Associative plurals and their associates

An integrated approach to the nominal plural markers of Hungarian

Marcel den Dikken

Eötvös Loránd University | Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics

This paper presents an integrated approach to the morphosyntax of the three nominal plural markers of Hungarian: multiplicative *-k*, possessive *-i*, and associative plural *-ék*. It explicates the relationship between the associative and multiplicative plural markers, and between the associative plural and the anaphoric possession marker *-é*. Central in the analysis proposed is the hypothesis that the marker *-é* consistently plays the role of a predicational RELATOR formally licensing the silence of one of the two terms in the predication relationship that it mediates. The syntax underlying the associative plural involves an asyndetic coordination relation in which the content of a silent plural pronoun is specified by a complex noun phrase headed by the silent noun GROUP. The analysis has im-plications for the syntax of number and demonstratives and for the licensing of silent nouns and pronouns.

Keywords: multiplicative plural, possessive plural, associative plural, anaphoric possessive, predication, asyndetic specification, silent nouns, pronouns, demonstratives

1. The aim and structure of this paper

Descriptively, Hungarian has three nominal plural markers: multiplicative (aka 'additive') *-(V)k* (1), possessive *-i* (2), and associative *-ék* (3).[1] The central objec-

---

tive of this short paper is to explicate the relationship between associative *-ék* and the other nominal plural markers, as well as that between *-ék* and the anaphoric possession marker *-é*, illustrated in (4).

(1) *a   lány-ok*
      the girl-MPL
      'the girls'

(2) *a   lány-a-i*
      the girl-POSS-PPL
      'his/her daughters'

(3) *a   lány-á-ék*
      the girl-POSS-APL
      'his/her daughter and (her) associates'

(4) a.   *a   lány-á-é*
            the girl-POSS-APOSS
            'the one belonging to his/her daughter'
      b.   *a   lány-á-é-i*
            the girl-POSS-APOSS-PPL
            'the ones belonging to his/her daughter'

The paper presents an integrated analysis in which *-(V)k* is systematically the exponent of the plural number head ($\#_{PL}$), and *-é* consistently plays the role of a predicational RELATOR formally licensing the silence of one of the two terms in the predication relation-ship that it mediates (a discourse-anaphoric proform or a silent noun GROUP). The syntax underlying associative-plural *lányáék* is argued to involve a specificational relation between a silent plural pronoun (pro_{PL}) and a constituent containing the overt noun (*lány*) and GROUP (see (5)).[2]

(5) $[_{DP}$ D $[_{:P} [_{DP}$ D $[_{RP} [_{Subj}$ *lánya* 'daughter'] $[_{R'} [_{Pred}$ GROUP] REL=*-é*]]] $[: [_{\#P}$ *pro* $\#_{PL}$=*-k*]]]]

-ék is also readily hosted by proper names (*a Kovácsék*; see (15b), below) and names of professions (*a doktorék*; see (25)).

Glosses used in this paper that may be unfamiliar or unconventional are the following: APL = associative plural marker; APOSS = anaphoric possession marker; MPL = multiplicative plural marker; POSS = possession marker; PPL = possessive plural marker (used to mark the fact that the possessum, not the possessor, is plural).

2. Throughout this paper, I will represent the functional projections occurring inside the Hungarian DP as underlyingly head-final. This is done purely for convenience, to obtain a direct translation from the structures to the corresponding surface strings.

The structure of the paper is the following. In Section 2, the syntax of number in possessive noun phrases will be laid out, following my earlier work on the subject. Section 3 subsequently turns to anaphoric possessive *-é*, which is analysed as the exponent of a RELATOR whose complement is a silent nominal proform (equivalent to English *one*, on which see Panagiotidis 2003 and references there). In Section 4, the knowledge garnered from Sections 2 and 3 is synthesised into an analysis of associative plural *-ék*, with *-é* once again serving as the RELATOR of a predication relation in which the RELATOR's complement is a silent noun (this time around a group-denoting noun), and with *-k* treated as the plural marker of the silent pronoun whose content is specified by the noun phrase featuring the marker *-é*. Section 5 presents a brief conclusion of the main results of this paper, whose analysis not only places Hungarian associative plurals in their wider typological context but also has implications for the syntax of number, demonstratives, and the licensing of silent nouns and pronouns.

2.   Number in possessive noun phrases

To set the stage for the analysis of (3) and (4), I will briefly examine the syntax of number in possessive noun phrases – a topic I already undertook a detailed investigation of in earlier work, esp. Den Dikken (1999), upon which this section will be drawing directly, along with Den Dikken's (2015) analysis of the syntax of possessive marking in the Hungarian noun phrase.

In the syntax of possessive noun phrases, a predication relationship is established between the possessum and a constituent containing the possessor, schematised for (6a) as in (6b):[3]

(6) a. *a   lány-a*
         the girl-POSS
         'his/her daughter'

---

[3] A few clarifications (addressed at greater length in my previous work) are in order. By 'a constituent containing the possessor', I mean to make it explicit that the possessor is not directly related to the possessum: it is usually contained in a PP (whose head may be silent or overt). In the structures presented in this paper, I will omit this PP-structure for expository purposes, to keep the representations as simple as possible. In Den Dikken (2015), I argue for a difference between alienable and inalienable possession with regard to the underlying directionality of the predication relation between the two terms (the possessum and the constituent containing the possessor). For the purposes of this paper, the alienable/inalienable dichotomy will not be important, so I will be abstracting away from it. I will adopt here a maximally 'wysiwyg' ('what you see is what you get') representation of the RP-syntax of possessive constructions, with the possessor as the specifier of the RELATOR and the possessum as its complement.

b.   [$_{DP}$ D=a [$_{RP}$ [$_{POSSESSOR}$ pro] [$_{R'}$ [$_{POSSESSUM}$ $lány$] RELATOR=-a]]]

The RELATOR of the possession relation is spelled out in Hungarian as the so-called 'possession marker' -$(j)a/e$.[4]

In the Hungarian possessive noun phrase, number for the possess*um* is marked with the specialised possessive plural marker -i, occurring to the right of the possession marker -$(j)a/e$. We saw this already in (2), which is repeated here as (7a), along with its syntactic structure. The head $\#_{PL}$ is spelled out as -i in Hungarian whenever its complement is a possessive small clause.

(7)   a.   *a   lány-a-i*
           the girl-POSS-PPL
           'his/her daughters'
      b.   [$_{DP}$ D=a [$_{\#P}$ [$_{RP}$ [$_{POSSESSOR}$ pro] [$_{R'}$ [$_{POSSESSUM}$ $lány$] RELATOR=-a]]
           $\#_{PPL}$=-i]]

Number for the possess*or* is marked with the standard multiplicative marker -k, which either occurs directly on the possessor (for non-pronominal possessors: see (8a)) or on the possessum (for third-person pronominal possessors: see (8b)).

(8)   a.   *a   nő-k   lány-a-i(*-k)*
           the woman-MPL girl-POSS-PPL-MPL
           'the women's daughters'
      b.   *az   ő(*-k)   lány-a-i-k*
           the (s)he-MPL girl-POSS-PPL-MPL
           'their daughters'

Number for the possessor is never exponed on both terms in the possessive rela-tionship – i.e., there is no number *agreement* in the Hungarian possessive noun phrase. When the number of the possessor is exponed on the possess*um*, as in (8b), the number marker -k has undergone movement in syntax (as argued in Den Dikken 1999, *q.v.* for discussion of why this movement happens only when the possessor is pronominal), -k docking on to the #-head of the possessive noun phrase and being spelled out after the possessive plural marker -i. This is illus-trated in (9), the syntax for (8b).

(9)   [$_{DP}$ D=a [$_{\#P}$ [$_{RP}$ [$_{\#P}$ [$_{POSSESSOR}$ $ő$] $\#_{MPL}$=-k] [$_{R'}$ [$_{POSSESSUM}$ $lány$] REL=-a]] $\#_{PPL}$=-i+$\#_{MPL}$=-k]]

---

4.   The vocalic allomorphy of the Hungarian possession marker is entirely phonologically con-ditioned: *a* is for [+back] stems and *e* for [−back] ones. The distribution of the *j* is determined by a mix of phonological, morphological and syntactic factors (see Den Dikken 2015: §3.1 for a concise summary, and references to the relevant literature).

An important conclusion to take away from this brief discussion of number in Hungarian possessive noun phrases is that multiplicative *-k* exhibits relative syntactic autonomy *vis-à-vis* the element whose number it marks. This will be important again in the discussion of the associative plural, in Section 4.3.

3.   Anaphoric possessive *-é*

3.1   Preamble: English anaphoric possessives

In English, a discourse-anaphoric possessum can be left unexpressed (*ec* = empty category):

(10)   *At first I liked her analysis of these data, but later on I ended up preferring his* ec.

There are no indications that *ec* in (10) is a surface anaphor with internal syntactic structure (i.e., a case of ellipsis). The literature's strongest argument for internal structure is the establishment of an Ā-dependency 'into' the silent category, as in familiar cases of sluicing: *I know he analysed some Hungarian data, but I don't remember which*. But in (11b), the attempt at having *which* bind a variable inside *ec* fails completely: (11b) is far worse than (11a) (which, though not brilliant due to the fact that extraction from a possessive noun phrase is never perfect in English, is certainly passable).

(11)   a. $^?$*I know which data they liked her analysis of,*
             but I don't know which they liked his analysis of ec.
       b.   **I know which data they liked her analysis of,*
             but I don't know which they liked his ec.

In light of this, I will proceed on the assumption that *ec* in (10) is a deep anaphor – a silent pro-form akin to *one* (an N-head: see Panagiotidis 2003). For Hungarian, I will make the same assumption.

In English (10), the discourse-anaphoric possessum remains entirely unexpressed and unaccompanied by any particular marker that would not occur in the presence of an overt possessum (i.e., *his ec* differs from *his analysis* only in the absence of *analysis*). But in this respect, third person singular masculine *his* is the odd man out in the realm of English pronominal possessors: thus, when the possessive pronouns in (10) are switched, the feminine singular possessive pronoun preceding the silent possessum must be adorned with an additional *-s*. The same is true in the case of the third person plural, first person plural, and second person possessive pronouns. And with a first person singular possessor, an alveolar

nasal must be added to the pronoun. The nasal of *mine* is likely to be a reduced version of the nominal proform *one* contracted onto the possessor (see Bernstein & Tortora 2005: 1233, fn. 26; and see Panagiotidis 2003: 282 on the occurrence of *my one* in dialects). If so, the nasal spells out the possessum overtly (see the structure below (10″)). But in (10′), the possessum is genuinely silent: the extra *-s* found in *hers, theirs, ours* and *yours* is in all likelihood the realisation of the RELATOR of the possession relationship – usually null with the pronominal possessors in question, but required to be overt whenever the possessum is silent, in order to license the silence.

(10′)   … *but later on I ended up preferring {hers, theirs, ours, yours}.*
       [$_{DP}$ D [$_{RP}$ [$_{POSSESSOR}$ *her/their/our/your*] [$_{R′}$ RELATOR=-*s*] [$_{POSSESSUM}$ *ec*]]]]

(10″)   … *but later on I ended up preferring mine.*
       [$_{DP}$ D [$_{RP}$ [$_{POSSESSOR}$ *my*] [$_{R′}$ RELATOR=∅] [$_{POSSESSUM}$ *’ne*]]]]

3.2   Hungarian anaphoric possessive *-é*

In Hungarian, a silent anaphoric possessum is always paired with an overt marker, *-é*, usually called the 'anaphoric possession marker' (see Bartos 2001; Dékány 2021, and references cited there).[5] We see this in (4), and again in (12a) (the version of (4) with non-possessed *lány*), analysed as in (12b).

(12)   a.   *a   lány-é*
            the girl-APOSS
            'the one belonging to the girl'
       b.   [$_{DP}$ D [$_{RP}$ [$_{POSSESSOR}$ *a lány*] [$_{R′}$ [$_{POSSESSUM}$ *ec*] RELATOR=-*é*]]]

Taking my cue from the analysis of English (10′) and the discussion of Hungarian in Section 2, I treat *-é* as an allomorph of the regular possession marker *-(j)a/e* (seen in (8) and (9)), an exponent of the RELATOR of DP-internal possession relations. This is illustrated in (12b). Whereas the regular possession marker harmonises with the overt possessum to which it is attached (*lány-a* 'girl-POSS', *öccs-e* 'brother-POSS'), the anaphoric possession marker is invariant. This is a direct con-

---

5. It is a logical possibility to treat *-é* as the exponent of the combination of an overt anaphoric proform *e* (cf. the proximal demonstrative of the same form) plus an 'ordinary', harmonising possession marker *-e* –i.e., *-é = e + -e*. But note that when the possession marker *-e* combines with a lexical noun that ends in the vowel *e*, the result is never just *-é* – rather, though the final vowel of the possessum does indeed lengthen, the *-j* allomorph of the possession marker is inserted after it: *kecske+POSS = kecské-je*. Here I will treat the *-é* of anaphoric possession as a monomorphemic form. (See also Dékány 2015 and Rocquet 2013: 80 for some discussion of the possible complexity of *-é*.)

sequence of the fact that the anaphoric possession marker has a radically silent host, not equipped with a vocalic melody with which the marker could harmonise.[6] The fact that the front-vowel allomorph of the possession marker is the one that is chosen here suggests that the front-vowel allomorph is the default version of the possession marker.

The fact that the anaphoric possession marker surfaces as *-é* (a long vowel) rather than short *-e* can also be straightforwardly recast as an effect of the silence of the possessum, as a case of compensatory lengthening. The long vowel of the anaphoric possession marker compensates for the absence of an overt possessum; when the possessum is spelled out, the possession marker is short. As the RELATOR of the possession relation, *-é* plays a key role in the licensing of the silent possessum: in the absence of *-é*, Hungarian forbids a silent possessum.

In the presence of the possession marker *-(j)a/e* on the host of anaphoric possessive *-é*, as in (4), the possession marker lengthens, resulting in *-(j)á/é*: *a lány-á-é* 'the one belonging to his/her daughter'. This is the product of Low Vowel Lengthening (Siptár & Törkenczy 2000: 56–57, 170–173), a late phonological rule unhindered by the fact that *lánya* is not itself the syntactic host of *é*.[7] But the fact that *-é* is syntactically hosted by a null proform ('*ec*'), not by the overt noun preceding it, does have an effect on another phonological process: vowel/zero alternation. Under the addition of the possession marker *-a/e*, nouns such as *bokor* 'bush' and *pokol* 'hell', ending in a sequence of a vowel and a liquid, lose the vowel:

---

6. Balázs Surányi (p.c.) asks why harmony is not induced by the phonological host (i.e., the possessor). It is true that in cases of nominal ellipsis, the surface host of the stranded suffix conditions vowel harmony: *három ec-nak* 'three-DAT' ~ *négy ec-nek* 'four-DAT' (as in *as for girls, John gave flowers to three and Bill to four*). But the nature of the silent nominal in anaphoric possessives is different: we are not dealing here with ellipsis (surface anaphora) but with a radically silent proform (deep anaphora). In ellipsis contexts, the stray affix is morphologically reassociated and phonologically integrated with the surface host; in anaphoric possessives, by contrast, *-é* is morphologically attached to *ec* and comes together with its overt left-hand sister only after the application of vowel harmony rules.

Surányi (p.c.) also points out that in *keves-en vannak* 'there are few (people)' and *sok-an vannak* 'there are many (people)', there is vowel harmony. If the syntactic structure of *keves-en* and *sok-an* features a silent noun confining the reference of these expressions to humans, this would appear to contradict the text proposal. In Den Dikken & Dékány (2022), a radically silent noun is indeed postulated in the syntax of *négy-en vannak* 'they are a group of four (people)' – an analysis that extends to *keves-en* and *sok-an*. But in their analysis, *-en/-an* is the phrasal spell-out of a large syntactic unit comprising the silent noun – *-en/-an* is not morphologically hosted by the silent noun; instead, *-en/-an* forms a morphophonological unit with the quantifier to its immediate left. Vowel harmony is thus correctly ensured here.

7. When the possession marker on the host of anaphoric possessive *-é* is [−back], the result is a sequence of two *é*'s, as in *az öccs-é-é* 'the one belonging to his/her brother'.

a bokr-a/pokl-a 'his/her/its bush/hell'; but (as Péter Rebrus has pointed out to me) the attachment of anaphoric possessive *-é* to such nouns preserves the vowel: *a bokor-é/pokol-é* 'the one belonging to the bush/hell'. The vowel/zero alternation is sensitive to the fact that *-é*, while phonologically attached to *bokor/pokol*, is syntactically hosted not by this noun but by the null proform in the complement of the RELATOR that *-é* expones. Because the morphosyntactic relationship between *-é* and the element that physically hosts it is non-local, the morphophonological rule of vowel/zero alternation is not triggered in the formation of anaphoric possessives.

When the element that physically hosts anaphoric possessive *-é* is itself a pronoun, we get the forms in (13), where the anaphoric possession marker predictably harbours the person/number morphology cross-referencing the pronoun. In the syntax of these forms, the pronoun is the possessor of the anaphoric proform ('*ec*' in (12b)). Recall from (8b) (*az ő(*-k) lány-a-i-k* 'their daughters') that the third person plural pronoun, when serving the possessor role, 'launches' its plural marker up to the possessive marker, causing *-k* to be attached to the possessive marker (see (9)). The same happens in (13e), where *-k* surfaces to the right of the anaphoric possession marker *-é*.

(13) a. *az eny-é-m*
      the I-APOSS-1SG
      'mine'

   b. *a   ti-é-d / ti-e-d*
      the you$_{SG}$-APOSS-1SG
      'yours$_{SG}$'

   c. *az öv-é*
      the (s)he-APOSS
      'his/hers'

   d. *a   mi-é-nk / mi-e-nk*
      the we-APOSS-1PL
      'ours'

   e. *a   ti-é-tek / ti-e-tek*
      the you$_{PL}$-APOSS-2PL
      'yours$_{PL}$'

   f. *az öv-é-k*
      the (s)he-APOSS-MPL
      'theirs'

The fact that long *-é* occurs throughout the paradigm in (13) is as expected. But what is unexpected about the paradigm in (13) is that there is some variation in the realisation of the anaphoric possession marker: with second person singular and plural as well as first person plural pronouns, long *-é* alternates with short *-e*.

I do not profess to know what lies beneath the emergence of short *-e* in (13b,d,e). I will take this to be a phonological effect (triggered (optionally) under string adjacency to the vowel /i/), not a morphosyntactic one.[8,9]

The marking of number in anaphoric possessives is the same as in non-anaphoric ones. We see this in the left-hand column in (14), to be compared to the forms in the right-hand column. The plurality of the (silent or overt) possessum in (14) is expressed with the possessive plural marker *-i*; the plurality of the possessor is exponed in the form of the multiplicative number marker *-k*, directly on the possessor in the case of non-pronominal possessors, and to the right of *-i* in the case of pronominal possessors. The parallel between the left-hand and right-hand columns of (14) (the latter featuring the overt possessum *kép* 'picture') indicates that the syntax of anaphoric possessives matches that of headed possessives. This is consonant with the approach to *-é* taken in (12b), as the exponent of the RELATOR of the possession relation.

(14) a. *a lány-ok-é-i*   *a lány-ok kép-e-i*
          the girl-MPL-APOSS-PPL   the girl-MPL picture-POSS-PPL
          'the ones belonging to the girls' 'the pictures belonging to the girls'

      b. *az öv-é-i-k*   *az ő kép-e-i-k*
          the (s)he-APOSS-PPL-MPL   the she picture-POSS-PPL-MPL
          'the ones belonging to them' 'the pictures belonging to them'

4.   Associative plural *-ék*

The RELATOR *-é* also serves to license a silent term in the non-possessive syntax of Hungarian associative plurals, as shown in (15b) (juxtaposed here to anaphoric-possessive (15a)). In (15b), *ék* marks a plurality of individuals in the circle of the

---

8.   Note that the /i/ of (13b) is 'extra', causing form identity between the second person singular and plural pronouns (otherwise distinct: *te* 'you$_{SG}$' ~ *ti* 'you$_{PL}$') in anaphoric possessives. In (13a) an 'extra' [+high, –back, –round] feature bundle rears its head as well, in the form of the glide /j/ of *enyém* /ɛnjeːm/ [ɛɲeːm] (see Kálmán 1972: 57, where this is treated as a case of palatalisation of /n/ preceding a front vowel). I suspect that this /j/ is the same element as the one turning *te* 'you$_{SG}$' into *ti* in anaphoric possessive *tiéd* 'yours$_{SG}$'. Because /j/ is not a syllable nucleus, it does not facilitate the optional shortening of *-é* to *-e* seen in (13b,d,e), which is conditioned to occur only after the vowel /i/.

9.   The /v/ following the pronominal possessor in (13b) is an integral part of the possessor, not a separate morpheme. The pronoun surfaces with a short vowel (*ö*) in the presence of /v/ but with a long vowel (*ő*) in its absence –a compensatory lengthening effect. (To *ő* ~ *öv*-, compare the stem allomorphy in *tő* ~ *töv*- 'stem, root', *ló* ~ *lov*- 'horse', *tó* ~ *tav*- 'lake', etc. Systematically, the short vowel in the /v/-ful allomorph alternates with a long vowel in the /v/-less one.)

host noun. A question that has been debated in the Hungarian linguistics community since (at least) Simonyi (1895) is whether the associative plural marker *-ék* is a single morpheme or a morpheme complex consisting of *-é* (seen at work in Section 3 as the anaphoric possessive marker) and *-k* (the multiplicative plural marker).[10] In the 21st-century morphosyntax literature, the suffix *-ék* is standardly analysed as a monolith (see Bartos 2001; Moravcsik 2003; Dékány 2021, and references there).

(15) a.   *a   Kovács-é-i*
           the Kovács-APOSS-PPL
           'the ones belonging to Kovács' [*Kovács* is a family name, the equivalent of *Smith*]
      b.   *a   Kovács-ék*
           the Kovács-APL
           'Kovács and his associates (e.g., relatives or group members)'

My aim in this section is to argue explicitly that *-ék* is bimorphemic, consisting of the RELATOR *-é* and multiplicative plural *-k*. I will show that this particular analysis dodges all three of Moravcsik's (2003) arguments against a bimorphemic approach to *-ék*:

i.   anaphoric possessive *-é* is not strictly [+HUMAN] but *-ék* is
ii.   anaphoric possessive *-é* does not have inclusive semantics but *-ék* does
iii. anaphoric possessive *-é* combines with the possessive *-i* plural instead of the regular *-k*

The analysis proposed here for associative plurals captures the inclusive semantics of *-ék* and the [+HUMAN] restriction imposed on *-ék* with the help of the postulation of a projection of the silent noun GROUP (see Section 4.1) in an asyndetic specification relation with a silent personal pronoun (Sections 4.2 and 4.3). The plurality of this non-possessed pronoun also provides us with the source for the use of the regular multiplicative plural marker *-k* in associative plurals.

4.1   The *-é* of associative plurals as a RELATOR licensing silent GROUP

The fact that the regular multiplicative plural marker *-k* shows up in (15b), and not the possessive *-i* plural, indicates that in associative plurals we are not dealing

---

10. A reviewer asks whether the multiplicative plural marker can be added directly to a proper name like *Kovács*. The answer is affirmative: *a Kovács-ok*. But here we are not dealing with a group of people in Kovács's circle: rather, reference is being made to a set of (potentially unrelated) individuals bearing the name *Kovács*. See also fn. 15, below.

with a plural possessum. But the *é* of (15b) shares with that of (15a) the function of licensing of the silence of one of the terms of a RELATOR phrase: the *-é* of associative plurals is the exponent of a RELATOR that licenses a (non-anaphoric) silent group-denoting noun GROUP, whose noun phrase is in a predication relation with the name *Kovács*, the nominal element phonologically hosting *-é*.[11] This is shown in (16) (which represents an intermediate stage in the construction of the syntax of associative plurals; Section 4.2 develops this syntax in full).

(16)   [$_{RP}$ *Kovács* [$_{R'}$ [GROUP] RELATOR=*-é*]]

4.2   Asyndetic specification, with the pronoun as the second term

The predication structure in (16) is enveloped in a DP which serves to specify the content of a silent plural pronoun (*pro*$_{PL}$) – an asyndetic specification structure (':P'; see Koster 2000) inside DP:[12]

(17)   [$_{DP}$ D [$_{:P}$ [$_{DP}$ D [$_{RP}$ [$_{Subject}$ *Kovács*] [$_{R'}$ [$_{Predicate}$ GROUP] REL=*-é*]]] [: [$_{#P}$ *pro* #$_{PL}$=*-k*]]]]]

The asyndetic specification structure in (17) has the constituent specifying *pro*'s content occupying the specifier position of :P. That the constituent specifying *pro* is in the specifier of :P is clear from the syntax of associative plurals in Afrikaans (18a) and Yukaghir (18b), where instead of *pro* an overt 3PL pronoun (*hulle*, *taN*) occurs as the *second* term of the specification structure.[13]

---

11. That in expressions of the type *the Kovács family/group* there is a predication relation between *Kovács* and *family/group* is clear from syntactic behaviour shared between this construction type and qualitative binominal noun phrases of the type *that idiot (of a) doctor* (see Den Dikken 2006 for detailed discussion). Relevant here may be the alternation in German between *die Trapp Familie* and *die Familie von Trapp*, with *von* signalling Predicate Inversion.

12. Dékány (2021: 235) entertains this possibility in passing: "I find it possible that the associates are syntactically represented in the form of a *pro* or a silent noun in Spec,AplP, but I will not pursue this question further here."

13. The Yukaghir example in (18b) comes from Mauri & Sansò (2019: 611), cited in Dékány (2021: 227, fn. 5). For discussion of Afrikaans (18a), see Den Besten (1996) and, more recently, Van Huyssteen (2018).

Though in Afrikaans associative plurals it appears that first/given names and kinship terms are by far the most frequent choices of pre-*hulle* element, Van Huyssteen's (2018) corpus study finds that singular surnames are common in the construction: cf. Hungarian *a Kovácsék*. But Van Huyssteen (2018: 419) points out that "there is no evidence in our data that plural surnames can function as left-hand components of the *hulle* construction", and also that "in contrast with the literature, no instances could be found of plural kinship names and plural common nouns as left-hand constituents (e.g. *die ooms-hulle* the unclePL-3PL; *die honde-hulle* the dogPL-3PL)"

(18) a. *ma-<u>hulle</u>*   (Afrikaans)
         mum-they

     b. *emej-<u>taN</u>-pe*   (Yukaghir)
         mother-that-PL

     c. *anyá-é (*ő)-k*   (Hungarian)
         mother-REL PRON$_{3SG}$-MPL
         all: 'mother and her entourage'

A question that arises at this point is why the plural pronoun whose content is being specified by the DP of GROUP is necessarily silent in Hungarian: see (18c). A cocktail of factors likely plays a role in this: pro-drop, anaphoricity, and non-contrastiveness. In Afrikaans (18a), a plural pronoun must be used because Afrikaans is not a pro-drop language. (Yukaghir certainly is pro-drop, but in (18b) we are dealing with a demonstrative pronoun, not a garden-variety personal pronoun.) In Hungarian, overt personal pronouns are unnatural in contexts in which they are anaphoric and non-contrastive: *János bejött a szobába; (#ő) leült mellém* 'János$_i$ came into the room; he$_i$ sat down beside me'. In the structure in (17), the pronoun whose content is asyndetically specified is both anaphoric (to the group denoted by the constituent in Spec:P) and non-contrastive. The standard conditions for the use of an overt pronoun are therefore not met, and pro-drop is chosen instead. It may be that more is at play in ruling out an overt pronoun in (18c). But it seems to me that the factors highlighted in this paragraph are sufficient to stack the cards against the use of an overt pronoun in Hungarian associative plurals.

4.3 The locus of plural marking in associative plurals

The silent plural pronoun (*pro*$_{PL}$) in (17) is the source of plural reference and morphology for associative plurals: *pro*$_{PL}$ (plural reference) is locally associated with #$_{PL}$ (plural morphology). That #$_{PL}$ locally combines with the pronoun and not

---

(on this, cf. Bartos' 2001: 697 observation for Hungarian that quantified and (non-possessive) plural-marked noun phrases cannot host associative-plural *-ék*: *{*egy/öt/minden*} *fiú-ék*, **a fiú-<u>k</u>-ék*; also: **a Kovács-<u>ok</u>-ék*, and **a Kovács-<u>ék</u>-ék* 'the Kovács family and their associates').

   Den Besten (1996) and other sources report that associative plurals can alternatively feature *goed* 'good, stuff' as the second term, as in *pagoed* 'dad.stuff'. Den Besten (2001) further reports that *pagoed* can combine with *hulle* to form *pagoed-hulle* (which, though rare in Van Huyssteen's corpora, is still used frequently in Orange River Afrikaans according to Christo van Rensburg (p.c. to Van Huyssteen 2018: 415)). It seems to me plausible to think that *pagoed-hulle* is a fully spelled out case of (17), with *goed* representing the otherwise abstract noun GROUP and *hulle* representing the third-person plural pronoun whose content is specified by *pagoed*.

with the entire asyndetic specification structure is shown particularly clearly by the Tok Pisin examples in (19) (Mühlhäussler 1981: 43; Dékány 2021: 224).

(19) a. <u>ol</u> *pater*
          PL priest
          'the priests'
          $[_{\#P}\ ol_{PL}\ pater]$
      b. *pater* <u>ol</u>
          priest PL
          'the priest and his flock'
          $[_{:P}\ [...\ pater\ ...]\ [:\ [_{\#P}\ ol_{PL}\ pro_{PL}]]$

From (19a), we conclude that #P is head-initial in Tok Pisin. But the associative plural in (19b) features the plural marker *ol* in final position. This follows if in (19b) *ol* is linked to *pro*, not to *pater*, as indicated in the partial structure provided below (19b). The fact that *ol* serves not just as the nominal plural marker but also as the equivalent of the English pronoun *they* (itself a combination of D=*the* and an overt pronoun in D's complement) supports this analysis of (19b).

   The Tok Pisin data in (19) are one cogent reason for assuming that even when there is no overt pronoun in the surface output for an associative plural, a silent plural pronoun is present in its syntax. Hungarian associative plurals further strengthen this. In Hungarian, the head $\#_{PL}$ that belongs to the silent pronoun is exponed as the multiplicative plural marker *-k*. In the linear string produced by (17), this *-k* is sequenced to the immediate right of *-é*. This linear sequence is directly as predicted. And importantly, no source for *-k* would have been forthcoming if the structure of associative plurals had featured no pro_{PL}: if (as assumed here) the silent group-denoting expression in the complement of the RELATOR exponed by *-é* is not formally plural, it is not directly combinable with *-k*; and if the silent group-denoting expression *were* assumed to be plural, it would be difficult to rule out the emergence of the *-i* allomorph of the plural marker in associative plurals. The only source for the regular multiplicative plural marker *-k* of Hungarian associative plurals is the silent plural pronoun whose content is specified by the group-denoting noun phrase harbouring the overt noun.[14]

   A question that needs to be addressed is how $\#_{PL}$, locally associated as it is with *pro*, can be exponed at all. When the third person subject of a finite clause is pronominal, *-k* can readily be hosted by overt *ő* '(s)he' to form plural *ők* 'they'. But

---

14. It is not possible, therefore, to simplify the structure of Hungarian associative plurals by confining it to the DP in the specifier position of the :P in (17) (i.e., $[_{DP}\ D\ [_{RP}\ [_{Subject}\ Kovács]\ [_{R'}\ [_{Predicate}\ GROUP]\ REL=\text{-}é]]]$). Of course, such a simplified structure also would not be adequate for the analysis of the Afrikaans and Yukaghir facts in (18).

silent *pro* cannot combine with the multiplicative plural marker in this structural context. Consider the examples in (20) and (21):

(20)   a.   *A   kovács-ok   dolgoz-nak.*
           the smith-MPL work-3PL
           'The smiths are working.'
       b.   *A   Kovács-ék   dolgoz-nak.*
           the Kovács-APL work-3PL
           'The Kovácses/Smiths are working.'

(21)   a.   *Ő-k   dolgoz-nak.*
           (s)he-MPL work-3PL
           'They are working.'
       b.   pro*(*-k) dolgoz-nak.*
           pro-MPL work-3PL
           'They are working.'

The ungrammaticality of (21b) with *-k* is not due to the radical sentence-initiality of the 'orphaned' plural marker: it persists in root clauses with an initial non-subject (*má-k dolgoz-nak 'today they are working') and in subordinate clauses introduced by a complementiser (**azt gondolom hogy-ok dolgoz-nak* 'I think that they are working', *há-k dolgoz-nak 'if they are working'). The problem is that *-k* cannot find a host within its local syntactic domain, the maximal projection of the subject.

In possessive noun phrases, a *-k* associated with a silent pronominal possessor *can* be exponed within the possessive DP: indeed, it *must* be exponed, on the possessum (which, if itself plural, then hosts two plural markers: *-i* and *-k*). This is illustrated in (22a), analysed as in (22b).

(22)   a.   *a   pro(*-k) lány-a-i-k*
           the *pro*-MPL girl-POSS-PPL-MPL
           'their daughters'
       b.   [$_{DP}$ D=*a* [$_{\#P}$ [$_{RP}$ [$_{\#P}$ [$_{POSSESSOR}$ *pro*] #$_{MPL}$=*-k*] [$_{R'}$ [$_{POSSESSUM}$ *lány*] REL=*-a*]]
           #$_{PPL}$=*-i*+#$_{MPL}$=*-k*]]

This leads to the conclusion that a multiplicative plural marker associated to a silent pronoun is exponed as *-k* if it can find a host within the maximal nominal structure that contains it, and is otherwise left unrealised. In the structure of associative plurals given in (17) (repeated below), there is indeed a host for *-k* within the maximal nominal domain containing it: the multiplicative plural marker associated to *pro* can be attached to the exponent of the RELATOR of the structure in Spec:P.

(17)   [$_{DP}$ D [$_{:P}$ [$_{DP}$ D [$_{RP}$ [$_{Subject}$ *Kovács*] [$_{R'}$ [$_{Predicate}$ GROUP] REL=-*é*]]]] [: [$_{\#P}$ *pro* $\#_{PL}$=-*k*]]]]]

4.4   The locus of the definite article in associative plurals

The structure in the complement of outer D in (17) is pronominally headed – necessarily so, as we saw in Sections 4.2 and 4.3. The Spanish plural definite article *los* 'the$_{PL}$', which does double duty as a pronominal clitic, can combine with *pro*$_{PL}$ and spell out the outer D-head. Thus, in *los Franco* 'the Franco family', *los* can be housed by the outer D in (17).[15]

But for Hungarian associative plurals, a treatment of the initial definite article *a* in (3) and (15b) as the spell-out of the outer D is not an option: Hungarian personal pronouns do not combine with articles (**az ő*, **az pro*$_{[+HUMAN]}$), so *a* in *a lány-á-ék* and *a Kovács-ék* is not the exponent of the outermost D in (17). Instead, the initial definite article *a* must be inside the constituent specifying the content of *pro*, heading either the DP serving as the subject of GROUP (as in (23a)) or the larger DP on the left-hand branch of ':P' in (17) (as in (23b)).

(23)   a.   [$_{DP}$ D [$_{:P}$ [$_{DP}$ D [$_{RP}$ [$_{Subject=DP}$ D=*a lánya*] [$_{R'}$ [$_{Predicate}$ GROUP] REL=-*é*]]]] [: [$_{\#P}$ *pro* $\#_{PL}$=-*k*]]]]]
       b.   [$_{DP}$ D [$_{:P}$ [$_{DP}$ D=*a* [$_{RP}$ [$_{Subject=DP}$ *Kovács*] [$_{R'}$ [$_{Predicate}$ GROUP] REL=-*é*]]]] [: [$_{\#P}$ *pro* $\#_{PL}$=-*k*]]]]]

The option schematised in (23a) is plausible for (3), given that 'bare' [+COUNT] singulars do not usually occur as subjects in Hungarian: article-less *lánya* 'his/her daughter' cannot be used as a subject of predication (*Marival találkoztam; *(a) lánya nagyon szép* 'I met Mari; her daughter is very pretty'). For (15b), on the other hand, the representation in (23b) is more appropriate, esp. in those varieties of Hungarian in which personal proper names cannot combine with *a*: placing *a* in the D-head of the subject of GROUP would create the DP $^{\%}$*a Kovács*, which is not acceptable in all varieties of Hungarian; but the associative plural *a Kovácsék* is universally accepted, as far as I am aware – also by speakers who reject $^{\%}$*a Kovács*.

---

15. Spanish associative plurals (recently studied in detail in Camacho 2021) always have a singular family name. In certain varieties of Iberian Spanish, $^{\%}$*los Francos* does occur, but does not have an associative plural reading: instead, it is used to make reference to a plurality of (potentially unrelated) accidental namesakes. Recall here fn. 10, above.

4.5   On the size of the subject of GROUP

The subject of GROUP can be a large and complex DP: in (24) (taken from Bartos 2001: 695; see also Dékány 2021: 233), a plural possessed common noun phrase (*a barátaid* 'your friends') serves as the subject of GROUP.[16]

(24)   *a   baráta-i-d-ék*
      the friend-PPL-2SG-APL
      'your friends and their associates'

Further evidence that the subject of GROUP can be a full DP comes from examples such as the one in (25), discussed by Dékány (2021: 226).

(25)   *A   doktor-ék   késni   fognak; most telefonált.*
      the doctor-APL be.late will.3PL now phoned.3SG
      '<u>The doctor</u>$_i$ and his associates are going to be late; <u>he</u>$_i$ just phoned.'

In (25), it is the definite DP *a doktor* 'the doctor', represented as the subject of GROUP, that serves as the discourse antecedent for the anaphoric *pro*$_{3SG}$ that is the subject of the second clause.[17]

    Not only is it clear that the subject of GROUP *can* be a DP, there are indications that in fact it *must* be. Personal pronouns, which in Hungarian are smaller than DP, systematically fail to host *-ék* in associative plurals, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (26) (from Dékány 2021: 230).

(26)   a.   **én-ék*
         I-APL
         intended: 'me and my associates'
    b.   **mi-ék*
         we-APL
         intended: 'we and our associates'

---

16. Den Besten (1996) points out that the left-hand term of the Afrikaans associative plural can likewise be possessive-marked: *my pa-hulle* 'my dad-they'. Van Huyssteen (2018: 423–4) confirms based on a corpus study that associative plurals with *hulle* "indeed very often include possessive pronouns". Like Den Besten, I treat the associative plural as pronominally-headed, hence *my* in *my pa-hulle* can only be parsed as part of the left-hand term, not as belonging to the entire complex noun phrase: pronominally-headed noun phrases cannot be possessive-marked (**my hulle*).

17. In Afrikaans, the definite article *die* also occurs within the subject of GROUP in the associative plural construction (Den Besten 1996), although it is not particularly frequent in this construction in corpora (Van Huyssteen 2018).

c. **öv-ék*
    (s)he-APL
    intended: '(s)he & his/her associates'

But although the DP that serves as the subject of GROUP can contain the invariant demonstratives *e* and *ezen*, as in (27a), concordial demonstratives (which occur in a position to the left of D: *ezek a lányok* 'this.PL the girl.PL', *ezzel a lánnyal* 'this.COMIT the girl.COMIT') are barred from associative plurals (27b) (except in oblique-case contexts, to which Section 4.6 turns) (Bartos 2001).

(27) a. *e(zen) lány-om-ék*
          this   girl-1SG-APL
          'this daughter of mine and her associates'
      b. **ez(-ek) a lány-om-ék*
          this(-PL) the girl-1SG-APL
          intended: 'this daughter of mine and her associates'

The only plural element in the structure (17) is pro_{PL}, but pronouns cannot host demonstratives (see (28)), so plural *ezek* in (27b) cannot be associated to pro_{PL}. Nor can plural *ezek* form a constituent with the GROUP-DP or its subject (*lányom*) because neither of these is itself morphosyntactically plural in (27b).[18] With singular *ez*, (27b) also fails: there is a restriction on the size of the subject of GROUP that makes it impossible for the subject of GROUP to be structurally large enough

---

18. Indeed, it seems that, except if it is a possessive noun phrase (as in (24) and (iiia)), the subject of GROUP cannot denote a plurality: Bartos (2001: 697) points out that (ib,c) are ungrammatical. Peculiarly, the possessor of the subject of GROUP cannot denote a plurality either: see the contrast between the a- and b-examples in (ii) and (iii). Bartos (2001: 698) is right to note that it is difficult to imagine a structural explanation for these restrictions: the quantified noun phrases *öt fiú/orvos* and *minden fiú/orvos* are not formally plural (i.e., the plural marker *-k* is obligatorily absent); likewise, there is no sense in which the possessive noun phrase *a barátunk* is formally plural (it controls singular agreement with the verb in finite clauses: *a barátunk element(*ek)* 'our friend left'). The restrictions in (i)–(iii) seem to be semantic in nature, though in light of the grammaticality contrast between (ib) and (iiia) formulating the relevant restrictions in semantic terms will not be a simple matter either. For now, I will set these fascinating facts aside; but I hope they will eventually be folded into the analysis, at least partially.

(i) a. *a fiú-ék/orvos-ék* 'the boy/doctor and his associates'
     b. **a fiú-k-ék/orvos-ok-ék* 'the boys/doctors and their associates'
     c. **{öt/minden} fiú-ék/orvos-ék* 'five/all boys/doctors and their associates'

(ii) a. *a barát-om-ék* 'my friend and his/her associates'
     b. **a barát-unk-ék* 'our friend and his/her associates'

(iii) a. *a szüle-i-d-ék* 'your$_{SG}$ parents and their associates'
      b. **a szüle-i-tek-ék* 'your$_{PL}$ parents and their associates'

to accommodate pre-D concordial demonstratives, which I take to be located on top of DP (perhaps in a DemP or a *d*P; I will not commit to a particular labelling here, which is not immediately germane).

(28) *ez-ek   (az) ő-k
     this-PL the (s)he-PL

That there is a size restriction imposed on the subject of DP-internal predication is independently supportable, well beyond Hungarian. In *idiot of a doctor*-type binominal complex noun phrases (which are related to associative plurals on the analysis proposed: both involve DP-internal nominal predication; see Den Dikken 2006), the subject of predication can be a proper name (as in Dutch (29a)) or common noun (29b), but a definite article, demonstrative or Saxon genitive preceding the second noun is not possible, as shown in (29c), which is bad regardless of whether the indefinite article *een* is included or not: the problem with (29c) is the structural size of the subject noun phrase. Hungarian *idiot of a doctor*-type constructions likewise ban the definite article from the subject of predication (the second noun): (30b) is ungrammatical as a complex binominal noun phrase (again, irrespective of whether *egy* is included or not). So there is a precedent to a restriction on the determiner field for the subject of DP-internal predication structures.

(29) a. *die idioot van een Piet*
          that idiot of a   Piet
      b. *die idioot van een dokter*
          that idiot of a   doctor
      c. **die idioot van (een) de/die/Piets   dokter*
          that idiot of a   the/that/Piet's doctor

(30) a. *hülye egy orvos*
          idiot a   doctor
      b. **hülye (egy) az orvos*
          idiot a   the doctor

4.6 Associative plurals in oblique contexts

Bartos (2001) observes that while (27b) is bad, oblique (31a) is grammatical. Concordial *ez* cannot be spelled out on the edge of the full associative plural phrase because *(a)* when they are located on the edge of a noun phrase, Hungarian concordial demonstratives require the company of a structurally local overt D-head (*ez-t *(a) lány-t* 'this-ACC the girl-ACC') but *(b)* the outermost D-head in (17) is necessarily silent (it heads a pronominally headed DP, and as we

have seen, Hungarian personal pronouns do not combine with articles). However, placement of *ez* outside the complex noun phrase altogether, in the specifier of the (extended) projection of the postposition (as in (31b)), provides the demonstrative with a suitable spell-out site, in the local presence of an overt head (P).[19]

(31) a. *en-nél   a lány-om-ék-nál*
         this-ADESS the girl-1SG-APL-ADESS
         'at this daughter of mine and her associates'

   b. $[_{PP}$ *ez+-nél* $[_{P'}$ $[_{DP}$ *ez* $[_{D'}$ D $[_{DemP}$ *ez* $[_{:P}$ $[_{DP}$ D $[_{RP}$ $[_{Subject=DP}$ D=*a lányom*$]$
       $[_{R'}$ $[_{Predicate}$ GROUP$]$ RELATOR=*-é*$]]]$ $[:$ $[_{\#P}$ *pro* $\#_{PL}$=*-k*$]]]]]]$ P=*-nál*$]]$

This analysis of (31a), placing the demonstrative in a specifier position in P's entourage, has the additional benefit of yielding a simple account of case concord. The fact that the demonstrative bears the same case morphology as the DP with which it combines falls out from the fact that P is simultaneously in a downward Agree relation with its complement and in a Spec–Head agreement relationship with the demonstrative in its specifier position.[20]

   Gyuri Rákosi (p.c.) makes the interesting observation that in oblique case environments, associative plurals can (at least on some occasions, for some speakers) sanction the dropping of the case particle normally selected by the verb:

(32) *Unokatesó-m-ék-$^{\%}$(hoz) megyek.*
     cousin-1SG-APL-ALLAT go.1SG
     'I am going to my cousin and his/her associates.'

Rákosi also points out that such dropping is never possible with anaphoric possessive *-é* (*unokatesó-m-é-*(hoz) megyek* 'I am going to the one belonging to my cousin'). So it seems that this dropping of the case particle is a function, not of the presence of *-é* but of the presence of *pro*$_{PL}$ in the syntax. But it is not the case that

---

19. Whether the concordial demonstrative arrives in the specifier of the postpositional phrase as a result of movement or is base-generated there is a question I remain agnostic about here. Either approach will do for present purposes.

20. The oblique example in (31a) raises a question for the pronominally headed analysis of associative plurals. Ordinarily, when a case particle combines with a pronominally headed host in Hungarian, it inflects for the person and number features of the pronoun (regardless of whether the pronoun is overt or silent): *(ő)nál-uk* 'at them'. But associative plurals do not give rise to plural-inflected case particles: *a lány-om-ék-nál*(-uk) 'girl-1SG-APL-ADESS-3PL'. The fact that there is no inflection on the case particle here follows from the fact that the case particle (an exponent of P) takes the entire complex DP in (17)/(23) as its complement, and cannot see the null pronoun (*pro*$_{PL}$), which, though being the head of the associative plural noun phrase, is deeply embedded within its structure. Hungarian case particles taking a full DP complement never inflect for the φ-features of the DP (*a lányok-nál*(-uk) 'the girls-ADESS-3PL'). With regard to outward φ-feature inflection, associative plurals behave like non-pronominal DPs.

Hungarian can generally drop case particles in the local presence of pro_{PL}, so the connection between case drop and pronominality is indirect.

It seems to me plausible that the dropping of the case particle in Rákosi's (32) is intimately related to the P-drop phenomenon observed in Modern Greek (33b) (see Den Dikken & Ioannidou 2009 for discussion and references), which, importantly, goes hand in hand with the obligatory absence of the definite article on the complement of P despite the fact that the complement of P is interpreted as a definite expression (suggesting that a DP is projected in syntax).[21] Associative plurals are full-scale complex DPs whose outer D, as I argued in Section 4.4, must remain empty in Hungarian because of the fact that Hungarian pronouns do not combine with the definite article. It is probably thanks to the silence of the outer D in (17)/(23) that P-drop is sanctioned in (32), analogously to the way P-drop is contingent on D-drop in Modern Greek (33b).

(33)   a.   *Gyrizo   s-to   spiti.*
            return.1SG to-the house
       b.   *Gyrizo   (*to) spiti.*
            return.1SG the   house
            both: 'I am returning home.'

4.7   On licensing silence

Silent GROUP in (17) is formally licensed by the RELATOR spelled out as *-é*. The analysis predicts that when the group-denoting predicate nominal is overt, no *-é* is needed because there is no silent GROUP-noun requiring licensing. This is correct: with overt *család/csoport*, we get (34a), not (34b):

(34)   a.   *a   Kovács család/csoport*
            the Kovács family/group
       b.   **a   Kovács család/csoport-é*
            the Kovács family/group-RELATOR
            intended: 'the Kovács family/group'

The *család/csoport*-DP, being explicitly singular, cannot serve to content-license pro_{PL}; but content licensing is successful when the group-denoting noun phrase

---

21. Note that English *I am returning home*, the prose translation of Modern Greek (33), likewise features the combination of P-drop and obligatory absence of a definite article: *I am returning *(to) the home of my ancestors*. But whereas *home* is an isolated case in standard English, the combination of P-drop and D-drop is more productive in Greek.

is headed by silent GROUP, which is not explicitly singular.[22] So the specificational structure is available only with silent GROUP, which explains why *a Kovács család/csoport* cannot control plural agreement, unlike *a Kovácsék*:

(35)   a.   *A   Kovács család/csoport elment(*-ek).*
            the Kovács family/group   away.went-3PL
       b.   *A   Kovács-ék   elment*(-ek).*
            the Kovács-APL away.went-3PL
            both: 'The Kovács family/group went away.'

In associative plurals, there is a *bi*directional dependency between silent GROUP and *pro*$_{PL}$. In (17), the silent GROUP noun content-licenses *pro*$_{PL}$. But silent GROUP, while formally licensed by *-é*, in turn also needs to be content-licensed. Because GROUP has no discourse antecedent, it requires DP-internal apposition to *pro*$_{PL}$. This derives the fact that the inner DP in (17), [$_{DP}$ D=*a* [$_{RP}$ *Kovács* [$_{R'}$ [GROUP] REL=-*é*]]], cannot occur by itself with the associative meaning 'the Kovács family/group'. Though the surface string *a Kovács-é* is grammatical, it only supports an anaphoric possessive interpretation ('the one belonging to Kovács'), not an associative reading.[23]

---

22. Combined with what Kayne (2003) says about silent nouns and plurality, this suggests silent nouns are unspecified for number. The English overt nouns *family*, *group* and *team* are not explicitly singular, hence they are legitimate content-licensers of *pro*$_{PL}$ in associative *the Smith family*, and also in 'pluringular' *the family have left* (Den Dikken 2001), where a group-denoting noun controls plural agreement with the verb. Hungarian does not have 'pluringulars'.

23. As Balázs Surányi (p.c.) points out, in *a Kovácsék elmentek;* {**Szabóé/a Szabóék*} *pedig otthon maradtak* 'Kovács and his entourage left; Szabó's group stayed at home', *Szabóé* cannot be an anaphoric-possessive noun phrase whose silent head is discourse-anaphoric to GROUP. As Surányi notes, this is true even if the discourse-anaphoric group is the same as the group denoted by the associative plural: one can refer to a family consisting of János, Mari and two children either as *a Jánosék* or as *a Mariék*; but *Marié* (without the *-k*) still cannot be discourse-anaphoric to the silent GROUP in the syntax of associative *a Jánosék*. The fact that the projection of the silent noun GROUP that is an integral part of the syntax of associative plurals cannot serve as a discourse antecedent for a silent anaphoric possessive is probably a consequence of the fact that GROUP is too deeply embedded within the syntactic structure of the associative plural to be able to "assert itself" in the external syntax: the entire complex DP in (17) can serve as a discourse antecedent, but a subpart of the constituent in the specifier of :P cannot, by itself, be the antecedent for an anaphoric element in discourse.

5.   Conclusion

This short paper has sought to explicate the relationships between four Hungarian suffixes: the multiplicative plural marker *-k*, the possessive plural marker *-i*, the anaphoric possession marker *é*, and the associative plural marker *-ék*. One of the main objectives of the paper has been to argue that associative *-ék* is a composite of *-é* and *-k*, while warding off Moravcsik's (2003) three objections to a bimorphemic approach to *-ék* along these lines. *(i)* The fact that associative plurals with *-ék* are strictly [+HUMAN] while anaphoric possessives with *-é* are not follows from the presence in the structure of associative plurals of a silent noun GROUP whose projection specifies the content of a silent personal pronoun. *(ii)* That *-ék* (unlike anaphoric possessive *-é*) has inclusive semantics is thanks to the asyndetic specification relation established between the GROUP phrase and the silent pronoun in the syntax of associative plurals. And *(iii)* the fact that in associative plurals we find the regular multiplicative plural marker *-k* (whereas anaphoric possessive *-é* combines with the possessive *-i* plural) is a function of the fact that in associative plurals $\#_{PL}$ combines with a non-possessed pronoun, not with a possessed nominal.

   A key ingredient of this exercise is an outlook on *-é* that treats it as the silence-licensing spell-out of a RELATOR mediating a predication relation – a predication that can be possessive, as in anaphoric possessive *a lány-é* 'the one belonging to the girl', but does not have to be: in associative plural *a lány-ék* 'the girl and her associates', *-é* licenses a silent [+HUMAN] noun GROUP whose projection serves as a predicate nominal for the projection of *lány* 'girl'. Thus, the morpheme *-é* is not *per se* predestined for use in possessive noun phrases: it is neither the exponent of a possessed noun nor a functional element intrinsically tied up with the syntax of possession. What unites the structures in which *-é* occurs is that they are predicational (hence involve a RELATOR) and that one of the terms of the predication structure is (deeply) silent and in need of formal licensing by *-é*.

   In the process of working out the complex morphosyntax of associative *-ék*, the paper has been an advocate *(a)* for the syntactic autonomy of the Hungarian multiplicative plural marker *-k* (allowing it to be exponed on a host with which it does not form a constituent underlyingly), *(b)* for the importance of a mediating RELATOR in the syntax of predication, *(c)* for the role played in syntax by the silent noun GROUP, *(d)* for the need to formally license deep anaphors and Kaynean silent nouns, and *(e)* for a Koster-style representation of asyndetic specification relations in syntax.

Funding

Acknowledgements

References

Bartos, Huba. 2001. Az inflexiós jelenségek szintaktikai háttere [The syntactic background of inflectional phenomena]. In Ferenc Kiefer (ed.), *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan, Vol. 3, Morfológia*, 653–762. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Bernstein, Judy & Christina Tortora. 2005. Two types of possessive forms in English. *Lingua* 115. 1221–1242.

Besten, Hans den. 1996. Associative DPs. In Crit Cremers & Marcel den Dikken (eds), *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 13. 13–24.

Camacho, José. 2021. *The structure of plural proper names in Spanish and other languages*. Ms., Rutgers University.

Dékány, Éva. 2015. The syntax of anaphoric possessives in Hungarian. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 33. 1121–1168.

Dékány, Éva. 2021. *The Hungarian nominal functional sequence*. Cham: Springer.

Dikken, Marcel den. 1999. On the structural representation of possession and agreement. The case of (anti-)agreement in Hungarian possessed nominal phrases. In István Kenesei (ed.), *Crossing boundaries: Theoretical advances in Central and Eastern European languages*, 137–178. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dikken, Marcel den. 2001. 'Pluringulars', pronouns and quirky agreement. *The Linguistic Review* 18. 19–41.

Dikken, Marcel den. 2006. *Relators and linkers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Dikken, Marcel den. 2015. On the morphosyntax of (in)alienably possessed noun phrases. In Éva Dékány, Katalin É. Kiss & Balázs Surányi (eds), *Approaches to Hungarian* 14, 121–145. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dikken, Marcel den & Éva Dékány. 2022. *On collectives with numerals*. Ms., Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics.

Dikken, Marcel den & Alexandra Ioannidou. 2009. P-drop, D-drop, D-spread. In *Proceedings of the 2007 Workshop in Greek Syntax and Semantics, MITWPL* 57. 393–408.

Huyssteen, Gerard B. van. 2018. The *hulle* and *goed* constructions in Afrikaans. In Geert Booij (ed.), *The construction of words*. Studies in Morphology, vol. 4, 399–437. Cham: Springer.

Kálmán, Béla. 1972. Hungarian historical phonology. In Loránd Benkő & Samu Imre (eds), *The Hungarian language*, 49–83. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Kayne, Richard. 2003. Silent years, silent hours. In Lars-Olof Delsing, Cecilia Falk, Gunlög Josefsson & Halldor Armann Sigurðsson (eds), *Grammar in focus. Festschrift for Christer Platzack*, Vol. 2, 209–226. Lund: Wallin & Dalholm.

Koster, Jan. 2000. *Extraposition as parallel construal*. Ms., University of Groningen.

Mauri, Caterina & Andrea Sansò. 2019. Nouns & co. Converging evidence in the analysis of associative plurals. *STUF – Language Typology and Universals* 72. 603–626.

Moravcsik, Edith. 2003. A semantic analysis of associative plurals. *Studies in Language* 27. 469–503.

Mühlhäusler, Peter. 1981. The development of the category of number in Tok Pisin. In Pieter Muysken (ed.), *Generative studies in creole languages*, 35–84. Dordrecht: Foris.

Panagiotidis, Phoevos. 2003. *One*, empty nouns, and θ-assignment. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34. 281–292.

Rocquet, Amélie. 2013. Splitting objects: A nanosyntactic account of direct object marking. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Ghent.

Simonyi, Zsigmond. 1895. *Tüzetes magyar nyelvtan* [A thorough Hungarian grammar]. Budapest: MTA.

Siptár, Péter & Miklós Törkenczy. 2000. *The phonology of Hungarian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Address for correspondence

Marcel den Dikken
Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics
Benczúr utca 33
H-1068 Budapest
Hungary
marcel.den.dikken@nytud.hu
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2602-2331

Publication history