She loves you, *-ja -ja -ja*: objective conjugation and pragmatic possession in Hungarian

Albert Ortmann & Doris Gerland

1 Introduction*

Hungarian displays two inflectional asymmetries which pertain to verb agreement and possessor agreement, respectively. One goal of this paper is to provide a thorough description and analysis of both splits. Although each of them is dealt with in quite some detail in the literature, and although the morpho(phono)logical affinities between the two are striking, no analytical link between them has as yet been suggested. As its second goal, this paper suggests a common rationale of the two splits, namely the expression of the presence or absence of a pragmatic component in the anchoring of the object and of the possessor, respectively.

The possessor agreement asymmetry involves an 'inalienable' possessor suffix and an 'alienable' counterpart *-ja* (or, depending on vowel harmony, its allomorph

Doris Gerland, Christian Horn, Anja Latrouite & Albert Ortmann (eds.). 2014. *Meaning and Grammar of Nouns and Verbs.* Düsseldorf: dup.

269

-je). It indicates that the possessor is perceived as standing in a contextually established relation to the possessum noun, rather than in a part-whole relation that is inherent to the latter. Consequently, we argue that the alienability split expresses the contrast between semantic and pragmatic possession.

The verb agreement asymmetry consists of the contrast of so-called subjective and objective conjugation, where the paradigm of the latter also comprises the suffix *-ja* (with its front vowel variant *-i*). The distribution of the two conjugations is sensitive for those referential dimensions such as definiteness and specificity that are typically located on the definiteness scale; concretely, we refer to Coppock (2013), who suggests that the decisive notion is partitive specificity coming about by a lexical specification of familiarity. We therefore propose an analysis that draws on differential object marking. The distribution is furthermore sensitive to the category of person, in that 1st and 2nd person trigger the subjective conjugation, even though they are definite. We show that the special status of local person objects has another ramification in Hungarian. The otherwise obligatory accusative case marking of the direct object is being abandoned with local persons, even if these only feature as possessors of 3rd-person lexical objects. We analyse these facts in the light of a typological trend of reluctance to treat local persons as direct objects: local persons are highest on the definiteness scale, and are preferred as subjects acting on 3rd-person objects, but dispreferred as objects. As a common denominator of the non-occurrence of the objective conjugation on the upper end and on the lower end of the scale, we introduce the notion of 'Robust Transitivity'. We argue that the objective conjugation occurs if the object implies a presupposition regarding the identifiability of the referent of the object. Given this, we are able to propose a common explanation for both agreement splits.

The paper is structured as follows: in section 2 we analyse the alienability split in the possessor agreement, and in section 3 the subjective-objective split in the verbal conjugation. Section 4 connects the conjugation split with differential object marking in other languages. Section 5 analyses the person asymmetry in the objective conjugation in view of the special status of local person objects. In section 6, we develop the notion of robust transitivity and suggest a common explanation of the verbal split and the possessor agreement split. Section 7 sums up the key results.

2   A split in the possessor agreement

2.1   Typological context: the morphosyntax of alienability

Cross-linguistically it is very common for languages to show a morphosyntactic split in adnominal possession that has a semantic-conceptual basis (Seiler 1983, Nichols 1988, Chappell & McGregor 1996). The two classes can roughly be characterised as follows:

(i)   *inalienable possession* involves a lexically inherent affiliation of the possessum to the possessor, which is unchangeable under normal conditions. It is typically instantiated by those relations that are not subject to choice or control, such as kinship, body parts and part-whole relationships.

(ii)   *alienable possession* involves temporary affiliation, where the possessor typically has control over the possessum, and may be dissolved by selling, etc. Accordingly, the purpose or the function of the possessum for the possessor (for example, eating, growing, use as a tool) is of relevance. It is precisely in this area that the notion 'possession' can be understood in the literal sense. Moreover, often the relation between the two individuals is a purely a contextual one, thus, dependent on the speech situation, as in *my chair*, denoting, for example, the chair that I am sitting on right now.

One way of expressing an (in)alienability distinction in contexts of possession is that the marker of possessor agreement is directly attached to inalienably possessed nouns, whereas it is mediated by a possessive connective when used with alienably possessed nouns. This strategy of endowing non-relational nouns (that is, sortal nouns in the sense of Löbner 1985, 2011) with a POSS(ession) connective prior to possessor agreement is illustrated here from Udihe:

(1)   Udihe (Tungus < Altaic; Siewierska 2004: 138f)

    a.   *bi   anda-i*
        PRON1SG friend-P'OR1SG
        'my friend'

    b.   *nuanija:-ŋi-ni*
        cow-POSS-P'OR3SG
        'his cow'

The noun in (1a) is semantically relational, hence 'inherently', or inalienably possessed. Accordingly, it is immediately combined with a possessor prefix or phrase. By contrast, the noun in (1b) is sortal and can therefore be combined with a possessor (in other words: can be made possessable) only after it is extended by

the connective suffix *-ŋi*. Thus, some additional material is required, hence we are dealing with the marked variant. This way, the relators are sensitive for the underlying semantics of the noun in that they typically occur only with underlyingly sortal nouns, which they transfer into relational concepts (cf. Löbner 2011 for an analysis of the conceptual shifts between different types of nouns).

We construe the conceptual basis of the alienability dichotomy as the opposition of semantic possession and pragmatic possession. By the former, it is meant that the relation between possessor and possessum is inherent to the lexical semantics of the head noun, the argument structure of which accordingly contains the possessor. Pragmatic possession, on the other hand, implies that the POSS relation is contextually established, thus coming about from world knowledge or from the speech situation rather than being derived from the lexical semantics.[1] The opposition is parallel to that of semantic and pragmatic definiteness, or more precisely (since we reserve the latter term for the corresponding syntactic feature), semantic uniqueness and pragmatic uniqueness in the sense of Löbner (1985, 2011) and Ortmann (2014). The uniqueness of *the sun* and *John's mother* is guaranteed by the lexical semantics of an individual noun and a functional noun, respectively. By contrast, with definite descriptions involving a sortal noun such as *the dog*, unique reference comes about by anaphoric or deictic use, hence pragmatic uniqueness.

2.2 Possession and alienability in Hungarian

In Hungarian, the head noun of a possessive noun phrase always bears a morphological specification of the possessor (*ház-am* house-P'OR1SG 'my house', *ház-ad* house-P'OR2SG 'your house', etc.).[2] The possessor morphology displays an alienability split that was first investigated in Kiefer (1985) and subsequently mentioned by Elekfi (2000) and Moravcsik (2003). The split occurs almost only with 3rd-person possessor suffixes. In addition to the "unmarked" *-a/-e* (singular) and

---

[1] This dichotomy differs from that in Jensen & Vikner (2004: 5f) in that these authors subsume both inalienable and alienable possession under semantic interpretations, thus, also including ownership. The difference arises from the fact that Jensen & Vikner consider Qualia roles as part of the lexical semantics, whereas the present approach considers only those relational components which are also manifest in the argument structure, hence make the noun a relational noun.

[2] In addition, the possessor can be realised by a personal pronoun for emphasis (*az én ház-am*, DEF PRON1SG house-P'OR1SG, 'MY house'). Lexical possessors can either be in the unmarked nominative (*Péter ház-a*, Péter house-P'OR3SG, 'Péter's house') or in the dative (*Péter-nek a ház-a*, Péter-DAT DEF house-P'OR3SG, 'Péter's house'); see Szabolcsi (1994: 198ff) and É. Kiss (2002: 157f) for empirical and analytical details.

-uk/-ük in the plural (the distribution of the allomorphs being governed by the backness/frontness of the final stem vowel), there is also a variant with an additional *–j*; thus, *-ja/-je* and *-juk/-jük*, respectively. This is illustrated in (2):

(2) a.   inalienable: *ablak-a*   *ablak-uk*

                          window-P'OR3SG   window-P'OR3PL

                          'its window'   'their window'

      b.   alienable: *ablak-ja*   *ablak-juk*

                          window-ALIEN_P'OR3SG   window-ALIEN_P'OR3PL

                          'his/her window'   'their window'

The contrast is also apparent when the possessed noun is in the plural, thus *ablak-a-i* window-P'OR3SG-PL, 'its windows', vs. *ablak-ja-i* window-ALIEN_P'OR3SG-PL, 'his/her windows', and *ablak-a-i-k* window-P'OR3-PL-P'OR.PL, 'their windows', vs. *ablak-ja-i-k* window-ALIEN_P'OR3-PL-P'OR.PL, 'their windows'. An example with front vowels is *keret-e-i-k* frame-P'OR3-PL-P'OR.PL vs. *keret-je-i-k* frame-ALIEN_P'OR3-PL-P'OR.PL, 'their frames'. For simplicity, we will only use examples with a singular possessum here.

Conceptually, the forms in (2a) usually represent inalienable possession, thus, the window standing in a part-whole relation to a house or a door. By contrast, the forms in (2b) with the additional *–j* in the possessor suffix express alienable possession; typically, the possessum is literally possessed by a person in the sense of ownership. (Note that although for some speakers the *–j*-less variant can also be used with alienable possession, the *–j*-full variant cannot be used with inalienable possession; Elekfi 2000: 154f.) Kiefer (1985: 108) characterises this semantic differentiation as an ongoing change, and states: "In general, the suffix *-ja/-je* can be used to render conspicuous the relation of real possession whereas the other *habeo* relations are indicated by means of the suffix *-a/-e*."[3] Consider the following examples of alternating nouns, taken from the exhaustive description in Elekfi (2000: 154–168):

---

[3] Like Kiefer, we hesitate to ascribe a separate morpheme status to *–j*, even though our use of Moravcsik's terminology of '-*j*-full and '-*j*-less' possessor suffixes may suggest such an analysis. The reason is that its presence and segmentation is obscured by allomorphy. For example, it fails to occur with nouns that end in *ő* or *ö* and are used as plural possessees, as in *szülő* 'parent', with *szülei* 'his/her (e. g., a child's) parents' and *szülői* 'its parents (e. g., of a school)'. Contrarily, with many nouns the *–j* sometimes occurs invariantly in the possessor suffixes for reasons of the phonology rather than of the semantics.

(3)   inalienable: alienable:

    üveg-e 'its glass (of a window)'   *üveg-je* 'his/her glass'

    zseb-e 'its pocket (of a coat)'   *zseb-je* 'his/her pocket'

    taréj-a 'its crest (of a cock)'   *taréj-ja* 'his/her crest'

    keret-e 'its frame (of a picture)'   *keret-je* 'his/her frame'

    anyag-a 'its material (of something)'   *anyag-ja* 'his/her material'

    talp-a 'his/her sole (of a person's foot)' *talp-ja* 'his/her sole'

    játék-a 'his/her play (of an author)'   *játék-ja* 'his/her toy'

    test-e 'his/her/its body (of sb./sth.)'   *test-je* 'his/her geometrical solid'

    küszöb-e 'its threshold (of a house)'   *küszöb-je* 'his/her threshold'

    bőr-e 'his/her/its skin (of a person)'   *bőr-je* 'his/her leather'

    gép-e 'its machine (of a car)'   *gép-je* 'his/her machine'

    fonal-a 'thread (of a ball of wool)'   *fonal-ja* 'his/her thread'

This alienability split, then, implies that one and the same noun may be 'temporarily' assigned to either construction according to whether it is construed as standing in a part-whole relation, or in a contextual relation to the possessor.[4] The *-j*-less variant *-a/-e* expresses semantic possession, whereas the *-j*-full variant *-ja/-je* expresses pragmatic possession. This is in line with the typological generalization that less conceptual distance between possessor and possessum is mirrored by less structural markedness (Seiler 1983, Chappell & McGregor 1996).

---

[4] Typologically, it is very common for there to be so-called 'temporary' (or 'fluid') assignment that comes about in terms of different conceptualisations. Consider the following minimal pair:

   (i) Patpatar (Oceanic < East Malayo-Polynesian; Papua New Guinea; Chappell & McGregor 1996: 3)

      a. *a   kat-igu*
         ART liver-P'OR1SG
         'my liver'

      b. *agu kat*
         1SG liver
         'my liver (that I am going to eat)'

   The inalienable variant in (i)a requires a possessor suffix on the head noun whereas the alienable variant (which involves a shift from relational to sortal concept) is expressed by a free possessor pronoun.

It is the alienable use of a relational noun which is marked additionally, while a noun in the inalienable use takes the less marked possessor suffix.[5]

The example list shows that the alternating nouns denote meronyms, thus, their lexical meaning involves a part-whole relation. Furthermore, most of them are artefacts. These two criteria exclude, for example, such nouns as *honap* 'month' or *ötlet* 'idea', which may well be regarded as relational, from the alternation. Note especially that kinship terms do not alternate either (the only exception being *szülő(k)* 'parent(s)'). There are very few alternating nouns which cannot be classified as meronymic artefacts. One of them is *játék* as mentioned in (3), another is *pincér* 'waiter', with the inalienable variant *pincére* referring to the waiter of a restaurant and the alienable variant *pincérje* referring to the employee of the restaurant owner. The inalienable variant refers to the waiter as a member of an organisation, thus, as a part of a whole, albeit not denoting an artefact.[6] Some nouns fail to exhibit two different variants for phonological reasons. Some phonological environments in Hungarian do not allow for *–j* altogether, others require it invariably in the possessor suffix irrespective of (in)alienability. Stems ending in one of the strident or palatal consonants [s, z, ʃ, j, ɲ, ɟ] allow only the *-j*-less variant; conversely, stems ending in a vowel require the *-j* as an epenthetic segment in the suffix (Olsson 1992, Siptar & Törkenczy 2000). Furthermore, most nouns ending in a voiced stop ([b, d, g]) invariably exhibit the *-j* in the suffix: *család-ja*, 'his/her family', *darab-ja*, 'its/his/her piece', *hang-ja*, 'his/her voice'.

To generalise, we can state the following two input conditions for alternating nouns:

---

[5] There are only a few counterexamples to this generalisation. These end in a vowel and consequently display *-j* in the inalienable use as well, as a result of epenthesis. However, these nouns still exhibit a contrast in that the final vowel alternates (Elekfi 2000: 157):

(i)	a.	stem: *ajtó* 'door'	*ajta-ja*	*ajtó-ja*
			'its door' (of a house)	'his/her door'
	b.	stem: *tüdő* 'lung'	*tüde-je*	*tüdő-je*
			'his/her/its lung' (of a person or animal)	'his/her lung' (in the soup)

In a sense, then, it is the inalienable rather than the alienable variant that involves a marking. The behaviour in (i) is, however, idiosyncratic.

[6] As for the two other exceptions, *titkár* 'secretary' behaves analogously to *pincér* 'waiter', with *titkára* referring to a person working for a party or an association, and *titkárja* referring to a person as an employee of some boss; conversely, *füzet* 'exercise book' denotes an artefact but is not meronymic (where *füzete* refers to a pupil's exercise book and *füzet-je* to, for example, the exercise book in a stationery shop).

(4)   Input conditions for Hungarian nouns displaying the alienability alternation

-   Semantic input condition: The noun is relational; specifically, it denotes a meronymous artefact.
-   Phonological input condition: The noun ends in a consonant other than a strident or palatal consonant, or in vowel other than [a].

Pursuing the approach of concept types and type shift set out by Löbner (2011), using a meronym with an alienable possessor implies the following: an underlyingly relational noun is used as a sortal noun which is then again shifted to a relational noun, where the relation at issue is different from its inherent relation, thus RC → SC → RC. With a *–j*-less possessor suffix, the relational concept is maintained as such, namely a part-whole relation in accordance with the lexical semantics of the noun. For the *–j*-full possessor suffix, a relation between possessor and possessum is established which is contextually instantiated; hence we are dealing with pragmatic possession. We represent this contrast as follows:

(5)   a.   Representation of semantic and pragmatic possession in Hungarian
scheme for RCs: $\lambda y \, \lambda x \, [((\text{SortalComponents}(x))) \, ... \, \& \, \text{RelationalComponent}(x,y)]$
instantiation by *ablak*: $\lambda y \, \lambda x \, [\text{WINDOW'}(x) \, ... \, \& \, \text{PART-OF}(x,y)]$

b.   semantic possession: *–j*-less form simply saturate the p'or argument:
applied to *-a* "it": $\lambda x \, [\text{WINDOW'}(x) \, ... \, \& \, \text{PART-OF}(x, \text{"it"})]$

c.   pragmatic possession: *-j*-full forms indicate a shift RC → SC → RC
and at the same time saturates the p'or argument:
-ja applied to (5a): $\lambda RC \, \lambda x \, \exists y \, [RC(x,y) \, \& \, \text{POSSCONTEXT}(\text{"s/he"},x)]$
applied to *ablak*: $\lambda x \, \exists y \, [\text{WINDOW'}(x) \, ... \quad \& \, \text{PART-OF}(x,y) \, \& \, \text{POSS}_{\text{context}}(\text{"s/he"},x)]$

The general scheme for relational nouns in (5a) shows that they entail sortal components and relational components. The latter require the saturation of the possessor argument and specify the kind of relation between the respective noun's referential argument and the possessor. For artefacts such as *ablak* 'window', this kind of relation consists of a part-whole relation. The *-j*-less possessor suffix saturates the possessor argument and specifies it as a 3rd-person pronoun.[7]

---

[7]   Strictly speaking, all possessor suffixes are ambiguous between pronominal and non-pronominal agreement markers. The latter variant is chosen in combination with a prenominal possessor phrase (see footnote 2 as well as 3.2.5). Formally, one can simply assume a person specification that must

The *-j*-full suffix represented in (5c) has the additional status of an operator. It introduces a relation of possession other than the lexically inherent meronymic relation, and existentially binds the second argument of the latter. This way, the inherent relation, over which we abstract by using 'RC' as a variable for two-place relations, is "suppressed" (rather than remaining at issue as in (5b)). The newly introduced relation POSS presupposes that its precise instantiation can be determined from the context. The relation also implies that the possessor is animate, or in fact human, which is indicated in the somewhat informal representation of the pronominal argument.

For some nouns, the alternation has given rise to two different lexicalized meaning variants:

(6) a. *csillag-a*   *csillag-ja*
         'its star' (of the sky)   'his star' (star-shaped insignia of soldiers)

     b. *szőlő-je*   *szőle-je*
         'its grape'   'his/her vineyard'

     c. *nej-e*   *nő-je*
         'his wife'   'his/her woman'

     d. *férj-e*   *férfi-je*
         'her husband'   'his/her man'

     e. *fej-e*   *fő-je*
         'his/her/its head' (of a per-   'its head' (leader of a group)
         son/animal)

(6a–d) show minimal pairs one variant of which is an RC and the other is underlyingly an SC.[8] Significantly, in (6c–e) the *-j* is reanalysed as belonging to the stem of the RC variant. Although for (6e) both variants, 'head' and 'leader', are relational, the latter can be assumed to involve less conceptual closeness between possessum and possessor since it involves neither a meronymic nor a kinship relation.

---

be unified with that of the possessor phrase, rather than saturation of the possessor argument as the pronominal variants in (5).

[8] Note that (6b) does not show the exceptional markedness behaviour discussed in footnote 5, but rather the expected pattern in that the inalienable variant corresponds to the stem *szőlő*, whereas the alienable variant is derived.

The lexicalization of the *-j* as part of the stem is also found with a sub-group of body part terms: *száj* 'mouth', *máj* 'liver', *haj* 'hair', *fej* 'head', *ujj* 'finger'. Contrary to the above examples (6c–e), these nouns do not alternate. Their non-alternating behaviour cannot, however, be explained on phonological grounds: a geminate [jj], as it would result from suffixing *-ja/-je*, is attested in Hungarian, both in general (as in *ujj* 'finger', contrasting with *új* 'new') and in the morphological context at issue (as in *taréj-ja* 'his/her crest'; this is the only example, though). We therefore consider this invariant behaviour as a sub-pattern within the Hungarian alienability asymmetry. With body parts, the *–j* indicates (vacuously, without performing an operation) an inherent rather than a contextually established relation; hence, in this case it represents semantic rather than pragmatic possession.

Interestingly, most of those body part terms that do not end in *-j* do not alternate either, although, again, this is not excluded for phonological reasons. Examples are *kar* 'arm', *láb* 'leg', *comb* 'haunch', *fül* 'ear', *vér* 'blood', *veríték* 'sweat', *köröm* 'nail', all of which allow only for one variant of the possessor suffix. (The only exceptions are *bőr* 'skin', *velő* 'marrow', *taréj* 'crest', *talp* 'sole', *test* 'body', and *tüdő* 'lung', thus, *bőre* vs. *bőrje*. These six nouns either refer to butcher's goods or exhibit two different meaning variants such as 'skin/leather'; see the list in (3)). Thus, although body parts denote meronyms, most of them do not alternate. We explain this by the fact that they are not artefacts in the sense of artificial objects. The role of artificiality and animacy in the possession split is further evidenced by the fact that kinship terms also fail to alternate. As with *láb* 'leg', *kar* 'arm', etc., kinship terms do not exhibit reanalysis of *–j* into the stem (for example, *báty* 'big brother', *nővér* 'big sister', *húg* 'little sister', etc.; the only apparent exceptions are *férj* 'husband' and *nej* 'wife' (6c,d), which are lexicalised variants of the sortal nouns *férfi* 'man' and *nő* 'woman'). Taken together, the entirety of the facts corroborates the above generalisation that nouns that undergo the alienability split denote meronymic artefacts.

One may wonder why the split is only found with 3rd person and not with 1st and 2nd person possessors. Our explanation is that for 1st and 2nd person, such a split would have no functional load because they hardly ever occur as inalienable possessors of inanimate artefacts. In other words, if the part is inanimate, then the whole will be inanimate too, and thus 3rd person. It follows that 1st and 2nd person possessors of artefacts are necessarily alienable possessors, which renders an alienability distinction in terms of additional possessor suffixes absurd. Note in this connection that the lack of contrast also holds for 1st and 2nd person as

verbal objects, namely in the verbal agreement system. Later we will return to the lack of contrast in both environments.

2.3   Conclusion

To sum up, the Hungarian alienability split involves an interaction of morphological and semantic distinctions which is well in harmony with typological generalisations, though instantiating a particular sub-kind. Meronymic artefacts which are used in congruence with their inherent relationality take the *-j*-less possessor suffix variant. If their use involves a relation different from the inherent one, that is, in case of pragmatic possession, they take the *-j*-full variant. The latter denotes, apart from specifying the possessor, two type shifts, namely RC → SC → RC. The status of –*j*-full suffixes with alternating nouns is thus that of an exponent of relationality that bears on the pragmatic character of the relation.

The contrast of two suffixes with and without the occurrence of *-j* has its parallel in the paradigm of the verbal conjugation and is dealt with subsequently.

3   A split in the verbal agreement

3.1   Basic facts

The verbal agreement morphology of Hungarian comprises two different conjugations, the so-called 'subjective' and 'objective' conjugations. The objective verbal conjugation displays agreement with the subject, and at the same time depends on referential properties of the direct object. It is found in the present and preterite indicative (as well as in the future tense, which is, however, composed of a present tense form of *fog* and the infinitive), and in the imperative. In the present, it involves *-j*-full forms as they also occur with possessed nouns as dealt with in the previous section. The *-j* occurs with subjects of 3rd-person singular as well as of all persons in the plural. The following charts give a survey of objective, subjective and possessor agreement.

(7)   a. Paradigm for *lát* 'to see'

	objective present	subjective present	objective preterite	subjective preterite
1SG	*lát-om*	*lát-ok*	*lát-tam*	*lát-tam*
2SG	*lát-od*	*lát-sz*	*lát-tad*	*lát-tál*
3SG	*lát-ja*	*lát*	*lát-ta*	*lát-t*
1PL	*lát-juk*	*lát-unk*	*lát-tuk*	*lát-tunk*
2PL	*lát-játok*	*lát-tok*	*lát-tátok*	*lát-tatok*
3PL	*lát-ják*	*lát-nak*	*lát-ták*	*lát-tak*

    b. Possessor agreement paradigm for *ablak* 'window'

ablak-om	'my window'
ablak-od	'your window'
ablak-a/-ja	'its window' (inal.)/ 'his/her window' (al.)
ablak-unk	'our window'
ablak-otok	'your window'
ablak-uk/-juk	'their window' (inal./al.)

It can be seen that the objective conjugation closely resembles the possessor series (more precisely, in the 'alienable' or pragmatic possession variant), with the exception of 1st and 2nd plural subject, where the subjective conjugation looks like the possessor series.[9]

  The objective conjugation is obligatorily used when the object is a definite lexical noun phrase as in (8a), including proper names and demonstrative determination, and with 3rd-person pronouns as in (8b).[10]

---

[9] Verbs with a front vowel in their final syllable take *−i* as the front-harmonising suffix variant of *-ja*: *szeret-i* love.3SG.OBJ, *szeret-ik* love.3PL.OBJ. For this class, the similarity between objective conjugation and possessor agreement (*−je*, *-jük*) may not be as obvious as with verbs with a back vowel. Crucially, however, for [i] and [j] we are dealing with the same segment, in a vocalic and a consonantal variant, respectively. The expression '*−j*-full' should therefore be taken to be more abstract, in terms of comprising a suffix with the features [+high, +front].

[10] A note on the gloss of the conjugation suffixes is in order here. We annotate the specification of the subject (e. g., 2nd plural in the case of *−játok* 2PL.OBJ), followed by a dot and the information whether the suffix furthermore indicates an object, thus, '.OBJ' if it does and '.SUBJ' otherwise. In specifying two arguments, the objective agreement suffixes crucially differ from the possessor agreement suffixes. The latter invariably specify one argument (the possessor), and are consequently glossed without a dot, thus P'OR2PL in the case of *-atok*. Given this difference, 2PL.OBJ as we use it is, in fact, an abbreviation of SUBJ2PL.OBJ3, which would be a more accurate gloss.

(8) a. *Lát-játok   a   kutyá-t.*
     see-2PL.OBJ DEF dog-ACC
     'You (pl.) see the dog.'

   b. *Lát-játok   ő-t.*
     see-2PL.OBJ PRON3SG-ACC
     'You (pl.) see him/her.'

   c. *Lát-tok.*
     see-2PL.SUBJ
     'You (pl.) see.'

   d. *Lát-tok   egy   kutyá-t.*
     see-2PL.SUBJ INDEF dog-ACC
     'You (pl.) see a dog.'

Conversely, objective agreement is incompatible with intransitive verbs (or intransitive verb uses, as opposed to 'dropped' objects in elliptic contexts, which exhibit the objective conjugation), or with (unpossessed) objects featuring the indefinite article; see (8c,d). It is therefore commonly analysed as being triggered by the definiteness of the object. This is the key notion of numerous descriptions and accounts, in informal terms (Comrie 1977, Kenesei, Vago & Fenyvesi 1998, Coppock & Wechsler 2010), in terms of syntactic (DP-)structure (Bartos 1997, 1999, É. Kiss 2002), as well as in terms of a feature [+DEF] that is either purely formal (den Dikken 2004, Coppock & Wechsler 2012) or semantically motivated (Coppock 2013). Accordingly, the objective conjugation is often referred to as the 'definite conjugation'. In the following, we list the complexities of the conjugation split; that is, those contexts where the choice of the conjugation does not clearly follow from the rule of thumb in terms of definiteness.

3.2   Complexities of the distribution

3.2.1   'Local' object

The most prominent distributional peculiarity that is not explicable in terms of (in)definiteness of the object is that 1st- and 2nd-person pronouns, that is, the local person objects, trigger the subjective rather than the objective conjugation:

(9) a. *Engem   lát-sz/*-od.*
     PRON1SG.ACC see-2SG.SUBJ/2SG.OBJ
     'You see me.'

    b. *Téged   szeret/*-i.*
       PRON2SG.ACC love.3SG.SUBJ/3SG.OBJ
       'S/he loves you.'

    c. *Lát-unk/*-juk   téged.*
       see-1PL.SUBJ/1PL.OBJ PRON.2SG
       'We see you.'

    d. *Lát-unk/*-juk   titeket.*
       see-1PL.SUBJ/1PL.OBJ PRON.2PL.ACC
       'We see you-guys.'

As (9c,d) show, the combination 1st-person plural subject and 2nd-person object requires the subjective conjugation just like other local-object combinations do. For 1st singular subject and 2nd-person object, however, there is a particular exponent, namely the portmanteau suffix *-lak/-lek*.

(10) a. *Lát-lak   (téged).*
       see-1SG→2 PRON.2SG.ACC
       'I see you.'

    b. *Lát-lak   titeket.*
       see-1SG→2 PRON.2PL.ACC
       'I see you-guys.'

The examples show that object pro-drop is possible with *-lak/-lek* for 2nd singular, but not for 2nd plural objects; see (10b). For the latter, the pronoun serves the function of disambiguating, since the number of the object is not specified by the portmanteau suffix.

    Any analysis of the conjugation split is furthermore confronted with a series of other subtleties regarding the distribution, which will be discussed successively now.

3.2.2   Objects with wh-words:
interrogative pronouns and relative pronouns

Hungarian exhibits several interrogative pronouns. Two of them are distributed according to [±human], namely *ki* with reference to human and *mi* to non-human. Both of them combine with the subjective conjugation. By contrast, the variant *melyik* and the indefinite pronoun *bármelyik*, which can be used with referents of either sort, trigger the objective conjugation.

(11)   a.   *Ki-t   / mi-t   lát-sz/*lát-od?*
            who-ACC   what-ACC   see-2SG.SUBJ/*2SG.OBJ
            'Who/what do you see?'

       b.   *Melyik vázá-t   vesz-ed/*vesz-el?*
            which vase-ACC   buy-2SG.OBJ/*2SG.SUBJ
            'Which vase do you buy?'

       c.   *Bármelyik váza-t   megvesz-em/*megvesz-ek.*
            whichever vase-ACC   buy-1SG.OBJ/*1SG.SUBJ
            'I buy any vase.'

In contrast to the 'simple' indefinite wh-pronouns in (11a), those in (11b,c) involve a partitive component, in that they operate against the background of some superset. This generalisation is informally stated in Comrie (1977: 9), Trommer (1995: 23), and more formally in Coppock (2013). The latter account, which we will use as a major point of reference, relies on the lexical-semantic foundation of the syntactic feature [+DEF]. It is this specification which is assumed to cause the objective conjugation. It is assumed to be present if the semantics of a nominal entails that its referent is familiar, in the sense of D(iscourse)-linking and partitive specificity (see von Heusinger 2011 for an overview of the various kinds of specificity). On the other hand, a negative specification of an item with respect to familiarity ([−DEF]) implies that the referential argument is new. Coppock posits a 'Lexical Familiarity Hypothesis', stating that "If the referential argument of a phrase is *lexically specified* as familiar, then the phrase triggers the objective conjugation" (2013: 7). This way, the choice of the conjugation follows "under the assumption that *melyik* 'which' imposes a familiarity requirement on the referential argument and *mit* 'what' does not" (2013: 17). Thus, whereas the latter is treated as equivalent to 'something', *melyik* is lexically specified as familiar, since its referential argument is mereologically related to a presupposed entity.

The distribution of the conjugation with respect to relative pronouns is analogous to that with interrogative pronouns. There are three different relative pronouns. Two of them, human *aki* and non-human *ami*, require the subjective conjugation as in (12a). The third relative pronoun *amelyik*, which is used with referents of either sort, optionally occurs with either the subjective or objective conjugation as shown in (12b) (see also Trommer 1995: 22).

(12)   a.   *A   férfi, aki-t   / A   ház, ami-t   ott   lát-sz*
            DEF man who-ACC   DEF house which-ACC there see-2SG.SUBJ
            'the man who / the house which you see over there'

    b. *A   férfi / A   ház,   amelyik-et ott   lát-sz/-od*
       DEF man   DEF house which-ACC there see-2SG.SUBJ/-2SG.OBJ
       'the man / the house you see over there'

Unlike with (11a), the NPs in (12) are all clearly definite. This is obvious from the determination of the relativised head nouns. Why, then, do *aki* and *ami* not trigger the objective conjugation? The reason lies in the morphological source of the relative pronouns, namely interrogative pronouns, whose referents are of necessity not familiar. Observe the parallel in the morphological structure and the choice of the conjugation between interrogative *ki, mi, melyik* on the one hand, and the relative pronouns *aki, ami, amelyik* on the other. As mentioned above, the *ki* and *mi* stems pass their non-familiarity on to the entire noun phrase, hence the choice of the subjective conjugation.[11] By contrast, *amelyik* comprises the suffix *−ik*. É. Kiss (2002: 154) observes that this suffix generally triggers objective agreement. The fact that it has the function of deriving ordinal from cardinal numbers, as well as turning *egy* 'one, a' into a quantifier with a presupposed superset, *egy-ik* 'one of them', lends further support to the role of a partitive component. These morphological differences, then, are decisive for the choice of conjugation.[12]

3.2.3   Objects with indefinite pronouns and quantifiers

The indefinite pronouns *néhány* and *valamennyi* 'some' and the quantifier *minden* 'every' trigger subjective agreement, whereas *valamennyi* 'each' triggers objective agreement.[13]

(13)   a. *Lát-ok/*-om*   *néhány / minden / valamennyi gyerek-et.*
       see-1SG.SUBJ/1SG.OBJ some   every   some   child-ACC
       'I see some / all children.'

---

[11] This is notwithstanding the fact noted by É. Kiss (2002: 243f) that the initial *a-* is a remnant of the demonstrative pronoun *az*. É. Kiss considers the *a-* to be optional; its omission, however, appears to be a colloquial feature.

[12] Note in this connection that coordinate object NPs call for some technical amendment to any formal analysis of the conjugation split, namely with respect to linearity. Regardless of whether the coordinate object is pre- or postverbal, it is generally the constituent closest to the verb that decides the choice of the conjugation; see Trommer (1995:28, 44ff).

[13] Thus, *valamennyi* is polysemous, with the meaning 'some' in addition to that of 'each', the former calling for the subjective and the latter for the objective conjugation (Csirmaz & Szabolcsi 2012). See also Kenesei, Vago & Fenyvesi (1998: 324) for some other quantifiers and indefinite pronouns.

b. *Lát-om/*-ok   valamennyi gyerek-et (az osztály-ból).*
   see-1SG.OBJ/1SG.SUBJ each   child-ACC DEF class-ELATIVE
   'I see each child (of the class).'

The different behaviour of *valamennyi* 'some', *néhány* and *minden* in (13a) on the one hand, and *minden*'s only apparent equivalent *valamennyi* 'each' in (13b) (as well as the obsolete *mind*) on the other is conditioned in the same way as the contrast between the two types of interrogative pronouns. The lexical semantics of *valamennyi* 'each' involves a partitive component. Recall that Coppock's (2013) familiarity analysis explicitly hypothesises a specification in the lexical semantics to be responsible for triggering objective agreement. Accordingly, she explains the contrast of *minden* and *néhány* to *valamennyi* by assuming a presuppositional component of the lexical entry of the latter but not of the former, namely the sum of all entities with the property denoted by the noun. As a result, *valamennyi* 'each' receives a familiarity specification that gives rise to [+DEF].

   The same partitivity contrast is also found with possessed indefinite objects, which will be discussed in 3.2.5.

3.2.4   Infinitival and clausal objects
Complement clause objects trigger the objective conjugation, whereas infinitival complements trigger the subjective conjugation.[14] Compare (14) and (15):

(14) *Tud-ta,   hogy   Péter csal-t   egy*
      know-PRET.3SG.OBJ COMPL Péter cheat-PRET.3SG.SUBJ INDEF
      vizsgá-n.
      exam-SUPERESSIVE
      'He knew that Péter cheated in an exam.'

(15) *János szeret   mosogat-ni   ebéd   után.*
      John like.3SG.SUBJ wash_dishes-INF dinner after
      'John likes to do the dishes after dinner.'

The motivation for this contrast unquestionably lies in the fact that complement clauses are (onto)logically affine to individual terms and, as such, to definite NPs. Note that subordinate clauses tend to be nominalised, especially in SOV languages with central-embedding VPs. By contrast, infinitives can be seen to instantiate

---

[14] Intriguingly, though, if the infinitive comes with an object, the matrix verb can show objective agreement provided that it is transitive. This is, for example, the case with *akar* 'want', as opposed to *igyekez* 'make efforts to'; see É. Kiss (2002: 50). Den Dikken (2004) accounts for this contrast in terms of clause union with the former class.

the logical type of properties, not of individuals, hence they do not correspond to definite NPs. Starting from the assumption that clauses, just like DPs, have a referential argument in the sense of a discourse referent, Coppock (2013: 24) hints at a formal explanation of the use of the objective conjugation in terms of a part-whole relation between atomic possibilities and multiple possible worlds: "A clause could then be analyzed in a parallel fashion to a definite description, with maximization over possibilities rather than individuals." The CP complementiser *hogy* is consequently analysed as a quantifier over possibilities.[15]

3.2.5 Possessed and specific indefinite objects

We will now illustrate that the objective conjugation is also found with indefinite objects, provided that these are either possessed or specific. First, consider the possessive NPs in (16). Only (16a) is definite, but all of them obligatorily trigger the same agreement.

(16) a. *egy   magyar   író   első könyv-é-t   olvas-om*
         INDEF Hungarian author first book-P'OR3SG-ACC read-1SG.OBJ
         'I read the first book by a Hungarian author.'

      b. *János egy   könyv-é-t   olvas-om*
         János INDEF book-P'OR3SG-ACC read-1SG.OBJ
         'I read one of János's books.' (lit.: I read a book of János's.)

      c. *egy   könyv-em-et   / könyv-ünk-et   olvas-om*
         INDEF book-P'OR1SG-ACC   book-P'OR1PL-ACC read-1SG.OBJ
         'I read one of my books / of our books.'

---

[15] É. Kiss (2002) mentions a group of optionally transitive verbs such as *telefonál* 'telephone', for which the complement clause is associated with an accusative pronoun in their transitive use. The pronoun is optional, or, in É. Kiss's analysis "dropped in post-verbal position. Nevertheless, its presence can be reconstructed from the objective conjugation of the matrix verb" (2002: 242). For intransitive sentence-embedding verbs such as *szól* 'call out', which take the subjective conjugation, the status of the *that*-clause is that of an adjunct clause. Consequently, É. Kiss analyses the objective conjugation as being triggered by the associated pronoun. Obviously, the association of complement clauses with pronouns is another effect of their ontological affinity to individuals. Coppock & Wechsler (2012: 725) argue explicitly against the idea of complement clauses adopting a syntactic DP specification mediated by a correlative pronoun. On the basis of extraction asymmetries, they conclude that "complement clauses trigger the objective conjugation, yet are CPs rather than DPs", without further motivating the choice of the conjugation.

   It is not clear to us whether any of the approaches mentioned will also account for the obligatoriness of objective agreement on the matrix verb of direct speech complements (see Trommer 1995: 20). In particular, we are not sure whether it is legitimate to assume a null complementiser or a dropped pronoun in connection with direct speech.

   d. *egy   magyar   író   könyv-é-t   olvas-om*
      INDEF Hungarian author book-P'OR3SG-ACC read-1SG.OBJ
      'I read a book by a Hungarian author.'

In view of (16b,c), which exhibit indefinite head nouns with a definite possessor, one might be tempted to put forward an analysis in terms of a definiteness effect, according to which the referential uniqueness of the entire noun phrase would be warranted by that of the possessor. However, such an explanation would not work in the light of (16d), in which not only the head noun but also the possessor is indefinite. This example seems to show that the presence of any possessor suffices to trigger the objective conjugation.

One other possible speculation would be that it is syntactic complexity rather than uniqueness that makes the difference. However, that this cannot be the case is clear from the fact that the objective conjugation is neither found with indefinite objects modified by relative clauses or by complex APs, nor with coordinated indefinite NPs. For that reason, such notions as complexity or 'heaviness' of the NP are not relevant here. Much rather, what is significant beyond definiteness and possession is a certain kind of specificity. Bartos (1997) observes the contrast in (17):

(17)   a. *Olvas-tuk   Péter (öt) vers-é-t*   (Bartos 1997: 368)
         read-PRET.1PL.OBJ Péter five poem-P'OR3SG-ACC
         'We have read Péter's (five) poems.'

      b. *Olvas-tunk   Péter-nek (öt) vers-é-t.*
         read-PRET.1PL.SUBJ Péter-DAT five poem-P'OR3SG-ACC
         'We have read (five) poems by Péter.'

Neither is (17a) formally marked by the definite article *a(z)*, nor is (17b) formally marked as indefinite by a quantifier or *egy*. So how does the different choice of the conjugation come about? Significantly, (17a) implies totality in the sense that Péter wrote no more than the (five) poems that are at issue, whereas (17b) makes no such commitment. In other words, although the NP is referentially anchored by the speaker (the speaker knows which poems were read) and, hence, epistemically specific, it is not partitive-specific.

Partitive specificity has indeed been well-known for being a relevant criterion for object case marking since Enç (1991), who refers to the notion of D(iscourse)-linking. Enç shows that in Turkish indefinite objects are marked by accusative only if the referent is included in a set that was previously established in the

discourse. For Hungarian objective agreement, however, this does not fully suffice. This can be seen from (18), the translation of Enç's (1991: 6) corresponding example in which the Turkish noun displays accusative.

(18) (Several children entered my room …)
       … *két lány-t ismer-ek   / *ismer-em*
       two girl-ACC know-1SG.SUBJ / know-1SG.OBJ
       'I know two girls'

We conclude that partitive specificity as such is not a sufficient condition for Hungarian objective agreement, but rather overt partitive specificity, meaning that it is carried either by one of the above-discussed indefinite pronouns and quantifiers or by a possessor. Our conclusion is furthermore underpinned by the fact (pointed out to us by an anonymous reviewer) that not only the lexical-semantic specification but also the syntactic structure plays a role. Notice that the subjective agreement in (17b) depends on a syntactic configuration under which the possessor is marked by dative case and furthermore extracted from the possessed noun phrase. As long as it is realised locally – that is, according to É. Kiss (2002: 168f), adjoined to the DP – it triggers objective agreement. This is obvious from the difference in word order that arises when further material such as an adverb is added:[16]

(19) a. *Olvas-tunk   Péter-nek$_i$ tegnap   [$_{DP}$ (öt) vers-é-t t$_i$].*
          read-PRET.1PL.SUBJ Péter-DAT yesterday five poem-P'OR3SG-ACC
          'Yesterday we read (five) poems by Péter.'

      b. *Olvas-tuk   tegnap   [$_{DP}$ Péter-nek$_i$ [$_{DP}$ (öt) vers-é-t t$_i$]].*
          read-PRET.1PL.OBJ yesterday Péter-DAT   five poem-P'OR3SG-ACC
          'Yesterday we read Péter's (five) poems.'

To account for this asymmetry, Bárány (2013) proposes that the feature [+DEF] (used in the sense of Coppock 2013) is located in D, therefore triggered by a 'local' possessor (that is, either a nominative possessor or a non-extracted dative possessor), this way inducing specificity. The correlation between the location of the possessor and specificity is also manifest in other syntactic environments, especially, as pointed out in Szabolcsi (1994: 223ff) and É. Kiss (2002: 172–175), with the verb *születik* 'be born' and the existential verbs *van* 'be' and *nincs* 'not be', which

---

[16] The specificity contrast in (19b) appears to be somewhat less strong than in (17), in the sense that the totality can in principle be cancelled. We suspect that this has to do with the position of the possessor, namely adjoined to DP rather than embedded in the DP.

can only be combined with extracted possessors, hence non-specific arguments. Equally, overt partitive specificity is the criterion for objective agreement, and the local realisation of the possessor argument (in [Spec, D] or adjoined to DP, or purely in terms of pronominal agreement as in (16c)) ensures overtly expressed partitive specificity.

Taken together – and disregarding local person objects for the moment – the objective conjugation is triggered by objects that are either definite or overtly partitive-specific. Note that, stressing the parallel in the referential anchoring of partitive-specific (or D-linked) NPs to that of definite NPs, Özge (2013) builds on the notion of 'presuppositionality' of the object – in other words, a pragmatic component just like in the case of the *-j*-full forms in the possessor agreement split. We follow Coppock (2013) in essential regards, who draws on the notion of familiarity by proposing the above-quoted Lexical Familiarity Hypothesis. This way, the trigger of the objective series is explicitly based in semantic terms rather than in a mere feature specification. As for possessed nouns, Coppock explains the choice of objective behaviour by ascribing to the possessor suffix the lexical information that the possessor is part of the presupposed universe, which is tantamount to our assumption that possessed nouns are explicitly partitive-specific.[17]

Given that definiteness is only a sufficient but not a necessary condition for Hungarian objective agreement, we replace the syntactic feature specification [+DEF] as commonly assumed in this context by [+PARTSPEC]. Furthermore, although otherwise in harmony with Coppock (2013), our account will depart from hers at one point. While she explains the behaviour of 1st and 2nd person as illustrated in 3.2.1 by positing that they incur no familiarity since they are not anaphoric, we will later bear on the marked status of local objects, and argue for the role of presuppositionality in referential anchoring. Before that, however, we will examine the conjugation split from a typological point and explain why, in the first place, specificity of the object can play such a major role here.

---

[17] Bartos (1999) notes that in some dialects possessed nouns determined by non-partitive *néhány* 'some', which otherwise trigger the subjective conjugation as illustrated in (13a), allow for both conjugations:

> (i) *(i)Ismer-ek/%-em néhany könyv-ed-et* (*Bartos 1999: 99*)
> know-1SG.SUBJ/1SG.OBJ some book-P'OR2SG-ACC
> 'I know some of your books.'

This variation can be interpreted as following from the conflict of the non-specificity of *néhány* and the partitive specificity indicated by the presence of a possessor. See Coppock (2013: 22ff) for a proposal along these lines.

4   The conjugation split in a typological context: differential object marking in Hungarian

The sensitivity for referential dimensions such as definiteness and specificity speaks for the role that 'salience', or 'prominence' plays for the object. This encourages an analysis of the split in the light of the well-established typological notion of DOM ('differential object marking').

4.1   The realisation of object agreement

Although in some languages, such as Basque and Greenlandic, object case and object agreement are employed across the board to all sorts of objects, in most languages they are differential. Basically, they are restricted to noun phrases either with human (or animate) referents, or with a definite (or specific) interpretation. To mention a classical example, object agreement in Swahili is confined to objects that are definite or human, whereas indefinite non-human objects trigger only subject agreement. Similarly, in Palauan, direct object agreement in the perfective aspect is, according to Woolford (1995), restricted to human and specific non-plural objects (the particle *a* marks NPs, and *el* licenses modifiers of the noun):

(20)   Palauan (Austronesian; Woolford 1995: 658ff)

    a. *Te-'illebed*   *a* *bilis a*   *rengalek*
       SUBJ3-hit.PERF DET dog DET children
       'The kids hit a dog / the dogs / some dog(s)'

    b. *Te-'illebed-ii*   *a* *bilis a*   *rengalek*
       SUBJ3-hit.PERF-OBJ3SG DET dog DET children
       'The kids hit the dog.'

The motivation of DOM asymmetries is that object agreement (and, likewise, object case) is restricted to those objects which display properties that are typical of subjects, hence to 'marked' objects. It is generally assumed in the typological literature that DOM splits are related to 'topicality' or 'salience' hierarchies; see especially Siewierska (2004: 149) for five explicit sub-hierarchies. Of these, those in (21a-c) are of particular relevance, as well as the definiteness hierarchy suggested by Aissen (2003).

(21)   a. Person hierarchy: 1st > 2nd > 3rd

    b. Animacy hierarchy: Human > Animate > Inanimate > Abstract

c. Focus hierarchy: not in focus > in focus

d. Definiteness Scale: Pronoun > Name > Definite > Indefinite Specific > Non-Specific

Notice that 1st- and 2nd-person pronouns are located on top of three of the scales because of their necessarily definite and human reference. It is a language-specific option whether the cut on the scale is marked by definite and indefinite, or human and non-human, or specific and non-specific. The fact that object linking splits follow these hierarchies – in the sense that a language will choose some step as its threshold of which sort of objects are morphologically marked and which are not – can be functionally explained by the requirement for an economic and efficient linking system. The distribution of object marking is economic since the morphological markers are avoided in cases of little concrete individuation.

If it is possible to show that the Hungarian verb inflection paradigm as illustrated in chart (7) above should best be analysed as involving object agreement, then the subjective–objective asymmetry can indeed be readily explained as an instance of DOM.

4.2 The Hungarian objective conjugation as object agreement

Given that the objective series does not distinguish the person and number of the object, it would appear natural to assume (as in fact many authors do[18]) that Hungarian has only subject but no object agreement. This way, one would not speak of verb-object agreement since the object itself is not specified in terms of its phi features, but only as to its mere presence plus the feature [+DEF], which is indeed the position taken by Coppock & Wechsler (2012). We will assume, by contrast, that the objective series includes a specification of the category of person, hence qualifies as object agreement. We analyse the Hungarian objective conjunction 1.) as object agreement, 2.) as being restricted in terms of DOM, 3.) with [±PartSpec] marking the lower bound. This explains why the distribution of would-be subject agreement is governed by object properties. Evidence for our proposal comes from the following considerations:

(i) With 2nd-person objects, in view of the portmanteau affix *-lak/-lek* for the combination 1SG→2 as illustrated in (10), it is obvious that there is an agreement specification. This holds regardless of whether one segments *-lak/-lek* into *−l-* for the object and *-ak/-ek* for the subject, as Bartos (1997: 364), É. Kiss

---

[18] For example, Nikolaeva (1999: 336) and Siewierska (1999: 244f).

(2002: 54, 2005: 113, 2013: 9) and den Dikken (2004) as well as Trommer (2003) do, or not.[19]

(ii) For 1st person, a specification of the object is excluded as an effect of the person hierarchy 1 > 2 > 3. For the combinations 2→1 and 3→1, the object would be higher than the subject, which amounts to a less natural scenario (see section 5). For these combinations, Hungarian has neither a portmanteau suffix in store, nor inverse morphology (see section 5.1). It is precisely this strategy of non-realisation, the gap in the object agreement and the resort to mere subjective agreement, that is symptomatic for most Uralic languages.

(iii) Finally, with 3rd person there is an agreement specification in the sense of paradigmatic contrast since the whole rest of the objective series indicates that the object is neither 1st nor 2nd person. Among others, this is also a key feature of the analysis by É. Kiss (2005: 113), who states: "The object agreement morpheme does have a person feature after all. The allomorphs *−(j)a/-j/-i/-e* mark a 3rd-person object, whereas the *-l-* marks a 2nd-person object." Even if one does not subscribe to this segmentation and assumes *-om, -juk* etc. to be impartible suffixes, the specification still follows from the paradigmatic contrast, on the assumption that *-lak/-lek* belongs to the objective paradigm.

The upshot is that although the Hungarian objective conjugation apparently displays only subject agreement, we are in fact dealing with object agreement. The objective conjugation series displays the specification [1/2/3→3rd-person object]. Apart from that, there is only the portmanteau form *-lak/-lek* for the scenario 1SG→2. For object agreement it is cross-linguistically the rule rather than the exception that it is restricted in terms of DOM, thus to be avoided in those cases where the object is least 'salient', in the sense of having little affinity to prototypical subjects.[20] In Hungarian, the threshold for objective agreement is marked by [±PartSpec].

---

[19] Trommer (2003) advocates an abstract and strictly featural-compositional analysis. In accordance with the framework of Distributed Morphology, morphemes are construed of as syntactic feature bundles. Trommer assumes zero morphemes for the object part of objective agreement, in order to keep them distinct from the subject part, thus denying the status of portmanteau for Hungarian verb agreement altogether, not only for *-lak/-lek*.

[20] Quite in the same vein, Szamosi (1974) already observed that Hungarian objective agreement is typologically in line with clitic doubling with respect to the definiteness restriction. Accordingly, Szamosi proposes analysing the former as an instance of clitic doubling and clitic placement.

The opposite view is taken by Bárány (2012), who argues that "typical criteria of DOM [...] cannot explain the distribution of the Hungarian conjugations" (p3). The person asymmetry and the assumed redundancy resulting from the fact that Hungarian displays accusative case marking

What still needs to be explained is how the person split (ii), illustrated above in 3.2.1, fits into the picture. In the following, we will therefore motivate the person sensitivity, that is, the restriction at the upper end of the definiteness hierarchy.

5 The person asymmetry, or: 1st- and 2nd-person pronouns are 'bad' direct objects

We have pointed out in the previous section that the absence of the objective agreement with local pronouns is not motivated in terms of DOM, in fact is the opposite of what DOM predicts. Note that it is not the existence of a second split as such that is unusual. Such splits are very common, especially in terms of a tripartite case system ergative–nominative/absolutive–accusative. Here, however, we are dealing with just two different markers, but a seemingly unexpected distribution in that only a segment in the middle of the scale is singled out for objective agreement.

We would like to put forward the claim that the person sensitivity arises due to the tendency of local person pronouns not to display the full range of object properties.

5.1 Typological context: why local person objects are dispreferred

The rationale behind the dispreference of 'normal' object marking with 1st and 2nd person, that is, the reluctance to treat them like 3rd-person objects, lies in the prototypical properties of 'good' and 'bad' objects. It is, in a way, the other side of the coin of DOM. The most natural and 'unmarked' objects are low in salience, animacy, definiteness, which means that 1st and 2nd person are the most 'marked' objects – the worst, so to speak. There are several strategies by which languages react to this markedness, regarding grammatical relation, morphological linking, and the syntactic processes they undergo.

First, it may give rise to DOM in the usual sense. By this we mean that if it comes to the realisation of 1st and 2nd person as a genuine object, then accusative case and object agreement cannot be left out unless it is left out for less salient objects (hence, all other objects) as well. This is an instance of person hierarchy-driven DOM effects, observed elsewhere but not in Hungarian. For example,

---

in addition lead Bárány (2012: 21) to conclude that with respect to the DOM status, Hungarian objective agreement "is a peculiar kind that does not adhere to principles seen in other languages".

in the Papuan language Yimas only the local persons are realised by designated object agreement, as opposed to neutralisation to 'nominative' agreement prefixes with 3rd; see Wunderlich (2001b) for references and closer analysis.

Second, that local objects are challenging is corroborated by languages that employ distinctive morphological linking devices such as the inverse marking system as found in Algonquian languages, for example, Fox, Cree, and Potawatomi. As long as the agent is higher on the person scale (2 > 1 > 3 in the case of Algonquian) than the patient, the unmarked 'direct' scenario will hold. If the agent is lower on the person scale than the patient, the same person-number affixes are employed, but with an inverse marker in addition, rather than with the direct marker.

(22)   Cree (Algonquian; Siewierska 2004: 150f)

     a. *Ki-wapam-i-n*
        2-see-DIRECT-1
        'You see me.'

     b. *Ki-wapam-iti-n*
        2-see-INVERSE-1
        'I see you.'

     c. *Ki-wapam-ikw-ak*
        2-see-INVERSE-3PL
        'They see you.'

Third, it is not uncommon for languages with otherwise transparent combinatorial systems of subject and object agreement markers to exclude some of the combinations of 1st and 2nd person (see also Heath 1998). This may give rise to gaps in the paradigm, or to repairs such as portmanteau forms. Both are found in Yimas, for which Wunderlich (2001b: 331) notes: "In all 1Ag/2Th settings, the expected transparent combination of prefixes is blocked. There exists a fused morpheme for 1Ag/2sgTh (namely *kampan-*); in the other instances, 2Th is expressed by a prefix, while 1Ag can only be expressed by a free pronoun". In the Northern Australian language Dalabon, it is the combination 2→1 that calls for a repair, namely neutralisation, in the sense that a subject prefix of 3rd rather than 2nd person is used. Most significantly, however, in Dalabon's rich system of pronominal prefixes, a 1st-person singular object cannot be morphologically expressed at all (Wunderlich 2001a).

Fourth, one other reaction to local objects is to deny them their object status, thus excluding them from (all or some) object privileges: (i) In Selkup (a Samoyedic language, thus remotely related to Hungarian), 1st- and 2nd-person pronouns do not trigger objective agreement either, and furthermore, according to Polinsky (1992: 415f), they fail to show direct object status altogether since they are not 'passivisable'. In other words, they are incapable of occurring as subjects of a passive structure, while 3rd-person pronouns trigger objective agreement and do occur as passive subjects. (ii) Bresnan et al. (2001) base their framework of stochastic OT syntax on the following observations. If the agent is lower on the person scale (here: 1st, 2nd > 3rd) than the patient, the passive is preferred or even obligatory, depending on the language. Conversely, if the agent is higher the passive is dispreferred, if at all possible. In fact, in Lummi (Salish) 1st and 2nd person are precluded as passive agents, just as 3rd person cannot be used for active subjects when the object is 1st or 2nd. And in languages like English, although 1st and 2nd person are not excluded altogether from being passive agents (*He is seen by me* is possible), it is much more common to say *I see him.*

We would like to propose that the Hungarian person asymmetry should be seen in the same vein, namely the trend that objects should not be too high compared to subjects. Of course, Hungarian local persons do not fail to show direct object status; this is corroborated by the fact that none of the criteria discussed here apply. However, there are two areas with respect to which Hungarian clearly is just as 'reluctant' as the languages mentioned in this section to treat local person objects parallel to 3rd-person pronoun and lexical objects. These areas are accusative case marking and also objective agreement, the subject of this paper.

5.2   Accusative marking and object agreement in Hungarian

The first piece of evidence for Hungarian's special response to local persons as direct objects comes from the omission of case marking in certain environments. Direct objects usually bear the accusative suffix *-(V)t*, which is, however, often omitted with (i) 1st and 2nd pronominal objects, and (ii) 3rd-person lexical objects when preceded by a possessor suffix of 1st or 2nd person. As for the first context of omission, Hungarian had developed unusually complex accusative forms for the local pronouns. These forms consist of the base, *én* and *te* respectively, which is extended by a final velar before the possessor suffix is attached; finally, the case suffix that is also used with nouns occurs. The old-style forms are thus *eng-em-et* PRON1SG-P'OR1SG-ACC, literally 'my I/me', and *tég-ed-et* PRON2SG-P'OR2SG-

ACC 'your you'. From a functional point of view, the accusative marker on local pronouns is entirely redundant, since the stems *engem* and *téged* PRON2SG.ACC clearly differ from the nominative (the mere base) and the dative and, hence, are already indicated as accusative objects. Significantly, the accusative suffix on 1st- and 2nd-person pronouns is obsolete, at best optional, in the contemporary language; see (23). It is, however, still maintained in poetry as in (24), a passage from a traditional old folk song.[21]

(23) a. *Téged(-et)*   *szeret.*
　　　　PRON2SG.ACC-ACC love.3SG.SUBJ
　　　　'She loves you.'

　　b. *Eng-em(-et)*   *látsz.*
　　　　PRON1SG.ACC-ACC see.2SG.SUBJ
　　　　'You see me.'

(24) Excerpt from the folk song "Tavaszi szél" ('Spring wind'):
　　　　Hát én immár ki-t   *válassz-ak,*   *virág-om,*   *virág-om.*
　　　　so 1SG now who-ACC choose-1SG.SUBJ flower-P'OR1SG flower-P'OR1SG

　　　　Te **engem-et**   *'s én* **téged-et,**   *virág-om,*
　　　　2SG PRON1SG.ACC-ACC and 1SG PRON2SG.ACC-ACC flower-P'OR1SG

　　　　virág-om.
　　　　flower.P'OR1SG
　　　　'Who should I choose now? My flower, my flower. You me and I you, my flower, my flower.'

The morphological structure in terms of possessor and possessed provides the link to the second context of omission. As a speciality of Hungarian, the reluctance against local person as regularly case-marked objects increasingly extends

---

[21] Also note the strong contrast to accusative marking of the 3rd-person pronoun, which does not involve a possessor suffix. Accordingly, omission of the accusative suffix is not possible with these forms, thus, *ő* PRON3SG – *ő-t* PRON3SG-ACC, *ők* PRON3PL – *ők-et* PRON3PL-ACC.

　　The structure of the accusative plural forms of the local persons is fully parallel to the singular: *mi-nk-et* PRON1PL-P'OR1PL-ACC 'us' and *ti-tek-et* PRON2PL-P'OR2PL-ACC 'you (pl.)' (the segmentation is suggested in den Dikken 2004). The corresponding nominative forms are *mi* PRON1PL 'we' and *ti* PRON2PL 'you (pl.)'. With these plural forms the accusative marker cannot be omitted; see footnote 23 on the role of number in object marking asymmetries..

　　For pronouns in the dative as well as for all semantic cases, the stem is (notably, in all three persons) not the pronoun stem as such, but rather the morpheme that otherwise functions as the suffix indicating the respective case with nouns: e. g., *nek-em*, DAT-P'OR1SG, 'to me', *vel-ed* INSTR-P'OR2SG 'with you', and *nál-uk*, ADESSIVE-P'OR3PL, 'by/at them'. É. Kiss (2002: 194) points to the parallel composition of postpositional phrases with a pronominal complement.

from local person as objects to 'locally possessed' nouns, so that even with lexical objects the accusative suffix is not always obligatory: it is optionally omitted on lexical objects provided a 1st- or 2nd-person possessor suffix precedes.[22] This is evidenced by the contrast of (25a) with local possessors and (25b) with a 3rd-person possessor, where the accusative suffix is obligatory.

(25) a. *Elveszt-ettem a toll-am(-at) / toll-ad(-at)*
   lose-PRET.1SG.OBJ DEF pen-P'OR1SG-ACC pen-P'OR2SG-ACC
   'I lost my/your pen.'

  b. *Elveszt-ettem a toll-á-t /* toll-a*
   lose-PRET.1SG.OBJ DEF pen-P'OR3SG-ACC pen-P'OR3SG
   'I lost his/her pen.'

For 1st and 2nd plural, the omission of the accusative suffix is somewhat less common, but still possible. Crucially, the same contrast between local and 3rd person applies; see (26a) vs. (26b).

(26) a. *Elveszt-ettem a toll-unk(-at) / toll-atok(-at)*
   lose-PRET.1SG.OBJ DEF pen-P'OR1PL(-ACC) pen-P'OR2PL(-ACC)
   'I lost our/your(PL) pen.'

  b. *Elveszt-ettem a toll-uk-at /* toll-uk*
   lose-PRET.1SG.OBJ DEF pen-P'OR3PL-ACC pen-P'OR3PL
   'I lost their pen.'

For possessed nouns and the phrases they project, we are, of course, dealing with 3rd-person objects. We assume that the Hungarian reluctance of treating 1st and 2nd pronouns as objects with full object status has analogously extended to the morphological context '1st or 2nd within the lexical object', regardless of its actual status of a 3rd-person NP.

5.3 The rank of subject and object on the person hierarchy

Given that all those direct objects that fail to exhibit accusative case in Hungarian involve a local person p'or suffix which would appear immediately preceding the accusative suffix, let us state as a mere generalisation about the data that this combination as such is dispreferred. As an explanation of this generalisation, we suspect that the cease of realising the accusative in combination with local person objects is an analogy to the person sensitivity of the conjugation split. It

---

[22] This is especially common in oral speech, but also found in written language.

is precisely with these combinations where we see the link to the trend discussed in 5.1: local persons are so unsuitable as objects that they are likely to fail to fulfil all structural grammatical properties of objects, be they morphological or syntactic.

Some languages afford this markedness for the sake of expressivity, and provide the full paradigm. To give an example from Uralic, the Finnic language Mordvin displays portmanteau suffixes for all except the reflexive combinations (Zaicz 1998). In contrast, Hungarian has neither portmanteau affixes nor inverse marking for 2→1, 1PL→2, 3→1 and 3→2. These combinations as such are, of course, not precluded (cf. the examples in (9) and (23)). The point is that the object can only be syntactically specified, not morphologically.

To conclude, (i) local person arguments are 'bad' objects. The unavailability of objective conjugation is just one ramification of this status, the decline of accusative marking is another. (ii) Portmanteau suffixes are one typological strategy of reacting to the challenge of dealing with local objects. To the extent they exist in Uralic, they should be analysed as belonging to the objective series since by their nature they specify the object. (iii) Hungarian resolves the conflict of faithfulness ("morphological marking of the object should be realised") and markedness ("avoid bad objects") by allowing for just one combination with a 'bad' object, namely the least marked one in terms of the person hierarchy 1 > 2 > 3, in the morphological inventory, namely the combination 1SG→2, with *-lak/-lek*, as in *lát-lak (téged)* 'I see you'.[23] (iv) As an effect, the objective series can functionally be interpreted as portmanteau forms for the 'unmarked' combinations in which the object does not outrank the subject on the hierarchy: 1→3, 2→3, and 3→3 (the consequence being that it specifies the feature value 3rd person of the object). The 'bad' scenarios (3→1, 3→2, 2→1, 1PL→2) are ignored in the objective conjugation. Instead the subjective series can only be employed.

As for combinations of equally high (or low) subject and object, anaphor scenarios defy any obvious integration into the scale because subject and object have the same referent, which typically calls for some morphosyntactic device

---

[23] Recall from the above examples in (9c,d) that the combination 1plural→2 requires the subjective conjugation, rather than the portmanteau affix *-lak/-lek*, which is restricted to 1singular→2. We attribute this to the fact that singular entities are conceptualised as being more prominent, or salient, than plural entities. This difference gives rise to DOM effects in other languages as well; an example is Palauan object agreement as illustrated in 4.1. The individual number values are therefore assumed to occupy different positions on the salience scale, with 1[−pl] > 1[+pl], and *mutatis mutandis* for 2nd and 3rd person. With respect to Hungarian this means that 1st person plural is not considered higher than 2nd person. Accordingly, the version adopted by É. Kiss (2005: 112, 2013: 8) is 1SG > 1PL/2 > 3.

of its own. In Hungarian, all anaphors trigger objective agreement: *magam-at lát-om*, myself-ACC see-1SG.OBJ, 'I see myself'; *magad-at lát-od*, yourself-ACC see-2SG.OBJ, 'you see yourself', *magá-t lát-ja*, him/herself-ACC see-3SG.OBJ, 's/he sees him/herself'. Notice, crucially, that the reflexive pronouns morphologically consist of the stem *mag* 'kernel' and a possessor suffix with the person/number specification of the referent. We therefore assume with É. Kiss (2005: 112) that the choice of the objective series follows from the reflexive's morphosyntactic status of a possessed noun. This status is, in fact, more obvious than in the case of the accusative pronouns discussed above; for example, it is possible to realise a free pronoun in addition, as with possessor constructions in general. While accounting for reflexive anaphors, however, the possessive analysis does not apply to the reciprocal pronoun *egymás*. This form is composed of *egy* 'a, one' and *más* 'other'. Evidently, the fact that *egymás* also triggers objective agreement does not follow from the morphological structure of the word (see note 27 on the matter). The most appropriate generalisation in terms of the person hierarchy would therefore appear to be: objective agreement is restricted to the unmarked scenarios; more precisely, subject and object having the same rank is 'still alright', while a scenario with the object higher than the subject, and in addition 1PL→2, is not – hence our absolute (rather than relative) generalisation in terms of the restriction to non-local objects except 1SG→2.

In referring to the person hierarchy, our proposal shares an essential feature with that of É. Kiss (2005, 2013) who also draws a connection between the person asymmetry and the portmanteau suffix *-lak/-lek*. Her generalisation, named the 'Inverse agreement constraint', is that object agreement is only licit when the object is lower than the subject on the hierarchy 1SG > 1PL/2 > 3, rather than including equal ranking. The major difference between this and our proposal is, however, that É. Kiss refers to the inverse systems as they are also found in Eurasia, namely in Kartvelian and Paleo-Siberian languages (see also the example from Cree in 5.1). Given that objective agreement also occurs in combination with 3rd-person subjects although these are lowest, É. Kiss refines her generalisation by adding a stipulation concerning the lowest rank. (The additional stipulation that we need, incidentally, concerns the combination 1SG→2, as the 'best of the worst', thus, in this case referring to the relative rank of the two arguments). Note that if one were to integrate definiteness and specificity into É. Kiss's scale (parallel to animacy in other inverse languages) this would yield an incorrect prediction,

namely that objective agreement should not occur with specific objects but with non-specific objects, since these are lowest.[24]

5.4 The person asymmetry as a by-product of familiarity?

We would finally like to compare our analysis to that by Coppock (2013) with regard to whether her analysis actually copes with the person asymmetry and the partitivity-driven asymmetry in terms of one single explanation based on familiarity. Coppock emphasises that of all the proposed explanations, hers is the only one from which the person asymmetry follows, rather than treating person as a separate factor. She argues that "[u]nder the present account, the reason that first and second person non-reflexive, non-reciprocal pronouns do not trigger the objective conjugation is that they are not anaphoric; they are purely indexical" (2013: 25).[25] The reason why we do not subscribe to this claim is that in Coppock's theory, anaphoricity is understood in the sense of familiarity being modelled in Discourse Representation Theory, for these are the concepts that are made use of formally. Notably, the referents of local person pronouns, though they are not anaphoric, are indeed familiar. This is actually implied by the definition that Coppock (2013: 8) provides, thus conflicting her explanation of the person asymmetry: "Crucially, 'familiarity' is broader than 'anaphoricity': Familiar discourse referents do not necessarily have a linguistic antecedent, so long as the discourse referent can be found in the associated context". The referential arguments of local person pronouns would therefore seem to be no less familiar than those of nouns determined by indefinite pronouns operating over a presupposed domain, or by demonstratives pronouns.[26] After all, the speaker and hearer of an utterance are among the discourse referents in the common ground, thus

---

[24] For further criticism of É. Kiss's (2005) inverse analysis, see also Coppock & Wechsler (2010: 177f). They provide a historical motivation based on incorporation of pronouns that only involves 3rd-person pronouns. Consequently, they also deny a connection between the person asymmetry and the portmanteau suffix -*lak*/-*lek*.

[25] This solution is also considered by Bartos (1997: 370), who notes in a footnote: "É. Kiss (p.c.) suggests that one might toy with the idea of taking 1st and 2nd person pronouns to be non-specific, in a discoursal sense, on the grounds that they can never be co-indexed with a syntactic antecedent – the sole way of rendering an NP specific." Bartos does not pursue this idea any further, preferring a syntactic account in terms of the categorical difference between DP and NP. He finally admits the person asymmetry as a problem and points to the possibility that 1st and 2nd person pronouns might be "less-than-DP" (1997: 382).

[26] With regard to demonstratives, Coppock (2013: 12f) argues to the contrary. She posits that also in case of purely deictic use, demonstratives involve familiarity, just as in their anaphoric use, by virtue of the accompanying gesture. This gesture is assumed to introduce the referent into the discourse, unlike with the purely indexical local pronouns.

300

fulfilling one of the two alternative conditions on the referential argument of a lexical item to be classified as familiar (2013: 8), at least to the same extent that uniques such as *the sun* do. Accordingly, they carry the feature [+DEF] which is responsible for objective agreement. In short, as long as familiarity – which is explicitly assumed to be a broader, thus, less restrictive concept compared to anaphoricity – is the key criterion, the failure of object agreement to occur with local persons does not follow from their non-anaphoricity.[27]

A familiarity analysis of the person split, moreover, does at least not gain further plausibility in the light of dialects of the closest relatives to Hungarian, namely the Ob-Ugric languages Khanty and Mansi (also known as Ostyak and Vogul, respectively). In Northern Mansi and Northern Khanty, the objective conjugation also occurs with (non-focus) local person objects as in (27b).

(27)   Northern Khanty (Ob-Ugric; Nikolaeva 1999: 337):

    a.   *ma năŋ-en   / năŋ   xot-en   wan-s-əm*
       I   PRON2SG-ACC   PRON2SG house-P'OR2SG see-PRET-1SG.SUBJ
       'I saw YOU / YOUR HOUSE.'

    b.   *ma năŋ-en   / năŋ   xot-en   wan-s-em*
       I   PRON2SG-ACC   PRON2SG house-P'OR2SG see-PRET-1SG.OBJ_SG
       'I saw you / your house.'

This extended use has to do with the fact that these languages no longer exhibit a morphological person specification of the object; instead, only number is specified (into singular, plural, and dual). One can therefore assume, as Coppock & Wechsler (2010: 170f) explicitly do in an LFG format analysis, that the objective agreement markers of Northern Khanty, in contrast to Eastern Khanty, have lost the 3rd-person specification of their lexical entry. The authors suggest that the same loss occurred in Hungarian too (counter to our assumption made in 4.2 that we are dealing with the specification [1/2/3→3rd-person object]), but for this language the condition of objective agreement was reanalysed from topicality to [+DEF]. This latter feature is assumed not to be predictable from the meaning, which enables them to stipulate that non-reflexive 1st and 2nd person are not specified as [+DEF]. Now Coppock's familiarity analysis, which aims at a semantic foundation of this stipulation, appears to fare well with the fact

---

[27] As far as reflexive and reciprocal pronouns are concerned, Coppock's explanation is successful, because these are necessarily anaphoric, thus correctly predicted to trigger objective agreement. On the other hand, as stated above, in the case of reflexives the choice of agreement also follows from their morphological status of possessed nouns.

that in Northern Khanty the objective conjugation is not found with local objects that are focal (which we indicate by capital letters in the translation of (27a)) but only with non-focus objects, in fact those that are secondary topics according to Nikolaeva (1999: 372).[28] On the other hand, given this very opposition, and especially the existence of a grammaticalised pattern for local objects that are familiar (namely the occurrence of objective agreement as in (27b)), it is even questionable whether non-reflexive local person pronouns should strictly be conceived as non-anaphoric.

In fact, under the assumption that the person asymmetry is a by-product of the 'lexical familiarity' analysis, differential object marking and the behaviour of local objects would for most languages be subject to conditions strikingly different from those of Hungarian. Either the object would not be required to be familiar, or this specification would not have to result from a lexical item. Note in this connection that Coppock (2013: 7, 14f) regards accusative marking in Turkish, following Enç (1991) and Özge (2013), as also being sensitive to familiarity but in contrast to Hungarian not necessarily in the sense of arising from a lexical item. It is not fully obvious to us how this will account for the fact that Turkish local objects exhibit the same object marking as 3rd-person objects (anaphoric and non-anaphoric). In any case, other DOM languages dismiss local person objects just as little as Turkish from their marking patterns of object case, agreement and clitic doubling.

We conclude that the absence of objective conjugation at the upper end of the definiteness hierarchy on the one hand (the local persons) and at the lower end on the other hand (non-specific objects) does not follow from one and the same featural specification. Instead, the two gaps have so far been given different motivations under our analysis: whereas the gap at the lower end was argued to be an instance of object agreement constrained by factors responsible for DOM (that is, the object is of little salience), the failure of local person pronouns to trigger objective agreement is traced to the typological trend that 1st- and 2nd-person objects are highly marked since in most of the cases they outrank the subject on the person scale.

These two trends are combined in Hungarian so as to circumscribe a medium section of the salience hierarchy, namely from 3rd pronoun down to partitive-specific, the effect being that it is precisely this medium segment which displays

---

[28] Notice that this information-structure-based asymmetry can be captured by making reference to the focus hierarchy in (21c). See, moreover, Marcantonio (1985) on the relevance of the object's topic status for accusative marking and objective agreement in the history of Hungarian.

objective agreement. Similarly, in the other Ob-Ugrian languages Eastern Khanty and Eastern Mansi (in contrast to the above-mentioned Northern varieties; cf. Nikolaeva 1999), as well as in Selkup (Polinsky 1992) and other Samoyedic languages, objective agreement fails to occur, on the one hand, with local pronouns, and on the other with indefinite objects (or non-topical objects, see Coppock & Wechsler 2010 for a historical account of the variation). The question that we eventually investigate is whether it is yet possible to find a uniform rationale for these two restrictions of the distribution of the objective series. The goal will be approached by way of returning to the split in possessor agreement as analysed in section 2.

6   'Robust' transitive scenarios and agreement splits restricted by pragmatic factors

In order to provide a uniform explanation for the non-occurrence of Hungarian objective agreement, we will pursue two questions: how does the distribution fit with typological generalisations concerning subject-and-object scenarios, thus, with transitivity? And why does the objective agreement series, thus, the *−j*-full of the two conjugation paradigms, align with the alienable variant of possessor agreement?

6.1   Restrictions on grammatical 'objecthood' and the notion of robust transitivity

There is ample evidence that object marking is not only constrained by low saliency in the sense of DOM, thus by referential properties of the internal argument such as non-specificity, but also by properties of the event or situation denoted by the verb. Above all, these are the categories of aspect and aktionsart. A case in point from Uralic is Mordvin, whose object agreement is referred to as the 'direct declension' (Zaicz 1998). As already mentioned in 5.3, it consists of portmanteau suffixes for all person and number combinations. Crucially, it is only employed in the perfective aspect, so that in imperfective contexts the definite object combines with the 'indirect' series. The relevance of aktionsart-based transitivity splits is evidenced by the analysis of two-argument activity verbs in Van Valin (1990). For example, in Italian two-argument activities do not allow for a passivisation variant while their accomplishment counterparts do, similar to the contrast of *eat spaghetti (#in five minutes)* and *eat the spaghetti (in five minutes)* in English. Still more conclusive is the behaviour of two-argument activity verbs in

ergative languages such as Samoan or West Caucasian as mentioned by Van Valin & LaPolla (1997: 122ff). In Samoan, the ergative-absolutive case pattern that is typical of transitive verbs is not available when the verb is taken to denote an activity rather than an accomplishment. Instead, the pattern absolutive-locative must be used, that is, absolutive case for the otherwise ergative-marked argument. This implies that in these languages a two-place activity is treated as an intransitive rather than a transitive scenario.

Besides, as Van Valin & LaPolla (1997: 122ff) point out, when the internal argument is non-specific or non-referential it can be thought of as an inherent argument, in the sense of inherent to the lexical semantics of the verb. One important characteristic is that it can be omitted in many languages (including English and Hungarian, as in *speak/beszél*). Another characteristic is that it is incorporated, especially in languages such as Lakhota and Samoan, whose verbal morphology exhibits a regular pattern of object incorporation.

Overall, these findings show that object marking can be further restricted to the effect that the internal argument of a two-place verb fails to fulfil all morphological and syntactic properties of direct objects. In fact, it may not enjoy the status of a direct object at all. This status can be affected by referential properties as well as by situational properties. Like with local pronouns, this also holds true of 3rd lexical NPs in scenarios of too little transitivity. This leaves us, for the Samoyedic and the Ob-Ugrian languages including Hungarian, with a middle part of the hierarchy that delimits those scenarios for which we would like to introduce the term robust transitivity. By this we mean that the likelihood is highest for an internal argument to star as a bona fide direct object. What does it take, then, to be a robust transitive scenario?

6.2 The role of presuppositionality for the internal argument

Situational properties such as aspect, tense and mood are, for those languages in which they play a role in the above sense, just as relevant for robust transitivity as object properties such as animacy and discourse saliency. Unlike the latter, the former cannot be readily be ranked in terms of salience hierarchies such as the ones in (21). A hard and fast account that combines all the various dimensions involved would go beyond the present scope.

As regards Hungarian, the distinction that is responsible for the agreement splits is not simply transitive vs. intransitive. This is clear from the fact that indefinite NPs do not only bear accusative case but can also be passivised, hence are

clearly treated as direct objects. Apparently, it is in the case of high, but not too high, saliency of the object that the object is specified with respect to person. The relevance of the robustness of transitivity for Hungarian is further corroborated by the fact that the objective conjugation requires the internal argument to have the grammatical status of a direct object, while that of an oblique object does not suffice. Two-place verbs such as *segít* 'help' and *örül* 'look forward to' that assign dative or local case rather than the accusative exhibit the subjective conjugation throughout, even if the internal argument is possessed and definite (*örülök a nyaralásomra* 'I look forward to my holidays'). This excludes the possibility of basing an approach merely on the presence of a semantic relation between two individuals. Furthermore, since the object has to be at least [+PartSpec], objective agreement signals more than merely transitivity in the sense of involving a direct object.

What is therefore essential is our assumption of a conceptually grounded scale that elaborates on the person and definiteness hierarchies (21a,d), and the definition of the two cut-off points for Hungarian. This scale is indicated on the left-hand column in (28). To more precisely define how the middle segment of the scale, which delimits objects of robust transitivity for Hungarian, can be positively characterised, we make use of the concept of presupposition. More concretely, we specify the contents of the involved presupposition for each step on the scale. It turns out that from local pronouns down to proper names on the one hand, and from non-referential NPs up to proper names on the other, each step on the scale subsumes the information of the previous step. The increase of presuppositional contents towards the objects of robust transitive scenarios is explicated in the right-hand column in (28).

The use of any NP upwards from [+PartSpec] NPs includes a presupposition concerning the anchoring of the referent.[29] For local pronouns, the anchoring is purely indexical, that is, determined by the context of utterance. No coherence

---

[29] In making use of the notion 'referential anchoring' we draw on von von Heusinger (2011), who conceives this notion to be the common denominator of the various different kinds of specificity.

The non-specific segment of the scale, that is, those nominals that are not referentially anchored, is largely equivalent to those which Chung & Ladusaw (2004) propose to analyse in terms of 'predicate restriction'. As an additional mode of composition next to argument saturation (modelled as function application), predicate restriction involves a modifier that conjoins with the verb predicate, thus leaving the latter unsaturated and still allowing for subsequent saturation or existential closure.

Furthermore, the term 'identifiability' as we use it should be understood as non-ambiguity of reference, in the sense of individual and functional concepts as employed in Löbner's (1985, 2011) Concept Type and Determination approach.

(28) Scale according to the referentiality of internal arguments and their presuppositional contents

	Status of internal argument in terms of definiteness and referentiality	Illustration or example reference	Presuppositional contents	
subjective	definite personal pronouns local pronouns	(9)	identifiability only in speech situation	**indexical**
objective: robust transitivity	non-local (= 3rd) person pro-nouns	(8b)	identifiability via coherence in discourse set (previous mentioning)	**anchoring via coherence in discourse**
	unique concepts, proper names	*Látom a napot/ Jánost* 'I see the sun / John'	identifiability via utterance-independent common ground and discourse	
	anaphoric (including ellipsis)	(8a)	identifiability via coherence in discourse set (previous mentioning)	
	indefinite: possessed	(16b-d)	existence and coherence; anchoring via superset that contains the referent	
	[+PartSpec]	(11b,c), (12b), (13a)		
subjective	[−PartSpec]: epistemically or scopally specific	(8d), (11a)	(existence asserted, not presupposed)	**no referential anchoring**
	not referentially anchored:	*Nem üt (egy) kutyát.* 'He doesn't beat dogs.'	(no anchoring, only warranted by speaker)	
	non-specific indefinite (pseudo-)incorporated arguments[30]	*fagylaltot eszek* 'I ice-cream-eat'	(no anchoring, only modificational restriction on verb meaning)	
	no genuine exponent: inherent objects	*beszélek* 'I speak' *szólok* 'I call out'		
	existentially bound arguments	(8c)		
	no internal arg.(monadic verbs)	*megyek* 'I walk'		

---

[30]The notion of pseudo-incorporation comes from Dayal (2011). Dayal shows that the notion also applies to Hungarian. It characterises such instances as *fagylaltot eszek* 'I ice-cream-eat', where the incorporated nominal is syntactically vigorous. In Hungarian, it may bear number and accusative case morphology, while in Hindi it may even be phrasal; that is, NP rather than only N°.

306

or discourse knowledge is presupposed, so that the referential anchoring is only 'locally' warranted. This is in opposition to the anchoring of non-local (= 'talked about') NPs, which presuppose some background of coherence. For one thing this involves identifiability in the discourse set, especially the resolution of anaphoric NPs and 3rd-person pronouns. Moreover, the identifiability of non-deictic definite NPs generally presupposes some common ground that is independent of the utterance. This also holds for the felicitous use of proper names (including NPs of which the name is not the head) and other semantically unique concepts. (Note that the existence of the referent is not presupposed in all cases. This is obvious from non-specific definites such as *the owner of the car with the license plate xyz, the winner of the next championship.*) Coherence in discourse is also at issue here, presupposing, for example, that names will be assigned referents in a one-to-one fashion.

Utilising the concept of coherence, partitive-specific indefinites are positively circumscribed since they presuppose an identifiable superset to which the referent belongs. By contrast, the reference of merely epistemically or scopally specific and other [−PartSpec] indefinites is only warranted by the speaker, thus, not anchored in the common ground of speaker and hearer. Note that the amount of descriptive content is low with pronouns and non-referentially anchored NPs, and highest 'in the middle', namely with common (as opposed to proper) nouns, and especially with so-called 'establishing' modifiers such as restrictive relative clauses as they are typically employed in first-mention use of sortal nouns. In this sense, syntactic complexity corresponds to descriptive complexity, and to more presuppositional contents in terms of common ground.

The different behaviour of 3rd and local pronouns is now straightforwardly captured. We propose that objective agreement signals the need for discourse coherence in the anchoring of the referent. For local pronouns anchoring is possible without any knowledge of previous discourse. This means that the context for objective agreement is not met, and, consequently, subjective agreement is employed.[31] Overall, for Hungarian robust transitivity implies a presupposition of coherence with respect to the referent of the object.

---

[31] As an anonymous reviewer rightly points out, the present analysis does not account for the existence of the portmanteau suffix *−lak/-lek* for the particular combination 1st singular subject and 2nd object, thus, an overt object agreement specification for a local object. In this respect, our approach does not fare better than the familiarity explanation which we contrast to ours in section 5.4. At this stage, we can offer no more than the assumption that this suffix, with its special morphological status, does not underlie the same coherence presupposition as the rest of the objective series. See also the discussion in 5.3 on the status of this particular combination, and on the 'inverse' analysis by É. Kiss (2005, 2013) in terms of the relative ranking of subject and object on the peron hierarchy.

6.3   Pragmatic factors in verb and possessor agreement splits

That the crucial factor for the choice of verbal agreement is not simply the presence of a relation (denoted by a transitive verb), but rather a pragmatic relation involving the notion of presupposition, has an equivalent in the choice of the possessor agreement morphology. Remember that in section 2 the possessor split was analysed as an opposition of semantic and pragmatic possession. The forms of the objective paradigm, most of which feature -*j* as a component, indicate a presupposition pertaining to the relation denoted by the verb and its internal argument. Much in the same way, the forms of the alienable sub-paradigm, which also regularly involve the ingredient -*j*, indicate that the possessor is in a pragmatically established relation with the possessum, usually presupposing context or world knowledge.

Recall further from section 2 that just like with verb agreement, the morphological contrast in possessor agreement is found with 3rd person but not with 1st and 2nd person. We explained this by the fact that an artefact-denoting meronym cannot exhibit an alienability distinction with local person possessors, since it cannot be inalienably possessed by the latter (it cannot be, so to speak, a part of speaker or hearer). 3rd-person possessors, by contrast, can either be alienable or inalienable possessors; thus a morphological contrast 'makes sense' here and only here, given the restriction to meronymic artefacts. On the basis of the analysis in this section, we suggest that the role of discourse coherence that is indicated by the verbal conjugation contrast is just as immaterial for local person objects as for local person possessors. Local person objects are invariant with respect to their referential status, whereas 3rd-person objects may exhibit the full range from non-referential/non-specific to anaphoric pronouns.

In sum, the '-*j*-full' suffixes that crop up in possessor agreement and in verb agreement are indicators of a relation involving presuppositional contents. As far as possession is concerned, the -*j*-full possessor is construed as standing in a pragmatically established relation with the possessum. As regards objective agreement, it is triggered by the middle segment of the definiteness scale from 3rd pronoun down to partitive-specific. In semantic-pragmatic terms, this segment is characterised as presupposing speech situation-independent identifiability. For definite and partitive-specific 3rd-person objects, the anchoring of the referent or of a superset presupposes coherence.

7   Conclusion:
pragmatic restrictions on agreement morphology

This paper has connected two inflectional splits of Hungarian, one pertaining to possessor agreement and the other to verbal agreement. Both splits display an obvious morphological parallel. For possessed nouns, the split was analysed as expressing the contrast of semantic versus pragmatic possession, the latter being marked by an additional *-j* in the agreement suffix. This '-*j*-full' morphological make-up constitutes the link to the objective conjugation, where its occurrence is analogously limited so as to indicate a relation with certain pragmatic conditions.

Specifically, we argued that Hungarian objective agreement is restricted by a refined definiteness hierarchy. Two facts have been given particular reference and were accounted for in their typological context: first, the objective conjugation is also used with indefinite objects, provided that these are (either definitely or indefinitely) possessed. Second, if the object is a local pronoun the subjective rather than the objective conjugation is used. We are therefore dealing with a combination of the two dimensions of 'not too low' referentiality – in terms of [+PARTSPEC], and in line with differential object marking – and of speech situation-independent identifiability. Taking these two restrictions affecting the upper and the lower end together, an intermediate segment on a refined definiteness scale is circumscribed which encompasses what we refer to as robust transitive scenarios. Which segment it is that exactly triggers objective agreement in Hungarian (roughly: 3rd Pronoun > Proper Name > Definite > Partitive-specific, therein slightly different from that of other Uralic languages) was characterised in terms of a restriction regarding the presuppositional contents in the referential anchoring of the objects.

The morphological parallels between the two splits could thus be given a conceptual rationale by analysing both the alienable and the objective paradigm as involving a restriction in terms of a pragmatic component in the anchoring of the referent of the internal argument: for possessed nouns, in the sense that pragmatic possession presupposes a contextual instantiation which is not presupposed for semantic possession; for transitive verbs, in the sense of including a presupposition concerning the anchoring via discourse coherence.

Bibliography

Aissen, J. 2003. Differential object marking: Iconicity vs. economy. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21. 453–483.

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

Bartos, H. 1999. *Morfoszintaxis és interpretáció: a magyar inflexiós jeleségek szintaktikai háttere*. Budapest: ELTE dissertation.

Bresnan, J., S. Dingare & C. D. Manning. 2001. Soft constraints mirror hard constraints: voice and person in English and Lummi. In M. Butt & T. Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG 01 conference*, The University of Hong Kong.

Bárány, A. 2012. Hungarian conjugations and differential object marking. In *Proceedings of the first central European conference in linguistics for postgraduate students*, 3–25. http://cecils.btk.ppke.hu/cecils1proceedings.

Bárány, A. 2013. The Hungarian subjective paradigm and possessed DOs. Abstract for the 11th International Conference on the Structure of Hungarian (ICSH). http://icsh11.nytud.hu/abs/ICSH13abstract17.pdf.

Chappell, H. & W. McGregor. 1996. Prolegomena to a theory of inalienability. In H. Chappell & W. McGregor (eds.), *The grammar of inalienability: a typological perspective on body part terms and the part whole relation*, 3–30. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chung, S. & W. A. Ladusaw. 2004. *Restriction and saturation*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.

Comrie, B. 1977. Subjects and direct objects in Uralic languages: a functional explanation of case-marking systems. *Études Finno-Ougriennes XII*, 5–17.

Coppock, E. 2013. A semantic solution to the problem of Hungarian object agreement. *Natural Language Semantics* 21. 345–371. Issue 4.

Coppock, E. & S. Wechsler. 2010. Less-travelled paths from pronoun to agreement: the case of the Uralic objective conjugations. In M. Butt & T. Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG 10 conference*, 165–185. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Coppock, E. & S. Wechsler. 2012. The objective conjugation in Hungarian: agreement without phi-features. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 30. 699–740.

Csirmaz, A. & A. Szabolcsi. 2012. Quantification in Hungarian. In E. Keenan & D. Paperno (eds.), *Handbook of quantifiers in natural language*, 399–466. Dordrecht: Springer.

den Dikken, M. 2004. Agreement and 'clause union'. In K. É. Kiss & H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *Verb clusters: A study of Hungarian, German and Dutch*, 445–498. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

É. Kiss, K. 2002. *The syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

É. Kiss, K. 2005. The inverse agreement constraint in Hungarian: A relic of a Uralic-Siberian sprachbund? In H. Broekhuis et al. (ed.), *Organizing grammar. linguistic studies in honor of Henk van Riemsdijk*, 108–115. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

É. Kiss, K. 2013. The inverse agreement constraint in Uralic languages. *Finno-Ugric Languages and Linguistics* 3. 2–21.

Elekfi, L. 2000. Semantic differences of suffix alternates in Hungarian. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 47. 145–177.

Enç, M. 1991. The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22. 1–25.

Heath, J. 1998. Pragmatic skewing in 1 ↔ 2 pronominal combinations in native American languages. *International Journal of American Linguistics (IJAL)* 64. 83–104.

von Heusinger, K. 2011. Specificity. In K. von Heusinger, C. Maienborn & P. Portner (eds.), *Semantics. an international handbook of natural language meaning*, vol. 2, 1024-1057. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Jensen, P. . & C. Vikner. 2004. The English prenominal genitive and lexical semantics. In J.-Y. Kim, Y. A. Lander & B. H. Partee (eds.), *Possessives and beyond: semantics and syntax*, 3–27. Amherst: GLSA.

Kenesei, I., R. M. Vago & A. Fenyvesi. 1998. *Hungarian.* London: Routledge.

Kiefer, F. 1985. The possessive in Hungarian: a problem for natural morphology. *Acta Linguistica Scientiarum Academiae Hungaricae* 35. 139–149.

Löbner, S. 1985. Definites. *Journal of Semantics* 4. 279–326.

Löbner, S. 2011. Concept types and determination. *Journal of Semantics* 28. 279–333.

Marcantonio, A. 1985. On the definite vs. indefinite conjugation in Hungarian: a typological and diachronic analysis. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 35. 267–298.

Moravcsik, E. 2003. Inflectional morphology in the Hungarian noun phrase. In F. Plank (ed.), *Noun phrase structure in the languages of Europe*, 113-252. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Nichols, J. 1988. On alienable and inalienable possession. In W. Shipley (ed.), *In honor of Mary Haas. Haas festival conference on native American linguistics*, 557–609. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Nikolaeva, I. 1999. Object agreement, grammatical relations and information structure. *Studies in Language* 23. 331–376.

Olsson, M. 1992. *Hungarian phonology and morphology*. Lund: Lund University Press.

Ortmann, A. 2014. Definite article asymmetries and concept types: semantic and pragmatic uniqueness. In T. Gamerschlag, D. Gerland, R. Osswald & W. Petersen (eds.), *Frames and concept types. applications in language and philosophy*, 293–321. Dordrecht: Springer.

Özge, U. 2013. What does it mean for an indefinite to be presuppositional? In G. Bezhanishvili, S. Löbner, V. Marra & F. Richter (eds.), *Logic, language, and computation. 9th international tbilisi symposium on logic, language, and computation, TbiLLC 2011*, 138–154. Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer.

Polinsky, M. 1992. Verb agreement and object marking in Sel'kup: interaction of morphology and syntax. In C. P. Canakis, G. P. Chan & J. Marshall Denton (eds.), *Papers from the 28th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, vol. 1, 412–425.

Seiler, H. 1983. *Possession as an operational domain of language*. Tübingen: Narr.

Siewierska, A. 1999. From anaphoric pronoun to grammatical agreement marker: Why objects don't make it. *Folia Linguistica* 33. 225–251. Special issue "Agreement", ed. by Greville G. Corbett.

Siewierska, A. 2004. *Person*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Siptar, P. & M. Törkenczy. 2000. *The phonology of Hungarian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Szabolcsi, A. 1994. The noun phrase. In F. Kiefer & K. É. Kiss (eds.), *The syntactic structure of Hungarian. syntax and semantics*, 179–274. San Diego/New York: Academic Press.

Szamosi, M. 1974. Verb-object agreement in Hungarian. In M. W. La Galy, R. A. Fox, and A. Bruck (eds.) *Papers from the 10th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 701–711.

Trommer, J. 1995. Ungarische Verb-Objekt-Kongruenz im Rahmen einer Unifikationsgrammatik. In *Arbeitspapier der Forschungsstelle Artikulationsprozesse (FORSA) 1: Verbale Kategorien und Aktantenkonfiguration*, 17–66. Osnabrück: Universität Osnabrück.

Trommer, J. 2003. Hungarian has no portmanteau agreement. Ms., University of Osnabrück.

Van Valin, R. D. Jr. 1990. Semantic parameters of split intransitivity. *Language* 66. 221–260.

Van Valin, R. D. Jr & Randy LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax: structure, meaning and function.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woolford, E. 1995. Object agreement in Palauan: Specificity, humanness, economy and optimality. In J. Beckman, S. Urbanczyk & L. Walsh (eds.), *Papers in Optimality Theory*, 665–700. University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics 18, Amherst: GLSA.

Wunderlich, D. 2001a. A correspondence-theoretic analysis of Dalabon transitive paradigms. In G. Booij & J. van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of morphology 2000*, 233–252. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Wunderlich, D. 2001b. How gaps and substitutions can become optimal: the pronominal affix paradigms of Yimas. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 99. 315–366. Special issue on Morphological paradigms, ed. by James P. Blevins.

Zaicz, G. 1998. Mordva. In Daniel Abondolo (ed.), *The Uralic languages*, 184–218. London: Routledge.

Authors

Albert Ortmann
Doris Gerland
Departement of Linguistics and Information Science
Heinrich-Heine-University Düsseldorf
{ortmann,gerland}@phil.hhu.de