Minimalist Research of Prenominal Restricted Finite Relative Constructions with Person Marking Morphemes in Hungarian

SUMMARY OF PHD THESIS

Péter Nádasdi

University of Szeged

December 2012

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. István Kenesei, DSc

University of Szeged

Doctoral School of Linguistics

Ph.D. Programme in Theoretical Linguistics

1. Introduction[*]

The aim of my PhD thesis is to analyse attributive constructions that are statistically infrequent but fully productive in Hungarian as in the following examples:

(1) [DP *a* [TP [DP *Vágó István*] [DP *e*j] *vezette*j]   [CP C^0 [DP [NP *vetélkedő*]]]

     the   proper noun   present-*tt*-suff+def.agr.sg.3   quiz

   'The quiz show that István Vágó has presented/presents.'

(2) [DP *a* [TP [DP [DP *e*i] *vére*i]   *hullott*] [CP C^0 [DP [NP *Vászka*]]]

     the   blood-poss.sg.3. fall-*tt*-suff   proper noun

   'Vászka whose blood has flown/*flows'

The main peculiarity of these constructions is that they contain a person-marking morpheme either on the verbal element *(vezett-e)* of the construction such as in (1) or on the nominal element *(vér-e)* such as in (2) and own a nominal element without an overt case-marking morpheme *(Vágó István, vére)*. Both constructions have a verbal element with the -*tt* suffix *(vezet-**t**-e, hull-**ott**)*. The construction (1) always contains a transitive verb and the construction (2) a mostly unaccusative, intransitive verbal element. These constructions modify a head noun *(vetélkedő, Vászka)*. While descriptive grammars consider such phrases mostly as compounds in Modern Hungarian, the PhD thesis argues that these highly constrained attributive constructions do not behave as frozen adjectival compounds but as productive syntactic structures.

The theoretical framework that is based on the work of Adger & Ramchand (2005) uses Chomsky's Minimalist Program. Adger & Ramchand distribute two kinds of operation that are available from the Universal Grammar: the MOVE & MERGE strategies. They suppose that both operations can work side by side in any languages of the world such as in Gaelic and Irish. The PhD thesis supposes that not just move strategy exists in Hungarian which appears only in the postnominal relative clause and whose examination is excluded from the scope of

Szegedi Tudományegyetem
Cím: 6720 Szeged, Dugonics tér 13.
www.u-szeged.hu
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu

2

this paper, see Kenesei (1992) but the merge strategy also does which can appear only in prenominal relative clauses in Hungarian.

2. Theoretical framework

Since Chomsky (1977, 1981, 2001) the relativization is assumed to belong to Ā-dependencies where an operator binds a variable that can be trace (copy) or an empty category (*pro*). If one decides whether the gap is filled with a trace or *pro*, one is aware whether MOVE (REMERGE) or MERGE takes place. Adger & Ramchand (2005) apply the Identity Effect to decide whether MOVE or MERGE works. If the Identity Effect can be applied, the putatively displaced element can be put back into the gap but they have observed Anti-identity Effect in Gaelic and Irish. See the Gaelic examples below (Adger & Ramchand 2005: 169):

(3) *Dè   a'   chraobh$_i$ a   bha   thu   a'geàrradh ___$_j$?*
    which   the   tree.nom   C-REL   be.past   you   cutting
    'Which tree were you cutting?'

(4) **Dè   na   craoibhe$_i$ a   bha   thu   a'geàrradh ___$_i$?*
    which   the   tree.gen   C-REL   be.past   you   cutting
    'Intended meaning: 'Which tree were you cutting?'

The Gaelic verb in Progressive Aspect always governs a complement with Genitive Case, but the *wh*-element apparently takes Nominative Case, so it can be supposed that the two constructions are different: they cannot be derived from each other. This can be considered as the lack of identity. Adger & Ramchand claims that the lack of the agreement between the gap and the putatively moved constituent always triggers anti-identity effects which indicate that the gap cannot be interpreted as a trace but a phonetically empty *pro*. The existence of *pro* excludes movement, so base generation or merging occurs. This *pro* is different from the φ featured pronouns which are interpreted by their antecedents. It is identified by a predicate abstraction operator and receives dep-feature, that is, it can be considered as a default pronoun.

       The resumptive pronoun needs to be agreed with an element that may evaluate it. This element is the complementizer which behaves as a predicate abstraction operator, and has an

Szegedi Tudományegyetem
Cím: 6720 Szeged, Dugonics tér 13.
www.u-szeged.hu
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu

3

interpretable Λ feature since it is used to build a relative clause. It also bears a valued ID-feature that undergoes Agree with the unvalued ID-feature on the pronoun and values it as dep. The dependency between them is mutual: the resumptive pronoun can be interpreted only by the complementizer, and the complementizer requires the pronoun, because of the Principle Interpret Once Under Agree, which claims that interpretable features in an Agree chain are interpreted only once, on the one hand and because of the Full Interpretation, which ensures that a feature can be interpreted on only one element, on the other hand. These are exemplified by the following Gaelic sentence of Adger & Ramchand's (2005: 175):

(5) *an duine   a   bhuaileas   e   pro*

    the man   C-REL   strike-FUT   he   *pro*

        C[Λ, ID:dep]   *pro*[ID:] ·

        C[Λ, ID:dep]   *pro*[ID:dep]

        λx   x

    The man that he will hit.'

The relative clause above contains a gap that can be interpreted as a pronoun, but it needs a complementizer that has [ID:dep] feature to evaluate it, and the relative complementizer *a* bears an interpretable ID-feature that has dep as its value.

3. Possessor vs. Subject

The constructions in question contain a nominal element with an obvious null morpheme. In Hungarian a noun (any kind of nominals) with null morpheme can be considered as a noun in Nominative case or a caseless noun. Possessive constructions are proved as caseless by den Dikken (1999) and É. Kiss (2002). They claim that no case is assigned in that constructions. In the possessive constructions, however, a possessor can also take Dative case, as one can see in the following examples:

(6) *Vágó István-**nak**   a   vetélkedő-je*

    proper noun.dat the quiz-poss.sg.3.

Szegedi Tudományegyetem
Cím: 6720 Szeged, Dugonics tér 13.
www.u-szeged.hu
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu

4

'István Vágó's quiz show'

This can alternate with a caseless form, see as follows:

(7) *Vágó István*[Ø] *vetélkedő-je*

   proper noun-[Ø] quiz-poss.sg.3.

   'István Vágó's quiz show'

The possessive construction can license both Dative case and the caseless form but in the constructions in question only Nominative case can be assigned by the verbal, Dative case is prohibited. The most crucial argument can be presented by the pronominalization test because the singular demonstrative pronouns such as *az* 'that', *ez* 'this' in their full form can take only Dative case in the possessive construction, and only Nominative case in the prenominal finite relative clause. The plural personal pronoun in third person (*ők* 'they') can appear in a possessive construction only in its short form *ő*, and in the construction in question always in its full form. See the following examples with demonstrative pronouns:

(8) (*az) *ennek* (*a*   *fiúnak*) *(*a*)   *kalap-ja*

   the   this.dat the   boy.dat   the   hat-poss.sg.3.

   'this boy's hat/his/its hat'

(9) (*az) *ez   *a*   *fiú*   *kalap-ja*

   the   this the boy   hat-poss.sg.3.

   Intended meaning: 'this boy's hat'

(10) (*az) *ez   *kalapja*

   the   this   hat-poss.sg.3.

   Intended meaning: 'his/its hat'

(11) (*az)   *e*   *fiú*(*nak*   *a*)   *kalap-ja*

   the   this(short form) boy(dat) (the)   hat-poss.sg.3.

   'this boy's hat'

Szegedi Tudományegyetem
Cím: 6720 Szeged, Dugonics tér 13.
www.u-szeged.hu
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu

5

The definite article at the left side of the nominal element is always ill-formed and it is obvious from the test that the singular demonstrative pronouns in their full form can be licensed only with Dative case in the possessive construction and the caseless form is prohibited. The demonstrative pronoun *ez* 'this' also has a short form *e* as one can see above, but this form can appear only in possessive constructions. Contrary to these above, see the examples below[1]:

(12) ₊*az ennek* (*az embernek*) *a vezett-e vetélkedő*

    the this.dat the man.dat the present-*tt*-suff+def.agr.sg.3 quiz

    Intended meaning: 'The quiz show that this (man)/he has presented/presents.'

(13) *hogy így öli ez s amaz adta fajt*

    that so kill+def.agr.sg.3 this and yonder give-*tt*-suff+def.agr.sg.3 race.acc

    'that he kills the different human races this way.' (1700, Gyöngyösi: 220)

The nominal element of the constructions above is well-formed only with the null morpheme form, Dative case was never licensed, so one can suppose that only Nominative case can be assigned, and it must be a subject of the clause. Let us consider the following cluster of examples that examine the behaviour of the personal pronoun *ők* 'they':

(14) *az ő(*k) kert-jük*

    the they(short form) garden-poss.pl.3.

    'their garden'

(15) * *az ők kert-je*

    the they(full form) garden-poss.sg.3.

    Intended meaning: 'their garden'

---

[1] The occurence of the singular demonstrative pronouns is presented in a Middle Hungarian example because authentic present-day Hungarian data cannot be available.

Szegedi Tudományegyetem
Cím: 6720 Szeged, Dugonics tér 13.
www.u-szeged.hu
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu

6

(16) *az   ők   (?)vezett-e   vetélkedő* (Laczkó 2001:751[2])

    the they(full form) present-*tt*-suff+def.agr.sg.3   quiz

    'The quiz show that they have presented/present.'

(17) **az   ő   vezett-ük   vetélkedő*

    the they(short form) present-*tt*-suff+-poss.pl.3.   quiz

    Intended meaning: 'The quiz show that they have presented/present.'

The plural personal pronoun in third person can appear only in its short form in possessive constructions. Contrary to this in the verbal construction only the full form is well-formed. The main peculiarity of the verbal constructions is that the nominal element always ends in a null morpheme, and never alternates with any other cases, but it does in any other caseless constructions including possessive constructions.

The caseless forms are always derived from forms with a case, and because the verbal constructions in question can never take Dative case, one can suppose that it does not function as possessive construction, and its nominal element takes Nominative case which is licensed by the verbal. The nominative case is assigned by Tense feature (É. Kiss 2002) which is necessary but not sufficient condition for finiteness. In Hungarian the so-called *-ván, -vén* construction can assign Nominative case beside the finite verb (É. Kiss 2002) but the verb of the former cannot consider as finite one, so one has to continue the examination from the side of the verbal element to prove the finiteness of the verbal element.

4. Finite verb vs. Non-finite verb

McFadden & Sundaresan (2013) maintain that Chomsky's (1981, 1999, 2000) theorem about finiteness is still valid: „Within Case theory, nominative case has long been tied to finiteness, being assumed to be assigned or checked by finite Infl/T." Den Dikken (1999) and É. Kiss (2002) claim that in possessive constructions there is not Nominative case but the possessive noun is caseless, that is, no case is assigned in that construction as seen above.

Now let us examine the quality of the verbal that appears in the construction in question, that is, whether it is suitable to assign Nominative case, what triggers the Agree morpheme on the verbal and whether it can be considered a finite or non-finite verb.

---

[2] A great amount of native speakers debates its well-formedness, some consider it as obsolete.

Szegedi Tudományegyetem
Cím: 6720 Szeged, Dugonics tér 13.
www.u-szeged.hu
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu

7

Let us start with Agree morpheme. Because the caseless form of the possessive construction can be considered right, one has to account for the Agree morpheme on the verb. Overt Agr-feature can be borne by the verb in Sg3 only if it governs a definite object either overtly or non-overtly. In the construction (1) no definite objective argument can be found. Laczkó (2001, 2002) supposes that an unarticulated object must be hidden that is bound by a noun anaphorically, so a lexical nominal antecedent must exist outside of the clause which it is coreferent with. So the verb in the clause must be conjugated with definite morpheme in Sg3, and it indicates that the verb agrees with not only its subject but with its object, too. In the construction (1) the noun in plural does not seem to agree with the verb, as in the example below:

(18) *a   gyerekek   rajzolt-a   kör*

    the children   draw-*tt*-suff+def.agr.sg.3 circle

    'the circle that the children have drawn/draw .'

In Hungarian, however, there is no non-finite verbs that agree with its object but the finite verb. Let's consider a cluster of the examples:

(19) egy {[*a vetélkedő-t] vezet-ő}   műsorvezető*

    a   the quiz.acc   present-ing   tv presenter

    'a tv presenter presenting the quiz show'

(20) az {[*egy vetélkedő-t*] *vezet-ő}   műsorvezető*

    the   a   quiz.acc   present-ing tv presenter

    'the tv presenter presenting a quiz show'

(21) *Vágó Istvánnak*ⱼ *sikerült jól   vezet-ni-e*ⱼ   *a   vetélkedő-t*.

    proper noun.dat managed well   to present+poss.sg.3. the quiz.acc

    'István Vágó managed to present the quiz show well.'

(22) *Vágó Istvánnak*ⱼ *sikerült jól   vezet-ni-e*ⱼ   *egy vetélkedő-t*.

    proper noun.dat   managed well to present+poss.sg.3. a   quiz.acc

Szegedi Tudományegyetem
Cím: 6720 Szeged, Dugonics tér 13.
www.u-szeged.hu
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu

8

'István Vágó managed to present a quiz show well.'

(23) *A műsorvezető vezet*(**-**i***)   ***egy*** *vetélkedő-**t***

   the tv presenter present(+def.agr.sg.3) a   quiz.acc

   'The tv presenter presents a quiz show.'

(24) *A műsorvezető vezet-**(***i***)   ***a*** *vetélkedő-**t***

    the tv presenter present+def.agr.sg.3 the quiz.acc

   'The tv presenter presents the quiz show.'

The finite verb that governs an indefinite object argument, takes indefinite agreement, and the finite verb which governs a definite object takes definite agreement except the non-finite verbs, so if the verbal elements in question were non-finite, they should not agree with their arguments.

   In construction (2) the Agree morpheme appears not on the verbal element (*hullott*) but on the noun (*vér-**e***).

(25) *a vér-e*   *hull-ott   Vászka*

   the blood-poss.sg.3. fall-*tt*-suff proper noun

   'Vászka whose blood has flown'

This means that the Agree morpheme on the verb in construction (1) (*vezett-**e***) is not triggered by the nominal element (*Vágó István*) but a phonetically empty category (unarticulated element). This represents the antecedent in the relative clause, and the Agree morpheme indicates the element which always appears as an empty category in the construction that functions as an object in construction (1) and as a possessor in construction (2). The main difference between the constructions (1) and (2) is that the verb in construction (2) is intransitive and that in construction (1) is transitive. The Agree morpheme cannot appear on the verb in construction (2) because the Agree morpheme is triggered by the objective argument which the intransitive verbs lack. The finite transitive verbs can take definite agreement or indefinite agreement depending on the definiteness of the object as can be seen above.

Szegedi Tudományegyetem
Cím: 6720 Szeged, Dugonics tér 13.
www.u-szeged.hu
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu

9

If agreement were triggered between the noun and the verb, one could not account for its lack on the intransitive verb *hullott(-*a).* In that case an intransitive verb should take the same Agr morpheme like the definite ones such as in the case of infinitives:

(26) *Jánosnak*ᵢ *most nem szabad* **aludni-a**ᵢ

　　John.dat　now　not　allow　to sleep+poss.sg.3.

　　'John must not sleep now.'

(27) *Vágó Istvánnak*ⱼ　*sikerült jól*　**vezetni-e**ⱼ　　　*a/egy vetélkedőt.*

　　proper noun.dat　managed well　to present+poss.sg.3. the/a　quiz.acc

　　'István Vágó managed to present the quiz show well.'

The former contains an intransitive verb *(aludni* 'to sleep'*)* and the latter a transitive one *(vezetni* 'to present')*, and both of them agree with the noun in Dative which shows that the only explanation for the difference between the constructions (1) and (2) is that the overt agreement is not triggered between the noun and the verb in construction (1) but between a non-overt pronominal object and the verb. It follows from the Projection Principle, which determines that all the arguments need to be projected from the lexicon either overtly or non-overtly. The verb in construction (1) also conforms to this principle and it contains both arguments: the subject (always overtly) and the object (always covertly):

(28) *vezet-t-e'* present-*tt*-suff+def.agr.sg.3'

　　1ˢᵗ (external) argument: *Vágó István* (subject)

　　2ⁿᵈ (internal) argument: *pro* (object): triggered overt agreement with the verb

　　{*Vágó István <(pro) vezet-t-e>*} [*vetélkedő*]

The existence of both Tense and Agr features is necessary to produce finiteness. The infinitive as was seen above, has +Agr feature *(vezetni-e)* but ˜Tense feature, therefore it cannot assign Nominative case. As was pointed out above nominative case is assigned by Tense feature which is a necessary but not sufficient condition for finiteness. That is the reason why the infinitive cannot be assigned Nominative case and cannot be considered as finite. The verbal

Szegedi Tudományegyetem
Cím: 6720 Szeged, Dugonics tér 13.
www.u-szeged.hu
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu

10

elements of the constructions in question, however, bear both a T feature (Nominative case assigner) and an overt or covert Agr feature, so it follows that these verbs have to be finite:

(29) *a   Vágó István   vezet-**t**-**e**   vetélkedő*

  the proper noun   present+**Tense**(-*tt*-suff)+**Agr**(def.agr.sg.3)   quiz

  'The quiz show that István Vágó has presented/presents.'

(30) *a   vér-e   hull-ott-Ø   Vászka*

  the blood-poss.sg.3. fall+**Tense**(-*tt*-suff)+**Agr**(indef.agr.sg.3) proper noun

  'Vászka whose blood has flown'

If one managed to demonstrate the existence of a finite verb, possessive agreement cannot take place, because possessive agreement can only appear between a nominal and a verbal if the verbal is non-finite, such as it occurs in the case of infinitives in Hungarian, see above. So an object agreement suffix has to be posited because a verb in Hungarian has to agree not only with its subject but its object, too. The agreement with the objective argument depends on its finiteness, and the pronouns that appear either overtly or non-overtly as *pro*, always trigger definite agreement with the verbs, see above and below:

(31) *Vágó István csak vezet(***i***)   egy vetélkedőt, de   nem ő*

  proper noun only   present+def.agr.sg.3 a   quiz.acc   but not he

  *szerkeszt***i***)   pro/ ***őt   /azt.*

  edit+def.agr.sg.3   *pro*/*(s)he.acc/*it.acc/that.acc

  'István Vágó just presents a quiz show but he does not edit it.'

Contrary to Kenesei (1986), Laczkó (2001, 2002) and Márkus (2009), I claim that the verbal elements of the Hungarian prenominal relative clauses have both AGR and T features: *vezet-t*(T)-*e*(AGR) and *hull-ott*(T)-*Ø*(AGR), so they can be considered as finite verbs. The arguments are examined from the sides of both the nominal element based on pronominalization test, and the verbal element based on the test of the Hungarian verbals and on the distinction of the two contructions. The person marking morpheme (the definite agreement morpheme in conjugation) is not triggered by the connection between the nominal

Szegedi Tudományegyetem
Cím: 6720 Szeged, Dugonics tér 13.
www.u-szeged.hu
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu

11

(*Vágó István*) and the verbal (*vezett-e*) such as in possessive constructions (*Vágó István vetélkedője* 'István Vágó's quiz show') but between the verbal (*vezett-e* 'present-*tt*-suff+def.agr.sg.3') and an unarticulated object argument which is represented by *pro*. It triggers definite agreement with the verb and is realized as an objective agreement suffix on the verb. It has been proved that construction (1) contains a finite transitive verb which has two arguments: an external one (subject) in Nominative case and an internal one (direct object) which always remains non-overt, so the verb of the relative clause is conjugated with definite morphemes (*vezett-e*) wherever the verb takes definite object. This enables one to claim that this verb is finite and to apply the analysis of Adger & Ramchand to it.

5. The application of the theoretical framework

In order to apply the analysis of Adger & Ramchand (2005), some peculiarities are necessary to agree with their Irish and Gaelic constructions:

1. The constructions must contain a finite verb
2. The constructions must contain a gap
3. The gap must be interpreted as *pro* (a covert resumptive pronoun)

The Adger & Ramchand's analysis can also help one to account for deciding much more explicitly whether MOVE (REMERGE) or MERGE takes place. If one succeeds to find a gap and to interpret it as *pro*, one answers the question of what kind of syntactic operations are essential for this analysis. Adger & Ramchand apply the Identity Effect to decide whether MOVE or MERGE works. If the Identity Effect can be applied, the putatively displaced element can be put back into the gap. They claim that the lack of the agreement between the gap and the putatively moved constituent always triggers anti-identity effects, which indicate that the gap cannot be interpreted as a trace but a phonetically empty *pro*. The existence of *pro* excludes movement, so base generation or merging occurs.

Consider the example as follows:

(32) *A vetélkedő,* [$_{CP}$ *amelyet*$_i$ C [$_{TP}$ *Vágó István vezet*(*ett*)/*vezette/*vezeti   _t$_i$_].

   the quiz   which.acc   C   proper noun present(ed)+*(in)def.agr.sg.3 GAP

             [Λ, ID:φ]   [C]   [Λ, ID:φ]

Szegedi Tudományegyetem
Cím: 6720 Szeged, Dugonics tér 13.
www.u-szeged.hu
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu

12

Nemzeti F
www.uj

Nemzeti Fejlesztési Ügynökség
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu
06 40 638 638

A projekt az Európai Unió támogatásával, az Európai
Szociális Alap társfinanszírozásával valósul meg.

λx   x

'The quiz show (that/which) István Vágó presents (has presented).'

In Hungarian postnominal relativization is constructed in the same manner as in English, so Adger & Ramchand's analysis can also be applied to it and although, as mentioned in the introduction, it is excluded from the scope of this paper, one has to register the main difference between MOVE & MERGE strategies. The gap above can be interpreted as a trace or copy because the putatively displaced element (*amelyet* 'which.acc') can be put back into the gap, so the Identity Effect can be applied for it. Adger & Ramchand (2005) claim that Wh-elements simply possess both interpretable features as part of its lexical specification: [Λ] and [ID: φ]. They bear an interpretable Λ feature since they are used to build a relative clause, and an interpretable φ feature because of being variables. Since features in Agree relations are interpreted only once, the Λ-feature is interpreted at the top of the dependency and the [ID: φ] at the bottom. Any other choice leads to semantic incoherence with the remainder of the structure. Since the semantic correspondence needs to interpret both the Λ feature and the interpretable ID feature, but since these features are on a single lexical item, movement must take place to create copies that the semantic correspondence can apply to.

Similarly to the postnominal construction, in the prenominal one a gap also takes place. In order to decide whether MOVE or MERGE works, one has to examine whether the gap is filled with a trace/copy or *pro*. The verb in the prenominal relative clause in the construction (1) takes definite agreement. This means that the clause must contain a definite objective complement (direct object), even if it appears only covertly optionally. There exists Agree but to decide whether the gap is filled with a copy (trace) or *pro*, one needs to see whether Identity Effect can work. If Identity Effect takes place, the putatively displaced element can be put back into the gap, and movement strategy occurs. However, if Identity Effect does not work, the putatively moved element cannot be put back into the gap, and merge strategy occurs. Let's see the examples below:

(33) *Mária beszélt   **a** [híres   műsorvezető**k**$_j$ __$_i$ vezett**e**$_{(i)(j)}$]   **vetélkedőkről**$_i$ (a tévében).*
    Mary speak.past the famous tv presenters   present(ed)+def.agr.sg.3. quizes.about   the tv.in
    'Mary has spoken about the quiz shows that (the) famous tv presenters have presented/present on TV.

Szegedi Tudományegyetem
Cím: 6720 Szeged, Dugonics tér 13.
www.u-szeged.hu
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu

13

Nemzeti F
www.uj

Nemzeti Fejlesztési Ügynökség
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu
06 40 638 638

(34) *A híres   műsorvezető**k**ⱼ **a vetélkedőket** *vezette*(i)(j)

    the famous tv presenters   the quizes.acc   present(ed)+def.agr.sg.3.

    Intended meaning: 'The famous tv presenters have presented/*present the quiz shows.'

(35) *A híres   műsorvezető**k**ⱼ **a vetélkedőket**ᵢ vezett**é**(i)**k**ⱼ*

    the famous tv presenters the quizes.acc present(ed)+def.agr.pl.3.

    'The famous tv presenters have presented/*present the quiz shows.'

The plural noun in the embedded clause does not agree with the verb, but this does not cause the ill-formedness of the construction. In the main clause, however, anti-agreement makes the sentence ungrammatical, and the putatively moved element cannot be put back into the gap, so the Identity Effect cannot be applied to it. The lack of the agreement between the subject and the verb triggers an anti-identity effect which indicates that the gap cannot be interpreted as a trace but a phonetically empty *pro*. The main difference between the two relativization strategies is that the gap in the postnominal one is interpreted as a trace or copy, while in the prenominal one as *pro*.

      The only question that has remained unanswered, is what kind of pronoun can be interpreted as *pro* in the prenominal relative clause. Consider the following example:

(36) *A Vágó István* (*őt/*őket/*azt/*azokat) *vezette*   *vetélkedő*(*k*)

   the proper noun (him/her/them/it/those) present(ed)+def.agr.sg.3   quiz(es)

   'The quiz show(s) that István Vágó has presented/presents.'

The *pro*-drop is obligatory in prenominal relative clause in Hungarian, but the pronoun with plural accusative cannot be omitted from the matrix sentence, see below:

(37) *Vágó István csak vezet*(**i**)*   *a vetélkedőt, de nem ő*

   proper noun only   present+def.agr.sg.3   the quiz.acc   but not he

    szerkeszt(**i**)*   *pro*/ *őt   */azt*.

    edit+def.agr.sg.3   *pro*/*(s)he.acc/*it.acc/that.acc

    'István Vágó just presents the quiz show but he does not edit it.'

Szegedi Tudományegyetem
Cím: 6720 Szeged, Dugonics tér 13.
www.u-szeged.hu
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu

14

Nemzeti F
www.uj

Nemzeti Fejlesztési Ügynökség
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu
06 40 638 638

A projekt az Európai Unió támogatásával, az Európai Szociális Alap társfinanszírozásával valósul meg.

(38) *Vágó István csak vezet*(i)*   *a   vetélkedőket, de   nem ő*

proper noun only   present+def.agr.sg.3   the quizes.acc   but not   he

szerkeszt*(i)   **(őket/azokat)*

edit+def.agr.sg.3   them.acc/those.acc

'István Vágó just presents the quiz shows but he does not edit them.'

(39) *a*   pro$_i$ *vér-e$_i$*   *hullott*   *katona/katonák*

the *pro*   blood-poss.sg.3. fell+indef.agr.sg.3 soldiers(s)

'the soldier(s) whose blood has flown'

(40) *a*   pro$_i$ *vér-ük$_i$*   *hullott*   **katona/katonák*

the *pro*   blood-poss.pl.3. fell+indef.agr.sg.3   soldiers*(s)

'the soldiers whose blood has flown'

The gap in the prenominal finite relative clauses is interpreted as both singular and plural. So the pronoun can be considered as a default *pro* as it has been observed in Gaelic above:

(41) *A* [*Vágó István pro$_i$*   *vezett-e$_i$*   COMP]   *vetélkedő$_j$*

         pro[ID:] ·   COMP[Λ, ID:dep]

         pro[ID:dep]   COM[Λ, ID:dep]

            x   λx

(42) *a*   [*pro$_i$ vér-e$_i$*   *hull-ott* COMP]   *Vászka$_j$*

     pro[ID:] ·   COMP[Λ, ID:dep]

     pro[ID:dep]   COM[Λ, ID:dep]

       x   λx

The covert resumptive pronoun in the Hungarian prenominal relative clause needs a complementizer that has [ID:dep] feature to evaluate it, and there must exist an unarticulated relative complementizer that bears an interpretable ID-feature that has dep as its value. The dependency between them is mutual: the pronoun can be interpreted only by the complementizer, and the complementizer requires the pronoun, because of the Principle

Szegedi Tudományegyetem
Cím: 6720 Szeged, Dugonics tér 13.
www.u-szeged.hu
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu

15

Interpret Once Under Agree which claims that interpretable features in an Agree chain are interpreted only once, on the one hand and because of Full Interpretation which ensures that a feature can be interpreted on only one element, on the other. The Universal Principle ensures that there also must exist a binding operator in Hungarian but the Language-specific Parameter accounts for its non-overtness in Hungarian, that is, Adger & Ramchand's analysis can be adapted to the Hungarian prenominal finite relative constructions.

6. Conclusion

The aim of the dissertation is to analyze the constructions that are statistically infrequent but fully productive in Hungarian. The research claimed that not only MOVE strategy exists in Hungarian but MERGE strategy also does as in the constructions examined. The constructions in front of the modified noun are finite relative clauses which contain a subject in Nominative case, have a finite verb with definite conjugation, which has both Tense and Agr features. The constructions can be considered as relative clauses because according to Chomsky (1977, 1981, 2001) they have an empty category. I applied the Minimalist framework of Adger & Ramchand (2005) to the analysis of the Hungarian prenominal person-marked constructions. Merge takes place in these constructions, so the empty category is identified as a covert resumptive pronoun *(pro)*. And *pro* belongs to the default pronouns, which lack a φ feature. The language-specific peculiarity of these constructions is that they contain neither overt complementizers nor overt resumptive pronouns.

References

Adger, David & Gillian Ramchand. 2005. Merge and Move: *Wh*-Dependencies Revisited. *Linguistic Inquiry 36*, 161–193.

Chomsky, Noam 1977. On *wh*-movement. In: Peter W. Culicover et al. (eds.): *Formal Syntax*. New York & San Diego. Academic Press. 71–132.

Chomsky, Noam 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding.* Dordrecht−Holland/Cinnaminson−USA. Foris Publications.

Chomsky, Noam 1999: Derivation by phase. In: Michael Kenstovicz (ed.): *Ken Hale: A Life in Language.* MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1–54.

Chomsky, Noam 2000: Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In: Roger Martin, David Michaels and Juan Uriagereka (eds.): *Step by step: Essays on minimalism in honor of Howard Lasnik.* MIT

Press, Cambridge, MA, 89–155. [First publication: 1998 In: *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics (MITOPL)* 15 = *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics (MITWPL)* 18, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.].

Chomsky, Noam 2001: Derivation by phase. In: M. Kenstovicz (ed.): *Ken Hale: A Life in Language.* MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1–54.

Dikken, Marcel den 1999. On the Structural Representation of Possession and Agreement The Case of (Anti-)Agreement in Hungarian Possessed Nominal Phrases. In: István Kenesei (ed.): *Crossing Boundaries: Advances in the Theory of Central and Eastern European Languages*. Amsterdam. John Benjamins, 137–178.

É. Kiss, Katalin 2002. *The Syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge Syntax Guides. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gyöngyösi István 1700/2005: *Új életre hozatott Chariclia* [Charicleia by Gyöngyösi]*,* Brewer Sámuel özvegye betűivel, Lőcse. (The facsimile edition József Jankovics & Judit Nyerges (eds.) 2005, Balassi Kiadó, Budapest = Péter Kőszeghy (ed.): *Régi magyar könyvtár. Források* **14.** [Old Hungarian Books. Sources 14])

Kenesei, István. 1986. On the Role of the Agreement Morpheme in Hungarian. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* **36**. 109–120.

Kenesei, István. 1992. Az alárendelt mondatok szerkezete [The Structure of the Subordinate Clauses], In: Kiefer Ferenc szerk.: *Strukturális Magyar nyelvtan* **1**: *Mondattan* [Ferenc Kiefer (ed.): Structural Hungarian Grammar **1**: Syntax]. Budapest. Akadémiai Kiadó, 529–713.

Laczkó, Tibor. 2001. Néhány lexikai-funkcionális gondolat a személyragos -(T)T igenévről [Some Lexical-functional Thoughts About The Past Participle With Agreement Morpheme], In: Andor József et al. szerk.: *Színes eszmék nem alszanak… Szépe György 70. születésnapjára* [József Andor et al. (eds.): Colorful Ideas Do Not Sleep... On György Szépe's 70th Birthday], Lingua Franca Csoport, Pécs, 741–759.

Laczkó, Tibor. 2002. Rejtett alanyok és tárgyak a főnévi csoportban [Covert Subjects and Objects in Noun Phrases], In: Maleczki Márta szerk.: *A mai magyar nyelv leírásának újabb módszerei* **5** [Márta Maleczki (ed.): The Current Methods Of Description Of Modern Hungarian], Szeged, SZTE, 137–150.

Márkus, Andrea 2009. Egy sokak vitatta szerkezetről [A Construction debated by a lot of persons], In: Balázs Sinkovics (ed.): Theses of PhD Students in Linguistics **8**], SZTE, JATEPress, Doctoral School in Linguistics, 27–46.

McFadden, Thomas – Sandhya Sundaresan 2013 (To appear). Nominative case is independent of finiteness and agreement. In: *Case at the interfaces. Syntax and Semantics = Papers from Brussels Conference on Generative Linguistics (BCGL)* 5. Brussels.

PUBLICATIONS RELATED TO THE THESIS

1. Nádasdi, Péter. 2006. Mozgatás nélkül? Egy prenominális vonatkozó szerkezet minimalista elemzése a magyarban [Merge & Agreement: Minimalist Research of A Prenominal Finite Relative Construction in Hungarian], In: Sinkovics Balázs és Gárgyán Gabriella szerk.: *LingDok5 Nyelvész-doktoranduszok dolgozatai* [Balázs Sinkovics & Gabriella Gárgyán (eds.): Theses of PhD Students in Linguistics **5**], SZTE, JATEPress, Nyelvtudományi Doktori Iskola, 61–86 [Doctoral School in Linguistics]. URL: http://www.arts.u-szeged.hu/nydi/lingdok5/nadasdi_p.pdf

2. Nádasdi, Péter 2009. Argumentumkonfigurációs kontra diskurzuskonfigurációs nyelvek: Út az univerzális szórend felé [Argument Configurational versus Discourse Configurational Languages: The Path Towards Universal Word Order], In: Sinkovics Balázs (szerk.): *Nyelvészdoktoranduszok dolgozatai* **8** [Balázs Sinkovics (ed.): Theses of PhD Students in Linguistics **5**], Szeged, JATE Press, 51–75. URL: http://www.arts.u-szeged.hu/nydi/LingDok8.pdf

3. Nádasdi, Péter 2010a. Egy a nominális elemen személyjelölt jelzői tagmondat régen és ma ˜ esettanulmány [An attributive clause with a person-marked nominal element: A case study in present-day Hungarian], *Magyar Nyelvőr* 134, 471–483. URL: http://www.c3.hu/~nyelvor/period/1344/134408.pdf

4. Nádasdi, Péter 2010b. Igei igenevek problémája számítógépes nyelvészeti szempontból [The Research of Person-marked Constructions in Computational Linguistics], In: Tanács Attila és Vincze Veronika (szerk.): *VII. Magyar számítógépes nyelvészeti konferencia (MSZNY 2010)* [Attila Tanács & Veronika Vincze (eds.): 7th Conference

on Hungarian Computational Linguistics]*,* Szeged, JATEPress, 371−374. URL: http://www.inf.u-szeged.hu/mszny2010/mszny2010.pdf

5. Nádasdi, Péter 2011a. Egy ismeretlen vonatkozó szerkezetről [On an unknown prenominal relative clause in Hungarian], *Általános Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok* 23 [General Linguistic Studies Serial 23], Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 415–436.

6. Nádasdi, Péter 2011b. Prenominális vonatkozó szerkezetek a magyarban [Prenominal Relative Clauses in Hungarian], In: Tóth Zsófia Anna (szerk.): *A varázsgyűrűtől az interkonfesszionális kommunikációig. Információtudományi metszéspontok bölcsészeti megközelítésben,* Primaware, Szeged, 213–220. URL: http://otodikalprogram.huminf.u-szeged.hu/sites/default/files/Konyvek/TZsA_ebookInftud%20a%20bolcseszetben_szerk.pdf

7. Nádasdi, Péter 2011c. Az *isten-adta* és a *magva-szakadt*-féle szerkezetek vizsgálata a nyelvemlékek tükrében [The Research of the Person-marked Constructions in the Light of Linguistic Records], In: Bakró-Nagy Marianne és Forgács Tamás (szerk.): *A nyelvtörténeti kutatások újabb eredményei* **VI** [Marianne Bakró-Nagy & Tamás Forgács (eds.): New Results in Historical Linguistic Research 6], Szeged, SzTE Magyar Nyelvészeti Tanszék, 157−176.

8. Nádasdi, Péter 2011d. Egy vonatkozó szerkezet a nyelvemlékek tükrében [A Relative Clause in the Light of Linguistic Records], In: É. Kiss Katalin és Hegedűs Attila (szerk.): *Nyelvelmélet és diakrónia* [Katalin É. Kiss & Attila Hegedűs (eds.): Linguistic Theory and Diachrony]*,* Budapest/Piliscsaba, Szent István Társulat az Apostoli Szentszék könyvkiadója, PPKE BTK, 133–151.

9. Nádasdi, Péter 2012. Prenominális vonatkozó szerkezetek szintaktikai vizsgálata a magyarban [Syntactic Research of Prenominal Relative Clauses in Hungarian], In: Gécseg Zsuzsa (szerk.): *Nyelvészdoktoranduszok dolgozatai* **11** [Zsuzsa Gécseg (ed.):

Szegedi Tudományegyetem
Cím: 6720 Szeged, Dugonics tér 13.
www.u-szeged.hu
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu

19

Theses of PhD Students in Linguistics **11**], Szeged, JATE Press, 139–165. URL: http://nydi.bibl.u-szeged.hu/SZTE_NYDI/LingDok_kotetek_files/LingDok11.pdf

10. Nádasdi, Péter 2013 (To appear). Az Univerzális Grammatika szempontjából adhat-e a *-ván,-vén* alanyesetet? [Can the Person-marked Hungarian Adverbial Participle assign Nominative Case to its Argument in the Light of Universal grammar?], In: Gécseg Zsuzsa (szerk.): *Nyelvészdoktoranduszok dolgozatai* **12** [Zsuzsa Gécseg (ed.): Theses of PhD Students in Linguistics **12**], Szeged, JATE Press.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS RELATED TO THE THESIS

2004.   8th National Conference of PhD Students of Linguistics, Szeged, 11–12 November 2004.

The Title of the Talk: *Létezik-e japán típusú prenominális vonatkoztatás a magyarban? (Does there exist a Japanese-style prenominal relative clause in Hungarian?)*

2006.   10th National Conference of PhD Students of Linguistics, Szeged, 30 November–1 December 2006.

The Title of the Talk: *Az univerzális szórendről az információs szerkezet tükrében. (On the Universal Word Order in the Light of the Information Structure)*

2007.   11th National Conference of PhD Students of Linguistics, Szeged, 6–7 December 2007.

The Title of the Talk: *Argumentumkonfigurációs kontra diskurzuskonfigurációs nyelvek: Út az univerzális szórend felé (Argument Configurational versus Discourse Configurational Languages: The Path Towards Universal Word Order)*

2009.   Linguistics workshop lecture series, April 8, 2009, Szeged Center of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Szeged, Hungary.

The Title of the Talk: *Az* isten-adta-*,* magva-szakadt-*,* nap-kelte-*féle szerkezetek vizsgálata Révaitól napjainkig nyelvtörténeti adatokkal (The Research of the Person-marked Constructions from the Beginning until Today with Historical Data)*

Szegedi Tudományegyetem
Cím: 6720 Szeged, Dugonics tér 13.
www.u-szeged.hu
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu

20

2009. A nyelvtörténeti kutatások újabb eredményei VI. konferencia (New Results in Historical Linguistic Research 6 Conference) Szeged, 15 October 2009.

The Title of the Talk: *Az* isten-adta-*, magva-szakadt-féle szerkezetek vizsgálata a nyelvemlékek tükrében (The Research of the Person-marked Constructions in the Light of Linguistic Records)*

2009. 13th National Conference of PhD Students of Linguistics, Szeged, 25 November 2009.

The Title of the Talk: A vére hullott Vászka *és társai (A Relative Clause with a person-marked nominal element in the Light of Present-day Hungarian Data)*

2010. Nyelvelmélet és diakrónia konferencia (Linguistic Theory and Diachrony Conference) Piliscsaba, PPKE (Pázmány Péter Catholic University), 16–17 November 2010.

The Title of the Talk: *Egy vonatkozó szerkezet a nyelvemlékek tükrében (A Relative Clause in the Light of Linguistic Records)*

2010. 14th National Conference of PhD Students of Linguistics, Szeged, 30 November−1 December 2010.

The Title of the Talk: *Prenominális vonatkozó szerkezetek a magyarban (Prenominal Relative Clauses in Hungarian)*

2010. 7th Conference on Hungarian Computational Linguistics (MSZNY 2010) Szeged, 2−3 December 2010.

The Title of the Talk: *Igei igenevek problémája számítógépes nyelvészeti szempontból (The Research of Person-marked Constructions in Computational Linguistics)*

2011. Információs Társadalom Alprogram Szakmai (Támop) Konferencia (Information Society Programme Professional Conference) Szeged, 3 February 2011.

The title of the Talk: *Prenominális vonatkozó szerkezetek a magyarban (Prenominal Relative Clauses in Hungarian)*

Szegedi Tudományegyetem
Cím: 6720 Szeged, Dugonics tér 13.
www.u-szeged.hu
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu

21

Nemzeti F
www.uj

Nemzeti Fejlesztési Ügynökség
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu
06 40 638 638

A projekt az Európai Unió támogatásával, az Európai Szociális Alap társfinanszírozásával valósul meg.

2011. 15th National Conference of PhD Students of Linguistics, Szeged, 17−18

November 2011.

The Title of the Talk: *Az Univerzális Grammatika szempontjából lehet-e a -ván,-vén-*

nek alanya? (Can the Person-marked Hungarian Adverbial Participle assign

Nominative Case to its Argument in the Light of Universal grammar?)

2012. A nyelvtörténeti kutatások újabb eredményei VII. konferencia (New

Results in Historical Linguistic Research 7 Conference)

Szeged, 29–30 March 2012.

The Title of the Talk: *A* -va, -ve *személyragozása és a* -ván, -ván *független*

cselekvéshordozóval a nyelvemlékek tükrében (The Person Marking on the Hungarian

Adverbial Participle in the Light of Linguistic Records)

Szegedi Tudományegyetem
Cím: 6720 Szeged, Dugonics tér 13.
www.u-szeged.hu
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu

22

Nemzeti F
www.uj

Nemzeti Fejlesztési Ügynökség
www.ujszechenyiterv.gov.hu
06 40 638 638

A projekt az Európai Unió támogatásával, az Európai
Szociális Alap társfinanszírozásával valósul meg.