SCRAMBLING IN HUNGARIAN[*]

BALÁZS SURÁNYI

Research Institute for Linguistics
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
Benczúr utca 33.
H–1068 Budapest
Hungary
suranyi@nytud.hu

Abstract: This article revisits the (non)configurationality debate of the 80s and early 90s concerning Hungarian, a "free word order" language, which was shown during that period to be characterized by an articulate and, crucially, hierarchical preverbal domain, with A-bar positions dedicated to discourse functions such as topic and focus. What this debate did not conclusively settle, however, is the question whether or not the structure of A-positions in Hungarian is also configurational. The most prevalent, and indeed empirically most well-argued and elaborated analysis that has emerged is that of É. Kiss's (1987a; 1987b; 1991; 1994b; 2002; 2003), according to which the answer

---

is negative: arguments are base-generated in the verb phrase in a free order in a flat structure. The present paper challenges this view by demonstrating systematically that the arguments put forward to back it up are inconclusive, and in fact it fails descriptively as well. The alternative proposed here is based on a hierarchical verb phrase (vacated by the raised verb) and a Japanese-type local scrambling movement that operates in the post-verbal domain of the clause. The scrambling movement analysis, besides being theoretically more desirable than the nonconfigurational verb phrase approach, makes available a superior descriptive coverage by accounting for a varied set of structural symmetries and asymmetries holding between subject and object. Modulo scrambling, Hungarian is configurational all the way down.

Keywords: scrambling, (non)configurationality, Weak Crossover, binding, Hungarian

1. Introduction

Hungarian is well-known for its overt movements to a richly articulated preverbal left-periphery ("discourse-configurationality"), where syntactic hierarchy and scope interpretation are isomorphic (e.g., É. Kiss 1987a; 1991; 1995; Kenesei 1986). By contrast, its postverbal domain, where constituent order exhibits a radical freedom, has received much less attention. The only empirically argued and elaborated analysis that has emerged from the discussion in the 80s/early 90s of the issue whether Hungarian is configurational with respect to its argument positions is that of É. Kiss's (1987a; 1987b; 1991; 1994b; 2002; 2003). According to this view, the Hungarian nuclear clause (S in (1987a; 1987b) and later, VP) is non-configurational (cf. also Kenesei 1984), in particular, arguments (and adjuncts) are generated in a free order in a flat structure, as schematized in (1) (É. Kiss 1994b; 2002; 2003).[1]

(1) (a) $[_{VP} [_{V'} \text{ V DP}_{subj} \text{ DP}_{obj}]]$
     (b) $[_{VP} [_{V'} \text{ V DP}_{obj} \text{ DP}_{subj}]]$

The flat VP analysis is not without appeal due to its descriptive merits, which is probably the reason why it has become the most widely

---

[1] In É. Kiss (1994a), the VP is flat and there are no inflectional projections like AgrPs or TP in the clause. Her (2002) survey of Hungarian syntax does adopt inflectional projections for the treatment of inflectional morphology, but these projections are assumed to play no role in the syntax of arguments.

   A terminological caveat is also in order: permutation in the flat VP has also been referred to as 'scrambling' in the literature on Hungarian, but this sense of the term should be kept apart from the claim made in the present paper.

accepted view in the literature on Hungarian.[2] In this paper I argue for an alternative approach in terms of a hierarchical basic VP structure, coupled with local scrambling movements. It is demonstrated that the central subject–object symmetries that have served as the empirical base for the flat VP analysis can be accommodated equally well under the hierarchical VP plus scrambling approach, while on the other hand, a number of subject–object asymmetries (to be pointed out) strongly favor the latter view.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In section **2** I enumerate the empirical arguments that have been presented in favor of a non-hierarchical VP structure, which involve a lack of subject–object (S/O) asymmetries.[3] In section **3** I demonstrate that the arguments reviewed in section **2** in favor of a flat VP are inconclusive: some of the arguments are ill-founded, and some others lose force once a scrambling movement analysis based on a hierarchical VP (or rather, vP) is shown to derive the observed patterns equally well. Section **4** presents a host of asymmetry facts that are problematic under a flat VP analysis, but fall out on a scrambling approach modulo the hierarchical vP that this account adopts. Section **5** examines the basic properties of the postverbal object–subject reordering in Hungarian, and demonstrates that this reordering is akin in particular to (local) scrambling of the Japanese-type. Section **6** concludes the paper, and spells out the significance of its results.

---

[2] This is not to say that the configurational view has lacked proponents (e.g., Horváth 1986; Marácz 1989, and Speas 1990; cf. also Kenesei 1989). Nevertheless, the proposed implementations of a configurational approach were partly incomplete and partly descriptively inadequate, and/or relied on analytic devices that are no longer available (or, in some cases, even formulable) in the current restrictive framework. In a recent manuscript I received while working on this material, Katalin É. Kiss (2006) offers a phase-based analysis of the Hungarian verb phrase, which adopts the view that the verb phrase is hierarchical at the initial point of the derivation, but maintains a flat structure for the verb phrase at some later point in the derivation. I must leave the comparison of this recent hybrid approach with the one put forward in the present paper for another occasion.

[3] To keep a reasonable depth of subject matter, I will limit the discussion to the base position of the subject and the direct object; the placement of postverbal internal arguments and adjuncts cannot be addressed within the confines of this paper. Nevertheless, the scrambling operation envisaged to apply in Hungarian displaces not only direct objects, but also other internal arguments, including not only DPs but PPs as well.

2. The coverage of the flat VP analysis

The flat VP approach is designed to capture two central properties of the syntax of the Hungarian clause: first, constituent order to the right of the verb exhibits a degree of freedom unattested in "fixed word order" languages like English; and second, Hungarian is assumed to lack most subject/object asymmetries characteristic of languages where the subject is base-generated in a position higher than the object. This is not to say that Hungarian lacks subject/object asymmetries altogether. Within a flat VP approach, observable asymmetries of that kind must be treated as non-structural in nature, as we will see shortly. In this section I review the major arguments cited to back up the non-configurational view of the Hungarian verbal phrase (É. Kiss 1987a;b; 1994b; 2002; 2003).

2.1. Weak Crossover

(i) Weak Crossover (WCO) effects typically obtain when an element X is A-bar moved across an expression Y, where Y properly contains a variable bound by X. In languages like English, where the A-position of the subject is higher than the A-position of the object (the former c-commands the latter), *wh*-movement of the object across the subject gives rise to a marked degradation in acceptability, as in (2a) below, while no such deterioration is observable in the reverse configuration, as in (2b). Reinhart (1983) proposes to capture WCO in terms of the configuration licensing bound variable pronouns: bound variables must be A-bound (bound from an A-position) by their antecedent. Koopman and Spotiche's (1982) alternative view based on their Bijection Principle essentially dictates that pronouns must not be locally A-bar bound. According to Lasnik and Stowell's (1991) formulation, if a pronoun *pron* and a trace t left behind by an A-bar movement are both bound by a quantifier (like the displaced *wh*-expression), then t must c-command *pron*. It follows from (2) on any one of these generalizations that the A-position of the object does not c-command the A-position of the subject (and the pronoun inside it), while the A-position of the subject does c-command the A-position of the object (and hence also the pronoun inside it).

(2)   (a) $^?$*[Who$_i$ does [[his$_i$ mother] like t_i]]?
       (b) [Who$_i$ [t_i likes [his$_i$ mother]]]?

Hungarian, by contrast, is a language that does not display a WCO effect in analogous constructions (see (3a)), which has received an explanation under the flat VP analysis as follows. If the VP is flat, the position (marked by t_i) from which the object is *wh*-moved across the subject is sister to the position of the subject. No WCO effect obtains, because the object is moved from a position where it c-commands the (co-indexed pronominal variable inside the) subject. The WCO effect is absent also when the subject undergoes *wh*-movement, as is the case in English. On the flat VP analysis, this is expected as the A-position of the object (and hence the pronoun inside it) is c-commanded by the A-position of the subject.

(3) (a) [Kit]$_{ACC_i}$ hívott fel [az *pro*$_i$ anyja]$_{NOM}$ t_i?
    who-acc$_i$ called-3sg up the (his$_i$) mother-poss.3sg-nom
    '$^{?}$*Who$_i$ did his$_i$ mother call up?'

   (b) [Ki]$_{NOM_i}$ hívta fel t_i [az *pro*$_i$ anyját]$_{ACC}$?
    who-nom$_i$ called-3sg up the (his$_i$) mother-poss.3sg-acc
    'Who$_i$ called up his$_i$ mother?'

WCO effects are not wholly absent from Hungarian: they are attested in long *wh*-movement, as illustrated by the contrasted sentences below.[4]

----

[4] This fact is exemplified by Puskás (2000, 293), however, her example is ungrammatical independently of the WCO configuration; the one in (4a) is out exclusively due to WCO (the degradation is only aggravated by whatever factor determines long *wh*-movement to be felt marked by many speakers of Hungarian, compare (4b)). Puskás's example is (i). (i), however, is independently rendered ungrammatical by the choice of affixation on the embedded verb, which in (i) agrees with a definite object (*wh*-pronouns are known to trigger indefinite object agreement conjugation on the selecting verb). But even granting the correct (indefinite) agreement form of the embedded verb, the example is out (even when it involves a matrix subject that does not contain a bound pronominal, cf. (ii), where *pro* in indexical), because the matrix verb form is also incompatible in (i) with an object *wh*-pronoun long-moved into the matrix clause, which routinely triggers indefinite object agreement on the matrix verb.

(i) *Kit$_i$ mondta az *pro*$_i$ anyja, hogy a fiúk látták t_i?
    who-acc said.3sg.defobj the (his) mother-nom that the boys-nom saw.3pl.defobj
    'Who did his mother say the boys had seen?'

(ii) *Kit$_i$ mondta az *pro* anyád, hogy a fiúk láttak t_i?
    who-acc said.3sg.defobj the **your** mother-nom that the boys-nom saw.3pl.**indef**obj

Note that the acceptability of long *wh*-movement is known to exhibit a certain degree of variation among speakers: the spectrum goes from speakers who find them perfectly acceptable and also use them in their speech to those that flatly

In the (a) example, long *wh*-movement proceeds across the dative DP in
the matrix clause, which embeds a silent pronoun co-referring with the
moved *wh*-element. In (b), in contrast, the deictic second person covert
pronoun *pro* does not interfere.

(4) (a) *Kivel$_i$ mondtad   az *pro*$_i$ anyjának,   hogy
           who-with say-past-2sg.def the (his) mother-poss.3sg-dat that

           kikezdtek a   fiúk t_i?
           flirted-3pl the boys-nom

           '*Who$_i$ did you tell his$_i$ mother that the boys had flirted with?'

     (b) $^?$Kivel$_i$ mondtad   az *pro*   anyádnak,   hogy
           who-with say-past-2sg.def the (your) mother-poss.2sg-dat that

           kikezdtek a   fiúk t_i?
           flirted-3pl the boys-nom

           'Who did you tell your mother that the boys had flirted with?'

This observation is important to make, as it shows that Hungarian has
no internal property which would preempt WCO effects in general; nev-
ertheless, WCO is unattested in short *wh*-movement of objects.[5]

---

reject them. Of course, the contrast above exists only for speakers who accept
long *wh*-movement constructions to begin with.

[5] Brody (1995) argues that when undergoing *wh*-movement, objects touch down in
a Case-checking specifier, [Spec,AgrOP], an A-position from which the *wh*-object
c-commands and A-binds the pronoun within the VP-internal subject. This is
claimed to be the reason why WCO is unattested with short *wh*-movement in
Hungarian. It is irrelevant that this Case-related position is identified as the
*v*P-edge in the more recent AgrP-less clause structure model: what is crucial is
that it has the property of being above the base position of the subject. Precisely
this latter property is argued against and is rejected by the Johnson–Koizumi–
Lasnik approach to object Case checking, also embraced by Chomsky in his
most recent work, according to which the Case position of the object is higher
than its own base position, but lower than the base position of the subject.
Independently of this issue, however, there are a number of empirical problems
with the suggestion. For one thing, the same WCO-obviating derivation is ex-
pected to be available with long *wh*-movement too, since long-moved *wh*-objects
trigger (indefinite) object agreement on the matrix verb, which indicates that
the moved *wh*-object passes through matrix AgrOP. Then, the WCO-effect is
predicted to be obviated with long movement of *wh*-objects, which is contrary
to fact, cf. (i) (vs. (ii)). Another inadequacy of Brody's (*ibid.*) Case-position
based proposal is that it fails to extend to non-object internal arguments, which
behave on a par with objects with regard to WCO, but which do not bear
structural Case, and consequently are not related to a Case-checking position
above the subject. Finally, as also pointed out by É. Kiss (2002), it is unclear

2.2. Superiority

(ii) Superiority effects in single *wh*-fronting languages like English are exemplified by (5). In this language type it is the higher *wh*-item that must be attracted to the left periphery, i.e., to CP. The effect of Superiority in a multiple fronting language is illustrated from Bulgarian in (6): the original c-command relations between the *wh*-elements must be preserved after multiple *wh*-fronting (see Boškovič 2002; Richards 1997).

(5) (a) Who saw what?
   (b) *What did who see?

(6) (a) Koj   kogo   vižda?
       who-nom who-acc sees
       'Who sees whom?'
   (b) *Kogo koj vižda?

Hungarian shows no sensitivity to Superiority in multiple *wh*-fronting:

(7) (a) Ki   mit   vett?
       who-nom what-acc bought
       'Who bought what?'

   (b) Mit   ki   vett?
       what-acc who-nom bought
       'What was bought by whom?'

If neither argument is generated higher than the other, the lack of a Superiority effect in multiple *wh*-fronting of arguments of the same verb is expected.

---

why the same derivation (with an identical WCO-obviation effect) does not occur in English.

(i) *Kit$_i$ mondott   az *pro*$_i$ anyja,   hogy megláttak t_i?
    who-acc said.3sg.indefobj the (his) mother-nom that pv-saw.3pl.indefobj
    'Who did his mother say that they had seen?'

(ii) $^?$Kit$_i$ mondott   az *pro* anyád,   hogy megláttak t_i?
    who-acc said.3sg.indefobj the (your) mother-nom that pv-saw.3pl.indefobj
    'Who did your mother say that they had seen?'

2.3. Idioms and compositional theta-role assignment

(iii) A particularly interesting variety of evidence offered in favor of the flat VP analysis comes from idiom chunks. É. Kiss points out that as opposed to configurational languages of the English type, besides V+O idioms, Hungarian also has idioms composed of V+S, exemplified below.

(8) (a) Jánosra rájár   a   rúd   (pv = preverb/verbal particle)
          J-onto   pv-goes the stick-nom
          'John is having trouble.'

     (b) Jánost eszi a   fene
          J-acc   eats the plague-nom
          'John is extremely worried/envious.'

In other words, there is no subject/object asymmetry in the domain of idiom chunks either, as predicted by a non-hierarchical VP structure.

Similar in vein is the argument from indirect theta role assignment. English has numerous examples where the theta role of the subject is determined not simply by the verb, but by the choice of verb and object together, as in (9). Now given that English is taken to be characterized by a lack the opposite scenario, where the choice of the subject would determine the semantic role of the object, this has been taken to constitute evidence that the subject is external to a constituent containing the verb and the object (VP, prior to the VP-Internal Subject Hypothesis (VISH), V′ or big VP after the VISH became generally accepted) (cf. Marantz 1984).

(9) (a) John broke a vase
     (b) John broke an arm

É. Kiss (1987b, 244), citing Komlósy (1983), points out examples from Hungarian, where it is the choice of the subject that determines the semantic role of the object:

(10) (a) Eszi Jánost az   oroszlán
          eats J.-acc the lion-nom
          'The lion is eating John.'

     (b) Eszi Jánost az   irigység
          eats J.-acc the envy-nom
          'Envy is eating John.'

If Hungarian lacks the above subject/object asymmetry characterizing idiomaticity in configurational languages like English, then this provides support for a structural analysis wherein subject and object assume symmetric positions.

2.4. Movement of subjects

(iv) Subjects and objects in many constructions are extracted from their local clause with an equal ease in Hungarian. In English, the complementizer *that* blocks the extraction of the subject (a.k.a. the *that*-trace effect), whereas it has no effect on the extraction of the object (see (11)). Hungarian has no comparable *that*-trace effects (see (12)), hence subject-extraction behaves on a par with object-extraction in this regard. (Note that for many speakers the long-moved subject *wh*-expressions preferably appear in accusative case, licensed by the verb within the clause where they are moved to (see e.g., É. Kiss 1987b, (20)). No *that*-trace effect is attested in that variety either.)

(11) (a) Which candidate did you say (*that) became president?

    (b) Which candidate did you say (that) the people elected?

(12) Melyik jelölt   mondtad,   hogy elnök   lett?
    which   candidate-nom say-past-2sg that president become-past-3sg
    'Which candidate did you say became president?'

Hungarian has no ban on *wh*-extraction across a local [Spec,CP] filled by another *wh*-phrase either. While in English the extraction of a *wh*-phrase across the local [Spec,CP] filled by a *wh*-expression leads to ungrammaticality with subjects, but only to a milder degradation with objects (cf. (13)), no such difference can be detected in Hungarian, cf. (14) (É. Kiss 1987b).

(13) (a) **Which boy do you wonder why wants to buy a new car?

    (b) ?Which car do you wonder why John wants to buy?

(14) (a)(?)Melyik tanár   nem tudod,   hogy miért buktatott meg *pro*?
        which   teacher-nom not know-2sg that why   failed-3sg pv   (you.acc)
        '**Which teacher do you wonder why flunked you?'

(b)^(?)Melyik diákot   nem tudod,   hogy miért buktatták meg?
    which   student-acc not   know-2sg that   why   failed-3pl pv
   [?]'Which student do you wonder why they flunked?'

These two discrepancies between subject and object in English-type languages are normally accounted for in terms of the position of the subject. While the object is generated as sister to the verb (in a complement position), the subject is not: it originates (and also surfaces) higher. What É. Kiss concludes from the lack of these subject/object differences in Hungarian, is that not only the object, but also the subject is born as sister to the verb in a flat VP in this language.

2.5. Condition C

(v) Condition C (which requires referential expressions like names not to be c-commanded by a co-referential DP) rules out (15b), while it rules in (15a), because in English the subject c-commands the object, but the object does not c-command the subject.

(15) (a)   Yesterday Peter$_i$'s mother phoned him$_i$

    (b) *Yesterday he$_i$ phoned Peter$_i$'s mother

É. Kiss argues that in Hungarian Condition C effects obtain with R-expressions inside objects and subjects alike. (16) illustrates binding into the subject by the object.

(16)*Tegnap   felhívta   a   fiúk$_i$ anyja$_{NOM}$ őket$_{ACCi}$
    yesterday up-called-3sg the boys-nom mother-poss.3sg-nom them
    'Yesterday the boys'$_i$ mother called them$_i$ up.'   (judgment from É. Kiss 2002)

This judgment once again follows from a non-configurational verb phrase structure, where the subject DP c-commands (into) the object DP, and vice versa.[6]

---

[6] Deletion rules also operate without a subject/object asymmetry, see (i). This has no bearing on the configurationality issue, however, since in these constructions the element escaping deletion (whether a subject or an object) is moved out of the ellipsis site prior to deletion (by focusing, topicalization or some other A-bar movement) (see É. Kiss 1994b; 2002).

2.6. Free postverbal consitutent order

(vi) The major descriptive appeal of the flat VP analysis is the ease with which it can treat the apparent radical freedom of postverbal word order. While we find a strict hierarchy to the left of the finite verb, in the postverbal area a radical freedom of constituent order is attested. This falls out in a flat VP analysis, on the assumption that the overt material to the right of the finite verb corresponds to what is dominated by the VP.

2.7. Anaphor and pronominal variable binding

(vii) S/O asymmetries are nevertheless manifested in anaphor and pronominal variable binding.

(17) (a) *Gyakran elemzi(k)   önmaguk/egymás   a   pszichológusokat
           often   analyze-3sg/3pl themselves-nom/each other-nom the psychologists-acc
           '*Themselves/each other often analyze psychologists.'

    (b) Gyakran elemzik   a   pszichológusok   önmagukat/egymást
         often   analyze-3pl the psychologists-nom themselves-acc/each other-acc
         'Psychologists often analyze themselves/each other.'

These asymmetries are presumed not to be a reflection of a structural asymmetry, but instead, of an asymmetry in terms of prominence in a Thematic Hierarchy or in terms of linear precedence: É. Kiss (1991; 1994b) posits a Primacy Condition, which subsumes these two factors disjunctively in order to cover the complete set of anaphor and pronominal variable binding facts.[7]

    (i) Marinak VIRÁGOT vett   János, Zsuzsának pedig CSOKOLÁDÉT
         M.-dat   flower-acc bought J.-nom Zs.-dat   as.for chocolate-acc
         'As for Mary, John bought her FLOWERS, and as for Susan, he bought her
         CANDY.'   (É. Kiss 1987b, (11))

    (ii) Marinak JÁNOS vette   a   virágot,   Zsuzsának pedig PÉTER
         M.-dat   J.-nom bought the flower-acc Zs.-dat   as.for P.-nom
         'As for Mary, JOHN bought her the flowers, and as for Susan, PETER bought
         her the flowers.'

[7] Notice that the flat VP structure causes Condition C to be violated in examples like (17b): the anaphor binds the referential expression within a flat VP. Condition B appears to be violated in a flat VP in examples like (i) below. In É. Kiss (2002), these unwelcome consequences are prevented by assuming the principle in (ii): since the subject DP can bind the thematically less prominent object DP,

All in all, the flat VP theory appears to be a descriptively successful and analytically simple account of the facts above taken together.

3. Reducing subject–object symmetries to scrambling

What I demonstrate next is that the arguments reviewed in the previous section are not compelling. The various forms of a lack of an S/O asymmetry **(i)**–**(vi)** enumerated in section **2** are inconclusive in supporting a non-configurational, flat VP approach. Arguments **(iii)**, **(iv)** and **(v)** are ill-founded, and **(i)**, **(ii)** and **(vi)** lose their force, given that a scrambling movement analysis based on a hierarchical vP can derive the observed patterns just as well.

3.1. Weak Crossover and Superiority

In particular, **(i)** and **(ii)** lose force because scrambling is known to obviate WCO violations. Scrambling languages typically lack WCO and Superiority violations in mono-clausal contexts (see (2) and (3), respectively) (e.g., Haider 1986; Saito 1992; Grohmann 1997; Wiltschko 1998; Fanselow 2001; compare Fanselow 2004). I illustrate this from German in (18) and (19), respectively.

---

the object cannot bind the subject, so Condition B and Condition C are in fact not disobeyed.

(i) Ő/*pro*   megölte   magát
     he-nom/*pro*-nom pv-killed-3sg himself-acc
     'He killed himself.'

(ii) **The asymmetry of binding**
     If a can bind b, b cannot bind a.

Note that É. Kiss's Primacy Condition involves notions (relative thematic prominence, linear precedence) that are not directly available to build a grammatical analysis on within the current mainstream minimalist framework, where thematic roles are configurationally encoded in an articulated verb phrase structure (Hale–Keyser 1993b), and linear order is not encoded in syntactic structure (Kayne 1994). This Primacy Condition is actually akin to analogous principles of prominence utilized within the LFG framework in order to restrict binding relations. For instance, Bresnan's (1995; 1998) Prominence Principle involves a hierarchy of grammatical functions, precedence and thematic prominence; languages are then claimed to vary as to which of these constraints are active (which aspect of Bresnan's approach is, once again, not transposable to a minimalist model).

(18) Wen   liebt seine Mutter   nicht?
   who-acc loves his   mother-nom not
   'Who is such that his own mother does not love him?'

(19) (a) Wen   hat wer   gesehen?
       who-acc has who-nom seen
       'Who saw whom?'

   (b) Was   hat wer   gesehen?
       what-acc has who-nom seen
       'Who saw what?'

   (c) Ich weiss wen   wer   liebt.
       I   know who-acc who-nom loves
       'I know who loves whom.'

Scrambling languages are assumed to show no Superiority or WCO effects becasue scrambling itself obviates Superiority / WCO. (20) exemplifies WCO obviation in German, and the same is illustrated in (21) for Japanese:

(20) (a) *... weil seine Mutter   jeden Studenten   liebt
          since his   mother-nom every student-acc loves
       '*... because his mother loves every student'

   (b) ... weil [jeden Studenten]$_i$ seine Mutter t_i liebt
          since every student-acc his   mother-nom   loves
                                        (Grewendorf–Sabel 1999, 16)

(21) (a) $^{?}$*[[Soitui-no   hahaoya]-ga [darei-o   aisiteru]] no?
         the-guy-gen mother-nom who-acc love   Q

   (b) $^{?}$Darei-o [[soitui-no   hahaoya]-ga [t aisiteru]] no?
       who-acc   the-guy-gen mother-nom   love   Q
       '$^{?}$*Who does his mother love?'   (Saito 1992, 73)

The obviation effect follows on the assumption that an object can undergo A-bar movement starting from a position **above** the subject, a position that is available to it precisely due to scrambling. As Fanselow (2001) points out, *was-für* split can strand the *für* + XP component of the complex *wh*-phrase in a scrambling position, providing evidence that scrambling can feed *wh*-movement in German, see (22a). This approach receives further confirmation from the fact that an *in situ* object *wh*-

phrase can overtly scramble above the subject *wh*-phrase, see (22b) (or over a non-specific indefinite subject, see Fanselow 2001, 414).[8]

(22) (a) Was hätte denn [*t* für Aufsätze] selbst Hubert nicht rezensieren wollen
  what had prt [*t* for papers] even Hubert not review wanted
  'What kind of paper would even Hubert not have wanted to review?'

  (b) Wem hat was wer *t* gegeben?
  who-dat has what-acc who-nom given
  'Who gave what to whom?'

Although WCO S/O asymmetries are absent with short *wh*-movement and focusing, they obtain in some other cases (cf. Marácz 1989). I illustrate this in (23) with universal quantifiers. The contrast in (23) would be explained on a flat VP analysis by É. Kiss's (1991; 1994b) Primacy Condition on Binding involving thematic prominence and linear precedence disjunctively (see **(vii)** in section **2** above). But the contrast receives a straightforward explanation on a hierarchical *v*P account as well: covert Quantifier Raising (QR) of the universal QP (cf. Surányi 2002) produces a WCO configuration in (23a), but not in (23b).

---

[8] As far as Superiority violations are concerned, various other alternative analyses might in principle be applicable. For instance, Bošković contends in a series of papers (see Bošković 2002 and references therein) that if a functional head attracts (and enters an Agree relation with) multiple instances of the same feature, the attracted elements can move to the functional head in any order, given that the same total number of nodes will be crossed whatever the order of the movements. Based on work by Reinhart (1995; 1998) and Fox (1995; 1998; 2000) on what has come to be termed "interface economy" phenomena, another possible line is to argue that Superiority-violating multiple *wh*-fronting orders are licensed *qua* economy violations because they target an interpretation that cannot be achieved by the non-Superiority violating *wh*-order (an approach embraced in Fanselow 2004; see also Surányi 2002, ch. 6 for this point). Indeed the sorting keys (cf. Kuno 1982) in (6a) and (6b) above are different, and accordingly, appropriate answers differ too. (i) can answer (6a) but not (6b), and (ii) can answer (6b) but not (6a).

(i) [TOP János] [FOC tortát] csinált, [TOP Mari] [FOC jégkrémet], ...
  J.-nom cake-acc made-3sg M.-nom ice-cream-acc,
  'John made a cake, Mary made ice-cream, ...'

(ii) [TOP A tortát [FOC János] csinálta, [TOP a jégkrémet [FOC Mari], ...
  the cake-acc J.-nom made-3sg the ice-cream-acc M.-nom
  'The cake was made by John, the ice-cream by Mary, ...'

(23) Nem ismerte   fel . . .
     not   recognized-3sg pv

  (a) *[az a férfi,   aki bement pro_{3SGi} hozzá] [mindegyik lányt]
     that the man-**nom** who in-went-3sg   to.her$_i$ every   girl-**acc**$_i$
     '*The man who dropped by her$_i$ didn't recognize every girl$_i$.'

  (b) [mindegyik lány]$_i$ [azt   a férfit, aki bement pro_{3SGi} hozzá]
     every   girl-**nom**$_i$ that-acc the man-**acc** who in-went-3sg   to.her$_i$
     'Every girl$_i$ didn't recognize the man who dropped by her$_i$.'

Universal QPs (and other increasing distributive QPs) can be fronted in
Hungarian to their preverbal scope-taking position overtly (traditionally
identified as an adjunction site; Szabolcsi 1997 argues that it is DistP,
but see Surányi 2002; 2004 for a defense of the traditional view). If we
apply this overt form of QR (call it QP-fronting) in (23a), we get (24),
and somewhat surprisingly, the degradation of (23a) almost completely
disappears.

(24) $^{(?)}$[Mindegyik lányt]$_i$ felismerte $t_i{}'$ [az a férfi,   aki bement
     every   girl-**acc**$_i$ recognized-3sg   that the man-**nom** who in-went-3sg
     pro_{3SGi} hozzá] t_i
          to.her$_i$
     '*$^?$The man who dropped by her$_i$ recognized every girl$_i$.'

The Primacy Condition, which disjunctively involves precedence and the-
matic prominence as a condition on binding, is able to cover this fact: the
quantifier precedes the bound pronominal in (24).[9] However, the same
fact receives an explanation on the scrambling account too, and does so
in the same way as in the case of (3a) above: in the derivation of (24), the
object is first scrambled to a position above the subject $(= t_i{}')$, and is A-
bar-moved to its preverbal position in a second step. What explains that

---

[9] However, the disjunctive definition runs into a problem with simple cases like (i).

  (i) *Szereti   Jánost önmaga
     love-3sg J-acc   himself-nom

If binding of B by A is licensed either if A thematically more prominent than B,
or if A precedes B, then (i) is predicted to be grammatical, contrary to fact. If,
however, only thematic prominence matters, but linear precedence does not (cf.
É. Kiss 2002), then the apparent feeding effect of placing the object to the left of
the subject on A-binding of anaphors and pronominal variables, which I analyze
here as an effect of scrambling, and which is discussed extensively in É. Kiss
(1991; 1994b) (see also (7), as well as section 6 below for examples of this), is left
without any account.

this derivation is not available in (23a), is that scrambling is generally restricted to overt syntax.[10]

In short, on a scrambling account, thematic prominence can be replaced with c-command inside the vP, and instead of precedence, scrambling takes care of the availability of A-binding by the object into the subject precisely when the object comes to precede the subject. On this approach, the licensing condition of binding can simply be based on c-command, instead of the theoretically less desirable disjunctive principle of the Primacy Condition.

3.2. Idioms and compositional theta-role assignment

The appealing argument from idioms and compositional theta-role assignment **(iii)** is inconclusive for two reasons (for the sake of brevity, I

---

[10] É. Kiss (1994a) notes that Brody (1990) discusses the example below, which he marks as *?. É. Kiss claims that context can improve it into a grammatical, though still degraded, sentence (namely, if the universal QP quantifies over a familiar and salient set). These judgments fall into place under the present view. If the set quantified over by the universal quantifier is familiar/salient, then it can (somewhat marginally) function as an information structural topic. In this case, on its way to the left peripheral landing site, the QP can touch down in a scrambled position, which explains (23b). If, however, these conditions are not met, then a universal QP like *mindenkit* 'everyone' is difficult to be construed as a topic, it will normally function instead as the information focus of the sentence (in this case the immediately following complex verb can undergo stress eradication). This discourse structural status does not allow the QP to undergo scrambling prior to QP-fronting, whence it is fronted to the left periphery in one step, giving rise to a WCO effect.

(i) *?Mindenkit   felismert   a   férfi,   aki belépett   a   szobájába

　　 everyone-acc pv-recognized the man-nom who in-stepped the (her) room-in

　　 '*The man who entered her room recognized every girl.'

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(judgment Brody's)

Dobrovie-Sorin (1990) points out an analogous contrast in Romanian in the domain of *wh*-elements: whereas D-linked object *wh*-phrases can escape inducing a WCO violation, non-D-linked ones cannot. It is interesting in the present context to note a recently discovered parallel in English. Ishii (2006) shows that object *which*-phrases (i.e., overtly D-linked *wh*-expressions) in English fail to show a WCO effect in their local clause, which he ascribes to the movement step that targets the vP-edge (performed by *wh*-objects in the course of their successive cyclic movement to CP). Given that this intermediate step (which is likened by Ishii to scrambling) may count as an A-movement operation only in the case of D-linked *wh*-phrases, the obviation effect of this movement operation is limited to *which*-phrases.

concentrate here on idioms, but the arguments extend also to compositional theta-role assignment). First, the logic of the argument is flawed: on a flat VP analysis, which the evidence is supposed to support, [V + S] does not form a base structure constituent, and nor does [V + O]. This apparently flies in the face of the notion (going back to Marantz 1984) that idioms are (roughly) base structure constituents. Second, a number of idioms cited to instantiate the [V + S] idiom type are not in fact disallowed in a hierarchical VP structure on Marantz's (1984) assumptions either. For instance, [V + S] idioms involving a subject that is arguably an underlying internal argument of the verb, such as unaccusatives, are predicted to be allowed. *Piroskának leesett az álla* lit. 'Piroska-dat fell the jaw' and *Piroskának kinyílt a szeme* lit. 'Piroska-dat opened the eye' (cited in É. Kiss 2002) exemplify this type of idiom.[11] Psych verb constructions are another case in point. Chtareva (2005) argues that a group of [V + S] idioms in Russian that are apparently problematic for Marantz's (1984) hypothesis in reality fully conform to it, insofar as they represent idioms involving psychological causative predicates whose surface subjects are themes, and whose surface objects are experiencers (like one of the two uses of the English verb *frighten*); see (8a). On a fairly standard approach (see Belletti–Rizzi 1988), in these constructions the experiencer is generated above the theme, hence the verb and the surface subject form a base structure constituent.[12] This type of example has often been used, albeit wrongly, to back up the flat VP analysis (see e.g., É. Kiss 1987b, 22–23); see (25b), as well as (8) above.

(25) (a) Ivan-a   zajela sovest'
         Ivan-acc up.ate conscience-nom
         'Ivan's conscience was troubling him.'

     (b) Jánost elkapta   a   gépszíj
         J-acc   pv-caught the driving.belt-nom
         'John is intensively involved/caught up in something.'   (É. Kiss 2003, 26)

---

[11] These two examples involve a possessor that has been extracted out of the underlying complement DP (cf. Szabolcsi 1983). Idioms with an open possessor slot are possible, independently (e.g., *cat got* x*'s tongue*), as the possessor is not an argument of the verb.

[12] Nunberg et al. (1994) argue that many idioms are in fact compositional: the parts of these idioms have contextually restricted metaphorical interpretations, which combine transparently (see also Marantz 1997). This is what happens in examples like (25a,b), too.

Third, even English has idioms involving S and V, but not the complement of V: for instance, *God bless him, Fortune smiled on Gwendolyn* or *The devil alone knows X* (see Postal 2002 for more examples, and compare also Everaert 1993; the same goes for the influence on theta role assignment, e.g., *Somebody is eating popcorn* vs. *Something is eating him*). According to Everaert (*ibid.*), subject idioms are much more frequent in clearly configurational languages than often suggested in the literature, although object idioms are clearly the less marked case.[13] Of course, the same is true for Hungarian: [V + O] idioms are more abundant than [V + S] idioms. All in all, no firm conclusions can be drawn from the domain of idioms to back up a flat VP analysis.

3.3. Movement of subjects

Moving on to the observations in **(iv)**, it is easy to see that, even though they involve a difference between subject and object, they are quite independent of the issue of (non)configurationality. As far as the lack of *that*-trace effects is concerned, this has been correlated with the property of *pro*-drop (Perlmutter 1971), and with the availability of *v*P-internal subjects (Bennis 1986; Szczegielniak 1999), properties that are applicable to Hungarian and that can be found in configurational languages as well.

As for the general availability of *wh*-extraction across a local filled [Spec,CP], this is a feature that can be put down to the left-peripheral multiple specifier configuration underlying Bulgarian-type multiple *wh*-fronting (Rudin 1988), which is also found in Hungarian (see Surányi 2006). It has also been suggested that this behavior is a feature of languages where a *v*P-internal surface position is available to subjects, e.g., Italian, Spanish (see Sabel 2002 and references therein), which is once again a property that apparently holds of Hungarian. The availability of a *v*P-internal position for the subject once again does not directly concern the hierarchical asymmetry between the position of the subject and that of the object.

3.4. Condition C

Let us now come to the alleged S/O symmetry with respect to Condition C violations, i.e., **(v)**. The first point I would like to make concerns the

---

[13] See Martin Everaert's clarificatory note on the *Linguist List*, Vol-4-122.

status of examples like (16). 10 out of the 25 informants whose judgments
I have had access to found examples analogous to (16) degraded, but not
unacceptable (? or ??), and 7 speakers judged them to be OK, and only
8 informants rejected them as ?* or *. Second, the degradation found
in (16) can partly be put down to the placement of the pronoun, which
is in a final position, separated from the verb by the subject phrase. In
Hungarian such a surface position is known to be generally disfavored
by personal pronouns, which, if postverbal, prefer to be close to the
verb (Varga 1981), not separated from it by a stress-bearing element.
Indeed when the subject expression is fronted to a topic position and
hence the accusative pronoun follows the verb immediately, the judgment
profile improves significantly: OK = 10, ? = 9, ?? = 3, ?* = 2, * = 1. A
more radical improvement is attested when the antecedent of the pronoun
is made salient by the context, and the (3sg) overt pronoun in examples
analogous to (16) is replaced by a (3sg) object *pro*. In contrast, when
the silent pronoun is a subject bound by the possessor in the object, the
sentence is severely degraded.[14]

---

[14] A similarly strong contrast is found with overt oblique case-marked internal
argument pronouns, which lack a covert counterpart, see (i–ii). (More precisely,
oblique pronominal expressions are realized as an element corresponding to the
oblique case marker, whose morphosyntactic form is that of a possessed noun
head, and whose possessor is the personal pronoun itself, typically a *pro*).

(i) $^?$A legjobb barátom$_i$ anyja   gyerekként egyáltalán nem foglalkozott vele$_i$
     the best   friend-poss.1sg mother-nom child-as   at.all   not took.care   with.him
     'My best friend's$_i$ mother didn't take care of him$_i$ as a child at all.'

(ii) *A legjobb barátom$_i$ anyjával   idős korában   nem foglalkozott ő$_i$ egyáltalán
      the best   friend-poss.1sg mother-with old age-poss.3sg-in not took.care   he at.all
      '*He$_i$ did not take care of my best friend's$_i$ mother in her old age.'

It must be noted that prosodic context seems to affect the acceptability level
of sentences like (16): when followed by a stress-bearing element (as in (iii)),
the acceptability profile of sentences like (16) involving an overt object pronoun
improves noticeably. As has been noted in the main text, it also enhances accept-
ability if the object pronoun is not separated from the verb by a stress-bearing
element. Using a dative possessor instead of the nominative form is another
factor that increases acceptability for some speakers. Another improving factor
according to the judgment of some informants is the topicalization of the subject
DP containing the antecedent possessor. By contrast, none of these factors alter
the judgment of overt subject pronouns.

(iii) $^{?(?)}$Hét közben már   nem is hívja fel a   fiúk anyja
          week during anymore not also calls up the boys-nom mother-poss.3sg-nom
          őket egyáltalán
          them at.all
          'The boys' mother does not call them anymore at all during the week.'

(26) (a) $^?$Péter$_i$ főnöke   hívta fel *pro*$_i$ reply to: Who called up Peter?
         Peter's$_i$ boss-nom called up him$_i$

     (b) *Péter$_i$ főnökét hívta fel *pro*$_i$ reply to: Who did Peter call up?
         Peter's$_i$ boss-acc called up he$_i$

It is important to note that although examples with an object pronoun
co-referring with a lexical possessor inside the subject are of varied ac-
ceptability across speakers, speakers tend to find sentences with a sub-
ject pronoun co-referring with a lexical possessor inside the object much
worse. Although judgments of co-reference (involving nominative and
accusative pronouns—but see note 14) are not so sharp as to serve as the
basis of a strong argument either pro or con, they lean in the expected
direction only if the subject is indeed generated above the object.[15]

---

[15] As for the reason for the preference of personal pronouns to surface immediately
after the verb (or verb plus particle), it can be speculated that this is due to their
prosodic properties and/or the familiarity of their referents. On either account,
it may well be that they preferably undergo scrambling (to the right of the verb).

   If this is correct, then it makes available two potential ways to capture
why sentences of type (16) are degraded. One possibility is to construe (16) as
involving the scrambling of both S and O (call this 'dual scrambling'): in this
case the scrambled object pronoun will bind the base copy of the R-expression
inside the subject. The fact that a scrambled object anaphor does not give rise
to ungrammaticality even though it c-commands the base copy of its antecedent
R-expression in seeming violation of Condition C does not in intself speak against
such a "dual scrambling" analysis of the degradation of (16). This is because this
particular behavior of object anaphors in relation to the subject R-expression is
well-known to be an independent property in scrambling languages as different as
Japanese, Hindi, Korean, German and Georgian (a property put down to "lethal
ambiguity" by McGinnis 2004); see (40) for the Hungarian example. What argues
against this account, however, is that object personal pronouns are known not
to be exempt, in the manner object anaphors are, from inducing a Condition C
violation in the very same language type, as they are not in Hungarian either
(see (i) below).

(i) *Tegnap   felhívta   [őket]$_i$ [a fiúk$_i$ anyja]   *t*
    yesterday up-called-3sg them   the boys-nom mother-nom
    'Yesterday the boys' mother called them up.'

According to the second possibility, (16) is construed as not involving scrambling
at all, and its degradation is therefore due to the above-mentioned preference
of personal pronouns to undergo scrambling, which the object pronoun in (16)
fails to satisfy. Scrambling the object pronoun to the left of the subject in (16)
cannot help either: in such a scenario the object personal pronoun binds the R-
expression within the subject from its scrambled position, inducing a Condition
C violation (see (i)).

Interestingly, É. Kiss has suggested that with *wh*-possessors (instead of lexical possessors) we get no S/O asymmetry, unlike in English (judgments from É. Kiss 1987a), compare (27) and (28). On the flat VP approach, (27) can be seen as involving Strong Crossover, i.e., a Principle C violation.

(27) (a) *Kinek$_i$ az anyja   hívta fel őt$_i$?   (cf. (28a))
         whose$_i$ the mother-poss.3sg-nom called up him$_i$

     (b) *Kinek$_i$ az anyját   hívta fel ő$_i$?   (cf. (28b))
         whose$_i$ the mother-poss.3sg-acc called up he$_i$

(28) (a) Whose mother called him up?
     (b) *Who did his mother call up?

Let us accept É. Kiss's judgments in (27) at face value (though, see note 16 for qualification). What I would like to argue is that even given these judgments, such a subject/object symmetry does not necessarily provide evidence for a flat VP analysis. The ungrammaticality of (27b) follows if S c-commands O inside the *v*P. As for (27a), I propose that it is ruled out because it is blocked by (29).

(29) Kit$_i$ hívott fel t_i' az (ő$_i$) anyja t_i?   (= (3a))
     who-acc called up   the his mother-poss.3sg-nom
     '*?Who$_i$ did his$_i$ mother call up?'

Ruys (1994) argues that, given an interface economy approach (see Reinhart 2006 and references therein), (28b) is blocked in English by (28a), because (28a) is derivationally more economical than (28b), as it involves a shorter *wh*-movement (cf. also Spector 2004). On account of its optionality, scrambling is often taken to incur no derivational cost (see e.g., Fukui 1993; Saito–Fukui 1998; Boškovič–Takahashi 1998; note that this follows directly on a base-generation account of scrambling). Recall that I assumed in section **3.1** above that (29) (= (3a)) is well-formed in the first place because of the availability of a derivation involving scrambling of O *above* S prior to *wh*-movement, i.e., to a position that is closer to the left peripheral CP/FocP position than the base position of S. This means that the derivation of (29) involves a shorter *wh*-movement to CP/FocP than (27a), and I propose that this is why (27a) is blocked.

An analogous paradigm is found with universal quantifiers in the place of *wh*-phrases, and the same blocking effect will be triggered. I

omit the examples here in the interest of saving space.[16] Note finally that (27a) is also out in German. German is configurational and has scrambling, hence the same logic of blocking applies there as well.

3.5. Free postverbal constituent order and verb raising

The freedom of postverbal constituent order, i.e., **(vi)**, is clearly not compelling evidence in favor of a flat VP insofar as scrambling can derive the freedom in word order just as well. Scrambling is predicted to be restricted to the postverbal field, once it is assumed that the verb is moved to the head of a functional projection above the vP. That the verb is raised into the IP domain (in neutral sentences) is a view shared among

---

[16] In a late lexical insertion model like Distributed Morphology, one can have (27a) and (29) stem from the same Numeration, if one makes the assumption that *wh*-pronouns in Hungarian are nothing else but (spellout forms corresponding to) pronouns in the local context of a *wh*-feature (either on D or on Foc); this matter will not be pursued here. In fact, Ruys's (1994) conception of blocking in (28) derives from the view that the competing (reference) set of derivations is determined by interpretive equivalence, rather than on a Numeration of lexical items (see also Fox 2000 and Reinhart 2006 and references therein; the special relevance of Fox's implementation of this view is that his account is formulated in terms of the relative length of movement paths).

   The interface economy approach is supported by the fact that if the *wh*-element *ki(nek)* 'who(se)' in (27a) is replaced by the a D-linked *wh*-phrase like 'which boy,' then (27a) improves significantly, see (i). (In comparison, performing the same replacement in (27b) does not result in any improvement.) By the same logic of blocking as applied above, (i) should be degraded just as much as (27a) is, given that there exists a more economical derivation targeting the same interpretation (involving object scrambling prior to *wh*-movement), see (ii). The reason why the same logic is inapplicable to (i–ii), I believe, lies in the fact that (i) and (ii) are not entirely synonymous: informally, while (i) is a question about a set of mothers (as a function of a set of boys), the question in (ii) quantifies directly over a set of boys. The non-identity of the LF representations of (i) and (ii) actually follows on Rizzi's (2001) theory of A-bar reconstruction, whereby only non-D-linked *wh*-expressions have their descriptive restriction obligatorily reconstructed, whereas the same is not enforced in the case of D-linked *wh*-phrases, whose descriptive restriction is contextually given, topic-like, and as such they can remain in the left periphery, licensed there as topics generally are (cf. also Heycock 1995). Thus, the lexical restriction undergoes reconstruction in (27a), yielding the same LF representation as (29), which can be informally given as ?x. x*'s mother called* x. In contrast, the lexical restriction does not necessarily reconstruct in (i) (see Shavrit–Guerzoni 2003 for an argument for the stronger view that it cannot), therefore it can (or, following Shavrit – Guerzoni *ibid.*, it must) produce an LF representation different from that of (ii).

others by Szabolcsi (1997), Puskás (2000), and Brody–Szabolcsi (2003). The exact identity of the projection hosting the verb is immaterial for the present purposes. Determining the exact landing site (and potentially, also a trigger) of the Hungarian scrambling movement operation is tangential to the main point of the present paper, and indeed the choice is underdetermined by the data discussed in these pages (e.g., scrambling targeting the vP-edge, or the TP-edge are equally conceivable, depending, of course, on the choice of specific theoretical assumptions;[17] for recent alternatives, see e.g., Boškovič–Takahashi 1998; Grewendorf–Sabel 1999;

(i) [?](A   három közül) melyik fiúnak$_i$ az   anyja   hívta fel
        the three   out.of which   boy-dat the mother-poss.3sg-nom called up
    őt$_i$ idejében?
    him time.in
    'Out of the three boys, which boy's mother called him in time?'

(ii) (A   három közül) melyik fiút$_i$ hívta fel az   (ő)$_i$
       the three   out.of which   boy-acc called up the   he
     anyja   idejében?
     mother-poss.3sg-nom time.in
     'Out of the three boys, which boy did his mother call in time?'

To the extent that one can interpret *kinek az anyja* 'whose mother' in (27a) as D-linked in a given context, the same processes that I have argued to apply in (i) can—to some degree—mitigate the unacceptibility of (27a) (here the descriptive restriction, besides *person*, is derived from the discourse context). Indeed, a number of speakers that I have consulted find (27a) marginally acceptable (once again, the factors discussed in section **3.4** in relation to (16) apply to (27a) as well, to the relative improvement of its acceptability).

   Note that the present account of (27a) presupposes that the subject cannot raise to a srambled position: otherwise the *wh*-movement of the subject in (27a) and the *wh*-movement of the scrambled *wh*-object in (29) could be equally short, in which case (29) could not block (27a). That local subject scrambling is unavailable is argued (for Japanese) by Saito (1985), and is a reasonably well-established generalization in the literature on Japanese-type scrambling (see Ko 2005 for an argument for an opposing view).

[17] Note that if scrambling targets the vP-edge, say, by adjunction to vP, then the blocking analysis of (27a) and (29) is compatible only with such a metric of the length of movement paths that is sensitive only to categories that *properly contain* the moved element at its pre-movement position. Such a metric determines the movement of a scrambled object (as in (29)) to be shorter than the movement of a subject out of a vP where no object scrambling has taken place (as in (27a)): the vP category is contained in the movement path only in the latter case. If the target of scrambling is (exclusively) the vP-edge, then it must be

Karimi 2003; Kitahara 2002; Miyagawa 1997; 2001; 2003; Saito 2003). Therefore, the issue is not discussed here in any detail.[18]

3.6. A-binding

Finally, the A-binding S/O asymmetries (= **(vii)**) can be captured in a hierarchical vP without directly relying on thematic prominence or linear precedence, or indeed a disjunctive definition incorporating both: A-binding facts can be deduced from structural asymmetries in the hierarchical structure in terms of c-command. The issue of A-binding will be taken up and will be dealt with in more detail in section **5**.[19]

Having shown that some of the arguments for a flat VP are ill-founded, and others are forceless once a scrambling account is considered as an alternative, in the next section I go on to present phenomena of S/O asymmetries that seriously challenge the non-configurational VP analysis, and directly bolster a scrambling approach (*modulo* a hierarchical vP).

---

ensured that adjuncts can intervene between a scrambled phrase and the subject in [Spec,vP] (because an *Object > Adjunct > Subject* postverbal order is well-formed in Hungarian). Neither of these two conditions applies to an approach that takes scrambling to target the TP-edge (or allows scrambling to target either the vP-edge or the TP-edge). This latter account presupposes that the verb in a neutral clause sits in a functional projection even higher than the TP (say, in the head of the projection whose specifier is occupied by the verbal particle in a neutral sentence). An advantage of the former view, however, is that it can straightforwardly account for the unavailability of subject scrambling (see the previous note), which would be ruled out *qua* vacuous movement taking place **within** the edge of a projection (viz. vP).

[18] Although it apparently provides a simple account of postverbal free word order, adopting a flat VP implies giving up the binarity of Merge, and it is also diametrically opposed to what Kayne's Linear Correspondence Axiom (LCA) permits (one of the consequences of the LCA is that "if two phrases differ in linear order, they must also differ in hierarchical structure", Kayne 1994, 3). É. Kiss (2002) speculates that "a relaxed version" of Kayne's (1994) LCA is not necessarily at odds with a flat VP: elements under VP are unordered precisely because they do not asymmetrically c-command each other. This "relaxed version" is not provided, however. Should the LCA be relaxed in such a way as to allow structures involving symmetric c-command, as in the case of a flat VP, a whole range of welcome results of LCA-based syntax would be effectively lost (among others, the way aspects of X-bar theory are derived by the LCA).

[19] As Surányi (in press) shows in some detail, Hungarian does not share the properties of either one of the two well-studied classes of non-configurational languages. This further weakens the position of the flat VP approach.

4. Arguments in favor of the hierarchical
vP + scrambling account

In addition to the S/O asymmetry exhibited by universal QPs for WCO, which was discussed in section **3**, in this section I point out several other S/O asymmetries. These asymmetries are all problematic for a non-configurational VP approach, but are expected if the Hungarian vP is hierarchical.[20]

4.1. Superiority

The first asymmetry to be noted here concerns effects of Superiority, which do obtain in various constructions. The illustrative example in (30) involves n-word fronting, where obviation by scrambling (cf. section **3**) is dispreferred. Scrambling is disfavored (as an intermediate movement step) in the derivation of (30) due to the fact that the discourse effect that scrambling results in, i.e., familiarity, is incompatible with the non-specific (non-familiar) interpretation of the fronted object n-word in (30). In a context, however, where the object n-word can be interpreted as specific (quantifying over a familiar set), the pattern in (30) becomes acceptable. As expected under a configurational analysis of vP, if the subject n-word is fronted instead of the object n-word in (30), the sentence is acceptable once again.

(30) #Nyilvános helyen szerintem senkit se csókoljon meg senki
     public place-on in.my.view noone-**acc** neg kiss-imp-3sg pv noone-**nom**
     intended: 'I think nobody should kiss anybody in a public place.'

The same holds true of multiple *wh*-questions in which one *wh*-element is fronted only, asking for a single pair of individuals, in particular, of the type that involves two non-D-linked *wh*-expressions. In the dialogue below, the inspector (I) can ask the witness (W) the question in (a), while question (b) is infelicitous, given that neither of the two *wh*-pronouns is D-linked.

(31) W: I heard the noise of someone slapping someone else in the face behind my
        back. I turned around at once.
    I: And what did you see?

---

[20] These asymmetries are not covered by the Primacy Condition on binding (cf. **(vii)** in section **2**).

(a) Ki   vágott   pofon kit?
who-nom hit-past-3sg face.on who-acc
'Who slapped whom in the face?'

(b) #Kit vágott pofon ki?

Scrambling is unavailable to the non-D-linked *wh*-object, whence it can only move to the left peripheral CP/FocP from its VP-internal position. This, however, results in a Superiority effect.

4.2. Movement out of subjects

A second difference between S and O, one that is expected on a configurational analysis of vP, is that subjects, but not objects (and other complements) are CED islands, similarly to what we find in English. If not only objects, but subjects are also complements of the verb, as the flat VP account presumes, then such asymmetries are unexpected.

(32) (a) ?Melyik tisztviselővel$_i$ olvastál   [egy interjút t_i]?
which official-with   read-past-2sg an interview-acc
'Which official did you read an interview with?'

(b) *Melyik tisztviselővel$_i$ állította [egy interjú t_i], hogy nő   a   GDP?
which official-with   claimed an interview   that grows the GDP
'With which official did [an interview t] claim that the GDP is growing?'

4.3. Condition C

Although judgments go in the direction expected on a configurational vP account, Condition C effects involving overt nominative and accusative pronouns do not result in a very sharp contrast between S and O, as discussed in section **3.4** (perhaps due to factors discussed there, see especially note 14). However, Condition C effects do produce a strong S/O asymmetry in the domain of epithets, i.e., definite NPs which are coreferential with, though different in descriptive content from, their antecedent; see (33a–b). These function like pronouns, but can be used for testing purposes here free of the complications associated with pronouns (again, cf. section **3.4**). Similarly, we find a marked S/O asymmetry for Condition C in A-bar reconstruction (33c–d), and with lexical DPs (33e–f) (the latter is noted by Marácz 1989, and by Choe 1989). In (33c–d) the object and the subject, respectively, are fronted to the topic position. This

A-bar movement is reconstructed to the position marked by the trace (Chomsky 1993; 1995) i.e., to a vP-internal position.

(33) (a) János anyja$_k$ nem is látogatja t_k azt a szerencsétlen gyereket
John's$_i$ mother-**nom** not even visit-3sg that-acc the poor child-**acc**$_i$
'John's$_i$ mother does not even visit that poor child$_i$.'

    (b) *Az a szerencsétlen gyerek$_k$ nem is látogatja t_k János anyját
that the poor child-**nom**$_i$ not even visit-3sg John's$_i$ mother-**acc**
'*That poor child$_i$ does not even visit John's$_i$ mother.'

    (c) *[A Jánossal$_i$ való beszélgetésünket]$_k$ később letagadta (ő$_i$) t_k
the J$_i$-with expl discussion-poss.1pl-acc later pv-denied-3sg he$_i$
'*He$_i$ later denied our discussion with John$_i$.'

    (d) [A Jánossal$_i$ való beszélgetésünk]$_k$ rossz színben t_k tüntette fel őt$_i$
the J$_i$-with expl discussion-poss.1pl-nom bad color-in showed pv him$_i$
'Our discussion with John$_i$ gave him$_i$ a bad reputation.'

    (e) Felhívta János$_i$ anyósa Jánost$_i$
pv-called-3sg J's$_i$ mother.in.law-**nom** J-**acc**$_i$
'John's$_i$ mother-in-law called John$_i$.' (adapted from Marácz 1989)

    (f) *Felhívta János$_i$ János$_i$ anyósát.
pv-called-3sg J-**nom**$_i$ John's$_i$ mother.in.law-**acc**
'*John$_i$ called John's$_i$ mother-in-law.'

These data demonstrate that Condition C does in fact tease apart subject from object, as far as their base positions are concerned: the subject in Hungarian too originates higher than the object. The same conclusion is suggested by the observation (illustrated in note 14 above) that while various factors (namely, prosody, topicalization of the DP containing the antecedent possessor, and the case-form of the possessor) influence the acceptability of an object pronoun coreferring with the possessor inside the subject, the same factors do not affect the (non-)acceptability of a subject pronoun coreferring with the possessor contained in the object. This latter fact is predicted on the scrambling account, as only the latter scenario involves a Condition C violation, given a hierarchical vP.[21]

---

[21] Returning to the examples with covert (*pro*) pronouns in (26), it is conceivable that they do not involve binding per se, in which case (26) is analogous to (33e–f) above (cf. Reinhart 1983). Without a context, (26a) is strongly ungrammatical. The possessor in (26) is apparently not salient enough in itself, i.e., without a context, to license a *pro*, which is known to require a highly salient antecedent. This is confirmed by the examples below, where the *pro* element is one clause down from the possessor, whence Condition C cannot explain why these sentences are out.

4.4. Scope-taking of non-increasing QPs

Another domain where an S/O asymmetry is detected is scope-taking by postverbal non-increasing QPs (increasing QPs take scope via a mechanism distinct from that involved in scope-taking by non-increasing QPs, see Szabolcsi 1997 and Surányi 2004 for diverging views). A few-QP$_{OBJ}$ cannot scope over a uQP$_{SUBJ}$ (34a), while a few-QP$_{SUBJ}$ can scope over the uQP$_{OBJ}$ (34b):

(i) *Mari$_i$ anyjának   elmondtam,   hogy nem kedvel pro_i már   engem
    M.-nom mother-dat pv-tell-past-1sg that not like-3sg (she) anymore me
    'I told Mary's mother that she doesn't like me anymore.'

(ii) *Mari$_i$ anyjának   elmondtam,   hogy nem kedvelem pro_i már
    M.-nom mother-dat pv-tell-past-1sg that not like-1sg   (her) anymore
    'I told Mary's mother that I don't like her anymore.'

Oblique pronominals seem to tolerate an antecedent of the degree of salience associated with a possessor, as witnessed by (i) of Note 14 above. Following this line of thought, a potential explanation for the degradedness of É. Kiss's example (16) as well as that of (27a) could be based on the requirement of the degree of salience (accessibility) imposed by the overt third person pronoun on its antecedent. The degradedness of (26) may then follow, insofar as a possessor in the subject is simply not salient enough to serve as an antecedent of an overt third person object pronoun either. Indeed, if pro in (i) is replaced with an overt pronoun, the acceptability of the sentence does not significantly improve. The accessibility requirements of anaphoric forms are known to vary (see e.g., Ariel 1994); this might be the reason underlying the fact that the Hungarian data involving overt personal pronouns (in object position) differ from their English counterparts. That it is not c-command, but salience that is at issue in (16) is also compatible with the observations based on examples like (33a–b): it is well-established that epithets impose a different requirement of salience than third person pronouns. Another factor that matters for salience is the level of embedding. The more deeply the antecedent is embedded, the less salient it is. Thus it is expected that the overt third person object pronoun will be able to take as its antecedent a non-possessor nominal inside the subject, as in (33d). The fact that for some speakers dative possessors inside the subject are better licensors of coreferential object pronouns than nominative ones can also be made sense of in the very same terms, given that the dative possessor is known to occupy a higher (in fact, a left-peripheral) position within the DP than their nominative counterpart. Topicalization of the subject DP, which is another improving factor in the licensing of the object pronoun (see Note 14) can be also explained in terms of accessibility: topicalization enhances the salience of the antecedent possessor. I have not been able to study the salience requirements of the various pronominal forms in sufficient detail, therefore these considerations remain tentative, and will not be pursued here any further.

---

(34) TAVALY   végzett el ...
      last.year did-3sg pv ...

   (a) minden diák   kevés kurzust   (S > O, *O > S)
        every   student-**nom** few   course-**acc**
        'It was last year that every student did few courses.'

   (b) kevés diák   minden kurzust   (S > O, O > S)
        few   student-**nom** every   course-**acc**
        'It was last year that fewer than 100 students did every course.'

This is because decreasing QPs do not take inverse scope higher than their
A-position (see Szabolcsi 1997 and Surányi 2004 for detailed discussion
and references). The contrast in (34) is explained only of the A-position
of the subject is higher than the A-position of the object.[22]

4.5. Incorporation

As Marácz (1989) points out, incorporation of a bare nominal is possible
when the nominal is an object, but impossible when it is a subject. This
is exactly what is predicted in Baker's (1988) model of incorporation as
involving syntactic (upward) head-movement, provided, of course, that
the subject is generated higher than the object.

(35) (a) János   könyvet olvas
           J.-nom book-acc read-3sg
           'John is reading a book.'

---

[22] As for increasing quantifiers like universal QPs, their relative scope in the postver-
bal domain is known to be free with respect to each other (e.g., É. Kiss 2002)
(even though stress seems to influence relative scope for many speakers). This
situation is not different from that of languages like English, where verb phrase
internal increasing quantifiers can also take both wide and narrow scope with
respect to each other (with some exceptions, like the double object construction,
which lacks a direct counterpart in Hungarian). This basic fact of English is
conveniently captured in a standard Quantifier Raising based approach, and I
proposed in Surányi (2002; 2004) to apply a QR-based analysis to Hungarian as
well (*contra* Szabolcsi 1997). As for focused elements, they also exhibit freedom
of relative scope within the postverbal domain, a generalization that I argued to
capture in terms of covert focus movement in Surányi (2002; 2004). In short, the
apparent lack of syntactic restrictions of postverbal relative scope does not bear
on the issue of the configurationality of the verb phrase.

(b) *Tanár   olvas egy jó   könyvet
    teacher-nom read a   good   book-acc
    'Teacher(s) read(s) a good book.'

Thus far I have presented arguments in favor of the approach that incorporates a hierarchical VP (i.e., vP) structure and postverbal scrambling (N.B. the verb overtly raises out of the vP). In the remainder of the paper I demonstrate that the reordering of the object to the left of the subject in the postverbal field indeed has the properties of (a certain type of) scrambling movement.[23]

5. Probing the properties of Hungarian scrambling

If Hungarian indeed has a configurational vP, with the subject generated higher than the object, and postverbal object–subject order is indeed the result of scrambling movement, we expect sentences with this order to exhibit properties normally displayed by scrambling orders in well-known scrambling languages. Given that several distinct types of scrambling languages and scrambling operation types have been described in the literature (cf. e.g., the German-type vs. Slavic-type vs. Japanese type oppositions), probing the properties of what I have assumed to be a scrambling movement will also involve situating Hungarian scrambling (descriptively) within the scrambling typology.

5.1. Scrambling and anaphor binding

Scrambling of the object above the subject feeds the binding of anaphors in the possessor position of the subject in Hungarian (see 36a–b).

(36) (a)*[?]Sokat kritizálják egymás   szülei   Jánost és   Pétert
        lot-acc criticize-3pl each other's parents-nom J.-acc and P.-acc

---

[23] It has also been pointed out for Hungarian (e.g., Speas 1990) that PRO in non-finite clauses can only function as a subject, but not as an object. This follows on theories of control where the syntactic position of the subject is different from that of the object. Note, however, that this does not necessarily turn into an argument in favor of a hierarchical verb phrase, as the position at issue is that of the verb phrase external, canonical subject position. Nevertheless, it still needs to be ensured on a flat VP approach that only a verb phrase internal subject, but not a verb phrase internal object can move here.

(b) $^?$Sokat kritizálják [Jánost és Pétert]$_i$ egymás szülei t_i
  lot-acc criticize-3pl J.-acc and P.-acc each other's parents-nom
  'John and Peter are criticized a lot by each other's parents.'

This property is characteristic of Japanese local scrambling (cf. (37) below, see Saito 1992, 74f); whereas it is not shared by German, Slavic or Albanian scrambling (see, e.g., Grewendorf–Sabel 1999; Kitahara 2002; Saito 2003; Karimi 2003, and references therein). (38) exemplifies the case of German.

(37) (a)$^?$*[[Otagai-no sensei]-ga karera-o hihansita] (koto)
       each other-gen teacher-nom they-acc criticized (fact)

   (b) $^?$[Karera-o$_i$ [[otagai-no sensei]-ga t_i hihansita]] (koto)
       they-acc each other-gen teacher-nom criticized (fact)
       '*Each other's teachers criticized them.'

(38) (a) *... weil [die Lehrer von sich$_i$] zweifellos den Studenten$_i$
         since the teachers-nom of *sich*] undoubtedly the student-acc
     in guter Erinnerung behalten haben
     in good memory kept have
     'The teachers of himself have undoubtedly kept the student in good memory.'

   (b) *... weil [den Studenten]$_i$ [die Lehrer von sich$_i$] zweifellos t_i
         since the student-acc the teachers-nom of *sich* undoubtedly
     in guter Erinnerung behalten haben
     in good memory kept have (Grewendorf–Sabel 1999)

This follows if Hungarian scrambling is or can be A-movement and Condition A is an "anywhere condition" in the sense of Belletti–Rizzi (1988), Epstein et al. (1998), among others. The anaphor inside the subject is A-bound by the scrambled object in (36b).[24]

---

[24] É. Kiss (2002, ch. 3.4.2) discusses instrumental case marked arguments, like the ones in (i) below, arguing that grammatical functions as manifested in the form of case suffixes cannot be responsible for anaphora distribution, since—as she argues—there are examples (such as (i)) where it is the instrumental case-marked phrase that can bind the accusative anaphor, whereas in general it is the accusative argument that can bind the instrumental case-marked argument. However, if—as seems plausible—(i.a) is taken to have a structural description along the lines of (ii), a c-command based account of the distribution of anaphors in (i) is derived. Note that, although É. Kiss marks (i.b) as ungrammatical, it actually has a reading, where the pattern in (i.b) is well-formed: on that reading the

Scrambling also feeds pronominal variable binding, both in Hungarian (see (39a–b)) and in Japanese (see, e.g., Saito 2003, 485) (but not in German, see Grewendorf–Sabel 1999 (= G&S 1999)), to which the same explanation will extend.

(39) (a) *?EBBEN A VÁROSBAN bántalmazott [*pro* pár   diákja]
         this-in the town-in   assaulted   *pro*$_i$ several student-poss.3sg-nom
         [kevés tanárt]
         few   teacher-acc$_i$

   (b) EBBEN A VÁROSBAN bántalmazott [kevés tanárt]$_i$ [*pro*$_i$ pár diákja] t_i
        'It's this town where few teachers were assaulted by several of their students.'

5.2. Scrambling and Condition C

Postverbal scrambling in Hungarian does not feed or obviate Condition C:

(40) (a) Látta (ön)magát$_i$ János t_i a   tükörben
         saw-3sg (his-)himself-acc$_i$ J.-nom t_i the mirror-in
         'John saw himself in the mirror.'

   (b) **Látták a   fiúk   anyját$_i$ ők t_i (cf. the discussion of (5))
        saw-3pl the boy-pl$_i$ mother-acc they-nom$_i$ t_i
        '*They$_i$ saw the boys'$_i$ mother.'

The same holds true of Japanese short (i.e., local) scrambling:

---

instrumental case-marked phrase is indeed the thematic instrument argument of the verb. Such an interpretation is illustrated in (iii).

(i) (a) A lányokkal felhívattam   egymást.
          the girls-with up-call-caus-past-1sg each other-acc
          'I got the girls call each other.'
     (b) *A lányokat felhívattam   egymással.
          the girls-acc up-call-caus-past-1sg each other-with
          '*I got each other call the girls'
(ii) [I CAUSE [the girls-with call each other-acc]]
(iii) (a) Hívasd   fel őket egymással!
          call-caus-imp-2sg up them each other-with
          'Make them call each other!'
      (b) Kend   meg a   kenyereket egymással!
          smear-imp pv   the bread-pl-acc each other-with
          'Butter the slices of bread with each other!'

(41) (a) [Zibunzisin-o$_i$ [John-ga t_i semeta]]
           himself-acc$_i$ J.-nom t_i blamed
           'John blamed himself.'

   (b) *[[John-no hahaoya]-o$_i$ [kare-ga t_i semeta]]
           J.-gen   mother-acc$_i$ he-nom t_i blamed
           '*He$_i$ blamed John's$_i$ mother.'

5.3. Scrambling and WCO

The Hungarian short scrambling operation does not induce WCO effects,
rather, it obviates WCO violations. This was demonstrated by examples
(23)–(24) in section **3.1** above. Note that if the object universal QP moves
only as far as the t_i' position in (24) (object scrambling without the extra
QP-fronting step in (24)), the result is still grammatical, see (42) below.

(42) $^{(?)}$Felismerte   [ˈmindegyik ˈlányt]$_i$ [az   a   férfi,   aki bement
       recognized-3sg every   girl-**acc**$_i$ that the man-**nom** who in-went-3sg
       pro_{3SG_i} hozzá] t_i
             to.her$_i$
       '*$^?$The man who dropped by her$_i$ recognized every girl$_i$.'

Japanese type scrambling (and also German type scrambling, see (44))
exhibits analogous contrasts:[25]

(43) (a)$^?$*[[Soitu$_i$-no   hahaoya]-ga [dare$_i$-o aisiteru]] no?
           the-guy-gen mother-nom who-acc love   Q
           '$^?$*Who$_i$ does his$_i$ mother love t_i?'

   (b) $^?$Dare$_i$-o [[soitu$_i$-no   hahaoya]-ga [t_i aisiteru]] no?
       who-acc the-guy-gen mother-nom   love   Q   (Saito 1992, 73)

(44) (a) *... weil seine$_i$ Mutter   jeden Studenten$_i$ liebt
             since his   mother-nom every student-acc loves
           '*His$_i$ mother loves every student$_i$.'

---

[25] Licensing of parasitic gaps (which is taken to be a property of A-bar movement)
is notoriously difficult to test in Hungarian, but to the extent it is testable, it
appears not to be affected by scrambling. If so, this would contrast Hungarian
scrambling with German (and Dutch) scrambling, where parasitic gaps are ap-
parently licensed by the scrambling movement. As for Japanese, parasitic gaps
do not exist in the language (see Saito 1992).

(b) ... weil [jeden Studenten$_i$ [seine Mutter$_i$ t_i liebt]]
        since every student-acc his   mother$_{nom}$ loves   (G&S 1999)

5.4. Scope

In cases where scope interpretation in a subject–object order is unam-
biguously S > O, as in (34a) above, reproduced here as (45), scrambling
of the object over the subject introduces scope ambiguity, as in (46).

(45) TAVALY végzett el minden diák   kevés kurzust
     last.year did-3sg pv every   student-nom few   course-acc
     'It was last year that every student did few courses.'   (S > O, *O > S)

(46) TAVALY végzett el [kevesebb mint öt kurzust]$_i$ minden diák t_i
     last.year did-3sg pv fewer   than five course-**acc**$_i$ every   student-**nom** t_i
     'It was last year that every student did fewer than 5 courses.'   (S > O, O > S)

The same holds true of Japanese, and German too. (45) illustrates the
case for Japanese: while in the subject–object order only a direct scope
interpretation is available, when the object is scrambled to the left of the
subject, both scope interpretations become available.

(47) (a) Dareka-ga   daremo-o   aisite iru.
          someone-nom everyone-acc loves
          'Someone loves everyone.' $\exists > \forall$ / *$\forall > \exists$

     (b) Daremo-o$_i$ dareka-ga t_i aisite iru
          everyone-acc someone-nom   loves
          'Someone loves everyone.' $\exists > \forall$ / $\forall > \exists$

All in all, the basic properties of the postverbal reordering under scrutiny
here appear to most closely match those of Japanese short scrambling.[26]

---

[26] Japanese short-scrambling is often categorized as A-scrambling (see Grewendorf–
   Sabel 1999 for corroboration of this view), but as it is well-known, at least prima
   facie, its properties are mixed (also involving traits of obligatory reconstruction,
   a putative property of (some) A-bar movements, which is uncharacteristic of A-
   movements; see Ueyama 2002 and Saito 2003 for two different approaches to this
   mixed behavior). Therefore I refrain here from situating Hungarian scrambling
   within the A/A-bar dichotomy (a distinction called into question in the current
   minimalist framework). My claim is simply that the basic properties of Hungar-
   ian scrambling, as reviewed in this section, reveal that the reordering operation
   behaves on a par with Japanese short scrambling.

This provides strong confirmation for the proposal that this reordering indeed involves scrambling in Hungarian.[27]

Finally, it is shown in Surányi (in press) that a number of fundamental implications involving scrambling that have been noted in the literature (e.g., V-raising, *pro*-drop, richness of morphology, etc.) are applicable to the language, which lends further plausibility to the scrambling approach I advocate.

6. Concluding remarks

The main result of the present paper is that it eliminates an alleged residual idiosyncrasy of Hungarian, the non-configurationality of its verb phrase, by demonstrating systematically that a scrambling approach, based on a configurational vP, is indubitably available, and what is more, empirically superior to the flat VP account. Modulo scrambling, Hungarian is configurational not only in its left periphery, but all the way down. It has also been shown that postverbal object–subject reordering in this language is akin in particular to short scrambling of the Japanese-type (and contrasts in crucial ways with German or Slavic scrambling). Due to verb raising, what occurs in the best-studied scrambling languages to the left of the verb characterizes the postverbal field in Hungarian.

It is not the purpose of this work to choose from, or evaluate, alternative approaches to Japanese/Hungarian-type local scrambling. At

---

[27] It is not clear if a specific interpretation of indefinites should be enforced in a scrambled position (as in Dutch or German, see de Hoop 1992) (e.g., examples like *Keres egy ügyvédet Mária* 'lit. seeks a lawyer-acc Mary-nom' appear to be degraded for some speakers if the indefinite object NP is non-specific, but judgments are murkier in other cases.) Nevertheless, options for the projection of information focus are affected by scrambling in much the same way as in Japanese (cf. Miyagawa 2005 and references therein, see also Neeleman–Reinhart 1998 for a discussion of Dutch). A sentence like (i) can answer either *What happened?* or *What did John do?* or *Who did John see?*, whereas (ii) involving the scrambled order is apparently inappropriate as an answer to the last two questions. (ii) can serve as a (non-exhaustive) answer to *Who saw the teacher?*, whereas (i) is not felicitous in the same context.

(i) Meglátta János   a   tanárt
     pv-saw   John-nom the teacher-acc

(ii) Meglátta a   tanárt   János
     pv-saw   the teacher-acc John-nom

the same time, insofar as the main conclusions reached here can be up-held, a more microscopic study of the properties of Hungarian scrambling can serve as excellent testing ground for current competing accounts of Japanese-type scrambling, with repercussions for the ongoing debate over the proper typology of scrambling in general.

References

Ariel, Mira 1994. Interpreting anaphoric expressions: A cognitive versus a pragmatic approach. In: Journal of Linguistics 30 : 1–42.

Baker, Mark C. 1988. Incorporation: A theory of grammatical function changing. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Barbosa, Pilar – Danny Fox – Paul Hagstrom – Martha McGinnis – David Pesetsky (eds) 1998. Is the best good enough? Optimality and competition in syntax. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.

Belletti, Adriana – Luigi Rizzi 1988. Psych-verbs and θ-theory. In: Natural Langauge and Linguistic Theory 6 : 291–352.

Bennis, Hans 1986. Gaps and dummies. Foris, Dordrecht.

Boškovič, Želko 2002. On multiple wh-fronting. In: Linguistic Inquiry 33 : 351–84.

Boškovič, Želko – Daiko Takahashi 1998. Scrambling and last resort. In: Linguistic Inquiry 29 : 347–66.

Bresnan, Joan 1995. Linear order, syntactic rank, and empty categories: On weak crossover. In: Mary Dalrymple – Ronald M. Kaplan – John T. Maxwell – Annie Zaenen (eds): Formal issues in Lexical-Functional Grammar, 241–74. Stanford University, CSLI Publications.

Bresnan, Joan 1998. Morphology competes with syntax: Explaining typological varia-tion in Weak Crossover effects. In: Barbosa et al. (1998, 59–92).

Brody, Michael 1990. Remarks on the order of elements in the Hungarian focus field. In: István Kenesei (ed.): Approaches to Hungarian 3 (Structures and arguments), 95–121. JATE, Szeged.

Brody, Michael 1995. Focus and Checking Theory. In: István Kenesei (ed.): Ap-proaches to Hungarian 5 (Levels and structures), 29–43. JATEPress, Szeged.

Brody, Michael – Anna Szabolcsi 2003. Overt Scope in Hungarian. In: Syntax 6 : 19–51.

Choe, Hyon-Sook 1989. Restructuring parameters and scrambling in Korean and Hun-garian. In: László Marácz – Peter Muysken (eds): Configurationality: The typol-ogy of asymmetries, 267–92. Foris, Dordrecht.

Chomsky, Noam 1993. A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory. In: Hale – Keyser (1993a, 1–52).

Chomsky, Noam 1995. The minimalist program. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.

Chtareva, Angelina 2005. An experiencer analysis of subject idioms in Russian. In: Proceedings of FASL 13. The Columbia Meeting, 80–91. Michigan Slavic Publi-cations, Ann Arbor.

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen 1990. Clitic doubling, *wh*-movement, and quantification in Romanian. In: Linguistic Inquiry 21 : 351–97.

É. Kiss, Katalin 1987a. Configurationality in Hungarian. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.

É. Kiss, Katalin 1987b. Is the VP universal? In: István Kenesei (ed.): Approaches to Hungarian 2 (Theories and analyses), 13–85. JATE, Szeged.

É. Kiss, Katalin 1991. Logical structure in syntactic structure: The case of Hungarian. In: James Huang – Robert May (eds): Logical structure and linguistic structure: Cross-linguistic perspectives, 111–48. Kluwer, Dordrecht.

É. Kiss, Katalin 1994a. Scrambling as the base-generation of random complement order. In: Norbert Corver – Henk van Riemsdijk (eds): Studies on scrambling, 221–56. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin & New York.

É. Kiss, Katalin 1994b. Sentence structure and word order. In: Katalin É. Kiss – Ferenc Kiefer (eds): The syntactic structure of Hungarian (Syntax and semantics 27), 1–90. Academic Press, New York.

É. Kiss, Katalin 1995. NP-movement, WH-movement and scrambling in Hungarian. In: Katalin É. Kiss (ed.): Discourse configurational languages, 207–43. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

É. Kiss, Katalin 2002. The syntax of Hungarian. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

É. Kiss, Katalin 2003. Argument scrambling, operator movement and topic movement in Hungarian. In: Karimi (2003, 22–43).

É. Kiss, Katalin 2006. A phase-based theory of free word order. Manuscript. Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest.

Epstein, Samuel David – Erich M. Groat – Ruriko Kawashima – Hisatsugu Kitahara 1998. A derivational approach to syntactic relations. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Everaert, Martin 1993. Verbal idioms, subject idioms and theta-theory. In: Laurel Smith Stvan (ed.): Papers From the Third Annual Formal Linguistics Society of Midamerica Conference, 43–59. IULCP, Bloomington.

Fanselow, Gisbert 2001. Features, theta-roles, and free constituent order. In: Linguistic Inquiry 32 : 405–37.

Fanselow, Gisbert 2004. The MLC and derivational economy. In: Arthur Stepanov – Gisbert Fanselow – Ralf Vogel (eds): The minimal link condition, 74–123. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin & New York.

Fox, Danny 1995. Economy and scope. In: Natural Language Semantics 3 : 283–341.

Fox, Danny 1998. Locality in variable binding. In: Barbosa et al. (1998, 129–55).

Fox, Danny 2000. Economy and semantic interpretation. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.

Fukui, Naoki 1993. Parameter and optionality in a grammar. In: Linguistic Inquiry 24 : 399–420.

Grewendorf, Günther – Joachim Sabel 1999. Scrambling in German and Japanese: Adjunction versus multiple specifiers. In: Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 17 : 1–65.

Grohmann, Kleanthes K. 1997. German superiority. In: Abraham Werner – Kleanthes K. Grohmann (eds): Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik 40, 97–107. University of Groningen, Groningen.

Haider, Hubert 1986. Deutsche Syntax – Generativ. Ph.D. thesis, Habilitation thesis, Vienna.

Hale, Kenneth – Samuel J. Keyser (eds) 1993a. The view from building 20. Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.

Hale, Kenneth – Samuel Jay Keyser 1993b. On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations. In: Hale – Keyser (1993a, 53–109).

Heycock, Caroline 1995. Asymmetries in reconstruction. In: Linguistic Inquiry 26 : 547–70.

de Hoop, Helen 1992. Case configuration and NP interpretation. Doctoral dissertation, University of Groningen.

Horváth, Júlia 1986. Focus in the theory of grammar and the structure of Hungarian. Foris, Dordrecht.

Ishii, Toru 2006. A nonuniform analysis of overt *wh*-movement. In: Linguistic Inquiry 37 : 155–67.

Karimi, Simin (ed.) 2003. Word order and scrambling. Blackwell, Malden MA & Oxford.

Kayne, Richard 1994. The antisymmetry of syntax. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.

Kenesei, István 1984. On what really figures in a non configurational language. In: Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik 24 : 28–54.

Kenesei, István 1986. On the logic of Hungarian word order. In: Werner Abraham – Sjaak de Meij (eds): Topic, focus, and configurationality, 143–59. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Kenesei, István 1989. On pronominal binding in Hungarian. In: László Marácz – Peter Muysken (eds): Configurationality: The typology of asymmetries, 223–36. Foris, Dordrecht.

Kitahara, Hisatsugu 2002. Scrambling, case, and interpretability. In: Samuel David Epstein – Daniel T. Seely (eds): Derivation and explanation in the Minimalist Program, 167–79. Blackwell, Malden MA & Oxford.

Ko, Heejeong 2005. Syntax of why-in-situ: Merge into [Spec,CP] in the overt syntax. In: Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 23 : 867–916.

Komlósy, András 1983. Vonzatok és szabad határozók az egyszerű mondatokban [Complements and adjuncts in simple sentences]. Manuscript, Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

Koopman, Hilda – Dominique Sportiche 1982. Variables and the Bijection Principle. In: The Linguistic Review 2 : 139–60.

Kuno, Susumu 1982. The focus of the question and the focus of the answer. In: CLS 18: Papers from the Parasession on Nondeclaratives, 134–57. Chicago Linguistics Society, Chicago.

Lasnik, Howard – Tim Stowell 1991. Weakest crossover. In: Linguistic Inquiry 22 : 687–720.

Marantz, Alec 1984. On the nature of grammatical relations. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.

Marantz, Alec 1997. No escape from syntax: Don't try morphological analysis in the privacy of your own lexicon. In: UPenn Working Papers in Linguistics 4.2 : 201–25.

Marácz, László 1989. Asymmetries in Hungarian. Doctoral dissertation, Groningen University.

McGinnis, Martha 2004. Lethal ambiguity. In: Linguistic Inquiry 35 : 47–95.

Miyagawa, Shigeru 1997. Against optional scrambling. In: Linguistic Inquiry 28 : 1–25.

Miyagawa, Shigeru 2001. EPP, scrambling, and wh-in-situ. In: Michael Kenstowicz (ed.): Ken Hale: A life in language, 239–338. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.

Miyagawa, Shigeru 2003. A-movement scrambling and options without optionality. In: Karimi (2003, 177–200).

Miyagawa, Shigeru 2005. On the EPP. In: Perspectives on phases. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 49 : 201–35.

Neeleman, Ad – Tanya Reinhart 1998. Scrambling and the PF interface. In: Miriam Butt – Wilhelm Geuder (eds): The projection of arguments lexical and compositional factors, 309–53. CSLI Publications, Stanford.

Nunberg, Geoffrey – Ivan Sag – Terry Wasow 1994. Idioms. In: Language 70 : 491–538.

Perlmutter, David 1971. Deep and surface structure constraints in syntax. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.

Postal, Paul 2002. Skeptical linguistic essays. Manuscript. NYU.

Puskás, Genoveva 2000. Word order in Hungarian. The syntax of A-bar positions. John Benjamins, Amsterdam & Philadelphia.

Reinhart, Tanya 1983. Anaphora and semantic interpretation. Croom Helm, London.

Reinhart, Tanya 1995. Interface strategies (OTS Working Papers in Theoretical Linguistics). OTS, Utrecht.

Reinhart, Tanya 1998. Interface economy: Focus and markedness. In: Chris Wilder – Hans-Martin Gaertner – Manfred Bierwisch (eds): The role of economy principles in linguistic theory, 146–69. Akademie-Verlag, Berlin.

Reinhart, Tanya 2006. Interface strategies. Reference set computation. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.

Richards, Norvin 1997. What moves where in which language? Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Rizzi, Luigi 2001. Reconstruction, weak island sensitivity and agreement. In: Carlo Ceccheto – Gennaro Chierchia – Maria Teresa Guasti (eds): Semantic interfaces, 145–76. CSLI, Stanford.

Rudin, Catherine 1988. On multiple questions and multiple wh-fronting. In: Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 6 : 445–501.

Ruys, Eddy 1994. A global economy account of Weak Crossover. In: Linguistics in the Netherlands 1994 : 223–34.

Sabel, Joachim 2002. A minimalist analysis of syntactic islands. In: The Linguistic Review 19 : 271–315.

Saito, Mamoru 1985. Some asymmetries in Japanese and their theoretical implications. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Saito, Mamoru 1992. Long distance scrambling in Japanese. In: Journal of East Asian Linguistics 1 : 69–118.

Saito, Mamoru 2003. A derivational approach to the interpretation of scrambling chains. In: Lingua 113 : 481–518.

Saito, Mamoru – Naoki Fukui 1998. Order in phrase structure and movement. In: Linguistic Inquiry 29 : 439–74.

Shavrit, Yael – Elena Guerzoni 2003. Reconstruction and its problems. In: Paul Dekker – Robert van Rooy (eds): Proceedings of the 14th Amsterdam Colloquium, 205–10. University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam.

Speas, Margaret J. 1990. Phrase structure in natural language. Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Spector, Benjamin 2004. Pseudo weak crossover in French relative clauses and global economy. In: Actes des Journées d'Etudes Linguistiques de Nantes (JEL04), 155–64. University of Nantes, Nantes.

Surányi, Balázs 2002. Multiple operator movements in Hungarian. Doctoral dissertation, LOT, Utrecht.

Surányi, Balázs 2004. Differential quantifier scope: Q-raising versus Q-feature checking. In: Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics 5 : 215–40.

Surányi, Balázs 2006. Mechanisms of *wh*-saturation and interpretation in multiple *wh*-movement. In: Lisa Cheng – Johan Rooryck (eds): WH-movement moving on, 289–318. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.

Surányi, Balázs in press. Hungarian as a Japanese-type scrambling language. In: Christopher Davis – Amy Rose Deal – Youri Zabbal (eds): Proceedings of NELS 36. GLSA Publications, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Szabolcsi, Anna 1983. The possessor that ran away from home. In: The Linguistic Review 3 : 216–89.

Szabolcsi, Anna 1997. Strategies for scope taking. In: Anna Szabolcsi (ed.): Ways of scope taking (SLAP 65), 109–55. Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Szczegielniak, Adam 1999. That-t effects cross-linguistically and successive cyclic movement. In: MIT Working Papers in Linguistic 33 : 369–93.

Ueyama, Ayumi 2002. Two types of scrambling constructions in Japanese. In: Andrew Barss (ed.): Anaphora: A reference guide, 23–71. Blackwell, Malden MA & Oxford.

Varga, László 1981. A topicról és a fókusz utáni elemek sorrendjéről [On the topic and the order of elements after the focus]. In: Magyar Nyelv 27 : 198–200.

Wiltschko, Martina 1998. Superiority in German. In: Emily Curtis – James Lyle – Gabriel Webster (eds): Proceedings of WCCFL 16, 431–46. CSLI, Stanford.