Syntactic configuration and interpretation

1. Goal Instead of relying on what is effectively a syntax-internal stipulation of a fixed, absolute hierarchy of designated functional heads entering feature checking, a reasonable alternative to the so-called cartographic approach (CA) is to shift the burden of explanation to conditions imposed by the interface systems. In this talk I present an account of the Hungarian left periphery that explains the complex patterns of distribution of the various pre-verbal elements as arising from the interaction of locally compositional interpretive rules applying in the mapping from the syntactic to the semantic representation, governing functions like topic and focus. Such interpretive rules are formulated in terms of *relative* syntactic configurations, or templates (Neeleman and Koot (N&K) to appear; cf. Diesing and Jelinek 1995).

2. The cartographic view of the Hungarian left periphery Hungarian is characterized within the CA as a language that routinely applies overt movements to a recursive DistP (for monotone increasing distributive quantifiers, henceforth iQPs), as well as to a recursive TopP (or RefP) and a non-recursive FocP (which alternates with CountP, housing "counting quantifiers" (=counters; e.g. *few N, at most n N*) in Szabolcsi 1997, Brody and Szabolcsi 2003) (a.o. Puskas 1996, 2000; Szabolcsi 1997; É. Kiss 1998, 2002, to app.; see (1a–c)).

3. When the CA really meets Hungarian If the CA account of A-bar elements in the Hungarian clause is to be descriptively adequate in an extended empirical domain, it needs to allow for a freely ordered and optional generation of the three crucial functional projections of RefP, DistP and FocP in the post-verbal region of the clause, a domain within which the scope of iQPs and identificational foci (see É. Kiss 1998 for this notion) is free (e.g. É. Kiss 2002). This freedom in projection, paradoxically, diminishes the core motivation for a CA analysis. Even if we allow a recursion of the whole of the fixed series of projections RefP*>DistP*>CountP* (cf. Brody and Szabolcsi 2003), some basic facts remain unexplained, calling for various stipulations (see also É. Kiss, to appear).

4. Quantifer scope The limitation on inverse scope-taking options for counters (a key argument motivating a functional projections based account of scope) follows independently on recent proposals according to which these NPs are not generalized quantifiers (see Krifka 1999; cf. also de Swart 2001; Nouwen and Geurts 2007; Solt 2007; Schwartzschild 2006). This is the reason why they do not undergo QR, unlike iQPs. However, as I show, counters can take wider than surface scope via focusing. As true generalized quantifiers, iQPs can be combined with any constituent of type $\langle e, t \rangle$ (derived by their extraction from a constituent of type *t*). This is what accounts for the variability in the scope positions occupied by iQPs.

5. Syntactic configuration and interpretation The alternative I propose for "discoursedriven" movements in Hungarian is built on the assumption of the modes of composition in (4) and (6b,c), operating on the general templates in (3a) and (6a), respectively (see Neeleman and Koot (N&K) to appear for such templates). 5.1 Drawing on É. Kiss (to appear) and Csirmaz (2006), I adopt (2) as the structure of the neutral (finite) clause in Hungarian, where phi-features of T are satisfied by overt V-to-Pred-to-T movement, and the "EPP" property of T pulls up the closest c-commanded phrase to its Spec position (in the manner of Scandinavian Stylistic Fronting à la Holmberg 2000), normally the XP in Spec-PredP below TP (dubbed 'Verbal Modifier'). I take V-movement to be a structure building operation in the sense of Ackema et al. (1993) and Koeneman (2000) (a.o.), where V (via head movement) cyclically projects a different (bundle of) feature(s) at each stage. PredP corresponds to a core proposition (in the Montagovian sense), which T turns into a tensed sentence (a proposition anchored by tense). Clausal negation (a truth-functional operator) is an adverbial adjoined to PredP. When present, it is attracted to SpecTP as the closest phrase c-commanded by T. An overt focus can also satisfy T's "EPP" property, by raising to Spec-TP. Negation can appear above the focus, as the focus+background constituent is of a propositional type (t). 5.2 Irurtzun (2006) puts forward the proposal that focus involves re-projection (cf. Hornstein and

Uriagereka 2002). Having moved out of β , the focus element, designated in (3a) as $\langle \alpha, [foc] \rangle$ (N.B. syntactic elements are ordered sets of features), is first Merged to β , and then is reprojects its [foc] feature. Modulo the application of the Focus Rule (FR), this turns β into a logical subject of $\langle \alpha, [foc] \rangle$, which will be interpreted as its logical predicate (see a.o. Higgins 1979, Mikkelsen 2004, É. Kiss 2006; formally, FR involves type shift). The [foc] feature (which is interpretable only through (3a)) is generated on an LI that is (reflexively) contained in the constituent to be interpreted as focus. This is necessary to account for mismatches between the constituent undergoing focus movement and the one actually interpreted as focus, since the latter can be larger or smaller than the former. As Hungarian has no recourse to in situ (identificational) focus interpretation, the FR correctly predicts focus movement to be obligatory. Note that the FR does not specify the phonologically overt/covert status of $<\alpha$.[foc]>, hence, unless independent properties of the language enforce overt or covert realization (in Hungarian they don't), overt/covert status of the movement of focus remains a free option. As I show, postverbal foci in Hungarian behave accordingly. V-focus is an exception for a principled reason: V[foc] does not need to move, given that the configuration it appears in (see (3b)), invariably instantiates (3a). 5.3 I claim that in addition to (3a), languages can parametrically develop more specific varieties of (3a). Hungarian has (3b), where V represents a projected V that has saturated all its features. As (3c) is more specific than (3a), (3c) will be chosen whenever it can be, and we fall back on (3a) when (3c) is unattainable (due to the Elsewhere Condition; cf. N&K to appear). As there is only one stage in the derivation at which V has become fully saturated (after that point, V-movement has no 'trigger'), it follows that there is only one position in the clause where (3c) can be applied. This position is the one in which V's last feature, in the case of Hungarian: [T(ense)], has been projected. This is a case of a focus satisfying T's "EPP" property (schematized in (5) both before and after re-projection). If (3a) is Merged with another focus, as in (3d), the FR interprets γ as a logical predicate (the focus) and α as the logical subject, but it simultaneously interprets α as a logical predicate (the focus) and γ as the logical subject. Assuming that a syntactic representation that is assigned inconsistent interpretations interpretive rules is rejected as uninterpretable. Indeed, [foc]P in (5) cannot have a second focus specifier (*FOC FOC V). A further focus can only be accommodated if V is again head-moved, this time out of [foc]P. As a result, the highest focus will always be left-adjacent to the verb. 5.4 I argue that in Hungarian DPs (and some other XPs) can undergo Scrambling of the Japanese type. This yields a radically free postverbal order to the right of the 'Verbal Modifier' (VM), but without any discourse-effect, as this movement is internal to the proposition. If Scrambling leaves the proposition, (6b) will apply, as I show. If Scrambling leaves the tensed sentence (i.e., if a DP moves above TP, filled by the VM in a neutral clause), (6c) applies, again, correctly. A further correct prediction is that a DP Scrambled (anywhere!) above the VM in an infinitival clause will be under the effect of (6b), but not (6c).

(Puskás 2000) (1)[TopP* [AlsoP* [DistP* [NegP [FocP [NegP ...]]]]]] a. [RefP* [DistP* [FocP / CountP [AgrP V [...]]]]] (Szabolcsi 1997) b. (É. Kiss 2002 +É. Kiss to appear) [TopP* [DistP* [FocP [TP [PredP ...]]]]] c. (2) $[_{TP} XP_{VM} [_{T} V] [_{PredP} XP_{VM} [_{Pred} V] [...]]]$ b. <V,1,...,[foc]> c. <[foc]> ? (3) <[foc]> d. a. $\beta < V, 1, ..., [foc] >$ $<\alpha$.[foc]> $\dots <\alpha,[foc] > <V > <\gamma,[foc] > <\alpha,[foc] >$ *Focus Rule* for (3a): β is predicated of by $\langle \alpha, [foc] \rangle$. (4) $[_{TP} < \alpha, [foc] > [_{T} V] [_{PredP} XP [_{Pred} V] \dots]] \rightarrow [_{[foc]P} < \alpha, [foc] > [_{T} V] [_{PredP} XP [_{Pred} V] \dots]]$ (5) b. If β is a proposition, interpret α as discourse-old/specific. (6) a. β c. If β is a tensed proposition, interpret α as a logical subject (topic) of β . β α