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Object agreement with personal pronouns

(1) a. Én lát-ok valaki-t.
    I see-1SG.SBJ someone-ACC
    ‘I see someone.’

    b. Én lát-om Ő-t.
    I see-1SG.OBJ s/he-ACC
    ‘I see her/him.’

(2) a. Én lát-lak téged.
    I see-1SG>2 you.SG.ACC
    ‘I see you (sg.).’

    b. Ő lát téged.
    s/he see-3SG.SBJ you.SG.ACC
    ‘S/he sees you (sg.).’

1 → 2: direct
3 → 2: inverse
Main claims

Person features

Person features can grammaticalise referential or semantic properties. In Hungarian, they grammaticalise referentiality.

Syntax

Syntax is sensitive to person features: \( v \) in Hungarian only agrees with direct objects with person features.

Morphology

All personal pronouns trigger agreement in Hungarian, but it is only visible in direct configurations: “downwards” on 1 > 2 > 3
Hungarian object agreement

Differential object agreement in Hungarian

(3) a. Lát-ok  egy nyelvész-t.
    see-1SG.SBJ  a  linguist-ACC
    ‘I see a linguist.’

b. Lát-om   a nyelvész-t.
    see-1SG.OBJ  a  linguist-ACC
    ‘I see the linguist.’

▶ What triggers agreement? Definiteness?

▶ possessive DOs are not always definite, but trigger agreement
▶ melyik ‘which’, mindegyik ‘each’ do — minden ‘every’ does not
▶ personal pronouns: engem ‘I.ACC’, téged ‘you.SG.ACC’?
Coppock (2013) and Bartos (1999)

- Coppock suggests that some lexical items are specified as [DEF] (roughly presuppositional and anaphoric)
  - Works for *melyik* ‘which’, *mindegyik* ‘each’ vs. *minden* ‘every’
  - 1st/2nd person do not agree, because they are indexical

- Bartos argues that syntax plays a crucial role: all and only DPs trigger object agreement
  - 1st/2nd person not DPs?
Object agreement and person: two types of analysis

- **Only third person** triggers agreement
  - Bartos (1999), Coppock and Wechsler (2012), Coppock (2013), Rocquet (2013): -lAk is special, lack of agreement with 1st/2nd is regular

- **Any person** can agree
  - den Dikken (2006), É. Kiss (2013), Bárány (2015): -lAk is regular, lack of agreement with 1st/2nd is special

- I adopt the second approach: all personal pronouns agree
  - There are arguments for this!
1: Several types of personal pronouns agree

- **anaphoric:** Ő-t ‘her/him-ACC’

(4) Lát-om Ő-t.
see-1SG.OBJ s/he-ACC
‘I see her/him.’

- **indexical:** Őn-t ‘you (formal)’, Téged ‘you.SG.ACC’

(5) Lát-om Őn-t.
see-1SG.OBJ you.-ACC
‘I see you (sg.).’ (formal)

- **reflexives:** Magam-at ‘myself’
2: Object-drop vs. ellipsis

- Connection between object-drop and object agreement

(6) a. Lát-ok.
    see-1SG.SBJ
    ‘I see.’

b. Lát-ok valaki-t.
    see-1SG.SBJ someone-ACC
    ‘I see someone.’

c. Lát-om (ő-t).
    see-1SG.OBJ s/he-ACC
    ‘I see her/him.’

d. Lát-lak (téged).
    see-1SG>2 you.SG.ACC
    ‘I see you (sg.).’
2: Object-drop vs. ellipsis (cont’d)

▶ Dropped objects can control a depictive secondary predicate

(7) a. (Én)i lát-ok részegeni.
    I see-1SG.SBJ drunk
    ‘I see drunk.’

   b. (Én)i lát-ok valaki-tj részegeni/j.
      I see-1SG.SBJ someone-ACC drunk
      ‘I see someone drunk.’

    c. (Én)i Lát-om (ő-tj) részegeni/j.
       I see-1SG.OBJ s/he-ACC drunk
       ‘I see her/him drunk.’

   d. (Én)i lát-lak (tégedj) részegeni/j.
      I see-1SG>2 you.sg.ACC drunk
      ‘I see you (sg.) drunk.’
2: Object-drop vs. ellipsis (cont’d)

(8) **Context:** Látsz valakit? ‘Do you see someone?’
    (Én\textsubscript{i}) lát-ok.
    I see
    ‘I do.’ (lit. ‘I see.’)

(9) **Context:** Látsz valakit? ‘Do you see someone?’
    (Én\textsubscript{i}) lát-ok részegen\textsubscript{i/j}.
    I see drunk
    intended: ‘I do (see someone) drunk.’ (lit. ‘I see drunk.’)
    ▶ elided non-referential object cannot control secondary predicate
2: Object-drop vs. ellipsis (cont’d)

(10) a. \((T_e_i) \ lát\text{-}sz \ (\text{engem}_j) \ \text{részegen}_{i/j}.
    \text{You see-2SG.SBJ I.ACC drunk} \ ‘\text{You see (me) drunk.’}

b. \((Ő_i) \ lát \ (\text{engem}_j) \ / \ (\text{téged}_k) \ \text{részegen}_{i/j/k}.
    \text{s/he see.3SG.SBJ I.ACC you.SG.ACC drunk} \ ‘\text{S/he sees me drunk.’}

- Agreement is not visible, but \(lát\text{-}sz\) and \(lát\) behave like agreeing forms
- \(\text{engem, téged}\) pattern like \(ő\text{-}t\) ‘s/he-ACC’
- But: \(\text{Kérsz sör? — Melegen}_i \text{ nem kérek sört}_i.\) (É. Kiss, p.c.)
  - non-referential?
3: Cross-linguistic evidence

Table 1: Object agreement with personal pronouns in Hungarian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBJ → OBJ</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>lát-lak</td>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>lát-om</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>lát-sz</td>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>lát-od</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>lát</td>
<td>SBJ</td>
<td>lát-ja</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3: Cross-linguistic evidence (cont’d)

Table 2: Direct and inverse agreement in Mohawk (Béjar and Rezac 2009, 59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBJ → OBJ</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I see you</td>
<td>direct</td>
<td>I see her/him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>You see me</td>
<td>inverse</td>
<td>You see her/him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S/he sees me</td>
<td>inverse</td>
<td>S/he sees her</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(11) (h)s-\textit{k}-see
2-1-see
‘You see me.’

[Mohawk]

(Béjár and Rezac 2009: 59)
Interim summary

- We know that 3rd/2nd pronouns can agree in Hungarian
- Indexicality/anaphoricity does not derive agreement split
- Only agreeing objects can be dropped and control secondary predicates?
- Cross-linguistic evidence for agreement in inverse contexts
The idea

- Person features (1st, 2nd, 3rd) are complex
- A probe can agree repeatedly, **but only if** it gains features
  - Cyclic Agree (Béjar and Rezac 2009)
- **Object agreement** when \( v \) is valued by two arguments: \( v[1, 2] \)
- **Subject agreement** when \( v \) is valued by a single argument: \( v[1] \)
- Hierarchical effect **without** a hierarchy
  - \( 1 > 2 > 3 \)
Person features

  - complex, representing feature geometries or
  - sets of features:
    - [1] = { SP(eaker), PART(icipant), π }
    - [2] = { PART(icipant), π }
    - [3] = { π }
    - [ ] = {}

- There are four persons, rather than three
Cyclic Agree

▶ v is a probe
  ▶ it enters Agree relations with matching goals
  ▶ only goals with person features are visible

▶ v has unvalued sets of features, DPs have valued sets of features

\[
\begin{align*}
\nu & \equiv [1] \\
\left[u\{\text{SP, PART, } \pi\}\right] & = 1 \\
\left[u\{\text{PART, } \pi\}\right] & = u_2 \\
\left[u\{\pi\}\right] & = u_3
\end{align*}
\]

DO

\[
\begin{align*}
\left\{\text{SP, PART, } \pi\right\} & = [1]
\end{align*}
\]

▶ proper subsets are valued (and deleted) automatically
▶ a first person argument values v fully
Cyclic Agree (cont’d)

- partial valuation

\[
\begin{align*}
\nu & = u_1 \\
\{ \text{PART, } \pi \} & = 2 \\
\{ \pi \} & = u_3
\end{align*}
\]

Valuation of [2]
Deletion of [3]

\[
\{ \text{PART, } \pi \} = [2]
\]

- [u1] not valued, \( \nu \) can continue probing

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ \text{SP, PART, } \pi \} & = [1] \\
\{ \text{PART, } \pi \} & = 2 \\
\{ \pi \} & = u_3
\end{align*}
\]

Valuation of [1]
Cyclic Agree (cont’d)

- Second cycle is only possible if the second argument’s features are a proper superset of the first argument’s features
- \( v \) agrees with the object first
- We get a “hierarchy”
- \([1] \supset [2] \supset [3]\)

Object agreement in Hungarian

Object agreement in Hungarian surfaces when \( v \) is valued by two arguments, the subject and the object.
An example: $1 \rightarrow 3$

(12)

$$T' \quad \text{SBJ} \quad [\phi \ 1, \text{SG}] \quad \text{vP}$$

$$[u\phi \ 1, 3] \quad \text{v+T}$$

A Agree

B Move

C Agree

VP

DO

$$[\phi \ 3, \text{PL}]$$
Interim summary

- $v$ can enter several Agree relations
- only when $\Pi(SBJ) \supset \Pi(DO)$
- $v$ can be valued as $[1, 2], [2, 3], [1, 3]$
- What about $[3, 3]$?
What about 3→3?

- 3→3 patterns with *direct* configurations in Hungarian
- not in other languages: in Mohawk, above, it counts as *inverse*
Fusion

- This is captured by fusion
- When the strongest features of T and v match, the two heads fuse:

(13) Fusion of v and T
Direct derivation: 1→2

- Én látlak téged. ‘I see you.’

(14) 1→2
(15) Fusion of $v$ and $T$

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{bmatrix}
[ u\pi \ 1, 2 ]
\end{bmatrix}
\end{array}
\rightarrow
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{bmatrix}
[u\phi \ u\pi \ 1]
\end{bmatrix}
\end{array}
\rightarrow
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{bmatrix}
[u\phi \ u\# \ SG]
\end{bmatrix}
\end{array}
\rightarrow
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{bmatrix}
[u\pi \ 1, 2]
\end{bmatrix}
\end{array}
\]

\text{Fusion}
Inverse derivation: 3→2

- Ő lát tégéed. ‘S/he sees you.’

(16) 3→2
Inverse derivation and fusion: 3→3

▶ Ὠ látja őt. ‘S/he sees her/him.’

(17) 3→3

[ uπ 3 ]  [ uϕ 3, SG ]  [ φ 3, SG ]
[ CASE NOM ]  [ uCASE NOM ]

A Agree
B Move
C *Agree
D Agree

T'

T

v

T

SBJ

v'
(18) Fusion of $\nu$ and $T$

$\begin{bmatrix}
    u\pi & 3 \\
    u\phi & u\pi & 3
\end{bmatrix}$

$\begin{bmatrix}
    u\pi & 3, 3 \\
    u\# & SG
\end{bmatrix}$
Interim summary

- Two types of syntactic derivation:
  - **direct**: $\Pi(SBJ) \supset \Pi(DO)$
  - **inverse**: $\Pi(DO) \supset \Pi(SBJ)$

- Fusion allows “cheating”: 3→3 is an *inverse* derivation, but the outcome is *direct*

- Language-specific rule for a language-specific outcome
The idea

- DM: syntax manipulates bundles/sets of features (Halle and Marantz 1993 et seq.)
  - spell-out matches *vocabulary items* (VIs) to feature bundles
- Features can be manipulated before spell-out: *fusion*
- **Object agreement** when $v+T$ has two sets of features: $v+T[\alpha, \beta]$
- **Subject agreement** otherwise
- The Hungarian verb spells out a single *φ-agreement suffix*
  - *only* those with a full set of φ-features
  - if $T$ and $v$ do not fuse, only $T$ has a full set
Vocabulary items

- *-lAk* $\leftrightarrow$ [1, 2, SG]
- *-ja/-i/-e* $\leftrightarrow$ [3, 3, SG]
- *-jUk* $\leftrightarrow$ [1, 3, PL]
- *-játok/-itek* $\leftrightarrow$ [2, 3, PL]
- *-ják/-ik* $\leftrightarrow$ [3, 3, PL]

What about *-Om* (1SG.OBJ), *-Od* (2SG.OBJ)?

- wide distribution (Szabolcsi 1994)
- *ház-am* ‘my house’, *lát-t-am* ‘I saw-PST-1SG’
- *ház-ad* ‘your.SG house’
Vocabulary items (cont’d)

- Trommer (2005): -Om/-Od are **not object agreement** suffixes
  - -Om ↔ [1, sg]
  - -Od ↔ [2, sg]

- -Ok (1SG.SBJ) / -Ol/-sz (2SG.SBJ) are more specific (narrower distribution!)
  - -Ok ↔ [1, sg, +v]
  - -Ol/-sz ↔ [2, sg, +v]

- these VIs are restricted to +v contexts: no possessive suffixes
- Impoverishment derives syncretism for past tense
  - +v → Ø / [1SG, +PST]
What does this buy us?

▶ Szabolcsi (1994): curious overlap between possessive and verbal morphology
   ▶ *objective* forms in the singular, *subjective* forms in the plural
   ▶ *lát-om* ‘I see (her/him/it)’ — *ház-am* ‘my house’
   ▶ *lát-unk* ‘we see’ — *ház-unk* ‘our house’

Overlap between possessive and verbal morphology
Overlap when the least specific VI has a **single set of person features**:

\[(19) \quad /-VI/ \leftrightarrow [\alpha, \text{SG/PL}]\]
Person, syntax, and morphology

- **Person** grammaticalises referentiality in Hungarian, but
  - other properties in other languages: inverse phenomena based on animacy, topicality, etc.
  - sets of features derive hierarchical effects without hierarchies
  - referential arguments trigger agreement in Hungarian

- **Syntax** provides two types of derivations
  - direct: $v$ is valued more than once
  - inverse: $v$ is valued once

- **Morphology** gives rise to surface variation
  - how many suffixes are spelled out?
  - language-specific operations: $3 \rightarrow 3$ direct in Hungarian, inverse in other languages
That’s it — Thank you!
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