

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. Quantifier 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 “discourse-driven” 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 Koenenman (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

