agree with their subjects in person and number. Hungarian is special, however, in having two sets of subject agreement forms, the choice between them depending (roughly) on the presence of a definite object noun phrase (see Bartos 1997 for more careful discussion; though speaking in terms of definite/indefinite agreement may not ultimately be optimal, for our purposes here this potential simplification will do). The broad generalisation that emerges from the data is that the set in (2) is chosen whenever the verb takes a *definite* object, with (1) selected elsewhere (including constructions in which the verb takes no object at all); cf. (3)–(4).

(1)	*indefinite agreement* (present tense)	(2)	*definite agreement* (present tense)
a.	-Vk	a.	-Vm
b.	-sz/-Vl	b.	-Vd
c.	-∅	c.	-ja/-i
d.	-unk/-ünk	d.	-juk/-jük
e.	-tok/-tek/-tök	e.	-játok/-itek
f.	-nak/-nek	f.	-ják/-ik

(3) a. *János olvasott-∅* {∅/ *valamit/ egy könyvet/ néhány könyvet/ minden könyvet*}.
János read-PAST-INDEF ∅ something a book some book every book

b. **János olvast-a* {∅/ *valamit/ egy könyvet/ néhány könyvet/ minden könyvet*}.
János read-PAST-DEF ∅ something a book some book every book

(4) a. **János olvasott-∅* {*azt/ a könyvet/ azt a könyvet/ Mari könyvét/ Marinak a könyvét*}.
János read-PAST-INDEF that the book that the book Mari book Mari-DAT the book

b. *János olvast-a* {*azt/ a könyvet/ azt a könyvet/ Mari könyvét/ Marinak a könyvét*}.
János read-PAST-DEF that the book that the book Mari book Mari-DAT the book

There are intriguing complications, however. While the characterisation 'definite agreement' is generally accurate in the sense that it is only definite object noun phrases that trigger the paradigm in (2), the first and second person object pronouns are a bit of a fly in the ointment. If the object is second person (singular or plural) *and* the subject is first person singular, a special agreement form has to be used — the *-lak/-lek* form illustrated in (5). In all other cases in which the object is first or second person, the agreement form to be selected comes from the *indefinite* paradigm in (1). The examples in (6) and (7) serve to illustrate this, for second and third person subjects, respectively.

(5) a. *(Én) szeret-lek (téged/ titeket/ benneteket).*
I love-LAK/LEK you_{sg} you_{pl}-ACC you_{pl}-ACC

b. **(Én) szeret-ek (téged/ titeket/ benneteket).*
I love-INDEF you_{sg} you_{pl}-ACC you_{pl}-ACC

c. **(Én) szeret-em (téged/ titeket/ benneteket).*
I love-DEF you_{sg} you_{pl}-ACC you_{pl}-ACC

(6)	a.	*(Te)*	*szeret-sz*	*(engem/*	*minket/*	*bennünket).*
		you	love-INDEF	me	us-ACC	us-ACC
	b.	**(Te)*	*szeret-ed*	*(engem/*	*minket/*	*bennünket).*
		you	love-DEF	me	us-ACC	us-ACC
(7)	a.	*János*	*szeret-∅*	*(engem/*	*minket/*	*bennünket/*
		János	love-INDEF	me	us-ACC	us-ACC/
		téged/	*titeket/*	*benneteket).*		
		you_{sg}	you_{pl}-ACC	you_{pl}-ACC		
	b.	**János*	*szeret-i*	*(engem/*	*minket/*	*bennünket*
		János	love-DEF	me	us-ACC	us-ACC
		téged/	*titeket/*	*benneteket).*		
		you_{sg}	you_{pl}-ACC	you_{pl}-ACC		

The remarkable thing about Hungarian first and second person objects, then, is that they by and large pattern with indefinite objects. But from a semantic point of view, it hardly makes sense to call them indefinite. The fact that they can be pro-dropped, which is a privilege of definites, casts further doubt on their indefiniteness (cf. Farkas 1990). Besides, they do not behave *exactly* like third person indefinite objects in any event. As Bartos (1997:370, fn. 8) points out (crediting the observation to Katalin É. Kiss), first person objects, when selected by a so-called '*ikes ige*' (a verb whose third singular indefinite form ends in *-ik*), trigger an *-ik*-less third person singular form (*esz engem a méreg* 'eat-3SG me the anger'), not the *-ik* form showing up in the presence of an indefinite object (*eszik valamit* 'eat-3SG.*IK* something'). And as seen in (5), second person object pronouns of verbs with a first singular subject conjure up the special *-lak/-lek* form in (5a).

It will be instructive at this early point in the exposition to take a microscopic view of the constitution of this special *-lak/-lek* form (cf. also Bartos 1997:364, fn. 2). This form consists of three segments, /l/, a vowel whose quality is dependent (as a reflex of vowel harmony) on the phonological environment, and /k/. We need not concern ourselves with the middle segment, which in all likelihood is just an epenthetic vowel linking the two consonants. What remains, then, is an /l/ and a /k/ — and interestingly, these two consonants both show up on their own in the indefinite agreement paradigm in (1): /k/ as the ending for first person indefinite agreement, and /l/ as one of the two forms of second person indefinite agreement. The possibility presents itself, then, that the *-lak/-lek* form found in (5a) is a composite element combining the first and second person agreement markers, with the latter this time representing the object rather than the subject (as it does in (1b)). If this is on the right track, the *-lak/-lek* form seen in (5a) is the only inflectional ending of Hungarian which crossreferences both the subject and the object; and the element crossreferencing the second person object turns out to be identical in form to one of the elements crossreferencing subjects of the same person. We will return to the significance of the composite nature of the agreement form featured in (5a).[1]

Even though the two paradigms in (1) and (2) are both *subject agreement* paradigms, the fact that the choice between (1) and (2) is conditioned by the definiteness of the object leads us to implicate an Object Agreement projection in the analysis of Hungarian agreement. In the exposition of the analysis, we will refer to this object agreement projection as *v*P/AgrOP, sailing a steady course between Scylla (*i.c.*, Chomsky 1991, 1993) and Charybdis (Chomsky 1995:Chapter 4) — but see section 4.4 for an argument favouring *v* over AgrO. The head of this projection is responsible for the checking of both structural accusative Case and definiteness in Hungarian. The [+definite] feature of *v*/AgrO is an uninterpretable feature, to be deleted and erased under checking against the object. The indefinite agreement paradigm in (1) is a case of *default* agreement (with respect to definiteness). Our cue to this effect comes from the fact that the paradigm in (1) is used not just when the object is indefinite but also when there is *no* object. (1), then, is truly the 'elsewhere' case, surfacing whenever there is no [+definite] feature on AgrO; definiteness is a so-called *privative* opposition.

We will have much more to say about the technicalities of object agreement and Case-feature checking in Hungarian in the remainder of the paper. But for the moment, this will serve as sufficient background for an investigation of the four construction types which form the subject matter of this paper, to be outlined in the next section.

3 Four 'clause union' constructions

The data which form the basis for the claims enumerated in the introduction can be grouped into four sets (on some of these, see É. Kiss 1987), to identified by the matrix verbs participating in them. The chart below sums up the four classes of verbs and their properties with respect to the three key parameters of clause union which we will focus on in what follows:

- (i) whether or not the preverb (*meg* in the examples below) 'climbs up' to the matrix verb
- (ii) whether or not the matrix verb agrees in (in)definiteness with the embedded object
- (iii) whether or not the matrix verb agrees in person with the embedded object (cf. the special *-lak/-lek* form used in constructions with first person subjects and second person objects; see the b–examples in (10), (13), (16) and (19))

	(i) PV climbing	(ii) definiteness agr	(ii) person agr
I (*fog*)	obligatory	obligatory	obligatory
II (*jön*)	impossible	impossible	optional/variable
III (*-tat/-tet*)	cannot tell	obligatory	obligatory
IV (*hagy*)	impossible	obligatory	obligatory w/o DAT impossible w/ DAT

TABLE 1

Let us illustrate these four verb classes with the aid of representative examples for each class, starting with the case where everything is obligatory: the class of auxiliary verb constructions, featuring *fog*.

I **auxiliary verb constructions** (e.g. *fog* 'will', *akar* 'want'[2])

(8) a. **Fogsz* *meglátogatni* *valakit.*
will-2SG.INDEF PV-visit someone

b. **Fogod* *meglátogatni* *valakit.*
will-2SG.DEF PV-visit someone

c. *Meg* *fogsz* *látogatni* *valakit.*
PV will-2SG.INDEF visit someone-ACC

d. **Meg* *fogod* *látogatni* *valakit.*
PV will-2SG.DEF visit someone-ACC

(9) a. **Fogsz* *meglátogatni* *Pétert.*
will-2SG.INDEF PV-visit Péter-ACC

b. **Fogod* *meglátogatni* *Pétert.*
will-2SG.DEF PV-visit Péter-ACC

c. **Meg* *fogsz* *látogatni* *Pétert.*
PV will-2SG.INDEF visit Péter-ACC

d. *Meg* *fogod* *látogatni* *Pétert.*
PV will-2SG.DEF visit Péter-ACC

(10) a. *Meg* *fogsz* *látogatni* *(engem).*
PV will-2SG.INDEF visit me
b. *Meg* *foglak* *látogatni* *(téged).*
PV will-LAK/LEK visit you

II ***come/go* verb aspectual constructions** (featuring matrix *jön* 'come', *jár* 'go', *(el)megy* 'go (off)', *van* 'be'[3]); also **some subject-control constructions** (*igyekszik* 'strive', *irtózik* 'abhor', *törekszik* 'endeavour', *vágyik* 'long for', *fél* 'fear', *hozzáfog* 'start', *kényszerül* 'be forced')

(11) a. *Jöttél* *meglátogatni* *valakit.*
come-PAST-2SG.INDEF PV-visit someone-ACC
b. **Jötted* *meglátogatni* *valakit.*
come-PAST-2SG.DEF PV-visit someone-ACC
c. **Meg* *jöttél* *látogatni* *valakit.*
PV come-PAST-2SG.INDEF visit someone-ACC
d. **Meg* *jötted* *látogatni* *valakit.*
PV come-PAST-2SG.DEF visit someone-ACC

(12) a. *Jöttél* *meglátogatni* *Pétert.*
come-PAST-2SG.INDEF PV-visit Péter-ACC
b. **Jötted* *meglátogatni* *Pétert.*
come-PAST-2SG.DEF PV-visit Péter-ACC
c. **Meg* *jöttél* *látogatni* *Pétert.*
PV come-PAST-2SG.INDEF visit Péter-ACC
d. **Meg* *jötted* *látogatni* *Pétert.*
PV come-PAST-2SG.INDEF visit Péter-ACC

(13) a. *Jöttél* *meglátogatni* *(engem).*
come-PAST-2SG.INDEF PV-visit me
b. *Jöttelek* *meglátogatni* *(téged).*
come-PAST-LAK/LEK PV-visit you
b′. %*Jöttem* *meglátogatni* *(téged).*
come-PAST-1SG PV-visit you

A few notes are in order here with respect to the data for class II. For most aspectual verbs in class II, the grammaticality of the *-lak/-lek* form is strongly dependent on *tense*: while past-tense (13b) is perfect, present-tense **jölek meglátogatni téged* is completely impossible. For *jár* 'go' this tendency seems slightly weaker; but I hasten to add that for many speakers even the past-tense *-lak/-lek* form for *jár* (as in *Jártalak meglátogatni*) is not very good.[4]

The optionality of the *-lak/-lek* form shown for *jön* in (13b,b′) apparently is a matter of native-speaker variation as well: not all speakers seem to like the form in (13b′). Variation also appears to manifest itself here with *igyekszik* type subject-control verbs: while É. Kiss (1987:228) reports that in contexts like (13b) both *igyekszem* 'strive-1SG.DEF' (definite because '*ikes igék*' lack a first person singular indefinite form) and *igyekezlek* 'strive-LAK/LEK' are grammatical, some speakers strongly prefer the latter; on the other hand, for *irtózik* the tendency seems to go in the other direction, judging from É. Kiss (1987:228/29, ex. (42)). É. Kiss calls the agreement behaviour of *igyekszik* type verbs "largely idiosyncratic".[5]

Much more systematic is the agreement behaviour of most other subject-control verbs of Hungarian, including *megpróbál* 'PV-try', *utál* 'hate', *szeret* 'like' and *un* 'find-boring'. While sharing with the *igyekszik* set the ban on preverb climbing, they systematically force upstairs person agreement (*-lak/-lek*: *Szeretlek meglátogatni téged* '(I) like-LAK/LEK PV-visit you') *and* definiteness agreement

(*Szeretem/*ek meglátogatni Pétert* '(I) like-1SG.DEF/*INDEF PV-visit Peter'). In these respects, these verbs largely pattern together with verbs of classes III and IV, to which we now turn.[6]

III *-tat/-tet* 'make' causatives

Class III differs primarily from class II in that agreement in definiteness with the embedded object is obligatorily marked on the causative verb. Person agreement (*-lak/-lek*) is obligatory as well.

(14) a. *Meglátogattattál* *(Jánossal)* *valakit.*
PV-visit-PAST-2SG.INDEF János-INST someone-ACC
b. **Meglátogattattad* *(Jánossal)* *valakit.*
PV-visit-PAST-2SG.DEF János-INST someone-ACC

(15) a. **Meglátogattattál* *(Jánossal)* *Pétert.*
PV-visit-PAST-2SG.INDEF János-INST Péter-ACC
b. *Meg*látogattatt*ad* (Jánossal) Pétert.
PV-visit-PAST-2SG.DEF János-INST Péter-ACC

(16) a. *Meglátogattattál* *(Jánossal)* *(engem).*
PV-visit-PAST-2SG.INDEF János-INST me
b. *Meglátogattattalak* *(Jánossal)* *(téged).*
PV-visit-PAST-LAK/LEK János-INST you

IV *hagy/enged* 'let' permissive-causatives[7]

Class IV largely patterns with class III, but introduces an interesting split with respect to person agreement conditioned by the presence or absence of a dative-marked 'causee', as seen in (19).

(17) a. *Hagysz* *(Jánosnak)* *meglátogatni* *valakit.*
let-2SG.INDEF János-DAT PV-visit someone-ACC
b. **Hagyod* *(Jánosnak)* *meglátogatni* *valakit.*
let-2SG.DEF János-DAT PV-visit someone-ACC
c. **Meg* *hagysz* *(Jánosnak)* *látogatni* *valakit.*
PV let-2SG.INDEF János-DAT visit someone-ACC
d. **Meg* *hagyod* *(Jánosnak)* *látogatni* *valakit.*
PV let-2SG.DEF János-DAT visit someone-ACC

(18) a. **Hagysz* *(Jánosnak)* *meglátogatni* *Pétert.*
let-2SG.INDEF János-DAT PV-visit Péter-ACC
b. *Hagyod* *(Jánosnak)* *meglátogatni* *Pétert.*
let-2SG.DEF János-DAT PV-visit Pétert-ACC
c. **Meg* hagysz (Jánosnak) látogatni Pétert
PV let-2SG.INDEF János-DAT visit Péter-ACC
d. **Meg* *hagyod* *(Jánosnak)* *látogatni* *Pétert.*
PV let-2SG.DEF János-DAT visit Péter-ACC

(19) a. *Hagysz* *(*Jánosnak)* *meglátogatni* *(engem).*
let-2SG.INDEF János-DAT PV-visit me
b. *Hagylak* *(*Jánosnak)* *meglátogatni* *(téged).*
let-LAK/LEK János-DAT PV-visit you

Table 1 testifies to a scale of 'clause union' effects — class I behaves in all respects like a 'clause union' construction in the sense that preverb climbing, definiteness agreement on the upstairs verb and person agreement on the upstairs verb are all featured by it; classes III and IV are 'one notch lower' on the 'clause union' scale (though for class III this is somewhat difficult to tell with any certainty, since we cannot be sure whether or not PV climbing, independently of complex verb formation, has taken place); and class II is lowest on the scale, (optionally) featuring only one 'clause union' effect (person agreement). This confirms what we said at the outset — 'clause union' is not a unitary phenomenon but a sliding scale. In what follows we will analyse this sliding scale on the basis of concrete syntactic analyses of the four classes of 'clause union' constructions in Hungarian.

4 Class IV: *hagy* permissive-causatives

It will be fruitful to start our investigation of the data tabulated above with the permissive/causative *hagy* constructions illustrated in (17)–(19). Of the four batches of facts laid out in section 3, these present us with the most difficult questions — and ultimately, once these questions are properly understood, with the clearest insight into the problems at hand.

4.1 Preverb placement

Let us begin by discussing the simplest ingredient of the paradigm in (17)–(19): the placement of the resultative-marking preverb *meg*. The facts are that *meg* must be placed right in front of the causativised verb, and cannot 'climb' up into the matrix clause and glom onto *hagy*. This is interesting in view of the fact that Hungarian, in other construction types, allows preverbs like *meg* to behave relatively autonomously with respect to the verb which they 'belong to'. The auxiliary verb construction illustrated in (8) is a case in point: here *meg* effectively must climb up to the auxiliary *fog*. But in the *hagy* constructions in (17) this is impossible: the examples in (17c,d) are bad.

In view of the relative independence of preverbs and their hosts in the grammar of Hungarian, we assume that preverbs are not prefixes base-generated on verbs in the lexicon, but are housed in syntactic projections independent of the verbs in the structure. And in the light of Piñón's (1995) arguments to the effect that Hungarian preverbs are 'aspectualisers' (cf. also É. Kiss 1998), we assume that preverbs like *meg* are harboured by an *aspectual* functional projection (to be labelled AspP), generated in the extended projection of the verb. Thus, we liken the analysis of *meg* to that of the Mandarin Chinese perfectiviser *le* (see Den Dikken & Sybesma 1998) and the perfectivising incarnation of the Spanish clitic *se* (see Hulk & Cornips 1998, also discussed in Den Dikken & Sybesma's work).

(20) Juan *se* comió la manzana.
Juan SE ate the apple
'Juan ate the apple up.'

(21) *Meg* (like Mandarin *le* and Spanish aspectual *se*) is harboured by AspP.

The fact that the preverb must stay low in permissive-causative constructions featuring verbs like *hagy* 'let' (cf. (17)) now indicates, from the perspective of the hypothesis in (21), that AspP is generated *low* in the structure of *hagy* constructions — in the complement of the causative verb. We may thus proceed to proposing the following substructure for class IV constructions:

(22) ... [$_{VP}$ *hagy* [$_{AspP}$ *meg* [$_{VP}$ *látogatni* OB]]]

4.2 *Definiteness agreement*

With this partial structure in place, we can immediately draw one important conclusion concerning the locus of definiteness agreement checking in Hungarian. Notice that, as (17) and (18) illustrate, it is the *upstairs* verb (*hagy*) which agrees in definiteness with the embedded object of a permissive-causative construction of class IV. Since we had just concluded that AspP finds itself downstairs, below the causative verb, in class IV constructions, we can now conclude that definiteness checking in Hungarian is *not* a function of AspP — otherwise we would expect no definiteness agreement on the finite verb (in fact, since non-finite verbs do not show definiteness agreement, we would expect to find no forms featuring definite agreement morphology at all, contrary to fact). This conclusion vindicates another of the theoretical claims enumerated in section 1: object agreement is *not* tied to aspect, hence not checked in the domain of an aspectual head.

Rather than linking object agreement to Asp, we introduce a separate *v*/AgrO projection for the checking of the [+definite] feature (recall from section 2 that the indefinite paradigm is the default case; definiteness is a privative opposition). The *v*P/AgrOP which checks definiteness (and Case) on the object is located, in *hagy* constructions, in the *matrix* functional domain: it is the matrix causative verb which checks definiteness agreement, as is shown by the facts in (17) and (18). This is one respect in which class IV constructions behave as 'clause union' constructions — *v*P/AgrOP, checking the definiteness feature of the embedded object, is located in the matrix functional domain, as in (23).

(23) ... $[_{vP/AgrOP}$ *v*/AgrO$_{[+acc,+def]}$ $[_{VP}$ *hagy* $[_{AspP}$ *meg* $[_{VP}$ *látogatni* OB]]]]

Objects in Hungarian do not seem to raise to *v*/AgrO's checking domain in overt syntax. In our examples in (17) and (18), *valakit* and *Pétert*, the NPs whose features check those present under AgrO, do not appear to have moved overtly, surfacing at the right edge of the clause. Of course, it might be the case, *a priori*, that even in examples like (17) and (18), *valakit* and *Pétert* have actually undergone overt-syntactic movement to Spec*v*P/AgrOP, with the material preceding these NPs having raised to positions higher up in the clause. But we believe there is evidence that the object's definiteness features are *not* checked via overt-syntactic NP–movement but via covert feature-movement instead. The evidence comes from an intriguing difference between definiteness and person feature checking on the part of the embedded object.

4.3 *Person agreement*

Hungarian permissive-causative constructions of class IV introduce an interesting split between definiteness agreement and what we may call *person* agreement between the upstairs verb and the embedded object. By 'person agreement' we refer to the occurrence of the special *-lak/-lek* form of the inflected verb which is obligatory in constructions with a first person singular subject *and* a second person object (see (5) for initial illustration). As we see in (19b), this *-lak/-lek* form is obligatory in class IV constructions *when there is no dative-marked causee* (i.e., embedded subject): *Hagylak meglátogatni* 'I let (someone) visit you'. But when there *is* a dative-marked causee present, the construction is ungrammatical — not just with *-lak/-lek* (cf. (19b)), but also in any other variety. There simply is no way of saying 'I let János visit you' with an embedded infinitive and a dative-marked causee. There are, of course, ways of getting this proposition across, but Hungarian must in that case resort to the use of a *finite* embedded clause, as in (24c), where the verb shows definite agreement as a function of its taking a finite clause as its complement.[8]

(24)	a.	*Hagy*<u>*ok*</u>	*Jánosnak*	<u>*meg*</u>*látogatni*	*(téged).*
		let-1SG.INDEF	János-DAT	PV-visit	you
	b.	*Hagy*<u>*om*</u>	*Jánosnak*	<u>*meg*</u>*látogatni*	*(téged).*
		let-1SG.DEF	János-DAT	PV-visit	you

c.	Hagy*om*	Jánosnak	hogy	*meg*látogasson	(téged).
	let-1SG.DEF	János-DAT	that	PV-visit-3SG.INDEF.SUBJUNC	you

What we just pointed out with reference to second person embedded objects by and large holds true also of first person objects, as is indicated by the deviance of (19a), and confirmed by the fact that (24a,b) have no grammatical counterparts with *engem* 'me' replacing *téged* 'you' either.

How do we account for the fact that when there is a dative-marked causee present, there is no way of having an infinitival clause with a first or second person object below *hagy*? This question factors out into three subquestions, each concerned with a different member of the triplet constituted by (19b), (24a) and (24b) (and their counterparts with *engem*). Let us address each in turn, starting from the back.

Accounting for the deviance of (24b) is simple. We have already argued that *v*P/AgrOP (the projection in where definiteness is checked) finds itself in the extended projection of *hagy* 'let' in class IV constructions (cf. (23)). So *hagy* could agree in definiteness either with its propositional complement (the infinitival clause) or with the object thereof; but in neither case is the [+definite] feature checkable — we know that first and second person objects behave like indefinites in triggering the selection of the paradigm in (1); and we know independently that infinitival clauses, unlike finite clauses, do not trigger definite agreement either:[9]

(25)	*Próbálkoz*ok*/*om*	[*meg*látogatni	*Pétert*].
	try-1SG.INDEF/*DEF	PV-visit	Péter-ACC

There is no way, then, for *hagyom* in (24b) to ever check its [+definite] object agreement feature. Since that feature is uninterpretable, Full Interpretation is therefore violated in (24b).

Its variant with indefinite agreement, given in (24a), needs a little more work. Indefinite morphology here could only be the reflex of agreement between *hagyok* and its infinitival complement. We know from (25) that infinitival clausal complements trigger indefinite agreement. But such is impossible in class IV constructions. Suppose that the infinitival complement of *hagy* does indeed check the features of *v*/AgrO. That will trap *téged*, the embedded verb's object. With the single *v*/AgrO in the structure checking its features against the infinitive, *téged* has nowhere to go to check its Case feature. This may not be devastating, if *téged* does not need to bear a Case feature (cf. section 10.6, below). But we will soon outline an analysis of first and second person object pronouns in Hungarian according to which they involve a clitic; and the technicalities of clitic movement will make it impossible for that clitic to reach its designated landing-site (the matrix Infl) if the infinitive checks *v*/AgrO's features in (24a). We need not tarry on these technicalities in the present context, though, since there is good reason to surmise that *hagy*'s infinitival complement *cannot* in fact check the features of *v*/AgrO at all, due to its reduced structure. While *próbálkoz* takes a fully clausal complement, (23) identifies the complement of *hagy* as a 'bare' AspP, lacking the requisite features.

Ultimately, then, the problem with (24a) is that the features of *v*/AgrO will be trapped: they can be checked neither by the complement of *hagy* nor by the embedded object (the latter for reasons to be discussed presently). The result is a fatal violation of Full Interpretation.

Now we are back to square one: the construction which started our discussion of 'person agreement', (19b). Why is it that the *-lak/-lek* form also fails, whenever there is a dative-marked causee present? The answer must lie in the fact that the second person object is unable to make its way up into the checking domain of the matrix *v*/AgrO to get its uninterpretable features checked, and to check the uninterpretable features of *v*/AgrO, whenever there is a dative-marked causee present. Notice that, in both preceding sentences, we added a qualification in the form of a 'whenever' clause: for as soon as the dative-marked causee is dropped, the *-lak/-lek* form is fine, and the sentence is grammatical. So apparently, the embedded object's ability to make its way up into the matrix clause is related to the presence/absence of an overt causee with dative Case.

The blocking effect of an overt causee on upstairs *-lak/-lek* agreement can be interpreted as a straightforward reflex of Rizzi's (1990) Relativised Minimality (or its minimalist successor, the Minimal Link Condition of Chomsky 1995), if two conditions are met:

- The embedded object establishes a person agreement (*-lak/-lek*) relation with the matrix verb by undergoing *A–movement* into the matrix functional domain, across the causee.
- The causee occupies an *A–specifier* position intervening between the extraction and landing-sites of the embedded object — a specifier position which, moreover, cannot be rendered 'equidistant' from the landing-site of the embedded object.

That the dative-marked causee does indeed find itself in a position of the required sort is suggested by the fact that the dative causee in a *hagy* permissive-causative can bind an anaphoric embedded object, as in (26):

(26) *Hagytam* *Jánosnak* *dicsérni* *magát.*
let-PAST-1SG János-DAT praise himself-ACC
'I let János praise himself.'

Anaphors must be bound; and binding requires a syntactic c-command relationship between the binder and the bindee. From the grammaticality of (26), we may hence conclude that the dative-marked causee *Jánosnak* c-commands the embedded object. Such will be guaranteed only if *Jánosnak* occupies an A–specifier position structurally intervening between the embedded object and the matrix functional domain. Execution is straightforward, though we will refrain from making any specific assumptions here so as to avoid committing ourselves at this point in the discussion to the exact location of *Jánosnak*.[10] This issue is tangential to our concerns at this time, and we can leave it open for the moment since whichever tack we take, there will be no way of rendering this specifier position and the landing-site of an A–moved embedded object equidsitant from this NP's extraction site. Two options present themselves: either *(i)* XP is an extended projection of the embedded infinitive (so that the dative effectively occupies the subject position of the embedded infinitival), or *(ii)* XP is a small clause containing the dative phrase and the projection of the causativised verb as its subconstituents. Either way, XP will be the complement of V, and raising X to V will not serve to make the dative-marked and the landing-site of matrix-bound A–movement applied to the embedded object equidistant from the embedded object's extraction position.

(27) *[$_{YP}$ embedded object$_i$ ... [$_{XP}$ *Jánosnak* ... [$_{VP}$ V t_i]]]
A–spec A–spec
└—not equidistant—┘

The binding facts in (26) thus lead us to conclude that there is a c-command relationship between the dative causee and the embedded object in a Hungarian *hagy* permissive-causative, which confirms that the second of the two conditions on a successful RM/MLC based account of (19b) is met.[11] We can now complete the account of (19) along RM/MLC lines (as in (27)) by meeting the first condition as well — that is, by arguing that there is overt-syntactic NP–movement involved in the derivation of Hungarian constructions with first and second person objects.

But it seems very unlikely that the overt object pronoun (*engem, téged*) is the element undergoing overt-syntactic NP–movement into a position relatively high up in the matrix clause (cf. the location of *v*P/AgrOP in (23)) — not just because they do not *seem* to have raised so high, but also, and more significantly, because it can be argued that object noun phrases in general do not undergo overt NP–movement in Hungarian. That they do not follows from the foregoing discussion, which thus allows us to return to the issue that came up at the end of the previous subsection.

If the objects in (17) and (18) underwent overt-syntactic movement, this would be a case of NP–movement into Spec*v*P/AgrOP, which is an A–position. But we have just set up an argument, on the basis of (19), to the effect that NP–movement across the dative-marked causee of class IV constructions is illegitimate. Hence we would predict to find a blocking effect on the embedded object's definiteness checking imposed by an overt dative-marked causee — but we do *not* find such an effect: (17) and (18) are fine both with and without *Jánosnak*. In the light of the foregoing, then, this is evidence that Case and definiteness checking in Hungarian involves *covert feature movement*.

This means that the definiteness and Case features of *v*/AgrO are *weak* in Hungarian. And that, in turn, means that no object will be triggered to raise to Spec*v*P/AgrOP in overt syntax in this language. So we can be reasonably confident that the physical first and second person pronouns in (19) do not themselves undergo overt-syntactic NP–movement. But now we seem to have worked ourselves into a paradox: we have interpreted the blocking effect of *Jánosnak* in (19) as evidence for overt NP–movement, but we have just found out that the pronouns themselves do not seem to undergo such movement. Two questions hence pose themselves at this point: what *is* undergoing overt-syntactic NP–movement in the course of the derivation of the constructions in (19), and *why* does that movement obtain?

The answer to the latter question must be that there are reasons *extraneous* to definiteness and Case which force overt-syntactic movement in the case of first and second person objects. And those reasons, we believe, are the same that force overt-syntactic movement in the case of *clitic pronouns* in languages like Romance:

(28) a. *Ho visto Gianni.*
have-1SG seen Gianni

b. *L'ho visto.*
him-have-1SG seen

Concretely, we propose that Hungarian first and second person objects involve a *clitic*, and that, like their counterparts in the Romance languages, the clitic part of Hungarian first/second person objects has to cliticise onto an Infl–node in the course of the overt-syntactic derivation.[12] More specifically, in Hungarian object clitic movement is a two-step process: *(i)* first, the entire maximal projection of the clitic undergoes NP–movement to the Spec*v*P/AgrOP position local to the Infl–node targeted by cliticisation; and *(ii)* subsequently, the head of the NP head-moves and left-adjoins to Infl.[13]

(29) Hungarian object clitic movement involves:
(i) NP–movement to the Spec*v*P/AgrOP local to the target Infl–node, and
(ii) head-movement of the clitic into a position left-adjoined to Infl.

The reasons why we resort to this two-step derivation are twofold: first, it allows us to preserve the Head Movement Constraint (the clitic, by first pied-piping its projection to the local Spec*v*P/AgrOP, does not skip any 'harmful' head positions when adjoining to Infl), and secondly, it gives us the desired explanation for the ban on first and second person objects in class IV constructions in the presence of a dative-marked causee. The NP–movement step will be responsible for the 'dative effect': NP–movement to SpecAgrOP will be blocked by the MLC whenever the SpecXP position in a structure à la (27) is occupied by a dative-marked causee.

4.4 'Passive infinitives' and the v*/AgrO debate*

This essentially completes our analysis of class IV constructions with *hagy*. But before closing this discussion and proceeding to an investigation of the properties of Hungarian object clitics (to which section 4.3 gives rise), we would like to examine the variants of (19a,b) lacking the dative-marked causee. What we know about this construction is that, unlike its counterpart with an overt causee, it allows overt-syntactic NP–movement from out of the infinitival constituent. But what we do not know quite yet is what the structure of the complement of *hagy* is in this kind of case. We actually turn out to have all the necessary tools in hand to force a conclusion on this question, a conclusion which also sheds light on the question of whether (definiteness and) accusative Case is checked in the domain of AgrO or, instead, in that of a 'light verb' *v* (*à la* Chomsky 1995:Chapter 4).

The grammaticality of (19) without *Jánosnak* must mean, in the light of the foregoing, that either *(i)* there is no SpecXP position obstructing NP–movement into the matrix functional domain, or *(ii)* the SpecXP position is used as an escape hatch for NP–movement. Suppose the latter is correct. Then we expect that the embedded object will, at some point in the derivation, come to behave as a 'derived causee' with respect to the embedded verb, in virtue of passing through SpecXP, the position otherwise

harbouring the causee. So concretely, we then expect (19a,b) without *Jánosnak* to behave like constructions with a first or second person causee when it comes to formal properties of the infinitive — in particular, agreement. Infinitives in Hungarian *hagy*+dative constructions are obligatorily inflected for person and number when their subject is a first or second person (null) pronoun, as seen in (30):

(30)	a.	*Hagyta*	*(nekem)*	*meglátogatnom*	*Pétert.*
		let-PAST-3SG.DEF	me-DAT	PV-visit-1SG	Péter-ACC
	b.	*Hagyta*	*(neked)*	*meglátogatnod*	*Pétert.*
		let-PAST-3SG.DEF	you-DAT	PV-visit-2SG	Péter-ACC

Arguably, agreement in (30) is a formal reflex of the relationship between the element in SpecXP and the infinitival causativised verb. Precise details need not concern us here;[14] the important thing is that no agreement surfaces on the infinitive in (19a,b) without *Jánosnak* — examples like **Hagysz meglátogatnom engem* or **Hagylak meglátogatnod téged* are totally unacceptable. This suggests that the object, on its way into the matrix functional domain, does *not* stop over in SpecXP. This conclusion is significant, for it makes an analysis of constructions of the type in (19) without *Jánosnak*, involving a 'passive infinitive' (an infinitival clause internal to which NP–raising to subject has taken place) untenable (see also Petter 1998 for arguments against a 'passive infinitive' analysis of Dutch constructions of this type).

So we are left with option *(i)*: there is no SpecXP position obstructing NP–movement. This also turns out to be a strong conclusion. For not only is there no overt occupant of this position, the position must effectively be absent altogether: if it were there and contained a null category of sorts (*pro* or PRO), NP–movement would still be blocked, for the same reasons that it is blocked when there is an overt occupant of SpecXP. In sum, the causee is *radically absent* from the variants of the (19a,b) which do not feature *Jánosnak*.

This, we believe, is an important result, not obtainable in such a strong form on the basis of non-Hungarian evidence. The bottom line is that constructions like 'They had the car repair' (meaning what English *They had the car repaired* means) in languages like Hungarian (and also Romance and Germanic, with the exception of English) do not involve infinitival passivisation, nor do they feature a structurally represented $pro_{(arb)}$ causee. And this, in turn, leads us to draw some broader theoretical conclusions with respect to the representation of external arguments and Case-checking functional heads, an issue we will briefly comment on in closing this section.

The lie of the land is as follows. We would like there to be obstruction to NP–movement of the embedded object into the matrix functional domain when there is a dative-marked causee present, and, conversely, we want there to be no such obstruction when the dative-marked causee is absent. Moreover, we would like the accusative Case-checking potential of the embedded object to vanish when the matrix verb is passivised (as in Italian constructions like *La macchina è stata fatta riparare* 'the car has been made repair'; cf. Guasti 1993). The latter we can accomplish by making the embedded object Case-dependent on the matrix causative verb. And this we gave formal shape by generating the accusative Case-checking head in the matrix functional domain. If that accusative Case-checking head is *v*, Chomsky's 'light verb', and if there is exactly one such head present in the structure of *faire à* causatives, we expect there to be precisely one external argument represented in the structure of *faire à* causatives — since *v* introduces not just the accusative Case feature but also the external θ-role, any complex structure with a single instantiation of *v* will have a single accusative Case feature *and* a single external argument. The embedded verb, then, will not be associated to an external argument of its own; it is essentially a middle verb in the sense of Den Dikken & Sybesma (1998), projecting a root VP without an accompanying *v*P. As a consequence of there being no external argument represented in the causative verb's complement, there will be no need to ever postulate a PRO/*pro* subject inside the infinitival constituent — in fact, postulating such a null category will be impossible (since there is no θ-role available for it).

This is a step in the desired direction. For now we know that, in the absence of a dative-marked causee, there certainly will not be a null subject represented inside the causativised constituent. So this

eliminates one potential blocker of NP–movement of the embedded object. The dative-marked causee, whenever present, will not find itself inside the causativised verb phrase; instead, it will be a constituent of the matrix clause: an indirect object of the 'cause' type verb, which, viewed this way, belongs in the class of triadic verbs.[15] Triadic verbs can often be used dyadically as well — cf. *give*: *I will give Sue a book/a book to Sue* and *I will give a book*. There is no particular reason to assume that, when used dyadically, verbs like *give* structurally project an indirect object; instead, it is customarily assumed that, when *give* type verbs are used dyadically, the beneficiary argument is radically absent from the syntactic representation. With 'cause' type verbs participating in *faire à* constructions analysed as triadic verbs, we can now take the final step necessary to get the behaviour of (19) fully under control: the dative-marked causee, when present, is the indirect object of the causative verb;[16] and when there is no dative-marked causee, the causative verb is simply used dyadically, the causee being radically absent from the syntactic representation (though it will still be present in the lexical-conceptual and perhaps even the argument-structure representation of the causative construction). This said, there will indeed be no obstruction to NP–movement of the embedded object into the matrix functional domain in *faire à* constructions lacking a dative-marked causee.

We initiated the preceding train of thought with the assumption that the head responsible for checking accusative Case in the matrix functional domain of *faire à* causatives is *v*, Chomsky's (1995: Chapter 4) 'light verb' which introduces, apart from the accusative Case feature, also the external argument. Suppose now that the accusative-checking head were AgrO rather than *v*. Then there would be no *a priori* reason to expect the causativised VP to necessarily lack an external argument — after all, AgrO is not the introducer of an external θ-role; the two are entirely independent of one another. It should be possible, therefore, to represent the dative-marked causee as the external argument of the causativised VP on an approach which localises the accusative-checking property in AgrO rather than *v*. On such an analysis (on which XP in (27) is an extended projection of the causativised verb), the blocking effect of dative-marked causees is still guaranteed. But the disappearance of blockage in the absence of an overt dative-marked causee is not — after all, if indeed the dative-marked causee were the external argument of the causativised verb, and if we are right in claiming that the causee-less construction does not involve infinitival passivisation, there must be a null external argument present in the structure of *faire à* constructions with null causees; and that null subject would be expected to block NP–movement of the embedded object in the same way that the overt embedded subject does.

Our point here is not that an analysis which locates the accusative-checking property in AgrO *necessarily* leads to an analysis which treats the dative-marked causee as the subject of the causativised verb. Rather, our point is that such an analysis would make an approach along these lines a real possibility. And since that would leave us empty-handed with respect to the analysis of (19), that should be avoided. Localising the accusative-checking potential in a 'light verb' *v*, by contrast, has the desired effect of making the unwanted representation radically impossible — with *faire à* causatives featuring precisely one *v*P, there will be precisely one accusative Case feature available (which is desirable in view of Italian 'long passives' like *La macchina è stata fatta riparare* 'the car has been made repair') *and* there will be exactly one external argument: the *matrix* external argument. The causee is a matrix indirect object, structurally present only when physically present.

All in all, then, the behaviour of causee-less *faire à* causatives can be construed as an argument in favour of Chomsky's (1995:Chapter 4) proposal to 'replace' AgrOP with a 'light verb' projection *v*P, with *v* responsible for the checking of accusative Case and the introduction of the external argument.

4.5 Summary

Now we really digested the class IV construction to the full. The main properties of *hagy* permissive-causatives of class IV can be summarised as in (31):

(31) a. AspP is downstairs.
b. *v*P/AgrOP is upstairs ('clause union').
c. Clitic climbing is obligatory ('clause union') but obstructed by a dative causee.

It is high time now to broaden the discussion and to address what is perhaps the most remarkable result of the discussion in this section: the claim that Hungarian has object clitics. This claim gives rise to a variety of questions and consequences which we will discuss in the next section.

5 On Hungarian object clitics

5.1 Person split and the representation of first and second person pronoun phrases

If we are right that the facts of *hagy* constructions of class IV are evidence for the clitic-hood of first and second person objects in Hungarian, the very same batch of facts also shows that third person (null) pronominal objects are *not* clitics in Hungarian. After all, (32) is grammatical, with and without the overt object pronoun and, crucially, with and without the overt dative-marked causee. So apparently we have a person split in the domain of object clitics in Hungarian: first and second person objects involve a clitic structure, third person objects never do.[17]

(32)	*Hagyod*	*(Jánosnak)*	*meglátogatni*	*(őt).*
	let-2SG.DEF	János-DAT	PV-visit	him-ACC

If this split stood perfectly on its own, there would be little merit in our analysis. But there are interesting ways in which this split does not in fact stand on its own. For one thing, a person split in which first and second person pattern together to the exclusion of third person is familiar from 'split ergative' systems (something we will not dwell on any further here). And for another, there is an important formal difference between first and second person object pronouns and their third person counterparts. A brief look at the paradigm in (34) should make this clear.

(33) *Hungarian nominative pronouns*

a.	*én*	'I'	d.	*mi*	'we'
b.	*te*	'you$_{sg}$'	e.	*ti*	'you$_{pl}$'
c.	*ő*	'(s)he'	f.	*ők*	'they'

(34) *Hungarian accusative pronouns*

a.	*engem(%et)*	'me(ACC)'	d.	*mink%(et)*	'us(ACC)'
			d′.	*bennünk%(et)*	'us(ACC)'
b.	*téged(%et)*	'you$_{sg}$(ACC)'	e.	*titek%(et)*	'you$_{pl}$(ACC)'
			e′.	*bennetek%(et)*	'you$_{pl}$(ACC)'
c.	*őt*	'(s)he-ACC'	f.	*őket*	'they-ACC'

The third person pronominal system is perfectly transparent, and built on the nominative singular pronoun *ő*— the accusative singular is formed by attaching the accusative marker *-t* onto the base form; the plural is made by glomming the plural marker *-k* onto the base form; and the accusative plural features both plural *-k* and accusative *-t*, in that order. The forms for first and second person seem much less transparent: the accusative forms certainly do not result from just sticking the accusative marker *-t* onto the nominative forms (cf. *én – *ént*, *te – *tét*). In fact, the accusative marker does not even seem to be important in the first and second person object pronouns at all — certainly for the singular pronouns *engem* and *téged*, the forms lacking the accusative marker are much more natural; for the first/second person plural pronouns the standard language does require the accusative marker, but dialects seem to be able to do without the *-et* in these cases as well.

The optionality of the accusative Case-marker in *engem/téged* (and, in dialectal Hungarian, in their plural counterparts as well) reminds us of a regularity found elsewhere in the grammar of Hungarian: possessed noun phrases with a first or second person possessor typically lack the accusative Case-marker when functioning as a direct object:

(35) a. *Megkaptam az útlevelem(et).*
PV-got-1SG.DEF the passport-1SG(ACC)
b. *Megkaptad az útleveled(et).*
PV-got-2SG.DEF the passport-2SG(ACC)
c. *Megkaptuk az útlevelünk(et).*
PV-got-1PL.DEF the passport-1PL(ACC)
d. *Megkaptátok az útleveletek(et).*
PV-got-2PL.DEF the passport-2PL(ACC)

This suggests a parallel between possessed nominals and first/second person object pronouns. And that parallel goes much further — in fact, the first/second person object pronouns look *exactly* like possessed noun phrases: a comparison of the forms in (34a,b,d,e) and the corresponding forms of *útlevel* 'passport' in (35) will make this clear.[18] Abstracting away from the accusative Case-ending, the first/second person object pronouns all end in the possessive agreement marker of the pertinent person and number — that is, *engem* ends in the *-em* found on possessed nouns with a first person singular possessor; the *-nk* of *minket* is the same element as the *-ünk* of *útlevelünk* in (35c); etc.

Formally, then, the full forms of the Hungarian first and second person objects in (34a,b,d,e) are possessed nominals, with the full pronoun serving as the morphological host to the possessive morphology — possessive morphology which has the exact same person and number features as the pronoun itself: when the pronoun is first plural *mi*, the possessive morpheme is first plural *-nk*; when the pronoun is second plural *ti*, the possessive morpheme is second plural *-tek*; etc. Possessive morphology occurs in Hungarian only in the presence of a possessor. So we know, given that possessive morphology shows up on all first/second person accusative pronouns, that there has to be a possessor present in the structure of these pronouns. That possessor could either be the overt pronoun itself, in which case the possessum would — in any event in the case of first person pronouns — be null (and the possessive morphology would, irregularly, be hosted by the possessor since they end up adjacent due to the emptiness of the possessum); or the (first person) possessor will be null and the overt pronoun functions as the possessum, bearing possessive morphology in the usual way. The latter approach is somewhat more straightforward in the sense that it provides a concrete host for the possessive morpheme. And for the purposes of the discussion to follow this approach also works out rather better than the alternative (see also fn. 20, below, for a potential additional argument against the former approach). So we adopt it here, and assume that the overt first/second person object pronouns are possessed nouns, possessed by elements with the same person and number features as the overt pronoun (the possessum). Those elements will be the *clitics* which undergo movement into the matrix clause.[19] The first person clitic is null; the second person clitic can be overt (*-l*).

(36) a. $[_{NP*}\ CL_{[1sg]}$ en<g>+*em*$]$
b. $[_{NP*}\ CL_{[2sg]}$ té<g>+*ed*$]$
c. $[_{NP*}\ CL_{[1pl]}$ mi+*nk*$]$
d. $[_{NP*}\ CL_{[2pl]}$ ti+*tek*$]$

Third person pronouns do not work this way in Hungarian — as pointed out in the foregoing, third person pronoun forms are all built on the nominative singular base form *ő* via the addition of plural and accusative Case-markers; there is no possessive morphology on the accusative forms in (34).[20] So third person pronouns have a substantially simpler structure: they are simply a projection of the pronoun; there is no clitic in the possessor position.

Just on the basis of this formal distinction between the first/second person object pronouns in (34a,b,d,e) and their third person counterparts, then, we naturally arrive at a conclusion we had drawn in the discussion in section 4: that first/second person object pronouns involve a *clitic* while third person pronouns do not. And we have also arrived at an interesting way of putting both that clitic and the overt pronoun into a single noun-phrase structure: the clitic is the possessor of the overt pronoun, which is adorned with possessive morphology.

It is interesting to draw a parallel between this representation and the so-called object clitic doubling constructions of Romance, exemplified by Spanish (37a/a′):

(37) a. *Lo* *vimos* *a* *el.*
him(CL) we-say to him
'We saw him.'

a′. *Yo* *tengo* *asma,* *pero* *el* *asma* *no* *me* *tiene* *a* *mi.*
I have asthma but the asthma not me(CL) has to me
'I have asthma, but asthma doesn't have *me*.'

b. [$_{NP*}$ {*me/te/lo/la*} *a* {*mi/ti/el/ella*}]

What is interesting is that in Spanish object clitic doubling constructions the full noun phrase must be preceded by the dative preposition *a*. And we know that the dative preposition occurs inside possessed nominal phrases in Romance (cf. French *voiture à Jean* 'car to Jean'). A possibility that presents itself, then, when it comes to the representation of object clitic doubling constructions in Romance is that the object clitic and its double form a single possessed noun phrase, much as in Hungarian (cf. (37b)), this time with the object clitic as the possessum and the full pronoun as the possessor (cf. option 1 for Hungarian, which we have not quite discarded, though the alternative, as depicted in (36), works more straightforwardly). Schmitt (1998) comes fairly close to this type of representation of the object clitic doubling construction (see section 5.2 for some more discussion of her proposal), though she does not draw the link with possessed noun phrases. What the Hungarian facts canvassed in the above suggest is that, if these Hungarian cases involve object clitic doubling, there is indeed a link between the structure of object clitic doubling constructions and possessed noun phrases, a link that is very much worth looking into in more detail in future research.

What now remains is to add a brief word about the internal make-up of the alternate first/second person plural forms in (34d′,e′), *bennünket* and *benneteket*. Their structure has the locative adposition *ben* 'in' at its core, followed by an inflectional marker for first/second person plural (identical with the possessive markers for these person/number combinations, as is generally the case for prepositional inflection in Hungarian) and the accusative Case-marker. The historical development of these forms sheds light on this remarkable composition. In older varieties of Hungarian locative *ben* had a function as a partitivity marker: *Látsz bennünk* '(lit.) you see in us' could mean 'ou see some of us' (modern Hungarian *Látsz néhányat közülünk* 'you see some among us'). In those early days, *bennünk* was not adorned with the accusative marker; the actual direct object was a null indefinite pronoun (cf. 'some' in the translation). But in later times *bennünk* (and the same goes for *bennetek*), when following verbs not otherwise taking *ben*-PPs as their complements, came to carry the accusative Case-marker, functioning as a regular direct object. It seems to be the case, though, that *bennünket* and *benneteket* still behave as complex syntactic constituents headed by a null indefinite pronoun. This is suggested by their agreement behaviour in object positions, to which we now turn.

5.2 Definiteness, Case and first/second person objects

As we noted in section 2, first and second objects in Hungarian trigger indefinite agreement on the finite verb, as shown in (7), repeated here:

(7) a. *János* *szeret-∅* *(engem/* *minket/* *bennünket/*
János love-INDEF me us-ACC us-ACC/
téged/ *titeket/* *benneteket).*
you$_{sg}$ you$_{pl}$-ACC you$_{pl}$-ACC

b. **János* *szeret-i* *(engem/* *minket/* *bennünket*
János love-DEF me us-ACC us-ACC
téged/ *titeket/* *benneteket).*
you$_{sg}$ you$_{pl}$-ACC you$_{pl}$-ACC

It has been tentatively suggested in the literature (cf. Bartos 1997:382, 1998, É. Kiss 1999) that this agreement pattern is the reflex of the fact that the structure of first and second person objects is smaller than DP — NumP, according to Bartos and É. Kiss. This seems entirely reasonable for the *ben*-forms of the first and second person plural pronouns, which historically go back to partitive noun phrases headed by a null indefinite pronoun. We therefore follow the Bartos/É. Kiss line on *bennünket* and *benneteket* in its essentials, dressing it up by treating these pronouns as partitive noun phrases headed by a null indefinite (the null counterpart of *some*).

But for the other first and second person object pronouns (*engem, téged, minket, titeket*), there does not seem to be any independent support for an approach along these lines. And we already pointed out in section 2 that neither semantically nor syntactically do first and second person objects pattern with indefinite noun phrases. So we will present an alternative analysis that will face the challenge that the variants of (7b) featuring *engem, téged, minket* and *titeket* pose: the fact that the first/second person object pronoun does *not* check definiteness against the verb, while it *does* manage to get its accusative Case feature checked. This is looks like a paradox — after all, accusative Case and definiteness are checked in the domain of one and the same head, *v*/AgrO. But the possessive approach to the structure of these first and second person objects outlined in the foregoing provides a way out of this paradox. The crux of the solution is the realisation that, of the two members of the structure in (36), only one is specified for definiteness, and only one is specified for Case.

Starting with the latter, all we need to draw attention to is the morphological fact that the accusative Case-marker manifests itself on the possessum (which it linearly follows) but *not* on the clitic. We can ascertain this by looking at constructions with a first person singular subject and a second person object, where the special *-lak/-lek* inflectional marker surfaces (cf. (5a), repeated here).

(5a)	*(Én)*	*szeretlek*	*(téged/*	*titeket/*	*benneteket).*
	I	love-LAK/LEK	you	you_{pl}-ACC	you_{pl}-ACC

In section 2 we already drew attention to the compositionality of the *-lak/-lek* form: it consists of one of the forms for second person subject inflection and the form for first person subject inflection, both from the indefinite paradigm. We proposed to give the *-l* and the *-k* of the *-lak/-lek* marker independent status, such that *-l* actually functions as a second person *object clitic* in (5c). Now notice that the *-l* of *szeretlek* and the *-l* of unergative *mosolyogtál* 'you smiled' or unaccusative *megjöttél* 'you have come' are identical in form — that is, there is no formal distinction between object clitics and what we may now take to be subject clitics (the *-l* in the latter two forms): *-l* is invariant, regardless of whether its function is that of subject or object. This suggests that object clitics in Hungarian indeed do not carry an accusative Case-feature — and this makes perfect sense if the object clitic is structurally represented as the (nominative) possessor of the structurally Case-marked object pronoun.[21]

There is good reason, then, to believe that, of the two members of the DP–structure in (36), the possessum has a structural accusative Case-feature while the possessor (the clitic) does not. Now what about definiteness? To answer this question, let us take Schmitt's (1998) lead and say that in clitic doubling constructions (of which we take (36) to be an instantiation; cf. section 5.1) the relationship between the clitic and the doubling (pro)noun phrase is akin to that between an expletive and its associate. From clauses involving an expletive and a nominal associate we are familiar with the fact that the latter must be indefinite (cf. English *There is a/*the man in the garden*). Let us take this to show the nominal associate of an expletive cannot be marked [+definite]; and with [+definite] being a feature of D, this will naturally entail that the associate of an expletive is smaller than DP. For sentential expletive constructions this has the familiar consequences (see Chomsky 1995 for a specific development of the indefiniteness requirement on the 'expletive adjunction' approach). For clitic doubling constructions, the same line of argument leads us to conclude that in (36) it is the clitic which is marked [+definite] while the full pronoun is not so marked:[22]

(36′) a. $[_{NP*}\ CL_{[1sg]}$ en<g>+*em*$]$ [+def] [+acc]

b. $[_{NP*}\ CL_{[2sg]}$ té<g>+*ed*$]$ [+def] [+acc]

c. $[_{NP*}\ CL_{[1pl]}$ mi+*nk*$]$ [+def] [+acc]

d. $[_{NP*}\ CL_{[2pl]}$ ti+*tek*$]$ [+def] [+acc]

A [+definite] D is an operator head, and as such needs to bind a variable. In the bulk of cases this variable is created via N–to–D raising (i.e., via the creation of a *chain*) in the course of the derivation (cf. Longobardi 1993). But in clitic doubling configurations of the type portrayed in (36′), the [+definite] D–head of the clitic (an expletive on Schmitt's 1998 proposal) associates to the requisite variable via the formation of a *CHAIN* (in Chomsky's 1986 sense). The net result in both cases is the saturation of the [+definite] feature of the D–head. In the 'normal' case, D is the head of the entire noun phrase; but in (36′) the [+definite] D–head is not: [+definite] is represented *only* on the clitic, not on the NP*. This conclusion is an important step towards the solution of the mystery of Case and definiteness checking in Hungarian constructions with first/second person objects.

Before proceeding, it will be good to briefly recapitulate the crucial ingredients of the analysis of *hagy* permissive-causative constructions in section 4. Recall that the the fact that *hagy* constructions feature obligatory agreement in definiteness between the finite verb and a third person embedded object regardless of the presence of a dative-marked causee (cf. (17)/(18)) led us to conclude that the [+definite] feature of *v*/AgrO is *weak*. Recall also that the presence of a dative-marked causee does block the *-lak/-lek* form of the finite verb (in terms of the analysis proposed, blocks clitic climbing from out of the causativised constituent) prompted an analysis of Hungarian clitic placement in terms of a two-step derivation: NP–movement to the Spec*v*P/AgrOP position local to the target Infl–node followed by actual cliticisation.

In concrete terms (in keeping with the general adage that movement should affect the smallest constituent necessary for convergence), the element that undergoes NP–movement (feeding cliticisation) is *just* the projection of the object clitic (the possessor in (36′)). Suppose, then, that by so moving, the clitic destroys the possibility of checking the definiteness feature of *v*/AgrO. The result will then be default indefinite agreement on the finite verb whenever there is overt-syntactic movement of the object to Spec*v*P/AgrOP. This is the desired result; let us make it more precise.

In particular, let us make a specific assumption with respect to the nature of weak features, as a companion to Chomsky's (1995:Chapter 4) assumption about strong features in (38):

(38) Strong features are features which a derivation cannot tolerate. (Chomsky 1995)

(39) Weak features are features which can only be checked within X^0. (this paper)

Given (39), weak features can never 'accidentally' be checked by overt-syntactic XP–movement. This has the desired effect of making it impossible for the raised object itself to check definiteness agreement against the matrix *v*/AgrO in Hungarian sentences in which the object is first or second person. Moreover, it is a standard assumption that NP–movement, if it leaves copies at all, does not allow lower copies to be 'active' after Spell–Out. That is, only the highest member of an A–chain survives at LF. It also will be impossible, therefore, to check *v*/AgrO's [+definite] feature in the case of first/second person objects by launching the matching feature from one of the clitic's lower copies at LF — those copies, if present at all, are inert at LF. Finally, since in a clitic doubling structure of the type in (36′) the complex NP* has no [+definite] feature at all (definiteness being represented on the clitic only; cf. above), it cannot 'come to the rescue' either. There will be no way, then, for the object to enter into a definiteness agreement relationship with *v*/AgrO in Hungarian if the object is first or second person: the [+definite] feature of *v*/AgrO, which is weak and uninterpretable, would fail to get checked, causing a violation of Full Interpretation. The result, as said, is *default* indefinite agreement on the finite verb: *v*/AgrO has no [+definite] feature, and the inherent [+definite] feature of the first/second person object clitic is interpretable on the clitic, hence is not in need of checking at all.

This takes care of definiteness agreement in the case of first/second person objects. What about Case? Recall that we had concluded on the basis of the fact that on the clitic itself we cannot discern any Case-marking and that instead it is the full pronoun that hosts Case-morphology, i.e. that it is the projection of the possessum that is Case-marked (as is a standard assumption for possessed noun phrases). So the clitic does not have an accusative Case feature; to the extent that it ever had a Case feature, it will already have checked and lost this feature prior to its movement from out of the complex DP in (36). The clitic therefore cannot check the Case feature of *v*/AgrO — not even 'accidentally' (in violation of (39)), since it simply does not have a Case feature (any more). But in contrast to the situation we faced in the case of definiteness checking, there *is* a way this time of getting *v*/AgrO's accusative Case feature checked. After all, the projection of the possessum (the non-clitic object pronoun) bears accusative Case. So it can launch its features up to *v*/AgrO and get its accusative Case feature checked against that of *v*/AgrO, Full Interpretation being fully satisfied as a result.

So we see that an additional virtue of the representation of object pronouns as in (36)/(36′), above and beyond the fact that it provides a direct explanation for the morphological realisation of these pronouns in Hungarian (and opens up a new perspective on the representation of clitic doubling in Romance as well), is that it eliminates the paradox with respect to Case and definiteness checking that Hungarian first/second objects seemed to present us with. The paradox evaporates once we recognise that, in the structure in (36′), it is the possessum's projection that harbours the Case feature while the possessor (the clitic) carries the [+definite] feature of first/second person object pronouns.[23]

5.3 Order

One last remark concerning Hungarian object clitic constructions is in order, concerning order. If indeed the *-l* of (5a) is a clitic, and if indeed it adjoins to the left of Infl (like object clitics in Romance; cf. Kayne's work), we immediately capture the relative order of the constituent parts of the *-lak/-lek* form in (5a) (*szeretlek* 'I love you'). The *-k* of first person singular subject agreement is either a subject clitic (see the discussion at the end of section 5.2) or a direct morphological realisation of the [1SG] feature bundle under finite Infl — Hungarian inflectional morphology is concatenative, and gives occasion to a non-lexicalist approach (as argued in Den Dikken 1999 with reference to the Hungarian possessive agreement system). So the *-k* of *szeretlek* sits in Infl. The *-l* of *szeretlek* is the physical realisation of an object clitic — it adjoins to Infl, as we claimed in the foregoing. In keeping with Kayne's (1991, 1994) strictly left-adjoining approach to clitic placement, we have it adjoin to the left of Infl, ending up preceding whatever is in Infl (i.e. *-k*). The surface word order *-lek* (with the *-e-* being an epenthetic vowel; Hungarian has no *-lk* clusters) thus results without further ado. And moreover, *-l* and *-k* end up forming a unit under Infl; more generally, the object clitic and the subject clitic/agreement marker form a unit under Infl (resulting from adjunction of the former to the latter), and this may ultimately help us make sense of the difficult co-occurrence restrictions on these markers (cf. Kayne 1994 for a suggestion along similar lines with respect to the analysis of co-occurrence restrictions on multiple clitics in French; cf. also the *le>se* switch in double-object clitic constructions in Spanish).

6 Class III: *-tat/-tet* causatives

The discussion of *hagy* permissive-causatives of class IV basically provides us with everything we need to know to proceed to a discussion of the remaining three classes. We will go through them in reverse order, building on the analysis of class IV.

For class III, the morphological causatives featuring *-tat/-tet* 'make/have', we observe that base verb plus preverb linearly precedes the affixal causative verb *-tat/-tet*. It is difficult to tell what this means with respect to the question of whether 'preverb climbing' takes place in this construction or not. Since the causative verbal complex is arguably the result of *incorporation* of the lower verb into the affixal causative verb, the Aspect phrase harbouring preverb may either be base-generated low, in the

complement of the causative verb, in which case the incorporating base verb will raise up to *-tat/-tet* via Asp, picking up *meg* along the way, or Asp may be base-generated in the matrix clause, in which case *meg* directly precedes the verbal complex in the base.

There are ways of forcing a decision on this question. One would be to capitalise on the fact that *meg* precedes the entire complex verb: on an antisymmetry approach to adjunction, the only way for the lower verb to 'pick up' *meg* on its way up would be for it to left-adjoin to *meg*, which would not deliver the appropriate surface word order. Another would be to argue that *meg* occupies SpecAspP rather than Asp^0. And a third would be to capitalise on Li's (1990) theory of 'improper head movement', preventing the lower verb from raising through any functional head on its way up to the causativiser. The net result of all three would be that *meg*'s AspP would have to be base-generated in the extended projection of the causativiser. We will keep the door to low generation of AspP ajar, however; nothing hinges on its location here.

We can be more categorical when it comes to the structural position occupied by the causee and by *v*P/AgrOP in *-tat/-tet* causatives. Let us start off with the latter. The empirical facts in (14) and (15) show that the complex causative verb agrees in definiteness with the embedded object, just like in *hagy* permissive-causatives of class IV. Moreover, the agreement marker is affixed to *-tat/-tet*, not to the embedded verb with which *-tat/-tet* forms a unit. The morphological constitution of the verb form in (15b) hence shows that *v*P/AgrOP finds itself in the matrix functional domain. The definiteness feature of *v*/AgrO is once again weak, checked by LF feature movement.

When we now turn to the structural location of the causee, let us first of all recall from the discussion of *hagy* permissives of class IV that the mere presence of an overt dative-marked causee makes it impossible for the embedded infinitive to take a first or second person object — in technical terms, the dative-marked causee obstructs cliticisation of the first/second person object. In the domain of morphological *-tat/-tet* causatives of class III, on the other hand, we do not find any such obstruction by the causee: (16) is grammatical regardless. There appears to be a correlation here between the case-form of the causee and the possibility of object cliticisation: in class IV the causee is dative-marked; in class III it is instrumental-marked. Instrumentally case-marked noun phrases typically occupy non-argument (A′–)positions in the structure. On the assumption that the instrumental-marked causee in class III morphological causatives is no exception in this regard, the fact that its presence is innocuous with respect to the cliticisation of first/second person embedded objects is as expected.

In sum, what we have seen in our discussion of class III is the following scenario:

(40) a. AspP's location is unclear (theory-internal issue).
b. *v*P/AgrOP is upstairs ('clause union').
c. Clitic climbing is obligatory ('clause union') and unobstructed by an INST causee.

7 Class II: *come/go* constructions

The *come/go* constructions of class II present a more intriguing picture than do the *-tat/-tet* causatives of class III. Not with respect to the location of AspP — the fact that the preverb must stay downstairs makes it clear that AspP is generated in the complement of the *come/go* verb. More intriguing is the agreement cocktail served up by class II constructions: the *come/go* verb can agree in person with the object clitic (cf. the *-lak/-lek* form in (13b)), but it does not agree in definiteness with the object.

It will be good, right at the outset, to discourage any kind of 'functionalist' outlook on the fact that definite agreement on the *come/go* verb is impossible in class II constructions. One might think that this is impossible simply because *come/go* verbs cannot be transitive — but such an approach would never cover the entire spectrum of facts. After all, *jár* 'go' is a member of the set of verbs which partake in class II constructions,[24] and unlike *jön* 'come' and *elmegy* 'go off' it does actually allow transitive construal. And when it is construed transitively and takes a definite object, as in (41), it actually shows definite agreement with the object (unsurprisingly). It is not structurally impossible for *jár*, therefore, to

take definite agreement. Yet, when it occurs in the type II *come/go* construction, it behaves just like its fellow *come/go* verbs in rejecting definiteness agreement with the embedded object, as (42) shows.

(41)	*Járom*	*az*	*utat.*	
	go-1SG.DEF	the	road-ACC	
(42)	*Járok/*om*		*meglátogatni*	*Pétert.*
	go-1SG.INDEF/*DEF		PV-visit	Peter-ACC

It is something specific to the class II *come/go* constructions, then, that makes upstairs definiteness agreement impossible.

That 'something specific' is the location of *v*P/AgrOP *vis-à-vis* the matrix *come/go* verb. While in constructions of classes III and IV we have found evidence to believe that *v*P/AgrOP is located in the matrix functional domain, *v*P/AgrOP finds itself in the *complement* of the matrix verb in *come/go* constructions in Hungarian. As a consequence, no [+definite] agreement morphology will ever manifest itself on the matrix verb in these constructions — the embedded object checks definiteness against an embedded *v*/AgrO; but since definiteness agreement has a morphological reflex only in the domain of finite verbs, definiteness checking is invisible in the examples in (11) and (12).

Recall that in class II constructions AspP patterns with *v*P/AgrOP when it comes to its location in relation to the matrix verb — it finds itself in the complement of the *come/go* verb as well, as the placement of the preverb *meg* in our examples in (11) and (12) shows. With respect to *v*P/AgrOP and AspP placement, then, class II constructions are not 'clause union' constructions at all. Still, these constructions do exhibit one 'clause union' feature, albeit only optionally for some speakers (see above): what we have called 'person agreement' between the upstairs verb and the embedded object (the *-lak/-lek* form of (13b)). On our approach to this so-called 'person agreement', this is the reflex of unobstructed overt-syntactic cliticisation of the embedded first/second person object clitic to the matrix Infl–node, an effect of the presence of only a single IP in the structure. *Come/go* constructions, then, can do without an IP in the infinitival complement, and when they lack an embedded IP, clitic climbing is automatic, yielding (13b). But speakers accepting (13b′), lacking *-lak/-lek*, do not force clitic climbing, which, on our assumptions, amounts to saying that they allow an IP to be present in *come/go*'s complement. Hungarian *come/go* constructions split into two subcases, therefore: one corresponding to English *come/go fetch the newspaper* (no embedded IP) and the other matching English *come/go to fetch the newspaper* (where *to* in English and the absence of *-lak/-lek* in Hungarian (13b′) signals the presence of an embedded IP).

The picture for class II that emerges from this discussion is the following:

(43) a. AspP is downstairs.
b. *v*P/AgrOP is downstairs.
c. Clitic climbing is possible ('clause union.) and unobstructed.

8 Class I: auxiliary constructions

The last class on our list is class I, featuring auxiliary verbs like *fog*. These show the full array of 'clause union' effects:

(44) a. AspP is upstairs ('clause union').
b. *v*P/AgrOP is upstairs ('clause union').
c. Clitic climbing is obligatory ('clause union') and unobstructed.

The upstairs location of AspP reveals itself in obligatory 'preverb climbing' — *meg* must surface to the left of *fog* in (8) and (9), it cannot show up downstairs.[25] Our analysis of *meg*, which treats it as the

earmark of AspP, thus leads us to place AspP in the extended projection of the auxiliary in class II constructions. That *v*P/AgrOP is also upstairs can be read off the fact that *fog* must agree in definiteness with the object whenever the object is third person (cf. (8) *vs* (9)). And finally the occurrence of the *-lak/-lek* form in (10) shows that clitic climbing is obligatory, another hallmark of 'clause union'.

Concerning the behaviour of class I verbs in first language acquisition, there is some interesting data available in the literature.[26] Papp (1998:269–70) points out that, even though '[t]here is one instance of a raised prefix in Zoli's production at age 1;8 and one in Andi's files at 2;1', preverb climbing from out of the complement of *akar* is often omitted by Hungarian L1 learners — cf. *Én is akarom* ***meg****nézni* 'I too want-1SG.DEF PV-look.at' (Gyuri, 2;3) and *Én is akarok* ***föl****szálni* 'I too want-1SG.INDEF PV-climb' (Éva, 2;7).[27] This indicates that one 'clause union' property of class I verbs is not stably in place before the age of three. But notice that definiteness agreement in the two examples just given is entirely as expected on the basis of the adult grammar of class I verbs: in Gyuri's utterance *akar* bears definite agreement in keeping with the fact that the embedded verb *megnézni* takes a (pro-dropped) definite direct object here ('I want to watch it, too'), while Éva correctly selects indefinite agreement in recognition of the fact that *fölszálni* is intransitive. So apparently 'clause union' effects with respect to definiteness agreement and preverb climbing do not develop at the same time — a clear indication that even with verbs of class I, which are positively specified for all three 'clause union' earmarks in Table 1, the three 'clause union' parameters are independent of one another.

9 'Clause union'

The child language data reported at the end of the previous section confirm the 'modular' approach to 'clause union' effects taken in this paper. 'Clause union' is a sliding scale, defined by three separate parameters: *(i)* preverb climbing, *(ii)* definiteness agreement and *(iii)* person agreement. The auxiliary verb constructions of class I are at the top of the scale. These are full-fledged 'clause union' constructions — that is to say, they locate both AspP and *v*P/AgrOP in the matrix functional domain, and they also feature obligatory clitic climbing. The causatives of classes III and IV are one notch lower on the 'clause union' scale: they have *v*P/AgrOP upstairs and they have obligatory clitic climbing, but they feature AspP in the complement of the matrix verb (though this cannot be concluded with certainty for the *-tat/-tet* cases of class III; depending on one's point of view, there might actually be arguments to the effect that AspP is located upstairs in these cases). Lowest on the 'clause union' ladder are the *come/go* constructions of class II. These do have obligatory clitic climbing, but in the other two respects they fail the litmus test for 'clause union': they have both AspP and *v*P/AgrOP located downstairs.

'Clause union' effects can now be factored out into three factors:

(45) a. the location of AspP
b. the location of *v*P/AgrOP
c. the presence/absence of IP in the embedded clause

Whenever AspP is located 'upstairs' we get 'preverb climbing', i.e., the occurrence on the matrix verb of the preverb that belongs to the embedded verb. Whenever *v*P/AgrOP is located 'upstairs' we get upstairs definiteness agreement with the embedded definite object. And whenever there is no IP in the complement of the matrix verb *and* there is no A–specifier blocking clitic movement, we get 'clitic climbing' effects. Class I constructions have the full array of (45a–c) while class II constructions only feature clitic climbing (i.e., they have no downstairs IP); class IV has (45b,c) but not (45a), and depending on one's analysis class III is either like class IV or like class I.

An important regularity that presents itself when we inspect the patterns observed is that AspP is never located upstairs without *v*P/AgrOP also being in the matrix functional domain. In observational terms: 'preverb climbing' and upstairs definiteness agreement always go together; it does not seem to be possible to have 'preverb climbing' (upstairs AspP) without at the same time having definiteness

agreement between the matrix verb and the embedded object. This suggests that there is a close structural relationship between AspP and the projection in which accusative Case and definiteness are checked, and (on the *v*P approach) by which the external θ-role is introduced as well. Such an interplay between the two projections would seem to fit in most comfortably with Chomsky's (1995:Chapter 4) 'light verb' *v* perspective on the latter: an interdependence between Asp and the 'light verb'. This would square with the line of thought presented at the end of section 4 of the present paper, to the effect that *v* should be preferred to AgrO.

10 Long A′–movement, agreement and Case

'Clause union' effects are typically confined to infinitival complementation constructions across languages. And at first blush Hungarian seems to pose no exceptions to this generalisation: it is impossible to have the embedded subject or object agree in definiteness with the upstairs verb in an example such as (46); it is impossible to have a second person subject or object of the embedded finite clause trigger the *-lak/-lek* form on the matrix verb, as in (47); and it is also impossible to have the preverb *meg* 'climb' into the matrix clause in an example such as (48) (see fn. 28, below, for some qualifications which do not, however, affect the discussion to follow).

(46) a. *Akarom/*ok hogy valaki meglátogassa Jánost.*
want-1SG.DEF/*INDEF that someone PV-visit-SUBJUNC-3SG.DEF János-ACC
b. *Akarom/*ok hogy János meglátogatasson valakit.*
want-1SG.DEF/*INDEF that János PV-visit-SUBJUNC-3SG.INDEF s.o.-ACC

(47) a. *Akarom/*lak hogy te meglátogasd Jánost.*
want-1SG.DEF/*LAK/LEK that you PV-visit-SUBJUNC-2SG.DEF János-ACC
b. *Akarom/*lak hogy János meglátogatasson téged.*
want-1SG.DEF/*LAK/LEK that János PV-visit-SUBJUNC-3SG.INDEF you

(48) <**Meg*> akartam hogy János <*meg*>látogasson engem[28]
PV want-PAST-1SG.(IN)DEF that János PV-visit-SUBJUNC-3SG.INDEF me

But there are contexts in Hungarian in which a constituent of the embedded clause triggers definiteness/person agreement on the matrix verb, and will show up in the accusative Case-form regardless of its function in the embedded clause. Those contexts involve A′–extraction from out of the embedded clause, affecting *wh*-phrases and focused constituents.[29] The most spectacular examples of this type involve extraction of the embedded *subject*, for these exhibit not just upstairs agreement but 'Case switch' as well. Exemplification is provided below.

(49) *Kit/*ki akarsz/*od hogy meglátogassa Jánost?*
who-ACC/*who want-2SG.INDEF/*DEF that PV-visit-SUBJUNC-3SG.DEF János-ACC
'Who do you want to visit János?'

(50) *TÉGED akarlak hogy meglátogass engem.*
you-FOC want-LAK/LEK that PV-visit-SUBJUNC-2SG.INDEF me
'It is you that I want to visit me.'

Upstairs definiteness/person agreement and 'Case switch' are obligatory in contexts such as these. But they become impossible in cases of multiple *wh*-extraction from out of the embedded clause, as Lipták (2001) shows: (51) with accusative Case-marking on *ki* and upstairs definiteness agreement is very awkward (on the intended reading of the example, on which *mikor* 'when' temporally modifies the embedded clause, i.e. the time of visiting János).

(51) *Ki/*kit mikor akarod/*sz hogy meglátogassa Jánost?*
who/*who-ACC when want-2SG.DEF/*INDEF that PV-visit-SUBJUNC-3SG.DEF J-ACC
'Who do you want to visit János when?'

The data in (49)–(51) present a complex array of facts. In this section we will present an analysis of these data based on the analysis of 'clause union' phenomena offered in the foregoing, and taking the structure of the second person object pronoun *téged* proposed in section 5 as its crucial cue.

10.1 Extraction from the embedded clause

One thing that we need to establish before proceeding any further is that in examples of the type in (49) and (50) we are dealing with extraction of the *wh*-constituent or focused phrase from out of the embedded clause. While this may seem to go without saying, an *a priori* alternative analysis would treat these constituents as matrix elements, as in English constructions such as *I think of John that he is stupid*. There is evidence within Hungarian that the latter is not the right approach to the facts in (49)–(50) — evidence constituted, in fact, by the contrast between (49) and (51).[30]

Lipták (2001) offers an analysis of this contrast whose crucial claim is that in (51) extraction proceeds from the embedded clause via the formation of a complex *wh*-constituent containing both *wh*-phrases. That is, *ki* and *mikor* 'join forces' in the embedded SpecCP in (51), moving on into the matrix clause as one unit. This approach to (51) explains the impossibility of upstairs agreement and 'Case switch' for *ki*, on the plausible assumption that the Case and definiteness features of neither of the members of the *wh*-complex can percolate up to the *wh*-complex. The *wh*-complex, then, has no Case or definiteness features, which makes it impossible for this complex to be attracted by the upstairs checker of these features, *v*/AgrO. Instead of attracting the *wh*-complex, *v*/AgrO checks its features against the entire embedded CP, resulting in definite agreement, as usual in Hungarian.

The ease with which Lipták's analysis handles the contrast between (49) and (51) suggests that it is on the right track. And if it is, it constitutes a direct argument to the effect that the *wh*-phrases in (51) *both* come from out of the embedded clause — for otherwise they could not have formed a *wh*-complex in the embedded SpecCP; the matrix SpecFocP would then be the first position in which they could team up, but that position is too high in the structure to make it impossible for the embedded subject-*wh* phrase to check Case and definiteness against the matrix *v*/AgrO.

We conclude, then, that constructions of the type in (49)–(51) involve long movement, i.e. extraction from out of the embedded clause. With this conclusion drawn, let us proceed to examining the upstairs Case and agreement checking phenomena exhibited by (49) and (50).

10.2 The accusative-marked subject is accusative from the start

Just looking at an example such as (49), a tempting move would be to say that *kit* 'starts out' as *ki*, the nominative-checking subject of the embedded clause, and gets adorned with the accusative marker *-t* once it transits through the upstairs Spec*v*P/SpecAgrOP position. Such an approach would raise questions about the way in which the Case feature of the matrix *v*/AgrO node are checked, and would seem to imply that a single noun phrase can possess multiple (even non-identical) Case features. But we need not tarry on such questions, since (50) shows that an analysis of this sort cannot be correct.

Recall from section 5 that the structure of *téged*, the second person object pronoun, is entirely different from that of *te*, its nominative counterpart: the former features a possessed noun phrase structure while the latter does not. Importantly, then, *téged* is not the result of glomming the accusative marker *-t* onto the nominative base form *te* — and in this respect the first/second person pronouns of Hungarian are crucially different from third person noun phrases in the language. In view of this, we cannot claim that (50) 'starts out' with *te* in the embedded subject position, with subsequent movement of the focused second person pronoun through the matrix Spec*v*P/AgrOP position, resulting in the addition of the accusative marker. If such were actually the case, we would expect (50) to surface with **TÉT* rather than *TÉGED*.

Since *téged* cannot be compositionally 'created' in the course of the A′–movement derivation in an example such as (50), we are left with the conclusion that the surface accusative is *always* an accusative, from the very beginning, in such constructions. And since the focused constituent of (50) starts out in the embedded clause (not in the matrix), this means that the external argument of the embedded predication (base-generated in Spec*v*P/VP) is *téged*, not *te*.

10.3 That-*trace avoidance, the Italian way*

Since *téged* does not have a nominative Case feature, it never moves to or through the embedded SpecIP position. If such movement were to accidentally take place, it would arguably destroy the possibility for I's nominative Case feature to ever be checked, which would result in a violation of the Principle of Full Interpretation. The derivation would crash.

There is a second reason, in fact, why the derivation would crash if the embedded subject were to raise from its base position into SpecCP via an intermediate touch-down in SpecIP. The step from SpecIP into SpecCP across the overt finite complementiser *hogy* 'that' would create a classic *that-t* configuration, which we know many languages do not tolerate. On the assumption that Hungarian is one of those languages, movement from SpecIP to SpecCP across *hogy* will be impossible for trace-licensing reasons as well.

Instead of raising up via SpecIP, *téged* makes its way straight from its base position into the embedded SpecCP. In this respect, Hungarian behaves just like Italian (cf. Rizzi 1982): subject extraction across a lexical complementiser is legitimate thanks to the possibility of 'by-passing' SpecIP. As Rizzi argues (cf. also Brandi & Cordin's 1989 supporting evidence from Northern Italian dialects), the SpecIP position gets 'plugged' in derivations of this type by a null category, *pro*. It is *pro* which checks the D–features of Infl, including nominative Case. This gives us a partial derivation of (50) as in (52). For Hungarian (and in this respect Hungarian is different from the Northern Italian dialects discussed by Brandi & Cordin) we need to assume that the *pro* in SpecIP in (52) agrees in phi-features with the embedded subject — after all, the embedded verb agrees in phi-features with the embedded subject, even though it does not directly check its features against that noun phrase.[31]

(52) ... $[_{CP}\ [CL_{[2sg]}\ \textit{téged}]_i\ [\textit{hogy}\ [_{IP}\ \textit{pro}\ [I\ [_{v/VP}\ t_i\ ...]]]]]$

10.4 *Clitic and feature movement from SpecCP*

Once (52) is reached, the following things need to happen:

(53) a. The complex *téged* phrase needs to check its focus feature against the matrix Foc–head.
b. Tthe clitic part needs to NP–move to Spec*v*P/AgrOP and to subsequently cliticise to I.
c. The Case feature of *téged* needs to undergo LF feature movement to *v*/AgrO.

Of these, the first two take place in overt syntax. The cycle (Chomsky's 1993 'extension condition') demands that (53b) take the lead. Movement of the clitic part of the complex constituent in SpecCP in (52) into the matrix Spec*v*P/AgrOP position is unproblematic. Notice that we need to assume in any event that the clitic possessor of the second person object pronoun *téged* is free to vacate its position within the complex noun phrase via NP–movement — otherwise everything said in section 5 would collapse. This presumably means that the clitic occupies an A–position within the complex noun phrase, and can exit without stopping by in any A′ escape hatch along the way.[32] 'Improper movement' is thereby avoided: the clitic itself does not raise from out of an A′–position into an A–position. The NP–movement step taken by the clitic (cf. (53b)) thus converges; and subsequent cliticisation to I is entirely straightforward. The result of this part of the derivation will be the *-lak/-lek* form of the matrix verb — one of the ingredients of (50) that we needed to account for.

With (53b) executed as sketched, (53a) then follows suit. What raises to SpecFocP is the *remnant* left by overt extraction of the clitic part of the constituent in SpecCP in (52). This being a case of A′–movement, it is unobstructed by any A–position in the matrix clause. Like other instances of A′–movement, focus movement as in (53a) leaves a *copy* of the moved constituent behind in SpecCP.

This copy in SpecCP contains *téged*'s accusative Case feature, which can straightforwardly be launched up to *v*/AgrO at LF, via feature movement. Even though *téged* itself is the head of the constituent sitting in SpecCP, its feature bundle is not sitting in an A′–position, hence 'improper movement' is once again averted: feature movement is never 'improper'.

LF movement of the formal features of the copy in SpecCP takes place in the derivation of (49) as well. And just as in the case of (50), the result will be that the matrix *v*/AgrO checks its accusative Case feature against that of the A′–moved embedded subject. The occurrence of the accusative-marked form *kit* in (49) is thereby accounted for as well. And the indefinite agreement form of the verb is the reflex of the fact that the feature bundle attracted by *v*/AgrO (that of *kit*) has no [+definite] marking for the definiteness feature — default indefinite agreement is the result.

10.5 Attraction and economy

With the analysis of (49) and (50) now in place, an interesting question arises: why is it that 'Case/definiteness switch' phenomena are *obligatory* under long A′–extraction in Hungarian? Why, in other words, *must v*/AgrO attract the formal features of the constituent in SpecCP, rather than attracting the formal features of the embedded complementiser? We know that verbs taking a finite CP complement can otherwise attract the formal features of the complementiser: when there is no A′–extraction involved, the matrix verb shows definite agreement, with the embedded CP (cf. (46)–(47)). So why doesn't it do so in (49) and (50) as well?

The answer, we believe, lies in *economy* conditions — in particular, in the idea that *v*/AgrO will attract that feature bundle which matches its own which is structurally closest to it. When we consider the structure in (52) and consider which of the relevant feature bundles is structurally closer to *v*/AgrO, those of the constituent in SpecCP or those of the complementiser, the answer must be that it is the former that qualifies as such. A simple node count will deliver the desired result: SpecCP is dominated by fewer nodes than C, so SpecCP is closer to *v*/AgrO than C. Thus, *v*/AgrO will attract SpecCP's feature bundle whenever possible. In (49) and (50) it has no trouble doing so; and the result is 'Case/definiteness switch'.

But in (51) it is impossible for *v*/AgrO to attract the features of the constituent in SpecCP. The reason is that, as discussed in section 10.1 (cf. Lipták 2001 for the source of this proposal), the constituent in SpecCP in this example is the *wh*-complex formed jointly by the two *wh*-phrases, and the only feature present on this *wh*-complex (as a result of percolation) is the *wh*-feature; the Case and agreement features do not percolate, and therefore are unattractable. To get its features checked, *v*/AgrO will then have no other option than to settle on the feature bundle of the embedded complementiser. And since the embedded complementiser *hogy* is marked [+definite],[33] the result is definite agreement on the finite verb in (51) — exactly as in the extractionless examples in (46) and (47).

Notice that 'settling on the formal features of C' is automatic in the case of (51): the economy metric never comes into play because there is precisely one way in which *v*/AgrO can get its features checked in this example — once again, exactly as in (46)–(47). In (49) and (50), by contrast, there are two potential candidates for checking *v*/AgrO's features: the constituent in SpecCP and C. And it is here that economy conditions assert themselves as an arbiter, picking the closer of the two as the actual attractee.

10.6 The Inverse Case Filter

We now have the facts in (46)–(51) under control, but there is one question left to be addressed concerning the multiple extraction case in (51). It is directly observable that in this example the subject-*wh* does not check the matrix *v*/AgrO's features: *ki* is nominative, and the matrix verb is definite-marked. And in

view of the discussion in section 10.3, we must also conclude that *ki* has not checked any features against the embedded Infl–node either: after all, if movement from SpecIP to SpecCP across *hogy* causes a *that-t* effect in (49)–(50), then the same must be true for (51). All this does not cause any trouble for the matrix *v*/AgrO and the embedded Infl: these check their features against C and the *pro* in the embedded SpecIP, respectively. But it does raise an interesting question for *ki* itself — if *ki* does not check its features against either *v*/AgrO or I, then what about its Case feature?

The answer to this question is straightforward: since *ki* never ends up in the checking domain of a Case-feature checker, *ki*'s Case feature will violate the Principle of Full Interpretation. And since (51) is not actually ungrammatical, a conclusion that we tie up immediately to the one just drawn is that *ki* in this example *does not have a Case feature*. The nominative form of *ki* must be the *default* form.

The analysis of (51) expounded here thus leads us to conclude that noun phrases have no need, *per se*, to be adorned with a Case feature. In the bulk of cases they *will* be so adorned, because it is them that check the uninterpretable Case feature of some non-substantive head (*v*/AgrO, I, or some Case-checking head in PP, DP etc.). But they will *need* to have a Case feature only if that is the way in which the non-substantive heads' Case features can be (most economically) checked. This leaves predicative noun phrases completely free to be Case-featureless (since they are never called upon to check a non-substantive head's Case feature: their subject does so). And it also allows *ki* in (51) to be devoid of a Case feature. After all, even if it did have a Case feature, that feature would not percolate up to the *wh*-complex in SpecCP of which *ki* is a part in (51); so if *ki* had a Case feature it would never be attractable/checkable. In contexts such as this, Full Interpretation then effectively makes it impossible for a noun phrase to have a Case feature.

Sometimes, then, argumental noun phrases pattern with predicate nominals in having no structural Case feature. The Case Filter (or the Visibility Condition, in which it is commonly taken to be rooted), which decrees that argumental noun phrases must have Case (features), therefore cannot be correct. Instead, we need what Bošković (1997) has called the Inverse Case Filter: the uninterpretable Case features of *non-substantive* heads (*v*/AgrO, Infl, and their counterparts in PP, DP etc.) must be checked, in the most economical way whenever there is a choice. The Inverse Case Filter of course fits in much more neatly within the overall perspective of the minimalist program, with its emphasis on the needs and demands of non-substantive categories, and its lessened attention to θ-roles (casting doubt on the θ-based Visibility Condition). The discussion of Hungarian (51) has shown that this perspective is empirically superior to the classic Case Filter/Visibility Condition approach.[34]

10.7 Some consequences

In closing, we add a few brief remarks on some consequences of the analysis of 'clause union' effects in long A′–movement constructions offered in the preceding subsections.

Let us start out by going back to the examples in (46)–(48):

(46) a. *Akarom/*ok hogy valaki meglátogassa Jánost.*
want-1SG.DEF/*INDEF that someone PV-visit-SUBJUNC-3SG.DEF János-ACC

b. *Akarom/*ok hogy János meglátogatasson valakit.*
want-1SG.DEF/*INDEF that János PV-visit-SUBJUNC-3SG.INDEF s.o.-ACC

(47) a. *Akarom/*lak hogy te meglátogasd Jánost.*
want-1SG.DEF/*LAK/LEK that you PV-visit-SUBJUNC-2SG.DEF János-ACC

b. *Akarom/*lak hogy János meglátogatasson téged.*
want-1SG.DEF/*LAK/LEK that János PV-visit-SUBJUNC-3SG.INDEF you

(48) <**Meg*> akartam hogy János <*meg*>látogasson engem
PV want-PAST-1SG.(IN)DEF that János PV-visit-SUBJUNC-3SG.INDEF me

In the last of these examples, the preverb belonging to the embedded verb has attempted to 'climb' up into the matrix clause, without success. The reason why 'preverb climbing' fails will be straightforward now: base-generation in the matrix functional domain of the AspP whose head checks the embedded VP's aspectual features will be impossible since the embedded verb will never manage to reach the Asp–head, the complementiser *hogy* being in the way (at the very least).

In general, what we can say is that constituents of an embedded finite clause will be able to check features upstairs only if they ever get 'close enough' to the non-substantive heads in the matrix functional domain to be attractable by them. Since *wh*-phrases and focused constituents transit through the embedded SpecCP, they create themselves the possibility of being so attracted. But in (46)–(47) there is no way for the features of the noun phrases in the embedded finite clause to ever be closer to *v*/AgrO than the features of the complementiser. 'Case/agreement switch' phenomena will therefore be contingent on A′–movement through SpecCP — a generalisation that fits the empirical facts like a glove.

But 'Case/agreement switch' will not ensue just whenever there is A′–movement through SpecCP. We know that not all languages are like Hungarian. There are *two* factors which further restrict the distribution of 'switch phenomena':

(54) a. *that-t* avoidance by skipping SpecIP
b. weak D–features in *v*/AgrO

Hungarian meets both (54a) and (54b) — the perfect cocktail for 'switch phenomena'. Since the embedded subject never checks a Case feature against the embedded Infl, its Case feature is available for checking upstairs; and since *v*/AgrO's D–features are checked via LF feature movement, no 'improper movement' is incurred when *v*/AgrO attracts the formal features of the constituent in SpecCP: feature movement is never 'improper'.

The combination of (54a) and (54b) is the only one which caters for 'switch phenomena'. If (54a) is not met, the subject will raise to SpecIP and check its Case feature there, making 'Case switch' impossible; and if (54b) is not met, the constituent in SpecCP will perform 'improper movement' when raising to the matrix Spec*v*P/AgrOP — movement from an A–position (the base position of the embedded subject) via an A′–position (SpecCP) back into an A–position (Spec*v*P/AgrOP). So we may now generalise that languages that feature 'switch' phenomena will feature both (54a) and (54b), and that in all other languages either one or both of the conditions in (54) fails to be met.

In a language like Italian, in which the subject escapes from an embedded finite clause with a lexical complementiser in the same way as in Hungarian (cf. Rizzi 1982: movement from out of a VP–internal position straight into SpecIP), (54a) holds true. Yet 'switch phenomena' do not seem to occur in this language — for instance, in a clitic left dislocation construction the clitic is unable to 'climb' out of an embedded finite clause. We surmise, in the light of the previous discussion, that the non-occurrence of 'switch phenomena' in Italian is a consequence of the fact that the D–features of *v*/AgrO are strong in this language (cf. (54b)).

English presents an interesting case. Though in standard English (55b) is ungrammatical, only (55a) coming out right, there are (British) varieties of English in which (55b) is produced (cf. Jespersen 1965).

(55) a. Who shall I say is calling?
b. %Who*m* shall I say is calling?

The example in (55b) exhibits a 'Case switch' which seems similar in nature to the one found in Hungarian. If it really is parallel, the logic of the discussion so far leads us to look for the difference between standard English and varieties in which (55b) is good in the domain of the strength of the D–features of *v*/AgrO (given that the two types of English do not seem to differ with respect to *that*-trace effects; this actually raises a question, from the perspective of (54a), which we leave aside here).

In particular, from our perspective the variation with respect to (55b) suggests a relation with the well-known speaker variation concerning the acceptability of (56):

(56) %I believe John *sincerely* to have lied.

Postal (1974) features examples of this sort, in which *sincerely* is a matrix manner adverb preceded by the ECM subject of the embedded clause, and judges them as acceptable. But sentences like (56) are not accepted uniformly; cf. e.g. Johnson (1991). There is speaker variation, then, in the domain of the acceptability of (56) — and this speaker variation presumably centres on the strength of the D–features of *v*/AgrO: weak in varieties in which (56) is bad, but strong for speakers who accept (56) and hence apply overt Object Shift to the ECM subject (cf. Bošković 1997 for relevant discussion).

If we are right in suspecting a connection between the variation in the domain of (55b) and that in (56) *and* in analysing the facts in the way we have sketched, the precise relation we expect is that speakers who accept (55b) (hence must have *weak* D–features on *v*/AgrO to meet (54b)) will reject (56). The reverse is not necessarily true: accepting (56) does not necessarily imply accepting (55b) as well, for there may be other factors which come into play when it comes to licensing (55b).

Our present state of knowledge does not allow us to verify whether there is indeed a relationship of the sort described between (55b) and (56). But the fact that our analysis of 'switch phenomena' leads us to make a direct and verifiable prediction in this direction — something which earlier approaches to either (55b) or (56) do not — heightens the general interest of the approach developed in these pages.

11 Concluding remarks

This paper has presented a perspective on 'clause union' phenomena which factors them out into three main conditioners: (i) the structural location of AspP ('preverb climbing'); (ii) the structural location of *v*/AgrO ('agreement climbing'); and (iii) the presence/absence of an embedded IP dominating the clitic ('clitic climbing'). A cline of 'clause union' effects has been found attested in Hungarian, analysed as a function of the three factors just enumerated. 'Clause union' effects are not restricted to non-finite complementation constructions: even finite complementation exhibits it, iff the two requirements in (55) are both met. Our investigation of 'clause union' constructions in Hungarian, with particular reference to agreement phenomena, has allowed us to argue that object agreement and accusative Case feature checking are not tied to Asp but to *v*/AgrO instead, with *v* standing a better chance of delivering the desired result in the domain of *faire à* causatives than does AgrO. The analysis of the first/second person pronoun system of Hungarian has furthermore led to the novel conclusion that Hungarian has object clitics, and has cast new light on the representation of clitic doubling constructions, an analysis in terms of a possessed noun phrase structure harbouring both the clitic and the full noun phrase presenting itself in the light of the Hungarian facts. And we have also found occasion to trade the classic Case Filter/Visibility Condition in for Bošković's (1997) Inverse Case Filter, requiring that the uninterpretable Case features of non-substantive heads be checked (in the most economical way) but not requiring that every argumental noun phrase bear a Case feature.

Acknowledgements

The roots of this paper sprouted from a discussion with Ildikó Tóth about the syntax of *hagy/enged* permissive-causative constructions. Her take on these constructions is now available in print as chapter 5 of Tóth (2000), which critiques several aspects of the proposals laid out herein. The present paper was conceived and written in 1999, and appears here in its *original* incarnation (*modulo* some bibliographical updates). *Caveat lector*: since this paper's content dates back to 1999, it is not in all respects a reflection of current thinking. I thank Ildikó Tóth and István Kenesei for very useful comments on parts of the material discussed herein. Special thanks are due to Anikó Lipták for her many comments, suggestions and grammaticality judgements.

Notes

1. Historical grammars of Hungarian have reconstructed the genesis of *-l* as a second person inflectional marker in some detail (cf. e.g. Benkő 1991). It appears that *-l* came in first as a second person subject agreement marker in so-called *-ik* verbs (*ikes igék* in Hungarian) — verbs whose underlying object surfaces as a subject (unaccusative/ergative). These verbs get their name from the *-ik* marker found in the citation form of these verbs, the third person singular present tense indefinite form. Originally, *-l* seems to have functioned as the second person counterpart of this *-ik* marker. Eventually, *-l*'s distribution spread to other verb classes, and at a still later point the special *-lak/-lek* form for combinations of first person singular subjects and second person objects came in.

With respect to the emergence of the *-lak/-lek* form, the existence of pairs like *kér/kérel* 'ask' seems to have been instrumental: there were certain verbs in earlier Hungarian which could add a (presumably non-inflectional) *-Vl* suffix to the stem. The first person singular form of such verbs would come out, in contexts in which there was an indefinite object, as either *kérek* or *kérelek*: *Én kér(el)ek valakit/téged* 'I ask something of someone/you'. The *kérelek* form simply disappeared with non-second person objects (only *én kérek valakit* being grammatical nowadays), with the *kérelek* form (shortened, via apocope, to *kérlek*) eventually specialising its distribution to constructions in which there is a second person object.

The strength of such an approach to *-lak/-lek*'s emergence is its explanation for the fact that this form is restricted to first person singular subjects. But it will need to be supplemented with an account for eventual second person object specialisation. It is here that the phonological identity of the *-Vl* suffix of *kérel* and the *-l* of the second person subject agreement marker of *ikes igék* is presumably crucial — eventually, the *-l* of *kérelek téged* was reanalysed as a marker of second person, this time not for the subject but for the object. It is reasonable, then, to take this *-l* to be a marker of second person agreement, even though the origins of this *-l* may lie elsewhere.

2. Desiderative verbs like *akar* 'want' can take subjunctive complements as well; we turn to these later (cf. section 10, below).

3. The *van* case I am hinting at here involves 'plain' *van*, as in *Voltalak meglátogatni téged* '(I) was-LAK/LEK PV-visit(ing) you'. As É. Kiss (1987:227) points out, *kész van* 'be ready' blocks the *-lak/-lek* form (*Kész vagyok/*vagylak felhívni téged* '(I) ready am/am-LAK/LEK PV-call you, i.e. I am ready to call you'). The presence of *kész* apparently blocks clause union here, not too surprisingly.

4. See also É. Kiss (1987:228), who lists *jár* in the set of verbs allowing no *-lak/-lek* agreement; she even includes *elmegy* 'go off' in this set, but the speakers I have asked all find *-lak/-lek* agreement with *elmegy* acceptable.

5. The subset of subject-control verbs that largely pattern with aspectual *come/go* verbs has a rather haphazard constitution as well: *hozzáfog* contains auxiliary *fog* (class I), while four of the verbs in this set are so-called *ikes igék*, bearing the suffix *-ik* (whose precise nature continues to pose questions; to some degree it is like Romance *se/si*). I cannot speculate here on the roots of the differences (with respect to definiteness agreement and *-lak/-lek* person agreement) between these subject-control verbs and other such verbs, like *utál* 'hate'.

6. Subject-control verbs will not be assigned a class of their own, nor will the discussion to follow focus in much detail on their syntactic analysis. The rationale for this is three-pronged: *(i)* subject-control verbs do not constitute a homogeneous class in Hungarian with respect to agreement behaviour, hence *(ii)* should presumably be divided up among the four classes identified with the aid of other verbs (*igyekszik* 'strive' fitting into class II, and *utál* fitting into classes III/IV); and *(iii)* subject-control verbs, in contradistinction to the other verb classes listed in classes I–IV, have received a good deal of attention in the literature already (cf. É. Kiss 1987:chapter 5).

7. Hungarian 'let' permissive-causatives are the spitting image of French *laisser* permissive-causatives. They both participate in two syntactic patterns: the construction exemplified under IV in which the embedded subject bears dative Case (whenever the embedded VP is transitive), and an alternative construction which features ECM (Exceptional Case-marking) of the embedded subject. For Hungarian *hagy*, this construction is exemplified in (i). As expected, the verb agrees in definiteness with the embedded subject (the ECM'ed NP).

(i)	*Hagy<u>od</u>/*<u>sz</u>*	*Jánost*	*<u>meg</u>látogatni*	*valakit.*
	let-2SG.DEF/*INDEF	János-ACC	PV-visit	someone-ACC

The construction in (i) exhibits no 'clause union' effects, and will therefore be left unaddressed in the remainder of this paper. See Tóth (2000) for detailed discussion of the syntactic patterning of 'let' permissive-causatives in Hungarian.

8. Alternatively, if one wants the embedded clause to be infinitival, one may choose the *let*–ECM construction directly paralleling English 'I let János visit you'; we will not address this construction here since it does not exhibit 'clause union' effects (cf. fn. 7).

9. In (25) we use the verb *próbálkoz* 'try' instead of the simpler form *próbál*, which also means 'try'; the reason is that the latter exhibits 'clause union' effects (which is surprising when viewed from the perspective of the distribution of 'clause union' in Romance):

(i)	*<<u>Meg</u>>próbál<u>om</u>/*<u>ok</u>*	*<<u>meg</u>>látogatni*	*Pétert.*
	PV-try-1SG.DEF/*INDEF	PV-visit	Péter-ACC

The minimal difference between *próbálkoz* (which never allows preverb climbing or agreement with the embedded object) and *próbál* raises interesting questions. It seems likely that *próbálkoz* should be analysed as a syntactic complex, with *-koz* introducing additional structure which blocks the upstairs generation of *v*P/AgrOP. How to work this out in detail is something we will leave for another occasion (especially since questions concerning the function and semantics of this *-koz* morpheme are not particularly easy to answer).

10. We will return to this question in the next subsection.

11. A caveat is in order, though. For while (26) shows incontrovertibly that the dative-marked causee *can* c-command the embedded object and A–bind it, it does not show that the causee *must* always c-command the embedded object. We need precisely this stronger conclusion to keep the analysis offered in the main text going. We will therefore assume that the dative causee in *hagy* permissive-causatives always c-commands the embedded object (cf. also fn. 15, below).

That this is a real issue is shown by the behaviour of Italian *fare a* causatives. In Italian, the dative-marked causee of a *fare a* construction can bind an anaphoric the embedded object (cf. (i); Burzio 1986:230). This indicates that the causee *can* c-command the embedded object in such constructions. Yet, on the other hand there are clear indications that the causee does not *have to* occupy a c-commanding A–position *vis-à-vis* the embedded object: constructions of the type in (i) and (ii) are grammatical (cf. Guasti 1993:54–55 for discussion):

(i)	*Con*	*le*	*minacce*	*fecero*	*accusare*	*se stesso*	*a Gianni.*
	with	the	threats	(they) made	accuse	himself	to Gianni
(ii)	*Fatte*		*pulire*	*le toilette*	*a Ugo,*	*Lia fu*	*felice.*
	made-F.PL		clean	the toilet-F.PL	to Ugo	Lia was	happy
(iii)	*la*	*macchina*	*è*	*stata*	*fatta*	*riparare*	*a Gianni.*
	the	car(F.SG)	is	been-F.SG	made-F.SG	repair	to Gianni

The absolute construction in (ii) involves movement of *le toilette* to AgrOP (cf. Belletti 1990), and while one may wonder whether this is a case of overt-syntactic NP–movement or LF feature movement, (iii) is unmistakably a case of overt-syntactic NP–movement from out of the embedded object position into the matrix SpecIP. The presence of the dative-marked causee is inconsequential, in both cases. With NP–movement constrained by Relativised Minimality (or minimalism's Minimal Link Condition), this shows that the dative causee does not necessarily occupy an A–position c-commanding the embedded object in Italian causatives.

It seems likely, in fact, that in overt syntax the dative causee of Italian *fare a* causatives occupies the position occupied by the *to*–PP in an English type prepositional dative construction (cf. *I gave a book to John*), which does not c-command the object (cf. Barss & Lasnik 1986). At LF, the formal features of the causee may make their way up to a position from which they can c-command the embedded object, to render anaphor binding possible; but LF feature movement will not create any RM/MLC problems for movement of the embedded object in examples of the type in (ii)/(iii). The facts of Hungarian discussed in the main text show that in Hungarian the dative-marked causee occupies an A–position c-commanding the embedded object *in overt syntax*.

12. The fine structure of Hungarian first and second person pronouns will be taken up in section 5.

13. Hungarian differs, when it comes to the workings of clitic climbing, from Romance, where there is evidence that clitic climbing involves successive-cyclic head-movement (cf. Kayne 1989, 1991). Italian (i) is a particularly clear indication to this effect: clitic climbing from out of embedded infinitival *constituent* questions is possible while clitic climbing out of infinitival *yes-no* questions is blocked.

(i)	a.	?*Non*	*ti*	*saprei*		*che*	*dire* (Rizzi 1982:36, Kayne 1989:243)
		not	CL.2SG	would-know		what	to-say'
	b.	**Non*	*li*	*so*	*se*	*fare.*	(Kayne 1989:246)
		not	CL.3PL	know	if	to-do	

The facts in (i) are concrete empirical evidence in support of a head-movement analysis of Italian clitic climbing. By contrast, the blocking effect of dative-marked causees on clitic climbing in Hungarian is evidence that clitic climbing there involves an NP–movement step. Ultimately, we suspect, this difference between Romance and Hungarian reduces to a parametric difference in the domain of clitics with respect to their sensitivity to the Head Movement Constraint: Romance clitics can skip over some (but not all) intervening heads; Hungarian clitics cannot. How exactly this difference is to be given formal substance is a question we will have to eschew here (for want of sufficient background on which to base a formalisation: the status of the HMC remains elusive in our present state of knowledge).

14. The agreement morphology seen in (30a,b) is fully identical with that found on possessed noun phrases in Hungarian. Whether the analysis of inflected infinitives should be fully assimilated to that of possessed noun phrases (see Den Dikken 1999 for a full-fledged analysis of the latter) is a question that cannot receive a straightforward answer at this time, in particular because of the fact that there are non-trivial differences between inflected infinitives and possessed noun phrases (esp. concerning optionality of agreement marking and so-called 'anti-agreement': the former is found in inflected infinitives but not in possessed nominals, while the latter is a hallmark of possessed nominals which does not manifest itself in inflected infinitives; see Tóth 2000 for discussion). We will avoid the issue here.

15. This ties in well with the fact that verbs participating in *faire à* constructions always seem to be able to take a dative-marked argument independently (as in French *Je lui fais un plaisir* 'I him-DAT make/do a pleasure').

A complication arises from the fact that Hungarian triadic dative constructions do not block the *-lak/-lek* form: (i) is grammatical. Notice, however, that (ii) is also grammatical (just like its English counterpart) — and here we need the direct object (a null pronoun) to c-command the dative anaphor.

With (i) also derived from a structure in which the direct object c-commands the dative indirect object, no blocking effect by the latter will ensue, as desired. In *hagy* permissive-causatives, there apparently is no representation in which the dative is lower than the causativised infinitival constituent. Put differently, 'dative shift' (i.e., raising of the dative into a position c-commanding the direct object/infinitival constituent) is ostensibly obligatory in *hagy* constructions. Though it will lead us too far afield to develop this line of argument in detail, it seems to us that the obligatoriness of 'dative shift' in these constructions can be tied in with the 'clause union' effects found in these constructions: 'dative shift' facilitates 'clause union'; non-application of 'dative shift' obstructs it.

(i)	*Megmutattalak*	*Jánosnak.*		
	PV-show-PAST-LAK/LEK	János-DAT		
	'I showed you to János.'			
(ii)	Megmutattalak	magadnak	(a	tükörben).
	PV-show-PAST-LAK/LEK	yourself-DAT	the	mirror-in

16. This is tantamount to saying that XP in the structure in (27) is a dative small clause; see Den Dikken (1995:Chapter 5) for an analysis of *faire à* causative constructions along such lines. The predication relation between the dative PP harbouring the causee and the infinitival constituent establishes the desired interpretive relationship between the two (without reference to θ-roles of sorts).

17. There is a further split in the domain of Hungarian object clitics, between overt and covert/null forms. The first person object clitic is *always* null in Hungarian; and in the domain of second person object clitics, we find a split between constructions having a first person singular subject and other constructions, with the clitic showing up overtly (in the form of *-l*, resulting in the *-lak/-lek* marker) in the former only. See fn. 1, above, for discussion of the historical roots of this state of affairs.

18. See also Simonyi (1907:254) for this parallel: *engem* 'mein ich'. The forms in (34d′,e′) also feature this inflectional morphology, but this time it is affixed to a locative adposition, *ben*. We will turn to these cases further below, ignoring them for the time being.

19. The intrusive *-g-* in *engem* and *téged* as well as the vowel shortening/lengthening processes evinced by these forms raise questions which we cannot address at this time. Historical grammars have little to offer with respect to these two properties of *engem* and *téged*; all Benkő (1991) says is that the *-g-* may go back to a reconstructed **-ng-* whose nature/function remains obscure. For want of deeper knowledge we will ignore these details here, though ultimately they may prove to be important, for instance when it comes to choosing between the two options outlined in the preceding discussion. ('NP*' in (36) is some extended projection of N, presumably smaller than DP.)

20. This is not to say that *ő* does not have a possessed form — in fact, it does: *övé* 'his/hers', found in such constructions as 'this is your book, that is his/hers', is the regular possessed form. The other pronouns also have possessed forms like this, and these are not identical to the possessed forms found in the accusative paradigm:

(i)	a.	*enyém*	'mine'
	b.	*tied/tiéd*	'yours$_{sg}$'
	c.	*övé*	'his/hers'
	d.	*mienk/miénk*	'ours'
	e.	*tietek/tiétek*	'yours$_{pl}$'
	f.	*övék*	'theirs'

An important constant in these forms is that they all contain an *-e/é-*, and it is this vowel that can be taken to represent the possessum in these forms. In the first/second person accusative forms in (34) there is

no extra element (abstracting away from the mysterious *-g-* of *engem* and *téged*) which could be taken to be the overt possessum. We speculate that Hungarian possessums must always be overt, however tiny — *-e/é-* suffices as a host for possessive morphology; but a completely null possessum does not seem to exist. This, if true, is another reason for preferring the option taken in the main text to the one that treats the overt pronoun as the possessor of a completely null possessum.

21. If we are right in assigning a partitive analysis to *benneteket* (even in present-day Hungarian), the occurrence of the *-l* in *szeretlek benneteket* poses a question. Here *-l* cannot be a clitic originating as the possessor of a second person object pronoun; nor does it seem a reasonable candidate for the head of the partitive structure that *benneteket* represents (since 'you from among you' makes little semantic sense). Though we have no data to substantiate this claim, we hypothesise that the *-lak/-lek* form with *benneteket* is a case of analogy, triggered by the occurrence of the *-lak/-lek* form with the other second person object pronouns of Hungarian.

22. Thus, it is essentially true that first/second person object pronouns *per se* are not marked for definiteness; but given our representation of object pronouns this does not lead us to claim that the NP* dominating first/second person object pronouns likewise has no [+definite] feature in it: we can have our cake and eat it, too, as it were, by locating the [+definite] feature on the possessor (the clitic).

23. Recall that for the *ben*-marked forms *bennünket* and *benneteket* we have proposed an analysis according to which these function, outwardly, as indefinite-headed partitive noun phrases.

24. At least for some speakers; recall that É. Kiss (1987:228) denies *jár* membership of this set, and István Kenesei (p.c.) tells me that for him *Jártalak meglátogatni téged* '(I) come-PAST-LAK/LEK PV-visit you' is not very good either, but I have found several speakers for whom such sentences are marginally or even fully acceptable. It is those speakers' judgements which construe the main text argument.

25. The text statement holds true for so-called 'neutral sentences'. In constructions featuring some operator (like negation or focus) 'preverb climbing' is impossible (cf. (i)). In general, the presence of such operators blocks placement of preverbs in front of the finite verb, also in single-verb constructions (cf. (ii)). Since their properties do not directly impinge on the themes of the present paper, we will not concern ourselves with 'non-neutral sentences' here, and will skirt the question of what makes pre-V_{fin} placement of preverbs impossible in such constructions (see Koopman & Szabolcsi, to appear, and references cited there for discussion).

(i) a. **Nem meg foglak látogatni.*
not PV will-LAK/LEK visit

b. *Nem foglak meglátogatni.*
not will-LAK/LEK PV-visit
'I will not visit you.'

(ii) a. **Nem meglátogatlak.*
not PV-visit-LAK/LEK

b. *Nem* látogatlak meg.
not visit-LAK/LEK PV
'I do not visit you.'

26. Unfortunately I am not aware of any acquisition data concerning 'clitic climbing' effects in class II constructions, nor do I know of any child language data on 'clause union' phenomena with the other classes of verbs.

27. Papp (1998:268) ascribes these errors to the presence of *is* 'too', misanalysed as an operator of the type blocking pre-V_{fin} placement of preverbs (cf. fn. 25). But across the board, 'preverb climbing' in contexts in which it is obligatory in the adult language seems to come in late (cf. Papp 1998:270); so the text examples do not seem peculiar to constructions featuring *is*.

28. The matrix verb form *akartam* is unmarked for definiteness (it so happens that the first person singular past tense form is underspecified in this regard).

Though (48) with 'preverb climbing' is indeed bad, grammatical examples of 'PV–climbing' out of the subjunctival complement of *akar* have been reported in the literature. Thus, É. Kiss (1998:135) mentions (ia). A number of things should be noted about such examples, however. First, 'PV–climbing' is by no means obligatory here (in contradistinction to the non-finite complementation context) — alongside (ia) we find the alternative word order patterns in (ib) and (ic), in which the preverb finds itself in the complement clause. (Prescriptive grammars frown upon (ib), but it is widely attested in everyday Hungarian.)

(i) a. *János el akarja hogy menjek.*
János PV want-3SG.DEF that go-SUBJUNC-1SG.INDEF
b. *János akarja hogy el menjek.*
c. *János akarja hogy menjek el.*

Secondly, it is appears to be significant that (ia) has a *pro*-dropped embedded subject: with an overt embedded subject, (ia) degrades substantially (cf. ??*János el akarja hogy Péter menjen*), for reasons unclear. Thirdly, 'preverb climbing' out of subjunctive complements to *akar* is selective with respect to particular preverbs: *el* works particularly well, *meg* is less felicitous (cf. ?*János meg akarja hogy látogassam* 'János PV want-3SG.DEF that visit-SUBJUNC-1SG.DEF'), and very poor is 'preverb climbing' performed on a non-compositional, idiomatic preverb–verb combination (cf. ?**János be akarja hogy rúgjak* 'János PV want-3SG.DEF that get.drunk-SUBJUNCT-1SG.INDEF'); the corresponding non-finite constructions are perfect in all cases. The deviance of the idiomatic example suggests that the operation by which the preverb ends up in the matrix clause in subjunctive complementation constructions is a case of A′–movement, not a garden-variety case of 'preverb climbing'. If this is right, this makes (ia) irrelevant with respect to the text discussion of 'clause union' effects.

That the facts about subjunctive complements to *akar* are not of great significance in the context at hand is further confirmed by the fact that all of the effects laid out in (46)–(47) can be reproduced with bridge verbs that do not take subjunctival complements, such as *gondol* 'think'. The subjunctive and its peculiar properties are not crucially implicated here, therefore. The reason why we have selected examples of *akar*+subjunctive in this section is that, overall, these are felt to work somewhat better than constructions with *gondol*.

29. As Brody (1995) has argued, *wh*-movement in questions and focus movement target the same structural position: SpecFocP.

30. Besides, (ia), with non-focused *téged* in the matrix clause (which is liable to *pro*-drop; cf. (ib)), is much worse than (50).

(i) a. ??*Akarlak téged hogy menjél.*
want-LAK/LEK you-ACC that go-SUBJUNC-2SG.INDEF
b. ??Akarlak hogy menjél.
want-LAK/LEK that go-SUBJUNC-2SG.INDEF

The fact that (i) does not seem to be entirely impossible for some speakers raises interesting questions, but these are clearly orthogonal to the text discussion. We will leave them aside.

31. For technical reasons, we cannot assume that *pro* is actually coindexed with the embedded subject, for this would yield a violation of Principle C of the Binding Theory in (52): the trace of *téged* would be A–bound within the domain of its maximal A′–chain. So feature agreement is not necessarily reflected by coindexation.

32. We know from Szabolcsi's (1983, 1994) work that possessors can 'run away from home'; but these normally are dative-marked possessors, which occupy, or in any event transit through, an A′–position (SpecDP). The structure of pronominally headed noun phrases is presumably smaller than DP, however; and extraction of the possessor of *téged* will then be possible without touching down in SpecDP. Details remain to be worked out.

33. This may be a simplification — cf. Kenesei (1992) for the idea that Hungarian complement clauses with *hogy* 'that' are in a chain with a (*pro*-droppable) accusative pronoun *azt* — but it will suffice for our purposes here.

34. The discussion of (24a) in section 4.3 is compatible with the Inverse Case Filter approach, as we pointed out there: though there is a way of capturing the deviance of (24a) with reference to the classic Case Filter (applied to *téged*), there are causes independent of the Case Filter which make the sentence bad, one of these in fact lying in the Inverse Case Filter.

References

Barss, A. and Lasnik, H. 1986. "A note on anaphora and double objects". *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: 347-354.

Bartos, H. 1997. "On 'subjective' and 'objective' agreement in Hungarian". *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 44: 363-384.

Bartos, H. 1998. "Az alanyi és a tárgyas ragozásról". In *A mai magyar nyelv leírásának újabb módszerei* III, L. Büky and M. Maleczky (eds). Szeged: JATE.

Belletti, A. 1990. *Generalized Verb Movement: Aspects of Verb Syntax*. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Benkő, L. (ed.). 1991. *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Bošković, Ž. 1997. *The Syntax of Nonfinite Complementation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Brandi, L. and Cordin, P. 1989. "Two Italian dialects and the null subject parameter". In *The null subject parameter*, O. Jaeggli and K. Safir (eds), 111-142. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Brody, M. 1995. "Focus and checking theory". In *Approaches to Hungarian V*, I. Kenesei (ed.). Szeged: JATE Press.

Burzio, L. 1986. *Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Chomsky, N. 1986. *Knowledge of Language. Its Nature, Origin and Use*. New York: Praeger.

Chomsky, N. 1991. "Some notes on economy of derivation and representation". In *Principles and Parameters in Comparative Syntax*, R. Freidin (ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; reprinted in Chomsky (1995), 129-166.

Chomsky, N. 1993. "A minimalist program for linguistic theory". In *The View from Building 20*, K. Hale and S.J. Keyser (eds), 1-52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Dikken, M. den 1995. *Particles: On the Syntax of Verb–Particle, Triadic and Causative Constructions*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Dikken, M. den 1999. "On the structural representation of possession and agreement. The case of (anti-)agreement in Hungarian possessed nominal phrases". In *Crossing Boundaries: Theoretical Advances in Central and Eastern European Languages*, I. Kenesei (ed.), 137-178. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dikken, M. den and Sybesma, R. 1998. "'Take' serials light up the middle". Paper presented at GLOW 21, Tilburg University.

Farkas, D. 1990. "Two cases of underspecification in morphology". *Linguistic Inquiry* 21: 539-550.
Guasti, M.-T. 1993. *Causative and Perception Verbs: A Comparative Study*. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.
Hulk, A. and Cornips, L. 1998. "Réflexifs aspectuels". Paper presented at *Langues et grammaire* 1, Paris; ms., University of Amsterdam & P.J. Meertens-Instituut, Amsterdam.
Kayne, R. 1989. "Null subjects and clitic climbing". In *The null subject parameter*, O. Jaeggli and K. Safir (eds). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Kayne, R. 1991. "Romance clitics, verb movement and PRO". *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 647-86.
Kayne, R. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Kenesei, I. 1992. "Az alárendelt mondatok szerkezete [The structure of subordinate clauses]". In *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan* I (*Mondattan*), F. Kiefer (ed.), 529-713. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
Kiss, K. É. 1987. *Configurationality in Hungarian*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
Kiss, K. É. 1998. "Verbal prefixes or postpositions? Postpositional aspectualizers in Hungarian". In *Approaches to Hungarian* 6, C. de Groot and I. Kenesei (eds), 125-148. Szeged: JATEPress.
Kiss, K. É. 1999. "The Hungarian noun phrase is like the English noun phrase". Ms., Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest.
Koopman, H. and Szabolcsi, A. 2000. *Verbal Complexes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Li, Y. 1990. "X^0-binding and verb incorporation". *Linguistic Inquiry* 21: 399-426.
Lipták, A. 2001. *On the Syntax of Wh-Items in Hungarian*. Diss., University of Leiden/ULCL.
Papp, Sz. 1998. "The acquisition of Hungarian negation, *wh*-questions and focus by L1 and adult L2 learners". In *Approaches to Hungarian* 6, C. de Groot and I. Kenesei (eds), 253-280. Szeged: JATEPress.
Petter, M. 1998. *Getting PRO under Control*. Diss., Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam/HIL.
Piñón, C. 1995. "Around the progressive in Hungarian". In *Approaches to Hungarian* 5, I. Kenesei (ed.), 153-191. Szeged: JATEPress.
Postal, P. 1974. *On Raising*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Rizzi, L. 1982. *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
Rizzi, L. 1990. *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Schmitt, C. 1998. "Lack of iteration: Accusative clitic doubling, participial absolutes and *have* + agreeing participles". *Probus* 10:3. 243-300.
Simonyi, Zs. 1907. *Die ungarische Sprache. Geschichte und Charakteristik*. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.
Szabolcsi, A. 1983. "The possessor that ran away from home". *The Linguistic Review* 3: 89–102.
Szabolcsi, A. 1994. "The noun phrase". In *The syntactic structure of Hungarian. Syntax and Semantics* 27, F. Kiefer and K. É. Kiss (eds), 179-274. New York: Academic Press.
Tóth, I. 2000. *Inflected Infinitives in Hungarian*. Diss., Tilburg University.

Linguistics Program
CUNY Graduate Center
365 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10016–4309
USA
MDen-Dikken@gc.cuny.edu
