Approaches to Hungarian 17

As described in detail in the preceding foreword introducing the renewal of the *Approaches to Hungarian* series, the current thematic issue of the journal, titled *Approaches to Hungarian* 17, is the direct continuation of the *Approaches to Hungarian* book series, which was previously also published by John Benjamins. The issue has developed from selected papers based on talks given at the 14th International Conference on the Structure of Hungarian (*ICSH* 14).

ICSH is a biennial international conference forum for linguistic research that makes a contribution to our understanding of the structure of Hungarian and general linguistic theory. ICSH 14 took place in June 2019 at the University of Potsdam. The editors wish to thank the welcoming local organizers Malte Zimmermann, Mira Grubic, Doreen Georgi and Gisbert Fanselow for generously organising and hosting the event. (In addition to the present selection, an additional collection of four other papers from the same conference is contained in issue 2 of *Acta Linguistica Academica* Vol. 69.)

The current collection contains four research articles. Besides basing themselves on data from Hungarian, each of them concerns itself, in one way or another, with the interface between morphosyntax and meaning, including both semantic and pragmatic aspects.

In the first paper, titled "Answering overt *wh*-questions: How similar are Hungarian pre-verbal focus and English *it*-clefts?", Edgar Onea discusses the meaning of two frequently compared focus constructions: the Hungarian pre-verbal focus construction and English-type *it*-clefts. While in general, these constructions are very similar in terms of their semantics, it has been known for some time that they differ in at least one important respect: while clefts in English and other languages are typically very unnatural as answers to *wh*-interrogatives, pre-verbal focus in Hungarian is the unmarked, default strategy to respond to a constituent question. In this paper, the author argues that this difference can be fully accounted for by recourse to pragmatic factors (modelled within the Rational Speech Act framework of Frank & Goodman 2012), and thus a uniform semantics for *it*-clefts and pre-verbal focus can in fact be maintained.

The second contribution, by Brigitta R. Schvarcz, also lies at the juncture of morphosyntax and meaning. In her paper titled "*Hárman, sokan, mindannyian*: a presuppositional analysis to -AN-marked numerals and quantifiers in Hungarian", she proposes a unified compositional analysis for the semantics of -AN-suffixed numerals and quantifiers in Hungarian. The author argues that -AN is a predi-

cate at type <e,t>, which derives a plural set of humans with the cardinality provided by the numeral, with the [+human] and [+plural] features giving rise to corresponding presuppositions. The paper provides an account for the distribution of -AN-marked numerals and quantifiers, which turns out to be made up by two main types of positions: predicative positions and positions in adnominal pronominal constructions.

The paper "Ordinals, reflexives and unaccusatives: Unification by predication" by Marcel den Dikken presents a novel unified account of the syntax of the seemingly varied set of constructions appearing in its title, arguing that their morphosyntax encodes the same type of predication. Focusing on Hungarian, the author argues that that the suffix *-ik* found in the verbal morphology of reflexive and unaccusative VPs and the suffix *-ik* found in the nominal morphology of ordinals are not mere homophones but, in fact, the same morpheme. Specifically, the paper proposes a unified underlying morphosyntax of *-ik* in these constructions according to which in each of them *-ik* is a reflexive clitic of the SE type that serves as a subject of reverse predication in the sense of Den Dikken (2006). Dutch ordinals are also analysed in similar terms, lending cross-linguistic validity to the proposal.

Anikó Lipták in her contribution "Response particles and verbal identity" revisits the Verbal Identity Requirement on V-stranding ellipsis in Hungarian. The author argues that contrary to previous claims, this requirement is not morphosyntactic in nature, therefore it can be eliminated from the grammar as a stipulative condition. The crucial piece of evidence, underpinned by an acceptability survey, is that the extent to which verbal identity mismatches are tolerated in V-stranding ellipsis in answers to polar questions is highly sensitive to the presence (or absence) of a polar response particle. It is argued that the strong preference for identity in the absence of a response particle is, in fact, due to a pragmatic inference: if the speaker uses a different verb in the answer, this signals modification as to the content of the proposition asked about, and therefore, it is not the expected discourse move, namely a polar answer. The same problem does not arise in the presence of a polar response particle: here the polar answer is furnished by the response particle itself, and an alternative verb can be freely deployed.

Each submission was reviewed by at least two anonymous referees, as is the norm both in the *Approaches* series and in the Journal of Uralic Linguistics more generally. The editors wish to thank all reviewers for lending their time and expertise to reading and commenting on various stages of the manuscripts. We are also grateful for Péter Siptár's dedicated copy-editing, to which the quality of the published version of the texts in the collection owes an enormous deal.

Tamás Halm, Elisabeth Coppock, Balázs Surányi
(Editors of *Approaches to Hungarian 17*)